

- Pépin, J., 'Σύμβολα, Σημεία, Όμοιώματα. 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*,¹ 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)'.²

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,³ 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.'. ⁴ 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

¹ P. J. Parsons, *ZPE* 25 (1977), 1-50.

² Ibid. 20, ad B iii 2.

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

⁴ C. G. Heyne (ed.), *Apollodori Atheniensis Bibliothecae Libri Tres* (Göttingen, 1782¹, 1803²), ad loc.

preface to his edition of the *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*,⁵ that Paris. gr. 2722 (s. xiv), which Wagner later realised was the archetype of all the other manuscripts,⁶ has *Μόλορκον*. Hence I would venture to say that in this regard Wagner's silence is untrustworthy, and that all or most of the manuscripts, and in particular the archetype Paris. gr. 2722, have *Μόλορκον* in the latter passage, just as they have *Μολόρκω* in the former, and that *Μολόρχω* and *Μόλορχον* are nothing more than conjectures of Aegius, which he made under the influence of the prevalence of *Molorchus* in the manuscripts and editions of various Latin authors.

The next incidence of editorial intervention occurred in the case of Nonnus at 17.52. In the *editio princeps* of 1569, Falkenburg⁷ printed *Μολόρκης* in his text and in his appendix he emended this to *Μολόρχου*, which subsequently became the vulgate. But in 1857 Koechly, to his lasting credit, noted that although earlier editors had printed *Μολόρχου*, the codex Monacensis 94 (s. xvi¹) has *Μολόρκου*, and he duly restored this to his text.⁸

With the publication in 1909 of Arthur Ludwich's edition,⁹ it became possible to see what had happened: Falkenburg had founded his *editio princeps* on F = Vindobonenses 45 and 51 (s. xvi), which at 17.52 has *μολορ^κ*. This contraction was misinterpreted by Falkenburg and rendered by him as *Μολόρκης*,¹⁰ and the -χ- in his subsequent conjecture *Μολόρχου* is devoid of manuscript support; the archetype L = Laurentianus xxxii 16 (s. xv) and all the rest of the manuscripts have *Μολόρκου*, which modern editors of Nonnus have retained. It was left to Pfeiffer, in his note on fr. 59.16 of Callimachus,¹¹ to turn back the clock a century by proposing to reintroduce *Μολόρχου* into the text of Nonnus.

Stephanus of Byzantium has the entry *Μολορκία, πόλις Νεμέας, ἀπὸ Μολόρκου τοῦ ξενίσαντος Ἡρακλέα ἀπιόντα ἐπὶ τὸν ἀγῶνα. τὸ ἐθνικὸν Μολορκίτης*. The earliest editors¹² left the κ's untouched, but in 1688 Abraham Berkel changed them all to χ's, with the following note, which deserves quotation in full as a dire *exemplum* of unjustified self-confidence and unwarranted self-congratulation: 'In omnibus libris scriptis & editis male exhibebatur *Μολορκία, Μολόρκου & Μολορκίτης*: nam pauper ille, Herculeum hospitio excipiens, non *Molorcus*, sed cum aspiratione *Molorchus* dicebatur, uti unanimi consensu testantur Mythicae Theologiae doctores. Apollodorus lib. ii: *Πορευόμενος οὖν ἐπὶ τὸν λείοντα, εἰς Κλεωνᾶς ἦλθε, καὶ ξενίζεται παρὰ ἀνδρὶ χερνήτη Μολόρχω*. Virgil. lib. iii Georg.

Cuncta mihi, Alpheum linquens, lucosque Molorchi,
Cursibus, & crudo decernet Graecia caestu.

⁵ K. Müller (ed.), *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, i (Paris, 1841), p. v. Again, this is not as clear as one would like, since Müller cites *Μόλορκον* from Paris. gr. 2722 at 2.5.1.2 rather than 2.5.1.4, but he gives this entry against *Μόλορχον* in the 'editio Heyniana', which is the latter passage.

⁶ Wagner, op. cit., pp. xiii ff.

⁷ G. Falkenburg (ed.), *Nonni Panopolitae Dionysiaca* (Antwerp, 1569), pp. 304 and 881-2.

⁸ A. Koechly (ed.), *Nonni Panopolitani Dionysiacorum Libri XLVIII* (Leipzig, 1857), i, pp. lxxii and 255.

⁹ A. Ludwich (ed.), *Nonni Panopolitani Dionysiaca* (Leipzig, 1909), i.360.

¹⁰ Presumably this arose from mistaking a suprascript J = ου for a suprascript s = ης. For these contractions, see E. M. Thompson, *A Handbook of Greek and Latin Palaeography* (Cambridge, 1911), pp. 94-5.

¹¹ R. Pfeiffer (ed.), *Callimachus* (Oxford, 1949), i.63, ad fr. 59.16sq.

¹² E.g. Aldus Manutius (Venice, 1502), Antonius Francinus (Florence, 1521), G. Xylander (Basel, 1568), Thomas de Pinedo (Amsterdam, 1678).

Ad quae verba sic commentatur Servius: *Lucosque Molorchī. Id est sylvam Nemeam, in qua celebrabatur agon in honorem Archemori. Molorchus autem pastor fuit, qui Herculem, venientem ad occidendum Nemeum Leonem, suscepit hospitio. Ex his & similibus locis, quae ex aliis adduci possent, evidenter liquet, nos in urbis et conditoris nomine, ut & gentili, bene τὸ χ reposuisse*.¹³ Berkel's alterations were accepted by Meineke¹⁴ in his edition of 1849, and from there they passed into August Lentz's reconstruction of Herodian's *Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωδίας*.¹⁵ There had been, however, a note of protest: in the third edition of Henri Estienne's *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae*, v (Paris, 1829), revised by C. B. Hase, W. Dindorf and L. Dindorf, s.v. *Μολορχία*, the quotation of the entry from Stephanus was followed by the observation 'Apud quem *Μολορχία* etc. per χ pro κ restituit Berkel., coll. Apollod. 2,5,1,2 et 5, et Latinis scriptt. Quamquam etiam Apollodori libri per κ scribunt nomen viri'.

Now we come to Callimachus. The name of Hercules' host first came to light in a papyrus of the *Aetia* published by Lobel in 1941. At P. Oxy. 2169, line 12, he printed

]υς τε Μολόρχ

and in his notes ventured the suggestions *Μολόρχου* or *-ωι*.¹⁶ In his edition,¹⁷ however, Pfeiffer observed that these supplements were metrically impossible (unless the hexameter ended here, which seems unlikely from the spacing), and instead conjectured *Μολόρχειος*, which in 1983 was reprinted by Lloyd-Jones and Parsons at *Supplementum Hellenisticum* 265.

In 1976, with the publication of P. Lille 79,¹⁸ we at last had, in an interlinear scholion to the *Victoria Berenices*, direct evidence for how Callimachus spelled the name:

ὁ Μό[λ]ορκος λέγει. Ἰ.ε.υ.ξ.ο [

Much else in the line is mutilated or uncertain, but the κ in the name of Hercules' host is clearly visible. And one could not reasonably expect to find better evidence for the orthography employed by Callimachus himself: Parsons dates this papyrus to 'the late third century' B.C., and goes on to say 'This copy of Callimachus was written within a generation of the poet's death'.¹⁹

Let us now review the evidence for the spelling of the name. On the Greek side there is no evidence at all for the spelling *Μόλορχος*. As evidenced by a papyrus written within half a century of the publication of the *Aetia*, Callimachus wrote *Μόλορκος*, and this is the only form attested elsewhere in later Greek authors, Apollodorus, Nonnus, and Stephanus, who directly or indirectly drew on Callimachus' account and who thereby testify to the fact that throughout antiquity in MSS. of the *Aetia* the spelling *Μόλορκος* persisted. With this fact in mind, let us now turn to the Latin evidence.

¹³ A. Berkel (ed.), *Stephani Byzantini Gentilia per Epitomen, antehac De Urbibus Inscripta* (Leiden, 1688), ad loc.

¹⁴ A. Meineke (ed.), *Stephani Byzantii Ethniconum Quae Supersunt* (Berlin, 1849), i.455, ad loc.

¹⁵ A. Lentz (ed.), *Herodiani Technici Reliquiae* (Leipzig, 1867), i.266.20, 289.17.

¹⁶ E. Lobel, *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, xviii (London, 1941), no. 2169.

¹⁷ R. Pfeiffer, op. cit.

¹⁸ C. Meillier, *Cahiers de Recherche de l'Institut de Papyrologie et d'Egyptologie de Lille* 4 (1976), 257–360.

¹⁹ Parsons, op. cit. 4.

Of all the extant Latin authors who mention Hercules' host, by far the oldest and best manuscripts are those of Vergil, who at *Georg.* 3.19–20 wrote

cuncta mihi Alpheim linquens lucosque Molorc(h)i
cursibus et crudo decernet Graecia caestu.

This passage is preserved by four of the capital manuscripts of Vergil:²⁰ F = Vat. lat. 3225 (s. IV^{ex}), M = Medic. Laur. lat. xxxix, 1 (s. V), R = Vat. lat. 3867 (s. V), and P = Vat. Pal. lat. 1631 (s. IV/V). Of these, FMR have *MOLOACHI*, but P has *MOLOACHI*. Although P is disfigured by innumerable slight corruptions, its sole testimony on a matter of orthography is nonetheless credible and even trustworthy, e.g. a little below at line 44 P alone preserves the genuinely antique spelling *TAYGETI*, which its fellow manuscripts have modernised to *TAYGETI*.²¹ What clinches the matter in favour of P's witness is that this very passage at the opening of *Georgics* 3 is a direct imitation by Vergil of the opening of the third book of Callimachus' *Aetia*, as Richard Thomas demonstrated at some length;²² hence it would be inconceivable that Vergil would have mis-spelled the name of the peasant who played such a prominent role in his Callimachean model.

We therefore see that the corruption of *Molorcus* to *Molorchus* had infested even the capital manuscripts of Vergil by the fourth century. This will hardly be surprising to anyone who has ever collated, or merely examined with attention, a manuscript of a Latin poet who frequently mentions Greek names. Scribes continually omit, add, or transpose *h*'s in such names.²³ Thus I have made no systematic investigation of how this name is spelled in the much later MSS. of all the other Latin authors who mention the name of Hercules' host, for there is no point in canvassing mediaeval testimony which we know is unreliable when we have the direct evidence of a papyrus of Callimachus' *Aetia* written within half a century of its publication. Furthermore, given the fact that the author of the *Panegyricus Messallae*, Statius, and Martial imitated Callimachus,²⁴ with Martial explicitly saying at *Epigr.* 10.4.12 'legas Aetia Callimachi', it would be absurd to suppose, whatever may be the readings of the mediaeval MSS. of their texts, that they would have misspelled the name of Hercules' host. I therefore simply list all the passages where Latin authors mention Molorcus, indicating with an asterisk those where I have observed that at least some of the MSS. preserve the proper spelling: Vergil, **Georg.* 3.19 (plus Servius *ad loc.*, who is excerpted by the first Vatican mythographer, cap. 52,²⁵ and 'Probus' *ad loc.*²⁶), *Panegyricus Messallae* 13, Statius, *Silu.* 3.1.29, 4.6.51, and *Theb.* 4.160 (plus the

²⁰ I have taken the dates for these manuscripts from M. Geymonat (ed.), *P. Vergili Maronis Opera* (Turin, 1973), pp. xix–xx.

²¹ Velius Longus, *De Orthographia* (GL Keil VII [Leipzig, 1880], p. 49) reports that the first-century grammarian Verrius Flaccus rendered the Greek *υ* by *u*: for evidence of this spelling preserved by the capital manuscripts of Vergil, see O. Ribbeck, *Prolegomena Critica ad P. Vergili Maronis Opera Maiora* (Leipzig, 1866), pp. 452–3.

²² R. F. Thomas, *CQ* 33 (1983), 92–101.

²³ L. Havet, *Manuel de critique verbale appliquée aux textes latines* (Paris, 1911), §1076.

²⁴ The fascination of the author of the *Panegyricus Messallae* with Callimachean allusiveness is evident throughout his poem. For discussions of Statius' enthusiasm for Callimachus, see R. F. Thomas, *CQ* 33 (1983), 103–5, and A. S. Hollis (ed.), *Callimachus, Hecale* (Oxford, 1990), p. 34. Martial displays his adherence to Callimachean aesthetics at *Epigr.* 4.49 and 9.50, where he contrasts his own brief epigrams with bombastic epics, and at *Epigr.* 4.23 he obliquely hopes that Thalia would place his own Latin epigrams on a level with Callimachus' Greek epigrams.

²⁵ P. Kulcsar (ed.), *Mythographi Vaticani I et II (Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina, XC1c)*, (Turnhout, 1987), p. 24.

²⁶ H. Hagen (ed.), *Appendix Serviana* (Leipzig, 1902), pp. 376–7.

Lactantian scholia *ad loc.*, which were utilised by the second Vatican mythographer, *cap. 183²⁷), Martial, *Epigr.* 4.64.30 and 9.43.13, Lucius Ampelius, **Liber Memorialis* 2.5,²⁸ and the scholia to Germanicus' *Aratea* (p. 72.1ff. and p. 131.9ff. Breysig).

We have now reviewed all the evidence for the spelling of the name of Hercules' host. We have found that the consensus of the Greek evidence, starting with a papyrus of Callimachus' *Aetia* 'written within a generation of the poet's death' and continuing with Apollodorus, Nonnus, and Stephanus Byzantius, supports *Μόλορκος*. We have seen that the correctly transliterated Latin spelling *Molorcus* is preserved in a s. V capital manuscript of Vergil and in various mediaeval manuscripts of other Latin authors, although the false spelling *Molorchus* seems to be more common.²⁹ In the process of conducting this examination, we have seen that editors of Greek authors, commencing with Benedictus Aegius in 1555 and continuing with a considerable number of distinguished textual critics who ought to have known better, systematically allowed the spelling of Latin manuscripts, in which *h*'s are continually dropped, added, and transposed, to dictate the 'immendation'³⁰ of *Μόλορκος* to *Μόλορχος*, even though in Greek manuscripts *χ* is much less often confused with *κ*.³¹ We have also seen that editors of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, had they taken the trouble to survey the evidence in readily available critical editions, could have found that *Μόλορχος* is a ghost word. It is long past time to exorcise this ghost. In obedience to the consentient evidence of the Greek manuscripts, the name should be spelled with a *κ* in the texts of Apollodorus, Nonnus, and Stephanus Byzantius, and at Callimachus fr. 59.16 Pfeiffer = *SH* 265.16 *Μολόρ[κ]ειος* should be restored in place of *Μολόρ[χ]ειος*. Correspondingly, the spelling with a *c* rather than a *ch* should be restored in the texts of all the Latin poets of the Golden and Silver Ages who imitated Callimachus, in the text of Ampelius, and in the text of the second Vatican mythographer and hence probably of the Lactantian scholia to Statius' *Thebaid*. Whether an editor should make this correction also in the texts of Servius and 'Probus' on *Georg.* 3.19 and of the first Vatican mythographer, as well as in the scholia to Germanicus' *Aratea*, is to a greater or lesser extent a matter of guesswork and of personal attitude to emending an error at the risk of correcting the author.

Modern English and German authors should also take note of the fact that the proper spellings are 'Molorcus' and 'Molorkos', respectively, rather than 'Molorchus' and 'Molorchos'. But ironically, the Italian descendants of those Latin scribes of late antiquity who did so much to confuse later generations of scholars need not emend their spelling at all: in Italian *c* before *o* represents *κ* and *χ* alike, so the 'Molorco' used by modern Italian scholars turns out to have been perfectly correct all along!

Having dealt with the origin of the name 'Molorc[h]us', I should now like to comment on the origin of the character Molorcus, and in particular on Parsons'

²⁷ P. Kulcsar, *op. cit.*, p. 239.

²⁸ E. Assmann (ed.), *Lucii Ampelii Liber Memorialis* (Leipzig, 1935), p. 4.

²⁹ Richard Thomas has suggested to me that the commonness of Greek names ending in *-archus* may have influenced many Latin scribes to alter *Molorcus* to *Molorchus*; the commonness of Greek words beginning with *orch-* may also have contributed.

³⁰ H. L. Lorimer, *CQ* 32 (1938), 131, asked 'Why does our language lack so desirable a word as "immendation", known to me only on the lips of a contemporary scholar?' If enough scholars use it, this deficiency of our language relative to German, which has long had *Schlimbesserung*, will be made good.

³¹ For another instance, only recently detected, where Aegius made an immendation in his text of Apollodorus under the influence of the spelling of Latin MSS., see E. J. Kenney, *CQ* 39 (1989), 274-5, with the follow-up by L. Lehnus, *ZPE* 80 (1990), 16.

suggestion that 'so far as our evidence goes, Callimachus invented (or discovered) Molorchus; his was the first and only full-scale treatment',³² which is echoed in Richard Thomas's suggestion that 'the impoverished Molorchus' was 'a figure possibly invented by Callimachus, and at least lifted by him from total obscurity'.³³ This *argumentum ex silentio* that Callimachus may have invented Molorcus reminds me of nothing so much as the suggestion made a century ago by E. Maass that Eratosthenes had invented Erigone, the daughter of Icarus, and her dog Maera.³⁴ At the time Maass's suggestion could not be falsified, but then the discovery of P. Oxy. 1011 (fr. 75 Pf.) and 1362 (fr. 178 Pf.) showed that this story certainly went back to Callimachus, and as Pfeiffer noted,³⁵ it almost surely went back further still to some Atthidographer. If we take at all seriously Callimachus' claim ἀμάρτυρον οὐδὲν αἰῶ, 'I sing of nothing without a witness', we shall be quite loath to believe that Callimachus would have invented Molorcus. The analogous case of Hecale, another impoverished rustic who entertained another transient hero on his way to vanquish another vexatious beast, is illuminating. From Plutarch, *Thes.* 14 we happen to know that the story of Hecale went back to the Atthidographer Philochorus, who wrote early in the third century B.C., and hence that Callimachus founded his tale on an earlier tradition. Hence I should think it highly probable that Callimachus founded his story of Molorcus on some earlier work, perhaps a detailed story of Hercules' labours, or perhaps a local history of the Argolid. If the latter, a likely candidate, which we know Callimachus utilised elsewhere in the first book of the *Aetia*,³⁶ would be the *Argolica* of Agias and Dercylus.³⁷

University of Delaware

J. D. MORGAN

³² Parsons, op. cit. 43.

³³ R. F. Thomas, op. cit. 94.

³⁴ E. Maass, *Analecta Eratosthenica* (*Philologische Untersuchungen*, 6, 1883), 124–31.

³⁵ R. Pfeiffer, *Kallimachosstudien* (Munich, 1922), pp. 104ff.

³⁶ Cf. fr. 3 Pf. and F. Jacoby, *FGrHist*, no. 305, F 4 and 8, and the *addendum* on p. 757, with Jacoby's accompanying commentary, especially p. 19: 'die neuen fragmente 4 und 8 scheinen zu bestätigen, dass diese *Argolika* nicht nur den grammatikern der guten zeit, sondern schon dem Kallimachos unter dem doppelitel Ἀγίας καὶ Δερκύλος vorlagen und dass er dieses buch vielleicht als das zu seiner zeit modernste und ausführlichste (wie für Athen Philochoros) für die vielen argivischen geschichten benutzte, die er besonders in den *Aetia* erzählte'.

³⁷ I am grateful to George Goold, Edward Courtney, and Massimo Gioseffi for information regarding the readings of various manuscripts, to Ihor Ševčenko for a discussion of contractions in Greek manuscripts, and to Richard Thomas for his comments on an earlier draft of this article; also to the Editor for alerting me to the recent note by F. Vian, *REG* 104 (1991), 585, n. 4, where Vian observes that Greek MSS offer only the form *Μόλορκος*. Unlike Vian, I attribute the preference for 'Molorchus' not to 'poètes et grammairiens latins', but to the scribes of their MSS.

BION I, LINES 25–7

These important lines have not yet received an adequate discussion.¹ Aphrodite has been told that her beloved Adonis is dying on the mountainside; she rushes to him in grief, letting down her hair and calling for him. Then, in Gow's text,

ἀμφὶ δὲ νιν μέλαν αἶμα παρ' ὀμφαλὸν ἄωρεῖτο, 25
στήθεα δ' ἐκ μηρῶν φοινίσσεται, τοὶ δ' ὑπὸ μαζοῖ
χιόνεοι τὸ πάροιθεν Ἀδώνιδι πορφύροντο.

25 νιν Wilamowitz: μιν codd. ἄωρ. Wil.: ἤωρ. codd. 26 τοὶ Wil.: οἱ codd. ὑπὸ μ. Lobeck: ὑπομαζοῖ codd.

¹ I shall refer to the following editions and discussions of the passage: H. L. Ahrens, *Bucolicorum graecorum Theocriti Bionis Moschi reliquiae* (Lipsiae, 1855); F. Buecheler, *Jahrb. f.*