

ΠΑΝΗΓΥΡΙΚΗ ΣΥΝΕΔΡΙΑ ΤΗΣ 30ΗΣ ΔΕΚΕΜΒΡΙΟΥ 1980

ΠΡΟΕΔΡΙΑ ΓΕΩΡΓΙΟΥ Ε. ΜΥΛΩΝΑ

ΙΣΤΟΡΙΑ ΚΑΙ ΑΡΧΑΙΟΛΟΓΙΑ

ΟΜΙΛΙΑ ΤΟΥ ΠΡΟΕΔΡΟΥ ΓΕΩΡΓΙΟΥ Ε. ΜΥΛΩΝΑ

Τὸ ὑπ' ἀριθμὸν 83 ἄρθρον τοῦ ὀργανισμοῦ τῆς Ἀκαδημίας Ἀθη-
νῶν ὀρίζει ὅπως ὁ Πρόεδρος τῆς Ἀκαδημίας, εἰς τὸ τέλος τοῦ χρόνου
τῆς Προεδρίας του, «ἐκφωνεῖ λόγον ἀναφερόμενον εἰς θέμα τῆς εἰδι-
κότητός του καὶ μὲ τρόπον εὐληπτον εἰς ὄλους». Θὰ προσπαθῆσω νὰ
εἶμαι εὐληπτος, ἀλλὰ καὶ σύντομος, διὰ νὰ δοθῇ ἐπαρκῆς χρόνος
εἰς τὸν κ. Γενικὸν Γραμματέα τῆς Ἀκαδημίας νὰ ἀναγνώσῃ τὴν ἔκθε-
σίν του καὶ μετ' αὐτὴν νὰ ἀναγγείλῃ τὰ βραβεῖα καὶ τοὺς βραβευθέν-
τας τοῦ ἔτους 1980.

Παρακαλῶ νὰ μοῦ ἐπιτραπῇ νὰ λάβω τὸν λόγον.

Κύριε Πρόεδρε τῆς Κυβερνήσεως,

Μακαριώτατε, Κύριοι Ὑπουργοί, Κυρίες καὶ Κύριοι,

Ὁ τίτλος καὶ μόνος τῆς ἀποφινῆς ὁμιλίας «Ἱστορία καὶ Ἀρχαιολο-
γία» φέρει εἰς τὸν νοῦν τοὺς δύο μεγάλους ἱστορικοὺς τῆς Ἀρχαιό-
τητος, τὸν Ἡρόδοτον καὶ τὸν Θουκυδίδην. Ὁ Ἡρόδοτος, τὸν ὁποῖον
πρῶτος ὁ Κικέρων ὠνόμασε «πατέρα τῆς Ἱστορίας», προσεπάθησεν,
ὡς γνωστόν, νὰ περιγράψῃ τοὺς Μηδικοὺς πολέμους. Τὴν προσπάθειάν

του αὐτὴν ἀπεκάλεσεν «ἱστορίας ἀπόδειξιν», δηλαδή ἐκθεσιν τῶν ὄσων ὁ ἴδιος εἶδεν, ἤκουσε καὶ ἔμαθεν ἀπὸ ἄλλους. Τὰς πληροφορίας πὸν συνέλεξε δὲν προσεπάθησε νὰ ἐξακριβώσῃ καὶ νὰ ἐπαληθεύσῃ, ἐνίοτε δὲ εἰς τὴν διήγησίν του περιέλαβε ποικίλους μύθους διὰ νὰ διασκεδάσῃ τοὺς ἀκροατὰς ἢ τοὺς ἀναγνώστας. Διὰ τοῦτο σήμερον δὲν θεωρεῖται ὑπὸ πάντων ὡς ἀντιπροσωπευτικὸς τῆς ἐπιστημονικῆς ἐρεῦνης.

Ὁ Θουκυδίδης, ἐν ἀντιθέσει, περιώρισε τὴν ἱστορίαν του εἰς γεγονότα, τὰ ὁποῖα ἦτο δυνατόν νὰ ἐξακριβώσῃ καὶ νὰ ἐπαληθεύσῃ καὶ τὰ ὁποῖα κατὰ τὰς λεπτομερείας ὑπέβαλεν εἰς ἐπιλογὴν, ἀντικειμενικὴν κρίσιν καὶ ἐρμηνείαν. Διὰ τοῦτο δικαίως θεωρεῖται ὡς ἰδρυτὴς τῆς Ἱστορίας ὡς ἐπιστήμης. Καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Θουκυδίδης ὅμως καταφεύγει εἰς τὴν παράδοσιν διὰ νὰ ἐνισχύσῃ κρίσεις καὶ συμπεράσματα προαχθέντα ἀπὸ τὴν ἐπιστημονικὴν του ἔρευναν. Οὕτω, τὸ προοίμιόν του ἀκολουθεῖ μακρὰ σχετικῶς ἀναφορὰ εἰς συμβάντα διασωθέντα εἰς τὴν παράδοσιν. Ὁ Θουκυδίδης ἀνεγνώρισεν ὅτι ἡ ζωὴ καὶ τὰ ἐπιτεύγματα ἑνὸς λαοῦ δὲν περιορίζονται εἰς τὰ ὅσα διεφύλαξαν γραπτὰ πηγαί· ὅτι διασώζονται ἀμυδραὶ ἴσως ἀναμνήσεις εἰς τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν λαῶν, πολῦτιμοὶ διὰ τὴν σκιαγράφησιν τῆς προόδου των διὰ τῶν αἰώνων. Σπουδαιόταται γενεαλογικαὶ ἀναμνήσεις διατηροῦνται εἰς τὴν συνείδησιν καὶ μνήμην ἀρχαιοτάτων ἀκόμη καὶ πρωτογόνων λαῶν. Ὅχι μόνον γενεαλογικὰς ἀναμνήσεις, ἀλλὰ καὶ γενεαλογικοὺς καταλόγους ἀνευρίσκομεν εἰς τὴν παράδοσιν τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ λαοῦ πὸν μετεδίδοντο προφορικῶς ἀπὸ γενεᾶς εἰς γενεάν, ἀπὸ εἰδικὸς ἄρχοντας, τοὺς ἱερομνήμονας. Εἶναι γνωστοὶ οἱ κατάλογοι τῶν ἱερείων τοῦ Ἡραίου τοῦ Ἄργους, ὁ γενεαλογικὸς κατάλογος τῶν Βασιλέων καὶ τῶν Ἐφόρων τῆς Σπάρτης, τῶν μυθικῶν Βασιλέων τῶν Ἀθηνῶν καὶ ἄλλοι. Ἡ ἀναγραφὴ τῶν ὀνομάτων τῶν νικητῶν εἰς τοὺς Ὀλυμπιακοὺς ἀγῶνας ἀποτελεῖ συνέχειαν τῆς συνηθείας τῆς διατηρήσεως γενεαλογικῶν δεδομένων ὑπὸ πόλεων καὶ ἱερῶν. Εἰς τοὺς γενεαλογικοὺς καταλόγους προσετίθεντο, μὲ τὴν πάροδον τοῦ χρόνου, ἀναφοραὶ διαφό-

ρων σπουδαίων γεγονότων και οὕτω οἱ κατάλογοι μετετρέποντο εἰς Ἱστορικὰ Χρονικά.

Τὰ ἱστορικὰ χρονικά, ἀκόμη και τὰς ἀμυδρὰς ἀπηγήσεις τῶν παραδόσεων, ἡ Ἑλληνικὴ φαντασία μετουσίωσεν εἰς μύθους γλαφυρούς, τοὺς ὁποίους γνωστοὶ καὶ ἄγνωστοι μυθογράφοι διὰ τῶν αἰώνων συνέδεσαν εἰς σύστημα διηγήσεων, σχηματίσαντες τὴν θαυμαστὴν Ἑλληνικὴν μυθολογίαν. Οἱ μῦθοι αὐτοὶ σκιαγραφοῦν τὴν ζωὴν καὶ τὰ ἐπιτεύγματα παναρχαίων προγόνων, πὺ δὲν εἶναι δυνατὸν νὰ περιληφθοῦν εἰς τὸ ἱστορικὸν πλαίσιον τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ Ἔθνους. Ἀλλὰ κατὰ θαυμαστὸν τρόπον ἡ ζωὴ καὶ τὰ ἐπιτεύγματα τῶν Ἑλλήνων προπατόρων προχωροῦν και πέραν τῶν ὁρίων τῶν μυθογράφων και τῶν μυθοπλαστῶν. Τὴν ζωὴν και τὰ ἐπιτεύγματά των μᾶς ἀποκαλύπτουν μόνον τὰ κατάλοιπα τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐκεῖνων, κατάλοιπα πὺ διατηροῦνται κάτω ἀπὸ τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς γῆς μας και πὺ φέρονται εἰς φῶς ἀπὸ τὴν ἀρχαιολογικὴν σκαπάνην. Ἡ ἀνασκαφὴ καταλοιπῶν και τῶν ἱστορικῶν ἀκόμη χρόνων, πολλάκις προσθέτει λεπτομερείας, φωτίζει προβλήματα και συμβάλλει εἰς τὴν πληρότητα τῶν περιγραφῶν και τῶν συμπερασμάτων τῆς Ἱστορίας. Ἱστορία και Ἀρχαιολογία, ἀδελφαὶ ἐπιστῆμαι, ἀλληλοσυμπληροῦνται και ἐπιδιώκουν κοινὸν στόχον, τὴν ὅσον τὸ δυνατὸν πληρεστέραν και ἐξηκριβωμένην γνῶσιν τῆς ζωῆς και τῶν ἐπιτευγμάτων ἐνὸς λαοῦ. Πρέπει ἴσως νὰ τοιςσῆ ὅτι ἡ Προϊστορικὴ Ἀρχαιολογικὴ ἔρευνα εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα προσέθεσε χιλιετίας ὄλας εἰς τὴν ἐξηκριβωμένην γνῶσιν τῆς ζωῆς τῶν προγόνων μας. Αἱ ἀνασκαφαὶ τῶν μεγάλων διδασκάλων τῆς προϊστορικῆς ἐρένης, τοῦ Schliemann, τοῦ Τσοῦντα, τοῦ Evans, τοῦ Μαρινάτου, ἔφερον εἰς φῶς ὄχι μόνον τὰ πρῶτα χρόνια τοῦ νεολιθικοῦ ἀνθρώπου τῆς Ἑλλάδος, ἀλλὰ και τὸν πρῶτον χρυσοῦν αἰῶνα τῆς ζωῆς της. Χρυσοῦν αἰῶνα, πὺ ἤγκμασεν ἑκατονταετίας ὄλας πέραν τοῦ χρονικοῦ ὁρίου τὸ ὁποῖον ἐσκιαγράφησεν ἡ φαντασία τῶν μυθογράφων και ἡ παράδοσις τῶν φύλων.

Ἡ ἀρχαιολογικὴ ἔρευνα ὅταν γίνεται ὡς ὁρίζει ἡ ἐπιστῆμη εἶναι πολῦτιμος βοηθὸς και συμπαραστάτης τῆς Ἱστορίας. Ἀλλὰ και ἡ

Ἱστορία συμβάλλει ποικιλοτρόπως εἰς τὸ ἔργον τοῦ ἀρχαιολόγου. Ἡ γνῶσις τῶν ἱστορικῶν πληροφοριῶν, π. χ. διὰ τὴν Ὀλυμπον, ἐβοήθησε τοὺς ἀρχαιολόγους νὰ ἀνεύρουν τὴν θέσιν τῆς σπουδαίας ἐκείνης Μακεδονικῆς πόλεως, ὠδήγησε τὴν σκαπάνην νὰ ἀποκαλύψῃ τὴν μεγάλην ἐκείνην ἑλληνικὴν πόλιν τοῦ 4^{ου} π. Χ. αἰῶνος καὶ νὰ ὁρίσῃ τὸν βαθμὸν τῆς ἀναπτύξεως τοῦ πολιτισμοῦ τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐκείνου. Αἱ ἱστορικαὶ περιγραφαὶ τοῦ Πausanias, ἂν καὶ περιηγητικαί, ἔγιναν βοηθοὶ δεξιοὶ τῶν ἀνασκαφῶν. Παραλλήλως, ἀνακαλύψεις ἀρχαιολογικαὶ τῶν ἱστορικῶν χρόνων παρέχουν θετικὰς πληροφορίες καὶ συμπληρώματα εἰς τὴν Ἱστορίαν καὶ τὴν καθιστοῦν ἀπτήν καὶ ζωντανήν.

Ὡς παράδειγμα τῆς σχέσεως τῶν δύο ἐπιστημῶν θὰ μοῦ ἐπιτρέψετε νὰ ἀναφέρω τὴν τραγικὴν ἱστορίαν τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ βασιλέως Πύρρου, πὸν διέσωσεν ὁ Πλούταρχος εἰς τοὺς «Παραλλήλους Βίους» του. Ὁ Βασιλεὺς τῶν Μολοσσῶν, τῆς Ἡπείρου δηλαδὴ, ὁ Πύρρος εἶναι πολὺ γνωστὸς εἰς τὴν Ἱστορίαν ὄχι μόνον διὰ τὰς κατακτήσεις του μέρος τῆς Μακεδονίας καὶ τῆς Στερεᾶς, ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ τὴν ἐκστρατείαν του εἰς τὴν Ἱταλίαν καὶ Σικελίαν. Παρὰ τὰς νίκας πὸν ἐκέρδισεν ἐκεῖ, ἠναγκάσθη νὰ ἐπιστρέψῃ εἰς τὴν Ἡπειρον χωρὶς νὰ ἐπιτύχῃ τὸν σκοπὸν τῶν ἀγῶνων του. Ἀλλὰ καὶ πάλιν ὁ ὀρμητικὸς καὶ θυμώδης χαρακτήρ του τὸν ἐξώθησε νὰ ἀναλάβῃ ἐκστρατείαν κατὰ τῆς Πελοποννήσου διὰ νὰ ὑποτάξῃ τοὺς Σπαρτιάτας. Κατὰ τὴν διάρκειαν τῆς ἐκστρατείας αὐτῆς, τοῦ 272 π. Χ., εὔρε τραγικὸν καὶ ἄδοξον θάνατον. Λέγει ὁ Πλούταρχος ὅτι ὁ Πύρρος ἔφιππος καὶ ἀκολουθούμενος ἀπὸ ὀλίγους ὀπλίτας ἐν καιρῷ νυκτὸς εἰσέδυσεν εἰς τὸ Ἄργος καὶ περιεφέρετο εἰς στενωποὺς δρομίσκους προχωρῶν πρὸς τὴν Ἀγοράν. Τυχαίως τὸν δρόμον του ἀπέκλεισε νέος, τὸν ὁποῖον ὁ Πύρρος ἐφόνευσε. Τὸ βίαιον ἐκεῖνο τέλος τοῦ νέου παρηκολούθησεν ἡ γραῖα μήτηρ του ἀπὸ τὴν στέγην τῆς οἰκίας της. Μὲ τὸ θάρρος πὸν δίδει ἡ ὀδύνη καὶ ἡ ἀπελπισία, ἡ γραῖα ἐξεσφενδόνισε κεραμίδα κατὰ τοῦ Πύρρου καὶ τὸν ἐκτύπησεν εἰς τὴν κεφαλὴν. Ὁ βασιλεὺς ζαλισθεὶς κατέπεσε τοῦ ἵππου του

καὶ τότε οἱ ἀντίπαλοί του τὸν ἐφόνευσαν. Ὁ θάνατος τοῦ Πύρρου ἦτο μοιραῖος καὶ διὰ τὸν στρατὸν του, ὁ ὁποῖος παρεδόθη εἰς τὸν Ἀντίγονον καὶ τοὺς Ἀργεῖους. Ἡ ἱστορία λέγει ὅτι οἱ Ἀργεῖοι ἀνέθεσαν εἰς τὰ ἱερὰ τῆς πόλεως καὶ τῆς ἐπικρατείας των τὰ ὄπλα τῶν ἀποθανόντων ἐχθρῶν των. Ὁ Πανσανίας, ὁ ὁποῖος διηγεῖται ἐπίσης τὸν θάνατον τοῦ Πύρρου, λέγει ὅτι εἶδε τὴν ἀσπίδα τοῦ Πύρρου εἰς τὸ ἼΑργος ὅπως εἶχεν ἀνατεθῆ εἰς ἱερὸν πλησίον τοῦ χώρου ὅπου ἐπλήγη. Κανεὶς ὅμως μέχρι πρὸ ὀλίγου δὲν εἶδεν ἀνατεθειμένα ὄπλα τῶν ὀπαδῶν τοῦ Πύρρου εἰς Ἄργεῖα ἱερὰ. Καὶ ἐδῶ ἐπεμβαίνει ἡ Ἀρχαιολογικὴ ἔρευνα.

Εἰς ἀπόστασιν 2 χιλιομέτρων πρὸς Βορρᾶν τῆς ἀκροπόλεως τῶν Μνηκηνῶν ἀνεσκάψαμεν πρὸ ὀλίγων ἐτῶν μικρὸν ἱερὸν, ἰδρυσμένον εἰς γραφικὸν διάσελον μεταξὺ καταφύτων λοφίσκων. Ἡ θέσις εἶναι γνωστὴ εἰς τοὺς χωρικοὺς ὡς «ἼΑσπρα Χώματα». Τυχαία εὗρεσις ἐπιγραφῆς ἀρχαϊκῆς ὑπὸ χωρικῶν ὑπέδειξε πρὸς ἀνασκαφὴν τὴν θέσιν αὐτὴν.

Ἡ μικρὰ ἀλλὰ διδακτικὴ ἀνασκαφὴ εἰς τὰ «ἼΑσπρα Χώματα» ἔφερεν εἰς φῶς σχετικῶς ὀλίγα θεμέλια ποὺ ἀνήκουν εἰς κτίσματα δύο διαφόρων χρονικῶν περιόδων. Τὰ ἀρχαιότερα εἶναι τμήματα ἀρχαίου ναοῦ. Εἰς λάκκον μεταξὺ δύο τοίχων, ἐνὸς τοίχου τοῦ ναοῦ καὶ ἐνὸς νεωτέρου τοίχου, εὗρέθησαν πεταμένα ὑπολείμματα ἀναθημάτων. Μεταξὺ αὐτῶν εἶναι μάχαιραι, αἰχμαὶ δοράτων, βέλη ἀνήκοντα εἰς τόξα ποὺ διελύθησαν καὶ τὸ μεγαλύτερον τμήμα κράνους. Τὰ ἀναθήματα ἀποδεικνύουν ὅτι ὁ ναὸς ἦτο ἀφιερωμένος εἰς πολεμικὸν θεόν. Ὅταν ἐκαθαρίσθη τὸ τεμάχιον τοῦ κράνους, ἀπεδείχθη ὅτι ἔφερε κατὰ τὴν παρυφὴν ἐγχάρακτον γραμμικὴν διακόσμησιν, ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς ἀριστερᾶς παραγναθίδος τὴν λέξιν $ENYFA \frac{1}{4}$ = ἼΕνναλίω. «Ἄνατίθεται εἰς τὸν ἼΕννάλιον» (εἰκ. 1). Εἷς καὶ μόνος θεὸς ἐκαλεῖτο κατὰ τὴν ἀρχαιότητα ἼΕννάλιος, ὁ ἼΑρης: κατ' ἀκολουθίαν κατὰ τὴν ἀρχαϊκὴν ἐποχὴν καὶ εἰς τὰ ἼΑσπρα Χώματα ὑπῆρχε ναὸς τοῦ ἼΑρεως, τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ὁποίου ναοὶ εἶναι τόσον σπάνιοι εἰς τὴν ἠπειρωτικὴν ἼΕλλάδα. Τὰ ἀνευρεθέντα κινητὰ εὗρηματα ἀποδεικνύουν ὅτι ὁ ναὸς ἤκμαζε πρὸς τὸ τέλος

του 6^{ου} και τὰς ἀρχὰς τοῦ 5^{ου} π. Χ. αἰῶνος, ἐνῶ τὰ θεμέλια ἐφανερώ-
ναν ὅτι κατεστράφη πρὸ τῶν μέσων τοῦ 5^{ου} π. Χ. αἰῶνος.

Ποῖοι ἦσαν οἱ καταστροφεῖς τοῦ ἱεροῦ; Ἡ Ἱστορία βοηθεῖ εἰς
τὴν συναγωγὴν συμπερασματικῆς ἀπαντήσεως εἰς τὸ ἐρώτημα.

Διδάσκει ἡ Ἱστορία ὅτι πρὸς τὸ τέλος τοῦ πρώτου ἡμίσεος τοῦ
5^{ου} π. Χ. αἰῶνος ἀβυσσαλέον μῖσος καὶ ἀντιζηλία ἐχώριζε τοὺς Μυκη-
ναίους καὶ τοὺς Ἀργεῖους. Οἱ Μυκηναῖοι ἐθεώρουν τοὺς ἑαυτοὺς τῶν
ὑπερμάχους τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Ἐλευθερίας, διότι εἶχον λάβει μέρος εἰς
τὸν κατὰ τῶν Περσῶν ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐλευθερίας πόλεμον, εἰς τὰς μάχας
τῶν Θερμοπυλῶν καὶ τῶν Πλαταιῶν. Οἱ Ἀργεῖοι, μολοντί δὲν ἐμή-
δισαν, ἐν τούτοις ὅμως ἔμειναν οὐδέτεροι εἰς τὸν τιτάνειον ἐκείνον
ἀγῶνα. Ἡ ὑπερηφάνεια τῶν Μυκηναίων, ἴσως καὶ ἡ ἀλαζονεία των,
τοὺς ἔκαμε νὰ διεκδικοῦν ἀκόμη καὶ τὸ δικαίωμα τῆς διευθύνσεως τῶν
Πανελληνίων ἀγώνων τῆς Νεμέας. Οἱ Ἀργεῖοι ἐθεώρησαν ὅτι ἡ
τοιαύτη ἀπαίτησις ἦτο ὕβρις πρὸς αὐτοὺς καὶ ὅταν, περὶ τὸ 468 π. Χ.
οἱ Μυκηναῖοι ἐστερήθησαν τῆς βοηθείας τῶν συμμάχων, τῶν Σπαρ-
τιατῶν ἰδίᾳ, οἱ Ἀργεῖοι ἐπετέθησαν αἰφνιδιαστικῶς κατ' αὐτῶν, κατέ-
λαβον τὴν ἀκρόπολιν τῶν Μυκηνηῶν, κατέστρεψαν τὸν συνοικισμὸν των
καὶ ἐξεπάτρισαν τοὺς κατοίκους τῆς περιοχῆς. Τότε προφανῶς, περὶ
τὸ 468 π. Χ., ἐγκατέλειψαν εἰς ἀφάνειαν ἢ καὶ κατέστρεψαν τὸν ναὸν
τοῦ Ἄρεως καὶ ἀπέρριψαν τὰ ἀναθήματα πρὸς διαιώνιζον πολεμικὰς
τῶν Μυκηναίων δόξας.

Πέραν τῆς ἐπιστήμης, οἱ ἀρχαιολόγοι ἐνίοτε δικαιοῦνται νὰ
ἀσκοῦν τὴν φαντασίαν των διὰ νὰ δημιουργοῦν δικαιολογημένας ὑποθέ-
σεις, μὲ τὴν προϋπόθεσιν ὅτι θὰ τονίζουσι ὅτι πρόκειται περὶ ὑποθέσεων
καὶ φαντασίας. Ἐδῶ εἶναι δυνατὸν νὰ ἀσκήσωμεν τὴν φαντασίαν μας,
βασιζόμενοι εἰς τρία στοιχεῖα ἀποδεικνύόμενα ὡς ἀληθῆ ἀπὸ τὴν Ἱστο-
ρίαν καὶ τὴν ἀρχαιολογικὴν ἔρευναν.

Πρῶτον: Τὸ ἀβυσσαλέον μῖσος πρὸς ἐχώριζε τοὺς Μυκηναίους
καὶ τοὺς Ἀργεῖους εἰς τοὺς μετὰ τὰ Περσικὰ χρόνους εἶναι ἀποδε-
δειγμένον.

Δεύτερον : Τὸ ἀνευρεθὲν κράνος, χρονολογούμενον εἰς τὰς ἀρχὰς τοῦ 5^{ου} π. Χ. αἰῶνος, ἦτο ἀνάθημα εἰς ἱερὸν πολεμικοῦ Θεοῦ. Τὸ ἀνάθημα αὐτὸ κατεπατήθη καὶ ἀπερρίφθη εἰς λάκκον ὅταν οἱ Ἀργεῖοι ἠφάνισαν τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦ Ἄρεως τὸ 468 π. Χ.

Τρίτον : Τὸ κράνος ἀνετέθη εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν μετὰ τὴν λῆξιν τοῦ πολέμου εἰς τὸν ὅποιον οἱ Μυκηναῖοι ἔλαβον μέρος καὶ ἠρίστευσαν. Ὁ μόνος μέγας καὶ ἱστορικῶς ἐξηκριβωμένος ἀγὼν τῶν χρόνων ἐκείνων, εἰς τὸν ὅποιον ἔλαβον μέρος οἱ Μυκηναῖοι καὶ τοῦ ὁποίου δὲν μετέσχον οἱ Ἀργεῖοι, ἦσαν οἱ Περσικοὶ πόλεμοι. Αὐτὸ δὲ καὶ ἐγένετο αἰτία τῆς θανασίμου διαφορᾶς τῶν δύο περιοχῶν.

Εἶναι, κατὰ ταῦτα, λογικὸν νὰ δεχθῶμεν ὅτι τὸ κράνος εἶχεν ἀνατεθῆ εἰς τὸν ναὸν τοῦ Ἄρεως ὑπὸ ἄρχοντος Μυκηναίου ὡς τρόπαιον τοῦ κατὰ τῶν Περσῶν πολέμου. Τὸ τρόπαιον αὐτό, πὸν διαιώνιζε τὴν πολεμικὴν ἀρετὴν τῶν Μυκηναίων, δὲν ἦτο δυνατὸν νὰ ἀνεχθοῦν οἱ Ἀργεῖοι, οὔτε ἦτο δυνατὸν νὰ τὸ χρησιμοποιήσουν, διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τὸ κατεπάτησαν, τὸ ἐτσάκισαν καὶ τὸ ἔρριψαν εἰς τὸν λάκκον.

Εἶναι δυνατὸν νὰ ὑποθέσωμεν ὅτι πράγματι τὸ κράνος τῶν Ἀσπρων Χωμάτων ἦτο τρόπαιον τῶν Περσικῶν πολέμων καὶ ὡς ἐκ τούτου πολῦτιμον μαρτύριον μιᾶς τῶν ἐνδοξοτέρων σελίδων τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Ἱστορίας ; Τὴν ἀπάντησιν ἀφήνω εἰς τὴν φαντασίαν σας. Εἶναι ὅμως ἐξηκριβωμένον ὅτι ὁ χῶρος τοῦ ἀφανισθέντος ναοῦ ἔμεινεν ἀχρησιμοποίητος ἐπὶ δύο περίπου αἰῶνας, ὡς ἀποδεικνύεται ἀπὸ τὴν παντελεῖ ἔλλειψιν ὀστράκων τῶν μετὰ τὸ 468 π. Χ. χρόνων.

Ὁ Διόδωρος, ὁ ὁποῖος περιγράφει τὴν δραματικὴν καταστροφὴν καὶ τὸν ἐκπατρισμὸν τῶν Μυκηναίων τοῦ 468 π. Χ. (XI, 65), προσθέτει : «ἐκτοτε αἱ Μυκῆναι παρέμειναν ἀκατοίκητοι». Καὶ ὁ Στράβων βεβαίωι ὅτι οὔτε ἶχνος διεσώθη τῆς πόλεως. Κατὰ τοῦτο ἡ Ἱστορία εἶναι ἐλλιπής, διότι νεώτεροι ἀνασκαφαὶ ἔφερον εἰς φῶς ἀρχιτεκτονικὰ κατάλοιπα καὶ ἐπιγραφὰς πὸν ἀποδεικνύουν ὅτι κατὰ τὰς ἀρχὰς τῆς 3^{ης} π. Χ. ἑκατονταετίας οἱ Ἀργεῖοι συνώκησαν τὰς Μυκῆνας, ἐπεσκεύα-

σαν τὰ ρήγματα εἰς τὰ τεῖχη της καὶ μετέτρεψαν τὴν ἀκρόπολιν εἰς κώμην. Ἀσφαλῶς τότε ἀνίδρυσαν καὶ πάλιν τὰ ἱερά, τὰ ὅποια εἶχον καταστρέφει οἱ προπάτορές των, ὡς ἀποδεικνύει καὶ ὁ ἐπὶ τῆς κορυφῆς τῆς ἀκροπόλεως τῶν Μυκηναίων ναός. Εἰς τοὺς χρόνους ἐκείνους τοῦ νέου συνοικισμοῦ ἀνάγονται τὰ θεμέλια τοῦ νεωτέρου ἱεροῦ τῶν «Ἀσπρων Χωμάτων».

Τὸ νεώτερον αὐτὸ ἱερὸν περιελάμβανε μικρὸν ναόν, βωμούς, βοηθητικὸν κτήριον σχήματος ἀνεστραμμένου Γ καὶ κεντρικὴν αὐλήν. Ὁ ναός, μικρὸς μὲν ἀλλὰ σπουδαῖος διὰ τὴν κάτοψίν του, ἀποτελεῖται ἀπὸ ἓν καὶ μόνον τετράπλευρον δωμάτιον, ἀπὸ τετράπλευρον σηκὸν (μῆκος 8.40 μ. καὶ πλάτους 4.70 μ.) καὶ εἶναι προσανατολισμένος ἀπὸ Νότου πρὸς Βορρᾶν. Ἡ εἴσοδος του εἶναι εἰς τὴν νοτίαν πλευράν. Εἰς τὸ μέσον σχεδὸν τοῦ σηκοῦ διασώζεται τμημα βάθρου λαξευμένου εἰς τὸν βράχον (0.85 × 0.95 μ.), τὸ ὅποῖον ὑπεβάσταζε τὸ λατρευτικὸν ἄγαλμα, προφανῶς ἐκ ξύλου. Πρὸ τῆς ἀνατολικῆς πλευρᾶς τοῦ βάθρου εὐρέθησαν σιδηροῖ δακτύλιοι καὶ χαλκᾶ ἐλάσματα, πιθανῶς ποικίλματα τοῦ ξοάνου. Τὸ ἄγαλμα ἔβλεπε πρὸς Ἀνατολὰς καὶ πρὸς μικρὰν θύραν (πλάτους 1.45 μ.) πὺν ἀφέθη εἰς τὸν ἀνατολικὸν τοῦ σηκοῦ τοῖχον. Πρὸ τοῦ ναῖσκου ἀπεκαλύφθησαν τὰ θεμέλια μεγάλου πωρίνου βωμοῦ (μῆκος 3.82 μ. καὶ πλάτους 2.37 μ.) μεῖ ἄξονα ἀπὸ Βορρᾶ πρὸς Νότον, ἀλλὰ μεῖ ὄψιν ἐστραμμένην πρὸς Ἀνατολὰς.

Τὸ βοηθητικὸν κτήριον, σχήματος ἀνεστραμμένου Γ, παρουσιάζει ἀρκετὸν ἐνδιαφέρον, ἰδίᾳ διότι ἡ προσθία ὄψις τῆς μακρᾶς του πλευρᾶς ἀπετελεῖτο ὑπὸ στοᾶς μῆκος 13.95 μ. καὶ πλάτους 3.53. Κατὰ χώραν εὐρέθησαν 5 βάσεις κιόνων τῆς στοᾶς καὶ εἷς καὶ μόνος ἀρράβδωτος πώρινος σφόνδυλος. Ὁ χρόνος καὶ ὁ σκοπὸς τῆς ὁμιλίας δυστυχῶς δὲν μᾶς ἐπιτρέπουν νὰ ἐνδιατρίψωμεν περισσότερον εἰς τὸ ἐνδιαφέρον στωικὸν αὐτὸ κτίσμα.

Ὁ προσανατολισμὸς τοῦ ναοῦ, ἡ κυρία εἴσοδος του εἰς τὴν νοτίαν πλευράν καὶ ἡ δευτέρα θύρα εἰς τὴν ἀνατολικὴν ἐνθυμίζουσι τὴν διάτα-

ξιν τοῦ ναοῦ τοῦ Ἐπικουρείου Ἀπόλλωνος εἰς τὰς Βάσσας. Εἶναι ἀξιοσημείωτον ὅτι ὁ ναὸς τοῦ Ἀσπροχώματος δὲν εἶναι ὁ μόνος εἰς Μυκῆνας μὲ προσανατολισμὸν διάφορον τοῦ συνήθους, τοῦ ἀπὸ Ἀνατολῶν πρὸς Δυσμὰς δηλαδὴ συνήθους προσανατολισμοῦ τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν ναῶν. Εἰς τὰς Μυκῆνας φαίνεται ὅτι ἦτο συνήθης, ἴσως δὲ καὶ παραδοσιακός, διότι καὶ ὁ ἀρχαϊκὸς καὶ ὁ ἑλληνιστικὸς ναὸς τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἢ Ἑρας εἰς τὴν κορυφὴν τῆς ἀκροπόλεως εἶχον προσανατολισμὸν ἀπὸ Νότου πρὸς Βορρᾶν. Ἀκόμη καὶ ὁ ἀνασκαφεὶς ναὸς τῆς ΥΜ III Β περιόδου τῆς ἀκροπόλεως τῶν Μυκηνηῶν ἦτο θεμελιωμένος ἀπὸ Βορρᾶ πρὸς Νότον. Ἐνδιαφέρουσα εἶναι καὶ ἡ πλαγία ἀνατολικὴ θύρα τοῦ ναῦσκου τοῦ χώρου τοῦ Ἀσπροχώματος, ἡ ὁποία ἐπέτρεπε τὴν πρὸς Ἀνατολὰς θέαν τοῦ λατρευτικοῦ ἀγάλματος. Αἱ παρατηρήσεις αὐταὶ καὶ ἄλλαι ἀκόμη θὰ γίνονιν κέντρον ἰδίας μελέτης εἰς τὸ προσεχὲς μέλλον.

Τὰ ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ καὶ τοῦ βωμοῦ εὐρήματα ἀποδεικνύουν ὅτι ἡ κατασκευὴ του ἀνάγεται εἰς τὸν 3^{ον} π. Χ. αἰῶνα. Ἐν τῶν εὐρημάτων, τὸ καὶ σπουδαιότερον δι' ἡμᾶς σήμερον, τὸν χρονολογεῖ ἀκόμη ἀκριβέστερον. Τοῦτο εἶναι διασωθὲν ἐνεπίγραφον τμήμα χαλκῆς ἀσπίδος. Ἡ πλήρης ἀσπίς θὰ εἶχε διάμετρον περὶ τὰ 0.70 μ. Παρουσιάζει μικρὰν κυρτότητα εἰς τὴν ἐξωτερικὴν τῆς ὄψιν καὶ προφανῶς εἶναι τύπου Μακεδονικοῦ. Ἐπὶ τῆς ἐπιφανείας τῆς διασώζεται τμήμα τριστίχου ἐπιγραφῆς πὸν ἐγένετο διὰ καρφίδος μετὰ τὴν κατασκευὴν τῆς. Ἡ ἀνάγνωσις τῆς ἐπιγραφῆς δὲν παρέχει δυσκολίας: (εἰκ. 2)

ΤΟΙ ΑΡΓΕΙΟΙ

ΘΕΟΙΣ ΑΠΟ Β (ασιλέως)

ΠΥΡΡΟ (v)

Προφανῶς εἰς τὸ εὔρημα τοῦτο ἔχομεν μίαν τῶν ἀσπίδων τῶν ὀπαδῶν τοῦ Πύρρου, αἱ ὁποῖαι μετὰ τὸν θάνατόν του ἀνετέθησαν ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀργείων εἰς τὰ ἱερά των. Ὁ θάνατος τοῦ Πύρρου ἐπῆλθε τὸ

272 π. Χ., ὡς διδάσκει ἡ Ἱστορία. Ὁ ναὸς εἰς τὸν ὁποῖον τελικὰ ἀνετέθη θὰ ἐκτίσθῃ ἀπὸ τοὺς Ἀργεῖους ὅτε συνόκησαν καὶ πάλιν τὰς Μυκῆνας, ὡς διδάσκουν τὰ κατάλοιπα τῆς ἀκροπόλεως τῶν Μυκηνηῶν καὶ τὰ ἄλλα κινητὰ εὐρήματα ἐξ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ναοῦ. Ἐπειδὴ δὲ οἱ προπάτορες τῶν Ἀργείων εἶχον ἀφανίσει τὸν ἀρχαιότερον ναὸν καὶ εἶχον ἀπορρίψει τὰ ἀναθήματά του, καὶ ἀκόμη τὸ πολεμικὸν ἴσως τρόπαιον, τὸ κρᾶνος, διὰ τὰ ἐξευμενίσουν τὸν θεὸν Ἄρηνα τῶρα οἱ ἀπόγονοί των τοῦ ἀνήγειραν νέον ναὸν καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἀνέθηκαν ἓν τῶν πολυτιμοτέρων πολεμικῶν των κειμηλίων, τὴν ἀσπίδα ὀπαδοῦ τοῦ Πύρρου. Κατὰ ταῦτα ἡ ἀνέγερσις τοῦ ναοῦ θὰ ἐγένετο ὀλίγον μετὰ τὸ 272 π. Χ., χρόνον τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ Πύρρου. Ἡ ἀνασκαφή του, πλὴν τῶν θεμελίων, μᾶς ἀπέδωσε καὶ τρόπαιον μοναδικόν, τὴν ἀσπίδα, καὶ τὴν ἐπαλήθευσιν ἱστορικοῦ καὶ παραδοσιακοῦ γεγονότος καὶ θρύλου. Σύμπτωσις, τύχη, ἢ θεὰ τῶν ἀρχαιολόγων καὶ πάλιν φέρει διὰ τῆς σκαπάνης τοῦ ἐπιστήμονος τὸν μελετητὴν πλησιέστερον πρὸς τὴν ἱστορικὴν πραγματικότητα.

Κυρίαί καὶ Κύριοι,

Ἐλπίζω ὅτι διὰ τῆς συντόμου ὁμιλίας μου κατεδείχθη ὁ στενὸς δεσμὸς τῆς Ἱστορίας καὶ τῆς Ἀρχαιολογίας. Τὸ ἔργον τοῦ ἀρχαιολόγου εἰς τὸν προϊστορικὸν κύκλον, ἀποτελεῖ βασικὴν πηγὴν τοῦ ἱστορικοῦ. Τὰ ἀποκαλυπτόμενα ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀρχαιολόγου κατάλοιπα ἀποτελοῦν οἷονεὶ σελίδας διασωθέντος κλειστοῦ ἀπὸ αἰῶνων βιβλίου. Τὸ χῶμα, τὰ ὄστρακα, οἱ λίθοι, τὰ μέταλλα πὸν ἀποκαλύπτονται, ἀποτελοῦν τὸ περιεχόμενον τῶν σελίδων αὐτῶν. Ὅταν αἱ σελίδες καὶ τὸ περιεχόμενόν των ἀναγνωσθοῦν, μελετηθοῦν καὶ ἀποδοθοῦν ἀκριβῶς, τότε καθίστανται πολῦτιμος πηγὴ διὰ τὸν ἱστορικόν. Εἰς τὸν κύκλον τῶν ἱστορικῶν χρόνων, τὸ ἔργον τοῦ ἀρχαιολόγου καθιστᾷ τὴν Ἱστορίαν ζωντανὴν καὶ ἀκριβεστέραν. Παραλλήλως τὸ ἔργον τοῦ ἀρχαιολόγου καθίσταται σαφές καὶ ὀλοκληροῦται ἀπὸ τὰς διασωζομένας ὑπὸ τῆς Ἱστορίας πληροφορίας. Ἡ μία ἐπιστήμη δὲν δύναται

νά ὑπάρξῃ χωρὶς τὴν ἄλλην. Εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἠδ' ἐτυχήσαμεν νὰ ἔχωμεν σπουδαίους ἀντιπροσώπους καὶ τῶν δύο ἐπιστημῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἡροδότου καὶ τοῦ Θουκυδίδου μέχρι τοῦ Παπαρρηγοπούλου, τοῦ Λάμπρου, τοῦ Καρολίδου, τοῦ Τσοῦντα, τοῦ Ρωμαίου, τοῦ Κουρουνιώτη, τοῦ Μαρινάτου, τοῦ Καρούζου, τοῦ Ὀρλάνδου. Εὐτυχεῖς οἱ ζῶντες καὶ ἐργαζόμενοι σήμερον εἰς τὸν Ἑλληνικὸν χῶρον ποὺ εἶναι πλήρης ἐκπλήξεων καὶ δάφνης. Οἱ παλαιότεροι ποὺ ζῶμεν καὶ ἐργαζόμεθα εἰς τὸν χῶρον αὐτόν, μὲ τὸν καιρὸν θὰ ἀφήσωμεν εἰς τοὺς νέους τὸν εὐγενῆ στίβον τῆς δράσεως. Θὰ τὸν ἀφήσωμεν εἰς τοὺς συνεχιστάς ποὺ θὰ ἀναλάβουν νὰ κρατήσουν ὑψηλὰ καὶ νὰ μεταβιβάσουν εἰς τοὺς νεωτέρους τὴν φωτεινὴν λαμπάδα τῆς γνώσεως καὶ ποὺ θὰ συνεχίσουν τὸν δρόμον τῆς τιμῆς. Τύχη Ἀγαθὴ νὰ τοὺς συνοδεύῃ.

Μὲ αὐτὴν τὴν εὐχὴν πρὸς τοὺς νεωτέρους, μὲ τὸ καλὸν κατευόδιον εἰς τὸν δρόμον των καὶ τὴν ἐπιτυχίαν εἰς τὸ ἔργον των, μὲ αὐτὴν τὴν ἐλπίδα, καταθέτω τὸ λειτούργημα τοῦ Προέδρου, ποὺ μοῦ ἀνετέθη ἀπὸ τὸ μέγα τοῦτο Πνευματικὸν Ἰδρυμα, ἀπὸ τὴν γεραρὰν Ἀκαδημίαν Ἀθηνῶν, διὰ τὸ ὅποιον τὴν εὐγνωμονῶ.

HISTORY AND ARCHAEOLOGY

The title of tonight's brief lecture "History and Archaeology" brings to mind the names of the two great historians of Antiquity, Herodotos and Thucydides. Herodotos, whom Cicero called "Father of History", tried, as is well known, to narrate the Persian Wars of the fifth century B. C. He called his efforts (ἱστορίας ἀπόδειξις), that is, a narration of what he saw in his travels, what others told him and what he heard from the people. Whatever information he collected he never tried to verify; he even added myths to his narrative to amuse and interest his hearers or readers. Because of his method of writing, Herodotos is not considered by all scholars as representing scientific research.

In contrast, Thucydides limited his history to events which could be verified and which, in their details, could be submitted to selection, could be critically considered and interpreted. Because of his method he is justly considered the founder of History as a science. However, even Thucydides turned to tradition to strengthen his suggestions and conclusions adduced from his scientific research. Thus, after his introduction, he wrote a long statement related to events preserved in the tradition of the country. Thucydides recognized that the life and the achievements of people are not limited to details mentioned in books and parchments; that vague impressions of events are retained in the tradition of people, impressions that form most valuable contributions to the outlining of progress through the ages. In the memory and conscience of people, even in the memory of primitive people, are indeed preserved most valuable genealogical remembrances. Not only genealogical remembrances but also lists are known from Greek tradition, catalogues that were orally

transmitted from generation to generation, by the *hieromnemon*s. Known are the lists of the priestesses of the Argive Heraeum, of the kings and ephors of Sparta, of the mythical kings of Athens, etc. The recording of the names of the victors of the Olympic games, forms a continuation of the custom of keeping genealogical details by cities and sanctuaries. With the passing of time, important events were added to the genealogical lists and thus the catalogues were transformed into historic chronicles.

The historic chronicles, even the vague recollections of events in the tradition, were transformed by the fertile Greek imagination into brilliant myths, which, collated by known and unknown mythographers, formed the marvellous Greek mythology. The myths, sketching the life and the achievements of most ancient progenitors, could not be incorporated into the historic records of the life of the nation. However, the life and the achievements of the Greek progenitors go beyond the limits of the ancient mythographs and mythoplasts. The remnants of objects and of constructions preserved below the surface of our soil brought to light by the pick of the archaeologist; these remnants only reveal the achievements of prehistoric men. The discovery of relics belonging to historic times often enough add details, illumine the problems and add to the completeness of descriptions and conclusions of History. History and Archaeology, sister studies, supplement each other and have the same goal: the knowledge of the life and achievements of people complete and documented, as far as possible. I wish to emphasize especially that Prehistoric Archaeological research conducted in Greece has added millenia to our knowledge of the life and achievements of the Hellenes. The excavations conducted and the discoveries made by Schliemann, Tsountas, Evans, Marinatos,

brought to light not only the Bronze and Stone Age cultures of man in Greece, but also the first Golden Age in her life. A Golden Age that flourished centuries before the limits sketched by the imagination of the ancient mythographers and by the traditions of tribes established in Greece in the remote past.

When the archaeological research is conducted as prescribed by science it becomes a valuable collaborator to History. However, History aids in many ways the archaeologist in his research. The knowledge, for example, of the details preserved in History made possible the location of the site of Olynthos in the Chalcidice, and led the pick of the excavator to reveal that large Greek city of the 4th century B.C. and to establish the evolution of the culture current in that century. The historic descriptions of Pausanias, though they seem to us touristic, have become faithful assistants of the excavator. At the same time, archaeological discoveries of the Historic Era add definite details and additions to History and give it life and vividness.

You will allow me to mention now the tragic story of the death of a king to illustrate this interdependence of the two scientific studies. It is the story of the death of Pyrrros preserved in the Parallel Lives of Plutarch. The King of Epeiros, king Pyrrros, is a well known personality in the history of the fourth century B.C. of Greece. A great leader of men he is especially known for his expedition to South Italy and his battles against the Romans. In spite of his victories, that cost him so much in manpower, he never achieved his goals and was obliged to return to his homeland in Greece. But soon after, his uneasy character made him undertake an expedition against the Peloponnesos with the hope of subduing the Spartans. In the course of that expedition, and in 272 B.C., he found a tragic and unglorious

death. Plutarch relates that Pyrrhos on horseback followed by few soldiers maeandered through narrow streets intending to reach the Agora of Argos. His way was blocked by a young Argive warrior. Him Pyrrhos killed. That violent end of the youth was witnessed by his old mother who was stationed on the terrace of her house. With the desperate courage which great sorrow and despair provide, the old woman threw a tile against the killer of her son. The king, struck on the head, became dizzy, fell off his horse and was killed by his opponents. The king's death proved fatal to his army which was forced to capitulate to king Antigonos and the Argives. History records that the Argives dedicated the arms of Pyrrhos and his companions to the shrines and sanctuaries of the city. The sudden death of Pyrrhos is also narrated by Pausanias, who furthermore states that in his visit to the city of Argos saw Pyrrhos' shield dedicated to a shrine of Demeter in the neighborhood of the spot where the king was killed. However, to the present no one has seen dedicated any of the armour of Pyrrhos' companions who fell at Argos. And here intervenes Archaeological Research.

A few years ago and at a distance of some 2 kilometers to the North of the acropolis of Mycenae, we excavated a small sanctuary on a ridge amidst pine-covered hills. The site, known to the villagers as "Aspra Homata" (White Earth), was brought to our attention through the accidental discovery of an inscription belonging to the late archaic period. The small but instructive excavation of the site, brought to light comparatively few foundations belonging to buildings of two different chronological periods. The older remains are remnants of a temple. In a pit between two walls, the wall of the old temple and that of a much later building, were found what was left of objects dedicated to the God of the temple. Among them are knives, spearheads,

arrow heads and a large segment of a helmet. These objects prove that the temple to which they were dedicated belonged to a war God. The straightening of the helmet and the clearance of its surface from corrosion revealed a geometric linear pattern engraved along its edges and most important a single – word inscription on its left side, reading: *ENYALIO* = *Enyalio* = = *TO ENYALIOS* the helmet is dedicated, of course. Only one of the Olympian Gods was known as *ENYALIOS*, *ARES* the God of War. Consequently the building was a temple dedicated to *ARES*. The objects discovered in its fill prove that the temple flourished towards the end of the 6th and the beginning of the 5th century B.C., while the foundations proved that it was destroyed before the middle of the 5th century B.C.

Who were the destroyers of the temple?

History teaches that towards the end of the first half of the 5th century B.C. jealousy and abyssal hatred existed between the Argives and the Mycenaeans. The latter considered themselves as defenders of Greek Liberty since they took part in the Persian war. They distinguished themselves in the battles of Thermopylae and Plataia and their name, with others, was inscribed on the Delphic Trophy. In the titanic struggle that shook Greece, the Argives remained neutral. The Mycenaeans, filled with pride and perhaps arrogance, claimed for themselves all kinds of privileges, even the right to administer the Nemean Games and the temple of Hera in the Argive plain. Such claims the Argives considered insulting and when, about 468 B.C., the allies of the Mycenaeans, especially the Spartans, could not go to their aid, the Argives attacked Mycenae, captured and partially demolished its acropolis, destroyed the homes and buildings beyond the walls and sent to bondage and exile the entire population of the



Εἰκὼν 1. Τμήμα κράνου ἀπὸ τὰ Ἄσπρα Χώματα.



Εικών 2. Ένεπίγραφος ύσπις άπό τή Άσπρα Χόματα.

famous city. It seems not only possible but evident to maintain that then, in 468 B.C., the Argives destroyed also the temple of Ares at Aspra Homata and threw into a hole the offerings that proclaimed the military glories of the Mycenaeans that reminded the default of the Argives.

Sometimes, archaeologists have the right to exercise their imagination beyond the limits allowed by Science, to develop justified hypotheses; but it should always be mentioned that the statements made are hypothetical and not scientific facts. In our case here, we can use our imagination based upon three elements proved true by History and archaeological research.

F i r s t: The abyssal hatred that separated Mycenaeans and Argives is a proved historic fact.

S e c o n d: The unearthed section of the bronze helmet, dated to the beginning of the 5th century B.C., was an offering to a War God. This offering was trampled and thrown into a pit when the Argives destroyed the temple of Ares around 468 B.C.

T h i r d: The helmet was dedicated to the shrine after the completion of a war in which the Mycenaeans took part and perhaps distinguished themselves. The only great war of the times, historically proved, in which took part the Mycenaeans but not the Argives was the Persian War. This brought about the hatred of the two peoples.

Isn't it logical then to assume that the helmet found at "Aspra Homata" was a trophy from the Persian Wars and therefore a most valuable testimony of one of the most glorious pages of Greek History? I leave the answer to your imagination. The area of the early shrine remained unused for almost two centuries, as it is proved by the complete absence of small objects, especially pottery, dating from the years after 468 B.C.

Diodoros, who described the tragical destruction of Mycenae of about 468 B.C. and the expulsion of its inhabitants states that Mycenae ever after remained uninhabited. Strabo also reported that no trace of the city survived. In this respect History is not completely accurate. For the recent excavations both in and out of the acropolis of Mycenae brought to light architectural foundations and inscriptions proving that at the beginning of the 3rd century B.C. the Argives themselves repaired the Mycenaean fortification walls and transformed Mycenae into a "koma", a township. The remains of the temple on the summit of the acropolis prove that in that century the temples and shrines were also rebuilt. To those years of the "New Synoikismos" of Mycenae should be ascribed the chronologically later foundations of the sanctuary found at Aspra Homata.

The later sanctuary was composed of a small temple, of altars, of an auxiliary building in the shape of inverted Γ and a central court. The temple, small but interesting because of its ground plan, is composed of one and only rectangular room (a cella 8.40 m. in length and 4.70 in width) and is oriented from South to North. On the South narrow side we find its entrance. Almost in the middle of the room is to be seen, cut in the rock, a fragment of the base, on which stood the statue of the God to whom the temple was dedicated. apparently the statue was of wood and around its base were found a number of iron rings and bronze fragments, trimmings that probably ornamented the xoanon. The statue faced east and towards a small door that was left in the middle of the long east side of the temple (the width of the door is only 1.45 m.). To the south of the temple were revealed the foundations of a long and narrow altar of poros stone, (maximum length 3.82 m. and width 2.37 m.) with a north and south axis, but with face towards the East.

The auxiliary building, in plan resembling an inverted Γ, is quite interesting especially because its long side is fronted by a stoa some 14 m. in length and 3.50 m. in width. Five bases of its columns were found in situ and only one unfluted drum of poros stone. I regret that the scope of this lecture and the time allotted do not permit the farther description of this interesting structure.

The orientation of the temple, its main entrance on its South side and the secondary door in its Eastern wall, bring to mind the arrangements of the Temple of Apollo Epikoureios at Bassae. It is interesting to note that our small temple at Aspra Homata is not the only one at Mycenae with an orientation different from that usual in Greek temples, from the East and West orientation. It seems that at Mycenae the North and South orientation was usual and probably traditional. For both the archaic and the hellenistic temple on the summit of its acropolis are oriented from South to North. Furthermore, the LH III B temple excavated on the west slope of the acropolis is also oriented from North to South. The side door on the east wall of the temple of Aspra Homata is also of interest; it provided the possibility for the statue in the cella to face east and thus face the sunrise as it seems to be required by religion. These observations and others, made in the course of the excavation, will form part of a special study to be published in the near future.

The construction of the temple is placed in the 3rd century B.C. by the small finds made in its area. One of the finds, that has a special significance to our talk tonight, helps to date that construction even closer. This find is a fragment of a bronze shield. The complete shield must have had a diameter of about 0.70 m. The small outer projection of its surface proves that the

shield is of Macedonian type. On that surface is preserved part of an inscription made by means of a nail, apparently after the casting of the shield and probably a few years after the beginning of its use. The inscription is clear and easy to read. It states :

ΤΟΙ ΑΡΓΕΙΟΙ	THE ARGIVES
ΘΕΟΙΣ ΑΠΟ Β(ασιλέως)	TO THE GODS FROM K(ing)
ΠΥΡΡΟ (v)	PYRRO (v)

It is evident that in this find we have one of the shields of the followers of Pyrrhos dedicated to Argive shrines after the death of the King and the surrender of his army. As we have seen, the death of Pyrrhos occurred in the year 272 B.C. The shield must have been dedicated after that date to the temple of Ares at Aspra Homata. The shield also dates the Argive "Synoikismos" of Mycenae in the 3rd century B.C. It seems that the Argives of that century in their effort to placate the God for the destruction wrought upon the earlier temple and its offerings not only erected a new temple in His honor, but placed in it one of their most valuable trophies of the war against Pyrrhos to take possibly the place of the gifts thrown away by their ancestors. Thus the excavation at Aspra Homata gave to us not only a shrine dedicated to Ares, to whom rather few temples were erected, but also a unique war trophy, the shield that is definitely identified by an inscription, as well as the verification of a fact given by History and preserved in the traditions of the people of Argos. Coincidence, rather the Goddess of Archaeologists, Eternal Luck, again by means of the pick of the archaeologist gave life to a story and took us nearer to a historic event.

Ladies and Gentlemen :

I hope that the short lecture tonight has proved the close bond that unites History and Archaeology. The work of the archaeologist, especially in the prehistoric area, forms a basic source of information for the historian. The remains brought to light by the archaeologist form, one may maintain, the pages of a book that remained sealed for ages. Earth, Sherds, Stones, Metals constitute the content of these pages. When the pages and their content are read, described accurately, and their study published, then they form a most valuable source for the historian. In the area of historic times, the work of Archaeology becomes clear and is completed by the information contained in History. Neither science can be complete without the other especially in the field of ancient Greek studies. Important representatives of both sciences are to be found in the life of Greece, from Herodotos, Thucidides and Xenophon to Paparegopoulos Lambros, Karolides, Tsountas, Rhomaios, Kourouniotes, Karouzos, Oikonomos, Marinatos. Fortunate is the scholar who is working today in the Greek area that is filled with surprises and laurel. In time, the older scholars delving in her soil will yield their place and their lighted torch to younger scholars who will have to keep it aloft and burning and pass it on to generations to come. May they be blessed by Good Fortune, by ΑΓΑΘΗ ΤΥΧΗ.

With this wish for the younger scholars, with the hope and prayer of their greater success, I end my service as the President of this august Body of Scholars, to whom I express my gratitude for entrusting to me the administration of the Institution.
