

evidence from Plutarch is ambiguous, and Aristophanes for his part twice treats long moustaches as a defining feature of Spartans or Spartan sympathizers. Emendation to change the meaning in Antiphanes fr. 46 is therefore unnecessary, although the correct reading remains uncertain. Casaubon's *φορεῖν*, although without his interpretation of *καταφρονέει*, is possible; *καταφρονέω* can govern an infinitive, although there are no other examples in comedy.¹⁶ Ruhnken's *ρόφει* is perhaps better.¹⁷ He himself cited Ar. *Eq.* 51 as a parallel; the verb appears elsewhere in Antiphanes at fr. 185.5 K-A and is used in reference to *ζωμός* at e.g. Ar. *Pax* 716. *καταφρονέω* seldom, if ever, governs the accusative in comedy, but E. *Ba.* 503 provides a parallel.¹⁸ Unlike the two passages in Aristophanes, the fragment of Antiphanes, as emended by either Casaubon or Ruhnken, offers nothing explicit about the length of the moustaches but instead requires that it be understood from the context; this understanding is perhaps easier with Ruhnken's text. At any rate, it seems clear that Antiphanes' command that a fourth-century Laconizer not despise wearing a moustache, presumably long, reflects a standard stereotype about Spartan customs rather than a textual anomaly to be emended away.¹⁹

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

B. W. MILLIS

¹⁷ The corruption is easily paralleled; cf. A. E. Housman, *Classical Papers* (Cambridge, 1972), i.68, 220.

¹⁸ Cf. Dodds ad loc. and on 286 for the tendency of verbs compounded in *κατα-* to become transitive.

¹⁹ For their helpful criticism, I owe many thanks to S. D. Olson, D. Sansone, and the anonymous reader.

A NEW FRAGMENT ON NIOBE AND THE TEXT OF PROPERTIUS 2.20.8*

Michael Choniates (c. 1138–c. 1222), a pupil of Eustathius of Thessalonica, who was Greek Orthodox Metropolitan of Athens for some 25 years up to that city's capture by Frankish crusaders in A.D. 1205,¹ is best known to classical scholars as the possessor of probably the last complete copy of Callimachus' *Hecale* and *Aetia*.² He had brought with him from Constantinople many books of all kinds, and added to his collection when in Athens.³ Although an immense task, it would be well worth trying to identify all Michael's classical allusions, as an indication of how much ancient Greek literature was still available just before Constantinople too succumbed to the crusaders. That enquiry might produce a number of otherwise unknown quotations; it is with one such fragment that I am here concerned.

When lamenting the death of his brother Nicetas, Michael writes as follows (1.346.13–20 Lambros):

*I am most grateful to Dr S. J. Heyworth and Mr N. G. Wilson for comments on an earlier draft of this paper.

¹ See N. G. Wilson, *Scholars of Byzantium* (London, 1983), pp. 204–6, A. Kashdan (ed.), *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium* (New York and Oxford, 1991), vol. I, pp. 427–8 s.v. Choniates, Michael. His writings in prose and verse were published by S. P. Lambros (2 vols., Athens, 1879 and 1880).

² See my Oxford (1990) edition of Callimachus' *Hecale*, pp. 38–40. In *ZPE* 115 (1997), 55–6, I suggest that Michael may provide a clue to the link between *Hecale* frs. 1 and 2 H. It is odd that he never mentions Callimachus by name.

³ Vol. 2, p. 295, lines 20–2 ed. Lambros.

καίτοι καὶ εἰς τινα στήλην μεταβαλὼν εἴτε λαίην καὶ μυθικὴν καὶ κωφὰ ῥέουσιν δάκρυα, εἴτε γραφικὴν καὶ καλουμένην ἄλως, . . . οὐδ' οὕτως ἂν τῆς Ἀδραστείας τὴν νέμεσιν διαπέφενγα διαρκεστέραν τίσιν ὑποσχών, τοῦτ' αὐτὸ τοῦ δι' αἰῶνος ἐκκείσθαι πᾶσιν ἐπὶ θεομηνίαι στήλιτεύμενος.

It seems clear that κωφὰ ῥέουσιν | δάκρυα is a quotation (previously unknown)⁴ from a hexameter or elegiac poem. Although other women were petrified,⁵ much the most famous person to suffer this fate was Niobe,⁶ who, like Michael, mourned for her family. And κωφὰ would suit Niobe very well: her grief-stricken silence (even before transformation) contrasts with the earlier loquacity which ruined her.⁷ So the probability that Michael's fragment refers to Niobe must be extremely high. I suspect that his (otherwise puzzling) mention of Adrasteia continues the allusion to the myth of Niobe in the same poetic source. At least Nonnus, *Dionysiaca* 48.408 τίς φθόνος, εἰ λίθον ἄλλον ὑπὲρ Σπύλοιο τελέσσω,⁸ suggests that in some earlier poem Nemesis played a part in Niobe's transformation. That seems reasonable enough: Niobe's offence was suitable for the goddess' attention, and her 'Phrygian' homeland (loosely defined, as usual) would make her a near neighbour of Adrasteia.⁹ In this view, Niobe's transformation is a further punishment,¹⁰ not a merciful release.¹¹

Other traces of the same poetic treatment of Niobe may perhaps be found in the commentaries of Michael's teacher Eustathius. On *Iliad* 24.616ff.¹² Eustathius discusses the myth at vast length, and refers to a version given by τῶν τις παλαιῶν ἐποποιῶν.¹³ Although he does not quote verbatim, some of his phrases seem

⁴ I am grateful to Dr Dirk Obbink for confirming this point after consultation with the computer. A glance at Michael's hexameter verse (2, pp. 375–93) should suffice to show that this elegant phrase is not his own composition.

⁵ See P. M. C. Forbes Irving, *Metamorphosis in Greek Myths* (Oxford, 1990), pp. 139–48.

⁶ στήλη is probably not the word which Michael would have chosen for Niobe alone, but he needs a noun which will cover both his mythical and his scriptural (γραφικὴν) example (Lot's wife turned into a pillar of salt, from *Genesis* 19.26). Also, as Mr N. G. Wilson points out, there is a wordplay between στήλη and στήλιτεύμενος ('posted', or even 'pilloried'). I learn from Miss R. Atanassova that Niobe is linked with Lot's wife in Clement of Alexandria (*Protrepticus* 103.4), and that the detailed transformation of Lot's wife in Prudentius (*Hamartigenia* 742ff.) strongly recalls Niobe.

⁷ Cf. Cicero, *Tusc. Disp.* 3.63 'Niobe fingitur lapidea propter aeternum, credo, in luctu silentium'. In Aeschylus' *Niobe*, the heroine sat silent by her children's tomb, uttering no word until the play was well advanced. See Aristophanes, *Frogs* 911–24 with *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* vol. 3, Aeschylus (ed. S. Radt [Göttingen, 1985]), pp. 265ff.; O. P. Taplin, *HSCP* 76 (1972), 60–2; W. S. Barrett in *The Papyrus Fragments of Sophocles*, an Edition with Prolegomena and Commentary by Richard Carden with a Contribution by W. S. Barrett (Berlin and New York 1974), pp. 171–235, especially pp. 171–4 and 223–35. Barrett is particularly concerned with Sophocles' *Niobe*, but also deals with other tragic accounts, and with the legend in general.

⁸ Nemesis speaks of Aura, who has insulted Artemis.

⁹ In Aeschylus fr. 158.2 Radt Niobe's father Tantalus says of his homeland ἐνθ' Ἀδραστείας ἔδος.

¹⁰ As in Quintus of Smyrna 1.305 μακάρων ὄλοδον χόλον ἐκτελέουσα.

¹¹ As Ζεὺς ἐλέησας . . . in the *Iliad* scholion connected with Euphron fr. 102 Powell (to be discussed below).

¹² M. van der Valk (ed.) *Eustathii Commentarii ad Iliadem Pertinentes*, vol. 4 (Leiden, 1987), p. 962.4ff.

¹³ 4.963.23 van der Valk. The epithet παλαιῶν does not favour a pre-Hellenistic poet; nor does it exclude Quintus of Smyrna, to whom van der Valk (see his note *ibid.*) would give the reference. The unnamed poet apparently stressed that the rock looked like a woman only from afar, not when viewed from nearby. That accords with Q.S. 1.302–4. But the poetic phrases which appear in Eustathius (see below) are not drawn from Quintus, and if (as I suspect) Eustathius and Michael have in mind the same poet, Michael's verbatim quotation shows that he is not Quintus of Smyrna.

strongly poetical: *καταρρέειν δάκρυον* (4.963.16–17),¹⁴ ὕδωρ καταλείβειν (*ibid.* 18), *καταστάζειν ἔτι δάκρυον* (*ibid.* 20), and (in his Commentary on Dionysius Periegetes 87)¹⁵ ὕδωρ ἀέναον καταρρεῖ. It is not inconceivable that *καταρρέειν δάκρυον* might represent the very words quoted by Michael, *ρέουσιν | δάκρυα*. Since Michael was able to quote the text verbatim, his teacher Eustathius could probably have done the same (and named the author) had he so chosen.

The most favoured candidate for Eustathius' 'ancient hexameter poet' has been Euphorion of Chalcis,¹⁶ on the basis of an *Iliad* scholiast who describes Niobe's transformation as follows: *θρηνοῦσαν οὖν τὴν Νιόβην τὸ τοιοῦτο δυστύχημα Ζεὺς ἐλέησας εἰς λίθον μετέβαλεν, ὡς καὶ μέχρι νῦν ἐν Σιπύλῳ τῆς Φρυγίας ὁράται παρὰ πάντων πηγὰς δακρύων προίεμένη*, adding *ἡ ἱστορία παρὰ Εὐφορίῳ* (fr. 102 Powell). In such a case one cannot know whether the named poet recounted the whole myth or merely referred to some part of it. This doubt applies particularly strongly to Euphorion, who was much given to brief mythological allusion. And the summarizer who names just one source may in fact be producing a version conflated from several. The above summary stresses the visibility of Niobe's rock (*ὁράται παρὰ πάντων*), but does not mention the point in which Eustathius is interested—that the rock only looked like a woman from afar. On the other hand the designation *ἐποποιός* in Eustathius would suit Euphorion well, since (apart from two elegiac epigrams) all his poetry which we know was written in hexameters.¹⁷

Comparing Michael's allusion to Niobe with the *Iliad* scholion which mentions Euphorion,¹⁸ we find a similar stress on Niobe's rock as an enduring monument (. . . 'being exposed to everyone for all time'). But the scholiast has nothing about Adrasteia; indeed Niobe's transformation is an act of mercy by Zeus (*Ζεὺς ἐλέησας*) rather than part of the punishment ('posted as an example of divine wrath').¹⁹ Such differences by no means prove that Michael is not quoting from Euphorion, but alternative sources should clearly be considered. Callimachus (to whom Michael had special access) is always a possibility; he wrote on Niobe in the Second Hymn (22–4), but we have no indication that he mentioned her in the *Aetia* or *Hecale*.²⁰ One might also make a case for the *Heteroeumena* of Nicander. To judge from the paraphrase of

¹⁴ At this point Eustathius is ostensibly summarizing Palaephatus, though no such phrase occurs in the surviving abridgment of N. Festa (ed.), Palaephatus 8 (*Mythographi Graeci* vol. 3, 2 [Leipzig, 1902]).

¹⁵ See F. Vian, *Recherches sur les Posthomerica de Quintus de Smyrne* (Paris, 1959), pp. 131–3, arguing, reasonably, that the passages in Eustathius' two commentaries go back to the same source.

¹⁶ E.g. in Vian's book (n. 15 above) though with varying degrees of confidence: p. 132 'sans doute Euphorion', but p. 133 'Qu'il s'agisse d'Euphorion ou d'un épique plus ancien'.

¹⁷ ὁ ἐποποιός is a regular designation of Euphorion in Athenaeus (e.g. 4.182e). As for Eustathius' knowledge of Euphorion, nearly all the references and quotations can be found in surviving secondary literature earlier than Eustathius; the exceptions are frs. 52 and 171 Powell, though these too may be derived from secondary literature now lost rather than directly from the text of Euphorion. But the poetic colouring in Eustathius' accounts of the Niobe myth (above) does suggest direct access to a lost poetic source, whether Euphorion or some other writer.

¹⁸ I have not noticed any trace of Euphorion elsewhere in Michael's writings.

¹⁹ This phrase clearly includes Lot's wife.

²⁰ If Michael's source were Callimachus' elegiac *Aetia*, then the author of Eustathius' version of Niobe (described as *τῶν τις παλαιῶν ἐποποιῶν*) must almost certainly have been a different poet.

Antoninus Liberalis, the *Heteroeumena* concentrated on transformations which produced a surviving local landmark, combining metamorphosis with aetiology.²¹ Michael certainly possessed a text of Nicander, and shows detailed knowledge of the *Theriaca*;²² perhaps his manuscript contained other Nicandean poems as well.²³ And there were, of course, other transformation poems, e.g. the *Metamorphoses* by Parthenius of Nicaea (*Supplementum Hellenisticum* 636–7).

Although it is hardly possible to prove whether or not Eustathius and Michael refer to the same poetic treatment of Niobe, or to establish the identity of the author(s), I suspect that Michael's source was a poet distinguished enough to have been imitated by Propertius. The most striking feature of our new fragment is the use of the verb *ῥέω* with an internal accusative, *ῥέουσιν | δάκρυα*. This is rare, and not attested before the Hellenistic age,²⁴ but can be paralleled in Theocritus 5.124 *Ἰμέρα ἀνθ' ὕδατος ῥείτω γάλα* and 126 *ῥείτω χά Συβαρίτις ἐμὴν μέλι*.²⁵ I would like to suggest that the new fragment can throw light on the disputed text of Prop. 2.20.8. The pentameter

²¹ See Forbes Irving (n. 5 above), pp. 19–32 (especially p. 27), and e.g. my edition of Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 8 (Oxford, 1970) on lines 719–20.

²² The passage of Michael is of considerable interest, and provides a good example of the way in which he mixes classical with Biblical allusions. I translate Mich. Chon. 2.206.5–11, where Michael conveys thanks to his young friend Georgios 'both for making a copy of Nicander and for doing so from such an original, which seemed to be a closed book for reading, in my opinion, to everyone but him; it had been written in such very ancient letters, as if they belonged to a different language, and these blotted and faint, so that one could more easily discern the track of a serpent across a rock—something that not even Solomon [*Proverbs* 30.9] knew—than the hexameter treatise on snakes which the book contained. Nonetheless, treating my instructions as a further commandment from the Lord, which brings light to the eyes [*Psalms* 19.8], he accurately surveyed what could not be espied [*οὐκ ἐπίσπτα*, probably from Aratus, *Phaen.* 25], read the Nicandean *Theriaca* which were beyond the range [*οὐχ ἄλωτά*, perhaps from Sophocles, *OT* 111] of ordinary eyes, and made a copy, hunting down the reptiles as not even a deer can do [Nicander, *Ther.* 141–4], or that most sharp-sighted of birds [the eagle—see *Ther.* 448ff.]. Later, however, Michael seems less pleased with Georgios, ending a letter curtly (without final salutation!): *τὸν Νικάνδρον οὐπα ἀπέστειλας* (2.242.24—it is unclear whether he refers to the original or to the copy). As for the manuscript written 'in very old letters, as if they belonged to a different language' (2.206.8, *ἀρχαιοτάτοις καὶ οἷον ἑτερογλώσσοις . . . στοιχείοις*), one naturally thinks of an uncial text. Mr N. G. Wilson, however, is surprised that Michael should have had such difficulty with uncial script, and suggests that he may be referring to an early, experimental form of minuscule (perhaps c. A.D. 800), which can be very hard to read.

²³ Eustathius' *τῶν τις παλαιῶν ἐποποιῶν* would suit Nicander too, since nearly all the Nicandean poems are in hexameters. The Delphians in 254/3 B.C. (*SIG*³ 452) granted privileges to Nicander of Colophon *ἐπέων ποιηταί*. It seems beyond doubt that there were two poets called Nicander, the younger of whom flourished perhaps c. 200 B.C.; see Alan Cameron, *Callimachus and his Critics* (Princeton, 1995), pp. 199–205. I suspect, however, that the existence of two Nicanders was forgotten as early as the first century B.C., leaving scholarly squabbles about a single Nicander's date and parentage.

²⁴ I wonder (though there is no evidence in the ancient scholia) whether it might have sprung from scholarly interpretation of *Odyssey* 9.140–1 *αὐτὰρ ἐπὶ κρατὸς λιμένος ῥέει ἀγλαὸν ὕδωρ | κρήνη ὑπὸ σπέλιος*. The possibility of taking *ὕδωρ* there as an internal accusative is mentioned by J. Chadwick, *Lexicographica Graeca* (Oxford, 1996), pp. 248–9, although he (like editors, who put a comma after line 140) prefers to take *ὕδωρ* as nominative, with *κρήνη* in apposition.

²⁵ Also in later Greek prose (LSJ s.v. *ῥέω* II.2). The compound *πορεύω* is more often used with internal accusative, as in *H.H.* 3.380 *πορεύειν καλλίρροον ὕδωρ*, Ap. Rh. 3.225 *ἢ δ' ἄρ' ὕδωρ πορεύσκε* (see Malcolm Campbell ad loc. (*A Commentary on Apollonius Rhodius, Argonautica III.1–471* [Leyden, 1994], pp. 206–7), who adds [*Orph.*, Arg. 1132]).

(which I quote with its preceding hexameter)²⁶ appears as follows in the codex Neapolitanus:²⁷

nec tantum Niobe, bis sex ad busta superba,
sollicito lacrimas defluit a Sipylo.

The objection commonly brought against this reading of line 8 is that *defluere* with an accusative is not found before the time of Ambrose. Certainly 'lacrimas defluit' is a bold expression, but no more so than 'carmen hiare' in Prop. 2.31.6 'marmoreus tacita carmen hiare lyra'. In both cases an erudite Roman reader would surely have realized that the poet was operating in Greek mode. We can point to a specific model for 2.31.6 in Callimachus, *hymn* 2.24 *μάρμαρον ἀντὶ γυναικὸς διζυρόν τι χανοῦσης*—not an idle reminiscence,²⁸ since the punishment of Niobe illustrates the power of Apollo and was depicted on the doors of the Palatine temple (Prop. 2.31.14). *ῥέουσιν* | *δάκρυα* in the new fragment could similarly provide a model for 'lacrimas defluit'.²⁹ Propertius' 'carmen hiare' found one imitator in the first century A.D. (Persius 5.3 'fabula seu maesto ponatur hianda tragoedo'); 'lacrimas defluit', so far as we know, did not. But the two phrases are equally comprehensible by analogy with Greek, and the absence of an imitation need not tell against 'lacrimas defluit' in Prop. 2.20.8.³⁰

Keble College, Oxford

A. S. HOLLIS

²⁶ Note, however, that 'superba', in cod. Paris. 8458 (saec. XV), is no doubt a conjecture (see n. 30 below); the main manuscripts have 'superb(a)e'.

²⁷ Dr Heyworth tells me that 'the reading of the Poggian manuscripts is split; T and S (the most reliable) agreeing with N in reading "lacrimas"; the others following the Petrarchan tradition. Contamination is probably responsible; but this might be one of those cases where the archetype had alternatives.' The variant 'lacrimans' for 'lacrimas' has been printed by several editors. Conjectures include 'lacrimas depluit' (Scaliger, printed in G. P. Goold's 1990 Loeb), 'sollicito lacrimans defluit os Sipylo' (Housman, with 'Niobae . . . superbae' in the hexameter), 'lacrima sollicito defluit a Sipylo' (Phillimore, also with 'Niobae . . . superbae'). I would prefer the reading of N to any of these.

²⁸ For discussion of the two passages together, see S. J. Heyworth, 'Some Allusions to Callimachus in Latin Poetry', *MD* 33 (1994), 51–79 at pp. 56–9.

²⁹ And perhaps also for Ovid, *Met.* 6.312 'lacrimas [v.l. 'lacrimis'] etiam nunc marmora manant'. The exact equivalent for *defluo* would be *καταρρέω*. Although LSJ do not recognize the use of that verb with internal accusative, note the phrases in Eustathius on Niobe (discussed above) *καταρρέειν δάκρυον* and *ῥῥωρ ἀέναον καταρρεῖ*, which look as though they come from an ancient poem, perhaps even the poem from which Michael drew his quotation. It is possible that *κατά*, whether or not in tmesis with *ῥέουσιν*, stood earlier in the first line, e.g. <εἰσέτι νῦν στυφελοῦ πέτρης κάτω> *κωφά ῥέουσιν* | *δάκρυα*.

³⁰ Dr Heyworth (as a future editor of Propertius) warns me that vindication of 'lacrimas defluit' would not remove all the difficulties which have been felt over the couplet 2.20.7–8: 'Housman's point [*The Classical Papers of A. E. Housman*, edd. J. Diggle and F. R. D. Goodyear (Cambridge, 1972), (vol. 1) pp. 270–1] that we would expect *in*, not *a Sipylo* still seems to hold good; Shackleton Bailey [*Propertiana* (Cambridge, 1956), pp. 102–3] produced reason for doubting the conjecture *superba*; and I have yet to see any cogent explanation of *sollicito*' (S.J.H.).