

## NEW READINGS IN THE TEXT OF DIOGENES OF OENOANDA

THE new readings recorded here are derived from epigraphic squeezes made at Oenoanda in May 1971.<sup>1</sup>

HK fr. 39, Chilton fr. 18

1. Some letters which HK show to be wholly or partly obliterated are partly or wholly preserved. Read *καταγελῶ καὶ εἰδῶς* [τοῦς], as conjectured by William.

2. Again, more letters are visible than are recorded by HK. Read *παρὰ-δεδομένους ἡμεῖν*.

3. The line ends *φασ*. HK record *τας*, and Grilli suggested that the stonemason made an error (cf. Smith C, 61).

4. The first letter, *κ*, is partly preserved. In the second part of the line the text is extremely worn, and HK's readings seem to me very doubtful.

5. All the letters in *κόσμον* are preserved, though faintly.

12-14. HK misread several letters. Read - - - [φν]λάξα[ι] οὖν | ὅπως μὴ ἀναστομώμε|νος τὴν γῆν γεμῖ|[ση]ς καὶ = 'Take care, then, that you do not make the earth gape open and fill it and . . .' Note the personification of the earth implied in *ἀναστομώμενος* (cf. e.g. Lucr. 5. 487).

HK fr. 40, Chilton fr. 3

I have not rediscovered this fragment.

Col. I

9-10. I propose [το]ῦ πρῶ|[του].

HK fr. 48, Chilton fr. 10

Col. IV

11. The textual crux is discussed by C. W. Chilton, 'The Epicurean Theory of the Origin of Language. A Study of Diogenes of Oenoanda, Fragments X

### *Abbreviations*

Cousin = G. Cousin, 'Inscriptions d'Oenoanda', *BCH* xvi (1892), 1-70.

HK = R. Heberdey and E. Kalinka, 'Die philosophische Inschrift von Oinoanda', *BCH* xxi (1897), 346-443.

William = J. William, *Diogenis Oenoandensis fragmenta* (Leipzig, 1907).

Chilton = C. W. Chilton, *Diogenis Oenoandensis fragmenta* (Leipzig, 1967).

Smith A = M. F. Smith, 'Fragments of

Diogenes of Oenoanda Discovered and Rediscovered', *AJA* lxxiv (1970), 51-62.

Smith B = M. F. Smith, 'New Fragments of Diogenes of Oenoanda', *AJA* lxxv (1971), 357-89.

Smith C = M. F. Smith, 'Observations on the Text of Diogenes of Oenoanda', *Hermathena*, cx (1970), 52-78.

NF = new fragment(s) of Diogenes' inscription. NF 1-4 in Smith A, NF 5-16 in Smith B.

<sup>1</sup> I am grateful to the University College of North Wales for making a generous grant towards the cost of my visit and allowing me to be absent for part of the Summer Term

1971. Two more new fragments of Diogenes' inscription (NF 17-18), not yet published, were found on the same visit.

and XI (W)', *AJP* lxxxiii (1962), 164–5. He favours the reinstatement ('possibly queried') of HK's βασιλέες, though he remarks that it 'is not indeed very convincing if only because this uncontracted form occurs nowhere else'. In Smith C, 59 I said that I could not believe that Diogenes used the form and proposed βασιλεῖς. However, the squeeze shows that HK and Chilton are right, and, unless a stonemason's error is to be assumed, this apparently unique form must be read. As Chilton<sup>1</sup> points out, Diogenes has ὁστέοις for ὁστοῖς in Chilton fr. 37, col. II, 9–10, and it may be noted that elsewhere in the inscription we find odd spellings such as ἀπόροϊαν (NF 5, col. II, 6) and ἀναροφήσαι (NF 7, col. II, 2–3).

HK fr. 53, Chilton fr. 12

HK's drawing makes it appear that the surface of the stone has broken off where almost the whole of col. II<sup>2</sup> and the beginning of col. III, 1–9 were inscribed. In fact, only the left of col. II has broken off.

### Col. III

That the text is extremely worn and difficult to read is shown by the fact that HK managed to decipher completely only line 14.

-----  
 -----  
 πάντες ἄνθρωποι ἦ[λ]-  
 πισαν ----- -υ . .  
 5 ----- φάσματα  
 ----- -ον ἄ[μή]-  
 χανοι. ἄν γὰρ [αὐτοῖς]  
 φάσματα ἐναργῆ τυ[ν]-  
 χάνη, πῶς δὲ γένε-  
 10 ται ταῦτα εὐρίσκειν  
 μὴ δύνωνται, εἰκότως,  
 οἶμαι, εἰς ὑποψίαν πε-  
 ρικυλῶνται. ποτέ δὲ  
 καὶ πίστιν δημιουργ[γόν τινα εἶναι ἔχουσι]

'For if they (i.e. human beings) experience distinct visions, and are unable to discover how these are produced, understandably, I think, they are involved in apprehension. And sometimes they are even convinced that there is a Creator . . .' The mention in line 14 of a δημιουργός shows that Diogenes is referring to visions of the gods. According to the Epicureans, the gods did not create the world and have no desire or power to intervene in human affairs. Perfectly self-sufficient, tranquil, and happy, they live in the μετακόσμος. Being of atomic composition, they continually discharge εἶδωλα or atomic films—films so fine that they can be received and perceived only by the human mind, usually in sleep. What Diogenes is saying in the present passage is that if men, on experiencing the distinct and true visions of the gods, do not understand the nature of the gods and the cause of the visions, they may wrongly assume or suspect that the supremely beautiful, powerful, and happy beings<sup>3</sup> who appear to them are responsible for the creation and ordering of the world.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. HK, 434, William, p. xxxix.

<sup>2</sup> Col. I of the editors (see Smith C, 59–60).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Lucr. 5. 1169–82.

It would be surprising if Diogenes did not, like Lucretius (5. 82–90, 1183–93, 1204–40), also point out that ignorance of the true causes of celestial phenomena is another reason why men suppose that the gods created and govern the world (cf. Epicurus, *Sent.* 11).

Although HK fr. 53 was probably part of a passage dealing exclusively with the gods, it is just possible that it belonged to the same discussion of *φάσματα* as Chilton fr. 7 and NF 1.

8. *φάσματα ἐναργῆ*. Cf. Epicurus, *Ep. ad Men.* 123 *θεοὶ μὲν γὰρ εἰσὶν ἐναργῆς γὰρ αὐτῶν ἔστιν ἡ γνώσις*.

12–13. *περικυκλίουται*. The verb is uncommon, especially in this metaphorical sense. Diogenes invariably uses epsilon iota for long iota (cf. line 9).

14. The restoration of *τινα εἶναι* was proposed by William. The incompletely preserved *γ* which HK record on the edge of the stone after *ρ* is not visible to me. Moreover, lines 8–13 suggest that the end of the column coincided with the edge of the stone, and the division *δημιουργ|όν* would not be in accordance with Diogenes' practice.<sup>1</sup> It is almost certain, therefore, that HK were deceived.

HK fr. 58, Chilton fr. 2

Col. I (Chilton col. II)

3. The squeeze confirms *γῆν* (cf. Smith C, 55). The first two letters are certainly not very clear, and it looks to me as though the stonemason might have corrected an error without making a proper erasure.

8. The squeeze suggests that my comments in Smith C, 55 are wrong, and that HK's reading is correct.

HK fr. 68, Cousin fr. 23

For the text of this very worn block, of which only the fifteenth line was recorded in the nineteenth century, see Smith B.

Col. II

9–10. Read *κατὰ σέξτα καὶ ῥῆο[υ]ς | περίπλεα* (= 'superabundant') *καὶ τῇν κτλ.*

Col. III

10. After *ποις* read *δελέατος τρόπον*, 'like a bait'. The verb *δελέαζω* occurs in Epicurus, *Sent. Vat.* 16.

NF 1

Several additions and corrections must be made to the text in Smith A, 57, which was edited without the aid of a squeeze.

Col. I

4. Read *εχει καὶ*.

Col. II

1–7. Read *[μᾶλλ]ον ----- | ...μν... τελοῦμεν | τὰ ἀφροδείσια, ὡς καὶ ὅ|παρ οὐδέν ἐστι τὸ μά|την ἀπ' αὐτῶν εὐφρο|σύνην λαμβάνειν | ὅτι καθεύδομεν*.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Smith B, on NF 5, col. II, 6–7.

Diogenes is evidently saying: '[It is of no consequence that in our dreams] we perform the sexual act, since the enjoyment which we vainly derive from it is certainly not a true experience, because we are asleep.' The argument is against Democritus' view that dreams are veridical: cf. Smith A, 57-8 and see NF 12 and my notes there.

3-4. For ὕπαρ, 'true vision', as opposed to ὄναρ, 'dream', cf. e.g. Hom. *Od.* 19. 547, 20. 90. The two words occur as adverbs in Epicurus, *Ep. ad Men.* 135.

5. αὐτῶν, sc. τῶν ἀφροδισίων.

6-7. Sexual intercourse is a kinetic pleasure, and εὐφροσύνη denotes pleasure of that kind. Cf. Diog. Laert. 10. 136, quoting Epicurus: ἡ μὲν γὰρ ἀταραξία καὶ ἀπονία καταστηματαίκαί εἰσιν ἡδοναί· ἡ δὲ χαρὰ καὶ ἡ εὐφροσύνη κατὰ κίνησιν ἐνεργεῖα βλέπονται. Cf. also NF 12, lines 7-9 (where the reference is, as in NF 1, to visions in sleep): κατευφραίνει μάλιστα τὴν ψυχὴν.

8. For [ἐπ]η read μὲν.

### Col. III

1-2. The text is very worn. Read ὥς ὑπολαμβάνει Δημ[ό]κριτος. ν [ἀ]μήχανον γὰρ κτλ. A comma should be placed at the end of col. II, 14. ὑπολαμβάνω occurs in Chilton fr. 8, col. II, 2 (of a false opinion, as here) and Chilton fr. 15, col. II, 7-8.

### NF 2

The text in Smith A, 59 was edited without the aid of a squeeze and several corrections are necessary, though the argument is hardly affected.

### Col. II

2. The first letter is certainly sigma, not epsilon, and I propose [φη]σί.

8-14. The stone is in many places extremely worn. Read as follows: εἰ μὲν | ρῆ[ν] δύνανται καθ' ἑαυτὰς [α]ἱ ψυχὰι μένειν μηδὲ ... φυλῆεις σύρειν | εἰς ζ[ώ]ου φύσιν καὶ τοῦτου χάριν μεταφέρειν | [α]ὐτὰς, τί σοι δύναται ἡ | μετέβασις (Chilton fr. 34, col. I, 1, which is a continuation of NF 2); 'If then the souls are able to survive by themselves and you do not [propose] to drag them into a living nature and for the sake of this change them, how, I ask you, is the transmigration possible?' For σύρειν cf. Chilton fr. 34, col. I, 11, fr. 1, col. I, 7.

### Line 15 (lower margin)

Some text is faintly visible where the surface of the stone is preserved on the extreme left. Read α.ρα. These letters will have been separated from the text in Chilton fr. 34 *margo inferior* by about sixteen letters.

### NF 7

One addition should be made to the text in Smith B.

### Col. III

8. Read δαπανώμενος, 'being consumed', 'used up'.