CHAPTER 3. DIONYSIUS ON THE GRAMMATICAL THEORY OF THE PARTS OF SPEECH

3.1. Introduction

Our study of Dionysius’ integration of different language disciplines will continue with an examination of the connections between grammar and rhetoric. Ancient grammar focused on the word as the central unit of language. Modern scholars have characterised the ancient artes grammaticae (τέχναι γραμματικαί) as ‘word-based grammars’. Adopting the ‘word and paradigm model’ as their framework, these treatises mainly consist of a discussion of μέρη λόγου (normally translated as ‘parts of speech’ or ‘word classes’) and their accidentia.¹ The Technê Grammatikê that has come down to us under the name of Dionysius Thrax distinguishes eight word classes: ὄνομα (noun), ῥῆμα (verb), μετοχή (participle), ἀρθρον (article), ἀντωνυμία (pronoun), πρόθεσις (preposition), ἐπίρημα (adverb) and σύνδεσμος (conjunction).²

For a long time, Dionysius Thrax (170-90 BC) was considered to have been the first grammarian who used this system of eight parts of speech. In 1958, however, Di Benedetto put forward the view that most part of the Technê Grammatikê, including the exposition of the word class system, was to be regarded as a compilation that was put together in the 3rd or 4th century AD.³ Although doubts about the authenticity of the Technê had already been expressed in antiquity, Di Benedetto was the first to claim that Dionysius Thrax himself only wrote the first five paragraphs of the Technê.⁴ The publication of Di Benedetto’s views was the starting point of a long and passionate debate on the authenticity and authority of the Technê.⁵ Although several scholars (notably Pfeiffer and Erbse) have tried to rebut Di Benedetto’s arguments, most specialists have now accepted the view that Dionysius Thrax himself wrote only the very first part of the Technê Grammatikê, while the rest of the work, including the classification of the parts of speech, belongs to the 3rd or 4th century AD.⁶

² The English terms do not entirely coincide with the Greek concepts: the ἀρθρον does not only cover the article, but also our relative pronoun, the ἐπίρημα also includes interjections, and the σύνδεσμος comprises what we call ‘particles’. The ὄνομα covers both substantives and adjectives. The Romans substituted the interjection for the ἀρθρον, thus listing the following eight word classes: nomen, verbum, participium, pronomen, praeposito, adverbium, coniunctio, interiectio.
⁶ Exceptions are prof. A. Wouters and prof. P. Swiggers, who regard the Technê Grammatikê as authentic, although they acknowledge that the preserved text may have undergone some changes. See e.g. Wouters (1998) and Swiggers & Wouters (2002) 16-17.
Having acknowledged that the major part of the *Technē* was not written by Dionysius Thrax, historians of grammar had to reconsider questions about the origin and development of the traditional system of eight word classes. According to ancient testimonies, Dionysius Thrax ‘separated’ ὄνομα (proper noun) and προσηγορία (appellative), and ‘combined’ ἄρθρον (article) and ἄντωνυμία (pronoun).\(^7\) This would mean that he did not use the word class system that we find in the *Technē Grammatikē*. Those scholars who have accepted Di Benedetto’s thesis that the *Technē* is not authentic have pointed to the works of other grammarians as the possible origin of the traditional word class system. In particular, Di Benedetto himself and others have argued that it was the grammarian Tryphon (1\(^{st}\) century BC) who first adopted the traditional system of eight word classes.\(^8\) More recently, however, Matthaios has shown that Aristarchus (216-144 BC), the teacher of Dionysius Thrax, already distinguished the word classes that were to become the canonical eight.\(^9\) He did not discuss these word classes in a grammatical treatise, but he employed them for his philological activities (Ax characterises Aristarchus’ grammar as a ‘Grammatik im Kopf’).\(^10\) Apart from the adverb, for which he used the term μεσότης (instead of the later ἐπίρημα), all word classes that were identified by Aristarchus carried the names that would become standard in later grammars. With the acknowledgement of the important role of Aristarchus, a new picture of the early history of the system of eight word classes has been drawn.\(^11\)

Many things are still unclear, however, concerning the distribution, development and systematisation of the traditional word class theory in the period after Aristarchus.\(^12\) It is certain that many other word class systems, consisting of nine or more μέρη λόγου,

---

\(^7\) Sch. D. Thrax, *G.G.* I 3, 124,7-14; Sch. D. Thrax, *G.G.* I 3, 160,24-161,8. The information that Dionysius Thrax combined ἄντωνυμία and ἄρθρον may depend on Apollonius Dyscolus’ report (*Pron.*, *G.G.* II 1.1, 5,18-19) that Dionysius Thrax called the pronouns ἄρθρα δεικτικά. Scholars interpret Apollonius’ testimony in different ways. Some believe that Dionysius Thrax treated the pronouns and articles as one single word class, whereas others think that he called pronouns ἄρθρα δεικτικά (‘deictic articles’) without rejecting their status as a separate word class (so Matthaios [2002] 193). See sections 3.2 and 3.6.3 of this study.

\(^8\) For the view that Tryphon was the one who introduced the system of eight word classes, see Di Benedetto (1958) 125-126, Pinborg (1975) 116-117, Schenkeveld (1994) 268 and 277, and Lallot (1998) 124-125. Ax (1982) 98-100 usefully summarises the views that various scholars have expressed on the two relevant questions: (a) from which time was a grammatical theory of word classes used? And (b) at which point was it fixed in a grammatical treatise?

\(^9\) See Matthaios (1999), who has elaborated the views of Ax (1982, 1996\(^2\)).

\(^10\) *Ax* (1996\(^2\)) 288.

\(^11\) Matthaios has used the results that he obtained from his research on Aristarchus to write a new reconstruction of the history of the theory of the parts of speech: see Matthaios (2001) and Matthaios (2002).

\(^12\) Cf. Robins (1998\(^7\)) 19: ‘We know the names of several important grammarians in the Greek world who were active in the first centuries BC and AD, and we desperately need to find out what was going on in the Greek world between the times of Dionysius [i.e. Dionysius Thrax] and Apollonius over a span of about three hundred years.’ See also Lallot (1998) 29-30.
circulated in the period between Aristarchus (second century BC) and Apollonius Dyscolus (second century AD), before the latter grammarian adopted the system of eight word classes in his Syntax and other grammatical works.\textsuperscript{13} And although Apollonius was very influential, the octopartite system probably did not become canonical until the Roman grammarian Donatus (active around 350 AD) had adopted it.\textsuperscript{14} What happened in the period between Aristarchus and Apollonius is difficult to tell, because so many important texts have been lost: only fragments survive of the works written by important grammarians such as Dionysius Thrax, Tyrannion, Asclepiades of Myrlea and Tryphon (see section 3.2).

Dionysius of Halicarnassus did not write any grammatical treatises, but we have seen (section 1.5) that in the context of his rhetorical theory he makes use of views that were developed in philology, grammar and philosophy. Unlike the grammatical treatises of Alexandrian scholars (Tyrannion, Asclepiades of Myrlea and Tryphon), most of the works of Dionysius have survived. Schenkeveld was the first to draw attention to Dionysius’ treatises as ‘a possible source of information for the level of linguistic knowledge in the second half of the first century BC.’\textsuperscript{15} In this chapter, I intend to build on Schenkeveld’s work by using Dionysius’ works as a source that can increase our knowledge of the theory of the parts of speech as it was circulating at the end of the first century BC. I will shed more light on the transmission of that theory in the period between Aristarchus and later grammarians by re-examining the relevant data that Dionysius offers on the word class theory and by interpreting them in the light of recent scholarly work.\textsuperscript{16} In this way, I will also attempt to establish Dionysius’ place in the history of the theory of the ‘parts of speech’.

\textsuperscript{13} Ancient histories of the theory of the parts of speech inform us about the existence of various systems: see Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Comp. 2.6,20-7,13 and Quintilian, Inst. orat. 1.4.17-21 (see sections 4.2.1 and 4.2.3 of this study). See also Sch. D. Thrax, G.G. I 3, 356,16-21 and Sch. D. Thrax, G.G. I 3, 520,23-27 (systems of nine, ten and eleven word classes). In practice, we find systems with nine word classes in the grammatical papyri P. Yale I 25 (nr. 1 Wouters) and P. Heid. I 198 (nr. 12 Wouters). See Wouters (1979) 179 n. 22. If one follows Schenkeveld (1983), Dionysius of Halicarnassus also uses a system of nine parts of speech, but see my section 3.6.6. For Apollonius’ use of the eight word classes, see Synt. I.14-29. Schoemann (1862) 12 already pointed out that many grammarians after Aristarchus adopted different word class systems.

\textsuperscript{14} The Romans substituted the interjection for the article. This may have been the work of Palaemon (see Taylor [1996a] 344), but the definitive canonisation of the system of eight word classes, to the exclusion of systems with nine or more partes orationis, belongs to later times. For the influential role of Apollonius Dyscolus, see Lallot (1997 I) 23 n. 35.

\textsuperscript{15} Schenkeveld (1983) 67.

I will argue that Dionysius’ treatment of the parts of speech incorporates views from different language disciplines, in particular the Alexandrian philological tradition (known to us especially through the fragments of Aristarchus) and the Stoic philosophical tradition. In other words, as far as Dionysius of Halicarnassus shows knowledge of the grammatical theory of word classes, he belongs to a particular tradition of scholars such as Dionysius Thrax, Tyrannion, and writers of some grammatical papyri: in the surviving fragments of these grammarians we find the influence of the original Alexandrian tradition of philologists (Aristophanes, Aristarchus) on the one hand and the Stoic tradition on the other. From Dionysius Thrax onwards, Alexandrian and Stoic ideas on language were integrated into one system that constituted the basis of technical grammar. Apollonius Dyscolus completes the integration process by making a complete synthesis of the two traditions. I will discuss various aspects of Dionysius’ use of grammar that support the view that he was influenced by both philological and Stoic ideas. Further, we will see that Dionysius’ use of the parts of speech theory is not only influenced by philology, grammar and philosophy, but also by the tradition of poetic criticism (see sections 3.2 and 4.3).

The study of Dionysius’ works can increase our knowledge of the development of grammatical theory between Aristarchus and Apollonius Dyscolus. This should, however, not obscure the fact that Dionysius is a rhetorician and not a grammarian: when using his works in order to reconstruct the history of linguistics, we should not ignore the fact that his concept of ‘parts of speech’ is somewhat different from that of the grammarians (see section 3.4), and that he uses grammatical theory for different purposes, namely rhetorical theory and literary criticism. In the current chapter I bring together the relevant data from Dionysius’ works, in order to reconstruct his grammatical knowledge. In chapter 4, I will discuss the contexts in which Dionysius mentions the grammatical theories, in order to show how he makes use of the theory

---

17 See also Matthaios (2001) 89.
20 Dionysius’ remarks on the parts of speech are often cited as evidence for the grammatical knowledge of his time, but his own aims are sometimes ignored. Thus, Pinborg (1975) 117 n. 45 pays no attention to the function of Dionysius’ discussion of the accidentia in Comp. 6 (see section 4.3.1), and Matthaios (2001) 89 refers to Dionysius as if he were a grammarian. Schenkeveld (1983) 69 does mention the fact that Dionysius’ grammatical observations serve ‘his argument on literary matters’, although in his interpretation of single passages he does not always take the rhetorical context into account, which can sometimes lead to misunderstanding (e.g. when dealing with Dionysius’ ‘system’ of word classes, see section 3.6.6).
of the parts of speech in different parts of his rhetorical and critical works. Before I investigate Dionysius’ views on the parts of speech, I will recall the earlier views on the parts of λόγος and λέξις (section 3.2) in various language disciplines, and consider to what extent Dionysius was acquainted with these views (section 3.3).

3.2. Logos, lexis, and their parts in the various language disciplines

The most obvious approach to reconstructing the history of the parts of speech in the period before Dionysius of Halicarnassus might seem to start from his own history of the theory of the parts of speech in De compositione verborum.21 As I have argued elsewhere, this passage may be characterised as the first extant history of linguistics in the western world.22 Dionysius describes the gradual increase of the number of the parts of speech from Aristotle onwards: Theodectes and Aristotle distinguished three parts (ἀνόματα, ρήματα and σύνδεσμοι), the Stoic philosophers added the ἄρθρον and distinguished four, ‘later generations’ (οἱ μεταγενέστεροι) separated ἀντονομασία as the sixth part of speech, and ‘yet others’ (οἱ δὲ) added the ἐπιρήματα, προθέσεις and μετοχαί, thus arriving at five parts. ‘Others’ (ἕτεροι) distinguished the ἀντονομασία as the sixth part of speech, and ‘yet others’ (οἱ δὲ) introduced still further divisions. I will discuss this overview of the development of the parts of speech in section 4.2, where I will argue that Dionysius’ overview is the archetype of the traditional historiography of linguistics. His presentation of the history of the parts of speech as a gradual progress (from three parts in Aristotle to a system of nine or more parts) has remained standard in overviews of ancient grammar until the end of the twentieth century. When determining Dionysius’ own position in the history of linguistics, however, I will not adopt his approach as a historian of linguistics. Taylor (1986), Schenkeveld (1994) and other scholars have rightly argued that historians of linguistics should no longer ignore the different contexts in which ancient ideas on language were developed.23 This means in particular that we should take into account that the units that were called μέρη were in fact very different items that were used differently in distinct language disciplines. The English term ‘parts of speech’ is the traditional translation of the Greek τὰ μέρη τοῦ λόγου, and the Latin partes orationis.24 Originally a philosophical term, it was used in different ways and


---

21 Comp. 2.6,17-7,21.
22 De Jonge (2005a).
23 See also Sluiter (1993, 1998) and De Jonge (2005a) 15-16.
24 On the terms μέρη λόγου and partes orationis, and their meaning and possible translations, see also Pinborg (1975) 116, Lambert (1985) 115-116, Robins (1986) 20, Lallot (1992) 127-129 (‘Comment dit-on “mot” en Grec?’), Blank (1998) 174, Matthaios (1999) 198-200 and Law (2003) 59. Pinborg (1975) 116 is particularly instructive: ‘The concept of “part of speech” is somewhat heterogeneous as a consequence of its historical origin. It is used of a segment of a string (identified with a word) and of classes of such segments. Aristotle seems to have used the term exclusively in this way. It is then used
contexts by Aristotle and the Stoic philosophers respectively. Philologists and grammarians, on the other hand, distinguished different ‘word classes’, for which at some point they borrowed the expression τὰ μέρη τοῦ λόγου from the philosophers. In theories of composition and syntax, the term could be used to designate the ‘parts of a phrase’: the words in their context. In short, the phrase τὰ μέρη τοῦ λόγου did not mean the same thing to the various thinkers who used the term. Therefore, when sketching the history of the theory of the parts of speech as a background to Dionysius’ position, I will not follow Dionysius’ own historical overview, which does not pay attention to the contexts of the views of Aristotle, the Stoics, and other thinkers. Instead, I will summarise the most important distinctions that his predecessors, including philosophers, critics, philological and technical grammarians, made concerning λόγος, λέξεις and their μέρη.25

For Aristotle, the μέρη λόγου were the parts of the λόγος ἀποφαντικός (‘assertion’), and in De interpretatione he distinguished two of them, namely ὄνομα and ῥήμα.26 The term σύνδεσμος does occur in this work, but it is not considered a part of the λόγος: it only refers to the ‘joining’ of primitive assertions.27 Likewise, in his Rhetoric, Aristotle considers ὄνομα and ῥήμα the sole components of a λόγος, although the σύνδεσμοι do appear elsewhere in the same work.28 Aristotle’s distinction of ὄνομα and ῥήμα in De interpretatione is the result of a logical analysis of a sentence as the bearer of truth or falsity, which Aristotle needs for his investigation into contradictions.29 In the Poetics, however, Aristotle discusses the μέρη λέξεως or ‘parts of the expression’:30 στοιχεῖον (‘element’, i.e. ‘letter’), συλλαβή (‘syllable’), σύνδεσμος (‘conjunction’), ὄνομα (‘noun’), ῥήμα (‘verb’), ἄρθρον (‘joint’), πτώσις (‘case’) and λόγος (‘utterance’). This list contains all items that can be considered ‘components of diction’, whether they are smaller than words of classes established as semantic classes (especially by the Stoics) and of classes of words undergoing similar inflections. The traditional exposition of the eight parts of speech reflects a conglomeration of these different approaches.’

25 The treatment of the μέρη λόγου and μέρη λέξεως by various philosophers, philologists and grammarians is, of course, a complex problem: I can only deal with the aspects that are most relevant as a background to Dionysius’ use of the ‘parts of speech’.


27 The expression συνδέσμω εἶκε occurs in Int. 17a9 and 17a16: non-primitive assertions are ‘single by conjunction’, i.e. formed by joining primitive assertions together. Thus, the Iliad is also ‘single by conjunction’. Cope (1867) 392-397 discusses Aristotle’s use of the term σύνδεσμος.

28 For ὄνομα and ῥήμα as the components of the λόγος, see Rh. 1404b26-27; the σύνδεσμοι are mentioned in Rh. 1407a21, 1407b12, 1407b39 and 1413b33.


(e.g. ‘element’ and ‘syllable’), words, or combinations of words: thus, λόγος is here a μέρος λέξεως and it is defined as ‘a compound, significant utterance, some of whose parts do have independent significance’. Aristotle’s μέρη λέξεως and his μέρη λόγου represent two entirely different approaches to language, and neither of these concepts corresponds to the ‘word classes’ that grammarians identified in later times.

The Stoics had a different ontology and logic than Aristotle, which is mirrored in their list of μέρη λόγου. They identified first four, later five ‘parts of speech’: Chrysippus added the προσηγορία to the list of four parts that were distinguished by earlier Stoics, namely ὄνομα, ῥῆμα, ὁρθρόν and σύνδεσμος. The μεσότης (adverb) was added at a still later stage, presumably under influence of Alexandrian philology. Chrysippus’ distinction between ‘proper noun’ (ὄνομα) and ‘appellative’ (προσηγορία) was based on the ontological difference between an individual quality and a common quality. For the Stoics, λέξες is articulated sound, which is either meaningless or meaningful. Λόγος, however, is a semantic unity, which is always meaningful, whether it refers (in non-Stoic terms) to a word, a series of words or an entire text. The στοιχεῖα λέξεως (or φωνῆς) are the ‘elements of articulated sound’, that is the letters, while the στοιχεῖα λόγου are the ‘elements of speech’, that is the (meaningful) ‘parts of speech’.

Alexandrian philologists and (in a later period) technical grammarians partly used the same terms as the Stoics, but they did so in a different way and for a different

---

31 Lallot (1992) 128 remarks that Aristotle does in fact not have a word meaning ‘word’.
35 In Stoic grammar the μεσότης was introduced by Antipater (Diogenes Laertius VII.57), but Aristarchus used the term already before that time. See Matthaios (1999) 553: ‘Diese Entwicklung impliziert die Annahme, Antipater habe unter dem Einfluß der Ansichten der Alexandriner die Selbständigkeit des Adverbs auch für das stoische Redeteilsystem angenommen und zu dessen Bezeichnung von den Alexandrínern geprägten Terminus μεσότης übernommen.’
36 Diogenes Laertius VII.58. See also section 3.3.6.
37 Unlike the grammarians, who equated λέξις with ‘word’, the Stoics used the term λέξεως (‘articulated sound’) only in the singular.
39 See FDS 539-541. The term στοιχεία λόγου also appears in the title of a work by the Peripatetic philosopher Theophrastus: Περὶ τῶν τούτῳ λόγῳ στοιχείων (fr. 683 Fortenbaugh). It has been suggested that this title refers to the first part of Theophrastus’ Περὶ λέξεως, but Schenkeveld (1998a) 69-79 has argued that it is the title of a logical work. See section 3.3.1.
purpose. Matthaios has shown that Aristarchus (216-144 BC) distinguished the names of eight word classes, namely ὄνομα (‘noun’), ῥῆμα (‘verb’), μετοχή (‘participle’), ἄρθρον (‘article’), ἀντωνυμία (‘pronoun’), μεσότης (‘adverb’), σύνδεσμος (‘conjunction’) and πρόθεσις (‘preposition’). Aristarchus and his Alexandrian colleagues used these word classes and their accidentia for the explanation and textual criticism of Homer. For example, Aristarchus observed that in a certain verse Homer used a passive instead of an active verb form (ποθητικὸν ἀντὶ ἐνεργητικοῦ), or that he used the word τοῦς not as an ἄρθρον (article), but instead of an ἀντωνυμία (pronoun). Aristarchus seems to have refined the terminological system of his Alexandrian predecessors, who already made some important distinctions: Apollonius Dyscolus reports that Aristophanes of Byzantium used the term πρόθεσις (‘preposition’), and that Aristarchus’ older contemporary Comanus knew the pronoun, which he called ἀντωνυμασία (see section 3.6.3). Aristarchus’ most important contributions may have been the distinction of the adverb and the participle as separate word classes, for the terms μεσότης and μετοχή are not used in this sense in earlier extant texts. For our reconstruction of the history of the word class system after Aristarchus, it is important that we pay attention to two important facts. First, Aristarchus did not use the term ἐπίρρημα, which was the normal term for ‘adverb’ in later times. Second, he presumably did not use the expression τὰ μέρη τοῦ λόγου to designate ὄνομα, ῥῆμα, etc. Unlike the philosophers, Aristarchus was not interested in ‘parts of λόγος’, but in ‘word classes’ (types of words).

---

40 See Matthaios (1999). Matthaios concludes that careful analysis of the fragments of Aristarchus confirms the testimony of Quintilian (Inst. orat. 1.4.20; see section 4.2.3), who states that Aristarchus knew eight partes orationis. On Aristarchus and his philological work, see Pfeiffer (1968) 210-233.
43 For μετοχή, see Aristarchus fr. 92a Matthaios. For μεσότης, see Matthaios (1999) 520ff.
45 The term μέρη λόγου is not found in the fragments of Aristarchus and Dionysius Thrax: see Matthaios (1999) 198-200. Aristarchus seems to have used the term λέξεως when discussing the category to which a word belongs, and later grammarians still used λέξεως when they defined particular word classes. But grammarians did not say that ‘there are eight (or nine) λέξεως’. Schenkeveld (1994) 279-280 thinks that the ‘parts’ of the Alexandrians (Aristophanes and Aristarchus) were actually μέρη λέξεως in the Aristotelian sense; however, it should be emphasised that Aristotle included also other units than words among the μέρη λέξεως.
In the generation of Aristarchus’ pupil Dionysius Thrax (ca. 170-90 BC), Stoic influence on the Alexandrian grammarians became stronger. It has been noticed that where the teachings of Dionysius Thrax (as reported by ancient testimonies) differ from the theories in the Technê Grammatikê, Dionysius Thrax seems to have adopted Stoic ideas. In particular, Dionysius Thrax is said (1) to have separated ὅνομα (proper noun) and προσημορία (appellative), (2) to have called the pronoun ἀρθρον δεικτικόν (‘deictic article’), and (3) to have defined the verb as ‘a word that signifies a predicate’ (ῥῆμα ἐστὶ λέξις κατηγόρημα σημαίνουσα). All these doctrines can be explained as resulting from Stoic influence. As Frede and Janko point out, it may have been Apollodorus of Athens who influenced Dionysius Thrax by introducing to him the teachings of the Stoic Diogenes of Babylon (2nd century BC). Both Apollodorus and Dionysius Thrax studied with Aristarchus in Alexandria. Apollodorus shared at least one of the views of Dionysius Thrax: he too called pronouns ἀρθρα δεικτικό (see section 3.6.3). A second factor that may have contributed to the integration of philological and Stoic ideas was the so-called secessio doctorum: in 145 BC many scholars were forced to leave Alexandria and moved to Rhodes, Pergamon, Athens and (in later times) Rome. As a result, many ideas seem to have been exchanged between philosophers and philologists who now came into contact with each other at various Hellenistic centres of learning.

In the period after Dionysius Thrax, a new discipline must have developed from the philological work of the Alexandrian scholars, namely that of technical grammar: scholars now started to write systematic grammatical treatises, including lists of word classes and their accidentia. One might say that these technical treatises systematically fixed down the ‘Grammatik im Kopf’ that Aristarchus and Dionysius Thrax used for their philological explanations. We do not know who wrote the first treatise of technical grammar, but I have already mentioned (in section 1.4) that Asclepiades of Myrlea (who came from Alexandria to Rome in the first century BC) wrote a treatise Περὶ γραμματικῆς (On Grammar), which Sextus Empiricus used as a source for his refutations of grammatical theories in his Against the Grammarians.

47 A very instructive history of the word class theory in the period after Aristarchus is found in Matthaios (2002) 191-213. For the fragments of Dionysius Thrax, see Linke (1977) and for a reconstruction of his ‘Precepts’ (Παραγγελματα), see Schenkeveld (1998b) and Di Benedetto (2000).
50 Frede (1987b) 358-359; Janko (1995) 215. Diogenes of Babylon, who wrote a τέχνη περὶ φωνῆς, is mentioned several times in the account of Diogenes Laertius (VII.55-58 etc.). On Apollodorus, see Pfeiffer (1968) 252-266.
51 Apollonius Dyscolus, Pron., G.G. II 1, 5,18-19.
53 On Asclepiades, see section 1.4 and the literature mentioned there.
We have also seen that Tyrannion, who lived in Rome from 67 BC onwards, wrote a treatise Περὶ μερισμοῦ τῶν τοῦ λόγου μερῶν (On the Classification of the Parts of Speech). In this work, Tyrannion may have discussed the number and order of the word classes, and presumably he also dealt with the assignment of words to their proper word class, the procedure for which Apollonius Dyscolus uses the word μερισμός. The title of this work on the parts of speech makes Tyrannion the first grammarian of whom we know that he used the expression τὰ μέρη τοῦ λόγου, which is until this time only attested in philosophical writings. The introduction of the originally philosophical expression τὰ μέρη τοῦ λόγου in philology and technical grammar is another example of Stoic influence on Alexandrian scholars. For Aristotle and the Stoics, this term referred, as we have seen, to the components of λόγος, but for the grammarians it now came to designate the types of words (word classes) that they distinguished. From now on, μέρος λόγου seems to be the standard term for word class, but the term μόριον was used as well: in the grammatical papyri, the works of Apollonius Dyscolus and the Technē grammaticē, both μέρος λόγου and μόριον are used in the sense of word class. Finally, the distinction between λέξις and λόγος developed into one between ‘word’ and ‘sentence’: this is a relatively late application of these terms, which we find in Apollonius Dyscolus and in the Technē Grammatikē, where λέξις is defined as ‘the smallest part of the constructed sentence (λόγος)’.

54 Haas (1977) has collected the fragments of the two grammarians named Tyrannion (Diocles, the younger Tyrannion, probably took over the name of his teacher Tyrannion). Pfeiffer (1968) 272-274 offers a general discussion of the scholarly work of Asclepiades and Tyrannion. For Tyrannion’s life and works, see section 1.4 and the literature mentioned there.

55 On the content of Tyrannion’s treatise, see Wendel (1943) 1815. The titles Περὶ μερισμοῦ and Περὶ τῶν μερῶν τοῦ λόγου (Tyrannion fr. 55-56 Haas), both mentioned in Suda, have been identified as one treatise that would have carried the title Περὶ μερισμοῦ τῶν τοῦ λόγου μερῶν, which was also the title of one of the works of Apollonius Dyscolus. Cf. Wendel (1943) 1815: ‘Gewiß betont Lehrs (...) mit Recht, daß μερισμός die Aufteilung der Sprache auf die Wortklassen bedeutet, so daß deren Zahl und wechselseitiges Verhältnis sowie die Unterbringung von Wörtern zweifelhafter Zugehörigkeit in derartigen Schriften vorwiegend erörtert werden mußte (...), aber das Ergebnis solcher Untersuchungen war doch eben die Feststellung und Abgrenzung der μέρη τοῦ λόγου, so daß die Titel Περὶ μερισμοῦ und Περὶ τῶν μερῶν τοῦ λόγου durchaus verschiedene Kürzungen des gleichen Volltitels darstellen können.’ On Apollonius’ use of μερισμός, see Sluiter (1990) 106-139.

56 If Blank (1998) is right that Asclepiades of Myrlea was, via an intermediate Epicurean text, the main source of Sextus’ Against the Grammarians, we may assume that Asclepiades also used the term τὰ μέρη τοῦ λόγου, since the discussion in Adv. Math. I.131-158 (esp. 132-141) presupposes a grammarian who used that term.


58 The term μέρος λόγου is found in Apollonius Dyscolus, e.g. Synt. I.14-29 etc., [D. Thrax], G.G. I 1, 22,4-23,3, and in the following papyri: P. Yale I 25 (nr. 1 Wouters), P. Lond. Lit. 182 (nr. 2 Wouters), P. Heid. I 197 (nr. 6 Wouters), and P. Heid. I 198 (nr. 12 Wouters). For μόριον, see e.g. Apollonius Dyscolus Synt. I.19 (where τὸ μόριον refers to the word class pronoun) and Synt. I.22 (where τὸ μόριον refers to the word class participle).

Not only Tyrannion’s adoption of the expression τὰ μέρη τοῦ λόγου, but also his treatment of the different word classes betrays Stoic influence. For example, he does not seem to have distinguished the participle as a separate word class, but as a subtype of the noun. The integration of Alexandrian and Stoic ideas that characterises the grammatical views of Dionysius Thrax and Tyrannion is mirrored in some grammatical papyri from later times. In these texts, the originally Stoic distinction of ὄνομα and προσηγορία (proper noun and appellative) is incorporated in a list of word classes: this results in a system of nine word classes (with proper noun and appellative noun as two separate classes), which we find in two papyri in the collection of Wouters.

We recall that for most word classes, Aristarchus already used the names that were to become the traditional ones, but that he called the adverb μεσότης, not ἐπίρρημα. The term ἐπίρρημα (in the sense of adverb) seems to have been introduced in the first century BC: it first appears in the fragments of Tryphon (active in the Augustan period), namely in the title of his work Περὶ ἐπιρρημάτων (‘On Adverbs’), and, in roughly the same period, in the rhetorical works of Dionysius of Halicarnassus (see section 3.6.5).

While philologists in Alexandria were explaining and commenting on the Homeric texts, another group of Hellenistic scholars, known as κριτικοὶ, was engaged in a heated debate on the criteria of good poetry (see section 1.5). We know these critics from Philodemus’ On Poems. One of the surviving fragments of this work, which Janko has assigned to the critic Pausimachus of Miletus (cited by Philodemus via Crates), mentions ὄνομα, ῥήμα, σύνθεσις, and a word that must be restored as πρόθεσις. For our purposes this fragment is important because the interests of the κριτικοὶ are similar to those of Dionysius of Halicarnassus. The way in which the ‘parts of speech’ (we do not know what they called them) are used in this context
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60 On Stoic influence on Tyrannion’s treatment of the parts of speech, see Matthaios (2002) 193-195.
62 P. Yale I 25 (nr. 1 Wouters) and P. Heid. I 198 (nr. 12 Wouters) (see also section 3.6.6).
63 Tryphon, fr. 65 Von Velsen (= Apollonius Dyscolus, Adv., G.G. II 1, 146,15-23). See also Tryphon, fr. 66-77 Von Velsen. Cf. Matthaios (1999) 559-560. For Dionysius’ use of the adverbs, see also section 5.3.4.
64 Janko (2000) 282-283 (P. Herc. 994 fr. 19,4-5). Note that Janko reads προθέσις because προθέσις would exceed the space of the lacuna. If Janko’s reconstruction is correct, the fragment would confirm the belief, based on Apollonius Dyscolus’ reference to Aristophanes of Byzantium, that the προθέσις was already distinguished in the period before Aristarchus. Apollonius (Sym. IV.11) suggests that Aristophanes of Byzantium already knew the προθέσις (see above). In an earlier publication, Janko (1995) 228 assigned the fragment from Philodemus to Aristarchus’ older contemporary Crates of Mallos, but more recently (Janko [2000] 186-187) he has identified this critic as Pausimachus of Miletus, who, according to Janko’s reconstruction, is quoted by Crates of Mallos.
seems to correspond to the way in which Dionysius of Halicarnassus employs them in some passages of De compositione verborum (see below, section 4.3.1). Like Dionysius, the kritikoi seem to have used the doctrine of the parts of speech in their discussion of σύνθεσις (composition), in particular by arguing that the modification of the parts of speech (by adding and removing letters) can lead to a more euphonious composition. The fragmentary state of Philodemus’ On Poems and the lack of other evidence make it impossible to judge the exact connections between the kritikoi and Dionysius, but it is not unlikely that Dionysius’ use of the parts of speech was influenced by these Hellenistic critics (see section 4.3.1).

Dionysius’ contemporary colleague Caecilius of Caleacte, critic and rhetorician, also seems to have used the grammatical theory of the parts of speech in his rhetorical teaching (see also section 1.5). Only a few fragments of his works have come down to us, but they show us that, in his work On Figures, Caecilius dealt with at least ὀνόματα and ἰδεῖα and discussed figures that made particular use of the accidentia, in particular πτώσεις (cases), ἀριθμός (number), πρόσωπα (persons) and χρόνοι (tenses). In as far as the fragments allow us to draw conclusions, Caecilius’ use of the parts of speech in rhetorical theory resembles that of Dionysius of Halicarnassus (section 4.4.2).

This overview of the various traditions of philosophers, philological and technical grammarians, poetical critics and rhetoricians, all of which played their own role in the history of the analysis of λόγος and λέξις into μέρη, be it as ‘parts of the expression’, ‘parts of speech’, ‘parts of the phrase’, or ‘word classes’, serves as a background to Dionysius of Halicarnassus’ use of the μόρια λόγου and μόρια λέξεως. Before we turn to a discussion of Dionysius’ use of these ‘parts of speech’, we should consider his possible connections to the different traditions listed above, so that our analysis will enable us to establish Dionysius’ place in the history of the theory of the parts of speech.

3.3. Dionysius’ knowledge of earlier and contemporary theories

Dionysius uses the theory of the parts of speech only in four of his treatises, namely Dem., Comp., Thuc. and Amm. II, all of which are works belonging to the middle or late periods in the division of Dionysius’ works (see section 1.3). Although we should
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65 It may well be that the concept of the ‘parts’ of the kritikoi was similar to that of Dionysius, namely ‘word classes’ as well as ‘parts of the phrase’ (words as building blocks of composition): see section 3.4.
66 Caecilius of Caleacte fr. 73 and 75 Ofenloch.
not exclude the possibility that it was because of the character of his earlier works (\textit{Lys.}, \textit{Isoc.}, \textit{Is.}) that Dionysius did not use grammatical theories there, I think that Schenkeveld has rightly argued that Dionysius obtained his knowledge about grammatical theories when he had been in Rome for some time.\footnote{Schenkeveld (1983) 69.} In this section, I will discuss the connections between Dionysius and the scholars of various disciplines that dealt in some way with a theory of the parts of speech. This discussion will consist of two parts. First, I will discuss those philosophers, philologists and critics of earlier periods with whose ideas we know Dionysius must have been acquainted, since he refers to their works (section 3.3.1). Second, I will list a number of contemporary grammarians with whose views on the parts of speech Dionysius may have become familiar in Rome, where many intellectuals came together in the first century BC (section 3.3.2).\footnote{For the intellectual life in Augustan Rome, see section 1.4 and the literature mentioned there.} Finally, I will briefly discuss the passages where Dionysius describes how one learns to read and write: Dionysius’ discussion shows that the word classes were part of the grammatical curriculum of his time (section 3.3.3).

Because Dionysius does not mention the names of contemporary scholars, we can never be certain about his connections with them, but we should definitely allow for the possibility that he knew their ideas on language. This is not to say that this study will engage in \textit{Quellenforschung} here: it will not be my purpose to assign each of Dionysius’ ideas to one particular philosopher or grammarian. Instead, I will explore the intellectual context in which Dionysius was working, so that we may better understand how Dionysius’ use of the \textit{μόρια λόγου} is related to the various theories that existed in his time. As I have argued above (section 1.3), Dionysius’ participation in the network of intellectuals at Rome is fundamental to our understanding of his works. In this light, it is not useful to point to specific sources of his ideas, but more so to reconstruct the collective set of ideas that circulated in this network, and the discourse in which these ideas were expressed and exchanged.

Only in a few cases will I point to a specific text as the possible source of Dionysius’ views: I will only do so when there are strong reasons to believe that a certain passage should be traced back to an earlier treatment, for instance because Dionysius’ terminology in that passage differs from the terminology in the rest of his work, or because the views that are expressed in that passage seem to be typical of a particular school or discipline: the history of the theory of the parts of speech (\textit{Comp. 2}) may be a case in point (see section 4.2.3). Here, Dionysius tells us that ‘some’ (\textit{τινες}) call the
parts of speech στοιχεία. Quintilian offers a history of the parts of speech that closely resembles Dionysius’ account (see section 4.2.3), and Blank has argued that much of Quintilian’s grammatical theory is based on Asclepiades of Myrlea. We can imagine that a technical grammatical treatise started with a historical overview of the development of the parts of speech from Aristotle onwards, so in this case we might indeed think of Asclepiades’ On Grammar (or another grammatical work) as the source of Dionysius’ account. Another case is Dionysius’ Second Letter to Ammaeus (see section 4.4), which partly seems to be based on a philological commentary on Thucydides. In general, however, I will refrain from tracing his ideas back to specific sources: it is more useful to illustrate the ways in which Dionysius reflects the discourse of his time.

3.3.1. Dionysius’ knowledge of earlier views on the parts of speech

Dionysius knew the views of several thinkers of the four traditions that we have discussed in section 3.2: those of the Peripatetic philosophers, the Stoic philosophers, the Alexandrian philologists and the Hellenistic kritikoi. He mentions representatives of the first three groups, while his connection to the kritikoi seems to be clear from the similarity between their and his views on euphony. Did Dionysius also know how the parts of speech were treated in these different traditions?

In section 1.5, we have observed that Dionysius knew both Aristotle’s Rhetoric and Theophrastus’ On Style. Above, I have pointed out that, in the Rhetoric, Aristotle distinguished only two μέρη λόγου, namely ὄνομα and ῥήμα. He did mention σύνδεσμοι in the same treatise, however, and this could explain why Dionysius, in his history of the theory of the parts of speech (see section 4.2.1), tells us that Aristotle (and Theodectes) considered ὄνόματα, ῥήματα and σύνδεσμοι the primary parts of speech. Janko’s suggestion that Dionysius is here quoting an Aristotelian dialogue in which Theodectes appeared seems unnecessary, for we can imagine that Dionysius is referring to the third book of Aristotle’s Rhetoric and to a similar work on style by Aristotle’s pupil Theodectes. In any case, there is a reasonable chance that Dionysius’ history of the theory of the parts of speech in Comp. 2 depends on a grammatical source (Asclepiades’ On Grammar has been suggested), and,
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70 See also De Jonge (2005a) 14 n. 19.
71 Aristotle, Rh. 1404b26-27.
72 Comp. 2.6.20-7.2. The σύνδεσμοι are mentioned in Aristotle, Rh. 1407a21; 1407b12; 1407b39; 1413b33.
73 Janko (2000) 186-187. Frede (1987a) 317 thinks that the information on Theodectes can only derive from ‘Theodectes’ remarks on diction in one of his rhetorical writings’.
consequently, that the observations on the number of parts of speech distinguished by Aristotle and later thinkers are not necessarily based on Dionysius’ own investigations. Dionysius presumably did not know Aristotle’s *Poetics*, but there is a chance that the Aristotelian difference between μέρη λόγου (parts of the assertion, namely ὄνομα and ῥῆμα) and μέρη λέξεως (parts of expression, namely στοιχεῖον, συλλαβή, σύνδεσμος, ὄνομα, ῥῆμα, ἀρθρον, πτώσις and λόγος) was known to him from the works of Aristotle’s successor Theophrastus. Simplicius tells us that Theophrastus, in his work *On the Elements of Speech* (Περὶ τῶν τοῦ λόγου στοιχείων) inquired ‘whether just the noun and verb are elements of speech (τοῦ λόγου στοιχεῖα), or also ἄρθρα and σύνδεσμοι and certain others — these too are parts of expression (λέξεως μέρη), but noun and verb are parts of speech (λόγου) — (...)’. The latter words indicate that Theophrastus preserved the Aristotelian distinction between λόγος and λέξις and their respective μέρη. Now, it has been suggested that *On the Elements of Speech* is another title of Theophrastus’ book *On Style* (Περὶ λέξεως), or perhaps a name of the first part of that work. If this were true, it would mean that Dionysius could have taken notice of the Peripatetic distinction between λόγος and λέξις from Theophrastus’ *On Style*, a work that he used extensively. However, Schenkeveld has argued that Simplicius’ passage mentioned above does not refer to Theophrastus’ *On Style*, but rather to a logical treatise by the same author. Therefore, we do not know whether Theophrastus mentioned the parts of expression (either in connection with the parts of the assertion or not) in his work *On Style*, nor do we know whether Dionysius was acquainted with the difference between Aristotle’s μέρη λόγου and μέρη λέξεως. Dionysius himself does not distinguish between parts of the assertion and parts of the expression: as we
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74 See Kroll (1907) 91-92, Blank (1998) xlv-xlvi, and my section 4.2.3.
75 Dionysius seems to be ignorant of the *Poetics*: in *Comp.* 2, he states that Aristotle only distinguished ὄνομα, ῥῆμα and σύνδεσμοι as parts of speech, but in *Poetics* 20.1456b38-1457a10 the ἄρθρον is mentioned. Cf. Fortenbaugh (2005) 249.
76 Simplicius, *In Cat.* 8.10,20-11,2 (= Theophrastus fr. 683 Fortenbaugh): ἐν τῷ Περὶ τῶν τοῦ λόγου στοιχείων ὃ τε θεοφραστὸς ἀνακινεῖ (...) οἷον πότερον ὄνομα καὶ ῥῆμα τοῦ λόγου στοιχεῖα ἢ καὶ ἄρθρα καὶ σύνδεσμοι καὶ ἄλλα τινά (λέξεως δὲ καὶ τοῦτα μέρη, λόγου δὲ ὄνομα καὶ ῥῆμα) ...
77 See Theophrastus fr. 666 (titles of books) 17a (On Style) and b (On the Elements of Speech) and Fortenbaugh’s comments there. On the possible identification of On the Elements of Speech with On Style, see also Frede (1987a) 317.
78 Schenkeveld (1998a) 69-79. In his commentary, Fortenbaugh (2005) 244-245 agrees with Schenkeveld: he now recommends placing fr. 683 before fr. 78 (Ammonius, *On Aristotle’s De Interpretatione* 4.17a1), which seems to be based on the same logical treatise by Theophrastus.
79 P. Hib. 183 (Theophrastus fr. 683 appendix 8 Fortenbaugh) seems to mention ‘eight parts of the expression’, but Fortenbaugh (2005) 250-254 is not convinced that this text should be attributed to Theophrastus. P. Hamb. 128 (Theophrastus fr. 683 appendix 9 Fortenbaugh) contains a discussion of types of words, where ‘nouns and verbs combined’ (ὄνοματων ἢ ῥημάτων συνθέτων) are mentioned. But Schenkeveld (1993) disagrees with Snell’s attribution of the text to Theophrastus’ *On Style*. Fortenbaugh (2005) 254-266 (see esp. 265-266) hesitates.
will see, he uses both μόρια (or μέρη) λόγου and μόρια (or μέρη) λέξεως, but without adopting the Peripatetic (or the Stoic) distinction between the two (see section 3.5).

In Comp. 4, Dionysius tells us that he has read two treatises of the Stoic philosopher Chrysippus with the title Περί τις συντάξεως τῶν τοῦ λόγου μερῶν, On the Syntax of the Parts of Speech, which did not adopt a rhetorical but a dialectical approach (see also sections 1.5 and 5.3.1). They dealt with ‘the composition (σύνταξις) of true and false propositions, possible and impossible ones, propositions that are contingent, changing their truth value, ambiguous ones and others of such a kind’. Dionysius emphasises that Chrysippus’ books were not useful to civil oratory, ‘at least as far as the attractiveness and beauty of style (ηδονή καὶ κάλλος ἐρμηνείας), which should be the aims of composition, are concerned’. Just before mentioning the title of Chrysippus’ treatise, Dionysius also refers more generally to Stoic τεχναί ἐπὶ τῶν συντάξεως τῶν τοῦ λόγου μορίων, ‘handbooks on the syntax of the parts of speech’, which were very disappointing to him, because the writers who claimed to write on the syntax of the parts of speech, and Chrysippus in particular, turned out to be the worst examples of stylistic writing themselves: ‘they never even dreamt it is that makes composition attractive and beautiful.’ Although Dionysius objects so strongly both to Chrysippus’ own stylistic composition and to his logical approach to the grouping of the parts of speech, we should not exclude the possibility that the rhetorician’s use of the μόρια λόγου reflects to a certain extent his reading of these Stoic texts. This seems to be true at least for the experiment concerning natural word

80 Comp. 4.22,12-17. The title does not entirely correspond to the titles of Chrysippus’ works that we know from Diogenes Laertius VII.192: Περί τις συντάξεως καὶ στοιχείων τῶν λεγομένων and Περί τις συντάξεως τῶν λεγομένων. On Chrysippus’ treatises mentioned by Dionysius and Diogenes Laertius, see Barwick (1957) 21, Frede (1987a) 324-325, Atherton (1993) 142 n. 7 and Van Ophuijsen (2003) 81 and 93.

81 Comp. 4.22,14-17: ύπερ αξιωμάτων συντάξεως ἀληθῶν τε καὶ ψευδῶν καὶ δυνατῶν καὶ αδύνατων ἐνδεχόμενων τε καὶ μεταπεπτόντων καὶ άμφιβολῶν καὶ ἀλλων τινῶν τοιοτοῦτων.

82 Comp. 4.22,18-23,1: οὐδεμίαν οὖτ’ ὥφελεν οὖτε χρείαν τοῖς πολιτικοῖς λόγοις συμβαλλομένας εἰς γόνων ἠδονήν καὶ κάλλος ἐρμηνείας, ὅσον δὲ στοχάζεσθαι τὴν σύνθεσιν.

83 Comp. 4.21,10-18: ἀπόχρη δὲ τεκμηρίω χρῆσεσθαι τοῦ λόγου Χρυσίππῳ τῷ Στοικῷ (περαιτέρω γὰρ οὐκ ἂν προβαίνῃ· τοῦτο γὰρ οὔτ’ ἐμείναιν οὖν ἡμείς τὰς διαιλεκτικὰς τέχνας ἠκριβώσκεν οὔτε ἀρμονία χείρονι συνταχθέντας ἐξήγετε λόγους τῶν γονών ὑνόματος καὶ δόξης ἐξωθέντων. κατὰ σπουδάζεσθαι γὰρ τῶν προεποίησθαι αὐτῶν καὶ περὶ τοῦτο τὸ μέρος ὡς ἀνεξαντίκητὸν ἐν τῷ λόγῳ καὶ τέχνας γὲ τινας ἐγραψαν ύπέρ τῆς συντάξεως τῶν τοῦ λόγου μορίων. ‘It is sufficient to point to Chrysippus the Stoic as proof of my statement [that those who claim to be philosophers and publish handbooks on logic are inept in the arrangement of their words], for beyond that I refuse to go. Of writers who have been judged worthy of renown or distinction, none has written treatises on logic with more precision, and none has published discourses that are worse specimens of composition. And yet some of those writers claimed to make a serious study of this department also, as being indispensable to good writing, and even wrote handbooks on the syntax of the parts of speech.’ In this passage, I follow the text of Aujac & Lebel (1981). Usener reads προβαίνειν instead of προβαίνῃ (MSS).

84 Comp. 4.22,2-3: οὐδ’ ὄναρ εἶδον, τί πο’ ἐστι τὸ ποιοῦ ἢδειαν καὶ καλὴν τὴν σύνθεσιν.

85 While the Stoic treatises dealt with σύνταξις, Dionysius himself is interested in the σύνθεσις of the parts of speech. Sextus Empiricus, Adv. Math. IX.8 tells us that according to technical authors
order (Comp. 5), which immediately follows the remarks on Chrysippus’ works (see section 5.3). Dionysius abandons that experiment with the logical ordering of the parts of speech (nouns precede verbs, verbs precede adverbs, etc.) for the reason that in many cases the logical rules do not lead to a composition that is pleasing (ηδονικά) and beautiful (καλά): this was, as we have seen, exactly the objection that he had uttered to Chrysippus’ work and to the logical handbooks in general. I will argue that Dionysius’ discussion of natural word order is indeed based on the Stoic theory of the parts of speech, although I do not think that Chrysippus himself was as interested in pleasing and beautiful word order as Dionysius was: we should rather believe that Dionysius borrowed Stoic theories on the hierarchy of the parts of speech, which he himself applied to the art of composition. Stoic ideas also play a role in other parts of his work, and Schenkeveld has rightly drawn attention to the Stoic terminology that Dionysius uses in his grammatical observations. It will turn out that many aspects of Dionysius’ use of the parts of speech can indeed be considered Stoic. This does not imply, however, that Dionysius borrowed all such theories from Chrysippus or another Stoic source. Since Stoic thought influenced many grammarians of the second and first centuries BC, Dionysius’ Stoic terminology may also have resulted from his use of grammatical, rather than philosophical treatises. Stoic terminology was part of the intellectual discourse of the time.

We can be quite certain, then, that Dionysius was acquainted with Stoic views on the μέρη λόγου. Although he is less explicit about his knowledge of the achievements of Alexandrian philologists in this field, we may assume that he was acquainted with their views. When Dionysius refers to Aristophanes of Byzantium, he only mentions the fact that the Alexandrian scholar ‘or any other metrician’ divided poems into metrical

(τεχνογράφοι), who may be identified as Stoics, ‘a definition differs from a universal statement only in σύνταξις, but it is the same in “semantic potential” (δόνημας).’ The translation is by Van Ophuijsen (2003). Sextus Empiricus gives an example that suggests that, for the Stoics, σύνταξις has nothing to do with the order of words, but with the logical combining (by the use of conjunctions) of propositions. See Van Ophuijsen (2003) 82-84.

86 Comp. 5.26,17-20.
87 Kroll (1907) 91 has suggested that Dionysius’ experiment concerning natural word order, including its examples, is borrowed from Chrysippus. See also Jensen (1923) 149. Barwick (1957) 21 also thinks that the Stoic τέχνοι themselves treated the order of the parts of speech in a sentence, and so does Frede (1987a) 324-325. It is, however, also possible that the Stoics discussed the natural hierarchy of the parts of speech without implying that the μέρη λόγου should be placed in a sentence according to that order: in that case, Dionysius (Comp. 5) would have gone one step further than the Stoics themselves. See section 5.3.7.
Dionysius nowhere mentions Aristarchus or Dionysius Thrax. However, in his discussion of the style of Thucydides, he remarks that nobody could understand the historian without the use of a ‘linguistic interpretation’ (εξήγησις γραμματικής) (see section 4.4). The term εξήγησις does not necessarily imply a commentary (ὑπομνήμα), but the similarity between Dionysius’ notes on Thucydidides in the Second Letter to Ammæus and the comments in the scholia on Thucydides indeed suggests that Dionysius made use of a philological commentary. Such a commentary may have originated in Alexandrian scholarship. If Pfeiffer correctly assumes that Aristarchus wrote the first commentary on Thucydides, then we may believe that Dionysius used that work. In any case, Dionysius’ analysis of Thucydides’ use of the parts of speech resembles the kind of remarks that we know from Aristarchus’ work on Homer. For example, Dionysius points out that a noun is used instead of a verb (or vice versa), or that a single pronoun is combined with a plural verb. I will discuss the relation between Dionysius and Alexandrian scholarship in more detail in section 4.4.2. Dionysius does not refer to the kritikoi whom we know from Philodemus’ On Poems. Nevertheless, in the discussion of Dionysius’ theory of μετασκευή (Comp. 6), we will see that the way in which the theory of the parts of speech is used in that passage is related to the views of the kritikoi (section 4.3.1).

3.3.2. Dionysius’ knowledge of contemporary views on the parts of speech

Having considered Dionysius’ connections to the earlier thinkers who wrote about the parts of speech in different contexts, we should now focus on the grammarians of the first century BC, whose views Dionysius may have learned during his stay in Rome. Dionysius may have known Tyrannion’s Περὶ μερισμοῦ τῶν τοῦ λόγου μερῶν (On the Classification of the Parts of Speech) (see section 1.4). He also may have known the commentary on this work, the Ἐξήγησις τοῦ Τυραννίνου μερισμοῦ, written by the younger Tyrannion or Diocles. Particularly relevant for our purposes is the work of Asclepiades of Myrlea, Περὶ γραμματικής (On Grammar). It has been argued that the structure of Asclepiades’ book is reflected in Sextus Empiricus’ Against the Grammarians. According to David Blank, Sextus Empiricus made use of an Epicurean source that attacked Asclepiades’ treatise. In On Grammar, Asclepiades also included a discussion of the parts of speech, which was probably the basis for
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90 Comp. 22.102.2: Ἀριστοφάνης ἦ τῶν ἄλλων τις μετρικῶν. Comp. 26.140,19: Ἀριστοφάνης ἦ ἄλλος τις. Dionysius himself is not interested in Aristophanes’ division into metrical clauses, but only in the division of a poem into rhetorical clauses, i.e. grammatical unities that contain a complete thought. On Dionysius’ concept of colon, see Viljamaa (2003), who compares the colon to the intonation unit of modern text analysis.
91 Thuc. 51.410,15-17.
92 See Pfeiffer (1968) 225. See further section 4.4.2.
Sextus’ attacks on that theory in *Adv. Math.* I.131-158. Blank has suggested that Asclepiades’ grammatical theories have influenced both Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Quintilian (*Inst. orat.* 1.4-8). He even goes so far as to state that not only Sextus Empiricus and Quintilian, but also Dionysius of Halicarnassus closely follow Asclepiades’ exposition of grammatical doctrines. Dionysius’ discussion of ‘voice’ ([Comp.] 14), letters or elements ([Comp.] 14); syllables ([Comp.] 15); words ([Comp.] 15); and *lógos* ([Comp.] 16) (thus Blank) in *De compositione verborum* would reflect what Asclepiades had written on these topics. Although I do think that Asclepiades may have influenced Dionysius’ ideas, I do not agree with Blank’s suggestion that Comp. 14-16 follows the sections of a grammatical treatise. These chapters are all part of Dionysius’ discussion of *μέλος*, one of the means of composition, and they contain many observations that originate in musical and stylistic theory rather than grammar. A grammatical treatise may have been one of the models (besides a treatise of Aristoxenus) for the discussion of the individual properties of letters and syllables in Comp. 14-15. But from the end of Comp. 15, the focus is on such combinations of letters and syllables that aim to portray emotions or to express the content of a passage in general. There is no grammatical discussion of ‘words’ in Comp. 15, nor is there any linguistic treatment of ‘logos’ in Comp. 16, which deals, in fact, with the selection and formation of imitative words.

Especially relevant to this analysis is the grammarian Tryphon, Dionysius’ contemporary in Augustan Rome (see section 1.4). As I have pointed out, it is possible that Tryphon and Dionysius participated in the same network of intellectuals, although we do not have any evidence that they knew each other. We have seen that Tryphon was the author of separate treatises on the parts of speech, namely Περὶ ἀρθρων, Περὶ προθέσεων, Περὶ συνδέσμων, and Περὶ ἐπιρημάτων. I recall the fact (see section 3.2) that the latter title of Tryphon’s treatise on adverbs and Dionysius’ rhetorical works are the earliest extant texts in which the term ἐπίρημα is used for the adverb.

Finally, we should briefly consider the possible connections between Dionysius and the Roman grammarians who were active under the reign of Augustus (see section

---

95 *Comp.* 15.60.6ff.
96 I do think that Dionysius’ surveys of grammatical teaching in *Dem.* 52 and *Comp.* 25 (letters, syllables, parts of speech) correspond to the expositions that we find in Sextus Empiricus and Quintilian. Blank (1998) does not mention this agreement, but I consider these more convincing parallels than Blank’s reference to *Comp.* 14-16: see below.
97 See Von Velsen (1853) and Wendel (1939).
1.4). Varro enumerated only four parts of speech on a strictly morphological basis, and in this respect he was an outsider in Hellenistic grammar. As far as the theory of the parts of speech is concerned, his influence on someone like Dionysius was probably limited. Varro’s views on the parts of speech were not influential: in the beginning of the first century AD, Remmius Palaemon wrote an *ars grammatica* in which he distinguished eight parts of speech, thus following the Alexandrian grammarians rather than his famous Roman predecessor. Quintilian’s remarks on Palaemon (see section 4.2.3) suggest that he was only one of the grammarians who distinguished eight *partes orationis*. It is possible that earlier Roman grammarians also listed eight parts of speech, but Suetonius, who is our major source on the grammatici of the first century BC, does not mention any treatise on the parts of speech. We do not know whether Dionysius’ contemporary Roman colleagues mentioned by Suetonius (Marcus Verrius Flaccus, Lucius Crassicius, Scribonius Aphrodisius, Gaius Iulius Hyginus, Gaius Melissus: see section 1.4) wrote on the parts of speech.

3.3.3. Dionysius on the grammatical school curriculum

Although Dionysius does not mention any of the grammarians listed above (section 3.3.2), there is one strong indication that he was familiar with contemporary theories on the parts of speech: in two similar passages, Dionysius refers to the curriculum of grammar schools, in which he tells us that pupils first learn the letters (*γράμματα*), then the syllables (*συλλαβαί*), then the words (*λέξεις*) or parts of speech (*τὰ τῶν λόγων μόρια*) and their *accidentia* (*σαμβεβηκότα*); finally they start to read and write. Barwick has argued that Dionysius’ discussions of the curriculum of grammar (*Comp. 25* and *Dem. 52*) depend on Stoic sources. He based his

---

98 On Varro’s unconventional treatment of the parts of speech, see Dahlmann (1932), Taylor (19962a) 338, Taylor (1996b) 18-30, Taylor (2000) and Matthaios (2002) 203-208. Varro distinguished the following word classes: words with case, words with tense, words with both case and tense and words with neither.

99 Suetonius, *De grammaticis et rhetoribus* 23 is silent on Palaemon’s *ars*, but Quintilian, *Inst. orat.* 1.4.19-20 and Juvenal 6.451-453 inform us about the work and its reputation. On Palaemon, see Kaster (1995) 228-242. Barwick’s reconstruction (1922) of Palaemon’s *Ars grammatica* has been criticised on various points, particularly on his view that the Stoic (Pergamenic) *τέχνη περὶ φανῆς* was the starting point of Roman grammar: see Pinborg (1975) 113-114, Schenkeveld (1990), Baratin (2000) and Schenkeveld (2004) 22.

100 Kaster (1995) 230 warns against overestimation of Palaemon’s *ars*. Other works may have been equally influential despite of Suetonius’ silence. Suetonius focuses on the lives of the grammarians, and does not intend to mention all their writings.

101 *Dem.* 52.242,12-243,9 and *Comp.* 25.134,23-135,12. For the Greek text, see section 3.7. Note that the three technical stages are termed differently in the two passages: in *Dem.* 52 they are referred to as (1) *στοιχεῖα τῆς φανῆς* or *γράμματα*, (2) *συλλαβαί* and (3) *τὰ τῶν λόγων μόρια*, while in *Comp.* 25 they are (1) *γράμματα*, (2) *συλλαβαί* and (3) *λέξεις*.

conclusion on the assumption that in these passages, Dionysius uses Stoic terminology when he distinguishes between the ὄνομα, τύπος and δύναμις of letters. However, even if it is true that these terms are Stoic, we should realise that Stoic ideas had influenced both philologists and technical grammarians (e.g. Dionysius Thrax and Tyrannion) of the second and first century BC (see section 3.2). Therefore, Stoic terminology cannot be used as evidence for the use of a Stoic source. Given the importance of grammatical teaching in Augustan Rome and Dionysius’ own career as a teacher of rhetoric, it seems obvious that in a description of grammatical schoolpractice he would present his own knowledge and experience rather than relying on Stoic sources. Moreover, he refers to the grammatical curriculum as ‘something that we all know’ (ὅ γὰρ ἵπποντες ἵσμεν), thus implying that his audience recognises his description (see section 3.7).

Now, the nature of the relationship between the scholarly treatises mentioned earlier and the type of grammar that was actually taught at grammar schools in Rome is a complex problem. The few sources, apart from Dionysius, that inform us about the teaching of grammar in the first century BC seem to indicate that technical grammar was only a small part of it: ‘grammar’ (γραμματική) was the art of reading and writing, and the γραμματικός or grammaticus taught literature, especially poetry. Most scholars assume that some parts of technical grammar, dealing with letters, word classes, orthography and ἐλληνισμός, made their entrance in the school curriculum at the end of the first century BC. That is exactly the period in which Dionysius of Halicarnassus was working in Rome. Therefore, it is plausible that his remarks on the teaching of letters, syllables and parts of speech (as preparation for reading and writing) refer to the actual situation that he observed in Rome between 30 and 8 BC (see also section 3.7).

103 Comp. 25.135,1-2; Dem. 52.242,16-18.
104 Comp. 25.134,21-22.
105 According to Suetonius, De grammaticis 3, there were more than twenty grammar schools (super viginti celebres scholae) in Rome. On the teaching of grammar in antiquity, particularly in Rome, see Bonner (1977), Kaster (1988), Hovdhaugen (1996), Morgan (1998) and Schenkeveld (2000).
107 It should be noted that Cicero, De Oratore 1.187 does not include any theory of word classes under the parts of ‘grammar’: he only mentions ‘the examination of the poets, the investigation of the stories, the explanation of words, and the sounds that should be used in pronouncing them.’ (Translation May & Wisse.) As Sextus Empiricus, Adv. Math. I.252 tells us, Asclepiades of Myrlea divided γραμματική (i.e. ‘science of literature’) into three parts: ‘the expert, the historical and the grammatical’ (τεχνικῶν ἱστορικῶν γραμματικῶν). The ‘expert’ part (τεχνικῶν) dealt with letters, word classes, orthography, etc., the ‘historical’ part (ἱστορικῶν) with historical and mythical data, and the ‘grammatical’ part (γραμματικῶν) with the interpretation of poets and prose-writers. See also Adv. Math. 1.91-95 and cf. Blank (1998) 264-266 and Blank (2000) 409.
108 See Schenkeveld (1994) 264 and Hovdhaugen (1996) 389. This assumption is based on several sources, including Suetonius, Quintilian, the grammatical papyri and Dionysius of Halicarnassus.
Schenkeveld thinks that Dionysius’ description ‘looks implausible’, because it implies that pupils first learn ‘a complete grammar’ before starting to read and write.\textsuperscript{109} However, exercises containing (1) alphabets, (2) syllabaries (αν Βαν γαν δαν ζαν etc.) and (3) isolated words are numerous among the grammatical papyri, as well as exercises with classifications and declensions of nouns and conjugations of verbs.\textsuperscript{110} Schenkeveld’s suggestion that the doctrine of the parts of speech was explained at a later stage, when pupils could already read and write, may sound more convincing; but I emphasise that Dionysius’ words do not suggest that one learns a ‘complete grammar’ before starting to read and write, but rather that one digests a (brief) survey of the parts of speech and their properties. Besides, Dionysius states that his readers are familiar with his description of the grammatical curriculum. I will come back to this problem in section 3.7. For now, the most important thing is that Dionysius’ information shows that the theory of the parts of speech had a place in the school curriculum.

It is possible that in this period grammarians had started to make use of τέχναι (grammatical manuals), although the earliest extant remains of such works in the papyri date from the first century AD.\textsuperscript{111} It should be noticed that the curriculum of grammar as Dionysius describes it (letters, syllables, parts of speech and finally reading and writing) largely corresponds to the exposition of grammatical doctrines that we find in Sextus Empiricus and Quintilian, which Blank has traced back to Asclepiades’ \textit{On Grammar} (see section 1.4).\textsuperscript{112} In my view, the agreement between Dionysius’ references to school grammar and the evidence from Sextus and Quintilian suggests that some technical grammatical schooltreatise was used at the end of the first century BC, which may have been a τέχνη not known to us, or, perhaps, (a summary of) Ascepiades’ \textit{On Grammar}.\textsuperscript{113} My hypothesis is that Dionysius knew (theories from) such a treatise and combined it with ideas found in a number of other sources, including the Peripatetic and Stoic works by Theophrastus and Chrysippus mentioned above.

\textsuperscript{110} See Morgan (1998) 163-164 and 156-158.
\textsuperscript{111} Cf. Wouters (1979) and Morgan (1998) 156. See especially P. Yale I 25 (nr. 1 Wouters), from the first century AD, in which nine parts of speech are listed.
\textsuperscript{112} Blank (1998) xlvi and Blank (2000) 410. As I mentioned above, Blank detects the structure of Asclepiades’ \textit{On Grammar} (letters, words, logos) in Dionysius, \textit{Comp.} 14-16. He does not refer to the passages on grammatical teaching in \textit{Dem.} 52 and \textit{Comp.} 25, which are in my view much more convincing parallels to the expositions known from Sextus Empiricus and Quintilian.
\textsuperscript{113} Blank (1998) 110 only briefly refers to \textit{Dem.} 52, but he does not discuss the correspondence between Dionysius’ discussions of school grammar and the exposition of grammatical theories in Sextus Empiricus and Quintilian.
3.4. The double character of Dionysius’ μόρια λόγου

Having considered the intellectual contexts of his grammatical ideas, we can now focus on the actual theories on the parts of speech that we find in Dionysius’ rhetorical works. As we have seen, the terminological differences between Aristotle, the Stoics and the grammarians are closely related to their different interests and approaches. The terminology that we find in the works of Dionysius of Halicarnassus differs from that of all these groups, which can again partly be explained by the fact that his analyses have a different purpose, namely that of instruction in rhetorical theory. Dionysius uses various expressions when referring to the parts of speech, namely τὰ μέρη τοῦ λόγου, τὰ μέρη τῆς λέξεως, τὰ μόρια τοῦ λόγου and τὰ μόρια τῆς λέξεως (see section 3.4.2). When referring to Dionysius’ ‘parts of speech’ I will for the sake of convenience use the term μόρια λόγου (or τὰ μόρια τοῦ λόγου): this choice is based on two considerations, namely that μόρια λόγου and μόρια λέξεως occur in his works more frequently than the other two expressions, and that μόρια λόγου is used in Dionysius’ definition of composition in Comp. 2.114 In this section, I will examine Dionysius’ concept of the μόρια λόγου. The next section (3.5) will deal with the terminology with which he refers to words, word classes and parts of speech.

Dionysius’ use of the term μόρια λόγου combines the point of view of the grammarians, who listed several ‘categories of words’, with an approach that is closer to that of Aristotle’s analysis of the ‘components of the λέξις’. On the one hand, Dionysius classifies words as ‘word classes’, a procedure that grammarians called μερισμοῦ.115 On the other hand, Dionysius considers the μόρια λόγου the primary building blocks of composition (σύνθεσις) (see section 4.3.1). Thus, Dionysius’ μόρια λόγου are both word classes and parts of the phrase, even if one of the two aspects can be dominant in a specific context. The double character of the μόρια λόγου is particularly clear in Dionysius’ definition of ‘composition’ (σύνθεσις) in Comp. 2, a passage that is extremely important for our understanding of both Dionysius’ use of the parts of speech and his theory of composition:116

’Η σύνθεσις ἔστι μὲν, ὡσπερ καὶ οὐτὸ δηλοὶ τοῦνομα, ποιά τις θέσις παρ’ ἀλλήλα τῶν τοῦ λόγου μορίων, ὥ δὴ καὶ στοιχεῖα τινες τῆς λέξεως καλοῦσιν.

‘Composition is, as the name itself indicates, a certain arrangement of the parts of speech, or the elements of diction, as some call them.’

114 Comp. 2.6,17-19.
116 Comp. 2.6,17-19. For Dionysius’ definition of composition in its context, see section 4.2.1.
Τὰ τοῦ λόγου μόρια are here presented as the building blocks (στοιχεῖα) of σύνθεσις; they are literally the ‘parts’ of the structure that they constitute. Therefore, it would be natural to interpret τὰ τοῦ λόγου μόρια as ‘parts of the phrase’. However, Dionysius immediately tells us that various generations of philosophers and grammarians distinguished different numbers of μόρια λόγου, and he lists the items that they distinguished in different periods: ὅνομα, ῥῆμα, σύνθεσις, ἀρθρον, προσθεμικόν, ἀντονομασία, ἐπίρρημα, πρόθεσις, μεταχείριση (for a discussion of this passage, see section 4.2). In the second instance, then, it becomes clear that τὰ τοῦ λόγου μόρια are also the ‘word classes’ that were distinguished by grammarians. Dionysius does not distinguish between the concept of the μέρη λόγου in Aristotle and Stoic philosophy on the one hand, and the concept of the word classes of the philologists and technical grammarians on the other. His own concept of the μόρια λόγου has two aspects: they are parts of the phrase and word classes. Unlike the writers of artes grammaticae, Dionysius is not so much interested in word classes as such, but rather in words as they are combined in larger structures of language. By consequence, his concept of μόρια λόγου seems to be broader than that of the μέρη λόγου in the Technē Grammatikē, which focuses on separate words, without paying much attention to matters of composition or syntax. Dionysius’ concept of the parts of speech is more similar to that of the syntactician Apollonius Dyscolus, who is, like Dionysius, concerned with words in their contexts.117

3.5. Words, word classes, and parts of the phrase: Dionysius’ terminology

Dionysius does not only use the term μόρια λόγου, but he also makes use of other terms, which can, from various points of view, all refer to ‘words’.118 μόρια λέξεως, μέρη λέξεως, μέρη λόγου, πρῶτα μέρη, πρῶτα μόρια, στοιχεῖα λέξεως and στοιχειώδη μόρια.119 Dionysius also refers to ‘words’ as ὅνοματα and, less often, as

117 See Lallot (1997 II) 9 n. 9 on Apollonius Dyscolus’ concept of μέρος λόγου: ‘La synonymie qui vient d’être signalée met en évidence que le syntagme méros (toû) lógou ne doit pas être traduit mécaniquement, chez A[pollonius], par “partie du discours”, expression figée qui évoque pour nous la catégorie grammaticale dont relève un mot. Pour Α., méros (toû) lógou, en plus de ce sens, peut aussi bien avoir celui de segment d’une phrase particulière; c’est en raison de cette flexibilité du sens de l’expression grecque que j’ai pris le parti (…) de la traduire par “partie de (la) phrase”.

118 Cf. Schenkeveld (1983) 70 and Schenkeveld (1998 2) 50: ‘This fact [i.e. Dionysius’ use of a ‘mixture of expressions for “word classes”’] I can only explain by the assumption that an original distinction between μέρη λέξεως as “parts of the expression” and μέρη λόγου “parts of the proposition” was not taken over by the first Alexandrian scholars.’ In grammar, however, the term μέρη λόγου is only attested from Tyrannion onwards: concerning the first Alexandrian scholars we do not know whether they used this term; neither μέρη λόγου nor μέρη λέξεως is found in the fragments of Aristarchus: see Matthaios (1999) 198-200.
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λέξεις. How does he use all these different expressions? Although ὄνομα, λέξις, μέρος, μόριον and στοιχεῖον can all refer to a ‘word’, each of these terms seems to represent a different point of view.

(1) Although in Dionysius’ works, as in the grammatical tradition, the term ὄνομα can refer to the word class ‘noun’, it normally has the general meaning of ‘word’. In particular, it is used to distinguish ‘words’ from letters and syllables on the one hand, and clauses, periods and discourse on the other hand. Thus, ὄνομα is Dionysius’ most general term for ‘word’, and as such it plays the role that λέξις plays in the works of the Alexandrian grammarians. The use of ὄνομα as ‘word’ in general, which we do find in Plato and Aristotle, is rare in technical grammatical works: for Aristarchus, ὄνομα is the word class ‘noun’ (including κόριον ὄνομα, προσγορία and ἐπίθετον), and although there are a few instances where Apollonius Dyscolus uses ὄνομα in the sense of ‘word’, he, too, normally uses it in the specific sense of ‘noun’. ‘Demetrius’ and ‘Longinus’, however, frequently use the word ὄνομα as ‘word’, for instance when speaking of ὄνοματων ἔκλογη (selection of words) or ὄνοματων σύνθεσις (composition or ‘putting together’ of words). In this respect there seems to be a noteworthy difference between the rhetorical and grammatical traditions. The difference between the terminology of rhetoricians and grammarians can probably be explained by pointing to the genres in which they were writing. In rhetoric and literary criticism, the term λέξις was primarily reserved for ‘style’, ‘diction’, ‘expression’ or ‘passage’. For that reason, the rhetoricians seem to have selected the term ὄνομα as their standard term for ‘word’, in order to avoid the confusion that would arise from using λέξις for too many different items. In grammatical works, on the other hand, ὄνομα carried the technical meaning of ‘noun’, which explains why the grammarians, on their part, preferred λέξις as their normal term for ‘word’.

---

120 Schenkeveld (1983) has listed the various expressions, but he has refrained from analysing the ways in which they are used. He considers ὄνομα, λέξις and μόριον λόγον equivalents, without paying attention to their different connotations. See also Schenkeveld (1998) 50: ‘(...) in the treatises of Dionysius of Halicarnassus we come across a mixture of expressions for “word classes”, (...) without any difference between the terms.’

121 See Comp. 16.63.4-18, where the symmetry between the levels of γράμματα, συλλογία, ὄνοματα and λόγος is discussed.

122 On the use of λέξις in technical grammar, see Lallot (1992) 129.


124 For Aristarchus’ use of ὄνομα, see Matthaios (1999) 201-296. For Apollonius’ use of ὄνομα, see Lallot (1997) II 22 n. 64.

125 See e.g. ‘Demetrius’, Eloc. 49, 50, 92; ‘Longinus’, Subl. 8.1, 30.1, 30.2.

126 Apollonius Dyscolus, Synt. I.18 considers two explanations for the fact that ὄνομα means both ‘word’ and ‘noun’: either ὄνομα was originally only used for ‘noun’ and, because of the primacy of
(2) Besides ὄνομα, Dionysius also uses λέξις in the sense of word, but this use is less frequent. In the cases where Dionysius uses λέξις (and not ὄνομα) as ‘word’, he often points to a particular word in the text that he is analysing: in most cases, λέξις is a word qua concrete and specific form. In purely grammatical contexts, the term λέξις may be preferred to ὄνομα for practical reasons. Thus, Dionysius refers to μίαν λέξιν εἴτε ὄνοματικὴν εἴτε ῥήματικὴν (‘a single noun or verb’) when he opposes the use of one single word to the use of ‘more nouns or verbs’ (πλείοσιν ὄνωμασιν ἢ ῥήμασιν). In this case, use of the term ὄνομα for ‘word’ (e.g. ὄνομα ὄνοματικῶν) would of course be rather confusing, because in the same passage it already has the meaning of ‘noun’.

(3) When Dionysius refers to a ‘word’ with the term μόριον or μέρος (λέξεως or λόγου), he normally regards it as a word that is a part or constituent of a larger structure. This perspective is, of course, particularly relevant in De compositione verborum, where words are considered the units of which texts are composed.

(4) In Dionysius’ works, μέρη λέξεως, μέρη λόγου, μόρια λέξεως and μόρια λόγου can all refer to words. Μόρια, however, is much more frequent in this sense than μέρη: Dionysius refers to words only once as μέρη λόγου, and only twice as μέρη λέξεως, while μόρια λόγου and μόρια λέξεως (or simply μόρια) are the standard expressions: μόρια λόγου is found ten times, μόρια λέξεως twelve times.

this part of speech, it was later used in the sense of ‘word’ in general; or ὄνομα originally meant ‘word’ and was later introduced as the special term for the ‘first’ in the hierarchy of the parts of speech, i.e. ‘noun’. According to Apollonius, both explanations would confirm the primacy of the ‘noun’ over the other parts of speech.

For λέξις as ‘words’ in Dionysius, see e.g. Comp. 6.30,11; 9.34,13; 11.41,18; 11.41,19; 11.42,5; 20,91,10; 20,92,16; 20,93,7; 25.135,4.

E.g. λέξις (Comp. 6.30,11) in the context of the modification of specific words; τῆς αὐτῆς λέξεως (Comp. 9.34,13) refers to the repeated word καλεῖσθαι in Aesch. 3.202, τῶν τριῶν λέξεων (Comp. 11.42,5) refers to Euripides’ σίγα σίγα λεικόν. In Comp. 11.41,18-19 (τάς τε λέξεις τοις μέλεσιν ὑποτάσσειν ἀξίοι καὶ οὐ τὰ μέλη ταῖς λέξεσιν) Dionysius does not discuss specific words, but here, too, it is the form of words that is relevant.

A similar distinction between λέξεως and μέρος λόγου is found in Apollonius Dyscolus. Lallot (1997 II) 9 n. 9 states that in Apollonius Dyscolus, λέξεις, μέρος τοῦ λόγου and μόρια are ‘largement interchangeables’. There is, however, a difference in connotation, which Lallot himself confirms elsewhere: see Lallot (1992) 129, where he explains that λέξεις is Apollonius’ term for a word qua ‘forme individuelle et concrète’, whereas μέρος λόγου points to a word as belonging to a word class.

The distinction between ‘particles’ and ‘word classes’ is one of later times, as has been shown by Schenkeveld (1988).

Dionysius himself uses the term τῶν μέρη τοῦ λόγου for words only in Comp. 6.29,13 (τῶν ἄλλων τοῦ λόγου μέρων). In Comp. 4.22,12-13, the expression is part of the title of Chrysippus’ treatises Περὶ τῆς συντάξεως τῶν τοῦ λόγου μερῶν. The epitome of Comp. (17.171,12) substitutes πάν μέρος λόγου for
Dionysius’ preference for μόρια instead of μέρη can again be explained by the fact that he is a rhetorician. Philosophers used τά μέρη τοῦ λόγου when referring to the parts of speech, and in later times grammarians adopted the term for their word classes (as we have seen, Tyrannion may have been the first grammarian who used the term). For rhetoricians, however, τά μέρη τοῦ λόγου is the technical expression that refers to ‘the parts of a speech’, i.e. the parts of a text. Indeed, Dionysius uses the word μέρη normally when referring to larger structures. Τά μόρια τῶν λόγων, on the one hand, are primarily the parts of a text, such as introduction (προοίμιον) and narrative (διήγησις). The arrangement of these ‘parts of a text’ is called οἰκονομία, while the arrangement of the smaller ‘parts of the phrase’ is called σύνθεσις. Τά μέρη τῆς λέξεως, on the other hand, are the aspects of stylistic writing, namely selection of words (ἐκλογή) and composition (σύνθεσις).

The fact that Dionysius speaks of both ‘parts of the λόγος’ and ‘parts of the λέξεως’ when referring to words reminds us of Aristotle’s ‘parts of the assertion’ (μέρη λόγου) and ‘parts of the expression’ (μέρη λέξεως) (see section 3.2). We have already seen that Dionysius may have been familiar with the Peripatetic distinction between μέρη λόγου and μέρη λέξεως from his reading of Theophrastus’ On Style (see section 3.3.1). However, Dionysius uses the expressions ‘parts of the λόγος’ and ‘parts of the λέξεως’ without adopting the Aristotelian distinction between the two: in his case, the different terms do not imply two different concepts.

πάν ὀνομα καὶ ῥῆμα καὶ ἄλλο μόριον λέξεως (Comp. 17.68,13). Τά μέρη τῆς λέξεως refers to words only in Comp. 2.7.2 (with the adjective πρῶτα) and Comp. 12.43,18.

134 Τά μόρια τοῦ λόγου (οἱ μόρια λόγου): Dem. 26.185,1; Dem. 52.242,20; Comp. 2.6.18-19; Comp. 4.21,17; Comp. 5.23,14; Comp. 6.28,15-16; Comp. 6.30,5; Comp. 11.41,2; Comp. 12.46,21; Comp. 25.132,7. Τά μόρια τῆς λέξεως (οἱ μόρια λέξεως): Dem. 39.211,24-25 (τοῖς ἐλαχίστοις τε καὶ στοιχειώδεσι μορίοις τῆς λέξεως); Dem. 48.232,20-21 (τοὶς πρῶτοις μορίοις τῆς λέξεως); Dem. 48.233,10-11 (τῶν πρῶτων μορίων τῆς λέξεως); Dem. 51.240,6-7 (τά μόρια τῆς λέξεως); Comp. 2.7,1-2 (τά πρῶτα μόρια τῆς λέξεως); Comp. 7.30,14-15 (τα πρώτα μόρια καὶ στοιχεῖα τῆς λέξεως); Comp. 12.44,6 (τῶν τῆς λέξεως μορίων); Comp. 16.66,19 (τά μόρια τῆς λέξεως); Comp. 17.68,13 (μόριον λέξεως); Comp. 17.69,17 (δισυλλαβικοῖς μορίαν λέξεως); Comp. 20.90,20 (τά λοιπά τῆς λέξεως μόρια); Comp. 22.101,7-8 (λέξεως μορίων); Comp. 22.109,9-10 (τῶν μορίων τῆς λέξεως); Comp. 26.136,5 (τά τῆς λέξεως μόρια); Amm. II 5.426,15 (τὰ ἑρμηνευτικὰ μόρια τῆς λέξεως). In Pomp. 2.230,14-15, Dionysius does not refer to a word but to an aspect of Plato’s style, whether one retains the MSS’ τῆς δὲ λέξεως τι μόριον, which is printed by Aujac (1992) 85, or reads Usener’s τοῦ δὲ λεκτικοῦ μορίου.

135 See Ant. Rom. 1.40.6; 3.65.6; Lys. 16.27.10-11; Is. 14.111,11-12.


137 See Thuc. 22.358,8-27 (ὅτι μὲν ἄπασα λέξεως εἰς δύο μέρη διαιρεῖται τὰ πρῶτα ετc.); cf. Pohl (1968) 11-12.

138 Rosén (1990) 116-117 discusses the definition of σύνθεσις in Comp. 2.6.17-19 and concludes that Dionysius of Halicarnassus preserves the Aristotelian distinction between λόγος (‘Satz’) and λέξεως (‘Rede’ or ‘Ausdruck’). But he does not take into account the fact that Dionysius uses μόρια λέξεως and μόρια λόγου in quite the same way. Rosén thinks that a direct line runs from Aristotle’s Poetics to Dionysius Thrax and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, but he ignores the Stoic influence on the theory of the ‘parts of speech’. Besides, Aristotle’s μέρη λέξεως also include ‘elements’ and syllables, whereas Dionysius’ parts of the phrase are words only.
(5) Dionysius also refers to words as στοιχεῖα, ‘elements’. This term points to the role of words as building blocks in the process of composition. The same idea is expressed by the term στοιχειώδης μόρια. In Comp. 2, Dionysius states that the μόρια λόγου are also called στοιχεῖα τῆς λέξεως (‘elements of the phrase’). Now, we know that the Stoic philosophers considered the parts of speech στοιχεῖα (elements), but they did not refer to them as στοιχεῖα τῆς λέξεως, but as στοιχεῖα τοῦ λόγου. For them, the στοιχεῖα τοῦ λόγου were the parts of speech, while the στοιχεῖα τῆς λέξεως were the letters. The same distinction can be found in the works of the grammarian Apollonius Dyscolus. As far as we know, Dionysius of Halicarnassus is the only author who refers to the ‘parts of speech’ as στοιχεῖα λέξεως (instead of λόγου). In Dionysius, words are τὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς λέξεως, whereas the letters (and the corresponding sounds) are τὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς φωνῆς. If it is true that the parts of speech were called στοιχεῖα τῆς λέξεως by some people, as Dionysius claims, then we might suppose that these people (or perhaps Dionysius himself?) have combined an originally philosophical idea (the parts of speech as elements) with a rhetorical approach to language as expression (λέξις) (see also section 4.2.1).

However, we have seen that Dionysius does not use μόρια λόγου and μόρια λέξεως with different meanings. We should therefore not attach too much importance to his use of στοιχεῖα τῆς λέξεως instead of στοιχεῖα τοῦ λόγου.

(6) The parts of the phrase are also called τὰ πρῶτα μέρη (τῆς λέξεως) and τὰ πρῶτα μόρια τῆς λέξεως. The adjective πρῶτος emphasises the idea that words are the units from which the process of composition starts: the connotation of πρῶτα μέρη

---

139 Στοιχεῖα refers to words in Dem. 48.232,20-21; Comp. 2.6,19; Comp. 2.7,8; Comp. 7.30,14. It refers to letters in Dem. 52.242,16-17; Comp. 14.48,5; Comp. 14.48,6; Comp. 14.48,8; Comp. 14.50,4; Comp. 22.101,14; Comp. 22.101,16; Comp. 22.102,9. Other applications of the word στοιχεῖον in Dionysius’ rhetorical works: in Lysias (15.25,14; 15.26,16; 16.26,18), the στοιχεῖα are elements of the subject matter (not of language); τὰ πρῶτα στοιχεῖα in Dem. 37.209.18-19 are the physical elements of the world; στοιχεῖον in Dem. 53.244,6 refers to ‘delivery’ (ὑπόκρισις) as an essential ‘element’ of oratory.

140 For Dionysius’ explanation of the use of στοιχεῖα in the sense of ‘letters’ (Comp. 14.48,3-8), see section 2.2.

141 Dem. 39.211,24-25 (στοιχειώδη μόρια τῆς λέξεως) and Thuc. 22.358,13 (στοιχειώδη μόρια). In Comp. 14.49,11-12, however, τὰς πρῶτας τὰ καὶ στοιχειώδεις τῆς φωνῆς δυνάμεις are the letters (or sounds).

142 Comp. 2.6,17-19. Cf. Dem. 48.232,20-21: τοῖς πρῶτοις μορίοις τῆς λέξεως, ὃ δὴ στοιχεῖα ὑπὸ τινὸς κολλᾶται ...

143 For the Stoic use of the term στοιχεῖον λόγου for a part of speech, see FDS 536a and 539-541. Cf. Sluiter (1990) 43-44.

144 Dionysius, however, refers to letters (γράμματα) as στοιχεῖα, as στοιχεῖα φωνῆς or as ἀρχαὶ φωνῆς; see Comp. 14.48,3-8; Dem. 52.242,16-17 (τῶν στοιχείων τῆς φωνῆς); Ant. Rom. 1.20.3.


146 Τὰ πρῶτα μέρη: Comp. 2.7,7; Comp. 2.7,14-15; τὰ πρῶτα μέρη τῆς λέξεως: Comp. 2.7,1-2; τὰ πρῶτα μόρια τῆς λέξεως: Dem. 48.232,20; Dem. 48.233,10-11; Comp. 2.7,12-13; Comp. 7.30,14.
seems to be similar to that of στοιχεία (see also section 2.2).\textsuperscript{147} The expression τὰ πρῶτα μέρη (or μόρια) only occurs in passages where the word στοιχεία is also mentioned, in some cases clearly as an alternative: τὰ πρῶτα μόρια καὶ στοιχεία τῆς λέξεως (‘the first parts and elements of the phrase’); τοῖς πρῶτοις μορίοις τῆς λέξεως ἢ δὴ στοιχεία ὑπὸ τινὸς καλεῖται (‘the first parts of the phrase, which are called elements by some people’) (see section 4.2.1).\textsuperscript{148} Just as the term πρῶτος characterises the parts of speech as the ‘primary’ units of composition, it also refers to the letters as the ‘first and elementary powers of voice’.\textsuperscript{149}

(7) Schenkeveld also mentions τὰ τῆς φράσεως μόρια as one of Dionysius’ expressions for parts orationis.\textsuperscript{150} It is doubtful whether this is right. The term is found only once in Dionysius’ works, and there the context seems to make clear that it refers to ‘parts of the expression’ in a more general sense:\textsuperscript{151} in Thuc. 24, Dionysius first tells us that the typical style of Thucydides is characterised by (a) his choice of words (ἐκλογὴ τῶν ὄνομάτων), (b) his σύνθεσις τ’ ἐλαττόνοις καὶ τῶν μειζόνων μορίων (‘composition of both shorter and longer parts’), and (c) his figures (σχηματισμοί). Then he remarks that, during the entire war, ‘Thucydides never stopped revising his eight books (...) and polishing and rounding off every single one τῶν τῆς φράσεως μορίων.’\textsuperscript{152} This statement is illustrated by a range of examples, some of which belong to the level of words, while others are related to matters of composition and figures of speech. Therefore, I would prefer to interpret τὰ τῆς φράσεως μόρια in the same way as the ‘shorter and longer parts’ mentioned earlier: they include both word classes and longer units (e.g. clauses).\textsuperscript{153} I have found no other ancient text in which the expression τὰ τῆς φράσεως μόρια (or μέρη) occurs. However, Dionysius himself provides us with a useful parallel. When discussing Plato’s style in Pomp. 2, he tells us that Plato, ‘in aiming to achieve lofty, impressive and daring effects of expression (φράσεως), did not succeed in all aspects (μέρη).’\textsuperscript{154}

---

\textsuperscript{147} Cf. Comp. 7.30,13: Μία μὲν δὴ θεωρία τῆς συνθετικῆς ἐπιστήμης ἢ περὶ αὐτὰ τὰ πρῶτα μόρια καὶ στοιχεῖα τῆς λέξεως ἢ δὲ. ‘This, then, is one aspect of the science of composition, the one which is concerned with the primary parts and elements of speech.’ See section 4.2.1.

\textsuperscript{148} Comp. 7.30,14; Dem. 48.232.20-21.

\textsuperscript{149} Comp. 14.49,11-12: see section 2.2.

\textsuperscript{150} Schenkeveld (1983) 70.

\textsuperscript{151} Thuc. 24.361.18.

\textsuperscript{152} Thuc. 24.361.15-19: διετέλεσε γὰρ τοῦ ἐποτικειοσκετή χρόνον τοῦ πολέμου ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἦς τῆς τελευτῆς τὰς ὡς ὡς ββίλους, ἢς μόνες κατέληπον, στρέφον ἄνω καὶ κάτω καὶ καθ’ ἐν ἐκαστὸν τῶν τῆς φράσεως μορίων ῥίνων καὶ τορεύων.

\textsuperscript{153} Usher (1974) 527 translates ‘the individual phrases’, Aujac (1991) 75 ‘chacun des éléments de son énoncé’.

\textsuperscript{154} Pomp. 2.231.21-24: (...) τῆς ὑφηλῆς καὶ μεγαλοπρεποῦς καὶ παρακεκινδυνευμένης φράσεως ἐφιέμενον Πλάτωνα μὲ περὶ πάντα τὰ μέρη κατορθοῦν.
Here, τὰ μέρη are clearly general ‘aspects’ of expression, which seems to support our interpretation of τὰ τῆς φράσεως μόρια in Thuc. 24.155

3.6. The word classes according to Dionysius

I have argued that Dionysius’ μόρια λόγου are both word classes and parts of the phrase. In this section, I will concentrate on the former aspect. In his passage on the history of the theory of the parts of speech, Dionysius lists nine word classes: ὄνομα, ῥῆμα, σύνδεσμος, ἀρθρον, προσηγορικόν, ἀντονομασία, ἐπίρρημα, πρόθεσις, μετοχή.156 All these word classes are also used in other passages in Dionysius’ works.157 They appear in different forms: either as nouns (e.g. ὄνομα, προσηγορία, ῥῆμα) or as neuter adjectives (e.g. ὄνοματικόν, προσηγορικόν, ῥηματικόν). In the latter case, the adjectives either qualify a substantive like ὄνομα (e.g. τὸ μετοχικὸν ὄνομα) or μόριον (e.g. τὰ προθετικὰ μόρια), or they are used as substantives (e.g. τὸ προσηγορικόν, τὸ ῥηματικόν).158 I will briefly discuss each of the word classes that occur in Dionysius: ὄνομα and προσηγορικόν (and ἐπίθετον) (section 3.6.1), ῥῆμα and μετοχή (section 3.6.2), ἀρθρον and ἀντονομασία (section 3.6.3), πρόθεσις and σύνδεσμος (section 3.6.4) and ἐπίρρημα (section 3.6.5). This discussion has two purposes. On the one hand, it will enable us to compare Dionysius’ word class theory with the views of philologists and grammarians, so that we may establish Dionysius’ place in the history of the theory of the parts of speech. On the other hand, the overview will serve to answer an important question: does Dionysius use a system of nine word classes (section 3.6.6)? Schenkeveld has concluded that ‘we may safely ascribe to Dionysius the use of the system of nine word classes.’159 I will reconsider the evidence and argue that, although Dionysius makes use of a total of nine word classes, we cannot attribute to him the use of a ‘system’ of nine word classes.

3.6.1. ὄνομα and προσηγορικόν (and ἐπίθετον)

Dionysius uses the term ὄνομα in many different ways. We have already seen (section 3.5) that ὄνομα is the most general term for ‘word’. In grammatical contexts, Dionysius uses ὄνομα on two different levels. First, ὄνομα is ‘noun’ in general; that is, any proper noun or appellative noun, and (in modern terms) any substantive or adjective. Second, when it is directly opposed to appellative noun (προσηγορικόν or

---

155 The parallel is in itself not decisive, however, because the difference between μέρη (generally larger structures and only in a few cases designating ‘words’) and μόρια noted above might play a role here.
159 Schenkeveld (1983) 72.
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προσηγορία), ὄνομα means ‘proper noun’, i.e. a personal name.160 When classifying apppellative nouns, Dionysius does not consistently use the term προσηγορικὸν (or προσηγορία). This term is used when Dionysius points to the difference between a proper noun (ὄνομα) and an apppellative noun (προσηγορικὸν); but when this opposition is not relevant, apppellatives are often classified as ὄνόματα (see below).161

The form προσηγορικὸν occurs fifteen times, the form προσηγορία only twice (in Amm. II 11).162 The fact that προσηγορία appears only in the Second Letter to Annaeus supports the idea that Dionysius used a philological commentary in this work (see section 4.4.2). Dionysius’ preference for the term προσηγορικὸν might seem to suggest that he regards the apppellative noun as a subtype of the noun (i.e. as προσηγορικὸν ὄνομα) rather than as a separate word class (i.e. προσηγορία). Schenkeveld, however, observes that in the history of the word class system, Dionysius also uses the term προσηγορικά when a separate word class is meant.163 Therefore, the neuter form προσηγορικὸν does not indicate that the apppellative noun is a subtype of the ὄνομα (noun) rather than a separate word class. It is possible that the neuter form προσηγορικὸν stands for προσηγορικὸν ὄριον (‘appellative part’) rather than for προσηγορικὸν ὄνομα (‘appellative noun’).

Dionysius classifies the words χορόν, Ὄλυμποι, κλυτάν, πανδαιδαλον and Ἄθηναίος as προσηγορικά, and the word πόλεις as προσηγορία.164 In some cases, however, apppellatives are called ὄνοματικά or ὄνόματα (nouns). For instance, Dionysius (Amm. II 5-6) analyses how Thucydides ‘changes verbs into nouns and nouns into verbs’: where normal usage would have demanded a verb, Thucydides uses

160 See e.g. Thuc. 24.361,23-362,1: καὶ ἄρτων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀναστρέφων τὰς χρήσεις, ἢν τὸ μὲν ὄνοματικὸν προσηγορικὸν γένεται, τὸ δὲ προσηγορικὸν ὄνοματικός λέγεται. ‘He [i.e. Thucydides] inverts the normal use of the nouns, so that the proper noun becomes an apppellative noun, and so that he expresses the apppellative noun by a proper noun.’

161 In the history of the theory of the parts of speech (Comp. 2.7.5-6), Dionysius states that the προσηγορικά were separated from the ὄνοματικα. See section 4.2.1.

162 The term προσηγορικὸν occurs in the following passages: Thuc. 24.361,23-362,1 (twice); Amm. II 2.423,2-7 (= Thuc. 24.361,23-362,1; twice); Comp. 2.7.5-6; Comp. 2.7,11; Comp. 5.26,12-13; Comp. 5.26,13-14; Comp. 22.101,8-9; Comp. 22.101,11; Comp. 22.101,14-15; Comp. 22.102,17-18; Comp. 22.103,9; Comp. 22.105,6; Comp. 22.108.18. The term προσηγορία occurs at Amm. II 11.430,13 and Amm. II 11.430,20.

163 Schenkeveld (1983) 70. The argument does not work for Comp. 2.7.5-6 (τὰ προσηγορικὰ διελόντες ἀπὸ τῶν ὄνοματικῶν) because here Dionysius could mean that ‘they separated the προσηγορικὰ ὄνοματα [not yet a separate word class] from the other nouns’, thus forming a new word class προσηγορία. But Schenkeveld’s argument does work for Comp. 2.7,11 (καὶ τὰς μετοχὰς ἀπὸ τῶν προσηγορικῶν), where the ‘apppellatives’ (προσηγορικά) must be a separate word class.

164 See Comp. 22.101,8-11 (χορόν and Ὄλυμποι), Comp. 22.102,17-18 (κλυτάν), Comp. 22.105,6 (πανδαιδαλον), Comp. 22.108,18 (Ἄθηναίος) and Amm. II 11.430,20 (πόλεις). Schenkeveld (1983) 77 also mentions χάριν, but Dionysius does in fact not classify that word in his discussion of ἀπὸ τὰ κλυτάν πέμπει χάριν θεῷ in Comp. 22.102,5-104,13.
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a noun, and *vice versa* (see section 4.4.2). The reason for this categorisation is that Dionysius opposes these nouns to the verbs *parainein*, ἀξιοῦν, ἀποτείχισαι, ὀλοφυροῦσαι, ἀνάγκη and πόλεμος respectively. In this context, there is no need for Dionysius to classify the relevant nouns as ‘appellatives’, because the opposition here is between verbs and nouns, not between common and appellative nouns. It may be significant that Dionysius uses the term ὄνοματικά in this passage, and not ὄνόματα, for it is the distinction of ‘nominal’ and ‘verbal’ parts that is relevant here. Elsewhere, Dionysius classifies the words ἄνδρα, μήνιν and ἦλιος as ὄνόματα. This can be explained in the same way. Dionysius points out that in three Homeric verses that he quotes, the nouns are placed before the verbs (section 5.3.3): ἄνδρα precedes ἐννεπε (Odyssey 1.1), μήνιν precedes ἀκεδ (Iliad 1.1), and ἦλιος precedes ἀνόροουσε (Odyssey 3.1). In these examples, the opposition is again between nouns and verbs. The fact that these nouns are *appellative* nouns is not important here, so Dionysius calls them ὄνόματα, ‘nouns’. The other words to which Dionysius refers as ὄνόματα are τὸν Συρακόστον (‘the Syracusian’) and τῷ Ἀθηναίῳ (‘the Athenian’), but here one might also think that ὄνόματα has the general sense of ‘words’.

Apart from its use as ‘noun’ and ‘proper noun’, ὄνομα is also used in opposition to ἐπιθέτων. The latter use is only found once in Dionysius’ works, in the passage where he discusses the natural word order of ὄνοματικά and ἐπιθέτα (see section 5.3.6): ἦτοι τὰ μὲν ὄνοματικά προτάττειν τῶν ἐπιθέτων. ‘I thought I should place ὄνοματικά before ἐπιθέτα’. The word ἐπιθέτων is first mentioned in Aristotle’s

---

165 See Amm. II 2.423,4-5: καί νῦν μὲν τὸ ῥηματικόν ὄνοματικός ἐκφέρον, αἰθής δὲ τοῦνομα ῥῆμα ποιῶν. ‘And sometimes expressing the verbal part in a nominal form, and sometimes changing the noun into a verb.’ Amm. II 5.426,15-16: Ἐν οἷς δὲ τὰ ῥηματικά μόρια τῆς λέξεως ὄνοματικάς σχεματίζει, τοιούτην ποιεῖ τὴν φράσιν. ‘When he casts the verbal parts of speech in the form of nouns, he expresses himself in the following way.’ Amm. II 6.427,8-10: Ὄταν δὲ ἀντιστρέψας ἐκατέρω τοῦτον τὴν φύσιν τὰ ὄνόματα ποιήμα τῆς, τούτον τῶν τρόπων ἐκφέρει τὴν λέξιν. ‘But when he reverses the natural use of both of these parts and turns nouns into verbs, he produces the following kind of expression.’ See section 4.4.2.

166 Amm. II 5.426,15-427,16. For the context, see section 4.4.2.

167 Amm. II 5.426,20-427,1; Amm. II 5.427,4-6; Amm. II 6.427,14-16. See section 4.4.2.

168 Comp. 5.23,15-24,4.

169 Dionysius does not make explicit which are the ὄνόματα that are ‘placed after the verbs’ in the Homeric verses quoted in Comp. 5.24,9-14. However, the ὄνόματα seem to include Ἀρτυόνην, Μοῦσαν and Ἀχιλλεῖον, and in that case Schenkeveld (1983) 72 is wrong in saying that ‘nowhere does DH classify a proper name’.

170 Amm. II 9.429,2-4. Schenkeveld (1983) 77 also includes the words τάραχος, ταραχή, ὁχλησις and ὀχλος among the words that Dionysius classifies as ὄνόματα, but Dionysius merely mentions these words in his discussion of the interchange of masculine and feminine (Amm. II 10.429,17-430,11), without assigning them to word classes. On this passage, see section 4.4.2.

171 Comp. 5.26,11-12: see section 5.3.6.
Rhetoric, where it refers to any ornament that characterises something or somebody.\textsuperscript{172} The first definition of the ἐπίθετον is found in the Hellenistic papyrus P. Hamb. 128 (ca. 200 BC): τὸ μετὰ κυρίων ὄνομάτων λεγόμενον ‘that which is said together with substantives.’\textsuperscript{173} The papyrus mentions examples like σίδηρος αἰθῶν and χρυσός αἰγήλης, which seem to support Snell’s interpretation of κύριον ὄνομα in this text as ‘substantive’.\textsuperscript{174} Aristarchus does not regard ἐπίθετον as a separate word class, but as one of the functions of the noun (ὄνομα).\textsuperscript{175} He classifies adjectives as ὄνόματα (nouns): a word may perform the role of ἐπίθετον, but that does not mean that it belongs to a separate word class.\textsuperscript{176} In antiquity, the ἐπίθετον was never treated as a separate word class. Apollonius Dyscolus states that ‘the ἐπίθετα signify size, quantity, condition of the soul or something similar’.\textsuperscript{177} In the Technê Grammatikê, the ἐπίθετον is a subtype of the ὄνομα: ‘it is placed next to proper or appellative nouns alike, and conveys praise or blame.’\textsuperscript{178} Dionysius of Halicarnassus does not offer any examples of ἐπίθετα, so that it is difficult to determine the status of this item in his theory. Rhys Roberts thinks that Dionysius regards the adjective as a separate part of speech, but Schenkeveld has rejected that view.\textsuperscript{179} Schoemann argues that Dionysius uses ἐπίθετον in the same way as Aristotle and he states that Dionysius ‘nennt (...) ein und dasselbe Wort bald ἐπίθετον bald προσηγορικόν, je nachdem es entweder sich dem Eigennamen oder ein anderweitigen Benennung des Gegenstandes anschließt, oder allein als dessen Bezeichnung auftritt (...).’\textsuperscript{180} It is true that, in the rest of Dionysius’ work, the term ἐπίθετον is a rhetorical rather than a grammatical concept. It appears for example in phrases like τὴν ἐπίθετον καὶ κατεσκευασμένην φράσιν (‘the ornamental and elaborate expression’), or τοῦ ἐπίθετος κόσμους (‘the additional ornaments’).\textsuperscript{181} Likewise, ἐπίθετα are ‘additions’ or ‘appositions’ in general.\textsuperscript{182} The only grammatical context in which the term appears is the phrase ἦξιον τὰ μὲν ὄνοματικὰ προτάπτειν τῶν ἐπιθέτων. According to Schoemann, the

\textsuperscript{172} See e.g. Aristotle, Rh. 1405a10; 1405b20. Cf. Schoemann (1862) 86 and Matthaios (1999) 236-237.
\textsuperscript{175} See Aristarchus fr. 12b Matthaios, where Aristarchus points out that, in Iliad 2.111, μέτας is not used ‘as an epitheton’ (κατ’ ἐπίθετον) but in order to differentiate the great Ajax from the small Ajax. See Matthaios (1999) 233-244.
\textsuperscript{176} See Matthaios (1999) 241.
\textsuperscript{177} Apollonius Dyscolus, Pron., G.G. Π 1, 26,12: ἀλλὰ μὲν τάπιθετικά ἢ πηλικότητα ἢ ποσότητα ἢ διάθεται πνεύμα δήλαν ἢ τι τοιοῦτον.
\textsuperscript{178} [D. Thrax], G. G. Ι 1, 34,3: Ἐπίθετον δὲ ἐστὶ τὸ ἐπὶ κυρίων ἢ προσηγορικῶν ἢ ὄμονύμως τοιούτων καὶ δηλόν ἐποίησεν ἢ ψόγον. The translation is by Kemp.
\textsuperscript{179} Rhys Roberts (1910) 299; Schenkeveld (1983) 72.
\textsuperscript{180} Schoemann (1862) 86.
\textsuperscript{181} E.g. Dem. 4.135,16-17; Dem. 13.158,7; Dem. 18.166,3.
\textsuperscript{182} See e.g. Dem. 5.137,18.
nomata are not ‘substantives’ here but ‘nomina propria’. This is possible, but not necessary. The corresponding passage in Quintilian (see section 5.4.3) seems to translate nomata and epitheta literally: *nomina adpositis (...) essent priora*. In Aristarchus, epitheta are combined with both persons and things. Therefore, I conclude that the opposition nomata / epitheta is one of nouns (appellatives or proper nouns) and epithets (nomata used with the function of describing other nouns). Dionysius presumably thinks of words that we would call adjectives. But if we translate epitheta as ‘adjective’, we should be aware that the epitheta is not a separate word class for Dionysius, but a noun (nom) that is used to qualify another noun (nom).

In his use of the term kyrion nom, Dionysius adopts the rhetorical, not the grammatical meaning of the term (see also section 2.5.5). Just like Aristotle, Dionysius uses this term for a noun that is used in its proper sense, as opposed to a word that is used in a metaphorical sense. This use of kyrion nom is different from the one that we find in Alexandrian scholarship. Aristarchus employs the term kyrion nom for a word that expresses the actual designation of a person or thing: the kyrion nom is normally opposed to the epitheta, which describes or characterises the person or thing designated by the kyrion nom. Neither kyrion nom nor epitheta are separate word classes for Aristarchus, but ‘Anwendungsarten’ of the nom. In later times, kyrion nom (‘proper noun’), epitheta (‘adjective’) and prosopagogikon (‘appellative’) are treated as subtypes of the nom. Dionysius of Halicarnassus does not employ any of the grammatical concepts of kyrion nom. In his works, kyrion nomata are words that are used in their proper sense: we often find the collocation tа kyria te kai koina nomata, ‘standard and ordinary words’.

---

183 Schoemann (1862) 86 n. 2 adds his own examples: Φωκίων ὁ στρατηγός (‘Phokion, the commander’) and ὁ στρατηγός Φωκίων (‘the commander, Phokion’). In the former order, στρατηγός would be an epithet, in the latter order it would not be an epithet, according to Schoemann.
186 On the ancient use of the term kyrion nom, see Matthaios (1996).
188 Matthaios (1999) 224 points out that kyrion nom in Aristarchus means ‘dasjenige Nomen (nomos), das in Opposition zu anderen nomata die geltende bzw. die Haupt-Benennung eines Objektes zum Ausdruck bringt.’
189 Matthaios (1999) 214-244.
190 E.g. [D. Thrax], G.G. I 1, 33,6-35,2.
191 For Dionysius’ use of kyrion nom, see Lys 3.10,7-8; Lys. 3.12,10; Lys. 4.12,22; Isoc. 11.70,20; Dem. 13.156,1; Comp. 3.14,14-15; Comp. 21.95,14-15 (kyrios nomasin opposed to metaforikos nomasin); Pomp. 2.228,6-7.
3.6.2. ῥήμα and μετοχή

Just like ὄνομα, the term ῥήμα is used in different ways. First, it has the non-technical sense of ‘saying’ or ‘word’. In grammatical contexts, ῥήμα is used both in a general and a more specific sense. On the one hand, ῥήμα can refer to any verbal (rhematic) form, including both verbs and participles. On the other hand, when ῥήμα is opposed to μετοχή (participle), it refers to the ‘verb’ in the strict sense. In other words, just as ὄνομα can comprise all ‘nominal’ forms, ῥήμα can cover all ‘verbal’ forms. The term μετοχή occurs twice, the term μετοχικόν thrice in Dionysius’ works. The word μενόντων is the only word that Dionysius classifies as a participle (τὸ μετοχικὸν ὄνομα). The words ἐπιμιγγώντες, καταφηκτάς and σκηριπτόμενος, however, are called ῥήματα (not μετοχαί). In the case of ἐπιμιγγώντες and καταφηκτάς, their classification as ‘verbs’ can be explained by the fact that in the relevant context these words are considered ‘verbal’ forms, which adopt the verbal accidentia. Thus, in Amm. II 7-8, Dionysius discusses how Thucydides interchanges passive and active forms of verbs (see section 4.4.2): the historian uses ἐπιμιγγώντες instead of ἐπιμιγγώμενοι καὶ καταφηκτάς instead of καταφηκήμενος. The relevant contrast is here between active and passive, and not between verbs and participles: the accidentia active and passive are attributes of all verbal forms, including participles. Therefore, Dionysius has not used the term μετοχή in this context. Although the case of σκηριπτόμενος is less clear, we can assume that Dionysius classifies this word as a ῥήμα again because he considers the word as a

192 For the non-technical use of ῥήμα, see Ant. Rom. 1.28.2; 4.18.2; 10.7.3.
193 In the history of the theory of the parts of speech (Comp. 2.6,20-7,13; see section 4.2.1), Dionysius says that the μετοχαί were separated from the προσθεργορικά. Most modern scholars, however, think that participles were classified as ῥήματα before they were regarded as a separate word class. Dionysius’ reconstruction in Comp. 2.7,11 (τὰς μετοχαίς ἀπὸ τῶν προσθηργορικῶν) seems incompatible with his own classification of participles as ῥήματα.
194 The term μετοχή occurs in Amm. II 11.430,13 and Comp. 2.7,11. The term μετοχικόν occurs in Thuc. 24.362,7; Amm. II 2.423,14; Amm. II 12.432,10. Usener rightly deleted τὰ μετοχικά in Amm. II 11.431,1-2.
195 Amm. II 12.432,10. Since Dionysius uses the term μετοχή in the same letter (Amm. II 11.430,13), we should not believe that the expression τὸ μετοχικὸν ὄνομα implies that the participle is a subtype of the ὄνομα (a view that Matthaios [2002] 193 attributes to Tyrannion). The term ὄνομα in the expression τὸ μετοχικὸν ὄνομα means ‘word’ rather than ‘noun’. Likewise, in Comp. 6.30,2-3, Dionysius refers to κατεδόν as τοῦ ὄνομα, where ὄνομα again has the general sense of ‘word’.
196 For ἐπιμιγγώντες, see Amm. II 7.428,8. For καταφηκτάς, see Amm. II 8.428,17. For σκηριπτόμενος (not mentioned in Schenkeveld [1983] 77), see Comp. 20.90,9-21. In Amm. II 7-8, one might argue that not only ἐπιμιγγώντες and καταφηκτάς are classified as verbs, but (implicitly) also their ‘passive’ equivalents ἐπιμιγγώμενοι and καταφηκήμενοι.
197 See Amm. II 7.427,17-18: Ὅτεν δὲ τῶν ῥημάτων ἀλλατίττη τὰ εἴδη τῶν παθητικῶν καὶ ποιητικῶν, οὕτω σχηματίσει τὸν λόγον.
198 Amm. II 7.428,7-9: καὶ γὰρ (ὡ) τούτοις τὸ ἐπιμιγγώντες ἐνέργητικον ὑπάρχειν ῥήμα τοῦ ἐπιμιγγώμενοι παθητικοῦ ὄντος χώραν ἔπει. Amm. II 8.428,17-18: ἄντι γὰρ τοῦ ποιητικοῦ ῥήματος τοῦ καταφηκήμενος τὸ παθητικὸν περεύληθεν τὸ καταφηκήμενος.
‘verbal’ part of speech: in Comp. 20, Dionysius analyses the description of Sisyphus’ torments in Od. 11.593-598; he shows that the composition of these Homeric verses imitates first Sisyphus’ sufferings when rolling his stone to the top of a hill, and then the speed with which the stone tumbles downhill again.199 The first observation is that ‘in the two lines in which Sisyphus rolls up the rock, except for two verbs all the remaining words in the passage are either disyllables or monosyllables’.200 This part of the analysis clearly refers to Od. 11.595-596, and that means that both skhriptÒmenow and »yeske are classified as =Æmata.201 Here, Dionysius refers to the two longer words in the Homeric lines by calling them ‘verbs’, thus again opting for the more general classification. The other words that Dionysius classifies as =Æmata are unproblematic.202

3.6.3. ãerðrop and ἀντονομασία

The terminology for most parts of speech corresponds to that of technical grammatical texts, but Dionysius’ term for the pronoun deserves some attention. Instead of the usual éntvnum¤a, Dionysius normally uses the word ἀντονομασία (or ἀντονομαστικόν).203 According to Apollonius Dyscolus, the term ἀντονομασία (not ἀντονομασία) was used by Comanus, an older contemporary of Aristarchus.204

199 Comp. 20.89,20-93,19. Schenkeveld (1983) 77 has not included this passage in his list of Dionysius’ classifications of words. The analysis of the Sisyphus passage may be compared with ‘Demetrius’, Elac. 72.

200 Comp. 20.90,19-91.1: πρότον μὲν ἐν τοῖς δυσι στίχοις οἷς ἀνακυλίει τὴν πέτραν, ἔξω δεύειν ῥῆματων τὰ λοιπὰ τῆς λέξεως μόρια πάντ’ ἐστίν ἦτοι δισύλλαβα ἢ μονοσύλλαβα. Od. 11.595-596: ἦτοι ὁ μὲν σκηνητόμενος χεραίν τε ποσίν τε | λάαν ἄνω οἴδεκε ποτὶ λόφον (Comp. 20.90,11-12). The rest of Od. 11.596 (ἐλλέυθεροι ἦν) and Od. 11.597-598 are discussed in the second part of Dionysius’ analysis (Comp. 20.92,3-93,19).

202 The following words are also classified as ῥήματα or ῥηματικά: ἐννέε (Comp. 5.23,19), ἄειδε (Comp. 5.23,21), ἄνώφορα (Comp. 5.24,2), κλάθ (Comp. 5.24,9), μυσσα (Comp. 5.24,12), τύπε (Comp. 5.24,21), ἵππε (Comp. 5.25,1), ἐκλάθη (Comp. 5.25,2), πέτονται (Comp. 5.25,7), ἐκφανεί (Comp. 5.25,9), δεύτε (Comp. 22.101,8), παραφεύγει (Amm. II 5.426,20), ὀξύον (Amm. II 5.426,20), ἀποτειχίσσαι (Amm. II 5.427,4-5), ὀλοφύρωσα (Amm. II 5.427,5), ἐθέλουμεν (Amm. II 12.431,22-432,1), περιγινόται (Amm. II 12.432,2), γίνεται (Amm. II 12.432,6), ἔσται (Amm. II 12.432,7), ἐπικείμεναι καὶ παραφεύγει (Dem. 26.185,18-21); the latter two verbs are not listed in Schenkeveld (1983) 77. Schenkeveld does mention ἐκπείς (Comp. 5.25,2) as a word classified as ῥῆμα, but in the Homeric line that Dionysius cites it is ἐκλάθη that precedes the adverb: ἐκπείς is not relevant here. Further, ἐροσαν (Comp. 5.25,15) does not belong in Schenkeveld’s list of ‘cases of merismos’ either, for Dionysius does not classify this word.

203 ἀντονομασία is found in three passages of the Teubner text: Comp. 2.7,7 (ἀντονομασία, which V corrects into ἀντονομασία), Comp. 5.26,13 (ἀντονομασία, but P and the second hand of F have ἀντονομασία, while the first hand of F has ἀντονομασίας) and Thuc. 37.389,17 (ἀντονομασία, where SYL Borg proposed to read ἀντονομασία). Further, ἀντονομαστικόν is found in Amm. II 12.432,11 (where some MSS have ἀντονομασία).

204 Apollonius Dyscolus, Pron., G.G. II 1, 4,18-19: ἐκφεύγοντας φασὶ τὸ Αἰολικὸν τοὺς περὶ Κομανὸν ἀντονομασίας καλεῖν, ἐφε τὸ μὲν ὄνομα οὐ κοινὸν, τὸ δὲ ὄνομα. ‘They say that Comans and those who agree with him, in order to avoiding the Aeolic form, called the pronouns ἀντονομασίας, for the reason that ὄνομα is the common word, not ὄνομα.’ The expression τοὺς περὶ Κομανὸν (‘those around
Comanus preferred the term ἀντωνομασία, because he considered ἄντωνωμία an Aeolic form, to which he objected. The term ἀντωνομασία is not only found in Dionysius, but also in a papyrus fragment that dates from the middle of the first century AD. Wouters has argued that those scholars who favoured the use of pure Attic language selected this term. It is possible that Dionysius of Halicarnassus used the term ἀντωνομασία for the same reasons. We should observe that in one passage of Dionysius’ text (Comp. 5.26,13), the MSS have ἀντωνομασίας (Comanus’ term), which the editors correct into ἀντωνομασίας. The traditional term, ἄντωνωμία, occurs only once in Dionysius (Comp. 6.29,20). Usener suggests that we should read ἀντωνομασία here, and Schenkeveld agrees. However, the terminology of Comp. 6 (where we also find other unusual terms such as παρακολουθεῖν and τὰ μέρη τοῦ λόγου instead of τὰ μόρια) might indicate that this passage is based on a specific model (see section 4.3.1); this would also explain why ἄντωνωμία is used here instead of ἀντωνομασία.

Dionysius classifies three words as ‘pronoun’: he calls the word τούτον an ἄντωνωμία, and the word ἡμῶν an ἀντωνομαστικῶν. More interesting is the word αὐτό, which is classified as ‘either an ἀρθρον δεικτικόν or an ἀντωνομασία’. Dionysius refers to this word as follows: ἐνικόν καὶ κατὰ τὴν γενικήν ἑσχηματισμένον πτώσιν, εἰ τε ἀρθρον δεικτικόν βούλεται τις αὐτῷ καλεῖν εἰ τε ἀντωνομασίαν, τὸ ’αὐτό’, ‘(...) the genitive singular αὐτό, whether one wishes to call it a deictic article or a pronoun.’ For our purpose, it is important to observe that there are two possible explanations for the fact that Dionysius offers two classifications. The first possibility is that Dionysius uses a system of nine word classes, and that he refers to the fact that αὐτό could, within that system, for different reasons be called either a deictic article or a pronoun. The second possibility is that Dionysius refers to the fact that different systems of word classes were used: in a system with only five or six parts of speech, αὐτό would belong to the ἀρθρον (which covers both articles and pronouns), whereas in a system with eight or nine


Wouters (1979) 58-59. See also Matthaios (1999) 445-446, 503-504 and Matthaios (2001) 69-70. On Atticism in Dionysius, see section 1.2. In his glossary of rhetorical terms, Anderson (2000) 23 defines ἀντωνομασία as ‘an expressive periphrasis used instead of a proper name’, and also lists Dionysius, Comp. 2, Comp. 5 and Thuc. 37 under that heading. However, although it is true that the pronoun was understood as ‘replacing the noun’ (see also section 4.2.1), Dionysius does not use the term ἀντωνομασία for a rhetorical figure.

Schenkeveld (1983) 73.

For τούτον, see Comp. 6.29,20 (see also sections 5.3.6 and 7.3.2). For ἡμῶν (not in the list of Schenkeveld [1983] 77), see Amm. II 12.432,11.

Thuc. 37.389,16-17. For the context, see section 5.2.
parts of speech, it would be classified as an ἄντονομασία. As Schenkeveld has pointed out, this problem is connected to a difficult text from Apollonius Dyscolus’ De pronominibus. Together, these texts cast light on the terminology of ἄρθρα and ἄντονυμα in the grammatical writers who were influenced by Stoic ideas.211 I will first discuss Apollonius’ text and then return to Dionysius.

Apollonius Dyscolus tells us that the Stoics did not distinguish the pronouns as a separate word class, but classified them as ἄρθρα. For them, the ἄρθρα included both ἄρθρα ἀόριστα (the later articles) and ἄρθρα ὁρισμένα (the later pronouns).212 Apollonius adds the following information:213

Καὶ ᾿Απόλλωνος ὁ ᾿Αθηναῖος καὶ ὁ Θράξ Διονύσιος καὶ ἄρθρα δεικτικά τὰς ἄντονυμίας ἐκάλουν.

‘And Apollodorus from Athens and Dionysius Thrax called the pronouns also deictic articles.’

Scholars strongly disagree on the interpretation of this sentence.214 Three interpretations have been suggested. (1) Apollodorus and Dionysius Thrax used the expression ἄρθρα δεικτικά for all pronouns, while completely avoiding the term ἄντονυμίαι.215 This would mean that (the later) pronouns and articles were treated as one single word class in the word class system of Dionysius Thrax. According to this interpretation, Apollonius’ words καὶ ἄρθρα δεικτικά should be explained as ‘also deictic articles’, that is, apart from ἄρθρα ὁρισμένα. (2) Apollodorus and Dionysius Thrax used the term ἄντονυμίαι for pronouns, but they also (‘gelegentlich’) called the pronouns ἄρθρα δεικτικά: according to the latter interpretation all pronouns could be called either ἄντονυμίαι or ἄρθρα δεικτικά.216 According to this interpretation,

---

211 Schenkeveld (1983) 75.
212 Apollonius Dyscolus, Pron., G.G. II 1, 5,13-15: Ὁ ἀπὸ τῆς Στοιχείας ἄρθρα καλοῦσι καὶ τὰς ἄντονυμίας διαφέροντα δὲ τῶν παρ᾽ ἦμῖν ἄρθρων, ἂν τούτως μὲν ὁρισμένα, ἐκείνη δὲ ἀόριστόδη. ‘The representatives of the Stoic school call the pronouns as well articles, which differ from our articles in that the former [i.e. the later pronouns] are definite articles, and the latter [i.e. the later articles] indefinite articles.’
213 Apollonius Dyscolus, Pron., G.G. II 1, 5,18-19.
216 For this option, see Schoemann (1862) 120: ‘Ich halte es für viel wahrscheinlicher, dass er [i.e. Dionysius Thrax] sich in diesem Punkte an die Tradition der Schule gehalten, und etwa nur gelegentlich in Erörterungen über das Wesen und die Function der Pronomina und mit Beziehung auf
Apollonius’ words καὶ ἀρθρα δεικτικά should be explained as ‘also deictic articles’, that is, apart from ἀντονομαία. (3) Apollodorus and Dionysius Thrax used the term ἀντονομαία for pronouns, but they called only the deictic (not all) pronouns ἀρθρα δεικτικά.  

Di Benedetto has convincingly argued that the third of these interpretations, which is defended by Erbse, is incorrect, because in the context of Apollonius’ remark, he uses the term ἀντονομαία for all pronouns and not in the restricted sense of ‘deictic pronouns’. We may add that Dionysius of Halicarnassus’ classification of ἀυτοῦ as ἀρθρον δεικτικόν confirms that Erbse is wrong in assuming that only ‘demonstrative’ pronouns were classified as ἀρθρα δεικτικά. Matthaios correctly argues that the expression ἀρθρα δεικτικά does not designate demonstrative pronouns only: ἀρθρα δεικτικά is an equivalent of the Stoic expression ἀρθρα ὁρισμένα, which included the later personal, demonstrative and anaphoric pronouns. It seems clear, then, that Dionysius Thrax called all the pronouns ἀρθρα δεικτικά, just as the Stoics called them ἀρθρα ὁρισμένα. Two possibilities remain: did Dionysius Thrax and Apollodorus, when referring to pronouns, use only the expression ἀρθρα δεικτικά (1), or did they use both the term ἀντονομαία and (‘gelegentlich’) the expression ἀρθρα δεικτικά (2)?

Di Benedetto and Schenkeveld follow the first interpretation: they think that Dionysius Thrax did not treat the pronoun as a separate word class. Schenkeveld has argued that Apollonius’ use of the word καὶ in καὶ ἀρθρα δεικτικά indicates that Apollodorus and Dionysius Thrax called pronouns both ἀρθρα ὁρισμένα (as the Stoics) and ἀρθρα δεικτικά. All this would imply that Dionysius Thrax did not recognise the ἀντονομαία as a separate word class: and that is exactly what a scholiast seems to report when saying that Dionysius Thrax ‘combined the pronoun with the article’ (συνήπτε τῷ ἀρθρῳ τὸν ἀντονομαίαν). This statement may be based on Apollonius’ remark about Dionysius Thrax, in which case it does not have an

die bei den Stoikern übliche Benennung derselben gesagt habe, sie könnten auch ἀρθρα δεικτικά heissen.’ See also Matthaios (1999) 513.

217 See Erbse (1980) 255, who translates Apollonius’ sentence as follows: ‘Und wirklich nannten Apollodor und Dionysios die (scil. entsprechenden, d.h. deiktischen) Pronomina sogar “deiktische Glieder”’. Schoemann (1862) 120-121 already mentions this interpretation.


220 Schenkeveld (1983) 76: ‘(...) the most acceptable exegesis seems to me that Stoics called both demonstrative and anaphoric pronouns ἀρθρα ὁρισμένα a), and that Apollodorus and Dionysius Thrax followed Stoic views when they called these words ἀρθρα δεικτικά also b), i.e. apart from the Stoic nomenclature.’

独立的价值作为一个来源；但即使那是真的，它也是一个重要古代解释的来源。不过，如果那是真的，它是一个重要的古代解释。222 现在，Matthaios 已经表明，在 Dionysius Thrax 之前，Aristarchus 已经区分了 
\( \acute{a}n \nu o \nu \acute{m} \) 作为单独的词类。223 因此，如果我们跟随 Di Benedetto 和 Schenkeveld 关于 Dionysius Thrax 的解释，一个应该不认为 ‘after Dionysius Thrax and Apollodorus pronouns acquired names of their own’，就像 Schenkeveld 所认为的。224 我们应该相反假定，Aristarchus 使用了八个词类系统（包括 
\( \acute{a}n \nu o \nu \acute{m} \) 作为单独的词类），Stoic 影响在语法中变得如此强大以至于 Dionysius Thrax 采用了不同的词类划分（词类数量较少），在这个中，代词属于 
\( \acute{e}r \rho \alpha \delta \varepsilon i k t i k \)。Matthaios 拒绝这种解释：他不相信 Dionysius Thrax 没有使用术语 
\( \acute{a}n \nu o \nu \acute{m} \)，因为 Aristarchus 已经在之前使用了这个术语。225 但似乎我们不应该排除 Dionysius Thrax 在他之前采用这种解释的可能性。

Matthaios 他自己采用第二种解释：Dionysius Thrax 使用术语 
\( \acute{a}n \nu o \nu \acute{m} \) 作为代词的称为（就像 Aristarchus），但有时他添加说他们也可以叫 
\( \acute{\alpha}r \theta \rho \alpha \)。226 据此解释，Dionysius Thrax 不会使用一个词类系统，其中代词和文章被认为是一个词类，但他会同意 Aristarchus 在处理 
\( \acute{a}n \nu o \nu \acute{m} \) 作为单独的词类；他只会允许两个可能的替代术语为代词，即 
\( \acute{a}n \nu o \nu \acute{m} \) 和 
\( \acute{e}r \rho \alpha n \delta \varepsilon i k t i k \)。这个解释将 Apollonius’ 的话从语法问题（那就是，词类系统的问题）。

222 For the problematic nature of the text, see Matthaios (1999) 511. Di Benedetto (1990) 26-27 argues that the scholion correctly interprets Apollonius Dyscolus’ information about Dionysius Thrax.
225 Matthaios (1999) 511: ‘Ferner hat die Interpretation von Di Benedetto zur Folge, daß sich der terminus post quem für die Anerkennung des Pronomens als selbständiger Wortart und die Einführung des Terminus \( \acute{a}n \nu o \nu \acute{m} \) auf die Grammatikergeneration nach Dionysios Thrax und Apollodor verschiebt. Diese Schlußfolgerung ist aber unannehmbar. Denn wie unsere Ausführungen gezeigt haben, haben Aristarch und seine unmittelbaren Zeitgenossen das Pronomen bereits als eigenständige Wortart anerkannt und es \( \acute{a}n \nu o \nu \acute{m} \) — so Komanos — bzw. \( \acute{a}n \nu o \nu \acute{m} \) (...) genannt.’ But I do not see why it is impossible that Dionysius Thrax distanced himself from Aristarchus and started to call the pronouns \( \acute{\alpha}r \theta \rho \alpha \delta \varepsilon i k t i k \). A parallel case is the grammarian Tyrannion. Matthaios (2002) 194 believes that, unlike Aristarchus, Tyrannion did not regard the participle as a separate word class but as a subtype of the \( \acute{\nu} \nu o \). If Stoic influence caused Tyrannion to disagree so strongly with Aristarchus, could it not have had a similar effect on Dionysius Thrax?
Apollonius’ information about Dionysius Thrax remains difficult to interpret. One thing is clear: Dionysius Thrax was influenced by Stoic ideas on the parts of speech. The question is to what extent the Stoics exercised their influence. According to the first interpretation, Dionysius Thrax was so strongly influenced by Stoic ideas that he distanced himself from the word class system of his teacher Aristarchus, adopting a system of fewer word classes and classifying the pronouns as ἄρθρα. In this case, Apollonius would be saying: and Apollodorus of Athens and Dionysius Thrax called the pronouns ἄρθρα δεικτικά apart from ἄρθρα ὁρισμένα. According to the second interpretation, Dionysius Thrax did not change the Aristarchean system but merely allowed for an alternative name for pronouns, thus showing his respect for the Stoic terminology. In this case, Apollonius would be saying: and Apollodorus of Athens and Dionysius Thrax called the pronouns ἄρθρα δεικτικά apart from ἀντονυμίαι. I cannot solve the problem, but I would like to mention one more argument in favour of the first interpretation: Apollonius’ claim that Apollodorus and Dionysius Thrax called the pronouns ‘also ἄρθρα δεικτικά’ directly follows his observation that the Stoics did not call the pronouns ἀντονυμίαι but ἄρθρα ὁρισμένα (see above); within this context, it would be more natural to understand that, just like the Stoics, Dionysius Thrax called the pronouns ἄρθρα (namely ἄρθρα ὁρισμένα and also ἄρθρα δεικτικά), rather than that, unlike the Stoics, he called them ἄρθρα δεικτικά as well as ἀντονυμίαι.

We can now return to our own Dionysius and his classification of αὐτός as either a pronoun or a deictic article (Thuc. 37.389,16-17; see above). The explanation of Dionysius’ text depends on the interpretation of Apollonius’ information about Dionysius Thrax: the two interpretations of Apollonius’ remark that we have discussed above correspond to two different interpretations of Dionysius’ classification of αὐτός. According to Matthaios, Dionysius of Halicarnassus’ view that one could call the word αὐτός either a ‘deictic article’ or a ‘pronoun’ (εἴ τε ἄρθρον δεικτικόν βούλεται τις αὐτό καλεῖν εἴ τε ἀντονυμασίαν) agrees with the alleged use of these terms by Dionysius Thrax:227 both Dionysius Thrax and Dionysius of Halicarnassus would have used ἄρθρον δεικτικόν and ἀντονυμία (ἀντονυμασία) as alternative terms. Matthaios points out that the particles εἴ τε / εἴ τε are not disjunctive, but indicate that the two options distinguished are both possible. For this reason, he rejects the explanation of Schenkeveld, who argues that Dionysius of Halicarnassus double classification of the word αὐτός shows that he knows of two different word class systems, namely one with nine word classes (in

which the ἄντονομασία is a separate word class) and one with fewer parts (in which pronouns and articles constitute one single word class — the ἂρθρον). Matthaios concludes: ‘Es ist unwahrscheinlich, daß Dionysios von Halikarnaß den Terminus ἂρθρον δεικτικά als Hinweis auf eine Untergruppe des sowohl Artikel als auch Pronomen umfassenden Redeteils ἂρθρον hat gelten lassen. Denn die Kategorien Artikel und Pronomen stellten seiner Ansicht nach sonst zwei selbständige Wortarten dar.’ Here, I would like to raise two objections. First, it is true that Dionysius of Halicarnassus elsewhere classifies τοῦτον and ἡμῶν as ἄντονομασίαι (see above). However, we have also seen that Dionysius classifies appellatives sometimes as ὀνόματα and sometimes as προσηγορικά, and that he classifies participles sometimes as ῥήματα and sometimes as μετοχαῖ: he uses both general terms and more specific terms. I would suggest that this same principle might apply to his use of ἂρθρον and ἄντονομασία: according to this interpretation, the word ἄντοτοι could be classified either in a general way as ἂρθρον δεικτικόν or in a more specific way as ἄντονομασία. My second objection to Matthaios’ analysis is his interpretation of the particles εἰ/τε / εἰ/τε. I agree that these particles indicate that the two options are both acceptable for Dionysius. However, I do not agree that this would be inconsistent with Schenkeveld’s suggestion that the two alternative classifications refer to two different word class systems. In my view, it is possible that Dionysius refers to the existence of a system with fewer than nine word classes (without the category of the ἄντονομασία) on the one hand, in which ἄντοτοι would be classified as an ἂρθρον, and of a system of nine word classes on the other hand, in which it would be classified as an ἄντονομασία. Dionysius would in that case mean to say the following: ‘(...) whether one wishes to call ἄντοτοι a deictic article (as do the Stoics, and Dionysius Thrax, who treat pronouns and articles in one word class) or a pronoun (as do the grammarians who use a system of eight or nine word classes).’ In my view, the fact that Dionysius uses εἰ/τε / εἰ/τε merely shows that he gives equal value to both possibilities: Dionysius leaves the question open, because he is not interested in the use of grammatical ‘systems’ of word classes with an exact number of μόρια λόγου. I conclude that I prefer Schenkeveld’s interpretation of Dionysius’ classification of ἄντοτοι as referring to two different word class systems. But both Apollonius’ reference to Dionysius Thrax and Dionysius of Halicarnassus’ classification of ἄντοτοι remain difficult problems, which are closely related to our poor knowledge of the most obscure period in the history grammar.

229 See Smyth (1956) 647.
230 To make things even more difficult, Dionysius (Comp. 2.7.7-8; see section 4.2.1) tells us that the ἄντονομασία were separated from the ὀνόματα. This would mean that, if one takes different phases of the history of the word class system into account, one could classify the word ἄντοτοι as either an ὀνόμα or an ἄντονομασία, but not as an ἂρθρον. But the history of the theory of the parts of speech is
3.6.4. πρόθεσις and σύνδεσμος

We have seen that Dionysius uses several grammatical terms both in a more general and in a more specific sense: ὄνομα (‘noun’) covers both ὄνομα (‘proper noun’) and προσηγορικόν (‘appellative’), ῥήμα (‘verbal part’) covers both ῥήμα (‘verb’) and μετοχή (‘participle’); the classification of the word αὐτός as either an ἀρθρον δεικτικόν or an ἀντονομασία might also be interpreted as indicating that ἀρθρον as a general term covers both the pronouns and the articles. Dionysius’ treatment of πρόθεσις (‘preposition’) and σύνδεσμος (‘conjunction’) is similar in this respect. The classification of κατ- in κατιδόν as πρόθεσις is unproblematic, as is the classification of τε and ἄρα as σύνδεσμοι.231 However, the words ἐπί and ἐν are called σύνδεσμοι (not προθέσεις), although Dionysius allows for an alternative classification of ἐπί as πρόθεσις.232 In Comp. 22, Dionysius analyses a Pindaric ode, and classifies the words of the first two cola according to their word classes. In his discussion of the first colon (Debeτ’ ἐν χορόν Ὁλύμπιοι), he calls the word ἐν a σύνδεσμος.233 When discussing the second colon (ἐπί τε κλυτάν πέμπτε χάριν θεοί), he remarks the following:234

ἐν δὲ τῇ κατὰ μέρος συνθέσει τοῦ κόλου τοῖς μὲν ἐπί τε συνδέσμοις ἄρ’ ἔν ἄρχεται τὸ κόλον, εἰτε ἄρα πρόθεσιν αὐτὸν δεῖ τὸ ἡγούμενον καλεῖν, τὸ προσηγορικόν ἐπικείμενον μόριον τὸ κλυτὰν ἀντίτυπον πεποίηκε καὶ τραχεῖαν τὴν σύνθεσιν.

‘In the detailed arrangement of the clause, the placing of the appellative word κλυτάν after the connectives ἐπί τε (or perhaps the first of these should be called a preposition) has made the composition dissonant and harsh.’

As Schenkeveld remarks, according to a system with nine parts of speech, both ἐν and ἐπί should be classified as προθέσεις, not as σύνδεσμοι. Dionysius himself says that ἐπί might be called a πρόθεσις, but he does not say that with regard to ἐν. Possibly, the juxtaposition of ἐπί τε has reminded Dionysius that he could give a more precise classification, since some people would not regard these words as belonging to the same word classes. In any case, Dionysius’ mention of two possible classifications for ἐπί (σύνδεσμος or πρόθεσις) could be explained in two ways. The first possibility is

a rather isolated passage in Dionysius’ work; we have already pointed out that his classification of participles as ῥήματα does not agree with his view (in Comp. 2.7,11) that the participles were separated from the προσηγορικά.

231 See Comp. 6.30,2 (κατ-); Comp. 22.102,16 (τε); Comp. 25.129,5 (ἀρα).
232 Comp. 22.102,15-17.
233 Comp. 22.101,7-21.
234 Comp. 22.102,15-17.
that Dionysius’ remark points to the difficulty of the *merismos* procedure. In that case, Dionysius’ idea would be that one could argue for two different classifications of the word ἐπί, which, for different reasons, could be assigned to either the prepositions or the conjunctions. We should not exclude this possibility, but the problem is that we do not know of any grammatical debate on the classification of ἐπί within a word class system of eight or nine parts of speech. The second possibility has been suggested by Schenkeveld: he argues that the alternative classifications offered by Dionysius are related to the existence of different word class systems: the classification of ἐπί as a σύνδεσμος ‘is a sure sign of a system with less than nine (or eight) parts.’ In other words: in a system with five or six parts of speech, the σύνδεσμος would also have covered those words that in a system of eight or nine parts would have been identified as prepositions.

In order to support Schenkeveld’s interpretation, I would like to point to a passage from Apollonius Dyscolus’ *Περὶ συνδέσμων.* According to Apollonius, Posidonius (probably the Stoic philosopher who lived ca. 135-50 BC) had objected to those people who thought that σύνδεσμοι do not indicate (δηλοῦσι) anything but merely connect the phrase (τὴν φράσιν συνδέουσι). Posidonius thought that σύνδεσμοι did have a meaning of their own, and to prove this he pointed out that ἐπιδοῦναι (‘to give besides’) differed from ἀποδοῦναι (‘to give back’) and ἄπαιτεῖν (‘to demand back’) from προσατεῖτεν (‘to beg’). Thus, he showed that ἐπί, ἀπό and πρός did in fact ‘indicate’ something, and he did so ‘being confident that the preposition and the conjunction are one part of speech’ (πιστούμενος ὃτι ἐν μέρος λόγου ἢ τε πρόθεσις καὶ ὁ σύνδεσμος). Apollonius Dyscolus, however, did not agree that πρόθεσις and σύνδεσμος were one word class, and therefore he had to find another way of proving that σύνδεσμοι have meaning. Posidonius’ view seems to correspond to that of the Stoics, which Apollonius reports elsewhere: ‘the Stoics also called prepositions “prepositive conjunctions” (προθετικοὺς συνδέσμους), considering it better to name this class from its distinctive position than from its force, as was done for the conditional (συναπτικοῖ) and copulative (συμπλεκτικοῖ) conjunctions, and all the other types.’

---

237 The view that conjunctions do not have a meaning goes back to Aristotle’s definition in *Po.* 1456b38: see Sluiter (1997b) and my section 4.3.2. See also Kidd (1988) 199-204 (the commentary ad Posidonius fr. 45).
239 Apollonius Dyscolus, *Syn.* IV.5: ἐνθεν χρὶ καὶ οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Στοιχεῖα προθετικοὺς ἐκόλουθον συνδέσμους τὰς πρόθεσις, ἀλλὰ καὶ αἱ ἀκολουθεῖται ἀπὸ τῆς ἑξευρέσεως συνδέσμους τὴν οἰκείαν ἀκολουθεῖ ἢμερ ἀπὸ τῆς διανόησις, καθάπερ οἱ τε συναπτικοὶ καὶ συμπλεκτικοὶ καὶ οἱ ὑπόλοιποι.
Dionysius' use of the term ἐπίρρημα is of high importance. As I have pointed out above, Dionysius' works and the fragments of Tryphon are the earliest extant texts in which the word ἐπίρρημα occurs (see sections 3.2 and 3.3.2). It is interesting that the grammarian Philoxenus (who came from Alexandria to Rome in the first half of the first century BC) still uses the term μεσότης for the adverb: this is the term that the Stoics used, and we also find it in the fragments of Aristarchus. Given the fact that Tryphon was a contemporary and fellow citizen of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, we may regard Dionysius' use of the term ἐπίρρημα as an important sign that his works reflect the most recent developments in grammatical theory. He classifies seven words as adverbs.

240 In Comp. 2.7,10, Dionysius states that the prepositions were separated from the conjunctions (τὰς προθέσεις ἀπὸ τῶν συνδέσμων). This analysis seems to confirm the view that his classification of ἐν and ἐπί represents the use of an older system; these words would be συνδέσμοι before they were treated as a separate word class (προθέσεις). Dionysius' classification of participles as verbs and his classification of a pronoun as a 'deictic' article, however, cannot be related to his history of the word class theory: there, the participles are said to be separated from the appellatives (not from the verbs) and the pronouns from the nouns (not from the articles) (see above).

241 The term ἐπίρρημα occurs seven times in Dionysius' works: Dem. 26.185,18-19; Dem. 26.185,19; Comp. 2.7,9; Comp. 5.24,16; Comp. 5.24,19-20; Comp. 5.25,4; Comp. 5.25,11.


243 Philoxenus, fr. 578 Theodoridis: here, Philoxenus classifies the word ἐτῶς as a μεσότης. See Matthaios (1999) 559-560. On Philoxenus and his works, see section 1.4 and the literature mentioned there.

244 The term ἐπίρρημα also occurs in a fragment of Tyrannion in Herodian, but the latter grammarian may be using his own terminology while presenting the views of Tyrannion: see Matthaios (1999) 559-560.

245 The list of Schenkeveld (1983) 77 is not complete, for it does not include the words ἵκανός and ἑμενός (Dem. 26.185,18-19). The remaining 'adverbs' are ἐπιστροφήδην, ἐξοπλίζω, ἐπέρωσε, βοτρυοῦν and σήμερον (Comp. 5.24,15-25,11).
Schenkeveld has rightly drawn attention to the three types of adverbs that Dionysius mentions in *Comp.* 5.24,18-19: ἐπιρρήματα τρόπου (adverbs of manner), τόπου (place), and χρόνου (time) (see section 5.3.4). The ἐπιρρήματα τρόπου are usually called ἐπιρρήματα ποιότητος, but Schenkeveld’s suggestion that the ἐπιρρήματα τρόπου are ‘unique’ in ancient theory was not correct: Sluiter refers to some later texts, in which the term is used as well. 246 In the examples to which Dionysius refers, ἐξοπίσω and ἐτέρωσε are probably adverbs of place, σήμερον is an adverb of time, while ἐπιστροφόδην and βοτρυδόν must be adverbs of manner. 247 It is interesting to notice that the grammarian Apollonius Dyscolus mentions βοτρυδόν among his examples of the adverbs that end on –δον, which are always adverbs of manner (ποιότητος). 248

3.6.6. Does Dionysius use a system of nine word classes?

In his history of the theory of the parts of speech, Dionysius of Halicarnassus mentions systems of three (Aristotle and Theodectes), four (Stoics), five (later Stoics), six, and nine μόρια λόγου: although he adds that other people made more distinctions, the system with nine μόρια is the last one he explicitly mentions (see section 4.2.1). 249 Does this mean that Dionysius himself also used the system of nine word classes? In view of the fact that Dionysius mentions each of the nine word classes not only in the *Comp.* 2 but also in other chapters of *On Composition* and in the other three treatises where grammatical theories are used (*Dem.*, *Thuc.* and *Amm.* II), Schenkeveld states that ‘(...) we may safely ascribe to DH the use of the system of nine word classes.’ 250 The system of nine word classes seems to have been a common alternative to the system of eight μέρη λόγου. The nine-part system differs from the system that we find in the *Technē* in that the appellative noun (προσηγορία) is not treated as a subdivision of the ὄνομα, but listed as a separate part of speech. 251 As I have pointed out above (section 3.2), this separation of proper and appellative noun was taken over from the Stoics, for whom the distinction was based on the ontological difference between

250 Schenkeveld (1983) 72. See also Morgan (1998) 154. Schenkeveld (1983) 73 remarks that, although the distinction between ὄνομα and προσηγορία is originally Stoic, ‘it would be dangerous (...) to call the nine-parts system typically Stoic.’ In fact this would not only be dangerous, but even wrong: the system with nine parts of speech seems to have been quite common among grammarians; the Stoics however distinguished only five μέρη λόγου (in later times six, including the μεσότης); these parts of speech were essentially different from the grammatical ‘word classes’.
251 Cf. Quintilian *Inst. orat.* 1.4.20 (see section 4.2.3).
The adoption of this originally Stoic element in the grammatical word class theory resulted in a system with the following μέρη λόγου: ἐνόμα, προσηγορία, ῥῆμα, μετοχή, ἄρθρον, ἀντονομασία, πρόθεσις, ἐπίρημα and σύνδεσμος. We know two grammatical papyri that adopt this system. Schenkeveld argues that Dionysius of Halicarnassus uses this same system with nine word classes. There are, however, some passages in Dionysius’ works that do not seem to support the conclusion that Dionysius used the system of nine word classes: in these passages, Dionysius appears to classify certain words differently from what a system of nine parts of speech would have required. First, we have seen that ἐνόμα and ῥῆμα are in some cases used as general terms covering two word classes: ἐνόμα covers both ἐνόμα and προσηγορίκος, while ῥῆμα covers both ῥῆμα and μετοχή. Second, we have seen that Dionysius’ classification of ἐν and ἐπί as σύνδεσμοι points to the use of a system with fewer word classes. According to Dionysius, the prepositions are either covered by the term σύνδεσμος or they are separately classified as πρόθεσις. A similar explanation is possible in the case of his classification of ἀρθρον as a ‘deictic article’: pronouns are either covered by the general term ἄρθρον or they are separately classified as ἀντονομασία. In other words, although Dionysius knows the names of nine word classes, in many cases he gives classifications that do not fit into the most elaborate system that is available to him. How can we explain this?

According to Schenkeveld, Dionysius normally uses a system of nine parts of speech, but in some instances ‘uses a system of less than nine (or eight) parts and mixes it with the full-blown one’. I would like to suggest a slightly different interpretation. In my view, it would be more correct to avoid ascribing any ‘system’ of word classes to Dionysius in the first place. The fact that his classifications in some instances fit into a system of nine and in other instances into a system of five or six word classes (without ἀντονομασία and πρόθεσις) does not mean that he is actually using two different grammatical systems. Dionysius is not a grammarian, and he only uses grammatical theories inasmuch as they can help him to clarify his own rhetorical ideas. His rhetorical instructions do not demand that he adopt a specific grammatical ‘system’ of word classes. Therefore, instead of assuming that Dionysius uses a system of nine parts of speech, which he sometimes mixes up with a system of fewer μέρη λόγου, it would be better to accept that Dionysius is not so much interested in the

---

252 FDS 536 = Diogenes Laertius VII.58.
253 P. Yale I 25 (nr. 1 Wouters; first century AD) and P. Heid. I 198 (nr. 12 Wouters; third century AD).
254 See also Matthaios (2001) n. 115.
255 Schenkeveld (1983) 73.
exact number of word classes: he is not concerned with grammatical systems, but with the composition of texts. This is especially clear in his discussions of specific texts. A good example is his analysis of the arrangement of a Pindaric poem in *Comp.* 22 (see section 3.6.4 above). Dionysius analyses the austere beauty of the σύνθεσις of the verses, which are characterised by rough sounds and dissonant combinations. In his discussion, he points to ‘the connectives ἐπί and τε’, and immediately adds ‘or perhaps the first of these should be called a preposition’. Now, the classification of ἐπί, or of any other word, for that matter, does not have any effect on his analysis of the euphonic aspects of the composition of the Pindaric dithyramb; therefore, Dionysius leaves it to the reader to decide what he wants to call the specific parts of speech.

In fact, Dionysius himself makes it explicitly clear that the exact number of μόρια λόγου is not important for his purpose, and that he does not support any grammatical ‘system’ at all. At the end of his discussion of the different word class systems that have been adopted by earlier thinkers (consisting of three, four, five, six, nine, or more μόρια λόγου), Dionysius concludes the following:

> οπέρ ὅν οὐ μικρὸς ἄν εἴη λόγος, πλὴν ἢ γε τῶν πρῶτων εἴτε τρίων ἢ τεττάρων εἴθ’ ὅσων δὴ ποτε ὄντων μερῶν πλοκή καὶ παράθεσις τὰ λεγόμενα ποιεῖ κῶλα, (...)‘The subject could be discussed at considerable length, but it is enough to say that the combination or juxtaposition of these primary parts, whether there be three, four or any number of them, forms what are called clauses (...)’.

Unlike Quintilian, who gives a similar history of the word class theory (see section 4.2.3), Dionysius does not choose any of the systems that he mentions. He leaves the question open, ‘whether there be three, four or any number of them’. In *Dem.* 48, he adopts the same attitude: ‘The primary parts of speech, which some call the elements, whether they be three, as Theodectes and Aristotle believe — nouns, verbs and conjunctions — or four, as Zeno and the Stoic school say, or more, are always accompanied by two phenomena of equal importance, tone and time.’ Again, Dionysius does not select any of the systems known to him, but makes clear that the number of τὰ πρῶτα μόρια τῆς λέξεως is not relevant to his rhetorical

---

256 *Comp.* 22.102.15-17.
257 *Comp.* 2.7.14-16.
Our conclusion should be that Dionysius does not use a system of nine word classes, nor does he mix different systems of word classes. This teacher of rhetoric makes use of the grammatical word classes when he needs them, but he does not select any of the systems that we find in grammatical treatises. We can also put this in a more general way: as we have seen in section 1.6, Dionysius incorporates many ideas from different disciplines, but he does not want to deal with the too technical details of metrical, grammatical or philosophical problems. Several times, Dionysius emphasises that, although he makes use of theories from grammar, music, metrics, and philosophy, the technical details of these studies are not relevant for his investigations. These disciplines are only important for him as far as they support his rhetorical instructions. For modern scholars, this implies that they should not interpret Dionysius as if he were a grammarian, or, for that matter, a philosopher.

3.7. The accidentia of the parts of speech: συμβεβηκότα versus παρεπόμενα

An important part of the ancient grammatical doctrine of the parts of speech was the theory of the accidentia: the categories that are applicable to each word class. In Greek technical grammar, these accidentia are called παρεπόμενα. They traditionally include both inflectional and derivational categories. The Technê Grammatikê lists five παρεπόμενα for the noun (γένη, εἶδη, σχήματα, ἀρτθμοὶ and πτῶσεις) eight for the verb (ἐγκλίσεις, διαθέσεις, εἰδη, σχήματα, ἀρτθμοὶ, πρόσωπα, χρόνοι and συζυγίαι) and also mentions the accidentia of the participle, article and pronoun. Dionysius of Halicarnassus refers to the accidentia at several passages in his rhetorical works. In this section, I will discuss Dionysius’ technical terminology for the accidentia and some related terms. In the next section (3.8), I will deal with the specific categories that he distinguishes.

---

259 A similar lack of interest in the exact terminology of the word classes seems to be expressed in Comp. 17.68.13-14: πάν ὄνομα καὶ ῥήμα καὶ ἄλλο μόριον λέξεως, ὃ τι μὴ μονοσύλλαβον ἔστιν, ἐν ῥυθμῷ τινι λέρεται. ‘Every noun and verb, and every other part of speech, if it does not consist of a single syllable only, is spoken in some sort of rhythm.’

260 See Comp. 14.50.1-11; Comp. 15.59.2-14; Comp. 18.73.10-13.

261 Dionysius’ views on the referents of the mÒria lÒgou (such as oÈs¤a, sumbebhkÒw, tÚ poioËn μ pãsxon; see Comp. 5.23.13-27.6) will be analysed in the discussion of Dionysius’ views on natural word order (section 5.3.3), since we can only interpret these views by paying close attention to their context. The same is true for Dionysius’ remarks on σώμα, πράγμα and πρόσωπον (which are designated by words), and his use of the terms σημαίνων (that which signifies) and σημαίνόμενον (that which is signified): these subjects will be discussed in section 4.4.2. For σώμα, πράγμα and πρόσωπον, see Comp. 12.46.19-47.2; Dem. 40.215.14-15; Amm. II 14.433.6-434.12. For σημαίνων and σημαίνομενον, see esp. Amm. II 13.432.14-433.5 (cf. sections 2.3 and 4.4.2).


263 [D. Thrax], G.G. I 1, 24,6-7 and 46,5-47,2: the accidentia of the noun are gender, type, form, number and case. The accidentia of the verb are mood, voice, type, form, number, person, tense and conjugation.
Apart from occasional references to particular *accidentia*, there are four passages ([Amm. II 6-12, Comp. 6, Comp. 25, Dem. 52]) where Dionysius mentions a number of *accidentia*.\(^{264}\) In the analysis of Thucydides' style in the *Second Letter to Ammaeus* ([Amm. II 6-12; see section 4.4.2]), Dionysius points out that the historian uses for example active instead of passive verb forms, singular instead of plural nouns, masculine instead of feminine nouns, a present instead of a future tense, etc. In his discussion of the three *ἐργα* of composition ([Comp. 6; see section 4.3.1]), Dionysius says that the second activity is the selection of the correct grammatical form of nouns, verbs and other parts of speech: one should select the number, case and gender of nouns, and the voice, mood and tense of verbs, in order to attain the most effective composition. Finally, there are two passages ([Comp. 25; Dem. 52]) where Dionysius describes how children learn to read (see section 3.3.3). These two texts will be the starting point for our discussion of the *accidentia* (the other texts where the *accidentia* are treated are discussed in sections 4.3.1 and 4.4.2). In *Dem. 52*, Dionysius gives the following information:\(^{265}\)

> ταύτην γὰρ ὅταν ἐκμάθημεν, πρῶτον μὲν τὰ ὅνόματα τῶν στοιχείων τῆς φωνῆς ἀναλαμβάνομεν, ὃ καλεῖται γράμματα, ἔπειτα τοὺς τύπους τέων αὐτῶν καὶ δυνάμεις, ὅταν δὲ ταύτα μάθημεν, τότε τὰς συλλαβὰς αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ περὶ ταύτας πάθη, κρατήσαντες δὲ τούτων τὰ τοῦ λόγου μόρια, ὅνόματα λέγω καὶ ῥήματα καὶ συνδέσμους, καὶ τὰ συμβεβηκότα τούτως, συστολάς, ἐκτάσεις, ὀξύτητας, βαρύτητας, γένη, πτώσεις, ἀριθμοὺς, ἐγκλίσεις, τὰ ἄλλα παραπλήσια τούτως μιρία ὄντα.

When we learn this [i.e. grammar (γραμματικῇ)] properly, we begin by learning by heart the names of the elements of sound, which we call letters. Then we learn their shapes and values. When we have discovered this, then we learn how they combine to form syllables, and their properties. Having mastered this, we learn about the parts of speech, I mean nouns, verbs and conjunctions, and their *accidentia*: shortenings, lengthenings, high pitches, low pitches, genders, cases, numbers, moods, and countless other related things.'

The corresponding passage ([Comp. 25]) is worded more briefly:\(^{266}\)

> τὰ γράμματα ὅταν παιδευόμεθα, πρῶτον μὲν τὰ ὅνόματα αὐτῶν ἐκμαθήμας, ἔπειτα τοὺς τύπους καὶ τὰς δυνάμεις, εἰδ’ οὖν τὰς συλλαβὰς καὶ τὰ ἐν ταύταις

---

\(^{264}\) *Amm. II* 6.427.7–12.432.13; *Comp. 6* 28.20–29.14; *Comp. 25* 134.23–135.6; *Dem. 52* 242.15–24.

\(^{265}\) *Dem. 52* 242.15–24.

\(^{266}\) *Comp. 25* 134.23–135.6.
‘When we are taught to read (“letters”), first we learn by heart the names of the letters, then their shapes and their values, then, in the same way, the syllables and their properties, and finally the words and the \textit{accidentia} that apply to them, by which I mean lengthenings and shortenings and variations in pitch and similar functions.’

Despite some differences, the passages in Dem. 52 and Comp. 25 are quite similar, and they serve the same purpose in their context.\textsuperscript{267} In both passages Dionysius draws a comparison between rhetoric and grammar, in order to prove that slow and gradual learning finally leads to success: having completed a process of long and laborious learning one will in the end succeed in mastering a technique, which one can then apply with great ease. Part of the process is that one learns the parts of speech and their \textit{accidentia}. For these categories of the parts of speech Dionysius does not use the term \textit{parepómena}.\textsuperscript{268} Dionysius’ term for \textit{accidentia} is \textit{sumbebhkótta}, which he uses in both Dem. 52 and Comp. 25 (it does not occur in Comp. 6 and Amm. II). There is one other passage where \textit{tá sumbebhkótta} refer to the \textit{accidentia}: earlier in Comp. 25, Dionysius quotes fictitious opponents who do not believe that Demosthenes composed poetic prose (see section 6.3) by ‘keeping a careful watch on the length and quantities of his syllables, and taking great trouble over the cases of nouns, the moods of verbs and all the \textit{accidentia} of the parts of speech’ (\textit{parafulãttvn tå mÆkh kai tås πτώσεις tòn ὄνομάτων kai tås ἐγκλίσεις tòν ῥημάτων kai pάnta tå sumbebhkótta tòiς μορίοις tòu λόγου}).\textsuperscript{269} The term \textit{sumbebhkótta} does not only refer to the \textit{accidentia} that apply to the various parts of speech: Dionysius also employs the words \textit{sumbebhkótta} and \textit{sumb°bhke(ν)} when discussing properties or characteristics of style, letters, and the human body.\textsuperscript{270}

Dionysius does not use the verb \textit{parrépsebhai} in discussions of the \textit{accidentia}, but we do find the related words \textit{ἀκολουθεῖν} and \textit{παρακολουθεῖν} in his works. In Dem. 48,
which seems to be influenced by musical theory, Dionysius states that ‘two phenomena of equal importance, namely tone (μέλος) and time (χρόνος), always accompany (ἀκολουθεῖ) the primary parts of speech, whether there be three, four or more of them.’ In Comp. 6, Dionysius uses the word παρακολουθεῖν when referring to the accidentia that ‘apply’ to the verb. Like παρέπτεθοι, the term (παρ)ακολουθεῖν seems to have its origin in Aristotelian philosophy. Both terms indicate that certain attributes ‘closely follow’ something to which they belong. Apollonius Dyscolus also uses παρακολουθεῖν for the accidentia of the parts of speech.

Apart from συμβεβηκότα and (παρ)ακολουθεῖν, one more technical term should be mentioned. In Comp. 6, Dionysius tells us that the second activity of composition is to decide how every part of speech should be ‘formed’ (σχηματισθέν). The verb σχηματίζω is a technical grammatical term, which refers to the morphological formation of words. Dionysius uses the term in that specific sense, but also in a wider (syntactical and rhetorical) sense with regard to word order, figures of speech and figures of thought. Both σχῆμα and σχηματισμός can refer to the form of a word and to a construction. In the specific sense of word formation, σχηματίζειν

271 Dem. 48.232,20-233,2: τοῖς πρώτοις μορίοις τῆς λέξεως, ἢ δὴ στοιχεία ὑπὸ τινὸς καλεῖται, εἶτε τρία ταῦτα ἐστὶν, ὡς Θεοδέκτη τε καὶ Ἀριστοτέλει δοκεῖ, ὅνοματα καὶ ῥήματα καὶ σύνδεσμοι, εἶτε τέσσαρα, ὡς τοῖς πέρι Ζήνον τοῦ Σταυκοῦ, εἶτε πλείο, δύο τούτα ἀκολουθεῖ μέλος καὶ χρόνος ἦσα. ‘The primary parts of speech, which some call elements, whether they be three, as Theodectes and Aristotle believe — “nouns”, “verbs” and “conjunctions” — or four, as Zeno and the Stoic school say, or more, are always accompanied by two phenomena of equal importance, tone and time.’ This is a shorter version of Dionysius’ history of the theory of the parts of speech in Comp. 2.6,17-7,21: see section 4.2.1. Dionysius mentions Aristoxenus at Dem. 48.233,8-9 (cf. section 1.5).

272 Comp. 6.29,11-12: εἶναι τοῖς ῥήμασιν ἄλλα παρακολουθεῖν πέρυσε. See section 4.3.1. Dionysius uses παρακολουθεῖν in various other contexts. It can e.g. refer to the qualities ‘belonging’ to the three styles (Dem. 34.205,3) and to propriety (τὸ πρόκειν) ‘accompanying’ the three other means of composition (Dem. 47.232,17).


274 See Apollonius Dyscolus, Pron., G.G. II 1, 43. Aristarchus uses the term παρακολουθεῖν in a grammatical context (that is, if Apollonius preserves Aristarchus’ phrasing) when he denies the existence of plural forms of the ‘composite’ third person reflexive pronouns (i.e. ἑαυτῶν, ἑαυτοῖς) for the reason that the pronouns of the first and second person do not have such forms either: Apollonius, Pron., G.G. II 1, 71,20 (= Aristarchus fr. 125a, 8-9 Matthaios): τῶν πτώσων καὶ δευτέρων οὔ ὄντων ἐν συνθέσει πληθυντικῇ, ἧν ἀνάγκης καὶ τοῖς τρίτοις παρακολουθήσαι ταύτων. ‘Since the first and second persons do not exist in the plural composite, the same thing necessarily applies also to the third persons.’ Cf. Ax (1982) 104-105 and Matthaios (1999) 206-207.

275 For σχηματίζειν as the morphological forming of words, see also Thuc. 37.389,15-16 (κατὰ τὴν γενικὴν ἐσχηματισμένον πτῶσιν), Thuc. 37.389,19-21 (τῷ πληθυντικῷ καὶ οὐδετέρῳ καὶ κατὰ τὴν αἰτιατικὴν ἐσχηματισμένη πτῶσιν) and Amm. II 5.426,15-16 (τῷ ῥηματικῶς μορίῳ τῆς λέξεως ἑσματικῶς σχηματίζει). See e.g. Thuc. 23.359,27 (σχηματίζειν ἐκ τῆς λέξεως καὶ τῆς νοησεως), Amm. II 7.427,18 (σχηματίζει τὸν λόγον), Amm. II 8.428,11 (σχηματίζει τὸν τρόπον), Amm. II 11.430,19-20 (σχηματιζόντες τὴν φράσιν).

276 Cf. Blass DAB I (1979 [1868]) 211-212.
Dionysius’ use of the term συμβεβηκότα provides important evidence for the history of the theory of the *accidentia*. In 1922, Karl Barwick argued that συμβεβηκότα was the term that the Stoics used for the *accidentia* that applied to their μέρη λόγου, and his most important piece of evidence was Dionysius’ use of this term in *Dem. 52* and *Comp. 25* (which we have quoted above). Barwick thought that Dionysius follows a Stoic source in these two passages, because in the same texts he also distinguishes between the ὄνομα, τόπος and δόνομις of letters, a distinction that belongs, according to Barwick, to Stoic theory. Although I agree that the Stoics may have used the term συμβεβηκότα for the *accidentia* of their parts of speech, I do not agree with Barwick’s argument that Dionysius’ reference to the distinction between name, type and value of letters in *Dem. 52* and *Comp. 25* indicates that he used a Stoic source for these chapters; nor do I think that συμβεβηκότα was used for the *accidentia* by Stoics only. I have three objections to this analysis. First, we have already seen that Dionysius also uses συμβεβηκότα in another passage (*Comp. 25.131,18-132,8*), where we do not find the same remarks on the name, type and value of letters, or any other Stoic theory. Second, Stoic terminology in the two passages does not necessarily point to the use of a Stoic source, for we know that many grammarians of the second and first century BC were influenced by Stoic ideas. Therefore, passages in which Stoic distinctions are mentioned should not automatically be traced back to Stoic sources. This brings us to the third and most important objection against Barwick’s analysis. As I have argued in section 3.3.3, the relevant passages from *Dem. 52* and *Comp. 25* describe the contemporary practice of grammatical education. If we take into account the purpose of Dionysius’ argument in these passages, we will easily see that it is not very probable that in this context Dionysius refers to specific Stoic theories. Dionysius intends to point out that his readers know very well that slow and gradual learning in grammatical education finally leads to good results. Likewise, Dionysius argues, rhetorical training demands much exercise and patience, but in the end orators are able to compose texts with great ease. Now, this comparison between grammar and rhetoric would not be very convincing when it did not refer to the

---

278 For Aristarchus’ use of the term, see Matthaios (1999) 204-205 and 257-258; for Tryphon, see fr. 56 Von Velsen; for the papyri, see P. Yale I 25 (nr. 1 Wouters), P. Heid. I 197 (nr. 6 Wouters) and P. Lit. Lond. 182 (nr. 2 Wouters); for Apollonius’ use of the term, see Schneider, *G.G.* II 3, 268 (*index vocabulum*).

279 Barwick (1922) 107-108. See also Barwick (1957) 47-48.

contemporary practice in grammar schools, for it depends on the audience’s knowledge of grammatical teaching. In Dionysius’ words, it is ‘something that we all know’ (ὅ γάρ ἄπαντες ἔσμεν). For these reasons, I do not agree with Barwick that Dionysius directly follows Stoic sources in Dem. 52 and Comp. 25.

How can we then reconstruct the early history of the theory of the事故? Pinborg has rightly argued that the general concept of accident is of Aristotelian origin. Scholars disagree, however, on various problems concerning the ancient theory of grammatical accidentia. The most important questions are the following. (1) Did the Stoics know a theory of accidentia? And if so, did they use the term συμβεβηκότα or παρεπόμενα? (2) Which term did the early philologists and technical grammarians use? I will briefly consider these questions, paying special attention to the information that Dionysius of Halicarnassus offers.

(1) Pinborg argues that the Aristotelian concept of accident is inconsistent with Stoic epistemology. Frede, on the other hand, thinks that the accidents of the parts of speech were treated in Stoic grammar, and that the use of the concept of ‘accident’ in grammar may have been of Stoic origin. In my view, our knowledge of Stoic grammar does not support Pinborg’s view that the Stoics did not know ‘the purely Aristotelian concept of accident’. The word συμβεβηκότα occurs three times in the Stoic fragments: the concept of ‘accidents’ (συμβεβηκότα) is used to describe predicates (FDS 695), corporal accidents such as form and sweetness (FDS 746, compare Dem. 50.237,3); the consequence of a cause is also an ‘accident’ (FDS 762). I would like to add that in Comp. 5, Dionysius distinguishes between ‘substance’ and ‘accident’ in a passage that is almost certainly based on Stoic theories (see section 5.3.3). There, τὰ συμβεβηκότα do not refer to the accidentia of the parts of speech, but to the predicates that are expressed by verbs: Dionysius tells us that nouns (ὄνόματα) indicate the substance (οὐσία), while verbs (ῥήματα) indicate the accident (τὸ συμβεβηκός). If the passage on natural word order is indeed

---

281 Comp. 25.134.21-22.
282 Pinborg (1975) 102. For the Aristotelian concept of accident and its connection to the grammatical accidentia, see Ildefonse (1997) 81-86.
283 Pinborg (1975) 102.
284 Frede (1987a) 332.
285 Pinborg (1975) 111 thinks that the grammatical accidentia are the result of direct Peripatetic influence on grammar. See also Matthaios (1999) 207.
286 FDS 695 (κατηγορήματα καὶ συμβεβηκότα) = SVF II.182. FDS 746 (bodily accidentia such as form [σχῆμα] and sweetness [γλυκότης]) = SVF II.381. FDS 762 (άττιον and συμβεβηκός) = SVF I.89.
287 Comp. 5.23,17-18.
288 Ildefonse (1997) 290 relates Dionysius’ remark on the priority of οὐσία over συμβεβηκός to the Aristotelian concept of accident. For the pair οὐσία and συμβεβηκός this is in itself possible, but the rest of Comp. 5 shows that Dionysius’ experiment is based on Stoic ideas. My view is that Comp. 5 can
inspired by Stoic views (as I will argue in section 5.3), this could be an important sign that the Stoics knew the concept of accidence.

Schenkeveld has suggested that the Stoics may have used the term παρεπόμενα for the accidentia of the parts of speech.289 However, there is no evidence for the use of παρεπόμενα by the Stoics: this term is mentioned nowhere in the Stoic fragments. Elsewhere, Schenkeveld draws attention to the fact that Dionysius does not use the term σωμβεβηκτά in Comp. 5-6: ‘Now the background of Comp. 5-6 seems quite Stoic, so take τὰ σωμβεβηκτά, which does not occur here, as a distinctly Stoic term is uncalled for.’290 I agree that at least Comp. 5 has a Stoic background (see section 5.3), but I object to the argumentum e silentio that Schenkeveld uses: the omission of the term σωμβεβηκτά in Comp. 6 cannot be used as an argument for the view that the Stoics did not use that term. Moreover, σωμβεβηκτός and σωμβεβηκτά do in fact occur as opposed to οὐσία in Comp. 5, as I have already mentioned. To conclude, I believe that the Stoics knew the concept of accident and that they used the term σωμβεβηκτά for the accidentia of the parts of speech.

(2) The second problem concerns the terminology for accidentia in the early grammatical texts. Scholars used to think that the term σωμβεβηκτά was chronologically prior to the term παρεπόμενα: the latter term is only found in grammatical texts from the second century AD onwards (Apollonius Dyscolus, grammatical papyri, and the Techne Grammatikê).291 Recently, however, both Ax and Matthaios have questioned the chronological priority of σωμβεβηκτά.292 Ax has suggested that Apollonius Dyscolus literally quotes Aristarchus when saying that,

only be explained on the basis of the Stoic categories: otherwise, one cannot understand why common nouns should be placed before proper nouns and pronouns before common nouns. See De Jonge (2001) and chapter 5 of this study.

289 Schenkeveld (1999) 192: ‘This Latin term [accidentia] is a translation of σωμβεβηκτά and in texts on the Stoic theory of causes and effects this word means necessary or constant consequence. But it is not found in grammatical texts as a technical term for constant attributes of verb and noun. The traditional Greek name is παρεπόμενα, a word known from Aristotelian works in the sense of necessary consequence, and it may well be that Stoics, too, used this term.’ Luhtala (2000) 100 has recently defended Barwick’s view that the Stoics used the philosophical notion of σωμβεβηκτά for the grammatical accidents.

290 Schenkeveld (1983) 85.

291 The terms παρεπόμενον and παρέπηκτα are used for the grammatical accidentia in Apollonius Dyscolus (cf. Lallot [1997 II] 347), in P. Iand. V 83,13 (nr. 13 Wouters; end of the 3rd century AD) and P. S.I. VII 761,7 (nr. 16 Wouters; 5th-6th century AD), and in the Techne Grammatikê (D. Thrax), G.G. 1 1, 24,6; 46,5; 60,2; 62,1; 64,1). For the chronological priority of the term σωμβεβηκτά, see Schenkeveld (1994) 279: ‘The accidentia are called σωμβεβηκτά, not yet παρεπόμενα’. In a more recent publication, Schenkeveld (1999) 192 is less certain about the chronological priority. Note that ‘Longinus’, Sibl. 10.1 uses παρεπόμενα in the general sense of ‘accompanying symptoms’: see section 5.3.4.

according to the latter, the word ἀνεφι is an adverb, because its lack of flection and lack of congruence are properties ‘that did not apply (παρείπετο) to nouns’. Matthaios has pointed out that Aristarchus uses the term ἐκ παρεπομένου ‘in einem grammatisch-technischen Kontext’, namely when reasoning for the meaning of a word ‘aufgrund dessen, was aus der Bedeutung des Wortes folge’ (ἐκ παρεπομένου). I think that we should be very careful when using these two fragments as evidence, for the following reasons. Concerning Ax’ suggestion, it should be emphasised that we do not know how closely Apollonius Dyscolus follows the words of Aristarchus: the word παρείπετο may very well be Apollonius’ own phrasing, and not Aristarchus’. Concerning Matthaios’ reference to Aristarchus’ expression ἐκ παρεπομένου, it should be noted that the term is used here in a different sense than in technical grammar, and in my view it does not prove that Aristarchus actually used the terms παρεπόμενα or παρέπεσθαι for the accidentia of the parts of speech. Therefore, the doubts of Ax and Matthaios about the chronological priority of the term συμβεβηκότα over παρεπόμενα are based on rather scanty evidence.

For the use of συμβεβηκότα in early times, however, there is more evidence: in a fragment of Philodemus’ On Poems, which Janko has assigned to the critic Pausimachus, it is said that ‘(...) in this manner neither the diction (λέξις) nor the subject-matter (ὑποκείμενα) nor any of the συμβεβηκότα will be cause of excellence’. Janko interprets the συμβεβηκότα as the ‘accidents of language, i.e. declension, conjugation and prosody’. This would fit another fragment from Philodemus, where Pausimachus offers a list of several accidentia, namely grave and acute (ἀνεσίς and ἐπίταξις), aspiration and lack of aspiration (πρόσπνευσις and ψιλότης), lengthening and shortening (ἐκτάσεις and συστολή), prefixation and case (πρόθεσις and πτώσις). This list partly corresponds to Dionysius’ list in Dem. 52 quoted above: he too mentions συστολάς, ἐκτάσεις and πτώσεις, and both the critic and Dionysius enumerate prosodic elements, accents and inflectional categories in one list (see below). Furthermore, the term συμβεβηκότα in the sense of the grammatical

---

293 Aristarchus fr. 136 Matthaios (= Apollonius Dyscolus, Adv., G.G. II 1, 145,5ff.).
295 Matthaios (1999) 205 says: ‘Es ist nun durchaus möglich, daß Aristarch den Ausdruck παρέπεσθαι bzw. παρακολούθειν über dessen Gebrauch in den Erklärungen ἐκ παρεπομένου bzw. ἐκ τοῦ παρακολουθοῦντος hinaus auch in den Kontext der Wortartsystematik übertragen und dazu verwendet hat, die einer grammatischen Kategorie zukommenden, akzidentiellen Merkmale zu kennzeichnen.’ (My italics.) We can indeed not exclude the possibility, but we do not have any hard evidence for Aristarchus’ use of παρεπόμενα as accidentia.
accidentia occurs not only in the Pausimachus fragment, but also in Philodemus’ rebuttal.299

We have seen that Dionysius of Halicarnassus uses the term συμβεβηκότα when referring to the grammatical curriculum. I have pointed out that his reference to the teaching of letters, syllables and parts of speech (as preparation for reading and writing) presumably corresponds to the actual curriculum of grammar schools in Rome at the end of the first century BC. The various stages that Dionysius mentions (letters, syllables, parts of speech and finally reading and writing) agree with the exposition of grammatical doctrines that we find in Sextus Empiricus and Quintilian. Blank has argued that these expositions depend on Asclepiades’ On Grammar.300 But if these expositions of grammatical teaching reflect the general practice of grammar schools, we do not have to trace these texts back to a specific source. Concerning the terminology of accidents, I think that Dionysius’ reference shows that συμβεβηκότα (and not παρεπόμενα) was the normal term for accidentia in the first century BC.

Having taken the evidence into consideration, I conclude that it is most plausible that the term συμβεβηκότα was chronologically prior to the term παρεπόμενα. The Aristotelian concept of accidence was taken over by the Stoics, who used the term συμβεβηκότα. The kritikoi, Philodemus and presumably the grammarians of the first century BC also used this term for the accidentia of the parts of speech. In my view, there is insufficient evidence to suggest that Aristarchus used the term παρεπόμενα for the grammatical accidentia. In later times, grammarians (grammatical papyri, Apollonius Dyscolus, the Technê Grammatikê) preferred the term παρεπόμενα for the accidentia. But grammarians still understood the two terms as having the same meaning.301 The Roman term accidentia, however, is a translation of the original Greek grammatical term, as Barwick has already pointed out.302

3.8. Dionysius on the accidentia of nouns and verbs

We now leave the discussion of the terminology of accidentia in general and turn to the specific categories themselves. We have already seen that under the

301 Cf. Sch. D. Thrax, G. G. I 3, 217,23: Παρεπόμενα δὲ ἐστὶ συμβεβηκός. See also Steinhall (1891 II) 243-244.
302 Barwick (1922) 107.
σωμβεβηκότα, Dionysius lists items from (1) prosody, (2) accentuation and (3) inflectional categories (accidents in the sense of the παρεπόμενα distinguished by grammarians of later times). In Dem. 52, Dionysius mentions συστολάς, ἕκτάσεις, ὀξύτητας, βαρύτητας, γένη, πτώσεις, όριθμοὶς and ἐγκλίσεις. In Comp. 25, he lists ἕκτασεις, συστολάς and προσφόδιας. So, the ὀξύτητας and βαρύτητας of Dem. 52 are summarised in the προσφόδιας of Comp. 25, while the latter chapter does not include the genders, cases, numbers and moods that occur in Dem. 52.303 Συστολαὶ and ἕκτάσεις refer to the shortenings and lengthenings of syllables, which later grammarians treat under the so-called πάθη λέξεων.304 As we have seen, these items of prosody (ἕκτασεις and συστολὴ) are also included in the list of accidentia in a fragment of Philodemus’ On Poems.305 That same fragment also mentions items of accentuation (ἀνεσίς, grave, and ἐπίτωσίς, acute), be it in different terms than Dionysius, who uses ὀξύτης (high pitch), βαρύτης (low pitch) and, in general, προσφόδια (scansion).306 The combination of items from prosody, accentuation and inflection under the term σωμβεβηκότα in both Philodemus and Dionysius of Halicarnassus indicates that the technical grammatical distinctions that we know from later texts, such as the grammatical papyri, Apollonius Dyscolus and the Technê Grammatikê, were not yet established in the second and first century BC. Besides, Dionysius combines theories from various language disciplines; concerning his use of accidents this is particularly clear in Dem. 48, where Dionysius says that there are two phenomena that accompany (ἀκολοουθεῖ) all the parts of speech, namely tone (μέλος) and time (χρόνος).307 These accidents are borrowed from musical theory, and it is no coincidence that Aristoxenus is mentioned in the passage that discusses the high and low pitch and rhythm of words.308 In the rest of this section I will focus on those accidentia that are treated as such in technical grammar.

In the list of σωμβεβηκότα in Dem. 52, only the γένη (genders), πτώσεις (cases), όριθμοί (numbers) and ἐγκλίσεις (moods) correspond to the morphological accidentia, which were also distinguished by technical grammarians of the first century AD onwards.309 In Comp. 6, the accidentia are mentioned in two groups, one for nouns and one for verbs, which I will discuss in that order.310

---

304 Cf. Schenkeveld (1983) 82. Dionysius himself speaks of πάθη συλλαβῶν, not of πάθη λέξεων: see Comp. 15.59,15-16; Comp. 25.135,2-3 and Dem. 52.242,19-20.
308 Dem. 48.233,9.
310 In Comp. 6, Dionysius’ terminology differs from that in the rest of his work: see my discussion in section 4.3.1.
With regard to the nouns (ἐπὶ μὲν τῶν ὄνομάτων), *Comp.* 6 mentions the following items.\(^{311}\)

1. ἐνικός (singular) and πληθυντικός (plural)
2. ὀρθή πτώσις (nominative) and πλάγια πτώσεις (oblique cases)
3. ἀρρενικά (masculine), θηλυκά (feminine) and οὐδέτερα (neuter)

These *accidentia* correspond to ἀριθμοί (numbers), πτώσεις (cases) and γένη (genders) respectively. Dionysius also refers to the numbers as nouns: τὸ ἐνικόν and τὸ πληθυντικόν or τὰ ἐνικά and τὰ πληθυντικά.\(^{312}\) The oblique cases are specified as αἰτιατική, γενική and δοτική, and the cases are not only mentioned in connection with nouns, but also with appellative nouns (προσηγορικά), participles (μετοχαῖ) and articles (ἀρθρα).\(^{313}\) The terms of the genders occur as nouns (τὸ ἀρρενικόν, τὸ θηλυκόν and τὸ οὐδέτερον), as adjectives in combination with γένος (τὸ θηλυκό γένει) or μόριον (τὸ θηλυκόν μόριον), and as adverbs (ἀρρενικός).\(^{314}\)

With regard to verbs (ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν ῥημάτων), *Comp.* 6 mentions the following items:\(^{315}\)

1. τὰ ὀρθά ή τὰ ὑπίπτα
2. κατὰ ποίας ἐγκλίσεις ἐκφερόμενα, ὡς δὴ τινὲς πτώσεις ῥηματικῆς καλοῦσι
3. ποίας παρεμφαίνοντα διαφορᾶς χρόνων

These *accidentia* correspond to (1) voice, (2) mood, and (3) tense respectively. Elsewhere, Dionysius also mentions (4) number and (5) persons.\(^{316}\) Because his terminology for the verbal accidents casts light on the development of grammatical theory between Aristarchus and Apollonius Dyscolus, I will discuss each of these items separately.

---

311 *Comp.* 6.29,1-7.
312 *Dem.* 27.189,8; *Thuc.* 24.362,3; *Thuc.* 37.389,7-21; *Amm.* II 2.423,9; *Amm.* II 9.428,19-429,17.
313 For the specific cases, see *Thuc.* 37.389,7-21 and *Amm.* II 11.431,1-15. See further *Thuc.* 24.362,7 and *Amm.* II 2.423,13-14: ὄνοματικῶν ἡ μετοχικῶν πτώσεις, ‘the cases of nouns and participles’; *Amm.* II 11.430,12-14: τὰς πτώσεις τῶν ὄνομάτων καὶ τῶν προσηγοριῶν καὶ τῶν μετοχῶν καὶ (τῶν) συναπτομένων τούτων ἀρθρῶν, ‘the cases of proper nouns, appellative nouns, participles and the articles attached to them’. These references to the cases of participles and articles should be added to the lists of Schenkeveld (1983).
314 *Dem.* 27.189,8; *Thuc.* 24.362,4-5; *Thuc.* 37.389,7-21; *Amm.* II 2.423,11; *Amm.* II 10.429,18-430,11; *Amm.* II 11.430,20-431,1 (τὸ τὴν θηλυκὰ γένει τῆς προσηγορίας τὸ θηλυκόν ἄν ξευξίσαν μόριον); *Amm.* II 11.431,6-7. The adverb ἀρρενικώς occurs at *Amm.* II 10.429,21. *Comp.* 6.29,7-12. See section 4.3.1.
315 *Dem.* 27.189,8; *Thuc.* 24.362,3; *Thuc.* 37.389,7-21; *Amm.* II 2.423,9; *Amm.* II 9.428,19-429,17.
316 Dionysius does not mention the ‘conjugations’ (συζυγίας) of verbs, which we find in grammatical texts. In Dionysius, the term συζυγία refers either to the connection or combination of letters and words (e.g. *Comp.* 3.15,1) or to a ‘group’ of letters that share the same characteristics (e.g. *Comp.* 14.56,6).
(1) Voice. The *Techné Grammatikê* distinguishes three voices (διαθέσεις), namely active (ἐνεργεία), passive (πάθος) and middle (μεσότης).\(^{317}\) It is clear that Dionysius of Halicarnassus distinguishes only two voices, namely active and passive, and not the middle voice. In this respect, Dionysius does not differ from the early grammarians: Aristarchus and Varro do not distinguish the middle voice either.\(^{318}\) As far as we know, Apollonius Dyscolus is the first grammarian who gives the διάθεσις μέσα a separate treatment besides the διάθεσις ἐνεργετική and the διάθεσις παθητική.\(^{319}\) In grammatical texts, the two voices are called ἐνεργητική (active) and παθητική (passive). These terms are also found in the fragments of Aristarchus.\(^{320}\) The Stoic philosophers, however, used different terms, namely δραστική or ὥρθι (active) and ὑπτια (passive).\(^{321}\) It is interesting that both the grammatical and the philosophical terms are found in Dionysius of Halicarnassus. In *Amm. II* 7-8 (see section 4.4.2), Dionysius uses the terms ποιητικόν and ἐνεργητικόν for active, and παθητικόν for passive.\(^{322}\) In the introduction of the same letter (which he cites from *On Thucydidès* 24), however, he employs the terms τὰ δραστήρια (the active forms) and τὰ παθητικά (the passive forms).\(^{323}\) In *Comp. 6* (see section 4.3.1), which seems to be influenced by theories from Hellenistic poetic theory, he mentions τὰ ὥρθα (active) and τὰ ὑπτια (passive).\(^{324}\) Dionysius’ terminology of active and passive is important evidence for the reconstruction of the history of grammar in the first century BC. The blending of philological terms on the one hand and Stoic terms on the other confirms that technical grammar in the period after Aristarchus was influenced by Stoic philosophy.

(2) Mood. Dionysius does not mention the specific terms for indicative, subjunctive, optative and imperative. He once refers to τὰ ἀπερέμφατα (‘infinitives’) and τὰ παρεμφατικά (‘finite verb forms’) (see section 5.3.6).\(^{325}\) Besides, Dionysius is the first extant writer who uses the grammatical term ἕγκλισις, which is the usual

---

\(^{317}\) [D. Thrax], *G.G. I* 1, 46,5ff.


\(^{321}\) Sch. D. Thrax, *G.G. I* 3, 401,1 (= FDS 803): Ἐνεργητική μὲν ἐστὶ διάθεσις (…), ἢτις παρὰ τούς φιλοσόφους δραστική καὶ ὥρθι καλεῖται. ‘Active is a voice, which is called δραστική and ὥρθι by the philosophers.’ For ἰματο ὥρθα and ὑπτια, see also Sch. D. Thrax, *G.G. I* 3, 548,34-37.

\(^{322}\) *Amm. II* 7.427,17-428,18.

\(^{323}\) *Amm. II* 2.423,8-9: καὶ τὰ μὲν παθητικά ῥήματα δραστήρια, τὰ δὲ δραστήρια παθητικά.

\(^{324}\) *Comp. 6.29.8*. See also sections 4.3.1 and 5.3.6. Steinthal (1891 II) 274 thinks that the distinction between ὥρθα and ἐγκλίσμα (ἐγκλίσματον according to P) in *Comp. 5.26,14-15* is the same as that between ὥρθα and ὑπτια in *Comp. 6.29,8*: he interprets ὥρθα as present indicatives, and ὑπτια (= ἐγκλίσμα) as all other tenses and moods. Schenkeveld (1983) 84 corrects Steinthal. The term ὑπτια refers to ‘passives’, whereas ἐγκλίσμα is the reading that is to be preferred to the reading ἐγκλίσμα (which is the usual) are non-indicatives (see below).

\(^{325}\) *Comp. 5.26,15-16*.\n
grammatical term for ‘mood’ in later grammatical texts (Apollonius Dyscolus and the *Technē Grammatikē*).\(^{326}\) Although Aristarchus already mentions all the specific moods (indicative, subjunctive, etc.), he does not know the term ἔγκλησις in the sense of ‘mood’.\(^{327}\) We do not know whether Dionysius’ contemporary Tryphon used the term ἔγκλησις, but if Dionysius’ references to the grammatical curriculum in *Comp.* 25 and *Dem.* 52 refer to the educational practice of his time, as he suggests (see above), then we may conclude that the term was introduced at some point in the first century BC.\(^{328}\) With regard to the moods, Dionysius uses two expressions that almost certainly betray Stoic influence. First, he tells us that some people (τίνες) call the moods πτῶσεις ῥήματικάς (verbal cases) (see section 4.3.1).\(^{329}\) Second, he mentions a distinction between between ὀρθά (indicatives) and ἐγκλησιόμενα (non-indicatives) (see section 5.3.6).\(^{330}\) In later grammatical texts, the verb is defined as a word ‘without case’ (ἀστέτων).\(^{331}\) For Aristotle, however, πτῶσις refers to the flection of both nouns and verbs. Thus, the view that moods are ‘verbal cases’ might seem to be related to Aristotle’s views on the verb and its cases (πτῶσεις ῥήματος). However, there is an important difference, for Aristotle’s ‘cases of verbs’ are not moods, but tenses: according to Aristotle, ὑγιαῖνε (‘is healthy’) is a verb (ῥήμα), whereas ὑγίανεν (‘was healthy’) and ὑγιανεῖ (‘will be healthy’) are not verbs but ‘cases of verbs’ (πτῶσεις ῥήματος).\(^{332}\) In other words, only the forms that indicate the present tense (τὸν παρόντα χρόνον) deserve the full title of verb, while the forms of the past and future tense, which indicate ‘the (time) beyond’ (τὸν πέριξ), are cases of a verb.\(^{333}\) Matthaios argues that Dionysius’ reference to πτῶσεις ῥήματικάι betrays Aristotelian influence. Schenkeveld, however, draws attention to a passage from Macrobius, who states that the Stoics called only the indicative *rectum*, thus comparing the indicative to the nominative (*denique Stoici hunc solum modum rectum, velut nominativum, vocaverunt*).\(^{334}\) Although Matthaios believes that the Stoics only used the term πτῶσις for nouns, Macrobius’ text strongly suggests that they compared the cases of nouns to the moods of verbs, and, in particular, the

---

\(^{326}\) For Dionysius’ use of ἔγκλησις (‘moods’), see *Comp.* 6.29,9; *Comp.* 25.132,6; *Dem.* 52.242,23. In *Dem.* 54.246,2, the word is not used for grammatical moods, but for the tone of delivery.


\(^{328}\) Graefenhan corrected one title of Tryphon’s work into Περὶ ῥήματων ἐγκλῆσεων [instead of ἐγκλητικῶν καὶ ἀπαρεμφάτων καὶ προστακτικῶν καὶ εὐκτικῶν καὶ ἀποσφακτικῶν], but Matthaios (1999) 358 n. 299 rightly doubts the correctness of the expression Περὶ ῥήματων ἐγκλῆσεων. On this title, see also section 1.4.

\(^{329}\) *Comp.* 6.29,9-10.

\(^{330}\) *Comp.* 5.26,14-15.


nominative to the indicative.\textsuperscript{335} In my view, this would explain both the expression πτόσεις ῥηματικά (verbal cases) and the distinction between ὁ ἀρνὺ and ἔγκλινόμενα (indicatives and non-indicatives). The terms ὁ ἀρνὸ and ἔγκλινόμενα will be discussed more fully in section 5.3.6.

(3) Tense. Concerning tenses, Dionysius of Halicarnassus distinguishes between the ‘present’ (ὁ παρὼν χρόνος) and the ‘future’ (ὁ μέλλων χρόνος); we do not know whether he also knew a term for the past tense, since his examples concern present and future tenses only.\textsuperscript{336} Schenkeveld and Matthaios argue that Dionysius’ terminology shows Aristotelian influence: the term ὁ παρὼν χρόνος is found in Aristotle’s Poetics, but the traditional grammatical term is ὁ ἐνεστῶς χρόνος.\textsuperscript{337} The latter term seems to be of Stoic origin, and Aristarchus also uses it to designate the present tense. The Aristotelian tradition was not only preserved in Dionysius of Halicarnassus’ use of the term ὁ παρὼν χρόνος, but also in the Latin translation praesens.\textsuperscript{338}

(4) Number. Dionysius uses the category number (ἀρίθμος) not only in connection with nouns (see above), but also in connection with verbs.\textsuperscript{339} Dionysius’ terms, ἕνικόν (singular) and πληθοντικόν (plural), are the traditional ones, which Aristarchus already uses.\textsuperscript{340} The term for dual is not attested in Dionysius’ works.

(5) Person. Dionysius once refers to the first person as τὸ τοῦ λέγοντος προσώπων (‘the person of the speaker’) and to the third person as λόγος περὶ τῶν προσώπων (‘speech about persons’).\textsuperscript{341} He uses these terms when pointing out that in a certain passage Thucydides changes from the third to the first person.\textsuperscript{342} Matthaios has argued that the distinction between grammatical persons ultimately goes back to Aristotle’s distinction between ὁ λέγων (‘the speaker’), πρὸς ὁν λέγει (‘to whom he speaks’) and περὶ οὗ λέγει (‘about which he speaks’).\textsuperscript{343} Dionysius’ terminology largely corresponds to that of Aristarchus, who refers to the first person as τὸ λέγων

\textsuperscript{335} Matthaios (1999) 299.
\textsuperscript{337} Aristotle, Po. 1457a17-18. Cf. Schenkeveld (1983) 83-84. For the classification of ἐθέλομεν as a future tense, see section 4.4.2.
\textsuperscript{339} Amm. II 9.429,10-17: ἡρωσεν is classified as singular, φθονοῦντες and ἀπίστοισιν (indirectly) as plurals.
\textsuperscript{340} See Matthaios (1999) 377.
\textsuperscript{342} Thuc. 48.407,2-15 on Thuc. 6.78.1.
\textsuperscript{343} Aristotle, Rh. 1358a37. See Matthaios (1999) 393-394.
πρόσωπον (‘the speaking person’), to the second as πρὸς αὐτόν (‘to him’) and to the third person as περὶ αὑτοῦ (‘about him’).344

3.9. Conclusion

In this chapter, I have collected and interpreted Dionysius of Halicarnassus’ views on the parts of speech. In this way, I have reconstructed as it were a hypothetical grammar that was used by Dionysius. This is a helpful procedure if one wishes to describe the history of grammar in the first century BC. However, we should realise that Dionysius is not a grammarian, but a rhetorician who makes use of grammatical theory only if he can use it for his own purposes. For this reason, I have argued (pace Schenkeveld) that Dionysius does not use a ‘system’ of nine word classes. He is neither interested in the exact classification of words, nor in the precise number of the μόρια λόγου. His attitude towards grammar as a discipline of which the technical details should be left to the grammarians also explains his fluctuating terminology concerning linguistic matters. As we have seen, Dionysius refers to the voices (active and passive) sometimes by the Alexandrian and sometimes by the Stoic terms. One of the reasons for the variety of terms is, of course, that he does not care about systematic terminology: he is only interested in the effects of the use of active and passive verbs on stylistic composition. Dionysius’ profession also accounts for his terminology and his concept of the μόρια λόγου. I have argued that Dionysius prefers the expression μόρια λόγου (and μόρια λέξεως) because a rhetorician uses the expression μέρη λόγου for the parts of a text (e.g. introduction, narrative), and the expression μέρη λέξεως for the aspects of expression (selection of words, composition). Similarly, Dionysius prefers ὄνομα as the most general term for ‘word’, because in rhetoric λέξις (the grammatical term for ‘word’) refers to ‘style’ and ‘expression’. The concept of Dionysius’ μόρια λόγου comprises two aspects: they are both word classes and parts of the phrase. The former aspect is especially relevant when Dionysius refers to the remarkable use of a specific word class (e.g. the active instead of the passive use of a verb). The latter aspect is especially relevant when Dionysius deals with composition (σύνθεσις), the putting together of ‘parts’.

We have seen that in his use of the parts of speech Dionysius is influenced by several ancient language disciplines, in particular Alexandrian philology and Stoic philosophy. In general, Dionysius follows the Alexandrian distinctions and terminology concerning word classes and their accidentia. A number of aspects of the grammatical theories in his work, however, betray Stoic influence. In this respect,

Dionysius of Halicarnassus is similar to grammarians like Dionysius Thrax and Tyrannion. Among the Stoic aspects of Dionysius’ treatment of the μόρια λόγου are the distinction of ὄνομα and προσηγορία (προσηγορικόν) as two separate word classes (a Stoic element in an Alexandrian word class system) and the use of the Stoic terms τὰ ὀρθὰ (active) and τὰ ὑπτως (passive) (I have not yet been able to assign Dionysius’ use of the term ποιητικῶν in the sense of ‘active’ to any of the earlier traditions). I have argued that the terminology for moods, πτώσεις ῥηματικαί (‘verbal cases’) and ὀρθά (indicatives) and ἐγκλινόμενα (non-indicatives), is also Stoic. Dionysius’ reference to pronouns as ἀρθρα δεικτικά (‘deictic articles’) corresponds to an ancient testimony on Dionysius Thrax, who seems to have adopted this same expression under Stoic influence. Dionysius’ idea that the parts of speech are στοιχεῖα (‘elements’) is also Stoic. Further, I have argued that Dionysius’ term for accidentia, συμβεβηκότα was also used by the Stoics. In chapter 4 and 5, we will see that in the field of syntax Dionysius is also influenced by Stoic theories, as the Stoic expressions ὁ κατάλληλος λόγος and ἀκολούθω τι ιδικά indicate.345 But apart from the philological and the Stoic tradition, there were other language disciplines that made use of the parts of speech theory, and in some cases Dionysius follows views that were developed in these disciplines. Thus, in his terminology for tenses, Dionysius seems to follow the Peripatetic tradition, naming the present tense ὁ παρὰν χρόνος instead of ὁ ἐνστῶς χρόνος, which is the Alexandrian and Stoic expression. Dionysius’ use of the ‘persons’ can be traced back to Aristotelian ideas on communication. It is important to realise that if a certain term is called ‘Stoic’, this does not imply that Dionysius borrowed that term from Stoic sources. Grammatical treatises of the first century BC seem to have mixed ideas of both Alexandrian and Stoic origin; Dionysius’ terminology shows the same integration of philological and philosophical ideas and may therefore be based on grammatical texts of the first century BC.

Two grammatical terms are important because Dionysius’ works are the earliest extant texts in which they appear: the term ἐπίρημα (adverb) first occurs in Tryphon and Dionysius (both active in Augustan Rome). The grammarian Philoxenus (also active in the first century BC) still uses the term μεσότης (which also designates the ‘adverb’ in the fragments of Aristarchus). The term ἐγκλίσεις (‘moods’) is first attested in Dionysius of Halicarnassus. Because he uses the term when referring to grammatical school practice, we may assume that it was introduced in earlier periods.

345 In section 5.3, it will be argued that Dionysius’ investigation into natural word order (Comp. 5), too, is based on Stoic ideas, in particular on the Stoic theory of categories.
In general, Dionysius’ descriptions of ‘how we learn to read’ (τὰ γράμματα ὡταν παιδευόμεθα) (Comp. 25 and Dem. 52) deserve to be taken into account more seriously than some modern scholars have done. I do not think that these passages are directly based on Stoic texts (pace Barwick), nor do I believe that Dionysius’ description is unrealistic (pace Schenkeveld). Dionysius tells us that one learns first letters (γράμματα), then syllables (συλλαβαὶ), then words (λέξεις) or parts of speech (τὰ τοῦ λόγου μόρια) and their accidentia (συμβεβηκότα); finally one starts writing and reading. Grammatical papyri confirm that the writing of separate letters, syllables and words was practiced. Both Dionysius’ passages on the grammatical curriculum depend on his audience’s recognition of the fact that this is the way children learn to read. Therefore I believe that Dionysius’ description corresponds to the practice of grammar schools of his time, which he must have known very well.

To conclude, Dionysius of Halicarnassus’ treatment of the parts of speech confirms Matthaios’ reconstruction of the history of the word class system in the period between Aristarchus and Apollonius Dyscolus. After Aristarchus, the Alexandrian scholars were deeply influenced by Stoic theories. This Stoic influence resulted in a number of grammatical works that must have combined Alexandrian and Stoic ideas on language. Most of these works are lost, but the few extant fragments of Dionysius Thrax and Tyrannion show that they adopted Stoic views in their classification of the word classes. The works of these grammarians have not survived, but my investigations have shown that the grammatical discourse of the Augustan period was indeed characterised by a deep amalgamation of Alexandrian and Stoic theories on language. This integration of philological and philosophical ideas would finally culminate in the work of Apollonius Dyscolus (2nd century AD).

The next two chapters will further confirm the view that Dionysius brings theories from different language disciplines together in a useful way. In chapter 5, I will show that Dionysius’ views on style and word order, which are related to Stoic ideas on syntax, foreshadow Apollonius Dyscolus’ syntactic theory. But first, it is time to focus on Dionysius’ use of the μόρια λόγου in the rhetorical and literary context of his works. In chapter 4 we will find that his use of the parts of speech is not only related to the traditions of philologists and philosophers, but also to the disciplines of poetical criticism and musical theory.

---

346 Matthaios (2002).