The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Remarks on the Text op Herodas

Walter Headlam

The Classical Review / Volume 7 / Issue 07 / July 1893, pp 313 - 314

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00198245, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00198245

How to cite this article:

Walter Headlam (1893). Remarks on the Text op Herodas. The Classical Review, 7, pp 313-314 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00198245

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

I have been waiting for the appearance of Dr. Sandys' edition before offering a note on this passage. Dr. Sandys prints *ἐνταῦθ' ἐγγέγραπται* for *ἐντεῦθεν γέγραπται*, and gives the following notes: *ἄλλῃ καταβολῇ*, 'fail to pay an instalment.' *ἐνταῦθ' ἐγγέγραπται*, 'it is entered in this document'; this seems preferable to *ἐντεῦθεν γέγραπται*, 'a note is made of it from this record' (K.). When I first read this passage in Mr. Kenyon's edition I understood the meaning to be as follows; 'and if any one falls short in respect of an instalment (= fails to pay it in full), from that point (*i.e.* the point at which the short payment is reckoned) an entry is made (= the amount of shortage is registered), and he has to pay up the balance in duplicate or suffer imprisonment.'

This procedure was devised, not so much against those who failed to pay an instalment altogether, as against those who pretended to have brought their full instalment, and after a deal of shuffling and fumbling produced something short of the full payment, and either endeavoured to get off the payment of the balance, or promised to bring it another time, to be again probably forgotten.

F. T. RICKARDS.

Bombay.

* *

Cic. Att. v. 12.

Cuius studium in legendo non erectum Themistocli fuga redituque retinetur?

This is evidently either a slip of the memory, or rather pen, on the part of Cicero, or the passage is corrupt. Schutz proposes 'Themistoclis fuga, Alcibiadis fuga

redituque.' Professor Tyrrell 'Themistoclis fuga, Coriolani fuga redituque.' It may be objected to the former that there was nothing specially moving in the return of Alcibiades: to the latter that Coriolanus never returned from banishment in the ordinary sense. He returned as a hostile conqueror: and the fact that Cicero elsewhere compares him to Themistocles is an argument *against* the introduction of his name here, where he would be contrasted with Themistocles. I cannot find that the return of Aristides, one of the most moving passages in Greek history, has been thought of: and I have little doubt that Cicero either accidentally wrote *Themistocli* for *Aristidi* or wrote *Themistoclis fuga, fuga Aristidi redituque*. The omission of *Aristidi* is fairly accounted for by the similarity of the neighbouring letters.

ARTHUR PALMER.

* *

ἀραιωτών. In the *Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie*, viii, A. Funck cites and emends many glosses from the great collection of Loewe and Goetz. On p. 379 n. 86 he confesses himself puzzled where a moment's reflexion ought to have resolved his doubt. After citing ii 435 17 *σπανωτών malibarbis*, he remarks 'σπανός für σπανωτών ist griechischen Lexicis bekannt; was aber das griechische *ἀραιωτών* iii 329 63 ('de natura corporis humani') mit *malibarbis* erklärt, bedeutet, sehe ich nicht.' As Liddell and Scott have ten Greek compounds beginning with *ἀραιω-*, we need not hesitate to see here an eleventh, *ἀραιωτών*.

J. E. B. M.

REMARKS ON THE TEXT OF HERODAS.

I SHOULD like to publish in advance of my edition a few remarks on the text of Herodas:

I. 7. I read ΜΗΤ. *κάλει—τίς ἐστιν*; 'Ask the visitor to come in:—who is it?' *καλεῖν* is properly used of inviting a visitor; cf. *e.g.* Lucian i. 40, and especially Chariton p. 172, 4, p. 55, 8.

I. 58. *ἐφ' ἡμέρῃ* as Hes. Op. 102.

II. 20. *καλὴν καινὴν*?

III. 55. *ὁπῆμος*.

IV. 94. The unmeaning ΔΩΙ or ΛΩΙ should, I believe, be ΜΟΙ. The appearance

of ΜΟΙ in the facsimile at vii. 102 will show how easily the error might be made.

In V. 43, where both Buecheler and Crusius have an unmetrical *ἐάν*, I incline to think Danielssohn right in suggesting <τῇ> σοι *ἄν*, σοι being elided: though I suspect the present text to have been caused rather

ΟΙ

by THICΔN. The Herodotean use confirms me: see Hdt. i. 151, ii. 29, v. 33, vi. 74, ix. 11, 66.

VI. 102. Before ΚΗΝ comes, I think, not ΔΙ but ΓΔΡ.

VII. 17. Probably ἀνω[θεν].—ἀ μάκαρ (or ὀλβία) Μητ]ροῦ, οἱ ἔργ' ἐπόψεσθ'. Cf. Eur. *fr.* 446, Anth. Append. Cougny vi. 46, Philostr. *Ep.* 54, Aristoph. *fr.* 488, Theocr. xv. 146.

VII. 54. The solution of the puzzling traces in the MS. may be δεῖ μάλ' ἔς γ' ἐν ἡσθείσας ὑμέας ἀπελθεῖν. 'You must be pleased in respect of one (thing or pair)

before you go.' The scribe appears to have written ΓΕΝΝΗΘΕΙCΔC which would be a very natural error for ΓΕΝΗCΘΕΙCΔC. It looks as though a distinguishing mark had afterwards been added between Λ and C, and a C inserted between Η and Θ.

WALTER HEADLAM.

EDITIONS OF THE HERODAS PAPYRUS.

Classical Texts from Papyri in the British Museum, including the newly discovered poems of Herodas, edited by F. G. KENYON, M.A. By order of the Trustees of the British Museum. 1891.

HPΩNΔOY MIMIAMBOI. *Herondas, a first recension*, by WILLIAM GUNION RUTHERFORD, M.A., LL.D. London: Macmillan & Co. 1891.

HPΩAOY MIMIAMBOI. *Herodas, Facsimile of Papyrus CXXXV. in the British Museum*. By order of the Trustees. 1892.

Herondae Mimiambi. Edidit FRANCISCUS BUECHELER. Bonnae, 1892. Mk. 2.40.

—: exemplum iteratum. 1892. *Untersuchungen zu den Mimiamben des Herondas*: von OTTO CRUSIUS. Leipzig, 1892. Mk. 6.

Herondae Mimiambi. Edidit OTTO CRUSIUS. (Bibliotheca Teubneriana) Lipsiae, 1892. Mk. 2.40.

It is a matter for national congratulation that the British Museum has secured two such treasures as the papyrus-manuscripts of the Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία and the *Mimes* of Herondas. There is every probability that papyri will more and more form a most valuable portion of all great collections of manuscripts; and, however fortune may change in the future, the British Museum would now be recognized as surpassed in this respect by no other library. Before the Herondas was acquired, Prof. Blass (in Iwan Müller's *Handbuch*, vol. i. ed. 2) reckoned the Naples and London collections together as forming a first class; but even though the Epicurean's library from Herculaneum were fully decipherable, its contents hardly attain to the height of varied interest to which our papyri can lay just claims. The collections at Leyden and Berlin contain, as far as is known, little of literary importance: apart from the new speech of Hyperides, the same may be said

of the Paris collection; and the Archduke Rainer's many thousand papyri at Vienna (though such things as the musical score to a chorus of Euripides are of high interest, and we are promised sixty more lines of Callimachus' *Hecale*) are mostly so fragmentary that they stimulate curiosity rather than satisfy it.

Official publications from all these collections have earned the gratitude of scholars: but an English review may refer to the compliment paid by Prof. Diels (in *Deutsch. Literaturz.* 1891, no. 39) to the admirable and exceptional promptitude with which both the Aristotle and the Herondas have been given to the world.

In the *Academy* of Oct. 11, 1890, Professor Sayce published a transcript of a page and two lines of the Herondas. These turn out to be col. 41 and fragment 1, lines 3-4, i.e. mimes 7, 116-129 and 8, 1-3, 6-7. The beginnings of the lines were not given, and it was barely possible even to guess at the significance of the passage.

The reputation Mr. Kenyon deserved and gained from his work on the Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία was a guarantee of his success in the easier task of deciphering Herondas. The author's name does not occur in the manuscript, but it contains three passages quoted by Stobaeus (none with perfect accuracy), and two or three others quoted in ancient lexicæ and collections of proverbs, from Herondas. The transcript, accompanied by notes giving the minutiae of the MS. readings, is of course accurate to a degree: though here and there the untrained reader at all events may hesitate or withhold assent, and occasionally the facsimile shows beyond dispute that a certain reading has been missed, as in 1.68 where κατάπλωσιν is undoubted for the καταπλάξεις of the transcript. Something might be said for the plan of publishing the facsimile along with the transcript: a good deal of vain thought