

## NOTES ON GREEK GRAMMARIANS

### 1. A Note on the Chronology of Herodian's Works

Using examples from Eustathius and Apollonius Dyscolus, K. Lehrs has shown the difficulty of drawing chronological inferences from the tense of cross-references within the corpus of a grammarian's works<sup>1</sup>). However, the only possible indices that we have for the chronology of Herodian's works are such cross-references; hence, Lehrs' pupil, A. Lentz, did not hesitate to exploit their possible chronological implications<sup>2</sup>). Perhaps a further passage can be added to those adduced by Lentz for Herodianic chronology:

Et. Gen. (AB) s.v. ἦδος: ... ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἡδονῆ κατὰ μετασχηματισμόν· τὸ γὰρ ἡδονῆ δασυνόμενον (δ. sscr. add. B<sup>1</sup>) μετασχηματίζεται εἰς τὸ ἦδος φιλούμενον, ὥσπερ τὸ ἡμέρα δασυνόμενον μετασχηματίζεται εἰς τὸ ἡμαρ φιλούμενον καὶ (καὶ B om. A) τὸ ἅμα δασυνόμενον (δ. A μετασχηματίζεται B) εἰς τὸ ἄμυδις φιλούμενον οὕτως Ἑρωδιανὸς ἐν τῇ (τῇ om. B) Ἰλιακῇ (Ἰλ. A Ἰλιαδῆ B) προσωδία (2, 30, 22 Lentz = sch. A ad A 576). ἐν δὲ τῷ Συναποσίῳ (fr. 2: 2, 904, 22 Lentz) φησὶν ὅτι (ὅτι B om. A) τὸ ἦδος βούλονται τινες δασύνειν· ἐκρίναμεν δὲ (post δὲ verb. γη sscr. add. B<sup>1</sup>) τοῦτως (οὗτ [cd.] A cd. inc. B leg. αὐτό?) μᾶλλον (μ. A om. B) φιλοῦν, ἐπεὶ τὰ εἰς ὄσ λήγοντα οὐδέτερα δυσύλλαβα ἀρχόμενα ἀπὸ φύσει μακροῦς φιλοῦσθαι θέλει, οἷον αἰσχος, εὐχος, εἶδος· οὕτως οὖν καὶ ἦδος φιλωτέον (cf. EM 419, 29).

I suspect that the aorist ἐκρίναμεν in the fragment of the *Symposium* refers to a past decision on the breathing of ἦδος, a decision which would have been taken at the time of the composition of the Ἰλιακῆ προσωδία (which precedes the Καθολικῆ προσωδία; cf. on O 338: ... περὶ ὧν εἰρήσεται ἡμῖν ἐν τοῖς Περι καθολικῆς προσωδίας, cited by Lentz, p. XIV). If this is correct, the sequence *Il. pros.-Somp.* can be added to the discussion of the chronology of Herodian's works in Lentz, pp. XIII–XV.

1) Karl Lehrs, *Quaestiones Epicae* (Regimontii Prussorum, 1837), pp. 37ff.

2) *Herodiani Technici Reliquiae*, collegit disposuit emendavit explicavit Augustus Lentz, *Grammatici Graeci*, 3, 1 (Lipsiae, 1867), XIII–XV, hereafter cited in the text.

## 2. Herodian on σφῶ (2, 30, 19 Lentz = Il. Pros. A 574)

A) σφῶ: τοῦτο πρὸς ἔμφρασιν τῶν προσώπων. πρωτόθετον δὲ αὐτὴν ἀντωνυμίαν ὁ Ἡρωδιανὸς καλεῖ (2, 30, 19–21 Lentz), καὶ οὐκ ἀπὸ τοῦ σφῶϊ· διὸ δέξνεται· τὸ γὰρ ᾠ τῶν δυνικῶν ἀπέστραπται τὴν περισπωμένην (Epimerismi Homerici on A 574).

B) σφῶ: πρωτόθετον αὐτὴν φησιν Ἡρωδιανός (2, 30, 19), οὐκ ἀπὸ τοῦ σφῶϊ· διὸ δέξνεται· τὸ γὰρ ᾠ τῶν δυνικῶν ἀπέστραπται τὴν περισπωμένην (sch. bT on A 574a Erbse).

These two passages, in each of which the grammarian Aelius Herodian is cited by name, present a clear and consistent doctrine about the form σφῶ attested in Iliad A 574. It is therefore surprising that Herodian's opinions on the subject have often been misunderstood by reputable scholars. Readers of Lentz's standard edition of Herodian's works will encounter the doctrine in this rather different form:

σφῶ: οὐ πρωτόθετον αὐτὴν φησιν Ἡρωδιανός. δυνικὸν ἀπὸ τῆς σφῶϊ· διὸ δέξνεται· τὸ γὰρ ᾠ τῶν δυνικῶν ἀπέστραπται τὴν περισπωμένην (2, 30, 19).

In Lentz's note on the passage we read: "οὐ πρωτόθετον pro πρωτόθετον et δυνικὸν pro οὐκ dedit L(ehrs), qui confert Io. Al. p. 23." The relevant passage of the Herodianic epitome by Ioannes Alexandrinus<sup>3)</sup> is as follows:

C) Αἱ δυνικαὶ πρότον καὶ δευτέρον κοινὰ καὶ ἀπαθεῖς βαρύνονται, νῶϊ, σφῶϊ. καὶ αἰτιατικῇ ταύτας κατὰ ἀποβολὴν τοῦ ἰ μονοσυλλάβως Ἀθηναῖοι προφέρουσι, νῶ, σφῶ, οὐκ ἔτι περισπωμένως, καίτοι τῷ λόγῳ τῆς ἀποκοπῆς ὀφειλούσας περισπᾶσθαι, ὡς τὸ Ποσειδῶ, κνκεῶ· ἀλλ' οὐδὲν δυνικῶν εὐθείας πτώσεως περισπᾶται· ὅθεν ὠξύνθησαν μετὰ τὴν ἀποκοπὴν. αἱ δὲ τούτων γενικαί, νῶϊν, σφῶϊν, προπερισπῶνται (23, 23–30 Di.).

The doctrine here presented by no means conflicts with that of the Epim. Hom. and the scholium (A and B above). Herodian carefully distinguishes between the nominative and accusative forms: the nominative σφῶ of A 574 is to be regarded as a πρωτόθετον (A, B); on the other hand, the accusative σφῶ (attested O 146) results from loss of ἰ, but has an acute, rather

3) *ΙΩΑΝΝΟΥ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΕΩΣ ΤΟΝΙΚΑ ΠΑΡΑΓΓΕΛΜΑΤΑ, ΑΙΔΙΟΥ ΗΡΩΔΙΑΝΟΥ ΠΕΡΙ ΣΧΗΜΑΤΩΝ*, ed. Guilelmus Dindorf (Lipsiae, 1825).

than the expected circumflex, accent by analogy with the nominative (C)<sup>4</sup>). There is, then, no need for violent alteration of the text of A and B in order to achieve consistency. Cobet<sup>5</sup>) makes a similar mistake when he juxtaposes B with sch. T on O 146b Erbse (σφῶ: τῆς σφῶϊ ἀποκοπή. ...) and remarks: "Non satis sibi constat, ut vides: sed sic solet Herodianus οὐ τὰ αὐτὰ περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν λέγειν." Again, the difference is that in O 146 the accusative σφῶ is under discussion, whereas in A 574 it is the nominative; passage C (above) fully explains the difference in treatment<sup>6</sup>).

### 3. On the Source of Epim. Hom. on A 572

... εἰς δὲ τὴν Καθόλου (1, 398, 8 Lentz) εὔρον οὕτως· ἔστιν ἦρ, ἢ ἐπικουρία, καὶ δξύνεται, καὶ ἦ γενικὴ ἦρός καὶ ἡ αἰτιατικὴ ἦρα καὶ ἐν συνθέσει ἐπίηρα. Ἀρίσταρχος δὲ ὑφ' ἐν κατ' ὀρθὴν σημασίαν λέγει τὸ ἐπίηρα (Epim. Hom. on A 572).

The text is quoted above in the form in which it was printed in Cramer's *editio princeps*<sup>7</sup>). It is not questioned that the words ἔστιν ἦρ ... ἐν συνθέσει ἐπίηρα are derived from the *Καθολικὴ προσωδία* of Herodian. The problem concerns rather the last sentence (Ἀρίσταρχος ... τὸ ἐπίηρα). In the corresponding place in sch. A on A 572 we read:

Ἀρίσταρχος δὲ ὑφ' ἐν κατ' ὀρθὴν σημασίαν †τὸ ἐπίηρα, καὶ ἐπεκράτησεν ἢ Ἀριστάρχου, καίτοι λόγον οὐκ ἔχουσα.  
σημασίαν τὸ ἐπίηρα] σημασίαν, ἐπίηρα Erbse

4) Apollonius Dyscolus *pron.* 87, 17 Schneider had considered and rejected the hypothesis of two θέματα and had concluded instead that νῶ and σφῶ (without distinction of case) were apocopated and οὐκέτι περιεσπᾶσθησαν, κατάληξιν δυϊκὴν ἀναδεξάμεναι. ἄλλως τε τὰ εἰς τῶ λήγοντα πτωτικά, κλίσεως τυγχάνοντα, οὐποτε περισπασμὸν ἀνεδέξατο. One wishes that Herodian's reasons for departing from his father on this point had been preserved.

5) C. G. Cobet, *Miscellanea Critica* (Lugduni Batavorum, 1876), p. 260.

6) It is hardly surprising if later compilers obscured Herodian's careful distinctions and thus made it appear as though he had contradicted himself; cf., e. g., EM 609, 46: Ἀλλὰ λέγει ὁ τεχνικός, ὅτι, εἰ ἀπὸ τοῦ νῶϊ καὶ σφῶϊ συνεκότη (sc. νῶ καὶ σφῶ), ὠφελεῖ περισπᾶσθαι, a statement fully in accord with his treatment of nominative σφῶ as a πρωτόθετος; EM 609, 51, on the other hand, evidently refers to the accusative forms: Λέγει δὲ ὁ τεχνικός, ὅτι ἀπὸ τοῦ νῶϊ καὶ σφῶϊ γέγονε κατὰ συγκοπήν τοῦ ι, καὶ δξύνεται ἀναλόγως· καὶ γὰρ τὸ ἐν τοῖς δυϊκοῖς τῶ ἀποστρέφεται τὴν περισπωμένην τάσων (cf. Et. Gen. AB, in which only the latter doctrine is ascribed to Herodian).

7) *Anecdota Graeca e codd. mss. bibliothecae regiae Parisiensis*, ed. J. A. Cramer, 3 (Oxford, 1841), 366, 19–22.

The last sentence (καὶ ἐπεκράτησεν ... ἔχουσα) is not derived from the Epim. and, as Lehrs has shown<sup>8</sup>), is not likely to be Herodianic. The bT scholia at this point have simply: Ἀρίσταρχος δὲ ὕφ' ἔν. Now *ceteris paribus* Aristarchian doctrine on a problem of *μερισμῶς* (word-division) in the Epim. Hom. is likely to derive from the | Ἰλιακῆ προσφθία of Herodian. Our passage, however, has not been included among the fragments of that work because both Lehrs and Lentz felt the phrase *κατ' ὄρθην σημασίαν* to be un-Herodianic<sup>9</sup>). One additional witness to the text of Epim. Hom. on A 572 can now be cited, however, namely Cod. Oxon. Novi Colleg. 298, which in this place reads:

Ἀρίσταρχος δὲ ὕφ' ἔν κατορθοῖ τὴν σημασίαν λέγει τὸ ἐπίρρημα.

The 'scholia-epimerismoi' of O are a peculiar mixture, carelessly copied (note *ἐπίρρημα* for *ἐπίηρα*) but from an exemplar of a certain value, so that sometimes corrections of Cod. Coisl. 387 (P, on which Cramer's *editio princeps* is based) can be obtained from it<sup>10</sup>). In this passage note that *κατορθοῖ* as written in O (*κατορθοῖ*) could easily be confused with *κατορθῆν* written *κατορθ<sup>θ</sup>* or with *κατορθῶν* written *κατορθ<sup>θ</sup>* (in fact, in this place P, whose scribe is commonly conscientious in adding apostrophes and breathings, has merely *κατορθ*). I suspect that the true reading may be:

Ἀρίσταρχος δὲ ὕφ' ἔν κατορθῶν τὴν σημασίαν λέγει τὸ ἐπίηρα.  
If so, we can vindicate this material for Herodian's Ἰλιακῆ προσφθία<sup>11</sup>).

4. On Epim. Hom. *An. Ox.* 1, 24, 25  
(~ Et. Gud. 30, 15 Stef.)

Epim. Hom. *κατ. στοιχ.* s.v. ἀθέριζον present the following text:

ἀθέριζον: μεταφορικῆ ἢ λέξις ἀπὸ μεταφορᾶς τῶν ἀθέρων,

8) Cf. Lehrs ap. Lentz (n. 2 *supra*), 1, LXXVIII note; eundem, *De Aristarchi Studiis Homericis*<sup>3</sup> (Lipsiae, 1882), p. 110.

9) Cf. Lehrs ap. Lentz (see preceding note).

10) Cf. the discussion of this MS in *Epimerismoi on Iliad A* 1-129, ed A.R. Dyck, diss. (Chicago, 1975), pp. 7ff., 11-12, 15.

11) On the use of *κατορθῶ* and *κατορθοῦσθαι* in the works of Apollonius Dyscolus and Herodian, cf. Jacob Wackernagel, *De pathologiae veterum initiiis*, Diss. (Basel, 1876), pp. 50-51 = *Kleine Schriften*, 3 (Göttingen, 1979), 1476-77.

ἤγονν τῶν ἀσταχῶν τῶν ἐκ τῆς ἄλωνος ἀπορριπτομένων οἰονεὶ  
ἢ μὴ θεριζομένη καὶ πρὸς χρεῖαν συναγομένη ἀλλ' ἀποβαλλομένη...<sup>12)</sup>  
ἀθέρων Pa ἀθη Oa ἐκ τῆς ἄλωνος Pa ἐν τῇ ἄλω Oa

De Stefani detected the corruption and in the corresponding passage of Et. Gud., which here derives from Epim. Hom., proposed the following solution:

ἀθέριζον: ἀπεδοκίμαζον μεταφορικῇ ἢ λέξις, ἀπὸ μεταφορᾶς  
τῶν ἀθέρων, ἤγονν τῶν ἀσταχῶν τῶν ἐκ τῆς ἄλω ἀπορριπτομέ-  
νων <ἀθέρες γὰρ> οἰονεὶ οἱ μὴ θεριζόμενοι καὶ πρὸς χρεῖαν συνα-  
γόμενοι, ἀλλ' ἀποβαλλόμενοι<sup>13)</sup>.

ἢ μὴ θεριζομένη cwz ἀγομένη ἀλλ' ἀποβαλλομένη wz et (προ-  
προ ἀπο-) c in ras.

It is not very difficult to assume loss of ἀθέρες γὰρ or change of  
οἱ to ἦ by etacism; however, it is hard to believe that οἱ has  
chanced to become ἦ not once but four times in a single passage:  
ἢ μὴ θεριζομένη, συναγομένη, ἀποβαλλομένη; nor is it easy to see  
why a scribe should have deliberately altered οἱ to ἦ. One is left  
with the impression that a noun must have dropped out, but  
perhaps a feminine singular rather than a masculine plural. What  
noun needs to be supplied can be seen from Eust. 100, 17:

Ἴστέον δὲ ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἀθερίζειν καὶ ἰχθὺς ἢ ἀθερίνα ἔοικε λέ-  
γεσθαι. ἀθερίζεται γὰρ πῶς καὶ αὐτὴ διὰ τὸ εὐτελές.

Perhaps, then, in our passage after ἀπορριπτομένων such words  
as ὅθεν λέγεται καὶ ἰχθὺς ἢ ἀθερίνα have fallen out and the follow-  
ing οἰονεὶ ἢ μὴ θεριζομένη κτλ. should refer to the ἀθερίνα.

Los Angeles

Andrew Dyck

12) *Anecdota Graeca e codd. manuscriptis bibliothecarum Oxoniensium*,  
descripsit J. A. Cramer, 1 (Oxford, 1835), 24, 23–26; Pa = alphabetical  
Epim. Hom. in Cod. Coisl. 387, X. cen.; Oa = alphabetical Epim. Hom. in  
Cod. Nov. Coll. 298, first half, XIV. cen.; cf. op. cit. (n. 10 supra), pp. 6 ff.

13) *Etymologicum Gudianum quod vocatur*, recensuit et apparatus criti-  
cum indicesque adiecit Ed. Aloysius De Stefani, 1 (Lipsiae, 1909), 30, 13–16.