AN HERONDEAN DIPTYCH*

This paper is intended as a reinforcement of the assumption that the placement side by side of these dramatic sketches which Koritto recommended to her friend Metro the wares of a certain Kerdoz and another dramatic sketch in which Metro and Kerdoz actually transact business is neither an accident nor attributable to the whim of some editor who collected the poet's works posthumously. No, I continue convinced that the arrangement is entirely Herondas' own and that Mimiambi 6 and 7 have been consciously brought together to form a diptych series comparable to those paired elegies (for example, I 21 and 22, II 6 and 7, II 14 and 15, III 24 and 25) distributed through the several books of Propertius. Having so stated, I am almost ready to inaugurate discussion of the interconnections, sometimes obvious, sometimes subtle, between Herondas' two juxtaposed skits.

But first I must point to various of what the Germans would call "Schwierigkeiten." Apart from scattered fragments quoted by grammarians, the only text of Mimiambi 1—8 available to us is that uncovered in Egypt in the early 1890's and thereupon variously classified, most familiarly as British Museum Papyrus 135. Despite its being separated from the autograph copy by no more than three or four centuries — it is now commonly acknowledged that Herondas may have been a contemporary of Callimachus and Theokritos — the Papyrus itself is beset not only with questionable readings, but also with ambiguities as to the distribution of speaking parts. Nor does that document offer any

* Presented at a meeting of The Classical Association of the Middle West and South, New Orleans, Louisiana, April 12, 1974.

1 In this connection one might profitably consult not only Karl Barwick's "Zur Interpretation von Properz II 15 und 14," *Philologus* XCIX (1955) 112—132, but also the same scholar's earlier "Catullus c. 68 und eine Kompositionsform der römischen Elegie und Epigrammatik," *Wiibb* II (1974) 1—15.


4 Defects of BMP 135 are succinctly summarized at coll. 1082f. of G. A. Gerhard's article s.v. Herondas, *RE* VIII 1, 1080—1102. See ibid. coll. 1080f. on the much debated question of whether the author's name is Herondas (my own preference), Herodas (favored by many), or even Herodes (little upheld).
conclusive evidence as to whether the author intended his Mimiambi (1) for staging by a company of actors, (2) merely for perusal at home, (3) for dramatic recitation by a lone individual — possibly even Herondas himself — who would adapt his voice and gestures to the requirements of each rôle.5

Add yet another problem. During the many centuries of concealment under the desert sands the British Museum Papyrus suffered considerable physical damage. Particularly hard hit was the seventh Mimiambi, large portions of which remain practically unintelligible, save through massive conjectural restoration. The remedies, not surprisingly, are as varied as the sensibilities of the scholars who since 1891 have attempted to eliminate the gaps6. But I. C. Cunningham, the latest to edit the Mimiambi, seems to have acknowledged the hopelessness of the task. In his nicely printed text most of the lacunae of the Papyrus are left unfilled7.

Actually Cunningham’s most significant contribution comes not in the realm of textual criticism, but in the realm of interpretation, as is well demonstrated both in his commentary on the individual skits and in the articles which he contributed previously to certain British periodicals8. Particularly is this true in the case of the sixth and seventh Mimiambi. Only a handful of scholars has denied close interconnection between the two9. Yet of those who are willing to acknowledge the existence of what Théodore Reinach called „une petite comédie en deux tableaux“10 only a handful has bothered to specify in some detail wherein the continuity is to be found. Most prominent in that latter company are Cunningham himself and those Herondeans of a much earlier day, Otto Crusius and Rudolf Herzog11. To them I am very

---

5 The third likelihood has attracted much scholarly assent. See, for example—C. Hertling, _Quaestiones mimicae_ (Diss., Strasbourg 1899) Ch. I; H. Krakert, _Herodas in mimiambis quatenus comediae repuxisse uideatur_ (Diss., Freiburg: publ. Leipzig 1902) pp. 7f.; G. C. Richards, „The Mimiambi of Herondas“10, _New Chapters in the History of Greek Literature_ (edd. J. U. Powell and E. A. Barber) (Oxford 1921) pp. 112—120 (p. 114 ad fin. especially); I. C. Cunningham, „Herodas 4“, _CQ_ NS XVI (1966) 113—125 (p. 119 and n. 1 especially; see also the commentary incorporated into the edition mentioned below and n. 7).

6 And sometimes even the same scholar has changed his mind drastically, as comparison of two sets of _Ergänzungen_ for Mim. 7, those proposed by Otto Crusius at pp. 131ff. of _Untersuchungen zu den Mimiamben des Herondas_ (Leipzig 1892) and those which Crusius printed more than three decades later in his fifth Teubner edition of the Mimiambi (ibid. 1914), will make clear.


8 Sc. „Herodas 6 and 7“, _CQ_ NS XIV (1964) 32—35, and opp. citt. (above, nn. 3 and 5).

9 E.g. P. Groeneboom. see his annotated _Les Mimiambes d’Hérodas_ 1—VI (Groningen 1922).

10 Quoted from p.228 of his „Hérodas le mimographe“, _REG_ IV(1891)209—232.

much indebted, though it is my intention to go beyond their formulations and add a few specifics of my own.

Let me start with the obvious. In Mimiamb 6 Metro seeks to learn the identity of whoever it was who supplied her friend Koritto with a scarlet object made of leather (18. etc. The object in question is called in Greek a βαυβών. No longer do scholars cringe in Victorian embarrassment at its mention or strive to classify it as a girdle or a head-dress or some other article of feminine toilery which it so clearly is not\(^1\)\(^2\) They unblinkingly recognize that βαυβών is the same as the δλισβος described by Aristophanes’ Lysistrata as σκύτινη ’πικουρία (Lys. 109f.), by a scholiast more bluntly as αιδοΐον δερμάτινον — in other words, a dildo or artificial phallos, a device with a long history of acknowledgment in the Greek pictorial arts as well as in Greek literature\(^1\)\(^3\).

Not until she has elicited from Metro an explanation of how the latter came to know of the mechanism’s existence (6, 19f. etc.) does Koritto identify the maker as Kerdon (48), more specifically, thanks to Metro’s request for greater precision (48ff.),\(^1\)\(^4\) as bald little Kerdon the shoemaker, a native of Chios or Erythreai who operates clandestinely from house to house rather than in a shop, lest his activities attract the attention of tax-collectors (58—64)\(^1\)\(^5\). Koritto’s praise of his quasi-divine workmanship (65—67)\(^1\)\(^6\), her ecstatic description of the two βουβώνες themselves which Kerdon brought along to her residence (67ff.), her indication of willingness to wheedle, and cajole, even offer her body, should that prove necessary, in order to gain possession of the second (74—78)\(^1\)\(^7\) — how ironic that she relinquished the first to Euboule (who later transferred it to yet another lady) before she herself had had a chance to put it to use (28ff.)!\(^1\)\(^8\) — all goad Metro into

\(^1\)\(^2\) Among those who err are Reinach, art. cit. (above, n. 10), W. G. Rutherford (whose pioneering edition of the Mimiambi appeared at London in 1891), and J. van Leeuwen (see Excursus ad Minum VI, Mnemosyne NS XX (1892) 97—100).

\(^1\)\(^3\) Cf. Crusius-Herzog, op. cit. (above, n. 11 ad fin.) Intro. pp. 25f.

\(^1\)\(^4\) Metro knows of two Kerdones who do not correspond to the individual in question. Cf. below, p. 73.

\(^1\)\(^5\) Groeneboom, op. cit. (above, n. 9) p. 189, suspects that the real import of lines 63f.,

\[κατ’ οἴκην δ’ ἐργάζετ’ ἐνττολέων λάθρη,\]
\[τοὺς γὰρ τελώνας πᾶσι νῦν θύρη φρίσσει.\]

has to do not with tax-evasion so much as with the likelihood that Kerdon is trying to hide the fact that he deals in questionable goods. The nature of the goods did not elude Groeneboom as it did the scholars mentioned above, n. 12.

\(^1\)\(^6\) Comparable even with Athena’s. Cf. p. 77 ad fin. below.

\(^1\)\(^7\) Metro even goes so far as to assert that Koritto should have made the offer (79). The latter agrees (80), but points out that she was constrained by the presence of Euboule, who frequently came by to grind grain (80ff.). Cunningham interprets ἀλλά ν’ ἔκκακον ὑ’ πρέποντ’ εἶναι at line 80 (most others, Puccioni included, read ἀλλὰ κακίρον) as a reminder of the concern for appearances which affects even such as Metro and Koritto.

\(^1\)\(^8\) Is it not ironic too that it was Euboule’s inopportune arrival at the house which constrained Koritto from attempting sexual relations with Kerdon? Cf. above and n. 17. Most ironic of all, however — and I am surprised that Groeneboom, who
setting out for the home of Artemeis, wife of Kandas the tanner; for it was Artemeis who sent Kerdon to Koritto in the first place (87ff.).

Surely Artemeis’ lodgings, not her own, are Metro’s most immediate destination (95ff.). The notion that the words λαίμασε τ[ις], γόμη/ η[μι] άφερπεν [ετ[ι]] at lines 97f. — if correct — refer to a hungry husband whose supper Metro must rush home to prepare (such is the view of Walter Headlam and A. D. Knox, for example)\textsuperscript{19} strikes me as an absurdity. If either Metro or Koritto had a husband, what need would either have for a device recognized in antiquity as a solace to widows and spinsters?\textsuperscript{20} Far more plausible, in my opinion, is the suggestion set forth by Alfredo Leone and seconded by I. C. Cunningham, namely that it is Metro herself who is prey to hunger and that her hunger consists in lust not for food, but for the services of a βαυβών.\textsuperscript{21}

How irksome, then, that this seemingly final utterance should be followed in the text of Mimiamb 6 by an order from Koritto to one of her household slaves to close the door and count the hens, lest thieves be encouraged to make off with some of them! I had long thought lines 98—102 to be merely another instance of the sort of genre-painting which led Reinach to compare Herondas with such actual practitioners of the paintbrush as David Teniers and Adrian Ostade.\textsuperscript{22} Frederic Will, however, sees the passage in question as ,,another brusque move back from the world of erotic self-gratification into the world of prudence and middle-class caution".\textsuperscript{23}

Would that Will had been equally alert in analyzing the seventh Mimiamb! But that work would have been a bafflement to scholars, I suspect, even had the text been free of lacunae and even there been no doubt as to who was the speaker at any given moment.\textsuperscript{24} Whereas it is certain that Metro, the seeker of artificial erotic gratification, and Ker-

\textsuperscript{19} See their ambitious and perhaps excessively massive edition: Herodas, \textit{The Mimes and Fragments} (Cambridge 1922; repr. 1966). Headlam and Knox translate the verses in question as ,,my old man is hungry and its [sic] time to be making my way home“. Note that they read λαίμασε, as does Alfredo Leone, though the latter’s interpretation is more comparable to that of Cunningham, who returns to λαίματι [τις]. Cf. locc. cit. (below, n. 21).

\textsuperscript{20} Consider the fuller text of the scholium on Aristophanes, \textit{Lys.} 109ff. mentioned initially above, p. 69:

\[
\ldots \sigmaκότινου γάρ οι ἀλυσθοὶ-εἰσὶ δὲ δερμάτινα ιδίοις ὦ Ἓς
\chiρὸν ἄισι νυνδέ ὀνειρεύονται. \chiρὸν δὲ ἀλυσθοὶ-εἰσὶ δὲ δερμάτινα ιδίοις ὦ Ἓς.
\]

\textsuperscript{21} See respectively Eroda VI, \textit{Paideia} VI (1951) 30ff. and the note ad loc. in the commentary to Cunningham’s Oxford text.

\textsuperscript{22} See art. cit. (above, n. 10) p. 232 ad init. Reinach’s comparison is endorsed by Richards, art. cit. (above, n. 5) p. 120.

\textsuperscript{23} Quoted from \textit{Herondas} (= \textit{Twayne World Authors Series} \# 227) (New York 1973) p. 78.

\textsuperscript{24} On difficulties presented by BMP 135 cf. above, pp. 67 ff.
don, the purveyor of the very implements of which she has need, have found one another, several discrepancies lurk like traps for the would-be theorist of diptychal interconnection between the seventh Mimiamb and the sixth. On the one hand, if I may point to a series of correspondences noted by Crusius and Herzog\(^2\),

1. Kerdon is as bald as ever (71f.).
2. Just as Koritto had described him, Kerdon is very much the *galant* (passim).
3. Kandas the tanner is mentioned anew (29).
4. Kerdon denounces a sluggish slave near the outset (5.ff.), much as did Koritto at 6, 2ff.

On the other hand, to take up all but the third of these so-called correspondences in turn,

1. It may well be objected that the expression τήνδε τὴν τέφρην κόρσην suggests the presence of hair rather than its absence.
2. Whereas in the seventh Mimiamb Kerdon repeatedly shows a certain partiality toward Metro\(^2\), as contrasted with his considerably less than chivalrous attitude toward the new customers whom she has introduced into his presence\(^2\), in the sixth it was the female party, namely Koritto, who told of having made romantic *overtures*\(^2\).
3. Denunciations of sluggish or recalcitrant slaves by annoyed masters or mistresses are the Herondean norm all the way from first Mimiamb to the eighth. Why need their recurrence in the sixth and seventh be taken as a special sign of interconnection between those two adjacent pieces?
4. But now I return to Item \(\neq\) 3, the reappearance — actually a reappearance in absentia — of Kandas. That cobbler’s and tanners should be forced to deal with one another is obvious enough. Were the text of Column 36 of the Papyrus in better shape, we might have a

\(^2\) Collected from pp. 26f. of their bilingual second edition.
\(^2\) As, for example, at lines 126ff. (quoted below, p. 74 ad init.).
\(^2\) E. g. at 117f. Here I quote both from the text and from the translation of Crusius-Herzog:

\[\ldots\ δός αυτή καί σύ τον ποδα-ψωρήν αρηρεν οπλή·

βούς λακτίσας υμεας.
\]

\[
\ldots\ \text{Den Fuß her. Räudig ist der Huf, in dem Er steckt: ein Ochs war's der euch hat versohlt,—}
\]

I find this *Verdeutschung* considerably livelier than the attempt at English prose („You, too, give me your foot. Ah, what a ragged hoof had the ox that trampled on you“) supplied in the Headlam-Knox edition.

\(^2\) Cf. p. 69 above.
better inkling of whether Kerdon, whose very name seems to indicate preoccupation with profit\(^{29}\), really meant to complain that tanners somehow manage to wax rich at the expense of cobblers. Koritto, on the other hand, need not have mentioned Kandas at all. To her he is significant only as the spouse of Artemeis, the lady who directed Kerdon to Koritto’s door and who, presumably, would do the same for Metro, were she to be asked.

One may read between the lines and draw the conclusion that Artemeis herself came to know of Kerdon, who at the time still peddled his merchandise surreptitiously, thanks to his having to contract with her husband for raw materials. But in the seventh Mimiamì̇b Artemeis is mentioned no more. Kerdon still deals with Kandas, of course — as lines 27ff. seem to indicate. No longer, however, need he be introduced by Kandas’ bride in secret from house to house. Having surmounted his fear of being taxed— if, indeed, that was what had previously dictated a clandestine operation\(^{30}\) — Kerdon has opened his own shop. And now it is Metro, she who first became aware of his existence, thanks to having seen one of the products which he himself had manufactured, who brings in customers and who does so without concealment.

On the surface Kerdon’s advancement from itinerant peddler of contraband to owner of a thriving shop might seem a stumbling block to acceptance of the notion that Mimiamì̇bi 6 and 7 are closely interconnected. Also a stumbling block is the undeniable fact that in the sixth Mimiamì̇b Kerdon was celebrated as a maker and dispenser of \(\beta\alpha\upsilon\beta\nu\zeta\nu\varepsilon\zeta\nu\), whereas in the seventh his wares apparently consist of shoes exclusively, a long catalogue of which he reels off even as he puts them on display before Metro and her companions (56ff.)\(^{31}\).

But let us probe again beneath the surface. Whether or not there is anything to the surmise that the high prices quoted for Kerdon’s inventory conceal a continuation of his previous illicit trade in \(\beta\alpha\upsilon\beta\nu\zeta\nu\varepsilon\zeta\nu\) — Crusius and Herzog doubt it, yet grant the possibility that he who fronts as a shoemaker manufactures such contraband in secret still\(^{32}\) — the seventh Mimiamì̇b is replete with additional hints that the rather unwholesome atmosphere of the sixth has been subtly and sometimes not so subtly renewed. Consider, for example, the prevalence in both Mimiamì̇bi of the homely verb \(\beta\alpha\pi\tau\tau\iota\nu\nu\), translatable, of course, as „sew“ or „stitch“ and, of course, quite à propos in the case

---

\(^{29}\) The derivation from \(\kappa\varepsilon\rho\delta\omicron\omicron\zeta\) meaning „gain“ is reinforced even by the cobbler himself as he appeals to Hermes and Persuasion at line 74 and accords similarly derived epithets (\(\kappa\varepsilon\rho\delta\omicron\omicron\nu\) and \(\kappa\varepsilon\rho\delta\omicron\omicron\iota\)) to both. Cunningham (who reads \(\kappa\varepsilon\rho\delta\omicron\omicron\iota\)) seems to think it appropriate that the artisan in question „invokes Hermes, the god of merchants, and Persuasion, the patroness of good speakers“. He takes note too of Puccioni’s reminder (supported by two passages from Nonnus’ Dionysiaca: V 574sq. and VIII 220sq.) that the two deities are said to have been marital partners.

\(^{30}\) Cf. p. 69 and n. 15 above.

\(^{31}\) Concerning three specific items see p. 74 below.

\(^{32}\) See p. 30 of their Introduction.
of a cobbler. I think it significant that at no time in either of the two Mimiambi is the verb employed with reference to the manufacture of shoes, Kerdon's ostensible stock in trade. Instead Metro, who has not yet even heard the talented artisan's name, thrice identifies him as a stitcher of dildoes as she begs her friend and hostess to eschew falsifications and state forthrightly who he is. Such is the case first at 6, 17–19,

\[ \text{Δίσσωμα [ι σε, μη ψευσι, } \]
\[ \text{φιλη Κορίττοι, τις πορτ' ἡν ὅ } \]
\[ \text{σοι } ρ ἁ ψα ες } \]
\[ \text{τὸν κόκκινον βαυβώνα; } \]

again at 6, 43,

\[ \text{τις ἔθο' ὅ } ρ ἁ ψα ες } \]
\[ \text{αὐτῶν; εἰ φιλεῖς μ' εἴπων. } \]

yet again at 6, 46f.:

\[ \text{ἐν οὐ χαμα, Κορίττι, μη μ' εἴπης } \]
\[ \text{εἰπέ τὸν } ρ ἁ ψα ντ' χα. } \]

When Koritto finally replies at lines 47f., her language closely echoes Metro's:

\[ \text{Κέρδων ἐραψε. } \]

However, inasmuch as Koritto failed to specify which bearer of the name she had in mind, Metro mentions two Kerdones, neither of whom could be identified with the βαυβών-monger, the one being old and in retirement, the other, as she points out at line 51, incapable of performing needle work of any sort:

\[ \text{άλλος οὐδ' ἀν πλήκτρον ἐς λύρην } ρ ἁ ψα χα. } \]

So much for the sixth Mimiamb. In the seventh the verb recurs twice, first in a sneering command to Kerdon himself issued at lines 98f.,

\[ \text{... ἀλλὰ θύλακον } ρ ἁ ψα χα } \]
\[ \text{τὰς μνέας ὅκως σοι μη } σι } \]
\[ \text{γαλαξί διώσουσι } \]

whether by Metro (so Cunningham believes, along with Crusius and Herzog)\(^{33}\), or by one of the new customers whom she has brought along to the shop (so Headlam and Knox, also Giulio Puccioni),\(^{34}\) again at the very end of the piece — that is, at lines 126–128 — where Ker-

---

\(^{33}\) See the editions mentioned above, nn. 7 ad init. and 11 ad fin. respectively.

\(^{31}\) See the editions mentioned above, nn. 19 ad init. and 7 ad fin. respectively.

If the vocative γύναι is the correct reading at line 79 (assigned to Kerdon), it would seem likely that the somewhat insulting speeches which precede and follow (77f. and 83ff. respectively) should be assigned to one of the newcomers rather than to Metro, who is regularly addressed by name (3: 17 (if Blass’ restoration is right); 20; 50; 127 (quoted below, p. 74 ad init.)). An unchivalrous remark of Kerdon to one of the new customers is quoted, along with two translations, above, n. 27.
don addresses himself to Metro alone and hints anew at favored treatment:

Σύ δέ ἤκες, Μητρώ, πρὸς τὴν ἐνάτην πάντως
ὀνος γάρ βαλης καρκίνια τὴν γάρ οὖν βαίτην
θάλπουσαν εὖ δεῖ 'υδὸν φρονεύντα καὶ φάντασμα.

What are καρκίνια? A type of shoe — red in color, apparently, if derivation of the term from καρκίνος meaning „crab“ be allowed — which has been included already in Kerdon’s catalogue of his stock (60), along with such other special items as Νοσσίδες and Βαυκίδες (57 and 58 respectively). Cunningham and H. Lloyd-Jones are right, I think, in suspecting a clear cross reference in the latter two instances to what Metro said back at 6,20 when asked where she had seen the βαυβών whose maker she was seeking:

Νοσσίς εἰς ἦρικνης καὶ η.nii

That the poet has chosen his vocabulary in such a way as to create a double-barrelled literary allusion twice over for his sophisticated audience ought to be clear enough. The names Nossis and Erinna simultaneously designate ladies of the neighborhood and famous poetesses who flourished not long before Herondas’ own time. Even to label a certain type of footwear as Βαυκίδες is to call Erinna yet again to mind; for that author’s most famous poem is a lament over the decease of a close friend named Baukis.

As for the warming βαίτη which, according to the shoemaker, the sensible man will „stitch“ for protection, it may be more than the mere peasant’s coat of skins recognized by the lexicographers. And Kerdon’s proverbial-sounding utterance may mean something in addition to what Liddell, Scot, and Jones take it to mean:

One good turn deserves another.

Possibly there is some justification for the erotically oriented analysis essayed by Cunningham:

Skin coats and heat have no possible relevance to shoes: but a baubon is made of leather and produces θάλπος.

---

25 On the nature of the catalogue taken as a whole cf. above, p. 72.
26 Though Ptolemaic Alexandria had become a great centre for the cognoscenti, Herondas may well have looked beyond his own time and place in addressing himself to an audience, much as, if Will, op. cit. (above, n. 23) Preface (unpaged), has argued aright, did his contemporaries and colleagues, Kallimachos, Theokritos, and Apollonios Rhodios:

They adopt, toward those coming ages, the pose of connoisseurs, of adepts of the highest verbal craft; they address themselves across the ages to the literary elite.

27 See the notes on both passages in Cunningham’s commentary. With regard to Erinna’s career see my own „Quaestione s Erinneanae“, HSCP LXVI (1962) 193—204.
28 So LSJ s.v.
29 Ibid.
έρωτος. K. [erdon] indicates to M. [etron] that in coming to him for baubons she is showing good sense.

If this approach is valid, the diptychal structure of the sixth and seventh Mimiambi would be nicely buttressed thereby. The same would be the case if Cunningham is right in suggesting an obscene import behind the shoemaker-dildo-peddler’s little riddle, addressed to Metro and her companions at 7, 62f., about the predilection of women and dogs for gnawing on leather:

ευτέκες γυναῖκες καὶ κύνες τί βρώζουσιν.

Whereas Arthur Ludwich, for one, must convert the object of the verb from neuter plural "(leather goods)" into masculine singular (σκύτεα

40 Note that the theme of warmth established via the participle θάλπουσαν at line 128 (quoted above, p. 74 ad init.) was enunciated already in two earlier utterances of Kerdon:

... νύκτα χήμερην θάλπω. [40]

41 Quoted from Cunningham’s note ad loc. (where την... ράπτειν, lines 128f., is the lemma),

But there is even more artistry working at this point, which Herondas carefully turns back into the whole mime. *Hen-snatching recalls baubon snatching* [emphasis mine]; Koritto is still thinking of her perfidious friend Eubule, who loaned Koritto’s scarlet baubon to Nossis.

The locution νόκτα χήμερην (G. Puccioni, who points to recurrences of the same or similar wording at 1,58 and 5,7 (see the close of his „Eroda VI 65, “ *SIFC NS XXIV* (1949—1950) 231—233), insists on printing νύκτα κήμερην) recurs in a possibly erotic-oriented passage. namely lines 110—112:

έχεις γάρ οὐχ γλάσσα, ήδονής δ’ ήθων α’, θεών εκείνος οὐ μάκρη ν ἀπεστήρων νύκτα χήμερην οἰγεις.

The speaker is Kerdon again, of course. Is the addressee one of the newcomers? Or is it, as I think more likely, Metro herself? Cunningham too assumes that Metro is the addressee. He agrees with Crusius’ supposition that designation of the tongue as „a sieve of pleasure“ could refer to καταγλωττισμός; but in his subsequent note on line 112 allows too for the alternative interpretation of χείλεα as the vulva (supported by Aristotle, *HA* 583a16ff.: to be sure, Cunningham must dispute the assumption of LSJ s.v. χείλος ad fin. that Aristotle is talking about the rim of the womb). Cf. art. cit. (above, n. 8 ad init.) p. 35, n. 4, where, bolstered by Herzog’s surmise of a „Doppelsinn“ (*PhW* XLVI (1926) 198 ad init.), the soon-to-be most recent editor of the *Mimiambi* lays bare the possibility that Kerdon alludes here to actual sexual intercourse (which he may even have enjoyed already with Koritto, as Cunningham speculates—perhaps rashly—at p. 35 ad init.).

23 Živa Antika
meaning „cobbler“) and understand the verb itself to be a by-form not of βιβρώσκειν, but of βράζειν or βράσσειν — all to conduce to a rendering of line 63 as „Weiber und Hunde setzen den Schuster in Unruhe“42—Cunningham leaves the Greek text undisturbed and counterfeits a sort of scholium of his own, which I here reproduce in full:

ὅτι κύνες μὲν σκύτινον ἱμάντα διατρώγειν μαθοῦσι

— here I interrupt to ask such questions as „Why not μαθόντες?“ „Need the riddle apply only to bitches rather to dogs in general?“43—

γυναῖκες δὲ σκύτινον βαυβῶνα εἰς τὰ τῶν αἴδων χείλη ἐλκεῖν μαθοῦσιν οὐκ ἐπιλήσονται.

This formulation, which appeared originally in an article in the staid Classical Quarterly44 albeit not without encouragement from the example of Gordon Williams, who in an earlier issue of the no less respectable Classical Review hinted at comparable obscenities45— is repeated in English in the commentary to Cunningham’s Oxford edition of the Mimiambi, along with the observation that oral as well as vaginal use of the βαυβῶν might be indicated in Kerdon’s utterance, as can be attested from Greek vase-painting46.

On the other hand, though he offers a cogent explanation likewise for Metro’s own words κύων ὠλακτεὼ at 6, 14,

Not „I bark like a dog,“ but „I become a barking dog,“ identification in function, not comparison...47

Cunningham fails to capitalize on the likelihood that this hookup of canine imagery and behavior of the human female distributed between two adjacent Mimiambi corroborates still further his quite credible support of the thesis that the sixth and seventh were quite consciously

42 See coll 635f. of „Zum siebenten Minus des Herondas“, BPW XXII (1902) 635—638.

43 Philip Städter lias objected to my supposition that Cunningham is in error, „Unless otherwise specified“, he points out, „κύων is feminine“. He has in mind particularly the example of Xenophon, who, of course, devoted much attention in his writings to hunting-hounds. Note, however, that the ejaculation employed by Socrates et al. is not νη τὴν κύνα, but νη τὸν κύνα.

44 Sc. art. cit. (above, n. 8 ad init.) p. 34.

45 See p. 99 ad fin. of Dogs and Leather, CR NS IX (1959) 97—100.

46 On the possibility that genuine erotic contact between two persons (whether the allusion is to passionate kissing or to commingling of genitals or to both) is hinted in the location χείλεα νύκτα γηλεια χήρεις ἀγείεις at 7, 112 see above, n. 40.

47 Quoted from Cunningham’s commentary ad loc. Cunningham would have us consult in this connection not only the exempla collected by Headlam and Knox ad loc., but also two works of Eduard Frankel: Plautinisches in Plautus (or rather pp. 35ff. of the Italian version thereof) and the three-volume annotated edition of Aischylos’ Agamemnon (Oxford 1950), specifically the commentary on lines 393ff.
An Herondean Diptych

designed by Herondas himself to form a diptych. Similarly it is left for others to try to make something of patterns of repetition in which Kerdon’s references at 7,80—82 and more particularly at 7, 116f. to the goddess Athena (recognized by Headlam and Knox as „the cobbler’s patron saint“) somehow echo Koritto’s own assurance to Metro at 6, 65—67 that the βαυβώνες which Kerdon had exhibited at her house were such splendid specimens that one would have thought them the creation of the deity rather than of Kerdon himself.

Houston (Texas). D. N. Levin.

ARISTOTLE, EPITAPH ON HERMIAS

Turpiter hunc olim pharetratae Persidis Orco rex dedit, abrupta religione deum; nec Mauorte fero domuit neque comminus hasta, uerum ope fucosi fretus et arte uiri.


18 Quoted from their note on 7,81.
19 Puccioni, art. cit. (above, n. 40), takes note also of a closely similar reference to Athena at lines 57f. of the fourth Mimiamb:

οί ἐργα- κοινήν ταυτ' ἐρείς Αθηναίην
γλύψαι τὰ καλὰ ... 

And at p. 233 he quotes other sorts of instances of what he chooses to call „auto-citazioni“.