

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](#)



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. HPΩΝΔΟΓ ΜΙΜΙΑΜΒΟΙ. *Herondas, a first recension*, by William Gunion Rutherford, M.A., LL.D. London: Macmillan & Co. 1891. HPΩΔελτα;ΟΓ ΜΙΜΙΑΜΒΟΙ. *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*: Otto von Crusius. Leipzig, 1892. Mk. 6. *Herondae Mimiambi*. Edidit Otto Crusius. (Bibliotheca Teubneriana) Lipsiae, 1892. Mk. 2.40.

R. A. Neil

The Classical Review / Volume 7 / Issue 07 / July 1893, pp 314 - 318

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00198257, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00198257

How to cite this article:

R. A. Neil (1893). The Classical Review, 7, pp 314-318 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00198257

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

VII. 17. Probably ἀνω[θεν].—ἀ μάκαρ (or ὀλβία) Μητ[ρο]ῦ, 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.

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

Herondae Mimambi. 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 Mimambi. 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 καταπλάζεις of the transcript. Something might be said for the plan of publishing the facsimile along with the transcript: a good deal of vain thought

and conjecture would have been saved if this had been done.

Dr. Rutherford's edition appeared almost simultaneously with the transcript, and was apparently based on the transcript only. This edition was the first attempt to give the distribution of speakers, to mark punctuation, and generally to give the author in a readable form. It supposes that the reader will have the transcript before him. This supposition gives the excuse and the corrective for the fault of the edition—a fault for which Dr. Rutherford has been sufficiently criticized—disregard of the manuscript and consequent licence of conjecture. Take the opening lines: Dr. Rutherford fills up line 1 with $\Theta[\rho\acute{\epsilon}\iota\sigma\sigma]a$, which is certain, and line 9 with $\tau\acute{\iota}\sigma\upsilon\theta[ε\acute{o}s\pi\rho\acute{o}]s\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\acute{\omega}\pi\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$; which is not only certain, but brilliant, however easy it may seem when once done; but in line 2 he alters $\pi\alpha\rho'\ \acute{\eta}\mu\acute{\epsilon}\omega\nu$ into $\pi\alpha\rho'\ \acute{\eta}\mu\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\varsigma$, and in line 3 he writes $\xi\rho\epsilon\iota\delta\epsilon$ for $\epsilon\sigma\omega\delta\epsilon$ of the transcript. In this last case the facsimile would have probably set him on the right track: it gives the plain stop after $\theta\acute{\upsilon}\rho\eta\nu$, which the transcript neglects, and which must have a meaning: but the $\pi\alpha\rho'\ \acute{\eta}\mu\acute{\epsilon}\omega\nu$? If $\pi\alpha\rho'\ \acute{\eta}\mu\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\varsigma$ was the original reading, how could it have been corrupted into $\pi\alpha\rho'\ \acute{\eta}\mu\acute{\epsilon}\omega\nu$? There is a deep difference between different men's minds on such points: but nothing will seem less probable to most readers than that such a change should have happened. The speakers are generally characterized, by hint or otherwise, as early as possible in each mime: and here no doubt Metriche is made to allude to her country-house in the second line. She is one of the few respectable characters in the book: and her property and position are implied at once.

Dr. Rutherford's work has the boldness, without the caution, of the good pioneer. Those conjectures of his that have been adopted imply only the slightest departure, if any, from the manuscript. Where other scholars have allowed themselves as much freedom as he, they have had no more success. Some of his proposals that have been rejected may yet be adopted, as the ingenious $\acute{\eta}\nu\sigma\phi\eta\rho\gamma\acute{\gamma}\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ in l. 55, which Prof. A. Palmer approves: but that needs no change from the MS.

His notes are clear and vigorous: there is no mistaking his meaning, and there is no superfluous matter. Whether we agree with him or not, the first attempt to explain the author, without scholia, from internal evidence only, demands and should receive a special respect.

The first impression was soon exhausted, and Dr. Rutherford issued a second, which is also out of print some time ago. Several corrections were introduced, both in text and notes, in this reprint: but the character of the editing was naturally unchanged, marks of haste still remained (*e.g.* $\sigma\upsilon$ unaccented in l. 3, $\tau\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\iota\nu\acute{\alpha}\sigma\upsilon$ in l. 36), and such strange proposals as $\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\ \sigma\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\epsilon$ in l. 48 were not withdrawn.

Immediately after the appearance of the transcript and of Dr. Rutherford's edition there began what Prof. Crusius calls an 'acerrima velitatio' of scholars conjecturing and explaining. In England valuable proposals were made by Canon Hicks, Mr. Robinson Ellis, Dr. Jackson, Prof. A. Palmer, Mr. Walter Headlam, Mr. E. W. B. Nicholson and others. Mr. Nicholson's letters to the *Academy* were mainly devoted to a keen defence of MS. readings against Dr. Rutherford.

Without exception, it may be said, the conjectures that have stood the test of examination are those that come nearest to the manuscript. In some cases, a conjecture turned out to be the reading of the papyrus, or, as in l. 80, a conjecture that filled up the line received its confirmation from a farther examination of the MS.

Several editions of separate mimes were published in periodicals: Bücheler gave the first mime in *Rhein. Museum*, Kaibel the fourth and sixth in *Hermes*, Gercke and Günther the third in the *Wochenschrift für Klass. Philologie*.

The second complete edition was published by Prof. H. van Herwerden of Utrecht in *Mnemosyne* early in 1892. The editor gives pressure of time as his reason for preferring the pages of that well-known periodical to a separate publication of the mimes, and expresses obligations to van Leeuwen for the removal of the misprints, which he says 'scripta mea cum multo meo detrimento corrumpere solent.' The edition contains notes, critical and explanatory, and as it follows the transcript (the facsimile was not issued in time to be used) much more closely than Dr. Rutherford had done, it marks a distinct advance towards a received text. It does not appear that many independent corrections are due to van Herwerden. His 'facile Atticism,' as Dr. Rutherford has called it, has made him the best follower of Cobet: but the special qualities of the Dutch school are not called for in Herondas, and he has felt rightly that explanation is needed more than conjecture, withdrawing several proposals he had formerly published

in the *Berlin Phil. Woch.* He believes that the mimes were meant for representation on the stage, the meaning being often brought out by the acting: and he suggests that the papyrus was copied from an older manuscript in a difficult cursive hand.

An edition published by the veteran scholar, Prof. Bücheler, in February 1892 was soon sold off, and a re-issue with a few additions and corrections appeared in March. For nearly the whole book the facsimile was available by the time when the first issue appeared: *κατάπλωσιν* is of course read without remark in l. 68 and there is a tone of greater confidence in the general correctness of the MS. readings. The speakers' names are not given in the text, *παράγραφοι* being used instead. This was, no doubt, the old Greek way: but there will be a general hope that the example set by such distinguished scholars as Bücheler and Wilamowitz-Möllendorff in adopting it will not be widely followed. A Latin translation is given below the Greek text, in a somewhat Petronian style, which is not inappropriate: words like *cetipendia* (withdrawn in the second edition), *impilia*, *assatim*, will add to the Latin vocabulary of most readers. The brief notes always make us feel the great learning of the veteran scholar, though we sometimes wish that he had shown it more explicitly, as in the note to 2. 73, where the words 'cf. de historico proditam memoriam' will afford a puzzle. The indices are the most complete that have appeared, being indeed concordances.

Professor Otto Crusius of Tübingen was well known to scholars as editor of the *Philologus*, and by his papers on Greek Paroemiography, Mythology, and proper names: his work on Herondas will bring his name and qualities into a wider reputation.

The preface to the *Untersuchungen* is dated mid-May 1892, that to the edition a month later. The *Untersuchungen* was originally intended to include a fuller treatment of the metre and technique of the mimes: it is interesting to read the author's reason for issuing the book as it is: 'die beiden Ferien- und Arbeitsmonate August und September hab ich, als *iuvenis* im alten und im allerneusten Sinne, unter einem andern Herrn zu dienen.' The facsimile appeared when about half the book was printed: hence the *Nachlese* at the end must be carefully consulted for the author's final views. The book is a commentary, not continuous, but on the more difficult passages only. The learning applied is very great, if sometimes cumbrous: wide knowledge of proverbs and

acuteness in seeing the points implied in the proper names are the most serviceable qualities displayed: and they are qualities especially to be looked for in Prof. Crusius and especially needed in dealing with Herondas.

Crusius' text is as near that of the papyrus, where it is legible, as is consistent with a regard for sense: he is persuaded that grave changes are unnecessary, if the words are properly studied and explained. The difficult question of the dialectic forms is left much as the MS. presents it. Dr. Rutherford's text is ionized throughout: Prof. Crusius thinks that the Coan poet has intentionally mingled Doric forms with the Ionic and Attic, suiting the forms of expression to the characters who use them: 'inepta rάλης forma mulieres utuntur cavillantes' (3. 35, 7. 88): *ὑμέων* is a cretic in 2. 27, *ἡμέων* a molossus in 1. 46, though *ὑμέας* and *ὑμέων* are generally contracted into spondees. Where the MS. is illegible, he allows himself free scope: everything is filled up, though the careful use of brackets usually marks every letter that is not vouched for (sometimes the bracket has been omitted as in *ἡμέας* l. 16, where the MS. shows only the final letter): 'audax esse volui, ubi alii cauti fuerunt, cautus, ubi fuerunt audaces.' The critical notes give a very full collation of the MS. and all conjectural supplements and alterations are carefully assigned to their authors. Some marks of haste appear in both books: these will be found removed, as far as the text-edition is concerned, in an article of Prof. Crusius in *Philologus* for 1892, p. 536, where he accepts Meister's *λήξεε* (from *λάσκω*) in 3. 11. It was almost inevitable that the author should change his opinion on several points: in an excellent review article (on the English editions) in *Liter. Centralb.* for Sept. 12, 1891, he described Rutherford's *Πρίσκε* in 3. 71 as a 'wunderhübsche End-Koseform,' but he ignores it in his edition.

Crusius' indices are excellent, though the index of words is not a concordance as Bücheler's is: the list of proper names marks with an asterisk those names which are found in inscriptions or myths of Cos. He gives also a useful bibliographical list of books and articles on the subject: to this list may now be added Blass' review of Crusius in *Gött. gel. Anz.* 1892, p. 857, Weil's review of the later literature in *Journal des Savants* 1893, p. 18, and Setti's *Mimi di Eroda* (Modena 1893).

It may be desirable to mention in this review certain opinions expressed and conclusions arrived at, not only in the

editions mentioned above, but also in articles and reviews. Few contributions to the knowledge of Herondas are more important than some such articles, especially those of Prof. Blass in the *Gött. Gel. Anzeiger*.

The author's name is given sometimes as Herodas, and sometimes as Herondas, by ancient authorities. The form Herondas is the rarer, and its rarity has determined Crusius in its favour. The occurrence of Herodas in Greek Egyptian inscriptions such as those given in *Notices et extraits des MSS.* xviii. p. 360 and *Classical Review* 1891, p. 483, is of no weight in the matter. ΗΡΩΙΔΑΣ occurs in a Lesbian inscription (*C.I.G.* add. 2197c). A Herondas, son of Alciades, was buried at Heraclea Pontica (*Mitth. d. deutsch. arch. Inst.* iv. 18). Names in -ώδας are mainly Boeotian, and such forms must have come to Cos with the immigration from Orchomenus in the fourth century B.C.: possibly the names in -ίχος and -ίχη have the same origin.

The reign of the third Ptolemy seems to be generally accepted as the most probable date: though Mr. Maunde Thompson (*Palaeography*, p. 113) says 'Herodas flourished in the first century B.C.' Prof. van Herwerden proposed, but withdrew, the singular opinion that the fourth mime is much older than the others. Cos is certainly the scene of the second and fourth mimes, and nothing seems to require us to suppose that the others are to be placed elsewhere. Many of the names, as Crusius' index shows, occur in Coan inscriptions and other records: and the *Δύδη Μένωνος* of Paton and Hicks' *Inscr.* 300 comes near the *Ἀμφυταΐη Μένωνος* of 5. 3. The prevalence of names beginning with Μητρ- implies an Asiatic locality, although Paton and Hicks' index gives only two such for Cos. The names are generally what we should look for in the characters described: we know what to expect from a Gyllis or a Battaros son of Sisymbras, as from a Lady Booby or a Mrs. Slipslop.

As to the date of the papyrus, Blass (in *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1891, p. 728) holds that the spelling is that of Tryphon and his time: in the second century A.D. we should have had many more cases of α and ε confused (*ἡμεθα* 3.45 is about the only instance); the rare accentuation too he thinks is old. On the other hand Mr. Maunde Thompson (*Palaeography*, p. 128) gives lines from the papyrus 'as an example of a rougher style of uncial writing of about the third century. The corrections written over the text are taken by Bücheler as really corrections, by

Crusius as conjectures (except when obviously from the first hand), by Blass as various readings noted from other copies. Where the MS. is corrupt, it may very possibly turn out to be hopelessly so: but, in the main, the most careful readers and followers of it have got the best text. Blass still holds that in 1.74 it reads ὃν δὲ γρήμαιοι.

As regards religion, Weil has pointed out that invocations of the Μοῖραι (as in 1. 11, 66 and 4. 30) are rare elsewhere, and were probably characteristic of certain localities. ἰγυία in 4.94, as Mr. Paton showed in *Class. Rev.* 1891, p. 483, is probably a *pain bénit*. The exact ritual meaning of ἐπίδορα in 4.13 has not been explained: it may be found to determine the time of day when the mime is supposed to begin and so to explain line 54.

The bearing of this fourth mime on the history of art has been treated by Mr. A. S. Murray in *Class. Rev.* 1891, p. 389, by Dr. Waldstein (reported in *Class. Rev.* 1892, p. 136), and by Gurlitt in *Arch. Epigr. Mittheil. aus Oest.-Ungarn* xv. p. 169. Prof. Diels pointed out that the mime gives the view of art's mission prevalent at the time — portraiture, truth to life, and realism of presentation. Dr. Meister, in a paper before the *Sächs. Ges. der Wissensch.* (reported in *Berl. Philol. Wochenschr.* for 24 Dec. 1892), gives an interesting explanation of 4.59–, as a group consisting of Isis, Harpocrates, Apis, Horus and Anubis, remarking that πασρός in Greek temples is only used in connexion with shrines for the worship of Egyptian deities. Other questions of *realia*, which may be of importance in fixing the scene, whether Cos or elsewhere, have regard to the coinage, to the names of months (Taureon 7.86), festivals (Gerania 5.80), and proverbs (Crusius' explanation of μάλλον ὁ Φρύξ in 5.14 seems hardly to be borne out by the ancient authorities, and does not τὰ Ναρνάκου of weeping in 3.10 refer to the Phrygian story of the deluge with Nannacus as its Noah?).

'Some are darker than you would like, and not family subjects' as Mr. Borthrop Trumbull said of the Old Masters. Many details are far from clear, but there can be no doubt about the kind of life portrayed. Hardly a single character reaches the standard of common decency. Probably no one has doubts now as to the meaning of the sixth mime. Coarse and cruel abuse of slaves appears throughout and is taken as a matter of course. But, given the characters and the situations, the treatment is

excellent in the true classical style. The sentiments are as 'just' as in Racine.

Three recent theories bearing on the transmission of ancient texts are on their trial, and any new papyrus may be regarded as supplying a test of their truth. But it cannot be said that any very remarkable evidence can be brought out of this papyrus to bear on any of the three—Wilamowitz' theory of the publishers' selection of texts about Hadrian's time, Usener's theory of the corruption and carelessness of most papyri, and Rutherford's theory of adscripts. In 4.7 Crusius does not mention that Dr.

Rutherford reads *δορκάδες* in his second issue, on the supposition that *δοτράγαλοι* is an adscript.

The enormous destruction of papyri in Egypt, which went on apparently in the eleventh century above all, must have spared many copies. More literary resurrections may be hoped for with good fortune: and we may be startled next by the discovery of Philochorus' *Atthis*, a play of Cratinus or of Menander, or Sappho herself.

R. A. NEIL.

LANG'S HOMER AND THE EPIC.

Homer and the Epic, by ANDREW LANG, M.A., etc. Longmans Green and Co. 1893. 9s. net.

WHEN a man of genius and a poet condescends to the dusty arena in which prosaic scholars rend one another over the body of Homer, he is sure to throw a new light on some things and to dispel some of the mist brooding over us. In this and similar cases however his arm is apt to be weakened by his not getting up the details with proper care. Not of these is Mr. Lang; he may say with Madame Bovary 'J'ai tout lu'; German and English, the separatist criticism is at his fingers' ends. His book is a really important contribution to the Homeric question, as I think must be acknowledged by even his most determined adversaries. At the same time we must allow that Mr. Lang is rather a special pleader and partisan than impartial judge. So perhaps are all the others who discuss this subject; so perhaps must they ever be. As Mr. Lang says, it is largely an affair of temperament. 'Our prepossession, as lovers of poetry, is in favour of the unity of the *Iliad*. The prepossessions of Mr. Leaf, Mr. Grote, Mr. Jebb, and other critics are in favour of separatism' (p. 135). True; but this is to admit a partial stand-point. Others also are lovers of poetry who yet, when it comes to a scientific problem, must give up their natural prepossession; Mr. Lang does it himself to some extent, as we shall see.

But the problem is literary, cries Mr. Lang at the threshold; it is literary and you try to solve it by other methods.

What then is the literary method? He does not tell us. Let us see how he applies his method to the tenth book, the least defensible of all the *Iliad*. In the body of the work he faintly defends it, on the ground that 'if it were possible, somewhere, somehow, to foist a whole book into the sacred text of Homer, then it would also be possible to foist many others.' We are not to confess to this interpolation for fear we should have to give up our cherished prepossession. Is this fair argument? But in a note at the end of the volume, he appears to throw over the tenth book, *because* Mr. Monro points out to him that it is one thing to foist in a whole book simply, another to foist in complicated changes such as those required by Bergk's theory of the *δπλοποιία*. So soon then as it does not threaten his main position he is willing to let this outpost pass into the enemy's hands, but he will not look at the matter as a scientific question at all. If *this* is the literary method, I confess to preferring the scientific, when it is really scientific. Mr. Lang is here seen at his worst, and if his method were always like this it would not help us much. But it is unfair to judge by one instance; let us take another. Mr. Lang says of Wilamowitz-Moellendorf's theories (p. 254): 'Now here at least we are on fair literary ground. These passages are among the immortal glories of art and of the *Odyssey*. A critic who assures us that they are the work of a "slenderly gifted botcher of the seventh century" may fairly be said to put himself out of court.' Such criticism is truly scientific, for it argues not from personal