

LANGUAGE – TEXT – LITERATURE  
ARCHETYPES, CONCEPTS, AND CONTENTS OF ANCIENT SCHOLARSHIP  
AND GRAMMAR

Language as a system and the realization of linguistic content in textual form, and more precisely in literature, constitute the core of ancient Scholarship since its foundation as a distinct discipline in the Hellenistic era. The parameters *Language – Text – Literature* in their function as immediate components of the ancient *grammatike technē*, either in their initial conception as a whole or as individual parts, form the thematic spectrum of the conference.

The conference focuses on the disciplinary profile and the dynamics of ancient Greek Scholarship, the grammatical theory included, and aims at investigating its concepts and contents from a methodological, ideological, epistemological as well as cultural perspective. The relevant chronological frame, starting from the 3rd century BC until the first centuries AD, coincides with the autonomy of the discipline which soon reached its peak. Despite this chronological limitation, the conference theme cannot ignore the historical perspective of ancient Scholarship and Grammar, in the sense of continuity or discontinuity, and its interdisciplinary character. Similarly, its branches in terms of schools and interpretative traditions are also to be taken into consideration along with the further development of the philosophy of language and literary criticism. Finally, the way the Greek concepts were perceived by the Romans in their attempt to establish the *ars grammatica* is being addressed as well, although from a narrower point of view.

The conference includes two main sections: Scholarship and Grammatical Theory. An attempt to show how these two fields correlate and interact is highly desirable. Apart from issues such as the identity and the tasks of the *grammatikoi*, the role of the addressee, the didactic aspect as well as the problems relating to the matter of technical literature, the following topics are also particularly relevant to the philological context: reflexion on poetics, literary genres and literary criticism, models of interpretation, and methodological problems regarding text editing. In the area of linguistic theory, the emphasis is on the issue of language correctness – in relation to literary interpretation but also independently of the literary context – and on the pairs: ‘The Language of literature vs. Actual language use’ and ‘Language change and linguistic norm’.

**ABSTRACTS**  
**(in alphabetical order)**

1. WOLFRAM AX (University of Cologne)

*Quintilians Grammatik (inst. 1,4,1-9) und ihre Bedeutung für die Geschichte der römischen Grammatik.*

Quintilians Abriss der *grammaticé* (*téchne grammatiké*, *ars grammatica*) in seiner *institutio oratoria* (1, 4, 1- 9) ist die zeitlich früheste und zugleich inhaltlich und strukturell zuverlässigste Darstellung der römischen *ars grammatica*. Der Vortrag versucht, in die heutigen philologischen Probleme der Erschließung des Textes einzuführen und seine Bedeutung für die Geschichte der römischen Grammatik zu bestimmen.

Quintilian`s survey of *grammaticé* (*téchne grammatiké*; *ars grammatica*) in his *institutio oratoria* (1, 4, 1 – 9) is the earliest and at the same time the most reliable account of content and structure of the Roman *ars grammatica*. In my paper I will try to introduce in today`s philological problems of this text and to determine its importance for the history of Roman grammar.

## 2. MARC BARATIN (University of Lille III)

*Genre et indétermination chez Priscien: notions philosophiques et interprétations grammaticales*

Le couple genre / espèce est présent dans la grammaire scolaire antique : on le trouve dans la *Tekhnê* de Denys le Thrace, pour caractériser certaines catégories du nom, «ceux qui peuvent se diviser en plusieurs espèces», comme «animal» ou «plante» vs «ceux qui proviennent de la division d`un genre», comme «bœuf» ou «olivier». Apollonios fait allusion à la catégorie du nom générique (Synt. IV 68), tout en superposant peut-être, en partie au moins, ce qui est «générique» et ce qui est «commun» (cf. Synt. I 31). Quoiqu`il en soit, la notion est rare chez Apollonios. Priscien en revanche en fait un usage abondant, qui repose sur une théorie tout à fait originale de la *généricité*. Il considère en effet comme une catégorie particulière les «noms» qui/*quis*, *qualis*, *quantus*, etc., et les adverbes *ubi*, *quo*, *unde*, *qua*, *quando*, *cur*, etc., en les qualifiant de noms et d`adverbes génériques (*nomina / aduerbia generalia*). Ce trait homogénéise un ensemble de termes issus de parties du discours différentes et pourvus de fonctions variées, et qui ne sont pas rapprochés les uns des autres chez les prédécesseurs de Priscien.

Pourquoi Priscien a-t-il créé cette catégorie ? Le nécessaire reclassement en latin des «articles postpositifs» d`Apollonios, et la théorie des pronoms que Priscien emprunte à son modèle grec, ne suffisent pas à en rendre compte. Il est plus pertinent de mettre cette innovation en perspective avec l`héritage doctrinal stoïcien, d`une part, et d`autre part avec l`arrière plan philosophique scolaire marqué par la vulgarisation de Porphyre.

### 3. LOUIS BASSET (University of Lyon)

#### *Apollonios entre koinè et langue épique*

Une *tekhnè* grammaticale d'époque hellénistique se veut la description raisonnée de la langue des poètes, plus particulièrement de la langue épique. Il s'agit de faire comprendre les textes épiques aux contemporains. Cette description est faite à partir de l'usage de la *koinè* hellénistique. Le *tekhnikos* a ainsi à mettre en œuvre une double compétence linguistique, ce qui le conduit souvent, en cas de divergence, à faire une paraphrase en langue commune du texte épique. Cette double compétence conduit à des attitudes diverses, que je me propose d'illustrer principalement à partir du traitement de l'« article » dans la Syntaxe d'Apollonios.

Le plus souvent les divergences sont facilement identifiables, parce qu'elles sont morphologiques ou parce qu'elles modifient nettement la structure syntaxique de la phrase. Le grammairien a alors à faire un premier choix : accepter la divergence observée ou la rejeter comme fautive. Pour être acceptée, l'irrégularité doit être, régulière, ou du moins fréquente, chez les bons auteurs. Mais même en ce cas, l'excès d'irrégularité par combinaison avec une autre irrégularité peut entraîner un rejet plus ou moins ferme. D'ailleurs, une explication raisonnée est souvent recherchée comme argument supplémentaire pour accepter une divergence.

L'usage de la *koinè* étant pris comme norme même pour le poète, une divergence acceptée n'est que très rarement interprétée comme la marque d'une évolution linguistique. Le *tekhnikos* impute habituellement les divergences de la langue épique à des licences poétiques. Même quand il connaît le caractère dialectal d'une variation, il y voit un écart à partir de la *koinè*, un choix du poète. Ces écarts constituent un système de figures, souvent sur un plan uniquement formel. Mais il peut s'agir aussi d'un écart fonctionnel, ainsi quand un mot change de catégorie. Ce dernier type de « figure », plus raisonné, me semble relever d'une meilleure compréhension de la divergence.

Enfin, il peut arriver que la double compétence du *tekhnikos* soit plus ou moins mise en défaut. Une divergence d'ordre sémantique ou syntaxique peut ne pas perturber nettement la forme et le sens de la phrase. En ce cas, le *tekhnikos* risque de ne pas la voir. L'explication raisonnée d'un usage peut alors souffrir d'inconséquences liées à la confusion des deux états de langue. Ou bien le *tekhnikos* prête à la langue épique un fait de langue qui appartient à la *koinè* (par exemple l'existence d'un véritable article défini). Ou bien, il fait pour la langue commune une description qui trouverait une meilleure justification dans la langue épique (par exemple la conception de l'article défini comme « anaphorique », ou l'explication du syntagme nominal avec

« article » et adjectif épithète). Le tekhnikos peut être ainsi contraint à contredire plus ou moins consciemment sa théorie.

#### 4. MARGARETHE BILLERBECK (University of Fribourg)

*Stephanos von Byzanz als Grammatiker*

Die Arbeit an der neuen Ausgabe des Stephanos von Byzanz sowie die abgeschlossene Fragmentausgabe des Grammatikers Epaphroditos haben gezeigt, dass im Bereich der Grammatik die Quellenforschung der Ethnika neu angegangen bzw. die bisherigen Resultate korrigiert und aufdatiert werden müssen. Auf diese Notwendigkeit hatte vor rund achtzig Jahren bereits E. Honigmann im entsprechenden Abschnitt seines RE-Artikels über Stephanos hingewiesen (III A 2 [1929] 2379); doch eine solche Studie bleibt ein Desiderat.

Der geplante Vortrag kann diese Lücke zwar nicht füllen; aber nach Editionsabschluss der ersten neun Buchstaben des Lexikons, also einem guten Drittel des Gesamtwerks, drängt sich ein erster Überblick im Sinn einer kritischen Bestandesaufnahme auf. Folgende Punkte sollen zur Sprache kommen:

Die Herodian-Zitate in der Epitome der Ethnika

Stephanos und die 'Kanones'

Grammatiker-Kontroversen im Spiegel der Ethnika

#### 5. PETER BING (Emory University)

*Afterlives of a Tragic Poet: The Hypothesis in the Hellenistic Reception of Euripides*

The narrative hypotheses of Euripides' tragedies have generally been taken by scholars as mere plot-summaries, aimed at readers whose interest lay in mythology rather than in the Euripidean plays themselves. That is, they are seen as mythography, operating mainly apart from the plays. In this paper, I test that scholarly consensus, and argue that the hypotheses' chief aim is to introduce readers to the tragedies of Euripides, and that they reflect this poet's enormous popularity in the Hellenistic Age.

#### 6. GUILLAUME BONNET (University of Bourgogne (Dijon, France))

*Le syntagme dans la grammaire ancienne*

Nous entendons par « syntagme » l'association de deux (voire plus) lexèmes subsumés sous un seul signifiant. Il a évidemment existé, dans les langues classiques, des syntagmes satisfaisant à des nécessités lexicales ou

morphologiques. C'est ces derniers qui nous intéresseront essentiellement : formes verbales périphrastiques, ou certains composés nominaux ou pronominaux. Nous nous attacherons à déterminer dans quelle mesure ces syntagmes sont perçus comme unitaires, quel nom ils peuvent avoir, etc. Ce qui est en jeu dans un tel questionnement, c'est la question de l'absence éventuelle de sens d'éléments morphologiquement pertinent ; c'est celle du rapport qu'entretiennent recherche de sens et découpage morphologique

My paper deals with what I call « syntagm », that is the association of two (or more) lexems to build one signification. Such words have existed in ancient languages, at a lexical or a morphological level. We shall focus on this last category (periphrastic verbal forms, nominal or pronominal compounds) in order to determine if they were analyzed as such, what name they could receive, etc. In the background stand the questions of the lack of signification in morphological units, and eventually the gap between the search for signification and the morphological analysis of the parts of speech.

7. BRUCE KARL BRASWELL (University of Fribourg)

*Didymus on Pindar*

The scholia vetera on Pindar record the opinion of Didymos of Alexandria on points of interpretation some 75 times, more often indeed than any other grammarian including Aristarchos. I intend to discuss a small number of texts which are illustrative of the range of Didymos' interest and method and, where relevant, in the context of the opinions of his predecessors.

8. MARIA CHRITI (Centre of the Greek Language, Thessaloniki)

*The Neoplatonic Commentators on Aristotle about the "arbitrariness of the linguistic sign"*

9. STYLIANOS CHRONOPOULOS (University of Freiburg)

*Rewriting personal jokes: How do the scholia interpret the ὀνομαστικὴ κωμωδεῖν*

10. ELEANOR DICKEY (University of Exeter)

*Pre-Atticist criteria of linguistic correctness*

What is the difference between "right" and "wrong" in Greek grammar and usage? For the modern teacher of prose composition, it is normally classical Attic: a word, form, or construction found in any Athenian prose author of

the fifth or fourth century BC is right, and one not found in such a source is wrong, even if it occurs elsewhere in ancient literature. This situation is not a modern invention but goes back to the second century AD, when the concept of Attic as the standard of correctness was codified in numerous lexica and other aids.

But for how long before the second century was this criterion in force, and how did teachers and critics determine the boundaries of correct usage before it? It cannot be that there was no concept of correctness before the second century, for teachers of grammar abounded in the Hellenistic world, and much Greek literature of the first centuries BC and AD is very different linguistically from the products of less educated writers (as evidenced in subliterate sources such as documentary papyri).

This paper will investigate the development of concepts of linguistic correctness, from their earliest roots (whenever those turn out to be) to the second century AD. Sources will include scholia, treatises on style, and grammarians (particularly Herodian, who although he lived in the second century was not an Atticist). Controversies between different types of Atticists will also be examined, as they may shed light on other criteria of correctness. The paper will conclude by sketching possible consequences for the development of Atticism itself.

11. Marco FANTUZZI (Columbia University, NY, & University of Macerata)  
*Scholarly panic: panikos phobos, Homeric philology and the beginning of the Rhesus*

12. RICHARD HUNTER (University of Cambridge)  
*Plato's Ion and the origins of scholarship*

13. CASPER DE JONGE (University of Leiden)  
*Not without a linguistic commentary. Dionysius of Halicarnassus and the Thucydides scholia on the historian's obscure syntax*

The rhetorician Dionysius of Halicarnassus (active in Rome between 30 and 8 BC) makes use of a great variety of theories that were developed in different language disciplines. He borrows numerous ideas from earlier and contemporary scholars, including philosophers, philologists, grammarians, metricians, musical theorists, literary critics and rhetoricians, and he integrates these ideas into an effective programme of rhetorical theory. In his Second Letter to Ammaeus, Dionysius analyses the style of Thucydides, which he criticises for its poetic diction, variety of figures, brevity of thought,

and obscure syntax. He describes various aspects of Thucydidean style as 'unnatural', and he points out that it does not preserve the 'logical order' (akolouthia) and 'grammatical congruence' (katallêlotês), technical terms that anticipate the syntactical theories of the grammarian Apollonius Dyscolus.

Usener (1889) first noticed the similarities between Dionysius' observations and the scholia on Thucydides (ed. Hude). It is still not clear, however, how we should interpret the connection between the rhetorician's Second Letter to Ammaeus and the Thucydides scholia. Some scholars (Usener, Radermacher) have suggested that Dionysius made use of an edition of Thucydides that contained critical signs and scholia. This view seems to be supported by Dionysius' remark that we cannot understand certain passages in Thucydides 'without linguistic explanation' (khôris exêgêseôs grammatikês) (DH, Thuc. 51). Luschnat (1954) has argued that both the scholia on Thucydides and Dionysius' Second Letter to Ammaeus can ultimately be traced back to an Alexandrian commentary on Thucydides that was composed in Hellenistic Alexandria, perhaps by Aristarchus. Some of the scholia, however, seem to react to Dionysius' discussion, which complicates the exact relation between the two texts.

The connection between the Thucydides scholia and Dionysius' grammatical notes provides us with a unique opportunity to observe the different ways in which technical grammar was employed in scholarship on the one hand, and in rhetorical instruction on the other. Where the scholia comment on difficult syntactical constructions in order to explain them to the reader, Dionysius objects to Thucydides' unusual expressions and refers to them as solecisms. In this way, the rhetorician wants to prevent his students from imitating Thucydides' style, which he considers inappropriate for both historians and orators.

In this paper I will further investigate the relationship between the Thucydides scholia and Dionysius' Second Letter to Ammaeus. This examination will not only illuminate the precise connection between the two texts, but it will also contribute to our understanding of the interdisciplinary character of ancient linguistic disciplines, by demonstrating the interaction between scholarship, technical grammar and rhetorical theory.

14. JEAN LALLOT (École Normale Supérieure, Paris)

*Les grammairiens d'Alexandrie avaient-ils le sens de l'histoire?*

Le linguiste d'aujourd'hui qui fréquente les grammairiens alexandrins, en particulier les technikoi (Apollonius, la Technè attribuée à Denys le Thrace et ses scholies) éprouve d'emblée le sentiment qu'un abîme sépare le grammairien moderne de ses prédécesseurs d'Alexandrie pour ce qui est de l'attention prêtée à l'histoire de la langue. Ce n'est un secret pour personne

que la grammaire historique, dans la forme que nous lui connaissons, est une invention récente. L'idée, qui nous est familière, que, à tous les niveaux, de la phonologie à la syntaxe, la langue est en perpétuelle transformation, et que, pour nous en tenir au grec ancien, il est légitime d'écrire, non seulement une « grammaire historique » du grec, mais aussi une grammaire homérique, une grammaire du grec classique, une grammaire de la koinè hellénistique, etc. — cette idée paraît tout à fait étrangère à l'auteur de la *Technè* ou à Apollonius. Il est facile d'illustrer ce fait par des exemples.

Partant de ce constat, je me pose plusieurs questions. N'y a-t-il pas malgré tout des indices que la dimension du temps – le temps de la langue et l'inscription des écrivains dans cette temporalité – n'a pas totalement échappé aux *grammatikoi* et aux *technikoi* ? Si c'est le cas, y a-t-il une spécificité de leur rapport au temps qui puisse rendre compte du sentiment d'étrangeté qu'éprouve un moderne en les lisant ? Et si ce rapport est fuyant, impalpable ou même absent, pouvons-nous cerner la configuration épistémologique dans laquelle leur travail trouve son sens et sa cohérence ?

Questions ambitieuses, sinon prétentieuses dans leur formulation, auxquelles sans doute je ne saurai pas répondre complètement. Au moins voudrais-je contribuer, à partir d'une approche philologique attentive de textes grammaticaux anciens, à rendre sensible les problèmes que je me pose et indiquer dans quelle direction on peut leur chercher des réponses. Les données sur lesquelles je raisonnerai seront prises tant dans les commentaires grammaticaux dont nous disposons – principalement les scholies de l'Iliade – que dans les traités techniques que la tradition nous a conservés – principalement l'œuvre d'Apollonius et la *Technè*.

#### 15. FRÉDÉRIC LAMBERT (University of Bordeaux)

*La syntaxe avant la syntaxe: usages du terme de σύνταξις chez les grammairiens grecs avant Apollonios Dyscole*

Le terme de σύνταξις a acquis chez Apollonios Dyscole une technicité et une rigueur inconnue avant lui. Les passages où Apollonios argumente en faveur de sa démarche montrent assez que la σύνταξις n'était pas l'objet d'un consensus de la part de ses prédécesseurs et de ses contemporains, sans parler de son fils, qui risque d'avoir été plus conservateur sur ce point notamment. Tout laisserait donc attendre que le créateur de la syntaxe dans la tradition grammaticale grecque soit bien l'illustre grammairien d'Alexandrie au III<sup>ème</sup> siècle.

Il n'en reste pas moins que d'autres grammairiens ont utilisé le terme. On le trouve dans le manuel de Denys dans la fameuse définition de la λέξις, si elle est bien de sa main. Mais j'ai voulu enquêter chez les autres grammairiens, depuis l'époque hellénistique jusqu'aux prédécesseurs immédiats



d'Apollonios. Si les usages du terme σύνταξις chez quelqu'un comme Aristarque, usage qui est d'ailleurs encore connu d'Apollonios, est celui d'« ouvrage construit », « traité », certains auteurs comme Ptolémée d'Ascalon (élève d'Aristarque ou peut-être contemporain de Trajan?), utilise le mot dans un sens plus technique. Il en va de même du révérend Tryphon. Mais ces usages grammaticaux sont-ils strictement semblables à celui du créateur de la syntaxe? Quel degré d'autonomie métalinguistique possèdent-ils? Je me propose, dans cet exposé, de mesurer le plus précisément possible le décalage entre ces usages, ainsi que les niveaux de rupture entre les usages « courants », comme celui de « traité », et les usages « autonomes » qui ont abouti à la « construction » apollonienne.

J'utilise comme outil de recherche dans les textes le TLG.

#### 16. ANNELI LUHTALA (University of Helsinki)

##### *Imposition of Names in Ancient Grammar*

Throughout Antiquity, philosophers discussed the question whether names are given by nature or by convention. In a more general way, this issue was raised concerning simply names, the discussion being practically restricted to nouns. However, some philosophical schools went further than this, and discussed the way in which various parts of speech signify, namely the Peripatetics and the Stoics. In the Peripatetic tradition, the definitions of the *nomen* and *verbum* make it explicit that they signify by convention. Moreover, these two parts of the proposition are understood as signifying differently; the *verbum* says something about the *nomen* and it additionally signifies time. Their theory of meaning posits that words are directly related to the human mind and indirectly to things in the real world.

The Stoic definitions of the nominal parts of speech refer to semantic and physical terms, suggesting that they are directly related to things in the material world. By contrast, the verb signifies a predicate, which is an incorporeal *lekton*, like the proposition itself. Thus, the noun and the verb signify in radically different things, corporeals and incorporeals respectively.

The Stoic doctrine was adapted to grammar by Apollonius Dyscolus and Priscian, whereby the crucial distinction between the ways in which the noun and the verb signify is largely obscured. The definitions of the parts of speech do not bear out this distinction, whereas some other contexts bear traces of the unequal positions of these parts of speech in statement-making. Furthermore, these definitions do not seem to take into account the workings of the human mind at all.

In my paper I will ask the question, how these two grammarians understand the imposition – not of names – but of the parts of speech, and how their theory of meaning is related to the human mind.

17. JOHN LUNDON (University of Cologne)

*Homer Commentaries on Papyrus: A Survey*

Numerous and sometimes extensive fragments of texts relating to the Homeric poems have been unearthed in Egypt over the last century or so. These texts, often referred to as Homerica, can be distinguished into several types, though not everything that has been found can be simply squeezed into one or the other of the categories and there is also a degree of internal variation. It is clear that readers of Homer in the metropoleis, towns and villages of Greco-Roman Egypt were well provided with secondary literature and works of reference for the understanding and appreciation of the poet. In my paper, I shall deal specifically with one of these types: the commentary. After a discussion of some general questions, including the problems of identification, characteristics, variety, number and distribution of papyrus commentaries on Homer, I shall consider a few of the most significant specimens in slightly more detail. Since the bulk of the critical and exegetical scholia transmitted in the margins of the medieval manuscripts ultimately goes back to ancient commentaries, these are apt, even in their fragmentary state, to shed considerable light on the scholarly tradition and its development. They also well illustrate ancient scholarship in practice and as applied to two of antiquity's greatest literary achievements.

18. FLORA MANAKIDOU (University of Thrace)

*Ut poesis grammatica: Theocritus, Philitas, and the bucolic diction*

19. STEPHANOS MATTHAIOS (University of Thessaloniki)

*Eratosthenes aus Kyrene: Lesarten seiner „Grammatik“-Definition*

Eratosthenes aus Kyrene (3. Jh. v.Chr.) gilt als der vielseitigste Gelehrte des hellenistischen Zeitalters, der neben seinem dichterischen Werk auf den verschiedensten Gebieten wie der Philosophie, den Naturwissenschaften, der Chronographie und der Geschichtsschreibung, der Musiktheorie und der Philologie Herausragendes geleistet hat. Aufgrund seines umfangreichen Oeuvres und der Universalität seines Wissens wird er zurecht als "Symbol für die Einheit der Wissenschaft" betrachtet. Diese Ansicht spiegelt sich bereits in der von ihm selbst ausgewählten Bezeichnung φιλόλογος ("Gelehrter") wider.

Von Ptolemaios III. nach Alexandria berufen, wurde Eratosthenes der renommierte Posten der Leitung der dort beheimateten Bibliothek übertragen.

Während seiner Amtsperiode dürfte sein philologisches Werk entstanden sein, welches u.a. eine aus 2 Büchern, jedoch heute allein dem Titel nach bekannte Schrift "Grammatische Probleme" umfaßte. Darin bemühte sich Eratosthenes die zu dieser Zeit in Alexandria neu begründete philologisch-grammatische Disziplin theoretisch zu fundieren und in ihrem Systemcharakter zu erfassen. Von der Zielsetzung seiner Abhandlung zeugt die unter Eratosthenes' Namen überlieferte Definition der Grammatik. Laut diesem Beleg definiert Eratosthenes die γραμματικὴ τέχνη als die vollkommene ἔξις ('Habitus', 'Zustand', 'Fertigkeit') in Fragen der schriftstellerischen Produktion einschließlich der Literatur.

Dieser nach unserem Wissensstand früheste Versuch einer Bestimmung der grammatischen Disziplin ist in der heutigen Forschung zur Geschichte der antiken Grammatik wenig berücksichtigt worden. Der Beitrag zielt darauf ab, eine umfassende Interpretation von Eratosthenes' Definition zu geben, die den Aussagen des Kyrenäers sowohl zum Wesen als auch zum Gegenstand und Aufgabenbereich der grammatischen Disziplin Rechnung trägt. Vom Begriff ἔξις und seiner Bedeutung in der aristotelischen und stoischen Ontologie und Wissenschaftstheorie ausgehend, soll zunächst der theoretische Hintergrund dieser Definition ermittelt werden. Darauf aufbauend ist anhand eines Vergleichs mit den weiteren Grammatik-Definitionen, vorwiegend mit denen des Dionysios Thrax und des Asklepiades von Myrlea (1. Jh. v.Chr.), der Gegenstandsbereich und das wissenschaftliche Profil der Grammatik zu erläutern und in den Kontext der historischen Entwicklung dieser Disziplin einzuordnen. Abschließend soll die ideologische Dimension von Eratosthenes' Definition aus der Perspektive der zwiefältigen Identität der Dichter-Philologen, die für die hellenistische Literatur charakteristisch ist, beleuchtet werden.

20. FRANCO MONTANARI (University of Genova)

*Ancient Scholarship and Classical Studies*

21. RENÉ NÜNLIST (Brown University)

*Aristarchus and Allegorical Interpretation*

In recent years, Aristarchus has been described as the champion of a position that is firmly and expressly opposed to allegorical interpretations (Porter 1992: 70; Struck 2004: passim, esp. 21–2 with n. 3). In the first part of the paper, I will argue that the chief witness that these scholars adduce for their view, schol. D Il. 5.385, does not actually have the claimed 'anti-allegorical' meaning, but is primarily concerned with a different form of (mis)interpreting Homer. Porter and Struck acknowledge that their view is based on the

reading of the D-scholion by Eustathius (561.28–30), who added the crucial word *allêgorikôs* (not in the scholion). I will argue that he thereby distorted the actual meaning of the scholion and hence Aristarchus' position, which will be further fleshed out. In the second part of the paper, I will examine whether other sources allow for a reconstruction of what Aristarchus thought about allegorical interpretation.

## 22. FILIPPOMARIA PONTANI (University of Venice)

### *Ex Homero grammatica*

It is by no means obvious that the grammatical tradition of a language should develop from the philological and linguistic study of a single, authoritative text. This happened with Arabic, the linguistic analysis of which originated in the cultural and political need for a standard text and a widely accepted interpretation of the Quran (8th-9th cent.). The holy book's textual constitution (legends of Abu Bakr and Uthman), its study and its exegesis led to the birth of Arabic grammar, first in embryonic form within the commentaries, later as an autonomous discipline, with the remarkable subdivision between "analogists" and "anomalists" (Sibawayhi and al-Farra'; schools of Basra and Kufa).

Can we trace a similar story in Hellenistic Greece? Homer was considered as the norm of *hellenismos* (correct Greek) by the Alexandrine critics, particularly Aristarch and his pupil Ptolemy Pindarion, both concerned with the diorthosis of Homer's text and both - especially the latter - involved in a polemic against the Pergamene school. Was Homer's normative role connected with the theory of his Athenian origin, with the controversy over Homeric dialects, with the boundaries of "poetic licence" (*poietike adeia*) or with the issue of the language spoken by the heroes at Troy? How did Homer's status influence the large number of quotations from epic in the grammatical tradition down to Apollonius Dyscolus, who claims at the beginning of his *Syntax* that his primary concern is precisely the exegesis of poetry? Was the study of epic in school curricula perceived as a *Schwerpunkt* of Greek language and identity or as a bulk of outdated erudition? And what is Homer's role in the debate over *Sprachrichtigkeit* and its constituents and criteria (etymology, analogy, *synetheia* and above all *paradosis*)?

Texts to be discussed: Sext. Emp. adv. math. 1, 199-208. Ps.-Hrd. sol. et barb., p. 311, 5-10 Nauck; Ps.-Plut. de Hom. 2, 2 (Dion. Thr. fr. 2 Linke); Vita Homeri p. 25, 8 Wil.; Ap. Dysc. pron. 71, 14-72, 16 (= Aristarch. fr. 125A Matthaios); Ap. Dysc. synt. 1, 2 - 2, 1; 51, 11-12; 71, 25 Schn.; some Homeric scholia.

## 23. FRANCESCA SCHIRONI (Harvard University)

*Playing with language: Homeric grammar according to Aristarchus*

The aim of this paper is to discuss Aristarchus' approach to linguistic analysis in the context of his philological activity. In particular, I will focus on how Aristarchus analyzes Homeric morphological and syntactical peculiarities through the concepts of ἐναλλαγή, μετάληψις, ἔλλειψις, παρολκή.

24. ANDREAS SCHMIDHAUSER (University of East Anglia)

*Ancient linguistic science and textual criticism: The possessive pronoun ὅς/έός in Homer*

25. MARTIN SCHMIDT (University of Hamburg)

*Ein Portrait eines unbekanntem "Scholiasten"*

Die Erklärungen zur Ilias, die in den bT-Scholien zur Ilias überliefert sind, stammen bekanntlich aus unterschiedlichen Quellen. Bei der Kompilation des Scholien-Corpus wurden wahrscheinlich mindestens drei "exegetische" Kommentare zur Ilias verwendet, ferner ein Exemplar des sog. Viermännerkommentars, ein Exemplar der D-Scholien und wohl auch "scholienfremde Bestandteile". Ob die Kompilation ebenso wie die der Vorlage des Ven.A in einem Zug geschah oder in mehreren Stufen wissen wir nicht.

Die Herkunft der "exegetischen" Kommentare, also des (Haupt-) Teils der bT-Scholien, ist immer wieder untersucht worden, mit bisher relativ geringem Erfolg. Es sieht so aus als sei dies ein aussichtsloses Unterfangen.

Dennoch will ich einen neuen Versuch starten: in dem vielstimmigen Konzert von Wort- und Sacherklärungen, von Bemerkungen zur Mythologie, zu Sprache, zum Stil, zur Moral usw. ist eine Stimme außergewöhnlich unüberhörbar. Es sind die Erklärungen, die von den Beziehungen zwischen dem Dichter und seinem Hörer, seinem Publikum handeln, von den Emotionen, die der Dichter hervorruft und die dabei davon ausgehen, daß die Sympathien sowohl des Dichters wie seiner Hörer auf Seiten der Griechen stehen.

Man kann die Scholien dieser Tendenz herausarbeiten und kennzeichnen. Da im Einzelfall durch gegenseitige Bezugnahme der Scholien aufeinander die identische Autorschaft für einzelne Scholien gesichert ist, und da es in der Regel immer nur eine diesbezügliche Erklärung zu einem Vers gibt, keine Parallelen, liegt es näher, an eine Person als Autor eines Kommentars zu Ilias zu denken als eine allgemeine Tendenz für diese Scholien verantwortlich zu machen.

Für einzelne Gesänge der Ilias (von Buch 11, dem  $\Lambda$  an) habe ich die in Frage kommenden diesbezüglichen Scholien zusammengestellt, werde sie analysierend darstellen, und von ihnen aus insbesondere mit ihrer Terminologie prüfen, was alles in die Nachbarschaft dieser Scholien gehört. Das Ergebnis: der unbekannte spätantike "Scholiast" und seine Sicht Homers - ein bisher wenig beleuchtetes Kapitel in der Homerphilologie

26. INEKE SLUITER (University of Leiden)

*Analogy and Exceptions – Herodian and Galen on the Criteria for Linguistic Correctness*

The grammarian Herodian (2nd cent AD) is best known for his morphological work. Much less studied is his work 'On Exceptions'. However, in this work Herodian offers a fascinating glimpse of his views on the overall structure and functioning of language. This aspect of his work has been completely ignored in the secondary literature.

Son of the grammarian Apollonius Dyscolus, Herodian enters into interesting, often implicit discussions with his father, and works out a hierarchy of the criteria for linguistic correctness which is essentially his own, and which reflects his particular interests and purpose. The relation between the notions of 'analogy' and the thorny problem of grammatical 'exceptions' is particularly revealing here.

In the same period, the famous doctor Galen also sees himself confronted with questions of linguistic correctness in his study of his illustrious predecessor Hippocrates. Interestingly, the doctor and the grammarian show many points of contact, especially in their views on the relevance of 'usage' as a criterion for linguistic correctness.

27. Konstantinos SPANOUDAKIS (University of Crete)

*Ancient scholia and lost identities: The case of Simichidas*

Ancient scholia, as we read them today, are the outcome of a long and rather sad process of suppression, compression and distortion. Gems lie together with mud, sometimes unnoticed for centuries. Theocritus' seventh poem is a characteristic case. It has long been observed that the action takes place in a very 'real' setting on the island of Cos, in terms of both places (cf., e.g., P. Zanker, *Simichidas' Walk and the Locality of Bourina in Theoc. id. 7, CQ 31 [1980], 373-7*) and persons mentioned in the poem. It is the ancient Theocritean scholia, along with internal evidence supplied by the poems themselves, that give us glimpses of the reality that Theocritus experienced on Cos and had in mind when he wrote the seventh idyll. The factual value of

these pieces of information, within the parameters noted above, varies from absurdity or irrelevance to obvious or well-hidden historical truth. To this last category may belong scholium 21a (84.17 Wendel). This scholium concerns the identity of Simichidas, the narrator and protagonist of the poem. Corrupt as it is, it relates the story of a certain Simichidas son of Pericles from Orchomenus, who left home after the destruction of his city by the Thebans and, together with other refugees, settled on Cos where he was granted full citizenship. This piece of information has often been outright dismissed (by e.g. Wilamowitz) as an ad hoc invention, but it seems too complicated to have simply sprung out of thin air. Furthermore, closer attention to coeval historical and social facts about Cos as well as to chronological data regarding Theocritus' life rather point towards the suggestion that we might be dealing with some genuine information concerning the very real circumstances of a metic's (such as Theocritus) relationship with his *prostatês*. The realisation of this alleged fact would shed new light, within a self-referential context, on certain nuances of well-trodden passages of the seventh poem, as well as to the appearance of Orchomenus at the coda of Theocritus' sixteenth poem.

28. CHRISTOS THEODORIDIS (University of Thessaloniki)

*Nochmals zum Verhältnis des Lexikons des Photios zum 'Ρητορικόν des Etymologicum Genuinum*

29. VALERIE VAN ELST (K.University of Leuven, Centre for the Historiography of Linguistics)

*Byzantine grammarians on the participle in inflectional morphology. A didactic approach*

As participating in the characteristics of both the noun and the verb, the participle has a somewhat "twofold" status within the parts-of-speech system. This hybrid nature, which formed an object of discussion and disagreement among grammarians during Greek Antiquity and beyond, led the Alexandrian scholars to the recognition of the participle as a separate word-class. Contrary to their Stoic predecessors, they accorded it, from the 2nd century BC onwards, an autonomous status within their system of 8 word-classes.

In our paper we will focus on the participle in one specific domain of the Alexandrian grammatical tradition, namely that of inflectional morphology. As derived from verbal stems, participle forms are included in the descriptions of the verbal morphological system. Although the participle does not belong to the moods of the verb, its morphological rules are treated on the same level as those of the real moods. Furthermore, the participle is a point of

reference in the morphological rules for several modal forms. Sources which represent this approach are, first of all, the *Kanovne* of Theodosius of Alexandria (probably 4th-5th century AD) and the commentaries of Joannes Charax (6th-8th century AD) and Choeroboscus (8th-9th century AD). Secondly, there is a lot of scholiastic and lexicographical material. In the third instance, participle forms are included in several conjugation tables preserved on papyrus from the 1st-2nd century AD onwards. These grammatical papyri, together with the *Kanones* and the other sources mentioned, convey a clear picture of the teaching and learning process of verbal morphology in a school context, and, more specifically, of the position occupied by the participle in this verbal system.

30. LOUISE VISSER (K.University of Leuven, Centre for the Historiography of Linguistics)

*Learning Latin in the early medieval West: 'rules' on participles*

As in the Roman Empire in the centuries following Donatus' famous *Ars grammatica* spoken Latin diverged ever more from the conventionally taught Latin of the classical authors, grammar teachers had to adapt their subject to this new situation. Already in the first generation of Donatus commentaries, from the end of the 4th century AD till the beginning of the 6th, we see a more prescriptive approach to language than in the work of Donatus himself and, as time went by, this tendency in Latin grammars became stronger. Also for non-native speakers grammars were needed. One sees several attempts to set up a prescriptive terminological framework for the morphology of Latin. Prescriptive morphological rules are naturally most predictable in the chapters on the noun and the verb. However, this prescriptive approach to morphology (sometimes mixed with semantic and/or syntactic 'rules') also occurs in chapters on other word classes. In this paper, I take the chapter on the participle as an example and will demonstrate how the new concerns grammar teachers had in the 4th to 8th centuries AD, induced them to modify the grammar texts from Late Antiquity. What about the endings of participles, for example, and their declension? What are 'defective participles'? And how to separate participle-like nouns from real participles? These and other questions had to be dealt with. I will also investigate, as far as possible in this case study, the terminology used in the 'rules' and its consistency and development. If time allows it, I might add later Latin grammar texts, up to and including the 10th century, to the corpus.

31. ALFONS WOUTERS / PIERRE SWIGGERS (K.University of Leuven, Centre for the Historiography of Linguistics)



*New Papyri and the history of ancient grammar*