

tutions of Greece under the Turcocracy. The sections on the attempted military reorganisation in Greece, on the central organs of government, and on Capodistrias's interest in education are also of value: They bring together useful specialist information, most of which is already to be found in Greek secondary sources. But in the presentation of this material little attempt is made to distinguish between intention and real achievement. Many will be surprised to read: "The reorganisation of the army was one of the most significant developments in this period. Capodistrias, with an effective army at his disposal, was able to bring pressure on the great powers, England, France, and Russia, in their discussions of the final frontier settlement." All one can say is that if Capodistrias had had such army at his disposal he might possibly have become a political architect of some consequence.

Birkbeck College
University of London

DOUGLAS DAKIN

John A. Alexander, *Potidaea. Its History and Remains*. Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 1963. 146 pp., 23 plates.

Research on the Northern Greek region is seriously behind in practically all areas, especially in the areas of history and archaeology. For this reason any new effort in these two fields becomes both precious and welcome. Thus, it was with great joy that we saw appear John A. Alexander's monograph on Potidaea, bearing the sub-title "Its History and Remains." Dr. Alexander, of Greek origin, is at present Professor of History in Georgia State College, Atlanta. When he was still a student he had the opportunity to take part in the excavations his professor, D. M. Robinson, was then carrying out in Olynthus and was therefore able to visit the Potidaea area in 1938 and study it locally. From what he writes, he does not seem to have had a chance to visit the place recently or to look again at the finds, so that he might change or confirm his previous observations.

With his monograph Dr. Alexander aimed at collecting all information and archaeological finds related to Potidaea so as to compose an historical monograph on it. His intention was certainly laudable, but I am afraid he was immediately faced with a basic difficulty which has been proved insurmountable: lack of enough evidence to allow him a more or less perfect synthesis. At any rate, the author divides the material he has into 7 chapters. In the first one he examines the problem of where Potidaea was situated, its topography, the archaeological remains and the findings of the area. His second chapter "From the founding of Potidaea to the Persian War (ca. 600 - 490 B.C.);" he divides further into 6 smaller sections: a) Pre-corinthian occupation of the site b) The resources of the new city c) Government d) Religion e) The Potidaean Treasury at Delphi f) Dedicatory inscription of a Potidaean at Delphi.

In the following III - VII chapters he gives the historical events pertaining to the town from 490 to 316 B.C., and inserts as a chapter

V an examination of Potidaean coins in the period 550-432 B.C. and continues it in the 4th section of chapter VII. This insertion may break up the exposition of Potidaean history (chapters III-IV, VI and VII, section I-III and section V), but perhaps it does not cause essential damage, as lack of evidence does not allow for a real history of the town to be written; actually it forces the author to confine himself to a few important but fragmentary events that brought Potidaea into the limelight of Ancient Greek history. The 479 B.C. revolt of Potidaea against the Persians and its participation in the battle of Plataeae forms the first episode covering chapter III of the book. The second episode consists of the famous *Potidaea* (432 B.C.) that constituted Potidaea's tragic entering the Peloponnesian War and its submission to the Athenians (Ch. VI). Finally, Potidaea submitting to Philip (356 B.C.) and its virtual destruction is the third episode (Ch. VII).

To these historical events we can add the one of Potidaea participating in the first Athenian Alliance (Ch. IV). All these points occupy a critical position in Greek history and have been investigated by many noted scholars, so that the author did not have the possibility to proceed toward a personal contribution in examining the subject. Thus, no special discussion on the views he holds is called for. For instance, the view that Potidaea took part in the battle of Plataeae is probable but it is not certain. More doubtful is the interpretation of the famous Thucydides' passage 1,61,4 that follows Woodhead's opinion that «καὶ ἀφικόμενος εἰς Βέρουαν» should be emended to «ἀφικόμενος εἰς Βρέαν» and that Vrea must be situated between Thermi and Strepsa. I think however that neither this opinion nor the opinion of the late Professor Stratis Pelekidis, who located Veria where Veryiá is, 14 klm NW of Potidaea, are convincing enough. It seems to me a) that the name of Veria is not the word which needs to be changed and b) that Veria cannot be any other town than the well-known one in Central Macedonia, without my being able, however, to give any solution at all to this yet insoluble problem. What Professor Alexander writes on the coins of Potidaea is clear and concrete. I would only note that the author's remark that "Potidaeans, most likely, were reproducing on their coins the image of the statue of Poseidon" might best have been left out. And as an archaeologist, I believe that his mistrust of the value of style-examination when gauging chronology, is, to say the least, carried to an extreme.

The author had a wider scope for personal research in his first two chapters, although here, too, his material is both limited and fragmentary. In the first chapter, the site of Potidaea is investigated, and so are its topography, the archaeological remains and the finds of the area. There is no problem about the site where the town was; ancient testimony as well as extant visible remains certify safely that the present-day village of Nea Potidaea has taken the place of the ancient town. The extant remains are accurately and clearly described, although

the interpolation (pp. 2-3) of written sources on the ancient walls breaks up the unity of his description. Perhaps the author might have found it worth his while to go into a more accurate designation of the walls preserved, for the expression "mediaeval wall" where Greece is concerned, is vague and confusing.

Besides a minor test-excavation carried out by the late Professor Stratis Pelekidis, no systematic archaeological excavation has taken place in the area of Potidaea. Hence, Professor Alexander had to confine himself to incidental finds which do not permit him to deduce safe or rich conclusions. Three Doric capitals are the most important of the finds the author mentions, and they might have come from buildings older than of classical years, but not from the "very early history of the town," if by this expression we understand, as one might, the first fifty years of the 6th century.

In his enumeration of finds the writer leaves out two very important reliefs coming from Potidaea and now in the archaeological museum of Thessaloniki. And yet he is familiar with both. One of them appears on Table XXI, 1 top right-hand side (an extremely bad photograph) and the other is mentioned in the following chapter in the part he devotes to religion (p. 24), because he thinks that the relief represents an Apollo with lyre. The omission is due to the fact that he believes both are dated from the 3rd century B.C. during the period when Potidaea was transnamed to Kassandra. The first relief is an excellent "funeral banquet" of the 4th century that would deserve attention for its theme as well as for its artistic quality. The second one is neither a votive piece nor does it represent an Apollo; instead, it is a funeral relief that depicts the dead full-face and holding a lyre. As far as the date is concerned, I believe that it can be placed safely enough within the decade of 380-370 B.C. It thus constitutes a characteristic sample of the artistic creation of the town. We must also note that most of the objects in the pictures of plate XXI belong to Roman times, indeed some vases of the picture on plate XXI, 2 may even reach the last limits of those years.¹

In the second chapter, entitled "From the founding of Potidaea to the Persian wars (ca. 600-490)," there is first a discussion of the founding date of Potidaea and then the prevailing opinion of the historians is accepted: that this Corinthian town was founded in the beginning of the 6th century B.C. The title of the second part in this chapter is: "Pre-Corinthian occupation of the site." While, however, one would have expected an array of concrete pieces of evidence, especially archaeological ones, to be presented, we see to our surprise the writer supporting the opinion based on mythology that older inha-

¹ We should add that recently there have been some interesting finds in the area of Potidaea deserving mention in this book, although they belong to years later than 316 B.C. The most important find is a Hellenistic tomb with golden jewelry. See *BCH*, 84, 1960, p. 791 f.

bitants existed on the Pallene peninsula. The reader really wonders at how it can be proved that this peninsula "was inhabited to some extent before the arrival of the Greeks" by bringing in this piece of information, namely that the mythical giant-battle is placed precisely in this area or that Hercules fought here after the fall of Troy, etc. Even if the writer did not have the opportunity to look for and collect sherds of older times in Pallene (there are many of them in Aphytis, today's Athytos), he might have done better founding his opinion on the existence of many other prehistoric settlements in neighboring areas of Chalcidice, namely Olynthos, where he has also worked.

I am not going to dwell on the data produced about the cults of Potidaea: may I just remind that, as we have seen, the relief which has been thought of as a votive piece of Apollo was a tombstone. Nor does the offering of a Potidaean to Apollo, at Delphi imply that there should have been any worship of Apollo at the offerer's native place. On the other hand, the worship of Hercules remains as uncertain, without it necessarily being excluded.

Finally, a discussion of the treasury of Potidaeans at Delphi, useful as it is in a book devoted to Potidaea, does not add much new information about the dating of the building or its identity.

I am sorry that I have to make two general remarks not favorable to the writer. The first one is connected with the bibliographical annotations. The author refers us perhaps too often to books that were written a hundred years ago (e.g. Grote, *A History of Greece*, 1869. Hermann, *A Manual of the Political Antiquities of Greece*, 1836. Müller, *The History and Antiquities of the Doric race*, 1830). Elsewhere the quotes old textual editions (inscriptions, for instance) or refers to editions that are not very usable or authoritative (R.I.G. = C. Michel, *Recueil d'inscriptions Grecques*, instead of *I.G. I²*, or M.N. Tod - G.H.I. Kaibel, *Epigrammata* instead of Peek, *Grab-Epigramme*.) At other times he does not mention later publications that should definitely have been there (e.g. p. 97 n. 22 needed to mention L.H. Jeffery, *The local Scripts of Archaic Greece*, p. 104 n. 112 the new edition of J. Marcadé, *Signatures*, p. 122 n. 11, the article of J. Papastavrou «Τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Χαλκιδέων καὶ οἱ Ὀλύθιοι» *Ἐπιστημονικὴ Ἐπειρὶς τῆς Φιλοσοφικῆς Σχολῆς τοῦ Πανεπιστημίου Θεσσαλονίκης*, vol. 6, 1950).

Finally, when ancient sources are mentioned in the bibliography (p. 128) the titles of the works appear now in English, now in Latin, now in Greek and not rarely in a strange mixture of languages (Aristotle, *Oeconomica*, *Rhetoric*, *Athenaion Politeia*, *Politica*. Herodotus, *History*, etc, etc.)

My second remark pertains to the plates in the book. Although the writer justifies the bad condition they are in, attributing it to the old age of the pictures (they were made in 1938), may I be permitted to think that a book of 1963 should not have been allowed pictures like the ones in plates XXI, XXII and XXIII. Nor are the rest of the pictures much clearer, although it would not have been difficult today

to have better pictures made of the remains of Potidaean walls and the remains of the Potidaean treasury at Delphi.

It would be unfair if I concluded the presentation of this book with the latter remarks. I ought to add that most of its weakness is due to the nature of the material the author had to work with as well as to the lack of evidence. This is clearly seen in chapters where safer and more plentiful evidence offers itself to the author, as for example in the historical chapters. In these, there is clear judgement, objectivity, and knowledge of the subject and Dr. Alexander presents a lucid report of the facts, expressing opinions that are often correct and to the point.

University of Thessaloniki

M. ANDRONIKOS

Kurt Weitzmann, *Geistige Grundlagen und Wesen der Mazedonischen Renaissance* (Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Forschung des Landes Nordrhein - Westfalen. Geisteswissenschaften, Heft 107), Westdeutscher Verlag, Köln und Opladen. S. 55, Abbildungen 51, Farbtafeln 5.

There is no need for me to present the author of this study. Kurt Weitzmann has been well known for many years to those who are interested in Byzantine Archaeology. His studies on Byzantine minor arts and especially on illuminated manuscripts have established him as an authority for both the specialist and the interested layman. His thorough knowledge of the problems in Byzantine painting enables him to offer safe and responsible answers based on attested sources and accurate dating of the illuminated manuscripts. His work on the origin and dating of the frescoes at the Lombard town, Castelseprio (*The fresco cycle of S. Maria di Castelseprio*, Princeton, 1951), which still are two of the major problems in Byzantine painting, is an example of this. Despite the objections raised by some scholars (M. Shapiro, *Art Bulletin*, 34, 1952, 148 foll.; G. R. Ceccelli, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 45, 1952, 97 - 104), Weitzmann's conclusions are, at least so far, the most satisfying and persuasive of all. Hence they have been accepted as correct, either in part or as a whole (A. Grabar, *Les Fresques de Castelseprio*, *Gazette des Beaux - Arts*, 37, 1950, 107 - 114; P. Lemerle, Milan et Castelseprio "Orient ou Rome," *Byzantion*, XXII, 1952, 188 - 199). The book we are presenting here treats the same problem of Byzantine painting and its accurate dating, both in the monumental art and in the illuminated manuscripts.

Kurt Weitzmann himself states in his short preface that the problem he is dealing with is the one nearest to his heart: it is the relation between classical tradition and Byzantine art. The author does not confine himself to a stylistic analysis, but goes beyond this as he attempts to give an answer to the more general problem of cultural history, the history of ideas, in the era he has selected for study and which he calls the "Macedonian Renaissance." Although I am not