Asklepiaides and *Historia*

William J. Slater

What we know of Asklepiaides’ grammar is preserved by Sextus Empiricus, who quotes him by name three times in the *adv. Grammaticos*, but follows him, as has long been known, to some extent in the general layout of his refutation. In his summary of the doctrines of the grammatical theorists, however, Sextus has not only compressed their views but also distorted them by forcing them into artificial schemes.

We know that Asklepiaides (*adv. Gramm.* 61, cf. 72) defined γραμματική as a τέχνη in contradistinction to the ἐπιστείρα-definition of his great predecessor Dionysius Thrax; in this I believe he was following an otherwise unknown Ptolemaios the Peripatetic;2 in addition he quoted3 Callimachus (*adv. Gramm.* 47ff) to demonstrate that γραμματική was divided into two sections, γραμματική (= litteratio), reading and writing, and γραμματική proper (= literatura),4 higher literary studies. This was a well known division (Stoics, Quintilian, Varro, Cicero),5 the origin of which lay in Greek educational and

---

1 For Cicero’s view on such a distinction see H. Dahlmann, *Studien zu Varro’s “de Poetis”*, AbhMainz 1962 no.10, p.14. It seems that Asklepiaides too followed a traditional scheme in the introduction to his work.

2 A. Dihle, *Hermes* 85 (1957) 314ff, rejects the identification with Ptolemaios Chennos, and also Wilamowitz’ guess of Ptolemaios of Askalon (*Antigonus von Karystos* [Berlin 1881] 27). But his own equation with the φιλολογόσφαιρος peripatetic Ptolemaios whom Longinus heard in his youth (*Porph.* V.Plot. 20; cf. RE 23.2 [1959] 1860 s.v. PTOLEMAIOS 70) can scarcely stand in view of F. Kudlien’s new dating of Sextus to ca. 100 (RhM 106 [1963] 254). If the *adv. Gramm.* is in fact a late work (references in E. Krentz, *Phronesis* 7 [1962] 155), it should have been written about 130 or before. More important, the language of § 61 seems to indicate to me that Asklepiaides is following Ptolemaios’ argument, i.e. that Ptolemaios is to be placed between Dionysius Thrax and Asklepiaides, and therefore, like all the other grammarians quoted by Sextus, before 30 B.C.

3 For the reasons adduced by B. A. Müller, *De Asclepiade Myrleano* (diss. Leipzig 1903) 27; cf. schol. Dion.Thrax 3.19ff Hilgard.


5 *RE* 7 (1912) 1808ff s.v. Grammatik (Gudeman); *SVF* II p.31,25; Varro fr.235 F.; Quint. 1.4.2; K. Barwick, *Remmius Palaemon und die röm. Ars grammatica* (Leipzig 1922) 219ff and esp. 231. Varro, as one would expect, mentioned several systems of grammar, including that of Dion. Thrax (234F) and the notorious quadripartitio, which H. Usener probably wrongly attributed to Tyrannion (*RE* 7A [1943] 1818 s.v. TYRANNION 2 [Wendel]).
grammatical theory, as can be seen from the division into ὁμοτική-ἐξηγητική or μεθοδική-ἱστορική. Unfortunately what follows Asklepiades’ definition is certainly not all his, nor is what precedes (ad. Gramm. 44–46); and we can only conclude that his analysis of the word γράμματα was meant to justify the concern of grammar with literature in its widest form, i.e. both prose and poetry.

In §§ 61–90 Sextus gives us a series of definitions of previous grammarians (Ptolemaios, who agrees with Asklepiades in his criticism of Dionysius Thrax; Chares; Crates the Stoic; and Demetrios Chloros). These two fragments however are insignificant compared with Asklepiades’ tripartition of γραμματική quoted in adv. Gramm. 252, for it corresponds to Sextus’ own outline in § 91, which he follows throughout. γραμματική is divided by Sextus into τεχνικόν, ἱστορικόν and ὑποκύπτον, while Asklepiades (§ 252) divides into τεχνικόν, ἱστορικόν and γραμματικόν, which partakes of the previous two parts. Sextus has rechristened Asklepiades’ special term γραμματικὸν as ὑποκύπτον, in order to avoid confusion with the general term γραμματική (cf. 44 with 93). By this division Asklepiades doubtless meant, in Stoic fashion, that the τεχνικόν and the ἱστορικόν were together subordinate to the γραμματικὸν proper, i.e. the study of literature, or literary criticism. This view takes support from several considerations: (a) the definition of Chares (76ff), which looks like a development of Asklepiades’ system, where this subordination is evident; (b) the fact that Asklepiades’ γραμματικὸν, unlike the other two parts, is nowhere separately defined by Sextus; (c) the parallel with the Stoic system of

6 W. Heintz, Studien zu Sextus Empiricus (Halle 1932) 264, points out that §§ 44–48 and 49–56 do not logically connect with each other or what follows or what precedes.

7 J. Mau’s second ed. (Leipzig 1961) annoyingly fails to correct the definition of Chares or Chairis as it appears in § 76; the correct text is given by schol. Dion. Thrax p.118,11 Hilgard: ἐξαν ἐξαν ἀπὸ τέχνης καὶ ἱστορίας διαφοράστηκαν. The homoiooteleuton was first corrected, to my knowledge, by Barwick, op.cit. (supra n.5) 219 n.2. I am incidentally not quite so certain as Mau and some older scholars that Chares was not his name. The paradigmatic declensions of Chares and Theon in § 237 are both grammarian names, and it was a habit of grammarians to use their own names as παραδείγματα, which would then be transmitted by the doxography, the most notorious instance being Tryphon in Apoll. Dysc. Syntax; in general see A. Nauck, Aristophanis Byz. Fragmenta (Halle 1848) 6 n.8; many Stoic examples in G. Bühring, Untersuchungen zur Anwendung . . . der stoischen numeri officii (diss. Hamburg 1960) 26 n.83.

8 In the middle of the first cent. B.C., V. di Benedetto, AnnPisa 35 (1966) 321ff.

9 There is a remarkable parallel in Sen. Ep. 88.3, which was noted by Barwick, op.cit. (supra n.5) 219, and not by A. Stückelberger, Senecas 88. Brief (Heidelberg 1965) 103, who wrongly compares Dion. Thrax for the tripartition curam sermonis . . . historias . . . carmina.
Tauriskos (248), whose λογικόν and τριβικόν together equal Asklepiades' τεχνικóν, and whose κριτική has subordinate to it λογικόν + τριβικόν and ἱστορικόν; (d) the fact that Sextus clearly has confused Tauriskos' system by parallelism instead of subordination.¹⁰

These three divisions of Asklepiades are followed by Sextus:

(i) §§ 97–247 deal with the τεχνικόν, or technical part, divided as Sextus promises (91ff) into three parts, as was customary: (a) 99–168, εἰσοχεία and μέρη λόγου; (b) 169–75, orthography; (c) 176–247, ἔλληνισμός (= latinitas), which includes a discussion of analogy versus anomaly, etymology, and barbarism.


(iii) The literary part: § 270-end, το περὶ ποιητᾶς καὶ συγγραφεῖς. Roughly speaking, these three parts represent the same areas as the six subdivisions of Dionysius Thrax.

The problem centres on § 252, where Sextus summarizes Asklepiades' theory of the ἱστορικόν, a passage which at one time gave rise to a great deal of controversy¹¹ through its implications for the origin of the novel and its parallels with the divisions of narratio according to the Auctor ad Herennium and Cicero, De Inventione. My purpose is to see what we can derive from the text of Sextus' treatise to help elucidate this early theory of the ἱστορικόν. The text of §§ 252–53 runs as follows (in my translation, with Mau's text and apparatus):

"Asklepiades, after stating in his work on grammar that there are three primary parts of grammar, technical, historical, grammatical (the last partakes of both the historical and the technical), divides the historical part (ἱστορικόν) into three; for, he says, of ἱστορία one (sc. ἱστορία) is true to some extent [if this is the translation of τοια], one false, and one as if true; true is the πρακτική (sc. ἱστορία), ψευδής δὲ τὴν περὶ πλάσματα καὶ μύθους, ὥς ἀληθής δὲ οί ἐστιν ἢ κωμῳδία καὶ οἱ μίμαι; of the true (sc. ἱστορία) there are in turn three parts: the one (sc. ἱστορία) is concerned with the persons of gods and heroes and notable men, another with places and times, another with actions (πράξεις). Of the false (sc. ἱστορία) i.e. the mythical, he says there is only one kind, the genealogical. He says, like Dionysius, that the part dealing with glosses is also subordinated to the ἱστορικόν; for it evidences (ἱστορεῖ) that κρήνον is 'true' or 'good'. Similarly with παροιμίας καὶ ἄρων."

¹⁰ Barwick, op.cit. (supra n.5) 218 n.2.
¹¹ E.g. W. Schmid (1914) in E. Rhode, Der griechische Roman (Darmstadt 1960) 603 n.3.
Mau quotes Mette for the transposition and Theiler for the refutation. The original emendation, however, was made by Kaibel (cf. § 263) in 1897\textsuperscript{12} and rejected by Reichel,\textsuperscript{13} who compared § 265. This was rejected in turn by Barwick.\textsuperscript{14} Mau followed Theiler’s defense\textsuperscript{15} of the text, in comparing § 92. The question is highly complex and depends ultimately on how carefully Sextus followed and interpreted his sources.

As it stands § 252 makes no practical sense, nor does it fit in with §§ 91ff or 263, where we have views so similar that it has been generally assumed that both these passages also are to be attributed to the influence of Asklepiades. Schissel von Fleschenberg\textsuperscript{16} recognized the problem in § 252 that there were really two divisions, one wrongly subordinated to the other, but his solution appealing to the divisions of some of the later progymnasmatic theoreticians is improbable; yet he rightly saw that there were two separate systems, one literary ‘rhetorische-tendenziose’, the other historiographical ‘historisch-sachlich’. Yet he did not account for the parallel chapters in Sextus, nor consider whether it was reasonable for Asklepiades to postulate a system into which only the first of the three types of history (true, false, and as-true) could be divided according to the aspects of place, time, etc., while the other two are apparently incapable of such a division.\textsuperscript{17} Worse still, how can \textit{γλώσσαι} be true or false or as-true, let alone \textit{παρουσία} or ‘definitions’?\textsuperscript{18} The one example that Sextus gives,
that the gloss κρήγγων means ‘true’, is meaningless as a general criterion, for then we would divide according to the meaning of glosses, and not according to the correctness of the use of glosses. As it stands and probably as Sextus wrote it, § 252 can only be a misrepresentation of a grammatical system.

We have three sources to which we may appeal, all in themselves of dubious value as evidence, §§ 91, 263 and Sextus’ general discussion19 of the ἱστορικόν 248–69. He begins, as he did in classifying the parts of γραμματική, by discussing earlier theories of the Stoic Tauris-kos, pupil of Crates, of the Alexandrian Dionysius Thrax, and finally of Asklepiades. In §§ 255–69 he deals with and refutes various types of ἱστορία, utilizing his own medical analogies.

In §§ 257 (cf. 92) and 263 the definitions of Asklepiades recur, first the tripartite division (ἱστορίαι) times/places, people, actions, followed by examples; then the tripartite division (ἱστορούμενα) true, false, astrue, followed again by examples. Here there is no sign that these systems are in any way subordinated to each other; on the contrary, it seems clear that these two systems are redivisions of the same subject matter according to different criteria. The ‘historiographical’ division occurs in §§ 92, 252, 257, and from 252 and 257 we see that such divisions are called ἱστορίαι whereas the ‘rhetorical’ divisions are called ἱστορούμενα; i.e. we have a division according to (a) the nature of the subject to be investigated and (b) the degree of truth of the object under investigation. It might be possible then to subordinate (b) to (a), but not vice versa, and we may safely assert that it is Sextus who forced this absurdity upon Asklepiades.20

What caused Sextus to introduce his mistaken subordination? It is possible that he thought that the ‘historiographical’ division applied only to πρακτική ἱστορία, but in trying to follow through with his equations he became muddled in equating πλάσματα, ‘myth’, ‘false’, and γενεαλογική, which of course must be wrong. An incidental but im-

---
19 Barwick, op.cit. (supra n.14) 269, gives a similar explanation of the confused divisions of narratio in Anon. Seguerianus, which is generally accepted, e.g., by A. La Penna, Sallustio e la rivoluzione romana (Milan 1968) 312ff.
20 Sexti, Asclepiadis arte grammatica [diss. Strassburg 1904] 75) apparently agree that the ὀριστικόν is unsystematic (§§ 269 and 254). To the emendations proposed in Mau’s text I would add ποτάμων καὶ ὄρων, comparing ὄρων γῆ ποτάμων in § 92 as the object of the ὀριστικόν; but see below p. 324 for a probable explanation.
important advantage of this supposition is that it would partially resolve
the problem of the glosses and proverbs; since it might conceivably
be possible to consider them under the headings of both (a) the area
to which they belong and (b) whether or not they are true. The ex­
ample that Sextus gives then must be fictitious, an attempt to ex­
plain his own confusion. It may be that Sextus’ confusion was caused
by the terminology of Asklepiades. He divides γραμματική into three
parts, one being γραμματικῶν; he divides—so Sextus—πρακτική into
three parts, one of which is πράξεως; and he divides ἱστορικῶν into
three parts, one of which was ἱστορία, corresponding to the later argu­
mentum, fabula, historia.

Both these systems occur elsewhere, separately but never sub­
ordinated. The ‘historiographical’ system is really quadripartite, as
the parallel literature shows, and, we might suppose, originally a
Stoic περιπτάσεως; it is not historiographical (Polyb. 9.1.3; Cic. De Or.
2.53) in any real sense, but is simply a practical system of division
(quis, quid, ubi, quando) which finds expression in rhetoric, law and
philosophy, technical grammar (Varro, Ling. 1.5.3ff) and ἐκφράσεως.
None of Sextus’ three statements concerning this system match each
other exactly. In § 92 he divides personae, loci and then switches into
πλάσματα, μόθοι and the rest, where we should expect tempora and res.
We have a tripartition here compounded from our two systems,
which should not therefore be used as a basis for judging the text of
§ 252. In § 257 Sextus gives us the complete division into four parts,
which he subdivides into two groups; personae + res and tempora + loci.
In § 253 these four divisions have become three by a fusion of loci +
tempora. This is significant, since it seems to me almost certain that
Asklepiades’ division of the ἱστορία was quadripartite, as in § 257, and
that therefore the presentation in § 252 is caused by Sextus himself.

After I had written this paragraph, I discovered that the remarkable
dissertation of G. Bühring suggested other avenues of exploration.
The Stoic numeri have a longer history and a wider application than

21 On the possibility of confusion with πραγματική and πρακτική, see infra n.37.
22 Quis, quid, quando, ubi are the first parts of almost all the περιπτάσεως cited by R. Volk­
mann, Rhetorik der Griechen und Römer (Leipzig 1885) 36ff. See also Dahlmann, op. cit.
(supra n.1) 121ff with litt.; M. Fuhrmann, Das systematische Lehrbuch (Göttingen 1960) 186
n.2, and 166. H. Lausberg, Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik 1 (Munich 1960) 202ff, follows
the slightly different system of Quint. 5.10.23. First authority on all these systems is now
Bühring, op. cit. (supra n.7), after H. Usener, “Ein altes Lehrgebaude,” Kl. Schriften II (Leip­
zig 1912) 286–87, and F. Schupp, WS 45 (1926) 175f.
previously realized. Bühring\textsuperscript{23} seems to follow Matthes in suggesting a dependence of Asklepiades from Hermagoritic rhetoric; this I believe to be unjustified. The \textit{quadripartitio} of Asklepiades has no more direct parallel with Hermagoras’ or Theophrastus’ rhetoric than with Quintilian’s or with Aristotle’s categories or the ethical \textit{numeri} of the Stoics. It is a definite division into four and no more. We know it to be associated principally with Varro, as his words (Ling. 5.10) reveal:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Pythagoras Samius ait omnium rerum initia esse bina ut finitum et infinitum, bonum et malum, vitam et mortem, diem et noctem. quare item duo status et motus; quod stat aut agitatur, corpus; ubi agitatur, locus; dum agitatur, tempus; quod est in agitatu, actio. quadripartitio magis sic apparet; corpus est ut cursor, locus stadium qua currit, tempushora qua currit, actio cursio. quare fit, ut ideo fere omnia sint quadripartita et ea aeterna, quod neque unquam tempus, quin fuerit motus; eius enim intervallem tempus; neque motus, ubi non locus et corpus, quod alterum est quod movetur, alterum ubi: neque ubi is agitatus, non actio ibi. igitur initiorum quadrigae locus et corpus, tempus et actio.}\textsuperscript{24}
\end{quote}

Whence Varro derived this strange paragraph, we cannot say; I do not follow Dahlmann’s view, who sees a mixture of Stoic and Pythagorean doctrines, and prefer to think that Varro found both bipartite and quadripartite divisions in the same text, which would not of course exclude the view that the ultimate sources were as Dahlmann postulates. If Varro had one text, then it was a pseudo-Pythagorean.

What is important is the fact that Varro attached such importance to this \textit{quadripartitio} that he used it as scheme for different works, and even in such a place as this, fr.335 Buecheler from Aulus Gellius 13.11: 

\begin{quote}
\textit{Ipsum deinde convivium constat, inquit, ex rebus quattuor et tum denique omnibus suis numeris (!!) absolutum est, si belli homunculi conlecti sunt (1), si electus locus (2), si tempus lectum (3), si apparatus non neglectus (4).}
\end{quote}

Bühring\textsuperscript{25} learnt this from Knoche, but Dahlmann\textsuperscript{26} had already drawn attention to this same phenomenon and paralleled it from other works, following Boissier and Usener. There can be no doubt that this is the same \textit{quadripartitio} as is followed by Asklepiades, since

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{23} Op.cit. (supra n.7) 248 n.606, though only indirectly.
\item \textsuperscript{24} Quoted after H. Dahlmann, \textit{Varro und die hellenistische Sprachtheorie} (Berlin 1932) 36, who analyses the passage.
\item \textsuperscript{25} Op.cit. (supra n.7) 314.
\item \textsuperscript{26} Dahlmann, \textit{MusHelv} 7 (1950) 219 with references.
\end{itemize}
Varro’s actio/actus/res corresponds to Asklepiades’ πράξεις,27 where we might expect circumstantiae or causae had the system followed been that of Theophrastus (ap. Gell. 1.3.28) or Aristippus (fr.29 Mannebach = Diog.Laert. 2.66) or Seneca (De Officiis, deduced by Bühring from Martin of Bracara, Formula vitae honestae p.475,30 Haase) or other quadripartitions. Bühring follows Dahlmann in supposing that Varro derived his quadripartitio from a reduction of the Stoic numeri and suggests as source Antiochus of Askalon.28 I find this not entirely satisfactory. Certainly Varro was much influenced by Stoic linguistic theory as by other Stoic beliefs, but it is difficult to see why at the cost sometimes of great confusion to his work he should have picked out only the four numeri and applied them so relentlessly to so many areas. One feels he must have known of a quadripartitio of some wider appeal. Again it seems impossible that Varro and Asklepiades, who were contemporaries, could have derived the quadripartitio from each other, or independently from the Stoic numeri; it would be easier to imagine an intermediate source for both Varro and Asklepiades.

But now we see that the ‘historiographic’ divisions are numeri, and are intended to define an act, hence the frequent connection of them with ὑπόκεισθαι, e.g. Arist. EN 1109b14: οὖν γὰρ ὑπόκεισθαι διόρισεν καὶ πῶς καὶ τίς καὶ ἐπὶ πολλοί καὶ πόσον χρόνον δριμυτέον; cf. Pl. Leg. 636b, where the νόμων πέρι διακοσμοῦμενοι will be able to judge by using them.

From this observation we may derive two results. The ‘definitions’ of Sextus are a mistaken attempt to convey the notion that the quadripartitio is a means of definition of the subject of ιστορία; its four divisions are διορισμοί, the very term that Bühring29 has found in Aspasius applied to the numeri. Secondly they are means of definition, not, as Sextus claims, objects of definition of ιστορία, which is represented by our next division.

The second division30 of the ιστορούμενα into true, false and as-true

27 Noted by Bühring, loc.cit. (supra n.23); Dahlmann (see previous note) defends actus in Varro, Ep. ad Mar. ap. Non.Marc. 545,4 M. Res=actus in Quint. Inst. 3.6.28. Varro also used res as the final part of a quadripartitio (Bühring, op.cit. [supra n.7] 113; Dahlmann, op.cit. [supra n.24] 36 n.4). Obviously the terminology was not fixed, which means that in Greek we could substitute πράξεις for πράγματα. See infra n.37.
28 Cf. W. Kroll, RKM 58 (1903) 564ff.
29 Bühring, op.cit. (supra n.7), quoting Aspasius, Comm. in Arist. EN p.82,21 (Heylbut) on EN 1115b10 ff. I am indebted to Bühring for the two previous quotations also.
recurs only in § 263, since we have seen that the mention of \( \pi\lambda\acute{\alpha}m\alpha\tau\alpha \) and myths in § 92 is due to a confusion and therefore unhelpful for our purposes. However, § 263 contradicts § 252 both in general and in detail: (a) in general, the divisions that are defined in § 263 are \( \iota\sigma\tau\omega\rho\iota\alpha \), \( \mu\theta\omicron\omicron\) and \( \pi\lambda\acute{\alpha}m\alpha\tau\alpha \), whereas the divisions defined and exemplified in 252 are true, false and as-true; (b) in particular, \( \pi\lambda\acute{\alpha}m\alpha\tau\alpha \) as division is defined in 263 as ‘as-true’ while the division ‘false’ in 252 is exemplified by \( \tau\eta\nu\varphi\iota\rho\iota\pi\nu\iota\pi\alpha\tau\alpha \) and \( \mu\theta\omicron\omicron\) (sc. \( \iota\sigma\tau\omega\rho\iota\alpha \)).

Not unreasonably, therefore, Kaibel and others saw in 263 the original system, since (a) \( \pi\lambda\acute{\alpha}m\alpha\tau\alpha \) must include comedies and mimes, (b) a similar connection of \( \mu\theta\omicron\omicron\) and \( \pi\lambda\acute{\alpha}m\alpha\tau\alpha \) occurs in 92 and 265, showing the tendency of the thought of Sextus (cf. Plut. Camill. 22 \( \ldots \mu\theta\omicron\omicron\) καὶ \( \pi\lambda\acute{\alpha}m\alpha\tau\alpha \)), (c) the parallels show that the objects to be defined are as in 263, and (d) the addition in 263 of \( \gamma\epsilon\gamma\omicron\omicron\nu\omicron\omicron\alpha \) (truth) and \( \alpha\gamma\epsilon\nu\nu\tau\alpha \) (myth) presupposes a third division of \( \omicron\nu\gamma\epsilon\gamma\omicron\omicron\nu\omicron\omicron\alpha\omicron \) \( \acute{\alpha} \) \( \gamma\epsilon\nu\omicron\omicron\omicron \), i.e. κατὰ \( \phi\omicron\omicron\omicron\nu\omicron\omicron \) possible, i.e. comedy\(^{31}\) and mime. However it should be apparent by now that Sextus, probably by equating true \( \iota\sigma\tau\omega\rho\iota\alpha \) with the \( \nu\omicron\omicron\nu\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron \), was perfectly capable of making the blunder with \( \pi\lambda\acute{\alpha}m\alpha\tau\alpha \); we should therefore refrain from emending the text in § 252.

If the first division represents means, then the second division represents objects, which are to be defined by the application of the \( \nu\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron \) as belonging to three groups, true, false and in-between. The immediate inference is that we have a reworking of the Stoic concept of the ethical \( \acute{\alpha}\theta\omicron\alpha\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron \), which by application of the \( \nu\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron \) can be defined as good, bad or indifferent. But we can go further. What Asklepiades has done is to introduce a literary true, false and true-false \( \tau\pi\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron \) into the framework we normally associate with Stoic ethics. This tripartition has been traced rightly to Isocrates and ultimately to Plato, Rep. II 376\( \varepsilon \) by Pfister.\(^{32}\)

\(^{227}\) for its being generally Peripatetic. Matthes, \( \textit{op.cit. (supra n.13)} \) 196 n.3, agrees with Barwick, and in the context of the rhetoric of Hermagoras, shows that we have in it a κατὰ \( \pi\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron \) system opposed to a κατὰ \( \pi\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron \) system. Müller, \( \textit{op.cit. (supra n.3)} \) 35, thinks of \( \acute{\alpha}\rho\omicron\omicron\nu\omicron\omicron \) as opposed to \( \mu\omicron\omicron\omicron \), as in the system attributed by Usener to Tyrannion.

\(^{31}\) Clearly New Comedy, since Old Comedy would be \( \pi\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron \). On this complex issue, see the basic discussion of Barwick cited \( \textit{supra n.20} \) with Matthes' comments. Sextus has misunderstood his source here too.

\(^{32}\) F. Pfister, \textit{Hermes} 68 (1933) 457. One must of course avoid confusion with the common \( \textit{historia} (=\textit{facta})—\textit{fabula} \) antithesis, where grammatical theory is disregarded; cf. Mesk, \( \textit{op.cit. (supra n.14)} \) 233. Our tripartition is not to be confused again with the famous one in Pl. Rep. III 392\( \omicron \), on which lastly P. Steinmetz, \textit{Hermes} 92 (1964) 461.
To summarize, Asklepiades subordinated τεχνικῶν and ἱστορικῶν to his γραμματικῶν proper, explained in § 91. The τεχνικῶν he subdivided into elementary grammar, orthography and ἐλλημερίακα. The ἱστορι-κῶν he subdivided in one way, according to a quadripartition (persona, loci and tempora, res, the first being subdivided [§§ 92, 252] into gods, heroes and men); the object being a κατὰ πράγματα division of ἱστορούμενα according to truth content. Asklepiades then used a περὶκταισι with the object of defining ἱστορία as true, false, or as-true, i.e. historia proper, fabula, and argumentum.

It will be obvious that such a scheme might be useful for the historiographer, but of little value for the grammarian, since the application of truth as a criterion to literature is historical, not literary criticism. We shall find that this suspicion is justified. What have we to understand by this term ἱστορία, and why is Sextus so opposed to it? The complexity of the problem is principally due to the varied meanings of the Greek word, which underwent further variations on being imported into the Roman language. As a result, a historian or a grammarian or a rhetorician each had a different view of ἱστορία, inasmuch as it formed a part of all their arts. I offer an example of Polybius' conception, which makes an interesting parallel with the scheme of Asklepiades.

Polybius (9.14, 11.8) defines an education in generalship as (a) research ἐκ τῶν ὑπομνημάτων, i.e. in commentariis, (b) acquaintance with proper informants, (c) personal experience δὲ αὐτῶν τῶν πραγμάτων. In 12.25ε he applies a similar system to πραγματικὴ ἱστορία, i.e. (a) research into the commentarii, (b) geographical experience, (c) experience περὶ τὰς πράξεις τὰς πολιτικὰς. This methodological treatment of the art of the political historian is parallel and not subordinate to

33 Cf. the discussion in Entretiens Hardt 9, Varron (Geneva 1963) 26.
34 In general see TLL s.v. historia and litt. there cited.
35 Bühring, op.cit. (supra n.7) 302, notes that Epictetus, Ench. 30 mentions the application of numeri to define the duties of a general.
36 H. J. Mette, Paratereseis. Untersuchungen zur Sprachtheorie des Krates von Pergamon (Halle 1952) 56, considers Polybius' views here to be 'empiric'.
37 F. W. Walbank, A Historical Commentary on Polybius (Oxford 1957) ad loc., translates πραγματικὴ as 'political history', which must be right. But the term was a difficult one, cf. esp. for rhetoric W. Kroll, Philologus 91 (1936) 197ff, and for poetical theory H. Färber, Philologus 92 (1937) 369ff. In Plut. Galba 2.3 the function of πραγματικὴ ἱστορία (cf. A. W. Gomme, A Historical Commentary on Thucydides I (Oxford 1945) 55), as opposed to Plutarch's own methods, is τὰ καθ' ἐκαστα τῶν γεγονότων ἀπογγέλλων ἀκρίβειας. This comes from Arist. Poet. 1451b11: τὸ δὲ καθ' ἐκαστον τι 'Ἀλκιβιάδης ἐπραξεν καὶ τί ἐπάθεν. At Pol. 1341b30 πρακτικὰ is a division of poetry.
another theoretical discussion of historiography in 9.1.3 (cf. 9.2.1), where Polybius opposes his own \( \delta \ \varpi \rho \lambda \zeta \iota \varsigma \\tau \alpha \varsigma \ \pi \rho \delta \varepsilon \iota \varsigma \ \tau \rho \omicron \omicron \sigma \varsigma \) to (a) \( \delta \ \gamma \varepsilon \varepsilon \alpha \lambda \omicron \alpha \gamma \gamma \kappa \omicron \omicron \varsigma \) and (b) \( \delta \ \varpi \rho \lambda \zeta \iota \varsigma \ \alpha \omicron \rho \omega \iota \kappa \iota \varsigma \varsigma \) to \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \), which is essentially a chronological scheme.\(^{38}\) Despite the seeming coincidence here of his own type of history, which he claims appeals to the \( \pi \omega \lambda \iota \tau \iota \kappa \varsigma \), with the \( \pi \rho \alpha \gamma \mu \alpha \tau \iota \kappa \eta \iota \omicron \rho \iota \alpha \iota \) \( \omicron \iota \tau o r i a \), a closer examination shows that this is not so, since the two schemes are different in nature, one dealing with methods of acquiring and distinguishing true information, the other dealing with the (chronological) areas to be covered by historical research. Yet as I have suggested it is precisely by this easy error in subordinating the methodological division to \( \pi \rho \alpha \kappa \tau \iota \kappa \kappa \iota \omicron \rho \iota \alpha \iota \) only that Sextus too may have arrived at his subordinating system.

We must note also that in 12.25D–F Polybius is making an extensive but scarcely apposite\(^{39}\) comparison with an early Alexandrian tripartite division of medicine. Of this comparison, which is both epitomized and corrupt, we can say only with certainty that Polybius equated the first part of his historical division with the \( \lambda \omicron \iota \kappa \kappa \omicron \) of medical terminology, \( \i.e. \) theoretical research into doxographical case histories, which, according to Polybius, being over-emphasized by the Alexandrians, militates against truth and the facts because not enough attention is paid to the practical side of medical research.

It will not be denied that there is a suspicious similarity between Polybius’ three systems (a) \( \text{commentarii} / \text{genealogy-myth/theory} \), (b) \( \theta \varepsilon \alpha \) concerning geography, (c) personal experience, \( \pi \rho \delta \varepsilon \iota \varsigma \, \pi \rho \alpha \gamma \mu \alpha \tau \iota \kappa \eta \iota \omicron \rho \iota \alpha \iota \); and a resemblance to the quadripartition. Important for us is the conclusion that behind all this artificial systematization we seem to see a scheme where a type of \( \iota \tau o r i a \) was equated with \( \lambda \omicron \iota \kappa \kappa \omicron \), with \( \text{commentarii} \), research into myth, genealogies and mythological

\(^{38}\) P. Scheller, \textit{De Hellenistica historiae conscribendae arte} (diss. Leipzig 1911) 15ff; Schissel, \textit{op.cit.} (supra n.13) 624. Isoc. 15.45 distinguishes prose mythographers, commentators on poetry, and war historians as prose genres before giving up. Varro apparently followed this chronological scheme in his \textit{De Gente Populi Romani}.

\(^{39}\) Cf. Walbank (supra n.37) ad loc.; Fuhrmann, \textit{op.cit.} (supra n.22) 177; in general P. Pédech, \textit{La Méthode historique de Polybe} (Paris 1964) index \textit{s.v. Asclepiade}, and pp.21–43.

\(^{40}\) Cf. Tauriskos \textit{ap. Sext. adv. Gramm. \S\ 248}; later the empiric-skeptic \textit{epimeleustikōn}. Also cf. Galen, \textit{Subfiguratio empirica} 67.4 (Deichgräber): \( \kappa \alpha \lambda \varepsilon \iota \nu \tau \nu \varepsilon \varepsilon \nu \beta \iota \beta \iota \lambda \iota \varsigma \varsigma \) \( \gamma \varepsilon \rho \alpha \gamma \mu \varepsilon \omicron \mu \sigma \dot{\iota} \ eta \iota \omicron \rho \iota \alpha \iota \omicron \rho \omicron \iota \varepsilon \varepsilon \) \( \kappa \alpha \lambda \nu \dot{\iota} \iota \nu \tau \nu \varepsilon \varepsilon \nu \kappa \alpha \lambda \nu \dot{\iota} \iota \nu \tau \nu \varepsilon \varepsilon \nu \). For genealogy in place of \textit{personae} in our \textit{quadripartitio} see the scholia to Dion.Perieg. cited by Usener, \textit{loc.cit.} (supra n.22).
personae. Therefore Polybius (9.14.1, cf. 11.8.1) equates τὰ ἐξ ἱκτρόπιας with διὰ τῶν ὑπομνήματων, i.e. not empiric research, a true Hellenistic attitude.

Historia in Latin may mean fabula as in poetry or annalium confectio (Cic. De Or. 2.52) or anything in between. But in grammatical (i.e. educational) and medical parlance it preserved an original Greek sense of bibliographic research. In grammatical language, despite the definition of Dionysius Thrax and occasional protests from grammarians, this historia came to mean what every schoolboy knew, the enarratio poetarum.

This grammatical historia may be of a more specialized kind as in Varro, Ling. p.126,19 (Goetz-Schoell), which appears to mean ‘Entwicklung der Sprache’,\(^{41}\) or in the general use of auctoritas to translate ictrophia in the sense of determination of stylistic authority. But its most common use in Latin as in Greek in grammatical language is in describing the research necessary to determine and explain the meaning and origin of a word or phrase or story in poetry; e.g. Cicero, Div. 1.116 compares interpreters of oracles with the grammarians’ duty to the poets. Now this historia fabularis (Suet. Tib. 70) was always the province of the grammaticus (Suet. Gramm. 4: poetarum interpres = grammaticus) and included even what we should call aetiology.\(^{42}\) But there was a strong feeling that history in the strict sense belonged to the rhetor (Quint. 2.4.2, 2.5.1, esp. 2.1.4). This was a professional quarrel which could arise only with the division of education between grammaticus and rhetorician. Sextus §268 agrees with Quintilian and Cicero (De Or. 2.62; De Leg. 1.2.5 etc.) that true historiography is the province of the rhetorician, though they often meant by this no more than prose history: concessum est rhetoribus ementiri in historiis, jokes Cicero, Brut. 42. In De Or. 2.62ff\(^{43}\) Cicero assumes this, regrets the rhetoricians have not written historiography, proceeds to give (a) general historiographical principles, and then in 63 (b) the areas of history according to the scheme tempus, locus, res gestae, homines, causae.

\(^{41}\) R. Reitzenstein, M. Terentius Varro und Johannes Mauropus von Euchaita (Leipzig 1901) 82.

\(^{42}\) Dahlmann, op.cit. (supra n.24) 27.

\(^{43}\) But Isoc. 15.45 and schol. Dion. Thrax 449.1 both exclude historiography from rhetoric. Note that at De Or. 2.53 Cicero classifies our quadripartitio as annalium confectio, possibly a hit at Varro.
In the eyes of dedicated historians, or those who had learned the proper clichés, the division between poetic *historia* and prose history was one between lies\(^{44}\) and truth, and therefore the limits of grammatical *historia* were of perennial interest to all historians, since it was part of elementary schooling; many of the fixed clichés assembled by Scheller and Avenarius are to be explained by the desire on the part of historians to disassociate themselves from the common school prejudices about history, which reeked of pedantry and mythological obscurities, but also of fiction.

Precisely what this grammatical history was we can see best from the examples given us by the educators, who, if rhetoricians, usually write with a certain contempt, and by Sextus himself: it consists almost wholly of what we should now call mythology and biography, *usque ad ineptias atque derisum* (Suet. *Tib.* 70). Sextus adduces (§§ 257–258) several stories of biographical interest, which he calls *αὐξηρητα*.\(^{45}\) He goes on to exemplify the folly of biography from the various accounts given of the deaths of Odysseus and Asklepios.\(^{46}\)

In Roman and in Hellenistic times we see the traces of a discussion that begins with the critics of Homer in the fifth century concerning the relationship of *historia* to truth\(^ {47}\) and its place in education. Of this we are offered principally views biassed according as the source is a historian, a rhetorician or a grammarian.\(^ {48}\)

Sextus' tirade against *ἐκτοπία* falls into place when we realize that though skeptic, he dislikes the empiric school of medicine.\(^ {49}\) Especially he dislikes their—to his mind—unskeptical reliance on *ἐκτοπία*, transmitted case doxographies. We have a remarkable parallel in


\(^{45}\) Avenarius, *op.cit.* (supra n.44) 22ff, shows this to be a part of the technical abuse used by historians.

\(^{46}\) Cf. *RAC* 6 (1966) 1258ff s.v. *EXITUS ILLUSTRIUM VIRORUM* (Ronconi) for this *topos*, where add Cic. *Brut.* 43 on *mors vulgaris*.


\(^{48}\) Isid. *Etym.* 1.41.2 following Augustine still defines *historia* as belonging to grammar, but cf. 1.44.5 and L. Arbusov, *Colores rhetorici*² (Göttingen 1963) 95 and 109, where most of the topoi listed are Hellenistic in origin.

[Galen’s] Περὶ ἀρίστης εὐρέσεως I, pp.142ff Kühn, where arguments very similar to those of Sextus are marshalled against ἱστορία, e.g. that it is ἄχρηστος and without a κριτήριον of truth. Again with [Galen’s] contention that (I p.145,5–6) the judges of ἱστορία cannot judge λόγω, compare Sextus’ introduction § 43, where a claim of the grammarians is that they can τὰ ἐκ τῶν μυθῶν τε καὶ ἱστοριῶν λόγῳ διορίζειν.

In this passage (I p.148,4 Kühn) and in Galen’s Subfiguratio empirica p.68,8 D. we have the same example given for methods of ἱστορία, viz. how can we know for a fact that Crete is an island. We shall not, we are told, accept e.g. as evidence letters to this effect, cf. Sen. Ep. 22.1ff: non potest medicus per epistolas cibi aut balinei tempus eligere. But we shall accept as evidence the συμφωνία of reports of intelligent observers. Deichgraber says: “In der Zusammenstellung dieser Kriterien wie in der Einführung des Prinzips der ἱστορία überhaupt sind die Empiriker durchaus selbständig. Wenn Philippson ... in Aristoteles einen Vorläufer dieses Prinzips findet, so weiss ich nicht welche Nachrichten es sind, die zu dieser Annahme berechtigen.”

There is in fact such evidence: at Pl. Leg. 662B the Athenian replies ironically to the Cretan, who has asked καὶ πῶς ἂν ταῦτα γ’ ἐτι συγχωροῦν; the following: ὅπως; εἰ θεός ἦμιν, ὡς ἔουσαι, ὡς ἂνοι, δοή τις συμφωνήσαι, ὡς νῦν ἡ σχεδὸν ἀπάθομεν ἀπ’ ἀλλήλων. ἐμοὶ γὰρ δὴ φαίνεται ταῦτα οὕτως ἀναγκαία, ὡς οὐδέ, ὡς ἄλλα Κλεινία, Κρήτη νήσος καθά. This is a direct reference to the proverb δὲ Κρῆς τὸν πώντον, which is as old as Alkman (Alcaeus?) fr.164 (Page, PMelGr) and is based on the ancient reputation of the Cretans for falsehood. The variant proverb δὲ Σικελὸς ... is therefore secondary, though Σικελίαν occurs at Gal. Subfig.emp. p.68,7 D. also. We are forced to believe that the methodological discussion of ἱστορία is at least as old as Plato.

Now Bühring has shown that from the time of Plato onwards the numeri are often connected with medicine (Pl. Phdr. 268a, Prot. 314a, etc.), and Aristotle speaks of them as being applied by a doctor, EN 1137a16: τοσοῦτον ἔργον ὅσον ἱατρῶν εἶναι. It becomes all the more difficult to believe the numeri and the discussion of ἱστορία do not belong together in medical practice from an early period. Why should Asklepiades have been interested in them? There is an obvious solution.

50 Deichgräber, op.cit. (supra n.49) fr.59, with other medical passages.
51 Deichgräber, op.cit. (supra n.49) 300, but cf. Reid on Cic. Acad.Pr. 95.
Opinion has been unanimous in this century, though not before, that Asklepiades in the *adv. Gramm.* is Asklepiades of Myrlea, who was among other things a source for Strabo. The grounds for this are (a) the Myrlean was a grammarian and only a grammarian would write on grammar; (b) Suidas, in a confused passage, tells us that an Asklepiades wrote at least ten books on grammarians; if he followed an *ars/artifex* principle or *ars/artifex/opus* division, we should expect that he would be the same man who wrote on grammar; and (c) both Asklepiades of Myrlea and our Asklepiades criticize Dionysius Thrax. Against these arguments we have to set others just as convincing. (a) Sextus does not indicate that Asklepiades is a grammarian; in fact everywhere else in his works Asklepiades or οἱ περὶ Ἀσκληπιάδην refers to the famous doctor of the first century B.C., Asklepiades of Bithynia. Since there is no further definition in the *adv. Grammaticos*, Sextus must mean the same person. Even the οἱ περὶ Ἀσκληπιάδην (adv. Gramm. 73) has its exact parallels in other works with the systematic school founded by Asklepiades the physician, while we nowhere hear of a school of the Myrlean. Perhaps Sextus mistook another Asklepiades—as a physician he must have read several—as the famous physician, but there seems little doubt that he does not differentiate his source in the *adv. Grammaticos* because he believes it to be the same as the one he knows best. (b) Though we do not know that either Asklepiades wrote a grammar, we learn from Pliny, *NH* 26.7 that the medical Asklepiades was a rhetorician before he became a physician and earned the abuse of Galen. Further, physicians were more interested in literary matters than we are apt to believe. Galen especially wrote an immense number of literary tracts. Dahlmann

52 RE 2 (1896) 1628 s.v. ASKLEPIADES 28 (Wendel), on which see W. Kroll, *Philologus* 88 (1933) 463 n.34, who makes some sensible remarks about our evidence for Stoic rhetoric.


55 D. van Berchem, *MusHelv* 9 (1952) 79ff, but again there is no evidence for general application.


57 J. Ilberg, *RhM* n.f. 52 (1897) 617ff.
has shown the fragility of the whole *ars/artifex* argument; we cannot suppose that a work on Grammarians automatically implies a work on Grammar. (c) The third point has to be considered in the light of the reputation of Dionysius Thrax; since he was the grammarian *par excellence* for the first century B.C. and later times, it would be impossible for anyone who wrote a grammar to avoid criticism of his definition of grammar. This is far from being sufficient evidence for equating two people of the same name.

We cannot say who the source of Sextus certainly is, but Sextus appears to assume that it is the famous physician. Confusion was easy, since there were many persons named Asklepiades, and our two came from the same area at about the same time; they are confused even in the text of Strabo 12.4.9 C566. But if the physician wrote on grammar and had available to him the source of Varro's *quadripartitio*, he would have produced a chapter on * ecstatica* much as we have reconstructed. The 'historiographical' element in the system would be due to its use in medical *historia*, and ill adapted to grammar. Polybius too saw parallels in medicine with historiography; it is not surprising that someone applied the methods of medical *historia* to grammatical *historia*. Who could be more likely to do so than a rhetorician (i.e. at this time a *grammaticus* also) with medical interests?

To sum up, I believe the methodological interest in *historia* to be originally a medical one; its methodology produced a series of *numer* which could be applied not only to *historia* but to ethics and other fields. The application to grammar took place in the first century B.C. when both Varro and Asklepiades applied it to the *τεχνικόν* and the * ἡστορικόν* respectively. Their source had affinities with Stoicism, but need not have been Stoic.

A final thought. Bühring, following Knoche, points out that fr.127 of Pindar seems to presuppose the concept of *numer*. The term *ἀριθμός* one connects with Pythagoreanism. Varro mentions a debt to Pythagoreanism. Is it too much to suggest that the original impetus to systematize might have come from that fertile but obscure source of much Greek thought? The *μεταττημένον* concept, which is not too far from the *numer* we can trace in medicine and then in ethics,68 it too is found in Pythagoreanism. Perhaps the idea is not to be rejected out of hand.

68 F. Wehrli, "Medizin und Ethik," *MusHelv* 8 (1951) 40ff, esp. 56.
As for Sextus, we find him to be a bungling doctor, whose eagerness to refute grammatical doctrines was not equalled by his capacity to understand them. Since we have recently been informed by a learned essay that the *adv. Grammaticos* illustrates Sextus' "unity of thought," it may be as well to emphasize that what little unity of thought we find usually conceals a distortion of his sources.
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59 Krentz, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.2). The tendency to tripartition is attributed with exaggeration to Asklepiades by Müller, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.3), a view modified by Heinicke, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.18) 14ff. There is good reason to believe that Sextus may be in part responsible for the division into three, since this was typical of empiric medicine, with its *ευστατικά* and *τελικά*, and cf. Usener, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.22) 274ff.