

At the Origins of Greek Grammar

By VINCENZO DI BENEDETTO, Pisa

In 1958–59 I published a long paper concerning the “*Techne*” ascribed to Dionysius Thrax¹). More recently, in an article²) published in 1973, I added something else concerning in particular Pfeiffer’s observations in his *History of Classical Scholarship*: as far as I know this article remained unanswered. I should like to take up the question once more, prompted by an important work by Prof. H.Erbse³): my respect and admiration for a master of philology as Prof. Erbse is, induces me to discuss this work of his with the greatest consideration and the utmost frankness. I shall also be referring to some other works written since 1973.

My thesis that the “*Techne*” is not authentic was accepted by many⁴), but I am particularly pleased in remembering the consent of P.Maas, who even before publication of my 1958–59 paper declared his agreement with me and later wrote to me expressing his acceptance of the non-authenticity thesis regarding the “*Techne*”⁵).

¹) Cf. V. Di Benedetto, *Dionisio Trace e la Techne a lui attribuita*, *Annal. Scuola Norm. Sup. di Pisa, Cl. di Lettere, Storia e Filosofia*, Ser. II, 27, 1958, 169–210 (= Di Benedetto I); 28, 1959, 87–118 (= Di Benedetto II).

²) Cf. V. Di Benedetto, *La Techne spuria*, *Annal. Scuola Norm. Sup. di Pisa*, Ser. III, 3, 1973, 797–814 (= Di Benedetto III).

³) Cf. H.Erbse, *Zur normativen Grammatik der Alexandriner*, *Glotta*, 58, 1980, 236–258.

⁴) Cf. P.M.Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, Oxford 1972, I 470 and II 680; J. Pinborg, *Current Trends in Linguistics*, 13, The Hague–Paris 1975, 69–126; E. Siebenborn, *Die Lehre von der Sprachrichtigkeit und ihren Kriterien. Studien zur antiken normativen Grammatik*, Amsterdam 1976; D.Fehling, *Gnomon*, 51, 1979, 488–490; M.Saraiva Barreto, *Gramatologia grega: dois temas da história da lingüística*, *Humanitas*, 31–32, 1979–1980, 3–22. The non-authenticity of the “*Techne*” is taken for granted by K.Hülser, *Die Fragmente zur Dialektik der Stoiker*, I–II, Stuttgart–Bad Cannstatt 1987.

⁵) The complete text of P.Maas’ postcard, dated Oxford 2.10.1959 (which I still hold and which begins with “*Sehr geehrter Herr Kollege, Ich danke Ihnen bestens für die freundliche Zusendung des ersten Teiles Ihrer Studie über die Τέχνη des Ps.-Dion. Thrax*”) was published in Di Benedetto III, 797, n.2.

I.

A very important testimony⁶⁾ regarding the question of the authenticity of the “Techne” is that of Apollonius Dyscolus, *De pronomine* GG II 1.1. 5, 13–19 *Οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Στοᾶς ἄρθρα καλοῦσι καὶ τὰς ἀντωνυμίας, διαφέροντα δὲ τῶν παρ’ ἡμῖν ἄρθρων, ἧ ταῦτα μὲν ὠρισμένα, ἐκεῖνα δὲ ἀοριστώδη. «καὶ ὃν τρόπον», φασί, «τὸ ἄρθρον διχῶς νοεῖται (ἧ τε γὰρ συμβολῇ τῶν κῶλων, ἐν ᾧ φαμεν ἕξαρθρον, καὶ (αὐτὸ τὸ) κῶλον, ἐν ᾧ φαμεν μεγάλοις ἄρθροις κεχρησθ(αι) τὸν δεῖνα), οὕτω καὶ ἐν τῷ λόγῳ ἄρθρον τὸν αὐτὸν (τρόπο)ν».* – *Καὶ Ἀπολλόδωρος ὁ Ἀθηναῖος καὶ ὁ Θραξ Διονύσιος καὶ ἄρθρα δεικτικὰ τὰς ἀντωνυμίας ἐκάλεσαν.*

According to Erbse⁷⁾ in the expression *ἄρθρα δεικτικὰ τὰς ἀντωνυμίας ἐκάλεσαν* of the last phrase we should integrate, as if by zeugma, *δεικτικὰς* also for what concerns the object *ἀντωνυμίας* (as if it was *τὰς δεικτικὰς ἀντωνυμίας*), and, according to Erbse, Apollodorus and Dionysius Thrax did not call *ἄρθρα δεικτικὰ* the pronouns in general, but only the ‘deictic’ pronouns.

I do not think this interpretation is exact. I believe that Apollonius means to say that Apollodorus and Dionysius Thrax called pronouns, i. e. all pronouns, *ἄρθρα δεικτικὰ*.

Already in the phrase which immediately follows in 5, 20–22 *(Συνη)γορεῖ δὲ αὐτοῖς ὁ λόγος, καθὸ αἱ ἀντωνυμῖαι καὶ ἀναφορικῶς λαμβάνονται, καὶ τὰ ἄρθρα δὲ ἀναφορὰν δηλοῖ* the word *ἀντωνυμῖαι* is used as referring to pronouns as such, with no distinction made as to classes. But more particularly, the expression *τὰς ἀντωνυμίας ἐκάλεσαν* of Apoll. pron. 5, 18–19 (with reference to Apollodorus and Dionysius Thrax) is exactly in line with 3, 12–13 *ἐκάλεσε τὰς ἀντωνυμίας* (regarding Aristarchus who suggested his definition of

⁶⁾ K. Linke, *Die Fragmente des Grammatikers Dionysios Thrax*, SGLG Band 3, Berlin–New York 1977, quotes as fr. 54 and as fr. 55 Sch. Dion. Thr. GG I 3. 160, 26–28 and 161, 6–8 but omits Apoll. Dysc. pron. GG II 1.1. 5, 18–19: this deprives the reader of an evidence which is one of the most ancient on Dionysius Thrax and which is also the primary source of part of Linke’s fr. 54. I think also that it is not correct on Linke’s part not to have quoted Sextus Empiricus’ testimony (*Adv. Math.* I 57) according to which Dionysius Thrax’s definition of grammar was given *ἐν τοῖς Παραγγέλμασι*, an expression behind which one can recognize the title of a work by Dionysius Thrax: Fraser, *op. cit.*, II 680 thinks that the title could originally have been *Παραγγέλματα γραμματικά* (or *τεχνικά*).

⁷⁾ *Op. cit.*, 255–257.

pronouns as being *λέξεις κατὰ πρόσωπα συζύγους*), with 3,17 *κλητέον* (scil. *τὰς ἀντωνυμίας*: concerning Dionysodorus who termed pronouns *παρονομασίας*), with 4,2 *αὐτὰς* [scil. *τὰς ἀντωνυμίας*] *ἐκάλεσεν* (concerning Tyrannion who termed pronouns *σημειώσεις*), with 4,19 *καλεῖν* (scil. *τὰς ἀντωνυμίας*: on those of the Comanus' school who gave to the *ἀντωνυμῖαι* the name of *ἀντωνομασίας* to avoid an aeolian colouring). All these cases concern pronouns as such, in a general sense (and the whole section begins in 3,9 with *Ἀρκτέον δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς κλήσεως, ἐπεὶ παρὰ τισι διάφορος*: the matter is how each author called the pronouns, the pronouns as such).

On the other hand, Apollonius' reference to Apollodorus and Dionysius Thrax is made in connection with another definition of pronouns – all pronouns –, that of the Stoics, who *ἄρθρα καλοῦσι καὶ τὰς ἀντωνυμίας*, i.e. did not distinguish between articles and pronouns as two different parts of speech, calling articles (*ἄρθρα*) *ἀοριστώδη* and pronouns (*ἄρθρα*) *ὠρισμένα*.

In support of his interpretation Erbse⁸⁾ quotes Apoll. con. GG II 1.1. 248,10–11 *ἀμέλει αὐτοὶ οἱ σύνδεσμοι πλεονάσαντες οὐδὲν συνδέουσι καὶ σύνδεσμοι καλοῦνται*. Here too, Erbse observes, we are concerned with a particular class of *σύνδεσμοι*, the *παραπληρωματικοὶ σύνδεσμοι*, yet Apollonius simply uses *σύνδεσμοι*. This interpretation seems doubtful to me. The Stoic Chaeremon (whose words Apollonius is quoting) when defending the *παραπληρωματικοὶ σύνδεσμοι* ('expletive' conjunctions) referred to the fact that some patronymics are such by virtue of their form (the grammatical *τύπος*) but not in their semantic value; in the same way

⁸⁾ As a confirmation of the fact that in pron. 5,18–19 Apollonius uses the genus (*τὰς ἀντωνυμίας*) instead of the species (*τὰς δεικτικὰς ἀντωνυμίας*) Erbse refers to the fact that Apollonius "bekennt sich [...] ausdrücklich zu diesem Grundsatz (pron. 4,15)": ... *εἰ μὴ τοῖς γενικοῖς πολλάκις συνεχρώμεθα ἀντὶ τῶν ἰδικῶν, τὸ ζῶον τιθέντες ἐπ' ἀνθρώπου καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ φοίνικος τὸ φυτόν*. But here Apollonius intends to justify the use of the term *ἀντωνυμία* instead of the more correct *ἀντώνυμον* (with reference to *ἐγώ*) and he states that this is not *παράλογον*: we often use generic terms (*τοῖς γενικοῖς*) instead of specific ones (*τῶν ἰδικῶν*). This polemical objection against a possible objector has a sense only if Apollonius is referring not to his own personal mode of expression but to a generalized use; of course also Apollonius is concerned, but just as an individual out of all the speakers of Greek. Things are therefore different from the use of *τὰς ἀντωνυμίας* in pron. 5,18–19 which Erbse presents as a mode of expression personal to Apollonius.

some nouns are masculine in their form but not in semantic value (on this point we could remember Sch. Dion. Thr. GG I 3. 361,35–362,7, where the distinction is made between the grammarian's and the philosopher's view, the grammarians considering for instance *πύργος* masculine and the philosophers neuter; and when we find the word *οἱ φιλόσοφοι* in such a context we should think first of the Stoics); and analogously – the Stoic Chaeremon goes on – the *παραπληρωματικὸς σύνδεσμος* is a conjunction in its form but not its semantic value: “and in fact the conjunctions when they are pleonastic they do not join anything and are called conjunctions” (through *αὐτοί* the strangeness of this fact is underlined⁹). If Chaeremon had said *οἱ παραπληρωματικοὶ σύνδεσμοι πλεονάσαντες κτλ.* he would have diverted the attention from the strange fact that there are *σύνδεσμοι* which *οὐδὲν συνδέουσι*, conjunctions which do not conjoin at all. Chaeremon had in his mind the notion of conjunction as such (conjunctions which are not conjoining!) and at the same time through the addition of *πλεονάσαντες* he wanted the reader to understand that he thought of the expletive conjunctions¹⁰).

⁹) Erbse is right in saying that *αὐτοί* was misunderstood by R. Schneider in GG I 1. 2. 249.

¹⁰) Erbse translates: “Gewißlich werden ebenso die Konjunktionen (unmittelbar vorher war von anderen Wortarten die Rede), wenn sie abundieren und nichts verbinden, sogar (~ trotzdem) *σύνδεσμοι* genannt”: with a sliding of *καί* which I feel could lead to misunderstanding. – The passages of pron. 15,1. 16,1. 16,19. 18,12 etc. which Erbse in n.30 quotes in support of his interpretation do not appear to me to be conclusive proof. In 14,25–15,1 *εἰ ὅλως προτατικῶν ἄρθρων ἐπιδεκτικαὶ εἰσιν αἱ ἀντωνυμίαι* Apollonius when saying *αἱ ἀντωνυμίαι* is referring to pronouns in general and not to one particular class of them, and when, following this, he narrows the field to possessive pronouns, it is only in order to give an example (*τουτέστιν ἐν τῷ ὁ ἐμός κτλ.*). Of course not the personal pronouns but the possessive pronouns were suitable to exemplify the case of an article referring to the following pronoun; but Apollonius at the beginning wants to formulate the thought in a general way, in order to put the question whether a pronoun can or can not be preceded by an article (the point of view of Apollonius is that in cases like *ὁ ἐμός* the article refers not to the pronoun but to the thing which is possessed). In 16. 1–2 *Ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ δύο ἄρθρα ὡμολόγησεν, ὅτι καὶ τῆς ἀντωνυμίας ἐστὶ τὸ ἄρθρον* Apollonius expresses the point of view of people who thought that in phrases like *ὁ πατὴρ ὁ ἐμός* one of the two articles referred to the following pronoun: the thought (erroneous according to Apollonius) is formulated in such a way in order to assert the general principle that an article can refer to the following pronoun. In 16, 19–20 *Οὐχ ὕγιές τε λέγειν, ὅτι τὰ ἄρθρα οὐ προστίθεται ταῖς ἀντωνυμίαις, ὅτι ἐν τοῖς γένεσιν ἀδιάστολοί εἰσιν* the pronouns of which Apollonius speaks are the personal pronouns, because the possessive pronouns are not *ἐν τοῖς γένεσιν ἀδιάστολοι*. But, again, the thought

According to Erbse Apollonius in the passage of *De pronomine* concerning Apollodorus and Dionysius Thrax is not referring the word *ἄρθρον* to a particular part of speech but has in mind a significance of the word *ἄρθρον* which “theoretisch” would make its use possible for any part of speech. In the passage in question, however, Apollonius says that the Stoics spoke of just two uses of the term *ἄρθρον*, one for what we (and Apollonius) call pronouns and the other for what we (and Apollonius) call articles. And the reference the Stoics made to the double use in everyday speech of the notion of *ἄρθρον*, one as *συμβολή τῶν κώλων* and the other as *ἄρθρον* in its narrowest sense, can be explained exclusively by the fact that they divided *ἄρθρα* in *ῥιζοσύνετα* and *ἀρτισυντάκτα*: but remaining inside the notion of *ἄρθρον* as a single part of speech.

And that in Apollonius we are concerned with a discussion about the *ἄρθρον* as a part of speech is confirmed by the fact that shortly afterwards, in pron. 6,15, within the exposition of the arguments in favour of the thesis of the Stoics, Apollonius uses the expression *τὸ αὐτὸ μέρος λόγου τὰ ἄρθρα καὶ αἱ ἀντωνυμίαι*, and shortly after, in pron. 6,20–23, when he starts the confutation of the arguments in favour of the Stoics, he clearly shows that the question rests on whether pronouns are, or are not, a single part of speech, *τὸ αὐτὸ μέρος λόγου* (see also 7,8–9; 8,13–14; 8,26; 9,4–6).

Since for the Stoics *ἄρθρον* had the value of a part of speech comprising both articles and pronouns, it is incomprehensible that in a section dedicated to Stoics, Apollonius should have included a reference to Apollodorus and Dionysius Thrax, who would have used the term in a different sense. Erbse supports his opinion by the comparison with the human body which was suggested by the Stoics. But since this comparison was used by the Stoics to the end of demonstrating that pronouns and articles are *ἄρθρα* (and one part of speech), it would indeed be strange that Apollonius should link the thesis of Apollodorus and Dionysius Thrax to this comparison, if these two grammarians sustained the opposite of the Stoics, i. e. that

is formulated in a general way, in order to show that the principle of the relationship of pronouns and article as such was involved; and at the same time the addition of *ὅτι ἐν τοῖς γένεσιν ἀδιάστολοί εἰσιν* left no doubt that the possessive pronouns were not taken into account. Analogous considerations could be made for the other passages Erbse quotes in n.30 (for what concerns 18,12 *ἐδείκνυτο γὰρ ὥς οὐκ ἀντωνυμία* all the phrase is strongly elliptical – cfr. R. Schneider in GG II 1. 2. 37; a lacuna was also conjectured – and is substantially different from that of 5,18–19).

articles and pronouns are not one but two parts of speech. It is, I would think, rather an artificial procedure to extract from this comparison of the Stoics a distinction between the use of *ἄρθρον* “im eingeschränkten Sinne” and an use of *ἄρθρον* im allgemeinen Sinne and to separate this aspect of the question from the aim to which the comparison was directed. And the reference to Apollodorus and Dionysius Thrax is not, in my opinion, an exemplification of a restricted use of the word *ἄρθρον*, it is a confirmation of the fact that both articles and pronouns should be considered as one single part of speech.

Finally, according to Erbse, with the interpretation given by myself and others to Apoll. pron. 5,18–19 a crass error is attributed to Apollodorus and Dionysius Thrax, who in this case would define pronouns as “deictic” while not all pronouns are in fact such. Now, Apollonius speaks in pron. 9,17–10,4 of a deictic function which concerns all first and second person personal pronouns and which alternates with an anaphoric function in third person personal pronouns¹¹), Pap. Gramm. 2 (ca. 300 A.D.), ll.10–21 speaks of a deictic as well as an anaphoric function in third person pronouns¹²), Pap. Gramm. 16 (V–VI A.D.), ll.15–16 speaks of anaphoric and deictic pronouns, and in line with Apollonius¹³) is Sch. Dion. Thr. GG I 3.

¹¹) The integration in Apoll. Dysc. pron. 10,2 *ὅτι γένους εἰσὶ παραστατικά* was made by G.Uhlig on the basis of GG I 3. 86,9–10. But it is a striking fact that the scholiast in GG I 3. 86,13 (Heliodorus ~ Choeroboscus?) presents just this phrase as a personal datum (*εἶπον*), and on the other hand the use of *αἱ ὑπολειπόμεναι* in Apoll. Dysc. pron. 10,4 (which has no correspondent in GG I 3. 86,7–15) may be congruent with the fact that Apollonius did not want to make an explicit subdivision on the basis of the evidentiatio or not of the gender (although a grouping of *ἐκεῖνος, ὅδε, οὗτος, αὐτός* against *ἐ, οὗ, οἷ, ἐ* was implicit – and obvious: therefore *ὑπεσταλμένης τῆς αὐτός* in ll.2–3; and it is worthy of notice that not even *ὅτε γένους ἀπαρέμφατοί εἰσιν* of GG I 3. 86,14 appears in Apollonius).

¹²) By Pap. Gramm. I refer to A.Wouters, *The Grammatical Papyri from Graeco-Roman Egypt. Contributions to the Study of the ‘Ars Grammatica’ in Antiquity*, Brussel 1979. – The diction of ll.10–11 of Pap. Gramm. 2 is not accurate: *πρώτου* was written by mistake for *τρίτου*? But perhaps the corruption is deeper (cf. also Wouters, ad loc.: his statement that “the discussion that follows is not concerned exclusively with the pronouns of the first person, but with those of all three persons” is wrong: in ll.12–27 [with l.27 a new subject is broached; and already ll.22–27 are something separate] only pronouns of third person are discussed).

¹³) As here the issue is the authenticity or not of the “*Techne*”, the reference

86, ll. 7–15 (and cf. also GG I 3. 261, ll. 1–5). From all these texts we see clearly that the deictic function certainly did not cover all pronouns. But we cannot judge Apollodorus and Dionysius Thrax by what came after them. In defining pronouns as *ἄρθρα ὀρισμένα* the Stoics wished to underline their definite character (“I” indicates one person in particular and not another); analogously Apollodorus and Dionysius Thrax when speaking of *ἄρθρα δεικτικά* for pronouns¹⁴) were aiming to emphasize another important aspect, the deictic one. We are not able to tell whether and how far they generalized, since we do not even know whether they in the notion of pronouns (i.e. the *ἄρθρα δεικτικά*) included the pronouns which Apollonius defined as *παραγωγοί*, i.e. the possessive pronouns. Nonetheless we certainly cannot find fault with their definition on the basis of theorizations formulated after them and without knowing exactly which phenomena they included within the notion of *ἄρθρα δεικτικά*. Neither, of course, can the fact that two pupils of Aristarchus (although we know that Apollodorus was also a pupil of Diogenes of Babylon) accepted the Stoics’ line in defining pronouns, be considered an objection. The picture of the origins of Greek grammar as delineated by J. Pinborg¹⁵), the most correct one so far drawn, demonstrates how history of Greek grammar must be seen free from such schematic divisions.

Besides, the expression *δεικτικαὶ ἀντωνυμίαι* is not in the “Techne”, as well as it is not in the “Techne” the expression *ἄρθρα δεικτικά* which, in Erbse’s opinion, corresponds to it. Even if we accepted Erbse’s interpretation of Apoll. Dysc. pron. 5, 18–19 and

to the *δείξις* for personal pronouns in the “Techne”, GG I 1. 65, 2–66, 1 must not be considered.

¹⁴) In Di Benedetto I, 209–210 I suggested, on the basis of the *καί* preceding *ἄρθρα δεικτικά*, that Apollodorus and Dionysius Thrax defined pronouns as *ἄρθρα ὀρισμένα ἢ δεικτικά*. This is a possibility, but it is also a possibility that Apollonius added *καί* because he was mentioning another definition of pronouns, which however was in line with that of the Stoics mentioned immediately before.

¹⁵) Cfr. Pinborg, op. cit. D. Fehling’s brief remarks in *Gnomon* 51, 1979, 488–490 are also illuminating for the history of the ancient grammar (by D. Fehling see also Varro und die grammatische Lehre von der Analogie und der Flexion, *Glotta*, 35, 1956, 214–270 and 36, 1957, 48–100). Scanty and unreliable F. Montanari in “Dizionario degli scrittori greci e latini”, II, Settimo Milanese 1988, 1093–1105. Full and correct information about Alexandrian grammar and philology by Fraser, op. cit., I, 447–479. Important is the contribution of Erbse, op. cit., 237–244 about the grammatical knowledges of Aristarchus.

even if we accepted the authenticity of the “Techne”, the supposition would be necessary that Apollonius was referring to something of Dionysius Thrax otherwise unknown to us¹⁶).

II.

If, as I believe, Apoll. Dysc. pron. 5,18–19 attests that Dionysius Thrax (like Apollodorus) accepted the Stoics’ theory which took the pronouns and the articles as belonging to the same part of speech, it follows that the author of Sch. Dion. Thr. GG I 3. 160,24–161,8 (= Prol. B; ~ Sch. Dion. Thr. GG I 3. 124,7–14 = Prol. A) did not willingly or unwillingly misunderstand the passage of Apollonius Dyscolus as Erbse asserts. Besides, it would be strange for Prol. B to have misunderstood Apollonius, since Prol. B belongs¹⁷) to the 6th century A.D. Alexandrian neo-Platonic school, i.e. an environment which was one of the most learned in its time, and where erudite-grammatical interest was very strong.

Now, Prol. B as an argument against the authenticity of the “Techne” says: “(Dionysius Thrax) connected the article to the pronoun, whereas the author of the “Techne” [...] sees the article and the pronoun as being two parts of speech, not one alone”.

¹⁶) In the “Techne” – 65,2–66,1 – the function of *δείξις* is mentioned for the personal pronouns (*διὰ δὲ τῆς ὑπ’ αὐτῶν δείξεως*), but this is something less than the statement that Dionysius Thrax called the (deictic) pronouns *ἄρθρα δεικτικά*. And a mere hypothesis would be the conjecture that Apollonius read in the “Techne” something which afterwards disappeared. Erbse, op.cit., 256 n.29 points out rightly that the “Demonstrativpronomina” are not enumerated in the “Techne”: in Di Benedetto II 109ff. I suggested that the compiler of the “Techne” could have forgotten them. But the question concerning the omission of *οὗτος, αὐτός, ἐκεῖνος, ὅδε, ὁ δεῖνα* in the “Techne” has little to do with the absence of the expression *δεικτικαὶ ἀντωνυμίαι* or *ἄρθρα δεικτικά*. Apollonius Dyscolus (and others) thought that *δεικτικά* were in the first place the personal pronouns of the first and second person and these pronouns are present in the “Techne”.

¹⁷) All my detailed analysis concerning Prol. B and Prol. A is ignored by R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age*, Oxford 1968, 271. The consequence is that Pfeiffer, instead of giving to the reader specific information concerning the *τινές* or the source of Prol. B or Prol. A, supplies only the generic consideration that “it was a bad habit of grammarians to say ‘some’ instead of quoting the name of the source”. Erbse, op.cit., 253 accepts my identification of the cultural environment to which Prol. B belongs.

The source of this information is to be thought to be Apoll. Dyc. pron. 5, 18–19. Prol. B in fact cites as the source of this information about the true Dionysius Thrax, as well as of the other information according to which the true Dionysius Thrax considered the *ὄνομα* and the *προσηγορία* as two distinct parts of speech (whereas the “Techne” includes them under the same part of speech) *οἱ τεχνικοί*, an expression behind which Apollonius Dyscolus or Herodianus is to be recognized. And Apollonius Dyscolus’ *Ῥηματικόν* is explicitly cited in Prol. B as the source of the third information, concerning the definition of the verb given by (the true) Dionysius Thrax.

R. Pfeiffer¹⁸⁾ attempted to undermine the importance of these facts. According to Pfeiffer the three informations given by Prol. B are “three small items”, “minor controversial points”, on which Dionysius Thrax “may well have changed his mind”. But the trouble is that the information given by Prol. B concern essential points as the number of the parts of speech and the definition of the nature of the noun, of the article, of the pronoun and of the verb. To speak of “small items” about these subjects is not to realize adequately the real being of the question.

On the other hand, all these items of information from Prol. B are coherent not only for what concerns their source but also for what concerns the historical position of the true Dionysius Thrax. We learn in fact that concerning the article/pronoun relationship, the *ὄνομα/προσηγορία* relationship and the definition of the verb, Dionysius Thrax accepted substantially the Stoics’ opinion and not that which we find later as asserted by Apollonius Dyscolus in II. century A.D. Pfeiffer says that Dionysius Thrax may have changed his mind. This is of course possible, but it means to superpose an hypothesis to real facts. (And in pron. 5, 18–19 Apollonius simply speaks of Dionysius Thrax, without specifying whether he is referring to Dionysius Thrax No. 1 or to Dionysius Thrax No. 2). In fact, the postulated change of mind of Dionysius Thrax would correspond to a radical change in his historical and cultural position. No such hypothesis should be advanced without precise documentary evidence – and this does not in fact exist.

Erbse¹⁹⁾ is of the opinion that the definition of the verb attributed to Dionysius Thrax in Apollonius’ *Ῥηματικόν* (as Prol. B informs us) *ῥῆμά ἐστι λέξις κατηγορημα σημαίνουσα* does not really con-

¹⁸⁾ Op. cit., 271.

¹⁹⁾ Op. cit., 257–258. Cf. also Pfeiffer, op. cit., 271.

trast with that of the “Techne” § 13 *ῥῆμά ἐστι λέξις ἄπτωτος, ἐπιδεκτική χρόνων τε καὶ προσώπων καὶ ἀριθμῶν, ἐνέργειαν ἢ πάθος παριστάσα*, since the former concerns the function of the verb in the sentence and the latter (that of the “Techne”) attempts to sum up the “formalen Besonderheiten” of the verb. The drawback to this argument is that the former definition is very similar to that of the Stoics (cfr. Diogenes of Babylon fr.22 in St. V. Fr. III p.213 *ῥῆμα δέ ἐστι μέρος λόγου σημαῖνον ἀσύνθετον κατηγορημα*) and the latter on the contrary coincides to some extent with that of Apollonius Dyscolus (which is, incidentally, more precise: cf. Di Benedetto II, 105). What matters is not the compatibility or not of these two definitions, what matters is that the two definitions belong to two different historical-cultural lines. The history of grammar in ancient times is made above all of formulations which must be judged according to their specific diction.

One last word on the relationship between *ὄνομα* and *προσηγορία*. Erbse²⁰) says that the statement of Prol. B, according to which Dionysius Thrax distinguished between *ὄνομα* and *προσηγορία* as being two different parts of speech, is not reliable. And yet this distinction, with its Stoic character (cf. Diogenes of Babylon fr.22), is perfectly congruent with the other two items of information in Prol. B, and already for this reason is reliable. On the other hand, in the “Techne” the *προσηγορία* clearly belongs to the same part of speech as the *ὄνομα*: cf. GG I 1. 23,2–3 *ἡ γὰρ προσηγορία ὡς εἶδος τῷ ὀνόματι ὑποβέβληται*. Erbse believes that Dionysius Thrax “mußte [...] bei jeder näheren Ausführung die Unterschiede beider Gruppen kennzeichnen” and that “böswillige oder leichtsinnige Wiedergabe seiner Ausführungen konnte auch in diesem Fall durch falsche Grenzziehung zu Irrtümern führen”. But this presupposes some work of Dionysius Thrax for which we have no documentary evidence²¹) (quite apart from the consideration that one

²⁰) Op.cit., 258.

²¹) That Sch. Dion. Thr. GG I 3. 124,7–14 and 160,24–161,8 should produce evidence of an original edition of the Dionysian “Techne” is merely an ingenuous invention of G. Morelli, *Ricerche sulla tradizione grammaticale latina* I 1, Roma 1970, 114, n.7. The two passages do not speak of an original edition of the “Techne”, but of opinions from Dionysius Thrax which are in contrast with the “Techne” attributed to him. Morelli asserts that the original edition known to Apollonius was complete, while the “Techne” is an epitome: were then conflicting opinions (from the same author, and on points fundamental for grammatical science) coexisting in this alleged original edition?

cannot see what should be explained in what is said in the “Techne” in 33,6–34,2 *Κύριον μὲν οὖν ἐστὶ τὸ τὴν ἰδίαν οὐσίαν σημαῖνον, οἶον Ὅμηρος Σωκράτης. Προσηγορικὸν δὲ ἐστὶ τὸ τὴν κοινὴν οὐσίαν σημαῖνον, οἶον ἄνθρωπος ἵππος*).

III.

Both Pfeiffer²²⁾ and Erbse²³⁾ have admonished me not to rely too much on an argument *ex silentio* concerning evidence from the grammatical papyri. I think that some words must be spent in clarification on this argument *ex silentio*.

In his edition of the grammatical papyri (1979) Wouters has collected 16 documents concerning *τέχναι γραμματικάι*. Of these, two contain pieces from the “Techne” ascribed to Dionysius Thrax: P. S. I. I 18 and a bifolium of a parchment codex defined as Pap. Hal. 55 A. Both belong to the 5th century A. D., while 6 other documents which do not appear to be transcription from the “Techne” belong to a period not later than the end of the 2nd century A. C. And recently (1982) Pap. Köln IV 176 was published: it has on the recto a text which largely (but not completely) coincides with the “Techne”, GG I 1. 14,4–9. This papyrus probably belongs to the 4th century A. D. (In Di Benedetto II 118 I wrote that the “Techne” should have been compiled about the 4th century A. D.).

Is all this a trick of fate? In any case something more can be added about some grammatical papyri. Pap. Lit. Lond. 182 (written about 300 A. D.) is in important points comparable to the “Techne” for what concerns the approach to the subject and the scope of the treatise. Moreover, Pap. Lit. Lond. 182 enables us to see a grammatical falsification in the making. In spite of the explicit *Τρύφωνος τέχνη γραμματικοί* (scil. *γραμματική*) there can be no doubt in fact that this is a false attribution (I myself have demonstrated the falseness of the attribution to Tryphon in great detail in Di Benedetto I, 191–196: Wouters, who subscribes the non-authenticity theory, does not understand what I have written and ascribes to me a different point of view²⁴⁾).

²²⁾ Op. cit., 270.

²³⁾ Op. cit., 247.

²⁴⁾ Cf. Wouters, op. cit., 86 (it is not true that I considered the text of Pap. Lit. Lond. 182 “una inintelligente riduzione del testo trifeniano”: Wouters simply does not understand what I wrote in Di Benedetto I, 195) and 91 (it is not true

Further interesting considerations can be got out of another papyrus, Pap. Amh. II 21, from the early 4th century A.D., more or less the same period as Pap. Lit. Lond. 182 (and the “Techne”). The treatment of the parts of speech (which in some points is highly comparable with the “Techne”²⁵) is in fact preceded in this papyrus by a section dedicated to the *προσφῳδαί*. Now, a section dedicated to the *προσφῳδαί* (the so-called Suppl. I in G. Uhlig’s edition in GG I 1) appears to be associated with the “Techne” at least since the end of the 5th century A.D. (the time of the Armenian translation). The case of Pap. Amh. II 21 suggests caution in accepting the thesis that several centuries passed between Suppl. I and what we specifically call the “Techne” (Suppl. I and the “Techne” have a common manuscript tradition). In a similar way, in P.S.I. I 18 (5th century A.D.) the beginning of § 1 of the “Techne” is preceded by the final part of a section concerning the feet as metrical units. And the Suppl. III, concerning the feet, is associated with the “Techne” in our manuscript tradition too.

Association in the manuscript tradition does not of course mean identity in birth age. Nevertheless it is possible to catch about the 4th century A.D. a process of systematization of grammatical knowledges at a scholastic level, a process which involves the Supplementa as well the “Techne” itself. It is a fact worthy of noticing that there is no substantial difference of cultural level between the Supplementa and the “Techne” itself, and it seems to be no fortuitous case that the first testimonies of the Supplementa are either identical or in any case not chronologically distant from the first testimonies of the “Techne”. And I think it is no mere coincidence that Theodosius’ *Εἰσαγωγικοὶ κανόνες περὶ κλίσεως ὀνομάτων* and *περὶ κλίσεως ῥημάτων*, which were a necessary integration of the “Techne” and of the Supplementa, belong to about the end of the 4th century A.D. (and some important manuscripts contain both the “Techne” and the *Κανόνες* of Theodosius).

that in Di Benedetto II, 113 I shared the opinion of E. Thost according to whom Pap. Lit. Lond. 182 contains excerpts from one or more of Tryphon’s works). And, what is more, the most important arguments against the authenticity brought by Wouters in p. 91 coincide exactly with those that I myself had already put forward in Di Benedetto I, 192–196 (within the context of a more detailed discussion than that of Wouters on p. 91). My Italian was better understood by Fraser, *op. cit.*, II, 687.

²⁵) Cf. Di Benedetto I, 190.

I doubt whether we can consider all this the result of coincidence. But how can be a fortuitous coincidence the strict parallelism between direct and indirect tradition? Indirect tradition gives us the earliest attestations of the “*Techne*” as a work of Dionysius Thrax (as far as its technical-grammatical content is concerned: Dionysius Thrax’s famous definition of grammar which we read at the beginning of the “*Techne*” had already been discussed by Asclepiades of Myrlea in the 1st century B. C.) in the 5th–6th centuries A. D.: Timotheus of Gaza, Ammonius and Priscianus.

If indeed the “*Techne*” were authentic, this silence, lasting up to the 5th century A. D., is inexplicable. It should be noted that between the time when Dionysius Thrax lived (ca. 170–90 B. C.) and the 4th century A. D. there is a whole series of authors, many of whose works have come to us and which we can still read: Apollonius Dyscolus, Herodianus, Sextus Empiricus and Quintilianus. How could it be possible that they all joined in a conspiracy, in a pact never to speak of this work of Dionysius Thrax (which, we must not forget, would have been the earliest technical-grammatical codification in Greek culture)?

Particularly important is the evidence from Apollonius Dyscolus. Not only does he not mention Dionysius Thrax’s “*Techne*”, not only does he supply information about Dionysius Thrax which contrasts with the “*Techne*”, Apollonius even gives us positive indications about the origins of Greek grammar which scarcely fit in with the “*Techne*” as written by Dionysius Thrax. From Tryphon (the grammarian active in the 2nd half of the 1st century B. C.) Apollonius has handed down to us (according to A. von Velsen’s edition) 6 pieces of evidence concerning the *Περὶ ἄρθρων* (and the title of the work too), 10 pieces of evidence concerning the *Περὶ ἀντωνυμιῶν*, 1 piece of evidence concerning the *Περὶ προσώπων* (and the title of the work), 1 piece of evidence concerning the *Περὶ προθέσεων* (and the title of the work), 20 pieces of evidence concerning the *Περὶ συνδέσμων* (and the title of the work), 14 pieces of evidence concerning the *Περὶ ἐπιρρημάτων* (and the title of the work). In comparison to these 52 pieces of evidence for Tryphon, which concern an area covered also by the “*Techne*” attributed to Dionysius Thrax, we know in Apollonius of only two pieces of evidence for Dionysius Thrax (to which one more can be added by conjecture). This 3:52 ratio gives us an idea of who Dionysius Thrax was and who was Tryphon to Apollonius Dyscolus (the most learned grammarian in the ancient world). To Apollonius, Dionysius Thrax

was a grammarian of relatively minor importance, who in some points had accepted the doctrine of the Stoics; Tryphon was on the contrary a grammarian who was highly esteemed for a long series of technical-grammatical works: as I once wrote Tryphon can be legitimately considered “il primo grande maestro della nuova scienza”.

To another grammarian who was active in the 1st century B.C., Tyrannion²⁶), we have to attribute, in addition to an exegetical-grammatical activity, a *Περὶ μερισμοῦ τῶν τοῦ λόγου μερῶν*, and about a pupil of Tryphon, Habron, we know that he wrote a *Περὶ ἀντωνυμίας*, a *Περὶ παρωνύμων* and a *Περὶ κτητικῶν*.

It is in the 1st century B.C., after Dionysius Thrax, that grammar as an autonomous science begins to blow fully²⁷), especially with Tryphon. But it is worthy of noticing that neither for Tryphon nor for any grammarian of his time we know that he wrote a compendious handbook like the “Techne” attributed to Dionysius Thrax: this was an achievement of a still later time.

²⁶) For an accured and detailed discussion concerning the life and works of Tyrannion (the elder) see W. Haas, *Die Fragmente der Grammatiker Tyrannion und Diokles*, SGLG Band 3, Berlin-New York 1977.

²⁷) Pfeiffer, *op.cit.*, 271–272 wrote that if Dionysius Thrax is not the author of the “Techne” then “the part played by scholars in the systematization of grammar a century later must have been greater than we believed”: I think that this should not be any more a matter of conjecture. – Pfeiffer, *op.cit.*, 270, n.2 wrote that Pap. Würzburg 2 “has apparently escaped di Benedetto’s attention”. But that in this 2nd century A.D. papyrus (which concerns the *τρόποι* and not the specific subject of the “Techne”, and rightly was not included in Wouters’ collection of grammatical papyri) *Διονύσιος* in col. I, l. 14 is Dionysius Thrax is merely an hypothesis not founded on any evidence. Moreover, that in l. 15, after *ἐν τῇ(ι), γραμματικῇ τέχνῃ* should be integrated was an arbitrary hypothesis of J. Stroux, who incidentally did not think of Dionysius Thrax as the author of this *γραμματικὴ τέχνη* but of *Διονύσιος ὁ Τρύφωνος*, and based his conjecture on the (apocryphal!) explicit of Pap. Lit. Lond. 182 on the assumption of a relationship between the postulated *Διονύσιος ὁ Τρύφωνος* and the grammarian *Τρύφων* (and cf. also Di Benedetto III, 804–805). The authenticity of the “Techne” as a work of a pupil of Aristarchus can not certainly be defended on the basis of the fact that in the 2nd century A.D. a certain Dionysius is mentioned (in a non technical-grammatical context) who was probably the author of a work, in the title of which there was a feminine substantive. That is all. Why should I have spoken of an unfounded hypothesis?

IV.

In line with G. Uhlig Erbse compares the passage of the “*Techne*” 17,4–19,4–concerning the long syllable—with Sext. Emp. Adv. Math. 1,121–122. According to Erbse the coincidences show that Sextus made direct use of the “*Techne*”: Sextus’ additions (which Erbse puts in brackets) are meaningless and evidently, according to Erbse, Sextus in § 122 forwent to reproduce the examples for sake of convenience²⁸).

There are indeed coincidences between the two texts. But in my opinion we should distinguish between coincidences regarding matters of fact (the various possibilities when it is possible to have a long syllable) and coincidences in formulations. The former are not decisive for establishing a contact between the “*Techne*” and Sextus, since Sextus can have derived the theory of the 8 possibilities of long syllables from some other texts unknown to us (for instance, the same 8 cases of long syllable are enumerated by Hephaestion 1,11–3,2 C.). And as far as the coincidences at the formal level between Sextus and the “*Techne*” are concerned, they appear to me to be fewer and less important than the differences.

The formulation of the “*Techne*” 17,4–5 *κατὰ τρόπους ὅκτώ, φύσει μὲν τρεῖς, θέσει δὲ πέντε* is not exactly matched in Sextus’ text. Sextus does not speak, in a resumptive way, of 8 possibilities, he points out—through *διχῶς*—that the cases can be grouped in two groups, he does not use the word *τρόπος* and he uses instead the adverbs *τριχῶς* and *πενταχῶς*, and he says that the syllable is long *θέσει ... πενταχῶς* only after having enumerated the 3 cases of the first group (besides, Erbse puts in brackets the phrase *οὐκοῦν φύσει τριχῶς μηκύνεται συλλαβή* at the end of the first group, but this phrase seems to be necessary for the structure of all the passage and it is hardly an addition of Sextus; analogously Erbse brackets at the beginning, as an addition of Sextus, the opening phrase *Πᾶσα οὖν συλλαβή ἢ μακρά ἐστὶν ἢ βραχεῖα*, depriving in this way the following *μακρά* of his substantive). In this (introductory) part of the text the formal(?) coincidences between the “*Techne*” and Sextus are limited to the use of the opposition of the words *φύσει* and *θέσει* (but Sextus, diverging also on this point from the “*Techne*” repeats

²⁸) Cf. Erbse, op.cit., 248–251. In GG I 1. 17 G. Uhlig wrote: “Transcripsit octavam § praemisso *φασί* plurali Sextus E. 626,28”.

φύσει, and afterwards *θέσει*, after having said *φύσει τε καὶ θέσει*). Moreover, for what concerns the first case, whereas the “*Techne*” has *ἦτοι ὅτ’ ἂν διὰ τῶν μακρῶν στοιχείων ἐκφέρεται*, Sextus has *ἦ ὅταν ἔχη στοιχεῖον φύσει μακρόν*, and the example is *ἥως* in Sextus but *ἥρως* in the “*Techne*” (the example is introduced with *οἷον* in the “*Techne*” and with *ὡς ἐπὶ τῆς ... λέξεως* in Sextus); for what concerns the second case the example coincides in the two texts, but the formulations differ radically, and among other things Sextus uses a nexus – *κοινὸν ... στοιχεῖον* – which is never found in the “*Techne*”. Analogous considerations could be made for the other 6 cases, with the aggravating fact that Sextus inverts the order of the discussion for the second and third case of long syllables by nature and for the fourth and fifth case of the long syllables by position.

If we were to admit that the text used by Sextus was the “*Techne*” we would have to suppose that Sextus reproduced it with a whole series of changes. But on which grounds could such an hypothesis be based? I can not see any. In some important points the text of this part of the “*Techne*” coincides with Hephaestion (and diverges from Sextus), but this fact is not sufficient for supposing that Hephaestion also copied the “*Techne*”. Since the 8 cases of the long syllable are exactly the same in Hephaestion and in Sextus (and in the “*Techne*”: but for the order of the fourth and the fifth case of long syllables by position Hephaestion coincides with Sextus and not with the “*Techne*”), for this part of the grammatical science there must have been, at least at a certain level, a sort of *κοινή* in the 2nd century A.D.: and in my opinion the most natural way of explaining the facts is to think that this *κοινή* left afterwards evident traces in the “*Techne*”. But let us see how Sextus behaves for what concerns vowels and consonants.

In 1,99 Sextus speaks – concerning the *στοιχεῖον* – of the *χαρακτήρ*, the *τύπος*, the *δύναμις* and the *ὄνομα*: this does not have a counterpart in the § 6 of the “*Techne*”, but (partially) in Apollonius Dyscolus GG II 3. 3 (Sch. Dion. Thr. GG I 3. 31, 19 ff. ~ Prisc. Inst. I 6. 8).

In 1,100–101 for ancipital vowels (presented as *κοινὰ μήκους τε καὶ βραχύτητος*) Sextus uses the words *δίχρονα*, *ύγρά*, *ἀμφίβολα* and *μεταβολικά*. On the contrary, in the “*Techne*” (10,2) only one word – *δίχρονα* – is used. On this point Sextus is closer to his near-contemporary Pap. Osl. II 13 (ca. 100–150 A.D.) where (ll.76–85) for the ancipital vowels in addition to *δίχρονα* certainly another term is used, perhaps *ἀμφίβολα* (and the couple of verbs *ἐκτείνε-*

σθαι/συστέλλεσθαι used by Sextus for the ancipitals has a counterpart not only in the “*Techne*”, 10,2–3, but also in Pap. Osl. II 13, ll.78–80). As exemplification for the ancipital vowels 3 verses are cited by Sextus (the same verses in the same context are taken into account by Pap. Köln IV 177 of the 4th century A.D.), and analogously 3 examples are cited in Pap. Osl. II 13, ll.81–83: on the contrary no example is cited in the “*Techne*”²⁹).

In 1,102–103 Sextus speaks of the consonants. As *ἡμίφωνα* 11 consonants are enumerated, and the theory according to which the *ἡμίφωνα* are 8 in number (excluding *θ, φ, χ*) is referred to as the opinion of *τινές* or *ἔνιοι*. In the “*Techne*” (11,5) the *ἡμίφωνα* are 8 in number, with no oscillation. In this case the “*Techne*” does not coincide with what Sextus presents as the basic opinion, but with a variant; on the contrary, in Sextus 1,142 on the genders of the noun the situation is opposite: the genders are 3 in number as in the “*Techne*”, where however it is pointed out that *ἔνιοι* add two more genders, the *κοινόν* and the *ἐπίκοινων*.

Again, if the omission in Sext. 1,102–103 of the denomination – regarding the consonants – of the *μέσα* (in relation to *β, γ, δ*: the denomination is registered in the “*Techne*”, 12,5–13,1) can easily be explained, in abstract, by a process of simplification carried out by Sextus, the same cannot be said for the definition of rho (as the consonant which has *δασύτητα* and *ψιλότητα*) which is present in Sex-

²⁹) Concerning Pap. Osl. II 13 G. Morelli, op.cit., 112–130 does his utmost to demonstrate (self-confident manipulations are not lacking: 1) he omits noticing in pp.123–126 that ll.97–101 do not have their counterpart in the “*Techne*”; 2) he speaks of the greater extension – in comparison with the “*Techne*” – of ll.45–66 and of ll.76–85 after having pronounced his judgment on the papyrus, through a comparison with the “*Techne*” which involves only a part of the papyrus; 3) it is wrong to compare – as Morelli does in p.125, n.36 – Pap. Osl. II 13, ll.85–104 with GG I 1. 11, 1–16,5: the papyrus is interrupted after the part corresponding to 14,7–9; 4) Morelli in p.119 says that Pap. Osl. II 13, ll.15–37 “corresponds to Dion. Thr. p.9, 5–6”, but the verb “corrispondere” in this context is ambiguous: in fact the papyrus is not only much broader, but faces also important problems concerning the structure of the syllables which ‘Dionysius Thrax’ ignores) that the “*Techne*” is on some points more detailed and grammatically superior to the papyrus. But the postulated superiority of the “*Techne*” does not yet prove that the papyrus is later than the “*Techne*”. (In p.120 Morelli distorts many times my thought, showing small respect for his interlocutor and his readers; and to say – as Morelli does in p.114 – that about the end of the 1st century B.C. an abridged text of the “*Techne*” began to oust the original one, this is not philology but science fiction.)

tus and missing in the “*Techne*”, and for the definition of the *ἄφω-
ν*α which in Sextus is radically different from that in the “*Techne*”.

In conclusion, I do not believe that the comparisons made by Erbse demonstrate that the source of Sextus was the “*Techne*” attributed to Dionysius Thrax. The (partial) coincidences found between Sextus and the “*Techne*” (and between Hephaestion and the “*Techne*”, and, for instance, Pap. Osl. II 13 and the “*Techne*”) can more simply be explained by the fact that Sextus was drawing on the same current of Greek grammatical culture which was to leave its traces later, together with other currents, in the “*Techne*”.

And there is yet another aspect of the question to be considered. “Da sich Sextus 1,57 (vgl. 1,72. 80. 82)” – writes Erbse³⁰) on the subject of points of contact to be found between Sextus and the “*Techne*” – “ausdrücklich auf Dionysios Thrax berufen hat und 1,250 (vgl. auch 253) nochmals auf ihn zurückgreift (die genannten Stellen handeln vom Prooimion der “*Techne*”), liegt die Vermutung von vornherein nahe, er benutze die “*Techne*” auch in den Ausführungen über die Einzelheiten”. These observations of Erbse are to me rather perplexing. If the grammar text used by Sextus did indeed belong to one of the grammarians he cites, I do not see why it should have to belong to Dionysius Thrax and not to some other grammarian whom Sextus takes into consideration in this part of his work. Particularly Asclepiades of Myrlea should be taken into account, since he is mentioned already in Adv. Math. 1,47 (even before Dionysius Thrax), and then in 1,72 (in connection with the definition of Dionysius Thrax reported in 1,57) and afterwards, at a long distance, in 1,252 (immediately after Dionysius Thrax): Asclepiades is the grammarian who, as it were, has the first and the last word.

On the other hand, for what concerns Dionysius Thrax, Sextus reports the criticism to his definition of grammar brought forward by Ptolemaeus the Peripatetic (1,60–61) and Asclepiades (1,72–73), but Sextus himself disapproved the definition of Dionysius Thrax (1,62–63) as well as that of Asclepiades (1,74–75), of Chares (1,80–83) and of Demetrius Chlorus (1,84–89). If Sextus reports the definition of Dionysius Thrax at the first place and if he refers to Dionysius Thrax when discussing the definition of Chares it is because the

³⁰) Op. cit., 248–249. This remark is made by Erbse before comparing GG I 1. 17,4–19,4 with Sext. Adv. Math. 1,121–122.

dionysian definition must have been the oldest, and it had been criticized also by Ptolemaeus and Asclepiades. But it is not legitimate, in my opinion, to privilege Dionysius Thrax as the source of Sextus, in his discussion of the syllable, among all the grammarians who are cited by him: we are not even sure that Sextus read directly the work of Dionysius Thrax and did not know his definition through Demetrius or Asclepiades³¹).

Apart from the definition of grammar, for what concerns the grammar in its entirety it is not Dionysius Thrax, it is Asclepiades of Myrlea who was the main reference point for Sextus. In 1,91–93 Sextus speaks of the partition of grammar in three parts, the *ἱστορικόν*, the *τεχνικόν*, the *ἰδιαίτερον*. Each of these three parts will be later discussed by Sextus, but the partition in itself is accepted by him. And this partition, as the comparison of 1,91–93 with 1,252 shows, was that of Asclepiades of Myrlea. On the contrary, in 1,250–251 Dionysius Thrax's partition of grammar in 6 parts³²) is criticized by Sextus (*ἀτόπως διαιρούμενος*), and the criticism is based on the fact that the dionysian partition does not entirely correspond to that of Asclepiades. That is not all. Sextus says that the 4th and the 5th part

³¹) My point of view that Asclepiades of Myrlea should be the source of Sextus for what concerns 1,57 was accepted by Fraser, op.cit., II, 680. It is striking that in Dion. Thr. T 4 L., ll. 19–20 *Διονύσιος ὁ Θρᾷξ* is immediately followed by [*καὶ Ἀσκληπιάδης ὁ*] *Μυρλεανός*. – About the definition of Demetrius Chlorus see V.Di Benedetto, *Demetrio Cloro e Aristone di Alessandria*, Annal. Scuola Norm. Sup. di Pisa, Ser. II, 35, 1966, 321–324 (where I suggested to read *τε καὶ (συγγραφεῦσι λεγομένων καὶ) τῶν κατὰ κτλ.*).

³²) Pfeiffer, op.cit., 269, n.2 states that I translated *κρίσις ποιημάτων* with “textual criticism”. This is not the truth. In Di Benedetto I, 179 I translated *κρίσις ποιημάτων* with “giudizio critico delle opere poetiche”, and “giudizio critico delle opere poetiche” is an Italian expression which does not coincide with “textual criticism” (“critica del testo”). And from what I wrote in p. 179, n. 4 emerges that in this “giudizio critico” I included *also* textual criticism. This in order to re-establish the truth. On the other hand Pfeiffer's statement that textual criticism is *διόρθωσις* and not *κρίσις ποιημάτων* is not unobjectionable. For a detailed discussion cf. Di Benedetto III, 807, n.1. In fact, I do not see how in such a general expression as *κρίσις ποιημάτων* is a reference to textual criticism can be excluded: remember that in Sext. Adv. Math. 1,93 the exegesis (*τὰ ἀσαφῶς λεγόμενα ἐξηγοῦνται*) is strictly connected with textual criticism (*τὰ ὑγιῇ καὶ τὰ μὴ τοιαῦτα κρίνουσι*: the use of the verb *κρίνω* is to be noticed). Moreover, several fragments from Dionysius Thrax show that he did indeed textual criticism on Homer: cf. in particular fr. 14–20 and K. Linke's observations, pp. 42 ff. Have we to suppose that Dionysius Thrax omitted in his partition of grammar a so considerable aspect of his grammatical practice?

of the dionysian partition were taken out of the *τεχνικόν* (the *τεχνικόν* was a part of the partition of Asclepiades and when saying *ἐκ τοῦ τεχνικοῦ (λαμβάνων)* Sextus falls into anachronism: but since he accepted Asclepiades' partition as the true one he inadvertently thought of it as timeless). Now, for Asclepiades the *τεχνικόν* included also all the technical-grammatical matter, beginning from the *στοιχεῖα* and the parts of speech (cf. 1,92 *περὶ τῶν στοιχείων καὶ τῶν τοῦ λόγου μερῶν*). These subjects, according to Sextus, were not considered by Dionysius Thrax, but they were considered (at least in his formulation of the partition of grammar) by Asclepiades. Therefore, when afterwards in 1,97 ff. Sextus discusses the *στοιχεῖα* and then the syllables and afterwards the noun, if we had to choose between Dionysius Thrax and Asclepiades of Myrlea as the grammatical source of Sextus, our preference should go to Asclepiades. Sextus can of course have used a grammatical text which was neither of Dionysius nor of Asclepiades. But I think it would be methodically incorrect to say that the source was Dionysius Thrax and not Asclepiades of Myrlea or some other grammarian.

It should also not be forgotten that Sextus does not mention a technical-grammatical handbook of Dionysius Thrax, nor does he mention a title like *Τέχνη γραμματική*. He says that Dionysius Thrax enunciated his definition of grammar *ἐν τοῖς παραγγέλμασι*: a title like *Παραγγέλματα* is not attested in the manuscripts which transmitted to us the "Techne" ascribed to Dionysius Thrax.

It is to be pointed out, finally, that the § 2 of the "Techne" (concerning the *ἀνάγνωσις*) contains an explication of just the first of the 6 parts of the (authentic) dionysian partition of grammar in § 1. The relationship between § 2 and § 1 (containing the authentic definition of grammar and of its 6 parts) is strict, as the comparison between § 1 *παρὰ ποιηταῖς τε καὶ συγγραφεῦσιν* and § 2 *ποιημάτων ἢ συγγραμμάτων*, between § 1 *ἀνάγνωσις ἐντριβής* and § 2 *ἀδιάπτωτος προφορά*, between § 1 *κατὰ προσφδίαν* and § 2 *κατὰ προσφδίαν* shows. A word like *τέχνη* appears only in § 1 and § 2 and not in the following part of the handbook, and the same goes for *προσφδία*. We are not able to say how far § 2 reproduces the very words of Dionysius Thrax, but certainly the substance of § 2 corresponds, at least partially, to the *ἀνάγνωσις ἐντριβής* of § 1. This means that only for the 1st of the 6 parts of the dionysian partition of grammar there is in the "Techne" an (at least partial) explanation. If (apart from § 1 and § 2) the "Techne" were all authentic, it would be impossible to find out a reason for this interruption.

Erbse³³) considers § 2 together with § 3 (concerning the *τόνος*) and § 4 (concerning the *στιγμή*) and thinks that “der inhaltliche Einschnitt liegt hinter § 1”: according to Erbse “die ‘Techne’ spricht also streng genommen von zwei verschiedenen Fertigkeiten des Lesens, und nur die Namensgleichheit verführt zur Annahme der Identität”. But I do not see how the *ἀνάγνωσις ἐντριβῆς κατὰ προσφδίαν* of § 1 can be distinguished from the *ἀνάγνωσις ἀδιάπτωτος προφορά* (with the addition that *ἀναγνωστέον ... καθ’ ὑπόκρισιν, κατὰ προσφδίαν, κατὰ διαστολήν*) of the immediately following § 2. Actually of the 6 dionysian parts it was only the first, that concerning *ἀνάγνωσις*, which could interest the boys of the school to whom the “Techne” was directed; the other 5 parts belonged to a level which was not of a school of about the 4th century A.D. (and instead were essential for the philological-grammatical activity of an Aristarchus’ pupil in the 2nd–1st century B.C.).

³³) Op. cit., 246.