

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 *Saranyu* 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 *saranā* 'the swift one' and the conjectured **svaranā* '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.

ΟΤΤΟ SKUTSCH

University College London

An Inscribed Gold Ring from the Argolid:

Addendum

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 *Ἡαφρικνίδας* has uncovered no real parallels. Professor Olivier Masson has suggested (*per litteras*) that we have here the name *Φρικνίδας*, derived from **Φρῖκνος*, which the etymologists have posited as the source of the adjective *φικνός* ('shrivelled').¹ The name *Φροῖκος*, published by

Professor Masson, belongs to the same linguistic group.² Masson makes the interesting complementary suggestion that the initial *Ἡα* is the neuter plural relative pronoun *ἧα*, 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.

STEPHEN TRACY

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.

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

Aristotle¹ relates that during his second exile Pisistratus joined with others in the colonization of Rhaecclus on the Thermaic Gulf: *πρῶτον μὲν συνώκισε περὶ τὸν Θερμαῖον κόλπον χωρίον ὃ καλεῖται 'Ραίκη-λος*. The context of this foundation is very obscure. J. W. Cole² 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. Herodotus³ 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 ποιούμενα ἐπ' ἑωυτῷ ἀπαλλάσσετο ἐκ τῆς χώρας τὸ παράπαν, ἀπικόμενος δὲ ἐς Ἐρέτριαν ἐβουλεύετο ἅμα τοῖσι πιασί*. 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 δὲ [after the arrival at Eretria and a collecting of funds], οὐ πολλῶ λόγῳ εἰπεῖν, χρόνος διέφθυ καὶ πάντα σφί 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 Strymon⁵; but the historian wanted to be brief (*οὐ πολλῶ 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

* I thank Professor R. Van Compernelle and Professor G. Donnay who kindly read this note and gave me valuable advice: and I am grateful to the National Fund of Scientific Research (Belgium) for the tenure of a research assistantship.

¹ Arist. *Ath. Pol.* xv 2. See also P. J. Rhodes, *A commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaiion 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.

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

on leaving Athens⁶ and the collecting of funds in several cities. But if we compare these two versions, then we can assume that at the beginning of his second exile the tyrant initially went to Eretria where he held a council with his sons in order to draw up a strategy. Then he collected funds and went to the North, where he first settled Rhaecelus before reaching Mt. Pangaeus and exploiting its mines. Afterwards, he came back to Eretria where he prepared his third coup d'état. Now, this relative chronology carries two important implications. The first concerns the funds collected by Pisistratus in several cities in order to restore the tyranny at Athens.⁷ They did not *directly* finance his return, not only because they were collected at the beginning of the exile, about ten years before the battle of Pallene, but also because Aristotle⁸ explicitly states that the tyrant raised money in Thrace and paid mercenaries with these revenues, which were therefore presumably adequate to cover the expenses for the preparations for his reconquest.⁹ The first funds rather financed his expedition to the North and especially the working of the mines of Mt. Pangaeus, which was probably obtained by concession and therefore demanded funded capital.¹⁰ The second deduction from this relative chronology concerns Eretria, which seems to have been a necessary stage on the road from Attica to the North where Pisistratus spent his second exile.

We know the good relationships between the Athenian tyrant and the *hippeis* ruling over Eretria. Pisistratus not only stayed in this town on several occasions during his second exile, but he was also helped by the Eretrian *hippeis* when he firmly established his tyranny at Athens.¹¹ On the other hand, the archaeological excavations in the aristocratic part of the town of Eretria have brought to light a well, bedded with T-shaped clamps in the same manner as the great Pisistratid buildings at Athens. It might be a gift offered by Pisistratus to the *hippeis* for their help during his second exile.¹² Now, the use of the verb *συνώρισε* by Aristotle¹³ may imply that Pisistratus joined with the people of another city in the colonization of Rhaecelus:¹⁴ in that case, Eretria, which knew the Chalcidic Peninsula well,¹⁵ would be a strong candidate.

⁶ I do not believe that πάλι, in Arist. *loc. cit.* (ἐλθὼν [Pisistratus] εἰς Ἐρέτριαν ἐνδεκάτω πάλι εἶται . . .), means that Pisistratus returned to Eretria. This adverb only specifies the interval of time.

⁷ Hdt. i 61: Ἰππίω δὲ γνώμη νικήσαντος ἀνακτᾶσθαι ὀπίσω τὴν τυραννίδα, ἐνθαῦτα ἡγεῖρον δωτίνως ἐκ τῶν πολίων αἰτίνας σφι προαιδέατό κού τι.

⁸ Arist. *loc. cit.*

⁹ About the importance of these private means from the Strymon, see also Hdt. i 64.

¹⁰ We do not know how Pisistratus exploited the mines of Mt. Pangaeus which were probably at the hands of the Edonians. Cole (n. 2) 43–4 supposes that the tyrant used diplomacy and secured privileges in exchange for 'a promise to expand the worship of Dionysus at Athens'. But it is more conceivable that he obtained, for a consideration, a kind of concession from the Thracians for the working of the mines (cf. Thucydides' well known case: Thuc. iv 105.1; P. Perdrizet, 'Scaptèsyle', *Klio* x [1910] 21).

¹¹ Hdt. i 62; Arist. *loc. cit.*

¹² Cf. P. Auberson, 'A propos d'un puits public à Erétrie', *BCH* ic (1975) 789–99.

¹³ Arist. *loc. cit.*

¹⁴ See e.g. *LSJ* s.v.; J. De Wever and R. Van Compernelle, 'La valeur des termes de "colonisation" chez Thucydide', *AC* xxxvi (1967) 504–10 and recently M. Casevitz, *Le vocabulaire de la colonisation en grec ancien* (Paris 1985) 204.

¹⁵ We know that Eretria founded at least two colonies in

But where was Rhaecelus situated? Aristotle¹⁶ located it on the Gulf of Therme, as we saw, and the scholiast on Lycophron's *Alexandra* (1236) identified Rhaecelus with Aenaea, a city on Cape Megalo Karaburnu.¹⁷ Yet this identification probably results from a misunderstanding of Lycophron's text by the scholiast, as Ch. Edson¹⁸ showed. In fact, Lycophron¹⁹ says that Aeneas *occupied* Rhaecelus (οἰκίειν), not that he founded it (which would be οἰκίζειν). Rhaecelus then was the name of the region, not Aeneas' colony itself. We must also take into consideration the use of the present καλεῖται by Aristotle. Edson and Cole affirm that Rhaecelus was thought by Aristotle to be a city-name which disappeared after Pisistratus' final restoration, but that does not explain the present καλεῖται. We must rather assume that Rhaecelus was a toponym still used during the fourth century BC, and that it designated the region²⁰ where Aenaea is located²¹ but no specific place. In fact, although this region of the Chalcidice is fairly well known, no author ever mentions Rhaecelus as a city,²² and the name does not occur either in the Athenian Tribute Lists or in the Epidaurian and Delphic Lists of Theorodokoi. But it is not necessary to suppose, as Cole did,²³ that this settlement was renamed by its inhabitants, nor, with Edson,²⁴ that it 'was soon surpassed by the near-by Aenaea'. Pisistratus simply settled a city in the region called Rhaecelus, a city of which Aristotle did not know the exact name.

That name might be Dicaea. The Athenian Tribute Lists²⁵ attest the existence in the fifth century BC of a city, Δίκαια Ἐρετρι(ῶν), of which the inhabitants were called Δικαιοπολίται Ἐρετριῶν ἄποικοι. From the Epidaurian List of Theorodokoi²⁶ we know that this city was situated between Aenaea and Potidaea, and Pliny²⁷ says that it stood on the road from Therme to Potidaea.²⁸ Herodotus²⁹ mentions all the cities on the

Chalcidice, Mende (cf. e.g. Thuc. iv 123.1) and Dicaea (cf. *ATL* i 266–7).

¹⁶ Arist. *loc. cit.*

¹⁷ Ch. Edson, 'Notes on the Thracian "Phoros"', *CPh* xlii (1947) 89–91; N. G. L. Hammond, *A history of Macedonia* i (Oxford 1972) 186.

¹⁸ Edson *loc. cit.*

¹⁹ Lyc. *Alex.* 1236–8.

²⁰ Arist. *loc. cit.* has χωρίον, which does not necessarily mean a town (cf. *LSJ* s.v.). Edson *loc. cit.* and Hammond *loc. cit.* considered Rhaecelus as the name of both a city and a region; Cole (n. 2) 42 affirmed without demonstration that it was only the name of a particular place.

²¹ There is no evidence for the identification of Rhaecelus with the modern Kalamaria proposed by S. Casson, *Macedonia, Thrace and Illyria* (Oxford 1926) 82–3.

²² St. Byz. s.v. 'Ράκηλος' wrote: πόλις Μακεδονίας, but, as Edson (n. 10) 91 noted, Stephanus clearly derives from the scholia on Lycophron, and his evidence consequently derives from the same misunderstanding.

²³ Cole (n. 2) 43.

²⁴ Edson (n. 10) 91.

²⁵ *ATL* i 266–7.

²⁶ *IG* iv² 1.94 Ib.11. It is of course an itinerary, and we can only infer that Dicaea was situated on the road from Aenaea, the harbour, to Potidaea: not necessarily south of Aenaea but probably east of it, as we shall see.

²⁷ Plin. *HN* iv 10 (17) 36.

²⁸ In fact, the manuscripts, most corrupt in this passage, read †*Palinandrea*†, but this name is absolutely unknown; *ATL* i 482 rightly proposed the correction: *Pallen* <ensis *Isthmus* et *Cass*> *andrea*. Cassandrea was the name of Potidaea from the Hellenistic period.

²⁹ Hdt. vii 123.

south coast of Aenaea without any allusion to Dicaea, which implies that this Eretrian colony was settled somewhere between Therme and Aenaea.³⁰ It was probably not far from the latter, because in 454/3 Dicaea paid four talents to the League although it generally paid only one: the other three are in fact the regular contribution of Aenaea, and so these four talents may have been the single payment of both Dicaea and Aenaea. If so, that implies their proximity.³¹

Dicaea must therefore be located in exactly the same region as Pisistratus' settlement and, if it is right to suppose that Eretria actively participated in this foundation, it hardly seems likely that the new city on the Thermaic Gulf was settled just beside an earlier Eretrian colony, and consequently entered into direct rivalry with it. On the contrary, both their proximity and the origin of their colonists imply the identification of Dicaea with Pisistratus' settlement.

To conclude, this identification shows not only that, as Cole says, Pisistratus' activity on the Gulf of Therme 'would have been a deliberate preplanned enterprise rather than an accidental landing', but also that Pisistratus was only a participant in an expedition organized by Eretria, the real mother city of Dicaea. How many Athenians joined with him in this settlement is impossible to determine, but the great majority of the colonists were without doubt Eretrian (*cf.* Ἐρετριῶν ἄποικοι). As far as Pisistratus is concerned, immediately on his arrival at Eretria, his principal objective was to restore his authority at Athens,³² and to this end he knew that he had to acquire his own financial means. He consequently collected funds which made possible his expedition in Thrace and the working of the mines of Mt. Pangaeus. On the road to this region Dicaea was an ideal stage, which explains Pisistratus' participation in this Eretrian enterprise. This identification of Pisistratus' settlement on the Thermaic Gulf with Dicaea also throws a light on the disputed chronology of Eretrian colonization.³³ According to S. C. Bakhuizen,³⁴ 'there is no evidence to hold that these colonies [Mende and Dicaea] were founded in the eighth century'; and M. Zahrnt³⁵ affirmed: 'von der landschaftlichen Gegebenheiten her müssen wir Dikaia und Mende als Ackerbaustädte ansehen; die Anlage solcher Kolonien erfolgte aber erst in der zweiten Phase der griechischen Kolonisationszeit'. We can now propose a precise date for the foundation of Dicaea between 555 and 546/5;³⁶ that would fit well with the tendency to lower the chronology of the Eretrian colonization in Chalcidice.

DIDIER VIVIERS

rue Lambert Vandervelde 10,
B-1170 Bruxelles.

³⁰ Cf. *ATL* i 483.

³¹ Cf. *ATL* i 176.

³² *Hdt.* i. 61.

³³ Cf. A. J. Graham, *The colonial expansion of Greece, CAH² iii 3* (1982) 115.

³⁴ S. C. Bakhuizen, *Chalcis-in-Euboea, iron and Chalcidians abroad* (Leiden 1976) 24.

³⁵ M. Zahrnt, *Olyth und die Chalkidier* (München 1971) 30 n. 73.

³⁶ I hope to discuss elsewhere the chronology of Pisistratus' tyrannies and exiles.

Aristotle, *Metaphysics* 1019a4

The broad context is a discussion of priority and posteriority, which runs from 1018b9–1019a14 (compare *Categories* 14a26–b24). A type of priority is described at 1019a2–4, and then further discussed at 1019a4–14. It is described as follows: 'All those things are said to be prior in respect of nature and being, which can exist without other things, while those other things cannot exist without them.' My concern in this note is with the parenthesis which immediately follows: 'This is a distinction which Plato employed.'

All the commentators despair of locating this reference to Plato. Some, like Tredennick, (*ad loc.* in his Loeb edition), simply despair; others, like Ross (*ad loc.* in his edition), speak of 'an oral utterance', and are accordingly tempted towards finding yet another reference to the Unwritten Doctrines, either in the vague sense that anything not in the dialogues is by definition 'unwritten', or more specifically in the sense of some aspect of the doctrine of ideal numbers (e.g. Trendelenburg, cited by Ross).

As a matter of fact, this is yet another case where reference to the Unwritten Doctrines is unnecessary. At *Republic* 522c, Plato points out that all τέχνηαι τε καὶ δεινόμοιαι καὶ ἐπιστήμηαι use calculation and arithmetic. This is repeated at *Philebus* 55d–e, where the arithmetical sciences are called ἡγεμονικὰς (πρώτας at 56c) relative to other skills and branches of knowledge, because without arithmetic those other branches of knowledge would be nothing—mere guesswork. In so far as they do in fact use mathematics, albeit on material objects, they are called 'the mathematics of the masses', whereas arithmetic in itself—i.e. pure mathematics, whose objects are immaterial—is called 'the mathematics of philosophers' (56d–57a). See further my Penguin *Philebus* 27–31.

What was not perfectly clear in *Republic* becomes clear in *Philebus*. Plato is not just distinguishing arithmetic from the branches of knowledge which use it, but is also assigning priority to arithmetic on that basis. It exists as a pure science in its own right, whether or not its practical applications exist; they, on the other hand, could not exist without it—each would be mere guesswork, not a science at all.

So here is the distinction of priority and posteriority which Aristotle attributes to Plato. It is worth noting, as corroboration, that not only Aristotle, but also the Neoplatonists seem to have understood and followed Plato on this point. The outstanding passages are Nicomachus of Gerasa, *Introduction to Arithmetic* ix 5–18 (Hoche) and ps.-Iamblichus, *Theologumena Arithmeticae* xxi 13–17 (de Falco). Ps.-Iamblichus is echoing just one of Nicomachus' reasons for assigning priority to arithmetic over the other sciences of the quadrivium when he writes: 'The association of arithmetic with the monad is reasonable: for when arithmetic is abolished, so are the other branches of knowledge, and they are generated when it is generated, but not vice versa, with the result that it is more primal than them and is their mother, just as the monad turns out to be as regards the numbers which follow it.'

R. A. H. WATERFIELD

Teddington, Middlesex