



NISAEA AND MINOA

NISAEA and MINOA

Introduction

Scholars are generally agreed that the site of Nisaea is on the coast south of Megara and that Minoa is adjacent to it. One opinion, represented notably by Lolling (*Ath. Mitt.* v, 1880, 1 f.), is that the hill of H. Giórgios is Nisaea and that the mound of Paliókastro is Minoa. The other opinion, put forward by Bölte and Weicker (*Ath. Mitt.* xxix, 1904, 79 f.) is that Paliókastro is Nisaea and H. Giórgios Minoa. Most people now favour the Bölte-Weicker hypothesis and in his *Commentary on Thucydides* ii, 334 f., Professor A. W. Gomme accepts it, although not without acknowledging the difficulties entailed. It will be convenient to set forth at the outset some of the principal arguments for and against either hypothesis; other factors will be dealt with later, in relation to the literary evidence on the subject.

Paliókastro is on the coast and, although the long beach to the west of it is open to all weathers, there is a short stretch to the east which is sheltered by H. Giórgios and could serve as a landing-place. The mound is without doubt a classical site; parts of a temple and other buildings are visible on it and Bölte and Weicker discovered inscriptions and pottery covering many centuries. The distance from Paliókastro to Megara is over 2000 yards, which is more than the eight stades specified by Thucydides; but apart from H. Giórgios there is no other likely site at a comparable distance from the city. In addition, there are on the southern outskirts of Megara traces of walls that are headed towards Paliókastro and may be part of the Long Walls which the Athenians built. Finally, there are five islets between the site and Salamis; and this corresponds to Strabo's description of Nisaea.

There is thus a fairly compact body of evidence to support the identification of Paliókastro with Nisaea. But there are also formidable difficulties.

(a) The site is too small for a town. It might hold a small acropolis, but there are no signs of a town in the fields around it. In any case the mound is evidently artificial for the most

part and scarcely meets the defensive requirements of an acropolis; such buildings of the classical age as have been found on it need not have exceeded the limits of a temple precinct. It has to be remembered that Thucydides mentions two sacred monuments in the vicinity of Nisaea and that Pausanias refers to two more; there is nothing to prove that Paliókastró is not a site of this kind rather than a sea-port.

(b) If Paliókastró were Nisaea, it would follow that H. Giórgios was the Minoa described by Thucydides. It would also follow that H. Giórgios was an island in the time of Thucydides and of Pausanias. But, although we may say with confidence that the shore of Vourkádhi bay, which lies east of Megara, has dried out a long way in the last two thousand years, there is little likelihood that the plain to the north and west of H. Giórgios was under water as late as Pausanias' time or even Thucydides'. Indeed, if H. Giórgios had been surrounded by water, Paliókastró itself would probably have been an island and therefore could not have been the site of Nisaea. Moreover, an island that included H. Giórgios would inevitably have taken in also the Tichó promontory, which is 3 miles away. This would not be compatible either with Pausanias' reference to a *smali* island or with the impression created by Thucydides' account of the capture of Minoa.

(c) The distance between Paliókastró and the foot of H. Giórgios is less than half a mile and it is very difficult to imagine the elaborate operations described by Thucydides being carried out in such a small space. A landing at the present Skála of Megara would be difficult enough in any circumstances and, if the defending troops held fortified positions, would almost certainly fail long before the attackers reached the top of H. Giórgios. Granted, however, that the Athenians had established themselves on the hill, it seems unlikely either that the Peloponnesians would have allowed them to remain there for a period of three years or that they themselves would have been content to look down on Nisaea for so long, without making any attempt to capture the place. Lastly, when the Athenians did attack the Long Walls and Nisaea, they made an approach-march by night and lay in ambush till dawn, and they used a complicated stratagem to force a way inside the Walls; in the space between H. Giórgios and Paliókastró, such preparations would have been unnecessary and they could hardly have escaped detection.

(d) The Paliókastro site fits one sentence of Strabo's account of Nisaea (see above) but is at variance with the rest. The geographer mentions not the island of Minoa but a headland of the same name, which can only be the ridge from H. Giórgios to Tichó or its eastern extremity. He also makes it clear that Nisaea is closely associated with this headland and that it does not lie between the headland and the Scironian rocks. In addition he says that Nisaea is eighteen stades from Megara, and not eight as stated by Thucydides. Scholars are often inclined to dismiss most of Strabo's description as inaccurate, just as they ignore the difficulty of reconciling Thucydides' account with the Paliókastro — H. Giórgios area or reject Pausanias' reference to the island of Minoa on the ground that Minoa was by this time a headland. But any interpretation which contradicts the bulk of ancient literary evidence is obviously on shaky ground and is not to be accepted lightly.

Lolling's theory, which reverses the identifications of Nisaea and Minoa, is even less convincing than that of Bölte and Weicker. H. Giórgios is not much farther than Paliókastro from Megara. Its steep, rocky slopes descend on the south side to the Skála of Megara, which, even if it has no beaches, is a haven for small vessels; and its western slopes overlook the beach towards Paliókastro. In addition, there are on this hill remains of ancient walls and buildings which are a good deal more extensive than those on Paliókastro. There may have been a fair-sized town on H. Giórgios, and its summit certainly has the character of an acropolis. To this extent, the hill is a more plausible location for Nisaea. Finally, it would be fairly easy to reconcile the whole of Strabo's description with this site.

If, however, this identification means assigning Minoa to Paliókastro, it is unacceptable. The geographical conditions demand — as in the case of the Bölte-Weicker hypothesis — that, if Paliókastro were an island, then the ridge from H. Giórgios to Tichó must have been an island too. An Athenian landing on an island at Paliókastro would have been more easily accomplished than a landing at the Skála; but the resulting tactical situation would have been equally unreal. The Peloponnesians could hardly have tolerated the presence of the enemy at their harbour-entrance for three years, and the Athenian plan for capturing the Long Walls would have been detected at the outset by the defenders of H. Giórgios and would surely have been frustrated.

It seems to me that Lolling's identification of Nisaea has at least as much to commend it as the Bölte-Weicker hypothesis, and perhaps more, but that his argument is nullified through his attempt to connect Minoa with Paliókastró. This makes nonsense of Thucydides' account and is at variance with the geographical probabilities; and it does not suit the archaeological discoveries made by Bölte and Weicker after Lolling's time.

It is necessary to re-examine the literary evidence and to seek a means of reconciling it with topographical and archaeological fact. In the discussion that follows ancient place-names are taken chiefly from H. Kiepert *Formae Orbis Antiqui*, map xxiv (1906), and modern place-names chiefly from the British staff map GSGS 4439 (1 : 100,000), sheet K. 3; I have also used Admiralty Chart no. 1513 (based on a survey of 1836—38).

1. BOUDORON, 429 B. C.

Thuc. ii. 93. 4, 94. 3; iii. 51. 1.

Boudoron, says Thucydides, is a fort; it is situated on a headland of Salamis; and near it there is a beach with room for at least three triremes. The fort faces Megara and its garrison can in some sense keep watch on Nisaea. It is not stated, however, that Nisaea was actually visible from Boudoron. One purpose of the fort and its supporting triremes was to give warning of ships from Nisaea entering the Gulf of Eleusis, and, if possible, to prevent them doing so; and in 429 the Peloponnesian commanders evidently had a project of this kind in mind. To fulfil this purpose, it would suffice if Boudoron commanded some part of the strait between Salamis and the Megarid.

It was long thought, and many people still think, that the headland facing Megara was that on which the convent of Phaneroméni now stands and that the fort corresponded to a ruined site on the ridge above the convent. If Boudoron were here, the garrison would see any ship rounding the Tícho promontory, and the three triremes — if in serviceable condition (in 429 they were not) — would sail out to meet them from the beach north of the convent. The site commands the whole of Vourkádhi bay and the city of Megara; watchers on it can see the north side of H. Giórgios and Paliókastró, but not the beach beyond them.

This identification is acceptable as far as it goes. Bölte and Weicker were unable to accept it, because they thought that the Athenians in Boudoron must have been able to see the

harbour of Nisaea. They placed the fort in the neighbourhood of Cape Petrítis, which faces Paliókastró across four miles of sea. The position is conjectural, there being no archaeological evidence of a fort at this point. In addition, its distance from Paliókastró is too great for accurate observation of ships by the naked eye; and triremes stationed there would not have time to forestall ships sailing out of Paliókastró towards Salamis and the Gulf of Eleusis. Thus a site on Petrítis is much less plausible than the traditional location at Phaneroméni.

Further discussion of the Phaneroméni site will be found in § 5.

2. MINOA, 427 B. C. — 423 B. C.

Thuc. iii. 51. 1 f.; iv. 67. 1, 118; Strabo ix. 1. 4; Paus. i. 44. 4.

Thucydides tells us that Minoa was an island and that it was nearer than Boudoron to Nisaea. His description of Nicias' assault on the island is obscure in places and its meaning has been disputed. My own translation of the passage (iii. 51. 1f.) is as follows:—

'The Athenians launched an attack on the island of Minoa, which lies off Megara. The Megarians had built a fort on the island and were using it as a strongpoint . . . By landing siege-engines from the sea, Nicias captured two advanced forts on the Nisaea side and in this way cleared the passage to the landward side of the island. Then he built a wall to protect his position on the mainland (sc. as well as capturing the island) at a point where the island, which is not far from the mainland, could be counter-attacked *via* a bridge over a marsh. After the Athenians had completed this task, which they did in a few days, he established a fortified camp on the island also, put a garrison in it and withdrew his assault-force.'

The difficulty of the passage lies mainly in the prepositional phrases ἀπὸ τῆς Νισαίας δύο πύργῳ προύχοντε, ἐς τὸ μεταξὺ τῆς νήσου and τὸ ἐκ τῆς ἡπείρου. In the first and third of these, ἀπὸ and ἐκ seem to me to indicate a position viewed from the opposite side of a channel. (Cf. Thuc. iii. 4. 5 τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀθηναίων, "envoys at Athens", as regarded from Lesbos; so iii. 5. 1. οἱ δ' ἐκ τῶν Ἀθηνῶν πρέσβεις). There is an island with one tower on it, a channel, and a mainland; and Nicias captures two towers on the Nisaea-side, i.e. on the mainland, facing the island. The area of these two towers is then referred to simply as the position *on* the mainland. The καὶ preceding τὸ ἐκ τῆς ἡπείρου

marks a contrast with τῆς νήσου in the earlier phrase. In the second of the three phrases, τὸ μεταξύ seems to denote the shore of the island nearest to the captured forts on the mainland; it is "the between shore" of the island, i.e. its inner shore, facing the mainland. The word ἔσπλουν shows, I believe, that the channel was navigable. The two forts on the mainland may have been adjacent to either end of this channel but need not have been in the narrows. Once they had been captured and there was no longer any danger of interference from that quarter, Nicias could sail into the channel and land on the inner shore of the island.

Another difficulty lies in the words ἐπιβोधῆια ἦν τῆ νήσω. At first sight they suggest that the island was separated from the mainland only by shallow water and that this obstacle was crossed by a raised bridge or perhaps by a sunken causeway. This interpretation, however, is scarcely compatible with the term ἔσπλουν or with the rest of Thucydides' account. It is plain that Nicias occupied not only an island but also a part of the mainland. Therefore there could have been no question of enemy troops attacking the island unless they had first overrun his position on the mainland. Accordingly the bridge over the marsh cannot have lain between the island and the mainland position; it must have been on the mainland, but on the side away from the island. It may also be inferred from the fact that this mainland position could only be reached by a bridge that it was a somewhat inaccessible headland or *peninsula*. That is to say, the topographical features must have been arranged as follows:—

(Megara) — marsh with bridge — headland with two forts — channel — island — (open sea).

A force attempting to re-capture the island would have to cross the bridge, take the mainland position and then go by boat to the island. This interpretation pre-supposes a remarkable compression of language on Thucydides' part; it is nevertheless guaranteed, in my opinion, not only by the context itself but also by iv. 67, 118 and by the evidence of Pausanias and Strabo (see below).

Although in iii. 51 Thucydides speaks only of the *island of Minoa*, he later describes a movement of troops by night from this island to an area outside Nisaea and the Long Walls in terms which do not suggest, and indeed virtually preclude, movement by sea. It looks as if this assault force had been

landed on the island (or in the channel between the island and the mainland position) and had been concealed there during the day; at night they were probably concentrated in the mainland position and from there marched by way of the bridge across the marsh to two places near the Long Walls (see below, § 3). This impression is confirmed by the armistice terms of 423 B. C., which mention a bridge leading to Minoa *and* the island captured by the Athenians. Here the mainland position is evidently called Minoa and the island is unnamed.

This situation can be explained, if we assume that there was an *ἄκρα Μινώα* and a *νῆσος Μινώα* and that each could be called simply *Μινώα*. The Thucydidean expression *Μινώαν τὴν νῆσον* may well reflect this distinction. By this means we may also explain the descriptions given by Pausanias and Strabo, which otherwise seem incompatible with each other. Pausanias agrees with Thucydides that Minoa is an island; he also says that it is quite small and that it lies alongside Nisaea. Some scholars are inclined to think that Pausanias did not know what he was talking about; on the ground that Minoa must have been a headland at this time, as Strabo says, they suggest that he is quoting from Thucydides or some other early author. But Pausanias' account, though brief, is emphatic and not lacking in detail; it is unwise to accuse him of error. His 'small island lying alongside Nisaea' may be held to confirm Thucydides and not merely to paraphrase his meaning. Strabo says that Minoa is a headland which in some sense forms the harbour of Nisaea, and he adds that the harbour itself was formerly called Minoa. Although Thucydides believed the island and, for that matter, the mainland position opposite to be quite near Nisaea, his account does not suggest that either of them formed the harbour; this problem will be discussed later (see below, § 4). For the present it is enough to observe that Strabo's headland called Minoa may be the same as the Minoa of Thuc. iv. 118 and also the mainland position occupied by Nicias in Thuc. iii. 51.

If we look in the vicinity of Megara for a headland and an island which will fit the descriptions of Thucydides, Pausanias and Strabo, it seems to me that the *Tíchó* promontory and *Trypíka* (*Macrónisos*) are the only possibilities. *Trypíka* is much nearer than *Phaneroméni* to *H. Giórgios*. Soldiers encamped on it or ships based on the channel between it and *Tíchó* would be well able to guard the entrance to the Gulf of Eleusis. They would not see the beach beyond the *Skála* but they could keep

watch on any vessels anchored under H. Giórgios and they would at least notice any ship that sailed out of Paliókastró. There is no doubt that they would be able to fulfil the first task mentioned by Thucydides, viz. to prevent excursions by enemy warships and privateers. Whether they could also prevent warships *entering* Nisaea is questionable. If they had triremes patrolling from Minoa westwards, the answer is 'yes'; and they may have had such a force, following the debacle at Boudoron in 429 B. C. It is hard to say where Thucydides' two Megarian forts on the mainland may have been; but obvious possibilities are the extreme tip of Tichó in the east and the spit of land that projects southwards from the headland a little to the west of Trypíka. Nicias might well have found it necessary to take these positions before landing on the island. Once established on Tichó, he would draw a wall across the low-lying isthmus which separates it from the H. Giórgios ridge. At the northern end of this wall, his troops would look across the broad salt-flats of Vourkádhi bay towards Megara. In ancient times the line of the bay may have extended further inland than it does now, and the salt-flats may have been more marshy in character. It is easy to imagine a road coming from the low plain between Megara and H. Giórgios, reaching the isthmus by means of a bridge or submerged causeway. Such a road would have enabled the Megarians not merely to supply their forts on the headland but also to use the channel between it and Trypíka as a haven. (The channel is still used for this purpose.)

There is only one detail of Thuc. iii. 51 that constitutes an objection to this hypothesis. If Nicias' wall were at the Tichó isthmus and if Nisaea were at H. Giórgios, one might wonder why Nicias expected a counterattack from the marsh rather than from the H. Giórgios ridge. Although the ridge is stony and uneven, it would not be very difficult for soldiers to make their way along it and to attack the wall. I can only guess why Thucydides should have overlooked this possibility; it would be idle to suggest that he did not know of the ridge or that he had forgotten its existence. It is just conceivable that because the Athenians later crossed the marsh to attack the Long Walls, Thucydides supposed that this was the best, if not the only, way for the Megarians to attack Minoa. A more plausible reason, however, is that the ridge, which is now entirely without vegetation, was then covered with trees and scrub so thickly as to impede movement over its rough surface (see below, § 3).

3. NISAEA, 424 B. C.

Pindar *N.* v. 46; Thuc. 1. 104, iii. 67—73; iv. 109. 1; Plut. *Phoc.* xv; schol. *Ar. Ach.* 760.

Nisaea is referred to by Pindar as Νίσου τ' ἐν εὐαγκεῖ λόφῳ. Ordinarily one would expect ἄγκεια to be wooded valleys in mountainous country; cf. Call. *H. Cer.* 83, εὐάγκεια of Pindus. There is no such area on the coast near Megara; but Pindar's words might be regarded as a somewhat magniloquent description of the steep sides of the H. Giórgios ridge, especially if they were thickly wooded in antiquity (see above, § 2, and below). It is hardly possible that he should have been thinking of groves on the plain between Megara and H. Giórgios, even if the Nisaeian games, which prompted his description, were held there; trees on the plain would not make the λόφος itself εὐαγκής.

In the middle of the 5th century, the Athenians had built Long Walls, on the model of their own Themistoclean defences, across this plain. If the foundations which are still to be seen on the Southern outskirts of Megara are part of a Long Wall, they presumably belong to the Walls built by Phocion in the 4th century; for these would almost certainly be of stone, whereas Thucydides says that the 5th century Walls were of brick and also that they were utterly destroyed in the winter of 424/3 B. C. (iv. 109. 1 κατέσκαψαν ἐλόντες ἐς ἔδαφος). We may reasonably assume, however, that Phocion's Walls would follow the same course as the earlier Walls, and therefore that one 'leg' of these early Walls ran from Megara to Paliókastró. If, then, H. Giórgios was the site of Nisaea, the other 'leg' must have run from Megara to the western end of the H. Giórgios ridge. This 'leg' would pass at no great distance — perhaps half or three-quarters of a mile — from the shore of Vourkádhi bay. The two 'legs' together would enclose not only the town of Nisaea, situated on the summit and western slopes of H. Giórgios but also the beach between the Skála and Paliókastró; and this beach would be the harbour of Nisaea. There would thus be a wall enclosing an acropolis on the summit and also the harbour.

When the Athenians undertook the task of capturing the Long Walls, they landed 600 hoplites and some Plataean light troops at Minoa. Thucydides says that the landing-place was on the island, but it is reasonable to suppose that, before the attack began, the men were concentrated on the Tichó headland (see above, § 2). The hoplites were moved by night to a clay-pit

which the Megarians had dug to obtain bricks for the Long Walls; the light troops occupied a shrine or monument called the Enyalion, which was still closer to the nearer Wall. There is no suggestion that the troops went by boat to their positions, and it seems likely enough that they marched across the bridge and the marsh. At dawn the light troops seized a gate in the Wall, which was opened to receive a boat brought by cart from the sea along "the ditch". Following our hypothesis, the boat will have come from Vourkádhi bay, and therefore "the ditch" will have run, on a rough estimate, from the shore of the bay to the gate in the Wall (see below). The Athenian attack went according to plan. The light troops, helped by the Megarian traitors who owned the boat, took the gate, and the hoplites entered and quickly cleared the wall northwards as far as the citywall of Megara; meanwhile the Athenian rearguard drove the Peloponnesian garrison behind the fortified perimeter of Nisaea.

If our hypothesis is correct, the Megarian clay-pit will have been near the shore at the head of Vourkádhi bay and not far from the bridge over the marsh. The gate in the Long Wall seems to have been close to Nisaea; and so the Athenians must have swung to the left when they made their attack from the clay-pit. Consequently, the Enyalion will have been on the route from the head of the bay towards the foot of H. Giórgios and probably not more than two or three hundred yards from the Long Wall. Thucydides refers to "the Enyalion" as if it were a well-known feature of the landscape; and we shall find reason to believe that it was familiar to the Athenians and that it was in the area that I have indicated (see below, § 5).

But Thucydides also speaks of "the ditch", without any further indication of its nature and purpose. We might expect this to be a ditch parallel either to the Long Walls or to the city-wall of Nisaea. The latter possibility is excluded, however, by our conception of the perimeter of Nisaea. The former is, I believe, quite acceptable; for, if the Long Wall passed near the head of the bay, the traitors might well carry the boat from the water's edge to the ditch outside the Long Wall and then along the ditch to the gate. The only other possibility that occurs to me is that the ditch ran straight from the Long Wall to the bay, being intended to carry off flood-water that might sap the Wall. In this case, however, Thucydides might have been expected to describe it in greater detail.

At dawn an Athenian army of 4000 foot and 600 horse arrived from Eleusis and took up position outside Megara. Thucydides does not say that this force went at once to the Long Walls, and I think it unlikely that they joined the assault-troops from Minoa until it became clear that Megara was not to be surrendered at once. They may have marched from the frontier to the northern or western gate of the city; and the siege-train that accompanied them may have been intended to force the city-gates in case of temporary opposition from the people inside. In the end, however, the Athenians concentrated their forces outside Nisaea and proceeded to consolidate their gains.

Thucydides' account of the siege-works again falls short of complete clarity. He says that the Athenians "started from the wall which they held and built a cross-wall at the Megarian end". He then tells how a wall and ditch were drawn round Nisaea and all but finished on the second day. Having described the wall and ditch in some detail, he ends by saying that in the end the Athenians had "severed the Long Walls from the city of Megara" and "taken over Nisaea". The second of these phrases refers to the completion of the works round Nisaea, which induced the garrison to surrender immediately. The first phrase indicates the building of the cross-wall, about which no details are given. We have to suppose that the Athenians cut the Long Walls at a safe distance from Megara and joined the ends of the two 'legs' by a wall which turned the space between the Walls into an Athenian fortress. Thucydides uses the singular of *τείχος* not only here, with reference to the cross-wall, but also at iv. 68. 1, in connection with the storming of the gate; it seems to me likely that in these two passages the singular noun is used of one 'leg' of the wall only. (Elsewhere the historian uses *τείχη*, plur., meaning both 'legs' together.) Each leg would be double, with battlements on the inside as well as on the outside — as for example in the Peloponnesian siege-wall round Plataea, Thuc. iii. 21. The first Athenian attack would carry them along the eastern 'leg' to Megara and, later in the morning, when they began to build their cross-wall, they would start from the eastern 'leg' and move towards the western one. When the Megarians abandoned the western 'leg' is not clear from Thucydides' account; but at all events it must have been occupied by the Athenians by the time that the cross-wall was finished on the second day. But the method used in the investment of Nisaea suggests that this western 'leg' was taken at the outset; for, as

we shall find, the lines of circumvallation probably ran close to its seaward end. Once the eastern leg had fallen, the Megarians may have withdrawn from the other in order to avoid further trouble.

The Athenian wall round Nisaea seems to have started, like the cross-wall, from the eastern leg, but it proceeded in two directions towards the sea. This means that from a point to the north of H. Giórgios they built eastwards towards Vourkádhi bay and south-westwards towards Paliókastró; indeed this latter wall may have reached the sea almost at the end of the Long Wall. The siege-train, supported by some five thousand troops, would have no difficulty in completing the investment in two days; their works would pass over level ground all the way. At the Vourkádhi bay end, the wall and ditch would approach the road across the marsh to Minoa, which the Athenians already held; and so Nisaea would be invested on three sides. To strengthen their wall and ditch, the builders used stone and brick from a place which Thucydides calls simply "the suburb". This I take to be the lower part of Nisaea, lying at the foot of the northern and western slopes of H. Giórgios and excluded from the perimeter of the acropolis and harbour. The Athenians also cut down trees and bushes to provide building-material. If, as I have suggested, the eastern part of the H. Giórgios ridge was wooded, they may have obtained the timber from there; and this is the only area on the south side of Megara where bushes or scrub (βύλι) are at all likely to have been available in large quantities. It is possible, however, that the Athenians removed cultivated trees (although hardly olives or fruit-trees) from the plain through which the Long Walls ran.

When Nisaea was surrendered, the Athenians held all the high ground from H. Giórgios to the point of Tichó and also the fortified area enclosed by the Long Walls — an L-shaped position of considerable strength. Here they awaited the approach of Brasidas' army from Tripodiscus, and they sent out their Plataean light troops to reconnoitre the plain to the east and north of Megara. The combined Peloponnesian and Boeotian force numbered six thousand hoplites and an unspecified cavalry force. Brasidas arrived at Megara with an advance-guard of three hundred troops; the rest of the army followed and may have encamped on the northern or north-eastern shoulder of Mt. Geraneia. At the outset the Boeotian cavalry had no difficulty in sweeping the plain clear of the Plataeans, who fell back

towards the sea in the vicinity of Vourkádhi bay and Minoa. The Athenian army formed up in front of the H. Giórgios ridge and repelled the Boeotians when they came in pursuit of the Plataeans. Later, Brasidas brought his force nearer to Megara and occupied a position where he could safely offer battle. Conceivably this was on the high ground that runs eastwards from Megara and ends at a hill overlooking the bay, where there is a chapel of St. George. On this occasion the Athenians came out of Nisaea and formed their line in front of the eastern leg of the Long Walls, their right flank no doubt resting on the slopes of H. Giórgios or on the marsh near the bay. Their object was doubtless to prevent Brasidas cutting them off from Megara itself. In this situation, either side, if it had wished to attack the other, would have had to wheel, exposing its flank in the direction of the bay; but neither side had any real desire to provoke a general engagement, least of all in such an equivocal position, and nothing happened. Shortly afterwards, Brasidas retired to Tripodiscus and from there to the Isthmus; the Athenian field army also departed, leaving a garrison in Nisaea and at Minoa.

Once the army had gone, the Athenians had not enough men to hold the Long Walls; nor, since the attempt to capture Megara had failed and it was vain to hope for another opportunity of the same kind, did they have any reason to keep a garrison near the city. So, during the winter that followed, the Megarians came out and destroyed the Walls, apparently without encountering any serious opposition. The Athenians were henceforth confined to the H. Giórgios ridge and Tichó, but the Megarians were unable to dislodge them. In the next summer, when armistice terms were arranged, the situation remained unaltered. As there was now only a stretch of open ground between the opposing sides, it was necessary to define a boundary. This ran from a gate in the walls of Nisaea to a shrine of Poseidon, and from there in a direct line to the bridge which led across the marsh to Minoa. All land on the seaward side of this boundary, and in addition the island of Minoa, was to remain in Athenian hands.

It is perilous to try to locate the gate "beside Nisus" or the Poseidonion. Nevertheless I believe that the line prescribed in the agreement can be identified with fair probability. It seems evident that the Enyalion mentioned previously in connection with the assault on the Long Walls was not a landmark on this

boundary and that the Poseidonion, which did serve as a landmark, had played no part in the earlier assault. Therefore one may assume that they were some distance apart. Since, however, the line from the Poseidonion to the bridge can hardly have been far removed from the line of that earlier assault, one may also guess that the Poseidonion and the Enyalion lay *in opposite directions* as viewed from the former site of the Long Walls. That is to say, the Poseidonion may well have lain to the west of Nisaea. Now on Paliókastró there are certainly remains of a small temple, no matter what else there may have been; and this hillock by the sea-shore is not an unlikely site for a shrine of Poseidon. Moreover, if a straight line were drawn from Paliókastró to the head of Vourkádhi bay, we should have a line that would secure for the Athenians a strip of level-ground on the north side of the H. Giórgios ridge and prevented them encroaching on the arable land further north. To this extent the line is quite plausible.

Now, if we suppose, as before, that the harbour of Nisaea lay under H. Giórgios, in the angle of the beach between the present Skála and the stream a short way to the west, the town-wall will have reached the sea near this estuary. If we suppose further that there was a gate near the shore at this point, we have a likely enough location for the start of the boundary. The purpose of the delineation would be to deny to the Megarians the beach between the estuary and Paliókastró; for it is likely enough that they would have access to the Poseidonion on this hillock, even if the Athenians occupied it, and encroachment on this beach might imperil the Athenian position. It is usually thought that there was a shrine or statue of the hero-founder Nisus at the gate in question; but it seems to me quite possible that Nisus was really the stream from which the hero took his name and from which the town-name Nisaea was derived. Accordingly we may proceed on the hypothesis that the boundary-line ran from the stream to Paliókastró and from there north-eastwards to Vourkádhi bay.

We have found that the whole of Thucydides' account can be explained, without distortion of the text and without straining topographical or archaeological data, if we assume that Minoa is the Tichó headland with the adjacent island of Trypíka and that Nisaea is on the crest of H. Giórgios. These identifications may now be tested in the light of the descriptions given by Strabo and Pausanias.

4. NISAEA and MINOA in the early Roman Empire.

Paus. i. 44. 4; Strab. ix. 1. 4, 9.

It is at least probable that the town of Nisaea was not moved any considerable distance in the centuries between the Peloponnesian War and the imperial period; and it is also probable that during this interval the headland and island originally called Minoa had not been re-named. We may perhaps allow for some elasticity in the use of place-names; the areas to which they are applied may be extended or contracted. But even this is not to be assumed without argument. In my opinion, it is also probable that the line of the coast had not changed a great deal. Vourkádhi bay may have dried out eastwards, but the shore from the Skála to the Scironian rocks probably remained approximately the same as before. Some scholars have in fact postulated great changes on the shore; but they have done so in order to support interpretations of the texts, which can be proved invalid on other grounds and without taking adequate account of the topographical conditions (see above, § Introduction). I shall not invoke any changes either in the place-names or in the nature of the coastline.

Strabo's opening remark makes it clear that Nisaea lay on or near a headland, but not between the headland and the Scironian rocks (see above, § Introduction). Looking eastwards from the Scironian rocks, the traveller would see the ridge of H. Giórgios stretching as far as Tichó, with the sea all along the southern shore and with Vourkádhi bay reaching some way farther inland than is now the case. This ridge is the first major headland that would meet his eye on the coast of the Megarid, and indeed the only one of any importance. He could be forgiven for regarding H. Giórgios, the acropolis of Nisaea, as the beginning of this headland, because the sea came so near to it on both sides. Granted this slight extension of reference, Strabo's Minoa is substantially the same as the headland which Thucydides calls Minoa.

The statement that Minoa "forms" or "constitutes" the harbour at Nisaea is at first sight perplexing. It might be thought to signify that the harbour was a well-defined bay, of which the headland formed one side or arm; but the beach that lies under H. Giórgios and west of the Skála cannot be so described. Nevertheless it is clear that Strabo does mean this beach; for, when he sails out of Nisaea in the direction of Salamis, he passes

five islets which must be the Methurides — Pacháki, Páchi, Revithóusa, Trypíka and an unnamed rock to the south of these. Accordingly the term *ποιοῦσα* may be no more than a reference to the angle formed by the spit of rock at the Skála and the beach further west. This, I think, is a possible explanation; but I prefer to suppose that Strabo had in mind *all* possible landing-places along the length of the headland, primarily the beach under H. Giórgios but also the present Skála and the channel between Tichó and Trypíka. For him these landing-places may collectively have formed the harbour of 'Nisaea' (see below); and at the present time the whole area is in fact marked on maps as ὄρμος Μεγάρων.

Strabo mentions the Long Walls, which must be those of Phocion, and states that the distance that they covered was eighteen stades. This is certainly a mistake, whether it be due to the geographer himself, to his source or to the ms-tradition of his works. The eight stades given by Thucydides is much nearer the truth, although even this is an under-estimate of the distance from Megara to H. Giórgios or Palióastro. I am inclined to think that Strabo's 'eighteen' results from the accidental combination of 'ten' and 'eight', these being alternative estimates from one source or another. Ten stades would seem to be a more accurate measurement.

The remark that Nisaea had been called Minoa in the past may be accounted for in two ways. Strabo may have had in mind poems in which the harbour town was called 'Minoan' because of its legendary associations with Crete. Or, if, as I have already suggested, he regarded all landing-places on the headland as part of the harbour of Nisaea, he may also have confused the headland itself, which for Thucydides stops short at the western end of Tichó, with the site of the town and acropolis as well as with the remainder of the ridge.

In general, Strabo seems to confirm the account given by Thucydides. If his description is obscure, this need only be because it is brief and concerned only with the main features of the coastline. We need not suppose that by his time the shape and extent of the headland had changed greatly or that he himself failed to identify it correctly.

Pausanias' remarks on Nisaea are equally brief but perhaps less systematic. He approached Nisaea from Megara, presumably along the line of the Long Walls, and on his way he passed a partly ruined temple of Demeter Malophoros. This may have

been situated in the town of Nisaea or, perhaps (less probably) somewhere in the plain south of Megara and near the Long Walls. After describing this temple, Pausanias says that at Nisaea there is an acropolis "which is itself called Nisaea". This phrase may be explicable if we consider it in the light both of Pausanias' subsequent remark about Minoa and of Strabo's description of the headland. For Pausanias Minoa is a smallish island which "lies off" or, more exactly, "lies alongside" Nisaea; and he says that in the war against Nisus the Cretan fleet anchored there. This description is obviously applicable to the island of Trypíka and the channel which separates it from Tichó. It can hardly refer to Pacháki and the present Skála; for anyone who regarded Pacháki as Minoa would have to mention at the same time the adjacent island of Páchi, and in any case the shore at the Skála is scarcely an anchorage for a fleet of ships. If, then, Pausanias means by Minoa the island of Trypíka, it would appear that he considered 'Nisaea' to include the whole of the ridge from H. Giórgios to the point of Tichó, just as Strabo may have done (see above). And when he comments on the fact the acropolis as well as the harbour is called Nisaea, he may be expressing surprise that the fortified crest of H. Giórgios should not be designated by a separate name from the main harbour below or from all the little landing-places along the shore of the ridge (see also below).

From the acropolis Pausanias went down to the sea and came upon a shrine of Lelex, a son of Poseidon. It is natural to assume that his route took him down the western or south-western slopes of H. Giórgios to the main harbour. If so, there would be nothing surprising in his finding the tomb of Lelex on the shore. It may even be conjectured that this tomb would not be far from the Poseidonion of Thucydides, which I have placed provisionally at Paliókastro. On the other hand, if Pausanias actually visited Minoa, he may have gone eastwards along the ridge from H. Giórgios and the tomb of Lelex may have been on the Tichó headland. The fact that he does not mention the Poseidonion at all might in some degree favour the latter hypothesis; but, since he also omits all reference to a headland, I think it preferable to suppose that he did not go there but merely caught a glimpse of Trypíka from the ridge near H. Giórgios.

The faults of Pausanias' description are again such as may be due to excessive brevity. On the whole, I think it likely that

he visited the acropolis on H. Giórgios and then went down to the shore near Paliókastró, and further that he describes Trypíka correctly insofar as it lies parallel to Tichó but fails to pin-point its position in relation to the town of Nisaea. If so, his errors are not more serious than those that occur in the best modern guide-books of Greece; and there is no good ground for asserting that he did not in fact see what he describes or that he borrowed from Thucydides an island of Minoa which no longer existed.

5. NISAEA and BOUDORON in the time of Solon.

Herodotus i. 59, 4, viii. 94. 2; Plut., *Sol.* 8. 4, 9, 12. 5; cf. Polyaen. i. 20. 2; Justin. 2, 8; Aen. Tact. 4. 8; Front., *Strat.* ii. 9. 9.

Solon was credited, on the evidence of his own poems, with having cleared Salamis of the Megarians. Herodotus says that "in the command against Megara" *Peisistratus* took Nisaea. Plutarch gives two variant accounts of *Solon's* achievement. In the first—which he describes as the popular version—he says that *Solon* and *Peisistratus* together defeated the Megarians at Cape Colias in Attica and then sailed to capture the town of Salamis; in the second, he records that *Solon* alone defeated the Megarians at a headland called the Sciradion and captured the town of Salamis. The other authors who give versions of this tale make *Peisistratus* the hero; Aeneas and Justin connect the story with Demeter Eleusinia, and they make *Peisistratus* capture not Salamis but Nisaea and Megara.

It seems certain that in the 6th century there was a war between Athens and Megara for the possession of Salamis and that Athens won. I doubt whether there was more than one such war and would readily ascribe the victory in this contest to *Solon* and *Peisistratus* jointly or to one or the other. But my concern now is not to reconstruct the military history of the 6th century; indeed I am convinced that the only certain feature of the tradition is the Athenian victory and that the stratagems assigned to *Solon* and *Peisistratus* are in the main mythical. I am at present interested in the tradition only insofar as it affects the location of Nisaea and neighbouring areas, and I believe that Plutarch's second version has a real bearing on this problem. From this point of view Plutarch's first version and the other variants are of minor importance, as I shall try to show.

The second version seems to end, like the others, with the capture of the town of Salamis, and this town is evidently the

classical Salamis on the north-eastern promontory of the island. It is with surprise that we learn in c. 12. 5 of the Athenians losing *Nisaea* and being driven again from Salamis; for Plutarch has not told us previously that Solon took Nisaea at all. Accordingly there may be an implication here that the fighting described in the second version (c. 9) had ended with the fall of Nisaea; and this would certainly be a plausible means of driving the Megarians from Salamis. It is also possible to suspect that for the benefit of the story the Athenians *had* to be expelled from Nisaea and Salamis in order that Peisistratus might have an opportunity to re-conquer both; but this notion need not detain us. What matters is that we should seek in the second version of Solon's war, which is to some extent corrupt and incomplete, an allusion to Nisaea.

Plutarch relates in c. 9 that Solon was directed by a Delphic oracle to placate two Salaminian heroes, Periphemus and Kychreus, who were buried in the *west* of the island, on the shore of a gulf or in the valley of a stream — τοὺς κόλποις Ἀσωπιάς ἀμφικαλύπτει. (Asopias is Salamis; the site of the graves is unknown). After carrying out this command, Solon raised a force of five hundred men and sailed with a fleet of fishing boats and one warship, to a long narrow headland on the coast of Salamis — χηλὴν τινα πρὸς τὴν Εὐβοίαν ἀποβλέπουσαν. Here Εὐβοίαν is obviously corrupt and Sintenis changed it to *Νίσαιαν* to suit c. 12, 5; the emendation rests on the assumption that a copyist mistook Ἀσωπιάς for the Boeotian Asopus, and in my opinion Sintenis was certainly right (see below). The Megarians in Salamis observed Solon's approach and sent a ship to find what his purpose was. Solon captured their ship and manned it with his own men; they were ordered to conceal themselves on board, and the vessel sailed to attack "the city". When it was gone, the Athenians with Solon engaged a Megarian force in battle *on land*, and while this battle was being fought, the men on the ship captured "the city". The final sentences of c. 9 support this tale by a reference to ritual — ἔοικε δὲ τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ καὶ τὰ δρώμενα μαρτυρεῖν. Unfortunately the explanation is hard to understand. It runs as follows: — 'For an Athenian ship approached (impf.), at first in silence; then, as they came on, shouting and cheering, one armed man leapt ashore with a loud cry and ran (impf.) to the point (summit?) of Sciradion . . . (to meet?) those approaching on land. The shrine is near the Enyalion and Solon founded it (or, which Solon founded?). For

he defeated the Megarians and freed under a truce all those who were not killed in the battle.'

At first sight these sentences merely increase the obscurity of the passage. Nevertheless the chapter as a whole provides several clues of a fairly precise nature. First, we are concerned with the *west* of Salamis; secondly, we have to identify a *long narrow headland*, which is associated or perhaps identical with a place called the *Sciradion*, and this Sciradion in turn is connected with a *shrine* and with a ritual that is supposed to justify the whole story; and finally, there is an *Enyalion*, called simply "the" Enyalion, not far from the shrine. Now, Thucydides also mentions "the" Enyalion and says that it is near a gate in the Long Walls of Megara; and we have found that this monument was probably at the head of Vourkádhi bay, which faces towards Salamis. Moreover, monuments bearing this name were not to be found at every cross-roads in Greece; they were in all probability very rare.

It is possible to trace the position of the Sciradion from another source. Herodotus, reporting a malicious tale which the Athenians invented after the battle of Salamis, tells how the Corinthian squadron were supposed to have deserted the Greek fleet and to have sailed away "as far as the shrine of Athena Sciras in Salamis (or, on the coast of Salamis)". Now, if this story were related to the context of the battle, the Corinthians must have sailed westwards through the Gulf of Eleusis; they could not have gone eastwards round Cynosoura, passing the Persian fleet on the way. Therefore they must have been heading for Phaneroméni and Vourkádhi bay when a miraculous apparition brought them to a halt. It was alleged that a boat approached the ships *θείηι πομπήι* and that unknown persons on board addressed the Corinthians, bidding them return whence they had come. So this story, like Plutarch's, brings us in the direction of Nisaea; and it is tempting to identify Plutarch's Sciradion and its shrine with the Athena Sciras of Herodotus. We may observe also that the Athenian slander against the Corinthians was obviously invented to glorify the goddess Athena. She is made to appear in a boat, giving counsel to faint-hearted Peloponnesians, in much the same way as Homer makes her stand beside Achilles, Diomedes or Telemachus when they are in need of help. One might even wonder whether the statue of Athena Sciras was regularly carried in a boat in the course

of her yearly festival; for Plutarch makes it plain that boats were prominent in the celebrations.

The thread of circumstance which we have followed is extremely tenuous, but it seems to me to point in one direction and in no other. We must expect to find Athena Sciras towards the south-west end of Salamis and within sight of Nisaea and its Enyalion. In this case, there is only one long narrow headland that comes into the reckoning, and that is the Phaneroméni headland, on which we have already located Boudoron. And here there exists the convent of Phaneroméni, a very old and famous foundation. From the number of ancient building-stones which are to be found in the convent itself and at the nearby site which is called "Kolónnes", it has often been conjectured that this shrine of the Virgin replaced a pagan cult. Here then is a site which fits the little evidence that we have on Athena Sciras; and, in terms of general probability, why should not the Panagía Phaneroméni have succeeded the incarnate protectress of ancient Athens?

We now have reason to dissociate the town of Salamis from Plutarch's second version and transfer the story to the strait between Salamis and the Megarid. We may assume also that the picturesque details of Solon's conquest were based on the belief that he had driven the Megarians from a shrine of Athena on the Phaneroméni headland and had captured Nisaea on the other side. The Enyalion on Vourkádhi bay was evidently regarded as a trophy; perhaps Solon was thought to have landed there and to have assaulted Nisaea from the same direction as that which Nicias took later. Perhaps Solon was also regarded as the builder of the temple of Athena on the other side. But, whatever may have happened in Solon's time, the Salaminians in later generations must have regarded the rites of Athena Sciras as re-enacting and perpetuating the exploits of Solon and Peisistratus. It is clear, however, that these rites did not provide confirmation of the tradition, as Plutarch suggests, but that they were actually its basis and origin. The few details that Plutarch reports are not enough to show what the ceremonies consisted of or what they really meant. They do, however, suggest certain outstanding features — a procession of boats from various parts of Salamis (and perhaps from all Attica) to the Sciradion; the dispatch of a single ship towards the west; a general landing from the boats at the Sciradion and perhaps some kind of mock-battle; the return of the ship from the west, accompanied by

shouts of triumph. It is conceivable that all these actions embodied historical truth and kept Solon's deeds alive; but it is somewhat more likely that Solon's deeds were simply conjured out of a ritual that in origin had a purely religious significance.

Plutarch's first version and the other variants need not detain us long. Even in the second version there is an obvious tendency to displace events from the south-west of Salamis to the north-east. One would naturally assume, but for Plutarch's imperfect explanation, that the headland referred to was Cynosoura and the city Old Salamis. The cause of this tendency may have been a desire to magnify Solon's success by representing the Megarians as holding all Salamis and threatening the Attic coast and then being all the more decisively beaten. In the first version, the entire action takes place in the North-east. The headland is no longer in Salamis but in Attica; the Megarians do not come to spy on Solon but to carry off the Athenian women worshipping Demeter on the headland; the Athenians kill the intruders and sail to capture not Nisaea but Salamis. The other versions develop the same tendency still further, and in the end connect the war with the Eleusinian Demeter. Aeneas and Justin go this far; but they also retain the original reference to Megara, omitting Salamis. The introduction of Demeter in place of Athena Sciras is itself illuminating. There was a Demeter Sciras on the outskirts of Phaleron, and it is possible that the Cape Colias version was in an early phase of its existence connected with her rites; alternatively, there may have been a cult of Demeter Sciras at Halimous, near Cape Colias. Another Demeter of the same designation may have been worshipped on the Sacred Way from Athens to Eleusis; and this may account for the transplantation of the story from the east side of Athens to the west. On the other hand, the very eminence of the Eleusinian cult would be sufficient to attract the legend; and the fact that the town of Salamis was within easy reach of Eleusis would facilitate this change. At any rate, the effect of time on the tradition seems to have been to carry the story round the greater part of a circle, from the Phaneroméni headland, via the north-east of Salamis and the coast east of Athens, to Eleusis.

Returning to the question of the Sciradion and the Enyalion, we may say that the importance of Plutarch's evidence is not outstanding, but that it does to some extent confirm the positions for Nisaea and the Enyalion already inferred from Thucydides, and that it tends to establish the Phaneroméni

headland in Salamis as the obvious counter-position to Nisaea, as we have also inferred from Thucydides' account of Boudoron.

If my explanation of the Solon story is anywhere near the truth, it may provide some scope for reflection on the Athenian operations against Megara in the Peloponnesian War. It would seem that in 424 the assault on the Long Walls virtually repeated, after three years of waiting, what Solon was believed to have achieved by sailing direct from Phaneroméni to Vourkádhi bay. Indeed, the Athenians, in building the Long Walls before the war, may have been guided by the extreme vulnerability of Nisaea which their ancestors had demonstrated. Above all, the evidence of Plutarch and Thucydides together reveals in a glaring light the maritime weakness of the Megarians and shows how tempting and easy it must have been for Pericles to impose his blockade on the city.

For Salamis as a daughter of Asopus (above, p. 39), see esp. C. M. Bowra, *The Daughters of Asopus* (*Hermes* 73, 1938, 213 f.).

Edinburgh

A. J. Beattie

ZUM KAISERKULT IN DER GRIECHISCHEN DICHTUNG

Der Anteil der römischen Dichter an der Gestaltung der Ideologie des römischen Prinzipats und an der Begründung des Kaiserkultes ist eine allgemein bekannte Tatsache¹⁾. In einer stetig wachsenden Reihe von Spezialuntersuchungen ist die Entwicklung der Topik des hymnischen Kaiserlobes, das Vergil inaugurierte, aufgezeigt worden²⁾. Das Kaiserlob er-

1) L. Cerfaux — J. Tondriau, *Le culte des souverains dans la civilisation Gréco-romaine*, Bruges 1957; F. Taeger, *Charisma*, Studien zur Geschichte des antiken Herrscherkultes 1, Stuttgart 1957, 371/96; 2, 1960, 407/416. — Dieser Aufsatz wartete seit 1958 auf seine Drucklegung, so daß die Ergebnisse, welche Taeger im 2. Bande vorlegt, nicht mehr im einzelnen mitverwertet werden konnten. Die Zeugnisse der griechischen Dichtung, insbesondere die Proömien Oppians und Pseudooppians, hat Taeger nicht beachtet.

2) A. Fincke, *De appellationibus Caesarum honorificis et adulatoriis usque ad Hadriani aetatem apud scriptores Romanos obviis*, Diss. Königsberg 1867; K. Scott, *Emperor Worship in Ovid: Transactions and Proceed-*