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affords a number of parallels. I can supply no convincing explanation for the dislocation of the line, although the similarity in the endings of consecutive lines (στρόφουν 767, στρατόν 773) may have caused the omission of 767. In any event, it is as likely to have fallen out from after 772 as after 769 (Page), 776 (Siebelis) or 777 (van Nes). The manuscripts of the tragedians provide several examples of lines omitted in cases where no obvious palaeographical explanation (homoioteleuton, homoiooton, vel sim.) is available, in some instances the line being inserted later in the margin or at the foot of the page. On at least two occasions, however, the omitted line and the line preceding it have identical words in the middle of the verse in the same metrical sedes, as 772 and 767 have γάρ. So, the scribe of Vat. gr. 1345 initially omitted Eur. Phoen. 9 (φύναι λέγουσιν, ἐκ δὲ τοῦδε Λάιον; line 8 reads Πολύδωρον ἐξεψε, τοῦ δὲ Λάβδοκον), later adding it, in the correct place, between the lines. And the scribes of both Madrid 4677 and Leiden Voss. gr. Q4A omitted PV 515 which, curiously enough, ends in οἰκοστροφός (τίς οὖν ἀνάγκης ἢ στίν οἰκοστρόφος; line 514 reads τέχνη δ’ ἀνάγκης ἢ στις στέρα μακρώ), the former adding it in the margin while, in the latter manuscript, the line was added between the lines by a later hand.
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14 Pers. 667–70, Sept. 336–8, Suppl. 713–14, Ag. 532–4, 832–34, 1186–7, Cho. 75–6, 753–5 (with πῶς γάρ οὐ; intervening), 989–90. See also PV 333 (πάντος γάρ οὐ πείσεις νν· οὐ γάρ εύπνης.).


AN EPIGRAM AND A TREASURY: ON SIM. FGE XXXIIIIB

[B. 162; D. 163; EG XXXIII]

Κίμων ἔγραψε τὴν θύραν τὴν δεξιάν,
ην δ’ ἐξιόντον δεξιάν Διονύσσιος.

Cimon painted the door to the right,
and the right door as one goes out, Dionysius.

(Anth. Pal. 9.758)

Denys Page correctly classified this epigram, which comes from a series of Simonidea in the ninth book of the Palatine Anthology, as a signature epigram. The Cimon

1 I would like to express my gratitude to the anonymous reader of CQ for a number of suggestions and improvements. I am grateful to Melissa Mueller and Ivana Petrovic for discussing this epigram with me. The abbreviations of the epigraphic corpora follow SEG. CEG = P.A. Hansen, Carmina epigraphica Graeca, vols. 1–2 (Berlin, 1983; 1989); EG = D.L. Page, Epigrammata Graeca (Oxford, 1975); FGE = D.L. Page, Further Greek Epigrams (Cambridge, 1981). All references to EG and FGE are limited to the corpus of the epigrams ascribed to Simonides, unless otherwise stated.
mentioned in the first line of the epigram is regularly identified as Cimon of Cleonae, a late sixth-century B.C. painter commended by Pliny (HN 35.34) and Aelian (VH 8.8) for his technique and, possibly, use of perspective. The identity of Dionysius from line 2 is disputed: from little that we know of a painter named Dionysius of Colophon who may have been a younger contemporary of Cimon, it is difficult to reach any conclusion. What connects the two artists is that they were both famed for their portrayal of humans and that they may have entered in a sort of a competition with each other.

The location of the epigram proves elusive and commentators have so far refrained from suggesting a precise physical setting for the verses. Taking my cue from Page’s remark that the epigram was painted on a door, I would suggest that the phrase τὴν ἐξοικνην δὲ δεξιάν [Θύραν], refers to the doors of a temple (or a precinct) or, most likely, to a door leading to a temple treasury (Θυσιατήριον).

Epigrams with artists’ signatures are very well attested on a variety of objects, from vases to monumental funeral paintings, and can be dated to as early as the late Archaic period. That such signatures can take form of verse inscriptions is also attested in the context of temple architecture: Pliny reports that in the early fifth century B.C. the shrine of Ceres in the Circus Maximus at Rome was decorated with paintings and sculptures by Damophilus and Gorgasus. Damophilus and Gorgasus decorated the right- and left-hand side of the shrine respectively, and their works of art were accompanied by verse inscriptions indicating in Greek who did what: there can be little doubt that these epigrams resembled XXXIIIb to some extent.

As is well known, painters’ signatures typically consist of some form of the verb γράφω and an object in the accusative. The convoluted expression ἔγραψε … τὴν

\[ \text{GVI} = \text{W. Peek, Griechische Versinschriften (Berlin, 1955). Overbeck = J. Overbeck, Die antiken Schriftquellen zur Geschichte der bildenden Künste bei den Griechen (Hildesheim, 1959).} \]

\[ \text{(Paris, 1896), 142 assumes the poem was a } \]}


\[ \text{2 Identified also in a further epideictic epigram, Anth. Plan. 84, FGE XXXIIIa. For literary sources on Cimon, see Overbeck, nos. 375–9, 67–8; for further information, see G. Lippold, s.v. Kimon (10), RE 11, 454; for a bibliography, see Brill’s New Pauly, Cimon [4].} \]

\[ \text{3 FGE, ibid. Page rejects association of Dionysius from the epigram with Dionysius of Colophon (see Overbeck, No. 1136) accepted by Diehl, Budé and Beckby.} \]

\[ \text{4 On Dionysius see Plin. HN 35.113: nihil aliud quam homines pinxit, ob id anthropographos cognominatus. The anonymous reader for CQ points out that the epigram may bear witness to an agonistic relationship between Cimon and Dionysius: Page FGE, 246 plausibly argues that epigram XXXIIIb (a signature epigram by Cimon) is a reply to XXXIIa (a boastful signature epigram by Iphion of Corinth), originating from a rivalry in a competition. In this sense it appears attractive to think of the epigram XXXIIIb as originating in a sort of a competitive context as well; its wording would then imply that Cimon and Dionysius both came out of it victorious or, at least, standing both on the right side, as equals. On official competitions between painters in context of sanctuaries, see J. Onions, Classical Art and the Cultures of Greece and Rome (New Haven, CT and London, 1999), 64–70. However, according to Pliny, competitions in paintings were instituted at Delphi and Corinth only in the mid fifth century B.C. (Plin. HN 35.58). While this may be a slightly late date for Cimon’s participation in such official competition, some sort of a local agonistic context cannot be excluded either.} \]

\[ \text{5 Page concisely notes in the apparatus of EG XXXIII: picturae in portis inscriptae. In FGE XXXIIIb, 246 Page points out that the epigram was in all likelihood a graffito.} \]

\[ \text{6 Some have thought that the location of the epigram is fictitious: A. Hauvette, De l’authenticité des épigrammes de Simonide (Paris, 1896), 142 assumes the poem was a } \]

\[ \text{and argues that the wordplay with the adjective is unsuitable for a real inscription. The reasoning is unassailable.} \]

\[ \text{7 Plin. HN 35.154 (XLV) = Overbeck, No. 616: Plastae laudatissimi fuere Damophilus et Gorgasus, idem pictores, qui Cereis aedem Romae ad circum maximum utroque genere artis suae excoluerunt, versibus inscriptis Graece, quibus significarent ab dextra opera Damophilis esse, } \]

\[ \text{8 The accusative object is often a deictic, sometimes a personal pronoun: the earliest attestation is} \]
δ̣ ἐξιόντων δεξιάν [Θύρων] was considered by Page to be ‘oddly phrased’, while Hugh Lloyd-Jones stressed that this elocution ‘might be accounted for by the desire for an euphemism’. Both observations are fitting: the repetition of δεξιά seems indeed to be motivated by the wish to avoid any quality judgement or comparison between the individual flaps which would be implied by the use of ἀριστεράς. On the other hand, the expression is indeed an unusual and a marked elocution – and one which has parallels in the very specific context of the language of Greek financial records (especially of the temple inventories and public accounts).

Δεξιάς εἰσίνται, ‘on the right-hand side as one goes in’, like ἀριστεράς εἰσίντι, ‘on the left-hand side as one goes in’, is a marked phrase found in Attic and Delian inscriptive temple inventory lists from the fourth century B.C. onwards. Such inscriptions, often placed on the sacred ground in the vicinity of a treasury or on its walls, give a conspectus of the content of the treasury: typically, the lists record the object, its location, its monetary value and sometimes also the name of the dedicator. In such a context, the elocutions δεξιάς εἰσίνται and ἀριστεράς εἰσίντι are used as topographical references pointing out the physical location of an object in the treasury (typical objects found in such lists would include phialai, lamps, cups, seals, rings, crowns, to name but a few). At times, the reference to the location of the object is doubly highlighted on the stone: first, by being cut in bigger letters than the rest of the text,
and second, in so far as the expression is often placed at the beginning of a line. Another financial record, *IG II² 1657.5–6* (an account of the fortification of Piraeus), supplies a parallel for τὴν δ’ ἐξιόντων δεξιῶν from line 2, that is for avoidance of the adjective ἀριστερός.  

Thus, the expression τὴν δ’ ἐξιόντων δεξιῶν in the epigram seems to have been modelled after a technical expression found in the epigraphic record: the author’s clever deployment of the technical language typically limited to temple inventories and financial records thus implies the same status and value for the paintings themselves that the objects in the treasury possessed.
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14 ἐπ’ Εὐβολίδῳ ἄρχοντο[ς] ἀπὸ τὸ σημεό ἀρξάμενον μέχρι τὸ μετώπι τῶν πυλῶν τῶν κατόιτο Ἀφροδίσιον ἐπί δεξιά ἐξιόντι. See also: δεξιά[ς παρεξιόντι]. *SEG* 21 562.27.

A NEW APPROACH TO THE DESCRIPTION OF A BABYLONIAN HYDRAULIC WORK BY HERODOTUS

1. INTRODUCTION

Herodotus is a fascinating author, not only to scholars of history, but also to a wide spectrum of scientists, such as engineers, who are not usually considered to be relevant to humanistic studies. A strong indication of the persisting interest in Herodotus is the recent proliferation of books, for example those of C. Dewald and J. Marincola¹ and A. M. Bowie,² on various aspects of his work. At the same time, there is a remarkable interest in the evolution of knowledge in different scientific fields which promotes the understanding of a) the relationship between socio-economic phenomena and technological progress and b) the process of acquiring and documenting scientific knowledge. In the field of hydraulics and hydrology in particular, this interest is documented by journal papers (for example by L.W. Mays et al.³ and D. Koutsoyiannis et al.⁴), books (for example by A.K. Biswas,⁵ Ö. Wikander⁶), book chapters (for example by A.I. Wilson⁷) and conference proceedings.

The aim of our paper is to shed new light on a Babylonian hydraulic work described by Herodotus and attributed by him to Nitocris. Our initial point of view was that his

6 Ö. Wikander (ed.), *Handbook of Ancient Water Technology* (Leiden, Boston and Cologne, 2000).