

LITERARY PERFORMANCE IN THE IMPERIAL
SCHOOLROOM AS HISTORICAL REËNACTMENT:
THE EVIDENCE OF THE *COLLOQUIA*,
SCHOLIA TO CANONICAL WORKS, AND
SCHOLIA TO THE *TECHNE* OF DIONYSIUS THRAX

JACK MITCHELL



Abstract. Literary performance in the form of expressive reading aloud was central to Greco-Roman cultural transmission; scholars have described its role both in education and in ancient scholarship. Noting parallels in the terminology, objectives, and criteria for literary performance among the *Techne Grammatike* of Dionysius Thrax, scholia to canonical works, the *Colloquia*, and the scholia to the *Techne*, I argue that the scholia to canonical works reflect a performance culture in the Imperial period that included the ancient schoolroom, and that the dynamics of literary performance in the ancient schoolroom may therefore help to solve the question of whether references to performance style and audience response in the scholia to canonical works were intended to guide real performances or, instead, they were meant simply describe an ideal performance by The Poet. I conclude that this is a false distinction for the schoolroom setting, since student performances were strongly conditioned by ideas of the historical origins of genre.

IT IS WELL KNOWN THAT LITERARY PERFORMANCE WAS CENTRAL TO EDUCATION in the High Roman Empire;¹ as a “reading event,”² this institution is of particular interest amidst the multiplicity of literary

¹The best description of education under the *grammaticus* (what below I call “grammatical” education) is Bonner 1977, 189–249; for literary performance in the schoolroom, see esp. 212–26. See also Criboire 2001, 189–219; Kaster 1988; Del Corso 2005, 9–30. The loose chronological scope of the present study is determined only by the fact that the key texts considered (scholia to canonical works, *Colloquia*, and the scholia to the *Techne* of Dionysius Thrax) are all difficult to date with precision; all pertain to the general educational culture of the Mediterranean in the Hellenistic and Imperial periods. Accordingly, I situate the study in the “High Roman Empire” (the period also covered by Johnson’s *Readers and Reading Culture* of 2010 and many of the studies in Johnson and Parker 2009), a somewhat vague chronological term centered on the second century C.E., purely in order to distinguish its timeframe from preceding (Classical) and following (Late Antique) periods.

²I follow the terminology of Johnson 2010, 3–16.

performance practices under Rome³ because a great part of the extant authors from Hellenistic times onward will have undergone just such training: statistically it must have been the form of literary performance that occurred most frequently (indeed, daily) and may well be understood, therefore, as a central practice in the cultural transmission of the Greco-Roman literary canon. Equally well known is the fact that ancient scholarship (preserved for us in manuscript scholia) was interested in performance-oriented details of the canonical literary works they discussed, an interest particularly apparent in the scholia to Aristophanes, Terence, and other dramatic authors but also in the scholia to Homer.⁴ Since canonical texts were thus regularly being performed (by ancient students, among others) and being commented upon (sometimes with respect to performance) by ancient scholars,⁵ the question naturally arises as to whether commentary by ancient scholars on performance was intended to regulate actual literary performance by their contemporaries (whether students, adult amateurs, or professional readers) or whether ancient scholars' observations on the subject of performance constituted a purely intellectual aspect of the interpretive exercise of criticism. It is tempting for modern scholars to identify personally with the scholiasts, given our shared interest in ancient literature; and, since we ourselves take a purely historical attitude towards ancient literature, we are apt to suppose that ancient scholars, who obviously were conscious of the antiquity of their canon, must also have done so. On the other hand, as we shall see, the practice of performance is often so vividly imagined in the scholia to canonical works that one is tempted to take scholiasts' opinions on the subject as practical advice. This dilemma—which, I hasten

³For the performance of poetry and prose (classic and contemporary) in social contexts, see Starr 1990; Balsdon 1969. On professional readers aloud, see Starr 1990. On the evolving *recitatio*, see Funaioli 1914; Dalzell 1955; Quinn 1982; Salles 1994; Dupont 1997; Markus 2000. Literary performance by students in public contests is attested at *IMyl.* 16 (Mylasa), *SIG* 959 (Chios); *SEG* 44902 (Cnidus); *CIG* 3088 (Teos); *AthMitt* 37 [1912] 277.1 (Pergamon); on which see Del Corso 2005, 6–21; Mitchell 2006, 81–101; Boeckh 1843, 675. We find performance of texts at religious festivals at *IG* XI.4.418, *IG* II.204; see Johnson 2010, 95, 129, for numerous types of public performance by intellectuals; Parker 2009 insists that we not forget silent study of bookrolls by the literary-minded, though Cameron 1990 and Nagy 2008, 1.157–71, note the centrality of the reader aloud even in the editorial process.

⁴Key works in this regard, discussed below, are Rutherford 1905, esp. 97–179; Basore 1908; Degenhardt 1909; Nünlist 2009, esp. 338–66.

⁵The *Celtis colloquium* (Dionisotti 1982, 100, lines 38–39) provides a long list of authors read. On the Greek curriculum, see Marrou 1982, 162–64; Clarke 1971, 18–22; Criboire 2001, 194–204. On the Latin curriculum, see Bonner 1977, 212–19. On the centrality of Homer in ancient education, see Robb 1994, 159–82.

to add, I conclude below to be a false dilemma—is exemplified in one particular performance-oriented concept: the audience.⁶ Do the frequent, sensitive, and sometimes vivid⁷ references to a listening audience in the Homer scholia describe contemporary audiences, or are such audiences, which the Homer scholia portray as the objects of skillful manipulation by The Poet (who is obviously not the scholiasts' contemporary), either a conceptual construct or a historical reconstruction? Or do references to “the listener” refer to a contemporary consumer of literature who is actually a reader? How we answer such questions has broad implications for our understanding both of the cultural function of ancient scholarship and of the relationship between literary performance in the High Roman Empire and earlier performance traditions.

One might hope that this question of the practicality or non-practicality of performance-oriented material in the scholia to canonical works would be clarified by modern classical scholarship, but in fact studies of rhetorical and aesthetic observations in the extensive scholia to Homer generally do not refer to performance at all.⁸ Some recent

⁶Duckworth 1931 treats *proanaphonesis*, for which the Homer scholia's awareness of audience perception is central; Richardson 1980, 269–70, discusses remarks on audience attentiveness and anticipation; the seventh volume of Erbse 1969 (the index) collects references in the *Iliad* scholia to “listeners”; Nannini 1986 is the most thorough treatment of the audience in the Homer scholia. Nünlist 2009, 135–57, discusses much of the material in Nannini 1986.

⁷Σ 15.56b (bT, *ex.*): ῥητέον οὖν ὅτι σχῆμά ἐστι ἢ προανακεφαλαίωσις, ὡς Ὀδυσσεὺς προαναφώνει Τηλεμάχῳ τὴν μνηστηροκτονίαν . . . πρὸς δὲ τούτοις παραμυθεῖται τὸν ἀκροατὴν, τὴν ἄλωσιν Τροίας σκιαγραφῶν αὐτῷ· τίς γὰρ ἂν ἠνέσχετο ἐμπιπραμένων τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν νεῶν καὶ Αἴαντος φεύγοντος, εἰ μὴ ἀπέκειτο ταῖς ψυχαῖς τῶν ἐντυγχανόντων, ὅτι οἱ ταῦτα πράξαντες κρατηθήσονται ποτε; (“It must be said, therefore, that the rhetorical device is one of anticipatory summary [*proanakephaliosis*], in the same manner as Odysseus foretells the slaughter of the Suitors to Telemachus . . . In addition, he comforts the listener by outlining the sack of Troy to him; for who could keep calm with the Greek ships being burned and Ajax in retreat, if it were not explained to the spirits of those on hand that those who have done such things will soon be vanquished?”). Here, τὸν ἀκροατὴν and αὐτῷ must refer to an external listener, since the internal addressee is the feminine Hera; so the anticipatory summary describes interaction between The Poet and a Philhellenic listener in need of reassurance. There is perhaps a parallel at Σ 8.87a¹ (T, *ex.*), where the scholia comment that ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ δὲ καθιστὰς τὸν ἀκροατὴν καὶ τὸν δεινὸν Ἑκτορα αὐτῷ ἐπάγει (“Having put the listener in suspense he [sc. The Poet] also brings up the terrible Hector before him”); here, the terminology parallels that of Σ 15.56b, suggesting that τὸν ἀκροατὴν is the antecedent of αὐτῷ rather than Nestor, who might have to face Hector.

⁸Most studies of the Homer scholia have been purely philological: the VMK scholia, as primary conduits for Alexandrian editorial opinion, have received the bulk of the attention. Thus, performance features not at all, or only very incidentally, in major works by Lehrs 1833; Ludwich 1884–85; Erbse 1960; or Van der Valk 1963; it does not appear in

scholars have understood references to performance in the Homer scholia as divorced from practical performance;⁹ by contrast, a recent study of performance directions in the tragic scholia connects them to the direct experience of theatrical performance at Alexandria.¹⁰ Just as questions of practical performance seldom intrude on discussions of the scholia, likewise the scholia's remarks on performance are seldom brought to bear on practical performance in the Greco-Roman schoolroom¹¹ or on the education-oriented precepts for performance in ancient sources.¹² That said, four works known to me do treat practical performance in education and scholia together. Firstly, Bonner's volume on Roman education from 1977 notes parallels of punctuation (*stigma*), accentuation (*tonos*), and "acting out" (*hypokrisis*) between the scholia to canonical works and the education-oriented *Techne Grammatike* attributed to Dionysius Thrax.¹³ Secondly, the most concise, complete, and useful survey of both testimonia on schoolroom performance and material on exegesis and

Deecke 1912. Of works on aesthetics in the Homer scholia, neither Bachmann 1902 nor von Franz 1940 treat performance; Meijering 1987 (e.g., 128–30, 200–219) speaks interchangeably of "the audience" and "the reader" (sc. as consumer) and does not discuss the reader as performer; Richardson 1980 treats the audience but not the performer.

⁹Nünlist 2009, 12 (with n. 41), follows Schenkeveld 1992 in understanding ἀκούω ("hear") as a reference to reading; discussions of performance in the scholia, Nünlist argues, "should not be taken as an indication that ancient scholars were aware, for example, of the oral background and performance of the Homeric epics" since their authors "cater to an audience of readers" and "mostly address questions that a reader of the plays might have."

¹⁰Falkner 2002 takes the tragic scholia as mainly Alexandrian in origin, viewing notes on performance therein as reflective of Alexandrian critics' engagement with Hellenistic performance of tragedy, both positively and in defense of the text against actors' interpolations. Taplin 1977, 435–38, rebukes the tendency in the nineteenth century to equate notes on performance in the tragic scholia with fifth-century practice. Rutherford 1905, 103–4, does note "two stage-directions of a kind that no reader could imagine," which concern non-verbal utterances by the comic chorus.

¹¹Cribiore 2001 makes no reference to commentary on performance in scholia to canonical works; she views reading aloud (189–90) as a way of training students to read *scriptio continua*; but see Johnson 2010, 4–9, for a summary of the debunking of the view that silent reading was unknown in antiquity. Contemporary scientific studies of reading-skills acquisition by speakers of contemporary *scriptio continua* languages like Thai (Reilly and Radach 2003; Kasisopa 2011) prove that, physiologically, *scriptio continua* is no impediment to reading-skills acquisition.

¹²Busch 2002; Markus 2000; and Del Corso 2005 refer to the discussion of reading in the *Techne* of Dionysius Thrax but do not relate this to schoolroom performance. Pfeiffer 1968, 268–69, holds that the discussion of reading aloud in the *Techne* reflects simply a problem of the relationship of letters to words in a literary culture that relied on *scriptio continua*, on which see above, n. 11.

¹³Bonner 1977, 221–26.

performance remains Degenhardt's of 1909, who by his inclusion of both performance-oriented material (described as concordant with schoolroom performance) and exegetical material may be thought of as associating, albeit not explicitly, ancient scholars' critical interpretations with contemporary performance. Thirdly, Rutherford's study of 1905, *A Chapter in the History of Annotation*, structures its analysis of performance-oriented material in the Aristophanes scholia¹⁴ in terms of the precepts of the *Techne*; while Rutherford mentions only in passing the association of schoolroom performance and scholia,¹⁵ he makes the case that most of the exegetical material in the Aristophanes scholia reaches us as echoes of *viva voce* teaching by *grammatici*,¹⁶ and we may infer that Rutherford viewed the Aristophanes scholia's interest in performance as related to schoolroom performance, perhaps even that references in the scholia to the tools of the original performance context (such as the *ekkyklema*) were intended to complement overt instructions in performance. Finally, Basore's *The Scholia on Hypokrisis in the Commentary of Donatus* of 1908 directly addresses questions of the practicality and historical origin for the scholia on Terence, allowing that they may have been included "either for purposes of reading aloud or with no practical intent"¹⁷ but also that "the ultimate sources of this [scenic direction] may well have been the actors' copies of the plays, or the records of their production made accessible through the works of earlier Roman scholars",¹⁸ on the one hand, the Terence scholia discuss the audience (including, for example, cheering and heckling by female audience members), the actor (who is contrasted with a reader), stage blocking, gestures hard to perform while declaiming, and so forth;¹⁹ on the other hand, there are many references to the reader, as well as to facial expressions that would not have been possible in Terence's day because actors wore masks.²⁰ The result, Basore argues, is a composite text deriving from "varied strata," and one not unsuited either for contemporary performance or for education since "the stage and the rostrum had much in common,"²¹ though he does not expand on the latter point.

¹⁴ Rutherford 1905, 97–179.

¹⁵ E.g., Rutherford 1905, 109: "Boys had to be taught to read καθ' ὑπόκρισιν, but every teacher was free to teach in his own way."

¹⁶ Rutherford 1905, 31–33.

¹⁷ Basore 1908, 3.

¹⁸ Basore 1908, 4–5.

¹⁹ Basore 1908, 5–9.

²⁰ Basore 1908, 4 (references to the reader); Basore 1908, 3, 43 (facial expression).

²¹ Basore 1908, 10.

In what follows, I propose to answer the question of the practicality or non-practicality of performance-oriented material in the scholia to canonical works somewhat differently, arguing for the compatibility of commentary on performance, practical performance that was contemporary with that commentary, and historical information on performance not only philologically (in the sources of a synthetic commentary like that of Donatus on Terence or the Homer scholia) or chronologically (in the coexistence of professional performance with commentary on the canon) but also conceptually, in the very aims and assumptions underlying reperformance of the canon in ancient education. I adduce four related but distinct sources: scholia to canonical works (especially the abundant Homer scholia); the *Techne Grammatike* attributed to Dionysius Thrax (hereafter the *Techne*);²² the *Colloquia*;²³ and the scholia to the *Techne*. The latter three are closely connected to ancient “grammatical” education, although their actual functions differ (the *Techne* is a textbook, the *Colloquia* serve as practically eyewitness accounts of the ancient schoolroom, and the scholia to the *Techne* define the task of the *grammaticus*) and they overlap incompletely in their subject-matter, variously addressing concepts of education (*Techne*, scholia to the *Techne*), the content of instruction (*Techne*, *Colloquia*, scholia to the *Techne*), and actual schoolroom practice (*Colloquia*, scholia to the *Techne*). Using the definitions of education and literary performance found in the *Techne* to structure the inquiry, I propose first to address terminological parallels between the *Techne* and the *Colloquia*, then to show that their vocabulary of literary performance is shared with the scholia to canonical works; while the comparison does not allow us to plant the scholia to canonical works exclusively in the classroom setting, the parallels are stark enough to allow us to read

²² On the date and authorship of the *Techne Grammatike*, see Di Benedetto 1958; Pfeiffer 1968; Di Benedetto 1990; Robins 1997; Lallot 1998. On the influence of the *Techne*, see Uhlig 1883 (*GG* I.1.VI–VII); below, *GG* refers to the *Grammatici Graeci* series.

²³ The *Colloquia* form part of the *Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana*, a diverse corpus of bilingual texts designed to facilitate ancient language-acquisition; see Dickey 2012, 3–55, for a thorough description. All six versions of the *Colloquia* classified by Dickey 2012 feature, among other things, a day in the life of a Roman schoolboy. With regard to the six versions, Dickey 2012 is a new and very complete edition of the *Monacensia-Einsidlensia* (ME), the *Leidense-Stephani* (LS), and the *Stephani* (S); the remaining three, *Harleianum* (H), *Montepessulanum* (Mp), and *Celtis* (C), will shortly appear in a second volume and are referenced below in the edition of Goetz 1892 (*Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum*, Vol. III, 637–59, for the *Harleianum* and *Montepessulanum*) and the 1982 publication of Dionisotti (for the *Celtis*). Below, translations of material from the *Colloquia* are by Dickey for ME, LS, and S, by me for H, Mp, and C. Except as noted here and below, all translations are my own. I quote Dionisotti’s diplomatic text.

the scholia to canonical works in light of the ideas about performance found in the sources on education. Having established these parallels, I then explore the third source on literary performance in the classroom, the scholia to the *Techne*; from hitherto overlooked discussions in that source, I resolve the dilemma of the practicality (or non-practicality) of performance-oriented material in the scholia with three points. Firstly, I show that literary performance in the ancient schoolroom not only aimed at effective performance of the text as such but was also self-consciously a form of historical reënactment of the “original”²⁴ performance parameters of particular genres, as imagined by ancient *grammatici* if not necessarily by modern scholarship. Secondly, I argue that historical material about ancient texts was provided to students by their teachers in part so as to enable more authentic historical reënactments by student performers of literature. Thirdly, I propose that ancient commentary on performance was therefore both deeply interested in historical performance contexts (such as we today consider essential to our understanding of canonical texts) and concerned to regulate contemporary performance, because contemporary performance and historical performance were intended to be, ideally, one and the same. While remarks on performance in the scholia to canonical works may not, therefore, communicate authentic advice from Pisistratean rhapsodes, Sophoclean protagonists, or Terence himself, they would certainly be applicable to a living (and historically conscious) performance tradition of great contemporary importance, that of the schoolroom; as distillations of generations of experience of literary performance, moreover, they are of real practical interest to us moderns, who basically lack such a tradition not only for the literature of the ancients but even for our own.

The first chapter of the *Techne* of Dionysius Thrax, section 1 *On grammar*, defines *grammatike* as the experience (ἐμπειρία) of commonly read authors and declares that it contains six parts, involving first, “diligent reading according to prosody” (ἀνάγνωσις ἐντριβής κατὰ προσφδίαν), and last, the “finest part of the *Techne*,” the judgment (κρίσις) of poems; the other parts are exegesis of poetic tropes, accounts of words (γλώσσαί) and background material (ἱστορίαι), etymology, and paradigms (ἀναλογίας ἐκλογισμός). The scholia to the *Techne* take the paideutic intention of the

²⁴Here and below I place the word “original” in inverted commas to indicate that I would not, of course, take the scholia’s ideas of original performance contexts as necessarily accurate from the point of view of modern historians: if they do discuss an original performance context, the way they imagine such a context will be of more interest than the accuracy of their portrait.

Techne for granted,²⁵ but its contents in themselves align it with the scholia to canonical works, since, with the exception of “reading” and “judgment,” the other parts of *grammatike* here make up the subject-matter of the exegetical scholia and D-scholia to Homer, with corresponding material in the scholia to other canonical works;²⁶ as to the *Colloquia*, the generalized curriculum of the *Techne*²⁷ is perhaps illustrated in the catalogue of authors read by a *Colloquia* student,²⁸ who is found actually employing his *techne* in both concrete and abstract senses,²⁹ while the communication of background material by *grammaticus* to student is a recurring feature of the *Colloquia* schoolroom.³⁰ Just what the *Techne* means by “judgment of poems” is not perfectly clear;³¹ the scholia to canonical

²⁵ On the projection of didactic intent from Homer scholiast to Poet, see Sluiter 1999, 176–79; for other examples both from scholia to Homer and from scholia to other authors, see Degenhardt 1909, 94–96.

²⁶ Degenhardt 1909, 52–76, excerpts both “exegetical” and “D” scholia to Homer, along with scholia to other authors, for the categories of Γλώσσαί και Ἱστορίαι (explanations of words and background information), etymologies, geography, natural history, and analogies.

²⁷ According to the *Commentarius Melampodis* (GG I.3.11.9–10), ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ means “most easily accessible”; according to the *Scholia Vaticana* (GG I.3.168.14–18) and *Scholia Marciana* (GG I.3.301.10–23), it refers to works with easy vocabulary.

²⁸ See above, n. 5.

²⁹ Like our word “grammar,” *techne* can refer either to a book on grammar or to the subject of grammar in the abstract; both senses of *techne* appear in the *Celtis colloquium* (Dionisotti 1982, 101).

³⁰ *Colloquia Monacensia-Einsidlensia* (ME 2p Dickey): Φωνηθεὶς πρὸς ἀνάγνωσιν ἀκούω ἐξηγήσεις, διανοίας, πρόσωπα / *Clamatus ad lectionem audio expositiones, sensus, personas* (“When called to [do] a reading, I listen to explanations, meanings, persons”); *Celtis* (Dionisotti 1982, 100): Ἀπιοὺσι προτοσχοιοὶ πρὸς διδά<σκαλον>, ἀναγενοσκούσιν ἀναγνώσιν περὶ Ἐλιαδος, ἀλλήν περὶ Ὀδισσεΐας. Λαμβανουσι τοπον, παρενεσιν, ἀμφισβήτησιν, ἱστορίαν, κωμηδίαν, δραγματά, ἀπασιν φιλοπονίαν ρηθωρίας, προφασιν τοῦ Ἑλλιακοῦ πολεμοῦ, προφασιν τῆς ἀναγορευσεῖς, ἀναδοσιν / *Eunt priores ad magistrum, legunt lectionem de Iliade, aliam de Odysseia. Accipiunt locum, suasoriam, controversiam, historiam, comoediam, narrationes, omnem industriam orationis, causas Troici belli, materiam recitationis, redictiones* (“The older students go up to the teacher, they read a reading from the *Iliad*, another from the *Odyssey*. They are given the passage, the scenario [*suasoria*], the debate, the background [*historia*], the comedy, the stories, the whole workload of rhetoric, the causes of the Trojan war, the material for the recital, the *dictées*”). The *Colloquium Stephani* (S 17a–c Dickey) likewise associates recitation with background information: ἐπερώτησα, καὶ διορθωθεὶς ἀνέγνωκα ἀνάγνωσιν τὴν ἐμὴν, ἦν ἐμοὶ ἐξέθετο ἐπιμελῶς, ἕως νοήσομαι καὶ πρόσωπα καὶ διάνοιαν ῥημάτων τοῦ ποιητοῦ / *interrogavi, et emendatus legi lectionem meam, quam mihi exposuit diligenter, donec intelligerem et personas et sensum verborum au<c>toris* (“I asked questions, and having been corrected I read my reading, which [the teacher] explained to me carefully, until I understood both the characters and the meaning of the poet’s words”).

³¹ The *Commentarius Melampodis* (GG I.3.15.25–16.2), the *Scholia Vaticana* (GG I.3.170.2–5), the *Scholia Marciana* (GG I.3.303.26–4.5), and the *Scholia Londinensia* (GG I.3.471.26–72.18) take κρίσις ποιημάτων as referring to editorial activity.

texts are certainly full of remarks on both the legitimacy and beauty of the various lines under discussion.³²

Narrowing the focus from curriculum to schoolroom practice, we find that the second chapter of the *Techne*, section 2 *On reading*, specifies three key components in reading:

Reading is the faultless pronunciation (προφορά) of poems and prose works. One must read aloud according to *hypokrisis* (“acting out”), according to prosody (προσωδία), according to *chunking* (διαστολή, literally, “separation”). From the *hypokrisis* we observe the excellence, from the prosody the *techne*, from the chunking the overall frame of thought (τὸν περιεχόμενον νοῦν): so that we should read tragedy heroically, comedy in a lifelike manner, elegy clearly, epic vigorously, lyric poetry melodically, songs of lamentation in a subdued or keening manner. If things are not done in accordance with this observation, it both destroys the excellences of the poets and makes the training of those doing the reading ridiculous.³³

A few points leap out. Firstly, the reading that the *Techne* defines here is reading aloud: the verb προφέρω (“pronounce”) is used of the voice, and obviously evaluation of reading skill—which the *Techne* assumes to be part and parcel of the act of reading—requires a listener. Secondly, *hypokrisis* (“acting out”) is given priority, both in the sequence of skills that go into reading and as the vehicle of a poem’s “excellence” (ἀρετή). Third, *techne*—here in its abstract sense—is the technical component of *grammatike*,³⁴ but this is coupled both with *hypokrisis* and with a fourth component, *chunking* (διαστολή), which takes the *Techne* at once into a discussion of genre.

Parallels with schoolroom practice as described in the *Colloquia* are numerous: there, the student performs long passages;³⁵ when he reads, it can be either with book in hand or from memory,³⁶ either by himself or

³²Degenhardt 1909, 86–94, collects many examples of such appreciations.

³³*GG* I.1.6.5–13.

³⁴The *Commentarius Melampodis* (*GG* I.3.16.12–13) glosses κατὰ προσωδίαν as κατὰ τέχνην, τούτεστι κατὰ τόνους, χρόνους, πνεύματα, πάθη (“according to *techne*, i.e., according to tonal accent, lengths [of vowels], breathings, inflections”).

³⁵In the *Celtis colloquium* (Dionisotti 1982, 99) we find, Δίδωσιν μοι αναλογιον και κελευει με αναγιγνωσκειν παρ’ αυτω σελιδας πεντε / *Dat mihi manuale et iubet me legere apud se paginas quinque* (“He gives me a book and orders me to read five pages at his side”).

³⁶Reading usually appears to be done with the text in hand (as in the example in the previous note). In the *Colloquium Stephani* (S 15a Dickey), if we follow one of the solutions to textual difficulties here preferred by the editor (Dickey 2012, 240), the student covers his work with his hand in order to demonstrate that he has memorized it: προσήλθον, ὑποτεθείσης χειρός δέλτον ἀπέδωκα, <και ἀπέδωκα> μνήμη ὑπογραφὴν αὐτῶν ὅπου ἐπραξα / *accessi, et posita*

in a group;³⁷ the teacher also reads canonical texts to the students,³⁸ the reading is “according to punctuation” (κατὰ διαστολήν / *ad distinctum*);³⁹ technical proficiency and performance style are coupled;⁴⁰ the student

manu tabulam reddidi, <et reddidi> memoria subscriptionem eorum ubi egeram (“I came forward, and having put down [my] hand I handed over the tablet [containing my lesson], <and I produced> from memory an outline of the things I had done”).

³⁷ *Colloquia Monacensia-Einsidlensia* (ME 2k Dickey): *Sed statim dictavit mihi condiscipulus. Et tu, inquit, dicta mihi* (“But at once a fellow student dictated to me. ‘You too,’ he said, ‘recite for me’”); *Celtis colloquium* (Dionisotti 1982, 100–101): εἰς τὰς τῆν ἀναγορευοῦσιν ἑκαστος κατὰ τὴν διναμὴν / *in ordinem recitant quisque pro posse* (“Each student recites in order as best he can”).

³⁸ *Colloquia Monacensia-Einsidlensia* (ME 2u Dickey): φωνηθεὶς πρὸς ἀνάγνωσιν ἀκούω ἐξηγήσεις, διανοίας, πρόσωπα. ἐπερωτηθεὶς τέχνην ἀπεκριθην· πρὸς τίνα λέγει; τί μέρος λόγου; ἔκλινα γένη ὀνομάτων, ἐμέρισα στίχον. ὡς δὲ ταῦτ’ ἐπράξαμεν, ἀπέλυσεν εἰς ἄριστον, ἀπολυθεὶς ἐπανέρχομαι ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ. ἀλλάσσω, λαμβάνω ἄρτον καθαρὸν, ἐλαίαις, τυρόν, σχάδια, κάρνα. πίνω ὕδωρ ψυχρὸν. ἠρισθηκὼς ἐπανέρχομαι πάλιν εἰς τὴν σχολήν. εὗρισκω καθηγητὴν ἐπαναγινώσκοντα, καὶ εἶπεν· Ἀρξασθε ἀπὸ ἀρχῆς. / *clamatus ad lectionem audio expositiones, sensus, personas. interrogatus artificia respondi. Ad quem dicit? Quae pars orationis? declinavi genera nominum, partivi versum. ut haec egimus, dimisit ad prandium. dimissus venio domi. muto, accipio panem candidum, olivas, caseum, caricas, nuces. bibo aquam frigidam. pransus revertor iterum in scholam. invenio magistrum perlegentem, et dixit: Incipite ab initio* (“When called to [do] a reading, I listen to explanations, meanings, persons. When asked, I answered grammatical questions: ‘To whom is he speaking?’ ‘What part of speech [is it]?’ I declined the genders of nouns, I parsed a verse. When we had done these things, [the teacher] dismissed [us] for lunch. Having been dismissed, I come home. I change [my clothes], I take white bread, olives, cheese, dried figs, nuts. I drink chilled water. Having eaten lunch, I return again to school. I find the teacher reading [something] over, and he said, ‘Begin from the beginning’”). I provide the passage in full here because I suggest that the material being read over by the teacher upon the student’s return, which Dickey cautiously supplies as “[something],” is in fact the text the students were studying before lunch; it is otherwise not clear of what the ἀρχή / *initium* (“beginning”) would be, and to my mind the point is that the student gets straight back to work after his fully described lunch. It is on this basis that I describe the teacher as reading a “canonical” work, since such are the works capable of sustaining the curriculum (*expositiones, sensus, personas plus artificia*).

³⁹ *Colloquium Leidense-Stephani* (LS 8b Dickey): καὶ ἄλλοι ἐν τάξει ἀποδιδούσιν κατὰ διαστολήν, καὶ ἐγὼ διέρχομαι ἀνάγνωσιν / *et alii in ordine reddunt ad distinctum, et ego transeo lectionem* (“And the others in order produce their [readings] with proper pauses. And I go through my reading”); *Colloquium Stephani* (S 39a Dickey): ἔγραψα ἐκ λόγου Δημοσθένους ἐπαγορευόντος καθηγητοῦ, ὃ ἐπῆρκει καὶ ὥρα ἐπέτρεπεν· ἔστιξα ὡς ἔδει. < > ἀναγορεύοντας πρῶτον, καὶ αὐτὸς ἀνηγόρευσα μόνος / *scripsi de oratione Demosthenis dictante praeceptore, quod sufficiebat et hora permittebat; distinxī ut oportebat. < > recitantes primum, et ipse recitavi solus* (“I wrote [an extract] from a speech of Demosthenes with the teacher dictating, as much as was enough and as the time allowed; [and] I put in punctuation marks as was proper. <I watched the others (?)> reciting first, and [then] I myself recited on my own”); on her tentative suppletion here, see Dickey 2012, 245.

⁴⁰ *Celtis colloquium* (Dionisotti 1982, 99): κελενεὶ με ἀναγινώσκειν παρ’ αὐτῷ σελιδας πεντε· καὶ ἀνεγνώκα ἀκριβῶς καὶ ἐπισημος / *iubet me legere apud se paginas quinque; et legi*

must work at inhabiting the character (ἠθοποιᾶ);⁴¹ the student is evaluated on his reading.⁴² Many of these descriptive details are paralleled in prescriptions for schoolroom performance provided by Quintilian and Ausonius, who both highlight *distinctio* (i.e., *diastole*, chunking) and correct intonation as essential to reading aloud, along with (in Quintilian's prescription) understanding of the text as the overriding requirement for effective performance.⁴³

Parallels with scholia to canonical works are so extensive as to allow for only a brief summary, although several examples from the Homer scholia are so vividly illustrative as to be worth careful examination; they generally fall into the three categories of effects of *emphasis* achieved through punctuation or chunking (*diastole*), effects of characterization (*prosopopoeia*) achieved through punctuation or chunking, and effects of characterization achieved through manner or tone. Notes on punctuation run through both the scholia to dramatic authors⁴⁴ and the Homer scholia; in the latter, they appear both in the anonymous "exegetical" scholia and in material from the Venetus A manuscript assigned by modern scholars

certe et nobiliter ("He orders me to read five pages at his side; and I read [them] accurately and nobly"). The coupling of the moral character of the student with the characters he reads about is explicit in the *Colloquium Stephani* (S 26a): Υἱὸς εἶη τούτων οὗς ἀναγινώσκομεν ἀρχαίους παρὰ Ὀμήρῳ, καὶ μεγίστους βασιλεῖς καὶ ἡγεμόνας Ἑλλήνων, καὶ φρονίμους νέους καὶ γέροντας / *Filius sit eorum quos legimus antiquos apud Homerum, et maximos reges et duces Graecorum, et prudentes, iuvenes et senes* ("May he be a [worthy] son of those ancient men [about] whom we read in Homer, [who were] both the greatest kings and leaders of the Greeks, and prudent, [both] youths and old men"). Dickey's translation here supplies "about" in "whom we read [about]," but it is striking that the Greek and Latin versions enumerate the student's role-models via the student's very act of recreating them in his reading.

⁴¹ *Celtis colloquium* (Dionisotti 1982, 100–101): Τότε επανερχετε εκαστος, εν τω ιδιω τοπω καθεσουσιν. Εκαστος αναγινωσκη ανα<γνωσιν> αυτω δεδειγμενην· αλλος γραφει, εθοποιει· εις ταξην αναγορευουσιν / *Tunc revertitur quisque, in suo loco consistit. quisque legit lectionem sibi subtraditam; alter scribit, alter meditat. in ordinem recitant* ("Then each [student] goes back, they sit down in their places. Each of them reads the reading assigned to him; one writes, another thinks / works on the character [*meditat* / ἠθοποιεῖ]; they recite in order").

⁴² The *Colloquium Montepessulanum* (CGL III.656.6) features praise of a student's *encomium*, the *Celtis colloquium* (Dionisotti 1982, 100–101) both praise and the threat of punishment.

⁴³ Quint. 1.8.1–3, Auson. *Protrept. ad nep.* 45–54. Both dwell on the importance of punctuation or chunking (*distinctio*): Quintilian summons the student to know "where to suspend the breath, at what point to distinguish the verse, where the sense ends and begins" (*ut sciat ubi suspendere spiritum debeat, quo loco versum distinguere, ubi claudatur sensus, unde incipiat*), while Ausonius remarks that "chunking enhances the sense and pauses give strength to the dull" (*distinctio sensum / auget et ignavis dant intervalla vigorem*).

⁴⁴ Rutherford 1905, 168–79.

to the punctuational theorist Nicanor.⁴⁵ In both corpora, the vocabulary of punctuation on the physical page (e.g., στίζωμεν, “let us place a point”) alternates with the vocabulary of pausing (e.g., διασταλτέον, “one must separate”); the latter terminology blurs the line between text and performance, since one of the innovative Nicanor’s marks of punctuation was the βραχεῖα διαστολή (“short separation”).⁴⁶ Punctuation or chunking can have the effect of what the scholia term *emphasis*, which we might translate as “display of enhanced significance”;⁴⁷ different choices of punctuation or pausing can create different effects of *emphasis*. The *emphasis* can be as subtle as the effect of pausing before an exclamation such as “Wonder to behold!” (θαῦμα ιδέσθαι)⁴⁸ or between adjectives or adverbs in serial asyndeton;⁴⁹ usually the *emphasis* effected is left unspecified, sometimes spelled out.⁵⁰ The *emphasis* can be of a character’s emotions:

⁴⁵There are 848 scholia attributed to Nicanor by Friedländer 1857, 141–278 (Carnuth 1875 covers the *Odyssey*); Erbse 1969 follows Friedländer. Apart from frequent references in the Homer scholia, Nicanor’s overall novel system of punctuation is preserved only by the *Commentarius Melampodis* (*GG* I.3.26–27) in a striking example of overlap between scholia to canonical works, ancient commentaries, and an education-oriented treatise.

⁴⁶Likely owing to the excerpting of Nicanor’s commentary on Iliadic punctuation, the Homer scholia provide 369 variations on βραχὺ διασταλτέον; there is only one parallel use in the tragic scholia, at Soph. *Aj.* 651. For the close relationship between the act of adding punctuation to the page and the act of recitation in the *Colloquia*, see above, n. 39.

⁴⁷*Emphasis* (ἔμφασις) derives not from φημί (“say”) but from φαίνω (“show”); Aristotle uses it of a rainbow (*Meteorologica* III.iv [373b]); other examples at LSJ s.v. On ancient theories of *emphasis*, see Rutherford 1988. Aristarchus highly valued *emphasis* (Nannini 1986, 62), being apt to athetize verses that diminished it (e.g., Σ 17.172 [A, *Ariston.*] [= Nannini 137]).

⁴⁸Σ 18.377a (A, *Nic.*) (ὁν ἡδ’ αὖτις πρὸς δῶμα νεοῖατο θαῦμα ιδέσθαι [“And again to his house return a wonder to behold”]): Βραχὺ διασταλτέον ἐπὶ το νεοῖατο· μᾶλλον γὰρ ἐμφαίνει (“One must observe a *bracheia diastole* after ‘return’ [νεοῖατο]; for this lends greater *emphasis*”).

⁴⁹Pausing between adjectives in serial asyndeton is said to lend “greater *emphasis*” at Σ 11.119a¹ (A, *Nic.*) and at Σ 15.308–9 (A^{int}, *Nic.*).

⁵⁰The *emphasis* is specified at Σ 22.146a (AbT^{II} | AT^{II} | A, *ex.*): τείχεος αἰὲν <ὑπέκ κατ’ ἀμαξίτων ἔσσεύοντο>; βραχὺ διασταλτέον μετὰ τὸ ὑπέκ· (AbT^{II}) τὸ γὰρ ἐξῆς, ὑπέκ τείχεος κατὰ τὴν ἀμαξίτων, (AT^{II}) οἷον ὑπὸ τὸ τείχος· ἡ δὲ ἐκ πρόθεσις προ<σ>κειμένη ἐμφαίνει ὡς και μικρὸν ἔξω τοῦ τείχους ἔτρεχον (A) (“Always <away> from the wall <they rushed along the waggon track>: A *bracheia diastole* after ὑπέκ [away], (AbT^{II}) “for the order of thought [τὸ ἐξῆς; see Levy 1969] is ‘away from the wall and along the waggon track,’” (AT^{II}) “that is ‘under the wall; the preposition ἐκ lends an *emphasis* to the effect that they [Achilles and Hector] were running only slightly apart from the wall” (A). More often the *emphasis* is left unspecified: at Σ 18.377a (A, *Nic.*), a short pause is suggested prior to the exclamation θαῦμα ιδέσθαι (“wonder to behold”); μᾶλλον γὰρ ἐμφαίνει (“for this lends greater *emphasis*”); at Σ 13.366c (A^{int}, *Nic.*), a short pause is specified at the penthemimeral caesura, with the effect of high-

in the *Iliad*, for example, we learn to achieve *emphasis* of Agamemnon's sneering contempt for Chryses,⁵¹ Achilles' rage,⁵² Patroclus' frustration,⁵³ or the narrator's (or possibly Achilles') sorrow at Patroclus' recklessness.⁵⁴ The dramatic effects thus achieved through *emphasis* are by no means obvious or banal but rather sometimes point to an extraordinarily sensitive understanding of the text as a performance piece, as when Achilles, moved to reverse the ruin of the Greeks that he had held out for, at last gives in to Patroclus' plea (16.126–29):

ὄρσοο διογενὲς Πατρόκλεες ἱπποκέλευθε
 λεύσσω δὴ παρὰ νηυσὶ πυρὸς δηϊοιο ἰωήν
 μὴ δὴ νῆας ἔλωσι καὶ οὐκέτι φυκτὰ πέλωνται
 δύσσοο τεύχεα θᾶσσον ἐγὼ δέ κε λαὸν ἀγείρω⁵⁵

lighting the boldness of a Trojan's vow to push back the Achaenas single-handed, but the explanation is merely ἐμφαίνει <γάρ> (“<for> this lends *emphasis*”).

⁵¹ Σ 1.30a (A^{int}, Nic.) (ἡμετέρῳ ἐνὶ οἴκῳ ἐν Ἀργεῖ τηλόθι πάτρης [“In my house in Argos far from fatherland”]): “We pronounce this all by itself, and it displays greater *emphasis*” (καθ’ ἑαυτὸ τοῦτο προφερόμεθα, καὶ γὰρ ἐμφατικώτερον).

⁵² Σ 1.231a (A, Nic.) (δημοβόρος βασιλεύς [“king eater-of-the-people”]): “It is necessary to read this all by itself (καθ’ ἑαυτό), as Philoxenus in his *On Prosodies* remarks, so that the choppy manner (τὸ κομματικόν) of the pronunciation better displays (ἐμφαίνειν) his rage. Alternatively (καὶ) *are* (εἶ) can be left out, so that, when we pronounce the whole line as a single item (ὅφ’ ἐν), it becomes ‘You are an eater-of-the-people king because you rule over nobodies.’ But this is not required” (καθ’ ἑαυτὸ τοῦτο ἀναγνωστέον, ὡς καὶ Φιλοξένῳ ἐν τῷ Περί προσωιδίων δοκεῖ, ἵνα τὸ κομματικόν τῆς προφορᾶς τὴν ὀργὴν μᾶλλον ἐμφαίνῃ. δύναται δὲ καὶ τὸ εἶ ῥῆμα λείπειν, ὅφ’ ἐν ἡμῶν ὅλον προφερομένων τὸν στίχον, ἵν’ ἡ ‘δημοβόρος εἶ βασιλεύς ἐπεὶ οὐτιδανοῖσιν ἀνάσσεις; ἄλλ’ οὐκ ἐπέιγαι). “Choppiness” (τὸ κομματικόν) in delivery is several times recommended in the Homer scholia as a tool for the representation of anger (Σ 1.231a here, Σ 2.337a [AA^{int}, Nic.], Σ 9.374–79 [bT, Nic.]), including in notes that derive from Aristarchus (Σ 13.172a [A, Ariston.] and Σ 14.169a [A, Ariston.]); cf. the scholion to Aesch. *Eum.* 145 and, for the Terence scholia, Basore 1908, 67–69.

⁵³ As for anger, reproach (as we learn at Σ 13.623a [A, Nic.]) is given effective *emphasis* with a phrase pronounced καθ’ ἑαυτό (“by itself”): δύναται δὲ καθ’ ἑαυτὸ λέγεσθαι μόνον τὸ <κακαὶ κύνες> καὶ μᾶλλον γε τὸν σχετλιασμὸν ἐμφαίνει (“the phrase ‘foul dogs’ alone can be spoken by itself, and so indeed it lends more *emphasis* to the indignant reproach”). For “blame” in the Terence scholia, see Basore 1908, 72–73.

⁵⁴ At Σ 16.686 (A, Nic.), Nicanor recommends that the narrator's frustration with Patroclus, expressed by his calling him a νῆπιος, should be pronounced “by itself: for thus it better displays (ἐμφαίνει) one who is expressing grief (τὸν ἐπισχετλιάζοντα). Those who join it [sc. to the preceding line] are mistaken” (καθ’ ἑαυτοῦ· οὕτως γὰρ μᾶλλον ἐμφαίνει τὸν ἐπισχετλιάζοντα. ἀμαρτάνουσι δὲ οἱ συνάπτοντες). Here, and in the preceding examples, such participles as ὀργιζόμενος, σχετλιάζων, or ἐπισχετλιάζων, characterising the effect of an *emphasis* of character through certain deliveries, become virtual stage directions.

⁵⁵ I omit punctuation from the Greek here, the punctuation being the point at issue.

Rise up Zeus-born Patroclus driver-of-horses
 I see indeed by the ships the loud shout of blazing fire
 let them not indeed take the ships nor let there be escape any longer
 put on your armor quickly and I will rouse the men

Here, Nicanor comments (Σ 16.128a [A, *Nic.*]) upon “μη δὴ νῆας ἔλωσι” (Let them not indeed take the ships):⁵⁶

By common consent, this part is spoken all by itself; for he is speaking with extreme concern (ὕπερφυλαβούμενος). The sequence of thought (τὸ ἐξῆς) could be “Rise up” (16.126), so that they do not take the ships; but the former way [i.e. speaking the first half or the whole of 16.128 on its own] is better. One must take care to note, with respect to the *asyndeton*, that the characterization is extremely full of *emphasis* (ἐμφαντικωτάτη).

Here we see that the choice of how to effect the *prosopopoeia* of Achilles is left in the reader’s hands,⁵⁷ even if the scholiast here endorses the more dramatic alternative, whereby Achilles’ grief for the Greeks is to burst forth in an asyndetic negative command (μη ἔλωσι!) rather than in a blander final clause (ὄρσεο, μη ἔλωσι). From the point of view of literary history, however—lest we be tempted to regard punctuation as a trivial matter—we note that here one of the most dramatic moments in the poem, a hinge of plot and character alike, is to be defined by whether or not to dissociate, by a pause in the voice, one line or half-line from another. As to other authors, Rutherford provides many examples of such characterisation through punctuation in the scholia to Aristophanes.⁵⁸ Scholia focused upon delivery as regulated by punctuation also specify interrogative and exclamatory intonation, which is also related to *hypokrisis* and can again reflect concern for characterization.⁵⁹ Here is a particularly

⁵⁶This is one of many places at which the scope of the interpretation presented by the scholia depends upon the length of the lemma; in the manuscript here, this is “μη δὴ νῆας ἔλωσι,” while the editor (Erbse) has supplied the second half of the line. The scholion references “ταῦτα,” but does this refer to the whole of line 128 or just its first half?

⁵⁷In examples above, e.g., we have seen the scholia presenting a choice of deliveries to the reader at Σ 1.231a (A, *Nic.*), Σ 9.372a (A, *Nic.*). This is particularly common in discussions of punctuation in the tragic scholia, where application of *diastole* or marks of punctuation usually produces two viable alternatives, one being preferable, or where the punctuation favored by *τινες* (“some people”; but not, presumably, the scholiast himself) warrants a mention: see, e.g., scholia at Eur. *Alc.* 909, Eur. *Androm.* 480, and Eur. *Hipp.* 465, 573, 634, 1378.

⁵⁸Rutherford 1905, 168–79.

⁵⁹On discussions of interrogative or exclamatory intonation in the Homer scholia, see Mitchell 2006, 166–71; in the Aristophanes scholia, see Rutherford 1905, 155–56; in the Terence scholia, Basore 1908, 84–85.

delicate example, as Iris the Messenger responds to Poseidon's rebuff to his elder brother Zeus (15.201–4):

οὕτω γὰρ δὴ τοι γαιήοχε κυανοχαῖτα
 τόνδε φέρω Διὶ μῦθον ἀπηνέα τε κρατερόν τε
 ἢ τι μεταστρέψεις στρεπταὶ μὲν τε φρένες ἐσθλῶν
 οἴσθ' ὡς πρεσβυτέροισιν Ἐρινύες αἰὲν ἔπονται

Thus indeed truly earthshaker darkhaired
 I bear to Zeus this very *muthos* unyielding and mighty
 or will you change your mind? For the minds of the good can be
 changed.
 you know how the Furies always follow the elder

Here the scholia comment (Σ 15.204b) on the last line,

You know . . . the elder—It is possible to present (προάγειν) this either as a question (ἐρώτησις) or as an assertion (ἀπόφασις). *Follow* in the sense of *attend upon and fight on behalf of*. It is convincing [sc. as spoken] to one who says “Let him in no way completely frighten me like a coward” (15.196). For he (Zeus) does not go so far as to say that he is stronger than you, but elder. For the advantage of age is <not> a cause of jealousy (τὸ γὰρ τοῦ γήρωσ πλεονέκτημα †ἐπιφθονον <ἀνεπίφθονον Bekker>).⁶⁰

The argument here is that 15.204 can either be spoken with interrogative intonation or not, depending on how the reader chooses to handle the emotional relationships between Zeus and Poseidon and between Iris and Poseidon: if Iris is threatening Poseidon, she will speak line 204 as a (rhetorical) question, but if she is wheedling him, she will frame οἴσθ' as a *reminder* to Poseidon, an assertion (ἀπόφασις) that it is Zeus' authority as brother, not as king, that should change the earthshaker's mind. This is a remarkably intricate piece of characterization on the part of the scholia, fully cognizant of the subtlety of Iris' whole speech (the impact of which depends very much on the effect of the line in question); it proposes two possible ways of presenting (προάγειν) that subtlety; and the presentation is explicitly said to be dependent on the tone of voice not only of a character but also of the reader.⁶¹

Diastole and interrogatory or exclamatory intonation can thus

⁶⁰ See Erbse 1969, vol. 4, 57, n. 87, citing Eustathius *ad loc.*, for convincing proof of Bekker's clarificatory emendation.

⁶¹ It is interesting that Iris' speeches are often the subject of complex questions of characterisation in the scholia: see Nünlist 2009, 276–78, 313–14.

be tools of *prosopopoeia*;⁶² but sometimes the communication of emotion (*ethos*) is discussed in the scholia at the level of the scene or the speech rather than that of the word or phrase. This has been noted in general terms by several scholars⁶³ and in detail by Rutherford for the Aristophanes scholia.⁶⁴ Nünlist has drawn attention⁶⁵ to the scholia's command that Achilles' speech to Apollo (22.14–20) be pronounced “not with a bold voice, but rather as a high-minded noble man would speak when threatening a god,”⁶⁶ which certainly would require an imaginative *hypokrisis* on the part of the reader. Richardson and Martin have both noted the scholion to 16.130–39 (Patroclus' arming scene), a passage that “it is necessary to pronounce hurriedly, imitating a longing for the exit” (σπεύδοντα δεῖ προφέρεσθαι ταῦτα, ἐπιτόθησιν τῆς ἐξόδου μιμούμενον);⁶⁷ Martin rightly terms this a “triplicate” longing, including “the performer's desire to bring about an effective *exodos*; the desire of Patroklos, the character he represents, to achieve an end in battle; and finally, the audience's desire to see and feel the most satisfying conclusion.”⁶⁸ I may adduce two comments on characterisation not mentioned by earlier scholars, which likewise would require great creativity on the part of the performing reader. Rousing the Argive chiefs, a disguised Poseidon at 13.99–101 exclaims at the unimaginable event of “The Trojans coming to our ships!” The scholia specify that this exclamation is to be performed “with emotion” (ἐν ἤθει, Σ 13.101.b [bT^{II}])⁶⁹ and that there is

⁶² On ancient theories of *prosopopoeia*, see Lausberg 1998, 367–72; Degenhardt 1909, 50. Rutherford 1905, 138, notes that Theon treated ἠθοποιία and προσωποποιία as synonyms.

⁶³ See Rutherford 1905, 138–46; Kroll 1910; von Franz 1940 (part II.1); Richardson 1980, 272–75; and esp. Nünlist 2009, 246–56.

⁶⁴ Rutherford 1905, 146–54; Kroll 1910. In the tragic scholia, we find the scholia urging us to pronounce a line “with emotion” (ἐν ἤθει or μετ' ἤθους) on four occasions: at Eur. *Med.* 500, Eur. *Phoen.* 1684, and Eur. *Andr.* 645 and also “earnestly and emotionally” at *Or.* 135. On the translation of ἐν ἤθει as “with emotion,” see Kroll 1910.

⁶⁵ Nünlist 2009, 350.

⁶⁶ Σ 22.20c¹ (T, ex.): εἰ μοι δύναμις γε παρείη· δύναμις ἴση τῇ σῆ. προφέρεσθαι δὲ ταῦτα δεῖ οὐ τεθαρρηκυῖα φωνῆ, ἀλλ' ὡς ἂν εἴποι ἀνὴρ γενναῖος μεγαλόφρων ἀπειλῶν θεῶ (“If I had the power—Power equal to your own. It is necessary to pronounce [προφέρεσθαι] all this not with a bold voice, but rather as a high-minded noble man would speak when threatening a god”). For specifications of a threatening tone in the Terence scholia, see Basore 1908, 75–76.

⁶⁷ Σ 16.131 (T, ex.).

⁶⁸ Martin 1997, 141.

⁶⁹ Σ 13.101b (bT^{II} | T^{II}, ex.): ἐν ἤθει τὰ θαύματα ταῦτα (bT^{II}) ὡς τὸ “Ἐκτωρ δὴ παρὰ νηυσὶ [(13.123)] (T^{II}) (“These wonders [θαύματα] with emotion [ἐν ἤθει] (bT^{II}), just as with ‘Hector indeed by the ships’ (13.123) (T^{II})”). For specifications of a tone of wonderment in the Terence scholia, see Basore 1908, 73–74.

“great *emphasis* in ‘our,’ and there are countless things implied, such as: ‘barbarians to the Greek ships,’ ‘cowards to the ships of the nobly born,’ ‘few men to the ships of a greater number’” (Σ 13.101a [bT]);⁷⁰ to achieve these implications, the reader must inhabit not only Poseidon but the character whom Poseidon himself is inhabiting. Similarly complex is the *hypokrisis* prescribed at 9.453, when Phoenix, recounting his break with his father to Achilles, describes how he gave in to his mother’s plea that he sleep with his father’s mistress: “I obeyed her and did it” (τῆ πιθόμην καὶ ἔρεξα). The scholia comment “It is necessary to read this with emotion (ἐν ἤθει δεῖ ἀναγινώσκειν)⁷¹ as though he is changing his mind (ὡς μετανοοῦντος αὐτοῦ)”: this scholion amounts to a stage direction that the reader is left to interpret, whether with a sigh or a grimace or a shake of the head, but at any event in such a way that the Phoenix who changes his mind (as a young man) blends with the Phoenix who is speaking to Achilles (as a middle-aged man), enacted by the reader. This is surely as subtle a stage direction as any modern director could give, and indeed the scholiast immediately afterward resorts to quoting Menander and Sophocles to illustrate the idea of rueful reflection on past misconduct. Falkner has drawn attention to performance cues of a similar sort in the tragic scholia, and Basore has catalogued a great variety of them in the Terence scholia.⁷²

In sum, the Homer scholia and the scholia on dramatic authors all feature extensive, sometimes exceedingly delicate commentary geared to the performance of the text by a reader, commentary that, in its focus both on “chunking” (*diastole*) and on characterization (*prosopopoeia*) and in its vocabulary of pronunciation (*prophora*) and emotion (*ethos*), parallels firstly, the actual schoolroom practice of the *Colloquia*, in which

⁷⁰ Σ 13.101a (bT, ex.): Τρῶας ἐφ’ ἡμετέρας· ἐν τῷ ἡμετέρας μεγάλη ἔμφασις, καὶ ἔστι μυρία ὑπακοῦσαι, οἶον τοὺς βαρβάρους ἐπὶ τὰς Ἑλληνικάς, τοὺς δειλοὺς ἐπὶ τὰς τῶν γενναίων, τοὺς ὀλίγους ἐπὶ τὰς τῶν πλεόνων.

⁷¹ Σ 9.453a (bT, ex.). The *b* manuscripts add τὸν στίχον (i.e., it is necessary to read the whole line in character).

⁷² Falkner 2002, 357–61, notes directions that Odysseus in the *Aj.* should at one point skulk furtively; that the protagonist in *OC* “does not stumble, but he exits straight as if being led by the god” (scholion on Soph. *OC* 1547; Falkner’s translation, as are those below); that in *OT* “perhaps the members of the chorus turn away as they look, unable to behold the suffering” (scholion on Soph. *OT* 1297); that in the *Aj.* “the man playing the part of Ajax should make a very rough sound and howl more like a dog, for that is why the poet said θωύσσει” (“shout, cry out”; scholion on Soph. *Aj.* 334). The Terence scholia in Basore’s catalogue of comments requiring “complex delivery” (1908, 62–85) involve “the whole bearing, face, gesture, and voice must be conceived as playing a part,” since the scholia there often prescribe an effect without describing how to achieve it.

we found the student reading “according to *diastole*” (κατὰ διαστολήν / *ad distinctum*) and engaging in “character-creation” (ἡθοποιῖα), and secondly the definition of reading in the *Techne*, which had defined reading as pronunciation (*prophora*) and included *diastole* as one of its three components of reading, along with “acting out” (*hypokrisis*) and prosody. Having established these parallels, which in themselves suffice to show that the categories in which literary performance was conceived and discussed (sometimes with remarkable subtlety) were common both to the schoolroom and to ancient scholarship, I now turn to a fourth source on performative reading, namely, the scholia to the *Techne* of Dionysius Thrax in their comments on section 2 *On reading*.⁷³ This corpus offers a subtly different perspective on literary performance: less schematic, more detailed, and more practical than the definition of reading in the *Techne* on which they comment, these scholia nevertheless seek to establish general rules for literary performance where the scholia to canonical works treat questions of performance strictly *ad loc*. In their practicality, the scholia to the *Techne* resemble the *Colloquia*; in their goal of providing a comprehensive guide to correct reading procedure, they resemble the *Techne* itself; in their sensitivity to performance criteria, they resemble the scholia to canonical works. In describing their portrait of literary performance, I will first note parallels with these other sources, then explore an aspect of performance theory unique (among the sources discussed in this article) to the scholia to the *Techne*, namely, their grounding of real contemporary performances partly in the historical origins of genres.

The paideutic orientation of the scholia to the *Techne* is explicit throughout the corpus; specifically on the subject of reading, the scholia to the *Techne* note that “genuine reading is ultimately the result of practice and much diligence,” the aim being to read like a real *grammaticus*;⁷⁴ we

⁷³The scholia to the *Techne* (ed. by Hilgard 1901 as the *Scholia in Dionysii Thracis Artem Grammaticam*, the third part of the first volume of *Grammatici Graeci*) are a collection of commentaries on Dionysius’ *Techne*; they are not abbreviated marginal scholia but rather continuous texts in independent manuscripts, structured with lemmata from the *Techne*. On the manuscript sources of these scholia, and on the question of their dates and authorship, see Uhlig *GG* I.1.xxxiv–xl; Hilgard *GG* I.3.v–xlix. The commentaries are entitled *Commentarius Melampodis seu Diomedis* (from Codex C), the *Commentarius Heliodori* (from Codex O), the *Scholia Vaticana* (from Codex C), the *Scholia Marciana* (MSS. VN), the *Scholia Londinensia* (MSS. AE), and the *Commentariolus Byzantinus* (MSS. LHF).

⁷⁴*Scholia Vaticana* (*GG* I.3.170.28–33): Τὸ δὲ δοκίμως ἀναγινώσκειν πάντως ἐκ τριβῆς καὶ ἐπιμονῆς πολλῆς γίνεται· ἐνδέχεται οὖν τὸν γραμματικὸν οὕτως ἀναγινώσκειν καὶ ὅσοις μὴ ἐντετύχηκε συγγράμμασιν, ὥσπερ ἕκείνα οἷς πολλὰκις ἐντετύχηκεν· δεῖ γὰρ οὕτω προδιοικονομεῖν ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἐθίζειν ἐν οἷς ἐγχειρίζεται, ὡς ἐκ τούτων καὶ παρατυχόντα δοκεῖν πολλὰκις ἀνεγνωσμένα (“Genuine reading is ultimately the result of practice and much diligence; the *grammaticus*

recall the scene in the *Celtis colloquium* in which the student, returning from lunch, first sees the *grammaticus* reading and then undertakes the reading himself.⁷⁵ This reading, as the *Techne* had implied by including *hypokrisis* as the first aspect of reading, involves (according to the scholia to the *Techne*) the whole body, being “imitation (*mimesis*) of the bodies or things under consideration, produced through measured movement whether bodily or vocal”;⁷⁶ the *hypokrisis* is *mimesis* of characters,⁷⁷ in which gesture is a necessary component,⁷⁸ one factor on which recognition of the poet’s excellence depends.⁷⁹ We have seen a student in the *Celtis*

is able to read even writings he has not met with before in the same way as those he has often met with: thus he must prepare himself beforehand and acquire the habit with those things he takes in hand, so that from [studying] that material he may seem often to have read before whatever he may encounter”). Cf. *Colloquium Stephani* (S 17d Dickey): εἶτα ἀπὸ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ ταχέως ἄγνωτων καὶ ὁ σπανίως ἀναγινώσκειται / *deinde ab oculo citatim ignotum et quod rare legitur* (“Then [I read] at sight, quickly, an unknown [work] and [one] that is rarely read”).

⁷⁵See above, n. 38.

⁷⁶*Scholia Marciana* (GG I.3.305.26–28): ὑπόκρισις μὲν οὖν ἔστιν ἢ τῶν ὑποκειμένων σωμάτων ἢ πραγμάτων μίμησις ἢ διὰ σωματικῆς ἢ φωνητικῆς ἐμέτρον κινήσεως γινομένη.

⁷⁷*Scholia Vaticana* (GG I.3.172.2–3): Ὑπόκρισις ἐστὶ μίμησις ἀρμόζουσα τοῖς ὑποκειμένοις προσώποις ἐν τε λόγῳ καὶ σχήματι (“*Hypokrisis* is *mimesis* fitted to the designated characters in text and presentation”); *Commentarius Melampodis* (GG I.3.16): ‘καθ’ ὑπόκρισιν’· κατὰ μίμησιν (“*According to hypokrisis*: i.e., according to *mimesis*”).

⁷⁸One example adduced for the importance of gesture in a reader’s *hypokrisis* appears in two sources in the scholia to the *Techne*, concerning Menelaus at Eur. *Or.* 644: οὐ μόνον γὰρ δεῖ μμεῖσθαι τῷ λόγῳ τὰ πρόσωπα, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς τῶν σωμάτων κινήσεις κατὰ τὸ ἀπαιτοῦν, ὡς ἐν τῷ Ὁρέστη τοῦ Μενελάου μηδὲν εἰρηκότος αὐτῷ ἀποκρίνεται λέγων, ‘οὐ χρήματ’ εἶπον’· δηλοῦται γὰρ ἐκ τούτου, ὡς οὐ λόγῳ γεγένηται ἡ ὑπόκρισις, ἀλλὰ μόνῳ τῷ σχήματι, τοῦ Μενελάου τὰς χεῖρας ἀνατείναντος καὶ τρόπον τινὰ μετασηματιζομένου ὡς οὐδὲν εἰληφότος. ‘Καθ’ ὑπόκρισιν’ οὖν, τουτέστι κατὰ μίμησιν τῶν προσώπων (“It is not only in words that one must enact the *mimesis* of the characters but also in the movement of bodies in demanding something, as in the *Or.* when Menelaus says nothing to him he [sc. Orestes] answers by saying, *I didn’t say anything about money*; from this it is clear that the *hypokrisis* [sc. in the case of Menelaus] did not consist in text (οὐ λόγῳ) but only in the presentation, as Menelaus stretches out his hands and by some change of posture indicates that he didn’t take anything. So ‘according to *hypokrisis*’ means ‘according to the *mimesis* of the characters,’” *Scholia Vaticana* at GG I.3.172.1–9); cf. *Scholia Londinensia* at GG I.3.474.2–13 for a similar explanation of this passage. Such passages are termed πρὸς τὸ σιωπώμενον (“in reaction to silence”); instances from the scholia to dramatic writers together with other references to gesture are collected at Rutherford 1905, 109, n. 11, 111–12.

⁷⁹The commentator of the *Scholia Londinensia* concludes his discussion of this passage in Eur. *Or.* by warning (GG I.3.474.12–13), εἰ γὰρ μὴ κατὰ τοιοῦτον τρόπον γένοιτο τὰ τῆς ὑποκρίσεως, οὐκ ἄν τις διαγνοίη τὴν ἀρετὴν τοῦ ποιητοῦ (“If questions of *hypokrisis* are not undertaken in this manner, you would not recognize the excellence of the poet”): in other words, full appreciation for a literary work depends upon correct *hypokrisis*.

colloquium engaging in “character-creation” (ἠθοποιῶα) in the schoolroom; the *Commentarius Melampodis* explains “lifelike” imitation of character as requiring the “massaging” or “kneading” of that character’s personality.⁸⁰ The *Techne* had said that a second aspect of reading, *diastole* (“chunking”), governed the “overall frame of thought” (περιεχόμενος νοῦς) of the work read, which we would term *genre*; according to the scholia to the *Techne*, this concerns not the enactment of particular character but overall performance style. Here is how the *Commentarius Melampodis* expands on the prescription in the *Techne* that epic be read “heroically” (ἠρωικῶς) and comedy “in a lifelike manner” (βιωτικῶς):

One must read heroic poems aloud with an earnest and eager voice and not with a careless one; the “poetry of life,” that is comedy, as in life, that is they should imitate young women or old women or fearful or angry men or whatever is suitable for the characters brought in by Menander or Aristophanes or the other comic poets.⁸¹

In the case of epic, performance style applies not only to speeches by heroes but equally to narrative, since, according to the *Scholia Marciana*, “one must pronounce the tone, that is the epic verse,⁸² in a vigorous manner (εὐτόνως) and in so doing imitate (μιμῆσθαι) with the voice the

⁸⁰ *Commentarius Melampodis* (GG I.3.20.10–12): Ταύτην οὖν τὴν κωμῶδιαν δεῖ βιωτικῶς ἀναγινώσκειν, τουτέστιν ὡς ἐν τῷ βίῳ, μιμουμένους τὸ παρεισαγόμενον πρόσωπον καὶ τὴν ἐκείνου σχέσιν ἀναματτομένους (“Therefore it is necessary to read comedy in a lifelike manner, that is as one speaks in life, imitating the character in question and ‘refurbishing’ [ἀναματτομένους] his personality [τὴν ἐκείνου σχέσιν]”). Ἀναμάσσω is a rare word: “refurbish” is one of the definitions at *LSJ* s.v. (A.II.4, citing Max. Tyr. 8.2); Aristophanes uses it to describe the kneading of bread (*Clouds* 676). Either meaning seems to me an excellent metaphor for the process of learning to inhabit a character.

⁸¹ *Commentarius Melampodis* (GG I.3.16.21–25): Δεῖ γὰρ τὰ μὲν ἠρωικὰ συντόνω τῆ φωνῆ ἀναγινώσκειν καὶ μὴ ἐκλελυμένη, τὰ δὲ βιωτικά, τουτέστι τὰ κωμικά, ὡς ἐν τῷ βίῳ, τουτέστι μιμουμένους γυναῖκας νέας ἢ γραιδας ἢ δεδοικότας ἢ ὀργιζομένους ἄνδρας, ἢ ὅσα πρέπει τοῖς εισαγόμενοις προσώποις παρὰ Μενάνδρῳ ἢ Ἀριστοφάνει ἢ τοῖς ἄλλοις κωμικοῖς.

⁸² This word (τόνος) elsewhere refers either to pitch accent or to “tone of voice” in our sense (cf., for instance, Jerome the Philosopher [at Dion. Hal. *De Isocrate* 13] on Isocrates’ lack of τόνος), but the *Scholia Marciana* here (GG I.3.307–8) take it as a synonym for ἔπος: Ἐπος κυρίως ὁ ἔμμετρος στίχος, καταχρηστικῶς δὲ καὶ πᾶς λόγος· ἔπος λέγεται καὶ τόνος παρὰ τισιν, ἔξαμέτροις τοῖς τόνοις κεχρησθαι (“*Epos* proper is a metrical verse, misused when used to refer to any speech; *epos* is also called *tonos* by some, [as in] ‘to employ hexametrical tones’”). Dionysius’ injunction to read epic “in a vigorous manner” (εὐτόνως) also prompts the *Scholia Vaticana* to distinguish (GG I.3.173.22–24) between the normal meaning of *tonos* as pitch accent and Dionysius’ meaning of “power” (δύναμις). The intended meaning here, rather than the peculiarity of the usage, is the important element in the present discussion.

speeches (λόγους) and the deeds (πράξεις) of the heroes.”⁸³ The *Comentarius Melampodis* goes further, declaring that Dionysius “teaches us to read [epic] ‘in a vigorous manner,’ i.e. with an earnest voice (συντόνω τῆ φωνῆ) and not a dissolute one, in view of that fact that it [sc. ἔπος] contains the background (ἱστορίας) of the heroes.”⁸⁴

So far, these remarks in the scholia to the *Techne* on performance style merely expand on the adverbs in section 2 *On reading*, albeit with a still more practical paideutic aim. When the scholia to the *Techne* come to explain the rationale for these performance styles, however, they tie the act of performance to the essential setting for each genre. Here is how the *Scholia Vaticana* describe the cheerful style of performance suitable to comedy:

Comedy is discourse in the middle of the people, or rather demotic speech; it takes its name from *kome* (village) and *ode* (song), and it is a type of poetry sung in villages in the normal course of life. For this reason it is also called “lifelike,” that is to say cheerful, as one would pray to live, in other words “surrounded by pleasure and laughter.” Therefore anyone acting out (ὑποκρινόμενον) comedy should pronounce it with laughter and much wit and with a cheerful character (προσώπου⁸⁵).⁸⁶

Here, village life exists in an eternal present, and we might wonder if the village of comedy here is anything more than a theoretical setting. Nonetheless, to judge by the treatment of laments (which the scholia to the *Techne* know is “not a type [εἶδος] of poetry, rather it is found in every type of poetry, in lyric, in writers of elegy, and likewise in the work of those who write epic, as also, in Homer, Andromache speaks in lamentation to Hector”⁸⁷), the reader’s challenge lies in living real grief:

⁸³ *Scholia Marciana* (GG I.3.308.1–3): Δεῖ γοῦν τὸν τόνον, ὃ ἐστὶν ἔπος, εὐτόνωσ προφέρειν καὶ ἐν τούτῳ τῆς φωνῆς τοὺς λόγους καὶ τὰς πράξεις μιμῆσθαι τῶν ἡρώων.

⁸⁴ *Comentarius Melampodis* (GG I.3.21.9–11): Ὅπερ διδάσκει ἡμᾶς “εὐτόνωσ” ἀναγινώσκειν, τούτέστι συντόνω τῷ φωνῆ καὶ μὴ ἐκκελυμένη, ὡς καὶ ἡρώων ἀνδρῶν περιέχον ἱστορίας.

⁸⁵ Intentionally or not, the very word for “character” here blends historical and contemporary performance, since it signifies equally “character” (as in the text), “mask” (such as an original actor would have worn), and “face” (the contemporary performer’s).

⁸⁶ *Scholia Vaticana* (GG I.3.172.25–31): Κωμῳδία ἐστὶν ἢ ἐν μέσῳ λαοῦ κατηγορία ἡγῶν δημοσίευσιν· εἴρηται δὲ παρὰ τὸ κῶμη καὶ τὸ ψῆδη, ἐστὶ δὲ εἶδος ποιήματος ἐν κῶμαις κατὰ τὸν βίον ἀδόμενον. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ “βιωτικῶς” λέγεται, τούτέστιν ἰλαρῶς, ὡς ἂν εὐξαιτό τις βιώναι, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐν ἡδονῇ καὶ γέλωτι· δεῖ οὖν τὸν τῆν κωμῳδιαν ὑποκρινόμενον μετὰ γέλωτος καὶ πολλῆς ἀστειότητος καὶ ἰλαροῦ τοῦ προσώπου προφέρεσθαι.

⁸⁷ *Scholia Vaticana* (GG I.3.174): Εἶδος μὲν ποιήσεως ὁ οἶκος οὐκ ἔστιν, εὐρίσκεται δὲ ἐν παντὶ εἶδει ποιήσεως, παρὰ λυρικοῖς, παρ’ ἐλεγιογράφοις, ὁμοίως καὶ παρὰ τοῖς τὰ ἐπιγράφοισιν,

elegy is to be read shrilly (λιγυρῶς) “as though choked and beaten down by the multitude of evils”⁸⁸ since “as a result of a change in the voice from weeping, grief introduces a rather sharper note,”⁸⁹ while, as to laments, “in every poem we ought to be watchful for the element of lamenting speech (ἐλεεινολογία) and slow down for that material, as though hard-pressed by emotion,”⁹⁰ since “the reader of lament must appear such that he is pitied by the listeners.”⁹¹ Precepts for the performance of genres are thus far from theoretical.

As in the case of comedy, discussions of how to perform elegy are introduced by aetiologies and etymologies.⁹² When aetiology precedes the discussion of the performance style suitable to tragedy, however, we find that contemporary performance by the student is regulated in terms of that genre’s historical origins. Discussing the curt precept in the *Techne* that tragedy be read “heroically,” the *Commentarius Melampodis* embarks on an overview of the origin (Athenian) and purpose (civic) of tragedy that fills in total some twenty lines of Hilgard’s edition (*GG* I.3.17.16–18.2), concluding with a description of how Euripides, Sophocles, and Aeschylus (who are named) chose their actors:

They [the tragic poets], in publicly presenting (ἐπιδεικνύμενοι⁹³) the heroes as it were through their characters, first picked men with strong voices who were able by the grandeur of their voices to imitate the heroes; next,

ὡς καὶ παρ’ Ὀμήρῳ Ἄνδρομάχη λέγει ἐλεεινολογουμένη πρὸς Ἐκτορα. A similar view of the genre-crossing qualities of lament appears in the *Scholia Marciana* (*GG* I.3.308.21–23).

⁸⁸ *Scholia Vaticana* (*GG* I.3.173.16–18): ‘Λιγυρῶς δέ, ὅιον ὀξέως ἀναγινώσκειν ἡμᾶς δεῖ τὰ ἐλεγεία, ὡς ἂν συμπεπνιγμένους καὶ ἐκπεπληγμένους τῷ πλήθει τῶν κακῶν.

⁸⁹ *Commentarius Melampodis* (*GG* I.3.21.3–5): ἡ γὰρ λύπη τῇ παρατροπῇ τῆς φωνῆς ἐκ τοῦ κλαυθμοῦ ὀξύτερά τινα παρῆσάγει; a similar idea appears at *GG* I.3.475.35–36 (a comment in the *Scholia Londinensia* attributed by Hilgard to Heliodorus).

⁹⁰ *Scholia Marciana* (*GG* I.3.308.23–25): Δεῖ γοῦν ἐν ἐκάστῳ ποιήματι τὸν τόπον τῆς ἐλεεινολογίας παραφυλάττειν καὶ παρ’ αὐτὰ ἀναπαύειν, ὡς ἂν κερμηκότητα τῷ πάθει.

⁹¹ *Scholia Vaticana* (*GG* I.3.174.12–13): δεῖ γὰρ τὸν ἀναγινώσκοντα τὸν οἶκτον τοιοῦτον φαίνεσθαι, ὡς ἐλεεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀκουόντων.

⁹² *Commentarius Melampodis* at *GG* I.3.20.13–21.5; *Scholia Vaticana* at *GG* I.3.173.5–18; *Scholia Marciana* at *GG* I.3.307.14–36; *Scholia Londinensia* at *GG* I.3.475.28–76.6.

⁹³ This is the word used for Homeric performance by rhapsodes in the *Scholia Vaticana* on Dionysius’ *Περὶ ῥαψωδίας* (on which see below), regarding the collection of Homeric poetry by Pisistratus: Προθεῖς δὲ ἀγῶνα δημοτελῆ καὶ κηρύξας καὶ δοῦς ἄδειαν τοῖς εἰδόσι καὶ βουλομένοις τὰ Ὀμήρου ἐπιδείκνυσθαι (“Establishing a contest at the public expense and announcing it and giving safe-conduct to those who were knowledgeable [sc. regarding Homeric poetry] and who wished to publicly perform [ἐπιδείκνυσθαι] Homer’s poems”) (*GG* I.3.179); it appears in the same context and with the same meaning in the other commentaries.

wishing to exhibit (δεικνύειν) heroic bodies they wore slippers and clothes reaching down to their feet. Tragedy being such (Ταύτην οὖν τὴν τραγωδίαν), the writer on grammar (ὁ τεχνικός, i.e. Dionysius) says that we must read it aloud in a heroic manner and with great solemnity. For in pronouncing tragedy we must, with a loud voice with great solemnity and grandeur, imitate in every way the heroes, both in their greatness of body and in their perfection (ὑπερβολῇ) of speech.⁹⁴

Here, as above with the “deeds” (πράξεις) of epic heroes that the student is to realise, the bodily component is to the fore; and since a teenaged student obviously could not literally imitate tragic heroes’ greatness of body, lacking as he did even the aid of tragic slippers, the vital point is that the bodily act of performance is not, in this view, merely a question of gesture or poise or manner or voice alone, but also a question of the mentality of the performer; a version of the same sentiment in the *Scholia Marciana* prescribes the adverb ἀξιοπίστως (“in a manner worthy of trust”) as an ideal style for the schoolroom performance of tragedy,⁹⁵ an effect surely to be achieved only by means of a performer’s sincerity or strong identification with tragic heroism. But the key to the passage quoted from the *Commentarius Melampodis* is the particle οὖν (“therefore”): tragedy is to be read loudly, solemnly, and grandly because it was on the basis of their talents for loudness, solemnity, and grandeur that the original performers of tragedy were selected. In providing a rationale for performance style thus anchored in a historical performance context, the scholiast is explicitly urging the Imperial student performer to identify with Athens’ tragic actors and thus to undertake a *mimesis* of tragic heroes parallel to theirs.

⁹⁴ *Commentarius Melampodis* (GG I.3.17.27–18.2): Ἐπιδεικνύμενοι δὲ τῶν ἡρώων ὡσανεὶ τὰ αὐτῶν πρόσωπα πρῶτον μὲν ἐπελέγοντο ἄνδρας τοὺς μείζονα φωνὴν ἔχοντας καὶ τῷ ὄγκῳ τῆς φωνῆς μμείσθαι δυναμένους τοὺς ἥρωας· δεῦτερον δὲ βουλόμενοι καὶ τὰ σώματα δεικνύειν ἡρωϊκά, ἐμβάδας ἐφόρουσιν καὶ ἱμάτια ποδήρη. Ταύτην οὖν τὴν τραγωδίαν φησὶν ὁ τεχνικός δεῖν ἡρωϊκῶς ἀναγινώσκειν, τουτέστι μεγάλην τῆ φωνῆ μετὰ πολλῆς σεμνότητος καὶ ὄγκου. δεῖ γὰρ ἡμᾶς τὰ τραγικὰ προφερομένους μμείσθαι πάντα τρόπον τοὺς ἥρωας, καὶ μεγέθει σώματος καὶ λόγων ὑπερβολῇ. That the subject here is indeed “the tragic poets” (specifically Euripides, Sophocles, and Aeschylus) is evident from the text that immediately precedes this passage, in which the named poets’ patriotic function as educators of the Athenian public is enlarged upon.

⁹⁵ *Scholia Vaticana* (GG I.3.172.22–25): ἀξιοπίστως, μετὰ πολλῆς σεμνότητος καὶ ὄγκου· δεῖ γὰρ ἡμᾶς τραγικὰ προφερομένους κατὰ πάντα τρόπον μμείσθαι τοὺς ἥρωας, καὶ μεγέθει σώματος καὶ λόγου ὑπερβολῇ (“In a manner worthy of trust, with great solemnity and grandeur; for in pronouncing tragedy we must in every way imitate the heroes, both in their greatness of body and in the perfection of speech”); a still shorter abbreviation of this idea appears at GG I.3.306.12–14 (*Scholia Marciana*).

Such a rediscovery of historical performance styles in the classroom setting is, if anything, still more explicit in the case of lyric poetry, which, according to the *Technē*, was to be read “with melody” (ἔμμελῶς). The *Scholia Londinensia* explain that this means that

we must sing lyric poetry with the appropriate song (μέλος); which is now impossible for us to do. For if one wished [to sing] in accordance with the old music (κατὰ τὴν ἀρχαίαν μουσικὴν) according to which it was written, that is impossible, for the old music is something different from the one that now prevails. . . . How then could songs written in accordance with the old harmony be sung in accordance with the current melody? This is indeed impossible in literary study (γραμματική) because there has been a change in harmony. Nevertheless (μὴν), let the type of reading (ὁ τρόπος τῆς ἀναγνώσεως) not be completely unrecognizable (οὐ μὴν πάντως ἄδηλος ἔσται): rather there is a difference of some sort with respect to this sort of reading in the voice, reflecting the fact that these [texts] are set to music.⁹⁶

Thus, even though it is now in fact impossible to fulfil the imperative of a historically authentic reënactment of original performance context, schoolroom (“ἐν γραμματικῇ”) performance of lyric still requires acknowledgment in performance of that lost historical context: from the injunction to “let the type of reading not be completely unrecognizable,” we infer that, since no one would in fact be able to recognize the original melody and compare it with the makeshift melody, the recognition here is recognition on the part of the audience of the historical context that the performer is acknowledging (if not recapturing) through his style of performance,⁹⁷ wielding as it were a notional archaic lyre.

⁹⁶The full text, in the *Scholia Londinensia* (GG I.3.476.29–77.3), is as follows: “Ἐμμελῶς δὲ εἶπεν, ὅτι δεῖ μετὰ μέλους τοῦ προσήκοντος ἄδειν τὰ λυρικά· ὅπερ νῦν ἡμῖν ἀδύνατον· εἰ μὲν γὰρ τις ἐβελήσει κατὰ τὴν ἀρχαίαν μουσικὴν, καθ’ ἣν καὶ ἐγγράπτο, ἀδύνατον, ἑτέρα γὰρ ἢ ἀρχαία πρὸς τὴν νῦν· ἢ μὲν γὰρ εἰς τρεῖς τρόπους διήρητο, Δῶριον, Φρύγιον, Λύδιον, ἢ δὲ νεωτέρα εἰς δεκαπέντε· πῶς ἂν οὖν τις δύνατο κατὰ τὴν ἀρχαίαν ἀρμονίαν γεγραμμένα μέλη κατὰ τὴν νῦν μελωδίαν ἄδειν; ὥστε ἀδύνατον τὸ τοιοῦτον ἐν γραμματικῇ διὰ τὸ γεγενῆσθαι μεταβολὴν τῆς ἀρμονικῆς· οὐ μὴν πάντως ἄδηλος ἔσται ὁ τρόπος τῆς ἀναγνώσεως, ἀλλὰ διαφορὰ τις ἔστι περὶ τοῦτο τὸ ἀνάγνωσμα τῆς φωνῆς ὡς πρὸς τὰ μέλη ὑπαγομένους. This passage is mentioned at Prauscello 2006, 56, who adduces it as confirmation that ancient lyric poetry was indeed not transmitted with musical notation.

⁹⁷A very similar observation, though shorter and evidently not directly related to the discussion above in the *Scholia Londinensia*, is to be found in the *Commentarius Melampodis* (GG 1.3.21.12–21) on the same topic (Dionysius’ view of lyric performance), again with a strong emphasis on the history of the genre and the challenge of performing it authentically: “Ἔστι τινὰ ποιήματα, ἃ οὐ μόνον ἐμμέτρως γέγραπται, ἀλλὰ καὶ μετὰ μέλους ἔσκειπται, ἃ καὶ διπλασίονα κάματον παρεῖχε τοῖς σκεπτομένοις, τὸ τε μέτρον σπουδάζουσι διασφίξιν καὶ τῶν

What of the notional rhabdos? It is a peculiarity of the *Techne* that it includes a short, separate chapter (section 5 *On rhapsody*) on the genre of epic—the only genre thus honored. We have seen above that the *Techne* in section 2 *On reading* had commanded us to perform epic “in a vigorous manner” (εὐτόμως), prompting the *Commentarius Melampodis* to insist that the performer’s manner should reflect understanding of the “background information” (ιστορίαι) of the heroes; but detailed background information on the historical origins of epic does not appear in remarks in the scholia to the *Techne* on section 2 *On reading*, appearing instead (at great and interesting length⁹⁸) in notes on section 5 *On rhapsody*. These remarks lack the explicit connection of historical material to performance style such as we find for tragedy and lyric in the scholia’s commentaries on section 2 *On reading*, although the inclusion of section 5 *On rhapsody* is defended by the scholia to the *Techne* as suited to the paideutic intention of the *Techne*, owing to the preëminence of Homer in education;⁹⁹ elsewhere it is suggested that Dionysius ought to

μελῶν ἐπινοεῖν τὴν εὖρεσιν. Ταῦτα οὖν τὰ ποιήματα καλεῖται λυρικά, ὡς ὑπὸ λύραν ἐσκευμένα καὶ μετὰ λύρας ἐπιδεικνύμενα. Γεγόνασι δὲ λυρικοὶ οἱ καὶ πραττόμενοι ἑννέα, ὧν τὰ ὀνόματά ἐστι ταῦτα, Ἀνακρέων, Ἀλκμάν, Ἀλκαῖος, Βακχυλίδης, Ἴβυκος, Πίνδαρος, Στεισίχορος, Σιμωνίδης, Σαπφῶ, καὶ δεκάτη Κόριννα. Ταύτην οὖν τὴν λυρικὴν ποιήσιν δεῖ μετὰ μέλους ἀναγινώσκειν, εἰ καὶ μὴ παρελάβομεν μηδὲ ἀπομεμνήμεθα τὰ ἐκείνων μέλη (“There are some poems that are not only written metrically but are experienced (ἔσκεπται) along with music, which furnish critics with a double challenge, as they strive to preserve the meter and to ponder the discovery of the songs. These poems are accordingly called lyric poems, being experienced along with the lyre and presented along with the lyre. There are nine lyric poets whose poems are put to use (πραττόμενοι), whose names are the following: Anacreon, Alcman, Alcaeus, Bacchylides, Ibycus, Pindar, Steisichorus, Simonides, Sappho, and Corinna as a tenth. Lyric poetry being such, it is necessary to read it with song, even if we do not possess and have forgotten its songs”).

⁹⁸The comments in the scholia to the *Techne* on section 5 *On rhapsody* abound in vivid and (for modern scholarship) vital details of rhapsodic practice, such as the verbal association of the staff (ράβδος) and the metaphor of the weaving (ράπτειν) together orally of songs by traveling poets (*GG* I.3.28.26–29.13), the connection of rhapsodes with Apollo, laurel, and prophecy (*GG* I.3.180.6–29 [*Scholia Vaticana*, quoting Porphyry]; *GG* I.3.316.2–15 [*Scholia Marciana*, in a passage Hilgard attributes to Heliodorus]), the tale of the Pisistratean recension (*GG* I.3.29.16–30.24 [*Commentarius Melampodis*]; *GG* I.3.179.5–80.7 [*Scholia Vaticana*]), and such curious details as the fact that rhapsodes performing the *Iliad* wore red wreaths (for blood) while those performing the *Odyssey* wore blue wreaths (for water) (*GG* I.3.316.15–19 [*Scholia Marciana*, in a passage Hilgard attributes to Heliodorus]).

⁹⁹*GG* I.3.28.10–14 (*Commentarius Melampodis*), *GG* I.3.314.25–31 (*Scholia Marciana*, in a passage Hilgard attributes to Heliodorus); Pfeiffer says that section 5 *On rhapsody* “now looks rather out of place, but perhaps it was not quite so inappropriate in the original, given that Dionysius’ main interest was in Homer and that the rhapsodes were the first ‘interpreters’ of epic poems” (Pfeiffer 1968, 269).

have placed section 5 *On rhapsody* “in the account of poetry” (ἐν τῷ περὶ ποιητικῆς λόγῳ), surely a reference to the discussion of poetic genres in section 2 *On reading*.¹⁰⁰ The background provided for epic in section 5 *On rhapsody* does, like the background on tragedy, focus on Athens and on etymology, but this coincidence alone does not justify an inference that the scholia to the *Techne* projected the historical performance contexts they describe for epic onto the schoolroom performance environment, as they do for tragedy and lyric. Instead, remarkably, the scholia to the *Techne* here do the opposite: a passage in the *Commentarius Melapodis* actually projects the “reading culture” of schoolroom performance onto a pivotal episode in the historical trajectory of Homeric epic.¹⁰¹ The tale runs thus: the poems of Homer were (in physical form) scattered the length and breadth of Greece, but Pisistratus, “a general of the Athenians,” announces that he will pay cash for the verses, thereby acquiring many superfluous or reduplicated verses along with the authentic ones. Like King Ptolemy instigating the Septuagint in the *Letter to Aristaeas*, Pisistratus then summons seventy-two *grammatici* who each create a version of Homer, “for a fee suiting men of intellect and critics of poems” (ἐπὶ μισθῷ πρέποντι λογικοῖς ἀνδράσι καὶ κριταῖς ποιημάτων). Then,

he brought together all the aforesaid *grammatici*, obliging each of them to present (ἐπιδειξάει) his own version (σύνθεσιν), with everyone gathered together. When these men had heard [all the versions], then, with a view not to strife but to truth and to everything that accorded with the *techne*, they all, as one and by common agreement, judged (ἔκριναν) the versions and editions of Aristarchus and Zenodotus to be best, and further they judged that, of these two versions and editions, Aristarchus’ was the better.¹⁰²

We are then told the origin, contemporary with this episode, of the critical sign of the obelus, by which the critics (κριτάς) distinguished redundant or unworthy verses that “had already become usual among readers” (καὶ ἤδη ἐν συνηθείᾳ ἐγένοντο τοῖς ἀναγινώσκουσιν).

It was a prosaic soul indeed who, upon reading this pleasant story,

¹⁰⁰ *GG* I.3.314.18–24 (*Scholia Marciana*, in a note attributed by Hilgard to Heliodorus).

¹⁰¹ *GG* I.3.29.16–30.24.

¹⁰² *Commentarius Melampodis* (*GG* I.3.30.4–10): εἰς ἐν συνήγαγε πάντας τοὺς προλεχθέντας γραμματικούς, ὀφείλοντας ἐπιδειξάει αὐτῶν ἕκαστον τὴν ἰδίαν σύνθεσιν, παρόντων ὁμοῦ πάντων. Οὗτοι οὖν ἀκροασάμενοι οὐ πρὸς ἔριν, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸ ἀληθές καὶ πᾶν τὸ τῇ τέχνῃ ἀρμόζον, ἔκριναν πάντες κοινῇ καὶ ὁμοφρόνως, ἐπικρατήσαι τὴν σύνθεσιν τε καὶ διάρθρωσιν Ἀριστάρχου καὶ Ζηνοδότου· καὶ πάλιν ἔκριναν τῶν δύο συνθέσεων τε καὶ διορθώσεων βελτίονα τὴν Ἀριστάρχου.

scrawled a note on the margin of the *Commentarius Melampodis* that declared Οὐκ οἶδας τί λέγεις· πολλῶ γὰρ μεταγενέστεροι Ἀρίσταρχος καὶ Ζηνόδοτος Πεισιστράτου (“You don’t know what you’re talking about: Aristarchus and Zenodotus came much later after Pisistratus”); for we are clearly dealing here with a literary myth in which we recognize many features of schoolroom performance. We find *grammatici* undertaking an *epideixis* (“display”)¹⁰³ of their versions of Homer to one another and being judged by other *grammatici* partly on the basis of *techne*, just as the student reads Homer before his teacher, aspiring to do so as capably as a real *grammaticus* and displaying his *techne* in the process; we find scholarship in the persons of Aristarchus and Zenodotus, represented in the *Colloquia* by the *hypomnema* employed by the student;¹⁰⁴ we find the act of criticism (κρίσις), which, according to the *Techne*, is “the finest of all things in the art [of *grammatike*],” occurring in this original and collective act of *diorthosis*;¹⁰⁵ we find a culture of listening and reading inextricably intertwined. The “reading culture” that produced this myth was plainly a culture that viewed its own literary history as so essential to its own ideas of performance that it was willing, on occasion, to adjust that history to reflect contemporary practice. This is “diachronic skewing”¹⁰⁶ with a vengeance, more typical of an oral tradition than of a modern literate culture; it is surely no stretch to imagine that the background historical information on Homeric performance furnished by the same types of sources could well have been meant, conversely, to condition the performance of epic in the schoolroom.

Before we take our leave of the scholia to the *Techne*, I wish to draw attention to a passage in the *Commentarius Melampodis* in which the actual act of literary performance is depicted and its association with ancient scholarship is made explicit. We have seen above that, in section 2 *On Reading*, the *Techne* itself concludes its precepts on performance styles with an admonition that “If things are not done in accordance with this observation, it both destroys the excellences of the poets and makes the training of those doing the reading ridiculous.” The *Commentarius Melampodis* elaborates:

¹⁰³ See above, n. 94. Given that the *Scholia Vaticana* version here definitely accords with the historical Panathenaic competitions in rhapsody, and given the general parallels between it and the *Commentarius Melampodis* version, it is safe to assert that this gathering of *grammatici* in the *Commentarius Melampodis* is a reworking of the Panathenaea.

¹⁰⁴ For the *hypomnema* in the schoolroom, see above, n. 29.

¹⁰⁵ For *diorthosis* in the schoolroom, see above, n. 30.

¹⁰⁶ This is Nagy’s term for how the Homeric rhapsodes projected themselves back into the heroic world as the Homeric bards (2003, 39–48).

Having described how each [type of] poem differs in terms of its *hypokrisis*, Dionysius adds this, that if these things are not followed as described, “he [sc. the reader] disgraces the excellences of the poems,” that is he disparages them, makes them disappear, and reduces to the lowest level even poems that are themselves excellent; or perhaps it is that he reduces the virtuous toil of critics (σκεψαμένων ἀνδρῶν¹⁰⁷) to the lowest level. *And the skills of the readers. Skills* [refers to] the preparations, the things learnt, the things taught, that is the things they [the readers] had picked up in their learning. *Ridiculous* [means] worthy of ridicule, degraded, disreputable. *Establishes*: displays; so they [sc. the readers] display how the things learnt by and the things taught to the readers are worthy of ridicule. Thus it is that one must observe the [proper] *hypokrisis* of each poem, so that the virtue of the critics (σκεψαμένων ἀνδρῶν) is made manifest, as also the *techne* of the one reading aloud.¹⁰⁸

This passage synthesizes several components of literary performance observed above. Firstly, as with the audience in the *Scholia Vaticana* that will pity the skillful reader of laments, an audience liable to ridicule a performer is a real audience, not an abstraction; it is also a critical or educated audience, able to evaluate the performance on the terms established by the *Techne*, just as the audience was to recognize in a student’s melodic performance of lyric that genre’s historical origins. Secondly, the stakes are high, and success turns first and foremost on *hypokrisis*, the suitability of which to the genre performed will make or break the performance. Thirdly, success will display not only the *techne*

¹⁰⁷ σκεψαμένων ἀνδρῶν (“men who have engaged in σκέψις”) must surely refer to scholars (and not to any teacher on-hand to observe the act of ἀνάγνωσις), since their activity of σκέψις (“judgment”) is twice expressed here in the aorist (thus preceding the act of reading) and even, in the second instance, coupled contrastively with the *techne* of the reader; moreover, terms such as *virtue* and *toil* evoke the thoroughness of the writers of commentaries. It is not long afterwards that the *Commentarius Melampodis* again employs (*GG* I.3.30.12) the participle σκεψάμενοι to describe acts of criticism by the peers of Aristarchus and Zenodotus.

¹⁰⁸ *Commentarius Melampodis* (*GG* I.3.22.2–13) εἰρηκῶς ὁ Διονύσιος ἐκάστου τῶν ποιημάτων τὴν διαφορὰν τῆς ὑποκρίσεως, ἐπιφέρει τοῦτο, ὅτι ἐὰν μὴ παραφυλάττωνται ταῦτα, ὡς προείρηται, ‘καὶ τὰς τῶν ποιημάτων ἀρετὰς καταρρίπτει,’ τούτέστιν ἐξευτελίζει, ἀφανίζει, εἰς ἔδαφος καταβάλλει καὶ τὰ ἐνάρετα ποιήματα· ἢ οὕτως· καὶ τῶν σκεψαμένων ἀνδρῶν τὸν ἐνάρετον κάματον καταβάλλει εἰς ἔδαφος. ‘Καὶ τὰς ἕξεις τῶν ἀναγινωσκόντων.’ ‘Ἐξεις’· τὰς σχέσεις, τὰς μαθήσεις, τὰς διδασχάς, τούτέστιν ὧν τινων μετέσχον καὶ ἀντελάβοντο τῇ [τῆς in *GG* is a misprint] μαθήσει· ‘καταγέλαστος’· ἀξίας καταγέλωτος, ἀποβλήτους, ἀδοκίμους· ‘παρίστησι’· δείκνυσιν· ἦτοι τὰς μαθήσεις καὶ διδασχὰς τῶν ἀναγινωσκόντων ἀξίας καταγέλωτος δείκνυσιν. Ὅθεν δεῖ ἐκάστου ποιήματος τὴν ὑπόκρισιν παραφυλάττειν, ἵνα καὶ τῶν σκεψαμένων ἀνδρῶν ἡ ἀρετὴ διαφανήται καὶ ἡ τέχνη τοῦ ἀναγινώσκοντος.

(i.e., educational training) of the reader but equally the virtue (ἀρετή) of the critics; the excellences (ἀρετάς) of the poems are closely associated with the “virtuous toil” (ἐνάρετον κάματον) of the critics (σκεψάμενοι ἄνδρες), and failure will result in ridicule equally for the reader and for the reader’s whole educational experience: “the preparations, the things learnt, the things taught, that is the things they [the readers] had picked up in their learning” (τὰς σχέσεις, τὰς μαθήσεις, τὰς διδαχάς, τουτέστιν ὧν τινων μετέσχον καὶ ἀντελάβοντο τῇ μαθήσει). This tying in of the whole process of literary study to performance is paralleled, as we have seen, in one *Colloquium*, in which the student is “called to the reading” (*clamatus ad lectionem*) and then absorbs “explanations, trains of thought, characters,”¹⁰⁹ while in another, students “read a reading from the *Iliad*, another from the *Odyssey*. They are given the passage, the scenario (*suasoria*), the debate, the background (*historia*), the comedy, the stories, the whole workload of rhetoric, the causes of the Trojan war, the material for the recital (προφασιν τῆς αναγορευσις / *materiam recitationis*), the *dictées*.”¹¹⁰ Most of all, in the text of the scholia to the *Techne* themselves, we found that the “vigorous” manner suited to epic performance was to reflect the inclusion of background information (*historiae*), while the performance styles of tragedy and lyric were introduced by and justified through the literary-historical background material, by which the student performer was meant to be inspired and which his own performance was to imitate.

Just as the performance practices described in the *Colloquia* and scholia to the *Techne* fit squarely with the performance-oriented material in the scholia to canonical works, so, too, the curriculum described in the *Colloquia* and furnished (at least regarding the origins of genres) in the scholia to the *Techne* fits squarely with the “exegetical” material of the scholia to canonical works. The following three conclusions therefore seem unavoidable. Firstly, the performance-oriented material in the scholia to canonical works was not intended by the scholiasts solely (if at all) to describe an “original” performance context, but neither are the audiences described solely imaginary or ideal audiences, i.e., interpretive constructs: the scholia to canonical works employ a vocabulary which is in itself practical (“pause here to enhance the meaning”; “this is to be read it with emotion”), and they occasionally yield gems of direction (“read it like a proud man threatening a god”); the vocabulary employed is parallel to the vocabulary of performance in the *Colloquia*, *Techne*, and

¹⁰⁹ *Colloquia Monacensia-Einsidlensia* (ME 2p Dickey); see above, n. 30.

¹¹⁰ *Celtis colloquium* (Dionisotti 1982, 100); see above, n. 30.

scholia to the *Techne*, and in both *Colloquia* and scholia to the *Techne* we find real audiences evaluating student performers. Thus there is no reason to suppose that the observations in the scholia to canonical works on the subjects of the audience and of performance technique are purely or even principally theoretical. Secondly, given that the students of the *Colloquia* are shown absorbing background information prior to literary performance and that the scholia to the *Techne* explicitly declare such background information to be essential to performance style and success, the scholia to canonical works may also be understood to reflect the background material that was provided not only to enhance general understanding of the canon but also to provide depth, nuance, and confidence to the student performer, though of course such “exegetical” scholia (or rather their sources in *hypomnemata*) will have been of interest not only to students but also to any ancient enthusiast for literature, not to mention the various performers, amateur and professional, of canonical works in Greco-Roman society.¹¹¹ Thirdly, it follows from the association of tragedy’s, lyric’s, and (possibly) epic’s historical origins with student performance styles that schoolroom performances were conceived as reënactments of the “original” performance contexts of the works performed: therefore, Rutherford, Kroll, Nannini, and Nünlist are correct in viewing observations on performance style and audience reaction in scholia to canonical works as descriptive of an “original” performance context, as imagined by the scholia; but, because that “original” performance context was meant to be reënacted, such observations were equally intended to regulate actual contemporary performance, as the student performers took up the notional tragic slipper or the notional lyre.

It is true that the texts that form the basis of the present study are not prestigious ones: all are fragmentary, jumbled, repetitive, undatable, documentary, polyvocal, and, thus, sometimes self-contradictory; they are from the ordinary, everyday “reading community” of the ancient schoolroom, uninfused with the individual genius and abstract schemes of an Aristotle, Longinus, or Dionysius of Halicarnassus. But they are vestiges of a “reading event” that, for centuries, served to define the very idea of literature for its adherents, who included the bulk of those Hellenistic and Imperial authors and statesmen known to us, at least in their formative years. In Johnson’s formulation, a “reader’s conception of ‘who s/he is,’ that is, to what reading community s/he thinks to belong, is an important, and determinative, part of the reading event”,¹¹² the

¹¹¹ See n. 3 above.

¹¹² Johnson 2010, 11.

“reading event” of schoolroom literary performance, I suggest, featured the telescoping of literary history through the student’s own high-stakes reenactment of his cultural heritage; such, indeed, is the “reading culture” that lies behind Ausonius’ injunction to his school-aged grandson, some nine hundred years after the origin of his culture’s canon (*Protrepticus ad nepotem* 52–54):

quando oblita mihi tot carmina totque per aevum
conexa historiae, soccos aulaeque regum
et melicos lyricosque modos profundo novabis?

When shall you renew so many songs, now forgotten by me, and so
many age-old
threads of history, comedies, and tragedies of kings
and melic and lyric modes—when shall you renew them in speaking
them forth?

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS, DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY
e-mail: jack.mitchell@dal.ca

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bachmann, Wilhelm. 1902. *Die ästhetischen Anschauungen Aristarchs in der Exegese und Kritik der homerischen Gedichte*. Nuremberg: Sebald.
- Bakker, Egbert, and Ahuvia Kahane, eds. 1997. *Written Voices, Spoken Signs: Tradition, Performance, and the Epic Text*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Balsdon, J. P. 1969. *Life and Leisure in Ancient Rome*. London: Bodley Head.
- Basore, J. W. 1908. *The Scholia on Hypokrisis in the Commentary of Donatus*. Baltimore: Furst.
- Boeckh, Augustus, ed. 1843. *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum* (CIG). Berlin: Berlin Academy of Sciences.
- Bonner, S. F. 1977. *Education in Ancient Rome*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Busch, Stephan. 2002. “Lautes und leises Lesen in der Antike.” *RhM* 145:1–45.
- Cameron, Alan. 1990. “Isidore of Miletus and Hypatia: On the Editing of Mathematical Texts.” *GRBS* 31:103–27.
- Carnuth, Otto, ed. 1875. *Nicanoris Περὶ Ὀδυσσειακῆς στιγμῆς reliquiae emendatiores*. Berlin: Borntraeger.
- Clarke, M. L. 1971. *Higher Education in the Ancient World*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Criore, Raffaella. 2001. *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

- Dalzell, A. C. 1955. "C. Asinius Pollio and the Early History of Public Recitation at Rome." *Hermathena* 86:20–28.
- Deecke, Wilhelm. 1912. *Auswahl aus den Iliasscholien zur Einführung in die antike Homerphilologie*. Bonn: Marcus und Webers Verlag.
- Degenhardt, Clemens. 1909. *De Veterum Grammaticorum Scholis*. Borna: Noske.
- Del Corso, Lucio. 2005. *La lettura nel mondo Ellenistico*. Rome: Laterza.
- Di Benedetto, Vincenzo. 1958. "Dionisio Trace e la *Techne* a lui Attribuita." *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* n.s. 27:169–210.
- . 1990. "At the Origins of Greek Grammar." *Glotta* 68:19–39.
- Dickey, Eleanor. 2012. *The Colloquia of the Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana. Volume 1: Colloquia Monacensia-Einsidlensia, Leidense-Setephani, and Stephani*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dionisotti, A. C. 1982. "From Ausonius' Schooldays? A Schoolbook and Its Relatives." *JRS* 72:83–125.
- Duckworth, G. E. 1931. "Πρωαναφώνησις in the Scholia to Homer." *AJP* 52:320–38.
- Dupont, Françoise. 1997. "Recitatio and the Reorganization of the Space of Public Discourse." In *The Roman Cultural Revolution*, ed. Thomas Habinek and Alessandro Schiesaro, 45–52. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Erbse, Hartmut. 1960. *Beiträge zur Überlieferung der Iliasscholien*. Munich: Beck.
- , ed. 1969. *Scholias Graeca in Homeri Iliadem (scholia vetera)*. 7 vols. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Falkner, Thomas. 2002. "Scholars versus Actors: Text and Performance in the Greek Tragic Scholia." In *Greek and Roman Actors: Aspects of an Ancient Profession*, ed. P. E. Easterling, 342–61. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Friedländer, Ludwig, ed. 1857. *Nicanoris Περὶ Ἰλιακῆς στιγμῆς reliquiae emendatiores*. Berlin: Ehle.
- Funaioli, Gino. 1914. "Recitationes." *RE* 1A:435–46.
- Goetz, Georg. 1892. *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Hilgard, Alfred. 1901. *Scholias in Dionysii Thracis Artem Grammaticam*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Hyönä, Jukka et al., eds. 2003. *The Mind's Eye: Cognitive and Applied Aspects of Eye Movement Research*. Oxford: Elsevier.
- Johnson, W. A. 2010. *Readers and Reading Culture in the High Roman Empire: A Study in Elite Communities*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- , and H. N. Parker, eds. 2009. *Ancient Literacies: The Culture of Reading in Greece and Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kasisopa, Benjawan. 2011. *Reading without Spaces between Words: Eye Movements in Thai*. Ph.D. diss., University of Western Australia.
- Kaster, R. A. 1988. *Guardians of Language: The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kroll, Wilhelm. 1918. "Ἐν ἤθει." *Philologus* 29:68–76.
- Lallot, Jean. 1998. "Grammatici certant: vers une typologie de l'argumentation pro et contra dans la question de l'authenticité de la *Techne*." In Law and Sluiter 1998, 27–39.

- Lausberg, Heinrich. 1998. *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Study*. Trans. M. T. Bliss et al. Leiden: Brill.
- Law, Vivien, and Ineke Sluiter, eds. 1998. *Dionysius Thrax and the Techne Grammatike*. Münster: Nodus.
- Lehrs, Karl. 1833. *De Aristarchi studiis Homericis*. Ph.D. diss., University of Göttingen.
- Levy, H. L. 1969. "To Hexēs in Homeric Scholia and Servius' *Ordo*." *TAPA* 100:237–54.
- Ludwich, Arthur. 1884–85. *Aristarchs Homerische Textkritik nach den Fragmenten des Didymos*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Markus, D. D. 2000. "Performing the Book: The Recital of Epic in First-Century C.E. Rome." *CA* 19:138–79.
- Marrou, H. I. 1982. *A History of Education in Antiquity*. Trans. George Lamb. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Martin, R. P. 1997. "Similes and Performance." In Bakker and Kahane 1997, 138–66.
- Matthaios et al., eds. 2011. *Ancient Scholarship and Grammar: Archetypes, Concepts, and Contexts*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Meijering, Roos. 1987. *Literary and Rhetorical Theories in Greek Scholia*. Groningen: Forsten.
- Mitchell, Jack. 2006. *The Aural Iliad: Alexandrian Performances of an Archaic Text*. Ph.D. diss., Stanford University.
- Most, G. W., ed. 1999. *Commentaries—Kommentare*. Aporemata Vol. 4. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Reprecht.
- Nagy, Gregory. 2003. *Homeric Responses*. Austin: University of Texas.
- . 2008. *Homer the Classic*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Hellenic Studies.
- Nannini, Simonetta. 1986. *Omero e il suo pubblico*. Rome: dell'Ateneo.
- Nünlist, René. 2009. *The Ancient Critic at Work: Terms and Concepts of Literary Criticism in Greek Scholia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Parker, H. N. 2009. "Books and Reading Latin Poetry." In Johnson and Parker 2009, 186–229.
- Pfeiffer, Rudolf. 1968. *History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Prauscello, Lucia. 2006. *Singing Alexandria: Music Between Practice and Textual Transmission*. Leiden: Brill.
- Quinn, Kenneth. 1982. "The Poet and His Audience in the Augustan Age." *ANRW* II.30.1:75–180.
- Reilly, R. G., and Ralph Radach. 2003. "Foundations of an Interactive Activation Model of Eye Movement Control in Reading." In Jukka Hyönä et al. 2003, 429–55.
- Richardson, Nicholas. 1980. "Literary Criticism in the Exegetical Scholia to the *Iliad*: A Sketch." *CQ* 30:265–87.
- Robb, Kevin. 1994. *Literacy and Paideia in Ancient Greece*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Robins, R. H. 1997. "The Authenticity of the *Techne*: The *Status Quaestionis*." In Law and Sluiter 1998, 13–26.
- Rutherford, Ian. 1988. "Ἐμφασίς in Ancient Literary Criticism and *Tractatus Coislinianus* c. 7." *Maia* 2:125–29.
- Rutherford, W. G. 1905. *A Chapter in the History of Annotation*. London: Macmillan.
- Salles, Catherine. 1994. *Lire à Rome*. Paris: Belles Lettres.
- Schenkeveld, D. M. 1992. "Prose Usages of ἀκούκειν 'to read.'" *CQ* 42:129–41.
- Sluiter, Ineke. 1999. "Commentaries and the Didactic Tradition." In Most 1999, 173–205.
- Starr, Raymond J. 1990. "Reading Aloud: *Lectores* and Roman Reading." *CJ* 8: 337–43.
- Taplin, Oliver. 1977. *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus: The Dramatic Use of Exits and Entrances in Greek Tragedy*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Uhlig, Gustav. 1883. *Dionysii Thracis Ars Grammatica*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Van der Valk, Marchino. 1963. *Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad*. Leiden: Brill.
- Von Franz, M. L. 1940. *Die ästhetischen Anschauungen der Iliasscholien*. Ph.D diss., University of Zurich.