

THE LOST ENDING OF PS.-HERODIAN'S *ON SOLECISM**

Abstract: Due to a lacuna in some codices, Nauck's 1867 edition of Ps.-Herodian's short treatise *On Solecism* lacks the sections on adverbs and conjunctions. A fresh and detailed study of the manuscript tradition makes it possible to fill this gap, and to produce a critical edition of the relevant paragraphs, in which definitions and prescriptions – often comparable to parallel passages in other grammatical sources – are sometimes backed through quotations from literary authors.

Keywords: Herodian, barbarism, solecism, ancient grammar, manuscript tradition

1. Introduction

Since the Hellenistic times, Greek grammar developed a special branch of treatises devoted to 'Sprachrichtigkeit', or linguistic correctness, an issue that had already been addressed by Aristotle and the Peripatetic school.¹ Perhaps the purest examples of these writings are those devoted to two related violations of the right usage of Greek, namely barbarism (a mistake involving one single word) and solecism (a mistake involving the combination of two or more words).² Today, texts dealing with these phenomena are scattered in old and unreliable editions, and are surely in need of a general reappraisal. Studying the manuscript tradition of the writings on barbarism and solecism printed by Boissonade / Nauck³ and by

*) Our thanks to Lara Pagani and Giuseppe Ucciardello for their suggestions.

1) See most recently L. Pagani, *Language Correctness (Hellenismos) and its Criteria*, in: F. Montanari / S. Matthaios / A. Rengakos (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship*, Leiden / Boston 2015, 798–849. J. Lallot, *Syntax*, *ibid.*, 850–95: 857–59.

2) E. Siebenborn, *Die Lehre von der Sprachrichtigkeit und ihren Kriterien*, Amsterdam 1976, esp. 26–27, 35–36 and 50–52 (also on the Latin counterparts, esp. *Quint. Inst. or.* 1,5,38 ff.). Pagani (as in note 1) 803–805. S. Valente, *Typology of Grammatical Treatises*, in: Montanari / Matthaios / Rengakos (as in note 1) 600–21: 615.

3) J. Fr. Boissonade, *Anecdota Graeca III*, Paris 1831, 241–61; A. Nauck, *Lexicon Vindobonense*, Petersburg 1867, 294–312.

Valckenaer,⁴ Maria Giovanna Sandri has been able to identify the hitherto unknown ending of what some manuscripts present as Herodian's work *περὶ σολοικισμοῦ* (pp.241–61 Boissonade and 294–312 Nauck):⁵ while Sandri's new edition of the whole of this spurious work is in progress, we shall present here its unpublished final part, in the hope it may be of use to researchers in the domain of Greek grammar and beyond.

2. *The manuscript tradition*

Of the ten manuscripts carrying Ps.-Herodian's *On solecism*, those relevant to our purpose are three (sigla as in Sandri's future edition):

– U = Vind. phil. gr. 263 (our text on ff. 96r–102v) is a collection of grammatical texts by Manuel Moschopoulos and (Ps.-) Herodian, written around 1430 by Girard of Patras;⁶

– I = Ambr. C 69 sup. (our text on ff. 10r–16r) is a miscellaneous manuscript composed of ten codicological units all copied in Padua in the mid-16th century, in the circle of the great humanist and book-collector Gian Vincenzo Pinelli (1535–1601; scribes include Theodoros Rendios and Lazaro Bonamico), and opened on ff. 1–26 by a set of grammatical works copied by Manuel Morus (active in Padua and Venice 1562–64);⁷

4) L. C. Valckenaer (ed.), *Ammonius. De differentia adfinium vocabulorum*, Leipzig ²1822 (¹1739), 176–87.

5) E. Dickey, *A Catalogue of the Works Attributed to the Grammarian Herodian*, CPh 109 (2014) 325–45: 339 no. 45. F. Pontani, *Ex Homero grammatica*, in: Matthaios / Montanari / Rengakos (as in note 1) 87–103: 96; Pagani (as in note 1) 828; Valente (as in note 2) 615. No hint to this treatise in A. R. Dyck, *Aelius Herodian: Recent Studies and Prospects for Future Research*, ANRW 34.1, Berlin / NY 1993, 772–94.

6) H. Hunger, *Katalog der griechischen Handschriften der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek*, I, Wien 1961, 371–72; K. Hajdù, *Ps.-Herodian De figuris*, Berlin / NY 1998 (SGLG 8), 47.

7) The description by Aem. Martini / D. Bassi, *Catalogus codicum Graecorum Bibliothecae Ambrosianae*, I–II, Milano 1906, 194–200 is now superseded by a very thorough study of this codex: P. Géhin, *Évagre le Pontique dans un recueil de mélanges grammaticaux du fonds Pinelli, l'Ambr. C 69 sup.*, in: C. M. Mazzucchi / C. Pasini (eds.), *Nuove ricerche sui manoscritti greci dell'Ambrosiana*, Milano 2004, 265–313. See also Hajdù (as in note 6) 38–39. The watermark of our folios is vaguely similar to *cerf* 910 Zonghi (a. 1565). On Pinelli's library see M. Grendler, *A Greek Collection in Padua*, RenQ 33, 1980, 386–416.

– J = Ambr. A 119 suss. (our text on ff. 8v–14r) is a coherent collection of grammatical texts copied by Nicasius Ellebodus († 1577, active in Padua 1561–65).⁸

According to Hajdù's stemma, in the related text of (Ps.-) Herodian's *De figuris*⁹ J is an apograph of I, and I is an apograph of U: we shall argue below that this is partly debatable with respect to our work, but we do agree with Hajdù that U must be derived from the same hyparchetype as IJ (ϑ), which is also the father of the rhetorical, poetical and grammatical miscellany ms. Par. gr. 2551 (ff. 2–19, end of 15th c.; siglum B in Boissonade, Nauck and Sandri; this is also the antigraphon of two 16th-century manuscripts such as Par. gr. 2929 and Dresd. Da. 49).¹⁰

UIJ and B (with its apographs) are thus all derived from ϑ: only UIJ, however, have preserved the correct ending of the work on solecism falsely attributed to Herodian and published by Boissonade (pp. 241–61) and Nauck (pp. 294–312), namely the treatise we shall from now on call *πᾶς λόγος* (from its incipit). The reason for this is that the copyist of ms. B overlooked a single folio in his model, and this entailed the disappearance of the last paragraphs of the work (i. e. the part after 307,19 Nauck), as well as of the first paragraphs of the following treatise – which, as Nauck correctly ascertained, consists of a short anonymous précis on barbarism and solecism.¹¹

Three more manuscripts carry the *πᾶς λόγος* text, namely Par. gr. 1270 (A), Par. gr. 2720 (C) and Vind. phil. gr. 199 (W):¹² however, while these witnesses are certainly connected on the philological niveau (further collations will establish more precisely their reciprocal relations), and while they clearly represent a different branch from ϑ, none of them is of help in our case, because all three show important lacunae in the final part of the relevant text.¹³

8) This ms. formerly had the shelfmark A.S.II.28 (see Martini / Bassi [as in note 7] 1144–45; Hajdù, [as in note 6] 39; Géhin [as in note 7] 284). The watermark of our folios is similar to *ange* 646 Briquet (1537, latest variant Padua 1558).

9) Where the *siglum* for I is A and that for J is C.

10) See Hajdù (as in note 6) 40–41 (*siglum* P), and 73–87 for the entire branch of ms. ϑ.

11) Printed by Nauck (as in note 3) 291,15–293,2.

12) These are not considered by Hajdù because they do not contain the *de figuris*. In Pontani (as in note 5) 102, these witnesses are wrongly assigned to the *περί σολοικισμού κατὰ πλάτος* printed by Valckenaer (as in note 4) 181–87.

13) The lacunae are in fact even bigger than B's: p. 306,4 Nauck to the end in mss. AW; p. 303,11 to the end in ms. C.

It should finally be remarked that after the *πᾶς λόγος* treatise and the short anonymous *précis* (pp. 291,15–293,2 Nauck), what follows in UIJ and in B (and its apographs), and what is therefore printed in Nauck, is first a rather awkward copy of the treatise called *περὶ βαρβαρισμοῦ κατὰ πλάτος* (pp. 308,13–311,3 Nauck),¹⁴ then a peculiar insert of uncertain provenance on the nature of Homeric language (p. 311,5–10 Nauck),¹⁵ and finally (pp. 311,11–312,2 Nauck) a brief concoction of a definition of barbarism.¹⁶ This bundle of texts of different origin, probably first put together in ms. ϑ , will be disentangled by Sandri's fresh study of the manuscript tradition.

3. *The lost ending*

For the time being, we can ascertain that U, I and J, having avoided the lacuna that affects the ending of the *πᾶς λόγος* in all the rest of the manuscript tradition, remain the only witnesses to the complete version of this treatise, whose rationale is very straightforward:¹⁷ after a brief definition of the topic, the different kinds of solecisms are listed, namely those to be found in nouns and *προσηγορίαι* (296,13–302,2; articulated in number, case and gender, with an appendix on comparatives), those concerning the verb (302,3–306,3; articulated in diatheses, persons, modes, tenses, with an appendix on participles on 306,4–11), and those about the article, the preposition and the pronouns (306,12–307,18). At p. 307,19 Nauck, as mentioned above, the syntax breaks suddenly, and the list is clearly defective, for we hear nothing of solecisms relating to adverbs or conjunctions.¹⁸ Our three manuscripts (U, I and J) offer precisely this conclusion, i. e. some paragraphs that represent by far

14) Printed by Valckenaer (as in note 4) 178–81, and most certainly the beginning of an autonomous treatise whose second part is the *περὶ σολοικισμοῦ κατὰ πλάτος* on pp. 181–87.

15) Pontani (as in note 5) 96.

16) Printed by Nauck (as in note 3) 290,1–8. On this bundle of texts see also Géhin (as in note 7) 290–91.

17) See Siebenborn (as in note 2) 51 note 4.

18) These kinds of solecism are briefly mentioned in the haphazard order of the small anonymous *précis* following the *πᾶς λόγος* in all the manuscripts. Cp. also Siebenborn's embarrassment on this point ([as in note 2] 51 note 4).

the most complete extant text on the topic of solecism with respect to ἐπιρρήματα and σύνδεσμοι, and discuss in the process some interesting quotations.¹⁹

What we present in this article is therefore a preliminary critical edition of these paragraphs, which round off the πᾶς λόγος text and should thus replace once and for all the series of texts on pp. 307,20–312 Nauck, whose heterogeneous origin we have just described (§2). As will become evident from the critical apparatus, in view of the considerable number of separative errors of U against IJ (many more appear in the other paragraphs of the text) we have considered the latter as independent witnesses rather than apographs of U,²⁰ and in many places we have followed their text against the Vindobonensis. Furthermore, the corrections penned on the margins of I by G. V. Pinelli (siglum I²) and on the margins of J by the scribe Nicasius Ellebodus (J^{Pc}), are certainly the fruit of a collation with a different witness now lost (indeed, as emerges from the rest of the work, this was a manuscript belonging to the ACW group, and very close to ms. C).²¹ The readings of I²J^{Pc}

19) That these paragraphs belong to the original, genuine version of the treatise is confirmed also by a comparative analysis with the aforementioned treatise περὶ σολοικισμοῦ κατὰ πλάτος (see note 12): on pp. 185,11–186,2 Valckenaer we find a brief epitome of our paragraphs.

20) As opposed to what Hajdú ([as in note 6] 78–80; followed by Géhin [as in note 7] 278–79) has done: while acknowledging the several better readings offered by I against U also in the *De figuris*, Hajdú attributed them partly to Manuel Morus' conjectural activity and partly to the collation of another exemplar. But it is safer to assume that both U and IJ (which share conjunctive errors both in these paragraphs and in the rest of the treatise) derive from a common father.

21) On f. 10r Pinelli states that his corrections come “ex codice D. Antonii Ἡρωδιανοῦ περὶ σολοικισμοῦ” (the same note in ms. J, f. 8v: “in codice S. Antonii ita inscribitur”): it is unclear whether this should refer to Padua's Biblioteca Antoniana (where, however, Greek manuscripts were very rare), or – more likely – to a manuscript preserved in the Venetian convent of Sant'Antonio di Castello, where the prestigious library of cardinal Grimani had been deposited in 1523 (see A. Diller / L. G. Westerink / H. D. Saffrey, *Bibliotheca Graeca Manuscripta card. Dominici Grimani*, Venezia 2003: but none of the manuscripts in the catalogues of Grimani's library, mostly lost in the fire of 1636, mentions either Herodian or a work on solecism – though of course these might be concealed under generic titles such as *Grammatica varia*). A couple of readings in IJ are conjectures attributed to Νικ., most certainly Nicasius Ellebodus, the scribe of J (ff. 13r, 14v, 17v: see Géhin [as in note 7] 282). That the marginal corrections of I²J^{Pc} do not reach beyond the πᾶς λόγος, is a proof that the model of I²J^{Pc} did not contain the bundle of texts that followed ours in ϑ (namely those printed by Nauck on pp. 308–12, see above).

should therefore also be regarded as derived from a primary witness for our paragraphs.

Finally, ms. J has been regarded as a 'photocopy' of ms. I, for both mss. share even the position and amount of the marginal corrections;²² however, in a number of places (ll. 5, 17, 32, 41; many more in the rest of the *πᾶς λόγος*) J's readings cannot be explained away by positing a simple derivation from I – indeed in several cases J clearly has the better reading, which is almost never the case with I. It should be borne in mind that I and J originated in the same years in the same circle, namely that of Pinelli in Padua in the 1560s, and thus a certain degree of contamination between them is anything but unlikely: while a closer appreciation of their stemmatic position will only be possible once collations are completed, for now we simply register their variant readings in the apparatus.

A definitive word on the dating of the *πᾶς λόγος* text (if not on its attribution to Herodian, which can hardly be trusted) will be uttered once Sandri's critical edition and apparatus fontium are completed. For the time being, we can observe that the new section, while uneven and occasionally baffling (why should the discussion about *ἐκάτερος* / *ἐκάτεροι* on ll. 26–29, however prompted by the issue of *δύο*, belong to the chapter on adverbs? why does the text insist on the "separations and conjunctions" of adverbs, ll. 11 and 28?), yields a couple of interesting definitions, above all that of the adverb on l. 7 (which resonates with the one provided by PYale 1,25, 1st c. CE), and that of the conjunction on l. 34 (which is to the best of our knowledge totally unparalleled).²³ These paragraphs, as is customary, also refer to poetic loci in order to illustrate grammatical phenomena: we find quotations from Homer, Hesiod, Pindar, and Euripides.

22) See Géhin (as in note 7) 284. It should be remarked that in another section of ms. I, the source of Manuel Morus is actually a manuscript copied by Theodoros Rendios, which also contains sections copied by Ellebodus himself, Ambr. G 88 suss. (see *ibid.*, 284–87).

23) Most other definitions in the work seem to have some proximity – though hardly ever a verbatim one – with those to be found in Dionysius Thrax, or in the *τέχναι* on papyrus (e.g. *προσηγορία* cp. Dion. Thr. ars 22,5; PYale 1,25, 2; *ἀντωνυμία* cp. Dion. Thr. ars 63,2–3; PYale 1,25, 19).

4. Text (after p. 307,18 Nauck)

- γίνεται δὲ περὶ τὰς ἀπλᾶς καὶ συνθέτους [scil. ἀντωνυμίας] οὕτως ὁ σολοικισμός· ὅταν συνθέτῳ δέον χρῆσθαι, χρήσθαι τις τῇ ἀπλῇ, οἷον ‘ζωργεῖτ’, αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν ἐμὲ λύσομαι’ [K 378], ἀντὶ τοῦ ‘ἐμαυτόν’. καὶ πάλιν δὲ ὅταν ἐν τοῖς προσώποις τις ἀντωνυμίαν
- 5 ἀλλάξῃ· ‘δεῦτε Δί’ ἐννέπετε σφέτερον πατέρα’ [Hes. op. 2], ἀντὶ τοῦ ‘ὑμέτερον’ {ἔδει γὰρ εἰπεῖν}.
- Ἐπίρρημά ἐστι λέξις κατὰ μίαν ἐκφορὰν ἐπιλεγομένη τῷ ῥήματι καὶ ὑποτασσομένη. πολλὰ δὲ εἶδη ἐπίρρημάτων· ἃ μὲν γὰρ αὐτῶν ἐστὶ ποιότητος δηλωτικά, οἷον ‘καλῶς’, ‘φαύλως’, ‘λάξ’,
- 10 ‘βοτρυδόν’· τὰ δὲ ποσότητος, οἷον ‘ὀλιγάκις’· τὰ δὲ τάξεως, οἷον ‘ἐξῆς’, ‘ἐφεξῆς’· τὰ δὲ διαζεύξεως καὶ συναφῆς, ‘ἐκατέρως’, ‘ἀμφοτέρως’· τὰ δὲ τοπικά, ‘οὐρανόνθεν’· τὰ δὲ εὐχῆς, οἷον ‘εἴθε’· τὰ δὲ σχετλιαστικά, οἷον ‘φεῦ’· τὰ δὲ συγκαταθέσεως, ‘ναί’, ‘πάντως’· ἀπωμοτικὸν τὸ ‘μά’, συγκαταθετικὸν τὸ ‘νή’.
- 15 ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἐπίρρημασι γίνονται σολοικισμοὶ πλείστοι μὲν περὶ τὰς συνθέσεις· ‘ναὶ μὰ τόδε σκῆπτρον’ [A 234], καὶ ἔμπαλιν ‘οὐ νῆ τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα’, δέον τὸ ἀρνητικὸν τῷ ἀπωμοτικῷ ἐπενεγκεῖν ‘οὐ μὰ τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα’ [A 86]. καὶ ‘ὅσα μὴ πεφίληκε Ζεὺς ἀτύζονται βοᾶν Πιερίδων’ [Pind. Pyth. 1,13–14]· παρείληπται γὰρ τὸ ἀπαγορευτικόν, προστάσσεται δέ, οἷον ‘μὴ φίλει’, ‘μὴ ποιεῖ’, οὐδεὶς γὰρ λέγει ‘μὴ πεφίληκε’, ‘μὴ πεποίηκε’· γίνονται δὲ καὶ ἕτεροι σολοικισμοὶ περὶ τὰ ἐπίρρηματα· ὡς ὅταν τις εἴπῃ ‘δεύτεροι ἐδειπνοῦμεν’ ἀντὶ τοῦ ‘δύο’· τὸ μὲν γὰρ ‘δεύτεροι’ τάξεως ἐστὶ, τὸ δὲ ‘δύο’ ἀριθμοῦ· εἰ μὲν τὴν ποσότητα δηλοῦμεν ‘πόσοι δειπνοῦμεν’, ἐροῦμεν
- 20 ‘δύο’ ἢ ‘τρεις’· εἰ δὲ τάξιν, ἐροῦμεν ‘ τρίτος ἀνεκείμεν ἢ τέταρτος’· ἀμαρτάνουσι καὶ οἱ λέγοντες ἐπὶ δύο ‘ἐκατέρους ἀπέκτεινα’· ἔδει γὰρ χρώμενον τῇ διαζεύξει καὶ χωρίζοντα λέγειν ‘ἐκάτερον ἀπέκτεινα’· ὁ σολοικισμὸς οὗτος λέγεται περὶ τὰς διαζεύξεις τῶν ἐπίρρημάτων καὶ συναφᾶς. οἶμαι δὲ ὅτι κάκεινο σολοικισμὸς, εἰ ἐπερωτώμενός τις ‘πόσοι ὦραί εἰσιν’, εἴποι ‘πέμπτη’· τὴν γὰρ ποσότητα λέγειν χρή, ‘πέντε’, τάξεως δὲ τὸ ‘πέμπτη’· γίνονται δὲ καὶ περὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα ἐπίρρηματα σολοικισμοί, οἷον ‘οὐρανοῦ ἔσω’ [Eur. Hipp. 2] ἀντὶ τοῦ ‘ἔνδον’.
- ὁ δὲ σύνδεσμος ἔχει σφραγίδα τῆς δυνάμεως τὸ ὄνομα· ἐπειδὴ
- 35 γὰρ ὡσεὶ λελυμένον καὶ διεσπαρμένον τὸν λόγον παρεισερχόμενος εἰς τὸ ἀκόλουθον δεσμεῖ, σύνδεσμος εἴρηται. τινὲς αὐτῶν αἰτιολογικοὶ λέγονται, ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰτίαν τοῖς ὑποτακτικοῖς παρέχειν· ‘ἴνα’, ‘ὄφρα’, ‘ὅπως’, ‘ἐάν’, ‘ὅταν’· εἰσὶ δ’ οἱ μὲν προτακτικοί, ὡς ὁ ‘ἦτοι’,

40 ὁ 'μέν', ὑποτακτικοὶ δὲ ὁ 'ἤ' καὶ ὁ 'δέ'. σολοικισμὸς οὖν γίνεται, ὅταν τις τὸν 'μέν' προθεῖς μὴ ἐπάγῃ τὸν 'δέ', ὡς τὸ 'πολλὴ μὲν ἐν βροτοῖσι κούκ ἀνώνυμος' [Eur. Hipp. 1]. οὕτω συντόμως τὴν τῶν σολοικισμῶν εὐθύνην παραδεδώκαμεν.

apparatus testimoniorum

2 cf. schol. A K 378b; schol. D K 378; Ap. Dyc. pron. 36,13, 42,2; vide Polyb. barb. sol. 287,13–14 Nauck

4 cf. schol. Hes. op. 2a Pertusi; Ap. Dyc. pron. 109,23 Schneider; Hrd. de fig. 7,17–23 Hajdù; Polyb. barb. sol. 288,16–18 Nauck; περὶ σολ. κατὰ πλάτος, 185,4–5 Valckenaer; schol. Dion. Thr. 447,11 Hilgard (de soloecismo cum pron.)

7 de adverbii definitione cf. Dion. Thr. ars 19 (72,5 Uhlig), sed praes. PYale 1,25, 37–38 (κατὰ μίαν ἐκφορᾶν) et PLitLond 182, 80–82 (vide A. Wouters, *The Grammatical Papyri from Graeco-Roman Egypt*, Brussels 1979, 55 et 83); vide etiam PHeidSiegmann 197, 42–44 et PHarr 59, 31–33 (cf. Wouters, *ibid.* 132 et 172); hic tamen adverbium verbo postponitur tantum, non etiam anteponitur ut alibi

7–14 de adverbiorum speciebus (quas aliter alii fontes enumerant, noster valde compendiose) cf. Dion. Thr. ars 19 (73–86 Uhlig, cum scholiis) et PYale 1,25, 37–53; PLitLond 182, 82–105; PHeidSiegmann 197, 41–58; PHarris 59, 34–56; nusquam tamen inveniuntur adverbia διαζεύξεως et συναφῆς (quae potius μεσότητος, cf. EGud p. 126,6 Stef. et EM 91,30 Gaisf.; ipsi termini, qui iterum infra l. 28, potius e theoria musica deprompti videntur, cf. Aristoxen. elem. harm. 22,17; Plut. frat. amor. 491a etc.); de συγκαταθετικόν (l. 14) = κατωμοτικόν cf. Ap. Soph. 109,27–28

16–18 de μὰ cf. e.g. schol. D A 234; Ap. Soph. 109,26–28 Bekker; Ael. Dion. μ 1 Erbse; schol. Dion. Thr. 101,22; 434,13; 563,36; περὶ σολ. κατὰ πλάτος 186,2–3 Valckenaer; epim. Hom. v 32; Phot. μ 1 Theod. (Suid. μ 1 Adler); Eust. in Od. 1450,42; EGud 401,32 Sturz; lex. Vind. μ 21; οὐ νῆ τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα prob. fictum, non apud auctores

18–21 nusquam locus Pindari laudatur apud grammaticos pro usu μῆ adverbii ἀπαγορευτικοῦ (de quo vide PYale 1,25, 50; PLitLond 182, 90; schol. Dion. Thr. 280,33 et saepius); προστάσσεται scil. cum imperativo iungitur, non indicativo, et in phrasi imperativa usurpatur (vide e.g. schol. Dion. Thr. 96,7; 272,24 et alibi)

21–25 de re cf. Ammon. de impr. 23 Nickau, unde EGud 382,17 Stef. (cf. schol. Dion. Thr. 242,35–243,7; sed nostri exempla ficta videntur, de τρίτος ἢ τέταρτος cf. fort. Theocr. 2,118); ad adverbia haec pertinent si modo δύο tamquam ἐπίρρημα ἀριθμητικόν (cf. Choer. epim. Ps. 152,7 Gaisf.; EGud 382,16 Stef.) respexeris, sed inter ὀνόματα ponunt fere omnes, cf. e.g. Dion. Thr. ars 12, p. 44,2–5 Uhlig

26–29 cf. schol. Thuc. 3,82,8 (p. 214,9 Hude); aliter Ammon. adf. voc. 35 (cum app. Nickau); sed haec proprie ad pronomina spectant, minime ad adverbia, fort. igitur aliunde petita (monet per litteras G. Ucciardello eandem locutionem ἀμαρτάνουσιν οἱ λέγοντες saepius in Herodiani personati De locutionum pravitatibus [Dickey, A Catalogue, 333–34 no. 25] inveniri)

29–31 de numeris ordinalibus vide supra ad 22–25, sed nil simile de horis dictum invenimus

32 nil tale apud schol. Eur. Hipp., sed vide anon. de sol. 289,3 et 292,13–16 Nauck; περὶ σολ. κατὰ πλάτος 185,15–16 Valckenaer; de eadem re (sine versu Euripidis) Ammon. adf. voc. 169 (EGud 470,1–3 Stef.) cum app. Nickau

34–36 coniunctionis definitio valde alia ac ceterae, quae apud grammaticos inveniuntur (e.g. Dion. Thr. ars 20, p. 86 Uhlig, cum schol. Dion. Thr. 283,5 et 435,31 ss.; PHal 55a, 52–94), ubi σύνδεσμος συνδέει τὴν διάνοιαν potius quam τὸν λόγον (vide tamen schol. Dion. Thr. 383,20 Hilgard)

36–38 de coni. causativis cf. Dion. Thr. ars 20, p. 93,1–2 Uhlig et PHal 55a, 78–82 (nusquam tamen εἶν vel ὅταν his adnumerantur); de veriloquio et ὑποτακτικά cf. Ps.-Theod. gramm. 48,4 Göttling (vide iam Choer. prol. in Th. Alex. can. 277,10 Hilg.)

39 de μέν et δέ cf. Ap. Dyc. synt. 1,37, p. 34,8 Uhlig; de ἦτοι cf. Ap. Dyc. coni. 220,28 Schneider et synt. 4,6, p. 437,6 Uhlig; vide etiam schol. Opp. hal. 2,456; alibi potius ut συμπλεκτικοί respiciuntur hi σύνδεσμοι, cf. Dion. Thr. ars 20, p. 88,3 Uhlig; PHal 55a, 63 etc.

39–40 de re vide anon. barb. sol. 292,16 Nauck; schol. T Γ 16a cum app. Erbse; locum Euripidis unus laudat G. Lecapenus epist. 1, p. 7,15–16 Lindstam

41–42 scil. id quod p. 295,1 Nauck pollicitus erat perficit

apparatus criticus

- 1 γίνεται nos : γίνονται UIJ ἀπλάς U
 2 ὅταν δὲ U δέον nos : δεῖ UIJ
 3 ζωγρεῖτ' J^{pc} : ζωγρεῖται U : ζωγρεῖτε IJ^{ac} αὐτάρ : αὐτόν U
 4 τοῖς om. IJ ἀντωνυμίαν J^{pc} : ἀντωνυμία UIJ^{ac}
 5 πατέρα om. U : post πατέρα praebebet ὑμνεῖοντες (oblitt.) ἔδει
 J, ἔδει tantum (oblitt.) praebebet I
 6 ἔδει γὰρ εἰπεῖν delevimus
 8 τῶν ἐπιρρημάτων U
 10 τὰ¹ : τῶν U
 12 τὰ δὲ εὐχῆς, οἶον εἴθε om. IJ
 14 ἀπωματικόν U μα U συγκατεθετικόν U νη U
 16 τόδε τὸ U νή : μή U
 17 ἀπομοτικῶ J : ἀποματικῶ U : ἀπομοτικῶ I
 18 ἀτύζοντε βοᾶν U
 19 τὸ 'μή' ἀπαγορευτικόν possis
 20 προστάσσεται I²J^{pc} ('ἴσως' conl. 'Νικ.'): προτάσσεται UIJ
 24–25 ἐροῦμεν – ἐροῦμεν omiserant IJ, in mg. redintegrev-
 runt I²J^{pc}
 25 τρίτην ἀνακειμένην ἢ τετάρτην UI¹J^{ac}, corr. I²J^{pc} ἂν
 ἐκεῖμην possis
 27 χρώμενοι U διαλέξει UI¹J^{ac}, corr. I²J^{pc} λέγειν I²J^{pc} :
 λέξι UI¹J^{ac}
 28 περὶ I²J^{pc} : παρά UI¹J^{ac}
 30 ἐπερωτόμενος U ὥραι I εἴπη U
 31 γέγονται U
 32 τὰ om. I, in mg. add. J^{pc}
 34 ἐπειδὴ I²J^{pc} : ἐπεὶ UI¹J^{ac}
 35 διεσπαρμένον : διεφθαρμένον IJ παρεισερχόμενον I¹J^{ac},
 corr. I²J^{pc}
 36 ἀκολούθ- U
 36–37 αὐτῶν αἰτιολογικοὶ λέγονται I²J^{pc} : αὐτὸν αἰτιολογικὸν
 λέγουσιν UI¹J^{ac}
 38 δ' : δὲ U
 39 ὑποτακτικὴ U
 40 πολλοὶ UJ^{ac}
 41 κούκ ἀνώνυμος IJ^{pc} : καὶ οὐκ ἀνώνυμοι UJ^{ac}

Venezia

Filippomaria Pontani
Maria Giovanna Sandri