

A NEW GREEK GRAMMARIAN

In his exposition of MS Vat. gr. 2226 (V) in 1888,¹ Leopold Cohn brought to light two consecutive grammatical treatises, both attributed to Aelius Herodian: the *Περὶ ἡμαρτημένων λέξεων* (here *loc. prav.*),² containing seventy paragraphs, and the *Φιλέταιρος* (here *Philet.*) with 312 glosses. Both had been published in part: fifty-four paragraphs of *loc. prav.* by G. Hermann in 1801 from MS Mon. gr. 529 (M)³ and a version of fifty-nine paragraphs by J. Cramer under the title of *Περὶ τῶν ζητούμενων κατὰ κλίσιν παντὸς λόγου μερῶν*.⁴ Glosses 1–78 of *Philet.* were published by J. Pierson (1759)⁵ from a copy of MS Par. gr. 2552 (P).

In his edition of *Philet.* (1954), A. Dain⁶ seized upon Cohn's discovery in Vat. gr. 2226 and pointed to other instances of the two 'Herodianic' works appearing together. Dain also used MS Par. suppl. 70 (Q) and the original MS (P) of Pierson's edition. He followed Cohn in questioning the attribution to Herodian, but like Lehrs⁷ and Lentz,⁸ the editors of Herodian, assumed the likelihood of underlying Herodianic material.

Early use of the two works

Describing the difference between *φιλοπότης* and *φιλοπώτης*, the *Etymologicum Magnum* (794.34) cites *loc. prav.* 28 – οὕτως Ἡρωδιανὸς εἰς τὰ ζητούμενα τῶν μερῶν τοῦ λόγου. Phavorinus too (1610, 13) acknowledges 'Herodian' for his entry on *παύ* (*loc. prav.* 33). Thomas Magister has frequent citations from both *loc. prav.* and *Philet.* with no mention of their author. In the *συλλογή* attributed to Manuel Moschopoulos (156^r) there is one entry from *loc. prav.* 11 and one clear example of use of *Philet.* (142^r from gl. 124), but without reference to any author. The fourteenth-century MS of Harpocration, Marc. gr. 444, contains (unacknowledged) material from both works.⁹

Thomas's citations¹⁰ can, with one exception, be traced to a later Excerpt, *ἐκ τῶν Ἡρωδιανοῦ* (Exc. 'Hdn' here), compiled from both *loc. prav.* and *Philet.*¹¹ But at Thom. 399.2 we find him reporting that 'Phrynichus' (the grammarian) thinks *χωρὶς ἡ μὴ* to be *ἀδόκιμον*. In what we have of Phrynichus¹² this is not so, but *loc. prav.* 66 does deal with the phrase in this way. Similarly, at 90.15 Thomas begins with a

¹ Leopold Cohn, 'Unedirte Fragmente aus der atticistischen Litteratur', *Rhein. Mus.* 43 (1888), 405ff.

² I am indebted to Mr J. G. Griffith for a Latin title, *de locutionum pravitatibus*, which he considers sufficiently Quintilianesque as a translation.

³ Gottfried Hermann, *De emendenda ratione Graecae grammaticae*, i (Leipzig, 1801), 301ff. Dain incorrectly gives Hermann's MS as Par. gr. 3027 (A. Dain, *Le 'Philetairos'* [Paris, 1954], p. 10).

⁴ J. Cramer, *Anecdota Graeca Oxoniensia*, iii (Oxford, 1836), pp. 246ff.

⁵ Jan Pierson, *Moeris Atticistae Lexicon... accedit Herodiani Philetaerus* (Leipzig, 1750, rev. ed. G. A. Koch, 1888).

⁶ See n. 3 above.

⁷ K. Lehrs (ed.), *Herodiani scripta tria emendatiora...* (Koenigsberg, 1848), p. 22.

⁸ A. Lentz (ed.), *Herodiani Technici Reliquiae* (Grammatici Graeci, iii.1.3, Leipzig, 1867–70), i.xv.

⁹ Edited by J. Kearney, *TAPA* 98 (1967), 205ff.

¹⁰ Thomas Magister, *Ecloga*, ed. F. Ritschl (Halle, 1832).

¹¹ This Excerpt is printed by Dain at pp. 75ff. of his edition of *Philet.* Since I hope to show that the works excerpted were not by Herodian, I put his name in quotes.

¹² E. Fischer, *Die Ekloge des Phrynichos* (Berlin–New York, 1974).

definite citation from *Philet.* 174, goes on with a phrase from Phrynichus (*Ecl.* 180), and makes attribution to Phrynichus alone. Since he seems to have used Phrynichus as much as the *Exc.* 'Hdn', this confusion is understandable. They were clearly of like value to him.

These grammarians all thought sufficiently well of our two works to make use of them. Thomas (260.10) actually puts them on a par with the ἀκριβείς τεχνικοί,¹³ and the compiler of Cod. Marc. gr. 444 drew on them as he drew on Moeris and the Aristophanic scholia. Phavorinus and the *EM* refer to *loc. prav.* (τὰ ζητούμενα τῶν μερῶν τοῦ λόγου) or to 'Herodian'.

Modern views

Later scholars have not been eager to approve of the attribution to Herodian. Pierson accepted his seventy-five *Philet.* glosses as Herodian's, and they are still cited as such in LSJ⁹. In the *Introducción a la lexicografía griega* (ed. F. R. Adrados, Madrid, 1977) Concepción Serrano Aybar attributes both works to Herodian (p. 95). But Lehrs had rejected *loc. prav.*, while conceding that it might be based on genuine Herodianic material: 'weder ist die Sprache Herodianisch, noch sind jedenfalls die Sachen von ganz Unherodianischen frei' (p. 22). In *Philet.* too 'kann eines oder das andere aus Herodian sein'. Lentz placed both of them at the head of his 'supposititious and suspect' works (i.xv). But Lentz's edition also compounded the problem, through his tendency to print as Herodian's much conjectural material gleaned from later authors. The 'true' style was hardly available for comparison.

In Cohn's discussion of MS Vat. gr. 2226 he added further grounds for rejecting Herodian's authorship. Since Atticism was a Pergamene interest, Herodian could not have been involved with it. In response, Richard Reitzenstein¹⁴ attempted to prove not only that *Philet.* was a genuine work of Herodian, but also that Herodian was an Atticist.

These critics might have substantiated their claims with more detailed comparison between our two works and those of Herodian: *loc. prav.* and *Philet.* contain fewer parallels with Herodian than with, e.g. Phrynichus, Moeris, or Lucian. When they do deal with the same word, Herodian is often more concerned with accentuation.¹⁵ Even when the advice given is the same in substance, the vocabulary differs: e.g. at gl. 241 the 'Attic' form of ἄχρειος is described as pronounced βαρυτόνως in *Philet.*, but Herodian uses the words προπαροξύνουσι (ii.441, 4 Lentz) and τὴν πρώτην ὀξύνουσι (i.136, 1 L). We also find Herodian reporting rather than condemning some usages disapproved of in *Philet.*: e.g. ἄχρῃς and μέχρῃς (gl. 69 vs. Hdn ii.101,29); εἰληχα and λέλογχα (gl. 16 vs. Hdn ii.289,30); he does not condemn εὐχαριστῶ (gl. 33 vs. Hdn ap. Choer. *Can. Theod.* ii.52,51); and contrary to the recommendation of gl. 209, he assigns ξυπᾶν to the second conjugation (Hdn ap. Choer. *Can. Theod.* ii.163,26). All in all, there is nothing especially 'Herodianic' in the two works.

Clues to the authorship

With the ascription to Herodian rejected, other clues have to be followed up in search of an author. One path to pursue is to look at those grammarians who dealt with the same, or similar, grammatical mistakes.

¹³ On this see R. Reitzenstein, *Geschichte der griechischen Etymologika* (Leipzig, 1897, repr. Amsterdam, 1964), p. 390.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 371ff.

¹⁵ Compare, e.g., *Philet.* 25, 132, 227, 241, 252 with Hdn i.190, 7; i.464,1; ii.308,30; i.135,23; i.97,17 (in Lentz).

Phrynichus

An obvious similarity exists between the *Philetaerus* and the *Eclogē* of Phrynichus, not simply in the format, a haphazard collection of grammatical hints and helps, but to some extent also in the tone – so much that Thomas Magister was led to confuse one with the other.

Both Phrynichus and our author use a characteristic (οὐκ) ἐρεῖς, οὕτως χρῆ λέγειν, ἀμάρτημα, ἀμαρτάνουσιν, although Phrynichus is more personal (σὺ λέγε), more didactic and extreme – κατὰ μηδένα τρόπον εἶπης, μηδέποτε εἶπης. There are agreements and disagreements to be found throughout, and it is among these that one chances on a pleasing link between the two.

In *Ecl.* 231 Phrynichus chides his friend Cornelianus (to whom the *Eclogē* is dedicated) for citing the pseudo-Demosthenic *In Neaeram* for an example of the word βασιλίσσα. This is exactly what we find in *Philet.* 121. And again in *Ecl.* 371 he becomes extremely sarcastic (σὺ μέντοι τῇ σεαυτοῦ πολυμαθίᾳ¹⁶) with his friend for citing a line of Aristophanes to illustrate χρέος. This same citation comes in the relevant *Philet.* gloss (146). In his edition of Phrynichus, Rutherford¹⁷ took these two references in the *Eclogē* to illustrate his view (p. 482) that ‘the two scholars were in the habit of discussing together doubtful points of Atticism’. He did not go on to identify the passages in *Philet.* because at that time only the first seventy-five glosses had been published (by Pierson in 1759).¹⁸ The relationship is clear to see:

Eclogē of Phrynichus

231 Βασιλίσσαν· Ἀλκαῖόν φασι...
καὶ Ἀριστοτέλην...εἰρηκέναι. σὺ
δὲ βασιλικὸς ἐπιστολεὺς ἀποφαν-
θεὶς ἀνάλογον τῇ σεαυτοῦ παρασκευῇ
γεννικώτατον ἡμῖν ἐκόμισας μάρτυρα
τὸν συγγράψαντα τὸν Κατὰ Νεαίρας.
ὅς διὰ τε τὰ ἄλλα ὑπωπτεύθη μὴ
εἶναι Δημοσθένους κτλ.

371 Χρέως· Ἀττικὸς ἂν φαίνοιο...
εἰ διὰ τοῦ ὦ μεγάλου χρέως λέγεις.
σὺ μέντοι τῇ σεαυτοῦ πολυμαθίᾳ
τὸν Ἀριστοφάνην διὰ τοῦ ὃ
ἐδείκνυες τὸ χρέος ἐν ταῖς
ἐτέραις Νεφέλαις εἰπόντα “ἅτᾳρ
τί χρέος ἔβα με μετὰ τὸν Πασίαν;”
ἔοικε δὲ παρωδηκῶς εἰρηκέναι,
διόπερ οὐ χρηστέον αὐτῷ.

Philetaerus

121 Βασιλίσσαν ὁ Δημοσθένης
ἐν τῷ κατὰ Νεαίρας. ἔστι
δὲ ἡ φωνὴ Μακεδόνων.

146 τὸ χρέως καὶ τὸ χρέος
ἀμφοτέρως· “ἅτᾳρ τί χρέος
ἔβα με μετὰ τὸν Πασίαν;”
Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν Νεφέλαις.

But there is still another clue. Both of the Phrynichus passages come from Part 2 of the *Eclogē*. In his earlier Part 1 we find a previous gloss on βασιλίσσα:

197 Βασιλίσσα οὐδεὶς τῶν
ἀρχαίων εἶπεν, ἀλλὰ βασιλεία
ἡ βασιλὺς.

Cornelianus read Part 1 of his friend's *Eclogē* and commented upon it. In Part 2 Phrynichus came back with a defence and a counter-attack.

¹⁶ Gellius also uses the Heraclitean phrase (Diels, *Vorsok.* 40) sarcastically: ‘illud Ephesii viri summe nobilis verbum...πολυμαθὴν νόον οὐ διδάσκει’ (*Noctes Atticae*, praef. 12) and ‘δυναί σου, inquam, doctissime virorum, ταύτης τῆς πολυμαθίας’ (*NA* 14.6.5). I am indebted to Leo Franc Holford-Strevens for these references.

¹⁷ W. G. Rutherford, *The New Phrynichos* (London, 1881).

¹⁸ Fischer (p. 41 n. 10) sees the connection of *Ecl.* 197 with Cornelianus, but does not trace it to the *Philetaerus*.

In case these two parallels seem too slender to count as evidence for the identification of a hitherto unknown author, a look at other parallels in the two works may reveal whether there are further grounds for supporting any connection. We shall contend that in the *Philetaerus* the author takes up some of the points made by Phrynichus in *Ecl.* Part 1, correcting, contradicting, or perhaps endorsing, with the addition of a literary reference. From even a limited sample of such parallels (see Appendix I), details of this method can be seen.

Pursuing the same line, we see that in Part 2 of the *Eclogē* Phrynichus in turn takes up some of the *Philetaerus* glosses – both those commenting on his Part 1 and others (e.g. *Ecl.* 197–*Philet.* 121 mentioned above). For examples, see Appendix II.

We may also consider Phrynichus' rival Pollux, to see if there is any sign of a relationship with his work, the *Onomasticon*.¹⁹

Pollux

Taking only a sample again, we find parallels in *Philet.* gls. 38, 119, 121, 127–9, 141, 148, 156, 161, 168, 175–6, 180–2, 185, 187, 195, 197, 199, 200, 217–19, 228, 261, 264, 266 (sharing the same reference), 267.

Sometimes the *Philetaerus* expands or clarifies, sometimes all there is to go on is a word in a list from the *Onomasticon*. Occasionally Pollux has more material: e.g. Poll. 2.9 and 18 have *μειρακίσκος* and *μειρακίσκη* (cf. Ael. D. μ 12, *μειρακίσκος*), lacking in *Philet.* 107. Some of this Pollux material is used in *Philet.* in corrections or suggestions made to Phrynichus' *Eclogē* Part 1: on that word *βασίλισσα* *Philet.* 121 inclines to Poll. 8.90 (and others) rather than to Phrynichus; *μασχάλη* from Poll. 2.139 is used to correct or amplify *Eclogē* 169. Gloss 279 uses Pollux on *μονόφθαλμος* against Phrynichus; and gl. 281 tallies with Poll. 7.67–8 against Ammonius 215.

Cornelianus does occasionally correct Pollux or disagree with him: thus gl. 118 on *κοτταβίζειν* has some differences from Poll. 6.109–11; and gl. 120, on the gender of *κανοῦς/κανοῦν* opposes Poll. 7.176.

To other passages of Pollux the *Philetaerus* adds a new point, not necessarily in condemnation: e.g. gl. 116 amplifies and gives a reference to Demosthenes; 166 adds a ref. to Herodotus; 194 adds a Diocles ref.; 210 adds a Sophocles ref.; 213 adds *ἐπίκαινα* and *ἐπεργα*; 228 adds refs. to Aristophanes and Menander; 249 adds a point on *πολιτεύτης/δημήγορος*; 190 discusses the noun instead of the verb (Poll. 5.102).

In *loc. prav.*, §2 echoes Poll. 3.30; §9 draws upon Poll. 1.230; §24 adds refinements on *φакή* (Poll. 6.60); and §29 corrects the accentuation of the word discussed by Pollux in 1.14.

But the most pleasing feature of the Pollux connection for anyone interested in our author is the finding that in Bk 10 of the *Onomasticon* Pollux takes up some of the points made in the *Philetaerus*.

Pollux does not invariably, in Bk 10, add to parallels with a word in the *Philetaerus*: e.g. Poll. 6.87 had as much, if not more, on *κοχλιάριον/κοχλιώρυχον* as *Philet.* 217; in 10.89 he merely has *κοχλιωρύχοις* in a list. On the other hand, we see a nice sequence at times – e.g. to Poll. 4.19 on *ἀργυροθήκη* *Philet.* 194 adds a corrective and a reference from Diocles, then in 10.152 Pollux comes back with a further reference from Antiphanes.

In view of Cornelianus' position as *ἐπιστολεύς* (see further below), it is tempting to see the appointment of Pollux to the Chair of Rhetoric at Athens as influenced by

¹⁹ Pollux, *Onomasticon*, ed. E. Bethe (Leipzig, 1900).

<i>Philetaerus</i>	Pollux 10
85	49 adds βλαυτία.
93	42 incorporates <i>Philet.</i> gloss.
108	89 adds ref. to Pherecrates.
120	65 reiterates the neuter of κανοῦν.
158	165 adds Aristophanes ref.
175	123 adds Homeric ref.
185	91 adds refs. to Eupolis and Pherecrates.
194	152 adds Antiphanes ref.
208	160 perhaps in response to <i>Philet.</i> gl.
226	121 adds Aristophanes ref.
248	51 perhaps in response to <i>Philet.</i>

Cornelianus in favour of the grammarian whose opinions were more congenial to him.

We shall return to Phrynichus and Pollux (below, p. 529), but I select two more authors, passing over several (e.g. Moeris, Philemon, Lucian), with whom the parallels are frequent.

Ammonius

K. Nickau,²⁰ who prefers to ascribe what we know as the work of Ammonius to the grammarian Herennius Philo (c. A.D. 100), points out the resemblance between thirty-three Ammonius passages and their parallels in the *Philetaerus*, 'qui ad Herennii verba interdum propius accedit quam quod casui attribuas' (p. lxvi). He does, however, preserve discretion as to the precise relationship, because of uncertainty about the authorship, date, etc. of *Philet.* (see especially Nickau, pp. lxiv–lxv). He includes the *de impropriis* (his Appendix I).²¹

To Nickau's list may be added *Philet.* 96 and 271, related to Amm. 524 and 406 respectively; and *loc. prav.* 67–Amm. 48. We may also ignore Nickau's Amm. 182 and 469–70, paralleled by him with Dain's version of the *Exc.* 'Hdn' 92 and 106 (pp. 81–2 Dain), which are not in fact from *Philet.* or *loc. prav.* Amm. 489 parallels *loc. prav.* 24 (φακούς plural and φακή) and not the *Excerpt* (φακός, φακή).

Nickau gives as a prime example the obvious *Philet.* 142 matching Amm. 299, where there is a difference of one word only, παράστασις/παράστημα. A less obvious, but equally valid, example appears in *Philet.* 91 – Amm. 331, where alone among the many grammarians dealing with νανάγιον/νανάγια the two use the phrase τὸ ἐκβρασθέν.

Having seen something of our author's treatment of Phrynichus and Pollux, we may be less hesitant. The *Philet.* glosses often add to the Ammonius text, perhaps with a literary reference: e.g. *Philet.* 27 – Amm. 50 (with *Philet.* also adding ἡνίκα); *Ph.* 96 – Amm. 524; *Ph.* 97 – Amm. Suppl. 24; *Ph.* 107 – Amm. 317 (but without Ammonius' μεираκίσκος); *Ph.* 271 – Amm. 392. But our author does not compete with Amm. 120, which has three literary references already. The example of Philip is added by *Philet.* 279 to Amm. 197 (and used to counter Phrynichus, as above). On the other hand, *Philet.* 243, on ἀτέχνως/ἀτεχνῶς, paraphrases and shortens Amm. 84. On occasion the *Philetaerus* offers a correction to the Ammonian parallel: e.g. *Ph.*

²⁰ Ammonius, *de adfinium vocabulorum differentia*, ed. K. Nickau (Leipzig, 1968).

²¹ A printing error in Nickau's list (p. lxiv) has equated Amm. 83 with *Philet.* 294, whereas it should be Amm. 84 – *Philet.* 243 and then Amm. 116 – *Philet.* 294.

281 on ζώνη/ζώνιον may be a corrective to Amm. 215; *Ph.* 69 to Amm. 91; *Ph.* 155 to Amm. 139.

These comparisons incidentally suggest certain emendations to the text of both authors: e.g. *Ph.* 96 via Amm. 524 (add ἀντὶ τοῦ ὀνήσασθαι); Amm. 142 would be improved by διαστροφῶν, as at *Ph.* 130; and *impropr.* 36 by μετ' ἀπατῆς, as at *Ph.* 270 (cf. Antiatt. 116.16).

It is apparent that our author is using, and sometimes embroidering, the earlier work. At times he incorporates 'Ammonius' or *de impropr.* phrases into his comments on Phrynichus' *Eclogē* Part I.

The Antiatticist

Turning to the Antiatticist,²² we find that his glosses sometimes complement paragraphs of *loc. prav.* and *Philet.* glosses (see Appendix III). Since the dating of the Antiatticist is in some doubt, and he is claimed by some as a 'source' for Phrynichus,²³ it might seem perverse to claim that his work postdates our treatises. But for example, Antiatt.'s condemnation of λαβῶν τὸν ἵππον (106.14) looks very much as if it is directed towards *Philet.* 258. The possibility that Antiatt. is commenting on *Philet.*, and not vice versa, is strengthened by the number of literary references added by Antiatt. to the various glosses. (At the same time it may be conceded that where there is a similar gloss in Phrynichus' *Eclogē*, Antiatt. appears to have that in mind rather than the one in *Philet.* e.g. κρούειν/κόπτειν in Antiatt. 101.22–*Ecl.* 148 as against ψόφειν/κόπτειν of *Philet.* 112.) Parallels with *Philet.* 2, 5, 14, 112, 121, 136, and 294 afford criticism, add literary references, etc. but they also have parallels in Phrynichus. Again, the wording suggests that it was Phrynichus rather than our author that the Antiatticist had in mind.

Nor is it disputed that most of the glosses held in common are dealt with by other grammarians (e.g. Ael. D. for *Philet.* 96, Moeris for 90, Pollux for 161), but there are enough links between *Philet.* and *loc. prav.* and the Antiatticist to validate consideration of some relationship between their authors.

The author

We have already seen that the author of the *Philetaerus* was the Cornelianus addressed by Phrynichus in the *Eclogē* (pp. 526–7 above) and that he was very probably a friend and supporter of Pollux. We learn from Phrynichus (g11. 231, 357, 371, 394 and the dedication) that he was ἐπιστολεύς and σύμβουλος 'to kings' (βασιλεῖς), that he liked to be known for his erudition, and that he admired Menander. I shall suggest that Phrynichus' attacks against that poet caused Cornelianus to make changes in revising his work, as there are few references to Menander in the present text. And he improved the Greek language of officialdom.

According to Naechster and Bowersock²⁴ it was during the joint rule of Marcus Aurelius and Commodus (A.D. 177–80) that Cornelianus was appointed *ab epistulis*, following Tertullus, which puts him at the latter end of the 170s. This suits the dating of Phrynichus' *Eclogē* (c. 178, according to Fischer, p. 44). He is represented by Phrynichus as wielding much power, but the imminence of the appointment to the

²² Ed. I. Bekker, *Anecdota Graeca*, i (Berlin, 1814), pp. 75ff.

²³ e.g. by Fischer, p. 39; cf. K. Alpers, *Das attizistische Lexicon des Orus* (Berlin, 1981), p. 108 n. 5.

²⁴ M. N. Naechster, *De Pollucis et Phrynichi controversiis* (Diss. Leipzig, 1908); G. W. Bowersock, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1969).

Chair of Rhetoric at Athens may account for some flattering exaggeration. Of his literary interests there can be no doubt. And if we accept that he both held the position and wrote grammatical treatises, his influence on other grammarians is easier to comprehend.

There have been attempts²⁵ to identify Cornelianus with a friend of the orator Fronto, referred to in a letter about the year 146 (*ad Amic.* 1.1) – the one who studied with Fronto and is described by him as ‘ingenio libero et liberali...litterarum studio et bonarum artium elegantia’ (cf. *ibid.* 1.ii). This would be possible if the Imperial Secretary was in his fifties or sixties. But if we take the norm for the age of the Secretary as about thirty-five or forty,²⁶ he would not be the Sulpicius Cornelianus mentioned by Fronto. Another, earlier, Cornelianus is addressed by Pliny (*Ep.* 6.31) and Stobaeus attests a Cornelianus as writer of a *κατὰ Βερενίκης* (3.4.45). Cornelian in office include L. Attidius (*PIR* 1 A 1341; 2 C 1305), mentioned in the *Vita Marci* (8.6), suffect consul before 151 and later governor of Syria. A Cornelianus contemporary with our author was suffect in 180 or 181 (*PIR* 1 A 1342; 2 C 1304). Identification in the absence of further evidence must remain incomplete. (There are no grounds for suggesting with Klebs that he was father of the Metrophanes ‘sophistae Lebadea oriundi’ in *PIR* 2 C 1303.)

A faint gleam of illumination may be discerned in a passage at the end of the *Philetaerus* in the MS Vat. gr. 2226. The scribe recalls material similar to that of *Philet.*, written by ‘Ἀλεξάνδρῳ τῷ κωμικῷ. Something is clearly wrong with the scribe’s memory or the recording of it. Cohn (p. 412), following Studemund, wanted to emend κωμικῷ to Κορνηλίῳ (but with Alexander Polyhistor in mind). Reitzenstein (op. cit., p. 389) preferred Alexander of Cotys, but conceded that his description might be τῷ κριτικῷ or τῷ γραμματικῷ. This last suggestion gains a little support from ‘Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ γραμματικοῦ acknowledged as one of his mentors by Marcus Aurelius (*Med.* 1.10.1) and taken to refer to Alexander of Cotys.²⁷ Here then we may have a possible teacher or colleague of our author.

Another possibility may be adduced. If the scribe is here pointing to a version of the *Philetaerus* put out under the author’s own name, before its attribution to Herodian, we may have a second name for Cornelianus – Alexander. And it would not be impossible to emend the note to read ‘Ἀλεξάνδρῳ Κορνηλιανῷ. There is no other evidence to support such a claim, but note a similar combination of names: C. Julius Alexander Berenicianus, suffect consul at the end of 116.²⁸ The name Alexander is appropriate for a graecophile, and it is a name found in the imperial family.²⁹ Aelius Herodian himself and Claudius Didymus are reminders that an imperial name might be favoured by literary men whose patrons were emperors.

Here are the passages of Phrynichus’ *Eclogē* that illustrate our description of Cornelianus.

²⁵ e.g. by E. Champlin, *Fronto and Antonine Rome* (Cambridge, Mass.–London, 1980), pp. 29–30; *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, s.v. Phrynichus Arabius.

²⁶ The view of Sir Ronald Syme (personal communication), who also points out the error in *OCD*² in calling him ‘Attidius’ (a quite different Cornelianus, *cos. suff.* in 150 and Governor of Syria).

²⁷ Another intellectual Alexander connected with Marcus was ‘the Platonist’ (*Med.* 1.1.12). Other, earlier Alexanders favoured and promoted by emperors are mentioned by Syme, *Bonner Historia Augusta Colloquium 1982–3* (1985) = *Roman Papers*, v, ed. Anthony R. Birley (Oxford, 1988), pp. 552, 556.

²⁸ *PIR* 1 A 510; cf. B 109.

²⁹ e.g. Severus (*PIR* A 510; A 1610; 2 p. xviii).

τὴν τε ἄλλην σου παιδεῖαν θαυμάζων, ἣν διαφερόντως ὑπὲρ ἅπαντας ὅσοις ἐνέτυχον πεπαίδευσαι, καὶ... τοῦτο θαυμάσας ἔχω, τὸ περὶ τῶν καλῶν καὶ δοκίμων ὀνομάτων κρίσιν. ταῦτ' ἄρα κελεύσαντός σου τὰς ἀδοκίμους τῶν φωνῶν ἀθροισθῆναι... πάσας μὲν οὐχ οἶδς τ' ἐγενόμην τὰ νῦν περιλαβεῖν... οὐ λανθάνει δὲ σέ, ὥσπερ οὐδ' ἄλλο τι τῶν κατὰ παιδεῖαν, ὡς τινες ἀποπεπτωκότες τῆς ἀρχαίας φωνῆς καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ἀμαθίαν καταφεύγοντες πορίζουσι μάρτυράς τινας τοῦ προειρησθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀρχαίων τάσδε τὰς φωνάς· ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐ πρὸς τὰ διημαρτημένα ἀφορώμεν, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὰ δοκιμώτατα τῶν ἀρχαίων. (*Ecl.* dedication, p. 60 Fischer)

σὺ δὲ βασιλικὸς ἐπιστολεὺς ἀποφανθεὶς ἀνάλογον τῇ σουτοῦ παρασκευῇ... ἐκόμισας... (*Ecl.* 231)

...σὺ μέντοι τῇ σεαυτοῦ πολυμαθίᾳ... (*Ecl.* 371)

...πρώτιστον μὲν ἐν παιδείᾳ μέγιστον ἀξίωμα ἀπάντων ἔχοντα σὲ καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐκ προκρίτων ἀποφανθέντα ὑπὸ βασιλέων ἐπιστολέα αὐτῶν. (*Ecl.* 394)

“τὰ πρόσωπα ἀμφοτέρα παρῆν”... σὺ καθαρὸς καὶ ἀρχαῖος ὢν ῥήτωρ καὶ μόνος... ἐπανάγων εἰς τὸ ἀρχαῖον σχῆμα καὶ δόκιμον τὴν ῥητορικὴν, οὐ μόνον αὐτὸς δυσχεραίνων οὐδεπώποτε ἐχρήσω τῷ ὀνόματι, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἐκώλυσας χρῆσασθαι, ἐξελληνίζων καὶ ἐξαττικίζων τὸ βασιλικὸν δικαστήριον καὶ διδάσκαλος καθιστάμενος οὐ μόνον αὐτῶν τῶν λόγων, οἷους χρὴ λέγειν, <ἀλλὰ καὶ> σχήματος καὶ βλέμματος καὶ φωνῆς καὶ στάσεως. τοιγαροῦν σε τῶν μεγίστων ἀξιώσαντες οἱ Ῥωμαίων βασιλεῖς ἀνέθεσαν τὰ Ἑλλήνων ἅπαντα πράγματα διοικεῖν, παριδρυσάμενοι σύμβουλον ἑαυτοῖς, λόγῳ μὲν ἐπιστολέα ἀποφύγαντες, ἔργῳ δὲ συνεργὸν ἐλόμενοι τῆς βασιλείας. (*Ecl.* 357)

“σύσσημον”... τί πάσχουσιν οἱ τὸν Μένανδρον μέγαν ἄγοντες καὶ αἶροντες ὑπὲρ τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν ἅπαν... τὰ ἄκρα τῶν Ἑλλήνων ὁρᾷ μανικῶς περὶ τὸν κωμωδοποιὸν σπουδάζοντα, πρώτιστον μὲν ἐν παιδείᾳ μέγιστον ἀξίωμα ἀπάντων ἔχοντά σε καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐκ προκρίτων ἀποφανθέντα ὑπὸ βασιλέων ἐπιστολέα αὐτῶν... ἄγε οὖν ὅπως λύσης μου τὴν ἐν τοιαύτῃ δυσχερείᾳ τῶν ὥτων ἀπορίαν· οὐ γὰρ περιόψεσθαι σε ἡγοῦμαι ἐρήμην ὀφλόντα σου τὰ παιδικὰ Μένανδρον. (*Ecl.* 394)

Cornelianus is linked to this last passage with a grammarian, Balbus, described as *λειπόμενον πολὺ τῆς σῆς παρασκευῆς*, and with a *rhetor*, Gaianus of Smyrna, *ἄνδρα ζηλωτὴν καὶ ἐραστὴν τῆς σῆς ἐν παιδείᾳ φιλοκαλίας*. The word *σύσσημον* which begins the gloss and gives rise to Phrynichus' anger, does not appear in either of our two works, just as there is no reference to *πρόσωπα*, condemned in *Ecl.* 357. We may presume that Cornelianus used his influence to improve the language of official documents (no doubt replacing *σύσσημον* with *χαρακτήρ*) and/or that the condemned words were removed from a revision of the work.

One treatise or two?

The parallels cited above between *loc. prav.* and other grammatical works are not as compelling as our evidence for the authorship of *Philet.* But the linking of the two treatises in the Excerpts and their frequent appearance *in tandem* (with titles, although ascribed to the wrong author) contribute to the likelihood that *loc. prav.* too was written by Cornelianus.

Another, though maddeningly indecisive, hint may be found in the fact that the Excerpts³⁰ and a clear majority of the MSS containing *Philet.* have none of the glosses before gl. 73. Indeed most begin at 82. Cramer's version, perhaps an abbreviated Byzantine version, has none before gl. 97. Only MS Vat. gr. 2226 and Pierson's Par. gr. 2552 have the early glosses.

In MS Ambros. gr. 482 (E) and in Cramer's version (z, from five MSS) the title is

³⁰ Besides the *Exc.* 'Hdn' there is an anonymous Excerpt in MS Vindob. phil. gr. 172, which has selected abbreviations from *loc. prav.* 1–62, going on without a break to *Philet.* 82, with selections up to the final gl. 319. There are no titles and the material is continuous with the works that precede and follow.

virtually the same: (περὶ) τῶν ζητουμένων κατὰ τὴν κλίσιν πάντων τοῦ λόγου μερῶν. Then without any break the *loc. prav.* paragraphs are followed by gl. 82 (E) and 97 (Z). MS Par. suppl. gr. 1238 (Q) similarly has no break between the last few paragraphs of *loc. prav.* and gl. 82 of *Philet.* (untitled), though because of its fragmentary nature we have no more than six *loc. prav.* paragraphs, and no title for that either. However, at the juncture between the two treatises there is no failure in the MS, just a clear continuation.

Whereas Dain (p. 24) suggested that a large section had been 'lost' when the 'Byzantine compilation' was made, it makes more sense, in my opinion, to accept these continuous versions as closer to the original work than the arrangement of the two complete works in V, the only testimony to that arrangement, and on which Dain's edition is based. It makes more sense to observe the pattern that runs throughout the MSS in which both works are represented: nouns/adjectives, verbs, adverbs/prepositions, followed by sundry glosses. Phrynichus does not refer to any title for his friend's work, but to τῆς σῆς παρασκευῆς (*Ecl.* 394), which might well indicate a single work. He also wants less of the διημαρτημένα and more of the δοκιμώτατα τῶν ἀρχαίων (*Ecl.* dedication). It is possible that Cornelianus increased the number of positive examples – those that now appear in MSS VP. This is only a suggestion, but it would account for the 'missing' glosses of *Philet.* and help to establish the same author for both works. It is quite credible that the tidying up consisted of the division, and perhaps the expansion, of the original into the two works as we now have them in Vat. gr. 2226.

As a postscript to this speculation about the original and the newer versions, I would point out that one of the MSS, Q, differs from all the others in having a style of its own. Q has the personal λέγομεν (for λέγουσι in other MSS); ἐρεῖς (cf. Phrynichus) for ἐροῦμεν; the personal οὐκ οἶδ' ὅθεν, such phrases as παρ' Ἀττικοῖς, οἱ παλαιοί, παρὰ τοῖς ἀρχαίοις, and many versions of glosses which, though they cover the same problem in the same order as the other MSS, are couched in different phraseology or have different examples. Q also contains literary references that are absent from other MSS, including two to Menander (gl. 103 and 285) and two to the νεώτεροι (103 and 155). If the references to Menander were cut down in response to criticism of that poet by Phrynichus (see above, p. 529), we may have here an unpolished παρασκευή, or as it were a first draft of the work.

The attribution to Herodian

Cornelianus is not known as an author elsewhere than in Phrynichus' references to him. Whether he himself or his followers or later scribes put out his work under a name that was better known is impossible to say. It is a long way to go for the hypothetical corruption of his own name to Αἰλίου Ἡρωδιανοῦ, even taking into account the suggestion made above (p. 530) about Ἀλεξάνδρω. That the attribution may have not been Cornelianus' idea, but a later development, gains some credence if we recall the flattery he received from Phrynichus, as well as his apparently influential position in the Empire. Whether one of such authority would have felt it necessary to assume a 'better-known' name, we cannot tell.

APPENDIX I: PARALLELS WITH PHRYNICHUS

*Eclogē Part I**Philetaerus*

13	84 adds Theopompus ref.
28	271–2 give different examples; add Plato and the Ionic connection.
29	133 adds ἀπὸ τότε and compounds of πάλαι, with a general remark about temporal adverbs.
32	154 disagrees and adds μέσον ἡμέρας and μέσημβρία.
*33	182 incorporates one of Phrynichus' words (βῶλος) into a larger gloss (cf. <i>Ecl.</i> 51); both add to Ael. D. β 21.
39	275 adds that πεινᾶν and δυῖᾶν are Doric, with an extra note (cf. Ap. Dysc. <i>coni.</i> 229. 7).
*43	172 adds λάρυγξ (thus adding to Ael. D. φ 3, on which Phrynichus is based).
*51	182 combines it with other words (cf. <i>Ecl.</i> 33); both echo Ael. D. ρ 6, <i>Philet.</i> varying it by giving the plural.
56	168: ἀφήλιξ is answered by ἀφηλικέστερος.
58	84 adds a (wrong) ref. to Demosthenes.
76	305 expands, adding literary refs.
92	190 has noun instead of verb and adds another.
100	100 is virtually the same.
103	144 gives an alternative form of the gloss, with other synonyms.
107	279 disagrees, preferring Pollux and Ammonius.
134	215 adds ref. from Archippus and gives modern equivalent.
144	176 adds other συμ- words.
148	112 substitutes ψόφειν for κρούσαι.
155	228 contradicts, adding Aristophanes ref., with a note on μάχλος and a Menander ref. for μάχλας.
156	89 adds ref. to Cratinus.
*160	183 shortens the gloss, but introduces αἰσχύνεσθαι; both look to Ael. D. δ 34.
169	261 elaborates and adds μασχάλη (cf. on Pollux above, p. 527).
171	266 gives another definition and adds ref. to Herodotus.
*180	174 prefers τοῖς δύο (cf. Ael. D. δ 31), adding note on declension of numbers.
*181	225 adds ref. to Demosthenes and slips in usage of 'others'; both use Ael. D. δ 31–2.
183	107 elaborates, adding ref. to Menander, omitting Ael. D.'s μειρακίσκος (μ 12); Phryn. and Cornelianus both perhaps had in mind Ar. Byz. <i>περὶ ὀνομασίας ἡλικιῶν</i> .
193	177 adds a note on derivation.
*197	121 comes up with an example in Demosthenes and adds that the word is Macedonian; Poll. 8.90 and Ael. D. β 5 used against Phryn. (see Phryn.'s riposte in Part 2).
202	208 adds τῶν σκευῶν.
220	130 gives example of use of κατορθῶσαι and adds ἐπανορθῶσαι and διορθῶσαι.
226	92 merely repeats, perhaps asserting the modern use of πέπων.

A similar pattern is found in *loc. prav.*: compare *Ecl.* 2–*l.p.* 63; *Ecl.* 19–*l.p.* 42; *Ecl.* 124–*l.p.* 51; *Ecl.* 158–*l.p.* 34; *Ecl.* 182–*l.p.* 22; *Ecl.* 213–*l.p.* 27.

* Parallels with Aelius Dionysius, a source for both authors, are indicated by the asterisk.

APPENDIX II: MORE PARALLELS WITH PHRYNICHUS

Eclogē Part 2

-
- 231 is the scathing comment on *Philet.* 121.
 233 rephrases *Ph.* 136.
 239 elaborates on *Ph.* 273.
 253 expands *Ph.* 38.
 280* adds literary ref. to *Ph.* 182.
 281 confirms spelling of *πύελος* (again *Ph.* 182).
 285 adds refs. from Aristotle and Chrysippus for *Ph.* 87.
 (And see on *loc. prav.* just below.)
 291 is a variation of *Ph.* 5.
 300 introduces *φάγομαι* in response to *Ph.* 239.
 308 adds ref. from Antiphanes (*Ph.* 303).
 334 expands *Ph.* 41.
 371* attacks *Ph.* 146.
 372 adds definition of *φιλόλογος* and underlines condemnation of
φιλολογεῖν (*Ph.* 101).
 379 perhaps prompted by *Ph.* 313.
 391 condemns *λήθαργος* (*Ph.* 150), naming Menander as user of the word
 (cf. *Ecl.* 394).
 397 endorses *Ph.* 268, again with ref. to Menander's misuse of word.
-

For *loc. prav.* compare *Ecl.* 234–*l.p.* 17; *Ecl.* 285–*l.p.* 56; *Ecl.* 346–*l.p.* 20; *Ecl.* 418*–*l.p.* 67.

* Parallels with Aelius Dionysius in both authors are indicated by the asterisk, as in Appendix I.

APPENDIX III: PARALLELS WITH THE ANTIATTICIST

<i>loc. prav.</i>	Antiatticist
7	84.18 gives a Sophocles ref. for alternative form of βού.
45	93.14 adds Herodotus ref. for the compound form.
49	97.29 gives Euripides and Sophocles refs. for ζή.
52	99.16 adds Euripides ref. for θύσαι.
64	108.16 gives Herodotus ref. for μάλιστα with superlative.

Antiatt. 98.31 and 83.12 are variations on the themes of *loc. prav.* 3 and 10; Antiatt. 108.22 may be an attempt to say something different about σμύρνα or Σμύρνα (*loc. prav.* 13).

<i>Philetaerus</i>	Antiatticist
2	107.9 contradicts <i>Philet.</i> and Phrynichus, supporting μέθυσος for man (cf. Moeris 239.3).
90	100.33 suggests an alternative word.
96	78.3 adds a Demosthenes ref.
108	107.28 adds ξίφη and ref. to Plato.
116	101.16 adds a ref. to Diphilus.
130	96.25 gives an Aristophanes ref. for ἐπανορθῶσαι.
136	101 adds a literary ref.
161	107.23 modifies and adds the noun (as in Pollux).
191	106.33 gives the appropriate Sophocles ref.
209	109.32 differs on the form of the verb.
223	80.29 adds a Diphilus ref.
231	114.15 virtually disagrees with first part of <i>Philet.</i> gl.; takes up second part.
249	111.29 adds two literary refs. – Plato and Thucydides.
258	106.14 condemns <i>Philet.</i> gl.
270	116.16 adds Plato ref.; and ἐξαπατῶντα perhaps looks back to ἀπατήs.
299	103.5: same point, with change to third-person plural instead of infinitive.
303	96.11: same point.
312	82.32 disagrees and cites Sophocles.
313	116.1 corrects φοιτήτης to συμφοιτήτης.