

"excited by the prospect of high pay and expecting rather to conduct a profitable piece of business than to carry on a war," are in an altogether different position. They are bound to be regarded as opportunists of the worst sort, come to Sicily for private gain on the coattails of the powerful Athenians. Compare what the Mytilenaeans say to the Spartans when they "desert" their privileged position in the Athenian empire and ask the Spartans to accept and assist them in their revolt (3. 9, in Crawley's translation):

Those who revolt in war and forsake their former confederacy are favourably regarded by those who receive them, in so far as they are of use to them, but otherwise are thought less well of, through being considered traitors to their former friends. Nor is this an unfair way of judging, where the rebels and the power from whom they secede are at one in policy and sympathy, and a match for each other in resources and power, and where no reasonable ground [*πρόφασις ἐπιεικής*] exists for the rebellion.

The position of Mytilene qua city is analogous to that of the volunteer sailor qua individual. Since they had been (relatively) free members of the Athenian empire, the Mytilenaeans know that their revolt is likely to be regarded with suspicion by those who receive them (*οἱ δεξάμενοι*). They therefore need a "suitable explanation" (*πρόφασις ἐπιεικής*) of their conduct. This is exactly the case with the foreign sailor who had served as a volunteer in the Athenian army. In giving himself up to a city in Sicily hostile to Athens he too would require a *prophasis*. His excuse is desertion: "I renounce the Athenian cause and espouse yours—use me as you see fit." Note that *αὐτομολία*, *αὐτόμολος*, and *αὐτομολῶ* generally carry the active connotation of "going over to the enemy," while *λιποστρατία*, *λιποταξία*, and their verbs have only the more passive meaning of "deserting."⁸

For those volunteers who have deserted and need a place of refuge, there is an alternative solution. Rather than seeking refuge with the enemy they escape "however they can (Sicily is a large place)." In other words, they simply lose themselves in the great expanse of Sicily—no excuses, no explanations or personal confrontations of any kind, simply anonymity. The point of the parenthesis now becomes clear: even for the deserter who chooses to avoid the numerous cities in Sicily now allied to Syracuse, the vast size and population of Sicily provide plenty of places in which to hide.

HUNTER R. RAWLINGS III
University of Colorado

fought among themselves, and there was no order in anything that was done." Who deserted? Clearly those ships in which a substantial majority of crewmen were members of, or at least sympathizers with, the aristocratic faction. They would have had no difficulty convincing the Peloponnesians that they served against their will (*ἀναγκαστοί*).

8. Cf. especially J. E. Powell, *A Lexicon to Herodotus*, and E.-A. Bétant, *Lexicon Thucydideum*, s.vv., and the passages cited in each; and *Suda*, s.vv. *αὐτομόλως*, *αὐτομολῆσαι*. See also Classen-Steup's commentary, 74:237.

THE RITUAL IN SLAB V-EAST ON THE PARTHENON FRIEZE

No ancient author refers directly to the Parthenon frieze. Pausanias, in his description of the external statues of the Parthenon, mentions only the pediments on the western and eastern ends. Early travelers, like Cyriacus of Ancona in 1447 and Francis Vernon in 1676, conceived differing opinions on the frieze. Cyriacus thought it represented the Athenian populace in a victory parade from the time

of Perikles, but Vernon suggested it showed a procession on its way to a sacrifice.¹ James Stuart and Nicholas Revett, *Antiquities of Athens*, volume 2 (London 1789), first published the interpretation that the frieze depicted specifically the Panathenaic procession. Ever since, this identification has been almost universally accepted by students of Greek art and religion.²

More than any other aspect of the frieze, a scene near the middle of slab V has inspired controversy, primarily in the nineteenth century.³ Here, to the right of three other standing figures, are shown a tall, bearded figure (34), usually identified as a temple priest, and a shorter figure (35), probably a cult attendant. The two are handling a rectangular, limp piece of cloth that has been folded several times. Occupying a position above the main door on the eastern end, this scene would seem to have been of some importance. For this reason, most modern writers have maintained that slab V depicts the climax of the Panathenaia, i.e., the delivery of the new *peplos*. Scholars who have held this view include: A. Michaelis, *Der Parthenon*, page 255; A. Mommsen, *Feste der Stadt Athen* (Leipzig, 1898), page 114; E. Cahen, s.v. "Panathenaia," *Dar.-Sag.*, 4¹ (1911): 306; M. Collignon, *Le Parthénon* (Paris, 1914), page 188; L. Deubner, *Attische Feste* (Berlin, 1932), page 30; and L. Ziehen, s.v. "Panathenaia," *RE* 36.2 (1949): 1925.

Despite this preponderant acceptance of the new-*peplos* identification, its weaknesses have been exposed by its opponents. C. Waldstein, for example, has objected that the unity of the theme of the frieze is ruined by a scene that shows the final presentation of the new *peplos*.⁴ In his opinion, it would have been inept for the artist to show people hurrying to see a dedication when that dedication is already taking place on the eastern end.

Another difficulty is that the gods on either side, in slabs IV, V, VI, are made, almost without exception, to look away from the alleged presentation of the new *peplos*, and to watch instead the approaching procession. The few gods who do not look away were probably shown in that pose in order to avoid the monotony of a row of faces all looking in the same direction. Even the figure generally identified as Athena (36) has her back to the proceedings.⁵ Advocates of the new-*peplos* theory have approached this problem by arguing that the attitude of the gods was the artist's way of indicating their invisibility (cf. E. Petersen, *Kunst des Pheidias* [Berlin, 1873], p. 301). But this argument is faulty, since not only do the gods look away but so also do the two groups of male figures that stand on either

The substance of this paper was delivered at a colloquy at Harvard University on April 5, 1975. I wish to thank Professor Sterling Dow for his many valuable suggestions, including [ἐπιστ]ῆτης in fragment a of IG, 2¹. 1060 + 1036.

1. For these and other accounts, see A. Michaelis, *Der Parthenon* (Leipzig, 1870-71), pp. 341 ff.

2. But see C. Kardara, *ArchEph* 1960 (1963), pp. 185 ff.

3. Following the scheme first used by Michaelis, *Der Parthenon*, and now also by M. Robertson and A. Frantz in their excellent new publication, *The Parthenon Frieze* (London, 1975), slabs of the frieze are assigned Roman numerals, while figures on the slabs are assigned Arabic numerals.

4. Waldstein, *Essays on the Art of Pheidias* (Cambridge, 1885), p. 246. Pls. 9, 11, and 12 show fragments of a terra-cotta plaque that duplicates some of the figures from the eastern end of the frieze. Waldstein's thesis was that the artists of the frieze had worked from this terra-cotta model. The fragment illustrated in pl. 11 (the fragment itself is now in the Royal Museum of Copenhagen) shows more clearly certain features of the object handled by the bearded man and the shorter figure (only the latter's face is seen on the fragment), such as the indentation of the cloth between the thumb and the forefinger of the shorter figure.

5. Cf. J. E. Harrison, "Some Points in Dr. Furtwaengler's Theories on the Parthenon and Its Marbles," *CR* 9 (1895): 91: "No artist in his senses would have so arranged the slabs that Athene should actually turn her back on the gift offered her."

side of the seated gods (20–23, 42–47). These men (I think they may be magistrates, perhaps Athlothetai) seem unattentive to the activities in the middle, since they are shown talking with one another in completely relaxed poses.

Even within the group of five figures in slab V, the figure usually identified as the priestess of Athena (33) has her back turned to the supposed presentation of the new *peplos*. Moreover, this priestess (who has two small figures to her right, while the bearded man has only one) is the principal figure in the group, and it is she, one would think, who should be involved with the new *peplos*.

Still another problem is the gestures of the bearded man (34) and his attendant (35). The bearded man does not have both of his hands outstretched, the gesture a sculptor usually employs to indicate the reception of an object. As for the attendant, his left hand leaves a noticeable impression on the cloth, part of which is tucked beneath his left elbow. Both these gestures signify that the attendant has a firm grip and is not about to let go. Also, in real life, a person giving a limp object like this cloth would not hold it in the middle, as the attendant in the frieze is holding it, but instead by the edges. Indeed, it seems almost certain that the attendant is receiving the garment and not the bearded figure. Why would an attendant be depicted receiving the new Panathenaic *peplos*?

Finally, the folded condition of the cloth is itself notable. If the scene is meant to depict the presentation of the new *peplos*, what reason would there be for showing the robe folded? We are told by our sources (as in Michaelis, *Der Parthenon*, p. 260) that many interesting and elaborate designs (usually events from the Gigantomakhia) were woven into or embroidered on the woolen *peplos*. Why would the artist of the frieze conceal these designs?

There is an obvious and attractive alternative to the new-*peplos* identification. According to M. Robertson (*The Parthenon Frieze*, p. 11), the frieze constantly evokes a feeling of “stillness and unreadiness,” and it may well be that the “. . . whole is . . . primarily intended to suggest a moment before the procession actually sets off.” Thus Robertson’s theory is that the object on the frieze represents not the new *peplos* but the old *peplos*, which is being given to the attendant for storage as part of the preparations for the arrival of the new *peplos*.⁶

This alternative is acceptable for several reasons. Most important, a scene showing the removal of the old *peplos* suggests the delivery of the new one, and thus the central slab of the frieze would still be thematically associated with the climax of the Panathenaic procession. In addition, this theory answers Waldstein’s objection that the unity of the frieze suffers if slab V shows the final presentation of the new *peplos*: the central slab would instead be showing preparations for a presentation which all of Athens is likewise preparing to see. Also, the attitude of the gods would no longer be awkward. All the figures that look away can do so, because the new *peplos* has not yet arrived. Finally, the old-*peplos* theory would also account for the folded condition of the robe.

6. There is evidence, not mentioned by Robertson or any other scholar, of a place for the storage of old *peploi*. *IG*, 2². 1462 is a fragment from a *med. s. IV a.* inventory of Athena’s treasurers. The stone is badly damaged, but all editors have read and restored *πεπλοθήκη* as the only word preserved in line 12. The context is of little help—the preceding and following lines merely list items that were probably kept in the Khalkotheke (cf. U. Koehler in the commentary on *IG*, 2. 715). Still, it should be noted that, in Attic inscriptions, *πέπλος* always means the Panathenaic *peplos*. Thus the *Peplothke* of this fragment must refer to a repository for old *peploi*. By analogy, one may observe that at Eleusis a *ἱματιοθήκη* was a room or a whole building, since Pentelic stone is said (in *IG*, 2². 1672. 309, 330/328 B.C.) to have been donated for its construction.

And yet, a major fault weakens the old-*peplos* theory or, for that matter, the new-*peplos* theory. The historical *peplos* was a very substantial piece of cloth. The *xoanon*, which it clothed, was a good-sized log. The East Room of the Erekhtheion, about five meters high, was surely built with the height of the statue in mind.⁷ More crucial is the testimony that the *peplos* was used as the sail on the Panathenaic ship, which was borne along the Panathenaic Way in the great procession.⁸ According to the late fifth-century writer Strattis (quoted in Harpokration, s.v. *τοπέλον*), "countless men" were needed to hoist the large *peplos*-sail onto the mast of the ship.⁹ In Hellenistic times, as many as 120 girls would take part in the weaving of the *peplos* (cf. *IG*, II². 1034 and 1036, *fin. s. II a.*). Probably the robe was pieced together from the many sections woven by individual girls.¹⁰ In contrast to this historical *peplos*, the object on the frieze appears small, so small that the short attendant is able to hold it. Indeed, one recalls the suggestion of A. Flasch and others that the object was merely the cape of the bearded figure, a conclusion which must have been at least partially based on the small size of the vestment.¹¹

Another identification may be suggested. We know from Pausanias that, in certain instances, the cult statues of the shrines he visited wore a full complement of clothes. At Elis (6. 25. 6), for example, the so-called Satrap statue had three coverings—one made of wool, another of linen, and a third of *byssos*. Similarly, at Titane (2. 11. 6), the archaic statue of Asklepios was almost completely covered (only the face, hands, and feet were visible) by an outfit consisting of a white woolen *khiton* and a *himation*. As for the *xoanon* of the Athenian Akropolis, the *peplos* has usually been thought of as its only dress. The following evidence, however, needs to be considered.

IG, I². 80, circa 470–450 B.C., has been recently published by D. M. Lewis, "Notes on Attic Inscriptions," *ABSA* 49 (1954): 17–21 (= *SEG*, 14. 3); and by F. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques* (Paris, 1969), no. 15. Apparently, this fifth-century document details the *patria* of the Athenian Praxiergidai, which included the dressing of the *xoanon* (cf. Hesychius s.v.). Lewis' text for lines 10–12 follows:

- 10 [τά]δε ἡο' Ἀπόλλων ἐχρεσεν γ[όμῃ]μα Πραχσιεργίδαις]
 11 [ἀμ]φιεννύουσιν τὸν πέπλον τ[ὸν] Θεὸν καὶ προσθύουσιν]
 12 [Μοί]ραῖς, Διὶ Μοῖρ(α)γέται, Γ[έ]ν-----]

In the view of J. Prott–L. Ziehen, *Leges Sacrae* (Leipzig, 1896), page 61, "... ex ipsorum v. 11–12 reliquiis id apparet de sacrificiis cum pepli induendi caerimonia coniunctis sermonem esse." A similar subject matter is taken up in lines 24–25, where Lewis has:

- 24 [ν τὸς] Πραχσιερ[γίδας τὸ]ν ἥδος] ἀμφιεννύ[ν]-
 25 [αἱ] μ[ε] δ[ί]μνον χι[τ]ῶνα ἐ μνᾶν ἀπο[τί]νει vacat

7. J. M. Paton, *Erechtheum* (Cambridge, Mass., 1927), pp. 298, 456, pl. 10.

8. For the references, see Michaelis, *Der Parthenon*, p. 329.

9. Testimony that the ship was large includes Pausanias (1. 24. 1), who saw the ship (but not the *peplos*) and was impressed by its size. Philostratos (*VS* 2. 1. 5) claimed the ship had one thousand oars.

10. At Amyklai, in a practice which parallels most closely the one at Athens, a statue of Apollo, thirty πῆχες tall, was dressed in a robe that was woven yearly by the local women (Paus. 3. 16. 2, 3. 19. 2).

11. A. Flasch, *Zum Parthenonfries* (Würzburg, 1877), p. 99.

A different restoration of line 25, one better suited for the context and the spacing, has been offered by A. M. Woodward, "Notes on Some Attic Decrees," *ABSA* 50 (1955): 271:

25 [αι] δέμονον χί[τονα] κτλ.

If correct, this restoration supplies evidence that the *hedos* or *xoanon* was dressed in a *khiton* as well as in the *peplos*. Woodward remarks (p. 271): "That 22 drachmai was an exceptionally high price for a chiton may be taken for granted, but no doubt the goddess had to be provided with one no less worthy of her than the *peplos* to be worn over it."

Important evidence regarding the wardrobe of the *xoanon* comes also from the second century B.C. In a forthcoming article, I will show that *IG*, 2². 1060 and *IG*, 2². 1036, previously published as two inscriptions, are actually fragments from the same stele. The inscription consisted of at least two decrees. Decree II deals with the Ergastinai, girls who wove the Panathenaic *peplos*. Decree I is relevant here: seven lines, as preserved in *IG*, 2². 1060 (= frag. a), and three lines, as preserved in *IG* 2². 1036 (= frag. b), are printed in table 1.

It is difficult to establish precisely what is being dealt with in this decree. In all of the lines, most of the letters are lost, and the size of the gap between fragment a and fragment b cannot be determined with precision. Still, we see, in the restorations and readings, the titles of officials connected with the *peplos*: the Athlotheta[i], whose Panathenaic duties included overseeing the making of the *peplos* (*Ath. Pol.* 60. 1); and the [Praxiergi]dai, whose function was to dress the *xoanon* (cf. p. 139). Also, it is significant that, in addition to the *peplos*, two other garments are mentioned: a λευκήν ἐσθήτα (line 5), and a ἱμάτιον (line 10). Now ἐσθῆς means nothing more specific than "clothing" or "raiment" (LSJ, s.v.). As for the ἱμάτιον which is to be "brought out," Deubner (*Attische Feste*, p. 31) thought it was just another word for the *peplos*. But it must be remembered (cf. note 6) that in all other Attic inscriptions, the word πέπλος is used exclusively to designate the Panathenaic *peplos*. Instead, it may be that this *himation* was yet another garment in

TABLE 1

DECREE I

IG, 2². 1060 + 1036

108/107 B.C.

NON-ΣΤΟΙΧ. ca. 65-70

Uncertain number of lines missing.

Fragment a

1	[-----]ων καλ[-----]
2	[----- ἐπιστ]άτης καὶ οἱ ἀθλοθέτα[ι-----]
3	[----- παρθένους] καλῶς προσημαμέναις τὸν π[έπλον-----]
4	[----- τῆς βουλῆς καὶ] τοῦ δήμου θαλλοῦ στεφά[νωι-----]
5	[----- π[έ]πλου λευκήν ἐσθήτα[-----]
6	[----- ἀθλ]οθέτης εἰς τὴν πομπ[ήν-----]
7	[-----]ο[·]·καθ[άπερ?-----]

Uncertain number of lines missing.

Fragment b

1	[--]εχ[---]ε[---]ταῦτα[-----Πραξιεργι[-----]
2	δαὶ παραλάβωσιν τὸν ἐφέτειον πέπ[λον-----]
3	ἱμάτιον ἐξάγωσιν παραδιδότωσαν[-----]

the statue's wardrobe: perhaps it was a small cape that was placed over the *peplos*.

In sum, one may argue that, in addition to the *peplos*, perhaps as many as three other items of clothing were part of the *xoanon*'s outfit. Moreover, a *khiton* or an *esthes* or a *himation* may have been significantly thinner and lighter and smaller than the *peplos*. When folded, any one of these lesser items might well resemble the object depicted on the frieze. Thus it is worth suggesting that the vestment in the frieze is in fact one of these other garments of the *xoanon*. If correct, the other-vestment theory has all the advantages of the old-*peplos* theory. The new *peplos* is still suggested; the gods et al. can look away; the bearded man can be shown giving the object to the attendant; and the folded condition of the garment is no longer troublesome. But unlike the old-*peplos* theory, this new theory accounts for the size of the object in slab V.

BLAISE NAGY

College of the Holy Cross

TWO UNNOTICED PARALLELS TO PROPERTIUS 2. 12

Among the parallels to Propertius 2. 12 are two passages cited at Athenaeus 13. 562.¹ The first, from Eubulus (Kock, *CAF*, 2, frag. 41), is usually cited in the commentaries; the second, from the *Apocryptomenus* of Alexis (*CAF*, 2, frag. 20), has been noted by Richard Reitzenstein.² I should like to adduce two previously unnoticed further parallels from the comic fragments. One is quoted by Athenaeus in the same section and comes from the *Phaedrus* of Alexis (*CAF*, 2, frag. 245):

πορευομένῳ δ' ἐκ Πειραιῶς ὑπὸ τῶν κακῶν
καὶ τῆς ἀπορίας φιλοσοφεῖν ἐπῆλθέ μοι.
καὶ μοι δοκοῦσιν ἀγνοεῖν οἱ ζωγράφοι
τὸν Ἑρωτα, συντομώτατον δ' εἰπεῖν, ὅσοι
τοῦ δαίμονος τούτου ποιῶσιν εἰκόνας.
ἔστιν γὰρ οὔτε θῆλυς οὔτε ἄρσεν, πάλιν
οὔτε θεὸς οὔτ' ἄνθρωπος, οὔτ' ἀβέλτερος
οὔτ' αὖθις ἔμφρων, ἀλλὰ συνεννεγμένους
πανταχόθεν, ἐνὶ τύπῳ τε πόλλ' εἶδη φέρων.
ἡ τόλμα μὲν γὰρ ἀνδρός, ἡ δὲ δειλία
γυναικός, ἡ δ' ἄνοια μανίας, ὁ δὲ λόγος
φρονοῦντος, ἡ σφοδρότης δὲ θηρός, ὁ δὲ πόνος
ἀδάμαντος, ἡ φιλοτιμία δὲ δαίμονος.
καὶ ταῦτ' ἐγώ, μὰ τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν καὶ θεούς,
οὐκ οἶδ' ὅ τι ἐστίν, ἀλλ' ὅμως ἔχει γέ τι
τοιούτου, ἐγγύς τ' εἰμί. τούνοματος.

The other is from Lucian (*Amores* 32), attributed by Kock to an unknown comedian (*CAF*, 3, Adespota, frag. 1214):

οὐχ ὁποῖον ζωγράφων
παῖζουσι χεῖρες, ἀλλ' ὅν ἡ πρωτοσπόρος
ἀρχὴ τέλειον εἶδος—

1. P. J. Enk (ed.), *Sexti Propertii Elegiarum liber secundus* (Leyden, 1962), pp. 169 ff., compiles and analyzes the ancient parallels.

2. *Hellenistische Wundererzählungen* (Leipzig, 1906), pp. 166–69.