

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. ὑγρὰ ... κύματα, and 22.167 ὑγρόν ... κύμα; *A.P.* 7.263.3f. ὑγρὰ ... 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

opening lines recall in their choice of words a Theocritean passage (*Id.* 24.11) and contain a rare use of a plural form (μεσονυκτίοις... ὥραις; see A. W. Bulloch, *Callimachus: The Fifth Hymn*, Cambridge, 1985, p. 181); the setting is a commonplace one in erotic poetry, most familiar from Vergil (*Aeneid* 4.522ff.), and also here recalls the conventional setting for an epiphany (see Dodds on Euripides' *Bacchae* 1084–5); Eros, shut out in the night and demanding admission (6–13), recalls the common motif of the *exclusus amator*; lines 24–30 recall the episode of Odysseus and the bow, especially in vocabulary (24f. πειράσωμεν | τόδε τόξον, εἴ τί μοι νῦν | βλάβεται βραχεῖσα νευρή ~ *Od.* 21.393ff. τόξον... πειρώμενος... μὴ κέρα ἵπες ἔδοιεν; 27 τανύει ~ *Od.* 21.407 ἐτάνυσσε; 29 ἀνὰ δ' ἄλλεται... εἶπε ~ *Od.* 22.2–4 ἄλτο δ' ἐπὶ μέγαν οὐδὸν... ἔειπεν, cited by West *ad loc.*; add 30 ξένε ~ *Od.* 22.27 ξείνε). The phrase ὕγρον ὕδωρ, then, in the light of this close dependence, should be regarded as a distinct allusion to the Proteus episode: Eros, in the manner of Odysseus, relinquishes his suppliant pose and shoots his host; Eros, in the manner of Proteus, reveals his true nature, and his parting words (32)

σὺ δὲ καρδίαν πονήσεις

recall Proteus' words to Menelaus (*Od.* 4.493f.)

οὐδέ σέ φημι
δὴν ἄκλαυτον ἔσεσθαι κτλ.

The University of Western Australia

IAN C. MARTLEW

A NOTE ON [HIPPOCRATES], *DE MORBIS II* 1, 4 A

In the fourth chapter of the Hippocratic treatise *De morbis II* 1¹ an unnamed illness² is discussed which arises allegedly from an overabundance of blood in the vessels around the brain. The author of the chapter, however, disputes this aetiology:³

**Ἦν περὶ τὸν ἐγκέφαλον φλέβια ὑπεραιμύση⁴ – τὸ μὲν οὖνομα οὐκ ὀρθὸν τῇ νόσῳ· οὐ γὰρ ἀνυστὸν ὑπεραιμῆσαι οὐδὲν τῶν φλεβίων οὔτε τῶν ἐλασσόνων οὔτε τῶν μειζόνων· ὀνομαίνουσι*

¹ As is well known, *De morbis II* consists of what are in fact two separate works, one comprising chapters 1–11 and the other chapters 12–75, which derive (independently, in all probability) from a common model: cf. J. Jouanna, ed., *Hippocrate*, Tome X, 2^e Partie, *Maladies II* (Paris, 1983), pp. 11–12 and 25–50; idem, *Hippocrate. Pour une archéologie de l'école de Cnide* (Paris, 1974), 26–126 and 285 n. 1, and I. M. Lonie, 'The Cnidian Treatises of the *Corpus Hippocraticum*', *CQ* 15 (1965), 6–9. (Against Jouanna's identification of the common model of *De morb. II* 1 and 2 with the so-called *Κνίδιαι γνώμαι*, however, cf. most recently Volker Langholf, *Medical Theories in Hippocrates* = Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte, Band 34 (Berlin and New York, 1990), pp. 12–36, especially 21–5.) I follow Jouanna's terminology (cf. Jouanna, *Maladies II*, op. cit., p. 12) and designate chapters 1–11 as *De morb. II* 1.

² In the *recentiores* the tag ἐτέρη νόσος is prefixed to the chapter, but the primary witnesses to the text (θ = Vindobonensis medicus graecus 4 (s. x/xi) and M = Marcianus venetus graecus 269 (s. x/xi)) omit these words.

³ Text and punctuation follow Jouanna, *Maladies II*, op. cit., p. 134, lines 10ff. Potter in the Loeb edition (*Hippocrates*, Vol. V, with an English translation by P. Potter [London and Cambridge, MA., 1988], 194) ends the parenthesis after ἐσέλθη, but this is clearly wrong, since the clause μετεωρίζονται τε γὰρ αἱ φλέβες καὶ σφύζουσι obviously is meant to explain why the vessels seem to be overfilled with blood. With Potter's punctuation the γὰρ would be unmotivated, and in fact he simply ignores it in his translation. (I express my thanks to CQ's anonymous reader for alerting me to this problem.) On this parenthesis cf. further below.

⁴ Here and throughout the chapter the MSS (θ M) offer forms of ὑπερεμείν, which is clearly wrong; the correction to ὑπεραιμύσει etc. is due to Ermerins: see Jouanna, *Maladies II*, op. cit., p. 134 n. 4 (on p. 216), and cf. LSJ s.v. ὑπερεμείω and I. M. Lonie, *CQ* 15 (1965), 8 n. 1.