

readers' attention to surprising continuities and internal debates within the long tradition of philosophical biography.

U.S. Military Academy

HUGH LIEBERT
hugh.liebert@usma.edu

HERODAS IN ENGLISH

RIST (A.) (trans.) *The Mimiambes of Herodas. Translated into an English 'Choliambic' Metre with Literary-Historical Introductions and Notes*. Pp. viii + 143. London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2016. Cased, £85, US\$114. ISBN: 978-1-350-00420-7.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X17000865

During the past 20 years, interest in the Hellenistic author Herodas has flourished, bolstered by the publication of new editions of – and commentaries on – his *Mimiambes*: poems in choliambic metre, with subjects redolent of mime. Increasingly, Herodas is being made available to non-specialists – a recent notable contribution being G. Zanker's text, commentary and translation (*Herodas: Mimiambes* [2009]). R.'s book aims to follow suit, making Herodas accessible to 'a wide spectrum of contemporary readers' (p. 1).

The book consists of a general introduction; translations of the *Mimiambes* (Greek is not included) with individual introductions, rendered into an approximation of Herodas' metre; select bibliography; and an index. In her translations, R. successfully mediates between preserving textual accuracy and conveying the spirit of the *Mimiambes*: the archaisms and colloquialisms which R. employs capture what W. Headlam called the 'pleasing incongruity' of Herodas' dialect (*Herodas: the Mimes and Fragments* [1922], p. lxiv), for Anglophone readers. The translations are the strongest element of the work, and one can readily imagine them being utilised as scripts, introducing students to Herodas' poetry through performance.

In the general introduction, R. provides a brief overview of Herodas and his milieu. The range of apposite comparisons employed to acquaint those unaccustomed with the author is commendable: R. provides analogies through which to conceptualise Herodas for the reader familiar – among other things – with Monty Python or Shakespearean comedy. The most significant ongoing discussions of Herodean scholarship are outlined, including the debate surrounding the performance-status of the corpus and the presence of aesthetic criticism in *Mimiamb* 4. In addition, a beginner-friendly précis of Herodas' diction and the choliambic metre is provided. Given R.'s target audience, there is understandably less of note for the specialist, though R. does offer some food for thought: particularly, the suggestion that *Mimiambes* 1–7 constitute a series of complementary pairs (1/2, 3/5, 6/7, with 4 as a centrepiece) – organised according to the oppositional prominence of male and female speakers within the poems – warrants further consideration in discussions about the arrangement of the *Mimiambes* as book-poetry (p. 24).

In the introductions to each *Mimiamb*, the reader finds starting-points for further investigation, and is presented with a sound assessment of the issues each poem raises. However, two major lapses in interpretative quality must be flagged: first, on the occurrence of the names Nossis and Erinna in *Mimiamb* 6, R. states 'both names are striking as having "lesbian" connections, Nossis being a third-century poetess who claimed to rival Sappho of Lesbos, and Erinna, her teacher and the close friend of the poet Baukis,

to whom Nossis addressed a celebrated love-poem, “The Distaff for Baukis” (p. 92). There are numerous issues with this statement, chief among them being that we possess no evidence that Baucis composed poetry, and Erinna – not Nossis – is the *Distaff*’s author. Second, there are extensive problems with R.’s treatment of *Mimiamb* 8, which require detailed consideration. As a programmatic work, *Mimiamb* 8 has received considerable attention, but full comprehension is stymied by the lacunose state of the papyrus. In discussing the poem, R. returns to an argument she made previously (*Phoenix* 51 [1998], 354–63), that Archilochus is Herodas’ antagonist within the dream-narrative, not Hipponax, as is usually held. R. asserts that Herodas composed iambic poetry – specifically, in a metre other than choliambic – prior to writing *Mimiamb* 8: the besting of ‘Archilochus’ within the dream is thus emblematic of his established iambic prowess. Evidence for Herodas’ non-choliambic compositions is sparse, constituting only a quotation by the scholiast on Nicander’s *Theriaca* of Herodas’ ‘hemiambs’ (p. 377). R. notes this reference (p. 127), but does not mention – as in her 1998 article – that the quoted lines bear similarity to 59–60 of *Mimiamb* 8 (I give the line numbers of I.C. Cunningham’s Teubner text [2004]), nor that the scholiast attributes the lines to a work entitled *Ἔπνος*, strikingly reminiscent of *Mimiamb* 8’s title, *Ἐνύπνιον*. There is thus a question as to whether the scholiast refigured choliamb into hemiamb, in faulty recollection of *Mimiamb* 8, but R. does not flag this issue. Further, R. presents a letter of Pliny the Younger (*Ep.* 4.3) – wherein he likens the compositions of Arrius Antoninus, lauded for their sweetness and elegance, to the poems of Callimachus and Herodas – arguing that Pliny must here refer to now lost Herodean poetry, as the terms used to praise Antoninus’ poems ‘hardly describe the Mimiamb’s’ forceful and scathing tones!’ (p. 127). However, R. fails to mention that Antoninus’ poems are explicitly identified as *mimiambos* by Pliny (4.3.3). Internally, R.’s argument depends upon reading *ἰάμβων* as referring to poetry previously composed (8.77), contrasting with Herodas’ new ventures in singing *τὰ κύλλα* (8.78) – his apparent ‘second (skill)’ (R.’s reading of *δευτέρη γυῖ* at 8.77). Despite R.’s confidence that Herodas ‘could hardly be plainer!’ (p. 124), the reality is that the text of the closing lines of *Mimiamb* 8 is parlous, and the evidence attesting to Herodean iambs hardly dependable.

Thus, R.’s assertion that Herodas depicts prior iambic success relies heavily upon identifying his opponent as Archilochus, but this is equally tenuous. R. announces that the character is easily recognised because he is depicted as angry, and ‘Archilochus was famous for anger!’ (p. 123), but this ignores the numerous sources which emphasise Hipponax’ wrath. R. also dismisses Herodas’ apparent quotation of Hipponactean verse in this character’s speech (pp. 126–7), suggesting that scholarly fixation on this as evidence that he is Hipponax is, at best, confirmatory bias; however, R. offers no discussion of any particularly Archilochean aspect to said speech. R.’s argument rests lastly on the supposition that Hipponax cannot be Herodas’ antagonist because Herodas treats Hipponax as ‘his revered master’ at the poem’s close (p. 126); this is a perplexing interpretation, as the text only submits that Herodas will follow *μετ’ Ἰππώνακτα* (8.78), offering no clarity regarding their precise relationship. R.’s interpretation of *Mimiamb* 8 is, therefore, unconvincing: furthermore, it is disappointing that a reader is offered no reference to the many scholars who present alternative readings of *Mimiamb* 8.

Throughout, the book suffers from lackadaisical editing – there are formatting errors, several spelling mistakes, and the index is riddled with incorrect or incomplete data: *inter alia*, ‘Erinna’ directs a reader to page 96 (instead of 92); ‘Plautus’ to 83 (instead of 84); R. Finnegan’s surname is misspelled (‘Finnigan’); the name of Gyllis’ daughter in *Mimiamb* 1 is given as Philaenis in the index, but Philainis in the main body; comedy receives an entry, but tragedy (discussed in relation to *Mimiamb* 8, pp. 122–4) does not.

These mistakes are particularly galling given this slim volume's hefty £85 price tag. Furthermore, a reader with a burgeoning interest in Herodas could have been better served by the select bibliography. Most surprising is the omission of Zanker's commentary which, despite being cited repeatedly, and a natural next step for the nascent Herodean reader, does not receive a bibliographical entry. Additional mistakes hinder further reading: E. Esposito's chapter on Herodas in the *Companion to Hellenistic Literature* is given as Esposito (2010) in the bibliography, but (2014) – the year of the *Companion's* reissue – in an endnote (p. 33).

R.'s translation offers a valuable means of introducing Herodas to a wider audience, and the introductory material is a mostly equitable basis for further study. It is thus unfortunate that R.'s laudable endeavour in bringing this intriguing poet to new readers suffers from lapses of rigour and is diminished by slapdash editing.

Texas Tech University

BARNABY CHESTERTON
fbchesterton@gmail.com

LEONIDAS OF TARENTUM AND CYNICISM

SOLITARIO (M.) *Leonidas of Tarentum. Between Cynical Polemic and Poetic Refinement.* (Quaderni 19.) Pp. vi + 110. Rome: Edizioni Quasar, 2015. Paper, €31. ISBN: 978-88-7140-607-7.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X17000245

This slim volume, an English version of S.'s 2010 Rome master's thesis, promises a systematic study of the relationship between the third-century B.C.E. literary epigrammatist Leonidas of Tarentum and ancient Cynicism. More precisely, though, the topic of the book is the apparent tension in Leonidas between humble subject matter and elaborate poetic style. Scholars have long found Leonidas' sympathetic epigrams on the lives of simple folk, his depiction of his own principled poverty and the ethical exhortations he addresses to his reader redolent of Cynicism (cf. p. 4 n. 7). Despite early suggestions to the contrary (pp. 4–5) S. too ultimately allows that Leonidas was influenced by Cynicism to some significant degree (p. 75). Nevertheless, he insists that a single-minded critical focus on apparently Cynic elements has hindered an appreciation of the remarkable stylistic features of Leonidas' poetry. Packed with uncommon, often elaborately-confected, words, this style seems to jar with the poet's lowly subject matter and ethics. While earlier critics deplored the style as gratuitous ornamentation ('tedious' per A.S.F. Gow, 'Leonidas of Tarentum', *CQ* 8 [1958], 1), more recent studies (e.g. K.J. Gutzwiller, *Poetic Garlands* [1998], p. 90) have read the disjunction between style and content as a deliberate strategy, saying, *in nuce*, Leonidas imparts a stylistic grandeur to humble subjects to exalt them and/or to create humorous irony. S. claims that Leonidas' style, especially the minute technical names for tools and the elaborate adjectives describing them, is placed in the service of a distinctly un-Cynic agenda, being calculated to bring to life – in S.'s words to 'animate' – not just the world of the poor, but specifically of productive labour.

The work consists of a brief introduction, two chapters, two brief appendices on philosophical topics, plus bibliography and indexes. Each chapter contrasts the treatment of a theme in Leonidas, poverty and work respectively, with Cynic texts (treated here, regrettably, more as a grab bag of motifs, anecdotes and ethical slogans than as literary works in their own right). In the first chapter, S. examines in turn Leonidas' depiction of his own life and outlook, his epigrams on rich and poor figures, negative portrayals of *inter*