Iohannes Alexandrinus’ Τονικὰ παραγγέλματα (known also as Praecepta tonica) is one of the two major epitomes of the now lost Περὶ καθολικῆς προσοφίας, 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 Hauiniensis 1965 of the late fifteenth century (A). It has long been acknowledged 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). 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.

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...
long element (that is, either a long vowel or a diphthong) and take the circumflex: e.g. ο/upsilonlΔnisΒιρΒumς, βο/upsilonΒιρΒumς, να/upsilonΒιρΒumς 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 Τα/upsilonΒιρΒumτα ἐν το/iotaΒιρΒumς μονοσυλλάβοις (subaudi μακροκαταλήκτοις)5) περισσώμενα, τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ οξύνεται, φώς, Τρώς, μήν, χήν, Ζεύς (sic AV, recte : Ζώς Dindorf, perperam), τρύξ, ὅψ 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. Περὶ διχρόνων II 9,18 Lentz Τὰ εἰς υξ 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:6 the rest of the words are very straightforward examples, since they contain elements which are unambiguously long: φώς, Τρώς, μήν, χήν, Ζεύς, δόν; on the contrary, τρύξ is unfortunate in that upsilon is διχρόνον, 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, κυαμοτρώξ and γραμματοτρώξ.7

The second part of the paper will discuss the question of the source of the word τρώξ. There is no evidence that Herodian derived τρόξ from technical authors, since the extant writings of Aristotle and Theophrastus, for instance, do not contain it. The word τρόξ 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 ἐδρία τὰ ἐν τοῖς ὀσπρίοις. οὕτως Στράτις (οὕτ. Στρ. om. Et. Gen. et EM).

5) For the peculiar phrase μονοσύλλαβον μακροκαταλήκτον see e.g. Ioh. Alex. 7,16–7.
6) There are a few cases in which John of Alexandria though composing an epitome of Περὶ καθολικῆς προσφοδίας departs from Herodian; so it is not possible to ascribe everything in his treatise to Herodian.
7) (i) Hrd. Περὶ Τλιωκῆς προσφοδίας II 37,2 Lentz = sch. A ad B 755b Erbse ἀπορρώξ· Ἀρίσταρχος ὀξυτόνως, ὡς θυλακοτρώξ. καὶ ἡ σύνθεσις τοῦτο ὀπαίτει (παρ. Στρ. om. Et. Gen. et EM). (ii) Hrd. ap. [Arcad.] 19,10–2 Schmidt (Pseudo-Arcadius is the other major epitome of the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσφοδίας and thus it too can be taken to reflect Herodianic material) Τὰ εἰς ΩΞ ὀξύνεται, ὅσα μίαν συλλαβὴν ἔχει ἐπὶ τέλους ἐν τῇ συνθέσει ἀπορρώξ, κυαμοτρώξ (Αρ. Εq. 41), θυλακοτρώξ, κυμορρώξ (Αρ. Εq. 41), θυλακοτρώξ, κυμορρώξ. (iii) Hrd. ap. Eust. Od. Π 275,41–2 εἰσὶ δὲ τοιαῦτα καὶ ὥς Ἑρωδιανὸν καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ τρώγῳ γραμματοτρώξ, κυμοτρώξ.
Hesychius τ 1589 is corrupt: τρώγης· τρώγλας· τρώματας. Editors (Schmidt, and recently Hansen and Cunningham) have seen here a reference to the aforementioned fragment of Strattis. They are most likely right, and I may perhaps add that the accusative plural of the Hesychian lemma τρώγης can be explained as a corruption of the nominative plural of Strattis’s fragment τρώγης under the influence of the faulty explanation or the entry which follows: Hesych. τ 1590 τρώγλας· τρύπας.

As regards the attestation of τρώγης 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. It thus carries no independent weight.

Tzetzes adds nothing to the picture, since he obviously depends on the lexicographical sources we have already examined.

Finally, Manuel Philes is the only author to give the word a new meaning – namely ‘gnawer of leaves’ as distinguished from ‘gnawer of pulses’. He uses τρόξ in line 18 of his Περὶ σηροσκώληκος to refer to the silkworm, and he employs φυλλόν three lines above: the combination of these words strongly suggests the compound φυλλοτρώξες, an Antiphanean coinage known from Athenaeus and Eustathius. I take it as very likely that Philes’s τρόξ 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 τρόξ in literature by making two observations: (i) with the exception of Philes, all authors derive τρόξ from Strattis. Obviously, Strattis’s fragment containing the rare word τρόξ 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 τρόξ no one predates Herodian but Strattis himself. So did Herodian derive τρόξ from Strattis or did he extract τρόξ from one of his three compounds, that is, θυλακοτρόξ, κυαμοτρόξ, γραμματοτρόξ?

---

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.


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.), Scholia in Theocritum vetera (Lipsiae 1914) xi. However, Wendel (p. xi) is mistaken to claim that sch. 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 49b must be replaced with ‘Et. Gen. [Et. M. 770, 43]’).


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: in his Περὶ παθοδῶν Herodian analysed the etymology of Strattis’s name: Hrd. Περὶ παθοδῶν II 307,17 Lentz = Et. Gen. AB = EM 729,38 Στράττις· ὥσπερ παρὰ τὸ Βάκχος γίνεται Βάκχις, Κρόνος Κρόνις, δήμος Δήμις καὶ Δάμις, οὕτω στρατός Στράτις καὶ πλεονασμὸς τοῦ τ Στράττις (= K.-A. vol. VII p. 623 s. fin.).

The second consideration is that Herodian derived the compound θυλακοτρῶξ 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 τρῶξ 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 Herodianic corpus, but are now known to belong to pseudopigraphic parts of the corpus. Two of the instances, Stratt. fr. 81 K.-A. and the title Ψυχαστάι occur in the Attic glossary transmitted as Herodian’s Περὶ ὀρθογραφίας (§ 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 Α ῦ τικῶν 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 προσαγωγῆς: (i) H. Hunger, Palimpsest-Fragmente aus Herodians Καθολική Προσαγωγή, 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 παθοδῶν, with a collection of new fragments from Ετυμολογικον genuine, Ph. D. thesis (Cambridge 2001) 135 with n. 87 has shown that πλεονασμὸς is by far the commonest term in the surviving fragments of Herodian’s Περὶ παθοδῶν. 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. παθοδῶν II 206,5 = Et. Gen. AB (EM 802,40): φυλλίς· παρὰ τὸ φύλλον, φυλλίς (φυλλίς om. EM). (ii) Hrd. Π. παθοδῶν II 272,21 = Et. Orion. 57,31: ε ὑ νις· ὁ ἐστερημένος τινὸς παρὰ τὴν ἑνὸς γενικῆς ὁ γὰρ παρώνυμος χαρακτήρ ἀπὸ γενικῆς γίνεται. οὕτω παρὰ τὴν ἑνὸς γενικῆς ἑνὶ καὶ πλεονασμῷ τοῦ τ ὑ νις. οὕτως εὑρόν ἐν τῷ Περὶ παθοδῶν.
comic poets on a very great number of occasions;\(^{16}\) 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.\(^{17}\)

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
προσώπωσις; and (ii) we are justified to think that Herodian derived τρώξ from Strat-
tis. 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
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16) His extensive use of comic poetry may well be illustrated in e.g. his Περὶ
μονήρως λέξεως, where he quotes from as many and diverse authors as Epichar-
mus, Eupolis, Ameipsias, Aristophanes, Nicophon, Plato, Telecleides, Hermippus,
Rhinthon, Alcaeus, Pherocrates, 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.