

ΠΡΑΚΤΙΚΑ ΤΗΣ ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑΣ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

ΕΚΤΑΚΤΗ ΣΥΝΕΔΡΙΑ ΤΗΣ 5^{ΗΣ} ΦΕΒΡΟΥΑΡΙΟΥ 2002

ΠΡΟΕΔΡΙΑ ΜΗΤΡΟΠΟΛΙΤΟΥ ΠΕΡΓΑΜΟΥ ΙΩΑΝΝΟΥ (ΖΗΖΙΟΥΛΑ)

ΕΠΙΣΗΜΗ ΥΠΟΔΟΧΗ ΤΟΥ ΑΝΤΕΠΙΣΤΕΛΛΟΝΤΟΣ ΜΕΛΟΥΣ ΤΗΣ ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑΣ JAMES DIGGLE

ΧΑΙΡΕΤΙΣΜΟΣ ΑΠΟ ΤΟΝ ΠΡΟΕΔΡΟ ΤΗΣ ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑΣ
ΣΕΒΑΣΜΙΩΤΑΤΟ ΜΗΤΡΟΠΟΛΙΤΗ ΠΕΡΓΑΜΟΥ κ. ΙΩΑΝΝΗ (ΖΗΖΙΟΥΛΑ)

Ἡ σημερινή ἔκτακτη συνεδρία τῆς Ἀκαδημίας Ἀθηνῶν εἶναι ἀφιερωμένη στήν επίσημη ὑποδοχή τοῦ καθηγητοῦ τοῦ Πανεπιστημίου τοῦ Cambridge κ. James Diggle ὡς ἀντεπιστέλλοντος μέλους τῆς Ἀκαδημίας.

Στό πρόσωπο τοῦ καθηγητοῦ Diggle ἡ Ἀκαδημία τιμᾷ ἓνα διαπρεπῆ ἐρευνητή καί πανεπιστημιακὸ διδάσκαλο, ὁ ὁποῖος ἀφιέρωσε τὴ ζωὴ του μὲ ἄκρα ἐπιτυχία στὴ μελέτη τῆς κλασσικῆς ἀρχαιοελληνικῆς γραμματείας, ἰδιαιτέρως μάλιστα τῆς ἀρχαίας ἐλληνικῆς τραγωδίας μὲ ἐπίκεντρο τὸ ἔργο τοῦ Εὐριπίδη καί ἀποκορύφωμα τὴ θαυμάσια ἔκδοση τῶν δραμάτων τοῦ τραγικοῦ ποιητῆ στὴν τελευταία πρὸ αὐθεντικὴ καί ἔγκυρη μορφή της.

Στὴν ὅλη σταδιοδρομία καί τὸ ἔργο τοῦ καθηγητοῦ Diggle θὰ ἀναφερθεῖ ἐντὸς ὀλίγου ἀρμόδιος ἀκαδημαϊκός. Περιορίζομαι στὸ νὰ ἐξάρω τὴν ἰδιαίτερη σημασία ποὺ ἔχει γιὰ τὴν Ἀκαδημία Ἀθηνῶν, τὸ ὅτι ἐντάσσει ἀπόψε καί ἐπισήμως στὰ ἀντεπιστέλλοντα μέλη της ἓνα τόσο διακεκριμένο ἐπιστήμονα, ἐρευνητὴ καί φίλο τῆς ἐλληνικῆς παιδείας καί τοῦ ἐλληνικοῦ πολιτισμοῦ, στό πρόσωπο τοῦ ὁποῖου ἀναγνωρίζεται καί προβάλλεται διεθνῶς καί μεταλαμπαδεύεται στὸ σύγχρονο τεχνοκρατούμενο κόσμο τὸ πνεῦμα τῶν μεγάλων στοχαστῶν τῆς ἐλληνικῆς ἀρχαιότητος, τοῦ ὁποῖου ἔχει τόσην ἀνάγκην ἡ ἐποχὴ μας.

Dear Professor Diggle,

It gives me great pleasure to welcome you officially this evening on behalf of the Academy of Athens as one of its corresponding members. In your person our Academy recognises and honours a distinguished classical scholar who has devoted his life with great success to the study of the classical Greek and Latin heritage and who by so doing has contributed not only to the preservation, restoration and knowledge of the uniquely invaluable spiritual treasures of classical antiquity, but also to the spiritual and moral welfare of humanity in our time.

On behalf of our Academy I express to you, distinguished colleague, our joy and satisfaction for your presence among us, and extend to you our best wishes for a long and fruitful continuation of your scholarly activities.

Καί τώρα παρακαλώ τὸν ἀκαδημαϊκὸ κ. Κονομῆ νὰ λάβει τὸν λόγo.

ΠΡΟΣΦΩΝΗΣΗ ΑΠΟ ΤΟΝ ΑΚΑΔΗΜΑΪΚΟ κ. ΝΙΚΟΛΑΟ ΚΟΝΟΜΗ

Σεβασμιώτατε Πρόεδρε,

Κύριοι Συνάδελφοι,

Κυρίες καὶ Κύριοι,

Ὁ σημερινὸς ὁμιλητὴς μας κ. James Diggle εἶναι καθηγητὴς τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς καὶ Λατινικῆς στὸ Πανεπιστήμιο τοῦ Καίμπριτζ καὶ ἐπιπλέον ἐταῖρος, διευθυντὴς Κλασσικῶν Σπουδῶν καὶ Praelector τοῦ Κολλεγίου τῶν Βασιλισσῶν (Queens' College).

Τὶς σπουδές του ὡς φοιτητὴς τῶν κλασσικῶν γραμμάτων πραγματοποίησε στὸ φημισμένο γιὰ τὴν κλασσικὴ φιλολογία κολλέγιο τοῦ Richard Bentley (St. John's College), ὅπου ἀρίστευσε στὶς ἐξετάσεις τοῦ Κλασσικοῦ Τρίποδα καὶ κατὰ τὴ διάρκεια τῶν σπουδῶν του κέρδισε ἐξαιτίας τῆς ἐπίδοσής του ὑποτροφίες καὶ βραβεῖα, ἀνάμεσα στὰ ὅποια τὸ Browne Medal, γιὰ τὴν ἑλληνικὴ ἐλεγεία καὶ τὸ λατινικὸ ἐπίγραμμα, ὅπως καὶ τὸ βραβεῖο Porson, τὸ σπουδαιότερο βραβεῖο γιὰ τὰ ἑλληνικὰ γράμματα στὸ Πανεπιστήμιο τοῦ Καίμπριτζ.

Τὸ 1966/7 ἔγινε Ἐταῖρος Ἐρευνητῆς τοῦ Κολλεγίου τῶν Βασιλισσῶν καὶ τὸ ἐπόμενο ἔτος Ἐπίσημος Ἐταῖρος, τὸ 1995 Ἐταῖρος Καθηγητῆς καὶ Διευθυντῆς Κλασσικῶν Σπουδῶν τοῦ Κολλεγίου του. Τὰ ἔτη 1982-93 ἐκτέλεσε τὰ σημαντικὰ καθήκοντα τοῦ Πανεπιστημιακοῦ ρήτορα (Orator) καὶ τὸ 1985 ἀπέκτησε τὸν τίτλο

Litt. D. και έγινε εταῖρος τῆς Βρεττανικῆς Ἀκαδημίας. Τὸ 1989-95 κατεῖχε τὴν πανεπιστημιακὴ θέση τοῦ Reader στὰ Ἑλληνικά καὶ Λατινικά καὶ τὸ 1995 προήχθη σὲ καθηγητὴ τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν καὶ Λατινικῶν Γραμμάτων.

Παράλληλα μὲ τὴν ἀκαδημαϊκὴ του ἀνέλιξη ἄσκησε ποικίλα καθήκοντα πού τοῦ ἀνατέθηκαν ἀπὸ τὸ Κολλέγιό του, τὸ Πανεπιστήμιο καὶ τοὺς συναδέλφους του. Ἀπὸ ἓνα μακρὺ κατάλογο ἀναφέρω τὰ καθήκοντα τοῦ Γραμματέα (1970-74) καὶ τοῦ Προέδρου (1996-98) τῆς Φιλολογικῆς Ἑταιρείας τοῦ Καίμπριτζ, τοῦ συνεκδότη τῆς γνωστῆς σειρᾶς τοῦ Πανεπιστημιακοῦ τυπογραφείου Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries, τοῦ Προέδρου τῆς Συμβουλευτικῆς Ἐπιτροπῆς τοῦ Ἑνδιάμεσου Ἑλληνικοῦ Λεξικοῦ (1998-) κ.ἄ.

Μακρὺς εἶναι ὁ κατάλογος τῶν δημοσιευμάτων του. Θὰ ἀναφερθῶ μόνο στὰ κυριότερα βιβλία του:

1. *The Phaethon of Euripides*, μὲ προλεγόμενα, κείμενο καὶ σχόλιασμο (1970).

Μιά ἀπὸ τίς πιὸ συναρπαστικὲς φιλολογικὲς ἀνακαλύψεις στίς ἀρχές τοῦ 19ου αἰ. ἦταν ἡ εὕρεση ἀπὸ τοὺς Hase καὶ Bekker τῶν θαυμάσιων ἀποσπασμάτων τοῦ ἔργου τοῦ Εὐριπίδη *Φαέθων*. Περιείχοντο σὲ δύο φύλλα τοῦ κώδικος Claromontanus καὶ κάποια μελέτη τους ἔγινε ἀπὸ τὸν Gottfried Hermann καὶ ἀργότερα τὸν Wilamowitz. Τὸ 1907 ἓνας πάπυρος στὸ Βερολίνο ἐβελτίωσε τὸ κείμενο τῶν λυρικῶν στίχων τῆς παρόδου. Τὸ ἔργο τῆς ἐκδόσης καὶ τοῦ σχόλιασμοῦ ἀπετέλεσε ἰδανικὸ θέμα γιὰ τὴ διδακτορικὴ διατριβὴ τοῦ πολυμαθοῦς καὶ ἔξυπνου νέου ἐπιστήμονα μὲ τὴν καθοδήγηση τοῦ καθηγητοῦ του μακαρίτη Denys Page. Τὸ ἀποτέλεσμα ἦταν ἓνα σημαντικὸ καὶ ἐνδιαφέρον βιβλίον ἄξιον νὰ διαβαστεῖ προσεκτικὰ. Στὸ βιβλίον ἀντικατοπτρίζονταν ἡ πολυμαθεῖα ἀλλὰ προπαντὸς ἡ κριτικὴ ὀξύνουια τοῦ νέου φιλολόγου.

Ὅλα τὰ ἄλλα ἔργα τοῦ καθηγητῆ Diggle, ἂν ἐξαίρεσει κανεὶς ἓνα τόμο μὲ ἐπιλεγμένα ἀποσπάσματα τῶν τραγικῶν (*Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta Selecta*), OCT 1998 καὶ μιὰ ἐπιλογή ἀπὸ τοὺς Πανεπιστημιακοὺς λόγους (*Cambridge Orations* 1982-93) πού ἐκφώνησε λατινιστὶ ὡς University Orator (1994), ἀναφέρονται στὴ μνημειώδη τρίτομο ἐκδοσὴ ὀλόκληρου τοῦ Εὐριπίδη στὴ γνωστὴ σειρὰ τῆς Ὁξφόρδης, OCT (1981-1994). Τρεῖς τόμοι συνόδευσαν ἢ προετοίμασαν τὴν ἐκδοσὴ αὐτή:

(1) Μελέτες στὸ κείμενο τοῦ Εὐριπίδη (*Studies on the text of Euripides*), 1981.

(2) Ἡ χειρόγραφη παράδοση τοῦ Ὁρέστη τοῦ Εὐριπίδη (*The Textual Tradition of Euripides' Orestes*), 1991.

(3) Εὐριπίδεια: Συγκεντρωμένα Δοκίμια (*Euripidea: Collected Essays*), 1994.

Οἱ τόμοι αὐτοὶ γιὰ τὴ χειρόγραφη κυρίως παράδοση τοῦ κειμένου τοῦ Εὐριπίδη ἀφ' ἑνὸς συμπληρώνουν τὴν ἴδια τὴν ἐκδοσὴ καὶ ἀφ' ἑτέρου ἀποδεικνύουν μὲ πόση

προσοχή ὁ ἐκδότης παρακολουθεῖ τὴν παράδοση τοῦ κειμένου, τὴ γλωσσικὴ καὶ μετρικὴ λεπτομέρεια, ὥστε νὰ ἐπαυξήσῃ τὴν κατανόησίν μας τῶν κειμένων. Στὴ χειρόγραφη παράδοση τοῦ Ὁρέστη, ὅπου συμβουλευτήκε 55 χφφ, 35 ἀπὸ τὰ ὁποῖα μὲ αὐτοψία, καὶ τοὺς σχετικοὺς παπύρους, μᾶς ἐφοδιάζει μὲ τὴν καλύτερην ἀντιβολή, γιατί τὸ ἔργον του εἶναι πολὺ πιὸ ἀξιόπιστον ἀπὸ ὁποιοδήποτε ἄλλο ἀνάλογον. Ἐκτὸς τοῦ ὅτι συνεισφέρει σ' ἓνα καλύτερον κείμενον τῆς τραγωδίας αὐτῆς, βελτιώνει τὴν κατανόησίν μας τῶν σχέσεων ὄλων τῶν χειρογράφων τοῦ Εὐριπίδου συνολικά.

Ἐρχόμαστε τώρα στὴν τρίτομην ἐκδοση τῶν δραμάτων τοῦ Εὐριπίδου. Προσωπικά τὴ θεωρῶ ὡς ἓνα ἀπὸ τὰ κατορθώματα τῆς φιλολογίας τοῦ τέλους τοῦ 20οῦ αἰ. Πλήρης κριτικὴ ἐκδοση τοῦ Εὐριπίδου εἶχε γίνῃ ἀπὸ τὸν διάσημον καθηγητὴ τῆς Ὁξφόρδης Gilbert Murray (1893-1913) στὴν ἴδια σειρά καὶ ἔγινε ἀμέσως ἡ καθιερωμένη ἐκδοση χωρὶς νὰ ἀπειλεῖται ἐπὶ ἓνα αἶωνα εἴτε ἀπὸ τὴν συλλογικὴν ἐκδοση Budé εἴτε ἀπὸ τὴν ἐπίσης συλλογικὴν ἐκδοση Teubner, πού δὲν ἔχουν ἀκόμην ὀλοκληρωθεῖ.

Στὰ χρόνια μετὰ τὴν ἐκδοση Murray ἔχουμε μιὰ πολὺ μεγάλη σειρά ἀπὸ μεμονωμένες ἐκδόσεις, σχολιαστικά ὑπομνήματα καὶ σημαντικὰς μελέτες γιὰ τὸ κείμενον, τὴ μορφήν καὶ τὴς δραματουργικὰς σπουδὰς ὄλων τῶν εἰδῶν, οἱ ὁποῖες ἀγκαλιάζουν ὀλόκληρον τὸ ἀρχαῖον δράμα, ὅχι μόνον τοῦ Εὐριπίδου. Τὸ ἀποτέλεσμα ἦταν ὅτι ἡ πρόκληση σ' ἓνα νέο, μοναδικὸν ἐκδότην γιὰ μιὰ καινούργια ἐκδοση πού νὰ κρατήσῃ ὅσον καὶ τοῦ Murray ἦταν κάτι πολὺ ἐθεωρεῖτο σχεδὸν ἀκατόρθωτον. Ὁ καθηγητὴς Diggle ἄρχισε τὴς δημοσιεύσεις του στὸν Εὐριπίδον τὸ 1969 καὶ, καθὼς οἱ δημοσιεύσεις αὐτὲς πλήθαιναν, ἡ ἐλπίδα μεγάλωνε ὅτι ὅχι μόνον θὰ ἐκδώσῃ τὸν Εὐριπίδον ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅτι θὰ βασάνιζε κριτικὰ τὴς παραδεδομένης γραφῆς καὶ εἰκασίας τοῦ κειμένου καὶ ὅτι θὰ παρουσίαζε δικὰς του ἀξιόλογες προτάσεις. Ὅλα αὐτὰ συνέβησαν κατὰ τὸν πιὸ θαυμαστὸν τρόπον. Τὸ ἀποτέλεσμα εἶναι ὅτι στὸ κάθε δράμα, ἐκτὸς ἀπὸ τὴν κωλομετρία, βελτιώθηκαν 100-120 χωρία χωρὶς νὰ προσμετροῦμε ὀρθογραφικὰς βελτιώσεις. Τὸ κριτικὸν ὑπόμνημα εἶναι ἐξαιρετικόν, μὲ χρῆσιν ἐπακρῶν καὶ οἰκονομικῶν συμβόλων. Συχνὰ σ' αὐτὸ διορθώνονται προηγούμενες ἀντιβολὲς ἢ ἐσφαλμένες ἀποδόσεις εἰκασιῶν. Ὑπάρχουν βοηθητικὰς σύντομες συζητήσεις ἰδιαιτέρων δυσκολιῶν, σποραδικὰς ἀναφορὰς σὲ ἀνάλογα φαινόμενα, γλωσσικὰ ἢ μετρικὰ. Τὸ τελικὸν ἀποτέλεσμα εἶναι γενικὰ μιὰ ἐμπιστοσύνη στὴν πληρότητα τοῦ ἔργου, τὴν ἀκρίβειαν καὶ μαζί τὴν ἐπιστημονικὴν αὐστηρότητα πού πείθουν γιὰ τὴς πρωτότυπες εἰσηγήσεις. Ὁ καθηγητὴς Diggle εἶναι βαθὺς γνώστης καὶ τῶν δύο γλωσσῶν καὶ μαζί μὲ τὸν F.R.D. Goodyear ἐξέδωκαν τὸ 1970 τὸ ἔργον τοῦ Flavius Cresconius Corippus, *Johannidos seu de bellis Libycis libri VIII*. Πρόκειται γιὰ ἓνα ἔπος 5000 σχεδὸν ἐξαμέτρων γιὰ τοὺς πολέμους τοῦ Ἰουστινιανοῦ στὴ Β. Ἀφρική. Στὴ νέα ἐκδοση ἐνσωματώνονται οἱ εἰσηγήσεις γιὰ τὸ κείμενον προηγούμενων μελετῶν. Ἀπὸ τὴς 200 περίπου εἰσηγή-

σεις που γίνονται δεκτές στο κείμενο, οι 50 ανήκουν στους δύο εκδότες. Ο καθηγητής Diggle επιμελήθηκε ως εκδότης πέντε έργα, ανάμεσα σ' αυτά μαζί με τον Goodyear το τρίτομο έργο *The Classical Papers of A.E. Housman* (1972). Ο ίδιος ο Housman άφησε εντολή κανένα από τα κείμενά του που δημοσιεύτηκαν σε περιοδικά να μη δημοσιευθεί μετά το θάνατό του, οι εκδότες του όμως υπερνίκησαν την επιταγή του συγγραφέα προσφέροντας έτσι σημαντική ύπηρεσία στις κλασσικές σπουδές, καθώς ο Housman, όπως είναι γνωστό, υπήρξε ένας από τους μεγαλύτερους φιλόλογους του αιώνα. Μαζί με τον άλλο μαθητή του Page, τον R.D. Dawe, επιμελήθηκε την έκδοση του μεταθανάτιου τόμου του καθηγητού τους *Further Greek Epigrams* (1981), που ο Page συνέγραψε τις τελευταίες μέρες της ζωής του κάπου στη Northumbria. Τέλος, μαζί με δύο άλλους μαθητές του Denys Page εξέδωσε τον τόμο *Dionysiaca* με έργασίες 10 μαθητών του, μνημόσυνο σε έναν από τους μεγαλύτερους έλληνιστές της Βρετανίας, του οποίου ή παρουσία στις έλληνικές σπουδές θά συνεχίσει για πολλά χρόνια να γίνεται αίσθητή.

Αν στα παραπάνω βιβλία προστεθούν 96 μελετήματα αναφερόμενα τόσο στην ελληνική όσο και τη λατινική φιλολογία καθώς και 60 βιβλιοκρισίες για έργα της ελληνικής και λατινικής φιλολογίας, θά συμπληρωθεί κάπως ή εικόνα του νέου άντεπιστέλλοντος μέλους της Ακαδημίας μας.

Dear Professor Diggle,

Your scholarly work and your devotion for life to the Greek studies worthily led you to the Academy of Athens. As an old acquaintance and co-student of the late Denys Page I welcome you with joy and wish you every success in your academic career for the benefit of Classical Philology.

THE CHARACTERS OF THEOPHRASTOS

JAMES DIGGLE

CORRESPONDING MEMBER OF THE ACADEMY OF ATHENS

When Plato died in 348, his pupil Aristotle left Athens. He accepted the offer of a visiting lectureship from a former fellow-student in the Academy, Hermias, now ruler of Assos, on the coast of Asia Minor, opposite the island of Lesbos. On Lesbos at this time lived a young man called Turtamos, and he, we may assume, enrolled himself among the pupils of Aristotle. For when Aristotle left Assos, Turtamos followed him, first to the court of Philip of Macedon, and then to Athens. And when Aristotle left Athens again on the death of Alexander in 323, Turtamos succeeded him as head of the school which he had founded, the Lykeion. Later writers say that it was Aristotle himself who changed the man's name from Turtamos to Theophrastos, 'the divinely spoken', so highly did the master value his pupil's eloquence.

Good judges in antiquity echoed this verdict. And antiquity had more of Theophrastos to read than we have. Diogenes Laertios, in his brief biography of Theophrastos, written in the third century AD, lists the titles of more than 200 works. Quintilian, in the first century AD, speaks of a 'loquendi nitor diuinus', 'a brightness of language heaven-sent'. Cicero calls him 'dulcis' (sweet) and 'suavis' (pleasant), and Plutarch tells us that Cicero was accustomed to describe him as his *ἰδίᾳ τρυφή*, 'particular delight'. Modern judges have looked in vain for brightness and sweetness of style in the works of Theophrastos which survive. But, of those 200 works mentioned by the biographer, only three complete works have survived: the two works on botany entitled *Περὶ φυτῶν Ἱστορίας*, *Inquiry into Plants*, and *Περὶ φυτῶν Αἰτιῶν*, *Explanations of Plants*, and, third, the *Χαρακτῆρες*, *Characters*. Perhaps we should not expect to find brightness and sweetness in the botanical works. But we might expect to find them in the *Characters*. And yet a modern English translator calls the *Characters* 'sometimes obscure and inelegant ... the style unvaried and abrupt', and he believes that 'Their terseness suggests notes for lectures, and they can hardly have been written for separate publication as a literary work'. And a modern commentator complains that 'the Greek is not Greek at its most limpid', though he does concede that 'for all its potential monotony the style is not without a certain charm and aptness'. So why do I regard the *Characters* as the work of a master

stylist, who writes Greek that is limpid, elegant, pointed, ever glinting with flashes of brilliance?

First let us take a step back and ask ourselves what exactly it is that we have got here. What is this work which is called *Characters*? It is a collection of thirty short sketches, illustrating thirty different types of person, each of whom exemplifies a kind of behaviour which is faulty, abnormal, objectionable. The form of the sketches is unvarying. An individual is introduced in the first sentence. After the name of the individual there is added the expression *τοιούτος τις οἷος*, '(is) such a person as to'. For example, in sketch no. 1, 'The Dissembler (*εἰρων*) is such a person as to', 'is the sort of man who'. And the rest of the sketch is a series of sentences each containing an infinitive constructed with that introductory formula, and each sentence is linked by a simple *καὶ* or *καὶ* plus *δέ*. So The Dissembler is 'such a person as to do A and to do B and to do C', and so on. This is a new technique. It is very different from the way that Aristotle describes faulty characters in the *Nicomachean Ethics*. Many of the faults illustrated by the characters of Theophrastos are faults which are analysed by Aristotle: *δειλία* 'cowardice', *ἀνελευθερία* 'lack of generosity', *ἀναισχυντία* 'shamelessness', *ἀλαζονεία* 'boastfulness', among others. But Aristotle focuses on the abstract fault and defines what it is and how it relates to other virtues and vices. Theophrastos discards the abstract noun and substitutes the person, the *δειλὸς* Coward, the *ἀνελεύθερος* Ungenerous Man, the *ἀναισχυντος* Shameless Man, the *ἀλαζών* Boastful Man. Furthermore, he locates this person in a specific time and place. The time is the late 4th century, shortly after the death of Alexander. The place is Athens. And it is an Athens whose daily life is recreated for us in dozens of dramatic pictures and incidents. Theophrastos takes us everywhere: to the market, theatre, baths, gymnasia, wrestling-schools, lawcourts, assembly, dining-room and bedroom. And he peoples these places with a huge cast of extras: bankers and barbers, cooks and call-girls, fullers and fishmongers, priests and parasites, soldiers and sycophants, teachers and trierarchs. All life is here, and it is real life. They shop and gossip, and eat and drink, and lend and borrow, repair their shoes, belch in the theatre, carry coins in their mouths, stub their toes in the street, nail the soles back on their shoes, fall off horses and crack their skulls, keep pet monkeys and oriental pheasants, buy spherical oil-flasks from the South of Italy and twisted walking-sticks from Sparta and little ladders for pet birds, rummage through the rubbish when their wife mislays a small coin, and get bitten by a neighbour's dog while going to the lavatory during the night.

How real this life is easily goes unnoticed. Here is an example. We read (VI.9) of a money-lender who charges market-traders interest of one and a half obols to the drachma per day. This is 25% interest per day. If you think about it, you will realise that this represents an astronomical rate of interest per year. Look at the latest commentator: he records that the usual rate per year was 16%-18%, and he passes on, unconcerned, and leaves the incautious reader to suspect that the lenders and borrowers of Theophrastus, with their 25% interest per day, have gone mad, or are mere caricatures, and that this is a world of unreality. So I turn to the book entitled *Lending and Borrowing in Ancient Athens*, by a former pupil of mine, Paul Millett, and there I discover what is happening here. A market-trader will take out a loan at high daily interest in order to buy in the morning the goods which he hopes to have sold at a profit by the evening, when he will repay the loan and interest. The butchers and fishmongers of Theophrastus, who are borrowing at 25% per day, are behaving no differently from tradesmen in medieval Bruges or Victorian London.

Another example, just for the fun of it. We hear of a man who takes an excessive pride in his appearance. 'He has frequent haircuts, keeps his teeth white, and persistently changes his clothes' (V.6 πλειστάκις... ἀποκείρασθαι καὶ τοὺς ὀδόντας λευκοὺς ἔχειν καὶ τὰ ἱμάτια δὲ χρηστὰ μεταβάλλεσθαι). How does the man keep his teeth white? What did the ancient Greeks use for toothpaste? They used a kind of chewing gum. They chewed a resinous plant called σχῆνος 'mastich', which comes from the island of Chios. You see what an education it can be to study this work. That is not the kind of thing you learn by reading Euripides.

I have said that Theophrastus discards the abstract nouns of Aristotle and describes a person instead of a quality. But if you have looked at a text of this work, you will have noticed that every single sketch does in fact begin with an abstract noun, and a definition of that abstract noun. So, for example, the first sketch, the Εἶρων, The Dissembler, begins Ἡ μὲν οὖν εἰρωνεία δόξειεν ἂν εἶναι, ὡς τύπῳ λαβεῖν, προσποιήσις ἐπὶ χειρὸν πράξεων καὶ λόγων ('Dissembling, to define it in outline, would seem to be an affected self-denigration in action and speech'). Only then do we get to the personal subject: 'And The Dissembler is the sort of man who, and so on'. Every sketch begins like this with a definition of the abstract noun. Is not this more like Aristotle? Yes, indeed, it is. And it is intolerable. In the middle of the nineteenth century a German scholar called Friedrich Hanow suggested that these introductory definitions were not written by Theophrastus himself but were added by some later writer. Few scholars were

persuaded. Another German scholar, Markus Stein, has recently devoted a whole book to the examination of these definitions: *Definition und Schilderung in Theophrasts Charakteren* (1992). He has, in my view, proved beyond all doubt that the definitions were not written by Theophrastos. Even those definitions which are unobjectionable are no better than trite or banal. Some definitions appear to be based on entries in the pseudo-Platonic work entitled Ὅροι, *Definitions*; others appear to be copying phraseology found in Aristotle. In some cases the behaviour described in the definition is incompatible with the behaviour illustrated in the sketch. The definition which I have quoted, Dissembling, is at fault in two ways. It misrepresents the behaviour of the Dissembler, and it does so in language clumsily borrowed from the *Nicomachean Ethics*. That is proof enough that this definition was not written by Theophrastos. Now the most recent editor of the text deletes this and a few others definitions which he accepts that Stein has proved cannot be genuine. But he retains those definitions which, however inadequate they may be, cannot be *proved* to be spurious. This is perverse. The definitions have the same stamp. They come from the same workshop. They stand or fall together. And, contrary to what is claimed by everyone, including even Stein, Hanow was not the first scholar to suggest that the definitions are spurious; the first scholar to suggest this was your compatriot Δημήτριος Νικόλαος Δάρβαρις, who published a text of the *Characters*, with a commentary in modern Greek, in Vienna in 1815. And while I am paying tribute to Darvaris and restoring to him the credit which later scholars have denied him, let me mention another Greek scholar, of incomparably greater name, who published a celebrated edition of the *Characters* 16 years before Darvaris, the greatest of all the philologists of Hellas, Adamantios Korais.

The definitions are not the only spurious additions which the sketches have attracted. Several have moralising epilogues. For example, the first one ends with these words: 'Such are the remarks, tricks and repetitions which The Dissembler will invent. One should be more wary of disingenuous and designing characters than of vipers' (τοιαύτας φωνάς καὶ πλοκάς καὶ παλιλλογίας εὐρεῖν ἔστι τοῦ εἰρωνος. τὰ δὴ τῶν ἡθῶν μὴ ἀπλᾶ ἀλλ' ἐπίβουλα φυλάττεσθαι μᾶλλον δεῖ ἢ τοὺς ἔχρεις). Fortunately, nearly everyone now agrees that these epilogues were not written by Theophrastos. They may well have been written by the author of the rambling Preface, prefixed to the whole collection, which claims that the sketches are the work of a man ninety-nine years old writing for the moral edification of the young. This Preface may be a very late addition indeed, dating from the Byzantine period.

So, what are we left with when we have stripped the work of its spurious Preface, its spurious definitions, and its spurious epilogues? Have we unwrapped the genuine nucleus that is Theophrastos? Alas, we have not. Other additions have become embedded in the body of the sketches. Some of these additions, ranging in extent from single words to whole sentences, have been long recognised, and are now bracketed as interpolations by editors. But I believe that there are many others interpolations which remain to be expelled. Here is a simple proof that interpolation is a real phenomenon, not a fiction designed to save Theophrastos's credit as a stylist. The show-off with the white teeth owns a little wrestling school, and he hires this out to philosophers, sophists, instructors in fighting with weapons and music lecturers for them to perform in: V.10 τοῖς φιλοσόφοις τοῖς σοφισταῖς τοῖς ὀπλομάχοις τοῖς ἄρμονικοῖς. So say the manuscripts. But this quartet, of philosophers, sophists, weapons-instructors, and music lecturers, listed in asyndeton, that is without connecting words, ought to worry us. Theophrastos has several triads, of either nouns or verbs, in asyndeton, but never four nouns or verbs. Furthermore, philosophers and sophists are too much alike, when compared with the pair which follows, weapons-instructors and music-lecturers. If we are to reduce the list to three, by getting rid of either the sophists or the philosophers, then which of the two should we get rid of? Clearly the philosophers, because sophists are more likely than philosophers to wish to hire a place for public displays. It happens that parts of this sketch are preserved in a papyrus from Herculaneum, dating from the 1st century BC. And the papyrus omits the philosophers. But before the papyrus was discovered, nobody had suspected that the philosophers were intruders; and if anyone had voiced that suspicion, nobody would have believed him. There is an important lesson here, applicable not only to the text of Theophrastos but to any classical text. Anything that is anomalous, that is, anything that differs from the normal usage of the author, should be regarded with suspicion. Nothing is genuine merely because it is in the manuscripts and cannot be proved to be spurious.

Suppose (what in fact is impossible) that we can detect and expel all additions and interpolations. Shall we then see Theophrastos in his true colours? Alas, once again, we shall not. There is no Greek text more corrupt than this, and there are many places where we have no hope of recovering what Theophrastos wrote. For sketches I to XV we must rely on only two manuscripts, written in the eleventh century. For XVI to XXX we must rely on only one manuscript, written in the 13th century. Once again, let the papyrus offer a

warning. The Greek for that 'little wrestling-school' is, according to the manuscripts, *ἀλλίδιον παλαιστριαῖον*. If you consult the lexicon of Liddell and Scott you will find that *ἀλλίδιον* is attested once, as diminutive of *ἀλλός*, in the sense 'small tube'. Nevertheless the lexicon invents a sense for the word to have here, 'place of athletic exercises, ring'. You look up the adjective *παλαιστριαῖος*, and where do you find it attested? Here and here only, in the sense (according to the lexicon) 'suited for a *παλαίστρα*'. The nineteenth-century Dutch scholar Cobet boldly replaced *ἀλλίδιον παλαιστριαῖον* with *παλαιστρίδιον*, 'little palaistra, little wrestling-school'. Once again, I wonder whether anyone would print this in the text if it had not been confirmed later by the papyrus. The lesson is the same as before. Anomalies ought to provoke suspicion. Nothing is right merely because it is in the manuscripts and cannot be proved to be wrong.

The point to which I have been making my way is this. That you cannot say that Theophrastos is 'obscure and inelegant' and 'not limpid' simply because much of what we read in our printed texts is obscure and inelegant and unlimpid. Our printed texts have been put together by modern editors from the evidence of three manuscripts, written more than a thousand years after the time of Theophrastos. These manuscripts are very corrupt. Some of what they offer makes no sense at all, and therefore could not have been written by Theophrastos.

The next stage of my argument is to show that Theophrastos can, and often does, write Greek that is the reverse of obscure and inelegant and unlimpid. Look at a few examples.

First the ἄγροικος. ἄγροικία is the behaviour of a countryman seen through the eyes of a townsman, and Theophrastos' ἄγροικος is a countryman who comes to town and shows his country manners. Here is the first sentence of the sketch: 'The Countryman is the sort of man who drinks a bowl of spicy broth before going to the assembly, and claims that garlic smells as sweetly as perfume, and wears shoes too large for his feet, and talks with a loud voice' (IV.1-4 ὁ δὲ ἄγροικος τοιοῦτός τις οἶος κυκεῶνα πιὼν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν πορεύεσθαι, καὶ τὸ μύρον φάσκειν οὐδὲν τοῦ θύμου ἥδιον ὄζειν, καὶ μείζω τοῦ ποδὸς τὰ ὑποδήματα φορεῖν, καὶ μεγάλην τῇ φωνῇ λαλεῖν). What could be more limpid than that? The Greek is simplicity itself, and conveys, in a very few words, a whole range of impressions, which develop logically the one from the other. First, the Countryman drinks a *κυκεῶν*, a kind of drink associated with the poor or the countryman. It was a mixture of grain and liquid (water, wine, milk, honey, or oil) and sometimes of cheese, often seasoned with herbs, such as garlic. So, after he has drunk this concoction for breakfast, his breath will be pungent. And with this pungent

breath he goes to town, to the assembly, where he will meet townsmen, on whom he will pungently breathe. And he says that garlic smells as sweet as perfume: there was garlic in his broth, and so there is garlic on his breath. In the town they smell not of garlic but of perfume; but perfume and garlic are all the same to him. And he walks to town in boots too big for him, and talks too loud. Sound, sight, smell. All that in twenty six words. Lectures notes, never intended for publication? Or 'loquendi nitor diuinus', a brightness of language heaven-sent?

Here is another illustration from the same sketch. The Countryman 'answers the door himself, calls his dog, grabs it by the snout, and says "Here is the guardian of my estate and house"' (IV.12 τὴν θύραν ὑπακοῦσαι αὐτὸς καὶ τὸν κύννα προσκαλεσάμενος καὶ ἐπιλαβόμενος τοῦ ῥύγγου εἶπεῖν «Οὗτος φυλάττει τὸ χωρίον καὶ τὴν οἰκίαν»). First, he answers the door himself. Why? Normally, you would have a slave to answer the door for you. Is he too poor to keep a slave for that purpose? What follows suggests a different answer. A knock at the door alarms him, and so he investigates for himself who his visitor is. We may assume that he does not have many visitors. Anyone who knocks at his door is an object of suspicion to this solitary and unsociable man. Next, he muzzles the dog, he takes hold of its snout. Again, why? Again, Theophrastos has prompted a question, and again we have to supply the answer. By muzzling the dog, the Countryman shows his visitor that it can bark and bite, and will do so if he lets go of its snout. If the visitor intends harm, he will take the Countryman's action to mean 'Beware of the dog'. If he intends no harm, he may suppose that the dog has been muzzled as a courtesy to him. The Countryman then grandly describes the dog as 'guardian of my estate and house'. If the visitor is innocent, this is an expression of pride in the animal. Otherwise, it means 'This dog has got the measure of 'you'. The words 'estate' and 'house', words simple and prosaic on their own, when paired sound pompous and affected. There is something very similar in the *Cena Trimalchionis* of Petronius. Trimalchio, the vulgar and pretentious host, summons his dog Scylax into the dining room and calls him, with affectation and pomposity, 'praesidium domus familiaeque', 'the protection of my house and household'. The lesson is this. By the simplicity and economy of his language Theophrastos can prompt us to think, to ask questions, to fill in the details for ourselves and supply the thoughts at which he only hints.

Next, see how much Theophrastos can hint at in the careful placing of a single word. The Ὀψιμαθής, The Late Learner, is a man who pursues activities for which he is too old. 'He falls in love with a courtesan and tries to batter down her door, and when her other lover beats him up he goes to court' (XXVII.9

ἔρῳν ἑταίρας καὶ κριοὺς προσβάλλων ταῖς θύραις πληγὰς εἰληφῶς ὑπ' ἀντεραστοῦ δικάζεσθαι). Again, simple and straightforward language. In one respect the Greek is a little more vigorous than my translation. κριοὺς προσβάλλων, literally 'applying battering rams', is not to be taken too literally. The battering rams are an effective exaggeration, figuratively comprehending within this single term the various implements normally used on such occasions: axes, shovels, and crowbars. The really telling detail comes in the final word, δικάζεσθαι, 'he goes to court'. Read the sentence through again, and you will see why. A man past his prime has fallen for a hetaira. He behaves like the typical infatuated young lover from comedy, elegy, and mime: he tries to batter her door down. Along comes her other lover, a young man we assume, to claim not only the girl but also the role (as batterer) which the old man has usurped from him. So battery (but of a different kind) follows: he beats the old man up. And now comes the real punch. Because we have not yet had an infinitive, we know that the story is not quite over. What conclusion might we expect? Any sensible man will now retire chastened, to lick his wounds in silence and hush up his humiliation. But not our Late Learner. He takes the young man to court, on a charge of assault and battery. He steps out of comedy, elegy, and mime, and steps back into real life, to become an ordinary litigious Athenian. But at the same time, he remains the man he was, insensitive to his own absurdity, impervious to the ridicule of others: ridiculous then as the elderly lover, now to be ridiculous again when his past behaviour is exposed in court. What an ancient biographer said of Sophocles could equally be said of Theophrastos, that he can create a whole personality out of half a line or a single word.

Here is one more linguistic gem. This time it involves nouns. It is from the sketch about the Ἀπονενοημένος, The Man Who Has Lost All Sense Of Judgement. He comes into court 'with a boxful of evidence in his coat pocket and strings of little documents in his hands' (VI.8 ἔχων ἐχῖνον ἐν τῷ προκόλπῳ καὶ ὄρμαθούς γραμματιδίων ἐν ταῖς χερσίν). This translation does not get the full flavour of Theophrastos' nouns. He has an ἐχῖνος in his προκόλπῳ. The ἐχῖνος, which I translated 'boxful of evidence', is actually a sealed jar in which a plaintiff or defendant has placed all the evidence relating to an impending court case. The προκόλπῳ, which I translated 'coat pocket', is a sort of pouch, such as kangaroos have. You make this pouch by pulling your χιτῶν up through your belt and letting it hang out in a capacious fold. Why he needs to carry the jar in this pouch is shown by the next phrase. His hands are full of ὄρμαθούς γραμματιδίων, 'strings or chains of little documents'. Some commentators take this in a

literal sense, to mean that the documents are tied together in a bundle. But a word exists for a bundle of documents tied together. That word is not ὄρμαθός but δέσμη. I think that we should take ὄρμαθούς, 'strings, chains', metaphorically, as implying an almost interminably repetitive series, much as in Aristophanes, who complains of Aeschylus's 'strings of lyrics, four in a row, without a break'. And so the man, as he enters the courtroom, is an absurd and ungainly figure, carrying a bulky jar in the front fold of his cloak, while his hands are full of an endless chain of little documents.

The complaint was made that the style is unvaried. What is unvaried is not the style but the structure, with its succession of parallel infinitival sentences. Within this unvaried structure Theophrastos achieves considerable variety. A simple and obvious way in which he varies the style is by introducing direct speech, by letting us hear his characters talk. And how his characters talk is how real Athenians talked, and real Athenians talked just like us. The Dissembler expresses disbelief at what he has been told: I.6 Ἔλλω τινὶ λέγε, 'Tell someone else'. I find the identical expression in a short story by Muriel Spark: 'Tell that to someone else ... Do I look like a fool?'

But not all the characters speak as simply and colloquially as this. The Μικροφιλότιμος, The Man of Petty Ambition, while serving as a member of the Council, gets himself the job of announcing in the Assembly the results of official sacrifices. So 'he steps forward wearing a smart white cloak, with a crown on his head, and says "Men of Athens, my colleagues and I celebrated the Milk-Feast with sacrifices to the Mother of the Gods. The sacrifices were propitious. We beg you to accept your blessings"' (XXI.11 παρεσκευασμένος λαμπρὸν ἱμάτιον καὶ ἔστεφανωμένος παρελθὼν εἰπεῖν « ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, ἐθύομεν οἱ πρυτάνεις τῇ Μητρὶ τῶν θεῶν τὰ Γαλάξια, καὶ τὰ ἱερά καλὰ, καὶ ὑμεῖς δέχεσθε τὰ ἀγαθὰ»). This closely reflects the form of words prescribed for these occasions. We can see that from one of the so-called prooimia, Introductions, of Demosthenes. While I read the translation of this, look out for the differences as well as the similarities: 'Men of Athens ... we sacrificed to Zeus the Saviour and Athena and Victory, and the sacrifices were propitious and salvatory for you. And we sacrificed to Persuasion and the Mother of the Gods and Apollo, and we had propitious sacrifices here too. And the sacrifices made to the other gods were safe and secure and propitious and salvatory. Therefore we beg you to accept the blessings which the gods give' (ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι... ἐθύσαμεν τῷ Διὶ τῷ σωτῆρι καὶ τῇ Ἀθηνᾷ καὶ τῇ Νίκῃ, καὶ γέγονεν καλὰ καὶ σωτήρια ταῦθ' ὑμῖν τὰ ἱερά. ἐθύσαμεν δὲ καὶ τῇ Πειθοῖ καὶ τῇ Μητρὶ τῶν θεῶν καὶ τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι, καὶ ἐκαλλιεροῦμεν καὶ ταῦτα. ἦν δ' ὑμῖν

καὶ τὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις θεοῖς τυθένθ' ἱέρ' ἀσφαλῆ καὶ βέβαια καὶ καλὰ καὶ σωτήρια. δέχεσθ' οὖν παρὰ τῶν θεῶν διδόντων τὰγαθά). The Man of Petty Ambition asked for this job because it gave him his brief moment of glory, a solo performance, garlanded and brightly robed, with a solemn and impressive script. It was not a demanding speech to make, because it was composed entirely of traditional phrases. But, when you notice how his speech differs from the one by Demosthenes, you will see how Theophrastos has composed it in a style which is suited to his representation of a pettily ambitious man. The speaker in Demosthenes has sacrificed to a multitude of gods: to so many that he divides his list into three parts, whose language and structure he varies. The Man of Petty Ambition has only a single sacrifice to report. This sacrifice was held for the *Galaxia*, the 'milk feast', which, as Robert Parker says in his book *Athenian Religion*, 'seems to have been a tranquil and somewhat unimportant affair'. We may suspect that the occasion which the man chooses to report is not the one which would best have served his wish to be impressive, and that the mention of the *Galaxia*, which takes its name from a noun meaning a barley porridge cooked in milk, deflates the solemnity of the traditional phrases. The man himself, however, is satisfied with his performance. For the sketch has a wonderful last sentence: 'After making this report he goes home and tells his wife that he has had an extremely successful day' (XXI.11 καὶ ταῦτα ἀπαγγείλας ἀπελθὼν οἴκαδε διηγήσασθαι τῇ ἑαυτοῦ γυναικί ὡς καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ἡνήμερει). This is just like Harpagos in the 1st book of Herodotos. Harpagos receives an invitation to dinner from king Astuages, not knowing that the king intends to murder his son and serve up the boy's flesh for him at dinner. Having received the invitation 'He went home ... in his delight he told his wife what had happened'. It was a stroke of genius on the part of each author alike to bring in the wife to listen to her husband's naïveté.

Here is another kind of stylistic device, reflecting popular or colloquial speech. The Ἀηδής, The Disagreeable Man, claims that 'His house is an inn, for it is always full; and his friends are a leaking jar, for however many good turns he does them he can never fill them up' (XX.9 λέγειν... ὅτι ἡ οἰκία αὐτοῦ πανδοκεῖόν ἐστι, μεστήν γὰρ αἰεὶ καὶ τοὺς φίλους αὐτοῦ εἶναι τὸν τετραήμερον πίθον· εὖ ποιωὶν γὰρ αὐτοὺς οὐ δύνασθαι ἐμπλήσαι). This is the so-called identification riddle, a form of speech which was splendidly analysed by Eduard Fraenkel in his *Plautinisches im Plautus*. You set up a riddle by identifying two things which are not alike. Petronius (*Sat.* 42) says 'antiquus amor cancer est', 'an old love is a crab'. Why? Because (we infer) it pinches. 'Die Welt ist ein Sardellensalat', 'The

world is a sardine salad', says Goethe. 'Er schmeckt uns früh, er schmeckt uns spät', 'It tastes good late or early'. Sometimes we get comparison rather than identification. The comic poet Antiphanes writes: 'Our life is very like wine: when there is little left, it becomes vinegar' (fr. 240 σφόδρ' ἔστιν ἡμῶν ὁ βίος οἴνω προσφερής: ἢ ὅταν ἦι τὸ λοιπὸν μικρόν, ὄξος γίγνεται). Comparison is less vigorous than identification. And, as you see, it is the more vigorous identification that we get in Theophrastos. 'His house is an inn.' Then we are given the explanation: 'for it is always full'. The second riddle, 'his friends are a leaking jar', is suitably explained by the words which are transmitted by the manuscript, 'for by εὖ ποιῶν, by doing good to them, by doing them favours, he cannot fill them full', in other words, they are spongers, never satisfied by his generosity. Here I reject an emendation which is superficially brilliant, and at first sight appears to restore to the text precisely the kind of point and colour which we have been looking at. The Italian scholar Giorgio Pasquali wanted to change εὖ ποιῶν to εὖ ποτίζων, 'giving them a good drink' — he can never fill them full however much he gives them to drink. This expression was suggested to Pasquali by its appearance in the sketch about the Περύεργος, The Overzealous Man: 'When the doctor orders him not to give wine to the invalid he says he wants to do an experiment and gives the poor man a good drink' (XIII.9 ἀπαγορεύοντος τοῦ ἱατροῦ ὅπως μὴ δώσει οἶνον τῷ μαλακιζομένῳ φήσας βούλεσθαι διάπειραν λαμβάνειν εὖ ποτίσαι (Foss: εὐτρεπίσαι mss) τὸν κακῶς ἔχοντα), where εὖ ποτίσαι is a truly brilliant correction for the manuscript reading εὐτρεπίσαι. But a good turn is much more subtle and appropriate here than a good drink. What Pasquali failed to realise was that εὖ ποιεῖν is the expression which is regularly used to describe the relationship of reciprocal benefit which exists between friends. To give and to receive favours is the essence of friendship; it is what defines friendship. For example, Lysias says 'because I did him a good turn I expected him to be my friend' (3.5 εὖ ποιῶν αὐτὸν ἤξιον εἶναί μοι φίλον).

The riddling identification appears in one other place, and here, by contrast, we *must* restore a more colourful verb. The Φιλοπόνηρος, The Man Who Is Friendly With Villains, offers his support to an unscrupulous democratic politician. 'He says that he (the politician) is the guard-dog of the people, because he protects offenders' (XXIX.4 φῆσαι αὐτὸν κίνα εἶναί τοῦ δήμου, φυλάττειν γὰρ αὐτὸν τοὺς ἀδικοῦντας). Clearly the guard-dog is not protecting offenders; so you have to give φυλάττειν the sense 'watch out for', which it sometimes has: 'He is the guard-dog of the people, because he watches out for offenders'. But this sense is not satisfactory either. A guard-dog deters offenders;

it does not watch out for them. You remember the Countryman's dog, which φυλάπτει, protects, estate and house. So here the proper object for φυλάπτειν, if it were correct, would be the people, the citizens: 'He is the guard-dog of the people, because he protects them'. But, according to the manuscript, the object of the verb is 'the offenders'. Therefore either the verb or the noun is wrong. Now 'Guard-dog of the people' had long been a familiar way of picturing democratic politicians. You find the same image in Aristophanes and in Demosthenes. So 'He is guard-dog of the people' is an identification which has lost the capacity to puzzle and appears not to call for any explanation. If it is to be explained at all, it must be explained by something less obvious than either 'he guards the citizens' or 'he watches out for offenders'. The riddle is given point when φυλάπτειν is changed to ὕλακτεῖν, 'he barks at offenders', which sustains, to the fullest degree, the identification of dog and man. Once again, then, we find that the word which perfectly suits the idiom is a word which glows, or should I say yelps, with life and vigour. This proposal, ὕλακτεῖν, was made by another Greek scholar, Konstantinos Kontos, in 1878.

Here is the essence of the problem. We do very often find that our text of Theophrastos exhibits qualities of language and style very different from those which we have seen that he is capable of achieving, that it really is obscure and inelegant, that it is not Greek at its most limpid. Why? I suppose that a writer may be inelegant at one moment, elegant at another, at one moment obscure, at another clear and limpid. But I should not expect that a writer who is capable of writing with consummate elegance and limpidity and point will be often satisfied with inelegance, obscurity and pointlessness. And so, when our text exhibits these faults, we have a right to be dissatisfied and suspicious.

I will end by giving you a passage where the text is demonstrably wrong and where I think that I can restore the kind of pointed and colourful language which we have seen Theophrastos using.

This passage comes from the sketch about the Δυσχερής, The Offensive Man. 'He wipes his nose while eating, scratches himself while sacrificing, discharges <spit> from his mouth while talking, belches at you while drinking, sleeps in bed with his wife without washing, and through using rancid oil at the baths he ...' (XIX.4-6 ἐσθίων ἀπομύττεσθαι, θύων ἄμ' ἀδαξᾶσθαι, προσλαλῶν <σίαιλον> ἀπορρίπτειν ἀπὸ τοῦ στόματος, ἄμα πίνων προσερυγγάνειν, ἀναπόνιπτος ἐν τοῖς στρώμασι μετὰ τῆς γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ κοιμᾶσθαι, ἐλαίῳ σαπρῶ ἐν βαλανείῳ χρώμενος ἴσφύζεσθαι†). At the beginning of this passage we face a familiar issue. How tolerant should we be of a linguistic anomaly? The anomaly is the use of the verb

ἀπορρίπτειν without an object, 'throw out, discharge'. What the man is discharging is spit, and it happens that the noun meaning spit, *σίαλον*, is remarkably similar in its sequence of letters to the end of the participle *προσλαλῶν*. So I prefer to assume that the scribes have overlooked the word and omitted it by accident. We then have an expression very similar to Xenophon, *Mem.* 1.2.54 τὸ *σίαλον* ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ἀποπτύουσιν. But the more interesting problem is what was the last word of the sentence? 'Through using rancid oil at the baths he ...'. What does he do? There are many suggestions for replacing the nonsensical *σφύζεσθαι*. The most recent editor accepts a conjecture proposed in the 19th century by Petersen, ὀξεσθαι, 'he smells'. Well, of course he smells. Rancid oil does smell. But to say that he smells is a feeble thing to say. In classical Greek you do not say that a person or a thing smells, you say what he or it smells of. So I propose *συφεοῦ ὀξεσθαι*, 'he smells of the pig-sty'. This word restores the kind of down-to-earth detail that Theophrastos loves, because of the associations which it prompts: the mud, the wallowing pig, the stench of manure.

Theophrastos, according to a reputable source, was a lively lecturer: 'Hermippos says that Theophrastos would arrive at the Lukeion punctually and well dressed, then would sit down and deliver his lecture, in the course of which he would use all kinds of movements and gestures. Once, when he was imitating a glutton, he stuck out his tongue and licked his lips' (Athenaios 21B: Ἐρμιππος δὲ φησι Θεόφραστον παραγίνεσθαι εἰς περίπατον καθ' ὥραν λαμπρὸν καὶ ἐξησκημένον, εἶτα καθίσαντα διατίθεσθαι τὸν λόγον οὐδεμιᾶς ἀπεχόμενον κινήσεως οὐδὲ σχήματος ἑνός. καὶ ποτε ὀψοφάγον μιμούμενον ἐξείραντα τὴν γλῶσσαν περιλείχειν τὰ χεῖλη). I can believe it. And I can picture him wiping his nose on his hand while pretending to eat, or scratching himself while purporting to sacrifice, or staggering forward as if burdened by a jar, his hands plucking at documents which threaten to elude his grasp, either in his study as he wrote his sketches, or in the lecture room while reciting them, as he may have done, for all we know.