

On Fragments of Three Historians

George Huxley

I

The Son of Xenophanes

PAUSANIAS remarks that Antiochos the Syracusan historian was son of a Xenophanes¹ and in the preface to the *περὶ Ἰταλίας* Antiochos calls himself in Ionic, Ἀντίοχος Ξενοφάνεος.² In this paper I propose to explore two linked hypotheses: (1) that Antiochos of Syracuse was a son of Xenophanes the Ionian philosopher; (2) that Xenophanes was a source of Antiochos.

Xenophanes spent his later life in the West. Amongst the places he almost certainly visited is Syracuse, because he reported that impressions of a fish and of seals were to be seen in the quarries there.³ Timaios the Sicilian historian asserted that Xenophanes lived in the time of Hieron the tyrant and of Epicharmos (*FGrHist* 566 F 133). Hieron reigned from 478 to 467 B.C. and Epicharmos was at Syracuse about that time;⁴ so Timaios may well have had evidence that Xenophanes was in Syracuse in old age. There is no objection to the hypothesis that Xenophanes was still active ca. 470 B.C. since he himself tells us that he was still alive in his 92nd year (*Vorsokr.* 21 B 8) and there is no reason to date his birth earlier than about 560 B.C. Fragment 8 suggests that he may have left Kolophon and begun his wanderings at the age of twenty-five, but we do not know that he left “when the Mede came”: *πηλίκος ἦσθ’, ὅθ’ ὁ Μῆδος ἀφίκετο*; (*Vorsokr.* 21 B 22, 5).

During his western sojourn Xenophanes interested himself not only in the geology of Syracuse, but also in the eruptions of the Aeolian islands. According to the pseudo-Aristotelian *Mirabilia* (833a15) the

¹ Paus. 10.11.3 = *FGrHist* 555 F 1.

² Dion.Hal. *Ant.Rom.* 1.12.3 = *FGrHist* 555 F 2.

³ Hippol. *Haer.* 1.14.5 = Diels/Kranz, *Vorsokr.* 21 A 33.

⁴ *Marmor Parium*, *FGrHist* 239 A 35, and cf. Epicharmos fr.98 (Kaibel) which mentions that Hieron stopped Anaxilas of Rhegion from destroying Lokroi (in 476 B.C.). Epicharmos seems to have addressed Xenophanes (Arist. *Metaph.* 3.5, 1010a4).

fire of the volcano at Lipara was, Xenophanes maintained, sometimes quiescent for sixteen years but erupted on the seventeenth. The intermediate source of this remark is not known; Timaios has been suggested (see *Vorsokr.* 21 A 48), but if the Aristotelian writer did not take it directly from Xenophanes himself, then Antiochos of Syracuse may well have been his authority. For the only surviving fragment of the *Σικελικά* or *Σικελιῶτις συγγραφή* of Antiochos is concerned with the settlement of Pentathlos and his Knidians in the Aeolian islands and with the islands' geology (*FGrHist* 555 F 1): "they cultivate the land in Hieria (today Volcano) and Strongyle (Stromboli) and Didymai, and cross over to them in ships; and in Strongyle fire can be seen coming up from the earth; in Hieria, however, the fire of its own accord burns up towards the high points of the island." Professor Dover has noted the close connexion between this passage and the description of the Aeolian islands in Thucydides 3.88.2-3; and he has shown that Antiochos was here the source of Thucydides, who mentions that the inhabitants cross to Didyme, Strongyle and Hieria to cultivate the land.⁵ Thucydides adds a poetical detail not found in the extant fragment of Antiochos: that the local people think that Hephaistos has his smithy in Hieria because of the fire seen to be emitted there at night and the smoke by day. Such a detail may well have come to Thucydides by way of Antiochos from a poetical source. It is not wildly speculative to suggest that Antiochos had it, not from his own local knowledge, but from Xenophanes, who wrote about eruptions at Lipara.

According to Diogenes Laertius (9.20), Xenophanes wrote a poem on the colonisation (by the Phokaians) of Elea in Italy. This alleged work, *ἀποικισμὸς εἰς Ἑλέαν τῆς Ἰταλίας*, should not be dismissed as a forgery, or a forged title, by Lobon of Argos; for some detailed account was available of the battle of Alalia and the settlement at Elea, as is clear from Herodotos and from Antiochos.⁶ Antiochos had evidence not given by Herodotos, namely that the leader of the emigration from Phokaia was Kreontiades. The alleged poem on the colonisation of Elea ascribed to Xenophanes deserves therefore to be considered as a possible source of information for Antiochos. We do not know that

⁵ K. J. Dover, "La colonizzazione della Sicilia in Tucidide," *Maia* 6 (1953) 8-9; A. W. Gomme, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides* II (Oxford 1956) *in loco*, doubts, but without good reason, that this passage of Thucydides comes from Antiochos.

⁶ *FGrHist* 555 F 8 = Strabo 6.1.1 (252).

Xenophanes ever settled at Elea, but he was interested in the place and made some critical comments on the worship there of Leukothea (*Vorsokr.* 21 A 13).

If there is a case for maintaining that Antiochos may have used Xenophanes as a source, it may also be worthwhile to ask whether Ἀντίοχος Ξενοφάνεος was a son of the Ionian philosopher. We do not know how old Antiochos was when he published his works, but he seems to have brought his narrative down to 424/3 at the earliest,⁷ so that his *floruit* lies sometime between that of Herodotos and Thucydides. A child of Xenophanes' old age born *ca.* 490 B.C. could still be active *ca.* 420 B.C. and writing or publishing history. The chronological objection to the hypothesis that Antiochos was the Ionian philosopher's son is thus not fatal. Noteworthy too is the fact that Antiochos does not in his preface (τ 2b) call himself a Syracusan;⁸ since a simple omission from the text is not easily to be assumed here, it is possible that Antiochos, who is by others called a Syracusan (τ 1-3), was a foreigner or metic resident in the city. We cannot argue however that, because he wrote in Ionic, he was an Ionian metic; for Ionic was the accepted medium of scientific and historical prose in Antiochos' time, at least outside Athens.

I am conscious that the arguments advanced here fall far short of proof; both hypotheses however have much in their favour, and would, if true, lead to some significant inferences. For if Antiochos used Xenophanes, then one of his authorities was a highly intelligent man; that authority had lived before 500 B.C., travelled widely amongst the western Greeks, was interested, as his autobiographical fragment shows, in chronology, and may even have described in verse the Phokaian settlement of Elea. The credibility of Antiochos' work would thus be enhanced and not least his chronology, which, as Professor Dover has demonstrated,⁹ is the source of the excursus on western colonisation at the beginning of Thucydides' Book 6. With good reason could the historian of the Western Greeks have

⁷ *FGrHist* 555 F 1, and see also Jacoby, *ibid.* vol. IIIb, Komm. Text p.486.

⁸ Jacoby, *FGrHist* vol. IIIb, Komm. Noten p.288².

⁹ *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) lff, following with some modifications the arguments of E. Wölfflin, *Antiochos von Syrakus und Coelius Antipater* (Winterthur 1872) 1-21. H. Thesleff, *On Dating Xenophanes* (Finska Vet.-Soc. *CommHumLitt* 23.3 [Helsingfors 1957]) would date the birth of Xenophanes as late 540 B.C. Correctly P. Steinmetz, *RhM* 109 (1966) 13ff, puts his death after 478 B.C.

claimed at the beginning of his *περὶ Ἰταλίας*, Ἀντίοχος Ξενοφάνεος τάδε συνέγραψε περὶ Ἰταλίας ἐκ τῶν ἀρχαίων λόγων τὰ πιστότατα καὶ σαφέστατα.¹⁰

THE QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST

May, 1968

¹⁰ I am grateful to Professor K. J. Dover and Mr W. G. Forrest for tolerant criticism of the rather irresponsible speculations contained in this article. The latter points out that if Antiochos were a *great-grandson* of Xenophanes, having been born about 470 B.C., the generations would fit as well, or better; unless of course Xenophanes did become the father of Antiochos the historian in extreme old age. The name Antiochos is found amongst Ionians: the Ionian founder of Delos was called Antiochos (schol. Dionys.Per. 525; see my book, *The Early Ionians* [New York 1966] 29).

II

Kleidemos and the ‘Themistokles Decree’

ONE of the historical problems raised by the purported Themistokles decree is to determine the date of the first mention of it in Greek literature. For Jameson, the discoverer of the decree at Troizen, this is not a serious problem at all, for he believes the text of the decree to be a genuine document of the Athenian state dating from before the battles of Artemision and Salamis in 480 B.C.¹ But in supposing that the text is genuine, Jameson has to reject or to ignore much of the testimony of Herodotos, our most important authority. Herodotos gives a different order of events, he describes a strategy quite different from that implied by the decree, he carefully distinguishes the decision to man the ships (7.144) from the order to evacuate the city after the battle of Artemision (8.41.1)—but the decree confounds the two—and he gives numbers of ships in the Athenian fleet that cannot be reconciled with the round two hundred ships of the decree. The choice is between Herodotos and the decree: there is no middle way. If the decree is treated as genuine, then Herodotos must be declared careless and irresponsible, or seriously misled by his sources and informants; but since Herodotos had no known reason to misunderstand or to misrepresent the facts, I assume that the text from Troizen is a fabrication. When was it forged?

No fifth century author states that Themistokles proposed a decree for the manning of the ships and for the evacuation of Athens. To find the clearest allusion to the decree we turn to Plutarch’s *Themistokles*. From Chapter 10 of that *Life* it is plain that Plutarch knew a variant of the text found at Troizen: he repeats from the text the conventional words *τὴν πόλιν παρακαταθέσθαι τῇ Ἀθηνᾶ τῇ Ἀθηναίων μεδεούσῃ*. He adds the words *παίδας δὲ καὶ γυναῖκας καὶ ἀνδράποδα σῶζειν ἕκαστον ὡς ἂν δύνηται*: those come from Herodotos (8.41: *Ἀθηναίων τῇ τις δύναται σῶζειν τέκνα καὶ τοὺς οἰκέτας*) and are not found in the extant

¹ M. Jameson, “A Decree of Themistokles from Troizen,” *Hesperia* 29 (1960) 198–223. a publication of commendable promptitude. Jameson presents a revised text in *Hesperia* 31 (1962) 310–315.

parts of the Troizenian text nor, presumably, in what is missing. Plutarch records from Herodotos the decision to evacuate slaves (*ἀνδράποδα*), who are called *οἰκέτας* in Herodotos but are not mentioned in the Troizenian text. These conflation show either that Plutarch used a source who had attempted to combine the narrative of Herodotos with the Troizenian text or that he combined them himself. It is not certain that Plutarch also saw a copy of that text, but he does repeat from his source the words from *τὴν πόλιν παρακαταθέσθαι* to *Ἀθηναίων μεδεούση* which had stood in the original 'decree' (*Ἀθηναίων codd.*, *Ἀθηνῶν* Reiske; the stone has *Ἀθηνῶν*).

After mentioning the decree of Themistokles, Plutarch describes the evacuation of the Athenian families to Troizen. "The Troizenians welcomed them warmly and voted to support them at public expense, giving two obols to each person, and to the children permission to help themselves to the harvest everywhere. They also paid the salaries of their schoolmasters. Nikagoras wrote the decree." Nikagoras, then, according to Plutarch was the author of a Troizenian decree providing for the Athenian refugees, Themistokles of an Athenian decree ordering the abandonment of Athens. An inscription purporting to be the Nikagoras decree may well have stood, together with the text found by Jameson, in the Agora of Troizen. It may await discovery there.

Plutarch continues: "But since the Athenians had no public funds, Aristotle says that the Areopagus, having provided eight drachmae for each of the combatants, was chiefly responsible for the manning of the triremes: Kleidemos, however, supposes that this too was a stratagem of Themistokles. For he states that when the Athenians had come down to the Piraeus, the Gorgoneion was missing from the statue of the goddess. Therefore Themistokles, pretending to search and examine everything, found plenty of money hidden in their belongings; and when that was brought together into the open, the crews of the ships were well supplied with pay and provisions." This stratagem can hardly be treated as serious history. What first concerns us here is Plutarch's statement that according to Kleidemos the stratagem was also the work of Themistokles: *Κλείδημος δὲ καὶ τοῦτο τοῦ Θεμιστοκλέους ποιεῖται στρατήγημα* (*FGrHist* 323 F 21). The *καὶ* refers to the previous mention of Themistokles, where he is stated to be the author of the decree ordering the manning of the ships, the evacuation of Athens and the entrusting of the city to Athena. We infer therefore

on the authority of Plutarch that Kleidemos declared Themistokles to be the architect of Athenian victory in 480 B.C. Not content with making him proposer of the decree, Kleidemos asserted that Themistokles by a stratagem ensured that the fleet was paid and supplied. A remarkable omission from the Troizenian text is any mention of pay and provisions for the fleet; in such a carefully composed document the omission cannot be accidental. The composer of the decree had another story to explain how the fleet was paid. The story was, I suggest, the stratagem of Themistokles at the Piraeus. Did Kleidemos give the decree, and then go on to tell the story of the stratagem? The narrative of Plutarch, who connects Kleidemos both with the decree and with the stratagem, suggests that he did. Was Kleidemos, then, the fabricator of the Themistokles decree?

Kleidemos, according to Pausanias was the earliest of the Atthidographers (10.15.5 = *FGrHist* 323 τ 1). He was active about 350 B.C., and was an ἐξηγητής or Expounder of sacred law,² an office that gave authority to all he wrote. One of the few facts known about him is the statement of Tertullian that the historian was crowned with a golden crown (*FGrHist* 323 τ 2). Since in the fourth century B.C. the Demos awarded crowns to its benefactors, we may follow Jacoby³ in believing that Kleidemos was publicly honoured because in his *Protogonia* or *Atthis*, the first literary-political work of its kind, he had proved himself a steadfast defender of the democracy against those who, with the approval of the School of Isokrates, were advocating a return to Areopagitic government—in other words to the πάτριος πολιτεία, the ancestral constitution. The fragment of Kleidemos in Plutarch's *Themistokles* confirms that the Atthidographer's sympathies were democratic, not conservative. In his view, Themistokles, not the Areopagus, planned and executed the successful campaigns of 480 B.C. Kleidemos is the earliest historian known to have mentioned the Themistokles decree; and we have shown that Plutarch uses words found in the text at Troizen, in which Themistokles is by implication made the architect of victory. I suggest that the text from Troizen once stood in the *Atthis* of Kleidemos, and that Kleidemos was the fabricator of the decree.

One of the first to reject the democratic version of the events of 480 B.C. was Aristotle. Plutarch points out that Aristotle held the

² *FGrHist* 323 F 14. Cf. Jacoby, *ibid.* III B Suppl. 1, Text p.57².

³ F. Jacoby, *Atthis* (Oxford 1949) 75.

Areopagus responsible for the victory at Salamis, because that council gave each of the combatants eight drachmae a head. Here Plutarch is drawing on the *Constitution of the Athenians*, where Aristotle states (*Ath. Pol.* 23.1–2): “After the Persian wars the Areopagus was again strong and directed the city, taking the leadership *by no decree*, but by being the cause of the sea battle at Salamis. For when the generals were at a loss what to do and had ordered each to save himself, the Areopagus distributed eight drachmae to each person, and brought them aboard the ships.” The words are a pointed rebuttal of Kleidemos: twenty or so years before the writing of the *Constitution of the Athenians*, Kleidemos had asserted that Themistokles had saved Athens by his decree, had by a stratagem arranged for the fleet to be paid and provisioned, and had planned the evacuation of Athens. Here we find Aristotle stating that the generals (including Themistokles) were at a loss, that the Areopagus had paid the fleet, and, following Herodotos, that each was ordered to save himself. He seems in fact to be rejecting the chief provisions of the ‘Themistokles decree’. We cannot prove that he follows here the conservative Androtion against Kleidemos, but he may well do so.

Why did Aristotle reject the democratic view of the Salamis campaign? In other matters he follows the *δημοτικοί*, of whom Kleidemos was one, with approval. He accepts their account of Solon’s reforms, and by silent omission rejects, in the matter of the cancellation of debts, Androtion’s view of them (*FGrHist* 324 F 34). Later he gives a highly democratic—and unhistorical—account of the reforms of Ephialtes, according to which the reformer was aided by Themistokles. Yet he does not hesitate to rebut point by point the democratic view of the events of 480 B.C. If he had thought the ‘Themistokles decree’—what we may now call Kleidemos’ decree—genuine, he could never have supposed the Areopagus responsible for saving Greece.

Aristotle had read the narrative of Herodotos carefully, and one of his reasons for rejecting the decree may well have been the impossibility of reconciling it with Herodotos. Attidography was not exact history. Attidographers, both conservatives like Androtion and *δημοτικοί* like Kleidemos, wrote history with clear political purposes, one of the aims of the conservatives being to support the ancestral constitution, of the democrats to champion the democracy. The heroes of the democrats were Themistokles and Ephialtes, of the Areopagites

Aristides and Kimon. The democratic historians were determined to show that Themistokles, the man of the Demos, alone had planned the salvation of Athens from the Mede, in order to prove that the democracy could save Athens from another barbarian, the Macedonian. But Herodotos and Thucydides did not make Themistokles sole architect of victory over the Persians; therefore cogent evidence for his part in saving Greece, even before battle was joined, had to be provided by the *δημοτικοί* themselves. So, I submit, the earliest and the most popular of the Attic-born Atthidographers, relying on his authority as *Exegetes*, produced the needed document, the 'Themistokles decree'. Very soon afterwards, before the peace of Philokrates, Aischines in 348 used the decree as an exhortation to fight the Macedonian. "Who was it," Demosthenes (19.303) in 343 taunted him, referring to the time before the peace, "who was it who read to us the *psēphismata* of Miltiades and of Themistokles?"⁴ Kleidemos, I suggest, had composed the decree as part of his attack on the Areopagus, and Aischines found it equally useful as a rallying point against Macedon. Writing at this very time Theopompos of Chios accused the Athenians of deluding the Greeks with exaggerated historical claims and with forged decrees. Such a decree was the Themistokles decree of Kleidemos, from whose *Atthis* Aischines borrowed it. Later, perhaps early in the third century B.C., a Troizenian or an Athenian had the decree copied from Kleidemos and set up in the Agora of Troizen.

⁴ M. Guarducci, *RivFC* n.s. 39 (1961) 59, who proposes to date the fabrication in the years 357 to 355 B.C., and C. Habicht, *Hermes* 89 (1961) 17, emphasise the significance of this passage for any explanation of the circumstances in which the 'decree' was composed. I can find nothing in Plutarch's text to confirm the assertion of Habicht (*op.cit.* 29) that although Kleidemos mentioned the psephism of Themistokles, "das Zitat spricht eher gegen die Annahme, dass er den Text selbst eingelegt hat." Habicht (*loc.cit.*) justly states that the date of publication of Kleidemos' *Atthis* is not exactly known: the outside limits are 354 and 340, with *ca.* 350 a likely epoch. (Jacoby, *op.cit.* [*supra* n.2] 1). It is however most unlikely that Aischines in 348 could have made use of the Themistokles *psēphisma* in his speech unless it had already been exhibited in public as an inscription or *leukōma* or published in an *Atthis*. Taking due regard for all the possibilities I incline to the view that Kleidemos did not merely include the forged decree in his *Atthis* before 348, but composed it himself in time for Aischines to make political use of it soon afterwards. M. Chambers provides a useful doxography of writings on the 'decree' (*Philologus* 111 [1967] 157-169, esp. 165) and looks, in my opinion correctly, for the origins of its fabrication amongst mid-fourth century Athenian politics.

A draft of this paper was read in 1962 by Professor Sterling Dow and Mr W. G. Forrest. I am grateful to both scholars for their comments, the more so since their views on the genuineness of the inscription are, or were, opposed—against and for, respectively. Having pondered the problem of the 'decree' for a long time, I now offer the Kleidemos hypothesis as a small contribution to the debate.

About the political tendencies of the Atthidographers in the middle of the fourth century the Themistokles decree of Kleidemos tells us much; but alert historians will admit the possibility that the same decree, of which the Troizenian text is a copy, may add nothing to our knowledge of the Persian wars.

THE QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST

June, 1968

III

Nikolaos of Damascus on Urartu

IN HIS *Jewish Antiquities* (1.94–95) Josephos quotes from Book 96 of the *Universal History* of Nikolaos of Damascus (first century B.C.) some remarks on the Ark: “There is above the country of Minyas in Armenia a great mountain called Baris, where, so the legend goes, many fugitives saved themselves during the flood, and one man being carried in an ark ran aground on the summit; and the relics of the timbers were preserved for a long time. This might well be the very man of whom Moses the Jewish lawgiver wrote.”

Baris is an ancient name of Ararat, the highest mountain in Armenia.¹ The name Minyas is kept by most editors and is assumed to be an allusion to the Argonautic expedition or to the Minni of Jeremiah,² the Mannai of Assyrian inscriptions, who, however, belong to the Lake Urmia, not to the Lake Van, region. It is true that the historian Medeios, who wrote about Alexander the Great, asserted that Thessalians followed Jason from Armenion in Thessaly and came to Armenia;³ so the linking of the ‘Minyad land’ to Argonautic legend in the Nikolaos fragment is attractive. The weight of the manuscripts is not in favour of the reading *Μιννάδα*, however, although Naber in his Teubner text of Josephos (Leipzig 1888) implies that it is. Generally the group RO(M) followed by Niese in his edition (Berlin 1887) is superior. R (Codex Regius Parisinus; cent. xiv), O (Codex Oxoniensis [Bodleianus], miscell. graec. 186; cent. xv) and L (Codex Laurentianus, plut. lxix, 20; cent. xiv) are reported to give here *μηννάδα*.⁴ I suggest that the temptation to emend to *Μιννάδα* here should be resisted; still less do we need to put, with J. Vossius, *Μιλνάδα*; for the Milyas is a country in southwestern Asia Minor, remote from Armenia.

¹ Kiepert, *Formae Orbis Antiqui* (Berlin 1902) v; H. Treidler, in *Der Kleine Pauly* I (Stuttgart 1964) 825–826.

² Jer. 51:27, “The Kingdoms of Ararat, Minni and Ashkenaz.”

³ *FGrHist* 129 F 1 (Strabo 11.14.12). Nikolaos (*FGrHist* 90 F 11, 54 and 55) also wrote about the Argonauts, but only, it seems, in connexion with Kolchis, not with Armenia as a whole.

⁴ See *FGrHist* 90 F 72 *app.crit.*

The land of Van and Ararat once lay in the heartland of the great kingdom of Urartu (*i.e.* Ararat, the Uruatru of Assyrian annals). The most successful of Urartian conquerors was king Menua, who extended his frontiers as far to the west as Melitene and northwards to the neighbourhood of Erevan about 800 B.C.⁵ Urartians were long established in the Van region, and they survived as the Alarodloi of Herodotos (3.94 and 7.79) under the Persian empire, long after the decline of their independent power during Skythian, Cimmerian and Assyrian incursions. Thus there is no reason to suppose that the name of the great conqueror Menua was blotted out in Armenia. Rather, the presence of the Menuad land in the fragment of Nikolaos strongly suggests that Menua was not quite forgotten some eight centuries after his death.

The mention of Moses shows that Nikolaos compared the 'one man' in the Ark with Noah of the Old Testament. Josephos names here Berossos, Hieronymus the Egyptian (*FGrHist* 787), Mnaseas (of Patara) and "many others" as having written about the Flood and the Ark; but he does not state that they also mentioned Noah. The identification of the person who landed on Mount Baris with the Hebraic Noah or Noe is thus almost certainly due to Nikolaos himself;⁶ but what his source for the mention of the Menyad land was we do not know. There is no reason to think that he took the toponym from Berossos; in his *Babyloniaka* that scholar called the king who sailed in the Ark Xisouthros and declared that it went aground amongst the Kordyaian (Kurdish?) mountains of Armenia; but the fragments of his account suggest that Xisouthros floated away from Babylonia in the cataclysm; in the version of Nikolaos the Ark may well have been said to have been launched near Ararat, to the summit of which many persons, he claimed, were able to flee. In Berossos' account, however, it seems that only those who sailed in the Ark were saved.⁷ The narrative of Nikolaos was therefore independent of Berossos and of the Mosaic version, according to which "All in whose nostrils was the breath of life, of all that was in the dry land, died."⁸

THE QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST

April, 1968

⁵ A. Goetze, *Kleinasiens*² (Munich 1957) 192.

⁶ Ben Zion Wacholder, *Nicolaus of Damascus* (Univ. Calif. Publ. Hist. 75, 1962) 55.

⁷ Berossos, *FGrHist* 680 F 4b (16) and c.

⁸ *Genesis* 7:22. I am grateful to my colleague Mr E. D. Phillips for his comments on a draft of this paper.