

from every region of the body (πανταχόθεν ἐκ τοῦ σώματος 67c7–8). Since the complete detachment is possible only at his death, he must wait for it by practice of dying.

The requirement of the detachment from every region of the body goes too far. Following this line of argument, the exact requirement is only the detachment from all senses; since sense-perceptions are the activities of sense-organs, the detachment from all sense-organs alone is sufficient to facilitate the philosopher to reach his goal in the present life. There is no need of the detachment from every region of the body, which is the separation of the soul from the body, or the death of the man; other life processes than the sensitive can still go on as ever when he pursues the knowledge he desires.

Because Socrates in the *Phaedo* does not see the difference of the exact detachment needed from the general and knows no adequate method for the acquisition in question *via* the needed detachment, the above said pessimism ensues. When attention is paid to life alone instead of to the contrast of life and death, as first in the *Symposium* and then in the central books of the *Republic*, the method missed in the *Phaedo* is found there. The vision of Ideas is attained *via* the new method and the pessimism in the dialogue simultaneously turns into its opposite, optimism. I made it clear earlier how it happened in the *Symposium* and shall do the same in the *Republic* on another occasion.

University of South Florida

Ludwig C. H. Chen

ENNIANA

In what follows I shall examine a number of verses from the dramatic works of Ennius, as well as a number of lines from what we may conventionally call, since the 1933 edition of Ettore Bolisani¹⁾, Ennius Minor, and compare them with corresponding passages from Greek literature in order to provide a fuller picture of the meaning of Ennian fragments²⁾.

1) E. Bolisani, *Ennio Minore*, Padova, 1935, 11.

2) The fragments of Ennius here presented are taken from the edition I. Vahlen, *Ennianae Poesis Reliquiae*, Leipzig ²1903.

I. Neoptolemos is considered to be speaking in the following fragment (Sc. 376):

Philosophari est mihi necesse, paucis: nam omnino haud placet.

But if we accept as closer to the ancient reading of Ennius the fragment transmitted in the form: *philosophandum est paucis: nam omnino haud placet* as does H. D. Jocelyn in his 1967 edition³), there is nothing to persuade us that the verse unquestionably belongs to the *Andromacha* of Ennius. The observation of Vahlen (p. 191) “cuius fabulae philosophans iste Neoptolemus fuerit ignoratur” remains valid and the question as to which work of Ennius this verse belongs to must remain open, i. e. the possibility of its being newly interpreted can be entertained. It is very likely that Ennius composed a tragedy or a comedy concerning the mission of Neoptolemos and Odysseus to Lemnos to obtain the arms of Philoctetes. What is known for certain is that Epicharmus, whose works Ennius knew, did write a comedy entitled Φιλοκτήτας⁴). The marked antithesis between *philosophari paucis* – (*philosophari*) *omnino* is an indication, I believe, that at this point in the work of Ennius Neoptolemos is found on the verge of some decisive action. Perhaps he is replying to Odysseus, who remarks to him in the *Philoctetes* of Sophocles (v. 119): σοφός τ' ἄν αὐτὸς κάγαθὸς κεκλή' ἄμα.

In Sophocles' tragedy Neoptolemos' rejoinder is exceptionally laconic. He wishes he says to be σοφός, to act cunningly, but for only one reason and only in this particular circumstance – because he is compelled to do so. To Odysseus his reply is (v. 122): εἰσάπαξ. In the line from Ennius Neoptolemos declares he does not desire to be σοφός in each and every case⁵) (*nam omnino haud placet*) – he does not wish to be another Odysseus. I think that Ennius is here reversing the Heraclitean reflection VS 22 B 35 that: χρηὴ γὰρ εὖ μάλα πολλῶν ἴστορας φιλοσόφους ἄνδρας εἶναι, a

3) H. D. Jocelyn, *The Tragedies of Ennius...*, Cambridge 1967, 88 fr. 95. Cf. *ibid.* p. 253 f. The contributor of the article *omnino* in the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* follows Jocelyn's reading.

4) A. Olivieri, *Frammenti della commedia greca ... I: I frammenti della commedia dorica siciliana*, Naples ²1946, 49.

5) Consequently, the verb *philosophari* here ought to mean “devise ingeniously, contrive”, a meaning which the Greek verb φιλοσοφῶ also possesses. LSJ s.v.

technique which he again employs in his Satires (Var. 60)⁶). As for the wisdom present in brevity of utterance, it is known that in the *Epicharmeia* this was present as characteristic of the thought of Epicharmus (fr. 127 Ol = fr. 113 K).

II. Much has been written of the relationship of Ennius' literary production to the writings of Euhemerus⁷). Aside from scholarly disagreements, it is accepted that twelve fragments, whose context testify to their belonging to the Ennian work *Euhemerus sive Sacra Historia*, have been preserved in Lactantius⁸). In what follows I shall endeavor to validate the proposition that fragment Sc. 384 of Ennius, which is preserved in Servius auctus Verg. Georg. I. 12–13, could be from this work.

The fragment is as follows:

Ager oppletus imbrium fremitu

There is no ancient testimony regarding the work from which this fragment might derive, nor for the broader context in which it appeared. O. Ribbeck notes that 'hoc (sc. fragmentum) . . . referri potest ad Andromacham. . .⁹'). But this is mere surmise. We are here dealing with a quite particularized description of a natural setting. The landscape's visual appeal entirely absorbs the reader's attention, *ager* being expressed in the nominative. I propose that this fragment comes from Ennius' *Euhemerus* and that it reflects the same conception of Euhemerus as Diodorus 5, 43, 1 (FGrHist 63 F 3, p. 305, 18 ff.). The Greek text describes . . . τὸ μὲν οὖν περὶ τὸ ἱερόν (sc. Διὸς τριφυλίου) πεδῖον. It is likely that the wording *ager oppletus imbrium fremitu* is equivalent to the reading of the Greek text . . . πλήθοντος τοῦ τόπου ναματιαίων ὑδάτων. . . Here we are dealing with the gushing forth of a spring of water: . . . πλησίον γὰρ τοῦ τεμένους ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἐκπίπτει τηλικαύτη τὸ μέγεθος πηγῆ γλυκέος ὕδατος. . . (F 3, p. 305, 22). Ennius preferred to represent by means of the words he chose not the actual flow of the waters (ναματιαίων), but the echoing splash produced by the

6) This is the well known verse *simia quam similis turpissima bestia nobis*. For the meaning of φιλόσοφος in this difficult fragment of Heraclitus, see W. Burkert, Platon oder Pythagoras? Zum Ursprung des Wortes "Philosophie", Hermes 80, 1960, 171.

7) See A. Marrastoni, Studio critico su Ennio minore, Aevum 34, 1961, 8 f.

8) Fragment XIII, the word *gluma* is transmitted by Varro, see Vahlen p. 228.

9) ²TRF, p. 66.

spring's outflow (see Serv. Auct. Aen. 11, 299: *antiqui aquae sonitus fremitus dicebant*), preferring the word *imber* to *aqua* (see Serv. Auct. Aen. 1, 123: *veteres... omnem aquam... imbrem dicebant*).

III. We cannot be precisely certain what Ennius means by his use of the phrase *Cyprio bovi* in the fragment (Var. 26):

Cyprio bovi merendam,

apart from what is said in Paulus-Festus, where it is preserved¹⁰). What is certain is that in Greek βοῦς κύπριος was synonymous with σακτοφάγος or κοπροφάγος¹¹). In Latin, other than in this fragment of Ennius, the phrase is nowhere used in the entire history of the language. We may suppose, however, that the quality Ennius meant to describe by the phrase *bos Cyprius* would have been immediately apparent to the Romans, judging from the testimony of Pliny, N.H. 28, 266: *boves in Cypro contra tormina hominum excrementis sibi mederi*. Thus, in the fragment of Ennius with which we are dealing there is little doubt that some mean fare is being offered as an afternoon snack (*merenda*) to an unknown person with a propensity for consuming dung. In spite of the above *realia*, the meaning of the phrase *Cyprio bovi merendam* eludes us, mainly because its context is lost.

It is because of this difficulty, I suppose, that the contributor of the article *merenda* in the Thesaurus Linguae Latinae, attempts to elucidate the Ennian fragment by stating that *merenda* here refers "de pabulo bestiarum"¹²). If this is so, however, one would have to accept that only here, in all the known Latin passages, the word *merenda* is used for the food of a cow, and that only in this passage the collocation *bos Cyprius* has a strictly literal signification. As a means of evading his difficulty I suggest that we test the following interpretive possibility: that there are two semantic units present in our fragment, that is, a mean kind of fare, *merenda*, is being served up to an individual of corresponding baseness, one for whom the appellation of *bos Cyprius* is fitting. For by means of this appellation the Romans denoted not only the consumption of excrement but physical deformity as well, and particularly hump-backedness, as is seen in the following passage (Serv. Auct. Georg.

10) P. 51, 23L.

11) Cf. e.g. Zenob. 2,82. Diogen. 3,49. 5,80. Apostol. 4,100.

12) ThLL VIII 2, 802,4.

I, 138): *quidam autem* (sc. *dicunt*) *non omnium boum* ὄβον, *sed eorum tantum qui sunt, ita ut Cyprii, gibberi*. By applying this interpretation to our passage, the characterization *bos Cyprius* possesses even greater force as a term of abuse in Latin than it does in Greek, thus strengthening the validity of the interpretation I propose.

IV. The characterization of the fish *scarus* as *cerebrum Iovis* in the following verse from the *Hedyphagetica* of Ennius is an *hapax legomenon* in Latin (Var. 40):

quid scarum praeterii cerebrum Iovis paene supremi

Cerebrum Iovis corresponds to the Greek formulation Διὸς ἐγκέφαλος used to describe a choice type of food, precisely which we do not know, since no explanatory passage has survived from the Greek¹³). Only in the Ennian verse is the specific food expressly mentioned, otherwise there is no evidence which convincingly explains the origin of the phrase Διὸς ἐγκέφαλος¹⁴). However, I think we can compare the phrase with the Homeric μυελὸς ἀνδρῶν used as an epithet for ἄλφιτα (β 220, υ 108). This food is called the “marrow of men” because in the Homeric epics it frequently figures as human nourishment, providing when converted into marrow exceptional strength to the human organism¹⁵). The σκάρος was food for the gods, as we read in these verses from Epicharmus’ comedy, Ἦβας γάμος, fr. 19 a Ol (= fr. 54 K): αὐτὸς ὁ Ποτ(ε)ιδὰν ἄγων γαύλοισιν ἐν φοινικικοῖς / εἶκε καλλίστους ... σπάρους / καὶ σκάρους τῶν οὐδὲ τὸ σκάρθ θεμιτὸν ἐκβαλεῖν θεοῖς. The fish itself was distinguished for its intellectual abilities¹⁶) as

13) See Plato comicus, fr. 38 Kock: ‘Ο δ’ ἐγκέφαλον Διὸς ἐξαύσας καταπίνει and Ephippus comicus, fr. 13, 6 Kassel-Austin. These are the only known fragments from Greek literature in which this phrase is used, apart from readings from documentary sources, which one may consult assembled in Chr. Theodoridis, Photii Patriarchae Lexicon, vol. I [Berlin 1982] n° 655. It should be noted that the phrase Διὸς ἐγκέφαλος in Plato Comicus’ fragment has been restored. Eustathius suggests (p. 757, 53) that Διὸς ἐγκέφαλος could refer to ... τὰ παρὰ τῷ κωμικῷ εὐ ἠρτυμένα θρία τοῦ ἐγκεφάλου. He certainly has in mind Aristophanes, Frogs 134.

14) See fragments 51 A Wehrli and 51 D Wehrli of Clearchus of Soloi where the phrase is Διὸς ἅμα καὶ βασιλέως ἐγκέφαλος.

15) As Eustathius observes (p. 1445, 61): Μυελὸν δὲ ἀνδρῶν τὰ ἄλφιτα λέγει, ἀντὶ τοῦ μυελοποιά, θρεπτικά ... διὰ τοῦ ἐνδομυχοῦντος μυελοῦ, τὴν ὄλην παραδηλοῦν τοῦ θρεπτικοῦ ἐνεργεῖαν. See further p. 309, 45 (= p. 481, 11 Van der Valk): καλὸν δὲ καὶ τὸ μυελὸν ἀνδρῶν Ὀμηρικῶς λέγειν τὰ ἄλφιτα.

16) See for example Opp. H. 2, 661. Plut. Mor. p. 977 C. Ael. N.A.1, 4.

was Zeus on a different plane. One may therefore accept that with this phrase Ennius was alluding not only to the culinary appeal of the fish – on account of which it became a divine dish¹⁷⁾, but also to the fish's fame, in antiquity, for quick-thinking and good sense.

V. In the following fragment from Ennius' *Epicharmus* the subject of the verse, according to Varro by whom the fragment is transmitted, is *Terra Ops* (Var. 48):

Terris gentis omnis peperit et resumit denuo

All recent editors of the fragment, Vahlen¹⁸⁾, Bolisani¹⁹⁾, and Olivieri²⁰⁾, in their remarks on this verse do not cite the fragment ²TGF 195 = XII Ka²¹⁾ from the *Antiope* of Euripides²²⁾, a text which provides the closest reflection on the Ennian verse: ἅπαντα τίπτει χθῶν πάλιν τε λαμβάνει. The concept here expressed by Ennius that life (mostly of humans) springs from the earth is widely spread in Greek thought already in the 5th century B.C. Moreover, for Ennius as well as for Euripides the unity of body (σῶμα) and spirit (πνεῦμα) is not broken up by death. Both the above concepts, which cannot be traced back to a particular philosopher exclusively²³⁾, had, over the years, acquired the nature of commonplace as the two following Greek passages would indicate: Menander, Mon. 145 Jae: Γῆ πάντα τίπτει καὶ πάλιν κομίζεται, Men.-Phil. Comp. 1, 113 Jae: Ἐπὶ γῆς ἔφυ πάντα κείς γῆν οἴχεται. Of the two passages, the first even more closely corresponds in thought to Ennius than does the fragment of Euripides. At this point, however, I would like to draw attention to the appearance of *terris* in Var. 48, a choice of case which has passed unobserved by commentators on this verse. It is with the use of the *terris* that the verbal energy of *peperit* is actualized by the subject *Terra Ops*. This type of formulation, which is of certain significance in relation to the subject-ablative combination of *Terra Ops* – *Terris*, occurs only in the Ennian verse; it is not found in the Greek verses

17) For a similar reason, according to the Romans at least, certain plants also appear to have been eaten by Zeus, Lucil. 1188 M = 1209 K.

18) p. CCXIX.

19) E. Bolisani, p.80–1.

20) A. Olivieri, p. 114.

21) J. Kambitsis, *L'Antiope d'Euripide...*, Athènes 1972, 47.

22) On the contrary Nauck, p. 418, takes note of the Ennian passage.

23) As C. W. Müller has convincingly argued: *Gleiches zu Gleichem*, Ein Prinzip frühgriechischen Denkens, *Klassisch-Philologische Studien* H. 31, Wiesbaden 1965, 167 ff. especially p. 170 f.

I have presented above. A Latin formulation analogous to that of Ennius is that of Lucretius ... *terreno corpore terra / crescit* ... 2, 1114/5²⁴).

VI. In fragment Var. 50 from the same work of Ennius it is apparent that Ceres is introduced as the goddess of germination and fruitfulness:

quod gerit fruges Ceres

The etymology of the name *Ceres* from the verb *gero*, an etymology which could be with some certainty ascribed to Ennius²⁵), does not find its Greek analogue in the passage from Euripides' *Bacchae* (275/6), which Vahlen and Olivieri compare with the Ennian verse²⁶). In the Euripidean passage Δημήτηρ is thought of as a composite of the goddesses Γῆ and Μήτηρ²⁷). Euripides is only concerned with identifying the parts which form the Demetrian whole. This line of approach is absent from the Latin verse, where the goddess's name is etymologized on the basis of the actions she performs. In the following passage from Plato's *Cratylus* 404 B Δημήτηρ μὲν φαίνεται κατὰ τὴν δόσιν τῆς ἐδωδῆς διδοῦσα ὡς μήτηρ 'Δημήτηρ' κεκληῖσθαι the etymology of the goddess' name from the verb δίδωμι in direct conjunction with the production of food-stuffs (ἐδωδῆ), displays the same intention on Plato's part as is exhibited in the Ennian verse (*gerit fruges*).

When Ennius etymologizes, as here, he is basically composing in the spirit of Epicharmus, who according to traditional accounts and scholarly investigators, ancient and modern, also etymologized²⁸). I would like to propose the following in regard to the question of the etymologies of Epicharmus. In those comic fragments which are genuinely thought to be from Epicharmus we are dealing with a kind of word-play based primarily on the sound

24) For this thought commentators generally refer to Empedocles, VS 31 B 37 = 31 Wright, cf. C. Bailey, II 975n., but the manner in which this growth occurs is not explained in the Empedoclean passage.

25) K. Kerényi, *Pythagoras und Orpheus*..., Zürich 1950, 78. This etymology gained broad acceptance among the Romans, as one may see from the passages cited by A. S. Pease, *M. T. Ciceronis De nat. deorum*..., 1958, 722.

26) See Vahlen, p. CXCIX (who expresses reservations), and A. Olivieri, p. 114 (who compares the same passage and fr. 839 N² of Euripides). Cf. E. Bolisani p. 81.

27) Δημήτηρ θεά-Γῆ δ'ἔστιν, ὄνομα δ'ὀπότερον βούλη κἀλει. Cf. A. Henrichs, *Die "Erdmutter" Demeter*, ZPE 3, 1968, 111.

28) *Serv. ad Verg. Aen.* 1, 8. Cf. E. Bolisani, p. 81.

of syllables: fr. 19 Ol (= fr. 54 K): καὶ σαάρους, τῶν οὐδὲ τὸ σαάρ θέμιτον ἐκβαλεῖν θεοῖς, fr. 111, 3 Ol (= fr. 87 K): ἀλλ' οὐτι γέρονον, ἀλλ' ἔρανόν (γά) τοι λέγω. In the *Epicharmeia* when etymology is employed it serves a didactic function: fr. 228 Ol (= fr. 246 K): αὐτα φύσις ἀνθρώπων, ἀσκοὶ πεφυσσάμενοι, Serv. Aen. 1, 8: *has musas Siculus Epicharmus non musas sed ὁμοιοούσας dicit*. The etymology of the name *Ceres* given above also has a didactic tone, as does that of Proserpina in Ennius' *Epicharmus*²⁹).

VII. The longest fragment from the *Epicharmus* of Ennius, in which our poet "physicam Graecorum doctrinam exposuerat"³⁰, is as follows (Var. 54–9):

*Istic est is Iupiter quem dico, quem Graeci vocant
aerem, qui ventus est et nubes, imber postea,
atque ex imbre frigus, ventus post fit, aer denuo.
haec propter Iupiter sunt ista quae dico tibi,
qua mortalis atque urbes beluasque omnis iuvat.*

The question is of course which Greek thinker this "physica doctrina" represents. It has been thought that the ideas here presented are of Pythagorean-Orphic derivation³¹). But this is simply an hypothesis³²) (relevant Greek testimonia have not been preserved), based on Vitruvius De Arch. 8 Praef. 1: *Pythagoras, Empedocles, Epicharmus, aliique physici et philosophi haec principia quattuor posuerunt: aerem, ignem, aquam, terram*. Vahlen, more soberly, merely compares, while expressing some reservations in admirable Latin, the Ennian verses with a fragment of some lines of Menander³³) 614 K–T: Ὁ μὲν Ἐπίχαρμος τοὺς θεοὺς εἶναι λέγει ἀνέμους ὕδωρ γῆν ἥλιον πῦρ ἀστέρας... The Ennian fragment however is only concerned with Jupiter, while that of Menander deals with all the gods. Perhaps with Menander we have a comic generalization of an Epicharmean idea, but we must still note that the difference between Ennius' passage and Menander's is significant. Leaving this difference aside we observe that the following ideas are ex-

29) In precisely the same spirit is the phrase *Iuppiter id est iuvans pater quem ... appellamus a iuvando Iovem*, Cic. N.D. 2, 64 (A.S. Pease, supra, p. 712), which F. Marx, De Ennii Epicharmo, RhM, NF 80, 1931, 207, attributes to the *Epicharmus* of Ennius.

30) See F. Marx.

31) K. Kerényi, p. 77–8.

32) Cf. Liuzzi, Ennio ed il pitagorismo, AFML 3, 1973–74, 283.

33) Vahlen, p. CCXVIII–IX.

pressed in the fragment of Ennius: 1) a Jupiter-Air equivalence, 2) the continuous transformation of Air (Jupiter) into different physical elements (*ventus, nubes, imber, frigus*) ever terminating in the dominant form, air, and that 3) it is to this interchange that man and beast owe their existence.

The first idea can be traced back to Diogenes Apolloniates (VS 64 A 8): Διογένης ἔπαινεῖ τὸν Ὀμηρον ὡς οὐ μυθικῶς ἀλλ' ἀληθῶς ὑπὲρ τοῦ θείου διειλεγμένον. τὸν ἀέρα γὰρ αὐτὸν Δία νομίζειν φησί, ἐπειδὴ πᾶν εἶδέναι τὸν Δία λέγει³⁴). We do not know precisely which Homeric passage Diogenes is referring to here³⁵), and in the Homeric texts as they have been transmitted the poet nowhere explicitly equates Zeus with Air. It is in my opinion quite possible however that the reference is to the *hapax legomenon* Homeric epithet of Zeus at Θ 250: ἐνθα πανομφαίῳ Ζηνὶ ῥέξεσκον Ἄχαιοί, due to the fact that the following scholium on the epithet has been preserved: πανομφαίῳ: τινὲς τῶ ὑπὸ πάντων φωνουμένῳ, Erbse II, 351³⁶). This doctrine of Diogenes, which is the starting point for the allegorical interpretation of the Homeric texts³⁷), had a wide impact in antiquity and was also given a comic treatment in subsequent literature. Of the many relevant reflections³⁸) the well known passage of Philemon is of particular interest to us here: ὄν οὐδὲ εἷς λέληθεν οὐδὲ ἐν ποιῶν / οὐδ' αἶ ποιήσων οὐδὲ πεποικῶς πάλαι, / οὔτε θεὸς οὔτ' ἄνθρωπος, οὐτός εἰμ' ἐγώ, / Ἄηρ, ὄν ἄν τις ὀνομάσειε καὶ Δία. / ἐγὼ . . . εἰμὶ πανταχοῦ, / . . . ἐν ὑμῖν πᾶσιν οὐκ ἔστιν τόπος, / οὔ μὴ ᾿στιν Ἄηρ· ὁ δὲ παρῶν ἀπανταχοῦ / πάντ' ἐξ ἀνάγκης οἶδε πανταχοῦ παρῶν, fr. 91 Kock. This same idea, that god as air (Zeus) knows everything and the actions of everyone, and that no one can escape his observation, is also found in the *Epicarameia*, fr. 232 Ol (= fr. 266 K): οὐδὲν ἐκφεύγει τὸ θεῖον τοῦτο γινώσκειν τυ δεῖ. Although in the remainder of the passage, which has been preserved, it is not stated why nothing escapes the god's inspection, one might easily hypothesize that god is here being thought of as air, since this idea was not unknown in these

34) Cf. VS 68 B 30. I am reminded of the appellation Ζεὺς Ἀέριος, H. Schwabl, RE X A (1972) 260, 36 f. 309, 1 and RE Suppl. XV (1978) 1442, 19.

35) F. Buffière, *Les mythes d'Homère et la pensée grecque*, Paris 1956, 90 n. 20, repeats the opinion of Diels-Kranz in their note on the passage above that perhaps Diogenes is referring to Ω 88.

36) Cf. Eustathius p. 711, 52: Πανομφαῖος δὲ Ζεὺς κατὰ μὲν ἀλληγορίαν, εἷς ὄν πᾶσα ὁμφῆ, ἤγγουν ἀπλῶς φωνή, ἀνάγεται, τουτέστιν ὁ πάσης φωνῆς αἴτιος ἄηρ.

37) H. Schwabl, RE Suppl. XV (1978) 1325, 45.

38) See VS 64 C 1-4.

text as is evident from the fragment of Menander I have presented above (614 K–T). Further weight is also given to this hypothesis by the well known passage of Vitruvius (8 Praef. 1).

On the basis of these observations I believe we can accept, with additional evidence of its correctness, the conjecture of Schwabl³⁹) that the lines Var. 55–56 from the *Epicharmus* of Ennius reflect the ideas of Diogenes Apolloniates. This conjecture is further strengthened by an assessment of the second line of thought present in the Ennian fragment above, which concerns the alternation in the forms of air. This idea, too, seems to derive from Diogenes: τόν τε ἀέρα πυκνούμενον καὶ ἀραιούμενον γεννητικὸν εἶναι τῶν κόσμων . . . VS 64 A 1. For, in fact, the sequence *ventus – nubes – imber – frigus – aer* as formulated by Ennius is basically an expression of the successive rarefaction and densification of the vaporous elements of the air. And it is to this ἑτεροίωσις, to use Diogenes' term, that the existence of things is owed⁴⁰). As Ennius expresses it: *haec propter Iupiter sunt ista quae dico tibi*. Unfortunately, in the *Epicharmia* a relevant passage reflecting the thought of Diogenes has not been preserved, so we are unable to ascertain how Ennius, by echoing his predecessor's ideas, set out to express his own. Nevertheless, how Jupiter as air *mortalis – urbes – beluasque iuvat*, can be explained if we return again to Diogenes VS 64 B 5: καὶ μοι δοκεῖ τὸ τὴν νόησιν ἔχον εἶναι ὁ ἀήρ καλούμενος ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ ὑπὸ τούτου πάντας καὶ κυβερνᾶσθαι καὶ πάντων κρατεῖν. Regarding men and animals specifically Diogenes wrote . . . ἀνθρωποι γὰρ καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ζῶα ἀναπνέοντα ζῶει τῷ ἀέρι καὶ τοῦτο αὐτοῖς καὶ ψυχὴ ἐστὶ καὶ νόησις . . . (VS 64 B 4). This idea is reflected in the *Epicharmia*. The internal air which is found within living beings is called by Hippocrates, in a passage undoubtedly influenced by Diogenes Apolloniates, φύσα: πνεῦμα δὲ τὸ μὲν ἐν τοῖσι σώμασι φύσα καλεῖται . . . (VS 64 C 2). Also, in the *Epicharmia*, the internal, bodily air is called φύσα αὐτὰ φύσις ἀνθρώπων, ἄσκοι πεφυσαμένοι, fr. 228 Ol (= fr. 246 K). There exists for this fragment

39) H. Schwabl, RE Suppl. XV (1978) 1326, 41.

40) See VS 64 B 2 . . . πάντα τὰ ὄντα ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἑτεροιοῦσθαι καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ εἶναι . . . 64 B 5 . . . καὶ ἄλλαι πολλαὶ ἑτεροιώσεις ἐνεῖσι. The idea of difference in air temperature being productive of birth is an intellectual concept originating with Diogenes, VS 64 B 5: ἐστὶ γὰρ πολῦτροπος, καὶ θερμότερος καὶ ψυχρότερος καὶ ξηρότερος καὶ ὑγρότερος, J. Zafiropoulo, Diogène d'Apollonie, 1956, 48. Cf. Enn. Var. 46: *frigori miscet calorem atque humori aritudinem* and VS 64 A 1: . . . τὴν γῆν . . . τὴν σύστασιν εἰληφυῖαν κατὰ τὴν ἐκ τοῦ θερμοῦ περιφορὰν καὶ πῆξιν ὑπὸ τοῦ ψυχροῦ.

the scholium of Iamblichus at Stob. I 49 p. 384 W: ἐνεστιν ἡ ψυχὴ τῷ σώματι καθάπερ ἐν ἀσκήῳ πνεῦμα περιεχομένη.

An inquiry which has as its object texts in such a fragmentary state cannot arrive at conclusions. It was rather an attempt to reduce the interpretive difficulties.

University of Ioannina

Alexander Kessissoglu

KRITISCHE KLEINIGKEITEN ZU STATIUS

1. *Silv.* 2,2,100–103

*saepe per autumnum iam pubescente Lyaeo
conscendit scopulos noctisque occulta sub umbra
palmitate maturo rorantia lumina tersit
Nereis et dulces rapuit de collibus uvas.*

Die reizende Vignette der Nereide, die des Nachts das felsige Ufer ersteigt und sich in Pollius' Weinberg an den süßen Trauben gütlich tut, fand ihren Nachahmer bereits in der Antike¹); dem Auge des Kritikers entging sie offenbar bis in jüngste Zeit. Daß dem Vers 102 kein befriedigender Sinn abzugewinnen sei, äußerte zuerst A. Ker (*ClQu* n.s.3, 1953, 3); ihm folgte L. Håkanson (*Stattius' Silvae*, Lund 1969, 59–61). Beide stoßen sich am Ausdruck *lumina tersit*, der für sich genommen („sie wischte sich die Augen ab“) zwar verständlich ist²), hier und zusammen mit *palmitate maturo* aber Schwierigkeiten bereitet, „one may ask ... why the Nereid chose a wine-stem ... to brush her eyes, rather a peculiar instrument for that purpose. And one may perhaps also

1) Ausonius, Mos. 175–177 *saepe etiam mediis furata e collibus uvas / inter Oreiadas Panope fluvialis amicas / fugit lascivos pagamica numina Faunos*. Allgemein zur Statius-Nachahmung im Moselgedicht des Ausonius vgl. E. J. Kenney, *G&R* n.s. 31, 1984, 190–202, und C. Newlands, *TAPhA* 118, 1988, 403–419.

2) Håkanson a.O. 61 verweist auf *silv.* 1,2,92 f.; 3,3,7; *Ov. met.* 13,132 f.; *Moretum* 107.