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I. Introduction

The last decades have witnessed a lively debate on Empedocles’ thought and its connection with other philosophers; besides, on the number of his works, on many features of his cosmogony and zoology, and, above all, on the relationship between physics and daimonology. Indeed, as I have tried to show elsewhere, his output may even have been more articulate, and some fragments may come from the *Proem to Apollo* and other works, which are generally believed to be completely lost¹.

As to the text of one of the most largely preserved among presocratic philosophers, scholars seem to have recently concentrated above all on publishing several editions of the relics of the Strasbourg Papyrus; but the issues concerning the fragments already known before the *editio princeps* of the P.Strasb. gr. 1665-1666 have more or less been neglected, although one complete edition of Empedocles has come out and at least two almost complete collections of the fragments. Efforts have rather been turned to defining the place of the newly-acquired verses in the frame of the already known fragments². In a rough synthesis, the main contrast still lies between H. Diels’ edition, indispensable (in spite of some flaws) but too ready to emend the text, and J. Bollack’s, sharp and much more inclined to defend the *lectio tradita*, now and then even to a degree unacceptable for some.

In the present paper I mean to throw light on a textual problem of a different kind: the choice between two variants at B30.1, each supported by two independent traditions concerning the same fragment. I will try to refute the reading commonly accepted from at least the beginning of the nineteenth century until these days, and defend the one selected by J. Bollack; nonethe-

---

¹ On all this see Santaniello 2022 and the bibliography quoted therein; add, on some of the main issues, Saetta Cottone 2023. Testimonies (A) and fragments (B) are quoted from D.-K., although several other editions are referred to. The symbol ≈ indicates a partial correspondence between two fragments of different editions. All translations are mine. I wish to thank the anonymous reviewers for their kind words and for their remarks. Of course, all responsibility for this paper lies with me.

less, I will not follow the French scholar’s interpretation and translation of such verbal form, and I will prefer those —utterly overlooked today— proposed by C. Gallavotti. Besides, while supporting this solution with new arguments, I will reconstruct Strife’s action at the beginning of the cosmogony more accurately.

Lastly, I will also argue that the *lectio tradita* should be restored at v. 3, and suggest a new understanding of part of the line.

II. The Problem

Here is the text of fr. 30, according to D.-K. (the three lines are complete, but the sentence is hanging in the air), whereas the apparatus is my work:

> αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ μέγα Νεῖκος ἐνὶμμελέεσσιν ἐθρέφθη
> ἐς τιμάς τ᾽ἀνόρουσε τελειομένοι χρόνοι,
> ὅς σφιν ἀμοιβαίος πλατέος παρ᾽ ἐλήλαται ὁρκου...

1 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ Simpl. : ἀλλ᾽ὅτε Arist., Syrian., Asclep. | ἐνὶμμελέεσσιν
ἐνὶμελέεσσιν Arist. | ἐθρέφθη Arist., Syrian., Asclep., plerique viri studiosi :
Syrian. || 3 ὅς σφιν Simpl. codd. αF : ὅ φις Simpl. cod. Μ : ὅσφιν Arist. |
pαρ᾽ἐλήλαται Diels-Kranz, Wright, Primavesi, alii : παρελήλαται Simpl.,
Most : παρελήλατο Arist. codd. EJ, Asclep. : παρ᾽ ἐλήλατο Sturz

The text of B30 is preserved only by Arist., *Metaph.* B 4, 1000b 12 ff., and Simpl., *in Ph.* 1184, 12 ff. In D.-K. the fragment is edited according to Simplicius’ witness, except for the emendation of *παρελήλαται* into *παρ᾽ ἐλήλαται* at v. 3, and, above all, for the last word at v. 1. Such word is

---

3 Here follows a provisional translation, which corresponds to the D.-K. text and, as a whole, to the current way of understanding the fragment: «But, when the great Strife grew in the limbs, / And rose to honours, the time being completed, / Which is fixed to them in turn by a wide oath ...». At the end of the paper I will propose a different (at one point of v. 1 and another of v. 3) text and translation.
ἐθρέφθη, preserved by the Aristotelian mss., whereas in the Simplician mss. we find ἐρέφθη.

I have checked such readings, reported in all editions, on the three Aristotelian mss. mentioned in n. 5 (the only independent ones, according to W. D. Ross and W. Jaeger); and on the three Simplician mss. mentioned in the same note (the only ones that are relevant to the constitution of the text, according to H. Diels); of these I have found digital reproductions mainly through the site Pinakes and those of several libraries, except for the first Simplician one, Marcianus Gr. 226 (A), of which no reproduction is available on the web; I have managed to obtain digital copies of the relevant folios from the Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana. To sum up, I can confirm the reading ἐθρέφθη for the Aristotelian mss., and the reading ἐρέφθη for the Simplician ones, apart from correcting some minor mistakes in the apparatuses of current editions.

Almost all of the many Empedocles editors and scholars, starting from F. G. Sturz (1805) to O. Primavesi (2021a), follow the reading ἐθρέφθη from the Metaphysics. In my opinion, four causes at least have contributed to the nearly undisputed success of such variant so far:

4 In the apparatus I have also mentioned two other commentators, Syrianus and Asclepius, who closely follow the text transmitted by Aristotle.

5 Ross 1924, p. CLV; Jaeger 1957, pp. V-XII (cf. the fine work by Fazzo 2017); Diels 1895, pp. V-VIII. Here follow the mss., with the relevant folios: 1) Aristotelian mss.: Vin-dobonensis Phil. Gr. 100 (J, 9th c.), f. 142v, l. 27; Parisinus Gr. 1853 (E, 10th c.), f. 239r, l. 14; Laurentianus Gr. 87.12 (A, 13th c.), f. 88r, l. 2 (EJ form the recensio II, according to Jaeger); 2) Simplician mss.: Marcianus Gr. 226 (A, mid-9th c.), f. 241r, l. 3; Marcianus Gr. 227 (F, end of the 13th c.), f. 411r, l. 5 from below; Monacensis Gr. 428 (M, 14th c.), f. 156v, l. 17. The dates are those indicated on the site Pinakes; as to cod. Parisinus Gr. 1853, see Moraux 1967, p. 23 and n. 4, who assigns the folios containing the Metaphysica to the 10th c. As to Syrianus and Asclepius quoted in the apparatus, I refer to the editions by G. Kroll (1902) and by M. Hayduck (1888). The primary importance of the Simplician mss. mentioned above for the book VIII of the commentary is confirmed by Tarán 2001, p. 636.

6 For instance, compare my apparatus with those of W. D. Ross and J. Bollack concerning ὃς σφιν and other small details, which are irrelevant to my inquiry.

1. Aristotle’s *Metaphysics* obviously enjoyed a much greater authority than Simplicius’ commentary of the *Physics* in all times, and, as far as earlier times are concerned, it was more easily accessible: for instance, not only did Stephanus accept Aristotle’s variant for B30.1, but in his *Poeisis Philosophica* he quoted no Empedoclean fragments from Simplicius at all⁸.

2. The meaning of the verb ἐθρέφθη seems to be much clearer than the meaning of ἐρέφθη. This very questionable criterion may have persuaded F. G. Sturz (although he offers no explanation) in 1805, and others later on, that the former was the right reading⁹.

3. The extraordinary (and perhaps undeserved¹⁰) fortune, which F. Panzerbieter’s conjecture (θρεφθεῖσα instead of the readings transmitted δρυφθεῖσα / θρυφθεῖσα at B17.5) has obtained since 1844, may have encouraged many scholars to accept the reading ἐθρέφθη for B30.1, as the same verbal form had been reconstructed elsewhere in the *Physical Poem*.

4. It is difficult to establish which verb the form ἐρέφθη comes from.

### III. The Solution I Propose

In expounding my arguments I will try to follow the four points listed above:

1. It is remarkable that the large majority of scholars have accepted Aristotle’s variant rather than Simplicius’. In fact, Simplicius clearly offers a text of the fragment which does not depend on Aristotle; besides, as has been acknowledged even by an authoritative supporter of the reading ἐθρέφθη like D. O’Brien, the text reported in the *Metaphysics* seems to be misquoted from memory¹¹. While other commentators like Syrianus and Asclepius acritically

---

⁸ Stephanus (1573, p. 19) drew the verses corresponding to B30 from Aristotle.

⁹ Sturz (1805, p. 581) quoted his v. 94 (=B26.2) to corroborate his choice of ἐθρέφθη, although that line reads αὔξεται, because he regarded ἑρέφομαι and αὔξομαι as synonymous.

¹⁰ See below.

¹¹ Compare ἀντίκρα ἐπεί (Simpl.) with ἀλλὰ ὅτε δὴ (Arist.) and the other differences between the two witnesses (ἀντίκρα ἐπεί figures also in Emp. B59.1). Besides, see O’Brien 1981, pp. 71-72 («Une comparaison d’ensemble des citations que font d’Empédocles Aristote et Simplicius … nous permet d’attribuer la différence entre ces deux expressions à la négligence relative d’Aristote, probablement parce qu’il cite souvent de mémoire, par opposition à Simplicius, qui a tout l’air de recopier soigneusement un texte écrit»); and Wright 1981, p. 190 («Aristotle’s pedestrian version»). Primavesi (2021b, p. 117) offers a persuasive demonstration that Simplicius had a complete copy of Empedocles’ *Physical Poem*. The commentator’s great care for the passages
accepted the reading they found in the text they were commenting upon, Simplicius probably had a complete copy of Empedocles’ *Physical Poem* at his disposal, which he of course preferred to follow instead of following Aristotle. Besides, we know at least another instance in which the reading preserved by a commentator has been chosen by S. Karsten and J. Bollack instead of the reading transmitted by the Stagirite\(^{12}\).

2. ἐθρέφθη is generally understood in the sense of «growing bigger»: so D.-K. («... groß gezogen war»); N. Van der Ben («had grown great»); M. R. Wright («had increased in size»), A. Laks & G. W. Most («had grown great»)\(^{13}\). But the word constantly used by Empedocles for «growing bigger» is the passive of αὔξω: see fr. 17.1=17.16 (ηὐξήθη) — a Parmenidean legacy (cf. 28B8.7 D.-K.)—. Besides, for «making bigger» cf. Emp. B17.14 and B37 (αὔξεται); in B110.4 (αὔξεται) it is uncertain whether the verb is used in transitive or intransitive sense. Indeed, the difference between αὔξομαι and τρέφομαι emerges from an example of *hysteron proteron* by a contemporary of Empedocles’, Antipho Soph., 87B36: ...τὸ ἔμβρυον αὔξάνεται τε καὶ τρέφεται... («...the embryo is formed, τρέφεται, and grows, αὔξάνεται,...»)\(^{14}\).

3. It should be borne in mind that — contrary to the belief of many — *there is no sure proof* that ἐθρέφθη is part of the Empedoclean vocabulary. The word is positively attested for B30.1 by Aristotle, but, as we know, Aristotle is disproved by Simplicius. As to B17.5\(^{15}\) (also this fragment is preserved by

---

\(^{12}\) In vv. 223-224 (corresponding to B82), Karsten (1838, p. 230) preferred φλονίδες to Arist., *Mete.* IV, 9, 387b 5 Louis λεπίδες, on the strength of Olymp., *in Mete.*, 335, 21 Stüve φολιδονίδες and Hsch., s. u. φλονίδες· λεπίδες. Karsten was followed by Bollack, whose choice was praised by Burkert 1972, p. 436. Aristotle’s variant is accepted by D.-K., Gallavotti, Laks & Most; cf. Primavesi 2021a, fr. 185: φολίδες.


\(^{14}\) Cf. Demont 1978, p. 377 and his translation of Hes., *Th.* 191 τὸ δ’ ἐν κούρῃ ἐθρέφθη («dans cette écume prit corps une jeune fille») and 197-198 οὕνεκ’ ἐν ἀφρῷ / θρέφθη («pour avoir prit corps dans l’écume»). Besides, on the difference between τρέφεσθαι and αὔξεσθαι see Emp. A77. The erroneous belief that the meaning of τρέφομαι perfectly overlaps with αὔξομαι was explicitly upheld by Van der Ben 1975, p. 141 (and already by Sturz: see n. 9 above).

\(^{15}\) For the sake of commodity I append the text of B17.1-5 (restoring δριφθείσα at l. 5), and I add my translation:

διπλ.’ἐρέω: τοτὲ μὲν γὰρ ἐν ἡμεί’θη μόνον εἶναι ἐκ πλεόνων, τοτὲ δ’ αὐ διέφυ πλέον’ ἡ ἐνὸς εἶναι.
Simplicius), θρεφθεῖσα is simply an emendation by F. Panzerbieter for θρυφθεῖσα (codd. D and F), «broken to small pieces» / δρυφθεῖσα (cod. E), «torn»16. By the way, this emendation, strenuously defended by D. O’Brien and accepted by the large majority because the double cosmogony theory is grounded on it, puzzles me for its intrinsic gratuitousness, as the emendation θρεφθεῖσα διέπτη (B17.5) is based only on the symmetry with τίκτει τ’ ἀλέκει τε (B17.4)17. But this is not the only reason why I strongly doubt it: the other is that I wonder how the ἀπόλειψις, the ‘déperissement’ (J. Bollack), the ‘passing away’ (M. R. Wright, A. Martin & O. Primavesi), the ‘waning’ (B. Inwood), the ‘death’ (L.-S., A. Laks & G. W. Most), could grow18. I would rather accept the lectio tradita θρυφθεῖσα, ‘broken to small pieces’, or, better, δρυφθεῖσα, ‘torn’: the ἀπόλειψις can well be said to be ‘cut to pieces’ or ‘torn’, with a poetical slide from the abstract of the disappearance to the concrete of physical disaggregation.

I am bringing forward this argument ad abundantiam: it is not —strictly speaking— indispensable for my demonstration, which I hope would hold
even if a form of the verb τρέφω were surely witnessed (and not only conjectured) in B17.5.

4. I go back to B30. It is not included in the _P.Strasb._; so, no information can be drawn from that much debated source either in favour of the Aristotelian reading or of the Simplician one. Besides, as the verb τρέφω is not witnessed for B17.5, we cannot refer to Empedocles’ _usus scribendi_ in order to decide between ἐθρέφθη or ἐρέφθη at B30.1, but we should look at the matter considering the _lectio difficilior_19.

The two words ἐθρέφθη and ἐρέφθη differ by a single letter (a circumstance which contributed to the confusion between the wrong and the right reading)20. The _lectio difficilior_ can only be the mysterious ἐρέφθη, of which ἐθρέφθη must be a banalization; the contrary is hardly possible.

But what could ἐρέφθη mean?

I take into account the work of three scholars who, in my opinion, contributed to the solution:

a) First of all, in 1969 J. Bollack maintained that Strife cannot grow, because it is constantly as great as Love (who, on her part, is as great as the elements)21. Therefore he rejected ἐθρέφθη in favour of ἐρέφθη. He believed the latter to derive from ῥέπω —a verb which means ‘turn the scale’, that is, metaphorically, ‘preponderate’, ‘prevail’ (L.-S.)22—. Accordingly, Bollack translated «Discorde, puissante, l’emporta sur les membres».

b) But this use of the so-called passive aorist is unparalleled for ῥέπω, according to dictionaries, nor can the example brought by the French scholar (A., _Suppl._ 405) support his interpretation. In 1972 W. Burkert criticized J. Bollack for stretching the meaning and the morphology of ῥέπω. At the same

---

19 On _usus scribendi_ and _lectio difficilior_ see Pasquali 1952, pp. 121-126.
20 Reynolds & Wilson 1991, p. 223 include «the confusion of two words of similar shape or spelling» among the «typical causes of error».
21 On this see Emp. B17.19-20=fr. 31.18-19 Bollack, with the latter’s commentary (1969, III, pp. 64-65); cf. O’Brien 1969, pp. 130-140, who offers a richer analysis on this matter. I consider Love to be feminine and Strife neuter, following Solmsen 1965, p. 120, third line from below, and p. 119, first line from the top.
22 On ἐρέφθη see Bollack 1969, III, 1, pp. 158-159.
time the German scholar suggested that ἐρέφθη would rather have struck the ancient Greeks as coming from the verb ἐρέφω. 23

C) Lastly, in 1975 C. Gallavotti published his edition of Empedocles, which is seldom reliable, because of its sometimes unwarranted combinations of D.-K. fragments, but it brings forward a few brilliant ideas disregarded by scholars. 24 Gallavotti praised Bollack for adopting the variant ἐρέφθη, but (without quoting Burkert’s suggestion) he declared such form to come from ἐρέφω — whose stem is the same as that of ὄροφος, ὀροφή. 25 According to him, B30.1 means: «But when strong Strife took cover among the limbs (i.e. of the Sphairos) ...» 26 In my opinion, this translation is worth much more attention than it has received so far.

I submit that Gallavotti’s proposal offers some advantages, which confirm that the chosen variant is the right one:

α) the meaning of ἐρέφθη, so understood, results much clearer;

β) the passive diathesis is now fully explained (literally, it means «was covered or sheltered»). 27

---


24 For another example see Santaniello 2022, p. 208.

25 Frisk 1960, s. u. ἐρέφω; Chantraine 1968-1980, s. u. ἐρέφω.

26 Gallavotti 1975, p. 227: «Ma quando dentro le membra il forte astio si è messo al coperto...».

27 According to the digital TLG s. u., there is no occurrence of the passive aorist indicative of ἐρέφω beside the one in Simpl., in Ph. 1184.14; cf. L.-S. s. u. In addition, we have at least one example of the passive aorist participle ἐρεφθείς: see B. 13.70. In this case (and in many others: Pi., O. 13.32; N. 6.43) the verb refers to having one’s head covered with a vegetal crown. But there are some occurrences much nearer to the sense conveyed by the verb in Emp. B30.1: halls, houses or rooms covered with a roof. Two well-known Homeric passages may have influenced Empedocles: Il. I 39 (εἴ ποτὲ τοι χαρίεντ᾽ ἐπὶ νηὸν ἔρηψα, «if I have ever built a nice temple for you ...»: Chryses’ prayer to Apollo); and Od. XXIII 192-193 (θάλαμον ... εὖ καθύπερθεν ἔρηψα, «I covered the nuptial chamber well with a roof»: Odysseus recalls his building the bedroom). Remarkable are the passages in Pi., I. 4.54 (κρανίοις ὄφρα ἔρηψον ναὸν Ποσειδῶνος ἐρέφοντα σχέθοι, «... in order to prevent [Antaeus] from roofing Poseidon’s temple with the skulls of his guests»); Ar., V. 1295 (εὖ κατερήψασθε κεράμῳ τὸ νῶτον, said of turtles: «you have covered your back well with roof-tiles»); Au. 1110 (τὰς γὰρ οἰκίας ἐρήψομεν ..., «we will roof your homes ...»). Philostr., Via VII 125 offers two occurrences (from ἐρέπτω = ἐρέφω), one of them conjugated in the perfect passive (τὰ δὲ βασιλεία χαλκῷ μὲν ἔρεπται, «the royal buildings are roofed with bronze»).
γ) the picture of Strife taking cover, i.e. establishing itself, among the limbs of the Sphairos seems to suit Empedocles’ luxuriant imagery\textsuperscript{28}; and, δ) above all, this way of constituting the text of B30.1 allows us to fill an important gap in the process of the breaking of the Sphairos by Strife. Let us follow that process step by step, moving from the Sphairos for commodity’s sake:

Stage 1: at first, absolute stillness reigns: «so Sphairos is firmly set in the dense obscurity of Harmony, proud of his joyful solitude» (fr. 92b Bollack≈B27)\textsuperscript{29}; «in its limbs no conflict or quarrel is proper» (fr. 99 Bollack≈B27a)\textsuperscript{30}. Strife is not mentioned by the name νεῖκος, but it is certainly not among the elements; these are fastened together in the Sphairos by Love – as clearly stated by Arist., GC A 315a 4-8\textsuperscript{31}.

Stage 2: now, the description of Strife settling down among the «limbs» of Sphairos (i.e. among the particles of the elements pressed together in the

\textsuperscript{28} Gallavotti (1975, p. 227) acutely remarked that ἐρέφθη, ‘took cover’ (i.e. among the limbs of the Sphairos), neatly contrasts with B36: τῶν δὲ συνερχομένων ἐξ ἔσχατον ἱστάτο Νεῖκος, «while they (sc. the elements) were coming together, Strife was retreating to the limit». So, in our fr. 30 Strife takes cover among the limbs of the Sphairos to prepare disgregation; whereas, when the elements are joining together (B36), Strife goes to the limit.

\textsuperscript{29} Fr. 92b Bollack: οὕτως Ἁρμονίης πυκινῷ κρυφῷ ἐστήρικται / Σφαῖρος κυκλοτερὴς μονίη περιηγέϊ γαῖον (≈B27.3-4). See also the reprise in fr. 95 Bollack (≈B28): ἀλλ᾽ὅ γε πάντοθεν ἰσός <ἐὼν> καὶ πάμπαν ἀπείρων / Σφαῖρος κυκλοτερῆς μονίη περιηγεῖ χαίρων («but he, <being> equal on every side and endless in every way, / Sphairos the circular, joyful about his solitude all around»). I prefer Bollack’s text (cf. D89 and D90 Laks & Most) to D.-K.’s, because the former is closer to the lectio tradita; see his commentary (1969, III, 1, p. 135) also for the meaning and the accent of κρυφός. I am inclined to understand μονίη as «solitude» (from μόνος) rather than «steadfastness», because the latter concept is already conveyed by ἐστήρικται in fr. 92b (so Ferella 2019, p. 72); whereas Gemelli (1990, pp. 74-77) and O’Brien (2010) support the derivation of μονίη from the Homeric καμμονίη, ‘steadfastness’, i.e. from μένω.

\textsuperscript{30} I accept the text proposed by Bollack, fr. 99 (the emendation ἀναίσιμος is superfluous): ὰδ στάσις <οὐδὲ> τε δῆρις <οὐδέν> ἐν μελέσσαν. Bollack is followed by Gallavotti, Laks & Most, and Primavesi (cf. Meriani 1990); contra D.-K. and Wright.

\textsuperscript{31} This passage is not included in D.-K. nor in Bollack’s or in Laks & Most’s editions, but it is in Primavesi 2021a, fr. 94a: Ἄμα μὲν γὰρ ὃς φυσιν ἑτερὸν ἐξ ἑτεροῦ γίνεσθαι τῶν στοιχείων οὐδεν, ἀλλὰ τὰλα πάντα ἐκ τούτων, ἀμα δ’ ὅτεν εἰς ἐν συναγήγῃ τὴν ἄπασαν φύσιν πάλην τοῦ νείκως, ἐκ τοῦ ἑνὸς γίνεσθαι πάλιν ἐκάστων, «in fact, on one hand, (Empedocles) denies that any of the elements comes from any other of them, but (he says) that all the other things come from them; on the other hand, when he has collected all nature but Strife into the one, (he maintains) that each thing is born again from the one» (the italics are mine).
Sphairos) would be missed by accepting the Aristotelian reading ἐθρέφθη; how could Strife start growing among the elements unless first establishing itself among them, if it was separate from them earlier, i. e. in the Sphairos stage? This —in my opinion— is one more reason to adopt the variant ἐρέφθη, which provides a vivid picture of Strife’s action, in B30.1.

It should be borne in mind that Love and Strife willingly conform to a sworn agreement: no attack on the part of Strife against Love is needed, in order to separate the elements from each other, but just the settling down of Strife among the roots mixed in the Sphairos.

This also causes the shaking of the roots one after the other in fr. 31. This shaking shows that Strife (and movement with it) has begun to prevail; that is why I prefer to place fr. 31 after fr. 30, as D.-K. and most editors do, rather than before, as J. Bollack does (his fr. 120 =B31 comes before his fr. 126≈B30).

IV  B30.3

Before closing my paper, I wish to turn to v. 3. Leaving apart some minor points, I will briefly deal with two questions.

One concerns the form παρελήλαται. This appears in all the mss. which I have personally checked (save for codd. E and J of the Metaphysics —the so-called recensio Π— which read παρελήλατο), and, if we trust the editors of the Metaphysics and of Simplicius’ commentary on the Physics, in all the other manuscripts. The reading παρελήλατο (corrected into παρ᾽ἐλήλατο) was selected without any explanation by F. G. Sturz, probably because of Aristotle’s prestige; but S. Karsten blamed this choice, because of the pluper-

32 If needed, this confirms that the limbs mentioned in B30.1 are not those of Strife —as O’Brien (1969, pp. 274-275), Rashed (2018, p. 53) and Primavesi (2021b, p. 176) maintain,— but of Sphairos (cf. Bollack 1969, III, 1, p. 158; Wright 1981, p. 191): it would be strange to describe anyone as taking cover in one’s own limbs (or as «growing in one’s own limbs»; where else could one grow?). Karsten (1838, p. 187) proposes a splendid parallel in Verg., Aen. VI 726-727: totamque infusa per artus / mens agitat molem (sc. mundi).

33 Strife is explicitly described as leaping up to its honours, not as attacking Love.

34 πάντα γὰρ ἐξείης πελεμίζετο γυῖα θεοῖο, «in fact, all the god’s limbs trembled, one after the other».

35 See Gallavotti, frr. 36-37; Wright, frr. 23-24; Laks & Most, D94-D95; Primavesi, frr. 77-78.
fect: in fact, such tense seemed to imply that the alternation of Love and Strife took place just once in the past, whereas such alternation would occur again and again cyclically, according to S. Karsten, and especially according to the interpretation given by Aristotle. This point would be worth dwelling longer than it is proper here.

I pass on to another question, although linked with the foregoing. The comprehension of the syntactical structure of B30.3 depends on the choice between the lectio tradita παρελήλαται (or παρελήλατο) and the emendation παρ᾽ἐλήλαται (or παρ᾽ελήλατο). As far as I can see, F. G. Sturz corrected παρελήλατο into παρ᾽ἐλήλατο in order to provide a preposition for the supposed efficient cause πλατέος ... παρ´... ὅρκου. So, he started the habit of separating the preverb from the verb and of recognizing an efficient cause complement in those words —a habit which was almost universally observed ever since (although later scholars have generally preferred the perfect, παρ᾽ἐλήλαται)— but not by H. Diels in his Poetarum Philosophorum Fragmenta (1901). The separation of the preverb from the verb is all the less justified as it contradicts the witness of all the mss. of Aristotle, Simplicius, Syrianus, and Asclepius. Besides, in providing a preposition for his would-be

---

36 Sturz 1805, p. 519, v. 153 (both Diels 1901, p. 120, apparatus, and D.-K. I, p. 325, apparatus, wrongly report that Sturz emended the verb into παρ᾽ἐλήλαται instead of παρ´ἐλήλατο). See Karsten 1838, p. 187: «...illa vicissitudo non olim obtinuit, sed perpetuo durat». I will certainly not venture to go so far as to regard παρελήλατο as the lectio difficilior: however, this rather extremist position was held by a great scholar and a staunch opponent of the cyclical interpretation of Empedocles like U. Hölscher 1968, 186 (who emended παρελήλατο into παρ´ἐλήλατο like F. G. Sturz).

37 Among those who separated παρ´ from the verb and regarded πλατέος ... παρ´... ὅρκου as an efficient cause complement see D.-K. 1951, fr. 30; Zafiropulo 1953, fr. 30; Wright 1981, fr. 23; Inwood 2001, fr. 35; Primavesi 2021a, fr. 77. Also two famous editors of the Metaphysics, Ross (1924) and Jaeger (1957), would read παρ´ἐλήλαται. Other scholars preserved the lectio tradita —one word, παρελήλαται— either without taking any position on the nature of the complement (Karsten 1838, p. 94, v. 68; Stein 1852, p. 47, v. 141, Diels 1901, p. 120, fr. 30) or regarding it as an efficient cause (Gallavotti 1975, fr. 36; Messina 1991, fr. 36; Laks & Most 2016, p. 452, D94). Lastly, Bollack (1969, II, 1, p. 57, fr. 126) both preserved the reading παρελήλαται and did not see an efficient cause in the last verse; nonetheless I will argue below for a different construction of such line. It is remarkable that Diels read παρελήλαται both in his Poetarum Philosophorum Fragmenta, 1901, p. 120, and in the first edition of his Vorsokratiker, 1903, p. 194; while he read παρ´ἐλήλαται starting from the second edition of the Vorsokratiker, I, 1906, p. 184.
efficient cause complement πλατέος ... παρ᾽... ὅρκου, F. G. Sturz was reprehensible also for two other reasons:

— because he quoted two examples, II. IV 97 and XVIII 191, which were not apt to support the hypothesis of an efficient cause complement, being really two instances of source complement38; and

— because no examples are known in Empedoclean fragments of an agent or an efficient cause complement construed with παρά + genitive. As a rule, the agent complement or the efficient cause complement is expressed by our philosopher in the dative case, as shown by several examples39.

Instead, παρά + genitive is used, or in some cases may have been used, to indicate the source complement40.

To all this I add that seeing in πλατέος παρ᾽ἐλήλαται ὅρκου an efficient cause complement (as though the philosopher were saying: «a reciprocal time-share has been defined for them by a wide oath») sounds too abstract a style to be Empedoclean.

Then, how should v. 3 be construed?

In B30.3 the adjective ἀμοιβαῖος is predicative of the relative δς, which refers to ... τελειομένοι χρόνοιο. J. Bollack proposed a bold syntactic solu-

---

38 II. IV 97: τοῦ κεν δὴ πάμπρωτα παρ᾽ ἄγλα αὖρα φέροιο, «from him, first of all, you would receive splendid gifts»; and XVIII 191: στεῦτο γὰρ Ἠφαίστειο πάρ᾽ οἰσέμεν ἔντεα καλά, «in fact, [my mother] declared that she would bring me fine weapons from Hephaestus».

39 This is a complete or an almost complete list: B2.7 (ἐπιδερκτὰ ... ἀνάφερον, «to be seen by men»); B21.4 (δῶρα φέροιο ... καὶ ὅργυς ὅρκου, «things that are moistened by heat and by swift rays»); B56 (αὐγῇ ἡμέρα ἐπίγεις ἐνθαμμένας καλά, «salt was made solid, having been pressed by the blows of the sun»); B71.4 (συναρμοσθέντα Ἀφροδίτης, «adapted together by Aphrodite»); B100.3 (πουκιναῖς τέτρηνται ἅλοξιν, «are pierced with close-set furrows»); D4.7-8 L.-M. (ἀνάφερον ἀνὰ γυναῖκας συναρμοσθέντα, «... by men and women I am revered»); B115.2 (πλατέεσσι κατεσφρησμένον ὅρκος, «sealed by broad oaths»). The line B84.9 (... χοάνῃσι δίαντε τετρήμα θεσπεσίαι) («they were pierced throughout by marvellous channels») was refuted by most scholars, not by Rashed (2018, pp. 151-172), who accepted it and moved it to the end of the fragment; cf. Primavesi 2021a, fr. 111.6.

40 In Emp. B23.11 (θεοῦ πάρα μῦθον ἀκούσας, «having heard the tale from a god») θεοῦ πάρα is a source complement. In B3.5 and B4.2, it is uncertain whether παρ᾽should be construed with Εἰσθήμεν and, respectively, with Μούσης (source complement: D.-K. I, pp. 310-311; Primavesi 2021a, p. 443 and p. 447; and many others), or it should be understood as preverb of ἐλάουσ᾽and, respectively, of κέλεται (Karsten 1838, p. 176; Bollack II 1969, 1, pp. 30-31).
tion, letting the genitive πλατέος ... ὅρκον depend on άμοιβαῖος. He rendered (cf. the Greek starting from ... τελειομένου χρόνου): «...le temps s’accomplissant, / qui est tracé tout de leur long, en lieu d’une large enceinte». In J. Bollack’s opinion, ‘leur’ referred to the elements: so the French scholar put emphasis on the meaning of the preverb παρ(ά) in παρελήλαται, and ὅρκος, ‘the oath’, preserved its «valeur étymologique d’enceinte» 41. According to this picture, all the elements would be kept together ‘in exchange for’, i.e. because of, an oath 42. Unfortunately, the example recalled by Bollack concerning άμοιβός (= άμοιβαῖος), where it commands the genitive case, is not undisputably relevant. It is S., Ant. 1067: νεκὺν νεκρῶν ἀμοιβὸν ἀντίδους ἔσῃ 43. The phrase «one corpse in exchange for corpses» can scarcely suggest the idea of the attribution of a time-share to each of the two powers in exchange for ‘a wide oath’. Why so? Because the exchange of corpses for corpses takes place among things which are identical; whereas, according to J. Bollack, the time-share is assigned to Love and respectively to Strife in return for the oath: now, ‘time’ certainly belongs to a different category from ‘oath’. All in all, J. Bollack’s interpretation is interesting, but, failing useful examples, I am tempted to look elsewhere to understand the syntax of v. 3.

There is still an alternative to try, which has so far been overlooked. As already said, the agent or the efficient cause is expressed by Empedocles with the dative and never with παρὰ + genitive. But, according to P. Chantraine 44, the Greek genitive-ablative expresses ‘le point de départ’: the examples brought by the French scholar show that Homer let the genitive-ablative be governed both by verbs lacking preverbal prefixes and by verbs provided with them. The latter instances are significant for this survey 45.

---

42 Here I cannot go into the question concerning who swears this oath (the elements?, the two powers?).
43 «You will give one corpse in exchange for corpses»: Teiresias is predicting that Kreon will lose his son Haemon’s life in compensation for Polyneikes’ and Antigone’s lives.
44 Chantraine 1963, pp. 63-64.
45 See, for instance, Il. II 310 (βωμοῦ ὑπαίξας, «having darted from under the altar»); XX 125 (Οὐλύμποι κατέλθομεν, «we came down from Olympus»). The examples quoted by P. Chantraine, as drawn from epic poems, strictly concern vivid scenes of war and adventure. However, Od. IX 81 (... Βορέης ἀπέωσε, παρέπλαγξεν δὲ Κυθήρων, «... Boreas pushed me back, and drove me away from Kythera») at least includes a source complement. So, it can foreshadow the complement indicating the ‘wide oath’ as the source of the law of Necessity.
V. My Text of Emp. Fr. 30 and A Recapitulation

So, these are my text (to which I append my apparatus with the convenient changes) and my translation of fr. 30 (the parts where I diverge from the commonly accepted text and translation are italicized):

αὐτὰρ ἐπεί μέγα Νεῖκος ἐνὶμμελέεσσιν ἐρέφθη
ἐς τιμάς τ᾽ἀνόρουσε τελειομένοι χρόνοι,
δός σφιν ἄμοιβαιος πλατέος παρελήλαται ὁρκοῦ...

1. About ἐρέφθη

My defence of the reading ἐρέφθη was argued on the strength of several arguments:

(implemented by Love and Strife), which governs the world. On Necessity cf. the two passages which have preserved the fragment: Arist., Metaph. B 4, 1000b 9-17; and Simpl., in Ph. 1184, 5-18. Reviewer A of this paper objected to accepting the transmitted compound form παρελήλαται / παρελήλατο because παρελαύνω is translated by lexica only as ‘passare accanto’ (‘to pass by’) and ‘sorpassare’ (‘to overcome’). But I find the emendation into παρ᾽ἐλήλαται / παρ᾽ἐλήλατο to be very doubtful, as it disregards the witness of all manuscripts. In my opinion and in the light of P. Chantraine’s remark, it is well possible that Empedocles let the genitive-ablative πλατέος ὁρκοῦ be governed by παρελήλαται.
— Simplicius showed a deep knowledge of the text of the *Physical Poem*, and it is almost sure that he had a copy at his disposal, whereas Aristotle is believed to have quoted from memory.
— We cannot be sure that the verb τρέφω belonged to the vocabulary of the Empedoclean poems.
— As no help can be drawn from the *usus scribendi*, attention should be lent to the *lectio difficilior*.
— Now, ἐθρέφθη can well be a banalization of ἐρέφθη; the contrary is most unlikely, not to say impossible.
— Besides, considerations of verbal morphology have led me to prefer Gallavotti’s interpretation (ἐρέφθη would come from ἐρέφω) to Bollack’s (ἐρέφθη would come from ῥέπω).
— This latter choice provides a full justification of the passive diathesis of ἐρέφθη; it is satisfying from the point of view of the Empedoclean style; and it offers a more reliable and detailed reconstruction of the breaking of the Sphairos.

2. *About πλατέος παρελήλαται ὅρκου*

The reading παρελήλατο is interesting and attracted the attention of at least two distinguished scholars as F. G. Sturz and U. Hölscher, who lived in so distant times from each other (although they emended it into παρ´ἐλήλατο). Strangely enough, this variant is preserved in two of the most important mss. of the *Metaphysics*, E and J, but, if accepted, it would flatly contradict (as noted by S. Karsten) Aristotle’s interpretation of Empedoclean physics, focused on the repetition of the cycle even on the cosmic level.

So, I have dropped this, and have concentrated on the variant παρελήλαται. This should be kept and not emended into παρ´ἐλήλαται, for at least two reasons:
— all mss. read παρελήλαται (or παρελήλατο), written in one word;
— in Homer, the most important model of Empedocles’ language, if not also in other poets, the genitive-ablative (source complement) can be governed both by verbs lacking preverbal prefixes and by verbs provided with them.

In my opinion and contrary to the trend largely prevailing among scholars, we should avoid reading an efficient cause in πλατέος παρελήλαται ὅρκου, as such complement is always rendered by Empedocles with the dative, and
we should consider the possibility of regarding those words as a source complement (not the only one present in the Acragantine’s fragments)\textsuperscript{46}, which points to the origin of time and necessity in Empedoclean physics.
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