

# Lustrum

Sollemnia aedificii a. D. MCMXI inaugurati

Separatum



# Lustrum



Ménesi út 11–13.  
Sollemnia aedificii a.D. MCMXI inaugurati

Ediderunt  
László Horváth, Krisztina Laczkó, Károly Tóth,  
et  
András Péterffy (Appendix)

Typotex Kiadó–Eötvös Collegium  
Budapest, 2011

Sumptibus NKA

**nka**  
Nemzeti Kulturális Alap

© Auctores et compositores, 2011  
ISBN 978 963 279 441 9



Lócsi Levente

P. J. Rhodes

## The *Erxadieis* inscription

(SEG xxvi 461; Meiggs & Lewis, 1988 reissue, 67 bis; *Nomima* i 55)

I first visited Budapest in 1979, when FIEC (the Fédération Internationale des Associations d' Études Classiques) ventured into eastern Europe for its great quinquennial conference, and on that occasion I had the pleasure of meeting Prof. Ritoók (who was in the chair for the session at which I read this paper) for the first time. I was brought into contact with Hungarian scholars again more recently in connection with those pages of the Archimedes Palimpsest which contain texts not of Archimedes but of the Athenian orator Hyperides: Prof. Horváth and his colleagues here have played a very important part in deciphering and interpreting this material, and I have been one of the British scholars who have been involved in the work together with them. Prof. Horváth and I have met and have discussed Hyperides on various occasions in Britain and here, and in particular I have twice before visited the Eötvös Collegium: in September 2007, for a meeting on the palimpsest and a conference on Texts and Traditions; and in April 2009, for a conference in memory of István Borzsák and a seminar for the students here.<sup>1</sup> I have also been made a member of the editorial board of *Acta Antiqua* (which has not yet been a burdensome appointment). I therefore feel very much at home in Budapest and in the Collegium, and I am greatly pleased and honoured to have been invited to take part in your centenary celebrations now.

At the seminar in 2009 I discussed inscriptions which shed light on the fourth-century alliance known as the Second Athenian League; and here I should like to discuss one inscription which sheds light on classical Sparta's relations with its allies: part of an alliance between Sparta and a subdivision or dependency of the Aetolians, almost certainly called the *Erxadieis*. It was found on the Spartan acropolis and is now in the museum in Sparta; it was first published, by W. Peek,

<sup>1</sup> Cf. RHODES, P.J.: Thucydides and His Audience: What Thucydides Explains and What He Does Not. *A.A.Hung.* 48 (2008) 83–88; Thucydidean Chronology. *A.A.Hung.* 49 2009 (published 2010) 353–358, and in CZEGLÉDY, A., et al. (edd.): *Pietas non sola Romana* (volume in memory of I. Borzsák). Budapest 2010, 177–183.

in 1976.<sup>2</sup> What survives is from the upper part of the *stèle*, and not only the lower part but also the top left-hand corner and the right-hand side are missing, but enough can be safely restored to establish the approximate width; and most of the text is reasonably certain.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>[συνθῆκ]αι Αἰτολοῖς. κ[αττάδε]<br/>         [?φιλία]ν καὶ ἠιράναν   [ -- ποτ']<br/>         [Αἰτο]λὸς καὶ συναμαχ[ίαν ?αἰδιο]-<br/>         [ν -- ]ανμονος μαν[ -- ἠεπο]-<br/>         5 [μ]ένος ἡόπι κα Λα[κεδαιμόνι]-<br/>         [ο]ι ἠαγίονται καὶ κ[ατὰ γᾶν]<br/>         καὶ καθάλαθαν, τὸ[ν αὐτὸν]<br/>         φίλον καὶ τὸν αὐτ[ὸν ἐχθρὸν]<br/>         ἔχοντες ἡὸν περ [καὶ Λακε]-<br/>         10 δαιμόνιοι. μεδὲ κ[ατάλυθιν]<br/>         ποιῆθαι ἄνευ Λα[κεδαιμονίον]<br/>         μεδενί, ἀνηιέν[τας τὸν πόλεμον?]<br/>         ἐπὶ ταῦτὸν πὸθ' ὄν [περ Λακεδα]-<br/>         μονίος. φεύγον[τας δὲ μὲ δεκέθο]-<br/>         15 ἠαν κεκοινανεκ[ότας ?ἀδικε]-<br/>         μάτων. ἀέ δέ τίς κα [ἐπὶ τὰν τῶν]<br/>         [Ἐ]ρξαδιέον χόραν [στρατεύει]<br/>         ἐπὶ πολέμοι, ἐπι[κορῆν Λακεδαιμο]-<br/>         νίος παντὶ σθένει[? κα τὸ δύνατον]<br/>         20 αὶ δέ τίς κα ἐπὶ τὰ[ν τῶν Λακεδαιμο]-<br/>         νίον χόραν στρα[τεύει ἐπὶ πολέ]-<br/>         μοι, ἐπικορῆν Ἐ[ρξαδιῆς παντὶ ]<br/>         [σθένει κα τὸ δύνατον? ----- ]<br/>         -----</p> | <p>Alliance with the Aetolians.</p> <p>1 On the following terms [friendship?] and peace [shall be?] made with the Aetolians, and alliance [for all time? ---];</p> <p>4 following where the Spartans lead both by land and by sea, having the same friend and the same enemy as the Spartans.</p> <p>10 Neither shall they make a settlement with any one without the Spartans, but giving up [the war?] against the same enemy (?) as the Spartans.</p> <p>14 They shall not receive exiles who have taken part in [wrongdoing?].</p> <p>16 If any one campaigns against the land of the Erxadieis for war, the Spartans shall support with all their strength [as far as possible?]; and if any one campaigns against the land of the Spartans for war, the [Erxadieis shall support with all their strength as far as possible?]. ---</p> |
|--|--|

<sup>2</sup> PEEK, W.: *Ein neuer spartanischer Staatsvertrag*. Abh. Leipzig 65. iii (1974), with photographs Taf. I (stone), II (squeeze), and facsimile p. 4. For other full editions see Gschnitzer, F.: *Ein neuer spartanischer Staatsvertrag und die Verfassung des Peloponnesischen Bundes* (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 93). Meisenheim an der Glan 1978; ΠΙΚΟΥΛΑΣ, G. A.: *Λακεδαιμονίων συνθήκαι Αἰτολοῖς. ἡόρος 14–16* (2000–2003), 455–67 (on the basis of repeated examination of the stone, with A. P. Matthaiou and others; with Peek's facsimile and his own, and photographs at πιν. 100–1). Also MEIGGS–LEWIS (1988 reissue), p. 312 no. 67 bis; VAN EFFENTERRE, H.–RUZÉ, F.: *Nomima*, i. Rome 1994, no. 55. The text will be included in OSBORNE, R.–RHODES, P. J.: *Greek Historical Inscriptions, 478–404 B.C.* Oxford forthcoming.

Restorations by Peek except where otherwise stated. 1 Ἐ[ρξαδιεῦη] Gschnitzer, but Pikoulas reports that Ξ is not possible. 2 [σπονδὰ]ς G. T. Griffith *ap.* Kelly. ἔ[μεν ποτ] Peek, ἴ[σχευ? ποτ'] Pikoulas & Matthaïou. 3–4 Pikoulas & Matthaïou: unrestored Peek. 4 – – ]νμονος μαν[τι – Peek, ?πλ]ἄν μόνος Μαν[τινῆς? Gschnitzer (Mantineia is the only *polis* whose name begins thus in the *Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*), ?πλ]ἄν μόνος Μαν[ – – Pikoulas & Matthaïou (thinking of another unknown subdivision or dependency of the Aetolians). 10 For κατάλυσις in this sense cf. e.g. Thuc. III 18. 2, 37. 6; *IG* i<sup>3</sup> 83. 11, 17; 105. 35. 12 Pikoulas & Matthaïou: μεδενίαν hiέν[τας πρέσβες] Peek, μεδενί, ἀνhiέν[τας πολεμῆν?] Gschnitzer, μεδενί, ἀνhiέμε[ν δὲ μαχομένος] Lurpe. 15–16 ?ἀδικε| μάτων considered but rejected by Peek; Gschnitzer. 17 Rhodes: Ἐρξαδιέον Peek, [ . ]ρξαδιέον Pikoulas & Matthaïou. 19 Lewis: καττὸ δύνατον Peek, c. 7–8 letters unrestored Pikoulas & Matthaïou. 20 Pikoulas & Matthaïou: τὰν Λακεδαιμο]- Peek. 22–23 Lewis: καττὸ δύνατον Peek, E . . [- – and no further restoration Pikoulas & Matthaïou.

Before I discuss the content, I must say that this text has added to our knowledge of the Spartan dialect. Features such as aspirate for *sigma* as in κ[ατάλυηιν] (10) and δεκέθο|ηαν (14–15), and *iota* for *epsilon* as in χαγίονται (6), were already-known features; additions to our knowledge are hόπυι for ὄποι (5), and the remarkable θάλαθαν (7), with *theta* for *sigma* and single letter for double;<sup>3</sup> ποιῆθαι for ποιῆσθαι (11); Peek regarded τὸνν (8) as a simple mistake, and was puzzled by ἀέ (16) when we have the expected αἰ later (20).

The text is that of an unequal alliance, in which the other party agrees to follow where Sparta leads, to have the same friends and enemies as Sparta, not to make peace without Sparta and not to receive some exiles; and that is followed by reciprocal clauses in which each party undertakes to join in the defence of the other against attackers. Strangely, friendship (if that is the correct restoration) is mentioned before peace, when logically it should follow and in several other Greek treaties it does follow.<sup>4</sup>

Almost everybody has accepted, I think rightly, that the Aetolians mentioned here are those of north-western Greece, though a fragment of Androtion claims that there was a perioecic city called Aetolia in Laconia.<sup>5</sup> What begins as a treaty made by Sparta with the Aetolians becomes later a treaty with one particular

<sup>3</sup> Cf. BAUSLAUGH, R. A.: Messenian Dialect and Dedications of the “Methanaioi”. *Hesp.* 59 (1990) 661–668 at 663–665.

<sup>4</sup> Examples cited by PEEK, 5; COZZOLI, U.: Sul nuovo documento di alleanza tra Sparta e gli Etoi. In BROILLO, F. (ed.): *Xenia: Scritti in onore di P. Treves*. Rome 1985, 67–76 at 67.

<sup>5</sup> Androt. *FGrH* 324 F 63: considered but rejected by PEEK (n. 2); preferred by Gschnitzer (n. 2) 24, *Nomima* (n. 2); against see other discussions of this text and SHIPLEY, D. G. J.: in HANSEN, M. H. – NIELSEN,

subdivision or dependency of them. Even if the first letter of line 17 cannot be read, the *epsilon* in line 22 makes Erxadieis the likeliest name of this subdivision (as Pikoulas agrees, though he is not confident enough to print it in his text), but knowing the name does not help us, since there is no other attestation of this name or of a name which could be another form of it. Presumably the treaty was in fact made with this subdivision, presumably one which established a relationship with the Spartans when the other Aetolians did not, but referring to it as the “Aetolians” at the beginning makes the treaty and the subdivision seem more important.

Beyond that, to interpret the text we need to know when the treaty was made, and that is very difficult. It is agreed that this unequal treaty in which Sparta is superior must belong to the period of Sparta’s league of allies which we call the Peloponnesian League, which is attested from the late sixth century to its breaking up in 365,<sup>6</sup> but suggested dates for the treaty have ranged over almost the whole period of the Peloponnesian League’s existence, from the late sixth century or early fifth (on the basis of the lettering)<sup>7</sup> to c. 388 (on the grounds that Agesilaus’ march through Aetolia then provides an occasion when the Aetolians, or some of them, might have become friends of Sparta after previously being enemies).<sup>8</sup> Other occasions which have been suggested are c. 470 (on the basis of Gschnitzer’s restoration of the Mantineans in line 4),<sup>9</sup> c. 450 (shortly after the

---

T. H. (edd.): *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*. Oxford 2004, 574 – but this text is not mentioned in the section on Aetolia by FREITAG, K., et al. in *Inventory*, 379–390.

More recently GSCHNITZER has suggested that these Aetolians were an amphictyony centred on Olympia: Diskussionsbeitrag zum Referat P. Siewert. *Symposion 1993 = AGR 10* (1994) 33–34 at 34: cf. Pind. *Ol.* iii. 12, Bacchyl. viii. 29 Snell & Maehler, Strabo 354 / VIII. 3 30, Tzetz. *Chil.* xii. 354–369. For the alleged Aetolian origin of the Eleans see MAEHLER, H.: *Die Lieder des Bakchylides*. Leiden, 1982, ii. 142, and for an Olympian amphictyony called “Aetolians” see SIEWERT, P.: Eine archaische Rechtsaufzeichnung aus der antiken Stadt Elis. *Symposion 1993 = AGR 10* (1994), 17–32 at 29, EBERT, J. – SIEWERT, P.: Eine archaische Bronzeturkunde aus Olympia. *Olympia Bericht xi* (1977–1981) (publ. 1999) 391–412 at 403–404 (cf. earlier KAHRSTEDT, U.: Zur Geschichte von Elis und Olympia. *Nachr. Göttingen* [1927] 157–176 at 159–162 [without mention of Aetolians]).

<sup>6</sup> Cleomenes I called on Sparta’s allies to join in an attack on Athens c. 506, Hdt. V 74. 1; and Sparta proposed to its allies that Hippias should be reinstated in Athens but failed to gain their support c. 504, Hdt. V 91–3. Corinth and its neighbours agreed to a peace treaty to which Sparta did not agree in 365, Xen. *Hell.* VII 4. 4–11, cf. Isoc. VI. *Archidamus*, Diod. Sic. XV. 76 3.

<sup>7</sup> Late sixth century, *Nomima* (n. 2); 500–470, PEEK (n. 2).

<sup>8</sup> KELLY, D. H.: The New Spartan Treaty. *LCM 3* (1978) 133–141 at 136–141; see Xen. *Hell.* IV 6. 14, cf. Ages. 2. 20.

<sup>9</sup> WELWEI, K.-W.: Orestes at Sparta: The Political Significance of the Grave of the Hero. In Figueira, T. J. (ed.): *Spartan Society*. Swansea 2004, 219–230 at 220 with 226 nn. 10–11; for Sparta’s troubles with Mantinea at that time see Hdt. IX 35. 2.



Athenians' establishment at Naupactus of the Messenians whom many people have seen as the exiles about whom Sparta is concerned, in lines 14–16);<sup>10</sup> c. 426 (when Sparta joined the Aetolians in attacking Naupactus) or shortly after;<sup>11</sup> c. 400 (after Aetolia's involvement in the war between Sparta and Elis c. 402–400, and the expulsion of the Messenians from Naupactus);<sup>12</sup> early fourth century (from the formulations used, and particularly εἰρήνη in the sense of peace treaty).<sup>13</sup> If the exiles are the Messenians settled at Naupactus, that will limit us to the period between c. 455, when they arrived there, after which they captured Oeniadae but were driven out by the Acarnanians, and c. 400, when Sparta expelled them and they departed to fight in wars in Cyrene and the west.<sup>14</sup> (It is a problem that when they left the Peloponnese c. 455 they went under truce and were threatened only with enslavement if they returned to the Peloponnese, and Sordi suggested that the time of their expulsion from Naupactus is the time when they could most plausibly be referred to as exiles, but I do not think the circumstances of their leaving the Peloponnese c. 455 would prevent the Spartans from referring to them as exiles afterwards.) The literary texts do not mention Sparta in connection with Aetolia very often, and, although inevitably we look for occasions when Sparta is known to have been involved with Aetolia and its neighbours, and such occasions are the only ones which we can identify as appropriate, we cannot be confident that this treaty must be connected with one of those occasions.

Public inscriptions from Sparta in the classical period are extremely rare, and the lettering of this text is careless, so it is hard to suggest even an approximate date on the basis of comparison with other texts: Peek on the basis of the lettering suggested c. 500–470(–450), and the editors of *Nomima* went even before 500.<sup>15</sup> L. H. Jeffery, who knew the Spartan material very well, but considered the

<sup>10</sup> COZZOLI (n. 4) 71–73; ΠΙΚΟΥΛΑΣ (n. 2) 463–66; ΜΑΤΘΑΙΟΥ, A. P.: “καττάδε ἔδοξε τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις”· ἐπιγραφὴς δημοσίου χαρακτῆρα ἀπὸ τὴν Σπάρτη τοῦ 5ου αἰῶνα π.Χ. Athens 2006, 8–10.

<sup>11</sup> CARTLEDGE, P. A.: A New 5th-Century Spartan Treaty. *LCM* 1 (1976) 87–92 at 91–92; see Thuc. III 100–102.

<sup>12</sup> SORDI, M.: Il trattato fra Sparta e gli Etoi e la guerra d' Elide. *Aevum* 65 (1991), 35–38; for the Aetolians in the war between Sparta and Elis see Diod. Sic. XIV 17. 9–10.

<sup>13</sup> BALTRUSCH, E. A.: *Symmachie und Spondai: Untersuchungen zum griechischen Völkerrecht der archaischen und klassischen Zeit (8.-5. Jahrhundert v. Chr.)*. Berlin, 1994, 21–24.

<sup>14</sup> For the installation of the Messenians at Naupactus see Thuc. I 103. 1–3 with 108. 5, cf. Diod. Sic. XI 84. 6–8; for their war against Oeniadae Paus. IV 25; for their fate c. 400 Diod. Sic. XIV 34. 2–5, Paus. IV 26. 2 cf. X 38. 10. For Sparta's anxiety about the Messenians / helots cf. the alliance with Athens in 421, Thuc. V 23. 3; also the clause about deserters, “free or slave”, in the truce of 423, IV 118. 7.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. above, n. 7. Cleomenes in exile in Arcadia in the late 490's is said to have made the Arcadians swear to follow where he led, Hdt. VI 74. 1: whatever the truth behind that, the notion that others might be bound to follow a leader was clearly credible when Herodotus was writing.

inscriptions “particularly difficult to date by their letter-forms alone”,<sup>16</sup> judged that our inscription was earlier than the other texts with which she compared it but need not be earlier than the 420’s — but that was in an exercise in which she supported a date c. 396 for the inscription listing contributions to a Spartan war fund, which nobody since the finding of an additional fragment has wanted to date later than c. 409,<sup>17</sup> and the earlier date for that might suggest in turn a date before the 420’s for our text.<sup>18</sup> We cannot be too confident on the basis of the lettering, as the debate on the dating of fifth-century Athenian inscriptions has made clear; but those with experience of Spartan inscriptions agree that the lettering of this text favours the fifth century rather than the fourth, and an earlier date looks more likely than a date during the Peloponnesian War.

A way forward has been sought by relating this to the development of Sparta’s relationship with its allies in the Peloponnesian League, but that too is controversial. The traditional view is that a crucial step was taken between Cleomenes’ calling on the Peloponnesians to join his campaign against Athens c. 506 and the Spartans’ consulting the allies about their proposal to reinstate Hippias c. 504, and that the basic relationship between Sparta and the League members was in existence from then onwards.<sup>19</sup> D. M. Lewis commented on our text, “The surest result seems to be the confirmation of the view . . . that the alliance formula of lines 4–10 was the primitive formula of Spartan alliances.”<sup>20</sup> However, some scholars more recently have argued that the fully-fledged Peloponnesian League

<sup>16</sup> JEFFERY, L. H.: *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece*. Oxford 1961, reissued with a supplement by JOHNSTON, A. W., 1990, 187.

<sup>17</sup> JEFFERY, L. H. The Development of Lakonian Lettering: A Reconsideration. *BSA* 83 (1988) 179–181 at 181; JOHNSTON in his supplement to JEFFERY’s *Local Scripts* (n. 16) 447–48 (G), notes the possibility of dates between the First Peloponnesian War and the 380’s but opts for “c. 400 (?)”. For the inscription about a Spartan war fund (*IG* v. i 1 = MEIGGS–LEWIS 67), after the finding of the additional fragment, see MATTHAIΟΥ, A. P.–PIKOULAS, G. A.: ἔδον τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις ποττὸν πόλεμον. ἰόρος 7 (1989, publ. 1991) 77–124, MATTHAIΟΥ, A. P.: τὰ ἐν τῇ στήλῃ γεγραμμένα: Six Fifth-Century Greek Historical Inscriptions. Athens, 2011, 35–43 (420’s – 410’s); LOOMIS, W. T.: *The Spartan War Fund*. *Hist. Einz.* 74 (1992) (420’s); BLECKMANN, B.: Sparta und seine Freunde im Dekeleischen Krieg: zu Datierung von *IG* v. i 1. *ZPE* 96 (1993) 297–308; PIÉRART, M.: Chios entre Athènes et Sparte. *BCH* 119 (1995) 252–82; BLECKMANN, B.: Nochmals zur Datierung von *IG* v. i 1. *Ktema* 27 (2002) 35–38; cf. SEAMAN, M. G.: The Athenian Expedition to Melos in 416 BC. *Hist.* 46 (1997) 385–418 at 391–402 (c. 409) — and the dating to 420’s – 410’s seems to me best.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. PIKOULAS (n. 2) 464.

<sup>19</sup> E.g. DE STE. CROIX, G. E. M.: *The Origins of the Peloponnesian War*. London 1972, 101–151, 333–341: for c. 506 and c. 504 cf. n. 6, and for reference in 421 to the “ancient oaths” see Thuc. V 30. 1–4.

<sup>20</sup> MEIGGS–LEWIS (1988 reissue), p. 312 no. 67 bis.

was not completed until later.<sup>21</sup> Some distinguish between the members of the Peloponnesian League and other allies of Sparta (as we can distinguish between members of Athens' Delian League and other allies of Athens), and Cartledge classified the Erxadieis among the other allies.<sup>22</sup> Bolmarcich recently distinguished between "equal" allies of Sparta and "unequal" allies whom Sparta had conquered, as she took the Erxadieis to be, and proposed to date our text c. 400; and in a later article she has argued that the terms imposed on Athens in 404 are the first instance of the terms found in our text, newly arrived at by combining the Delian League's oath to have the same friends and enemies with an oath to follow a leader, and simply places our text some time after that.<sup>23</sup>

The problem is that we do not have texts of other Spartan treaties with which we can compare this: the terms imposed on Athens in 404, as quoted by Xenophon, are the earliest surviving in which we find the combination of formulae indicating the relationship of superior and inferior which we have in our text, but in the state of our evidence the silence before that is not a guarantee that these formulae were not used together earlier. (Sparta's alliances with Athens and with Argos in Thucydides V were "equal" alliances, in which these formulae would not have been used.<sup>24</sup>) As for the development of the Peloponnesian League, I think de Ste. Croix was too rigid and systematic about what the League was and what its rules were, but if we abandon that rigidity we can still accept that, while there were later developments, and problems were dealt with as they arose, there was a crucial stage in its formalisation c. 506–504, and that Sparta would have been capable of requiring some or all of its allies to follow its lead at any time. Certainly it seemed credible to Herodotus that as early as the late sixth century and the early fifth allies might be required to follow where Sparta led, and this inscription could indeed be the earliest attested treaty in which it appears.

The lettering, problematic though that is, and the reference to exiles are still our best indicators. We have no reason to think that Sparta had any occasion to

<sup>21</sup> 450's, CAWKWELL, G. L.: Sparta and Her Allies in the Sixth Century. *CQ* n.s. 43 (1993) 364–76; not before the five-year truce of 451, YATES, D. C.: The Archaic Treaties Between the Spartans and Their Allies. *CQ* n.s. 55 (2005) 65–76; LONDON, J. E.: Thucydides and the "Constitution" of the Peloponnesian League. *GRBS* 35 (1994) 159–177 argued that all the members had unequal alliances with Sparta and Sparta never had a formal obligation to consult them.

<sup>22</sup> DE STE. CROIX (n. 19) 102–105; CARTLEDGE (n. 11) 91.

<sup>23</sup> BOLMARCICH, S.: Thucydides I 19. 1 and the Peloponnesian League. *GRBS* 45 (2005) 5–34, arriving at c. 400 independently of SORDI (n. 12); The Date of the "Oath of the Peloponnesian League". *Hist.* 57 (2008) 65–79 at 69–75: see for Athens Xen. *Hell.* II 2. 20, for the Delian League *Ath. Pol.* 23. 5.

<sup>24</sup> Thuc. V 23–24, 77–79.

take an interest in Aetolia before the settlement of the Messenians at Naupactus in the 450's, and from the end of the Persian Wars until then Sparta had enough preoccupations nearer home to make that positively unlikely, so I think the two most likely occasions for our text are Cozzoli's date c. 450 and Cartledge's date c. 426, both of them occasions when the Messenians at Naupactus drew the attention of the Spartans to that region. Expert views on the lettering make c. 450 the more probable of the two, but I should not rule out c. 426 — and, unlike Cozzoli and Pikoulas, if c. 450 is right I should not rule out the period of the five-year truce between Sparta and Athens, 451–446: that truce did not prevent the Second Sacred War, in which Sparta and Athens both sent forces to intervene at Delphi, but at different times and therefore without fighting against each other,<sup>25</sup> so I do not think that period of truce is an impossible time for the treaty between Sparta and the Erxadieis. This is a fascinating text, about which debate will no doubt continue.

<sup>25</sup> Thuc. I 112. 5.

# Tartalomjegyzék

<i>Laudationes externorum</i> .....	9
René Roudaut .....	11
François Laquièze .....	14
Monique Canto-Sperber .....	15
Salvatore Ettore .....	16
Andrea Ferrara .....	18
Chiara Faraggiana di Sarzana .....	21
P. J. Rhodes .....	23
Herwig Maehler .....	24
Chris Carey .....	26
Mike Edwards .....	28
Shawn Gillen .....	29
Nikolaus Hamm .....	32
Elisabeth Kornfeind .....	34
Leonore Peer .....	36
Christian Gastgeber .....	38
Hermann Harrauer .....	42
Herbert Bannert .....	45
Jana Grusková .....	46
Christine Glaßner .....	47
August Stahl .....	48
Javier Pérez Bazo .....	50
Alicia Gómez-Navarro .....	52
 <i>Laudationes Hungarorum</i> .....	 57
Réthy Miklós .....	59
Hoffmann Rózsa .....	61
Dux László .....	65
Mezey Barna .....	67
Szepessy Tibor .....	70
Hiller István .....	73
Keszei Ernő .....	74
Dezső Tamás .....	76
Kozma László .....	77

Soós Anna .....	79
Pintér Károly .....	82
Kátai Zoltán .....	84
Körmendy Mariann .....	85
Karsai György.....	87
Kincses János .....	90
<i>Rectores</i> .....	93
Conspectus .....	95
Gerevich Tibor: Az Eötvös Collegium története – Bartoniek Géza (1854–1930) .....	96
Kiss Jenő: Gombocz Zoltán életéről és munkásságáról .....	103
Markó Veronika: Szabó Miklós .....	113
Nagy János: Keresztury Dezső .....	126
Pál Zoltán: Lutter Tibor .....	132
Szijártó István: A világra nyitott ablak .....	136
Vekerdy József .....	145
Bertényi Iván: Igazgatói működésem az Eötvös József Collegiumban (1993–1996) . . .	147
Bollók János.....	149
Takács László .....	154
<i>Historica • Res gestae</i> .....	161
Gángó Gábor: Eötvös József és barátai egyetemi éveiről, különös tekintettel a politikatudományi képzésre .....	163
Garai Imre: A magyar középiskolai tanári szakma kialakulása .....	176
Tóth Magdolna: „A budai parti ígéretföldje” .....	203
Kovácsik Antal: Az Eötvös Collegium Ménesi úti épületének felavatása a korabeli sajtó tükrében .....	211
Markó Veronika: Hogyan lett az Eötvös József Collegium könyvtárából az Irodalomtudományi Intézet Eötvös Könyvtára? .....	220
Szojka Emese: Fülep Lajos néprajzi gyűjteménye .....	236
Kucsman Árpád: Kémikusok a régi Eötvös Collegiumban .....	272
Győri Róbert: A múlttal való tudományos leszámolás – Eötvös collegista geográfusok az 1950-es években .....	288
Czifrusz Márton: Helyek és pozíciók újraírása – Wallner Ernő, Lettrich Edit és a hazai szociálgeográfiai iskola viszonya Mendöl Tibor örökségéhez .....	312
Tóth Károly: Művészettörténészek az Eötvös Collegiumban (1896–1950).....	328
Ritoók Zsigmond: Klasszika-filológia az Eötvös Collegiumban.....	345
Kucsman Árpád – Liptay György: Eötvös-kollégisták a Fasori Gimnázium tanári karában .....	348
Kapitány Adrienn: Az 1950-es évek a Kollégium történetében.....	365

Marafkó László: Nagyhatalmak ugratása, avagy groteszk lapok az Eötvös Kollégium félmúltjából .....	378
Dénes Iván Zoltán: Diákmozgalom Budapesten 1969-ben .....	383
Bakos István: Emlékeim a kollégista Kilencekről .....	401
ifj. Arató György: „Szabadság a jelszavunk” Március 15-e az Eötvös Kollégiumban, 1955–1984 .....	410
Szabics Imre: Az Eötvös József Collegium és az École Normale Supérieure .....	419
Nemes Tibor: Az Eötvös Collegium és az École Normale Supérieure közötti közvetlen kapcsolatok újraélesztése a 80-as években .....	428
Bubnó Hedvig: Összefoglaló a collegiumi spanyol nyelvoktatásról, 1992–2010 .....	432
<i>Historica • Magistri</i> .....	435
Korompay H. János: Horváth János és az Eötvös Collegium .....	437
Móser Zoltán: Ha a szellem napvilága ragyog .....	456
Farkas Zoltán et alii: Czebe Gyula élete dokumentumokban.....	463
Szakály Sándor: Szurmay Lajos, tábornok az Eötvös Collegiumból .....	553
Szávai János: Gyergyai Albert és az Eötvös Collegium .....	563
Ress Imre: Hugo Kleinmayr és a germanisztikai oktatás megalapozása az Eötvös Collegiumban .....	570
Kiss Jenő: Zsirai Miklós .....	579
Keszthelyi Lajos: Bay Zoltán .....	596
Pál Zoltán: Keresztury Dezső igazgatósága az állambiztonsági megfigyelések tükrében .....	599
Keszthelyi Lajos: Faragó Péter .....	612
Farkas Zoltán: Gyóni Mátyás .....	617
Papp István: Kettős ügynök – Nagy Péter, Szabó Dezső és az állambiztonság.....	625
Balogh Elemér: Szász Imre versus Brusznay Árpád .....	638
Bottyán Gergely: Antal László és a mai magyar nyelvtudomány .....	643
Dörnyei Sándor: Emlékezés Tomasz úrra .....	648
Ifj. Tomasz Jenő: Tomasz úr és az Eötvös Collegium.....	653
<i>Memorabilia</i> .....	683
„Felújítani azt, ami érdemes” – Beszélgetés Elekfi Lászlóval .....	685
Tóth Gábor: Az idő sodrában .....	709
Lekli Béla: Az Eötvös Kollégium az 1956 utáni években .....	836
Gereben Ferenc: Egyetemi évek (1962–1967).....	838
Kósa László: Az Eötvös Kollégiumban éltem én is (1963–1967).....	861
Bakos István: Az Eötvös Kollégium autonómiaöregvései és Baráti Körének megalakítása.....	889
Galántai Ambrus: Szubjektív történelem .....	899

*Studia Germanica* ..... 923

Balázs Sára: "Freiwillig dient der Geist":

Germanistik in der Veranstaltungsreihe des Lustrum Saeculare Collegii ..... 925

Eve-Marie Kallen: Dezső Keresztury als Kulturvermittler und Pädagoge

und das Eötvös-Collegium ..... 928

August Stahl: „Schlussstück”. Rilkes Sicht und Deutung des Todes ..... 944

Frank Baron: Die Entstehung des Faust-Mythos im 16. Jahrhundert ..... 962

Christine Glaßner: Zur handschriftlichen Überlieferung der Visiones Georgii ..... 967

András F. Balogh: Schlacht der Stereotype in der Vngrischen

Schlacht des Jacob Vogel ..... 975

Ilona Feld-Knapp Cathedra Magistrorum – Lehrerforschung.

Lehrer-Denken und Lehrer-Wissen ..... 982

Géza Horváth: Elmar Tophoven, der Begründer des Europäischen

Übersetzer-Kollegiums ..... 997

Anita Czeglédy: „Schutzmarke: der Steg.”

Interkulturalitätin Márton Kalász' Lyrik ..... 1006

*Studia Slavica* ..... 1021

Katalin Kroó: Slawistik in der Veranstaltungsreihe

des Lustrum Saeculare Collegii ..... 1023

Urs Heftrich: Lew Tolstoi und Anton Tschechow: Zum Doppeljubiläum 2010 ..... 1025

Bettina Kaibach: Raum für Nostalgie: Steppe und Prärie in Anton Čechovs Step'

und Willa Cathers My Ántonia ..... 1032

Wolf Schmid: Eventfulness and Context ..... 1052

*Studia Classica* ..... 1065

Tamás Mészáros: Klassische Philologie in der Veranstaltungsreihe

des Lustrum Saeculare Collegii ..... 1067

Mike Edwards: The Application of Criticism to Textual Criticism ..... 1069

Herwig Maehler: Pindar und die Tyrannen ..... 1076

P. J. Rhodes: The Erxadieis inscription ..... 1084

*Artes* ..... 1093

Teleki Pál, a Collegium kurátora (1920–1941) ..... 1095

Epikus és komikus collegiumi enumeráció 1935-ből – Közreadja: Takács László .... 1100

Farkas Zsuzsa: Fotótörténeti adalékok az Eötvös Collegium archív fotóiról ..... 1119

Sütle Ágnes Katalin: Az Eötvös Collegium épülete ..... 1137

Havas László: Hadrianus mint Pseudo-Alexandros? ..... 1146



---

Sántháné Gedeon Mária: Kultúraközi kommunikáció: magyarságkép az angol mint lingua franca tükrében .....	1156
Csuday Csaba: Az irodalom: „negatívan élni” .....	1161
Szlukevényi Katalin: Kollégisták, költők, korszakok: szépirodalmi hagyományok az Eötvös Collegiumban .....	1165
<i>Membra et alumni</i> .....	1179
<i>Pro patria defuncti</i> .....	1211
Tartalomjegyzék .....	1215
Appendix – Mellékletek jegyzéke .....	1221

Kedves Olvasó!

Önre gondoltunk, amikor a könyv előkészítésén munkálkodtunk. Kapcsolatunkat szorosabbra fűzhetjük, ha belép a *TypoKlubba*, ahonnan értesülhet új kiadványainkról, akcióinkról, programjainkról, és amelyet a [www.tygotex.hu](http://www.tygotex.hu) címen érhet el. Honlapunkon megismerkedhet kínálatunkkal is, egyes könyveinknél pedig új fejezeteket, bibliográfiát, hivatkozásokat találhat, illetve az esetlegesen előforduló hibák jegyzékét is letöltheti.

Kiadványaink egy része e-könyvként (is) kapható:

[www.interkonyv.hu](http://www.interkonyv.hu)

Észrevételeiket a [velemeney@tygotex.hu](mailto:velemeney@tygotex.hu) e-mail címen várjuk.

Kiadja az Eötvös Collegium és a Typotex Kiadó, az 1795-ben alapított Magyar Könyvkiadók és Könyvterjesztők Egyesülésének tagja.

Felelős kiadó: dr. Horváth László – Votisky Zsuzsa

Tördelte: Vidumánszki László

A borítót tervezte: Tóth Norbert

Terjedelem: 85,6 (A/5) ív

Nyomta és kötötte: Séd Nyomda, Szekszárd

Felelős vezető: Katona Szilvia