

recto—is to end with ‘Indices Graeci et Latini Accuratis-
simi et Locupletissimi’! It is true that Bentley’s MS notes
in the complete copy cover all the texts contained in
Morel’s edition, but from the incomplete one we now
know that the actual work on the huge project never
exceeded the first two books of *Vita Apollonii* . . .

There is also, as far as I have been able to find out,
nothing in Bentley’s published correspondence to
support Monk’s statement that the editions of Philo-
stratus and Manilius were in 1694 ‘in a state of readiness
for the printer’. In 1690, Bentley first mentions ‘an
Edition of Philostratus, which I shall set out this next
year’,⁹ in 1692 Graevius expresses his delight that
Bentley is now fully engaged in the work on the new
edition,¹⁰ and in December 1694, as we have seen,
Graevius just asks about its progress.

For the same period there is also some—unfortu-
nately rather confusing—information to be had from
other sources. With reference to Bentley’s Philostratus,
Fabricius states in his *Bibliotheca Graeca*: ‘Hujus primum
folium Lipsiae excusum vidi Anno 1691’.¹¹ He must be
mistaken. The statement cannot be reconciled with the
evidence of the letters, and the reference he gives in this
connection, to Tentzel’s *Monatliche Unterredungen* 1691,
p. 521, is also wrong: it refers to the announcement of
Muhlius’ edition (above n. 7). When, some lines further
down, he really wants to refer to Muhlius, his reference
(1693, 882 f.) is to Bentley! And at this place Tentzel
only says that Bentley’s edition, printed in Leipzig, will
be welcome when it appears.¹² Thus, Fabricius cannot
be adduced as a support for Monk’s timetable, and
Tentzel’s *Monatliche Unterredungen* unfortunately do not
mention Bentley’s Philostratus again.

The project thus seems to have been abandoned
simply because it had not advanced very far at all when,
in the later part of the 1690s, other well-known
activities increasingly absorbed Bentley’s time.¹³ It thus
shared the fate of many other similar enterprises. There
seems to have been a definite decision at some time
between December 1694, and the beginning of 1698.
Graevius, who constantly tries to push Bentley on,
continues in letters of February and June 1698 to ask for
the editions of Hesychius and Manilius, but Philostratus
he mentions no more.¹⁴ Already in his letter of 6th
February, 1697, when quoting Spanheim’s laudatory
reference to Bentley’s projected Philostratus (in his
Julian of 1696), Graevius abstains from any remark of
his own on this (delicate?) topic—he just wants to elicit
from Bentley his comments on a certain locus in
Imagines, which he also receives in Bentley’s reply of
26th March.¹⁵

⁹ *Op. cit.* (n. 5) 11. The earlier edition of Bentley’s letters, *Richardi
Bentleii et doctorum virorum epistolae partim mutuae* (Leipzig 1825) 127,
reads ‘which I shall send out this next year’, which may have misled
Monk.

¹⁰ *Op. cit.* (n. 5) 46.

¹¹ Vol. iv. 2 (Hamburg 1711) 53. The whole passage is reprinted,
without corrections, in the 3rd edn, vol. v (Hamburg 1796) 555 f.

¹² November 1693, 882: ‘Dannhero ist kein Zweifel, der
Philostratus, so ietzo in Leipzig mit seiner neuen Lateinischen *Version*
und *Annotationibus* in Druck kommet, werde bey der gelehrten Welt
angenehm und willkommen seyn.’

¹³ *Cf. op. cit.* (n. 5) 18 (Feb. 1691?), 164 (15 Feb. 1698), 194 (20 Aug.
1702: ‘scias me toto hoc biennio vix unum et alterum diem vacavisse
humanioribus literis’).

¹⁴ *Op. cit.* (n. 5) 158, 175.

¹⁵ *Op. cit.* (n. 5) 138–43.

On the other hand, this decision, whenever it was
made before 1698, does not seem to be connected with
another one; namely, to let Olearius take over the job
and use Bentley’s collations. The young Olearius—‘iste
egregius juvenis’—is not mentioned in the correspon-
dence until June 1698, when he is about to set out for
London and is introduced to the great man by Graevius:
‘Cognosces juvenem integerrimae vitae, et nostrarum
artium cupidissimum . . .’¹⁶ There is no mention of
Philostratus here; possibly Olearius’ visit to London was
the very occasion when the idea to let him take over was
formed. Eleven years later Olearius’ edition appeared, in
Leipzig, with Fritsch.

Anyway, the German printers are not the ones to
blame for the fact that Bentley gave up and the learned
world had to wait another 150 years for a decent edition
of Philostratus.

TOMAS HÄGG

University of Bergen, Norway

¹⁶ *Op. cit.* (n. 5) 175 f.

A Thucydidean Scholium on the ‘Lelantine War’

The purpose of this note is to bring to light a piece of
evidence on the ‘Lelantine War’ which has hitherto
been neglected, and briefly to review the Thucydidean
and some of the other evidence in the light of it. The
neglected evidence is a scholium on Thuc. i 15:

οὐ γὰρ ξυνειστήκεσαν πρὸς τὰς μεγίστας πόλεις
ὑπήκοοι, οὐδ’ αὖ αὐτοὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ἴσης κοινὰς
στρατείας ἐποιούντο, κατ’ ἀλλήλους δὲ μάλλον ὡς
ἕκαστοι οἱ ἀστυγείτονες ἐπολέμουν. μάλιστα δὲ ἐς
τὸν πάλαι ποτὲ γενόμενον πόλεμον Χαλκιδέων καὶ
Ἐρετριῶν καὶ τὸ ἄλλο Ἑλληνικὸν ἐς ξυμμαχίαν
ἐκατέρων διέστη.

The gloss is on the word διέστη:

διεπάσθη, ἀνεχώρησεν, οὐ συνεμάχησεν· οὐ γὰρ
λέγει ὅτι ἐμερίσθη, ἀλλὰ μόνοι Χαλκιδεῖς μόνοις
Ἐρετριεῦσιν ἐμάχοντο. ABMC₂f.

1. *Thucydides* i 15.3

In his introductory chapters¹ Thucydides gives a
brief survey of earlier Greek history, the purpose of
which is to show that τὰ πρὸ αὐτῶν (i.e. Greek history
before the Peloponnesian war) were οὐ μεγάλα . . .
οὔτε κατὰ τοὺς πολέμους οὔτε ἐς τὰ ἄλλα,² to explain
why this was the case and thus to support his view that
the Peloponnesian war was ἀξιολογώτατον τῶν
προγεγενημένων.

In our passage he is saying that land-wars in general
were not on a large scale as there were no combinations
of resources either on the basis of inequality or ἀπὸ τῆς
ἴσης; but rather wars tended to be purely local affairs
between neighbouring πόλεις. Does the next sentence,
μάλιστα δὲ . . . διέστη, illustrate or modify this? The
orthodox and, I think, clearly correct view is that it
modifies: ‘The best exception is that long-ago war
between Chalcis and Eretria in which the rest of the
Greek world was divided in alliance with either side.’

(a) διῆσθαι in Thucydides always means ‘divide’,

¹ i 1–23.

² i 1.3.

'take sides', 'be at variance', 'in contrarias partes abire', (Bétant)³ and so must mean here 'divided in alliance'.

(b) It would be peculiar and obscure for Thucydides to be giving a particularly good example of where the rest of Greece did *not* become involved. *μάλιστα* would, in fact, be redundant because no example of non-involvement could be any better than any other.

There are, however, difficulties with this interpretation.

(i) Despite (b) above, *μάλιστα* at the beginning of the sentence does initially lead one to expect that an especially good illustration of what Thucydides has just been saying is going to be given.⁴ This expectation appears to be being confirmed by the mention of Chalcis and Eretria, which, it might be supposed, are as good examples as any to illustrate what Thucydides has just said about *ἀστυγείτονες*.⁵ It is only when we reach the end of the sentence, which, as we have seen, must mean 'divided in alliance with either side', that it becomes clear that *δέ* does point a strong antithesis in this case and that *μάλιστα δέ* must mean 'the best exception' rather than 'the best illustration'.⁶

(ii) *ξυμμαχία* could be taken loosely as 'alliance', not necessarily involving actual 'fighting together'.

(iii) Thucydides does not use the verb *ξυμμαχεσθαι* or even *ξυμμαχεῖν* but the rather inactive phrase, *διϊστάναι ἐς ξυμμαχίαν*.

Thucydides has always been known for his frequent obscurity of expression⁷ and in this passage he is being particularly terse, to the extent, indeed, that it sometimes reads like notes. This sentence, brief and obscure, gives us little indication what he thought the nature of the war was. Furthermore it does not seem that he or his readers can have thought it was much of an exception to his general rule that *τὰ πρὸ αὐτῶν* were *οὐ μεγάλα* or that it had any serious claim to challenge the Peloponnesian war in *μέγεθος*. One is, indeed, led to suspect that this was a good instance of where *σαφῶς μὲν εὐρεῖν διὰ χρόνου πλῆθος ἀδύνατα ἦν*.⁸ Ignorance and/or uncertainty may thus be an additional reason for the brevity and obscurity of the reference.⁹ This impression is

³ Cf. i 18.3; iv 61.1; vi 79.3.

⁴ Just as it had a few lines above, i 15.1: *ἐπιπλέοντες γὰρ τὰς νήσους κατεστρέφοντο, καὶ μάλιστα ὅσοι μὴ διαρκῆ εἶχον χώραν*.

⁵ As it turns out, of course, they are good examples to illustrate an exception to what he has just said about *ἀστυγείτονες*.

⁶ If he had said *πλὴν ὅτι*, or something similar, it would have been clearer that he was pointing a contrast.

⁷ Cf. D.H. de Thuc. xxiv(ff.).

⁸ i 1.3.

⁹ It is not clear that *τὸν πόλεμον* here (or in Hdt.) indicates anything more than that it is a war the mention of which should ring a bell in the minds of educated readers. Why it will do so we can only guess: perhaps they will be aware of it from poets or (less likely) early prose-works; perhaps it was merely general knowledge that there was a war between the two cities. If we think it likely that there was a series of squabbles between the two cities, if not a protracted war, this might be supposed to have left an impression on the popular historical awareness such as England's traditional enmity, or Scotland's traditional friendship, with France has done; cf. our phrases 'The Old Alliance', 'The Hundred Years War'. There is even a slight possibility that, even at this stage, it might only have been known about because it was controversial. At any rate if there was a shared corpus of knowledge/tradition, and this is indicated by the definite article here, there is no reason why it should be a uniform one. In short, it seems to me that *τὸν* in both Thuc. and Hdt. could carry such a variety of implications that speculation on the matter, though it might be instructive, is ultimately bound to be fruitless.

confirmed, I think, by the way he supposedly refers to the war elsewhere.¹⁰

2. The Scholium

The Thucydidean scholia are generally ignored by all except those interested in the text of Thucydides *per se*.¹¹ In its tradition this comment is indistinguishable from the bulk of the scholia: it is found in three of the seven prime manuscripts of Thucydides and in later hands in two others; not in any way unusual.

First we must try to establish exactly what the scholiast is saying: let us consider the clauses in reverse order.

ἀλλὰ μόνοι Χαλκιδαῖς κτλ: the meaning of this is self-evident and clearly shows that the scholiast thinks Thucydides' sentence is an illustration rather than a modification of his hypothesis. This must be an interpretation of Thucydides, not a deliberate contradiction.¹²

οὐ γὰρ λέγει ὅτι ἐμερίσθη: the scholiast is clearly not taking *διέστη* in its usual classical sense but rather to mean 'took up a position apart from the conflict' (much as if it were *ἀπέστη*). This may have been a more natural meaning in later Greek: Herodotus can use it in the sense 'part after fighting'¹³ and this is developed at Isoc. v 38, where it means 'reconciled'; whence it is but a short step (along the same path as that taken by *ἀναχωρῶ* below) to 'being at peace'. The correct interpretation of Thucydides depends on an understanding of his use of *διϊστάναι*, an understanding which the scholiast seems to lack.¹⁴

οὐ συνεμάχησεν: (he means) did not fight in alliance' or '(he does not mean) fought in alliance'? The former is more likely: with the latter the scholiast would be consciously correcting (or rather, reversing) the (to us) orthodox interpretation of Thucydides, whereas what he actually seems to be doing here (see below) is conflating the two opposite interpretations.

ἀνεχώρησεν: perhaps (cf. above) the scholiast's thought process led him from *διέστη* via *διαχωρίζω* (cf. Suda ii 1050 Adler, glossing *διίσταται* by *διαχωρίζεται*) to *ἀναχωρίζω* / *ἀναχωρῶ*. This may seem a little far-fetched, but we are dealing with a scholiast, and a scholiast faced with Thucydides at that. Whether or not this is the case the sense required seems to be 'stood aloof', which is a possible enough meaning in later Greek.¹⁵

¹⁰ Cf. section 3 below.

¹¹ And even then they are not considered worthy of much attention: cf. Gomme, *HCT* i 43.

¹² It should be pointed out that there is no second *ὅτι* inserted between *ἀλλὰ* and *μόνοι*: this does make the final clause read like a statement of fact rather than purely an interpretation of T. Of course it may read like a statement of fact merely because it was thought that this was the fact of which T. was informing us.

¹³ i 76; viii 16, 18.

¹⁴ Cf. section 1(a) above.

¹⁵ Mr W. S. Barrett kindly provided the following examples: Polyb. xxi 26.7 (of Scipio's mother) ... *τὸν πρὸ τοῦ χρόνου ἀνακεχωρηκίας αὐτῆς ἐκ τῶν ἐπισήμων ἐξόδων*; Polyb. xxviii 3 (two Roman legati in Greece) ... *ἅμα δε, διὰ τῶν λόγων παρενέβαινον ὡς εἰδότες τοὺς ἐν ἐκάσταις τῶν πολέων παρὰ τὸ δέον ἀναχωροῦντας, ὡσαυτῶς δὲ καὶ τοὺς προπίπτοντας (προσπίπτοντας codd.). καὶ δῆλοι πάντων ἦσαν δυσαρεστούμενοι τοῖς ἀναχωροῦσιν οὐχ ἦττον ἢ τοῖς ἐκφανῶς ἀντιπράττουσιν*. In these two cases it clearly means 'stand aloof'. Also cf. Aristid. xlix 39 p.

διεσπάρθη: this is very hard to reconcile with the rest of the gloss and, indeed, seems wholly contradicted by *οὐ γὰρ λέγει ὅτι ἐμερίσθη*. The best we could do would be to take *διεσπάρθη* as 'were scattered in disorganised lack of agreement', 'torn apart', in the sense that they were not involved with one another either in conflict or alliance,¹⁶ as opposed to *ἐμερίσθη* 'neatly divided', 'split into parties'. Needless to say, this is unsatisfactory, but it might have been the way it was understood by the scholiast following an earlier commentator (who was presumably using *διεσπάρθη* in its normal sense). Anyway it is likely that the scholiast is here conflating our orthodox interpretation with its opposite.¹⁷ Garbling of this sort by scholiasts is not at all unusual.

Apart from *διεσπάρθη*, then, I take the scholiast to interpret Thucydides as saying: 'Particularly in that long-ago war between Chalcis and Eretria the rest of the Greek world stood aloof as far as alliance with either side was concerned.'¹⁸

Thucydides' lack of lucidity, the possibility that *διέστη* may have been obscure to a late Greek and that the scholiast might well have been a man of not very great knowledge or intelligence may suffice to explain our gloss: it may merely be a misunderstanding. Thus we would rightly be wary of giving any weight to the gloss *by itself* as an historical opinion. If, however, he is conflating two interpretations he is not himself responsible for them. There will originally have been two, or more, sources or groups of sources, one of which will have interpreted *διέστη* by *διεσπάρθη* or words to that effect. The propounder of the opposite view is quite likely, *prima facie*, to have taken Thucydides' sentence as an illustration for reasons which, as we have seen, need not be far to seek, and explained it accordingly. It remains possible, however, that this view of the Chalcis–Eretria war was one held by serious scholars in antiquity and that the 'original commentator',¹⁹ with this view of the war in mind, sought to apply it to Thucydides.²⁰ That serious scholars may have held such a view and that this view may not merely have stemmed from a misunderstanding of Thucydides I hope to show in the next section.

422.17 Keil (i 498 Dindorf): the speaker, because of a previous oracle, is careful to avoid eating beef. Now, after an earthquake, *ὁ θεὸς κελεύει μοι . . . θῦσαι βούν δημοσία τῷ Διὶ τῷ σωτήρι ἀναχωρούντος δέ μου καὶ ὑποπτεύοντος, καὶ δεδιότος τὴν προτέραν ἐκείνην πρόρρησιν, ἐγένετο κτλ.*; and Aristid. li 59 p. 465.6 Keil (i 549 D).

¹⁶ Pl. *Leg.* 876c may be closer to this: 'pull in different directions' (LSJ).

¹⁷ If we thought the scholiast was giving the traditional interpretation we would have to take *ἀνεχώρησεν* as 'retreated from one another', i.e. into two (or even, perhaps, many) different camps; this force of the word would be very peculiar and the interpretation would break down anyway at *οὐ γὰρ λέγει κτλ.*

¹⁸ *ἐς* in *ἐς ξυμμαχίαν* used respectively as it is earlier in the sentence: cf. LSJ s.v. IV 2.

¹⁹ I am asked to stress that, on the whole, there is little evidence of much historical interest on the part of commentators on Thuc. This is a generalisation, however, from which it is quite unwise to jump to conclusions. This comment is quite likely to have come from the same source as a preceding scholium (in ABGc₂), which does give us a piece of historical information not in Thuc., namely that the war was fought for the Lelantine plain: *πόλεμον Χαλκιδέων καὶ Ἐρετριέων ἐπολέμου οὗτοι πρὸς ἀλλήλους περὶ τοῦ Ἀηλαντίου πεδίου.*

²⁰ Cf. n. 12.

3. *The other evidence*²¹

(i) Herodotus

Two passages of Herodotus are usually taken to be referring to the Chalcis–Eretria war:

(a) i 18: *οὗτοι δὲ τὸ ὅμοιον ἀνταποδιδόντες ἐτιμώρεον· καὶ γὰρ δὴ πρότερον οἱ Μιλήσιοι τοῖσι Χίοισι τὸν πρὸς Ἐρυθραίους πόλεμον συνδιήνεικαν.* The Chians help the Milesians against Lydia in return for previous Milesian help against the Erythraeans.²²

(b) v 99: *οἱ γὰρ δὴ Μιλήσιοι πρότερον τοῖσι Ἐρετριέουσι τὸν πρὸς Χαλκιδέας πόλεμον συνδιήνεικαν, ὅτε περ καὶ Χαλκιδέουσι ἀντὶ Ἐρετριέων καὶ Μιλησίων Σάμοι ἐβοήθεον.* Eretrians help Milesians in return for previous help against the Chalcidians. There are difficulties however:

(1) If we place the war in about 700, or even down into the seventh century, the Eretrian help is given for services 200 years earlier.

(2) But even granted that Herodotus is referring to 'The Chalcis–Eretria war' here²³ (and the definite article at v 99 does indicate that he has some sort of idea, however vague, of a war²⁴) there is no indication that he connected these two passages in his mind; and if, indeed, he knew much about the war at all he did not consider it an important, and certainly not a Panhellenic, event.

Herodotus' conception of the war, at any rate, cannot be the result of misinterpretation of Thucydides i 15.3! Rather it is much the same as Thucydides' has been seen to be above—vague and unsubstantial.

(ii) Thucydides

Further indication of this in Thucydides can be found in other passages thought to be relevant. His information about Ameinocles' help to Samos,²⁵ which is used as evidence for, but which does not require, a Corinthian–Samian alliance, comes only two chapters before his aside on the *πάλαι ποτὲ γενόμενον πόλεμον* but no connection is made between the two incidents;²⁶ nor is any made at vi 4, which is used as evidence for Chalcidian hostility to Megarians (in Leontini). Final confirmation of Thucydides' ignorance and/or uncertainty (for we must, I think, call it one of the two), is *ποτὲ* here at i 15.3 which means, as LSJ puts it, 'at some unknown point in time'.²⁷

²¹ I do not propose to indulge in a thorough review of the evidence here. Cf. especially W. G. G. Forrest, *Historia* vi (1957) 160 ff.; and generally J. N. Coldstream, *Greek Geometric Pottery* (London 1968) 368 ff. and *Geometric Greece* (London 1977); A. R. Burn, *The Lyric Age of Greece* (London 1960) 92–3. Contrast Gardner, *CR* xxxiv (1920) 90–1.

²² This passage tends only tentatively to be asserted as relevant.

²³ One thing *τὸν πόλεμον* does indicate in Thuc. and Hdt. is that there was one war. With this should be compared modern theories of multiple wars: e.g. Dondorff, *De Rebus Chalcidensium* (Berlin 1855).

²⁴ But cf. n. 9.

²⁵ i 13.3.

²⁶ See L. H. Jeffery, *Archaic Greece* (London 1976) 159 n. 2 for possible re-dating of Ameinocles to the mid-seventh century.

²⁷ *πάλαι ποτὲ* does, it seems to me, indicate vagueness, uncertainty or something of the sort. *ποτὲ* either merely emphasises *πάλαι* thus suggesting the mists of antiquity, or it invests whatever *πάλαι* is describing with a sort of legendary quality, equally misty (cf. 'once upon a time'). Cf. Plat. *Critias* 110a. *Ar. Plut.* 1002 is no exception: *πάλαι ποτ' ἦσαν ἄλκιμοι Μιλήσιοι.* The vigour of the Milesians has long since degenerated into pleasure and luxury: it is far back in the mists of a legendary past that they were *ἄλκιμοι*. There is here in Thuc. too, I think, a suggestion of either the great amount of time

If, then, Herodotus and Thucydides had much of an idea of the 'war' it was perhaps a little confused and, at any rate, by no means the same as modern reconstructions of alliances based on their texts.

(iii) Strabo

Strabo x 1.12 (448): τὸ μὲν οὖν πλεόν ὠμολόγουν ἀλλήλαις αἱ πόλεις αὐταί, περὶ δὲ Ληλάντου διενεχθεῖσαι οὐδ' οὕτω τελέως ἐπαύσαντο, ὥστε τῷ πολέμῳ κατὰ αὐθάδειαν δρᾶν ἕκαστα, ἀλλὰ συνέθεντο, ἐφ' οἷς συστήσονται τὸν ἀγῶνα. δηλοῖ δὲ καὶ τοῦτο ἐν τῷ Ἀμαρυνθίῳ στήλη τις, φράζουσα μὴ χρῆσθαι τηλεβόλοις.

The war here is envisaged as a gentlemanly affair with its compact μὴ χρῆσθαι τηλεβόλοις.²⁸ There is no indication that Strabo thought it was a Panhellenic event. Neither, presumably, did his source(s), who, his mention of the στήλη indicates, were probably local guides. Surely they, if anyone, would have been anxious to point out to Strabo that their local cities were once so important that all the rest of Greece fought on one side or the other. It is quite likely, in other words, that Strabo's source/guide did *not* think this war was Panhellenic and I doubt that he reached this conclusion from having misread Thuc. i 15.3! So we might surmise that a (or the) local Euboean tradition did not believe the war was Panhellenic.

(iv) Plutarch

There are two relevant passages in Plutarch:

(a) *Mor.* 153f–154a (*Sept. Sap. Conn.* 10): (Periander is speaking) ἀκούομεν γὰρ ὅτι καὶ πρὸς τὰς Ἀμφιδάμαντος ταφὰς εἰς Χαλκίδα τῶν τότε σοφῶν οἱ δοκιμώτατοι ποιηταὶ συνήλθον· ἦν δ' ὁ Ἀμφιδάμας ἀνὴρ πολεμικός, καὶ πολλὰ πράγματα παρασχὼν Ἐρετριεῦσιν ἐν ταῖς περὶ Ληλάντου μάχαις ἔπεισεν. ἐπεὶ δὲ τὰ παρεσκευασμένα τοῖς ποιηταῖς ἔπη χαλεπὴν καὶ δύσκολον ἐποίει τὴν κρίσιν διὰ τὸ ἐφάμιλλον, ἧ τε δόξα τῶν ἀγωνιστῶν, Ὀμήρου καὶ Ἡσιόδου, πολλὴν ἀπορίαν μετ' αἰδοῦς τοῖς κρίνουσι παρείχεν, ἐτράποντο πρὸς τοιαύτας ἐρωτήσεις, καὶ προύβαλ' ὁ μὲν, ὡς φησι Λέσχης . . .

φησι O, φασι QHjnWB

(b) *Mor.* 760c–761a (*Am.* 17): Cleomachus comes with his cavalry from Thessaly . . . ἐπίκουρος Χαλκιδεῦσι τοῦ Ληλαντικοῦ (Θεσσαλικοῦ codd.) πολέμου πρὸς Ἐρετριεῖς ἀκμάζοντος . . . He dies in the battle fighting gloriously for the sake of his lover who is watching . . . Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ τὸν μὲν Κλεόμαχον ἄλλως ἀποθανεῖν φησι, κρατήσαντα τῶν Ἐρετριεῶν τῇ μάχῃ· τὸν δ' ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐρωμένου φιληθέντα τῶν ἀπὸ Θράκης Χαλκιδεῶν γενέσθαι, πεμφθέντα τοῖς ἐν Εὐβοίᾳ Χαλκιδεῦσιν ἐπίκουρον· ὅθεν ἄδεσθαι παρὰ τοῖς Χαλκιδεῦσιν . . .

since the war or its rather mythical character. It is precisely the phrase Thuc. would use if his source(s) were poets, local traditions or his own general knowledge and when he is not particularly confident in any or all of them; cf. *ἀεί ποτε*, with Gomme's note, ii 13.3 (*HCT* ii 26).

²⁸ Forrest's scepticism about this on the basis of the paucity of inscriptions at this early period. Strabo's supposed lack of epigraphic skill and the intrinsic unlikelihood of such a compact is reasonable but not necessarily to be shared. Archilochus *fr.* 3 (West) is probably irrelevant *per se* to the inscription; both of them clearly reflect a particular reputation that the Euboeans had and it seems sensible to suppose that they did so independently of one another. This does not affect the point, however, that this was, for S., a chivalrous and, it seems, local affair.

We might note the following:

(1) 760c–761a is the only mention or evidence in our sources of actual armed conflict involving the supposed allies (Thessaly in this case); peculiar, one might think, if there was actually active *ξυμμαχία*.

(2) 'Aristotle' here *may* have been Aristotle of Chalcis, the local historian, rather than the philosopher.²⁹ In any case it is interesting that he provides a variant for this story, although he still apparently thought Cleomachus died in victorious battle with the Eretrians. Furthermore in his version the Chalcidians from Thrace are involved. Who else, one wonders, if anyone, did he think were involved?

(3) If in (a) we accept the reading of the majority of MSS, φησι, then we should probably conclude that Lesches is Plutarch's source here. If so, this is just the sort of unreliable source that might also be behind Thuc. i 15.3. If, however, we think it unlikely that Lesches wrote a poem about the Chalcis–Eretria war, there are two further alternatives:

(a) Plutarch is portraying Periander as having learnt about the contest from Lesches; i.e. Lesches is, for Plutarch, Periander's contemporary, who might perhaps be expected to know about earlier poetical contests (and to sing of them at Periander's court?).

(b) We accept the reading ὡς φασι in which case Lesches is, not unreasonably, being portrayed as taking part in the contest with Homer and Hesiod.³⁰

In either of these two cases Plutarch's source is to be sought elsewhere (one of the Aristotles perhaps?); but, whichever of the three alternatives we choose, this anecdote and the one about Cleomachus are mythical in tone (cf. Thucydides' *πάλαι ποτέ*) and likely to have been the subject of poetry such as may have provided Thucydides with his 'knowledge' of the war. At any rate it is not immediately or explicitly apparent in Plutarch that the Chalcis–Eretria war was a Panhellenic event.

(v) Aristotle

Aristotle at *Pol.* iv 1289b36 mentions the war: *διόπερ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων χρόνων ὅσαις πόλεσιν ἐν τοῖς ἵπποις ἡ δύναμις ἦν, δλιγαρχίαι παρὰ τούτοις ἦσαν· ἐχρῶντο δὲ πρὸς τοὺς πολέμους ἵπποις πρὸς τοὺς ἀστυγείτονας, οἷον Ἐρετριεῖς καὶ Χαλκιδεῖς.*

Aristotle may have been aware that horses were used in the war because he knew about the Cleomachus story (the alternative version of which he *may* have read in the work of his namesake). But here too it sounds like a local war: Aristotle is talking about wars between *ἀστυγείτονας* much as Thucydides is at i 15.3, but, unlike Thucydides, he cites the Chalcis–Eretria war as an illustration. Had Aristotle merely misread Thucydides then? Those of us who have a high opinion of Aristotle or do not wish to accuse him of the same mistake as made by a Thucydidean scholiast will think this unlikely. It is more likely that another, perhaps Aristotle of Chalcis, was his source here³¹ (in whose

²⁹ Even if he was not he is quite likely to have been the philosopher's source: cf. Jacoby on A. of Chalcis, *FGH* 423, 'und dann könnte dieser A. eine der Quellen seines grossen Namensvetters für die Politieen euboeischer Städte gewesen sein'.

³⁰ If this concurrence is found implausible it can be avoided by deleting *Ὀμήρου καὶ Ἡσιόδου* (Wilamowitz), or deleting *Λέσχης* and reading *προύβαλ' ὁ μὲν, ὡς φασι* (David).

³¹ Cf. n. 29.

ability to interpret Thucydides we may have less confidence).

It is not clear, then, that Herodotus, Strabo, Plutarch, Aristotle or their respective sources thought that the Chalcis–Eretria war was a Panhellenic event; indeed one may get the opposite impression. Nor does it seem that misreading of Thucydides is at the root of the matter. Apart from those who believe in Thessalian involvement, it is not clear that they would disagree with the remark of the scholiast, *μόνοι Χαλκιδαίεις μόνοις Ἐρετριεῦσιν ἐμάχοντο*.

4. Conclusion

We should remember that there are two distinct but (especially in this case) connected questions: (i) what the ancients thought about the war;³² (ii) what we think about it.

(i) The tradition in general is vague and uncertain. In the 250 years or so between the events and our earliest evidence, that of Herodotus, it is not unlikely that it was kept alive through poetry, possibly that of Lesches. In the fifth century we have brief and uninformative references in Herodotus and Thucydides; it is not even clear that they are referring to the same events.³³ Neither of them *appears* to have thought these events important. In the fourth century and beyond, with developing scholarship and interest in local history, there was plenty of scope for controversy: When exactly did the war take place?³⁴ How many wars were there? Who won?³⁵ Who was involved? On this last question some or all the authors we have briefly considered may have stood in a tradition which thought the war was a local event. At some stage the crucial sentence in Thucydides came to be misinterpreted in favour of this localised view. The question of when this misinterpretation took place is important but obscure. For if it was early it may be thought to discredit this view. If, on the other hand, it occurred late (i.e. if it supported an already existing view rather than initiating one), then the view may be considered more credible.

(ii) If there was such a view and it was credible we should at least take it into account when considering what actually happened, although we may not wish to reject our firmest evidence on the matter, Thucydides' short sentence, correctly interpreted. All the evidence can be reconciled with the view that it was not an *important* event, that it was not central to the history of the period.³⁶ Apart from Thucydides there is little, if any, evidence which could not be reconciled with the view that it was not Panhellenic.³⁷ Whatever conclu-

³² Or wars.

³³ Cf. section 3 on chronological difficulties in Hdt.

³⁴ Also the Euboean chronicler Archemachus involves the mythical Curetes in a Lelantine war (*FGH* 424 F 9).

³⁵ Chalcis wins in Plutarch but archaeological evidence indicates Eretrian dominance in the seventh and sixth centuries: Pyrrhic victory perhaps? See Boardman *BSA* lii (1957) 1 ff.

³⁶ The First Messenian War, for instance, might make just as valid a claim to importance. Professor Forrest suggests that the conflict between Assyria and Phrygia over division of power in Asia Minor at about this time, particularly with reference to the Black Sea ports, ought also to be considered in connection with the war.

³⁷ This might suggest the simple and drastic solution of considering Thuc. i 15.3 as an interpolation made in the context of controversy about the war and by someone who meant the sentence the way the

sions we *do* wish to draw about the events themselves, given these uncertainties in the evidence, they should be tentative and highly qualified.³⁸

S. D. LAMBERT

Keble College, Oxford

scholiast interprets it. Some may be attracted by this solution; it seems to me, however, that the evidence is insufficient.

³⁸ My thanks are due to Professor W. G. G. Forrest and Messrs W. S. Barrett and P. S. Derow for their advice in general and for their careful, perceptive and useful criticism of earlier drafts of this paper.

A Louvre Fragment Reconsidered: Perseus becomes Erichthonios¹

PLATES IX–Xa

A fragmentary red-figure cup, formerly in the collection of Henri Seyrig, has been connected with the myth of Danae and Perseus ever since Beazley first noted it in 1954.² Although a number of iconographical discussions of this myth have appeared since, the vase has never been published and, therefore, its iconography never discussed.³ Today, the fragments are in the Louvre, inv. no. 980.0820.⁴ Thanks to the kindness of F. Villard and A. Pasquier, I am able to publish them here for the first time (PLATE IXa–b).

Of the vase, only two joining fragments, part of the handle zone (6 cm × 4.5 cm), are preserved. On the inside remain black glaze and part of the meander-saltire square pattern which surrounded the tondo; on the outside the lower two-thirds of a section of the scene which decorated one side of the cup. The vase dates to 450–40 BC. Beazley did not attribute the vase, nor can I.

At first glance the scene on the outside appears to depict a woman and child standing in a chest-like object, hence the interpretation of the scene as Danae and Perseus. It had been foretold by an oracle that Perseus, the offspring of Zeus and Danae, would kill his grandfather, Akrisios, king of Argos. Although Danae, who had been impregnated by Zeus in the form of golden rain, was able to hide the existence of the youth for a few years after his birth, Akrisios eventually heard the child's cries and discovered him. Attempting to protect himself, Akrisios had a chest built and set the two adrift in it. Eventually the chest landed on Seriphos, and Danae and Perseus were discovered and saved by Diktys, brother of King Polydektēs.⁵

¹ I would like to thank Prof. Christoph Clairmont for reading an earlier draft of this article and Judith Binder for a stimulating discussion of this vase. I am also indebted to the following curators for permission to publish vases in the collections under their care: M. Schmidt (Basel), C. Vermeule (Boston), and F. Villard (Paris).

² J. D. Beazley and L. D. Caskey, *Attic Vase Paintings in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston* ii (Oxford 1954) 12.

³ For the iconography of Danae and Perseus on vases, see Beazley–Caskey (n. 2) 11–12; K. Schauenburg, *Perseus in der Kunst des Altertums* (Bonn 1960) 7–12; J. Henle, *Greek Myths: A Vase Painter's Notebook* (Bloomington/London 1973) 87–88, 210–12; and J. Oakley, 'Danae and Perseus on Seriphos', *AJA* lxxxvi (1982) 111–15 (see 111, n. 3 for the earlier bibliography).

⁴ I would like to thank Prof. Dietrich von Bothmer for informing me of the current location of this vase and D. Knoepfler, Mme Nicolet and H. Cahn for answering inquiries concerning it.

⁵ For the literary sources of this myth, see M. Werre-de-Haas, *Aeschylus' Dictyulci* (Leiden 1961) 5–10; J. M. Woodward, *Perseus: A Study in Greek Art and Legend* (Cambridge 1937) 3–23; J. L. Catterall,