explain, as they would seem naturally to do so, why Oedipus is driven to call Teiresias ὁ μακάων νάκιστε: ‘for you would anger a very stone’

Oedipus then asks if Teiresias intends to remain impervious to his pleas for information, to which Teiresias replies (reading ὅμηρον): ‘you blame my desire’ (to keep silent) but you do not see clearly the one that dwells with you’ (the desire to find out the truth, with the undoubted double entendre ‘the female one who lives together with you’). Teiresias is not, of course, retorting to Oedipus’ charge that he has roused him to angry words: he is replying to the charge of being hard-hearted and evasive.

At 339 Oedipus’ repeated reference to his anger is not, as Booth would have it, ‘a very weak repetition of the idea already expressed more forcibly in lines 334–5’, but an attempt to justify his censure of Teiresias, about which Teiresias has just complained. It is anger which has driven Oedipus to call Teiresias ἄτεγκτος κάτελευκίτης.

It would therefore seem unobjectionable in principle to take ὀργάνεις as transitive and to remove any reference to Teiresias’ anger at 337. In fact, I suggest that a closer examination of this passage and its immediate context will show beyond any reasonable doubt that Teiresias keeps his temper under control until perhaps 350 with its sarcastic ἄληδες. He shows no sign of anger – the meaning which I maintain ὅμηρον would have to carry at 337 – only a resigned determination to maintain silence regardless of the unfounded charges of Oedipus.

University of New England, Australia

Alan S. Henry

ON DIOG. LAERT. X. 73

Diogenes Laertius X 73 (Epicuri Epistula ad Herodotum):

ἐπὶ τε τοὺς προερημένους τοὺς κόσμους δεῖ καὶ πᾶσαν σύγκρουσιν πεπερασμένην τὸ ὀμοιὲς τοῖς θεωρημένοις πυκνῶς ἐξουσιαν νομίζειν γιγνόναι ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀπείρου...

4) ‘Stone’, not ‘rock’: see Kamerbeek Oedipus Tyrannus (The Plays of Sophocles IV), 89.

5) For this usage of ὅμηρος, see e.g. Philoctetes 236–7: τὶς προσήγαγεν χελα; τὶς ὅμηρος; (almost τὶ βουλόμενος), and Plato Phil. 53d τὴν τε ὅμηρον καὶ ἐπιθυμίαν. Cf. also Hesychius s.v. ὅμηρος, βουλή, ἐπιθυμία.
The words τὸ ὀμοιεῖδες τοῖς Θεωρομένοις πυκνῶς ἔχουσαν are difficult to understand. Bailey, *Epicurus the extant remains* p. 244 writes: Bignone translates ‘like in kind to the things which we constantly see’, but the order of the words is strongly against this, and πυκνῶς must go with ἔχουσαν, not with Θεωρομένοις. It will mean then ‘exhibiting continuously, i.e. throughout its extension, a likeness in appearance to the things we see’. The expression is a little obscure and it is possible that Epicurus is intending to exclude from his statement the bodies of the gods, which though of atomic structure, were not made ‘like the things we see’.

But the expression τὸ ὀμοιεῖδες ... πυκνῶς ἔχουσαν is not merely a little obscure, it is virtually without meaning. Yet to take πυκνῶς with Θεωρομένοις which is the other alternative, is not satisfactory either, as apart from the less usual position of the adverb in relation to the participle (which would be acceptable if that was all) it introduces by implication a contrast between things seen πυκνῶς, and things seen but not seen πυκνῶς which seems to have no point here at all.

Although πυκνῶς ἔχουσαν is the reading of all reported manuscripts, the adverb is not found elsewhere in Epicurus or in Epicurean testimonia1). Moreover, its meaning is not ‘continuously’ but either ‘thickly, densely’, or ‘frequently, repeatedly’ i.e. ‘continually’ but not ‘continuously’. But πυκνῶσις and πύκνωμα have important technical meanings for Epicurus – a πύκνωμα in this sense is ‘a packing together of atoms in some particular arrangement’ – cf. πυκνώματι D. L. X. 1052). So here in place of πυκνῶς ἔχουσαν read πύκνωμι ἔχουσαν. The meaning will then be ‘In addition to what has already been said we must suppose that the worlds and every finite compound with an

1) I am very grateful for the opportunity given to me to confirm this point by consulting the unpublished index to Usener’s *Epicurea* in the Philologisches Seminar in the Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität at Bonn.

2) τὸ ἔξω τὸ πύκνωμα in D. L. X. 50 probably refers to the successive thickening of the image received in perception, but its exact meaning in this passage is far from clear. It certainly cannot mean ‘reduction to scale’ as De Witt, *TAPA* 70 (1939) 418 would have it. The other occurrence of the term is more general in meaning (D. L. X. 36). For πυκνῶ see Epicurus fr. 27. 16. 2 Arrighetti, πυκνῶτης fr. 24. 17. 2 and 24. 42. 9, πυκνῶσις fr. 27. 20. 1, all with the meaning ‘thickening’. πυκνῶς in D. L. X. 88 and 103 has the same meaning (‘thick’), while it has the meaning ‘frequent’ in D. L. X. 35 and 62 and fr. 6. 29 Arrighetti.
atomic structure similar in appearance to the things we see\(^3\) has come into existence from the infinite...? Palaeographically an angular displacement of \(M\) at an early stage could easily have been read as \(\Sigma\). The occurrence of the phrase \(\text{ἐν πυκνόμοσι} \tauιοι \text{ὁμοιοειδέοις}\) in D. L. X. 115 shows that Epicurus (or conceivably an imitator) was interested to classify \(\text{πυκνόματα}\) by their appearances, and suggests that \(\text{τὸ ὁμοειδὲς πύκνομα}\) was just the kind of technical expression which it would have been natural for him to use in the \textit{Letter to Herodotus}.

University of Manchester          G.B. Kerferd

A HUMANIST CONJECTURE IN TIBULLUS,

\(^{1, 9, 61}\)

\textit{illum saepe ferunt convivia ducere Baccho}

Thus the received text. In cod. Laur. 33, 11 \textit{ferant} is read\(^1\). This humanist conjecture was described as ‘evident richtig’ by G. Luck, who compared the present subjunctives in lines 54, 56, 57, 58, 59 and 63\(^2\). He did not, however, explain how a correct \textit{ferant} came to be corrupted to \textit{ferunt} in a context so rich in present subjunctives. And a close look at that context reveals that the couplet 61 f. is not on all fours with what precedes. Although Luck has since returned to \textit{ferunt} in his Artemis edition of Propertius and Tibullus (Zürich 1964), it is perhaps still worth while to trace the movement of Tibullus’ thought in this part of the poem and to show how appropriate to his argument is the indicative in line 61.

\(^3\) A possible alternative rendering would be ‘similar in appearance to those (i.e. the \textit{πυκνόματα}) that we see’, cf. D. L. X. 50.


\(^2\) RhMus 105, 1962, 330.