

## NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

### HESYCHIUS Θ 216 AND EMPEDOCLES FRAGMENT 21. 6

The transmitted text of Empedocles fragment 21. 6 Diels-Kranz reads:

ἐκ δ' αἷης προρέουσι †θέλημνά† τε καὶ στερεωπά.<sup>1</sup>

There are variants θέλημα and θελήματα, but clearly an adjective meaning “heavy” or “solid” is needed, since the line is paraphrased by Aristotle *Gen. corr.* 315a10 as τὴν δὲ γῆν (sc. λέγει) βαρὺ καὶ σκληρόν. The standard conjectural solutions to the crux are based on a gloss of Hesychius, which reads in the manuscript θελεμνον· ὅλον ἐκ ριζῶν (Θ 216 Latte). “Ὀλον ἐκ ριζῶν is taken as “close-packed,” “firmly rooted.”<sup>2</sup> Guyet, comparing Homeric προθέλυμνον, emended θελεμνον to θέλυμνον in Hesychius. So Diels prints θελεμνά in Empedocles, while noting Sturz’s conjecture θέλυμνα.

Whatever the correct reading in Empedocles, the Hesychian gloss cannot in fact be based on this passage, since it has been misinterpreted and means the opposite of what is demanded by the context. Far from denoting “a whole firmly rooted” or the like, ὅλον ἐκ ριζῶν means “utterly, by the roots,” i.e., “root and branch,” *radicitus*, πρόσριζον, in a context of utter destruction. Ἐκ ριζῶν is first used literally of trees, e.g., at Hom. *Il.* 21. 243 ἐκ ριζῶν ἐρίπουσα; *Orphica* frag. 38. 18 Kern ἐκ ριζῶν εἰς χθόνα πίπτει; Theophr. *Hist. pl.* 3. 7. 1 πύκη τε καὶ ἐλάτη τελέως ἐκ ριζῶν αὐτοτετεῖς αὐαίνονται; and the fig-tree ἐξηραμένην ἐκ ριζῶν at Mark 11:20. For its metaphorical extension to other contexts of destruction, cf., e.g., Heraclid. Pont. ap. Ath. 12. 523F ἐκ ριζῶν ἀνείλον τοὺς ἐχθροὺς; LXX Job 28:9 κατέστρεψεν ἐκ ριζῶν ὄρη; *ibid.* 31:12 ἐκ ριζῶν ἀπόλεσεν; Joseph. *AJ* 9. 181 ἐκ ριζῶν ἂν τὴν τῶν Σύρων βασιλείαν ἐξεῖλες; Plut. *Pomp.* 21 τὸν πόλεμον ἐκ ριζῶν παντάπασιν ἀνήρηκε. For ὅλον as “utterly” in this context, compare the compounds ὀλόρριζος and ὀλορριζί: literally of plants, Theophr. *Hist. pl.* 3. 18. 5 ἀνακάμπτεσθαι ὀλόρριζα; metaphorically, LXX Job 4:7 ὀλόρριζοι ἀπώλοντο; Prov. 15:5 οἱ δὲ ἀσεβεῖς ὀλόρριζοι ἐκ γῆς ὀλοῦνται; Esther 3:13 πάντας . . . ἀπολέσαι ὀλορριζί; Cyr. Alex. *Ps.* 36. 8 (*PG* 69. 928D) ἵνα μὴ ὀλόρριζος ἐκ γῆς ἀπολή.

Thus, even apart from the fact that θελεμνον is quoted in the singular rather than the plural (not a decisive proof in itself that Hesychius is not glossing Empedocles), the Hesychian gloss has completely the wrong sense for the line of Empedocles to which it is supposed to refer. It is possible that θέλυμνα is still the correct solution to the crux in Empedocles, if the word means “foundations,” as

1. Frag. 14. 6 in M. R. Wright, ed., *Empedocles: The Extant Fragments* (New Haven, 1981).

2. So Wright, *ad loc.*, who, however, leaves obeli in her text.

Permission to reprint a note in this section may be obtained only from the author.

other evidence suggests. Regarding Hesychius, Guyet's emendation θέλυμνον must be on the right track, and θελεμνον is certainly a *vox nihili*. According to the D-scholium on Hom. *Il.* 10. 15, θέλυμνα are θεμέλιοι, "foundations" (the latter term is glossed ῥίζαι in Hesychius). Such a sense is supported by the Homeric compound προθέλυμνος, which is formed in the same way as πρόρριζος and is glossed πρόρριζος by schol. AD on *Il.* 9. 541, D on 10. 12, and schol. on Ar. *Peace* 1209 (the meaning "overlapping," "one upon another" at *Il.* 13. 130 is apparently a secondary development).<sup>3</sup> M. Schmidt tentatively proposed emending θελεμνον to <ἐκ> θεμέθλων;<sup>4</sup> but, to remain closer to the paradosis, I propose <προ>θέλυμνον or <ἐκ> θελύμων.<sup>5</sup>

R. JANKO  
Columbia University

3. I follow H. Frisk, *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg, 1960–72), s.v. θέλυμνος. Τετραθέλυμνος is a further evolution, as Frisk argues; the account of P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* (Paris, 1968–80), s.v. -θέλυμνος, is erroneous. See my note on *Il.* 13. 130 in *The "Iliad": A Commentary*, vol. 4 (Cambridge University Press, forthcoming).

4. *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon* (Jena, 1858–64), s.v. (Θ 215).

5. I wish to thank the Editor, an anonymous referee, and J. E. Wills, who kindly helped me to consult the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* database at Harvard University.

#### HELEN'S FAMOUS HUSBAND AND EURIPIDES *HELEN* 1399

Θε.	χωρεῖτ' ἐφεξῆς, ὥς ἔταξεν ὁ ξένος, δμῶες, φέροντες ἐνάλια κτερίσματα. Ἑλένη, σὺ δ', ἦν σοι μὴ κακῶς δόξω λέγειν, πεῖθου, μέν' αὐτοῦ· ταῦτά γάρ παροῦσά τε πράξεις τὸν ἄνδρα τὸν σὸν ἦν τε μὴ παρῆς. δέδοικα γάρ σε μὴ τις ἐμπεσῶν πόθος πέισῃ μεθεῖναι σῶμ' ἐς οἶδμα πόντιον τοῦ πρόσθεν ἀνδρὸς χάρισιν ἐκπεπληγμένην· ἄγαν γὰρ αὐτὸν οὐ παρόνθ' ὅμως στένεις.	1390
Ελ.	ὦ καινὸς ἡμῖν πόσις, ἀναγκαίως ἔχει τὰ πρῶτα λέκτρα νυμφικὰς θ' ὁμιλίας τιμᾶν· ἐγὼ δὲ διὰ τὸ μὲν στέργειν πόσιν καὶ ξυνθάνοιμ' ἄν· ἀλλὰ τίς κείνῳ χάρις ξὺν κατθανόντι κατθανεῖν; ἔα δέ με αὐτὴν μολοῦσαν ἐντάφια δοῦναι νεκρῷ.	1395      1400

There is universal agreement among modern editors and commentators that in line 1399 of Euripides' *Helen* the traditional reading κλεινός is an error for καινός, a conjecture first proposed by Beck.<sup>1</sup> The scribes have only themselves to blame for this, since the confusion of κλεινός with καινός is a common error in

1. Καινός is printed by Murray, whose text is given here (OCT<sup>2</sup>, 1913), Pearson (Cambridge, 1903), Grégoire (Budé, 1950), Campbell (Liverpool, 1950), Alt (Teubner, 1964), and Kannicht (Heidelberg, 1969). A. M. Dale (Oxford, 1967) gives tacit approval to Murray's text.