GIUSEPPE GIANGRANDE
Καθηγητοῦ τοῦ Παν/μίου τοῦ Λονδίνου
(Birkbeck College)

TWO PASSAGES OF CHAMAILEON AND A FRAGMENT OF ARISTOTLE

The recent edition of Chamaileon by D. Giordano[1] gives me the opportunity of explaining two passages, which the critics have unnecessarily altered. Athen. 461 a-c quotes Chamaileon's words as follows (fr. 11 Giordano, = fr. 9 Wehrli): οὐδὲ γὰρ παλαιὸν οὐδὲ τοῦτό γέ ἐστι παρὰ τοῖς Ἕλλησιν, ἀλλὰ νεωστὶ εὑρέθη πεμφθὲν ἐκ τῶν βαρβάρων· ἐκεῖνοι γὰρ ἀπεστερημένοι τῆς παιδείας ὁρμῶσιν ἐπὶ τὸν πολὺν οἶνον καὶ πορίζονται τροφὰς περιέργους καὶ παντοίας· ἐν δὲ τοῖς περὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα τόποις οὔτ' ἐν γραφαῖς οὔτ' ἐπὶ τῶν πρότερον εὑρήσομεν ποτήριον εὐμέγεθες εἰργασμένον πλὴν τῶν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἡρωϊκοῖς. For οὐδὲ γὰρ παλαιὸν οὐδὲ τοῦτο Kaibel, followed by Gulick (in his Loeb edition of Athenaeus), Wehrli and now by Giordano, proposed οὐ γὰρ παλαιὸν οὐδὲ τοῦτο. It is true that "οὐδὲ γάρ... ist niemals einem einfachen...οὐ γὰρ gleichzusetzen", according to strict grammar[2], but it is no less true that οὐδὲ γὰρ instead of the correct οὐ γὰρ is attested in post-Attic prose[3]: this is due to "abgeschwächtes καί"[4], whereby the type οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδὲ (in this case οὐδὲ γὰρ παλαιὸν οὐδὲ) came to mean, as in this passage of Chamaileon, "denn...nicht"[5], and not, as it should

---

1. *Chamaeleontis Fragmenta*, ed. D. Giordano,Bologna 1977. I quote the fragments according to the numeration in Giordano's and in Wehrli's editions (F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, Basel-Stuttgart 1957, sec. ed. 1969).

2. E. Mayser, *Gramm. der griech. Pap.*, Band II 3, Berlin-Leipzig 1934, p. 122.

3. Cf. e.g. Fr. Blass - A. Debrunner, *Gramm. neutest. Griech.*, 11th ed., Göttingen 1961, § 452, 3.

4. Blass - Debrunner, *loc. cit.*

5. W. Bauer, *Wört. z. N.T.*, s.v. οὐδέ, 1.

according to Attic grammar[6], "denn auch nicht". Giordano, strangely enough, although accepting Kaibel's alteration οὐ γὰρ οὐδέ, translated the passage erroneously ("giacché *neppure* questa é antica consuetudine presso gli Elleni": "neppure" = "auch nicht"); the correct sense of οὐδὲ γὰρ παλαιὸν οὐδὲ τοῦτο κ.τ.λ. is, as correctly perceived by Gulick, "but this is, in fact, *not at all* [i. e. "denn...nicht"] an ancient custom...".

After οὔτ' ἐν γραφαῖς οὔτ', Schweighäuser marked a lacuna, which has been filled in different ways by different editors (cf. now Giordano's apparatus *ad loc.;* Wehrli does not posit a lacuna and postulates a corruption, (by printing οὔτ' ἐν γραφαῖς οὔτ' ἐπὶ τῶν †πρότερον†). There is no need for a lacuna, and there is no corruption, because ἐπὶ + gen. (here, ἐπὶ τῶν πρότερον) means "auf Grund der Aussage von"[7]: the sense of οὔτ' ἐν γραφαῖς οὔτ' ἐπὶ τῶν πρότερον, a phrase which is perfectly sound, is therefore "neither in paintings nor according to the testimony of (ἐπὶ) the ancients (τῶν πρότερον)". Chamaileon means that large cups are neither represented in the works of art which have come down from the past, nor can their existence be proved on the basis of the testimony of earlier writers. On οἱ πρότερον = "die Früheren" cf. Bauer, *op. cit.*, s.v. πρότερος, 1, b, β. The phrase πλὴν τῶν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἡρωϊκοῖς cannot mean "except those in honour of heroic beings" (so Gulick), because the word for "heroic beings" in Greek is οἱ ἥρωες: on the other hand, there is no need to alter ἡρωϊκοῖς into ἥρωσι with Giordano. The sense is "except those (πλὴν τῶν) intended for (ἐπὶ) the requirements of heroes (τοῖς ἡρωϊκοῖς)". Τοῖς ἡρωϊκοῖς is the dative of the neuter τὰ ἡρωϊκά, which neuter has the sense "requirements of heroes" (on the articled type τὰ νυμφικά, τὰ γεωργικὰ cf. A. Ammann, *-ικὸς bei Platon*, Diss. Bern 1953, p. 250 f.: "Typus C"), and ἐπὶ denotes here the purpose for which the cups under discussion were made. To sum up: the sense of the passage is (I suitably adapt Gulick's translation) "but in the regions of Greece we shall not find a cup that has been wrought to very great size, either represented in art or according to the testimony of the ancients".

In *schol. Genav.* Φ 390, vol. I, p. 206 Nicole (fragm. 20 Giordano, = fr. 18 Wehrli) we read:[8] ᾽Αριστοτέλης ἐν ᾽Απορήμασι ζητεῖ πῶς τῷ ῞Αρει ἐπι-

6. On οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδὲ cf. e.g. Kühner - Gerth, *Ausf. Gramm.*, II, p. 204.

7. W. Bauer, *op. cit.*, s.v. ἐπί, I, 1, b, β.

8. The text of the scholion as printed by Nicole contains misreadings, which have been repeated by Wehrli and Giordano. I have printed the text of the scholion as it is contained in the *Gen. graec. 44*, after collating a photograph of the manuscript kindly sent to me by M. Ph. Monnier, to whom I am greatly indebted.

πλήξας ὅτι αὐτῷ "ἔρις φίλον πόλεμοί τε" (Hom., *Iliad* 5, 891), οὗτος γέγηθεν ἐπὶ τούτοις· φησὶ δὲ ὅτι "ὀρθῶς ἐπιτιμᾷ τῷ Ἄρει: οὐ γὰρ ἔχαιρεν ἀλλ' ὅτι αἰεὶ οἰνόφλυξ οὐδὲ φιλόμαχος ὅστις χαίρει οἴνῳ ἀλλ' ὅτι αἰεὶ καὶ σφόδρα". Χαμαιλέων ἐν α' περὶ τῆς Ἰλιάδος μέμφεται τὸ ἐθελόκακον τοῦ Διὸς καί φησιν: "ὥσπερ εἴ τι καλὸν ὁρῶ, ἀλλ' οὐ τὴν μεγίστην ἀτοπίαν· ῥητέον οὖν ὅτι περὶ ἀρετῆς ἡμιλλῶντο· οὐ γὰρ ἦσαν θνητοί, ἵνα κινδυνεύσωσιν".

To begin with, the pronoun οὗτος (altered to αὐτός, quite unwarrantably, by Nicole, whom Giordano and Wehrli follow) is perfectly sound: οὗτος is here used to take up again, emphatically, the previous participle[9] ἐπιπλήξας[10], the sense being literally "Aristotle investigates how anybody who has blamed Ares (ἐπιπλήξας) because Ares likes wars, this very person (οὗτος) can rejoice in wars". The person in question is, of course, Zeus, as the quotation ἔρις φίλον πόλεμοί τε makes clear. The text of Aristotle is drastically modified by Nicole, whose alterations are adopted by Giordano and Wehrli: in reality, no change is warranted. The passage should be punctuated as follows: οὐ γὰρ ἔχαιρεν ἀλλ' ὅτι αἰεί· οἰνόφλυξ, οὐδὲ φιλόμαχος, ὅστις χαίρει οἴνῳ, ἀλλ' ὅτι αἰεὶ καὶ σφόδρα. The two κῶλα which conclude each sentence (ἀλλ' ὅτι αἰεί and ἀλλ' ὅτι αἰεὶ καὶ σφόδρα) are evidently parallel; moreover, that the first sentence should end with ἀλλ' ὅτι αἰεὶ is confirmed by *schol. B* on *Il.* XXI, 389: ἡ δὲ λύσις ἐκ τῆς λέξεως: τὸ γὰρ αἰεὶ προσκείμενον τὴν διαφωνίαν ἔλυσεν. In Aristotle's opinion, that is, an opinion shared by *schol. B,* the word αἰεὶ in Homer's line (αἰεὶ γάρ τοι ἔρις φίλον πόλεμοί τε) makes all the difference. The sense of Aristotle's sentence is "Zeus blames Ares rightly, because really (οὐ γάρ...ἀλλὰ) Ares liked them (*scil.* the ἔρις πόλεμοί τε under discussion) permanently (αἰεί)". Οὐ γάρ... ἀλλὰ means here "for really", "because really". Instead of ἀλλά, we find in the passage ἀλλ' ὅτι, a well-known vulgarism[11]. Whether this vulgarism proceeds from the scholiast's pen, who quoted Aristotle from memory and wrote ἀλλ' ὅτι instead of ἀλλά, or from Aristotle himself[12], is impossible to

9. On οὗτος "vorhergehendes mit erhöhtem Nachdruck wiederaufnehmend", cf. Bauer, *op. cit.*, s.v. οὗτος 1, a, ε; this use of οὗτος is "sehr üblich", cf. Blass - Debrunner, *op. cit.*, § 290, 2.

10. The non-articled substantivized participle ἐπιπλήξας means "anybody who has blamed" (not, of course "the person who has blamed", which would be ὁ ἐπιπλήξας). Giordano's rendering "in che modo (Zeus), dopo aver biasimato Ares" is inaccurate.

11. On ἀλλ' ὅτι = ἀλλά, cf. D. Tabachovitz, *Etudes sur le grec de la basse époque,* Uppsala 1943, p. 45f.

12. Aristotle was notoriously fond of ὅτι "pleonastice positum" (e.g. "ἢ ὅτι, πότερον ὅτι, ubi ἤ, πότερον requiras"): cf. Bonitz, *Index Aristotelicus,* s.v. ὅτι.

say. The point, in sum, is that, whereas Zeus was not to be blamed because he liked fighting only when the occasion required it, Ares deserved to be blamed because he liked fighting permanently.

After thus distinguishing between the relative bellicosity of Zeus and Ares, Aristotle adds, by the common procedure of an *asyndeton*, an apposite parallel example. According to a well-known *topos*[13], both the man who drinks wine as a means of becoming warlike (φιλόμαχος) and the alcoholic like wine, but the alcoholic likes it permanently and in excess. Therefore Aristotle says: "an alcoholic (οἰνόφλυξ), certainly not a warlike person (φιλόμαχος), is he who likes wine, but (ἀλλ' ὅτι[11]) permanently and in excess". The point is that being warlike (φιλόμαχος) was a quality[14], as such not to be blamed, whereas being an alcoholic was a vice, as such deserving to be blamed[15]. The parallel example is apposite, because Aristotle is discussing the relative warlike nature of Zeus and Ares: the latter is to be blamed for permanently liking wars (as opposed to one who likes fighting only when the occasion requires it), just as the alcoholic is to be blamed for permanently and excessively drinking wine (as opposed to one who likes drinking it only on occasions). The parallelism between the two κῶλα is perfect, both from the formal point of view (ἀλλ' ὅτι αἰεὶ = ἀλλ' ὅτι αἰεὶ καὶ σφόδρα) and from the conceptual one. After ἀλλ' ὅτι αἰεί, which literally means "but permanently (on οὐ γὰρ ἀλλὰ cf. Kühner-Gerth II, p. 286: οὐ γὰρ ἔχαιρεν ἀλλ' ὅτι αἰεὶ means" he liked wars, but permanently") we must understand "unlike Zeus, who liked them occasionally"; after ἀλλ' ὅτι αἰεὶ καὶ σφόδρα, which means "but permanently and in excess", we must understand "unlike the φιλόμαχος, who likes wine occasionally and not in excess". Finally, it is to be observed that the ms. reading ὁρῶ need not be altered into ἑώρα, with Nicole, Wehrli and Giordano. Chamaileon's words are ironic: "As it were (ὡσπερεί), I see here (ὁρῶ) something beautiful, and not the greatest absurdity". Ὡσπερεὶ with the present indicative is of course common (e.g. Plat. *Crat.* 407D, ὡσπερεὶ λέγει ὅτι, 408A ὡσπερεὶ ἐπιτάττει, 422A ὡσπερεὶ στοιχεῖα...ἐστί. Τὸ ἐθελόκακον does not mean "intenzionale stortura", as Giordano takes it, nor is ἵνα final, as Giordano interprets it: "non erano

13. On this *topos* cf. e.g. Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 1117 a 13ff., explaining why the μεθυσκόμενοι are courageous; *Entr. Hardt* XIV, p. 171, on the "Zechermut"; *Quad. Urbin.* 24, 1977, p. 154, n. 18: "il troppo vino puó addirittura consegnare al nemico".

14. Being warlike, φιλόμαχος, is a quality: the epithet φιλόμαχος is a term of praise e.g. at Aesch. *Sept.* 129, *Agamemn.* 230.

15. Οἰνοφλυγία is an ἀκολασία, as Aristotle states (cf. Bonitz, *Index Aristot.*, s.v. οἰνοφλυγία).

mortali (che si scontravano) per correre rischi". Τὸ ἐθελόκακον means here "military cowardice" (cf. LSJ, s.v. ἐθελόκακος, II), and ἵνα is consecutive[16]. Aristotle's "Rechtfertigung des Zeus in Ilias XXI, 390"[17], which Chamaileon criticizes here[18], would make of Zeus a coward (τὸ ἐθελόκακον τοῦ Διός): this is absurd, so argues Chamaileon, because Zeus and Ares "were not mortals, such as to (ἵνα, consecutive) risk their lives (κινδυνεύσωσιν)" when taking part in the wars.

16. Cf. Bauer, *op. cit.*, s.v. ἵνα.
17. Cf. Wehrli, *op. cit.*, p. 77.
18. Cf. Wehrli, *ibid.*