

## HERODIAN AND STRATTIS: A FURTHER LINK?\*

Iohannes Alexandrinus' Τονικὰ παραγγέλματα (known also as *Praecepta tonica*) is one of the two major epitomes of the now lost Περί καθολικῆς προσφῳδίας, a work which was composed by the second-century grammarian Aelius Herodianus and which offered a comprehensive treatment of Ancient Greek accentuation in no fewer than twenty books. The only edition of the aforementioned epitome is Karl Wilhelm Dindorf's (Leipzig 1825), which is based on a single manuscript, the Hauniensis 1965 of the late fifteenth century (A).<sup>1</sup> It has long been acknowledged<sup>2</sup> that Dindorf's text is in need of a thorough overhaul. In addition to A, the future editor must take into systematic account its gemellus, to which Peter Egenolff has drawn attention since 1887; this is the sixteenth-century codex Vindobonensis phil. gr. 240 (V).<sup>3</sup> He will also need to correct by conjecture the numerous corruptions which Dindorf left standing in his text and which the new MS does nothing to remedy.<sup>4</sup>

In this paper I should first like to consider one such corruption. It is found in the section where the Τονικὰ παραγγέλματα treats the monosyllables that have a

---

\*) I am grateful to the editors of RhM for their penetrating observations on this article.

1) Ἰωάννου Ἀλεξανδρέως Τονικὰ παραγγέλματα. Αἰλίου Ἡρωδιανοῦ Περί σχημάτων. Edidit G. Dindorfius (Lipsiae 1825). For MS A see B. Schartau, Codices Graeci Haunienses; ein deskriptiver Katalog des griechischen Handschriftenbestandes der Königlichen Bibliothek Kopenhagen (Copenhagen 1994) 168–77; K. Hadjú, Ps.-Herodian, De figuris: Überlieferungsgeschichte und kritische Ausgabe (Berlin / New York 1998) 37–8.

2) The need for a recollection of A and a replacement of Dindorf's text was expressed by G. Uhlig (Acta conventus philologorum Treverensia, p. 169) as early as 1879. As regards A, Dindorf did not examine the manuscript himself, but worked from a collation put at his disposal by the Danish scholar O. D. Bloch. In 1881 Egenolff corrected several mistakes of Bloch's collation. In 1900 Egenolff presented new manuscript evidence derived from V and assessed its importance for the constitution of the text: see his articles In Herodianum technicum critica III, RhM 36 (1881) 492–4 and Zu Lentz' Herodian I, Philologus 59 (1900) 239–47.

3) P. Egenolff, Die orthoepischen Stücke der byzantinischen Litteratur (Leipzig 1887) (Wissenschaftliche Beilage zu dem Programm des gr. Gymnasiums Mannheim für das Schuljahr 1886/87) 12–3 with n. 12 and 37–8. See also H. Hunger, Katalog der griechischen Handschriften der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek. Teil 1: Codices historici, codices philosophici et philologici (Vienna 1961) 347–9. The symbol V was assigned to the manuscript by P. Egenolff, Zu Lentz' Herodian I, Philologus 59 (1900) 239.

4) A. Lentz, Herodiani Technici Reliquiae, vol. I (Lipsiae 1867) used some portions of the *Praecepta tonica* for his reconstruction of the *De prosodia catholica*; he offered minor improvements ope ingenii here and there, but as a rule he confined himself to merely reproducing Dindorf's text.

long element (that is, either a long vowel or a diphthong) and take the circumflex: e.g. οὐς, βούς, ναύς etc. The closing line of this section mentions that all other monosyllables that have a long element take the acute accent; it then cites a number of examples: Ioh. Alex. 8,6 Dindorf Ταῦτα ἐν τοῖς μονοσύλλαβοις (*subaudi μακροκαταλήκτοις*<sup>5</sup>) περισπόμενα, τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ ὀξύνονται, φῶς, Τρώς, μήν, χήν, Ζεὺς (sic AV, recte: ζῶς Dindorf, perperam), τρύξ, θῶψ καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ.

Τρύξ, which is transmitted in both manuscripts AV, is problematic: whereas the context requires a monosyllable that contains a long element, the upsilon in τρύξ is short, a fact of which Herodian was aware: Hrd. Περί διχρόνων II 9,18 Lentz Τὰ εἰς υῖ μονοσύλλαβα συστέλλει τὸ υ, τρύξ, Φρύξ, πτύξ, Στύξ.

It is not a satisfactory solution to suppose that at this point the epitomist deviates from Herodian and takes the upsilon in τρύξ to be long:<sup>6</sup> the rest of the words are very straightforward examples, since they contain elements which are unambiguously long: φῶς, Τρώς, μήν, χήν, Ζεὺς, θῶψ; on the contrary, τρύξ is unfortunate in that upsilon is δίχρονον, two-timed, and therefore its quantity is not readily clear to the reader.

We can overcome the difficulty by changing a single letter; I suggest that we should read here τρώξ ('weevil', 'a pest of stored pulses'). Τρώξ occurs in Herodian as the second part of the compound words θυλακοτρώξ, κυμοτρώξ and γραμματοτρώξ.<sup>7</sup>

The second part of the paper will discuss the question of the source of the word τρώξ. There is no evidence that Herodian derived τρώξ from technical authors, since the extant writings of Aristotle and Theophrastus, for instance, do not contain it. The word τρώξ is very rare – there exist only seven occurrences: in Photius' Lexicon, *Etymologicum Genuinum* (*Et. Gen.*), *Etymologicum Magnum* (*EM*), Hesychius, Scholia to Theocritus, Tzetzes and Manuel Philes. The first three lexicographical works provide in fact one single occurrence, since they are interdependent in respect of the passage which contains τρώξ: the *EM* borrowed the passage from the *Et. Gen.*, and the *Et. Gen.* borrowed it from Photius. This passage traces τρώξ back to the comic poet Strattis (fr. 90 K.-A.): Phot. 609,12 Porson (unde *Et. Gen.* AB, unde *EM* 770,43) τρώγες· θηρία τὰ ἐν τοῖς ὀσπρίοις. οὕτως Στράτ(τ)ις (οὗτ. Στρ. om. *Et. Gen.* et *EM*).

5) For the peculiar phrase μονοσύλλαβον μακροκατάληκτον see e.g. Ioh. Alex. 7,16–7.

6) There are a few cases in which John of Alexandria though composing an epitome of Περί καθολικῆς προσφθίας departs from Herodian; so it is not possible to ascribe everything in his treatise to Herodian.

7) (i) Hrd. Περί Ἰλιακῆς προσφθίας II 37,2 Lentz = sch. A ad B 755b Erbse ἀπορρώξ· Ἀρίσταρχος ὀξύνωνας, ὡς θυλακοτρώξ, καὶ ἡ σύνθεσις τοῦτο ἀπαίτει ... (ii) Hrd. ap. [Arcad.] 19,10–2 Schmidt (Pseudo-Arcadius is the other major epitome of the Περί καθολικῆς προσφθίας and thus it too can be taken to reflect Herodianic material) Τὰ εἰς ΩΞ ὀξύνονται, ὅσα μίαν συλλαβὴν ἔχει ἐπὶ τέλους ἐν τῇ συνθέσει· ἀπορρώξ, κυμοτρώξ (Ar. Eq. 41), θυλακοτρώξ, κυμορρώξ. (iii) Hrd. ap. Eust. Od. II 275,41–2 εἰσὶ δὲ τοιαῦτα καθ' Ἡρωδιανὸν καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ τρώγω γραμματοτρώξ, κυμοτρώξ.

Hesychius τ 1589 is corrupt:<sup>8</sup> τρῶγας· †τρῶγλας†. Editors (Schmidt, and recently Hansen and Cunningham) have seen here a reference to the aforementioned fragment of Strattis. They are most likely right,<sup>9</sup> and I may perhaps add that the accusative plural of the Hesychian lemma τρῶγας can be explained as a corruption of the nominative plural of Strattis's fragment τρῶγες under the influence of the faulty explanation or the entry which follows: Hesych. τ 1590 τρῶγλας· τρύπας.

As regards the attestation of τρῶγες in the sch. Theoc. I [49b] Wendel, this scholion is an interpolation from a version of the etymological material which represents a lost intermediary between the *Et. Gen.* and the *EM*.<sup>10</sup> It thus carries no independent weight.

Tzetzes adds nothing to the picture, since he obviously depends on the lexicographical sources we have already examined.<sup>11</sup>

Finally, Manuel Philes is the only author to give the word a new meaning – namely 'gnawer of leaves' as distinguished from 'gnawer of pulses'.<sup>12</sup> He uses τρῶξ in line 18 of his *Περὶ σηροσκώληκος* to refer to the silkworm, and he employs φύλλον three lines above: the combination of these words strongly suggests the compound φύλλοτρῶγες, an Antiphanean coinage known from Athenaeus and Eustathius.<sup>13</sup> I take it as very likely that Philes's τρῶξ is an extraction of his own from the above compound – an extraction both in form and in meaning. So it does not seem to have any claim whatsoever to antiquity.

We can conclude this survey of the uses of τρῶξ in literature by making two observations: (i) with the exception of Philes, all authors derive τρῶξ from Strattis. Obviously, Strattis's fragment containing the rare word τρῶξ had acquired an independent life in the context of the Greek lexicographical tradition, and the relation of the aforementioned authors to the comic poet's fragment was only indirect; (ii) of authors using τρῶξ no one predates Herodian but Strattis himself. So did Herodian derive τρῶξ from Strattis or did he extract τρῶξ from one of his three compounds, that is, θυλακοτρῶξ, κυμοτρῶξ, γραμματοτρῶξ?

8) I. C. Beavis, *Insects and other invertebrates in Classical Antiquity* (Exeter 1988) 180 refers the reader to Hesychius without mentioning the corrupt state of his text at the point in question.

9) See P. A. Hansen / I. C. Cunningham (edd.), *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*, vol. IV: Τ–Ω (Berlin / New York 2009) ad loc.

10) The scholion is preserved in the thirteenth century codex Ambrosianus 886 (C 222 inf.) (symbol K). For the interpolations in this manuscript see C. Wendel (ed.), *Scholiorum in Theocritum vetera* (Lipsiae 1914) xi. However, Wendel (p. xi) is mistaken to claim that sch. I 49b is a composite entity drawing on both the *Et. Gen.* and the *EM*; for all the elements of this scholion are present in both lexica. (So his 'Et. M. 770, 43' ad sch. I 49b3 must be replaced with 'Et. Gen. [Et. M. 770, 43]').

11) Sch. Tzet. ad Hes. Op. 418 ἀδηκτοτάτη ἄσηπτος, μὴ γεννώσα σκώληκας· δὴς γὰρ ἐστὶν εἶδος σκώληκος ἐγγινομένου ἐνδον ξύλου· ἢ ψ δὲ σκώληξ ἐστὶ κεράτων, ἢ ξ ἀμπέλων, σὴς ἐσθιμάτων, τρῶξ ὀσπρίων, ψῆν σύκων, καὶ ἕτεροι ἄλλων· T. Gaisford (ed.), *Poetae minores Graeci*, vol. II (Leipzig 1823), 270,22–5.

12) Manuel Philes, *Περὶ σηροσκώληκος* 15–8 Ὅταν δὲ καὶ τὸ φύλλον, ὃ τρέφει τῆος, / ἀποτραχυνθῆ τῆ παρακμῆ τοῦ χρόνου, / καὶ τῆς χλιδῆς τὸ σῶμα τῷ κόρῳ βλύσῃ, / ὁ τρῶξ ὁ νωθῆς τοὺς χυμοὺς ἀναπτύει: F. Dübner / F. S. Lehms (edd.), *Poetae bucolici et didactici* (Paris 1862) 67.

13) Antiphanes, fr. 170.2 K.-A. ap. Athen. IV 130e et Eust. II. I 374,2.

The latter alternative is of course possible, but there is nothing to commend it. On the contrary, the former is rendered very likely (not certain, of course) by the two observations made above and by two further considerations: there is some positive evidence that Herodian was familiar with Strattis:<sup>14</sup> in his *Περὶ παθῶν* Herodian analysed the etymology of Strattis's name: Hrd. *Περὶ παθῶν* II 307,17 Lentz = Et. Gen. AB = EM 729,38 Στράττις· ὡσπερ παρὰ τὸ Βάκχος γίνεται Βάκκις, Κρόνος Κρόνις, δῆμος Δήμις καὶ Δάμις, οὕτω στρατός Στράτις καὶ πλεονασμῶ τοῦ τ Στράττις (= K.-A. vol. VII p. 623 s. fin.).<sup>15</sup>

The second consideration is that Herodian derived the compound *θυλακοτρόξ* too from comedy, in particular from Aristophanes' *Equites* 41. Finally, there is also an a priori, admittedly weaker, argument weighing in favour of Herodian's drawing *τρόξ* from Strattis: Herodian is heavily indebted to comic poetry and cites

---

14) However the evidence is not as much as scholars used to believe. There are three more occurrences of Strattis in the Herodian corpus, but are now known to belong to pseudepigraphic parts of the corpus. Two of the instances, Stratt. fr. 81 K.-A. and the title *Ψυχασταί* occur in the Attic glossary transmitted as Herodian's *Philetaerus* (§ 193 and § 223 ed. Dain, respectively), but this treatise is now considered spurious (see A. Dyck, *Aelius Herodian: Recent Studies and Prospects for Future Research*, ANWR II 34.1 [Berlin / New York 1993], 791–2 with references). The third instance, i. e. Stratt. fr. 9 K.-A., appears in Lentz's edition of Herodian's *Περὶ ὀρθογραφίας* (II 602,26), but this fragment has recently been proved not to be by Herodian (see this author's article: An unnoticed fragment of Orus' treatises *Περὶ ὀρθογραφίας* and *Ἀττικῶν λέξεων συναγωγή* and Phrynichus' *Σοφιστικὴ προπαρασκευή*, forthcoming in *Mnemosyne*). It should be noted that I have included in the Herodianic corpus material that has come to light since the time of Lentz's edition: e. g. the two newly discovered epitomes of the *Περὶ καθολικῆς προσφῶδιας*: (i) H. Hunger, *Palimpsest-Fragmente aus Herodians Katholikhē Prosfōdia*, Buch 5–7, *Cod. Vindob. Hist. gr. 10, Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinischen Gesellschaft* 16 (1967), 1–33. See especially pp. 9–10 on the comic fragments; (ii) A. Wouters, *The grammatical papyri from Greco-Roman Egypt: Contributions to the study of the 'Ars Grammatica' in Antiquity* (Brussels 1979), 216–24. There is a useful summary of Herodianic material unknown to Lentz in E. Dickey, *Ancient Greek scholarship* (Oxford / New York 2007), 75–7.

15) Since the comic poet Strattis is by far the most known bearer of this uncommon personal name (as opposed e. g. to the tyrant of Chios, RE s.v. 1), it is likely that the above passage refers to him. Furthermore, Lentz's attribution of the passage to Herodian seems to be correct: C. Nifadopoulos, *Greek Language Pathology: Herodian's Περὶ παθῶν*, with a collection of new fragments from *Etymologicum genuinum*, Ph.D. thesis (Cambridge 2001) 135 with n. 87 has shown that *πλεονασμός* is by far the commonest term in the surviving fragments of Herodian's *Περὶ παθῶν*. Moreover, we have other fragments of undoubted Herodianic origin which deal with *παρώνυμα*, that is, nominal derivatives, and which employ the same pattern of analysis: (i) Hrd. Π. παθῶν II 206,5 = Et. Gen. AB (EM 802,40): φυλλίς· παρὰ τὸ φύλλον, φυλλίς (φυλλίς om. EM). περὶ παθῶν. (περὶ παθῶν om. Et. Gen.). (ii) Hrd. Π. παθῶν II 272,21 = Et. Orion. 57,31: εὐνίς· ὁ ἐστερημένος τινός παρὰ τὴν ἑνός γενικὴν· ὁ γὰρ παρώνυμος χαρακτηρ ἀπὸ γενικῆς γίνεται. οὕτω παρὰ τὴν ἑνός γενικὴν ἕνις καὶ πλεονασμῶ τοῦ υ εὐνίς. οὕτως εὐρον ἐν τῷ περὶ παθῶν.

comic poets on a very great number of occasions;<sup>16</sup> therefore his acquaintance not only with the name, but also with the poetry of Strattis, such a productive poet of the Old Comedy, is to be expected.<sup>17</sup>

In sum, our investigation has produced two results: (i) we should read τρώξ for τρύξ in Ioh. Alex. 8,6, i.e. in the epitome of Herodian's *Περὶ καθολικῆς προσοδίας*; and (ii) we are justified to think that Herodian derived τρώξ from Strattis. The latter result is noteworthy for two reasons: (a) it establishes for the first time a link between Herodian and the poetry of Strattis; (b) it also reveals the earliest (second-century) stage in the 'Nachleben' of Stratt. fr. 90 K.-A. noticed so far.

Nicosia

Georgios Xenis

---

16) His extensive use of comic poetry may well be illustrated in e.g. his *Περὶ μονήρου λέξεως*, where he quotes from as many and diverse authors as Epicharmus, Eupolis, Ameipsias, Aristophanes, Nicophon, Plato, Telecleides, Hermippus, Rhinthon, Alcaeus, Pherecrates, Cratinus and Cephisodorus.

17) These considerations and the a priori argument show that in the case of Herodian as opposed to the other authors mentioned above (e.g. Hesychius, Photius etc.) direct use of Strattis's fragment is likelier than indirect.