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ARISTARCHUS, GREEK DIALECTS AND HOMER

Francesca SCHIRONI
(University of Michigan)*

To Alfons, with gratitude for his ξενία when I was in Leuven

As a philologist working on the language of Homer, Aristarchus showed a sophisticated sense for the Greek language and its grammatical rules. In this paper I would like to address the question of the ‘otherness’ of the language of Homer, and whether Aristarchus had a sense of the ‘diachronic’ and ‘geographic’ difference between koine Greek and the Homeric dialect. Obviously, the fact that much of Aristarchus’ exegesis consisted of paraphrases, i.e. ‘translations’ of Homeric words into koine, means that Aristarchus had a clear sense that Homeric language was different. But how, exactly, did he understand this difference? In particular, did he realize that the Homeric language was more archaic than koine? And did he have a sense that it was also an idiosyncratic mix of various dialects? These two questions are distinct; I will review them separately, using as evidence the scholia maior to the Iliad.

1. Homer vs. Us: the Otherness of Homeric Diction

The first question to address is whether by realizing that Homeric Greek and koine Greek were two different ‘languages’ Aristarchus ever tried to put them in some sort of historical relationship. In other words: did he have a diachronic view of the Greek language? Did he understand that

---

* I would like to warmly thank Albi Cesare Cassio for reading a previous version of this paper and offering invaluable help and suggestions.

1 See Matthaios (1999).

2 By “koine” I mean the modern concept of koine, i.e. the Greek language as spoken in the Hellenistic period; this was the variety of Greek spoken by Aristarchus. This modern sense of koine must be kept distinct from the ancient idea of the κοινὴ διάλεκτος, which was considered another language (i.e. ‘standard’ Greek) and was put on the same level as the other dialects for a total of five Greek dialects: Ionic, Attic, Aeolic, Doric, and κοινὴ διάλεκτος. The best discussion of the problem is Cassio (1993).
Homeric Greek was linguistically more archaic than *koine* Greek? Or did he consider the two to be simply two different linguistic phenomena to be compared, but which were not part of a diachronic development of the same language? After all, the fact that two linguistic usages are different from one another does not necessarily imply that they represent two different stages of the evolution of the same language.

As a matter of fact, while we have much evidence that Aristarchus perceived Homeric Greek as something different from *koine* Greek, there is much less evidence that he considered it somehow more ancient. In a large number of *scholia* Aristarchus opposes Homeric usage to *koine* usage and refers to the latter with a first person plural ‘we’. In these cases, Homer (ὁ ποιητής) is opposed to ‘us’ (ἡμεῖς) or to ‘our usage’ (ἡμετέρα χρῆσις/συνήθεια). This opposition is of course not significant, since it only highlights the ‘otherness’ of Homeric diction, not its diachronic relationship with ‘our’ language.

2. Some temporal clues

There are, however, some *scholia* in which the difference between Homeric language and *koine* is described in chronological terms. One is from a direct quotation of Aristarchus’ monograph *Against Comanus*, as reported by Didymus:

```latex
Sch. II. 1.97-9 (Did.) ἀεικέα λοιγὸν ... ἀπριάτην: λέξεις ἐκ τῶν Πρὸς Κομανόν ... ἀπριάτην δὲ σαφές, ὡς ἄνευ τοῦ πρίασθαι καὶ ταῦτὸν τῷ νῦν λέγομένῳ δωρεάν". A

‘Shameful ruin ... without ransom’: quotation from *Against Comanus* [he says that] ... ἀπριάτην instead is clear, [it means] ‘without buying her’ and it has the same meaning of what we say now ‘as a free gift’.
```

The Homeric word is opposed to what is said ‘now’ (νῦν). The same expression can be found in *Sch. II. 2.500b* ("Ὑλὴν ... νῦν δὲ καλοῦνται Ὑλαὶ πληθυντικῶς"). In *Sch. II. 18.413a*, instead, the modern usage is defined as νεωτερικὸν. These examples clearly suggest that Aristarchus

---

3 Unless otherwise specified, all the *scholia* I quote are from Aristonicus, the most reliable source for Aristarchus’ fragments.

4 E.g., *Sch. II. 2.36c; 2.56b; 2.135a; 2.148a; 2.807; 3.99a; 3.206a; 3.297a; 10.383b; 10.461c; 10.466b; 11.71; 12.46a; 17.201d; 17.202a; 18.560a; 18.614; 20.290b; 21.126-7a; 23.638-42; 24.304a.

5 E.g., *Sch. II. 5.121; 9.219b; 9.481a; 9.682; 16.57a."
at least sensed some opposition between the Homeric language and contemporary, more recent usage (which corresponds to koine).

That the language of Homer was considered somehow ancient is also suggested by several other scholia of Aristonicus. Here, however, some further distinctions are necessary. In three cases (Sch. II. 9.489a; 9.542a; 11.630c) a Homeric word is explained as being used by οἱ παλαιοί or οἱ ἀρχαῖοι. Although it may be a coincidence, in all three instances the word in question belongs to realia — more specifically, it is a name of food (ὀψον at II. 9.489 and 11.630, μῆλα at II. 9.542). The fact that Aristarchus says that the ‘ancients’ used a certain name for a particular food (i.e. the name that Homer uses) is in itself ambiguous evidence, as he could well be referring to the usage of the society depicted by Homer, and not to Homer himself. These comments do not prove therefore that for Aristarchus Homeric language in general was ‘ancient’, but only that certain names of realia were used ‘by the ancients’, probably to be understood as the heroes of the poems. It is the language of Achilles and Agamemnon that was ‘ancient’, not necessarily that of Homer.

Far more significant are cases in which a syntactic usage within the narrative, rather than a single word referring to daily life, is defined as ‘ancient’. This happens in Sch. II. 21.166a, where Aristarchus defines as ἀρχαϊκῶς the usage of the double accusative for the part and for the whole (μιν πῆχυν ... βάλε instead of τὸν πῆχυν αὐτοῦ). Similarly, the construction of δέχεσθαι with the dative rather than with παρ’ αὐτοῦ to mean ‘to take from him’ is called ἀρχαϊκότερον in Sch. II. 2.186a. Another example is the anticipatory and resumptive γάρ, which precedes the clause that it explains, a typical feature of Homeric syntax. Aristarchus comments on this usage by saying that it is typical of Homer to start a sentence with γάρ (Sch. II. 2.284a-b: ἐθος δὲ αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τοῦ γάρ ἄρχε- σθαι) and in Sch. II. 7.328b he defines the construction as ἀρχαϊκῶς. These three examples of the treatment of archaic syntax seem to suggest that somehow Aristarchus had the idea that Homeric Greek was not only ‘different’ from, but in fact more archaic than koine.

---

7 See also Sch. II 17.221; 23.627a and Didymus in Sch. II. 18.182c.
8 This usage of γάρ as preceding the clause to be explained is indeed more common in Homer and Herodotus than in Attic; see Kühner – Gerth (1898-1904: 2, 332) and Denniston (1950: 70).
3. The Geography of Homeric Language

The second question concerns the ‘geographic’ status of Homeric language. Did Aristarchus recognize that Homer was ‘speaking’ a language that not only was never spoken by any people, but was in fact a combination of various dialectal forms, with those of Ionic Greek predominating?

As already noted, the first operation that Aristarchus performed on Homeric language was to translate Homer into koine Greek by using paraphrases. This, of course, was a very common strategy in ancient scholarship deriving from the school practice, in which students had to read the Homeric poems, written in a language that was almost foreign to them; scholia minora on papyrus, in which Homeric words are listed with a ‘modern’ synonym, testify to this practice. In trying to detect Aristarchus’ understanding of Greek dialects, however, simple paraphrases are not enough. For example, the fact that Aristarchus ‘translates’ an Ionic dative plural δειλοῖσιν into the koine δειλαίοις in Sch. Il. 17.38c is not significant per se. Even if the change of endings does reflect a change of dialect (Ionic vs. Attic and koine), there is no comment or explanation about what the two forms are. As they are, these two scholia (and the examples could be multiplied) are just further examples of how Aristarchus paraphrased Homeric Greek into koine.

In order to enquire about how Aristarchus understood Greek dialects, we need to look for fragments where one form is explicitly labeled as belonging to a particular dialect. In fact, quite a few scholia to the Iliad meet this criterion and can be analyzed according to the dialect to which they refer.

3.1. Attic

The most common comments on dialects in the scholia derived from Aristarchus are those on the Attic features found in Homer. Some Atticisms are found in the Homeric use of prepositions and cases, e.g. the usage of the nominative instead of the vocative, defined as ‘Attic’ in Sch. Il. 3.277a.

---

9 In this example it is not only a question of endings. Aristarchus also operates at the level of semantics, translating the Homeric δειλός, which in the context means ‘wretched’, and not ‘coward’ (the other, more ‘modern’ meaning of the word), with the unambiguous δείλαιος, which can only mean ‘wretched’ in koine Greek.

10 Cf. Schwyzser – Debrunner (1950: 63-64). This usage is especially attested in Aeschylus, Aristophanes, and Xenophon, which is probably the reason why Aristarchus defined it as Attic.
Likewise, the prepositional phrase ἐπί + genitive to indicate movement towards a place is labeled with the adverb Ἀττικῶς with reference to Homeric phrases like ἐπ’ Ὠκεανοῖο ῥοάων (instead of εἰς ... ῥοάς in Sch. II. 3.5), ἐφ’ ἑπτάων (instead of ἐπὶ τοὺς ἱπποὺς in Sch. II. 5.249c) and ἐπὶ νηῶν (instead of ἐπὶ τὰς ναῦς in Sch. II. 5.700a). Aristarchus also singles out as Attic the constructions of the verb κελεύειν, ‘to order’, with the accusative instead of the dative (Sch. II. 20.4b) and of the verb ἀφαιρεῖσθαι ‘to deprive someone of something’, with the double accusative (instead of the accusative of the thing and the genitive of the person who is deprived of it; cf. Sch. II. 1.275a.b).

Interestingly, Aristarchus also labels as ‘Attic’ the oldest form of the third person plural of the present imperative, claiming that Homer’s φευγόντων is used instead of regular koine form φευγέτωσαν (Sch. II. 9.47a). The standard ending for the third person plural of the active present imperative becomes -τωσαν (rather than -ντων) in literary authors towards the end of the 5th century, including Thucydides and Euripides, and in inscriptions after 300 BC. Therefore by ‘Attic’ Aristarchus must have meant an older form of Attic, attested before the middle of the 5th century BC. This earlier Attic was indeed much closer to Homer than the contemporary koine.

The other major Attic feature in Homer according to Aristarchus is the dual. The main evidence is given by the following scholium:

Sch. II. 13.197 {ῑμβριον αὖτ’} Αἴαντε <μεμαότε>: δότι συνεχῶς κέχρηται τοῖς δυϊκοῖς. ἢ δὲ ἀναφορὰ πρὸς τὰ περὶ τῆς πατρίδος· Ἀθηναίων γὰρ ἵδον. Α

The two Ajaxes eager [of furious strength]: because he has used the dual continuously. The reference is to the question of [his] homeland: for [this is] typical of the Athenians.

---

11 Cf. Schwyzer – Debrunner (1950: 470), who notes that the construction with ἐπί + genitive becomes more and more frequent from the 5th century BC onwards (and it is commonly used by Sophocles and Herodotus).

12 Κελεύειν with the accusative and infinitive is indeed the normal Attic construction. Cf. Kühner – Gerth (1898-1904: 1, 411 [Anm. 7]).

13 In Sch. II. 1.275b Aristarchus’ solution is defined as Ἀττικόν, while in Sch. II. 1.275a it is defined ἄρχημακος. The definition of the latter scholium (both of them are by Aristonicus) was considered corrupt by Erbse, who suggested Ἀττικός on the basis of Sch. II. 22.18, an Aristonicus-derived exegetic scholium, which defines the construction ἔμε ... κύδος ἀφείλεο as Ἀττικός. Kühner – Gerth (1898-1904: 1, 324-325 [c]), Schwyzer – Debrunner (1950: 82 [d]) and Chantraine (1963: 43, d), do not single it out as ‘Attic’. It is however true that the double accusative with verbs of ‘depriving’ is widely attested in Attic authors such as Euripides, Sophocles, and Demosthenes.

14 Cf. also Sch. II. 2.438; 8.517; 8.521; 23.160d.

15 Cf. Kühner – Blass (1890-1892: 2, 50-51); Schwyzer (1939: 802).
Here Aristarchus praises Homer for his consistent use of dual forms in referring to the two Ajaxes throughout an entire scene containing a simile (Il. 13.197-202). Aristarchus also points out that the ability to use the dual correctly ‘solves’ the question of Homer’s origin: he is from Athens, since only there the dual is really at home (Ἀθηναίων γὰρ ἵδιον).

Aristarchus is always very attentive to duals, singling them out as a Homeric peculiarity (Sch. II. 8.109a) and very often explaining why Homer is right in using a dual (e.g. Sch. II. 5.153a; 5.224a; 5.230a; 6.38a; 10.349b16; 13.66a; 13.707a; 17.387a; 23.276a). According to Aristarchus, Homer is so good at using the dual that lines with doubtful duals (Sch. II. 4.407a) or with subjects in the plural followed by dual verbs (Sch. II. 8.185a, 8.186 and 8.191a) must be athetized. When Aristarchus cannot opt for an athetesis because the line with an incorrect dual cannot be eliminated without disrupting the syntactic articulation of the passage, he tries to ‘save the poet’ by showing that for some (usually weak) reason the dual must be understood as a sort of poetic license referring to more than two subjects (cf. Sch. II. 10.578a)17.

His most notable defense of a Homeric dual is surely that of the duals in Book 9 during the embassy to Achilles. According to Aristarchus, the problem of the use of the dual here, which has puzzled many critics because the delegation consists of three people (Phoenix, Odysseus and Ajax) and not two, is easily solved. The dual is right because the ‘real’ delegation is formed only by Odysseus and Ajax, while Phoenix is just accompanying them. Aristarchus ‘proves’ his point with lines 168-169 of Book 9, where Nestor proposes that an embassy be sent to Achilles and says: Φοῖνιξ μὲν πρώτιστα Διῷ φίλος ἡγησάσθω αὐτὰρ ἀφ’ Ἀἴας τε μέγας καὶ δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς. [“Let Phoenix, dear to Zeus, lead the way first; then after him great Ajax and divine Odysseus (will go)”]. The adverbs πρώτιστα and ἀφ’ are understood by Aristarchus in a temporal way: Phoenix will leave first, then Odysseus and Ajax — the real ambassadors — will follow (Sch. II. 9.168a and 9.169a). Hence the duals later in Book 9 refer only to Ajax and Odysseus18.

16 Cf. also Didymus in Sch. II. 10.349a12.
17 The contrary is also true, since Aristarchus notices that Homer uses sometimes a plural to refer to two: cf. Sch. II. 17.628; 21.287.
18 In many other scholia Aristarchus defends the dual as pertaining only to Odysseus and Ajax on the basis that Phoenix is not part of the embassy: see Sch. II. 9.180a; 9.182; 9.192a; 9.197a; 9.520; 9.657b; and also Sch. II. 4.377a. Not all types of duals in Homer are accepted by Aristarchus, however; for example, for the nouns of the first declension, he accepts the dual in the masculine but not in the feminine; see Ascheri (2004) and Schironi (2004: 157-165).
3.2. Ionic

Ionic, which is generally seen as the main component of the Homeric language, is not often recognized as such in the Aristarchean scholia. Of course, one reason for the apparent lack of interest in singling out Ionic usage could be that Aristarchus considered this dialect to be the basis of the Homeric language, with the result that specifically ‘Ionic’ features of Homer were seen to be the norm and thus not worthy of comment. This reason seems to be confirmed by a series of cases where Aristarchus picks up forms that prima facie contradict the Ionic rules and explains that they are indeed Ionic, but modified.

For example, Aristarchus does recognize the substitution of η for long α as an Ionic feature, though he does not comment on forms with η to clarify that they are Ionic. Rather, he comments on forms with a non-Ionic α by saying that they are Ionic but ‘shortened’. This is the doctrine of ‘Ionic shortening’, very common in Antiquity, to which Aristarchus seems to have subscribed. A typical example is the epic perfect λελασμένος19, which according to Aristarchus is a shortened Ionic participle instead of the more regular λελησμένος as explained in Sch. II. 16.776a. The scholium (διὰ Ἰακῶς λελασμένος ἀντὶ τοῦ λελησμένος πρός τὸ “ἐν καρός αἵσῃ” διὰ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐν κηρός μοίρῳ) refers to another problematic phrase, pronounced by Achilles in Book 9: τίω δὲ μιν ἐν καρός αἵσῃ [‘I do not care at all’]. Κάρ, a hapax of uncertain gender and meaning, is for Aristarchus a shortened form of κήρ, ‘death’, ‘doom’, with the form καρός standing for the regular genitive κηρός. He cites as a parallel II. 3.454: ‘he was hated by all like black death (κηρὶ μελαίῃ)’ (Sch. II. 9.378b). This analysis is probably wrong, but what it is interesting is that Aristarchus considers κάρ to be an Ionic, ‘shortened’ variant of the ‘standard’ Ionic κήρ20.

There are several other forms that attract Aristarchus’ attention and are defined by him as ‘Ionic’. One example is the ‘shortened’ forms of compound adjectives in -κλεής. Aristarchus (Sch. II. 2.115a) notes that Homer has the masculine accusative singular δυσκλέᾰ (II. 2.115, 9.22)

19 Cf. Chantraine (1973: 434), and Monro (1891: § 22.1).
20 Of course, the explanation of the ‘Ionic shortening’ is not linguistically correct. Forms with the zero-grade Ablaut like λελασμένος are just archaic (cf. Schwyzer [1939: 770]; Leumann [1959: 251-258]; Chantraine [1973: 420]), not Ionic. The ancients understood them as ‘Ionic’ probably because they found them in Homer. Thus they coined the rule of the ‘Ionic shortening’ for these perfect participles with a zero-grade Ablaut (cf. also Aristarchus in Sch. H Od. 18.85 for λελακυῖα). This rule was then applied to cases like κάρ, now explained as a ‘shortened Ionic’. 
and ἀκλέᾱ (Od. 4.728) with the last vowel abbreviated (κατὰ συστολήν) in the Ionic fashion (Ἰονικὸς), while speakers of Attic lengthen it (i.e. they pronounce these words as δυσκλεᾶ and εὐκλεᾶ)\(^{21}\). Along the same lines, Aristarchus contrasts the shortened Homeric accusative plural εὐκλεῖᾱς (contracted from εὐκλεέας) to the corresponding Attic εὐκλεεῖς, with long final syllable (Sch. II. 10.281a: ὅτι ᾿Ιακὸν τὸ συστέλλειν, ... οἱ δὲ ᾿Αττικοὶ ἐκτείνουσι)\(^{22}\). The epic third aorist participle of φθάνω, (ὑπο)φθάς in II. 7.144 and (παρα)φθάς in II. 22.197, is also considered by Aristarchus to be an Ionic form, used instead of the regular first aorist — φθάσας (ἀντὶ τοῦ ὑποφθάσας, ᾿Ιακός in Sch. II. 7.144a and ᾿Ιακός ἀντὶ τοῦ παραφθάσας in Sch. II. 22.197a)\(^{23}\). Finally, in a scholiast directed against Zenodotus (Sch. II. 11.589a) Aristarchus recognizes psilosis as alien to the Ionic of Homer (τῆς καθ᾿ ᾿Ομήρων ᾿Ιάδος).

On the other hand, Aristarchus criticizes cases of “hyperionism” by Zenodotus. In Sch. II. 1.530a he argues against the genitive κρητός (instead of κρατός) suggested by Zenodotus: οὐκ ἔστι δὲ ᾿Ιακόν, he says, since Homer uses the accusative κρῆτα in Od. 8.92\(^{24}\). The same happens for the “hyperionic” reading ὠρῆτο that Zenodotus gave instead of ὠρᾶτο (imperfect of ὠράω) in II. 1.56 and 1.198. Aristarchus claims that Zenodotus wrote ὠρῆτο with η, thinking it was Ionic, but that such a form is in fact Doric, and hence it is wrong: Ζηνόδοτος ἀγνοήσας τὸ τῆς διαλέκτου ἰδίωμα ὡς ᾿Ιωνικὸν ἐξέθετο “ὁρῆτο”. ἔστι δὲ Δώριον [“Zenodotus, not recognizing the peculiarity of the dialect, took ὠρῆτο as Ionic. But it is Doric” (Sch. II. 1.198b\(^2\), cf. also Sch. II. 1.198b\(^1\) and 1.56c)]\(^{25}\).

---

21 Cf. e.g. Eur. Hipp. 405, 717; Soph. Phil. 1422. The contracted form is indeed Attic; the forms in -ἐά and -έά (i.e. with hyphaeresis), however, are not only ‘Ionic’ or ‘Homeric’, but common to all other dialects except Attic. See Kühner – Blass (1890-1892: 1, 437); Schwyzer (1939: 252); Chantraine (1973: 74). Probably Aristarchus defined these forms as ‘Ionic’ in opposition to the normal contracted Attic form.

22 Cf. Monro (1891: § 105.5); Kühner – Blass (1890-1892: 1, 433-434 [Anm. 8], 436, 437).

23 Cf. also Sch. II. 17.197a (but without mention of the dialectal origin). The participle φθάσας is indeed the only one attested in Attic: see Schwyzer (1939: 742 and n. 4).


25 The form ὠρῆτο is unattested elsewhere. However, Aristarchus might have considered it ‘Doric’ on the basis of the Doric imperative ὤρη used by Theocritus in Id. 7.50, 15.2, and 12. Cf. Ahrens (1839-43: 2, 195). For a modern analysis of the form ὤρητο, see Nussbaum (2002: 179-183).
3.3. Aeolic

Unlike Herodian or other grammarians who often use dialectal labels other than Ionic or Attic to explain features of Homeric language, Aristarchus does not seem to find many Doric or Aeolic traces in Homer. Instead, he uses Doric and Aeolic examples as comparanda to show that the language of Homer is different. This is for example the case of ῥέθος:

\[\text{Sch. II. 16.856b}^1 \{ψυχή δ’} \, ἐκ ῥεθέων: διὶ πάντα τῷ μέλῃ ῥέθη Ὅμηρος προσαγορεῖει. οὐ δὲ Ἀἰολεῖς μόνον τὸ πρόσωπον.\]

‘His soul [flying] from his limbs (ἐκ ῥεθέων): because Homer calls ῥέθη all the limbs. The Aeolians instead [call ῥέθος] only the face.

Homer thus uses ῥέθος for all the limbs together, i.e. the body, whereas for the Aeolians ῥέθος means only the face. It is impossible to decide whether in this case by Ἀἰολεῖς Aristarchus means the speakers of the Aeolic dialect or the Aeolic poets. The word ῥέθος is attested in Sappho 22.3 (Voigt), but the fragmentary status of the papyrus (P.Oxy. 1231) does not allow us to determine whether it indicates the face or the body. The lack of documentation of spoken Aeolic also makes this question hard to answer.

In the scholia to the Iliad we never find explicit comments by Aristarchus categorizing a certain linguistic feature in Homer as Aeolic, even if he sometimes does support a form that we now recognize as belonging to the Aeolic group. Didymus once (Sch. II. 16.430b) comments on the reading κεκλήγοντες, which he found in one of Aristarchus’ editions (cf. Sch. HQ Od. 14.30), and says that it is Aeolic. But this is probably Didymus’ comment, not Aristarchus’. Another doubtful case is Sch. II. 9.6b, where Herodian discusses the Aeolic reading ἄμυδις (with smooth breathing) chosen by οἱ περὶ Ἀρίσταρχον. Yet the explanation which Herodian explicitly attributes to the pupils of Aristarchus, however, is that words that are derived from other words with a rough breathing often convert the original breathing into a smooth one; thus, from ἄμα the smooth ἄμυδις is derived. In this explanation, there is no hint that ἄμυδις is felt to be Aeolic; the dialectal origin is mentioned only later on in the scholium, and this latter point is Herodian’s comment, not Aristarchus.

---

26 For example, in Sch. II. 15.651a Hellanicus (fr. 2 Montanari) argues against Aristarchus and says that in ἄχνυμενοι περ ἔταιρον the word πέρι is the Aeolic form for περι, so that it is not a case of ellipsis of περι, as Aristarchus believed. Cf. Montanari (1988: 62-67).

27 Aristarchus also mentions the Aeolians, again in a comparison to show that Zenedotus is wrong, in a highly corrupted scholium (Sch. II. 2.694a).

28 Cf. also Sch. II. 20.114c (Hrd.). Pace Wathelet (1970: 47), who quotes Herodian according to the highly problematic edition of Lentz (G.G. III/1, 541.3), which in this case
Similarly difficult to assess is another note by Herodian in *Sch. II. 5.299b*. Here Heronian quotes Tryphon discussing the dative ἀλκί, ‘strength’, in *Il. 5.299b*.

*Sch. II. 5.299b* (Hrd.) ἀλκί : .... Τρύφων δὲ ἐν τῷ Περὶ τῆς ἄρχαίας ἀναγνώσεως (fr. 97 V.) φησιν ὅτι Ἀρίσταρχος λέγει ὅτι ἔθος αὐτοῖς ἐστὶ λέγειν τὴν ἱωκήν “ἰῶκα” (II. 11.601) καὶ τὴν κρόκην “κρόκα” (Hes. *WD* 538). καὶ τὴν ἀλκήν ἄλκα ὡς σάρκα. εἰ δὲ σάρκα ὡς ἄλκα, καὶ ἀλκί ὡς σαρκί.

ἀλκί [‘in his force’]... But in *On the Ancient Reading* Tryphon says that Aristarchus says that their custom is to say ἱωκήν as ἱῶκα (*Il. 11.601*) and κρόκην as κρόκα (Hes. *WD* 538) and ἀλκήν as ἄλκα, like σάρκα. If thus σάρκα is like ἄλκα, then ἀλκί is like σαρκί.

In commenting on a Homeric word (ἰῶκα), Aristarchus refers to some unspecified people (ἔθος αὐτοῖς ἐστὶ λέγειν) who use the similar third declension accusatives κρόκα (found in Hesiod) and ἄλκα. In the previous part of the scholium, Herodian says that the lemma ἀλκί is Aeolic, according to some: τινὲς δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀλκίς Αἰολικοῦ αὐτό (i.e. ἀλκί) φασιν. Thus one might be tempted to conclude that the αὐτοῖς mentioned by Aristarchus might indeed indicate the Aeolians. However, this is only an inference (though perhaps a likely one); in fact, the fragment concerning Aristarchus does not explicitly mention the Aeolic dialect; moreover since the quotation comes from Tryphon’s *On the Ancient Reading*, in theory one could just as easily think that by ‘their custom’ Aristarchus simply means ‘the custom of the ancients’, or ‘of the poets’. Indeed, Aristarchus here seems only to refer to ‘odd’ accusatives of the third declension originating from nominatives of the first declension: ἱῶκα is Homeric, κρόκα is Hesiodic, ἄλκα is never attested, while σάρκα is instead a common Greek accusative of σάρξ, used by Aristarchus as an example of the normal declensional pattern. This fragment thus is too problematic to be sure that Aristarchus considered these Homeric (and Hesiodic) forms to be Aeolic.

surely contributed to the false interpretation of the sources. Wathelet (ibid.: 48) also quotes other examples of Aristarchus’ Aeolic readings to demonstrate that Aristarchus, though considering Homer to be an Athenian, did allow Aeolic forms in the poems. But in the scholia adduced by Wathelet (Aristonicus in *Sch. II. 1.168a* and Didymus in *Sch. II. 10.176a*) the ‘Aeolic’ readings of Aristarchus are never defined as such; for all we know, Aristarchus might have considered those forms purely ‘Homeric’. Wathelet (ibid. 49-50), however, rightly notes that Herodian recognized many more ‘Aeolic’ traits in Homer and that this was in opposition to Aristarchus, who was generally more in favour of finding Attic features in Homer.
3.4. Doric

There is no clear evidence that Aristarchus recognized any feature in Homer as Doric. According to Herodian, the athematic aorist of the first person singular κατέκταν chosen by Aristarchus in Iliad 4.319 was Doric but it then became a common Attic form (Sch. II. 4.319c (Hrd.): … κατέκταν δὲ μετὰ τοῦ ν ἀἱ Αριστάρχου καὶ ἐν ἔκτάσει τοῦ α Δωρικῆ ὀυσί, ὃς “ἔβαν ἐγώ” (Soph. Ai. 868). ἢ γὰρ χρῆσις τοιώτη ἤν παρὰ Ἀττικοῖς …). So it is plausible that for Aristarchus κατέκταν was indeed Attic. Another dubious piece of evidence concerns the pronoun τύνη: in Sch. II. 6.262a τύνη is labeled (rightly) as Doric; in Sch. II. 19.10b, however, Aristonicus notes that ‘some’ consider it Doric (σημειούνται τινες ὃτι Δωρικὸν τὸ τύνη). Hence, it is impossible to know Aristarchus’ position: whether he considered τύνη as a Doric form, or whether instead he was arguing against others (τινες) who claimed it to be Doric, while for him it was only a Homeric pronoun.

The doubt is legitimate, since there is at least one case where Aristarchus seems to reject a Doric form as not compatible with the language of Homer. In Sch. II. 5.269d Aristarchus argues against Hellanicus (fr. 1 Montanari), who gave the plural accusative θηλέας a short final syllable for metrical reasons, but kept the accent on the same syllable as in the normal accusative form θηλείας, attested in II. 2.767. The right form, Aristarchus says, is θήλεας (from θῆλυς), while Hellanicus’ reading would imply the presence of a Doricism in the poet (ὡς Δωρικῶς ἐκτίθεμένου τοῦ ποιητοῦ). This type of short accusative feminine plural, Aristarchus continues, is never found in Homer, but only in Hesiod (τὸ δὲ τοιοῦτο παρ’ Ἡσιόδῳ πλεονάζει, Ὡμηρος δὲ οὐ χρῆται). This evidence must be added to that of Sch. II. 1.56c and 1.198b, where

29 Similarly, according to Sch. II. 14.199a (ex., Hrd.?) the form δάμνῳ was considered Doric by ‘some’ who derived it (as δάμνα) from δάμνασαι. The scholium then mentions Aristarchus in these terms: οἱ δὲ Δώριον αὐτὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ δάμνασαι ὡς Αρισταρχὸς φησιν ἔπιστα, δύνα, ἄλον δὲ ἐπιστασαι. Aristarchus is mentioned here as commenting on the forms ἐπίστα attested in Pind. P. 3.80, Aesch. Eum. 86, 581, and δύνα, attested at Theocr. Id. 10.2, Soph. OT 696 (in a choral ode) and Phil. 798, 849 (the latter in a choral ode). These forms are indeed typical of Doric and Attic tragedy (see Swizzey 1950-1953, 1 68 and Giangrande 1970, 261), and are absent from Homeric diction. In this specific case, Aristarchus is thus commenting on two non-Homeric forms and rightly labels them as ‘Doric’, but he is not connecting them with the Homeric dialect.

30 In Theogony 60, 267, 401, 534, 653; WD 564, 663, 675. It is extremely difficult to decide whether these short accusative feminine plurals are really Doric features; probably they are not. See Morpurgo Davies (1964: 152-165) and (West 1966: 85). On the ancient grammarians’ opinions on this question, see La Roche (1866: 280-281), and Montanari (1988: 63-65).
Aristarchus rejects the reading of Zenodotus (ὅρητο) because it is Doric, as analysed above. These examples are in my view sufficient evidence to conclude that according to Aristarchus the Doric dialect was alien to Homeric language.

3.5. *Scriptio continua* and Some ‘Dialectal’ Solutions

Aristarchus also makes use of his knowledge of dialects when he chooses a certain reading for his text. A very interesting case is the question of how to divide a sequence of *scriptio continua* in the case of past verb forms: a group of *scholia* by Didymus says that Aristarchus chose to have past tenses without the augment, Ἰακῶς, i.e. ‘according to the Ionic dialect’. Of course the lack of augment is not an Ionic feature, but merely a characteristic of poetic diction, and of Homeric diction in particular. Herodotus, however, sometimes uses the past of iterative verbs in -σκον without the augment (e.g., Hdt. 1.148.6; 2.151.15; 2.174.5; 4.130.6 …). It is thus possible that a form without the augment could have been felt by Aristarchus as belonging to the Ionic dialect.

In the easiest case it is just a question of attaching the ε of the syllabic augment to the preceding word, as in σφωε πόρεν and not σφὼ ἐπόρεν (cf. Didymus at *Sch. II.* 10.546a). In many other cases, however, in addition to the division of the *scriptio continua* a slight emendation of the text is also required. This happens in many cases where a past-tense verb with syllabic augment is preceded by a word ending in vowel. The solutions are either to keep the syllabic augment and elide the final vowel of the preceding word, or instead to get rid of the syllabic augment and keep the preceding word without elision. According to Didymus, Aristarchus always chooses the second option, as the following table illustrates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solution with augment</th>
<th>Aristarchus’ solution</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>πολλ’ ἐμόγησα</td>
<td>πολλὰ μόγησα</td>
<td><em>Sch. II.</em> 1.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μὴρ’ ἐκάτη καὶ σπλάγγχνα ἐπάσαντο</td>
<td>μὴρε κατ καὶ σπλάγγχνα πάσαντο</td>
<td><em>Sch. II.</em> 1.464d and 2.427b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τρηξίν’ ἐνέμοντο</td>
<td>Τρηξίνα νέμοντο</td>
<td><em>Sch. II.</em> 2.682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἔργ’ ἐνέμοντο</td>
<td>ἔργα νέμοντο</td>
<td><em>Sch. II.</em> 2.751</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

32 See also Herodian in *Sch. II.* 1.464a and 2.427a; Didymus in *Sch. II.* 1.464b⁵. Cf. Schironi (2004: 96-102 [fr. 8]).
In all these cases 34 Didymus defines Aristarchus’ reading as Ἰακῶς. A similar case occurs when the verb has a preverb ending in a vowel, which is maintained instead of the augment:

Here too Aristarchus’ solution is called “Ionic” (with the one exception of Sch. II. 5.425a1 35). In other cases, Aristarchus simply drops the temporal augment, Ἰακῶς 36:

---

33 Along the same lines is Aristarchus’ choice of the imperfect μήδεα κείρε instead of the present μήδεα κεῖρε (Didymus in Sch. II. 16.120a1-2).
34 With the exceptions of Sch. II. 8.163b, 9.492, 11.773a, and 17.279.
35 The attribution of the augmented reading ἐπεδραμέτην to Aristarchus (in Sch. II. 10.354b) may be a mistake on Didymus’ part. In fact, Aristonicus in Sch. II. 10.354a comments on the unaugmented form ἐπιδραμέτην, which was probably the reading of Aristarchus, in line with the other examples shown. See, however, La Roche (1866: 427).
36 Aristarchus’ solution is defined as Ἰακῶς only in Sch. II. 1.598a, 4.213b1, 4.329 and 4.367a1; however, since the pattern is always the same we can safely conclude that
A bit more invasive are the cases in which Aristarchus deleted the syllabic augment ‘according to the Ionic dialect’, without replacing it with other syllables. The meter, however, is never affected by this deletion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solution with augment</th>
<th>Aristarchus’ solution</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ὃνοχόει</td>
<td>οἰνοχόει</td>
<td>Sch. II. 1.598a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εἶλκε</td>
<td>ἐλκε</td>
<td>Sch. II. 4.213b; 11.457b; 13.383a; 16.406a; 16.504a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὀπλίζοντο</td>
<td>ὀπλίζοντο</td>
<td>Sch. II. 8.55a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἱχθαίρε</td>
<td>ἱχθαίρε</td>
<td>Sch. II. 17.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡλπετο</td>
<td>ἠπετο</td>
<td>Sch. II. 17.603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εἰστήκει</td>
<td>ἑστήκει</td>
<td>Sch. II. 4.329; 4.367a; 6.373a; 11.600a; 12.446; 18.557b; 22.36a and 23.106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This survey shows how consistent Aristarchus’ choices seem to have been. The impression we get from these scholia by Didymus is that whenever the meter would allow it, Aristarchus chose a form without augment, either syllabic or temporal. In doing so, he would either divide the sequence of letters differently or change or even eliminate a vowel, as long as the meter was not disturbed. What is most important is that the resulting form was considered “more Ionic” than the form with the augment.

Some other cases of Ionic readings by Aristarchus are attested by Didymus, who for example says that Aristarchus reads κεῖνος rather than ἐκεῖνος, again — and this time correctly — Ἰακῶς (Sch. II. 15.94a). This choice is made especially when κεῖνος is preceded by καί; in these cases Aristarchus writes καὶ κεῖνος rather than the form with crasis κἀκεῖνος, which would imply the full form ἐκεῖνος (Didymus in Sch. II. 15.45a, all the readings without the temporal augment listed in the following table were considered ‘Ionic’.
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15.179b, and 16.648b\(^1\); cf. also Sch. II. 21.62 on καὶ κεῖθεν\(^3)\). An initial ε- is also eliminated (without affecting the meter) in another ‘Ionic’ reading when, according to Didymus, Aristarchus reads οὐτὰρ νέρθε instead of οὐτὰρ ἐνερθε at II. 20.57 Ἰακώς (Sch. II. 20.57a). Why Aristarchus considered νέρθε Ionic is not clear, and our sources are silent. Perhaps he considered it Ionic by analogy with κεῖνος vs. ἐκεῖνος; still, the form νέρθε is used by the Attic poets (Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides) as well as by the Doric Theocritus.

An Ionic-Attic reading is chosen by Aristarchus when he reads the accusative Μίνων belonging to the Attic declension (but also used by Herodotus 7.171) against Zenodotus, who read Μίνω, and against others who read the epic accusative Μίνωα (Didymus in Sch. II. 14.322a\(^1\)

Sch. Il. 4.410a <όμοιητ> ένθεο: Ἀρίσταρχος ἐν ποιεῖ τὸ ένθεο ἀντι τοῦ ένθου, ἵνα γένηται Ἀττικόν, δομιον τῷ “μὴ ψεύσον, ὦ Ζεῦ, <τῆς> ἐπιούσιςς ἐλπίδος>” (Aristoph. Thesm. 870), Ἀπολλώνιος (fr. 15 M.) δὲ διαστέλλει τὸ ἐν, ἵνα γένηται ἐν ὅμοιῃ. Α ‘do [not] place (ἐνθεο) [our fathers] in the same [honor]: Aristarchus makes one word out of ένθεο instead of ένθου, so that it becomes Attic, like “Zeus, please do not cheat [μὴ ψεύσον] [me] of this hope” (Aristoph. Thesm. 870). Apollonius instead separates the ἐν so that it becomes ἐν ὅμοιῃ

In the line τῷ μὴ μοι πατέρας ποθ’ ὀμοίη ένθεο τιμῇ (“therefore do not place our fathers in the same honour as us”) the question at issue is whether to read ἐν as a preposition referring to ὀμοίη τιμῇ and thus have ὀμοίη ἐνθεό τιμῇ (Apollonius’ solution), or to attach it to the verb and have the compound ἐνθεό (Aristarchus’ solution). Herodian’s quotation from Aristophanes must be only a parenthetical remark (much like his observation that (ἐν)θεό is an uncontracted form of (ἐν)θου) to give a parallel for the unusual construction (μὴ with the aorist imperative) that was offered by the Homeric vulgate, but it cannot serve to explain why Aristarchus’ reading made the line become ‘Attic’ (Ἀρίσταρχος ἐν ποιεῖ τὸ ένθεο ἀντι τοῦ ένθου, ἵνα γένηται Ἀττικόν): in fact, Herodian calls ‘Attic’ only Aristarchus’ reading but not Apollonius’, which shows the same syntactic solution (μὴ + aorist imperative) and the same uncontracted morphology.

\(^37\) In the cases where Aristarchus gives καὶ κεῖνος and καὶ κεῖθεν, Aristarchus’ solution is never called ‘Ionic’ by Didymus; still the clear case of Sch. II. 15.94a, where κεῖνος is called ‘Ionic’, suggests that this was the rationale of Aristarchus in all the cases where he read καὶ κεῖνος and καὶ κεῖθεν.

\(^38\) Cf. also Sch. II. 4.410b (Did.).
One possible solution to explain the scholium is that reading ἐν as preverb (ἐνθεο) could seem to be a more ‘Attic’ (= more modern?) reading compared to the more archaic order proposed by Apollonius, in which the preposition was in anastrophe with one of the elements it referred to. Otherwise, we must understand that ‘Attic’ refers to the imperative aorist with μή, as attested in the ‘Attic’ Aristophanes. In this case, it does not define Aristarchus’ reading as opposed to Apollonius’.

We cannot say whether the Ionic and Attic dialectal readings were chosen by Aristarchus on the basis of manuscript evidence, namely because he found them in an “Ionic copy” or in the edition of Homer brought from Athens. Or did Aristarchus himself correct the text? It is also impossible to be certain whether Aristarchus consistently used the same readings in the same circumstances, given that we do not have evidence of his comments on every single line of the Iliad. At any rate, whatever their origin is, these readings all seem to suggest that for Aristarchus anything that was Ionic or, alternatively, Attic was suitable in Homer.

4. Placing Homer in time and place

The above survey allows us to draw some conclusions concerning Aristarchus’ view of Homeric language.

Aristarchus not only perceives Homeric language as different from koine, but also as somehow more ancient (ἀρχαϊκώτερον, ἀρχαϊκῶς). As for the dialectal nuances of this language, Aristarchus seems to notice essentially Attic and Ionic peculiarities in Homeric diction and to reject readings that he considers ‘Doric’. Whether or not he recognized the Aeolisms in Homer is still an open question.

In describing Homeric language, Aristarchus notes Attic usages but does not normally point out Ionic ones, except when a particular Ionic feature does not appear in the standard form; in this case, Aristarchus takes care to explain that they are indeed Ionic but modified (as for example the “shortened” α instead of the regular η). On the other hand, when it is a question of correcting the text and changing it, Aristarchus generally chooses the “more Ionic” reading of verbs without augment.

This data seems to line up with what we know from other sources about Homer and ancient forms of Greek. According to the ancients, the Attic dialect could be diachronically divided into two phases, the παλαιὰ
Ἀτθίς, which lasted until the end of the 5th century, and the νέα Ἀτθίς, the post-classical Attic. Moreover, the παλαιὰ Ἀτθίς was identified with the Ἰάς, the Ionic dialect, as Strabo clarifies:

Strabo 8.1.2.1-7 Ἑλλάδος μὲν οὖν πολλὰ ἔθνη γεγένηται, τὰ δ’ ἀνωτάτω τοσύτα ὄψες καὶ διαλέκτους παρειλήφαμεν τάς Ἑλληνιδάς· τούτον δ’ αὐτὸν τετάραυς οὐδόν τὴν μὲν Ἰάδα τῇ παλαιᾷ Ἀτθίδι τὴν αὐτὴν φαμέν (καὶ γὰρ Ἰωνες ἐκαλοῦντο οἱ τότε Ἀττικοί, καὶ ἐκεῖθεν εἶσιν οἱ τὴν Ἀσίαν ἐποικήσαντες Ἰωνες καὶ χρησάμενοι τῇ νῦν λεγομένῃ γλώττῃ Ἰάδι), τὴν δὲ Δωρίδα τῇ Ἑλληνίδι·

There have been many tribes in Greece, but those which go back to the earliest times are only as many in number as the Greek dialects which we have learned to distinguish. But though the dialects themselves are four in number, we may say that the Ionic is the same as the ancient Attic, for the Attic people of ancient times were called Ionians, and from that stock sprang those Ionians who colonized Asia and used what is now called the Ionic speech; and we may say that the Doric dialect is the same as the Aeolic. [trans. H. L. Jones 1927: 5]

This is not an isolated notion. In his commentary on the Iliad Eustathius remarks that there is affinity between Attic and ancient Ionic (130,43 = vol. 1, 201, 8 Van der Valk: δῆλον δὲ ὅτι κοινωνία τις ήν τῇ παλαιᾷ Ἰάδι καὶ Ἀτθιδί). That Homer was indeed seen as speaking the παλαιὰ Ἀτθίς is moreover confirmed by Herodian, via Cheroboscus (Choerb. In Theod. Can. G.G. IV/2, 86.20 = Hrd. G.G. III/2, 326.16) who says: παρὰ τῷ ποιητῇ ὅντι τῆς παλαιᾶς Ἀτθιδος⁴¹.

Homer thus spoke the “ancient Attic” dialect, which was very similar, if not identical, to Ionic. Such an idea fits with what we read in the Vitae of Homer. Many cities claimed to be Homer’s hometown, including Athens (Vita IV, 245.8; Eust. 4.21 = vol. 1, 6.8 Van der Valk; Su. o 251, pars III, 525.11-16). Among scholarly authorities, Aristarchus and Dionysius Thrax are quoted as particular supporters of an Athenian origin for Homer⁴². They also believed that Homer lived during the period of Ionian colonization⁴³.

⁴⁰ This passage is echoed by Eustathius, Commentarium in Dionysii periegetae orbis descriptionem 820.15-19 (= K. Müller, GGM vol. 2., 361. 23-27).
⁴² Ps.-Plut., Hom. 2. 2: [ὢμηρον] Ἀρίσταρχος δὲ καὶ Διονύσιος ὁ Ὁρᾶς Ἀθηναῖοι. And Vita V, 247. 7-8 [ὢμηρος] κατὰ δ’ Ἀρίσταρχον καὶ Διονύσιον τὸν Ὁρᾶκα Ἀθηναίοις.
⁴³ Procl. Vita 101. 13: τοῖς δὲ χρόνοις αὐτὸν οἱ μὲν περὶ τὸν Ἀρίσταρχον φιλότατα κατὰ τὴν τῆς Ἰωνίας ἀποικίαν, ἤτε οὖστερεί τῆς Ἡρακλείδου καθόδου ἔτεσιν ἐξέκοντα, τὸ δὲ περὶ τοὺς Ἡρακλείδας λειπέται τῶν Τρωικῶν ἔτεσιν ὁγδοήκοντα. Cf. also Ps.-Plut., Hom. 2. 3.
The data collected from the scholia to the Iliad and the information we gather from the Vitae are consistent with each other and allow us to conclude that, according to Aristarchus, Homer was an Athenian, who lived during the colonization of Ionia and spoke the dialect known as the παλαιὰ Ἀτθίς. Perhaps he even went to Ionia, whose language — the Ἰάς — was basically the same as, or at least very similar to, the παλαιὰ Ἀτθίς. As a consequence, Aristarchus could explain linguistic usages that were different from koine by saying that they were Attic or Ionic. Surely between the two variants of the same dialect there were differences, but nuances of both could be found in Homer. This also explains why Doric (and perhaps also Aeolic) elements were rejected by Aristarchus: Homer had simply never been part of the Doric world.
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