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](#)

Theocritus and Herodas

H. Kynaston

The Classical Review / Volume 6 / Issue 03 / March 1892, pp 85 - 86

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00184963, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00184963

How to cite this article:

H. Kynaston (1892). Theocritus and Herodas. The Classical Review, 6, pp 85-86
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00184963

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

The Classical Review

MARCH 1892.

THEOCRITUS AND HERODAS.

THERE are not a few passages in which Theocritus and Herodas mutually illustrate one another: and it may be expected that the writings of the former will materially assist the work of deciphering the text of the latter.

We should naturally look to those Idylls of Theocritus which are distinctly Mimic for the most frequent instances of resemblance, presuming that both poets were imitators of Sophron, or at all events preserved certain traditions or characteristics of the Mime which were originated (?) by him. Let us look first at Theoc. Id. ii.

Here in ll. 18, 19

. . . . ἀλλ' ἐπίπασσε,
Θέστυλι· δειλαία, πᾶ τὰς φρένας ἐκπεπτόασαι;
we find an instance of that peevish irritability and impatience in addressing slaves, of which Herodas affords frequent examples, e. g.

οὐ σοι λέγω αὐτῇ τῇ ὧδε χῶδε χασκούσῃ;
μᾶ. μὴ τιν' ὥρην ὦν λέγω πεποίηται,
ἔστηκε δ' ἔς μ' ὀρεῦσα· καρκίν', οὐ με ζεῖς;
—iv. 42.

. . . σὺ δ' οὐδὲν ἄν, τάλαινα, ποιήσῃς
αὐτῇ ἀπὸ σεωντῆς· μᾶ. λίθος τις οὐ δούλη
ἐν τῇ οἰκίῃ μευ εἶς. κ.τ.λ.—vi. 3.

Δριμύλῳ φωνέω· πάλιν καθεύδεις;—vii. 5.

Ψύλλα, μεχρὶς τευ κείσει βέγκουσα;—
viii. 1.

The occurrence of such expressions is a strong argument in favour of the theory that Mimes were really acted; they would give occasion for plenty of comic 'business.' Further on in the same Idyll we may compare l. 55 with Herodas v. 17.

χρέω μοι ὅκη βούλει
καὶ μὴ τὸ μευ αἶμα νύκτα χημέρην πῖνε.
NO. XLIX. VOL. VI.

The word *μακαρίτης*, too, very rare in the feminine, occurs in Theoc. Id. ii. 70 and in Herodas vi. 55. The custom also of borrowing smart clothes for special occasions (although it was not peculiar to that age or country) is alluded to in this same Idyll, l. 74, and in Herodas vi. 26, as pointed out by Dr. Rutherford.

In Idyll xiv. I have not noticed anything besides the introduction of the proverb

μὺς φαντί, Θυνόνιχε, γέμεθα πίσσας,
with which compare Herodas ii. 62

πέπονθα πρὸς Θαλήτος ὅσσα χῆ' μ' πίσσῃ
μὺς.

Dr. Rutherford, in his note on the passage in Herodas, quotes from *Paroem. Gr.* to the effect that the proverb is applied to those who have succeeded in overcoming their adversaries after great difficulty. But is it not rather applicable to one who has been attracted by the hope of gain, and finds that he is inextricably entangled in something particularly disagreeable? It certainly has that meaning in the case of Aeschines (Theoc. l.c.) who is disappointed in the result of his love-affair, and in the case of Battarus (Her. l.c.) who expected half-pence rather than kicks from Thales. But this is rather digressing. Let us go on to Idyll xv.

The commencement of this Idyll (as Dr. Rutherford has pointed out) bears a very strong resemblance to Herodas i. Compare the 'ὡς χρόνῳ' of Praxinoe with 'τί σὺ θεὸς πρὸς ἀνθρώπους; κ.τ.λ.' (i.e. 'to what am I indebted for this angel's-visit?') of Metriche: similar reasons too are given for the long interval between the visits—

τὸ δ' ἐκαστέρῳ ὧ μὲλ' ἀποικεῖς (Theoc.) and

μακρὴν ἀποικέω, τέκνον, ἐν δὲ τῆς λαύρης
ὁ πῆλος ἀχρὺς ἰγνῶν προσέστηκεν (Herodas).

Another good example of the peevish irritability of mistresses must be noticed in this Idyll, ll. 27 foll. We may also compare the expressions of wonder uttered by Gorgo and Praxinoe on viewing the tapestry-work, with those of the ladies who admired the votive images in the Asclepieum at Cos.

Compare:—

θεῶν περονάματα φασεῖς

ὡς ἔτυμ' ἐστάκαντι, καὶ ὡς ἔτυμ' ἐνδιενῦντι.

ἔμψυχ', οὐκ ἐνυφαντά. σοφόν τι χρῆμ' ὦν-
θρωπος.—Theoc. xv. 79, 82.

with Herodas iv. 20:—

μᾶ. μᾶ. καλῶν, φίλη Κυνοῖ,

ἀγαλμάτων

and iv. 32.—

πρὸ τῶν ποδῶν γοῦν εἴ τι μὴ λίθος τοῦργον

ἐρεῖς λαλῆσαι. μᾶ. χρόνῳ κοθ' ὠνθρωποι

κῆς τοὺς λίθους ἔξουσιν τὴν ζόην θεῖναι.

and iv. 57.—

ταῦτ' ἐρεῖς Ἀθηναῖον

γλύψαι τὰ καλὰ . . . and more.

Next in importance to these Mimic illustrations come the indications of the date of Herodas which are furnished by the comparison of his Mime i. with Theoc. Id. xvii. The latter contains the praises of Ptolemy Philadelphus, and was presumably written after Theocritus had migrated to Alexandria from Sicily, *i.e.* some time between 270 and 266 B.C. The wealth of the king and the extent of his kingdom are enthusiastically described, ll. 76 foll., and the advantages of a residence in Egypt are briefly summed up by Gullis in Herodas i. 26 foll. Theocritus says of Philadelphus (l. 121) that 'he is the only one who either in past or present time dedicated altars to his mother as well as to his father.' Herodas mentions θεῶν ἀδελφῶν

τέμενος. That would not apply to the divine honour paid to the father and mother of Philadelphus; but if we presume that Euergetes followed his father's example of filial piety and dedicated a τέμενος to Philadelphus and Arsinoe, who were brother and sister, then it follows that Herodas was writing of the reign of Ptolemy III.

I will add a few more trifling perhaps, but still noticeable points of connexion between the two poets.

Cp. Theoc. i. 18.—

καὶ οἱ αἰεὶ δρυμεῖα χολὰ ποτὶ ῥινὶ κáθηται.

with Herod. vi. 37.—

μὴ δὴ, Κοριττοῖ, τὴν χολὴν ἐπὶ ῥινὸς
ἔχ' ἰθὺς ἦν τι ῥῆμα μὴ καλὸν πεύθη.

Theoc. v. 51 and xv. 125.—

ὑπῶ μαλακώτερα.

with Herodas vi. 71.—

ἡ μαλακότης ὑπνος.

Theocr. x. 13.—

ἐκ πίθῳ ἀντλεῖς δῆλον.

with Herodas iv. 14.—

οὐ γάρ τι πολλὴν οὐδ' ἐτόιμον ἀντλεῦμεν.

The expression ὠνάθην μεγάλως in Theoc. xv. 55 may help to fill up the lacunæ in Herodas i. 83, 84, thus—

πέισουσά σ' ἦλθον, ἀλλὰ [μᾶλλον ὠνάθην].

ὦν οὐνεχ' ἐν μοι, Γύλλι, ὠνά[θης, χαίρω].

The use of the future indicative in place of the optative with ἄν of Attic Greek (which in the word ἐρεῖς is frequent in Herodas, as Dr. Rutherford has noticed) is also met with in Theocritus, *e.g.*

Ὁρᾶν πεπλῦσθαι νιν ἐπὶ κράναισι δοκασεῖς.—i. 150.

τάχ' ὥτερος ἄλλον ὀνασεῖ.—vii. 36.

θεῶν περονάματα φασεῖς.—xv. 79.

ἄργυρος, ἣ τίς ὁ μισθός, ἐρεῖς, ᾧ κέν σε πίθοι-
μεν;—xxii. 64.

H. KYNASTON.

ADVERSARIA ON THE GREEK ANTHOLOGY.

While reading Mr. Mackail's delightful book of selections I have jotted down the following notes, which I should like to submit to his attention and that of other scholars who are concerning themselves with the *Anthology*.

Anth. Pal. v. 237 (Mackail, Sect. 1. xxx. 5).

Ὅρματα δ' οὐ λάοντα φυλάσσεται
μύοντα Hecker. δὲ σταλαῖοντα *al.*

Read ὅρματα δ' οἰδόντα, and cf. κυλοι-

διδόντες in a similar connexion, Theoc. i. 38.

A. P. vi. 30 (Sect. 2. vii. 7, 8).

Keep the MS. reading and punctuate
Θρέψον ἔτι σπαῖρον τὸ γερόντιον, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ γαίης,
ὡς ἐθέλεις μεδῶν καὶ χθονὶ καὶ πελάγει.
= 'since thou rulest as thou wilt equally on land and sea.'

A. P. ix. 142 (Sect. 2. xxxv. 2).

The alteration of the MS. κέκευθε into
λέλογχε hardly commends itself. It is better