

Aeschylus for the *Herakleidae* passage,¹⁰ where its meaning may have been clarified by a preceding account of the events leading to Herakles' death, and borrowed thence by Euripides for use in a context where the idea of a child 'with two (rival) "mothers"' was very much in point. The choral song, *Andr.* 465ff., follows a scene in which Andromache has voluntarily accepted death in order to save her son's life (406–20), only to be told (431–2) that the child's fate will now be decided by his 'stepmother' Hermione. And after the song, Andromache and the child are brought out together for execution – the mother by Menelaos' decree, the child by Hermione's (516–19) – and as the son clings to his mother's bosom the word *μήτηρ* is heard five times in seventeen short lines.¹¹

University of Nottingham

ALAN H. SOMMERSTEIN

¹⁰ It may not be the only Aeschylean coinage in that passage, if *αὐτότευκτον* and *θαμνούχοις* are correctly restored: neither of these adjectives is otherwise attested.

¹¹ 498, 504 *bis*, 511, 514.

RESTORING AN ANTITHESIS TO GORGIAS (82 B 16 DIELS-KRANZ)

καὶ ἔτι τέταρτον τὸ ψυχρὸν ἐν ταῖς μεταφοραῖς γίγνεται . . . οἷον Γοργίας χλωρὰ (τρέμοντα) καὶ ἄναιμα τὰ πράγματα· σὺ δὲ ταῦτα αἰσχυρῶς μὲν ἔσπειρας, κακῶς δὲ ἐθέρισας· (Gorgias 82 B 16 D–K = ii.304 = Arist. *Rhet.* 3.1406b4).

According to the apparatus which accompanies the fragment in Diels–Kranz, the reading *χλωρὰ καὶ ἄναιμα* is found in the scholia and in the MSS. of class II, whereas class I has *χλωρὰ καὶ ἔναιμα*. We are also referred to Demetrius, *Eloc.* 116, *τρέμοντα καὶ ὥχρὰ τὰ πράγματα*, and it is suggested that *τρέμοντα καὶ χλωρὰ* may be the 'gorgianische Ausdruck', while *ὥχρὰ* in Demetrius and *ἄναιμα* in Aristotle are a 'Glossem'.

Clearly, the text cannot be accepted as it stands, nor can the suggestions in the apparatus be regarded as very helpful. The first step we should take is to separate the second sentence *σὺ . . . ἐθέρισας* from the preceding one, for these two quotations from Gorgias' writings have no connection with one another and they are in fact also treated as unrelated by the editors of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*.

Rudolf Kassel in his outstanding edition of the *Rhetoric*¹ prints *χλωρὰ καὶ ἄναιμα τὰ πράγματα* although he finds *ἄναιμα* only in F (Cantabrigiensis 1298, saec. XII–XIII) and in an anonymous commentary on the *Rhetoric*, while from the best manuscript A (Parisinus 1741, saec. X), the *vetus translatio latina* (saec. XIII), and the hyparchetypus Δ, he reports the reading *ἔναιμα*. W. D. Ross, in his Oxford edition of the *Rhetoric* (1959), has the same text as Kassel, yet he too reports *ἔναιμα* for A and other manuscripts. And even though the manuscript transmission was not nearly so well known to him as it is to us now thanks to Kassel,² A was for Ross too 'codicum . . . vetustissimus et optimus'.³ A. Roemer's Teubneriana of 1898 (reprinted in 1914) has *χλωρὰ καὶ ἔναιμα τὰ πράγματα*. His apparatus records *ἄναιμα* from three manuscripts.

The reason why despite better attestation of *ἔναιμα* the reading *ἄναιμα* is preferred by Kranz, Kassel, and Ross is the presence of a similar text in Demetrius' *Περὶ*

¹ Rudolfus Kassel (ed.), *Aristotelis Ars Rhetorica* (Berlin, 1976).

² Idem, *Der Text der Aristotelischen Rhetorik* (Berlin, 1971).

³ *Praef.* v.

ἐρμηνείας 116. This Demetrius, who for a long time was falsely identified with Demetrius of Phaleron, depends for his rhetorical outlook so closely on the Aristotelian and Peripatetic tradition that the temptation to place him (with G. M. A. Grube and George Kennedy) in the early third century B.C. is very strong.⁴ He actually refers to Aristotle at the beginning of paragraph 116 (cf. 115) as his authority for the *ψυχρὸν ἐν λέξει*. The passage of Demetrius in which the quotation from Gorgias appears has suffered from lacunae but the quotation itself is preserved. In the texts of Radermacher and Roberts, both of which appeared in the first years of this century,⁵ the passage reads: *τρέμοντα καὶ ὠχρὰ τὰ πράγματα*. The apparatus of these editions informs us that the manuscript P (which is identical with Aristotle's A) has *γράμματα*, and that *πράγματα* is a correction made by Victorius 'ex Aristotele' (or, as Roberts puts it, 'ex codd. Aristotelis').

It would be very astonishing if Gorgias called *τὰ πράγματα τρέμοντα καὶ ὠχρὰ* as Radermacher and Roberts want us to believe, yet also *χλωρὰ καὶ ἄναιμα* as Kranz, Kassel, and Ross suggest. One may also wonder why readings so well attested as *ἔναιμα* in Aristotle and *γράμματα* in Demetrius should be left on the battlefield. There is nothing wrong with *ὠχρὰ τὰ γράμματα*. Moreover if *τρέμοντα... γράμματα* is left in the text of Demetrius and *ἔναιμα τὰ πράγματα* in that of Aristotle, an antithesis is taking shape which looks promising enough to prompt the question whether *χλωρά* as modifier of *πράγματα* and *ὠχρά* in the same relation to *γράμματα* may also be antithetical to one another. The answer does not come easily because while *χλωρόν* in many instances of its occurrence is in fact best rendered by 'green', 'fresh', 'blooming', 'alive' and other similar expressions (which would of course be welcome), it quite often has a meaning which the lexica appropriately enough render by 'pale' or 'pallid'.⁶ There are passages where not only modern Hellenists but even ancient authors in dealing with earlier texts found it difficult to decide between these alternative and, we may as well say, opposite meanings.⁷ For our present problem it would be futile to quote and discuss a number of passages where the intended meaning must be something close to 'fresh' or 'alive'. Nor can the antithesis which we saw shaping up provide us with an argument; for as this antithesis, strictly speaking, is still the *demonstrandum*, it would be poor logic to employ it in the demonstration. The fair – and in fact the decisive – question is whether *ἔναιμα*, by now, I take it, established as modifier of *πράγματα*, associates readily with another adjective

⁴ G. M. A. Grube, *A Greek Critic: Demetrius on Style*, Phoenix Supplementary vol. 4 (Toronto, 1961), 55ff.; George A. Kennedy, *The Art of Persuasion in Greece* (Princeton, 1963), 285ff. See however n. 5.

⁵ Ludovicus Radermacher, *Demetrii Phalerei qui dicitur De Elocutione libellus* (Leipzig, 1901); W. Rhys Roberts, *Demetrius on Style* (Cambridge, 1902). Although Radermacher's arguments for a late date (see especially his *praefatio* and his *adnotationes*, p. 92 and pp. 100ff.) have worn thin, the observations made by Roberts (pp. 49ff.) and especially the more recent ones of Dirk Marie Schenkeveld, *Studies in Demetrius 'On Style'* (Amsterdam, 1964) are too weighty to be ignored. The remarkably developed doctrine of the *χαρακτήρες* and the author's interest in the writing of *ἐπιστολαί* (223–35) are some of the arguments suggesting larger distance from the first generations of the Peripatetics. Exactly where in the Hellenistic centuries the treatise should be placed remains difficult to decide because our knowledge of major rhetorical doctrines in this period is too limited and uncertain. All I venture to say is that I know of no reason to place the work close to the beginning of the Christian era or even within it.

⁶ For the former meaning see LSJ s.v. under III (cf. also Fraenkel's comments in *Aeschylus Agamemnon* ad v. 677 and A. S. F. Gow on Theoc. 14, 70); for the latter meaning see LSJ *ibid.* under II.

⁷ Consultation of (the old Stephanus–Dindorf) TLG s.v. *χλωρός* (coll. 1537f.) shows repeated instances of the difficulties Galen and others had in deciding which of the alternative meanings *χλωρός* had in 'Hippocratic' passages.

suggesting life and freshness or with one indicative of pallor and low vitality.⁸ The answer is obvious.

Demetrius' dependence on the Peripatetic and Aristotelian tradition does not by any means entail complete identity between his illustrations and Aristotle's own. Many of his quotations find no parallel in Aristotle, and he clearly had larger material at his disposal.⁹ On the present occasion where, we must remember, the actual concern of both authors is not with antitheses but with metaphors it happened that Aristotle chose one limb of the antithesis and Demetrius the other. Our inclination may be to integrate *τρέμοντα καὶ ὥχρὰ τὰ γράμματα* and *χλωρὰ καὶ ἔναιμα τὰ πράγματα* into the standard form of an antithesis by adding *μὲν* to the one *κῶλον* and *δέ* to the other. But since this is more than we have a right to propose, we must content ourselves with insisting that the two quotations respond to one another by similarity of structure and opposition of content, although the manner in which they were syntactically connected eludes us.

Chapel Hill, N.C.

FRIEDRICH SOLMSEN

⁸ Early examples of *χλωρόν* contrasting with a word meaning 'dry' are *Od.* 9.3–21 and *Hes. Op.* 742f. Note also *χλωρόν αἶμα* at *S. Tr.* 1064; *E. Hec.* 129.

⁹ For his sources, see my paper 'Demetrios *περὶ ἑρμηνείας* und sein peripatetisches Quellenmaterial', *Hermes* 66 (1931), 241–67 = *Kleine Schriften* (Hildesheim, 1968), ii.151ff. In that paper I dealt with the passage 1406b9 in a footnote (249 = 159 n. 2, cited by Kassel *ad* 1406 b9) but in a manner apt to increase rather than to clear up the confusion. Thanks are due to my late friend Rudolf Güngerich for helping me toward a better solution.

TWO MEN IN A BOAT: ANTIPHON, ON THE MURDER OF HERODES 42

Antiphon, in his fifth oration, relates that *c.* 422–413 B.C.¹ Euxitheos, a young Mytilenean, and Herodes, probably an Athenian cleruch in Mytilene,² embarked together on a ship bound from Mytilene for Ainos in Thrace. Shortly after they left port, a storm forced them to put into an unnamed harbour in Methymnian territory. The two men left their uncovered ship to take shelter in a covered one; whether others from their own ship went with them is not indicated. During the night, a drinking party ensued. Herodes, after heavy drinking, left the covered ship and disappeared; he could not be found in the morning, nor even after two days of searching. When the weather cleared, the search was abandoned, and all ships in the port resumed their voyages. On Euxitheos' return to Mytilene, a charge of murder was brought against him by Herodes' relatives, who tried him in Athens. Antiphon's fifth oration is his final defence; we do not know whether the speech was successful.

What actually happened to Herodes has been much debated by scholars. Determining the most plausible cause of his disappearance requires the scrutiny of even the smallest clues, but Euxitheos' narrative, while 'full of argument',³ is not generous with details. Two men whose testimony was crucial are simply introduced as *τοὺς*

¹ On the date see U. Schindel, 'Der Mordfall Herodes', *NAWG* 8 (1979), 206–8.

² While not mentioned in the speech, this is especially well argued by Schindel, *op. cit.* (above n. 1), 208–13; on the controversy, cf. recently A. Maffi, review of E. Heitsch, *Antiphon aus Rhannus* (*AAWM* 1984, 3, Wiesbaden, 1984; reference from M. Haslam) in *Gnomon* 57 (1985), 696.

³ B. Due, *Antiphon. A Study in Argumentation* (Copenhagen, 1980), 34. Due 34–7 and Schindel, *op. cit.* (above n. 1), 231–2 are among the most recent scholars to consider Euxitheos' narrative – in fact, his whole speech – sophistic and misleading.