As we have no direct information even about the poet's true name, we are lacking the relevant evidence for establishing the dates spanning his life. This lack obliges us to turn to his works to see whether, at least indirectly, we can determine the period of his life and the dates of his compositions. In fact there are some indications given unsuspectingly by the writer himself, which can suggest a solution to the problem quite satisfactorily. To be precise:

1) In the first Mime (1.30) we read: θεῷν ἄδελφῳ τε, εὐνῷ, δ ἰ βασιλεὺς χρηστός. The words θεῷν ἄδελφῳ convey clearly ptolemy II (Philadelphos) and Arsinoe his sister and consort at the same time, both of whom were worshipped after her death, deified as ἄδελφοι θεοί "brother and sister gose". If so the Mime must have been written after 270 B.C., the year of her (1) death. In addition the phrase δ βασιλεὺς χρηστός refers to ptolemy II, celebrated also by other poets of Alexandrian literature, above all by Tachocritos (see particularly Idyll 17 "Encomion to ptolemy"). On the other hand the Mime again must almost certainly have been written before ptolemy II's death, which occurred

(1) See G.H. Macurdy. Hell.
in 247 B.C., that is to say between 270 and 247 B.C. Some scholars however have maintained that the "good king" was Ptolemy Benefactor and that the date of the Mime's composition should be placed between 247 and 222 B.C.

2) In the fourth Mime (1.23) a series of statues in the sanctuary of Asclepios are attributed by the poet to Praxiteles' sons, Kefisodotos and Timarchos. These sculptors flourished at the beginning of the 3rd century B.C. They had already started their careers in 325 B.C., as it was then that they made the statue of rhetor Lycurgos who died in 323 B.C. The reference to them makes one think that they were alive, when the Mime was written. It would not be an untenable hypothesis that the statues which are described in the Mime had been made before 270 B.C.

3) Also in the fourth Mime (11.73 ff.) there is a reference to Apelles, with the poet's intention of defending the famous painter against certain anonymous sycophants. The whole subject-matter allows us to think that Apelles was still alive, or, at least, that not many years had passed from his death, as people kept the sly denigration of the artist still fresh in their memories. If we consider the year 356 B.C. rough that of Apelles' birth and it could not be much later that according to Nairn's
argument (P.XIV) - the conclusion is that the Mime could well have been written just before 270 B.C.

3) Herondas in the composition of Mimes I and 4 undoubtedly imitated the famous Idyll 15 of Theocritos describing the visit of two Syracusan women to the feast of Adonis. The scene of the Idyll is set in about 272 B.C. and the date of its composition cannot be much later that (A.S.F. Gow, Theocritus II, p. 265). It follows then that Herondas' Mimes I and 4 were written probably about 270 B.C.

5) Finally an examination of the sculptured objects referred to in the fourth Mime permits us to determine the date of their production. The matter has been investigated by W. Gurlitt who concluded that the Mime was written most probably in the decade of 270 to 260 B.C. (1)

On the basis of the above evidence we can conclude that Herondas flourished in the period of 270 to 260 B.C., which means that he was born around 300 B.C. The view that Herondas lived in the years of Ptolemy Benefactor's reign is rather weak; he might still have been alive, but too old to be active in literary production. In any case he would be contemporary with or somewhat later than Theocritos and Gallimachos.

THE HOME OF HERONDAS

Herondas was essentially an Alexandrian. But we do not know his home country, nor have we satisfactory sources to establish details of his identity. The information we possess is given indirectly by his own compositions.

First of all we are impressed and obliged to put in the centre of our research the undoubted fact that kos is the setting of the second Mime. From 1.95 f. Battaros, the main character eulogizes kos for her glorious past.

In the fourth Mime there is a description of the sanctuary of Asclepios; and kos was the most important centre of the god's cult. The description is so faithful that it betrays the poet's familiarity with the place. A.D. Knox, however, in his article "Herodes and Callirrhos" states that "of kos ('Herondas) had hardly a tourist's knowledge. He does not even seem to have known its calendar, nor the streets of its city, 'thus denying a close connection between the poet and kos, and concludes that "(Herondas) seems at some time to have lived in a small Attic country house. 'Knox' argument is not firmly supported. We should take into consideration the fact that a poet not interested to insist obstinately on the details of calendars or the topography of a place in his verses; or, even if such a thing is needed,

(1) See Philologus 81 (1926), P. 247.
he purposely avoids mentioning his immediate environment as of course, he has other aims.

But, let us turn to the women visitors to the temples. The works described by them have been recognized for the most part by archaeologists, though there are some inconsistencies which can be explained. E.g. Herondas omits to mention by name the famous picture by Apelles of "Aphrodite Rising". Let us examine, however, some details: From 1. 39 f. kynno asks her companion to come closer, as she would like to show her "something beautiful which the latter has not seen in her life. "In the meantime Kynno's reprimand against her girl-slave prolongs the conversation and suddenly the doors of the temple open, obliging the visitors to hasten towards the temple to fulfil their primary purpose. Thus kynno forgets what she has said before, and does not carry out her promise to show her friend "something beautiful..... "The contemporary audience of the Mime would certainly know "this beautiful something" as they themselves could easily identify it. It would be reasonable to take Kynno's words as a hint to "Aphrodite Rising".

In the same Mime the poet refers to three places, i.e. Trikke, Kos, and Epidaurus, all three being centres of the Asclepian cult. Though Trikke and Epidaurus are mentioned quite simply, kos is accompanied by the adjective ἀυτῆς "sweet", which gives a particular emphasis, underlying the
poet's preference for the island, as this adjective (γλυκός "sweet") fits something beloved, of one's own, and has been used since Homer as an adjective for the mother-land.

On the other hand, there is an obvious similarity between the names we encounter in the Mimes and those we find in the inscriptions of kos, and some analogous is observed in the "sacred names". The similarity is more impressive in the vocabulary referring to the religious life; a fact which makes us think that the poet borrowed such words on purpose from the sphere of religion, wanting probably to satirise in his own fashion.

Finally we see the same function of the derivative endings of the proper names, e.g. Διον (Herondas) - Ἱερών (inscriptions), Νηπρίχη (Herondas) - Ἰηναψη (inscriptions) etc.

The Doric forms in the language of Herondas show an influence of a dialect foreign to the literary style the poet himself employed. The Doric elements we encounter are: the nominal forms γλάσσα (3,93), μυκώς (6,59), the verbal forms ἀφη (4,27), ἀφής (4,23), ἀφής (12,3), ἦρα (4,21), the interjection μά (1,85), crasis of αις into η and κατες into Χη. Even those few samples are indicative of an unconscious influence, which only the dialect of an area with which someone has a close relationship could excercise. Kos was a Doric colony, and consequently her dialect was Doric. However,
these words could be simply satirical arrows dressed-up in the characteristics of a "country" language.

Nevertheless because of the spread and prevalence of the Ionic dialect kos could not avoid acquiring some "ionisms" here and there in the inscriptions of the island. Herondas certainly practising a literary style created and developed in the hands of Ionians, and having the Ionic text as model (especially that of Hipponax), used the Ionic dialect. Which was the vehicle for this kind of poetry.

On the other hand there are certain atticisms in Herondas' text, some of which were changed into the corresponding Ionic forms by the corrector of the papyrus. The Attic elements- it is unknown whether these are due to the poet himself or to a later scribe - betray the influence exercised by the Attic tongue on a panhellenic scale during Hellenistic times.

The above data, both "realia" and linguistic constitute strong indications of the special relation between Herondas and the island of kos. If these data were not opposed to other drawn also from Herondas' Mimes the subject would not have difficulties and the conclusions would be rather more certain. Yet, there are references leading in other directions:

In Mime 5 (1.32) the poet uses the word $ζηρείον$ according to the Etymologicum Magnum means "the prison of
the slaves, called μυμαθων by Chians and koans." Further
the Lexicon mentions that we can find in Herondas the phrase
εγε αντον εις το θησαυρον. We must add here that the Lexicon
gives 'Αχαιων "Achaeans", which was corrected to Κωνις
"Koans" by Crusius.

On the other hand Chios is mentioned in Mime 6 (1.58)
with reference to kerdon's native country, when the woman
asks for the maker of the "baubon". In the same verse Eryt-
hrai is also mentioned as kerdon's probable home.

Other places also recorded in the Mimes of Herondas are:
Brikindera (2,57), a port in Rhodes, Abderea (2,58) in Thrace,
and phaselis (2,59) a city on the coast of Lycia. Still,
1.51 of Mime 3 contains a hint of the island of Delos. Fur-
thermore in Mime 3 (1.45) the coin μυμαθων is mentioned,
which according to Hesychios (s.v.) it was used in kyzicos,
a coastal city in propontis on the border of Asia Minor. In
the calendar of the same city there was a month named Τωρρων
to which Herondas refers in Mime 7,86. There is also a
reference to the city Artake (7,87) situated in the same dis-
trict as kyzicos, and finally Attica seems to be the setting
of the 8th Mime (Knox' opinion). Other places which are men-
tioned en passant are: Corinth (1,52), Pisa (1,53) on the
occasion of games, Ephesos (4,72) in relation to the painter
Apelles, Samos (2,73) with reference to a notorious incident,
Trikke (4,2) and Epidaurus (4,2) as seats of the Asclepian cult, and finally Ake (2,16) and Tyros (2,18) from whence several commodities were exported, destination for kos.

These places serve a purpose in the plot of the Mime or add some element to the personality of the characters involved. For this reason they need not refer to Herondas' immediate environment and may be considered simply as geographical incidents in the service of literature. Indeed, some place-names are known because of their defects. They are used in the Mimes skillfully in the service of irony and satire.

We should however exempt from this category the special reference to Egypt made by Herondas in the first Mime, 11. 26-35. It is eulogy of the land and its monarch; it is a description which reminds us of similar expressions by other writers for the same country. The writers in the third century B.C. searched for occasions to praise ptolemaic Egypt, probably for an ulterior motive, that they might gain a favour from a certain ptolemy; probably too in immitation of a certain original piece of literature, and probably finally by the necessity to earn a living.

The conclusion after what has been said, is that kos is the kernel of the works of Herondas, while, in parallel, Egypt plays a determining role in the life of the poet. The mention of Egypt by way of eulogy shows that Herondas had
close ties with the kingdom of the ptolemies. If we remem-
ber philias, who, though born and raised in Kos, had a suc-
sessful career in Alexandria, we should not be far from
the truth to put Herondas into the same pattern; which
means that Herondas lived for some time in Alexandria, from
whence he acquired a great deal of the influence on his
writings.

The first Mime has a title consisting of two nouns:

\[ \text{προσυχλ} \text{ς ἡ μοστροκός} \]. The first is a compound of the prepo-
sition \( \pi\rho \) and the verb \( \chiυκλεω \) meaning move
round searching" it is used here for the first time (Hapax),
and is explained by Hesychios as equal of \( \text{προσυχλεω} \).
"a woman who woos, courts for another, the matchmaker, and
in the bad sense "pimp". The Italian word "ruffiana" is
known internationally in this sense. Now, the verb \( \chiυκλεω \)
is found in a popular song known as \( \chiυλ\omegaν\zeta\varepsilon\i\upsilon \) "singing of
the s. walow song", and preserved by Athenaios (VIII 360
B 6) \( \kappaαλ\delta\αν να \chiυκλει \) "You do roll the fruit-cake.
"The fact that the word \( \chiυκλεω \) was rare justifies
the parallel use of the phrase \( \text{ἡ μοστροκός} \) as a synonym to
explain further the first word. It could be considered
as superfluous and deleted, as Kaibel has pointed out; yet,
we find a similar use not only in Herondas, e.g. in the Mome-6,
title: \( \phiιλιδ\zeta\ου\σσι \ η \ ιδιδ\zeta\ου\σσι \) but also in Theocritos 26,
title. \( \Lambda\nu\νι \ η \ Βαχ\χαι \) as well as in Menander, e.g. \( \Sigma\μιλα \ η \ Κυδεία \)
'Αρηφόρος \ η \ Αἵλιτρες \ etc. (see more examples in the edition

On the other hand μαστροκάς is connected by etymology with the words μαστήρ, μαστός and signifies "pimp, "a person who panders, with reference to both male and female. Hasychios gives the explanation:

"ο τὰς γυναικάς ή ἄνδρας προσκαλῶν κατ' μαστίγων, η προσαγωγάς, "who invites and panders either a woman or a man, the pandere,". And in the Etymologicum Magnum (101,30) we read: μαστροκάς παρὰ τὸ μαλέσθαι τοὺς τρόπους τῶν πορνευοντος γυναικῶν, which means; that "the word μαστροκάς derives from μαλέσθαι search for women who prostitute themselves" and the Etymologicum Gudianum adds: ὥστως ἐν ἔρωματι ξυφρονος Ἀνδρέας (scil. μήρους) which means that Sophron had used that word as well.

In the second line of the Mime I we read the word ἄγοινης after a correction of the copyist of the papyrus. It is beyond any doubt that the original scribe wrote ἄγοινης and the corrector, perhaps the scribe himself, or a second person acting as a "proff-reader," changed the reading by inserting the letters Π above the Π of the prototype. G. Giangrande in his article "interpretation of Herodas," supported the first hand of the papyrus asserting that Egypt

(1) See G.U.C.G. 15 (1873), PP. 8298.
was an éminence on the mainland, and

Methrione is waiting for a letter from her husband in Egypt, not for visiting peasants from an alleged farm. "Nevertheless, the palaeographical point of view should not escape our attention. It is clear that the letters Ψ written with one

movement (Ψ') resemble the η (η) and conversely, when the η is written hastily (η') could resemble two letters, i.e. Ψ and P. I think that this could have happened: a copyist seeing the letters Ψ

in a monogram took them as η and wrote ΝΟΙΚΗΣ. The corrector of the papyrus rightly changed the false reading into ΝΟΙΚΗΣ.

At the end of 1. 81 we have the reading Δίδα, propo-
ned by Crusius and Edmonds, the latter asserting that he read Δίδα after a close study of the papyrus, he under-
took in 1923 and 1924. I myself could not read more than Δίκτος. In 1979, when I visited the Library of the British Museum and inspected the papyrus (B.M. Pap. 135) for several
days, Crusius' reading was accepted by Headlam, while Knox and Cunningham read Δίκτος rendering the word to Cyliss' speech. For the word Δίκτος Hesychios gives the explanation (τοῦ ἄνδρος τὸ ξηρὸν (scil. ἔργον) according to Crusius) "a large drinking-cup", and thus the meaning is" to give a large cup to drink. "But the subject is not con-

fined to the size of the cup, because the quantity of wine offered by Methrione has been determined: it is three hecte-

res (or better hektarion) equals 1/6
of the liquid measure, which in Herondas' times was named χόταλη and was equivalent to 0.275 litre, i.e. 27 grams. 

χόταλη was further divided into 6 χάδοι (or ἔκτιμορία or ἔκτιμορίον) and that gives a capacity of 4.5 grams to one χάδος, or ἔκτιμορι or ἔκτιμορος.

So the wine offered to Gyllis was as much as 13 grams roughly, which is very little. On the basis of these calculations, quite different from those worked out by Nicholson (1) I think that crusius' reading ἄδροι is the least probable, because noone would pour out such a small drop of wine in a large cup. Nicholson seems to accept that the wine offered to Gyllis would be more, because a further two parts of water would be added to it. But the mixture of water with wine would have been made in the crater before the wine was offered and not in the drinkingcup.

Bucheler read ἄδρος translating the sentence "dabibere largiter," and in a similar way Meister renders the sentence into German" gieb ihr reichlich zu trinken. "The reading has admittedly a papallel in Diphilos 5:

ἀδρότερον πιέτω "drink more deeply" but this meaning by no means suits the context. We certainly say "drink it up" if the cup is full or when we want to finish drinking, otherwise it would be foolish to ask someone to drink deeply.

(1) Academy 1891, P. 287; see also Nairn's Herondas, P. 13.
(largiter, reichlich) a mouthful of wine.

Blass read ήρφη, the meaning of which was misunderstood by Nairn, writing "it seems to mean 'in a bumper,' lit. violently." "Obviously Nairn gives the meaning of ἠρής and not ἠράς which means basically" sweat. The word ἠρής also means exudation of trees, i.e. gum or resin (see LSJ s.v. 1 2). It comes then to my mind that we could have here ἠρή or rather ἠράτα (scil. ὀξυνυ) with reference, for the first time in the Greek literature, of a resinated wine, so popular in Modern Greece. Cf Antiphon 52,12 ἐρμίδδος ἠράτα πηγής, of wine.

And now let us note that Headlam once read ἄλλως accrediting, the word to Gyllis, who answers thus to the phrase ὅς κιεῖν. In other words Gyllis answering ἄλλως "fine" agrees with the previous sentence, and it is, if she says "thanks". The reading was forgotten by headlam himself but cunningham appropriated it, as this arrangement forms the most satisfactory interpretation every given.

Finally, the ἄρρης context could also be ascertained perfectly by the reading ὅς κιεῖν connected with "given her to drink without fear. "As is known, drinking was forbidden to women, and free women were excluded from symposia, the main occasion for drinking. It is also known

(1) See Academy 1891, P. 538.
that Aristophanes ridicules women who drink. In such a society and under these circumstances Gyllis. Would be afraid of accepting a glass of wine, but Metrice is generous to her: "drink, Gyllis, and do not be afraid of anything"

Let us now come to Mime 2 and examine the lines 5-10

The papyrus at this point is much damaged so that restoration attempted by scholars is uncertain, and admits of more than one interpretation. Line 5 has lost about 5 letters at the beginning. The letters ΝΕΡΕΕΙ just after the gap suggest the reading διηρέξει, accepted as almost certain by most scholars. The restoration of the beginning requires much scholarship and imagination. Crusius writes ..........

δυκὶ διηρέξει in his first edition (1892) which changes into. ἀλλ' εἰ διηρέξει in his fifth edition (1914) influenced in some way by Headlam who restored the passage into.......... ἀλλ' εἰ Ἰ πέρ ἤξει. In the first case the verse must be connected with the negative οὔ in verse 3, i.e. οὔ δυκὶ διηρέξει (περιηγημέναι) εἰ .... ἤξει, the meaning being "he will not win the case, even if has money at his disposal, if only he ruins Bataros".

In the second case the meaning of the verse is "but if he can ruin Bataros," and then the next verse comes as apodosis. But the verse then contains more difficulties, because the letters there are much erased and the gap is long. Milne's reading in verse 6 (as well as Knox) πολλοῦ γε καὶ δει
satisfies the sense there also wants much, "but takes more space than that available in the Papyrus. Similarly Edmonds reads ἔσπυ ᾫς καὶ δὲ(ς)ἵ: reducing thus the length of the reading and remaining close to the sense which Milne's restoration gives. On the other hand Crusius and more Herzog went far away from the point, suggesting readings which lead in other directions of interpretation: η ἐγὼ αἰτή Crusius (1): similarly χήρω όυν .............. Crusius (5):

φέρω δὲ πλυντήρ. Herzog.

Thereafter one can read with certainty the letter:

[Ωάκοντα] which have been arranged: τῶδε ἡμιν γὰρ [ἀν]

knox: ἀρχωτον γὰρ - ὑμέας Crusius: λέγων γὰρ ἡμῖν

Blass (and similarly Meister) followed by Nairn: τῶδε ἡμῖν γὰρ δὲι

............. Headlam. Blass' restoration gives the verse the meaning" it is eanough to make a wolf cry, "which further means, according to Nairn," to extort a display of feeling from the most unsympathetic. "Crusius's restoration leads to an interpretation freely translated as "noone could prevent me from making you cry. "knox' and Headlam's reading τῶδε [ἐπὶ] (='τὸ δὲ ἡμῖν "salty") should be connected with χλαδοςι (or χλαδοςι without, if we accept the particle [ἀν] ) and thus the sense which comes out is literally" he will cry with bitter tears." we find a somewhat parallel usage in Callimachos, fr. 313 δὲ οἱ χῆτε and Theocritos 23,34 ἄλμωρα χλαδοσι, both instances supporting Headlam's restoration.
The next verse (7) also had difficulties in attempts to arrange it both in words and in sense. The letter which can be read after a gap of about five letters are ΙΗΕΟΜΑΛΣ-ΤΟΗΗΛΑΔ[. This series of letters can be divided to form words in various ways. To be precise: the group of the letters ΙΗΕ can be the ending of a noun in -τη (e.g. βίς, αἰξίς etc) or the end of one word and the beginning of another (e.g. -της ?). Some scholars connect these letters with the following two (OM) to from the end of a verb: -τρομη (e.g. γενήσαμαι. Crusius: ποιήσαμαι. Terzaghi: οίσαμαι. Bell, to which could be added ἀπασμαι. "I could be thought as....", and then the remaining word is ἀντίς "citizen", but there is also the possibility of writing ὁ μαστός, a word which Herondas would play with for its double entendre: ὁ μαστός "woman's breast," and ὁ μὴ ἀντίς "foreigner".

In Mime 3, verse 34, I have written Ἀγνησ. The papyrus has ΑΥΙΕΥ which was read by kenyon as Αυρέω perhaps justly as the shape of I in this particular spot is not sharply discriminated from that of P.J.U. Powell asks: "should we read ΑΓΝΗΣ?" In fact Powell discerned the correct reading, but he did not proceed to justify it. If we examine the letter Ρ in this column of the papyrus, we observe that in all cases its vertical line is extended beneath the imaginary horizontal line forming the basis on which the letters sit. This does not occur with the letter read
as P in the word we are looking at. On the basis then of palaeographical criteria we can conclude that the letter is not P but I, or more correctly, a badly shaped I. The corrector of the papyrus added a Ρ between Α and Υ and a little higher (i.e. ΑΫΕΥ), which was taken, already by Kenyon as an attempt to correct the first hand (ΑΥΕΠΕΥ according to Kenyon) into ἄγρεις, .... as there is a clear resemblance between Υ and Ρ in hand-writing during the second century A.D. In other words the corrector of the papyrus changed the letter Υ into Ρ, the solution Kenyon succeeded to give in the ed.pr. of Herondas was accepted permanently in all the following editions.

Escaping the usual pattern A.E. Crawley suggested in a note the reading ἄγρεις "god of vacations" rather than ἄργεις of the ed.pr. obviously taking the papyrus reading as a result of transposition of letters. However he did not pay much attention to the fact that the word is unknown to Greek lexica, and still it attibutes to Apollo a qualification entirely foreign to the god, known, on the contrary, as ἄγρεις, ἄγριος, ἄγρευτης ....... while at the same time Apollo and Athene Ergane were worshiped as θεός Ἑργάτης and Apollo with Zeus as θεός ἄγρατερος (ἄγρεις). Rightly then Crawley's suggestion has been abandoned.

(1) See C.R. 22 (1908), P.216.
(2) See Academy 1891, P. 314.
(3) See Paus. VIII 32, 4.
The word ἄγρεσ is, as an epithet for Apollo (and of other gods as well) is well attested in ancient sources. see e.g. Aeschylus, fr. 200 (A. Sidgwick) ἄγρεσ δ' Ἀπόλλων όρθον εὐθύναι βῆλος........ "may Apollo, the hunter, direct his arrow straight, "and Sophocles O.C. 1091 Τὸν τὸν ἄγρευταν Ἀπόλλω "Apollo the hunter; "thus ἄγρεσ derives from ἄγρα "hunting." We could however connect the word ἄγρεσ with ἄγρα "field" as other determinatives of Apollo suggest; e.g. Ἀπόλλων, ὡς ἄγροιχος εἶ phib. 6, 35 (=C. Austin, CGF 258) "Apollo dwelling in the fields. these reasons probably made A.D. knox, The Greek Choliambic Poets (LCL), P. 254 complete the papyrus text of Pargent, 307 verso (b) 2, attributed to Phionix, with the phrase Ἀπόλλων ἄγρεος ?? (sic).

To return to the point; a boy of the streets, as Kotta-
os was, ἄγροιχος, ἀλήπη, had reasons to refer to the guardian of the streets where games and carefreeness were the rule and not to the fields or hunting where were toil and work. And in such a guardian way, Apollo Agyiēus looked after the streets and highways and protected those who found themselves as way-fares or travellers using the streets in any way. People used to found altars to Apollo Agyiēus outside their houses or at crossroads, but more often gathered stones and formed a cairn without the elaboration which a proper altar would need. Similar altars were erected in honour of Hermes and Hecate.
The word ἀγυιεύς derives from the noun ἀγυια (more often in the plural ἀγυιατ) related to ἀγω as a quasi-participial form of this verb (see LSJ, s.v).
The word was not only used as an epithet for Apollo, but also signified the altar itself of the god. See Hesychios, s.v. ἀγυιεύς: ὁ πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν ἐστις βωμὸς ἐν σχήματι κλώνος, "agyieus is the alter erected in front of the doors in the shape of a column." Similar information is drawn from οὖν: ὁ ἱεὺς ὁ πρὸ τῶν αὐλείων θυρῶν κατοικίσθαι κλών, λεπός Ἀκόλλωνος, καὶ ἁγίος θεὸς" agyieus is a conical column in front of the gates, sacred to Apollo, as well as the god himself." It is interesting to note at this point that the custom of erecting altars to gods has survived up to the present day, but they are not devoted to gods but to the local Saints.

We should finally add that both Meister and Crusius (the latter in his fifth edition) accepted Kenyon's reading ἄναρχον on the basis of the testimony that the word ἑναρχος is qualified as a name of Apollo by Hesychios: ἑναρχος ὁ Ἀκόλλων. ἑναρχον πρωτό ἱερατευς. The word ἑναρχος can easily be related to the epithet Ἑδώιος (= Ἑυστήρος) of Apollo; see Ap.R. Arg. B 686 Ἑδώιος Ἀκόλλωνος. Herzog is probably right in believing that such a formation is a linguistic impossibility, as words in -εύς denote a person dealing with some activity or some profession, and the word ἄρευς could not be assigned to this category.
In mime 4, V. 52; we again have some difficulties in fixing the meaning of the verse. This is due to the doubtful reading in the papyrus, which seems, rather probably, *χαρδιτηθόλου* Kenyon, to start with the ed., pr., reads *χαρδιτη βολον*. Nothing that "an a appears to follow the λ but is cancelled by a dot above it; and the ο appears to have been re-written. When I inspected the papyrus (in 1979) I formed the impression that the letter which follows λ is another λ and not α, above which there is a dot. The ο is cancelled by a faint vertical line, and a small circle resembling a tiny omicron is added above ο. The last letter is most probably Y. Edmonds read (in 1923-24) *χαρδιτηθόλει* "with a dot over the second Α, and over the E and ο perhaps followed by traces of Y or the like; another ο correctin βολω to βολε would be no longer visible. "1 On the basis of Edmond's observations, Headlam adopted the reading *χαρδιτηθόλει* which was also accepted by Cunningham stating that the alternative form *χαρδιοβολειοθαι (=λυκειοθαι)* has been preserved by Hesychios (s.v.).

Paton had already written *χαρδιτηθόλου* in a note of his which appeared in C.R. 5 (1891), P. 483, and similarly Meister read *χαρδιτηθέλει* in his edition (1893) on the grounds of Hesychios' information. The scholars referred to above take the reading as one word, a parasynteron, adopted by LSJ from Herondas.

(1) "Some notes on the Herodas Papyrus, "C.Q.19 (1925), P. 133."
On the other hand Kenyon split the reading into two words, χαρδή βάλω, and this division was followed by Crusius, Hicks, Bucheler and others perhaps. Blass first made a sound correction; he read χαρδή βάλη on the grounds of Aeschylus' phrase θυμό βάλε from Prometheus 706 putting rightly the verbal form in the aorist subjunctive, as we have here a prohibition: μὴ ... χαρδή βάλη, "don't take it to heat", i.e."seriously."

Prof. B. Mandilaras

(1) See Gott. gel. Anz. 6 (1892), P. 233.