

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-43828-6 - Herodas: The Mimes and Fragments

Edited by A. D. Knox

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

---

**HERODAS**  
**THE MIMES AND FRAGMENTS**

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-43828-6 - Herodas: The Mimes and Fragments

Edited by A. D. Knox

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

---

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-43828-6 - Herodas: The Mimes and Fragments

Edited by A. D. Knox

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

---

**HERODAS**  
**THE MIMES AND FRAGMENTS**

WITH NOTES BY  
**WALTER HEADLAM**

EDITED BY  
**A. D. KNOX**

**CAMBRIDGE**  
**AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS**  
1966

Cambridge University Press  
978-1-107-43828-6 - Herodas: The Mimes and Fragments  
Edited by A. D. Knox  
Frontmatter  
[More information](#)

---

**CAMBRIDGE**  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

[www.cambridge.org](http://www.cambridge.org)

Information on this title: [www.cambridge.org/9781107438286](http://www.cambridge.org/9781107438286)

© Cambridge University Press 1922

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 1922

Reissued 1966

First paperback edition 2014

*A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library*

ISBN 978-1-107-43828-6 Paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-43828-6 - Herodas: The Mimes and Fragments

Edited by A. D. Knox

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

## PREFACE

FROM the time of the publication of the first text of Herodas, Walter Headlam worked always with an eye to the establishment and elucidation of the Mimes. On learning that Henry Jackson did not intend to write a commentary he took the work in hand; but always there remained some problems<sup>1</sup> which held him back. A great many of the notes which are printed here are as he left them; but the majority, which are of earlier date, have been expanded either from additions by Headlam at the side of the notes, from 'adversaria' by him in other editions of Herodas, or from references at the end of his books. A few additions, more especially from recent discoveries, have been made by the present editor. A small minority of the notes up to Mime VII, several of the notes on Mime VII, and a large majority of the subsequent notes have been written by the present editor, together with text, translation, critical notes and indexes. The aim has been partly to produce a complete edition, partly to give as fully as possible the results of all Headlam's researches. Various circumstances have made it difficult to take account of recent literature on Herodas without unduly delaying the appearance of this work; and, though the actual date of publication is 1922, the edition is no more advanced than it might have been in 1913.

In order to distinguish between the actual notes of Walter Headlam and those of the present editor the marks (ʹ ʹ) have been used to show that the collocation of, and deductions from, references collected by Headlam are due to the present editor and have no other warrant. These marks doubled (ʹʹ ʹʹ) mean that both references and deductions are by the present editor<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> In dealing with these the present editor claims no special success; but in more than one place the problem has been complicated by faulty mounting of the papyrus, and, in order to assist others to be more fortunate, he has devoted some space to the presentation of the revised problem (II. 5—7, VII. 8).

<sup>2</sup> For the sake of brevity, when one slides from the first class to the second, the signs are given ʹ ʹ ʹʹ, not ʹ ʹʹʹ ʹʹ.

Cambridge University Press  
978-1-107-43828-6 - Herodas: The Mimes and Fragments  
Edited by A. D. Knox  
Frontmatter  
[More information](#)

---

vi

*PREFACE*

Introduction I is composed from various sources—lecture notes, jottings and an article by Headlam in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*: and it has been thought more important to preserve actual words than to aim at a uniform style, or formality of diction. Introduction II gives the views of the present editor on editing Herodas, in as brief a form as possible.

The present editor desires to acknowledge, as Headlam would have done, his thanks to Sir Frederic Kenyon for his unfailing courtesy and readiness to assist in testing various ideas, to Mr J. T. Sheppard (from whom he took over the work) for his willingness to supply suggestions, to Mr A. S. F. Gow for his kindness in reading some early proof-sheets, and to Prof. H. Stuart Jones for several corrections. Other suggestions are acknowledged throughout where received; but a special debt is due to Mr Bell and Mr Lamacroft of the British Museum for contributing most materially to the piecing of two columns.

My very best thanks are due to the staff of the University Press for some especially difficult and trying work.

A. D. KNOX.

KING'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.  
*March 1922*

Cambridge University Press  
 978-1-107-43828-6 - Herodas: The Mimes and Fragments  
 Edited by A. D. Knox  
 Frontmatter  
[More information](#)

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	ix
TEXT AND NOTES :	
MIME I . . . . .	I
" II . . . . .	61
" III . . . . .	109
" IV . . . . .	165
" V . . . . .	219
" VI . . . . .	273
" VII . . . . .	317
" VIII . . . . .	369
" IX . . . . .	401
" X . . . . .	409
" XI . . . . .	415
" XII . . . . .	419
" XIII—XV . . . . .	423
INDEXES :	
I (WORDS) . . . . .	427
II (INDEX TO NOTES: GREEK AND LATIN) . . . . .	446
III (SUBJECT INDEX) . . . . .	455
IV (GRAMMAR, METRE, STYLE, TEXTUAL CRITICISM, ETC.) . . . . .	460
V (PASSAGES ILLUSTRATED OR EMENDED) . . . . .	464
PLATE	
FACSIMILE OF PORTION OF PAPYRUS CXXXV . . . . .	<i>to face</i> lvii

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-43828-6 - Herodas: The Mimes and Fragments

Edited by A. D. Knox

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

## ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA

- p. 4, l. 2 from foot: *read* νεωτερησιν P.  
 p. 17, l. 14: *after* οὐ *insert* μή.  
 p. 42, l. 15 from foot: *read* Iambl. *V. P.* xxxi. 195.  
 p. 46, l. 4 from foot: *for* 14 *read* 114.  
 p. 62 (II. 6): I now prefer

ἂν κλαύσαι  
 τῆς αἰκίης ὁ μὴ ἄστος ἦ κτλ.,

and would compare Appul. *Met.* p. 45 (179) *constanter itaque in hominem alienum ferte sententias de eo crimine quod etiam in vestrum civem severiter vindicaretis. ἦ ἄστος ἂν χώρης*, which would complete the parallel, cannot be *read*.

- p. 63, crit. n., l. 1: *read* ενδ]υσμενη[ιγ]εστι.  
 p. 81, l. 19: *read* ἀπόρθητοι; *and in* note 5, *μεγάλα for* μέγα.  
 p. 167, crit. n., l. 5: *read* τονλιθ ον; *and* l. 6 αυτα.  
 p. 256, l. 25: *read* στίξω.  
 p. 275, crit. n., l. 10: *read* <sup>η</sup>for υλ'ακτω? <sup>η</sup>  
 p. 280 (v. 97): *read* κῶρη.  
 p. 288, l. 22: *read* Lentz.  
 p. 372 (VIII. 27): I have preserved the punctuation of the papyrus. But I doubt if it is defensible (I. 85 n.). I would suggest (VIII. 26 sqq.):

καὶ πλησίον με τοῦ αἰγὸς εὖρον ἀθροῦντες,  
 κωνείδισάν μ' ἄλιτρά τῳ θεῷ πρήσσειν.  
 σχιστὸν κροκωτὸν ἠμφίεστ' ὁ μὲν, μηροῦ δ' κτλ.

- p. 402 (IX. 11): I now prefer:  
 οὐ πρόσθ' ἀμαρτοῦσ'—ἦ τε νῆνις ἢ ξείνη,  
 τίθεσθ' ἄμιλλαν ἦτ' ἄεθλον ἐξοίσει  
 γλήχωνα; καίτοι κτλ.



Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-43828-6 - Herodas: The Mimes and Fragments

Edited by A. D. Knox

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

## INTRODUCTION

## I.

HERODAS' *Mimes*—dramatic scenes in popular life—were written for Alexandria 270–250 B.C. The date has been contested, but everything conspires to place him here, the only passage in antiquity which refers to him by name, Pliny, *Ep.* iv. 3. 3, where he is coupled with Callimachus, his references to historical personages, which are like the references of a contemporary<sup>1</sup>, not of a later writer, and the nature of his work, which bears all the marks of his age. One of the reasons he is worth some study is just that he is a thoroughly characteristic type of Alexandrian aims and methods.

Most difficult of Greek authors Professor Blass called him in 1892. Well, he is difficult undoubtedly, but not difficult as Aeschylus and Pindar are difficult, from the depth of thought, the pregnant brevity, the complicated figurative expression. There are many lacunae in the MS.; he is allusive, and many of the allusions are obscure; and all is couched in an antique and unfamiliar dialect. So full, indeed, of apparent difficulty was he at first sight, that Sir Frederic Kenyon, with his usual modesty, merely printed an accurate and trustworthy reading of the papyrus. If you have the curiosity to look at that and other earliest editions, you will find that our text now is in a very different state. The text has been difficult to restore and explain: it is not, when restored and explained, difficult to appreciate. At first critics were all puzzled, and the art is indeed of a new species. Still it is surprising and not encouraging that so many allusions have been left unexplained, considering that somewhere, if we can only find it, there exists the clue to a solution of them all. There is only one way: learn your author by heart—every word, and then set to work to read. Many dull authors must be dredged, and for some (the later Attic comedians, for instance, and much Alexandrian poetry) we require to reconstruct.

Apart from their intrinsic merit—their dramatic skill and liveliness—these sketches offer us variety of interest. For the illustration of private life—manners and customs, and ways of thinking—here is a rich abundance of material and opportunity: enough, indeed, and to spare.

<sup>1</sup> IV. 23, 72; I. 30.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-43828-6 - Herodas: The Mimes and Fragments

Edited by A. D. Knox

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

x

## INTRODUCTION

Incidentally there are some interesting points. We get in IV mentions and descriptions of contemporary art, painting and sculpture—including a very interesting judgment on Apelles.

And I hope—for that is what Herodas himself would have wished—that we shall find some interest in studying his various types of character.

They are not, with a few exceptions, very reputable.

Compared  
with Dutch  
artists

We are going to enter as it were a gallery of Dutch genre paintings—the work, say, of a Teniers or a Jan Steen. The comparison is one which I am not the first to make; and indeed the affinity is salient and singularly close, at many points, not only in the nature of the themes but in the style of workmanship. We find in both the small canvas, the high finish, the richness and precision of significant detail,—and in subject, the same predilection for the ugly and the seamy sides of life.

Not everyone perhaps may care for Dutch paintings of that kind;—I can myself remember the time when I would not even cross a room to look at one—but in studying the History of Painting we cannot possibly neglect them; and, apart from any influence the painters may have had, their work has an enduring interest, because they too are true to the life they choose to represent, and because of the consummate excellence of the technique.

But we must know what to look for. All that school are aiming at effects of light and shade—not only Rembrandt, but the others—whether it is an interior, there will be crossing sunlight through the windows, if it is a landscape of Hobbema's, there will be sunlight in the middle distance falling on a pink farmhouse; and in the darkest and blackest landscape, there will always be on the extreme horizon some streak of pale green light relieving it.

Once we have discovered that, we shall regard our Dutchmen with quite a different interest and pleasure. Just so,—though no one with any sense of humour can fail to be amused by Herodas—we shall appreciate him much better: indeed we shall not be in a position to estimate him fairly until we have found out what he is endeavouring to do. Some of *his* pictures, as Mr Neil so happily said of them, in the words of Mr Borthrop Trumbull in *Middlemarch*, 'Some of them are darker than you would like, and not family subjects'—but even so there is always some gleam to relieve the darkness. There is more in Herodas than meets the unpractised eye.

Herodas'  
position in  
Greek  
letters

Then again, if we wish to understand not only *what* our Dutchmen are doing, but *why*, we must enquire into the conditions under which they worked. They lived in a flat country, and in the absence of bold natural features it is those effects of light which the eye learns to look for and to value. And so, to view

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-43828-6 - Herodas: The Mimes and Fragments

Edited by A. D. Knox

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

## INTRODUCTION

xi

Herodas right, we must try to see him in relation to his predecessors, to perceive the continuity which there is in Literature as in everything else, to put ourselves in the stream of literary tendency in his time, and to some extent in the position of the audience for whom he wrote.

In order to do that, we must cast our eyes rapidly over the preceding century.

One of the least considerable of Greek writers, we may suppose, if his work be judged on its literary merits, was Antimachus<sup>Anti-machus</sup> of Colophon. Yet, if his work be judged by its effect for good or evil, as a warning or an inspiration to succeeding writers, he might rank next to Homer and Menander. He flourished toward the end of the Peloponnesian war; and the work of his which, as we shall see, excited most comment was his *Thebais*. It was praised<sup>His Thebais</sup> by good judges at the time and is said to have been admired by Plato. But if the tradition that Plato alone could sit it out is correct, we may suppose that he had to content himself with a small but fit audience. The work was considered second to Homer's, but at a long interval. The twenty-three books which preceded the arrival of the seven champions must have been spun out with interminable digressions on mythology, and with geographical descriptions. The style was marked by *εὐτονία* and *ἀγωνιστική τραχύτης*: he aimed at the *αὐστηρὰ ἄρμονία*—*τὰν ἀγέλαστον ὄπα* says Antipater of Thessalonica.

He was, as we shall see, the forerunner of the Alexandrian critics in their work upon Homer: but his other famous original work was the *Lyde*. Ovid, in the *Tristia*<sup>His Elegiacs</sup><sup>1</sup>, selects him with Philetas as founder or typical representative of the amatory elegiac. He strung together mythical stories of those who were crossed in love, and so furnished the Alexandrians with a suitable model. His style seems to have been deficient in art, arrangement, and charm: but in his fondness for *γλῶσσαί* he is precisely of the character we call Alexandrian.

Sophocles and Euripides both died in 406, and the Peloponnesian war ended in 404 with the capitulation of Athens. After that date, whatever the contributory causes may have been, there is no high and serious poetry—no great spiritual *poetry*—produced. 'Tragedy languishes in a feeble imitative way,' and in other branches of poetry there is a lack of creative power. The work produced seems to have been prosaic, laboured, full of affectations and conceits. On the lyrical side, Tragedy, as we know, was supplanted in popular favour by the Cyclic-Dithyramb<sup>2</sup>, from

<sup>1</sup> *Trist.* i. 6. 1 *Nec tantum Clario est Lyde dilecta poetae, nec tantum Coe Bittis amata suo est.*

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Ath. 181 c *τῶν μὲν Ἀθηναίων τοὺς Διονυσιακοὺς χοροὺς καὶ τοὺς κυκλίους προτιμώντων....*

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-43828-6 - Herodas: The Mimes and Fragments

Edited by A. D. Knox

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

xii

## INTRODUCTION

which Tragedy had been born, and into which Tragic poetry now relapsed. The decline of poetry is simultaneous with an advance of music, which becomes more and more a vehicle for the exhibition of technique. What is now popular is programme-music, and the style is that of free rhapsody. The *Persae* of Timotheos we now possess: another specimen, which illustrates the levity of the new school, is the burlesque *Banquet* of Philoxenus. Timotheos avowed himself the apostle of the New Music, which Plato and later writers regard as a depravation, marking the decay of moral fibre<sup>1</sup>. One reason which was alleged for the degeneration was the necessity of pandering to the taste of the crowd. As the Peisistratid Hipparchus had once been the discriminating patron of good poetry, so now the Demos was the tyrant who patronized Timotheos.

Intellectual tendencies

But such a phenomenon cannot be assigned to any single cause. It is true, as Sir Richard Jebb observed, that 'the intellectual (and the literary) tendencies of the age, its scepticism and its rhetoric, were unfavourable to ideal art in every kind.' It is true also, in the words of Professor Murray, that 'the crash of 404 B.C. stunned the hopes of Athens and dulled her faith in her own mission and in human progress generally.' Her highest inspirations in art and literature had disappeared—her religion and her national pride. Different critics according to their different temperaments may attach more weight to one fact or the other.

It was an age of critical enquiry and analysis, of philosophy and science and unsettled conviction—the old theology destroyed, and no new faith to take its place. The effect on literature was comparable to the effect which the Natural Philosophy inaugurated by Bacon and carried on by his successors—influencing France, and from France reacting upon England—had upon the age of Reason in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Such analogies ought not to be pressed too far, because the sum of influences and conditions is not exactly the same. But the eighteenth century is a useful analogy to keep in mind.

The Alexandrians

We may just glance at the various fields, carrying the succession down to the Alexandrian time. In doing so we shall notice that to a large extent the Alexandrians are only following, with some modification, leads given previously, while in other departments the conditions of the time forbid them to pursue the method of their predecessors.

<sup>1</sup> Plat. *Legg.* 600 (see Jebb, *Bacchylides*, p. 1), Aristoxenus (in Ath. 632 a, b), εἰς μεγάλην διαφθορὰν προελήλυθεν ἡ πάνδημος αὐτῆ μουσική. Cf. Ath. 633 b τὸ χρηστο-μουσεῖν καὶ μὴ παραβαίνειν τοὺς ἀρχαίους τῆς μουσικῆς νόμους, and τρόποι μουσικῆς φαῦλοι...οἷς ἕκαστος τῶν χρωμένων ἀντὶ μὲν πρᾶβήτος περιποιεῖτο μαλακίαν, ἀντὶ δὲ σωφροσύνης ἀκολασίαν καὶ ἀνεσιν.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-43828-6 - Herodas: The Mimes and Fragments

Edited by A. D. Knox

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

## INTRODUCTION

xiii

As it is for the most part an age of science and philosophy, Philosophy so its natural medium for expression is Prose. We are reminded of the development of French prose, which put poetry out of fashion in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Intellectual activity was displayed in many branches of speculation, but what is important for us, as students of Alexandrian literature, to notice, is the tendency, increasingly strong, to *analysis*,—the spirit which, as it were, delights to take a watch to pieces, and explain the works. In this connexion Plato himself is for us less significant than his pupil Speusippus (who was trained by Isocrates as well as by Plato). Succeeding Plato at the head of what is called the Older Academy, he was a link between the Athenian philosopher and the Alexandrian savant. The Sophists, or Journalists, of the early part of this century, Plato himself, and many others might serve to illustrate the fact that Alexandrian scholarship is descended from Athenian philosophy. But the one name which is of first importance for our period is that of Aristotle, who was appointed in 343 B.C. by Philip of Macedon to be tutor to the young Alexander—a conjunction which piques one's fancy to imagine, though Alexander too enlarged the bounds of knowledge in a manner not suggested by his tutor, since he gave a wider range and a new stimulus to the study of Geography, always fascinating to the Greek imagination. The Peripatetic school, founded by Aristotle in 335, set itself to catalogue and classify facts in every branch of universal knowledge, and to collect rare books as well, so that the Alexandrian scholars are the lineal descendants of Aristotle, and in pursuing the history and criticism of literature are carrying on traditions of his encyclopaedic school. In 317 Aristotle was succeeded by Theophrastus, whose pupil Demetrius Demetrius of Phalerum, an Athenian, had a decisive influence in determining the course which Alexandrian literary studies were to follow. Demetrius was a man of the most varied accomplishment and erudition—the record of his works covers the provinces of history, politics, literature, philosophy and rhetoric—and was regarded as the last Attic Orator. He is the main link between the culture of Athens and the culture of Alexandria. Approved by Cassander, he was regent of Athens for ten years, when he was expelled by Demetrius Poliorketes (307), migrated to Egypt, and became the counsellor of the first Ptolemy, Soter. Many of his ideas were carried out or carried on by Philadelphus. This multifarious activity was the aim of many great men of letters about this period. Eratosthenes, astronomer, geographer, philosopher, historian and grammarian, is typical.

If we turn to historians we are able to see that the tendency to make of history a matter of antiquarian research is not exclusively Alexandrian. Philochorus, for instance, whose *floruit* may be

placed about 300, composed his *Atthis*, a collection of the legends and antiquities of Attica.

Criticism

Even the Alexandrian criticism of Homer (which was just like that of the eighteenth century, *e.g.*, of Shakespeare) was partly following leads set a century before. Antimachus is supposed to have been the first critical editor of Homer, and Zenodotus and Aristarchus, when they *athetized* passages which seemed to them to be dubious, had been to some extent anticipated by the rhetorical exercises of Zoilus, if, as is now generally held, he flourished in the middle of the fourth century.

Science and Philosophy, then, form the general movement of the fourth century, and the development of prose is one reason to account for the decline of poetry. The truest poetry of the age is to be found in the prose of Plato, who has been an inspiration to so many poets since.

Natural decay

But there is another reason to account for the decline of letters. Simply, the flower had bloomed, the harvest had been reaped. It is what is felt by painters at the present day. 'We don't despise the methods of the great old Masters, but what *they* did has been done; we cannot surpass them in their lines. But Art to be living, must progress; we cannot continue doing the old things; we must find new aims, strike out new lines.'

Already in the fifth century Choerilus of Samos had complained that there was no scope left for originality; previous writers had anticipated every theme—the material was exhausted—every province was occupied already.

Comedy

What is fitted to survive in such an epoch as we are considering (430–300 B.C.) is Comedy. While the Dithyramb took the place of the lyric of Tragedy, the dramatic motive was absorbed in the sentimental interests of later Comedy. In the cloying colour, verbal conceits and affectation of such writers as Chaeremon the Tragic style perishes.

But Comedy—the Comedy of Manners—is based upon habits and conventions which have grown up through a long-established system of society. And for its audience it requires a world 'of cultivated men and women wherein ideas are current, and the perceptions quick'—such an audience as that of Paris in the present day, Athens in the past.

Ptolemy, indeed, endeavoured to attract Menander to Alexandria. Menander declined the invitation—Alciphron represents it as out of love for Glycera, as though the lady could not make the journey too! No. It was the society of Athens that Menander tried to draw, not the society of Alexandria. Such comedy as his, with its charming and delicate urbanity, depends largely upon fine and subtle *nuances*, which only the wits of an Athenian audience were quick enough to catch.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-43828-6 - Herodas: The Mimes and Fragments

Edited by A. D. Knox

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

## INTRODUCTION

xv

How could he produce his plays at Alexandria? It would have been the difference between presenting a French comedy in Paris and in London. Of the great authors of comedy only Philemon ever visited Alexandria. How different is Macho with his silly, coarse jests and witticisms!

Alexandria, with its huge mob of mixed races, its Hellenistic tongue, its passion for shows of tawdry finery, its commercial crowd, was not the place for the flowers of Attic wit. The cultured were few: there was no *δῆμος* of literary taste.

All the critical and scientific studies organized by the Peripatetic school, all the researches of Aristotle into various branches of science were continued with unabated vigour by the Alexandrian writers of prose: and in many branches they made valuable improvements.

But those who preferred to present their ideas artistically in verse, what form were they to choose? Lyric had decayed, so had Tragedy, though they still composed some to be read; and Comedy would not bear transplanting from the soil of Athens.

What then remained?

Well, there were certain other paths already opened, which they could follow, which would not tax their creative powers too much: which would appeal to a literary reader, at any rate, and would suit the taste of Ptolemy Philadelphus, pupil of the scholar and poet Philetas of Cos.

They might also succeed in striking out some new lines of their own, and novelty might be obtained by a use of different dialects, and by a reshuffling of old metres to apply to new themes. But all the poets are themselves learned students too, and the forms they seek will be such as will recommend themselves primarily as suitable vehicles for the display of erudition.

This might be done either with taste and judgment, or without, but the life they led, out of touch with any general public, was not favourable to taste, and their learning is always tending to outrun their poetry, and the appeal to become merely intellectual.

To take the worst first: the extremest case is Lycophron. Whatever his exact date he is typical of the school we are considering. Lycophron had accumulated a vast mass of the obscurest geographical and legendary lore, and the literary form in which it occurred to him to frame it shows some ingenuity.

Cassandra, as we know, had been cursed by Apollo, who annulled his previous gift. Prophecy she should still, but without convincing anyone. Lycophron therefore puts into her mouth a prophecy, but in order to prevent her from convincing expresses

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-43828-6 - Herodas: The Mimes and Fragments

Edited by A. D. Knox

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

xvi

## INTRODUCTION

it in such a form as to be wholly unintelligible. In place of ordinary words he devises the obscurest synonyms—gods and places and people are called by some recondite local title: Cassandra herself is Alexandra. The prophecy itself is one thousand four hundred and thirty lines long, and, what is more surprising, it is reported by a messenger—surely the most extraordinary feat of memory on record. The piece is not, as I have seen it called, an Epic or a Tragedy or a Drama, but simply a Tragic *ῥῆσις* by an *ἐξάγγελος*.

Well, it is successful so far—it is not convincing. It is strange, a little saddening perhaps, to find this extravagant absurdity regarded with serious admiration. Gilbert Wakefield writing to C. J. Fox recommends Lycophron as being ‘as delightful as any of the ancients,’ and Fox replies ‘nothing was ever more soothing in the melancholy strain.’ Lycophron *has* indeed indirect value as a source of information: but I should be sorry for any one to study Greek if he were to end by regarding the *Alexandra* as a work of admirable art.

Calli-  
machus

Of the same kind, though not so bad, because only a sort of *jeu d’esprit*, is the *Ibis* of Callimachus, which survives in Ovid’s imitation. It is an invocation upon *Ibis* of all the horrible fates which had happened to anyone in legend, and these are described in an allusive and enigmatic way. It is comprehensive; like Sterne’s Mr Shandy and the Excommunication, you might ‘defy a man to swear out of it—but!’ It is said to have been directed against the rebel Apollonius, but its prime object is a theme to string these stories on, and the riddles were a pleasant intellectual exercise to read.

Of the same kind, but in a more legitimate form, and wholly different in style, were Callimachus’ *Αἴτια*, *Reasons, Origins*, ‘which deal in a pleasant and comparatively straightforward manner’ with curious customs, sacrifices, holidays, names of places, and stories. The work contains the fruit of the author’s antiquarian researches, like those of his Athenian contemporary Philochorus, the prose-writer. Even Apollonius is full of such curious researches: but, of course, the chief example is the incomplete *Fasti* of Ovid, a brilliantly executed work. Let me try to turn William Hone’s *Every Day Book* into verse, and, by comparison, everyone would acknowledge Ovid’s extraordinary vivacity and skill.

Excursions of this kind to us seem frigid: but at the same time it is fair to remember that they were not so for them. The wonder of the world in those days was still young: there was a natural curiosity in the Greek mind, an instinct for *ιστορία*, which led them to inquire into the causes of things and the composition of the universe: and there was a romance for them in



Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-43828-6 - Herodas: The Mimes and Fragments

Edited by A. D. Knox

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

## INTRODUCTION

xvii

the discoveries of Natural Science and of Travel. Geography again always had a fascination for the Greek mind, and of course for poetry it was a happier time when knowledge was not definite, when the associations that names brought with them were vague and shadowy, and the imagination could have room to spread its wings. No one revelled in this field so much as Aeschylus, and among English poets those who delighted in it most are those whose romantic imagination has been most akin to Aeschylus—Marlowe and Milton—for example in the first book of *Paradise Lost*:—

never, since created Man,  
Met such embodied force, as, named with these,  
Could merit more than that small infantry  
Warred on by cranes—tho' all the giant brood  
Of Phlegra with the heroic race were joined  
That fought at Thebes and Ilium, on each side  
Mixed with auxiliar gods; and what resounds  
In fable or romance of Uther's son,  
Begirt with British and Armoric knights;  
And all who since, baptized or infidel,  
Jousted in Asramont or Montalban,  
Damasco, or Marocco, or Trebisond;  
Or whom Biserta sent from Afric shore,  
When Charlemain with all his peerage fell  
By Fontarabbia;

and the long passage in the eleventh book of *Paradise Lost* where Satan showed Christ all the kingdoms of the world.

Or again in *Lycidas*, notice the allusive manner:—

Whether beyond the stormy Hebrides,  
Where thou perhaps, under the whelming tide,  
Visit'st the bottom of the monstrous world;  
Or whether thou, to our moist vows denied,  
Sleep'st by the fable of Bellerus old,  
Where the great Vision of the guarded mount  
Looks toward Namancos and Bayona's hold—

As for *Mythology*, we ought not to forget that it was their own mythology and alive for them—not borrowed and imported as it was by the Romans and as it is by us, but the growth of their own native soil, created by their own invention. Mythology was the form in which the Greek imagination naturally crystallized, and here for them chiefly lay their regions of romance.

To illustrate a theme by examples drawn from legend had *always* been the habit of Greek poetry from the earliest times. The difference with the Alexandrians is that, writing for a later literary audience, they draw their examples from more recondite sources and introduce them in a more allusive way, without observing due measure and proportion, forgetting the wise advice that Corinna gave to Pindar 'not to sow with the whole sack.'

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-43828-6 - Herodas: The Mimes and Fragments

Edited by A. D. Knox

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

xviii

## INTRODUCTION

So when we are inclined to condemn such passages off hand as *frigid*, let us first remind ourselves of such a one as this in Milton, *Il Penseroso*:

But, O sad Virgin, that thy<sup>1</sup> power  
Might raise Musaeus from his bower,  
Or bid the soul of Orpheus sing  
Such notes as, warbled to the string,  
Drew iron tears down Pluto's cheek,  
And made Hell grant what Love did seek:  
Or call up him that left half told  
The story of Cambuscan bold,  
Of Camball, and of Algarsife,  
And who had Canacè to wife.

Is that frigid? Well, it is entirely Alexandrian, both in spirit and in manner.

If Demetrius of Phalerum was the Richelieu of the Alexandrian Academy, Callimachus may be called its Boileau, laying down its artistic canons. Probably it was Philetas of Cos earlier who had set its fashions and ought properly to be considered parent of the school, as he is sometimes acknowledged by the Roman elegists. But almost all his work has perished, and it is in Callimachus that we find the principles most passionately stated, and, with his masterful personality and acknowledged position at the court of Ptolemy Philadelphus, he must have had a very considerable influence.

Anti-  
machus  
the  
warning

The main subject of literary debate was concerned with the merits of the *Thebaid* of Antimachus, that wordy poet: evidently they were hotly contested and his name becomes the watchword of debate. In some of his methods, his episodical digressions, even his opponents were influenced a great deal by his example; but in scale and subject the school of Philetas and Callimachus repudiated him. To write such an epic as the *Thebaid*, at such length, on so hackneyed a subject, was to challenge comparison with Homer: and although Antimachus was ranked above the other cyclic poets, yet *next*, as Quintilian says, is not the same as

<sup>1</sup> Compare now Callim. *P. Oxy.* VII. 53 sqq.:

τεὸν δ' ἡμεῖς ἕμερον ἐκλύομεν  
τόνδε παρ' ἀρχαίου Ξενομήδεος ὅς κοτε πᾶσαν  
νῆσον ἐνὶ μῆμῃ κάτθετο μυθολόγῳ,  
ἀρχμενος ὡς νύμφῃσιν ἐναίετο Κωρυκίῃσι  
τὰς ἀπὸ Παρρασσού λῖς ἐδίωξε μέγας,

ἐν δ' ὕβριν θάνατόν τε κεραύνιον, ἐν δὲ γόητας  
Τελχίνας, μακάρων τ' οὐκ ἀλέγοντα θεῶν  
ἠλεὰ Δημώνακτα γέρον ἐνεθήκατο δέλτοις,  
καὶ γρηῖν Μακελῶ μητέρα Δεξιθέης,  
ὡς μούνας ὅτε νῆσον ἀνέτρεπον εἶνεκ' ἀλιτρῆς  
ὕβριος, ἀσκηθεῖς ἔλλιπον ἀθάνατοι,  
τέσσαρας ὡς τε πολῆας ὁ μὲν τείχισσε κτλ.<sup>77</sup>

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-43828-6 - Herodas: The Mimes and Fragments

Edited by A. D. Knox

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

## INTRODUCTION

xix

*near*: and these critics, all of them students and devoted worshippers of Homer, felt that his ambition was a vain one. It wouldn't do.

Homer is unapproachable: but leads in various lines that *we* can follow are to be found, for example, in the various poems of Hesiod; what *we* write must be taken from less familiar *sources*: our *scale* must be a small one—Guy de Maupassant must succeed Richardson; and at this date, when, as Choerilus had said, 'Art has reached its limit'—when all the secrets of technique are ours—our *style* must not be dragging and diffuse; there must be nothing redundant and superfluous; our writing must be terse and brisk, succinct, polished, turned and finished, every line of it, upon the lathe. It is very much like the 'correcting' treatment English verse underwent after the Jacobean period in the hands of Waller and Dryden and Pope.

These principles, repeated expressly by Propertius, are founded on Callimachus' own sayings—μέγα βίβλιον ἴσον τῷ μεγάλῳ κακῷ—*Ἀντιμάχου παχὺ γράμμα καὶ οὐ τορόν* 'fat and not lucid'—and again ἐχθαίρω τὸ ποίημα τὸ κυκλικὸν οὐδὲ κελεύθῳ χαίρω τίς πολλοὺς ᾄδει καὶ ᾄδει φέρει, μισέω καὶ περιφροῖτον ἐρώμενον οὐδ' ἀπὸ κρήνης πίνω· σικχαίνω πάντα τὰ δημόσια, 'I hate the cyclic poem, and I drink not from the common spring; my spirit loathes all that is popular and vulgar.' But he commends Aratus (II. 350 Schn.) as πολυμαθὴ καὶ ἄριστον ποιητήν—whose *Phaenomena* 'Signs of the Sky' appealed, we may suppose, as Hesiodic, didactic, in subject and manner. 'Ἡσιόδου τόδ' ἄεισμα καὶ ὁ τρόπος· οὐ τὸν ἀοιδῶν ἔσχατον, ἀλλ' ὀκνέω μὴ τὸ μελιχρότατον τῶν ἐπέων ὁ Σολεὺς ἀπεμάξατο. χαίρετε λεπταὶ ῥήσιες Ἀρήτου σύγγονοι ἀγρυπνίη.' And so Catullus praises the *Smyrna* of Cinna by contrast '*at populus tumido gaudeat Antimacho*.' What of Callimachus' own work? To us he appeals 'even now' to most advantage in his epigrams. The scholar in him tends to overcome the poet, and his simplicity to be the simplicity of artifice, but in all he writes there is a force and high distinction. Meleager, who made the first Anthology of Epigrams, describes the poets who composed his Garland, each of them in terms of flowers, with exquisite delicacy and sureness; and among them Callimachus is admirably introduced:

ἠδὺ τε μύρτον  
Καλλιμάχου, στυφελοῦ μεστόν ἀεὶ μέλιτος.  
'and the sweet myrtle of Callimachus  
filled full ever of astringent honey.'

That just seizes the qualities that are so characteristic of his manner—the conciseness and packed concentration of his phrase, and his peculiar dry and pungent flavour—a sad bitterness,

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-43828-6 - Herodas: The Mimes and Fragments

Edited by A. D. Knox

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

xx

## INTRODUCTION

drawn from the irony of the world's tragedy and the disillusionment of life<sup>1</sup>.

Apollonius Apollonius, as we have said, rebelled from Callimachus' influence and wrote his Epic *Argonautica* for which his master banned him as a heretic: he retired to Rhodes but eventually returned. Callimachus' sentence is conveyed in a passage appended to his hymn to Apollo:

Said Momus whispering in Apollo's ear:  
 'I care not for the bard whose verse's tide  
 Spreads not as vast as all the ocean wide.'  
 Apollo spurned her with her foot, and said:  
 'Vast through Assyria's continent doth spread  
 Euphrates; but he sweeps upon his flood  
 Massed, a great drift of filthiness and mud.  
 'Tis not from every fount the sacred Bees  
 Draw water for Demeter's mysteries:  
 That which is pure and undefiled they bring,  
 A little droplet from an holy spring,  
 The choicest bloom and finest—' Lord, farewell;  
 And where Damnation is, let Envy dwell!

But while, in scale and ambition, Apollonius writes in defiance of the general movement of the period, still it appears in the soft Correggio-like colouring of the sentiment and profusion of various and recondite lore he introduces.

Versifiers 'There are many sides of Alexandrian poetry on which I shall only touch briefly. Besides Aratus' *Phaenomena*, which versified Eudoxus' work, a manual, it is thought, for practical purposes, we have the *Diosemeia*, used so much by Vergil in his First Georgic; and there are other treatises of a more or less technical character. Extant—the date, it is true, is uncertain and he is in any case much later than Aratus—are Nicander's *Theriaca* and *Alexipharmaka* on snake-bites; his *Georgica* and *Melissurgica*, though lost, are famous as a Vergilian source. Quintilian asks whether Vergil can be called an unsuccessful follower of Nicander. Nicander wrote also on *γλώσσαι*—strange and local words, and his own verses contain many such. His *Heterooumena*, five books in heroic verse, were, no doubt, largely used by Ovid in his *Metamorphoses*: they remain for us otherwise only in the prose extracts of Antoninus Liberalis. The Oppians' works on hunting and fishing are in conformance with Alexandrian rules. Manetho and Maximus echo an Alexandrian original. Eratosthenes, the Leonardo da Vinci of the age, used the poetic form for two astronomical poems. Alexandrian in their contents and style, whatever their date, are the geographical works of Dionysius Periegetes, Scymnus, and others. Por-

<sup>1</sup> "See further *A Book of Greek Verse*, pp. 217, 219, 221, 225, 304, 300, 301–307, from which I have drawn these remarks."<sup>11</sup>

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-43828-6 - Herodas: The Mimes and Fragments

Edited by A. D. Knox

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

## INTRODUCTION

xxi

phyrio says of Horace's *Ars Poetica*: *in quem librum congescit praecepta Neoptolemi de arte poetica non quidem omnia sed eminentissima*, and we may suppose that the Alexandrian grammarian had written in verse a Τέχνη Ῥητορικὴ.<sup>1</sup>

Alexandrian in this respect are very many of the Roman poets. The didactic style and subject that Callimachus approved of in Aratus were followed by Lucretius in his *De Rerum Natura* — Περὶ Φύσεως that is—by Vergil in one of his three considerable works, by Horace in his Epistles on Rhetoric, and by Ovid in his *Halieuticon*, and even in some of his technical amatory works. There are the *Cynegetica* of Nemesian and Gratius, the *Astronomica* of Manilius, and the medicinal works of Serenus Samonicus. Avienus derived his works directly from Alexandrian originals, and Priscian, who used Dionysius Periegetes with more freedom, and wrote an *Epitome Phaenomenon*, actually committed to verse a treatise *De Ponderibus et Mensuris*. There are many verse treatises of such character in English and French, especially in the eighteenth century.

These are some of the forms—and there were others. As we Idylls have seen, you might not try<sup>1</sup>, like Antimachus, to rival Homer,

<sup>1</sup> The note of resignation to humbler themes is constant in later Greek poetry and its derivatives. <sup>†</sup>Possibly we have this *motif* in Herodas VIII. *fin.*: the work is apparently a δευτέρη γνῶμη—the full wind of Epic inspiration was denied him.<sup>††</sup> So a tragedian, perhaps Euripides (p. 910 Nauck), in the common formula:

ὄλβιος ὄστις τῆς ἰστορίας  
ἔσχε μᾶθῃσιν

*Blessed is he that hath gotten knowledge of science, turning neither to hurt his fellow-citizens nor to wrongful actions, but contemplating the ageless ordered frame of immortal Nature, the composition of it and the how and the why. Upon such spirits care for shameful deeds doth never settle.*

The reference, as may be seen from Ov. *Met.* xv. 60, is to Pythagoras—Pythagoras and the Pythagoreans who made cosmogony their province, and there are sufficient indications left to show that what Eur. says had been said before of Pythagoras by Empedocles in his poem *περὶ φύσεως*. After them comes Vergil:

Felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas  
atque metus omnes et inexorabile fatum  
subiecit pedibus strepitumque Acherontis avari—

*but if the blood around my heart is too dull, I will content myself with the humbler theme of woods and rivers.*

This is what Milton so pathetically wrote at 19 in a college exercise:

Yet I had rather, if I were to choose,  
Thy service in some graver subject use,  
Such where the deep transported mind may soar  
Above the wheeling poles, and at Heaven's door  
Look in, and see each blissful deity,  
How he before the thunderous throne doth lie,  
Listening to what unshorn Apollo sings  
To the touch of golden wires, while Hebe brings  
Immortal nectar to her kingly sire;  
Then, passing through the spheres of watchful fire,  
And misty regions of wide air next under,  
And hills of snow and lofts of piled thunder,

but you might write Epic scenes or Idylls, such as Tennyson's *Idylls of the King* or his *Ulysses* or *Oenone*—Tennyson was thoroughly an Alexandrian, though he grew eventually into something more. Several of Theocritus' pieces are of this kind—Epic rhapsodies they might be called. Or you might write Hymns such as those of Callimachus. 'Alexandrian in scope and style are the Meliambi of Cercidas which, like the Anglican hymn, employ for purposes of his philosophy the form of the lyric: Cercidas seems to have been a friend of Aratus. It is probable that the Choliambic form was commonly adapted to similar ends.' Most cultivated was the elegiac epigram, following the tradition of Archilochus, Sappho, Anacreon and Simonides, with their tradition of grace and simplicity. The work of Asklepiades, Posidippus, Leonidas of Tarentum, and, best of all, Callimachus, corresponds in motive and in spirit, and in finely-chiselled workmanship to much of the small Art-work of the period.

The  
epigram

Parody

'There was another feature of Alexandrian literature to which reference must be made. Parody (Ath. 697f. sqq.) was discovered, it was said, by Hipponax, who naturally selected the Epic. Hegemon, a contemporary of Epicharmus, Cratinus and Hermippus, themselves in some sort parodists, wrote also in Epic: one of his themes was a *Γιγαντομαχία* and he won prizes at Athens. Matron was an Athenian parodist of the fourth century. Timon of Phlius, who lived at Athens in the early third century and used Xenophanes the philosopher as his model, aimed his shafts principally at philosophy. His *Silli* were widely read. Sotades, with his queer lampoon-plays, half-metrical like Sophron's work, was of the same period. To Rhinthon (see p. xxv) is ascribed a special type, the *ίλαροτραγωδία* or Burlesque of Tragic Heroes. How this type differed from the Comic or Satyric in style is not easy to see; it is easier to suppose that it bore the same relation in scheme to burlesque Comedy, as did the ordinary Mime to Comedy. The type was naturally suited to the Alexandrian period—just as at the Restoration we pass from *Paradise Lost* to *Absalom and Achitophel*. Epic is the traditional form: but the *Frogs* and Philoxenus' *Banqueteers* show the possibilities of Lyric, which was not despised as a source of parody, as may be seen from the lines of Sotater quoted in Ath. 649a. A kind of mime or burlesque comedy is called *μαγῳδία* Ath. 621c, and we hear of *σκώμματα μαισωνικά*,

May tell at length how green-eyed Neptune raves  
In heaven's defiance mustering all his waves:  
Then sing of secret things that came to pass  
When beldam Nature in her cradle was;  
And last of kings and queens and heroes old,  
Such as the wise Demodocus once told.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-43828-6 - Herodas: The Mimes and Fragments

Edited by A. D. Knox

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

## INTRODUCTION

xxiii

and other forms. Instances of literature of these last-named or kindred classes have been found, but in style and artistic achievement they are so slight as to possess no importance whatever for our purposes.<sup>1</sup>

Poetry must seek for Romance, and what is Romance to one man may be platitude to another. A poor but cultured *δήμος* may find its romance in the courts of kings and queens: for those whose life is in the latter there is a romance in country lanes and in mean streets, because they are both alike remote from the daily experience of their life. The imagination desires to be transported somewhere afar from the scene of its own daily occupation; and distance lends enchantment to the view, if it be not too constantly disturbed by realism, by the disillusioning intrusion of sordid and unlovely details. We may like to hear about mean streets, if they are not too much a part of our lives; and for those of us who are not accustomed to stand on the footboard there is a romance in Kipling's treatment of the mechanism of our engines. So it is not only in the stars, and stories of distant lands, nor in mythologies of long ago, that the cultured poet and his affluent audience would find a thrill.

¶ I have reserved for the last Theocritus, who of the Alexandrian poets resembles Herodas in most details, if not in most essentials. The IVth Mime of Herodas and the XVth idyll of Theocritus bear so close a resemblance that we might have inferred they were drawing on the same original. The original as we know in Theocritus' case was a mime of Sophron the Sicilian who flourished in 450 B.C. Other of Theocritus' pieces may well derive from this model—as to Idyll II the statement is definite.

We do not know exactly the nature of Sophron's work or of his sources. As far as his work goes a not very dangerous conjecture<sup>1</sup> has supposed that, besides these two idylls of Theocritus for which the testimony is express, other and more bucolic pieces may derive from him. We shall see several connexions with other pieces of Herodas. If so, Sophron must have had a wide range of subjects and sympathies. It may be worth while to observe that tradition is more or less unanimous in assigning to him the rank of a literary poet who chose to give the title of Mimes to his work because in some degree they resembled the common farce of the Italian<sup>2</sup> and Sicilian people. Choricus in his apology for the mime (p. 42, 3 Graux) says *ἴσμεν δέ που καὶ τὴν Σώφρονος ποίησιν ὡς ἅπαντα μίμοι προσαγορεύεται* and *οἶεσθ' οὖν εἰ τὸ μίμων ἄδοξον ἦν ἐπιτήδευμα ἢ Σώφρονα μίμους ἐπιγρά-*

<sup>1</sup> Of Wilamowitz.

<sup>2</sup> Whether it was native or a development of the Doric *δικημισαί* in favourable soil, I do not know.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-43828-6 - Herodas: The Mimes and Fragments

Edited by A. D. Knox

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

xxiv

## INTRODUCTION

φειν αὐτοῦ τὰ ποιήματα κτλ. The queer rhythms used by Sophron would not have entitled him to this name (Philodem. *fr.* 53); it was the literary value of his work that was recognized as giving him a high claim. It may be that the later mime was more vulgar than the popular pieces which gave Sophron his idea and his title; but the evidence now at hand would lead us to suppose that Sophron's 'dramas'—a title given by Demetrius *de eloc.* 156—were far more literary than his common sources. The tradition of these is very likely to have been maintained throughout the history of the mime. Marcus Aurelius (xi. 6) seems to consider the mime a development of comedy; but, though comedy may have added something of plot (*cf.* Plut. *Mor.* 973 E) to the more refined mime, yet it is most probable that there was no serious difference between the raw material that Sophron worked on, and the pieces acted, according to the *Secret History*, by Theodora in her infancy, or condemned by the puritanism of a Tertullian.

The later  
mime

Typical of this low mimic buffoonery is vulgarity of subject, broadness of treatment, and rough horseplay. Of *mimica adulteria* we hear constantly: for instance in Lampridius, who tells us that Heliogabalus in such pieces ordered *ea quae solent simulacro fieri effici ad verum*. There was the long-haired *cinædus*; there was the shaven old fool (Cic. *de orat.* ii. 61) exposed *contumeliis alarparum* (Tertull. *de spect.* 46). But such buffetings were not limited to the male actor such as Marianus (Mart. ii. 74): Procopius (*Hist. Secr.* 9) says that Theodora τοιαύτη τις ἦν οἷα ραπιζομένη μὲν τε καὶ κατὰ κόρρης πατασσομένη χαριεντίζειν τε καὶ μέγιστα ἀνακαγχάζειν. A very similar performance with a different history is that of the *μαγῶδος* Ath. 621 c: τύμπανα ἔχει καὶ κύμβαλα καὶ πάντα τὰ περὶ αὐτὸν ἐνδύματα γυναικεῖα· σχινίζεται δὲ καὶ πάντα ποιεῖ τὰ ἔξω κόσμου, ὑποκρινόμενος ποτὲ μὲν γυναικας καὶ μοιχοὺς καὶ μαστροποὺς, ποτὲ δὲ ἄνδρα μεθύοντα καὶ ἐπὶ κῶμον παραγινόμενον πρὸς τὴν ἐρωμένην.

Choricus gives the following list of mime-characters, some of them no doubt representing later additions to the repertoire of the mime (p. 65):—a man lecturing his wife, soldiers, two orators one unreasonable and one sensible, masters, slaves, petty tradesmen, sausage-sellers, cooks, *ἐστιάτορες*, *δαιτυμόνες*, *συμβόλαια γράφοντες*, a lispng child, a young man in love, one angry and another placating his anger:—all these besides the common immoralities.<sup>7</sup>

Sicily

The mime was a product of Sicily and Magna Graecia. The Sicilians were a people of native wit, and it took the form of short racy humour. In the *Symposium* of Xenophon (ix. 2) we have a Syracusan jester, and *ἰαμβισταί*—satyrists—were most popular at Syracuse; Ath. 181 c τῶν μὲν Ἀθηναίων τοὺς Διο-



Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-43828-6 - Herodas: The Mimes and Fragments

Edited by A. D. Knox

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

## INTRODUCTION

xxv

νυσιακούς χορούς και τοὺς κυκλίους προτιμώντων, Συρακοσίων δὲ τοὺς ἰαμβιστάς. Alexander Aetolus who lived at the period of Herodas in Alexandria records as popular with the Syracusans one Boeotus—*ἔγραφε δ' ὄνηρ εὐ παρ' ὀμηρεῖην ἀγλαίην ἐπέων πισύγγους ἢ φώρας ἀναιδέας ἢ τινα χλούνην, φλύων ἀμβροσίη σὺν κακοδαμονίῃ τοῖα Συρηκοσίοις καὶ ἔχων χάριν* (Ath. 699 c). The merry Philoxenus resided at Syracuse, and presumably Theodoridas (Ath. 699 e) was a writer of his stamp. To this Graeco-Latin region belonged the Atellane farces with their stock characters, Petronius, and that delightful work in style, though not in subject, so akin to Petronius, the *Pentamerone* of Giambattista Basile, tales by Italian *improvvisatori* in the seventeenth century.

Sophron's example of making the mime literary was followed by others besides Boeotus. Rhinthon of Tarentum<sup>1</sup> was a well-known φλύαξ whose works were praised by Nossis (*A.P.* vii. 414) —*τὰ τραγικὰ μεταρρυθμίζων ἐς τὸ γελοῖον*, and we have also mention of a Sciras of Tarentum, a Blaesus of Καπρίη, and a mime-writer Xenarchus connected with Rhegium. But it was Sophron<sup>2</sup>, whose works, under the patronage of Plato, achieved

<sup>1</sup> The Style travelled also to Alexandria with Sopater ὁ φλυακογράφος Ath. 644 c, al.

<sup>2</sup> 'I have found and adapted to this place the following note of W. H. I do not think that he was concerned in the connexion with Sophron, which is somewhat hazardous.'<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Some passages which seem to reflect an original scene in Sophron may deserve brief notice.<sup>1</sup>

Herodas vi. 1 τῇ γυναικὶ θὲς δίφρον ἀνασταθεῖσα—*do I have to tell you everything? you're a stone, not a servant.*

vii. 6 *Set the larger bench outside for the ladies...* πάλιν καθεῦδει; κίνει ταχέως τὰ γούνα....

vii. 19 *οἶσε....*

Theocr. xv. 2 ὄρη δίφρον Εὐνόα αὐτῆ. ἐμβαλε καὶ ποτίκρανον.

id. 26 ΓΟΡ. ἔρπειν ὦρα κ' εἴη.

ΠΡΑΞ.

ἀεργοῖς αἰὲν ἐορτά—

Εὐνόα αἶρε τὸ ψάμα† καὶ ἐς μέσον αἰνόθρυπτε

θές· πάλιν αἱ γαλέαι μαλακῶς χρήζοντι καθεῦδειν!

κινεῦ δὴ, φέρε θάσσον ὕδωρ. ὕδατος πρότερον δεῖ·

ἀ δὲ σμάμα φέρει.

Anaxipp. (iii. 300 Kock) in Ath. 169 b:

ζωμήρυσιν φέρ· οἶσ' ὀβελίσκουσ δώδεκα.

οὐ μὴ πρότερον οἶσεις, θεοῖσιν ἐχθρὲ σὺ,

τὸ λεβήτιον; τὰκ τοῦ νίτρου! πάλιν ὑστερεῖς;

<sup>1</sup>All derive probably from Sophron: cf. *fr.* 10 (17) (attributed by Valckenaer), and *fr.* 16 (23).

In each we have the command, the repetition of the command and the exclamation or question *Asleep again!*—this the editors have often obscured.<sup>1</sup>

In Theocritus for νάμα must be read νίμα, i.e. νίμμα 'water for washing.' νάμα is impossible: it means a *flowing stream*. Burlesque could speak of wine as νάμα βάκχιον (*Ar. Eccl.* 14) or of honey as ζουθῆς μελίσσης νάμασιν (*Antiphan.* 52. 7), but for *water to wash your hands with* it is as ridiculous as *bring the flood* would be in English.

Hence I read νίμμα for 'water' as in Dromo (ii. 419 K.) in Ath. 409 e νίμματα ἐπέχει τῖς and take αἶρε as meaning simply 'to bring' as in Plat. *Com. fr.* 46. 4 αἶρ' ὄδωρ.

a considerable popularity in Greece generally. Plato is said to have slept with them under his pillow, and, more important, to have taken from them the idea of his dialogues—*ἠθοποιῆσαι πρὸς αὐτά* says Diogenes Laertius (iii. 18).

Theocritus' style and metre

Here Theocritus had at hand an inspiration, which he adopted, with that rearrangement of metres and dialects which is so typical of the Alexandrians. Some of his pieces are Aeolic in the language and metre of Sappho. For his Mimes, as in his Bucolics, he uses the Sicilian Doric, but in a novel metre, the Ionic Hexameter—doubly novel, because used for ordinary dialogue. His sources in subject, Stesichorus, Epicharmus and Sophron have perished, probably from deficiency in form: but their ideas became common property, assimilated, absorbed, and embodied in a new setting—*τοῦτο γὰρ ἀθάνατον φωνᾶεν ἔρπει εἴ τις εὖ εἴπη τι*. His special merits and defects are too well known to describe here in full: what I would insist on is his adherence to the theories of Philetas and Callimachus. His brief little Epic stories I have already touched on: his style is plain, his diction learned; but there is one passage in which his acknowledgment is more or less specific.<sup>7</sup>

His brevity

In his *Harvest Home* (vii. 39 sqq.) the poet—Simichidas he calls himself—says: 'I cannot outsing yet, in my compare, Sicelidas' (Asklepiades) 'from Samos, or the rare Philetas; 'tis but as a frog I croak Against cicalas.' Or again in the answer of Lycidas: 'I hate your builder that would build a shed As towering as the sovran mountain's head, And birds of poesy that fondly strain, Cackling against the Chian bard in vain.'

The seventh idyll

If anyone would wish to see what Alexandrian fashions, followed with complete fidelity, could produce in the hands of a true artist, I would choose this poem of Theocritus (*Book of Greek Verse* pp. 206–215) to be their representative. Observe the novelty of form—new subject for the metre, and new combination with the dialect—the smallness of the scale, the finish the vivacity, the picturesqueness, the variety, the unhackneyed freshness of the rustic themes, so quaint and homely, some of them, but all in keeping; the description at the end, the geographical mention of romantic names, the touch of courtier's compliment, and the literary criticism. How rich it is, Goëthe would have said, in *motives*; and how many tastes and interests it would make appeal to without pedantry!

Cos

The scene of the Idyll is laid in Cos; and it is with Cos that Herodas is connected, not only by the fact that he puts there the scene of two Mimes (II. and IV.)—others are placed elsewhere, two (VI. and VII.) apparently at Ephesus. But the fact is immaterial. The connexion of Philetas with Cos does much to account for its attraction to Herodas as to Theocritus. It was

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-43828-6 - Herodas: The Mimes and Fragments

Edited by A. D. Knox

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

## INTRODUCTION

xxvii

high in the royal favour of the Ptolemies, for political reasons. It stands midway on the route from the Dardanelles and Asia Minor to Alexandria. To-day it supplies Alexandria daily with fruit and vegetables. It possessed a distinguished medical school; it was the scene of the labours of Apelles, and it is said that he died there. This connexion of Herodas with Cos has stimulated German scholars to make fresh excavations of that island: but the hope that digging up Cos may throw much light upon Herodas is, I fear, likely to be disappointed<sup>1</sup>. His sketches are not antiquarian documents: there is very little about Cos in them: there were plenty of Coan legends to use if he had wished, but that was not his design.

No, it was merely a setting for literature, and it is from literature that his works are to be illustrated. Unfortunately, that is the last thing that many scholars are willing to do. It costs some time and expense to read Greek literature: how much easier to take a spade!

Herodas has been called 'most difficult.' Difficult he is in some sense. Not with the conscious difficulty of a Lycophron. His difficulty lies in the fact that he is *alluding*, and his allusions, however easy for his audience, for us are difficult. His references can only be discovered by extensive reading: many authors must be dredged and some branches reconstructed, before we can arrive at conclusions. Herodas

When Herodas, like Theocritus, is going to write *literary* Mimes, the literary dress he chooses is Alexandrian all over. A true  
Alexan-  
drian

His material (we shall see) is largely literary, derived from previous writings, and presuming a knowledge of antique dialect. He has chosen a novel metre. The work is on a small canvas, with nothing superfluous or redundant, but with firm clear outlines, and highly finished execution.

There are Alexandrian qualities that are not pleasing to our taste. But Herodas, like Theocritus, is good in his kind. He has no ostentation of curious erudition: he has a compliment to Ptolemy in the first Mime but it is not undignified or servile.

In a word, he has *καιρός*, a sense of the fitting, a quality His *καιρός* which goes with a sense of humour. The only thing we need regret is the unpleasant nature of some of his subjects—they are not pretty, and there is further occasional grossness of expression. That is, for us, unfortunate: but it belonged to the tradition of the Mime, and it is all in character. And, to a considerable

<sup>1</sup> It has been found that many of the names used in the Mimes were those of real persons in Cos. Strange! But less strange perhaps, if we remember that Sophron was not the least important of Herodas' sources. Digging on any Dorian site would produce the same coincidences.

extent, Herodas disarms us by his attitude—so impersonal and disinterested, so calm and cool and unashamed, that he fairly compels us to take the audacities for granted, and accept them.

His  
moderate  
popularity

Herodas enjoyed a certain popularity with the ancients. Pliny the younger (*Ep.* iv. 3, 3) in praising the Greek epigrams and *iambi* (or *mimiambi*) of an Antoninus says: '*quantum ibi humanitatis, venustatis, quam amantia, quam arguta, quam recta! Callimachum me vel Heroden vel si quid his melius tenere credebam: quorum tamen neuter utrumque aut absolvit aut attingit.*' Pliny names him as the chief writer of *mimiambi*. Several scholars have detected in Plutarch (p. 18 c) an allusion to *Mime II.*, but here, as elsewhere, the reference may be to his sources. He was quarried by the grammarians and the hunters after proverbs: and by at least one writer of *Anthologies*, whose choice survives in *Stobaeus'* work. The Roman writers of *mimiambi*, *Mattius* and *Vergilius Romanus*, may well have used him: there is no satisfactory evidence for his use by any other Roman poet.

He is, however, a true, and by no means bad instance of the method of the Alexandrians: and it is for this purpose that I have given a rough account of their general aims and designs.

His metre

The metre he adopts is that invented, they say, by that sturdy old plebeian satirist, *Hipponax* of *Ephesus* (550 B.C.), regarded also, as we have seen, as the originator of parody. Herodas, at the end of the '*Dream*,' acknowledges him as his model in this respect, the founder of the *scazon* or *choliambic*, 'halt,' or 'lame' metre with its limping spondee at the end of the verse. The metre was used too by his contemporary *Ananias*.

Whoever was the first to use the metre, we must feel that Herodas has made a happy choice. It has a growling and grimacing effect, with an accompaniment of irony, well suited to sardonic humour. *Sophon's*, as the *Atellane farces*, were written in plebeian language, and Herodas' metre and *dialect* are intended to convey that impression.

His dialect

The dialect—let us be quite clear about that—is intended to be the antique *Ephesian* Ionic of *Hipponax*, used also, a generation later, by *Heraclitus*, of whom our fragments are unhappily so few.

Other  
choliambic  
writers

Herodas is not the only writer to use it. Whoever it may have been who set the fashion—the end of the '*Dream*' is too uncertain to allow us to suppose that he claimed credit for the Revival—the metre soon became a favourite. There are the *Choliambics* of *Callimachus*,<sup>77</sup> so recently discovered, full of literary criticism, but unfortunately so mutilated as to prevent us from deciding whether they were directed at Herodas.<sup>77</sup> *Aeschrius* used it: so did *Phoenix*. *Theocritus* writes an epitaph on *Hip-*

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-43828-6 - Herodas: The Mimes and Fragments

Edited by A. D. Knox

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

## INTRODUCTION

xxix

ponax in it : so did Leonidas of Tarentum. The tradition is taken up by Babrius, <sup>†</sup> and there are others reviewed by Gerhard in his *Phoinix von Kolophon*.<sup>†</sup> I may add what may sound queer : two writers whose diction is closely akin are Sophocles and Thucydides. The latter 'writes,' as Gilbert Murray says, in an 'artificial style, obscure amidst its vividness, archaistic and poetic in vocabulary....He writes in an artificial semi-Ionic dialect.' This is due chiefly to the literary tradition of history, to his predecessors, but also, presumably, to immediate sources of portions of his work.

This antique Ionic, with Herodas, extends to little more than his vocabulary: the cast and construction of his sentences is for the most part fluent Attic; he is thinking in the style of Attic comedy, then translating words or phrases into what he considers to be their antique equivalents, not always with perfect accuracy. Once we have recognized that, we shall see that there are several phrases which we can only explain by translating them into Attic—for example *ἐκὼν ἐπίσπη, ἀλεωρή* (for *ἀσφάλεια*).

There is another practice which Herodas systematically adopts—a device for securing ornate and poetic diction to replace the simplicity of Attic comedy. His ornateness is secured largely by the use of heightened and remoter synonyms—the constant practice of Lyric and Tragedy. The habit reaches absurd proportions in Nonnus who, avoiding, as far as possible, the use of *ἔχω, φέρω, αἴρω*, for to 'hold,' 'bear,' 'lift,' indulges for choice in such words as *μεθέπω, κουφίζω, ἀερτάζω, ἐλαφρίζω, ὀχλίζω*.

Herodas habitually adopts this plan to carry out the effect of quaintness and oddity which he aims at. Examples, some of which have puzzled editors, I collect here<sup>1</sup>—

- I. 16 *γῆρας καθέλκει (βαρύνει)*.
- II. 32 *τῇ γενῇ φυσῶντες (πνέοντες)*.
- III. 93 *τὴν γλάσσαν ἐς μέλι πλύνας (βάψας)*.
- V. 50 *ἦν τι...παραστείξεης (παραβῆς)*.
- VI. 33 *κῆτέρην...φίλην ἀθρείτω (ὀράτω or σκοπέιτω)*.
- VII. 7 *ὑπνον ἐκχέη (ἀποβάλη)*.
- VIII. 15 *φρένας βόσκεις (τρέφεις)*.

Having considered these external difficulties it may be possible to penetrate beneath the surface.

†First of all, however, there are one or two other features of The Herodas' style to which attention should be called. The first of these is his use of the proverb. This may well have been calculated to convey the impression of common life: but it is

<sup>1</sup> See also *nn.* on I. 22, 38, II. 25.

more frequent in Herodas than in more vulgar authors, and, as I have said already, was due chiefly to his model Sophron. Herodas does not appear so dependent upon the tradition of oriental proverbs introduced to the Greek world by Democritus; and the queer, sometimes confused style of allusion often suggests literal borrowing. For example in III. 76 οὐδείς σ' ἐπαινέσειεν οὐδ' ὅκου χώρης οἱ μὲν ὁμοίως τὸν σίδηρον τρώγουσιν the dialect (μὲν) and the queer use of ὁμοίως suggest that the transference is not wholly skilful.

Borrowed  
from  
Sophron

Here is what 'Demetrius' says of Sophron (*de eloc.* § 156) *φύσει γὰρ χάριεν πρᾶγμά ἐστι παροιμία, ὡς ὁ Σώφρων μὲν, Ἡπιόλης, ἔφη, ὁ τὸν πατέρα πνίγων. καὶ ἀλλαχόθι πού φησιν, ἐκ τοῦ δυνχος γὰρ τὸν λέοντα ἔγραψεν· τορύναν ἔξεσεν, κύμινον ἔπρισεν, καὶ γὰρ δυσὶ παροιμίαις καὶ τρίσιν ἐπαλλήλοις χρῆται ὡς ἐπιπληθύνονται αὐτῷ αἱ χάριτες· σχεδόν τε πάσας ἐκ τῶν δραμάτων αὐτοῦ τὰς παροιμίας ἐκλέξαι ἐστίν.* Rhys Roberts' note on the proverb may here be consulted; he does not sufficiently emphasize, however, the importance of Sicilian and Italian tradition. One of his modern instances, the remark of President Kruger that Dr Jameson 'made one hand wash the other' was, as we shall see (on II. 80), used in another sense by Epicharmus, whose name should be added to the note with that of Herodas and Democritus, for whose connexion with Ahikar see the preface to the latter's tale in Charles' *Apocrypha*. But the influence of the Sicilians, as may be judged from Plato's habit, must have been far more potent.<sup>1</sup>

Allusions  
to Comedy

If Herodas, in his use of proverbs, is, like the Atticist orators, literary, there is also, as we have seen, a fondness for obscure and literary allusion to the characters and incidents of comedy, which frequently occasions difficulty (for example in v. 68 ὡσπερ ἡ Δάου τιμή, where one solution of †καταμνος† is that the word is an unintelligent application of the proverb κατὰ μὺς ὄλεθρον).

Nomen-  
clature

Of a piece with the allusive system of Herodas is his practice of nomenclature. In comedy, as we shall see, 'types' had established themselves; and the names for the types tended to become, to some degree, fixed. Herodas takes these names and uses them, even for those who are not his main characters, so that we are sometimes dependent on guess-work for the exact significance. But he also draws from wider sources. Some of his names are historic. We are not surprised to find that the old Gyllis is mother of Philaenion or Philaenis (I. 5 n.)—Philaenis is a lady whose curious works would have been on the *Index* of our Circulating Librarians; nor that Gyllis' *protégées* are called (v. 89) Myrtale and Sime—besides the literary use of the names, theology and physiognomy can tell us why. The names Gryllus (if this is