the southwestern limit of the Melas Gulf,[6] near Suvla Bay. Coins and an inscription mentioning the Alopekonnesians 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 Alopekonnesos settled, who were followed by ἔποικοι 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 Alopekonnesos, and from Alopekonnesos he could have gone to Ainos. That is conjecture. What is clear is that an Athenian could easily have had dealings with Alopekonnesians in the time of Alkaios, because Elaious and Alopekonnesos 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. 'Αἶνος', 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 Alopekonnesos in the Chersonese they would be Dolonkoi (Herodotos vi. 34.1–2). At Poltymbria-Ainos they would be Apsinthioi: 'Άψινθος 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 Matthaiou (ΗΟΡΟΣ 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 τό|δε σἔμα νέο π|ροσορόν ἀν|ιόμαι /
καὶ θα|νάτοι 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 σἔμα | θανόν-
τος:
Σμικύθ[ο] | hός τε φίλον ὄλεσε|ν ἔλπ' ἀγαθέν.

Although Willemsen's proposal to emend the first word to οἴκτιρο⟨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 εὖτ' ἂν ἴδωμαι,
οἰκτίρω σε τάλαν Καλλία, οἷ' 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 Helen[1] may seem hazardous. As to her name, Chantraine'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' ἵκεο 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.

more recent in the geographical detail, is the story that Helen travelled to Egypt, whether she went there on her own before the Trojan War, or after it together with Menelaus. Even Homer, who makes her go to Troy, makes her return at any rate from Egypt.

In the treatment of myth two tendencies were strong in the second half of last century. With comparative philology coming into its own it became fashionable to equate Greek mythological names with those of India. I shall have to say more about this tendency later on. The other one was to reduce all mythological figures to natural phenomena. Zeus-Dyaus was the god of the sky, and Thor with his hammer in Germanic mythology obviously was thunder and lightning. So why not others? The famous *Vedische Mythologie* of Alfred Hillebrandt in its first edition (1891 ff) had a great many figures representing the moon, but the second edition of 1927 was far more restrained. Both these tendencies widely overshot the mark, and the inevitable reaction threw out the cargo with the bilge. Helen, worshipped as a goddess in Sparta, was so worshipped also on the island of Rhodes, there under the title of Ἑλένα Δενδρῖτις. She was in fact a tree goddess or, more generally, a goddess of vegetation.[2] Wilamowitz denies this,[3] but his argument that she was worshipped under a tree because the early Dorians had no temples, and that she was therefore called Δενδρῖτις, fails to convince. The fact that other gods have no such surnames could perhaps be explained by a wish to distinguish the goddess Helen and the person. But an image of her actually hung on a tree, and above all the Indo-European connections of the vegetation goddess, which will be mentioned immediately, show that Wilamowitz was mistaken.

M. L. West[4] suggested that Helen went to Egypt because Egypt was the only land in the south which was known to the early Greeks; that she went away to the south like the sun when the winter came, and that her return was celebrated at the Heleneia, the festival when Spartan maidens poured oil at the root of a plane tree and wrote her name in the bark, as described by Theocr. xviii, the wedding song for Helen's nuptials sung by the girls. We have no definite evidence as to the time of the Heleneia, except that Theocritus says in line 2 that the girls are wearing blooms of hyacinth in their hair. So spring seems certain.

Helen went to the south like the sun, and there are indeed indications connecting her with the sun.[5] She is the daughter of Leda and Zeus, and her brothers are the Dioscuri. The Dioscuri appear elsewhere in Indo-European mythology. In the Rigveda they are known as the Aśvins. That name, derived from *aśva* 'horse', refers to their appearance ὠκυπόδων ἐφ' ἵππων. Another aspect of their nature is revealed by the name *nāsatyā*, by which they are also known. Indian grammarians derive that name from *nās* 'nose' and explain it as 'nose-born'. They refer to a myth that their mother conceived them by sniffing the spilt semen of Vivasvant. It should be

obvious, however, that the myth arose from the false interpretation of the name. We know now[6] that the etymology, ludicrous as it is, is impossible because the suffix -*atya* does not make derivatives from nouns. Another Indian etymology makes them into the 'not unreal' or 'not untruthful' ones (*na-a-sat-*), which, with its double negative, does not seem a probable sobriquet for gods.[7] The correct etymology derives the name from the root *nes*, from which we have νέομαι, νόστος, and Νέστωρ. They are the saviours who guarantee the traveller's or warrior's safe return, whether on land or on sea.

Identical, then, with the Dioscuri, these divine twins are known to many of the Indo-European tribes. They appear in Germanic mythology,[8] and, under the names of *Hengist* and *Horsa*, led the Anglo-Saxons into England. In the Veda the Aśvins are the suitors of a divine maiden, who is the daughter of the Sun, and who sometimes gets a name suggesting that she is herself the Sun. The folksongs of Lithuania and Latvia too know two figures called sons of god, who are always mounted on their grey horses, and they again want to win the daughter of the Sun. Although we may use their connection with the sun as to some extent supporting the theory of Helen receding to the south like the sun, we must not minimize the differences. Those Indian Aśvins are not the brothers of Helen but suitors of the sun's daughter. There is in fact another female with whom they are associated, this time not as her suitors but as her sons. Her name is Saraṇyu, and she was the wife of Vivasvant. After some time she could not bear Vivasvant and ran away in the shape of a mare, leaving behind an image of herself, an εἴδωλον, with whom Vivasvant lived for some time. But when he learned that the real Saraṇyu had run away in the shape of a mare, he turned himself into a stallion, ran after her, caught her, and with her begat the Aśvins.

The idea of the εἴδωλον is not uncommon: when Ixion tries to violate Hera, an εἴδωλον is substituted for her. But surely it is extraordinary and can hardly be an accident that the woman associated with the Aśvins was replaced by an εἴδωλον just as the sister of the Dioscuri was. Saraṇyu means 'swift' and is derived from the adjective *saraṇa* 'running, swift', the feminine of which is *saraṇā*, and *saraṇā* is in every sound identical with Ἑλένα, that is to say with that form of her name which had no diagamma, either alone or preceded by *s*, in the beginning. So we seem here to have an Indo-European mythological name appearing both in India and in Greece. As stated before, the excessive zeal of last century's philologists, who e.g. identified the Indian Gandharva with the κένταυροι, had made the pendulum swing the other way. The reaction was so strong that Martin Nilsson[9] could say that of all the equations only Dyaus-Zeus-Ju(ppiter) remained unshaken. Here again the case is overstated: Greek Ἀώς, divine personification of the dawn, from *ausōs (cf. Latin *aurora*) is near-identical with Sanscr. Uṣas, and Wilhelm Schulze never

---

[2] Martin F. Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*[3] i. (Munich 1967) 211.

[3] *Der Glaube der Hellenen* i (Berlin 1931) 231 n. 1.

[4] *Immortal Helen*, Inaugural Lecture at Bedford College, London, 1975.

[5] Like West I discount the questionable statement of Ptolemy Chennos, preserved in Photios' *Bibliotheke* 149a, which makes her the daughter of Leda and the Sun.

[6] O. Szemerényi, *Monumentum Nyberg* ii (Teheran-Liège 1975) 316 f.

[7] It is a different matter if a hymn in the Rigveda, x 129, begins: *nāsad āsīn, nó sád āsīt tadānīm* 'no not-being was then, nor being', where the double negative was required by the contrast.

[8] D. J. Ward, *The divine twins*, Folklore studies, University of California Publications xix (1968).

[9] Nilsson (n. 2) 5.

ceased (as I can say from recollection of his seminar nearly sixty years ago, shortly before his death) to believe in the equation of Sanscr. *Pūṣan* with Pan, whose original Arcadian form was Πάων, an equation he had pointed out twenty years earlier.[10] Wilamowitz objected,[11] declaring that a god inherited from Indo-European times could not possibly be restricted to so narrow a region as Arcadia. However, because of its isolation and difficulty of access Arcadia has preserved many archaic features especially in the religious sphere,[12] and together with Cypriote it has retained many old Indo-European words which have disappeared in the other Greek dialects. Seldom has Wilamowitz been so obviously wrong.

There are, therefore, correct equations of Greek and Indian mythological names, and Ἑλένα = *Saraṇyu* or **saraṇā* seems to be one of them. The identity of Saraṇyu and Helen was first suspected by the German Sanscritist J. Ehni in 1890 and supported, perhaps originally without knowledge of him, by V. Pisani, *RFIC* lvi (1928) 476 ff.[13]

A name beginning with *s*, which may have to do with Helen, is welcome, because it may help to resolve a great difficulty. The name of Helen as worshipped at Sparta and Therapne began with a digamma. Some literary evidence of the digamma, e.g. in Dion. Hal. *A.R.* i 20 and Marius Victorinus, *GLK* vi 15, was not decisive and could be brushed aside. Even a line quoted by the grammarian Astyages, adduced by Priscian, *GLK* ii 15, is not compelling, since it has only tentatively been assigned to Alcman: ἑλικωπίδα ὀψόμενος Ἑλέναν, where the diagamma would be responsible for the lengthening of -ος. However, two Laconian inscriptions from Sparta[14] are decisive. An aryballos of bronze, belonging to the seventh century, seems to contain Helen's name in the form of *Felena*, and a bronze hook of the sixth century certainly does so. On the other hand, at Corinth there is evidence of Helen without a digamma. The Doric dialect of Corinth retains the digamma, at any rate in the beginning of a word, for a very long time. The first instance of its omission— and it remains isolated until much later—is found in an inscription for those who died at Salamis, early in the fifth century. But on two Corinthian craters, belonging to the beginning of the sixth century[15] we have Helen without a digamma, and in the early period in Italy, in the Doric dialects and in Etruscan, there is no trace of a digamma. It may be tempting to ascribe the spelling to the influence of Homer; but little influence of Homer is shown in the form O*l*ysseus for O*d*ysseus on a Corinthian vase of *c.* 560, and we shall see below a difference in the functions of Helen which strongly suggests that we have to do

with two different names, two different mythological Helens.

We tried above to establish an etymology, in fact an identity of name, for Helen with an initial *s* ; perhaps there is an etymology also for Helen with an initial digamma. We may dismiss the suggestion that the original form was **uenenā*, the first of the two *n*s eventually turning to *l* by progressive dissimilation. The author of that etymology connects the name with the root of *Venus*; but both the formation of the name and the connection of Helen with the Aśvins-Dioscuri absolutely rule out that idea. To explain the difference between the *sel-* form and the *vel-*form it has been assumed that the name began neither with *s* nor with a digamma but with a combination of the two, digamma preceded by *s*. As an explanation of the difference between the two this is shown to be wrong by the absence of the digamma in Corinth; but that the digamma was preceded by *s* is not at all improbable. W. Brandenstein[16] thus derived the name from the root *suel*, which appears in Sanscr. *svarati* 'he shines'; thus *svaraṇā*, a feminine adjective, if made into a name, would be 'the shining one', and that name fits the vegetation goddess who recedes to the south like the sun extremely well. It also, as we shall see below, fits another aspect of Helen.

We may take it, then, that **Selenā* and **Suelenā* are different divinities.[17] The Spartan goddess and Helen of Troy are identical. The vegetation goddess is linked with Menelaos in their cult at Therapne, and these two gods thus became husband and wife. T. B. L. Webster[18] suggested that the Homeric story was influenced by a Ugaritic epic, the hero of which is a man called Keret. Keret has been deserted by his wife, and in a dream he is told to go and conquer a town, in which he will find a new wife. A poetic genius then, Webster thought, identified the woman to be won in the conquered town with Helen who had disappeared. And how did she get to the town to be conquered? Clearly he had to have her abducted by a Trojan prince. This remains a possible construction even without the somewhat doubtful connection with the Ugaritic epic. That poetic genius could have made Helen, who disappeared, go to Troy with Paris because he wanted a reason for the great war which he was going to describe. And what did that poet make of the Dioscuri? He left them behind at Therapne. For had they been about, they would have pursued and rescued Helen, just as they pursued and rescued her when she was abducted by Theseus, and thus the reason for the war would have disappeared. He knew, of course, the story of the abduction by Theseus. He passes over stories which he knows very well, e.g. stories about Heracles: he does not tell us why Zeus was going to punish Hera when Hephaestus, trying to protect his mother, was hurled down from heaven and crashed on Lesbos. Here, however, he had particularly good reason

---

[10] *KZ* xlii (1909) 81 = *Kleine Schriften* 217 (he thought of it in 1880).

[11] Wilamowitz (n. 3) 247 n. 1.

[12] E. Meyer, *Der Kleine Pauly* i 594.

[13] Wackernagel's equation of *Saraṇyu* with Ἐρινύς (*Kleine Schriften* 759) fails to account for the absence of the rough breathing in the Greek name and, more importantly, for the iota in the central syllable.

[14] Hector Catling and Helen Cavanagh, *Kadmos* xv (1976) 145 f.; now *SEG* xxvi 457 f.

[15] R. Arena, *Le iscrizione Corinzie su vasi* Accad. dei Lincei ser. 8 xiii 2 (Rome 1967) nos. 15 and 29. The former contains in *Fhekabā* a particularly early form; see Arena ad loc.

[16] *Griechische Sprachwissenschaft* i (Berlin 1954) 137.

[17] Some scholars, e.g. M. Doria, *La parola del passato* (1962) 161 ff., believe that the name of Helen, whether with *s* or with digamma, is one and the same. A parallel to this might be thought to be the numeral six, which has a digamma in Greek dialects, Armenian and Old Prussian, but *s* in other languages. The *s* there, however, is probably secondary and due to the influence of the following numeral; see O. Szemerényi, *Studies in the Indo-European system of Numerals* (Heidelberg 1960) 78 f.

[18] *From Mycenae to Homer* (London 1958) 86 f.

for the omission: that first abduction would to some extent have clashed with his own story. And he makes a point of stressing the absence of the Dioscuri: Helen, in *Il.* iii, identifying the Greek heroes for Priam, expresses her surprise, 236 ff., that the Dioscuri are not among them. It seems to me, in fact, as good as certain that Helen originally had nothing to do with Troy. Now that we can, not without probability, say that Troy was destroyed in some power conflict, perhaps between the Hittites and the king of Ahhiyawa, her abduction by Paris appears as a calque on that by Theseus.

The other aspect of Helen which seems to support the relationship of her name to **svaranā* 'the shining one' is her connection with lights other than the sun, especially torches, and the corposant. To take torches first. Virgil's Helen with her torch on the walls of Troy, *Aen* vi 518 f., inviting the Greeks to enter and destroy the town, is not the Roman poet's invention. Norden *ad loc.*, rightly following Schneidewin, observes that Triphiodorus, who has the same story, does not depend on Virgil but on Virgil's source, and that the Helena novel of Simo Magus must have the story from an early source. That it goes back to Stesichorus or the cyclic Iliupersis is possible but cannot be proved.[19] The noun ἑλένη 'torch', attested by Hesychius, can hardly be identical with Helen's name but betokens some connection with it. Its original form seems to have been ἑλάνη, since the formation with -άνη occurs frequently in words denoting instruments or implements such as δρεπάνη 'sickle', οὐράνη 'chamber pot', σκαπάνη 'mattock', whereas –ένη is found only in ὠλένη 'arm' and Aeol. φερένα 'dowry', a variant of φέρνη, attested in Herodian and the *Etymologicum Magnum*. ἑλάνη is in fact found in Neanthes of Kyzikos, Nicander and other Hellenistic writers. The epsilon in Hesychius' ἑλένη is usually explained as a result of progressive assimilation. That is not impossible, but I would rather think that the influence of Helen as a light, as a woman with a torch, as a corposant, has brought about the change.[20]

Of little significance as evidence for Helen as a personification of light is the fact that in the Rigveda the mother of the Aśvins is sometimes identified with Uṣas-Aurora. Considering the ease with which shifts of personality occur in mythological relationships, we can rely on this as little as on the Sibylline oracle xi 125 Ἴλιον, οἰκτείρω σε, ἀπὸ Σπάρτης γὰρ Ἐρινὺς ἥξει σοῖς μελάθροις ὁλοῷ κεκεφασμένη ἄστρῳ, the date of which is wholly uncertain, and whose 'star', though probably meant to be taken literally, could perhaps be a metaphor.

Far more important is the phenomenon known as St. Elmo's fire. In several places in Spain and Portugal St Erasmus, a saint said to have been broken on the wheel under Domitian (though other saints compete for the honour and for the name), is called St. Elmo and is

considered a patron of ships. The English 'St. Elmo's fire' and the *m* in German *Elmsfeuer* would seem to betray the influence of Spanish seafarers: the original name of that electrical phenomenon, the corposant, was of course 'Helen's fire'. That follows with certainty from the fact that in antiquity it was ascribed to Helen, and it would also be most peculiar if that saint had been turned into a female in the alternative names of St. Helen's fire, *tan santez Helena, feu d'Elène*, and *Helenen-feuer*. Nor would it be a nice compliment to the saint if he had given his name to a sign which generally is thought to foretell not only salvation but also destruction. What has happened clearly is that a good heathen name has been converted into a pious Christian one, just as Demeter has become St. Demetrius or Lady Dimitria, and Artemis St. Artemidos, or, as, with the opposite change of sex, Apollon appears in Rhodes as *domina nostra Apollonia*, or as, without change of sex, Poly-deukes has become St. Polyeuktes, the much prayed-to one.

What are we told about Helen and the Dioscuri as corposants? There is of course nothing in Homer, since that would not have fitted into his story, nor is there anything in Hesiod, a landlubber if ever there was one (*Erga* 649). Alcman and the Homeric Hymn 33 speak of the Dioscuri as saviours at sea without reference to Helen or St. Elmo's fire. The electrical phenomenon, in my opinion not very likely to be referred to in their names, Κάστωρ 'Brilliant' and *Πολυλεύκης, is known to Alcaeus in the poem part of which was quoted above, and it is discussed by Xenophanes (Diels, *Vorsokr.* iii 124 n. 39), who says that the lights are νεφέλια. The additional remark οὓς καὶ Διοσκούρους καλοῦσί τινες belongs in that form to the source transmitting the fragment, but since the *Peri Physeos* of Xenophanes was a σίλλος directed against mythological explanations of meteorological phenomena, we may take it that the substance belongs to the philosopher. In the sixth century, then, and probably even earlier, popular belief saw in those curious lights an appearance of the Dioscuri. For the beginning of the fifth century we have the testimony of the two golden stars set up by the Aeginetai at Delphi, in thanksgiving for their rescue and victory at Salamis.

What about Helen? The first mention of her in connection with ships in Aeschylus' famous etymology of her name in the *Agamemnon*, which will be discussed later. The Homeric Hymn 33, where Helen is not mentioned although the Dioscuri are praised as helpers at sea, is generally taken to show that Helen at that time was not yet associated with the twins as saviours. I would question the inference. It may well be that she was a hostile spirit and therefore could not be mentioned in a hymn celebrating the Twins. In Eur. *Or.* 1636 ff., on the other hand, we have a direct testimony showing Helen like her brothers as benign and helpful to sailors in peril: Κάστορί τε Πολυδεύκει τ' ἐν αἰθέρος πτυχαῖς σύνθακος ἔσται, ναυτίλοις σωτήριος. This evidence, too, seems questionable to me. Euripides is known to be very free in treating popular beliefs. The *Orestes* was written very soon after the *Helen*, where the poet, following Stesichorus, gave a favourable picture of Helen, whereas in the late *Iphigenia in Aulis* he makes his characters speak most unfavourably of her, reflecting the popular view of her as a wicked woman. More important is the setting of the *Orestes* passage. It belongs

---

[19] Helen with a torch on the ramparts of Troy seems to be shown on a gem (Furtwängler, plate xxxviii 6) belonging to the Augustan or early Imperial age. It may therefore reflect Virgil's story, but again it may go back to earlier sources.

[20] Linda L. Clader, *Helen*, 1976 (*Mnemos. Suppl.* xlii) 80, considers two etymologies of the name: (1) A semantic back-formation from ἐλενηφόρια; (2) ἐλένη meaning 'shoot, sprig' used as the name of the vegetation goddess. However, (1): the 'basket-carrying' festival must have been celebrated in honour of some divinity, and if it was not Helen herself, she could not have replaced the goddess so worshipped; (2): the meaning 'shoot, sprig' is posited without support.

to the speech of Apollon consoling Menelaus over the loss of Helen. He could not possibly say there that in contradistinction to her brothers she would be hostile to sailors; and mentioning the beneficial activities of the brothers he could probably not even have been silent about the qualities of the sister: he had to make her benevolent. We note also that Apollon repeats his statement in line 1689 σὺν Τυνδαρίδαις, τοῖς Διὸς υἱοῖς, ναύταις μεδέουσα θαλάσσης. What does the repetition indicate? Insistence, apparently, insistence needed because Helen as a saviour was an innovation which had to be brought home to his audience.

It is in connection with this passage that we get the first clear testimony of Helen as a corposant and as an omen of disaster. The scholiast on it remarks: 'It appears that according to Euripides Helen too comes to the aid of storm-tossed sailors. Sosibios, however, believes that her appearance is hostile' (*FGrH* 595). The testimony is to be dated *c.* 200 BC, and we could wish we had what Sosibios actually said. There can be little doubt, however, that he did not invent the hostility of Helen, and that, when he speaks of her *appearing* (οὐκ εὐμενῶς αὐτὴν ἐπιφαίνεσθαι), he attests a belief among Greek sailors in the third century that one type of corposant was Helen and heralded disaster.[21]

The next statements about Helen, the single flame of the corposant as malevolent, and the Dioscuri, the double flame as benign, come from Roman authors: Pliny, *N.H.* ii 101 *diram illam appellatamque Helenam ferunt.* The words *appellatamque ferunt* make it quite clear that Pliny here is not reporting a belief of Roman sailors (he would have said *Helenamque appellant*) but that he follows earlier sources, and what we have later in Statius obviously goes back to Greek Hellenistic poetry: 'The ship is lost when the brothers of Therapne have deserted the sails doomed by the fire of their sister' (*Theb.* vii 792) or 'Settle on the two points of the rigging, ye brothers from Sparta, and drive far away the stormy star of your sister from Ilium' (*Silv.* iii 2.8 ff.).

How old is the idea of Helen condemning and destroying ships? We must ask this question when we consider the etymology of Helen's name in Aeschylus, *Ag.* 681 ff.: τίς ποτ' ὠνόμαζεν ὧδ' ἐς τὸ πᾶν ἐτητύμως . . . τὰν δορίγαμβρον ἀμφινεικῆ θ' Ἑλέναν. ἐπεὶ πρεπόντως ἑλέναυς, ἕλανδρος, ἑλέπτολις ἐκ τῶν ἁβροτήνων προκαλυμμάτων ἔπλευσε ζεφύρου γίγαντος αὔρᾳ: 'Who was it who named her with such entire truth, her the spear-wedded, strife-raising Helen. For true to her name, ship-destroying, man-destroying, town-destroying she sailed away from her luxuriously curtained bedchamber'. The interpretation of the passage, as translated, seems certain. Some slight doubt might be raised by an echo in Eur. *Tro.* 892 f., where Hecuba warns Menelaus not to look at Helen again: ὁρῶν δὲ τήνδε φεῦγε, μή σ' ἕλῃ πόθῳ. αἱρεῖ γὰρ ἀνδρῶν ὄμματ', ἐξαιρεῖ πόλεις, πίμπρησι δ'οἴκους: 'Flee her sight, or she will capture you by the longing she arouses. For she captures the eyes of men, she captures and destroys towns and burns their houses'. The connection with the Aeschylean passage is obvious. ἑλέναυς of course is omitted because Hecuba could not know what

would happen to the Greek fleet on the return from Troy. Here αἱρεῖ ἀνδρῶν ὄμματα might suggest that ἕλανδρος in Aeschylus means something similar: 'she who captures men', and if that were so, ἑλέναυς might refer not to the destruction of ships but to the raising of the thousand ships that followed her to Troy. However, ἑλέπτολις is unambiguous, and the ἑλε-part in all the three words should be the same. It is true that etymologies often have something playful or even humorous about them. When in *Odyssey* iv one of the Greeks inside the Trojan horse is prevented by Odysseus from making reply to Helen calling from outside, it seems to me that he owes his name, Antiklos, to his proposed ἀντικαλεῖν, a point which the commentaries fail to note. There too, although there is something slightly ludicrous about it, ἔπος and ἔργον belong together, and in Aeschylus in particular we find the belief that the fate and the deeds of men are determined by their ἐπωνύμια.[22] We may certainly say that only 'ship-destroying' and 'man-destroying' has the weight required by the prophecy contained in the name. ἑλέναυς, of course, refers to the fate of the Greek fleet on its way home to Greece; but is there perhaps a little more in it than that?

The problem which we have to decide, or at any rate to face, is this: here we have a belief among Greek sailors in the third century, as attested by Sosibios, and quite possibly even earlier, that Helen, as opposed to her brothers, was hostile; and there we have Aeschylus saying in the fifth century that she destroys ships. Wilamowitz[23] declared that the wicked, hostile Helen was secondary: that Euripides with his ναυτίλοις σωτήριος was right, and that the people always believed in a helpful Helen, as was shown by the fact that they prayed to ἁγία Ἑλένη (the evidence for this seems to belong to the 19th century), and that in Lesbos the rainbow was known, again in modern times, by that name. The people's prayers to ἁγία Ἑλένη, I believe, prove nothing at all, nor does the rainbow. If you are afraid of a supernatural being you pray to it. We have seen the feared Helen of the corposant turned into a St. Elmo. So why should that terrible Helen not be turned into a St. Helen? As to Euripides, we may with all due caution say that his testimony is possibly to be discounted, because in his context, as we have seen, he could not have called Helen evil. The secondary development assumed by Wilamowitz must have come about according to him (although I cannot find an explicit statement to that effect) in something like the following way: when the corposant was seen, a ship could either perish or be saved. Clearly, when it was a double light, it was the Dioscuri, the saviours, and the ship would be safe. But when it was a single light, then it could not be the Dioscuri, but it had something to do with them. So it was their sister, and as they were undoubtedly the saviours, she presided over the alternative and foretold disaster. I would not call that theory impossible, but it does not strike me as highly likely. Could there be a connection between Aeschylus' 'ship-destroying' Helen and Helen as the hostile corposant? I think we may rule out the possibility (although it was not discounted by A. B. Cook)[24] that the passage in

---

[21] Sosibios, known as ὁ Λάκων, wrote a commentary on Alcman, and one might assume that his comment on Helen occurred in connection with Alcman's poem in praise of the Dioscuri; but he also wrote on Sparta, her religion and customs, and it is just as likely that he made it in speaking of the worship of Helen there.

[22] W. Kranz, *Stasimon* (Berlin 1933) 287.

[23] *Griechische Verskunst*[2] (Darmstadt 1958) 219.

[24] *Zeus* i (Cambridge 1914) 773 n. 3.

Aeschylus was responsible for that belief among Greek sailors. Would a passage in Shakespeare have caused a superstitious belief in English sailors? Far more probable seems to me the view of Moritz Haupt (*Opusc.* iii 322) that a popular etymology of the name, identical with that of Aeschylus but arisen independently, assigned to Helen a function opposite to that of her brothers. But a third possibility remains to be considered: what if the sailors' belief were not merely as old as the third century, for which it is attested, or as the fourth, to which we may quite possibly assign it, but went back as far as to the fifth century—and was known to Aeschylus? Nobody will want to deprive Aeschylus of the etymology, which is so much in character with his mode of thought. But the idea may have come to him from a popular belief.

That popular belief may itself be based on an etymology, if we date Haupt's popular etymology a few centuries earlier than he seems to have done; or it may even have come about, as Wilamowitz imagined, through the creation of a figure related to, but contrasting with the Dioscuri. But again there is a third possibility. We tried to combine the early Corinthian Helena without a digamma with the *Saraṇyu* of the Veda, who there is connected with the Aśvins. There is nothing hostile about her in the Veda, but her name means 'the swift one'. Could 'the swift one' have become the storm and the harbinger of the storm which threatens disaster? We are dealing with matters wholly speculative, and it can hardly be otherwise when one is trying to analyse matters of mythology and popular belief, because there is no consistency in them, and little logic. If there is anything in what has been said here, then *saraṇā* the swift one' and the conjectured **svaraṇā* 'the shining one' have early invaded each other's fields and functions. Amid all this uncertainty only this much seems not altogether uncertain to me: that two mythological figures are fused in Helen: that Helen in the story of Troy is a calque on her abduction by Theseus; and that commentators on Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* should give some thought to Helen as the threatening corposant.

<div align="right">OTTO SKUTSCH</div>

University College London

<div align="center">

An Inscribed Gold Ring from the Argolid:

Addendum

</div>

Technicians at the J. Paul Getty Museum have kindly informed me that the ring turns out not to be of solid gold but rather a substantial gold-plate. Analysis has not yet been done, but the metal underneath is most probably bronze.

Further discussion with colleagues here and abroad concerning the unusual, indeed unique, name Ηαϝρικνίδας has uncovered no real parallels. Professor Olivier Masson has suggested (*per litteras*) that we have here the name Ϝρικνίδας, derived from *Ϝρῖκνος, which the etymologists have posited as the source of the adjective ῥικνός ('shrivelled').[1] The name Ϝροῖκος, published by

---

[1] Chantraine, *Dictionnaire Etymologique de la Langue Grecque* (Paris 1977), s.v.

Professor Masson, belongs to the same linguistic group.[2] Masson makes the interesting complementary suggestion that the initial Ηα is the neuter plural relative pronoun ἅ, i.e. 'Those things which Wriknidas dedicated . . .'. The ring would then be one of a series of objects. There are no exact parallels for the relative, but there are dedications with the demonstrative pronoun.[3] This is certainly on linguistic grounds a nice explanation of this puzzling name. However, I do not think it likely that, among a group of items dedicated, so small an object as a ring would bear the dedicatory inscription.

<div align="right">STEPHEN TRACY</div>

Department of Classics
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210-1319.

[2] *Report Department of Antiquities Cyprus* (1982) 151.
[3] See, for example, *IG* II/III² 4556 and V 1 255.

<div align="center">

Pisistratus' settlement on the Thermaic Gulf: a connection with the Eretrian colonization*

</div>

Aristotle[1] relates that during his second exile Pisistratus joined with others in the colonization of Rhaecelus on the Thermaic Gulf: πρῶτον μὲν συνῴκισε περὶ τὸν Θερμαῖον κόλπον χωρίον ὃ καλεῖται ʽΡαίκηλος. The context of this foundation is very obscure. J. W. Cole[2] nevertheless proposed to consider this enterprise as 'a combined Peisistratus-Eretria settlement': this is a very attractive hypothesis which I should like to explore, adding some further considerations.

I shall begin by discussing the relative chronology of Pisistratus' acts during this second exile. Herodotus[3] states that, when the tyrant left Attica after refusing to get children by Megacles' daughter, he initially went to Eretria: μαθὼν δὲ ὁ Πεισίστρατος τὰ ποιεύμενα ἐπ' ἑωυτῷ ἀπαλλάσσετο ἐκ τῆς χώρης τὸ πάραπαν, ἀπικόμενος δὲ ἐς ᾽Ερέτριαν ἐβουλεύετο ἅμα τοῖσι παισί. Pisistratus' deliberation with his sons about their projects presumably took place at the beginning of his exile, and this implies that Eretria, where it was held, was the tyrant's first stage. Moreover, although Herodotus omits Pisistratus' journey to the North, he writes:[4] μετὰ δέ [after the arrival at Eretria and a collecting of funds], οὐ πολλῷ λόγῳ εἰπεῖν, χρόνος διέφυ καὶ πάντα σφι ἐξήρτυτο ἐς τὴν κάτοδον, and we may suppose that the tyrant's visit to the northern Aegean was included in this lapse of time. Herodotus surely knew Pisistratus' activity in the North, because he reveals that during his third period of power at Athens the tyrant received revenues from the Strymon[5]; but the historian wanted to be brief (οὐ πολλῷ λόγῳ εἰπεῖν) and did not relate in all their details the preparations for the third coup d'état. As far as Aristotle is concerned, he omits both Pisistratus' arrival at Eretria

---

[1] Arist. *Ath. Pol.* xv 2. See also P. J. Rhodes, *A commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia* (Oxford 1981) 207–8.
[2] J. W. Cole, 'Peisistratus on the Strymon', *G&R* xxii (1975) 42–4.
[3] Hdt. i. 61.
[4] *Ibid.*
[5] Hdt. i 64.