

## THE WOMAN AT THE WINDOW: OBSERVATIONS ON THE 'STELE FROM THE HARBOUR' OF THASOS\*

THE stele from the harbour ('la stèle du port') of Thasos, *SEG* xlii.785, has been so named because it was dredged up from the small fishing harbour on 13 June, 1984. The inscription is of the greatest importance for Thasian epigraphy and dialect as well as for its contents, and has been amply published by H. Duchêne.<sup>1</sup> While the stele of Thasian marble is preserved complete, the inscribed surface has suffered much from the effects of its immersion in the sea.<sup>2</sup> The lower part is well preserved, and from line 42 to the end (49) there is no problem in reading the letters on the stone.<sup>3</sup> Above that, it is a very different matter; some parts seem irretrievably lost, and much of the preserved lettering consists of faint traces only. My own examination of the stone<sup>4</sup> confirmed that we can have complete confidence in Duchêne's facsimile.<sup>5</sup> He and those who helped him have achieved wonders of skilful decipherment on this difficult text. Unless fancy new technology may one day offer better ways of recovering the letters on the stone,<sup>6</sup> it seems unlikely that the readings published by Duchêne could be improved.

The inscription contains building and hygiene regulations for some of the streets of the city. There is no internal evidence for its date, so we are thrown back entirely onto its external characteristics, the *boustrophedon* arrangement and forms of letters. Even so, since Thasian epigraphy is rich and well studied, reasonably secure, if approximate, chronology is attainable by these means. Duchêne's long and helpful discussion of parallels led him to propose, tentatively and with all due provisos, the decade 470-460.<sup>7</sup> The rather close parallel of the inscription containing regulations about wine and vinegar,<sup>8</sup> which is also inscribed *boustrophedon* and has been dated *c.* 480 by Salviat, seems very likely to be of the same general period as the 'stele from the harbour'. So, late Archaic to early Classical seems to be a justifiable and cautious chronological conclusion.<sup>9</sup>

\* I am very grateful to my friends Keith DeVries, Harold Mattingly and Ralph Rosen for kindly reading this paper in draft and making helpful suggestions. For help on individual points I owe thanks to Dr. Colin Austin, Dr. John Chadwick, Dr. Sitta von Reden, Professor Michael Reeve, Professor David Sedley and Professor Brian Sparkes.

<sup>1</sup> *La stèle du port. Fouilles du port 1 (Etudes Thasiennes 14, Paris 1992)*. In what follows I refer to this work by the author's name alone. For the circumstances of discovery, see 9-10.

<sup>2</sup> Duchêne 15.

<sup>3</sup> As Duchêne 30.

<sup>4</sup> I am grateful to Dr. H. Koukouli-Chrysanthaki, Ephor at Kavala, and to the staff at the Thasos museum, for making it possible for me to study the inscription. I also acknowledge with gratitude the grant from the Research Foundation of the University of Pennsylvania which financed my travel.

<sup>5</sup> This is important, because, as Gauthier has remarked (*Bull. Épig.* [1993] 395 (*REG* 106 [1993] 525-6)), it is not possible for a reader to see the letters in the damaged parts on the published photographs.

<sup>6</sup> As, e.g., the photography employed on the Segesta treaty (*IG* i<sup>3</sup> 11) by M.H. Chambers and his colleagues; see M.H. Chambers, R. Gallucci, P. Spanos, 'Athens' alliance with Egesta', *ZPE* 73 (1990) 38-63. The objections expressed by A.S. Henry, 'Through a laser beam darkly: space-age technology and the Egesta decree (*IG* i<sup>3</sup> 11)', *ZPE* 91(1992) 137-46, and 'Pour encourager les autres: Athens and Egesta encore', *CQ* 45 (1995) 237-40 do not seem cogent to me. Chambers has no difficulty in replying to them; see 'The archon's name in the Athens-Egesta alliance', *ZPE* 98 (1993) 171-4.

<sup>7</sup> Duchêne 109-31.

<sup>8</sup> Duchêne 119-20, no. 17.

<sup>9</sup> By choosing the decade 470-460, Duchêne involves himself in discussing the possible chronological relationship of the document to the war with Athens of 465-462, but that seems a completely unknowable and unnecessary consideration.

Thus there seems little cause for disagreement with Duchêne's reading of the letters on the stone or his chronology. It is a different matter, however, with his interpretation, which is open to question, as has already been briefly pointed out by Gauthier.<sup>10</sup> Duchêne's transcription of lines 30-5 runs as follows:

ἐπὶ τῷ τέγῳ τῶν  
κατοικιῶν τῶν δημοσίων τῶν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ τ-  
αύτηι: θῆς ἔνεκεν μηδὲς ἀναβαινέτω: μηδ-  
ὲ γυνὴ δ' ἐ[κ] τῶν θυρίδων θῆσθω· ὅ τι ἂν τοῦτ-  
ων ποιῆι: στατήρα κατ' ἕκαστον ὁ ἐνοικέων  
ὀφελέτω τῇ πόλι:

This he translates (34): 'Sur le toit des immeubles publics qui sont dans cette rue, personne ne monter pour regarder. Et aucune femme ne se penchera plus aux fenêtres pour regarder. Pour toute infraction, l'habitant devra verser chaque fois un statère à la cité'. The two provisions concerning roof and window are clearly linked. It is the contention of this paper that both were designed to prohibit certain practices of prostitution, and that that conclusion has important consequences for the interpretation of the document as a whole.

The provision that no woman shall look<sup>11</sup> out of the windows immediately suggests prostitution and soliciting. Duchêne considers that interpretation, but rejects it (52-4). That is a hard decision. The association of whores with windows is extremely ancient. Barnett was able, in his discussion of the famous scenes on the Nimrud ivories, to cite Sumerian texts.<sup>12</sup> And the association is still well known in our own times. The practices of prostitution are unchanging and everlasting.<sup>13</sup>

The use of windows by prostitutes is well attested in Greco-Roman Antiquity.<sup>14</sup> In the parabasis of the *Thesmophoriazusae* we find the statement (797-9):

κἄν ἐκ θυρίδος παρακύπτωμεν, ζητεῖ τὸ κακὸν τεθεᾶσθαι.  
κἄν αἰσχυνθεῖς ἀναχωρήσῃ, πολὺ μᾶλλον πᾶς ἐπιθυμεῖ  
αὔθις τὸ κακὸν παρακύψαν ἰδεῖν.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>10</sup> Above n. 5. Duchêne's interpretation is accepted by S.G. Cole, 'Civic cult and civic identity', in M.H. Hansen (ed.), *Sources for the Ancient Greek City-State* (Copenhagen 1995) 292-325 at 311, but she warns (n.106) that 'all conclusions here should be taken as provisional'.

<sup>11</sup> For the morphology of θῆσθω, which is to be seen as the third person singular of the present imperative of θεῆσθαι/θεᾶσθαι, see Duchêne's convincing treatment 38-9.

<sup>12</sup> R.D. Barnett, *Catalogue of the Nimrud Ivories* (London 1957) 147-51 and pl. IV.

<sup>13</sup> As noted by I. Bloch, *Die Prostitution* (Berlin 1912) 37.

<sup>14</sup> See H. Herter, 'Die Soziologie der antiken Prostitution im Lichte des heidnischen und christlichen Schrifttums', *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 3 (1960) 70-111, at 87. Herter's thorough and well documented study is the best treatment of ancient prostitution that I have found. In particular, his inclusion of material from the Christian Fathers, who were very interested in prostitution, greatly enriches his documentation. In what follows I refer to Herter's paper by the author's name alone.

<sup>15</sup> In line 797 all editors accept J. Kaye's emendation, τὸ κακὸν ζητεῖτε θεᾶσθαι. See B.B. Rogers' good note *ad loc.* in his edition, *The Thesmophoriazusae of Aristophanes* (London 1904). The emendation is still printed in A.H. Sommerstein's recent edition of the play, *Thesmophoriazusae* (Warminster 1994). The trouble with this emendation is that it requires, not only the easy correction of a faulty division, but also the assumption that the original word order has been transposed. And it is certainly possible to defend the MS text; see C. Austin, 'Textual problems in Ar. *Thesm.*', *Dodone* 16 (1987) 61-92, at 83, who notes that the third person singular of ζητεῖ is perfectly acceptable in a context of ζητεῖ (796) and πᾶς ἐπιθυμεῖ (798). In line 799, on the other hand, the manuscript text, αὔθις παρακύψασαν ἰδεῖν τὸ κακὸν, must be emended, because it is unmetrical. For the text normally printed, see the apparatus in V. Coulon's Budé edition (*Aristophane* 4 [Paris 1928]).

‘And if we peep out of a window, [every man] seeks to see the evil. And if she is ashamed and retreats, every man desires much more to see the evil peeping out’.

The passage is part of the women’s refutation of the common view that they are an evil (κακόν). Since the chorus consists of citizen women, what they say about their behaviour cannot literally describe the doings of prostitutes, who were normally slaves.<sup>16</sup> But, as is his frequent practice, Aristophanes’ humour depends here on the sexual *double entendre*, because the behaviour is indeed that of disreputable women. That this is the correct interpretation is shown by the very close parallel of *Peace* 979-85:

καὶ μὴ ποίει γ’ ἄπερ αἱ  
μοιχευόμεναι δρῶσι γυναῖκες.  
καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖναι παρακλίνασαι  
τῆς ἀυλείας παρακύπτουσιν,  
κάν τις προσέχηι τὸν νοῦν αὐταῖς  
ἀναχωροῦσιν.  
κἀὶτ’ ἦν ἀπίηι παρακύπτουσιν.

‘Don’t do what the adulterous women do. For they open part of the outer door and peep out. And if anyone pays attention to them, they go back. And again, if he goes away, they peep out’.

The behaviour described is identical to that of *Thesmophoriazusae* 797-9 (except that here the women are peeping out of the main door of the house), and here it is explicitly described as behaviour of sexually disreputable women. There is much more detail of the way prostitutes tried to lure their customers in the scene at *Ecclesiazusae* 877-1111. Once again the women are ostensibly free citizens, but here we have many quite unmistakable references to the practices of prostitution, as clearly at the beginning, where the first old woman says (878-82):

ἐγὼ δὲ καταπεπλασμένη ψιμυθίῳ  
ἔστηκα καὶ κροκατὸν ἡμφιεσμένη  
ἀργός, μιμυρομένη τι πρὸς ἑμαυτὴν μέλος,  
παίζουσ’ ὅπως ἂν περιλάβοιμ’ αὐτῶν τινὰ  
παριόντα.

‘But I am standing idle, plastered with white lead and wearing a yellow dress, humming some tune to myself, to see if I can get my sport and capture<sup>17</sup> one of them passing by’.<sup>18</sup>

In any case, Praxagora has announced earlier that the women will end prostitution by slaves, in order to take over that role themselves.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>16</sup> Herter, 77-9. The matter is proved for Aristophanes’ own times, without the need for other evidence, by *Ecclesiazusae* 717-24, quoted below n. 19.

<sup>17</sup> There is editorial disagreement on the text here. I follow R.G. Ussher, *Aristophanes Ecclesiazusae* (Oxford 1973) and borrow the translation in his commentary.

<sup>18</sup> For the detailed allusions to practices of prostitutes here, see Ussher *ad locc.*; for the general interpretation, J. Henderson, *The Maculate Muse*<sup>2</sup> (New York & Oxford 1991) 103.

<sup>19</sup> See *Ecclesiazusae* 717-24:

(Pr.) Ἐπειτα τὰς πόρναις καταπαύσαι βούλομαι  
ἀπαξάπασας. Βλ. ἵνα τί; Pr. δηλον τουτογι·  
ἵνα τῶν νέων ἐχῶσιν αὐταὶ τὰς ἀκμάς.  
καὶ τὰς γε δούλας οὐχὶ δεῖ κοσμουμένας  
τὴν τῶν ἐλευθέρων ὑφαρπάζειν Κύπριν,  
ἀλλὰ παρὰ τοῖς δούλοισι κοιμᾶσθαι μόνον κτλ.

(Praxagora) ‘Then I wish to put down completely the whores one and all. Bl. To what end? Pr. That at least is obvious. In order that these women may have the young men in their prime. The slaves must not dress up and

With regard to our present interests, it is to be noted that there is no explicit mention of a window in this scene, and scholars have differed on the question where the first old woman and the young woman were during their altercation and interaction with the young man.<sup>20</sup> It is certain, however, from lines 960-2, where the young man asks the young woman to run down and open the door, that she at least was upstairs. So some earlier scholars assumed that she was at the upstairs window of her house, and, for the sake of symmetry, that the old woman was also at hers. E. Fraenkel even suggested that the two women were on the roofs of their houses.<sup>21</sup> Ussher has, however, argued well that the old woman is at the door of her house, and the young woman at the upper window, or possibly on the roof, of hers.<sup>22</sup> We would thus lose the symmetry, but not only does the detailed wording support him, so does Praxagora's foreshadowing of what was going to happen (689-709), which envisages women on the ground competing with women on the upper storey (693-8):

αἱ δὲ γυναῖκες κατὰ τὰς διόδους  
προσιππουσαι τοῖς ἀπὸ δείπνου  
τάδε λέξουσιν· δέυρο παρ' ἡμᾶς,  
ἐνθάδε μείραξ ἔσθ' ὠραία·  
'παρ' ἔμοι δ', ἑτέρα  
φήσει τις ἄνωθ' ἐξ ὑπερώιου κτλ.

'And the women in the alleys will fall on the men coming from dinner and say the following: "come to my house, there is a beautiful girl here". But another will say from the upper storey above, "come to my house etc.'"

So while it may not be absolutely certain, it is likely that the young woman was trying to lure men from her upper window.

If Ussher is right, the two allusions to peeping out, when the young woman says to the old (884) νῦν μὲν με παρακύψασα προῦφθης, 'now you have been before me in peeping out', and (924) παράκυφθ' ὥσπερ γαλῆ, 'peep out like a ferret', concern peeping out from the outside door of the house, such as we have already seen in the passage from the *Peace*.<sup>23</sup> Nevertheless, the Aristophanic passages clearly attest the association of windows with disreputable behaviour like that of prostitutes,<sup>24</sup> and introduce us to the standard word for erotic peeping out, παρακύπτω.

Other verbs could naturally be used, as we see in the famous distich by Praxilla:

ὦ διὰ τὰς θυρίδος καλὸν ἐμβλέποισα  
παρθένε τὰν κεφαλὰν τὰ δ' ἔνερθε νύμφα.

'Oh you who glance beautifully through the window, a maiden as regards your head, but as regards the parts below a young wife'.<sup>25</sup>

snatch away the sexual pleasure of the free women, but sleep with slave men only, etc.'. (I follow here the suggestions of Ussher, *Ecclesiazusae*, commentary to 718-20).

<sup>20</sup> See Ussher xxx-xxxii, with earlier bibliography.

<sup>21</sup> 'Dramaturgical problems in the *Ecclesiazusae*', *Greek Poetry and Life. Essays Presented to Gilbert Murray on his Seventieth Birthday* (Oxford 1936) 257-76, at 261-6.

<sup>22</sup> I agree with Ussher xxxii that it is very unlikely that both women were on the roof.

<sup>23</sup> Above, p. 24.

<sup>24</sup> Some of these passages are briefly considered by W. Fauth, *Aphrodite Parakypytusa. Abhand. Mainz. Akad. der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse* 1966, no. 6 (Wiesbaden 1967) 331-437, at 359-60, who concludes that "das Hinauslehnen aus dem Fenster" zu einer hetärenhaften Praxis erotischer Anlockung gehörte'.

<sup>25</sup> The text (but not the translation) is that of D.A. Campbell, *Greek Lyric* 4 (Loeb, Cambridge, Mass. & London 1992) 754.

This apparently simple couplet has generated much scholarly debate. Fortunately this can be treated summarily, in view of the good recent discussions by R. Renehan<sup>26</sup> and E. Cavallini.<sup>27</sup> The first problem is the plural τῶν θυρίδων of the manuscripts. This gives an unsatisfactory sense, but the main reason for changing to the singular is the existence of a red-figured Attic vase, on which a symposiast is depicted, from whose mouth emerges the graffito (retrograde) Ο ΔΙΑΤΕΣΘΥΡΙΑΟΣ. This vase may be dated to the second quarter of the fifth century BC.<sup>28</sup> The words ὦ διὰ τῆς θυρίδος have been recognized all but universally to be the beginning of Praxilla's couplet,<sup>29</sup> so the graffito provides absolutely contemporary evidence for the singular θυρίδος, and those editors are well advised who have preferred that reading to the plural of the manuscripts.<sup>30</sup> The second question is the exact sense of ἐμβλέποισα. Here Page<sup>31</sup> was oddly misguided, and has led people astray by his note 'ἐκβλέποισα expectasses', which shows misunderstanding of both verbs. He is presumably the source, for example, of Campbell's mistranslation in the Loeb: 'You who look so beautifully in through the window'.<sup>32</sup> The best discussion of the meaning of the verb ἐμβλέπω is that of Cavallini. The analogies that she rightly adduces, Plato, *Charm.* 155 c-d and Xen. *Mem.* 3.11.10, especially the latter, show that the verb had the special meaning 'to look at seductively'.<sup>33</sup> So the addressee of Praxilla's couplet looked through (i.e. out of) the window seductively. Finally, there is the question of general interpretation. We need waste no time on such notions as that the moon is addressed,<sup>34</sup> or that the windows (*sic*) really mean eyes.<sup>35</sup> Both have been decisively refuted.<sup>36</sup> But even Cavallini's generally sound treatment breaks down here (39-41). She is influenced by *a priori* assumptions, such as that such a poem, if it has a disreputable meaning, cannot have been composed by a respectable woman. What do we know of the topics a Sicyonian poetess of the fifth century BC might treat? We do know, however, that Praxilla wrote

<sup>26</sup> 'The early Greek poets: some interpretations', *HSCP* 87 (1983) 1-29, at 29 and 'Praxilla fr. 8 Page (= PMG 754)', *Hermes* 115 (1987) 373-7.

<sup>27</sup> 'Note a lirici corali', *Eikasmos* 3 (1992) 19-41, at 36-41.

<sup>28</sup> For this vase, British Museum no. 95.10-27.2, see the excellent treatment by E. Csapo and M.C. Miller, 'The "kottabos toast" and an inscribed red-figured cup', *Hesperia* 60 (1991) 367-82, who give comprehensive references to earlier bibliography and also provide a very useful list of 'Singers of lyric verse in Attic red figure' at 381-2. Their explanations of the inscriptions on the vase, and the relationships of the inscriptions to the figures, are entirely convincing, and remove any doubts about their significance and context. On the Attic script and dialect of the Praxilla excerpt, see 369, 376.

<sup>29</sup> W. Aly's different opinion (*RE* 22. s.v. 'Praxilla' 1764-5) was perverse and is rightly rejected by D.L. Page, *Poetae Melici Graeci* (Oxford 1962) ad no. 754, and by Cavallini n. 85.

<sup>30</sup> The matter is well argued by Renehan (n.26, *HSCP* p.29), who also offers an ingenious and attractive explanation of how the change to the plural occurred. Campbell was wrong, however, in his Loeb to attribute the reading τῶς θυρίδος to Renehan, since it is already in E. Fraenkel (n.21 above) 263. Another line from early Greek poetry should be corrected on the basis of a graffito on an Attic vase by Duris from the same period, no. 173 in Diana Buitron-Oliver, *Douris* (Mainz 1995), where a symposiast says οὐ δύναμ' οὐ. This has been recognized long since as the beginning of Theognis 939-42, so the reading in the book texts, οὐ δύναμαι φωνῆι λιγ' ἀειδέμεν ὡσπερ ἄηδων, should be corrected to οὐ δύναμ' οὐ φωνῆι. See F. Hauser in A. Furtwängler and K. Reichhold, *Griechische Vasenmalerei* 2 (Munich 1901) 231, followed by G.M.A. Richter, *Attic Red-figured Vases: A Survey* (New Haven 1958) 15 and 167 n. 25. Yet this correction seems to have escaped the editors of Theognis; see, e.g., M.L. West, *Iambi et Elegi Graeci*<sup>2</sup> 1 (Oxford 1989) 220.

<sup>31</sup> See n. 29 above.

<sup>32</sup> (n.25) above. Cf. Renehan (n.26) *Hermes* pp. 374-5.

<sup>33</sup> Cavallini (n.27) 38-9. Renehan (n.26) misunderstands and mistranslates the passages he adduced to justify the sense 'to appear' (*Hermes* pp. 374-5).

<sup>34</sup> W. Aly (n.29) 1765.

<sup>35</sup> J.W. Halporn, 'A note on Praxilla fr. 754 PMG', *Hermes* 111 (1983) 499-500.

<sup>36</sup> Renehan (n.26) *Hermes* pp. 375-6; Cavallini (n.27) 37-8.

drinking songs,<sup>37</sup> and was thought disreputable by people of Christian times.<sup>38</sup> Misled by such false *a priori* assumptions, Cavallini proposes that the poem is an invocation of Aphrodite, specifically Aphrodite Parakuptousa (Venus Prospiciens). This improbable suggestion is decisively refuted by the vase in the British Museum, on which the couplet is sung by a symposiast, evidence, as noted above, precisely contemporary with the poetess.<sup>39</sup> So Wilamowitz must have the last word: 'Das Gedicht ist eine lascive Anrede bei der Fensterparade'.<sup>40</sup>

As Cavallini rightly notes (40), Praxilla's couplet alludes to the fact that only the head of a woman at the window would be visible, while the rest of her body would be concealed. This observation leads directly to representations of women in windows in Greek art. Pictures of women in windows are a very common motif in the red-figured ware of S. Italy and Sicily. This pottery was produced from about the last third of the fifth century BC to the end of the fourth.<sup>41</sup> The motif also occurs on Late Attic red figure, but it seems to be found earlier in S. Italian.<sup>42</sup> A female head or bust is depicted in a window. The face is often veiled<sup>43</sup> and the head is most frequently in profile, but sometimes faces forward.<sup>44</sup> The motif is so popular in S. Italian and Sicilian vase-painting that it can occur by itself,<sup>45</sup> or without apparent significance or connection with the scene depicted below.<sup>46</sup> On the other hand, there are many instances where the context is plainly erotic,<sup>47</sup> and others where it is probably or possibly so.<sup>48</sup>

<sup>37</sup> Athen. *Deipn.* 15.694a (= T 2 in Campbell, *Greek Lyric* 4); Schol. Aristophanes, *Wasps* 1239 (quoted in F 749 of Campbell).

<sup>38</sup> Tatian, *Against the Greeks* 33.1 (= T 4 in Campbell), which should be read in its context.

<sup>39</sup> Above 8-9. Cavallini's defence of her case (40 n. 103), that the invocation of the goddess, once it became part of the symposiac tradition, could have been transformed into a profane address to a woman, merely undermines her hypothesis.

<sup>40</sup> *Die Textgeschichte der griechischen Lyriker. Abhand. d. königlichen Gesellschaft d. Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Phil. Hist. Klasse* 4 (1900-1901) no. 3 (Berlin 1901) 9 n.4.

<sup>41</sup> See A.D. Trendall, *Red Figured Vases of South Italy and Sicily* (London 1989) 15-18.

<sup>42</sup> See K. Schauenburg, 'Frauen im Fenster', *Röm. Mitt.* 79 (1972) 1-15 (hereinafter Schauenburg), at 10.

<sup>43</sup> For the significance of veiling and women's sexuality, see D.L. Cairns, 'Veiling, αἰδώς and a red-figure amphora by Phintias', *JHS* 116 (1996) 152-8.

<sup>44</sup> See Schauenburg 8-9. Good examples of the more common form of the motif are shown on his plates 13.1 (= A.D. Trendall, *The Red-figured Vases of Lucania, Campania and Sicily* (Oxford 1967; hereinafter *LCS*) 586 no. 15, pl. 227.1-2) and 16.2 (= *LCS* 172 no.984). For the head facing forward, see, e.g., Schauenburg, pl. 17.2 (= A.D. Trendall and A. Cambitoglou, *The Red-figured vases of Apulia* (Oxford 1978; hereinafter *Apul.*) 507 no. 116); cf. also the Attic sherd illustrated on his pl. 19.1.

<sup>45</sup> As Schauenburg pl. 16.2.

<sup>46</sup> As Schauenburg 14, who gives as examples his pl. 13.2 (= *LCS* 339 no.798, pl. 132.1-3), where the woman in the window can hardly have any connection with the two Nikai below, and 18.1 (= A.D. Trendall, *Paestan Pottery: A Revision and Supplement* [*Pap. Brit. Sch. Rome* 20, 1952] 1-53, at 7 no.78), where the woman in the window seems equally detached, in this case, from Dionysus, the actor and the female mask on an altar below.

<sup>47</sup> A.D. Trendall, *Phlyax vases*<sup>2</sup>, *BICS* Suppl. 19 (1967) 36, illustrated in colour in Martin Robertson, *Greek Painting* (Geneva 1959) pl. opp. 160; *Phlyax Vases*<sup>2</sup> no. 65, illustrated by Trendall, *Paestan Pottery* (Rome 1936) pl. IX c; *Apul.* 401 no. 31, Schauenburg 12 and pl. 24.2; *Apul.* 405 no. 47 and pl. 143.3 (reverse), Schauenburg, 'Zur Symbolik unteritalischen Rankenmotive', *Röm. Mitt.* 64 (1957) 198-221 pl. 42.1 (face); *LCS* 53 no. 268, Trendall, *Frühhittorische Vasen* (Leipzig 1938) pl. 7, or idem, *Vasi antichi dipinti del Vaticano* (Città del Vaticano 1953) pl. 1.d; *LCS Third Supplement* (*BICS* Suppl. 41, 1983) 282 no. 216b, Schauenburg 4, 14 and pl. 2; *Apul.* 607 no. 28 and pl. 233.4 (reverse), Schauenburg, pl. 21.2 (face).

<sup>48</sup> *LCS* 586 no. 15 and pl. 227.1-2, Schauenburg, pl. 13.1 (face); *Apul.* 213 no. 161, Schauenburg pl. 17.1 (face); *Apul.* 507 no. 116, Schauenburg, pl. 17.2 (cf. S. von Reden, *Exchange in Ancient Greece* (London 1995) pls. 2-8 and the discussion 195-202); Trendall, *PBSR* 20 no. 157 (much more fully described by E.M.W. Tillyard, *The Hope Vases* (Cambridge 1923) 145 no. 278), Schauenburg, pl. 18.2; *LCS* 167 no. 926, Trendall, *Vasi antichi dipinti del Vaticano* 14-15 with pl. III; Trendall, *Phlyax Vases*<sup>2</sup> 52 no. 80, well illustrated in L. Bernabò Brea and M. Cavalier, *Meligunis-Lipara* 2 (Palermo 1965) pls. 72 and 73.

The examples listed are undoubtedly not exhaustive, but they show that in S. Italian and Sicilian red figure the motif of 'woman in window' can often be associated with scenes that are clearly erotic. We should agree with Schauenburg's conclusion (13-14) that the motif had nothing to do with cult, and the women can often be identified as *hetaerae*.

Vase paintings of women's heads in profile found on other Greek fabrics were included by Fauth among the instances he collected of the woman in the window in ancient art.<sup>49</sup> For our present concerns, however, it seems advisable to restrict our attention to the representations in Greek art where the heads are incontestably shown in windows. But Fauth's general theme is relevant to this discussion.

Literary evidence shows that there was at Salamis on Cyprus a temple of Aphrodite Parakuptousa, and a stone statue of a woman looking out of a window, whom we may take to be the goddess.<sup>50</sup> Fauth argued that this attests the sacred prostitution of the great fertility goddess of the East, who was represented in the Greek world by certain manifestations of Aphrodite. Herodotus already tells us (1.199.5) that there was sacred prostitution in some parts of Cyprus. It may be assumed that the Πόρνη Ἀφροδίτη at Abydos and Ἐταῖρα Ἀφροδίτη of Ephesus<sup>51</sup> had the same character, and the very numerous sacred prostitutes of Corinth are well known. So Fauth may well be right to see these Greek cults as the same as the very widespread and very longlived fertility cults of the East. In any case, the existence of a cult of Aphrodite Parakuptousa, and the representation of the goddess looking out of a window, offer further testimony for the association of women in windows with prostitution in the ancient Greek world.

The evidence that we have looked at so far is either precisely contemporary with the 'stele from the harbour' of Thasos (Praxilla) or close in time (Aristophanes, vase painting). In Greek literature as a whole there are many other passages which attest the connection of windows, women and prostitution<sup>52</sup> or erotic behaviour.<sup>53</sup> In contrast to all these passages, I have found only three episodes described in Greek literature, where a woman is associated with a window, and the usual erotic significance seems to be absent: Dion. Hal. *AR* 4.5.1, Plut. *Antony* 77.1 and *Acta Pauli et Theclae* (*Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*, R.A. Lipsius (ed.) [Leipzig 1891]) 1.7. In the first instance, Plutarch shows (*QR* 36, 273C) that there was another *aition*, in which the window did serve an erotic purpose. In the other two, it may even be that the erotic implications of women in windows are in the background. The first is about Cleopatra and Antony, and, in the second, there are many reminders of love and passion.

<sup>49</sup> Fauth (n.24) 351-2. A. Caubet's brief discussion of the phenomenon, 'Pygmalion et la statue d'ivoire', *Architecture et Poésie dans le monde grec. Hommages à Georges Roux* (Paris 1989) 247-54, at 252-3, seems not to take account of Fauth's fundamental and detailed study.

<sup>50</sup> Ovid, *Met.* 14.698-761 (note the name of the goddess, Veneris ... Prospicientis, in lines 760-1), combined with Plut. *Amatorius*, *Moralia* 766 c-d (note Παρακύπτουσαν, Παρακυπτούση), may be taken to establish this. A third source, Antoninus Liberalis, *Metamorphoses* 39, was dependent on Hermesianax, a writer of the third century BC, so the aetiological story common to the three accounts goes back at least to early Hellenistic times. These literary sources are fully and well discussed by Fauth 331-6. W. Helck's objection in his review of Fauth (*Gnomon* 40 [1968] 217-18), that the actual Greek words Ἀφροδίτη Παρακύπτουσα are not attested in our record, and so the existence of the deity is in doubt, seems captious, pedantic and unconvincing.

<sup>51</sup> Athen. *Deipn.* 13.572 e-f, 573a.

<sup>52</sup> Since Herter's documentation for windows in ancient prostitution (87 n. 325) is, for once, rather thin, and, apart from Aristophanes *Eccl.*, confined to Latin sources, I add some references here: Lucian, *Bis Accusatus* 31; *Josephus et Aseneth*, M. Philonenko (ed.) (Leiden 1968) 7.2; [Joannes Chrysostomus] *In Genesim*, Sermo 3 (Migne, *Patrologia Graeca* 56) 535 lines 44-5; Joannes Damascenus, *Sacra Parallela* (Migne, *Patrologia Graeca* 95) 1320 lines 23-5.

<sup>53</sup> Asclepiades, *AP* 5.153; Libanius, *Progymnasmata, Descriptiones*, R. Foerster (ed.) (Leipzig 1915, vol.8) 30.1.1-2; [Joannes Chrysostomus] *De turture* (Migne, *Patrologia Graeca* 55) 601 lines 7-10.

The material we have looked at shows that the normal significance of a woman and a window in ancient Greece was erotic and disreputable. This is the positive argument in favour of seeing the provision in the 'stele from the harbour' of Thasos as designed to control prostitution and soliciting. But there is also a negative way of looking at the matter: could this provision concern the actions of respectable women? Consider the passage of Lycurgus, *Against Leocrates* 39-40:

ἦνίκα ἡ μὲν ἦττα καὶ τὸ γεγονὸς πάθος τῶι <δήμῳ> προσήγγελο, ὀρθῆ δ' ἦν ἡ πόλις ἐπὶ τοῖς συμβεβηκόσιν, αἱ δ' ἐλπίδες τῆς σωτηρίας τῶι δήμῳ ἐν τοῖς ὑπὲρ πεντήκοντ' ἔτη γεγονόσι καθειστήκεσαν, ὄραν δ' ἦν ἐπὶ μὲν τῶν θυρῶν γυναικας ἐλευθέρας περιφόβους κατεπτηχίας καὶ πυνθανομένας εἰ ζῶσι, τὰς μὲν ὑπὲρ ἀνδρός, τὰς δ' ὑπὲρ πατρός, τὰς δ' ὑπὲρ ἀδελφῶν, ἀναξίως αὐτῶν καὶ τῆς πόλεως ὀρωμένας, κτλ. (J.O. Burt's text in Loeb *Minor Attic Orators*).

'When the defeat and consequent disaster had been reported to the people, and the city was tense with alarm at the news, the people's hope of safety had come to rest with the men of over fifty. Free women could be seen crouching at the doors in terror inquiring for the safety of their husbands, fathers or brothers, offering a spectacle degrading to themselves and to the city, etc.' (Burt's translation).

If that was the attitude to women showing themselves after a costly defeat in battle, we should surely conclude that a law forbidding respectable women to watch from a window would be inconceivable in classical Greece.<sup>54</sup>

The reason why Duchêne rejects the obvious way to understand the provision about women looking out of windows is that it is connected to the previous provision, which forbade people to go up on to the roof for the sake of looking. Duchêne thinks that the provision about the roof was designed to protect tiles from damage, for which he cites Herodas 3.40-8 (see below). Since people were going up for the sake of viewing, Duchêne envisages occasions such as religious processions, and assumes that the women would be forbidden to watch these through the windows. So, having found the roofs respectable, he thought the windows were too. But the flat (or nearly flat) roofs on ancient Mediterranean houses were by no means always of good repute.

Herter wrote (87) that ancient prostitutes could show themselves at windows and perhaps also on the roof. The reason for his uncertainty about the roof is that the word τέγος (στέγος) is frequently used as a euphemism for brothel, in place of the more common οἰκήμα. So when we have ἐπὶ τέγους in an erotic context, it could mean not only 'on a roof' but also 'in a brothel', like the standard ἐπ' οἰκήματος.<sup>55</sup>

There are many instances where it is certain or probable that τέγος means brothel.<sup>56</sup> In some cases the verb or preposition makes it certain, as Xen. Ephes. 5.7.1:

ὁ δὲ πορνοβοσκὸς ὁ τὴν Ἀνθίαν ὠνησάμενος χρόνου διελθόντος ἠνάγκασεν αὐτὴν οἰκήματος προεστάναι, καὶ δὴ κοσμήσας καλῆι μὲν ἐσθῆτι πολλῶι δὲ χρυσῶι ἤγεν ὡς προστησομένην τέγους.

'The brothel-keeper who had bought Anthia after a time compelled her to stand in front of a brothel. And, having adorned her in fine dress and much gold he led her to stand in front of a brothel'.

<sup>54</sup> Although he phrased it a little cryptically, it is clear that D.M. Lewis, in his review of Duchêne, thought that the ban on women looking out of windows was concerned with prostitution; see *CR* 43 (1993) 402-3: 'the worries about women looking out of windows will touch on wider considerations of public order'.

<sup>55</sup> For this use of ἐπὶ see *LSJ* s.v., I.1, where Hdt.'s ἐπ' οἰκήματος (2.121 ε) is cited.

<sup>56</sup> Herter's notes 326 and 327 provide a rich collection of ancient passages where τέγος is used in connection with prostitution, both in pagan and in Christian writers.



She complains that after all her other sufferings ἔτι καὶ πορνεῦειν ἀναγκάζομαι, ‘further I am even compelled to be a prostitute’ (5.7.2). The facts here, that τέγους is *variatio* for οἰκήματος, and that the verb is ‘to stand in front of’, show very clearly that the meaning of τέγους must be brothel.<sup>57</sup> In many other instances the general sense makes brothel a more probable meaning than roof.<sup>58</sup> The way that τέγος came to be a euphemism for brothel was probably via its sense as a covered place. Pindar could use the word of both cave and temple,<sup>59</sup> and in *fr.* 2 of Callimachus’ *Hekale* τέγος ἀκλήϊστον means ‘an open house’. The way in which οἰκημα, a building, became the most common euphemism for brothel, seems a good analogy for a similar progress in the case of τέγος. So it was probably not the meaning ‘roof’ that led to the euphemism for brothel. But that conclusion does not save the reputation of the roof.

We have already seen that E. Fraenkel conjectured that the girl and the first old woman were on the roofs of their respective houses in the scene from *Ecclesiazusae* discussed above,<sup>60</sup> and there is a striking passage in which Lucian describes how Rhetoric solicited her lovers from either the roof or the window. In the dialogue *The Double Indictment (Bis Accusatus)* Lucian (31) defends himself against Rhetoric’s accusation that he has abandoned her, his lawful wife. His defence is that Rhetoric had become meretricious, and he describes her behaviour as follows:

ἐγὼ γὰρ ὁρῶν αὐτὴν οὐκέτι σωφρονούσαν οὐδὲ μένουσαν ἐπὶ τοῦ κοσμίῳ σχήματος οἶδόν ποτε ἐσχηματισμένην αὐτὴν ὁ Παιανεὺς ἐκεῖνος ἠγάγετο, κοσμουμένην δὲ καὶ τὰς τρίχας εὐθετίζουσιν εἰς τὸ ἐταιρικὸν καὶ φυκίον ἐντριβωμένην καὶ τῶφθαλμῶ ὑπογραφομένην, ὑπώπτειον εὐθὺς καὶ παρεφύλαττον ὅποι τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν φέρει. καὶ τὰ μὲν ἄλλα ἐὼ· καθ’ ἐκάστην δὲ νύκτα ὁ μὲν στενωπὸς ἡμῶν ἐνεπιμπλατο μεθύοντων ἔραστῶν κωμαζόντων ἐπ’ αὐτὴν καὶ κοπιόντων τὴν θύραν, ἐνίων δὲ καὶ εἰσβιάζεσθαι σὺν οὐδενὶ κόσμῳ τολμώντων. αὐτὴ δὲ ἐγέλα καὶ ἤδετο τοῖς δρωμένοις καὶ τὰ πολλὰ ἢ παρέκυπτεν ἀπὸ τοῦ τέγους ἀδόντων ἀκούουσα τραχεῖαι τῆι φωνῆ ὡδᾶς τινας ἐρωτικὰς ἢ καὶ παρανοίγουσα τὰς θυρίδας ἐμὲ οἰομένη λαμβάνειν ἡσέλγεινε καὶ ἐμοιχεύετο πρὸς αὐτῶν.

‘Seeing that she was no longer modest and did not continue to clothe herself in the respectable way she did once when Demosthenes took her to wife, but made herself up, arranged her hair like a courtesan, put on rouge, and darkened her eyes underneath, I became suspicious at once and secretly took note where she directed her glances. I pass over everything else, but every night our street was full of drunken lovers coming to serenade her, knocking at the door, and sometimes even venturing to force an entrance in disorderly fashion. She herself laughed and enjoyed these performances, and generally, when she heard them singing love-songs in a hoarse voice, she either peeped over the edge of the roof, or she even slyly opened the windows, thinking I would not notice it, and then behaved licentiously and committed adultery with them’ (translation by A.M. Harmon, Loeb [1921] adapted).

<sup>57</sup> Cf. Clement, *Stromata* 3 28.1 (αἱ προεστῶσαι τοῦ τέγους πόρνοι, ‘the prostitutes who stand in front of the brothel’); Joannes Chrysostomus, *de inani gloria (Jean Chrysostome, sur la vaine gloire etc.*, ed. A.-M. Malingrey [Paris 1972]) 30 lines 41-2 (ἐστῆκοι ... πρὸ τοῦ τέγους, ‘would stand ... in front of the brothel’).

<sup>58</sup> E.g. Polyb. 12.13.2 (τῶν ἀπὸ τέγους ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος εἰργασμένων οὐδεὶς, ‘none of those from a brothel who make a living from their body’); Clement, *Paed.* 3.21.2 ἐπὶ τέγους ἐστάσι ... τὴν σάρκα τὴν ἑαυτῶν εἰς ὄβριον ἡδονῆς πῖπράσκουσαι γυναῖκες, ‘women stand in a brothel selling their own flesh for lust of pleasure’); Clement, *Paed.* 3.11.74 (ἔνθα ἐταιρικῶς κεκοσμημένοι ὡσπερ ἐπὶ τέγους καθεζόμενοι, ‘where women spend the whole day adorned liked courtesans, as though they were sitting in a brothel’; text and translation from M. Schofield, *The Stoic Idea of the City* [Cambridge 1991] 115-16).

<sup>59</sup> *LSJ* s.v. τέγος, 2.

<sup>60</sup> See p. 25.

The only textual variant of importance is that the manuscripts of the β tradition have θύρας instead of the θυρίδας of the γ manuscripts.<sup>61</sup> Since the authority of both traditions is good, where they differ the choice may be hard for an editor,<sup>62</sup> but in this case θυρίδας is the rarer word and so preferable as *difficilior*. The allusions to prostitution throughout the passage are unambiguous. An erotic and disreputable function of roofs is also attested in other passages, and I give some examples:

1. Josephus, *AJ* 19 9.1:

ὅσοι στρατευόμενοι τότε ἔτυχον...οἴκαδε ἀπήλθον, καὶ τοὺς ἀνδριάντας τῶν τοῦ βασιλέως θυγατέρων ἀρπάσαντες ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐκόμισαν εἰς τὰ πορνεία καὶ στήσαντες ἐπὶ τῶν τεγῶν ὡς δυνατὸν ἦν ἀφύβριζον ἀσχημονέστερα διηγήσεως δρῶντες.

‘And all who were then on military service ... went off to their homes, and seizing the images of the king’s daughters carried them with one accord to the brothels, where they set them up on the roofs and offered them every possible sort of insult, doing things too indecent to be reported’ (translation Feldman, Loeb). There is no doubt about the meaning ‘roofs’ here.

2. Aristoph. *Aeolosicon* fr. 11:

καὶ δι’ ὀπῆς κάπῃ τεγους  
‘Both through window and on roof’.<sup>63</sup>

In view of the close parallel in Lucian, and the disreputable behaviour of women mentioned in *fr.* 10, it seems probable that window and roof have an erotic significance here.

3. Herodas 3.40-1:

ἢ τοῦ τέγουσ ὑπερθε τὰ σκέλεα τείνας  
κάθητ’ ὄκως τις καλλίης κατὰ κύπτων.

‘or else sits on top of the roof, stretching his legs apart and peering down like some monkey’.<sup>64</sup>

The mother’s subsequent complaint (44) that ἀλλ’ ὁ κέραμος πᾶς ὡσπερ ἴτ<ρ>ια θλήται, ‘but the whole tiling is smashed like so many biscuits’ (A.D. Knox again), was what led Duchêne, as we have seen, to use this passage to explain the provision about the roof in the ‘stele from the harbour’. But Herodas’ words contain an unmistakable obscene *double entendre*, which Knox’s translation shows that he recognized. τὰ σκέλεα τείνας reminds one of ἀνατείνας τῷ σκέλει at Aristoph. *Peace* 1254,<sup>65</sup> and the use of αἴρειν τὰ σκέλη at *Eccles.* 265 and *Peace* 889.<sup>66</sup> Note finally κάτω κύπτων, peeping down, which is reminiscent of Lucian’s παρέκυπτεν ἀπὸ τοῦ τέγουσ. Herodas has, therefore, chosen words that suggest the son is making a sexual solicitation, i.e. he is using the roof like a (male) prostitute. We should not forget that Headlam (xlili) thought that the theme of the dramatic predecessors of Herodas 3 was probably not unobjectionable in the normal Greek view.

<sup>61</sup> See the text and apparatus in the *OCT*, Vol. 2, ed. M.D. Macleod (1974).

<sup>62</sup> See Macleod’s preface, Vol. 2 p.x.

<sup>63</sup> R. Kassel and C. Austin, *PCG* 3.2 p.39. J.M. Edmonds’ translation, ‘through window, upon roof’ (*The Fragments of Attic Comedy* 1 [Leiden 1957]) 577, is surely preferable to any ideas about ὀπή meaning a hole in a roof; *LSJ* s.v; see also the commentary in Kassel and Austin, who mistakenly follow Edmonds in expecting ἀπὸ rather than ἐπὶ.

<sup>64</sup> Teubner text, I.C. Cunningham (ed.); see idem, *Herodas Mimiambi* (Oxford 1971) 214 and the list in Appendix 3, 209-10. The translation is by A.D. Knox in W. Headlam, *Herodas. The Mimes and Fragments* (Cambridge 1922).

<sup>65</sup> Cited by Henderson, *The Maculate Muse*<sup>2</sup> 85 and translated by him 39.

<sup>66</sup> See Henderson 173 no. 317, and Ussher’s comments on the phrase οἴκτα τις αἴτη τὰ σκέλη ἠρκυῖα at Theophrastus, *Char.* 28.3; R.G. Ussher, *The Characters of Theophrastus* (London 1960) 241.

Since the roof was a natural viewing point, it is not surprising that one can find instances where it was so used in a respectable way, as e.g. Plut. *Cicero* 22.4 and Callimachus *Hymn to Demeter* 4-5. Even if it is possible, however, to find examples of innocent uses of the roof, the material above makes clear that it was certainly possible for roofs to be used for disreputable purposes in the ancient world. So, far from the respectability of the roof forcing us to deny the obvious meaning of the ban on women watching from windows, it is quite the other way round. The very clear significance of the woman and the window shows what was the purpose of the provision about the roof. That provision does not specify the sex of the people who went onto the roof for looking, and it is possible that the words μηδὲ γύνῃ of the next phrase imply that those on the roof could be male. In which case we could think of pimps and *pornoboskoi* in addition to the prostitutes themselves. That the aim of both provisions was to control some practices of prostitution is as certain as it could be—short of explicit wording.

There is another problem in Duchêne's reading of the lines under discussion, the word κατοικίων. Objections to this word in this context were trenchantly expressed by Gauthier,<sup>67</sup> who preferred, on the basis of Duchêne's facsimile, καπηλείων, a reading that Duchêne himself (28) expressly excluded. καπηλείων would suit the sense of the passage well, since taverns were frequently associated with prostitution,<sup>68</sup> though δημοσίων would still need explanation. My own examination of the stone, however, confirms that Duchêne's reading κατοικίων best represents the traces of the letters preserved, and the reading καπηλείων is not possible.<sup>69</sup> The meaning of κατοικία is 'settlement' in general. From that more specific senses, like 'village', developed.<sup>70</sup> Such meanings are inappropriate and incomprehensible in our context. So Duchêne suggested that the word is here a synonym for συνοικία, lodging house; hence his translation 'immeubles publics'. But he has no example of such a use for κατοικία and his suggestion is rightly characterized by Gauthier as a conjecture. Would it not be better to make a different division? We could read:

ἐπὶ τὸ τέγεος τῶν  
κατ' οἰκίων τῶν δημοσίων τῶν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ τ-  
αύτηι: θῆς ἔνεκεν μηδὲς ἀναβαινέτω:

(Literal translation) 'On the roof let no one of those throughout houses, the public ones, the ones in this street, go up for the sake of looking'.

The main advantage of the proposed reading is that it gets rid of the inexplicable κατοικίων. But it also removes another objectionable feature of Duchêne's text, the singular τέγεος followed by the plural of the supposed buildings. Contrast Xen. *Hell.* 4.4.12, οἱ δὲ ἐπὶ τὰ τέγη τῶν νεωσοίκων ἀναβάντες, 'and others who had climbed onto the roofs of the ship-sheds'.

Leaving aside for the moment the meaning of οἰκίων τῶν δημοσίων, let us consider possible objections to the proposed new reading. It might be thought that the interpunct after ταύτηι represents a difficulty, since this divides μηδὲς from the people (τῶν κατ' οἰκίων) to whom it refers. But the interpuncts do not seem to mark off sense divisions; see, e.g. (19) τὴν ὁδὸν καθαρὴν παρεχέτω: ὁ ἐνοικέων κτλ., or (27-28) δς [ἄν] τι [τ]οῦτων μὴ ποιῆι: κ-/ατὰ τὰ γεγραμμένα κτλ.. So this objection disappears. A different objection to the same connection is that the word order makes a long separation of τῶν from μηδὲς. But the order

<sup>67</sup> *Bull. Épig.* (1993) 395.

<sup>68</sup> See Herter 73-4.

<sup>69</sup> The reading κα[τοικι]ών in line 26, however, was explicitly suggested on the basis of the word's presumed appearance in line 31; see Duchêne 27. It has no independent justification, and may be ignored here.

<sup>70</sup> See Gauthier (n.67) and Duchêne 107-8.

is acceptably chiasmic, especially as we have a similar separation—as wide as possible—between ἐπὶ τῷ τέγῳ and ἀναβαίνετω.<sup>71</sup>

There is also the question of κατὰ with the genitive in κατ' οἰκιῶν. In addition to the common ablative use of κατὰ with the genitive to express 'down from', the preposition is also used with the true genitive, either in a local or temporal sense or to express relationship ('concerning', 'in relation to').<sup>72</sup> It is sometimes difficult to distinguish the topographical sense from that expressing relationship, but there are cases where κατὰ with the true genitive is used with a clearly distinguishable local sense. Schwyzler and Debrunner write: 'Echter Gen (loci et temp.). Parallel zum Akk. der Erstreckung, "durch-hin", "über-hin"'. Among the examples that they cite for this local sense, the passage Polyb. 1.17.10, τοὺς πολεμίους ἐσκεδάσμενους κατὰ τῆς χώρας, illustrates it well. The κατὰ here should be rendered 'over' or 'throughout' rather than 'about' as in W.R. Paton's (Loeb) translation, 'the enemy ... dispersed about the country'. We may conclude that κατὰ in κατ' οἰκιῶν τῶν δημοσίων is acceptable Greek grammar and has an acceptable, local, sense. It can be rendered in English 'throughout' or, in normal English idiom, simply 'in'. But what does 'in houses, the public ones' mean?

The adjective δημόσιος connected with some piece of property normally means 'in public ownership'.<sup>73</sup> At Athens there were two categories of such property. The first was in the permanent possession of the state, and included, for instance, the great public buildings, the Agora, roads and considerable parts of the Piraeus.<sup>74</sup> The second category, private property confiscated by judicial decision, was only temporarily in the possession of the state. Once it had been sold by the *pōlētai* it became once again private.<sup>75</sup> So when a piece of property is described as δημόσιος, scholars think either of property permanently owned by the state or temporarily confiscated. There are, however, three passages where the meaning 'confiscated', 'owned by the state', does not give a good sense.

In the inscription IG i<sup>3</sup> 84 we find the words (lines 34-7):

τῆς τάφρου καὶ τῷ ὕδατος κρατῆν τὸ ἐγ Διὸς τὸν μισθοσάμενον, ὅπόσον ἐντὸς ρεῖ τὸ Διονυσίῳ καὶ τὸν πυλῶν ἐ<ι> ἄλαδε ἐ[χ]σελαύνουσιν οἱ μύσται καὶ ὅπόσον ἐντὸς τῆς οἰκίας τῆς δημοσίας καὶ τὸν πυλῶν αἰ ἐπὶ τὸ Ἰσθμονικό βαλανεῖον ἐκφέρουσι.

'The lessee to control "the ditch and all the rainwater that flows between the Dionysion and the gates where the *mystai* drive out to the sea, and all that flows between the public house and the gates that lead to the baths of Isthmonikos"'.<sup>76</sup>

This virtually complete inscription records an Athenian decree of 418/17 BC, providing for the establishment of the boundaries and fencing of the sanctuary (ἱερόν) of Codrus, Neleus and Basile, and the leasing of the *temenos*. There has been considerable discussion of the location of this sanctuary. The over-confident and over-precise position advocated by J. Travlos on the

<sup>71</sup> Notice also the word order in the Polybius passage cited above (n.58): τῶν ἀπὸ τέγῳ ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος εἰργασμένων οὐδεὶς.

<sup>72</sup> See E. Schwyzler and A. Debrunner, *Griechische Grammatik 2* (Munich 1959) 479-80.2, who call the last sense 'Betreff'.

<sup>73</sup> The subject is well and comprehensively treated by D. Lewis, 'Public property in the city', in O. Murray and S. Price (eds.), *The Greek City from Homer to Alexander* (Oxford 1990) 245-63.

<sup>74</sup> Lewis (n.73) 249-51. The sacred property of the gods was also in effect in the permanent possession of the state, but that was termed *hiera*; see Lewis (n.73) 259.

<sup>75</sup> See Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 52.1 and 47.2; the beautiful *pōlētai* inscription of 367/6, *SEG* xii 100 (but see now M.K. Landon, 'Poletai records', *The Athenian Agora* 19 (Princeton 1991) 53-143, no. P5) and Lewis 247-8.

<sup>76</sup> Translation of words in double inverted commas by G.T.W. Hooker, 'The topography of the Frogs', *JHS* 80 (1960) 112-17, at 115.

basis of an anonymous *horos* found *in situ*<sup>77</sup> has rightly been questioned by N.W. Slater,<sup>78</sup> who argues well for a return to the topography of Hooker,<sup>79</sup> who put the sanctuary outside the city wall, between it and the river Ilissus. R.E. Wycherley originally preferred the same solution.<sup>80</sup> A strong argument in favour of this topography exists in the date and nature of the decree. If the sanctuary was outside the walls, the Athenians would not have been able to take good care of it during the Archidamian War.<sup>81</sup> After the Peace of Nicias they were able once more to turn their attention to Attica, just as those did who, at the same period, built a substantial house on a major route between Athens and Eleusis.<sup>82</sup>

As we have seen, Hooker translated τῆς οἰκίας τῆς δημοσίας neutrally as ‘the public house’, and did not comment on its precise significance. Wycherley chose a more tendentious translation, ‘the official house’,<sup>83</sup> and stated (65) ‘One cannot say where or what the *oikia demosia* was; perhaps a house taken over by the state for some official or religious purpose; one does not know of a public building or office in this quarter’. The problem is that τῆς οἰκίας τῆς δημοσίας was obviously a well-known landmark,<sup>84</sup> which needed no further description, and was expected to remain so. A confiscated house would presumably have been quickly sold by the *pōlētai*, when the term δημοσία would cease to be attached to the said building, and, in any case, the description lacks the easily recognized specificity required by the context. Some other sense seems to be needed.

The second passage comes from Xenophon’s description of the incarceration of the Arcadian aristocrats at Tegea in 363/2 BC. He writes:

... πολλοὺς ἔδει τοὺς συλλαμβανομένους εἶναι· ὥστε ταχὺ μὲν αὐτοῖς τὸ δεσμωτήριον μεστὸν ἦν, ταχὺ δὲ ἡ δημοσία οἰκία

The Loeb translator (C. L. Brownson, 1921) rendered this as follows:

‘... those who were seized were necessarily many, so that their prison was speedily full, and the city hall likewise’.

A more neutral translation of ἡ δημοσία οἰκία would be ‘the public house’, but translators favour ‘the town hall’ *aut sim.* G.E. Underhill’s cautious comment, ‘its use is not further specified’, seems preferable.<sup>85</sup> Since there is a perfectly standard Greek word for ‘town hall’,

<sup>77</sup> *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Athens* (London 1971) 332-5 and fig. 379 on 291.

<sup>78</sup> ‘The Lenaean theatre’, *ZPE* 46 (1986) 255-64, at 259-63.

<sup>79</sup> See (n. 76).

<sup>80</sup> ‘Neleion’, *BSA* 55 (1960) 60-6, at 65. In ‘Pausanias at Athens II’, *GRBS* 4 (1963) 157-75, at 173, and *The Stones of Athens* (Princeton 1978) 168, Wycherley accepted Travlos’ new argument. There is a long and learned note on the topography by D. Behrend, *Attische Pachturkunden* (Munich 1970) 35-6, n. 23, but he also seems to strive for greater precision than our evidence allows.

<sup>81</sup> This seems preferable to Wycherley’s view (n.80, *BSA* p. 62) that the problems of the sanctuary had been caused by the influx of refugees from the countryside; Thuc. 2.17.1. That would not have been a factor with the topography that he then preferred.

<sup>82</sup> See J.E. Jones, L.H. Sackett and A.J. Graham, ‘The Dema House in Attica’, *BSA* 57 (1962) 75-114; see 100-1.

<sup>83</sup> (n.80) *BSA* 61; followed in this by Travlos, *Pictorial Dictionary*, 232.

<sup>84</sup> Cf. Lewis (n.73) 250: ‘surely large enough to serve as a clear landmark, but there is absolutely no indication as to its use’.

<sup>85</sup> *A Commentary on the Hellenica of Xenophon* (Oxford 1900) 299. Much earlier B. Weiske wrote ‘δημοσία οἰκία cui usui destinata fuerit, in coniectura positum est’ (*Xenophontis ... Scripta* 4 [Leipzig 1801] *ad loc.*).

πρυτανεῖον,<sup>86</sup> we may be confident that that is not the meaning of ἡ δημοσία οἰκία here. Since it was obviously a large building, it is improbable that it was a publicly owned or confiscated house. Yet it could be given the definite article, and it is obvious that to Xenophon and his readers the meaning was unambiguous and needed no further explanation. The case seems similar to the use of the same term in *IG* i<sup>3</sup> 84.

The third passage is Xen. *Poroi* 4.49, where he writes:

οὐ τοίνυν μόνον ἡ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνδραπόδων ἀποφορὰ τὴν διατροφήν τῆι πόλει αὐξοί ἐν, ἀλλὰ πολυανθρωπίας περὶ τὰ μέταλλα ἀθροισμένης καὶ ἀπ' ἀγορᾶς τῆς ἐκεῖ οὐσης καὶ ἀπ' οἰκῶν περὶ τὰργύρεια δημοσίων καὶ ἀπὸ καμίνων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων πρόσοδοι ἐν πολλὰι γίνονται.

'However, the rent derived from the slaves would not be the only source of relief to the community. With the concentration of a large population in the mining district, abundant revenue would be derived from the *agora*, from public houses around the silver mines, from furnaces and all the other sources' (Loeb translation adapted).

This passage forms part of Xenophon's argument that the resuscitation of fullscale working of the silver mines at Laurium would be of great financial benefit to the Athenian state.<sup>87</sup> Here his emphasis is on the revenues that would accrue from the large population that would be attracted to the area by the revival and expansion of mining activity. Bearing that emphasis in mind, we may ask what were these revenues.

In the case of the *agora* the answer is easy. The benefit would come to the state from the taxes levied on the retail trade in the market. Although we do not know the amount of these taxes, nor precisely how they were levied, it is certain that there was a sales tax on goods sold in the market, and this tax was important.<sup>88</sup> As for the furnaces, although the word κάμινος can mean any oven or furnace or kiln, in the context of the silver mines it would be perverse to look for any other sense than 'smelting furnace'. We know of these furnaces, called κάμιννοι, from epigraphical evidence,<sup>89</sup> and actual examples have been found in the archaeological exploration of the region.<sup>90</sup> A question arises about the ownership of these furnaces in Xenophon. Ph. Gauthier thought that the word δημοσίων also governed καμίνων, and so they belonged to the state,<sup>91</sup> but the order of the Greek is strongly against him. The idea that the furnaces were state-owned is, however, old. B. Weiske suggested that δημοσίων should be supplied with καμίνων,<sup>92</sup> which is not subject to the same objection linguistically, but his reason was the *a priori* assumption that the Athenian people

<sup>86</sup> This is the word that Herodotus uses at 7.197.2 to explain an unusual local term: λήιτον δὲ καλέουσι τὸ πρυτανεῖον οἱ Ἀχαιοί. The useful list of testimonia in S.G. Miller, *The Prutaneion* (Berkeley, Los Angeles & London 1978) 132-218, has been updated by M.H. Hansen and T. Fischer-Hansen, 'Monumental political architecture in Archaic and Classical Greek poleis. Evidence and historical significance', in D. Whitehead (ed.), *From Political Architecture to Stephanus Byzantius (Historia Einzelschr. 87, Stuttgart 1994)* 23-90.

<sup>87</sup> I am happy to accept the general views about the date and nature of the *Poroi* expressed by S. Lauffer, 'Das Bergbauprogramm in Xenophons *Poroi*', *Thorikos and the Laureion in Archaic and Classical Times*, ed. H.F. Mussche, P. Spitaels, F. De Poerck-Goemaere, *Miscellanea Graeca* Fasc. 1 (Ghent 1975) 171-94, according to which Xenophon is offering his programme to Athens after her defeat in the Social War (357-355 BC), and its three main elements were peace, trade and the silver mines.

<sup>88</sup> See A. Boeckh, *Die Staatshaushaltung der Athener*<sup>3</sup> 1 (Berlin 1886, reprinted Berlin 1967) 393-5. Along with other evidence, Boeckh used the passage *Poroi* 4.49 in his argument for the existence of this tax.

<sup>89</sup> E.g. *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 1588.6; for the text see now *Athenian Agora* 19, P38 line 28; *SEG* xii.100, *Agora* 19, P5, 54; *SEG* xviii.129, *Agora* 19, P28, 25. In all these cases the furnaces serve as topographical markers.

<sup>90</sup> See, e.g., H.F. Mussche and C. Conophagos, 'Ore-washing establishments and furnaces at Megala Pevka and Demoliaki', *Thorikos* 6 (1969; pub. Brussels 1973) 61-72.

<sup>91</sup> *Un commentaire historique des Poroi de Xenophon* (Geneva & Paris 1976) 187.

<sup>92</sup> *Xenophontis ... Scripta* 6 (1804), note *ad loc.* (124).

would not get much from taxes on private furnaces.

There now seems to be a consensus in favour of the view argued by R.J. Hopper, that the state owned (or otherwise controlled) all the mines, which it leased out, while the land and buildings on the surface remained private property.<sup>93</sup> A strong argument in favour of the thesis that the property on the surface remained private is provided by the 'mortgage' stones relating to it, especially workshops etc.,<sup>94</sup> since only privately owned property could serve as a security in this way. And one of these stones names a furnace (κ[α]μίνου) as one of the securities.<sup>95</sup> We may conclude that the smelting furnaces at Laurium were privately owned.

So the revenues to the state, which would accrue from these furnaces, if the population was large, was not from letting or leasing state property; since the property was private, it must have been from taxes. We do not know of a specific tax on furnaces, but, as A. Boeckh stated, there were many taxes at Athens for which no evidence has been preserved.<sup>96</sup> In this case a possible tax would seem to be that called the five drachma tax,<sup>97</sup> which M. Crosby thought was probably related to the mining industry, and may have been levied on workshops, water rights or something of the sort.<sup>98</sup> It is, therefore, possible that it was a tax on smelting furnaces, but in default of other evidence, that can only be a guess. That the revenues envisaged by Xenophon came from some tax on smelting furnaces seems, however, reasonably certain.

The οἰκιῶν περὶ τὰργύρεια δημοσίων were taken by Gauthier as houses confiscated by the state, or made public by other circumstances, which were leased to individuals, in this case those with mining concessions, who would use them as lodgings for their labour force. Xenophon, he thought, envisaged that they would be permanently leased at a high price.<sup>99</sup> If the houses were publicly owned through confiscation, it is not clear why they should be numerous, nor why they had not been promptly sold in the usual way by the *pōlētai*. So we need to find the other circumstances, if Gauthier's suggested interpretation is to stand. It might be tempting to assume that Xenophon thought the state could either build or acquire large numbers of houses as permanent public property in the mining district, in order to lease them out. He was writing in a visionary way in the *Poroi*, and he does propose at 3.12-13 that lodging houses and shopping halls should be built for the traders in Athens and Piraeus, which would be not only an ornament, but also a source of revenue.<sup>100</sup> In another passage, 3.14, Xenophon even proposes that the state should own merchant-ships and lease them out. But it is very hard to apply these analogies in the silver mining district, because there Xenophon expressly states that the only innovation he would propose is state ownership of slaves (4.17).

If it is difficult to explain these public houses as permanent state property, the important revenues which would come from them to the state, if the area was heavily populated, cannot be from leases. The situation seems similar to the other two cases discussed above. The meaning of δημοσίων οἰκιῶν is obscure to us, and so are the revenues they would produce, yet to

<sup>93</sup> 'The Attic silver mines in the fourth century BC', *BSA* 48 (1953) 200-54; cf. Rhodes, *Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*, 553; C.E. Conophagos, *Le Laurium antique* (Athens 1980) 111-12; R. Osborne, *Demos: the Discovery of Classical Attika* (Cambridge 1985) 115-16; M. Faraguna, *Atene nell'età di Alessandro*, *Atti Accad. Linc. classe scienze morale, storiche e filologiche*, *Memorie* ser. 9 Vol. 2.2 (Rome 1992) 294-5.

<sup>94</sup> See M.I. Finley, *Land and Credit in Ancient Athens, 500-200 BC. The Horos-Inscriptions* (New Brunswick, N.J. 1951; new edition by P. Millett, New Brunswick & Oxford 1985) nos. 88-92.

<sup>95</sup> *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 2750 (= Finley no. 92).

<sup>96</sup> *Staatshaushaltung*<sup>3</sup> 1 405. On taxation in the mining district, see Faraguna 203 n. 1.

<sup>97</sup> See *Athenian Agora* 19, no. P26, lines 474-5: ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τὴν πεντεδραχμίαν.

<sup>98</sup> 'The leases of the Laureion mines', *Hesperia* 19 (1950) 189-312, at 203 n. 44.

<sup>99</sup> *Commentary* p. 187. Gauthier's explanation is accepted by Duchêne 108.

<sup>100</sup> Cf. Gauthier's commentary *ad loc.*, 106-7.

Xenophon and his readers those meanings were obviously self-evident. Is it too far-fetched to use analogies from other languages? In French ‘maison publique’, in German ‘öffentliches Haus’, in Spanish ‘casa publica’, and in Italian ‘casa pubblica’ are all euphemisms for brothel.<sup>101</sup> If οἰκία δημοσία could also mean a brothel in ancient Greek, we find good sense in the three cases considered above. In the inscription *IG* i<sup>3</sup> 84, if ‘the public house’ meant ‘the brothel’, we should have not only an easily recognized landmark, but also a very appropriate location in the vicinity of a public bath. Brothels in the ancient world were regularly associated with baths.<sup>102</sup> In the case of the imprisoned Arcadian aristocrats at Tegea, ‘the brothel’ could provide a suitable overflow building for the prison, and it would add piquancy to the account to remark that some of the aristocrats found themselves in such a place of detention. The meaning ‘the brothels’ for the οἰκίων δημοσίων of the *Poroi* passage provides the best sense of all. The heavily populated mining district would generate many brothels, and the revenue to the state would come from the tax on prostitutes which is well attested at Athens.<sup>103</sup> So, as in the two other cases specified by Xenophon, the revenues envisaged would come from taxes.

There is to my knowledge no passage which proves that οἰκία δημοσία could mean brothel in ancient Greek. On the other hand, both words did independently have associations with prostitution. Ussher took the phrase from Theophrastus’ *Characters* quoted above, οἰκία τις αὐτή τὰ σκέλη ἠρκυῖα, as a slang term for a brothel.<sup>104</sup> Photius, writing of the time when Athanasius was accused of corrupting a woman, used the expression (*Bibliotheca* 480.b.23), ἡ δὲ οἷα γύναιον ἐκ δημοσίου τέγους, ‘and she like a woman from a public brothel’.<sup>105</sup> The feminine of the adjective δημόσιος is also used of disreputable women. Athenaeus, for example, wrote (*Deipn.* 10.437-8) ἦν δὲ ὁ Διονύσιος ...πρὸς τὰ ἀφροδίσια ἐκμανῆς καὶ πρὸς τὰς δημοσίας εἰσῆιει παιδίσκας ἀδιαφόρως. ‘Dionysius had a mad proneness to lustfulness, and used to visit common streetwalkers without discrimination’ (C.B. Gulick, Loeb). ‘Hippocrates’ mentions αἱ ἐταῖραι αἱ δημόσιαι at *De Carnibus* 19, which E. Littré translated ‘les filles publiques’.<sup>106</sup> And, finally, the adjective δημοσία standing alone can mean a prostitute. See, e.g., Asterius Amasenus, *Homilies* (ed. C. Datema, Leiden, 1970) 4.8.6: χάρισαι πρὸ τῆς πόρνης τῆι χήραι, πρὸ τῆς δημοσίας τῆι σεμνῶς κατακεκλημένῃ, ‘give presents to the widow in preference to the whore, and to the woman chastely confined to the house in preference to the prostitute’. These usages provide a general support for taking οἰκία δημοσία as a euphemism for ‘brothel’ in ancient Greek.<sup>107</sup>

If we divide line 31 of the ‘stele from the harbour’ in the way I have proposed, and understand οἰκίων τῶν δημοσίων to mean brothels, we may translate the provision about the roof: ‘Let no one of those in the brothels in this street go up onto the roof for the sake of

<sup>101</sup> The fact that ‘public house’ does not mean brothel in English provides material for jokes, e.g.: – ‘Vous n’avez pas dit qu’en Grande Bretagne dans tous les hôtels et toutes les maisons publiques ... – <public houses> – c’est bien différent’; F. de Grand’Combe, *Tu viens en France* (Paris 1951) 69.

<sup>102</sup> See Herter 74-5.

<sup>103</sup> Boeckh, *Staatshaushaltung*<sup>3</sup> 1 404-5.

<sup>104</sup> See n. 66.

<sup>105</sup> For the meanings of τέγος, see above pp. 29-30.

<sup>106</sup> *Oeuvres complètes d’Hippocrate*, Vol. 8 (Paris 1853) 611.

<sup>107</sup> An anonymous reader for *JHS* acutely pointed out that in *Bacchae* 226-7 (ἄσας μὲν οὖν εἴληφα [i.e. Pentheus] δεσμίους χέρας / σώιζουσι πανδήμοισι πρόσπολοι στέγαις, ‘as many as I caught, servants are keeping with hands bound in the public house(s)’), the words πανδήμοισι στέγαις might mean brothel(s). The phrase is normally taken to mean prison (as Dodds *ad loc.*), but Pentheus could well have thought a brothel a suitable place of detention for women whose behaviour he saw as disreputable. The word στέγαις suits this interpretation, in view of the meaning of (σ)τέγος discussed above, and πάνδημος, like δημόσιος, can be used of common or disreputable love; see *LSJ* s. v. πάνδημος II.



looking'. With this interpretation we obtain a very satisfactory coherence in the whole provision about roof and window. Duchêne's idea that the first ban was to protect the roofs of public buildings from damage, and the second to prevent women observing religious processions, which were not permitted to them, was always vulnerable to the question why the women were only prevented from seeing these ceremonies from *public* buildings.<sup>108</sup> With οἰκίων τῶν δημοσίων meaning brothels, we have the explicit wording which, in Duchêne's reading, seemed to be absent, and there can no longer be any doubt whatever about the meaning of both prohibitions.

The correct understanding of the provisions about roof and window allows a reconsideration of the general interpretation of the document as a whole. But, first, it also offers the solution of a detailed problem in lines 44-5. Here, after a designation of an area, which may be presumed to be the central part of the city (41-4),<sup>109</sup> we meet the words, ἐν τῷ μέσῳ τούτων κοπρὸν μὴ ἐσβα-/λλέτω μηδὲ προιστάσθω, which Duchêne translates (34) 'au milieu de cet espace, on ne jettéra ni n'entassera d'ordures'. As Duchêne rightly states (57), βάλλω and its compounds provide the normal Greek term for throwing rubbish;<sup>110</sup> προῖστημι, however, has no such associations, and the meaning that Duchêne gives to it, 'to pile up', is unexampled and not at all close to the attested uses of the verb.<sup>111</sup> Duchêne has two reasons for his opinion that προιστάσθω also governs the accusative κοπρὸν, first, the order of the words, and, secondly, his belief that προιστάσθω must be transitive. The order of words, by which κοπρὸν precedes both prohibitions, is thought to require that both verbs govern the noun in the accusative. But that is not necessary, as another provision in the document shows (3-5): ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ταύτῃ ὁδὸν μὴ ποιέτω μηδὲ ὑδ[ρευ-]/έτω κτλ, 'in this street do not make a threshold, and do not draw water etc.'<sup>112</sup> The resemblance is exact: first the topographical indication, then a prohibition, in which the object is placed before μὴ and its verb, and then a different prohibition attached by μηδέ.

προιστάσθω is rightly identified by Duchêne as third person singular of the present imperative of what he takes to be the middle voice. So he states that it must be transitive and the meaning 'to prostitute oneself' is excluded.<sup>113</sup> But it could also be passive, and the passive certainly is used of prostitution.<sup>114</sup> We have already noted the passage Xen. Ephes. 5.17.1,<sup>115</sup> where προστησομένην, which is either passive or middle, means to be made to stand, or to stand, in front, i.e. to be made to be, or to be, a prostitute. The use of προῖστημι for 'to be a prostitute', 'to solicit as a prostitute', is very common,<sup>116</sup> and the verb can stand alone in this sense. See, e.g., Joannes Chryostomus, in *Eph. hom.* 15.3 (Migne, *Patrologia Graeca* lxii 109), in a context about prostitution:

<sup>108</sup> As Gauthier observed, *Bull. Épig.* (1993) 395.

<sup>109</sup> For attempts to define this area more closely, see Duchêne 101-6 and J.-Y. Marc, 'L'agora de Thasos', in *L'espace grec* (Paris 1996) 105-13.

<sup>110</sup> He is able to cite good epigraphical parallels from Thasos itself.

<sup>111</sup> It is enough to cite *LSJ* s.v. Duchêne's suggestion (57) that the προ- could also express intention seems pure fantasy, and such a nuance would, in any case, be quite out of place in the practical and down-to-earth language of the document.

<sup>112</sup> The incompleteness of the text here makes the precise sense of ὑδ[ρευ-]έτω uncertain; see Duchêne 45.

<sup>113</sup> Duchêne 57 with n. 90.

<sup>114</sup> *LSJ* s.v. προῖστημι, B.4. The passage from Vettius Valens there cited has, however, nothing to do with prostitution; see J.-F. Bara, *Vettius Valens d'Antioche, Anthologie Livre I* (Leiden 1989) 81.

<sup>115</sup> Above p. 29.

<sup>116</sup> See Herter 87.

μυρία πρότερον λαιδορησαμένη τῆι ἀθλίῳ καὶ ταλαιπώρῳ, Θεσσαλίδα, δραπέτριαν, προεστῶσαν καλοῦσα κτλ.,

‘After having thrown myriad insults at the wretched and suffering girl, calling her Thessalian [i.e. witch], runaway slave, prostitute ...’.

The Latin equivalent of προῖστημι, *prosto*, is the origin of our word ‘prostitute’. In view of the certain prohibition of some practices of prostitution in lines 30-5, there is no doubt that in line 45 μηδὲ προιστάσθω means ‘and not to stand (be made to stand) in front’, i.e. ‘not to solicit as a prostitute’.

For the general interpretation of the document two analogies are important. The first is the great *Astunomoi* inscription from Pergamum, which lays down building and street regulations.<sup>117</sup> The Pergamene inscription is, therefore, parallel to the Thasian in its general purpose and character, and Duchêne is able to use analogies from it for three specific provisions of the ‘stele from the harbour’:<sup>118</sup> the prohibition of building thresholds on the street (lines 3-4); the requirement that streets be kept clean and passable (lines 19-30); and the ban on pouring water into the street from upper storeys (lines 36-8). Not all these analogies are exact, however, and the gap in time between the two documents is considerable. The actual inscription from Pergamum dates from Roman imperial times, but the law it records is called royal, so there is general agreement that the regulations are Hellenistic.<sup>119</sup>

The second analogy, *Ath. Pol.* 50.2, is more satisfactory, both chronologically and in content. In this passage the duties of the *astunomoi* at Athens and Piraeus are described. Duchêne cites from it, as parallels for the ‘stele from the harbour’, the prohibition of building in the streets, of balconies projecting over the street, and of pipes from above discharging water into the streets.<sup>120</sup> The part of the passage that he actually quotes (70) also contains their control of the *koprologoi* and the ban on windows opening onto the street.

While Duchêne had no reason to refer to the duty of the *astunomoi* to arrange for the taking up of those who died in the streets, it was an important omission that he never refers to their control of female musicians. They had to see that no one paid more than two drachmae to hire one of these women, and to arrange for casting of lots, if several people were eager to hire the same woman. This information is confirmed by Hyperides’ statement (4.3) that men have been impeached for hiring flute girls for more than the law prescribes. These women were *hetaerae* and the *astunomoi* were controlling a market which took place, as has been noted,<sup>121</sup> at a fixed time and place, in the streets. We have already seen that there was a tax on prostitutes at Athens, which was farmed out,<sup>122</sup> so the tax farmers must have kept a register of the women engaged in the trade. We may be hesitant to believe that Solon established prostitutes at Athens,<sup>123</sup> but the state’s interest in prostitution is clear. So the duties of the *astunomoi* described in *Ath. Pol.* 50.2 included some which are in general analogous to the measures about prostitution in the ‘stele from the harbour’.

<sup>117</sup> Ditt. *OGIS* 483, but see the republication by G. Klaffenbach, ‘Die Astynomeninschrift von Pergamon’, *Abhand. Akad. Berlin*, No. 6, 1954.

<sup>118</sup> Duchêne 45-7, 55.

<sup>119</sup> See Klaffenbach’s discussion 19-25.

<sup>120</sup> Duchêne 44-6, 55.

<sup>121</sup> See Rhodes’ commentary *ad loc.*, 574. The abundant evidence that the female musicians also served as prostitutes is given by Herter 97 n. 509. Theophrastus, *Char.* 20.10, is explicit.

<sup>122</sup> See above p. 37.

<sup>123</sup> Athenaeus, *Deipn.* 13.569 d-f..

It may even be that the Thasian inscription throws light on an obscurity in the passage of the *Ath. Pol.* Commentators have found it hard to understand the prevention of windows opening on the street (κωλύουσι ... καὶ τὰς θυρίδας εἰς τὴν ὁδὸν ἀνοίγειν). Some even thought that θυρίδας should mean 'doors' here, but Sandys easily refuted that in his commentary.<sup>124</sup> So the consensus has been that the aim of the prohibition was to prevent the outward-opening shutters of Greek windows from falling and injuring people in the street.<sup>125</sup> That explanation has always seemed very lame. Guided by the provision in the 'stele from the harbour', we may now suggest that the purpose of the Athenian regulation was to prevent the use of windows for purposes of prostitution.

The two analogies we have been looking at are concerned with building and street regulations, and those alone. *Prima facie* that is also true of the 'stele from the harbour'. Duchêne (41), however, believes that the Thasian regulations are founded on a sacred law, which organized one or more religious festivals, and which established the itinerary of their processions. For these it was necessary to prepare the main places, buildings and sanctuaries.<sup>126</sup> In support of this interpretation he adduced two Attic inscriptions, *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 380 (= Ditt. *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 313) and 659 (= Ditt. *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 375). The first, which dates from 320/19 BC, orders the *agoranomoi* in the Piraeus to clean up the *agora* and the streets where the procession for Zeus Soter and Dionysus took place. The second, which dates from 287/6 BC, makes the *astunomoi* responsible for the cleansing and repair of the sanctuary of Aphrodite Pandemos in preparation for her festival. Since both these decrees expressly mention the festivals for which the cleaning and repairing activities are required, they do not so much support Duchêne's hypothesis as tell against it. As for the supposed internal indications in its favour, they have been removed by our discussion of the provisions of lines 30-5. Gauthier expressed the opinion that Duchêne's interpretation was possible, but nothing proved it. We can now go further. There is nothing about religion in the 'stele from the harbour'. The gods appear solely as recipients of fines and topographical markers. In the second capacity they are very important for our knowledge of the topography of the city of Thasos, but that is a topic to which I might turn elsewhere.

A.J. GRAHAM

*University of Pennsylvania*

<sup>124</sup> J.E. Sandys, *Aristotle's Constitution of Athens*<sup>2</sup> (London 1912) 196-7.

<sup>125</sup> See Rhodes' commentary *ad loc.*, 575.

<sup>126</sup> Duchêne's interpretation was briefly discussed by Gauthier, *Bull. Épig.* (1993) 395 (p. 526).