



January 1992

Mixing of Genres and Literary Program in Herodas 8

Ralph M. Rosen

University of Pennsylvania, rosen@sas.upenn.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://repository.upenn.edu/classics_papers

Recommended Citation

Rosen, R. M. (1992). Mixing of Genres and Literary Program in Herodas 8. Retrieved from http://repository.upenn.edu/classics_papers/30

Reprinted from *Harvard Classical Studies in Philology*, Volume 94, 1992, pages 205-216.

We have contacted the publisher regarding the deposit of this paper in ScholarlyCommons@Penn. No response has been received.

This paper is posted at ScholarlyCommons. http://repository.upenn.edu/classics_papers/30
For more information, please contact libraryrepository@pobox.upenn.edu.

Mixing of Genres and Literary Program in Herodas 8

Comments

Reprinted from *Harvard Classical Studies in Philology*, Volume 94, 1992, pages 205-216.

We have contacted the publisher regarding the deposit of this paper in ScholarlyCommons@Penn. No response has been received.



Mixing of Genres and Literary Program in Herodas 8

Ralph M. Rosen

Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, Vol. 94 (1992), 205-216.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0073-0688%281992%2994%3C205%3AMOGALP%3E2.0.CO%3B2-P>

Harvard Studies in Classical Philology is currently published by Department of the Classics, Harvard University.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/dchu.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

MIXING OF GENRES AND LITERARY PROGRAM IN *HERODAS* 8

RALPH M. ROSEN

IN Herodas' eighth *Mimiamb*, one of the most enigmatic examples of Hellenistic literary polemic, the speaker (usually identified with the poet himself) relates to one of his slaves a dream from which he has just awakened. He states explicitly (66–79) that the dream presaged attacks from his critics: just as the goatherds tore apart and feasted on the limbs of his goat, so the poet's critics will tear apart his own limbs, both literally and metaphorically (with a pun on μέλος = poem; τὰ μέλεα πολλοὶ κάρτα, τοὺς ἐμοὺς μόχθους || τιλεῦσιν ἐν Μούσησιν).¹ Few would deny, therefore, that in this poem Herodas, as Clayman has recently put it, “defends his literary innovations in the very act of making them.”² More specifically, as many have observed, the final lines, by proclaiming that the poet will attain κλέος from his allegiance to Hipponax, underscore the iambic quality of his genre. But I shall argue in addition that Herodas' dream, in alluding to an original (if not actual)³ dramatic element of mime, functions as an *apologia* for the

¹ The following abbreviations are used in this article: Cunningham = I. Cunningham, *Herodas Mimiambi* (Oxford 1971); *HK* = W. Headlam and A. D. Knox, *Herodas: The Mimes and Fragments* (Cambridge 1922); Herzog = R. Herzog (with an initial section by O. Crusius published posthumously), “Der Traum des Herondas,” *Philologus* 74 (1924) 370–433; Mastromarco = G. Mastromarco, *The Public of Herondas* (Amsterdam 1984); Vogliano = A. Vogliano, *Ricerche sopra l'ottavo mimiamb di Heroda* (Milan 1906). Except where noted, I cite the text of I. C. Cunningham, *Herodae Mimiambi* (Leipzig 1987).

The phrase ἐν Μούσησιν remains problematic (cf. G. Crane, “Three Notes on Herodas 8,” *HSCP* [1986] 88 n. 15), Knox's claim (above, 395–396; and Herzog 419) that there is an ellipse (τῶν) ἐν Μούσησιν (δόντων) = “literary critics,” has found considerable favor, though Cunningham (above, 202) registers sober discomfort with this explanation. Perhaps somewhat less difficult (*pace* Knox in *HK* ad loc., 396) would be to take τὰ μέλεα . . . ἐν Μούσησιν as simply “my efforts in poetry.”

² D. L. Clayman, *Callimachus' Iambi* (Leiden 1980) 71.

³ The issue of whether or not the *Mimiamboi* were performed dramatically or as a

bold combination of the dramatic and the iambographic that he incorporates into a new genre, the *mimiamb*.

Most critics of *Mimiamb* 8 have understandably focused on the identification of the goatherds (20, 69), the young man (63) and the old man (59, 62), and many have reconstructed particulars of a contemporary literary quarrel.⁴ But while the end of the poem itself both assures the allegorical significance of these characters and affirms the poem's literary concerns, the details remain—probably, to a degree, by design—obscure.⁵ It is curious, however, that most scholars have largely ignored or underplayed the milieu of the dream itself, a Dionysian ritual, since it is a textual datum that must have direct relevance to the allegory lying behind the other players and events of the poem.⁶ It has indeed often been noted that the reference at line 68 to a “gift from fair Dionysus” (. . . . καλοῦ δῶρον ἐκ Δ[ιῶν]ύσου), almost certainly refers to the narrator's goat,⁷ and as such refers in turn to the dreamer's poetry. But why in the first place would Herodas include Dionysus in his dream?⁸ What would it mean to say that his poetry was a “gift of

monologue, or were simply *Buchpoesie*, is unsettled. Cf. Mastromarco's survey of the scholarship (above, n. 1, 5–19). Even if the *Mimiamboi* were written only for reading, it would suit Hellenistic tastes for Herodas to dwell on a merely vestigial element of the genre.

⁴ For bibliography cf. Cunningham (above, n. 1, 194) and Mastromarco (above, n. 1, 71 n. 11).

⁵ Mastromarco (above, n. 1, 71) puts the poem's obscurity in the most positive light when he states that “the identities of the characters . . . are marked by strong allusive facets.”

⁶ Knox, “Herodas and Callimachus,” *Philologus* (1925–1926) 253, does indeed notice the emphasis on the “Rural Dionysia with their dramatic element,” but only to illustrate his hypothesis that Herodas looked to the iambus of Attic drama for his meter, in contrast to Callimachus. J. Sitzler, in his review of Vogliano's monograph, *Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie* 25 (1908) 174, suggests rather offhandedly that the old man of the poem is “der Vertreter der bisherigen dramatischen Poesie,” but does not explain what he has in mind by this. Sitzler is no more helpful in his review of Herzog, *Philologische Wochenschrift* 47 (1927) 40: “vielleicht ist der Alte nur der symbolische Vertreter der bisherigen dionysischen Poesie.”

⁷ E.g., Cunningham (above, n. 1) 193. Actually this is a more recent reading, based on a better transcription of the papyrus; Vogliano prints μα|λλοῦ δῶρον ἐν[.]υ; *HK* supplements heavily: [οὐ σχῶν παρ' ἄλλου δῶρον, εἰς Διωνύσου] (“no gift at another's hand, to the house of Dionysus”); Herzog modifies further: οὐ σχῶν παρ' ἄλλου δῶρον, ἐκ δ' [έμοῦ σηκο]ῦ.

⁸ Knox's answer to this question is surprisingly uninspired (*HK* 395, ad 64): “Naturally the god most concerned with a writer of Herodas' character appears to the dreaming

Dionysus,” and what does the goatherds’ allegorical destruction if this “gift” signify? B. Veneroni is the only scholar, to my knowledge, who has addressed these questions directly, and his suggestion that in *Mimiamb* 8 Dionysus and the goat represent a dramatic background of the *mimiambos* forms the starting point for this paper.⁹ In what follows I wish first to argue for Veneroni’s basic insight into the Dionysian background of the *mimiamb* in somewhat greater detail, and then to offer a new interpretation of the poem which helps to resolve some of the problems that have long plagued our understanding of the text.

It is striking, though universally overlooked, that the opening of the dream bears many of the hallmarks of a typical scene of poetic initiation:¹⁰

τράγον τιν’ ἔλκειν [διὰ] φάραγος ὠήθη[ν
μακρῆς, ὁ δ’ εὐπώ[γω]ν τε κεῦκερωσ, [. . .
ἐπεὶ δὲ δὴ [. . .]] . τῆς βήσεως (16–18)

Here the narrator is alone in an isolated, natural setting, dragging a goat

author.” The role of Dionysus at the beginning of the dream is indeed uncertain, since the section in which he first appears (18–40) is highly lacunose. We can glean only enough information from the text (30–32) to assure us that he appears at some point among the goatherds, viz. the characteristic “fawnskin” (νεβροῦ), “ivy around his head” (ἀμφὶ κρητὶ κ[ί]σιν’ ἔστεπτο), and “buskin” (κ[ο]θόρνου); cf. Cunningham (above, n. 1) 199. We cannot tell whether he is already among the goatherds when the narrator comes upon them, or whether he appears to them suddenly at that time. But since the end of the poem connects the goat with Dionysus, there can be little doubt that the figure of Dionysus, as well as the goatherds, held literary significance in the dream.

⁹ B. Veneroni, “Ricerche su due *Mimiambi* di Eroda,” *Rendiconti dell’Istituto Lombardo* 105 (1971) 223–242. In my interpretation of the poem as a whole, however, I differ from Veneroni in one crucial respect, as will become clear below. Whereas he wants Herodas to be emphasizing the dramatic element of the *mimiamb* as his own innovation, I argue that Herodas’ claim to originality lies in his grafting of an “iambic” element onto the inherently dramatic genre of mime.

¹⁰ Cunningham 195 does mention that “when a dream appears in a literary work, it is normally the vehicle through which the subject-matter is revealed to the author . . . or the means of limiting the author to a specific subject,” but he does not pursue the ramifications of this statement for *Mimiamb* 8. Similarly, Herzog (398–400) notes the common Hellenistic connection between Dionysus and the Muses, and even cites Hesiod’s meeting with the Muses as an analogue of poetic inspiration, but he does not discuss the dream as an initiatory event. See also A. P. Smotrytsch, “Ὁ καλὸς νεανίας καὶ αἴπολοι,” *Helikon* 1 (1961) 120–122.

through a glen for an unspecified reason.¹¹ These details are reminiscent of many other scenes from Greek literature in which a poet receives his inspiration or instruction from a god or gods. The most famous, of course, is Hesiod's encounter with the Muses as he tends his sheep on Mt. Helicon (*Th.* 22–34). But many other variations occur: Archilochus in the Mnesiepes inscription receives the gift of a lyre from the Muses while taking a cow to market;¹² Simichidas in Theocritus 7.92 claims to have been taught by the Nymphs while tending cattle; Callimachus' instruction occurs in a dream in which he is transported to Helicon to meet the Muses as Hesiod once did.¹³ The typical beginning of Herodas' dream, therefore, sets the stage for a theophany of literary import, and leads the reader to suspect that the lowly, ill-omened¹⁴ goat will turn out to play a centrally symbolic role therein. Our suspicions are soon confirmed when the dreaming poet proceeds to encounter Dionysus and the goat takes on explicit allegorical significance at the end of the poem.¹⁵ Indeed, the fact that the goat is called a δῶρον from Dionysus at line 68 suggests that it was a token analogous to Hesiod's scepter (*Th.* 30) or Archilochus' lyre (Testim. 4 Tarditi, col. 2.38), both symbolic gifts from the Muses.¹⁶

¹¹ The τίς may imply that the dreamer himself was not sure why he had a goat in the first place. Herzog (above, n. 1, 396) sees the goat as an offering to Dionysus and cites, among others, Plutarch *De cup. div.* 527d, which mentions "dragging a goat" to a Dionysian festival. Knox, "The Dream of Herodas," *CR* 39 (1925) 13, argues that the Plutarch passage shows "that the whole affair [in *Mimiamb* 8] proceeds *nach Plan*—the dreamer was going there all the time." But since the narrator emphasizes that the goatherds' destruction of his goat was an act of violence (69), it seems more likely that in fact he was an unwitting interloper at their celebration. Why, moreover, would the poet *voluntarily* offer his goat up for violent slaughter, then complain in the "interpretation" that the slaughter represented his critics' mangling of his poetry?

¹² Cf. M. Lefkowitz, *The Lives of the Greek Poets* (Baltimore 1981) 27–31.

¹³ Callimachus fr. 2 Pf. On the ancient convention of poetic initiation cf. M. L. West, *Hesiod Theogony* (Oxford 1966) 158–160.

¹⁴ On the traditional πονηρία of goats, cf. *HK* (above, n. 1) 382 and Cunningham (above, n. 1) 198.

¹⁵ I suspect that the inflated skin used for the ἀσκωλιασμός was made out of the speaker's goat—thus developing the symbolism of the animal even further—though the damaged text does not allow us to be certain. The issue would probably be clearer if we had more of lines 24–26; possibly line 25 refers summarily to this (τὸν αἶγ' ἐποίηυ [. . .] π[], e.g., "they made by goat [into an inflated bag].")

¹⁶ It is unclear from the text whether the goat had been a gift from Dionysus even before the dreaming poet dragged it through the glen (as Crane [above, n. 1] 88 implies: "the goat had been a gift from Dionysus"), whether it came to be considered a gift only during the course of the dream, or, as I shall suggest below, whether the word "gift" of

Why does the poet employ a goat to make his programmatic statement? Vogliano (41), in one of the first studies of *Mimiamb* 8, adduces the theory that the goat was the traditional prize at the dramatic festivals,¹⁷ and concludes that “in questo caso però non deve avere una tale limitazione; s’intende il premio in genere come ricompensa alle fatiche del poeta.” But he treats the goat as if it were given to the narrator as a prize for his victory in the ἀσκολιασμός (“Heroda che ha ottenuto l’onore del vello, è rimasto soddisfatto, e quindi si considera come il vero vincitore dell’agone poetico”), which is not apparent from the text. In any event, Vogliano considers the agon that the narrator wins representative simply of a general agon between the poet and his critics. Veneroni (227) suggested that the goat might be considered Herodas’ poetic σφραγίς, and indeed, since the goat had at least by Hellenistic times become associated with the dramatic agon (see n. 17) and the ἀσκολιασμός was an agon associated with Dionysian dramatic festivals,¹⁸ it does seem likely that Herodas was trying to highlight the dramatic element of the mimiambos.

It is noteworthy, after all, that the narrative of the dream lays great emphasis on the ritual ἀσκολιασμός itself and the narrator’s victory in it. The narrator’s initial encounter with the goatherds and their abduction, slaughter and ceremonial consumption of his goat must have been

line 68 refers not to the unremarkable goat with which the dream opens, but rather to the inflated skin made from it when slaughtered. On Dionysus as a close associate of the Muses (an association that makes it easy for him to play the role of an initiatory deity) cf. n. 10 above.

¹⁷ The evidence for an original goat-prize at the dramatic festivals is not decisive, and there is in any event no indication that it was a part of fifth-century dramatic competitions. W. Burkert in “Greek Tragedy and Sacrificial Ritual,” *GRBS* 7 (1966) 87–121 boldly attempts a defense of the theory (for bibliography see 88 n. 2), though he has convinced few; cf. most recently C. J. Herington, *Poetry into Drama: Early Tragedy and the Greek Poetic Tradition* (Berkeley 1985) 247 n. 36. The reality of an original goat-prize, of course, is less important for our purposes than the fact that in the Hellenistic period the theory was current—and this much seems clear from the ancient sources, cf. A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, *Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy*² (Oxford 1962) 69, 123–124.

¹⁸ Cf. K. Latte, “ΑΣΚΩΛΙΑΣΜΟΣ,” *Hermes* 85 (1957) 385–391 (= *Kleine Schriften* [Munich 1968] 700–707) on the confusion surrounding this term in antiquity. By Herodas’ time, however, it was, at least in popular usage (however erroneously), associated with Attic dramatic festivals; cf. Latte 390 and A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*² (Oxford 1968) 45, and, of course, line 41: ὥσπερ τελεῦμεν ἐν χοροῖς Διονύσου.

highly compressed¹⁹ into the lacunose lines 24–27, since lines 28–34 apparently describe Dionysus and at 35 ff. the contest is already underway. Beginning at line 37, however, Herodas relates in disproportionate detail for at least ten lines²⁰ his quite voluntary competition in the ἀσκολιασμός. The dream narrative, in other words, does not dwell on what we might expect to be the most traumatic (and symbolic) aspect of the narrator’s experience, namely the destruction of the goat. Rather, the central event of the dream becomes the narrator’s *participation* in a Dionysian ritual.²¹ Even though the goatherds are later claimed to represent hostile antagonists, there is a point at which they must welcome the dreaming narrator into their competition, i.e., into their own Dionysian celebration. The narrator, in turn, seems to embrace the competition with good cheer in spite of the fact that his competitors had just committed an act of violence against him (. . . αἱ]πόλοι μιν ἐκ βίης [ἐδ]αιτρεῦντο, 69). The description of the humorous scene in which the competitors fall off the skin and dive to the ground (41–43) conjures up a carnivalesque atmosphere, and the narrator’s assessment of the sight to the slave Annas at 43–44 is phrased in such a way as to be equally applicable to a spectacle of tragic and comic drama: “everything, Annas, was altogether [a jumble] of laughter and distress” (πάντα δ’ ἦν, Ἄνν[ᾶ, || εἰς ἔν γέλωσ τε κἀνίη [.]εντα).²² When the narrator finally takes his turn at the hop (45 ff.) he notes that he is performing in front of spectators who encourage him with boisterous shouts:²³

¹⁹ It is telling that we only know for certain that the goatherds killed and ate the goat from the summary “interpretation” at the end of the poem (69–70). Herzog 396 notes the peculiar style of the poem: “Die Traumerzählung schlägt entsprechend den rasch wechselnden Traumbildern ein rasches, angehacktes Tempo ein, kurze Sätze, z.T. ohne Verbindung, elliptisch, oft mit καί verbunden.”

²⁰ This topic may continue for a good part of the next ten lines as well. Legible text resumes at line 58, τὰ δεινὰ πνεῦσαι λάξ πατε[, and although its relation to what follows is uncertain, it clearly concerns the ἀσκολιασμός.

²¹ The connection with the dramatic festivals of Dionysus is assured by line 40: ὥσπερ τελεῦμεν ἐν χοροῖς Διωνύσου.

²² Herzog supplements the end of the verse with [κερασθ]έντα, while Knox suggests [ἄναμιχθ]έντα; some such word indicating “mixed” is appropriate. On γέλωτον and ἀνίη as terms applicable to comedy and tragedy cf. Aristotle *Poetics* 1449a34–35, and 1452b11–12.

²³ The word ἀλαλάζω, though used of war cries, is also specifically associated with the cries of inspired Bacchantes; cf. Euripides *Ba.* 593 and Σ Pindar *Ol.* 7.68.

κἀγὼ δόκεον δις μ . . [. .] . ἐκ τόσης λείης
 ἐπ' οὖν ἀλέσθαι, κηλάλαξαν ὠνθρωπ[οι
 ὡς μ' εἶδ[ον . .]ως τήν δο[ρῆ]ν πιεξεῦσαν²⁴ (45–47)

Thus the presence of an audience who are, in effect, judging the narrator's performance in the agon implies a public dimension to the narrator's (literary) work.²⁵ And since it is Dionysus who apparently oversees this agon as part of a ritual associated with his own dramatic festivals, it is reasonable to suppose that the type of poetry allegorized by the agon is, as Veneroni suggests, in some sense "dramatic."

We are now in a better position to examine the end of the dream as it is enigmatically related to Annas. A more intractable problem even than the identity of the γέρων and the νεανίας of 62–63 has been interpreting the dialogue that begins at line 58:

[
 τὰ δεινὰ πνεῦσαι λάξ πατε[
 ἔρρ' ἐκ προσώπου μή σε καίπιερ ὦν πρέσβυς 60
 οὔληι κατ' ἰθὺ τῆι βατηρίηι κό[ψω]."
 κῆγὼ μεταῦτις· "ὦ παρεόν[τες
 θανεῦμ' ὑπὲρ γῆς, εἰ ὁ γέρων μ[
 μαρτύρ[ο]μαι δὲ τὸν νενη[ίην
 ὁ δ' εἶπεν [ἄ]μφο τὸν δορέα . [65

These lines indicate that the allegory of the dream is not as transparent as it may seem at first sight. The goatherds do not represent the poet's only critics in the dream, for the old man in lines 59–60 seems to attack

²⁴ I favor Knox's emendation, *πιεξεῦντα*, tentatively endorsed by Cunningham; for a discussion of the text cf. Cunningham (above, n. 1) 200.

²⁵ Mastromarco argues that "the 'publication' of the mimiambi took place *by means of stage performance* either at court or in the houses of the richest and most educated families in Alexandria" (95; his emphasis), and if this is so the programmatic agon in *Mimiamb* 8 could be taken as a realistic reflection of this phenomenon. One could also argue, however (and the evidence unfortunately does not, I think, send us forcefully in one direction or another) that the poetic agon here is a symbolic pretense. Though the mimiambic genre, in other words, was certainly dramatic in origin, in Herodas' hands it may have been strictly *Buchpoesie*, and the dramatic context of the allegory a learned acknowledgement of its actual generic provenience.

him as well. But if we assume, with Knox and many critics since,²⁶ that the old man is Hipponax, why, as Cunningham asks (p. 94), “[would] Hipponax, whose follower Herodas apparently claims to be . . . threaten him?” The answer to this question lies in the Dionysian setting of the dream and the programmatic significance that I have proposed for it. For if the narrator’s participation in the ἀσκωλιασμός represents the dramatic element of his poetry, it is reasonable to suppose that Hipponax is angered at him for adulterating his own type of poetry with drama, i.e., for creating a “mimiambos” out of the Hipponactean “iambos.”²⁷

The narrator’s reply to the old man’s threat in 62–63 still remains a puzzle, both because the text is incomplete at 62–63 and because the meaning of θανεῖμ’ ὑπὲρ γῆς is not clear.²⁸ But even if the text were complete at this point, the sense would be elliptical and perhaps no less obscure than it is now. It is reasonably clear, however, that the narrator calls on the young man, in the presence of bystanders (ὦ παρεόν[τες],

²⁶ It is highly probable that 59–60 are spoken by the man identified as the γέρον in 62; since these lines indisputably allude to a line from Hipponax (8 Dg = 20 W) it does seem likely that they are spoken by the figure of Hipponax himself; cf. Veneroni (above n. 9) 228–229. Moreover, the epithet ὀρνιθέντι applied to the old man at line 75 is perfectly consonant with the characterizations of Hipponax in the ancient vita tradition; cf., e.g., Degani Testimonia 11–17, and note especially Sext. Emp. *Adv. math.* 1.298 (= Degani Testim. 57), which records that those who are “ὄργιλοι” are said to regard Hipponax and Archilochus as “trainers” in their particular form of κακία. Cf. also E. Degani, *Studi su Ipponatte* (Bari 1984) 52.

²⁷ The absence of lines 48–57 is particularly painful since, although they might not clarify the identity of the old man, they would almost certainly have indicated the reason for his anger.

²⁸ Crane (above, n. 1) 87 has argued that the expression means “I shall die above ground” in a literal sense: “although the old man may succeed in killing him, the narrator will remain literally ‘above ground’ until the moment of death.” Aside from the fact that this assumes a supplement at line 62 of something like “if the old man [*strikes me down*]” rather than an equally plausible “if the old man [*orders me*]” (e.g., cf. Knox *HK* 394), it seems unlikely, as Crane must also assume, that the narrator is still perched on the skin at this point. Would he be engaged in a conversation while hopping around furiously in competition? The ἀσκωλιασμός proper seems to come to a halt around line 50, after the audience cheers the poet’s success, and we need time for the introduction of the old man and the beginning of his speech. Furthermore, it is unclear how Crane would reconcile the mutual antagonism between the narrator and the old man/Hipponax presumed by his reading of 61–62 with line 75, where the narrator claims to have done things “in common” with him (κῆ τῷ γέροντι ζῦν’ ἔπραξ’ ὀρνιθέντι); Knox in *HK* 394 makes this objection to Crusius’ με συγκόψει.

to witness the conflict between himself and the old man:²⁹ μαπτρ-
ρ[ο]μαι δὲ τὸν νεγ[ί]ην. Between this line and the formal closure
of the dream (καὶ τοῦτ' ἰ[δ]ὼν ἔληξα) one line seems to represent the
young man's resolution to this conflict: ὁ δ' εἶπεν [ἄ]μφω τὸν δορέα
[. . .]. Once again the brevity of the passage seems intended to obfuscate
the meaning. Taking δορέα as a *nomen agentis* = "flayer," as subject
of an infinitive in the lacuna at the end of the line, has led Herzog,
Knox and others to supplement with ξ[ύ]λω δῆσαι.³⁰ The main problem
with this reading, as with any reading that implies the punishment of
and the continued enmity between him and the old man, is its discon-
tinuity with line 75, which states explicitly that the narrator was in
some sense engaged in common pursuit with the old man (see above
n. 29). Pisani's explanation of δορέα as derived from δορά < δέρω =
"the inflated skin"³¹ of the ἀσκολιασμός has the distinct advantage of
making reasonable sense of the line consonant with the rest of the nar-
rative, without relying on utter speculation. According to this reading,
δορέα becomes the object of the missing verb and [ἄ]μφω the subject.
We may understand the line, then, to say: "and he (the young man)
said that the two of them (the narrator and the old man) [missing verb:
'should have something to do with'] the inflated skin." Pisani holds the
sense to be that the two of them should take (or deserve) the skin as the
prize in the contest,³² and this may be right. Since the goat functions as
a programmatic symbol of the narrator's poetry, it stands to reason that
the skin of the flayed goat should also have a symbolic aspect.³³ When,
therefore, the young man (who probably is Dionysus) adjudicates the
dispute between the narrator and the old man by telling them that they

²⁹ This conflict may, according to the narrator, end in his death (cf. previous note), but the tone of 61–63 is impossible to judge, and hence the seriousness of his death wish. Likewise much depends on the missing verb in the clause εἰ ὁ γέρων μ[. . .].

³⁰ Herzog 416: "Die beiden Kampfhähne sollen nicht getrennt, sondern vielmehr mit den Köpfen gegeneinander in den Block gespannt werden, wo sie sich nichts tun können und sich vertragen müssen." Knox originally supplemented with διαχρήσθαι, but followed Herzog in his 1929 Loeb edition.

³¹ V. Pisani, "Glosse a Eroda," *Paideia* 7 (1952) 93.

³² Pisani 93 cites Σ Aristophanes *Plutus* 1129 as evidence that the prize for the winner of the ἀσκολιασμός was the skin filled with wine.

³³ See n. 15 above on whether the skin used in the contest came from the narrator's slaughtered goat. Note also the possibility that δῶρον in 68 puns on the δορέα of 64; i.e., the "gift" from Dionysus is actually the skin of the goat rather than the goat itself, as is usually supposed.

activity with Hipponax and the Hipponactean iambos. It is the combination of the two, as these lines imply, the fusion of the mime and the iambos, that will account for the poet's fame. Moreover, the last lines of the poem, 76–79, even in their present state,³⁵ are easily understood as celebrating the mixed nature of the mimiambic genre. For, when we read ἦ . . . ἦ as disjunctives, the passage continues as follows:

. . . by the Muse, *either* the verses <that come> from my iambs [will bring?] me fame, *or* on second th[ought]³⁶ my choliambos (τῆ ἀκύλλῃ) <composed> in the manner of Hipponax of old will [bring me fame] <which I> sing to [my] <audience of> Xouthidai [. . .].

The juxtaposition of and apparent contrast between ἔπεα . . . ἐξ ἰάμβων and τῆ ἀκύλλῃ has bothered scholars for some time, since, as Herzog noted, the two elements (iambs and choliambos) are practically synonymous.³⁷ But the emphatic distinction between them is undeniable in this context, and the causal clauses of 73–75 correspond logically to each element (a ~ a'; b ~ b')

Since a: I have won the contest and
 b: I have a share in Hipponax's poetic endeavor,

then I shall have fame either:

a': from the verses of my iambs, or
 b': from the choliambic, strictly Hipponactean, element of my poetry.

The distinction Herodas makes between iambs and choliambos, in other words, is once again that between the new dramatic element and the

³⁵ See Cunningham (above, n. 1) 203 on the uncertainties of the text, and the various possible interpretations of the syntax. He reacts, however, by throwing in the towel: "supplements can be found to fit most preconceptions." Degani, *Studi* (above, n. 26) 103 n. 145 offers a detailed overview of the many emendations and interpretations of this passage.

³⁶ Reading δευτέρη γινώμηι with Herzog, Knox and others; Cunningham again remains non-committal, cf. 203. Cf. Degani, *Studi* (above, n. 26) 102 n. 142.

³⁷ Cf. Herzog (above, n. 1) 420, though he ends in aporia, as does Degani, *Studi* (above, n. 26) 51. Knox (above, n. 1) 397 suggests that "Herodas is chosen by the Muse to represent her in this class of poetry, her original choice, Hipponax, being somewhat of a failure."

traditional Hipponactean element of the poet's oeuvre. In the end Herodas seems to be humorously uncertain about which element will ultimately be responsible for his fame, though if δευτέρη γν[ώμη] is the correct reading, he seems, as he reflects on the matter, to concede that it is his adherence to the Hipponactean style that makes his dramatic mimes powerful and worthy of his audience.³⁸

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

³⁸ By mentioning Hipponax *qua* stylistic mentor at the very end of the poem, Herodas ensures that the reader will make the connection with the old man, who, as I have argued above, bears all the appropriate features of Hipponax. The dream is quite clearly crafted as an *ainigma*, and the mention of Hipponax by name assists the reader in solving the riddle.