

But clearly it is not possible to argue that Thucydides was implying any comparison between the Egyptian and Sicilian Disasters, and Meiggs invokes language not figures. If one looks at the language one finds that the phrase 'few escaping out of many' is also used (as Meiggs himself points out (105 n. 2) of an Ambraciot defeat in which the operation was, of course, on a much smaller scale. Finally it remains necessary to argue that Thucydides' language on Egypt fits the reductionalist view. Surely it is true that the affairs of the Hellenes were destroyed in Egypt in 454 even if 'only' 100 ships and 20,000 men perished, as against the monstrous number of 230-40 ships and 46,000-48,000 men?

†A. J. HOLLADAY

Trinity College
Oxford

Family quarrels

Much has been written already about the dispute between Mantitheos and Mantitheos-Boiotos (henceforth Boiotos), sons of Mantias of Thorikos; but the currently accepted chronology needs some modification and the relations between institutions and strategies have not been fully explored.

The current view (APF 9667, largely following J. Rudhardt, *Mus. Helv.* xix [1962] 39-64) has Boiotos born, in wedlock, c. 382; by c. 381 Mantias would have divorced Boiotos' mother Plangon and remarried, Mantitheos being born c. 380. Mantitheos entered the deme Thorikos and married c. 362; Boiotos succeeded in getting Mantias to present him to his phratry in autumn 359 and in summer 358, by which time Mantias was dead, presented himself to the deme under the name Mantitheos. Demosthenes xxxix is dated to autumn 348, [D.] xl to 347.

The problem with this chronology is that it leaves Boiotos kicking his heels for an uncomfortably long time between reaching eighteen, the age at which he should have entered a deme, and starting proceedings against his father, a delay which would have been particularly foolish if he could indeed demonstrate that he was born well before his father's marriage to Mantitheos' mother, and one which would have put him in a very awkward position in Athenian society.¹ It is clear that he had not been introduced to any phratry and deme other than those of Mantias; Mantitheos makes the most of the fact that Boiotos had taken part in boys' choruses in the tribe Hippothontis, to which his mother's family belonged (xxxix 22) and would not have failed to take advantage of inscription in a corresponding phratry or deme if it had taken place.

Boiotos' case seems to have been that he had the necessary qualifications for citizenship and was being deprived of it by Mantias' failure to have him

¹ Some continue to argue (most recently, K. R. Walters. *Class. Ant.* ii [1983] 314-36) that as the son of two Athenian parents Boiotos was entitled to citizenship even if he was born out of wedlock, and that Mantias never acknowledged him and his brother as legitimate sons. This view ignores the fact that recognition by Mantias led to an equal division of his estate between the three sons (cf. M. H. Hansen, *Demography and democracy* [Systime, Herning, Denmark 1985] 73-6). In the mind of Mantitheos at least, recognition, citizenship and inheritance were indissolubly connected. The view that Boiotos was only seeking recognition as a *nothos* would make his behaviour particularly difficult to explain on the current chronology.

inscribed in the deme Thorikos (xxxix 2 τῆς πατρίδος ἀποστρεψίθαι). We do not know under what rubric such a suit would have fallen, except that it was a *dikē* and not a *graphē*; in any case Mantias was not keen to face a court (xxxix 3), so the question of rubric scarcely arose.²

Boiotos claimed to be older than Mantitheos, and all the latter can say in reply is that he has always looked younger (xxxix 27). He knows this argument is weak. Boiotos' assertion that Mantias had given him his own father's name, Mantitheos, as befitted a first born son, at a formal naming ceremony (*dekatē*) ten days after his birth, was accepted by the deme and, eventually, by a court; since his witnesses were not kin of Mantias (xxxix 22, cf. xl 59), his argument may have rested less on the *dekatē* rite than on proof that he had been called Mantitheos throughout his boyhood.³ His claim that Mantias gave him the name Boiotos, when presenting him to his phratry, as an insult (xxxix 32) points the same way. (In reality Mantias was surely trying to avoid embarrassment. An adopted son is given a new name on presentation to the phratry in Isaios vii 17.) Boiotos' story evidently was that soon after his birth and *dekatē* his parents had quarrelled and this had led Mantias to reject Plangon's sons (xxxix 22-3, xl 29); when Mantitheos grew up he had made sure that this attitude persisted (xxxix 27, xl 45).

It has been recognised that the ambiguity of the relationship between Mantias and Plangon—which persisted or was renewed during his brief period of marriage to Mantitheos' mother (xl 8-9, 27, cf. xxxix 26)—was connected with the fact that her father Pamphilos I died heavily indebted to the state. Part of the debt was still unpaid in 347/6 (xl 22). Boiotos asserted that at Pamphilos' death Mantias had claimed part of the debtor's property as owed to him for Plangon's dowry (xl 20), and this is very probably true, although of course the claim does not prove that Mantias and Plangon were married. We find a similar ambiguity over Aphobos' marriage to Onetor's sister in Demosthenes' suits against his guardians. It is not impossible that Mantias left Plangon at home with her three brothers (at least two of whom were still childless and presumably unmarried in 359). By claiming the dowry but not taking Plangon to his own home, Mantias could have secured the family some property while remaining sufficiently detached to avoid involvement in their ruin.⁴ Plangon and her brothers were not

² Even if young men between the ages of 18 and 20 were already in c. 360 debarred from appearing in court except in cases concerned with inheritance and similar matters (such as rights to *genos* priesthoods), which is not certain (Rhodes, *Comm. Ath. Pol.* 509), suits concerning entry to the deme must have been included in the permitted category. Rhodes (501) thinks that appeals against rejection by the deme—and presumably also suits such as Boiotos threatened—would have had to be brought by a parent or guardian, but this seems to me unnecessarily legalistic. Boiotos had older and more experienced supporters, predictably characterised by Mantitheos as sycophants.

³ Note that the boyhood acquaintances of Boiotos who testify that he took part in boys' choruses in the tribe of his mother's family, Hippothontis, (xxxix 24) were not asked to testify that he was called Boiotos at that time.

⁴ Rudhardt argues that if Mantias had put in an official claim for Plangon's dowry Mantitheos could not have asserted that there was no proof of it (xl 21). But Athenian litigants do not produce documentary evidence of such transactions from state records; they

in a position to complain when Mantias married a well-connected and rich widow—who died, after giving birth to Mantitheos and a younger brother who died in infancy, while Mantitheos was still a small child (xl 27). By this time the relationship with Plangon had been renewed (if indeed it had ever ceased) and Boiotos' younger brother Pamphilus II had been born.⁵ After the widow's death Mantias continued to maintain two separate households (xxxix 26, cf. xl 9, 51), presumably in order to avoid involvement in the debts of Pamphilos I. While the boys were young this created no problems. Boiotos and Pamphilos II attached themselves informally to the tribe Hippothontis (xxxix 22); perhaps the plan to filiate them eventually to their mother's brothers as adopted sons (xl 10) was already mentioned.

When Boiotos grew up, however, this scheme did not satisfy him, either because he believed himself born in wedlock and entitled to a share in Mantias' estate, or because he doubted Mantias' willingness to support him if anyone queried his eligibility for adoption.⁶ In my view, if it is accepted that Boiotos was older than Mantitheos yet Mantitheos was presented to Mantias' deme before Boiotos was presented to his phratry (xxxix 29), the only convincing explanation of the discrepancy in dates is that Mantias was able to postpone settling Boiotos' claims during his office as general in 360/59. This implies that both Mantitheos and Boiotos were born c. 378; Mantitheos was presented to the deme Thorikos in summer 360, married immediately and had a daughter in spring 359; Mantias escaped thankfully from the pressure put on him by his two eldest sons to military service, finding his position as commander of

call persons who were in office at the time to testify from memory (Humphreys, *History and Anthropology* i 2 [1985] 236–7). After a 30-year interval Boiotos would have found this difficult. For the risks to affines and close associates in such circumstances see Lysias xix and xxix. We really cannot tell whether Plangon ever lived under Mantias' roof. It is not essential to my argument to hold that she did not; however, if Mantias had formally married her before witnesses and celebrated *gamēlia* in his phratry Boiotos should have been able to produce witnesses to the fact, in which case one would expect Mantitheos to try to deal with their testimony. No doubt he assured Plangon and her family that he was acting in their best interests and would secure citizen rights for the boys when the time came. Once the initial step had been taken, they had little choice. On the manoeuvres by which debtors' friends could save property from confiscation see R. Osborne, *JHS* cv (1985) 40–58; Humphreys, *Law and History Review* (1988) n. 25. The 'dowry' may have included the house in which Plangon and her sons lived, presumably with her brothers. Whether there was further property retained by Mantias after his marriage to Mantitheos' mother—as Boiotos seems to have claimed—and used by him to pay the expenses of Plangon's household, as Mantitheos alleges (xl 51), is much more doubtful.

⁵ Mantitheos' claim to be the oldest son implied an admission that Mantias was sleeping with Plangon while married to the widow. This may well be true. Pamphilos II, old enough to enter the phratry in autumn 359, should have been born by 375. His name does not imply that Mantias disclaimed paternity; to name a second son after his maternal grandfather was normal. Carey and Reid (*Demosthenes. Selected Private Speeches* [Cambridge 1985] 165–6, 183) suggest that Pamphilos was older than Mantitheos. On their view Mantias developed suspicions during Plangon's second pregnancy that she was being unfaithful to him, sent her home to her brothers and refused to take further steps to legitimise Boiotos, whose *dekatē* he had celebrated earlier. This view lengthens the gap in age between Boiotos and Mantitheos and I do not find it plausible.

⁶ It might even conceivably have been claimed that state debtors, who were deprived of many of their citizen rights, lacked the capacity to adopt—though the question was hardly likely to arise often.

Argaios' naval base in the Thermaic Gulf during his unsuccessful attempt to wrest control of the Macedonian kingdom from Philip in 359 perhaps peaceful by contrast; in autumn 359 Mantias was forced to recognise Plangon's sons and present them to his phratry, but before the presentation of new members to Thorikos in summer 358 he was dead.⁷

Mantias' position was indeed embarrassing. He seems to have been one of those politicians, not unknown in more modern times, whose presumptive shrewdness and *pronoia* in public affairs deserts them in private life. Boiotos was pressing for recognition, Mantitheos with equal insistence defending his position as sole legitimate son and heir (xxxix 27, xl 45). Mantitheos' marriage at the age of eighteen (xl 12), during his father's lifetime, is utterly unparalleled⁸ and I can only imagine that his father wanted to give him something else to think about. The joint enterprise in mining which they undertook (xl 52) may have been designed to provide the newly-married couple with an income,⁹ and if Mantias had lived longer he would perhaps have set them up in a separate household.

Mantitheos claims that Mantias came to an arrangement with Plangon in 359: he would pay her thirty minas, and she would refuse to swear on oath that Boiotos was his son (xxxix 3, xl 10–11). Plangon and Boiotos would have been foolish to accept this compromise, since the oath would have made it very difficult, if not impossible, for Boiotos to obtain citizenship through adoption by his mother's brother; the whole business of the oath may have been a charade designed to keep Mantitheos quiet. In any case Plangon swore that both Boiotos and Pamphilos II were Mantias' sons, and he made no further attempt to contest it. The affair was a scandal, *periboētos* (xl 11; cf.

⁷ xxxix 5. Diodorus Siculus (xvi 2.6–3.5) puts Mantias' command in 360/59; he is not always reliable on such matter, and 359/8 would be possible, but would make the date of [D.] xl more problematic. Mantitheos' statements (xl 12–13) that he was married after Boiotos' presentation to the phratry and that Mantias lived 'not many years' after the birth of his daughter involve, at the least, *suggestio falsi*, since Mantias cannot have lived for as much as a year after the phratry presentation. Mantitheos seems to be trying to stress that he was already a settled, responsible paterfamilias before his father's death, while Boiotos was still an adolescent in process of initiation into full citizenship. The date of Boiotos' entry into the deme cannot be exactly determined, but was probably somewhere fairly close to the beginning of the Attic year in July (D. Whitehead, *The Demes of Attica* [Princeton 1986] 89–92, 269–70). Mantitheos may have celebrated his wedding and begun married life in summer and sacrificed *gamēlia* at the Apatouria when Boiotos was admitted to the phratry.

⁸ Dikaiogenes (Lysias *fr.* xxiii 2–3 Gernet, 24, 30 Thalheim) also married at 18 but grew up in the household of the speaker, probably a stepbrother or matrilateral kinsman, and was therefore presumably fatherless, as was Nikias II son of Nikeratos of Kydantidai, who married at 23 (APF 10808, cf. Lewis, *BSA* 1 [1955] p. 30). Other early marriages which definitely took place during the father's lifetime are those of Hippias son of Peisistratos (APF 11793. III, VII), of Menestheus son of Iphikrates to the daughter of Timotheos, at 24 (APF 7737)—these two clearly atypical—and of Kritoboulos, the eldest son of Sokrates' friend Kriton (APF 8823).

⁹ Mantitheos' sentimental picture of the old man longing for grandchildren (xl 12) is hardly convincing; if Mantias' death was anticipated he would have said so more plainly, and the birth of a child to Mantitheos had no legal bearing on Boiotos' position. He repaid the borrowed capital alone, although he gave his brothers a share of the proceeds of the mine (xl 52); at 18 he may not have been able to borrow money or lease a mine alone. Note the remarks of M. Walbank, *Hesperia* lii (1983) 225, on leasing by young men.

Ar. *Rhet.* 1398b2–3); Mantitheos' pun may have been designed to distract any juror who still remembered the affair from recalling that the main element of scandal lay in the closeness of his own age to that of Boiotos.

With this background, relations between Mantitheos and his brothers could hardly be expected to be good. However, they were not as consistently stormy as might have been expected. When Mantias died they divided his estate (xl 13, 52) but disagreed on the amount due to them as their mothers' dowries. 'Those present' (40.14—presumably kin and friends) advised them to keep Mantias' house and slaves undivided until this matter was settled, and all three of them settled down to live in the house together (xl 2, 13). After an interval of unspecified length (μετὰ ταῦτα, xl 16) the first attempt at a formal lawsuit was made. Intermittent quarrels, in and out of court, had been going on for eleven years by the time [D.] xl was delivered (xl 3, 18).¹⁰ At some time, perhaps in the late 350s, there was a fight, after which Boiotos prosecuted Mantitheos unsuccessfully before the Areopagus for wounding with intent (xl 32–3). Mantitheos filed suit to prevent his brother from using the name Mantitheos in winter 349. By February 348 he was in Euboea, on military service at Tamynai, and the case did not come to trial until some time in 348/7 (xxxix 16–17). Demosthenes wrote the speech for Mantitheos; it may seem odd that he should take on a client with a case for which there was no legal basis or precedent, but he may have seen Mantitheos as a rising young military commander whose friendship was worth cultivating, and Mantitheos was probably more interested in publicity than in getting a favourable sentence.¹¹

Dionysios of Halikarnassos (*Deinarchos* 13) thought that two or three years had elapsed between the delivery of D. xxxix and that of [D.] xl. The text is confused, the full statement of his argument is not preserved, and his main concern was to show that [D.] xl was far too early to be by Deinarchos; but there are other reasons for accepting an interval of this length. By the time of [D.] xl Mantitheos' daughter was close enough to marriageable age for him to express concern about sharing a house with his brothers and about providing her with a dowry. (His statement, xl 56, that she looks more like his sister than his daughter should not be taken too

¹⁰ In c. 342 a debt owed by Mantias from his service as steward of the dockyards in 377/6 was paid by his three sons, listed as Mantitheos, Mantitheos and Pamphilos (*IG* ii² 1622. 435–43). If they were aware of the existence of this debt it may have supplied another motive for the three sons to postpone final settlement of the division of Mantias' estate; but of course it could not be mentioned in court. (Mantias is also recorded as trierarch in ?378/7: D. M. Lewis, *Gnomon* xlvii [1975] 718.)

¹¹ Gernet's date of 349 for Tamynai (*Dem. Plaidoyers civils* ii [Budé] 14) is a slip of the pen. In xl 34–5 we are told that Mantitheos sued because Boiotos had attempted to take office as taxiarch in his brother's place and had claimed that his brother was liable for a judgement given against him. In xxxix 7–16, however, such manoeuvres are mentioned merely as hypothetical possibilities. Either Mantitheos felt that the suit over the name had made him look foolish and was trying to improve his case retrospectively, or xl 34–5 is an interpolation. The question of the cause of action in D. xxxix is probably insoluble. Carey and Reid (166) discuss the arguments for and against regarding it as a suit for damages (*dikē blabēs*). We should beware, however, of assuming that Athenian litigants were only permitted to sue under attested rubrics. Most magistrates will not have cared to impose strict rules, and on this occasion Boiotos had no reason to make procedural objections; his case was strong enough without that.

literally, and in any case is intended as a comment on his age rather than hers; *he* does not look old enough to have a marriageable daughter.) Boiotos will no doubt have hoped to resolve the family quarrels by marrying her—if she was, as appears, an only child, he will even have had some right to expect this—and presumably Mantitheos' refusal to accept this solution intensified the deterioration in their relations. The normal age of marriage for girls in Athens was probably soon after menarche; this may have meant fifteen to sixteen in many cases, but *epiklēroi* were married at fourteen (*Ath. Pol.* 56.7, cf. Rhodes *ad. loc.*). Mantitheos' daughter was only a potential *epiklēros*, if that, but he would get no peace from his brothers until the question of her marriage was settled.¹²

The other clue to the date of [D.] xl is that Mantitheos had recently been in Lesbos with Ameinias¹³ raising money to recruit mercenaries for a purpose which he only describes as useful for Athens and for her friends on the island (xl 36–7). Presumably he was involved in preparations for unseating Kammys, the tyrant of Mytilene, who in fact lost power in spring 346 (*IG* ii² 213, *Staatsverträge* 328). Boiotos claimed that his brother had been collecting debts due to their father, and was accused by Mantitheos of serving Kammys' interests. The case should probably then belong in late 347 or early 346, not because it would have been impossible for Mantitheos to smear Boiotos by connecting him with Kammys after the tyrant's fall, but because he does not explain openly what the Athenians were trying to do in Lesbos.¹⁴ On this dating Mantitheos' daughter will have been between twelve and thirteen. I find it much easier to believe that her father could have spoken of her as nubile at that age than to believe that Boiotos waited until he was about twenty-three before pressing his father to present him to his deme.¹⁵

¹² The next-of-kin could not legally claim an *epiklēros* until her father's death, and then (probably) only if she had not produced children (A. R. W. Harrison, *The Law of Athens* i [Oxford 1968] 10–11); but for the father to marry her outside the family would provoke conflict. Boiotos was perhaps behaving like the Egyptian cousins of the Danaidai in Aeschylus' *Suppliants*. Plato, *Laws* 833D, sets the age of marriage at 13 for *epiklēroi*. On menarche and marriage see H. King, 'Bound to Bleed', in A. Cameron and A. Kuhrt, eds. *Images of Women in Antiquity* (London 1983) 109–27. The medical writers of the Roman period tend to set menarche at 14, but may be influenced by the classification of the life-cycle into seven-year stages; comparative data from preindustrial societies would put it earlier rather than later (King, pers. comm.). Texts recommending a later age for marriage are collected in J. J. B. Mulder, *Quaestiones nonnullae ad atheniensium matrimonia vitamque coniugalem pertinentes* (Diss. Utrecht 1920) 7–20.

¹³ Perhaps *PA* 673, the son of Lysikrates, whose tombstone in Mytilene 'atticis antiquissimis litteris' was recorded by Cyriacus of Ancona (*IG* xii. ii. 307).

¹⁴ Those who still, despite the arguments of M. J. Osborne (*BSA* lxxvi [1971] 297–322) regard *IG* ii² 207 as a single inscription dated in 349/8 might think that Mantitheos had gone to the north-east Aegean with Phokion during his service as taxiarch, in spring 348. But this inscription—which on the pre-Osborne view has an embarrassingly large number of generals in the north-east for 349/8 and has to posit a move for Phokion not supported by the other sources—seems to be concerned with corn supplies and with collecting the regular League contributions of *syntaxis* in Lesbos rather than with raising money through private contacts to pay mercenaries; and if Mantitheos' trip to Lesbos had taken place in spring 348 (or earlier, as suggested by Thalheim, *Jahresbericht d. Kgl. Gymn. Schneidemühl* xx [1889] 10) Boiotos' allegations should already have been mentioned in D. xxxix.

¹⁵ He would have been eligible for presentation to the phratry at 16 but could not threaten to sue at that age.

By the time this case came to court Manti-theos had moved out of the family house, mortgaging his share of it to Kriton.¹⁶ There was general concern in Athens, the origins of which are unclear, that unauthorized persons had been making their way into the demes; in 346/5 the demes were ordered to conduct a general scrutiny of their membership lists. Boiotos and Pamphilos successfully passed this test, whether because they were popular in the deme or because Manti-theos on this occasion was prepared to support them we cannot tell; if the question of Mantias' debts to the state had already been raised it was not in Manti-theos' interests that his brothers should be forced into emigration or have their property confiscated.¹⁷ In any case, the scrutiny will have entered into their calculations in dealing with each other. Pamphilos in particular was in a very vulnerable position, which may account for his low profile in the whole affair; he must have been born during or after Mantias' marriage to Manti-theos' mother, whereas Boiotos could apparently plausibly claim to have been born before it.

This account of Mantias' and his sons' manoeuvres may seem to treat Athenian law in a somewhat cavalier fashion. To me the much-debated question whether Mantias was a bigamist has little sense; it did not explicitly become an issue at the time, and we cannot say how a court would have dealt with it if it had (*cf.* H.-J. Wolff, *Traditio* ii [1944] 76–7, 80–4). Legally, Mantias and his sons were living in a mess, from the death of Pamphilos I to 346 and in all probability longer, and this cannot have been an uncommon state for Athenians. Nevertheless, although the law did not set rigid boundaries to their conduct, it has to be taken into account in understanding their strategies. Boiotos urgently needed to settle the question of his civic status when he came of age. Manti-theos knew that if Mantias legitimised his brothers he would lose two-thirds of his inheritance. They all knew that if Manti-theos died leaving an only daughter who had not yet produced an heir Boiotos could claim her in marriage, and they presumably knew too that Mantias had left a debt to the state which they might be called on to pay. Mantias had woven a tangled web from which his heirs had no possibility of extricating themselves neatly, either psychologically or legally.

Many Athenian forensic speeches present us with similar problems: shady dealings (in this case the deliberate creation of doubt about the status of Mantias' union with Plangon, because of her father's debts¹⁸)

¹⁶ The reference to 'sale' in xl 58–9 surely means *prasis epi lysei*. In such transactions it was commoner for the mortgager to retain possession and pay interest on the loan (Harrison, *Law* i ch. 8, especially pp. 258, 263), but in this case Kriton may well have moved in.

¹⁷ The speaker of D. lvii (§ 70) seems to think that people would expect him to leave Attica if he lost his case. Some *apepsēphismenoi* were still there after Chaeronea (Hyperides *fr.* 18.3 Blass, 29 Kenyon), but these may be men who did not appeal to the courts. The legal position is not very clear (Gernet, *Plaidoyers civils* iv [1960] 9–10).

¹⁸ A similar ambiguity contributes to the plot of Terence's *Phormio*. Chremes has one household in Athens and another on Lemnos; he plans to marry his Lemnian daughter to the son of his brother, who is ready to accept her without asking awkward questions about her civic status. In theory Lemnians might have impeccable claims to citizenship through cleruch ancestry on both sides, but evidently the standards of evidence were suspect. 'Lemnians' turn up in court as well as on stage (Is. vi 13); David Konstan in his analysis of

lead to ambiguities in legal status which members of the family can exploit both in and out of court in their dealings with each other. Isaios vi, *On the Estate of Philoktemon*, where the tangle starts with an illegal compromise between Euktemon and his son Philoktemon, provides a good parallel. What I have tried to show in this note is that in order to understand such situations it is not enough to try to reconstruct the lost side of the arguments put forward in court, as Wyse did in his commentary on Isaios (Cambridge 1904). *Verstehen*-interpretation has to be pushed further, to the attempt to recapture the actors' perceptions of the situation and the possible strategies open to each of the parties involved as they developed and changed during the course of the quarrel. To do this involves drawing on information about historical events, Athenian law and institutions, norms of behaviour. Above all it involves that imponderable sense of what would or would not 'do' in a society which the anthropologist acquires by intensive socialisation in the field and the historian accumulates by reading and re-reading texts; one might almost say a sensitivity to the implications and impact of gossip. The argument stands or falls on my sense that whereas Mantias and Plangon's brothers had reasons to tolerate gossip about Mantias' relationship with Plangon, Boiotos knew that his half-brother and others were waiting to see whether he would succeed in asserting his right to citizen status, and therefore he could not afford to let time go by.

S. C. HUMPHREYS

University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

the *Phormio* (*Roman Comedy* [Ithaca 1983]) did not need to contrast the ambiguities of drama with the clarity of 'real life'. In real life too, if two brothers agreed to marry the 'Lemnian' daughter of one to the fully Athenian son of the other, they would not find it difficult.

Thracian Hylas

In a recently published fragment of an elegiac poem about gods who loved youths mention is made of stories about Apollon and Hyakinthos, Dionysos and Ampe-los, and Herakles and Hylas.¹ In the third tale Hylas is called a Thracian—Θρηϊκος Ὑλας.² However, Hylas was a Dryopian by birth, because his father Theiodamas was a Dryopian of Mount Oita.³ There is no sign that the Dryopians were of Thracian stock. The difficulty has prompted the comment that the poet either used a version of the Hylas-myth unknown to us or was deficient in knowledge of Greek geography.⁴

Some Dryopians migrated to the Argolid.⁵ Their presence near Argos may be recalled by Hyginus in the words *Hylas . . . ex Oechalia, alii aiunt ex Argis*,⁶ but, as the editors of the elegiacs insist, 'neither location justifies "Thracian"; nor does his disappearance which A<pollo-nius> R<hodium> places near Cius in Mysia'.⁷

A solution to the problem of 'Thracian' Hylas is

¹ *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* liv (1987) No. 3723, edited by J. M. Bremer and P. J. Parsons.

² *P.Oxy.* 3723, col. ii, line 19.

³ Callimachus F 24 Pfeiffer. *Ap. Rhod. Arg.* i 1213.

⁴ P. J. Parsons, *M.H.* xlv (1988) 67.

⁵ Aristotle F482 V. Rose. Callimachus F25 Pf.

⁶ 14.11, p. 16 H. J. Rose.

⁷ *P.Oxy.* liv p. 64.