



## APPENDIX C'

### ON DEPILATION: BODY COSMETICS IN CLASSICAL ANTIQUITY

The Scholium to ἄρτι παρατετιλμένοι (Aristoph. *Ranae* 546) apart from the general fact that women used to strip off the hair from their pubic area by plucking it: ἐκ τούτου δείκνυται ὅτι παρέτιλλον (as against other methods of, perhaps, later currency) καὶ οἶονεὶ ἐξέδερον ἢ ἔτυπτον τὸ γυναικεῖον αἰδοῖον· οὕτως γὰρ πάλαι ἐψίλουν, also adds an interesting detail: τίλλουσι δὲ τὰς τρίχας αἱ νεόνυμφοι which is another proof of the statement made above that this practice was particularly agreeable to men. And so, an older woman boasts of her ἀποψίλωσις (implying sexual proclivity and prowess) in Aristophanes, *Lysistrata* 825 sqq. (I reproduce a standard scanning, with reservation): ἀλλ' ὅμως ἂν οὐκ ἴδοις / καίπερ οὔσης γραδὸς ὄντ' αὐ- / τὸν κομήτην, ἀλλ' ἀπειψι- / λωμένον τῷ λύχνῳ.

For this clearing the pubic region of hair by the use of lamp, see the memorable beginning of *Ecclesiazousae*, where in the hymn to the lamp this function of the worshipped appliance is also mentioned, in mock-tragic style:

Μόνος δὲ (sc. ὁ λύχνος) μηρῶν εἰς ἀπορρήτους μυχούς  
λάμπεις, ἀφεύων τὴν ἐπανθοῦσαν τρίχα.

The above examples may suffice for the establishment of the general points mentioned in the text. But there are one or two more points that ought to be mentioned in this connection as completing the background against which we may appreciate the entire content and intent of Baubo's action.

Firstly, then, to have the pubic hair removed was practised by men, too, and this even in early times. The connotation is again of wantonness and lewd abandon to sexual pleasures. See Aristophanes, *Nubes*, 977-8: ἠλείφατο δ' ἂν τοῦμφαλοῦ οὐδεὶς παῖς ὑπένερθεν / τότ' ἂν, ὥστε / τοῖς αἰδοίοισι δρόσος καὶ χνοῦς ὥσπερ μήλοισι ἐπήνθει· where the contrast implies the opposite practice in Aristophanes' time among boys. (The above-mentioned connotation is testified by the context of the passage). This is, however, a general statement, applicable to all boys and not especially to those particularly prone to pleasure (ἠλείφατο rather indicates gymnastic exercises), and perhaps simply explainable by the repugnance which ancient Greeks felt to exist between beauty, either in young woman or young man, and hairiness in any part of the body other than the skull (compare, e.g. for women, the descriptions of the lowermost part of the female trunk in Rufinus' epigrams, *Anth. Graeca* Book V, 35 and 36, implying as they do, immaculate hairlessness); though, even so, the change of habits as reported by Aristophanes must be significant. But we may add another conclusive testimony from Menander's Ὀργή apud Athenaeus IV 166A (Fr. I, Meineke IV p. 178): καὶ βάψομαι, / καὶ παρατιλοῦμαι νῆ Δία, καὶ γενήσομαι / Κτήσιππος, οὐκ ἄνθρωπος, ἐν ὀλίγῳ χρόνῳ - where even the rest of the fragment, and, besides, what Athenaeus relates about Ctesippus, the son of the famous general Chabrias, make it clear that we have here to do with ἀσωτία and ἠδυνάθεια in men.

It is instructive here to compare the same Aristophanian sentiment as is found in Lucian, *Cynicus* §14. It is once more about the perennial theme of the good old days when morality prevailed. The men of old were real men, and they could move without shoes and without clothes (the modern equivalent of Lucian would not, though, praise nakedness equally fervently, I suppose!), and they wore the hair and beard that God bestowed on them as an ornament, like the mane of lions and horses. They were better than us, and no one of them would suffer to be shaved no less than any lion would suffer this. ὑγρότητα γὰρ καὶ λειότητα σαρκὸς γυναιξὶ πρέπειν ἠγοῦντο, αὐτοὶ δ' ὥσπερ ἦσαν, καὶ φαίνεσθαι ἄνδρες ἤθελον! ὑγρότης (limpid liquidity, this indefinable quality of moist voluptuousness which, for the ancients, could characterise a body and a form of life, a glance and a style) and smoothness are, as always, the signs of a body, and a temperament, luxuriating in sensual gratification. And Lucian ends

this comparison thus: *ἐκείνους οὖν ἐγὼ ζηλώ τοὺς παλαιούς, καὶ ἐκείνους μιμῆσθαι βούλομαι* (it is the *Κυνικός*, of course, who speaks all the time), *τοὺς δὲ νῦν οὐ ζηλώ τῆς θαυμαστῆς ταύτης εὐδαιμονίας ἧς ἔχουσι περὶ τραπέζας καὶ ἐσθῆτας καὶ λεαίνοντες καὶ ψιλοῦμενοι πᾶν τοῦ σώματος μέρος καὶ μηδὲ τῶν ἀπορρήτων μηδὲν ἢ πέφυκεν ἔχειν ἑῶντες.*

That this depilation of the whole male body including the pubic area and the fundament was a far from uncommon practice in Greek and Roman antiquity usually associated with intense and unprohibited enjoyment of sexual pleasures, especially of those not geared to generation, is a certainty, evidence for which will be presented below. But the point here is that it was not late; it was early, at least classical. Thus, to give some more examples, Aristophanes, *Ranae*, 422 sqq., makes the priest, in the midst of his religiously significant banter, to say:

*τὸν Κλεισθένης δ' ἀκούω  
ἐν ταῖς ταφαῖσι πρωκτὸν  
τίλλειν ἑαυτοῦ καὶ σπαράττει τὰς γνάθους,  
κᾶκόπτει ἔγκεκρυφῶς  
κᾶκλαε κᾶκεκράγει  
Σεβῖνον, ὅστις ἐστίν, ἀναφλύστιον* (I put this, for the  
mss. *ἀναφλύστιος*).

This is an excellent example of sustainedly multi-dimensional meaning, of richly interspersed allusions, that one expects from a supreme comic writer like Aristophanes. Cleisthenes here is made to mourn for Sebinus' death in a memorable way. This Cleisthenes was (in)famous as a *κίναϊδος* and *γυναικιζόμενος* or *γυναικῶδης*, v. Sch. ad *Nubes* 355: *οὗτος δὲ ἐπὶ κιναιδίᾳ διαβάλλεται. τοῦτον δὲ ὡς γυναικιζόμενον οὐκ Ἀριστοφάνης διαβάλλει μόνον* indeed in various places, *ἀλλὰ καὶ Κρατῖνος... τοῦτον ἰδοῦσαι, φησὶν, αἱ Νεφέλαι, εἰς γυναικας μετεμόρφωσαν ἑαυτάς.* Cf. Suda s.v. *Κλεισθένης ἀκρατέστερος*, which seems to have become proverbial, and s.v. *Κλεισθένης*. He is described as womanlike by Aristophanes in *Aves* 831 (the scholiast makes explicit Aristophanes' meaning), where the point lies in the contrast to Athena's manliness; and similarly the scholiast to *Lysistrata* 1092 says: *οὗτος Σιβυρτίου παῖς ἐπὶ θηλότητι κωμωδούμενος.* When in *Thesmoph.* Cleisthenes goes to the meeting of the women who celebrate the Thesmophoria to disclose that Mnesilochus

is among them disguised as a woman, he is taken at first as a woman (v. 571 sqq.); and he himself declares his affiliations in his following speech in no ambiguous terms (notice in particular the sexual connotation of the *γυναικομαχῶ* in v. 576; to his *ξυγγενεῖς τοῦμοῦ τρόπου*, the scholiast has: *τὰ αὐτά μοι πράττουσαι*. But this is not exactly correct: for if he wanted to allude to the general similarity between his and their ways, he would have more properly expressed it by using the formula *συγγενῆς τῶν ὑμετέρων τρόπων*. Aristophanes is exact here: their sexual behaviour is not the same, only similar to his). He is close shaven (575, where the scholiast has: *ἐψίλωτο γὰρ ὁ Κλεισθένης τὰς γνάθους γυναικωδῶς*; cf. 582-3). But in the passage from *Ranae* we have depilation of the *πρωκτός*. In intense mourning, plucking off of hair, naturally of the head, could take place; Aristophanes applies the custom to where is more apposite for the effeminate Cleisthenes: the anus. Similarly to strike and cut oneself when bereaved of somebody close to heart were habitual forms of extreme grief in mourning; but Aristophanes, by describing the mourner's convulsions by *ἐγκεκυφῶς* and by grammatically making this dependent on *κἀκόπτετο*, clearly alludes to quick anal coition in desolate places, such as ancient cemeteries were. These points have been succinctly made by the ancient scholiasts. Thus, for the last, sch. ad v. 422 ...*ἐν ταῖς ἐρημίαις καὶ περὶ τὰς ταφὰς καὶ τοὺς τάφους κακῶς ἔπασχεν* (= was suffering anal intercourse). As for the former points, the Scholiast observes: *τὸ οὖν τίλλειν τὰς τρίχας καὶ κόπτεσθαι ἅμα μὲν ὡς ἐπὶ τετελευτηκότῃ ἀναγκαίως, ἅμα δὲ εἰς μαλακίαν· καὶ τὸ κόπτεσθαι κακεμφάτως* (sc. *λέγει*). And as for the general point of the sexual import of bending or leaning forward or stooping down as a preparation for all sorts of quick sexual satisfaction, especially in isolated spots in the countryside, see on this matter in the study *Ἄρρητα Ἱερά* with the there given references.

Who is, finally, the man whom Cleisthenes mourns so singularly and for whom he calls out in tears? *Σεβίνος ὁ Ἀναφλύστιος*, both names being highly significant in a sexual way. For *Σεβίνος* is clearly fashioned from *σὲ βινεῖ* (coire, inire te); and thus the Athenians in *Lysistrata* 1092, hot with their erections, exclaim: *οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅπως οὐ Κλεισθένη βινήσομεν*. cf. *Ranae* 48 *ἐπεβάτευον Κλεισθένει* where notice the word used to signify the sexual act referred to; as the scholiast observes: *παίζει· λέγεται γὰρ καὶ ἐπὶ νεῶς τὸ ἐπιβατεύειν, καὶ ἐπὶ συνουσίας κατὰ μεταφορὰν τῶν ἀλόγων ζῴων, ἃ ἐπιβαίνο-*

ντα συνουσιάζει (cf. e.g. Aristotle, *Hist. Anim.* V, 2, 3 ἐπιβαίνοντος ἐπὶ τὸ θῆλυ τοῦ ἄρρενος) cf. also *Ranae*, 57: if one had sexual intercourse with a man (as distinct from a boy or youth) one was thinking of Cleisthenes as the probable partner. While Ἄναφλύστιος both signifies the demotic of the man in question, descended from the deme Ἄναφλύστιος, and may be taken in connection with ἀναφλᾶν, Hesychius s.v. ἀναφλᾶν, χειροτριβεῖν τὸ αἰδοῖον. οἱ δέ, στύνειν. ἢ μαλάττειν (this is the correct punctuation); and s.v. ἀναπεφλασμένον· ἀνατεταμένον ἔχων τὸ αἰδοῖον· ἀναφλᾶν γὰρ λέγουσιν Ἄττικοὶ τὸ ἀναμαλάσσειν τὰ αἰδοῖα (cf. the meaning of φλᾶν, which is explained by the Etym. M.: τύπτειν ἢ μαλάττειν. καὶ τὸ ἀναμαλάττειν, ἀναφλᾶν· Ἀριστοφάνης. Same entry in Photius); which ἀναμαλάσσειν, squeezing, Suda explains s.v. ἀναμαλάττεσθαι· ἀναφυρᾶν. And similarly Pollux II, 176: τὸ δὲ ἐπεγείρειν αὐτὸ (sc. τὸ αἰδοῖον) ταῖν χεροῖν, ἀναφλᾶν καὶ ἀνακνᾶν (pro ἀνακλᾶν) Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν Ἀμφιάρῳ λέγει. (Fr. XII Blaydes, 99 Di. = Fr. 37 PC Gr. vol. III 2 p. 50). Cf. Petronius 131, 5: admotisque manibus temptare coepit (sc. anicula) inguinum vires. Thus ἀναφλᾶν means exactly to cause an erection by the hand through rubbing and squeezing, just the same as ἀναψαθάλλειν which is connected with the πέος and explained thus by Phrynichus: (p. 916 Bekker) ἀναψαθάλλειν τὸ πέος. Ἐρμῖππος (Fr. 70 PC Gr. vol. V p. 596) ἄνευ προθέσεως λέγει ψαθάλλειν ἀντὶ τοῦ κνᾶν «σὺ δὲ τὴν κεφαλὴν ψάθαλλέ μου» (and we have noticed the ambiguity of κεφαλῆ), ἀντὶ τοῦ ψηλάφα. Καὶ Πλάτων ἐν Κλεοφῶντι (corrected from Κλειτοφῶντι) <πέος> ἐψάθαλλε λείος ὢν (Fr. IV Meineke vol. II p. 635 = Fr. 60 PC Gr. Vol. VII p. 457). This last fragment is particularly significant because it connects the practice here described with the character of being λείος, i.e. smooth-skinned, hairless. For Plato Comicus already, the two, sexual indulgence and bodily - smoothness and hairlessness - went together and were scoffed at together. This, then, is the sense of Eupolis ἀναφλασμός; Suda: ἀναφλασμὸν τὰ ἀφροδίσια (too general) Ἐϋπολις Αὐτολύκῳ. καὶ ἀναφλᾶν ἔλεγον τὸ μαλάττειν τὸ αἰδοῖον. And this is the sense required for the Aristophanian ἀμπεφλασμένως (Doric for ἀναπεφλασμένους) in *Lysistrata* 1099, that is having membra in tumefaction and erection just as the Hermae, as is required by the context. (For the erect membrum of these Hermae cf. Herodotus II 51; Eustathius ad *Iliadem* 1249, 8: διὸ καὶ οἱ Πελασγοὶ κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν ἐντεταμένον τὸν Ἐρμῆν, ἥτοι ὀρθιάζοντα, ἰδρύνονται etc.;

Cornutus *Theol. Graeca* 16 [p. 23.16-18 ed. BT], where *λείος* means the boy who has not reached puberty; Plutarch, *An Seni Respublica Gerenda Sit*, 28 [797F]; Macrobius I, 19, 14; Plotinus III, 6, 19, 25 sqq.: ὄθεν, οἶμαι, καὶ οἱ πάλαι σοφοὶ μυστικῶς καὶ ἐν τελεταῖς αἰνιττόμενοι Ἑρμῆν μὲν ποιούσι τὸν ἀρχαῖον τὸ τῆς γενέσεως ὄργανον αἰεὶ ἔχοντα πρὸς ἐργασίαν etc.; Cicero, *De Nat. Deorum* III §56, where he, in his erect condition, is brought, into connection with Proserpina, a fact of far-reaching significance as we shall see in another part of this work). I have insisted in determining the precise sense of ἀναφλᾶν, because the discussion of such matters tends to be, during the last few centuries, too general and vague: everything seems to be lumped together as sens. obs. Not quite so with Renaissance scholarship; and far from so in ancient times. Then there prevailed a general free acceptance of sexuality in all its faces; jesting with it presupposes such an acceptance, which, in its turn, does not imply necessarily praising it, or boasting of it. Thus, in our case, there were various expressions to denote the different things which can be done to the membrum virile even before anything involving a partner is concerned (similarly there were plenty of names, in common use, about the different συνουσιαστικὰ σχήματα and the various types of φιλήματα). One such expression is ἀναφλᾶν; another is ἀποσκολύπτειν (or σκολύπτειν; cf. Ἄρρητα Ἱερά n. 52); different again is ἀποτυλοῦν (already used by Pherecrates Fr. LXXI c, Fragm. Inc. Meineke vol. II p. 356 = Fr. 227 PCGr. Vol. VII p. 207: ἐκαλείτο δὲ καὶ τύλος τὸ αἰδοῖον, ὄθεν καὶ Φερεκράτης τὸ γυμνοῦν αὐτὸ (i.e. drawing back the skin so as to lay bare its head, the βάλανος) τῇ χειρὶ ἀποτυλοῦν εἶπεν); further we have ἀναστύψαι (Pollux II 176 and Hesychius s.v.); and finally the practice in which the κυνοδέσμιοι functioned (Pollux II 171 and Hesychius and Photius s.v. κυνοδέσμη). These expressions are found in comic writers and in lexicographers who collected them from comic writers; but comedy notoriously reflects the habits and customs of ordinary life in each age and nation; as can be seen from the elaborate naturalness of the Greek comic genius, the over-indulgent directness of the Roman, or the insipid sophistication of the contemporary scene.

But let us return to the passage from *Ranae* which kindled this digression. We have seen the onomatopoeic work of Aristophanes in

Σεβίνος and Ἄναφλύστιος. All this has been observed by the scholia ad loc.: ὀνοματοποιεῖ τοῦτο ὡς πρὸς τὴν μαλακίαν Κλεισθένους, παρὰ τὸ αἰσχρὸν. Πιθανῶς δὲ τὸ «ὄστις» ἐμφαίνει οὐ τὸν ὑπὸ ἐνὸς μόνον περαινόμενον (περαίνω = βινῶ i.e. «enter» anally; a very interesting suggestion that this is about ὄστις!). Πέπλασται δὲ αὐτῶ ὥσπερ ὁ Σεβίνος (another scholiast explains: καὶ Σεβίνος ἴσως παρὰ τὸ βινεῖν. Ἔστι δὲ καὶ Σεβίνος ὀνομασμένος παρὰ Πλάτωνι), οὕτω καὶ ὁ Ἄναφλύστιος· ἀναφλᾶν γὰρ ἔλεγον τὸ μαλάσσειν τὸ αἰδοῖον. Then it is added, by a different scholion, καὶ ὑποσύρειν τὸ καλύπτον τὴν βάλανον δέρμα. βάλανος δὲ ἐστὶ τὸ ἄκρον τῆς πόσθης. Ὑποσύρειν τὸ καλύπτον τὴν βάλανον δέρμα, i.e. leaving bare the glans penis is not correct, I think, for ἀναφλᾶν, and is an example of what I have said above about the lumping together of all things obscene in a similar way. The proper word in this sense would be ἀποτυλοῦν or ἀνασκολύπτειν. Anyhow, the unreliability of the scholion is manifest in its second part: πόσθη is just what covers the βάλανος; the ἄκρον τῆς πόσθης is called ἀκροποσθία (cf. e.g. Pollux II 171). The same indiscriminate application appears in the scholion ad *Lysistrata* 1099 where on ἀμπεφλασμένως we read: ἐκδεδαρμένους· τὰ αἰδοῖα ἀνατεταμένους. The second is correct; but the first is not, if it means, as I take it, ἀπεσκολυμμένους, i.e. circumcised.

This completes the discussion of the passage but for one final remark. Aristophanes does not only play an exquisite game of double entendre with Cleisthenes' mourning; by a stroke of genius he also clearly refers, without saying anything, to the parallel Dionysus affair with Prosemnus which has already been discussed (v. Clement, *Protr.* II, 34, 3; cf. Pausanias II, 37, 5). The same allusion seems to me to be operable in *Ranae* 56-57. When Dionysus says to Heracles that he was seized by a desire, Heracles asks desire for whom? For a woman? Certainly not is Dionysus' significant reply. But for a boy? Not at all. For a man then? Woe betide me. To which Heracles asks: ξυνεγένου τῷ Κλεισθένει; Finally it is a desire for the art of Euripides that Dionysus is meaning, but Prosemnus is in the mind of the viewers all along.

We have met thus with the practice of clearing a man's fundament of all hair. The same practice is made fun of in *Acharnenses* 119 sqq., again taking Cleisthenes as paradigm case. Two men approach, and Dicaeopolis exclaims:



καὶ τοῖν μὲν εὐνούχοι τὸν ἕτερον τουτονὶ  
 ἐγφῶδ' ὅς ἐστι, Κλεισθένης ὁ Σιβυρτίου.  
 Ὡ θερμόβουλον πρωκτὸν ἐξυρημένε,  
 τοιόνδε δ' ὦ πίθηκε, τὸν πώγων' ἔχων  
 εὐνούχος ἡμῖν ἦλθες ἐσκευασμένος;

Cleisthenes (and his fellow object of ridicule, Strato) are called εὐνούχοι here because, as the scholiast observes, with regard to the former, οὗτος δὲ ὁ Κλεισθένης αἰεὶ τὸ γένειον ἐξυρᾶτο πρὸς τὸ αἰεὶ φαίνεσθαι νέος· διὸ εὐνούχῳ αὐτὸν εἰκάζει; and the latter, ad.v. 122, καὶ οὗτος (sc. Strato) κωμωδεῖται ὡς λωβώμενος τὸ γένειον καὶ λειαινῶν τὸ σῶμα, ὡς Κλεισθένης, ὡς φησιν αὐτὸς Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν Ὀλκάσι: παῖδες ἀγένειοι <Κλεισθένης τε καὶ> Στράτων (Fr. 361 Dindorf = Fr. 422 PC Gr. vol. III 2 p. 231). Cf. also *Equites*, 1373-5 where they are called ἀγένειοι, to which the scholiast says: Κλεισθένης καὶ Στράτων: Γύννιδες οὗτοι καὶ πιττούμενοι τὰ γένεια, λείοι δὲ καὶ μαλακοί. It may be that τὰ γένεια should be deleted since depilation by pitch-plaster was chiefly practiced on the body; but in Alexis (Fr. X, Fab. Inc., Meineke vol. III, pp. 508-9 = Fr. 266 PC Gr. vol. II p. 171, apud Athenaeus XIII, 565b, πιττοκοπούμενον ἢ ξυρούμενον seem to refer to alternative ways of getting rid of beards, as is appropriate to the context as well; again however πιττοκοπούμενος may make all the difference; thus e.g. in Clement, *Paedagogus*, III, 20, 2 πιττοῦσθαι refers to the depilation of the privy parts. The πεπιττοκοπημένους of Fr. 38 of Fr. Com. Anonym. Meineke vol. IV p. 611 apud Clement, *Paedagogus* III, 68, 3 could refer to either area, or to both. Pollux VII 165 does not help either in our present concern; in any case however the following λείοι καὶ μαλακοί make for the required sense. A closely shaved face and hairless body go together here, as in Athenaeus XII, 528F, in the remarkable description of Sardanapallus by Ctesias, where we read among other equally exquisitely effeminate things:...γυναικίαν δὲ στολήν ἔχοντα καὶ κατεξυρημένον τὸν πώγωνα καὶ κατακεκισηρισμένον (rub again and again with pumice stone, so as to remove all hair from the body). Cf. Lucian, *De merc. cond.* 33: κίναιδόν τινα τῶν πεπιττωμένων τὰ σκέλη καὶ τὸν πώγωνα περιεξυρημένων. And similarly in Aristophanes' description of Agatho, *Thesmophoriazousai* 191-2:



σὺ δ' εὐπρόσωπος, λευκός, ἐξυρημένος,  
 γυναικόφωνος, ἀπαλός, εὐπρεπῆς ἰδεῖν

where εὐπρεπῆς refers to the body in contrast to εὐπρόσωπος, just as ἀπαλός refers to bodily smoothness and ἐξυρημένος to a closely shaven face; velvety and marble-like skin were especial attractions in youths: cf. the fine play by Cratinus apud Athenaeus I, 29D (Fr. III Πυτίνη, Meineke vol. II p. 117 = Fr. 195 PC Gr. vol. II p. 221: νῦν δ' ἦν ἴδη Μενδαῖον ἠβῶντ' ἀρτίως / οἰνίσκον (play on νεανίσκον), ἔπεται κάκολουθεῖ καὶ λέγει: / «οἴμ' ὡς ἀπαλός καὶ λευκός· ἄρ' οἴσει τρία;»); these features, stereotyped in the mask of one type of νεανίσκος, were appropriate for the impersonation of a beautiful young god: Pollux IV 136: ὁ δὲ ἀπαλός, βοστρύχους ξανθός, λευκόχρους, φαιδρός, πρέπων θεῶ καλῶ.

Cleisthenes is shaven in the fundament, his anus is described as θερμόβουλος in parody of a Euripidean verse, we are told by the scholiast, but with an apposite allusion to the hot desires of that part of Cleisthenes' anatomy. In the following verse, Aristophanes, parodying Archilochus this time, presents us with another of his ingenious games: he, this time, says something less than expected, something which is better literally fitting to the situation (for only Cleisthenes' face is actually seen, and it is, apparently, on account of his extremely careful and close shave that he is called a eunuch), while at the same time clearly alluding to the other more obscene and more really appropriate feature, which is unmistakably brought to mind by the previous verse (θερμόβουλον πρωκτὸν ἐξυρημένε), by the mention of the ape (in whose anatomy the hidden parts figure very eminently) and by the parody of the Archilochian verse, which makes the whole business clear as light. (The scholiast has: καὶ τοῦτο παρώδηκεν ἐκ τῶν Ἀρχιλόχου ἐπικωδῶν the correction is practically certain: τοιάνδε δ', ὦ πίθηκε, τὴν πυγὴν ἔχων, of which verse more will be said in a moment). We see, thus, how a seeming anticlimax (πώγων after πρωκτός) is really a masterfully constructed climax. Though the point is missed by Bentley on account of his overcleverness and overcriticism; he says commenting on the scholiast: immo non parodia sed vera lectio est τοιάνδε δ', ὦ πίθηκε, τὴν πυγὴν ἔχων. It is very typical of the misjudgements of a certain school of verbal thought in scholarship.

We conclude then that in classical times already the practice of removing the hair from a man's fundament existed, common enough to be repeatedly satyrised, and associated with effeminacy and, specifically, with desire to undergo anal intercourse. I am insisting on this specific characterization because we can see, in this case too, how exactly the latter fits with the earlier in our sources. One of Ausonius' epigrams (CXXXI) is entitled: *In quendam, qui laevia sibi inguina faciebat*, and runs thus:

Inguina quod calido laevas tibi dropace, causa est:  
                   irritant volvas levia membra lupas.  
 Sed quod et elixo plantaria podice vellis  
                   et teris incusas pumice Clazomenas,  
 causa latet: bimarem misi quod patientia morbum  
                   appetit: -et tergo foemina, pube vir es.

It is very clearly and nicely put: depilation of a man's pudendum area implies proclivity to exercise energetically his membrum during copulation (for such hairlessness is an irritant); depilation of a man's anal area means dominant desire to enjoy pathetically the activity of another's membrum. We have met with half of this situation in classical times, we cannot doubt the existence of the rest. Although, of course, the depilation was not really carried out in halves; hairlessness in the significant areas of a man was a sign of particular devotion to sexual pleasures in general - but was satyrised under the aspect in which the person made fun of was making himself vulnerable, as well as from the viewpoint of the comic writer.

We can multiply examples, if we wish. There would be no need for this exertion, but for the notion that used to, and still does, largely dominate the scholarly world of the last two centuries, according to which obscenity and immorality, as we would understand them, were, *grosso modo*, foreign to the classical period, and only to be found in the corrupt and perverted habits of the empire. This is a very obfuscatory and far from true conception. We should bravely appreciate, to put it concisely, that ancient morality was based on self-conscious natural excellences of proud natural essences, not on the dutiful, weak observance of a Law imposed from without (from above) on a weak and poor nature.

Thus Cratinus in his *ῥῶραι* (Fr. II, Meineke vol. II p. 163 = Fr. 276 PCGr. Vol. IV p. 261), speaking about a certain poet Gresippus (*παιγνιαγράφου τῆς ἰλαρᾶς μούσης* as is described by Athenaeus, XIV, 638d, a not very reputable fellow as is clear from the comic fragments satirizing him), says (Athenaeus XIV, 638 F):

ἴτω δὲ καὶ τραγωδίας  
 ὁ Κλεομάχου διδάσκαλος  
 μετ' αὐτόν, <ὁ> παρατίλτριων  
 ἔχων χορὸν λυδιστὶ τιλλουσῶν μέλη πονηρά.

Plucking both the chords of stringed instruments in the Lydian mode, and plucking off the hair in the Lydian fashion, Lydians being famous for luxurious softness and uninhibited indulgence to pleasures and the *πονηρά* keeps the fine ambiguity. *Παρατίλτριαι* were girls ready to perform the depilatory operations described above (cf. Philostratus, *Vita Apollonii* IV, 27, where the *παρατίλτριαι* are located in a *βαλανεῖον* with their pitch; cf. also idem, *de Vitis Soph.* I, 25, 5 ad fin. where again pitch and *παρατίλτριαι* are coupled together) to men, I believe, is required for the point to be made. (Gnesippus was further connected with adulterers and adulteries, as is clear from what else Athenaeus mentions *ad loc.*, whose special connection with depilation will be observed below, a connection which, as will be seen, further confirms the immaculate antiquity of all these cosmetic practices).

In *Thesmophoriazousai* 236 sqq. we have depilation of the fundament by *ἄφευσις*, burning out of the hair in that region by means of a (little) torch, *δᾶς* or a lamp, *λύχνος* (v. 239); the characteristic position here is stooping or leaning forward one of the indecent postures necessary in order for these practices to be carried out, and with indignation described by Clement, *Paedagogus*, III, 20, 2. The practice and the method must have been a relatively common one to be satirized by a comic writer. In the passage mentioned from *Thesmoph.*, Euripides is represented depilating Mnesilochus to make him passable as a woman among women.

236 ἀνίστασ' ἴν' ἀφεύσω σε, καγκύψιας ἔχε.  
 .....  
 ἐνεγκάτω τις ἔνδοθεν δᾶδ' ἢ λύχνον.  
 ἐπίκουπτε· τὴν κέρκον (i.e. membrum virile) φυλάττον  
 νῦν ἄκραν (in order not to be burned).

When later on in the same comedy, Cleisthenes comes to warn the women about the stealthy presence among them of Mnesilochus in his disguise as woman, the chorus asks how could he escape being noticed, to which Cleisthenes answers (v. 590-1)

*ἀφηῦσεν αὐτὸν κἀπέτιλ' Ἐὐριπίδης  
καὶ τᾶλλα ἄπανθ' ὥσπερ γυναικ' ἐσκεύασε,*

an answer indicating very clearly how widespread the depilation of the women's privy parts was. And when Mnesilochus, asks the women:

*Πείθεσθε τούτῳ ταῦτα; τίς δ' οὕτως ἀνήρ  
ἡλίθιος ὅστις τιλλόμενος ἠνείχετ' ἄν;  
οὐκ οἴομαι ἕγωγ', ὦ πολυτμήτῳ θεώ,*

he is simply trying to avoid being caught; the women, in any case, do not pay much attention to the comic and rhetorical argument.

Were such practices known and taking place in preclassical times? Certainly yes, though perhaps to a lesser extent, especially towards the end of the archaic period, although it is rather unlikely that such thorough-going depilations were generally exercised before it in Greece, save initially probably in aristocratic circles with the young nobility. It takes a certain type of sophistication (and thus generally implies a late-archaic age) to try to effect systematically and by artifice, what nature may not give, but the aesthetic preoccupations of a people do evaluate highly. For at whatever time widespread depilation may have taken root in Greece, its fundamental presupposition was always there, making it possible for the later habits to take hold and exercise their fashion and fascination. For the Greeks the idea of beauty as such found its most adequate materialization in the form of a well-developed youth (*βούπαις*), smooth-skinned and athletic. Sculpture is the most eloquent herald of this sentiment, one harmoniously conjugating an aesthetic judgement and an emotional experience; and in the epigrammatic literature, like the *Musa Puerilis Stratonis*, we meet the most carnal manifestation of that self-same sentiment. It is not, thus, accidental that there, in epigram after epigram, the praise of hairlessness is made and the leit-motif of the lover's warning to his beloved is heard: you are proud and unyielding in your beauty, but

think of the coming hair; I shall not be forever after you. Not many were there, whose infatuation would follow their beloved one's progress into full, mature manhood. Plato makes Socrates explain why he is still in pursuit of Alcibiades, after the rest had lost their interest in him; evidently, he states, because Socrates is solicitous of Alcibiades' soul, and not only desirous of his body. What then, given such aesthetic appreciations, is a man going to do when, past youth's prime, he wants still to be the object of affection, love and desire? He will take Agathon's way. And depilation will artificially create the required hairlessness, just as other practices will attend to the other conditions imposed by the idea of Greek beauty. Ideal beauty, homosexuality and depilation belong, naturally, to the same circle of peculiarly Greek notion and emotion. And as exquisite proportion in form, liquidity of posture and outline, visible and tactile smoothness, are wonderfully manifested in the athletic ideal of the young man in ancient sculpture, so is the elaborate hair cosmetics for head and pudendum; the archaic *κοῦροι* bear ample testimony to the fact. We have a vivid image of aristocratic youths in all this.

Of course, there was also the other side of the same coin. A popular robust and rather rustic attitude could not fail to take offense at the unmanly exploits of those committed to correcting nature, with or without Agathonian sophistication. It is important for our understanding in this particular of the ancient Greek spirit to keep carefully in mind that this reaction stems from the same presupposition as the tendency which it opposes and only objects to its, so to speak, misapplication in the latter direction. That rustic attitude is not moved by a different ideal of beauty or of its most adequate material representation; they only take exception at the attempt to undo the work of nature and to confuse the naturally established roles of the beloved one and of his lover. Beauty is the object of love, and beauty is the prerogative of youth; mature manhood desires youth and should not imitate or caricature it or pose for it.

This attitude lies at the core of the matter. Check it with any instance available and you will find it confirmed. The sentiment is well expressed by Alexis in an already referred fragment (Fr. 266 PCGr. vol. II p. 171 apud Athenaeus, XIII 565b):

<ἄν> πιπτοκοπούμενόν τιν' ἢ ξυρούμενον  
 ὄρῃς <δυσῶν> τούτων ἔχειν δεῖ (Cobet correction of ἔχει τι)  
 θάτερον·

ἢ γὰρ στρατεύειν ἐπινοεῖν μοι φαίνεται (Jacob's emendation of the  
 inappropriate γὰρ στρατεύειν of the mss. is *μαστροπεύειν* -  
 ingenious but not wholly satisfactory; as Meineke said: hoc tamen  
 certum est pro *στρατεύειν* requiri verbum quo cinaedorum mollities  
 indicetur; perhaps *ἐρατεύειν*, Headlam; or *ἐταιρεῖν* Herwerden)

καὶ πάντα τῷ πάγωνι δρᾶν ἐναντία,  
 ἢ πλουσιακὸν τούτῳ <τι> προσπίπτει κακόν.  
 τί γὰρ αἱ τρίχες λυποῦσιν ἡμᾶς, πρὸς θεῶν,  
 δι' ἃς ἀνὴρ ἕκαστος ἡμῶν φαίνεται,  
 εἰ μὴ τι ταύταις ἀντιπράττεσθαι ὑπονοεῖς;

That is, if hair displeases you, you must not be satisfied with the condition which makes it appear, i.e. mature manhood.

I shall give one different, but connected, example of the caution and qualification needed to correctly appreciate the specific import of negative, satirizing attitudes like the one mentioned above.

The qualities which are standardly involved in the appreciation of the male (as well as, *mutatis mutandis*, female) human body, apart from those pertaining to proportionate structure and formal beauty, are *λειότης*, *ἀπαλότης*, *λευκότης*, *ύγρότης*. *Λειότης*, smoothness (not to be confused with softness) is the one we most encountered above, hairlessness being probably the main contributor to its prominence and excellence, together with a healthy skin, glistening from gymnastic exercise, oil anointed massage and baths. *Υγρότης*, as already explained, is an elusive character, hardly definable because of an exquisitely complex foundation, expressing, as it were, the flowing rhythm of form as well as the emotional dimension of the flesh and its most peculiar attractiveness when it poses alluringly as the self-conscious object of delectation, exciting desire which calls for nothing but an absolute abandon to the pleasure of its enjoyment in unfulfilled satisfaction. *Ἀπαλότης*, softness in touch, pertains to the female body in its yielding quality, to the fresh and tender flesh of a boy, or to the elaborate delicacy of the effeminate. But the example I spoke of above will be taken from what concerns *λευκότης*.

*Λευκόν*, it should be noted to begin with, is not quite our white simpliciter. For instance, I doubt whether ancient Greeks of the

preclassical times naturally called a dull, mat, lustreless white *λευκόν*, at least not without some necessary qualification. And, conversely, *λευκόν* was anything resplendent, even if much less than immaculate, pure white in our sense, such as the chaff-heaps at threshing time when then burned under the intense heat and sun of a Mediterranean summer, or the dust setting on warriors during a close, violent combat in similar conditions: *Iliad*, E, 499 sqq.:

ὡς δ' ἄνεμος ἄχνας φορέει ἱερὰς κατ' ἀλωὰς  
 ἀνδρῶν λικμώντων, ὅτε τε ξανθὴ Δημήτηρ  
 κρίνη ἐπειγομένων ἀνέμων καρπὸν τε καὶ ἄχνας,  
 αἱ δ' ὑπολευκαίνονται ἀχυρμαί· ὡς τότε Ἄχαιοὶ  
 λευκοὶ ὑπερθε γέγοντο κοινοτάλω, ὃν ρα δι' αὐτῶν  
 οὐρανὸν εἰς πολύχαλκον ἐπέπληγον πόδες ἵππων.

We need not illustrate our standard use of *λευκόν* according to which snow, milk, bones, teeth, sails, flour, sugar etc. are white. I shall merely indicate here some of the unexpected uses: brilliant, bright, shining (*Iliad*, Ξ, 185: *λευκὸν δ' ἦν ἥελιος ὡς*, where the scholia A have: *γράφεται λαμπρόν*, which smells of Alexandrian, as much as of critical nineteenth century, ingenuousness; Sophocles, *Ajax* 708, *λευκὸν φάος*); clear, translucent (*Odyssey*, ζ, 45: *λευκὴ δ' ἐπιδέδρομεν αἴγλη*; κ 94: *λευκὴ δ' ἦν ἀμφὶ γαλήνη*; Euripides, *Andromache* 1228: *λευκὴν αἰθέρα πορθμεύόμενος*); metallic, silvery (*Iliad* Ψ 267-8: *λευκὸς λέβης*); and we should particularly notice the *λευκόν* as a quality of clear, transparent water (*Iliad*, Ψ 282: *λοέσσας ὕδατι λευκῶ*, where Eustathius perceptively notes: *ὕδωρ δὲ λευκὸν τὸ ἀλλαχοῦ καὶ μέλαν*, a remark the point of which appears, e.g. from his note to be adduced next; *Odyssey* Σ, 70: *κρηναὶ δ' ἐξείης πίσυρες ρέον ὕδατι λευκῶ*, to which Eustathius remarks: *λευκὸν δὲ ὕδωρ τὸ κρηναῖον τοῦτο, διὰ τὸ ἀβαθές. τὸ γὰρ βαθὺ μέλαν φαίνεται*: he also correctly explains this *λευκόν* as *διαυγές*, limpid, lucid, translucent, in p. 1553.20 with reference to the present verse; Aeschylus famous *ὦν γῆ καὶ λευκὸν ὕδωρ* in *Supplices* 23; Euripides, *Herc. Fur.* 573, *Δίρκης τε νᾶμα λευκὸν αἵμαχθήσεται*; notice further Callimachus, *Hymn. in Jovem* 18-9: *οὐδ' Ἐρύμανθος / λευκότατος ποταμῶν*). In fact Callimachus, fastidiously correct as he was, goes so far as to write: *λευκὸν ἔαρ, λευκὸν δὲ θέρος* (*Hymn. in Cererem* 124), where the scholiast concisely observes: *λευκόν· λαμπρόν*.



This semantic field of *λευκόν* thus, seems to have been in preclassical times like this, in our terms: shining bright brilliant resplendent shiny translucent transparent clear light (coloured) white. There existed also, of course, a perfectly matching sphere of connected meanings for *μέλαν*.

We see that this field of signification, in all its unmentionable variety, can be easily arranged around three points of reference, so to speak, in three clusters: (1) bright, glistening, lustrous (2) clear, transparent (3) light (and as a particularly obvious case of light-colouredness, white). This natural arrangement we also see taking place in the subtle colour distinctions and relationships in the colour-theories of the classical times: cf. especially Plato's views in *Timaeus* 67c sqq., where the *διαφανές*, the *λευκόν* and the *λαμπρὸν καὶ στίλβον* (answering to 2-3-1 respectively) are neatly distinguished, the two latter being brought in intimate connection (together with the *ἐρυθρόν*). One should also study carefully the intricate and very important Aristotelian tract *περὶ χρωμάτων*. But in order to comprehend correctly the ancient understanding of colours, just as in all other similar endeavours to know the ancient way of seeing things, we must not strive to produce simple one-to-one correspondences between the ancient and our own schemes: for all too often the divisions are drawn along significantly different lines so that both the elements of a certain field and their structural arrangements can be markedly unfamiliar to us when we try to penetrate into ancient ways of feeling and into their own natural conceptual articulation.

But let us return to our immediate topic, the *λευκότης* as a quality of the skin of the male body. We must bear in mind the above-delineated semantic analysis. The expression was proverbial: *λευκῶν ἀνδρῶν οὐδὲν ὄφελος*, depreciatory of white-skinned men. V. Macarius V, 55; Apostolius XIII, 35 adds the explanation *ἐπὶ τῶν ἀπράκτων*, those who do not do anything, any job, and therefore by not being exposed to the sun and the wind keep their skin *λευκόν*; in Appendix Paroemigraphorum IV, 35 the proverb runs thus: *οὐδὲν ἀνδρῶν λευκῶν ὄφελος ἢ σκυτοτομεῖν* and the same appears in Suda s. vv. and in Sch. ad Aristophanes, *Pax* 1310 with the variant *εἰ μὴ σκυτοτομεῖν*; Eustathius, p. 455.39, read the proverb in Aelius Dionysius' collection without any addition, which is to be connected, as Kusterus saw in his note ad Suda loc.cit., to Aristophanes, *Ecclesiaz*. 383 sqq.:

πλείστος ἀνθρώπων ὄχλος,  
 ὅσος οὐδεπώποτ' ἦλθ' ἀθρόος ἐς τὴν πύκνα.  
 καὶ δῆτα πάντας σκυτοτόμοις ἠκάζομεν  
 ὄρωντες αὐτούς· οὐ γὰρ ἀλλ' ὑπερφυῶς  
 ὡς λευκοπληθῆς ἦν ἰδεῖν ἠκκλησία.

Where Aristophanes, wishing to accuse the Athenians in the assembly of unmanliness and effeminacy, nothing-to-doers, suggests an absurd explanation of their λευκότης, namely that they are all σκυτοτόμοι. The scholiast has correctly: ἐπειδὴ οἱ σκυτοτόμοι ἐν σκιᾷ καθεζόμενοι ἐργάζονται τοῦτο ἔφη. Leather workers (shoemakers, cobblers etc.) were a conspicuous example of δημιουργοί, people really labouring and producing useful items without being dark-skinned, since they were not working in open places, and hence were not exposed to the darkening effect of the sun. As Galen said (vol. VI, p. 47): ἐξ ἡλίου μελανότης, ἐκ μακρᾶς σκιατραφίας λευκότης. Thus we find in Euripides, *Bacchae*, 445 sqq., Pentheus' description of Dionysus as an exceedingly beautiful youth, exciting πόθος, womanish as an austere man would see him,

λευκὴν δὲ χροιάν εἰς παρασκευὴν ἔχεις  
 οὐχ ἡλίου βολαῖσιν ἀλλ' ὑπὸ σκιᾶς,  
 τὴν Ἀφροδίτην καλλονῆ θηρώμενος

i.e. your attitude to things venereal is the one of an object of desire, of ἐρώμενος, not of ἐραστής.

The condemnation of such λευκότης, generally associated with non-involvement in any useful task, any outdoor labour, and particularly connected with effeminacy by the comic poets, appears again and again in various contexts. V. Aristophanes *Ecclesiaz.*, 428 (where the scholiast has the indispensable: γυναικώδης οὗτος - sc. ὁ Νικίας; *Thesmoph.* 191-2; *Ranae* 1090 sqq., where a slow moving - ὑπ' ἀγυμνασίας v. 1088 man is λευκός; and see the connected Sosicrates fragment apud Pollux, IX, 57 (Meineke vol. 4, p. 591 Fragmentum Παρακαταθήκης = Fr. 1 PCGr. vol. VII p. 600), where note: λευκὸς ἀνθρώπος, παχύς, ἀργός; cf. also, still in the same perspective, Xenophon, *Anabasis* V, 4, 32-3; see in particular the exquisite play of Cratinus, apud Athenaeus, 29D (Meineke vol. II p. 117, Fr. III Πυτινή = Fr. 195 PCGr. vol. II p. 221): οἴμ' ὡς ἀπαλὸς καὶ λευκός. ἀρ' οἴσει τρία, with reference to both a youth and

Mendaeian wine, and with a corresponding ambiguity in *τρία*; Dio Chrysostom, *Oratio* IV p. 177 Reiske: *λευκὸς ἰδεῖν καὶ τρυφερός, αἰθρίας καὶ πόνων ἄπειρος* etc.; Xenophon, *Hellenica*, III, 4, 19 (and the same story, Plutarch, *Agasilaus* 9; Polyaeus II, 1, 5; Frontinus I, 11, 17; Agatharchidas apud Athenaeus, XII, 550e); Lucian, *Abdicatus*, 28 describes how the bodies of men and women differ: *τὰ μὲν γὰρ τῶν ἀνδρῶν εὐπαγῆ καὶ εὐτονα πόνοις καὶ κινήσει καὶ ὑπαιθρίῳ διαίτη γεγυμνασμένα, τὰ δὲ (sc. τῶν γυναικῶν) ἔκλυτα καὶ ἀσμπαγῆ, ἔσκιατροφημένα καὶ λευκὰ αἵματος ἐνδεία καὶ θερμοῦ ἀπορία καὶ ὑγροῦ ἐπιρροία* (for a similar explanation for the existence and nonexistence of hair in men and women, cf. Clement, *Paedagogus*, III, 19, 2; cf. also Lucian, *Anacharsis*, 29, a passage to be quoted below).

But again we must not fall victim to one-sidedness however well-documented it may appear. Instead we must undertake an (if possible) exhaustive search for passages capable of being set against the ones belonging to the group that we happened to notice first; it is only in such bringing together of things connected, however divergent they may be, and in making them bear on each other, that we may hope to discover how the ancient Greeks felt and thought about the matter in question. This is why completeness and systematic utilization of all evidence, wherever it may come from and of whatever period, is indispensable in our endeavour to understand things the way the Greeks understood them.

What then do we find if we look around in the sense described and with that purpose in mind? To begin again with a proverb, alongside the one with which we started this discussion, we find another of different implications. On Aristophanes, *Pax* 1309-10

*οὐδὲν γάρ, ὦ πονηροί,  
λευκῶν ὀδόντων ἔργον ἔστ', ἣν μή τι καὶ μασῶνται,*

the scholiast remarks: *ὅτι παροιμία ἐστὶν καὶ οὕτως* (to put a full stop before *καί* is to misunderstand the passage; the scholiast must not mean to say that what Aristophanes wrote was a proverb, but that what follows is a proverb in two of its forms, on which therefore we are to understand that Aristophanes played) «οὐδὲν ἔργον ἔστιν ἀνδρῶν λευκῶν, ἣν μή τι καὶ μάχωνται», ἔτι δὲ οὕτως «οὐδὲν

λευκῶν ἀνδρῶν ἔργον, εἰ μὴ σκυτοτομεῖν». The two formulations are presented clearly enough as two forms of one proverb. It is the former one which should be examined now. If μάχωνται is sound, then either it is said ironically (which is the easy way out but not the best), or it points to the first qualification of the above documented negative attitude towards λευκότης; for the sense should then be that λευκοὶ ἄνδρες are useless if they cannot at least fight or contend for mastery in games and elsewhere, which would refer to idle gentlemen who do not toil and labour for their living, but who can be nonetheless (and are meant to be primarily) fearful fighters or brave warriors as the young aristocrats of old used to be. This explanation may appear at first sight somehow far-fetched, but on account of other corroborative evidence which will be presented in a moment, and given the oriental, and Platonic, division of classes (with one of them doing nothing but preparing for war), it gains in plausibility. (Aristophanes, I suspect, may further play with his substitution of ὀδόντων for ἀνδρῶν and the identically sounding verbs μασῶνται (chew) and μασσῶνται (being kneaded, squeezed, handled. But this is another question).

Λευκοὶ ἄνδρες then, may also have been the idle, non-toiling, non-labouring aristocrats, who, when the old traditions were still alive, devoted themselves to an easy-going, free from care, life of gymnastic exercises, sports, drill, games, and war; but who later were transformed (consonantly to the change from an aristocratic to a plutocratic structure of society) to the fat, ugly, indoors working or rather indoors laying rich or parasitic nothing-to-do nothings ridiculed by comic poets and satirists.

Further evidence in support of this thesis is forthcoming. In his exquisite comparison between the old, traditional education based on an easy, natural, free and dignified, aristocratic way of life, and the new, emerging type of instruction, reflecting the changed social conditions and requirements, Aristophanes gives, among other things, the repercussions of the adoption of the one or the other of the two contending Λόγοι on the body of the youth subscribing to them (*Nubes*, 1002 sqq.). If he follows the Δίκαιος Λόγος and submit himself to the old type of discipline, he, λιπαρός γε καὶ εὐανθής, will be passing his time in γυμνάσια (1002); if he is lured by the Ἄδικος Λόγος to be enslaved by the new conditions and needs, he will either

become a chatterbox babbling horny, coarse, low speech in the ἀγορά (στωμύλλων κατὰ τὴν ἀγορὰν τριβολεκτράπελ' / οἶάπερ οἱ νῦν, (1003), or he will wear down himself by wasting his time on *πραγμάτια γλισχραντιλογεξεπίτριπτα* (1005) an expression masterfully constructed (γλίσχρος + ἀντιλογία + ἐξεπίτριπτος) in order to convey the full Aristophanian scorn and contempt for the *μικρολογία* represented to his eyes by Socrates. (We meet the same attitude in the 4th century, only now it is Isocrates who inveighs against the petty, as he sees it, learning of the Academy; v. e.g. *ad Nicoclem*, 39: σοφούς νόμιξε μὴ τοὺς ἀκριβῶς περὶ μικρῶν ἐρίζοντας, ἀλλὰ τοὺς εὖ περὶ τῶν μεγίστων λέγοντας, an exceedingly poignant and well-expressed formulation. In *πραγματίον γλισχραντιλογεξεπίτριπτον* we have the following characters put together: (a) *πραγματίον*, small, petty, insignificant thing; (b) *γλισχρόν*, mean, niggardly, shabby; (c) *ἀντιλογικόν*, i.e. not interested in proclaiming truth, but rather in combatting a thesis; (d) *ἐξεπίτριπτον*, conveying also the notion of illiberally wearing down by doing a petty damned thing again and again. Having thus pinpointed the two main types of occupation for the Athenian youth of his decadent time, Aristophanes contrasts what the follower of older customs will do (1006 sqq.):

ἀλλ' εἰς Ἀκαδήμειαν (the gymnasium, not yet the seat of  
Platonic learning)

κατιῶν ὑπὸ ταῖς μορίαις ἀποθρέξει  
στεφανωσάμενος καλάμῳ λευκῷ μετὰ σόφρονος ἡλικιώτου,  
μίλακος ὄζων καὶ ἀπραγμοσύνης καὶ λεύκης φυλλοβολούσης,  
ἦρος ἐν ὥρᾳ χαίρων, ὅπῳταν πλάτανος πετελέα ψιθυρίζῃ.

A calm, serene, aristocratic, almost idyllic picture. Note the *ἀπραγμοσύνης*, and contrast it to *πολυπραγμοσύνη*. The scholion ad loc. is in a confused state, and it is instructive, not least for a correct appreciation of Alexandrian scholarship, to analyse it. In its relevant portion, it consists of the following strata:

- (a) *παρέμιξε τὸ «ἀπραγμοσύνης»*  
 (b) *ἀπραγμοσύνη δὲ φυτόν, ὡς Ἀριστοφάνης ὁ γραμματικός,  
ἐν Ἀκαδημίᾳ φυόμενον (...)*  
 (c) *ἀπραγμοσύνη εἶδος ἄνθους· οἶον πάσης εὐωδίας ὄζων καὶ  
ἀσφαλείας (i.e. the general sense is this)*

(d) ἀπραγμοσύνης ἀντὶ τοῦ <οὐ> πολυπραγμοσύνης (οὐ is evidently required and is preserved in R's version: ἢ «ἀπραγμοσύνη» ἀντὶ τοῦ «οὐ πολυπράγμων ἦν»).

(a) and (d) are clearly correct, clear as light. Aristophanes intermixed (παρέμιξε) in his idyllic description ἀπραγμοσύνη, in order to indicate that he considers it as a nice, pretty plant, a flower like the others growing in an old-fashioned γυμνάσιον, especially one in a sacred place (v. Scholia ad *Nubes* 1005). He means to extol the care-free, easy-going life of keeping to you and your own, to things beautiful and delicate away from the market-place and the assembly. Do not be a meddler in things which are, at bottom, insignificant this is his message. And from this fine stroke of Aristophanes the supreme comic poet, Aristophanes the grammarian makes, as it seems, a stupid mess, by inventing a plant specifically growing in the Academy! If there was such a plant, it was spiritual and this was the point of the poet missed by the grammarian. (Another such unexpected turn is given a few lines below, ψήφισμα μακρόν (1019) in the end of an enumeration of bodily features; with γλῶττα βαιά / γλῶττα μεγάλη there, Aristophanes bridges the gap between the physical characteristics and the final ψήφισμα μακρόν, by using expressions which, though they have a perfect physical application, are nonetheless obviously meant metaphorically). (c), at least, is pragmatic pedantry; the ἐν Ἀκαδημίᾳ φυόμενον of Aristophanes is the coup de grâce.

After this introduction, there follows in *Nubes* (1009 sqq.) the inimitable description of the opposite bodily characteristics which will distinguish the young man corresponding to his choice of the type of education he wants. Speaks the Δίκαιος Λόγος addressing the promising youth:

ἦν ταῦτα ποιῆς ἀγὼ φράζω,  
καὶ πρὸς τούτοις προσέχης τὸν νοῦν,  
ἕξεις αἰεὶ στῆθος λιπαρόν,  
χροιὰν λευκὴν, ὤμους μεγάλους,  
γλῶτταν βαιάν, πυγὴν μεγάλην,  
πόσθην μικράν.  
ἦν δ' ἄπερ οἱ νῦν ἐπιτηδεύης,  
πρῶτα μὲν ἕξεις χροιὰν ὠχρὰν  
ὤμους μικροῦς, στῆθος λεπτόν

γλῶτταν μεγάλην, πυγὴν μικράν,  
 ὠλὴν μεγάλην, ψήφισμα μακρόν,  
 etc.

Following the right education the lad will be broad shouldered and with a glistening, smooth, shiny, marble-arched breast. He will be, naturally, reticent. The contrast *πυγὴν μεγάλην, πόσθη μικράν - πυγὴν μικράν, κωλὴν μεγάλην* is instructive. *πόσθη* is, here, the whole penis, and the same is the *κωλῆ*, at least here. (Certainly *κωλῆ* signifies the *membrum virile* in *Nubes*, 989, too. And this is what normally it should mean in general, since *κῶλον* is a member, particularly one with obvious physical self-circumscription, as the hands or the legs. Thus, e.g., Apollodorus, *Bibliotheca*, III, 54 has: *γίνεσθαι γὰρ [sc. τὸν ἄνθρωπον] τετράπουον βρέφος ὄντα τοῖς τέταρσιν ὀχούμενον κώλοισι*. The *membrum virile* could easily fall under this head, especially since *κωλή* ordinarily meant probably rump. V. Athenaeus IX, 368, d-f and the passages there quoted. See particularly the description in Xenophon's *Cynegetica* V, 30 (repeated by Pollux, V, 69). So the youth with old-fashioned gymnastic formation will have full buttocks (especially attractive in anal coition) and small unattended penis; whereas the boys now (*οἱ νῦν*), among other bodily defects have small sized buttocks and a large from overworking *membrum*. The old idea is of a boy being *ἐρώμενος*, not of one continuously labouring under a lewd obsession with *μεμαλακισμένην* pleasure. In this context, we come finally to the point immediately concerning us. The youth with the right gymnastic upbringing will have forever (*ἀεὶ*) *χροιὰν λευκήν*. (Naturally some ancient critical philologists Alexandrian, no doubt were displeased with *λευκόν* for they corrected it to *λαμπρόν*. Just as they did to *Iliad* Ξ, 185, as noted above, p. 15). And this is contrasted to the *ὠχρὰ χροιά* (paleness) of the one devoting himself to the labours of illiberal learning on the one hand, or to the teaching of life (as we might put it) in the market place on the other. More neat expression of our point could not have been desired.

*Λευκότης* is far from incompatible with gymnastic exercise, athletics and other liberal, aristocratic toil. The dark skinned become the labourers, the mercenaries of life, those who sell their labour or the material things produced by their labour, those who do what they do



from practical necessity. In ancient times, the colours of the skin were either the superior *λευκόν* of aristocratic beauty, or the honest dark shade of outdoors, mainly agricultural labour. The sickly pale appears with the movement of mankind towards unnatural ways of life and disorderly social situations, occasioned, although not caused, by the emergence of trade, commerce and business economically, by the political formation of the plebeian populace in the large city, and by the growth of the godless intellectual proletariat with its pretentious narrow-mindedness and good-willed, short-sighted spiritual mediocrity.

My point is stronger, naturally, with the case of youths and young men, than in that of maturer ages. But it is only partly a question of degree, and partly a question relating to the gradual disappearance from classical times onwards of those conditions which could safeguard the continuing existence and flourishing state of any naturally aristocratic ideal for the whole span of a life; one was under pressure sooner or later to be an illiberal labourer of one sort or another whether rich or poor is immaterial.

It is then in the perspective elucidated above that we should view passages where *λευκότης* is associated with *ἀγυμνασία*, some of which passages have been mentioned already. Consult further Lucian, *Anacharsis*, 25 (indeed the whole section from §24 to 30 is very instructive): *οὐ πολυσαρκίαν ἀργὸν καὶ λευκὴν ἢ ἀσαρκίαν μετὰ ὠχρότητος ἐπιδεικνυμένους, οἷα γυναικῶν σώματα ὑπὸ σκιᾷ μεμαρασμένα*, etc.: the new emphasis lies on the antithesis between sluggish and white corpulence on the one hand, and pale leanness on the other; it squarely supports the views above expounded. To these antithetic evils, Lucian opposes persons of the following description: *ibid.*: *οὗτοι δὲ ἡμῖν ὑπέρυθροι ἐς τὸ μελάντερον ὑπὸ τοῦ ἡλίου κεχρωσμένοι καὶ ἀρρενωποί, πολὺ τὸ ἔμψυχον καὶ θερμὸν καὶ ἀνδρώδες ἐπιφαίνοντες, τοσαύτης εὐεξίας ἀπολαύοντες, οὔτε ρικνοὶ καὶ κατεσκευασμένοι, οὔτε περιπληθεῖς εἰς βάρος, ἀλλὰ ἐς τὸ σύμμετρον περιγεγραμμένοι*, etc. This again, in point of tint, seems to refer rather to the tawny bronze of the athletic young man exercising under the sun, than to the dark, dun-coloured skin of the man who labours outdoors for the whole of his life. Cf. also *ibid.* §29: *καὶ ἔλγηε ἡδέως ἂν παραστησάμενος πλησίον τῶν τε λευκῶν τινα ἐκείνων καὶ ὑπὸ σκιᾷ δεδιητημένων καὶ ὃν ἂν ἔλγη τῶν ἐν τῷ Λυκείῳ γυμναζομένων*,

ἀποπλύνας τὴν κόνιν καὶ τὸν πηλόν, ἐροίμην ἄν σε ποτέρῳ ἄν ὁμοίος εὖξαιο γενέσθαι... συνεστηκῶς καὶ συγκεκροτημένος εἶναι μᾶλλον ἢ θρύπτεσθαι καὶ διαρρεῖν καὶ λευκὸς εἶναι ἀπορία καὶ φυγῆ εἰς τὰ εἶσω τοῦ αἵματος. Similarly Plutarch refers clearly in a depreciatory fashion to Julius Caesar's λευκότης: *Jul. Caesar* 17: ἡ δὲ τῶν πόνων ὑπομονὴ παρὰ τὴν τοῦ σώματος δύναμιν ἐγκαρτερεῖν δοκοῦντος ἐξέπληττεν, ὅτι καὶ τὴν ἕξιν ὧν ἰσχνὸς καὶ τὴν σάρκα λευκὸς καὶ ἀπαλὸς καὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν νοσώδης καὶ etc. Here clearly the λευκότης is ἐξ ἀγυμνασίας, since it is conjoined with softness.

High appreciation of λευκότης in a youth is shown by another of the great aristocratically minded spirits of democratic Athens: Plato in *Republic* 474 D-E comments on the soft-point of the ἀνὴρ ἐρωτικός, his being aroused and excited in the sight of all lovely boys in the bloom of their youth: ἡ οὐχ οὕτω ποιεῖτε πρὸς τοὺς καλοὺς;... μέλανας δὲ ἀνδρικοὺς ἰδεῖν, λευκοὺς δὲ θεῶν παῖδας εἶναι· μελιχλῶρους δὲ καὶ τοῦνομα οἷε τινὸς ἄλλου ποίημα εἶναι ἢ ἔραστοῦ ὑποκοριζομένου τε καὶ εὐχερῶς φέροντος τὴν ὠχρότητα, ἐὰν ἐπὶ ὥρα ᾗ; (the passage is quoted by Plutarch, *Quamodo adulator ab amico internoscatur*, 56D). However we may allow for the exaggeration of one who ἀτεχνῶς γὰρ λευκὴ στάθμη εἰμι πρὸς τοὺς καλοὺς· σχεδὸν γὰρ τί μοι πάντες οἱ ἐν τῇ ἡλικίᾳ καλοὶ φαίνονται (*Charmides* 154B), the fact remains that it is λευκότης which is especially associated with those charming sons of gods. The swarthy type is praised as manly in the sense of a robust rusticity felt to be active in him. Paleness, or, as it is likely to be endearingly called by the lover, honey-pallidness (μελίχλωρος being a word of exquisite musicality in Greek), is again distinguished from λευκότης. It should be noticed that the difference of skin tints here spoken of are chiefly constitutional rather than having to do with the particular ways of training or life. But the appreciation involved points, nonetheless, in the same direction, which is the significant thing for our present concern.

Nor were things very different in Homeric times. Ajax the Telamonian, the Great, as Homer calls him, the mighty hero with the host of traditions about him relating his exploits and fortunes, and with hero worship instituted in his honour, the man to whom by right belonged Achilles' armor (he finally got them after death; cf. Pausanias I, 35, 4) since he was second to none but to the greatest of them all

(ἀνδρῶν αὐ μέγ' ἄριστος ἔην Τελαμώνιος Αἴας, / ὄφρ' Ἀχιλλεύς μῆνιεν, he was the best at the time when Achilles kept aloof from the war because of his μῆνις, Iliad, B, 768 says Homer in answer to the question (v. 761): τίς τ' ἄρ τῶν ὄχ' ἄριστος ἔην, σύ μοι ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα, etc.), this man is described by Homer as tall of stature, broad-shouldered, with perfect bodily development; when Priam asks Helen (Iliad, Γ, 255 sqq.):

τίς τ' ἄρ' δ' ἄλλος Ἀχαιὸς ἀνὴρ ἧς τε μέγας τε,  
ἕξοχος Ἀργείων κεφαλῆν τε καὶ εὐρέας ὤμους;

she answers:

οὗτος δ' Αἴας ἐστὶ πελώριος, ἕρκος Ἀχαιῶν.

(cf. on the subject of Ajax large body Pausanias, I, 35, 5; Philostratus, Heroica, I, 2). He was also surpassingly beautiful, inferior to none again but Achilles; Iliad, P, 279-80:

Αἴας, ὃς περὶ μὲν εἶδος, περὶ δ' ἔργα τέτυκτο  
τῶν ἄλλων Δαναῶν μετ' ἀμύμονα Πηλείωνα.

(repeated in Odyssey, λ, 549-50; to which passage Eustathius, 1698, 45 sqq., comments: γέγραπται σκόλιον παλαιόν, σύμφωνον τοῖς τοῦ ποιητοῦ, τὸ «παῖ τε Τελαμῶνος Αἴας αἰχμητά, λέγουσί σ' ἐς Τροίαν ἄριστον ἐλθεῖν Δαναῶν καὶ Ἀχιλλέα». Συλλαλεῖ δὲ τῷ τοιούτῳ λόγῳ καὶ ἡ Ἰλιάς). Odyssey ω, 17-8 makes it explicit that his excellence pertained both to face and body:

Αἴαντός θ', ὃς ἄριστον ἔην εἶδος τε, δέμας τε,  
τῶν ἄλλων Δαναῶν, μετ' ἀμύμονα Πηλείωνα.

This then Ajax had χροῖα λευκόν (Iliad Λ, 573) which must have been an eminent characteristic of his, for Hector refers to it when addressing him in Iliad, N, 824 sqq.: χροῖα λειριόεντα (v. 830). Eustathius (p. 863.32) mentions as a variant χαλκόν for the λευκόν of the former passage, which may be another instance of the already noticed tendency to correct all offensive instances of λευκόν which do

not conform to the (misunderstood) conventions about its use. (*Χαλκόν* in Eustathius may be corrupt, besides).

Menelaus must also have been famous for his ivory thighs, as Eustathius observes in his comment on Iliad Λ, 573, as well as calves and ankles, v. Iliad Δ, 141 sqq.:

ὡς δ' ὅτι τίς τ' ἐλέφαντα γυνή φοίνικι μίγνη

...

τοιοί τοι, Μενέλαε, μιάνθην αἵματι μηροῖ

εὐφυνέες, κνήμαί τε ἰδὲ σφυρὰ καλ' ὑπένερθεν.

As Eustathius says (455.31): *καὶ οὕτω μὲν ἢ παραβολὴ λευκὸν φύσει τὸν Μενέλαον ἱστορεῖ*; and in 457.2: *καὶ σημειώσαι ὅτι κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν λόγον οὐδ' ἂν Ἀλεξάνδρου (i.e. Paris) ψόγος εἶη τὸ ἀργύρεα, ἦτοι λευκά, καὶ καλὰ ἔχειν τὰ ἐπισφύρια*. Eustathius, here and in his commentary on the quoted passages, faces the problem of how Homer can speak of Ajax and Menelaus as having *λευκὸν χρῶα*, whiteness being not a particularly manly quality. From what we have above said, the solution of this worry must be evident. It is one thing to be *παχύς* and *λευκός* from *ἀργία*, *σκιατραφία* and *ἀγυμνασία*; it is another to be *λευκός* out of an effeminate care for your skin with a sense of its exquisite preciousness; it is still another thing to be *λευκός* with a perfectly built, athletic body. Eustathius gives us further valuable information on the matter (455.31 sqq.): *εἰ δὲ καὶ θηλυπρεπὲς ἐν ἥρωσιν ἢ λευκότης* (the effeminate sense of white-preciousness), *διὸ τὸν Τρωϊκὸν Κύκνον Θεόκριτος τοιοῦτον ὄντα θῆλυν ἀπὸ χροιάς ἔφη, ἀλλ' ἐνταῦθα φασὶν οἱ παλαιοὶ ὅτι κἂν ἄλλως εὐπαθὲς τὸ λευκὸν (ἰσχυρότερα δὲ τὰ μελάγχροα τῶν σωμάτων), ἀλλὰ παρὰ τοῖς Λάκωσι χαρακτήρ ἀνδρίας ἦν λευκὸς χρῶς καὶ κόμη ξανθή, ὁποῖον καὶ τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον εἶναι ἱστορεῖ ὁ ποιητής*. This fits very well with the athletic and warlike nature of *λευκοί* (not labouring in exposed conditions, aristocratic men, as we observed above in connection with the proverb: *οὐδὲν ἔργον ἐστὶν ἀνδρῶν λευκῶν, ἦν μὴ τι καὶ μάχωνται*). The present instance is a good example of what I mean by the natural fitting together of all bits and pieces of our evidence, if one goes thoroughly into the details of the matter with an unprepossessed mind. For example, we can go even further into this detail about the Lacedaemonians. For if they

considered *λευκότης* in body (naturally of the athletic, marble-like nature) as sign of particular valour, then, given the close association between *λευκότης* and *λειότης* (for partly *λευκότης* is the result of the absence of any hairiness and of the glistening quality of skin in a healthy body), we can better understand how it came to be that it was precisely the austere Spartans who abundantly practised depilation and had clearly shown an exquisite taste for a beautiful skin in the male body (another associated contributory factor was, of course, their strong Dorian homosexual proclivity). Cf. Apollonius, *Epistola* LXIII to the Spartan Ephors and the Lacedaemonians generally in answer to the public honour rendered by them to him. They sent the official testimony of that honour by some envoys respecting which Apollonius writes: *ἀνδρας ὑμῶν ἐθεασάμην ὑπήνην μὴ ἔχοντας, τοὺς μηροὺς καὶ τὰ σκέλη λείους τε καὶ λευκοὺς*, etc. (cf. Philostratus, *Vita Apollonii*, IV, 27). It is true that Apollonius and Philostratus (as so many other authors, mainly modern) associate this smoothness and brilliance with effeminate weakness and luxurious softness. But, as I have said, this is not necessarily the case. The error is of the same type as that committed in the prevailing Modern-European confusion and virtual identification of homosexuality and effeminacy. To correct such a faulty notion, one may begin by simply consulting Juvenal, II, 9 sqq. (in the *Satura de philosphis obscenis* as has it the chief ms. P):

----- Castigas turpia, quum sis  
inter Socraticos notissima fossa cinaedos.  
Hispidia membra quidem et durae per brachia saetae  
promittunt atrocem animum; sed podice levi  
caeduntur tumidae, medico ridente, mariscae.

Something similar (without, of course, the satirist's exaggeration) probably was not uncommon with the Lacedaemonians. We know what a keen interest they took in beautiful, manly, well-built bodies. Cf. e.g. Aelian, *Varia Historia*, XIV, 7; the source is Agatharchidas, v. Athenaeus, XII, 550c sqq. Athenaeus does not mention anything about the tint of the skin of the young Spartans. The Ephors caused them to appear nude before them to check how well they were built (*τὸ σχῆμα*) and whether they betrayed any tendency to corpulence (*τὸν ὄγκον τοῦ σώματος*). When Aelianus, therefore, says *Μηδένα*

*Λακεδαιμονίων ανανδρότερον ὀραῖσθαι τὴν χροάν ἢ τὸν ὄγκον τοῦ σώματος ἔχειν ὑπὲρ τὰ γυμνάσια*, we must suspect the substitution of the skin-tint for the beautiful and athletic built of the bodies of the Spartans. Probably Aelian had in mind the trivial remark about the healthy tint of those not eschewing physical activity, and even this, as above remarked, would rather apply to the bronze tan of those exercising in the open, not the blackened aspect of those working in the fields.

In a word, it should not be forgotten that delicacy and luxurious indulgence in pleasures are not incompatible with bodily vigour and physical valour (especially in an aristocratic context). Satyros characteristically writes as follows *περὶ τοῦ καλοῦ Ἀλκιβιάδου*, apud Athenaeus XII, 534b: *λέγεται, φησίν, ὅτι ἐν Ἰωνίᾳ μὲν ὦν <Ἰώνων> ἐφαίνετο τρυφερώτερος, ἐν Θήβαις δὲ σωμασκῶν καὶ γυμναζόμενος τῶν Θηβαίων αὐτῶν μᾶλλον Βοιώτιος, ἐν Θετταλίᾳ δὲ ἵπποτροφῶν καὶ ἥνιοχῶν τῶν Ἀλευαδῶν ἵππικώτερος, ἐν Σπάρτῃ δὲ καρτερίαν καὶ ἀφέλειαν ἐπιτηδεύων ἐνίκα τοὺς Λάκωνας, ὑπερῆρεν δὲ καὶ τὴν τῶν Θρακῶν ἀκρατοποσίαν.*

The general contrast between light skin tints and dark-skinned male bodies was carried a step further by its specialization in a particularly relevant area of the human body. I refer to the antithesis *λευκόπυγοι - μελάμπυγοι*. Due, probably, to another feat of shallow cleverness on the part of Alexandrian scholarship, the matter appears a little confused in our sources, but it really is clear enough. Among the various kinds of eagle, two prominent ones were called *πύγαργοι* and *μέλανες* or *μελανάετοι* (v. Aristotle, *Historia Animalium*, Z, 563b5-7, and especially I, 618b17 sqq.). The latter is a wilder species (but caring for its offspring, which is an exception as Aristotle implies, 618b29), smallest but strongest of the eagles (*μέλας τὴν χροάν καὶ μέγεθος ἐλάχιστος, κράτιστος τούτων* 618b26-27), inhabiting mountains and forests (ibid.), described by Aristotle in a series of positive attributes (618b29-31): *ἔστι δὲ ὠκυβόλος καὶ εὐθήμενος καὶ ἀφθονος καὶ ἀφοβος καὶ μάχιμος καὶ εὐφήμος*. It is to this kind that Achilles is compared in *Ilias* Φ, 251-3:

*Πηλείδης δ' ἀπόρουσεν ὅσον τ' ἐπὶ δουρὸς ἐρωή,  
αἰετοῦ οἶματ' ἔχων μέλανος, τοῦ θηρητῆρος,  
ὅς θ' ἅμα κάρτιστός τε ὠκιστος πετεηνῶν*

answering exactly to Aristotle's description. From what Eustathius says *ad loc.* (p. 1235.40 sqq.), it follows that many Alexandrian philologists did not perceive the point. Eustathius himself, on the other hand, after enumerating various emendations, correctly concludes: ἤρεσεν οὖν ἐν ἄρθρῳ γράφειν (the question is about the τοῦ in v. 252), «αἰετοῦ μέλανος, τοῦ θηρητῆρος», ὃν καὶ μελαναίετον (Aristotle's μελανάετος) τινὲς συνθέτως φασί, τὸν καὶ φασσοφόνον, μικρὸν μὲν, φασιν, ὄντα, τῶν ἄλλων δὲ ἰσχυρότερον. Καλῶς δέ, φασι, τὸν θηρητῆρα τοῦτον αἰετὸν ὡς καὶ κράτιστον καὶ ὤκιστον εἰς εἰκόνα τοῦ Ἀχιλλέως εἴληφε (sc. ὁ ποιητής) etc.

The former species of eagle is clearly called after the whiteness of its rump-region, *πυγὴ + ἀργός*. Thus when Aeschylus describes this type of eagle as τ' ἐξόπιον ἀργᾶς (*Agamemnon*, 115), the scholiast remarks: ὁ ἐξοπίσω λευκός, ἐστὶν ὁ πύγαργος. (The feature was so characteristic and picturesque that other animals too, were called accordingly; for a kind of antelope, cf. Herodotus IV, 192; Septuaginta, *Deuteron*. XIV, 5; Aelianus, *Hist. Anim.* VII, 19. For a kind of water bird, v. Aristotle, *Hist. Anim.* Θ, 593b5). This πύγαργος behaves badly towards its offspring (Aristotle, *Hist. Anim.*, Z, 563b5-6), kills fawns (ἐνιοὶ δὲ καλοῦσιν νεβροφόνον αὐτόν, I, 618b20), and, although it is the only species of eagle to be regularly found in plains, groves and even near the towns (οὗτος κατὰ τὰ πεδία καὶ τὰ ἄλση καὶ περὶ τὰς πόλεις γίνεταί... τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ γένη ὀλιγάκις εἰς πεδία καὶ εἰς ἄλση φοιτᾷ, 618b20-22), yet because of its bold and perhaps rash valour he flies also over mountainous regions and forests (πέτεται δὲ καὶ εἰς τὰ ὄρη καὶ εἰς τὴν ὕλην διὰ τὸ θάρσος 618b21). There is nothing fundamentally negative in this description, except the bird's inattentiveness and perhaps harshness exhibited towards its offspring, and its implied overbearing and overstepping daring, its may be rather audacious valour (since it is not the strongest, and is more accustomed to the milder surroundings of the plains).

Neither does Aeschylus wish to paint any negative picture for Menelaus when he clearly associates him to the πύγαργος eagle. Two eagles preyed on a pregnant hare, one κελαινός (the μελανάετος), the other ἐξόπιον ἀργᾶς (i.e. πύγαργος), interpreted by Calchas as the two leaders of the Greek army falling upon Troy. *Agamemnon* 109 sqq.:

ὅπως Ἀχαιῶν δῖθρονον κράτος, Ἑλλάδος ἦβας  
ξύμφρονα ταγάν,



πέμπει σὺν δορὶ καὶ χερὶ πράκτορι  
 θούριος ὄρνις Τευκρίδ' ἐπ' αἶαν,  
 οἰωνῶν βασιλεὺς βασιλευσὶ νεῶν, ὁ κελαινός, τ' ἐξόπι ἀργαῖς,  
 φανέντες ἵκταρ μελάβθρων, χερὸς ἐκ δοριπάλτου etc.

and, 122-3:

κεδνὸς δὲ στρατόμαντις ἰδὼν δύο λήμασι δισσοῦς  
 Ἄτρείδας μαχίμους, ἐδάη etc.

There is no question of Menelaus not being valourous or strong or athletic. He is only irascible, less solid and ponderous than Agamemnon, and can be thus compared with *πύγαργος*. (It may be significant that in Euripides, *Orestes*, 1584-5, Orestes calls on Menelaus thus:

οὗτος σύ, κλήθρων τῶνδε μὴ ψιάσης χεροῖν·  
 Μενέλαον εἶπον, ὃς πεπύργωσαι θράσει·

i.e. who are inflated and towering with insolent rashness; remember the Aristotelian «διὰ τὸ θάρσος» respecting the *πύγαργος*).

Similar remarks apply to Lycophron's use of *πύγαργος* in reference to Paris. Ἀλέξανδρος, as his very name implies, was not an effeminate weakling. See, e.g. Apollodorus, *Bibliotheca*, III, 150: *γενόμενος δὲ νεανίσκος* (sc. ὁ Πάρις), *καὶ πολλῶν διαφέρων κάλλει τε καὶ ρώμῃ, αὐθις Ἀλέξανδρος προσωνομάσθη, ληστὰς ἀμυνόμενος καὶ τοῖς ποιμνίοις ἀλεξήσας*. Certainly he was exceedingly beautiful (*δῖος* and *θεοειδής* are his standard epitheta in Homer; he was shining in his beauty, *κάλλει στίλβων*, *Ilias*, Γ, 392) and he was a natural seducer, with an innate eye as well as desire for women. (*Δύσπαρι, εἶδος ἄριστε, γυναιμανές, ἠπεροπευτά* exclaims Hector chastising him, *Ilias* Γ, 39; N, 769; we learn that ἦ (sc. Aphrodite) οἶ (sc. to Alexander) *πόρε μαχλοσύνην ἀλεγεινήν*, *Ilias*, Ω, 30. His taste for women did not, however, monopolize his desires: Antheus was his beloved; v. Lycophron, 134 with the scholia), qualities, which made him the obvious choice as the judge of the beauty contest among the goddesses. He might have been, understandably, very conscious of his beauty's preciousness, and therefore he could have been not particularly forward in continuously entering the battle (he would rather prefer to

enjoy the gymnastic games, at which he was excellent: v. Hyginus, *Fabula* XCI: ille amore incensus tauri sui (his favourite one) descendit in certamen et omnia vicit, fratres quoque suos superavit, etc. Virgil also implies Paris' supremacy in athletic certamens: Aeneas V, 270 where see Servius' commentary for further details. The distinction between occupation in, and preoccupation with, war or gymnastic contests, stretched back as far as the Dioscouroi, at least; excellence in either was a mark of eminent manhood, an example of ἀνδρεία: v. e.g. Apollodorus, *Bibliotheca*, III, 134: τῶν δὲ ἐκ Λήδας γενομένων παίδων, Κάστωρ μὲν ἤσκει τὰ κατὰ πόλεμον, Πολυδεύκης δὲ πυγμῆν, καὶ διὰ τὴν ἀνδρείαν ἐκλήθησαν ἀμφότεροι Διόσκουροι. In fact Pollux was the one of definitely divine (Jovial) origin, v. e.g. ibid. III, 126). But when provoked, Paris entered the lists with gusto see Homer's brilliant description in *Iliad*, Z, 506-514. This is the general notion one gets from Homer, especially the long narration where Paris is essentially involved in Rhapsodies Γ and Z.

So when Lycophron (v. 91) calls him πύγαργον, we need not suppose that anything radically different is involved than what Aeschylus implies by assimilating Menelaus to this species of eagle. Ἀβρότης, yes, may well be involved (Euripides, *Orestes*, 348 sqq:

Καὶ μὴν βασιλεὺς ὄδε δὴ στείχει,  
Μενέλαος ἄναξ, πολὺς ἀβροσύνη  
δῆλος ὀράσθαι,  
τῶν Τανταλιδῶν ἐξ αἵματος ὦν.

I wonder whether πολὺς is not the correct reading, which having deteriorated to πολὺ δ', ended in πολλῇ, πολλῇ δ' etc.). But, as I have argued in extenso, grace and beauty were not incompatible with a well-built body and athletic excellence.

Now whiteness, especially in the loins, thighs and adjacent regions of the body, may well have been part of the point in calling men like Menelaus or Paris (who where λευκοί) πύγαργους. And here it is that the associations coming from the character of that species of eagle were intertwined with implications deriving from an ancient dictum or proverb: μὴ τευ μελαμπύγου τύχης. As a proverb, the phrase was extremely common: Tzetzes, *Chiliad*. V, 94: ἡ παροιμία πάνδημος μυρίοις λελεγμένη. It is explained (in the form μὴ σύ γε μελ. τύχους)

in Zenobius V, 10, connected with a story involving Hercules, who was called *μελάμπυγος* (St. Gregory Nazianzenus, *Oratio* III, 78); and similarly explained by Nonnus Abbas in his scholia to St. Gregory's works, ch. 39. *Μελάμπυγος* was one very hairy in the buttocks, more particularly in the anal area (*οἱ δὲ δασύτητα περὶ τὴν πυγὴν τοῦ Ἡρακλέους* etc. Zenobius; ...*τοῦ Ἡρακλέους τὴν πυγὴν μέλαιναν θεασάμενοι ἐκ τῆς τῶν τριχῶν δασύτητος*, Nonnus). The meaning of the proverbial expression is succinctly put by Hesychius s.v. *μή τευ μελ. τύχοις*: *μή τινος ἀνδρείου καὶ ἰσχυροῦ τύχοις*. Gregorius Cyprius, cod. Leidensis II, 73 has the same. I do not notice the variations between *τύχης* and *τύχοις* corresponding to the two; cf. also Suda s.v. *μή σύ γε μελ. τύχης*; and s.v. *μελάμπυγος· ἀνδρείος*. *Τοὺς γὰρ δασεῖς τὰς πυγὰς, ἀνδρείους ἐνόμιζον*. This is the root of the matter: being hairy and shaggy in the buttocks was considered a sign of being rough and uncouth, of robustness, of rustic strength, of rash and impossible manliness, characteristics which befit Hercules and his rather erratic outbursts and exploits. To intensify the point, there was another form of the proverb: *μή δασυπρώκτω συντύχοις*; thus Macarius V, 82 has *Μελαμπύγω συντύχοις* (pro *συντύχοι*): *οἱ δέ, δασυπρώκτω*. The point of this change is illustrated by the form of the story involving Hercules, as it appears in Apostolius, XI, 19; Suda s.v. *μελαμπύγου τύχοις*; Photius s.v. *μελαμπύγου τύχης*. Now *μελάμπυγοι* are two brothers, two braggarts, who, being extremely licentious, were warned by their mother, lest they someday get crossed with a *δασύπρωκτος* which happened eventually, the *δασύπρωκτος* being, naturally, Hercules. The point now is that empathic shagginess in the anal region is sign of greater manly prowess than hairiness of the buttocks generally; although the focal semantic point of *πυγή* as well was the anus (cf. *πυγίζω* = *paedicare*).

Now this view of *μελάμπυγος* or *δασύπρωκτος* must have been very ancient: Archilochus utilized it (Fr. 93 Diehl). It is true that the scholia B (Venetus 453) ad Ilias Ω 915 (from Porphyry), which give us the Archilochian fragment, consider it to be related to the kind of eagle which Homer, in loc. refers to: *εἴωθε δὲ καὶ ὁ Ἄρχιλοχος μελάμπυγον τοῦτον* (sc. *τὸν ἀετόν*) *καλεῖν· ἢ τευ μελ.τύχ*. And in the scholia to the above discussed Lycophronian passage (v. 91), we find incorporated this bit: *εἰσὶ γὰρ μελάμπυγοι, πύγαργοι εἶδη ἀετῶν κατ' Ἀρχίλοχον· ἀφ' οὗ ὁ ἄρπαξ πύγαργος* (interpreting Lycophron's

calling Paris *πύγαργον* as referring to his rape of Helen as such). But all this may well be an (Alexandrian probably) example of philological obtuseness. Hesychius, the prince of the extant lexicographers, and the best source of accurate explanations for rare words and peculiar meanings, explains the Archilochian expression without any reference to eagles: *Μή τευ μελαμπύγου τύχοις· μή τινος ἀνδρείου καὶ ἰσχυροῦ τύχοις*. He knows, of course, that *πύγαργος* is an *εἶδος ἀετοῦ* (s.v.); the fact is that *πύγαργος* was; *μελάμπυγος* was not. The Homeric eagle in Iliad Ω, 316 is described as *αἰετόν... / μόρφνον θηρητῆρ', ὄν καὶ περκνὸν καλέουσι*. The difficulty as to the precise meaning of *μόρφνος* is well known. The Etym. Magnum s.v. proposes three derivations and corresponding meanings: from *μάρπτω*, the snatcher, the catcher; from *ὄρφνη*, the dark-coloured, blackened; from *μόρος* and *φόνος*, the *φόνιος*, murderous, deadly. Hesychius has an interesting note: *μορφνόν· εἶδος ἀετοῦ. καὶ ξανθός*. Significantly, Aristotle says that the name of this kind of eagle is *πλάγγος*: *Historia Anim.* I, 618b23 sqq.: *ἕτερον δὲ γένος ἀετοῦ ἐστὶν ὃ πλάγγος καλεῖται, δεύτερος μεγέθει καὶ ρώμῃ· οἰκεί δὲ βήσσας καὶ ἄγκη καὶ λίμνας* (hence likely to appear by the Greek camp), *ἐπικαλεῖται δὲ νηττοφόνος καὶ μορφνός· οὐ καὶ Ὅμηρος μέμνηται ἐν τῇ τοῦ Πριάμου ἐξόδῳ* (i.e. in our passage). And he continues immediately with: *ἕτερος δὲ μέλας τὴν χροάν* etc., which implies that the kind concerned is not *μέλας*; it could still be *μελάμπυγος*, it is true, but if it was so against a light, *ξανθόν* background this would be characteristic enough to be mentioned, side by side with the *πύγαργος*. Besides, *πλαγγών* was a wax item (esp. a girl's toy or ornament), as is very well attested: v. Hesychius, Photius and Etym. M. s.v.; Scholia ad Theocr. II, 110; Callimachus, *Hymn. in Cerer.* 92 with the scholion; should we not then assume that *πλαγγός* means waxen in colour, that is, precisely *ξανθός*? Perhaps the difficulty may be thought to lie with Homer's *ὄν καὶ περκνὸν καλέουσι*. But *περκνός* does not really mean black; it refers mainly to the ripening of the fruit, especially of grapes, to the darker hues assumed in this process by it; it does not even so much signify the dark or dusky as such but rather what is deeper and more ripe relative to something else. Like the word shade it can apply to anything from deep dark through dim to even the slightest shading in a drawing. And like the word deep, it does not indicate certain colours, but rather a darker tint even of the same

colour or in the same colour-dimension. In fact we can probably best approximate the meaning of *περκνός* by rendering it as deep(er) hue. Thus Theophrastus, *De Causis Plant.* 316.3: ὅταν ἄρχωνται περκάζουσαι οἱ βότρυες; *Hist. Pl.* 9.11.7: ὅταν ἄρτι περκάζει ἡ σταφυλή; Chaeremon, 12 [Müller, Fr.H.Gr.] of grapes just beginning to ripen: ὀπώρα ἄκραισι περκάζουσα οἰνάνθαις; v. also Homer, *Odyssey*, n, 123-6, where the ὑποπερκάζουσαι σταφυλαί are just one degree removed from being ὄμφακες, i.e. totally unripe, with still their flower. The compound is explained by Hesychius, s.v. ὑποπερκάζουσι· μεταβάλλουσιν (leg. pro καταβάλλουσιν) ἐκ τοῦ ὄμφακος, καὶ ὑπομελαίνονται. Besides applying as the word does to even a slight deepening of the hue of grapes (themselves having various colour-shades), it is used equally in reference to olives: *Georponika* 9.12.2, *Anthologia Gr.* VI, 102; Pollux I, 61 ...καὶ ἐλαίας περκνής, meaning the ripe olive; idem., V, 67 (speaking of a species of dog): ἰδέα λαγῶ καὶ φύσις, τὸ μὲν χρώμα ἐπίπερκνος (ἔστι δὲ τοῦτο περκνής ἐλαίας τὸ εἶδος, οὔτε ὄμφακος ἔτι, οὔτε ἤδη μελαινομένης), μέγεθος οὐ μέγας etc. This is a very significant passage; it is clear here that *περκνός* signifies rather a slight mellowing of the green olive, before the process of real darkening has begun. The word enjoyed a wider application. Thus Porphyry, *Vita Pyth.* 44: εἰ δὲ καὶ ἀνθοῦντος ἐν τῷ βλαστάνειν τοῦ κυάμου λαβὼν τις περκάζοντος τοῦ ἄνθους, etc. When Aristotle speaks of the *περκνός* ἔχης (*Mirab.* 846b18; cf. Nicander, *Theriaca*, 129), he probably means a speckled, or darkly spotted viper; and maybe the same sense is appropriate to the *περκνοὶ* ἰχθύες in Marcellus Sidetes (M. Schneider, *Comment. Philologicae quibus O. Ribbescio ... congatulantur discipuli*, Leipzig 1888, p. 115). For Hesychius s.v. *περκνόν* has *μελανόν* (clearly in the sense of dark, deep); *ποικίλον* (and s.v. *περκνόν*· *ποικιλόχροον*· *ἐλαφρόν* (?)); s.v. *περκάζει*· *μελανίζει*· *ποικίλλει*· ἢ *πεπαίνεται* (a concise description of the whole field of meanings); and s.v. *περκαίνειν*· *διαποικίλλεσθαι*· καὶ τὰ ὅμοια (v. also s.v. *ἐμπερκάζουσαν*· *ὑποβάλλουσαν*· *μελανίζουσαν*). It is interesting to note that the word was metaphorically used to signalize the first shades, the first sign of beard on a youth's face. Thus Callimachus, *Hymn. in Lavacrum Pallad.* 75-6: *Τειρεσίας δ' ἔτι μῶνος ἅμα κυσίν, ἄρτι γένεια / περκάζων* etc., where the scholiast notes: *περκάζων*· *μελαινόμενος* (in the sense explained) ὑπὸ τῆς φύσεως τῶν τριχῶν. And in an epigram by Philippus commenting

on the perennial complaint of the unsatisfied lovers when their loved ones begin to show the first hairy signs:

*Ἡμετέρης φίλης οὐδεὶς λόγος, ἀλλὰ μετ' ἄλλων  
παίζων, τὴν ἀκμὴν ὡς ρόδον ἠφάνισας.  
ὡς δ' ἐπιπερκάζεις μιαρῆ τριχί etc.*

Finally, we should note when Lycophron, 260, says (referring to Achilles):

*εὐτ' ἂν λαβράζων περκνὸς αἰχμητῆς Χάρων  
πτεροῖσι χέρσον αἰετὸς διαγράφων etc.*

The ancient commentators explain *περκνός* as follows: P (the *λέξεις Ἀλεξάνδρας*): *ταχύς· ἔστι δὲ εἶδος αἰετοῦ*. ρ (the *Μετάφρασις*): *ὁποῖαν λάβρος γενόμενος ὁ φοβερὸς πολεμιστῆς Χάρων Ἀχιλλεύς*. The main scholia have in the explanation of the whole context: *εὐτ' ἂν ὁ περκνὸς καὶ ὁ κυνηγετικὸς αἰετός*; and in the word by word comment we have two versions: (a) *περκνὸς δὲ ὁ φοβερὸς ἢ ὁ μέλας*; (b) *περκνός· κυνηγετικὸς αἰετός, περισσῶς καίνων καὶ κόπτων* (an example of ancient etymology, in a sense coinciding with the third suggestion for *μορφνός* of the Etym. Magn. mentioned above). The scholiasts are clearly reluctant to explain the word straightforwardly with *μέλας*; and even the single suggestion to this effect should be interpreted either in the light of what has been so often emphasized relating to the meaning of the opposition *λευκός* / *μέλας* in such applications or, more probably, as metaphorically signifying the deadly nature of the hero.

We conclude then that the kind of eagle referred to by Homer and Aristotle in the relative, discussed passages is not likely to be *μέλας* or *μελάμπυγος* in any strong, sufficiently distinctive sense. In fact the probability is, to judge from the evidence at our disposal, that it was, perhaps of a dappled, or rather pied appearance, but generally and distinctively of a rather deep, mellowed, yellowish colour, probably in a greyish-brownish direction. The above analysis presupposes the correctness of Aristotle's identification of the kind of eagle referred to by Homer in Ω, 316; if on the other hand, we should rather connect that eagle with the one mentioned in Φ, 252-3, then we get in effect

the same result via a different route. For the latter eagle is μέλας throughout therefore there is no point in calling him μελάμπυγον.

Thus, however this may be, it becomes clear that the isolated remark of the Scholia Veneta B about the Homeric eagle being called μελάμπυγος by Archilochus (it should be noted, incidentally, that Eustathius mentions nothing of the sort), and the corresponding, out of place and obviously confused, comment in the Lycophronian scholia (which makes even πύγαργος, a common appellation, Archilochian) are in all probability mangled and mistaken.

What Archilochus was referring to by his famous phrase was something on which the popular, common sentiment agreed whether it had already been crystallised in a proverbial expression or it was Archilochus who chiefly effected in the first place this formulization. And this widely held view was that a μελάμπυγος, or even worse, a δασύπρωκτος man was one whose manhood was particularly conspicuous in a rustic, rough and tough manner, manifested especially in a quarrelsome and pugnacious disposition ever ready for a brawl, and in corresponding uncouth behaviour. (Cf. for the attitude e.g. *Pseudologistes* 32: δέον, ὦ παιπάλημα καὶ κίναδος - the chastised man - ὑποπτήσσειν, εἴ τις ἀνὴρ δασύς καί, τοῦτο δὴ τὸ ἀρχαῖον, μελάμπυγος δριμύ μόνον εἰς σὲ ἀπεβλέψειεν. And Eubulus in the same direction points in his *Λάκωνες ἢ Λήδα* Fr. II [Meineke, vol. II, p. 234 = Fr. 61 PCGr. vol. V p. 224, apud Athenaeus 108A]: οὐκ ᾧου <σύ> με / χολήν [bile, gall] ἔχειν, ὡς δ' ἠπάτω (a kind of fish supposedly without gall-bladder) μοι διελέγου; / ἐγὼ δέ γ' εἰμὶ τῶν μελαμπύγων ἔτι, i.e. still one of the real men of old). Parallel to this notion there was the simile of the πύγαργος eagle, with the significance already explained above. Even if these two sentiments were initially unconnected, which I think probable, they were bound to be brought together very soon, associated as they were with a telling and relevant part of the body. But what in preclassical times was the opposition between the excitable robust and robustious, pregnacious, brawling peasant (such as Hercules was supposed to be and exaggeratedly caricatured in satire in his more boisterous and violent moods) on the one hand, and the beautiful but strong, well-built and well-exercised, graceful and aristocratic but athletic and mighty hero on the other, became later the contrast of the brave and manly to the timid, effeminate weakling. We saw above that πύγαργος was used by



Aeschylus' genuine and Lycophron's affected archaism in a way akin to what I evolved as the ancient sense; but Sophocles already uses the word to connote timidity or cowardice according to the Etym. Magn. s.v. πύγαργος (p. 695.48 sqq.) εἶδος ἀετοῦ. Λυκόφρων δειλὸν ἢ ἄρπαγα. Σοφοκλῆς ἐπὶ τοῦ δειλοῦ, ἀπὸ τῆς λευκῆς πυγῆς, ὥσπερ ἐναντίως μελάμπυγος ἐπὶ τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ, ἀπὸ τῆς μελαίνης πυγῆς. (The passage is also found in the scholia to Lycophron, 91). I have explained that Lycophron certainly need not and probably did not wish to call Paris a coward; ἄρπαξ (snatcher, robbing, rapacious) is better, but even this we must see in the aristocratic perspective elucidated above. Unless, of course, Lycophron wishes to refer to Paris' proclivity toward sexual pleasures. The scholion to our passage which explains the various senses of πύγαργος gives, apart from ἄρπαξ and δειλός, this singular explanation: ὁ δὲ αἰσχρὸς καὶ συνουσιαστικὸς πύγαργος λέγεται κατὰ ἀντίφρασιν ὁ μὴ ἀργὴν ἔχων τὴν πυγὴν ἀλλὰ κινῶν αὐτὴν ἐν τῷ συνουσιάζειν. The invocation of ἀντίφρασις here is too easy and weak. And the κίνησις of the οὐραῖον which Aristotle notices in *Hist. Anim.* Θ, 593b6, does not refer only to the πύγαργος (a kind of water bird) but to σχοινίλος and κίγκλος at least, as well. The change in signification and implication is illustrated in an admirably uncanny way by another scholion on Lycophron 91. The scholiast explains why πύγαργος means (as he thinks) δειλός: ὁ δὲ δειλὸς πάλιν πύγαργος λέγεται ὡς λευκὴν ἔχων τὴν πυγὴν ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου τῇ παροιμίᾳ «οὐπω μελαμπύγω τετύχηκας» ἐὰν γὰρ οἱ μελάμπυγοι γενναῖοι ὡς Ἡρακλῆς, οἱ λευκόπυγοι πάντως ἀσθενεῖς καὶ δειλοὶ καὶ ἄνανδροι. No mention of the πύγαργος eagle here and its character; in fact we have in this explanation what I believe is truly the case, namely that λευκόπυγος gets its later meaning from its opposition to μελάμπυγος, and not from its connection to the species of eagle. In fact the new connotation is standardly expressed by λευκόπυγος, not by πύγαργος. Thus in scholia on Aristophanes, *Lysistrata*, 802: τοὺς λευκοπύγους ὡς γυναικῶδεις ἐκωμῶδουν. Hesychius s.v. λευκόπυγος· ὁ ἄνανδρος. ἔμπαλιν δὲ μελαμπύγους τοὺς ἀνδρείους ἔλεγον (λευκόπυγος appears as a special case of λευκός, for Hesychius explains s.v. λευκοί· οἱ δειλοί. In fact there was a proverb to the same effect: λευκοὶ τοὺς δειλοὺς ὀνειδίζουσιν [Appendix Paroem. Gr. III, 61] which is explained thus: ἐπὶ τῶν ἐτέροις τὰ προσόντα αὐτοῖς κακὰ προσφερόντων, παρόσον οἱ λευκοὶ δειλοί. This well exemplifies

the later sentiment). Appendix Paroem. Gr. III, 62 has the latter version of the antithesis in a way which shows clearly enough the relationship to the older understanding: *Λευκόπυγος· ἐπὶ τῶν δειλῶν καὶ ἀνάνδρων. Τοιοῦτοι γὰρ οἱ μὴ πονοῦντες ἐν ἔργοις. Τούτῳ δὲ ἐναντίον τὸ μελάμπυγος, ἐπὶ τῶν γενναίων. Οἱ γὰρ πονοῦντες ἔντριχον ἔχουσι τὴν πυγὴν.* (We should notice, incidentally, that the *ἐντριχος* explicitly relates the *λευκόν* or *μέλαν* τῆς *πυγῆς* with its hairiness; hairiness blackens, darkens the appearance of the part concerned). The labourers and workers (in menial, manly jobs, naturally) are shaggy in their buttocks as a rule; the idle have their *πυγὴ* relatively smooth. But as we said, gymnastic exercise must be distinguished from labour; and then we see clearly the connections and differences.

The coinage of the word *λευκόπυγος*, or at least its being taken to signify cowardice or unmanliness may be the work of Alexis in which case all things will fit together nicely and closely. There was a *μελάμπυγος* (proverbial and Archilochian), meaning with shaggy buttocks; and there was a *πύγαργος* (in tragic or epic use) as a simile from the eagle of the same name. In classical times, when depilation becomes common and is connected with the lewdness of a (sometimes extravagant) pleasure-hunter, in contrast with the rustic robustness of the ancient *μελάμπυγος*, the *πύγαργος* takes in the hands of a tragic poet (Sophocles, as we saw above) the sense of *δειλός*, timid, and *λευκόπυγος* is coined (or used) by Alexis to signify *ἀνανδρος*, coward or unmanly. That Alexis originated this use may be inferred from Eustathius 863.29-31; he discusses the *λευκότης* of Ajax and Menelaus, feels uneasy because of the depreciatory conception for *λευκότης* in classical and post-classical times, and adds: *εἰ καὶ ἄλλως τὸ λευκὸν ἐλοιδορεῖτο τοῖς παλαιοῖς* (from the classical age onwards, roughly, I suspect)· *ἔθεν, φασί, καὶ Ἄλεξις ὁ κωμικὸς λευκόπυγον ἔφη τὸν ἀνανδρον· οὐ (?an καί?) ἔμπαλιν μελαμπύγουσ τοὺς ἀνδρείους ἔλεγον· ἔθεν καὶ παροιμία τὸ «οὐπω μελαμπύγω ἐνέτυχες», ὁποῖός τις ἐν ταῖς ἱστορίαις φέρεται καὶ ὁ Ἡρακλῆς.*

The correspondence between *λευκόπυγος* and *μελάμπυγος* extends to the point of having a *λευκόπρωκτος* to answer for *δασύπρωκτος*. Thus the scholiast comments on *Aves* 151: *Μελάνθιος ὁ τραγικὸς κωμωδεῖται λεπρὸς καὶ κακοπράγμων* (concerning him cf. Athenaeus, I, 6c; VIII, 343c; XII, 549a; Aristophanes *Pax* 801 sqq.

with the scholia; we see he was a lover of luxurious lewdness and exquisitely perverted pleasures). *Κωμωδεῖται γὰρ εἰς μαλακίαν καὶ ὀψοφαγίαν. ... Καλλίας Πεδήταις: «τί δ' ἄρα (Nauck's correction; cf. πῶς ἄρα, Meineke's conjecture for the mss. τίς ἄρα); τοὺς Μελανθίου τῷ γινώσομαι; / οὓς ἂν μάλιστα λευκοπρώκτους εἰσίδῃς»* (Fr. I, *Πεδήταις*, Meineke, vol. II, p. 238 = Fr. 14 PCGr. vol. IV p. 46). Here we have come back to our point of departure: fundament clear of hair bespeaks elaborate lasciviousness. On the other hand, what we have repeatedly emphasized in relation to the qualifications necessary for the alleged disrepute of the *λευκοί* or *λευκόπυγοι* to be comprehended properly, applies here, too. Thus the opposite condition of the fundament is equally liable to comic ridicule. Etym. M. p. 512.8 sqq. preserved a Cratinean fragment to this effect (Incertae Fabulae Fr. 27, Meineke vol. II 184 = Fr. 339 PCGr. vol. IV p. 287): *Κυρηβίων: καθαρματώδης ἐστὶ τὸ ὄνομα. κηρύβια γὰρ κυρίως τὰ ἀποβράσματα τῶν κυάμων. Κρατῖνος: Δασὺν ἔχων τὸν πρωκτὸν ἄτε κυρήβι ἐσθίων.*

The *μελάμπυγος*, *λευκόπυγος* antithesis, we thus see, pertains to the natural hairiness or otherwise of the *πυγὴ* (another proof that the connection of *λευκόπυγος* with the *πύγαργος* eagle could not have been but indirect, however obvious). The same general antithesis in its aggravated sense, i.e. as *δασύπρωκτος λευκόπρωκτος*, is liable to be (and was) applied also to the artificially induced condition of the anal region as regards hairiness. And we should never forget that it was really artificial hairlessness which became the object of comic and satiric lampoon; just as it was *λευκότης* resulting from lack of exercise and outdoor (mainly gymnastic) activities that was ridiculed and castigated.

But let us return to the main point, depilation in the male body. The usefulness of the digression becomes apparent if one will thoroughly examine the supposedly effeminate nature of Dionysus. However, for the purpose at hand, it has been established that the opposition to *λευκότης*, just as to hairlessness, was far from unqualified; to the contrary it was qualified in a number of specific important respects which have been discussed above. In fact, one may go as far as to claim that the appreciation was mainly positive; for the Greek ideal of beauty was materialized, as I said, primarily in the well-

built, large, smooth, shining body of a well-developed and well-trained youth. It was the ridiculous affectation of what one does not really possess, at which the Greeks were liable to, and did indeed, take offence the more intensely, the more they cherished and loved the natural manifestation of that ideal. The contrariety to nature of the enterprise, and its corresponding futility, are well brought out by Persius in his famous passage, *Satyra IV*, 33-41:

at sic unctus cesses et figas in cute solem,  
 est prope te ignotus cubito qui tangat et acre  
 despuat: hi mores! penemque arcanaque lumbi  
 runcantem populo marcentis pandere vulvas!  
 tunc cum maxillis balanatum gausape pectas,  
 inguinibus quare detonsus gurgulio extat?  
 Quinque palaestritae licet haec plantaria vellant  
 elixasque nates labefactent forcipe adunca,  
 non tamen ista felix ullo mansuescit aratro.

Before proceeding further, I shall adduce two more examples for the qualifications required to be made in the more well-known negative attitude. I shall mention them especially as they exhibit the woman's point of view, and are not located within the standard and normal context of the love of the man for the young man (as e.g. in Theocritus, E, 90; and in passage after passage of the XIIth book of the *Anthologia Graeca*; v. e.g. 13; 191; 195). In Lucian, *Dialogi Marini*, I, 1, two Nereides converse with each other, Doris making fun of Galateia on account of the latter's lover: whom she calls ironically *καλὸν ἔραστην*; she really disapproves of him because he is *ἄγριος* (the uncouth, rustic robustness we were talking about above - he is a *ποιμήν*), *λάσιος* (pilosus) and *μονόφθαλμος*. Galateia, it is true, rejoins that his *λάσιον* and *ἄγριον* is *ἀνδρῶδες*, but the point is being made that being (at least markedly) hairy can be considered to detract from beauty even in a man past his youth. In *Lysistrata*, 800-804, we see that an old woman scoffs at an old man on account of his dense hair in the membrum's area; the *λόχμη* (thicket) is there to be seen, as is clear firstly from the immediately preceding verse (799: *κἀνατείνας λακτίσαι*), which as the scholiast remarks (*τὸ σκέλος ἢ τὸ αἰδοῖον*) is a play of double entendre: raising the foot or the membrum to kick

her (as she is bend forward) or to penetrate her; and, secondly, from the exactly answering v. 824: τὸν σάκανδρον (i.e. pudendum muliebre) ἐκφανεῖς. The old man's answer runs thus:

καὶ Μυρωνίδης γὰρ ἦν  
τραχὺς ἐντεῦθεν (i.e. in that region), μελάμπυ-  
γός τε (the relevant connected area) τοῖς ἐχθροῖς ἄπασιν,  
ὥς δὲ καὶ Φωκίων.

He has to apologize, as it were, and to justify his hairiness there as if he was feeling ashamed about it. (The old woman on the other hand boasts in the exactly corresponding passage:

Ἄλλ' ὅμως ἂν οὐκ ἴδοις,  
καίπερ οὔσης γραός, ὄντ' αὐ-  
τὸν (sc. τὸν σάκανδρον) κομήτην, ἀλλ' ἀπειμι-  
λωμένον τῷ λύχνῳ.

i.e. it is hairless, not like yours!).

A final sufficient warning against oversimplifying the representation of Greek attitudes concerning conditions of the male body like the ones discussed here is conveyed by the study of ancient physiognomic treatises, as for example the tract incorporated into the Aristotelian corpus. I shall not enter here into a discussion of this important aspect of the subject, but I can refer, in particular, to chapters 3 and 6 of the Aristotelian work.

Having established the antiquity of the practice of depilation of the male body in Athens, I shall give now some passages providing valuable and characteristic additional information on the subject itself. Theopompus, in his 43rd book of Histories (Theopompus Fr. Gr. H 204), relates the customs of the Tyrrenians, respecting their unrestrained enjoyment of all kinds and types of sexual pleasure. He then has this to observe on our subject (apud Athenaeus, XII, 518a-b): καὶ πλησιάζουσι μὲν σφόδρα καὶ ταῖς γυναιξί, πολὺ μέντοι γε <μᾶλλον> χαίρουσι συνόντες τοῖς παισὶ καὶ τοῖς μειρακίοις. καὶ γὰρ γίνονται παρ' αὐτοῖς πάνυ καλοὶ τὰς ὄψεις, ἅτε τρυφερῶς διαιτώμενοι καὶ λειαινόμενοι τὰ σώματα. πάντες δὲ οἱ πρὸς ἐσπέρας οἰκοῦντες βάρβαροι (this is very interesting in its generality) πιττοῦνται καὶ ξυροῦνται τὰ σώματα. καὶ παρὰ γε τοῖς Τυρρηνοῖς

ἐργαστήρια κατεσκευάσται πολλά καὶ τεχνῖται τούτου τοῦ πράγματός εἰσιν, ὥσπερ παρ' ἡμῖν οἱ κουρεῖς. (For this singular species of barber shop, c.f. the already adduced passages relating to the later Spartan practices in the *βαλανεῖα*: Philostratus, *Vita Apollonii*, IV, 27 and Apollonius, *Epistola* 63). παρ' οὓς ὅταν εἰσέλθωσιν, παρέχουσιν ἑαυτοὺς πάντα τρόπον (the particular significance of this lies in that they must necessarily assume obscene postures in allowing the *δρωπακιστάς* or the *παρατιλτρίας* to remove the hair from their privy parts; cf. Clement, *Paedagogus*, III, 3, 15.4; and especially, for details of such σχήματα 20, 2), οὐθὲν αἰσχυρόμενοι τοὺς ὀρώντας οὐδὲ τοὺς παριόντας. χρῶνται δὲ τούτῳ τῷ νόμῳ πολλοὶ καὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων [καὶ] τῶν τὴν Ἰταλίαν οἰκούντων, μαθόντες παρὰ Σαυιτιῶν καὶ Μεσαπίων. [καὶ is omitted by Schweighäuser; I suspect, though, something like: καὶ τῶν Ἑλλ. καὶ <τῶν ἄλλων> τῶν τὴν Ἰταλ. οἰκ.]. Notice that χρῆσθαι τῷ νόμῳ τούτῳ implies a natural acceptance of the practice in the way that we consider it unobjectionable to go to the barber to have our face shaven or our hair cut.

The first Greeks of Magna Graecia to adopt or institute this custom were the Tarantines, according to Clearchus, apud Athenaeus, XII, 522d: *Ταραντίνους δέ φησι Κλέαρχος ἐν τετάρτῳ Βίων ἀλκὴν καὶ δύναμιν κτησαμένους εἰς τοσοῦτο τρυφῆς προελθεῖν ὥστε τὸν ὄλον χρώτα παραλεαίνεσθαι, καὶ τῆς ψιλώσεως ταύτης τοῖς λοιποῖς (probably Ἑλλησιν is meant) κατάρξαι. This thorough depilation is associated, as we should expect by now, with τρυφή. (For the degree of τρυφή of the Tarantines, and the consequent ὕβρις which they assumed and perpetrated, and the νέμεσις which they therefore attracted, see what follows in Athenaeus).*

Remarking on the evil influence of Philip in Thessaly and everywhere, Theopompus (Fr. 217b Grenfell-Hunt apud Athenaeus, VI, 260e) observes: *Φίλιππος τοὺς μὲν κοσμίους τὰ ἦθη καὶ τοὺς τῶν ἰδίων ἐπιμελουμένους ἀπεδοκίμαζε, τοὺς δὲ πολυτελεῖς καὶ ζῶντας ἐν κύβοις καὶ πότοις ἐπαινῶν ἐτίμα. τοιγαροῦν οὐ μόνον αὐτοὺς τοιαῦτ' ἔχειν παρεσκεύαζε, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ἄλλης ἀδικίας καὶ βδελυρίας ἀθλητὰς ἐποίησεν. τί γὰρ τῶν αἰσχυρῶν ἢ δεινῶν αὐτοῖς οὐ προσῆν ἢ τί τῶν καλῶν καὶ σπουδαίων οὐκ ἀπῆν; οὐχ οἱ μὲν ξυρούμενοι καὶ λειαινόμενοι διετέλουν ἄνδρες ὄντες, οἱ δ' ἀλλήλοις ἐτόλμων ἐπανίστασθαι (in obscene sense) πώγωνας ἔχουσι; καὶ περιήγοντο μὲν δύο καὶ τρεῖς ἔταιρουμένους, αὐτοὶ δὲ τὰς αὐτὰς*

ἐκείνους χρήσεις ἑτέροις παρείχον, etc. We see depilation in a context of unrestrained pleasure hunting, especially connected with uninhibited and promiscuous homosexual practices. (Cf. the strong expressions used by Theopompus in what follows this passage).

Sometimes close shaving of the beard and depilation of the pubic and anal region (indicating, as we saw above, a special proclivity to sexual passivity, cf. e.g. the already quoted epigram CXXXI by Ausonius) were considered to be connected: v. Athenaeus XIII, 565 sq. (cf. 564 sq.: ὑμεῖς δὲ ξυρουμένους τὰ γένεα περιφέρετε τοὺς ἐρωμένους) speaking about some cynically orientated Stoics, who were in the habit of accusing anyone dressed with the slightest elegance or wearing perfume as being κίναϊδος, remarks: οὐ δεῖ οὖν οὕτως ἔσταλμένους (they used to wear only wretched, dirty small pieces of rough cloth) περὶ ἀργύριον ἐπτοῆσθαι, καὶ ἐρωμένους περιάγεσθαι ξυρουμένους τὴν ὑπήνην καὶ τὸν ὄρρον, etc. Cf. Lucian, *De Mercede Conductis*, 33, where one τῶν πεπιττωμένων τὰ σκέλη καὶ τὸν πώγωνα περιεξυρημένων is a thoroughly effeminate man. On the other hand some were particularly industrious at keeping their sexual organ and anus free of hair, while unattentive in a similar way to the rest of their body: Lucian, *Pseudologista*, 31: κἀκεῖνα, εἰ δοκεῖ, ἄφελε, τὸ μύρω χρίεσθαι τὰς πολιὰς καὶ τὸ πιπτοῦσθαι μόνᾳ ἐκεῖνα. εἰ μὲν γὰρ νόσος τις ἐπείγει, ἅπαν τὸ σῶμα θεραπευτέον· εἰ δὲ μηδὲν νοσεῖς τοιοῦτον, τί σοι βούλεται καθαρὰ καὶ λεῖα καὶ ὀλισθηρὰ ἐργάζεσθαι, ἃ μηδὲ ὄρασθαι θέμις (the last clause does not fit with the Hellenic sentiment, of course, according to which they are αἰδοῖα, pudenda, not unseeable). Cf. also Lucianus, *Rhetorum praeceptor*, 24: καὶ μὴν καὶ πιπτοῦσθαι χρὴ μάλιστα μὲν τὰ πάντα (sc. μέρη τοῦ σώματος), εἰ δὲ μὴ, πάντως ἐκεῖνα (sc. the privy parts).

The practice was not restricted to low people. Julius Caesar himself was thought to submit to it: Suetonius, *Divus Julius* 45: circa corporis curam morosior, ut not solum tonderetur diligenter ac raderetur, sed velleretur etiam, ut quidam exprobraverunt. (Cf. the already quoted passage, Plutarch, *J. Caesar* 17: καὶ τὴν σάρκα λευκὸς καὶ ἀπαλός sc. Caesar). Emperor Otho also did the same thing; Suetonius, *Otho*, 12: ...munditiarum vero paene muliebrum, vulso corpore, galeniculo capiti propter raritatem capillorum adaptato et annexo, ut nemo dinosceret. Naturally, if emperors adopted the practice it could not have been a rare thing among eminent administrators; e.g. consider



the proconsul of Lucian, *Demonax*, 50: ἦν μὲν γὰρ τῶν πιπτουμένων τὰ σκέλη καὶ τὸ σῶμα ὄλον (where notice the irony of Demonax' intervention and final remark). The priests of Cybele, the *Γάλλοι*, castrated and satirized as effeminate, also indulged in this habit according to the injunctions of the Great Mother; Ovid, *Ars Amatoria*, I 505-8:

sed tibi nec ferro placeat torquere capillos,  
nec tua mordaci pumice crura teras.  
Ista jube faciant, quorum Cybeleia Mater  
concinitur Phrygiis exululata modis.

The significance of this fact is a matter of theological symbolism. Cf. the hair-abhorrence of the Egyptian priesthood.

Whole cities were famous for their homosexual practices, which were associated in general with depilation, especially in the relevant areas. Catana in Sicily was one of them: Juvenal, VIII, 16

si tenerum attritus Catinensi pumice lumbum etc.

Pumice stone was used to rub the body to make it smooth, probably after resin or some other depilatory has been applied. (Cf. Juvenal, IX 95; Martialis XIV, 205; Ovid, *Ars Amat.* 506; Plinius XXXVI, 21). The scholia to the passage have: Catana oppidum Siciliae, usque ad probra dissolutum notatur, ut Bibalculus (probably Bibaculus, the famous satiric iambographer):

Osce senex, Catinaeque puer, Cumana meretrix.

(To the youth of those available for pleasure in Catana alludes the tenerum lumbum of Juvenal). Catinenses was one of Lentulus' mimes certainly treating of the Catanian homosexual proclivity or effeminate behaviour, if we can judge by the example given in it teste Tertulliano, *De Pallio* 1042B (vol. II PG). The Balbius about whom Juvenal is speaking in our passage impurissimum et obscaenissimum mortalium fuisse, says Seneca, *De Benef.* IV, 30.

Greeks as a whole seem to have been addicted to these practices. Juvenal, VIII, 112 sqq. implies so much. (We should not naturally deduce from this that Romans were unspoilt, but that, as usually, a

Roman would blame Greeks for any loosening of his old national virtues and stern morals).

----- Despicias tu  
 forsitan imbellis Rhodios unctamque Corinthon:  
 despicias merito. Quid resinata juvenus,  
 cruraque totius facient tibi levia gentis?

and the contrast:

Horrida vitanda est Hispania, Gallicus axis  
 Illyricumque latus; etc.

The scholiast explains, on *resinata juvenus*: quod de resina pilos sibi tollant, ut cinaeidi. And for the use of resin in depilation especially by men, v. Plinius XIV, 20 (25) §123: pudetque confiteri maximum jam honorem ejus (sc. resinae) esse in evellendis ab virorum corporibus pilis.

Another popular way of thorough depilation of the male body was by the application of a plaster of hot pitch; the pitch from *Βρέττος*, a Tyrrhenian town (very appropriately, in view of what we saw above that Theopompus related of this nation), was particularly well known in this connection. V. Juvenal IX, 12 sqq., about Naevolus' changed bearing and behaviour:

Omnia nunc contra: vultus gravis, horrida siccae  
 silva comae, nullus tota nitor in cute, qualem  
 Bruttia praestabat calidi lita fascia visci  
 sed fruticante pilo neglecta et squalida crura.

This plaster was called *δρωπαξ* in Greek, as we can see from the medical writers (cf. also Martial III, 74; X, 65), as the scholiast to the present passage explains: *psilothrum* significant *dropacem*, quo solebat se accurate; there were various kinds of *psilothra* (the Latin, of Greek origin, *ψιλός*, *ψίλοθρων* for the depilatories). Reference to the Brettian pitch, probably in the same context, was already made by Aristophanes, directly or indirectly. We read in Stephanus Byzantius, s.v. *Βρέττος*: πόλις Τυρρηγῶν, ἀπὸ Βρέττου τοῦ Ἡρακλέους καὶ

*Βαλητίας τῆς Βαλήτου. οἱ οἰκοῦντες Βρέττιοι, καὶ ἡ χώρα Βρεττία, καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα. Ἀριστοφάνης* (Fr. 719 Di; 886 Blaydes; Fr. 638 PCGr. vol. III 2 p. 335) «μέλαινα δεινὴ γλῶττα Βρεττία παρῆν». Ἄντιοχος δὲ τὴν Ἰταλίαν πρῶτόν φησι κληθῆναι Βρεττίαν, εἶτα Οἰνωτρίαν. For the two occurrences of γλῶσσα, Bochartus (followed by Meineke) read *πίσσα* very appositely at first sight. The Etym. Magnum (p. 213, 8) s.v. *Βρεττία* has: μέλαινα πίσσα. καὶ βάρβαρος· ἀπὸ τοῦ Βρεττίων ἔθνους (or «Βρέττιος» ἔθνικοῦ). And the same in effect occurs in Hesychius s.v. *Βρεττία*· μέλαινα (an addendum <πίσσα>? ἢ βάρβαρος). ἀπὸ τοῦ Βρεττίων ἔθνους. The lexicographers note rather support the γλῶττα in Aristophanes' fragment: βάρβαρος γλῶσσα. If Aristophanes wrote γλῶττα, we can be sure, he was playing one of his usual, ingenious games of double entendre. In any case the μέλαινα, δεινὴ Βρεττία would have made clear the allusion to the famous pitch.

I shall end this study on ancient male depilation by referring to chapter III, book III of Clement, *Paedagogus*, entitled: πρὸς τοὺς καλλωπιζομένους τῶν ἀνδρῶν. V. especially 15, 2-4; 17, 3; 19, 1 21, 1; 23, 2; 5. We have in these passages a true picture of the situation, exaggerated only in the intensity of its absolute condemnation.

I shall conclude this essay by adding some further remarks on depilation.

(1) We are informed of a theatrical business very similar to Baubo's action as Arnobius represents it (for Clement's account, and what I take to have been the Orphic account lying at the source of both, see the discussion in this work). In Aristophanes, *Lysistrata*, 88-9, *Καλονίκη* the Athenian adds to the praise addressed to a Boeotian prime young lady, by saying: καὶ νῆ Δία / κομφότατα τὴν βληχῶ γε παρατετιλμένη. *Βληχῶ* refers here to the γυναικεῖον αἰδοῖον, as the scholiast explains. But he adds ad κομφότατα: κομφῶς ἔχουσα τὸ αἰδοῖον· ἀπτομένη δὲ αὐτοῦ τοῦτό φησι. So we have the placing of a hand to, and caressing gently that venerable part of the female nature but it is of course here another one's examining hand, unlike Baubo's case.

(2) It is interesting to note a passage which could provide another point of similarity with Arnobius account of Baubo's action. In Aristophanes, *Ecclesiazousai* 719 sqq., Praxagora wants to stop

prostitution in order that her friends, rather than the prostitutes, should enjoy τῶν νέων τὰς ἀκμάς, the vigour of young men. And then she adds (721 sq.): καὶ τὰς γε δούλας οὐχὶ δεῖ κοσμουμένας / τὴν τῶν ἐλευθέρων ὑφαρπάζειν Κύπριν, / ἀλλὰ παρὰ τοῖς δούλοισι κοιμᾶσθαι (this is an example of κοιμᾶσθαι as signifying coition, if examples were needed) μόνον / κατωνάκην τὸν χοῖρον ἀποτετιλμένας. Χοῖρος is of course the pudendum muliebre. But how is κατωνάκην to be construed? Mss. have κατωνάκη and the vulgate κατωνάκη, which Brunck tried to justify by interpreting it as χάριν τῶν δούλων. Κατωνάκη was a coarse cloth worn by slaves, a kind of frock with a lower border of sheepskin (κάτω + νάκος). V. Hesychius s.v. κατωνάκη: ἱμάτιον ἔχον ἐκ τῶν κάτω μερῶν νάκος προσεραμμένον, ὃ ἐστὶ μηλωτή. (Cf. also Moeris s.v.). It is true that the Etym. M. expressly remarks p. 597.14, s.v. Νάκη: τὸ αἰγείον δέρμα· κωδία καὶ κώδιον, τὸ προβάτιον. οὐκ ἄρα τὸ ἐν Κόλχοις, νάκος ρητέον. κακῶς οὖν Σιμωνίδης νάκος φησί (Fr. 39 (544) PMG Page). But this is at best ultra-purism. For Homer's *Odyssey* ξ, 530: ἀν δὲ νάκην ἔλετ' αἰγὸς εὐτρεφέος μεγάλοιο cannot be taken to imply more than that νάκη could be a goat-skin. The scholia have: νάκην· δέρμα αἰγὸς δασύμαλλον which suggests that the scholiast would agree to the remark in the Etym. M. in which case we may trace the source of the exclusive view to Alexandrian false scientism. What the Etymologus charges Simonides with, was committed by Lycophron, too; v. Alexandra, 1310; and before him Pindar *Pythia* IV, 68: πάγχρυσον νάκος κριοῦ. Herodotus, as well, uses νάκος for sheepskin, even if not in connection with the Argonautic expedition (II, 42). Theocritus, on the other hand, uses the word for a goat-skin, *Idyll* V, 2 (cf. 9 and 11-12); the scholia to this passage are instructive: one explains the word in its present use, τῆς αἰγὸς τὸ δέρμα; the other gives what was obviously taken from a lexicographic work: κώδιον, ὃ μηλωτὴν φαμέν; and the last gives both meanings, with the information that Zenodotus probably insisted on the "sheepskin view". This view we find in Photius (νάκος· ἔντριχον δέρμα ἥτοι δορὰ προβάτου - cf. also s.v. νακοτίλται). Suda has both interpretations, considering goatskin as the main one: νάκος ἔντριχον δέρμα, ἥτοι δορὰ προβάτου. Κυρίως δὲ τὸ τῆς αἰγὸς δέρμα, κῶας δὲ τὸ τοῦ προβάτου. Hesychius explains as κώδιον. αἰγείον δέρμα μετὰ τριχῶν· thus also providing both interpretations, though again he has νακοτίλται· οἱ

κείροντες τὰ πρόβατα, to which Suda as well agrees: *νακοτίλται· οἱ τῶν προβάτων κουρείς*. Eustathius (p. 1771.47 sqq.) gives both meanings. In conclusion we see that both uses were authorized by the poets and prosewriters, but that the grammarians and philologists were, as usual, in dispute as to which is the correct use. Pausanias IV, 11, 3 expresses I think the true state of affairs: *θώρακα γὰρ ἢ ἀσπίδα εἶχεν ἕκαστος, ὅσοι δὲ ἠπόρουν τούτων, περιεβέβληντο αἰγῶν νάκας καὶ προβάτων, οἱ δὲ καὶ θηρίων δέρματα* etc. The *δέρμα* of sheep and goat was called *νάκη* or *νάκος*. To return to Hesychius' explanation of *κατωνάκη*, we note that the scholia to *Ecclesiastousai*, 724 and Suda s.v., are in agreement: *ιμάτιόν ἐστιν ἐκ τῶν κάτω μερῶν νάκος, τουτέστι διφθέραν, περιερραμμένον*. This dress was considered appropriate for slaves, near-slaves, or the slavish in origin or behaviour. Thus the sch. to *Eccles.* 724 have: *ἐνταῦθα δὲ δουλικὸς καὶ ἀνελεύθερος χιτών;* and Aristophanes in *Lysistrata* 1150-1 describes the Athenians under the Peisistratidean tyranny to have worn *κατωνάκας*, i.e. be as slaves and wearing the characteristic dress of slaves (the former would be enough for the requirements of the Aristophanean passage just mentioned; but Hesychius and Suda s.v. *κατωνάκη* and the scholiast to *Lysistrata* 618 expressly mention that the tyrants did enforce the wearing of that dress by the Athenians); cf. also Athenaeus VI, 217d.

Now Brunck's construal of the Aristophanian passage in *Ecclesiaz.* (i.e. having plucked out the pubic hair for the sake of a slave, for him to enjoy it) is unnatural and improbable; it would further necessitate taking the characteristic cloth of a group of men for that group. *Κατωνάκη* on the other hand is accepted by all major critics; and it is connected generally to the various kinds of tonsure. (For *κουραὶ κεφαλῆς* v. *Acharnenses* 849 and *Aves* 806 with the scholia; also *Thesmophoriazousai* 838 with sch.; especially Pollux II 29-31; IX, 13; Herodotus IV, 175; Thucydides II, 62; Hesychius s.vv. *κῆπος*, *μιᾶ μαχαίρα*, and *σκάφιον*; Harpocration and Photius s.v. *σκάφιον*; Lucianus *Lexiphanes*, 5; Nicostratus apud Athenaeus, II, 47e; Eustathius 907.40 sqq.). Cf. Eupolis Fr. 313 PCGr. vol. V p. 479: *ἦλθες / ἐξυρημένος σαβύττους*, where the Glossae of pap. Ox. 1803 explain: *σάβυττος· κουρᾶς εἶδος τι*, whereas Hesychius hesitates whether it was a kind of hair dressing or shaving; s.v. *σάβυττος· εἶδος ξυρήσ(εως) εἰς καλλωπισμόν. πότερον δὲ τοῦ πύγωνος ἢ τῆς*

κεφαλῆς ἄδηλον. Cf. Photius p. 495.13 s.v. σαβύττης· ξυρήσεως εἶδος. Given the razor work (ξύρησις), it probably referred to a style of tonsure, which Eupolis no doubt translated to a particular fashion of hair cosmetics in the pudendum area. And so Hesychius continues the explanation of σάβυττος: τινὲς δὲ τὸ γυναικεῖον (sc. μόριον or αἰδοῖον); cf. Photius *ibid.*; and Suda c110: τὸ γυναικεῖον αἰδοῖον οἱ κωμικοὶ καλοῦσι... σάβυττον. For the plucking off the hair from the female triangle, cf. *Lysistrata*, 151: δέλτα παρατετιλμένα. Cf. *Ranae* 516: (ὄρχηστρίδες) ἤβυλλιώσαι κάρτι παρατετιλμένα. But then, it must mean here a kind of tonsure for the pubic hair (ἀποτετιλμένας in slave-fashion). In such a case it is very difficult to decide whether κατωνάκης as used in this way identifies the kind of tonsure as generally slave-like (i.e. one practiced by slave-girls; but then one could not very easily imagine a state of affairs where free-born women and slave-girls had different ways of arranging their pubic hair!); or perhaps as specially like that of the cloth κατωνάκη; for one could even surmise a fashion according to which the hair was removed round the labia but for a circular band of hair left at some distance away from them; that could be reasonably taken to represent the main feature of κάτω-νάκη. But however that may be, the interesting thing for our purpose is that, granting the correctness of the general standard interpretation of our passage, there was one at least particular way of tonsure for women's pubic hair and, therefore, presumably other ways at least possible as well. In which case Baubo might have utilized some one such way in her exhibition to Demeter - or perhaps she might have invented a novel and strange way on purpose and with a definite intent and significance. But I do not think that we should here take Aristophanes too literally in a mechanical way; he rather plays here one of his exquisite games. The Scholia (or any other source) do not speak of any kind of tonsure called κατωνάκης or κατωνάκη (as they do in *Acharnenses*, 849: Κρατῖνος ἀποκεκαρμένος μοιχὸν μιᾷ μαχαίρᾳ, to which the scholia remark: μοιχὸς δὲ εἶδος καὶ ὄνομα κούρας ἀπρεποῦς, κιναιδώδους; even here there may be a play involved, cf. Hesychius s.v. κῆπος). On the other hand we have other examples of such playful metaphors, misplacements or pregnant odd and unexpected combinations. Thus in Athenaeus, IX, 410c, we read: Χειρόμακτρον δὲ καλεῖται ὧ τὰς χεῖρας ἀπεμάττοντο ὠμολίνῳ. Σοφοκλῆς Οἰνομάχῳ: Σκυθιστὶ χειρόμακτρον ἐκκεκαρμένος (Sophocles,

Fr. 473 Radt). The sense would present exactly the same kind of difficulty as the present one, but for Hesychius' gloss on *Σκυθιστὶ χειρόμακτρον*: οἱ Σκύθαι τῶν λαμβανομένων ἐν πολέμοις ἀνθρώπων (Lennep for the ms. λαμβ. πολλοῖς ὦν; I would omit ἀνθρώπων altogether) τὰς κεφαλὰς ἐκδέροντες + ἦσαν+ (something is missing here) ἀντὶ χειρομάκτρων ἐχρῶντο. For details, see Herodotus IV, 64. In other cases the play is more obvious. Thus in Pollux, IX, 71, we have a Hermippian fragment from *Δημόται* (Fr. I Meineke, vol. II p. 385 = Fr. 13 PCGr. vol. V p. 568): Οἴμοι, τί δράσω σύμβολον κεκαρμένους; which is explained by Pollux as follows: εἴη δ' ἂν καὶ σύμβολον βραχὺ νομισμάτιον, ἡμίτομόν τι νομίσματος; thus the speaker in the fragment must have been tonsured on half of his head only, for some reason: κεκάρθαι ἔοικε τὸ ἥμισυ. (Pollux then goes on to explain how the *σύμβολον* can be half a coin in an appropriate sense. Other things, like knucklebones, could be used for *σύμβολα* - *σύμ+βάλλω* - for purposes of indisputable identification and recognition: v. Scholia to Euripides *Medea*, 610). The same expression could be used in describing a half-shaven face. This is what happens to Mnesilochus when he tries to escape in the midst of his sufferings at Euripides' hands; *Thesmoph.* 226-7: οὐκουν καταγέλαστος δῆτ' ἔσει / τὴν ἡμίκραιραν τὴν ἑτέραν ψιλὴν ἔχων. Such a case of literally incongruous combination of elements is, I think, presented by our present passage; *Ecclesiaz.*, 719 sqq. An antithesis to the οὐχὶ δεῖ κοσμουμένης is needed; thus, after: they must sleep with slaves only, we could expect: either (1) wearing a slave-dress, or (2) having hair dresses appropriate to slaves. Additionally some reference to their sexual condition would be more than likely. Aristophanes boldly combines all three expected elements in an utterly unexpected formation: *χοῖρος* provides the sexual reference; *κατωνάκη* the dress proper to slaves; *ἀποτετιλμένας* (in place of the would-be *ἀποκεκαρμένους* were it about hair-dressing proper, on the head) the some characteristic hair-dressing, like the *σκάφιον ἀποκεκαρμένην* of *Thesmoph.* 838, where see the scholia. The joke is that the slave girls must not only be not allowed to beautify themselves, but even their pudendum must be depilated in a slave-fashion! An Aristophanic comic extravagance.

That youths and young men had their pubic hair dressed in various ways and shapes already in archaic times is amply testified by



extant sculpture (κοῦροι).

(3) Plucking off the pubic hair was also reserved as a punishment for μοιχοῦς, adulterers, but in such cases it was executed in a way ensuring a painful and torturing experience. Thus in *Nubes*, 1083-4, the Δίκαιος Λόγος asks the Ἄδικος Λόγος about the likely influence of the latter's teachings on the young man, especially as regards his easy and free intercourse with married women:

τί δ' ἦν ραφανιδωθῆ πιθόμενός σοι τέφρα τε τιλθῆ;  
ἔξει τινὰ γνώμην λέγειν τὸ μὴ εὐρύπρωκτος εἶναι;

The scholia to this passage, and to *Plutus* 168, (cf. also Suda s.v. ραφανίς) explain the situation. Poor adulterers if caught, unable to pay the fine or recompense, were subjected to this inglorious treatment (δημοσίᾳ says the scholium ad *Plutus*, 168; we would scarcely believe this but for Demosthenes, p. 1367 Reiske to be quoted below) which consisted in a) ραφανίδωσις (= thrusting of raddish up the anus), and b) removal of pubic hair with simultaneous application of hot ashes to the thereby irritated skin. (Suda s.v. ραφανίς: οὕτω γὰρ τοὺς ἀλόντας μοιχοὺς ἠκίζοντο· ραφανίδας λαμβάνοντες καθίεσαν εἰς τοὺς πρωκτοὺς τούτων, καὶ παρατίλλοντες αὐτοὺς θερμὴν τέφραν ἐπέπαττον, βασάνους ἰκανὰς ἐργαζόμενοι. But perhaps the ashes were utilized in the process of depilation, just as pitch (δρῶπαξ) was normally). See also Lucianus *de Morte Peregrini* 9 for πληγάς (lashes) and ραφανισμούς as the punishment for adultery. For ραφανισμός cf. Hesychius s.vv. ραφανιδωθῆναι and Λακιάδαι; the proverbial expression ὦ Λακιάδαι in Appendix Paroemiogr. Gr. V, 43; Suda s.v. ὦ Λακιάδαι; Catullus XV, 18-19. When appropriate radishes (the μακρὰ ράφανος) were not ready to hand, the shaft of an axe or such like instrument could be employed or ἀλάβαστα, globular, elongated vases without handles, v. the passages from Suda and Appendix Paroem. already mentioned (ἀλαβάστοις is clearly the correct reading in both places, in view of Pausanias statement apud Eustathius, 1161.32: ἀλάβαστος· ὧ ἐχρῶντο ἐπὶ τιμωρίᾳ τῶν μοιχῶν ἀντὶ τοῦ ραφάνου). Still another substitute of ραφανίς was the sea-mullet (v. Catullus *loc.cit.*; Juvenalis, X, 317) which must have resulted in an excruciating operation in view of the fish's large head (sch. to Juvenal *ad.loc.*: mugilis: piscis grandis capitis, postremus exilis, qui in podicem

moechorum deprehensorum solebat inmitti); what Plinius, IX, 26 relates about this fish makes the whole thing more painfully clear, namely that mugilis or mugil piscis est cujus natura in metu capite abscondito totum se occultari credentis! But perhaps this aggravated manner of punishment has more to do with typical (rather later) Roman cruelty in inflicting pain.

The point of this practice, as is clear from the Aristophanian passage in *Nubes*, above quoted, was to make the adulterer feel and appear as an effeminate bent on suffering anal intercourse that is the contrary, in a sense, of what his action was meant to be taken as.

The passage in *Plutus*, 168 runs as follows:

ὁ δ' ἀλούς γε μοιχὸς διὰ σέ που παρατίλλεται.

The verse belongs to a passage where the things are being mentioned which men do for the sake of Wealth, personified *Πλοῦτος*, to whom the speakers address themselves. Since, as we saw, it was for want of money that the adulterer was suffering the painful and ignominious punishment, Bentley (followed by Valckenaer, cf. his note on Euripides, *Hippolytus* 417-8) wanted to emend *που* to *γ' οὐ*. But this is not necessary; for, as the scholia explain (which clearly read the verse as it is transmitted in our mss.), *διὰ σέ* here can easily mean on account of you in a neutral way, that is, you are responsible for the poor adulterer's torment, for if he possessed you, he would not suffer it<sup>1</sup>.

Finally, see Lucianus, *Fugitivi*, 33 for lashes and depilation by pitch as a punishment for a lewd, effeminate, mischievous fugitive slave (he was *τῶν ὑποσάθρων*, i.e. *τῶν σαθρὸν ἐχόντων τὸν πρωκτὸν* because of repeated anal intercourse; and he was called *Μυρόπνους*, breathing myrrh - ὄνομα καὶ πρᾶγμα. §32). We have already observed the connection between depilation of the anal region by pitch and proclivity to suffer anal intercourse; v. further the expression *κίναϊδος πεπιττοκοπημένος*, *Comica Adespota* 38 (Meineke vol. IV, p. 611). There were, of course, various ways of effecting depilation, with some of which (pitch-plaster, ashes, burning of the undesired hair) we have met above; for others one may consult the medical writers and Plinius.

(4) In Aristophanes, *Thesmophoriazousai* 533 sqq. we read (a

woman invites the rest to punish Mnesilochus who, disguised as a woman inveighed against them supporting Euripides, misogynic sentiments):

οὐ τοι μὰ τὴν Ἄγλαυρον, ὦ γυναῖκες, εἶ φρονεῖτε,  
ἀλλ' ἢ πεφάρμαχθ' ἢ κακὸν τι μέγα πεπόνθατ' ἄλλο,  
ταύτην ἐῶσαι τὴν φθόρον τοιαῦτα περιῦβρίζειν  
ἡμᾶς ἀπάσας. Εἰ μὲν οὖν τις ἔστιν εἰ δὲ μή, ἡμεῖς  
αὐταί τε καὶ τὰ δουλάρια τέφραν ποθὲν λαβοῦσαι  
ταύτης ἀποψιλώσομεν τὸν χοῖρον, ἵνα διδαχθῆ etc.

In *εἰ μὲν οὖν τις ἔστιν* (the vulgate text; the codex Ravennas has *τίς ἐστίν*, but they did not share in the 10th century our modern conventions) there is a problem of interpretation bearing on our present discussion. In the Schol. Ven. ad Iliadem A137 we meet the reversal *ἔστι τις* hence *ἔστιν τις* Hermann, *ἔστι τίσιν* Bergk (! What is to be expected from Bergk: daring ingenuity rather than truth), *ὑμῶν τις* Herwerden concerning whose construal see immediately below. Von Velsen, building upon Bergk's conjecture, reshaped the verse as follows: *εἰ μὲν οὖν τίσιν τίς ἐστ' ἐν ἡμῖν* etc. It is difficult to see how this could be corrupted to the mss. texts. And it gives a weak and inappropriate meaning. It is unnatural and very unAristophanic. The vulgate interpretation is "if there is somebody among you (presumably addressing the chorus who commented immediately before) who would punish this pest here (let her do it; an aposiopesis); otherwise we and our slave-girls will etc.", the *ἀποσιλωσις* *σὺν τέφρα* being mentioned as the intended punishment. But this is unsatisfactory, there being no adequate reason for the implied preference that somebody else should do the punishment; in fact the speaking lady, in an Aristophanic context, would rather enjoy executing the judgment she herself pronounces on the culprit. In any case the point would have been weak, or even lost, for such a forceful *ἀποσιώπησις* or *ἀνανταπόδοτον*. (To the vulgate interpretation Herwerden also adheres, who smooths out as it were the construction grammatically, by changing the *τις ἔστιν* to *ὑμῶν τις* as noticed above, and understands as implied *ἀποψιλώσει, καλῶς ἔχει* (= well and good)). Fritzsche attempts to supply the missing point by taking the appeal to be to some man ("since it would be improper for us

women to openly assume the role of afflicting vengeance on her on the spot, on the scene” he supposes the missing link to be). But I do not see even now, when a point for the antithesis has been supplied, how we could justify the force of the ἀποσιώπησις. There is a simple question to ask here: if that were the sense, then why is Aristophanes not stating it? Our solution to the difficulty clearly must enable us to answer this question, as well. (Unless one were to misapply modern sentiments, and argue that Aristophanes did not wish to exhibit the speaking woman as entertaining an *arrière-pensée*!). Blaydes moves a further step in the required direction. He says (*commentarius* p. 189): “Sensus, qui latuisse videtur interpretes, est: Quapropter, si aliqua illa est (si illi animi aliquid inest, si fortis et animosa est, Anglice, if she has any pluck in her), seipsam defendet; sin minus, nos ipsae et pedisequae nostrae etc.”, invoking this known idiomatic use of *τις* and giving some examples of which one may suffice: Plato, *Legg.* IV 716B καὶ πολλοῖς τισιν ἔδοξεν εἶναι τις. Clearly this is an improvement, for a suggestion is proposed which intends to account for the force, as well as for the point and meaning of the ἀνανταπόδοτον. Yet, contra, there are two considerations to be urged, one perceived by Blaydes, the other not. The latter, is this: There is a falsely ringing awkwardness in the idea if she has any pluck in her (let her defend herself); if not, let us pluck the hair off her hidden parts; the smoothly running antithesis, I submit, would have been something like if she has any pluck in her, let her defend herself and have a broil; if not, we shall have an easy ride. That is, the proper antithesis lies between easiness and difficulty in achieving one’s purpose, not so much between obstruction and the unqualified purpose itself. (By such formulations I am simply trying to evoke a feeling of subtle incongruousness in the antithesis as interpreted by Blaydes). On the other hand if the accomplishment of the purpose is kept as the second branch of the stated antithesis, then the former part of it must respect not mere opposition to the realization of that purpose, but rather the nonrealization of it tout court. And this is what will be catered to by my interpretation. But before stating that, let me briefly touch on the other consideration to be urged in objecting to Blaydes’ improved explanation. It concerns the construal of ἡμεῖς αὐταί τε καὶ τὰ δουλάρια. Blaydes understands ἡμεῖς as comprising both αὐταί and τὰ δουλάρια, as it were we on the scene, we around, that is, ourselves and the

slave-girls; thus he renders for *αὐταί τε καὶ τὰ δουλάρια* cum ipsae tum servulae. But as Enger (reported by Blaydes, in app. cr. ad locum) remarked: Non enim dicit, nos quum ipsae, tum etiam servulae, sed, nos ipsae cum servulis. To use punctuation as a logical tool, not *ἡμεῖς, αὐταί τε καὶ τὰ δουλάρια, τέφραν ποθὲν λαβοῦσαι* etc., but *ἡμεῖς αὐταί τε, καὶ τὰ δουλάρια, τέφραν ποθὲν λαβοῦσαι* etc.. I am not mentioning, of course, this point in order to illustrate the undoubtable subtleties of the Greek language, but simply by reason of its bearing on our purpose at hand; for Blaydes construal smoothes out the above noticed dissonance in the Aristophanian antithesis: “if she etc., otherwise we shall etc.” with unaccented “we” (the emphasis lies on the accomplishment of their intention as safely and certainly expected). In the competing construal (which I adopt) it is more difficult to iron it all out thus smoothly, the emphasis falling naturally on (at least partly, but definitely) “we ourselves and the slave-girls”. (I may mention here that, of the various parallels cited by Blaydes, none supports his construal of the phrase in question). (It should also be mentioned that the codex Ravennas has really *αὐτοί γε* (for *αὐταί τε*), a reading corrected by some (like Meineke, Bergk, Cobet and Blaydes himself) to *αὐταί τε*, and by others (like Dindorf) to *αὐταί γε*. If we retain the *γε*, then my two points above gain, of course, manifoldly in force.) But then the upshot of this discussion would appear to bring us back to the vulgate interpretation from which we began. For it certainly provides a smooth and consonant antithesis: if somebody else will do it, otherwise, we ourselves wite etc. In support of the vulgate understanding points the *γε* also of the main codex. And the ancient scholiast moves in the same direction, though he offers an interpretation which is unwisely neglected. The scholium runs thus ad 536: *συντιμωρεῖσθαι αὐτὸν βουλόμεναι* (-vn Fritzsche; -vos Hermann), *ἐπειδὴ ἐπὶ σκηνῆς εἰσίν*. (*αὐτὸν* because the person to be punished is really a man, Mnesilochus). The scholium evidently supplies the suppressed apodosis to *εἰ μὲν οὖν τις ἔστιν*, the sense being: “if there is anybody wishing to help in the punishment of the offender, let her help (accepting Fritzsche’s emendation; I do not see any natural point in Hermann’s change if it is correctly reported) otherwise, or, (almost), in any case, we ourselves (alone) etc.” I consider this attempt interesting, because it takes account of a point which I mentioned earlier, namely that the woman speaking and her

friends characterologically must be both willing and determined to share in the infliction of the punishment unless their enjoyment is spoilt by an objective circumstance which renders their resolve pointless (see my interpretation). Dübner (adnotatio ad scholium) reports that Claudius Puteanus' apographum scholiorum has: *εἰ μὲν οὖν τις ἄλλη, δηλονότι, γυνή, ἔστι τοῦτο ὅπερ λέγω ποιῆσαι <βουλομένη>, εἰ δ' οὐ μή, ἡμεῖς αὐταί* (sc. will do it). (I supplied <βουλομένη> as obviously required by the sense). And this is the vulgate interpretation. But as I observed above, everything is all right with the vulgate understanding apart from the perplexing fact of the *ἀποσιώπησις*. Why on earth should the *ἀπόδοσις* be withheld on such an interpretation? And besides, which are the two groups implied by *ἡμεῖς* on the one hand and that group of women from which the *τίς* may be prepared to help in doing or to do completely on her own the work envisaged? The women on the scene and the chorus respectively, one may say. But why one single woman on the one hand and quite a number on the other helped by slaves? Is it then a man who is searched out to perform the job (cf. Hermann's emendation above)? But, apart from everything else, even a man could not alone inflict such punishment except on a willing subject, which is impossible here.

To conclude this analysis: there is no naturally satisfying result in these endeavours. Suppose, then, striking a different line, that the sense was: "if she (i.e. Mnesilochus disguised) despite her age (for Mnesilochus is an older man) is one of those you know, then let her escape our vengeance, especially since in such a case her motivation in saying what she said (condemning the women) will be apparent (i.e. she judges about all of us from herself) and, furthermore, the particular form our vengeance would take (depilating her privy parts) cannot be exacted since she herself keeps clear the area of hair given her manner of life; but if not (and she therefore has not got a smooth and hairless pudendum), then let us teach her a lesson not to take the wrong side by etc." I think this gives the passage a sense both fitting to the context as regards meaning, and natural in itself respecting the interpretation of the Greek. Aristophanes, as usual, plays on many tableaux simultaneously: if she is one, i.e. one of those she condemns in speech, her hypocrisy will be unveiled; if not we shall make her appear as a sexually-prone hag. But also: if she is one, i.e. if she is somebody, and not a prudish nothing, if she is properly conscious of

her female nature (in all senses) and not a monstrosity of a woman with man-like feelings and thoughts etc. And again this latter dimension of meaning subtly alludes to the converse deceit actually being at work against the women. Thus the speaking woman also means: if she is a true woman, like the rest of us, she would feel like us and would not condemn in such a sweeping way practices and behaviour which we women all feel the urge towards, and, to a lesser or greater extent, all follow. And this sense has a special effect since Mnesilochus is not, in reality, a true woman at all.

#### NOTE

1. The legal situation as regards punishment of adultery in Athens seems to have been as follows. There was an ancient law which allowed the husband to kill the adulterer (if he caught him in the act of criminal intercourse with his wife) with impunity: Lysias, *de Caede Eratosth.* 30-2. The law was contained in the Solonian legislation; Plutarch *Solon*, XXIII, 1. But whether this law was actually considered valid in classical times, or if so, whether it was actually applied, is difficult to decide. Lysias, of course, invokes it; but even from what he says about the fact that actual, violent rape was not liable to death penalty (32-3; cf. 34 sqq.) [although he gives a transparently rhetorical turn to this discrepancy which, however, even if were itself discredited by the *βιαζομένη* in Plato, *Leges* 874c, was nonetheless a peculiar feature of Solon's codification of laws concerning women, v. Plutarch, *Solon*, XXIII, 1-4] we may conclude that the ancient law had fallen into relative or absolute abeyance. There might only be a question of the courts displaying some lenience towards one who killed the adulterer of his wife in the heat of passion and at the moment when not designedly caught them in the actual act. I think Lysias implicitly concedes so much in his peroration to the speech in question. There (§49) he represents the standing laws as allowing *ἐάν τις μοιχὸν λάβῃ, ὅ,τι ἂν βούληται χρῆσθαι*. Perhaps the ancient traditional and Pre-Solonian law had this form (rather than specifically allowing the killing of the adulterer), but the custom in classical times was to allow less than killing, namely what Aristophanes refers to. And even this was rather a liability reserved for the end of a law-suit; the normal procedure seems to be the one described by Demosthenes, *Contra Neairam* p. 1367 Reiske (§§65-6): the husband, by threatening the adulterer with an indictment or with violence on the spot, might agree to take a sum of money from him by way of compensation, and detain him in order to coerce him into such an



agreement or unless sureties for the payment were found. The alleged adulterer could then bring an action against the husband for unlawful detainment. If he won, he was pronounced not guilty and his sureties were released. Ἐὰν δὲ δόξη μοιχὸς εἶναι, παραδοῦναι αὐτὸν κελεύει τοὺς ἐγγυητὰς τῷ ἐλόντι, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ δικαστηρίου (δημοσία as the scholiast to *Plutus* 168 says), ἄνευ ἐγχειριδίου, χρῆσθαι, ὅ,τι ἂν βουληθῆ, ὡς μοιχῶ ὄντι. He could do with him what he wanted, excepting the use of dagger: i.e. not inflicting on him wounds, mutilation or death. The whole practice fits in with the more civilised spirit of 4th century late, and declining, classicism. But the Solonian and this law may have well coexisted in the 5th century. For the legal situation with regard to adultery in Rome, consult Lipsius, *Excursus on Annales Taciti*, Lib. IV.