

## ARISTOPHANES, *LYSISTRATE* 277–80

ὥχετο θῶπλα παραδούς ἐμοί,  
σμικρὸν ἔχων τρῦώνιον,  
πεινῶν, ῥυπῶν, ἀπαράτιλτος,  
ἐξ ἐτῶν ἄλουτος.

When Kleomenes seized the Athenian Akropolis (in 508/7 BC), he was forced to surrender and leave Attika. Why was he wearing a very short cloak? Wilamowitz (in his note ad loc.) thought it was because he had to give up part of his clothing when he surrendered. But in fact Spartans always wore scanty clothing; being unwashed for six years cannot have been a condition of surrender after a siege lasting only two days (Hdt. 5.72.2); and clearly the whole of 278–80 is not an account of the conditions of surrender, but an expression of the Athenians' amusement or disgust at the normal appearance of Spartans.

The Athenian view of the normal appearance and life-style of Spartans is given also in *Birds* 1282; ἐκόμουν, ἐπείνων, ἐρρύπων, ἐσωκράτουν; long hair, scanty food, dirtiness, scanty clothing. All the same features are mentioned in *Lys.* 277–80, which actually uses two of the same verbs: besides the reference to the short cloak we have πεινῶν (the reading of Γ, not to be removed in favour of R's πινῶν) referring to the meagre diet, ῥυπῶν and ἐξ ἐτῶν ἄλουτος to the dirtiness.

The remaining feature of Spartans mentioned in *Birds* 1282, long hair, appears to be represented in *Lys.* 279 by ἀπαράτιλτος. But that presents a problem. The Spartans let the hair on their heads grow long. The alternative would have been to cut it or shave their heads; but ἀπαράτιλτος does not mean 'unshorn' or 'unshaven', but 'unplucked'. The verb παρατίλλειν normally refers to plucking out pubic hair, which women did to beautify themselves (*Lys.* 89, 151, *Frogs* 516). A seducer might have his pubic hair pulled out as a punishment (*Wealth* 168), and a man passing time idly is said to pull out his hairs (*Acharnians* 31). But normal Athenian men were just as much 'unplucked' as Spartan men. An Athenian would not think it odd or remarkable that Kleomenes was ἀπαράτιλτος, and indeed, unless his cloak was quite exceptionally short, would not be able to see whether he was ἀπαράτιλτος or not. There is no evidence that this word can be used to refer to having long hair on the head, for which the word is κομῶν or κομήτης, as *Birds* 1282 indicates.

Emendation of line 279 has been suggested before, on metrical grounds. The latest discussion is by Jeffrey Henderson in *CQ* N.S. 29 (1979), 53–5. He rightly says 'The metre is essentially iambic dimeter', but nevertheless defends ἀπαράτιλτος as a trochaic metron. Now, it is true that a lyric passage may contain both iambic and trochaic metra, but when that happens there is usually a considerable number of each, and in comedy they are usually separated from each other fairly clearly. 'The ins and outs of iambic and trochaic metre rarely give rise to any ambiguity in comedy' (A. M. Dale, *The Lyric Metres of Greek Drama*<sup>2</sup>, p. 93). *Frogs* 209 ff., to which Henderson refers, is not an adequate parallel for the phenomenon of a single trochaic metron on its own. Although we cannot say that such a thing is impossible, it is strange enough to arouse suspicion.

Thus ἀπαράτιλτος is suspect both for metre and for sense. The emendation which I propose in order to meet both objections is κομήτης. The parallel of *Birds* 1282 shows that this is right in sense. In metre, it makes an iambic dimeter catalectic, which is suitable; it does not create a problem of responsion, since in line 264 of the strophe μοχλοῖς δὲ καὶ κλήθροισιν (for R's μοχλοῖσιν . . .), making an iambic dimeter, was proposed by Brunck and is accepted in the Oxford and Budé texts. I assume that ἀπαράτιλτος is a gloss which has ousted κομήτης from the text. But why should anyone have thought of glossing κομήτης by ἀπαράτιλτος? The answer, I think, is in line 827. There the gloss κομήτης · ἀπαράτιλτος would be in place, and some scholiast has misguidedly transferred the equation to 279, where it does not belong.

*University of Glasgow*

DOUGLAS M. MACDOWELL