

Perfume from Peron's:  
The Politics of Pedicure in Anaxandrides  
Fragment 41 Kassel–Austin<sup>1</sup>

ANDREW SCHOLTZ

When the Middle-Comic poet Anaxandrides presents us with one politician oiling the feet of another, what are we to make of it? Highly pointed satire, no doubt, but what is the point? How would a fourth-century B.C. Athenian audience have responded? After discussing the translation of the passage in question (Anaxandrides, *Protesilaus* fr. 41 K–A [40 K]), I shall adduce comparative evidence to gauge the rhetorical force of an allegation of this sort. I shall then explore the foot-anointing image in Anaxandrides as an evocation of sexual self-compromise—indeed, of *porneia*—and a figure for bribe-taking. Finally, I shall argue that because this fragment highlights the element of self-betrayal in bribe-taking, it provides a valuable glimpse into Athenian attitudes to the practice. For by shifting the focus away from “harm to the state or one of its citizens” (Dem. 21. 113),<sup>2</sup> Anaxandrides 41 will shed light on the question posed by F. D. Harvey, whether most classical Athenians would have agreed with Hyperides’ claim (5. 24–25) that bribe-taking was acceptable so long as it was not against the interests of the state.<sup>3</sup> As we shall see, Harvey’s tentative “yes” is in need of examination.

Text and Translation

μύρω δὲ παρὰ Πέρωνος, οὐπὲρ ἀπέδοτο  
ἐχθῆς Μελανώπῳ, πολυτελοῦς Αἰγυπτίου,

<sup>1</sup> A version of this paper was delivered at the 1994 APA annual meeting. I would like to thank Hugh Lloyd-Jones for his stimulating remarks after the talk. Also, special thanks to Victor Bers for his advice at all stages, and to David Sansone, the anonymous referees, and Nancy Worman for their immensely helpful criticisms.

<sup>2</sup> For legal and oratorical formulae associated with bribery as an offense, see especially F. D. Harvey, “Dona Ferentes: Some Aspects of Bribery in Greek Politics,” in P. A. Cartledge and F. D. Harvey (eds.), *Cruce: Essays in Greek History Presented to G. E. M. de Ste. Croix* (London 1985) 76–117; S. Perlman, “On Bribing Athenian Ambassadors,” *GRBS* 17 (1976) 224 and notes; see also below, notes 53 and 58.

<sup>3</sup> See Harvey (previous note); also below, page 80.

ῶ νῦν ἀλείφει τοὺς πόδας Καλλιστράτου<sup>4</sup>

1 μύρον δὲ <sup>1</sup>A: μύρον τε <sup>2</sup>A || 2 ἐχθὲς <sup>1</sup>A: χθὲς <sup>2</sup>A | αἰγυπτίου <sup>2</sup>A: ἐν  
αιπτίῳ <sup>1</sup>A || 3 νῦν ἀλείφει <sup>2</sup>A: συναλ- <sup>1</sup>A

This merest scrap, not even a complete sentence, presents the interpreter with a number of puzzles, not the least of which has to do with syntax. For even if we are correct in translating, “. . . perfume from Peron’s, some of which he sold yesterday to Melanopus, expensive Egyptian stuff, with which he is now rubbing the feet of Callistratus,” the meaning will remain obscure until we have determined the unexpressed subjects of ἀπέδοτο and ἀλείφει. As for ἀπέδοτο, the answer appears to be close at hand, namely Peron (Πέρων), a *parfumeur* familiar to audiences of the earlier part of the fourth century,<sup>5</sup> and mentioned as provider of ointment in the opening phrase. As for ἀλείφει, Bergk, in the first of two solutions, suggests Πέρων again, a reading that turns the fragment into an attack upon the perfume dealer for vacillating political loyalties.<sup>6</sup> Yet Bergk offers a second possibility: Melanopus as anointer of Callistratus’ feet. Read thus, the fragment becomes an attack upon Melanopus for behavior that we find described in Plutarch’s *Life of Demosthenes* (13. 3):

καὶ Μελάνωπος, ἀντιπολιτευόμενος Καλλιστράτῳ καὶ πολλάκις ὑπ’  
αὐτοῦ χρήμασι μετατιθέμενος, εἰώθει λέγειν πρὸς τὸν δῆμον· Ὁ μὲν  
ἀνὴρ ἐχθρὸς, τὸ δὲ τῆς πόλεως νικᾶτω συμφέρον.

Though an enemy and political opponent of Callistratus, Melanopus (Plutarch tells us) relented in his opposition on a regular basis. His excuse: that he was setting aside personal differences for the sake of the public good. The truth: that he was in the pay of his rival. On this evidence, Bergk suggests that Anaxandrides might be attacking Melanopus for lack of resolve in wavering between support and opposition to Callistratus,<sup>7</sup> an interpretation endorsed by Meineke,<sup>8</sup> though Kock, who remarks that the

<sup>4</sup> Anaxandrides fr. 41 K–A (40 K). Text and apparatus (where <sup>1</sup>A = Ath. 553d–e; <sup>2</sup>A = Ath. 689f–90a) from R. Kassel and C. Austin (eds.), *Poetae comici graeci* II (Berlin 1991) 259. This and fr. 42 K–A (41 K) are all that survive from the *Protesilaus*, for which see H.-G. Nesselrath, *Die attische Mittlere Komödie: Ihre Stellung in der antiken Literaturkritik und Literaturgeschichte* (Berlin 1990) 214–15, 273. Internal and external clues suggest a date between 386 and 361; see Edmonds ad fr. 42 K–A (41 K and Edmonds).

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Antiphanes fr. 37 K–A (35 K); Theopompus fr. 1 K–A (1 K), 17 K–A (16 K).

<sup>6</sup> T. Bergk, *Commentationum de reliquiis comoediae atticae antiquae libri duo* II (Leipzig 1838) 405: “Compositi autem hi versus sunt ad ipsius ut videtur Peronis inconstantiam castigandam, qui modo Melanopo faverit, modo a Callistrati partibus steterit.” For the enmity and rivalry of Melanopus and Callistratus, cf. Arist. *Rhet.* 1374b25–29; Plut. *Dem.* 13. 3. See also Xen. *Hell.* 6. 3. 2, 10–11; Dem. 24. 12–13, 125–27; Theopompus *FGrH* 115 F 97; R. Sealey, “Callistratus of Aphidna and his Contemporaries,” *Historia* 5 (1956) 178–203; Nesselrath (above, note 4) 214 n. 105; *RE* ss. vv. “Kallistratos 1” and “Melanopos 3.”

<sup>7</sup> Bergk (previous note) 405: “[Melanopum] poeta fortasse propterea notare voluit, quod parum firmo esset animo, ita ut Callistrato modo assentiret, modo adversaretur . . .”

<sup>8</sup> “Melanopus, cuius mollitiam hoc loco tangit Anaxandrides . . .” (A. Meineke [ed.], *Fragmenta poetarum comoediae mediae* III [Berlin 1840] 190). “[Bergk] qui postremum fragmenti versum recte de Melanopi in Callistratum obsequio interpretatur” (ibid.).

key to the puzzle would have been found in the lost context to the fragment, has his doubts.<sup>9</sup> Kassel–Austin and Nesselrath express no view on the matter,<sup>10</sup> while both Gulick and Edmonds translate with Melanopus as anointer.<sup>11</sup> In short, critics, if they show a preference, prefer Bergk's second proposal (Melanopus as anointer), yet that hardly counts as a consensus. Of course, the scant remains of Anaxandrides 41 do not permit certainty, yet Kock's agnosticism may be extreme, and it would be useful to see what clues the fragment itself contains as to how line 3 should be understood.

As it happens, the syntax of the second of the two relative clauses—the clause in which Callistratus' feet are anointed (ὧ̄ κτλ.)—depends on who that foot-anointer is. If Melanopus, the second relative clause should be seen as dependent on the first (οὐ̄περ κτλ.)—if not syntactically, then surely logically.<sup>12</sup> For it would explain how ointment sold yesterday to Melanopus is being used by him right now. If, on the other hand, Peron, seller of ointment in οὐ̄περ κτλ., also does Callistratus' feet in ὧ̄ κτλ., the logical, and probably syntactical, dependence of the second relative clause on the first is no longer possible. (Why would Peron use ointment he had sold to one customer to anoint the feet of another?) ῥ̄Ωι κτλ. would in that case depend on the first word of the fragment, μύρῳ, just as οὐ̄περ certainly does. The second relative clause would thus be coordinate with, not subordinate to, the first.

<sup>9</sup> T. Kock (ed.), *Comicorum atticorum fragmenta* II (Leipzig 1884) 151: "Quis esset ille, qui pedes Callistrati unguere dicitur, ex eis quae praecedebant aut sequebantur perspiciebatur: poterat Melanopus (ac sic Bergk . . .), poterat vero etiam is qui unguentum vendidisset significari."

<sup>10</sup> Nesselrath (above, note 4) 214: "einen kräftigen Hieb gegen die Politiker Kallistratos und Melanopus anbrachte." Cf. C. Wuerz, *Merces ecclesiastica Athenis: Quibus de causis quoque tempore instituta et qua ratione dispensari solita sit* (diss. Berlin 1878) 14–15.

<sup>11</sup> "Perfume bought at Peron's shop, some of which he sold yesterday to Melanopus, and expensive Egyptian it is too; with it Melanopus anoints the feet of Callistratus" (Gulick translating Ath. 553d–e, 689f–90a in the Loeb edition); ". . . And scent from Peron's, some of which— / It was Egyptian, only for the rich— / Last night he sold Melanopus, who's now rubbing / Callistratus's feet with it after tubbing" (Edmonds). Similarly *RE* s.v. "Melanopus 3" 424.59–61 ("Anaxandrides brauchte dafür [the arrangement described in Plut. *Dem.* 13. 3] den Ausdruck: M. habe die füße des Kallistratos mit kostbarstem ägyptischen Öl gesalbt . . ."). T. Long, *Barbarians in Greek Comedy* (Carbondale and Edwardsville 1986) 80 (cf. 81) somewhat more vaguely understands Callistratus as having "his feet anointed with an expensive Egyptian unguent purchased just the day before from the *unguentarius* Peron." The following secondary sources were unavailable to me for the writing of this paper: R. Vuolo Sofia, "Anassandride e la commedia greca nell'età di mezzo," in *I cinquant'anni d'un Liceo classico* (Salerno 1984) 218–27; eadem, "Ancora su Anassandride," *Euresis* (1985) 39–43; eadem, "Altri frammenti di Anassandride," *Euresis* (1986) 46–58.

<sup>12</sup> If Μελάνωπος is the subject of ἀλείφει, the natural choice for the antecedent of ὧ̄ is πολυτελοῦς Αἰγυπτίου (sc. μύρου), though ὧ̄ could still be seen as loosely referring to μύρῳ. For relative clauses dependent on relative clauses (by no means unusual in Greek), see C. Mugler, *L'Évolution des subordonnées relatives complexes en grec*, Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg 89 (Paris 1938) passim.

How then to explain the apparent asyndeton?<sup>13</sup> Most likely as anaphora (or rather, polyptoton) of the relative pronoun,<sup>14</sup> which in combination with the temporal adverbs ἐχθές and νῦν would produce a “then–now” antithesis (yesterday it was Melanopus’ turn at Peron’s shop, now it is Callistratus’; cf. Bergk’s first proposal, above, page 70). Yet the clauses in Anaxandrides show scarcely any of the parallelism usually associated with that effect. Οὐπερ, a partitive genitive serving as object to a verb of selling (“de quo non nihil vendidit,” Kock), emphatically delimits its antecedent, informing us that the “perfume from Peron’s” mentioned initially is the same variety as that sold to Melanopus: costly Egyptian.<sup>15</sup> ὦτι κτλ. by contrast indicates what use its antecedent was put to, and seems a nearly paratactical continuation of its antecedent clause.<sup>16</sup> In fact, there appears to be little reason why ᾧ κτλ. should not depend on πολυτελοῦς Αἰγυπτίου (sc. μύρου), the noun-phrase that immediately precedes it.<sup>17</sup> As for the subject of ἀλείφει, that is easily supplied by brachylogy ἀπὸ κοινοῦ from Μελανώφω in the preceding clause (so too Πέρων as subject of ἀπέδοτο).<sup>18</sup> Hence Melanopus as Callistratus’ foot-anointer, a reading that seems to offer fewer syntactical and logical obstacles than does the alternative.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>13</sup> Asyndeton, that is, if the relative clauses exhibit shared dependence. If the second relative depends on the first, there is, obviously, no need for a conjunction. For asyndeton, see Denniston, *Particles* xliii–xlvii; Kühner–Gerth II §546. For linked, coordinate relative clauses, cf. Xen. *An.* 1. 7. 3 ἐλευθερίας ἧς κέκτησθε καὶ ὑπὲρ ἧς ὑμᾶς ἐγὼ εὐδαιμονίζω; Thuc. 2. 43. 2 τὸν τάφον ἐπισημότατον, οὐκ ἐν ᾧ κείται μᾶλλον, ἀλλ’ ἐν ᾧ κτλ.

<sup>14</sup> A striking example of which is furnished by Soph. *Phil.* 663–66 (five asyndetic ὅς-clauses in a row). See Kühner–Gerth II §556.5.c for anaphoric asyndeton, both of relative and non-relative clauses.

<sup>15</sup> For ὅς = οἶος, see LSJ s.v. ὅς, ἦ, ὅ B.IV.5.

<sup>16</sup> For defining relative clauses, see C. Mugler, *Problèmes de sémantique et d’ordre syntaxique*, Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de l’Université de Strasbourg 92 (Paris 1939) 48–53. For continuative relative clauses (ᾧ = καὶ αὐτῷ), see Mugler 81–96; Kühner–Gerth II §561.2; Smyth §2490. As for other possible comparanda, the ἦν-clauses in Ar. *Nub.* 555–56 show asyndetic coordination, though asyndeton there seems to reflect a nearly complete lack of logical connection (cf. C. Lehman, *Der Relativsatz*, Language Universals Series 3 [Tübingen 1984] 143 on the “nur lose angeschlossen” relative clauses in *Il.* 13. 643–47). By contrast, the temporal adverbs in Anaxandrides suggest connection of some sort. *Il.* 5. 403–04 contains a pair of asyndetic, coordinate ὅς-clauses sharing an understood Αἴδης as antecedent. Yet the second ὅς-clause, clearly explanatory to the first, depends on it logically, if not syntactically. This, if anything, suggests for the Anaxandrides puzzle a non-asyndetic solution (viz., ᾧ κτλ. dependent on οὐπερ κτλ.).

<sup>17</sup> For continuative relative clauses, see previous note; cf. the translations of Gulick and Edmonds (above, note 11).

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Thuc. 5. 65. 4 τὸ ὕδωρ . . . περὶ οὐπερ ὡς τὰ πολλὰ βλάπτουτος ὀποτέρωσιν ἂν (= ἐς ὀποτέρους ἂν τῶν πολεμούντων) ἐσπίτη Μαντινῆς καὶ Τεγεαῖτα πολεμοῦσιν, where ὕδωρ as subject of ἐσπίτη in the minor relative clause is supplied from οὐπερ in the major relative clause. For brachylogy of this sort, see Kühner–Gerth II §597.2.a.

<sup>19</sup> That the subject of ἀλείφει is neither Πέρων nor Μελάνωπος, but an unknown third party to be supplied from the fragmentary μύρω δὲ παρὰ Πέρωνος clause seems not to be a serious possibility. (Such a connection would be very obscure.) Even Kock, the only critic actually to voice doubt over Bergk’s second reading, identifies Callistratus’ anointer as Melanopus or “is qui unguentum vendidisset,” i.e. Peron (Kock is perhaps unnecessarily vague about that; see above, note 9).

Read thus, the joke that this fragment appears meant to be gains a *para prosdokian* punch line: Melanopus is doing *what* with the stuff?<sup>20</sup> As for why it would be *para prosdokian* for Melanopus to anoint the feet of Callistratus, that is the next order of business.

### Foot-Anointers, Foot-Anointings

In ancient Greek society, the task of ministering to the cleanliness and comfort of the feet seems typically to have fallen to slaves, women, and prostitutes—persons, that is, of lower status than the recipients of these treatments. Washing of the feet<sup>21</sup> was a gesture of hospitality customarily extended by a host to his guests. Yet hosts did not take this task upon themselves; rather, they had their slaves do it. Thus in Plato's *Symposium* Aristodemus, before reclining at Agathon's victory party, has his feet washed by a slave.<sup>22</sup> In the *Odyssey* we find Penelope commanding her *amphipoloi* to wash the feet of the disguised Odysseus (19. 317 ἀπονίψατε), who would rather have his feet washed and anointed by another female slave in the household, his elderly nurse Eurycleia.<sup>23</sup> Antiphanes also shows us a female slave ordered to give a foot- and leg-anointing to a male *unguendus*, only there the anointee is (evidently) a patient rather than a guest and the anointing a miracle remedy of some sort (fr. 152 K–A [154 K]; see below, note 28).

Some accounts of foot-anointing clearly focus on the pleasure experienced by a male anointee at the hands of a female anointer. Thus Philocleon after a hard day's judging relishes the foot-anointing that he receives at the hands of his daughter (Ar. *Vesp.* 607–08). Evidence further suggests a connection between foot-anointing and sex. Of course, the aroma of ointment was considered a highly desirable, even essential, erotic accessory, and both men and women applied ointment to themselves before

<sup>20</sup> For *para prosdokian* humor, see W. B. Stanford (ed.), *Aristophanes. Frogs*, 2nd ed. (London 1963) xxxiii–xxxviii and passages cited in the index under “παρὰ προσδοκίαν jokes.” It seems fair to assume that the introduction of three well-known contemporary personalities—a pair of political rivals and a perfume dealer—in as many lines involves satire of some sort. Yet political satire against Peron would seem to lack point: Perfume dealers (at least in comedy) seem typically to have been non-Athenians (see Long [above, note 11] 79–80), though we cannot be sure in Peron's case. In any event, there is no evidence for political involvement on his part. One is also suspicious of Peron as foot-anointer. Perfume dealers might employ slaves (see, e.g. Hyperides 3), and it would stand to reason that a prosperous perfume dealer like Peron would have had a slave anoint Callistratus' feet (see below)—unless, of course, the foot-anointing is satire directed against Peron.

<sup>21</sup> In what follows I supplement the foot-anointing comparanda with evidence drawn from the world of foot-washing, an activity often conjoined with foot-anointing and physically (and hence symbolically) similar to it.

<sup>22</sup> 175a ἀπονίζειν. Ἀπονίζειν/ἀπονίπτειν is the term regularly used for washing the hands and feet, especially the feet.

<sup>23</sup> *Od.* 19. 343–48, 386–92, 505.

sex, and not just to the feet.<sup>24</sup> Yet the rubbing of the feet by female hands seems to have held for men a special attraction as a sexual stimulant, as it certainly does for the speaker in the following comic fragment (Antiphanes fr. 101 K–A [102 K]):

εἶτ' οὐ δικαίως εἰμὶ φιλογύνης ἐγὼ  
καὶ τὰς ἑταίρας ἠδέωσ πάσας ἔχω;  
τουτὶ γὰρ αὐτὸ πρῶτον ὃ σὺ ποιεῖς παθεῖν,  
μαλακαῖς καλαῖς τε χερσὶ τριφθῆναι πόδας,  
πῶς οὐχὶ σεμνὸν ἐστίν;

Fond of women generally (εἰμὶ φιλογύνης) and of *hetairai* in particular, the speaker explains (γάρ) his predilection in terms of a bit of foreplay in which his interlocutor specializes: a good foot-rubbing.

Oil, not mentioned in Antiphanes 101, figures in a foot-rubbing announced in Eubulus 107 K–A (108 K):

ἐν θαλάμῳ μαλακῶς κατακειμένον· ἐν δὲ κύκλῳ νιν  
παρθενικά τρυφερά ἴχλανιδανα μαλακὰ κατάθρυπτοι  
τὸν πόδ' ἄμαρακίνοισι μύροις τρίψουσι τὸν τῆμόντ'

Despite the poor condition of the text<sup>25</sup> one thing is clear: A man is going to have his feet rubbed in ointment. That he will be fussed over “in virgin-like fashion” (παρθενικά) while luxuriously ensconced in a *thamos* (a bedroom) leaves little doubt as to the sex of his anointers (female), or the sexual nature of the planned goings-on. As for the pleasure of having one’s feet rubbed by female hands, this τριβόμενος will fairly melt with it (τρυφερά ἴχλανιδανα μαλακὰ κατάθρυπτοι), just as the φιλογύνης does in Antiphanes 101 (μαλακαῖς καλαῖς τε χερσὶ τριφθῆναι πόδας, / πῶς οὐχὶ σεμνὸν ἐστίν;). But why? Why would men—or, at least, men in comedy—derive sexual pleasure from having their feet pampered in this way?

Timothy Long views these comic foot-anointings as a kind of *reductio ad absurdum* whereby ointment, a luxury item, is used in the most luxuriously wasteful fashion imaginable: on the feet.<sup>26</sup> While that certainly is the conceit underlying the paw-anointing ordered for a dog in Eubulus (fr. 89 K–A [90 K]), it is not clear that Long’s explanation of this comic *topos* does full justice to other instances. Indeed, when considering foot-anointing as an extreme form of *truphe*,<sup>27</sup> there are two things that one should bear in

<sup>24</sup> Archil. 48. 5–6, perhaps also 205 West; Semon. 16 West κάλειφόμην μύροισι καὶ θωμάσιν / καὶ βακκάρι· καὶ γάρ τις ἔμπορος παρῆν (surely a prostitute speaking); Ar. *Lys.* 938–47; Ach. 1063–66 (anointing the penis); *Eccl.* 524–26 (perfume as necessary to sex). See Long (above, note 11) 78.

<sup>25</sup> See Kassel–Austin ad loc.

<sup>26</sup> Long (above, note 11) 81.

<sup>27</sup> As does a speaker who exclaims in Ath. 553a ἔθος δ’ ἦν Ἀθήνησι καὶ τοὺς πόδας τῶν τρυφόντων ἐναλείφειν μύροις. In what follows (Ath. 553a–e) the speaker collects virtually

mind. One is that perfumes and ointments were believed to possess physical, especially medicinal, potency: To quote the Hippocratic corpus, “ointment warms, moistens, and softens,”<sup>28</sup> and one might add that the scent of ointment seems to have conferred a sense of well-being on its users.<sup>29</sup> The second is that the Greeks seem to have attributed to the feet a special sensitivity to physical treatment, the effects of which could be translated to the entire individual.<sup>30</sup> Thus for classical Athenian audiences a foot-rubbing in aromatic oils need not have come across simply as an outlandish extravagance; it also could have represented an exquisite, if expensive, pleasure. And the sheer physicality of such a pleasure could easily have become eroticized in certain (not all) contexts—hence Antiphanes 101 and Eubulus 107.<sup>31</sup>

Hence, too, it would seem, a fragment of Cephisodorus in which we encounter a cheeky slave who bristles at the thought of buying baccaris, a highly aromatic plant-root preparation, for his master’s feet (Cephisodorus fr. 3 K–A [3 K]):<sup>32</sup>

ἔπειτ’ ἀλείφεσθαι τὸ σῶμά μοι πρῶ

all the surviving evidence for foot-anointing in comedy (including Anaxandrides 41, but excluding Ar. *Vesp.* 607–08). Cf. Eust. *Il.* 974.56–57 (= III 603.11–13 van der Valk).

<sup>28</sup> *De diaeta* 2. 57–58, with specific reference to animal fat (λίπος δὲ θερμαίνει καὶ ὑγραίνει καὶ μαλάσσει). In Antiphanes fr. 152 K–A (154 K) Μηναργύτης/Μητραργύτης (“The Priest of Mên/The Priest of the Mother Goddess”), we seem to be dealing with a charlatan’s “snake oil,” though it is still significant that powerful physical effects are attributed to the ointment in question (see above, page 73). In Philonides (Ath. 691f–92b) the moistening effect of *muron* counteracts the warming effects of liquor. Dioscorides Pedianus discusses ointments in *De materia medica* 1. 52–76, and the physician Apollonius Mys wrote a treatise Περὶ μύρων (Ath. 688e–89b). See also Long (above, note 11) 75–78.

<sup>29</sup> In the Hippocratic *De morbis* 2. 13, a highly aromatic mixture of bayberry, galls, myrrh, frankincense, “flower of silver” (ἀργύρου ἄνθος), lard, and bay oil is applied to ulcers on the head. In Alexis fr. 195 K–A (190 K), *muron* vapors rise from the nose bringing health to the brain.

<sup>30</sup> The oracle reported at Hdt. 1. 55. 2 advises the “tender-footed (ποδαβρέ) Lydian” (Croesus) not to feel ashamed to flee in cowardly fashion (μηδ’ αἰδέσθαι κακὸς εἶναι) when the mule (Cyrus) becomes king of the Medes; this seems to associate a Lydian fondness for soft shoes with a “soft” disposition. In Plat. *Symp.* 195d, Agathon interprets the ἀπαλοὶ πόδες of Ate in *Il.* 19. 92–93 as indicating that Ate herself is ἀπαλή; he then attributes ἀπαλότης to Eros for similar reasons. Xen. *Lac.* 2. 1 notes that shoes and changes of clothes soften (ἀπαλύνουσι) the bodies and feet of the young. In 2. 3, barefootedness prepares Spartan boys for the hardships of the march; cf. the hardness of the barefooted Socrates in Plat. *Symp.* 220b. In Clearchus of Soli, a Paphian princeling’s *kolax* is described as holding the youth’s feet wrapped in a thin cloth on his knees—as to what that *kolax* was up to, the author notes only that it should be obvious (Clearchus of Soli fr. 19 Wehrli, p. 15.19–26 = Ath. 256f–57a). Clearchus regards this as ὑπερβάλλουσα τροφή (p. 14.6–10 Wehrli = Ath. 255e).

<sup>31</sup> J. Henderson, *The Maculate Muse*, 2nd ed. (New York 1991) 129–30, 138–39 equates πούς with πέος in several passages, including Eubulus 107, but see R. L. Hunter (ed.), *Eubulus: The Fragments* (Cambridge 1983) 207 and D. Bain, review of Hunter, *JHS* 104 (1984) 208, who call into question Henderson’s πούς–πέος equation. For the foot as an erotic object, see A. A. Berger, “Shoes (The Clothed Mind: Cultural Studies),” *ETC.: A Review of General Semantics* 47 (1990) 254–56; W. Rossi, *The Sex Life of the Foot and Shoe* (London 1977).

<sup>32</sup> Baccaris, though not a form of μύρον (scented oil) per se, was a redolent application made from a plant root (Erotian β 14; Pliny, *HN* 21. 29).

μύρον ἶρινον καὶ ῥόδιον, ἄγαμαι, Ξανθία·  
καὶ τοῖς ποσὶν χωρὶς πρῶ μοι βάκχαριν.  
Ξα. ὦ λακκόπρωκτε, βάκχαριν τοῖς σοῖς ποσὶν  
ἐγὼ πρῶμαι; λαικάσομ' ἄρα. βάκχαριν;

About to consult the oracle of Trophonius, a master is drawing up for his slave<sup>33</sup> a shopping list of ointments to be applied to his body as part of the ritual preparations (see Kassel–Austin ad loc.). Requesting *irinson* and *rhodinon* for the rest of him, the master has a very special request for his feet: *baccaris*. “Fuck!” exclaims the slave in a disgusted aside. “Get *baccaris* for your feet? Why not just say ‘Eat my prick!’?”

H. D. Jocelyn, who has established the meaning of the verb *λαικάζειν* as “perform fellatio,”<sup>34</sup> rightly understands *λαικάσομ' ἄρα* as signifying that the purchase of *baccaris* will somehow assimilate Xanthias to a fellator;<sup>35</sup> hence the slave’s angry retort (*λακκόπρωκτε*).<sup>36</sup> Why would Xanthias think this? Jocelyn adduces evidence for the wearing of perfumes as effeminate and for *baccaris* as a woman’s deodorant,<sup>37</sup> and it may well be that Xanthias fears people will think he is buying a particularly effeminate perfume to use on himself. Yet *baccaris* was hardly more inimical to manhood than many a perfume commonly worn by men attending symposia or in other situations, and other explanations should be sought.<sup>38</sup>

Long rightly points out that it is the specific use to which *baccaris* will be put that elicits disgust (note the repetition: *καὶ τοῖς ποσὶν χωρὶς πρῶ μοι βάκχαριν. / . . . βάκχαριν τοῖς σοῖς ποσὶν / ἐγὼ πρῶμαι*); yet one doubts that the slave would respond with such vehemence merely to the thought of wasting a fine perfume on the feet.<sup>39</sup> How then to explain the

<sup>33</sup> For Ξανθίας as a generic slave’s name in comedy, see the scholia on Ar. *Ach.* 243a and *Nub.* 1485d; Aeschin. 2. 157; see also Phot. *Bibl. cod.* 279, 532b.

<sup>34</sup> The future middle *λαικάσομαι* is to be understood actively as “I will perform fellatio.” See H. D. Jocelyn, “A Greek Indecency and its Students: ΛΑΙΚΑΖΕΙΝ,” *PCPhS* 26 (1980) 12–66; cf. K. J. Dover, *Greek Homosexuality* (Cambridge, MA 1989) 204–05.

<sup>35</sup> Jocelyn (previous note) 39–40 takes *λαικάσομ' ἄρα* as an apodosis to an understood protasis. (For *ἄρα/ἄρα* = “Do that? If I do I shall . . .,” cf. Ar. *Eccl.* 746–67; see also K–A ad loc.) Long (above, note 11) 81 and others (see Jocelyn 39) misread the formula as “anything but!” (Long: “he would rather become a sodomite than bring back the Lydian ointment.”)

<sup>36</sup> *Λακκόπρωκτε* (“broad-arsed,” “anally penetrated”) here seems intended as a general insult rather than a literally descriptive epithet (see Dover [above, note 34] 143, who cites this passage). By contrast *λαικάσομ'*, which the slave uses of himself, functions not just affectively but also informatively. Cf. Jocelyn (above, note 34) 15: “Affective use [of *λαικάζειν* and derivatives] cannot be said to have obliterated the denotative force of the words.”

<sup>37</sup> Jocelyn (above, note 34) 39–40, 63 nn. 296–97, adducing Hesychius s.v. *κυσσοβάκκαρις*: ἤτοι τὸν κυσὸν μυρίζων· ἢ τῷ κυσῷ μυρίζομενος; Semon. 16 West (see above, note 24, though the speaker does not specify where *baccaris* was applied).

<sup>38</sup> For use of *baccaris* by men, cf. Lucian, *Lex.* 8 (symposiasts); Dioscorides Pedianus, *De materia medica* 3. 44. 1 (used for garlands); Magnes fr. 3 K–A (3 K) (to be used as an after-bath application by a man; cf. Achaeus, *TrGF* 20 F 10 Snell). For ointment as a sexual accessory used by men and women alike (not just prostitutes), see above, pages 73–74.

<sup>39</sup> Long’s interpretation (above, note 11) 81. Cf. above, page 74.

slave's reaction? Surely Xanthias knows that he, his master's personal attendant, will have to rub his master's feet in this luxurious and highly aromatic substance,<sup>40</sup> an action that perhaps reminds him of the fancy foot-anointings in which female prostitutes seem to have specialized, but one that will in any event assimilate him to a fellator (λαϊκάσομ' ἄρα) and, hence, a *kinaidos* or *pornos*.<sup>41</sup> And not unlike another cheeky slave of the same name (in Ar. *Ran.*), this Xanthias balks at a request that he finds particularly unappealing (cf. *Ran.* 580–81), only here the slave must do something that will assimilate him not just to a slave, which he already is, but a prostitute, which he may not quite fancy himself as. For even slaves have their self-esteem to think of—at least, slaves in comedy.

### Self-Compromise

What does all this mean for Melanopus in Anaxandrides 41? Here are some key considerations:

(1) Foot-anointing involves contact with a sensitive part.

(2) In the hands of a woman, it can produce highly pleasurable sensations for a man.

(3) Melanopus has purchased a choice perfume (πολυτελοῦς Αἰγυπτίου)<sup>42</sup> doubtless intended to bring joy to Callistratus' feet.

(4) Melanopus presumably performs the service voluntarily.

(5) Melanopus and Callistratus are enemies (Plut. *Dem.* 13. 3; cf. Arist. *Rhet.* 1374b25–29).

Humiliating self-surrender, pleasuring one's "conqueror"—what all this suggests is the type of self-compromise associated with *kinaidia* in males. Or does it? Might not foot-anointing in this fragment imply other forms of humiliation? We have already seen how foot-washing and foot-anointing were very much slavish occupations; might not Melanopus be signifying to his rival, "I am your slave"? Doubtless he is, but there is more to it than that. Just as citizen-male Athenians who practiced *porneia* were commonly regarded as submitting to *hubris* with a view to another man's pleasure,<sup>43</sup> so Melanopus, through willing submission to the indignity of providing an enemy with a pleasurable foot-anointing, endures a kind of *hubris* that

<sup>40</sup> Ion, *TrGF* 19 F 24 Snell (*Omphale*), where it is better to know about the cosmetics of Sardis, including baccaris, than "the way of life on the island of Pelops." Cf. perhaps Magnes, *Lydians* fr. 3 K–A (3 K). In Hipponax 104. 21–22 it is smeared on the nostrils; in Ar. fr. 336 K–A (319 K) its smell, like that of other μύρα, arouses disgust (cf. Aesch. fr. 14 Radt).

<sup>41</sup> For metonymic, affective use of λαϊκάζειν and derivatives, cf. Ar. *Ach.* 72–79 and see Jocelyn (above, note 34) 41–42.

<sup>42</sup> For Egyptian ointment as a *parfum de luxe*: Theophr. *De odoribus* fr. 4. 30 Wimmer (elaborate preparation; numerous and costly ingredients); Dexicrates fr. 1 K–A (1 K); Achaeus, *TrGF* 20 F 5 Snell.

<sup>43</sup> See D. M. Halperin, *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality and other Essays on Greek Love* (New York and London 1990) 88–112, esp. 97; Dover (above, note 34) 103–04. See also below, note 67.

recalls *kinaidia* or *porneia*. But what about *kolakeia*? Evidence shows that those who took money to help others in the courts or assembly might be viewed as *kolakes* (see below, page 82), as might political climbers hanging on to the coattails of more powerful men (Ar. *Vesp.* 45, 418–19, 1033–34 = *Pax* 756–57; Dem. *De Cor.* 162). Might not Melanopus be a *kolax* along such lines, with Callistratus as his *kolakeuomenos*? One might object that foot-anointing does not seem to have formed part of a *kolax*'s repertoire.<sup>44</sup> One might also object that Melanopus as well-wishing toady does not sit well with what we know of the enmity between him and Callistratus. For *kolakes*, though not exactly friends, could supply companionship in place of friends,<sup>45</sup> yet it is highly unlikely that Anaxandrides presents us with so companionable a foot-anointing. *Kolakes* furthermore typically sought to wheedle favors from their *kolakeuomenoi*; indeed, *kolakeia* is sometimes presented as manipulation or control through gratification.<sup>46</sup> Yet it is difficult to see an established politician like Melanopus as a wheedling, manipulative political climber. Whatever he is doing in Anaxandrides, he is not flattering a potential benefactor, but capitulating to an enemy.

In fact, the chief reason why we should read sexual overtones into this foot-anointing (more than slavishness, toadyism, or even a generalized, non-specific self-humiliation)<sup>47</sup> is this element of Melanopus' self-surrender. It has been noticed that in many cultures, including the ancient Greek, power relationships can be expressed sexually, with conquest and dominance assimilated to the male role in heterosexual intercourse, and defeat and submission to the female. One particularly vivid example of this is a vase-painting in which a Greek victor at the battle of the Eurymedon in the early 460s is depicted as about to commit a phallic assault upon a vanquished

<sup>44</sup> As for what did form a part of a *kolax*'s bag of tricks, see O. Ribbeck, *Kolax: Eine ethologische Studie*, Abhandlungen der philologisch-historischen Classe der Königl. Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften 9.1 (Leipzig 1883). The foot treatment administered by a *kolax* to a Paphian princeling in Clearchus (see above, note 30) has more to do with the luxuries of Paphian royalty than the practices of *kolakes* in fourth-century Athens. Theorus blackens the boots of Athenian jurors to curry their favor (Theorus *kolax*, Ar. *Vesp.* 45, 419; Theorus bootblack, 600; cf. Plaut. *Men.* 390–91), but that is a far cry from a foot-anointing.

<sup>45</sup> Antiphon 65 D–K = *Suda* s.v. *θωπεία*; cf. Eur. fr. 364. 18–20 Nauck.

<sup>46</sup> Especially in Ar. *Eq.*, where Paphlagon and the Sausage-Seller represent politicians who manipulate the *demoi* through flattery. In Eupolis fr. 172. 6–10 K–A (159 K) a *kolax* seeks out a gullible (ἡλίθιον) *ploutax* whom he proceeds to gull by greeting every word out of the man's mouth with feigned admiration (cf. Eur. fr. 364. 18–20 Nauck, "do not make friends of those who talk themselves into your house" etc.). In Ehippus fr. 6 K–A (6 K) a *hetaira* ἐκολάκευσεν ἠδέως an obnoxious guest with kisses and soothing words; this points to connections between *kolakeia* and a woman's erotic *peitho*, though Anaxandrides 41, read in connection with Plut. *Dem.* 13. 3 (see below), suggests Callistratus as the *πειθῶν*.

<sup>47</sup> For the accommodation of non-friends (not necessarily enemies) as variously demeaning, Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 1124b30–25a2, where the great-souled man cannot allow his life to center around anyone but a friend; to do otherwise would be slavish (δουλικὸν γάρ), hence the low status of flatterers (διὸ καὶ πάντες οἱ κόλακες θητικοὶ καὶ οἱ ταπεινοὶ κόλακες).

Persian foe.<sup>48</sup> While the imagery in our fragment is rather more subtle than that, we do have a parallel in which foot-washing carries a symbolic meaning very much along those lines (oracle apud Hdt. 6. 19. 2):

καὶ τότε δῆ, Μίλητε, κακῶν ἐπιμήχανε ἔργων,  
πολλοῖσιν δεῖπνόν τε καὶ ἀγλαὰ δῶρα γενήσῃ,  
σαὶ δ' ἄλοχοι πολλοῖσι πόδας νίψουσι κομήταις,  
νηοῦ δ' ἡμετέρου Διδύμοις ἄλλοισι μελήσει.

According to Herodotus, this oracle came to fulfillment when the “long-haired” Persians captured Miletus, enslaved the women and children, and plundered and burned the temple at Didyma. What of the reference to foot-washing? The image of the wives of the Milesians washing the feet of their conquerors is probably to be understood in connection with the δεῖπνον mentioned in the oracle, and should therefore be seen as a kind of “hospitality” foot-washing. Yet the image of Persians feasting on Miletus and enjoying its “splendid gifts” places foot-washing within the context of pleasure taken in the spoils of victory, and hints at certain other duties—sexual ones—that will be required of women formerly wives (ἄλοχοι) to the Milesians. (A similar obliquity is seen in the god’s reference to the looting and burning of his temple as a “transfer of custody.”) In the oracle, then, foot-washing conjures up images of sexual submission to war enemies; in Anaxandrides, foot-anointing symbolizes a sexually tinged submissiveness to a political enemy. So far so good, but what kind of political arrangement does Anaxandrides satirize?

I submit that this picture of Melanopus pleasuring his rival targets precisely the venality attributed to that politician in Plutarch’s *Life of Demosthenes* (13. 3). Though scholars have long recognized the applicability of Plutarch to the interpretation of the comic fragment (see above, page 70), none to my knowledge has made the specific connection between foot-anointing and bribe-taking, much less explored such a connection to any degree. Yet a Melanopus who accommodates a rival and enemy in return for cash would seem an ideal target for the satire in Anaxandrides—satire evocative of *porneia*, a key element in which was the exchange of cash for services. But can we trust Plutarch? Though he is our only source for Melanopus’ *volte-face*, the enmity between Melanopus and Callistratus is confirmed by a passage in Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* where the latter’s prosecution of the former on the serious charge of defrauding the temple builders is mentioned (1374b25–29), a prosecution that certainly

<sup>48</sup> Red-figure oinochoe (“Eurymedon vase,” Hamburg, Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe, inv. 1981.173) discussed in K. Schauenberg, “Eurymedon eimi,” *MDIA* (A) 90 (1975) 97–121; Dover (above, note 34) 105; J. J. Winkler, *The Constraints of Desire: The Anthropology of Sex and Gender in Ancient Greece* (New York 1990) 51. For these phallic assertions of dominance, see Jocelyn (above, note 34) 38 and 63 n. 290; D. Fehling, “Phallische Demonstration,” in A. K. Siems (ed.), *Sexualität und Erotik in der Antike* (Darmstadt 1988) 282–323; Dover (above, note 34) 105–06. For an opposed view on the Eurymedon Vase, see G. F. Pinney, “For the Heroes are at Hand,” *JHS* 104 (1984) 181–83.

would not have earned the good will of the defendant in the case. As for the *bon mot* that Plutarch attributes to Melanopus (ὁ μὲν ἀνὴρ ἐχθρός, τὸ δὲ τῆς πόλεως νικᾶτω συμφέρον), that could very well be a historian's flourish, yet as such perhaps suggests that the Callistratus–Melanopus affair achieved a level of notoriety sufficient to draw the attention of a comic poet. It therefore seems unlikely that Plutarch or his source fabricated out of whole cloth the story in the *Life of Demosthenes*,<sup>49</sup> and we may thus read the joke in Anaxandrides in light of the anecdote in Plutarch, and understand foot-anointing in the fragment as a figure for bribe-taking.<sup>50</sup> How then might Anaxandrides 41 illuminate Athenian attitudes to the practice?

### Bribe-Taking Condoned?

Hyperides' speech against Demosthenes contains the following, rather surprising, assertion (5. 24–25):

You, gentlemen of the jury, are glad to let your generals and politicians reap great rewards. It is not the laws that allow this, but your own tolerance and generosity. You require only one thing: that the payments be to your benefit, not to your harm.

Hyperides gives the impression that Athenian “tolerance and generosity” (τῆς ὑμετέρας πραότητος καὶ φιλανθρωπίας) created an environment in which influence-peddling conducive to the well-being of the polis was allowed to flourish.<sup>51</sup> But does that reflect reality? In his study of bribery in ancient Greece, F. D. Harvey asks just that question, and answers as follows:

<sup>49</sup> Though Melanopus' *volte-face* presumably was common knowledge, the allegations of bribery would most likely have represented an inference from Melanopus' inconstancy, nor would Athenians of the time (not just Plutarch or his source) have hesitated to jump to such conclusions (see especially Harvey [above, note 2] 89–102). As for the truth of the allegation, that cannot be ascertained, nor is it strictly speaking relevant.

<sup>50</sup> One possible obstacle to interpreting Anaxandrides 41 in light of Plut. *Dem.* 13. 3 would be if the story told in the latter were actually an inference from the joke in the former. In fact, Plutarch made extensive use of Old Comedy as a source (see P. A. Stadter, *A Commentary on Plutarch's Pericles* [Chapel Hill and London 1989] lviii–lvix, lxiii–lxix), yet it seems unlikely that he or his source would have drawn on so allusive and oblique a joke.

<sup>51</sup> For the purposes of this discussion I shall define bribery as money payments (or similar material inducements) intended to influence politicians and public officials in the performance of their duties. In ancient Greek there is much overlap between the vocabulary of bribery and that of other forms of exchange. Δῶρον, δίδοναι, and λαμβάνειν could, for instance, be used with reference to both gifts and bribes. Πείθειν unqualified or out of context is similarly ambiguous (χρήμασι? λόγους?), though πείθειν χρήμασι could be used to mean “hire” for a legitimate purpose (Hdt. 8. 134. 1; Lys. 21. 10) as well as “bribe” for an illegitimate one. Δωροδόκος refers specifically to a taker of bribes (cf. δωροδοκεῖν, -ία, etc.); δεκάζειν has to do with judicial bribery. Evaluative language (see below, page 82) could also be used to distinguish bribes from other λήμματα (“takings”). For the vocabulary of bribery, see Harvey (above, note 2) 82–89.

The majority of Hyperides' fellow Athenians regarded taking bribes against the interests of the state as particularly heinous (it was indeed only this type of *dōron* that was actually illegal), and this attitude is not confined to the late fourth century, but can be discerned in the fifth century as well. *The evidence falls short of proving the other side of the coin, that other types of dōrodokia were condoned; but that would be a reasonable, though not inevitable, inference.*<sup>52</sup>

That bribes perceived to be "catapolitical" (harmful to the public good)<sup>53</sup> were regarded as more serious than other bribes,<sup>54</sup> that it was generally thought "to be more wicked to receive than to give" a bribe<sup>55</sup>—this has been convincingly argued in scholarship of the last twenty years.<sup>56</sup> That some forms of non-catapolitical bribe-taking might have been condoned—Harvey's hypothesis—is open to dispute.<sup>57</sup> To test this hypothesis it will be useful to reformulate the question as follows: Were there any criteria other than harm to the polis that would at least have focused disapproval upon a given act of bribe-taking, irrespective of whether the bribe was perceived to be illegal? This is where Anaxandrides 41 can be of use. For the transaction described by Plutarch and satirized by Anaxandrides does not appear to constitute a patently treasonable, or even actionable, form of bribe-giving or bribe-taking,<sup>58</sup> and should therefore fall within Harvey's

<sup>52</sup> Harvey (above, note 2) 112 (my emphasis).

<sup>53</sup> For Harvey's term "catapolitical," cf. e.g. Dinarchus 1. 47 δῶρα κατὰ τῆς πόλεως εἰληφός; also Dem. 21. 113, ps.-Dem. 46. 26. See Harvey (above, note 2) 108–13. In Harvey's scheme, catapolitical bribery amounts to remunerated treason; non-catapolitical, or "petty," bribery is everything else that still counts as a bribe. Under the heading "non-catapolitical" Harvey (110 n. 120) includes sycophancy and false witness—offenses, to be sure, though not in the first instance against the state as a whole. Yet Harvey's classifications may in the end prove somewhat artificial, particularly in the matter of sycophancy, which could indeed be viewed as a threat to the state, as the *probolai* against sycophants show (Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 43. 5; see especially M. R. Christ, "Ostracism, Sycophancy, and the Deception of the Demos: [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 43.5," *CQ* 42 [1992] 336–46; also Christ 342–43 for sycophancy as a broadly and imprecisely defined offense).

<sup>54</sup> See especially Perlman (above, note 2) 224; Harvey (as quoted above).

<sup>55</sup> Harvey (above, note 2) 80–81.

<sup>56</sup> Any comprehensive bibliography on bribery in classical Athens would include (apart from works already mentioned) G. Herman, *Ritualised Friendship and the Greek City* (Cambridge 1987); L. Mitchell, *The Greeks and the Foreign Friendships, 435–336 B.C.* (diss. University of Durham 1994); B. S. Strauss, "The Cultural Significance of Bribery and Embezzlement in Athenian Politics: The Evidence of the Period 403–386 B.C.," *AncW* 11 (1985) 67–74; J. T. Roberts, *Accountability in Athenian Government* (Madison 1982); H. Wankel, "Die Korruption in der rednerischen Topik und in der Realität des klassischen Athen," in W. Schuller (ed.), *Korruption im Altertum* (Munich 1979) 29–47.

<sup>57</sup> Harvey bases his tentative conclusion partly on Hyperides' claim, partly on extrapolation from such things as the tendency, noticed by Harvey (above, note 2) 109–10, for non-catapolitical bribe-taking to escape the really harsh censure applied to venality of the catapolitical variety.

<sup>58</sup> Which is not to say that Melanopus' alleged venality was invulnerable to catapolitical interpretation: An orator's aims and skill, and the mood of his audience, could have been just as crucial as the "objective facts" (such as there were) in the perceived seriousness of this or any instance of bribe-taking. Still, even a skilled speaker might have found it difficult to win a conviction against Melanopus. "Actionable" and "treasonable" seem to have been largely overlapping where bribe-taking was concerned. The general law on bribery (Dem. 21. 113)

non-catapolitical category. Of course, Hyperides might not have pointed to this as an instance of a bribe taken with the best interests of the state in mind, though Melanopus, as quoted by Plutarch, does try to represent his actions as patriotic. Yet the satire in Anaxandrides 41 does not evince much in the way of tolerance or generosity, or even indifference. Why? What has Melanopus done that leaves him open to attack?

To return briefly to Hyperides 5. 24–25, I suspect that the orator has foisted on his audience a rhetorical exaggeration designed to set off in sharper detail the really catapolitical venality of which Demosthenes stands accused.<sup>59</sup> For evidence suggests that non-catapolitical bribe-taking, however culpable legally, could be regarded as morally contemptible. Harvey himself documents how harm to the state was not the *only* consequence of improper payments,<sup>60</sup> though much of the evidence for bribe-takers as “damaged goods” is found in connection with catapolitical misconduct, and is therefore equivocal on the question of how Athenians felt in *non*-catapolitical cases. Yet Anaxandrides 41 is not alone in highlighting the damage done to individual recipients of ostensibly non-catapolitical, though questionable, payments. Cratinus, for instance, satirically invokes “Goddess Gift, the Fig-Sandaled” (fr. 70 K–A [69 K] Δωροῖ συκοπέδιλε; cf. *Od.* 11. 604 Ἥρης χρυσοπεδῖλου) as patroness of sycophantic bribes,<sup>61</sup> while Aristophanes satirizes sycophantic bribe-taking by association with *kolakeia* (fr. 172 K–A [167 K] ψίθυρός [“slanderer”] τ’ ἐκαλοῦ καὶ ψωμοκόλαξ).<sup>62</sup> In Xenophon’s *Memorabilia* (2. 9) we read

---

had to do with instances ἐπὶ βλάβῃ τοῦ δήμου ἢ ἰδίᾳ τινὸς τῶν πολιτῶν. Demosthenes (19. 7; cf. 273–75) remarks that although the law (i.e. apud Dem. 21. 113?) was not restricted to taking bribes for harming the state, the purpose of the general prohibition was to prevent corrupt individuals from having a hand in public policy. The *nomos eisangelitikos* applied, inter alia, [ἐάν τις] ῥήτωρ ὢν μὴ λέγῃ τὰ ἄριστα τῷ δήμῳ τῷ Ἀθηναίῳ χρήματα λαμβάνων (Hyperides 4. 8); cf. the law quoted in ps.-Dem. 46. 26. Stress is frequently laid on the catapolitical element in Dinarchus; see Harvey (above note 2) 108 and n. 114. The curse that began meetings of the *boule* and the *demos* seems to have been directed at catapolitical bribe-takers among others (Harvey 111).

<sup>59</sup> Hyperides may perhaps have felt he needed to dissociate the more casual backhandler from high-level corruption lest the former place the latter in a less sinister light. Harvey, too (above, note 2) 108–09, finds Hyperides’ words suspicious for these reasons, though in the end he tentatively adopts a position not too far removed from that expressed by the orator.

<sup>60</sup> Commercial vocabulary can be used to bring out the distastefully mercenary side of bribe-taking (e.g. Dinarchus 1. 28 μισθωτός; many passages cited in Harvey [above, note 2] 84–86). Διαφθεῖρειν used in the sense of “give a bribe” points to damage done to a politician’s integrity (e.g. Dem. 19. 13 διεφθαρμένος καὶ πεπρακώς ἐαυτὸν); the verb can be similarly used of sexual compromise (see Harvey 86–87). Aeschines specifically analogizes bribe-taking and prostitution (1. 29, 188; 2. 23; probably also 3. 106–07; cf. 3. 52, where the cowardly Demosthenes will “lay siege” to money being paid out but will “do no manly deed”; see Harvey 86 and below, note 67).

<sup>61</sup> In Harvey’s scheme, non-catapolitical; see above, note 53.

<sup>62</sup> Cf. Dem. 24. 199–200, 203 κολακεύει δὲ καὶ μισθὸν γράφει καὶ πολιτεύεται (Timocrates as orator for hire); 45. 66 κολακεύοντα καὶ τὰ ψευδῆ μαρτυροῦντα; ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ τῷ κερδαίνειν πᾶν ἂν οὕτως ποιήσῃ (false witness, one of Harvey’s non-catapolitical offenses [above, note 53], though in this section it is contrasted with civic-minded generosity). For the declassified implications of sycophancy, see Christ (above, note 53).

that Crito sought legal help from Archedemus, an out-of-pocket orator,<sup>63</sup> whom he cultivated with gifts, hospitality, and the like. Though Socrates (who recounts the incident) and Archedemus characterize the arrangement as a perfectly respectable friendship, it is, to quote Robin Osborne, “somewhat coyly presented by Xenophon,”<sup>64</sup> and the fact that Archedemus’ enemies accuse him of *kolakeia* suggests that “friendship” of this type was open to malicious interpretation. But why? What could be wrong with using one’s forensic skills to help out a friend, or with receiving in return a token of that man’s appreciation? It was in fact a problem of appearances—specifically, whether the gift in question appeared to express gratitude for a favor undertaken freely in the spirit of friendship, or to remunerate one man’s placing himself at the beck and call of another.<sup>65</sup> For any voluntary abridgment of one’s own civic autonomy was anathema to the democratic way of thinking at Athens,<sup>66</sup> and we should expect that putting one’s right of free speech (ἰσηγορία, παρησία) at the disposal of another in return for gifts of whatever sort could be viewed in the way that Aeschines views citizen-male prostitution as a “sin against oneself.”<sup>67</sup> Indeed, the satire in Anaxandrides 41 tends to confirm that a bribe-taker of Melanopus’ stripe has in the first instance sinned against himself by prostituting his right of

<sup>63</sup> Surely Archedemus “the blear-eyed,” a democratic leader involved in the prosecution of the generals after Arginusae (Xen. *Hell.* 1. 7. 2), and a butt of ridicule in comedy (Ar. *Ran.* 417–21, 588, etc.) and oratory (Lys. 14. 25). See J. K. Davies, review of W. R. Connor, *The New Politicians of Fifth-Century Athens*, in *Gnomon* 47 (1975) 377; R. Osborne, “Vexatious Litigation in Classical Athens: Sykophancy and the Sykophant,” in P. Cartledge, P. Millett, and S. Todd (eds.), *Nomos: Essays in Athenian Law, Politics and Society* (Cambridge 1990) 97–98.

<sup>64</sup> Osborne (previous note) 97, see also 96–98. For Xen. *Mem.* 2. 9, see also P. Millett, “Patronage and its Avoidance in Classical Athens,” in A. Wallace-Hadrill (ed.), *Patronage in Ancient Society* (London 1989) 33.

<sup>65</sup> Cf. the anecdote at Xen. *Mem.* 2. 8 and Millett’s commentary ([previous note] 28–29).

<sup>66</sup> For freedom as the cornerstone of democracy, see Arist. *Pol.* 1317b2–3 (the democratic principle of ruling and being ruled in turn as a component of ἐλευθερία); cf. *Ath. Pol.* 9. 1 (the abolition of debt slavery as the most democratic of Solon’s reforms). For putting oneself at the beck and call of another as demeaning, Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 1124b30–25a2 (see above, note 47). To quote David Konstan, “. . . the sovereign δῆμος was the unique entity toward which a citizen was expected, under the democracy, to show deference; in regard to a fellow citizen, such inequality signified a loss of freedom” (“Friendship, Frankness, and Flattery,” in J. T. Fitzgerald [ed.], *Friendship, Flattery, and Frankness of Speech: Studies on Friendship in the New Testament World* [Leiden 1996] 11).

<sup>67</sup> Aeschines describes the *nomos* barring prostitutes from public life as περὶ τῶν μειρακίων τῶν προχείρων εἰς τὰ ἑαυτῶν σώματα ἐξαμαρτανόντων (1. 22); cf. 1. 29, where prostitution as complicity in *hubris* against one’s person, and as an indication of a predisposition to political corruption, places a decidedly sinister coloring on the *hamartia* associated with it in 1. 22. Bribe-taking as self-compromise analogous to *porneia* and slavery is explored in some detail by Lena Rubinstein in an unpublished paper (“Corruption and Legitimate Self-Interest,” lecture given at Yale University, fall 1992). For prostitution as a self-inflicted political disability, see Halperin (above, note 43) 96. For ἰσηγορία and παρησία, see e.g. *Hdt.* 5. 78. 1; *Eur. Ion* 670–75; *Hipp.* 421–23; *Phoen.* 387–91; *Suppl.* 338–39, 433–41; *ps.-Xen. Ath.* 1. 6–9 (the right to address the assembly ἐξ ἴσης as a means of preserving the democracy and the freedom of the citizens); *Dem.* 21. 124 (the right of just redress identified with ἰσηγορία and ἐλευθερία). Also see G. Scarpata, *Parrhesia: Storia del termine e delle sue traduzioni in latino* (Brescia 1964) 22–45.

free speech—conduct that could be viewed as politically subversive insofar as it represented a contravention of democratic values. Thus when dealing with Athenian attitudes to political venality, it becomes difficult to divorce entirely the issue of self-compromise from that of harm to the state, or to suppose that any instance of political bribe-taking could be absolutely free of catapolitical implications. Yet Melanopus' sin runs even deeper.

In the introduction to her study of Greek foreign relations in the classical period, Lynette Mitchell analyses both Greek friendship and Greek enmity in terms of reciprocity and exchange, and shows how the relationship of *ekhthroi* to *ekhthroi* (personal enemies) was the mirror inverse of that between *philoï*. For the ethic that decreed one help one's friends also decreed harming one's enemies, as the Xenophontic Socrates' reformulation of Solon's prayer illustrates: "It is a sign of a man's *arete* for him to outdo his friends in kindness and his enemies in harm" (*Mem.* 2. 6. 35).<sup>68</sup> Among friends, good was to be met with good; among enemies, evil with evil—the latter is what Mitchell calls "negative reciprocity."<sup>69</sup> Anyone who, like Melanopus in Plutarch's *Life of Demosthenes*, accommodates a personal enemy violates that ethic flagrantly. For having sold his *arete* for money, he has allowed the categorical distinctions between friend and foe to become hopelessly confused.<sup>70</sup> In terms of the *quid pro quo* of Greek social interaction, he now deals with that enemy on a basis of asymmetrical reciprocity.<sup>71</sup>

Yet this ethic was not confined to the private sphere. For we hear of public officials excused for exploiting their positions to harm personal enemies (Lys. 9. 10, 20), and attacked for turning against friends (Aeschin. 3. 81).<sup>72</sup> One passage in which the ethic of "helping friends, harming

<sup>68</sup> Cf. Solon 13. 5 West; see M. W. Blundell, *Helping Friends and Harming Enemies: A Study in Sophocles and Greek Ethics* (Cambridge 1989); K. J. Dover, *Greek Popular Morality in the Time of Plato and Aristotle* (Cambridge, MA 1974) 180–84.

<sup>69</sup> See Mitchell (above, note 56) 37–41.

<sup>70</sup> Cf. Aeschin. 3. 52, where Demosthenes is taken to task for withdrawing his suit against Meidias on a charge of assault. Meidias had struck Demosthenes in the Theater of Dionysus, an insult that prompted the *demos* to pass a resolution of censure against the assailant (cf. Dem. 21). Aeschines, alleging that Demosthenes took money from Meidias not to pursue the matter, attacks Demosthenes' (alleged) venality as self-betrayal (he sold the "*hubris* against himself"), a slap in the face of the Athenian people (he sold the *demos*' resolution), and but one aspect of a thoroughly disgraceful private life (cf. 51–53).

<sup>71</sup> By asymmetrical reciprocity I mean a *quid pro quo* where what one gives is not matched by what one gets. In Plut. *Dem.* 13. 3, the money cannot adequately compensate the humiliation of Melanopus' *volte-face*—at least, not in the public eye. Indeed, it is part and parcel of that humiliation.

<sup>72</sup> See especially L. G. Mitchell, "New for Old: Friendship Networks in Athenian Politics," *G&R* 43 (1996) 11–21. Rubinstein (above, note 67) points out that whereas the appearance of mercenary motives tainted self-interested action on the part of public officials, the friends/enemies ethic could be invoked to legitimize self-interested prosecutions. Still, the "conflict of interest" objection to this ethic might be raised if it suited the needs of a speaker (Aeschin. 3. 194). Lycurgus (*Leocr.* 6) remarks that personal enmity should not be the sole grounds for a prosecution, but goes on to merge personal and state interests by identifying enemies of the polis with a statesman's personal enemies.

enemies” is cast in the teeth of a political turncoat occurs in Dinarchus’ speech against Demosthenes. There, after a long litany of that statesman’s disservices to the state, the speaker asks whether the jury would tolerate a politician who stood idly by while his political enemies did as they pleased—one who would switch sides politically without regard for the interests of the city (97–98). Demosthenes is, of course, the hypothetical idler and turncoat, while Demades, whose illegal measures went unprosecuted by Demosthenes—a signal instance of unpatriotic statesmanship on Demosthenes’ part (101)—seems to be the *antipoliteuomenos* foremost in the speaker’s mind. Of course, Dinarchus would have us understand that Demosthenes’ *antipoliteuomenoi* are pawns of Macedonia, and that his failure to oppose them amounts to a kind of treason. Still, the attack in 97–98 seems premised on the notion that politicians must as a matter of principle demonstrate devotion to the public good by opposing the policies of rivals. Thus in politics as in private life it was a virtue to remain true to friends, harsh to enemies, which makes it all the more difficult in the case of Melanopus’ *volte-face* to separate the element of καθ’ ἑαυτοῦ from that of κατὰ τῆς πόλεως.<sup>73</sup>

To conclude, then, Anaxandrides uses the invidious image of the foot-anointer to ridicule Melanopus’ venality. Slaves in their dealings with their masters, women with their men, and prostitutes with their clients all operated on a basis of asymmetrical reciprocity. The services that they provided and the compensation that they received were an expression of inferior status: Whatever their material gain, socially, they operated at a loss. By casting Melanopus in the role of foot-anointer, one typically filled by slaves, women, and prostitutes, the poet associates the asymmetry of slavery, prostitution, and the like with bribe-taking, and so constructs bribery as an essentially asymmetrical transaction. Put differently, a Melanopus oiling the feet of a rival stoops low indeed, and attaches to his real-life conduct the scorn and disgust aroused by this picture of him as a political pedicure. Considering that under the circumstances Melanopus resembles nothing so much as a *porne*, we can well imagine how an audience would have reacted to the poet’s characterization.

Yet it would have been up to the audience to associate Melanopus’ reputed conduct with this caricature. For Anaxandrides has constructed a kind of riddle-joke, one that asks: “Why is Melanopus like a foot-anointer?” “Because he lets himself be bribed by his enemy,” the audience

<sup>73</sup> Cf. Dem. 19. 9–16, where Aeschines’ *volte-face* vis-à-vis Macedonia is imputed to bribery. Aeschines responds that individuals and cities must bend to circumstances to achieve τὸ κράτιστον (2. 164); in this we hear echoes of Melanopus’ ὁ μὲν ἀνὴρ ἐχθρός, τὸ δὲ τῆς πόλεως νικάτω συμφέρον. Aeschines then analogizes Demosthenes’ allegedly treacherous private dealings with a treasonable nature (2. 165–66). For the intersections of political and personal enmity, see especially P. J. Rhodes, “Personal Enmity and Political Opposition in Athens,” *G&R* 43 (1996) 21–30. Rhodes, it should be pointed out, also explores some interesting cases of socio-political “fence mending.”

thinks as it makes the connection between image and referent. Thus Anaxandrides does not so much suggest a way of looking at bribe-taking as appeal to what must have been a widespread aversion to the kind of bribe-taking described by Plutarch, an aversion rooted in an ethic that condemned the voluntary abridgment of civic autonomy and prescribed helping friends, not selling out to enemies. And even allowing for what could have been rampant venality in the classical Athenian polis,<sup>74</sup> and a double standard to go with it,<sup>75</sup> one rather doubts that Athenians would have adopted an indulgent attitude toward any form of political bribe-taking—certainly not if what was taken resembled a bribe, a *quid pro quo* with humiliating implications for the taker of the *quid*.

*Yale University*

<sup>74</sup> Though Harvey (above, note 2) 89–102 rightly points out that the evidence on extent is inconclusive.

<sup>75</sup> Strauss (above, note 56) in particular explores a “wink–nudge” ambiguity between gifts and bribes.