

SOPHOCLES *OEDIPUS TYRANNUS* 334-340

- OIA. οὐκ, ὦ κακῶν κάμιστε, καὶ γὰρ ἂν πέτρον
φύσιν σὺ γ' ὀργάνειας, ἔξερεῖς ποτέ, 335
ἀλλ' ὡδ' ἄτεγκτος κἀτελεύτητος φανῆ;
TEIP. ὀργὴν ἐμέμφω τὴν ἐμήν, τὴν σὴν δ' ὀμοῦ
ναίουσαν οὐ κατεῖδες, ἀλλ' ἐμὲ ψέγεις.
OIA. τίς γὰρ τοιαῦτ' ἂν οὐκ ἂν ὀργίζουτ' ἔπη
κλύων, ἃ νῦν σὺ τήνδ' ἀτιμάζεις πόλιν;
337 ὀρμήν L^{ac}

Editors have been strangely reluctant to admit *ὀρμήν*, the uncorrected reading of L. Almost without exception¹⁾ they have accepted the correction *ὀργήν*, and then, to remove the apparent contradiction thus arising from Teiresias' words in 337-8, have been obliged to take *ὀργήν* as 'stubborn temper' or the like. Granting the notorious confusion between *ὀργή* and *ὀρμή* in mss. tradition I suggest that here if anywhere we have a classic case of *lectio difficilior potior*.

References to anger abound in this passage: apart from 335 and 339 see also 344-5 and 364. If then we read *ὀργήν* (and grant that *ὀργάνειας* is transitive) surely in the sequence *ὀργάνειας - ὀργήν - ὀργίζουτ'* the meaning can be nothing but 'anger'. But this clearly will not fit in with 337-8.

Booth's²⁾ solution to the problem was to make *ὀργάνειας* intransitive and to construe *πέτρον φύσιν* as an internal accusative (= 'you must have an *ὀργή* of very rock'). This, to say the least, is somewhat tortuous, and the aorist tense - as Booth fully realised - tells against it. Although we cannot adduce a parallel for the transitive usage of *ὀργάνειν* it is a well-known fact that many verbs in *-αίνω* (and in *-εύω* and *-ύνω*) may be either transitive or intransitive³⁾. If so, the words *καὶ γὰρ κτλ.*

1) L. Roussel in his edition of the play (Paris 1940) seems to be the only exception. However, his interpretation differs from mine in two important respects: (1) Roussel would not agree that *ὀργήν*, if correct, *must* mean 'anger'. Although he prefers *ὀρμήν*, he considers *ὀργήν* a possible reading 'à cause du sens, assez large, de *ὀργή*'; (2) he takes *ὀρμήν* as 'tendances naturelles', a quite different and, I would suggest, much less appropriate, interpretation than the one I offer below.

2) *Classical Quarterly* N.S. viii (1958), 142-3.

3) Cf. *Oed. Col.* 1282 for a transitive use of the normally intransitive *δυσχεραίνω*.

explain, as they would seem naturally to do so, why Oedipus is driven to call Teiresias ὁ κακῶν κάκιστε: 'for you would anger a very stone'⁴).

Oedipus then asks if Teiresias intends to remain impervious to his pleas for information, to which Teiresias replies (reading ὀργὴν): 'you blame my desire'⁵ (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, or 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 ἀπεγκτος κάτελεύτητος.

It would therefore seem unobjectionable in principle to take ὀργάνειας 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 ἄληθες. He shows no sign of anger – the meaning which I maintain ὀργὴν 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 τοῖς προειρημένοις τοὺς κόσμους δεῖ καὶ πᾶσαν σύγκρισιν
πεπερασμένην τὸ ὁμοειδὲς τοῖς Θεωρουμένοις πυκνῶς ἔχουσαν
νομίζειν γεγονέναι ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀπειροῦ.....

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

5) For this usage of ὀργή cf. e.g. *Philoctetes* 236-7: τίς προσήγαγεν
χρεῖα; τίς ὀργή; (?almost τί βουλόμενος), and Plato *Phil.* 35d τὴν τε ὀργὴν
καὶ ἐπιθυμίαν. Cf. also Hesychius s. v. ὀργή. βουλή, ἐπιθυμία.

The words τὸ ὁμοειδὲς τοῖς Θεωρουμένοις πυκνῶς ἔχουσιν 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 ἔχουσιν, not with Θεωρουμένοις. 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 ὁμοειδὲς ... πυκνῶς ἔχουσιν is not merely a little obscure, it is virtually without meaning. Yet to take πυκνῶς with Θεωρουμένοις 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 ἔχουσιν 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 πύκνωσις and πύκνωμα have important technical meanings for Epicurus – a πύκνωμα in this sense is 'a packing together of atoms in some particular arrangement' – cf. πύκνώμασι D. L. X. 105²). So here in place of πυκνῶς ἔχουσιν read πύκνωμα ἔχουσιν. 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 ἐξῆς 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 πύκνω see Epicurus fr. 27. 16. 2 Arrighetti, πυκνότης fr. 24. 17. 2 and 24. 42. 9, πύκνωσις fr. 27. 20. 1, all with the meaning 'thickening'. πυκνός 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 see³) has come into existence from the infinite...'. Palaeographically an angular displacement of *M* at an early stage could easily have been read as Σ . The occurrence of the phrase *ἐν πικνώμασι τισι δμιχλοειδέσι* in D. L. X. 115 shows that Epicurus (or conceivably an imitator) was interested to classify *πικνώματα* by their appearances, and suggests that *τὸ ὁμοειδὲς πύκνωμα* was just the kind of technical expression which it would have been natural for him to use in the *Letter to Herodotus*.

University of Manchester

G. B. Kerferd

A HUMANIST CONJECTURE IN TIBULLUS,

1, 9, 61

illam saepe ferunt convivia ducere Baccho

Thus the received text. In cod. Laur. 33, 11 *ferant* is read¹). This humanist conjecture was described as 'evident richtig' by G. Luck, who compared the present subjunctives in lines 54, 56, 57, 58, 59 and 63²). He did not, however, explain how a correct *ferant* came to be corrupted to *ferunt* in a context so rich in present subjunctives. And a close look at that context reveals that the couplet 61f. is not on all fours with what precedes. Although Luck has since returned to *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 *πικνώματα*) that we see', cf. D. L. X. 50.

1) B. L. Ullman, *Achilles Statius' Manuscripts of Tibullus*, in *Didascalicae, Studies in honor of A. M. Albareda* edited by S. Prete, New York 1961, 458.

2) *RhMus* 105, 1962, 350.