

The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



The Pylos and Sphacteria Question

G. B. Grundy

The Classical Review / Volume 11 / Issue 03 / April 1897, pp 155 - 159

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00026548, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00026548

How to cite this article:

G. B. Grundy (1897). The Pylos and Sphacteria Question. The Classical Review, 11, pp 155-159 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00026548

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

THE PYLOS AND SPHACTERIA QUESTION.

I VERY much doubt whether the controversy between Mr. Burrows and myself can be of very engrossing interest to the world in general. Still I should wish, if the editor of the *Classical Review* will allow me, to correct one or two errors which Mr. Burrows has made in his lengthy and somewhat polemical criticism of my paper, and also to repudiate the meanings which he has been kind enough to attribute to certain statements of mine.

In the first place I suspected when I read Mr. Burrows' original contribution to the *Hellenic Journal* that he was inclined to give to topography in relation to Ancient History an emphasis far greater than that which I should be disposed to allot to it. That it may contribute largely to our knowledge of the subject I, of course, believe; otherwise I should not give time and trouble to it: but I am also persuaded that the conclusions to be drawn from it cannot be by any means so detailed as some of those which Mr. Burrows has drawn from the evidence he obtained at Pylos, and are subject to far stricter limitations than those which he would assign to them. Mr. Burrows would like to separate the topographical from the historical evidence, and is apparently quite angry with me for not adopting this excellent but wholly impracticable plan. For instance, with reference to my estimate of the former breadth of the entrance from the bay into the lagoon he says '(Mr. Grundy) has placed the western end of the sandbar where he places it, for no other reason than because such a state of things fits in with his preconceived theory as to the Spartan defence of the harbour, and is not incompatible with the geological probabilities.'

This is a form of accusation to which any comparison between topography and history must expose the maker. At the same time had Mr. Burrows read more carefully the paper which he criticises he would have seen:—

(1) That the breadth I have allotted to the channel is only put forward as a very approximate estimate.

(2) That the so-called preconceived theory is founded on the whole story as given by Thucydides and not merely on those detached fragments of it on which Mr. Burrows appears to rely.

Throughout the whole of his paper Mr.

Burrows seems to think that I put forward my conclusions as though I considered them to be fully ascertained. In this he is mistaken. Still had he seemed to me to give a correct representation of the evidence I adduced, I should have been quite willing to let the original papers and the replies stand. As it is I am unwilling to allow readers of the *Classical Review*, who may not have seen the *Hellenic Journal*, to suppose that I made use of the sort of argument which Mr. Burrows attributes to me.

I. *The Final Struggle on Sphacteria.*

Mr. Burrows is glad to see that I have considerably altered my position with regard to the Spartan defence of the summit of the Island. I cannot understand what gives him this impression. I hold and have always held since I saw the ground that the Spartans were posted round the summit on the arc of a segment somewhat greater perhaps than a semicircle, of which the cliff from the summit into the little hollow formed the straight side, and that along the main cliff, into this hollow, and up this small cliff the Messenians made their way. As to the actual path by which they arrived at the hollow, I have already said that it is ultra-refinement of topography to attempt to indicate it in detail, and have pointed out that Mr. Burrows' theory involves a supposition directly at variance with the account given by Thucydides. Mr. Burrows gets over the difficulty by supposing a path from the Panagia along the foot of the cliffs, no trace of even the possibility of which can be shown at the present day.

I need hardly say that the remark of Mr. Tozer to which he refers is nothing more than the suggestion of a possibility.

I confess that I am wholly unable to determine the exact position which Mr. Burrows would assign to the Spartans: but, as far as I can make out, he seems to think that they were in occupation of the little hollow from the very first beginning of the fight at the summit, or, at any rate, were defending the northern outlet of it.¹

I can only say that, if this fairly represents Mr. Burrows' view, I do not see how in that case the first few Messenians could have arrived at the south end of the little hollow without being immediately discovered

¹ *J.H.S.* 60, 61.

and cut down by the Spartan troops stationed in it. There could at any rate have been no fatal surprise.

I incline to the view that it was from the south end of the hollow that the Messenians arrived, but I think that Thucydides' story of the surprise becomes quite inexplicable if there were any Spartan troops in the hollow itself. The rational explanation seems to be that in all probability the Spartans at the summit had good reason to suppose that no one could get into it undiscovered, and that therefore any possible attack from this very difficult side could be easily warded off by lining the low cliff, should the necessity for so doing arise. What the Messenians apparently did was to get into it unobserved, by some wholly unsuspected way, and hence they succeeded in gaining the actual summit by scaling the low cliff before the Spartans could provide for its defence.

As to the *παλαιον ἔρμα*, I have accepted Mr. Burrows' re-identification of Dr. Schliemann's discovery, and I have never had any doubt as to its having stood on the site indicated, Thucydides' evidence on this point being peculiarly clear. At the same time I shall retain my caution with regard to the care which must be exercised in drawing distinction between certain kinds of rock formation existent on Sphacteria and the earliest examples of wall work.

A fair example of the misunderstanding of my views which is so unfortunately frequent in Mr. Burrows' paper is afforded by his reference to the supposed remains on Hagio Nikolo. Mr. Burrows speaks of 'the Nestorian remains which he (Mr. Grundy) claims to have discovered on Hagio Nikolo.'

The addition of the word 'Nestorian' begs the question. I never made such a claim. I said expressly that 'there cannot be any certainty about the site until excavation has been done.'¹

II. *The S.E. Corner of Pylos.*

I have read Mr. Burrows' argument on this point carefully several times, and I confess I do not wholly understand its constructive side; so I will simply deal with it in so far as it is destructive.

Referring to the south end of the east cliff of Pylos, Mr. Burrows says² 'the rise of the ground at any rate never approaches the perpendicular,' a statement which he supports by an extremely disparaging reference

to the illustration which he inserted with his own paper. He does not even do his illustration justice. He says that in it 'the sandbar is regarded as non-existent,'³ whereas the beginning of it is plainly shown on the right edge of the picture in the form of a light patch in the engraving. I do not know, of course, what Mr. Burrows means by 'never approaching the perpendicular.' I see that at this south end of the east cliff, the summit of the cliff rises to a vertical height of 60 feet above its eastern foot, which is only at a horizontal distance of 81 feet from that summit. This slope moreover is not continuous, but in part much steeper than that implied by these general measurements; in fact, if I recollect aright, the lower part is perpendicular cliff, with a slope from the top of the cliff to the 60 ft. level. Anyone who realises what this really means in nature will understand that Mr. Burrows' remark is highly misleading.

Mr. Burrows then proceeds to talk of survey defeating its own object if it supersedes observation.⁴ Is he under the impression that surveying instruments act automatically? Is he not aware that a survey implies an enormous series of observations which have to be made with the greatest care, since one error may mean the loss of a day's work? Is he aware that every change of slope requires a new reading of the angle for contouring purposes? How can survey supersede observation, when it is itself nothing else save the record of observation aided by instruments of accuracy?

As to the path round the south end of the cliff, Mr. Burrows accuses me of forgetfulness as to its existence.⁵ The forgetfulness, or rather oversight, is Mr. Burrows' own. I refer to it on p. 17 of my original article in very definite terms.⁶ There is just room for the path and nothing more: but in my case, the matter is not of vast importance in view of the evidence of that south part of the east cliff having been washed by the sea in comparatively recent times.⁷ This also disposes of the main objection which Mr. Burrows makes as to the position of the south wall of defence as given on my map (wall BB.). As to this wall not having been on the actual shore, the facts given by Thucydides are quite sufficient to show this, viz.

(1) ἐχώρει ἔξω τοῦ τείχους ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν.⁸

³ C.R. p. 2, note 6.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 3.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 3.

⁶ J.H.S. p. 17, also *ibid.* p. 5.

⁷ *Ibid.* p. 10.

⁸ Thuc. iv. 9, 2.

¹ J.H.S. p. 49, *ad fin.*

² C.R. p. 2.

(2) καὶ τὰς τριηρεῖς αἵπερ ἦσαν αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τῶν καταλειφθεισῶν ἀνασπᾶσας ὑπὸ τὸ τεῖχος μα προσεσταύρωσε.¹

We may conjecture, too, from what Thucydides tells us, that Demosthenes never regarded this wall as a really practicable line of defence, and possibly never completed it.

What Mr. Burrows means by an attack by land on the south side of Koryphasion² I do not see, except that he seems to postulate the existence of low ground, now the western extremity of the sandbar, to the east of the south end of the east cliffs of Koryphasion.³ The evidence, in so far as it exists, is all against this postulate.

He is kind enough to present me with an argument against himself. I do not require it. The state of the cliffs and of the sandbar is evidence enough. I dealt with both in my first article.⁴

Mr. Burrows derives an argument from the present position of the emissaries.

In the first place they are all artificial at the present day. In the second place the two he mentions were made through the higher part of the sandbar several hundred yards from Koryphasion, because if made at the lower part of the sandbar close under the cliffs they have a tendency to become choked by the sand from the bank which is forming at the inner end of the Sikia Channel. That is what had happened with regard to the one which is shown on my map running half-way through the sandbar near Koryphasion.

Mr. Burrows fails to understand how Demosthenes could have beached his ships on the south-west shore of Koryphasion. He thinks the statement astounding, and apologises for me by supposing it to be an oversight. And yet Mr. Burrows allows the Peloponnesian vessels to get near enough in shore, even during the stress and confusion of battle, for them to be able to use their ἀροβάθραι. If they could do this under such circumstances, I do not see how it should be so astounding that Demosthenes at certain places on the same stretch of shore should have been able to draw up his vessels when there was no one to hinder him.

Mr. Burrows and I differ as to the place at which the Spartans proposed to attack by engines. He suggests his supposititious slope or low land at the south-east corner of Koryphasion. He imagines that a wall

running down to the end of the cliff on the Sikia Channel must have been the proposed object of attack. I have already shown that the existence of the piece of land he postulates is contrary to the evidence obtainable. But suppose that that low land had been in existence, the Peloponnesians could only have got at the last few yards of the wall close to the channel, and had they knocked that down they would only have opened a passage a few yards wide, which a few men could have defended against enormously superior numbers. Surely it would be more natural for them to assail the north wall, which in the position in which I conjecture it to have stood was easily assailable by engines, as Mr. Burrows admits.

I have nothing to add to or to subtract from my explanation of τὸ κατὰ τὸν λιμένα τεῖχος in the *Hellenic Journal*. As to the word ἀροβάσις, Mr. Burrows' criticism is evidently founded mainly on a misreading of what I have said in my original paper.⁵

Turning to the question of the position of the north wall, Mr. Burrows leaves the difference between us in much the same state as it was before. I see, however, that he has considerably modified his views with regard to certain details. In his reply to my criticism, he utterly ignores the two most important factors,

(1) The enormous superiority of the attacking force;

(2) The fact that an attacking party can choose the point of attack.

I am very strongly of opinion that the wall to whose remains he points, was some hurried structure run up in connection with the defence of the summit of Koryphasion, a very different object from the defence of the whole promontory.

On the lagoon question I have nothing to add to what I have already said, save that Mr. Burrows' accusation of an attempt on my part at dating its progress of formation is quite unwarranted by anything I have said on the subject.

Mr. Burrows refers to the modification which I have thought it necessary to make in my view as to the channels which were blocked.⁶ I freely admit that I missed in the first instance what seems to me to be the fairly obvious explanation of this very obscure point in a very obscure question. Nor do I think that those who have read Thucydides' narrative very closely, and can form an estimate of the very complicated nature of the factors involved in the

¹ *Ibid.* iv. 9, 1.

² *C.R.* p. 3.

³ *V.* again in *J.H.S.* p. 10.

⁴ *J.H.S.* p. 12, *ad fin.*

⁵ *Vide.* *J.H.S.* p. 29, *ad fin.*

⁶ *V.* end of this article.

explanation of any part of it, will feel much surprise that I have had in this section to amend the bill. I rejected the original theory on my own criticism of the story as a whole.

But had Mr. Burrows confined himself to re-killing this dead Voithio Kilia theory, he would have avoided a serious error. He proceeds however to attack the amended view that the channels blocked were the entrances into the lagoon harbour, (1) via the outer part of the Sikia Channel from the sea, (2) via the inner part of the same channel from the bay. He says 'If the object of the Spartans was to prevent the Athenians from getting into the inner harbour, why did they not block the mouth of that harbour itself?' etc. He then adds 'But can Mr. Grundy point me out in this case a single advantage'? viz. in the blocking of the two channels, as compared with the blocking of the lagoon entrance. Of course I can, and so can anyone else who reads Thucydides' text. If there is one point with regard to the views of the Spartans on which Thucydides lays peculiar stress it is that they were deeply convinced of the necessity of maintaining the communication with their men on the Island. Had they left the Sikia open, the communication would have been either cut, or rendered very difficult, so soon as the Athenian fleet arrived.¹

Mr. Burrows argues at considerable length for the superiority of his theory with regard to the channels over my own. According to him the blocking of the harbour entrances was a wild impossibility. Yet Thucydides, as his repeated and detailed assertions show, believed the thing to be possible. All this Mr. Burrows rejects in order to establish a theory founded on the fact that fifty, the number of the Athenian fleet, may be without difficulty divided into two parts having to one another the ratio of two to eight.

He inserts at this point of his argument a note. It is with reference to Thucydides' words ἐν τῇ τῷ λιμένι οὐσας τὰς ναῦς καὶ οὐκ ἐκπλεούσας.² He says:—

'Thuc. iv. 13, 3. Mr. Grundy *J.H.S.* p. 30-32, apparently thinks ἐν τῷ λιμένι refers to the ships blocking the eastern of the two channels. Here, then, even the first informant used *λιμήν* in a double sense! For these ships were not in the inner harbour.'

Of course they were not. That is exactly the point. But Mr. Burrows has not even taken the trouble to note that I said ex-

pressly in dealing with the two divisions of the story, 'The first part . . . closes at the end of the first section of the thirteenth chapter.'³ Consequently the informant was not the first informant at all but the second.

The other points raised in his article have been discussed in my previous articles, and repetition of the arguments would require more space and time than I have at my disposal.

G. B. GRUNDY.

I append herewith the revised view as to the blocking of the straits, to which reference is made in Mr. Burrows' paper.

Addendum, October 1896.

The foregoing paper (that in the *J.H.S.* of April 1896) was written eight months ago. It is one thing to reconsider one's views while still in the MS. stage; it is another to examine them when they appear in the cold impersonality of print. The intense complication of the subject made me somewhat anxious as to the result of the latter examination. Having now made it, I may say that I am prepared to abide by all that I have written on the many points of the narrative—with one exception: I should wish to modify the view expressed as to the explanation of the difficulties with regard to the blocking of the channels. Those who have read the paper will see that I believe that there was a solid foundation of actual fact beneath the express statement made on this point by Thucydides. In the paper I have stated my belief that the characteristics of the mouth of the Voithio-Kilia and the Sikia Channel contribute this basis, and that probably both of these were blocked, the latter both inside and out. On reconsideration I would modify this expression of opinion. I am inclined to think that the reasons for blocking the Voithio-Kilia are inadequate, and that, in fact, the blocking of the Sikia inside and out is the true explanation of the difficulty—in other words that the Peloponnesian fleet intended to block the entrance of the Lagoon harbour, which entrance the topographical evidence obtainable on the spot, and given in the paper, shows to have existed in its most recent form at the Pylos end of the sandbar

¹ *J.H.S.* p. 74 etc.

² *C.R.* p. 9, note 3.

³ *J.H.S.* p. 42.

right under the south portion of the east cliff of Pylos (now Palaeo-Kastro). The estimate I have formed of the condition of things at the time will be found marked in Plate II. of the maps.

That the blocking of the Sikia was part of the design in the blockade of Pylos I think there can be no doubt. If any one does doubt the fact, let him remove this

factor from the problem, and he will then see the enormous mass of difficulties which the removal would involve. Every mistake or difficulty (and there are many of the latter) in Thucydides' account, with the exception of the length attributed to Sphacteria, is ultimately traceable to his failure to recognise the existence of *two* harbours.

PLATO, SYMPOSIUM, 179 C.

ALTHOUGH the words that I would endeavour here to correct occupy but a small space, I quote the passage in which they occur (*symp.* 179 B—D) in extenso, in order plainly to show them in their proper connection:—

καὶ μὴν ὑπεραποθνήσκειν γε μόνον ἐθέλουσιν οἱ ἑρῶντες, οὐ<χ> [μόνον] ὅτι <οἱ> ἄνδρες, ἀλλὰ καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες. τούτου δὲ καὶ ἡ Πελίου θυγάτηρ Ἀλκίησις ἱκανὴν μαρτυρίαν παρέχεται ὑπὲρ τοῦδε τοῦ λόγου εἰς τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἐβέλθασα μόνη ὑπὲρ τοῦ αὐτῆς ἀνδρὸς ἀποθανεῖν ὄντων αὐτῷ πατρός τε καὶ μητρός, οὓς ἐκείνη τοσοῦτον ὑπερεβάλετο τῇ φιλίας διὰ τὸν ἔρωτα ὥστ' ἀποδείξαι αὐτοὺς ἄλλοτριους ὄντας τῷ νείῳ καὶ ὀνόματι μόνον προσήκοντας. καὶ τοῦτ' ἐργασαμένη τὸ ἔργον οὕτω καλὸν ἔδοξεν ἐργάσασθαι οὐ μόνον ἀνθρώποις ἀλλὰ καὶ θεοῖς ὥστε πολλῶν πολλὰ καὶ καλὰ ἐργασαμένων εὐαριθμήτοις δὴ τιςιν ἔδωκαν τούτο γέρας οἱ θεοί, ἐξ Αἰδου ἀνιέναι¹ πάλιν τὴν ψυχὴν, ἀλλ' α<ὕ> τὴν ἐκείνην² ἀνέισαν ἀγασθέντες τῷ ἔργῳ· οὕτω καὶ θεοὶ τὴν περὶ τὸν ἔρωτα σπουδὴν τε καὶ ἀρετὴν μάλιστα τιμῶσιν. Ὀρφέα δὲ τὸν Οἰάγου ἀτελὴ ἀπέπεμψαν ἐξ Αἰδου φάσμα δείξαντες τῆς γυναικὸς ἐφ' ἣν ἦκεν,

¹ ἀνιέναι MSS., em. Alexander Hommel in ed. *Symp.* Lipsiae 1834.

² ἀλλὰ τὴν ἐκείνης MSS. et. edd.

αὐτὴν δὲ οὐ δόντες, ὅτι μαλθακίζεσθαι ἐδόκει ἄτε ὢν καθαριδὸς καὶ οὐ τολμᾶν ἔνεκα τοῦ ἔρωτος ἀποθνήσκειν ὥσπερ Ἀλκίησις, ἀλλὰ διαμηχανᾶσθαι ζῶν εἰσιέναι εἰς Αἶδον.

Hommel's correction of ἀνιέναι to ἀνιέναι, which had forced itself upon me before I knew that he had made it, seems inevitable; albeit it has met with little or no favour with subsequent editors. The traditional reading is easily explained as due to the following ἀνείσαν.

As to the change that I would propose the following points must be noticed. First, there is a sharp antithesis implied between εὐαριθμήτοις—ψυχὴν and αὐτῆς (following the vulgate)—τῷ ἔργῳ: secondly, this antithesis is not expressed by the vulgate: thirdly, the position of τὴν ψυχὴν indicates that in the antithetical clause we should have a term contrasted with it; but τὴν ἐκείνης (sc. ψυχὴν) will not suffice. We gain help from the story of Orpheus where φάσμα and αὐτή, 'the real woman herself,' are contrasted. Reading αὐτὴν ἐκείνην we have the woman herself as σῶμα καὶ ψυχὴ contrasted with the mere ψυχή.

MORTIMER LAMSON EARLE.

Bryn Mawr College, Pennsylvania.

NOTE ON TERENCE *ADELPHI* LINE 415 (DZIATZKO), AND PLAUTUS *MOSTELLARIA* 805 *sqq.*

HORACE appears to have this passage in mind as he writes *Satire* 1, 4, 105 *sqq.* as noticed by Dz. In *Ep.* 1, 5, 23 he seems to have l. 428 before him. Demea in 415 says, 'I bring up my son to see himself reflected in the light of other people's lives as in a mirror and to take an example from the lives

of others.' Syrus parodies this, replacing Demea's lofty abstractions by concrete instances drawn from the repertoire of the cook: 'I tell my fellow slaves that it is their business to mend their ways: and I do this by holding up to them instances of failures or successes in certain dishes which