

A CHAPTER IN THE HISTORY OF GREEK LINGUISTICS – ARISTARCHUS’ INTEREST IN LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

In memoriam Martin Schmidt (1933–2011)

In his commentaries on various Greek ‘classics’, Homer in particular, the famous Alexandrian grammarian Aristarchus of Samothrace (c. 216–144 BC) paid close attention, among other things, to questions of chronology. As Schmidt (1976) has shown, this interest in chronology is rooted to no small degree in Aristarchus’ conviction that readers and critics must beware of temporal confluences that might result in anachronisms. Consequently, Aristarchus’ notes reflect a basic differentiation between four periods. In chronological order these are: (1) the period of Homer’s characters, (2) Homer’s own, (3) the period of the post-Homeric poets, the so-called νεώτεροι, and (4) Aristarchus’ own.¹ For instance, Homer himself knows things such as the carriage and four or the trumpet, which his characters do not.² The characters call the city on the Greek isthmus ‘Ephyra’, while Homer uses the more recent name ‘Corinth’.³ On the other hand, Homer’s ‘Maeonians’ are called ‘Lydians’ by his successors such as Hesiod.⁴ Similarly, the sacrifice of Iphigenia, an element of the larger Trojan myth that is

1) As is well known, the νεώτεροι include Hesiod, whom Aristarchus considered the younger of the two poets (Rohde 1881: 416 n. 1, Schmidt 1976: 226–7). See also nn. 4, 11.

2) (Unless indicated otherwise, all the A-scholía referred to in this article can be attributed to Aristonicus.) Carriage and four: schol. A Il. 5.195b (with test. and Schmidt 1976: 231–4); trumpet: schol. A Il. 18.219a (with test. and Schmidt 1976: 250–1). The carriage and the trumpet each appear in a simile, which is the spring-board for the distinction between Homer and his characters (Roemer 1924: 3). Cf. also schol. T Il. 24.480–2a¹ ex. (Ariston.), which expressly speaks of a possible ἀναχρονισμός (with respect to the simile of the exiled killer).

3) Schol. A Il. 2.570a¹ (with test. and Nünlist 2009: 117, with lit. in n. 8).

4) Schol. A Il. 10.431a (with test. and Lehrs 1882: 229): καὶ ὅτι Ὀμηρὸς οὐκ οἶδεν καλουμένους Λυδοῦς, ἀλλὰ Μήονας. πρὸς τὰ περὶ ἡλικίας Ἡσιόδου (fr. 334 Merkelbach-West). On the relative age of Hesiod see n. 1.

common among the νεώτεροι, is unknown to Homer.⁵ Likewise, the use of the crown or the mixing of wine with water did not become customary until later.⁶ These examples could easily be added to, but they sufficiently illustrate Aristarchus' general interest in questions of (relative) chronology. The purpose of the present article is to show that a similar interest accompanies his linguistic observations. Aristarchus was, in other words, aware of the fact that the Greek language had undergone changes over the centuries.

A first area in which Aristarchus noticed diachronic developments is semantics, a topic to which he generally devoted much of his energy, because the proper interpretation of a text as it were starts from the correct understanding of the individual words. Consequently, the fragments of his commentary on the *Iliad* alone explain the meaning of at least 600 Homeric words and expressions.⁷ This considerable effort provided ample opportunity to recognise and discuss, among other things, cases where the Homeric meaning differed from that of the νεώτεροι. Examples include the meaning of ἀπίη γαίη, ἐπίηρα, κεδνός, κέρδιστος, λευγάλεος, μέλεος, μῆλα (sheep), πῆρος, τλήμων or ὑπέρτερος.⁸ The common denominator of such explanations is the argument that the usage of the post-Homeric poets is an unreliable or even misleading guide for the meaning of a word in Homer.⁹ The focus on what the word means specifically in Homer indirectly explains why Aristarchus uses the broad category νεώτεροι, which combines poets whose lifetime stretches over several centuries (e. g. Hesiod and the trage-

5) Schol. A Il. 9.145a (Lehrs 1882: 176).

6) Crown: schol. A Il. 13.736b (Schmidt 1976: 215–16); mixing of wine with water: schol. A Il. 4.159a (with test. and Schmidt 1976: 261).

7) Apollonius Sophista and the scholia to the *Odyssey* add another 70 or so. The most comprehensive analysis of Aristarchus' semantic studies remains Lehrs (1882: esp. 36–161), which, however, needs to be updated, see Nünlist (forthcom.).

8) The passages in brackets all refer to A-scholia on the *Iliad*: ἀπίη γαίη (1.270a, etc., Lehrs 1882: 224), ἐπίηρα (1.572a = fr. 10 Schironi, where add Dimpfl 1911: 38), κεδνός (9.586a), κέρδιστος (6.153a, etc., Lehrs 1882: 117), λευγάλεος (9.119a, etc., Lehrs 1882: 106, Dimpfl 1911: 12), μέλεος (10.480a, etc., Lehrs 1882: 94–5, Dimpfl 1911: 12–13), μῆλα ('sheep', 10.485b, Lehrs 1882: 100), πῆρος (2.599a), τλήμων (5.670a, etc., Lehrs 1882: 91, Dimpfl 1911: 21), ὑπέρτερος (11.786a).

9) The corollary is of course that interpretation is 'textimmanent' or Ὀμηρον ἐξ Ὀμήρου σαφηνίζειν (on which see Montanari 1997: 285–6, with lit.).

dians).¹⁰ This temporal spread does not mean, however, that the term νεώτεροι has lost its chronological denotation (cf. n. 10). As has been mentioned in the opening paragraph, Aristarchus sided with the scholars who held the view that Hesiod was younger than Homer. Linguistic factors played an important role in this discussion. According to Aristarchus, the use of more recent names such as ‘Lydians’ or ‘Nile’ demonstrated that Hesiod was younger than Homer.¹¹ Likewise, Hesiod was the first (πρῶτος) to use the word μαχλοσύνη.¹² The relevant passage in the *Iliad* (24.30) therefore had to be spurious. Essentially the same point is made in a note (schol. A Il. 7.475a) which questions that the word ἀνδράποδον is Homeric. Instead, it is regarded as a νεωτερική ὀνομασία.¹³ The same expression recurs in a telling argument with Thucydides. In a famous passage of the so-called ‘archaeology’ (1.3), Thucydides points out that Homer does not have a comprehensive word yet (οὐδὲ ... πω) for ‘Greece’ (Ἑλλάς) or the ‘Greeks’ (Ἕλληνες), which therefore cannot have been a self-contained unit in Homeric times. Likewise, Homer does not know yet the comprehensive term ‘barbarians’ (βάρβαροι) for the opposing side either. Aristarchus agrees with Thucydides’ first observation.¹⁴ But he rejects the second because the compound βαρβαρόφωνος in *Iliad* 2.867 demonstrates that βάρβαρος is not a νεωτερική ὀνομασία (schol. A Il. 2.867a). In other words, Aristarchus does not dispute Thucydides’ point that different linguistic stages can be differentiated. He

10) Callanan (1987: 81) is right to point out the unspecificity of such categories, but he throws out the baby with the bathwater when he suggests that expressions such as ἀρχαῖον, οἱ παλαιοί (or, on the other hand, νῦν δέ) are devoid of chronological implications; for similar reservations see now Pagani (2011: 48 n. 121). Cf. also οἱ μεθ’ Ὀμηρον, an alternative expression for οἱ νεώτεροι (e.g. schol. A Il. 2.2b, London 2001: 835 n. 30).

11) Lydians: see n. 4; Nile: schol. HM¹P¹T Od. 4.477a1 (ed. Pontani): ὅτι τὸν Νεῖλον Ἀἴγυπτον ὀνομάζει. HM¹M¹P¹T ὁ δὲ Ἡσίοδος ὡς ἂν νεώτερος ‘Νεῖλον’ αὐτὸν οἶδεν ἤδη καλούμενον.

12) Schol. A Il. 24.25–30, cf. fr. 132 Merkelbach-West.

13) Interestingly, the note adds that the word ἀνδράποδον is ‘not even’ (οὐδέ) attested in the works that are falsely attributed to Homer (i.e. the Epic cycle). According to Eustathius (692.21, printed by Erbse ad loc.), the argument that ἀνδράποδον is not Homeric was already made by Zenodotus and Aristophanes of Byzantium (p. 178 Slater). Likewise, Aristophanes (p. 194 Slater) suspected the authenticity of Od. 2.205–7, because ἀρετή was a νεωτερικὸν ὄνομα. For this term see also schol. A Il. 18.413a (on κιβητός ‘chest’, which is indeed not attested in Homer).

14) Schol. A Il. 2.529–30 (with test., add 16.595a; Lehrs 1882: 225).

only rejects the second example. At the same time, this discussion shows that the consideration of chronological questions in semantic studies predates Aristarchus by centuries.¹⁵

The differentiation between Homer's vocabulary and that of the νεώτεροι also had an impact on Aristarchus' etymological explanations. Thus he argues that the verb ὄσομαι cannot derive from ὄσσα 'voice' because Homer uses the latter only in the restricted sense of 'divine voice' (which does not fit in the relevant Homeric passage because the character in question is human). The broad meaning 'voice' is un-Homeric and specific to the νεώτεροι (e.g. Hes. Th. 832). The Homeric verb ὄσομαι therefore derives from ὄσσε 'eyes' and means 'to look at' and not 'to speak'.¹⁶ Likewise, he rejects the view of the Glossographers (fr. 7 Dyck) that βράσσων is the comparative of βραχύς because the latter word is not attested in Homer (schol. A Il. 10.226).

A careful reader such as Aristarchus was bound to notice that here and there the Homeric meaning differed from the contemporary usage of this word. A case in point are the words ὄψον and μήλα, which both are said to have a specific meaning in Hellenistic times ('cooked food' and 'apples'), whereas the 'ancients' (οἱ παλαιοί or ἀρχαῖοι) designated by them more broadly any type of 'food' and 'fruits (grown on a tree)'.¹⁷ The note on μήλα, in particular, makes it clear what Aristarchus' concern is, in that it expressly opposes οἱ παλαιοί and ἡμεῖς.¹⁸ Hellenistic readers might either be puzzled or even actively misinterpret the Homeric text due to 'false friends'.¹⁹ In order to exclude this problem, several of Aristarchus' notes explicitly set off the Homeric meaning against the one that prevailed

15) Cf. also Hippias' of Elis (VS 86 B 9 D-K) observation that the word τύραννος did not enter the Greek language until Archilochus' time (test. 82 Tarditi).

16) Schol. A Il. 1.105a (with test., esp. 2.93b; Lehrs 1882: 88, Dimpfl 1911: 17–18, Nünlist forthcoming).

17) Schol. A Il. 9.489a, 11.630c (both on ὄψον, Lehrs 1882: 150), 9.542a (on μήλα, Lehrs 1882: 101).

18) For Callanan's view that such oppositions are devoid of a chronological implication, see n. 10. In Aristarchus' case, it is also contradicted by the notes which expressly explain the 'ancient' customs of the Homeric world to a Hellenistic readership: schol. A Il. 6.176a (on the Homeric protocol of entertaining a guest; Schmidt 1976: 180), 7.333 (on cremation; Schmidt 1976: 238), 7.473 (on barter trade; Schmidt 1976: 247), 16.810a (on fighting from a chariot), 18.492b (on nuptial processions; Schmidt 1976: 248), 22.88a (on dowry; Schmidt 1976: 240–5), etc.

19) Zenodotus was not immune to this problem (see next n.).

in his own time. Examples include ἀγγελίης, (οὐκ) ἀγνοέω, διακρίνω, θέμεθλα στομάχοιο, καταθύμιος, σχεδόν or ὦδε.²⁰ Such words have a meaning in Homer that is no longer customary or even obsolete in Hellenistic times and thus a possible stumbling-block.²¹ A related difficulty arises when a Homeric word has multiple meanings, not all of which are still common. A synopsis of the notes on εὔχομαι, for instance, reveals that Aristarchus recognised two basic meanings. One is ‘to pray’, which was in accordance with Hellenistic usage, the other ‘to boast’, which was not.²²

Aristarchus’ main goal was, to repeat, to elucidate as best as he could the Homeric text with all its peculiarities.²³ This focus on enucleating the specifically Homeric meaning of words explains why it was less important for him to distinguish among the individual members of the non-Homeric counterpart, at least not in the framework of a commentary on Homer. The picture would no doubt look different if more of his semantic notes on authors other than Homer had been preserved.²⁴ Moreover, even in his notes on Homer Aristarchus does not simply conflate the language of the νεώτεροι and that of his Hellenistic contemporaries. An example is the comment on the meaning of the verb θύω.²⁵ Aristarchus first explains that the poets Timotheus and Philoxenus, who no doubt qualify for him as νεώτεροι, understood the verb in an un-Homeric way (σφάζω ‘to slaughter victims’ instead of θυμιάω ‘to burn

20) Passages again refer to A-scholia on the Iliad: ἀγγελίης (3.206a, against Zenodotus, La Roche 1866: 176–7), (οὐκ) ἀγνοέω (2.807, Dimpfl 1911: 8), διακρίνω (3.99a, against Zenodotus, Lehrs 1882: 148), θέμεθλα στομάχοιο (17.47a, Lehrs 1882: 150), καταθύμιος (10.383b, etc., Lehrs 1882: 146), σχεδόν (17.202a, etc. = fr. 160 Matthaios), ὦδε (3.297a, etc. = fr. 157 M., in 12.346 against Zenodotus). Cf. also 24.304a¹, which takes exception to the un-Homeric meaning of χέρνιβον in this passage.

21) This topic is amusingly made fun of by the comic poet Strato (fr. 1 Kassel-Austin), who has a simoleon complain about the arcane language of a ‘Homering’ cook.

22) Schol. A Il. 5.121 (pray, κατὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν χρῆσιν), 8.526a (boast), 10.461c (pray, συνήθως ἡμῖν), 19.100a (boast), 21.183b (boast), 21.501b (boast); Lehrs (1882: 146).

23) Friedländer (1853: 1–35) gives a list of such peculiarities under the rubric ‘Fragmenta schematologiae Aristarchae’.

24) At this stage, there is evidence for fewer than twenty non-Homeric words that were explained by Aristarchus. None of these explanations refers to diachrony.

25) Schol. A Il. 9.219b (= Timotheus fr. 783 PMG, Philoxenus fr. 823 PMG).

incense'). He then adds the point that their understanding is comparable to Hellenistic usage (ὁμοίως τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ συνηθείᾳ). Aristarchus tellingly feels the need to make explicit a comparability that he does not simply take for granted.²⁶ Far from being an instance of indifference to chronology, the note indirectly confirms the observation that Aristarchus regularly argues against the back-drop of diachronic shifts and various linguistic stages, as seen in the examples above. The Homeric texts were a challenge for the reader, not least so because they were old texts with archaic words and meanings. Therefore the reader needed to be alerted to the relevant cases. By acknowledging the fact that the meaning of words was subject to change over the centuries Aristarchus continued an accepted line of research.²⁷

The second linguistic area in which Aristarchus commented on diachronic shifts is syntax. Thus a note on the particle γάρ makes it clear that Homer's habit of placing γάρ in the first sentence is 'archaic' (ἀρχαϊκῶς).²⁸ The same verdict applies to the phrase δέξατο οἱ σκῆπτρον (Il. 2.186), in which the dative is taken 'archaically' to represent παρ' αὐτοῦ.²⁹ A third type of archaic syntax is found in the double accusatives that accompany the verbs ἀφαιρέω and βάλλω instead of the expected accusative with genitive.³⁰

26) Cf. e. g. schol. A Il. 16.336a¹ (on μέλεος), which aligns the language of the tragedians with contemporary usage.

27) In addition to Hippias and Thucydides, there is Aristophanes of Byzantium, who in a section of his Λέξεις (fr. 1–36 Slater) dealt with the relative age of words (Pfeiffer 1968: 198–200, pace Callanan 1987: 76, 79, 81), see also n. 10. Similarly, the difference between the Homeric and the contemporary use, for example, of ὦδε (cf. n. 20) is noted by Apollonius Sophista (170.21) and Apollonius Dyscolus (adv. p. 178.25–7 Schneider = Aristarchus fr. 157 Matthaios). On archaic words in Homer see also Ps.-Plut. Hom. 14, Dio Chrys. 11.23, 12.66. For the need to establish the meaning that a word had when the text was written, see the analysis of ἀρετή by Plutarch (aud. poet. 24c–e).

28) Schol. A Il. 7.328b: ὅτι ἀπὸ τοῦ γάρ αἰτιώδους εἰσέβαλεν ἀρχαϊκῶς (= test. to fr. 173 Matthaios). This and the next example were singled out by Friedländer (1853: 1 n. 2) in his schematologia (cf. n. 23).

29) Schol. A Il. 2.186a: ὅτι ἀρχαϊκώτερον δέξατο αὐτῷ τὸ σκῆπτρον ἀντὶ τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ (= fr. 207 Matthaios). Modern scholars prefer the explanation as dative of interest (Matthaios 1999: 603, with lit.).

30) Schol. A Il. 1.275b: ὅτι ἀρχαϊκῶς τόνδε ἀφαιροῦ, οὐχὶ τοῦδε (in the Addenda Erbse withdraws the cruxes that he first printed around ἀρχαϊκῶς), 21.166a: ὅτι ἀρχαϊκῶς πάλιν τὸν πῆχυν αὐτὸν ἔβαλεν, οὐχὶ τὸν πῆχυν αὐτοῦ. Both scholia are listed in the test. to fr. 43 Matthaios. The fragment's scope is broader, in

Aristarchus' point is the same in all three cases: Hellenistic readers must not be surprised if they encounter unusual syntactical features in Homer. Such an old text is bound to contain 'archaic' elements, which must therefore be accepted as a regular characteristic. At the same time, Aristarchus' commentary attempts to lower the threshold in that it identifies and explains the relevant cases.

As in his semantic studies, Aristarchus made the same argument by pointing out syntactical features in Homer which differed from the customary usage of his own time. For instance, the active aorist κτεάτισσα (Il. 16.57) is seen as representing the middle ἐκτησάμην (supported by the parallel Od. 2.102), which is *παρὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν συνήθειαν* ('contrary to our customary language').³¹ Likewise, a note on the grammatical agreement of Il. 2.36 (the plural ἔμελλον agrees with the neuter plural ἄ) remarks that 'we, however, will say ἔμελλεν in the singular'.³² The same distinction is made in the comment on Il. 2.135, where another neuter plural (σπάρτα) is combined both with a plural and a singular verb (λέλυνται, σέσηπε). The former is in accordance with Homer's customary usage, the latter with 'ours'.³³ In his editorial decisions, Aristarchus unsurprisingly favours the Homeric usage,³⁴ but he repeatedly alerts the reader to the principal difference. Next, he notes that Homer uses the simple personal pronoun ἐμέ (in connection with λύσομαι), whereas the Greek of his own time would opt for the reflexive pronoun ἐμαυτόν.³⁵ Similarly, he explains that

that it treats one of the ἐναλλαγὰι τῶν πτώσεων, genitive instead of accusative. The observation that this change is 'archaic' appears to be restricted specifically to instances of double accusative.

31) Schol. A Il. 16.57a: ἡ διπλῆ, ὅτι ἰδίως καὶ παρὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν συνήθειαν 'κτεάτισσα' κατὰ τὸ ἐνεργητικὸν ἀντὶ τοῦ 'ἐκτησάμην'. καὶ ἐν Ὀδυσσεΐα (2.102) κτλ. (= fr. 60 Matthaios, see also his commentary pp. 218–19).

32) Schol. A Il. 2.36c: πρὸς τὸ σχῆμα, ὅτι 'ἔμελλον'. ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐροῦμεν 'ἔμελλεν' ἐνικῶς (= test. to fr. 81 Matthaios). Zenodotus, on the other hand, read ἔμελλεν (schol. bT Il. 2.36d Did.).

33) Schol. A Il. 2.135a: ὅτι κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν στίχον καὶ ἐαυτῷ καὶ ἡμῖν συνήθως ἐξενήνοχε τὸ 'λέλυνται' καὶ 'σέσηπε' (= test. to fr. 81 Matthaios).

34) Matthaios 1999: 383.

35) Schol. A Il. 10.378b: ὅτι παρὰ τὸ σύνθετος ἐξενήνοχεν, 'ἐμὲ λύσομαι' ἀντὶ τοῦ 'ἐμαυτόν' (= fr. 121 Matthaios). In light of this observation, Aristarchus' related point (fr. 120 M.) that in Homer the reflexive pronoun always appears 'in the full form' (i. e., in two words, not as a compound) probably contains a diachronic argument too and should therefore be added to the list of morphological examples. On the form of reflexive pronouns see also n. 43 below.

Homer's use of the accusative ἐνύπνιον (Il. 2.56) as an adverb is not like 'ours'.³⁶

The note on κτεάτισσα (quoted in n. 31) is worth a second look because it not only mentions that this use of the active voice is different from Hellenistic practice but also that it is peculiar (ιδίως) to Homer. It may well be the case that this very peculiarity of the Homeric language triggered Aristarchus' comments in the first place. But the remarkable fact remains that in these comments he repeatedly refers to different stages of the Greek language. In light of this observation one should perhaps not a priori rule out the possibility that a similar diachronic argument is implicit in the numerous notes that comment on typically Homeric features of syntax.³⁷

The third thematic area is morphology.³⁸ Unlike the notes on syntactical peculiarities, there is none which explicitly states that Homer's morphology is 'archaic'. But there is at least one (schol. A Il. 10.466b) which makes essentially the same point in different words when it explains the Homeric form of the adjective δέελον (instead of δῆλον): ἡ διπλῆ δέ, (ὅτι) ὃ ἡμεῖς λέγομεν 'δῆλον', αὐτὸς (sc. Ὅμηρος) εἶπε διελὼν 'δέελον' (i. e., the adjective is trisyllabic in Homer). The marked difference between present and past tense (λέγομεν vs. εἶπε) in all likelihood implicates the same diachronic development as in the examples above. Elsewhere Aristarchus insists on maintaining the correct Homeric form, for instance, μάρτυροι not μάρτυρες (fr. 53 Matthaïos, against Zenodotus), φυλακούς not φύλακας (schol. A Il. 24.566b/c), οἴσθα not οἴσθας (schol. A Il. 1.85e, the target is again Zenodotus, see Erbse ad loc.). The last form, in particular, has a distinctly κοινή flavour,³⁹ but Aristarchus does not explicitly say so. The question must therefore

36) Schol. A Il. 2.56b: ὅτι Ζηνόδοτος γράφει 'θειόν μοι ἐνύπνιον'. οὐ λέγει δὲ (sc. Ὅμηρος) ὡς ἡμεῖς, ἀλλ' ἀντὶ τοῦ 'κατὰ τοὺς ὕπνους, ἐνυπνίως' (= test. to fr. 137 Matthaïos).

37) E. g. schol. A Il. 1.131a (= fr. 178A Matthaïos, on the use of περ), 4.251a (= test. to fr. 216 M., on ἐπί with dative), 4.277a¹ (= fr. 30A M., on the comparative in connection with ἤϊστε), 10.559 (= test. to fr. 45 M., on the dative), 14.235a (= fr. 78B M., on the subjunctive), 14.284a (= test. to fr. 43 M., on a different type of double accusative).

38) Before Aristarchus an interest in the morphological development of the Greek language transpires from Aristophanes of Byzantium fr. 19 Slater (Pfeiffer 1968: 199–200). See also Pl. Cratyl. 418b–c on sound shifts.

39) Schwyzer 1953: 127.

remain open whether there is a chronological implication when Aristarchus insists in the relevant notes that ‘this is how Homer has formed the word’ (οὕτως ἐσχημάτικεν) or the like. In light of his comment on δέελον, this possibility should again not be ruled out.

Taken together, the notes on semantics, syntax and morphology collected above prove that Aristarchus sometimes argued on the basis of his insight that the Greek language had undergone changes over the centuries and thus displayed different stages. This interest is all the more remarkable because Lallot (2011) has recently demonstrated that Greek grammarians such as Apollonius Dyscolus or his son, Herodian, show virtually no awareness of such a historical development. The above argument corroborates Lallot’s concluding caveat that perhaps not all ancient scholars lacked a sense of ‘Sprachgeschichte’.⁴⁰ Aristarchus clearly possessed such a sense. But he does not seem to have made questions of linguistic diachrony a central focus of his research, let alone developed an early system of historical linguistics.⁴¹ The diachronic distinctions mostly play an auxiliary role in the business of elucidating the Homeric text, which is the linchpin of his activity. It is therefore not surprising that Aristarchus’ sense of linguistic development remains largely implicit in the examples given above.⁴² The particular focus on interpreting the poetic text also makes it unlikely that Aristarchus meant to advocate a form of stylistic archaism when he identified ‘archaic’ features in the language of Homer. In this connection, it is also worth mentioning that for Aristarchus the term ἀρχαῖος did not have the overtones that ‘ar-

40) Lallot (2011: 250 n.14) in response to objections raised by M. Schmidt after the conference in question. Schmidt’s argument can be expanded because Aristarchus’ findings go, as seen, beyond the realm of lexical differences between Homer and the νεώτεροι.

41) In this sense, Callanan (1987: 81) is right when he argues that ancient grammarians should not be saddled with the insights of historical linguistics as developed from the nineteenth century onwards. Probably the most detailed ancient account of language’s gradual development is transmitted by Diodorus Siculus (1.8.3–4). This account, however, deals with the gradual perfection of language (i. e. presumably before Homer) and not with its subsequent development.

42) To a certain extent, this situation is characteristic of scholia in general, which tend to be undertheorised (Nünlist 2009: 2 and *passim*). The abbreviation process is likely to have made things worse, as the papyrus commentaries show. For Aristarchus see esp. P. Oxy. 1086 (= pap. II Erbse) in comparison with the relevant medieval scholia on Il. 2.751–827 (Lundon 2001).

chaic' might have today. It simply referred to an older state of affairs, as did the alternative term *παλαιός*. There was not, in other words, an unbridgeable chasm between the language of Homer and that of his Hellenistic readers. Otherwise, it would be inexplicable how Homer could be called to witness in a dispute over the correctness of Greek.⁴³

From a modern perspective it is surprising that Aristarchus' observations on linguistic diachrony did not have more of an impact on the subsequent grammatical tradition.⁴⁴ The fact that he made these observations en passant probably did not help, but this can hardly be the full answer. An apparent oddity in the fragments of Aristarchus' commentary contains a hint in which direction such an answer should perhaps be sought.

The three notes that discuss the double accusative governed by *ἀφαιρέω* display an interesting terminological discrepancy. One describes it as an 'archaic' feature, for the other two it is 'Attic'.⁴⁵ Unless this is a simple scribal error (due, for example, to a misinterpreted compendium), one must conclude that 'archaic' and 'Attic' are in a way interchangeable here. For a modern scholar, the equation archaic = Attic is of course problematic. Aristarchus, however, famously held the view that Homer was an Athenian and placed his lifetime during the Ionian migration or 140 years after the Trojan war, that is, towards the end of the second millennium BC.⁴⁶ From that perspective the equation is at least possible. The case is, however, further complicated by the fact that the variant 'Attic' appears in two T-scholía (cf. n. 45). They have been attributed to Aristonicus because they transmit the spirit, if not the letter, of Aristarchus' commentary. It is therefore conceivable that

43) Aristarchus fr. 125A¹ Matthaïos (= Ap. Dysc. pron. p. 71.20–72.6 Schneider). The specific point is whether the reflexive pronoun of the third person plural should be compound (*ἑαυτῶν*, etc.) or not (*σφῶν αὐτῶν*, etc.). Aristarchus defends the latter and argues that with Homer τὰ τοῦ Ἑλληνισμοῦ ἠκριβῶται.

44) A revealing example is how Apollonius Dyscolus (coni. p. 239.21–5 Schneider) discusses γάρ in the first sentence. He considers it a Homeric idiosyncrasy and expressly refers to Aristarchus' treatment but shows no awareness of the latter's point that this usage is archaic.

45) Archaic: schol. A Il. 1.275b; Attic: schol. T Il. 1.275a Ariston., T Il. 22.18 Ariston. (these T-scholía are the reason why Erbse first printed cruces in schol. A Il. 1.275b, see n. 30).

46) Athenian origin: Pfeiffer 1968: 228; date: Proclus, vita Hom. 59–62 Severyns, cf. also Archilochus test. 18 Tarditi (= Clem. Al. Strom. 1.117.2).

these T-scholialia reflect a different stage, after the explicitly diachronic argument ('archaic') had been replaced by one based on dialect. Support for this hypothesis comes from other T-scholialia which explain the double accusative as 'Attic'.⁴⁷ It is further corroborated by one of the very rare exceptions that Lallot (2011: 248) found in Apollonius Dyscolus. In synt. 3.34 (pp. 300–2 Uhlig) the phenomenon under consideration, the nominative case used instead of the vocative, is first described as an ἀρχαϊκὴ χρῆσις but then categorised as an Ἄττικὸν σχῆμα. It looks as if this passage documented one of the final moments before arguments based on chronology yielded to those based on 'grammatical geography'.⁴⁸ A similar point can be made about the comment of another second century grammarian, Nicanor, who describes a particular σχῆμα both as 'Attic' and 'archaic'.⁴⁹ Interestingly, the scholia on one of Apollonius' examples, Il. 3.277, display a terminological difference comparable to the one discussed above. The A-scholion simply records that the nominative case stands for the vocative, while the T-scholion considers this 'Attic'.⁵⁰ In this connection it is worth

47) Schol. T Il. 15.427b ex., bT Il. 17.125b ex. In the former case an Aristarchean note has not been preserved. In the latter, the A-scholion reflects an interesting debate among Aristarchus' pupils whether the reason for the διπλῆ was the content or syntax of the passage (thus Dionysius Thrax fr. 12 Linke). The view of Linke (ad loc.) that Dionysius probably considered the double accusative a catachresis appears to be based on the b-scholion, which, however, misleadingly condensates T. The point about the catachresis of ἀπαυράω (τεύχεα) refers to the semantics of the verb not the syntax. For the 'Attic' accusative see also schol. T Il. 8.236–7 ex., schol. Dion. Thr. 464.18 and Lesboux (see next n.).

48) The latter can be documented, e. g., from Lesboux, who describes two of the above examples in terms of figures (σχήματα) that are typical of a particular dialect. Thus the dative in δέξαστό οἱ σκήπτρον (Il. 2.186) is 'Sicilian' (fr. 9 Blank, cf. Ps.-Plut. Hom. 13.2) and the double accusative is, again, 'Attic' (fr. 11 Blank, with test., cf. also fr. 12). Unfortunately, Lesboux' date is uncertain ("after Aristarchus' Homeric commentaries and before Arethas": Blank 1988: 145).

49) Schol. A Il. 11.657–8a¹ Nic.; the σχῆμα in question is πένθεος ὄσσον representing ὄσσον πένθος. Similarly, the permutation of cases (accusative instead of genitive/dative) is considered both 'archaic' (schol. A Il. 13.351–3 Nic.) and 'Attic' (schol. A Il. 6.479–80a¹ Nic.). For a similar combination of archaic and Attic see also schol. bT Il. 1.135–7 ex. (with test.), on conditional clauses that lack an apodosis. Likewise, Pseudo-Plutarch juxtaposes chronology and dialect (Hom. 43, on the gender of κίων in Od. 1.53–4). Nicanor, for his part, considers another type of ἄλλειψις a σχῆμα ἀρχαϊκόν (schol. A Il. 12.29a¹ Nic.).

50) Schol. A Il. 3.277a¹ vs. T Il. 3.277a² (= test. to fr. 39 Matthaïos). One of A's two parallels, Od. 17.415, recurs in Apollonius Dyscolus. A comparable difference

remembering that explicit references to dialect are comparatively rare in Aristarchus' commentaries, even though he considered Homer an Athenian.⁵¹

In light of these arguments, the hypothesis that arguments based on dialect superseded diachronic explanations is plausible. It is more difficult to provide a date for this transition. Given that Homer's linguistic habits were an important factor for determining (or confirming) his alleged Athenian origin, one wonders whether Didymus really preserves Aristarchus' own terminology when he describes the unaugmented verb forms, which the latter often favoured in his editorial decisions, as 'Ionic'.⁵² The same applies to the one scholion that considers Homer's frequent omission of the article an 'Ionic habit'.⁵³ These Augustan examples might perhaps serve as a rough terminus ante quem, which also aligns well with Latte's findings on the dialect glosses.⁵⁴ But it goes without saying that the transition may well have happened gradually. Didymus' contemporary Trypho, for instance, appears to have shared with his 'scholarly grandfather' Aristarchus an interest in language development, since he wrote a treatise *περὶ ἀρχαίας ἀναγνώσεως* (fr. 94–104 Velsen). Still more difficult is the question of what

between A and bT can be found in the respective notes on the phrase ἐν ᾧ ἔσσι (Il. 6.25). The A-scholion explains that the sheep pen is meant, which for bT is 'Attic'. Erbse designates the latter as 'exegetical', but in light of the parallels (schol. A Il. 4.500b, 8.213d) it may well belong to Aristonicus; see esp. Erbse's own note on the very similar schol. bT Il. 5.137 ex.: "fort(asse) sch(olium) Aristonici."

51) On Homer as an Athenian see n. 46, for which there is only one explicit reference in the extant scholia (schol. A Il. 13.197). Aristarchus' view may nevertheless be the source of the tendency among ancient grammarians to equate 'Homeric' with 'Attic' (cf. Erbse 1988: 85: "Attica nonnumquam eadem quae Homerica").

52) Schol. A Il. 1.162 Did. (with test.). The opposite view (e.g. Hillgruber 1994: 110) that Didymus does preserve Aristarchean terminology here requires the assumption that Aristarchus did not differentiate between the Attic and Ionic dialects, as is commonly done. It is also worth mentioning that Herodian appears to use two different terms. In schol. A Il. 23.440b the unaugmented form is called 'Ionic', but 'poetic' in schol. A Il. 8.229b. Does the latter represent an older terminology? 'Ionic' recurs e.g. in Ps.-Plut. Hom. 11.1.

53) Schol. HM³ Od. 2.206b1 (= fr. 100B Matthaïos), attributed to Didymus by Ludwig, to Aristonicus by Pontani. Note that none of the other testimonia listed by Matthaïos mentions the factor dialect.

54) Latte (1925: esp. 155, 171) argues that dialect studies were revived by grammarians of the first century BC, after Aristarchus had shown a limited interest in the subject. In this he may well have been the exception rather than the rule (contrast, e.g., his predecessor Aristophanes of Byzantium).

caused the authoritative grammarians to shift their focus away from diachronic considerations. For the time being, one must be content with the observation that Aristarchus, on the one hand, had a well-developed sense of language development. His successors, on the other, did not proceed along the same lines and, for whatever reason, largely failed to continue what in hindsight can be regarded as forays into the domain of historical linguistics.⁵⁵

Bibliography

- D. Blank, *Lesbonax, περὶ σχημάτων*, Berlin / New York 1988.
- Ch. K. Callanan, *Die Sprachbeschreibung bei Aristophanes von Byzanz*, Göttingen 1987.
- Ch. Dimpfl, *Beiträge zu Aristarchs homerischer Wortforschung*, Eichstätt 1911.
- H. Erbse, *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem*, 7 vols., Berlin / New York 1969–88.
- L. Friedländer, *Aristonici περὶ σημειῶν Ἰλιάδος reliquiae emendatiores*, Göttingen 1853.
- M. Hillgruber, *Die pseudoplutarchische Schrift De Homero*, vol. 1, Stuttgart / Leipzig 1994.
- J. La Roche, *Die Homerische Textkritik im Alterthum*, Leipzig 1866 (repr. Hildesheim 1992).
- J. Lallot, *Did the Alexandrian Grammarians have a Sense of History?*, in: S. Matthaios et al. (eds.), *Ancient Scholarship and Grammar: Archetypes, Concepts and Contexts*, Berlin / New York 2011, 241–50.
- K. Latte, *Glossographika*, *Philologus* 80, 1925, 136–75.
- K. Lehrs, *De Aristarchi studiis Homericis*, Leipzig 31882.
- K. Linke, *Die Fragmente des Grammatikers Dionysios Thrax*, Berlin / New York 1977.
- J. Lendon, *POxy 1086 e Aristarco*, in: *Atti del XXII congresso internazionale di papirologia*, Firenze, 23–29 agosto 1998, Firenze 2001, 827–39.
- S. Matthaios, *Untersuchungen zur Grammatik Aristarchs: Texte und Interpretation zur Wortartenlehre*, Göttingen 1999.
- F. Montanari, *The Fragments of Hellenistic Scholarship*, in: G. W. Most (ed.), *Collecting Fragments – Fragmente sammeln*, Göttingen 1997, 273–88.
- R. Nünlist, *The Ancient Critic at Work: Terms and Concepts of Literary Criticism in Greek Scholia*, Cambridge 2009.
- R. Nünlist, *Aristarch und das Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*, forthcoming in the proceedings of the *Kolloquium zum Abschluß des LfgrE (1955–2010)*, Hamburg, 6–8 Oct. 2010.
- L. Pagani, *Pioneers of Grammar: Hellenistic Scholarship and the Study of Language*, in: F. Montanari / L. Pagani (eds.), *From Scholars to Scholia: Chapters in the History of Ancient Scholarship*, Berlin / New York 2011, 17–64.

55) I would like to thank Stephanos Matthaios for a stimulating discussion of this paper.

- R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship: From the Beginning to the End of the Hellenistic Age*, Oxford 1968.
- A. Roemer, *Die Homeregeese Aristarchs in ihren Grundzügen*, ed. by E. Belzner, Paderborn 1924.
- E. Rohde, *Studien zur Chronologie der griechischen Litteraturgeschichte*, *RhM* 36, 1881, 380–434.
- M. Schmidt, *Die Erklärungen zum Weltbild Homers und zur Kultur der Heroenzeit in den bT-Scholien zur Ilias*, München 1976.
- E. Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik*, vol. 1, München ²1953.

Köln

René Nünlist