

A HISTORY OF THE PELASGIAN THEORY.

FEW peoples of the ancient world have given rise to so much controversy as the Pelasgians; and of few, after some centuries of discussion, is so little clearly established. Like the Phoenicians, the Celts, and of recent years the Teutons, they have been a peg upon which to hang all sorts of speculation; and whenever an inconvenient circumstance has deranged the symmetry of a theory, it has been safe to 'call it Pelasgian and pass on.'

One main reason for this ill-repute, into which the Pelasgian name has fallen, has been the very uncritical fashion in which the ancient statements about the Pelasgians have commonly been mishandled. It has been the custom to treat passages from Homer, from Herodotus, from Ephorus, and from Pausanias, as if they were so many interchangeable bricks to build up the speculative edifice; as if it needed no proof that genealogies found summarized in Pausanias or Apollodorus 'were taken by them from poems of the same class with the *Theogony*, or from ancient treatises, or from prevalent opinions;' as if, further, 'if we find them mentioning the Pelasgian nation, they do at all events belong to an age when that name and people had nothing of the mystery which they bore to the eyes of the later Greeks, for instance of Strabo;' and as though (in the same passage) a statement of Stephanus of Byzantium about Pelasgians in Italy 'were evidence to the same effect, perfectly unexceptionable and as strictly historical as the case will admit of.'¹

No one doubts, of course, either that popular tradition *may* transmit, or that late writers *may* transcribe, statements which come from very early, and even from contemporary sources. But this is quite a different matter from assuming, as a working hypothesis, that the unauthenticated statements of late writers *do* come from early sources. Even where such a statement tallies with a statement of Homer, or with the results of excavation, we are not justified in inferring, on that account only, that the late writer had Homer before him, any more than that he had himself conducted such an excavation. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, he may equally well be assumed to have got his information from a quite late handbook, or from an imaginative author who for once by chance was right.

Most recent writers meanwhile admit, tacitly, that authorities do vary

¹ Niebuhr, *History of Rome* (tr. Hare and Thirlwall 1837) i. p. 26.

in value, and that *ceteris paribus* the earlier sources are more trustworthy than the later. But the reservation '*ceteris paribus*' covers a great deal; for it is argued, not uncommonly, that Hecataeus, for example, stands much nearer in the scale to Pausanias than he does to Hesiod, and Hesiod nearer to Hecataeus than to Homer: in the sense, of course, that between Homer and Hesiod lies a great political convulsion, involving a fatal breach with the past; and that between Hesiod and Hecataeus lies at least a century of strenuous endeavour to bridge that gap, and 'restore' the missing data by strenuous use of the imagination.

At the time when the chronological lacuna between Mycenaean and Hellenic Greece was still unsurveyed, a considerable service was rendered by Mr. Cecil Torr, in an experimental reconstruction,^{1a} in which every interval of time which he was able to demonstrate was 'written down' (so to speak) to the 'least possible' dimensions; somewhat as if a prudent capitalist to-day were to 'write down' to 80 the value of his consols. The result was a chronological scheme which, although it has not been widely adopted, had at least the merit of being 'within the mark.' It called attention, besides, to certain other matters of historical method, which I need not specify here.

Now what I have attempted to do, in this essay, is to make a similar experiment with the ancient statements about the Pelasgians: to arrange them, in fact, strictly in accordance with the relative antiquity of the sources from which they severally become first known *to us*; and to use, at each stage, as commentary upon any passage, only such other statements as we know from extant authors to have been current at the date when that passage was penned. To interpret Homeric passages, that is, I shall use only Homeric evidence and the physique of the Aegean, accessible to 'Homer' as to us; to interpret Hesiod and the later Epic, only Epic sources; to interpret Thucydides, only sources of at least fifth century date. Not until I reach the authorities of the age of Alexander, shall I make use of any statement which rests merely on the authority of Ephorus or his kind. In this way alone, I think, can we be certain to avoid anachronism. Much else about the Pelasgians may very likely be ancient tradition, but it cannot be proved from extant sources to be so; and it may, on the other hand, find a more probable context—if not an assured origin—lower down, when once we have constructed, on the hypothesis of 'lowest possible' dates for each phase, the outlines of the growth of the Pelasgian Theory.

It is difficult to be certain, in an enquiry of this kind, that one has really left preconceptions behind; but I may at all events confess this, that I had not the faintest idea, when I began to apply this method to my materials, what the results of the experiment were going to be. Least of all was I prepared for the form which the Homeric evidence assumed, when once it was released from its Hellenic commentary; or for the part which I have found myself compelled to assign to Ephorus in the concoction of the Great Pelasgian Myth.

^{1a} C. Torr *Memphis and Mycenae*, Cambridge, 1896.

§ 1.—*Homeric Evidence: its Two-fold Character.*

To take, first and separately,^{1b} the Homeric passages.^{1b} They divide at once into two classes: those which contain the substantival forms Πελασγός, Πελασγοί and those which contain merely the adjective Πελασγικός. In the substantival passages it is a fair preliminary hypothesis that the poet had in his mind some more or less definite conception of an actual people, either still existent in his own time and that of his original audiences; or, if extinct, familiar both to him and to his audiences, through a lively and accepted tradition, as recent occupants of the areas in which he places them. In the adjectival passages, on the other hand, such a hypothesis is not legitimate. These do not indicate more than that the place or personality to which the poet applies the adjective 'Pelasgian' seemed to him, and presumably to his audience, to partake, in some way, of the Pelasgian character as he or they understand it. These passages therefore cannot be used by themselves as evidence that either the audience or the poet had any experience or immediate reminiscence of actual Pelasgian inhabitants in the area or about the personage to which the adjective is applied. And when we come to consider this class of passages in detail (B. below) we shall see, I think, that this consideration is valid, and of some importance.

§ 2.—*Substantival Πελασγοί in Homer.*

It will simplify discussion to take the substantival passages first. They are as follows:—

(1)

Il. 2. 840-3: Ἴππόθοος δ' ἄγε φύλα Πελασγῶν ἐγχεσιμῶρων,
τῶν οὐ Δάρισαν ἐριβώλακα καιετάσσκον
τῶν ἡρχ' Ἴππόθοός τε Πύλαιός τ' ὄζος Ἄρηος,
ὕιε δὺν Λήθοιο Πελασγοῦ Τευταμίδαο.

The passage stands at a critical point in the structure of the 'Trojan Catalogue.' Starting from Troy-Town, in l. 816, the poet has reviewed (1) the Trojans themselves (ll. 816 ff.); (2) their Dardanian neighbours to the N.E. (819 ff.); (3) other Trojans from Zeleia (823 ff.) on the lower Aisepos, where the lowest spurs of Ida sink into the Propontic seaboard; (4) Adrasteia

^{1b} It might fairly be argued that account should be taken here of the possibility that the Odyssey for example may represent a later phase of Homeric belief or of Aegean history than the Iliad; or that a distinction should be observed between data supplied by the 'earlier' or the 'later' parts of the Iliad. But, quite apart from the uncertainty which surrounds the whole question of such dissection of the Homeric corpus, I have thought it better to act

on the view that relatively—though of course not absolutely—these minor distinctions are unimportant; and that even if some parts of 'Homer' may possibly be approximately as late as some parts of 'Hesiod,' clearness will be gained, without sacrifice of truth, by treating the Homeric Epic as a single group of data, and Hesiod and the other fragments of Epic as a distinct, and on the whole well contrasted group.

(simply 'Adrastos' town,' like Midaëion, Kotyaion, and the like) with Paisos (Apaisos), and Mt. Tereia, between Parion and Lampsakos (835 ff.): *i.e.* the poet has reached the E. margin of the Troad, and is returning by the sea-coast to (5) Perkote, Praktios (river), Arisbe (on the Selleis river), Abydos, and Sestos. With the mention of Sestos we have passed from Asia into Europe. Then come the Pelasgians (l. 840): then (6) the Thracians, 'all those whose frontier is the Hellespont' 845: then (7) the Kikones (ll. 846 ff.), who are fixed by *Od.* 9. 39-40 in their historic habitat 'under Ismaros,' west of the lower Hebrus: then (8) the Paeonians (ll. 848 ff.), who come from as far off as the Axios river. Here the confederacy of Priam has its limit westward; and the poet starts again from the Troad, and strikes out, first north-eastward through Paphlagonia and beyond; and then finally southward, through Mysia, Phrygia, Maeonia, and Caria, to Lycia, where the confederacy ends south-eastward. Priam's confederacy, in fact, once plotted out upon the map, reveals itself as a coalition of the whole northern and eastern shores of the Aegean against a 'blow at the heart' delivered by Agamemnon, as overlord of the south and east from Kos and Rhodes to Olympus, Ithaca, and Dodona.

Now the whole of the rest of this tripartite list is in correct geographical order so far as it goes; and the single omission of importance (that of Bithynia, between the Troad frontier at Zeleia on the Aisepos, and the Paphlagonians) is sufficiently accounted for (*a*) by the later consensus that the historic Bithynians (like the Mygdones of the Odryses river, inland of Daskyleion and Myrlea) were Thracians-in-Asia, whereas for the Catalogue-poet the limit of Priam's Thracians is the Hellespont;² (*b*) by the indication supplied by *Il.* 3. 184 ff. that the Phrygians themselves were but recently arrived in what later became Bithynia, and were still cutting their way up the Sangarios valley in the early manhood of King Priam.

The Catalogue, then, sets a block of Pelasgians between the home-country of the Troad and the Thracians; and the mention of Sestos in the previous section, along with Abydos and Arisbe, shows that the poet's survey has already reached *and crossed* the Hellespont. The probability therefore is that the Pelasgians of the Catalogue occupied an area between the Hellespont at Sestos, and the proper country of the Thracians.

At this point a geographical consideration comes to our aid. Between the Isthmus of the Chersonese, and the headquarters of the Thracians in the basin of the Hebrus, lies the rougher and more hilly tract from C. Sarpedon to the Hieron Oros, which in historic times was occupied by the Caeni and Apsinthians, but which, though overrun thus later by Thracian tribes, never became wholly incorporated in the geographical area of 'Thrace.' It is therefore not unreasonable to suppose that this same area corresponds with the non-Thracian, and at the same time non-Hellespontine area, which the poet of the Catalogue assigns to the 'Pelasgians.'

² In post-Homeric time we shall find copious evidence of this Thrako-Phrygian thrust south-eastward across the Hellespontine area. I have broken here my rule of not using post-

Homeric evidence as commentary on Homer; but only because the event under discussion is itself *ex hypothesi* post-Homeric.

It was inevitable that the occurrence of the place-name *Larisa* in this passage should give rise to copious speculation: particularly as one of the principal towns of Thessaly bore this name, and lay at no very great distance either from 'Pelasgian' Argos or from 'Pelasgian' Zeus at Dodona; and another Larisa (L. Kremaste, not mentioned in Homer) lay later closely adjacent to the former, in the territory assigned to Protesilaus. Prof. Ridgeway, for example,^{2a} pronounces without hesitation for the Thessalian Larisa, and avoids the obvious difficulty, how people from the Thessalian Larisa should be fighting on Priam's side, by laying stress on the form *ναιετάσκειν* as meaning 'used to live there, but have ceased to live there now.' But exactly the same grammatical form is used of the men of Karystos and Styra (l. 539); and there is no more reason in the one case than in the other, for supposing that they did not intend to go back to their respective homes, as soon as the war was over. Further, the form *ναιετάσκειν* does not differ appreciably in meaning from the ordinary imperfect, *ἔναιον*, which is used for example (l. 681) of the Achaean Hellenes who inhabited Pelasgic Argos; nor in the significance of the tense from the *καλεῖντο* of l. 684. Had these people then migrated long since from South Thessaly, and ceased to be called Myrmidons?

Moreover, even supposing that *ναιετάσκειν* had the meaning which is suggested, it proves nothing more as to the *Thessalian* Larisa than it would prove about any other of the numerous towns of this name. The place-name Larisa, in fact, is so common in the Aegean, that it is of no practical use as a landmark. Moreover, so common a name probably had at first a merely descriptive meaning. What if *Λάρισαν ναιετάσκειν* should be found to have meant that they 'dwelt in a Burgh'? If however it were legitimate to 'count heads' in such a matter, or to neglect the lateness of our authorities for all these place-names, the distribution of the name Larisa on the map would distinctly favour a Hellespontine home for the Homeric Pelasgi as against a Thessalian; for a clear majority of the known sites are strewn down the Anatolian coast, from the Troad southwards, in exactly the same manner as are, for example, the towns with the name Pedasa, which looks as if it had the same termination, and occupies the analogous place in the ethnological cycle of the Leleges; and, for that matter, also, as those with the place-name Magnesia, which has likewise its counterpart on the Thessalian side.

As long as it was thought admissible to regard the Pelasgians as an 'Asiatic people,'³ any one of these Asiatic towns would have served the purpose of this passage. And if it were not for the specific mention of Sestos, it would be tempting to regard these Pelasgians as covering the basin of the Satnioeis which is not separately mentioned in the Catalogue, though two heroes are described as coming from thence to the war.⁴ But against this

^{2a} *Early Age of Greece* (Cambridge 1901) i. p. 172.

³ On the evidence of *Il.* 10. 429; on which see below.

⁴ *Il.* 6. 34, 14. 445. This Larisa might then be identified with a little town of that name on the coast about five miles south of Alexandria Troas.

identification the following considerations are decisive: (1) it would utterly dislocate the geographical sequence of the tribe-groups; (2) this area is definitely assigned in other Homeric passages to the Leleges,⁵ who (with their neighbours, the Kilikes) are not mentioned in the Catalogue; (3) the epithet *ἐριβόλακος* is hardly applicable to the mere coast-strip some four miles long by two wide, which is all that the Troad Larisa can offer; (4) when the Pelasgian Hippothoon is killed in *Il.* 17. 301, it is *τῆλ' ἀπὸ Λαρίσης ἐριβόλακος*, and the Homeric usage of *τῆλε* is entirely against its application to a town only fifteen miles (on a straight road) from Troy, and fully in sight of it.⁶

It is probable then that the 'deep-soiled' Larisa of the Pelasgians in the Catalogue is yet another unidentified site which bore this wide-spread name; and that it is to be sought, with the Pelasgians of the Catalogue themselves, on the European side of the Hellespont; not improbably in the low fertile ground round the head of the Black Gulf, near the site of the later Lysimachia.

(2)

Il. 10. 428-31: *πρὸς μὲν ἄλδς Κᾶρες καὶ Παίονες ἀγκυλότοξοι
καὶ Λέλεγες καὶ Καύκωνες δίοι τε Πελασγοί,
πρὸς Θύμβρης δ' ἔλαχον Λύκιοι Μυσοί τ' ἀγέρωχοι
καὶ Φρύγες ἰππόδαμοι καὶ Μήγρες ἰπποκορυσταί.*

The passage is Dolon's statement of the order in which certain allies of Priam had been assigned their camping-grounds on either flank—*πρὸς ἄλδς*, *πρὸς Θύμβρης*—of Troy-Town. The names are not in geographical order: the Karians are separated from the majority of the Asiatic allies, and are brigaded, so to speak, with Paeonians and Leleges; and the Pelasgians are separated both from the Paeonians, and from the Thracians. The latter are expressly stated in the sequel (*l.* 433) to have arrived late, and occupied a separate camp by themselves. The passage would, indeed, have barely deserved mention, were it not that some modern writers⁷ have quoted it to prove that the Pelasgians are an Asiatic people, ignoring not only the whole tenour of the context, but the further circumstance that whatever conclusions are drawn from the passage as to the geographical situation of the Pelasgians must equally apply to that of the Paeonians in the preceding line. Yet no

⁵ *Il.* 10. 429 (Leleges, without locality, in the camp-passage); *Il.* 20. 92-6 (Leleges and Trojans inhabit Lyrnessos and Pedasos); *Il.* 21. 86-7 (Leleges live on the Satnioeis R., and Pedasos is their capital).

⁶ *E.g.* in the whole Trojan Catalogue only the Alizones and the Lycians come *τηλόθεν*: in *Il.* 16. 233 Zeus of Dodona is *τηλόθει ναίων*, *i.e.* remote from Olympus, or from Phthia. Strabo's phrase about the Troad Larisa, *ἐν ὄψει τελέως*, is wholly justified when tested on the

site.

⁷ *E.g.* Busolt, *Gr. Gesch.* i.² 165. 'also unter historischen Stämmen Kleinasien.' To justify this, he omits the Paeonians from his list: compare p. 166 'kleinasiatische P.' Compare also Holm, *Gr. Gesch.* i. p. 69. 'Sie werden erwähnt als asiatische Hülfsstruppen der Trojaner'; p. 70. 'Nach diesen Stellen (the Homeric passages) zu urtheilen sind sie ein Stamm der in Epirus, Thessalien und Kleinasien sass.'

one, so far as I am aware, has ventured to contend that the Paeonians are an Asiatic people.⁸

(3)

Od. 19. 175-7 (describing the peoples of Crete): ἔν μὲν Ἀχαιοί,
 ἐν δ' Ἐτεόκρητες μεγαλήτορες, ἐν δὲ Κύδωνες,
 Δωριέες τε τριχᾶϊκες, δῖοί τε Πελασγοί.

Note here, first, that, as the context shows, the object of the poet is to 'add verisimilitude' to one of Odysseus' many inventions. Any information which it gives, therefore, may be assumed to have been correct information for the poet's original audience, as well as for the presumed audience of Odysseus. The passage therefore describes the populations of Crete as they appeared at the date of the composition of the poem; and it is consequently of the first value as evidence in the present enquiry.

At first sight it is not obvious how a tribe, whom elsewhere Homeric poets only know as a European people bordering on the Hellespont, should also have had an abode in Crete. But the context in which the Pelasgians are introduced seems to supply a clue. Of the other peoples enumerated, two, the Eteokretes and the Kydones, may probably be assumed to be indigenous (in a general sense); the former in the east of the island, where tradition and archaeology alike attest the survival in historic times of a distinct type of language and culture; the latter in the west, *ἰπὰν πόδα νεύατον*—so to speak—of the mountains of Sphakia. The Achaeans, on the other hand, may fairly be regarded as a southerly section of the Achaeans of the Greek mainland; and these we may accept, on Homeric authority, as comparatively recent immigrants.⁹

There remain the Dorians and the Pelasgians: both—like the Peloponnesian Achaeans of Herodotus viii. 73—in an intermediate position, neither exclusively Cretan, like the Kydones and Eteokretes, nor quite recent *ἐπήλυδες* like the Achaeans of Idomeneus. Anything therefore which we may infer from this passage as to the Cretan Pelasgians must either be applicable, provisionally at all events,^{9a} to the Cretan Dorians, or there must be countervailing evidence, of Homeric date, to enable us to differentiate the two cases. But the latter alternative is out of the question, for Dorians are not elsewhere mentioned at all in Homeric literature. We are therefore

⁸ Relying on *Il.* 2. 848-9, 16. 287-8, I make a present to the adversary of Hdt. 5. 23. 98, where the *force majeure* of Darius makes them 'Asiatic' for a season, as strategical needs do here!

⁹ For the pedigree of Idomeneus see the lines which immediately follow *Od.* 19. 178-81, and *Il.* 13. 449-453: it 'goes up to a god,' as Hecataeus would say, in the third generation: Idomeneus—Deucalion (the Argonaut)—Minos

—Zeus.

^{9a} If it were possible to demonstrate that any real ethnic or political convulsion occurred in the Aegean after the composition of *Iliad* ii but before the composition of *Odyssey* xix, this argument would of course be invalidated. This however is one of those prospective refinements in the treatment of these data which, as I have explained already, I have felt at liberty to neglect, in the interest of the main argument.

confined by our present purpose to such inferences only as would hold good equally of Dorians.¹⁰

Now the obvious inference, as to the Pelasgians, is that the Cretan Pelasgians were so called by the poet because they were known by him to be a branch of the Hellespontine Pelasgians: they are distinguished from the old population of the island, and linked with a people whom we have strong reason for believing to be of more northerly origin; and geographical considerations once more confirm the impression that the Pelasgians also hail from the north. The north wind prevails in the Aegean area for by far the greater part of the year: Homeric sailors at all events were well acquainted with its behaviour; and Crete, lying as it does like a breakwater across the mouth of the Aegean, was probably already then the same dreaded 'lee-shore' that it has been ever since, for every boat which goes adrift south of the Dardanelles.¹¹ Even on the modern map of Crete, place-names like *Τοπόλια*, *Βουλγάρος*, *Σκλαβιδοχώρι*, *Σκλαβοπούλα*—perhaps also *Ψωσσοχώρι* and *Ψώσσα-σπίτια*,—are sufficient evidence of what happens; and the post-Homeric stories of Phrygian settlements, no less than the occurrence of Phrygian cults, and of North-Aegean place-names like *Λάρισα*, *Ίδα*, and the Macedonian *Πύδνα* (*Ίεράπυτνα*)¹² and *Δίον* (*Δία*) go far to confirm the inference already drawn from the geography.

The mention of Macedonian place-names recalls us to the question whether the argument is equally applicable, as it should be, to the Cretan Dorians of the *Odyssey*. The non-mention of Dorians on the Homeric mainland makes it impossible to complete the parallel directly; but there is another case of silence in the poems, so significant that it can hardly be due to chance; while, if it is not due to chance, it comes very near supplying the missing link in our reasoning. Of all the coast-line of the Aegean, from Malea to the coast of Lycia, only one section is unaccounted for in the Catalogues of *Iliad* 2. Priam's confederacy ranges, as we have seen, from Lycia to the Hellespont, and from the Hellespont to the river Axios: Agamemnon's allies extend from Rhodes and Kos to Peloponnese and the Western Islands, and thence to Oloosson (*Elassona*) on the northern frontier of Thessaly. But of the coast of Macedon itself, from the foot of Olympus to the mouth of the Axios, there is not a word from the beginning to the end of

¹⁰ This point of view was in vogue already in late antiquity. Andron for example (fr. 3, quoted by Strabo 475) would seem to derive all three alike from Thessaly: impelled, no doubt, by the later belief that there were Pelasgians as well as Achaeans and Dorians in Thessaly. *τοὺς μὲν οὖν Ἐτεόκρητας καὶ τοὺς Κύδωνας αὐτόχθονας ὑπάρξαι εἰκόσ, τοὺς δὲ λοιποὺς ἐπήλυδας, οὓς ἐκ Θεσσαλίας φησὶν ἔλθειν ἄνδρων τῆς Δωρίδος μὲν πρότερον νῦν δὲ Ἑσθιαιωτῆδος λεγομένης.* But Andron's guess is neither Homer nor Homeric.

¹¹ Professor Ridgeway has taken exactly the

reverse view (*Early Age of Greece*, p. 86). 'As it is an island far removed from the rest of Greece, it was much less likely to have its population mixed by constant advances of other tribes, such as took place in the history of northern Greece and northern Italy.' What I say in the text rests only on my own experience of Crete, on that of the people I have met there, and on the history of Aegean navigation since Homeric times.

¹² *Λαρισαῖον πεδῖον* at Hierapytna. Str. 440: *Λάρισα* = Gortyna. St. Byz. s.v. *Γόρτυν*.

the epic. Now if the unanimous Hellenic tradition¹³ is correct, that the Dorians of historic times made their immediate entry into Greece in post-Homeric times, and from the north; and if, as Herodotus states, in the stage which immediately preceded that entry they were 'described as a Macedonian folk,' it would be exactly this strip of coast which would fall first into the hands of the new-comers, and give them access to the sea. It would be this strip also, consequently, which would first fall *out* of the ken of Aegean political life in the event of invasion from the north. Macedon in fact was already in the Homeric Age the thin end of the black wedge of barbarism, which two generations later was to be driven into the heart of the Aegean.

In the light of this consideration, the occurrence of a Dorian vanguard in Homeric Crete becomes not only natural but almost inevitable: as inevitable in fact, under the geographical conditions, then and now, as the occurrence there of a vanguard of Pelasgians; supposing only that the Pelasgians, as the previous passages have sufficiently suggested, were a people of the north-east angle of the Aegean, exposed to closely analogous pressure seawards from the Thracio-Phrygian movement across their *Hinterland*.¹⁴

§ 3—*The Adjective Πελασγικός in Homer.*

It illustrates well the peculiar methods of criticism which have been tolerated hitherto, that the two Homeric passages on which the greatest stress has been laid by commentators on this topic are those in which the Pelasgians themselves are not expressly named, or stated to exist in the areas in question; but where the mere adjective Πελασγικός is used to express some attribute which in the poet's mind recalled analogous attributes in the Pelasgians who were known to himself; and where, moreover, it is possible without going outside the text of the *Iliad* itself to set up a fair probability that there *were not* any Pelasgian inhabitants at the period described in the poems. The two passages are as follows:—

(4)

Il. 2. 681–4: Νῦν αὖ τοὺς ὄσσοι τὸ Πελασγικὸν Ἄργος ἔναιον,
οἳ τ' Ἄλουν οἳ τ' Ἀλόπην οἳ τε Τρηχίν' ἐνέμοντο,
οἳ τ' εἶχον Φθίην ἠδ' Ἑλλάδα καλλιγύναικα,
Μυρμιδόνες δὲ καλεῦντο καὶ Ἕλληνες καὶ Ἀχαιοί.

It will be admitted, I think, that it is a little unfortunate for the supporters

¹³ Here, as above, p. 173, I am using post-Homeric evidence solely to establish a post-Homeric event.

¹⁴ If further analogies be desired, they are supplied by the copious Hellenic tradition of the *Thracian* settlements in Euboea, in

Attica, and in Naxos, which belong, apparently, to the same immediately post-Homeric period as those Thracian incursions into Hellespontine Asia, which resulted in the establishment of a Bithynia. But the extant evidence for all this is comparatively late.

of current 'Pelagic Theories,' that on the one occasion in the Homeric poems where the epithet 'Pelagic' is applied to any *locality* at all, the poet should have so rapidly corrected any false impressions which this might convey, by adding that the people who actually lived there were not called 'Pelagians' or anything of the kind, but were in fact specifically 'Achaean,' and indeed uniquely 'Hellenes.' Note, moreover, that the Πελασγικὸν Ἄργος of Homer is a quite different region of Thessaly from that which contains Λάρισα.

The difficulty is usually evaded¹⁵ by explaining that though Πελασγικὸν Ἄργος was held by Hellenes in the time of the poet, or in the time of the Trojan War, it had once upon a time been inhabited by Pelagians, and that possibly descendants of these Pelagians may have survived as subjects of Achaean and Hellenic conquerors. All this however is commentator's inference, not the statement of the Homeric poet; and it will hardly be contended that a passage like this stands in the same plane of authority with that in the 'Trojan Catalogue' (*Il.* 2. 843). What it was about the Thessalian Argos which struck the poet or his audience as 'Pelagic,' it is probably too late to determine; but it may be conjectured that the phrase may have been suggested by some such remains of early or at all events pre-Achaean fortifications as are so prominent later in Attic legends. No such connotation however would be possible at all until the Pelagic name had ceased to be merely denotative, and had come to be used in just such a general sense of 'prehistoric' as would naturally prompt the observation, which follows, that though the *town*¹⁶ was of immemorial age, its *inhabitants* now were Achaeans, Hellenes, and Myrmidons, and of quite recent institution there. And this is all that, for the moment, we are concerned to show. 'Pelagian' in fact had already two senses in Homeric Greek: it meant, as a substantive, certain actual allies of Priam, and their congeners in Crete: as an adjective it meant 'prehistoric'—'that which once was, but most emphatically is not now.' Of course the occurrence of a connotative adjective of this kind is as far from disproving, as it is from proving, that the facts were as the poet seems to have believed: 'prehistoric' is not by any means the same as 'unhistoric.' All that I contend for is that if a Pelagian population of this Argos is ever assumed to have existed, it shall be on some more convincing data than can be derived from this passage.

The other adjectival passage is the phrase in the prayer of Achilles:—

¹⁵ E.g. Busolt, *Gr. Gesch.* i.² 165 'Das Epitheton Pelasgikon setzt jedenfalls voraus, dass in Thessalien Pelasger wohnten oder gewohnt hatten:' cf. 167 'so mussten wohl die Pelasger die vor-achaischen und vor-hellenischen autochthonen Bewohner des Landes gewesen sein.' See also S. Bruck, *Quae veteres de Pelasgis tradiderint* (Breslau 1884), p. 5.

¹⁶ Whether τὸ Πελασγικὸν Ἄργος means the *town* (ranging with Halos, Alope, and the rest)

or the *district*, is a matter of indifference to the argument. Analogy suggests that in the Catalogue, as it stands, a specific *town* is intended. In any case we must note that τὸ Πελασγικὸν Ἄργος in Homer means a quite different part of Thessaly from the Πελασγιωτῆς of Hellenic and later writers; and that the area of this Πελασγιωτῆς is quite differently accounted for in the Homeric Catalogue; as also is the country round the Thessalian Larisa.

(5)

Il. 16. 233-5 : Ζεῦ, ἄνα, Δωδωναίε, Πελασγικέ, τηλόθι ναίων,
 Δωδώνης μεδέων δυσχειμέρου· ἀμφὶ δὲ Σελλοὶ
 σοὶ ναίουσ' ὑποφῆται, ἀνιπτόποδες, χαμαιεῦναι.

Here we should note, first, that it is not quite clear why Achilles—most Hellenic of all the Achaeans, according to *Il. 2. 681 ff.* above—should pray in his deepest need to a Zeus 'of the Pelasgians,'¹⁷ if by this he meant actual contemporary non-Hellenic inhabitants of Dodona. To assume that Zeus of Dodona is a local 'Pelasgian' deity annexed by Achaean conquerors is to beg the question. Moreover, the more local a deity is, in all ages, the more restricted is his sphere of influence: for an Achaean at Troy the unqualified Zeus of the rest of the *Iliad*, anthropomorphic and *πολυπλόγητος κάρτα* as the Achaeans themselves, was surer defence than a *Gau-gott* in Epirus.

Next, the poet of the Catalogue at all events was aware that the actual inhabitants of Dodona were no more Pelasgians than were those of 'Pelasgic Argos:' for *Il. 2. 749* expressly describes them as 'Ἐνιῆνες (Aenianes) and Perrhaebians, both of them well-established and wide-spread Thessalian peoples who persisted into Hellenic times in this region,^{17a} and are in no sense identifiable with Pelasgians.¹⁸ Here therefore, as in South Thessaly, we have only the name, not the people themselves, in Homeric times; but here, fortunately, we have something of a clue, which was wanting wholly in Thessaly, as to *why* the Pelasgian name was appropriate to the cult of Zeus of Dodona.

If there were two points of behaviour on which an Achaean, whether chieftain, or poet, or audience, was scrupulously careful in daily life, it was in the use of the bath, and in the choice and arrangement of his bedding. If there were any two points therefore in which the dancing-dervishes of Dodona would seem remarkable and repulsive in the eyes of an Achaean, it would be that they were *ἀνιπτόποδες, χαμαιεῦναι*; and the only possible excuse for such behaviour in the ministers of a god to whom an Achaean chief could pray thus as to his own god, would be that this was actually part of the immemorial observance, and came down from 'prehistoric,' that is to say (as in Thessaly) from 'Pelasgian' times.

I admit that at one time I was puzzled by the intrusion, at such a moment, of details so grotesque and so pedantic; especially as there was no evidence either of interpolation in the prayer itself, or of 'late' tastelessness in the context; and consequently no doubt that we have here as genuine and fervent a prayer as the poet could frame for his hero. But we have only

¹⁷ Busolt, i.² 165, conjectures that Zeus of Dodona 'auch der einheimische Gott der Pelasgischen Thessaliens war.' This presupposes the existence of a Thessalian Dodona such as was invented by Unger (*Philol. Suppl.* Bd. ii. 1863, pp. 377 ff.) on the basis of a note of Suidas. Cf. Niese, *Hom. Schiffskatalog*, p. 43.

^{17a} *E.g.* Busolt, i.² 165.

¹⁸ Except of course in so far as Pelasgian can be forced to mean the 'Mediterranean Race' of modern Italian ethnologists; and even here I have my doubts whether the populations of Pindus would be accepted by ethnologists as in any true sense 'Mediterranean.'

to glance at our own Book of Common Prayer to see that the practice of piling up descriptive phrases in invocation is not confined to Homeric liturgy; and it does not need great experience of popular extempore prayer, to confirm the observation that the descriptive invocations which mean most to the suppliant are often quite ludicrous to the bystander. What the function of such descriptive invocations may be is not yet clear. Most probably they are of the nature of a pass-word, intimating to the deity, by allusion to some intimate quality or mystic rite, that the suppliant is himself initiate and fit to be heard. But doubtless they serve also to express and to enhance the suppliant's mental presentment of the recipient of his prayer; and also, no doubt, like picturesque abuse, to attract the attention of a god who, for the moment, peradventure sleepeth.

In this sense then, that he was a god with an ancient and unusual ritual, Zeus of Dodona may conceivably have been 'Pelasgic;' and certainly not demonstrably in any other. It is exactly as if a man nowadays should describe Stonehenge as 'Druidical.' No word is said in the text as to worship paid by *Pelasgians* either recent or extinct; and no Pelasgians can be shown, on Homeric evidence at all events, to have existed in Homeric times nearer than Crete and the Hellespont.

On the other hand, each of these two adjectival passages, taken literally and in connexion with Homeric passages solely, does seem to suggest that adjectivally 'Pelasgian' meant already not merely 'prehistoric,' but either positively 'pre-Achaean,' or negatively merely 'non-Achaean': that in fact the correlative—as well as connotative—usage, which predominated in Hellenic times, was already familiar in the Homeric Age.

§ 4.—*The Origin of the Connotative Usage of 'Pelasgian' in Homer.*

How did this antithesis between 'Pelasgian' and 'Achaean' arise? Again a probable answer seems to suggest itself, when once we refrain from contaminating Homeric texts with the later Hellenic commentary. Among all their references to earlier times the Homeric poets know no such universal 'gathering of the clans' as that which rallied to the aid of Menelaos. The Trojan Expedition then, as Thucydides was aware, was probably the first exploit—not excepting even the original Achaean Invasion, which may well have been gradual—which was in the strict sense *Panhellenic*, and so the first occasion on which a common designation was required for the members of the great confederacy. Hence two phenomena: firstly, a struggle for survival among several generic names, 'Ἀργεῖοι, Δαναοί, Ἀχαιοί,' with a marked predominance of the last named; secondly, the beginnings—under the literary stress of the compilation of the catalogue—of a new use of an originally merely tribal name Ἕλληνες, not merely as synonymous *both* with the specific *Μυρμιδόνες* and with the generic Ἀχαιοί but also as a characterization-word to express *connotatively* that dawning 'Hellenism' which was coming to be the common bond between chief and people, as well as between chief and chief. This latter connotative sense,

moreover, comes out more clearly still in the obviously 'coined' word *Πανέλληνες* in the description of Aias a few lines further on.^{18a} For Aias was not in the strict sense a 'Hellene' (*i.e.* a Myrmidon-Achaeon) at all.

The Homeric Achaeans, then, were brought to the very brink of 'Hellenism' by the crisis of the Trojan War; and in the compilation of the Catalogue the momentous name came to light. What determined, then, the choice of a correlative? In all probability, the same great crisis, and its sequel.

Thucydides explains the absence of the word *βαρβάρους* in Homeric Greek, *διὰ τὸ μηδ' Ἑλληνῆς πῶ*. But the converse also is valid: as soon as the Hellenic peoples began to feel the need of a common denomination for themselves, the need arose also for a common word for 'non-Hellenic.' The Homeric poets had however no single generic word for the confederates of Priam, and the circumstance, that the war was mainly a siege of Troy, made the name *Τρῶες*, and its quasi-synonyms *Δάρδανοι*, *Τεῦκροι* more nearly adequate than might otherwise have been the case.

Pass on however to the period which immediately followed the war. Troy-town had fallen; the hegemony of Priam was at an end; extensive settlements of Achaean 'Hellenes,' as the place-names¹⁹ and the archaeological evidence show, occurred on the Troad coast; and the need for a generic name for the neighbouring tribes recurred with renewed force. Landwards in Asia Minor, indeed, the old names 'Mysian' or 'Phrygian' seem to have remained in use for the nearest large groups of folk, who were moreover closely akin to the old Trojans. The Troad itself, with its population always mongrel, and its varying degrees of Hellenization, easily acquired the descriptive title of *Αἰολίς*—'patchwork-land.' It was only seawards, therefore, beyond the Hellespont, that any real difficulty would arise. Now exactly in this direction the contrast between Greek settler and barbarous native was being enhanced, during this very period, by that Thracian thrust which we have already seen to correspond dynamically with the Dorian thrust in the North-West Aegean; and with so marked a geographical feature as the Hellespont between Hellenic Asia and non-Hellenic Europe, it would be only natural to expect that the correlative to 'Hellene'—for this corner of the Hellenic world at all events—would be the name of the dominant or characteristic native tribe. Now we have already seen that in the Catalogue the dominant folk in this area between Hebrus and Hellespont are not the Thracians strictly so-called but the Pelasgi; and it was probably in some such circumstances as these that the antithesis of *Ἑλλην* and *Πελασγός* first took rise.²⁰ From

^{18a} *Iliad* 2. 530.

¹⁹ The case of Achilleion and Sigeion are typical. The Athenians, in the time of Perikles, could claim *οὐδὲν μᾶλλον Αἰολεῦσι μετεῶν τῆς Ἰλιάδος χώρας ἢ οὐ καὶ σφίσι καὶ τοῖσι ἄλλοισι, ὅσοι Ἑλλήνων συνεπρήξαντο Μενέλεω τὰς Ἑλένης ἀρπαγὰς*. Hdt. v. 94.

²⁰ All who like Busolt *G.G.* i.² 157 conjec-

ture that the antithesis arose in Thessaly, and was transferred during the Aeolic migration to Aeolis may reasonably be asked first to catch their Thessalian Pelasgians, and then to point to the circumstances (if any) *other* than the existence of our trans-Hellespontine Pelasgians, which made the transference itself appropriate

meaning 'pre-Achaean' in the mother country the name of the Pelasgi comes now to mean 'pre-Hellenic' in this colonial region; but acquires also now the further connotation of 'barbarous' which we can trace indeed to the case of Zeus of Dodona, but which does not otherwise meet us till we come to Hellenic writers.

We have thus, within Homeric time, a situation in which almost inevitably the names Ἕλλην and Πελασγός came, in merely descriptive fashion, to stand for 'civilized' and 'uncivilized' respectively: so that it was possible for a Homeric poet to describe either rude non-Achaean fortifications, or uncouth ritual survivals, as 'Pelasgian,' without intending to convey any suggestion as to the ethnological status of their originators.

That this interpretation of the evidence is correct is suggested also by comparison with what happened elsewhere. In the South-East Aegean we hear little of Πελασγοί; and in proportion as they recede from view, two other names Κάρες and Λέλεγες become prominent as generic names for non-Hellenes. Here, fortunately, in the case of the Carians, the Homeric evidence is sufficient to show that in Homeric times these folks were already dominant in Caria, and in possession of coast towns; that their speech was unintelligible to Achaeans; and that they were philo-Trojan. To this, the subsequent evidence adds only this: first that the domination of actual Carians over Caria persisted until the fourth century and later; but, secondly, that in the interval between Homer and Herodotus, there sprang up in the South Aegean a great 'Carian Theory'—in all respects analogous to the 'Pelasgian Theory' of the North Aegean—in which many 'Carian'-looking survivals and antiquities, in Crete, in the islands, and even so far afield as Attica and the Megarid, were construed in the light of the piratical performances of the real Carians of the vii-vi centuries as evidence of a wide-spread 'Carian' barbarism in pre-Hellenic times: until, by a strange inversion of history, it is to a direct ancestor of the Achaean Idomeneus that the first 'pan-Hellenic' crusade was attributed by the writers of the fifth century.²¹

An examination of the ancient references to the Leleges leads to a similar result. An actual people, in Homer, on the Asiatic coast land, they fade, in Hellenic times, first into the fabled builders of archaic τάφοι and πολίσματα, then into an ethnologists' label for pre-historic traits in Messenia and other parts of European Greece.^{21a}

§ 5.—*Lemnos, Imbros, and the Hellespontine Area in Homer.*

Before leaving the Homeric data, mention should be made of two groups of passages, which, though in a sense negative evidence, are of some importance when compared with the statements of fifth century writers.

One group concerns the population of Lemnos and Imbros in the Homeric Age. Both islands are mentioned as geographical stepping-stones

²¹ Hdt. i. 171. Thuc. i. 4.

^{21a} Strabo 611. Cf. Paton and Myres, *J.H.S.* xvi, 267-70.

between Europe and Asia,²² and are quite well known to the poet; but so far from being occupied by Pelasgians from the adjacent mainland, or by any allies of Priam at all, they are apparently on the Achaean side. Lemnos in particular is still the 'city of Thoas,'²³ and ruled by Eunëus, son of Jason and Hypsipyle,²⁴ who had apparently allowed the Achaeans to put in to Lemnos on their way to Troy,²⁵ and traded on provisions at their camp.²⁶ He also seems to have been of use to them by providing a market for their prisoners of war, for he bought Lycaon son of Priam from Patroclus with a Sidonian cup which had belonged to Thoas.²⁷ Eetion of Imbros carried on a similar slave trade with Eunëus, and in due course bought Lycaon;²⁸ but, being a *ξείνος* of the House of Priam, let his purchase escape and go home: or perhaps this indirect ransom of a princely prisoner was a 'put-up affair' throughout. In any case there is no trace of a Pelasgian in either island; and not only is the Minyan occupation still effective, but a native population is described, which is twice expressly described as *Σίντιες*.²⁹ In both passages they are mentioned in connexion with Hephaestus; but they are not stated to stand in any special relation to him,³⁰ and they cannot be merely mythical, for they are *ἀγριόφωνοι*,³¹ and this implies personal experience of them on the part not merely of the Achaeans but of the poet or his audience. The *Σίντιες* do not appear at all in historic times in Lemnos; but we shall see that a tribe of similar name existed on the neighbouring mainland to the north in the latter part of the fifth century (p. 205).

The other group of passages concerns the Hellespont, and implies at the same time a frontier and a tendency to migrate beyond it; and we shall be dealing so much with theories of migration in the sequel, that a Homeric hint of migration in the Hellespontine area must not be overlooked. The definition of the Thracians in the catalogue as

*ὄσσοις Ἐλλάσποντος ἀγάρροοι ἐντὸς ἔεργει,*³²

clearly suggests that, though the Thracians of Europe were under the overlordship of Priam, there existed other Thracians whom the Hellespont had had not succeeded in confining, and who led a more or less nomadic life on its further or Asiatic bank, like the Galatae of eventual Galatia. That a Thracian invasion of North-western Asia had already begun in Homeric times is probable, if only for this reason, that it is almost impossible to say where (in the generic sense) Thracian ended and Phrygian began; and it was only in Priam's youth, we must remember, that the Phrygians themselves had pushed up the valley of the Sangarius and fought their great battle

²² Lemnos, *Il.* 14. 230, 281; Imbros, 14. 281.

²³ *Il.* 14. 230.

²⁴ *Il.* 7. 467: 21. 40-42.

²⁵ *Il.* 8. 230

²⁶ *Il.* 7. 467.

²⁷ *Il.* 23. 745-7.

²⁸ *Il.* 21. 42-4.

²⁹ *Il.* 1. 554, *Od.* 8. 294.

³⁰ In the *Iliad* they merely pick him up when he was thrown out of Heaven: in the *Odyssey* too (in the mouth of his flighty lady) they are 'those horrid people' whom he will find when he goes to Lemnos.

³¹ *Od.* 8. 294.

³² *Il.* 2. 845.

with the Amazon-folk.³³ Now if, and when, any such pressure on the European shores of the Hellespont was in progress, the immediate and inevitable result would be to squeeze out the Pelasgians of the Catalogue from Europe into Asia³⁴: and exactly this result we shall meet before long.

§ 6.—*Hesiod and the Later Epic.*

For the long period which intervenes between Homer and Herodotus our sources are unfortunately very few and very fragmentary. They are sufficient, however, to show that the double usage of the Pelasgian name, which we have observed already in Homer, was provoking commentary and speculation; and they give some idea of the directions in which theorists were working. The period divides rather sharply into two phases; an earlier, in which our authorities are few and mainly epic, and where the allusions are incidental and explanatory; and a later, in which we are confronted with a critical and constructive movement, of rapidly increasing originality, and of a growing complexity and multiplicity both of local traditions and of schools of enquiry. It will be convenient still, as in the case of Homer, to keep separate so far as possible the denotative substantival, and the connotative adjectival passages.

A.—*Actual Pelasgians.*—Hesiod (Strabo 327 = fr. 225 Kinkel) is quoted as saying of somebody,

Δωδώνην φηγόν τε, Πελασγῶν ἔδρανον, ἦεν

which suggests that he interpreted the Homeric phrase Ζεῦ, ἄνα, Δωδωναίε, Πελασγικέ as if it referred to an actual settlement of Pelasgians at Dodona.^{34a} Now as Homer populates Dodona not with Pelasgians but with Perrhaebi and Enienes, Hesiod's phrase must imply either dependence on Homeric tradition for a description of Dodona as it might have been in pre-Achaean time—in which case the passage becomes evidence not of ethnology but of current theory—; or, if it is really descriptive of Dodona as it was in Hesiod's time (not much before 700 B.C.), it gives us this important addition to our knowledge, that, as we shall see in the case of Lemnos, the arrival of Hesiod's Pelasgians at Dodona must be assigned to post-Homeric time. In either case Hesiod's phrase is no proof that the Pelasgians were autochthonous at Dodona or even existed there in Homer's time.³⁵

³³ *Il.* 3. 181-189

³⁴ For a very remarkable echo in a late writer of this Homeric conception of a 'Thrakophrygian thrust' see the passage of Apollonius of Rhodes in the *Appendix* p. 222 below.

^{34a} Here he is more than followed by Holm, *Gr. Gesch.* i. 69. 'Hesiod hat dann ausdrücklich gesagt, dass Dodona der Sitz der Pelasger war.' Surely the most that may be argued is that Dodona was a settlement of Pelasgians.

³⁵ In later times it certainly was not always interpreted so. Ephorus for example, who as we shall see was mainly responsible for the rehabilitation of Hesiodic views about the Pelasgians, certainly regarded Dodona as one of the settlements of his Pelasgian emigrants from Arcadia. (Ephoros *ap.* Strabo 337 ἔστι δ', ὡς φησιν Ἐφορος, Πελασγῶν ἕδρανμα (ἡ Δωδώνη)· οἱ δὲ Πελασγοὶ τῶν περὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα δυναστευόντων ἀρχαιότατοι λέγονται.)

B. *Theoretical Pelasgians*.—Asius, who flourished about 700 B.C., is quoted by Pausanias (8. 1. 4) as follows:—

ἀντίθεον δὲ Πελασγὸν ἐν ὑψικόμοισιν ὄρεσσι
Γαῖα μέλαιν' ἀνέδωκεν, ἵνα θνητῶν γένος εἴη.

Here for the first time a man 'Pelasgus' appears as an individual eponymos; and also not merely as 'prehistoric,' but as 'primitive,'—the first of mankind. Pausanias has just stated that 'the Arcadians say that Pelasgus was the first man who lived in this land;' but an *Arcadian* origin is not claimed for Pelasgus in the passage of Asius, and there is no more reason for holding that Asius believed Pelasgus to have been an Arcadian than for holding that he made him a Dodonaean or a Thessalian.

Hesiod, similarly, knew of an individual Pelasgus, who was 'autochthonous' (Ἡσίοδος δὲ τὸν Πελασγὸν αὐτόχθονά φησιν εἶναι).³⁶ In this he agreed with Asius; but he went further when he wrote *υἱεῖς ἐξεγένοντο Λυκάονος ἀντιθέοιο, ὃν ποτε τίκτε Πελασγός*³⁷: for Lycaon is the great culture hero of Western Arcadia, and the progenitor of a family which came eventually to include some fifty eponymi of various places and peoples in Greece.

The contrast presented by these passages from the later epic with the Homeric evidence is apparent at once. In place either of real people familiarly known, or vague allusions to a mysterious past we have a clear-cut theory which represented Pelasgus as the Primeval Man, and consequently his descendants, the Pelasgians, as representatives of an aboriginal race and a primitive phase of culture; and we have also a further stage of theory in the localization of Pelasgus (and consequently of Pelasgians) in Arcadia, which is quite foreign to Homer, and marks the first step in a new path of speculation which we have next to follow out among the writers of the late sixth century and of the fifth.

§ 7.—*The Logographers of the Sixth and Early Fifth Century.*

Two distinct movements may be recognized among the Logographers. On the one hand the method of personification employed by Hesiod and Asius is applied to other parts of Greece, in which traces of Pelasgians were admitted. Hecataeus for example³⁸ makes Pelasgus a king in Thessaly: for Thessaly, he says, was called Pelasgia ἀπὸ Πελασγοῦ τοῦ βασιλέως. On the other hand, more than one writer, accepting the Hesiodic theory that Pelasgus was the First Man, were at pains to harmonize this theory with the claims of other peoples in Greece to be regarded as aboriginal.

Acusilaus, for instance, writing at about the same time as Hecataeus, seems to have interpolated a personal Pelasgus into the primeval genealogy of Argos. In this genealogy, Niobe, daughter of Phoroneus, becomes the

³⁶ Apoll. ii. 1. 1, 7 = Hesiod fr. 68 Kinkel.

³⁸ Schol. Apoll. Rhod. 4. 266.

³⁷ Str. 221 = fr. Kinkel.

earliest mortal consort of Zeus and gives birth to Argos. Acusilaus, himself an Argive, annotates this pedigree like that of the proverbial Welshman—‘about this time Adam was born’—and inserts Pelasgus as a cadet brother of Argos. The rest of the genealogy is the expanded version already mentioned of the Hesiodic theory: Pelasgus becomes the father of Lycaon, ὃς βασιλεύσας Ἀρκάδων ἐκ πολλῶν γυναικῶν πεντήκοντα παῖδας ἐγέννησε, including the *εponymi* of many Arcadian towns, and even of remoter Greek and non-Greek peoples: Thesprotus, Peucetius, Caucon, Macedonus, Phthius, Lycius, and the like. The list ends with Νύκτινος or Νύκτιμος, a ‘twilight’ personage associated with a *Dämmerung* in the shape of Deucalion’s Flood. Meanwhile Lycaon has also a daughter Callisto, who becomes by Zeus the mother of Arcas. Arcas, in due course, survives the Deluge, and becomes the founder of historic Arcadia. How much of all this was the real sequel to Hesiod’s phrase *υἱεῖς ἐξεγένοντο Λυκάονος ἀντιθέοιο*, or how much is later superstructure, is an open question.³⁹ All that is of importance here is the fact, recorded by Apollodorus,⁴⁰ that it was Acusilaus who engrafted Pelasgus into the Argive pedigree,—‘Phoroneus, —Niobe—Argos,’—and that this interpolation took place in defiance of the authority of Hesiod, who had made Pelasgus an *αὐτόχθων*.

That the expanded genealogy of Lycaon was a systematic attempt to ascribe ‘Pelasgian’ ancestry to certain sets of Greeks, especially in the North-West, is clear from the version ascribed to Pherecydes by Dionysius of Halicarnassus.⁴¹ Πελασγοῦ καὶ Δηιανείρης γίνεται Λυκάων . . . οὗτος γαμεί Κυλλήνην νηίδα νύμφην, ἀφ’ ἧς τὸ ὄρος ἢ Κυλλήνη καλεῖται—this domiciles Lycaon, as before, in Arcadia—ἔπειτα τοὺς ἐκ τούτων γεννηθέντας διεξιῶν, καὶ τίνας τόπους ἕκαστοι τούτων ᾤκησαν, Οἰνώτρον καὶ Πευκετίου μμνήσκειται λέγων ὁδε:—κτλ. Here we have a clear formulation of the theory of a *diaspora* of Pelasgian peoples from Arcadia north-westward, to which system and currency were given later on by Ephorus. And we can hardly doubt that the goal of this north-westward movement was the Πελασγῶν ἔδρανον at Dodona, which we have seen reason to believe that Hesiod had invented out of the Homeric epithet of Dodonaean Zeus.

Hellanicus, a generation later, writing ἐν Ἀργολικαῖς like the Argive Acusilaus, makes another and quite different attempt to associate the lineage of Pelasgus with a genealogy which is essentially Argive. This

³⁹ This genealogy comes to us as the work of Acusilaus in Apollodorus ii. 1. 1, cf. iii. 8. i., confirmed by Dionysius of Halicarnassus i. 17. 3 and Tzetzes, *Lyc.* 481.

⁴⁰ iii. 8. 1.

⁴¹ *Fragt.* 85=Dionys. Hal. i. 13. It is a misfortune that it is not possible to disentangle with certainty the contributions of the three writers named Pherecydes. Everything that is attributed to them on this topic is so saturated with the ideas of Ephorus (see §§ 14–16 below) that my own inclination is to assign all to the

latest of them. But Ephorus certainly used a great mass of genealogical material of earlier than fourth century date: genealogical study of this elaborate kind is characteristic of the later sixth and early fifth century; and in the particular case of Lycaon we have evidence that a metrical genealogy existed which was attributed to Hesiod. So, rather than press my own view of the matter to an extreme, I have chosen to discuss the statements of Pherecydes as if they belonged to the *λογογράφος* of that name. See also p. 220 below.

theory comes to us in the following form.⁴² Triopas, who stands in the same eponymous relation to the Dorian *hecarpolis* on the Carian coast, as the hero Argos does to its Argive metropolis, had three sons, Iasus, Pelasgus, and Agenor. On the death of Triopas, these 'divided his kingdom.' Pelasgus took the eastern half, τὰ πρὸς Ἐρασῖνον ποταμόν, and founded Larisa (the acropolis of Argos City), calling it after the name of his own daughter (fr. 29). Iasus took the western half, τὰ πρὸς Ἥλιν. On the death of Pelasgus and Iasus, Agenor brought cavalry and conquered the whole country. This is all to explain three Homeric epithets of Argos: Ἰασσον, ἰππόβοτον, Πελασγικόν; and the theory is ascribed to Hellanicus by name. It presupposes that the name Ἄργος was applicable to the whole of the kingdom of Triopas, which included all Peloponnese; and so gives us fifth-century authority for the belief underlying the statement of Apollodorus⁴³ that the hero Argos on succeeding Phoroneus as king called all Peloponnese after his own name. Whether Apollodorus' further contribution, when he puts the hero Argos in place of Triopas, is of earlier date, or is a subsequent attempt to square the genealogy given by Hellanicus with that given by Acusilaus, is another question; and the same observation applies to another variant given by Eustathius,⁴⁴ which puts Phoroneus in place of Triopas: an even nearer approximation to the theory of Acusilaus.

An obvious motive for these various attempts to interpolate Pelasgus in genealogies relating to the Peloponnesian Argos has doubtless suggested itself to the reader by this time. There can in fact be little doubt that Hellanicus, or Acusilaus, or both, were the victims, if not the perpetrators, of a simple literary blunder. Hellanicus, it is true, is the first known author who named Πελασγιῶτις as one of the Thessalian tetrarchies,⁴⁵ and he was as fully convinced as anyone of the existence of a Pelasgian settlement in Thessaly down to the time of the 'Coming of the Hellenes;,' so he cannot be acquitted of having known that the Homeric Πελασγικόν Ἄργος properly referred to some part of Thessaly. Yet he and his immediate predecessors are under grave suspicion of having taken that phrase also as referring not to the Thessalian but to the Peloponnesian Argos; of having confused both with that Thessalian Larisa which is neither part of Homer's Πελασγικόν Ἄργος nor the home of Homer's actual Πελασγοί; and further of having combined this non-existent 'Pelasgian Argos' in Peloponnese with the 'Pelasgian Arcadia,' which we have seen to be Hesiodic doctrine, and of which Acusilaus⁴⁶ and Hellanicus⁴⁷ were both aware.

The actual reduplication of the place-name Larisa, in Thessaly, in Argolis, and in the country of Homer's actual Pelasgians⁴⁸ inevitably increased the confusion, and led to a variety of fresh combinations. Hellanicus⁴⁹

⁴² Schol. *Il.* 3.75 = fr. 37. In spite of his later date, I class Hellanicus with the other genealogists, and separate him from Herodotus and Thucydides, on the ground that all that we know of his work marks him as a belated continuator of the logographic school of history-writing.

⁴³ *ii.* 1. 2. 2.

⁴⁴ Schol. *Il.* 3. 75.

⁴⁵ Harpoer. s.v. τετραρχίαι.

⁴⁶ Apollodorus *ii.* 1. 1.

⁴⁷ Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἀρκάς.

⁴⁸ *Il.* 2. 843.

⁴⁹ *Phoronis* fr. 1.

makes Pelasgus marry Menippe, a daughter of the Peneius,⁵⁰ and so localizes him in Thessaly, and makes him ancestor of a line of Thessalian kings; Phrastor, Amyntor, Teutamidas. Of these the last named is of course suggested by the ancestor of the leaders of that contingent of Pelasgians in Homer,⁵¹ who, as we have seen, are really Hellepontine, and have nothing to do either with Thessaly or Argolis. Hellanicus again,⁵² and also Pherecydes,⁵³ brought Acrisius the Argive on a visit to the Pelasgians of Thessaly, and so explained the existence in Thessaly of the Argive place-name Larisa; and, later, Staphylus of Naucratis brought Pelasgus himself from Argos to Thessaly to found this Thessalian Larisa.⁵⁴ There was however apparently yet another tradition in the field—perhaps the legend utilized by Staphylus—which put the foundation of the Thessalian Larisa earlier than the generation of Acrisius; so yet another step was taken by the defenders of the Acrisius theory, by duplicating their *protégé*.⁵⁵

Side by side with all this speculation, one passage from Hecataeus⁵⁶ reveals to us an actual population of the Pelasgian name, resident now in Lemnos, but believed to have once lived in Attica. The passage however is only preserved to us in abstract; and we shall be at all events on the safe side if we postpone consideration of it till we come to discuss the views of Herodotus, to whom we owe its preservation.

One set of fragments of Hellanicus⁵⁷ deals likewise with Lemnos, or rather, with the Σίντιες, its Homeric population. From merely tending the outcast Hephaestus—and the merest ‘Pelasgian’ could hardly do less under the circumstances—they have become his Lemnian craftsmen, ‘the first artificers of metals,’ inventors of armour and implements of destruction; and that is why they are Σίντιες, from σίνεσθαι.⁵⁸ They are also, by this time, immigrants from Thrace; for when certain Trojans, who play a part in the foundation-legend of Chios, landed in Lemnos, ἦσαν . . . αὐτόθι κατοικοῦντες Θράκῆς τινας, οὐ πολλοὶ ἄνθρωποι ἐγεγόνεισαν δὲ μιξέλληνας· τούτους ἐκάλουν οἱ περίοικοι Σίντιας. Their ‘Hellenic admixture’ we must suppose to have been due to contact with the Minyans, and perhaps also with Agamemnon’s Achaeans during the war. For the further history of the Σίντιες see p. 205 below.

⁵⁰ Compare the alliance arranged by Pherecydes between Pelasgus and Kyllene νηίδα νόμφην (above p. 187); with the result that Pelasgus is localized in Arcadia,

⁵¹ *Il.* 2. 843; *Phoronis* fr. 26 = Schol. *Ap. Rh.* 4. 1090. It is a further question whether in the Homeric phrase *ντε δύνω Λήθοιο Πελασγοῦ Τευταμίδαο* the word *Πελασγοῦ* means ‘son of Pelasgus’ or simply ‘the Pelasgian;’ and again whether *Τευταμίδαο* means ‘son of Teutamidas,’ as Hellanicus thought, or rather ‘son of Teutamus.’

⁵² Fr. 29.

⁵³ Fr. 26., cf. Schol. *Ap. Rh.* i. 40, Tzetz. *Lyc.* 338, Steph. Byz. s.v. *Λάρισα*.

⁵⁴ Schol. *Ap. Rh.* 1. 580.

⁵⁵ *Apoll.* ii. 4, 4.

⁵⁶ *Hdt.* vi. 137.

⁵⁷ Fr. 112–3.

⁵⁸ Philochorus (fr. 6 = Schol. *Il.* 1. 594) after his manner has pounced upon this bit of philology and adopted it, but explains it quite differently.

§ 8—*The Tragedians.*

How popular in the fifth century was this blunder about the Πελασγικὸν Ἄργος is well seen from the tragedians. Aeschylus for example in the *Suppliants* (ll. 1 ff.) makes the king of the Peloponnesian Argos call himself the son of Palaichthon the earthborn: he is the eponymos of the Pelasgi, and the lord of a realm which includes everything west of the Strymon, Paeonia, which he seems to put also west of the Strymon,⁵⁹ Perrhaebia, Pindus and beyond, and the hills of Dodona. It extends, in fact, as far as the sea, presumably the Adriatic. It also includes all south of this Strymon-Adriatic line as far as, and including, Peloponnese. Here the genealogical diagram Γῆ—Παλαίχθων—Πελασγός is clearly an expansion of the Hesiodic theory of a Πελασγός who is himself αὐτόχθων. The extent of the Pelasgian kingdom is no less clearly determined, partly by the desire to include a 'Pelasgian' Dodona (which had by this time become matter of common knowledge), and the 'Pelagic Argos' of Thessaly; partly by an attempt to claim for the Pelasgian Argos of Peloponnese the hegemony over all those parts of Greece (including Macedonia) which had come in historic times under the rule of *soi-disant* 'Heracleids from Argos.' It is possible also that the allusion to the Strymon may cover the poet's acquaintance with the fact, known to Herodotus⁶⁰ that 'actual' Pelasgians remained extant in the fifth century within the basin of that river.

In *Prometheus*, similarly, Πελασγία is used in a context which shows that the Peloponnesian Argos of Aegisthus and Danaus is meant:—

879 f. Πελασγία σε δέξεται, θηλυκτόνῳ
 Ἄρει δαμέντων νυκτιφρουρήτῳ θράσει.

and here too Aeschylus is further supported, as we shall see, by the Herodotean accounts of Argolis as having been Pelagic at the time of the coming of the Danaids.^{60a}

Sophocles in the same way transfers to the Peloponnesian Argos not merely the associations which belong to the Πελασγικὸν Ἄργος of Thessaly, but also all that other body of fifth-century doctrine which equated the 'actual Pelasgians' of Thessaly, the Thraceward parts, and Lemnos, with the no less mysterious Tyrseni.

Fr. 256. Ἴναχε γεννάτορ, παῖ κρηνῶν
 πατρὸς Ὠκεανοῦ, μέγα πρεσβεύων
 Ἄργους τε γύαις, Ἡρας τε πάγοις
 καὶ Τυρσηνοῖσι Πελασγοῖς.^{60b}

⁵⁹ Remember here (1) that Homer's Paeonia runs as far west as the river Axius; (2) that though in the sixth century Paeonia had extended a good way east of the Strymon, yet all this eastern region had been made *ἀνάστατος* in the time of Darius. Hdt. 5. 15. Nor does it seem ever to have recovered its Paeonian character; in the fifth and fourth centuries it

is definitely included in 'Thrace,' from which 'Paeonia' proper is distinct both in Homer, in Herodotus, and even later.

⁶⁰ Hdt. 2. 171; 7. 94, see § 10 below.

^{60a} Hdt. 7. 94: 2. 171.

^{60b} Dion H. 1. 25. For the Tyrseni see § 17 below.

Euripides contributes little. His regular use of the epithet 'Pelasgian' is to denote the Peloponnesian Argos and its population, both Achæan, as in the *Orestes*, and *Iphigenia in Aulis*,^{60c} and pre-Achæan, as in the *Phoenissæ*, and the *Suppliants*.^{60d} In *Orestes* 1247, Πελασγικὸν Ἄργος clearly means Achæan Mycenæ. Only in one passage does he distinguish between the previous Πελασγιῶται and the culture hero Danaus, whose name they are caused to assume.⁶¹

§ 9.—*Herodotus: (a) his independence of the Hesiodic School.*

With Herodotus we are once more in broad daylight. His allusions to the Pelasgians are numerous, and his usage of the name, though it varies, is on the whole intelligible. His work also shows sufficiently clear points of contact both with recent observation and with contemporary theory to permit it to be used as a commentary on the more fragmentary utterances of other fifth-century writers. It has on the other hand the disadvantage that, thanks to the eclipse which befel the History almost as soon as it was published, it had surprisingly little influence on the course of later speculation. But herein there was gain, as well as loss, as we shall see.

Herodotus has, in the first place, no mention of an individual eponymous Πελασγός; and no direct contact with the Hesiodic theory at all, except the bare allusion to the Arcadians as being in the theoretical sense Pelasgians,⁶² and as being autochthonous in Peloponnesian like the Cynurians.⁶³ But the Arcadians are in no way specially marked out as aboriginal or Pelasgic; and their Cynurian colleagues are never called by him Pelasgian.

This leads us to the positive side of Herodotus' work; and here once more we must distinguish between a writer's accounts of Pelasgians actually surviving in his own day, or extinguished within living memory, and his statements of a 'Pelasgian Theory' of early Greece.

§ 10.—*Herodotus: (b) actual Pelasgians as survivals, chiefly in the North Aegean.*

Actual Pelasgians, either surviving or recently extinct, are known to Herodotus in three distinct areas, all on or near the north coast of the Aegean.

(1) *At Placie and Scylace*, on the south shore of Propontis, a little east of Cyzicus, and presumably on the secluded Karadagh plateau. These Pelasgians still retain their name, and speak a peculiar language which is not intelligible to their neighbours.⁶⁴ Note that these Pelasgians are

^{60c} Πελασγία *Or.* 960, *I.A.* 1498; Πελασγικὸν Ἄργος *Or.* 1601; Πελασγὸν Ἄ. *Or.* 692, 1296; Πελασγὸν ἔδος Ἀργείων *Or.* 1247.

^{60d} Πελασγία *Suppl.* 368; Πελασγικὸν Ἄργος *Phoen.* 256; Πελασγικὸν στρατεύμα *Phoen.* 105-6.

⁶¹ *Fr.* 227. See p. 221 below.

⁶² i. 146, ii. 171.

⁶³ viii. 73 οἰκείει δὲ τὴν Πελοπόννησον ἔθνεα ἑπτὰ· τούτων τὰ μὲν δύο, ἀπόχθονα ἔόντα, κατὰ χώρην Ἰβρυται νῦν τε καὶ τὸ πάλαι [οἰκίον], Ἀρκάδες τε καὶ Κυνοῦριοι.

⁶⁴ i. 57.

situated immediately across the water from the abode of the Pelasgians of the Trojan Catalogue; and exactly in the direction to which the south-eastward thrust of Thracians, Treres, and Kimmerians in post-Homeric times had tended to drive the Homeric population of south-eastern Thrace. Note also that the silence of Homer, not merely as to Pelasgians in Asia, but as to Thracians in what afterwards became Bithynia, and also the positive Homeric evidence as to the non-Pelasgian character of the population of Lemnos and Imbros, makes a very strong case for assuming that this Pelasgian occupation of Placie and Scylace results from the same post-Homeric movement.

A similar raid, by some of these same Pelasgians, reached as far as Attica, and effected a regular lodgment there for a time, οἱ σύνοικοι ἐγένοντο Ἀθηναίοισι. The approximate date for this raid is given in the parallel passage in ii. 51: Ἀθηναίοισι γὰρ ἤδη τηνικαῦτα ἐς Ἑλληνας τελέουσιν Πελασγοὶ σύνοικοι ἐγένοντο ἐν τῇ χώρῃ, ὅθεν καὶ Ἕλληνες ἤρξαντο νομισθῆναι; so that if it is possible to discover at what point in their history Herodotus thought that the Athenians 'were just beginning to count as Hellenes,' it will be possible to assign at all events a relative date for the time at which these Pelasgians 'came to be fellow-lodgers with them in their country.' This point however will be best reserved until we come to the question of the Pelasgians in Attica.⁶⁵

(2) *In Lemnos and Imbros.* These Pelasgians also are post-Homeric intruders: for they expelled from Lemnos the Minyans,⁶⁶ who are still in possession there in Homer.⁶⁷ Moreover Herodotus fixes the date of the Minyan migration from Lemnos to Laconia in the same generation as the Dorian invasion of Peloponnese: for Theras was the brother of the wife of king Aristodemus.⁶⁸ These Pelasgians were still in the islands when they were annexed by Persia about 505,⁶⁹ and were also still in possession when Miltiades conquered them, not long before 493.⁷⁰ It has been argued from the phrase ἔτι τότε ὑπὸ Πελασγῶν οἰκομένης in v. 26 and from the omission of Lemnos in the list of extant Pelasgians in i. 57 that these Pelasgians were extinct when Herodotus was writing; but he nowhere states that the Pelasgians were wholly expelled by Miltiades, and in i. 57 he clearly hints at the existence of ὅσα ἄλλα Πελασγικὰ ἔοντα πολίσματα τὸ οὖνομα μετέβαλε, as though there were people who still talked 'Pelasgic' and were known to be of Pelasgic origin, but no longer satisfied his other condition that they should have retained their proper tribal name; and this would clearly cover such a case as that of Lemnos under Athenian rule.⁷¹

⁶⁵ See below, § 12.

⁶⁶ iv. 145.

⁶⁷ *Il.* 7. 468, 23, 747, the latter a late passage.

⁶⁸ iv. 147.

⁶⁹ v. 26.

⁷⁰ vi. 136.

⁷¹ Note that a 'Lemnian' who was in the Persian service in 480 B.C. (*Hdt.* viii. 11) counts as one τῶν σύν βασιλεῖ Ἑλλήνων ἐόντων. He also bears a Greek name, Antidorus. If the Lemnian Pelasgians had not 'changed their name' he would presumably have been described as a 'Pelasgian.'

Now these Pelasgians of Lemnos and Imbros lie, like those of Placie and Scylace, right in sight of the territory of the Homeric Pelasgians; and kept up to the close of the fifth century a piratical connexion with the mainland: for their Persian administrator had to deal severely with them, *τοὺς μὲν λιποστρατίης ἐπὶ Σκύθας αἰτιώμενος, τοὺς δὲ σίνεσθαι τὸν Δαρείου στρατὸν ἀπὸ Σκυθέων ὀπίσω ἀποκομιζόμενον*,⁷² and from a base in Lemnos they would only have done this either in south-eastern Thrace, or in course of its transit over the straits.

The Pelasgians of Lemnos and Imbros were also concerned in early raids on Attica: for the 'Pelasgians under Hymettus' in Attica, made Lemnos, among other places, their retreat: *ἄλλα τε σχεῖν χωρία καὶ δὴ καὶ Λήμνον*.⁷³ This connects them directly with the men of Placie and Scylace, whom we have already seen to be among those *οἱ σύνοικοι ἐγένοντο Ἀθηναίοισι*. The raid on Brauron moreover is expressly stated to have been the work of these same Attic Pelasgians after they had left Attica and settled in Lemnos.⁷⁴

(3) *In Samothrace*, Herodotus accounts for similar survivals by the same story. He is illustrating, by the *Καβείρων ὄργια* in Samothrace, an Attic cult which he believes to be of Pelasgic origin. This would not by itself prove that there were then, or ever had been, Pelasgians in Samothrace. But Herodotus goes on to explain, *τὴν γὰρ Σαμοθράκην οἴκεον πρότερον Πελασγοὶ οὗτοι, οἵπερ Ἀθηναίοισι σύνοικοι ἐγένοντο, καὶ παρὰ τούτων Σαμοθρήικες τὰ ὄργια παραλαμβάνουσι*.^{74a} The phrase about the *σύνοικοι* is identical, and the present tense of *παραλαμβάνουσι* suggests that in Herodotus' own time the fountain-head of Cabiric orthodoxy was an extant Pelasgian community.⁷⁵

⁷² v. 27.

⁷³ vi. 137. The words are part of the citation, or summary, of Hecataeus, already mentioned at the end of § 7.

⁷⁴ A closely analogous case is that of the Dolopes in Scyros. Originally a mainland and inland people, as indeed the rest of them were still in the time of the Persian Wars (Hdt. iv. 132, 185), they entered Scyros in post-Homeric time, and retained their hold on the island until they were suppressed by Cimon, as the Lemnians had been by Miltiades. That the Dolopian occupation of Scyros was post-Homeric seems to follow from *Il.* 9. 668, where the island is raided and captured by Achilles, and from *Il.* 19. 326-32, *Od.* 11. 509, where it still forms part of his dominions. The case is here too exactly analogous with that of Lemnos, *Il.* 14. 230 and Imbros *Il.* 14. 281. For the further fate of these Scyrian Dolopes at the hands of the historians, see p. 221 below.

^{74a} ii. 51.

⁷⁵ From the fact that in Roman times the

Samothracian ritual still used *παλαιὰν ἰδίαν διάλεκτον* (Diod. 5. 48. 2; cf. Lobeck, *Agl.* 1109, 1348), and that the cult itself was not then confined to Samothrace, but was observed elsewhere, not merely in Lemnos and Imbros, but in the Troad and on the Hellespont (Strabo 472-3), we may reasonably infer that here also, quite apart from theories, Herodotus is dealing with current verifiable observations of North Aegean cults, of the same kind as those which he quotes specifically for the cult of Heracles in Thasos. Demetrius of Scepsis, later on, had a theory of his own about Samothrace, which is quite independent of Herodotus, and at first sight quite different, but which on closer inspection seems to show that he had been led by similar data to a conclusion very similar to that reached by Herodotus about these North Aegean Pelasgians. Samothrace, he says (quoted by Strabo 472), was at first called *Μελίτη*: the name *Σαμοθράκη* is its second name, and dates from the coming of the Cabiri, whom he seems to identify with the Curetes. Their cult he regards as *Phrygian*.

(4) *At Antandrus*, on the south-west angle of the Troad, Herodotus lets fall, unexplained, the epithet *τὴν Πελασγίδα*.⁷⁶ He does not assert that there were any Pelasgians resident there in Hellenic times; but the geographical position of Antandrus is such as to facilitate settlement there (as at Placie and Scylace) in the event of Thracian pressure on the country of the Homeric Pelasgians. That such pressure was felt, and that such settlements were made, is clear from a fourth-century account of a colony of European Edones, like those of the Bithynian coast, at Antandrus itself⁷⁷; and that there was some non-Hellenic element at Antandrus much earlier than this, is clear from the phrase *Λελέγων πόλις* applied to it by Alcaeus.⁷⁸ We have seen already (p. 183) how closely the 'Lelegian theory,' of which this is one of the most northerly manifestations, replaces further south the 'Pelasgian theory' which prevails in the Hellespont and its neighbourhood.⁷⁹

The probability that in the fifth century Antandrus was believed to be not merely non-Hellenic, but positively Pelasgian, in the sense that it held a population of South-east European origin and post-Homeric arrival, is increased by the fragment of Hellanicus which is quoted to explain the proverb *Πιτάνη εἰμί. Φησὶ γὰρ* (Hellanicus) *αὐτὴν ὑπὸ Πελασγῶν ἀνδραποδισθῆναι, καὶ πάλιν ὑπὸ Ἐρυθραίων ἐλευθερωθῆναι*.⁸⁰ Note that this proverb itself can be traced back as far as Alcaeus, and presumably the legend likewise, which in that case falls within the class of data accessible to Herodotus. No dates are given, but the incident must fall (a) not later than the time of Alcaeus; (b) hardly, if at all, earlier than the foundation of Erythrae in the time of the 'Ionic migration:' for the point of the proverb is that the disasters of Pitane are incessant; so there can have been no long interval between enslavement and liberation. We may therefore place the incident in post-Homeric, and probably in very early Hellenic, times; and we may class this hint of the presence of raiding Pelasgians in Aeolis alongside of the other evidence of the kind.⁸¹

(5) *Near Creston*, finally, on the mainland between Thrace and Macedon in the district which lies south-westward of the middle course of the Strymon, Herodotus alludes to *τοῖς νῦν ἔτι ἐοῦσι Πελασγῶν τῶν ὑπὲρ*

The name *Σαμοθράκη* in any case looks as if it recorded an intrusion from the neighbouring European mainland, and it is instructive to find it suggested that it was a *Phrygian* cult which was intruded, and that its subject was a group of personages, who (like the Hellespontine Pelasgians of Homer) have so exact a counterpart in *Crete*.

⁷⁶ vii. 42. The phrase clearly denotes something peculiar to Antandrus, and not common to the Greeks of Aeolis. These latter are *τὸ πάλαι καλεόμενοι Πελασγοί, ὡς Ἑλλήνων λόγος* (vii. 95), but this is Greek theory, not Herodotean observation, and is discussed in its proper place in § 11.

⁷⁷ Aristotle *op. Steph. Byz. s.v.*

⁷⁸ Strabo, 606.

⁷⁹ The positive statements of Konon *Narr.* 41 and Mela i. 18 that there were Pelasgians at Antandrus are only worth noting here as evidence of a later revival of the authority of Herodotus. Mela's version contains an anachronism and two pieces of thoroughly Graeco-Roman philology.

⁸⁰ Fr. 115 b = Zenob. v. 61.

⁸¹ Pliny *N.H.* 5. 30. 32 and Steph. Byz. *s.v.* add *Cimmeris* to the already long list of ethnological epithets of Antandrus.

Thucydides on the other hand seems tacitly to put all this on one side as not-proven, when he specifies Antandrus merely as an Aeolian colony in viii. 108.

Τυρσηῶν Κρήστωνα πόλιν οἰκεόντων.⁸² They spoke a language which, though different from that of their neighbours, agreed with that of the Hellespontine Pelasgians at Placie and Scylace.

Much confusion has been wrought in recent commentary on this passage by the circumstance that Dionysius of Halicarnassus apparently read here Κροτῶνα for Κρήστωνα,⁸³ meaning thereby however not Croton in South Italy, but Cortona in Umbria, a reading which led him to use the passage as evidence for his own peculiar theory about the origin of the Etruscans. This reading however has been accepted and defended more than once recently, and notably by Prof. Eduard Meyer.⁸⁴

Those who read Κροτῶνα however may fairly be asked to meet the following objections:—

(a) Though Herodotus mentions Umbria twice,⁸⁵ he uses it merely as a general geographical expression for northern Italy, and displays no familiarity either with the country or with its people. It is difficult therefore to believe that he ventured upon exact philological comparison between the speech of the people of Cortona and that of the Pelasgians on the Hellespont; and still more that there should be truth in it if he did. It is only on the popular *a priori* assumption that in a passage of Herodotus an absurdity is more likely to be the true reading, that the variant commends itself at all; and it is, in fact, for the purpose of discrediting Herodotus that the reading Κροτῶνα is commonly defended.

(b) On the other hand Herodotus shows himself particularly well informed about the districts inland of Chalcidice; and his descriptions of Lake Prasias and of the road from Paeonia into Macedon have all the look of eyewitness.⁸⁶

(c) His association of Pelasgians with Τυρσηνοί and Κρηστωνάιοι is confirmed by the statement of Thucydides,⁸⁷ who had also special reasons for acquaintance with this neighbourhood. There are two discrepancies in detail, (1) that Thucydides is speaking of a mixed population *σύμμικτα ἔθνη*, nearer the sea-coast, and (2) that he speaks of it as consisting of *βαρβάρων διγλώσσων*. But they do not at all affect the conclusion that Thucydides either was independently acquainted with the same state of things, of which Herodotus describes the earlier and more inland counterpart, or was reading Κρήστωνα in the passage of Herodotus which is in question.⁸⁸ That such *σύμμικτα ἔθνη* should have come into existence nearer the seaboard, is exactly what we should expect as the result of successive thrusts from one northern intruder after another. That in the neighbourhood of the Chalcidic colonies

⁸² i. 57.

⁸³ i. 29.

⁸⁴ E. Meyer, *Forschungen z. alt. Gesch.* (Halle 1891) i. pp. 1-124.

⁸⁵ i. 94, iv. 49.

⁸⁶ v. 15-17.

⁸⁷ iv. 109.

⁸⁸ That he really knew the country, and that there was such a district—for even this has been denied latterly—is clear from his reference to Γρηστωνία in ii. 99.

the natives should have become bilingual, is again exactly what happens wherever two cultures meet: the mongrel population just beyond the Chalcidic 'pale' learnt Greek for use 'in town,' without forgetting their own language for communication with their friends in the interior.

(d) There is collateral evidence of community of population between this neighbourhood behind Chalcidice and those other districts in which an actual Pelasgian population is best demonstrable. (a) In the case of Lemnos, the Homeric Sinties,⁸⁹ though they do not appear to have survived there into historic times, have their counterparts in a Thracian tribe, known to Hellanicus,⁹⁰ which has its habitat fixed by Thucydides⁹¹ as lying on the left flank of Sitalces' march from Thrace into Macedon, while Paeonia lay on his right. It has left its name, moreover, in that Heraclea Sintica, of which the site is fixed on the right or western bank of the middle Strymon, a little N. E. of the district of Creston.⁹² (β) In the case of the Hellespontine area, Herodotus accepts without question a European origin for the Asiatic Phrygians (who had indeed but recently entered Asia in Homeric times) and compares them with the Macedonian Βρύγες.⁹³ He also locates Βρύγοι⁹⁴ between the Χαλκιδικὸν γένος and the Pieres (who lay east of the Strymon)⁹⁵ in a list which runs in an order which is quite intelligible geographically: that is to say, they lay somewhere between the Strymon and the promontory of Mt. Athos. This all agrees with the locality indicated with these Βρύγοι, whom he calls 'Thracians,' and who attacked the army of Mardonius, at a time when its escorting fleet was destroyed off Mt. Athos.⁹⁶ The bisection of the European Βρύγοι-Βρίγες is in turn paralleled by the duplication of the Pieres, some of whom are east of the Strymon,⁹⁷ while others, far west of it, are next neighbours of the Perrhaebians of Thessaly.⁹⁸

Like the Βρύγοι, the Edoni of the lower Strymon, who are also one of the components of the σύμμικτα ἔθνη of Thucydides,⁹⁹ have their Asiatic counterparts, as we have seen at Antandrus in the fourth century epithet Ἴδωνίς, where Herodotus had written τὴν Πελασγίδα. The Mygdones, also, who for Herodotus¹⁰⁰ and Thucydides¹⁰¹ inhabit a district of Macedon next west of Creston, north-west of Chalcidice, and east of the Axios, and survived in Strabo's time as a subdivision of the Edones near lake Prasias,¹⁰² had however by that time almost vanished out of Europe, and were best studied, like the Pelasgians of Herodotus, on the south shore of Propontis next east of the Doliones. For Strabo, they are thus immigrants from Europe, and of the same character as the Phrygians, the Mysians, and the Doliones themselves.¹⁰³ Here, again, no theory is in question: it is simply

⁸⁹ *Il.* i. 594, *Od.* 8, 294.

⁹⁰ *Fr.* 112.

⁹¹ *ii.* 98.

⁹² The *Γρηστονία* of *Thuc.* *ii.* 99. In Roman times there were traces of *Σιντοί* on *both* banks of the Strymon: *Strabo* 331.

⁹³ *vii.* 73.

⁹⁴ *vii.* 185.

⁹⁵ *vii.* 112-3.

⁹⁶ *vi.* 45.

⁹⁷ *vii.* 112.

⁹⁸ *vii.* 131. Cf. 177.

⁹⁹ *iv.* 109.

¹⁰⁰ *vii.* 123-4, 127.

¹⁰¹ *ii.* 99-100.

¹⁰² *Strabo*, *fr.* 11.

¹⁰³ *Strabo*, 566, 575, 736, 747.

a question, how much collateral evidence exists to support an observation of fact on the part of Herodotus, that a split tribe could inhabit Placie, Scylace, and the Strymon valley without appreciable damage to its common speech.

(e) The circumstance that Herodotus mentions a *Κρήστονα πόλιν* has been criticized in view of Thucydides' statement that his *σύμμικτα ἔθνη* lived *κατὰ μικρὰ πόλίσματα*.¹⁰⁴ But first, Thucydides' statement refers not to the people of the district of Creston but to the *σύμμικτα ἔθνη* of the coastland further south; secondly, it would be difficult to prove, even if it did refer to Krestonia, that some one or other of these *πόλίσματα* was not called *Κρήστον*; thirdly, that there was such a *πόλις* in later times is stated positively by Stephanus (s. v.) and an appropriate site for it exists at the modern settlement of Kilidj.

So far as we have gone, all the Herodotean evidence goes straight back to the denotative usage in Homer, which makes the Pelasgians a specific North Aegean people. Only, for Herodotus, instead of being located on the mainland (with a single offshoot in Crete), they are projected into the North Aegean islands, and onto the Hellespontine shore of Asia: exactly as the known stresses of the post-Homeric age would have led us to guess would be the case.¹⁰⁵ These 'actual' Pelasgians of Herodotus, moreover, retained still in his time a linguistic character which marks them as having issued, at an earlier stage still, from a centre of dispersal sufficiently far back in the Thracian mainland to permit similar projection of one band of them into the basin of the Strymon; and so puts their case on all fours with that of the Herodotean Phrygians. Whether all this observation was accurately made, is beside the question here, and is not conclusively proved even by its consistency within itself. All that we are concerned with, here, is that such observations were not only possible in the time of Herodotus, but are recorded by him as having been made. It is equally beside the question, whether they are consistent or not with his general 'Pelasgic Theory,' which must engage attention next.

§ 11.—*Herodotus: (c) his general Pelasgic Theory.*

If we look now to his connotative use of the name 'Pelasgian,' we shall find that Herodotus holds a well-defined 'Pelasgic Theory' of the ethnology of Greece. Once upon a time all that is now called Hellas was called 'Pelasgia' and was inhabited by Pelasgians.^{105a} These, in the majority of cases, have become Hellenized gradually; and the crucial test of Hellenization is the change of language from 'Pelasgian' to Hellenic.^{105b} Herodotus admits however that it is only by the study of the speech of the 'actual' Pelasgians discussed in the last section, that any idea can be formed of what 'Pelasgian speech' was like.

¹⁰⁴ Hdt. i. 57. Thuc. iv. 109.

^{105a} i. 56-7, ii. 52-56.

¹⁰⁵ For indications of such a movement even within the Homeric age see p. 184 above.

^{105b} i. 57.

Of this metamorphosis of theoretical pre-Hellenic Pelasgian into actual historic Hellene, Herodotus quotes particular instances in several districts of Greece. Let us take these districts in geographical order from north to south.

(1) *At Dodona*, though Herodotus does not definitely assert that there were ever any Pelasgian residents, he states that the oracle was consulted by 'the Pelasgians' in primitive times.^{105c} He had learned also, apparently on Dodonaean authority, the theory that in early times 'the Pelasgians' knew no names for their gods, and only acquired names later, and from abroad. Now there is nothing in all this which is not obvious 'by inspection' to any one who has before him (1) the Homeric phrase about Dodonaean Zeus, (2) the Hesiodic description of Dodona as Πελασγῶν ἔδρανον, and (3) the Herodotean observation that 'actual' Pelasgians talked a language different from Greek. The reasoning may be formulated as follows. Even without Hesiodic commentary it might well seem likely to any fifth century Hellene with a 'Pelasgian Theory,' that the Homeric epithet Πελασγικέ meant 'god of Pelasgians,' *i.e.* of the Pelasgian inhabitants of Dodona. If so, Pelasgians at Dodona, or their descendants, were calling the god of Dodona 'Zeus.' But 'Zeus' is the *Greek* name for the god of Dodona; and as the Pelasgian language is *ex hypothesi* different from Greek, the word for 'Zeus' in Pelasgic must have been different, if there was one. But was there a word for Zeus in Pelasgic? Enquiry at Dodona, possibly elsewhere, reveals none; all the βάρβαροι δίγλωσσοι, who are within hail, call Zeus 'Zeus' and nothing else. Yet Achilles addresses Zeus as Πελασγικέ, 'god of Pelasgians;' he was worshipped therefore by them in their unconverted 'Pelasgian' days. In those days therefore Zeus of Dodona was worshipped as a nameless god, and is now called Zeus, only because 'Zeus' is the Greek name for him. *Q.E.D.*

(2) *In Thessaly*, though Herodotus does not state that there were Pelasgians there, it is possible that he is assuming their presence when he describes the Aeolian Hellenes of north-west Asia Minor as τὸ πάλαι καλούμενοι Πελασγοί, ὡς Ἑλλήνων λόγος.^{105d} The qualifying phrase characterizes this attribution of Pelasgian origin as a matter of current Greek belief, and as something quite distinct from the 'Pelasgian' peculiarities of Antandrus—whatever they were—as has been noted already in § 10 above. This current Greek belief must mean that these Aeolians represent either Pelasgians domiciled in Aeolis and Hellenized *in situ*, or Pelasgians formerly domiciled in Thessaly, and Hellenized there before their migration to Asia Minor. In the former alternative, the phrase goes far to explain his phrase Ἄντανδρον τὴν Πελασγίδα, but at the same time makes it difficult to see in what peculiar sense Antandrus was worth calling 'Pelasgian.' In the latter, Herodotus would seem once more to be putting his own interpretation on the Homeric phrase τὸ Πελασγικὸν Ἄργος which (as we have seen) was, by

^{105c} ii. 50-52.

^{105d} vii. 95.

the time of Hellanicus, (1) extended so as to include Thessaly in general, and (2) confused with Pelasgiotis and with the country round Larisa, with which in the Homeric Catalogue it is clearly contrasted.^{105e} In any case, the phrase of Herodotus about the Asiatic Aeolians is either fair commentary on the trans-Hellespontine thrust of Priam's Pelasgians, or else a not-unnatural interpretation of the phrase τὸ Πελασγικὸν Ἄργος. Here also therefore we may regard Herodotus as going back to Homeric authority, and as admitting current Greek belief only so far as it seemed to conform to Homeric data.

(3) *In Attica*, Herodotus describes the aboriginal population as a Pelasgian tribe, the Κραναοί.¹⁰⁶ Here we have a fresh feature: a Pelasgian *genus* subdivided into *species* with tribal names. There is no Homeric authority either for Pelasgians or for Cranaans in Attica, nor for any of the regions which follow, further south; so that here we are free to regard Herodotus as summarizing contemporary theory, and perhaps even improving on it.

These Cranaan Pelasgians of Attica went through, not one, but several metamorphoses,¹⁰⁷ before they won their way to Hellenism as 'Ionians,' in the time of Ion, son of Xuthus; but they had made their first step as early as the days of Cecrops. Further proof that the Pelasgians of Attica were Hellenic already at the time of the Ionic migration is given when (in recounting the origin of the Ionians of Asia Minor,¹⁰⁸ whom Herodotus believed to have come immediately, though not ultimately, from Attica) the only Pelasgian admixture which he mentions, in that very mongrel crew, takes the form, not of Attic but of Ἀρκάδες Πελασγοί. The *quondam* Pelasgians of Attica were therefore no longer Pelasgic when the Ionic colonies were to be founded.

The passages about Pelasgians in Attica, however, present difficulties of their own which entitle them to separate discussion later on (§ 12). For the moment it is sufficient to have discovered (1) that 'Pelasgian' for Herodotus is a *genus* including tribal *species*; (2) that the process of Hellenization was in some cases capable of analysis, and approximately datable; (3) that the crucial event in this process was for Herodotus, as for Hellanicus and for Thucydides, the arrival in the country of some genuine 'son of Hellen.'

(4) *In North Peloponnese*, from Sicyon westward, there once lived a people who were *Pelasgians* generically, with the specific tribal name of Αἰγιαλείς.¹⁰⁹ These, like the Pelasgian Κραναοί of Attica, became Hellenized by means of Ion, son of Xuthus; and then, as fully Hellenized 'Ionians,' migrated into Attica, and thence again to the Asiatic Ionia.

(5) *In the Cyclades* the islanders are, for Herodotus, καὶ τοῦτο Πελασγικὸν

^{105c} See p. 179 and 188.

¹⁰⁶ vii. 94.

¹⁰⁷ viii. 44.

¹⁰⁵ i. 146.

¹⁰⁹ vii. 94.

ἔθνος: but the context^{109a} does not show whether he means Pelasgian aborigines, Hellenized *in situ*, or a branch (like their reputed kinsmen, the Ionians of Asia Minor) of the Ionized Pelasgians of North Peloponnese.¹¹⁰

(6) *In the Peloponnesian Argos*, Herodotus describes a population, autochthonous and Pelasgian, as receiving from immigrant Danaids the rite which the Greeks call *thesmophoria*. The natives in this case had neither the name nor the thing. Elsewhere he quotes Danaus (though he was not 'a son of Hellen') side by side with Xuthus, as one of those whose coming marked the crisis before which the people of all North Peloponnese *ἐκαλέοντο Πελασγοὶ Αἰγυαλεῖς*. Another point of theory emerges here. Hellenism in the sense of the operation of a 'son of Hellen' is not the only form of enlightenment. Danaus from Egypt can 'Hellenize' in a generic sense: at all events his arrival troubles the Pelasgian waters with the movement of a new spirit. Have we perhaps here a reminiscence of the phase, which we conjectured earlier,¹¹¹ when Danaus competed with Hellen for eponymous rank in Greece?

Meanwhile it is clear that though Herodotus may perhaps have shared with his contemporaries the current misconception as to the Pelasgian claims of the Peloponnesian Argos, there is no evidence that for him this district stood in any such special relation to Pelasgian antiquity as had been assumed recently by the genealogists.

(7) *In Arcadia* there were *Ἀρκάδες Πελασγοί*,—again apparently a specific sub-division of a Pelasgian *genus*,—who took part in the colonization of Ionia.¹¹² The Arcadians also were regarded by Herodotus as the sole survivors¹¹³ of the aboriginal population of Peloponnese; and this aboriginal population was apparently continuous with that of 'Pelasgian' Argos. On the other hand, in his formal survey of Peloponnesian ethnology,¹¹⁴ though he classes the Cynurians with the Arcadians as autochthonous, he omits to call either of them Pelasgians. We cannot say therefore that there is in Herodotus any preferential treatment of Arcadia as a source, or habitation, of Pelasgians.

(8) *In Cynuria* the same remark applies. Though autochthonous, the Cynurians are not called Pelasgians: their pedigree is taken only so far back as to describe them as 'apparently Ionians,' who have however since 'become thoroughly Dorized.'¹¹⁵ Here we get a fresh point of Herodotean theory. Hellenism, like Pelasgism, is a *genus* which includes diverse *species*. 'Ionian' Hellenism is one type, 'Dorian' Hellenism is

^{109a} As in the case of Asiatic Aeolis (2) above.

¹¹⁰ If there were any *early* evidence for the legends of Thracians in Naxos and other Cycladic islands, it would be tempting to regard this ascription of 'Pelasgian' origin as a hint of raids of Hellespontine Pelasgians like those which we have detected already as far afield as Crete and Attica. But in default of such early

evidence, this tempting guess remains unverifiable.

¹¹¹ p. 181, above.

¹¹² i. 46.

¹¹³ ii. 171.

¹¹⁴ viii. 73.

¹¹⁵ viii. 73.

another; and it is possible for *αὐτόχθονες* to undergo conversion, not merely from outer darkness to any one of these types of enlightenment, but from any one sect to another. The latter process, like the former, is a long one: *ἐκδεδωρίενται δέ*, he can say of the 'Ionian' Cynurians, *ὑπὸ Ἀργείων ἀρχόμενοι καὶ τοῦ χρόνου*.

§ 12.—*Herodotus: (d) the Pelasgians in Attica.*

Between the statements of what I have called 'Pelasgian theory' in Herodotus, and his accounts of Pelasgian tribes either actual, or only recently extinct, lies one group of passages which has caused some perplexity, but seems to me susceptible of simple and instructive explanation. The people of Attica, as we have seen in § 11, are for Herodotus autochthonous Pelasgians, who 'became Ionian' and so entered the Hellenic family, in the days of Ion son of Xuthos.¹¹⁶ On the other hand, just at this very phase *Ἀθηναίοισι ἤδη τηνικαῦτα ἐς Ἑλληνας τελέουσι, Πελασγοὶ σύνοικοι ἐγένοντο ἐν τῇ χώρῃ*:¹¹⁷ and by the side of these Pelasgian 'country cousins,' the autochthonous Attic Pelasgians really seemed quite civilized, *ὄθεν καὶ Ἑλληνες ἤρξαντο νομισθῆναι*. Of these intrusive and relatively recent Pelasgians, Herodotus gives further particulars, partly on the authority of Hecataeus, partly from local Attic tradition.

(1) He quotes Hecataeus to the effect that it was these Pelasgians who built for the Athenians the wall round the Acropolis. This reveals, as one element in the story, an aetiological myth about the so-called Pelasgic Wall, which was still defensible in the days of the Peisistratidae and may be identified with some certainty as that Mycenaean fortress-wall of which remnants are still to be seen. Of the open space below this wall, which Thucydides knows as *τὸ Πελασγικόν*, neither Herodotus nor Hecataeus has anything to say.

(2) He quotes Hecataeus further to the effect that these Pelasgian wall-builders were allowed to *settle* in the country *ὑπὸ τὸν Ἱμμηττόν*, that is, as the story shows, between Hymettus, the Ilissus, and the Saronic gulf. This repeats (what we already know) that these Pelasgians are not autochthonous in Attica, but recent immigrants; and it takes this belief as far back as Hecataeus.

(3) Eventually these Pelasgians misbehaved, and were expelled; and went and occupied *ἄλλα τε . . . χωρία καὶ δὴ καὶ Λῆμνον*.¹¹⁸ This also comes from Hecataeus, and consequently goes back to a contemporary of the conquest of actual Pelasgians in Lemnos by Otanes, between 510 and 500 B.C.; and also of their conquest by Miltiades, which belongs to the same generation.¹¹⁹

¹¹⁶ viii. 44.

¹¹⁷ ii. 51.

¹¹⁸ vi. 137.

¹¹⁹ v. 26. (Otanes): vi. 136-140 (Miltiades).

(4) Local Attic tradition added this,¹²⁰ that after settling in Lemnos, some of these Pelasgians returned and raided Brauron on the east coast of Attica; and that they did this *εὖ ἐξεπιστάμενοι τὰς Ἀθηναίων ὀρτάς*, presumably therefore within the lifetime of those who had been themselves expelled from Attica.

(5) The Pelasgian occupation of Lemnos is assigned by Herodotus to an ascertainable date. In Homer, as we have seen,¹²¹ the Minyans have not yet been expelled from the island. They were however expelled, according to Herodotus,¹²² in the third generation of the Argonautic occupation; that is, in the generation after the Trojan war, for Eunūs, who is king of Lemnos in Homer, is the son of Jason, who occupied the island. But here there is a slight hitch in the story. The local Attic tradition, as we have seen, attributed the raid on Brauron to Pelasgians who were *οὗτοι Λήμνον τότε νεμόμενοι*; in which case the raid was subsequent to the occupation of Lemnos. But in telling the story of the Minyans, Herodotus says that they were expelled by Pelasgians *τῶν ἐκ Βραυρώνος ληισαμένων τὰς Ἀθηναίων γυναῖκας*. It is possible that he merely adds this detail for the sake of identification, and without intending to say that they had already raided Brauron; but at first sight it certainly looks as if he meant to put the raid *before* not *after* the occupation. And there is this further evidence in the same direction. The rest of the story of the Minyans dates their eventual arrival in Laconia within the generation (*τὸν δὲ αὐτὸν τοῦτον χρόνον*)¹²³ of Theras, great-great-grandson of Polyneices of Thebes, and brother-in-law of Aristodemus, about the time of whose death the Dorians conquered Laconia; and this entry was fully two generations after the Trojan War. Either therefore we must allow the best part of a generation for the 'exodus' or '*νόστος*' of the Minyans, or else there must be a misfit of one generation in the chronology; and in the latter event it may well be the reason why there is ambiguity as to sequence of the occupation of Lemnos and the raid on Brauron. But there is no serious inconsistency; and though the whole story comes to us from two, or more probably three, independent authorities,—Hecataeus, local Attic, and perhaps local Laconian tradition,—we are in a position now to fit it all together as a single series of events, of brief duration and approximately ascertainable date; for it falls in any event within a generation of the Dorian invasion of Peloponnese.

According to Herodotus therefore—and I do not claim at present any earlier authority for this version,—once upon a time there were Pelasgians in Attica, in the same sense as there were Pelasgians everywhere in Greece in pre-Hellenic days. Just as these Attic Pelasgians were beginning to 'count as Hellenes,' in the days of Ion son of Xuthus,¹²⁴ Attica was invaded by quite a different sort of Pelasgians, of the Hellenic variety who survived at Placie, Scylace, Lemnos, Imbros, and Samothrace. His repeated phrase

¹²⁰ vi. 138.

¹²¹ *Il.* 14. 230 and § 2 above.

¹²² iv. 145.

¹²³ iv. 147.

¹²⁴ viii. 44.

οὐ σύνοικοι ἐγένοντο Ἀθηναίοισι can hardly mean anything else than that this Hellespontine type of Pelasgians is the source of the invaders of Attica; though no doubt, as in the case of Lemnos, Pelasgians ejected from Attica retreated in a direction where there were settlements of their own countrymen. As we have fifth century authority for the contemporary existence of Ion son of Xuthus and of Theseus, and as Theseus was himself an Argonaut, we can assign the invasion of Attica by Hellespontine Pelasgians to the generation of the Argonauts approximately; and as their expulsion from Attica occurred not earlier than the first generation after the Trojan War (*i.e.* the third of the Argonautic occupation of Lemnos) and not later than the second, we can give to it a duration of about three generations, and an approximate date within the fifty years which preceded the Dorian invasion. Within these fifty years falls the raid on Brauron, a second attempt of Hellespontine Pelasgians to get a footing in Attica; but whether of fresh Pelasgians from Hellespont, or of ex-Attic Pelasgians from Lemnos, remains in doubt. Within these two post-Trojan generations fall also the Pelasgian occupation of Placie and Scylace (in a neighbourhood which, for the *Catalogue*, is not Pelasgian) and probably also the settlements in Imbros, Samothrace, and the like: for Imbros also has no Pelasgians in Homer, though it had already, as we have seen, a Sintian population, which to fifth century eyes¹²⁵ must have seemed to be of mainland origin.

Now we have seen already that the department in which Herodotus seems to have struck out a new line of Pelasgian enquiry is in the collection of evidence of the survival of actual Pelasgians in the North Aegean, round the fringe, so to speak, of the Homeric Pelasgians of king Priam; and I do not think that we are unduly straining the sense of the passages which deal with the Pelasgian invaders of Attica, if we regard these also as a contribution to the same enquiry.

That Herodotus regarded some part of the population of the promontory of Attica as still of non-Attic origin, is suggested further by the terms of his comparison between Attica and Scythia. In this comparison, when once allowance has been made for the geographical conceptions of the fifth century,¹²⁶ all the other features quoted are markedly apposite; and when he goes on to say *καὶ παραπλήσια ταύτῃ καὶ οἱ Ταῦροι νέμονται τῆς Σκυθικῆς, ὡς εἰ τῆς Ἀπτικῆς ἄλλο ἔθνος καὶ μὴ Ἀθηναῖοι νεμοῖατο τὸν γουνὸν τὸν Σουνιακόν, κτλ.*, it is difficult not to believe that, although he does not mention them, he has the vision of non-Attic Pelasgians in his mind. It may indeed have been common knowledge in his time that these predatory Pelasgians had had a footing about Sunium, as well as 'under Hymettus.'

The Herodotean phase of the 'Pelasgian Theory' may therefore be summarized as follows. The logographers have done their work: they have multiplied Pelasgian origins to such an extent that it is possible already to generalize. All Greece, in fact, was 'Pelasgian' once, and the large majority

¹²⁵ Thuc. 2. 98.

Herodotus' in the *Geographical Journal*, viii.

¹²⁶ See my paper 'On the Maps used by 1896, pp. 605 ff.

of actual Hellenes are by descent Pelasgians, Hellenized. But 'Pelasgian' has now ceased to be a race-name, and means the pre-Hellenic phase of divers tribes whose proper names are known. There is even the beginning of a tentative and unformulated theory of how Hellenization is effected. In the light of this Pelasgian generalization, and of the new 'Hellenic Theory' which is its corollary, the special claims of Dodona, Thessaly, Arcadia, and the Peloponnesian Argos, are seen to fade away. Attica, on the other hand, begins to rise to new prominence in the story; ¹²⁷ due partly to the recent active contact between Peisistratid Attica and the 'actual' Pelasgians of Lemnos; partly to the contemporary desire to find some historical explanation of the rapid rise and peculiar characteristics of the Attic State since Cleisthenes; ¹²⁸ but partly also to the increased importance which the fifth century is coming to attribute to the evidence of cultural survivals, in comparison with that of place-names or of literary or oral tradition. Philology and Genealogy, in fact, are rapidly giving place to Anthropology as the instrument of historical research. And anthropology while it has nothing to say of Thessaly, and can prove only foreign influences in Arcadia, has already detected numerous cases of survival in the neighbourhood of the Homeric Pelasgians on the Hellespont, together with a true cause for their actual distribution. And when we come next to consider the attitude of Thucydides to the question, we shall find the same tendency predominant.

§ 13.—*Thucydides.*

From Thucydides, with his extraordinary concentration upon those aspects of history which he regards as his proper concern, we should not naturally expect much light on questions of ethnography. It is therefore the more instructive to find that on the rare occasions on which he does digress into such matters, his knowledge and his beliefs not only agree in general with normal fifth century views as we find them in Herodotus, but also, where they diverge from these at all, do so in directions which foreshadow exactly the principal new departures which are to characterize the speculations of the fourth century. In this, in fact, as in much else, Thucydides stands just at the parting of the ways.

A. First, as to *actual Pelasgians*. Thucydides gives an account of the natives of Mount Athos, ¹²⁹ the substance of which we have already noted in discussing the evidence of Herodotus. Its main points are as follows:—

¹²⁷ In Attica also, alone, do we find the 'theoretical' and the 'actual' or rather the 'historical' Pelasgian side by side in the same context, contrasted as Hellenizable Attic aborigines against savage Hellespontine intruders.

¹²⁸ In an earlier essay (*J.H.S.* xxvii. 84 ff.)

I have collected some evidence for the view that a similar demand of the Periclean Age to know *δὲ ἢν αἰρίην* there was a Delian League, was producing very similar effects in a reasoned retrospect of Mediterranean sea-power.

¹²⁹ *iv.* 109, see p. 196 above.

(1) The promontory, as its physical position would suggest, was a *sentina gentium*. Its population included waifs from all the principal native stocks of the adjacent mainland: Edones from beyond the Strymon, Bisaltae and men of Creston from between Strymon and Axios, and Pelasgians τῶν καὶ Ἀημιόν ποτε καὶ Ἀθήνας Τυρσηνῶν οἰκησάντων: a phrase which sums up all the main features of the Herodotean diagnosis of 'actual Pelasgians' in the North Aegean, except that he makes no mention of their kinsmen on the Hellespont.

(2) The mention of Creston, as we have seen already, is important confirmation of the manuscript reading of Herodotus i. 57.

(3) These people are σύμμικτα ἔθνη βαρβάρων διγλώσσων. If βαρβάρων, one of their languages was non-Hellenic. What their 'second language' was, is not stated; but we may fairly infer that it was Greek: for though 'barbarian,' these people are in the heart of Chalcidice; and, as Thucydides says, καὶ τι καὶ Χαλκιδικὸν ἐν Βραχί. For the rest, they presumably retained each his own native dialect; that is to say, the Pelasgians among them still talked Pelasgic, exactly as Herodotus says of their namesakes up-country.

(4) Though Herodotus does not actually say that Pelasgians of the district of Creston were among the colonizers of Attica, he does say so of the Hellespontine Pelasgians; and these he connects with those of Creston by the significant tie of a common dialect. In Thucydides, either we have additional evidence for this identification, coming from a fresh quarter, and from a writer who had peculiar opportunities for enquiring locally; or we have a fresh inference from the data supplied by Herodotus, in which case we must infer that these data were accepted by Thucydides as trustworthy so far as they went. The importance of this latter point is obvious, in view of the captious attitude which Thucydides usually adopts in dealing with his predecessors; and, no less, in view of modern attempts to show that Herodotus in this passage is describing Cortona in Italy!

(5) Thucydides has also one small piece of confirmatory evidence in regard to the general view of North Aegean ethnology, the history of which we are tracing. It is he who is our earliest authority for the existence of those Σίντροι in Thrace, whom we have already had occasion to compare¹³⁰ with the Homeric Σίντριες of Lemnos. Here also the strength of the evidence lies in Thucydides' special facilities for exact knowledge of τὰ ἐπὶ Θράκης; and, with this admitted, the significance of the reference, in Herodotus vii. 223, to a town Σίνδος near Therma, becomes obvious at once.

B. The *Pelasgian Theory* of early Greece, which is found in Thucydides, presupposes that of Herodotus, but differs from it in details, which all mark advances in historical method.¹³¹

¹³⁰ ii. 98, cf. p. 184 above.

¹³¹ i. 3.

(1) Thucydides recognizes that the 'theoretical' Pelasgians have their name from some single tribe, which really was called Pelasgian, but did not constitute the whole or even the majority of the pre-Hellenic population of Greece; *ἔθνη δὲ ἄλλα τε καὶ τὸ Πελασγικὸν ἐπὶ πλείστον ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν παρέχουσθαι*. We may fairly infer from this that since the time of Herodotus a still wider induction has been attempted, based upon data derived from those parts of the Greek world where the pre-Hellenic population had been previously labelled Carian, Lelegian, Caucon, and the like, as well as from those where it had been labelled Pelasgic.

(2) The Pelasgic name has consequently acquired for Thucydides a definite generic and connotative value, which is distinct from its specific and denotative use as in iv. 109. For the first time, that is, a Greek historical writer is using a Pelasgian hypothesis *consciously*, with the knowledge that it is a hypothesis, and not a summary of observed or reported facts.

(3) Whereas Herodotus rests content with a view of the process of Hellenization which is expressed intransitively¹³² and assumes a kind of spontaneous generation¹³³—'spec's I growed' as Topsy said—Thucydides is conscious that τὸ Ἑλληνικόν has arisen by actual contact of 'Pelasgian' non-Hellenes with a body, however small, of genuine and actual Ἕλληνες who had the higher culture, and so were 'of use' to their neighbours. Of course the discovery that Hellenism spreads by contagion only puts the problem one stage further back: for the obvious question is now, how to account for the real Hellenes. But it is a clear advance to have formulated the view that culture does thus come by contagion, *καθ' ἐκάστους μὲν ἤδη τῇ ὀμιλίᾳ μᾶλλον καλεῖσθαι Ἕλληνας*; that it is quality which tells, not quantity; that 'a little leaven' may work 'until the whole is leavened'; and that, like the Pelasgians, the Hellenes have come to have their name used in a connotative as well as in a denotative sense; of which indeed we have seen the vague beginnings already, in Herodotus' use of Danaus side by side with Xuthus. But we find no express formulation of it till Thucydides puts 'Danaans,' 'Argives,' and 'Achaeans' as equivalent Homeric names for those 'men of Phthia' *οὔπερ καὶ πρῶτοι Ἕλληνες ἦσαν*.

(4) Thucydides makes no doubt that the real Hellenes first became appreciable in Phthiotis. What then becomes, for him, of the view which we have seen growing up in post-Homeric times that τὸ Πελασγικὸν Ἄργος was a hotbed of Pelasgi? Surely here if anywhere the Hellenic 'leaven' must have 'worked' early and effectually. The process of Hellenization was gradual and lengthy, as he admits; *οὐ μὲντοι πολλοῦ γε χρόνου ἡδύνατο καὶ ἄπασιν ἐκνικῆσαι*: but missionary enterprise, like charity, surely begins at home.

¹³² τὸ ὄνομα μετέβαλε . . . τὴν γλῶσσαν μετέμαθε i. 57: τὸ Ἑλλ. ἀποσχισθὲν μὲντοι ἀπὸ τοῦ Πελασγικοῦ i. 58: ἀπεκρίθη ἐκ παλαιτέρου τοῦ βαρβάρου ἔθνους τὸ Ἑλλ. i. 60.

¹³³ Though even Herodotus associates in some cases the crisis of Hellenization with a 'child of Hellen' such as Xuthus.

§ 14.—*The Comparative Method, in Thucydides and in the Early Fourth Century.*

In a neighbouring passage¹³⁴ Thucydides formulates—also, I believe for the first time in literature—the ‘comparative method’ of ethnological enquiry. *Ceteris paribus*, he argues, it is permissible to infer from the present state of a backward people to a previous state of an advanced people. It is possible therefore to plot out, in a series, all known varieties of ‘Hellenic,’ from the most cultured to the least; and as Hellenism, for Thucydides, stands for the highest form of culture, the most cultured will be the most truly Hellenic, and the least cultured will show the most purely Pelasgian survival.

We, who have passed more recently through a similar phase of method, know only too well the corollary which a looser logic may allow to be drawn from such a series. Granting, as everyone did grant, including Thucydides, that early Greece had been the scene of intense ‘distress of nations’ and long continued *μεταναστάσεις*, it was only too easy to confuse *cultural* with *geographical* advance; and to argue (as the students of ‘Aryan languages’ argued repeatedly in the last century) as if those Greeks who had ‘progressed least’ in culture had therefore ‘advanced least’ from a geographical focus of dispersion. Now if the zero of advancement is the ‘Pelasgian’ stage of culture, the starting point of Greek *μετανάστασις* ought to be the ‘Pelasgian Home,’ to adapt a familiar expression. Thus all that was necessary, in order to discover inductively the Pelasgian Home, was to arrange all Greeks in their *cultural* order, and see whereabouts *on the map* the most backward of them were to be found.^{134a}

Now in the early fourth century, the answer to this question was easy; and it was threefold. (1) Only one people in nearer Greece (apart from districts like Messenia and Thessaly which had neither shaken off nor absorbed their ‘conquerors’ since the late *μεταναστάσεις*) had failed to adopt in full that *πόλις*-system which alone—so Thucydides, and Euripides, and Plato thought—could produce or sustain Hellenic Man: only one people in all Peloponnese answered to Thucydides’ description of his ‘actual’ Pelasgians, *κατὰ δὲ μικρὰ πόλιστα οἰκοῦσιν*:¹³⁵ only one area had so far ignored the trend of Hellenism as to permit its sons, in that clash of principles which was *ἀξιολογώτατον τῶν πρὶν*, to fight for either side indifferently:¹³⁶ and that was Arcadia and the Arcadians.

(2) On a broad review of the culture of Greece, the full Hellenism of Athens and the Ionian ‘colonies,’ of Corinth, of Argos, and of Delphi, might be

¹³⁴ i. 6.

^{134a} A very similar fallacy confounds advance in *culture* with progress in *time*. Ephorus is a conspicuous instance (Fr. 6=Diod. Sic. 1. 9) *περὶ πρώτων δὲ τῶν βαρβάρων διέξιμεν, οὐκ ἀρχαιοτέρους αὐτοὺς ἡγούμενοι τῶν Ἑλλήνων καθάπερ Ἐφορος εἴρηκεν, ἀλλὰ προδιελθεῖν*

βουλόμενοι τὰ πλείστα τῶν περὶ αὐτοὺς. To this frame of mind belongs also the Ephoran theory of the longevity of ‘primitive’ men (Fr. 24=Plin. *N.H.* 7. 48) ‘*Ephorus (ait) Arcadium reges CCC annos vixisse.*’

¹³⁵ iv. 109.

¹³⁶ vii. 57.

figured as fading away gradually north-westward, into a region where, first, as Thucydides well knew, πόλεις gave place to a life κατὰ κόμας ἀτειχίστους in Aetolia, and where even hoplite armour was unknown, as in Locris;¹³⁷ where, next, Hellenic speech became blundered and confused, so that Demosthenes' army had need of interpreters,¹³⁸ and he could trust to his Messenians being taken for Peloponnesians by their accent; where, further afield, Peloponnesian troops feared massacre ὑπὸ τῶν βαρβάρων καὶ ἐχθίστων Ἀμφιλόχων;¹³⁹ and where, behind all, and on the extreme edge of the Hellenic world, lay the rude ritual, and the immemorial age, of the oracle of Zeus at Dodona.

(3) On a still broader view of the civilized world, the march of culture was still more clearly seen to be westward. Danaus,¹⁴⁰ Pelops,¹⁴¹ and Cadmus¹⁴² had brought 'light from the East' to Hellenic lands; 'Hellen and his sons'¹⁴³ had spread their own light not only to Dodona, but also to Magna Graecia and to Sicily. But round these western outposts also lay a penumbra of barbarism, and beyond, a great expanse of peoples who, like the 'theoretical' Pelasgians of Greece,¹⁴⁴ ἐπαγομένων αὐτοὺς ἐπ' ὠφελίᾳ, καθ' ἐκάστους μὲν ἤδη τῇ ὀμιλίᾳ μᾶλλον were becoming severally confronted with Hellenic culture, whose receptivity of things Hellenic was remarkable, whose cults and legends bore strong resemblance to the ruder phases of Hellenic religion; who continued to practise a 'Lesbian rule' in their architecture, which recalled the primaeval citadels and terrace-walls—the Πελασγικὰ τείχη—of old Greece; and whose coasts were still infested by the lawless pirates whose name in the Aegean was already thrice associated with the Pelasgian,¹⁴⁵ and who had made the Lower Sea 'Tyrrhenian' for good and all. Italy and the West were rapidly being involved in an enlarged Pelasgian Theory.^{145a}

What precedes is, I believe, legitimate inference as to the probable course of speculation, from the position taken up by Herodotus, along the lines which are suggested by the indications of advancing method in Thucydides; and it accords with the actual extensions which Pelasgian theory received during the next generation. A crucial instance will make the situation clearer.

¹³⁷ iii. 94, 96, cf. 112 (Amphilochia).

¹³⁸ The Ophiones and Eurytanes were ἀγνωστότατοι γλώσσαν, καὶ ὠμοφάγοι εἰσίν, ὡς λέγεται. Thuc. iii. 94. The Messenians he describes as Δωρίδα τε γλώσσαν ἰέντας καὶ τοῖς προφύλαξι πῖστιν παρεχομένους. iii. 112.

¹³⁹ iii. 112. Of these same Amphilochians 'Hellenization' is predicated (for the first time I think in Greek literature) in the definitely linguistic sense: καὶ ἐλληνίσθησαν τὴν νῦν γλώσσαν τότε πρῶτον ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀμπρακιωτῶν ξυνοικησάντων, οἱ δὲ ἄλλοι Ἀμφίλοχοι Βάρβαροι

εἰσιν.

¹⁴⁰ Hdt. ii. 98, 171, 182, vii. 94.

¹⁴¹ Hdt. vii. 8, 11.

¹⁴² Hdt. ii. 44-49, iv. 147, v. 57-8.

¹⁴³ Hdt. i. 56, 60. Thuc. i. 3.

¹⁴⁴ Thuc. i. 3.

¹⁴⁵ Hdt. i. 57. Soph. Fr. 256. Thuc. iv. 109.

^{145a} The first traces of this lie very far back. As early as Pherecydes (if it be the fifth century author of that name) Peucetius and Oenotrus already count as children of Arcadian Lycaon.

§ 15.—*Ephorus.*

If there is one writer who represents for us the characteristics, good or bad, which distinguish fourth century historians from fifth, it is Ephorus of Cumae. The pupil of Isocrates, he was brought up in the laxest sect of the *ρήτορες*; and the fragments which we have of his work show how industriously he improved on the historical method of his master. Not only was his work on the early age of Greece the first and the most copious of the fourth century redactions, but it has been shown by more than one modern writer practically to have held the field until far on into the Alexandrine Age; to have been a standard book of reference for Polybius, and to have supplied Diodorus with almost the whole framework of his history for this period. Strabo, too, quotes him repeatedly on points of early ethnology.

It is from Strabo that we learn, among other points, that Ephorus had a Pelasgian theory of his own. In the well-known passage¹⁴⁶ in which Strabo summarizes the views which had been held by Greek writers on this matter, a large proportion of the more important data are assigned to Ephorus by name; and the whole of the Homeric evidence is marshalled in a form which makes it highly probable that we have here an abridgement of Ephoran commentary: for phrases characteristic of the Ephoran theory recur, as we shall see, throughout it. This theory of Ephorus may be summed up in a sentence. *The Pelasgians originated in Arcadia and nowhere else; and spread from thence, all over Greece and beyond, as military conquerors and colonists, at a period which can be dated approximately.*

Strabo says that Ephorus got this idea from Hesiod; and quotes the actual passage.¹⁴⁷ Now we have seen already that this is the only evidence preserved to us, down to the end of the sixth century, which expressly connects Pelasgians with Arcadia; that it gives an eponymous Pelasgus; that it not merely introduces a factor which is out of accord with the Homeric data, but had already set people thinking how to explain and justify a Pelasgian Arcadia; and that it had thus been the source of the temptation to transfer the phrase *Πελασγικὸν Ἄργος* from the Thessalian to the Peloponnesian Argos, with the disastrous results which we have seen.

The 'Arcadian theory' of Ephorus is introduced, in fact, in contrast to what Strabo regards as the popular theory (*ὁμολογοῦσι ἅπαντες σχεδὸν τι*) which made the Pelasgians *ἀρχαῖόν τι φύλον κατὰ τὴν Ἑλλάδα πᾶσαν ἐπιπολάσαν καὶ μάλιστα παρὰ τοῖς Αἰολεῦσι τοῖς κατὰ Θεσσαλίαν*. This theory, as we have seen, was current from the end of the sixth century to the days of Herodotus, and was based partly on an imaginative interpretation of the language of the Catalogue, partly on the discovery of the place-name *Πελασγιώτις*. But it sank into very minor

¹⁴⁶ Strabo, 221.

Lycæon: see p. 186 above.

¹⁴⁷ Fr. 68, in which Pelasgus is the father of

importance in Herodotus and Thucydides, who both tend to regard Thessaly as the starting point rather of Hellenes than of Pelasgians. We must infer however from Strabo's words, that after the eclipse of Herodotean history this 'Thessalian theory' revived; and this is indeed abundantly clear from the writers of the period between Ephorus and Strabo himself. We may fairly infer, meanwhile, that Ephorus did *not* hold this theory, or regard the Pelasgians as the generic aborigines of Greece; and that in particular he opposed the 'current view' that either the Πελασγικὸν Ἄργος, or the Πελασγιῶτις, or the Λάρισα of Thessaly were among their primary abodes.

Next, Strabo's argument treats the Homeric passages similarly, but more explicitly: καὶ γὰρ τῆς Κρήτης ἔποικοι γεγόνασιν, ὡς φασιν Ὀμηρος, quoting *Odyssey* 19. 177 ff. But Homer does not say that the Pelasgians of Crete ἔποικοι γεγόνασιν, and though, as we have seen, it is very probable that they did 'come to reside in addition to' its other inhabitants,—*fas est et ab hoste doceri*—the *Odyssey* gives no direct support to this view. The phrase ἔποικοι γεγόνασιν in fact, shows that what Strabo is giving us is somebody's explanation of *how* Pelasgians came to be in Crete at all: namely that they were intruders here, just as they were everywhere else but in Arcadia. Who was this somebody?

Further evidence follows, about the Πελασγικὸν Ἄργος of *Iliad* 2. 681: καὶ τὸ Πελασγικὸν Ἄργος ἢ Θετταλία λέγεται. This also is not true, at all events in the text of Homer which has come down to us. First, Homer never mentions Thessaly by name at all. Next, as we have seen already, the Homeric phrase τὸ Πελασγικὸν Ἄργος, refers only to that part of 'Thessaly' which includes Halus, Alope, Trachis, Phthia, and 'Hellas' in the narrowest sense: it is the country of the Myrmidons, and the kingdom of Achilles; and it does not include even places like Phylace and Pyrasus,¹⁴⁸ much less the head of the Pagasaeon gulf, or the country round Tricca or Larisa. This Thessaly, in fact, which, as Strabo goes on, includes τὸ μεταξὺ τῶν ἐμβολῶν τοῦ Πηνειοῦ καὶ τῶν Θερμοπυλῶν ἕως τῆς ὄρεινῆς τῆς κατὰ Πίνδον is the Thessaly, not of Homer, but rather of Aeschylus; and the reason why it is either 'Pelasgian' or 'Argos' is the same also as in Aeschylus;—διὰ τὸ ἐπάρξαι τῶν τόπων τούτων τοὺς Πελασγούς. It is an ἐπαρχία, an 'annexation' of the Pelasgians, not their original home.

Here, again, as in the previous instance, what Strabo is reporting is somebody's views about Homer, and about Aeschylus also; and this somebody has catch-words of his own, ἔποικοι, ἐπάρξαι, arising from his theory and betraying it whenever they recur.

A few lines below, Strabo refers again to Ephorus by name, ascribing to him the use of Πελασγία as a name for Peloponnesians. From this, we may be pretty sure that Ephorus also, like that early fifth century school of logographers which Herodotus and Thucydides ignore, took the phrase Πελασγικὸν Ἄργος as referring *primarily* to the Peloponnesian Argos, adjacent to 'Pelasgian' Arcadia; and as referring only *secondarily* to the Thessalian

district. If so, Thessaly was for Ephorus, as for our anonymous 'somebody,' merely an 'eparchy' of the Pelasgians of Arcadia.

This impression is confirmed by the words which Strabo adds next, *καὶ Εὐριπίδης ἐν Ἀρχελάφ φησὶν ὅτι Δαναὸς ὁ πεντήκοντα θυγατέρων πατήρ* came to Argos and gave the Danaan name to the *Πελασγιώτας ὀνομασμένους τὸ πρὶν*.^{148a} This is good fifth century belief, for we have it almost verbatim in Herodotus.¹⁴⁹ It refers of course to the Peloponnesian Argos, but it is noteworthy that both Herodotus and Euripides make use of the peculiar ethnic *Πελασγιώτης, -ῶτις*, which only occurs otherwise, in fifth century literature, as the name of a Thessalian *τετραρχία*; and this passage is in an excerpt from Hellanicus. But why bring in Euripides and Aeschylus in the middle of this discussion of Homer? Clearly because, not Strabo, but the anonymous 'somebody,' whose views are being traced in contrast with Homer, as with the *ἅπαντες* and *πολλοί* above, was concerned to claim their support. And if so, this somebody must have been at work not earlier than the date of the *Archelaus* of Euripides. This limits the range of our enquiry a good deal.

Similarly, Strabo goes on, in regard to Dodona: *τὸν δὲ Δία τὸν Δωδωναίου* *αὐτὸς ὁ ποιητῆς ὀνομάζει Πελασγικόν* (quoting *Iliad* 16. 233) . . . *πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ τὰ Ἑπειρωτικὰ ἔθνη Πελασγικὰ εἰρήκασιν*. Here again the phrase *αὐτὸς ὁ ποιητῆς ὀνομάζει* has all the look of an attempt on the part of 'somebody' to claim the reluctant Homer and the others who called the Wild West 'Pelasgic' as supporters of his theory that the Pelasgian hegemony, more or less forcible in its extension, had reached as far as Dodona, if not even into Epirus—*ὡς καὶ μέχρι δεῦρο ἐπαρξάντων*—and out comes the catchword again. Now this exactly accords with the known views of Ephorus about Dodona: for Strabo says of Dodona in another context¹⁵⁰ *ἔστι δ', ὡς φησιν Ἐφωρος, Πελασγῶν Ἰδρυμα*. Zeus of Dodona, that is, is *Πελασγικός per se* and *Δωδωναῖος per accidens*: as fine a rhetorical inversion of the Homeric phrase as could well be devised.

By this time, I think it will be clear that the anonymous fourth century 'somebody,' whose views we have been tracing in this passage, is none other than Ephorus himself; and that what Strabo is giving us is a detailed analysis of the Pelasgian theory of that writer, quoting him by name only when his views diverge from those which were orthodox in Strabo's time—which is very seldom—and quoting authors earlier than Ephorus only when their testimony is either of crucial value, or had required special ingenuity to make it 'fit in' with the theory.

We begin also, I think, to see the connexion between the curious and detailed commentary on the Homeric evidence, on the one hand, and the statement which follows immediately, that the ancient author who really best supported the Ephoran theory, and indeed suggested it to Ephorus, was Hesiod. It was indeed a choice between irreconcilables. The learned world from Acusilaus to Thucydides had expended itself in constructing theories

^{148a} Fr. 227: already noted above, p. 191.

¹⁴⁹ i. 171.

¹⁵⁰ Strabo, 327. The dependence of this on the Hesiodic *Πελασγῶν ἔδρανον* is obvious.

about the Pelasgians which would fit the Homeric evidence as they understood it; but one group of early passages had stood out, and could not be made to fit. These were the statement of Hesiod that a personal and therefore primeval Pelasgus was the father of Lycaon of Arcadia, and the conformable witness of Asius that Pelasgus was Earthborn and the First Man. Pherecydes, on the other hand, had collected round the passage of Hesiod a mass of local genealogies which went back to Lycaon; and he had probably been led to connect with these Arcadian genealogies the barbarous Northwest round Dodona, and places as far beyond as Peucetia and Oenotria. Meanwhile Acusilaus and Hellanicus had tried to reconcile the Homeric and the Hesiodic schools, by applying to the Peloponnesian Argos, with its citadel Larisa, the Homeric phrase about τὸ Πελασγικὸν Ἄργος in Thessaly, and also the Homeric statement that *some* Pelasgians (who however had nothing to do with τὸ Πελασγικὸν Ἄργος) dwelt round a place called Larisa. The tragedians belong wholly to this popular syncretistic school. Herodotus and Thucydides, on the other hand, use mainly Homeric data, but supplement these by fresh search for objective fact, and by new methods of interpretation. But now the reaction from anthropology, which Thucydides had foreseen, has come; and it is entirely in accord with the methods of fourth century rhetoric, and with the known bent of his own genius, that Ephorus should appear in due season with the mission to construct πρὸς τὸ παραχρῆμα ἀκούειν a completely inverted pyramid, resting its slender apex on the one outstanding passage about a personal Pelasgus in Arcadia, and incorporating the Homeric passages, somewhat unsuccessfully, very near the broad end of the structure.

With this clue in mind, the rest of the passage of Strabo is instructive reading. The remaining passage of Homer, about the 'actual' Pelasgians among the allies of Priam,¹⁵¹ is dismissed in a fashion as brief as it is characteristic: *καὶ τοῖς ἐν τῇ Τρωάδι Κίλιξιν Ὀμηρος εἶρηκε τοὺς ὁμόρους Πελασγούς*. Now this, once more, is simply not true, unless the Homeric text has suffered grievously since Strabo's time. Moreover, if it were, it would make Homer group with the Pelasgians just those allies of Priam who are least 'at home' in their Homeric position on the map, when compared with the historical Cilicians; and so would afford the plainest suggestion of τὸ πολυπλάνητον.^{151a}

That the Aeschylean theory, too (however well it suited Ephorus in Thessaly), needed amendment in Peloponnesian, is clear from the adversative clause which follows. *Αἰσχύλος δὲ ἐκ τοῦ περὶ Μυκῆνας Ἄργους φησὶν ἐν Ἰκέτισι καὶ Δαναΐσι τὸ γένος αὐτῶν καὶ τὴν Πελοπόννησον δὲ Πελασγίαν φησὶν Ἐφορος κληθῆναι*; and then follows the quotation, already noted, from Euripides. Aeschylus, that is, was in error in supposing that it was because the Peloponnesian Argos was Πελασγικὸν that Peloponnesian was called Πελασγία; and Ephorus has set him right. For it is not merely the Πελασγικὸν Ἄργος of Argolis, but Peloponnesian as a whole, which on his theory

¹⁵¹ II. 2. 843.

^{151a} We may note in passing the marked antithesis between the ethnology of Ephorus and

that of Herodotus. In the fifth century it is the Dorian Hellenes who are the migratory *ἔποικοι* of Greece, *πολυπλάνητοι κάρτα*. (i. 56).

acquired the name Πελασγία; and it acquired it, as we have seen, not in pre-Danaan days from the Argive Πελασγός of Aeschylus—wide reaching as his ἐπαρχίαι were—but from the Pelasgian στρατιωτικοί of Arcadia.

§ 15.—*The Successors of Ephorus.*

Two classes of data, it will be observed, have evaded, hitherto, the wide-spread net of the new 'Arcadian Theory': they will have to form the very cornice of the inverted pyramid; and they are just the data which had most contributed in the fifth century to throw fresh light on the realism of the Homeric evidence. We have not, in fact, had a word, as yet, either about Lemnos and Imbros, or about Attica.

Strabo goes on however (with an adversative construction once more) Ἀντικλείδης δὲ πρώτους φησὶν αὐτοὺς τὰ περὶ Λήμνον καὶ Ἴμβρον κτίσαι, καὶ δὴ τούτων τινὰς καὶ μετὰ Τυρρηνοῦ τοῦ Ἄττος εἰς τὴν Ἰταλίαν συνᾶραι. Now it is not very likely that any of Anticleides' writings were extant early enough to be of use to Ephorus; and Philochorus, the Atthidographer who is particularly responsible for the speculation about the Πελασγοὶ-Πελαργοὶ which Strabo quotes next, is even later still. It follows that what Strabo is doing now, is to supplement and develop the theory of Ephorus from the works of his immediate successors. In both cases the Pelasgians are represented not as aborigines but as immigrants; but the verbs are no longer ἐποικεῖν and ἐπάρξαι, but κτίσαι and ἐπιφοιτᾶν. How exactly the fact of these Pelasgian settlements was worked into the general structure of the theory, there is nothing in this passage to show; but the silence of Strabo as to Ephorus, and his use of later writers to supplement his theory on these two points, certainly suggest that a difficulty had been felt. In the case of Athens the problem was simplified in advance for Ephorus by the circumstance that, as Herodotus observed, the Athenians, whatever their origin, were so thoroughly Hellenized as to be reckoned τοῖσι πρώτοισι λεγομένοισι εἶναι Ἑλλήνων σοφίην,¹⁵² and therefore furthest removed from the simplicity and folly of barbarians. If, that is, the theory of Ephorus arose as a false corollary from a cultural classification of extant Greeks, such as was contemplated in the time of Thucydides, the Athenians must at once have fallen out of the list of possible candidates for genuine Pelasgian ancestry; and if so, the stories in Hecataeus and Herodotus about their dealings with Pelasgian πλανήται would come in as proof of the early date of Attica's conversion to Hellenism. The philological speculations of Philochorus about Πελασγοὶ-Πελαργοὶ rest on inadequate knowledge of the history of the Attic dialect. But, whatever their validity, they are incompatible with any theory which did not reject (or more probably ignore) the whole of the Herodotean treatment of the 'aboriginal' Pelasgians of Attica, and lay stress solely on the Herodotean admission that certain Pelasgians 'came and went' between Attica and Lemnos.

In the case of Lemnos we have further evidence of the fourth century treatment of Homer. Homeric proof of the late arrival of the Pelasgians in Lemnos existed indeed, though only of a negative kind, and so far Anticleides was justified in asserting that the Pelasgians were not aborigines but colonists. But in laying stress on the negative evidence, he ignored the positive testimony of the *Iliad* to a *pre-Pelasgian κτίσις* in Lemnos; and it was only by so ignoring it that he was able to state *πρώτους . . . αὐτοὺς τὰ περὶ Λήμνον καὶ Ἰμβρον κτίσαι*.

§ 16.—*Pelasgians and Tyrrhenians.*

Strabo's citation from Anticleides introduces another new feature, when it attributes to Pelasgians of Lemnos and Imbros a share in the foundation of Etruria. Attempts at an explanation of the western Tyrrhenians by means of a Pelasgian theory of the Aegean go back, as we shall see, at least as far as Hellanicus; and both Herodotus and Thucydides mention 'actual' examples of the two peoples in an association so close as to border on identity. But the statement of Anticleides is, I believe, the earliest which connects the 'actual' Tyrrhenians of Etruria with any part of the Aegean where 'actual' Pelasgians existed in historic times. It is on this ground that I have reserved till now an examination of the literary evidence about the Tyrrhenians by the same method of criticism to which I have confined myself in the preceding sections. If it leads to an intelligible result in this case also, I think I may claim this as some confirmation both of my previous results and of the method itself.

Considering how much has been written about the Tyrrhenians and how large a place they filled on the Greek horizon, it is almost surprising to find how little *early* evidence about them has survived in Greek literature. Homer has no mention of Tyrrhenians at all; and the isolated passage in Hesiod's *Theogonia* (l. 1016) is suspect. In fact the only direct reference in literature earlier than the fifth century, is that in the Homeric *Hymn to Dionysus* (l. 8). Here the sea-pirates who kidnap Dionysus, and are miraculously punished by him, are introduced without comment as *Τυρρηνοί*. But the Hymn gives no internal indication of the date or place of the episode, except that in l. 28 Egypt and Cyprus on the one hand, and the Hyperboreans on the other, seem to lie on the poet's horizon; and this does little but confirm the conclusion suggested by style and language that the Hymn may belong to the sixth or seventh century, and not much earlier. At two points in the Hymn there may be traces of 'Tyrrhenian' proper names; but if there are, they are hopelessly corrupted. It is possible, but is not proved by anything in our text, that the Hymn may belong to the same Cycladic cult of Dionysus as the fragmentary Hymn I, with its allusions to Naxos and Icaria; ¹⁵³ but it is also possible, as the unexplained allusion

¹⁵³ The earliest version of the story of Dionysus, which implies this is that in Apollod. iii. 5. 3.

to the bear¹⁵⁴ suggests, that it may belong to the Brauronian cult: in which case this Hymn (or the legend which it embodies) may be the source from which the Tyrrhenian name came later into the story of the Pelasgian raids round Attica.

In the fifth century four distinct stories were told about Tyrrhenians in the Aegean basin.¹⁵⁵

(1) Herodotus¹⁵⁶ and Thucydides¹⁵⁷ are agreed that Tyrrhenians existed still, in the fifth century, in the district enclosed between Chalcidice, the Strymon, the Axios, and the inland Paeonia; and that they were adjacent to (Hdt.), if not actually part of (Thuc.), the Pelasgians who survived in that district. Thucydides adds, as we have seen, that they retained a language of their own, and connects them with certain inhabitants of Lemnos and Attica who seem to be those whom Herodotus calls Pelasgians. But neither writer connects these actual fifth century Tyrrhenians with the Tyrrhenians of the West.¹⁵⁸

(2) Sophocles is quoted¹⁵⁹ as having used the double phrase *καὶ Τυρσηνοῖσι Πελασγοῖς* of a part (or the whole) of the people of the prehistoric realm of Inachus, namely the Peloponnesian Argos. But we have seen in the case of the word *Πελασγοί*, first, that its application to the Peloponnesian Argos results from misinterpretation of the *Πελασγικὸν Ἄργος* of Homer; secondly, that already in the time of Aeschylus this prehistoric realm was regarded as including a large part of central and northern Greece, and particularly the Thessalian Pelasgiotis. There is nothing in the Sophoclean use of 'Tyrrhenian' to preclude this interpretation of the passage, and there is no suggestion anywhere that there either were or had been 'Tyrrhenians' in the realm of Inachus in any other sense than that in which there were or had been 'Pelasgians.' The passage in fact is only of interest as confirming the evidence of Herodotus and Thucydides as to a growing belief in the fifth century that the 'Pelasgian' and the 'Tyrrhenian' names 'went together' in some way; and, as we shall see shortly, by the close of the fourth century these names had become practically interchangeable.

(3) Hellanicus,¹⁶⁰ though he does not expressly mention Tyrrhenians in the Aegean, has a theory about the origin of the Tyrrhenians in the West which derives them from his Pelasgians of Thessaly. These Thessalian Pelasgians, on being expelled from Thessaly by the Hellenes (who, for

¹⁵⁴ See l. 46 and Crusius' note.

¹⁵⁵ I neglect the tragedians' use of *Τυρσηνική* as a stock epithet of *σάλπιγξ* or *κώδων*, Aesch. *Eum.* 567, Soph. *Aj.* 17.

¹⁵⁶ i. 57.

¹⁵⁷ iv. 109.

¹⁵⁸ It is only by rewriting the passage of

Herodotus, and therewith that of Thucydides, that E. Meyer is enabled to conclude that Herodotus 'kennt Tyrsener im Bereiche des aegäischen Meeres nicht.' *Forschungen* i. p. 21.

¹⁵⁹ Fr. 256 = Dionys. Hal. i. 25.

¹⁶⁰ Fr. 1 = Dionys. Hal. i. 28.

Hellanicus, seem to have been immigrants from somewhere)¹⁶¹ took ship and landed in Italy ἐπὶ Σπίνῃτι ποταμῷ, that is, on the Umbrian coast near Spina; ¹⁶² they then went up country εἰς Κροτῶνα πόλιν.

That Hellanicus however had himself no evidence of the existence of the Tyrrhenian name in Thessaly, is suggested by his use here of the Pelasgian name solely, so long as he is describing events in Thessaly or indeed anywhere outside Italy; and by his statement that it was only on arrival in Italy that the Pelasgian refugees took the name 'Tyrrhenian.'¹⁶³ At the same time we must note that elsewhere ¹⁶⁴ he ascribes a settlement at Metaon in Lesbos to one Μέτας Τυρρηνός; and as most of the Lesbian towns were of Thessalian origin there is a *prima facie* case for regarding this Τυρρηνός as coming from thence.¹⁶⁵ He might however have been a Pelasgian from Lemnos or the Hellespont.

Hellanicus gives elsewhere, as a lower limit of date for this migration, the third generation before the Trojan war, and the twenty-sixth year of Aleyone, priestess of the Argive Heraeum; and Philistus, a little later,¹⁶⁶ gives the same date, in the formula 'eighty years before the Trojan war.' In both cases the actual date in question is that of the expulsion of the Sicels from Italy into Sicily; but as the Ligurians, who according to Philistus expelled them, were themselves under compulsion from 'Umbrians and Pelasgians,' the presence of Pelasgians in or near Umbria is presumed at a date not later than the Sicel migration. We cannot however be certain that the Pelasgians who landed at Spina were the only people of the name whom Philistus (or even Hellanicus) believed to be at that time in Italy.

(4) About the Western Tyrrhenians however Herodotus has a quite different story, which he gives on Lydian authority ¹⁶⁷: namely that they are of the same origin as the Lydians. His story is that in a time of famine these Lydian Tyrrhenians took ship and 'after passing many peoples' came to the Ὀμβρικοί where they founded cities; and there they live still. They

¹⁶¹ The story added by Dionysius, that this happened in the days of Deucalion, cannot be traced to any early source. The nearest analogy is Herodotus' statement (i. 56) that in the days of Deucalion the Hellenes οἴκεον γῆν τὴν Φθιώτιν and in the time of his grandson Dorus migrated to the Histiaeotis below Ossa and Olympus; but this does not prove that in the intervening generation they occupied the intervening territory, though Dionysius very likely thought it did. Hesiod (*Cat.* fr. 11) and Pindar (*Ol.* 9. 64) seem to have regarded Deucalion as king of Opuntian Loeris, or at least of Opus; but we do not know how early it was discovered that this king of Opus was the invader of Phthia.

¹⁶² That Spina should have maintained tributary relations with Delphi down to the time of its destruction, as is stated by Dionysius (i. 17, perhaps also on the authority of Hel-

lanicus, but not explicitly so), does not seem to prove Tyrrhenian, or Pelasgian, or even Thessalian origin. That the latter view at all events was popularly believed later is confirmed by the analogy of Ravenna. But even a Thessalian origin does not prove that the colonists were either Tyrrhenians or Pelasgians, and Strabo (214), who is our authority for this, has chosen to describe Spina as πάλαι δὲ Ἑλληνὶς πόλις ἐνδοξος, which is bad for its *Pelasgian* origin.

¹⁶³ There is some late evidence for a belief that there were Pelasgian settlers in Lesbos: see especially Strabo, 221, 621, Diod. 5. 81, Plin. *N.H.* 5. 31. 39.

¹⁶⁴ Fr. 121 = Steph. Byz. s.v. Μετάων.

¹⁶⁵ Dionys. Hal. i. 22.

¹⁶⁶ Dionys. Hal. *l.c.* = fr. 2.

¹⁶⁷ i. 94.

got their name from their leader Tyrsenus, who was son of Atys and consequently (i. 7) brother of Lydus the *eponymos* of the Lydians. Here the change of name suggests the same conclusion as in the case of Hellanicus, namely that Herodotus had no evidence before him of a Tyrrhenian people in Lydia. On the other hand a dichotomy of the Lydians, such as his story presumes, is in accordance with a native Lydian tradition of fifth century date: for Xanthus the Lydian¹⁶⁸ gives, as the sons of Atys, Lydus and Torebus (or Torrhebus) and adds that the languages of their respective descendants stood to one another as Ionic to Doric, that is, they were closely-kindred dialects. Xanthos however gives no indication of a Torrhebian emigration; but he knows of a town Torrrhaebus in Lydia. Not own 'Tyrrhenus' however is known either to Herodotus or to anyone else.¹⁶⁹

Another point is perhaps worth noting, to complete the parallel between the accounts of Herodotus and Xanthus, and to suggest a line of argument which may very likely have been present to the mind of the former. Herodotus introduces his account of the Tyrrhenian emigration as a footnote to the Lydian invention of *παιγνίαι*, which he ascribes to the Lydians, on Lydian authority, in a passage the rest of which is remarkable for its detailed knowledge of things Lydian.¹⁷⁰ Now we do not know enough either about Lydian or Tyrrhenian, or even about Hellenic *παιγνίαι*, to be able to confirm or to dispute Herodotus' account; but we may fairly assume that in his time there was actually sufficient similarity between these pastimes, to uphold such a story; and further that such similarity between Lydian and Tyrrhenian games was one of the *testimonia* to the story of the Tyrrhenian emigration—as one might argue from the games of New England or Virginia nowadays. So that it becomes important to note that in Xanthus also¹⁷¹ the place Torrhebus has a local culture-hero named Carius, who is *inventor artium*, and that is why Lydian music, in particular, is called Torrhebian: for here we seem to have another phase of the same general story of a Lydian or Torrhebian culture-hero.

It is by this time fairly clear how Herodotus came by his story, at its Lydian end. At its Italian end the story is clearly a variant of that of Hellanicus: for 'Umbria' in Herodotus¹⁷² extends northwards as far as the foot of the Alps, and so includes the site of Spina. Meanwhile his phrase, *ἔθνεα πολλὰ παραμειψαμένους*, looks very like an attempt to summarize a long series of data as to 'Tyrrhenian' settlements, or attempted settlements, on the route between Lydia and the head of the Adriatic.

Summing up the evidence of the fifth century writers we reach the following presentation of the fifth century view of the Tyrrhenians; and we

¹⁶⁸ Fr. 1 = Dionys. Hal. i. 28.

¹⁶⁹ The name *Τυρρηνός* would be a natural 'ethnic' if there was ever a place called Tyrrha, and it was believed in quite late times that there was such a town in the South Lydian district of Torrhebia (*Et. Mag.* s.v. *Τύραννος*) and that Gyges came from thence. But this proves nothing for the fifth century or earlier.

¹⁷⁰ i. 94 *φασί δὲ αὐτοὶ Λυδοὶ καὶ τὰς παιγνίας τὰς νῦν σφίσι τε καὶ Ἑλλησι κατεστρώσας ἑαυτῶν ἐξέυρημα γενέσθαι ἅμα δὲ ταύτας τε ἐξευρεθῆναι παρὰ σφίσι λέγουσι καὶ Τυρσηνὴν ἀποικίσαι ὧδε περὶ αὐτῶν λέγοντες.*

¹⁷¹ Fr. 2, summarized by Nicholas of Damascus.

¹⁷² iv. 49.

note at once the remarkable likeness between its main features and those of the Pelasgian theory at the same phase.

First, there are 'actual' Tyrrhenians (1) north of Chalcidice, (2) in Etruria; but no fifth century writer has recorded any attempt to identify them.

Secondly, the 'actual' Tyrrhenians of Chalcidice are closely associated with 'actual' Pelasgians in our two best authorities.

Thirdly, speculation has been at work, connecting, on the one hand the 'actual' Tyrrhenians of Chalcidice with the intrusive Pelasgians of Lemnos and Attica, on the other hand the 'actual' Tyrrhenians of the West (1) with 'theoretical' Tyrrhenians in Lydia, now extinct, (2) with 'theoretical' Pelasgians in Thessaly, also extinct now.

Fourthly, in popular belief, represented by Sophoclean Tragedy, the name 'Tyrrhenian', again in the closest association with 'Pelasgians' has got a general connotative sense of 'pre-Hellenic in the Aegean,' which exactly corresponds with the behaviour of the Tyrrhenian individuals whose exploits have come down to us in our one epic source, the Homeric *Hymn to Dionysus*.¹⁷³

But no sooner do we pass from the fifth century into the fourth than all is exaggeration and confusion.

First, as we should expect, the connotative use of 'Tyrrhenian' to mean 'violent and piratical' crystallizes into a definite theory, assigned to Ephorus by name, in which the Tyrrhenians play almost exactly the same part *at sea*, as has been assigned to the Pelasgians on land. The crucial passages are:

(1) Strabo 410, where Ephorus accounts thus for the lateness of Hellenic expansion in the West,¹⁷⁴ *τοὺς γὰρ πρότερον δεδιέναι τὰ ληστήρια τῶν Τυρρηῶν καὶ τὴν ὁμότητα τῶν ταύτη βαρβάρων*. Here the Tyrrhenian is the type of Outland barbarism, as the Pelasgian is of pre-Hellenic barbarism in the Aegean.

(2) Strabo 477, where the writer, speaking of the Cretans, says *μετὰ τοὺς Τυρρηνοὺς οἱ μάλιστα ἐδήλωσαν τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς θάλατταν, οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ διαδεξάμενοι τὰ ληστήρια*. At first sight it is tempting to take this as referring to the Cretan piracy of historic times, which is much in the mind of Strabo himself. But if the ascription to Ephorus is correct, this is out of the question, for the Cretan piracy did not appear to be serious till after the age of Alexander. Another possible interpretation would be to regard *τὰ ληστήρια*—a regular Ephoran catchword, like *ἔποικοι* and *ἐπάρξαι*—as the victims' expression for a 'sea-power.' But there is no evidence that Ephorus was acquainted with the Thalassocracy List which

¹⁷³ This is all quite independent of the late and far too sweeping generalization of Dionysius (i. 25, on the passage of Sophocles), *Τυρρηνίας μὲν γὰρ δὴ ἕνομα τῶν χρόνον ἐκείνον ἀνὰ τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἦν*.

¹⁷⁴ He assigns the foundation of the western Naos and Megara to the fifteenth generation after the Trojan war (1184 B.C.—[15 × 30 =]450 = 734 B.C.).

comes to us through Diodorus; and even if he was, it cannot be argued that he described as Tyrrhenian the sea-power¹⁷⁵ which the List calls Pelasgian: for the sea-power which succeeds it is not 'Cretan' in the List, but 'Thracian.' The only alternative is to regard the 'Cretan' ληστήρια as the famous 'sea-power of Minos,' and to regard the Tyrrhenian ληστήρια as the Ephoran equivalent for what Herodotus and Thucydides know as the 'Carian' sea-power which Minos overthrew.¹⁷⁶ So, whereas in the Aegean this 'Tyrrhenian' sea-power was broken by Minos, and permitted Hellenic expansion early, in the West Minos failed (as Herodotus knew), and Hellenic expansion tarried till the fifteenth generation after the Trojan War.

Secondly, whereas Hellanicus had made his Thessalian Pelasgians change their name on their arrival in Italy, and so leave the West a free field for Tyrrhenians, the fourth century, from Philistus onwards, admits unmodified Pelasgians in Italy. In Philistus' account, already cited,¹⁷⁷ of the dispossession of Ligurians and Sicels southward, their invaders are not Umbrians and Tyrrhenians, as we should expect from the fifth century evidence, but Umbrians and Pelasgians. The later writers carry this confusion further, sometimes identifying Pelasgian and Tyrrhenian, sometimes distinguishing them. The 'Thessalian' Ravenna, for example, strengthens itself against 'Tyrrhenian' attack, by admitting its 'Umbrian' neighbours.¹⁷⁸ In Southern Campania, beyond the Sarnus R. lie εἶτα Τυρρηνοὶ καὶ Πελασγοί, μετὰ ταῦτα δὲ Σαυνίται· καὶ οὗτοι δ' ἐξέπεσον ἐκ τῶν τόπων.¹⁷⁹ Diodorus, in fact, was probably under no misapprehension when he said that 'the Greeks' apply the name 'Tyrrhenian' to Latins, Umbrians, and Ausones indifferently.¹⁸⁰

Thirdly, the weakness of the evidence which in Hellanicus' story connects the Pelasgian immigrants from Thessaly with the Tyrrhenians of Etruria,—and perhaps also a discrepancy between the date of king Nanas of Thessaly in Hellanicus, and that of king Atys of Lydia in Herodotus and in the few writers such as Timaeus¹⁸¹ who followed him in this matter,—seem to have led later to the conclusion that in the West there were *two* movements of colonization, one earlier and 'Pelasgian,' the other later and 'Tyrrhenian.' A good example of the duplication which ensues is that legend of Caere,¹⁸² in which a Thessalian-Pelasgian in the town speaks Greek—χαίρει—to a 'Tyrrhenian' assailant, and is understood by him.¹⁸³ The Pelasgian emigration to the West from Thessaly, moreover, was certain sooner or later

¹⁷⁵ Placed by Eusebius (Jerome) between 1056 and 961 B.C.; and by myself about a century later (*J.H.S.* xxvii, pp. 88, 126-7).

¹⁷⁶ This agrees well with the fourth century date for the spread of the Hellenes over the Pelasgian 'eparchies' of the mainland: for Ion son of Xuthus is very nearly contemporary with Theseus, and Theseus is one generation below Minos and one generation above the Trojan war. Hellen therefore was four generations before the Trojan war, and Xuthus and Dorus were contemporaries of Minos of Crete.

¹⁷⁷ Fr. 2 = Dion. Hal. i. 17.

¹⁷⁸ Strabo, 214.

¹⁷⁹ Strabo, 247.

¹⁸⁰ For instances see the literature in Bertrand and Reinach, *Les Celtes dans les vallées du Po et du Danube*, 1894, pp. 74-6.

¹⁸¹ Fr. 19.

¹⁸² Strabo, 220.

¹⁸³ That Caere, or rather the unreformed Agylla, had like Spina, regular relations with Delphi, and even a treasury there, proves nothing as to its origin.

to be confused with the far earlier movements implied in the genealogy which Pherecydes constructed for the children of Lycaon of Arcadia. One version of the latter brought Oenotrians from Arcadia to Italy as its first inhabitants, and a kindred version (which however only comes to us through Dionysius, and is not assigned to Pherecydes or his followers by name) sets this Arcadian movement as far back as the seventeenth generation before the Trojan War. The evidence however for this double-colonization is all later than the fourth century:^{183a} it naturally proves nothing for any period earlier than the circumstances which called the theory itself into existence; and these circumstances are indicated very clearly in Dionysius' own version of the story of the Pelasgians in Italy,¹⁸⁴ for part of which he claims the support of Hellanicus. For he represents the Thessalian Pelasgians of Hellanicus as being themselves a detachment of the militant Pelasgians of Arcadia, who were not invented till a century after Hellanicus' time; and he puts their arrival back six generations before the days of Deucalion, whereas Hellanicus had kept them in Thessaly until the invasion of the Hellenes, at least one generation after Deucalion, and only three generations before the Trojan War. The whole story, in fact, as viewed by Dionysius, is seen through the spectacles of Ephorus; or rather perhaps of some follower of Ephorus whose aim was to work into the Ephoran theory some part of the calculations of Pherecydes.¹⁸⁵

Fourthly, the Tyrrhenian name became more and more widely applied to the Pelasgian invaders of Lemnos, Attica, and other parts of the Aegean. The statement of Thucydides, that his Tyrrhenian-Pelasgian folk in Mt. Athos were akin to the invaders of Lemnos, lay open to misconception in proportion as the word 'Tyrrhenian' gained more generic vogue; and we have already seen that Hellanicus had placed a 'Tyrrhenian' colony in Lesbos, over against *Ἀντανδρον τὴν Πελασγίδα*. There was some excuse, therefore, for the attempt of Anticleides to reconcile the accounts given by Herodotus, and by Hellanicus, of the western Tyrrhenians, by causing *Pelasgians* from Lemnos and Imbros (who on Thucydidean authority were akin to the Tyrrhenian-Pelasgians of Mt. Athos) to join *Tyrrhenus*, son of Atys, and his men, *ἔθνεα πολλὰ παραμειψαμένους*, as Herodotus says, on their way to Tyrrhenia-in-the-West.

But it is quite another affair, when Ephorus describes the Lemnians as Tyrrhenians without qualification;¹⁸⁶ or when Philochorus¹⁸⁷ retells the story

^{183a} It is set out in great detail by Ridgeway, *Early Age of Greece* i. pp. 231 ff.

¹⁸⁴ Dionys. Hal. i. 22.

¹⁸⁵ I have already commented (p. 187, n. 41) on the doubt which must exist as to the date of any statement attributed to Pherecydes, and my impression that, though the earliest of the three writers of this name was a *λογογράφος* and probably compiled genealogies, the quotations themselves betray the influence of the Ephoran theory, and may be quite late. It is certainly remarkable that Ephorus did not acknowledge his debt to Pherecydes as well as

to Hesiod, if fragment 85 of Pherecydes was extant and known to him.

¹⁸⁶ Diod. 10. 19.

¹⁸⁷ Fr. 5. We have already had two experiences of Philochorus as a philologist and it is in the very next fragment, fr. 6, that he derives the name of the Homeric *Σίντιες* from *σίνεσθαι* with reference to this same raid. But in this fragment he calls the raiders Pelasgians. The Homeric *Σίντιες* however as we have seen, have no more to do with the Pelasgians than they have with the Tyrrhenians.

of the Pelasgian raid on Attica with details derived from Hecataeus and Herodotus, but with 'Tyrrenians' substituted for Pelasgians throughout, and with the philological moral *τύραννος εἴρηται ἀπὸ τῶν Τυρρηνῶν τῶν βιαιῶν καὶ ληστῶν ἐξ ἀρχῆς . . . Τυρρηνοὶ γὰρ ὀλίγον τι νὰ χρονοὺν οἰκήσαντες ἐν ταῖς Ἀθήναις . . . πολλοὶ μὲν αὐτῶν ἀπώλοντο . . . ἄλλοι δὲ ἐκφυγόντες Λήμνον καὶ Ἰμβρον ᾤκησαν . . .* and then returned when *παρθένοι ἀρκετούμεναι τῇ θεῷ* were at their mercy at Brauron. After this it is not surprising that Apollonius of Rhodes,¹⁸⁸ followed by Plutarch¹⁸⁹ and Polyaeus,¹⁹⁰ should have described as 'Tyrrenians' the persecutors of the Minyans; that Aristoxenus¹⁹¹ should describe Pythagoras as a 'Tyrrenian' from Lemnos; that Diogenes Laertius¹⁹² should describe one Mnesarchus as *Τυρρηνὸν ὄντα καὶ γένος τῶν Λήμνον καὶ Ἰμβρον καὶ Σκύρου οἰκησάντων Τυρρηνῶν*; or finally that the Lemnians who were conquered by Miltiades should rank, for Cornelius Nepos, as *Carians*.¹⁹³ Only much later (with the single exception of one passage of Charax) does the revival of Herodotean authority permit Stephanus (*s.v.* Ἐφαιστίας), Suidas, and Zenobius (*s.v.* Ἐρμώνειος χάρις) to recur to the fifth century name of 'Pelasgian.'

The mention of Scyros is particularly instructive, because its inhabitants had been noted by Thucydides¹⁹⁴ as Dolopes, of a well-known mainland stock of ordinary North-Greek type.¹⁹⁵ Ephorus however called them 'Pelasgians,'¹⁹⁶ as we might almost have guessed, seeing they are *ἔπιοικοι* from North Greece; Scymnus couples them with the men of Sciathos as *Πελασγοί*, but gives them a quite different origin, *ἐκ Θράκης διαβάντες, ὡς λόγος*;¹⁹⁷ Nicolas of Damascus calls them 'Pelasgians and Carians'¹⁹⁸ and Diogenes, as we have seen, couples them with the men of Lemnos and Imbros, but calls all three peoples 'Tyrrenian.'

§ 17.—Conclusion.

Anyone who has followed this analysis of the Greek authorities as far as the close of the fourth century will agree, I think, that there is not much to be gained by classifying the unauthenticated statements of the writers further down. Anyone, moreover, who is familiar with those statements, will recognize at once how large a proportion of them consists in direct elaboration of the Homeric and Herodotean connotative view, that 'Pelasgian' meant 'pre-Hellenic' in much the same sense as 'British' is popularly used in England for 'pre-Roman,' or 'Druidical' for 'pre-Christian'; and how large a proportion of the remainder are *τεμάχη τοῦ μεγάλου δείπνου Ἐφόρου*.

Take the case of the famous Pelasgian settlement in Rome. There is

¹⁸⁸ *Argonautica* iv. 1760.

¹⁸⁹ *Q. Gr.* 21, *Virt. Mul.* 8.

¹⁹¹ *Fr.* 1. ¹⁹² viii. 1. 2.

¹⁹³ *Miltiades* 2. ¹⁹⁴ i. 98.

¹⁹⁵ *Hdt.* vii. 132, 185. Though he has occasion in vii. 183 to mention a Scyrian named

Pammon, all he has to say of him is that he betrayed a Greek anchorage to the Persians.

¹⁹⁶ Diodorus, xi. 60.

¹⁹⁷ Scymnus, 615.

¹⁹⁸ *Steph. Byz. s.v.* Σκύρος.

an obvious but anonymous culture-hero; so he is Evander (*εὐ-ανδρ-ος* = *vir Ionus*) and of Arcadian origin. There is the place-name Palatium; so it is a de-nasalized form of Pallantion in Arcadia. There is archaic masonry upon the hill; so it is a *Πελασγικὸν τεῖχος*: and behold! an 'important confirmatory proof' of the Ephoran theory of an Italian 'eparchy' of the Pelasgians; incidentally also a good excuse for Roman intervention in the affairs of 'Pelasgian' Epirus and 'Pelasgian' Greece.

Nor is the case of the Pelasgians exceptional. I have dealt already incidentally with the Carian Theory which grew up on parallel lines in the South Aegean, and more fully with the story of the Tyrrhenian name in the Aegean and in the West. The story of the Leleges is shorter and more fragmentary; but in its main outlines it hardly differs. In all, there is an early period, beginning with a time when there seems to have been a real but evanescent tribe, of limited geographical range, and some peculiarities of culture; and ending, between the sixth and the fifth centuries, with a vague cycle of memories, and a connotative usage of the name. To this, in each case, succeeds a fifth-century phase in which, while ingenious theory flourishes, real search for 'survivals' of backward folk is perceptible. Then comes the fourth century, regardless of research, reckless of accuracy or scholarship, infatuated with headstrong theory, to which the evidence (such as it is) must conform or be ignored; and then Alexandria, stupidly farraginous, but rehabilitated lately, as we saw to begin with, as 'evidence to the same effect, perfectly unexceptionable and as strictly historical as the case will admit of.'

J. L. MYRES.

APPENDIX ON APOLLONIUS, *ARGONAUTICA* I. 1021-4.

I have reserved for discussion in an appendix the one passage in which an ancient author purports to describe an attempt on the part of 'actual' Pelasgians to gain a footing on the Asiatic shore of the Hellespont. The passage itself is of late date; and my only reasons for not treating it among contemporary passages are that the personages to which it refers can be traced back beyond the fifth century; that the ethnic situation which it presupposes has already been shown to be presupposed in the Homeric Age; and that the incident itself occurs in a context which links it at latest with the Ionian colonization of Propontis, and at earliest with the Argonaut-saga, which we know from Homer to have been current in some form or other before the composition of the *Odyssey*.

The anecdote in question is as follows. The Argonauts, after passing the Troad, landed on the Asiatic coast of Propontis, made friends with the Doliones and their king Cyzicus, and fought some *γηγεῖες* from the interior, who tried to blockade the *Argo* in the so-called *χρὸς λιμῆν* at Cyzicus. Soon after, they were forced by stress of weather to put back to the same friendly coast. Then follow the crucial lines:—

- i. 1021-4. οὐδὲ τις αὐτὴν νῆσον ἐπιφραδέως ἐνόηεν
 ἔμμεναι· οὐδ' ὑπὸ νυκτὶ Δολιόνας ἄψ' ἀνιόντας
 ἦρωας νημερτὲς ἐπήμισαν· ἀλλὰ πού ἀνδρῶν
 Μακρίων εἶσαντο Πελασγικὸν ἄρεα κέλευται.

So there was a fight at cross purposes, and great slaughter of the Doliones, and in that fight was Cyzicus slain, their king: whose tomb remained at the city of Cyzicus in Hellenic times, honoured still with Argonautic *ἄεθλα*.

Now granted that all that Apollonius knew was the foundation-legend of Cyzicus, and some previous version, not necessarily early, of the Voyage of the Argo: granted also that the foundation-legend itself was mainly aetiological, and that every self-respecting town in Propontis, and beyond, had its own 'reminiscence' of the Argonauts, to prove its antiquity; yet nothing of all this explains either the specific name of the *Μακρίων*, or why the phrase *Πελασγικὸν ἄρεα* is applied to their raid.

This name, and phrase, completely puzzled the very learned scholiast of Apollonius. He seems to have begun by applying it to the Doliones themselves; and he explains (1) that the Doliones are colonists from Euboea; (2) that Euboea was once called *Μακρίς* 'Long Island'; (3) that as Euboea lies 'near Peloponnese, which is Pelasgian,' Cyzicene (*i.e.* paullo-post-Euboic) warfare was 'Pelasgian' likewise.¹⁹⁹ We have clearly to look further than this for an explanation.

Apollonius himself shares, as we have seen,²⁰⁰ the misapprehensions of his time as to the relations of Pelasgians and Tyrrhenians; and he is therefore not the most likely person to have held consciously a Pelasgian theory, or recounted willingly a Pelasgian anecdote, which presumed a quite different view from anything which had been held since the fifth century, if even consciously so late as this. It is therefore the most notable, if he *has* preserved such an anecdote; and if he has, there is a fair presumption that he did not invent it, but found it in existence and used it.

The version of the same incident which is given by Apollodorus²⁰¹ suggests that there was more in the authority which Apollonius was following, than he chose to incorporate in his *Argonautica*. The passage is worth quoting in full: *ἀπὸ Λήμνου δὲ προσίσχουσι Δολίοισι, ὧν ἐβασίλευε Κύζικος· οὗτος αὐτοὺς ὑπέδεδέξατο φιλοφρόνως. νυκτὸς ἀναχθέντες ἐντεῦθεν, καὶ περιπεσόντες ἀντιπνοίας, ἀγροοῦντες πάλιν τοῖς Δολίοισι προσίσχουσιν. οἱ δὲ νομίζοντες Πελασγικὸν εἶναι στρατὸν (ἔτυχον γὰρ ὑπὸ Πελασγῶν συνεχῶς πολεμούμενοι) μάχην τῆς νυκτὸς συνάπτουσιν, ἀγροοῦντες πρὸς ἀγνοοῦντας.*

Who were these Pelasgians by whom the Doliones were 'incessantly raided'? They can hardly be the Herodotean Pelasgians of Placie and Scylace; partly because the Pelasgians are apparently still an European people in Homer, and had certainly not yet reached Lemnos in the Homeric Age; but still more because it was a sea-borne raid which convinced the Doliones that the invaders were Pelasgian, and the Pelasgians of Placie and Scylace were on the same side of Propontis as Cyzicus itself.

But were they Pelasgians from Lemnos? Certainly not, in a poem by Apollonius, or we should surely have heard something of this exploit in his version of the Lemnian episode. Moreover, even if Apollonius had thought that there were Pelasgians in Lemnos in Jason's time, there is Homeric authority, as we have seen, to the contrary.

The whole question is somewhat complicated by the fact that there was also great doubt in antiquity as to who were the Doliones. Stephanus says²⁰² that Homer applied this name to the inhabitants of Cyzicus *ὡς τοὺς τὸν Ἰσμαρον Κίκονας*: but this does not occur in our text of Homer. It suggests however that there existed some 'Homeric' source of tradition about Cyzicus; and this we shall soon see to be probable otherwise.

In the ordinary way Cyzicus counted as a colony of Miletus; but we know from Hecataeus of Miletus,²⁰³ at the close of the sixth century, that it had a previous existence as a town of the Doliones (or Dolieis as Hecataeus himself wrote the name). The geographical situation is discussed fully and clearly by Strabo.²⁰⁴ But who the Doliones were is only known from one phrase of Ephorus, and from Alexandrine or later writers; and opinions differed then in an instructive way. Ephorus²⁰⁵ describes them as *Πελασγούς*

¹⁹⁹ Schol. Ap. Rh. i. 962, 1024.

²⁰⁰ Above p. 221, n. 188.

²⁰¹ i. 9. 18. 1. Apollodorus wrote *circa*

140 B.C.

²⁰² Steph. Byz. s.v. *Κύζικος*.

²⁰³ Fr. 204 = Steph. Byz. s.v. *Δολίονες*.

²⁰⁴ Str. 575.

²⁰⁵ Schol. Ap. Rh. i. 1037.

ὄντας καὶ ἐχθρῶδως διακειμένους πρὸς τοὺς τὴν Θετταλίαν καὶ Μαγιησίαν κατοικοῦντας διὰ τὸ ἀπελασθῆναι ὑπ' αὐτῶν, *i.e.* he regards the Doliones as exiled Thessalian-Pelasgians; and in this he is followed by Conon,²⁰⁶ who adds that Cyzicus was their king in Thessaly, and that those who expelled them were Aeolians. It is therefore not merely a confusion of names when another late writer²⁰⁷ calls the Doliones 'Dolopes'; for we have seen already²⁰⁸ that the population of Scyros which for Thucydides was 'Dolopian' had become 'Pelasgian' already for Ephorus, and remained so for Scymnus and Nicolas.

But there was a quite different account of the Doliones,²⁰⁹ which described them not as exiles from Thessaly, but as ἀποικοὶ Θετταλῶν, and consequently kinsmen of Jason, and fellow-enemies both of the expelled Pelasgians, and of the γηγενέες of the Cyzicene interior. This was the view of Deilochus, whom the Scholiast says that Apollonius was following.²¹⁰ These γηγενέες are an additional element of complexity in the story. Apollonius says that it was they who tried to blockade the Argo in the *χυτὸς λιμὴν* during the visit to Cyzicus²¹¹ and were slain by Heracles and his comrades; but Deilochus²¹² ascribes the blockade to the Pelasgians κατὰ ἔχθος τὸ πρὸς τοῖς Θετταλοῖς ὑφ' ὧν ἐξεβέβλητο,²¹³ and says²¹⁴ that the γηγενέες were Θεσσαλοῖς (*i.e.* Δολίοσι) ἐγχειρογάστορας, and that it was they who mistook the Argonauts for pirates and planned the attack on them: an obvious attempt to relieve the Thessalian Cyzicenes from the reproach of that blunder. Stephanus also (*s.v.* Βέσβικος) distinguishes the obstructive γηγενέες from the Pelasgians, but curiously reckons the Pelasgians as allies of Heracles in his destruction of the γηγενέες.

Conon also adds that ὕστερον (*i.e.* after the fight with Jason) the surviving Doliones ἰπὸ Τυρρηγῶν Κυζίκου μετανέστησαν καὶ Τυρρηνοὶ τὴν Χερρόνηπον ἔσχον: and that it was these 'Tyrrhenians' whom the Milesian colonists found there. Conon therefore had also before him, besides the 'Pelasgic' view of Ephorus, this other story which distinguished the Doliones of Cyzicus from 'Tyrrhenian' marauders in Hellespont; and we may well believe that, writing as late as he did, he meant by 'Tyrrhenian' to signify much the same as the Πελασγικὸν ἄρα of Apollonius.

We reach therefore this conclusion. Attractive and accepted as it was, the Ephoran view, that the Doliones were Pelasgians from Thessaly, did not wholly eclipse an alternative legend that they belonged to the same great Pagasaeon adventure-cycle as the Argonauts themselves; and that in their Hellespontine home they and their friends were exposed to the attack, not merely of half-conquered γηγενέες (αὐτόχθονες) on their own side of the water, but also of enemies from the European shore. These enemies Apollonius still calls 'Pelasgian': only a later compiler like Conon uses the marine equivalent 'Tyrrhenian.'

And this glimpse of another tradition does not stand quite alone. One of the theories, we may remember, to account for the Dolopes of Scyros and the men of Sciathos, was that they were Πελασγοὶ ἐκ Θράκης²¹⁵ διαβάντες, ὡς λόγος: and we know that in the Homeric Age there were already 'actual' Pelasgians as far afield as Crete. We must remember also that Placie and Scylace, where Herodotus knew of Pelasgians surviving and speaking 'Pelasgic' in the fifth century, are in the immediate neighbourhood of Cyzicus itself. Mela²¹⁶ moreover has a very similar suggestion about the Doliones themselves, for he brings both them and their king Cyzicus not from Thessaly or Euboea, but from *Thrace*, making them, in fact, almost an advanced guard of our immigrant Pelasgians from the same region; so that it is not impossible that here we may have a clue to the origin of that 'Pelasgian' ancestry or quality of the Doliones of Cyzicus, which attracted the attention of Ephorus, and led to their incorporation in the great Pelasgian mythology.

It seems probable, then, that we may infer that what is present to the mind of

²⁰⁶ *Narr.* 41.

²⁰⁷ *Orph. Arg.* 497 (530).

²⁰⁸ p. 221 above.

²⁰⁹ *Schol. Ap. Rh.* i. 921, 987.

²¹⁰ *Schol. Ap. Rh.* i. 1037.

²¹¹ *Ap. Rh.* i. 987.

²¹² *Schol. Ap. Rh.* i. 1037.

²¹³ *Schol. Ap. Rh.* i. 987.

²¹⁴ *Schol.* 989.

²¹⁵ Scymnus, 584, see p. 221 above.

²¹⁶ *Mela* i. 19, 2. Compare Strabo's discussion of the ethnography of all this region, summarized on p. 196 above.

Apollonius and some other late writers is a picture of a Thrace which the Hellespont, as in Homer's time, *ἐπὶ δὲ ἐέργει* with difficulty ; and of an Asiatic coast watched, like a 'Saxon shore,' day and night for the 'Winged Hats' from the European side.

But all this breathes a quite different atmosphere from that of the Alexandrian Library. It presumes the existence of the Thraceward Pelasgians of the Catalogue, of whom no single Greek writer, I think, takes any positive account till Strabo ; and even Herodotus only implicitly and vaguely. It comes to us in a context,—the foundation-legend of Cyzicus, and the ritual *πάθος* of its slain founder-king,—which we can trace in nomenclature back to Hecataeus of Miletus, and consequently beyond the period where the Ephoran theory of a Pelasgian conquest begins to predominate over all : back, in fact, into days when Lemnian Pelasgians were known to be post-Argonautic, and the Pelasgians of Placie and Seylace were still talking their own language and recounting their own traditions.

It gives us, in fact, a very strong case for believing that here, at any rate, Apollonius is incorporating, almost verbally, a section of a very much older *Argonautica* ; that this *Argonautica* goes up certainly into the early days of Milesian colonization, probably into the Homeric Age ; and very possibly even to a generation which stood to the Argonauts and the Doliones as Demodocus stood to the Trojan War.

J. L. M.