

JORDI REDONDO  
 Universitat de València  
 Jordi.Redondo@uv.es

UDC: 821.14'02-2.09

## HERONDAS' MIMIAMBS AND SATYR DRAMA

*Abstract.* – The extant mimiambos of the Hellenistic poet Herondas, dated around the III c. BC, have been the object of a challenging quest on their dramatic trend, in spite of our unsatisfactory knowledge of the genre of mime as a whole. A preliminary problem in this search deals with our deficient witnesses of mime, the fourth dramatic genre according with our ancient sources. Several attempts have been made to approach the mimiambos both to tragedy and to comedy – rather than mime, for the alleged reason – not to mention the iambic tradition, which has been quite often alluded to as the main model of the genre. Yet not enough attention has been paid to the genre of satyr drama, maybe because many researchers think of it as a simple blend of tragedy and comedy, and therefore not provided with any particular feature.

A literary language that could be defined and alluded to with the label of satyric did indeed exist in the ancient Greek culture, albeit its description has been a matter of quest for a long time. After former attempts to go further in our knowledge of the literary language of the satyr drama, this contribution aims to elucidate which influence could have had this genre on the mimiambic production of the Hellenistic poet Herondas.

*Key words.* – Mimiamb, satyr drama, subgenres, register.

### The genre of mime and its relationship with the Greek literary system

The ancient sources do not offer a single definition of mime as a literary genre. According with the information given on mime by Athenaeus, there was not only a diversity of genre subtypes, but also a coincidence of names that maybe implied other slight differences related to the structure, characters, plot, performance etc. of the play. The identity of a) mimes ἰλαρωδοί and σιμωδοί, b) mimes μαγῶδοί and λυσιῶδοί, and c) mimes ἰωνικολόγοι and κιναιδολόγοι seems not well established.<sup>1</sup> Unfortunately, the lack of a minimal textual evidence makes the problem almost hopeless.

<sup>1</sup> Ath. 620 d και οἱ καλούμενοι δὲ ἰλαρωδοί, οὓς νῦν τινες σιμωδοὺς καλοῦσιν, 620e μαγῶδός· οὗτος δ' ἐστὶν ὁ αὐτὸς τῶ λυσιῶδῳ. Ἀριστόξενος δὲ φησι τὸν μὲν ἀνδρεῖα καὶ γυναικεῖα πρόσωπα ὑποκρινόμενον μαγῶδὸν καλεῖσθαι, τὸν δὲ γυναικεῖα

Albeit the links between iambography and mime have been recently outlined and discussed by Tosheva (Tosheva 2016, both contributions), the place of mime in the framework of the dramatic genres remains almost an obscure subject. First of all the term itself μῖμος covers two different meanings, for it is used both for the play with its text and for the actor who performed it. The Aristotelic allusion in the *Poetics* witnesses the first use: οὐδὲν γὰρ ἂν ἔχοιμεν ὀνομάσαι κοινὸν τοὺς Σώφρονος καὶ Ξενάρχου μίμους καὶ τοὺς Σωκρατικούς λόγους οὐδὲ εἴ τις διὰ τριμέτρων ἢ ἔλεγείων ἢ τῶν ἄλλων τινῶν τῶν τοιούτων ποιῶτο τὴν μίμησιν.<sup>2</sup> The meaning “imitating body” is found in an Aeschylean fragment.<sup>3</sup> On the other hand, the meaning ‘actor who mostly performs through the simple imitation’ is also attested in common Greek conversation: for example, in the Demosthenic *Second Olynthiac* we read the following lines: καὶ γὰρ οὐς ἐνθὲνδε πάντες ἀπήλαυον ὡς πολὺ τῶν θαυματοποιῶν ἀσελγεστέρους ὄντας, Καλλιαν ἐκείνον τὸν δημόσιον καὶ τοιούτους ἀνθρώπους, μίμους γελοίων καὶ ποιητὰς αἰσχυρῶν ἀσμάτων, ὧν εἰς τοὺς συνόντας ποιούσιν εἵνεκα τοῦ γελασθῆναι, τούτους ἀγαπᾷ καὶ περὶ αὐτῶν ἔχει.<sup>4</sup> Therefore, μῖμος was at least at the mid-fourth century perfectly understood by the common people as the appropriate term both for the genre and for the performer actors.

As a dramatic genre, mime was featured first of all because of its content and extension. Any other main features seem quite problematic, as we will shortly discuss it later. Content and extension are beyond of question: on content, in the extant fragments of Sophron mythical and epic plots are excluded and substituted with two principal kinds of subjects, daily situations of common life and extraordinary events as a product of supernatural powers or imagination. It seems that mime was originally linked to plots taken from common life. Thus, the ancient sources give the following titles of Sophron’s mimes: with female characters, Ἀκέστριαι (*The Sewingwomen*), Νυμφοπόνοσ (*The woman who is at struggle for the bride*), Πενθερά (*The mother-in-law*), Ταὶ συναριστῶσαι (*The women at breakfast*), Ταὶ γυναῖκες αἰ τὰν θεὸν φαντι ἐξελᾶν (*The women who tell that they expel-*

---

ἀνδρείους λυσιφθῶν· τὰ αὐτὰ δὲ μέλη ἄδουσιν, καὶ τάλλα πάντα δ’ ἐστὶν ὁμοία. ὁ δὲ ἰωνικολόγος τὰ Σωτάδου καὶ τῶν πρὸ τούτου ἰωνικὰ καλούμενα ποιήματα etc., 620 e-f καλεῖται δ’ οὗτος καὶ κιναιδολόγος etc.

<sup>2</sup> Arist. *Po.* 1447b10. *For we can find no common term to apply to the mimes of Sophron and Xenarchus and to the Socratic dialogues: nor again supposing a poet were to make his representation in iambs or elegiacs or any other such metre* (transl. W.H. Fyfe).

<sup>3</sup> Aesch. fr. 57, ll. 8-9 ταυρόφογγοι δ’ ὑπομυκῶνται / ποθεν ἐξ ἀφανοῦς φοβερὸι μῖμοι etc. (‘with bull-like bellows they moo from some unseen place like fearsome effigies, our translation).

<sup>4</sup> Dem. II 19. *For the men who were unanimously expelled from Athens, as being of far looser morals than the average mountebank—I mean Callias the hangman and fellows of that stamp, low comedians, men who compose ribald songs to raise a laugh against their boon companions—these are the men he welcomes and loves to have about him* (transl. J.H. Vince).

led the goddess) and Ταῖ θάμεναι τὰ Ἴσθμια (*The women who show the Isthmian Games*); with male characters, Ἄγγελος (*The messenger*), Θυννοθήρας (*The tunnyfisher*), Παιδικὰ ποιφυξεῖς (*Those who are afraid of plays*), Προμύθιον (*The moral of the fable*) and Ὠλιεὺς τὸν ἀγροῖωτᾶν (*The fisherman to the peasant*). Yet in Ταῖ γυναῖκες αἱ τὰν θεὸν φαντι ἐξελάων we find a mime scene where a magic ritual is performed (Sophr. fr. 4 KA), so that other subjects were not excluded. And the post-Classical mime usually entitled by the scholars under the name of its protagonist, *Charition* (P. Oxy. 413), develops a plot around a Greek princess kidnapped in India, where the elements of fantasy have been not spared. Furthermore, a probable mime fragment presents Odysseus at Troy disguised as a beggar, an epic subject, cf. Hom. *Il.* IV 244-258.<sup>5</sup> As for the extension, mimes were conceived as short pieces: we know that the subcategory known as παίγνια, ‘entertainments’, was performed by an only actor (Plu. *Mor.* 712e) supposedly for a single comic scene. In any case, the most elaborated mimes were not at all comparable to a whole tragedy and comedy; maybe they were comparable in extent to an only tragic episode.

In fact, Athenaeus was completely right when he gave us advice that the concept of mime as a dramatic genre implies a plurality of objects. There were probably mimes consisting in simple monologues and consequently played by a single actor; but other mimes involve two or even three actors, and the participation of a chorus is also attested. Maybe the reason for our misunderstanding is the Attic dramatic model that we have always in mind. There is no reason for rejecting tragedies presented outside Athens for, say, two actors only. Dramatical productions linked to the popular culture were beyond any doubt subjected to all sorts of circumstances, so that the material and formal representation of mimes depended on both the commissioner and the dramatic company (Tedeschi 2002). Last, mime was not defined by the use of metrical forms; in the Hellenistic and Imperial Age at least, prosimetrum and plain prose were equally admitted.

This paper will try to cast some light on the literary genre of mime by means of the analysis of the linguistic devices that link the mimiambs and the satyr drama. Our starting point lies always on a fresh lecture of the mimiambs, having in mind to contrast their linguistic and stylistic structure with that of the satyr drama, a field in which our former research will be of great help. Our approach to Herondas' mimiambs takes into account the statements made on the genre of mime by Choricus. The analysis will cover all the linguistic levels, from those related at most to the oral performance, i.e. phonetics and morphology, to those more close to the use of literary sources, i.e. complex syntax and stylized word-formation. In so doing, a difference will be stated between some mimiambs that plainly show a closeness with

<sup>5</sup> The fragment belongs to a tragedy according with Parca 1991, to a mime according with Gianotti 2005.

the satyric lexis and style and others that follow an alternative literary pattern. This difference should lead to a twofold classification of Herondas' mimiambos, having as its main criterion the adoption or rejection of the satyric lexis. Actually in our sources this distinction between two opposite subgenres of mime can be found in authors such as Plutarch and again Choricius. The results obtained may add some valuable information for a better understanding of both the mimiamb and the mime as literary genres.

A main problem of the present research derives from the special status of mimiamb insofar as it must not be confused with mime. The mimiamb, as least as it is attested in our poet, shows a complete dependence on the Hellenistic literary frame and especially with the Alexandrine poetics. The insolvable difficulty consists of our lack of a satisfactory Hellenistic corpus of mimes, not to mention the meagre testimony of the mimiambos properly. From both sides there is too much to miss, but not so many literary categories are to such an extent elusive and gloomy as mime. Our task should be to distinguish in a neat and clear way which elements taken from satyr drama were embedded in Herondas' literary language.

### **Mimiamb and satyr drama: linking affinities**

As a fruitful starting point for our research we will have in mind the observation of Fernández when she states that the mimiamb was first of all a realistic imitation of common life.<sup>6</sup> Her view reinforces the theory that the mimiambos were composed for a dramatic performance, which is the conclusion reached by Mastromarco.<sup>7</sup>

The fact that the characters of Herondas' mimiambos were all from a very low social origin, not to say openly marginal (Cunningham 1971; Konstan 1989, 268), approaches this genre to that of the satyr drama, since in comedy there is a much more wide range of social classes. Besides the social origin of the characters, the predominance of women on the stage becomes a second major transgression of the common dramatic rules, only possible in those literary genres akin to a special kind of audience, placed in a rather marginal social position.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>6</sup> Fernández 2006, 95: La 'mimesis realista' de escenas de la vida cotidiana era la característica esencial de la mimografía antigua, mimesis encarnada en una serie de personajes pertenecientes al estrato más bajo de la sociedad.

<sup>7</sup> Mastromarco 1979, 21-23; Hunter 1993. A contrary view in Puchner 1993 and 2012.

<sup>8</sup> Some tragedies also present a considerable amount of female characters, not to include among them the members of female choruses. In Euripides' *Suppliant Women*, for instance, do appear Aethra, Evadne, Iphis and Athena, in front of Adrastus and Theseus; also in *Trojan Women* appear Athena, Hecabe, Cassandra, Andromache and Helen, in front of Poseidon, Talthybios and Menelaos. This is a quite a different case, since these characters, some of them of divine nature, cannot be taken as representative of a given society.

Therefore, mimiamb should have been addressed to a particular audience, made up of people with a very low or simply a non-existent education, aiming only at a simple entertainment as well as at a satisfaction of their inner appetites. The opposite view was supported by Bo, who stated that the language and metrics used by Herondas are those of the high-cultured and sophisticated Alexandrian poets.<sup>9</sup> Further studies show to what a high extent Herondas played a refined metaliterary strategy of intertextual imitation that involves the reception of Homer (Esposito 2001 and 2010), Hipponax (Degani 2002, 50-56), Aristophanes, Erinna (Neri 1994; Redondo 2020, 299), and probably Sophron and the mime tradition. Then the literary language of these mimiambos makes unlikely the theory of an illiterate, uncultured audience (so Smotrytsch 1966).

Though the chronological gap is all but small, an oration of the fifth-century AD rhetor Choricus of Gaza entitled *Συνηγορία μίμων*, *Defense of the mimes*, will help us to understand which was the function, the content and the style of the post-Classical mimes. The objective of Choricus was the defense of a literary genre blamed not for any artistic, aesthetical or cultural reason, but because of moral principles considered to be central in any given society. That is to say, mime was censured because of the immorality set forth by the poets and represented on stage by the actors. For example, much more indeed than comedy, mime is fond of wine and of characters drunk of wine.<sup>10</sup> As comedy does, mime is allowed to display a strong, even cruel criticism on power.<sup>11</sup> As in comedy also, mime relies on satire, mockery, invective and derision. Maybe the most useful term if we look for a keyword of both comedy and mime should be slander, for many of the injurious statements expressed are intended to be simply false, and probably all of them exaggerated for the purpose of blame and, when related to a social context by the comic authors, character assassination.<sup>12</sup>

In the opposite way of tragedy, mime is not concerned either with the political education of the audience or with the release of its angers and troubles. On the contrary, mime should be a genre of no social profit and for only individual pleasure. Its audience should con-

<sup>9</sup> Bo 1962, 127-132; Degani 1991, 182. Nevertheless, also Bo listed in such a short corpus a catalogue of 'popular terms', cf. Bo 1962, 124-126.

<sup>10</sup> Chor. *Mim.* 124 πῶς οὖν ἦθος φυλάττειν, πῶς δὲ ἄδειν ἐμμελῶς μεθύοντας ἔν-εστι etc., 129 εἶτα λέγεις λίχνους καὶ φιλοπότας εἶναι τοὺς μίμους.

<sup>11</sup> Chor. *Mim.* 120 Αναβαίνει γὰρ αὐτοῖς καὶ μέχρι δυναστείας ἢ παρρησία, καὶ τῶν μὲν ἡγεμόνων οἱ φίλοι τὸν ὄγκον ὑποστέλλονται τῆς ἐξουσίας, κἄν ἴδωσί τι ποι-οῦντας ἀνάξιον τῆς ἀρχῆς, οὐ θαρροῦσιν ἐπιτιμᾶν, μίμοις δὲ ἀραρεσι σκώπτειν ἀφό-βως.

<sup>12</sup> Chor. *Mim.* 3 Εἰ γὰρ πρὸς ἓνα κατήγορον οὐ ῥάδιον ἀντειπεῖν, ὅτι τῷ πρότερος λέγειν πλεονεκτεῖ λοιδορίας καὶ σκώμμασιν ἐμφράτων τῷ συλλόγῳ τὰς ἀκοάς, πῶς ἂν τις πολλὴν ἐπιστομίσειε φήμην πάλαι κρατοῦσαν καὶ πλείστην | καταχέουσαν τῶν μίμων διαβολήν.

sist of low people, able to find satisfaction in simple, even bawdy, amusements. Choricus had to concentrate his efforts in order to avoid the consequences of such a humble mime audience.<sup>13</sup> Moreover, the viewers of the mime performances were thought to be evil people, featured at least by some form of moral degeneration.<sup>14</sup> Generally speaking, mime could be considered just a major platform for the diffusion of depraved attitudes.<sup>15</sup> Of course they were not intended to be a kind of spectacle suitable for people with major obligations. This was an opinion firmly established in the 5th century AD society. To what an extent some seven centuries before it could have been softened or attenuated, nobody knows, but it seems acceptable that it did not exist any extreme difference between Herondas' age and Choricus'.

An opposition seems to be stated by Choricus between *μίμοι γελοίων* and *μίμοι σπουδαίων*, mimes on mocking and on serious subjects, respectively. He says that Demosthenes blamed Philippus because regardless of his duties as king of the Macedons *παρὰ τὰ σπουδαία τοῖς γελοίοις ἐχρήτο*, that is to say, he neglected reflection for the benefit of amusement.<sup>16</sup> Some three centuries before Plutarch also had opposed two alternative classes of mimes called *ὑποθέσεις*, that required a longer time for their representation, and *παίγνια*, these last ones being featured by its indecent content as well as by its coarse language.<sup>17</sup> Probably a fixed written text was unnecessary for *παίγνια*, while it was for *ὑποθέσεις*.

### Herondas' literary language regarding the dramatic tradition.

Our extant Herondas' corpus includes eight almost complete or sufficiently transmitted *mimiamb*s, besides a fragmentary sample of

<sup>13</sup> Chor. *Mim.* 5 ὡς δὲ φίλους ἄνδρας καὶ τραφέντας ἐν λόγοις καὶ τὸν τρόπον ἐπικεῖς τὰ μίμων ἡσθόμην ἐν ἀστεία τινὶ παίζοντας ἑορτῇ καὶ κροτοῦντα τὸν δῆμον, πρέπειν ὡήθη ἑμαυτῷ καὶ τοῖς φίλοις καὶ τῷ δήμῳ τὰ δίκαια συνειπεῖν, ἵνα μὴ δοκοῖεν ἐγὼ μὲν φαῦλον εἶναι συνήθη, οἱ δὲ ἀνελεύθερον ἔργον ἐπιτηδεύειν, ὃ δὲ δῆμος ἀγεννές τι ποιοῦντας κροτεῖν.

<sup>14</sup> Chor. *Mim.* 21 ὥρα γὰρ ἢ πάσας ἀτίμως ἐκ τῶν πόλεων ἐκκηρύξει – οὐδεμία γὰρ ἅπαντας ἔξει τοὺς φοιτητὰς ἀναμαρτήτους δεικνύναι – ἢ μὴδὲ τῶν μίμων φαυλίσαι τὴν ἐπιτήδευσιν παρὰ τὴν τῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς οὐ σωφρονούντων κακίαν.

<sup>15</sup> Chor. *Mim.* 73 ἢ καὶ τῶν Μενάνδρῳ πεποιημένων προσώπων Μοσχίων μὲν ἡμᾶς παρεσκεύασε παρθένους βιάζεσθαι, Χαϊρέστρατος δὲ ψαλτρίας ἔραν, Κνήμων δὲ δυσκόλους ἐποίησεν εἶναι, Σμικρίνης δὲ φιλαργύρους, ὃ δεδιώς μὴ τι τῶν ἔνδον ὃ καπνὸς οἴχοιτο φέρων;

<sup>16</sup> Chor. *Mim.* 60 καίτοι Φιλίππου, φησί, κατηγόρησε Δημοσθένης, ὅτι μίμους γελοίων ἀγαπᾷ καὶ περὶ αὐτὸν ἔχει, ἐπειδὴ παρὰ τὰ σπουδαία τοῖς γελοίοις ἐχρήτο πολλῶν αὐτῷ πολέμων συνεστηκότων.

<sup>17</sup> Plut. *Mor.* 712e (*Quaest. conv.* VII 8, 4) ‘οὐκοῦν’ ἔφην ἐγὼ ‘μίμοι τινες εἰσιν, ὧν τοὺς μὲν ὑποθέσεις τοὺς δὲ παίγνια καλοῦσιν· ἀρμόζειν δ’ οὐδέτερον οἶμαι συμποσίῳ γένος, τὰς μὲν ὑποθέσεις διὰ τὰ μήκη τῶν δραμάτων καὶ τὸ δυσχορήγητον τὰ δὲ παίγνια, πολλῆς γέμοντα βωμολογίας καὶ σπερμολογίας, οὐδὲ τοῖς τὰ ὑποδήματα κομίζουσι παιδαρίοις, ἂν γε δὴ δεσποτῶν τῶν ἢ σωφρονούντων, θεάσασθαι προσήκει.

papyri in which Cunningham distinguished among the mimiambs *per se* and a miscellaneous set where other minor dramatic genres could be recognised (Cunningham 1987, 11). This question seems fully open, since the mimiamb itself is described as a mixed literary genre (Rosén 1994). According with Nairn, the main sources of Herondas were Hipponax, Sophron and Aristophanes (Nairn 1904, XI). Other imitated authors were Epicharmus and Rhinton, Sotades, tragedians and the New Comedy among the dramatic poets, and finally the orators (Nairn 1904, XXVI). The role of Hipponax and Sophron as models of Herondas' mimiambs do not concern the present research, though their relevance is beyond any doubt. Yet Aristophanes was not such a major influence as Nairn suggests (Nairn 1904, XXVII–XXVIII), for most of the alleged parallels do not prove neither direct intertextual relationship nor a clear model. We must turn into a different direction.

Interesting observations have been made on singular mimiambs and selected passages. Esposito highlights the Epic background of mimiambs I, IV and VIII and their reflex of the Homeric language and style (Esposito 2010), always used with the aim of a comic contrast with the register of every speaker.<sup>18</sup> Within the dramatic tradition, Setti, Kamerbeek and Sonnino (Setti 1952, 212–215; Kamerbeek 1955; Sonnino 2021) have underlined the coincidence of themes between Epicharmus' and Aeschylus' satyr dramas and the fourth mimiamb of Herondas. Again, Shaw calls the attention on Herondas' I 13 μακρὴν ἀποικέω, as an intertextual allusion to Python's satyr drama *Agen*, l. 9 μακρὰν ἀποικῶν (Shaw 2014, 129).

The composite language of mime has a good parallel in satyr drama, since only in comedy we find the same strong, sharp and sudden contrast of different registers, but even so to a lesser extent. Moreover, in satyr drama as in mime such an artificial language, featured by the addition to its Ionic main component of other Doric and Aeolic traits (Fernández 2006, 107), plainly overcomes the usual comic style. Needless to remark that Herondas did not write a linguistic report on his own dialect –in fact, nothing requires that he really was an Ionian-speaker. His literary language shows a manifold composition in which different linguistic solutions appear next to each other, cf. II 31 ἔόντες and VI 32 ἐοῦσα, II 77 κήποροβοδσκευν, 85 εὔντων, VI 35 εὔντων.

### **Herondas' mimiambs and the satyric diction. Phonetics.**

Our analysis of this corpus will begin with a short account on phonetics, although the following sections follow a different scheme. Crasis, prodelision and glide deletion will be the three phonetical fea-

<sup>18</sup> In addition to the accurate observations of Esposito 2010, 273 it is also remarkable how much the Homeric hapax δραινῶ contrasts with the following cluster μυῖ ὄσον, a colloquial expression.

tures under survey. Crasis is especially frequent in mimiambos II, III, IV, VI and VII.<sup>19</sup> The frequency of this feature is maybe the highest in a given corpus, since it overcomes those found in tragedy, comedy and satyr drama.<sup>20</sup> If crasis can be recognised as one of the features of the feminine sociolect – especially when female characters talk to each other – it will be certain to recognise that Herondas had a programme to represent women as they really are and speak.<sup>21</sup>

Cases of prodelision are found in I 26 κεῖ (instead of the full form ἐκεῖ), III 73 'τέρω, III 78 'με V 29 'με and 43 'φάμαρται, VI 58 ῥυθρέων, and fr. 1, l. 5 'πιβούλωσ. The speakers are mostly women, viz. Gyllis, Bitinna twice, Coritto, and a third anonymous woman, who is the speaking character of fragment 1, as proved by the feminine participles in ll. 10, 24, 26 and 27. The only instance of prodelision spoken by a male character is III 78, by the schoolmaster Lampriscos.

Glide deletion occurs in mimiambos IV and VI and fr. 1 and 13. In mimiamb IV possible cases of deletion in ll. 22 and 49, respectively ἐποίει and κáεις, are not supported by the metre, since both of them are placed in the second long vowel of the first iambus, so that the diphthong must be kept in order to obtain the required scansion. In spite of their interest as a mark of what a spoken Greek the scholars and copyists used to ascribe to Herondas, the transmitted forms ἐποίει and κáεις must be rejected. A different case is that of VI 9 ποεῖς, where the first syllable of the verbal form is placed on the *anceps* of the last iambus. Also in fragment 13, l. 12, ποεῖν should be guaranteed by the metre, but some doubts are cast on it, since for Crönert they were Ionic verses and for Knox an iambic sequence. The speakers are Coritto and another anonymous female character, as proved by the feminine participles of ll. 7, 8, 10 and 13. Even if different characters were involved in a dialogue, our ποεῖν was pronounced by a woman. Other instances occur at IV 49 κáεις, again spoken by a female character, now Kynnô, and at fr. 1 l. 24 κατακάομαι, said by an unknown woman.

<sup>19</sup> Herond. I 3, 39, 40, 45, 80, II 8, 17, 26, 28, 33, 39, 44, 54, 69, 70, 71, 75, 76, 77, 83, 88, 96 (*bis*), 97, 98, III 10, 13 (*bis*), 14, 15, 23, 24, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 39, 43, 45, 49, 52, 54, 57, 58, 62, 69, 90, IV 2, 3, 5, 6 (*bis*), 7, 10, 12, 16, 33, 34, 54, 56, 62, 66, 67 (*bis*), 68, 83, 86, 90, 92, V 2, 7, 15, 22, 40, 51, 70, VI 4, 12, 13, 32, 33, 45, 68, 70, 84, 97, 99, 102, VII 21, 23, 30, 40, 44, 46, 47, 51, 70, 77, 87, 94, 102, 112, 121, 124, VIII 4, 17, 22, 41, 44, 45, 46 (*bis*), 61, 66, 75, fr. 1 l. 15, 13 l. 16. The frequency of these attestations should be in fact increased could we possess the whole of the poems, all of them severely damaged by a difficult transmission.

<sup>20</sup> There is no general survey on this feature in the dramatic genres. Partial data can be read in Redondo 2019 and 2021. See also Redondo Moyano 1995, 225, as she points out 'el uso abundante de la crasis'.

<sup>21</sup> A very negative portrait of these female characters in Arnott 1971 and Finnegan 1992; a more accurate account in Tosheva 2016 (both contributions), "Хеленистичката еротика", 300-305; Хеленски мимови, 28-32.



The deletion of post-tonic vowels belongs also to a special phonetics, that of the informal conversation between speakers of equal social status, as in VIII 8 τ]όνθρυζε, a form to be compared with VI 7 τονθορύζουσαν, and VII 77 τονθορύζεις. The more lively pronunciation of the imperative explains the creation of this *Allegroform*.

### Colloquialisms.

Our following observations will deal with those utterances usual in a colloquial diction that are avoided in the tragic genre, but especially frequent in satyr drama.<sup>22</sup> This sample of features suggests a secondary interpretation insofar as it is not simply that Herondas' mimiambos have a direct link with the language of satyr drama; they are so close to the colloquial diction because they were written with the aim of a dramatic representation.

As a linguistic device, brachylogy conveys to the discourse the marks of solidarity and affinity. At first, the Thracian slave asks at I 3 τίς τὴν θύρηγ;, and after the prostitute Gyllis tells her ἦν ἰδοῦ at I 4. These two cases of brachylogy belong to an informal register, also attested in fragment 6, ll. 97-98, when a character tells to the protagonist σὺ δέ, Χαρίτιον, δεῦρο ἔξω, and the answer goes δεῦρ', ἀδελφέ, θᾶσσον.

Repetition is a linguistic strategy quite opposite to brachylogy, but it is also used, as Metriche does in I 71 χολῆν δ' ἀείδειν χῶλ' ἄν ἐξεπαίδευσα, besides VII 106 καὶ ταῦτα καὶ ταῦτ', though now the speaker is Kerdon. Of a different kind are the enumerations, so common in the comic style, as in VII 57-61.

Colloquial phrases are quite frequent in our corpus, and the most noteworthy examples are the following: I 11 οὐδ' ὄναρ,<sup>23</sup> 15 μῦτ' ὄσον, 25 πέπωκεν ἐκ καινῆς, 54-55 οὐδὲ κάρφος ἐκ τῆς γῆς / κινέων, III 49 μηδ' ὀδόντα κινῆσαι, 67 κινεῦντα μηδὲ κάρφος, VII 33 οὐδ' ὄσον ῥοπήν. Excepting the last two examples, these colloquial expressions are used by female characters. Moreover, a special number of colloquialisms is closely related to the feminine sociolect. The τί-sentences, for instance, use to appear in women's interventions, as in I 9, VI 45 and 47, fr. 13, l. 3.

Some of these colloquialisms belong to the syntactic level, as in I 21 ἀλλ' οὐ τοῦτο μὴ σε θερμήνη, III 58-59 μὴ ἐπεύχεο / ἔξει γὰρ οὐδὲν μείον. Other colloquialisms belong to the field of phraseology, as in III 22 οὐδ' ἄλφα συλλαβὴν γνῶναι, VI 37-38 μὴ δὴ [...] τὴν

<sup>22</sup> Colloquialisms in general are quite frequent in satyr drama, Some of them never appear in tragedy, while others are also used in comedy. Just to quote some Sophoclean examples, see S. fr. 314, l. 104, τί δρῶμεν, ᾧ τᾶν;, l. 118 ναὶ μὰ Δία, l. 381 παμπόνηρε, l. 102 ταῦτ' ἔστ' ἐκεῖνα, l. 120 τί ἐστι τουτί, ll. 121-122 τουτί, τουπίσω, τὰ πρόσθεν, l. 182 δεῦρ', l. 278 ὥστε with indicative, l. 333 ὅστις ποθ' ὄς.

<sup>23</sup> This phrase is also attested in Call. *ep.* 64, l. 4.

χολήν ἐπὶ ῥινὸς ἔχ' εὐθύς, 60-61 οὐδ' ἄν σῦκον εἰκάσαι σύκῳ / ἔχοις ἄν οὐτῷ. This last example deserves also a comment on its syntax, since the repeated modal particle also points to a colloquial register.

### Familiar, vulgar and obscene language.

These data belong without exception to the category of substandard features, but the different registers are not interchangeable, even though the nuances are often barely distinguishable. The list of familiar terms will be not short, cf. I 8 ἀμμίη, III 34 and 38 μάμμη, 35 τάλης, 37 γρῦξαι and 85 γρῦξης, IV 33 and 43, V 13, 57 and 59 μᾶ, 69 τατί, VI 4 and 22 μᾶ, 7 and 77 τονθορούζουσαν, τονθορούζεις, 59 μικρός, 77 ταταλίζουσα, 97 λαιμάττει, 103 τωθάζει, and VIII 2 ῥέγχουσα. It is to be retained the highest number of instances attested in the mimiamb VI.

Slang expressions are of course attested, as in V 56 κέρκος, VIII 4 κῦσον, fr. 7 ll. 7, 27 and 38 μαστιγίας, l. 16 κύσθος. One step further far away of the standard daily language, coarse terms and phrases clearly point to the satyric diction, and this Herondas' poetic corpus shows a non-small sample of examples, as in fragment 6, ll. 1, 2, 23, 28, 39, 93, 110 and 130 πορδή, ll. 6, 17 πρωκτός, l. 22 πέρδεται. It could be rather simplistic to reduce the influence of the satyr drama on both mime and mimiamb just to this point (cf. S. fr. 314, l. 168, E. *Cy.* 328),<sup>24</sup> for many other examples of vulgar language can be quoted, as in I 16 ἡμέας καθέλκει,<sup>25</sup> VIII 2 and 7 χοῖρον.

Obscene expressions do also occur, as in VI 76 τὸ φαλακρὸν καταψῶσα, fr. 7, l. 3 ἴνα με βινήση. It is often amphibology to play also a role in this composite poetry that flows after lyric and dramatic sources. Amphibological passages, always intended to express feelings related with sexual emotions, are I 37 and 76-77, VI 82-84, VII 61-63, l. 112, 8 l. 7, and in fr. 15 l. 36 the term δελφάκιον.<sup>26</sup> The point in VI 82-84 lies on the word ὄνος, a substantive that both Pollux and Hesychius attest with the meaning “distaff”,<sup>27</sup> a term which in turn was used to allude to the female genitals (Stewart 2003, 130). VI 61-63 gives room to the comic ἀπροσδόκετον, since the keyword θυμός as a substitute of πέος, φαλλός, and the like, is here explicitly applied - θυμός ὑμέων ἐκάστης - to women, who obviously are not naturally provided with this body organ.

<sup>24</sup> Bain 2007, 51-52. A first example of sophisticate expression for an inconvenient and crude bodily act is *Hom. Hy.* IV 296. Cassola 1975, 532 explains this instance of expression of an abnormal behaviour because of the influence of the folktale. For a stylistic account see Katz 1991.

<sup>25</sup> It is quite surprising the literal translation in Navarro 1981, 29, *la vejez tira de mí hacia abajo*, as the sense is ‘the old age is fucking me’.

<sup>26</sup> The use of this term as a substitute for the feminine genitals is already attested in *Ar. Th.* 1061, *Lys.* 237.

<sup>27</sup> Poll. VII 32, Hesych. X 125.

The use of interjections at a larger extent than in tragedy and even comedy has been also identified as a mark of satyr drama.<sup>28</sup> On this device in Herondas' corpus see I 82 τῆ, III 78 ταταῖ -a dubious form-, 93 ἴσσαῖ, fr. 6, l. 123 αῖ, fr. 7, l. 35 ἐέ, l. 81 οὔαί, fr. 12, l. 30 οὔα· οὔα.

### Dialectalisms and Koine features.

Given that most of the dialectal features attested in the mimiambos have a literary explanation on account of the chosen model, usually that of the Hipponactean Iambi, Ionic dialectalisms are prevailing in phonetics, morphology, syntax and lexicon, so that there is not our target to give an account on them.<sup>29</sup> However, other dialectalisms must be highly appreciated, for they give us information on the Koine Greek really spoken by our characters. This is the case of the voiceless obstruent attested in fr. 7, l. 41 ποταπά, instead of the standard form ποδαπός, exactly as Herodotus rendered the name Κάνωβος and Athenaeus its variant Κάνωπος,<sup>30</sup> now as a reflex of the Egyptian adstrate. On the lexical field, at the fragment 9, l. 1 the noun μορβίλλων, cf. Lat. *mirmillo*, is only attested in Herondas and on Egyptian papyri (Kayser 2000, 462-463, on *P. Ryl.* I 15). Interesting indeed is the semantic value of κτίζω in fr. 1, l. 8 as a synonym of ποιέω, an innovation which can be found later in Biblical Greek (*Gn.* 14, 19; *Dt.* XXXII 6; *Mt.* 19, 4; *Apoc.* IV 11 (bis), X 6, etc.).

According with the history of the language, many of the already quoted phenomena must be ranged among the Koine innovations. For example, in VI 2 and VII 24 πάντα can be analyzed as an accusative of relation – *regarding whatever subject* – but it is no far from a temporal meaning, ‘always’, as in Byzantine and Modern Greek. A new local meaning has the adverb ὧδε, formerly just modal, at I 49. Herondas also shows a preference for Koine words as in fr. 15, l. 13 ⟨ε⟩ἴσοπτρον – in former ages the variant κάτοπτρον was largely pre-

<sup>28</sup> On interjections in satyr drama see Slenders 2021, 122-133 and especially 133, where he explains them as a use very close to that of tragedy. Yet we must take into account that, for instance, the interjection ὠή, twice attested at the reduced corpus of satyr drama, appears only nine times in tragedy (Slenders 2021, 132). The interjection ἄ, Herond. IV 20 and 30, VII 11 and 117, is attested four times in satyr drama, five in comedy, and nineteen in tragedy (Slenders 2021, 123). Therefore, the highest frequencies approach the mimiambos to satyr drama and tragedy.

<sup>29</sup> For a complete survey on Herondas' language see Schmidt 1968. Some examples deserve a short comment, as VII 70 τώληθές because of the phonetical crasis; the temporal markers in III 3 and 88 ἄχρις (with subjunctive), VII 41 (with indicative according to the transmitted text), II 43, VIII 3 and 8-9 μέχρι (with subjunctive always), VII 52 ἔστ'; and the prepositional cluster in fr. 6, l. 117 ἀπὸ κυνηγίου, where Attic, for instance, prefers μετά with accusative. Also noteworthy are the adverbial uses of III 18 ἐκ, IV 3 σύν, 29 and 49 ἐκ and V 76 ἐς.

<sup>30</sup> Hdt. II 15 Κάνωβον, Ath. 326a Κάνωπον. See on this confusion Gignac 1976, 63.

ferred – II. 15 κιβάρια, 20 (ε)ίκόνιον, 21 σινδόνιον, 29 φαλητάρια, 36 δελφάκιον, 37 κυνάριον, 46 τριβωνάριον (emendation by Manteuffel). In fr. 6, l. 130 maybe the transmitted text ὡς θέλεις should be emended in either ὡς θέλης or better ὡς θέλοις, given that an Iotacistic pronunciation could be perfectly at work at the time. A Koine phonetics explains the form πάλι, with the lenition of the final nasal, which is the pronunciation attested at II 52, and fr. 6, ll. 92 and 102. Morphological Koine innovations are fr. 1, l. 6 καταλιμπάνειν, fr. 4, l. 22 ἐμέν. Syntactic Koinisms are, for instance, the preference for temporal sentences introduced by ἐπήν -or its by-form ἐπεάν-, as in II 46, III 30, 43, 45, V 27, 84, VI 61 and X 1, and the choice of μή instead of οὐ as negative adverb at VI 31 and 34.

The satyric diction had also a trend for foreign languages which is not limited to single words, as iambographers such as Hipponax did (Redondo 2017, 151-152), since it also constructs complete sentences. This is the case of the fragment 6, ll. 11-16, 32, 35, 39, 58, 60-65, 68, 70-87, 119 and 124. This mimiamb should be compared with the mime *Charition*, where the contrast between the Greek language and a foreign language is given a central role in some scenes (see an accurate discussion on the matter in Santelia 1991, 65-74).

### Poetical and metaliterary language.

As abovesaid, Herondas used all the available devices in order to enhance the literary language of his mimiambs. Also in this perspective the similarities with the language of satyr drama are both transparent and frequent, as it will be shown in this section.

In a former paper we recognized as a component of the satyric lexis a gnomic trend (Redondo 2021, 178). This paroemiological discourse, long time ago recognised in our author (Arnot 1971, 130; Gómez i Cardó 1990-1992 on V 14; Fernández Delgado 2010, 2011a and 2011b), occurs at I 41-42 νηῦς μιῆς ἐπ' ἀγκύρης οὐκ ἀσφαλῆς ὀρμεῦσα, II 62-63 πέπονθα [...] ὄσσα κῆν πίσση μῦς, III 75-76 οὐδ' ὄκου χώρης / οἱ μῦς ὁμοίως τὸν σίδηρον τρώγουσιν, VI 39 γυναικός ἐστι κρηγύης φέρειν πάντα, fr. 14, l. 17 ἔαρ χελιδῶν. This gnomic diction has to do partly with the folkloric comedy (Jung 1929, 38), partly with the satyr drama (see, for instance, E. Cy. 537-538, 542, 654).

As a consequence of the sharpening contrast between opposite registers, Herondas does not avoid picking up poeticisms, viz. I 3 δειμαίνεις, III 55 ἦμος,<sup>31</sup> fr. 1, l. 58 κατεῖδεν, fr. 4, l. 4 καλλονήν, fr. 6, l. 20 κατεῖδαν, fr. 8, l. 5 φαιοσφόρος. In fr. 14, l. 30 σαόπτολις echoes the language of the cultural hymns; moreover, on l. 33 the possessive pronoun τεόν casts more light on this interpretation (Redondo 2015,

<sup>31</sup> Another instance of this term in the Hellenistic poetry is Theocr. 13, 25. Actually Theocr. 13, 25-27 closely imitates Hes. *Op.* 679-682.

174; Sánchez 2015, 22-23). A Homeric bias has been recognised, although its presence seems quite feeble, cf. VIII 31 ἀμφὶ τοῖς ὤμοις, 32 ἀμφὶ κρητί, 42 ἀρνευτήρες, cf. Hom. *Il.* XII 385 and XVI 742, 45 δόκεον without verbal augment.<sup>32</sup> Even so, if we concentrate in the Homerisms of mimiamb VIII, it is not difficult to understand to what an extent Herondas was mixing the epic tradition with his vernacular idiolect: just to quote Ionic dialectalisms used next to the Homerizing passage of ll. 30-43, see ll. 21 and 25 ἐποίευν, 22 ἐσύλευν, 40 τελεῦμεν, 47 πιεζεῦσαν, 62 θανεῦμ', 70 τελεῦντες, 72 τιλεῦσιν.

The iambic poetry of Hipponax was indeed the best intermediary model for the integration of the Homeric flavour. However, this is not our subject now. Other poetic quotations belong to the dramatic tradition. At I 1 the noun ἀνηρίτης should be the Ionization of a term attested in an Epicharmus' comedy (Epich. fr. 114). The question remains unclear, since both terms are due to a conjecture of Causaubon for Epicharmus and to a correction of Meineke for Herondas. Probably in both cases the correct lesson is ἀναρίτης, so that the form in our mimiamb would keep the Dorian vocalism of the model.

Compound coinages are generally provided with a mocking sense, cf. fr. 1 l. 18 φρεναπάτης, fr. 4 l. 22 θακαθαλάπας, fr. 9 l. 10 καρτερόθρουον. The aim for comicity lies also behind the very frequent *Redennamen*, cf. II 5 Βάτταρος, V 15 Γάστρων, VI 48 Κέρδων, among many other examples. For a parody of the poetic style see fr. 7, l. 81 ἄκληρε, ἀλγεινέ, ἀναφρόδιτε, cf. Epich. fr. 113, 415 ἀφράτωρ ἀθέμιστος ἀνίστιος.

A sophisticated lexis occurs at fragment 15, less than fifty uncomplete lines where we can read terms such as l. 2 σχημάτιον, ll. 3 and 35 ῥημάτων, l. 39 περιζώματα, l. 47 σχήματα, ll. 9 and 24 ὑπομηστικόν, ll. 10 and 33 κουρικόν. A similar formation is surely attested, though only a restoration is possible, in l. 2 μιμήματος (our suggestion). The content of the poem shows a plain contrast with the use of these \*-μα and \*-ικός formations. Other cases of a specialized language occur at fr. 6, ll. 45-46 ἔχω φάρμακον θανάσιμον ὃ μετ' οἴνομέλιτος διηθήσασα δώσω αὐτῷ πεῖν, modelled on the medical language, and fr. 6, ll. 17-18 ἀπεσφίνωται, originally a military term.<sup>33</sup>

The topic of wine and drunkenness links of course these mimiamb with the satyr drama. Both genres use terms from the \*μεθυ- root, used from the Classical Age onwards for expressing unpolite drunkenness, as only barbarians and low people do: fr. 2 l. 20, fr. 3 l. 1, fr. 5 ll. 8-9, fr. 6 ll. 49-54 and 96, fr. 13 l. 18.

<sup>32</sup> Another example of past verbal form without augment is at fr. 12 l. 43 φίλησα, but the lack of context does not allow to understand which one is the purpose and theme of the poem.

<sup>33</sup> See Hero's Βελοποιηκά, cf. Hero, *Bel.* ed. Wescher 1867, 77, 2-4. ἐπὶ ὄν ὑποβληθῆ τὸ ΠΡ κανόνιον ὑπὸ τὸν δάκτυλον, ἀποσφηνοῖ αὐτὸν ὥστε ἀνανεῦσαι μὴ δύνασθαι.

It is not to be dismissed, in the extraordinary fragment 6, the enthronization of the Goddess Πορδή (l. 7), which is a case of cultural transgression perfectly accorded with the high-spirited soul of the satyrs and their partenaires. This transgressive attitude finds also a linguistic support, as shown by the adjective ἀργυρᾶν, with a non-Ionic form that can be explained in different ways, but coined in any case after a mimetic trend.

### **Distribution of the phenomena of interest. Its interpretation.**

Some of the linguistic devices already described belong to the legacy of the popular theatre developed along centuries from the second millennium BC onwards by means of the interaction of celebration and ritual, while others come from the derision of a wide sample of professionals, such as politicians, physicians and rhetors, and other exposed people: peasants, older people, women, barbarians and foreigners in general, etc. It is not without sense to suggest that this double origin of the dramatic devices –exaggerated gesticulation, emphasis of ridiculousness, full display of rudeness, verbal incontinence, on the one hand; aim for extreme mockery, derisory sophistication, imitation of the poetic style, on the other- help to create the paradoxical variance usual in satyr drama.<sup>34</sup> The mimiambs arouse this same effect of a full contrast between clashing literary models.

As stated, the contents, language and style usual in the satyr drama are easy to spot in the mimiambs I, III, IV and VI, besides the fragments 6 and 15. These mimiambs are in our opinion close to the genre of mime, though their literary richness can be explained only in the context of the Alexandrine poetry.

Right in the opposite way, the fragments 5 and 8 deserve special comment, for we do not find there any of those devices usual in satyr drama. Instead, their lexis is very close to that of cultural hymn, especially in fragment 8, where the prevailing anapaestic metre fits also with that lexis. Therefore, both fragments must be taken apart from the extant sample of Herondas' mimiambi.<sup>35</sup> Their literary character put them apart from the other mimiambs and make very problematic to ascribe these two poems to the genre of mime (for the opposite view see Fountoulakis 2002).

### **Conclusions.**

A minor dramatic genre, that of satyr drama, intended as such by the modern scholars partly because of its scarce extant remnants,

<sup>34</sup> On the attested representation of satyr drama in the Imperial Age see Skotheim 2021.

<sup>35</sup> Cunningham 1987, XI considers all the fragmentary poems included in his appendix more or less related to the genre of mimiamb or to other minor genres close to it. Yet this is not the case of this fragment.

was probably a major influence on the genre of mime. Our analysis of the extant Herondas' corpus reveals a significant number of features that were much more used by the authors of satyr dramas than by the comic poets and the iambographers. If we add to this fact a second observation, that satyr drama was closer to the mimiamb because of their common relationship with the dramatic productions, the links between Herondas' mimiambos and the satyric diction seems understandable, convenient and fully justified. On the other hand, the distinctions between two different sorts of mime made by Plutarch and Choricius have been shown not to be applicable to the mimiamb. The satyric lexis and style instead proves to provide a useful criterion to establish inner differences inside of the mimiamb.

Scholars have usually argued that the coarse and crude language of some of these mimiambos was borrowed from the iambic tradition. This is beyond any doubt a part of the truth. Nonetheless, the dramatic components of the genre make more attendable a concurrent explanation after the model of the satyr diction.<sup>36</sup> Actually some devices as those that convey a sophisticated language follow in a very close way the model of the satyr drama. What is quite likely is that mime was full of all kind of jokes based on misbeliefs, swearing, and physical and verbal incontinence. In this case, a clearcut difference with comedy was that comicity in mimes was not primarily addressed to the criticism of a known person. That is to say, instead of the comic *ὄνομαστὶ κωμωδεῖν*, always parody-oriented, mime aimed at achieving hilarity and laugh. It could be said, maybe too simplistically, that mime implied satire instead of parody.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Andreassi, Mario. "Il mimo tra 'consumo' e 'letteratura': *Charition e Moicheutria*". *Ancient Narrative* 2 (2002), 30-46.
- Andreassi, Mario. *Mimi Greci in Egitto. Charition e Moicheutria*, Bari 2001.
- Arnott, Geoffrey. "Herodas and the kitchen sink", *G & R* 18 (1971), 121-132.
- Bain, David. "Low Words in High Places: Sex, Bodily Functions, and Body Parts in Homeric Epics and Other Higher Genres", in Patrick Finglass, Christopher Collard & Nicholas James Richardson (edd.), *Hesperos. Studies in Ancient Greek Poetry Presented to M.L. West on His Seventieth Birthday*, Oxford 2007, 40-57.
- Bo, Domenico. *La lingua di Eroda*, Torino, Accademia Delle Scienze, 1962.

<sup>36</sup> On the evolution of satyr drama towards a more ludic and approachable performance, see Harrison 2021, 795: 'Satyr drama probably benefited from its closeness to more popular forms of entertainment in the Empire and their adoption at Rome'. It seems probable that satyr drama used to be played in very similar conditions to those of mime.

- Cassola, Filippo. *Inni Omerici*, Milano, Lorenzo Valla, 1975.
- Crusius, Otto. “Über das phantastische im Mimus”, *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum* 13 (1910), 81-102.
- Cunningham, Ian Campbell. *Herodae Mimiambi. Cum appendice fragmentorum mimorum papyraceorum*, Leipzig, Teubner, 1987.
- Cunningham, Ian Campbell. *Herodas: Mimiambi*, Oxford, The Clarendon Press, 1971.
- Degani, Enzo. *Studi su Ipponatte*, Hildesheim, Georg Olms Verlag, 2002 (= Bari, Adriatica Editrice, 1984).
- Esposito, Elena. “Allusività epica e ispirazione giambica in Herond. 1 e 8”, *Eikasmos* 12 (2001), 141-159.
- Esposito, Elena. “Herodas and the Mime”, in James J. Clauss & Martine Cuypers (edd.), *A Companion to Hellenistic Literature*, Chichester & Malden 2010, 267-281.
- Fernández Delgado, José Antonio. “El hipotexto cómico del mimo: de las *Nubes* de Aristófanes al *Didáscalo* de Herodas”, *AEF* 30 (2007), 95-113.
- Fernández Delgado, José Antonio. “Herodas’ Rhetoric of Proverbs”, in Milagros Quijada Sagredo (coord.), *Estudios sobre tragedia griega: Eurípides, el teatro griego de finales del siglo V a.C. y su influencia posterior*, Vitoria-Gasteiz, Universidad del País Vasco-Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea, 2011, 219-232.
- Fernández Delgado, José Antonio. “Las expresiones proverbiales más problemáticas del Mimiambo III de Herodas”, in Eugenio Rodríguez Luján & Juan Luis García Alonso (edd.), *A Greek Man in Iberian Street. Papers of Linguistics and Epigraphy in honour of Javier de Hoz*, Innsbruck, Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck, 2011, 55-64.
- Fernández Delgado, José Antonio. “Sobre el discutido significado de algunas expresiones proverbiales de Herodas”, *Exemplaria Classica: Journal of Classical Philology* 14 (2010), 13-19.
- Fernández, Claudia N. “Modelo literario, perfil psicológico y significado alegórico en los personajes del mimo I de Herondas”, *Synthesis* 13 (2006), 95-111.
- Finnegan, Rachel J. “Women in Herodian Mime”, *Hermathena* 152 (1992), 21-37.
- Fountoulakis, Andreas. “Herondas 8.66-79. Generic Self-Consciousness and Artistic Claims in Herondas’ *Mimiambos*”, *Mnemosyne* 55 (2002), 301-319.
- Fürst, Kamil, “Zlomky řeckých mimů novější dobou objevené”, *Listy filologické* (= *Folia philologica*) 50 (1923), 191-204.
- Gianotti, Gian Franco. “Odisseo mendico a Troia (PKöln VI 245)”, in Franco Crevatin & Gennaro Tedeschi (edd.), *Scrivere leggere interpretare: Studi di antichità in onore di Sergio Daris*, Trieste, Edizioni Università di Trieste, 2005, 225-232.
- Gignac, Francis Thomas. *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods I. Phonology*, Milano 1976.
- Giubilo, Barbara. “Una locuzione atipica in Eronda (III, 49)”, *Rivista di Cultura Classica e Medioevale* 1 (2010), 57-60.
- Gómez i Cardó, Pilar. “El frigi del mimiamb V d’Herodes”, *Itaca. Quaderns Catalans de Cultura Clàssica* 6-8 (1990-92), 71-80.
- Harrison, George W.M. “Lowering the Curtain: (Modest) Satyrs on Stage in the Roman Empire”, in Andreas P. Antonopoulos, Menelaos P. Christopoulos & George M.W. Harrison (edd.), *Reconstructing Satyr Drama*, Berlin, De Gruyter, 2021, 765-796.
- Walter Headlam, in Walter Headlam & A.D. Knox, *Herodas. The Mimes and Fragments*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1966<sup>2</sup>.
- Hunter, Richard L. “The presentation of Herodas’ *Mimiamboi*”, *Antichthon* 27 (1993), 31-44.
- Jung, Friedrich. *Hipponax redivivus*, Bonn, Universitäts-Buchdruckerei Gebr. Scheur, 1929.



- Kamerbeek, Jan Coenraad. “Adnotationes in Aeschyli Isthmiastias (Ox. Pap. 1262)”, *Mnemosyne* 4 (1955), 8-13.
- Katz, Joshua. “*Homeric Hymn to Hermes 296: ΤΑΗΜΟΝΑ ΓΑΣΤΡΟΣ ΕΠΙΘΟΝ*”, *The Classical Quarterly* 49 (1999), 315-319.
- Kayser, François. “La gladiature en Égypte”, *Revue des Études Anciennes* 102, (2000), 453-478.
- Konstan, David. “The Tyrant Goddess: Herodas’ Fifth Mime”, *ClAnt* 8 (1989), 267-282.
- Kutzko, David. *Herodas, Mime, and Comedy. Tradition and Reception in Mimiamboi 6 and 7*, Diss. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1999.
- Mastromarco, Giuseppe. *Il pubblico di Eronda*, Padova, Antenore, 1979 (= *The Public of Herondas*, Amsterdam, J.C. Gieben, 1984).
- Nairn, John Arbutnot. *The Mimes of Herodas*, Oxford, The Clarendon Press, 1904.
- Navarro, José Luis & Antonio Melero, *Herodas. Mimiambos. Fragmentos mímicos. Partenio de Nicea. Sufrimientos de amor*, Madrid, Gredos, 1981.
- Neri, Camillo. “Erinna in Eronda”, *Eikasmos* 5 (1994), 221-232.
- Parca, Maryline G. *Ptocheia or Odysseus Disguised at Troy (P. Köln VI 245)*, Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1991.
- Puchner, Walter. *Die spatantiken ‘Mimiamben des Herodas’: mimischer Solovortrag oder theatralische Aufführung?, Von Herodas zu Elytis. Studien zur griechischen Literaturtradition seit der Spätantike*, Wien, Köln & Weimar, Böhlau, 2012, 15-40.
- Puchner, Walter. “Zur Raumkonzeption der Mimiamben des Herondas”, *Wiener Studien* 106 (1993), 9–34.
- Redondo Moyano, Elena. *Estudio sintáctico de las partículas en el período helenístico: Herodas*, Amsterdam, Adolf M. Hakkert, 1995.
- Redondo, Jordi. *Le système pronominal dans la diction tragique. Essai d’étude des rapports entre la langue de la tragédie et la lyrique chorale*, in Jordi Redondo & Andrea Sánchez i Bernet, *Archaic, Classical and Hellenistic Poetry. Some Contributions to the History of the Ancient Greek Language*, Amsterdam, Adolf M. Hakkert, 2015, 155-181.
- Redondo, Jordi. “La lengua literaria de Hiponacte”, *Anales de Filología Clásica* 30 (2017), 143-159.
- Redondo, Jordi. “La parla dels personatges secundaris al pròleg de la tragedia euripídica”, in Francesco De Martino & Carmen Morenilla (edd.), *En el umbral de la obra. Personajes y situaciones en el prólogo*, Bari, Levante, 2015, 215-233.
- Redondo, Jordi. “*Satyrs speaking like rhetors and sophists*”, in Andreas P. Antonopoulos, Menelaos P. Christopoulos & George M.W. Harrison (edd.), *Reconstructing Satyr Drama*, Berlin, De Gruyter, 2021, 175-193.
- Redondo, Jordi. “On female voices in the Hellenistic epigram”, in Rafael J. Gallé Cejudo & Manuel Sánchez Ortiz de Landaluce (edd.), *Studia Hellenistica Gaditana II: De Calimaco a Nono de Panópolis. Estudios de crítica textual y exégesis literaria*, Lecce, Pensa Multimedia, 2021, 290-308.
- Redondo, Jordi. *Donne sulla scena eschilea: per una caratterizzazione linguistica*, *Codex* 9 (2021), 30-51.
- Rosén, Ralph M. *Mixing of Genres and Literary Program in Herodas 8*, *HSCPh* 94 (1992), 205-216.
- Sánchez i Bernet, Andrea, *Els pronoms del grec d’època arcaica*, in Jordi Redondo & Andrea Sánchez i Bernet, *Archaic, Classical and Hellenistic Poetry. Some Contributions to the History of the Ancient Greek Language*, Amsterdam, Adolf M. Hakkert, 2015, 3-32.
- Schmidt, Volkmar. *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Herondas. Mit einem kritisch-exegetischem Anhang*, Berlin, De Gruyter, 1968.

- Setti, Alessandro. “Eschilo satirico II. I frammenti dei Θεωροὶ ἢ Ἴσθμιασταί (*Pap. Ox.* XVIII 2162)”, *ASNP* 21 (1952), 205-244.
- Shaw, Carl A. *Satyrical Play. The evolution of Greek Comedy and Satyr Drama*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Skotheim, Mali. “Satyr Drama in the Late Hellenistic and Roman Imperial Periods: An Epigraphical Perspective”, in Andreas P. Antonopoulos, Menelaos P. Christopoulos & George M.W. Harrison (edd.), *Reconstructing Satyr Drama*, Berlin 2021, 749-763.
- Slenders, Willeon “*διαλαλήσωμεν τί σοι: Colloquialisms in Satyr Drama*”, in Andreas P. Antonopoulos, Menelaos P. Christopoulos & George M.W. Harrison (edd.), *Reconstructing Satyr Drama*, Berlin, De Gruyter, 2021, 115-139.
- Smotrytsch, Anton P. “Die Sprache als Mittel der Charakterisierung von Personen in den Mimiamben des Herodas”, in Михаил Леонович Гаспаров (ed.), *Вопросы античной литературы и филологии*, Moscow, Литературный институт им. А. М. Горького, 1966, 206-222.
- Sonnino, Maurizio. “The Riddles of Aeschylus' *Theoroi* or *Isthmiastai*”, in Andreas P. Antonopoulos, Menelaos P. Christopoulos & George M.W. Harrison (edd.), *Reconstructing Satyr Drama*, Berlin, De Gruyter, 2021, 409-432.
- Stewart, Alison. “Distaffs and Spindles: Sexual Misbehavior in Sebald Beham’s Spinning Bee”, *Faculty Publications and Creative Activity, School of Art, Art History and Design* 4 (2003), 127-154.
- Tedeschi, Gennaro. *Lo spettacolo in età ellenistica e tardo-antica nella documentazione epigrafica e papiracea*, *Papyrologica Lupiensia* 11 (2002), 89-187.
- Тошева, Даниела [Tosheva, Daniela], “Хеленистичката еротика во мимијамбовите на Херода”, in Јасмина Мојсијева-Гушева & Елена Цукеска [J. Mojsieva-Gusheva & E. Tchukeska] (edd.), *За љубовта, зборник на трудови*, Skopje 2016, 291-307.
- Тошева, Даниела [Tosheva, Daniela]. *Хеленски мимови: Софрон, Херода, Теокриџ и мимови од анонимни автори*, Skopje 2016.
- Wescher, Carle & Pétetin, Anselme. *Poliorcétique des grecs. Traités théoriques. Récits historiques*, Paris, Imprimerie Impériale, 1867.