

## SHORTER NOTES

### ON THE WORDING OF HERACLITUS, FRAGMENT 126

Heraclitus B 126 D.–K. (= 42 Marcovich) occurs in a scholion on Tzetzes' commentary on the *Iliad*. According to the first edition by G. Hermann (*Draconis Stratonicensis liber de metris poeticis, Ioannis Tzetzae Exegesis in Homeri Iliadem*, Leipzig, 1812) on which all editors of Heraclitus have based their text, it reads as follows: τὰ ψυχρὰ θέρεται, θερμὸν ψύχεται, ὑ<γρὸν> αὐαίνεται, καρφαλέον νοτίζειτ<αι> (p. 126, 17–19).

Despite a remark by Th. Bergk (*Kl. Schr.* II, p. 302 n. 4), it has escaped Heraclitean scholarship that there is a better reading of the fragment which avoids the illogical and confusing transition from the neuter plural in the first participle to the neuter singular in the subsequent ones. Tzetzes' commentary was also included by Ludwig Bachmann in his *Scholia in Homeri Iliadem*, vol. I (Leipzig, 1835). Both editions are based on the same manuscript Lips. 32 (previously 1275), dated 14/15th c., which at that time counted as the codex unicus. In view of its bad state, particularly in the margins which contain the scholia (see Hermann's preface p. vii), Bachmann undertook a diligent re-reading. In many places where Hermann had erred or indicated illegibility by dots (as for the bracketed letters above), he was able to provide a better or fuller version of the text (cp. H. Felber, *Quellen der Ilias-Exegesis*, Diss. Zürich 1925, p. 5). As for our fragment, he reads all four participles in the neuter plural: τὰ ψυχρὰ θέρεται, θερμὰ ψύχεται, ὑ<γρὰ> αὐαίνεται, καρφαλέα νοτίζεται (p. 826, 3–5).

This sensible correction can be confirmed from other evidence. According to C. Wendel, *Pauly-Wissowa* s.v. Tzetzes, col. 1967, there are the following unedited manuscripts of Tzetzes' commentary: cod. Cantabr. R 16.33 (14th c.); cod. Escorial. Y III 20 (16th c., of unknown extent); cod. Vindob. phil. gr. 303 (16th c.). In addition, there is the cod. Vat. gr. 905 (end of 15th c.), of which G. Calabrò has published some extracts ('De Ioannis Tzetzae studiis Homericis', *Bolletino del Comitato per la preparazione dell'Edizione Nazionale*, fasc. 12, 1964, p. 68). He reads the same version as Bachmann, the only difference being the omission of the article at the beginning.

In order to gain a broader basis, I have inspected the cod. Cantabr. in the Wren Library, Trinity College, Cambridge. It fully confirms the new reading (with the Vat. and against the Lips. omitting the superfluous initial article). Thus, there is overwhelming evidence that the standard form of B 126 only results from a misreading by Hermann whose authority was hitherto inadvertently followed. The fragment is therefore to be read: ψυχρὰ θέρεται, θερμὰ ψύχεται, ὑγρὰ αὐαίνεται, καρφαλέα νοτίζεται. The neuter plural is also attested in the echo of B 126, occurring in the pseudo-Heraclitean letter V (p. 72, 34 Bywater, = Marc. fr. 42 b): καὶ ἐν τῷ παντὶ ὑγρὰ αὐαίνεται, θερμὰ ψύχεται.

The philosophical implications of the correction seem but slight. It is, however, worth pointing out, first that once again it shows how carefully phrased and well-balanced Heraclitus' sayings are. We are not any longer compelled to explain the arbitrary change of number by 'archaic inconsistency' (G. Kirk, *Heraclitus, The Cosmic Fragments*, Cambridge, 1954, p. 150). Secondly, that the neuter plural seems especially appropriate here. In contrast to a more conceptual analysis as e.g. in B 51

and B 88 where the neuter singular of the participle is used, fr. 126 refers to a plurality of observable things.\*

*St Hugh's College, Oxford*

ROMAN DILCHER

\* I wish to thank Professor R. Kassel, University of Cologne, for encouraging me to pursue this problem.

# THE SIGNIFICANCE OF ΥΓΡΟΝ ΥΔΩΡ IN ANACREONTIC 33.22

παλάμαισι χείρας αὐτοῦ (sc. Ἐρωτος)  
ἀνέβαλπον, ἐκ δὲ χαίτης  
ἀπέθλιβον ὑγρόν ὕδωρ.

20

The phrase ὑγρόν ὕδωρ in *Anacreontic* 33.22 requires more explanation than has until now been offered: the parallel passages cited by M. L. West in his edition (*Carmina Anacreontea*, Leipzig, 1984), namely Ovid, *Ars Am.* 3.224, 'nuda Venus madidas exprimit imbre comas' and *Her.* 18.104, 'madidam...imbre comam', present the same image, but with quite a different vocabulary, whilst Patricia A. Rosenmeyer (*The Poetics of Imitation: Anacreon and the Anacreontic Tradition*, Cambridge, 1992, p. 80) regards it only as an example of tautology characteristic of the Anacreontic corpus. But it is by no means unique, and, both for this reason and in the context of the nature of the whole poem, it is capable of further elucidation.

We find exactly the same phrase in a passage which might be approximately contemporary, in lines 16–17 of poem 10 of Mesomedes (on whom see E. L. Bowie, 'Greek poetry in the Antonine Age' in D. A. Russell [ed.], *Antonine Literature*, Oxford, 1990, pp. 85–90). A river which has been frozen melts:

γίγνεται μὲν ὑγρόν  
πάλι ποταμὸς ὕδωρ.

Here ὑγρόν...ὕδωρ is contrasted with παγόμενον ὕδωρ (3; cf. 10–11 κατὰ δ' ὕδατοπαγοῦς | βραῖνε κελεύθου); the adjective ὑγρός in this context clearly has a meaning which implies motion, as opposed to the unmoving nature of ice, and Bowie (op. cit., p. 88) is therefore correct in rendering the phrase as 'flowing water'.

It is possible that Mesomedes' poem was known to the writer of the Anacreontic poem. But even if this is so, there is little chance that it inspired the use of this phrase, since a much more obvious model which both writers can be assumed to have followed is to be found in Homer. In *Od.* 4.458 (the Proteus episode) we find γίγνεται δ' ὑγρόν ὕδωρ, which is regularly cited by the lexicographers (e.g. Stephanus, LSJ) for ὑγρός with the meaning 'flowing'. The same passage was also without doubt the model for two passages in Nonnos' *Dionysiaca* 2.143, εἶην ὑγρόν ὕδωρ, and 12.84, Θίσβη δ' ὑγρόν ὕδωρ (ἔσσεται), and might explain the use of ὑγρός in other phrases, some of which might be too easily dismissed as tautologous; for example, Pind. *O.* 7.69 ἀλὸς ὑγρᾶς and *Pyth.* 4.40 ὑγρῶι πελάγει; Aesch. *Suppl.* 259 ὑγρᾶς θαλάσσης; Eur. *I.A.* 948 ὑγρῶν κυμάτων, fr. 636.6 ὑγροῖς κύμασιν, *Hel.* 1209 ὑγροῖσιν ἐν κλυδωνίοις, Alcidas (ap. Arist. *Ars Rhet.* 1406a) τὸν ὑγρόν ἰδρώτα (regarded by Aristotle as a typical specimen of the frigidity of Alcidas' style); Theocr. *Id.* 7.53f. ὑγρά ... κύματα, and 22.167 ὑγρόν ... κύμα; *A.P.* 7.263.3f. ὑγρά ... κύματ'; and Nonnos, *Dionysiaca* 16.65f. μᾶλλον ἐγὼ Δανάης ποθέων τύπον ὑγρόν ἐρώτων | ἤθελον.

In the Anacreontic text, therefore, ὑγρόν is far from being a tautology. It should be rendered as 'dripping' or 'running', and understood as a reminiscence of the Homeric phrase. Such recondite allusion is in keeping with the rest of the poem: the