

l'arc-en-ciel. Il éprouve des tintements d'oreille, il se plaint de sentir de mauvaises odeurs; il est de mauvaise humeur, et se met en colère sans aucun sujet. On a vu des hommes tomber épileptiques à l'occasion de quelque événement qui leur a affecté désagréablement l'esprit; d'autres pour avoir fixé le cours d'une rivière, le tour d'une roue, ou le pirouettement d'une toupie...»

Il est très évident que Coray avait l'intention de revoir ces traductions et d'y mettre la dernière main; mais leur édition paraît pourtant nécessaire parce qu'elles nous présentent des traductions classiques et des notes savantes, dignes d'un Coray, et spécialement en ce qui concerne celle de l'œuvre d'Arétée, puisqu'elle est jusqu'ici à ma connaissance, la seule qui en existe en français.

**ΑΡΧΑΙΟΛΟΓΙΑ. — The Campaign of Marathon according to a recent critic, by George Sotiriadis.**

In the present communication we shall examine the revolutionary theories of the distinguished English general and military writer, Sir Frederick Maurice, published by him about the 30<sup>th</sup> of June 1932 in the Journal of Hellenic Studies of the London Society for the Promotion of Greek Studies, pages 13 to 24 of Vol. LII.

However I knew nothing of the author of the above publication, which was simply signed F. Maurice. Nor did I gain more ample information about this author, even after I had adressed myself to competent people<sup>1</sup>. I was keen on knowing this, because I had already seen this theory expressed in the IV<sup>th</sup> volume of the excellent historical work Cambridge Ancient History. This volume was published in 1926 by M<sup>r</sup> Monro, and M<sup>r</sup> Monro is often referred to by Sir F. Maurice as the promoter of the theory, and, though he makes considerable additions to it, Sir Frederick considers himself simply a renovator and a warm partisan of the theory.

It was only on the 17<sup>th</sup> of March that I learnt, though the newspaper «Hestia», that the author of the article in the Journal of Hellenic Studies was General Sir Frederick Maurice, professor of military history at King's College who, in a lecture delivered at the Society for the Promotion of Greek Studies, had created a new theory in regard to the strategic tactics of the battle of Marathon and that he intended shortly to visit

<sup>1</sup> These were the Assistant Director of the British Archæological School in Athens M<sup>r</sup> Heurtley and the historian M<sup>r</sup> William Miller.

Athens and to deliver the same lecture on the very site of the battle.

Knowing something about Marathon, and having worked there for the Archaeological Society, I at once wrote a letter to the *Hestia* (which was published on the 18<sup>th</sup> of March) and another to the *Messenger d'Athènes*, a French paper better known abroad, (published on the 21<sup>st</sup> of March) stating that I would shortly write a refutation of the General's theories, in French, and that in the meantime I hoped to have the pleasure of making his acquaintance when he visited Athens and Marathon. But before I had heard of his arrival in Greece at the head of a group of 326 other distinguished English visitors, he had already left the country. I therefore made the necessarily short communication in the form of a letter to the Academy, not being able to do more at the time owing to the excavations at Pieria, Dion, on which I was then engaged, and postponed the writing of my refutation of the General's theory to a more suitable time.

This publication will appear in the University of Salonica's Year Book (*Ἐπετηρίς*) for 1933 in a first article of mine, exposing my views on the most essential parts of the General's criticism, a fundamental hypothesis of a purely philological character which I consider radically wrong. With regard to the other assertions of this military writer which I also consider erroneous, I will discuss them later in a second article which will be the second part of my counter-criticism of the General's theories.

In the present communication I consider it pressing to immediately expose my opinion on the above mentioned hypothesis of the writer, because that gives one, from the very beginning, a notion of the wrong path which the critic has followed in his attempt to overthrow the traditions created by the Father of History.

To that fallacy he added many other unfounded assertions which it would be unnecessary for me even to mention, were I not obliged to prove once for all the wrong basis from which the military writer made his unjustifiable attack on Herodotus.

Herodotus starts his narrative of the Expedition of Marathon in Chap. 94 of his VI<sup>th</sup> book. In the chapters 95 to 97 inclusive, the historian describes the preparations for the expedition in Cilicia and the cruise of the Persian forces as far as Samos and thence, by the open sea of Ikaria, to Naxos. In Chap. 96 he speaks of the attack on this island and the enslaving of the inhabitants as the primary object of the campaign. In the same way the Persians attacked the other islands of the Aegian Sea, first sailing to Delos, from whence the inhabitants attempted to escape to Tinos *οὐχόντο φεύγοντες*.

Chap. 97. But Datis, continues Herodotus in Chap. 97, having encircled Delos and prevented the inhabitants from leaving the island, told them that his master had not sent him «to harm either them or their country, but simply to carry out a sacred duty in a place where 2 Gods had been born, by burning three hundred talents of incense at their altars».

In Chap. 98 Herodotus clearly declares that Datis, with his fellow leader, the young royal prince, Artaphernes, (son of Artaphernes, son of Hystaspes and therefore brother of Darius) at the head of all the Asiatic coast (Herodotus book V Chap. 30) had received orders from Darius to attack Eretria and Athens (book VI Chap. 94) to take the inhabitants prisoners and bring them before him, and now, as commander evidently of the Persian expedition against Greece, gives orders for the fleet to sail direct to Eretria. (Beginning of Chap. 98). «Δᾶτις μὲν δὴ ταῦτα ποιήσας ἔπλεε (sailed on) ἅμα τῷ στρατῷ ἐπὶ τὴν Ἐρέτριαν πρώτα». Eretria was a small town barely able to raise a third of the forces afterwards used by the Athenians to withstand the Persians at Marathon. (Compare Strabo p. 448, book A' § 10). It was therefore natural that the Persians should wish to dispose of the Eretrians first, their chief purpose being to seize the more powerful Athens in their nets. Athens had always been the object of the Persians' policy in Greece, and they looked to far more important conquests in their expedition than the mere punishing of Athens and the insignificant Eretria. (Compare Herodotus' remarks on this subject in Chap. 94 of the VI<sup>th</sup> book where he relates the machinations of the Pisistratides at the Persian court and Darius' outspoken intention to use the attack on Eretria and Athens simply as an excuse to subjugate all those who still opposed his power in Greece.

During this campaign Naxos was incomparably stronger than Eretria, having 8,000 armed men (Herodotus V. Chap. 30) and an important fleet («πλοῖα μακρὰ πολλά»: Comp. the same book V Chaps. 28 and 31, on the subject of the size and wealth of Naxos). The conquest of this island by the Persians would necessarily be followed by that of Paros and Andros and the rest of the Cyclades, including the «big and prosperous Eubœa, equal almost to Cyprus» says Herodotus. Therefore as Naxos itself had shortly before fallen such an easy prey to the Persians under Datis, how should we not expect the occupation of Eretria, before the march against Athens, to be a far easier operation.

The conquest of the Cyclades was already an accomplished fact when sections only of their fleet approached the islands. More ships would not even have had room to station themselves for any length of time amongst the Cycladic islets! But more important still and more powerful was Karystos (Herodotus VI 99) owing to its position at the southern end of Eubœa. Karystos however, although she held out proudly against the Persians' proposals of surrender, when she saw them pillaging her beautiful country and already attacking her walls, immediately laid down her arms and accepted their hard conditions.

So what could Eretria do after that?

It is true that Eretria, unexpectedly for the Persians, resisted their attack for six days. I say unexpectedly because the conquest of Greece by the Persians (perfectly well informed of all that was taking place in that country) was made easy for them by the royalist party and the traitors. And no less so in Eretria itself. Compare Herodotus in Chap. 100 who speaks of the desperate state of affairs in this town when some of the citizens openly proposed to abandon it to the declared enemy or to escape to the mountains (beginning of Chap. 98). The Ionians and the Æolians who were forced to take part in the war against their fellow countrymen in Greece, were the first to give the news to the desperate Eretrians. Other citizens, moved by still baser motives (ἴδια κέρδεα προσδεκόμενοι παρὰ τοῦ Πέρσῃ οἴσεσθαι), were planning treachery (προδοσίην ἐσκευάζοντο Chap. 100) and the shameful surrender of their country to their cruel enemy. (Compare Herodotus VI end of Chap. 9 and Chap. 32 referring to the savage behaviour of the Persians to the Greeks).

And that is precisely what happened, as Herodotus clearly states in Chap. 101.

Because this Chap. 101 is a *continuation* of Chap. 99 which, to the very end, relates the expedition of Marathon, and in Chap. 101 repeats the words emphatically «Οἱ δὲ Πέρσαι πλείοντες κατέσχον τὰς νέας τῆς Ἐρετρικῆς χώρας κατὰ Ταμύνας καὶ Χοιρέας καὶ Αἰγίλειαν», while on the contrary, just before these words, Herodotus speaks of the Eretrians and the events in Eretria.

And this is precisely what neither the General, nor his predecessor, M<sup>r</sup> Monro, have understood.

They both thought that Chap. 100 contained the narrative of events which occurred immediately after the subjection of the Karystians to the Persians at the end of Chap. 99.

So this is the General's mistake. He did not grasp, being chiefly a military writer, that Chap. 100 is an *insertion* (παρεμβολή) referring to intervening events of the expedition (as innumerable other instances in the narratives of the epic historian Herodotus: Compare even Chaps. 96 to 132), an insertion regarding the expedition of Marathon some time *before the departure* of the Persian fleet from Karystos and its arrival within a few hours at Eretria for the purpose of immediately attacking that town.

But it is quite impossible for me to explain, in this short communication, how easy it is for anyone who understands Herodotus and who is an ordinary Greek scholar, to reach the gist of the matter. I should be obliged to say too much, and of a far too complicated and difficult a nature, owing to the arbitrary manner in which the critic interprets the perfectly lucid narrative of the historian. That explanation can only be given in a lengthy article and I intend to publish one shortly, in French, for the purpose of submitting it to a wider circle of readers.

---



---

ΑΝΑΚΟΙΝΩΣΕΙΣ ΜΗ ΜΕΛΩΝ

ΙΣΤΟΡΙΑ ΦΥΣΙΚΩΝ ΕΠΙΣΤΗΜΩΝ.—Νέος κώδιξ Στεφάνου τοῦ Ἀλεξανδρέως, ὑπὸ Ἀντ. Χ. Χατζῆ. Ἀνεκoinώθη ὑπὸ κ. Δ. Αἰγινήτου.

Ἐπὶ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ μαθηματικοῦ, ἀστρονόμου καὶ φιλοσόφου τοῦ Ζ' αἰῶνος μετὰ Χριστόν, Στεφάνου τοῦ Ἀλεξανδρέως, ὅστις ἐγένετο οἰκουμενικὸς διδάσκαλος, ἤτοι καθηγητῆς τοῦ ἐπὶ Θεοδοσίου τοῦ Β' ἐν ἔτει 425 μ.Χ. ἰδρυθέντος ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει Πανεπιστημίου, φέρεται παρὰ τῷ J. L. Ideler, *Physici et medici Graeci*, 2, σ. 199 κ.εξ., ἔργον, ὅπερ ἔχει τὸν τίτλον *Περὶ χρυσοποιίας, ὅπερ ὁμῶς ἄγνωστον κατὰ τίνα αἰῶνα ἐγράφη*. Ἰδίαν διατριβὴν περὶ τοῦ Στεφάνου τοῦ Ἀλεξανδρέως ἔγραψεν ὁ H. Usener, *De Stephano Alexandrino*, Bonnæ, 1880.

Εἰς τοὺς μέχρι τοῦδε γνωστοὺς κώδικας προσετέθη καὶ χαρτῶς κώδιξ, ὅστις πρό τινος διὰ δωρεᾶς περιήλθεν εἰς τὴν κατοχὴν μου. Ὁ κώδιξ οὗτος καὶ μὲν δὲν περιέχει ὀλόκληρον τὸ ἄνω ἔργον, ἀλλὰ παρέχει κείμενον ἐν τισὶ σημείοις γνησιώτερον· οὕτως ἐν σ. 219, 28-29 ἀντὶ κατανήσαι καὶ ἀπιέναι, ἅπερ κείνται ἐν τῇ τοῦ Ideler ἐκδόσει, ὁ ἐμὸς κώδιξ, ὃν ὠνόμασα C, παρέχει ἐν φ. 12 β κρατῆσαι καὶ εἰσιέναι, ἅπερ προφανῶς ἔγραψεν ὁ συγγραφεὺς τοῦ πονήματος.

Ἐν τέλει ὀφείλω νὰ μνημονεύσω, ὅτι καὶ ἄλλον κώδικα τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἔργου εὑρον· οὗτος σώζεται ἐν Ζαγορᾷ τῆς Θεσσαλίας· πβ. Σ. Λάμπρον, *Νέος Ἑλληνομνήμων*, 13, 1916, σ. 342 (κώδιξ 58).

Νομίζομεν λοιπόν, ὅτι ἡ μέλλουσα τυχὸν κριτικὴ ἔκδοσις τοῦ ρηθέντος ἔργου ὀφείλει νὰ λάβῃ ὑπ' ὄψιν καὶ τοὺς δύο τούτους κώδικας. Τέλος προσθετέον, ὅτι ἡ προσηχὴς ἔκδοσις κριτικῶν παρατηρήσεων ἐμοῦ εἰς τὸ εἰρημένον ἔργον θὰ ἀποκαταστήσῃ πολλαχῶς τὸ γνήσιον κείμενον αὐτοῦ.