The author of this treatise maintains that everything is made of fire and water, and that fire has the power to move everything, while water has the (opposite) power to nourish everything (I 3). Consequently, he associates movement, effort and strength with the metaphysical element fire, and lack of movement, effort or strength with the metaphysical element water. Against this background, blood seems to be, in the food catalogue, on the side of fire. For instance, at 172.4–7 the Hippocratic author says:

αὐτῶν δὲ τῶν ζῴων ἰσχυρόταται μὲν αἱ σάρκες αἱ μάλιστα πονέουσαι καὶ ἐναιμόταται καὶ ἐν ᾗσι κατακλίνεται· κουφόταται δὲ τῶν σαρκῶν αἱ ἥκιστα πονέουσαι καὶ ὀλιγαιμόταται, καὶ ἐκ τῆς σκιῆς, καὶ ὅσαι ἐσώταται τοῦ ζῴου.

The strongest animal flesh is that which endures most labour and has the most blood and on which they lie down. The lightest flesh is that which endures the least labour, has the least blood, comes from the shaded areas and is the innermost part of the animal.

Here, flesh strength is due to effort and a high amount of blood, while flesh lightness is due to the lack, that is, a low degree, of both effort and blood. Similarly, at 168.10–11 beef is considered strong because cattle are παχύαιμα and πολύαιμα. Since meat strength goes hand in hand with dryness, i.e. with fire (κύνεια ξηραίνει καὶ θερμαίνει καὶ ἰσχὺν ἐμποιεῖ, 168.22–3; ὑὸς ἀγρίου ξηραίνει καὶ ἰσχὺν παρέχει, 168.24), and meat lightness with moisture, i.e. with water (ἄρνεια δὲ κουφότερα ὀείων, καὶ ἐρίφεια αἰγείων, διότι ἀναιμότερα καὶ ὑγρότερα, 168.16–17), we may conclude that all these passages concur with the transmitted text at 172.1–2 and speak against Joly's conjecture.

We are left with no other choice but to dismiss the medieval Latin translation on which Joly bases his conjecture. Generally speaking, Joly does not have a great opinion of this version;[4] nor does he mention that its translation of the sentence in question is far from reliable. The Latin version not only omits the comparison τὰ ὀλιγοφάγα τῶν πολυφάγων and translates χορτοφαγέω as *terram uorare* but in the comparisons τὰ ὀλιγόποτα τῶν πολυπότων and τὰ πολύαιμα τῶν ἀναίμων καὶ ὀλιγαίμων the second term of the comparison is entirely missing. Under these circumstances, the words *illa quae parum bibunt et sine sanguine sunt* seem to offer little support for modifying the Greek text.

University of Vienna CĂTĂLIN ENACHE
catalin.enache@univie.ac.at
doi:10.1017/S0009838824000739

EURIPIDES, *HERACLES* 767*

ABSTRACT

This note presents a new supplement for Euripides, Heracles *767.*

Keywords: Euripides; *Heracles*; asyndeton; rhyme; metaphor; textual criticism

[4] R. Joly, 'Les versions latines du *Régime* pseudo-hippocratique', *Scriptorium* 39 (1975), 3–22, at 10: 'La traduction B est médiocre, souvent obscure, obérée de fautes graves dont on peut parfois soupçonner l'origine.'

* I am grateful to *CQ*'s editors for helping me to improve and clarify the structure of this piece. My thanks go also to Professors Pietro Giannini and Esteban Calderón Dorda for kindly reading a preliminary draft; and to *CQ*'s reader for suggestions. Translations are mine.

© The Author(s), 2025. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Classical Association.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838824000909 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The text of Euripides, *Heracles* 765–7 found in the manuscript Laurentianus plut. 32.2 (L) fol. 101v, is as follows:[1]

μεταλλαγαὶ γὰρ δακρύων,
μεταλλαγαὶ συντυχίας
ἔτεκον ἀοιδάς.

767 ante ἔτεκον lacunam statuerunt plerique edd.: alterum <ἔτεκον> Bothe, <νέας> Wilamowitz, <ἄλλας> Bond

For changes of tears,
changes of fate
have brought forth songs.

Heracles has returned and killed the tyrant Lycus. Everything has changed and the city of Thebes gathers to celebrate the hero with dances and songs. In the antistrophe, at lines 774–6, the chorus reflects on the consequences of wealth and good fortune. Together they can deprive a person of reason and lead to his exercising power unjustly. This is the text, the same as L, with only one change specified in the apparatus, which has no impact on the problem discussed in this paper:

ὁ χρυσὸς ἅ τ᾽ εὐτυχία
φρενῶν βροτοὺς ἐξάγεται
δύνασιν ἄδικον ἐφέλκων.

775 φρενῶν Ludouicus Dindorf: φρονεῖν L **776** ἄδικον del. Hermann

Gold along with good fortune
leads mortals out of their minds,
dragging behind unjust power.

Comparison of 767 ἔτεκον ἀοιδάς and 776 δύνασιν ἄδικον ἐφέλκων reveals their metrical incompatibility: 767 ἔτεκον ἀοιδάς is an iambic penthemimer or reizianum with resolution (⏑ ⏑⏑ ⏑ – –), whereas 776 δύνασιν ἄδικον ἐφέλκων is a catalectic iambic dimeter with two resolutions (⏑ ⏑⏑ ⏑ ⏑⏑ ⏑ – –). Metrical analysis highlights two possibilities: (a) there is a word intrusion at 776; (b) there is an omission at 767, before or after ἔτεκον, where a tribrachic word (⏑ ⏑ ⏑) is needed, although an iambic (⏑ –) or spondaic (– –) word before ἔτεκον is also possible.

Considering the first possibility, Triclinius attempted to resolve the problem by moving ἐφέλκων.[2] This solution is implausible because it ensures uniformity only in the number of syllables (six), without addressing the underlying metrical issues. Hermann's deletion of ἄδικον[3] is problematic too, since the adjective is crucial for defining the type of power lost through the gods' actions.[4] Therefore, the textual problem must be addressed within the strophic line.

[1] The manuscript has been digitised and is available online: for this page, see https://tecabml.contentdm.oclc.org/digital/collection/plutei/id/679008.

[2] Triclinius inserted a *dicolon* (:) before ἐφέλκων and through a dash connected this word to the following line, where he excised οὔτις by circling it.

[3] G. Hermann (ed.), *Euripidis Hercules Furens* (Leipzig, 1810), 43.

[4] The chorus repeatedly highlights the correlation between unjust actions and unfavourable outcomes: e.g. 779–80 νόμον παρέμενος, ἀνομία χάριν διδοὺς | ἔθραυσεν ὄλβου κελαινὸν ἅρμα ('by keeping away from the law, yielding to lawlessness, | he has smashed wealth's dark chariot').

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838824000909 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Three different additions have been proposed. Bothe suggested repeating the verb ἔτεκον,[5] while the other two supplements are adjectives qualifying the songs: Wilamowitz's νέας[6] and Bond's ἄλλας.[7] Bothe's second ἔτεκον repeats the tribrach of the antistrophic line and other words are repeated to express joy: 763 χοροὶ χοροί; 764–5 μεταλλαγαὶ … μεταλλαγαί; 772 θεοὶ θεοί.[8] For the same anadiplosis, see Soph. *Trach.* 893 ἔτεκ' ἔτεκε and Eur. *Or.* 989 ἔτεκεν ἔτεκε (*semel* L). But the suggestion oversimplifies the issue and does not fully address the complexity of Euripides' linguistic style; as will be seen, Euripides often employs the technique of using similar words with slight variations to achieve an artistic effect. Wilamowitz's νέας provides good sense[9] but lacks strong palaeographical justification. The omission could be attributed to the repetition of the ending -ας, but συντυχίας and νέας are in two different lines. While the responsion is appropriate, it does not precisely replicate the metrical shape of the antistrophe, replacing a tribrach (⏑ ⏑ ⏑) with an iambic foot (⏑ –). Bond suggested that the omission of ἄλλας may be influenced by the neighbouring word μεταλλαγαί; but since the metrical shape of the antistrophe is different, this involves a tribrach (⏑ ⏑ ⏑) responding to a spondee (– –). None of these proposals has won a general approval, and the text is usually printed with a lacuna marked before ἔτεκον.[10]

As just noted, Euripides often employs the technique of placing similar-sounding words side by side to achieve poetic, rhetorical and musical effects. Therefore, I propose supplementing a different word: ἔτρεφον, which produces the asyndetic rhyme that is so typical of Euripidean style. The combination of τίκτω and τρέφω is common,[11] and Euripides may be reversing the terms for rhetorical and pathetic effects: cf. *El.* 969 ἥ μ' ἔθρεψε κἄτεκεν.[12] The same rhymed asyndeton recurs at *IT* 212–13 καὶ θῦμ' οὐκ εὐγάθητον | ἔτεκεν ἔτρεφεν εὐκταίαν.[13] For the rhymed asyndeton, see *Supp.* 800 ἀΰσατ' ἀπύσατ', 919 ἔτρεφον ἔφερον, *Ion* 764 ἔλαβον ἔπαθον, *Tro.* 308 ἄνεχε πάρεχε, 1303 κλύετε μάθετε, 1310 ἀγόμεθα φερόμεθ', 1325 ἐμάθετ' ἐκλύετε, *Or.* 195 ἔκανες ἔθανες, *IA* 1317 φονεύομαι διόλλυμαι, *Cycl.* 203 ἄνεχε πάρεχε, *Erechth.* fr. 370.34 Kannicht φερόμεθ' ἀγόμεθ'.[14] Asyndeton enhances the emotional resonance of

[5] F.H. Bothe (ed.), *Poetae scenici Graecorum* (Leipzig, 1825–6), 2.645. Duplication of ἔτεκον is accepted by J.S. Lasso de la Vega, 'Cincuenta notas críticas a Eurípides, *Heracles furioso*', *CFC(G)* 24 (1990), 19–75, at 51–2. In his view, ἔτεκον should be understood as first person singular and μεταλλαγαί should be corrected to μετ' ἀλαλαγαῖς (twice!). The proposal is not convincing and adds another unnecessary correction.

[6] U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (ed.), *Euripides. Herakles* (Berlin, 1895[2]), 1.218.

[7] G.W. Bond, *Euripides. Heracles* (Oxford, 1981), 266–7.

[8] Repetitions in ritual invocations are common, as noted by Bond (n. 7), 265–6. Euripides makes frequent use of anadiplosis in his later works; for a catalogue, see W. Breitenbach, *Untersuchungen zur Sprache der Euripideischen Lyrik* (Stuttgart, 1934), 214–21. Aeschylus is depicted as ridiculing Euripides for abusing this device in Ar. *Ran.* 1351–5.

[9] See S.A. Barlow, *Euripides. Heracles* (Warminster, 1981), 158.

[10] See A. Kirchhoff (ed.), *Euripidis Tragoediae* (Berlin, 1855), 2.350; A. Nauck (ed.), *Euripidis Tragoediae* (Leipzig, 1871[3]), 1.348; L. Parmentier and H. Grégoire (edd.), *Euripide, Héraclès, Les Suppliantes, Ion* (Paris, 1923), 50; J. Diggle (ed.), *Euripidis fabulae* (Oxford, 1981), 2.147; K.H. Lee (ed.), *Euripides. Hercules* (Leipzig, 1988), 27.

[11] Cf. Hom. *Il.* 22.421 ὅς μιν ἔτικτε καὶ ἔτρεφε; *Od.* 2.131 ἥ μ᾽ ἔτεχ', ἥ μ᾽ ἔθρεψε; *Od.* 12.134 θρέψασα τεκοῦσά τε … μήτηρ; Pl. *Leg.* 929a ὃν ἔτεκέ τε καὶ ἐξεθρέψατο.

[12] Reversal is less frequent than logical order, so I propose the 'standard' order. On *hysteron proteron*, see L. Battezzato, 'Linguistica e figure retoriche: *hysteron proteron* e pleonasmo da Omero a Sofocle', in G. Avezzù (ed.), *Il dramma sofocleo: testo, lingua, interpretazione* (Stuttgart and Weimar, 2003), 17–48.

[13] The text is clear, even if the metre is not: E. Kearns (ed.), *Euripides. Iphigenia in Tauris* (Cambridge, 2023), 138.

[14] See J. Diggle, *Euripidea. Collected Essays* (Oxford, 1994), 99–100.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838824000909 Published online by Cambridge University Press

joy and happiness, helping to immerse the audience in a euphoric atmosphere.[15] Furthermore, another trisyllabic word creates an echo of trisyllabic and isometric words and a coincidence of word-ends between strophe and antistrophe:

767 ἔτεκον <ἔτρεφον> ἀοιδάς = 776 δύνασιν ἄδικον ἐφέλκων.

The verb ἔτρεφον may have been left out because the repeated ending -ον creates an omission similar to *saut du même au même*, within the same line and between two assonant words.

Giving life to songs is a common metaphor: cf. Eur. *Supp*. 180 ἂν τίκτῃ μέλη, Ar. *Ran*. 1059 τὰ ῥήματα τίκτειν, Philisc. fr. 1.5 W.[2] τεκεῖν τινα Λυσίᾳ ὕμνον, Callim. *Aet*. fr. 1.19–20 Harder ἀοιδὴν τίκτεσθαι, *Ia*. 13.14 τὰ χωλὰ τίκτειν.[16] The verb ἔτρεφον extends this metaphor, establishing a logical progression of thought. A similar metaphor of generating and then nurturing true virtue can be found at Pl. *Symp*. 212a5–6 τεκόντι δὲ ἀρετὴν ἀληθῆ καὶ θρεψαμένῳ ὑπάρχει θεοφιλεῖ γενέσθαι ('the love of the gods belongs to anyone who has given birth to and nourished the true virtue'). Moreover, Euripides enriched this stasimon with stylistic features of epinician poetry;[17] and the imagine of metaphorical nourishment (τρέφειν) is present in Pindaric passages, such as *Ol*. 1.112, where the Muse 'nourishes' poetic inspiration,[18] visualised as an arrow, or *Ol*. 10.95–6, where the Pierides 'nourish' glory for mortals.[19] The metaphorical value of τρέφειν agrees with the Pindaric flavour of *Heracles*' choral songs.[20]

The idea of bringing the songs to life and nourishing them shows us how Euripides interweaves dance, song and metaphorical language. The metaphor is so vivid that it comes alive in front of the audience. As a result, I propose the following text for *Heracles* 765–7:

μεταλλαγαὶ γὰρ δακρύων, 765
μεταλλαγαὶ συντυχίας
ἔτεκον <ἔτρεφον> ἀοιδάς.

Changes of tears,
changes of fate
generated, nurtured songs.

Montecatini Terme PAOLO SANTÉ
paolo.sante@outlook.it
doi:10.1017/S0009838824000909

[15] Cf. Soph. *El*. 1234–5 ἐμόλετ' ἀρτίως, ἐφηύρετ', ἤλθετ', εἴδεθ' οὓς ἐχρῄζετε.

[16] For poetic creation expressed in drama through the metaphorical language related to childbirth, cf. Eur. *Andr*. 476–7 (with Wilamowitz's τεκόντοιν) and Crat. fr. 203 K.–A.; see also D.D. Leitao, *The Pregnant Male as Myth and Metaphor in Classical Greek Literature* (Cambridge, 2012), 120–7.

[17] See H. Parry, 'The second stasimon of Euripides' *Heracles* (637–700)', *AJPh* 86 (1965), 363–74; R. Rehm, 'Performing the chorus: choral action, interaction, and absence in Euripides', *Arion* 4.1 (1996–7), 45–60; L.A. Swift, *The Hidden Chorus. Echoes of Genre in Tragic Lyric* (Oxford, 2010), 142–56 (131 on this stasimon); C. Carey, 'The victory ode in the theatre', in P. Agócs, C. Carey and R. Rawles (edd.), *Receiving the Komos. Ancient and Modern Receptions of the Victory Ode* (London, 2012), 17–36; A. Bagordo, 'Lyric genre interactions in the choruses of Attic tragedy', *Skenè* 1 (2015), 37–55, at 43–4; N. Weiss, 'Generic hybridity in Athenian tragedy', in M. Foster, L. Kurke and N. Weiss (edd.), *Genre in Archaic and Classical Greek Poetry. Theories and Models* (Leiden and Boston, 2020), 169–74.

[18] Pindar frequently employs the metaphor of the arrow as a metaphor for poetry: D.E. Gerber, *Pindar's Olympian One: A Commentary* (Toronto, 1982), 170; R. Nünlist, *Poetologische Bildersprache in der frühgriechischen Dichtung* (Leipzig, 1998), 148.

[19] See also Bacchyl. 3.90–2 and 13.60–2.

[20] This further argument is owed to *CQ*'s reader.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838824000909 Published online by Cambridge University Press