

'true' MS reading *inter*.⁸ Renaissance editors, as is well known, did not regard MS evidence very highly, often greatly to the detriment of the text itself. In this particular case, however, more studious examination of MS evidence actually led to error rather than improvement, since its reliance on the *paradosis* was at the expense of idiomatic Latin and better sense.

Università di Pavia

ROLANDO FERRI

SILIUS ITALICUS 10.108 AND JUPITER'S EAGLES

(The text is that of the most recent edition of *Silius Italicus: Punica*, by Josef Delz [Stuttgart, 1987].)

armiger haud aliter magni Iouis, auxia nido
cum dignos nutrit gestanda ad fulmina fetus,
obuersam spectans ora ad Phaethontia prolem
explorat dubios Phoebea lampade natos. 108

The thunderbolt-wielding eagles of Jupiter are masculine in some contexts (Virg. *Aen.* 5.255; Ovid *Met.* 15.386; Val. Flacc. 1.156; Sil. 4.126), and feminine in others (Stat. *Theb.* 3.532), but never both in one and the same passage. Here the gender is determined by the immutable *anxia*, and we require *armiger*<*a*>: the bird is after all engaged in mothering! In augural contexts in Silius, 4.120–7 and 17.52–5, on the other hand, the eagle is male (126) in the former, as may well be also the eagles of the latter (53 *armigerae* qualifies *volucres* and is, as normally, feminine).

Forest Hill, Oxford

P. T. EDEN

⁸ The last editor of note to read *intra* without comment is F. H. Bothe (L. A. Senecae, *Tragoediae* [Lipsiae, 1819]).

TERPSICLES (RE 1)*

Terpsicles is neglected in all current Histories of Greek Literature and Dictionaries of Antiquity, except for a five-lines-long entry by E. Bux in *Real-Encyclopädie* V.A. 790. He is the author of a treatise *Περὶ ἀφροδισίων*, which is only known from two references in Athenaeus—7.325d and 9.391e—and seems to have been a collection of sex-related marvels. In the first passage he provides a piece of information on the red mullet:

ἐὰν δ' ἐναποπνιγῇ τρίγλη ζῶσα ἐν οἴνῳ καὶ τοῦτο ἀνὴρ πίῃ, ἀφροδισιάζειν οὐ δυνήσεται, ὥς Τερψικλῆς ἱστορεῖ ἐν τῷ περὶ ἀφροδισίων. καὶ γυνὴ δὲ πίῃ τοῦ αὐτοῦ οἴνου, οὐ κυίσκεται. ὁμοίως δὲ οὐδὲ ὄρνις.

The red mullet, carnivorous and lecherous, is the impure fish *par excellence*. While Aristotle asserted that it is extremely fertile, breeding thrice per annum—to which fact it allegedly owes its name¹—the notion of its antaphrodisiac qualities due to its

* I thank Prof. C. Collard for various improvements and suggestions.

¹ Impurity: R. Parker, *Miasma* (Oxford, 1983), 362–3; fertility: Aristotle, *H.A.* 543a5 ἢ δὲ τρίγλη μόνη τρίς (sc. τίκτει), Athenaeus 7.324d, Oppian, *Hal.* 1.590.

association with Artemis enjoyed early popular acceptance, cf. Plato Com. *PCG* 189.20–1 *τρίγλη δ' οὐκ ἐθέλει νεύρων ἐπιήρανος εἶναι*. / *παρθένου Ἀρτέμιδος γὰρ ἔφν καὶ στύματα μισεῖ*, then Pliny, *N.H.* 32.120. Terpsicles' is a more drastic version involving the loss of a *τρίγλη*'s life in wine. The new mixture would take on the qualities of the dead fish. Drinking from it would render a male incapable of making love. But for a female it would produce the miraculous effect that she, and similarly even a female bird,² would suffer, as it seems, from permanent sterility.³ There may be a substratum of science here. Aristotle's assertion about the detrimental effect of wine on pregnant women may be lurking in Terpsicles,⁴ as well as the paramedical point of view that drinking wine in which a red mullet has been smothered creates a sense of disgust; cf. Pliny, *N.H.* 32.138 *mullus in vino necatus . . . , qui inde biberint, taedium vini adfert*, *ibid.* 32.91.

Noteworthy, a related but contrasting belief survives in Xenocrates of Aphrodisias, an eccentric first-century-A.D. medical writer,⁵ about the aphrodisiac properties of another fish, erythrinus. According to him, ch. 16 Ideler (p. 122.36–7), erythrinus is a palatable and nutritious fish, and furthermore *ἐντατικός πρὸς συνουσίαν*, *εἴ τις αὐτὸν ἐν οἶνῳ πνίξας πίοι*.⁶ Xenocrates compiled from older sources his *Περὶ τῆς ἀπὸ τῶν ἐνύδρων τροφῆς*, part of a larger *Περὶ τῆς ἀπὸ τῶν ζώων τροφῆς*, and is prone to adopting paradoxical beliefs. Information of the kind supplied about erythrinus may ultimately go back to Terpsicles. If material from his treatise was absorbed by later compilers, Xenocrates would provide a *terminus ante quem*.

Terpsicles' date may be placed further back by examining the second reference in Athenaeus 9.391e–f:

καὶ οἱ στρουθοὶ δὲ εἰσιν ὀχευτικοί· διὸ καὶ Τερψικλῆς τοὺς ἐμφαγόντας φησὶν στρουθῶν ἐπικαταφόρους πρὸς ἀφροδίσια γίνεσθαι. μήποτε οὖν καὶ ἡ Σαπφῶ (fr. 1 Voigt) ἀπὸ τῆς ἱστορίας τὴν Ἀφροδίτην ἐπ' αὐτῶν φησιν ὀχεῖσθαι· καὶ γὰρ ὀχευτικὸν τὸ ζῶον καὶ πολὺγονον. τίκει γοῦν ὁ στρουθός, ὥς φησιν Ἀριστοτέλης (fr. 350 Rose) καὶ μέχρι ὀκτώ κτλ.⁷

ἐπικατάφορος expresses an overwhelming lust and in principle may hark back to Terpsicles (LSJ s.v.), but its only other occurrence is again in Athenaeus, at 13.608d. It also seems unlikely that the reference to Sappho was part of Terpsicles' treatment.

² *ὁμοίως δὲ οὐδὲ ὄρνις*, if taken literally, implies the extraordinary drinking of fishy wine by a bird. The circumstances in Euripides, *Ion* 1202ff., where a dove tastes poisoned wine spilled on the ground after a libation, are exceptional. Still, the proceedings described in this passage look like an experiment and birds may be an alleged part of it. They often make an appearance in paradoxes and their involvement may serve as an extreme, albeit unreal, illustration of the red mullet's latent powers.

³ In *Cyranides* 4.119, 272, 308 de Mely the fish is said to generate the inverse effect: the whiskers extracted from a *triglê* which is subsequently thrown into the sea to remain alive, if offered to a woman in a drink, excite irresistible desire for intercourse. A red mullet in wine would also help delivery. This belongs to a different vein; following a conventional pattern, it is a late effort to attribute to the fish's sexuality a sympathetic impact on women. For works containing similar prescriptions in a medico-magical context see C. O. Pharaone, *Helios* 19 (1992), 92ff., D. Bain, *CQ* 48 (1998), 262–4.

⁴ *H.A.* 585a32ff. *μάλιστα δ' ἐν ταῖς κνήσεσι τοῦ οἴνου αἰσθάνονται αἱ πλείους* (sc. *γυναῖκες*). *διαλύονται τε γάρ, ἐὰν πῶσι, καὶ ἀδυνατοῦσιν*, *ibid.* 588a5ff., *Somn. Vig.* 457a14ff.

⁵ See on him F. Kudlien, *RE IX.A.1529ff.* s.v. Xenokrates (8).

⁶ Cf. also Pliny, *N.H.* 32.50. For the expression cf. Herodotus 2.92.5 (papyri) *ἐν κλιβάνῳ διαφανεῖ πνίξαντες οὕτω τρώγουσι*. On erythrinus as sexually invigorating, see D'Arcy W. Thompson, *A Lexicon of Greek Fishes* (London, 1947), 67.

⁷ The number is due to a simile in *Il.* 2.311ff.

Be this as it may, he glances here at Aristotle's information on the sparrow's lustfulness (cf. also *H.A.* 539b33 *συγγίγνεται . . . ὀξέως*, *G.A.* 774b29 *πολυτοκοῦσιν*), which by means of sympathy would pass to those who taste it.

The attention paid to Aristotle shows some learning and suggests a connection with early paradoxography, which largely absorbed Aristotelian material.⁸ Terpsicles may belong to that nest of Hellenistic paradoxographers writing under the guise of science. This was a trend in the third century B.C., particularly in medical matters, which provoked the reaction of scientific-minded physicians: Andreas 'the Herophilean', in the second half of that century, directed his efforts against 'false beliefs' (*Περὶ τῶν ψευδῶς πεπιστευμένων*, Athenaeus 7.312e), including paradoxical ones, cf. Scholia Nicandri *Ther.* 823a (290.6–10 Crugnola).

Rethymno

KONSTANTINOS SPANOUDAKIS

⁸ Aristotle pioneered interest in the field and that may have generated the ascription of the third-century-B.C. collection *Περὶ θαυμαστῶν ἀκουσμάτων* to him; see N. J. Richardson in F. Montanari (ed.), *La philologie grecque à l'époque hellénistique et romaine* (Entr. Fond. Hardt 40), (Vandœuvres-Genève, 1994), 14–15; P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* i.770–4 with notes. On the extensive presence of Aristotle's *H.A.* in Antigonus' *Ἱστοριῶν παραδόξων συναγωγή* see A. Giannini, *Acme* 17 (1964), 114ff. Callimachus in some chapters of his *Θαυμάτων τῶν εἰς ἅπασαν τὴν γῆν κατὰ τόπους ὄντων συναγωγή* expressly draws on scientific manuals, such as Theophrastus at fr. 407 ii, xxx Pfeiffer or Aristotle *ibid.* xl.

A NEW READING IN DIOGENES OF OINOANDA fr. 69

In fr. 69 Smith, the Epicurean Diogenes of Oinoanda, like Lucretius 4.353–63, explains why a square tower viewed from the distance appears to be round. The explanation is that εἴδωλα, filmy atomic images, emanating from the tower, are forced out of shape by the air through which they pass on their way to our eyes. Diogenes' account is fragmentarily preserved on a stone which I discovered in 1970. The stone bears the right half of one fourteen-line column and the left half of a second one. I first published the text in 1971.¹ When, twenty years later, I came to deal with it again, in preparing an edition of all the known fragments,² I was able, thanks in no small measure to the discussions and suggestions of other scholars, whose names can be seen in my *apparatus criticus*, to print a text which represents a considerable advance on that of the *editio princeps*. However, with so much of what Diogenes wrote missing, there has remained scope for further progress, and in this note I correct an error—an error present not only in my text, but also on the stone itself.

According to the reconstruction in my edition, Diogenes says in 2.1–10 that someone who receives roundish impressions of a square tower falsely accuses his eyes of deceiving him, and in 2.10–14 he continues as follows:

ἐκεῖ [γὰρ οὐκ οἶδεν],
ὡς εἰκός, [τὰ εἴδωλα ἀπο]-
ρέοντα ἐ[κ τοῦ πύργου]
ψυχόμε[να τῷ ἀέρι, ἀλλὰ]
εὖ ὁρᾷ ὅσ[τερον] . . .

10

¹ 'New fragments of Diogenes of Oenoanda', *AJA* 75 (1971), 371–3.

² *Diogenes of Oinoanda: The Epicurean Inscription* (Napoli, 1993).