

νοκτὸς οὐδὲν ἀποκοιμηθέντες παραρτέοντο (“And in fact they were making these preparations and got no sleep during the night”).<sup>20</sup>

In conclusion, Hall’s arguments for making the Greeks the subjects of *Persae* 374–83 are not persuasive. Lexical detail and structural features from the passage in question weigh against her claim, as does a brief comparison with Herodotus 8.76.3. The phrase *πειθάρχῳ φρενί* (l. 374) on which she relies describes not a “willing obedience to authority” on the part of the Greeks, but rather the subservient attitude of Persian subjects towards their sovereign who is accountable to no man. The traditional interpretation of the passage should stand: the lines describe the activities of Persian sailors.

GEOFFREY W. BAKEWELL  
Creighton University

20. See Hammond, “Salamis,” 44. However, given that Herodotus’ account of Salamis was written decades later than the *Persae* and may in fact have been influenced by it, this correspondence is not in and of itself conclusive.

KYATHOS AT ARISTOPHANES *PAX* 538–42, *LYSISTRATA* 443–44, AND  
[ARISTOTLE] *PROBLEMS* 890B7–38

In two passages of Aristophanes the term κύαθος is associated with the treatment of black eyes resulting from a blow. In *Pax*, Hermes remarks on the blissful situation of the reconciled Greek cities now that Eirene has been recovered:<sup>1</sup>

Ἰθι νυν, ἄθρει  
οἶον πρὸς ἀλλήλας λαλοῦσιν αἱ πόλεις  
διαλλαγεῖσαι καὶ γελῶσιν ἄσμεναι—

At this point Trygaeus interrupts with the observation:

καὶ ταῦτα δαιμονίως ὑπωπιασμένα  
ἀπαξάπασαι καὶ κύαθους προσκείμεναι

And in *Lysistrata*, when the Proboulos orders a Scythian archer to arrest one of the old women defending Lysistrata, a second old woman threateningly informs the archer:

Εἰ τᾶρα νῆ τὴν Φωσφόρον τὴν χειρ’ ἄκραν  
ταύτηη προσοίσεις, κύαθον αἰτήσεις τάχα.<sup>2</sup>

Early authorities such as LSJ and E. Pottier in *Dar.-Sag.* (s.v. *cyathus*) took the term κύαθος in these lines in its usual sense of “ladle,” which is the meaning of the

We are grateful to Michael Halleran and to our two anonymous referees for their useful comments and criticisms.

1. In this and the following passage we follow the assignment of lines by Platnauer and Henderson respectively. In fact it makes no difference to our argument who speaks them.

2. To these passages we may add Apollonophanes, *Iphigeron* frag. 3 (Kassel/Austin) πόθεν ἂν κύαθον λάβοιμι τοῖς ὑπωπίοις and Euripides frag. 374 (Nauck, *TGF*) ἢ κύαθον ἢ χαλκήλατον ἡθμὸν προσίσχων τοῖσδε τοῖς ὑπωπίοις.

word in its one other occurrence in Aristophanes.<sup>3</sup> Yet, to the present day virtually all scholarly translators and commentators known to us render κύαθος in these passages as “bleeding cup” or “cupping glass” (*Schröpfkopf*; *ventouse*).<sup>4</sup>

Aristophanists support their interpretation of κύαθος by citing the scholia on *Pax* 538–42 and *Lysistrata* 443–44 and by referring to ll. 890b7–38 of *Problems*, a treatise transmitted among the works of Aristotle.<sup>5</sup> In this treatise we are told three times in succession and in more or less the same language that κύαθοι are effective in treating black eyes.<sup>6</sup> The theory expounded is that the bronze κύαθος, when applied to the bruised area, imparts cold. This operation prevents heat from being driven away, and the retained heat in turn keeps blood from congealing. In this way a bruise is prevented from forming. It will be sufficient to quote just one of the relevant excerpts (890b20–24 Hett):

Διὰ τί τὰ ὑπόπια διαλύεται προσέχουσι τὰ χαλκᾶ, ὅσον κύαθους καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα; ἡ διότι ψυχρὸν ὁ χαλκός ἐστιν; κωλύει οὖν τὸ θερμὸν ἐξιέναι ἐκ τοῦ συνιόντος αἵματος ὑπὸ τῆς πληγῆς, οὗ ἐξελλθόντος ἐκ τοῦ ἐπιπολῆς γίνεται ὑπόπιον. διὸ καὶ ταχὺ δεῖ προστιθέναι πρὶν παγῆναι.

Aristophanists seem unaware that most translators of *Problems* 890b7–38 interpret κύαθος as a ladle or (erroneously in our view) as a small metal vessel rather than as a “bleeding cup.”<sup>7</sup> However, the latter view has been espoused by at least one translator of *Problems*.<sup>8</sup> Remarkably, even the great authority J. S. Milne, whose *Surgical Instruments in Greek and Roman Times* is still the standard work on the subject, also accepted the term κύαθος as designating a bleeding cup.<sup>9</sup> Milne offered no citations in support of his claim, but he must have had the passages in Aristophanes

3. *Ach.* 1053; κύαθον εἰρήνης.

4. Translations and commentaries include: *Pax*: F. H. Blaydes (1883), J. van Leeuwen (1906), V. Coulon/H. van Daele (1926), B. B. Rogers (1927), R. Cantarella (1949), M. Platnauer (1964), A. Sommerstein (1985); *Lysistrata*: F. H. Blaydes (1880), J. van Leeuwen (1903), V. Coulon/H. van Daele (1926), B. B. Rogers (1927), U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (1927), J. Lindsay (1940), W. Schadewaldt (1964), D. Parker (1970), J. Henderson (1987), A. Sommerstein (1990). To these add: W. G. Rutherford, *Scholia Aristophanica*, 3 vols. (London and New York, 1896); C. B. Gulick (1930; apud his Loeb translation of Athenaeus X 424b); P. Louis, *Aristote, Problemes*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1991), 1:206. Leonard in *RE* XI 2 (1922): 2242–45, s.v., is an exception. He opts for ladle (*Schröpfgefäss*), but taking account of the work of R. Meringer, does not exclude the possibility that a *Schröpfkopf* is meant.

5. For the authorship; see H. Flashar, *Aristoteles, Problemata Physica* (Berlin, 1962), 303ff.; G. Marengi, *Aristotele: Problemi di Medicina* (Milan, 1966), xl–xv; Philip van der Eijk, “Aristoteles über die Melancholie,” *Mnemosyne* 43 (1990): 33–72, esp. 55–72; Louis, *Aristote*, 1:xxiii–xxxv. Whether *Problems* is from the hand of Aristotle himself or the product of some other member of the Peripatos is not a matter of consequence to our argument.

6. The term ὑπόπιον is occasionally used to designate any bruise as opposed to a black eye, and translators of *Problems* prefer that meaning. We believe that eye bruises are at issue in *Problems* because the remedy for ὑπόπια, namely application of the κύαθος, is the same as in Aristophanes where black eyes are surely the issue (see the remarks of the scholiasts, n. 15 below). What is needed is something round so as to fit the eye socket; otherwise, a bronze object of any appropriate shape would do. Even if *Problems* is dealing with bruises in general, the fact that the κύαθος imparts cold is decisively in favor of our main argument.

7. Flashar renders κύαθος as *Metalbecher* (85–86) while Marengi uses the phrase “coppa di forma piata, comunemente di bronzo,” (125); cf. n. 5 above. Louis, *Aristote*, 1:206 translates “il s’agit d’un petit vase en forme de cloche.” Some very late sources such as Isidore of Seville include the κύαθος among the *genera poculorum*, but there is no evidence that cups were called κύαθοι in classical Greek; see Leonard, n. 4 above. As will become apparent, we believe a ladle is at issue in *Problems*. If so, E. S. Forster has it right. His translation of *Problems* first appeared in vol. 7 of *The Works of Aristotle*, ed. W. D. Ross (Oxford, 1927). It is reprinted in vol. 2 of *The Complete Works of Aristotle*, ed. J. Barnes (Princeton, 1984).

8. W. S. Hett in the 1953 Loeb edition.

9. J. S. Milne, *Surgical Instruments in Greek and Roman Times* (1907; reprint, New York, 1970), 100.

and/or *Problems* in mind. So who is right? In particular, can κύαθος be understood as bleeding cup in *Pax* 538–42 and *Lysistrata* 443–44, as is the usual practice among Aristophanists?

We maintain that κύαθος never means bleeding cup and should never be translated as such, whether in Aristophanes or anywhere else. In support of our position we rely, as others have not, on a thorough examination of Greco-Roman medical literature. It seems to us crucial that the bleeding cup is never called κύαθος in any medical treatise. A general search of the term in the *TLG* as accessed through the Ibycus System reveals approximately 1200 instances of κύαθος. The vast majority of these occurrences (in excess of 900) are to be found in medical and pharmaceutical authorities such as Dioscorides, Galen, Soranus, Oribasius, Aetius of Amida, and Paul of Aegina. But the meaning of κύαθος in every case is “ladle” or “ladleful,” and the only process in which the κύαθος is involved is the preparation, measurement, and consumption of medicaments.<sup>10</sup> The instrument used for cupping is regularly termed σικύα/σικύη or its Latin equivalent *cucurbita* in medical texts. Σικύη is precisely the name given the instrument in medical works contemporary or approximately contemporary with Aristophanes that are transmitted in the Hippocratic Corpus.<sup>11</sup>

Many specimens of the σικύα or bleeding cup survive. They are regularly made of copper alloy and shaped rather like mushrooms. Early Greek specimens (whether archaic or classical) are less sharply accented at the shoulder than their later Roman counterparts, but that is the only difference.<sup>12</sup> In short a bleeding cup and a ladle are quite distinct objects.

In cases where eye conditions are being treated and a bleeding cup is needed we find only the σικύα/*cucurbita* mentioned. Sources include Celsus, Pseudo-Galen, Oribasius, Alexander of Tralles, Aetius of Amida, and Paul of Aegina; conditions treated include: paralysis or uncontrollable eye movement, mydriasis or dilation of the pupil, cataract, amaurosis or blindness without apparent lesion, exophthalmos or abnormal protrusion of the eyeball, proptosis or displacement of the eye, suppuration and hypopyon, hemorrhage of the canthi, and inflammation.<sup>13</sup> Unfortunately, no Hippocratic work mentions the use of the bleeding cup in ophthalmologic procedures but, had the bleeding cup been recommended for eye treatment in any Hippocratic tract, it is clear from what has been said above that σικύη would have been the name used for the instrument in question.

Treatment for black eyes is never mentioned by any medical author, probably because the condition was not thought severe enough to merit surgical attention. The

10. For κύαθος/ “ladleful” as a unit of measure see Viedebant, *RE* XI 2 (1922): 2245 (s.v. 2).

11. Examples (Littre): *De Prisca Medicina* (22.14–20); *De Articulis* (48.21); *Aphorismi* (5.50.1); *De Medico* (7.1–12); *De Morbis* (2.26.7–11); *De Natura Muliebri* (33.5.17–18); *De Mulierum Affectibus* i–iii (110.36–41).

12. See E. Künzl, with the collaboration of F. J. Hassel and S. Künzl, *Medizinische Instrumente aus Sepulkralfunden der römischen Kaiserzeit* (Bonn, 1983) = *Sonderdruck aus den Bonner Jahrbüchern* 182 (1982): 21–23 and the references to further literature there.

13. Celsus, *De Medicina* (Spencer), 6.6.16C (a variety of eye complaints); Pseudo-Galen, *De Remediis Parabilibus* (Kuehn), 14.342.2 (eye complaints in general); Oribasius, *Syn. ad Eustath.* (Raeder): 8.46.2 (mydriasis), 8.49.3 (cataract), 8.50.2 (amaurosis), 8.52.4 (exophthalmos); Alexander Trallianus, *Therapeutica* (Puschmann), 1.587.14 (paralysis); Aetius (Olivieri): 7.26.16 (proptosis), 7.30.16 (suppuration and hypopyon), 7.50.37 (amaurosis), 7.51.22 (paralysis), 7.53.16 (cataract), 7.54.16 (mydriasis), 7.65.8 (hemorrhage of the canthi), 7.57.11 (exophthalmos); Paul (Heiberg): 3.22.3 (inflammation), 3.22.5 (“copious defluxion” according to Adams), 3.22.27 (mydriasis), 3.22.30 (cataract), 3.22.33 (exophthalmos).

closest we come to a black eye is Aetius' section on τραῦμα βαθύτερον or deep (serious) trauma to the eye.<sup>14</sup> When other remedies (cathartics, clysters, bleeding, and various medicaments) fail, Aetius directs us to apply the σικύα. However, the instrument is not applied to the region of the eye but to the occiput or to the crown of the head (σικύαν κολλᾶν τῷ ἰνίῳ καὶ τῇ κορυφῇ). This is in fact the unfailing rule in all ophthalmologic operations involving the σικύα: the instrument is never applied to the eye itself, as is the κύαθος in *Problems* and as is apparently the case in Aristophanes. At least, this is how his scholiasts and his contemporary, Euripides, understand the κύαθος treatment.<sup>15</sup> Rather, after heating, the σικύα is placed along the occiput of the head, the hair having been shaved. As the cup cools the resulting vacuum created in the cup's interior enables the instrument to cling to the gently curved surface of the occipital region and pull away the "vicious humor" or whatever other cause is thought to be the source of the eye problem. The cupping procedure may or may not involve scarification (bloodletting).

Note that in *Problems* the emphasis throughout is on the coldness of the κύαθος. This should warn us at once that a bleeding cup cannot be meant because a cup operates on the principle of heat. The sole pertinent association of the κύαθος with heat is found in the scholia of the Ravennas manuscript treating *Lysistrata* 444. Here we are told, "they fill a kyathos with heat and fasten it to swellings and they are cured."<sup>16</sup> The scholia to the Ravennas and the Venetus also maintain that heated bronze vinegar saucers (ὀξύβαφα χαλκᾶ) are applied to bruises (μώλωπες). It may be that some types of bruises were treated with heated vessels resembling bleeding cups and used like them. It is noteworthy that surgical tracts of the Roman Empire sometimes allow for the use of narrow-mouthed vessels in just this way, though not for eye complaints. Celsus, for example, declares that in the absence of a *cucurbita* a small cup or pottage bowl can be used for the bleeding operation,<sup>17</sup> and Aretaeus and Caelius Aurelianus refer to similar substitutes in a few other situations.<sup>18</sup> So, it may be that the scholiasts are referring to some similar use of metal saucers. It is hard, however, to see how heated ladles, rounded vessels, or bleeding cups could be applied to the eye.<sup>19</sup> We ask our readers, especially those who have suffered or

14. Aetius (Olivieri): 7.24.21

15. For Euripides see n. 2 above. The scholiasts read as follows: (*Pax*; Holwerda) καὶ κύαθος **R**: τοὺς κύαθος προσθλῶσι τὰ ὑπόπια. **RV** ἐπεὶ ἐν ὀξύβαφοις χαλκοῖς τὰ ὑπόπια ἀνατρίβοντες ἢ τοιοῦτοις **RV** οὖν **R** τισὶν ἀφανῇ ποιοῦσιν. καὶ Ἀπολλοφάνης ἐν Ἰφιγένοντι "κύαθον λάβοιμι τοῖς ὑποπίσις." **RV** ὀξύβαφα χαλκᾶ πυρῶσαντες καὶ ἐπιθέντες ἐθεράπευον τοὺς ἐκ τῶν πληγῶν μώλωπας. **V Tr** καὶ κύαθος κτλ.] ὀξύβαφοις. τούτοις γὰρ ἀνατρίβοντες τοὺς ἐκ τῶν πληγῶν ἐθεράπευον μώλωπας. (*Lysistrata*; Rutherford) **R** κύαθον αἰτήσεις. Ἵνα προσθῆς ταῖς γνάθοις· οὕτως ὑποπισθήσῃ ὑφ' ἡμῶν. γεμίζουσι γὰρ κύαθον θερμοῦ, καὶ προσκολλῶσι τοῖς οἰδήμασι καὶ θεραπεύεται. Many of these scholia find their way into *Suda* (kappa 2574, upsilon 653 [Adler]).

16. Cf. above, n. 15, for the Greek text.

17. 2.11.3.1, *caliculus quoque aut pultarius*.

18. Caelius Aurelianus allows for clay vessels like amphoras (which he says may also be made of glass) and cups (*ambices*), the former in cases of ileus when a metal cup is too heavy for the patient (*Ac. Pass.* 3.17.150), the latter in treating diseases of the colon (*Tard. Pass.* 4.7.94). Aretaeus once mentions a vaporizing vessel applied "like a bleeding cup" (ὡς τρόπος σικύης). This, he says, could be of clay or of bronze (*CA* 1.11.8–16.4).

19. Classical ladles very much resemble their modern counterparts: cf. B. Sparks, "Illustrating Aristophanes," *JHS* 95 (1975): 135 and pl. XVII for an example contemporary with Aristophanes. Cf. also D. M. Robinson, *Excavations at Olynthus, pt. X, Metal and Minor Miscellaneous Finds* (Baltimore, 1941), 194–98 and pl. L; W. Deonna, *Delos, Fascic. XVIII, Le mobilier délien* (Paris, 1938), 228–30 and pl. LXXV, 603. To these add E. Pottier in *Dar.-Sag.* (vol. 1, part 2 s.v. *cyathus*, 1675, fig. 2235) who also includes fine Roman examples from Pompeii.

treated a black eye, to consider the futility, from a medical point of view, of applying a heated sucking instrument to such a bruise, not to mention the difficulty of getting a bleeding cup, and especially a ladle with its cumbersome handle, to cling firmly to the uneven surface formed by the cheek, nose, and eyebrow. Note in this regard that the scholiasts never say that the κύαθος was fastened to the eye, just that it was fastened to unspecified bruises and swellings (οἰδήματα). When all is said and done, one gets the idea that the scholiasts who commented on these passages were simply casting about as to the precise function of the κύαθος that Aristophanes intended.

In sum, we hope to have shown that, even if κύαθοι were somehow sometimes applied like σικύαι to parts of the body other than the eye, they were never regarded by medical writers as bleeding cups and therefore should not be translated as such.

If, then, κύαθος cannot be equated with σικύα in Aristophanes and *Problems* 890b7–38, what is the sense of the former term in these passages? It seems to us obvious. Surely all the author of *Problems* and, before him, Aristophanes are referring to is a folk remedy involving the application of a cold metal ladle to a bruised eye, just as we today would apply ice or a cold compress.<sup>20</sup> And of course the round or oblong exterior surface of a ladle is perfectly suited for application to the eye, as a heated bleeding cup is not. Note especially in *Problems* the phrase προσέχουσι τὰ χαλκᾶ, οἷον κύαθους καὶ τὰ ταιαῦτα, which is best translated “by the application of copper utensils such as ladles and the like.” In this regard the Aristophanic scholiast on *Pax* who commented, τοῖς κύαθοις προσθλώσι τὰ ὑπόπια, interpreted the poet’s meaning correctly.<sup>21</sup>

To conclude: *Problems* 890b7–38 cannot be used in support of interpreting κύαθος as bleeding cup in Aristophanes, nor is there any other support for understanding the term as such in *Pax* and *Lysistrata*. We are unsure how and exactly when this interpretation arose. The error can be traced through the editions of Aristophanes published by Bothe in 1845 and Dindorf in 1835 to as far back as Brunck’s edition of 1783 (for *Pax*) and Bergler’s posthumous edition of 1760 (for *Lysistrata*).<sup>22</sup> It thus emerges before the mid-eighteenth century at least. The amazing thing is that this interpretation has been repeated so persistently in modern times against such authorities as LSJ and Dar.-Sag., not just by Aristophanists and some interpreters of *Problems* but even by a surgical authority of the stature of J. S. Milne.

20. Also smacking of modern remedies is Pliny’s prescription of a slice of veal to prevent swelling (*HN* 28.242).

21. In commenting on *Pax* 538–42 Athenaeus (see n. 4 above) observes: τὰ γὰρ ὑπόπια τοῖς κύαθοις περιθλώμενα ἄμαυροῦται. Owing to similarity of language (προσθλώσι/περιθλώμενα) we suspect a connection between this passage and the scholion on *Pax*. Gulick takes ἄμαυροῦται to mean “are blackened;” but in view of the common terminology we suggest that ἄμαυροῦται in this context means that the black eyes are “dimmed” in the sense that the eyes do not become black, or are rendered less black when treated with κύαθοι. If this interpretation of ἄμαυροῦται is acceptable, then Athenaeus too has interpreted Aristophanes correctly.

22. F. H. Bothe, *Aristophanis Comoediae* (Leipzig, 1854); W. Dindorf, *Aristophanis Comoediae: accedunt perditarum fabularum fragmenta ex recensione G. Dindorfii* (Oxford, 1835–38); R. F. P. Brunck, *Aristophanis Comoediae ex optimis exemplaribus emendatae studio Rich. Franc. Phil. Brunck* (Argentorati, 1783); S. Bergler, *Aristophanis comoediae undecim, graece et latine: ad fidem optimorum codicum mss. emendatae cum nova octo comoediarum interpretatione latina, & notis ad singularis ineditis Stephani Bergleri nec non Caroli Andreae . . .* (Lugduni Batavorum, 1760). We owe the references to Dindorf and his predecessors to an anonymous referee.

\* \* \* \* \*

ADDENDUM: Although, as observed above, LSJ has correctly interpreted the passages at issue in this paper, in the New Supplement to LSJ (ed. P. Glare) we find s.v. κύαθος 2 “*vessel for cupping, Insc. Perg. 8(3).72.9 (sp. κύεθος).*” So, ironically, LSJ too now allows for the meaning of κύαθος rejected by us as erroneous. The inscription in question dates to the Roman Empire and contains a list of common dedications (a ring, a lekythos, some silver and bronze figures, some clothing, etc.) to Asclepius and kindred gods. The fact that Asclepius is involved and the fact that the dedications include a νάρθηξ and an ὀθόν[ιο]ν, items that can in a medical context designate a medicine box and a bandage respectively (as opposed to an unguent/cosmetic box and a strip of linen), prompt the inscription’s editor, Ch. Habicht, to see the κύαθος as a *Schröpkopf*. This interpretation is not convincing. Habicht himself cites a κύαθος and at least one ὀθόνιον on other inscribed temple inventories, none of them associated with Asclepius or a medical context; see *Altertümer von Pergamon*, Bd. 8.3, *Die Inschriften des Asklepieions* (Berlin, 1969), 109–10. But most important are the surviving inventories of dedications to Asclepius at Athens. These do record a κύαθος dedicated to Asclepius, but they also include four σικύαι: see S. B. Aleshire, *The Athenian Asklepieion: The People, their Dedications and the Inventories* (Amsterdam, 1989), 44, 158, 321 and *IG 2<sup>2</sup> 47*, ll. 8, 11. Clearly these items are distinct objects, meaning that if the σικύαι are bleeding cups, which they clearly are, the κύαθος will hardly be other than a ladle. Note that one of the σικύαι, that on *IG 2<sup>2</sup> 47*, l. 8, is described as σικύα μ[εγ]ά[λη] ἀλύσει δεδεμένη, a description that corresponds exactly to a surviving specimen of bleeding cup now in Athens: cf. Milne, *Surgical Instruments in Greek and Roman Times* (Oxford, 1907), 103 and pl. XXXIII.

LAWRENCE J. BLIQUEZ  
PRISCILLA RODGERS  
*University of Washington*

#### TALKING FLAMINGOS AND THE SINS OF THE TONGUE: THE AMBIGUOUS USE OF *LINGUA* IN MARTIAL

There are thirty-five occurrences of the word *lingua* in the *Epigrams*: twenty-two are of a general nature referring either literally to the tongue’s various functions as part of the anatomy or speech-organ, or metaphorically to the kind of speech it conveys;<sup>1</sup> seven (in five epigrams) are of a specifically sexual nature and refer explicitly to *cunnilinctio* (male-to-female 3.81.2; 11.25.2; 11.61.1, 10; 11.85.1) and *fellatio* (male-to-male 2.61.2, 7);<sup>2</sup> while the remaining six examples are found in

I should like to thank Professor Barry Baldwin of the University of Calgary for his critical comments on an earlier draft of this article, and for friendship, support, and encouragement. He is not, however, responsible for any of the views expressed here, nor for any errors of fact or judgment which the piece may contain.

1. See *OLD* s.v. *lingua* for useful subdivisions.

2. For standard treatments of oro-lingual sexual practices in the ancient world, W. A. Krenkel, “*Fellatio und Irrumatio*,” *WZR* 29 (1980): 77–88, and “*Tonguing*,” *WZR* 30 (1981): 37–54, should generally be consulted.