die Gesamtheit gerade nicht so typisch ist, weil er dazu passende Sprüche angezogen und dauerhafter bei sich festgehalten hat, als es sonst in dieser Literatur üblich war.

Berlin

Gotthard Strohmaier


This is the second, and concluding, volume of Di Gregorio’s edition, containing supplementary bibliography, text with apparatus and translation, commentary, and indexes of words used by Herodas and of topics discussed in the commentary. I reviewed vol. 1 in this journal 73, 2001, 170–1, and what was said there applies, with one exception, also to this.

That exception is a great improvement in the arrangement of the commentary: we now have a more traditional general introduction to each mimiamb, covering subject, characters, sources, etc., followed by more detailed discussion, with cross-references between the two where necessary (but that from pp. 83–4 to 65 is missing, and strangely, 5.27 is discussed more fully at p. 125, with regard to 5.77–9, than in its proper place, with no reference on p. 90). Against this has to be set a tendency to place details in parentheses within general sentences (e.g. on p. 318 the first paragraph of 18 lines consists of one sentence taking up most of lines 1 and 2 and four words in line 8, with two parentheses filling up the remainder); this does not make it easy either to follow the general sentence or to find the details.

The text includes the remaining five mimiamb from the London papyrus (omitting, reasonably, the three minimal unplaced fragments, Teubner edition p. 35) and the four quotations in Athenaeus and Stobaeus, but not mentioning Degani’s attractive suggestion that Ἡρόδατος should be read for Ἡρόδοτος in Pollux 2.152. The only major revision of a reading in the papyrus, 8.46 ΚΗΛΑΛΑΞΑΝ, i.e. κηλαλαξάν, is mistaken: it undoubtedly has ΚΗΛΑΛΑΞΑΝ.1 The supplement in 7.43, εὐπροενίν μούχθους, is possible, but the passage remains obscure. The other new supplement proposed, 8.68 υάλων γὲ καλό̣ῦ, is too long; Di G.’s comparison with 7.2, where the same space contains 9 letters, is misconceived, as two of these are narrow iotas. The accent in 6.25 βεττάτος is not mentioned, nor are several spaces between letters and words (Di G. insists, p. 157, that these are sometimes meaningful, although they are sometimes not: he does not explain how this distinction can fail to be arbitrary). There is a lack of clarity in the apparatus on 6.19 (‘κ supra ν’ del. scr.’ means ‘litterā κ supra litteram ν primam deletam scriptā’).

---

1 As all previous editors have reported, and as has been confirmed and clarified for me by Dr Scot McKendrick of the British Library: the first half of the second A and the second half of the following A are visible, and there is a gap between these capable of being filled by the remainder of these letters – the two fragments here being mounted too closely together; these two partial letters cannot be reduced to one A.
Di G. takes a distinctly conservative approach to the text, frequently favouring not only the papyrus but its first hand, and not only in matters of dialect.

At 5.85 he explains why he does not adopt the attractive conjecture of Headlam ὀμελατιν: one should have to suppose that Herodas put a hapax in Bitinia’s mouth, and that a haplography in the transmission was followed by alteration of the now unintelligible τν to τη; not everyone finds this implausible. He adopts the first hand’s λεπρος in 6.36 as the more unusual expression, and its ὀψν in 6.38 as the usual one. He defends 6.81 δούκη (understood as ‘like a slave’, because he admits it cannot be taken with ἡ Βριτανία; obscure in the context) and 10.1 ἧλιον (to which my objection is not so much the uniqueness of the use as the impossibility of the sense ‘year’). In 8.19 he follows the vulgate ἑσόμαι as if it were the tradition: but the papyrus has no breathing or accent, and Wackernagel’s ἑσόμαι is not a conjecture but an interpretation, which gives a correct Ionic form rather than an unparallelled mixed one. In 6.70 the traces in the papyrus may be read as either Ionic ἐφευ or Attic ἐφευ: Di G. opts for the latter on the grounds that the papyrus normally writes τ for ετ; but this habit is very far from invariable. In several places Di G. appears to suggest that Herodas had the option of putting a spondee in the second foot, but chose not to (pp. 96, 172, 309); Hipponax may possibly have done things like this, but no Hellenistic poet could have.

In places where the reading of the papyrus was improved in course of time or fragments of it were correctly placed, the earlier conjectures or supplements inevitably became obsolete; but that does not stop Di G. from listing them in full (pp. 243, 250, 255 etc.). Another habit which lengthens the commentary unnecessarily is to refer to characters as ‘la protagonista del mimo’ and to earlier writers as ‘lo studioso italiano/inglese/tedesco’ and the like instead of by name (this occasionally is also confusing: p. 254 foot ‘l’editore inglese’ is Headlam, although Knox, Cunningham and Rutherford have been named since him; p. 384 ‘il filologo inglese e quello tedesco’ means not Edmonds who immediately precedes, but Knox [and Herzog] from several lines previously; it is not made clear either that Knox’s supplement is here adopted by Herzog and Terzaghi). Also one is given full citations of books which should be known to all users (e.g. Jebb’s Sophocles on pp. 171 and 180 [the third edition of the O. C. should be cited rather than the first]; Fraser et al., Lexicon of Greek Personal Names, passim, with the various editors of each volume listed on each occasion; however the use of this work is to be welcomed, cf. especially p. 113 on Κόος). Even more superfluous is the information that γάφ normally comes second in a clause (p. 97).

Some other citations are odd: in ‘Kühner–Gerth, II 1’ and ‘II 2’ (p. 180 etc.) either Gerth or II is superfluous; for comic fragments it is hardly necessary to cite Kock’s number, volume and page as well as those of PCG. P. 128 top suggests that Di G. is unaware that Bekker’s Anecd. VI is the same as Bachmann’s Anecd. I, out-of-date knowledge of lexicographical matters is also shown on p. 362 (the Etym. Gud. is now known not to derive from, but to use the same sources as, the Etym. Gen.). The contributions of Headlam and Knox to the 1921 edition, scrupulously marked in it, are sometimes confused, to the benefit of the former (pp. 230, 356, 367, 421) or of the latter (pp. 399–400, 402).

Despite the fulness of the commentary there are occasions when only a reference to some earlier work is given, when information on what is said there would be helpful: e.g. to Meister on 5.19 γουνάτων (p. 86) and to myself on 5.69 (p. 125).
Giving excessive attention to outdated or impossible theories continues, such as Vogliano’s on mim. 8 (speaker and perhaps Herodas himself a woman!), and on the meaning of βατζέισιν (pp. 129–30).

The baubon-using women of mim. 6 are frequently (pp. 139, 143, 173, 191, 198, 206) said to be depraved and corrupt; Di G. is also certain that they are Lesbians, not masturbatings heterosexuals, and that Metro is the subordinate of the couple. This last point is then used to deny her an important role in mim. 7: apart from lines 1–3, the dialogue is to be between Kerdon and an anonymous customer. Much of this is prejudice: Herodas does not judge his characters. I see no indication that the women are Lesbians (μεστίσεις in 71 does not prove it), nor that Metro is anything but Koritto’s equal friend. And I certainly find 7 more natural as a dialogue between Kerdon and Metro with the others mute bystanders.

I append a few notes on individual passages. 3.31 τείσεις is an interpretation, not a correction, of the papyrus’s τιςε. 6.1 is discussed at great length (pp. 147–50); it is difficult to believe that it means anything other than ‘Sit down, Metro. Get a chair for the lady’; κάθησο and δίψαρε are adequately defended by Ussher. 6.13–14 Di G. takes the dative with ἔλεγκτον despite this construction being unattested, because of the word order of the alternative: but this is the common hyperbaton with adverbial group + verb (cf. Fraenkel on Aesch. Agam. 136f and p. 827f). 6.13 Against on being a correction (therefore χορτεύει) rather than an addition (γιορτάζειν), Di G. notes that there is no mark above the Θ to indicate its deletion; but this is normal in the case of substitution, not simple deletion. 6.61–2 This refers only to his voice in general, indicating nothing about loudness or quickness. 6.63 (p. 182–3; ‘7’ at the top of p. 183 is a misprint) It is strange that Di G. has to cite Palmer from Sitzler’s survey: this is in the article in Hermathena 192 which is Palm.’ in the bibliography in this volume. 7.16 With regard to Knox’s θυργός, surely a present tense would be expected (as indeed Knox himself translates). 7.25 (p. 247) Di G. revives Knox’s ἡ Ἰτωνία, writing it as ἡ Ἰτωνία but this is unlikely when he is speaking to the customers (contrast 74). 7.38 Di G. denies that βιοσίδες in the list of shoes refers to Bautiscis the friend of Erinnia, whose fellow-poet Nossis also features in φοινίδες in the line above, his reason being that the shoes were so named before the era of these people: an illegitimate deduction, indeed this very fact may have suggested the reference to Herodas. 7.76 (p. 291 foot) The quotation from Zenob. 4.12 includes the misprint ξετ (for Ζητ) which appears in my 1971 edition. 7.96 μὲν is surely not solitarium (p. 327), but answered by δὲ in 97: ‘from us ... but to her ...’ 7.112 (p. 333 foot) The ξειθε in Philostr. ep. 74 are not being used for speaking. 8 ‘Ἀνδρία (p. 335) Why it is more logical for this to be feminine because the other slaves addressed are women is not clear to me.

It is obvious that Di G. has expended great amounts of time and effort on his edition. I sincerely regret not being able to be more enthusiastic about either the methods or the result. There are some works which can benefit from in-depth historical surveys of previous commentators and some scholars who can profitably supply them (Aeschylus’ Agamemnon and Eduard Fraenkel is an obvious example); I fear that the Mimiambi is not such a work, and Di G. not such an editor.

Minard, Argyll