A GARRISON INSCRIPTION FROM RHAMNOUS

An inscribed fragment of Pentelic marble was found at Rhamnous on January 11, 1939, by Mr. Henry S. Robinson and myself, in a clump of bushes about fifty yards south of the theatre. The fragment has since been brought to the Epigraphical Museum at Athens, where it is now listed as E. M. 12968. The right edge is preserved, but the other edges and the back are broken. The surface is discolored and somewhat flaked. Letters are carelessly cut and lines are neither parallel nor evenly spaced. There is, however, syllabic division at the ends of the lines.
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\begin{array}{c}
[\text{Restoration of this stone must be sought, as far as restoration is possible, from parallel phrases in other so-called "garrison inscriptions." These inscriptions generally conform to a clearly defined pattern; after a statement of the date and mover of the decree, the proposed award is justified by a laudatory account of the recipient's career. There follows the recording, in formal diction, of the honors bestowed; the stone may contain one or more crowns beneath the text. The new fragment evidently comes from the central section of a decree of this kind, and while no proper names are preserved, some of the phrases it contains are new.}]
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
[\text{Line 1. The commonest occurrence of the genitive \( \tau ᾱς \) ψυλάκτης is with the verb \( \varepsilon \upsilon\mu\eta\lambda\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\nu\varepsilon\omicron\masculine\upsilon \) (I.G., II², 1156, 46; Roussel, B.C.H., I. IV, 1930, p. 269, 7). Restorations in I.G., II², 1260, 14, 18; 1299, 60, 65 are reasonably certain, since both inscriptions are stoichedon. The presence of the particle \( \tau ε \) in the fragment requires}]
\end{array}
\]
a genitive corresponding to τῆς φυλακῆς in line 2; a good parallel is presented by I.G., II², 1304, 23 (τῆς τε [φυ]λακῆς ἐφρόντισεν τῆς χώρ[α]ς κ[α]ὶ τῶν φρουρίων[ν]). Slight variations of the formula are found in I.G., II², 1299, 60, and in Roussel, loc. cit., lines 7, 16. To use the phrases of the latter inscription in toto would make the restoration of the line too long; the most probable restoration is therefore a compromise. There is room for one more letter at the right end of the line. (This is true also of lines 3, 6, 7, and 9).

Lines 2-3. The restoration of [ά]δίκημα seems certain, for the word is used at least twice in the garrison inscriptions. In I.G., II², 1225, 9-11 we read πρόνοιαν ποιούμενον ὅπως ἄν μηθεν ἀδίκημα γίνηται κατὰ τὴν χώρ[α]ν; while in 1304, 16-17 the reading is ἐπιμ[έλ]ειαν τοῦ [μη]θ[ὲν μηδαμό]ῦ ἀδίκημα μῆτε ἐ[ν] τε[ὶ χώρας μ[ὴν] ὑπερτende to text.
A combination of these two passages suggests a reasonably safe restoration for the new fragment; from it an original stone of 52-56 letters to the line can be deduced.

Lines 3-4. In no other garrison inscription do we encounter either the phrase φύλακας καθιστάς or the words κύδυνον προορόμενος. Indeed, the word κύδυνον is found only once (I.G., II², 1304, 8-9). These phrases show that the person honored was of some importance: it is entirely probable that he was the στρατηγὸς ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν τὴν παραλίαν. Furthermore, the unique wording seems to indicate that he has coped successfully with some unusual kind of emergency, and that his award is more than a mere formality. Of no other garrison officer is it said that he “appointed garrisons” or “anticipated danger.”

Line 5. The use of the word στρατιώται in garrison inscriptions is very elastic. Wilhelm (Beiträge, p. 55) declares that the word means “mercenaries, both Athenian and foreign,” and there is no doubt that this is its usual connotation. In the following examples it is plain that mercenaries are indicated:

(a) I.G., II², 1286, 1-2, 7, 10. The committees of the στρατιώται include three Cretans and a Corinthian.
(b) I.G., II², 1299. The στρατιώται are contrasted with citizens (20-22) and are later equated with ξένοι (40-42).
(c) I.G., II², 1310, 1-2. The phrasing is analogous to a.
(d) I.G., II², 1312, 13-14. The leader of the στρατιώται (cf. Wilhelm, Att. Urk., III, p. 38) is Dionysios of Klagomenai, who is obviously a mercenary.
(e) I.G., II², 1313, 2-3. The leader of the στρατιώται is the ξειναγός.

On the other hand, the military roll of 306/5 B.C. contains a list of Athenians who are termed στρατιώται (I.G., II², 1954, 3), and in I.G., II², 1270, 15-16 τῶν στρατιώτων appears as the equivalent of τῶν [στρ.] ατευμένους ἐπὶ Σωμίων τῶν πολ.[υ]ν καὶ τῶν ξένων (5-7); cf. also line 10 (τοῖς στρατιώταις). In I.G., II³, 1958 στρατιώται is used to describe both citizens and foreigners, possibly all of them mercenaries, and in three other inscriptions the word includes foreign mercenaries and Athenians (I.G., II³, 1260, 21-24; 1287, 4; B.C.H., LIV, 1930, p. 269, 9-10, with commentary on p. 272).

The conclusion seems to be that the word στρατιώται can be applied to mercenaries, to citizen soldiers, or to both, but that its usual meaning is “mercenaries,” for non-mercenary citizen troops are generally called οἱ τεταγμένοι τῶν πολιτῶν, Ἀθηναίοι οἱ τεταγμένοι, or οἱ στρατευόμενοι. However, since the new fragment refers to mercenaries in line 7 (ξένων), it seems probable that the στρατιω[τῶν] two lines above includes soldiers of all kinds, and that the inscription originally contained a contrast between soldiers and civilians.
Lines 6-7. The occurrence of the expression τὸ συμφέρων in the singular is very unusual, but examples of it in the plural are fairly common. The customary phrase in honorary decrees is διεσέλει λέγων καὶ πράττων τὰ συμφέροντα. Ξένων is obviously the last word in its sentence, and therefore in all probability was preceded by a balancing genitive whose meaning was “all the soldiers except the mercenaries.” The word ὁπῶς is almost invariably used to begin a transitional hortative sentence between the end of the laudatory account and the formal bestowal of honors (cf. W. Larfeld, Handbuch der Griechischen Epigraphik [Leipzig, 1902], II, pp. 763 ff.). It is therefore reasonable to assume that the original inscription contained its transitional sentence at this point, and that after a line or two came the formal award beginning with the words ἄγαθε τίχει.

Lines 8-9. The presence of αὐτοῖς in line 8 makes the restoration of these two lines extremely hazardous. The nominative ὁ δῆμος in garrison inscriptions is preceded by the accusative singular αὐτόν, never except in this case by the dative plural αὐτοῖς (I.G., II², 1285, 3; 1299, 15; 1304, 10; 1307, 3). The demos is probably the demos of Athens, but it may be the demos of Rhamnous. In line 9, the letters ΕΝ must form the end of a syllable, since there is space on the stone for one more letter to the right; they are most likely the ending of a verb.

Line 10. A common phrase is δεδοξάθαι τοῖς στρατευομένοις, but in I.G., II², 1302, 10-11 the expression δεδοξάθα[ι τῷ] κοίνῳ τῶν [σ']στρατευομέν[ων] is used as an equivalent. The restoration δεδοξάθαι τῷ κοίνῳ τῶν στρατιωτῶν is therefore justified as being the equivalent of δεδοξάθαι τοῖς στρατιώταις, which is found in I.G., II², 1270, 10, and has been restored in I.G., II², 1286, 12.

A detailed special study of the garrisons of Attica during the Hellenistic period has not yet been made.¹ Literary sources tell us of garrisons in Classical times at Eleusis, Panakton, Phyle, Oinoe, Rhamnous, Anaphlystos, Thorikos, and Sounion, but after the days of Demosthenes the literary references are few. The epigraphical evidence first occurs at the point where the literary sources begin to fail; the earliest of the garrison inscriptions (I.G., II², 1191) has been dated 321/20 B.C., while the

¹ The topographical study of L. Chandler (J.H.S., XLVI, 1926, pp. 1-21) includes only forts on the northern frontier, and does not refer to Sounion. The watch towers noted in the article may have belonged to fortified farms. In the opinion of W. Wrede (Attische Mauern [Athens, 1933], passim) most of the present remains of the forts date from the first half of the fourth century B.C., though at Sounion, Oinoe, Phyle, and Thorikos there are constructions that go back to the Peloponnesian War. There are also remains from the Hellenistic period. Phyle offers a good example: the fort was first built in 412 B.C., but its present walls are early fourth century constructions containing some Hellenistic repairs (cf. Ath. Mitt., LXIX, 1924, pp. 220-224). However, the whole structure has been termed Hellenistic by G. Säffund (Opuscula Archaeologica, I, 1935, pp. 107 ff.). The best historical account of the frontier garrisons is contained in W. S. Ferguson, Hellenistic Athens (London, 1911), passim; the most detailed analysis of their internal organization is that of G. T. Griffith, Mercenaries of the Hellenistic World (Cambridge, 1935), pp. 80-88. Cf. also K. Grote, Das griechische Söldnerwesen der hellenistischen Zeit (Diss. Jena, 1913).
latest reference is from the year 100/99 B.C. (I.G., II², 2869). The great majority of the inscriptions belongs to the third century, and examples from the last third of the century are particularly numerous.²

Some sort of reorganization of the Attic garrisons must have taken place between the end of the Peloponnesian War and the time of Aristotle. During the Hellenistic period we hear nothing of fortified places at Oinoe, Anaphlystos, or Thorikos, and it is probable that they were not used after the battle of Chaironeia.³ Eleusis, Panakton, Phyle, Rhamnous, and Sounion were continued as garrison posts and were commanded by an Athenian general entitled ὑπὸ τῆς χώρας (Aristotle, 'Αθ. Πολ., 61, 1). These five garrisons were subsequently separated into two administrative divisions, probably in the year 261/60 B.C.; from this time on Eleusis with outposts at Panakton and Phyle comprised the western division, while the eastern section with garrisons at Sounion and Rhamnous guarded the coastal plain known as the Paralia.⁴ How long the garrisons continued to be maintained under this arrangement is uncertain; the latest extant allusion to them is from the year 100/99 B.C., and they are not mentioned during the campaigns of Sulla.⁵

In the fifth and early fourth centuries the function of the garrisons was purely military, and they were organized and maintained only in time of war.⁶ But by

² For the literary evidence, Busolt-Swoboda, Griechische Staatskunde (Munich, 1926), pp. 1195 ff. For late third-century inscriptions, I.G., II², 1299-1313. Of these, 1304b is the latest that can be dated with certainty. It is possible that nos. 1305-1313, assigned on epigraphical grounds to the end of the third century, are to be connected with the Second Macedonian War.

³ These three sites have not yet been excavated, and therefore a categorical statement is dangerous. Our knowledge of the garrisons at Rhamnous and Sounion would be very slight without the inscriptions that have been unearthed there. On the other hand, the new fragment was found above ground, whereas nothing has come to light in similar fashion at the three earlier forts.

It is significant that Eleutherai is at no period included among the Attic garrisons, and its omission gives strong support to the view of Beloch and Kahrstedt that the impressive ruins at the south entrance to the pass of Dryoskephalai are to be identified with Panakton. (Klio, XI, 1911, pp. 436-439; Ath. Mitt., LVII, 1932, pp. 16-18; Wrede, Attische Mauern, pp. 32 f., plates 83-86).

⁴ Ferguson, op. cit., p. 183; Klio, IX, 1909, p. 318. Eleusis was unquestionably headquarters for the western division, although we are told in I.G., II², 1299, 37-39 of a committee of eleven comprised of five representatives from Eleusis, five from Panakton, and one from Phyle. This is probably an instance of proportional representation; if so, the Phyle garrison must have been a mere handful (cf. note 15). There is no evidence to decide the headquarters of the Paralia, but Rhamnous is closer to Athens and guarded the overland route to Euboia. Possibly Rhamnous and Sounion were on equal terms, and the ὑπὸ τῆς χώρας divided his time between them.

⁵ In the slave revolt of 102/99 B.C. not only the Sounion garrison but the whole military strength of Attica was helpless (Athenaeus, VI, 272 f.). Sounion is significantly omitted from I.G., II², 2869 (100/99 B.C.). The frontier garrisons may have lingered on in miniature until the invasion of Sulla.

⁶ Thucydides, II, 13, 6; 18, 2. For criticism of Pericles' failure to organize Attic garrisons on a larger scale, cf. B. W. Henderson, The Great War Between Athens and Sparta (London, 1927), pp. 56-59. At no time in her history did Athens adopt a defence plan such as Henderson outlines.
Aristotle’s time they seem to have changed into a kind of rural police force, and were no longer expected to offer serious resistance to foreign invaders. The duty of their general was “to keep guard, and whenever war should arise in the countryside, to make war.” In other words, the garrisons were maintained permanently to patrol the frontiers and to police the plains of Attica. Aristotle’s statement is supported by evidence from the inscriptions, of which the decree in honor of Demanethos offers the clearest example (*I.G.*, II², 1304). Three times general of the western division, Demanethos is honored for having kept good order at the celebration of the Eleusinian Mysteries, for having cared for the citizens under his command, for having paid his mercenaries promptly, and for having obtained grain for his troops. It is true that this particular example comes from the last quarter of the third century, but earlier instances are not lacking. A police duty common to all garrisons was to assure an uninterrupted harvesting of the crops. Other tasks are occasionally mentioned: for example, the garrison at Sounion may have been responsible for the good behavior of the slaves in the silver mines.⁷

A police force can scarcely be counted on to prevent an armed invasion, and the border garrisons of Attica offer no exception to the rule. Macedonian troops landed at Rhamnous in 322 B.C., and ravaged the Paralia until they met defeat at the hands of the Athenians under Phokion. In the year 296/5 B.C. Demetrios Poliorketes seized Eleusis and Rhamnous without difficulty and ravaged the Attic plains.⁸ Antigonos Gonatas obtained control of Panakton and Phyle and marched unopposed into Attica in 265 B.C. From the years 261-229 B.C. the garrisons were administered jointly by the Athenians and Macedonians, but even with this added strength they failed in 238 B.C. to stop Aratos of Sikyon. After the withdrawal of the Macedonian troops the garrisons became still weaker, and in 201-200 B.C. the plains were invaded by the Akarnanians, and in the following year suffered a still more severe devastation at the hands of Philip V of Macedonia. Only once are we told that any garrison offered serious resistance; the garrison at Eleusis held out against a Macedonian detachment in 200 B.C., but was saved from destruction only by timely aid from Pergamon and Rome.⁹

In spite of their complete futility in the face of an invading army, the frontier garrisons of Attica were organized on a military basis during the whole of the

---

⁷ Ferguson, *Class. Phil.*, II, 1907, p. 306; *Klio*, IX, 1909, pp. 316-317. On the other hand, it has been shown by J. A. O. Larsen (*Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, IV, p. 462, note 28) that the mines were in Greek hands down to Roman Imperial times. Since the Attic border garrisons disappeared nearly a century earlier, it is more probable that under normal conditions the mines were policed by company employees.

⁸ Plutarch, *Phokion*, 25, 1; *Demetrios*, 33, 3.

Hellenistic period. Little is known, however, of the details of this organization before
the generation of the Macedonian domination (261-229 B.C.), during which the
garrisons were manned jointly by Athenian citizens and Macedonian mercenaries. In
the Macedonian period the commanders of the eastern and western divisions were
Athenian generals and were designated respectively ὁ στρατηγὸς ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν τὴν
παραλιαν and ὁ στρατηγὸς ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν ἐπὶ Ἑλευσίνος; the approval of the king of
Macedonia was requisite for office.10

An interesting survival from the fifth century is the title περιπόλαρχος, which
designated the leader of a squad of border police. The composition of these patrols
is puzzling in view of the statements of Aeschines and Aristotle which have been
used to support the opinion that περιπόλοι consisted of ephebes, for other literary
statements and all epigraphical evidence point toward mercenaries. If we believe that
the usual Greek practice in the fifth century was to use citizen troops, but that as
time went on the citizens were gradually replaced by mercenaries, it seems reasonable
to assume that the earliest Athenian περιπόλοι were citizen troops, even though there
is evidence for mercenaries in their ranks as early as 411 B.C. It is probable that the
Athenian military reforms of the fourth century not only created permanent garrisons
but also affected the organization of the περιπόλοι. At first glance it would seem that
the fifth-century citizens (and mercenaries) were replaced by ephebes in the new
system that Aristotle describes, but unfortunately this explanation is not valid. We
are told of φρουροὶ νεωρίων πεντακόσιων at the beginning of the Peloponnesian War
(Aristotle, Ἀθ. Πολ., 24, 3), and it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the
practice of training young recruits (ephebes in fact if not in name) in border patrols
goes back at least as far as the fifth century.11

In the Hellenistic period the term περιπόλοι was discontinued and there remained
only the title of the commander (περιπόλαρχος). It is significant that only after the
disappearance of the word περιπόλοι do we first meet the term ὑπαθροὶ, “open-air
soldiers.” It seems entirely probable that these two expressions refer to the same
body of troops: in other words, the title περιπόλαρχος had survived from the earlier
period, but in Hellenistic times its bearer was in command of the ὑπαθροὶ. That the
Hellenistic border patrols were at least partly professional soldiers is difficult to deny,
since we hear several times of a περιπόλαρχος in command of mercenaries (στρατιώται).

How can this be reconciled with the statements of Aeschines and Aristotle (our
sole evidence for ephebic περιπόλοι)? Aeschines says (Π, 167) that as soon as he

10 For the titles of the generals, Klio, IX, 1909, p. 322. For Athenian and Macedonian co-
11 There has been considerable difference of opinion concerning the date of the origin of the
Ephebia. A strong case for an early date has been advanced by J. O. Lofberg (Class. Phil., XX,
1925, pp. 330-335), who leaves little to support the views of Wilamowitz and others. Lofberg’s con-
clusions have also been attained, apparently independently, by A. W. Gomme (Population of Athens
[Oxford, 1933], p. 8, note 3).
passed out of boyhood he served as a περίπολος for two years; Aristotle (Ἀθ. Πολ., 42, 4) declares that for one year epheses περιπολούσι τὴν χώραν, and spend their time in blockhouses. Neither says that περίπολος were epheses exclusively. Perhaps the epheses were distributed in the ranks of the professional soldiers, and for this reason the περιπόλαρχος was required to be an Athenian citizen (I.G., ΠII, 1260, 9-22). This interpretation does not contradict I.G., ΠII, 1304, 41-42, where the ὑπαθροι are distinctly contrasted with πολίται and may therefore be either mercenaries or epheses, or a mixture of both.  

Whatever their relationship to the epheses may have been, mercenaries were not distributed amongst the ranks of the Athenian citizen soldiers, but remained at each outpost a separate group under their own officers. The commander of a group of mercenaries was known simply as ὁ ἡγεμών τῶν ξένων; during the years 261-229 b.c. he was probably appointed by the Macedonian king, and it is not unlikely that the use of his title was confined to these years. It is not until after 229 b.c. that we first meet the title ξεναγός.12 We are told occasionally of other titles for mercenary commanders, but a closer examination of the evidence shows that they are probably fictitious. The title στρατηγός ἐπὶ τῶν ξένων has been advocated on the basis of two inscriptions, but neither inscription contains the word στρατηγός. The title στρατηγός ἐπὶ τῶν ξένων, which is accepted by Griffith, is unsupported by any evidence whatsoever. It is safest to conclude that the only title down to 229 b.c. was ἡγεμών τῶν ξένων, and that it was replaced after this date by the more impressive title ξεναγός.13

There is a surprising similarity between the military organizations of third-century Athens and second-century Pergamon (cf. Rostovtzeff in C.A.H., VIII, pp. 594-597), and it is interesting to speculate how much of the Pergamene was borrowed from the Athenian and to what extent both systems sprang from a common

12 For a full discussion of the περίπολος cf. Hommel in Pauly-Wissowa, R.E., s. v. Peripoloi. Also P. Foucart, B.C.H., XIII, 1889, pp. 264-276; Griffith, op. cit., pp. 86-88; Lofberg, loc. cit., pp. 330-332. For ὑπαθροι used to distinguish rural settlers in Asia Minor from κατοίκοι, Dittenberger, O.G.I.S., 229; A. Schulten, Hermes, XXXII, 1897, pp. 532 f. It is possible that ζυταθροι is a military term of Macedonian origin, and came into use in Attica during the first half of the third century.

13 For ἡγεμών τῶν ξένων, I.G., ΠII, 1299, 94. For ξεναγός (an almost certain restoration), I.G., ΠII, 1313, 2-3. In the year 200 b.c. a certain Dioxippus is called praefectus cohortis mercede militantium auxiliorum (Livy, XXXI, 24, 6), but he seems to have been on duty in the city of Athens. Ferguson (Klio, IX, 1909, p. 318) sought to parallel the ἡγεμών τῶν ξένων with a corresponding ἡγεμών for the citizen soldiers. The latest reading of I.G., ΠII, 1958, 5 is, however, [Ἀπ]τέμων.

14 The two inscriptions cited in support of στρατηγός ἐπὶ τῶν ξένων are I.G., ΠII, 379, 11; 682, 21-28. In the former, the word στρατηγός is an unsatisfactory restoration because it contains too many letters (cf. Woodward, J.H.S., XXVIII, 1908, p. 309). The Greek of the latter is ambiguous. According to Ferguson, Phaidros' office was στρατηγός ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν, which included authority over mercenaries (Athenian Tribal Cycles [Cambridge, 1932], pp. 69-70). The alternate interpretation once advanced by Dinsmoor (Archons of Athens, pp. 70 ff.) has now been abandoned for chronological reasons (Athenian Archon List [New York, 1939], pp. 51 ff.). Cf. Tarn, J.H.S., LIV, 1934, p. 38.
source. The fact that the Attalids built up an effective military machine shows that
the design of the machine was not at fault, and one should not postulate defective
organization as an explanation of the ineffectiveness of the garrisons of Attica. It
seems rather that in the open market Athens could not compete with the great
monarchies, and that her mercenaries were inferior both in quantity and in quality.

During the third century the proportion of mercenary soldiers on garrison duty
in Attica was comparatively high, although the total numbers were never very large;
but after the Macedonian withdrawal in 229 B.C. there were fewer foreign troops in
the service, and therefore the total number of soldiers was probably less. A rough
estimate of the numbers in the closing decades of the century can be made from two
extant garrison lists: Eleusis can scarcely have had more than one hundred regulars,
and each division was therefore not more than two hundred and fifty men each. The
entire frontier force was probably less than five hundred men. By the end of the
century the garrisons were in a deplorable state of inefficiency, and the extraordinary
number of honorary decrees indicates not only a period of military difficulty but also
a time of "grave weakness of Greek character." 15

It is to this period that the new fragment is to be assigned. Of the published
garrison inscriptions it bears closest resemblance in letter forms to I.G., II², 1310
(also from Rhamnous), which belongs to the years of the Second Macedonian War.
The letters of the two stones are of the same type, but those of the new fragment
are much more irregular and careless. This can mean that the new fragment is the
later of the two; the somewhat unusual wording also suggests a time from which
no garrison inscription has hitherto been found.

It is my opinion that the fragment comes from the time of the war with
Antiochos the Great, and that its date must be very close to 190 B.C. It is true that
Antiochos never threatened to invade Attica, but his European base was the nearby
city of Chalkis, and in the year 191 B.C. the Roman admiral Aulus Atilius captured a
number of his Asiatic supply ships off Karystos, within easy sight of the Rhamnous
garrison. 16 It is not impossible that the phrase κῦνδωνον προορόμενος in the fourth line
of the fragment refers to the proximity of the powerful monarch of eastern Hellenism. 17
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15 Ferguson, Hellenistic Athens, p. 252. The evidence from the garrison lists (I.G., II², 1299;
1958) affords only a very rough estimate for the total numbers. Nor does it prove conclusively,
although it establishes a strong likelihood, that the number of mercenaries was reduced after 229 B.C.,
since in 235 B.C. the foreign troops are listed separately, where ca. 205 B.C. a single list contains nine
foreigners and fifty-four Athenians (cf. Griffith, op. cit., pp. 85-86). The small numbers on garrison
duty imply that during the slave revolt at Laurion in 132 B.C. special troops were called out from
Athens (Orosius, V, 9, 5).

16 Livy, XXXVI, 20, 7.

17 I should like to take this opportunity to thank Professor J. A. O. Larsen and Dr. Eugene
Schweigert for generous assistance and many helpful suggestions.