

Choeroboscus' *Prolegomena to Orthography*: The Evidence of *Psalm-Epimerisms* and Ps.-Theodosius

Stefano Valente

THE BODY OF Byzantine orthographical literature is quite enormous and, for the most part, studied rarely and edited poorly.¹ Most of the orthographical treatises are anonymous or falsely ascribed in antiquity to some famous grammarian; there are few critical editions, some careless transcriptions of single manuscripts, and few studies of the textual traditions of single works. Obviously, these are significant obstacles to understanding properly a basic part of the educational and grammatical system in the Byzantine world.

Among the Byzantine orthographers, George Choeroboscus,² a grammarian who lived in Byzantium in the eighth and ninth centuries,³ played an important role. He wrote many

¹ See K. Alpers, "Die griechischen Orthographien aus Spätantike und byzantinischer Zeit," *BZ* 97 (2004: hereafter "Alpers") 1–50, nominally a review of J. Schneider, *Les traités orthographiques grecs antiques et byzantins* (Turnhout 1999), but much more useful and well-grounded; see also P. Egenolff, *Die orthographischen Stücke der byzantinischen Litteratur* (Leipzig 1888: hereafter "Egenolff"); C. Wendel, "Orthographie," *RE* 18 (1942) 1442–1454; H. Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner* (Munich 1978) 18–22.

² On Choeroboscus' orthographical work and his sources see Alpers 31–36. See also N. Wilson, *Scholars of Byzantium*² (Oxford 1996) 69–74, 277; E. Dickey, *Ancient Greek Scholarship. A Guide to Finding, Reading, and Understanding Scholia, Commentaries, Lexica, and Grammatical Treatises* (Oxford 2007) 80–81.

³ See W. Bühler and C. Theodoridis, "Johannes von Damaskos *terminus post quem* für Choeroboskos," *BZ* 69 (1976) 397–401; C. Theodoridis, "Der Hymnograph Klemens *terminus post quem* für Choeroboskos," *BZ* 73

grammatical works, including an *Orthography* that was alphabetically arranged and tripartite—that is to say, divided into *σύνταξις* (“syntax,” dealing with problems of syllabification, especially the boundaries of syllables), *ποιότης* (“quality,” concerning doubts on the spelling of consonants), and *ποσότης* (“quantity,” handling doubts on the spelling of vowels).⁴ Unfortunately, the direct tradition preserves only an epitome of the latter part of this work.⁵ The only available printed edition is Cramer’s transcription of the most important witness, the MS. Bodleian *Barocci* 50 (tenth cent.).⁶

Following Hilgard,⁷ Alpers rightly stresses that “es gibt ...

(1980) 341–345.

⁴ See Wendel, *RE* 18 (1942) 1454–1455; Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur* 18; D. L. Blank, *Sextus Empiricus. Against the Grammarians* (Oxford 1998) 199; Schneider, *Les traités* 4 ff. Such tripartition dates back to the second half of the second century B.C., becoming canonical first with Trypho and later with Herodian, whose *Orthography* was for centuries consistently the main source for all Byzantine orthographers (see Egenolff 3–4, Wendel 1440, Hunger 18, Alpers 2–3).

⁵ See Alpers 31–32.

⁶ Cramer, *Anecd. Ox.* II 167–281. His transcription is not always reliable: see R. Schneider, *Bodleiana* (Leipzig 1887); Alpers 31. In this manuscript the title of Choeroboscus’ *Orthography* deserves attention (167.2–7): ἀρχὴ σὺν Θεῷ τοῦ ποσοῦ τῆς ὀρθογραφίας κατὰ στοιχείων (*scripsi* : *στοι*^x ms., see F. Ronconi, *I manoscritti greci miscellanei. Ricerche su esemplari dei secoli IX–XII* [Spoleto 2007] pl. 8 : -a Cramer) ἀπὸ φωνῆς Γεωργίου τοῦ Χοιροβοσκοῦ Βυζαντίου γραμματικοῦ καὶ οἰκουμενικοῦ διδασκάλου· ἐν συντομίᾳ τμηθὲν ἐκ τῆς καθόλου καὶ κατὰ πλάτος αὐτοῦ Ὀρθογραφίας· διὰ τὸ ἐν συντόμῳ εὐσύνοπτον εἶναι τὸ ζητούμενον, σὺν καὶ ταῖς αἰτίαις ἐκάστου (“incipit with God’s help of the quantity of the orthography arranged in alphabetical order according to the notes taken at lectures of George Choeroboscus, grammarian of Byzantium and ecumenical teacher; excerpt cut from his complete and extended *Orthography*, to make what is inquired easy to find quickly, with also the accounts of each one”). It confirms that Choeroboscus’ work was ἀπὸ φωνῆς (i.e. notes taken at his lectures or classes) and that the manuscript preserves only an abridged version of it (see Alpers 31 ff.). On the Bodleian *Barocci* 50 see Ronconi 91–131.

⁷ A. Hilgard, *Theodosii Alexandrini canones Georgii Choerobosci scholia Sophronii* (Leipzig 1894) LXXXI f.

deutliche Zeugnisse, daß die ursprüngliche Fassung, die *καθόλου καὶ κατὰ πλάτος αὐτοῦ Ὀρθογραφία*, auch detaillierte Prolegomena besaß.”⁸ Some fragments of the prolegomena (as well as of the other two parts on *σύνταξις* and *ποιότης*) can be found elsewhere in Choeroboscus’ works.⁹ For instance, in his *Psalm-Epimerisms*, a work in erotematic form in which the biblical text is explained merely from a grammatical point of view, he often handles spelling problems.¹⁰ According to Alpers,¹¹ “Reflexe der Prolegomena sind vielleicht auch in dem

⁸ Alpers 32 (n.130 for the quotation of Choerob. *In Theod.*, *Gramm.Gr* IV.2 156.35–36, ἡμεῖς δέ, εἰ θεῶ φίλον, ἐν τοῖς προλεγομένοις τῆς Ὀρθογραφίας διαλάβωμεν περὶ αὐτῶν, “if it pleases God, let us explain such things in the *prolegomena* of *Orthography*”).

⁹ See Alpers 31–33. Furthermore, a fuller version of Choeroboscus’ *Orthography* has been a direct source of Byzantine *Etymologica* (see Schneider, *Les traités* 235–255; Alpers 31 ff.). For example, Hilgard (*Theodosii* LXXXI) points out that *Et.Magn.* 816.52 Gaisford may come from this lost preface: see Choerob. *Orth.* 275.19 ~ *Et.Gud.* 566.26–36 Sturz (Hdn., *Gramm.Gr* III.2 604.30); Alpers (32 n.130) rejects the ascription of this entry to Charax suggested by Schneider (435 n.56). Moreover, Alpers (8 n.26) suggests that the similar definitions of the four canons in schol. Lond. Dion. Thrax, *Gramm.Gr* I.3 454.14 (dealing with the twelve canons of ἀνάγνωσις, “reading”: see D. Fehling, “Varro und die grammatische Lehre von der Analogie und der Flexion,” *Glotta* 35 [1956] 251) may also come from Choeroboscus. (E. Siebenborn, *Die Lehre von der Sprachrichtigkeit und ihren Kriterien. Studien zur antiken normativen Grammatik* [Amsterdam 1967] 159, cites this scholion, but does not identify the source nor the close relationship with the entry of the *Et. Magn.*)

¹⁰ The only available edition is that of T. Gaisford, *Georgii Choerobosci Epimerismi in Psalmos* (Oxford 1842), based on *Paris.gr.* 2756: see Schneider, *Les traités* 437–441, and particularly Alpers 35–36, for a survey of the textual tradition of this work. *Marcian.gr.* 492, mid-fifteenth century, can be added to the ten MSS. listed there: E. Mioni, *Bibliothecae Divi Marci Venetiarum codices Graeci manuscripti* II (Rome 1985) 302.

¹¹ Alpers 32 n.130, who cites Schneider, *Les traités* 439: “il est fait mention des quatre canons de l’orthographe. On trouve la doctrine complète p. 89.14ex.–26in., avec une allusion (p. 89.18–19) au double sens du mot ὀρθογραφία. Les exemples correspondent très bien à ceux du supplément 18, non à ceux de Charax.” On his latter statement see n.17 below.

Psalmenepimerismen 89,14–26 Gaisford zu erkennen”; here, dealing with the adverb *σήμερον* (Ps. 2:7), the grammarian introduces the (orthographical) canon of *παράδοσις* to account for the spelling with epsilon of syllable *-με-*, adding a concise list and explanation of the four canons of orthography: analogy, dialect, etymology, and history¹² (89.5–30 Gaisford, whence *Et.Gud.* 499.26–40 Sturz.):

σήμερον ... καὶ πόθεν γίνεται; παρὰ τὸ ἡμέρα, ἐξ οὗ καὶ γράφεται διὰ τοῦ η̄ ἀνεφάνη γὰρ τὸ ᾱ ἐν τῷ σάμερον, καὶ τὰ ἔχοντα ἀναφαινόμενον τὸ ᾱ διὰ τοῦ η̄ γράφεται, σάμερον σήμερον, ἄλιος ἥλιος, σᾶμα σῆμα. ... τὸ με ψιλόν, διατί; κατὰ παράδοσιν. κατὰ ποῖον κανόνα τῆς ὀρθογραφίας; κατὰ ἱστορίαν. καὶ πόσοι κανόνες τῆς ὀρθογραφίας; τέσσαρες· ἀναλογία, διάλεκτος, ἐτυμολογία, ἱστορία. τί ἐστὶν ἀναλογία; ὅταν κατορθοῦμεν¹³ γραφήν,¹⁴ ἢ ὅταν κανόνα ἀποδῶμεν, ὡς περ ἐπὶ τοῦ ταχεῖα ἐδηλώσαμεν. τί ἐστὶν διάλεκτος; ὅταν τὸ ἡμεῖς διὰ τῆς εἰ διφθόγγου γραφόμενον εἴπω, ἐπεὶ οἱ Αἰολεῖς ἄμ<μ>ε<ε>¹⁵ λέγουσι, τὸ προσὸν ε̄ τῇ λέξει ἐκφωνήσαντες. τί ἐστὶν ἐτυμολογία; ὅταν τὸ ἡπειρος διὰ τῆς εἰ διφθόγγου γράφω<ν>¹⁶ εἴπω, διότι πέρασ οὐκ ἔχει, ἄπερος καὶ ἄπειρός τις οὔσα. τί ἐστὶν ἱστορία; ὅταν τὸ χίλιοι διὰ τοῦ ι γράφηται, εἴπω “οὕτως αὐτὸ βούλεται γράφειν ἢ παράδοσις κτλ.”

today: ... and where does it come from? From day, thus it is spelt with eta: alpha is evident in *σάμερον*, and words which clearly have alpha are spelt with eta, as *σάμερον σήμερον*, *ἄλιος ἥλιος* (“sun”), *σᾶμα σῆμα* (“sign”) ... Why is the syllable *-με-* spelt with epsilon? According to paradosis. According to what canon of orthography? According to history. And how many are the canons of orthography? Four: analogy, dialect, etymology, history. What is analogy? When we correct the spelling, or when we enunciate a canon, as we have demonstrated for the word τα-

¹² On the four canons of orthography see Siebenborn, *Die Lehre* 67, 159–163.

¹³ *Scripti coll.* Ps.-Theodosius (see below) : κατορθῶμεν *Paris.gr.* 2756 (Gaisford), *Et.Gud.* 499.34–35 Sturz.

¹⁴ *Et.Gud.* 499.35 : γραφήν *Paris.gr.* 2756.

¹⁵ *Scripti coll.* Ps.-Theodosius (see below) : ἄμε<ε> *Paris.gr.* 2756.

¹⁶ *Scripti coll.* Ps.-Theodosius (see below) : γράφω *Paris.gr.* 2756.

χεία (“quick”). What is dialect? When I say that *ἡμεῖς* (“we”) is spelt with the diphthong epsilon-iota, because the Aeolians say *ἄμ<μ>ες* pronouncing the present epsilon in the word. What is etymology? When I spell *ἡπειρος* (“land”) with the diphthong epsilon-iota and I say because it has no limits, being *ἄπερος* and *ἄπειρος* (“boundless”). What is history? When *χίλιοι* (“a thousand”) is spelt with iota, I say “the paradosis has it spelt in this way.”

If we assume, following Alpers, that this passage reflects Choeroboscus’ own *Prolegomena*, the explanation of analogy-canon is surprising because here the grammarian says only *ὡσπερ ἐπὶ τοῦ ταχεία ἐδηλώσαμεν*, while he is never concerned with this adjective in the whole *Psalm-Epimerisms*.¹⁷ The same formula, indeed, occurs in the so-called Ps.-Theodosius.¹⁸ This work was edited for the first (and last) time in 1822 by Goettling,¹⁹ on the basis of *Paris.gr.* 2553 and 2555, in a very unsatisfactory manner.²⁰ As far as we can see, it is a hotchpotch of grammatical materials from many different and heterogeneous sources, some of them still unidentified, probably put together before the second half of the tenth century. Its tripartite orthographical part (pp.61–79) carries a general introduction to the matter (61.22–62.26), already edited in 1821 by Bekker²¹ on the basis of *Vat.gr.* 1370. After the definitions of orthography and of its three fields of investigation, the four canons are listed and described as follows:²²

¹⁷ Moreover, in the Psalms, the feminine adjective *ταχεία* never appears. Schneider, *Les traités* 439 (see n.11 above) considers it as simply an allusion to the double definition of orthography.

¹⁸ See G. Uhlig, *Dionysii Thracis ars grammatica* (Leipzig 1883) xxxvii; Egenolff 10–13; Alpers 23 ff. As Alpers rightly stresses, Schneider (*Les traités* 130–175) misleadingly calls it “Supplément 18” on the basis of Uhlig LV.

¹⁹ *Θεοδοσίου γραμματικοῦ περὶ γραμματικῆς*. *Theodosii Alexandrini Grammatica*, ed. C. G. Goettling (Leipzig 1822).

²⁰ See Alpers 23–26.

²¹ *Anecd.Bekk.* III 1127–1128 n. *. See Egenolff 11; Alpers 8, 24.

²² I print Bekker’s text with some slight corrections and supplements on the basis of the variant readings of Goettling’s edition (n.19 above).

δύο σημαίνει τὸ τῆς ὀρθογραφίας ὄνομα. ὀρθογραφία ἐστὶν ἡ ὀρθῶς γεγραμμένη λέξις, καὶ πάλιν ὀρθογραφία ἐστὶν ὁ κανὼν ὁ {ἀποδοτικὸς καὶ} ἀποδεικτικὸς τῆς ὀρθῶς γεγραμμένης λέξεως. ἔαν γὰρ τὸ ταχεῖα γράψω διὰ τῆς εἰ διφθόγγου, καὶ αὐτὴ ἡ λέξις ὀρθῶς γραφείσα ὀρθογραφία καλεῖται, κὰν ἐρωτηθεὶς τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς γραφῆς καὶ εἴπω <τὸν κανόνα>, ὅτι τὰ ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς υς <ληγόντων> ἀρσενικῶν παρεσχηματισμένα θηλυκὰ <διὰ τοῦ εἰα> διὰ τῆς εἰ διφθόγγου γράφεται, <οἷον ταχύς ταχεῖα, ὠκύς ὠκεῖα, ἡδύς ἡδεῖα,> βραδύς βραδεῖα, ὀξύς ὀξεῖα, καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ κανὼν ὀρθογραφία καλεῖται.

τῆς δὲ ὀρθογραφίας εἶδη τρία, σύνταξις, ποιότης καὶ ποσότης. καὶ σύνταξις μὲν ἐστὶν ὅταν ζητῶμεν ποία συλλαβὴ συντάξωμεν τὰ στοιχεῖα, οἷον ἐν τῷ ἀσθενῆς τὸ σ πότερον ληκτικὸν ἐστὶ τῆς προτέρας συλλαβῆς ἢ ἀρκτικὸν τῆς δευτέρας.²³ ποιότης δὲ ὅταν ζητῶμεν ποῖον στοιχεῖον γεγραμμένον ἐν τῷ ἔμπορος, τὸ ν ἢ τὸ μ· ποσότης δὲ ὅταν ζητῶμεν ἐν τῷ μῖμος πόσα στοιχεῖα ἐστὶ, μι ἢ μει. καὶ ταῦτα μὲν τὰ εἶδη τῆς ὀρθογραφίας.

κανόνες δὲ αὐτῆς τέσσαρες, ἀναλογία, διάλεκτος, ἔτυμολογία, ἱστορία. καὶ ἀναλογία μὲν κατορθοῦμεν γραφήν, ὅταν κανόνα ἀποδῶμεν, ὡσπερ ἐπὶ τοῦ ταχεῖα ἐδηλώσαμεν· διαλέκτῳ δέ, ὅταν τὸ ἡμεῖς διὰ τῆς εἰ διφθόγγου γράφων εἴπω ὅτι Ἄιολεῖς ἄμμες λέγουσι, τὸ π<ρ>οσὸν {ν} τῇ λέξει <ἐκ>φωνήσαντες.²⁴ ἔτυμολογία δέ, ὅταν τὸ ἡπειρος <διὰ τοῦ η τὴν πρώτην συλλαβὴν καὶ> διὰ τῆς εἰ διφθόγγου <τὴν δευτέραν> γράφων εἴπω “ἐπειδὴ πέρασ οὐκ ἔχει, ἄπερός τις οὔσα.”²⁵ ἱστορία δέ, ὅταν τὸ

²³ 62.3–7 Goettling: οἷον ἐν τῷ ἀσθενῆς πότερον τὸ σ κτητικὸν ἐστὶ τῆς ἀ συλλαβῆς ἢ γουν τῆς πρώτης, ἢ τῆς θε ἢ γουν τῆς δευτέρας, τουτέστιν ἀσ- λέγομεν ἢ ἀ-σθε, τῆς πρώτης ἐστὶ ληκτικὸν ἢ τῆς δευτέρας ἀρκτικὸν (“for example, whether in ἀσθενῆς sigma belongs to the syllable ἀ, the first, or to the syllable θε, the second, that is to say whether we say ἀσ- or ἀ-σθε, that is whether sigma ends the first syllable or begins the second”).

²⁴ *Scripti coll.* Choerob. (see above), Charax (see below) : ὅτι τὸ ποσον (*sic*) ἐν τῇ λέξει προφωνήσαντες *Val.gr.* 1370 (Bekker) : ὅτι οἱ Δωριεῖς ἄμμες λέγουσι καὶ ἡμεῖς τὸ περισσὸν ε συναιροῦντες δίφθογγον ἐποίησαμεν *Paris.gr.* 2553 and 2555 (62.18–19 Goettling).

²⁵ 62.20–24 Goettling: ὅταν τὸ ἡπειρος διὰ τοῦ η τὴν πρώτην συλλαβὴν καὶ διὰ διφθόγγου τὴν δευτέραν γράφοντες εἴπωμεν ἄπερος τίς ἐστὶν ἡ γῆ, ἢ γουν μὴ ἔχουσα πέρασ, τροπῇ δὲ τοῦ α εἰς η καὶ πλεονασμῷ τοῦ ι ἡπειρος (“when we spell ἡπειρος with eta in the first syllable and with the

χίλιοι γράφων διὰ τοῦ ι εἶπω· “οὕτως αὐτὸ βούλεται γράφεσθαι ἢ παράδοσις.”

The noun orthography has two meanings: orthography is the word correctly spelt and the demonstrative canon of the word correctly spelt. For example, if I write *ταχεῖα* with the diphthong epsilon-iota, the word itself correctly spelt is called orthography; and if I am asked about the account of the spelling and I say the canon, that is “the feminine adjectives ending in *-εῖα* of masculine ending in *-υς* are spelt with the diphthong epsilon-iota, as *ταχύς ταχεῖα* (“quick”), *ώκός ώκεῖα* (“swift”), *ἡδύς ἡδεῖα* (“sweet”), *βραδύς βραδεῖα* (“slow”), *ὀξύς ὀξεῖα* (“sharp”), then the canon itself is called orthography.

The fields of orthography are three: syntax, quality, and quantity. Syntax is when we inquire to which syllable we assign the letters: for example, whether the first sigma in *ἀσθενής* (“weak”) ends the first syllable or begins the second. Quality is when we inquire which is the letter to be spelt in the word *ἔμπορος* (“trader”), *my* or *ny*. Quantity is when we inquire which are the letters in *μίμος* (“mime”), *my*-iota or *my*-epsilon-iota. And these are the fields of orthography.

Its canons are four: analogy, dialect, etymology, history. And we correct the spelling with analogy, when we enunciate a canon, as we have demonstrated for the word *ταχεῖα*. With dialect, when I spell *ἡμεῖς* (“we”) with the diphthong epsilon-iota and I say that the Aeolians say *ἄμμες* pronouncing the epsilon present in the word. With etymology, when we spell *ἡπειρος* (“land”) with eta in the first syllable and with the diphthong epsilon-iota in the second and I say: “because it has no limits, being *ἄπερος*.” With history, when I spell *χίλιοι* (“a thousand”) with iota and I say “the paradosis has it spelt in this way.”

The third paragraph shows striking coincidences with the Psalm-epimerism cited above, in particular with the canon of analogy, which is illustrated, just as in Choeroboscus’ passage,

diphthong in the second and we say: ‘the earth is *ἄπερος*, that is it has no limits’; *ἡπειρος* comes from changing alpha in eta and adding iota in *ἄπερος*”).

only by ὡσπερ ἐπὶ τοῦ ταχεῖα ἐδηλώσαμεν. However, in Ps.-Theodosius, such a formula can be easily explained through the first paragraph dealing with the definition of orthography, where its second meaning—ὁ κανὼν ὁ ἀποδεικτικὸς τῆς ὀρθῶς γεγραμμένης λέξεως—is exemplified by the (analogical) canon of the adjective ταχύς ταχεῖα, which occurs elsewhere in Choeroboscus' *Orthography*.²⁶ The same example can thus be recalled a few lines below to account for the canon of analogy.²⁷ Thus, if the Psalm-epimerism hints, as it seems, at this extended definition, then at least the entire passage of Ps.-Theodosius may have been gathered from Choeroboscus' lost *Prolegomena* to orthography.

Moreover, two other possible pieces of evidence can be produced. In the entry ἡπειρος of Choeroboscus's *Orthography*

²⁶ See 179.20 (whence *Et.Gud.* 51.20 De Stefani, see [Zonar.] 81.14 αἰπεῖα· δίφθογγον· καὶ πάντα τὰ παρασχηματισμένα τὴν (ἀπὸ τὸ [Zonar.] ft. recte) εἰς υς· ταχύς, ταχεῖα· βραδύς, βραδεῖα (“high: diphthong; and all the adjectives from those ending in -υς: ταχύς ταχεῖα, βραδύς βραδεῖα”), 208.5 (Hdn., *Gramm.Gr* III.2 513.25–27) εὐρεῖα· διὰ τῆς εἰ διφθόγγου· ... τὰ ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς υς ἀρσενικῶν διὰ τοῦ εἰα παρασχηματιζόμενα θηλυκὰ, διὰ τῆς εἰ διφθόγγου γράφεται· οἶον, βραδύς, βραδεῖα· οὕτως καὶ ἡδύς, ἡδεῖα, καὶ εὐρύς, εὐρεῖα (“wide: with the diphthong epsilon-iota ... The feminine adjectives ending in -εἰα which derive from a masculine ending in -υς are spelt with the diphthong epsilon-iota, as βραδύς βραδεῖα, as well as ἡδύς ἡδεῖα and εὐρύς εὐρεῖα”), 253.12 (~ *Et.Magn.* 687.5 [Hdn. 573.5]) πρεσβεῖα· διὰ τῆς εἰ διφθόγγου γράφεται· ... τὰ ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς εὐς διὰ τοῦ εἰα παρασχηματισμένα θηλυκὰ διὰ τῆς εἰ διφθόγγου γράφεται· οἶον, ταχύς, ταχεῖα, οὕτως καὶ πρεσβύς, πρεσβεῖα κτλ. (“embassy: it is spelt with the diphthong epsilon-iota ... The feminine words ending in -εἰα which derive from one ending in -εὐς are spelt with the diphthong epsilon-iota: as ταχύς ταχεῖα, so πρεσβύς πρεσβεῖα”).

²⁷ Fehling (*Glotta* 35 [1956] 238) rightly stresses that “Analogie sei die Zusammenstellung des Ähnlichen, die zur Aufstellung der Regeln (worunter hier und im Folgenden speziell die ‘κανόνες’ der antiken Flexionslehre verstanden sein sollen) führe ... Sie—oder vielmehr der Grammatiker mit ihr—stellt die ähnlichen Wörter zusammen und bildet daraus die Regeln.” Thus, the enunciation of the canon suffices to find the correct spelling of a word; analogy can thus be the demonstrative canon (κανὼν ἀποδεικτικὸς) itself, corresponding to the second definition of orthography.

(217.7–13 [cf. Hdn., *Gramm.Gr.* III.2 517.32–35]), the account of its spellings according to the etymology (κατὰ ἐτυμολογίαν) is recalled with almost the same wording as in Ps.-Theodosius:

ἡπερος· ἡπειρος δὲ λέγεται ἢ γῆ· γράφεται δὲ τὸ μὲν ἠ ἐκ τοῦ α τοῦ στερητικοῦ, ἄπερος γὰρ λέγεται κατὰ ἐτυμολογίαν· τὸ δὲ πει δίφθογγος, ὅτι ἔχει ἀπὸ πρωτοτύπου φωνῆς τὸ ε· πέρασ γὰρ οὐκ ἔχει, ἄπερός τις οὔσα καὶ ἡπειρος κτλ.²⁸

ἡπερος: the earth is called land; eta is spelt because of alpha privative, because ἄπερος is said according to etymology. The diphthong epsilon-iota in πει, because the word has epsilon from the primitive name, since it has no limits, being ἄπερος and so ἡπειρος etc.

Furthermore, it seems worthwhile to cite the only other complete preface to orthography preserved, that of John Charax (second half of the sixth century), who wrote a complete and tripartite *Περὶ ὀρθογραφίας* (*About orthography*), still unedited as a whole, which closely depends on Herodian's *Orthography*.²⁹ The structure of his introduction is close to that of Ps.-Theodosius, but some remarkable differences in wording can be observed. Therefore it is generally assumed that they do not derive one from another, but the similarities can be explained by their independent use of Herodian's *Orthography* as a direct source:³⁰

²⁸ See also *Epim.Hom.* A 485A (~ *Et.Gen.* codd. **AB** s.v. ἡπίροιο, *Et.Gud.* 246.54–247.3 Sturz, *Et.Magn.* 433.54 Gaisford) ἡπίροιο· ἡπειρος λέγεται ἢ γῆ παρὰ τὸ ἄπειρός τις οὔσα καὶ ἡπειρος κατὰ πλεονασμὸν τοῦ ι καὶ ἐκτάσει τοῦ α (“of land: the earth is called land according to the fact that it has no limits (ἄπερος) and becomes ἡπειρος with the addition of iota and lengthening of alpha”). It is important to emphasise that the author of the anonymous *Epimerismi Homerici* can be possibly identified in Choeroboscus himself (see A. R. Dyck, *Epimerismi Homerici* [Berlin/New York 1983–1995] I 5–7, II 23–24).

²⁹ See Egenolff 4 ff., Alpers 7–8 and 19 ff.

³⁰ Egenolff 12–13; see however Alpers 26: “so besteht zwar der Verdacht, daß Ps.-Theodosios für Einleitung, σύνταξις und ποιότης von Charax abhängt, in dem Konglomerat seines ποσότης-Teiles dagegen, mindestens neben anderen, den Anonymus Crameri benutzt hat. Bei dem gegenwärtigen Kenntnisstand kann aber auch nicht ausgeschlossen werden, daß

ὀρθογραφία διττῶς λέγεται· ὀρθογραφία γάρ ἐστι καὶ <ή> κατὰ τὴν λέξιν ἠκριβωμένη γραφή καὶ ὁ κανὼν ὁ ἀποδεικτικὸς, ᾧ ἀποδείκνυται ἡ ὀρθῶς γεγραμμένη λέξις. ἐὰν γὰρ τὸ ἑαρινὸς γράφω διὰ τοῦ ι, καὶ αὕτη ἡ λέξις ἡ ὀρθῶς γραφείσα ὀρθογραφία λέγεται. κὰν ἐρωτηθεὶς τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς γραφῆς εἴπω πάντα τὰ εἰς ινος καιροῦ παραστατικὰ διὰ τοῦ ι γράφεται· ἡμερινός, νυκτερινός, καὶ ὁ κανὼν αὐτὸς ὀρθογραφία λέγεται.

εἶδη τῆς ὀρθογραφίας τρία· σύνταξις, ποιότης, ποσότης. σύνταξις μὲν οὖν ἐστὶ ζήτησις στοιχείων περὶ κατάληξιν καὶ ἐπιφορὰν συλλαβῶν, ὡς ὅταν ζητῶμεν, ποία συλλαβὴ συντάξομεν τὰ στοιχεῖα, οἷον· ἐν τῷ ἀσθενῆς τὸ σ πότερον ληκτικόν ἐστὶ τῆς πρώτης συλλαβῆς ἢ τῆς δευτέρας ἀρκτικόν; ποιότης δὲ ζήτησις περὶ σύμφωνα καὶ τὴν τούτων μεταβολήν, ὡς ὅταν ζητῶμεν, ποῖόν ἐστὶ στοιχείων ἐν τῷ ἔμπορος, τὸ ν ἢ τὸ μ. ποσότης δὲ ἐστὶ ζήτησις περὶ πλείονα ἢ ἐλάσσονα φωνήεντα κατὰ τὴν λέξιν, τουτέστι περὶ διφθόγγου ἢ μονοφθόγγου, οἷον· τὸ μῖμος πῶς γραπτέον; διὰ τοῦ ι ἢ διὰ τῆς ει διφθόγγου; ταῦτα μὲν οὖν τὰ εἶδη τῆς ὀρθογραφίας.

κανόνες ὀρθογραφίας τέσσαρες· ἀναλογία, διάλεκτος, ἔτυμολογία καὶ ἱστορία. καὶ ἔστι ἀναλογία μὲν κανὼν ἀποδεικτικὸς, ἱστορία δὲ ἡ τῶν παλαιῶν παράδοσις, διάλεκτος δὲ ἰδίωμα γλώσσης, ἔτυμολογία δὲ σύντομος καὶ ἀληθῆς ἀπόδειξις τοῦ ζητουμένου παρὰ τὸ ἔτυμον, ὃ ἐστὶ ἀληθές. καὶ πάλιν ἀναλογία μὲν οὖν κατορθοῦμεν γραφήν, ὅταν κανόνα ἀποδῶμεν, ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ ἡμερινός ἐφάνη, διαλέκτῳ δέ, ὅταν τὸ μείλιχος διὰ ει γράφω εἴπω ἐπειδὴ οἱ Αἰολεῖς μέλλιχος λέγουσι τὸ προσὸν ε ἐν τῇ λέξει ἐκφωνήσαντες, ἔτυμολογία δέ, ὅταν εἴλωτες διὰ τῆς ει διφθόγγου γράφω εἴπω παρὰ τὸ Ἔλος, ἢ τὸ εἰλικρινῆς παρὰ τὴν ἔλην, τουτέστι τοῦ ἡλίου ἀγῆν· ἱστορία δέ, ὅταν τὸ χίλιοι διὰ τοῦ ι γράφω εἴπω, ὅτι οὕτως αὐτὸ γράφεσθαι βούλεται ἡ παράδοσις. χρὴ μὲν γινώσκειν ὡς ἡ ἱστορία πολλάκις ἐναντιοῦται διαλέκτῳ· τῶν γὰρ Αἰολέων χέλλιοι λεγόντων ἀπήτει διὰ τῆς ει διφθόγγου γράφεσθαι, ἢ δὲ παράδοσις τῶν παλαιῶν τὸ ι ἔχει.

Ps.-Theodosios auf dieselbe Quelle wie Charax und der Anonymus Cramerii, also Herodian, zurückgeht." I print the text of Alpers 6–7 with a few modifications in punctuation; moreover, I adopt Graux's *κατορθοῦμεν γραφήν* instead of *κατορθῶμεν γράφειν* of the manuscripts, and *χίλιοι* proposed by Egenolff (20 n.14) instead of *χίλιος*.

Orthography has two meanings: it is both the exact spelling according to the word and the demonstrative canon which demonstrates the word correctly spelt. For instance, if I spell ἔαρινός (“of spring”) with iota, the word itself correctly spelt is called orthography. And if I am asked about the account of the spelling and I say “all the adjectives indicating seasons or moments of the day ending in -ινός are spelt with iota, as ἡμερινός (‘diurnal’) and νυκτερινός (‘nocturnal’),” then the canon itself is called orthography.

The fields of orthography are three: syntax, quality, quantity. Syntax is the investigation about letters at the end and in the sequence of syllables, as when we inquire to which syllable we assign the letters: for example, does the first sigma in the adjective ἀσθενής (“weak”) end the first syllable or begin the second? Quality is the investigation about consonants and their change, as when we inquire which is the letter in the word ἔμπορος (“trader”), my or ny. Quantity is the investigation about the presence of more or fewer vowels in a word, that is about diphthong or monophthong: for example, how must the word μίμος (“mime”) be spelt? With iota or the diphthong epsilon-iota? These are the fields of orthography.

The canons of orthography are four: analogy, dialect, etymology, and history. Analogy is the demonstrative canon, history the tradition of the ancients, dialect is a special form of a language, etymology is the concise and true demonstration of the matter of inquiry according to its genuine sense, that is, true origin. And we correct the spelling with analogy, when we enunciate a canon, as it has been made clear for the word ἡμερινός. With dialect, when I spell the word μείλιχος (“gentle”) with the diphthong epsilon-iota and I say: “because the Aeolians say μέλλιχος pronouncing the epsilon present in the word.” With etymology, when I spell εἰλωτες (“helots”) with the diphthong epsilon-iota and I say: “it comes from Ἑλος (‘Helos’),” or εἰλικρινής (“pure”) from ἔλη (“warmth of the sun”), that is the brightness of the sun. With history, when I spell χίλιοι (“a thousand”) with iota and say that the paradosis has it spelt in this way. It is necessary to know that history often contradicts dialect: for instance, since the Aeolians say χέλλιοι, the dialect would require the spelling with the diphthong epsilon-iota, but the tradition of the ancients has iota.

Apart from the general identity of structure and contents due to their common source, conclusive differences include the double definition of orthography and its exemplification in the first paragraph, and the examples used for the four canons in the third. In particular, the analogy-canon is accounted for by the exemplification of the second meaning of orthography—ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ ἡμερινός ἐφάνη—which differs from that of Ps.-Theodosius (ταχεία).

Therefore, only Ps.-Theodosius 61.22–62.26 seems to agree with *Epim.Ps.* 89.5–30: here Choeroboscus lists and explains the four canons which assure the correctness of spelling, as is usual in all introductions to orthography, seemingly citing his own lost *Prolegomena to Orthography*. The wording of these two passages is nearly the same, and Ps.-Theodosius can also justify the otherwise unintelligible definition of analogy as ὡς περ ἐπὶ τοῦ ταχεία ἐδηλώσαμεν. Thus, it can be inferred that these paragraphs of Ps.-Theodosius may be (or at least come from) Choeroboscus' lost *Prolegomena to his Orthography*, being thus a primary witness. However, this remains a hypothesis until a new complete critical edition of these two works is produced, which will allow for a more accurate inquiry into their mutual textual relationships.³¹

July, 2010

Dpt. di Filologia Classica e Medioevale
Università di Bologna
via Zamboni 32
I-40126 Bologna, Italy
stefano.valente@unibo.it

³¹ This paper is based on a lecture (“The Writing Identity of a Byzantine Man: Choeroboscus and the Canons of Greek Orthography”) given on 6 March 2010 at the conference *Being Byzantine: Limits, Definitions and Realities* (Oxford), organized by the Oxford Byzantine Society. I would like to express my gratitude to Marco Ercoles, Leonardo Fiorentini, Camillo Neri, Renzo Tosi, and the anonymous reader for *GRBS* for their valuable suggestions and criticism to my paper.