

## A FRESH LOOK AT HERODAS' BUCOLIC MASQUERADE

ANNA RIST

THE EIGHTH MIMIAMB of Herodas survives in an even more mutilated form than the surviving other seven, having been largely put together from fragments of papyrus and published in stages by Kenyon, Nairn *et al.* It is very different from its seven predecessors in the London papyrus (in which its first three lines appear intact), and it has been argued<sup>1</sup> that it stands as a "programme piece" at the end of a complete book. More plausible, particularly in view of the fact that it is followed in the papyrus by the fragmentary opening lines of *Mimiamb* 9, is the older suggestion<sup>2</sup> that the eighth mimiamb is the prologue to a second book, and that in it Herodas replies to critics of his earlier work. Who are these critics, and how does Herodas relate himself to Hipponax, inventor of the choliamb, the metre of this and all the extant mimiambis? That *Mimiamb* 8 is a "bucolic masquerade" comparable to Theocritus *Idyll* 7 is clearly to be suspected;<sup>3</sup> what is not agreed is the identity of the poets with whom Herodas is comparing himself. This article attempts to shed all assumptions except the indispensable one that everything we have must serve a coherent meaning, and look afresh at these and other problems.<sup>4</sup>

I start with a summary of what can be readily inferred from the text as it stands, then proceed to considerations which may help to fill in the import of the main *lacunae* (indicated by dots) and lead to conclusions about the author's meaning and intentions in "making" his *poiema*.

The speaker, rightly taken to be Herodas himself, rouses the slaves of his household in haste to offer a sacrifice on account of a dream, which he invites one of them to interpret and which he proceeds to narrate. Herodas had succeeded in dragging (ἐξείλκον, line 65) a goat—later identified with a "gift from Dionysus" if we accept the emendation of Edmonds and Knox—through a lengthy cleft in rocks when he was waylaid by goatherds, who tore the goat apart and ate it. . . . Dionysus appeared wearing a saffron-coloured tunic covered by a fawnskin, buskins, and an ivy crown. . . . A festival was held in honour of the god, with dancing and games, among them the *askoliasmos*, which—as we know from other

<sup>1</sup> Lawall 1967, in an appendix.

<sup>2</sup> Knox 1925. Knox took Herodas (whom he wished an Athenian and named Herodes) to be replying to an attack by Callimachus, referred to in the dream by the goatherds.

<sup>3</sup> Herzog 1924: 393: "Crusius hat schon hingewiesen auf das Gegenstück zu dieser Dichter-maskerade in Theokrits Thalsia." Cf. also 430.

<sup>4</sup> At about the same date as I wrote this article appeared one by Rosen (1992) which was first brought to my attention by a critic for *Phoenix*. While Rosen and I reached, independently, some similar conclusions, crucial differences will be apparent.

sources<sup>5</sup>—required the participants to perform (the verb ἀσκολιάζειν may mean “hop”) for as long as possible on an inflated and oiled wineskin, a feat at which Herodas excelled . . . . As he trod the skin under his feet, he was challenged by an old man uttering threats and wielding a stick—line 60 recalls a known line of Hipponax. Herodas responds with defiance: “I will die above ground” (ὕπὲρ γῆς, i.e., “aloft”)—in other words: “He shall not induce me to come down off the wineskin by threats; he’ll have to kill me!”<sup>6</sup> He appeals to “the young man” (from his garb and function as literary arbitrator, Dionysus<sup>7</sup>), who states—or he claims has already stated—that both are winners.<sup>8</sup> “Having seen this, I awoke,” concludes Herodas, and asks Annas for his cloak. This reminds the audience of the “real life” setting of the dream. Herodas has just arisen on a dark winter morning (lines 3–6) and will wish to be fully dressed both for warmth and to offer sacrifice. It also re-casts Annas as audience, rather than as interpreter, as Herodas appears to ignore his request to the slave and pushes ahead with his own interpretation.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Aristophanes and Vergil among them; see below and nn. 12 and 13.

<sup>6</sup> This seems to be the plain enough sense of ὕπὲρ γῆς, which does not naturally mean “on the ground” (ἐπὶ γῆς, ἐπὶ γῆ). Some have assumed that Herodas has descended from the skin before this, but the fact that he receives acclamation for his feat at lines 46–47 does not show that it is over; indeed the participle πεζεύοντα, as emended by Knox, would imply that it is not. The point of the contest is to remain “aloft” as long as possible, and the episode gains in drama if Herodas continues triumphantly to tread the winebag amid cheers and to flyte from his vantage-point with the menacing old man—even after it has become clear that he is the winner. See also Crane 1986. Rosen’s objection (1992: 212, n. 28) displays how his reconstruction of the scene differs from mine.

Dr Alan Griffiths tells me he supports Herzog’s (1924: 416) emendation ὕπ’ ὀργῆς, and compares Thuc. 3.36.2 and 5.63.2. The main objection to this is that there is no call to emend once we have accepted that Herodas is still on the skin. The subsidiary objection is that of *lectio facilior*.

<sup>7</sup> Smotrytsch (1961: 119) wanted him to be King Ptolemy Philadelphus, which of course would place the poem, and the literary disputes, squarely in the context of the court of Alexandria. The supposition is far-fetched and the notion of the King intervening in person in a rustic contest rather absurd—the more so if he is to be identical with the figure glimpsed in lines 28ff., i.e., dressed up as Dionysus.

<sup>8</sup> It makes no difference whether the award has or has not yet been made (above, n. 6), since the “old man” is not to be thought of as a competitor in this highly athletic game. Rather he is a previous champion, confronting the new clear victor. The past tense (ὁ δ’ εὔπεν) presents no difficulty; if it is part of Herodas’ speech from the winebag, it refers to a judgment of Dionysus made in response to the former champion’s menacing appearance, i.e., during the preceding ten-line lacuna (lines 48–57). Otherwise it records rather abruptly the response of the god to μαρτύρ[ο]μαι (line 63) and so concludes the dream (τοῦτ’ ἰ[δ]ὼν ἔληξα, line 65).

The general meaning of the curtailed line 64 will be, as I have stated it, that both are “winners”—whether or not the skin is, as I incline to accept, Herodas’ symbolic prize, his “palm.” Certainly Pisan’s (1952) understanding of δοπέα to mean “skin (bag)” would reinforce this latter assumption, and certainly the received meaning, “flayer,” yields no good sense. Possibly δοπεύς as a (winning?) throw at dice, with a play on δορά, needs more consideration.

<sup>9</sup> The lost ending of line 66 must contain the clue to this. A possible emendation would read (adapting Herzog): τὸ ἐνδύον / Ἀν|ῶ δ[ὲ] δδε· τοῦναρ δδ’ ἔ|σας κρινεῖς, implying that he is

We proceed on this, the same quest as the poet-dreamer's; we, though, have to fit together the puzzle of the damaged papyrus, which presents the dream in two main chunks: the seizing and devouring of the goat and the games and encounter with the old man. Linking these episodes is the defective passage introducing Dionysus, who, I suggest—from the introduction of Aeolus presenting the bag of winds to Odysseus (line 37)—presents the blown-up skin for the *askoliasmos*. The narrative connection would appear to be that Herodas intends the goat for the sacrifice to the god which is the occasion for the games. This accounts for εὐπώ[γω]ν τε εὐκέρως (line 17): fine specimens were required for sacrifice.

At a profounder level a connection is to be found in the imagery<sup>10</sup> (as occurs in dreams) and in the shifting associations of the poet's "gift" (δῶρον, line 68) and the "prize" (ἄεθλον) which he "alone" carries off (lines 73, 74). The rocky cleft at the dream's beginning plausibly stands for the poetic labours through which Herodas has struggled with the divine gift (line 68). Δῶρον has an old sense of "gift of honour"; it is similarly used of Aeolus' gift to Odysseus, the ἄσκον βοδὸς ἐννεώροιο of Hom. *Od.* 10.36, with which compare the ἄπνοον κόρυκον used for the *askoliasmos*. The air which inflates Herodas' skin-bag is "windless," unlike that of Aeolus; it is breath. This makes it, together with its associations with Dionysus (who may also inflate it with his divine breath), a fit symbol for the poetic composition in which Herodas claims to triumph.

*Askoliasmos*, specific to festivals of Dionysus, takes place particularly in the Attic countryside.<sup>11</sup> That it has reference to goats is clear from the scholiast on Aristophanes *Plutus* 1129, who writes, "It is said that they did this to honour Dionysus; for the 'askos' is the skin of a goat . . ." He gives the same explanation as Vergil (who also mentions *praemia*) for the sacrifice of a goat which preceded the games culminating in the *askoliasmos*.<sup>12</sup> This may have originated in a contest

---

suggesting his own interpretation as the slave's. His impatience realistically suggests his excitement and a growing conviction as to the dream's meaning.

<sup>10</sup> As by Cunningham (1971: 193). I agree with Veneroni (1971: 226) that the arduous (and successful, as ἐξεῖλκον, line 67 implies) dragging of the goat through the long chasm is symbolic of Herodas' sense of achievement (with the poetic toils [μύχθους, line 71]) which have led up to his choliambic mimiambos.

<sup>11</sup> In Cornutus (30) and Vergil (*G.* 2.380–384).

<sup>12</sup> Namely that goats damage vines, and—adds Vergil (*G.* 371–396)—were therefore sacrificed to the god of the vintage, which sacrifice was followed by games and competitions among which that of the goatskin-winebag is singled out.

We may treat this respectable explanation with reserve; clearly it was widely held, but, as Vergil has just pointed out, sheep and cattle have an equally devastating effect on young vines, and Dionysus' attachment to the goat as his sacrificial victim—or rather his devotees' attachment to communion with the god by means of tearing and eating goatflesh, as in the first part of Herodas' dream—is more probably explained by the wayward proclivities of the animal and their resemblance to irrational and wine-induced states in man.

Mention of an oak-tree (καὶ ἄλλης δρυός) at line 23 is hardly evidence that the dream goatherds killed Herodas' goat because it was eating (sacred) oak-leaves, or the ivy that grows on oaks (Veneroni 1971: 226).

for the victim's skin, which indeed may be Herodas' "prize" (line 73), or the prize may be the goatskin-winebag itself, perhaps made out of the skin of Herodas' "prize" goat,<sup>13</sup> or another goat—any of which suppositions points to a connection between Herodas' "gift from Dionysus" and his "prize."<sup>14</sup>

That *askoliasmos* is associated with the sacrifice of a goat suggests the tenor of the transitional passage, which clearly concerns a goat (αἴγ', line 25). It is unlikely that a different animal from that of line 16 (τράγον) and line 67 (αἴγα) is intended. It has been thought that lines 69–70 describe a *sparagmos*, the tearing and eating raw of the goat with the aim of partaking of the spirit of Dionysus. But [ἐδ]αιτρεῦντο, if correct, implies not tearing but the carving of portions (δαίτρά), while ἐκ βίης can refer to the violent seizure of the goat. In this case, the feasting on the animal's flesh took place by means of a regular sacrifice except that he who intended to perform it was prevented by those jealous of his access to the divine power of poesis. "I," he says with meaning emphasis, "did not skin it" (line 22). The remains of lines 23–25 are consistent with a sacrifice and lead to the apparition of the god, before whom the games are held. Since these would be open to all comers, Herodas could not be prevented by his dream assailants from taking part in them.<sup>15</sup>

Vergil (G. 2.381), significantly, associates this festival with the rustic theatre (*veteres ineunt proscenia ludi*); compare the scholiast on Ar. *Plutus* 1129, who says that the *askoliasmos* took place "in the middle of the theatre." Third-century B.C. sources tell us that the old prize from which at Athens τραγωδία, "goat-song," "tragedy" took its name was a goat (τράγος).<sup>16</sup> Why should Herodas claim a "tragic" prize? The answer in part will lie in the generic sense of "tragedy" now lost to us, that of a "serious poem." Thus Homer is called "tragedy" by Plato (*Tht.* 152e, cf. *Resp.* 10.595c)—and though the precise connection and import seem lost in the lacunae of our text, Homer is in the present poem. Such too were the (Dionysiac) dithyrambic songs out of which Aristotle tells us tragedy arose (*Poet.* 1449a). No-one doubts that the cult of Dionysus, wearer of the tragic κόθορνος as at line 33 here, is at the origins of the tragic choruses (to which dialogue was

<sup>13</sup> Veneroni assumes this (1971: 226): "Ed è proprio il capro fatto a brani, con la cui pelle è stato costruito l'otre, che serve per la gara, a procurare la vittoria ad Eroda." See Reinmuth (1964), who asserts that the skin was sometimes filled with wine—incorrectly attributing the latter claim to the scholiast on Aristophanes' *Plutus*.

<sup>14</sup> Veneroni (1971: 227) sees the goat as Herodas' device, his σφραγίς, though her connection of this with "tragedy" is on a more superficial level than my theory below.

<sup>15</sup> It is not necessary to assume, with Rosen (1992: 210), that his robbers "welcomed" him and "encouraged him with boisterous shouts," but rather that his outstanding (and so divine) "performance" (on the goatskin winebag) elicited ritual applause (κηλάαξαν, line 46), however grudging, from those who had formerly been jealous of him, and in hijacking the goat, attempted to appropriate its virtue for themselves.

<sup>16</sup> Marmor Parius and Dioscorides (*Anth. Pal.* 7.410), behind whom probably stands Aristotle. See Pickard-Cambridge 1962: 77, 113, 124. Whether the theory is right is a separate issue; it clearly was held.

a later addition)<sup>17</sup> nor, as Aristotle implies, of the satyric branch of the art, the satyrs (goat-men) attesting these origins.

Thus the δῶρον represented by the goat (lines 67, 68) is Herodas' poetic "gift" (as we also say in English) which arouses the envy of the "goatherds," while the ἀεθλον won for prowess on the goatskin winebag is its affirmation. Both goat-gift and prize-connected-with-goatskin symbolize Herodas' supremacy in his art.<sup>18</sup>

We arrive at the reading of the concluding lines 75–79, of which both ends are missing.<sup>19</sup> Key words which are in the unamended text are ἔπεα (line 76) and δευτέρη (line 77) and the ἢ . . . ἢ indicators of alternatives,<sup>20</sup> but here, I shall maintain, used inclusively, with the sense almost of "both (epic poems) and (a second something)" (cf. Callim. *Ia.* 4.32). Now while ἔπεα in the narrow sense means heroic verse, the word can be used more generally, particularly in contrast to lyric (μέλη). Clearly here Herodas is using it, albeit perhaps with some irony, of his iambic verse, but in contrast to his choliambic. Hipponax's ingeniously mocking variant on the iambic trimeter, with its inverted fifth foot which—in the apt phrase of Cunningham—"calls a sneering halt to the line," is strictly for "low" purposes. It would be strange indeed to find it called ἔπεα, and indeed by this word Herodas is marking the contrast between his *oeuvres* in the genus "iamb" and in the sub-species "choliamb," while at the same time the inclusive disjunctives ἢ . . . ἢ bracket them together.

Apart from heroic "epic" metre, iambics are viewed as the common metre of ancient Greek verse. As Aristotle puts it, they are μάλιστα λεκτικὸν τῶν μέτρων (*Poet.* 1449a24–25). This helps to explain how verse that became known specifically as *iambos*, notoriously characterized by invective, was still viewed as a serious genre—even if "informal."<sup>21</sup> Of this genre Hipponax's amusing travesty was a sub-species. Herodas' choice of it for the extant *Mimiamboi* marks them out as evocations of low life.

Thus, as I propose, in lines 76 and 77 Herodas contrasts an output of iambics with the choliambos for which he is known to us, but which there is no reason to suppose—and here reason not to suppose—is all he ever wrote. Indeed, it would seem most unlikely: Hipponax is chiefly known for his choliambos, but he started

<sup>17</sup> Rosen (1992) emphasizes (Attic) tragedy as the genre indicated by Herodas' goat symbolism and the novel element in his new creation the mimiamb. However, the dramatic element is, as the word makes explicit, not tragedy, and the disjunctives distinguish not tragedy and/or (chol-)iambics but iambics and/or choliambics.

<sup>18</sup> The skin which he was prevented from flaying off the animal could indeed be the same as that on which he triumphs in the ἀσכולιασμός, though this identity is not essential to my reconstruction. Rosen (1992), independently, makes this suggestion.

<sup>19</sup> See below, n. 32, for emendations.

<sup>20</sup> This is the natural assumption, defended by Herzog (1924: 420), and though it has been questioned, it has been accepted by Veneroni (1971) and Rosen (1992).

<sup>21</sup> See Easterling and Knox 1985: 117–128.

as an Ionian iambographer in the tradition of Archilochus, while Callimachus of course has both metres in his repertoire.

Evidence that Herodas wrote in a "straight" iambic metre may indeed survive in the quotation in acatalectic dimeter preserved for us by the scholiast on Nicander, who here calls Herodas a writer of half-iambis (ἡμιαμβικός, Keil's correction of the manuscript's ἡμι(ἡμί)αμβος).<sup>22</sup> The reference has generally been assumed to be to 8.59–60, to which the citation has some strong verbal similarities (though there are also striking differences), and the title "Υπνος" ("Sleep") given by the scholiast is assumed to be in error for "Ἐνύπνιον" ("Dream"); that is, the scholiast mistakenly thinks Herodas is a writer of hemiambs, and so casts his faulty memory of the choliambic lines into that metre. The alternative is that Herodas has employed more than once the enduring comic figure of the baffled old man who lays on with his walking-stick. (The possible significance of Hipponax fragment 20 will be discussed below.) The least that can be asserted is that, even if he or his source is forcing a memory of 8.59–60 into his concept of Herodas, the scholiast believes Herodas to have been known for hemiambs (ἡμιαμβικός), and if this too is to be held an error, it is surely a far less likely one if Herodas was so unusual a figure as to have written in one metre only.<sup>23</sup>

Thus lines 75–79 can be read to imply that Herodas based his claim to fame less on his choliambis, the metre of his surviving work, than on a probably earlier *oeuvre* in straight iambics. The reading ἐξ (for ἑξ) ἰάμβων would support this interpretation, though it is not, let me emphasize, essential to it. This would give the meaning "six pure iambs" in contrast to τὰ κύλλα of 79.<sup>24</sup>

Herodas depicts his angry antagonist as an old man; therefore it seems perverse to seek him among contemporaries, of whom Callimachus, presumably as a sort of poetic "senior," has been an oddly favoured candidate.<sup>25</sup> Herodas depicts himself as an athletic and therefore young man—at least for the purposes of the dream, which begins with him hauling a well-grown goat through a long cleft and ends

<sup>22</sup> *Scholia in Nicandri Theriaca* line 377 (Crugnola 1971: 161).

<sup>23</sup> J. M. Rist has made to me the venturesome suggestion that the papyrus' ἡμπεα (line 76) means in fact hemiambs. Despite the apparent anaphora ἦ με in the following line, this seems to me not impossible.

<sup>24</sup> Cunningham 1971: 203. As Cunningham has pointed out, Herzog's objection that the iambic trimeter was regarded as consisting of three *metra*, rather than of six feet (cf. Latin: *senarius claudus*), lacks weight; the foot is, as West (1982: 6) puts it, "an ancient alternative unit of analysis" and the salient feature of the choliamb is that it inverts the final iambic *foot*.

<sup>25</sup> Arguments advanced in favour of identifying Callimachus as Herodas' antagonist are that, despite evoking Hipponax as his master, he differs from him in his use of the choliamb, while his dissociation of himself from the Ionians contrasts with the end of *Mimiamb* 8, where Herodas claims, following Hipponax, to compose for the "sons of Xuthus."

Knox (1926) argued rightly that the old man could not be a contemporary when he opined that he "can hardly be other than Hipponax . . . , for γέρων is commonly used of the ancients, just as Xenomedes is called by Callimachus in the *Aetia* ἀρχαῖος and γέρων indifferently." The argument is against the identification with Callimachus or other contemporaries; while the "old man" has to be an ancient author, he does not have to be Hipponax.

with his prodigious performance on the slippery wineskin. (Compare Cornutus, who denotes as γεωργοὶ νεανίσκοι those who performed in the *askoliasmos*).<sup>26</sup> Contrasted with this, the πρέσβυς (line 59)/ γέρων (line 75) evokes someone of an earlier epoch, a "hoary" poet.

Though Callimachus is not the "old man," the phrase ἐν Μούσῃσιν (line 72) might cause us to suspect that he is not far from Herodas' thoughts, and there may be an adverse glance at him in Herodas' concluding manifesto of indebtedness to Hipponax.<sup>27</sup> That his identity with the "old man" has been maintained at all has the negative value of indicating the doubts surrounding the widely held theory of Crusius and Knox that the "old man" is Hipponax.<sup>28</sup> he *scilicet* is mentioned at line 77 and is an elder poet, added to which is the verbal echo at line 60, held to be conclusive though it consists of only two words:<sup>29</sup> "I'll strike (κόψω) you with my stick (τῇ βακτηρίῃ)" recalling Hipponax's "seeming about to strike (κόψαι) him with his stick (τῇ βακτηρίῃ)." However, we do not know that in fragment 20 Hipponax is casting himself as an old man.

The problem with this identification is that Herodas goes on to single Hipponax out for reverence, nay for acclaim: the resounding polysyllable Ἰππώνακτα falls before line 78's main caesura, at the climax of the whole poem. It strains belief that he can be one with the "aroused old man" (line 75) of the selfsame sentence, the curmudgeon jealous of his self-acknowledged pupil's prowess. It follows that the apparent allusion must be explained otherwise, whether Herodas is echoing his master, without further point to it, or makes use of a τόπος (which he arguably echoes in the hemiambs cited by the Scholiast on Nicander), or perhaps Hipponax himself has echoed Archilochus or another source of what after all is a stock figure and situation associated with New Comedy.

The sense of lines 75–79 thus seems clear enough, even with scant emendation, though I offer a plausible restoration (n. 32): "And if I came to terms

<sup>26</sup> Cornutus 30 (p. 60, 23 Lang). The staff of line 9 (σκήπτωνι) may suggest that the "real" Herodas, the (fictitious!) dreamer of his former athletic self, is an older man (Cunningham 1971: 197).

<sup>27</sup> Smotrytsch 1962. See also Puelma 1949. Smotrytsch further claims that Callimachus was a defender of antique ways in art and attempts to show that a hypothesized dispute between Callimachus and Herodas as to idealism *versus* realism in (plastic) art is the point of the comments passed by the women votaries at the temple in *Mimiamb* 4. One may reply that in poetry, at least, Callimachus is the emphatic champion of the contemporary "small-is-beautiful" school, and that Cunningham (1971: 16) sums up the matter when he writes that "to all appearances he [Callimachus] and Herodas would have been allies, not opponents, in any literary dispute." One might add that, if any critical stance is to be read into *Mimiamb* 4, it ought to suggest that naturalism in art is an assumption of the uninstructed. I have discussed this further in *The Mimes of Herodas*, a verse translation with introductions, which I hope may be forthcoming.

<sup>28</sup> Cunningham (1971: 194) notes that "The old man is frequently said to be Hipponax," and though he points to the problem with this, it is the view which, in my experience, persists.

<sup>29</sup> Thus Veneroni (1971: 229) wrote: "il personaggio col bastone è evidentemente Ipponatte" (my italics) and continued "sia perchè questa presentazione corrisponde all'immagine stizzosa che la tradizione ci dà dell'aggressivo poeta . . . sia perchè un ritorno a Ipponatte bene si inserisce nel gusto dell'età ellenistica . . ." Both of these proffered reasons would apply equally to Archilochus.

(ξύν' ἔπρηξα, lit. "made common things")<sup>30</sup> with the aroused old man, whether it be my serious poems (ἔπεα) in iambs (or "of six iambic feet") which have brought me to great fame—yes, by the Muses—or whether (*vel*, if you like) my second "string" (the missing word has to be γνώσις or γνώμη—Herzog's preference—and I suggest the latter, in its sense approximating to "skill") of composing choliambes for the sons of Xuthus, following Hipponax of old."<sup>31</sup> In other words, the "aroused old man" of the dream is connected with what Herodas considers his primary claim to fame, his more serious verse in "straight" iambs, while his "second ability to sing *choliambes*" (τὰ κύλλ' αἰεῖδεν) is explicitly connected with "Hipponax of old" (τὸν πάλαι). Both, taken together,<sup>32</sup> constitute his claim to preeminence in the iambic art, to the prize in the gift of Dionysus.

There can be little doubt that Herodas intends a specific poet by the angry old man of lines 59 and 75. Nor that if Herodas' audience thought of an angry poet, they were at least as likely to think of Archilochus of Paros,<sup>33</sup> the originator of the iambic lampoon and father of Ionian "iambography" of which the innovating Hipponax was the last exponent. Herodas, in the intriguing piece of literary self-revelation which is *Mimiamb* 8, is at pains to stake his claim for recognition in the two related genres of the Ionians, those "sons of Xuthus" whom he evokes as his audience in the concluding line: for his "straight" iambs (now all but lost to us, though in addition to our hemiambic fragment, there are fragmentary papyrus remains of mimes in iambs)<sup>34</sup> in which, I suggest, he envisages himself as defying the formidable Archilochus for the prize, and for his probably later adoption of the more frivolous choliamb, for which he emphasizes his debt to Hipponax.

<sup>30</sup>In relation to the meaning of this expression, Dr Alan Griffiths has drawn my attention to Callim. *Ia*. 4.72: ξυνὸν τόδ' αὐτοῖς, which I translate "This was *common ground* to them."

<sup>31</sup>Using both a facsimile of the London papyrus and Cunningham's Teubner edition (1987), based on a microscopic examination of its traces, I have adopted what seem to me the likeliest conjectures of scholars, plus some of my own, to give the following restoration of lines 76–79:

ἐπὶ κλέος, ναὶ Μοῦσαν, ἦ μ' ἔπεα κείνα  
μεγ' (') ἐξ ἰάμβων, ἦ με δευτέρη γνώμη  
ἐμοῖς [?] μετ' Ἰππώνακτα τὸν πάλαι ἔποντα  
τὰ κύλλ' αἰεῖδεν Εὐθίδης ἐπαίρουσιν.

<sup>32</sup>This answers Herzog's and others' objection (cited by Rosen 1992: 215, n. 37) to Herodas' apparent contrast here between iambs and choliambes. Herodas is treating choliambes as a separate species within the genre of iambs, and the *inclusive* sense of ἦ ... ἦ expresses this simultaneous connection and disjunction. (This is, also, plausibly, the significance of Herodas' *twice* performing on the goatskin [line 45]). Clearly I differ from Rosen's view that "the distinction between iambs and choliambes is . . . that between the new dramatic element and the traditional Hipponactean element of the poet's oeuvre." The weakness in this is that iambs are not *particularly* to be identified with drama, but rather both iambs and choliambes with invective.

<sup>33</sup>Two relatively recent writers on Archilochus describe him in the following terms: "turbulent and fierce" (Rankin 1977: 1); "anger is thus his most familiar muse" (Burnett 1983: 103).

<sup>34</sup>See Cunningham 1987.



Backtracking a little, we now note the word μέλεα at line 71—not a word to use of choliamb, any more than is ἔπεα (line 76). *Mimiamb* 8 is about its author's life *oeuvre*, of which the more imposing part, to his mind, was the "serious" verse (ἔπεα κ[ε]ῖνα) [μ]έγ', and τὰ μέλεα . . . τοὺς ἐμοὺς μόχθους), composed in serious verse's commonest metre, the "straight" iambics alluded to at line 77.

Herodas plays on the double sense of μέλεα: the goatherds divide up (ἐδαιτρεῦντο, line 69) and feast upon (ἐδαίνυντο, line 70) the "limbs" of the goat, which in the dream represent his "songs." As lines 69–72 make clear, the "goatherds" of the dream are (contemporary or future) critics of Herodas' work, and so his coevals. They thus subsist in a different sphere from the "old man"; Herodas is presenting us with what science fiction likes to call a "time-warp." Theocritus is of course the contemporary poet most readily associated with goatherds and the bucolic life, and while ἐν Μούσῳσιν may imply no more than the Muses' votaries, poets in general, it may be intended to suggest Alexandria, the sphere of Callimachus, but with which Theocritus also is connected by his *Idyll* 17 and where he probably spent two or three of the last years of the 270s B.C.<sup>35</sup> It is further probable that he left pupils and followers in Alexandria on his retirement to Cos. This assumption would entail a date after about 270 for the present poem.

If Theocritus and his school are the poet-critics adverted to in the dream's bucolic imagery, this further suggests that Theocritus was the senior contemporary, with his bucolic credentials established before Herodas attained recognition for either iambic or choliambic verses. The present poem cannot but recall Theocritus' "bucolic masquerade," *Idyll* 7, which commemorates his recognition (by "Lycidas," the "goatherd") among rustic poets.<sup>36</sup> In his case, the token of recognition is the wood of the wild olive, a "rustic" emblem and sacred to Athene; in Herodas' it is the winebag—with its Homeric overtones—fashioned from the skin of a goat, an emblem of Dionysus. The rituals of both these deities are found at the roots of both "iambic" and "tragic" poetry, in the Athenian tragedians and in the Ionian iambographers.

*Mimiamb* 8 is thus a notable piece of Hellenistic ingenuity. Within the framework of a recounted dream and its interpretation, which itself is placed in a framework of daybreak on a country estate in winter,<sup>37</sup> is set a poetic manifesto in which Herodas defies the attacks of critics of the circles of both Callimachus

<sup>35</sup> See Rist 1978: 10 (General Introduction).

<sup>36</sup> Rist 1978: Introduction to *Idyll* 7.

<sup>37</sup> The long winter nights are referred to in line 5, and line 6 makes it plain that day has not broken when the servants are required to rise. Cunningham (1971: 195)—after disposing tersely of Herzog's view—points out that these details accord with the season of the Dionysiac festivals, which took place at midwinter, adding "the date of the narration and that of the events of the dream do not necessarily correspond, but in a literary construction it is likely that they do." More explicitly, it is *dramatically* appropriate that they do: a dream of Christmas would dramatically suggest a setting in winter, and would have quite special implications if set in summer. Plausibly, it is not yet midwinter, as Cunningham states, but Herodas' dream looks forward to the coming festival.

and Theocritus, while claiming to stand with the best of the ancients in the twin tradition of Ionian iambography.<sup>38</sup>

CAMBRIDGE, U.K.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Burnett, A. P. 1983. *Three Archaic Poets*. London.
- Crane, G. 1986. "Three Notes on Herodas 8," *HSCP* 90: 85–90.
- Crugnola, A. 1971. *Scholia in Nicandri Theriaca cum glossis*. Testi e Documenti per lo studio dell' Antichità 34. Milan.
- Cunningham, I. ed. 1971. *Herodas Mimiambi*. Oxford.
- ed. 1987. *Herodas: Mimiambi*. Leipzig.
- Easterling, P. E. and B. M. W. Knox (eds.). 1985. *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature 1: Greek Literature*. Cambridge.
- Herzog, R. 1924. "Der Traum des Herondas," *Philologus* 79: 370–433.
- Knox, A. D. 1925. "The Dream of Herodas," *CR* 31: 13–15.
- 1926. "Herodas and Callimachus," *Philologus* 8: 241–255.
- Lawall, G. 1967. *Theocritus' Coan Pastorals*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Pickard-Cambridge, D. W. 1962. *Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy*<sup>2</sup>. Oxford.
- Pisani, V. 1952. "Glosse a Eroda," *Paideia* 7: 89–94.
- Puelma, M. 1949. *Lucilius und Kallimachos*. Frankfurt.
- Rankin, H. D. 1977. *Archilochus of Paros*. Park Ridge, N.J.
- Reinmuth, O. W. 1964. "Ἀσκολιασμός," *Kl. Pauly* 1: 648.
- Rist, A. T. 1978. *The Poems of Theocritus*. Chapel Hill.
- Rosen, R. M. 1992. "Mixing of Genres and Literary Program in *Herodas 8*," *HSCP* 92: 205–216.
- Smotrytsch, A. P. 1961. "ὁ καλὸς νεανίας καὶ αἰπόλοι," *Helikon* 1: 118–126.
- 1962. "Eronda e il Vecchio," *Helikon* 2: 605–616.
- Veneroni, B. 1971. "Ricerche su due Mimiambi di Eroda," *Istituto Lombardo (Rend. Lett.)* 105: 225–242.
- West, M. L. 1982. *Greek Metre*. Oxford.

<sup>38</sup> An earlier version of this article was read by Professor Patricia Easterling and Dr Alan Griffiths. Their comments have been most valuable in forewarning me of objections which might be made to my thesis and impelling me to further researches and the construction of a more watertight case. I am grateful to them both for this pedagogy and my failure substantially to change my mind is not to be laid at the door of either of them.