



SHORTER NOTES

HIPPOCRATES, *ON REGIMEN* 49.2

ABSTRACT

The article discusses a passage in chapter 49 of the Hippocratic treatise On Regimen. It defends the transmitted text against a conjecture proposed by R. Joly, the author of the Corpus Medicorum Graecorum edition.

Keywords: Hippocrates; Greek medicine; textual criticism; blood; water; fire; animals; meat; dryness; moisture

In chapter 49 of the treatise *On Regimen*, the anonymous Hippocratic author offers a classification of animals, that is, of meat, according to their dryness and moisture:

[170.23] τῶν δὲ ζώων τῶν τιθασῶν τὰ ὑλινόμα καὶ ἀγρονόμα τῶν ἐνδον τρεφομένων ξηρότερα, ὅτι πονέοντα ξηραίνεται καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ ἡλίου καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ ψύχεος καὶ τῷ πνεύματι ξηροτέρῳ χρήται. τὰ δὲ ἄγρια τῶν ἡμέρων ξηρότερα, καὶ τὰ ὀλιγοφάγα τῶν πολυφάγων, καὶ τὰ χορτοφάγα τῶν ποηφάγων, καὶ τὰ καρποφάγα τῶν [172.1] μὴ καρποφάγων, καὶ τὰ ὀλιγόποτα τῶν πολυπότων, καὶ τὰ ἄναιμα τῶν πολυαίμων καὶ ὀλιγαίμων, καὶ τὰ ἀκμάζοντα μᾶλλον ἢ τὰ λίην παλαιὰ καὶ τὰ νέα, καὶ τὰ ἄρσενά τῶν θηλέων, καὶ τὰ ἐνορχα τῶν ἀνόρχων, καὶ τὰ μέλανα λευκῶν, καὶ τὰ δασέα ψιλῶν· τὰ δ' ἐναντία ὑγρότερα.

Among domesticated animals, those that feed in the woods and on rough vegetation are drier than those that are nourished indoors, because hard work in the sun and the cold dries them out, and they also breathe a drier air. Wild animals are drier than tame ones; those that eat little than those that eat a lot; hay eaters than grass eaters; fruit eaters than non-fruit eaters; those that drink little than those that drink a lot; those without blood than those with much or little blood; those in their vigour than those that are either very old or very young; males than females; those with testicles than those without; black animals than white ones; those with thick fur than those without fur. The opposites are moister.

Thus Joly in the 1984 *CMG* edition.¹ At 172.1–2, however, the two main MSS, θ and M, read τὰ πολύαιμα τῶν ἀναιμῶν καὶ ὀλιγαίμων, and this is the text printed in the main editions before Joly's *CMG*.²

In his notes to the *CMG* text (page 272), Joly mentions two reasons for his conjecture. First, the previous pair of opposed terms states that animals which do not drink much (τὰ ὀλιγόποτα) are drier than animals that drink a lot (τὰ πολυπότα). Joly alleges that this contradicts the subsequent suggestion as it stands in the transmitted text that animals which abound in blood (τὰ πολύαιμα) are drier than animals which have little or no blood (τὰ ὀλίγαμα and ἄναιμα).

Second, an early medieval Latin translation of the treatise, which may have been made in the sixth century, reads:

¹ R. Joly with S. Byl (ed.), *Hippocrate. Du régime = Corpus Medicorum Graecorum* I 2.4 (Berlin, 1984), 170.23–172.4.

² É. Littré (ed., transl.), *Oeuvres complètes d'Hippocrate*, vol. 6 (Paris, 1849); W.H.S. Jones (ed., transl.), *Hippocrates*, vol. 4 (London and Cambridge, MA, 1931); R. Joly (ed., transl.), *Hippocrate. Du régime* (Paris, 1967).

igitur agrestia sicciora sunt mansuetis et illa quae terram uorant his quae herbis aluntur et illa quae fructuosa sunt his quae minus comedunt fructos sed et illa quae parum bibunt et sine sanguine sunt et ea quae aetate uigent his quae seniora sunt et parua.³

Wild animals are drier than domesticated ones, and those that eat soil than those that are nourished by herbs, and those that consume fruits than those that eat fewer fruits, and those that drink little and have no blood and those that are in the prime of life than those that are older or young.

Joly believes that this translation supports his conjecture because it puts small drinkers and bloodless animals on the same level.

This note aims to demonstrate that Joly's conjecture is untenable, because it contradicts the Hippocratic author's view about the high amount of blood being an indicator of dryness.

First, in the transmitted text the two opposed categories are animals with a lot of blood on the one hand, and animals with little or no blood on the other. This sounds like a natural partition. Joly's conjecture, however, opposes animals with no blood to the animals with a lot of blood or little blood taken together. This does not seem to make much sense, especially because it makes the *ἄναιμα* appear more important than they really are. Indeed, this term does not have in *On Regimen* its strict meaning 'bloodless = invertebrate' found later in Aristotle's classification of animals. This follows from the passage 168.14–20. Here, a pig is first said to have thin veins with little blood (*λεπτὰς τὰς φλέβας ἔχει καὶ ὀλιγαίμους*, 15) and then is described as *ἄναιμον* (19). Moreover, lambs and kids are described as *ἄναιμότερα* (16) than sheep and goats, respectively. Such uses of the term, especially the comparative, indicate that the Hippocratic author regards *ἄναιμα* as a subcategory or an extreme degree of *ὀλίγαίμα*, to the effect that what he calls 'bloodless' animals, far from lacking blood altogether, only have less blood than those with little blood. Hence we have no reason to assume any opposition between the *ἄναιμα* on the one hand, and the *ὀλίγαίμα* and *πολύαιμα* taken together on the other, as Joly's conjecture suggests. On the contrary, speaking of blood, the Hippocratic author seems to envisage a distinction between high and small amount, as he expressly puts it at 172.4–7, where the parts of an animal's body which are full of blood (*ἐναιμώταται*) are mentioned in opposition to those parts with little blood (*ὀλιγαίμωταται*).

But there is more. Far from correlating the amount of blood with the amount of water in the body, as Joly's first argument suggests, the Hippocratic author states that water is the very counterpart of blood in the body:

οἱ λευκοὶ καὶ οἱ λεπτοὶ [*sc. τῶν οἴνων*] . . . ψύχουσι μὲν καὶ ἰσχυναίνουσι καὶ ὑγραίνουσι τὸ σῶμα, καὶ τὸ αἷμα ἁσθενὲς ποιέουσιν, αὐξοντες τὸ ἀντίπαλον τῷ αἵματι ἐν τῷ σώματι.

White and thin wines . . . cool and weaken and moisten the body, and make the blood weak, increasing that which opposes the blood within the body. (172.26–8)

This explains why a small amount of blood is often said to be concomitant with above-average body moisture (*ἄναιμότερα καὶ ὑγρότερα*, 168.16–17; *εὐσαρκον ἐὸν τὸ ζῷον καὶ ἄναιμον ὑπερβολὴν ὑγρασίης ἔχει*, 168.19–20). This inverse proportionality of water and blood in a (human or animal) body seems to reflect the metaphysical dietetics of *On Regimen*.

³ I. Mazzini (ed.), *De observantia ciborum. Traduzione tardo-antica del Περὶ διαίτης pseudohippocratico, l. II* (Rome, 1984), 59, 313–17.

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 ζώων ἰσχυρόταται μὲν αἱ σάρκες αἱ μάλιστα πονέουσai καὶ ἐναιμόταται καὶ ἐν ᾗσι κατακλίνεται· κουφόταται δὲ τῶν σαρκῶν αἱ ἥκιστα πονέουσai καὶ ὀλιγαίμοταται, καὶ ἐκ τῆς σκίης, καὶ ὅσαι ἐσώταται τοῦ ζώου.

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; ὕδς ἀγρίου ξηραίνει καὶ ἰσχὺν παρέχει, 168.24), and meat lightness with moisture, i.e. with water (ἄρνεα δὲ κουφότερα ὀείων, καὶ ἐρίφεια αἰγείων, διότι ἀναμότερα 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 ἀναιμῶν 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.