Be this as it may, he glances here at Aristotle's information on the sparrow's lustful-ness (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'epoque hellenistique 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 ex-planation 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 some-one 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],   10
>   ὡς εἰκός, [τὰ εἴδωλα ἀπο]-
> ρέοντα ἐ[κ τοῦ πύργου]
> ψωχόμε[να τῷ ἀέρι, ἀλλὰ]
> εὖ ὁρᾷ ὕσ[τερον] . . .

---

[1] 'New fragments of Diogenes of Oenoanda', *AJA* 75 (1971), 371–3.
[2] *Diogenes of Oinoanda: The Epicurean Inscription* (Napoli, 1993).

'[For] in that case [he does not know], probably, that [the images] emanating [from the tower] are abraded [by the air, but afterwards] he sees well . . .' I suggested that what the person afterwards sees well is that it is not the eyes which are at fault, but the mind.

In 2.14 the letters *EYOPAYC* are clear on the stone,[3] and until recently $\epsilon\hat{v}$ $\acute{o}\rho\hat{a}$ (or, as I originally suggested, $\epsilon\hat{v}$ $\acute{o}\rho a$[4]) $\acute{v}\sigma[\tau\epsilon\rho o\nu]$ seemed to me inevitable. However, there is a problem: the reading violates Diogenes' general practice concerning hiatus. $\epsilon\hat{v}$ $\acute{o}\rho\hat{a}$ would be in order, because he permits hiatus after monosyllables such as $\delta\acute{\eta}$, $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$, $\mathring{\eta}$, $\kappa a\acute{\iota}$, $\mu\acute{\eta}$, $\sigma o\acute{\iota}$, $\mathring{\omega}$, but $\acute{o}\rho\hat{a}$ $\mathring{v}\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho o\nu$ would not be in accordance with his normal practice and, whilst he does admit some exceptions to his 'rules',[5] they are so rare that the sight of this hiatus should set an alarm-bell ringing.

Is a different reading possible? Let us look at the letters again and ask two questions. The first question is: *are* all the letters distinct? The answer is 'yes'. The second question is: are all the letters *correct*? The answer here, I now realise, is 'no'. *O* is an error, either of the stonemason or of the writer of the copy which he was following,[6] for Θ, and the true reading is $\epsilon\mathring{v}<\theta>\rho a v\sigma[\tau a]$, 'easily broken', 'easily damaged'. 2.13–14 may now be restored as follows:

$$\psi\omega\chi\acute{o}\mu\epsilon[\nu a \ \tau\hat{\omega} \ \acute{a}\acute{\epsilon}\rho\iota \ \kappa a\grave{\iota}]$$
$$\epsilon\mathring{v}<\theta>\rho a v\sigma[\tau a \ \mathring{o}\nu\tau a] \ . . .$$

= 'are abraded by the air and easily damaged . . .' Whether the sentence which begins in 2.10 finished in 2.14 or continued, one cannot tell.

I call $\epsilon\mathring{v}\theta\rho a v\sigma\tau a$ 'the true reading', because it is so obviously *le mot juste* that it compels acceptance. Three points are to be noted. First, the word is synonymous with $\epsilon\mathring{v}\theta\rho v\pi\tau a$, which in 1.7 is used by Diogenes to describe $[\tau\grave{a} \ . . . \ \acute{\rho}\epsilon\acute{v}\mu a\tau a] \ \tau\hat{\omega}\nu \ \acute{a}\tau\acute{o}\mu\omega\nu$, 'the currents of atoms', i.e. the $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\lambda a$. Secondly, the closing lines of col. 2 are to be compared with Sextus Empiricus' account of the Epicurean explanation of why the large square tower viewed from the distance is perceived as small and round. He says that the reason is that 'the edges of the images are broken off by their passage through the air': $\tau\hat{\eta} \ \delta\iota\grave{a} \ \tau o\hat{v} \ \acute{a}\acute{\epsilon}\rho os \ \phi o\rho\hat{a} \ \underline{\acute{a}\pi o\theta\rho a v o\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega\nu} \ \tau\hat{\omega}\nu \ \kappa a\tau\grave{a} \ \tau\grave{a} \ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\lambda a \ \pi\epsilon\rho\acute{a}\tau\omega\nu$ (*adv. Math.* 7.209). Thirdly, although $\epsilon\mathring{v}\theta\rho a v\sigma\tau os$, like $\epsilon\mathring{v}\theta\rho v\pi\tau os$, does not seem to occur in Epicurus' surviving writings, it occurs in an account of his atomic theory in *Placit.* 1.3.18 (Diels, *Dox. Graec.* 286a.8): $\tau a\hat{v}\tau a \ \gamma\grave{a}\rho \ \tau\grave{a} \ \sigma\chi\acute{\eta}\mu a\tau a \ \epsilon\mathring{v}\theta\rho a v\sigma\tau\acute{a} \ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu, \ a\acute{\iota} \ \delta\grave{\epsilon} \ \acute{a}\tau o\mu o\iota \ \acute{a}\pi a\theta\epsilon\hat{\iota}s \ \acute{a}\theta\rho a v\sigma\tau o\iota$. I have little doubt that both $\epsilon\mathring{v}\theta\rho v\pi\tau os$ (for which see Democr. A135 [2.120.20, 23] DK) and $\epsilon\mathring{v}\theta\rho a v\sigma\tau os$ were used by Epicurus himself.

Foula, Shetland Islands   MARTIN F. SMITH

---

[3] For photographs of fr. 69, see *AJA* 75 (1971), pl. 84 fig. 8, and M. F. Smith, *The Philosophical Inscription of Diogenes of Oinoanda* (Wien, 1996), pl. 33 fig. 100.

[4] *AJA* 75 (1971), 372. $\epsilon\hat{v}$ $\acute{o}\rho a$ was adopted by G. N. Hoffman, *Diogenes of Oenoanda: A Commentary* (Diss., Minnesota, 1976), 104, A. Barigazzi, 'Sui nuovi frammenti di Diogene d'Enoanda', *Prometheus* 3 (1977), 14, and A. Casanova, *I frammenti di Diogene d'Enoanda* (Firenze, 1984), 307. $\acute{o}\rho\hat{a}$ was first suggested by C. Millot, *Étude de l'inscription du mur de Diogène d'Oenoanda* (Diss., Lille, 1972), 151.

[5] For a statement of Diogenes' normal practice concerning hiatus and for a list of exceptions, see n. 2, 112.

[6] A list of uncorrected errors by Diogenes' stone-cutters is given by me (n. 2), 106–7. Add now $\kappa\tau\hat{\eta}\sigma\theta a\iota$ for $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\tau\hat{\eta}\sigma\theta a\iota$ in inventory number YF 189 l. 10. At the time of writing YF 189, which was found in November 1997, is unpublished.