SHORTER NOTES

SELINUS OR ATHENS?

Hephaestion, *Encheiridion* 8.3 (p. 25.17–20 Consbruch) cites from 'Aristoxenus of Selinus' a verse in anapaestic tetrameter catalectic printed in both West's *Iambi et elegi Graeci*[2] (2.45) and Kassel–Austin's *Poetae comici Graeci* (1.7) as that author's only fragment:

τίς ἀλαζονίαν πλείσταν παρέχει τῶν ἀνθρώπων; τοὶ μάντεις.

He also tells us that this Aristoxenus is mentioned by Epicharmus (fr. 77 K–A) as an innovator:

οἱ τοὺς ἰάμβους καὶ τὸν †ἄριστον τρόπον
ὃν πρῶτον εἰσαγήσαθ' Ὡριστόξενος …

The context has encouraged the emendation of the vague and unmetrical ἄριστον to ἄμπαιστον (Vaillant, acc. corr. West) or ἀμπαίστων (ἀνα- Bentley); the anapaestic tetrameter catalectic, being attested for Epicharmus in fr. 108, almost certainly in fr. 150, and probably in fr. 110, may not unreasonably be credited to his predecessor, who in turn is plausibly taken to be the person confused with Aristoxenus ὁ μουσικός by Eusebius s.a. Ol. 29.1 (= 664 B.C.).[1]

Wilamowitz was not convinced: 'der Vers den Hephaistion gibt … scheint mir den Stempel der Fiktion deutlich an sich zu tragen'.[2] Eduard Hiller supposed that an author had been found, apparently at random, for a fatherless verse.[3] Kaibel too roundly declared it a 'versus spurius',[4] but again without giving a reason; the nearest he came was to read doubt into Hephaestion's μνημονεύεται.[5] The absence of arguments permitted Otto Crusius to assert that 'ten to one' not only was the line authentic, but Epicharmus had quoted it.[6] More recently, Martin West accepted the attribution of anapaests, and of this verse, to Aristoxenus; he took the contemporary generic term to have been ἴαμβοι, favouring Porson's emendation in Epicharmus 77.1, καττὸν ἀρχαῖον.[7] It therefore seems appropriate to state the case against authenticity.

[1] See Kassel–Austin Test. 2; this is before either of the dates given for the foundation of his city (651 B.C. Diod. Sic. 13.59.4; 628 B.C. Thuc. 6.4.2), but all such dates go back to over-precise interpretations of generation-based guesses.

[2] 'Die megarische Komödie', *Hermes* 9 (1875), 319–41, at 334 n. 2.

[3] 'Der Vers des Maison', *NJbb* 113 (1876), 784–6, at 784.

[4] *Comicorum Graecorum fragmenta*, 1/1 (Berlin, 1899), 87.

[5] *RE* Aristoxenos 5 (2.1056).

[6] 'Aristophanes von Byzanz bei Zenobios und der Vers des Maison', *Philologus*, Suppl.-Bd. 6 (Göttingen, 1891–3), 274–80, at 278, cf. id., *Paroemiographica: Textgeschichtliches zur alten Dichtung und Religion* (SB München, 1910/4), 59 n. 2; both reprinted with original pagination in the supplement to the *Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum* (Hildesheim, 1961).

[7] M.L. West, *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus* (Berlin, 1974), 34–6; in his edition he obelizes.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983880999022X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Two arguments may be adduced, one less convincing than the other. To take the weaker first: if the Selinuntine was indeed responsible for our verse, it is by some two centuries the earliest example of the abstract meaning 'charlatanry', let alone of ἀλαζονία as opposed to the ἀλαζονεία familiar from Attic comedy,[8] formed from ἀλαζονεύομαι as εἰρωνεία from εἰρωνεύομαι; 'Aristoxenus' apart, the first attestation of -ία is in Demetrius of Scepsis ap. Strab. 12.3.23, p. 552C, of two places near Scepsis called Argyria and Alazonia (εἰ καὶ ἔστι, as Strabo comments of such blatantly speaking names),[9] Otherwise the earliest instances (as edited) are from the second century A.D., and none is in verse. Nevertheless, it is hard to determine a date before which no poet might have coined the form at need, and even Homer is no stranger to the nonce abstract (suffice it to think of πολυκοιρανίη); nor, if we suppose a Hellenistic or imperial fiction, is it easy to establish a context or a cause. Who might wish to father a line on this Aristoxenus, and what put fraudulent soothsayers in his head?

More serious exception must be taken to the nominative plural μάντεις, for which in any dialect other than Attic we should expect μάντιες, attested in Homer, Pindar, Herodotus, the Corpus Hippocraticum and other non-Attic sources including Epicharmus fr. 9.1 K–A; it will not do to say that the Attic nominative plural -εις in *i*-stems is an archaism, directly continuing Indo-European *-*eyes* like Latin -*es* and Sanskrit -*ayaḥ*, and therefore might have survived elsewhere, since it is passing strange it should have left a trace in this obscure poet's one line, not cited for it, and not in such an author as Homer or Pindar.[10] To be sure, Empedocles 31B146.1 D–K (= 132.1 Wright) shows that a fifth-century Siceliote might use the Attic form in epicizing Ionic, as being conveniently alien; it does not show that a seventh-century Siceliote would even have known it, when Athens was of neither cultural nor political significance.[11] Nor will it avail to prise Aristoxenus loose from his Eusebian moorings, far from secure as they are, to bring him within a generation of Epicharmus: an Atticism remains hard to account for even in Pisistratean times.

Despite the Sicilian antecedents, the anapaestic tetrameter is best known from Attic Old and Middle Comedy;[12] but if we assign such an origin to our fragment, we need to explain the Doric vocalization πλείσταν and the Doric definite article τοί, for marching anapaests are characterized by Attic diction. The dialectal tincture recalls the representation of genuine or bogus doctors:[13] thus Crates fr. 46 K–A ἀλλὰ σικύαν ποτιβαλῶ τοι καὶ τὺ λῆς ἀποσχασῶ.[14] In Menander's *Aspis*, a character pretending to be a doctor attempts to give a Doric tincture to his words. The reason is given at

[8] Note Choeroboscus' comment in his scholion, p. 234.16–18 Consbruch.

[9] The parallelism tells against the neuter Ἀλαζόνιον adopted by Gaude (fr. 45) from Strabo 13.1.45, p. 603C (fr. 29).

[10] It has also been suggested that the Attic form is not ancient, but a shortening of πόληες; A.L. Sihler, *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin* (New York, 1995), 314. Naturally such accusatives as πόλεις in Homer and other early authors are misspellings of πόλῑς (duly restored by West), from Indo-European *-*ins*, cf. Argolic and Cretan -ινς, Republican Latin -*is*.

[11] Callimachus fr. 194 [= *Iamb.* 4], at line 90, appears to show μάντεις in an Ionicizing poem; that is no proof that Hipponax would have used it. Such late concoctions as the 'Delphic' oracle cited in Phlegon, *FGrH* 257F1.7 = no. 488 Parke–Wormell and *Or. Sib.* 3.229 need not concern us.

[12] To be sure, the antepenultimate position is rarely contracted, and never in Aristophanes (cf. K–A on fr. 548); but for exceptions see Crates fr. 19.1,4, Cratinus fr. 143.2, Philyllus fr. 12.1, cf. M.L. West, *Greek Metre* (Oxford, 1982), 94.

[13] See Sandbach on Menander, *Aspis* 374, whose references I have updated.

[14] Since metre is unaffected, and neither Crates nor our source (Pollux 4.183) wrote accents, I restore Doric perispasis with Edmonds, even though most Doric would have said -ξῶ.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983880999022X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Alexis fr. 146 K–A: medical advice given in Attic is ignored, but let the doctor say the same thing in Doric and we are impressed. When Epicrates fr. 10.28–30 makes a character recount a Sicilian doctor's scorn for the Academic botanists, in the midst of an Attic *πνῖγος* the doctor is said to come *Σικελᾶς ἀπὸ γᾶς*, as in England we might say 'frae bonnie Scotland', his origin conferring the more authority on his drastically expressed contempt.

Since our verse is an accusation against soothsayers, the use of the anapaestic tetrameter suggests an *agôn* between a doctor and a soothsayer, each calling the other a charlatan, in which no doubt the soothsayer, speaking in iambic tetrameters, gave at least as good as he got. Although several Attic comedies are known to have featured doctors and druggists;[15] we do not know enough to suggest a candidate;[16] nevertheless, I suggest that it is to Athens and not Sicily that we should look. Perhaps indeed there was a comic poet Aristoxenus from whom the line was quoted for its content and whom Hephaestion or his source confused with the Selinuntine mentioned by Epicharmus; alternatively, the quoting author (in whatever work or context) was Aristoxenus the Musician, whom an intermediate author conflated with the author quoted.[17]

67 St Bernard's Road,
Oxford OX2 6EJ

LEOFRANC HOLFORD-STREVENS
aulus@gellius.demon.co.uk
doi:10.1017/S000983880999022X

[15] See Kassel–Austin on Aristophon fr. 3, Arnott on Alexis fr. 146.

[16] It would be over-speculative to suggest that the *agôn* preceded the arrival onstage of Anaxandrides' *φαρμακόμαντις*, who (speaking in Attic) is not ashamed to be an *ἀλαζών* (fr. 50 K–A), and might reasonably claim to combine both professions, though the poet is known to have used both the anapaestic and the iambic tetrameter (see frr. 10 and 35 K–A respectively). Neither he nor any other writer is known to have revived the Aeschylean *ἰατρόμαντις*.

[17] Who was perhaps not named; cf. the quotations from Euripides and Sophocles in fr. 50 Wehrli. A similar conflation in the source of Gell. *NA* 15.20.8 is posited by Hugh Lloyd-Jones, 'Alexander Aetolus, Aristophanes and the Life of Euripides (Alexander Aetolus fr. 7 Powell, Aristophanes fr. 676b Kock', in *Storia, poesia e pensiero nel mondo antico: studi in onore di Marcello Gigante* (Naples, 1994), 371–9, Aristophanes being cited by Alexander in a *Βίος Εὐριπίδου*; the objections of Enrico Magnelli, *Alexandri Aetoli testimonia et fragmenta* (Florence, 1999), 223–7 do not include any reason for supposing that Alexander would have composed such a text.

'UNDOING THE WINESKIN'S FOOT': ATHENIAN SLANG?[1]

ἀσκοῦ με τὸν προύχοντα μὴ λῦσαι πόδα …
πρὶν ἂν πατρώιαν αὖθις ἑστίαν μόλω.

That I should not undo the wineskin's jutting foot … until I had come once more to my hearth and home. (Euripides, *Medea* 679 and 681[2])

[1] My thanks to Dr Emma Stafford, Professor Judith Mossman and the anonymous referee for their comments on earlier drafts. This paper was completed before I learnt of the existence of S. Halliwell, *Greek Laughter: A Study of Cultural Psychology from Homer to Early Christianity* (Cambridge, 2008).

[2] Text from D.J. Mastronarde (ed.), *Euripides: Medea* (Cambridge, 2002), 135. Translation

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983880999022X Published online by Cambridge University Press