

the defence of Thermopylae and Artemisium (as previously of Tempe). Artemisium was in open water and therefore dangerous to the Greek fleet, as their defensive tactics show (Hdt. viii 2.1), while withdrawal to the Euripus would leave the route west of Euboea open. At Tempe there was no role for the fleet at all: Themistocles must surely have gone there with the Athenian hoplites to ensure that there would be no decisive action there. It would then have been the latest feasible time²¹ to begin the evacuation and to embark the whole of the fit male population as crew on the ships. Naturally there were no land troops to spare for Thermopylae, and Themistocles must have been on tenterhooks about the risk of suffering serious losses in a battle in the wrong place.

According to Herodotus (viii 40.2) the Athenians claimed that after the fall of Thermopylae they had been expecting the Peloponnesian army to be drawn up in the Boeotian plain. That is most implausible. There had, of course, been a promise from Sparta that she would send a full-scale force to Thermopylae when the festival ended, but after the pass fell it was far from clear that there was an acceptable position where the Peloponnesian army could maintain contact with the Greek fleet and defend Attica whilst avoiding encirclement. There is no Thermopylae pass in the Oropus area and substantial manpower was still tied up in the fleet. Could the Athenians ever have believed that they could leave their women and children in Attica to be defended by Peloponnesians even though there was no strong position to make this possible? Plataea was only possible after Salamis. There is no suggestion in Herodotus that any council of the allies had agreed to a plan to fight in Boeotia and, as has been argued, a decision to evacuate taken at so late a stage could not have been implemented successfully.

But after the great victory it was not tactful to remind Athens of this hard truth, any more than to question either the sincerity or the judgement of the Spartan arrangements at Thermopylae. The 'Themistocles Decree' from Troezen, at the least, whether it is based on a real document or is a very sophisticated forgery, let this cat out of the bag.²²

A. J. HOLLADAY

Trinity College, Oxford

²¹ So also A. R. Burn, *Persia and the Greeks* (London 1962) 361.

²² The suggestion of H. B. Mattingly (*Classical contributions: studies in honour of Malcolm Francis McGregor*, ed. G. S. Shrimpton and D. J. McCargar [Locust Valley 1981] 79) that this document would gain glory for Athens by showing her great prescience ignores the revelation of duplicity in pretending to be committed to the defence of Central Greece whilst showing by her actions her own disbelief in the policy. Herodotus offers Athens the best of both worlds by attributing the decision to 481 after the debate on the oracle (though not to 483/2) but leaving the impression that its implementation only came about when the fleet returned from Artemisium. He surely earned his 10 talents.

Onomakles and The Alopekonesians

Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 3711 discusses Lesbian anti-quoties. In column ii lines 31 to 36 a quotation from Alkaios is followed by remarks upon Alopekonesians who settled at Ainos. The passage quoted from Alkaios is already known (130 L.-P. 130 b 9–11 Voigt [P. Oxy.

2165, fr. 1 ii 17–19]), but the new evidence in the lemma has enabled the editor, M. W. Haslam, to make textual improvements. Haslam presents P. Oxy. 3711 ii 31–36 thus:

ὥς δ' Ὀνομακλέης ὠθ.γ.οσ
 εἰκήσα λυκαρχίαια φεύγων τ[ὸν
 π[όλ]εμον. Αἴνος Θρ[ά]κικης πόλις .[
 Αἴνου τοῦ Γερῶνι [
 δὲ τήν Αἴνον Ἀλωπεκον[νήσιοι,
 η[. . .] οὔντο δ' ὑπὸ Θραικῶ[ν.]η[ε]

After suggesting that the incomplete word at the end of line 31 was Ὠθάνασος, 'the Athenian', the editor asks concerning Onomakles 'was he an Athenian who had come to Lesbos and the Troad?' There is no mention of Alopekonesians or of Ainos in the lemma, but Haslam states 'I can only suppose that Onomakles and Aenus are connected in some way which the comment proceeded to elucidate. But if the Athenians (given Ὠθάνασος in the lemma) had anything to do with Aenus in this early period, it receives no mention in our sources. We hear only of the clash over Sigeum (cf. Alc. 428.167), nothing of any other Athenian activity in the region. Alcaeus and Aenus: fr. 45, Ἐβρε κτλ, but no link here with that'.

However, there is evidence of other Athenian activity in the region in the time of Alkaios. Athenians with Phrynon, an Olympic victor, were present not only in the Troad but in the Thracian Chersonese also. Pseudo-Skymnos, having mentioned the Aeolians of Alopekonesos (706), remarks

707 ἐξῆς Ἐλαιούσ, Ἀττικὴν ἀποικίαν
 ἔχουσα, Φρύνων ἦν συνοικίσαι δοκεῖ.

708 Φορβῶν (sine acc.) cod.: em. H. T. Wade-Gery, *Essays in Greek history* (Oxford 1958) 166 n. 2.

Thus Phrynon and his Athenian venturers were busy on both the Asiatic and European sides of the Hellespont.¹ Athenian activity at Elaiouss began in the last quarter of the seventh century BC; Corinthian and East Greek pottery has been found there, on the acropolis overlooking Morte Bay and in cemeteries.² The archaeological evidence from Elaiouss is consistent with chronographic data: Phrynon, whom Alkaios mentioned,³ was an Olympic victor in 636/5;⁴ about 620 he would have been senior enough to act as *oikistes* at Elaiouss, and a decade or so later he was no match for Pittakos in single combat—in 607/6 according to Eusebios.⁵

To the north of Elaiouss the neighbours of the Athenians were the Alopekonesians, who lived beside

¹ L. H. Jeffery, *Archaic Greece* (London and Tonbridge 1976) 89–90.

² Excavations were conducted during the Gallipoli campaign and again in the period from August 1920 to January 1921: *BCH* xxxix (1915) 135–240; *CRAI* (1915) 268–9; (1916) 40–7; (1921) 130–6. J. Boardman, *The Greeks overseas* (London 1980) 265.

³ 167.17 L./P. (167.17 Voigt). Cf. 428 ab L./P. (468, 469 Voigt). Denys Page, *Sappho and Alcaeus* (Oxford 1955) 152–61.

⁴ Eusebios, *Chron.* i, p. 92 Karst. Eusebios states that Phrynon won in the stadion, but Diogenes Laertios (i, 74) calls him victor in the pankration (*RE* xx 1. 929 s.v. 'Phrynon [1]).

⁵ Armen. Vers. *Ol.* 43.2, Ann. Abr. 1409, *Chron.-Kanon* p. 186 Karst. Hieron. *Ol.* 43. 2, p. 98 b Helm.² A. A. Mosshammer, *The Chronicle of Eusebios and Greek Chronographic Tradition* (Lewisburg 1979) 246–54.

the southwestern limit of the Melas Gulf,⁶ near Suvla Bay. Coins and an inscription mentioning the Alopekonesians were found thereabouts during the Gallipoli campaign.⁷ Across the Melas Gulf, beyond the Sarpedonian Cape lay a peninsular site close to the mouth of the southern channel of the Hebros. Here, at Polytymbria or Ainos, Aeolians from Alopekonesos settled, who were followed by ἔπιοικοι from Mytilene and Kyme.⁸

Since Alkaios in exile compared himself with Onomakles, it is possible that the Athenian was driven out from Elaious to his neighbours in Alopekonesos, and from Alopekonesos he could have gone to Ainos. That is conjecture. What is clear is that an Athenian could easily have had dealings with Alopekonesians in the time of Alkaios, because Elaious and Alopekonesos were neighbours in the Thracian Chersonese.⁹

G. L. HUXLEY

The American School of Classical Studies at Athens

⁶ Strabo vii fr. 52 Meineke. Skylax §67 (GGM i 55). *ATL* i. 468.

⁷ C. A. Hutton, *BSA* xxi (1914/5 and 1915/6) 166–8.

⁸ Ephoros *FGrH* 70 F 39. Apollodoros 244 F 184 (Steph. Byz. s.v. 'Aivos', p. 52, 9–10 Meineke). Topography of Ainos: F. W. Hasluck, *BSA* xv (1908/9) 249–57. J. M. F. May, *Ainos. Its history and coinage* (Oxford 1950) 1–7.

⁹ In *P. Oxy.* 3711 ii 36 who are the Thracians and what are they doing? Near Alopekonesos in the Chersonese they would be Dolonkoi (Herodotos vi. 34.1–2). At Polytymbria–Ainos they would be Apsinthioi: Ἀψινθῖος was another name of Ainos (Steph. Byz. p. 52.1 Meineke). Apsinthians were warlike (Herodotos *loc. cit.*) and engaged in human sacrifice (Herodotos ix. 119.1); so the settlers at Ainos are likely to have been attacked. Compare the Klazomenians whom Thracians drove from Abdera (Herodotos i. 168).

Bowie on Elegy: A Footnote

It may be desirable to draw attention to an item of some interest for the history of literary genres which has just appeared in a Greek periodical which is not, as yet, widely accessible.

Angelos Matthaïou (HOPOΣ iv [1986] 31–4) publishes two grave stelai from Nikaia, between Athens and Piraeus. The script is unusual, in that the texts are written retrograde and from the bottom to the top of the stele. The obvious parallel for this is a funerary text discussed by Miss Jeffery in *BSA* lvii (1962) 136 no. 42 and dated by her around 540; one of her last scholarly observations was to confirm that the new texts appeared to be in the same hand.

One of the new texts is hopelessly fragmentary; the other runs:

Αὐτοκλείδο τόδε σέμα νέο προσορόν ἀνῖομαι /
καὶ θανάτοιο ΤΑΥ[. .]ΑΝ[– – – c.7–10 – –]

Ample parallels exist for the cretic in the first foot when a proper name is involved (Hansen *CEG* nos. 14, 138, 320). The substantial point is that, whatever is going on in the second line, a nameless first person is expressing feelings about the dead. It has generally been thought that this should not happen in a grave epigram. Now that it is clear that it can, there is, as Dr Hansen points out to me, no reason to doubt the reading of the stone in a second text (Willemsen, *Ath. Mitt.* lxxviii [1963] 118–22 no. 4 = *SEG* XXII 78 = Hansen, *CEG* 51; ca. 510?);

οἰκτίρο προσορό[ν] παιδὸς τόδε σέμα | θανόν-
τος;

Σμικύθ[ο] | ἥος τε φίλον ὄλεσε|ν ἔλπ' ἀγαθέν.

Although Willemsen's proposal to emend the first word to οἰκτίρο<ν> was followed by Hansen, Peek (*ZPE* xxiii [1976] 93 n. 1) was right to reject this.

These two texts somewhat weaken the general refusal (Wilamowitz, *Sappho und Simonides*, 211; Friedländer–Hoffleit, *Epigrammata* 68–9; West, *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*, 21; Page, *Further Greek Epigrams*, 295) to see a sepulchral epigram in *Anth. Pal.* vii 511

σῆμα καταφθιμένοιο Μεγακλέος εὐτ' ἄν ἴδωμαι,
οἰκτίρω σε τάλαν Καλλία, οἴ' ἔπαθες.

At least, we now have parallels for an anonymous first person mourner, though not for a reference to a third person. So Bowie (*JHS* cvi [1986] 23) could still be right to see this one as consolatory, not threnodic. I cannot help thinking, however, that the existence on stone of two sixth-century texts of lamentation goes some way to breaking down the dividing-line between the funerary epigram and a hypothetical threnodic elegy and offers more support for the existence of the latter than Bowie is prepared to allow.

D. M. LEWIS

Christ Church, Oxford

Helen, her Name and Nature

To put forward ideas on the name and nature of Helen¹ may seem hazardous. As to her name, Chantaine's 'il est vain de chercher une étymologie' is fair warning, and as to her nature, the views of Wilamowitz and Martin Nilsson, diametrically opposed as they are, reveal the uncertainty of the evidence. Nevertheless an attempt to outline the problems shall be made, and if any solutions are proposed, it must be understood that they are meant to be tentative.

When Euripides wrote his play representing Helen as guiltless, telling his audience that it was an image of her that went to Troy with Paris whilst the real Helen went to Egypt, he followed a version of the story that was used a hundred or more years before him by Stesichorus. Stesichorus had earlier told the tale of the adulteress, and struck blind by the goddess Helen he wrote his famous palinode: οὐκ ἔστ' ἔτυμος λόγος οὗτος, οὐδ' ἔβασ ἐν νηυσὶν εὐσέλμοις οὐδ' ἴκεο Πέργαμα Τροίας. We may discard the story of the blindness, either as sheer invention or as a misunderstanding of his saying that he was blind and now saw the truth. It is, however, known now, thanks to *POxy* 2735, admirably discussed by M. L. West in *ZPE* iv (1969) 142 ff., that Stesichorus went to Sparta, where Helen was indeed worshipped as a goddess. He may there have come across the story of the image, or possibly, having known it before, he now used it in order to please his Spartan hosts. Possibly, for, as we shall see later, the story of the image may be old and go back to Indo-European times. Old also, though

¹ The contents of this paper were delivered as a T. B. L. Webster Memorial Lecture at Stanford University in April 1985. I am indebted for advice on several points to J. T. Hooker, O. Szemerényi and M. L. West, also to Prof. A. Mette and two unnamed advisors to this Journal.