

RAINBOWS AND FRAGRANT TREES

A Note on [Aristotle,] *Problemata* 12.3.906a36–38

The broad topic of Pr. 12 is fragrant things (τὰ εὐώδη). For the most part, Pr. 12 shares the lack of organization characteristic of virtually every book of the *Problemata*. Judging by their opening questions, however, the first three chapters (in the arrangement given to us by the mss. tradition¹) have the same narrow topic: why fragrant things (e. g. flowers and incense) smell better farther away than they do nearby. In fact, these chapters are connected in that they all raise questions about this topic as it is discussed in Theophrastus' *De Causis Plantarum* (6.17).²

But within this context, there is a problem with Pr. 12.2. Here is the first half of Pr. 12.2, which contains the problematic lines (in spaced type):

Διὰ τί αἱ ὄσμαι (ἐγγύθεν)³ ἦττον εὐώδεις τῶν θυμιαμάτων καὶ τῶν ἀνθῶν; πότερον ὅτι συναπέρχεται τῇ ὄσμη καὶ γῆς μόρια, ἃ προκαταφέρεται διὰ βάρος, ὥστε καθαρὰ πορρώτερον γίνεται ἡ ὄσμη; ἢ οὔτε ἐγγυς οὔσης τῆς ἀρχῆς πλείστον γίνεται τὸ ρέον, οὔτε λίαν πορρω; τὸ μὲν γὰρ οὐπω πολὺ, τὸ δὲ διασπᾶται. πότερον οὖν ἀληθές ἐστὶν ἢ ψεῦδος; καὶ εἰ ἀληθές, δι' αἰτίαν εἶη τὸ συμβαῖνον; λέγεται γὰρ ὡς εὐώδη γίνεται τὰ δένδρα εἰς ἄπερ ἂν ἡ ἴρις κατασκήψη. ὅτι μὲν οὖν οὔτε πάντα οὔτε αἰεὶ, δῆλον· πολλακίς γὰρ ἡ ἴρις μὲν γέγονε, τὰ δὲ δένδρα οὐθὲν ἐπίδηλα φαίνεται. ὅταν τε γένηται τοῦτο, οὐκ ἐν πάσῃ γίνεται ὕλη, ἐπεὶ συμβαίνει γέ ποτε· διὸ καὶ λέγεται. τὸ δ' αἴτιον κατὰ συμβεβηκὸς τῇ ἴριδι ἀποδοτέον, ἄλλως τε καὶ εἰ μὴ ἐστὶ τις φύσις ἡ ἴρις, ἀλλὰ τῆς ὄψεως πάθος ἀνακλωμένης. γίνεται δέ, ὡσπερ ἐλέχθη, οὐχ ὁπωσοῦν ἐχούσης τῆς ὕλης τὸ πάθος· οὔτε γὰρ ἐν τοῖς χλωροῖς δένδροις οὔτε ἐν τοῖς αἰοῖς, ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ ἐμπε-

1) I have used the best available text of Pr. 12–13: G. Marengi, [Aristotele] *Profumi e Miasmi: Introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e commento* (Naples 1991). The most important mss. for establishing the text are: Ap = Parisinus gr. 1865 (15th c.); C^a = Laurentianus gr. 87, 4 (13th c.); X^a = Vaticanus gr. 1283 (15th c.); and especially Y^a = Parisinus gr. 2036 (10th c.). See P. Louis, *Aristote: Problèmes I: Sections I–X* (Paris 1991) xxxv–lii.

2) This connection has long been recognized. See, e. g., C. Ruelle et al., *Aristotelis Quae Feruntur Problemata Physica* (Leipzig 1922) app. crit. ad loc.

3) Marengi (above, n. 1) adds (ἐγγύθεν) from Pr. 12.9.907a24, which is required for sense.

πρησμένη ὕλη φασὶν οἱ νομεῖς μετὰ τὰ ἐπὶ τῇ ἴριδι ὕδατα γίνεσθαι ἐπίδηλον τὴν εὐωδίαν, καὶ μάλιστα οὐ ἂν ἀσπάλαθος ἦ καὶ ῥάμνος καὶ ὄν τὰ ἄνθη εὐώδη ἐστίν. (906a30–b11)

Why are the smells from incense and from flowers (close by) less fragrant? Is it because particles of earth come away with the smell, which travel downward beforehand owing to their weight, so that the smell is pure farther away? Or is what flows from it greatest neither when the source is nearby, nor when it is very far away? For in the former case it is not yet strong, whereas in the latter it is scattered. Now is it true or false? And if true, through [what] cause would there be this occurrence? For it is said that trees upon which the rainbow has fallen become fragrant. Now it is clear that this is true neither for all [trees] nor always; for often the rainbow has come, but the trees reveal no noticeable [fragrance]. And when this does occur, it does not occur in every wood, since it does happen sometimes; and this is why it is said [sc. that trees upon which the rainbow has fallen become fragrant]. But the cause should be assigned to the rainbow only incidentally, especially if the rainbow is not a certain nature, but is an effect of refraction on the organ of sight. Now as was said, this does not occur whatever the condition of the wood; for it does not occur in green or in dry trees, but herdsmen say that the fragrance is noticeable in burned wood after the rains that come with the rainbow, and especially where there is camel's thorn and buckthorn and [plants] the flowers of which are fragrant.⁴

There are two textual issues involving the spaced typed lines (906a36–38): (1) Should Pr. 12.2 be divided between διασπᾶται and πότερον, and a new chapter created? (2) If 12.2 is divided into two chapters, (a) should the text otherwise be left as it is, or (b) should the two lines be transposed, or (c) should the text be emended in some other way?

I begin with a brief history of how editors and translators have treated this text. The manuscript tradition gives us – with little variation – the text as presented above.⁵ The manuscripts are followed

4) Translations from the Greek are my own. The remainder of the chapter continues the discussion of rainbows and fragrant trees.

5) Editors' reports about the mss. tradition are inconsistent, and in most cases unhelpful. Though they all divide the text into separate chapters, only J. Barthélémy-Saint Hilaire, *Les Problèmes d'Aristote I* (Paris 1891) and Marengi (above, n. 1) make clear that the mss. themselves do not include such a division. I. Bekker (ed.), *Aristotelis Opera II* (Berlin 1831) and U. C. Bussemaker, *Problemata*, in: F. Dübner et al. (ed.), *Aristotelis Opera Omnia Graece et Latine IV* (Paris 1869) say nothing about this; nor does P. Louis, *Aristote: Problèmes II: Sections XI–XXVII* (Paris 1993) in his app. crit. – though he does report in a note (238 n. 5) that according to ms. Ap there is no division in the text (implying that in the other

by the two earliest Latin translations – those of Bartholomew of Messina (13th c.)⁶ and George of Trebizond (1452)⁷ – and by the two earliest printed editions of the Greek text: the Aldine (1497) and Sylburg's (1585). Three early works differ or depart from the manuscript tradition: the Arabic version of Hunain ibn Ishāq (9th c.); the Latin translation of Theodore Gaza (1454, rev. ed. 1475); and (explicitly following Gaza) Casaubon's 1590 edition of the Greek text.⁸ In these three, the above material is divided into two chapters, and the two lines are transposed. Septalius (1607, rev. ed. 1632) tried to bring the text back to the tradition, but without success: Every editor since has accepted the division and presented this material as Pr. 12.2–3, and every editor but Marengi has transposed the two lines.

As indicated, there is a compelling reason for splitting this material into two chapters (which I henceforth refer to as Pr. 12.2 and 12.3): the clear shift in subject matter.⁹ In his Oxford translation,

major mss. there are two chapters). Similarly, Ruelle (above, n.2) reports that according to mss. Y^a and Ap there is no division. Cf. H. Flashar, *Aristoteles: Problemata Physica* (Darmstadt 1962) 552.

6) Bartholomew's *verbum de verbo* translation is based on Y^a or a lost ms. related to it. Unfortunately, there exists no modern edition of this translation, and I have made use of the version of it included in Peter of Abano's 1475 *Expositio problematum Aristotelis*, available here: <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k58528p> (last accessed 2 September 2011).

7) George of Trebizond's exemplar is O^a. See J. Monfasani, *George of Trebizond's Critique of Theodore Gaza's translation of the Aristotelian Problemata*, in: P. De Leemans / M. Goyens (eds.), *Aristotle's Problemata in Different Times and Tongues* (Leuven 2006) 282–283, and Marengi (above, n. 1) 156–157. (I would like to thank John Monfasani for showing me his unpublished concordance between George of Trebizond's translation and the modern editions of the Greek text of the *Problemata*.) Marengi (above, n. 1) 167–177 contains a critical edition of George's translation of Pr. 12–13. Marengi divides the material that concerns us into two chapters, but (as he indicates in the app. crit.) this is his editorial decision, and does not reflect the mss. of George's translation.

8) The Arabic version comes from an independent tradition; more on that shortly. The view that Gaza's translation is an important source based on a ms(s). now lost (see e.g. Louis [above, n. 1] xlvi) has been successfully challenged (see Monfasani [above, n. 7] 284–291). According to Marengi (above, n. 1) 159, Gaza relied on two (minor) mss.: A^m and D.

9) Noteworthy too, and adding support for this division, is the fact that Pr. 12.9 – which begins with the same question as Pr. 12.2 – has a different but similarly brief response, and says nothing about rainbows: *Διὰ τί αἱ ὄσμαι ἐγγύθεν ἤττον εὐώδεις καὶ θυμιαμάτων καὶ ἀνθῶν; ἢ ὅτι πλησίον μὲν συναποφέρεται τὸ γεῶδες, ὥστε κεραννύμενον ἀσθενεστέραν ποιεῖ τὴν δύναμιν, εἰς δὲ τὸ πόρρω*

Forster treats Pr. 12.2–3 as one chapter, maintaining that the lengthy discussion on rainbows is a “digression” from or “side issue” to the main subject;¹⁰ but that is implausible, as, at the very least, one would expect the author to provide some kind of transition to or indication of such a digression. Now if an editor were to accept the manuscript tradition and maintain that this material all belongs to one chapter, then at the very least a lacuna should be inserted between διασπᾶται and πότερον, in recognition of the abrupt shift in the text. As far as I know, this has never been proposed; and to my mind such an emendation does not have much to recommend it, as the difference in subject matter is too great to justify such a move.

So, if we accept that this material ought to be divided in two, should the beginning of the new 12.3 be emended? Marengi does not think so. In anticipation of a possible objection – that this is an unusual way to begin a chapter – he writes:

L'enunciato del probl. (πότερον ἀληθές ἐστὶν ἢ ψευδός), anche se si discosta dal modulo consueto, non costituisce certo una novità o un *unicum*, tant'è che si ritrova *infra*, cap. 10 (πότερον αἱ ὀσμαι καπνὸς ἢ ἀτμίς); e in altre sezioni dei *Problemi*. ... Ritengo pertanto arbitrario stravolgere la tradizione manoscritta – come nella scia del Casaubon ... hanno fatto altri editori, ultimo nel tempo il Ruelle ... – ed iniziare senza una ragione plausibile il capitolo con λέγεται γάρ, come accettano gli interpreti contemporanei dei *Problemi* (Forster, Hett, Flashar).¹¹

Marengi is right to claim that such an opening cannot be ruled out on the grounds that it begins with a question of the rare form Πότερον Ω Α ἢ Β ἐστὶν; (“Is Ω Α or Β?”).¹² And he is right to point to the opening of Pr. 12.10 as just such a legitimate case: Πότερον αἱ ὀσμαι καπνὸς ἢ ἀτμίς; (“Are smells smoke or vapor?”). But note that the opening of Pr. 12.3, though formally similar, is actually significantly

καταφέρεται ἡ ὀσμὴ; διὰ ταῦτα δὲ καὶ τριφθέντα τὰ ἄνθη ἀπολλύουσι τὴν ὀσμήν. (“Why are the smells both from incense and from flowers close by less fragrant? Is it because nearby the earthy part is transmitted along with it, so that being mixed it makes the power [of the smell] weaker, whereas the smell is carried to a distance? And it is also for this reason that the flowers when rubbed lose their smell.”)

10) E. S. Forster, *The Works of Aristotle Translated into English VII: Problemata* (Oxford 1927) n. 4 ad loc.

11) Marengi (above, n. 1) 94 n. 1.

12) The vast majority of the more than 900 chapters in the *Problemata* begin with διὰ τί. Of the exceptional chapters, a half dozen do begin with πότερον (1.37, 2.21, 2.33, 9.6, 12.10, 26.36). Far more often, however, πότερον marks the first reply to a διὰ τί question that opens a chapter; I counted 95 such cases.

different: Πότερον οὖν ἀληθές ἐστὶν ἢ ψεῦδος; (“Now is it true or false?”). As an opening question, this has no content – no referent to the understood “it”; as such, it is not a plausible chapter-opening.

Most modern editors, however, following Casaubon (who follows Gaza), transpose the first two lines, and instead begin the chapter without a question: λέγεται γὰρ ὡς εὐδῶδη γίνεται τὰ δένδρα εἰς ἅπερ ἂν ἡ ἴρις κατασκήψη. But here I agree with Marengi (see the above quote) that there is no plausible reason to think a chapter would begin with λέγεται γὰρ. Now Flashar makes the following suggestion: “Offenbar ist hier ein aus einer Quelle übernommenes Material noch nicht in die für die Probl. typische Frageform umgestaltet.”¹³ This would be a plausible speculation, were the source for Pr. 12.3 unknown. However, Thphr. CP 6.17 is the source for Pr. 12.1–4, and it is unlikely that only 12.3 was taken from this source without being put into the problem-format. More specifically, CP 6.17.1–2 is the source for Pr. 12.1, 2 & 4, whereas 6.17.7 is the source for 12.3 (another sense in which 12.3 differs from the other chapters in 12.1–4). Finally, a comparison of Pr. 12.3 with CP 6.17.7 reveals that the former is not simply unprocessed material pulled from the latter.¹⁴

Therefore, if there were no further evidence to shed light on this text, I would recommend inserting a lacuna at the opening of Pr. 12.3, but not transposing the lines: ... πότερον οὖν ἀληθές ἐστὶν ἢ ψεῦδος;¹⁵ I think there is further evidence, however, from the *Problemata Physica Arabica* (= *PPA*): the 9th century Arabic version of Hunain ibn Ishāq, which predates all extant Greek manuscripts.¹⁶ In the introduction to his edition of the Arabic text,

13) Flashar (above, n. 5) 552.

14) See, for example, the passages from CP 6.17.7 quoted below (p. 252 and n. 29).

15) Louis (above, n. 5) transposes the lines and posits a lacuna at the opening of the chapter. I find this combination of emendations unwarranted and unhelpful.

16) See L. Filius, *The Problemata Physica attributed to Aristotle: The Arabic Version of Hunain ibn Ishāq and the Hebrew Version of Moses ibn Tibbon* (Leiden 1999) 592–597. I do not read Arabic, and so rely solely on Filius’s translation, about which he writes: “The English translation is as literal as possible so that classical scholars can gain a clear idea of the formulation and content” (xii). On the similarities and differences between the Greek *Problemata* and the *PPA*, see pp. xvii–xxvi (and note especially his comments on Pr. 12.3, pp. xxii–xxiii). (NB: Book 12 in the Greek *Problemata* is 13 in the Arabic version, because Book 1 in the former is divided into two books in the latter. But I refer to Book 12 in either case, to avoid confusion.)

Filius argues that the *PPA* is “an accurate translation of a Greek revision” of the *Problemata*. In the case of Pr. 12.3, however, he concludes: “Comparing the Greek with the Arabic text, we see clearly here too that the Greek text has been carefully followed. The reviser has added little to this problem.”¹⁷

In the *PPA*, Pr. 12.3 begins as follows:

Why do people say that fragrant trees are agreeable in odor when the rainbow falls on them? Is that true, and if it is true, what is the cause of that?

Note that this translation transposes the key lines, but also offers an alternative opening which leaves no doubt about this actually being the beginning of a chapter – a new problem. It thereby provides a clue for how to emend the text in the hope of arriving at something like the original opening of the chapter. We cannot know whether the *PPA* here faithfully renders a Greek text that was closer to the original than any of the extant Greek manuscripts, or whether Hunain ibn Ishāq – faced with a corrupt text – undertook to emend it (in part by standardizing the opening). The former is a real possibility, which should give us some confidence in emending the text; with the latter, we are at least provided with an intelligent suggestion.

I accordingly emend our text as follows:

⟨Διὰ τί⟩ λέγεται [γὰρ] ὡς εὐώδη γίνεται τὰ δένδρα εἰς ἅπερ ἂν ἡ ἴρις κατασκήψη; πότερον [οὖν] ἀληθές ἐστιν ἢ ψεῦδος; καὶ εἰ ἀληθές, διὰ ⟨τίν'⟩ αἰτίαν ἂν εἴη¹⁸ τὸ συμβαῖνον;

Διὰ τί ego (cf. *PPA*) λέγεται – κατασκήψη post συμβαῖνον codd., transp. *PPA*, Gaza, Casaubon γὰρ om. Casaubon (cf. *PPA*) οὖν om. w, del. R¹ (recte ut opinor) ⟨τίν'⟩ Sylburg ἂν w^{ms} R, om. cett. codd.

⟨Why⟩ is it said that the trees upon which the rainbow has fallen become fragrant? Is this true or false? And if it is true, through ⟨what⟩ cause would there be the occurrence?

The combination λέγεται γὰρ ὡς is not found (elsewhere) in the *Problemata*, though it appears thrice in the rest of the corpus Aristotelicum.¹⁹ I think it possible that γὰρ was added to our passage

17) Filius (above, n. 16) pp. xxiv and xxii.

18) Marengi (above, n. 1) emends the text to read διὰ τί ἂν εἴη. But the *PPA* and all three Latin translations (Bartholomew [*causas*], Trebizond and Gaza [*causam*]) support the retention of αἰτίαν, the reading of the mss. Cf. Pr. 10.12.892a6 and 20.7.923a30.

19) Mete. 355b34, HA 597b1, EN 1132a10.

by a scribe early in the manuscript tradition, as part of an (unsuccessful) attempt to repair the textual corruption at the beginning of Pr. 12.3. But it does not belong in the opening question of a *Problemata*-chapter.

A T.L.G. search for the combination διὰ τί λέγεται ὡς yields no results; but, as the phrase is otherwise unproblematic, this by itself should not count against retaining ὡς. Διὰ τί λέγεται (without ὡς), though rare, is found five times in the *Problemata* (but nowhere else in the corpus Aristotelicum), always at the beginning of a chapter, raising a question about a line of verse:²⁰

a. 20.2.923a9–10: Διὰ τί λέγεται ‘μίνθην ἐν πολέμῳ μήτ’ ἔσθιε μήτε φύτευε’;²¹

b. 26.9.941a20–1: Διὰ τί λέγεται ‘οὔ ποτε νυκτερινὸς βορέας τρίτον ἵκετο φέγγος’;²²

c. 26.41.945a8–9: Διὰ τί λέγεται ‘ἀρχομένου τε νότου καὶ λήγοντος βορέαο’;²³

d. 26.46.945a37–8: Διὰ τί λέγεται ‘εἰ δ’ ὁ νότος βορέαν προκαλέσσειται, αὐτίκα χειμῶν’;²⁴

e. 26.57.947a7–9: Διὰ τί λέγεται ‘μή ποτ’ ἀπ’ ἠπείρου δείσης νέφος ἀλλ’ ἀπὸ πόντου χειμῶνος, θέρεος δὲ ἀπ’ ἠπείροιο μελαίνης’;²⁵

These passages provide further support for the addition of Διὰ τί to our text, in which Διὰ τί λέγεται introduces not a line of verse,

20) Cf. Plu. *Aetia phys.* 16 (Mor. 919e): Διὰ τί λέγεται ‘σίτον ἐν πληῶ φύτευε, τὴν δὲ κριθὴν ἐν κόνει’;

21) “Why is it said: ‘Neither eat nor plant mint in war time?’” This saying is otherwise unknown, though it is included in the Byzantine *Collectio paroemiarum* by M. Apostolius (11.6).

22) “Why is it said: ‘The Boreas [blows] not at night once the third daylight has come?’” This verse is found verbatim in Thphr. Vent. 49: ὄθεν ἡ παροιμία λέγεται ὡς ‘οὔποτε νυκτερινὸς βορέας τρίτον ἵκετο φέγγος’.

23) “Why is it said: ‘when the Notos begins and when the Boreas comes to an end?’” Cf. Pr. 26.45.945a28–29: διὸ καὶ ἡ παροιμία λέγει ‘εἰ πλεῖν ἀρχομένου τε νότου καὶ λήγοντος βορέαο’.

24) “Why is it said: ‘if the Notos summons a Boreas, winter comes forth-with?’” After a brief explanation, the author adds (945b2–3): διὸ λέγεται ‘εἰ βορρᾶς πληθὸν καταλήψεται, αὐτίκα χειμῶν’. This is alluded to in Thphr. Vent. 46, and called a proverb (κατὰ τὴν παροιμίαν).

25) “Why is it said: ‘Do not fear a cloud from the mainland in winter but from the open sea, and in summer from the dark mainland?’” Cf. Thphr. Vent. 60: Διὰ τί ποτε λέγεται ‘μή ποτ’ ἀπ’ ἠπείρου δείσης νέφος, ὡς ἀπὸ πόντου χειμῶνος, θέρεος δὲ ἀπ’ ἠπείροιο μελαίνης’;

but the equivalent of an old wives' tale – perhaps a saying common among herdsmen.²⁶

Further, as indicated in the notes, in three of these cases (b, d & e) the relevant line of verse is also recorded by Theophrastus (in his *De Ventis*). This is significant in that the idea behind the saying presented at the beginning of Pr. 12.3 is also found in a work by Theophrastus. In the course of discussing the various effects of heat and rain on the odor of certain plants, he writes:

ταῦτα δὲ ποιεῖ καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις. καὶ γὰρ τὸ περὶ τὴν ἴριν λεγόμενον, ὡς ὅπου ἂν κατὰσχη, ποιεῖ τὰ δένδρα καὶ τὸν τόπον εὐώδη, τοιοῦτόν ἐστιν (CP 6.17.7).²⁷

Now it [i. e., heat] also produces these results [i. e., concoction of rain-water, and fragrance] in other cases. Indeed, what is said about the rainbow – that whatever space it covers, it makes the trees and the region fragrant – is such an instance.

In each of the above five cases, the opening question is followed by a standard form of response,²⁸ whereas in Pr. 12.3 (as emended by me) the opening question is followed by the unusual “Is this true or false?”. This kind of response, however, though rare, is not unprecedented. For example, Pr. 19.7 begins:

Διὰ τί οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἑπταχόρδους ποιοῦντες ἀρμονίας τὴν ὑπάτην ἀλλ' οὐ τὴν νήτην κατέλιπον; πότερον τοῦτο ψευδὸς (ἀμφοτέρως γὰρ κατέλιπον, τὴν δὲ τρίτην ἐξήρουν), ἢ οὐ; (918a13–15)

Why did the ancients, when they made a seven-note *harmonia*, leave in the *hypatê* but not the *nêtê*? Is this false (for they did leave in both, but cut out the *tritê*), or is it not [false]?

Further, in each of the above five cases, the author does not challenge the truth of the saying, but simply attempts to explain why it is (thought to be) true. But in Pr. 12.3 (as in CP 6.17.7), it is clear that the author believes the saying is false. Shortly after the open-

26) Cf. Pr. 12.3.906b8–11: ἐν τῇ ἐμπερησμένη ὕλῃ φασὶν οἱ νομεῖς μετὰ τὰ ἐπὶ τῇ ἴριδι ὕδατα γίνεσθαι ἐπίδηλον τὴν εὐωδίαν κτλ. (“herdsmen say that the fragrance is noticeable in burned wood after the rains that come with the rainbow” etc.).

27) Cf. Plu. Quaest. Conv. 4.2 (Mor. 664e–f) and Plin. NH 12.52.110. See also Arist. HA 5.22.553b27–30, which could serve as part of an Aristotelian explanation of the supposed connection between rainbows and fragrant trees.

28) For example, in the first case, the opening question is followed by ἢ ὅτι καταψύχει τὰ σώματα; (“Is it because [mint] cools bodies?”) (923a10).

ing questions, he writes: ὅτι μὲν οὖν οὔτε πάντα οὔτε αἰεί, δῆλον· πολλάκις γὰρ ἡ ἴρις μὲν γέγονε, τὰ δὲ δένδρα οὐθὲν ἐπίδηλα φαίνονται (“Now it is clear that this is true neither for all [trees] nor always; for often the rainbow has come, but the trees reveal no noticeable [fragrance]”).²⁹ The unusual nature of the problem posed in Pr. 12.3 explains the unusual response πότερον ἀληθές ἐστὶν ἢ ψεῦδος;³⁰ – and perhaps it ultimately helps explain the problematic nature of the text that has come down to us.³¹

South Orange, NJ

Robert Mayhew

29) Cf. CP 6.17.7: ποιεῖ γὰρ οὐ πάντως, ἀλλ’ ἐὰν ὕλη τις ἢ νεόκαντος, οὐδ’ ἴσως καθ’ αὐτήν, ἀλλὰ τρόπον τινὰ κατὰ συμβεβηκός, ἐφύει γὰρ ὅπου ἂν ἐφιστῆ (“For [the rainbow] does not make [trees fragrant] in every case, but only if some wood is newly burnt, nor likewise does it do this itself, but in some way incidentally, since there is rain wherever [the rainbow] is present”).

30) Cf. Flashar (above, n. 5) 553, re. Pr. 12.3: “Die Ausnahme, das Mirakulöse ist also der Grund für die Aufnahme des Phänomens in die Probl.”

31) I wish to thank the journal’s anonymous referees, whose critical comments improved this note significantly, and Jason Rheins, for answering my questions about Greek meter.