



Between Poets and Philologists: The Proposition of a Language Ideal in Apollonius Dyscolus' *Perì syntáxeos*¹

Entre poetas e filólogos: a proposição de um ideal de língua no Perì syntáxeos de Apolônio Díscolo

Fábio Fortes

Universidade Federal de Juiz de Fora (UFJF), Juiz de Fora, Minas Gerais / Brasil

fabio.fortes@ufjf.edu.br

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4411-7115>

Abstract: Well known in the grammatical tradition as the formulator of the first treatise about the construction or syntax of the Greek language, Apollonius Dyscolus (2nd c. AD) devotes his *Περὶ συντάξεως* to a thorough examination of the Greek language, focusing mainly on its logical organization. However, the extensive reading of Apollonius' work under this key has contributed to the overshadowing of the 'philological' dimension of this treatise perceived in the numerous analyses of constructions derived from poetic use, as well as in the quotations and allusions to poets and philologists within his work. Considering that the justification by Apollonius in his prologue was the "understanding of the writers and poets", we ask ourselves: what role do poets and prose writers play in this study? We intend to show that Apollonius, despite never abandoning entirely the logic framework of his syntactic theory, puts in evidence a close reading of the Alexandrian philological tradition, both in the examples, quotations and allusions of poets and philologists, and in the procedure of analysis of Homer passages.

Keywords: Greek Syntax; Literary Examples; Philology; Language Model.

Resumo: Bem conhecido na tradição gramatical antiga como o formulator do primeiro tratado gramatical sobre a sintaxe da língua grega, Apolônio Díscolo (c. séc. II d.C.) consagra sua obra a um profundo exame da língua grega sob o viés da sua

¹ This study was financed in part by the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior – Brasil (CAPES) – Finance Code 001, being developed as part of my Post-Doctorate research project at the Département des Sciences de l'Antiquité, UR Mondes Anciens, Université de Liège – Belgium, supervised by Prof. Dr. Bruno Rochette.

organização lógica. Entretanto, por esse viés, o estudo da obra de Apolônio deixou à sombra a dimensão propriamente “filológica” desse tratado, que consiste na apreciação da tradição literária grega, particularmente daquelas construções decorrentes do uso poético. Considerando que a justificativa apresentada é, como o próprio gramático afirma, a “compreensão dos prosadores e dos poetas”, nos perguntamos: que papel os poetas e prosadores desempenham nesse estudo? Pretendemos mostrar que Apolônio, embora jamais se distancie do enquadre lógico de sua sintaxe, coloca em evidência uma leitura próxima da tradição filológica alexandrina, tanto através dos exemplos, citações e alusões a poetas e filólogos, quanto através dos procedimentos de análise de versos homéricos.

Palavras-chave: sintaxe grega; exemplos literários; filologia; modelo linguístico.

Introduction

Widely known in ancient grammatical tradition as the formulator of the first grammatical treatise to deal specifically with the syntax of the Greek language, Apollonius Dyscolus (2nd century AD) is also considered the principal model for the grammar of Priscian, whose grammatical work, written at the end of Late Antiquity, became the main reference for mediaeval and modern grammatical thought and teaching (LALLOT, 2009; SCHMIDHAUSER, 2009). Apollonius’ grammatical thinking is often associated with the idea that the syntax of the Greek language is regulated by logical principles which are attested in numerous examples of linguistic use (mostly written and poetical examples).

The defense of a logical functioning of language is an intellectual enterprise of considerable importance in Apollonius’ work, comprising an elegant doctrine on Greek syntax. However, an emphasis given to the ‘logical’ dimension of Apollonian thoughts regarding language can overshadow a properly ‘philological’ dimension of his work.² Even though Apollonius’ contribution to grammar tradition has been recognized as a compromise between the rationalist and the empiricist positions

² We use here the term ‘philological’ in a rather broad sense, for referring to everything concerning the appreciation, reception, transmission of the Greek literary tradition, as well as the debate about the ways of interpreting texts, after Alexandrian philology. Such ‘philological’ dimension is particularly evident in the quotations of excerpts from poets and prose writers throughout Apollonius’ work.

(BLANK, 1982, p. 14, BLANK, 2000, p. 404), it is also argued that the logical inheritance over his thoughts makes the “use” and “the literary tradition” be of secondary importance (ILDEFONSE, 1997, p. 261).

Considering Apollonius’ statement in the introduction to his work, that the study of syntax would be necessary to the “explanation of poems” (*Synt.*, I, 2: *exégesis tôn poiemáton*), in this article we aim at illuminating the properly ‘philological’ dimension of Apollonius’ treatise, by commenting particularly on the role played by the literary fragments quoted and on the canon that such quotations make up in the work as a whole. We follow here the edition of Lallot (1997).³

1 Apollonius Dyscolus and Alexandrian Philology

A somewhat legendary aspect surrounds the few biographical data available on the life of Apollonius. In *The Life of Apollonius of Alexandria*, a fourth-century biographical compilation attributed to Theodosius (GG II, 3: 6-24, 4th century AD), the grammarian is portrayed as a poor man born in Alexandria. According to Theodosius, the cognomen that he would have received, “Dyscolus” (from the Greek *dýskolos*, “difficult, demanding, difficult to please”), would refer either to a particular trait of the grammarian’s personality, or to the fact that his texts and lessons would be considered hard to read by his pupils, or even to the rigid upbringing to which the grammarian would have submitted his son and disciple Herodian. In addition to these anecdotal commentaries, the testimony allows us to situate the grammarian in Alexandria at the beginning of

³ The *Peri syntáxeos* is certainly the most extensive and important work by Apollonius Dyscolus, probably the last one to be written in his life (HOUSEHOLDER, 1995). The first edition of *Peri syntáxeos* is that of Aldo Manutius (1495), followed by Friederich Sylburg (1590), I. Bekkerus (1814 and 1817), Paul Maas (1911) and the *Grammatici Graeci* compilation by Uhlig and Schneider (1876-1901). In our research, however, we worked with the edition of Lallot (1997). According to Householder (1995, p. 111), “The first ancient grammarian whose more or less complete book-length works have been preserved is Apollonius Dyscolus (‘The difficult one’). Of the 59 (or fewer) titles mentioned by Priscian, Apollonius himself, the Suidas lexicon, and others, there are four: *On the Pronoun*, *On Adverbs*, *On Conjunctions*, and *On Syntax*, all in some measure defective.”

the second century AD, probably during the reign of Trajan (53-117 AD), since he identifies Herodian as his son. Herodian has also been a grammarian, the one who would have acted in Rome and dedicated a treatise on orthography to the Emperor Marcus Aurelius (c. 121-180 AD), of whom he would have been contemporary (BLANK, 2006, p. 327).

On the testimony of Theodosius, Lallot (1997, p. 11) comments that the rupture between Apollonius and Herodian could allude to a difference of grammatical conception between them: while the father would have been freer to explore the controversies of grammatical tradition and to base his theoretical discourse in ideas of his own, the son, more clinging to philological empiricism, would have tended to limit his work to the defense of established theses. As Lallot (1997, p. 12) concludes, “the biographical news of the father-son pair could connote, under a domestic question of a banal conflict between educator and disciple, an epistemological divergence between the father, more linguist (*tekhnikós*) and the son, more philologist (*grammatikós*)”.⁴

However, while Apollonius’ work, in contrast with Herodian’s, demonstrates a primarily theoretical concern, mostly associated to the study of the linguistic system,⁵ it does not mean that there would be no underlying empirical concern in this treatise. As a matter of fact, the theoretical aspect of his reflection on language has never ceased to be associated with the empirical aspect regarding the reading of literary texts (LALLOT, 1997, p. 14). So, it also reveals the unequivocal affiliation of Apollonius to the Alexandrian philological and grammatical models.

While it is possible to conceive that an empirical (i.e. ‘philological’) aspect would have historically preceded some theoretical (i.e. ‘linguistic’) aspect in the Alexandrian incursions on language (MÜLLER, 1875; ILDEFONSE, 1997); in Alexandria of the second century AD, however, both activities had already maturity and relevance in the works of the

⁴ Cf. “la notice biographique du couple père-fils ait pu connoter, sous les espèces domestiques d’un banal conflit entre éducateur et éduqué, la divergence épistémologique entre le père, plus linguiste (*tekhnikós*), Et le fils, plus philologue (*grammatikós*)”.

⁵ We understand here “linguistic system” the set of rules of logical-grammatical character, that give account of the different linguistic phenomena attributed by Apollonius to the category of “syntax”.

Alexandrian grammarians, Apollonius included (BLANK, 2006, p. 328). While Dionysius of Thrace and his master Aristarchus, commentator and interpreter of Homer's work in the second century BC, would have taken the philological commentary to what we could consider to be its culmination (PFEIFFER, 1968, p. 267), it would have been Apollonius, a few centuries later, who led the systematic metalinguistic reflection and its technique to its full development (LALLOT, 1997, p. 15).

2 *Exempla and fragments*

Having as main representatives Demetrius of Phalerum (4th century BC), Zenodotus (3rd century BC), Aristophanes of Byzantium (2nd century BC) and Aristarchus (1st century BC), the so-called Alexandrian Philology had as its main tasks the establishment of critical editions of texts (*diorthosis*, “correction of manuscripts” and *ékdoxis*, “text editions”), the elaboration of commentaries (*hypomnêmata*), the composition of monographic studies on works and authors (*syngrámmata*), and the development of lexicons and glossaries and other technical manuals (REYNOLDS; WILSON, 1991, p. 5-33; BECARES BOTAS, 1987, p. 18-20, LAMBERT, 2000, p. 385-393). The main objective was, therefore, the preservation, correction, explanation and interpretation of the work of Greek authors of the past, especially Homer. Closely related to philology, the Alexandrian grammar aimed at offering language explanations based on the analogical dimension of language, in order to help the process of reading and interpreting ancient texts. It is for this reason that the Alexandrian grammarians, such as Dionysius Thrax (2nd century BC) and even Apollonius Dyscolus (2nd century AD) would still justify their grammatical studies as a tool for reading Greek poets and prose writers.⁶

⁶ Among the six parts in which Dyonisius Thrax divides his grammatical study, he remarks that the sixth one consisted of criticizing the poems (κρίσις ποιημάτων), being after all the ‘most beautiful in the art’ (κάλλιστόν ἐστι πάντων τῶν ἐν τῇ τέχνῃ). In the same way, as we have seen above, Apollonius had justified his work to be ‘quite necessary to the explanation of poems’ (ἀναγκαιοτάτην οὖσαν πρὸς ἐξήγησιν τῶν ποιημάτων). Further comments on the role of literary criticism in Dyonisius Thrax, see Martinho (2007, 172-173).

For this reason, not only did Alexandrian grammar offer explanations of linguistic nature, based on the determination of principles and rules proper to the (ana-)logical character of language, but it also consisted of important instruments for textual criticism, reading and understanding of literary texts belonging to the Greek tradition.⁷ The ancient Alexandrian grammatical books recorded a huge number of occurrences of written language (mostly literary), which we may didactically split into two categories: the *exempla* (examples) and literary quotations ('fragments' or 'language facts').⁸ The *exempla* stand out as linguistic evidence registered in the minor levels of linguistic analysis, from the level of the individual sounds of words (*phoné*) up to the level of phrases and sentences (*lógos*). On the other hand, the fragments represent in general complete sentences or textual excerpts from prose or verse passages of authors of the Greek tradition. The quotation of either examples or fragments represents a grammatical procedure: depending on the grammar text in which they are used and on the context in which they appear, examples and fragments may propose either a partial view, a complete view, a sample or an illustration of a general rule of language,

⁷ As for as Apollonius' *Peri syntáxeos*, the emergence of principles regarding the functioning of language was an exigence for understanding language in different levels: from the minimal elements of sounds of speech (*phoné*) to the complete sentence (*autotelês lógos*). In the strictly grammatical point of view, Apollonius' syntax could see language as a complex combinatory system, in order to generate intelligible language sentences. Such 'complete' sentences should characterize themselves as: 1) having at least a noun and a verb; b) obeying the principle of congruency (*katallélotes*). The sentence 'congruency' (that is to say, the obedience to regular, logical or analogical principles of language) was both formal and semantic (*Synt.* I, 2; IV, 16; III, 10). For a more detailed discussion on the logical dimension of Apollonius' syntax, see my doctoral thesis (FORTES, 2012).

⁸ Such terminology comes after B. Colombat (2007, p. 58). The scholar proposes the difference between 'language facts' (or fragments) and *exempla*. While the fragments (language facts) are effectively language data (whose sources are the literary, technographic or philosophical traditions); the *exempla* are constructions *ad hoc*, mostly *ficta*, used by the grammarian. Notice that whenever we use in this article the term 'fragment', it is being used in a more flexible sense (almost as a synonym for 'excerpt'), not implying the idea of fragment for Textual Criticism *stricto sensu* (cf. WEST, 1973).

as well as they can be taken as a demonstration of a rule or evidence of an anomaly which, however, may or may not be allowed by some specific use of language attested by writers (COLOMBAT, 2007, p. 72).

In particular, in the case of the fragments presented in the grammatical text, for the most part, derived from literary genres, they are also put forward as language material showing what would be considered standard, exemplary or authentic in the language, either for reasons closely related to the use of a specific grammatical rule, or for reasons of stylistic or metrical order. Besides, the quotation *ipsis verbis* of a verse or a phrase from a well-known author provided the grammatical text with a kind of empirical authenticity, since such fragment could be regarded as a real fact of language, giving the text the authority associated with its author. That was actually a rhetorical expedient largely used in the grammatical domain, in order to ratify a rule or to authorize any language deviation (a figure of speech). In this way, the quotation of certain authors in the grammatical text, besides meeting specific explanatory requirements of the grammatical topic under analysis, would also correspond to the importance of that linguistic register for the purpose of the grammatical work, contributing, as a consequence, to the formulation or consolidation of a literary canon (BARATIN, 2011; FORTES, 2014).

In sum, the fragments used as examples by the ancient grammarians promoted a two-fold representation of language. Firstly, their function was associated to the explanation of linguistic facts, being true and authentic representations of “facts of language” by which one could understand and assess a rule or a grammatical exception (that is to say, by which one could ratify the analogical aspect of language or understand one of its anomalies). Secondly, the fragments also fostered cultural representations, standing for the standard of language to be favored along the grammatical teaching, a reference for the proper use of language, thereby collaborating for the definition of a “language norm”, the *hellenismós* (DESBORDES, 2007, p. 93).

Jean Lalot (2007, 59) comments that the examples and quotations in the work of Apollonius are clearly detached from the grammatical theoretical text, being introduced, for the most part, through two technical

terms: 1) *hypodeigma* (noun derived from the verb *hypodeiknumai*, which meant, among other meanings, “to show, to illustrate, to indicate, to teach”); 2) through the verb *paratithestai* (and its derived name *paréthesis*, which, among other meanings, have those of “example, quotation”).

While the first term seems to introduce *exempla* and quotations which have a primarily illustrative and argumentative function (as in *Adv.* 120,14, 121,27, 130,12, *Synt.*, I 107), the second seems to propose examples and quotations with demonstrative function. This second kind of examples would help enhance the validity of some linguistic ideas (as in *Synt.*, II, 79, III, 61). Although numerous throughout Apollonius’ work, the use of examples is relatively restricted to what is necessary to the argument. The grammarian does not present examples in profusion, nor proposes an exhaustive sample of facts of the language. The reason for this is simple: although a plethora of examples could be offered for every grammatical principle, supporting the general principles of grammar exclusively by the force of examples would denote some theoretical weakness (LALLOT, 2007, p. 62). On the other hand, for Apollonius, the strength of his theory of language would lie on the logical principles themselves (in the *lógos*), not in the empirical demonstration. In spite of this, different kinds of *exempla* and fragments are found in his work, varying according to their function in the text, as we see in the table below, where we also indicate an example of each one in the text of *Perì syntáxeos*:

TABLE 1 – Kinds of examples in Apollonius Dyscolus

KINDS OF EXAMPLES	OCCURENCY IN THE TEXT
1. Illustrative examples	<i>Synt.</i> I, 2-11
2. Examples of phrases manipulated in function of the grammatical argument	<i>Synt.</i> I, 53-56
3. Examples to refute a false idea	<i>Synt.</i> III, 35-41
4. Poetic examples that reveal an exception to a grammatical rule	<i>Synt.</i> I, 62-64
5. Poetic examples to analyze a philological issue	<i>Synt.</i> I, 152-153
6. Examples produced <i>ad hoc</i> to explain a more advanced rule of language	<i>Synt.</i> III, 83-87

Source: LALLOT, 2007

From the table above, we notice that Apollonius' examples, according to the proposed classification, respond to a variety of argumentative needs, in order to reinforce the theses on the Greek syntax proposed by the grammarian. It is important to note that among the six types, at least two of them (4 and 5) constitute the genre of what we can call fragments (or quotations). These examples would properly have a philological function in the text, although their relevance for grammatical explanation cannot be dismissed. They correspond to philological examples as they collaborate for the discussion and fixation of textual lessons, as well as for the consecration of a literary *corpus* in the grammatical discourse. The permanence of this *corpus* of fragments within the grammatical text may also have contributed to the elaboration (and preservation) of a canon of authors studied during Alexandrian times.

3 The making of a model of language

It is true that Apollonius has never abandoned the principles of Stoic logic as the conceptual framework for his grammatical thinking, such as the Stoic theory of meaning (FREDE, 1987) or the partition of the *logos* in sub-categories (BLANK, 1982). However, as Sluiter (1990) shows, both traditions are equally present in the work of Apollonius, so that the "tyranny of writing" proper to philology guides the thematic choices and even the logic analysis.

The philological dimension of *Perì Syntáxeos* can also be remarked in some characteristics of this work, as presented by Becares Botas (1987, p. 46).⁹ Besides these characteristics, there are also some digressions throughout the four books, in which issues of logical-

⁹ According to Becares Botas (1987), the following aspects can be accounted for a "philological dimension" of Apollonius' work: (i) the philological character of the initial justification for the study of Greek syntax (the necessity of explaining the poems); (ii) the parallelism carried out between syntactical explanations and orthography (which would indicate some preoccupation related to the writing of manuscripts); (iii) many references to philologists (Zenodotus, Aristarchus, Tryphon, among others) with whom Apollonius kept a sometimes productive, sometimes polemical dialogue; (iv) the existence of theoretical remarks which result in the exegesis of Homer (that is revealed, for example, in the observations of particularities of Homeric language).

grammatical order are connected to problems related to philology, as for instance in the following passages:

- *Synt.* I, 60-64: Apollonius shows that problems related to the textual tradition (such as the occurrence of *eírekas* or *eírekes* in a given text could be solved on the basis of the syntactic theory (60-62);
- *Synt.* II, 28-36: the observation of an idiosyncrasy in the use of articles in Homer. In the Homeric work, there is a pronominal use of articles: when the reference is something unknown, in Homeric language the article may have the value of a definite pronoun (*hoûtos*). Other particular observations regarding typical language uses in Homer are also in *Synt.* II, 95-102; III, 63-65;
- *Synt.* III, 152-154: the observation of verbs that only have the passive voice in the third person helps to elucidate a textual problem in Pindar.

The passages listed above show crucial moments in Apollonius' work in which concepts derived from a strictly syntactic discussion are taken to understand philological problems, whether linked to Homer's reading or linked to the critical establishment of texts (such as Pindar's). Thus, even though most of the literary fragments appear to be merely auxiliary to a grammatical lesson, as a whole they produce the effect intended by the grammarian in his introduction: to collaborate for the explanation of the poems. Moreover, the *corpus* of fragments quoted also informs us about the model of language pursued by the grammarian, otherwise, such idealized language would be far too abstract without any example for reference. In addition, they form a canon of authors whose explanation (*exégesis*), might also be intended by Apollonius through his investigation of the syntactical phenomena (phenomena) of Greek language.

Apollonius mentions 22 authors throughout the *Perì Syntáxeos*, effectively giving excerpts from 19 authors, between Greek poets and prose writers. The authors who are exclusively alluded (whose texts are not actually quoted in the text) comprise philologists and philosophers. If Lallot's (1997) identification of them is accurate, there are references of philologists and philosophers from the fifth century BC (with the only one mention to Plato), to authors from the third century AD (with

the allusion of the philologist Seleucus of Alexandria). (See TABLE 2, below).

TABLE 2 – Allusions to philosophers and philologists in the *Peri Synt*

ALLUSION TO AUTHORS CENTURIES	TEXTUAL REFERENCES
Aristarchus of Samothrace, c. III-II BC.	<i>Synt.</i> I, 4, 6, 83, 127-128; II, 15, 64, 125, 150, 152
Aristophanes of Byzantium, c. III-II BC.	<i>Synt.</i> IV, 11
Comanus, c. III-II BC.	<i>Synt.</i> II, 99
Habron, c. III-II BC.	<i>Synt.</i> I, 101; II, 15, 53, 68, 151-152; III, 45
Heraclides of Miletus, c. I-II AD.	<i>Synt.</i> IV, 56, 61
Plato, c. V-IV BC.	<i>Synt.</i> II, 150
Posidonius of Apamea, c. II-I BC.	<i>Synt.</i> IV, 65
Seleucus of Alexandria, c. I BC-I AD.	<i>Synt.</i> II, 130
Tryphon of Alexandria, c. I BC-I AD.	<i>Synt.</i> I, 50, 52, 74-75, 78, 84, 106, 136; II, 133, 148; III, 3, 5; IV, 6, 36
Zenodotus of Ephesus, c. IV-III BC.	<i>Synt.</i> I, 6, 62; II, 125, 126, 129; III, 48
The Stoics – séc. III a.C-II d.C (?)	<i>Synt.</i> I, 50, 111; III, 155; IV, 5, 27

Source: LALLOT, 2007.

The table above suggests that Apollonius may have promoted a theoretical debate by confronting his philological views with the lessons from those Alexandrian grammarians and philologists alluded. The opposition between the positions of Aristophanes, Aristarchus and his critics such as Habron and Tryphon also suggests the controversial character of the Alexandrian philological studies. On the other hand, these comments also represent evidence that the grammatical theory of Apollonius, even though intended to be based strictly on logical principles, had the philologists, not the Stoic philosophers, as privileged interlocutors. In fact, the Stoic philosophers were mentioned only in three occasions and were not even named by Apollonius, while philologists and grammarians, as the table shows, have been mentioned in 41 different occasions.

While there is no fragment from philologists, philosophers and grammarians in Apollonius' text, therein lies a great amount of verses and fragments of literary prose from different Greek authors, making up

a much broader temporal arc. In all, there are 17 different authors whose texts are effectively quoted, as well as some fragments of unidentified texts (see TABLE 3).

TABLE 3 – Quotations of authors in the *Peri Synt*¹⁰

FRAGMENTS CENTURIES	TEXTUAL REFERENCES
Alcaeus, c. VII-VI BC.	Fr. 308b,1 Loebel-Page, <i>Synt.</i> I, 154
Alcman, c. VII BC.	Fr. 14(a) Page-Davies: <i>Synt.</i> I, 3; fr. 70(c): II, 89, 100; frag. 87(a-e): IV, 61; fr. 105: III, 31; fr. 168 (duvidoso) doubtful : II, 77.
Anacreon, c. VI-V BC.	Fr. 3,6 Page: <i>Synt.</i> I, 92; fr. 364: III, 74
Aratus of Soli, c. III BC.	<i>Phen.</i> 24-25: <i>Synt.</i> I, 157
Aristophanes, c. V-IV BC.	<i>Assemb.</i> , 155: <i>Synt.</i> I, 84
Bacchylides, c. VI-V BC.	<i>Epin.</i> fr. 13, 17 Irigoin: <i>Synt.</i> II, 161
Callimachus, c. IV-III BC.	<i>Aetia</i> I frag. 1,21 Pfeiffer: <i>Synt.</i> IV, 10; fr. 28: I, 99; <i>Aetia</i> II, fr. 43, 44 Pf.: <i>Synt.</i> I, 70. <i>Inc. lib.</i> fr. 114,5: <i>Synt.</i> I, 99; <i>Epigr.</i> 21,1: <i>Synt.</i> II, 27; 48,1: <i>Synt.</i> IV, 74; 114,5: <i>Synt.</i> I, 99; <i>Iamb.</i> I fr. 191,47: <i>Synt.</i> III, 43; fr. de atribuição duvidosa a Cal.: fr. 728: <i>Synt.</i> II, 127 e 129; fr. 729-730: <i>Synt.</i> IV, 74; fr. 813: <i>Synt.</i> II, 87
Demosthenes, c. IV BC.	<i>Cor.</i> 39 e 77: <i>Synt.</i> I, 67; 51: <i>Synt.</i> IV, 36
Aeschines, c. IV BC.	<i>Tim.</i> 9: <i>Synt.</i> IV, 32
Hesiod, c. VIII-VII BC.	<i>Trab.</i> 29: <i>Synt.</i> IV, 51; 198: <i>Synt.</i> I, 84; III, 28
Homer, c. VIII BC.	From the <i>Iliad</i> : 1.1 : I 118, III 66; 2 : I 149, II 85, III 49; 8 : II 130; 11 : I 108; 12 : I 25, II 28; 18 : I 20, II 58; 20 : I 20, I 129, II 58; 56 : III 30; 68 : I 12; 84 : I 25, II 28; 131 : III 127; 180 : III 174; 271 : II 91; 286 : III 93; 295 : I 62 (bis) e 64; 336 : II 128; 396 : II 128; 415s. : III 97 (bis); 524 : III 133, IV 62. – <i>et alia</i> (LALLOT, 1997, 450). From the <i>Odyssey</i> : 1.1 : I 117, I 149, III 66; 1-2 : II 85; 7 : I 104; 8s. : III 133; 10 : II 64; 23s. : I 155; 40 : II 127; 45 : III 43; 69 : II 127; 81 : III 43; 115 : III 169; 182 : I 118; 185 : I 118; 225 : I 128; 247 : IV 4, IV 10; 409 : I 104, III 49. – <i>et alia</i> (LALLOT, 1997 450-451).

¹⁰ Approximate historical references based on Lesky (1995) and Harvey (1987); textual references according to Lallot (1997, p. 449-451), leaving aside only the references to the last pages of Apollonius' *Peri Epirrhem*. It is important to notice that all the books in Homeric poems are cited in Apollonius' text. Besides, according to Dalimier (2001, p. 477-480), in Apollonius' *Peri sundésmon*, there are 45 quotations of Homeric texts, this being therefore also the most quoted author in this small treatise.

Menander, c. IV-III BC.	<i>Arb.</i> : <i>Synt.</i> III, 183; fr. 664 Koerte: <i>Synt.</i> I, 73; II, 107
Pindar, c. VI-V BC.	<i>Ol.</i> 2,43 Snell: <i>Synt.</i> III, 154; <i>Ol.</i> 4,24: <i>Synt.</i> III, 2; fr. 5: <i>Synt.</i> II, 114; fr. 75, 18: <i>Synt.</i> III, 50; fr. 163: <i>Synt.</i> II, 148
Sappho, c. VIII BC.	Fr. 16,3-4 Loebel-Page: <i>Synt.</i> III, 172; fr. 33: <i>Synt.</i> III, 94
Sophocles, c. V BC.	<i>Ajax</i> 977 = 996: <i>Synt.</i> I, 73; III, 34; fr. 753 Radt: <i>Synt.</i> I, 3
Sophron, c. VII BC.	<i>Mim.</i> fr. 98 Kaibel = 106 Olivieri: <i>Synt.</i> IV, 62
Theocritus, c. IV-III BC.	Fr. VII 2: <i>Synt.</i> II, 69
Unidentified authors	<i>Corpus paremiographicum</i> , II Leutstch-Schneidewin: <i>Synt.</i> II, 27; <i>Lyr. adesp.</i> III, p. 742 Bergk: <i>Synt.</i> II, 114; III, 2; IV, 4, 8.

Source: LALLOT, 2007

As for the epoch of the authors quoted in the work of Apollonius, it is possible to see that they form a temporal arc extending from the 8th century BC, with Homer and Hesiod, until the third century BC, with the poets Aratus of Soli, Callimachus and Theocritus, this last one closer to the comedy playwright Menander. While the fragments cover a vast period of the Greek literature, including authors from what is commonly called the *archaic age* (such as the poets Alcaeus, Alcman, Homer, Hesiod, Sappho, Sophron), the *classical age* (Aristophanes, Bacchylides, Demosthenes, Sophocles) and the *Hellenistic age* (as Aratus, Callimachus and Theocritus), the outstanding majority of quotations comes from Homer.

Homer's epic poems are quoted 355 times in the text, out of a total of 406 citations, which represents more than 87% of all quotations in Apollonius' text.¹¹ The authors from the Hellenistic period are quoted only 18 times, representing a little more than 4% of the total amount of references. Among these, the temporally closest to Apollonius (*sc.* Aratus and Menander) were already about four of five centuries distant from Apollonius' times. Thus, the table of quotations above allows us to

¹¹ These numbers may vary from one analysis to other, considering also different editions. Householder (1981), for instance, comes to slightly different figures: "The majority of these (over a thousand) are quoted from ancient writers, especially poets, Homer alone accounting for at least 800, but about 400 examples are sentences made up by Dyscolus."

reaffirm that the model of language chosen as exemplary by Apollonius was a literary language of the past, whose main representative *corpus* was the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. Moreover, there is a large gap from the second century BC to the second century AD, lacking representative fragments for authors from this period. Such gap is almost as large as the period represented by the fragments presented (as we have seen, from approximately the 8th century AD to the 3rd century BC). As for the literary genres, the epic genre stands out, being represented mainly by the Homeric poems. In addition to the epic, there are also quotations from melic poets (Alcman, Anacreon, Alcaeus, Pindar, Sappho and Bacchylides), epigram (Callimachus), bucolic genre (Theocritus), mime/pantomime (Sophron) and Attic prose (Demosthenes and Aeschines) (PEREIRA, 2012; LESKY, 1995).¹²

Although this picture allows us to recognize some variation in the authors quoted, from both the chronological and literary point of view, the quotations of Homer display a much bigger figure. The prominence of Homeric quotations underlines the importance that his writings had received since the third century BC in the Alexandrian textual criticism (REYNOLDS; WILSON, 1991). The prevalence of Homer's quotations also reinforces the affiliation of Apollonius' treatise to the Alexandrian philological tradition (even if, from the properly theoretical point of view, his grammar could be better associated with the reflections on language carried out by the Stoic philosophers – LUHTALA, 2000; ILDEFONSE, 1997). Notwithstanding, the frank and open debate with philological approaches, as well as the great display of textual problems shown in the numerous quotations from the Homeric work, lead us to relativize the well consolidated assumption of the *Perì Syntáxeos* as an essentially rationalist grammar (a development of logical principles of language previously stated by Stoic philosophers).

¹² Notice that it is very difficult to establish categorically to which gender some fragment belong. For the analysis, we chose those genders generally admitted by the History of Greek Literature (cf. LESKY, 1995; BOWIE, 2004; PEREIRA, 2012). Of course, nothing could be said about the unidentified authors.

So, alongside the logical dimension of Apollonius' grammar, which nevertheless cannot anyway be entirely neglected, the quotations of poets within the text make it visible what we would call a 'philological interest' in Apollonius' reflections. The wide panel of texts effectively quoted seems to conduct the attention of the reader to textual and reading issues especially regarding Homer's work. In other words, it implies that Apollonius would never have in mind neither to provide us with a neutral and objective description of the Greek syntax, nor to speculate about the functioning of his contemporary Greek language. The focus was to describe the syntax of the Greek language, but it has been done in order to enhance the reading of poets, as the passage below make clear:

It is necessary to talk about those elements which, as far as form goes, are articles, but undergo a transposition and become pronouns, such as: ὁ γὰρ ἦλθε θοὰς ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν [*Il.*I, 12], [in which we see ὁ] standing for οὗτος.

And also:

τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος [*Il.* I, 84: "answering to this one"]

ὡς ἡ ῥίμφα θεούσα [*Od.* XIII, 88, "so, this <the vessel> going foward fast]

Also in:

εἵνεκα τῆς ἀρετῆς ἐριδαίνομεν,

[*Od.* II, 206, "we shall rivalry for her excellence"]

The article *tēs* undergoes a transposition to *taútes*, and must be supplementary to an article.¹³

(*Synt.* II, 28, 1-13)

¹³ Cf. Ρητέον δὲ καὶ περὶ τῶν τῆ φωνῆ ἄρθρων καθεστώτων, τῆ ἐ ἐξ αὐτῶν μεταλήψει ἀντωνυμιῶν,

ὁ γὰρ ἦλθε θοὰς ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν {A 12} ἀντι τοῦ οὗτος

τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος {e. g. A 84}

ὡς ἡ ῥίμφα θεούσα {v 88}

εἵνεκα τῆς ἀρετῆς ἐριδαίνομεν {β 206},

ὁ μεταλαμβάνεται μὲν εἰς τὸ ταύτης, προσλαμβάνει δὲ ἕξωθεν δεόντως τὸ ἄρθρον

In this brief passage, in which we observe four quotations from Homer, Apollonius intends to show an idiosyncrasy in the use of articles observed in the Homeric work. This is the phenomenon called “transposition” (*metálepsis*), which means the change in the grammatical status of a word accordingly to the condition of use (such concept is also defined in *Synt.* I, 25). In this case, the articles present in the quotations of Homer would not display the typical function of determinants of a nominal phrase (*i.e.* they were not within the scope of a nominal phrase) and therefore must be reanalyzed as anaphoric referents of a previously expressed word, a function paradigmatically performed by the Greek demonstrative pronouns (*hoútos, haúte, toúto*).

In this way, at first sight, Apollonius’ commentary might be understood as one more remark on a strictly grammatical property of the Greek language, that is, the syntactic-semantic poly-categorization of a word within the linguistic system. However, at a second glance, when we contrast such theoretical remarks to the quotations of Homer actually present in the passage (and we have nothing less than 4 different phrases and verses of Homer), we may assume that Apollonius’ basic concern must have been to understand not the general syntax of the Greek language, but the syntax useful to reading this specific passage of Homer. Thus, Homer’s citations here are more than a field of evidence or a sign of authority to Apollonius’ argumentation, they also seem to be the very object of analysis, insofar as (as long as) the elucidation of the grammatical principle contributes to their correct interpretation.¹⁴

5 Final remarks

Apollonius’ quotations of fragments from poets and writers along the *Perì Syntáxeos* put Homer’s work in prominence. It is possible to admit that such quotations are conveyed in accordance with the grammatical gender, and, in such sense, they would help Apollonius

¹⁴ As suggested by the anonymous referee of this article, a further development of this thesis is required. It is my intention to accept the suggestion of developing it further in another article.

propose his theoretical explanations on the Greek syntax (for instance serving to make an illustration, demonstrate a logical principle, exemplify an anomaly etc.). However, as we have seen, the proliferation of passages of poets reproduced in Apollonius' syntax also reinforces its 'philological orientation'. In this sense, not only is Homer (and other authors of the past) put at the service of discussions concerning their textual lessons (for which the grammatical explanations can be seen as complimentary), but they also manage to provide the public of Apollonius with a showcase of occurrences of poetic language use, contributing therefore, to propose a linguistic standard for grammar study.

Thus, along with the grammatical theory itself, the collection of fragments quoted in the *Peri Syntáxeqs* help characterize Apollonius as a philologist belonging to the Alexandrian tradition, a scholar in dialogue with the predecessor philologists and grammarians, such as Aristarchus of Samothrace, Aristophanes of Byzantium, Seleucus of Alexandria, among others actually mentioned in Apollonius' work. Moreover, the variation of quotations from poets and prose writers, from different periods and literary genres, contributes to the consolidation of a canon of literary works and authors that would become the models of the Greek language available to posterity.

References

APOLLONIUS DYSCOLUS. *Appolonii Dyscoli quae supersunt*. In: SCHNEIDER, R.; UHLIG, G. (org.). *Grammatici Graeci*, 1-3. Leipzig: Teubner, 1878-1910 [Republished: Hildesheim: Olms, 1965].

APOLLONIUS DYSCOLUS. *De la construction*. Edição e tradução de J. Lallot. Paris: Vrin, 1997. 2 v.

APOLLONIUS DYSCOLUS. *Sintaxis*. Introdução, tradução de notas de Vicente Bécares Botas. Madri: Gredos, 1987.

APOLLONIUS DYSCOLUS. *The Syntax of Apollonius Dyscolus*. Translated and with commentary by Fred W. Householder. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1981. (Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science, III: Studies in the History of Linguistics, 23).

BARATIN, M. La littérature comme performance de textes techniques: les *Artes grammaticae* antiques. In: CONGRESSO NACIONAL DE ESTUDOS CLÁSSICOS, XVIII., 2011, Rio de Janeiro. Rio de Janeiro: SBEC, 2011. (Conferência de encerramento).

BECARES BOTAS, V. Introducción. In: APOLÔNIO DÍSCOLO. *Sintaxis*. Introdução, tradução de notas de Vicente Bécares Botas. Madrid: Gredos, 1987. p. 9-70.

BLANK, D. *Ancient Philosophy and Grammar*. Chico – California: Scholars Press, 1982.

BLANK, D. Apollonius Dyscolus and Herodian. In: BROWN, K. (ed.). *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. 2. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Elsevier, 2006. p. 327-329. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/B0-08-044854-2/01338-9>.

BLANK, D. The organization of grammar in ancient Greece. In: AUROUX, S. (org.). *History of the Language Sciences/Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaften/Histoire des sciences du langage*. Berlin/Nova York: Walter de Gruyter, 2000. v. 1, p. 400-416.

BOWIE, E. L. Greek Literature after 50 B.C. In: DOVER, K. *et al.* *Ancient Greek Literature*. 2. ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

COLOMBAT, B. La construction, la manipulation de l'exemple et ses effets sur la description dans la tradition grammaticale latine. *Langages*, [S.l.] n. 166, p. 71-85, 2007. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3917/lang.166.0071>.

DALIMIER, C. *Apollonius Discole, Traité des Conjonctions*. Introduction, texte, traduction et commentaire. Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 2001.

DESBORDES, F. *Idées grecques et romaines sur le langage : travaux d'histoire et d'épistémologie*. Lyon: ENS Editions, 2007.

FORTES, F. *Non solum fama: os exempla de Prisciano na construção de um cânon literário*. In: LEITE, L. R. *et al.* (org.). *Fama e infâmia no mundo antigo*. Vitória: PPGL, 2014. p. 76-82.

FORTES, F. *Sintaxe greco-romana: Apolônio Díscolo e Prisciano de Cesareia na história do pensamento gramatical antigo*. 2012. 406f. Tese (Doutorado em Linguística) – IEL/UNICAMP, Campinas, 2012.

FREDE, M. *Essays in Ancient Philosophy*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987. p. 301-359.

HARVEY, Paul. *Dicionário Oxford de Literatura Clássica*. Tradução de Mário da Gama Kury. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar, 1987.

HOUSEHOLDER, F. W. Apollonius Dyscolus and Herodian. In: KOERNER, E. F. K.; ASHER, R. E. (ed.). *Concise History of the Language Science: from the Sumerians to the Cognitivists*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995. p. 111-115. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-042580-1.50022-2>.

ILDEFONSE, F. *La naissance de la grammaire dans l'Antiquité grecque*. Paris: Vrin, 1997.

LALLOT, J. Dis-moi comment tu traites les exemples, je te dirai quel grammarien tu es: application à Apollonius Dyscole. *Langages*, [S.l.], n. 166, p. 57-70, 2007/2. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3917/lang.166.0058>.

LALLOT, J. Entre Apollonius et Planude: Priscien passeur. In: BARATIN, M. et al. (org.). *Priscien: transmission et refondation de la grammaire. De l'Antiquité aux modernes*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2009. 153-166. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1484/M.SA-EB.3.1209>.

LALLOT, J. Notes et index. In: APOLÔNIO DÍSCOLO. *De la construction*. Edição e tradução de J. Lallot. Paris: Vrin, 1997. v. 2

LAMBERT, F. La linguistique grecque chez les alexandrins: Aristophane de Byzance et Aristarque. In: AUROUX, S. (org.). *History of the language Sciences/Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaften/Histoire des sciences du langage*. Berlin/Nova York: Walter de Gruyter, 2000. v. 1, p. 385-393.

LESKY, A. *História da Literatura Grega*. Tradução de Manuel Losa. Lisboa: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, 1995.

LUHTALA, A. *On the Origin of Syntactical Description in Stoic Logic*. Münster: Nodus Publikationen, 2000.

MARTINHO, M. Dionísio da Trácia, Arte. *Letras Clássicas*, São Paulo, n. 11, p. 153-179, 2007. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.11606/issn.2358-3150.v0i11p153-179>.

MÜLLER, M. *Vorlesungen über die Wissenschaft der Sprache*. Leipzig: Verlag Von Gustav Mayer, 1875. v. 1

PEREIRA, M. H. R. *Estudos de história da cultura clássica*. 11. ed. Edição revista e ampliada. Lisboa: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, 2012. v. I: Cultura grega.

PFEIFFER, R. *History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginnings to the End of Hellenistic Age*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1968.

REYNOLDS, L. D.; WILSON, N. G. *Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature*. 3. ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.

SCHMIDHAUSER, A. Le *De pronomine* de Priscien et son modèle grec. In: BARATIN, M. *et al.* (org.). *Priscien: transmission et refondation de la grammaire. De l'Antiquité aux modernes*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2009. 167-181. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1484/M.SA-EB.3.1210>.

SLUITER, I. *Ancient grammar in context*. Contributions to the study of Ancient Linguistic Theory. Amsterdam: VU Press, 1990.

UHLIG, G. Die τέχνη γραμματικαί des Apollonios und Herodian. *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, Köln, v. 25, n. 1, p. 66-75, 1870.

WEST, M. L. *Crítica textual e técnica editorial*. Lisboa: Calouste Gulbenkian, 2002.

Recebido em: 27 de maio de 2020.

Aprovado em: 17 de julho de 2020.