

ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

VOL. XVIII

HELSINKI 1984 HELSINGFORS

INDEX

Siegfried Jäkel	Die Tücke der Faktizität in den Epitrepontes des Menander	5
Mika Kajava	The Name of Cornelia Orestina/Orestilla	23
Klaus Karttunen	Κυνοκέφαλοι and Κυναμολγοί in Classical Ethnography	31
Bengt Löfstedt	Zu Smaragdus' Kommentar der Benediktinerregel	37
Teivas Oksala	Zum Gebrauch der griechischen Lehnwörter bei Vergil. I. Interpretationen zu den Bucolica	45
Tuomo Pekkanen	Petroniana	65
Leena Pietilä-Castrén	The Ancestry and Career of Cn. Octavius, cos. 165 BC	75
Olli Salomies	Beiträge zur römischen Namenkunde	93
Timo Sironen	Markas osco nel lupanare di Pompei	105
Heikki Solin	Analecta epigraphica LXXXVI—XCIII	113
Ronald Syme	Statius on Rutilius Gallicus	149
Toivo Viljamaa	Quintilian's "genus grammaticum" of Figures	157
De novis libris iudicia	169

QUINTILIAN'S "GENUS GRAMMATICUM" OF FIGURES

Toivo Viljamaa

1. Classification of figures

The main part of Books eight and nine of Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria* is devoted to the examination of the most usual ornaments of style, tropes and figures. In Book nine after having separated figures from tropes Quintilian gives the standard division of figures into "figures of thought" and "figures of speech" (9,1,17 *consensum est duas eius esse partes, διαβολίας, id est mentis vel sensus vel sententiarum, ..., et λέξεως id est verborum vel dictionis vel elocutionis vel sermonis vel orationis*). Then he divides figures of speech into two classes: *genus grammaticum* and *genus rhetoricum* (9,3,2 *Verum schemata lexeos duorum sunt generum: alterum loquendi rationem novat, alterum maxime conlocatione exquisitum est*). The classification occurs here the first time in our extant classical texts, though it evidently originates in Stoic language philosophy and in rhetorical doctrines of the Peripatetic school.¹

The chapters 9,3,2—27 in which Quintilian illustrates with examples the use of figures belonging to his *genus grammaticum* have caused embarrassment among students of Quintilian. Jean Cousin in his study on Quintilian's sources (*Études sur Quintilien*, Tome I, Paris 1953, 489—490) notes: "Il n'est pas malaisé de reconnaître qu'il y a un certain désordre dans la présentation qu'en fait l'*Institution oratoire* et que la

¹ Sources of Quintilian's doctrine are discussed in detail by K. Barwick, *Remmius Palaemon und die römische Ars Grammatica*, Leipzig 1922, 94—111, *Probleme der stoischen Sprachlehre und Rhetorik*, Berlin 1957, 97—111. For figures of speech and for their classification, H. Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik*, Munich 1960, I 266—374, J. Martin, *Antike Rhetorik*, Munich 1974, 295—315.

clarté n'est pas ici la qualité dominante de Quintilien. Parfois le bon Homère sommeille..." Karl Barwick (Probleme..., 109—110) shows that Quintilian uses different sources with originality but "wenig glücklich kontaminierend". In Barwick's opinion, Quintilian is not consistent with his own definition (*loquendi rationem novat*) because the examples which he presents are not confined to those concerned with substitution of parts of speech or their accidents but also include those that are more compatible with the definition of rhetorical figures (*conlocatione exquisitum est*) coming through addition or subtraction of words or through inversion of order.

What is the meaning of Quintilian's "grammatical figures"? It seems worth while to take up the question. Quintilian is known as a man of order, as a writer who shows a sound taste and a maturity of judgement. Are we in this case admitting that the chapters which deal with the *genus grammaticum* of figures are nothing but careless extracts from earlier works with Quintilian's own additions? In any case, we must consider how the elements are fitted together and furthermore adapted to the disposition and purpose of the whole *Institutio oratoria*.

2. Grammaticality versus Latinity

Greek and Roman theorists analysed style or eloquence according to four qualities: correctness of language (*Latinitas*, *Hellenismos*, *emendate loqui*), perspicuity, embellishment (*ornatus*), and appropriateness (*apte dicere*, *apte collocare*). These characteristics of good style are mentioned by Quintilian several times, for instance 1,5,1 *Iam cum oratio tris habeat virtutes, ut emendata, ut dilucida, ut ornata sit (quia dicere apte, quod est praecipuum, plerique ornatui subiciunt)...*, and 8, proem. 31 *nam cum Latina, significantia, ornata, cum apte sunt conlocata, quid amplius laboremus?* (cf. also 8,1,1—2 and 11,1,2). In his definitions and largely also in his organization of the subject matter Quintilian followed Cicero, who had adapted Theophrastus' system of four virtues of style to Latin in his *De oratore* and *Orator* (see particularly Cic. de orat. 1,144 and orator 79).²

² For Hellenistic theories of style and for their influence on Cicero and Quintilian, G. Kennedy, *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World*, Princeton 1972, 63, 114—126, 221—225.

In Quintilian's educational system the teacher of grammar (*grammaticus*) had to deal with the laws of correct speech, while the other qualities of style were reserved for the teacher of rhetoric (1,5,1; 8,1,2 *Sed ea quae de ratione Latine atque emendate loquendi fuerunt dicenda in primo libro, cum de grammaticae loqueremus, executi sumus*). The treatment of tropes and figures, on the other hand, had its proper place in the discussion of embellishment of style. However, the same language phenomena that were considered virtues in one circumstance, i.e. figures, could be explained as vices in another (cf. 9,3,2 *esset enim omne eiusmodi schema vitium si non peteretur, sed accideret*), i.e. as barbarisms (faults in single words) or solecisms (faults in arrangement of words or faults of using words ungrammatically). Therefore, they were also discussed in connection with the quality of correctness of language, and the doctrine of figures — especially as set forth by Quintilian — was part of both grammar and rhetoric. This dualism is well demonstrated by Quintilian's statement in 1,6,27 *aliud esse Latine, aliud grammaticae loqui*: in actual use of language the strict rules of grammar can be violated, and in effective speech every sentence is figurative in a certain sense so that it is in fact a fault to speak merely grammatically without figures (Quint. 9,1,13); furthermore, because language is changed by usage all the time, as Quintilian emphasizes (9,3,1), practically everything that is spoken today is figurative when compared to the usage of the past.

What is the meaning of "grammatical figures"? To answer the question it is important to keep in mind Quintilian's general views about grammar and style, about two levels of language: grammaticality and Latinity. The recognition of the *genus grammaticum* as distinct from rhetorical figures seems to be important for the future development of the theory of syntax. In the Renaissance times it became customary to divide syntax into two parts: simple or regular and figurative or irregular. The division was central particularly in the grammatical treatises of the English Humanist Thomas Linacre and the Spanish Franciscus Sanctius and later in the "New Method" of the Port-Royal grammarians.³ It was made in

³ See G. A. Padley, *Grammatical Theory in Western Europe 1500—1700*, Cambridge U. P., 53—55, 97—110, 211—219, and particularly, M. Brevé-Claramonte, *Sanctius' Theory of Language*, Amsterdam 1983, and T. Viljamaa, *The Renaissance Reform of Latin Grammar*, Turku 1976, 35—40.

accordance with Quintilian's concepts of "grammaticality" and "Latinity". This meant that the Humanists moved Quintilian's *genus grammaticum* out of the range of rhetoric and remodelled it to a solid part of syntax, i.e. the figurative syntax. In Humanist grammars the figurative syntax describes actual written or spoken utterances which deviate from grammatically full sentences formed according to the rules of the simple syntax. This reminds us of Quintilian's definition of figures: *figura, sicut nomine ipso patet, conformatio quaedam orationis remota a communi et primum se offerente ratione* (9,1,4); ... *a simplici rectoque loquendi genere deflexa* (9,3,3).

3. Poetical figures

In the opinion of Quintilian, the *genus grammaticum* of figures represents simple deviations from the rules of natural language, occurring particularly in poetry (9,3,2 *loquendi rationem novat, ... fit isdem generibus quibus vitia*; 1,5,52 *Schemata igitur nominabuntur, frequentiora quidem apud poetas, sed oratoribus quoque permessa*), while rhetorical figures are more elaborate devices serving the proper embellishment of eloquent speech (9,3,2 *maxime conlocatione exquisitum est*; 9,3,28 *Illud est acrius genus quod non tantum in ratione positum est loquendi, sed ipsis sensibus tum gratiam tum etiam vires accommodat*). Because Quintilian says that grammatical figures most frequently occur in poetical texts, one reason for using the definition of *genus grammaticum* may be that the interpretation of poetry (*enarratio poetarum*) was in Quintilian's time one of the main duties of the *grammaticus* (cf. 9,1,13 *id demum hoc loco accipi schema oportebit quod sit a simplici atque in promptu posito dicendi modo poetice vel oratorie mutatum*). In fact, most of the examples of grammatical figures presented in 9,3,2—27 are from poetical texts. However, Quintilian also says that these figures are permissible to orators as well, and he defends their use by the criteria of correct speech (*recte loquendi scientia*), which is the other main subject taught by the teacher of grammar: *verum auctoritate, vetustate, consuetudine plerumque defenditur, saepe etiam ratione quadam* (9,3,3; cf. also 1,6,1).

4. Figures suited to grammarians

As mentioned above, Quintilian is the first to use the term *genus*

grammaticum. Definitions that are reminiscent of his but not entirely similar can be found in later grammarians and rhetoricians.⁴ Diomedes (GL I 443,5—15) refers to Quintilian stating that he distinguishes two sorts of figures: *dianoeas, quod est cogitationis et sensus, et logu, quod est elocutionis et verborum*. In Diomedes' words *elocutionis et verborum* there is probably a reference to the distinction between rhetorical and grammatical figures, though Quintilian does not make this distinction clear but classifies both the *genus grammaticum* and the *genus rhetoricum* under the same heading of *figurae verborum* or *schemata lexeos* (9,3,1—2). Donatus (GL IV 397, 5—6) distinguishes *schemata lexeos* and *schemata dianoeas* and adds that the former are fitted for grammarians, the latter for rhetoricians. The commentators of Donatus (e.g. Sedulius Scottus, CCCM 40 B, 360,22—24) hasten to note that different use of figures is caused by the fact that grammarians discuss single parts of speech (*de una parte*) and rhetoricians their combinations (*de iunctura sententiarum*).

To be sure, Donatus does not, as Quintilian does, divide figures of language (*schemata lexeos*) into two sorts and the examples which he gives are those labelled by Quintilian as rhetorical. Nevertheless, the commentator's note may have some bearing on understanding Quintilian's *genus grammaticum*. The *grammaticus* had mainly to deal with single words or single parts of speech, not with combinations. Quintilian also seems to be aware of this limitation of the grammarian's duties. In describing the nature of solecisms — which are counterparts of grammatical figures, as noted above — he states (1,5,34—38) that there are some who contend that a solecism does not come under the head of faults in combination of words but the fault lies in a single word because it can be emended by the substitution of a single word. But this is a quibble, Quintilian objects. Though solecisms can lie in single words, they cannot do it without a context. In another place (8,5,35) Quintilian says that it is usually the *grammaticus* who gives the precepts concerning the use of tropes. The reason is evident: a trope is most frequently a single word used in a metaphorical or in a non-natural sense (9,1,4 *Est igitur tropos . . . , ut plerique grammatici finiunt, dictio ab eo loco in quo propria est*

⁴ Cf. Barwick, *Probleme*, 98—108, and L. Holtz, *Donat et la tradition de l'enseignement grammatical*, Paris 1981, 183—199.

tralata in eum in quo propria non est). Thus Quintilian is well aware of these definitions of the grammarian's branch. But he does not use them as a model for organizing his material. He holds fast to the disposition of his material according to the four virtues of style and regards only the first, correctness of language, as the grammarian's duty, while tropes and figures belong to embellishment of style and must be therefore, in Quintilian's opinion, treated with the other ornaments of style (see 1,5,1; 1,8,16) *Enimvero iam maiore cura doceat tropos omnes, quibus praecipue non poema modo sed etiam oratio ornatur, schemata utraque, id est figuras, ...: quorum ego sicut troporum tractatum in eum locum differo, quo mihi de ornatu orationis dicendum erit*).

It is possible that Quintilian chose the name *genus grammaticum* for the reason that this type comprises simple conformations of language that usually could be taught in the school of the *grammaticus*. On the other hand, it must be observed that he does not define his grammatical figures as occurring merely in single words or in single parts of speech. The conclusion can be drawn from the examples that he gives; for instance, *contumeliam facit* is a phrase used by some authors instead of more natural and grammatical constructions which can be formed from *adfici contumelia* (9,3,13); and in *gladio pugnacissima gens Romani* (9,3,8) it is not possible to decide which of the parts, *pugnacissima gens* or *Romani*, is figured, even though there is a figure in their combination (a disagreement in number).

From later Latin rhetoricians, Chirius Fortunatianus' classification of figures comes closest to that of Quintilian. Like Quintilian, Fortunatianus (126,24—127,4)⁵ distinguishes three kinds of figures: λέξεως, λόγου, διανοίας, and characterizes them in the following way: λέξεως *in singulis verbis fiunt, ut 'nuda genu', quas uno nomine ἐξηλλαγμένας possumus dicere: λόγου vero in elocutionis compositionibus, quae pluribus modis fiunt, ...: διανοίας autem in sensibus*. Evidently, the group characterized by λόγου corresponds to Quintilian's *genus rhetoricum* (9,3,2 *maxime conlocatione exquisitum est*) and accordingly the group characterized by λέξεως to Quintilian's *genus grammaticum*, as the word ἐξηλλαγμένας refers to

⁵ C. Halm, *Rhetores Latini minores*, Leipzig 1863.

changements in the normal use of language (Quintil. 9,3,2 *loquendi rationem novat*; 9,3,28 *in ratione positum est loquendi*).

The identification of the *genus grammaticum* (*in singulis verbis fiunt*) seems to be the same as presented by the commentators of Donatus. But the whole classification and the terminology is different in Fortunatianus: λέξεως, λόγου, διανοίας (cf. Diomedes, GL I 443,11—12 *dianoegas, logu = elocutionis et verborum*). The terms used by Fortunatianus reflect Stoic concepts about words and language. The Stoic grammarians made a distinction between the single word (λέξις = *dictio*) and the coherent speech (λόγος = *oratio, sermo*). In their terminology figures were either διανοίας or λόγου. Obviously under the influence of Peripatetic rhetoric the word λέξις became to be used by grammarians and rhetoricians only in opposition to διάνοια (*sensus* 'meaning') in the same meaning as Latin *verba, elocutio* or *forma orationis* ('utterance'). Thus the term *schemata lexeos*, as in Quintilian, usually covers all figures of speech. Naturally this double meaning of *lexis* caused confusion in terminology. Fortunatianus partly maintains the Stoic use labelling as *schemata lexeos* those figures of words which only occur in single words. One may guess that the opinions about different duties of the teacher of grammar and the teacher of rhetoric had influenced on him. There are, however, other factors as well. I shall discuss them in the following.

5. Figures due to substitution

As shown by Barwick (Remmius Palaemon, 94—100; Probleme, 97—111), the doctrine of figures in Roman *ars grammatica* is fully based on Stoic language philosophy, according to which there are four categories of language change: *immutatio* (substitution; in terms of figures: syllepsis, a transform in the parts of speech and their accidents), *adiectio* (addition, pleonasm), *detractio* (subtraction, omission, ellipsis), and *transmutatio* (inversion of order, hyperbaton). Quintilian says (1,5,38—39) that there was a considerable disagreement between the theorists as to which categories were to be included in the treatment of solecisms, and accordingly, in the treatment of the *genus grammaticum* of figures: *per quot autem et quas accidat species, non satis convenit. qui plenissime, quadripertitam volunt esse rationem, ... ut fiat adiectione ..., detractioe ..., transmuta-*

tionem, ...inmutatio sine controversia est. It is natural that in Latin and Greek *inmutatio* was considered to fall most clearly under the "grammatical" heading, because it violates the basic rules of sentence structure.

Barwick (Probleme, 108—109) identifies Quintilian's *conlocatio* (9,3,2), which characterizes rhetorical figures, with *compositio* (arrangement of words) and assumes that for this reason addition, subtraction and inversion were primarily devices of the *genus rhetoricum*. This seems to be the case as Quintilian treats rhetorical figures distributing them into three groups, *per adiectionem, per detractionem, per ordinem* (cf. 9,3,27): 9,3,28 *primum sit quod fit adiectione*; 9,3,58 *At quae per detractionem fiunt figurae...*; 9,3,66 *Tertium est genus figurarum quod...* Consequently under the heading of *genus grammaticum* only those figures that come through substitution should be listed. Quintilian should have done the same as does later the rhetorician Iulius Rufinianus (54,28—58,25 Halm), who under the type of figures "without names" (cf. Quint. 9,33,4, *sunt quaedam figurae ita receptae ut paene iam hoc ipsum nomen effugerint*) numerates only cases of substitution. This is also Barwick's opinion. In fact most examples of Quintilian's grammatical figures belong to the category of substitution: some figures are caused by a seeming disagreement in grammatical gender or number (9,3,6—8): "*oculis capti talpae*", "*fabricatus est gladium*", "*gladio pugnacissima gens Romani*", "*Qui non risere parentes, nec deus hunc...*"; others come through immutation of parts of speech, or through changes of cases, tenses and modes (9,3,9—11): "*Et nostrum istud vivere triste aspexi*", "*Virtus est vitium fugere*", "*Timarchides negat*", "*Hoc Ithacus velit*"; then there are changes of construction like "*non paenituum*" pro *non actuum paenitentiam* (9,3,12—13), or archaistic constructions used primarily by poets, as "*vel cum*", "*sed enim*", "*tam magis ... quam magis*" (9,3,13—16), and imitations of Greek constructions, e.g. "*Nec ciceris nec longae invidit avenae*", "*Tyrrhenum navigat aequor*" (9,3,17).

To be sure, the above mentioned paragraphs already include figures to which also subtraction or addition can be applied, I mean particularly new constructions, like "*non paenituum*", and poetical archaisms. In any case, Quintilian continues representing clear cases of addition, e.g. "*nam neque ... nam neque*" (9,3,18), and subtraction, like "*plus satis*" (9,3,18).

Then they are followed by examples which can be explained either as substitutions or as elliptical expressions (9,3,19—22): comparative instead of positive, plural in place of singular and vice versa, addressing an imagined person, interchange of persons. The last named devices are rather rhetorical than poetical. Finally, Quintilian presents figures which arise from interruption of the expected sequence of words by parenthesis or apostrophe (9,3,23—26).

From the above examples it has become clear that Quintilian does not confine himself to figures due to substitution, and indeed he expressly states that all four categories of language change are applicable not only to solecisms but also to grammatical figures: *Prius fit isdem generibus quibus vitia* (9,3,2); *Haec schemata, aut his similia quae erunt per mutationem, adiectionem, detractionem, ordinem...* (9,3,27).

Is there inconsistency in Quintilian's presentation (cf. chapter 1 above)? Barwick (Probleme, 109) raises the question on the ground that the definition of grammatical figures, *loquendi rationem novat*, is compatible only with the category of substitution, while the definition of rhetorical figures, *conlocatione exquisitum est*, refers to the other categories. Barwick comes to this conclusion indirectly, through investigation into sources of the Stoic doctrine of figures. The evidence, however, for establishing figures of *immutatio* as a distinct group is later than Quintilian. Certainly Quintilian had taken his material from earlier treatises, but he adapted it to the purpose of his work and to the views he had about language and oratory. In my opinion, in *loquendi rationem novat*⁶ the emphasis lies in the word *rationem* (cf. 9,3,28 *in ratione positum est loquendi*): grammatical figures are verbal patterns that depart in some justified way from the normal and simple patterns determined by the rules of grammar. A grammatical figure can arise from a disagreement in grammatical categories, which is the most apparent case, but also from addition or subtraction of elements or from inversion of normal order of words. The same factors are operative both in solecisms and in grammatical figures.

In this connection it is important to remember Quintilian's definition of solecism (1,5,51): *Est enim soloecismus in oratione comprehensionis unius*

⁶ Some editors accept the variant reading of mss. *vocat*.

sequentium ac priorum inter se inconueniens positio. Thus a solecism comes into existence "within the limits of a single clause". This restriction also is in accordance with occurrences of grammatical figures. Now we can return to Quintilian's definition of rhetorical figures, *conlocatione exquisitum est*. Here also, the emphasis lies in *exquisitum*, not in *conlocatione*: rhetorical figures are elaborate devices for different purposes of eloquent speech. Compare, *in ipsis sensibus tum gratiam tum etiam vires accommodat* (9,3,28), *amplificandi gratia* (9,3,28), *ad elevandum* (9,3,29), *acriter ac instantanter* (9,3,30), *cum quid instantius dicimus* (9,3,50), *convertit in se aures et animos excitat* (9,3,66). A rhetorical figure differs radically from a grammatical figure because it neither assumes a departure from correct language nor is restricted to the limits of a single clause. The word *conlocatione*, on the other hand, cannot only refer to the order of words within single clauses or sentences (cf. 3,3,1; 8, prooem. 6 and 31). It involves both disposition of speech material and appropriateness of diction. The meaning of *collocare* can be paraphrased as "to use right words and to say right things in right places".

6. Grammatical figures

I provide my conclusion with the heading "grammatical figures" because it most appropriately describes the nature of Quintilian's *genus grammaticum* of figures. In opposition to rhetorical figures, which are bound to particular speech situations, grammatical figures are bound to the simple grammatical rules. They are entitled to this name, because they are touched upon by the teacher of grammar in connection with lessons in correct and incorrect speech, because they most frequently occur in poetry, the prime material of the grammarian, but particularly, because they involve the rules of correct speech, i.e. the methodical part of grammar (*recte loquendi scientia*). For that reason Quintilian treats them in relation to the criteria of correct speech: reason, authority, antiquity and usage (9,3,3).

The disorder, if there is any, in Quintilian's arrangement of grammatical figures obviously is caused by the fact that he treats them from two different points of view, in relation to the categories of language change

on one hand and in relation to the criteria of correct language on the other. Furthermore, there was a great confusion in terminology and classification of figures in Quintilian's time. Quintilian knows it and often complains about it. He does not want to follow pedantic lists and subtle definitions made by his sources but rearranges his material according to his own conceptions about the range of grammar and rhetoric.