

QUOTATIONS OF EPICURUS COMMON TO DIOGENES OF OINOANDA AND DIOGENES LAERTIUS

INTRODUCTION

The philosophical inscription, which, probably in the first half of the second century AD, Diogenes of Oinoanda caused to be carved on the wall of a stoa in his home-city, is a valuable source of information about Epicureanism, not only because his own expositions of epistemology, physics, and ethics are informative and reliable, but also because he quotes letters¹ and maxims written by Epicurus.

My present concern is with those maxims of Epicurus quoted by Diogenes of Oinoanda (hereafter D.O.) which occur also in Book 10 of Diogenes Laertius (hereafter D.L.) and/or in the *Sententiae Vaticanae*, a collection of 80 Epicurean maxims contained in codex Vaticanus graecus 1950 and first published in 1888.² The writing of the article was prompted by the appearance, late in 1999, of Miroslav Marcovich's critical edition of D.L. published by Teubner³ – an edition which includes the *Sententiae Vaticanae* in an appendix.⁴

The maxims of Epicurus quoted by D.O. were carved in a continuous band running through the margin beneath the columns of his *Ethics*⁵ – a band which, since the *Ethics* occupied the lowest inscribed course of the wall, underscored not only that treatise, but also the entire inscription. Most

¹ *Letter to mother* (fr. 125–126 Smith), *Letter to a student of rhetoric (Hermarchus?)* (fr. 127), *Letter to Dositheus* (fr. 128). In fr. 72 Diogenes seems to be closely following the wording of another letter, in which Epicurus described how he nearly perished in a shipwreck. On the authorship of *Letter to mother*, see M. F. Smith, *Diogenes of Oinoanda: the Epicurean inscription* (Napoli 1993) 555–558.

² K. Wotke, “Epikurische Spruchsammlung”, *WS* 10 (1888) 175–201, including Nachtrag by H. Usener (pp. 199–201). In the *editio princeps* there are 81 maxims, not 80, but *Sent. Vat.* 56–57 almost certainly belong to a single maxim.

³ M. Marcovich, *Diogenis Laertii vitae philosophorum* (Stuttgart – Leipzig 1999) I: *Libri I–X*; II: *Excerpta Byzantina et indices*.

⁴ 1815–826.

⁵ *Kyria Doxa* 16 is quoted not only below the *Ethics*, but also, as we shall see, in a passage of D.O.'s own work.

of the quotations are of the *Kyriai Doxai* (*Principal Doctrines*), a collection of 40 moral sayings preserved by D.L. and placed at the very end of his work (10. 139–154).⁶ D.O. also quoted several other sayings, of which, as we shall see, one is probably one of the *Sententiae Vaticanae*, and another is probably taken from Epicurus' *Letter to Menoeceus*, while the rest cannot be identified with known sayings of Epicurus. D.O. quoted at least 13 *Kyriai Doxai*,⁷ and, although his quotations are only fragmentarily preserved,⁸ they are not without interest and significance, for they show some variations from the text of D.L. and sometimes help us to correct it.

Marcovich is aware that D.O. quotes some of the *Kyriai Doxai*, but it is unfortunate that his knowledge of him is thirty years out of date. The edition which he cites is that of Chilton,⁹ published by Teubner in 1967. In 1968, eight years before Marcovich began to collate the manuscripts of D.L.,¹⁰ I inaugurated the British investigations at Oinoanda – investigations which so far have added 135 new fragments to the 88 found at the end of the nineteenth century and known to Chilton. Ten of these, excavated in November 1997 and published in October 1999,¹¹ could not have been seen by

⁶ I do not mean, of course, that D.O. used D.L. as a source. If my dating of D.O. to the first half of the second century AD is correct, he predates D.L., who cannot have written earlier than the second half of the second century, as is shown by his mention of Sextus Empiricus (9. 87, 116) and Sextus' pupil Saturninus (9. 116). For full discussion of the date of D.O., see Smith, *Diogenes* (n. 1) 35–48; on the dating of D.L., see especially J. Mejer, *Diogenes Laertius and his Hellenistic background*, *Hermes-Einzelschriften* 40 (Wiesbaden 1978) 57–58.

⁷ *K.D.* 1–6, 8, 10, 13, 16, 25, 29, 32. (For the possibility – not a very strong one – that D.O. also quoted *K.D.* 37 or part of it, see below, under *K.D.* 37.) The *Sententiae Vaticanae* also include 13 *Kyriai Doxai* – 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 12, 13, 15, 17, 19, 27, 29, 35. Seven maxims (*K.D.* 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 13, 29) occur both in D.O. and in the Vatican collection.

⁸ The carving of the maxims in a single line below the columns of the *Ethics* has the disadvantage that, since many columns of the *Ethics* are missing, no maxim is preserved in its entirety, but the advantage that the quotations, since each runs across several stones, can sometimes help us to determine the order of *Ethics* fragments and the size of the gaps between them: see Smith, *Diogenes* (n. 1) 82, 99–100. One may contrast the state of preservation of the maxims below the *Ethics* with that of another collection of maxims (fr. 97–116, NF 130–132), probably composed by D.O. himself, which was displayed at a higher level in the inscription: although this second collection is by no means complete, some of its maxims are completely preserved, the reason being that each one occupies the whole or part of a single column of 9–11 lines, carved on a single stone with no overflow onto another stone.

⁹ C. W. Chilton, *Diogenis Oenoandensis fragmenta* (Leipzig 1967). For his choice of Chilton's edition, see Marcovich (n. 3) I 802.

¹⁰ Marcovich (n. 3) I xvii: "Codices conferre anno 1976 coepi".

¹¹ M. F. Smith, "Excavations at Oinoanda 1997: the new Epicurean texts", *AS* 48 (1998) 125–170.

Marcovich, but the others are included in my edition of D.O., published in 1993,¹² and in a companion-volume of illustrative material, published in 1996.¹³ Marcovich's deteriorating health, he informs us (and I am very sorry to hear it), prevented him from putting the final touches to his work,¹⁴ but this does not explain his ignorance of most of the new material from Oinoanda: even if he did not know of my 1993 edition (and it is to be noted that his bibliography contains several items which appeared after this date), he should have known of my publication of 124 new fragments, in a monograph and succession of articles, between 1970 and 1984.¹⁵

I shall now mention every maxim of Epicurus quoted both by D.O. and by D.L., updating Marcovich's use of D.O., where necessary, and commenting on some other points of significance. Fragment-numbers of D.O. are, unless otherwise shown, those of my edition, while NF denotes a new fragment of D.O. (i. e. a fragment found in 1969–1997) as published before republication in my 1993 edition or, in the case of NF 125–135, discovered after 1993.

K.D. 1 (D.L. 10. 139) = *Sent. Vat.* 1 = D.O. fr. 29 lower margin. The version in *Sent. Vat.* shows some minor variations from that given by D.L.: it omits ὥστε before οὔτε ὀργαίς and has ἀσθενεία ... πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα, not ἀσθενεῖ ... πᾶν τὸ τοιοῦτον. The relevant parts of D.O.'s quotation have not yet come to light.

K.D. 2 (D.L. 10. 139) = *Sent. Vat.* 2 = D.O. fr. 30 lower margin. Thus far, but only thus far, D.O. and the Vatican collection agree with the order in D.L. Although we cannot always be certain about the order of the fragments of D.O.'s *Ethics*, and therefore about the order of the maxims which he quoted, we can see that his arrangement of *Kyriai Doxai* is not the same as D.L.'s: for example, he has *K.D.* 3 and 4 later than 6, 8, 10. He quotes 1 and

¹² Smith, *Diogenes* (n. 1).

¹³ M. F. Smith, *The philosophical inscription of Diogenes of Oinoanda* (Wien 1996). One tiny, insignificant piece (NF 125 = fr. 182), found in 1994, appears in this volume (pp. 233–234), but not in my 1993 edition.

¹⁴ Marcovich (n. 3) 1 xvii: "Operi manum dare extremam valetudo ingravescentes prohibuit".

¹⁵ I fear that this failure to be aware of recent scholarship is not an isolated case. I give three other examples, and it will be noted that in each case the work of which Marcovich is ignorant was published more than 10 years before his edition. Under *K.D.* 3, citing a passage of Demetrius of Laconia, he refers to the edition of V. De Falco (1923) instead of to E. Puglia, *Demetrio Lacone. Aporie testuali ed esegetiche in Epicuro* (Napoli 1988). Under *K.D.* 1 he refers to K. Wilke's edition of Philodemus, *De ira* (1914), instead of to G. Indelli, *Filodemo. L'ira* (Napoli 1988). On D.L. 10. 13, 15–16 he cites K. Krohn's edition of Hermar-

2 first, because they are of outstanding importance, dealing respectively with fear of the gods and fear of death, which are the two chief obstacles to the attainment of ἀταραξία. As for the rest, an important consideration, probably the most important consideration, determining their disposition was his evident wish to bring about, wherever possible, a link between the content of the maxim and the content of the columns of the *Ethics* immediately above.¹⁶ This is a matter to which I shall have occasion to return later, in connection with D.O.'s probable quotation of *Sent. Vat.* 33 and *Letter to Menoeceus* 130–131.

K.D. 3 (D.L. 139) = D.O. fr. 34 lower margin. Marcovich gives no indication that D.O.'s version shows several variations from that of D.L. In the first sentence D.L. has παντὸς τοῦ ἀλγοῦντος, D.O. [τοῦ ἀλγ]οῦντος ἅπαντος. The second sentence goes like this in D.L.: ὅπου δ' ἂν τὸ ἡδόμενον ἐνῆ, καθ' ὃν ἂν χρόνον ἦ, οὐκ ἔστι τὸ ἀλγοῦν ἢ τὸ λυπούμενον ἢ τὸ συναμφοτέρον (ἂν before χρόνον and τὸ before λυπούμενον omitted by BP¹CoQ). D.O.'s version, as restored by Usener,¹⁷ is [οἷς δ' ἂν τὸ ἡδόμενον ἐνῆ, καθ' ὃν ἂν χρόνον ἦ, οὐκ ἂν ἔτι ὀχλοῖν]το τῷ ἀλγοῦντι ἢ λυπούμενῳ ἢ συ[ναμφοτέρῳ]. It is to be noted that the variations do not affect the meaning and message of the maxim. How precisely these and other variations – variations other than those which arise from corruptions in the text of D.L. – are to be explained is not known. Since good Epicureans learned *Kyriai Doxai* by heart (Cic. *Fin.* 2. 20), it is possible that quoting from memory is part of the explanation, but speculation is not very profitable.

K.D. 4 (D.L. 140) = *Sent. Vat.* 3 = D.O. fr. 44 lower margin. D.O. agrees with D.L. in reading ἔχουσι τὸ ἡδόμενον ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ ἥπερ, whereas *Sent. Vat.* 3 has ἔχουσιν ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ τὸ ἡδόμενον ἦ.

K.D. 5 (D.L. 10. 140) = *Sent. Vat.* 5 = D.O. fr. 37 lower margin. As Marcovich points out, D.O. confirms Gassendi's restoration of οὐδὲ φρονίμως καὶ καλῶς καὶ δικαίως after δικαίως in D.L.¹⁸ D.O. cannot yet help with the textual problems in the second sentence, where D.L. and *Sent. Vat.* 5 offer different readings, because the surviving quotation does not extend that far, and it is possible that he quoted only the first sentence.

K.D. 6 (D.L. 10. 140) = D.O. fr. 32 lower margin. Marcovich supplies πάντα after ἀνθρώπων and follows Usener in excluding ἀρχῆς καὶ βασι-

chus (1921) instead of F. Longo Auricchio, *Ermarco. Frammenti* (Napoli 1987).

¹⁶ See e. g. Smith, *Diogenes* (n. 1) 471–472.

¹⁷ H. Usener, "Epikureische Schriften auf Stein", *RhM* 47 (1892) 414–456 at 445. Before συναμφοτέρῳ Usener restored τῷ, which is wrong.

¹⁸ Strangely, we have the same omission in D.L. 10. 132 (*Letter to Menoeceus*), where the

λείας after φύσιν. Unfortunately D.O.'s quotation of this part of the maxim has not yet come to light.

K.D. 8 (D.L. 10. 141) = *Sent. Vat.* 50 = D.O. fr. 32 lower margin. Marcovich refers to D.O. fr. 26 Chilton (= fr. 32. I–IV Smith), the lower margin of which gives part of the first of the maxim's two sentences and agrees with *Sent. Vat.* 50 in reading καθ' ἑαυτήν, whereas the "best" manuscripts of D.L. have καθ' ἑαυτό. However, the fragment published by Chilton in 1967 was augmented in 1974 by the discovery of a new passage (NF 42 = fr. 32. V–VII), which contains in its lower margin part of the second sentence of *K.D.* 8. I first presented the new text, with detailed comments on D.O.'s version of the maxim, in a contribution to a volume published in 1976.¹⁹ It is particularly puzzling that Marcovich does not know this piece of mine, because he includes in his bibliography two other contributions, by A. Laks and D. Sedley, to the same volume. Of D.O.'s quotation of the second sentence we have ποιητικὰ ἐνίων ἡδονῶν πολλα[α]πλ[α]σί[ους]. *Sent. Vat.* 50 has the same, except that it omits ἡδονῶν. D.L., on the other hand, reads τινῶν ἡδονῶν ποιητικὰ πολλαπλάσιους.

K.D. 10 (D.L. 10. 142) = D.O. fr. 33 lower margin. D.O. has καὶ τῶν ἀλγηδόνων after ἐπιθυμιῶν, and Bignone, followed by several other editors, restores the words in D.L.; moreover, D.O. confirms Usener's suggestion of ἐκπληρουμένοις for εἰσπληρουμένοις. Marcovich adopts both these readings. However, he does not record that D.O. has ἐδίδασκε for D.L.'s ἐδίδασκειν,²⁰ or that his wording towards the end of the maxim, after τῶν ἡδονῶν, seems to have been somewhat different from D.L.'s, though the text is too fragmentary for us to be sure exactly how it went; for suggestions, see the *apparatus criticus* in Smith, *Diogenes of Oinoanda* (n. 1) 206. On the question of whether Marcovich is right to follow von der Mühl in deleting καὶ ἀλγηδόνων after θανάτου, D.O. cannot help, for his quotation of the relevant bit has not been found. Finally, it is to be noted that in 1997 I recorded at Oinoanda a new fragment, NF 128, which bears parts of fr. 33. IV–V and, in its lower margin, the letters πάντα, part of πανταχόθεν, from *K.D.* 10. See Smith, "Excavations" (n. 11) 146–152.

K.D. 13 (D.L. 10. 143) = *Sent. Vat.* 72 = D.O. fr. 35 lower margin. D.O.'s version begins, as Marcovich records, [οὐθὲ]ν ἦν ὄφελος rather than, as in D.L. and *Sent. Vat.* 72, οὐθὲν ὄφελος ἦν, but the rest of his quotation has

first sentence of *K.D.* 5 also occurs. There the same supplement was proposed by Stephanus.

¹⁹ M. F. Smith, "More new fragments of Diogenes of Oenoanda", in J. Bollack / A. Laks (eds), *Études sur l'Épicurisme antique* (Lille 1976) 279–318 at 297–300.

²⁰ The variation was first reported by me in "New fragments of Diogenes of Oenoanda",

not come to light, which is a pity, for the texts of D.L. and *Sent. Vat.* 72 have several variations.

K.D. 16 (D.L. 10. 144) = D.O. fr. 49 lower margin and fr. 71. II. 9–13 = Stobaeus II. 8. 28 p. 159. 17–19 Wachsmuth. Both fr. 49 and fr. 71 were discovered by me after the appearance of Chilton's edition of D.O., and Marcovich is ignorant of their existence, although more than a quarter of a century has passed since their first publication.²¹ Fr. 49 gives us μέγιστα καὶ κυριώτατα ὁ λογισμὸς – words which are not in dispute. The quotation in fr. 71, which belongs not to the *Ethics*, but to another writing of D.O., probably his *Letter to Dionysius*, is more extensive and useful than what is preserved in fr. 49 lower margin. Introduced with the words ὡς λέγει Νε[οκλείδης] (i. e. Epicurus, who was son of Neocles), it goes like this: βραχέα σοφῶ [τύχη παρεν]πίπτει,²² τὰ δὲ μέγιστα] καὶ κυριώ[ω]-τα[τα ὁ λογισμ]ὸς διο[ικ]εῖ κ[αὶ διώκ]ησεν. The somewhat fuller version given by D.L. is: βραχέα (οἱ βραχεῖα) σοφῶ τύχη παρεμπίπτει, τὰ δὲ μέγιστα καὶ κυριώτατα ὁ λογισμὸς διώκηκε (sic) (οἱ διώκει) καὶ κατὰ τὸν συνεχῆ χρόνον τοῦ βίου (some manuscripts omit τοῦ βίου). Stobaeus reads βραχεῖα, διώκηκε, and κατὰ τὸν βίον καὶ συνεχῆ χρόνον,²³ and omits ὁ and διοικεῖ καὶ διοικήσει. There are two points to note about D.O.'s version. The first is that it supports those manuscripts of D.L. which give βραχέα. The second point is that it is relevant to discussion of Usener's proposals concerning διώκηκε, which he emends to διώκησε, and διοικεῖ καὶ διοικήσει, which he considers to be a gloss on διώκησε and deletes. Although D.O.'s version is not the same as that given by the manuscripts of D.L. and includes (if my restoration is correct) διώκησεν, it differs also from the text favoured by Usener, and it is to be noted that it includes διοικεῖ. If one takes account both of D.O.'s διοικεῖ καὶ διώκησεν and of Stobaeus' διώκηκε, one can see that there is nothing to be said for accepting Usener's alterations to the text of D.L.

Before leaving *K.D.* 16, one may mention that excavations at Oinoanda in 1997 brought to light NF 132, a maxim probably composed by Diogenes himself, which puts across the same message as *K.D.* 16:²⁴ εἰς ὀλίγα τοῦ

AJA 75 (1971) 357–389 at 388.

²¹ Fr. 71, found in 1970, was first published as NF 8 in Smith, "New fragments" (n. 20) 369–371; fr. 49, discovered in 1972, was first published as NF 20 in my *Thirteen new fragments of Diogenes of Oenoanda* (Wien 1974) 15–20.

²² = παρεμπίπτει. On D.O.'s orthographical practices, see Smith, *Diogenes* (n. 1) 117–118.

²³ Emended by Heeren to κατὰ τὸν βίου συνεχῆ χρόνον.

²⁴ Jonathan Barnes, in a letter of 2 December 1999, makes the point that "Epicurus limits

βίου παρενπείπτει τὸ αὐτόματον, ὃ δὴ τύχην ὀνομάζομεν, τῶν δὲ πλείστων ἡμεῖς κρατοῦμεν (“Seldom does the fortuitous, which we term chance, interfere with life, and usually it is we who are in control”).²⁵

K.D. 25 (D.L. 10. 148) = D.O. fr. 40 lower margin. Only nine letters of D.O.’s quotation are preserved: [ἐπαν]οίσεις ἕκα[στον]. Marcovich follows von der Mühl and H. S. Long in stating that D.O. gives ἐπανοίσεις. The statement is incorrect, and the error can be traced back to William’s Teubner edition of D.O.,²⁶ which von der Mühl and Long used. It is strange that Marcovich repeats the error, for the edition which he cites is that of Chilton, who gives the correct reading.

K.D. 26 (D.L. 10. 148). δυσπόριστοι (DF), which Marcovich wisely prefers to the syntactically awkward δυσπόριστον (BP), is now strongly supported by D.O. NF 131, discovered in 1997. Lines 1–6 of the new fragment read as follows: αἱ κεναὶ τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν, ὥσπερ αἱ δόξης καὶ τῶν ὁμοίων, οὐ μόνον εἰσὶν κεναί, πρὸς δὲ τῷ κεναί, καὶ δυσπόριστοι. NF 131 proves that, contrary to the belief of some scholars, δυσπόριστος can be used of a desire (“difficult to fulfil”) and not just of a thing desired (“difficult to obtain”). For the full text of NF 131, see Smith, “Excavations” (n. 11) 158–160; and for detailed discussion of its relevance to the textual problem in *K.D.* 26, see my article “Epicurus’ *Kyria Doxa* 26 and a new fragment of Diogenes of Oinoanda”, *Hyperboreus* 4 (1998): 1, 193–195.

K.D. 29 (D.L. 10. 149) = *Sent. Vat.* 20 = D.O. fr. 39 lower margin. Marcovich, knowing only Chilton’s edition of D.O., is unaware that in my edition I show that what previous editors considered to be two separate passages (fr. 35–36 Chilton) is in fact one passage (fr. 39 Smith), fr. 35 Chilton being an immediate continuation of fr. 36 Chilton. Marcovich thinks that only fr. 35 Chilton carries part of *K.D.* 29, but in fact, as I demonstrate, fr. 36 Chilton does so as well, and the “new” piece of text, though small, is not entirely without significance, for it shows a slight variation from *Sent. Vat.* 20 at a point where the text of *K.D.* 29 in D.L. is defective and has to be restored. D.O.’s version of the maxim reads, and is to be restored, like this: [τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν αἱ μὲν εἰσι φυσικαὶ καὶ ἀνανκαῖαι· αἱ δὲ φ]υσ[ι]καὶ γε, [οὐκ ἀνανκαῖαι] δέ· αἱ δὲ οὔτε φυσικαὶ ο[ὔ]τ[ε] ἀνανκαῖ[α], παρὰ δ[ὲ] κενὴν δόξαν γεινόμεναι].

the message to the wise, whereas Diogenes [of Oinoanda] seems to make a general statement about all of us”. It is true that D.O., unlike Epicurus, does not mention the σοφός, but I take it that “we” in ἡμεῖς κρατοῦμεν, as in ὀνομάζομεν, are “we Epicureans”.

²⁵ I have published NF 132 in “Excavations” (n. 11) 160–162.

²⁶ J. William, *Diogenis Oenoandensis fragmenta* (Leipzig 1907) 52 (fr. XLIX).

K.D. 32 (D.L. 10. 150)²⁷ = D.O. fr. 43 lower margin. D.O. fr. 43 occupies two stones (NF 13, 12) which I discovered in 1970.²⁸ Since the discovery postdates the appearance of Chilton's edition, Marcovich is unaware of it. Although fr. 43 carries only six words of *K.D.* 32, the words are of interest. The most widely-accepted text of the first sentence of the maxim, as given by D.L.,²⁹ is as follows: ὅσα τῶν ζῶων μὴ ἐδύνατο συνθήκας ποιεῖσθαι τὰς ὑπὲρ τοῦ μὴ βλάπτειν ἄλληλα (Gassendi: ἀλλά manuscripts³⁰) μηδὲ βλάπτεσθαι, πρὸς ταῦτα οὐθὲν ἦν (Usener: ἦ BHPQ) δίκαιον οὐδὲ ἄδικον. However, some manuscripts, including DFZ, read οὐθὲν ἐστὶν οὐδέ instead of οὐθὲν ἦ, and ἐστὶν is supported by D.O., who has [β]λάπτεσθαι, πρὸς [τα]ῦτ' οὐθὲν ἐστὶν οὐτ[ε]. Sometime perhaps, when more of D.O.'s inscription has been recovered, we shall learn whether he read οὐτε before ἄδικον as well as before δίκαιον, and, more importantly, whether Gassendi's ἄλληλα is correct.

K.D. 37 (D.L. 10. 152) / D.O. fr. 50, discovered in 1975,³¹ bears in its lower margin the letters τεμη and traces of two preceding letters,³² which may possibly belong to the end of the first sentence of *K.D.* 37: [ἐάν τε τὸ αὐτὸ πᾶσι γένηται], ἐά[ν] τε μὴ [τὸ αὐτό]. But, with so little preserved, no certainty is possible: as I pointed out above (in the introduction), not all the maxims quoted in the lower margin of the *Ethics* are *Kyriai Doxai*; moreover, *K.D.* 37 is very long, indeed the longest maxim in the collection, and, unless D.O. quoted only its first sentence, he is unlikely to have included it in his selection.

Sent. Vat. 33 (?) and *Letter to Menoecus* 130–131 (?) = D.O. fr. 47 lower margin. Fr. 47 occupies two stones, NF 44 and NF 14, but the lower margin of NF 44 is broken off and missing, and all the surviving letters of the maxim-bearing line are carried by NF 14, which I discovered in 1970.³³

²⁷ With *K.D.* 32 Marcovich, like other editors, compares Porphyry, *De abstinentia* 1. 12. It would be helpful to add “=Hermarchus fr. 34 p. 73 Longo”.

²⁸ I first published them in 1971 in “New fragments” (n. 20) 376–381, then republished them in 1974 in *Thirteen new fragments* (n. 21) 45–47 after realising that NF 12, as well as NF 13, bears part of *K.D.* 32 and is to be placed immediately after NF 13.

²⁹ This text is not accepted by all editors, however: for example, J. Bollack, *La pensée du plaisir* (Paris 1975) 360–362, retains ἀλλά and, instead of Usener's ἦν, reads ἦ.

³⁰ P seems to indicate a lacuna after ἀλλά.

³¹ First published by me in “Fifty-five new fragments of Diogenes of Oenoanda”, *AS* 28 (1978) 39–92 at 55–57 (NF 60).

³² See the drawing in Smith, *The philosophical inscription* (n. 13) 125.

³³ NF 14 (= fr. 47. III–IV) was first published in 1971 in Smith, “New fragments” (n. 20) 381–384, NF 44 in 1976 in Smith, “More new fragments” (n. 19) 301–304.

On the left we read μαχέσαιτο ἄν, on the right οἱ λειτοί, and in between the stonemason has left a space sufficient for about seven letters – a space which shows that the first two words are the end of a maxim and the second two the beginning of another one.

It is highly probable that μαχέσαιτο ἄν ends a maxim very similar to *Sent. Vat.* 33, which in the manuscript reads as follows: σαρκὸς φωνή τὸ μὴ πεινῆν, τὸ μὴ διψῆν, τὸ μὴ ῥιγοῦν. ταῦτα γὰρ ἔχων τις καὶ ἐλπίζων ἔξειν καὶ ὑπὲρ εὐδαιμονίας μαχέσαιτο. Most editors (J. Bollack is an exception³⁴) have accepted Hartel's emendation of καὶ to κἄν and his addition of Δί after it.³⁵ Marcovich prints the traditional text, but, whilst Δί is almost certainly right in view of the passages quoted in Usener, *Epicurea* no. 602 pp. 339. 16 – 340. 22, κἄν is less certain: if indeed D.O. is quoting *Sent. Vat.* 33, it cannot have been in his version, seeing that he has ἄν after μαχέσαιτο.

What makes it "highly probable" that D.O. is quoting *Sent. Vat.* 33 is not just the significant word μαχέσαιτο, but also the appropriateness of the maxim in this place. As I pointed out above (under *K.D.* 2), a major consideration which influenced the arrangement of the quotations below the *Ethics* was D.O.'s evident desire to create, as often as possible, a link between the subject-matter of a maxim and the subject-matter of the columns immediately above it. Thus, for example, fr. 44, which addresses the question of whether physical pains or mental pains are more serious, has in its lower margin *K.D.* 4, which deals the physical pain. Fr. 47 too is part of D.O.'s discussion of pain: in it he argues a point, made by Epicurus in *K.D.* 4, that physical pain, if severe, is short-lived; and since *Sent. Vat.* 33 also is concerned with physical pain, asserting that those who are free from hunger, thirst, and cold can enjoy godlike happiness, its content would be linked to that of fr. 47.

Let us now turn to the second maxim in fr. 47 lower margin. οἱ λειτοί, if it belongs to a known saying of Epicurus, must be from *Letter to Menoecus* 130–131: οἳ τε (οἱ γὰρ Usener: ὅτι τε von der Mühl) λιτοὶ χυλοὶ ἴσην πολυτελεῖ διαίτη τὴν ἡδονὴν ἐπιφέρουσιν, ὅταν ἄπαξ (Usener: ἅπαν manuscripts³⁶) τὸ ἀλγοῦν κατ' ἔνδειαν ἐξαιρεθῆ: καὶ μᾶζα καὶ ὕδωρ

³⁴ Bollack, *La pensée* (n. 29) 469–470.

³⁵ Hartel's suggestions were published in the *editio princeps*: see Wotke (n. 2) 193. It may be noted that καὶ (without Δί) is found not only in cod. Vat. gr. 1950, but also in the version of the maxim in cod. miscell. Darmstad. 2773: see W. Crönert, *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen* 14 (1897) 562 and *Kolotes und Menedemos* (München 1906; repr. Amsterdam 1965) 10 n. 34.

³⁶ Most editors retain ἅπαν, but ἄπαξ, suggested by Usener, *Epicurea* XXI and adopted by R. D. Hicks in the Loeb edition of D.L., is probably right in view of *Letter to Menoecus*

τὴν ἀκροτάτην ἀποδίδωσιν ἡδονήν, ἐπειδὴν ἐνδέων τις αὐτὰ προσε-
νέγκηται. That D.O.'s οἱ λειτοῖ is indeed the beginning of this passage is
very probable.³⁷ It is to be noted that, since the passage makes the point that,
once the pain of want has been eliminated, perfect pleasure has been
achieved, it, like *Sent. Vat.* 33, would be related, in respect of content, to the
section of the *Ethics* (on pain) in the columns above. It is to be noted, too,
that it would follow on very naturally after *Sent. Vat.* 33.

Martin Ferguson Smith
Isle of Foula, Shetland Islands

В надписи Диогена из Эноанды неоднократно цитируются максимы Эпикура; некоторые из них приводятся и у Диогена Лаэртца. В ряде случаев чтения надписи могут служить основанием для установления аутентичного текста Диогена Лаэртца. Соответствующая сопоставительная работа и была предпринята Мирославом Марковичем в его недавнем издании Диогена Лаэртца. Однако Маркович упустил из виду фрагменты надписи Диогена из Эноанды, опубликованные после 1967 г. Данные заметки восполняют этот пробел.

128 ὅταν δὲ ἀπαξ τοῦτο περὶ ἡμᾶς γένηται and *K.D.* 18 ἐπειδὴν ἀπαξ τὸ κατ' ἐνδειαν ἀλγοῦν ἐξαιρεθῆ, though admittedly in Usener, *Epicurea* no. 417 p. 281. 18–19 we have τὴν παντὸς τοῦ ἀλγοῦντος ὑπεξείρεσιν.

³⁷ If D.L. did quote the passage, he may have stopped at the end of the first sentence, as I first suggested in "New fragments" (n. 20) 384.