The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Eiap: Blood ?

Arthur Sykes

The Classical Review / Volume 36 / Issue 3-4 / May 1922, pp 70 - 70

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00016164, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00016164

How to cite this article:

Arthur Sykes (1922). Eiap: Blood ?. The Classical Review, 36, pp 70-70 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00016164

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

NOTE ON THE BOEOTIAN LEAGUE.

IT is just possible that Thucydides' account (Book IV., c. 93) of the numbers of the Boeotian army present at Delion throws a ray of light upon one of the terms of the Federal compact.

We know from the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* (XI. 4) that each of the eleven *μέρη* into which Boeotia had been subdivided for League purposes was bound to contribute *περί χιλίους μὲν ὅπλιτας ἱππέας δὲ ἑκατὸν* to the Federal army, thus giving to the latter a total strength of approximately 11,000 hoplites and 1,100 cavalry, with whatever light-armed troops were also sent. Thucydides tells us that at Delion there were present about 7,000 hoplites, 500 peltasts, 1,000 horse, and above 10,000 light-armed troops. The 500 peltasts were in all probability contributed by some *μέρος* or *μέρη* in place of so many hoplites; the total number of hoplites present may therefore be reckoned as equivalent to 7,500 approximately.

Now Delion was obviously an occasion which called for a full muster of the Boeotian army, since the Athenians had moved against them with far-reaching designs and *πανδημέλ*, bringing with them even their *μέτοικοι* and *ξένοι* (Thuc. 4. 90). The Boeotian cavalry certainly are present in practically full force (1,000 out of 1,100); perhaps because cavalry were useful in preventing the Athenian *ψιλοί* from plundering the country. But the hoplites are 3,500 short. Where were these 3,500? No doubt they were retained as guards throughout the cities, in several of which pro-Athenian intrigues were well advanced. But on what principle, if any, was it decided that just so many (7,500) should come to Delion, and just so many (3,500) should remain on guard at home?

The analogy of the Spartan League may help us here. From Thucydides (2. 10; 2. 47; 3. 15; 5. 57) we gather that in the terms of the Peloponnesian *ἐνυμᾶχια* it was provided that on league expeditions each of the allies was to contribute two-thirds of its forces, except in the case where the war was to be waged in the territories of some member of the alliance, in which emergency this particular ally must turn out *πανστρατιᾷ*. If we assume that this provision had been borrowed in Boeotia and made a condition of their League, we can explain Thucydides' figures. The *μέρος* constituted by Tanagra, having been invaded, must turn out with all its hoplite forces, *i.e.* 1,000 strong. From the other 10,000 available in the remaining 10 *μέρη*, two-thirds (*i.e.* 6,666) must come; so that the total hoplite force assembled should have been about 7,666. Since, according to Thucydides, if we reckon the 500 peltasts as substitutes for hoplites, there were actually present about 7,500, the assumption of some such clause among the terms of the Boeotian Confederacy does not seem altogether unjustifiable.

P. A. SEYMOUR.

ΕΙΑΡ: BLOOD?

(a) Aeschylus, *Agam.* 1480 *νέος ἰχώρ*.

(β) Aeschylus, *Frags.* 459 (Sidgwick) *τίροπῶτις*.

(γ) Homer, *Il.* T. 87 *ν.λ. εἰαροπῶτις Ἐρινύς*.

(β) A conjecture is given: *εἰαροπῶτις* (Bergk).

(γ) Dr. Leaf's note says that *εἶαρ* was a Salaminian (Cyprus) word for 'blood.'

(a) W. Headlam conjectures (with the approval of Verrall) *ἱχαρ* (*ἰχανάω*), 'fresh in appetite'; strongly contesting the view that *ἰχώρ* can admit of the extended meanings 'bloodshed' or 'deed of blood' as they are applied to *αἶμα*.

If the word *εἶαρ* was in any way associated with the *Ἐρινύς*, and the *Ἐρινύς* corresponded in any way with the Vampire of later mythology (*cf. Ag.* 1189, *Eum.* 264 ff.), is it possible that Aeschylus wrote *νέον εἶαρ*?

In the previous lines the words *δαίμονα γέννης* and *ἔρως αἱματολοιχός* (together with the fact that the *Oresteia* is full of allusions to the *Ἐρινύς*, and to *αἶμα* in all manner of connotations) seem to suggest that *εἶαρ* might admit of the wider meanings, desiderated for the admittedly unsatisfactory *ἰχώρ* of the text.

Such a meaning as 'fresh blood to suck,' or 'another banquet of blood' (for the *Ἐρινύς*), corresponding to, and expanding *ἔρως αἱματολοιχός*, would seem to suit the tenour of the whole passage.

ARTHUR SYKES.

[ὥς ἄρ' ἐφώνησεν] τῇ δ' ἄπτερος ἔπλετο
μῦθος.

THIS phrase occurs four times in the *Odyssey*—ρ 57; τ 29; φ 386; χ 398. The traditional interpretations may be divided into two classes: (a) Those which assign the *μῦθος* to the previous speaker; (b) those which assign the *μῦθος* to his hearer—*i.e.* (a) that the speaker's *μῦθος*, having no wings with which to fly away, remained in the hearer's mind—*non evolabat sed haerebat in memoria*; (b) that the hearer's *μῦθος* never took the wings of utterance—remained unspoken. As a parallel for this use of *μῦθος*, ν 254 is quoted—*πάλιν δ' ὃ γε λάβετο μῦθον*—and translated, 'He took back his (unspoken) word'—*i.e.*, did not utter his thought. The main objection to interpretation (a) is that a strong phrase is used four times—and four times only—where it has no special point; to (b) that it involves an awkward change of thought: the *μῦθος* would *naturally* be that of the subject of *ἐφώνησεν*. Nor does either interpretation account for the fact that in the first two instances certainly and in the second two probably there is a second meaning in the speaker's words which does not reach the hearer.

Is it not possible that the *μῦθος* should be assigned to the speaker and that the