

ὑποδακρύνω 2. means ooze, of blood, and is employed by Galen at XI 318.11.

φιλόλουτρος, ον, *fond of bathing*, is not limited to Hippocrates and Aristotle, being found in Galen at XI 137.8.

τὸ χειρουργικὸν μέρος τῆς τέχνης is mentioned at XVIII (2) 667.7: the adjective is not as common as one would expect.

An early instance of ψυχρολουσία, ἡ, *bathing in cold water*, is Erasistratus ap. Gal. XI 240.12 = 76.12 Kotre).

Finally, ψυχροποτέω, *drink cold water* is used by Galen at XVII (2) 199.12 = CMG V 10 2, 2 236.12: it is not limited to Plutarch and Antyllus.

These instances are, individually, of little weight: together, they call for a major re-reading of the ancient medical authors for a projected *Dictionary of Ancient Medical Greek*, which will incorporate all the ancient medical terms and give some idea of their life from the *Corpus Hippocraticum* and Hellenistic authors such as Herophilus and Erasistratus to the late Byzantine compilers, Oribasius, Aetius of Amida, Alexander of Tralles, and Paul of Aegina. This essay is a contribution to that *Dictionary*, which I am preparing.

An Unnoticed Sense of κυμνοپرستης

By B. BALDWIN, Calgary (Canada)

The only sense assigned by Stephanus and *LSJ* to this noun is that of skinflint. Neither lexicon takes account of the following passage in the epitomated version of Dio Cassius (70.3.3) on the character of Antonius Pius: λέγεται δὲ ὁ Ἀντωνῖνος ζητητικὸς γενέσθαι, καὶ μηδὲ περὶ τὰ μικρὰ καὶ τὰ τυχόντα τῆς ἀκριβολογίας ἀφίστασθαι· ὅθεν αὐτὸν οἱ σκώπτοντες καὶ κυμνοپرσίστην ἐκάλουν.

Clearly the word here means not skinflint but quibbler or logic-chopper. A cognate expression bears the same¹⁾ sense in Julian,

¹⁾ Albeit Wright in the Loeb (2.356, n. 7) calls it proverbial for niggardliness, citing only Theocritus 10.50 (an error for 10.55; cf. Gow's note *ad loc.*). Likewise, Cary in his Loeb of Dio does not notice the parallel in Julian.

Caesares 312A, where Silenus mocks Pius in these words: *Βαβαὶ τῆς σμικρολογίας· εἰς εἶναι μοι δοκεῖ τῶν διαπριόντων τὸ κύμινον ὁ πρεσβύτης οὗτος.*

Albeit not impossible that the epitomator²⁾ derives his use of the idiom from Julian, with that emperor (uncongenial, of course, to the Byzantine monk Xiphilinus) meant to be thought of as one of the scoffers in question, it is more likely that Julian was using Dio; a detail may thereby be added to the continuing debate³⁾ over what sources the emperor exploited for his satire.

We can also see that accounts of Pius were more varied than the sustained⁴⁾ panegyric of the *HA* would have us believe. When Julian (*ibid.*) adds Pius to the parade of Caesars, he introduces him (as narrator, not as Silenus) as a fellow immoderate in love affairs, a characteristic of which there is no sign in the epitome of Dio or the *HA*.⁵⁾

Regarding Pius the quibbler, both Dio (or Xiphilinus) and Julian could also have had recourse to the *Meditations* of Marcus Aurelius, whose repeated (*Med.* 1.16.2, 3, 4, 9) praise of Antoninus for his indefatigable attention to details of all sorts may suggest a need to defend him against contemporary scoffers⁶⁾

²⁾ Although Xiphilinus states at the outset (70.1.1) that he had no text of Dio for Pius' reign, it emerges from the subsequent extracts that he did have a few details directly from him. These could have come second hand through other sources. Alternatively, Dio made cross reference to Pius in other sections of his work. F. Millar, *A Study of Cassius Dio* (Oxford, 1964), 62, n. 2, is a little misleading on this.

³⁾ Cf. for recent discussion with bibliography B. Baldwin 'The *Caesares* of Julian,' *Klio* 60 (1978), 449–66.

⁴⁾ Although the biographer occasionally betrays the existence of less favourable views of Pius' character that do not cohere with the eulogy; cp. *Pius* 4.8 with 7.5.

⁵⁾ *Pius* 8.9 coyly admits to the existence of an unnamed concubine. For discussion of the epigraphic evidence, cf. A. R. Birley, *Marcus Aurelius* (London, 1966), 97–8. Haines in his Loeb edition of the *Meditations*, 13, n. 5, connects Julian's aspersion with Pius' attitude to paederasty.

⁶⁾ Notice one or two linguistic concordances: the epitome of Dio calls Pius *ζητητικός*, an epithet also applied to him in *Medit.* 1.16.2; Julian makes Silenus upbraid his *σμικρολογία*, whilst the text of Dio says he bestowed *ἀκριβολογίας* even on τὰ μικρά: cf. *Medit.* 1.16.9: πάντα διειλημμένα λελογισθαι.