

not intrusive, there has been some corruption and/or disruption within it, possibly at an early stage of transmission when the text was not arranged colometrically. *ἡῦρε* . . . *μαρναμένους* would make good sense if *κοινὸν ἐννάλιον* were the object of an aorist participle such as *τελέσαντας*<sup>14</sup> ('She found at the Elektran gates her sons <who had completed> their mutual warfare with spears in the lotus-rearing meadow, like lions fighting [or 'fighting like lions'] at a lair'). *μάτηρ* would then no longer be inside the participle-phrase and would stand more easily as, or in apposition to, the subject of *ἡῦρε* ('She, their mother, found . . .'), although its position would still be striking.<sup>15</sup> Alternatively, *μάτηρ* itself might be a corruption of the needed participle. Either way, *ὥστε* . . . *μαρναμένους* would be a self-contained comparative clause. As for *ἐπὶ τραύμασιν* . . . *Ἄρης*, again the sense seems to require an additional participle:<sup>16</sup> '(and?)<sup>17</sup> <who had offered> now in their wounded state the chilly, gory libation of blood which Hades had been allotted and Ares had supplied.' This could be provided without disturbing the metre by deleting the pleonastic *αἵματος* (a gloss on *φονίαν*?) and inserting a participle such as *δόντας* (. . . *ἐπὶ τραύμασιν ἤδη | ψυχρὰν <δόντας> λοιβὰν φονίαν*).<sup>18</sup> Or *μαρναμένους* (not essential to the *ὥστε*-clause) might be a corruption of such a participle.

These suggestions can hardly be conclusive, but they may at least be of diagnostic value and help to support the contention that the passage is essentially genuine rather than intrusive.

*University of Calgary*

MARTIN CROPP

<sup>14</sup> *CQ*'s referee notes that similarity between a participle such as *τελέσαντας* and 1573 *ὥστε λέοντας* might have led to some textual disruption.

<sup>15</sup> *μάτηρ* could be shifted, e.g. by placing it before *λωτοτρόφον* and putting *λόγχαις* where *μάτηρ* now is; but such a displacement would be hard to explain. Mastronarde (on 1570–6) thinks the placement between *ἐννάλιον* and *μαρναμένους* is intended for pathetic effect.

<sup>16</sup> This was Paley's suggestion: 'Either some participle seems wanting... like *ἀποχευομένους* (cf. *Ion* 147), or we should read *ἐπὶ τραύμασί θ' αἵματος... λοιβὰν*, "a chilled (or congealed) outpouring of blood on their wounds". His second suggestion (anticipated by the reading *τραύμασι τ'* in ms. O) gives an unhappy zeugma: 'She found her sons fighting... and a chilled outpouring of blood on their wounds.' The Scholia also attempt to make the *λοιβάν*-phrase a second object to *ἡῦρε*, but asynchronously: *κοινὸν τὸ εὔρε· ὁ δὲ λόγος ἀσύνδετος· ἐπὶ τοῖς τραύμασιν εὔρε ψυχρὰν σπονδὴν αἵματος...* Musgrave proposed *τραύμασι δ'*.

<sup>17</sup> For suggestions to insert a connective (though to different effect) see previous note.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. 933 where Menoeceus must 'give gory blood as a libation to the ground', *φόνιον αἷμα γῆι δοῦναι χοάς*. For *δοῦναι* of offering libations (*χοαί*) cf. also *I.T.* 61, *Or.* 125, *Soph. Ant.* 902.

#### ANTIIPHANES FR. 46 K-A AND THE PROBLEM OF SPARTAN MOUSTACHES

ἐν Λακεδαίμονι  
γέγονας· ἐκείνων τῶν νόμων μεθεκτέον  
ἐστίν. βάδιζ' ἐπὶ δείπνον εἰς τὰ φιδίτια,  
ἀπόλαυε τοῦ ζωμοῦ, † φόρει τοὺς βύστακας.  
μὴ καταφρόνει, μηδ' ἕτερ' ἐπιζήτει καλά,  
ἐν τοῖς δ' ἐκείνων ἔθεσιν ἴσθ' ἀρχαϊκός

5

Lines 4–5 of Antiphanes fr. 46 K-A, an Athenian view of the stereotypical Spartan life, present several difficult, interrelated problems. The text as printed by Kassel–Austin is grammatically intelligible, although problematic, since *καταφρονέω* is used absolutely elsewhere in old or middle comedy only at *Amph.* fr. 1, where the

participle is used attributively and both the meaning of the verb and the text itself have been questioned.<sup>1</sup> The more serious problem is that wearing moustaches is listed with other typical Spartan customs, while most scholars have believed that Spartans kept their upper lips shaved. Casaubon was the first to articulate the problem and attempt a solution by emending *φόρει* to *φορεῖν* and making the infinitive dependent upon *καταφρόνει*.<sup>2</sup> In order to avoid having the Spartans wear moustaches, Casaubon, paraphrasing the clause as ‘ne ita mores Spartae asperneris, ut audeas in superiore labro pilos alere’, doubtfully claimed that *καταφρόνει* has a pregnant sense here and means ‘καταφρονῶν τόλμα’ or ‘prae contemptu aude aliquid’. Schweighäuser alone followed Casaubon completely. Most scholars have instead preferred Ruhnken’s *ρόφει* (‘slurp up’),<sup>3</sup> construing the lines as follows:

ἀπόλαυε τοῦ ζωμοῦ, ῥόφει· τοὺς βύστακας  
μὴ καταφρόνει, μηδ’...

Although this may present a tautology (*ἀπόλαυε, ῥόφει*) of a sort found nowhere else in this passage, and there are no other examples in comedy of *καταφρονέω* governing an accusative,<sup>4</sup> the more serious problem is Ruhnken’s very dubious assertion that here *βύστακας* means ‘beards’.<sup>5</sup> Meineke attempted to avoid this last problem by suggesting that *καταφρόνει* means the same thing as *κατανόει* or *ἐπιζήτει* (‘fixate upon’), although Van Herwerden correctly pointed out that this use is never found outside Ionic authors.<sup>6</sup> Emperius’ suggestion,<sup>7</sup>

ἀπόλαυε τοῦ ζωμοῦ, ξύρει τοὺς βύστακας,  
μὴ καταφρόνει, μηδ’...

like Kassel–Austin’s text, on the other hand, demands an absolute use of *καταφρόνει* which is unsuitable in this context.<sup>8</sup>

Lines 4–5 of this fragment have thus never been convincingly emended. Part of the problem would seem to be that most of the emendations which have been suggested are predicated upon the idea that the Spartans did not wear moustaches, so that a text which suggests that they did must be wrong.<sup>9</sup> In fact, the evidence for

<sup>1</sup> Although Men. *Epit.* 56 Körte may offer a grammatical parallel (cf. W. J. Verdenius, *Mnemosyne* IV 27 [1974], 21), the sense ‘don’t be haughty’ is at odds with the typical Spartan aloofness (e.g. Ar. *Pax* 623; Av. 1012–14).

<sup>2</sup> I. Casaubon, *Animadversiones in Athenaei Dipnosophistarum Libri XV*<sup>2</sup> (Lyons, 1621), p. 269. Kassel–Austin attribute this emendation to H. Richards, *Aristophanes and Others* (London, 1911), p. 76; Gulick in the Loeb *Athenaeus* ascribes it to J. Schweighäuser (ed.), *Athenaei Naucratis Deipnosophistarum Libri Quindecim* (Strasbourg, 1801–7), although Schweighäuser himself, v. 7 (1802), p. 472 rightly attributes it to Casaubon.

<sup>3</sup> Ruhnken’s emendation appears at D. Wyttenbach, *Animadversiones in Plutarchi De sera numinis vindicta* (Leiden, 1772), p. 25.

<sup>4</sup> The anonymous reader refers to com. adesp. fr. 1027.4 K–A (Men. fr. 722 Körte) *μὴ καταφρονήσης οἰκέτου συμβουλίας*, although K–A rightly accept Wilamowitz’ *συμβουλίας* for the papyrus’ *συμβουλίαν*.

<sup>5</sup> Ruhnken supports his claim with Hsch. β 1346 Latte, on which see below.

<sup>6</sup> *Observationes Criticae in Fragmenta Comicorum Graecorum* (Leiden, 1855), p. 46.

<sup>7</sup> A. Emperius, *Opuscula Philologica et Historica* (Göttingen, 1847), p. 310.

<sup>8</sup> The same is true, in addition to its being unmetrical, of Grotius’ *ἀπόλαυε ζωμοῦ· μὴ φόρει τοὺς βύστακας· ἢ μὴ καταφρόνει, μηδ’...* (*Excerpta ex Tragoediis et Comœdiis Graecis* [Paris, 1626], p. 605).

<sup>9</sup> The only editor of whom I am aware who does not attempt to remove Spartan moustaches

this custom is surprisingly slim and consists of only one statement of Plutarch, thrice repeated, and a reference to Aristotle. Aristotle's comments on the subject are otherwise unknown, and the three passages from Plutarch comprise Arist. fr. 539 Rose<sup>3</sup> in its entirety.

1. Plut. *Cleomen*. 9.3.

προεκήρυττον οἱ ἔφοροι τοῖς πολίταις εἰς τὴν ἀρχὴν εἰσιόντες, ὡς Ἀριστοτέλης φησί, κείρεσθαι τὸν μύστακα καὶ προσέχειν τοῖς νόμοις, ἵνα μὴ χαλεποὶ ᾖσιν αὐτοῖς, τὸ τοῦ μύστακος, οἶμαι, προτείνοντες, ὅπως καὶ περὶ τὰ μικρότατα τοὺς νέους πειθαρχεῖν ἐθίζωσι.

2. Plut. *Mor.* 550b (de sera num. 4).

ἐν Λακεδαίμονι κηρύττουσιν οἱ ἔφοροι παριόντες εὐθὺς εἰς τὴν ἀρχὴν μὴ τρέφειν μύστακα καὶ πείθεσθαι τοῖς νόμοις ὡς μὴ χαλεποὶ ᾖσιν αὐτοῖς.

3. Procl. ad Hes. *Op.* 724–6 Pertusi (722 Gaisford).

ἐν μὲν οὖν Σπάρτῃ τοῖς <πολίταις οἱ> εἰς ἀρχὴν καθιστάμενοι [οἱ] ἔφοροι προεκήρυττον μὴ τρέφειν μύστακας, ἵνα τοὺς τὸ φαῦλον τοῦτο καὶ εὐτελὲς παραβάντας μειζόνως κολάζοντες, παραβαίνειν μεζίονα κωλύσωσιν (=Plut. fr. 90 Sandbach).

Proclus' comment is derived from Plutarch's lost work on Hesiod, adds nothing which is not found in the other two statements, and has no independent authority.<sup>10</sup> Of the remaining two statements, the second would seem to be an abridged version of the first, in which Plutarch cites his authority, and can therefore be set aside as well. The only other evidence for the Spartans shaving is Apollonius of Tyana, *Ep.* 63 ἀνδρας ὑμῶν (i.e. Spartans) ἔθεασάμην ὑπήνην μὴ ἔχοντας. Although Apollonius' statement is relevant only for his own time, his further comment, οὐκ ἐπέγνων, implies that he is accustomed to seeing Spartans with facial hair, and thus that they regularly wore it.

Plutarch's use of the imperfect προεκήρυττον, his citation of Aristotle as an authority, and his reference to οἱ παλαιοί immediately afterwards (*Cleomen.* 9.4) strongly suggest that the Spartan practice of shaving their moustaches was not known in his own day.<sup>11</sup> If the imperfect was Aristotle's, it is possible that it was not a regular practice in his time either, and accordingly it is worth noting that no other reference to the custom exists in the classical period. The substantial problem, however, is whether the ephors used the present imperative ('shave regularly') or the aorist, which would imply that the Spartans were not normally clean-shaven. Since Plutarch's statement is at best second-hand information, it is impossible to give much weight to his use of the present infinitive κείρεσθαι, which may simply be assimilated to the tense of προσέχειν. The use of μὴ τρέφειν in *Mor.* 550b, as opposed to

from the fragment is C. D. Yonge in his translation of Athenaeus (London, 1854). Yonge, translating '... and not disdain to wear fierce whiskers', simply followed Schweighäuser's (i.e. Casaubon's) text but ignored both his Latin translation and his endorsement of Casaubon's interpretation.

<sup>10</sup> For Proclus' reliance upon Plutarch for his commentary on Hesiod, cf. M. L. West (ed.), *Hesiod, Works and Days* (Oxford, 1978), p. 68; C. Faraggiana di Sarzana, *Aevum* 52 (1978), 17–40.

<sup>11</sup> Plutarch's use of the present κηρύττουσιν in *Mor.* 550b need not imply a current practice, since in the same passage the present is understood in reference to a law of Solon as well, and the present tense is probably due to the context.

<sup>12</sup> The passage from Proclus echoes the wording (μὴ τρέφειν) of *Mor.* 550b, but the tense

κείρεσθαι (*Cleomen.* 9.3), is probably simply a loose paraphrase of the more exact pronouncement. The change may be unintentional carelessness, since he is not interested in the Spartans *per se* in this passage, or could perhaps be deliberate, designed to highlight the apparent absurdity of the custom and thus strengthen his argument.<sup>12</sup>

Two passages in Aristophanes, generally overlooked or misunderstood, however, clearly imply that the Spartans in the classical period were known for having large, prominent moustaches. At *V.* 475–7, first of all, bushy facial hair is a defining characteristic of Spartanizing behaviour and thus of pro-Spartan sentiments:

καὶ ξυνὼν Βρασιῖδα καὶ φορῶν κράσπεδα  
στεμμάτων τήν θ' ὑπήνην ἄκουρον τρέφων;

Pl. com. fr. 132.2 K-A, apparently referring to a Laconizer, is similar:

τὸν ὑπηνόβιον σπαρτιοχαίτην

At *Lys.* 1072–3, moreover, prominent ὑπῆναι serve as a means of identifying the Spartans themselves:

καὶ μὴν ἀπὸ τῆς Σπάρτης οἰδὶ πρέσβεις ἔλκοντες ὑπῆνας  
χωροῦσ'

As in the fragment of Antiphanes, the contrast here cannot be between the mere presence of facial hair and the lack of it, since the Athenians wore beards and moustaches; instead, the point must be that Spartans wore their facial hair longer than most other Greeks, as they did with the hair on their heads (e.g. Hdt. 1.82.8; Ar. *Av.* 1282). Although the etymology of ὑπήνη is uncertain, there is general agreement that it properly means 'moustache'.<sup>13</sup> That the word can occasionally also mean 'beard' is often asserted,<sup>14</sup> but the other commonly cited examples of the word with this sense have little or no force, and the only reason for interpreting it this way in Aristophanes and Plato comicus is an (essentially circular) unwillingness to believe that the Spartans wore moustaches.<sup>15</sup>

There is thus little solid evidence that the Spartans did not wear moustaches, for the (*προεκήρυκτον*) of *Cleomen.* 9.3. That Proclus followed the wording from the *Moralia* rather than from the *Lives* is not surprising since Plutarch's commentary on Hesiod, as presented by Proclus, offers numerous affinities with the *Moralia* but very seldom shows discernible interaction with the *Lives*. That Proclus' choice of tense agrees with that of *Cleomen.* is probably simply fortuitous, and in any case Proclus would most naturally use a past tense in reference to Sparta.

<sup>13</sup> Thus H. Frisk, *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg, 1954–72) s.v.; P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* (Paris, 1969–80) s.v.

<sup>14</sup> The evidence is mainly late and of little consequence, e.g. Hsch. v 535, 539 Schmidt; S v 427; Phot. *Lex.* p. 625.10–11 Porson; Eust. p. 1353.57–9. In general, the lexicographers treat the various sorts of facial hair as roughly synonymous, even producing such absurdities as Hsch. β 1346 Latte βύσταγα [sic]: πάγωνα, although traces of an original distinction do appear (e.g. Poll. 2.80). Pollux and Eustathius claim that ὑπήνη refers to both moustache and beard, but this assertion is probably as confused as the lexicographers' other attempts to define the terms for facial hair.

<sup>15</sup> At A. fr. 27 Radt δαῦλος δ' ὑπήνη καὶ γενειάδος πυθμήν, an ὑπήνη is clearly distinguished from a beard, unless one unnecessarily assumes hendiadys; Eub. fr. 98 (cited by Chantraine) is similar. In Pl. com. fr. 130 ἀναξ ὑπήνης Ἐπικράτες σακεσφόρε, ὑπήνη is usually assumed to refer to a beard because the fragment is cited by the Suda (π 2150; cf. ε 2416) under the lemma πάγων and by Σ<sup>RF</sup> Ar. *Ec.* 71 in reference to the beard of Epikrates. In both cases, however, πάγων is used to explain σακεσφόρος; ὑπήνη is not the focus and is basically irrelevant to the discussion of beards.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Kühner-Gerth ii.5; Hdt. 1.66.1; Th. 2.11.4; 3.83.4; X. *H. G.* 4.5.12.

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.<sup>16</sup> Ruhnken's *ρόφει* is perhaps better.<sup>17</sup> 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.<sup>18</sup> 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.<sup>19</sup>

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

B. W. MILLIS

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

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

<sup>19</sup> 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,<sup>1</sup> is best known to classical scholars as the possessor of probably the last complete copy of Callimachus' *Hecale* and *Aetia*.<sup>2</sup> He had brought with him from Constantinople many books of all kinds, and added to his collection when in Athens.<sup>3</sup> 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.

<sup>1</sup> 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).

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> Vol. 2, p. 295, lines 20–2 ed. Lambros.