

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

THE GARDEN OF EPICURUS

M. L. CLARKE

IN *Phoenix* 13 (1959) 73–77, R. E. Wycherley argued that the garden of Epicurus was not, as had generally been supposed, outside Athens between the Dipylon gate and the Academy, but inside the city, close to, perhaps adjacent to, the house in the deme Melite referred to in Epicurus's will (D.L. 10.17). He overlooked one piece of evidence which tells against his view.

In Heliodorus *Aethiopica* 1.16.5 there is a reference to "the garden where the monument of the Epicureans is" (τὸν κήπον . . . ἔνθα τὸ μνημα τῶν Ἐπικουρείων). This must surely be identified with the original Epicurean garden, and Heliodorus's narrative makes it clear that it is outside the city. The house to which Demaenete goes in the hope of indulging her guilty passion for her stepson is outside Athens (1.16.4) and is evidently thought of as near the Epicurean garden. The maid Thisbe arranges to meet Demaenete's husband Aristippus at the garden and from there she conducts him to the house where his wife is. He is already in the country (1.16.2), and she would not have brought him into Athens for the meeting; nor does the story allow sufficient time for her to go back into the city to fetch him (1.17.3).

While on the way back to Athens from the house Aristippus and Demaenete come to the pit (βόθρος) "where the polemarchs make the traditional sacrifices to the heroes" (1.17.5). The heroes were presumably Harmodius and Aristogeiton (see Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 58), whose tomb was on the road from the Dipylon gate and, to judge from Pausanias (1.29.15), on the city side of the Academy. Heliodorus describes the βόθρος as in the Academy (1.17.5), but the term Ἀκαδημία can be used for the whole area between the Dipylon and the Academy proper (Hesychius, Ἀκαδημία; cf. Judeich, *Topographie von Athen*, 404, 414). Wherever the βόθρος was, the house of Heliodorus's story must be thought of as beyond it; probably not much beyond, for the Epicurean garden was certainly on the city side of the Academy, as is shown by Cicero *De Finibus* 5.3, where Atticus, who has walked out to the Academy with Cicero and others, refers to the garden "which we passed just now" (*in Epicuri hortis quos modo praeteribamus*). Professor Wycherley's theory involved the supposition that Cicero and his friends passed the garden before emerging from the city; a more natural interpretation of *modo* would place the garden quite near

the Academy, and Heliodorus confirms that this is the right interpretation.

It follows that the house in Melite was quite separate from the garden. Cicero's letter to Atticus in which he refers to the "ruins in Melite" (*quae de parietinis in Melita laboravi* [*Att.* 5.19.3]) suggests that the property was a town house, to be distinguished from the suburban garden. It is possible that it also had its garden and that Pliny had this in mind when he said that Epicurus was the first to have a garden in a town (*HN* 19.51); more probably Pliny did not distinguish between the actual city of Athens and the suburban area outside the walls.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF NORTH WALES, BANGOR

TEXTUAL COMMENTS ON TIMAEUS 27 C-D

JOHN WHITTAKER

IN AN ARTICLE entitled "*Timaeus* 27 D 5 ff.," published in *Phoenix* 23 (1969) 181 ff., I argued that at *Tim.* 27 D 6 f. we should read not *τί τὸ γιγνόμενον μὲν ἀεί* but simply *τί τὸ γιγνόμενον μὲν*, rejecting the *ἀεί* as a tendentious interpolation inserted into the text in later antiquity in support of the non-literal interpretation of Plato's account in the *Timaeus* of the creation of the universe.

I have in the meantime had occasion to note that the manuscript evidence is much more strongly in favour of my thesis than I had supposed. According to Burnet and Rivaud the *ἀεί* in question is attested in both *Parisinus gr.* 1807 and *Vaticanus Palatinus gr.* 173, but in the case of neither manuscript is this information correct. In the *Palatinus* (fol. 127 verso) the *ἀεί* is lacking entirely, and the *apparatus* of Burnet and Rivaud should be corrected accordingly.¹ In the *Parisinus* (fol. 118 verso

¹It is perhaps appropriate to point out here that the hand of *Vaticanus Palatinus gr.* 173 seems to me indistinguishable from that of *Vindobonensis phil. gr.* 314 fol. 1-112, copied by an otherwise unknown Ἰωάννης γραμματικός in the year 925. The text of the two manuscripts is written in the same minuscule hand and shows the same range of abbreviations, whilst the scholia are in an identical half-uncial hand and display the same mixture of uncial and minuscule elements as well as the same abbreviations. Likewise, the half-uncial script in which titles and subscriptions are executed is identical in the two manuscripts. On the *Vindobonensis* cf. J. Bick, *Die Schreiber der Wiener griechischen Handschriften* (Vienna 1920) 17 (Bick's *Tafel* I shows fol. 110 recto with the subscription of Ἰωάννης γραμματικός); L. G. Westerink and B. Laourdas, "Scholia by Arethas in *Vindob. phil. gr.* 314," *Ἑλληνικά* 17 (1960) 105 ff.; H. Hunger, *Katalog der griechischen Handschriften der österreichischen Nationalbibliothek* 1 (Vienna 1961) 405 f.;