

DAVID KUTZKO

KORITTO IN HERODAS 6

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 133 (2000) 35–41

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

KORITTO IN HERODAS 6

Below I discuss three passages from the London papyrus of Herodas' *Mimiamboi* (British Library, Pap. 135). All of the passages are from the sixth mimiamb, in which Koritto and her friend Metro have a private conversation. These passages are particularly important for an appreciation of Herodas' characterization of Koritto. In the first section I discuss textual problems and propose a new supplement (6.67-8), and in the second and third I offer a solution to interpretive difficulties at the beginning and end of the poem (6.15-7 and 98-9).¹

I. Koritto and the two βαυβῶνες: 6.67-8

In lines 57-73 Koritto describes Kerdon and his wares to Metro. At lines 67-8 she clearly begins to talk about the βαυβῶνες, the leather dildoes that Kerdon had brought with him, but due to an abrasion in the papyrus, line 67 contains a lacuna and two letters have been rubbed out in line 68. Each line is usually treated separately, but the text I print below is based on my understanding of the two lines as a whole:

ἐ[νός] μὲν—δύο γὰρ ἦλθ' ἔχων, Μητροῖ—
ἰδοῦσ' ἀμίλλη τῶμματ' ἐξεκύμηνα.

67 ἐ[νός] μὲν scripsi : ἐ[γὼ] μὲν plerique : ἐ[γὼ] δ' ἐν Ellis 68 suppl. Blass : ἄμ' ἰδμῆ Meister

The basic kernel of the sentence is contained in line 68: Koritto marveled at what she saw. The choice of what to read after ἰδοῦσ' is between R. Meister's ἄμ' ἰδμῆ and F. Blass' ἀμίλλη.² ἰδοῦσ' ἄμ' ἰδμῆ is usually taken to be equivalent to εὐθύς ἰδοῦσα (cf. Headlam and Knox, p. 306), but this idiom is not attested elsewhere. To get this meaning out of the phrase, one must assume that Herodas derived ἰδμή from the aorist stem ἰδ- (= "see"), even though Hesychius states that ἰδμή is the same as φρόνησις (Hsch. τ 217), implying that the noun derives in fact from the perfect ἰδ- ("know").³

ἀμίλλη fits the traces better and makes good sense. ἄμιλλα, which generally means a "contest," can also have the more nuanced meaning in an amatory context of a "yearning" or "contentious desire." The chorus of the *Hippolytus* uses it metaphorically when they state that the banishment of Hippolytus has caused all of the maidens of Troezen to lose in their striving with one another to marry him: νυμφιδία δ' ἀπόλωλε φυγαῖ σᾶι / λέκτρων ἄμιλλα κούραις (E. *Hipp.* 1140-1). The noun ἀμίλλημα is used similarly in Sophocles' *Electra*, again in a choral passage, referring to Clytemnestra's and Aegisthus' unlawful and bloody yearning to marry each other: μαιφόνων / γάμων ἀμιλλήμαθ' οἴσιν οὐ θέμις (S. *El.* 493-4). ἄμιλλα also occurs in an amatory context in Gorgias (Gorg. *Hel.* 19), but is employed there in a

¹ I will refer to the following editions of Herodas:

- | | |
|------------------|--|
| Bücheler | F. Bücheler, ed., <i>Herodae Mimiambi</i> (Bonn 1892). |
| Crusius | O. Crusius, ed., <i>Herodae Mimiambi</i> ⁵ (Leipzig 1914). |
| Cunningham 1971 | I.C. Cunningham, ed., <i>Herodas Mimiambi</i> (Oxford 1971). |
| Cunningham 1987 | I.C. Cunningham, ed., <i>Herodae Mimiambi</i> (Leipzig 1987). |
| Cunningham 1993 | J. Rusten, I.C. Cunningham, and A.D. Knox, eds., <i>Theophrastus, Herodas, and Cercidas and the Choliambic Poets</i> (Cambridge, MA 1993). |
| Groeneboom | P. Groeneboom, ed., <i>Les Mimiambes d' Hérodas</i> (Groningen 1922). |
| Headlam and Knox | W. Headlam and A.D. Knox, eds., <i>Herodas The Mimes and Fragments</i> (Cambridge 1922). |
| Mandilaras | B.G. Mandilaras, ed., <i>Οι μίμοι του Ηρόνδα</i> (Athens 1986). |
| Meister | R. Meister, ed., <i>Die Mimiamben des Herodas</i> (Leipzig 1893). |

² Of the most recent editors, Cunningham 1987 and 1993 prints the reading of Meister and Mandilaras 1986 prints that of Blass.

³ Cf. Cunningham 1971, p.170. Meister, on the other hand, did understand and translate ἄμ' ἰδμῆ as being derived from the perfect stem ἰδ-: "mit Verständniss" (p.737). However, it is hard to see why it would take Koritto any time to comprehend what Kerdon was holding up before her.

much less concrete sense: εἰ οὖν τῷ τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου σῶματι τὸ τῆς Ἑλένης ὄμμα ἡσθὲν προθυμίαν καὶ ἀμίλλαν ἔρωτος τῇ ψυχῇ παρέδωκε, τί θαυμαστόν; Helen's eye has submitted to her soul an eagerness and contentious desire for love. ἀμίλλα, like προθυμία, is used abstractly to convey an emotional state.⁴

The sense of ἰδοῦσ' ἀμίλλῃ at Herod. 6.68 is quite close to that of the Gorgias passage: both Helen and Metro are filled with desire for what they see. I.C. Cunningham objected to the reading of ἀμίλλῃ on the grounds that an objective genitive is always present in the passages discussed above (Cunningham 1971, p.170). His assumption that Koritto does not explicitly name the object of her desire depends on the generally accepted supplement for the lacuna in line 67, which I will now contest.

In line 67 most editors print the supplement of F. Bücheler and F. Blass: ἐ[γὼ] μὲν. The problem with this is how to construe it with the rest of the line: ἐ[γὼ] μὲν—δύο γὰρ ἦλθ' ἔχων, Μητροῖ. The γάρ introduces the parenthetical remark, but it should also explain what has preceded it, which does not happen with the above supplement: "Now I—for he came with two, Metro." Even though Cunningham 1993, 282-3 prints this supplement, his translation points to how one would expect γάρ to function in this context: "when I saw them—for he came with two, Metro." δύο is in the emphatic position, and W. Headlam demonstrates that whenever this is the case elsewhere, the δύο elaborates upon the previous implication that more than one object has been under discussion. In spite of the evidence, however, Headlam, who prints ἐ[γὼ] μὲν ὀδύο γάρ, argues that at 6.67 there is no stress on δύο, and that γάρ only introduces a preliminary explanation for what follows in the next line.⁵ Nevertheless, of the several examples he offers, none has δύο in the emphatic position as it is here. Although a γάρ clause can be anticipatory instead of explanatory,⁶ numerals placed before γάρ in the emphatic position regularly explain a prior statement, in which the need for numerical specification was introduced.⁷

R. Ellis initially suggested ἐ[γὼ] δ' ἔν (CR 5 [1891] 362), but a *delta* does not fit the traces of the letter preceding *en* as well as a *mu* does. Nonetheless, Ellis' supplement is certainly a step in the right direction: a mention of one of the dildoes would naturally prompt Koritto to explain that there were two of them. For the lacuna I suggest ἐ[νός], which allows for this sense to be retained: Koritto begins to mention one of Kerdon's dildoes, ἐ[νός] μὲν, but she then must explain to Metro that he had more than one with him, δύο γὰρ ἦλθ' ἔχων, Μητροῖ, before she can finish her thought. This supplement in turn becomes the objective genitive for ἀμίλλῃ in the line below, thus satisfying Cunningham's reservations about reading ἀμίλλῃ. I translate as follows:

Now for one — he came with two, Metro —

I looked with contention, and my eyes bulged out.

Hyperbaton as a result of excited parenthetical remarks, such as ἐ[νός]...ἀμί[λλ]ῃ, is a common feature of Herodas' poetry (cf. 3.8-11, 5.69-72, 6.33-6, and 6.69-70). Furthermore, the contrast set up between ἐ[νός] and δύο fits well in the context of the second half of the mimiamb. After Koritto tells Metro that she purchased only one of Kerdon's dildoes, the dominant topic of conversation revolves around what happened to the other one (6.74-80 and 91-4).

I have translated ἀμίλλῃ as "with contention" because the noun here as elsewhere conveys more than just desire. Certainly, Koritto would have desired to have both dildoes, as she makes explicit at lines 74-8. However, Kerdon was reserving one of them for another customer (6.93-4) and Koritto therefore had to make a choice between them. The supplement ἐ[νός] with the phrase ἰδοῦσ' ἀμίλλῃ thus brings into sharper focus the humor of τῶμματ' ἐξέκუმηνα at the end of line 68: Koritto claims

⁴ Cf. D.M. MacDowell, ed., *Gorgias Encomium of Helen* (Bristol 1982) 42.

⁵ Headlam and Knox, p. 306; cf. E. Redondo Moyano, *Estudio sintactico de las particulas en el periodo helenistico: Herodas* (Amsterdam 1995) 60.

⁶ See the discussion of J.D. Denniston, *Greek Particles*² (Oxford 1959) 68-73.

⁷ The examples are numerous. Cf. Alex. 2.3 (PCG 2, p.24): τοῖς παῖσι τ' εἶπα (δύο γὰρ ἦγον οἴκοθεν) and Hdt. II.121 and Pl. *Phd.* 116B. δύο γάρ also occurs often as an explanation to a preceding ἕτερος, e.g. Hdt. IV.10: τὸν μὲν δὴ εἰρύσαντα τῶν τόξων τὸ ἕτερον (δύο γὰρ δὴ φορέειν τέως Ἑρακλέα; cf. also Thuc. IV.43.1.

that when she looked back and forth over which dildo to choose, her eyes in their contention for one of the two literally bulged out.

II. Koritto and her slave

A. 6.15-7

Several Hellenistic mimes feature an episode in which a character verbally abuses one or more slaves (Herod. 4.42-51, 7.5-13, and 8.1-14; Theocr. 2.18-21 and 15.27-33). Mimiamb 6 appears to feature two such episodes. The first instance is similar to the stock situations of the other Hellenistic mimes: Koritto orders her slave to get a chair for her guest Metro, and when the slave is too slow in accomplishing the order, Koritto utters a lengthy tirade on the slave's laziness (6.1-11).⁸ The episode seems at first to conclude when Metro starts to state her reason for visiting Koritto, ἀλλ' οὐνεκεν πρός σ' ἤλ[θ]ον (6.15), but then Koritto interrupts her to continue her tirade:⁹

15 (KO.) ἐκποδὼν ἡμῖν·
φθείρεσθε, νόβυστρα, ὦτ[α] μούνον καὶ γλάσσαι
τὰ δ' ἄλλ' ἔορτή—

15 (KO.) Jevons, Pearson ἡμῖν· interpunct Meister 17 εορτη P : corr. Blass, Danielsson

I have followed the 1893 edition of R. Meister in placing a stop at the end of line 15. Most editors, however, do not indicate a stop and thus construe ἐκποδὼν with φθείρεσθε in the line below. Meister's suggestion, in fact, does not appear in the *apparatus critici* of later editions other than that of O. Crusius, p.50. I believe, however, that the interpretive problems in this passage, which I discuss below, can be solved by retaining Meister's punctuation.

If we take ἐκποδὼν ἡμῖν with φθείρεσθε, as most do, Koritto now seems to be addressing more than one slave. There is no indication that anyone else has been in the room except for Metro, Koritto, and Koritto's one slave until the imperative φθείρεσθε at line 16. This is problematic in that Herodas' regular technique is to introduce even silent characters by their proper names.¹⁰ A comparison with Mimiamb 8 is informative here. 8 begins with a slave episode (8.1-14), in which the speaker abuses two of his slaves. Unlike Metro in Mimiamb 6, however, the speaker in 8 not only names both of his slaves, but directs his threats to each one individually (to Psylla in lines 1-9 and to Megallis in lines 10-14).

⁸ The beginning of Herod. 7 is very similar, in which Kerdon threatens to beat Drimylos for not bringing out a bench for his customers. In Herod. 4 and 8 and Theocr. 2 and 15, the subject of the characters' tirades is also the unresponsiveness of their slaves.

⁹ Although there is not a *paragraphos* marked in P, most editors concur that Koritto interrupts her guest here to ensure that no one eavesdrops on them; see most recently Mandilaras, 239. Koritto's action parallels that of Metriche in Mimiamb 1, who excuses her slave before she and her guest Gyllis begin to talk in earnest (1.7-8). Cunningham is the only editor since Groeneboom to believe that Metro continues to speak these lines. Metro had responded to Koritto's initial tirade against her slave (6.1-11) by saying that she too barks like a dog at her own slaves (6.12-4), and Cunningham argues that at lines 15-7 Metro demonstrates this barking ability (Cunningham 1971, p.163). If this were the case, it seems much more likely that Metro would yell immediately after line 14 instead of interrupting herself after she had already begun to state the purpose of her visit. The placement of ἐκποδὼν in the middle of line 15 makes it quite clear that a change of speaker is needed. Even though it is common for characters in the *Mimiamboi* to utter parenthetical comments in the middle of their speeches, there are no instances of a character changing in mid-sentence not only the subject, but also the direction of the address. For a discussion of the attribution of parts in P and the occasional absence of *paragraphoi*, see G. Mastromarco, *The Public of Herondas* (Amsterdam 1984) 102-12.

¹⁰ Thales at 2.3, Myrtale at 2.65, Euthies, Kokkalos, and Phillos at 3.59-60, Kydilla at 4.41, Drimylos at 7.5, Pistos at 7.6, Psylla at 8.1, Megallis at 8.10, and Annas at 8.14. Only twice does Herodas not give a silent character a name. At the beginning of Mimiamb 6 Koritto addresses Metro briefly and then turns to her slave, who remains nameless: κάθησο, Μητροῦ. τῆι γυναικὶ θὲς δίφρον (6.1). The change of address, although abrupt, is signaled in the text by Koritto's shift from naming Metro in the vocative to referring to her in an oblique case in the following sentence. In Mimiamb 7 Kerdon addresses a woman, whom he describes as jeering at his customers and him, simply as, "αὐτῆ σύ" (7.122). Two groups of characters also remain nameless: the jurors in Mimiamb 2 and Metro's friends in Mimiamb 7. Both groups are introduced explicitly in the first line of their respective poems.

Metro's imperative φθείρεσθε at 6.16 is surely in part directed at the slave addressed in lines 1-11, but the identity, or even number, of the other slaves is never made explicit.

Several scholars have claimed that this plural address must pertain to Koritto's slave addressed in lines 1-11 and Metro's slave, who would have accompanied Metro on her journey to Koritto's house (cf. Cunningham 1971, p.164). The literary basis behind this assumption is Theocr. 15. In the first half of this idyll (15.1-43), the only characters mentioned as present are the two Syracusan women Praxinoa and Gorgo, Gorgo's slave Eunoia, her nursemaid Phrygia, and her child Dinon. In the second half, when the women leave Phrygia and Dinon behind to attend Queen Arsinoe's festival, Praxinoa tells Eunoia to take the hand of her slave Eutyichis (15.66-7), which implies that Eutyichis had been present from the very beginning. A.F.S. Gow states that Theocritus' audience would have assumed all along that Praxinoa had a slave, since it was a Syracusan custom that women leave their homes only if attended by at least one slave (*Theocritus* II [Cambridge 1950] 283-4). Gow is citing Phylarchus (Jacoby, *FGrH* 81.45), but as Headlam points out, this is mentioned in the context of severe Syracusan practices, which would not necessarily reflect the societal norms of Herodas' characters.¹¹

Perhaps one would expect women in the Hellenistic world to be accompanied in public, even if it were not a strict custom, but several of the women in Herodas do appear without attendants. The fact that Metriche in *Mimiamb* 1 dismisses only her own one slave (1.8) implies that Gyllis came to Metriche's house by herself; in *Mimiamb* 3 Metrotime takes her son to see his school teacher unassisted; although Kynno and Kokkale leave their homes to visit an Asklepian temple in *Mimiamb* 4, only one slave is addressed, who accompanies Kynno;¹² and in *Mimiamb* 7 Metro and her friends appear to visit Kerdon's shoe shop without their slaves (cf. 7.126). Furthermore, the introduction of Eutyichis at Theocr. 15.67, though postponed, is made crystal clear by the use of her proper name, as is the case regularly in Herodas. Koritto's plural address at 6.16 remains difficult.

A. Leone asserted that the plural imperative φθείρεσθε is an example of the *pluralis sociativus*, typical of spoken speech, and that Koritto here continues her tirade against her one slave (*Paideia* 6 [1951] 301). Although this is an attractive idea, the examples produced from elsewhere in the *Mimiamboi* are of plural pronouns in oblique cases standing for singular pronouns. There is no instance in Herodas of a plural imperative standing in the place of a singular one.¹³

The difficulty of the plural address in lines 15-17 stems from the decision of editors to take ἐκποδὸν ἡμῖν with the imperative φθείρεσθε. It is true that ἐκποδὸν regularly modifies verbs of motion and that φθείρομαι is often used as a more dismissive substitute for ἔρχομαι.¹⁴ Nevertheless, ἐκποδὸν occurs as a command without a verb in Aristophanes (*Ach.* 239-40 and *Vesp.* 1340), and this is clearly how Meister interpreted ἐκποδὸν ἡμῖν at Herod. 6.15.¹⁵ Even in the one passage usually cited as a parallel to

¹¹ Headlam and Knox, p.xlv. The setting of *Mime* 6 is vaguely Asia Minor; see Mandilaras, p.261 on Herod. 7.86.

¹² I.C. Cunningham, *CQ* 16 (1966) 118-21 resurrected the earlier theory that the vocative φίλη at 4.27, 39, and 72 is the proper name Φίλη, and that Kokkale is a second mute slave accompanying Kynno and Phile; in recent editions other than those of Cunningham, Phile occurs as a character only in the translation of K. and U. Treu, *Menander—Herondas* (Berlin 1980) 318-21. This attribution of parts seems unlikely, since φίλη as a simple endearment accords with its use elsewhere in the *Mimiamboi*. Outside of *Mimiamb* 4, it occurs by itself in the vocative at Herod. 1.73 and 6.31 and modifies a proper noun in the vocative at 6.12, 6.18, 6.23, and 6.86. In 4, moreover, φίλη does occur as an endearment twice, each time modifying Κυννοῖ (4.20 and 56). This leads me to believe that the name Φίλη does not occur, because it would be awkward to have a woman named "Dear" address her friend as "Dear Kynno".

¹³ At 7.14 Kerdon says, ἔζεσθε, Μητροῖ, but he is referring to Metro and her group of friends. Similarly, Lampriskos tells Kokkalos, Euthies, and Phillos to let Kottalos go, μέθεσθε, Κόκκαλ' αὐτόν (3.87), but addresses only Kokkalos in the vocative as the group's representative. A. Leone, *Paideia* 10 (1955) 313 argued that Bitinna's command to Kydilla, Κύδιλλα, μὴ με λυπεῖτε (5.73) is an example of a plural imperative addressed to one person, but the reading of this line is in no way assured; see Cunningham 1971, 158.

¹⁴ See J.D. Denniston, ed., *Euripides Electra* (Oxford 1939) 77 and A.W. Gomme and F.H. Sandbach, eds., *Menander: A Commentary* (Oxford 1973) 152 on *Dys.* 101.

¹⁵ Even before Meister, F. Bücheler sensed that ἐκποδὸν ἡμῖν comprised a unit separate from φθείρεσθε; cf. his translation, "procul hinc nobis, pessum ite" (p.39).

slave as a νεοσσοπῶλις has always been taken at face value. Cunningham, for example, comments, "Presumably she is one of K.'s slaves who looks after and sells her chickens" (Cunningham 1971, p.174), and Headlam wondered whether the woman sells to Koritto or for her (Headlam and Knox, p.315). Nevertheless, a closer look at the context betrays a joke.

Koritto tells her slave to shut the door (6.97-8), presumably because Metro had left it open behind her. Koritto then commands the same slave to count the chickens and to feed them (6.99-101). Her orders reveal her concern for her own property: if any of the chickens escape or are malnourished, she will lose the profit from them. One of the jobs of a slave is to take care of the master's possessions, and by leaving the door open, Koritto's slave is not only being negligent, but is risking being a chicken seller of the wrong kind: people will be able to acquire the chickens for free. For this reason, I take νεοσσοπῶλι not as a real title, but as an ironic address: "close the door, you chick seller." The ironic reading of this vocative is supported by Koritto's unusual word choice. λαίμαστρον (4.46) and νόβυστρα (6.16) are other pejorative vocatives directed at slaves in the *Mimiamboi*, and like νεοσσοπῶλι, they are *hapax legomena*.

This interpretation is further supported by the acknowledged humor of Koritto's final words, in which she explains why she has ordered the slave to take care of her chicks: οὐ γὰρ ἀλλὰ πορθεῦ[σ]ι / ὠρν[ι]θο[κ]λέπται, κῆν τρέφῃ τις ἐν κόλπῳ (6.101-2). It is clear from her phrasing that Koritto is concerned not only about her birds, but about what really has been taken, namely the dildo Euboule borrowed before Koritto could use it herself: κῆδωκα, Μητροῖ, πρόσθεν ἢ αὐτὴ χρῆσασθαι (6.29). ἐν κόλπῳ is especially suggestive, since κόλπος can be synonymous with αἰδοῖον γυναικεῖον.²¹ Another contributing factor to the humor of these lines is the *hapax* ὠρν[ι]θο[κ]λέ[π]ται (6.102),²² which like νεοσσοπῶλι is a comic combination of two commonly used words unattested together. Koritto's address of her slave (6.98-9), therefore, sets an ironic mood over the speech, which culminates in the punch line at the very end of the mime (6.101-2).

Once we take νεοσσοπῶλι (6.98) as an ironic address, there is no reason to think that this slave is any other than the one addressed at the beginning of the mime. In addition to complaining that her slave is lazy (6.1-11), Koritto further displays a general distrust for her when in the middle of her tirade she calls her a thief—ληστρί (6.10). Similarly at the end, Koritto chides her slave for not shutting the door and, by calling her a νεοσσοπῶλις, accuses her of having no regard for her property. Structurally, the address of the same slave at the beginning and end recalls *Mimiamb* 1, which presents a similar visitation scenario: when Gyllis comes to visit Metriche, Metriche excuses Threissa from the room (1.8), and her address of the same slave at the end signals that the private conversation has concluded (1.79), just as is the case I have argued in 6.

There is no reason, then, to import additional characters at either 6.15-17 or 6.98-101: no more than Koritto's one slave appears at any time. As opposed to in *Mimiamb* 1, where Herodas uses Metriche's slave merely as a formal marker for the beginning and end of the poem's private conversation, in 6 Herodas develops the interaction between the mistress and her slave at the beginning and end to reveal the irony of Koritto's predicament as it unfolds in the middle of the poem. Koritto tells her slave to leave the room because slaves are notorious gossipers (6.15-7), but it is the gossip of Koritto's friends that has caused her secret to become public knowledge.²³ Koritto accuses her slave of being a thief—

²¹ See the discussion of J. Henderson, *Maculate Muse*² (Oxford 1991) 140-1. Cf. also Catullus' suggestive language regarding Lesbia's sparrow, "nec sese a gremio illius movebat" (Catul. 3.8).

²² This is the reading of Headlam, accepted by most editors.

²³ Koritto is shocked when Metro says that she has seen Koritto's dildo: κοῦ δ' ὀρόρηκας, / Μητροῖ, σὺ κείνον; (6.19-20). Metro explains that Euboule, to whom Koritto had shown her new possession, had given it to Nossis, who then showed it to Metro, even though Euboule had told Nossis not to tell anyone about it (6.21-6). When Koritto becomes furious, Metro says that she feels responsible because it is her own habit of gossiping that has caused her friend to be upset: (ῆ) πόλλα τήν μεν γλάσσαν ἐκτεμεῖν δεῖται (6.41).

ληστρί (6.10)—and of not guarding her mistress' possessions—γ[εο]ῤῥοπῶλι (6.99)—but in reality it is women of her own social class who have stolen her property.²⁴

University of Michigan

David Kutzko

²⁴ When Metro tells Koritto what has happened to her dildo, Koritto curses women in general and her friend Euboule in particular: γυναῖκες· αὐτή μ' ἦ γυνή ποτ' ἐκτρίψει (6.27). Koritto then equates Euboule with a thief, who has taken her property and given it away to others: ἢ δ' ὤ(σ)περ εὐρημ' ἀπάσα(σα) δωρεῖται / καὶ ταῖσι μὴ δεῖ (6.30-1).