A Textual Note on *Epim. Hom.* α 268 Dyck (Vol. II)

Federico Favi

Oriel College, University of Oxford

federico.favi@classics.ox.ac.uk

Received May 2019 | Accepted August 2019

The gloss *Epim. Hom.* α 268 Dyck (Vol. II)¹ is entirely devoted to αὐτή. The central section deals with the eight peculiarities of αὐτός. For the sake of the present discussion, it is only needed to report the first five:

ἔχει δὲ διαφορὰς ὁκτὼ μόνον τῶν μονοπροσώπων· (1) ἔστι μόνον ἀναφορικὸν τῶν ἄλλων καὶ δεικτικῶν οὐσῶν καὶ ἀναφορικῶν· οὗτος ἐκεῖνος {καὶ δεῖξις καὶ ἀναφορά}· καὶ πίστις τούτου, ὅτι οὐκ ἀνεδέξατο τὴν διὰ τοῦ ι ἐπέκτασιν· (2) μόνη τῶν μονοπροσώπων ὀξύνηται· (3) μόνη δὲ τῶν ἀντωνυμιῶν ἀπὸ μακρᾶς ἀρχομένη ψιλοῦται· (4) μόνη ἐξ ἀντωνυμιῶν δεδιπλασίασται· αὐτὸς αὐτός· (5) μόνη καὶ κωμωδίᾳ ἐπιτέτακται· αὐτότερος αὐτότατος.

Alone among the personal pronouns, (αὐτός) has eight peculiarities. (1) It is only anaphoric, whereas the others are both deictic and anaphoric, (such as) οὗτος and ἐκεῖνος. And the proof of this is that αὐτός did not admit of the suffixation -ι. (2) Only this among the personal pronouns is oxytone. (3) Only this among the pronouns, though beginning with a long first syllable, does not have the aspiration. (4) Only this among the pronouns is duplicated: αὐτὸς αὐτός. (5) Only this is imposed to comedy: αὐτότερος αὐτότατος.

The fifth peculiarity poses some textual problems.² The manuscripts of the *Epimerismi Homerici* unanimously transmit the text above. Dyck does not

1 Dyck 1995, 153-154.

2 Other grammatical texts discuss the forms αὐτότερος and αὐτότατος: Apollonius Dyscolus, *Pronouns* (ed. Schneider, *Grammatici Graeci* vol. II.1 p. 63.20 = Brandenburg 2005, 399): σύγκρισιν τε καὶ παραγωγὴν ἀνεδέξατο [sc. τὸ αὐτός], ὡς ἐν Ἀλκυονεῖ [-όνι cod.] 'Επίχαρμος αὐτότερος αὐτῶν [fr. 1] ('αὐτός admitted of degrees of comparison (see note on p. 3) and derivation'); *Scholia Marciana in Dionysii Thracis artem grammaticam* (ed. Hilgard, *Grammatici*

emend κωμωδίᾳ ἐπιτέτακται, but the paradosis makes little sense.³ Schneider suggested emending ἐπιτέτακται into ἐπιτέταται⁴ (ἐπιτείνω ‘intensify’ being common grammatical vocabulary),⁵ in which case the reference would be to the comparative αὐτότερος and superlative αὐτότατος. Schneider’s conjecture is very reasonable and should be accepted without further ado (thus also K-A *ad* Epich. fr. 1). Ludwich’s emendation κἂν <τῇ> κωμωδίᾳ⁶ for transmitted καὶ κωμωδίᾳ would make sense of the isolated dative, but ‘also in comedy’ remains puzzling, especially since forms like αὐτότερος and αὐτότατος are admittedly only attested in comedy (see below; K-A *ad* Epich. fr. 1 do not accept this emendation either). The position of καὶ after μόνη at the beginning of the sentence makes it unlikely that καὶ may be linking this section of the gloss with the preceding one, and therefore καὶ is more likely to be taken with what follows.⁷ Besides, all entries in the *Epimerismi* gloss are introduced by a bare μόνη (except the third one, which is connected to the preceding one with δέ), and only the subsections within the sixth and ninth peculiarity are linked to one another with connectives. Another possibility would be to emend the paradosis into εἰ καὶ ἐν κωμωδίᾳ. Together with Schneider’s ἐπιτέταται, the resulting text would be:

μόνη, εἰ καὶ ἐν κωμωδίᾳ, ἐπιτέταται· αὐτότερος αὐτότατος.

Only this [*sc.* ἀντωνυμία ‘pronoun’, i.e. αὐτός], albeit in comedy, is intensified: αὐτότερος αὐτότατος.

The corruption process behind μόνη εἰ καὶ ἐν κωμωδίᾳ > μόνη καὶ κωμωδίᾳ is straightforward, and may be easily explained through vocalic homophony in Byzantine Greek (εἰ because of the final vowel in μόνη, ἐν because of preceding καί).

Graeci, vol. I.3, p. 372.23): παρὰ Ἀριστοφάνει [*Plut.* 83] τὸ αὐτότατος καὶ παρὰ Μενάνδρῳ τὸ φαίτωτατος† [αὐται· Kock 1888, 250] [fr. 651]· τὸ δὲ αὐτότερος παρ’ Ἐπιχάρμῳ πέπαικται [fr. 1] (‘αὐτότατος is in Aristophanes and φαίτωτατος† in Menander. αὐτότερος in Epicharmus is a jocular form’); *Scholia vetera in Aristophanis Plutum* (ed. Chantry, line 83 = *Sud.* α 4529 Adler): ἡ αὐτότατος ἀντωνυμία πέπαικται κωμικῶς (‘the pronoun αὐτότατος is a jocular form in a comic fashion’). See further *Scholia vetera in Aristophanis Plutum* (ed. Chantry, line 83, a-c-d-e).

3 Dyck 1995, 153.

4 Schneider 1902, 88.

5 See Dickey 2007, 238.

6 Ludwich 1902, col. 806.

7 One may compare the use of καὶ in the seventh peculiarity, i.e. μόνη ἐξ ἀντωνυμιῶν καὶ ἴδια σημαίνόμενα ἔσχεν (‘only this among the pronouns also had its peculiar meanings’).

The implication of the concessive clause εἰ καὶ ἐν κωμῳδίᾳ⁸ would be to say that αὐτός is indeed peculiar, in that this is the only pronoun which has a comparative (αὐτότερος) and a superlative (αὐτότατος), but that these forms should not be taken at face value, since they are only used in comedy, where they serve a comic purpose. Such an observation is well paralleled in the other grammatical sources discussing αὐτότερος and αὐτότατος, see Apollonius Dyscolus, *Pronouns* (ed. Schneider, *Grammatici Graeci* vol. II.I p. 64.11 = Brandenburg 2005, 400-401): ἔνεκα γελοίου ἢ κωμῳδία σχήματά τινα ἔπλασεν, ὥστε οὐ κριτήριον τῆς λέξεως τὸ αὐτότερος, ἐπεὶ καὶ Δαναώτατος ὑπερτίθεται παρὰ Ἀριστοφάνει, τῶν κυρίων οὐ συγκρινομένων ('comedy created some forms for comic purpose, so that αὐτότερος is not a means to judge to which part of speech the form (sc. αὐτός) belongs,⁹ since Δαναώτατος too is created as a superlative in Aristophanes, though proper names do not have degrees of comparison'); *Scholia Marciana in Dionysii Thracis artem grammaticam* (ed. Hilgard, *Grammatici Graeci* vol. I.3 p. 372.25): τὸ δὲ αὐτότερος παρ' Ἐπιχάρμῳ πέπαικται ('αὐτότερος in Epicharmus is a jocular form'); *Scholia vetera in Aristophanis Plutum* (ed. Chantry, line 83 = *Sud.* α 4529 Adler): ἡ αὐτότατος ἀντωνυμία πέπαικται κωμικῶς ('the pronoun αὐτότατος is a jocular form in a comic fashion'). Interestingly, this doctrine has influenced the Latin grammarian Pompeius who discusses the comic superlative *ipsissimus* in Plautus and Afranius¹⁰ (*Pompeii commentum artis Donati*, ed. Keil, *Grammatici Latini* V p. 153.13: *ergo vides, quae nomina conparantur: quae sunt qualitatis et quantitatis. ea autem, quae non sunt qualitatis et quantitatis, non recipiunt comparationem. ne te decipiant illa Plautina* [Tr. 988] *et Afraniana* [432 CRF] *verba, ipsissimus; ioco comico hoc dixit. est etiam apud Graecos αὐτότατος* [Ar. Pl. 83] *tale. comica sunt ista et ad artem non pertinent*, 'therefore you see which names have degrees of comparison: those which express a quality or a quantity. Whereas those which do not, do not have degrees of comparison. Do not be misled by the word *ipsissimus* used by Plautus and

8 For the use of concessive εἰ καὶ in the *Epimerismi Homerici* one may compare e.g. *Epim. Hom.* ε 100 Dyck (Vol. II): ἔρματα ... ἢ παρὰ τὸ ἔρεισμα κατὰ συγκοπήν ἔρμα. καὶ διὰ τί τὸ μὲν ἔρεισμα ψιλοῦται, τὸ δὲ ἔρμα δασύνεται; τὰ βραχέα φωνήεντα καταλήγοντα εἰς ρ ἐπιφερομένου τοῦ μ δασύνονται, οἷον ὄρμος ὀρμή ἄρμα Ἑρμῆς· τῇ συντάξει οὖν τῶν συμφώνων δασύνεται, εἰ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἔρεισμά ἐστίν ('ἔρματα ... or it is created from ἔρεισμα by syncopation. And why does ἔρεισμα not have the aspiration, whereas ἔρμα does? Short vowels before ρ take the aspiration when ρ follows, as in ὄρμος ὀρμή ἄρμα Ἑρμῆς. ἔρμα therefore takes the aspiration because of the combination of consonants, even though it is from ἔρεισμα').

9 On this last sentence, see Schneider 1910, 219 and Brandenburg 2005, 401.

10 This form is also attested in Petronius (63,3; 69,3; 75,11; 76,1; see Schmeling 2011, 260).

Afranius. The poet used this form for a comic purpose. In Greek too αὐτότατος is such. These are comic forms, and do not pertain to the grammar’).¹¹

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to Luigi Battezzato and the anonymous referee for their valuable advice and to Il-Kweon Sir and Theodore Hill for improving the English. I am solely responsible for any remaining error or misjudgements. This research was funded by a British Academy Postdoctoral Fellowship.

Bibliography

- Brandenburg, P. (2005). *Apollonius Dyskolos, Über das Pronomen. Einführung, Text, Übersetzung und Erläuterungen*. München/Leipzig.
- Dickey, E. (2007). *Ancient Greek Scholarship. A Guide to Finding, Reading, and Understanding Scholia, Commentaries, Lexica and Grammatical Treaties, from their Beginnings to the Byzantine Period*. Oxford.
- Dyck, A.R. (1995). *Epimerismi Homerici. Pars Altera: Epimerismos continens qui ordine alphabetico traditi sunt. Lexicon AIMΩΔΕIN quod vocatur seu verius ETYMOΛΟΓΙΑΙ ΔΙΑΦΟΡΟΙ*. Berlin/New York.
- Kock, T. (1888). *Comicorum Atticorum Fragmenta, Vol. 3: Novae comoediae fragmenta. Pars II: Comicorum incertae aetatis fragmenta. Fragmenta incertorum poetarum. Indices. Supplementa*. Leipzig.
- Ludwich, A. (1902). Review of Schneider. *Berliner philologische Wochenschrift* 22, coll. 801-810.
- Schmeling, G. (2011). *A Commentary on the Satyrical of Petronius*. With the collaboration of Aldo Setaioli. Oxford.
- Schneider, R. (1902). *Grammatici Graeci II/II. Commentarius criticus et exegeticus in Apollonii scripta minora*. Leipzig.
- Schneider, R. (1910). *Grammatici Graeci II/III. Librorum Apollonii deperditorum fragmenta collegit disposuit explicavit. Indices omnium librorum confecit*. Leipzig.

¹¹ Priscian is less selective on this point, see *Prisciani grammatici Caesariensis institutionum grammaticarum* (ed. Keil, *Grammatici Latini* II p. 84.9-11).