The text includes the remaining five mimiambs 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 Ἡρόδωτος should be read for Ἡρόδοτος in Pollux 2.152. The only major revision of a reading in the papyrus, 8.46 ΚΗΛΛΑΣΑΝ, i.e. χιλιας-λέγεσθαι, is mistaken: it undoubtedly has ΚΗΛΛΑΣΑΣΑΝ.¹ The supplement in 7.43, εὐπροφέτην μογγόθους, is possible, but the passage remains obscure. The other new supplement proposed, 8.68 καλόν γε χιλιόθ, is too long; Di G.’s comparison with 72, where the same space contains 9 letters, is misconceived, as two of these are narrow iotas. The accent in 6.25 βιττώς is not mentioned, nor are several spaces between letters and words (Di G. insists, p. 107, 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 ὅμεληταιν: one should have to suppose that Herodas put a *hapax* in Bitinna’s mouth, and that a haplography in the transmission was followed by alteration of the now unintelligible την to την; not everyone finds this implausible. He adopts the first hand’s λέπρος in 6.36 as the more unusual expression, and its οὐσῶν in 6.38 as the usual one. He defends 6.81 δουλή (understood as ‘like a slave’, because he admits it cannot be taken with ἡ Βριθδύτρος; obscure in the context) and 10.1 ἵλιον (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 vultate ἐόσσῳ as if it were the tradition: but the papyrus has no breathing or accent, and Wackernagel’s ἐόσσῳ 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 οὐσῶν or Attic οὐσῶν: Di G. opts for the latter on the grounds that the papyrus normally writes ι for ει, 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 and fourth 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, 252, 253 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 pre-cedes, 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 γυναὶ 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 lexico-graphical 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 bene-fit of the former (pp. 230, 356, 367, 401) 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 γοναττῶν (p. 86) and to myself on 5.69 (p. 120).
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 ἱβαύρικν (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 masturbating 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 prejudiced: Herodas does not judge his characters. I see no indication that the women are Lesbians (ὑπερβαίνω 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. 5.31 τεῖσσας is an interpretation, not a correction, of the papyrus’s τις. 6.1 is discussed at great length (pp. 147–52); it is difficult to believe that it means anything other than ‘Sit down, Metro. Get a chair for the lady’; κῆθησαι and διὸν are adequately defended by Ussher. 6.13–14 Di G. takes the dative with ὰλεθέον 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. 1:56f and p. 827f). 6.13 Against on being a correction (therefore ὀψίνοια) rather than an addition (ὑπονομή), 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; ’73 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 1892 which is Palm. in the bibliography in this volume. 7.10 With regard to Knox’s [ὑπερβαίνεις], surely a present tense would be expected (as indeed Knox himself translates). 7.25 (p. 247) Di G. revives Knox’s ἡ Ἀποκτῆτος, writing it as ἡ ἀποκτήτης but this is unlikely when he is speaking to the customers (contrast 74). 7.38 Di G. denies that ἠποκτήτης in the list of shoes refers to Baucis the friend of Erinna, whose fellow-poet Nossis also features in ὑποκτήτης 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 Zeno. 4.12 includes the misprint ζει (for ζή) 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 ρήειν in Philostr. ep. 14 are not being used for speaking. 8 ‘Ἀνάφα (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.
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