

THE LUCK OF THE DRAW: AR. *ECC.* 999

In the penultimate scene of the *Ecclesiazusae*, the young man who has come to see his lover is accosted in succession by three old women, each insisting that the new legal code requires him to sleep with her first. In lines 999–1000, the first of these old women, faced with his refusal to cooperate sexually, swears by Aphrodite:

μὰ τὴν Ἀφροδίτην, ἣ μ' ἔλαχε κληρουμένη,  
μὴ γῶ σ' ἀφήσω.

Thus, as commentators point out, she boastfully claims the goddess as her personal *δαίμων*, using language clearly appropriate to the allocation of a deity to a specific 'province'.<sup>1</sup> Her oath warrants further consideration, however, for much of its humour lies in the precise nature of the relative clause ἣ μ' ἔλαχε κληρουμένη.

Κληρώ and λαγχάνω denote closely related concepts, and it is of course natural that forms of κληρώ and of the noun κλήρος should commonly be found in close conjunction with λαγχάνω (cf., e.g., Joseph. *AJ* 9.211: κληρωσαμένων οὖν ὁ προφήτης λαγχάνει). A search of the *TLG* data-base, however, reveals only two other passages in which a middle participle of κληρώ agrees with the subject of λαγχάνω. Plato has the *xenos* in the *Politicus* use the collocation in a passage concerning the allotment of archons: κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν δέ γε ἄρχοντας καθίστασθαι τοῦ πλῆθους, εἴτε ἐκ τῶν πλουσιῶν εἴτε ἐκ τοῦ δήμου παντός, ὃς ἂν κληρούμενος λαγχάνῃ (298e). Similarly, Aeschines, speaking of the procedural abuses of unscrupulous contemporaries, comments: ἂν δέ τις τῶν ἄλλων βουλευτῶν ὄντως λάχῃ κληρούμενος προεδρεύειν... ἀπειλοῦσιν εἰσαγγελεῖν (*Ctes.* 3).

Given the nature of this evidence, it is reasonable to suggest that the phrase is in fact a technical formula for the allotment of Athenian officials. Moreover, if, as seems plausible, the Platonic passage provides an accurate picture of the manner in which the expression was used in actual decrees, then Aristophanes, in employing it in the relative clause of the woman's oath, may be parodying relative clauses such as ὃς ἂν κληρούμενος λαγχάνῃ in Athenian legislation:<sup>2</sup> such a parody, after all, would be thoroughly in keeping with the nature of the entire scene, in which all of the participants continually apply technical legal language to sexual matters.

Georgetown University, Washington DC

ALEXANDER SENS

<sup>1</sup> R. G. Ussher, *Aristophanes. Ecclesiazusae* (Oxford, 1973), p. 215.

<sup>2</sup> The potentially formulaic character of the phrase did not escape the notice of B. Merritt and T. Wade-Gery, *JHS* 83 (1963) 110, who, adducing the Platonic passage, proposed it as an epigraphically plausible supplement to a decree of c. 448 B.C.: Γ[λ]αυκος εἶπε: [τέι / Ἀθηναῖαι τέι Νί[κ]κει hieréan hē āγ [κλ/ε]ρομένε λάχ[ε]ι ἐχς Ἀθηναίων παπα[σό/ν καθίστα]σθαι (*IG* i<sup>3</sup>. 35.3–6).

## AN ERRANT FRAGMENT OF THEOPHRASTUS

There are a number of fragments attributed to Theophrastus, as well as titles in Diogenes Laertius' catalogue of his writings (5.42ff.), of which it is uncertain whether they should be placed among his logical or rhetorical works. In this note I want to give my reasons for excluding one of them from my forthcoming edition of his logical fragments. It is not my intention here to discuss all the questions it raises; I hope to come back to them in a later volume of my commentary.

The fragment exists in two versions:

(a) Ammonius, *In De interpr.* 17a5, p. 65.31 Busse<sup>1</sup>

διττῆς γὰρ οὐσης τῆς τοῦ λόγου σχέσεως, καθὰ διώρισεν ὁ φιλόσοφος Θεόφραστος, τῆς τε πρὸς τοὺς ἀκρωμένους, οἷς καὶ σημαίνει τι, καὶ τῆς πρὸς τὰ πράγματα, ὑπὲρ ὧν ὁ λέγων πείσαι προτίθεται τοὺς ἀκρωμένους, περὶ μὲν τὴν σχέσιν αὐτοῦ τὴν πρὸς τοὺς ἀκροατὰς καταγίνονται ποιητικὴ καὶ ῥητορικὴ, διόπερ ἔργον αὐταῖς ἐκλέγεσθαι τε τὰ σεμνότερα τῶν ὀνομάτων, ἀλλὰ μὴ τὰ κοινὰ καὶ δεδημευμένα, καὶ ταῦτα ἐναρμονίως συμπλέκειν ἀλλήλοις, ὥστε διὰ τούτων καὶ τῶν τούτοις ἐπομένων, οἷον σαφηνείας γλυκύτητος καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἰδεῶν ἔτι τε μακρολογίας καὶ βραχυλογίας, κατὰ καιρὸν πάντων παραλαμβανομένων, ἥσαι τε τὸν ἀκροατὴν καὶ ἐκπλήξαι καὶ πρὸς τὴν πειθῶ χειρωθέντα ἔχειν. τῆς δέ γε πρὸς τὰ πράγματα τοῦ λόγου σχέσεως ὁ φιλόσοφος προηγουμένως ἐπιμελήσεται τό τε ψεῦδος διελέγχων καὶ τὸ ἀληθὲς ἀποδεικνύς, ὧν ἐκάτερον ἀποφάνσιν τινα ἀμφισβητουμένην δι' ἐναργῶν ἀποφάνσεων προτίθεται συμπεραίνεσθαι.

(b) Anon. in *De interpr.* p. 94a16ff. Brandis, XXIII Busse

δύο γάρ, φησὶν ὁ Θεόφραστος, τοῦ λόγου σχέσεις ἔχοντος, τὴν μὲν πρὸς τοὺς ἀκροατὰς τὴν δὲ πρὸς τὰ πράγματα, τὴν μὲν πρὸς τοὺς ἀκροατὰς ποιητὰ καὶ ῥήτορες διώκουσι τὴν δὲ πρὸς τὰ πράγματα φιλόσοφοι.

1 δύο Busse: μόνος codd.: μόνας Prantl: om. Wimmer

Both versions have been known since the last century and are included in Wimmer's edition as fr. 65 and 64 respectively. The fragment has been claimed for the *Περὶ λέξεως* by Schmidt, pp. 52f. (who cites some older literature), Mayer in his edition of that work (fr. A VI 1b), Hendrickson (1905), 255f., Stroux, p. 2, Regenbogen 1383.42 and 1522.26, and implicitly by Grube (1952), 177f. and (1965), pp. 106f.; for the *Περὶ καταφάσεως καὶ ἀποφάσεως* by Prantl, pp. 351f., Bochenski, *L. de Th.* pp. 32 and 39f. and *Formale Logik*, #17.03, and in the editions of Graeser (F1) and Repici (fr. 7a–b, with translation and comment on pp. 48–51). Most recently Innes ([1985], 254) and Fortenbaugh ([1990], 171ff.) agree that it is derived from the *Kataph.* and Fortenbaugh-Huby have printed it among the logical fragments in their edition (fr. 78). In spite of this, Innes claims that they imply an important modification of Aristotle's view of rhetoric; on this point Fortenbaugh is more sceptical, partly because of its (putative) provenance and partly because he believes, with good reason, that much of the description of the rhetorician's work in the first passage (lines 4–8) belongs to Ammonius rather than Theophrastus. I share his scepticism, but hope to show that we have enough evidence to establish with a high degree of probability that these fragments come from a rhetorical work.

Ammonius quotes this passage in connection with Aristotle's assertion that only 'apophantic' sentences, i.e. those which make a statement, are the subject of logic, while others, such as prayers or questions, are studied by other disciplines like poetics or rhetoric (*De interpr.* 17a5). Theophrastus accepted this distinction,<sup>2</sup> but in the present fragment he is making a different point. Aristotle's distinction was between two kinds of sentence and was based on their form, Theophrastus' between two aspects of any sentence, its relation to the subject-matter which it describes and the hearer whom it is intended to convince or influence. Both aspects are present in all meaningful sentences, irrespective of their form, and nothing is said to suggest that there are any exceptions.<sup>3</sup> Theophrastus would probably have admitted that the

<sup>1</sup> For references see the end of this paper.

<sup>2</sup> See Boethius, *In De interpr.* ed. 2, p. 9.18ff. Meiser.

<sup>3</sup> This was clearly seen by Grube (1952), 178 n. 20.

'objective' aspect is more prominent in some kinds of sentence than others (cf. Quintilian 3.7.1, quoted below), but we can neither say that it is confined to statement-making sentences, since it is obviously essential in questions and present to some degree in prayers and commands, nor that the 'subjective' element is absent from statement-making sentences. Oratory consists very largely of such sentences and even history and philosophical writing must appeal to the reader's aesthetic feeling, if not directly to his emotions, in order to be effective. The only thing both distinctions have in common is that they differentiate between something that is said to be philosophically important and something that is not, or not in the same degree. It follows that the original context of the Theophrastus fragment was different from the one to which Ammonius or his source transferred it.<sup>4</sup>

Bochenski (*L. de Th.*, pp. 39f.) believed that our fragment corresponds to *De interpr.* 16a3, where Aristotle says that 'spoken sounds are symbols of affections of the soul and written marks symbols of spoken sounds' (tr. Ackrill), and claimed that it contains a new semiotics intermediate between those of Aristotle and the Stoics (*SVF* 2.166); in a later work (*Formale Logik* #17.03) he adds that Theophrastus placed particular emphasis on the 'pragmatic dimension' of spoken signs. Graeser and Repici continue the same line of thought, although Graeser has expressed strong reservations and shown that it is not easy on this assumption to define the relationship between the teaching of Aristotle, Theophrastus and the Stoics at all precisely. In reality the resemblance between these passages of Aristotle and Theophrastus is illusory. The former is concerned with the relationship between thoughts (τὰ ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ παθήματα), the spoken sounds (τὰ ἐν τῇ φωνῇ) which symbolise them, and the written marks which symbolise the sounds; the relationship is linear and transitive, each term being symbolised by the one which follows, and thoughts, spoken sounds and written marks all originate in the same agent, even if the writing is done by an amanuensis.<sup>5</sup> The latter deals with the relationship of *logoi* to the things to which they refer and to the audience and its reactions; only the first of these could possibly be described as one of symbol to thing symbolised, although Theophrastus does not describe it in this way, and there is no reference at all to the speaker or the speaker's thoughts.

However, the same distinction is attributed to Theophrastus by Quintilian in a passage about the difference between epideictic and other kinds of oratory (*Inst. or.* 3.7.1): 'Quod genus videtur Aristoteles atque eum secutus Theophrastus a parte negotiali, hoc est πραγματικῇ, remouisse totamque ad solos auditores relegasse; et id eius nominis quod ab ostentatione ducitur proprium est.' Epideictic oratory, the art of saying nothing at length and in a pleasing manner, is least concerned with its subject-matter and most with the reactions of the audience. This is enough to establish the kind of context from which our fragment must have come; it is confirmed by the parallels in Aristotle's *Rhetoric*. The closest of these is in the first

<sup>4</sup> The anonymous commentator has moved it again, rather ineptly, to that part of his introduction in which he tries to explain the meaning of the title *Περὶ ἐρμηνείας*, corresponding to p. 4.27–5.25 of Ammonius' commentary. Ammonius tries to do this by contrasting the meaning of the word here with the one it has when used as the title of the treatise on style by Demetrius, where it is generally translated as *De elocutione*, but does not refer to any other writer at this point. However, this difference is almost certainly due to the anonymous commentator or an intermediate source. The anonymous writer was very much under Ammonius' influence, although he wrote considerably later and has some quotations not found in Ammonius' extant commentary; cf. Brandis (1833), 289 and Busse, pp. xixff.

<sup>5</sup> This passage has been analysed in great detail by Pépin (1985), pp. 29–44.

chapter of bk. 3, where Aristotle contrasts the objective discussion of problems appropriate to philosophers and scientists with the appeal to the emotions which is unavoidable in oratory 'because of the moral badness of the audience'; the first is described as *ἀγωνίζεσθαι τοῖς πράγμασιν*, the second as *φαντασία καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἀκροατὴν* (1404a5–12). In the earlier books Aristotle says that three factors contribute to the effectiveness of a speech, the facts of the case, the ethos of the speaker as reflected in his words and actions, and the direct appeal to the emotions of the audience. But both the second and the third of these involve the feelings of the audience rather than any objective judgement of the facts and it is easy to treat them as aspects of the same thing; this was in fact done by later rhetoricians, including Cicero and Quintilian.<sup>6</sup>

I conclude that our fragment came from a rhetorical work, perhaps the beginning of the *Περὶ λέξεως*, where Theophrastus had to define the scope of his work. Ammonius or some earlier commentator on the *De interpretatione*, faced with the very brief sentence in which Aristotle distinguished between what belonged to his 'present θεωρία' and to poetical or rhetorical theory, and perhaps with an equally brief statement in Theophrastus' *Περὶ καταφάσεως καὶ ἀποφάσεως*, looked in their rhetorical writings for further elucidation and came up with our fragment as the nearest thing. It can tell us a great deal about the habits of ancient commentators and the vicissitudes to which quotations from earlier authors were liable when detached from their original contexts.

University of Leeds

H. B. GOTTSCHALK

<sup>6</sup> Ar. *Rhet.* 1356a1 ff., 1358a38 ff., with Cope's notes; cf. Solmsen (1938), 290 ff. Cicero, *De oratore* 2.43.182 ff., *Partit. orat.* 13.46; Quint. 6.2.8.

#### REFERENCES TO MODERN AUTHORS CITED

- Ackrill, J. L. (translator), *Aristotle's Categories and De interpretatione* (Oxford, 1963).  
 Bochenski, I. M., *La logique de Théophraste* (Fribourg en Suisse, 1947).  
 —. *Formale Logik* (Freiburg/München, 1956; there are many later editions and translations, including one into English; references are to paragraphs).  
 Brandis, C. A. (ed.), *Scholia in Aristotelem* (Berlin, 1836).  
 —. 'Über die Reihenfolge der Bücher des Aristotelischen Organons und ihre Griechischen Ausleger'; *Abh. Akad. Berlin*, 1833, 249–99.  
 Busse, A. (ed.), Ammonius *In Aristotelis De interpretatione commentarius* (Berlin, 1897). (*Comm. in Ar. Graeca* vol. 4 pt. 5; includes extracts from related commentaries in the introduction, pp. xv ff.).  
 Fortenbaugh, W. W., 'Theophrastus, fr. 65 Wimmer: Is it Important for Understanding Peripatetic Rhetoric?', *AJP* 111 (1990), 168–75.  
 —, Huby, P. M. et al. (eds.), *Theophrastus of Eresus: Sources for his Life, Writings, Thought and Influence* (Leiden, 1992).  
 Gottschalk, H. B., 'Prolegomena to an Edition of Theophrastus' Fragments', in J. Wiesner (ed.), *Aristoteles, Werk und Wirkung* (Berlin, 1985), pp. 543–56.  
 Graeser, A. (ed.), *Die logischen Fragmente des Theophrast* (Berlin, 1973). (*Kleine Texte* 191.)  
 Grube, G. M. A., 'Theophrastus as a Literary Critic', *TAPA* 83 (1952), 172–83.  
 —. *The Greek and Roman Critics* (London, 1965).  
 Hendrickson, G. L., 'The Origin and Meaning of the Ancient Characters of Style', *AJP* 26 (1905), 249–90.  
 Innes, D. C., 'Theophrastus and the Theory of Style', in W. W. Fortenbaugh (ed.), *Theophrastus of Eresus: On his Life and Work* (New Brunswick and Oxford, 1985), pp. 251–67.  
 Mayer, A. (ed.), *Theophrasti Περὶ λέξεως libri fragmenta* (Lipsiae, 1910).

- Pépin, J., 'Σύμβολα, Σημεία, Ὁμοιώματα. A propos de De interpretatione 1, 16a3-8 et Politique 8.5, 1340a6-39', in J. Wiesner (ed.), *Aristoteles: Werk und Wirkung*, i (Berlin, 1985), pp. 22-44.
- Prantl, C., *Geschichte der Logik im Abendlande*, i (Leipzig, 1855).
- Regenbogen, O., 'Theophrastos von Eresos', *RE Suppl.* 7, 1353-1562.
- Repici, L. (ed.), *La logica di Teofrasto* (Bologna, 1977).
- Schmidt, M., *De Theophrasto Rhetore* (Halle, 1839).
- Solmsen, F., 'Aristotle and Cicero on the Orator's Playing on the Feelings', *CP* 33 (1938), 390-404 = *Kleine Schriften*, ii (Hildesheim, 1968), pp. 216-30.
- Stroux, J., *De Theophrasti virtutibus dicendi* (Lipsiae, 1912).
- Wimmer, F. (ed.), *Theophrasti Eresii Opera*, iii (Lipsiae, 1862).

## THE ORIGIN OF MOLORC[H]US

In his exemplary edition of the papyrus fragments of Callimachus' *Victoria Berenices*,<sup>1</sup> P. J. Parsons briefly considered the spelling of the name of Hercules' host, who played such a major role in Callimachus' αἴτιον on the founding of the Nemean games. At B iii 2 the papyrus has Μό[λ]ορκος. On this Professor Parsons noted 'elsewhere Μόλορχος: the unusual spelling, which no doubt comes from the text, reappears in Apollodorus, Bibl. 2.5.1 (Μόλορκω, but later Μόλορχον), Nonnus, Dion. 17.52 and Stephanus of Byzantium s.v. Μολορκία (above p. 2f)'.<sup>2</sup>

In this article I will argue, I hope conclusively, that what Parsons called 'the unusual spelling' Μόλορκος is really the only one which occurs in Greek sources, and that the spelling Μόλορχος, which one encounters almost everywhere in modern works, is in actuality a ghost word, which has its origin in highly unreliable evidence: the addition or omission of *h* in Greek words by scribes of Latin manuscripts. The matter in itself may not be of much significance, but for a student of editorial habits it is illuminating to explore the aetiology of the error and to track its almost complete proliferation into modern editions.

In his 1894 Teubner text of Apollodorus,<sup>3</sup> R. Wagner printed Μολόρχω at 2.5.1.1, and in his *apparatus* provided the entry 'μολόρκω A [his symbol for the consensus or near-consensus of all the manuscripts], corr. Aeg.', i.e. Benedictus Aegius in his influential *editio princeps* of 1555. At 2.5.1.4, Wagner printed Μόλορχον in his text and provided no note in his *apparatus*. If Wagner's silence could be trusted, in the latter passage Μόλορχον should be the reading of all, or all but an insignificant few, of the manuscripts of Apollodorus.

For my part, I found it quite incredible that Apollodorus would have spelled the same name two different ways in the space of a dozen lines, and so I decided to look into the matter further. Since in his edition Aegius provided no critical note on either passage, it is difficult to tell from it what he found in his manuscripts. However, in his 1782 edition (and in his second edition printed in 1803), Heyne has on the former passage the note 'Μόλορκον hic et mox libb.'. <sup>4</sup> This is not quite as clear as one might have liked, since in the former passage the manuscripts have Μολόρκω, but in any event Heyne certainly seems to convey the information that all his manuscripts had Μόλορκον in the latter passage, and in 1841 Karl Müller explicitly stated in the

<sup>1</sup> P. J. Parsons, *ZPE* 25 (1977), 1-50.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. 20, ad B iii 2.

<sup>3</sup> R. Wagner (ed.), *Apollodori Bibliotheca* (Leipzig, 1894), pp. 72-3.

<sup>4</sup> C. G. Heyne (ed.), *Apollodori Atheniensis Bibliothecae Libri Tres* (Göttingen, 1782<sup>1</sup>, 1803<sup>2</sup>), ad loc.