

PARAPLEROMATIC LUCUBRATIONS

INEKE SLUITER

Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam
Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton

Not unlike their modern counterparts, ancient linguists like neat and all-encompassing classifications. Their main theoretical framework, the system of the parts of speech, is designed to accommodate every instance of each and every word in the process called *μερισμός* ('parsing'). The *partes orationis* were defined by a combination of formal and semantic considerations, to which essential syntactic information could be added (as in 'adverbs tend to go with verbs'). The latter type of information was considered part of the general semantics of a word class and tended to be confined to observations on the physical combinations of words and their equally physical positions *vis-à-vis* each other. The main *partes* were subdivided into numerous subcategories, again mostly on the strength of semantic criteria. Dionysius Thrax, for instance, enumerates 26 different types of adverbs, all of which are purely defined by their meaning, with the likely exception of the *ἐπιρρήματα μεσότητος*. It is probable that the primary trait this latter group has in common is a morphological one, namely their ending in *-ως*. Similarly, he distinguishes eight (or nine) types of 'conjunctions',¹ all of which are defined by their function or their semantic load—often the two are hard to distinguish (D. Th. 87.1ff.).

As with any system descriptive of language, the actual empirical material turned out to be recalcitrant, and to resist complete pigeonholing in terms of the *partes* that were distinguished. This appears from the elaborate discussions Apollonius Dyscolus devotes to the classification of problematic words, and which he habitually inserts between his discussion of the definition, syntax and semantics of each part of speech and the more detailed discussion of the morphological characteristics of specimina belonging in each part. Such discussions are extant e.g. in his *De pronomibus* (*pron.* 26.23 - 35.5) and *De adverbis* (*adv.* 126.24 - 145.25), while a similar section from *De coniunctionibus* (*coni.*) got lost in the lacuna after *coni.* 214.26.²

However, the framework of the *partes orationis* itself offered some room to accommodate borderline cases, in that it contained several categories which were capable of absorbing precisely those words whose meristic characteristics were less clear-cut. The adverb is probably the best example. Any word which is used in a way that sets it off from the part of speech to which it would usually be taken to belong,

¹ The ancient word-class of the *σύνδεσμοι* encompasses both more and less than our term 'conjunctions'. I will use the word in inverted commas to draw attention to this fact.

² It is announced *coni.* 213.18 *προσέτι καὶ τὰ δόξαν ἐσηκότεα συνδέσμων, οὐ μὴν ὄντα.*

becomes an adverb.³ For instance, any declinable word which is used in an adverbial way thereby turns into an adverb itself (*adv* 120 1ff). As we will see, the subclassification of the ‘conjunctions’ (σύνδεσμοι) contains a potential receptacle for residual cases as well, the sub-set of the σύνδεσμοι παραπληρωματικοί.⁴

In the following I will argue that the theoretical distinction of this group of particles in antiquity develops out of the debate on whether or not ‘conjunctions’ have meaning, and an interest in the rhetorical and stylistic effects of redundancy. Later grammatical theory adopted the group with traces of its background in stylistic theory shining through, and exploited its potential to function as a port-manteau category in its word-class system.

‘Conjunctions’ (σύνδεσμοι) were a recognized linguistic category from Aristotle onwards (*Poet* 1456b39ff), but the subcategory of the παραπληρωματικοί was a later addition to linguistic theory. Summarizing the relatively late *locus classicus* on the topic (Ap Dysc *com* 247 22 - 258 26), the group can provisionally be defined as consisting of particles with a wide range of meanings, but sharing the characteristic that they are also (and even predominantly) used without any distinguishable semantic or syntactic impact or purpose, to ‘fill out’ or embellish metre and style. Their name derives from this common element, because it is more practicable than multiplying the number of types in an inordinate way by naming every one of these ‘conjunctions’ after their very diverse meanings.

It is likely that distinction of this category was facilitated by more general discussions about the question whether or not *syndesmoi* as a group had meaning. Aristotle had categorically denied this,⁵ and traces of the debate can be found in Posidonius (*apud* Apollonius Dyscolus).⁶ Only after a consensus had been established that the ‘conjunctions’ in general did have meaning, did the need arise for a separate subcategory which could deal with those instances that to all intents and purposes did not. Yet, from the beginning stylistic implications are more important than semantic-syntactic ones. [Ar] *Probl* XIX 20 (919a), often adduced in discussions of para-pleromatic particles, is usually interpreted as an early recognition of the non-necessary character of ‘some’ *syndesmoi*, and this is taken to refer to their semantic-syntactic qualities. However, a closer look at the context reveals that this is not its

³ The adverb was called *pandecten* for that very reason, e.g. Charisius 252 29ff B *cum adverbium Stoici pandecten vocent nam omnia in se capit quasi collata per saturam concessa sibi rerum varia potestate*, Clemens *Ars grammatica* (ed. Tolkieln) 88 17ff *Hoc quoque intuum quod haec pars id est adverbium duo nomina habet apud Graecos id est ‘epurrhema’ quod interpretatur ‘adverbium’ et ‘pandecten’ quod interpretatur omne dictum* [this is wrong, of course], *quia omnis pars orationis cum desinit esse quod est adverbium fit*.

⁴ Hellwig (1974: 149f) considers this category an *ad hoc* solution like the vague modern class of ‘particles’. Schenkeveld (1988) demonstrates that ‘particle’ is not an ancient concept.

⁵ *Poet* 20, 1456b38 σύνδεσμος δε εστιν φωνη ἄσημος, cf. 1457a4.

⁶ *Com* 214 4ff Ποσειδώνιος εν τῷ περι σύνδεσμων αντιλεγων προς τους φασκοντας, ως οι σύνδεσμοι ου δηλοῦσι μεν τι, αυτο δε μόνον την φρασιν συνδεουσι [possibly the Stoic ‘orthodoxy’, cf. D L VII 58]. This is Posidonius the Stoic (135 50 BC), not the grammarian, see Baratin (1989: 25 n. 2), Atherton (1993: 305, 306 n. 77), for the passage, see Belli (1982), Sluiter (1990: 117 n. 293).

primary intention, nor does it seem to envisage only those particles which were later styled parapleromatic.

In this ‘Problem’, [Aristotle] is dealing with music and in particular with the nature of the tone called *mese*. If this tone is out of tune, the whole melody will sound unpleasant, whereas other tones would just sound unpleasant themselves under the circumstances, but would not affect the whole. The author explains this as follows:

πάντα γὰρ τὰ χρηστὰ μέλη πολλάκις τῇ μέσῃ χρῆται, καὶ πάντες οἱ ἀγαθοὶ ποιηταὶ πυκνὰ πρὸς τὴν μέσῃ ἀπαντῶσιν, κἂν ἀπέλθωσι, ταχὺ ἐπανέρχονται, πρὸς δὲ ἄλλην οὕτως οὐδεμίαν.

‘For all the best tunes make frequent use of the *mese*, and all good musicians search it out frequently, and quickly revert to it, even if they leave it, but not to any other note to the same extent’ (tr. Hett, adapted).

Then follows a linguistic analogy:

καθάπερ ἐκ τῶν λόγων ἐνίων ἐξαιρεθέντων συνδέσμων οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ λόγος Ἑλληνικός, οἷον τὸ τέ καὶ τὸ καί, ἔνιοι δὲ οὐθὲν λυποῦσι διὰ τὸ τοῖς μὲν ἀναγκαῖον εἶναι χρῆσθαι πολλάκις, εἰ ἔσται λόγος, τοῖς δὲ μὴ, οὕτω καὶ τῶν φθόγγων ἡ μέση ὥσπερ σύνδεσμός ἐστι, καὶ μάλιστα τῶν καλῶν, διὰ τὸ πλειστάκις ἐνυπάρχειν τὸν φθόγγον αὐτῆς.

‘Just as when from discourse certain “conjunctions” are removed, the language is not (good) Greek, e.g. *te* and *kai*, while others can be removed without harm (for it is necessary to use some of them frequently for there to be discourse at all, but for others that is not the case); in the same way the *mese* is as it were the “conjunction” of musical sounds, especially of good music, because its sound must have a very frequent place in it.’

The author compares the *mese* to ‘conjunctions’ that need to be employed frequently, and are opposed to ones that can be left out without harm. The distinction is not, therefore, between ἀναγκαῖοι and μὴ ἀναγκαῖοι as such, but between ‘conjunctions’ that need to be employed *frequently* and those that do not. This is made clear by the preceding statement about the *mese* which is used *πολλάκις*, searched out *πυκνὰ* and reverted to *ταχύ*. The emphasis on style is confirmed by the repeated reference to the quality of the music (πάντα τὰ χρηστὰ μέλη) and the composers (πάντες οἱ ἀγαθοὶ ποιηταί). In the linguistic analogy, the author seems to be alluding to patterns of expectancy created by certain ‘conjunctions’ (e.g. τε ... καί). This would mean that not only parapleromatic particles, but also e.g. ‘conjunctions’ like γάρ belong in the group that can be removed without making the text incoherent.

When read this way, the text fits in perfectly with a whole series of early rhetorical treatises imparting stylistic advice on the audience-friendly use of *syndesmoi*.⁷

⁷ E.g. Anaximenes’ *Ars Rhetorica* 25 (1435a39ff.): μετὰ δὲ συνδέσμους, οὓς ἂν προείπης, ἀποδίδου τοὺς ἀκολουθοῦντας. τὸ μὲν οὖν συνδέσμους ἀποδιδόναι τοὺς ἀκολουθοῦντας τοιόνδε

Their correct use will lead to clarity and Hellenismos. In Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, the first factor contributing to Hellenismos is said to consist in the right use of σύνδεσμοι (*Rhet* III 5, 1407a19ff)

ἔστι δ' ἀρχὴ τῆς λέξεως τὸ ἐλληνίζειν τοῦτο δ' ἐστὶν ἐν πέντε, πρῶτον μὲν ἐν τοῖς συνδέσμοις, ἂν ἀποδιδῶ τις ὡς πεφύκασι πρότεροι καὶ ὕστεροι γίγνεσθαι ἀλλήλων, οἷον ἔνιοι ἀπαιτοῦσιν, ὥσπερ ὁ μὲν καὶ ὁ ἐγὼ μὲν ἀπαιτεῖ τὸν δέ καὶ τὸν ὁ δέ δεῖ δὲ ἕως μεμνηταὶ ἀνταποδιδόναι ἀλλήλοις, καὶ μῆτε μακρὰν ἀπαρτᾶν μῆτε σύνδεσμον πρὸ συνδέσμου ἀποδιδόναι τοῦ ἀναγκαίου κτλ

'The beginning of good style is Hellenismos, pure Greek. This consists in five elements, first in the use of "conjunctions", if one makes them correspond in their natural order of priority and posteriority, the way some of them require. E.g. *men* and *ego men* require *de* and *ho de*. They should be made to correspond to one another as long as they are still fresh in memory, and should not be made to connect at a long distance, nor should one make a different "conjunction" correspond instead of the necessary one.'

The desirable quick resolution of the expectancy created by a *syndesmos* corresponds to the way good composers quickly revert to the *mesē* in the *Problemata*.

The concept of the parapleromatic *syndesmoi* thus seems absent from the pseudo-Aristotelian *Problemata*, although the stylistic qualities of *syndesmoi* in general were recognized and would eventually be helpful in their distinction. (In fact, in contrast to the position taken in the *Problemata*, they would become the *syndesmoi* with a virtually exclusively stylistic impact *par excellence*.) Neither can the *παραπληρωματικοί* have commanded the particular interest of the first Stoic language theorists. Their theory of the 'conjunction' was limited to its logical uses for the construction of complex propositions, which are precisely defined by the type of 'conjunction' connecting their parts (D L VII 71ff). By their very nature, the parapleromatic ones would escape notice in that context. However, there are two contexts that connect the Stoics with the σύνδεσμοι *παραπληρωματικοί*, one vaguely, the other explicitly. The first is in D L VII 67.⁸ Here, in the Stoic version of speech-act theory, a distinction is made between *axiomata*, the bearers of truth and falsity, and the form called ὁμοίον ἄξιωματι ('similar to the axiom'). The latter is defined as follows:

ἔστιν ἐγὼ μὲν παρεγενομένην οὐδ' εἶπεν, σὺ δὲ φασκὼν ἤξειν οὐκ ἦλθε· πάλιν οὖν ὁ αὐτὸς σύνδεσμος ἀκολουθοῦς ἢ, οἷον σὺ γὰρ κακείνων αἰτίας ἐγένου, καὶ τούτων αἰτίας σὺ, further Isocrates *apud* Syrianus in Hermog. I 28 6 R, Max Planudes, V 469 Walz and Joannes Siceliota, VI 156 19 W = Radermacher *Artium Scriptores* B XXIV 22, Spengel, *Συναγωγή τεχνῶν* 154-72 believes this to be part of Isocrates' *τεχνῆς ῥητορικῆς*, contra Blass, *Att. Beredsamk.* II 105, cf. G Mathieu (Budé edition IV, 233f).

⁸ Professor Schenkeveld pointed out the relevance of this text to me.

ὁ τὴν ἐκφορὰν ἔχον ἀξιωματικὴν παρὰ τινος μορίου πλεονασμὸν ἢ πάθος ἔξω πίπτει τοῦ γένους τῶν ἀξιωματῶν, οἶον

καλὸς γ' ὁ Παρθενῶν
ὡς Πριαμίδησιν ἐμφορῆς ὁ βουκόλος.

'that which having the form of an axiom falls outside the class of axioms because it exceeds it by an extra word or by emotion, e.g.

Beautiful indeed the Parthenon!
How does the cowherd resemble Priam's sons!⁹

Note that neither the term σύνδεσμος nor that of παραπληρωματικός is used in this context. Γε certainly qualifies as a parapleromatic 'conjunction' in later theory, but ὡς is an adverb. Note also that the examples are both poetic. I will return to this passage later.

The second instance stems from a period in which a more general overview of grammar was extrapolated from Stoic work on logic, and attempts were being made to provide language descriptions with a claim to exhaustiveness. In that context, we know that the Stoic Chaeremon (a teacher of Nero's), who wrote on 'conjunctions', devoted some attention to the question of the classification of the parapleromatic 'conjunctions' in view of their alleged lack of meaning.¹⁰ It would seem that by this period 'conjunctions' as such were agreed to have meaning—the subcategories in Dionysius Thrax are after all semantic or functional in nature. It was the subcategory of the parapleromatic 'conjunctions' that had become the focus for discussion of the problematic notion of absence of meaning. This aspect was then combined with an element inherited from earlier Peripatetic observations on the class of 'conjunctions' as a whole, namely an interest in the rhetorical and stylistic function of these syndesmoi.

The earliest attestations of the use of παραπληρωματικοί date from the 1st cent. BC. We know that both Tyrannio (early 1st cent. BC) and Trypho (contemporary of Augustus) discussed this class. P. Yale 1.25 (1st cent. AD) lists it as one of the classes of the σύνδεσμοι. The discussions by Tyrannio and Trypho suggest that Dionysius Thrax indeed knew this sub-category, although the part of his *Techne* that contains its description amply postdates him. His description does not ascribe any meaning to this category, but neither does it define them by the absence of meaning. Rather, it describes them in functional terms as being used μέτρον ἢ κόσμου ἕνεκεν 'for the sake of metre or ornament' (D. Th. 96.3f.). Many ancient interpreters connect this view on the παραπληρωματικοί with the clause in Dionysius' over-all definition of σύνδεσμοι (D. Th. 86.3f.):

⁹ Cf. Schenkeveld (1984: 303, 307, 315).

¹⁰ Chaeremon: Ap. Dyc. *coni.* 248.1.

(Σύνδεσμός ἐστὶ λέξις συνδέουσα διάνοιαν μετὰ τάξεως) καὶ τὸ τῆς ἔρμηνείας κεχηγὸς δηλοῦσα. (v.l. πληροῦσα)

‘(A “conjunction” is a word that connects the thought while expressing order,) and it indicates (or: fills) the hiatus of the language’

They take it that τὸ κεχηγὸς refers to the collision of two vowels, which is judged to be a stylistically unpleasant effect, and that the παραπληρωματικοί are the subgroup that performs this syndesmic function *par excellence*.

The alternative and more sophisticated (but also more far-fetched) ancient interpretation is that the last clause of the definition allows the inclusion of the διαζευκτικοί or disjunctive ‘conjunctions’. These *syndesmoi* ‘conjunct’ on the formal level, but their meaning is to exclude, to separate off. It can however be described as ‘filling/indicating the gaps of discourse’, in the sense that they make the connection of thought explicit.¹¹ Baratin (1989: 38) generalizes the applicability of the clause καὶ τὸ τῆς ἔρμηνείας κεχηγὸς δηλοῦσα, interpreted along these lines, to all types of conjunctions.¹² I find his reading convincing as an attempt at a charitable and maximizing interpretation, but will concentrate in what follows on the ancient views, which predominantly take the more obvious route and understand the clause as referring to hiatus.

The use of parapteromatic particles smoothens and remedies the harshness created by hiatus, and renders the language more euphonic. Of the technical grammarians, notably Trypho is of this opinion, and he famously compared parapteromatic ‘conjunctions’ with ‘padding (στοιβή) to prevent jarring and breaking of amphoras’.¹³ When Apollonius Dyscolus is describing this euphonic use of ‘conjunctions’, he compares it to that of the ephelcistic -v-. Interestingly, the use of such a -v- is referred to in *pron.* 50.11 as:

σαφὲς ὅτι τὸ χασμῶδες τῶν φωνηέντων ἀναπληρῶν τῆ τοῦ ν προσθέσει (sc. Homerus)

‘clearly filling out the hiatus of the vowels by the addition of the *nu*’,

¹¹ See Uhlrig ad D. Th. 86.3-4, and e.g. Sch. D. Th. 103.9-12; 436.23

¹² He seems unaware of the anticipation of his interpretation by the Scholiast on D. Th. 436.30ff

¹³ Ap. Dysc. *coni.* 252.31; 253.2; 253.9f. In 252.32 Apollonius is clearly alluding to Trypho’s description of these ‘conjunctions’ as ‘padding’, showing that he derives his own views on their euphonic use from him (although he rejects the view that a whole part of speech should owe its existence to none other than euphonic reasons). Cf. 247.26ff, esp. 247.29 (Trypho) ὑπὲρ τοῦ τὰ τῆς φράσεως μὴ τραχύνεσθαι. Apollonius claims that Trypho added a clause to his definition of the σύνδεσμοι as a group in order to be able to include these meaningless particles, which do not strictly speaking do any ‘connecting’. The clause he mentions is καὶ τὸ κεχηγὸς τῆς ἔρμηνείας ἔστιν ὅπου παραπληρῶν, *coni.* 247.24f., alluded to in *synt.* 378.5f. on the parapteromatic conjunctions: ἀναπληροῦν τὸ κεχηγὸς τῆς ἔρμηνείας. Notice the resemblance with the Dionysian formulation. Baratin 1989: 35 has claimed that the form of the clause (with the masculine participle παραπληρῶν) makes it unlikely that it actually belonged in the definition of the whole *pars orationis*, since in that case one would have expected either a feminine form to correspond with λέξις, or a neuter to correspond with μέρος λόγου. This is very ingenious, but one cannot exclude the possibility that Apollonius’ quotation has undergone ‘grammaticalization of the lemma’, which would typically yield the nominative masculine (cf. Tosi 1988).

thus illustrating how naturally this interpretation fits in with normal linguistic usage. Indeed, there can be no doubt that the natural reading of τὸ χασμῶδες and τὸ κεχηνός is that it refers to hiatus between vowels.¹⁴

The avoidance of hiatus takes us straight back to stylistics. This fits right in with the fact that some of our earliest testimonies for the παραπληρωματικοί (as opposed, this time, to the group of *syndesmoi* as a whole) also take the form of stylistic recommendations. Protesting against their idle use, pseudo-Demetrius prescribes them only if one wants to produce an effect of grandeur (*Eloc.* 55ff.):

Τοῖς δὲ παραπληρωματικοῖς συνδέσμοις χρηστέον οὐχ ὡς προσθήκαις κεναῖς καὶ οἷον προσφύμασιν ἢ παραξύσμασιν, ὥσπερ τινες τῷ δὴ χρῶνται πρὸς οὐδὲν καὶ τῷ νυ καὶ τῷ πρότερον, ἀλλ' ἂν συμβάλλωνται τι τῷ μεγέθει τοῦ λόγου ...

‘One should use the parapteromatic “conjunctions” not as empty additions, and as it were as abnormal growths or superfluous polishing, the way *dé* and *nu* and *proteron* are sometimes used without a purpose, but only if they contribute something to the grandeur of the language’

One way of doing this is to use δὴ to amplify the beginning of a statement—this emphasizes the divide between two statements and makes for a dignified impression (*Eloc.* 56). Another function of the particle δὴ is to invest discourse with *pathos* (*Eloc.* 57). Pseudo-Demetrius refers to Praxiphanes, a student of Theophrastus’, who is scornful of those who πρὸς οὐδὲν ἀναπληροῦντες ... τὸν σύνδεσμον (‘use the “conjunction” as an idle filler’) (*Eloc.* 58). This is another indication of the stylistic interest taken in ‘conjunctions’ in general in the Peripatos, but although the context is suggestive, it cannot be proven that Praxiphanes was thinking of the parapteromatic ‘conjunctions’, identified as a separate group. Praxiphanes is not pseudo-Demetrius. He compares the idle use of words like νυ, but also like πρότερον, with actors’ interpolations of interjections like φεῦ and αἶ εἶ used *extra metrum*. (In fact, such a bad use of these *syndesmoi* would probably make them fall outside the scope of Dionysius Thrax’ definition, since they do not fill out the metre at all, but ruin it in a way.) In general, the whole context—as far as it can be made out from the poor transmission—emphasizes not the mere fact of ἀναπληροῦν, or of being a προσθήκη, but the use of προσθήκαι κεναί (*Eloc.* 55), πρὸς οὐδὲν (58) or μάτην (58). Such a usage violates the rhetorical requirement of τὸ πρέπον, and this is confirmed by the use of ἔπρεψεν in 57 for an acceptable use of the same particle.

The text in pseudo-Demetrius rewards further analysis. The terms πρόσφυμα and παράξυμα have no parallels in a stylistic context. Both are used metaphorically, much like στοιβή ‘padding’ was in Trypho, a πρόσφυμα being any kind of growth

¹⁴ Cf. e.g. Sch. D. Th.. 146.31ff.: καὶ ἐκθλιψις μὲν ἐστίν, ἥνικα εὐρεθῆ λέξις εἰς φωνήεν ἢ φωνήεντα καταλήγουσα, τῆς ἐπιφερομένης λέξεως ἀπὸ φωνήεντος ἢ ἀπὸ φωνηέντων ἀρχομένης· τότε γὰρ <διά> τὸ χασμῶδες καὶ κεχηνώδες ἐκθλίβεται τὸ τέλος τῆς προηγουμένης λέξεως. Clearly, we are dealing with well-established technical terminology here.

that is ‘in addition to (the natural constitution?)’ (πρός),¹⁵ while παράξυσμα may either mean ‘extra scratches, extra letters’,¹⁶ or maybe ‘a result of excessive polishing’.¹⁷ Παρά- in παράξυσμα points at the undue, excessive or redundant nature of the polishing. All three terms, προσθήκη, πρόσφυμα and παράξυσμα underline by their pseudo-etymologizing the essential redundancy of the παρα-πληρωματικός. Whereas compounds of πληρώω are routinely used to denote syntactic or semantic completion, i.e. the necessary completion of a semantic and syntactic structure, a παραπληρωματικός does its ‘filling out’ over and above what is strictly speaking required or necessary in those respects.

Unlike πρόσφυμα and παράξυσμα, προσθήκη resonates widely in the field of stylistics. Dionysius of Halicarnassus describes a certain κῶλον in Plato as an unfortunate προσθήκη, since it is neither necessary (ἀναγκαία) nor used ‘for the sake of beauty, or another form of additional ornamentation.’¹⁸ These possibilities are resumed a little later as μήτε τοῦ ἀναγκαίου χάριν ... μήτε τοῦ περιττοῦ.¹⁹ These are the only two acceptable forms of προσθήκη. Otherwise, an addition turns into ἀκαιρία, ‘bad timing, bad taste’. Clearly, the word ‘redundant’ (περιττός) by itself does not exclude a contribution to beautification, as did the pseudo-Demetrian qualification πρὸς οὐδέν.

Further, προσθῆκαι are a stock-issue in the context of the theory of the three styles. Firstly, the sublime or severe style (ἀύστηρὰ ἀρμονία) is not served by additions that smoothen stylistic ruggedness, since that is the very core characteristic of this style. Its aim is not to be periodical, so it avoids προσθῆκαι that do not contribute to the sense.²⁰ Interestingly, the same concept is also expressed using παραπλήρωμα (D. H. *Dem.* 39.212.20ff.):

(the severe style uses asymmetrical periods), μηδέ γε παραπληρώμασι τῶν ὀνομάτων οὐκ ἀναγκαίοις ὡς πρὸς τὴν ὑποκειμένην διάνοιαν χρωμένας
‘without using filler words that are not necessary for the underlying meaning’

¹⁵ One is strongly reminded of Sch. D. Th. 356.15ff., explaining why the Stoics had not recognized the adverb as a separate part of speech: τὰ γὰρ ἐπιρρήματα οὔτε λόγου οὔτε ἀριθμοῦ ἤξιωσαν, παραφυάδι καὶ ἐπιφυλλίδι αὐτὰ παρεικάσαντες. Ἐπιφυλλίς refers to the small grapes left for gleaners; it was used metaphorically for bad poets in Ar. *Ran.* 92 (cf. n. 17), quoted in D. H. *Ars Rhet.* X 18 to describe epilogues in a deprecating way after first having called them a sort of dessert after the main meal. The compound with ἐπι- may again have been found attractive for a description of ἐπιρρήματα, even though it is precisely denied that the Stoics recognized those words as a separate part of speech. Παραφυάς ‘side-growth’ is an interesting parallel for πρόσφυμα, the more so since at least one of the examples cited by Demetrius decidedly looks like an adverb (πρότερον), see below.

¹⁶ Ξύσματα = γράμματα, Hsch.

¹⁷ Rather than the ‘filings’ or ‘shavings’. Cf. for the metaphor Cic. *Brut.* 93; Hor. *Ars* 291; Ov. *Tr.* 1.7.30 (*ultima lima*); Quint. 10.4.4. An interesting verbal parallel is Ar. *Ran.* 881 (cf. n. 15) παραπρισματά τ’ ἐπών (‘sawdust, sawn-off bits’, Dover *a l*), where the παρα- element seems less emphatic than in παράξυσμα.

¹⁸ Κάλλους ... ἢ τῶν ἄλλων τινὸς τῶν ἐπιθέτων ἔνεκα κόσμων, *Dem.* 24.182.5ff.

¹⁹ D. H. *Dem.* 24.182.20f.

²⁰ D. H. *CV* 22.97.12: (ἀύστηρὰ ἀρμονία) ... οὔτε προσθήκαις τισὶν ὀνομάτων, ἴνα ὁ κύκλος ἐκπληρωθῇ μηδὲν ὀφελούσας τὸν νοὸν χρωμένη οὔτε κτλ.

The *ἀύστηρά ἄρμονία* is *ὀλιγοσύνδεσμος* and *ἄναρθρος*.²¹ And it even cultivates hiatus.²² *Grandeur* (*μέγεθος*) is one of the intended effects of the grand style. Longinus (*De subl.* 21.2) points out that *'syndesmoi* and other *προσθήκαι* 'detract from pathetic effects that sit well with this style—partly disagreeing with pseudo-Demetrius (*Eloc.* 57, see above).

The Stoic speech act *ὁμοιον ἀξιώματι*, defined by the presence of a redundant word or of *πάθος* and illustrated by poetic examples (see above p. 236), hovers at the intersection of logic and the type of stylistic observations discussed here. The poetic examples indicate that constructions that are directly relevant to logic are being supplemented (in order to arrive at something like an exhaustive description) by material drawn from the common stock of the student of language and literature, namely poetry. An emphasis on the presence of redundancy *vis-à-vis* the regular axiom in this specific type is confirmed by Sextus Empiricus' description of the same type of sentence as *πλέον τι ἀξιώματος* (*M.* 8.73). In both cases, however, the formal observation is made subservient to a general focus on logic: the speech act is defined with direct reference to the *ἀξίωμα* pure and simple, the bearer of truth and falsity and the central speech-act type in Stoic logic.²³ A prudent conclusion would be that the Stoics' wide interpretation of the scope of their dialectic led them to make observations on form and style over and above the requirements of logic, thus providing stimuli for later students of linguistic phenomena, who emphasized the stylistic side and downplayed that of logic.

To return to *προσθήκαι* and stylistic theory, in the elegant style (*ἄρμονία γλαφυρά*) *προσθήκαι* are useful and necessary to achieve the full intended stylistic effect. This style strives after *ἡδονή* and *κάλλος* rather than rugged *grandeur*, and *προσθήκαι* that are not strictly speaking necessary for the sense contribute to that purpose.²⁴ Again, *προσθήκη* may be replaced with its synonym *παραπλήρωμα*.²⁵ Secondly, a pleasant effect is contrived by euphony,²⁶ and again *προσθήκαι* are a helpful tool.²⁷ And thirdly, the *ἄρμονία γλαφυρά* avoids hiatus by adding words that again are not strictly speaking necessary, but prevent roughness (D. H. *Dem.* 40.215.19ff.):

²¹ D. H. CV 22.98.1f.; cf. *Dem.* 39.213.6ff.

²² D. H. *Dem.* 38.210.14ff.

²³ Albert Rijksbaron pointed out to me that in the sentence 'how like Priam's sons the cowherd is' the truth of the underlying *axioma* is presupposed—in that sense the sentence truly conveys 'more than an axioma'. This is true and relevant. However, it only goes for the examples with *ὡς*, not for those with *γε*.

²⁴ D. H. CV 9.33.7ff.: *ἀλλὰ μὴν ὅτι γε καὶ μετασκευὰς δέχεται τῶν κῶλων ἔνια τοτὲ μὲν προσθήκας λαμβάνοντα οὐκ ἀναγκαίως ὡς πρὸς τὸν νοῦν, τοτὲ δὲ ἀφαιρέσεις ἀτελεῖ ποιούσας τὴν διάνοιαν, ἅς οὐκ ἄλλου τινὸς ἔνεκα ποιῶσι ποιηταὶ τε καὶ συγγραφεῖς ἢ τῆς ἁρμονίας, ἴν' ἡδεῖα καὶ καλῆ γένηται, πάνυ ὀλίγου δεῖν οἴομαι λόγου.*

²⁵ D. H. CV 9.33.23f.: *τίς οὐκ ἂν φαίη παραπλήρωματι λέξεως οὐκ ἀναγκαίῳ προσηρανίσθαι;* (sc. a period from Plato).

²⁶ D. H. *Dem.* 40.214.23.

²⁷ CV 102f., 67.5ff.: *παραπλήρωμασιν εὐφῶνοις.*

καὶ δῆτα καὶ παρεμβάλλειν αὐτὰς ταῖς <ἀναγκαίαις> τινὰς ἑτέρας λέξεις ὑπομένει πρὸς τὸν ὑποκείμενον νοῦν οὐτ' ἀναγκαίαις οὐτ' ἴσως χρησίμας, δεσμοῦ δέ τινος ἢ κόλλης τάξιν ταῖς πρὸ αὐτῶν καὶ μετ' αὐτὰς κειμέναις ὀνομασίαις παρεξομένας, ἵνα μὴ συναπτόμεναι πρὸς ἀλλήλας αἱ καταλήγουσαι τε εἰς τραχὺ γράμμα καὶ αἱ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀπὸ τινος τοιούτου λαμβάνουσαι σπαδονισμούς τῶν ἤχων ποιῶσι καὶ ἀντιτυπίας, τῇ δὲ παρεμπιπτούσῃ λέξει προσαναπαυόμεναι μαλακοὺς φαίνεσθαι ποιῶσι τοὺς ἤχους καὶ συνεχεῖς.

'Indeed, [the smooth style] is quite prepared to allow unnecessary words to be added to the necessary which contribute nothing to the underlying sense, and perhaps have no useful purpose, but are intended to serve as a sort of connection or bonding between what precedes and what follows, so that words ending and words beginning with rough letters may not clash, choking the sound and producing dissonance. The intervening phrase provides a rest and makes the sound appear soft and unbroken', tr. Usher

Dionysius proceeds to state that in this style the aim is 'to draw and weave together (συσπασθῆναι, συνυφάνθαι) all the members of the period, achieving the impression of one continuous sound-stream (μιᾶς λέξεως)' (ibid. 216.8ff.).²⁸ The description sounds as a paraphrase of the concept of the σύνδεσμος παραπληρωματικός: παρεμβάλλειν and παρεμπιπτούση; the fact that they do not make a necessary contribution to the meaning; and the function of the intercalated words as δεσμός and κόλλα. The description of how roughness is avoided is also reminiscent of Trypho's view of these words as 'padding'.²⁹ However, there is no compelling evidence that Dionysius has the restricted group of the παραπληρωματικοί in mind, and rather a lot of circumstantial evidence to suggest that he does not.³⁰

²⁸ There is a faint echo of Aristotle's description of the λέξις εἰρομένη as συνδέσμω μία (*Rhet.* III 9, 1409a24f.; cf. the frequent description of the *Iliad* as a λόγος that is συνδέσμω εἷς, e.g. *Met.* B 4, 1030b10; H 6, 1045a13; *Poet.* 20, 1457a29), but in the case of D. H. we are dealing with an effect of sound rather than structure, and as such it is incorporated in a description of the periodic, not the concatenated, style.

²⁹ Cf. also τραχὺ (216.3); σπαδονισμούς, ἀντιτυπίας, (216.4f.).

³⁰ Schenkeveld (1983: 71f.) lists the uses of σύνδεσμος in D. H. Although D. H. is familiar with the term, he uses it in a rather loose way; thus it can include prepositions like ἐπί and ἐν (Schenkeveld 1983: 74). Schenkeveld does not discuss D.H.'s use of sub-groups of 'conjunctions', because there is none. The combination σύνδεσμος παραπληρωματικός does not occur. In fact, all his uses of παραπλήρωμα and προσθήκη suggest that they express a more general stylistic phenomenon, and are not connected with a specific type of 'conjunction' as a technical term. The more general usage of δεσμός and κόλλα in Aristotle also points in this direction. Δεσμός and κόλλα are two of the means by which unity is achieved, e.g. *Ar. Met.* Z 2, 1042b16ff. (συνθέσει, κράσει, δεσμῷ, κόλλῃ, γόμφῳ); *Met.* I 1, 1052a24 ὅσα κόλλη ἢ γόμφῳ ἢ συνδέσμῳ. Interestingly, these metaphors are picked up and applied to all the lesser parts of speech by Ammonius *In Ar. Int.*, CAG IV 5.12.25ff.: ὥσπερ γὰρ τῆς νεῶς αἱ μὲν σανίδες εἰσὶ τὰ κυρίως μέρη, γόμφοι δὲ καὶ λινὸν καὶ πίττα συνδέσεως αὐτῶν καὶ τῆς τοῦ ὅλου ἐνώσεως ἕνεκα παραλαμβάνονται, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον κὰν τῷ λόγῳ σύνδεσμοι καὶ ἄρθρα καὶ προθέσεις καὶ αὐτὰ τὰ ἐπιρρήματα γόμφων τινῶν χρεῖαν ἀποπληροῦσι; cf. 13.3ff. Obviously, in none of these cases does the application of the metaphor envisage the parapleromatics.

Undue application of these stylistic devices to produce a fully periodic style at all cost and irrespective of whether the subject-matter lends itself to it can lead to criticism, which Isocrates in particular comes in for (D. H. *Isoc.* 3.58.18ff.):

οὐ γὰρ ἅπαντα δέχεται οὔτε μήκος τὸ αὐτὸ οὔτε σχῆμα τὸ παραπλήσιον οὔτε ῥυθμὸν τὸν ἴσον. ὥστε ἀνάγκη παραπληρώμασι λέξεων οὐδὲν ὄφελουσῶν χρῆσθαι καὶ ἀπομηκύνειν πέρα τοῦ χρησίμου τὸν λόγον.
 ‘For not everything lends itself to the same length or a similar form or the same rhythm. And so it becomes necessary to use fillers of words that do not have any use, and to draw out the speech over and above what is useful’

Now, if we compare the texts adduced so far, it becomes clear that the *παραπληρωματικοὶ σύνδεσμοι* were associated particularly closely with a stylistic function that could also be fulfilled by other parts of speech or even whole phrases: if applied well, it fills out the sentence, not by the necessary completion of the thought, but by making it smoother, remedying hiatus, and providing supple transitions. Thus, it is the sub-group of the *παραπληρωματικοί*, rather than the *σύνδεσμοι* as a whole, that becomes the focus for remarks on absence of meaning.

Our texts make it equally clear that the delimitation of the group must have been vague originally, when *παραπλήρωμα* was a general stylistic qualification for a word (group) that was strictly speaking redundant.³¹ Of the ‘literary critics’, only pseudo-Demetrius uses the *terminus technicus* *παραπληρωματικὸς σύνδεσμος*. And in fact, corrupt transmission of pseudo-Demetrius was promptly assumed to get rid of the example *πρότερον*. But again, a comparison with the other stylistic criticisms seems to suggest differently: when Longinus points out that it is hard to convey *πάθος* when the style is being made smoother by *συνδέσμων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων προσθηκῶν*, the sentence he quotes as an example contains words like *καὶ μὴν*, and *γε μὴν*, but also *πρῶτον μὲν*, *εἶτα δέ*, and another *εἶτα* (21.1). In Lucian’s harangue against Atticism, *Lexiphanes*, the main character is given an emetic to get rid of his redundant Atticistic phrases, which include *μῶν*, *κᾶτα*, *δήπουθεν* and *ἄττα*.³² While later theory does not call these words *σύνδεσμοι παραπληρωματικοί*, it will point out that they are redundant. Common terms are *παρέλκειν*, *πλεονάζειν*, *ἄργος*, *ἐκ περιττοῦ*, *περιττός*, *περιττεύειν*, *κενός*, *κενώς προσκεῖσθαι*,³³ *ἐκ πλήθους*.³⁴

³¹ In Sch. D. Th. 461.15ff. *παραπλήρωμα* is one in a series of stylistic/rhetorical phenomena, and it is described as: *φράσις ἢ λέξις ἐκ περισσοῦ λαμβανομένη, ὡς τὸ <B 493> ἀρχοῦς αὐ νηῶν ἐρέω νῆας τε προπάσας· ἡ γὰρ πρό παρέλκει*. Note that preposition and prepositional prefixes were considered *σύνδεσμοι προθετικοί* by the Stoics. Traces of this usage can be seen in D. H., cf. previous note.

³² *Μῶν*, *κᾶτα*: both are *σύνδεσμοι ἀπορηματικοί* in D. Th. (94.2f.); Ap. Dysc. *coni.* 229.19ff. (*μῶν* = *διαπορητικός* and contains *ὄν παραπληρωματικός*; *κᾶτα* = used instead of *καί* or it is *διαπορητικός*, although there is some discussion about its status. It could also be an adverb, since it contains *εἶτα* (so Trypho)).

³³ Hipp. *In Aratum* 156.4; 8f. (ed. Manitius, BT) - *προσαναπλήρωμα*.

³⁴ Cf. Ruijgh (1971: § 60); Ruijgh points out that *παραπληρωματικός* is not synonymous with these terms, which always denote redundancy in a certain context, i.e. as an accidental feature, while *παραπληρωματικός* is used as a classificatory term (1971: § 65). The two exceptions where *τε* is

Elink Sterk has collected all the words whose redundant use has been noted by ancient Greek scholiasts, glossographers and Atticists (II 41ff.). Among the examples we find εἶτα, ἐπεί, ἔπειτα, δήπου, δήθεν, as well as numerous other σύνδεσμοι and adverbs, but also a word like ἄττα, singled out by Lucian.³⁵ Again, while there may often be critical overtones in designating the use of a word 'redundant', the terms as such do not exclude the possibility that their effect is to beautify the language.³⁶

Thus, there is a long-standing stylistic awareness of the incidental ornamental, meaningless use of words that do signify in other contexts. If their ornamental effect is doubted, such a use constitutes a stylistic *faux-pas*. The part of speech in which this phenomenon was observed to occur most frequently was the conjunction. Even after it had been established that conjunctions in general are not meaningless (like Aristotle had contended), but express the relationships—which have a reality of their own—between states of affairs (*Stoa*),³⁷ the discussion about meaningless words still naturally gravitated towards this part of speech, but it concentrated on a sub-group, the παραπληρωματικοί. Apollonius Dyscolus still feels the necessity of vigorously combating a majority view that these words have no meaning at all.³⁸ Supporters of that idea may have felt backed up by the very name of the sub-group, but Apollonius explains the name as a simple matter of classificatory convenience. There is no point in endlessly increasing the number of subcategories, each covering a sub-set of possibly one word only. The system of grammar should be kept simple, elegant and easy to memorize. These words have meaning, but they are rarely used for that. Usually, their euphonic function explains their appearance, without their making any contribution to the meaning; even so they are useful, and this is the use they are named for.³⁹ Apollonius' parallel for this terminological solution of convenience is the word ὑποτακτικὸς for 'subjunctive': this mode expresses a number of semantic values, but the common formal characteristic of always following a σύνδεσμος determines the name.⁴⁰

called παραπληρωματικός, are Ap. *Dysc. adv.* 148.5; Sch. Hom. O 124 (Ruijgh 1971: § 68f.). Note that Elink Sterk is confused about the use of ἐκ πληροῦς, which does *not* mean that the word used is redundant, but that it is spelled in *scriptio plena*, i.e. without apocope (e.g. II 48 γε, not γ'; 66 τε, not τ').

³⁵ Εἶτα: Sch. on Aristoph. *Pl.* 79, Elink Sterk II 51; ἄττα: Harpocration etc., Elink Sterk II 44.

³⁶ Cf. e.g. the use of περιττός signaled above (p. 240), in D. H. *Dem.* 24.182.20f.; cf. D. H. *CV* 9.33.12ff.: τίς γάρ οὐκ ἂν ὁμολογήσαι τήνδε μὲν τὴν λέξιν ἦν ὁ Δημοσθένης εἴρηκε προσθήκη πλεονάζειν οὐκ ἀναγκαῖα τῆς ἁρμονίας ἔνεκα; cf. 33.21 χαριέστερον.

³⁷ Frede (1977: 74), (1978: 62ff., 65f.), Atherton (1993: 302ff.).

³⁸ Ap. *Dysc. coni.* 247.22ff.

³⁹ *Coni.* 252.29ff. It should be pointed out that Elink Sterk's otherwise useful contribution is fundamentally vitiated by his view that a word without meaning cannot have anything to contribute to the beauty of a text (better: Jahn 1847: 37ff.; Kroon 1995: 37 n. 6). Therefore, he refuses to allow that the παραπληρωματικοί, even if just used *qua* παραπληρωματικοί (i.e. precisely in the cases where the name is not a misnomer), can be meaningless.

⁴⁰ Ap. *Dysc. synt.* 377.8ff.; D. H. also knows this principle in naming the elements and the three styles: they are never pure, but are named after the dominating characteristic, ὀνόμασαι δ' ἕκαστον αὐτῶν κατὰ τὸ πλεονάζον, *Dem.* 37.209.21ff.

I began this article by pointing out that the ancient meristic system allowed room for residual cases: the class of adverbs formed a natural receptacle for them, and within the class of the *syndesmoi*, so did the parapleromatic ones. All *syndesmoi* which would otherwise have formed a semantic class of their own fitted into this category. In this way it contributed to the economy of the system. The reason why parapleromatic uses of the *syndesmos* were not classified as adverbs is clear. Μερισμός is primarily decided on the ground of meaning.⁴¹ If a word incidentally behaves as if it belonged to a different word class, that instance will be classified accordingly. But parapleromatic uses of the *syndesmos* do not have any distinguishable meaning at all, and therefore retain their classification, as would happen with any other pleonastically used part of speech. The difference is that with other words pleonastic use is the exception, while here it is the rule, to the point where the whole sub-group is named for this use. Chaeremon allows the formal behaviour of these words (i.e. the fact that they are homonyms of regularly signifying 'conjunctions') to be the determining factor in their μερισμός.⁴² Apollonius strengthens this argument by putting their redundant use on a par with that of any other part of speech, and pointing out that incidental redundancy is never a reason to assign a word to a different part of speech (*coni.* 249.22ff.). He then proves that every σύνδεσμος παραπληρωματικός is also used in a meaningful way (*coni.* 249.31ff.), thus putting this sub-group firmly in the realm of the normal and regular.

In this contribution I looked at the grammatical class of the σύνδεσμοι παραπληρωματικοί from a specific angle. Two factors contributed to its development. One is that discussions about whether or not conjunctions have meaning were replaced with or focused on the question of whether or not this specific residual group had any. Here I emphasized the economy of the grammatical system, which has its own requirements that can take precedence over linguistic realities. The other factor is the discussion about the stylistic impact of conjunctions. Here, too, we observed a shift from early rhetorical admonitions about the most effective use of corresponding *syndesmoi* to an interest in an issue that directly affected the distinction of the parapleromatics: the rhetorical and stylistic interest in redundancy and its effects. This was an old issue, but here too, the focus had to be narrowed. Virtually any word or even phrase could be used redundantly, but it seemed especially relevant in the case of the *syndesmoi*, if no longer for the whole group, then certainly for this sub-set that even got to derive its name from it.

Not only particles, but also articles can be parapleromatic. They are not necessary, but hopefully they contribute to μέτρον, κόσμος or both of the book they are helping to fill. Certainly there can be no ἀκαιρία in their expressing their admiration for the author of the *Odyssey* around epic τε.

⁴¹ Sluiter (1990: 64). *Ap. Dysc. pron.* 67.6: οὐ γὰρ φωναῖς μεμέρισται τὰ τοῦ λόγου μέρη, σημαينوμένοις δέ.

⁴² *Apud Ap. Dysc. coni.* 248.1ff.

Bibliography

- Atherton, C.
1993 *The Stoics on Ambiguity*. Cambridge
- Baratin, M.
1989 *La naissance de la syntaxe à Rome*. Paris
- Belli, G.
1982 'Aristotele e Posidonio sul significato del "syndesmos"'. *Aevum* 61, 105-7
- Elink Sterk, J.W.
1845-46 'Grammatica Zetemata -- De Parapleromaticis'. *Symbolae Literariae* 7, 3-63 [= I]; 8, 3-71 [= II]
- Frede, M.
1977 'The Origins of Traditional Grammar'. In: R.E. Butts and J. Hintikka (eds), *Historical and Philosophical Dimensions of Logic, Methodology and Philosophy of Science*. Dordrecht, pp. 51-79
- 1978 'Principles of Stoic Grammar'. In: J.M. Rist (ed.), *The Stoics*. Berkeley-Los Angeles-London, pp. 27-75
- Hellwig, A.
1974 'Zur Funktion und Bedeutung der griechischen Partikeln'. *Glotta* 52, 145-71
- Jahn, C.F.
1847 *Grammaticorum graecorum de coniunctionibus doctrina*. Greifswald
- Kroon, C.M.
1995 *Discourse Particles in Latin. A Study of nam, enim, autem, vero and at*. Amsterdam
- Ruijgh, C.J.,
1971 *Autour de 'ε épique'. Études sur la syntaxe grecque*. Amsterdam
- Schenkeveld, D.M.
1983 'Linguistic Theories in the Rhetorical Works of Dionysius of Halicarnassus'. *Glotta* 61, 67-94.
- 1984 'Studies in the History of Ancient Linguistics II. Stoic and Peripatetic Kinds of Speech Act and the Distinction of Grammatical Moods'. *Mnemosyne* 37, 291-353
- 1988 'From Particula to Particle - the Genesis of a Class of Words'. In: I. Rosier (éd.), *L'héritage des grammairiens latins de l'antiquité aux lumières. Actes du Colloque de Chantilly, 2-4 septembre 1987*. Paris, pp. 81-93
- Sluiter, I.
1990 *Ancient Grammar in Context. Contributions to the Study of Ancient Linguistic Thought*. Amsterdam
- Tosi, R.
1988 *Studi sulla tradizione indiretta dei classici greci*. Bologna