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

ἔχει δὲ διαφορὰς ὀκτὼ μόνον τῶν μονοπροσώπων· (1) ἔστι μόνον ἀναφορικὸν τῶν άλλων καὶ δεικτικῶν οὐσῶν καὶ ἀναφορικῶν· οὗτος ἐκεῖνος {καὶ δείξις καὶ ἀναφορά· καὶ πίστις τούτου, ὅτι οὐκ ἀνεδέξατο τὴν διὰ τοῦ ι ἐπέκτασιν· (2) μόνη τῶν μονοπροσώπων ὀξύνεται· (3) μόνη δὲ τῶν ἀντωνυμιῶν ἀπὸ μακρᾶς ἀρχομένη ψιλοῦται· (4) μόνη ἐξ ἀντωνυμιῶν δεδιπλασίασται· αὐτός αὐτός· (5) μόνη καὶ κωμῳδίᾳ ἐπιτέτακται: αὐτότερος αὐτότατος.

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

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

1 Dyck 1995, 153-154.
2 Other grammatical texts discuss the forms αὐτότερος and αὐτότατος: Apollonius Dyscolus, Pronouns (ed. Schneider, Grammatici Graeci vol. II.1 p. 63.20 = Brandenburg 2005, 399): σύγκρισίν τε καὶ παραγωγὴν ἀνεδέξατο [sc. τό αὐτός], ὡς ἐν Ἀλκυονεί [-όνι cod.] Ἐπίχαρος· αὐτότερος αὐτῶν [fr. 1] (‘αὐτός admitted of degrees of comparison (see note on p. 3) and derivation’); Scholia Marciana in Dionysii Thracis artem grammaticam (ed. Hilgard, Grammatici
emend κωμῳδία ἐπιτέτακται, but the paradosis makes little sense. Schneider suggested emending ἐπιτέτακται into ἐπιτέταται (ἐπιτείνω ‘intensify’ being common grammatical vocabulary), in which case the reference would be to the comparative αὐτότερος and superlative αὐτότατος. Schneider’s conjecture is very reasonable and should be accepted without further ado (thus also K-A ad Epich. fr. 1). Ludwich’s emendation κἀν <τῇ> κωμῳδίᾳ for transmitted καὶ κωμῳδίᾳ would make sense of the isolated dative, but ‘also in comedy’ remains puzzling, especially since forms like αὐτότερος and αὐτότατος are admittedly only attested in comedy (see below; K-A ad Epich. fr. 1 do not accept this emendation either). The position of καὶ after μόνη at the beginning of the sentence makes it unlikely that καὶ may be linking this section of the gloss with the preceding one, and therefore καὶ is more likely to be taken with what follows.

Besides, all entries in the Epimerismi gloss are introduced by a bare μόνη (except the third one, which is connected to the preceding one with δέ), and only the subsections within the sixth and ninth peculiarity are linked to one another with connectives. Another possibility would be to emend the paradosis into εἰ καὶ ἐν κωμῳδίᾳ. Together with Schneider’s ἐπιτέταται, the resulting text would be:

μόνη, εἰ καὶ ἐν κωμῳδίᾳ, ἐπιτέταται: αὐτότερος αὐτότατος.

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

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

---

3 Dyck 1995, 153.  
4 Schneider 1902, 88.  
5 See Dickey 2007, 238.  
6 Ludwich 1902, col. 806.  
7 One may compare the use of καὶ in the seventh peculiarity, i.e. μόνη ἐξ ἀντωνυμών καὶ ίδια σημαίνειν ἐσχεν (‘only this among the pronouns also had its peculiar meanings’).
The implication of the concessive clause εἰ καὶ ἐν κωμῳδίᾳ would be to say that αὐτός is indeed peculiar, in that this is the only pronoun which has a comparative (αὐτότερος) and a superlative (αὐτότατος), but that these forms should not be taken at face value, since they are only used in comedy, where they serve a comic purpose. Such an observation is well paralleled in the other grammatical sources discussing αὐτότερος and αὐτότατος, see Apollonius Dyscolus, Pronouns (ed. Schneider, Grammatici Graeci vol. II.1 p. 64.11 = Brandenburg 2005, 400-401): ἕνεκα γελοίου ἡ κωμῳδία σχήματα τινα ἔπλασεν, ὡστε οὐ κριτήριον τῆς λέξεως τὸ αὐτότερος, ἐπει δὲ καὶ Δαναώτατος ὑπερτίθεται παρὰ Ἀριστοφάνει, τῶν χυρίων οὐ συγκρινομένων (‘comedy created some forms for comic purpose, so that αὐτότερος is not a means to judge to which part of speech the form (sc. αὐτός) belongs, since Δαναώτατος too is created as a superlative in Aristophanes, though proper names do not have degrees of comparison’); Scholia Marciana in Dionysii Thracis artem grammaticam (ed. Hilgard, Grammatici Graeci vol. I.3 p. 372.25): τὸ δὲ αὐτότερος παρ’ Ἐπιχάρῳ πέπαικται (‘αὐτότερος in Epicharmus is a jocular form’); Scholia vetera in Aristophanis Plutum (ed. Chantry, line 83 = Sud. α 4529 Adler): ἡ αὐτότατος ἀντωνυμία πέπαικται κωμικῶς (‘the pronoun αὐτότατος is a jocular form in a comic fashion’). Interestingly, this doctrine has influenced the Latin grammarian Pompeius who discusses the comic superlative ipsissimus in Plautus and Afranius (Pompeii commentum artis Donati, ed. Keil, Grammatici Latini V p. 153.13: ergo vides, quae nomina comparantur: quae sunt qualitatis et quantitatis. ea autem, quae non sunt qualitatis et quantitatis, non recipiunt comparationem. ne te decipiant illa Plautina [Tr. 988] et Afraniana [432 CRF] verba, ipsissimus; ioco comico hoc dixit. est etiam apud Graecos αὐτότατος [Ar. Pl. 83] tale. comica sunt ista et ad artem non pertinent, ‘therefore you see which names have degrees of comparison: those which express a quality or a quantity. Whereas those which do not, do not have degrees of comparison. Do not be misled by the word ipsissimus used by Plautus and

8 For the use of concessive εἰ καὶ in the Epimerismi Homerici one may compare e.g. Epim. Hom. ε 100 Dyck (Vol. II): ἡματε... ἢ παρὰ τὸ ἐρείσμα κατὰ συγκοπῆν ἐρμα. καὶ διὰ τὶ τὸ μὲν ἐρείσμα φιλούτῃ, τὸ δὲ ἐρμα δασύνεται; τὰ βραχέα φωνήν ταῖα καταλήγονται εἰς ρ ἐπιφερομένου τοῦ μ δασύνεται, οἷον ὅρμος ὁρμή ἅρμα Ἑρμῆς· τῇ συντάξει οὖν τῶν συμφώνων δασύνεται, εἰ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἐρείσμα ἐστὶν (ἐρματα... or it is created from ἐρείσμα by syncopation. And why does ἐρείσμα not have the aspiration, whereas ἐρμα does? Short vowels before ρ take the aspiration when ρ follows, as in ὅρμος ὁρμή ἅρμα Ἑρμῆς. ἐρμα therefore takes the aspiration because of the combination of consonants, even though it is from ἐρείσμα’).

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

10 This form is also attested in Petronius (63,3; 69,3; 75,11; 76,1; see Schmeling 2011, 260).
Afranius. The poet used this form for a comic purpose. In Greek too ἄυτότατος is such. These are comic forms, and do not pertain to the grammar).
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