

INTRODUCTION

I THEOPHRASTUS AND HIS TIMES

The sources for the life of Theophrastus are collected in W. W. Fortenbaugh, P. M. Huby, R. W. Sharples, D. Gutas, *Theophrastus of Eresus: Sources for his Life, Writings, Thought and Influence* (Leiden 1992) frs. 1–36. The primary source is D.L. 5.36–57 (fr. 1). Some modern discussions: O. Regenbogen, ‘Theophrastos’, *RE* Suppl. vii (1940) 1355–61 (ii.1 ‘Vita. Lebensumstände’), M. G. Sollenberger, ‘The Lives of the Peripatetics: An analysis of the contents and structure of Diogenes Laertius’ “Vita Philosophorum” Book 5’, *ANRW* ii.36.6 (1992) 3793–3879, J. Mejer, ‘A Life in fragments: the *Vita Theophrasti*’, in J. M. van Ophuijsen and M. van Raalte (edd.), *Theophrastus: Reappraising the Sources* (New Brunswick and London 1998) 1–28.

Theophrastus was born at Eresos on Lesbos (D.L. 5.36 = fr. 1.2) in 372/1 or 371/0.¹ His name, originally Τύρταμος, was changed by Aristotle to Θεόφρατος, in recognition (so later writers believed) of his divine eloquence (D.L. 5.38 = fr. 1.30–1 διὰ τὸ τῆς φράσεως θεσπέσιον, Suda Θ 199 = fr. 2.4 διὰ τὸ θείως φράζειν).² His association with Aristotle will have begun at Athens, if we accept that he studied with Plato (D.L. 5.36 = fr.

¹ Regenbogen 1357, Sollenberger 3843.

² Cf. Str. 13.2.4 = fr. 5A.3 τὸν τῆς φράσεως αὐτοῦ ζῆλον ἐπισημαίνόμενος, ‘setting his seal of approval on his style of speech’ (LSJ ζῆλος iii.2; ἐπισημαίνω iv.3, as in *Char.* II.4), not ‘signifying the fervour of his speech’ (H. L. Jones, Loeb ed. 1929) nor ‘signifying his keenness for speech’ (Fortenbaugh *et al.*), Cic. *Orat.* 62 = fr. 5B.2 <a> *diuinitate loquendi nomen inuenit*, Plin. *Nat. praef.* 29 *hominem in eloquentia tantum ut nomen diuinum inde inuenerit*, Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.83 *in Theophrasto tam est loquendi nitor ille diuinus ut ex eo nomen quoque traxisse dicatur*. Anecdotal tradition (Cic. *Brut.* 172, Quint. *Inst.* 8.1.2 = fr. 7A–B; cf. Mejer 15–16) suggests that he was proud of his command of Attic but that others regarded it as over-correct. The name Θεόφρατος is common in Attica (*LGPN* 2.223) and is attested elsewhere (*LGPN* 1.219, 3A.206–7). Cf. Regenbogen 1357, J. H. M. A. Indemans, *Studiën over Theophrastus* (Nijmegen 1953) 3–6, Sollenberger 3833–5.

INTRODUCTION

1.4; cf. D.L. 3.46).³ Otherwise it will have begun at Assos (on the coast of Asia Minor opposite Lesbos), where Hermias, ruler of Atarneus, former fellow-student of Aristotle in the Academy, gathered together a group of philosophers after the death of Plato in 348/7. The association continued in Macedonia, where Aristotle was invited by Philip II in 343/2,⁴ and in Athens, when Aristotle returned there in 335/4 and founded the Lyceum.

The vicissitudes of the period which follows, and some of its leading figures, are reflected in the *Characters*.⁵ Lysurgus, during whose period of political influence Athens had retained a democratic constitution and a measure of independence from Macedon, died c. 325/4. Alexander (XXIII.3) died in 323. During the uprising against Macedon which followed, Aristotle left Athens for Euboea, where he died in 322/1, and Theophrastus became head of the Lyceum (D.L. 5.36 = fr. 1.5–7). Antipater (XXIII.4), regent of Macedonia, defeated the Athenians and their allies in 322, placed Athens under the control of Phocion, and imposed an oligarchic constitution and a Macedonian garrison. He designated Polyperchon (VIII.6), general of Alexander, to succeed him in preference to his own son Cassander (VIII.6, 9), with whom Theophrastus was on friendly terms (D.L. 5.37 = fr. 1.13, Suda Θ 199 = fr. 2.8–9). Antipater died in 319. A struggle ensued between Polyperchon and Cassander. Polyperchon offered the Greek cities autonomy in return for their support. Athens rallied to him and executed Phocion. Cassander defeated Polyperchon and captured Athens in 317 and placed it under the control of Demetrius of Phaleron, pupil of Theophrastus (D.L. 5.75).⁶ Through his influence Theophrastus, though a metic (like Aristotle), was allowed to own land (D.L. 5.39 = fr. 1.38–40), and so

³ Regenbogen 1357–8, W. K. C. Guthrie, *A History of Greek Philosophy* 6 (Cambridge 1981) 34–5, K. Gaiser, *Theophrast in Assos: zur Entwicklung der Naturwissenschaft zwischen Akademie und Peripatos* (Heidelberg 1985) 24–7, Sollenberger 3806–7, Mejer 17–19.

⁴ Cf. Ael. *VH* 4.19 = fr. 28.

⁵ For fuller discussion of historical allusions see the section on Date (pp. 27–37).

⁶ W. W. Fortenbaugh and E. Schütrumpf (ed.), *Demetrius of Phaleron: Text, Translation and Discussion* (New Brunswick and London 2000) 39 (no. 8).

THEOPHRASTUS AND HIS TIMES

to establish the Lyceum in buildings of its own.⁷ Demetrius was expelled in 307. The restored democracy passed a law requiring heads of philosophical schools to obtain a licence from the state, and Theophrastus (along with other philosophers) briefly withdrew from Athens (D.L. 5.38 = fr. 1.22–9).⁸ On his return (the law was soon repealed) he remained head of the Lyceum until his death at the age of 85 (D.L. 5.40 = fr. 1.46) in 288/7 or 287/6.

He is reputed to have had some 2,000 students (D.L. 5.37 = fr. 1.16, Suda Θ 199 = fr. 2.7).⁹ He bequeathed his books to his pupil Neleus of Scepsis (D.L. 5.52 = fr. 1.310–11). The narrative of their subsequent history should be treated with reserve: together with the books of Aristotle, which Theophrastus had inherited, they were stored underground, suffered damage, and were sold to Apellicon of Teos, who issued unreliable copies; the library of Apellicon was carried off to Rome when Sulla captured Athens, and acquired by Tyrannion the grammarian, who, with Andronicus of Rhodes, put further unsatisfactory copies into circulation (Str. 13.1.54, Plu. *Sull.* 26.1–3 = fr. 37–8).¹⁰

⁷ J. P. Lynch, *Aristotle's School* (Berkeley etc. 1972) 97–105, Guthrie 39–40, Sollenberger 3822–3, C. Habicht, 'Hellenistic Athens and her philosophers', in *Athen in Hellenistischer Zeit: Gesammelte Aufsätze* (Munich 1994) 231–47 (at 236), Mejer 20, L. O'Sullivan, 'The law of Sophocles and the beginning of permanent philosophical schools in Athens', *RhM* 145 (2002) 251–62.

⁸ Lynch 103–4, Sollenberger 3821–2, Habicht 236–7, W. G. Arnott, *Alexis: The Fragments* (Cambridge 1996) Appendix II, H. B. Gottschalk in J. M. van Ophuijsen and M. van Raalte (edd.), *Theophrastus: Reappraising the Sources* (New Brunswick and London 1998) 282–3, O'Sullivan (n. 7 above).

⁹ Probably during his whole career (Regenbogen 1358, Habicht 233–4, Mejer 21, Gottschalk 283) rather than at any one time (advocates of this view are listed by Sollenberger 3828; add Lane Fox 134 and n. 69, misrepresenting Habicht).

¹⁰ Guthrie 59–65 is less sceptical of this story than H. B. Gottschalk, *Hermes* 100 (1972) 335–42. For its possible relevance to the early distribution of the philosophical works of Aristotle and Theophrastus see Regenbogen 1375–9, Mejer 25–7. It is unwise to found on it any theory concerning the early history of the text of the *Characters* (as does Navarre (1931) 22–4; *contra*, Ussher (1960) 14–15, Rusten 33). See p. 38 below.

INTRODUCTION

II THE NATURE AND PURPOSE
OF THE *CHARACTERS*

(i) Title

ABV entitle the work *Χαρακτῆρες*. Diogenes Laertius, in his catalogue of Theophrastus' writings,¹¹ lists it twice, first as ἠθικοὶ χαρακτῆρες α', second as *Χαρακτῆρες ἠθικοί* (5.47–8 = fr. 1.201, 241 = fr. 436.4a).¹²

The history of the noun *χαρακτήρ* is discussed by A. Körte, *Hermes* 64 (1929) 69–86 and B. A. van Groningen, *Mnemosyne* 58 (1930) 45–53. It describes the 'stamp' or 'imprint' on a coin, a distinguishing mark of type or value (Arist. *Pol.* 1257^a41 ὁ γὰρ χαρακτήρ ἐτέθη τοῦ ποσοῦ σημεῖον; cf. E. *El.* 558–9 τί μ' ἐκδέδορκεν ὥσπερ ἀργύρου σκοπῶν | λαμπρὸν χαρακτῆρ'; ἢ προσεικάζει μέ τωι;).¹³ It is also used figuratively, to describe the 'stamp' of facial or bodily features, by which kinship or race are distinguished (Hdt. 1.116.1 ταῦτα λέγοντος τοῦ παιδὸς τὸν Ἀκτυάγεα ἐσήιε ἀνάγνωσις αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ ὁ . . . χαρακτήρ τοῦ προσώπου προσφέρεσθαι ἐδόκεε ἐς ἑωυτόν, Hyp. fr. 196 Jensen *χαρακτήρ οὐδεὶς ἔππεστιν ἐπὶ τοῦ προσώπου τῆς διανοίας τοῖς ἀνθρώποις*; cf. A. *Su.* 282, E. *Med.* 516–19, *Hec.* 379, *El.* 572),¹⁴ and the 'stamp' of speech, as marked by local dialect (*χαρακτήρ γλώσσης* Hdt. 1.57.3, 1.142.4; cf. S. fr. 176) or by a style of speech (Ar. *Pax* 220 ὁ γοῦν χαρακτήρ ἡμεδαπὸς τῶν ῥημάτων) or (in later literary criticism) by a style of writing (LSJ II.5, Körte 79–83). Into this pattern fits Men. fr. 72 ἀνδρὸς χαρακτήρ ἐκ

¹¹ On the nature and sources of this catalogue see H. Usener, *Analecta Theophrastea* (Leipzig 1858), Regenbogen 1363–70, Sollenberger 3854–5, Mejer 22–4.

¹² Two late manuscripts which have the title *Χαρακτῆρες ἠθικοί* are copied from printed editions (Torraca (1994a) xii n. 8). For the suggestion (unacceptable) that the repeated title refers to a second book of *Characters* see p. 18.

¹³ R. Seaford, *JHS* 118 (1998) 137–9; also F. Will, 'The concept of *χαρακτήρ* in Euripides', *Glotta* 39 (1960) 233–8.

¹⁴ Similarly Shakespeare, *The Winter's Tale* II.3.98–9 'although the print be little, the whole matter / and copy of the father'.

THE NATURE AND PURPOSE OF THE *CHARACTERS*

λόγου γνωρίζεται, 'the stamp of a man is recognised from his speech': speech typifies him, makes him a distinct and recognisable individual.

A work entitled *Χαρακτήρες* advertises nothing more specific than 'types', 'marks', 'distinctive features', or 'styles'. This is not an adequate advertisement of Theophrastus' work. Definition is needed, and is provided by ἠθικοί, which the manuscripts have lost, but Diogenes Laertius has preserved. The title *Characters*, hallowed by usage, is both misleading and incomplete. The true title means something like *Behavioural Types* or *Distinctive Marks of Character*.¹⁵

We hear of a few other works which may have been entitled, in whole or part, *Χαρακτήρες*: (i) *Περὶ λέξεως ἢ περὶ χαρακτήρων* by Antisthenes (D.L. 6.15);¹⁶ (ii) *Χαρακτήρες α'* by Heraclides Ponticus (D.L. 5.88 = fr. 165 Wehrli), perhaps on style;¹⁷ (iii) *Χαρακτήρες ἢ Φιλοκώμωιδοι* by an unknown tragic poet Dionysiades of Mallos (*TrGF* 105), ἐν ᾧ τοὺς χαρακτήρας (styles?) ἀπαγγέλλει τῶν ποιητῶν (Suda Δ 1169);¹⁸ (iv) *Κάτυρος ἐν τοῖς περὶ χαρακτήρων* (Ath. 168C = *FHG* 3.164 fr. 20), discussed below (p. 11).

(ii) Antecedents and relations

The *Characters*, in conception and design, is a novel work: nothing like it, so far as we know, had been attempted before. But antecedents and relations can be recognised.

Descriptions of character-types had appeared sporadically in other genres. Homer describes the δειλός and the ἄλκιμος in

¹⁵ Addition of ἠθικοί is commended by Körte 77 n. 3, P. Steinmetz, *AUS* 8 (1959) 224–6 = *Kleine Schriften* (Stuttgart 2000) 130–2 (and his commentary, 2 (1962) 7–8), W. W. Fortenbaugh, *RhM* 118 (1975) 81–2, id. *Quellen zur Ethik Theophrasts* (Amsterdam 1984) 93–4. *Contra* van Groningen 52–3.

¹⁶ The nature of the work and the authenticity of the title are disputed: G. Giannantoni, *Socratis et Socraticorum Reliquiae* 4 (Naples 1990) 240–1.

¹⁷ F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, VII: *Herakleides Pontikos* (Basel ²1969) 119.

¹⁸ R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship, from the Beginnings to the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford 1968) 160.

INTRODUCTION

ambush, the former pale and fidgety, his heart thumping and his teeth chattering, the latter never blanching, eager for the fight to start (*Il.* 13.278–86). Eustathius recognised in this a foreshadowing of Theophrastus: διασκευάσαντος τοῦ ποιητοῦ ἀρχε- τυπικῶς ὥς ἐν τύπῳ χαρακτηῖρας, ὁποίους δὴ τινὰς ὕστερον καὶ Θεόφραστος ἐξετυπώσατο, οἷος μὲν ὁ ἄλκιμος ἐν καιρῷ λόχου, οἷος δὲ ὁ δειλός (931.22–3 = 3.469.3–5 van der Valk).¹⁹ Semonides describes ten types of women (fr. 7).²⁰ Herodotus (through the mouth of a Persian) describes the μόναρχος (3.80.3–6), and Plato describes the τιμοκρατικός (*R.* 548D–550B), the ὀλιγαρχικός (553A–555A), the δημοκρατικός (558C–562A), and the τυραννικός (571A–576B). Aristotle in the *Rhetoric* describes at length the characters (ἡθη) of νέοι, πρεσβύτεροι, and ἀκμάζοντες (1389^a3–1390^b13), and more briefly of εὐγενεῖς, πλούσιοι, and δυνάμενοι (1390^b16–1391^a29).

In the *Nicomachean Ethics* Aristotle distinguishes and analyses moral virtues and vices, ἠθικά (as opposed to λογικά) ἀρεταί and κακία. Virtue is a mean between two opposing vices, one of deficiency, the other of excess, in emotions and actions (1106^b16–18). First he lists 13 pairs of vices, with their mean (1107^a32–1108^b6).²¹ Theophrastus has 9 (here asterisked) of the 26 vices.

Deficiency	Mean	Excess
*δειλία	ἀνδρεία	θράσος
*ἀναισθησία	σωφροσύνη	ἀκολασία
*ἀνελευθερία	ἐλευθεριότης	ἄσωτία
*εἰρωνεία	ἀληθεία	*ἄλαζονεία
*ἄγροικία	εὐτραπεία	βωμολοχία

¹⁹ For a modern misunderstanding which has been built on the passage see p. 19.

²⁰ H. Lloyd-Jones, *Females of the Species: Semonides on Women* (London 1975) 29 ('he may be considered an ancestor of Theophrastus'), 32–3.

²¹ Cf. *EE* 1220^b21–1221^b3 (a rather different list), W. F. R. Hardie, *Aristotle's Ethical Theory* (Oxford 1980) 129–51, R. Bosley, R. A. Shiner, J. D. Sisson (edd.), *Aristotle, Virtue and the Mean* (Edmonton 1995).

THE NATURE AND PURPOSE OF THE *CHARACTERS*

δυσεριτία	φιλία	* ἄρέσκεια
δυσκολία	φιλία	* κολακεία
* ἀναισχυντία	αἰδημοσύνη	κατάπληξις

Aristotle develops the analysis of individual virtues and vices later (1115^a4–1128^b33).²² Although he personalises their bearers (exemplifying the δειλός and the ἀνδρεῖος, and so on, just as in the *Rhetoric* he exemplifies νέοι and πρεσβύτεροι), his persons exist, for the most part, out of time and space, moral paradigms, not flesh and blood. And so it is with the μόναρχος of Herodotus and the political characters drawn by Plato.

But Aristotle provides the seed from which Theophrastus's descriptions grow. He often indicates, in abstract and general terms, the circumstances or behaviour which are associated with each virtue and vice. For example, *Rh.* 1379^b17–19 τοῖς ἐπιχαίρουσι ταῖς ἀτυχίαις καὶ ὅλως εὐθυμουμένοις ἐν ταῖς αὐτῶν ἀτυχίαις· ἢ γὰρ ἐχθροῦ ἢ ὀλιγωροῦντος ζημεῖον (taking pleasure in the discomforts of others is the ζημεῖον, i.e. χαρακτήρ, of a hostile or scornful man), 1383^b19–20 οἷον τὸ ἀποβαλεῖν ἀσπίδα ἢ φυγεῖν· ἀπὸ δειλίας γάρ. καὶ τὸ ἀποστερεῖσθαι παρακαταθήκην· ἀπὸ ἀδικίας γάρ, 1383^b22–5 τὸ κερδαίνειν ἀπὸ μικρῶν ἢ αἰσχυρῶν ἢ ἀπὸ ἀδυνάτων . . . ἀπὸ αἰσχροκερδεῖας γὰρ καὶ ἀνελευθερίας.

Instead of an abstract circumstance Theophrastus gives us a real occasion, and instead of an anonymous agent, a real individual. So, while Aristotle says that τὸ περὶ αὐτοῦ πάντα λέγειν καὶ ἐπαγγέλλεσθαι is typical of ἀλαζονεία (1384^a4–6), Theophrastus lets us hear an Ἀλαζών making just such grand claims for himself before visitors in the Piraeus (XXIII). The ἀνδρεῖος, according to Aristotle, will best display his fearlessness at sea or in war (*EN* 1115^a34–^b1). Theophrastus shows us the Δειλός on a ship and on the battlefield (XXV). Aristotle is even capable of anticipating Theophrastus's technique. The βάναντος (Vulgar Man) makes a tasteless display of his wealth on unimportant

²² Cf. *EE* 1228^a23–1234^b13, *MM* 1190^b9–1193^a38.

INTRODUCTION

occasions, for example by entertaining his dining club on the scale of a wedding banquet or, when acting as choregus for a comedy, bringing on the chorus in purple (*EN* 1123^a22–3 οἷον ἐρανιστὰς γαμικῶς ἐστιῶν καὶ κωμωιδοῖς χορηγῶν ἐν τῇ παρόδῳ πορφύραν εἰσφέρων). With a minimum of change (οἷος ἐρανιστὰς γαμικῶς ἐστιῶν καὶ . . . εἰσφέρειν) this becomes indistinguishable from Theophrastus in content and style.

Like Homer, in his description of the δειλός and the ἄλκιμος, Theophrastus locates his characters in a specific time and place. The time is the late fourth century. The place is Athens. And it is an Athens whose daily life he recreates for us in dozens of dramatic pictures and incidents. If we look elsewhere for such scenes and such people, we shall not find them (until we come to the *Mimes* of Herodas)²³ except on the comic stage. ‘Plurima inuenias in his breuibis reliquiis’, observed Casaubon, ‘quae ueluti tabulae e naufragio superstites utcunque remanserunt, ex quibus huius operis cum poetis, scenicis maxime et comicis, quos esse optimos exprimendorum morum artifices scimus, affinitas percipi queat’.²⁴ Comedy furnishes much the same cast of players. Five characters of Theophrastus give their names to plays: the Ἀγροϊκος (Antiphanes, Menander, Philemon and others), Ἀπιστος (Menander), Δεισιδαίμων (Menander), Κόλαξ (Menander and others), Μεμψίμοιρος (Antidotus). Another, the Ἀλαζών, appears regularly on stage.²⁵ A late and dubious source (Pamphile, *FHG* 3.522 fr. 10 ap. D.L. 5.36 = T. fr. 1.11–12 = Men. Test. 8) claims Menander as a pupil of Theophrastus.²⁶

²³ Cf. L. A. Llera Fuego, ‘Teofrasto y Herodas’, *Minerva* 12 (1998) 91–102, and n. 77 below.

²⁴ 3rd edn. (1612) 88. ²⁵ See the Introductory Note to XXIII.

²⁶ For suggested affinities with Old Comedy see R. G. Ussher, *G&R* 24 (1977) 75–9; with later Comedy and Menander, J. van Ijzeren, ‘Theophrastus en de nieuwe comedie’, *NPh* 8 (1923) 208–20, P. Steinmetz, ‘Menander und Theophrast: Folgerungen aus dem Dyskolos’, *RhM* 103 (1960) 185–91 = *Kleine Schriften* (Stuttgart 2000) 152–8, A. Barigazzi, *La Formazione spirituale di Menandro* (Turin 1965) 69–86. The subject is handled judiciously by K. Gaiser, ‘Menander und der Peripatos’, *AA* 13 (1967) 8–40 (esp. 15 n. 36), R. L. Hunter, *The New Comedy of Greece and Rome* (Cambridge 1985) 148–9,

THE NATURE AND PURPOSE OF THE *CHARACTERS*

And so a new type of work came into existence, owing something to the ethical theorising of the Lyceum and something to the comic stage.

(iii) Later Peripatetics

Later Peripatetics attempted character-drawing of this kind, but to what extent and for what purpose is unclear. Lycon, who succeeded Theophrastus's successor Straton as head of the Lyceum c. 269 BC, wrote a description of a drunkard, preserved in the Latin translation of Rutilius Lupus (Lycon fr. 26 Wehrli ap. Rut. Lup. 2.7, 1st cent. AD). Rutilius adduces it as an example of *characterismos*, the *schema* by which an orator depicts virtues and vices, and he compares it to a painter's use of colours. The opening (*Quid in hoc arbitrer bonae spei reliquum residere, qui omne uitae tempus una ac despiciatissima consuetudine producit?*) betrays a moralising purpose. The sketch is composed not of illustrations loosely linked but as a coherent narrative, which follows the drunkard through the day, a technique used only once by Theophrastus (the exploits of the Δειλός in XXV). In style, it is far from Theophrastus: colours garish, rhetoric over-dressed, cleverness unremitting.²⁷

A papyrus of Philodemus preserves parts of a series of character-sketches, perhaps from a work Περὶ τοῦ κουφίζειν ὑπερηφανίας, 'On Relief from Arrogance',²⁸ by Ariston of Keos, who was probably Lycon's successor (c. 225 BC). The characters depicted in the parts we have (they represent aspects of ὑπερηφανία) are the Αὔθαδης, Αὐθέκαστος, Παντειδήμων, and Εἴρων, of whom the first and fourth are also depicted by Theophrastus; and perhaps also the Σεμνοκόπος, Εὐτελιστής, and

H.-G. Nesselrath, *Die attische mittlere Komödie* (Berlin 1990) esp. 150–1, Lane Fox 139–40. See also W. W. Fortenbaugh, 'Theophrast über den komischen Charakter', *RhM* 124 (1981) 245–60. For suggested affinities with mime see H. Reich, *Der Mimos* (Berlin 1903) 307–20.

²⁷ There is a good appreciation of the piece by G. Pasquali, *RLC* 1 (1918) 143–4 = *Scritti Filologici* (Florence 1986) 56–8.

²⁸ For this translation of the title see M. Gigante, *CErc* 26 (1966) 132 n. 16 (cf. 27 (1997) 153–4).

INTRODUCTION

Οὐδενωπτήc.²⁹ Although the form of the original sketches has been obscured by introductory matter, commentary, and paraphrase from Philodemus, it is clear that Ariston follows Theophrastus closely in style, technique, and content. He uses the introductory formula τοιοῦτος . . . οἷος or something like it,³⁰ builds his sentences around infinitives constructed with that formula, makes much use of participles, and normally links clauses and sentences with a simple καί. And he uses the same kind of illustrative vignettes from everyday life: a man asks for hot or cold water without consulting his fellow-bather (fr. 14, I p. 36.17–19 ἐν τῇι μάκραι θερμ[ὸ]ν [ἢ ψυ]χρὸν αἰτεῖν μ[ὴ π]ροανακρ[ί]ν)αc τὸν συμβεβηκότ' (cu<νε>μβ- Kassel and Austin on Eup. 490) εἰ κἀκεί[νω]ι συναρέcκει) and does not reciprocate a rub with oil (fr. 14, II p. 36.21–2 τὸν συναλείψαντα μὴ ἀντισυναλείφειν) or is deficient in epistolary courtesies (fr. 14, II p. 36.25–6 γρά[φ]ων ἐπιστολὴν τὸ χαίρειν μὴ προγράψαι (Diggle: προσ-Π) μηδ' ἐρρῶcθαι τελευταῖον)³¹ or postures Socratically (fr. 14, VII p. 39.13–14 “Ἐγὼ γὰρ οἶδα τί πλ[ή]ν γε τούτου, ὅτι [οὐ]δὲν οἶδα;”). In style and wit there is nothing to distinguish these from Theophrastus.³²

²⁹ Text in F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, VI: *Lykon und Ariston von Keos* (Basel² 1968) frs. 14–16, also in Rusten 182–95. Wehrli's view that the character-sketches belong to a separate work, not the work on ὑπερηφανία, is contested by M. Gigante, *Keos e Peripatos* (Naples 1999) 123–33. See also W. Knögel, *Der Peripatetiker Ariston von Keos bei Philodem* (Leipzig 1933), Regnbogen 1508–9. Further bibliography in E. Kondo, *CErc* I (1971) 87 n. 9.

³⁰ See the commentary on I.2.

³¹ Cf. Pl. *Bac.* 1000 *non priu' salutem scripsit?*, Plu. 1035 B–C (Chrysipp. *SVF* 2 fr. 30) εἰ μὴ, καθάπερ οἱ τὰ ψηφίσματα ταῖς πόλεσιν εἰσφέροντες προγράφουσιν Ἀγαθὴν Τύχην, οὕτω καὶ αὐτὸς προγράψει τὸν Δία κτλ., Luc. *Laps.* 5 οὕτε τὸ χαίρειν οὕτε τὸ εὖ πράττειν προύγραφεν. The prefix προ- is (i) apt with τὸ χαίρειν, (ii) needed to provide a temporal contrast with τελευταῖον. There is a mild zeugma: with μηδ' ἐρρῶcθαι τελευταῖον understand ὑπογράψαι (Luc. *Laps.* 10 ἐπὶ τέλει . . . ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐρρῶcθαι ὑπογράφας τὸ χαίρειν). See also XXIV.13.

³² A good appreciation of his style by Pasquali, *RLC* I (1918) 144–7 = *Scritti Filologici* (1986) 59–62.