SEPULCHRAL EPIGRAM FOR AN ATHENIAN PHYSICIAN

With a new fragment identified by G. A. Stamires, published by B. D. Meritt, *Hesperia* XXXIII 1964, p. 234, No. 71 with photograph, and highlighted by J./L. Robert, Bull. ép. 1965, No. 143, the sepulchral epigram *IG II²* 5935 is engraved in five epigraphical lines. We present from this arrangement and set up the text in three lines of dactylic hexameters as follows.

Novawv el1j [T1}v a[m.
To]kgya~ [olat
I KeaTwva vv
KvtVTO'P 4l0VT1]WV I raeY1]TTU:w'fjoe "inwOe
Zew'P, 'PtAtovr; oe TvnoVr; oelxvv
I aw<> hiwor;
• Eepijr; vacat

"The earth here has hidden a healer of sickness, endowed with the good Q. Fonteius, of Gargettus; the marble herm dis."

As the Roberts commented, the new confirmed the sense restored Koumanoudes 1) in line 3 and the exact wording restored by him in lines 4–5, but the text presented above is offered in the belief that the publication in *Hesperia* contained two errors of interpretation, worth correcting.

In epigraphical line 2 Meritt mistook the vacant area after Κράτωνα for rational punctuation, so that he interpreted as one sentence all that preceded. Hence, although in line 1 he rightly retained the sense of the first word 2) of Wilhelm’s restoration and discarded the rest, he thought that Σ[...]ης 'Αγάθ[ων] could be the name of the man who erected the monument. The vacant area, however, marks the end of the first metrical line. Vacant areas have been left after each metrical line, but in the two other cases the end of the metrical line coincided with that of an epigraphical line. Missing the second and third, Meritt misunderstood the significance of the first vacant area.

Usually the epigram praised a physician both for his skill and for his morality, as in an epigram at Smyrna published by W. Peek, *Ath. Mitt.* LVI 1931, 124, No. 7, δ'[υφότερον, τέχνην τ’ ἀγαθός καὶ ἱσσα κεφός. At Athens Plutarch’s friend Serapion had attached prime importance to the physician’s

1) S. A. Koumanoudes, 'Ἀττικής ἐπιγραφὴ ἐπιτύμβιοι (Athens 1871) 393.
2) A. Wilhelm, *Beiträge zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde* (Vienna 1907), 160–162, No. 139 restored line 1 eiη[τρων] σ[ορίθη λάμψατα], after rediscovering the inscription and reading the sigma and the breathing signs. Wilamowitz in G. Kaibel’s *Epigrammata graeca ex lapidibus collecta* (Berlin 1878) 108 had restored eiη[τῆα καὶ ἐσθλῶν δ’ ἄνδρα], and Dittenberger, *IG III* (1882) 1527, eiη[τῆα καὶ κεφάλαν ἄνδρα].
morbidity\textsuperscript{3}), and perhaps that is why the uninspired composer of our poem failed to mention the subject’s skill. There is a further possible interpretation, namely that Craton had passed his δοξηματία, which, conducted by laymen, concerned moral character rather than skill\textsuperscript{4}). The inscription, as Wilhelm noted, belongs to the second half of the second century after Christ.

The other error is the conflation of the name K. Φωντίμος Μάξιμος in the prytany catalogues of Hesperia IV 1935, p. 48, No. 11 and XXXIII 1964, p. 224, No. 7 with K. Φωντίμος Κρατός here. They are presumably from the same family, but Maximus and Craton are certainly not identical.

Baltimore, Maryland
James H. Oliver

PUBLILIUS SYRUS AND SATYRICON 55. 5–6

"Rogo", inquit, "magister, quid putas inter Ciceronem et Publilium interesse? Ego alterum patro disertiorum fuisse, alterum honestiorum. Quid enim his melius disi potest?"

So Trimalchio introduces an alleged quotation of the mimographer Publilius Syrus. The tendency has been to allow the “dramatic” function of the attribution to determine the question of its accuracy. The vast majority of scholars, supposing that the comparison of Cicero and the mimographer is foolish, have recognised that a faulty ascription adds still more material to the portrait of a bungling Trimalchio and have accordingly pronounced the verses spurious\textsuperscript{3}). A pair of passages in the two Senecas, however, provides neglected evidence that the verses are of Publilian authorship and that the comparison has a distinguished precedent.

The elder Seneca is discussing a rhetorical vitium: quod ex captione unius verbi plura significantis nascitur (Contr. 7. 3. [18]. 9). Cassius Severus defends Publilius against the charge that he is responsible for the vitium. It is, he says, the fault of those who should imitate quae apud eum [sc. Publilium] melius essent dicta... ut illum versum, quo aiebat unum versus inveniri non posse meliorem:

\textsuperscript{4} N. Lewis, „Exemption of Physicians from Liturgy“, BASP II 1965, 87–92.