

- Schlerath, B. (ed.). 1994: *Tocharisch: Akten der Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft Berlin, September 1990* (Tocharian and Indo-European Studies, Supplementary Series, 4; Reykjavik: Málvisindastofnun Háskóla Íslands).
- Schmidt, K. T. 1997: 'Ex Oriente Lux II: Untersuchungen zum Fortleben der indogermanischen Wurzel *kleu- "hören" im Tocharischen', in Crespo and García Ramón (1997), 541–69.
- Seldeslachts, H. 2001: *Étude de morphologie historique du verbe latin et indo-européen* (Collection d'Études Classiques, 15; Louvain, Namur, Paris, and Sterling, Va.: Éditions Peeters and Société des Études Classiques).
- Solmsen, F. 1912–13: 'Zur griechischen Wortforschung', *Indogermanische Forschungen*, 31: 448–506.
- Untermann, J., and Brogyanyi, B. (eds.). 1984: *Das Germanische und die Rekonstruktion der indogermanischen Grundsprache: Akten des Freiburger Kolloquiums der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Freiburg, 26.–27. Februar 1981* (Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science, Series IV—Current Issues in Linguistic Theory, 22; Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins).
- Vine, B. 1995: 'Greek ὄπρας/ὄπραρ "Awl"', *Glotta*, 72 (1994): 31–40.
- Viredaz, R. 1993: 'Palatalisations grecques: chronologie et classification des traitements', in Crespo *et al.* (1993), 331–7.
- Watkins, C. 1969: *Indogermanische Grammatik*, iii. *Formenlehre*, pt. 1. *Geschichte der Indogermanischen Verbalflexion* (Heidelberg: Winter).
- Winter, W. 1989: 'Tocharian B -aiñ: B -añ/-āñ and Related Problems', *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies*, 3: 111–20.

Accentuation in Old Attic, Later Attic, and Attic

Philomen Probert

1 Introduction

- (1) πηρόν {θέσαν}· ὡς χρηστόν κατ' ὄξειαν τάσιν παρὰ τῷ ποιητῇ. παρὰ δὲ τοῖς Ἀττικοῖς πῆρον ὡς λῆρον. . . . (Σ *Il.* 2. 599b (A))¹
- πηρόν {θέσαν}: (Accented) like χρηστόν, with an acute on the final syllable, in Homer. But among Attic speakers πῆρον, like λῆρον. . . .

This remark comes from the scholia in a tenth-century manuscript of the *Iliad*, Venetus A; as with many of the scholia to the *Iliad* dealing with prosody, its source is the grammarian Herodian writing in the second century AD and himself making use of earlier, Hellenistic, works on accentuation. We are told that the word πηρόν (nominative πηρός) 'disabled' is accented one way in Homer (πηρόν) but another way in Attic (πῆρον). A question that arises from this passage, and from others like it, is that of the Hellenistic and post-Hellenistic grammarians' sources of knowledge about Homeric accentuation. This question has been discussed since the early nineteenth century² and still deserves attention, but it is not the subject of the present essay. Instead we shall consider a different, perhaps less immediately obvious, question: what is meant here by 'Attic'? The language of Plato, or perhaps Menander? If so, how would Herodian have known how Plato or Menander accented a word? Or does the term refer to the speech of some contemporaries of Herodian? Or of some contemporaries of some of

I am grateful to many friends and colleagues for discussions about Herodian, and in particular to Eleanor Dickey for valuable criticism of a draft of this essay and to John Penney for careful editing. It gives me much pleasure to offer to Anna Morpurgo Davies, to whom I owe my interest in such questions, an attempt to understand something about the ancient Greeks' understanding of their language.

¹ Abbreviations for ancient authors and works, and the editions used, are as in Dyck (1995: 7–17) (except that Σ=sch.).

² See Lehrs (1833: 269–71; 1837: 175); Steinthal (1863: 459–60); Wackernagel (1893: 33–8; 1914; 1943: 181–2); Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1916: 8–9); West (1981).

Herodian's sources? Or is the term 'Attic' just used loosely here to include the Attic-based Koine?

Some fragments of Herodian refer to 'later' Attic or its speakers, and further questions arise as to the meaning of this term:

- (2) οὕτως συνθεσῖαι τε ὡς θυσῖαι τε. ὅσοι δὲ προπαροξύνοισι, πταίοισι· τῆς γὰρ μεταγενεστέρως Ἀτθίδος ἢ τοιάδε ἀνάγνωσις. (Σ II. 2. 339b (A))

συνθεσῖαι τε (is accented) like *θυσῖαι τε*. Those who put an acute on the antepenultimate syllable (*συνθέσῖαι τε*) are wrong. For this sort of reading belongs to later Attic.

Herodian prescribes the accentuation *συνθεσῖαι* for Homer, commenting that *συνθέσῖαι* is not Homeric but 'later Attic'. What period is meant by 'later', and how did Herodian know about the accentuation of 'Attic' at different periods?

Stephan (1889), investigating the meanings of Herodian's terms for various dialects, came to the following conclusions. The terms ἡ *συνήθεια* and ἡ *κοινή* *συνήθεια* referred to the Koine in our sense, which Herodian regarded as having arisen roughly after Alexander the Great.³ The Koine is contrasted with five other, 'old', dialects: Attic, Ionic, Doric, Aeolic, and Boeotian. Distinctions are drawn between older and later forms of Attic, Ionic, and Aeolic, but in each case the 'later' form is still an 'old' dialect by contrast with the Koine, i.e. one of the dialects used by authors who lived before Alexander. The 'later' forms of the 'old' dialects are regarded as having arisen at some point after the time of Homer; it is clear from several passages that Herodian thought Homer used forms from various different 'old' dialects, but that he did not use forms peculiar to their 'later' varieties or to the even later Koine.⁴

Stephan's conclusions are well supported and must be fundamentally correct. But Herodian's use of terms for Attic, later Attic, and the Koine in relation to discussions of accentuation is worthy of special attention. Serious grammatical discussion of accents, and the availability of signs for accents, began in the Hellenistic period. It is clear that there was some tradition about the accentuation of some pre-Hellenistic variety or varieties of Greek, in particular about the accentuation of Homer, but it is worth

³ Other Herodianic ways of referring to the Koine include the use of the first-person plural ('we say *x*', or 'in our dialect'), expressions involving the word *νῦν* or *νυνί* 'now', and the term ἡ *ἀνὰ χεῖρα ὀμιλία*: see Stephan (1889: 89–105) (discussing also instances in which the word *συνήθεια* or the first-person plural is used in other ways). On the terms *κοινός*, *κοινόν*, *κοινώς*, *κατὰ κοινήν διάλεκτον*, and ἡ *κοινή διάλεκτος*, see below with n. 7.

⁴ For Herodian's view that Homer did not use forms peculiar to 'later Attic', see passage (2); for the same exclusion of 'later Ionic' forms from the language of Homer, see Σ II. 18. 266a (T).

asking for how many different varieties of Greek, and especially of pre-Hellenistic Greek, the Hellenistic and post-Hellenistic grammarians had information about the accent. Were they really able to distinguish between the accentuation of Homer, that of an earlier and that of a later Attic, and that of the Koine (in addition to various other dialects), or did they have, for example, information about the accentuation of the Koine and about that of Homer, into which they fitted the accentuation of Attic of different periods according to some notions as to whether the Attic of a particular age would have agreed in accentuation with the Koine or with Homer?

Wackernagel (1893: 38) thought that on the whole the Hellenistic grammarians applied to the texts of 'Attic' authors the same accents and accentual rules as applied to the Koine, whose accentuation they knew from their own speech, and he attached little significance to the frequent oppositions made by grammarians between the accentuation of 'Attic' or 'old Attic' on the one hand and that of Koine or 'new Attic' on the other. In some cases he thought the accentuation assigned to 'old Attic' (or to 'old Ionic') was that known from the tradition of accenting Homer. In other instances he thought the distinction arose because an accent that the Hellenistic scholars assigned to a particular word was different from the one used by later scholars such as Herodian; the later scholars therefore recorded the accentuation prescribed by the earlier grammarians alongside their own accentuation of the word, labelling the former 'Attic' or 'old Attic' and the latter 'Koine' or 'new Attic'. He allowed that a performance tradition may have preserved some information about the accentuation of Attic tragedy, but did not elaborate on this suggestion. His discussion of the whole question is very brief and rather elliptical:

Was die alten attischen Texte betrifft, so wurden sie wohl im Ganzen nach der *κοινή* des dritten Jahrhunderts akzentuiert, obwohl für die Tragödie die Tradition der Bühnensprache in Betracht gekommen sein mag. Dass so oft attischer oder altattischer Akzent gemeinsprachlichem oder neuattischem Akzent entgegengesetzt wird, ist von nicht so grossem Belang. Bei Herodian zu B 339. E 54. Ξ 521 und *περὶ μου*. λεξ. 33, 11 (ebenso wie zu Σ 487, wo vom Spiritus die Rede ist) ist altattisch mit homerisch gleichwertig, wie bei Herodian zu Σ 266 altionisch. In anderen Fällen scheint mit 'attisch' der in alexandrinischer Zeit fixierte Akzent der attischen Autoren dem in der Gemeinsprache der Kaiserzeit üblichen entgegengesetzt zu werden. Gehört dahin auch das thucydideische *τροπαῖον* für sonstiges *τρόπαιον*? Ich bedaure, dass mir der Raum fehlt, über diese Dinge ausführlicher zu sprechen. (Wackernagel 1893: 38)

Notice that Wackernagel's view is based on an assumption, which I paraphrased above without comment, that in the relevant passages it is a

fundamentally two-way distinction that is being drawn: 'Attic' or 'old Attic' on the one hand is opposed to 'Koine' or to 'new Attic' on the other. This two-way distinction corresponds in some cases to a distinction between the accentuation of Homer and that of the Koine and in others to a distinction between Hellenistic Koine and the later Koine of the Roman period; either way the contrast is between one older and one newer variety. The intention of this essay is firstly to show that in some cases Herodian made at least a three-way distinction between the accentuation of Homer or of old Attic, that of later Attic, and that of the Koine, and secondly to consider briefly some of the possible consequences of such a three-way distinction.

I restrict attention deliberately to the fragments of Herodian, since the use of relevant terms by other grammarians deserves separate investigation. Scholarship on Herodian is, however, plagued by the difficulty of knowing for certain when something is a genuine Herodianic fragment.⁵ For present purposes we are fortunate in being able to rely heavily on the following good sources of Herodian's doctrines: [Arcadius]' epitome of Herodian's *Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωδίας*; the *Iliad* scholia deriving from Herodian; Herodian's surviving treatise *Περὶ μονήρους λέξεως*; and statements elsewhere to which Herodian's name is explicitly attached. Other sources will be used with caution where they can add something substantial.

A basic assumption, even though a commonly made one, needs to be stated. The surviving works of Herodian on accentuation give the impression that on the whole they describe not a particular variety of Greek but simply 'normal' Greek accentuation, Greek accentuation *par excellence*. Specific varieties of Greek are mentioned from time to time for points on which they differ from this 'normal' standard. I take Herodian's view of 'normal' accentuation to be based on the accentuation of the Koine familiar to him or to his Alexandrian predecessors. In other words, when accentuation is prescribed without comment for a word that was in use in the Koine, I take the accentuation given to be the, or at least *a*, Koine accentuation of the word.⁶

A similar assumption applies to three of the passages we shall discuss (6, 7, and 17), which refer to a particular accentuation as *κοινόν*. Consani (1991: 27–30), largely anticipated by Stephan (1889: 105–26), has shown that Herodian used this term not to mean 'in the Koine' but 'in most Greek dia-

⁵ See Dyck (1993).

⁶ There are occasional passages for which this assumption cannot be maintained because the *συνήθεια* ('Koine') is mentioned as the variety that apparently diverges from what is 'normal': see [Arcad.] 93. 7, 208. 16–19. These stand out as very unusual compared to the number of passages in which Attic or another non-Koine dialect is mentioned as the divergent variety, and I therefore suspect that they do not preserve Herodian's original wording very well.

lects' (i.e. rather generally, not only in one specific dialect).⁷ Forms said to be *κοινά* often happen to be the Koine forms as well (see Consani 1991: 28), but they are not always and therefore not necessarily. Nevertheless, I make the assumption that *in discussions of accents* such *κοινά* or 'general Greek' accents were in fact the Koine accents. If not, it would be very difficult to imagine where such accents could have come from; the grammarians clearly had accentual information about some non-Koine varieties, but their resources were not limitless and Koine was the variety whose accentuation was by far the most accessible to them.

2 Instances of Agreement between Homer and the Koine against 'Later Attic'

In order to discover as much as possible about the distinctions between different linguistic varieties that Herodian made and used when discussing accentuation, it is useful to collect the fragments of Herodian on the accentuation of particular words or classes of words for which he mentions different accentuations for different linguistic varieties. Often a particular fragment makes only a two-way distinction, between variety A and variety B, but another fragment on the accentuation of the same word or class of words makes a different two-way distinction, between variety A and variety C. C agrees in accentuation with B but we know that the term 'C' is not merely a synonym of 'B'. In other words, we appear to have three linguistic varieties, A, B, and C, with B and C agreeing on the particular accent under discussion and disagreeing with A. The passages we discuss first are ones that, as we shall see, reveal a situation involving the language of Homer, the Koine, and 'later Attic', with Homer and the Koine agreeing with one another against 'later Attic'.

NOMINATIVE PLURALS OF TYPE *συνθεσία*

Several fragments of Herodian relate to the fact that first-declension nouns with paroxytone nominative singular are also paroxytone in the nominative plural, except that at least some are proparoxytone in 'Attic' or in 'later Attic' (the first of these fragments was also quoted above as (2)):

⁷ Stephan argued that the term *κοινόν* as well as *κοινώς* and *ἡ κοινή διάλεκτος* referred to the 'original' dialect or to 'original' forms from which other dialect forms were derived. Consani takes *κοινός* (including *κοινόν*), *κοινώς*, and *κατὰ κοινήν διάλεκτον* to refer not to an 'original' dialect but to the consensus of most Greek dialects, but observes (1991: 29) that forms idiosyncratic to a particular dialect are typically taken as derived from 'κοινά' forms. Unlike Stephan, however, Consani shows that Herodian uses *ἡ κοινή διάλεκτος* (with the article) for the Koine in our sense, differently from *κοινός*, *κοινώς*, and *κατὰ κοινήν διάλεκτον*. Cf. the observations of Thumb (1901: 6 n. 1) and Maidhof (1912: 7–8).

- (3) οὕτως συνθεσῖαι τε ὡς θυσῖαι τε. ὅσοι δὲ προπαροξύνουσι, πταίουσι. τῆς γὰρ μεταγενεστέρως Ἀτθίδος ἢ τοιάδε ἀνάγνωσις. (Σ II. 2. 339b (A))
συνθεσῖαι τε (is accented) like *θυσῖαι τε*. Those who put an acute on the antepenultimate syllable (i.e. *συνθέσῖαί τε*) are wrong. For this sort of reading belongs to later Attic.
- (4) οὕτως ἐκηβολῖαι ὡς εὐστοχῖαι. ἔφαμεν γὰρ ὅτι τὸ ἀναδιδόναι τὸν τόνον τῶν μεταγενεστέρων ἐστὶν Ἀττικῶν, ὅτε περὶ τοῦ “πῆ δὴ συνθεσῖαι” διελαμβάνομεν. (Σ II. 5. 54 (A))
Ἐκηβολῖαι is accented like *εὐστοχῖαι*. For we said that retracting the accent (i.e. to the antepenultimate syllable) is a characteristic of the later Attic speakers, when we discussed *πῆ δὴ συνθεσῖαι*.
- (5) αἱ εἰς ΑΙ εὐθείαι παρεσχηματισμένα ἀρσενικοῖς ὁμοτονοῦσι ταῖς εὐθείαις τῶν ἰδίων ἀρσενικῶν τύπτοντες τύπτουσαι, χαρίεντες χαρίεσσαί, ταχέες ταχεῖαι, εἰ καὶ μὴ τὸν αὐτὸν τόνον· ἐναντίοι ἐναντίαι, Βυζάντιοι Βυζάντιαι, ἡμεροὶ ἡμεραὶ (τὸ τριγενές, ἡμέραι δὲ τὸ μονογενές). οἱ δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι (προ)παροξύνουσιν τινα μονογενῆ· ἡμεραὶ εὐπράξιαι τιμῶρια αἴτιαι. ([Arcad.] 152. 21–153. 4)
 The nominatives in *-αι* derived from masculines have the accent on the same syllable as the nominatives of the corresponding masculines: *τύπτοντες τύπτουσαι, χαρίεντες χαρίεσσαί, ταχέες ταχεῖαι* (even if the latter does not have the same *type* of accent), *ἐναντίοι ἐναντίαι, Βυζάντιοι Βυζάντιαι, ἡμεροὶ ἡμεραὶ* (i.e. the adjective; the nominative of the *noun* is *ἡμέραι*). But the Athenians make some of the nouns proparoxytone: *ἡμεραὶ εὐπράξιαι τιμῶρια αἴτιαι*.

The scholia (3) and (4) prescribe penultimate accentuation for the nominatives plural *συνθεσῖαι* and *ἐκηβολῖαι* in the Homeric text, noting that antepenultimate accentuation (*συνθέσῖαι, ἐκηβόλῖαι*) is incorrect (for Homer) and a characteristic of ‘later Attic’ or ‘later Attic speakers’. The existence of a linguistic variety ‘later Attic’ is thus taken for granted, and the point made that its accentuation is not always applicable to Homer. In passage (5), where Homer is not under discussion, the accentuation of nominative plurals of first-declension nouns with proparoxytone nominative singular arises again, but this time the contrast is between ‘the Athenians’, who make certain of these nouns proparoxytone, and, implicitly, ‘normal’ Greek accentuation or Koine. The accentual phenomenon attributed here to ‘Athenians’ is the same as that attributed in (3) and (4) to ‘later Attic’. From these discussions of first-declension nominative plurals we thus learn of three distinct varieties: the language of Homer; the Koine; and ‘later Attic’, also called simply the speech of ‘the Athenians’. We can be sure that ‘later Attic’ and the Koine are not identical because the linguistic forms used by these two

varieties are different. The language of Homer here agrees with the Koine against ‘later Attic’.

ἐρήμος, ἐτοῖμος, ὁμοῖος, AND γελοῖος
 A situation parallel to the one we have just seen emerges from passages (6), (7), (8), and (9):

- (6) τὸ δὲ ἐτοῖμος ἀττικόν, τὸ δὲ ἐτοῖμος κοινόν. ([Arcad.] 70. 7)
Ἐτοῖμος in Attic, *ἐτοῖμος* generally.
- (7) Ἐρήμος. οὐδὲν εἰς μὸς λήγον ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβὰς προπερισπώμενον τῷ ἠ παραλήγεται, ἀλλὰ μόνον ἐρήμος,
 ὡς ἴδε χώρον ἐρήμον [II. 10. 520].
 Ἀττικοὶ μέντοι προπαροξύνουσι τὴν λέξιν.
Ἐτοῖμος. οὐδὲν εἰς μὸς λήγον ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβὰς τῇ οἰ διφθόγγῳ παραληγόμενον προπερισπᾶται, ἀλλὰ μόνον τὸ ἐτοῖμος. καὶ τοῦτο δὲ παρ’ Ἀττικοῖς τοῖς νεωτέροις φασὶ προπαροξύνεσθαι. (Hdn. Mon. 938. 20–6)
Ἐρήμος. No properispomenon word of more than two syllables and ending in *-μος* has *η* in the penultimate syllable, except *ἐρήμος*, as in *ὡς ἴδε χώρον ἐρήμον* (II. 10. 520). But Attic speakers make the word proparoxytone.
Ἐτοῖμος. No word of more than two syllables, ending in *-μος*, and with *-οι-* in the penultimate syllable, is properispomenon, except for *ἐτοῖμος*. And they say that even this word is proparoxytone among the later Attic speakers.

- (8) ἔρημος (ἀττικῶς, ἐρήμος δὲ παρὰ τῷ ποιητῇ) . . . ([Arcad.] 69. 12–13)
Ἐρημος (in Attic, but *ἐρήμος* in Homer) . . .
- (9) διό, φησί, τὸ ἀχρεῖος . . . προπαροξύνεσθαι ὀφείλει. ὁ δηλαδὴ καὶ ἐποίουν οἱ Ἀττικοί, ὡς καὶ ἐν τῷ ἐρήμον καὶ ἐτοῖμον, τοῖς Ὀμηρικοῖς· καὶ αὐτὰ γὰρ οἱ νεώτεροι Ἀττικοὶ ἀναλόγως <προ>παρώξυναν,⁸ ὡς φησιν Ἡρωδιανός. (Eust. 217. 44–218. 1)

Therefore, he (Herodian) says, *ἀχρεῖος* ought (by the rules) . . . to be proparoxytone. The speakers of Attic actually did this, as in the case of the Homeric words *ἐρήμος* and *ἐτοῖμος*. For the later Attic speakers made these too <pro>paroxytone according to the rule, as Herodian says.

[Arcadius] in (6) tells us that *ἐτοῖμος* is the Attic form, *ἐτοῖμος* the ‘general’ (i.e. Koine) form. Consistently with this passage, (7) gives the forms *ἐρήμος* and *ἐτοῖμος* as the ‘normal’, i.e. Koine, forms, and contrasts *ἔρημος* and *ἔτοῖμος*, said to be used by ‘Attic speakers’ or ‘later Attic speakers’. In (8) (and compare the Homeric quotation in (7)) the ‘Attic’ form *ἔρημος* is

⁸ Van der Valk prints the manuscript reading *παρώξυναν*, but as he notes ad loc. this reading makes no sense and it is clear from the context that *προπαρώξυναν* is intended.

contrasted with 'Homer's' form *ἐρήμος*. Finally, passage (9) ascribes both *ἔρημος* and *ἔτοιμος* to 'later Attic speakers' while implying that *ἐρήμος* and *ἔτοιμος* are the Homeric forms. Again Homer agrees with the Koine against 'Attic' or 'later Attic'.

The 'later Attic' forms *ἔρημος* and *ἔτοιμος* have undergone the accent shift known as 'Vendryes' Law': a properispomenon word ending in a sequence consisting of light plus heavy plus light syllables (e.g. *ἐρήμος*, *ἔτοιμος*) tended to become proparoxytone in 'Attic'.⁹ Another word whose 'Attic' accentuation is due to Vendryes' Law is *ὁμοίος*, 'Attic' *ὄμοιος*, mentioned in the following passages:

- (10) τὰ εἰς ΟΙΟΣ ὑπερδισύλλαβα προπερισπῶνται, εἰ ἐπιθετικὰ εἶη ἢ κύρια ὁμοφωνοῦντα τοῖς ἐπιθέτοις· ἀλλοῖος αἰδοῖος ὁμοῖος γελοῖος παντοῖος. ([Arcad.] 50. 1–3)

Words of more than two syllables in *-οῖος* are properispomenon, if they are adjectives or proper names with the same form as adjectives: *ἀλλοῖος αἰδοῖος ὁμοῖος γελοῖος παντοῖος*.

- (11) τὸ μὲν ὁμοῖος ὡς "ἀλλοῖος" ἀναγνωστέον· τὸ γὰρ προπαροξύνει μεταγενεστέρων ἐστὶν Ἀττικῶν. . . . (Σ *Il.* 14. 521a (A))

Ὅμοιος is accented like *ἀλλοῖος*. For the paroxytone accentuation (*ὄμοιος*) is characteristic of later Attic speakers.

In (10) [Arcadius] simply prescribes *ὁμοῖος* with no mention of *ὄμοιος*, suggesting that the Koine form familiar to Herodian was *ὁμοῖος*. The scholion (11) prescribes the same form *ὁμοῖος* for Homer, ascribing *ὄμοιος* to the 'later Attic speakers'.¹⁰ These fragments on *ὁμοῖος* therefore agree with those on *ἐρήμος* and *ἔτοιμος* in suggesting that Homer and the Koine agreed with each other against 'later Attic'.

A parallel situation is suggested for *γελοῖος/γέλοιος* by an Aristophanic scholion and a passage in the *Etymologicum Magnum*, both of which may well have a Herodianic basis:¹¹

- (12) "γέλοιον" ἀττικῶς, "γελοῖον" δὲ κοινόν. ἢ δὲ σημασία ἢ αὐτή. (Σ *Ar. Ra.* 6)

Γέλοιον in Attic, *γελοῖον* generally. But the meaning is the same.

⁹ See Vendryes (1904: 262–3; 1905–6).

¹⁰ The scholion Σ *Il.* 14. 521b (b(BCE³)T) records exactly the opposite of (11): τὸ δὲ ὄμοιος προπαροξύνεται· τὸ γὰρ ὁμοῖος μεταγενεστέρων ἐστὶν Ἀττικῶν ('ὄμοιος is proparoxytone. For *ὁμοῖος* is characteristic of later Attic speakers'). One of the two scholia has clearly inverted Herodian's doctrine; this has to be Σ *Il.* 14. 521b, whose version would make *ὁμοῖος/ὄμοιος* unique among words displaying variation ascribable to Vendryes' Law in having the form *ὁμοῖος* rather than *ὄμοιος* in 'later Attic'.

¹¹ Compare passage (13), in particular, with (10) and (11).

- (13) τὰ δὲ διὰ τοῦ ΟΙΟΣ ὀνόματα ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβὰς ἅπαντα προπερισπῶνται· οἶον, παντοῖος, ἀλλοῖος, ἑτεροῖος· οἱ δὲ μεταγενέστεροι τῶν Ἀττικῶν τὸ γελοῖος καὶ ὁμοῖος προπαροξύνουσιν· οὐκ εὖ. (EM 224. 40–4)

Words of more than two syllables in *-οῖος* are all properispomenon. Thus, *παντοῖος*, *ἀλλοῖος*, *ἑτεροῖος*. But the later Attic speakers make *γελοῖος* and *ὁμοῖος* proparoxytone. That is not good.

The scholion (12) draws a contrast between 'Attic' *γέλοιος* and 'general' (i.e. Koine) *γελοῖος*; passages (10) and (13) also suggest that the Koine accentuation is *γελοῖος*, and (13) ascribes *γέλοιος* specifically to 'later Attic speakers'.¹² The word *γελοῖος/γέλοιος* is not attested in Homer (except in the quadrisyllabic form *γελοῖον* at *Il.* 2. 215), and we cannot therefore ask whether Homer again agreed with the Koine in the accentuation *γελοῖος*. The available facts on *γελοῖος/γέλοιος* are, however, parallel to those for *ἐρήμος/ἔρημος*, *ἔτοιμος/ἔτοιμος*, and *ὁμοῖος/ὄμοιος*.¹³

We shall see in §3 that the situation is rather different for some other words affected by Vendryes' Law. For the moment, however, we merely note that some instances of accentual variation resulting from Vendryes' Law follow the pattern of agreement between Homer and the Koine against 'later Attic'.¹⁴

3 Agreement between 'Later Attic' and the Koine against 'Old Attic' or 'Homer': τροπαῖον and ἀχρεῖος

Wackernagel, quoted in §1, mentioned the variation in accent attested for *τροπαῖον/τρόπαιον*. The accentuation *τρόπαιον* results from Vendryes' Law, as did *ἔρημος* from *ἐρήμος*. We have just seen that for some words affected by Vendryes' Law the proparoxytone accentuation (*ἔρημος*) is characteristic of 'later Attic', while Homer and the Koine agree in having the properispomenon form (*ἐρήμος*), i.e. in not showing the effects of Vendryes' Law. [Arcadius] suggests, however, that in the case of *τροπαῖον/τρόπαιον* the Koine had the form *τρόπαιον*, the form affected by Vendryes' Law, while 'Attic' had the unaffected form *τροπαῖον*:

- (14) τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΑΙΟΝ μονογενῆ τρισύλλαβα προπαροξύνεται· Ἡραῖον (τὸ τέμε-

¹² Cf. Eust. 205. 44–206. 1, where Herodian's older contemporary Aelius Dionysius is reported to have ascribed *γελοῖος* (and *ὁμοῖος* and *ἔτοιμος*) to 'old Attic speakers'.

¹³ There is an alternative tradition (alluded to in the last sentence of (12)) that *γελοῖος* and *γέλοιος* differed in meaning, but this tradition is not Herodianic: see Lentz (1867–70: i. 137).

¹⁴ For a situation in which Homer and the Koine agreed against 'later Ionic', see Σ *Il.* 18. 266a (T).

νος) ἔλαιον Δίρκαιον Κίρκαιον τρόπαιον (καὶ τροπαῖον ἄττικῶς). ([Arcad.] 138. 21–3)

Trisyllabic nouns in *AION* are proparoxytone: Ἡραῖον ('precinct') ἔλαιον Δίρκαιον Κίρκαιον τρόπαιον (and τροπαῖον in Attic).

Further information on τροπαῖον/τρόπαιον is provided by some passages that may well derive at least in part from Herodian but that one cannot simply take with confidence as further Herodianic fragments. They help, however, to elucidate [Arcadius]' statement in qualifying the 'Attic' speakers who said τροπαῖον as speakers of *old* 'Attic':

- (15) πᾶν κτητικὸν οὐδέτερον ἀπὸ θηλυκοῦ γεγονός, τρίτην ἀπὸ τέλους ἔχει τὴν ὀξεῖαν οἶον, κεφαλὴν, κεφάλαιον γυνή, γύναιον ὅθεν καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ τροπή, τρόπαιον. οἱ δὲ παλαιοὶ Ἀττικοὶ προπερισπῶσιν. (EM 769. 14–17)

Every neuter possessive noun derived from a feminine has an antepenultimate acute, as κεφάλαιον from κεφαλὴ, γύναιον from γυνή, and hence also τρόπαιον from τροπή. But the old Attic speakers make τροπαῖον properispomenon.

- (16) τροπαῖον ἢ παλαιὰ Ἀθίς, ἣς ἔστιν Εὐπολις, Κρατῖνος, Ἀριστοφάνης, Θουκυδίδης· τρόπαιον ἢ νέα Ἀθίς, ἣς ἔστι Μένανδρος καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι. . . . (Σ Thuc. 1. 30. 1)

Τροπαῖον in old Attic, to which Eupolis, Cratinus, Aristophanes, and Thucydides belong. Τρόπαιον in young Attic, to which Menander and the others belong.¹⁵

The Thucydidean scholion (16) states explicitly that speakers of 'young Attic' used τρόπαιον, the accentuation prescribed by [Arcadius] in (14) that we took there to relate to the Koine. If these conclusions are correct, 'young Attic' here agrees with the Koine against 'old Attic'. The scholion (16) is striking in using the absolute term ἢ νέα Ἀθίς 'young Attic' rather than a form of νεώτερος 'younger' or of μεταγενέστερος 'later', the comparatives normally used by Herodian to refer to 'later Attic' or its speakers. The use of an absolute term instead of a comparative may or may not be significant, but it goes together here with a fairly precise definition of 'old' and 'new' Attic. The authors said to belong to 'old Attic' wrote in the fifth century BC, Menander who belonged to 'new Attic' in the fourth century. We therefore appear to have a dividing line between 'old' and 'young' Attic of about 400 BC. However, it is important to notice that particularly since the term ἢ νέα Ἀθίς does not occur in any indisputably Herodianic passage,¹⁶ we may well have at least partly non-Herodianic material here.¹⁷

¹⁵ Cf. Σ Ar. *Thesm.* 697.

¹⁶ The phrase does occur four times in Choeroboscus' discussion of the form ᾗδη at Choer. *Th.* ii. 86. 7–24, a passage that Lentz takes to be based on Herodian's *Περὶ παθῶν* (see Hdn.

The following passages on another word affected by Vendryes' Law, ἀχρεῖος/ἄχρειος 'useless', reveal that again the Koine form was the proparoxytone ἄχρειος, but [Arcadius] in (17) states that the 'Attic' form is ἀχρεῖος while the scholion (18) states that the 'Attic' form is ἄχρειος:

- (17) . . . ἄχρειος (τὸ κοινόν, ἀχρεῖος δὲ τὸ Ἀττικόν, ὡς ἀστεῖος) . . . ([Arcad.] 99. 25–100. 1)

Ἄχρειος (in general, but the Attic form is ἀχρεῖος, like ἀστεῖος) . . .

- (18) ἀχρεῖον {ιδῶν}: Διονύσιος καὶ Τυραννίων τὴν πρώτην ὀξύνουσιν, ὡς περ καὶ παρὰ τοῖς Ἀττικοῖς, καὶ ἀναλόγως. . . ἢ μέντοι παρὰ τῷ ποιητῇ ἀνάγνωσις . . . <προ>περισπῶσθη. . . (Σ Il. 2. 269a¹ (A))

ἀχρεῖον {ιδῶν}: Dionysius and Tyrannio put an acute on the first syllable, as in Attic and as the rule demands. . . . But the reading for Homer . . . is properispomenon. . . .¹⁸

Since the sources for other words affected by Vendryes' Law suggest that proparoxytone accentuation in relevant words is characteristic of 'later Attic' while 'old Attic' had the properispomenon form, it would not be surprising if the form ἄχρειος similarly belonged to 'later Attic' while ἀχρεῖος were the 'old Attic' form. This assumption resolves the apparent inconsistency in the use of the term 'Attic' between (17) and (18): in (17) Ἀττικόν refers to 'old Attic' while in (18) οἱ Ἀττικοί refers to speakers of 'later Attic'. The use of 'Attic' interchangeably with both of these more precise designations may seem absurd, but we have already seen οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι, ἀττικόν, Ἀττικοί, and ἀττικῶς used in relation to 'later Attic' (passages (5), (6), (7), and (8)) as well as ἀττικῶς with reference to 'old Attic' (14). In each of these cases we could identify the 'Attic' as 'later' or 'old' by examining other passages discussing the accentuation of the same words; in the present case such evidence is not available but similar inconsistency in the use of the term 'Attic' needs to be assumed.

Passage (17) tells us that the 'general' (i.e. Koine) accentuation of ἀχρεῖος/ἄχρειος was ἄχρειος. The Koine therefore agreed with 'later Attic' against 'old Attic' in the accentuation of this word just as it did in the case of τροπαῖον/τρόπαιον. From (18) we learn that according to Herodian, who

παθ. 326. 2–19). I do not take the passage to be based very closely on Herodian, not only because of the phrase ἢ νέα Ἀθίς but because Choeroboscus' assertion that Homer belonged to ἢ παλαιὰ Ἀθίς represents a view slightly different from Herodian's: see Stephan (1889: 32–6).

¹⁷ I incline to think that Herodian did not work with a hard-and-fast dividing line between 'old' and 'later' Attic, but this question cannot be discussed here.

¹⁸ Cf. the more abbreviated scholion Σ Il. 2. 269a² (b(BE³)T¹¹). Compare also Eust. 217. 39–218. 1.

disagreed with two earlier grammarians, the Homeric form was ἀχρεῖος. The situation according to Herodian is therefore that for this word Homer and 'old Attic' agreed with one another against 'later Attic' and the Koine.

4 Conclusions

In §2 we examined fragments of Herodian that reveal agreement in accentuation between Homer and the Koine against 'later Attic'. The fact that the Koine and 'later Attic' may disagree in accentuation demonstrates that they are not simply equivalent as far as Herodian's knowledge of their accentuation is concerned.

In §3 we examined fragments revealing agreement between 'later Attic' and the Koine against Homer and/or 'old Attic'. These passages would fit much better than would those of §2 with Wackernagel's view that Herodian was essentially contrasting something old with something new (either traditional accentuation of Homer with Koine or earlier with later Koine).

Since, however, the instances of agreement between Homer and the Koine against 'later Attic' (§2) do not allow an interpretation as simply something old vs. something new, there is no particular reason to assume such an interpretation for the passages in §3 either. We need to assume because of the passages in §2 that Herodian had information on the accentuation of a linguistic variety he called 'later Attic' that was distinct from his 'normal' variety (the Koine). We must also assume that he had information on a variety he thought of as being Homer's, clearly not identical to the Koine even if its accentuation agreed with that of the Koine in these cases: from passages (17)–(18) on ἀχρεῖος/ἄχρειος we see that the accentuation assigned to a word for Homer can be different from that of the same word in the Koine.¹⁹

We may conclude that Herodian assumed the existence of at least three distinct linguistic varieties: the language of Homer, 'later Attic', and the Koine. A fourth variety, 'old Attic', never disagrees with Homer where a distinction is drawn between 'old' and 'later' Attic, yet Herodian's evidence for 'old Attic' accentuation cannot have been based exclusively on traditional pronunciation of Homer because the word τροπαῖον/τρόπαιον, with its specifically 'old Attic' accentuation τροπαῖον, is not attested in Homer.

It remains to ask quite what 'old' and 'later' Attic meant to Herodian. We know that Herodian made use of several Hellenistic works for information on the accentuation of Attic, including the treatise Περὶ Ἀττικῆς

¹⁹ For more cases in which the accentuation assigned to a word for Homer is different from that assigned to the same word, or to words of the same category, in the Koine, see the works of Lehrs, Steinthal, Wackernagel, and West cited in n. 2.

προσωδίας composed by Trypho in the first century BC,²⁰ and that Herodian himself was also the author of a Περὶ Ἀττικῆς προσωδίας.²¹ My suspicion is that Herodian took over a distinction between earlier and later Attic from the Hellenistic grammarians, and that these grammarians had access to information about the pronunciation of Athenians and to some sort of folk memory of Athenian accentuations that were no longer in use or perhaps used only by older or more linguistically conservative speakers. Wackernagel's suggestion about the *Tradition der Bühnensprache* of Attic tragedy may very well be relevant. Evidence that the Hellenistic grammarians already distinguished between earlier and later Attic when discussing accents is meagre, but one fragment of Trypho on accentuation is transmitted with the term οἱ παλαιοὶ Ἀττικοί,²² which may go back to Trypho himself. Furthermore, Choeroboscus in a discussion of ἡμέραι/ἡμέραι 'days' and similar nominative plurals (cf. §2) attributes the proparoxytone accentuation to οἱ . . . Ἀθηναῖοι . . . καὶ μάλιστα οἱ νεώτεροι 'the . . . Athenians . . . and especially the later [or younger?] ones', adding ὡς ἀπαγγέλλουσιν οἱ περὶ Ἀττικῆς συνηθείας γράψαντες 'as those who write on Attic usage report' (Choer. Th. i. 403. 16–19). Choeroboscus' immediate source is almost certainly Herodian,²³ but the phrase οἱ περὶ Ἀττικῆς συνηθείας γράψαντες does not look like a reference by Choeroboscus to Herodian but a reference by Herodian to some predecessors. Velsen (1853: 22) suspected, plausibly enough, that the information reported went back specifically to Trypho's Περὶ Ἀττικῆς προσωδίας. In any case, we may draw the conclusion that one or more of the Hellenistic grammarians Herodian used made distinctions between earlier and later Ἀθηναῖοι or Ἀττικοί.²⁴

One of Herodian's Hellenistic sources for Attic accentuation, a grammarian named Philemon, is most likely to be the glossographer Philemon who

²⁰ For Herodian's use of Trypho's Περὶ Ἀττικῆς προσωδίας, see Hdn. Mon. 948. 1–2 (cf. Tryph. fr. 7); Σ Ar. Av. 876c (cf. Tryph. fr. 7); Hunger (1967: 13–14) (fr. 53). In addition, Herodian used Chairis or Chares (Hdn. Mon. 947. 29; Σ Ar. Av. 876c; cf. Tryph. fr. 7, with Velsen (1853) ad loc.) and a Philemon (Hunger 1967: 13, fr. 52, 53) for information on Attic accentuation. On Philemon, see below.

²¹ See EM 804. 20; Σ Ar. Eq. 487a; AP iv. 181. 32–182. 2 (see Cramer ad loc. and Lentz 1867–70: i, pp. lxxiii–lxxiv); Hunger (1967: 14–15) (fr. 58); Velsen (1853: 10).

²² 'Amm.' 73 = Tryph. fr. 12. Interestingly, the difference in accentuation between ἀρπαγή 'seizing' and ἀρπάγη 'hook' ascribed here to the παλαιοὶ Ἀττικοί is mentioned at [Arcad.] 116. 16–18 as if it were simply 'normal', suggesting that the distinction was not peculiar to the παλαιοὶ Ἀττικοί but also characteristic of the Koine. This conclusion is strengthened by the fact that the same distinction is found in modern Greek. I do not know what to make of these facts.

²³ In any case [Arcad.] 152. 21–153. 4 (passage (5)) and our passage have a common source, since the examples εὐπράξιαι τιμώριαι αἴτιαι occur in the same order in each.

²⁴ Cf. the use of φασί 'they say' in passage (7).

lived around 200 BC and made a collection of Attic glosses (so Hunger 1967: 13);²⁵ he will in any case be the same Philemon who appears as a source for Trypho's knowledge of Attic accentuation at 'Amm.' 405 (= Tryph. fr. 15).²⁶ Athenaeus (II, 469 A) refers to the glossographer as Φιλήμων ὁ Ἀθηναῖος ('Philemon the Athenian'), while Trypho's source at 'Amm.' 405 is qualified as τὸν ἀγξωνέα or ἀγξονέα, a corrupt designation for which Frellonius conjectured Αἰξωνέα ('from the Attic deme Aixone'). Every indication thus suggests that the Philemon used by Herodian lived in Attica; he therefore allows us to connect the 'Attic' accentuation discussed by Hellenistic grammarians and then by Herodian with the speech of Athens or Attica rather than with e.g. Atticizers living in Alexandria or Rome.

The conclusion that Herodian's 'old Attic', 'later Attic', and Koine are genuinely separate linguistic varieties, and that his information on 'old Attic' and 'later Attic' is based on Hellenistic wisdom that recorded some linguistic reality relating to Attica, lends more *Belang* than Wackernagel thought to the contrasts Herodian draws between the Koine and various forms of Attic. In particular, by taking these contrasts seriously we may now add further evidence, and some clarification, to an aspect of Vendryes' description of the accent retraction in words such as ἐρῆμος/ἐρημος or τροπαῖον/τρόπαιον. Vendryes (1904: 263, 1905–6: 222–3) thought the retraction of the accent was a particular characteristic of later Attic but that it was also responsible for the accentuation of a good number of words in the Koine. We may now list some words for which the retracted form is specifically attested for later Attic but excluded from the Koine (ἐρημος, ἔτοιμος, ὄμοιος) and some others for which it is attested for later Attic and also for the Koine (τρόπαιον, ἄχρειος). The accentuation of such words should be added to the list of respects in which the Koine combined Attic and non-Attic elements.

REFERENCES

- Consani, C. 1991: *Διάλεκτος: contributo alla storia del concetto di 'dialetto'* (Testi linguistici, 18; Pisa: Giardini).
 Dyck, A. R. 1993: 'Aelius Herodian: Recent Studies and Prospects for Future Research', in Haase and Temporini (1993), 772–94.
 — (ed.). 1995: *Epimerismi Homericis*, pt. 2 (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter).

²⁵ See Wendel (1938).

²⁶ Wendel (1938), and hesitantly Velsen (1853: 19), identify Trypho's source with the glossographer.

- Haase, W., and Temporini, H. (eds.). 1993: *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt*, II. xxxiv. i (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter).
 Hunger, H. 1967: 'Palimpsest-Fragmente aus Herodians *Καθολικὴ Προσφθία*, Buch 5–7', *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinischen Gesellschaft*, 16: 1–33.
 Lehms, K. 1833: *De Aristarchi Studiis Homericis*, 1st edn. (Königsberg: Bornträger).
 — 1837: *Quaestiones Epicae* (Königsberg: Bornträger).
 Lentz, A. (ed.). 1867–70: *Herodiani Technici Reliquiae* (Leipzig: Teubner).
 Maidhof, A. 1912: *Zur Begriffsbestimmung der Koine besonders auf Grund des Atizisten Moiris* (Beiträge zur historischen Syntax der griechischen Sprache, ed. M. v. Schanz, 20; Würzburg: Kabitzsch).
 Steinthal, H. 1863: *Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft bei den Griechen und Römern*, 1st edn. (Berlin: Dümmler).
 Stephan, H. 1889: *De Herodiani Technici Dialectologia* (Strasbourg: Heitz).
 Thumb, A. 1901: *Die griechische Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus: Beiträge zur Geschichte und Beurteilung der Κοινή* (Strasbourg: Trübner).
 Velsen, A. von (ed.). 1853: *Tryphonis Grammatici Alexandrini Fragmenta* (Berlin: Nicolai).
 Vendryes, J. 1904: *Traité d'accentuation grecque* (Paris: Klincksieck).
 — 1905–6: 'L'accent de ἔγωγε et la loi des propérispomènes en attique', *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris*, 13: 218–24.
 Wackernagel, J. 1893: *Beiträge zur Lehre vom griechischen Akzent* (Programm zur Rektoratsfeier der Universität Basel; Basel: Reinhardt).
 — 1914: 'Akzentstudien, III: Zum homerischen Akzent', *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen: Philologisch-historische Klasse*, 1914: 97–130.
 — 1943: 'Graeca', *Philologus*, NS 49: 177–92.
 Wendel, C. 1938: 'Philemon (13)', in *RE*, 1st ser., xix/2. 2150–1.
 West, M. L. 1981: 'The Singing of Homer and the Modes of Early Greek Music', *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 101: 113–29.
 Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. 1916: *Die Ilias und Homer* (Berlin: Weidmann).