

By the time this case came to court Mantitheos 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 Mantitheos 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 Mantitheos' 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 Mantitheos' 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. Mantitheos knew that if Mantias legitimised his brothers he would lose two-thirds of his inheritance. They all knew that if Mantitheos 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 Ampepos, 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.

provided by the story of the presence and disappearance of Hylas in Mysia near Kios. Strabo also connected the story with Kios,⁸ and he believed the Mysians of northwestern Asia Minor to have been of Thracian origin.⁹ Artemidoros of Ephesos according to Strabo stated that Mysia had been settled by Mysians from beyond the Istros¹⁰—thus Artemidoros linked Mysoi with Moisoι.¹¹ Since the Mysians in the hinterland of Kios were thought to have come from Thrace, they resembled in their European origin their neighbours the Bithynians, who were known to have been Thracian.¹²

When Hylas was seized by one or more nymphs in Mysia, he did not cease to exist. Cult kept him alive and present. The Dryopian youth, though unseen, became a dweller in a land of Thracians, where Mysians together with their neighbours in Kios persisted in searching for him.¹³ Dryopian by birth, Hylas became perforce a Thracian by adoption in Mysia. To compensate for the loss, sons of the Mysians were settled at Trachis by Herakles as hostages, ἀντενέχυρα τοῦ Ὑλα.¹⁴

'Thracian' Hylas is therefore not evidence that the elegist was lacking in geographical knowledge; nor does 'Thracian' come from a hitherto unknown version of the tale. What the epithet shows is that the poet had some knowledge of ethnography.

G. L. HUXLEY

Gennadius Library
American School of Classical Studies
106 76 Athens Greece

⁸ xii 564 Cas.

⁹ vii 295 Cas.

¹⁰ xii 571 Cas.

¹¹ For the equivalence of ἡ κάτω Μυσία with *Moesia inferior* see Christian Habicht, *Die Inschriften Asklepieions. Altertümer von Pergamon* viii 3 (Berlin 1969) No. 125, lines 9–10.

¹² Herodotos i 28.

¹³ Ap. Rhod., *Arg.* i 1353.

¹⁴ Schol. Ap. Rhod. *Arg.* i 1355–7a, p. 122, 7–8 Wendel.

Some suggestions on the proem and 'second preface' of Arrian's *Anabasis*

In *JHS* cv (1985) 162–8, J. L. Moles has given an excellent treatment of the literary influences at work in the 'second preface' of Arrian's *Anabasis* (i 12.1–5).¹ I am in agreement with the main points of his work, and the purpose of the present note is to offer some additional evidence and suggestions.

1. *Literary influences.* Moles sees five major influences at work in the second preface: Homer, Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, and the prose encomium. Of this last he writes (164), 'Arrian's work will be biographical in orientation and fundamentally encomiastic'. There is no doubt, of course, that Arrian's work is encomiastic; Arrian does not hesitate to express admiration for Alexander at the outset of the work or in comments throughout the work or in the ἐπιμετρῶν λόγος at the work's conclusion.² But Arrian's history is not an encomium, though it may incorporate elements

¹ 'The Interpretation of the "Second Preface" in Arrian's *Anabasis*', cited throughout by author's name and page number.

² i 12.2–4; vii 28–30. See A. B. Bosworth, *A historical commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander* (Oxford 1980) 15–6 for the numerous exonerations of Alexander's conduct.

from that genre.³ It is an historical narrative, its subject ἔργα or *res gestae*.⁴ The ἔργα themselves, however, are those of a single man and in this sense it is an individual-centred history.⁵

The precedent for all individual-centred historiography in Greece is Theopompus, and in fact there are two possible echoes of the preface of the *Philippica* in *Anabasis* i 12.4–5. Among other things, Arrian states here: (1) that the uniqueness of Alexander and his deeds was the reason that he set out upon his history;⁶ (2) that he considers himself not unworthy of the first place in Greek letters. Two similar remarks appear in the preface of the *Philippica*. In the first, Theopompus states that Europe had never produced such a man as Philip, and that this is why he set out on his history:

Θεοπόμῳ, ὃς γ' ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς Φιλίππου συντάξεως δι' αὐτό μάλιστα παρορμηθῆναι φήσας πρὸς τὴν ἐπιβολὴν τῆς πραγματείας διὰ τὸ μηδέποτε τὴν Εὐρώπην ἐνηνοχῆναι τοιοῦτον ἄνδρα πάραπαν οἷον τὸν Ἀμύντου Φίλιππον, κτλ.⁷

Theopompus also boasted of his literary ability, mentioned his writings, and claimed a pre-eminent place among his contemporaries:

συνακάσαι δὲ λέγει αὐτὸς (sc. Θεοπόμπος) ἑαυτὸν Ἰσοκράτει τε τῷ Ἀθηναίῳ καὶ Θεοδέκτῃ τῷ Φασηλίτῃ καὶ Ναυκράτει τῷ Ἐρυθραίῳ, καὶ τούτους ἅμα αὐτῷ τὰ πρωτεῖα τῆς ἐν λόγοις παιδείας ἔχειν ἐν τοῖς Ἑλλησιν. (. . .) καὶ ὡς οὐκ ἂν εἴη αὐτῷ παράλογον ἀντιπιοιούμενῳ τῶν πρωτείων, οὐκ ἐλαττόνων μὲν ἢ δισμυρίων ἐπῶν τοὺς ἐπιδεικτικούς τῶν λόγων συγγραψαμένῳ κτλ.⁸

Now Theopompus was not (like Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon) in the first rank of the Greek historians. Such critics as Hermogenes and Philostratus have little to say of him that is good.⁹ On the other hand, Dionysius of Halicarnassus gave full (and perhaps fulsome) praise,¹⁰ Theon cites him frequently, and (on a more modest scale) Dio of Prusa recommends that a young man read Theopompus, whom he judges to be the best of the second rank of historians.¹¹ In some

³ The procedure in encomium is given in F. Leo, *Die griechisch-römische Biographie nach ihrer literarischen Form* (Leipzig 1901) 207 with n. 1.

⁴ i 12.4: οὐκ ἔστιν ὅστις ἄλλος εἰς ἀνὴρ τοσαῦτα ἢ τηλικαῦτα ἔργα . . . ἀπεδείξατο. Cf. i 12.5: οὐκ ἀπαξιώσας ἑμαυτὸν φανερά καταστήσει ἐς ἀνθρώπους τὰ Ἀλεξάνδρου ἔργα. Cf. Bosworth (n. 2) 15: 'It is basically a narrative of achievement, with a favourable verdict built into the narrative' (my emphasis).

⁵ P. Stadter, *Arrian of Nicomedia* (Chapel Hill 1980) 63 (though his remarks on Herodotus and Thucydides must be modified in light of Moles' analysis). Notice the twin elements of the actor and his deeds in the phrase Ἀλεξάνδρος τε καὶ τὰ Ἀλεξάνδρου ἔργα (i 12.3).

⁶ i 12.4: ἔθενε καὶ αὐτὸς ὀρμηθῆναι φημι ἐς τὴνδε τὴν συγγραφὴν, κτλ.

⁷ Polybius viii 11.1 = *FGrH* 115 F 27. It would be tempting to connect the ὀρμηθῆναι of Arrian with the παρορμηθῆναι of Theopompus, but apart from the possibility that Polybius is here paraphrasing or quoting from memory, ὀρμῶω can be found elsewhere in the sense of beginning an historical endeavour: D. Hal., *AR* i 1.2, Diod. i 4.2 (ἀφορμῇ).

⁸ *FGrH* 115 F 25.

⁹ Hermogenes, *Id.* ii 12, para. 412, 1; Philostratus, *VS* i 17.

¹⁰ D. Hal., *ad Pomp.* 6.

¹¹ Theon, *prog.* 154, 159, 163, 164, 185, et al.; Dio, *Or.* xviii 10: τῶν δὲ ἀκρῶν Θεουκιδίδης ἔμοι δοκεῖ καὶ τῶν δευτέρων Θεοπόμπος. Dio goes on to say that Xenophon is the best of all (14 ff.).