

# ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

VOL. XII

HELSINKI 1978 HELSINGFORS

I N D E X

Jaakko Frösén	Le transport du blé et le rôle des ἐπίπλοοι.....	5
Paavo Hohti	Einige Bemerkungen über die Aischines-Papyri.....	19
Iiro Kajanto	The Hereafter in Ancient Christian Epigraphy and Poetry.....	27
Saara Lilja	Descriptions of Human Appearance in Pliny's Letters.....	55
Ulla Nyberg	Über inschriftliche Abkürzungen der gotischen und humanistischen Schriftperioden.....	63
Martti Nyman	On the Alleged Variation <i>dēlēniō</i> ~ <i>dēlīniō</i> .....	81
Teivas Oksala	Warum wollte Vergil die Aeneis verbrennen?.....	89
Tuomo Pekkanen	Critical and Exegetical Notes on Tac. Germ. ....	101
Leena Pietilä-Castrén	Some Aspects of the Life of Lucius Mummius Achaicus.....	115
Eeva Ruoff-Väänänen	The Roman Senate and Criminal Jurisdiction during the Roman Republic.....	125
Juhani Sarsila	Some Notes on <i>virtus</i> in Sallust and Cicero.....	135
Heikki Solin	Analecta epigraphica L - LVI.....	145
Holger Thesleff	Notes on the New Epicharmean 'Iatrology'.....	153
Toivo Viljamaa	Livy 1,47,1-7: A Note on the Historical Infinitive.....	159
Henrik Zilliacus	Euripides Medeia 214-221 und Ennius	167
De novis libris iudicia	.....	173

NOTES ON THE NEW  
EPICCHARMEAN 'IATROLOGY'

H o l g e r   T h e s l e f f

Eric Turner, with Eric Handley as his deuteragonist, recently published an interesting papyrus fragment of Doric tetrameters.<sup>1</sup> Their reasons (49-54, 57f.) for regarding the piece as Epicharmean - in a broad sense - seem to me on the whole convincing. Some details may however require modification.

The problem of the short vowel plural accusative ending of o and α stems (50) is indeed a complicated matter. The tendency to use the short form before consonant and the long form before vowel, seen in some Cretan inscriptions,<sup>2</sup> cannot as far as I know be ascertained elsewhere. In general the short form, where it occurs, is a less common variety beside the long form. In literary Doric prose the short form does not appear at all.<sup>3</sup> In Doric poetry it is used for metrical convenience without any conspicuous preferences in sandhi or syntax (such as using the short form in unstressed words, as Epich. fr. 170,13 Kaib. τὸς ἀνθρώπους would suggest).<sup>4</sup> In the extant Epicharmea, note in addition to the instances mention-

---

1 WS N.F. 10, 1976, 48-60.

2 Buck, Greek Dialects<sup>2</sup>, § 78; cf. Thumb & Kieckers § 141,18b, Schwyzer Gr. Gr. 1,556 with ref.

3 Cf. H. Thesleff, Introd. to the Pythag. Writings, Acta Acad. Aboensis, Hum. 24,3, Åbo (Finland) (1961), 85; 92-96. But to some extent this may be due to a normalising tradition.

4 Gow, in his edition of Theocritus, 1,LXXIII n.1, is hardly right in assigning the short forms to Coan influence.

ed by Turner and Handley (which are from the Ἄρπαγὰς and from Alcimus' collection respectively), from the Ἦβας γάμος fr. 42,3 Kaib. πορφύρεας, but 10 τᾶς (relative); fr. 54,2 καλλίστοῦς (but the context is not certain); fr. 67 ἐκτραπελογάστοῦς; from the Μεγαρύς fr. 90,1 πλευρᾶς; from the Σευρήνες fr. 124,1 ἀφύας. Most cases of plural accusative stand in anceps position or before consonant, and the normal spelling of o stem accusatives in such cases is -οῦς.<sup>5</sup> I do not think there is sufficient material to indicate positively that the usage of the papyrus is Epicharmean in particular, nor indeed whether it is authentically Epicharmean or Pseud-epicharmean. - In this connection it may be noted that δυσπνοος in v. 24 of the papyrus is unlikely to be an accusative plural, as Handley tentatively suggests (59), because the normal spelling would be -οῦς unless the short form is required by the metre.

For the metrical problems of v. 17 (Turner 51), see below.

It is true that τεσσάρων v.3 (Turner 51) is the only clearly non-Doric form in the piece (viz., the only form that is not easily acceptable in literary Doric). The correct Doric form would be τεττόρων,<sup>6</sup> and the author has not used it, as is shown by the metre. Rather than explaining the long first syllable as an occasional Epicharmean homerism, I would interpret it as a normal Pseudepicharmean lapsus.

There is at least one additional linguistic indication that the text was produced in the 4th century rather than in the 5th (or 6th). The connective δῆ seen in v. 3 and, probably, in v. 6 (if there is no eavesdropper, see below), is more typical of 4th century than of 5th century Greek;<sup>7</sup> and two instances in this brief fragment are together rather symptomatic.

For ἦ ὄτι and the eavesdropper, see below.

5 E.g. fr. 42 passim, 88, 136,2, 161,1; 'Pseudepich.' fr. 254,5, 255-257.

6 E.g. Epich. fr. 149,2, 3 Kaib. - not τεττόρων which is pseudo-Doric and only found in Timaeus Locrus as far as I know.

7 Denniston, Greek Particles<sup>2</sup>, 237f.

\*

The main part of the fragment I would read as follows:

- 2 αὔτις ἐνλαυτός, διότι ἐν αὐτὸς αὐτῶι πάν[τ' ἔχει.  
 τεσσάρων δὴ δεῦ λαβεῦν ὥραν τριμήνων λ[όγον, ὅκα  
 ὁ νοσέων νοσεῦ τις ἢ ὁ τι. πολλάκις γὰρ τυγχ[άνει  
 5 κατ τὰς ἀλικίας ἐκάστας καὶ τὰς ὥρας ταὶ γ[όσου  
 συμπύτνουσαι. τοῦτο δὴ 'στι χαλεπὸν, αὖ κα [τ]υγ[χάνη  
 παιδίωι χειμῶνος ὥραν συμπετοῦσα τις γ[όσος.  
 ἔστι γὰρ χειμ[

Comments:

V. 2 αὔτις may sound a bit strange here, and the reading is not perhaps absolutely certain. But weak 'adversative' αὔθις (αὔτις) seems to have been in colloquial use in the 4th century.<sup>8</sup>

I accept Parsons' supplement of the verse as practically certain. The problem of the relation of this etymologising line to Euripides fr. 862 Nauck<sup>9</sup> is particularly interesting in view of the other contacts known to exist between Epicharmean and Euripidean sentences.<sup>10</sup> In this case at least a direct dependence is probable considering the specific iambo-trochaic formulation ἐν αὐτὸς αὐτῶι πάντα in both passages. I suspect that Euripides, the pupil of the sophists, should be given the priority.

Vv. 3 - 4. With some modification of Handley's supplement, and accepting his motives for excluding the eavesdropper from the scene (59), I would read λαβεῦν...λ[όγον which makes perfect sense, and [...ὅκα]...νοσεῦ τις ἢ ὁ τι which produces three 'variables' to be taken into account in curing diseases, season, patient and symptom: "Now, one must take account of four three-monthly seasons when the patient, whoever he is, is ill, or whatever (he suffers from)". The combination ὁ νοσέων...τις seems to be in order; in

8 Cf. Alexis fr. 245,8 Kock; and Men. Sam. 626(281), 637(292) to which Turner refers.

9 ἐνλαυτός is called so ὁθούνεκα | ἐν (αὐτὸς) αὐτῶι πάντα συλλαβῶν ἔχει.

10 See the references in Vorsokr. 1<sup>8</sup> 194.

addition to the Sophoclean illustration produced by Handley (59), one might refer to the Aristotelean ὁ τῆς ἀνθρώπου.<sup>11</sup> It is curious that a similar elliptic use of ἢ ὅτι has been found in, and indeed only in Epicharmus;<sup>12</sup> the exact context is unknown, but the commentary glosses ἢ ὅτι as ἢ τὸ τυχόν and paraphrases ῥᾶστα ἄν τοῦτ' ἐργασάμην ἢ τὸ τυχόν which presumably implies the sense "or whatever you like". And this sense, by the way, would not really suit the eavesdropper theory which requires in ἢ ὅτι the meaning "or something of the sort".

Vv. 4 - 5. The 'schema Pindaricum' with proleptic τυγχ[άνει is hardly very remarkable though no exact parallels have been recorded in the handbooks.<sup>13</sup> The author may have begun constructing his verse with the more sophisticated νοσηματα in his mind.

V. 6. Possibly the author felt πύτνω to be the authentic Doric present corresponding to the Doric aorist ἔπετον which he employs in v. 7. We can hardly prove that πύτνω is not Doric; but we can reasonably assume that it is a pseudo-Doric archaism, as it is very commonly used in tragedy.

Vv. 6 - 7. [τ]υγ[χάνη and τῆς γ[όσος are in my opinion rather unavoidable supplements (in spite of Turner's doubts, 56; cf. Handley 59). The photograph does suggest τῆς, and I understand Turner (cf. 53) would not regard it as entirely impossible.

V. 12. Rather ἐφή[βωι than hyper-Doric ἐφά[βωι, but there are of course many possibilities.

V. 13. A form or derivation of νοῦσος is even less likely because the stem νοσ- is used elsewhere in the papyrus.

V. 17. I cannot see that ἔπτ' ἐν τᾷ φύσει is satisfactory (Turner 56), even from a factual point of view: the hebdomatic speculations of Ps.-Hippocrates Hebd., chapters 1-11, have been shown to be late Hellenistic by J. Mansfeld.<sup>14</sup> The photograph would seem

11 LSJ s.v. τῆς A II 10.

12 Ὀδυσσεὺς Αὐτομόλος, P.Oxy. 2429 fr.1 (a) col. II 10; Turner 51.

13 Kühner & Gerth 1,68f.; Schwyzer 2,608; cf. Handley 59.

14 The Ps.-Hippocratic Tract Π. ἑβδομάδων, Philosophical Texts and Studies 20, Assen 1971; this does not of course apply to ch. 16 to which Turner refers in an earlier passage (55).

to admit, for instance, -τοῦ τὸ θεῖος ἔπει' (= ἔπειται; or ἔπει' = Att. ἔπεσε) ἐν ταῖς φύσει.

V. 24. δυσπνόςος, see above.

So I would agree with Handley (60) that the verses are more likely to come from a 4th century 'iatrologising' treatise than from a 5th century comedy. And so the Χύρων is a more likely source than Dinolochus' 'Ιατρός (Turner 53f.). For the Χύρων, cf. also Vorsokr. 1<sup>8</sup>,209 (with references). It is clear from fr. 290 Kaib. that the Χύρων was composed in trochaic tetrameters, and that the speaker was a doctor (presumably the Centaur) giving medical advice.