Extending this inquiry to the other tragedians, one finds that μῶν occurs three times in Aeschylus and 47 times in Euripides, if one adds the two instances given by Collard to the 45 instances in Allen–Italie.[2] In every case it comes after and not before a break in the rhythm.

Dr Parker having sent over a perfect pass, it remains to put the ball into the net. Sophocles in all probability wrote θέμις δὲ πῶς τάδ' ἐστὶ νῶιν; | οὐχ ὁρᾶις;

Ellendt–Genthe list fifteen instances of νῶιν, to which Radt adds another.[3] Two of these (1670, 1683) occur in the same lyric scene between the sisters to which 1729–30 belong.

Christ Church, Oxford HUGH LLOYD-JONES

[2] J. T. Allen and G. Italie, *A Concordance to Euripides* (Berkeley and London, 1954; repr. Groningen, 1970); C. Collard, *A Supplement to Allen and Italie's Concordance* (Groningen, 1971).

[3] F. Ellendt, *Lexicon Sophocleum*, rev. H. Genthe (Berlin, 1872; repr. Hildesheim, 1958); S. L. Radt, *TrGF* IV (Göttingen, 1985).

ATHENIAN ATTITUDES TO RAPE AND SEDUCTION: THE EVIDENCE OF MENANDER, *DYSKOLOS* 289–293

In his article 'Did the Athenians Regard Seduction as a Worse Crime than Rape?', *CQ* 40 (1990), 370–7, Edward M. Harris rightly casts doubt on the value of Lysias 1.30–5, which has generally been accepted as evidence that the Athenians did indeed regard seduction as the worse of the two crimes. Euphiletos in this speech is defending himself on a charge of murder, and, as Harris says (p. 375), 'Euphiletus' presentation of the Athenian statutes regarding rape and seduction is dictated by the rhetorical constraints of his case. It is not a reflection of widely held social attitudes.'

Harris points out that Euphiletos' argument may have had a certain specious appeal for the men who were to decide his case. But I wish to draw attention to a piece of evidence from later in the fourth century which supports Harris's contention that in other circumstances other attitudes would prevail.

In Menander's *Dyskolos* (produced in 316 B.C.), Sostratos has fallen in love with Knemon's daughter and is determined to marry her. Her half-brother, the honest young farmer Gorgias, suspects Sostratos of having less honourable intentions; he expresses his suspicion as follows at lines 289–93:

> ἔργον δοκεῖς μοι φαῦλον ἐζηλωκέναι,
> πείσειν νομίζων ἐξαμαρτεῖν παρθένον
> ἐλευθέραν, ἢ καιρὸν ἐπιτηρῶν τινα
> κατεργάσασθαι πρᾶγμα θανάτων ἄξιον
> πολλῶν.

You seem to me to have set your heart on a wicked action, thinking to persuade a free-born girl to do wrong, or watching for an opportunity to accomplish a deed deserving many deaths.

It looks as if Gorgias here distinguishes between two ways in which a girl might lose her virginity, in the one case as the result of persuasion, in the other without it; in current English, the distinction is between seduction and rape.[1] Both are wicked actions (on the part of the man), but Gorgias appears to regard rape as the more serious of the two offences, the one deserving punishment by death many times over.

[1] This is how the passage is understood by Walther Kraus in his commentary (Vienna, 1960), and by Elaine Fantham, 'Sex, Status and Survival in Hellenistic Athens: a Study of Women in New Comedy', *Phoenix* 29 (1975), 44–74, p. 53 n. 26 – and no doubt by others who do not feel the need to say so explicitly.

There are difficulties about taking the evidence of comedy at face-value.[2] But in this context I think it unlikely that there is anything comically rustic about Gorgias' scale of values and altogether more likely that he faithfully reflects a (not very surprising) view which was held at the time in Athens.

From the girl's point of view (or rather, from the perspective of men passing judgement on her), the matter may well have been more complicated. No doubt Menander's audience would not have thought well of a citizen girl who willingly consented to her seduction. For this reason, when girls in his plays have become pregnant it is either left unclear quite how they came to lose their virginity, or it is made clear that force was used; and a young man who did use force did not necessarily incur the strong disapproval of the audience.[3] But the words of the upright Gorgias suggest that he might sometimes incur the strong disapproval of some inhabitants of Attika; and they provide further evidence (in addition to Harris's discussion of the legal position) against uncritical acceptance of Euphiletos' argument in Lysias 1.

Trinity College, Oxford P. G. McC. BROWN

[2] See (for instance) K. J. Dover, *Greek Popular Morality in the Time of Plato and Aristotle* (Oxford, 1974), ch. I ('Interpretation of the Sources'). Dover regards New Comedy as less problematical than Old Comedy in this respect.

[3] So A. W. Gomme and F. H. Sandbach, *Menander: a Commentary* (Oxford, 1973), p. 33: 'If the girl had been a consenting partner, that would have lowered her in the eyes of the fourth-century Athenian. On the other hand, although rape was regarded as a disgraceful act, it was by no means an unpardonable or unthinkable one.' See also Jasper Griffin, *Latin Poets and Roman Life* (London, 1985), pp. 126–7.

HOW THIN WAS PHILITAS?

The poet Philitas was so thin, they say, that he had to wear lead weights on his shoes to avoid being blown away by a gust of wind. We have two versions of the anecdote. First Aelian, *Varia Historia* 9.14:

Φιλίταν λέγουσι τὸν Κῶον λεπτότατον γενέσθαι τὸ σῶμα· ἐπεὶ τοίνυν ἀνατραπῆναι ῥᾴδιος ἦν ἐκ πάσης προφάσεως, μολύβδου φασὶ πεποιημένα εἶχεν ἐν τοῖς ὑποδήμασι πέλματα, ἵνα μὴ ἀνατρέπηται ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνέμων, εἴ ποτε σκληροὶ κατέπνεον.

They say that Philitas of Cos had an extremely thin body; since he could easily be knocked over by the slightest cause, they say he had lead soles on his shoes so as not to be knocked over by any fierce gusts of wind.

Second, Athenaeus xii.552b:

λεπτότερος δ' ἦν καὶ Φιλίτας ὁ Κῶος ποιητής, ὃς καὶ διὰ τὴν τοῦ σώματος ἰσχνότητα σφαίρας ἐκ μολύβδου πεποιημένας εἶχε περὶ τὼ πόδε ὡς μὴ ὑπὸ ἀνέμου ἀνατραπείη.

Philitas of Cos the poet was rather thin; because of the skinniness of his body he wore lead weights on his feet so as not to be knocked over by the wind.

The two versions are sufficiently similar in expression as well as content that we may reasonably infer that they derive from the same source. But what was that source, and why such a silly story?

Or is it so silly? In view of the importance of the concept of λεπτότης to the Alexandrian poets of the generation after Philitas, notably Aratus and Callimachus,[1]

[1] E. Reitzenstein, *Festschrift R. Reitzenstein* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1931), pp. 25–39; M. Puelma Piwonka, *Lucilius und Kallimachos* (1948), pp. 160f.; W. Wimmel, *Kallimachos in Rom* (Wiesbaden, 1960), Stichwortindex s. v.; J.-M. Jacques, *RÉA* 62 (1960), 52–9; E. Vogt, *Antike und Abendland* 13 (1967), 84–7; G. Lohse, ibid. 19 (1973), 21–34; F. Cairns, *Tibullus: A*