to understand and do justice to some of Homer's intentional perturbations of surface structure. In other instances, where for example a conjunction superfluous to the presumed logical syntax threatens to mislead the reader into punctuating incorrectly, thereby mistaking the true meaning, Nicanor points out the true logical connection and punctuates accordingly, the most important function of language being to express meanings as clearly as possible.

Linguistic Theories in the Rhetorical Works
of Dionysius of Halicarnassus *)

By Dirk M. Schenkeveld, Heemstede (Holland)

0. The last decades have seen the publication of several important studies on the history of ancient linguistics. The period before Apollonius Dyscolus has especially been in the limelight, and gradually it has become clear that the authenticity of the Techne ascribed to Dionysius Thrax and the level of linguistic studies at the time of Aristarchus and his pupils form a pivotal problem.[1]

All these studies have one omission in common, in that they have all neglected the opuscula rhetorica of Dionysius of Halicarnassus (DH) as a possible source of information for the level of linguistic knowledge in the second half of the first century B.C. As I hope to prove, these works cast some light on this matter. It is, however, outside the scope of this article to relate here these results to the problem indicated above.

---

*) Dionysius Hal. (DH) is quoted after the Teubner edition of H. Usener-L. Radermacher (1899–1904), by chapter, page and line. Ep. Amm. = the second Letter to Ammaeus. Rhys Roberts 1901 and 1910 refer to the well-known translation and commentaries of The Three Literary Letters and On Literary Composition resp.; Aujac = Dénys d'Halicarnasse, Opuscules rhétoriques III, par Germaine Aujac et Maurice Lebel, CUF 1981. Vol. I (1978) is cited as Aujac I; Pritchett = Dionysius of Hal., On Thucydides, transl. by W. K. Pritchett, Univ. Cal. Pr. 1975; Usher = Dionysius of Halicarnassus, The Critical Essays in two Volumes, with an English translation by Stephen Usher, Loeb Cl. Libr., 1974. Dr. Pauline Allen kindly corrected my English.

[1] See W. Ax, Aristarch und die "Grammatik", Glotta 60, 1980, 96–119 and literature cited there.

The main reason for neglecting these rhetorical works will have
been the almost unassailable position of the Techne in the nine-
teenth and twentieth centuries, especially since the publication of
Schmidt's article (1850[2]). Moreover, the opinion that the Techne's
grammatical system and its underlying theory soon had become
common knowledge,[3] may have led to the assumption that DH's
rhetorical works could offer no new material, only some well known
facts. But even after Di Benedetto (1958) had started to undermine
the position of the Techne, no real attention was paid to DH's
works. It is true that scholars have discussed the second chapter
of Comp. Verb. because it contains a history of the development of
a word class system, and Barwick as well as Pinborg has adduced
several other passages, especially in connection with problems of
Stoic grammar.[4] On the whole, however, one will look in vain for
a study such as is undertaken now.[5]

Although, of course, some results will be more important than
others, I intend to present a complete survey of relevant material
as well as to discuss similarities to and deviations from what is
nowadays called 'traditional grammar', i.e. the grammatical system
and theories as apparent from the Techne, its commentaries and
the works of Apollonius Dyscolus. Comparisons with what is known
about Stoic grammar will also be made.[6]

Apart from some short references, neither the chapter on the
history of the word class system (Comp. Verb. 2) nor those on letters
and vowels (ibid. 14 and 15) is discussed here. Both subjects do in
fact belong to a proper survey of ancient linguistic theory, but are
easily separated from the rest of Dionysius' theories. Moreover,
his theory on letters and syllables is probably influenced by studies

---

[2]) Philol. 8, 1853, 231ff. Cp. V. Di Benedetto ANS 27, 1958, 69ff.

[3]) E.g. Rhys Roberts, 1910, 46f. and H. Erbse, Glotta 58, 1980, 246[19].

[4]) K. Barwick, Remmius Palaemon und die römische Ars grammatica,
Leipzig 1922, 95 and 102, and Probleme der Stoischen Sprachlehre und Rhe-
torik, Berlin 1957, 47f. J. Pinborg, Classical antiquity: Greece in: Current
trends in Linguistics, vol. 13,1, The Hague 1975, 102 and 111.

[5]) Commentators and editors of these treatises (e.g. Rhys Roberts, Aujac
and Pritchett) have often made sound annotations on linguistic aspects, but
these have passed unnoticed.

[6]) Of course, this qualification does not imply a chronological priority,
e.g. 'traditional' since 2nd cent. B.C., nor does tracing back various data
to Stoic or other sources mean that I believe that in the 1st cent. B.C., or
earlier, contending schools were existing.

of Aristoxenus and of οἱ κριτικοί[7]) rather than by linguistic views. Furthermore the history-chapter can be more profitably discussed in the context of a treatment of other histories, something I hope to tackle at a later date.

It is self-evident that the character of his works precludes DH from discussing grammatical theory fully. What he offers in this field stands always in the service of his argument on literary matters. Thus, the historical chapter serves as an introduction to the view that combinations of words make cola, which in combination produce periods. In Comp. Verb. 5 DH discusses the possibility of a natural order of the partes orationis, e.g. nomina before verba, in order to show that such an approach is fruitless for a theory about σύνθεσις ὀνομάτων. When he exemplifies his views on the three ἁρμονίαι συνθέσεως, he analyzes several κῶλα of famous authors and distinguishes some words according to their word class, but soon he abandons this method and focuses on the sounds of these words. The most extensive use of linguistic notions he makes in Ep. Amm. 2.422ff. when he expands what he has said in De Thucyd. 24 on the σχηματισμοί of Thucydides.

Accordingly, Dionysius' grammatical remarks are mostly incidental, and therefore shed interesting light on the level of grammatical knowledge of a man who, relatively speaking, is a layman in this field. I must add that evidently DH did not have this knowledge when he arrived at Rome about 30 B.C., but only several years later. For in his earliest treatises, collected in De ant. orator., no trace of grammatical distinctions can be found, and it is not before De Demosthene that terms such as μόρια λόγου, σύνδεσμος, πτῶσις, ἀκολουθία, κατάλληλον occurr. Prior to this treatise only ὄνομα is found, then with the meaning of 'word' tout court. Nowadays it is generally held that De Demosthene, De Comp. Verb., De Thucydide, Ep. ad Ammaeum and De Dinarcho are the latest works of DH[8]). Whereas the diverging character of the last treatise explains why technical terms do not occur in De Dinarcho, we find these in the other four. Because, as we shall see, DH does not use grammatical terms in e.g. De Lysia when he could have done so, it is evident that he acquired his information when he had already been in Rome for some time.

---

[7]) See W. Kroll, Rhein. Mus. 62, 1907, 91ff. on influence of Aristoxenus, and Karin Pohl, Die Lehre von den drei Wortfügungsarten, thesis Tübingen 1968, 97ff. and 146ff. and my article, Mnem. 21, 1968, 176ff. on οἱ κριτικοί.

[8]) Usher xxvi; Aujac I 22f.

70   Dirk M. Schenkeveld

1. In the history chapter, Comp. Verb. 2.6,17ff. DH mentions nine partes orationis, ὄνομα, ῥῆμα, σύνδεσμος, ἄρθρον, προσηγορικόν, ἀντονομασία, ἐπίρρημα, πρόθεσις and μετοχή, and adds that more distinctions had been made. From this list it appears that he knows of a system of nine classes. Though he uses the term προσηγορικόν this form does not suggest the bipartition, known from traditional grammar, of ὄνομα into two subclasses, κύριον and προσηγορικόν,[9]) for at 7,15 DH clearly indicates that by προσηγορικόν a separate class is meant.

His terminology for partes orationis, here and elsewhere, is fluctuating, for τὰ τοῦ λόγου μέρη or μόρια as well as τὰ μέρη/μόρια τῆς λέξεως appear, and even τά τῆς φράσεως μόρια, στοιχεῖα λέξεως and στοιχειώδη μόρια.[10]) In traditional grammar τὰ τοῦ λόγου μόρια/μέρη is the usual term[11]).

When indicating separate classed he uses either substantives (ὄνομα, προσηγορία) or adjectives, if necessary substantively, such as τὰ προθετικὰ μόρια, τὸ μετοχικὸν ὄνομα, τὸ προσηγορικόν.[12]) In this respect his terminology agrees with that of traditional grammar.

"Ὄνομα may indicate nomen proprium as distinct from nomen appellativum (προσηγορία), but more often it just means 'word.' In this case, it is equivalent to λέξεις and is used to differentiate between words and sentences (λόγος). In the same way μόρια λόγου may be used, without any connotation of 'word class'. This use of ὄνομα is common, and Ap. Dysc. is right in saying: κατεκράτησεν οὖν καὶ ἡ ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ θέσις τὸ πάντα τὰ τοῦ λόγου μέρη καλεῖσθαι ὀνόματα (synt. 19,2f.).

Outside the history chapter also, DH uses the system of nine word classes, as is shown by the following list (p. 71). Apart from ὄνομα(-τικόν) and ῥῆμα(-τικόν), all occurrences for the remainning classes are listed. The listing is made on the basis of the four treatises mentioned before.

From this survey it appears that, apart from ch. 2, in Comp. Verb. all classes occur except μετοχή, for the missing ἄρθρον is represented by ἄναρθρος. Presumably DH did not need to use μετοχή

---

[9]) Cp. Uhlig on Techne 23,2 and 33,6ff.

[10]) Comp. Verb. l.l.; 4.21,18; 6.29,13; 30,14; De Thuc. 24.361,18; 22.358, 13; De Dem. 30.211,24. Cp. Rhys Roberts 1901, 197.

[11]) DH does not distinguish between στοιχεῖα τοῦ λόγου and στοιχεῖα τῆς λέξεως, as is done in Diog. Laert. 7,56ff. See also Rhys Roberts, indices, s.vv.

[12]) Ep.Amm. 12,432,10; Comp. Verb. 22.101–103.

and ἄρθρον. More striking is the absence of ἐπίρρημα from De Thuc. and Ep. Amm., whereas ἀντονομασία is not found in De Thuc. 24, and, accordingly, not in Ep. Amm. 2 either, but it does occur elsewhere in both treatises. The absence of ἐπίρρημα can be explained by the purpose of the list in De Thuc. 24: DH wants to show that in his use of σχήματα[13]) Thucydides continuosly deviates from (ἐναλλάττεται) ordinary syntax. Probably examples of deviation were lacking for adverbs.[14])

Word classes / Treatises	De Demosthene	De Comp. Verborum ch. 2	De Comp. Verborum other chh.	De Thucydide	Ep. ad Ammaeum II
1. ὄνομα	passim	x	passim	passim	passim
-τικόν/ή	—		26,13; 44,16f.	361,23ff.; 358,13; 389,18	423,6ff.; 425,19ff.
-τικῶς				361,21ff.	423,4ff.; 426,15ff.
2. προσηγορία	—		—	—	430,13ff.
-ικόν		x	26,12f.; 101,8ff.; 102,17; 103,9; 105,6; 108,18	361,23f.	423,6f.
3. ῥῆμα	passim	x	passim	passim	passim
-τικόν/ή	—		103,9	358,13; 361,21	423,4; 426,1ff.
4. μετοχή	—	x	—	—	430,13; 431,1*)
-ικόν				362,7	423,14; 432,10
5. ἄρθρον	213,7	x	— (ἄναρθρος 98,2)	389,16 (362,10)	430,14 (424,1)
6. ἀντονομασία (ἀντωνυμία)	—	x	26,13; 29,20	389,17	
-αστικόν					432,11
7. πρόθεσις	—	x	30,2; 102,17		
-τικόν				362,10	423,17
8. ἐπίρρημα	185,19	x	24,19; 25,4 and 11	—	—

[13]) For the wide meaning of σχήματα/σχηματισμοί here see J. Ros, Die ΜΕΤΑΒΟΛΗ, Nijmegen 1938, 39[28].

[14]) See Ros 172 for such an example.

*) τῆς μετοχῆς, deleted by Usener, should be put instead of μόριον.

72   Dirk M. Schenkeveld

9. σύνδεσμος	146,19; x	101,9ff.;	
	213,7;	102,16;	
	232,22;	129,5;	
	242,21	(ὀλιγοσύν-	
		δετος 98,2)	
-δετικόν		358,14;	423,16
		263,10	

Notwithstanding these exceptions we may safely ascribe to DH
the use of the system of nine word classes.[15]) This system differs
from the traditional eight-parts system by the separate class of
προσηγορία. In accordance with this system DH nowhere employs
κύριον to indicate nomen proprium, but only with the meaning of
'word in its proper sense' as opposed to 'trope' (τρόπος, τροπικὴ
λέξις).[16]) However, in Ep. Amm. 5.426,20ff. both παραίνεσις and
ἀξίωσις are called ὀνοματικά, and not προσηγορικά, as DH should
have called it in the framework of nine parts. Consequently, the
question arises whether his usage of a nine-parts system is superficial
only. This I am inclined to doubt, for he does employ the distinction
of προσηγορία and ὀνόματα in the same treatise, Ep. Amm. 11.430,
12ff. and calls πόλεις a προσηγορία[17]). Moreover, we can explain why
earlier on the bipartition is neglected. In De Thuc. 24 and in its
correlate chapter, Ep. Amm. 2, DH first mentions Thucydides'
variations between λόγος and ὄνομα, viz. the use of a phrase instead
of one word, and vice versa. From Ep. Amm. 4.425,19ff. it follows
that in this context by ὄνομα are meant ὄνομα as well as ῥῆμα. The
next example concerns the change from 'noun' to 'verb' and vice
versa. There, too, DH does not yet need to distinguish between
ὄνομα in a restricted sense and προσηγορία, and so he can call ἀξίωσις
an ὀνοματικόν. It is only in ch. 11 that the bipartition becomes
appropriate and there it is in fact indicated. It may be added that
nowhere does DH classify a proper name. A similar explanation
may be adduced in the case of ῥῆμα, which is used to indicate a
participle (ibid. 427,17), although μετοχή occurs elsewhere.[18])

---

[15]) Aujac seems to suggests that DH used a system of eight parts. In his
discussion on the supposedly natural order of the parts of speech DH (Comp.
Verb. 5.26,11f.) mentions the rule of putting τὰ ὀνοματικά before τὰ ἐπίθετα.
Nevertheless, I do not agree with Rhys Roberts, 1901, 192 and 1910, 299,
who thinks that DH regards ἐπίθετον as a separate part of speech.

[16]) See Rhys Roberts, indices s.v.

[17]) Cp. Comp. Verb. 5.26,13 and 22.101,9ff.

[18]) The same explanation is valid for Comp. Verb. 5.23,19ff.

For these reasons I conclude that in principle DH's classification is based upon the nine-parts system. This conclusion agrees with what we know nowadays of the usage of the nine-parts system in the first century B.C.[19] The provenance of this system is unknown, but it is at least partially based upon a Stoic distinction between ὄνομα and προσηγορία, although Stoic grammar distinguishes only five parts, as Diog. Laertius 7,57 shows. It would be dangerous, therefore, to call the nine-parts system typically Stoic.

Before entering into a discussion of passages which exhibit traces of a different system I would point out that DH uses ἀντονομασία (-στικόν), whereas the traditional term ἀντωνυμία occurs once only in the Teubner edition (Comp. Verb. 6, p. 29,20). When ἀντονομασία is used, MSS. vary, for ἀντωνυμία(-ικόν) is also found. But in view of the popularity of the latter word in traditional grammar original ἀντονομασία will have been changed by copyists into the other word, and Usener is right in proposing ἀντονομασία as opposed to the unanimous tradition (Comp. Verb. 1.1.).[20] Apoll. Dysc. tells us (pron. 4,18ff.) that Comanus (s. I B.C.) used ἀντονομασία, and in Pap. Yale 1,25, l. 4 too (s. I A.D.) this word is found again[21]. ᾿Αντονομασία lost the battle against ἀντωνυμία, probably because the first word could also be used to indicate a poetical trope.[22]

2. In the foregoing section we have met with several examples of the application of a system of word classes, examples, therefore, of what Ap. Dysc. calls μερισμός. This procedure was sometimes rather difficult, and from his works we learn about ingenious discussions on the status of δεῖ, χρή etc. Therefore in itself it does not surprise us that twice DH, too, wavers between classifications. But on both these occasions cases are concerned which in traditional grammar were no problem at all. Then to all appearances DH uses a system of less than nine (or eight) parts and mixes it with the full-blown one.

The first time he does so, is Comp. Verb. 22.102,16f. In this chapter he analyzes a Pindaric dithyramb (fr. 75 Sn.-M.) as an

---

[19] See A. Wouters, The grammatical papyri from Graeco-Roman Egypt, Brussel 1979, 177ff. According to Sarah Molyneaux Weems, Greek gramm. papyri: the school texts, thesis Missouri 1981, a standard Techne was not accepted before 4th cent. A.D. In passing, I may be permitted to remark that in his history chapter DH does not mention a system of eight parts.

[20] Aujac retains ἀντωνυμία. ᾿Αντονομασία with -ω- (so F² 26,13) occurs elsewhere, e.g. Schol. Iliad M 1d.

[21] See Wouters 59.

[22] Schol. DThr. 462,4ff. et al.

74   Dirk M. Schenkeveld

example of ἁρμονία αὐστηρά. He discusses the first cola and classifies the words there by their grammatical names as follows:

col. 1-2   Δεῦτ' ἐν χόρον Ὀλύμπιοι
           ἐπί τε κλυτὰ πέμπετε (χάριν θεοί)

col. 1   ῥῆμα, σύνδεσμος, δύο προσηγορικά,

col. 2   σύνδεσμος/πρόθεσις, σύνδεσμος, προσηγορικόν, ῥῆμα.[23])

To classify χόρον, Ὀλύμπιοι, κλυτάν as προσηγορικά, τε as σύνδεσμος and πέμπετε as ῥῆμα is as one may except, but to say that ἐν and ἐπί are σύνδεσμοι is surprising, although DH admits that ἐπί may also be called a πρόθεσις (102,16: τοῖς ἐπί τε συνδέσμοις ἀφ' ὧν ἄρχεται τὸ κῶλον, εἴτε ἄρα πρόθεσιν αὐτῶν δεῖ τὸ ἡγούμενον καλεῖν). This classification of ἐπί and τε as syndesmoi is a sure sign of a system with less than nine (or eight) parts.[24]) It is precisely because DH also offers an alternative division that we are able to trace this system. For we know that the Stoics called prepositions σύνδεσμοι προθετικοί, in other words, to them the range of syndesmoi was larger than in the later systems of nine or eight parts,[25]) and in this older system ἐν had to be called a syndesmos.

In order to conclude this analysis of the Pindaric dithyramb, I would point out that the merismos of δεῦτε as ῥῆμα is paralleled by Et. Gud. 139,44,[26]) and this parallel favours the retention of δεῦτε against the MSS. alternative reading of ἴδετε.[27])

On the other occasion when DH hesitates between two choices, the same conclusion is imperative. Moreover, this case offers an interesting parallel to a hotly debated datum concerning Dionysius Thrax. In De Thucyd. 37 DH quotes from the Melian dialogue (Hist. 5,86) the passage: ἡ μὲν ἐπιείκεια τοῦ διδάσκειν καθ' ἡσυχίαν ἀλλήλους οὐ ψέγεται, τὰ δὲ τοῦ πολέμου παρόντα ἤδη καὶ οὐ μέλλοντα διαφέροντα αὐτοῦ φαίνετε. According to him αὐτοῦ refers to ἡ ἐπιείκεια, and a more grammatical agreement would have been achieved if at the end of this phrase Thucydides had written διαφέροντα αὐτῆς φαίνετε.[28]) Now, DH classifies the obnoxoiuos word αὐτοῦ

---

[23]) The remaining words of the dithyramb are no longer classified, except that πανδαίδαλον (col. 5) is ranked under the προσηγορικά (105,6).

[24]) So, too, Aujac 154[2].

[25]) Ap. Dysc. synt. 436,13ff. and Uhlig a.l.

[26]) Cp. Et. Magn. 259,2.10 and Anecd. Oxon. Cramer 1,109,16ff.

[27]) Aujac prefers ἴδετε of P, but there is no reason to do so, the more so as she remarks that "certaines formes dialectales semblent mieux conservées ou restituées dans F" (45, cp. 52ff.).

[28]) On this reading φαίνετε pro φαίνεται of the MSS see Pritchett 123[15].

as follows: εἴτε ἄρθρον δεικτικὸν βούλεταί τις αὐτὸ καλεῖν εἴτε ἀντονο-μασίαν (389,16f.).

In his commentary on this passage G. Pavano (Palermo 1958) merely says that by these two terms DH means the same, and Pritchett (123, n. 14) remarks that according to Apollonius Dyscolus (pron. 5,18f.) "Apollodorus of Athens and Dionysius Thrax called pronouns ἄρθρα δεικτικά," but in the specialized literature on ancient linguistics no reference can be found to this passage from De Thuc., whereas it sheds new light on the communication of Apoll. Dysc. Therefore, I shall discuss this passage to a greater extent than seems desirable at first sight.

Apoll. Dysc. gives αὐτός as an ἀντωνυμία with anaphoric value. Within the pronouns he distinguishes between δεικτικαί and ἀναφο-ρικαί, οὗτος, ἐκεῖνος etc. being deictic and αὐτός anaphoric. Οὗτος etc. occasionally have anaphoric value but αὐτός is never used in a deictic sense.[29]) The Stoics, however, he tells us (pron. 5,14ff.), had not distinguished pronouns as a separate class, but put them under the ἄρθρα. This class consisted of two groups, ἄρθρα ἀόριστα (or ἀοριστώδη) which were the articles, and ἄρθρα ὡρισμένα, the pronouns. According to a later source, Schol. DTh. 518,32ff., within the latter group a further subdivision between διὰ δείξεως and δι' ἀναφορᾶς had been made. But the way the Scholiast formulates this information betrays the fact that he has mixed Stoic and Apollonian terminology and, therefore, makes it unreliable. So far it is not clear which pronouns were recognized by Stoics as definite articles. This problem is aggravated when Diog. Laert. 7,78 is explained in this way, that to them οὗτος was a definite article, but ἐκεῖνος an indefinite one. A way out seems to be present in the information which Apollonius adds immediately after his exposition of the Stoic view: Καὶ Ἀπολλόδωρος ὁ Ἀθηναῖος καὶ ὁ Θρᾷξ Διονύσιος καὶ ἄρθρα δεικτικὰ τὰς ἀντωνυμίας ἐκάλουν. In interpreting this passage scholars nowadays go two different ways, for according to Di Benedetto (1958, 209–210) Dionysius Thrax and Apollo-dorus put all pronouns under ἄρθα δεικτικά, according to others this was the case for demonstrativa only, perhaps together with the personalia.[30]) Besides, the interpretation of the first and

---

[29]) Pron. 10,2f.; synt. 87,1ff. and 267,6ff. and see Uhlig a.ll.

[30]) Erbse, 254–7. Cp. M. Pohlenz, Begründung 55, and see R. Schneider comm. ad loc. for older interpretations. According to Erbse we have to take δεικτικά with τὰς ἀντωνυμίας as well. His parallel to this ἀπὸ κοινοῦ usage does not apply, however, for con. 248,10 stands in a quotation from Chaeremon

third καί was not unanimous, and in the view of Erbse Dionysius
Thrax used both the terms ἀντωνυμία and ἄρθρον δεικτικόν, whereas
Di Benedetto thought that this ancient grammarian did not use
ἀντωνυμία, but beside the Stoic ἄρθρον ὡρισμένον used ἄρθρον δει-
κτικόν also.[31])

It seems to me that in the discussion of the Apollonian passage
the meaning of δεικτικός has been taken for granted, and this word
has been identified with 'demonstrative', in which case an anaphoric
value was either denied or neglected. It was not said explicitly but
the presumption often was that to Stoics δεῖξις had the same mean-
ing as to Apollonius.[32]) However, in 1974 Frede made the view
probable that to Stoics "nicht nur Aussagen mit demonstrativ ver-
wendeten Pronomina als Subjektsausdruck, sondern auch solche
mit anaphorisch verwendeten Pronomina definit sind."[33])

When we take together the various data on the Stoic theory of
deixis and pronouns and the information on Dionysius Thrax, the
most acceptable exegesis seems to me that Stoics called both de-
monstrative and anaphoric pronouns ἄρθρα ὡρισμένα a), and that
Apollodorus and Dionysius Thrax followed Stoic views when they
called these words ἄρθρα δεικτικά also b), i.e. apart from the Stoic
nomenclature.

A relict of this tradition we have now when DH calls αὐτοῦ an
ἄρθρον δεικτικόν. But after Dionysius Thrax and Apollodorus pro-
nouns acquired names of their own, ἀντονομασία or ἀντωνυμία. It
seems probable that at the same time this implied a distinction of
pronouns as a separate class, but this we do not know for sure. At
any rate, the passage from De Thuc. 37 clearly shows that DH
knows of two kinds of classification. One of these fits into a system
with fewer parts whereas the other one is at home in a system with
nine (or eight) parts of speech.

(a), and αὐτοὶ οἱ σύνδεσμοι refers to all connectives, which even when they
are used superfluously do not connect at all, but nevertheless are called
syndesmoi (b). Of course, Erbse is right in denying that all possible pronouns
are meant, but this restriction to personal, demonstrative and anaphoric,
which applies already to the statement on the Stoics, is ignored by Ap. Dysc.

[31]) The relationship of this passage to the question of the authenticity of
the Techne needs no discussion here.

[32]) Erbse 255f.

[33]) M. Frede, Die Stoische Logik, Göttingen 1974, 54f. Cp. H. Hagius,
The Stoic Theory of the Parts of Speech, thesis Columb. Univ. 1979, 33 and
165f. For these reasons Wouters 54 is wrong in thinking that Pap. Yale 1.25
ll. 20–1 ἀναφορά is omitted.

The remaining cases of merismos do not call for comment, because they neither point to a system other than the one we already know was used by DH nor are different from the classification in works of traditional grammar. Therefore, it suffices simply to list these cases:

1. ὄνομα	C.V. 5.23ff.	ἀνήρ, μῆνις, ἠέλιος, τέκος, Μοῦσαι, Ἀχιλλεύς
	Ep.Amm. 19.426ff.	παραίνεσις, ἀξίωσις, ἀποτείχισις, ὀλόφυρσις, ἀνάγκη, πόλεμος
	429	Συρακόσιος, Ἀθηναῖος, τάραχος, ταραχή, ὄχλησις, ὄχλος
2. προσηγορία	C.V. 22.101ff.	χορός, ᾿Ολύμπιοι, χάρις, κλυτός
	105,6	πανδαίδαλος
	108,18	Ἀθηναῖος
	Ep.Amm. 11.430,20ff.	πόλις
3. ῥῆμα	C.V. 5.23ff.	ἔννεπε, ἄειδε, ἀνόρουσε, κλῦθι, μνῆσαι, τύπτε, ἤριπε, ἐκλίνθη, ἔκπεσε, πέτονται, ἐκφανεῖ, ἔρυσαν etc., δεῦτε
	Ep.Amm. 5.426.20	παραινεῖν, ἀξιοῦν, ἀποτειχίσαι, ὀλοφύρασθαι
	12.431.22f.	ἐθέλοιμεν, περιγίγνεται, γίνεται, περίεσται, ἔσται
4. μετοχή	Ep.Amm. 12.432,10	μενόντων
5. ἄρθρον	—	—
6. ἀντονομασία	C.V. 6.29,20	τουτονί
7. πρόθεσις	C.V. 6.30,2	κατ- in κατιδών
	22.102,16f.	ἐπί
8. ἐπίρρημα	C.V. 6.24,21ff.	ἐπιστροφάδην, ἐξοπίσω, ἑτέρωσε, βοτρυδόν, σήμερον
9. σύνδεσμος	C.V. 22.101,7ff. and 25.129,5	ἐν, ἐπί, τε, ἄρα

3. Occasionally DH shows more knowledge of linguistic views than the mere use of names of partes orationis. Thus, in Comp. Verb. 12.46,18ff. we find the words οὐδὲν . . . λόγου μόριον, ᾧ σημαίνεταί τι σῶμα ἢ πρᾶγμα. A similar formulation occurs De Dem. 40. 215,13ff., πᾶσαν σημαίνουσαν σῶμα ἢ πρᾶγμα λέξιν. Of course, these words remind one of the definition of ὄνομα in the Techne 24,1f., μέρος λόγου πτωτικόν, σῶμα ἢ πρᾶγμα σημαῖνον, where λίθος is an example of the first, παιδεία of the second group. However, the context of DH's phrases clearly shows that he is thinking either of verbs as well as of nouns (Com. Verb.), or of all possible words of whichever class (De Dem.). This means that somewhere he has

picked up these phrases but has applied them to ὄνομα in its general
sense of 'any word'.

In another case we have still more reason for explaining
Dionysius' words by assuming that he has mixed up various pieces
of information. In Ep. Amm. 14.433,6ff. he discussed those σχημα-
τισμοί in which Thucydides treats πράγματα as πρόσωπα and, con-
versely, σώματα as πράγματα. Usually scholars explain that both
πρόσωπα and σώματα stand for 'persons' and πράγματα for 'things',
so that here Dionysius would first discuss the device of προσωποποιία
and then its antithesis.[34]) This explanation is right for the second
case, for according to DH in Hist. 1,70 Thucydides puts τὸ ὑμέτερον
instead of ὑμεῖς, thus he uses a πρᾶγμα, not a σῶμα. In the first case,
however, difficulties arise when we follow the traditional inter-
pretation. Here DH quotes Hist. 1,71,7: πρὸς τάδε βουλεύεσθε εὖ,
καὶ τὴν Πελοπόννησον πειρᾶσθε μὴ ἐλάσσον᾽ ἐξηγεῖσθαι ἢ οἱ πατέρες
ὑμῖν παρέδοσαν. To use ἐξηγεῖσθαι for προάγειν ἔξω,[35]) he says, does
not agree with τὴν Πελοπόννησον for this is a χώρα, whereas the verb
does apply to its glory and its power (τῇ δόξῃ καὶ τοῖς πράγμασιν
περὶ αὐτὴν ὑπάρχουσιν), and this is what Thucydides means to say. If,
indeed, DH here is talking of προσωποποιία, he ought to have taken
τὴν Πελοπόννησον as an animate body, which is improbable. I prefer
to believe that he knows an antithesis πρᾶγμα – σῶμα (= abstrac-
tum – concretum),[36]) has identified this with another one, viz.
πρόσωπον – πρᾶγμα (= persona – res). and here uses these terms
indiscriminately and without realizing that his first example is a
case of the antithesis πρᾶγμα – σῶμα, and his second one of πρόσω-
πον – πρᾶμα.

In Comp. Verb. 5.23,15ff. DH mentions a difference between
the referents of ὄνομα and ῥῆμα. He says that in principle in a sen-
tence one should put nouns before verbs: τὰ μὲν γὰρ (sc. ὀνόματα)
τὴν οὐσίαν (F, Teubner text; αἰτίαν P, Budé text) δηλοῦν, τὰ δὲ (sc.
ῥήματα) τὸ συμβεβηκός, πρότεραν δ᾽ εἶναι τῇ φύσει τὴν οὐσίαν τῶν
συμβεβηκότων. Tὸ a certain extent these words remind one of Apoll.
Dysc. synt. 18,5ff.: τοῦ ῥήματος ἀναγκαίως πρόκειται τὸ ὄνομα ἐπεὶ
τὸ διατιθέναι καὶ τὸ διατίθεσθαι[37]) σώματος ἴδιον, τοῖς δὲ σώμασι

[34]) Rhys Roberts, Pritchett and Usher.

[35]) See C. G. Krüger, Dion. Hal. Historiographica, Hal. Sax. 1823, 235 on
the difficulty of DH taking προάγειν ἔξω as equivalent to ἐξηγεῖσθαι.

[36]) See Techne 24,3. Cp. G. Nuchelmans, Theories of the proposition,
Amsterdam 1973, 65f.

[37]) Cp. Comp. Verb. 5.24,17 τὸ ποιοῦν ἢ πάσχον.

ἐπίκειται ἡ θέσις τῶν ὀνομάτων. But he does not mention the contrast
οὐσία and τὸ συμβεβηκός. This contrast is not common at all in
linguistic works and is found in Choeroboscus[38]) and other late
authors only. In traditional grammar οὐσία is often used to define
ὄνομα[39]) but αἰτία is never thus used and τὸ συμβεβηκός is absent from
definitions of ῥῆμα. However, both αἴτιον (not αἰτία) and τὸ συμβεβη-
κός occur in a fragment of the Stoic Zeno[40]) (Stobaeus Ecl. 1,138,
14 W. = SVF 1,89), which offers a close parallel to the text of DH:
αἴτιον δ' ὁ Ζήνων φησὶν εἶναι δι' ὅ, οὗ δ' αἰτίαν συμβεβηκός· καὶ τὸ μὲν
αἴτιον σῶμα, οὗ δ' αἴτιον κατηγόρημα (. . .), αἴτιον δ' ἐστι δι' ὃ γίνεταί
τι, οἷον διὰ τὴν φρόνησιν γίνεται τὸ φρονεῖν κτλ. The parallel between
αἰτία (cod. P) and τὸ συμβεβηκός in the text of DH on the one hand,
and αἴτιον and συμβεβηκός in Zeno's on the other is striking, the more
so as Zeno's examples (φρόνησις, φρονεῖν) agree with how DH would
have classified them, and also because in Stoic texts κατηγόρημα is
commonly used in connection with ῥῆμα.[41]) In my opinion, there-
fore, in the Dionysian passage we have a reminiscence of what in a
Stoic treatise was said about ὄνομα and ῥῆμα,[42]) and, accordingly,
with Mme Aujac we must accept the reading of P, αἰτίαν.[43])

In De Thucyd. 24.362,10 ff. we some across the next passage
which calls for comment: ἐν δὲ τοῖς συνδετικοῖς καὶ τοῖς
προθετικοῖς καὶ ἔτι μᾶλλον ἐν τοῖς διαρθροῦσι τὰς τῶν ὀνομάτων δυνά-
μεις ποιητοῦ τρόπον ἐνεξουσιάζων (sc. ὁ Θουκυδίδης). The same words
occur in the quotation in Ep. Amm. 2.423,16 ff., albeit that here
νοημάτων, not ὀνομάτων, is used.[44]) The last words of this passage
have been misunderstood by translators and commentators, for
from Rhys Roberts onwards, these words have been taken as re-

---

[38]) 105,2–7. See Steinthal 2,233f., who does not mention the Dionysian
passage, and D. Donnet, AC 36, 1967, 38.

[39]) E.g. Techne 33.6ff. To take οὐσία as a sure sign of Aristotelian-Peripat-
etic theory (Wouters 179) is to ignore the many occurrences of οὐσία in
SVF.

[40]) Stobaeus Eclog. 1.138,14ff. = SVF 1, 89.

[41]) E.g. Diog. Laert. 7.58. Cp. my Studies in the history of ancient lin-
guistics II, Mnem. 37, 1984.

[42]) Steinthal 2.233f. speaks of Aristotelian influence on the passage of
n. 38.

[43]) Her reading of this text is based on her observation (44) that F more
than once modernizes the text. This is true for 5,26,13; 22.102,16 σύνδεσμον,
see Usener a.l.

[44]) The interchange between νοήματα and ὀνόματα is common in the MSS
of DH, and decision not always easy.

80   Dirk M. Schenkeveld

ferring to particles and articles, which parts "bring out the force
of individual words or complete their meaning".[45] Unfortunately,
in Ep. Amm. we do not have an explanation of these words by ex-
amples,[46] but, nevertheless, we can be sure that DH never meant to
designate particles. Such a group was never distinguished by ancient
linguists, but is a modern invention. Words which nowadays are put
under this vague term were classified in Antiquity mostly as σύνδε-
σμοι, and several of them as ἐπιρρήματα.[47] DH has already mentioned
τὰ συνδετικά, therefore by his last words he means another class,
which must be none other than the article.[48] This view is strength-
ened by a remark in Comp. Verb. 22.98,2ff. that ἁρμονία αὐστηρά
is ὀλιγοσύνδεσμος, ἄναρθρος κτλ. and a similar observation in De Dem.
39.213,17. We know that for DH in prose Thucydides, more than
anyone else, represents this style of composition.

But what does DH mean by διαρθροῦν τὰς δυνάμεις ὀνομάτων? In
other Dionysian texts δύναμις is used to mean 'phonetic value' of
letters or 'sense' of words,[49] and in Comp. Verb. 22.101,19ff. we
find the expression σιωπὴν τὴν διορίζουσαν ἑκατέρων τῶν γραμμάτων
τὰς δυνάμεις.[50] Outside these texts we have the Stoic definition of
ἄρθρον in Diog. Laert. 7,58: ἄρθρον (. . .) διορίζον τὰ γένη τῶν ὀνο-
μάτων καὶ τοὺς ἀριθμούς, οἷον ῾Ο, ῾Η, Τό, Οἱ, Αἱ, Τά. This definition
applies to a restricted group of Stoic ἄρθρα only,[51] and it, or a
similar one, must have been current later, for Apoll. Dysc. (synt.
35,5ff.) is opposed to those who assert that articles serve for διά-
κρισις γενῶν.

In all probability, therefore, these latter texts provide a clue for
the explanation of Dionysius' wording, in as much as according to
DH articles serve as distinctors of gender and number, and thus
have to do with the meaning of words. But one is justified in doubt-
ing whether he himself understood what he had written.

4. In his treatment of the accidentia of the partes orationis DH
has some remarks which are interesting because of their difference

---

[45] Usher 529. Cp. Rhys Roberts, 1901, 135 and Pritchett 17 and n. 39.
[46] For possible reasons for this omission see Ros 53[7] and 66.
[47] Cp. Antje Hellwig, Glotta 52, 1974, 145–8.
[48] So Reiske and Blass, AB I[2], 1887, 222f.
[49] See Rhys Roberts, indices s.v.
[50] Cp. *ibid.* 25.135,1f. and De Dem. 52.242,16ff. On the trias, mentioned
there, of ὄνομα – τύπος – δύναμις see Barwick RP 102 and 107, and Hagius
122. This trias is already present in Polybius 10, 47, 8.
[51] Cp. Pinborg 99.

Linguistic Theories in the Rhetorical Works of Dionysius of Halicarnassus 81

from those in traditional grammar. Most of these concern accidents of noun and verb, and when discussing these I shall also go into his terminology of accidents themselves.

First, however, comes a short discussion of the only passage where DH mentions accidents of classes other than noun and verb. In Comp. Verb. 5.24,17 ff. he takes the view that verbs are to be put before adverbs: ἐπειδὴ πρότερόν ἐστι τῇ φύσει τὸ ποιοῦν ἢ πάσχον τῶν συνεδρευόντων αὐτοῖς, τρόπου λέγω καὶ τόπου καὶ χρόνου, καὶ τῶν παραπλησίων, ἃ δὴ καλοῦμεν ἐπιρρήματα. To typify adverbs by τὰ συνεδρεύοντα τοῖς ῥήμασιν reminds one of Priscian's information on the view of Stoics who did not distinguish adverbs as a separate class and quasi adiectiva verborum ea nominabant,[52]) but this vague parallel is less interesting than the three kinds of adverbs which DH mentions: ἐπιρρήματα τρόπου, τόπου and χρόνου.[53]) The latter two terms are known from traditional grammar but the first does not occur there at all.[54]) DH quotes Homeric lines as examples of the order verb—adverb, and conversely, but does not indicate which adverb belongs to which subclass. However, we may safely assume that to him ἐξοπίσω, ἑτέρωσε and σήμερον are adverbs of place and time, and, consequently, that ἐπιστροφάδην and βοτρυδόν are adverbs of manner. In Techne 75,1 βοτρυδόν, together with πύξ, λάξ and ἀγεληδόν, is called ἐπίρρημα ποιότητος,[55]) and the identification of τρόπου with ποιότητος is easy to make. This is the more so as when explaining the Techne passage ancient commentators connect these adverbs with a sense of "the manner in which," e.g. Schol. DTh. 60,3 ff.: τὰ δηλοῦντα τὸν τοῦ σχήματος τρόπον καὶ τὴν ἔνδειξιν καλεῖται ποιότητος, οἷον πῶς ἔτυψε; πύξ· πῶς ἤρχοντο; ἀγεληδόν· πῶς ἐκαθέζοντο; γνύξ.[56]) In the case of DH we do not know whether he uses a current word or introduces a term of his own—though the first alternative seems more acceptable—, at any rate his ἐπίρρημα τρόπου is unique in ancient linguistics.

Accidentia themselves are indicated by various terms; once παρακολουθεῖν is used in this way, but more usual is τὰ συμβεβη-

---

[52]) II, 16.54,10.

[53]) Καὶ τῶν παραπλ. hints at more than three kinds, but DH does not say how many. E.g. Techne 73,3 and 76,2.

[54]) In Gramm. Lat. adverbia modi does not occur either.

[55]) Cp. Ap. Dysc. adv. 205,2: πᾶν εἰς δον λῆγον ἐπίρρημα ποιότητός ἐστι παρεμφατικόν, οὐ τύπου, βοτρυδόν κτλ. Ἐπιστροφάδην is not commented upon in Sch. Il.

[56]) Cp. Uhlig ad Techne 75,1.

82   Dirk M. Schenkeveld

κότα.[57]) This word also serves to indicate properties of letters and of styles of composition.[58]) Accidents of syllables, however, are called πάθη.[59]) Τὰ συμβεβηκότα, when referring to accidents of parts of speech, comprise more features than are indicated by the traditional term of τὰ παρεπόμενα in e.g. Apollonius' works. For in De Dem. 55 DH lists the following features: συστολαί, ἐκτάσεις, ὀξύτητες, βαρύτητες, γένη, πτώσεις, ἀριθμοί, ἐγκλίσεις, τὰ ἄλλα παραπλήσια τούτοις μυρία ὄντα. In a much abbreviated form the list is found again in Comp. Verb. 25, ἐκτάσεις, συστολαί, προσῳδίαι καὶ τὰ παραπλήσια τούτοις, where προσῳδίαι is a substitute for ὀξύτητες and βαρύτητες in the first passage. In traditional grammar συστολαί and ἐκτάσεις are placed under the πάθη λέξεων, morphological modifications,[60]) but breathings are not put there. However, even later still, προσῳδίαι is used as a generic term of which τόνος, χρόνοι, πνεύματα and πάθη are the differentiae.[61])

Thus we see that as far as terms for accidents and their contents are concerned, DH differs from traditional grammarians:

— τὰ συμβεβηκότα, not τὰ παρεπόμενα, is used (1),

— τὰ συμβ. also comprise the πάθη λέξεων of traditional grammar and the breathings (2),

— πάθη is used in connection with πάθη συλλαβῶν, not with πάθη λέξεων (3).

From Comp. Verb. 15 it appears that πάθη συλλαβῶν are the differences in short and long syllables which vary in proportion to the number of consonants before the vowel of the syllable,[62]) as well as the various sound values (harsh, smooth, soft etc.). In this context κατασκευάζειν also occurs, and ibid. 61,8 αἱ τῶν συλλαβῶ κατασκευαί is used to indicate manipulation of the properties of the syllables. In the examples of this procedure we find new terms, viz. παρέκτασις in connection with Homeric forms, βοόωσιν and ψηλαφόων (60,13ff.), and ἡ τῶν συλλαβῶν καὶ γραμμάτων ἐλάττωσις, probably referring to the forms ἀμβλήδην and ἔκπληγεν. More common in traditional

_____

[57]) Παρακολουθεῖν: Comp. Verb. 6.29,12, cp. Ap. Dysc. pron. 4,3. τὰ συμβεβ.: Comp. Verb. 25.132,7; 135,4 = De Dem. 52.242,20f.

[58]) Comp. Verb. 14.50,10; De Dem. 36.209,25 and 50.237,9. Cp. De Thuc. 22.358,17.

[59]) Comp. Verb. 15.59,15f. and 25.135,3 = De Dem. 52.242,20f.

[60]) See Schneider Ap. Dysc. Fragm. 177f. and E. Siebenborn, Die Lehre von der Sprachrichtigkeit und ihre Kriterien, Amsterdam 1976, 44.

[61]) See Steinthal 2, 205ff. and Wouters 192.

[62]) Cp. Rhys Roberts 1910 a.l.

grammar are (ἐπ-)ἔκτασις and συστολή, words that DH uses else-where (ibid. 25.135,4f.), but then alongside with πάϑη, as we have seen.

Outside the context of a discussion of πάϑη DH uses the verbs ἐκϑλίβειν and συναλείφειν in connection with the rapid pronunciation of οἴομαι and δέον.[63]) These verbs, together with the noun συναλοιφή in Comp. Verb., are used here for the first time as grammatical terms (see LSJ).

As far as the individual accidents are concerned, those of nouns agree with what we know about them from traditional grammar. They are the following: ἑνικῶς—πληϑυντικῶς, ὀρϑὴ πτῶσις—πλάγιαι πτώσεις, ἀρσενικά/ἄρρενα—ϑηλυκά—οὐδέτερα, and πτώσεις αἰτιατική, γενική and δοτική.[64])

More variation and differences are shown in the list of verbal accidents:

Comp. Verb. 6,29,7ff.:	τὰ ὀρϑά — τὰ ὕπτια
	ἐγκλίσεις, ἃς δή τινες πτώσεις ῥηματικὰς καλοῦσιν
	(ποίας) παρεμφαίνοντα διαφορὰς χρόνων
	καὶ εἴ τινα τοῖς ῥήμασιν ἄλλα παρακολουϑεῖν πέφυκε
5.24,35 and	τὸ ποιοῦν — τὸ πάσχον
26,14	τὰ ὀρϑά — τὰ ἐγκεκλιμένα
	τὰ παρεμφατικά — τὰ ἀπαρεμφατικά (or vice versa)
De Thuc. 24.362,1f.	τὰ παϑητικά — τὰ δραστήρια
= Ep.Amm. 2.423,8f.	
Ep.Amm. 7.427,17ff.	τὰ παϑητικά — τὰ ποιητικά
	τὸ παϑητικόν — τὸ ἐνεργητικόν
exx.	κωλύεται κωλύει
	ἐπιμιγνύμεοι ἐπιμιγνύντες
	ἐναλλάγησαν συνήλλαξαν
	κατῳκημένους κατῳκηκότας
ibid. 12.431,22ff.	(χρόνοι τῶν ῥημάτων), τὸ μὲν ἐϑέλοιμεν[65]) ῥῆμα τοῦ μέλλοντός ἐστι χρόνου δηλωτικόν, τὸ δὲ περι-γίγνεται τοῦ παρόντος ... τὸ μὲν γίγνεται τοῦ παρόντος ἐστί, τὸ δὲ ἔσται τοῦ μέλλοντος χρόνου δηλωτικόν.

To take the last passage first, Aristotle, Poet. 1457a17f., βαδί-ζει...προσσημαίνει τὸν παρόντα χρόνον seems to be a parallel, and,

---

[63]) Cp. Rhys Roberts 1910, s.v. συναλοιφή.

[64]) Comp. Verb. 6.29,1ff.; De Dem. 27.189,8ff.; De Thuc. 24.362,3ff.; Ep. Amm. 2.423ff.; 9.428,19ff. and 11.430,12ff.

[65]) Following Krüger (lviii) H. Usener, Dion. Hal. libr. de imitatione rell., Bonn 1889, 108 prefers ἐϑέλομεν of cod. C.

accordingly, we are not compelled to take the words of DH as technical terms, though it would not be inappropriate to do so. If we choose the latter course, ὁ παρὼν χρόνος would be notable, for ὁ ἐνεστὼς χρόνος is the traditional word. Ὁ μέλλων χρόνος is quite usual. The pronouncement that ἐθέλοιμεν is 'a verbal form which indicates the future' (so Rhys Roberts) is not unusual either when we consider Apoll. Dysc., synt. 354, 11 ff. Among the terms for the genders παθητικόν and ἐνεργητικόν are traditional, δραστήριον has a parallel in δραστικόν in Schol. DTh. 401, 2 f., and similar words in Apoll. Dysc. pron. 44, 1 etc., but ποιητικόν is unique in this sense of active (not in LSJ). The pair ὀρθόν—ὕπτιον too belongs to this accident, for Schol. DTh. 1.1. says, ἐνεργητικὴ διάθεσις (. . .) ἥτις παρὰ τοῖς φιλοσόφοις δραστικὴ καὶ ὀρθὴ καλεῖται and παθητικὴ (. . .) ἥτις παρὰ τοῖς φιλοσόφοις ὑπτία καλεῖται (cp. 548, 35 ff.). In view of what we know from Diog. Laert. 7, 64 we can trace this distinction to the Stoics.[66])

This assignment of ὀρθόν—ὕπτιον to gender means that in Comp. Verb. 6 we obtain the following tripartition, ὀρθά—ὕπτια ~ genders, ἐγκλίσεις ~ moods, διαφορὰς χρόνων ~ tenses. However, ibid. 5, 1. 1 we meet with the antithesis ὀρθά—ἐγκεκλιμένα (PMV; ἐγκλινόμενα F) (and ἀπαρεμφατικά—παρεμφατικά), which distinction does not square with those of ch. 6. If I understand him rightly, Steinthal (2, 274) thinks that both distinctions are compatible, if one interprets them as follows: in ch. 6 the pair ὀρθά—ὕπτια distinguishes between indicativi praesentis and all other moods and tenses, ὕπτια then is split up, first into ἐγκλίσεις, moods and finally into χρόνοι, tenses. This division, he thinks, occurs in ch. 5 too, where ὀρθά—ἐγκεκλιμένα tallies with the pair indicatives—non-indicatives, and παρεμφατικά—ἀπαρεμφατικά with that of non-infinitives—infinitives. I believe that the distinction ὀρθά—ὕπτια can better be explained as one of gender only, and that Steinthal's solution, though consistent, is wrong. The antithesis ὀρθά—ἐγκεκλιμένα may well be one of indicatives v. non-indicatives, but it is not necessary to take ὀρθά in both passages in the same way. DH avails himself of different distinctions, without being aware that they differ.[67])

At any rate, we see that the terminology in Comp. Verb. 5 and 6 is quite different from that in De Dem. 52 and Comp. Verb. 24 and 25, ll. ll., in as far as in the first passages τὰ συμβεβηκότα does not

---

[66]) Cp. Pohlenz 177 ff.   [67]) See also my Studies II.

occur. Now the background of Comp. Verb. 5–6 seems quite Stoic,[68])
so take τὰ συμβεβηκότα, which does not occur here, as a distinctly
Stoic term is uncalled for.[69]) On the other hand, when τὰ συμβεβηκότα
does occur, DH is speaking in general terms about how at school
children are taught γραμματική;[70]) nor does this prove a Stoic origin.
According to Pinborg 101 "this purely Aristotelian concept of
accident is inconsistent with Stoic epistemology" and he thinks (111)
that the use of accident "could point to a direct peripatetic influence
on grammar, which otherwise is difficult to prove"; he adds that "it
is probably not accidental that Dionysius of Halicarnassus who used
peripatetic sources, is our first witness to the use of the term accident
as a technical term of grammar." In favour of this view one may
adduce another Peripatetic (and Platonic) view in this chapter of
Comp. Verb. (25.134,11): ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις τέχναις ὧν ἐνέργειά τις ἢ
ποίησις τὸ τέλος.[71]) But the comparison with musical education here,
as well as the proper subject of this chapter, viz. the differences and
similarities between prose and poetry, remind one of views proposed
by οἱ κριτικοί. These people were inclined to Stoic theories.[72]) On
the whole, I do not exclude the possibility therefore, that τὰ συμ-
βεβηκότα was used in Stoic grammar (cp. also SVF 1,89 and 2,509),
but cannot prove it.

5. We may now turn to the remarks of DH which have to do
with the more philosophical aspects of linguistic theory. Several
times already I have quoted passages on word order; now I shall
deal with these systematically. In Comp. Verb. 5 DH embarks on
a fundamental treatment of the question whether a natural order of
word classes exists and is to be followed in the σύνθεσις. In the pre-
vious chapter he had said that when preparing his treatise he had
studied in particular Stoic writings, because Stoics "were accus-
tomed to pay no little attention to the department of discourse"
(tr. Rh. Rob.). However, a work such as Chrysippus' περὶ τῆς

---

[68]) See section 5 and e.g. Pohl, 80.

[69]) So Barwick Probl. 47, but see Pinborg 101 f.

[70]) In De Dem. 52 and Comp. Verb. 25 γραμματικὴ τέχνη refers to phono-
logy and morphology as well as to reading, subjects children are taught at
school (cp. *ibid.* 14.50,17), but De Thuc. 51.410,17 (cp. 45.417,22 and De
Lysia 4.12,17) γραμματικὴ ἐξήγησις, which even those with a thorough know-
ledge of Thucydides are in need of, has a wider meaning, of course, of philolo-
gical commentary.

[71]) Cp. Plato Symp. 205b and Aristotle Eth. Nic. 1094a4.

[72]) See note 7.

86   Dirk M. Schenkeveld

συντάξεως τῶν τοῦ λόγου μορίων had nothing to do with rhetoric,
but was concerned with dialectis. Therefore, DH put these Stoic
works aside, and "falling back upon my own resources [I] proceeded
to consider whether I could find some starting-point indicated by
nature itself" (φυσικὴν ἀφορμήν). This too led to a dead end, but
nevertheless he undertakes to treat of it, in order to avoid the blame
of having neglected a fruitful approach. Hence his discussion in
ch. 5.

Thus it seems that DH has independently embarked on this
matter. But at the end of ch. 5 (26,20ff.) he brackets together this
research and that of τέχναι διαλεκτικαί. Therefore, there is a consid-
erable chance at least that DH has been led to the problem of a
natural word order by these Stoic τέχναι, if he has not taken over
from these his exposition in ch. 5.[73] Later on, we shall see that this
speculation turns out to be almost a certainty.

DH tells his addressee that he started from the conception that
we must follow nature as much as possible and must put together
τὰ μόρια τοῦ λόγου such as she wishes. Therefore ὀνόματα must come
before ῥήματα (see p. 78), then verbs before adverbs (see p. 81),
what happens first before what happens later, and, finally, nouns
before adjectives,[74] προσηγορικά before ὀνόματα, ἀντονομασίαι before
προσηγορικά, and in the case of verbs, τὰ ὀρθά before τὰ ἐγκεκλιμένα
and τὰ παρεμφατικά before τὰ ἀπαρέμφατα.[75] In the first three in-
stances quotations are given which prove that a pleasant composi-
tion can be attained irrespective of whether one keeps to the natural
order or not. Later on he stops giving examples, but this causes
no wonder, for to him this whole avenue of thought is worthless.

Upton (1702, see G. H. Schaefer, comm. 1808) and Rhys Roberts
(1910) have referred here to· Quintilian 9,4,23–5 who mentions a
similar theory: est et alius naturalis ordo, ut viros ac feminas (. . .)
dicas potius quam retrorsum. (. . .) illa nimia quorundam fuit
observatio ut vocabula verbis, verba rusus adverbiis, nomina appo-
sitis et pronominibus essent priora (. . .) et illa nimiae superstitionis,
uti quaeque sint tempore, ita facere etiam ordine priora.[76] The
similarities are indeed significant, the only exceptions being the

---

[73]) Pohl 78 and Aujac 204.

[74]) See note 15.

[75]) Thus cod. F, Teubner; Cod. P, Aujac τὰ ἀπαρεμφατικά (πρό) τῶν παρεμ-
φατικῶν. Cp. Ap. Dysc. synt. 324ff.

[76]) Cp. F. R. Verwig, Der rhet. Naturbegriff bei Quintilian, Heidelberg
1976, 108–10.

distinction between and the order of προσηγορίαι and ὀνόματα, and
the placing of ἀντονομασίαι before προσηγορικά.

Another parallel from a rhetorical work is to be found in
Demetrius περὶ ἑρμ. 199: καὶ ὅλως (in the plain character and in lucid
narrative) τῇ φυσικῇ τάξει τῶν ὀνομάτων χρηστέον, ὡς τὸ Ἐπίδαμνός
ἐστι πόλις ἐν δεξιᾷ ἐσπλέοντι εἰς τὸν Ἰόνιον κόλπον (Thuc.
(1,24,1). πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ ὠνόμασται τὸ περὶ οὗ, δεύτερον δὲ ὃ τοῦτό
ἐστιν, ὅτι πόλις, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ἐφεξῆς. In the next paragraph Demetrius
gives counter-examples which are also acceptable. Pseudo-Longinus,
too, knows of ἡ ἐκ τοῦ κατὰ φύσιν εἱρμοῦ τάξις (22,1). Accordingly,
though these four literary critics reject the idea of a natural word
order as the only acceptable guide in composition, it is clear that
such a view was current.[77])

Basically, the same view is also found in Apoll. Dysc. synt.
15,6ff., but this parallel has almost never been noted.[78]) Apollonius
there discusses the order of the parts of speech, comparable to
that of letters, because in both cases ratio is dominating and guid-
ing. He compares the order of nominative—other cases, present—
other tenses, and masculine —feminine —neuter gender. In all these
instances the order is κατὰ λόγον, not κατὰ τύχην. As to the parts of
speech, Apollonius argues for the order of ὄνομα, ῥῆμα, μετοχή,
ἄρθρον, ἀντωνυμία, πρόθεσις, ἐπίρρημα and σύνδεσμος (synt. 15,6–
27,16).

Which τάξις is meant here? The comparison with the alphabet
suggest word order in the sentence, but Apollonius does not say so
explicitly. Pinborg (119) thinks that "this order primarily expresses
the relative importance of the parts of speech in the sentence, only
secondarily the actual word order", but this view is only partially
right. From the comparison with the alphabet, where the letters β,
γ, etc. all are seen as derivations of the α (19,11ff.), as well as from
terms used, such as θέσις, μετάπτωσις, πρεσβύτερον, ἀρχαιότερον, it
appears that τάξις also has to do with a chronological order of origin
of the parts of speech: before a verb could come into being, a noun
had to exist, otherwise a verb could not express the action (or
passion) which had to be connected with the noun.[79]) All the same,
noun and verb are τὰ ἐμψυχότατα μέρη, they cannot be left out, and
consequently, the Apollonian τάξις indicates the relative importance

---

[77]) For similar views on the natural order in other subjects cp. De Dem.
33.202,18; Comp. Verb. 2.7,23ff.; De Thuc. 11.341ff. and see H. Caplan on
Ad Herenn. 3,16 and F. Striller De Stoic. stud. rhet., Bresl. Abh. I, 2, 35.

[78]) Pohl 79.   [79]) Cp. adv. 121,4ff.

of parts of speech too and has a hierarchical character in addition
to that of chronological priority.

These two priorities of parts of speech have their counterpart in
those of the accidents. In synt. 324, 10 ff. Apollonius argues exten-
sively for the view that the infinitive as τὸ γενικώτατον ῥῆμα should
come before the indicative and therefore deserves a treatment
prior to the latter mood, even when from a didactic point of view
the opposite order of treatment looks preferable. Here, too, Apollo-
nius argues for a chronological priority, for the logos proves that
the infinitive may be compared with the original words, τὰ πρωτό-
τυπα, and the indicative with their derivatives, τὰ παραγωγά.

But in the case of some parts of speech Apollonius takes τάξις
as the actual word order. The preposition may have a later origin
than the noun, nevertheless it stands before the noun it belongs to
(μεταγενεστέρα μέν ἐστι τῇ φύσει, τῇ δὲ τάξει ἀρκτική). The same is
true for the article, ἄρθρον προτακτικόν.[80])

All in all, we must deduce from these and related passages that
to Apollonius ἡ κατὰ λόγον τῶν μερῶν τοῦ λόγου τάξις (synt. 15, 7 f.)
refers to an order of parts of speech which is chronological, hier-
archical and, to a certain extent, one of the actual order of words in
a sentence.

This order is quite rational, he says, i.e. by means of reasoning
one can deduce which words came into existence first. Moreover,
the whole of this train of thought presupposes the view that lan-
guage is dependent on an original namegiver (θέσει) and has been
given in accordance with the natural state of things (φύσει), which
view is definitely Stoic.[81])

To come back to the Dionysian passages, we now detect several
similarities between his remarks and those of Apollonius, e. g. when
DH says that nouns πρότερον εἶναι than verbs (23, 17 f.). Apollonius,
however, stresses less than DH the natural order in the sense of
word order, but this approach was understandably more attractive
to DH and other literary critics.

Several points remain for discussion here. Why does DH assert
that προσηγορικά must be put before ὀνόματα, and ἀντονομασίαι before
προσηγορικά? In Stoic opinion προσηγορίαι indicate a κοινὴ ποιότης
and ὀνόματα an ἰδία ποιότης (Diog. Laert. 7, 58). In view of the Stoic
character of chapter 5 we may assume that Dionysius' order was

---

[81]) D. Fehling, Rhein. Mus. 108, 1965, 218 ff. Steinthal 2, 231 ff. must be
accordingly corrected.

influenced by a presumed order of κοινά—ἴδια, but I have yet to find an exact parallel. Much more difficult is the explanation of the order pronoun—common noun. Apollonius, synt. 20,1 ff., declares it not unreasonable if one wishes to put—i.e. to discuss—the pronouns before the verbs because they replace the nouns, but he rejects this view. But this passage does not help in explaining Dionysius' order. Apollonius, however, does give an exact parallel to what DH says about the order ἀπαρεμφατικά—παρεμφατικά (26,15), whether with MS P we accept this order, or with F the order παρεμφατικά—ἀπαρεμφατικά. Apollonius defends the first order, but confesses to have formerly adhered to the second one (synt. 327,13 ff.).

At the beginning of this section I suggested that in chapter 5 DH was inspired by Stoic sources, to say the least. This suggestion has become almost a certainty, now that we have met with the parallels mentioned, to which I also reckon what has been said about αἰτία—συμβεβηκός (p. 79) and about ὀρθά—ὕπτια (p. 84).

6. Gradually a picture of DH has developed as a man who can easily use parts of different linguistic theories. Sometimes this eclectic procedure leads him into contradictions. This is clearly the case when we compare Comp. Verb. 16.62,9 ff. with 18.74,2. In the first passage he describes several Homeric lines as felicitously expressing things. For this feature nature is responsible, ἡ φύσις ἡ ποιοῦσα μιμητικοὺς καὶ θετικοὺς[82] ἡμᾶς τῶν ὀνομάτων, οἷς δηλοῦται τὰ πράγματα κατά τινας εὐλόγους καὶ κινητικοὺς τῆς διανοίας ὁμοιότητας. These words accord with the Stoic view that originally language is an exact replica of things signified, and that when composing names the namegiver acted in a precise way, be it that here we, not an imaginary name-giver, are said to do so.

However, in the second passage Dionysius deplores the fact that not all rhythms are equally excellent, and recommends that, consequently, we mix both good and ugly rhythms, in the same way as this is to be done in many cases, τὰ γὰρ ὀνόματα κεῖται τοῖς πράγμασιν ὡς ἔτυχεν (74,2). This idea is the very opposite of the first one: ὡς ἔτυχεν versus κατά τινας εὐλόγους ὁμοιότητας. This second opinion may have been taken from a Peripatetic source, also because of the similarities between this passage and 16.66,18 ff., which latter passage is preceded by a quotation from Theophrastus' περὶ λέξεως.[83]

---

[82] καὶ θετ. not in P, omitted by Usener, but retained by Fehling 222.
[83] Cp. Pohl 120.

We must not imagine that between ch. 16 and ch. 18 Dionysius has changed his mind; on the contrary, he only reproduces what he has read, without realizing its implications.

The first opinion, that of φύσις as the originator of language, we find again in Comp. Verb. 3. 14, 11 ff.; Herodotus has not picked and chosen his words with studious care; no they are οἷα ἡ φύσις τέθηκεν σύμβολα τοῖς πράγμασιν. One may wonder whether this expression betrays a Peripatetic source, —the use of σύμβολα certainly leads us to think so[84])—and in that case, confusion between Peripatetic and Stoic views seems complete.

7. Dionysius' views on figurations and figures of speech are closely related to the idea that there are natural properties of language. Of course, here is not the place to treat the whole of the theory of σχήματα, but only its linguistic aspects.

These aspects are not touched upon in the earlier treatises, where, moreover, by σχήματα almost exclusively the Gorgianic figures are meant. It is not before De Dem. and Comp. Verb. again that DH draws linguistic theory into the discussion of σχηματισμοί.[85]) Very evidently he does so in Comp. Verb., De Thuc. and its appendix, Ep. Amm., although not in a consistent way.

In Comp. Verb. 6 three functions of compositions are distinguished, ἁρμογή, σχηματισμός, and κατασκευή;[86]) all three have their place, irrespective of their objects, viz. single words, cola and periods. *Κατασκευή* comprises three processes, ἀφαίρεσις, προσθήκη and ἀλλοίωσις. This triad is well known from Plato's Cratylus, has a firm place in traditional grammar, and is transferred here to the field of rhetoric.[87]) In the case of word modifications DH mentions τουτονί (pro τοῦτον) and κατιδεῖν (pro ἰδεῖν) as examples of adiectio, μητ' (ἰδίας) to illustrate detractio, also called συναλοιφή, whereas mutatio is demonstrated by the pairs ἐχωροφίλησε—ἐφιλοχώρησε and ἀφαιρήσομαι—ἀφαιρεθήσομαι.

Under the heading of σχηματισμός of single words fall the many accidentia, dealt with in section 4, whereas in the part on the shaping of clauses DH uses the Stoic theory of speech acts, which I

---

[84]) Cp. Fehling 224 and Aujac 74.

[85]) See note 11.

[86]) MSS vary between κατασκευή and μετασκευή. See Aujac.

[87]) Cp. Th. Herrle, Quaest. rhet. ad elocut. pertin., Leipzig 1912, 40f. DH does not distinguish between μετάθεσις (transposition) and ἀλλοίωσις (transmutation), for which see H. Caplan on Ad Herenn. 4,29 and Siebenborn 44. In his later examples DH concentrates on addition and subtraction.

have discussed elsewhere,[88]) and which he calls τρόποι τῆς ἐκφορᾶς τῶν νοημάτων. After giving a list of these shapes he adds that a multitude of σχηματισμοὶ καὶ τῆς λέξεως ὥσπερ καὶ τῆς διανοίας exists, but then he drops the subject.

In these chapters DH sees composition as a conscious art; therefore, it is understandable that the subject of a natural configuration is not raised. This is done, however, in other texts, especially when the style of Thucydides comes under discussion. Then DH is talking about a natural sequence and agreement between words in phrases, and Thucydides' σχηματισμοί are seen as deviations (ἐξαλλαγή). Thus, the ἁρμονία αὐστηρά, of which Thucydides is a prime example, is characterized by τὸ τῆς ἀκολουθίας τῶν προεξενεχθέντων ὑπεροπτικῶς ἔχειν τὴν φράσιν μηδὲ κατ' ἄλληλα.[89]) Elsewhere the most characteristic trait of his style appears to be τὸ μὴ κατ' εὐθεῖαν ἑρμηνείαν ἐξενηνέχθαι τὰ νοήματα μηδ' ὡς ἔστι τοῖς ἄλλοις σύνηθες λέγειν, ἁπλῶς καὶ ἀφελῶς, ἀλλὰ ἐξηλλάχθαι καὶ ἀπεστράφθαι τὴν διάλεκτον ἐκ τῶν ἐν ἔθει καὶ κατὰ φύσιν εἰς τὰ μὴ συνήθη τοῖς πολλοῖς μηδ' ὡς ἡ φύσις ἀπαιτεῖ.[90]) An example of this process is the use of a nomen feminini generis together with a partic. masc., ἐξ ὧν ἡ κατὰ φύσιν ἀκολουθία πλανᾶται.[91])

Consequently, we here have the identification of usual (συνήθης) with natural (φυσική) word order and sequence. Whether this naturalness has at the same time the oldest rights, is not stated, but only implicitly assumed.

Deviation from usual agreement leads to incorrect usage, and, therefore, the Thucydidean configurations more than once are called σολοικοφανεῖς.[92]) This close relationship between these σχηματισμοί and σολοικισμοί most emphatically appears in De Thuc. 37.389,7ff., where with reference to Hist. 5,86 Dionysius exclaims, τοῦτο τὸ τελευταῖον εἴ τις ἐν τοῖς σχήμασι ἀξιώσει φέρειν, οὐκ ἂν φθάνοι πάντας τοὺς σολοικισμούς, ὅσοι γίγνονται παρὰ τοὺς ἀριθμοὺς καὶ παρὰ τὰς πτώσεις, σχήματα καλεῖν.[93])

This kind of figure of speech Quintilian also discusses (9,3,2ff.), asserting that it loquendi rationem novat and may be called genus

---

[88]) Studies II. Cp. De Dem. 54.246,14f.

[89]) De Dem. 39.213,10ff., cp. Comp. Verb. 22.98,2f.

[90]) De Dem. 9.145,6ff., cp. Ep. Amm. 3.425,16; 10.429,9 and 18f.; 11.430, 14 etc.

[91]) De Thuc. 24.362,6f., cp. 53.413,2ff.; De Dem. 9.147,9 and 39.213,1.

[92]) E.g. De Thuc. 24.362,16; 33.381,6f. cp. 41.396,26f. and Ep. Anm. 2.

[93]) Cp. Ep. Amm. 11.431,6ff. and see p. 74.

92   Dirk M. Schenkeveld

grammaticum. He too stresses the link with vitia orationis, and more
explicitly than DH he explains that these figures are acceptable
because of auctoritas, vetustas, consuetudo, and, sometimes, ratio.
Similar views are currently expressed after Quintilian,[94]) but DH
is one of the first authors who combines rhetorical and grammatical
doctrine. Although Barwick's statements on a Stoic origin of the
theory of figures are rightly rejected by Fehling[95]) and new research
on this subject is necessary, I shall not pursue this matter here. I
only point out that the frequent occurrences of ἡ κατὰ φύσιν ἀπαγ-
γελία, ἀκολουθία, κατάλληλος etc. in these parts dealing with con-
figurations seem to betray Stoic influence.[96])

If this suggestion is accepted, it will influence one's view on the
sources of the treatises on Thucydides, particularly as far as lin-
guistic theories play a part here. Usener expressed the opinion that
DH used works of Alexandrian grammarians, and Luschnat agrees
with him.[97]) One may wonder, however, whether 'Alexandrian' is
the right word,[98]) but, of course, this scepticism is related to the
far-reaching problem of the level of grammatical theory in the circle
of Alexandrian scholars, a problem which falls outside the scope of
this article.

8. At the outset I drew attention to the absence of any mention
of linguistic aspects from the earlier treatises, even when DH could
well have mentioned such aspects.[99]) When researching the matter of
composition of words, he came across grammatical theories and used
these in his own treatises. These are mainly of Stoic provenance, as
we have seen, but we do not yet know to what extent Stoic theory
had become common knowledge and had been transferred to other
linguistic works.

Two questions are then raised whether these traces of linguistic
theories are a reliable indication of the level of common knowledge
of linguistics in Rome at the end of the first century B.C. (1), and
even of the level of linguistic theory at all at that time (2).

Before entering into the first question we may consider several
related points. First, we must take into account that DH was not

---

[94]) Cp. Ros 54ff., Von Fritz, AJPh 70, 1949, 344ff. and Siebenborn 92ff.
[95]) GGA 212, 1958, 169ff.
[96]) Cp. Pinborg 102f. and D. L. Blank, Studies in the syntactic theory
of Apollonius Dyscolus, thesis, Princeton 1980, 53ff. und App. A.
[97]) Usener (see note 65), 71ff. O. Luschnat, Philol. 98, 1954, 22ff.
[98]) Cp. Ros 65[36].
[99]) E.g. De Isocr. 14.74,15.

a competent linguist, but at best a sound layman. Secondly, the sources he quotes by name are mostly "the old ones" — Plato, Aristotle, Theophrastus, Aristoxenus, Chrysippus, Epicurus, Callimachus, Aristophanes of Byzantium, but not e.g. Aristarchus, Dionysius Thrax, Diogenes of Babylon, Trypho, Posidonius. As one must conclude from the list in Rhys Roberts' edition of Comp. Verb. 50, DH mentions no author from later than second century B.C. However, at one time we can be sure that DH used a much more recent source, viz. a treatise of Philodemus,[100]) and at other the same conclusion applies with great probability when the works of οἱ κριτικοί are concerned (see note 7).

Therefore, we need not infer that the linguistic knowledge of DH represents an older, or even antiquated, level of grammatical theory. For other reasons, too, this inference is rather improbable: in his treatises DH uses the nine-parts system. If the eight-parts system was current in these times, he would at least have mentioned the modern system. For, as Mme Aujac (I, 15) rightly remarks, DH is always afraid of not seeming to be well up in his subject. A similar argument shows that his remark on ἄρθρον δεικτικόν is not wholly outmoded, and certainly what he says on the accidents in Comp. Verb. 25 (~ De Dem. 52) does not represent dated views, for it occurs in a sketch on current education in grammar at school, which, if already passé, would have made him a laughing-stock.

For all these observations I am inclined not to brand much of what DH offers on linguistic subjects as antiquated theory, but to draw from it the inference that his remarks correspond with the level of common knowledge of linguistic views which then at Rome, at least in Greek circles, were circulating. An exception, I think, must be made for the list of accidents in Comp. Verb. 6.29,8ff., which seems to come directly from an older source.

The second question is much more difficult to answer and involves an extensive discussion of all available data. As I have said before, it is not my intention to do so here. I may only remark that acceptance of my answer to the first questions strenghthens the case of those who think that the proper evolution of ancient grammar is to be put in the first century B.C.[101])

---

[100]) De Isocr. 13.73,5ff. See Aujac I, 193ff.

[101]) Fehling, Gnomon 51, 1979, 589.

94   Demetrius Moutsos

9. The main results of this inquiry are:

(1) DH uses a system of nine word classes, without showing awareness of the so-called traditional system of eight parts of speech.

(2) Twice his classifications of words betray the existence of older systems with fewer parts.

(3) He offers the only parallel to the statement that Dionysius Thrax called pronouns ἄρϑρα δεικτικά.

(4) He stands alone in mentioning ἐπιρρήματα τρόπου, presumably an equivalent of ἐπιρρήματα ποιότητος.

(5) His views on natural word order and agreement correspond on many points with those of Apollonius Dyscolus, and are probably of Stoic origin.

(6) Stoic influence on his views can also be seen in his statements on the origin of language and on the relation between noun and verb. Whether his use of συμβεβηκότα, instead of παρεπόμενα of traditional grammar, is influenced by Stoic theory, remains to be seen.

(7) There is a strong probability that a great part of what DH offers on linguistic subjects corresponds with the level of common knowledge of linguistic views circulating in Greek circles at Rome at the end of the first century B.C.

Greek καπάνη and Latin *capanna*

By DEMETRIUS MOUTSOS, Rochester

Καπάνη f. 'mule-car', the Thessalian counterpart of ἀπήνη 'four-wheeled wagon, any car or chariot' (Ath. 10.418e), and the variant καπάνη are derivatives of κάπη 'crib, manger', cf. κάπτω 'gulp down'. In Pollux 1.142 καπάνη means the cross-piece in the chariot seat, whereas the side-pieces are named καπάνακες. On the other hand, the Hesychian gloss καπαλαί·[κάπηλοι] φάτναι has been considered spurious. The interpretation κάπηλοι 'retail-dealers; tavern-keepers' has been correctly doubted as being dittographic,[1]) and the gloss itself, whose meaning is identical to that of κάπη, has been emended

---

[1]) *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*, ed. K. Latte, Hauniae 2 (1966) 409 s.v.