

eagles, and that the appearance was ominous. The writer of *λήμασι* conceived the difference to lie in the *tempers* of the princes, Agamemnon being conspicuously brave, Menelaus *μαλθακὸς αἰχμητῆς* (*Il.* 17, 588, cited by Plato *Symp.* 174 c). The eagle with white feathers in the tail and wings was commonly called *πύγαργος* (Schol. on *v.* 117 ὁ ἐξοπίσω λευκός, ὃ ἐστὶν ὁ πύγαργος), and the word, whether because this species though larger than others was not so strong or for other reasons, was applied to *cowards*: *πύγαργος εἶδος αἰετοῦ*. Σοφοκλῆς ἐπὶ τοῦ δειλοῦ. ἀπὸ τῆς λευκῆς πρυγῆς (*Soph. fr.* 962 A). Cf. the proverb 'showing the white feather', and see L. and Sc. *s.v.* *πύγαργος*.

Such is the ancient and traditional explanation, but it is far from satisfactory. For *first* Menelaus was not a coward or unwarlike. He is *βοῆν ἀγαθός* and his prowess is frequently celebrated. Plato, who requires for the sake of a jest to suppose him unwarlike, makes the most of a single expression divorced from the context, which shows it to be a mere insinuation made for the purpose of the moment. In this very passage of Aeschylus the epithet *μαχίμους* seems to be inserted to prevent any misconception. *Secondly* if the fact were so, it would be strange that Calchas should imply such an ignominy in the presence of Menelaus and his army. *Thirdly* *ιδών* points to *visible* difference. *Fourthly* part of the present symbol, or at least something closely resembling it, is found in Sophocles (*Ant.* 114) with an explanation. There 'the eagle with snow-white wings' stands for the *Argives* (in the narrower sense, the people of *Argos*) distinguished by their white shields. Note also that in the passage before us not only does the word *πύγαργος* not occur, but there is nothing definitely referring to the tail at all. The words are 'white-marked at the back'.

Putting this together, we may well believe that the difference which Calchas 'saw' was not in the characters of the brothers, but in *the shields slung upon their backs*, and consequently that *λήμασι* is a false correction of some word unknown. These considerations or some of them led Haupt to propose *λέμμασι* and Pleitner *σήμασι*. But no known or credible meaning of *λέμμα* will fit, and it is not the *emblems* (*σήματα*) of the shields to which we are directed by the passage in Sophocles, but their colours. Certainty in such a matter is impossible, but a word which would fit all the conditions is the derivative, whatever it should be, not of *λα-* but of *λιφ-* to *paint*—*λίμμα*, *ἄλιμμα*, *λείμμα* or *ἄλειμμα*. That this stem (like the Latin *lin-ere*) originally had this sense is shown by the use of *ἀλείφειν* (*μίλτω*, *ψιμυθίω* etc., see L. and Sc. *s.v.*): *λίμμασι δισσοῦς different in their tincts* gives the sense we should seek. Critically it is little less probable than *λήμασι* itself. The type