

THE INTRODUCTION TO DIOGENES OF OINOANDA'S *PHYSICS*

One of the best-known bits—perhaps the best-known bit—of the inscription of Diogenes of Oinoanda is frs. 2–3,¹ in which the author explains what motivated him to display Epicurean doctrines in epigraphical form.

The fragments, as William² was the first to see, are part of the introduction to Diogenes' *Physics*,³ but, since the *Physics* was meant to be read first,⁴ its introduction serves also as an introduction to the whole inscription. The majority of scholars,⁵ who regard frs. 2–3 as introductory either to the whole inscription (but not to the *Physics* as well) or to the *Physics* and *Ethics*, are clearly mistaken, for the fragments have the distinctive physical and epigraphical features of the *Physics*, and the *Ethics* has its own introduction (frs. 29–30)—a passage that has some marked similarities to frs. 2–3.⁶

The two surviving passages of the introduction to the *Physics* are carved in fourteen-line columns on three stones discovered in the 1880s: Heberdey and Kalinka⁷ (hereafter HK) frs. 57, 58, 59.⁸ HK fr. 57, which bears one column (fr. 3.I), immediately preceded HK fr. 58 (fr. 3.II–VI), a five-column block, which until recently was the

¹ Fragment-numbers in this article are, unless otherwise indicated, those of M. F. Smith, *Diogenes of Oinoanda: The Epicurean Inscription* (Napoli, 1993). The fragment-numbers of Heberdey–Kalinka (n. 7) are used for nineteenth-century finds, when it is necessary to refer to individual stones, for the fragment-numbers in my edition refer to continuous passages, which may, as in the case of fr. 3, occupy more than one stone.

² J. William, *Diogenis Oenoandensis fragmenta* (Leipzig, 1907), xvi–xvii.

³ The work dealt with epistemology, as well as with physics, and the full title, partly preserved as fr. 1, was probably *Epitome on sensation and nature* (περὶ αἰσθήσεως [or -εων] καὶ φύσεως ἐπιτομή).

⁴ See Smith, *Diogenes* (n. 1), 84–5.

⁵ The scholars who disagree that frs. 2–3 introduce the *Physics* are listed in Smith, *Diogenes* (n. 1), 432, where their views are refuted in greater detail than here. To the list add: D. Clay, 'The philosophical inscription of Diogenes of Oenoanda: new discoveries 1969–1983', *ANRW* II 36.4 (Berlin and New York, 1990), 2446–559, 3231–2, at 2458; A. Laks, reviewing my 1993 edition in *REG* 107 (1994), 267–72, at 271–2, who queries my attribution of frs. 2–3 to the *Physics*, while disregarding the arguments for my view and omitting to mention that I regard the introduction to the *Physics* as an introduction also to the whole inscription.

⁶ Fragment 119, one of Diogenes' *Ten-line-column Writings*, which stood higher up in the inscription than the *Physics* and *Ethics* (which occupied the second-lowest and lowest courses respectively), contains part of an introduction which reiterated some points (e.g. philanthropy towards foreigners) made in the introductions to the *Physics* and *Ethics*, but two of its three columns are very fragmentary and it cannot assist with the present discussion.

⁷ R. Heberdey and E. Kalinka, 'Die philosophische Inschrift von Oinoanda', *BCH* 21 (1897), 346–443.

⁸ The fragments were found by members of l'École française d'Athènes—HK fr. 58 by M. Holleaux and P. Paris in 1884, HK fr. 57 by G. Cousin and C. Diehl in 1885, HK fr. 59 by Cousin in 1889. They were rediscovered by HK, of the Austrian Academy's Kleinasiatische Kommission in 1895, and by me in 1968.

largest known piece of the inscription and is now the second largest.⁹ HK fr. 59 (fr. 2), which bears two complete columns and the left part (1–8½ letters) of a third column, does not link up with the other two fragments. That it was not far separated from them is obvious from the content, but it is not immediately obvious whether it preceded them or followed them, and it is with the order of the two passages that this article is primarily concerned. Henceforth I shall refer to HK fr. 59 as fr. 2 and to HK frs. 57–8 as fr. 3.¹⁰

Cousin, the first editor, printed fr. 3 before fr. 2, but did not see that they are closely connected and erroneously placed fr. 63.II–V (HK frs. 37–8), a passage of Diogenes' *Letter to Antipater*, between them¹¹ and associated fr. 2 with fr. 5.¹²

The second editor, Usener, was the first to bring the two passages together. He placed fr. 2 before fr. 3, though without explaining why he adopted this order.¹³ Like Cousin, he was under the misapprehension that frs. 2–3 belong to a letter, assigning them to a second *Letter to Antipater*.¹⁴

HK shared Usener's mistaken belief that frs. 2–3 are part of a *Letter to Antipater* and actually made fr. 3 an immediate continuation of fr. 62, which contains the opening columns of the *Letter to Antipater*, but they reversed his order, placing fr. 3 before fr. 2.¹⁵ They do not explicitly say why they changed the order, but, as evidence for the close connection between frs. 2 and 3 (and, in their opinion, fr. 62 as well), they draw attention¹⁶ to the words *πάλιν γὰρ ἐπαναλήμφομαι* in fr. 2.II.5–6, and presumably they took the view that Diogenes is there reiterating what he said in fr. 3.

The next editor, William,¹⁷ though he never set eyes on the actual stones of the inscription or even on photographs or squeezes of them, was often more successful than his predecessors in assigning fragments to their proper places. As I have said, he was the first to realize that frs. 2–3 belong to the introduction to the *Physics*. He was also the first to give a clear explanation of his preferred order of the two passages. He placed fr. 2 before fr. 3 and says that he has done so for two reasons: firstly, because in fr. 3.I.13–II.2 Diogenes tells us that he has given two *αἰτίαι* for setting up the inscription (*καὶ τὴν δευτέραν οὖν ἀποδοὺς αἵτι[ε]αν τοῦ συγγράμματος*), and one *αἰτία* is mentioned in fr. 2; secondly, because in fr. 3.IV.3–8 Diogenes says that he has already spoken about people's false opinions (*ψευδοδοξία*), and fr. 2 suits these words very well ('quibus verbis . . . optime congruit').¹⁸

William's order has been followed, though not always with complete confidence, by all later editors and translators: Grilli and Chilton, both in their translations and in

⁹ The width of HK fr. 58 is 158 cm. In November 1997 I recorded NF (= New Fragment) 126, which is 165 cm wide. NF 126, which, like HK fr. 58, belongs to the *Physics*, has been published by me in 'Excavations at Oinoanda 1997: the new Epicurean texts', *AS* 48 (1998), 125–70 at 131–44.

¹⁰ For the reason why HK's numbers have been used in this paragraph, see n. 1.

¹¹ G. Cousin, 'Inscriptions d'Oenoanda', *BCH* 16 (1892), 1–70 at 2–6, 34–7.

¹² *Ibid.*, 62.

¹³ H. Usener, 'Epikureische Schriften auf Stein', *RhM* 47 (1892), 414–56 at 430–2.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 419, 430. So far as we know, the inscription contained only one *Letter to Antipater*.

¹⁵ HK (n. 7), 398–402.

¹⁶ HK (n. 7), 350.

¹⁷ William (n. 2).

¹⁸ William (n. 2), xvii.

their Greek texts,¹⁹ Hoffman,²⁰ Casanova,²¹ myself,²² and Étienne and O'Meara.²³ However, as I shall now argue, the order is wrong.

Neither of William's arguments for placing fr. 2 before fr. 3 is persuasive. In reply to his first one, it must be said that in fr. 2 there is no mention of an αἰτία for the inscription, except in restored versions of the mutilated third column, which has been reconstructed by William and later editors (including myself) on the assumption that it preceded fr. 3. It is true that in fr. 2.II.4–III.2 Diogenes does explain that, when he saw people in a bad predicament, wasting their lives, he considered it right to do all he could to help them, but he says (II.5–6) that he is here reiterating a point made in an earlier passage, and we shall see that the earlier passage is undoubtedly fr. 3, where, having described the second of two αἰτίαι for the inscription, he says more about his motives. As for William's second argument, the point which Diogenes is reiterating in fr. 3.IV.3–8 is that 'the majority of people suffer from a common disease, as in a plague, with their false notions about things' (ἐπεὶ δέ, ὡς προείπα, οἱ πλείστοι καθάπερ ἐν λοιμῷ τῇ περὶ τῶν πραγμάτων ψευδοδοξία νοσοῦσι κοινῶς), but in fr. 2 there is no reference to the unenlightened being diseased or plague-stricken, and the mention of their κεναὶ δόξαι or ψευδοδοξία, introduced by William and other editors, including myself, in the passage which immediately preceded fr. 2.I.1,²⁴ is pure conjecture—conjecture based on the supposition that fr. 2 preceded fr. 3.

So William's arguments are circular and do not prove that he is right to place fr. 2 before fr. 3. How can one be sure that he is wrong? The answer is in the text.

Let us look first at fr. 3.III.3–IV.3. The words in italics are particularly significant from the point of view of my argument. Diogenes says:

I wanted, before being overtaken by death, to compose a [fine] anthem [to celebrate the] fullness [of pleasure] and so to help now those who are well-constituted (βοηθεῖν . . . τοῖς εὖσυνκρίτοις). Well, if only one person or two or three or four or five or six or any larger number you choose, sir, provided that it is not very large, were in a bad predicament (διέκειντο κακῶς), I should address them individually and do all in my power to give them the best advice.

¹⁹ A. Grilli, 'I frammenti dell'epicureo Diogene da Enoanda', in V. E. Alfieri and M. Untersteiner (edd.), *Studi di filosofia greca: pubblicazione in onore di R. Mondolfo* (Bari, 1950), 347–435 at 360–2; *Diogenis Oenoandensis fragmenta* (Milano, 1960), 29–34; C. W. Chilton, *Diogenis Oenoandensis fragmenta* (Leipzig, 1967), 1–6; id., *Diogenes of Oenoanda: The Fragments* (London, New York, and Toronto, 1971), 3–4, 26. In the latter work (p. 26) Chilton indicates that he is not completely convinced about the traditional order of frs. 2–3, but finds the arguments for it 'convincing enough in the present state of the text'. His tentative suggestion (p. 25) that HK fr. 57 (fr. 3.I) may have followed rather than preceded HK fr. 58 (fr. 3.II–VI) cannot be right, for there is a clear run-on from the end of fr. 3.I into the beginning of fr. 3.II.

²⁰ G. N. Hoffman, *Diogenes of Oenoanda: A Commentary* (Dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1976), 74–6.

²¹ A. Casanova, *I frammenti di Diogene d'Enoanda* (Firenze, 1984), 82–95. On p. 50 he follows Chilton (see n. 19) in being less than certain that the traditional order of frs. 2–3 is correct, and thinks that 'con ogni probabilità l'incertezza potrà essere superata solo grazie ad un nuovo ritrovamento'.

²² Smith, *Diogenes* (n. 1), 147–52; M. F. Smith, *The Philosophical Inscription of Diogenes of Oenoanda* (Wien, 1996), 47–53.

²³ A. Étienne and D. O'Meara, *La philosophie épicurienne sur pierre: les fragments de Diogène d'Enoanda* (Fribourg and Paris, 1996), 23–5.

²⁴ William (n. 2), 71, suggested that the passage went something like [ὁρῶν τοὺς ταῖς κεναῖς τῆς ψυχῆς δόξαις ἀκολουθοῦντας καὶ μὴ ἀκούοντας σώματος ἐγκλήσεις]. I proposed, in Smith, *Diogenes* (n. 1), 147, [ὁρῶν τοὺς πλείστους τῇ περὶ τῶν πραγμάτων ψευδοδοξία νοσοῦντας καὶ μὴ ἀκούοντας τοῦ σώματος ἐγκλήσεις]—a modification of a proposal which I made in 'Observations on the text of Diogenes of Oenoanda', *Hermathena* 110 (1970), 52–78, at 54.

He then goes on to assert that the majority of people are morally diseased (see the quotation two paragraphs above), and that he wants to help them, including future generations and foreign visitors, by advertising 'the [medicines] that bring salvation' (τὰ τῆς σωτηρίας . . . [φάρμα]κα) (IV.3–VI.2). He says that the efficacy of these medicines has been fully tested (VI.2–4); 'for we have dispelled the fears [that grip] us without justification, and, as for pains (λύπαι), those that are groundless we have completely excised, while those that are natural we have reduced to an absolute minimum, making their magnitude minute' (VI.4–14). The text breaks off here, but it is not unlikely that Diogenes went on to elaborate on his statement about λύπαι, which presumably include pains caused by unnecessary desires,²⁵ and that he made specific mention of such desires. With the list of disturbances given here compare that in fr. 34.VII.1–7, where, after asking what are the disturbances (τὰ ὀχλοῦντα) that prevent us from living a pleasant life, Diogenes mentions fear of the gods, fear of death, fear of pains (ὁ [sc. φόβος] . . . ἀπ' [ἀλγηδ]όνων), and 'desires that [outrun] the limits fixed by nature' (ἐπιθυμίας το[ύς] φυσικοὺς ὅρους [ἐκτρει]χουσαι).

Turning now to fr. 2, we can see that it follows on naturally after fr. 3. When fr. 2 opens, in mid-sentence, Diogenes is referring to the just accusations which the body brings against the soul,

alleging that it is unwarrantably mauled and maltreated by the soul and dragged to things which are not necessary (in fact, the wants of the body are small and easy to obtain—and the soul too can live well by sharing in their enjoyment—, while those of the soul are both great and difficult to obtain and, besides being of no benefit to our nature, actually involve dangers).

(fr. 2.I.1–II.4)

So fr. 2 opens with the conclusion of Diogenes' remarks on unnecessary desires—remarks which, I believe, began in the passage, in all likelihood occupying just one column,²⁶ missing between fr. 3.VI and fr. 2.I. And confirmation that fr. 2 followed fr. 3 is provided by the lines which immediately follow those just quoted:

So, to reiterate what I was saying (πάλιν γὰρ ἐπαναλήμφομαι), observing that these people *are in this predicament* (διακειμένους οὕτως), I bewailed their behaviour and wept over the wasting of their lives, and I considered it to be the responsibility of a good man *to help*, to the utmost of one's ability, *those of them who are well-constituted* (τοῖς εὐσυνκρίτοις αὐτ[ῶν] --- βοη[θ]εῖν).

(fr. 2.II.4–III.2)

Previously I supposed that Diogenes was reiterating what he said in the passage missing before fr. 2.I, a passage which, under the influence of William, I tentatively restored as follows: '[. . . observing that most people suffer from false notions about things and do not listen to the body] when it brings important and just [accusations] against the soul, . . .'. But I now see that he is recalling what he said in fr. 3: notice not only the similarity between the entire passages, but also how διέκειντο κακῶς (fr. 3.III.12–13) is echoed in διακειμένους οὕτως (fr. 2.II.6–7), how βοηθεῖν . . . τοῖς εὐσυνκρίτοις (fr. 3.III.3–5) is repeated in fr. 2.II.14–III.2, and how in each passage Diogenes says that he will act to the best of his ability (fr. 3.III.4–IV.2; fr. 2.II.13).

²⁵ λύπη like ἀλγηδών, can be physical or mental pain. In the only other place where Diogenes uses the word (fr. 149.II.18), he is speaking of desires: καθόλου μὲν γὰρ ὧν οὐκ εἰσιν ὀρέξεις πραγμάτων, περὶ τούτων οὐδὲ λύπηαι τυγχάνουσιν.

²⁶ If I am right in suspecting that just one column is missing, the stone which carried it will have had fairly broad margins left and right, for fr. 3.VI runs to the right edge of HK fr. 58 and fr. 2.I begins at the left edge of HK fr. 59.

Now that the two fragments have been restored to their proper order, one is bound to give some fresh thought to the restoration of what is missing on each side of each of them.

First let us consider fr. 3.I and what preceded. The text of fr. 3.I.1–13 in my 1993 edition²⁷ looks like this:

[ἡθέλησα δ' ἐλέγχειν τοὺς τὴν φυσιολογί]-

[αν αἰτιωμέν]ους ὅτι
[ἡμεῖν συμ]φέρε[ιν οὐ]-
[δὲν δύνατ]αι. ν οὕτω [δ', ὦ]
πο[λείται], καὶ οὐ πολ[ε]-
τερόμενος, διὰ τῇ[ς]
γραφή[ς] καθάπερ πρ[άτ]-
των λέγω ταῦτα, ν δε[ι]-
κνύειν δὲ πειρώμε-
νος ὡς τὸ τῇ φύσει
συμφέρον, ν ὅπερ ἐσ-
τὶν ἀταραξία, καὶ ἐνὶ
καὶ πᾶσι τὸ αὐτό ἐσ-
τιν.

5

10

From the middle of line 3 onwards there are no major problems, although my restorations at the end of line 3 and in lines 4 and 6 are different from those of earlier editors. However, it can be seen that very little survives of the first two and a half lines of the column, down to the punctuation space in line 3—much too little to allow sure reconstruction of the text. In suggesting that Diogenes said something like ‘and I wanted to refute those who accuse natural science of being unable to be of any benefit to us’, I was influenced by William,²⁸ though his wording is rather different from mine and he restores [φιλοσοφίαν] rather than [φυσιολογίαν]. I am now far from certain that the suggestion is correct and, in revising the text for a volume published in 1996,²⁹ I did not show any restorations in the first two and a half lines of the column, except [συμ]φέρε[ιν] in line 2. Even that restoration is not certain, for we could have [συμ]φέρε[ι] or even part of some other verb. Well worthy of serious consideration is a suggestion made by David Sedley and mentioned in my 1993 edition. Doubting the plausibility of my restoration of the beginning of the column and of what preceded it, Sedley thinks that ‘9–13 suggest a different contrast: people are in turmoil because they have such varied and fluctuating views about what [συμ]φέρε[ι] our nature: the aim of the treatise³⁰ is to rescue them by showing that just one thing συμφέρει our nature, viz. ἀταραξία’.³¹

It is impossible to know how many columns are missing before fr. 3.I, but I guess at least two and probably more: as we have seen, Diogenes tells us in fr. 3.I.13–II.2 that he has just given the second reason for his inscription, and the first reason must have been explained in the missing passage; moreover, we learn from fr. 3.IV.3–8 that he has

²⁷ Smith, *Diogenes* (n. 1), 149–50.

²⁸ William (n. 2), 4.

²⁹ Smith, *The Philosophical Inscription* (n. 22), 51.

³⁰ It would be better to say ‘the inscription’ rather than ‘the treatise’ in this context.

³¹ D. N. Sedley in Smith, *Diogenes* (n. 1), 437.

already mentioned that most people are plague-stricken with false opinions. It is possible that his wish to remedy the diseased condition of most people was the first reason for the inscription, though it is to be noted that, when he reiterates the point, he does so in a passage whose introduction (fr. 3.I.13–II.6) suggests that the considerations to be mentioned are additional to the two reasons already given. The fact is that we do not know what Diogenes' first reason was.³²

It is possible that the missing opening passage of the introduction to the *Physics* contained also an appeal to readers to study the work with care. When Diogenes makes such an appeal in the introduction to the *Ethics* (fr. 30.III.5–14), he reveals that he made the same appeal 'a little while ago' ([ἐ]παυχός, fr. 30.III.6–7). Since, as we have seen, he reiterates points inside the introduction to the *Physics*, it would be rash to rule out the possibility that the introduction to the *Ethics* contained two calls for his readers' close attention.³³ But it is quite possible and, in my opinion, more probable, that in fr. 30.III.6–7 he is referring to an appeal which he made in another writing; and if so, the reference 'must be to the *Physics*, which was intended to be read first and immediately preceded the *Ethics*.³⁴ Even if the reference in fr. 30.III.6–7 is to a missing passage in the introduction to the *Ethics*, it is difficult to imagine that the introduction to the *Physics*, which, as we have seen, also introduces the whole inscription, did not contain an appeal for readers' attention: it is an obvious place for one; and it is to be noted both that there is such an appeal in the preface to the *Letter to Pythocles*³⁵ attributed to Epicurus, and that Lucretius, when introducing his exposition of Epicurean physics, calls for Memmius' close attention (1.50–3). Also, the fact that the known columns of the introduction to Diogenes' *Ethics* contain several other points repeated from the introduction to the *Physics* makes it seem all the more likely that his appeal to his readers in fr. 30.III was repeated from it too. However, the appeal in the *Physics* could well have been made not in the passage which preceded fr. 3, but in the passage which separated fr. 2 from fr. 4. It is even possible that an appeal for readers' attention was made in an epilogue to the *Physics*, instead of, or as well as, in the introduction to it, and that the reference in fr. 30.III.6–7 is to this.

Let us turn now to the passage which separated fr. 3.VI and fr. 2.I. I have suggested above that it may well have occupied just one column. The later part of it, if not all of it, was concerned, as we have seen, with unnecessary desires, and in the last lines of it, a passage which is continued in fr. 2.I.1–II.4, Diogenes makes the point, already made by Democritus (fr. 159 DK) and Epicurus (Usener, *Epicurea* fr. 445), that it is not the body, but the soul, which is to blame for causing the pain generated by unnecessary desires. As I have said above, my earlier tentative restoration of what immediately

³² Laks (n. 5), 271, writes: 'La teneur de la première raison nous est en grande partie conservée, par le début du fr. 2, et surtout par la "reprise", explicitement désignée comme telle (fr. 2.II.4–III.2). Le motif est ici la pitié qu'inspire à un homme de bien (fr. 2.II.11–13) le spectacle d'individus dilapidant le temps dont ils disposent en raison de l'emprise qu'exercent sur eux les désirs superflus.' However, since fr. 2 followed fr. 3, Laks's comments lose their validity.

³³ The three columns of fr. 30 were probably cols. VIII–X of the *Ethics*. (For the calculation, see Smith, *Diogenes* [n. 1], 476–8.) Of the columns which preceded, three, probably cols. II–IV of the epitome, are preserved, or partly preserved, in fr. 29. So, if in fr. 30.III.6–7 Diogenes is referring to an appeal made earlier in the *Ethics*, that appeal will have been either in col. I or, much more probably, somewhere in cols. V–VII.

³⁴ See fr. 43.I.8–10, a passage of the *Ethics*, in which the *Physics* is called 'the writing before this one'.

³⁵ Epic. *Pyth.* 85. Pythocles is urged to study carefully not only the content of this letter, but also that of the *Letter to Herodotus*.

concluded that the incomplete letter near the worn right edge is probably β. β[ρώματα] seems suitable. No doubt Diogenes is thinking of foods which are luxurious: cf. fr. 29.II.9–10, where, in a passage which is part of the introduction to the *Ethics* and is closely related to the present one, he includes ἀβροδαίματος βίος καὶ τραπεζῶν πολυτέλεια in a list of things which cannot provide true happiness; cf. also fr. 109.1–2, [πολυ]τελῆ βρώμα[τα], Epic. *Men.* 130–2, and Usener, *Epicurea* fr. 207. For the combination of βρώματα and ἀλείμματα (12), cf. Pl. *Criti.* 115b, πώματα καὶ βρώματα καὶ ἀλείμματα φέρων. The punctuation-space between [θέα]τρα and καὶ β[ρώματα] can be paralleled from e.g. fr. 29.III,³⁷ where there are several instances of items in a list being marked off with a space and/or *paragraphe*. In lines 14ff. there is really no way of knowing whether one should restore [τὴν φιλοσοφίαν] (or [τὸ φιλοσοφεῖν]) or [τὴν φυσιολογίαν] (or [τὸ φυσιολογεῖν]), and it does not make much odds, seeing that for the Epicureans the former involves the latter. ‘Philosophy’ derives some support from four occurrences in the introduction to the *Ethics* (frs. 29.I.1, 29.I.7, 29.II.14, 30.I.7), ‘natural science’ from frs. 4.II.3, 5.I.2, 5.I.10 and from e.g. Epic. *Sent.* 11, 12. I first suggested *φυσιολογίαν* for William’s *φιλοσοφίαν* thirty years ago,³⁸ and I retain a preference for it, because this is the *Physics*³⁹ and in frs. 4–5, which are part of the epitome and now follow fr. 2, not fr. 3, Diogenes attacks those who explicitly or implicitly reject natural science.

To close this discussion of frs. 2–3, I reply to a criticism, made by Laks, of my punctuation and interpretation of fr. 3.II.7ff. It is necessary to quote 3.II.7–III.5, a passage which in my 1993 edition is presented as follows:⁴⁰

II	[ἐν δυ]σμαῖς γὰρ ἤδη [τοῦ β]ίου καθεστη- [κότ]ες ν (διὰ τὸ γῆρας [καὶ ὅ]σον οὐπω μέλ- [λοντ]ες ἀναλύειν [ἀπὸ τ]οῦ ζῆν), ν μετὰ [καλο]ῦ παιᾶν[ος ὅ]- [πέρ το]ῦ τῶ[ν ἡδέ]-	10
----	---	----

III	ων πληρώματος, ν ἡ- θελήσαμεν, ν ἵνα μὴ προλημφθῶμεν, βο- ηθεῖν ἤδη τοῖς εὖ- συνκρίτοις.	5
-----	--	---

Translation

Having already reached the sunset of my life (being almost on the verge of departure from the world on account of old age), I wanted, before being overtaken by death, to compose a [fine] hymn [to celebrate the] fullness [of pleasure] and so to help now those who are well-constituted.

³⁷ See also e.g. fr. 3.III.6–8.

³⁸ Smith, ‘Observations’ (n. 24), 55.

³⁹ It may be noted that, while Epicurus uses *φιλοσοφία* and *φιλοσοφεῖν* in the *Letter to Menoeceus* (122 *quater*, 132), which is concerned with ethics, he uses *φυσιολογία* and *φυσιολογεῖν* in the *Letter to Herodotus* (37 *bis*, 78) and *Letter to Pythocles* (85, 86), which are concerned with physics.

⁴⁰ The text in Smith, *The Philosophical Inscription* (n. 22), 51, is the same, except that there I do not admit [ὅπερ] in II.13–14.

(Part of this passage was quoted earlier, when the order of frs. 2–3 was under discussion.)

Laks's comments are these:

La ponctuation est bizarre. Smith semble avoir pensé que Diogène ne pouvait avoir écrit sans redondance [ἐν δυσμαίς γὰρ ἡδὴ τοῦ β]ίου καθεστη[κότ]ες διὰ τὸ γῆρας; il a donc rattaché ce dernier membre à la suite, imprimant l'ensemble entre parenthèses. . . . Mais n'est-il pas parfaitement improbable de rattacher διὰ τὸ γῆρας à μέλ[λοντ]ες ἀναλύειν? Les deux participes καθεστη[κότ]ες et μέλ[λοντ]ες, reliés par καί, sont sur le même plan. Les forces vitales déclinent, et cela, à cause du vieil âge; il est même sur le point de quitter la vie. Diogène distingue les deux moments, en fonction de l'urgence.⁴¹

The interpretation which Laks favours is that adopted by HK,⁴² William,⁴³ Chilton,⁴⁴ Clay,⁴⁵ and Étienne and O'Meara,⁴⁶ while the one which I favour is that of Casanova.⁴⁷ That the minority view is correct is virtually proved by an epigraphical feature which Laks overlooks: both before διὰ in 3.II.9 and after ζῆν in 3.II.12, there are, as my text shows, punctuation-spaces, and, whereas the space in line 9 would be inexplicable and inappropriate if διὰ τὸ γῆρας went with what preceded, it is of course both explicable and appropriate if it marks the beginning of a parenthesis—a parenthesis whose end is then indicated by the space in line 12.⁴⁸ To the text printed above I wish to make just one change: in line 10 [καί], which I took to be a particle of emphasis, is unlikely to be right. [νύν] is a possibility, but perhaps one letter too long, and Grilli's [δῆ], accepted by Casanova, is probably the best suggestion.

In 1997 the first excavation at Oinoanda for a hundred years was undertaken and quickly turned up ten new fragments of the inscription.⁴⁹ If all goes according to plan, further excavations will take place over the next few years. There is no doubt that much more of Diogenes' work awaits discovery, and there is always the chance that some of the missing columns of the introduction to the *Physics* will come to light.⁵⁰

Isle of Foula, Shetland Islands

MARTIN FERGUSON SMITH

⁴¹ Laks (n. 5), 272.

⁴² HK (n. 7), 401.

⁴³ William (n. 2), 5.

⁴⁴ Chilton, *Diog. Oen. fragmenta* (n. 19), 4; *Diogenes of Oenoanda* (n. 19), 3.

⁴⁵ Clay (n. 5), 2457.

⁴⁶ Étienne and O'Meara (n. 23), 24.

⁴⁷ Casanova (n. 21), 91.

⁴⁸ Grilli, *Diog. Oen. fragmenta* (n. 11), 9, respects the punctuation-space in II.9, taking διὰ τὸ γῆρας with what follows, but has no punctuation in II.12. Hoffman (n. 20), 75, does the same. The punctuation-space in II.9 was shown by Cousin (n. 11), 3, and observed by Usener (n. 13), 431, S. N. Dragumis, 'Συμμετικά: ἐπιγραφικά φροντίσματα', *Ἐφημερίς ἀρχαιολογική*, 3rd series, 11 (1893), cols. 165–9 at col. 166, and H. van Herwerden, 'Διορθοῦται ἡ Διογένους φιλοσόφου Ἐπικουρείου ἐξ Οἰνόανδων πρὸς Ἀντίπατρον ἐπιστολή', *Sylloge commentationum quam viro clarissimo Constantino Conto obtulerunt philologi Batavi* (Leiden, 1893), 31–9 at 32, but, although Usener, Dragumis, and van Herwerden, working independently, successfully restored most of II.9–11 (διὰ . . . ἀναλύειν), and van H. restored [ἀπὸ τοῦ] ζῆν in II.12 as well, they were impeded by some inaccuracies in Cousin's copy and did not restore, or did not restore correctly, either what preceded or what followed. One of Cousin's mistakes was to fail to show the punctuation-space in II.12. The spaces in both II.9 and II.12 were later to be shown in the drawing of HK (n. 7), 400.

⁴⁹ See Smith, 'Excavations' (n. 9). The British investigations at Oinoanda in 1968–94, which more than doubled the number of known fragments of Diogenes' inscription, did not involve excavation.

⁵⁰ I warmly thank CQ's anonymous referee, whose constructive criticisms enabled me to make several significant improvements to this article.