

Olga Tribulato, Federico Favi, Lucia Prauscello

Ancient Greek Purism

1: The Roots of Atticism

Purism in Antiquity



Edited by
Olga Tribulato

Volume 1.1

Olga Tribulato, Federico Favi, Lucia Prauscello

Ancient Greek Purism



1: The Roots of Atticism

DE GRUYTER

This publication is part of a project that has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No 865817).



European Research Council

Established by the European Commission

ISBN 978-3-11-135075-2

e-ISBN (PDF) 978-3-11-138289-0

e-ISBN (EPUB) 978-3-11-138297-5

ISSN 2942-1721

DOI <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111382890>



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. For details go to <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>.

Library of Congress Control Number: 2024945553

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2024 the author(s), published by Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston

The book is published open access at www.degruyter.com.

Typesetting: Integra Software Services Pvt. Ltd.

Printing and binding: CPI books GmbH, Leck

www.degruyter.com

Questions about General Product Safety Regulation:

productsafety@degruyterbrill.com

Preface and acknowledgments

This volume and the next two tomes of *Ancient Greek Purism* are part of the series *Purism in Antiquity*, one of the outcomes of the ERC project *PURism in Antiquity: Theories of Language in Greek Atticist Lexica and their Legacy* (PURA), which has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement no. 865817). Chapter 5 was jointly produced with the *ATLAS* project, which has received funding from the European Commission – Next Generation EU and Compagnia di San Paolo.

We wish to thank all the institutions and people who have collaborated in this project and helped the authors of the volume in several ways. Our first heartfelt thanks are for Giuseppe Ucciardello, who kindly accompanied us through the initial stages of the project and could not be part of the final volume for reasons of *force majeure*. We particularly wish to thank him for his insights into Sections 4.1 and 4.2 of Chapter 1 and for his unstinting advice on Chapter 7, Sections 4–6. We also wish to thank Emanuele Dettori for his notes on previous drafts of this volume and his unfailing support throughout. Albio Cassio has equally provided insightful comments and saved us from many blunders. The PURA research team (Roberto Batisti, Federica Benuzzi, Jacopo Cavarzeran, Giulia Gerbi, Elisa Nuria Merisio, and Andrea Pellettieri) have discussed several of the Atticist material commented in this volume with Federico Favi and Olga Tribulato: their expertise in all things Atticist is testified by the number of lexicographical entries from PURA's *Digital Encyclopedia of Atticism* (DEA: www.atticism.eu). Chiara Monaco has kindly shared unpublished work of hers with us. Carlo Vessella at De Gruyter has enthusiastically supported the project of the *Purism in Antiquity* series since its inception and together with his production team has overviewed its complicated completion. Crucial administrative support was provided by the staff of the Department of Humanities of Ca' Foscari University of Venice, PURA's host institution: we particularly wish to thank Elena Scanu (PURA's project manager), Francesco Negri, Sara Furlan, and Massimiliano Costantini.

Our friends and families have provided material help and emotional support and it is a pleasure to take this chance to thank Stefania De Vido, Arturo Knipe, Sergio Knipe, Chiara Maragna, and Thomas Pois here.

The volume is the result of the joint efforts of the three authors, who have discussed all its contents together and shared the editorial work on it. For research assessment purposes, the detailed authorship of each part of the volume is as follows: Chapters 1, 2, and 3 are by Olga Tribulato; Chapters 4 and 5 are by Federico Favi; Chapters 6 and 7 are by Lucia Prauscello.

Contents

Preface and acknowledgments — V

Abbreviations and reference editions — XV

Chapter 1

Ancient Greek purism: An introduction — 1

- 1 Ancient Greek purism: Focus and objectives — 1
- 1.1 A note on terminology and chronology — 3
- 2 Linguistic purism — 5
- 3 Linguistic purism in ancient Greek culture: Atticism — 8
- 3.1 The roots of Atticism: Dialect, koine, and the status-building of Attic — 10
- 3.2 Atticism in the Roman period: Between style and language — 13
- 3.3 The social power of language: The Second Sophistic — 16
- 4 How to sound Attic: The theorisation of Atticist lexicography — 20
- 4.1 Atticist lexicography: Definition(s) and corpus — 21
- 4.2 Beyond antiquity: The Atticist legacy in Byzantine lexicography — 31
- 4.3 Atticist lexicography on language: Preliminaries — 37
- 5 Ways to study Atticism: Past approaches to literary texts and lexica — 40
- 5.1 Studying the linguistic theorisation of Atticism through the lexica: The state of the art — 44
- 6 The *Ancient Greek Purism* volumes — 50
- 6.1 Outline of volume 1 — 53

Chapter 2

Atticism as a form of linguistic purism — 56

- 1 The linguistic classification of Atticism — 56
- 2 Standardisation, prescriptivism, and purism — 57
- 2.1 Differentiating elements: An increasingly militant linguistic ideology — 60
- 3 Atticism within the purist framework: A checklist — 67
- 3.1 The Atticist discourse: Evaluative terminology and impressionistic stances — 68
- 3.2 The ‘Golden Age Rule’ of Atticism — 76
- 3.3 The Atticist linguistic theorisation and its extra-linguistic criteria — 79

- 3.4 The Atticists: Self-appointed defenders of language — 83
- 3.5 The legacy of Atticism on Greek linguistic practices — 86

Chapter 3

Dialect, identity, and the invention of Athenian exceptionalism — 90

- 1 Language and identity — 90
- 1.1 Defining Greek identity: Ethnicity, language, and culture — 96
- 2 Greek: Language and dialect — 100
- 2.1 The origins of Greek: Methodological premises — 102
- 2.2 The diachronic and the synchronic dimensions — 105
- 2.3 Sources: Local dialects and literary languages — 108
- 2.4 The ancient accounts: Monogenetic origin and multilinear descent — 111
- 2.5 The Athenian revolution of identity — 114
- 2.6 Drawing the threads: Athens and the invention of purity — 120
- 3 The Classical dialects: Ancient perceptions of linguistic diversity — 127
- 3.1 The ancient perception of Ionic — 130
- 3.2 The ancient perception of Doric — 133
- 3.3 The ancient perception of Aeolic — 135
- 3.4 Conclusion: Inventing Attic — 139

Chapter 4

The one and the many: Athenian views on Attic — 142

- 1 Preliminaries — 142
- 2 Attic at the crossroads between tradition and innovation — 145
- 2.1 The emergence of literary Attic, the influence of Ionic, and ‘subterranean’ Attic — 146
- 3 The 5th-century BCE sources: The dawn of purism and its socio-political significance — 155
- 3.1 Aristophanes, fr. 706: Language, society, and Aristophanes’ poetic persona — 156
- 3.2 Pseudo-Xenophon, *Constitution of the Athenians* 2.7–8: The language of democratic Athens at the time of her maritime empire — 164
- 3.3 ‘Bad’ Attic equals ‘bad’ politicians: Plato Comicus, fr. 183 and Eupolis, fr. 99.25 — 172
- 3.4 ‘Good’, ‘bad’, ‘low’, ‘high’: An Attic ‘purism’ *ante litteram* — 180
- 4 4th-century BCE Attic and beyond: A language on the move, towards the koine — 182

- 4.1 Old and New Attic: Between bewilderment and curiosity — **184**
- 4.2 Professional languages and military jargon — **192**
- 4.3 Speaking Attic (and) Greek: From ‘international’ Attic to the koine — **199**
- 5 The ‘new’ language of a brave new world: 4th-century BCE literary Attic — **207**
- 5.1 The language of Xenophon — **209**
- 5.2 The language of Middle and New Comedy — **212**
- 5.3 Attic as the literary language of all Greeks — **218**
- 6 Conclusions — **221**

Chapter 5

Attic in the flesh: The language of late Attic comedy and its Atticist reception — **224**

- 1 Preliminaries — **224**

A. Phonology — **228**

- 1 Generalities — **229**
- 2 Retained /a:/ — **229**
- 2.1 Retained /a:/ in oaths — **230**
- 3 The diphthong /aj/ in prevocalic position — **232**
- 3.1 αἰτός and αἰτός (< *αἰφετός) — **233**
- 3.2 κλαίω and κλάω, καίω and κάω — **234**
- 3.3 ἐλαία, ἐλάα, and ἐλά (< *ἐλαίφα) — **234**
- 3.4 Ἀθηναία, Ἀθηνάα, and Ἀθηνᾶ — **236**
- 3.5 The diphthong /aj/ before nominal and adjectival suffixes beginning with vocalic /i/ — **237**
- 3.6 αἰεῖ and αἰεῖ (< *αἰφεῖ) — **239**
- 3.7 Other cases of prevocalic /aj/ and their treatment — **240**
- 3.7.1 Demotics in -αιεύς — **240**
- 3.7.2 Adjectives in -αιος — **241**
- 3.8 Ἑρμαῖσκος — **243**
- 3.9 ὠράζω and ὠραῖζω — **243**
- 4 The diphthong /uj/ in prevocalic position — **245**
- 4.1 υἰός and ὑός — **245**
- 4.2 Endings of the feminine perfect participle active -υῖα, -ῦα, -εῖα — **246**
- 5 Instances of the development /oj/ > /ej/ — **247**

B. Nominal morphology — 248

- 1 Nominal endings — **249**
- 1.1 Dual number — **249**
- 1.1.1 Dual nouns, adjectives, and pronouns — **249**
- 1.1.2 Genitive-dative of δύο — **251**
- 1.2 ‘Long’ datives -αισι(ν) and -οισι(ν) — **253**
- 1.2.1 -οισι — **254**
- 1.2.2 -αισι — **255**
- 1.3 The neuter nominative and accusative singular of ταυτό(ν), τοιοῦτο(ν), and τοσοῦτο(ν) — **256**
- 2 Nominal stems — **257**
- 2.1 *ā*- vs *ǎ*-stems — **257**
- 2.2 ‘Attic’ declension — **259**
- 2.3 Contracted thematic nouns and adjectives — **261**
- 2.4 Genitive -εος of *i*-stems — **262**
- 2.5 Nominative plural of *u*-stems — **263**
- 2.6 Analogical accusative plural -υας of *u*-stems — **264**
- 2.7 ‘Contracted’ genitive and accusative, singular and plural, of *eu*-stems — **265**
- 2.8 Accusative singular and plural of *eu*-stems — **265**
- 2.9 Analogical accusative plural of *eu*-stems — **267**
- 2.10 The inflection of *s*-stems as masculine *ā*-stems — **268**
- 2.11 Heteroclis and metaplasm — **269**
- 3 Comparatives and superlatives — **273**
- 3.1 Short and long primary comparatives — **273**
- 3.2 Primary comparatives with /i/ — **275**
- 3.3 Primary comparatives with alternating -ίων/-ίων — **275**
- 3.4 Analogical extension of the comparative and superlative endings -έστερος, -έστατος — **276**
- 3.5 Comparative and superlative endings -ίστερος and -ίστατος — **278**
- 3.6 Analytic comparatives in place of synthetic comparatives — **279**
- 4 Pronouns — **279**
- 4.1 Reflexive pronouns — **279**
- 4.1.1 The reduplicated personal pronoun αὐτός as a reflexive pronoun (αὐτὸς αὐτόν) — **279**
- 4.1.2 The 3rd-person singular reflexive ἑαυτοῦ/αὐτοῦ in place of the other reflexive pronouns (ἑμᾶυτοῦ, σεαυτοῦ, etc.) — **280**
- 4.1.3 Personal pronoun in place of the reflexive pronoun — **281**
- 4.2 Deictic -ί in demonstrative pronouns and adverbs — **281**

- 5 Derivational morphology — **284**
- 5.1 Adjectives in -(τ)ικός — **284**
- 5.2 Adjectives in -ιακός — **288**
- 5.3 Nouns in -(σ)μός — **288**
- 5.4 Nouns in -ότης, -ότητος — **291**
- 5.5 Adjectives in -ώδης — **293**
- 5.6 Diminutives — **295**
- 5.6.1 Suffix -ίδιον — **295**
- 5.6.2 Suffix -άριον — **297**
- 5.6.3 Suffix -ίσκος — **299**

C. Verbal morphology — **302**

- 1 Verbal endings — **303**
- 1.1 1st-person plural middle-passive ending -μεσθα — **303**
- 1.2 Optative — **304**
- 1.2.1 ‘Aeolic’ and ‘non-Aeolic’ aorist active optative endings — **304**
- 1.2.2 Analogical extension of -η- in the plural forms of the optative — **305**
- 1.3 The imperfect and perfect 2nd-person singular active endings
-θα, -ς, -θας — **305**
- 1.3.1 ἔφης — **306**
- 1.3.2 οἶδας — **306**
- 1.3.3 ἦεις — **307**
- 1.3.4 οἴσθας and ἦσθας — **308**
- 1.4 (Un)contracted 2nd-person middle-passive imperfect and
pluperfect — **310**
- 1.5 Imperative — **311**
- 1.5.1 Imperative 2nd-person active ending of the root aorist — **311**
- 1.5.2 3rd-person active plural ending -τωσαν — **312**
- 1.5.3 (Un)contracted 2nd-person middle-passive imperative
ending — **313**
- 1.6 Dual — **314**
- 2 Augment and reduplication — **314**
- 2.1 Augmented βούλομαι and δύναμαι — **314**
- 2.2 Augmented and reduplicated prefixed verbs — **315**
- 2.2.1 Augment before the prefix — **315**
- 2.2.2 Double augment and reduplication — **316**
- 3 Verbal stems and verbal conjugation — **318**
- 3.1 Thematisation of athematic verbs — **318**
- 3.1.1 Thematisation of athematic δίδωμι, τίθημι, ἔημι, and ἵστημι — **318**

- 3.1.2 Thematisation of the verbs in -νυμι in -νύω — **319**
- 3.2 Aorist — **320**
- 3.2.1 Alphathematic aorist — **320**
- 3.2.2 Sigmatic aorists in place of thematic aorists — **323**
- 3.2.3 Extension of the κ-suffix to the plural forms of the athematic aorists ἔδωκα, ἔθηκα, and ἤκα — **323**
- 3.2.4 Exchange between asigmatic and sigmatic aorist — **324**
- 3.2.5 ‘Strong’ passive aorist in place of ‘weak’ forms — **325**
- 3.2.6 Aorist passive in place of aorist middle — **326**
- 3.3 Future — **328**
- 3.3.1 Middle future replaced by active future — **328**
- 3.3.2 ‘Attic’ future — **330**
- 3.3.3 ‘Doric’ future — **331**
- 3.3.4 Variation between contracted and/or different types of sigmatic future — **332**
- 3.4 Perfect and pluperfect — **332**
- 3.4.1 γέγονα and γεγένημαι — **332**
- 3.4.2 μεμάνημαι — **333**
- 3.4.3 ἀπέκτονα and ἀπέκταγκα — **333**
- 3.4.4 ‘Strong’ perfects in place of ‘weak’ perfects — **334**
- 3.4.5 Aspirated perfects — **334**
- 3.4.6 Participle ἐστώς vs ἐστηκώς — **336**
- 3.4.7 Pluperfect: generalisation of -ει- in the indicative active — **336**
- 4 Notable cases: a (very partial) selection — **338**
- 4.1 Prefixed verbs — **338**
- 4.2 ἐθέλω vs θέλω — **339**
- 4.3 Present ἔδω — **339**
- 4.4 ἐκφυγγάνω — **339**
- 4.5 στρηνιάω — **340**
- 4.6 Future of ζῆν — **341**
- 4.7 Sigmatic aorist of φθάνω — **341**
- 4.8 ἔώρακα vs ἔώρακα — **342**
- 4.9 Verbs in -άζω (and -ίζω) — **342**
- D. Syntax — 347**
- 1 Use of prepositions — **348**
- 1.1 ανά + accusative — **348**
- 1.2 εἰς, ἐν, and ἐκ in place of the locative and suffixed forms of Ἀθῆναι — **349**

- 1.3 μετά + genitive and σύν + dative with comitative function — 350
- 1.4 μετά + genitive with the *verba sequendi* — 350
- 1.5 ὑπέρ + genitive — 351
- 1.6 ὡς + accusative — 352
- 2 Verbal constructions — 353
- 2.1 μέλλω + infinitive — 353
- 3 Subordinate clauses — 354
- 3.1 Final clauses — 354
- 3.2 Causal clauses introduced by διότι — 355

Chapter 6

Before Atticism: Early Hellenistic scholarship on Attic — 356

- 1 Preliminaries — 356
- 2 Methodology and scope — 358
- 3 Hellenistic ‘grammar’ and the glossographical tradition — 365
- 3.1 What is a gloss? Continuity and discontinuity in the *longue durée* — 370
- 3.2 Aristotle’s concept of γλῶσσα — 378
- 3.3 Ἑλληνισμός between grammar and style — 386
- 4 The roots of scholarship at Alexandria: Lexicography between literature and vernaculars — 391
- 4.1 The Peripatetic tradition — 394
- 4.2 Philitas of Cos and Simmias of Rhodes — 396
- 4.3 Zenodotus of Ephesus and Agathocles of Cyzicus — 400
- 4.4 Callimachus between poetry and scholarship: Glosses for a multicultural Greek world — 409
- 5 Eratosthenes of Cyrene — 413
- 5.1 Eratosthenes’ definition of γραμματική and his philological activity — 414
- 5.2 Eratosthenes on comic language — 419
- 5.3 Eratosthenes and linguistic purism — 428

Chapter 7

Towards Atticism: The blossoming of Hellenistic scholarship on Attic — 443

- 1 Preliminaries — 443
- 2 Aristophanes of Byzantium — 445
- 2.1 Aristophanes’ Λέξεις: Scope and structure — 446
- 2.2 Ἀττικάι Λέξεις — 460
- 2.2.1 Ar.Byz. fr. 337 — 462

2.2.2	Ar.Byz. fr. 338 —	469
2.2.3	Ar.Byz. fr. 340 —	472
2.2.4	Ar.Byz. fr. 341 —	474
2.2.5	Ar.Byz. fr. 342 —	476
2.2.6	Ar.Byz. fr. 345 —	477
2.2.7	Ar.Byz. fr. 346 —	480
2.2.8	Ar.Byz. fr. 347 —	483
2.3	Conclusions —	485
3	Aristarchus of Samothrace —	486
3.1	Aristarchus on comic language —	487
3.2	Aristarchus, Homer's παλαιὰ Ἄτθίς, and ἑλληνισμός —	494
4	Collections of Attic words in the Hellenistic period: A survey —	502
4.1	Ister and Philemon —	503
4.2	Demetrius Ixion —	508
4.3	Nicander of Thyateira —	514
4.4	Crates' Περὶ τῆς Ἀττικῆς διαλέκτου —	517
5	Lexicography in a minor key: Isolated Attic glosses in grammarians from the 3rd to the first half of the 1st century BCE —	523
6	Attic words in anonymous BCE collections of glosses on papyri —	529
7	Conclusions —	532

References — 533

Index locorum — 579

Index nominum et rerum — 607

Abbreviations and reference editions

The bibliographical abbreviations used in this book are provided in the list below. Works of ancient scholarship are mostly cited from the reference editions listed in the *Digital Encyclopedia of Atticism* (<https://atticism.eu/lexicographic-entries/reference-editions-of-erudite-sources>). Further reference editions of ancient scholarly and literary works are listed below.

Ancient authors and works are abbreviated according to LSJ and *DGE*, except for: Aeschylus: Aesch. (not A.); *Antiatticist*: *Antiatt.* (not *Lex.Antiatt.*); Apollonius Dyscolus: Apoll.Dysc. (not A.D.); Apollonius Rhodius: Apoll.Rh. (not A.R.); Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Antiquitates Romanae*: D.H. *Ant. Rom.*; Euripides: Eur. (not E.); *Hymni Homerici*: quoted in the format *H.Hom.Merc.*, *H.Hom.Cer.*, etc.; Josephus: Ios. (not J.); Phrynichus' *Eclogue*: Phryn. *Ecl.*; Scholia: all abbreviated with 'schol.' + abbreviation of author; Sophocles: Soph. (not S.); Sophocles' *Ajax*: *Ai.* (not *Aj.*); Suda: *Su.* for *Suid.*; Thucydides: Thuc. (not Th.).

Cramer, <i>AP</i>	Cramer, J. A. <i>Anecdota Graeca e codd. manuscriptis bibliothecae Regiae Parisiensis</i> . 4 vols. Oxford, 1838–1841.
<i>BNJ</i>	Worthington, I. (ed.). <i>Brill's New Jacoby</i> . Leiden, 2006–2024.
<i>BNJ</i> ²	Worthington, I. (ed.). <i>Brill's New Jacoby</i> . 2nd edition. Leiden, 2016–.
<i>CAF</i>	Kock, T. <i>Comicorum Atticorum fragmenta</i> . 3 vols. Leipzig, 1880–1888.
<i>CGMEMG</i>	Holton, D.; Horrocks, G.; Janssen, M.; Lendari, T.; Manolesou, I.; Toufexis, N. <i>The Cambridge Grammar of Medieval and Early Modern Greek</i> . 4 vols. Cambridge, 2019.
<i>CLGP</i>	Bastianini, G.; Haslam, M.; Maehler, H.; Montanari, F.; Römer, C. (eds.). <i>Commentaria et lexica Graeca in papyris reperta</i> . Munich, Leipzig, 2004–.
<i>CPG</i>	Leutsch, von E. L.; Schneidewin, F. W. <i>Corpus Paraemiographorum Graecorum</i> . 2 vols. Göttingen, 1839–1851.
<i>DEA</i>	Tribulato, O. (ed.). <i>Digital Encyclopedia of Atticism</i> . With the Assistance of E. N. Merisio. https://atticism.eu (accessed 17/07/2024).
<i>DELG</i>	Chantraine, P. <i>Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grec. Histoire des mots. Nouvelle édition avec un supplément</i> . Paris, 1999.
<i>DGE</i>	<i>Diccionario Griego Español</i> . Redactado bajo la dirección de F. R. Adrados. 6 vols. Madrid, 1980–2002. Online version accessible at: http://dge.cchs.csic.es/xdge (accessed 17/07/2024).
Diels–Kranz	Diels, H. (ed.). <i>Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker</i> . 3 vols. 6th rev. edition by W. Kranz. Berlin, 1951–1952.
<i>EAGLL</i>	Giannakis, G. K. (ed.). <i>Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics Online</i> . https://referenceworks-brill-com./display/db/eglo (accessed 17/07/2024).
<i>EDG</i>	Beekes, R. <i>Etymological Dictionary of Greek</i> . 2 vols. Leiden, Boston, 2010.
<i>Eratosthenica</i>	Broggiato, M. <i>Eratosthenica</i> . https://www.eratosthenica.it (accessed 17/07/2024).
<i>FCG</i>	Meineke, A. <i>Fragmenta comicorum Graecorum</i> . 5 vols. Berlin, 1839–1857.
<i>FGrHist</i>	Jacoby, F. <i>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i> . 3 vols. Berlin, Leiden, 1923–1958.
<i>GE</i>	Montanari, F.; Garofalo, I.; Manetti, D. <i>The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek</i> . Leiden, 2015.

<i>IANE</i>	Ἱστορικὸν Λεξικὸν τῆς Νέας Ἑλληνικῆς, τῆς τε κοινῶς ὀμιλουμένης καὶ τῶν ἰδιωμάτων. Athens, 1933–.
Kassel, Austin, <i>PCG</i>	Kassel, R.; Austin, C. <i>Poetae comici Graeci</i> . 8 vols. Berlin, New York, 1983–2001.
Kassel, Schröder, <i>PCG</i>	Kassel, R.; Schröder, S. <i>Poetae comici Graeci</i> . Vol. 6.1: <i>Menander. Dyscolus et fabulae quarum fragmenta in papyris membranisque servata sunt</i> . Berlin, New York, 2022.
K–B	Kühner, R.; Blass, F. <i>Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Elementar- und Formenlehre</i> . 2 vols. 2nd edition. Hannover, 1890–1892.
K–G	Kühner, R.; Gerth, B. <i>Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Satzlehre</i> . 2 vols. 3rd edition. Hannover, Leipzig, 1898–1904.
Kriaras, <i>LME</i>	Kriaras, E. (ed.). <i>Λεξικό της μεσαιωνικής ελληνικής δημώδους γραμματείας, 1100-1669</i> . Thessaloniki, 1969–.
<i>LfgrE</i>	Snell, B. et alii (ed.). <i>Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos</i> . Göttingen, 1955–2010.
<i>LGGA</i>	Montanari, F.; Montana, F.; Pagani, L. (eds.). <i>Lexicon of Greek Grammarians of Antiquity</i> . Leiden, Boston. https://referenceworks.brillonline.com/browse/lexicon-of-greek-grammarians-of-antiquity (accessed 17/07/2024).
<i>LGPN</i>	<i>Lexicon of Greek Personal Names</i> . Oxford, 1987.
<i>LGPN-Ling</i>	<i>LGPN-Ling. Etymological and Semantic Analysis of Ancient Greek Personal Names</i> . https://lgpn-ling.huma-num.fr/exist/apps/lgpn-ling7/about.html (accessed 17/07/2024).
<i>AKN</i>	Triantafyllides, M. <i>Λεξικό της κοινής Νεοελληνικής</i> . Thessaloniki, 1998.
<i>LSJ</i>	<i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> . Compiled by H. G. Liddell and R. Scott. Revised and Augmented Throughout by Sir H. S. Jones with the Assistance of R. McKenzie. Oxford 1940. Revised Supplement. Ed. P. G. W. Glare. Oxford, 1996.
Mayser, <i>Gramm.</i>	Mayser, E. <i>Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit. Mit Einschluss der gleichzeitigen Ostraka und der in Ägypten verfassten Inschriften</i> . 6 vols. Berlin, Leipzig, 1970. (Vol. 1.1, 2nd edition revised by H. Schmoll; vols. 1,2–2,3 reprint of the 1935 edition).
<i>PMG</i>	Page, D. L. <i>Poetae Melici Graeci</i> . Oxford, 1962, corrected reprint 1967.
<i>RE</i>	Pauly, A.; Wissowa, G.; Kroll, W. et al. (eds.). <i>Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft</i> , Neue Bearbeitung. Stuttgart, 1893–.
Schmid, <i>Atticismus</i>	Schmid, W. <i>Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern von Dionysius von Halicarnass bis auf den zweiten Philostratus</i> . 5 vols. Stuttgart, 1887–1897.
<i>SGG</i>	Montanari, F.; Montana, F.; Pagani, L. (eds.). <i>Supplementum Grammaticum Graecum</i> . Leiden, Boston, 2019–.
<i>SH</i>	Lloyd-Jones, H.; Parsons, P. J. (eds.). <i>Supplementum Hellenisticum</i> . Berlin, New York, 1983.
<i>SVF</i>	H. von Arnim. <i>Stoicorum veterum fragmenta</i> . 4 vols. Leipzig, 1905–1924.
<i>TrGF</i>	Snell, B.; Radt, S.; Kannicht, R. <i>Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta</i> . 6 vols. Göttingen, 1971–2004.
Velsen	Velsen, von A. <i>Tryphonis grammatici Alexandrini fragmenta</i> . Berlin, 1853.

Chapter 1

Ancient Greek purism: An introduction

1 Ancient Greek purism: Focus and objectives

The present volume is the first of three devoted to the topic of linguistic purism in ancient Greek culture and the texts that sustained it. Together with the entries of the *Digital Encyclopedia of Atticism* (DEA: www.atticism.eu), these volumes are among the outputs of the research undertaken by the ERC project *Purism in Antiquity: Theories of Language in Greek Atticist Lexica and their Legacy* (PURA), which focuses on the linguistic theorisation of Atticism, the purist movement that sought to revive the 5th-century BCE Attic dialect against the evolution of post-Classical Greek. The objective of the three volumes is to elucidate the roots of Atticism in ancient Greek culture, its blossoming in the Imperial age, and its impact and legacy between the Byzantine Middle Ages and the early Renaissance. This investigation of diverse cultural history of Atticism focuses on the body of ancient specialist works known as Atticist lexica. Niche products aimed at the educated elite, Atticist lexica promoted the idea that the dialect of 5th-century BCE Athens as a model of linguistic correctness. Their paradigms of language purity played a pivotal role in the evolution of both linguistic and literary practices from the Imperial age onwards: these precepts were treasured throughout Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages, profoundly influenced Byzantine literary language, and later provided canons of correctness for those in the Humanist West who wished to learn Greek. Sustained by the prescriptions of the Atticist lexica, Attic – already defunct at the beginning of the Common Era – remained an ideal reference point for Greek speakers down to the modern period and beyond.

No existing accounts of Atticism – both as a theory of language and as a style of literary production – have attempted a comprehensive analysis of its views of correct Greek or a sustained study of their reception and influence throughout the ages. While the relative lack of a thorough linguistic approach to Atticism within the sociolinguistic category of purism is probably accidental (although a few exceptions are discussed in Section 5.1), the main challenge in mapping out a comprehensive overview of its linguistic theories is undoubtedly the quantity and complexity of the individual entries of Atticist lexica, as well as the vagaries of this corpus' textual transmission in subsequent ages. The three volumes of *Ancient Greek Purism* adopt a collaborative and multidisciplinary approach to unravel this lexicographical tradition as well as its historical origins and impact on later periods of Greek culture.

Volume 2 (*The Age of Atticism*) offers a detailed analysis of Atticist views regarding what constitutes correct Greek, while Volume 3 (*The Legacy of Atticism*: see Section 6 for an outline of both volumes) addresses the transmission and influence of Atticism throughout Greek linguistic and cultural history. Meanwhile, the present volume tackles the phenomena that led to the emergence of Atticism in the Roman age. We begin with the archaic period, during which Greek was fragmented into local dialects, to highlight the elements of ethnic and cultural exclusivity that later blossomed in 5th-century BCE Athenian society (Chapter 3). We then trace the status-formation of Attic across literary and epigraphic texts (Chapters 4 and 5) and conclude with a study of those Hellenistic sources that bear witness to the cultural ‘monumentalisation’ of Attic as a prestigious literary variety (Chapters 6 and 7).¹ All these chapters in Greek linguistic history – which correspond to chapters in this volume – contribute to the later flourishing of Atticism as a form of linguistic purism that first reared its head in the early Imperial age. Given the tendency among linguists to regard antiquity as a remote *comparandum* for modern views of linguistic correctness, the investigation opens with a theoretical chapter, aimed at reasserting the place of Atticism within current sociolinguistic descriptions of purism (Chapter 2). Notwithstanding the many differences between Greek purism and its modern counterparts, beginning with the latter’s frequent connection with the rise of nation states and independentist movements, Atticism may be regarded as the first historical example of an intellectual movement that sought to promote an extinct variety to the status of linguistic standard, reflecting an ideological and nostalgic view of Hellenicity. The notion of Greekness itself was renegotiated in the period during which Atticism flourished: now unyoked from ethnicity (ἔθνος and γένος), it became a social and cultural construction that continuously expanded to include more peoples and individuals and thus respond to the needs of ancient cosmopolitanism. As a reaction, the broadening of Hellenicity increased the use of exclusivity markers, including vocabulary related to purity (not exclusively linguistic purity).² Section 2, below, offers a preliminary definition of purism and an account of its main characteristics and its application to Atticism. The chapter’s subsequent sections provide a broad introduction to the development of Atticist tendencies in Greek culture. The subsection that follows immediately below offers several remarks on the terminology and chronological boundaries that are used throughout this volume.

¹ See also Section 6.1 for an overview of this volume.

² Dench (2017, 105).

1.1 A note on terminology and chronology

The Atticists were not grammarians in the modern sense of the word, although they might have called themselves γραμματικοί.³ Throughout the volume, we refrain from labelling the Atticist lexicographers as ‘grammarians’. In referring to their views on the constituent elements of linguistic levels (phonology, morphology, syntax, and the lexicon), we use the synonymic expressions ‘theories of language’, ‘linguistic theories’, and ‘linguistic theorisation’.⁴ This terminology is also used to refer to the Atticists’ statements on language that do not necessarily involve ‘grammar’ or ‘linguistics’ but may instead broadly concern rhetoric and style. The Atticists did not aim to comprehensively describe the constituent elements of Greek or to define language in abstract terms. Rather, they selected features appropriate to high-register written and oral communication based on a selected literary canon. By ‘canon’ – a ubiquitous word in this volume – we understand an authoritative list of authors deemed worthy of study and imitation: in Greek culture, such canonical authors were regarded as the best models of each literary genre.⁵ For the Atticists, of course, the linguistic canon consisted almost exclusively of Attic authors (see also Sections 3.1 and 4.3). In this volume, ‘koine’ is understood as the chronological variety of post-Classical Greek that was used in both written and oral communication from the 4th century BCE until, conventionally, Justinian’s ascension to the throne (527 CE).⁶ Koine was not a static entity, and modern scholarship has underlined its internal variation (see further Section 3.1). Several diatopic varieties have been distinguished – chiefly, those of Attica, Egypt, and Asia Minor (the latter two heavily influenced by language contact), but regional variation is to be expected virtually everywhere and particularly in those regions whose local dialects survived for longer (García Ramón 2020, 304).⁷ Diastratic variation (both synchronic and diachronic) is prominently

3 As claimed by Strobel (2009, 105). In *Ecl.* 236, Phrynichus reproaches Polemon for hiring a γραμματικός, Secundus, to correct his writings, although it is unclear to what extent Phrynichus would place himself in the same category as Secundus.

4 However, see Bentein (2021, 406–7) on the difficulty of keeping these linguistic levels separate when dealing with ancient sources.

5 See Matijašić (2018, 1), who also discusses how the idea of the canon has been approached by Classical philology (Matijašić 2018, 7–38). Bourdieu (1991, 57) mentions the canon in the ‘capital of instruments of expression’ through which linguistic authority is defined.

6 For a similar endpoint, see Browning (1983, 53); Horrocks (2010, 207); Rafiyenko, Seržant (2020a, 2). Other scholars prefer to conventionally set the beginning of Medieval Greek to 330 CE, the year of Constantinople’s foundation.

7 Introductory overviews in Brixhe, Hodot (1993); Horrocks (2010, 110–4); see also Consani (1993). More specialist bibliography on koine diatopic variation is provided in Chapter 4, Section 4.

represented in koine written sources. One – admittedly simplistic – way of looking at it is to distinguish between a ‘high’ variety (coinciding with the koine of official inscriptions and literary prose) and a ‘low’ (or ‘lower’) variety used in sources ranging from the Old and New Testaments to documentary papyri, and arguably closer to the vernacular. Recent scholarship has also argued for a more refined distinction of different levels in the written koine, themselves influenced by diatopic and diachronic variation, and for their classification within the socio-linguistic category of register – that is, ‘a variety associated with a particular situation of use’, as defined by Biber and Conrad (2009, 6).⁸ For instance, S. E. Porter (1989, 152–3), followed by O’ Donnell (2000, 277), distinguishes three registers within the written koine (1) ‘Atticistic’ and ‘literary’; (2) ‘non-literary’ (e.g. official inscriptions); and (3) ‘vulgar’ (e.g. documentary papyri of a personal nature). Bentein (2013, 10) instead prefers the less rigid distinction of ‘high’, ‘middle’, and ‘low’. The definition of diachronic variation within the koine is no less problematic, crossing paths as it does with the definition of ‘Byzantine’ Greek (see below). Lee (2007, 113 n. 31) proposes a sub-periodisation into ‘Early Koine’ (3rd–1st century BCE), ‘Middle Koine’ (1st–3rd century CE), and ‘Late Koine’ (4th–6th century CE). Horrocks (2010) distinguishes two main chronological periods, ‘Hellenistic koine’ and ‘Roman koine’, and provides detailed overviews of the main changes that affected both varieties.⁹ In this volume, where we do not deal with the linguistic history of the post-Classical period in detail, we shall generally refer to the koine as the historical phase of Greek that corresponds to the period between the late 4th century BCE and the early 6th century CE, occasionally distinguishing between the ‘Hellenistic’ and ‘Roman’ chronological stages. The subsequent linguistic phase is here called ‘Byzantine Greek’, a term that refers – mostly – to the high- to popular-level registers of literary and official texts.¹⁰ The spoken language of this period is often labelled ‘vernacular’ in the literature, a more correct term being ‘Medieval Greek’. This variety surfaces in texts from ca. 1100 CE and later develops into ‘Early Modern Greek’ (1500–1700 CE), after which ‘Modern Greek’ conventionally begins.¹¹ Given that koine and Byzantine Greek are diachronic varieties of the ampler category of post-Classical Greek (i.e. ‘the entire set of spoken and written varieties of the period from 323 BC up to 1453 AD’: Rafteryenko, Seržant 2020a, 1), the further term ‘post-Classical Greek’ will be used

⁸ Cf. Bentein (2013, 9), who deals with the issue at length.

⁹ Horrocks (2010, 88–123) and Horrocks (2010, 124–88), respectively.

¹⁰ See Horrocks (2010, 220), but notice that he refers to these registers with the term ‘Byzantine Koine’.

¹¹ For this periodisation, see *CGMEMG* vol. 1, xviii–xix; notice that Kriaras, *LME*, subsumes both Medieval and Early Modern Greek under ‘Medieval Greek’.

here as a more general umbrella under which may be subsumed changes affecting the language from the Hellenistic period onwards.¹²

2 Linguistic purism

Purism is a recurrent phenomenon that is particularly associated with periods during which national or cultural identities are at stake or in the process of being redefined and responds to anxieties surrounding the notion that language is decaying or in danger. A common outcome of such perceptions is the wish to ‘save’ language from its natural evolution and the perceived ‘polluting’ effect of foreign features by freezing it at an ideal stage of purity. According to the classic definition offered by George Thomas (1991, 12), purism is ‘the manifestation of a desire on the part of a speech community (or some section of it) to preserve a language from, or rid it of, putative foreign elements or other elements held to be undesirable (including those originating in dialects, sociolects and styles of the same language)’.¹³ Purism, therefore, may be directed either towards external features (e.g. loanwords) or towards developments internal to the language itself; in most instances, however, purism targets both (see further Chapter 2, Section 2.1). The rejection of foreign features has prominently characterised forms of purism that have emerged in connection with political separatist stances, the rise of nation states, the promotion of a certain linguistic variety to the status of national language, or the opposition to the language of a perceived oppressing power or hegemonic culture. From among the many examples of such ‘xenophobic’ purism, we may cite two from the history of two European languages – German and Norwegian –; one from the recent history of India; and one from Canada.

Until the establishment of the German Empire in 1871, Germany lacked political unity. The High German dialectal variety served as a superregional unifying element, a language cultivated in literature and high-register communication. High German is a typical example of an ‘Ausbau language’: a variety within a dialectal continuum that has been elaborated ‘in order to become a standardized tool of literary expression’ (Kloss 1967, 29). Around the mid-16th century, attempts

¹² For approaches to post-Classical Greek, see Rafiyenko, Seržant (2020b); Bentein, Janse (2021b). For a periodisation within post-Classical Greek, see Bentein (2013, 10) who distinguishes four sub-periods: ‘Early Post-Classical Greek’ (3rd–1st centuries BCE), ‘Middle Post-Classical Greek’ (1st–3rd centuries CE), ‘Late Post-Classical Greek’ (4th–6th centuries CE), and ‘Early Byzantine Greek’ (7th–8th centuries CE). Overviews of the main grammatical features of post-Classical Greek may be found in, among others, Horrocks (2010); Rafiyenko, Seržant (2020a).

¹³ For a detailed discussion of G. Thomas’ definition, see Chapter 2, Section 2.

to establish High German as a language of culture on a par with other European languages ('status-planning': Fishman 1991) led to the desire to purge it of external influences, particularly from French and Latin (Langer 2001, 2–6).¹⁴ By the Age of Enlightenment, these prescriptive efforts took on nationalistic political aims, fuelled by the Romantic notion that a people (*Volk*) is identified by the language it speaks, as tellingly asserted by Jacob Grimm in his speech at the 1846 Frankfurter Germanistenversammlung.¹⁵ The outcomes of the 19th-century's highly politicised discourse on language were the attempts to replace foreign words (primarily French technicisms) with German equivalents in administrative communication, and the establishment of private societies such as the Allgemeiner Deutscher Sprachverein (1885), which linked the prohibition of foreign elements with the reinforcement of German national awareness.¹⁶ German history thus illustrates a situation in which purism is embedded in the promotion of a linguistic standard identified as a key factor in the nation-building process.¹⁷

The recent history of Norwegian, by contrast, represents a context wherein language is integral not only to the nation's unification, as in Germany, but also to its separation from a dominating country. Like the other languages of the Scandinavian continuum, Norwegian has been exposed to influences from Low German, Danish, French (mediated by Danish), and English.¹⁸ From around 1400 until 1814, Norway was under Danish rule, a state of affairs that is linguistically reflected in Bokmål, the standard form of Norwegian based on written Danish.¹⁹ During the 19th and 20th centuries, after Norway had attained independence from Denmark, Bokmål became increasingly 'Norwegianised' (another classic case of 'Ausbau': Kloss 1967, 34), although it continued to preserve many Danish features. Consequently, the 20th century produced a more pronounced purist attitude in the promotion of Nynorsk, a sort of linguistic koine based on the spoken Norwegian dialects, closer to Old Norse and betraying fewer Danish influences

14 Fishman (1991, 81) defines status-planning as the conscious attempt 'to do something about the societal functions or reputation of a particular language'. Status-planning is often a major factor in language shift reversal (the attempt to revive a language or curb its decline): examples include Finnish and Hebrew.

15 Young, Gloning (2004, 271).

16 Pfalzgraf (2009).

17 Such purist attitudes, regardless of their outcry against the perceived decay of the German language as a result of foreign influence, failed to thrive in the Nazi period and instead resurfaced in the post-unification period (Pfalzgraf 2006), highlighting that purism as an expression of nationalism is not necessarily linked to a political crisis of the state but to a deeper identity crisis on the psychological level.

18 Haugen (1966a).

19 Vikør (2010, 20–3).

than Bokmål. Although initially connected to the rise of a Norwegian independent state, the more recent Norwegian linguistic debate shows how separatist stances may lie at the heart of purism even after independence has been achieved.

Another example of purist attitudes that convey independentist vindications and opposition to the language of an oppressive power may be found in recent Indian history. Tamil, a Dravidian language, is now the official language of Tamil Nadu (formerly Madras), a southern state of multilingual India, where the most widely spoken language is Hindi (an Indo-Aryan language). In 1956, Tamil acquired the status of official language (another case of *Ausbau*: Schiffman 2008), a development anticipated by Tamil-speaking intellectuals' earlier nationalistic opposition to the use of Sanskrit, English, and Hindi – languages variously associated with the north-Indian elite. These protectionist stances found an outlet in the movement for 'pure Tamil' (*tanittamil*).²⁰ Although this purist movement failed to completely 'cleanse' Tamil (Ramaswamy 1997, 155), its successful status-planning is evidenced by the 2004 recognition of Tamil as one of the 'Classical languages' of India. Tamil purists also objected to the use of English, a language that is now increasingly perceived as a threat to the integrity, correctness, and even survival of local languages. For instance, in France and in French-speaking Quebec, this purist attitude has not only given rise to an ample public debate and the creation of private societies aiming to 'defend' French but has even prompted ad hoc legislation aimed at prohibiting the use of Anglicisms in several communication contexts.²¹ We may conclude from this that 'xenophobic' purism is a constant in societies for which multilingualism is the norm.

We have hitherto focused on examples of purism that target foreign influence, highlighting its connections with political discourse. In its broader manifestation as a refusal of certain undesirable elements internal to a language, purism has surfaced across a greater number of societies and historical periods. Among its key objectives has been the definition of a written (i.e. literary) form of the language in question. To approach this second kind of purism, which is typically archaising in nature (with 'regressive' and 'conservative' being two other common qualifications), we may consider examples from the history of Italian, Modern Greek, and Arabic.

From the Renaissance onwards, thanks largely to the theorisation of Pietro Bembo (1470–1547), Italian culture promoted the Florentine variety to the status of a prestigious literary norm.²² The language of poetry and prose had to be mod-

²⁰ Annamalai (1979); Ramaswamy (1997, 154–61).

²¹ O. Walsh (2016).

²² Vitale (1978) provides an overview of the Italian language question.

elled on that of the 14th-century Florentine authors Petrarch and Boccaccio above all (other Tuscan writers may be admitted into the canon, but with certain caveats), and various language societies were founded in pursuit of this aim, the most important of which was the Accademia della Crusca ('Academy of the Bran'), established in Florence in 1583. This archaising form of purism succeeded in severing much of the literary production of later centuries from other written registers and spoken varieties (standard Italian being a 19th-century creation, itself partly engineered based on Tuscan). Purism also lies at the roots of the Modern Greek diglossia (see the classic Ferguson 1959 for the concept),²³ whereby the high-register variety long employed in formal speech situations, *katharevousa* ('puristic [language]'), was created by resuscitating ancient Greek forms or endowing both vernacular and new words with phonological and morphological elements derived from the ancient language.²⁴ A comparable situation is that of Arabic diglossia, whereby the high-register variety taught in grammars is still exemplified based on the rules of Classical Arabic.²⁵

3 Linguistic purism in ancient Greek culture: Atticism

Like the modern examples cited above, Atticism qualifies as a kind of archaising, partly elitist purism (see further Chapter 2). It sought to freeze post-Classical Greek at an ideal stage of purity embodied by the Attic dialect, a prestige variety associated with the perceived 'Golden Age' of Greece but that had been dead for several centuries. Atticism has its roots in developments that affected Greek culture over a prolonged period. Originally fragmented into dialects (see Chapter 3), the Greek language acquired a superregional standard, the koine, during the 4th century BCE (see Chapter 4, Section 4).²⁶ Its linguistic diversity and rapid evolution induced Greek intellectuals to look back to the dialect of Classical Athens – an idealised symbol of great literature, free speech, and education – as a benchmark of linguistic correctness. Around the 2nd century CE, these nostalgic atti-

23 On diglossia, see further Ferguson (1991); Schiffman (1997); and the article of A. Hudson (2002).

24 See Alexiou (1982); Browning (1983, 100–18); Horrocks (2010, 46–7; 445–8).

25 Arabic diglossia is at the heart of a vast bibliography that focuses on the relationship between Classical Arabic and the language's many spoken varieties ('vernaculars'). For an introduction that also discusses the significance of Ferguson (1959) in the growing field of Arabic diglossia, see Versteegh (2014, 241–58). Versteegh (1986) offers an influential comparison of Greek and Arabic forms of diglossia.

26 Clackson (2015a, 321) warns against superimposing the modern notion of 'linguistic standard' onto the koine. See further Chapter 2, Section 2.1.

tudes, which had not hitherto been organised within a systematic thought framework, acquired the character of linguistic purism proper.

Atticism sought to counteract the changes taking place in the koine and to orient the literary prose production of the time, taking the extensive lexical corpus of Classical Attic as a model. Since aspiring Atticists required guidance in their use of an extinct dialect and the identification of suitable models to imitate, an entire industry of teachers and linguistic experts soon emerged as defenders of Attic purity. This scholarly activity on language is best exemplified by the so-called Atticist lexica, the most important of which are the late 2nd-century CE works of Phrynichus Atticista (or ‘Arabius’), the *Eclogue* and the *Praeparatio sophisticateda*; the anonymous *Antiatticist* lexicon (a modern title); Pollux’s *Onomasticon*; and the (probably) 3rd-century CE lexicon of one Moeris (see Section 4.1 for detailed introductions to these works).

Perhaps the most influential phenomenon in the history of the Greek language (Dihle 1977, 162), Atticism was partly a theory of literary style and partly a form of sustained linguistic purism that became the root cause of a situation of diglossia that was to endure for over a thousand years. It is important to note, however, that diglossia is merely the later result of a long period of Atticising tendencies to consciously model high-register language on Classical Attic and not the linguistic context in which Atticism developed.²⁷ The linguistic situation during the 2nd and 3rd centuries CE was not neatly polarised between a standard language (‘nobody’s tongue [. . .] but learnt at school’) and a ‘popular language’ that ‘had no prestige’ (these are the definitions of Versteegh 1986, 251, who defends this polarisation). The koine was by no means a mere popular variety lacking in prestige, since it was also the written medium of official inscriptions and many literary genres (see further Chapter 2, Section 2.1). Atticising Greek, while learned from books at the highest levels of education, was not necessarily used in cultured speech (the koine being the normal medium of oral communication as well). As mentioned in Section 1.1 above, between the extremes of Atticising Greek and ‘vulgar’ koine lies a broad range of linguistic levels, registers, and literary styles that reflect a centuries-long

²⁷ On Atticism and diglossia, see also Horrocks (2010, 135); Kim (2010, 469–71); Vessella (2018, 35). O’Donnell (2000, 276) attributes to Horrocks the notion that diglossia characterised the koine as well. To be fair, Horrocks (2010, 5) – whom O’Donnell quotes out of context – more precisely speaks of the effect of ‘the continuing role of the conservative written Koine as an official and literary language, the latter ever more self-consciously ‘Attic’ in character’ in the development of ‘the spoken Greek of the educated elite throughout the middle ages and much of the modern period’. There is no indication that Horrocks projects this diglossic situation back to the Hellenistic and Roman periods.

development not only of language but also of literary genres.²⁸ Of course, Versteegh (1986, 254) does not ignore this but acknowledges the existence of a linguistic continuum ‘with a large amount of mobility along the scale’, although he adheres to the idea that ‘koine’ does not exactly coincide with the written language (Versteegh 1986, 255).²⁹ He also assumes that Greek prescriptive texts yield no information on ‘the development of popular speech’ (Versteegh 1986, 268), a view that appears excessively extreme and has recently been problematised.³⁰ For example, Atticist lexicists clearly condemn forms that we find attested in lower-register texts, such as documentary papyri and the New Testament (see e.g. Lee 2013). Although these are written texts, their language is arguably close to ‘popular speech’. Conversely, archaising or prescriptive texts may yield abundant information on ongoing linguistic developments, particularly when we consider the above-positing notion (Section 1.1) that the koine was not static but was an entity wherein diastratic and diatopic variables mixed with – and influenced – diachronic varieties. Any strongly polarised notion of language in the Hellenistic and Roman periods should thus be abandoned in favour of a variationist approach. Any diastratic variety (register) of the koine should only be considered an approximate point in a continuum, with written texts exhibiting features that belong to different points in this continuum.³¹

3.1 The roots of Atticism: Dialect, koine, and the status-building of Attic

The roots of Atticism may be located at the crossroads between culture, political history, literary practice, and scholarship. In the 5th century BCE, Attic gradually stopped being a dialect that lacked the status of preferred variety and acquired a new standing, thanks to Athens’ political hegemony and the flourishing of Athenian literature (see Chapter 3, Section 2.5). Athenian propaganda itself promoted the notion that Athens was the cultural school of Greece, as reflected in Thucydides’ account of Pericles’ funeral oration (Thuc. 2.41.1) and in Isocrates’ *Panegyric* (Isoc. 4.50).³² Around the second half of the 5th century BCE, a less distinctive

28 Brixhe, Hodot (1993, 9). See also Bubeník (1989, 10), who sees the Hellenistic koine as ‘an educated supraregional variety, which represents an intermediate level between high- and low-level varieties of the same language’.

29 At the same time, Versteegh queries the use of the term ‘koine’ also for the spoken language.

30 See Bentein (2013, 6), who applies the framework of variationist linguistics.

31 S. E. Porter (2000, 277) cites the example of the New Testament, which, on the whole, is ‘closest to the non-literary variety, although parts might be considered vulgar (e.g. Revelation), while others could be seen as close to literary (e.g. Hebrews)’.

32 On this topos and its foundational texts, see Bowie (1970, 18–9); E. Hall (1989, 16–7); Saïd (2001); J. M. Hall (2002, 201–10; 224–5); Whitmarsh (2001, 7–8); Most (2006); J. Connolly (2022), on

form of the Attic dialect began to be used in official written communication. This variety, felicitously labelled *Großattisch* ('Great Attic') by Albert Thumb, disposed of Attic archaisms (such as the dual) and exclusive traits (e.g. $\tau\tau$ instead of $\sigma\sigma$ in words such as $\theta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\tau\tau\alpha$) in favour of the convergence with Ionic or the consensus between the other dialects (see Chapter 4, Section 4).³³ The Athenian state actively promoted this 'international' form of Attic, as is demonstrated by inscriptions concerning the Delian maritime League (478–404 BCE).³⁴ Great Attic later became the basis of the koine, the linguistic standard employed in official communication across the Hellenophone world from the late 4th century BCE onwards.³⁵ Epigraphic evidence attests that some local varieties resisted the koine's penetration, but Attic and Ionic – which were genetically closer to it – quickly disappeared from inscriptional documents; the other dialects followed suit at different speeds during the Hellenistic age.³⁶ The written use of some dialects (especially East Aeolic and Laconian) during the Roman period clearly betrays a desire to revamp the old traditions of certain regions: the extent to which these revivals corresponded to actual survival in everyday communication remains unclear.³⁷

Between the late Hellenistic and the Roman periods, therefore, 'Greek' coincided with the koine. This posed several problems to those speakers who were keen to emphasise their Greekness through language. Literature and the exegetical activity on literary texts had caused the Greeks to grow accustomed to an idea of their linguistic past that coincided with certain literary varieties, variously based on the spoken dialects. The koine was none of these, despite later efforts to frame it as a sort of *summa* of the Classical dialects.³⁸ In other words, the koine had no prestigious pedigree. The ancients had a notion that the koine was close to Attic, but this posed the additional problem of situating the precise moment of transition

their significance for Roman intellectuals and their political imagination; and Saïd (2006), who focuses on their reception in Aristides. See further Chapter 3, Section 2.6.

33 López Eire (1993); Crespo (2010).

34 Crespo (2006).

35 López Eire (1996a, 42) prefers 'Attic-Ionic' for this international form of Attic which was soon adopted by the Macedonian kings as a language of official communication and later evolved into the koine. For the koine as a standard, see Bubeník (1989, 7–8); Colvin (2009) and Chapter 2, Section 2.1.

36 See Horrocks (2010, 84–8). The papers in Brixhe (1996) discuss various instances of dialectal mingling with, and resistance to, the koine.

37 Cassio (1986) and Hodot (1990) discuss the Aeolic record; Rosenmeyer (2008) addresses the re-use of literary Aeolic in Julia Balbilla's poetry. Alonso Déniz (2014) and Kristoffersen (2019) focus, with different conclusions, on the use of Laconian in the inscription of Sparta's sanctuary of Artemis Orthia.

38 See Consani (1993, 35–7).

from Classical Attic to post-Classical Greek, an issue that particularly troubled the Atticists (see Chapter 5, Section 1). More importantly, the koine could not be seen as a later version of Attic. Not only did it differ in several crucial phonological and morphological features (e.g. $\sigma\sigma$ for Attic $\tau\tau$ in words such as $\theta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\sigma\sigma\alpha$, or the form $\lambda\acute{\alpha}\omicron\varsigma$ for Attic $\lambda\epsilon\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ ‘people’), but the intense language contact to which it was constantly exposed in lands as diverse as Egypt, Italy, and Asia Minor – to mention only a few – caused it to evolve rapidly beyond the language that was preserved in the literary texts of the past. The ‘global’ language of the Graeco-Roman world,³⁹ the koine was too unstable and new a variety to attain prestige in the eyes of the most learned Greeks.⁴⁰

The interaction and historical development of these various factors contributed to the emergence of Atticism as a purist reaction to the diachronic evolution of Greek. The purists turned to Attic with reason. In addition to the above-mentioned prestige-acquiring factors, the status of Attic as the cultural language of post-Classical Greece was also constructed by the intellectuals who were active in Alexandria and other seats of learning. Scholars such as Eratosthenes of Cyrene (Chapter 6, Section 5), Aristophanes of Byzantium (Chapter 7, Section 2), and Aristarchus of Samothrace (Chapter 7, Section 3) worked on editing and explaining the poetic texts of the archaic and Classical periods, and this exegetical effort required that they understand the language of the texts from within as they made informed decisions as to where and how to intervene by correcting errors or refuting dubious authorial attributions. Atticist lexicography, for its part, has its scholarly roots in the collections of rare words ($\gamma\lambda\tilde{\omega}\sigma\sigma\alpha\iota$) or notable terms ($\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\xi\epsilon\iota\varsigma$) assembled in the Hellenistic age, which offered a means of reflecting on language before the birth of grammar as a discrete field of learning.⁴¹ As a literary language, Attic took centre-stage in the activity of the Hellenistic scholars.

39 For the Roman Empire as a kind of proto-globalised world, see Dench (2017, 99). B. Gray (2022) is a recent exploration of the Hellenistic roots of ancient cultural cosmopolitanism. An account of multilingualism and its ties with identity in Graeco-Roman society may be found in Clackson (2015b, 63–95).

40 This is what Clackson (2015b, 58) describes as a ‘lack of acceptance’. Note, however, that the koine did receive acceptance in many other quarters: see Chapter 2, Section 2.1.

41 For an overview of ancient grammar, see Wouters, Swiggers (2015). Modern scholarship disagrees as to whether the Alexandrians had an interest in (and notion of) prescriptive grammar proper: see the positive answers of Erbse (1980); Ax (1982); Matthaios (1999); Matthaios (2011), versus the more cautious approaches of Siebenborn (1976, 30–1) and Schenkeveld (1994, 278; 281). A detailed discussion of the debate is provided by Pagani (2011); Matthaios (2020a, 272–8) (= Matthaios 2015b, 196–202); a shorter overview in Montana (2020b, 214–7) (= Montana 2015, 140–3). See further the discussion in Chapter 6, Section 3.

Athenian literature was central to the Alexandrian scholars' creation of the Classical canon. Joyce Connolly (2022, 212) demonstrates how this typically Hellenistic preoccupation became 'a significant factor in the history of conceptualising forms of group belonging' in the Graeco-Roman world.⁴² Just as Athens had been elevated to a universal symbol of learning, Attic was the privileged focus of an erudite activity that, while not equal to a theory of 'linguistics' or 'grammar', nevertheless placed much emphasis on language⁴³ and not solely on literary expression.⁴⁴ Atticist lexicography is much indebted to these pioneers' insights. In the multilingual Hellenistic world, Attic literature and its language gradually became an imaginative cultural focus that later, under Roman rule, came to embody the canonical knowledge that all educated individuals of the empire had to master if they wished to be admitted to the elite group.⁴⁵

3.2 Atticism in the Roman period: Between style and language

The transformation of Attic into a cultural monument – a linguistic means of re-enacting the past and through it ennobling the present – is part of a wider network of variously classicising, nostalgic, and archaising currents that had run through Greek culture for centuries. However, it was only around the 1st–2nd centuries CE, and most notably at Rome, that these trends blossomed into purism.⁴⁶ To begin with, around the 1st century BCE, Atticist tendencies emerge as a theory of *mimesis/imitatio* (Dihle 1977, 162), a practice that lay at the heart of the classicism of the first centuries BCE and CE and that developed particularly in

42 There is no comprehensive study of Greek literary canons: see Matijašić (2018, 1). Studies that deal with Hellenistic scholarship and its impact on later views of canons are Nicolai (1992, 250–340); Matijašić (2018); de Jonge (2022a); de Jonge (2022b). Matijašić shows how Alexandrian views of the Attic canon were partly shaped by late 5th- and 4th-century BCE Athenian culture: see especially Matijašić (2018, 128–35).

43 As recognised by Pfeiffer (1968, 197–8), followed, e.g., by Ax (1982, 96); Pagani (2011, 23–4); Montana (2020b, 215–7) (= Montana 2015, 140–3).

44 See, e.g., Pfeiffer (1968, 202) on Aristophanes of Byzantium's interest 'in the spoken language of his day': see Chapter 7, Section 2.

45 In the following discussion, 'elite' will be defined following definition of the γνώριμοι 'notables' in Arist. *Pol.* 1291b.28–30. They are characterised by wealth (πλοῦτος), nobility of birth, (εὐγένεια), virtue (ἀρετή), and education (παιδεία): see Ober (1989, 11–7).

46 The dichotomy that distinguishes 'stylistic' and 'linguistic' Atticism (on which see e.g. Bowie 1970, 36; Swain 1996, 20; Probert 2011, 269) is modern (see O'Sullivan 2015, 136) but nonetheless useful. Cf. also Chapter 6, Section 2.

Greek (and Latin) oratory and prose.⁴⁷ Of course, as an integral aspect of style, language was not absent from early Atticist reflections (O’Sullivan 2015). However, these early reflections did not entail a prescriptive attitude (see further Chapter 6, Section 2).

The ideology of classicism requires conformity to and the embodiment of Classical values. James I. Porter (2006, 310) argues that ancient literary criticism approached this task through the investigation of how a Classical text *sounded*. He explicitly mentions Atticism and purism as phenomena in which sonority – that is, how one’s language sounds – is a ‘marker of status’. Porter goes on to demonstrate that in the classicist ideology, the antiquity of sound (i.e. of language) transcends the social dimension, being profoundly associated with the pleasurable associations and feelings that lie at the heart of the classicist connection with the past and its resonance in the present.⁴⁸ While Porter is concerned with the role that sound played in ancient literary criticism and classicising practices, it is worth noticing that his intuition is confirmed by social psychology, which has demonstrated that nostalgia (a longing for the past) contributes positively to social connectedness and solidarity: the desire to reconnect with the past creates a new community within the present society, an ideal group that shares the same values and is like-minded.⁴⁹ As a literary practice, classicism forged its connection with the past through the emulation of ancient authors. In rhetorical theory, the authors deemed worthy of imitation were primarily the orators and prose writers of 5th- and 4th-century BCE Attic literature, who served as a model for those who wished to revive the glorious Athenian past after a period of perceived decline in oratory and public life in general.⁵⁰ The cultivation of a certain language in prose was part of this cultural and educational programme, but not its sole component. This is evident in Dionysius of Halicarnassus’ stylistic theorisation.⁵¹ Dionysius

47 We leave aside here the vexed question of whether ‘Atticism’ (as opposed to a more general interest in Attic literature and classicism) was born in Rome: for this classic debate in scholarship, see Dihle (1977); Wisse (1995); O’Sullivan (2015, 140–6); Kim (2017); Kim (2022, 272–5). As Wisse (1995, 71) remarks ‘what the Roman and Greek variants [i.e., of Atticism] conspicuously have in common is the rejection of the oratory and prose literature from the whole period that we call Hellenistic’.

48 J. I. Porter (2006, 314). See also J. Connolly’s (2022) investigation of ‘voice’.

49 See Routledge *et al.* (2011); Routledge (2016, 52–3; 56–8); Juhl, Biskas (2023). On nostalgia as a driving factor in Greek archaism, see the foundational Bowie (1970). J. Connolly (2022) explores the relationship between individual nostalgia (‘longing’) and the construction of collective belonging in the ideology of Graeco-Roman classicism.

50 For this rhetoric of decline and regeneration in Greek classicism of the period, see de Jonge (2008, 10–2) who discusses D.H. *Orat. Vett.* 1–3, p. 3–6 Usener–Rademacher.

51 See Hidber (1996); de Jonge (2008); Wiater (2011).

marks a fundamental turning point in the evolution of Atticising tendencies, providing unique – but probably highly personal (see below) – insights into at least some of the attitudes that may have characterised the 1st century BCE.⁵²

Although Dionysius' classicism foreshadows later linguistic Atticism in many respects (the emphasis on Attic authors and language is a necessary part of style), it is far more open-minded in terms of both the canon (with the full range of 5th- and 4th-century BCE Attic prose authors being represented) and the approach to linguistic correctness. Like Cicero in his criticism of the Roman imitators of Attic oratory (the *Attici*), Dionysius refuses the idea that oratory should only look to Lysias and Hyperides, representatives of the 'plain style'. His canon of models is wider.⁵³ He selects them based on each practical aim that he addresses (e.g. composition, descriptions, digressions, etc.), and his views on each author's merits change based on the author's relative strengths and weaknesses. The concrete organisation of Dionysius' rhetorical works makes it clear that one should not study and imitate Attic literature exclusively. At various points of his stylistic discussions, Dionysius presents his reader with positive examples from authors as diverse as Homer (e.g. on his pleasing combination of words, *Comp.* 3, p. 9.17–12.3 Usener–Radermacher), Pindar (in *Comp.* 22, p. 99.2–5 Usener–Radermacher treated as model of 'austere composition', σύνθεσις γλαφυρά), and – above all – Herodotus. Dionysius never states that one should not imitate Herodotus on the grounds that he writes in Ionic: not only does Dionysius consider Herodotus the purest model of Ionic, as Thucydides is of Attic (*Pomp.* 3.16, p. 239.8–10 Usener–Radermacher), but he actually prefers Herodotus' choice of words, composition, varied use of figures of speech, and general charm (*Thuc.* 23, p. 360.12–24 Usener–Radermacher; *Comp.* 3, p. 12.4–15.2 Usener–Radermacher; *Pomp.* 3.2, p. 233.2–3 Usener–Radermacher) to Thucydides' dissonant style (*Thuc.* 24, p. 360.25–364.2 Usener–Radermacher).⁵⁴ Moreover, concerning Attic, Dionysius establishes no clear boundaries as to what qualifies as 'admissible Attic' and what does not: he is interested not in a 'linguistic' definition of Attic but in identifying the best models for each stylistic purpose.

52 De Jonge (2008, 3–4) makes a good case for Dionysius' usefulness as a source on contemporary lost linguistic thought. Rhetorical theory is a neighbouring area of ancient grammar, and Dionysius is a unique source in that his rhetorical corpus has survived almost entirely, while all works on language from the 1st century BCE have been lost. See also Chapter 6, Section 2 and below for some caveats. On the 1st century BCE as an important point in Greek intellectual history, see the essays in Schmitz, Wiater (2011b).

53 See discussion in de Jonge (2022a).

54 On Dionysius on Herodotus and Thucydides, see Wiater (2011, 132–49); Matijašić (2018, 73–8); de Jonge (2022a, 325; 339); cf. Chapter 3, Section 3.

The acquisition of this linguistic orientation, which evolved into markedly prescriptive and purist positions, is the result of the rhetorical theory of the following period. The extent to which this attitude was influenced by Roman Atticism, a character of which had been, since the beginning, the reflection on the purity of the language (*Latinitas*) is uncertain.⁵⁵ The assessment of this matter is marred by the fact that, Dionysius aside, the surviving Greek sources from the period preceding the flourishing of linguistic Atticism are very scarce.⁵⁶ The question of to what extent Dionysius, with his lack of prescriptive (or proto-purist) inclinations, can be considered a reliable reflection of the general orientation of Greek rhetoric and grammar of his times remains unresolved. Greek linguistic thought during this period was already oriented towards the question of linguistic correctness (ἑλληνισμός, the equivalent of *Latinitas*).⁵⁷ It is not impossible, therefore, that proto-Atticist currents ran below the rhetorical-stylistic reflection of the time, although such currents do not emerge prominently, or with a clear prescriptive bent, in the extant sources (see further Chapter 6, Section 3.3).

3.3 The social power of language: The Second Sophistic

The 2nd century CE witnessed a major shift of perspective compared to earlier surviving sources, a shift that manifested in the considerably sharper focus on the modelling of language on Attic and in the restriction of the range of literary models deemed suitable for imitation. Atticism's new orientation is embodied in the production of the so-called 'Second Sophistic': orators, rhetors, and prose writers, such as Dio of Prusa, Herodes Atticus, Aelius Aristides, and Aelian who were active roughly in the Nerva–Antonine age (96–192 CE) until before the mid-3rd century CE.⁵⁸ The endpoint is traditionally set around the death of Flavius Philostratus (ca. 170–245 CE), whose *Lives of the Sophists* include a vivid account of the most important rhetors of this period. Philostratus also coined the expression 'Second Sophistic' (δευτέρα σοφιστική) to refer to these rhetors (Philostr. *VS* 1.481). The bibliography on this literary and cultural phenomenon is now substan-

⁵⁵ See Morin (2001).

⁵⁶ A discussion of earlier sources was undertaken by O'Sullivan (1997).

⁵⁷ See Hintzen (2011); Pagani (2015); Clackson (2015a); and Chapter 6, Section 3.3.

⁵⁸ On periodisation and its shifting boundaries, see Swain (1996, 1–6); Schmitz (1997, 33); Johnson, Richter (2017, 3–4).

tial.⁵⁹ Simplifying to the extreme, the common denominator found in studies from Bowersock (1969) onwards has been the promotion of the Second Sophistic, which was previously perceived as an unoriginal movement that parasitically fed on Classical models, to the standing of a prominent cultural phenomenon with a strong socio-political significance.⁶⁰ An examination of the individual authors and the topics treated in their works lies beyond the scope of this Introduction. Here, rather, we shall dwell on certain aspects pertaining to the role that language and education played in the ideological construction of the Second Sophistic, which are in turn reflected in the lexicographical production of the time.

In this light, the volumes *Hellenism and Empire* by Simon Swain (1996) and *Bildung und Macht* by Thomas Schmitz (1997) remain fundamental. Published almost simultaneously, these ground-breaking studies have revolutionised approaches to the linguistic disputes of Imperial society. Swain and Schmitz are unanimous in their criticism of exclusively literary approaches to the Second Sophistic (like those of Reardon 1971, and to an extent also G. Anderson 1993) and their defence of a wider socio-political reading as a way of revealing the organising principles of Graeco-Roman elite identity.⁶¹ These two works' importance is reflected in many later studies that refrain from an independent or closer investigation of Second Sophistic language practices and largely rely on Swain and Schmitz in this respect.⁶²

Swain's (1996) pioneering approach investigates language in the opening chapters of a volume that tackles the Greek cultural milieu of the Imperial age and its relationship with Classical legacy. He demonstrates how the ongoing negotiation of the boundaries of the past and of the ways to imitate it lay at the heart of the Second Sophistic's broad cultural programme. The emphasis on 5th-century

59 For the latest general overview, see Richter, Johnson (2017). The essays in Goldhill (2001); Borg (2004); T. Schmidt, Fleury, (2011) also contain some valuable discussions. Henderson (2011) explores reactions to the Second Sophistic elite ideology (what he calls 'counter' or 'sub-sophistic discourse').

60 Speaking of the Second Sophistic elite's confidence, (Swain 1996, 6) defines it as 'a feeling of great importance touching on the sources of power and the rights to exercise it'. A discussion of earlier approaches to the Second Sophistic is provided in Schmitz (1997, 9–18).

61 For Swain, the Second Sophistic and Atticism must be tackled as 'a disclosure of social and political events quite as much as an expression of literary tastes' (Swain 1996, 7). This orientation is then followed, for example, by Whitmarsh (2001, 17–20). On the issue of a 'Graeco-Roman' identity in Imperial society, where the boundaries between the notions of 'Greek' and 'Roman' may be blurred, see Schmitz, Wiater (2011a, 25–42, esp. 26–7); Dench (2017); J. Connolly (2022).

62 Examples include Whitmarsh (2001), who clarifies from the outset that his work is not concerned with 'the politics of literary language, the intense debates over 'Atticist' morphology and style' (Whitmarsh 2001, 1); Whitmarsh (2005, 41–7); the companion overview of Kim (2010, 469 and *passim*); and J. Connolly (2022).

BCE culture and its democratic ideals also acquired a special importance because it was integral to the promotion of Rome as the new Athens that was already in play in Dionysius of Halicarnassus' *Roman Antiquities*.⁶³ Graeco-Roman elite identity was thus organised around two main principles: the exhibition of a connection with the Classical past and the production of practical tools (notably, the Atticist lexica) with which Classical language could be replicated by those who wished to belong to the dominant cultural system.⁶⁴ Language, already a marker of identity in the archaic and Classical periods (see Chapter 3), becomes the expression of a transregional socio-cultural elite, an ideal community of hellenophones based on the unifying power of tradition.⁶⁵ The linguistic debates of the period unfolded precisely over the relationship with the past. As Swain (1996, 7) notes, post-Classical Greek was already 'widely polarised' between educated and uneducated Greek, but its closeness to, or distance from, Classical Greek was really a matter of degrees. This explains the oscillations in the linguistic approaches of Imperial Greek literature, including the Second Sophistic. Some authors and speakers adopted a more exclusive stance, as embodied by Atticism. Others opted for a more tolerant classicism that, being less uncompromising, was also more appealing to non-Greeks.⁶⁶

Like Swain, Schmitz (1997) ascribes to education (παιδεία) a fundamental status in the social hierarchy of the empire and in the construction of a Greek identity on a non-political basis.⁶⁷ However, he engages more closely than Swain with the role that public service (euergetism) and mastery of culture played in elite displays of status in a politically stable but socially stagnant system.⁶⁸ Schmitz addresses the question of whether education was also pursued as a means of social ascent, a question answered affirmatively by Bowersock (1969) but negatively by Bowie (1982). On the whole, Schmitz agrees with Bowie's assertion that education

⁶³ Swain (1996, 21–7).

⁶⁴ Swain (1996, 8).

⁶⁵ Swain (1996, 7–9). See also Whitmarsh (2001, 3) on Swain's views on the matter. He discusses identity at length: see especially Whitmarsh (2001, 20–9).

⁶⁶ On these varieties within Atticising practices, see also Kim (2017, 49). Whitmarsh (2001, 7) engages with the arbitrariness between 'the accepted and the ludicrous' in attempts at imitating Classical Attic.

⁶⁷ On this last point, see Schmitz (1997, 175–81). On παιδεία in Imperial Greek society, see Whitmarsh (2001, 90–130) and, for an overview of the concept with bibliography, see Whitmarsh (2001, 5 with n. 14), as well as the essays in Borg (2004).

⁶⁸ See Schmitz (1997, 94). A similar reading may be found already in Bowie (1970, 38). Ober (1989, 248) defines status as 'a broader and more fluid category than class [. . .] specifically linked to consciousness'. He isolates 'birth and behaviour' (i.e., γένος and ἄρετή) as the two characteristics that distinguish status from class.

was only secondary to class and hereditary rights in the documented ascension of some sophists to leading socio-political roles. In framing παιδεία and language as ‘commodities’ that have a ‘market value’ and embody the superiority of those who possess them, Schmitz denies that they were contributors to real social mobility despite the benefits that they offered in terms of economic reward, citizenship, and patronage.⁶⁹ By contrast, drawing upon Pierre Bourdieu’s cultural sociology, Schmitz regards παιδεία as integral to the *status quo* of power relations.⁷⁰ For him, the Second Sophistic reproduced social hierarchies through culture, thus bolstering the social superiority of the elite.⁷¹

This radical approach presents several problems, including the fact that it appears to be too abstract a construction, with a lack of factual evidence.⁷² However, it provides some food for thought for the investigation of Atticising practices as a form of language purism. Cross-culturally, many purist attitudes conceal beneath a patina of elitism the belief that anyone can achieve personal and social betterment by mastering language to an idealised standard (see further Chapter 2, Section 3.3). This would suggest that the goal of Atticist handbooks was to give would-be Atticists an opportunity to attain the same level as the educated elite. By contrast, Schmitz argues that the aristocratic organisation of Imperial Graeco-Roman society in fact concealed the reality of the inalienable subordination of non-aristocrats behind democratic pretensions and the rhetoric of a shared παιδεία (a topos of the Second Sophistic: what Schmitz 1997, 40 calls the ‘mask of the ancient’).⁷³ He highlights the ubiquitous emphasis found in the sophists’ declamations and the lexica on the ‘false’ παιδεία of those who reach high-level education too late or too imperfectly (the ὀψιμαθεῖς).⁷⁴ Here lies, in Schmitz’s opinion, the profoundly conservative character of the cultural programme of the Second Sophistic and of Atticism, whereby true παιδεία does not reside uniquely in one’s studies but in that *je-ne-sais-quoi* that members of the ruling classes acquire by

69 Schmitz (1997, 89–90; 193). On language as a kind of ‘capital’ that can afford social distinction, see Bourdieu (1991, 55).

70 For an implicit criticism of this position, see Whitmarsh (2001, 129–30).

71 Schmitz (1997, 45).

72 For this criticism, see Nesselrath (1998). Some of the essays collected in Borg (2004) explore material culture as evidence for the existence of a common elite *habitus* (in Bourdieu’s terms).

73 Such ‘silence of the masses’ (Schmitz 1997, 92) is not a cause of social discontent because, according to Schmitz, it is accepted by them precisely on cultural grounds. See, however, Nesselrath’s (1998) criticism.

74 Slander against the lack of education of one’s opponents was already a topos of Attic oratory: see Ober (1989, 182–3) and Chapter 4, Sections 3.3 and 4.1 on language and pronunciation.

hereditary right and that not even the best education can imitate.⁷⁵ Thus, the masses' inability to participate in public confrontation is sanctioned on cultural grounds: the elite has a level of education that is wholly unattainable for others without exception.⁷⁶

Although not uncontroversial, the interpretative framework that Schmitz (1997) proposes highlights the contradictions and tensions inherent in the cultural programme of the Second Sophistic and of Atticism. Beneath the façade of the glorious revival of the Classical Golden Age, both these phenomena in fact embody a profound identity crisis and the submission to a symbolic domination that operates through language. Chapter 2 further explores the links between identity, cultural constructions, social tensions, and prescriptive attitudes within a typological framework of language purism against which to assess the archaising and elitist characters of Atticism. To this end, the evaluative terminology employed in the lexica for linguistic features and registers as well as sociolects is particularly revealing with respect to the militant nature of their approaches to language (Chapter 2, Section 3.1). Meanwhile, the location of Atticist lexicography within the broader context of Second Sophistic debates helps us to grasp the role of linguistic controversies in the power relations of the time. The lexica do not merely indicate rules of linguistic correctness: they equip the sophist with a wealth of subtle usage nuances ('legitimate language', in Bourdieu's terms) with which to enter the linguistic arena, compete, and competently criticise his rivals' performances.⁷⁷

4 How to sound Attic: The theorisation of Atticist lexicography

Atticist prescriptivism expressed itself in the search for an authentically Attic diction (regardless of whether it was obsolete and even better if it was: here, classicism borders on archaism) and in the identification of the Attic roots of contemporary usage, especially in vocabulary. These aims are the cornerstone of the Atticist lexica: specialist 'usage guides' that aided writers and speakers of post-Classical Greek to attain

75 Schmitz (1997, 48–9; 155). Historical figures such as Lucian and Favorinus prove his point. Both were born 'barbarians' (in Syria and Gaul respectively) and acquired Hellenicity through παιδεία. Yet, despite their high standing in the cultural milieu of the time, both were criticised for their proficiency in Greek. On these two figures in relation to language, παιδεία, and identity, see also Swain (1996, 44–9); Whitmarsh (2001, 119–29). Henderson (2011, 27) discusses the links between sophistic criticism of performance style and marginal social or ethnic origin.

76 Schmitz (1997, 196; 233).

77 See Schmitz (1997, 114–7).

a linguistic form in accordance with Classical Attic.⁷⁸ Modern scholarship has invariably treated the lexica as mere ancillary tools and not as manifestations ‘of a precise intellectual sphere’ (a definition that Franco Montanari applies to ancient erudition in general).⁷⁹ This is reflected in the general lack of interest in the reasons why certain expressions were included in a lexicon or in the methodology and linguistic reasoning behind some of their *interpretamenta* (‘interpretations’, ‘definitions’). Only recently has this attitude begun to change, as will be discussed in Section 5.1, which presents a state of the art of linguistic approaches to Atticism and its lexicography. The three sub-sections that follow below offer an introduction to Atticist lexicography and its significance for the study of the historical evolution of Greek. Section 4.1 defines the Atticist corpus and offers an overview of its principal works, while Section 4.2 considers their legacy in the Byzantine period. Section 4.3 then offers some preliminary remarks on the insights that lexicography affords us into the theories of Atticist lexicography. Based on these historical sections, the chapter then addresses the gaps that still linger in the literature on linguistic Atticism (Section 5) before describing the approach to Atticist lexicography adopted in this series of volumes in light of recent linguistic research in this field (Section 5.1).

4.1 Atticist lexicography: Definition(s) and corpus

Broadly defined, Atticist lexica are works concerned with the identification of authentic Attic expressions (λέξεις). This includes both lexica that simply *describe* Attic usage and those that *prescribe* it as a preferable form of language. If we adopt this broad definition, the chronological limits of Atticist lexicography become very wide. Lexica concerned with Attic λέξεις were assembled as early as the Hellenistic period (see Chapters 6 and 7), and works concerning Attic continued to be produced down to the late Byzantine period.⁸⁰ Earlier collections, such as Aristophanes of Byzantium’s Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις, appear to have remained at the level of an erudite description of Attic usages (see Chapter 7, Sections 2 and 4).⁸¹

⁷⁸ The term ‘usage guide’ is borrowed from Tiekens-Boon van Ostade (2020), who studies this typology of texts written by non-professionals in connection with English prescriptivism.

⁷⁹ F. Montanari (2011, 23).

⁸⁰ The following outline does not discuss lexica on papyri, on which see Esposito (2009); Esposito (2024); Chapter 7, Section 6.

⁸¹ An introduction to the lexicographical activity of Aristophanes of Byzantium is in Montana (2020b, 197–8) (= Montana (2015, 123–4), with further bibliography. On the question of the relationship between Hellenistic scholarship on Attic and linguistic Atticism, see Chapter 6, Section 5.

The descriptive orientation may also have underpinned the Ἀττικὰ ὀνόματα of Minucius Pacatus Irenaeus (1st century CE).⁸² It is more challenging to determine whether the same orientation informed the (probably) early 2nd-century CE lexicon by Pausanias Atticista (Ἀττικῶν ὀνομάτων συναγωγή, *Collection of Attic Words*) and, to an extent, the contemporary work by Aelius Dionysius (Ἀττικὰ ὀνόματα, *Attic Words*).⁸³ Both are extant only in fragments quoted in Byzantine sources (most prominently Eustathius) and edited by Erbse (1950).⁸⁴ The two lexica collect information on Attic usages ranging from grammar to religious vocabulary and proverbs (these latter are very frequent in Pausanias).⁸⁵ Aelius' models are chiefly 5th-century BCE Attic authors, but he also exhibits an open attitude – for example, towards Herodotus.⁸⁶ Many entries deal with matters of vocabulary, phonology, and morphology, and various evaluative markers survive, particularly in Aelius, which would suggest that his lexicon has some kind of prescriptive orientation; the picture that we can draw from Pausanias is less clear.⁸⁷ The correct assessment of this matter, however, is complicated by the fact that the fragments attributed to Aelius and Pausanias are often quoted anonymously in Byzantine scholarship, leading to some confusion between them.⁸⁸ The question of whether the relatively low number of prescriptive expressions is an original feature of these works or the result of later excerption remains unresolved.

If Aelius and Pausanias were on the verge of Atticist purism, lexica that were likely produced later (under Marcus Aurelius and Commodus) qualify as markedly purist prescriptive usage guides to the correct re-use of Attic expressions on the

⁸² On early Imperial lexicography, see Matthaios (2020a, 366–8) (= Matthaios 2015b, 290–2). He is more positive in identifying a prescriptive orientation in Irenaeus' lexicon. For a different view, see Kim (2010, 476); Pagani (2015, 819).

⁸³ For Aelius Dionysius and Pausanias as representatives of a milder form of Atticism, see Strobel (2011, 16–72); Kim (2020). Benuzzi (2024c) and Benuzzi (2024d) deal with the traces of a markedly Atticist discourse in these lexicographers.

⁸⁴ In Erbse's edition Aelius Dionysius' lexicon consists of 1.080 entries and Pausanias' of 554, although most of them are attributed to either lexicographer even if the name is not explicitly mentioned in the sources. Further 8 glosses from Pausanias were identified by Heinimann (1992) in Ermolao Barbaro's *Castigationes Pliniana* (published in 1493), which shows that excerpts from Pausanias' lexicon must have circulated until at least until the 13th century (Heinimann 1992, 87). We are grateful to Giuseppe Ucciardello for information on this point. A new edition of Aelius' fragments is being prepared by Raffaella Cantore.

⁸⁵ See Wentzel (1895a, 370–7) on the differences between the two works, esp. at 373 on proverbs.

⁸⁶ On these two authors in Aelius' lexicon, see Tribulato (2016a, 183–5); Tribulato (2014, 204)

⁸⁷ Examples in Montana (2018a); Benuzzi (2024c); Benuzzi (2024d). On the pitfalls of adopting a mutually exclusive opposition *descriptivism vs prescriptivism*, see Chapter 6, Section 2.

⁸⁸ See Heinimann (1992, 74).

part of rhetors and writers.⁸⁹ The different phases of lexicography on Attic might thus be distinguished by adopting the terminology ‘Attic lexica’ for those that precede Phrynichus, Pollux, and the *Antiatticist* (in whatever order) and reserving the denomination ‘Atticist lexica’ for those works that have a clear prescriptive inclination, which, in many cases, verges on purism proper. This practical terminological divide is not without consequences for the unexpert reader. In the bibliography on Greek lexicography, one may find precisely the reverse situation, with the term ‘Atticist(ic) lexica’ applied to works whose purist intent is unclear (beginning the title of Erbse’s 1950 edition of Aelius Dionysius and Pausanias Atticista), and conversely ‘Attic lexica’ applied to prescriptive lexicography.⁹⁰ However, in the interest of imposing some order onto a seemingly undifferentiated list of lexica concerned with Attic, a clear distinction between ‘Attic lexica’ (mostly descriptive, non-purist, or not clearly so) and ‘Atticist lexica’ (prescriptive *and* proscriptive, strongly marked by evaluative terminology of the purist kind) will be adopted herein.

The body of extant works that may be subsumed under the label of Atticist lexicography proper comprises nine core texts. Seven belong to ‘the age of Atticism’, the late 2nd–late 3rd century CE: Phrynichus’ *Eclogue* and *Praeparatio sophistica*, the anonymous *Antiatticist* (a modern title: see below), Pollux’s *Onomasticon*, Moeris’ *Atticist*, and Philemon’s lexicon; the Pseudo-Herodianic *Philaeterus* (and related excerpts) of unknown date, must also go back to materials elaborated in this period. The eighth work is the lexicon attributed to Orus of Alexandria, produced around the 5th century CE. The ninth lexicon is considerably later: Thomas Magister’s 13th-century CE *Eclogue*, which heavily draws from Phrynichus’ *Eclogue* as well as other lexica (Philemon, Ammonius, Moeris). Furthermore, in addition to these nine lexica, Harpocration’s *Lexicon of the Ten Orators* should also be mentioned (see below).

These works, although all concerned with safeguarding correct Attic, do not exhibit precisely the same orientation. They also vary substantially in length, authoriality (i.e. how present vs anonymous the author is and how well or little known to us, in both cases because of the works’ different transmission paths), alphabetical or non-alphabetical arrangement, transmission history (i.e. whether the lexicon is complete, abridged, and/or transmitted in quotations in other works), and amplitude of the transmission (i.e. whether the work is transmitted by only one manuscript, by few, or by many). In this section, we shall simply consider some coordinates (date, general orientation, transmission, critical edition(s)) that will help us navigate this corpus. The lexica by Phrynichus, Pollux, Moeris, and the *Antiatticist* constitute the

⁸⁹ See Matthaïos (2020a, 366–72) (= Matthaïos 2015b, 290–6) for a brief historical sketch.

⁹⁰ Examples are Lee (2013); Kim (2017); la Roi (2022).

core group of the investigation undertaken by the PURA project, and receive full treatment in Volume 2, which also addresses some of the linguistic information contained in the lexica of Aelius Dionysius, Pausanias, Philemon, and the *Philetaerus*. The fragments of indirect transmission that may be attributed to Orus' lexicon (see below) and the Byzantine lexica of direct transmission responsible for the perpetuation of Atticist theories in the Middle Ages (*Synagoge*, Photius, *Suda*, Thomas Magister) are studied in Volume 3. Linguistic and philological commentaries of entries from all these works are also provided in the lexicographical entries of the *Digital Encyclopedia of Atticism* produced by the PURA project.⁹¹

The lexica that best represent Atticist prescriptions while allowing a reasonable reconstruction of the methodology and theorisation of their authors are those by Phrynichus, Pollux, Moeris, and the *Antiatticist*. Phrynichus Atticista or 'Arabius' (according to Photius; the *Suda* has him from Bithynia) worked under the principates of Marcus Aurelius and Commodus (161–192 CE); information about his life and activity is scanty.⁹² No other works authored by Phrynichus are known beyond his two lexica. The *Eclogue* (Ἐκλογὴ Ἀττικῶν ῥημάτων καὶ ὀνομάτων, *Collection of Attic Verbs and Nouns*, or Ἀττικιστῆς, *Atticist*, according to the *Suda*), in two books, comprises 424 entries (some repeated), not presented in alphabetical order. It collects erroneous usages with which Phrynichus contrasts correct Attic expressions.⁹³ These are sometimes overtly exemplified through quotations from 5th-century BCE Attic authors (chiefly Old Comedy) and some selected 4th-century authors (e.g. Demosthenes), although direct citations are not particularly frequent.⁹⁴ In the prefatory letter to Cornelianus, secretary *ab epistulis Graecis* of the emperors (probably Marcus Aurelius and Commodus who reigned together in 177–180 CE), Phrynichus states that the purpose of his work is to denounce the incorrect expressions used by his badly educated contemporaries

91 <https://atticism.eu>.

92 Recent attempts at reconstructing Phrynichus' cultural milieu are C. Jones (2008) and Berardi (2016), who connect him with the sophist Aristocles of Pergamum, the grammarian Alexander of Cotiaeum, and Aelius Aristides. See also Bowie (forthcoming).

93 The current edition is Fischer (1974). Previous scholarly editions are Lobeck (1820) and Rutherford (1881), the latter arranged according to topic. Its modern *editio princeps* was published in 1517 in Rome by Zacharias Calliergis (the entries were rearranged alphabetically). The *Eclogue* is transmitted by ca. 30 manuscripts: see Fischer (1974, 3–32), with the corrections of Ucciardello (2019a, 216 n. 25). Fischer (1974, 37) thinks that is unabridged, against the opinion of earlier scholars; but it would be unlikely if the work were complete (see Lamagna 2004b, 205–7; Tribulato 2022a, 928–9). For a list of other studies dealing with the *Eclogue*, see Fischer (1974, 51–2) and note 95 below.

94 For a full breakdown of sources quoted in the *Eclogue*, see Stiffler (2019, 56; 302–3).

who believe them to be ancient, expressions that ‘upset the order of the language and bring much shame to it’ (τὴν ἀρχαίαν διάλεκτον ταρρατούσας καὶ πολλὴν αἰσχύνην ἐμβαλλούσας; on this text, see further Chapter 2, Section 3.1). Phrynichus’ lexicon aims to distinguish ‘the ancient and careful way of speaking’ (διαλέγεσθαι ἀρχαίως καὶ ἀκριβῶς) from ‘innovative and careless’ usage (νεοχμῶς καὶ ἀμελῶς).

The *Eclogue*’s binary organisation (contrasting bad and good language), the vehemence of Phrynichus’ criticism, and its restricted canon of models have earned him the reputation of being the strictest among the Atticists and a rich bibliography.⁹⁵ However, Phrynichus was also capable of a milder approach towards both linguistic variation and literary models. This more open attitude is evident in his other work, the *Praeparatio sophistica* (Σοφιστικὴ προπαρασκευή, *Sophistic Preparation* or *Handbook for the Sophist*), originally in 37 books but now extant only in an extreme epitome of 1,020 entries preserved in cod. Par. Coisl. 345 and in 370 ‘fragments’ attributed to the lexicon with various degrees of persuasiveness by the latest editor, de Borries (1911).⁹⁶ The *Praeparatio* was a guide for the aspiring Atticist rhetorician to the subtleties of literary Attic and their suitability for different genres and occasions.⁹⁷ This required Phrynichus to adopt a wider spectrum of models, in which tragedy and oratory, but also Middle and New Comedy, figure more prominently than in the *Eclogue*. The lexicon’s stylistic orientation means that many of its extant entries apparently deal with rare expressions (many from lost works), which Phrynichus glosses and recommends for certain registers. Atticist prescriptions are also present but less prominently than in the *Eclogue*. The question of whether this reflects the original organisation of the *Praeparatio* or results from later shortening, which perhaps privileged stylistic and semantic comments over prescriptions, remains open.

⁹⁵ Overviews and general discussions of the *Eclogue*: Strout, French (1941, 921–4); Slater (1977); Swain (1996, 53); Regali (2008a); Strobel (2009, 98–101); Strobel (2011); Kim (2010, 477); Dickey (2007, 96–7); Dickey (2015a, 466–7); Matthaios (2020a, 369) (= Matthaios 2015b, 293). Other works, engaging with Phrynichus’ theories, are quoted in Sections 5 and 5.1.

⁹⁶ A new edition of the *Praeparatio* is a desideratum, since de Borries (1911) is outdated in many respects. The epitome of cod. Par. Coisl. 345 was previously edited by Bekker (1814–1821, vol. 1, 3–74). Overviews and general discussions of the *Praeparatio*: Kaiibel (1899a); Strout, French (1941, 924–5); Swain (1996, 54); Strobel (2009, 101); Strobel (2011); Dickey (2007, 96–7); Dickey (2015a, 466); Matthaios (2020a, 368–9) (= Matthaios 2015b, 293); Berardi (2016, 250–1). See also the papers in Favi, Pellettieri, Tribulato (forthcoming).

⁹⁷ The resumé in Phot. *Bibl.* cod. 158 is particularly useful to reconstruct the original aims, shape, and dedicatees of the lexicon.

Phrynichus' contemporary, Iulius Pollux (Πολυδεύκης) in his Ὀνομαστικόν (*Onomasticon*) selects a similarly ample canon of models.⁹⁸ Pollux is the Atticist lexicographer on whom we have most ancient information. Philostratus (*VS* 2.592–3), while remembering him for his 'honey-sweet voice', calls him 'both learned and unlearned at the same time' (καὶ ἀπαιδευτον καὶ πεπαιδευμένον) and provides us with two rare quotations of his style. The *Suda* credits him with several speeches and the epithalamium for Commodus' marriage to Bruttia Crispina (178 CE); shortly thereafter, Pollux was elected to the Athens chair of rhetoric.⁹⁹ The *Onomasticon*, in ten books, is the most complete surviving example of the lexicographical typology of onomastic lexica in which words are not arranged alphabetically but in 'horizontal' synonymic lists, organised according to semantic field.¹⁰⁰ Although Pollux's idea of language is inspired by Atticism, the structure of his lexicon, which consists of long lists of synonymic expressions for almost all aspects of human life, allows him to admit a variety of registers, sources, and Classical models. Nonetheless, Pollux is an Atticist at heart and invariably strives to recommend the best Attic expression against those employed by less prestigious models. To this end, he employs a careful evaluative terminology that is particularly attentive to diastatic and diachronic variation.¹⁰¹ The *Onomasticon* is a monument of the ancient lexicographical method that led Pollux to read and digest a vast range of previous lexica and literary texts. Its influence continued in the Middle Ages up to the modern period, as attested by the ample manuscript tradition and the host of early printed editions (beginning with Aldus Manutius' 1502 *editio princeps*), several of which were accompanied by commentaries and translations into Latin.¹⁰²

A somewhat different case is that of the lexicon known by the modern name of *Antiatticist*, which translates the Greek Ἀντιαττικιστής (Latin *Antiatticista*) coined by David Ruhnken in the 18th century as a name for its anonymous com-

⁹⁸ The current edition is Bethe (1900–1937). Previous editions are Dindorf (1824); Bekker (1846). General overviews: Dickey (2007, 96); Strobel (2009, 103–4); Matthaios (2020a, 369–71) (= Matthaios 2015b, 294–6); Dickey (2015a, 468). See also the essays in Bearzot, Landucci, Zecchini (2007); and those in Mauduit (2013).

⁹⁹ A brief consideration of Pollux as a historical figure is in Zecchini (2007), based on Naechster (1908).

¹⁰⁰ Overviews include Tosi (2007); Tosi (2015, 623–5); Matthaios (2020a, 368–71) (= Matthaios 2015b, 294–6). Tosi (1988, 87–113) discusses Pollux's onomastic method at length.

¹⁰¹ See Section 5.1 for further bibliography.

¹⁰² Overviews in Bethe (1895); Bethe (1900–1937 vol. 1, V–XVII); Bethe (1918, 776). A full study of Pollux's manuscript tradition has been undertaken by Cavarzeran (forthcoming); see also the codicological entries in the *Digital Encyclopedia of Atticism* (<https://atticism.eu>).

piler.¹⁰³ This lexicon survives in a single epitome (amounting to fewer than 850 entries in Stefano Valente's 2015 edition), transmitted under the general title of Ἄλλος ἀλφάβητος (*Another Alphabetical Lexicon*) in the lexicographical miscellany of cod. Par. Coisl. 345, which is also the *codex unicus* of the *Praeparatio sophistica*.¹⁰⁴ The *Antiatticist's* indirect tradition is very poor and limited to the Byzantine *Synagoge* and the lexica depending on this work.¹⁰⁵ *Antiatticist* is a misleading title. The lexicon is definitely concerned with issues of language correctness, although it adopts a more classicising stance than Phrynichus in affording more space to authors whom Phrynichus avoids: Herodotus and authors of New Comedy and, especially, Middle Comedy.¹⁰⁶ Nothing is known of the author and the work's original format. Given its clear relationship with Phrynichus' *Eclogue*, the *Antiatticist* is now thought to have been composed sometime in the later 2nd century CE.¹⁰⁷ Whether it is also an older lexicon than the *Eclogue* remains uncertain.¹⁰⁸ The two lexica rely on the same sources, which complicates matters.¹⁰⁹ The *Antiatticist* is an especially useful source for appreciating the Atticist lexicographers' perception of post-Classical developments, and particularly the common usage (συνήθεια) of the time. Although its entries are typically very short, they preserve traces of the Atticist debate – in which, therefore, the compiler was fully immersed – in some diagnostic terminology (e.g. οὐ φασὶ δεῖν λέγειν ἀλλὰ 'they (i.e. other Atticists) say that one should not use X but . . .'; κωλύουσι λέγειν 'they prescribe'; ἐκβάλλουσι 'they reject', etc.).¹¹⁰ Another noteworthy characteristic of the lexicon as it is presented in cod. Par. Coisl. 345 is that most entries preserve the names of ancient authors and titles of works in which the recommended forms may be found. This provides invaluable evidence for the reliance of Atticist theorisation on Classical sources.

103 The current edition is S. Valente (2015b). The lexicon was previously edited by Bekker (1814–1821 vol. 1, 77–116; vol. 3, 1074–7). On the origin of the title, see S. Valente (2015b, 3).

104 See S. Valente (2015b, 6–12).

105 See S. Valente (2015b, 13–30).

106 See Latte (1915, 383); S. Valente (2015b, 43 n. 257). Short overviews: Dickey (2007, 97); Dickey (2015a, 467); Matthaios (2020a, 367–8) (= Matthaios 2015b, 292). See also references quoted in Section 5.1 below.

107 This was demonstrated by Latte (1915), against previous views that identified its author as Orus (5th century CE); see also Alpers (2001, 198).

108 Fischer (1974, 39–41) argues that the *Antiatticist* is the polemical target of the *Eclogue* in its entirety. Latte (1915, 378–80), noting that some entries of *Eclogue* Book 1 are repeated in Book 2, proposed that the *Antiatticist* was written after (but not necessarily in response to) the first book of the *Eclogue*, and that Phrynichus retaliated with *Eclogue* Book 2.

109 See S. Valente (2015b, 53–4), who inclines towards Latte's hypothesis.

110 See S. Valente (2015b, 44–50).

Moeris' lexicon, entitled Ἀττικιστής (*Atticist*, also transmitted by some manuscripts under the title Λέξεις Ἀττικῶν καὶ Ἑλλήνων κατὰ στοιχεῖον, *Expressions of Speakers of Attic and (Common) Greek in Alphabetical Order*), differs substantially in this respect.¹¹¹ Informed by a mostly binary structure that opposes the approved usage of the Ἀττικοί 'Attic speakers' against that of the Ἕλληνες 'Greek speakers' (i.e. speakers of koine, with the additional category of κοινόν 'common' featuring in some entries), the extant lexicon makes very sparse references to ancient authors, and direct quotations are almost totally absent.¹¹² The text, surely epitomised and now consisting of 919 entries, is to be dated sometime between the late 2nd century and the late 3rd century CE, since it relies on earlier lexica such as that of Aelius Dionysius and the *Praeparatio sophistica*.¹¹³ Nothing is known of its author, who was also unknown to Photius (*Bibl. cod.* 157), who read Moeris' work. The lexicon enjoyed limited circulation in the Byzantine age. Its manuscript tradition amounts to ca. 15 specimens: the oldest is cod. Par. Coisl. 345 (10th century), and no other extant manuscripts are known before the late 13th century. The alphabetical arrangement of Moeris' lexicon makes it easier to consult, although it is difficult to obtain an overall idea of its selection of lemmas, which address vocabulary, pronunciation, morphology, and syntax.¹¹⁴ Moeris' canon, as it can be reconstructed by retrieving *loci classici* even when they are not explicitly quoted (only 82 entries include quotations), includes Aristophanes, Thucydides, the orators, and Plato. Tragedy and New Comedy are kept to a minimum, which suggests that the compiler prioritised 'plain' Classical Attic, excluding tragic polymorphism and later comic usages. Homer is sometimes quoted to exemplify usages of 'Old Attic' (παλαιὰ Ἀτθίς), in keeping with the Aristarchean tradition according to which Homer was an Athenian (cf. Chapter 7, Section 3.2). Sometimes considered a lesser Atticist lexicographer, Moeris is particularly useful to the linguist as he gives us a reasonably precise picture of features belonging to common post-Classical usage (συνήθεια), while his depiction of Attic is at times imprecise (perhaps because of epitomisation).¹¹⁵

Two other Atticist lexica of the Imperial age are known to us only in a fragmentary and problematic manner. The short Atticist lexicon known as *Philetaerus*

111 The current edition is D. U. Hansen (1998). Of the previous editions, the most important are the *princeps* by J. Hudson (1712); Pierson (1759); Bekker (1833).

112 The structure is studied in Maidhof (1912). Detailed overviews of the lexicon are Dettori (2022) and Pellettieri (2024b). Shorter introductions in Wendel (1932); Dickey (2007, 98); Strobel (2009, 101–3); Strobel (2011, 169–209); Dickey (2015a, 468).

113 Swain (1996, 51) puts it in the early 3rd century CE, followed by Strobel (2009, 101).

114 See Dettori (2022) and Section 5.1 for a discussion.

115 See further Section 5.1.

(Φιλέταιρος, *Companion*) is an anonymous lexicon attributed to the grammarian Herodian in the latter's manuscript tradition, which is closely linked to that of other pamphlets that preserve similar series of glosses as the *Philetaerus*.¹¹⁶ That Herodian was not the original compiler has been unanimously accepted since the 19th century.¹¹⁷ The proposal to identify the author with Cornelianus (the dedicatee of Phrynichus' *Eclogue*: Argyle 1989) seems tenuous. A likelier identification, suggested by Reitzenstein (1897) and approved by Alpers (1998, 108), might be Alexander of Cotiaem (2nd century CE), although the material that has reached us was probably assembled in a later period.¹¹⁸ In Dain's (1954) edition, the *Philetaerus* consists of 319 entries arranged in no particular order and focusing on features of vocabulary, morphology, and phonology. Syntax and morphosyntax are particularly well represented, making this lexicon an invaluable source for grammatical areas in which koine might diverge from Classical Attic. A thorough study of the rules expounded in this lexicon, based on a more complete edition of the text, is a *desideratum*.

The Athenian grammarian Philemon (late 2nd–early 3rd century CE, not to be confused with the homonymous Hellenistic scholar: see Chapter 7, Section 5) was the author of a Περὶ Ἀττικῆς ἀντιλογίας τῆς ἐν ταῖς λέξεσιν (*On Attic Controversy about Words*), a treatise in iambic trimeters that has survived through excerpts arranged alphabetically in two different manuscripts whose mutual relationship is unclear.¹¹⁹ The extant glosses mostly pertain to Attic lexical usages contrasted with unapproved words, although the work also includes entries on the morphology of verbs (Brown 2008, 217–220) and nouns (Brown 2008, 223), prosody (Brown 2008, 223–5), and phonology (Brown 2008, 226). The material in Philemon is often similar to that in Moeris, which may point to the use of a common source (perhaps the *Eclogue*: see D. U. Hansen 1998, 41–2).

Information that is useful for scholars of Attic has also come down to us through Harpocration's Δέξεις τῶν δέκα ῥητόρων (*Expressions of the Ten Orators*), a 2nd-century CE lexicon devoted to notable terms used in Attic oratory.¹²⁰

¹¹⁶ Ucciardello (2021, 56). The current edition is Dain (1954), which however is based on an incomplete study of the manuscripts: see Ucciardello (2021).

¹¹⁷ See Alpers (1998, 103 n. 49); Matthaios (2020a, 371–2) (= Matthaios 2015b, 296).

¹¹⁸ On this important scholar, teacher of Aelius Aristides and Marcus Aurelius, see Berardi (2016, 258–62); Montana (2018b).

¹¹⁹ Overviews in Ucciardello (2015); Batisti (2024c). The bio-bibliographical chapter in Brown (2008, 80–92) should be approached with caution. The two versions of the fragments are edited in Reitzenstein (1897, 392–6); Cohn (1898). Further information on Philemon may be gleaned from the use that Thomas Magister made of his lexicon: see Gaul (2007).

¹²⁰ Overviews of the lexicon and its complicated transmission and editorial history may be found in Montana (2004); Dickey (2007, 94). The fuller version of Harpocration's lexicon is pre-

Its focus is mostly on expressions pertaining to Athenian administration, politics, and justice, but there is some overlap with discussions found in Atticist and other lexica of the early Imperial age owing to the use of the same sources. Harpocration's glossary also influenced Byzantine lexicography, starting with the *Synagoge* and Photius (see Section 4.2). It should, therefore, be taken into account when dealing with the impact of Atticism not only as a theory of correct language but also as a phenomenon that sought to make Athenian traditions come to life for readers across radically different ages, in continuity with the interest in Attic *Realien* that was so prominent in the Hellenistic period (see Chapters 6–7).

The great season of Atticist lexicography ends with Moeris' lexicon, but a later work attributed to the important grammarian Orus of Alexandria (first half of the 5th century CE) testifies to its lasting impact. Orus is best known for his works on orthography, ambiguous words, and ethnic denominations.¹²¹ Ancient sources also credit him with an Ἀττικῶν λέξεων συναγωγή (*Collection of Attic Expressions*), which has not reached us directly. Alpers' (1981) masterly edition reconstructed this important work through the fragments that are mainly preserved in the lexicon of Pseudo-Zonaras (fragments that Alpers marks with the letter A) and in other Byzantine sources (fragments marked with the letter B), carefully distinguishing materials belonging to Orus from others that must be attributed to Orion, the author of an etymological dictionary of the 5th century CE that has been directly transmitted.¹²² Orus bases his investigation of Attic on the lexica of the 2nd and 3rd centuries CE, professing a moderate form of Atticism that sometimes goes against Phrynichus' strict precepts and canon. He quotes Lysias, Xenophon, and Menander, and – like Moeris before him – disregards tragic diction (only Euripides is mentioned). If these and other factors underpin the earlier identification of Orus as the author of the *Antiatticist* (see above), our interest in this lexicographer lies precisely in his invaluable reflection of the linguistic controversies that still raged in Late Antiquity and in the early Byzantine age, all the more so since literary and spoken language had become definitively separated.¹²³

served in more than twenty manuscripts that have traditionally been thought to depend on an archetype produced by Manuel Moschopulus. Gaul (2008, 183), instead, identifies the scholar behind this version with other early 14th-century scholars (Lopadiotes or Frankopulus).

121 Overviews in Matthaios (2020a, 344–5) (= Matthaios 2015b, 268–9); Ippolito (2008b).

122 See Ippolito (2008a); Alpers (1981, 87–97).

123 See Alpers (1998, 100–1).

4.2 Beyond antiquity: The Atticist legacy in Byzantine lexicography

Departing from Justinian's momentous closure of Athens' Neoplatonic academy (529), the 6th century CE marks a turning point in the history of Greek culture and scholarship. By and large, the period up to the early 9th century is characterised by cultural decline, the shrinking of philological activity, and the deterioration of teaching, after which a series of so-called 'renaissances' (a controversial denomination) ensued.¹²⁴ Byzantinists debate to what extent the period preceding the 9th century CE merits its traditional label of the 'Dark Ages'. Grammar, for instance, thrived even before this period, and evidence from later erudite works suggests that manuscripts of Classical texts must have circulated much more widely than traditionally assumed.¹²⁵ The first of the Byzantine cultural revivals occurred in the 9th–10th centuries after the end of iconoclasm, under the impulse of emperors of the Macedonian dynasty such as Leo VI (ruled 886–912) and his son Constantine Porphyrogenitus (who died in 959); the second revival coincides with the ruling period of the Comnenian dynasty (ca. 1081–1185); the third accompanied the reign of the Palaeologan emperors Michael VIII (died 1282) and Andronicus II (1282–1328).¹²⁶

A detailed overview of the new lexica assembled starting from this period – which prominently include the 9th-century *Etymologicum Genuinum* – lies beyond the scope of this chapter. Here, we shall focus on providing some basic coordinates pertaining to the production and transmission of and the mutual relationships between the major lexica that preserve earlier Atticist material, mostly as an expression of a broadly classicising – rather than Atticising – approach to the ancient language. A proper linguistic study of the Byzantine appropriation of, and dialogue with, the tradition of Atticist lexicography is the objective of Volume 3 of *Ancient Greek Purism*. It is worth noting here that no thorough study of Atticism can fail to consider the Byzantine approaches to it: not solely for the obvious reason that these lexica have been transmitted by manuscripts produced in the Byzantine pe-

¹²⁴ For the debate surrounding the Byzantine 'renaissances', see Fryde (2000, 11–3).

¹²⁵ On the flourishing of grammar and rhetoric before the 'Macedonian Renaissance', see Pontani (2020, 392–7) (= Pontani 2015, 318–23) for an introduction. Alpers (2013), based on the exemplary case-study of John of Sardeis, shows that scholars of this period had direct access to many manuscripts of ancient rhetorical handbooks as well as Classical texts; see also the earlier Alpers (1991, 235–46) on the factors affecting the preservation and circulation of Classical texts before the Macedonian Renaissance, and Canfora (1995), esp. at 70–4.

¹²⁶ Overviews of all these periods of Byzantine culture are provided in the classic Hunger (1978). For a focus on scholarship, see Pontani (2020) (= Pontani 2015).

riod but also, more compellingly, because Byzantine lexica often preserve Atticist precepts – or versions thereof – that would otherwise be lost to us.

In the realm of lexicography, in which no significant works were produced after the 6th century CE (i.e. after those of Hesychius, Stephanus of Byzantium, and Pseudo-Cyril), the late 8th and early 9th centuries represent a turning point.¹²⁷ The Atticist legacy in Byzantine lexicography as a whole is indebted to the anonymous alphabetical lexicon entitled *Συναγωγὴ λέξεων χρησίμων* (*Collection of Useful Expressions*, previously known as *Lexicon Bachmannianum* or *Lexicon Bekkeri VI*). The *Synagoge* survives in two different copies. The first, which is shorter, is preserved in cod. Par. Coisl. 347 (ca. 900 CE) and in three other, later manuscripts.¹²⁸ The second, expanded with much material under the letter α, is directly preserved only in cod. Par. Coisl. 345 (10th century CE). These copies correspond to different stages in the *Synagoge*'s development and transmission.

Cunningham's (2003) magisterial critical edition, the first to synthesise both versions, reconstructs the intricate history of the *Synagoge*, based on several fundamental intuitions offered by Wentzel (1893; 1895b) and Reitzenstein (1907). The *Synagoge* is based on the lexicon of Pseudo-Cyril (5th century CE), which it both abbreviates and expands with other material, a significant portion of which is of Atticist provenance.¹²⁹ The original version (called Σ) must date to the end of the 8th or the beginning of the 9th century. It was later copied into cod. Par. Coisl. 347 and the manuscripts that depend on it; it also formed the basis of later and simultaneous expansions (called Σ', Σ'', Σ''', and Σ'''' by Cunningham 2003) that do not survive as such, but were used by later Byzantine lexica, most notably Photius and the *Suda*. One of these expansions, which scholars call Σ^b, presents a much-augmented text in lemmas beginning with α (the other letters, instead, roughly correspond to the original version).¹³⁰ As mentioned, the only direct witness of Σ^b is the version preserved in cod. Par. Coisl. 345 (10th century), but the original expansion must date to approximately the early 9th century.¹³¹ This may be inferred from the fact that this expansion is a source – via at least two intermediary versions produced in the first decades of the 9th century – of both the *Etymologicum Genuinum* and Photius' lexicon (both produced in the first half of the 9th century: the earliest extant manuscripts of the *Genuinum*, A and B, date to the 10th cen-

127 An overview of the preceding period of Greek lexicography can be found in Alpers (2001, 200–2).

128 See Cunningham (2003, 13–9).

129 Cunningham (2003, 46).

130 Expansions in other letters may be postulated based on agreements between Photius and *Suda*, but no material evidence survives: see Cunningham (2003, 57–8).

131 Cunningham (2003, 49).

tury).¹³² The entries in α of Σ^b include lemmas from Aelius Dionysius, Pausanias Atticista, the *Praeparatio sophistica*, Orus, and the *Antiatticist* (this latter in a richer version than that preserved in the same manuscript, Par. Coisl. 345). They are also more generous than those of Σ with references to ancient authors and *loci classici*. Σ and Σ^b are valuable for two reasons. First, they preserve unknown or different versions of passages from the Atticist lexica and are thus useful for tracing these texts' transmission history. Second, they allow us to reflect on the interest that these earlier works, with their storehouse of linguistic information, aroused among Medieval scholars.

Photius (ca. 810–893) used two different expansions of the *Synagoge* (Σ'' and Σ''') to compile his lexicon, now mostly agreed to be a youthful enterprise of his, dating to no later than ca. 840 CE.¹³³ As stated in the prefatory letter, in this work, Photius pursues the practical aim of guiding his contemporaries in writing good classicising prose modelled on the vocabulary of Atticising prose writers and orators, complemented in many cases by that of the most prominent Christian authors.¹³⁴ In fact, Photius includes much poetic vocabulary, especially from comedy (a tendency that he inherits from his Atticising sources).¹³⁵ He is also likely to preserve the references to ancient authors and works that he found in his sources: therefore, Photius' work itself is a valuable source for the reconstruction of lost

132 Cunningham (2003, 14). On the *Genuinum*, which is still largely unpublished, and the later *etymologica* depending on it see Alpers (2001, 203–4); Dickey (2007, 92); Pontani (2020, 412–3) (= Pontani 2015, 338) for basic introductions and bibliography on editions. Alpers (2015) is a very clear account of the transmission history of the *etymologica* and their mutual relationship, while Alpers (1991) deals with the context of production of the *Genuinum* and advances the hypothesis that it might be the work of scholars connected to the Magnaura school at Constantinople, directed by Leo the Philosopher (born ca. 790 – died post 869); Alpers (2015, 296–9) also provides a clear overview of previous (erroneous) views on the relationship between the *Genuinum* and Photius' lexicon, and the advancements made by 20th-century scholarship. Cunningham (2003, 57) further speculates that the *Synagoge* might be another product of this school.

133 An introduction in N. G. Wilson (1996, 90–1). Theodoridis' (1982–2013) edition, in three volumes, currently ends with letter ϕ . For χ to ω , one must still rely on Porson (1823), who edited the text without the evidence of cod. Zavordensis 95, discovered in 1959, which is useful especially to fill the missing parts of the Galeanus codex, its antigraph. Cunningham (2003, 38) addresses Photius' 'double sourcing' from two different *Synagoge* expansions (Σ'' and Σ'''), the former also used by the *Suda*, and the latter being also the source of Σ^b), probably through an intermediary source (Σ''''), which would also be behind the *Synagoge* material in the *Etymologicum Genuinum*. The use of different expansions of the *Synagoge* explains why many lemmas are repeated in Photius' lexicon.

134 On the ampler boundaries of Byzantine Atticism see Ucciardello (2019a, 208–9).

135 See N. G. Wilson (1996, 90–1).

Classical works and texts,¹³⁶ offering useful insights into the lexicographical and literary practices of the early Byzantine revival. It is also a major repository of fragments from Phrynichus' *Praeparatio sophistica*, several of which are not known to us via what we call the *Synagoge*. It is unclear whether this may highlight Photius' personal and independent consultation of the *Praeparatio* and other lexica already at this stage (and not only when he later compiled the *Bibliotheca*, in which he claims to have read 36 books of the *Praeparatio*). Perhaps the likeliest solution is that he is relying on versions of the *Synagoge* that are not known to us.¹³⁷

The expansion of the *Synagoge* termed Σ also underlies much Atticist material in the so-called *Suda*, an anonymous encyclopedic lexicon comprising over 31,000 entries and compiled during the late 10th or the first years of the 11th century.¹³⁸ A true expression of the 10th-century 'encyclopedic' spirit fostered by emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus (912–959),¹³⁹ the *Suda* contains not only lexical items but also entries that are ethnographic, geographical, biographical, and historical in nature and that recycle information from earlier lexica (including Hesychius), collections of proverbs, and scholia.¹⁴⁰ Its Atticist lemmas often repeat the information and interpretation found in its sources *verbatim*, including comparisons between Classical Attic and post-Classical developments. It would be incorrect, however, to conclude that the *Suda* uncritically recycles earlier material. As Matthaïos (2006) has demonstrated, entries in which the lexicon adjusts earlier definitions to the linguistic situation of its time or adds an entirely new meaning to the Classical example are characterised by attention to the synchronic linguistic dimension.¹⁴¹ While these strategies are part of the *Suda*'s broader objective of actualising the Hellenic past for Byzantine readers, they offer historians

136 This became particularly obvious with the discovery of the cod. Zavordensis: see Tsantsanoglou (1984).

137 See Alpers (1981, 71–4).

138 The current edition is Adler (1928–1938). The title, variously transmitted in manuscripts, is also transcribed as *Souda*, or interpreted to be the name of its author (S(o)uidas): see the discussion in Matthaïos (2006, 4–5). General overviews are provided in N. G. Wilson (1996, 145–7); Dickey (2007, 90–1); Dickey (2015a, 472–3); Pontani (2020, 429–30) (= Pontani 2015, 354–5). For the relationship between the *Suda* and the *Synagoge*, see Cunningham (2003, 20; 29), who also briefly addresses the view (of Wentzel and Adler) that in its use of *Synagoge*'s material, the *Suda* is independent from Photius.

139 For the various denominations of the cultural production of this period ('Humanism', 'encyclopedism', 'cultura della συλλογή', 'florilegium habit'), see Lemerle (1971, 267); Odorico (1990); Odorico (2011); Schreiner (2011); Magdalino (2011). On the *Suda* as a typical product of this cultural milieu, see Matthaïos (2006, 13–5).

140 Adler (1931, 686–700).

141 The same approach is developed in Matthaïos (2010).

of language a unique insight into the everyday usage of the time and the negotiation between scholarly and ‘vernacular’ vocabulary that Byzantine hellenophones were obliged to perform.¹⁴²

The Comnenian dynasty’s reign, extending over a century (ca. 1081–1185), witnessed a new cultural revival, in which linguistic and lexicographical studies flourished. Two new lexica were assembled during this period: the *Etymologicum Symeonis*, which is an important source for the reconstruction of lost parts of the *Etymologicum Genuinum*, and the bulky *Etymologicum Magnum* (late 11th – 12th century), itself a reworking of both the *Genuinum* (9th century) and the *Etymologicum Gudianum* (a late 10th- to early 11th-century lexicon compiled in southern Italy).¹⁴³ The *Etymologicum Magnum* also includes much additional material. During the same century, two great scholars produced works on ancient literature: John Tzetzes (ca. 1110–died after 1180), who is known primarily for his exegetical works on poetry (Homer, Hesiod, Pindar, Aristophanes, Lycophron, etc.), and Eusthatus (ca. 1115–ca. 1194), archbishop of Thessalonica, the author of extensive commentaries on Homer, Pindar, and Dionysius the Periegete.¹⁴⁴ Eustathius in particular is a fundamental source for much ancient scholarship on Attic and Attic literature, from comic and tragic fragments to lemmas from Atticist lexica such as Aelius Dionysius, Pausanias, and the *Praeparatio sophistica*. His commentaries on the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* also provide a wealth of other parallel passages and comparanda for the linguistic theories of Atticist lexica.

The rule of the Palaeologan dynasty, from 1261 CE to the fall of Constantinople (1456), is associated with what has almost universally been considered a real ‘renaissance’, coinciding with the earlier part of this period (ca. 1261–1328) when Constantinople, having been regained by the Byzantines, attracted numerous intellectuals during the reigns of Michael VIII and Andronicus II.¹⁴⁵ Philological activity and grammatical and linguistic studies thrived, beginning with the magisterium of Maximus Planudes (1255–1305) and continuing with his pupil Manuel Moschopulus (ca. 1265–after 1316), both of whom studied Attic and its representative authors.¹⁴⁶ Lexicography also flourished, as attested by works such as the *Lexicon Vindobonense*

142 Matthaios (2006, 22).

143 For introductions to these *etymologica* and their complex history, reflected in the poor state of modern editions, see Dickey (2007, 91); Pontani (2020, 447) (= Pontani 2015, 373); S. Valente (2013a); Alpers (2015), esp. at 303–4 on the *Magnum*’s use of the *Genuinum* and the *Gudianum*.

144 On both, see the overview in Pontani (2020, 452–66) (= Pontani 2015, 378–93).

145 See Fryde (2000).

146 Among his many works, Planudes also wrote a treatise on verbal syntax, a dialogue on grammar (on both, see Ucciardello 2019a, 210 n. 5), and a collection of *epimerismi* to Philostratus. To Philostratus Moschopulus devoted a linguistic commentary that later served as a source for a lexicon (probably not by Moschopulus himself) of Attic nouns focused on teaching basic gram-

(in fact, the work of Andreas Lopadiotes)¹⁴⁷, and many more examples, of greater or minor momentum, that still lie unpublished in manuscripts produced in this period.¹⁴⁸

All these scholars and works deal with Attic material, in many cases reworked from earlier Atticist sources. However, the most important lexicon comes from the end of this period: Thomas Magister's *Eclogue*.¹⁴⁹ Thomas Magister (or Magistros, 1280–ca. 1330) is among the scholars who testify to Thessalonica's cultural boom in the Palaeologan age.¹⁵⁰ A highly learned rhetor (and later a monk), who knew Attic and Atticising literature to such an extent that two of his speeches were attributed to Aelius Aristides for a long time,¹⁵¹ around 1315 CE Magister compiled the Ὀνομάτων Ἀττικῶν Ἐκλογή (*Selection of Attic Words*), which enjoyed immediate success (it is transmitted in more than 80 manuscripts) and was soon expanded with other material.¹⁵² Although a product of the late Byzantine age, this lexicon is of great importance for our knowledge of Atticism.¹⁵³ It exhibits a profound acquaintance with a vast array of Classical and post-Classical authors, all of whom are integral to the revival of Atticising language as the 'sociolect' of rhetors and their means of self-representation.¹⁵⁴ More saliently for our present field of enquiry, Magister's *Eclogue* disregards the long tradition of Byzantine lexicography (chiefly originating in Pseudo-Cyril via the intermediation of the *Synagoge*) and returns to the original Atticist lexica.¹⁵⁵ Among its other significant characteristics, Magister's lexicon is the first indirect testimony of the Byzantine circulation of Phrynichus' *Eclogue*, whose direct use by earlier Byzantine scholars is uncertain and which suddenly resurfaces in manuscripts in the late 13th century.¹⁵⁶

mar: see Gaul (2008, 168–9); Ucciardello (2019a, 211 n. 8). On philological activity in this period, see Hunger (1959); Fryde (2000, 144–66).

147 Edited by Guida (2018). A discussion in Gaul (2008, 182–4).

148 See Gaul (2008, 165). Some examples are discussed in Ucciardello (2019a).

149 The edition is still Ritschl (1832), where the intricate history of the lexicon is not adequately represented: see Gaul (2008, 184–6) and Ucciardello (2018, 100–3), especially as concerns the origin of the Moschopouleian materials included in Magister's *Eclogue*.

150 On Thessalonica in this age, see Bianconi (2005).

151 On Magister's polyhedric personality, see Gaul (2011); on his philological work, see Bianconi (2005, 72–86); Gaul (2007).

152 A detailed discussion is in Gaul (2007).

153 On the need to study lexicography as an important source of information on late-Byzantine culture, see, in general, Gaul (2008).

154 See Gaul (2011, 274) for this interpretation.

155 Gaul (2007, 297; 327).

156 See Fischer (1974, 47–50); Ucciardello (2019b, 176).

4.3 Atticist lexicography on language: Preliminaries

In this section, we examine several general characteristics of Atticist lexicography to pave the way for our appraisal of how modern scholarship has treated this corpus (Sections 5 and 5.1). In spite of their individual differences, all Atticist lexicographers pursue the separation of ‘correct’ – that is, Atticising – language from the ‘incorrect’ expressions used by contemporary speakers. Such a dichotomic attitude is a typical feature of purism, which aspires to sift good language from bad.¹⁵⁷ Therefore, the kind of Atticism espoused by the lexicographers differs from the broader classicism of the Imperial age, an imitative orientation that, as Dihle (1977, 162) noted, is never questioned by authors contemporary with the Atticist movement, irrespective of their precise stylistic orientation: the stylistic models and the ethical values of Greek literature in the Imperial age are not exclusively Attic. Of course, both the Atticist lexicographers and their contemporaries prefer the forms documented in Attic texts to those current in the spoken – that is, ‘vulgar’ – language of their era. The real distinction between the adherents to various shades of Atticism lies in the degree to which they tolerate the evolution of contemporary language. Even the most Atticising writers of the Second Sophistic employ linguistic traits that are also common in less controlled texts. Consider, for instance, the word ἀλεκτορίς ‘hen’ that Phrynichus proscribes (*Ecl.* 200) in favour of ἀλεκτρούων, but used by Aelian, Alciphron, and Themistius (see Favi 2022a); or the future ἐλεύσομαι with its compounds, condemned by Phrynichus (*Ecl.* 24 and 161) and avoided by Aristides and Aelian but employed by Lucian, Dio Chrysostom, and Philostratus (see Favi 2022b); or, finally, the temporal use of the adverb εὐθύ ‘immediately’, proscribed by Phrynichus (*Ecl.* 113; see Benuzzi 2022b and Chapter 6, Section 5.3; Chapter 7, Section 2) and avoided by Atticising authors but found in Lucian.¹⁵⁸ The lexicographers, meanwhile, condemn everything that does not have well-documented traces in 5th- to 4th-century BCE Attic. The consequence is that their criticism is often directed not only at the elements of low-register and vulgar Greek but also at those typical of the cultivated high-register koine employed by most of the prose writers contemporary to them.¹⁵⁹ Atticist

157 For this common metaphor in purist thought, compare the name of the Italian Accademia della Crusca, ‘Academy of the Bran’, mentioned in Section 1.

158 See Schmid (*Atticismus* vol. 1, 112).

159 Here, the word ‘register’ is applied to notions that other scholars may call ‘variation’, ‘variety’, or even ‘style’. On ‘variation’ and ‘varieties’ in relation to post-Classical Greek, see the discussion in Bentein, Janse (2021a); for ‘styles’, see Horrocks (2010, 220 and *passim*), who elsewhere (e.g. Horrocks 2021) addresses the same features but employs the term ‘registers’. Schmitz (1997, 79) discusses the Atticists’ polarised perception of the linguistic spectrum.

lexicographers – Phrynichus in particular – constantly check language against a restricted body of Classical texts, an antiquarian inclination that often disregards the nuances of earlier literary usage (see the discussion in Monaco 2023) and to the correct distinction between low-register features of recent creation and current features that have a respectable ancient (but not invariably Attic) pedigree. We have a reflection of this collecting frenzy, which picks outlandish words from old texts with little consideration for their practical use, in the criticism that contemporary authors directed against Atticism: from Lucian’s caricatures (e.g. the ignorant purist in *Lexiphanes*, the stolid teacher of *The Professor of Rhetoric*) to Galen’s protestations against the Atticist tyranny outside high-register prose.¹⁶⁰

The Classical models of linguistic Atticism exhibit several key differences from those of rhetorical Atticism.¹⁶¹ On the one hand, in sheer quantitative terms, more authors receive attention. The most salient consequence is the inclusion of poetry alongside prose and 4th-century BCE oratory. On the other hand, the approach to the canon becomes pickier. What lies outside the chronological borders of 5th-century BCE Attic is attentively scrutinised (see examples discussed in Chapter 5). This is most evident in Phrynichus, who tends to reject 4th-century BCE authors, including paragons of Attic literature, such as Menander, Xenophon, and Lysias (who was notably, together with Hyperides, the chief model of the Roman *Atticī*).¹⁶² However, traces of this tendency are also evident in Pollux and Moeris. Even in the case of 5th-century Attic poetry, some specifications are necessary. Comedy is the Atticists’ main reference point, because of its perceived realism.¹⁶³ However, not all comic texts are equal. As expected, not only is 5th-century BCE Old Comedy generally preferred to 4th-century Middle and New Comedy but Phrynichus also traces clear distinctions within Old Comedy itself.¹⁶⁴

160 On Lucian, see Swain (1996, 46–9) and Stifler (2019) *passim*. In *De ordine librorum suorum* 19.60–1 Kühn, Galen refers to a (now lost) lexicon of his that was devoted to Attic vocabulary (see also Gal. *De indolentia* 20 Jouanna) and to another lost treatise devoted to linguistic correctness. On Galen’s complex attitude towards Atticism, see Manetti (2009); on his language as a compromise between different levels in the Atticism–low koine register continuum, see Vela Tejada (2015). Lillo (2015, 26–7) compares Moeris’ terminology with features of Galen’s language that, at times, complies with high-level koine and at other times with low-level (spoken) koine. On Galen and archaism, see further Chapter 6, Section 3.1.

161 On the Atticist canon, see further Volume 2.

162 Cic. *Brutus* 17.67–8.

163 A character recognised by the ancients, though to be taken with caution: see Colvin (1999, 31–3); Willi (2002b, 116–22) on ‘spoken’ Attic in Aristophanes; and Willi (2003a, 4; 268)

164 See Tribulato (2024). Middle Comedy is conventionally dated to the period between the death of Aristophanes (after 388 BCE) and the first staging of Menander’s plays (321 BCE): see Nesselrath (2010, 431) and the ampler discussion in Nesselrath (1990, 333–8).

The classic triad of Aristophanes (the prince of Attic speech), Cratinus, and Eupolis takes centre stage, with all other playwrights seemingly relegated to a more marginal role.

Tragedy too has a status apart. In comparison to comedy, its language is both outlandish and less determined, constituting an ‘independent system’ (Willi 2019, 100). Its distinct register, characterised by dialectal polymorphism and a broader stylistic range, is neither wholly Attic nor comparable to that of other genres, such as Ionic epic poetry.¹⁶⁵ The lexicographers react to tragic language’s special nature by adopting a careful approach. In the stylistic theorisation of the *Praeparatio sophistica*, Phrynichus often commends tragic usages for their inventiveness or solemnity, and Pollux often includes tragic examples in his synonymic lists or even – *faute de mieux* – selected as examples to be followed. However, Pollux often signals these usages with the label τραγικώτερον, highlighting that they are not appropriate for other communication purposes. In the *Eclogue*, Phrynichus refers to tragedy only seven times, in most cases to proscribe a certain usage (e.g. in *Ecl.* 200: see Favi 2022a).¹⁶⁶ Moeris cites only Euripides, once.

The definition of the canon of approved models is perhaps the most challenging aspect for the interpreter of Atticist lexicography. One reason for this is that the corpus is not monolithic, reflecting the more general fluctuation in the ancient selection of reading lists.¹⁶⁷ The general approach to the models varies widely between different lexica, and a lexicographer may forsake his general principles depending on the specific nature of the linguistic enquiry that he makes in a certain entry. Thus, for example, in *Ecl.* 64 Phrynichus proscribes ἠπάομαι ‘to mend’ and disregards Aristophanes’ use of the verb on account of its being a *hapax* in the poet’s work.¹⁶⁸ Another reason, however, is that we lack a reasoned overview of the lexicographers’ choices in this realm and of the specific role that the individual Attic lemmas (from prose, comedy, tragedy, etc.) play in their prescriptions (see further Section 5.1). This fact, among others, highlights the need for a global approach to the theories of Atticist lexicography as a whole.

¹⁶⁵ See Willi (2019, 127) for this interpretation. Tragic polymorphism, of course, is merely an instance of the kind of linguistic variation that is the hallmark of Greek literary language(s), on which see Clackson (2015b, 108–9).

¹⁶⁶ For preliminary enquiries, see Favi (2022a); Favi (2022g); Favi (2022h); Favi (2022i); Favi (2022j).

¹⁶⁷ See de Jonge (2022a).

¹⁶⁸ See Tribulato (2024).

5 Ways to study Atticism: Past approaches to literary texts and lexica

Atticism in literary texts has attracted more attention than its theorisation and methodology. This scholarly inclination is particularly evident in Graham Anderson's dismissal of the need to move beyond Schmid's (*Atticismus*) classic work on the linguistic practice of Atticism when he declared that 'to the unwieldy mass of statistics on the subject [i.e. of Atticism] assembled by Wilhelm Schmid at the end of the nineteenth century there is now relatively little to add' (G. Anderson 1993, 88). Anderson's statement reflects the common tendency to gloss over the linguistic reflection behind Imperial Greek prose production and the general belief that lexicography is ancillary to the study of literature. Both stances may be exemplified by considering four very different works produced at the chronological extremes of the period 1881–1997: W. Gunion Rutherford's *The New Phrynichus* (1881), Wilhelm Schmid's five-volume *Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern* (1887–1897), Simon Swain's *Hellenism and Empire* (1996), and Thomas Schmitz' *Bildung und Macht* (1997). All these works deal with the theories of linguistic Atticism and engage with lexicography to varying degrees; however, their regard for the thoughts expressed by the lexicographers is invariably subordinated to what they might tell us about the literary texts of the Classical and Imperial periods and their role in their respective cultural milieus.

It is convenient to begin with Schmid's formidable *Atticismus*, a monument that remains unsurpassed in many respects (to the extent that – as we have just seen – in relying on Schmid, some scholars of Imperial literature may feel excused in not dealing with language). In the preface to his work, the author clearly states that his purpose is to contribute to the history of the development of Greek literary prose by focusing on Atticism.¹⁶⁹ He sets out to analyse the ways in which Atticism was embodied in the prose of several prominent authors, from Dionysius of Halicarnassus to Philostratus. With the exception of the initial chapter on Dionysius of Halicarnassus, all the parts that constitute the first four volumes are devoted to a single author, whose linguistic purity ('Reinheit der Sprache') Schmid assesses against the model of Classical Attic prose. The individual sections, particularly those dealing with the lexicon, constitute a treasure trove of valuable information on these authors' linguistic and stylistic choices and how they compare not only to Attic but also to Classical and post-Classical literary prose in general. In this context, Schmid makes ample reference to lexicography, consistently signalling which linguistic features receive explicit praise as Atticisms in the lex-

¹⁶⁹ Schmid (*Atticismus* vol. 1, V).

ica.¹⁷⁰ However, the lexicographers' precepts are never analysed in their own right: rather lexis are treated as accessory sources, whose theories are not discussed in relation to the literary authors' choices or the linguistic contexts in which they composed their works. This approach is even more striking given that Schmid could already count on Lobeck's (1820) and Rutherford's (1881) linguistic notes on Phrynichus' *Eclogue*.

Rutherford's *The New Phrynichus* (1881) is still valuable in that it accompanies each entry of the *Eclogue* with a philological and linguistic commentary, connecting Phrynichus' precepts with evidence for 5th-century BCE Attic and the later koine. Upon further examination, however, this apparently linguistic approach exhibits a narrowly literary focus that is unusual even for its day. In discussing linguistic phenomena, Rutherford uses only literature, showing little sensitivity for documentary texts. Moreover, when addressing Attic literature in the two introductory chapters, he tackles only tragedy and comedy. He regards tragedy (unlike comedy) as the best source for Attic at its incipient stage (a 'storehouse of early Attic': Rutherford 1881, 56) and considers tragic polymorphism to be a consequence of later Ionic influence. In his eyes, tragic language is based on 'the Attic of the time when Tragedy sprang into life' (Rutherford 1881, 4) and 'if allowance is made for the peculiarities of metrical composition, Tragedy can supply the student of Attic with many of the most essential characteristics of that dialect during the sixth century' (Rutherford 1881, 16). This emphasis on tragedy as the most prominent Attic genre is a child of Rutherford's time but gives a good sense of his work's conservative approach to issues of language evolution. This is confirmed by the chapter on comedy, where – Rutherford argues – even the slaves 'have excellent Attic put into their mouths' (Rutherford 1881, 32). Rutherford therefore completely disregards the possibility that comedy may also yield information on register variation or substandard language: to his mind, only 5th-century BCE Attic speakers used the dialect 'with propriety' (Rutherford 1881, 32). He ignores prose entirely on the grounds that it is 'corrupted and interpolated' (Rutherford 1881, 33).

Like a new Phrynichus (tellingly, the title of his book), Rutherford adopts a critical attitude towards Greek itself when it diverges from the usage of tragedy and comedy. His approach is not authentically linguistic: it is not an objective description of language but an ideologically oriented appraisal. For instance, when dealing with Phrynichus' proscription of analogical forms of εἶμι like εἰσῖναι (for εἰσιέναι: *Ecl.* 7) and εἰσιέτω (for εἰσίτω: *Ecl.* 141), which are documented in low-

170 For his criteria, see Schmid (*Atticismus* vol. 1, 103). As Bowie (1970, 3) notes, 'Schmid sees the development of Atticizing fashions almost entirely as a movement *within* literature'.

register post-Classical texts, Rutherford (1881, 65–6) does not even give his reader an idea of where and when these substandard forms are attested.¹⁷¹ His commentary is limited to an endorsement of Phrynichus' criticism of the 2nd-century CE rhetor Lollianus' use of εἰσιέτω: '[t]hat Lollianus was himself a Greek and taught at Athens shortly before Phrynichus wrote, vividly illustrates the condition into which the Attic dialect had fallen in the first half of the second century A.D.' (Rutherford 1881, 65–6). The purist inclination of the statement, with its rhetoric of golden times and decline, is evident.¹⁷²

Despite its shortcomings, Rutherford's volume remains the only attempt at a full study of Phrynichus' theories of language (its indexes are still particularly useful). Later studies of this lexicon and others (see Section 5.1 below), even when informed by a sounder linguistic methodology, have remained at the level of piecemeal analyses. This approach is also adopted in the volumes produced by Swain (1996) and Schmitz (1997) on Second Sophistic culture, which have already been introduced in Section 3.3. Swain (1996) diverges from previous accounts of Imperial literature by devoting an entire chapter to linguistic theorisation and engaging with the precepts of the lexica themselves. In defining the 'elite's obsession with language' as 'the clearest way in which they expressed themselves as a stable grouping' (Swain 1996, 7), he also notes that the topic had received little attention, possibly owing to its technical character. Given that Swain approaches Atticism as a key to illuminating social and historical events as much as literary practices, he is more interested in how the lexica shed light on the socio-historical context of language than in the interpretation of individual precepts or theories (some of these he reserves for the illustration of these broader themes in the footnotes). This explains why Swain unexpectedly opens his account of Atticist lexicography with the later lexicon of Moeris.¹⁷³ By discussing the peculiar contrastive structure of this work (on which see Section 4.1 above), Swain searches for coordinates with which to navigate the maze of the linguistic usage of the period, in which the polarisation of 'Atticising' vs 'non-educated' language becomes diluted in the many nuances of educated speech.¹⁷⁴ This is why he, somewhat surprisingly, defines Moeris as 'a slightly more subtle lexicographer than his colleagues' (Swain 1996, 52).

Swain's treatment of lexicography is necessarily sketchy and not invariably without generalisations and omissions. For example, while he gives a pellucid résumé of the *Eclogue's* general inclinations regarding language and the canon

171 These entries of the *Eclogue* are analysed in Favi (2022c); Favi (2022d).

172 See, e.g., Rutherford's (1881, 339) scathing criticism of Polemon, which justifies Lee's (2013, 288) judgement: '[a] sort of latter-day Atticist'.

173 See Swain (1996, 51–2).

174 See López Eire (1991, 72–3).

(Swain 1996, 53), he remains silent on the features of post-Classical Greek that the lexicon proscribes. Swain understandingly finds the *Praeparatio sophistica* to be a ‘more interesting’ work for his purposes but does not inform his reader on the methodological pitfalls awaiting those who peruse its extant abridgment (on which see Section 4.1 above) in their search for a precise theory of language and style.¹⁷⁵ Swain rightly identifies the dissimilarity between Phrynichus’ and Pollux’s works in the different use they make of the same sources and disregards the hypothesis that a professional rivalry existed between them.¹⁷⁶ However, Pollux’s diverse and complex *Onomasticon* receives no description – and this despite the wealth of information it provides on Swain’s very focus of interest, the social dimension of Atticist lexicography.¹⁷⁷

These minor points of criticism aside, Swain’s insights into the relationship between Atticist purism and the changing nature of Greek identity have been appropriately influential on subsequent research on linguistic Atticism.¹⁷⁸ The treatment of the lexica in Schmitz (1997) is both more diverse and more fragmented. The work includes no separate section on lexicography: references to individual passages of the lexica are interwoven in the analysis of the cultural debates of the time, and their linguistic content is not discussed in detail.¹⁷⁹ Unlike Swain, however, Schmitz lingers on the authorial voices present in the lexica to construe the Atticist linguistic ideology.¹⁸⁰ He also expands on the social functions of ‘good’ and ‘bad’ language (Schmitz 1997, 35), demonstrating greater sensitivity than Swain for the evaluative nuances of the lexicographical theorisation.¹⁸¹ However, Schmitz’ account of language choices focuses exclusively on prose composed for declamation: the exclusion of genres such as medicine and philosophy is problematic from a linguistic perspective, given that the use of language in these other genres also sheds light on the choices of high-register declamations.¹⁸²

175 See Swain (1996, 54).

176 Swain (1996, 54).

177 See Matthaïos (2013); Matthaïos (2015a) and Section 5.1.

178 Swain does not press the association between purism and identity to the comparative level: for this, see Chapter 2.

179 See, e.g., Schmitz (1997, 166) on *Ecl.* 140 and *Ecl.* 236 as testimonies of Phrynichus’ criticism of contemporary rhetors.

180 See Schmitz (1997, 83) on the prefatory letter to Book 1 of the *Onomasticon*; Schmitz (1997, 85; 124) on the prefatory letter to the *Eclogue*; and Schmitz (1997, 52) on Phrynichus’ polemic against Menander. These and other programmatic texts are addressed in Chapter 2, Section 3.1.

181 For example, Schmitz (1997, 74) collects several entries of the *Eclogue* in which Phrynichus employs evaluative terminology (on which, see also Chapter 2, Section 3.1).

182 See Schmitz (1997, 34–5).

The works by Schmid, Rutherford, Swain, and Schmitz have been selected here to demonstrate how even with their different focuses (literary, lexicographical, and cultural) they share the same attitude to Atticist lexica. These are treated as informative sources for the understanding of other phenomena: the language of Imperial prose, the role of Attic literature in Greek linguistic history, the social dimension of the Second Sophistic, etc. None of these studies addresses the meta-linguistic reflection of the lexica, nor the picture of ‘Atticising Greek’ that may be gained from a full analysis of their theories. The neglect of lexicography as an integral aspect of the intellectual production of Atticism continues in recent all-encompassing handbooks on the Second Sophistic (Richter, Johnson 2017), of which Atticism is a manifestation.¹⁸³ Even some recent works that engage more closely with the Atticising choices of Chariton (Hernández Lara 1994; Sanz Morales 2014; Sanz Morales 2015), Aelian (Rodríguez-Noriega Guillén 2005), and Achilles Tatius (Gammage 2018; Gammage 2019) use the lexica – if at all – as instructive parallels on literary practices but do not analyse the lexicographical precepts in any detail.¹⁸⁴ A welcome exception is Stifler’s (2019) recent doctoral dissertation on Lucian’s Atticism, which devotes almost an entire chapter to the lexica, particularly the *Eclogue*.¹⁸⁵

5.1 Studying the linguistic theorisation of Atticism through the lexica: The state of the art

We have already (Section 4) remarked how the recent surge of interest in Greek erudition as a metalinguistic source has also fostered a new sensitivity towards lexicography, changing the earlier tendency to focus exclusively on individual questions of a (mostly) philological and lexicographical nature¹⁸⁶ or to privilege a cultural-historical approach.¹⁸⁷ Inspired by these forays, the *Purism in Antiquity* project studies Atticism and its impact on language by allowing its theorists’ voices to speak first, voices that emerge consistently only in the lexicographical cor-

183 Kim (2017) relegates the task of dealing with lexicography as a topic to two pages in the chapter on Atticism and Asianism. Note that he dubs the lexica ‘Attic’ rather than ‘Atticist’ (Kim 2017, 44–6): on this terminological problem, see also Section 4.1.

184 These works should be approached with caution in terms of their handling of lexicographical materials.

185 Stifler (2019, 48–86).

186 Some selected examples: Latte (1915); Tosi (1994a); Tosi (1997); Schironi (2009, 28–38); Ucciardello (2006); Broggiato (2000); Esposito (2017).

187 See e.g. the essays in Bearzot, Landucci, Zecchini (2007) and in Mauduit (2013) on Pollux’s *Onomasticon*.

pus. This approach proves particularly valuable in three areas, starting with cultural history. Lexicography is one of the fundamental genres in which the Greeks' linguistic thought was articulated and through which the knowledge of Ancient Greek has unfolded across centuries. Glossaries and lexica have thus been integral to the study of Greek and the perpetuation of the language's multifarious character and deserve to be studied in their own right as a means of unravelling the views of language entertained by the Greeks. The second aspect is material evidence. Although treatises devoted to linguistic correctness in a broad sense (ἐλληνισμός) were written both prior to and simultaneously with Atticism,¹⁸⁸ nothing substantial remains to us except – at best – snippets of indirect citation. Even the great grammatical enterprises of Apollonius Dyscolus and Herodian are now extant in an incomplete way and often through quotations in later scholarship, which makes it hard for us to reconstruct their theories of language comprehensively.¹⁸⁹ The Atticist lexica, even if in an abbreviated and interpolated form, have all come down to us by direct transmission. Together with Apollonius Dyscolus, they are therefore the closest we get to the linguistic thought of the Greeks in the period between the 2nd and 3rd centuries CE.

The third aspect is methodological. The question as to whether the Atticist lexicographers worked with a preordained idea of correct Greek and with an already defined descriptive system of language remains unresolved.¹⁹⁰ Despite the often elusive and contradictory character of its theories, Atticist lexicography nonetheless represents a rather coherent system (in terms of aims, terminology, chronological range, and linguistic target). It is possible, therefore, to apply the same analytical approach to all the works in the corpus to devise a method that we may then adopt to investigate theories of linguistic correctness in this epoch.

Leaving aside the many new critical editions of scholarly works, whose detailed introductions at times also deal with broad linguistic matters,¹⁹¹ some works stand out for their forays into a more sustained approach to the theories of Atticist lexicography. Two recent encompassing studies are the unpublished doctoral theses by Strobel (2011) and Monaco (2021). Strobel (2011) offers an overview of individual lexica, focusing on their social context and the role of lexicogra-

188 Pagani (2015) provides a detailed overview of these works.

189 This is especially the case with Herodian: see Dyck (1993), to be complemented with Dickey (2014). For an overview of Apollonius Dyscolus' and Herodian's grammatical thought, see Matthaios (2020a, 333–40) (= Matthaios (2015b), 257–64).

190 On this point, see Monaco (2021, 152).

191 For instance, S. Valente (2015b) on the *Antiatticist*; Sandri (2020) on barbarism and solecism; Sandri (2023a) on *tropoi*.

phers such as Phrynichus and Pollux in contemporary rhetorical controversies.¹⁹² Monaco (2021) discusses linguistic correctness in the Atticist lexica vis-à-vis koine developments, before turning to analyse the status of Attic in the 5th century BCE and the development of a systematic notion of linguistic correctness in Hellenistic scholarship, and whether it somehow foreshadows Atticist attitudes (see also Chapters 6 and 7). Unpublished is also the PhD thesis of Brown (2008), devoted to Philemon's lexicon as a source for linguistic evolution in the Imperial age. The only other substantial study of the linguistic theorisation of Atticist lexica is Vessella's (2018) ground-breaking demonstration that correct pronunciation was a major preoccupation for the Atticists and that this is reflected in many lexicographical entries. Apparently dealing with orthographic matters, several lemmas address post-Classical changes in vowel length, accentuation, and vocalic timbre. Getting these right was paramount for a correct oral delivery, and the lexica reveal that considerable thought went into such orthoepic prescriptions.¹⁹³

Aside from Vessella (2018), all other linguistic investigations of the lexica remain piecemeal studies of individual works or issues. Pollux's *Onomasticon* and Phrynichus' *Eclogue* have, understandably, attracted the most attention by virtue of their ample use of evaluative and technical terminology to describe language. The *Onomasticon* is particularly useful for the investigation of sociolinguistic categories. Matthaïos (2013) and Matthaïos (2015a) consider how the *Onomasticon* approaches linguistic registers, while S. Valente (2013b) discusses the changing nature of Pollux's use of the terms *συνήθεια* and *χρησις*, with which the lexicographer refers to the linguistic usages of his times. Through a detailed analysis of the various disparaging adjectives that in Pollux mark unapproved expressions, Conti Bizzarro (2018) demonstrates how the *Onomasticon* may be considered 'a work of linguistic criticism' (Conti Bizzarro 2018, 113).¹⁹⁴ The approaches of both Matthaïos and Conti Bizzarro are foreshadowed in an earlier, little known but valuable volume by Bussès (2011), which investigates Pollux's methodology through a full analysis of his evaluative terminology and use of literary models. In a more general investigation of the *Onomasticon*'s structure as an onomasiological lexicon, Chronopoulos (2016) discusses how Pollux organised his work around not only descriptive categories but also parts of speech (verbs, abstract nouns, participles, nouns, adverbs); the same 'grammatical' organisation is recognised by Conti Bizzarro (2018, 4). Tribulato (2018) confirms that the structure of the *Onomasticon* discloses Pollux's linguistic thought, analysing the ten prefatory letters as evi-

¹⁹² See also the shorter overview by Strobel (2009).

¹⁹³ See also Vessella (2010). Volume 2 addresses these orthoepic prescriptions and the Atticists' view of Attic and post-Classical phonology.

¹⁹⁴ Earlier contributions on the same topic are Conti Bizzarro (2014); Conti Bizzarro (2017).

dence for his authorial discourse and approach to the lexicographical method.¹⁹⁵ Although diverse in their scope and aims, these works share an interest in the way vocabulary is represented in the *Onomasticon*, and what its models are. As yet, however, no attempt has been made to develop a systematic study of Pollux's approach to other linguistic levels (phonology, morphology, syntax, etc.).

Similarly, Phrynichus' *Eclogue* is omnipresent in all overviews of linguistic Atticism, but a full investigation of its theories on a par with that of Rutherford (1881) remains a desideratum. Aside from individual discussions in the above-mentioned works by Strobel (2011), Vessella (2018), and Monaco (2021), a pointedly linguistic glance at the *Eclogue* informs the articles by Lee (2013) and la Roi (2022).¹⁹⁶ Lee (2013) begins with the *Eclogue* in his comparison of Atticist precepts on vocabulary and morphology with information from the New Testament as evidence of 'the Koine Greek of their day' (Lee 2013, 303), an original approach that warrants a broader investigation. Taking his cue from Lee, la Roi (2022) goes on to demonstrate that the lexica exhibit a far keener awareness of morphosyntactic changes than is typically assumed: they tackle paradigmatic and category changes triggered by analogical levelling, syntactic changes involving grammaticalisation (e.g. the periphrastic constructions with μέλλω and τυγχάνω), and the spread of prepositional constructions.

In his investigation of these linguistic phenomena, la Roi (2022) considers many entries in Moeris' lexicon. Apparently 'friendlier' than more elusive lexica from the reader's perspective, Moeris' work challenges its readers with some fundamental questions, the most compelling of which is the exact definition of his evaluative categories Ἑλληνες and κοινόν. Maidhof (1912) argued that Moeris uses the former to refer to Hellenistic literary language ('high-register koine') and the latter to vulgar, low-register usages. However, that his conclusion is an over-generalisation that disregards many entries is proven by the fact that κοινόν often characterises expressions that are equally well attested in high-register prose, while the usage marked with Ἑλληνες or ἑλληνικόν is by no means confined to high-register texts.¹⁹⁷ Striking at the heart of the problem, Monaco (2021, 32–3) argues that Moeris might use κοινόν in cases where the koine form coincides with that of Attic and makes the case for a reappraisal of the issue. There remain numerous gaps in the linguistic approaches to Moeris. As in the case of

¹⁹⁵ All these aspects of Pollux's lexicographical method are investigated in more detail in Volume 2.

¹⁹⁶ Bentein (2021, 394–400) provides a useful summary of the *Eclogue*'s content according to linguistic level, although note that he quotes the text from Rutherford (1881).

¹⁹⁷ A case in point would be ἀτυχής for ἀθλιος 'unfortunate', which also frequently occurs in papyri: see Pellettieri (2023a).

Pollux, no reliable overview of his treatment of linguistic levels has been produced. Compared to better-investigated lexicographers, Moeris is also poorly studied with respect to his use of Attic literary models. This is a consequence of the fact that in its extant form, the lexicon makes only sparse reference to authors and none to works. D. U. Hansen's (1998) critical edition does little to ease this task because its references to *loci classici* are at times misleading.

Those who study the *Antiatticist* are better served by the rich apparatuses of S. Valente (2015b), which provide readers with a first port of call not only on the literary attestations of all the expressions collected by the *Antiatticist* but also on their parallel sources in Greek erudition. By virtue of its less strict Atticism, the *Antiatticist* frequently features in studies approaching the Atticist canon from a linguistic viewpoint. Cassio (2012) applies a linguistic analysis to a handful of *Antiatticist* lemmas from Doric comedy, showing how the lexicon turned to numerous less canonical authors in commenting on, and defending, post-Classical usages. Tribulato (2014) and Tribulato (2016a) extend this broadly linguistic approach to the reception of, respectively, Menander and Herodotus in Atticist lexicography, while Tribulato (2021a) expands on how the *Antiatticist* uses the canon to champion a more inclusive notion of linguistic classicism. Fiori (2022) focuses on the *Antiatticist* entries that quote Aristophanes, but his commentaries are also rich in linguistic discussions. An in-depth study of the *Antiatticist* which details its choices in terms of canon, vocabulary, and general approach to post-Classical developments is a desideratum. Several forays that demonstrate its potential for a linguistic study are offered in Tribulato (2019a) and Tribulato (2021b), both of which tackle the possible influence of Byzantine exegesis and later linguistic usage in the material preserved in the epitome of the *Antiatticist*. Tribulato (2021c), while focusing on Pindar's presence in the lexicon, also offers some remarks on how the *Antiatticist* treats the morphological categories of verbal adjectives in *-τος* and analogical comparatives in *-έστερος*. Tribulato (2022) deals more broadly with the use of the comic canon in the lexicon.

The selection of Attic models lay at the heart of Atticist controversies (so much so that an unproven but still popular view identifies it as the kernel of a fictional dispute between Pollux and Phrynichus).¹⁹⁸ In this area too, however, the situation is not ideal for linguists. A considerable degree of emphasis has been placed on the comic canon – understandably, given comedy's pre-eminence as an Attic genre – and counts of various types have been produced.¹⁹⁹ Those in-

¹⁹⁸ The hypothesis was advanced by Naechster (1908). A discussion of the scholarly debate on this hypothesis may be found in Matthaios (2013, 71–8), with a more succinct overview in Matthaios (2020a, 370) (= Matthaios 2015b, 295); Regali (2008a). See also Volume 2 of this series.

¹⁹⁹ See Sonnino (2014); Tribulato (2022); Tribulato (2024).

terested in other genres are not well-served, beginning with the striking case of tragedy and tragic language (on the *Eclogue* alone, see Rutherford 1881), continuing with a pivotal genre like oratory, and first-ranking authors such as Thucydides, Plato, and Xenophon.²⁰⁰ Bussès (2011) is an exception in that he provides complete statistics of Pollux's use of literary sources in relation to his views on language. Relying on counts such as those by Bussès (2011), one can appreciate the relative similarity of the linguistic models chosen by Pollux and Phrynichus in the *Praeparatio sophistica* (but not the *Eclogue*). However, the *Praeparatio* is curiously neglected, not only by linguists but also by scholars of rhetoric and style. That the edition of de Borries (1911) is outdated and sparing in apparatuses and references is not sufficient reason for the disregard of this lexicon on the part of those who are not merely looking for information on some literary fragment. Despite the lexicon's heavily abridged status, it is still possible to perceive the rich palette of styles and registers through which Phrynichus drew his picture of Atticising language in this work.²⁰¹ The Phrynichus who reflects on Attic in the *Praeparatio* is still a strict purist, but his purposes are wider, and hence, his advice in this lexicon allows for variation, idiosyncrasy, and various levels of correctness. At least three areas offer room for improvement (see also Section 4.1).²⁰² First, we need a new identification of literary genres behind certain unattributed lemmas of the *Praeparatio*. Second, we must precisely map the relationship between stylistic advice, linguistic prescriptions, and the canon. The third area is more closely 'linguistic' and concerns the analysis of some phenomena that seem to have a special standing in the *Praeparatio*: neologisms (often marked by the evaluative term *καίνος*);²⁰³ rare compounds (with the accompanying issue of the many *hapax* expressions commended in the *Praeparatio*);²⁰⁴ and prefixed nouns and verbs.²⁰⁵

200 A discussion of these authors and genres in the Atticist canon is on the agenda for Volume 2 of this series. For tragedy, see the preliminary remarks in Favi (2022e); Favi (2022f); Favi (2022g); Favi (2022h); Tribulato (2023a); Tribulato (2023b). For Xenophon, see Favi (forthcoming a). Work on Xenophon in Atticist lexicography is being undertaken by Gabriella Rubulotta (University of Messina).

201 See Tribulato (forthcoming a).

202 For a new perspective on the lexicon, see Favi, Pellettieri, Tribulato (forthcoming).

203 See Gerbi (forthcoming).

204 See Monaco (2021, 67–8).

205 See Monaco (2021, 65–7) and Monaco (forthcoming).

6 The *Ancient Greek Purism* volumes

The above overview has highlighted the range of issues that a linguistic investigation of Atticist lexicography must confront and the gaps that linger in this growing field of study. The *Purism in Antiquity* project and the volumes issuing therefrom aim to contribute to this field by producing a comprehensive account of the lexica's theorisations and of their legacy with respect to Greek culture in later periods. We apply both diachronic and synchronic linguistic analyses to Atticist theories of language correctness, placing them within the sociolinguistic context in which they were produced or received. Our investigation's diachronic approach allows us to identify the causes (language change, language contact, etc.) that explain the Atticist proscription of certain forms and the preference for others that the Atticists typically identify with 'correct' 5th-century BCE Attic usage. The same diachronic sensitivity informs our analysis of the survival of these Atticist precepts and related linguistic forms in the scholarly debate and linguistic practice of later periods in Greek history. The lexicographical and literary sources are also investigated in a synchronic dimension, meaning that each linguistic feature is studied per se in relation to the linguistic period and the texts in which it is employed.

In addressing both dimensions, we seek to adopt a historical (or 'external': see Sluiter 1998, 24) approach to ancient scholarly sources and to interpret them in light of the system of thought and the age that produced them. This does not mean, of course, that we do not also probe these texts in light of questions and methodologies that are relevant or fashionable today (the 'internal' approach). The use of ancient sources to resolve some epistemological questions or to complement our understanding of cross-linguistic or typological phenomena is entirely legitimate: for example, in discussing the etymology of an obscure word, the information provided by the ancients can be of considerable use. As its title demonstrates, *Purism in Antiquity* proposes to study Atticism within the framework of modern sociolinguistic analyses of purism. However, this 'internal' approach veers into dangerous territory when it implies a judgement of ancient sources based on our modern methodological assumptions. Not infrequently, modern preconceptions about how 'linguistics' or 'literary criticism' should be executed have decreed the devaluation of ancient scholars and works. De Jonge (2008, 6–7) discusses the example of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, whose appraisal of the style of ancient authors has occasionally been dismissed owing to its failure to comply with our modern canons but above all because it has not been placed in the historical–cultural context in which it flourished.

In the case of Atticist lexicography, the adoption of a similarly 'internal' approach would require, for example, that lexicographers speak with terminological clarity and competence about the koine and its different levels/registers. The fact

that they do not clearly identify a linguistic entity matching our notion of ‘koine’, however, does not mean that Atticist lexicography is not useful for modern studies of koine, as discussed in Section 5.1. The lexicographers refer to contemporary Greek (koine) by focusing more on single phenomena (lexical, phonological, etc.) than on an overall picture of language, more on the idiolects of specific groups of speakers (see Matthaios 2013 and Section 5.1) than on defining the boundaries between spoken language, low-register written style, and high-register archaising style. Ancient linguistic sources must be studied in light of a cultural context in which language is always part of a rhetorical theory of style (see Chapter 6, Section 3.2). We should also acknowledge that a lexicon is not a grammatical treatise and therefore cannot be expected to describe language in a complete and abstract way: the ancients did this quite well, in fact, but in different genres (such as Dionysius Thrax’s *Grammar*, on which see Chapter 6, Sections 2 and 3.1; or Apollonius Dyscolus’ *Syntax*).

These methodological premises inform the linguistic analysis of Atticism in the *Ancient Greek Purism* series. Prior to considering the contents of the present volume, which is devoted to the cultural and historical roots of Atticism, let us consider a broad outline of the two subsequent volumes. Volume 2, *The Age of Atticism*, will provide a systematic study of how Atticist lexicography approaches the phonology, morphology, morpho-syntax, and lexicon of Atticising Greek vis-à-vis the evolution that post-Classical Greek underwent. This linguistic study, which will also consider the choices of Atticising writers of the Imperial age, will be complemented by an analysis of the lexicographers’ statements on language and their approach to the lexicographical method while also considering the contemporary theorisation of rhetoric.

Volume 3, *The Legacy of Atticism*, will chart the history of Atticist lexica and their views on language between Late Antiquity and the early Renaissance with a strong focus on the Byzantine period. One significant gap that has emerged in current scholarship on Atticism is the lack of a linguistic approach to Byzantine lexicography, which echoes the general neglect of linguistics in Byzantine studies.²⁰⁶ Owing to the widespread assumption that lexica, like all Byzantine literature, are repetitive ‘mechanical compilations’ (thus, e.g. Alpers 2001, 205 on Photius’ lexicon), research in this field is mostly textual–philological in orientation, which has produced critical editions of the main lexica, detailed studies of their textual transmission, and general overviews of their role within Byzantine scholarship²⁰⁷

²⁰⁶ See Robins (1993); Manolessou (2014).

²⁰⁷ Together with the references quoted in Section 4.2, see also the classic studies of Cohn (1900); Tolkiehn (1925); Alpers (1990); the papers in E. Trapp, Fatouros, Hörandner (1988); Hörandner, E. Trapp (1991); and E. Trapp, Schönauer (2007).

but almost no investigations of the relationship between Atticist prescriptions in Byzantine lexica and the linguistic reality of Byzantine and Medieval Greek.²⁰⁸ However, these lexica did not originate in a vacuum: they were compiled by scholars who lived during a period when mastery of the language of the classics went hand in hand with deciding which features of contemporary Medieval Greek were unfit for literary style. Volume 3 will place Atticism's legacy in Byzantine lexicography within its linguistic and literary contexts and will contribute further insights to the theoretical framework that has recently challenged the traditional view of a static Byzantine diglossia.²⁰⁹ This new interpretative trend advocates a more fine-grained theory that approaches Byzantine and Medieval Greek as extremes of a linguistic continuum in which choices of style, register, vocabulary, and grammar may vary considerably.²¹⁰

The survival of Atticism in the Middle Ages and beyond also has a highly material aspect, represented by the books themselves and the contexts of their circulation. The intellectual circles of 9th- and 10th-century Constantinople that produced the great Byzantine lexica (see Section 4.2) were also responsible for the abbreviation of works such as Pollux's *Onomasticon* and the production of new collections of ancient material (such as the lexicographical miscellany of cod. Par. Coisl. 345). Currently, no comprehensive overview exists of the survival, circulation, and reception of Atticist lexica after antiquity and of the manuscripts that carried them.²¹¹ The rich classic introductions to Greek learning and the dissemination of Greek manuscripts in the West devote little space to these works.²¹² The information that one may find in these studies (including the more recent Botley 2010 and Ciccolella, Silvano 2017) is understandably focused on the bigger picture and so offers no systematic assessment of either the use of the Atticist lexica in the intellectual milieu of 14th–16th-century Italy and the production of new copies. In Volume 3, two chapters will be devoted to a wide-ranging investigation of the circulation of Atticist lexica in Byzantium, their later reception by Humanism, or their interaction with the scholarly milieu that surrounded Greek learning in the West.

208 For some recent exceptions, see Matthaïos (2006); Matthaïos (2010); Tribulato (2019a).

209 As, e.g., in Meillet (1930, 23), or in the classic handbooks by Beck (1971) and Hunger (1978).

210 See, e.g., Ševčenko (1981); E. Trapp (1993); Toufexis (2008); Hinterberger (2014); Horrocks (2014); Cuomo (2017); Cuomo, E. Trapp (2017); Horrocks (2021).

211 Critical editions (see references in Sections 4.1–4.2) and their *prolegomena* (e.g. Bethe 1895; Wendel 1929) focus on defining the *stemma codicum*, and give very little information on the shape, contents, and history of the manuscripts themselves, especially those which are considered to be of lesser value for the *constitutio textus*.

212 E.g. Reynolds, Wilson (1968); Geanakoplos (1962); Layton (1994); N. G. Wilson (2017), to quote the most famous studies.

6.1 Outline of volume 1

This volume addresses the multifarious roots of Atticism against the background of the Greek linguistic and cultural history from the archaic to the late Hellenistic period. Although often defined as a form of linguistic purism, Atticism has never been analysed in light of current theories of linguistic purism. **Chapter 2** addresses this issue to lay the methodological basis for studying Atticism as a linguistic phenomenon, its relationship with standardisation and prescriptivism (Section 2), and the distinctive purist discourse that characterises Atticist lexica (Section 3). This methodological chapter is then followed by five historical chapters.

Chapter 3 provides a concise linguistic and cultural history of the archaic and Classical periods, when Greek was fragmented into several local varieties that competed in both literary and official communication (Sections 1–2.4). We examine the ways in which contemporary sources address these linguistic differences, how these views shaped the Greeks' linguistic identity, and how the linguistic differences were later perceived in ancient scholarship. Within this framework, the chapter then moves on to address the emergence of Attic in the 5th century BCE (Sections 2.5–6), and the way in which Attic literary sources constructed an idea of Athenian exclusivity based on the myth of autochthony and on a cultural supremacy in which language also implicitly plays a role. In exploring the contribution that Athens and her dialect made to the evolution of Hellenicity, the chapter primarily seeks to pinpoint the broad changes that explain the subsequent archaising reaction of Atticism. In the second part of the chapter (Section 3), we shall consider how ancient erudition (primarily of the post-Classical and Byzantine periods) viewed the relationship between the Classical dialectal groups. In describing how these sources address the peculiarities of Doric, Aeolic, and Ionic, we shall see that ancient scholars attributed to these varieties ethical and psychological characters, a framework that is less prominent in the case of Attic. This, we shall suggest, unveils the special place that is reserved for Attic in ancient dialectology, a prominence that found particular resonance in Atticist theorisation.

Later perceptions of Attic as the most prestigious Greek dialect was significantly shaped by Attic literature itself. **Chapter 4** discusses Athenian views on Attic and its relationship to other dialects and languages. With the notable exception of Pseudo-Xenophon's *Constitution of the Athenians*, most of the relevant texts belong to comedy (Aristophanes, Eupolis, Plato Comicus), and confirm the role of comedy as the primary source on Attic, a role that is also reflected in the great attention devoted to the comic genre by Hellenistic scholarship and Atticist lexicography. The later Atticist view of correct language typically operates according to a strict dichotomy between 'correct' 5th-century BCE Attic usages and 'incorrect' koine developments. Attic literature of the 4th century BCE is the thorn

in the side of this neat division between acceptable and unacceptable language: populated by such prominent figures as Demosthenes, Lysias, Menander, Xenophon, and Plato, 4th-century BCE Attic literature nevertheless employs an international form of Attic that is gradually evolving towards the koine (Chapter 4, Section 4) and that must at times have appeared suspiciously ‘unClassical’ to Atticist eyes. But how conservative or innovative was this form of later Attic? Were the Atticists correct in regarding it as a less pristine form of the dialect? **Chapter 5** strikes at the heart of this question by providing a comprehensive overview of the main phonological, morphological, and syntactic features of the language of 4th- and 3rd-century BCE comedy. This focus on comedy is justified by the Atticist method itself, which based its impression of Attic in no small part on Old Comedy, drawing from Middle and New Comedy only when their linguistic usage complied with the Atticist notion of ‘Classical’ Attic. Comedy was also one of the genres on which Hellenistic scholarship founded its approach to Attic culture and language, and thus it is an inescapable point of reference for those wishing to understand the transformation of literary Attic and its later scholarly reception.

Chapters 6 and 7 address the beginnings and later the blossoming of the monumentalisation of Attic in Hellenistic erudition, from the second half of the 4th to the end of the 2nd century BCE, with some targeted forays into the 1st century BCE. Both chapters focus on how Attic as a distinct (spoken) dialect *and* a literary language was perceived and evaluated by Hellenistic scholarship against other Greek dialectal varieties before the proliferation in the second half of the first century BCE of the so-called Τέχνην περὶ ἑλληνισμοῦ (*Manuals on Correctness*), which mark the first visible step towards the development of those tendencies that will later mature into the blossoming of the so-called linguistic Atticism. We shall concentrate on the emergence of the first lexicographical and dialectal collections against the wider background of Hellenistic philological activity and incipient grammatical theorisation – that is, on those two strands of early grammatical reflection that exerted the most enduring influence with respect to informing later Atticist theories and practice. While delineating the early stages of this process, we shall therefore constantly highlight – when the state of the available evidence allows it – the underlying continuities and differences in the conceptual framework within which Hellenistic and Atticist lexicography developed. **Chapter 6** will begin by addressing the conceptualisation of γλῶσσα and λέξις in Aristotle and the Peripatetic tradition (Section 3), its implementation in what are, for us, the first collections of unusual or rare words (Philaitas of Cos, Simmias of Rhodes: Section 4.2), before moving to the lexicographical work of Zenodotus (Section 4.3) and Callimachus (Section 4.4) and concluding with what is rightly considered to be the culmination of this first phase of Alexandrian scholarship on Attic: Eratosthenes’ monumental *On Old Comedy* and his onomastic repertoires

Ἀρχιτεκτονικός and Σκευογραφικός (Section 5). **Chapter 7** will broaden the scope by examining two different but complementary sets of evidence. The first part will survey how two leading figures of the heyday of Hellenistic erudition, Aristophanes of Byzantium (Section 2) and Aristarchus of Samothrace (Section 3), approached and treated the Attic dialect. Extensive attention will be devoted to Aristophanes' Λέξεις (Section 2.2), the first extant Hellenistic lexicographical collection that has come down to us in an appreciable size. Aristarchus, although not credited with any stand-alone collection of γλῶσσαι or λέξεις, also paid sustained attention to Attic dialect within the broader framework of his studies on Homer and comedy. The second part of the chapter will offer a review of the extant evidence for the collection of Attic glosses (isolated or in self-standing or semi-autonomous works) from the 3rd to the first half of the 1st century BCE, both on the part of well-known scholars (e.g. Ister, Philemon, Demetrius of Ixion, Apollodorus of Athens, Crates of Athens: Section 4) and minor grammarians while simultaneously examining the anonymous and fragmentary lexica transmitted by papyri (Sections 5 and 6). Building on Chapter 6, Chapter 7 will also examine this double set of evidence from the perspective of its reception and re-use in later Atticist theorization in an attempt to gauge what the points of continuity and divergence are between the Hellenistic approach to language issues and the Atticists' own perspective on the same linguistic material (i.e. how they remoulded it to serve their mindset and aims). This is precisely where *Quellenforschung* can tell us something also about cultural and intellectual history.

Chapter 2

Atticism as a form of linguistic purism

1 The linguistic classification of Atticism

From the Hadrianic age onwards, Atticism championed the 5th-century BCE Attic dialect as a model of correct Greek through the production of special ‘usage guides’ or lexica.¹ This chapter considers whether Atticism should be defined as a form of standardisation or prescriptivism or more narrowly subsumed under the more specific category of linguistic purism. These are contiguous sociolinguistic phenomena that are not always easily distinguished: Sections 2 and 2.1 provide a rough description of their similarities and mutual differences in light of contemporary linguistic research. Following on from this, Section 3 proceeds to explore a second issue: what criteria should we apply in assigning Atticism to one of these categories?

In this chapter, we shall demonstrate that it is preferable to treat Atticism as a form of linguistic purism. Of course, this conclusion is hardly new; much of the standard bibliography equates Atticism to purism, including foundational reference works such as Tolkieln (1925), Dihle (1977), and Tosi (1994a).² However, none of these works elaborated on the definition of Atticism as a form of purism: while the classification is taken for granted, it is never discussed critically. This is a direct consequence of the fact that although individual Atticist lexemes or lexicographic passages have been the object of linguistic analysis, Atticism as a whole has never been comprehensively studied from a distinctively linguistic perspective (see Chapter 1, Sections 1 and 5.1): we have neither a comprehensive view of its linguistic theories nor a set of criteria against which it might be assessed from the perspective of modern linguistics. Moreover, analyses of Atticism are inconsistent with respect to their use of terminology. Alongside the more ubiquitous ‘purism’, we also find alternative definitions, such as ‘normativity’, ‘prescriptivism’, and ‘language correctness’. Schmitz’ (1997) work, for instance, applies all the above

1 For the term ‘usage guide’, see Chapter 1, note 78.

2 The key terms employed in these studies include the following: ‘Purismus’ (Tolkieln 1925, 2453), ‘Reinheit’ (Schmid *Atticismus passim*; Tolkieln 1925, 2454), ‘Puristen’/‘Purismus’ (Dihle 1977, 165, who applies them to Roman oratory; Schmitz 1997, 76; 116; 192 who uses them for the Atticist lexicographers), ‘volontà analogistico-purista’ (Tosi 1994a, 174), ‘purismo’ (Tosi 1994a, 206), ‘purism’ (Swain 1996, 17 and *passim*; Kim 2010, 476; G. Anderson 1993, 90; Tosi 2015, 632; Pagani 2015, 828), and ‘linguistic purity’ (Frösén 1974, 108).

terms to Atticist theories and *lexica*.³ Again, in the absence of any theoretical discussion, it is impossible to ascertain whether Schmitz' terminological choice reflects an interpretative stance or is simply fortuitous (the latter seems more likely). The fact remains that prominent works on Atticism fail to discuss the criteria according to which they assign this phenomenon to a given sociolinguistic category.

Sections 2 and 3 will probe this issue and propose a set of criteria against which we can judge the extent to which Atticism may qualify as a form of purism according to the standards of (historical) sociolinguistics. We shall discuss the terminology, methodology, and structure of Atticist *lexica* against the framework proposed by G. Thomas (1991) and complemented by later works such as Langer, Nesse (2012). We shall also investigate the extent to which modern sociolinguistic categories enable us to approach Atticism as a linguistic phenomenon and the grey areas that remain after we have applied this methodology. Before commencing our analysis of Atticist *lexica*, we shall first briefly consider the difficulties inherent in the theoretical definition of purism vis-à-vis the contiguous phenomena of standardisation and prescriptivism.

2 Standardisation, prescriptivism, and purism

Standardisation, prescriptivism, and purism are all concerned with the definition of a superior, more desirable, or best form of language.⁴ They are closely related sociolinguistic phenomena that adopt different perspectives on this aim and how it should be achieved. The establishment of boundaries between standardisation, prescriptivism, and purism is challenging and contingent on how broad or restrictive a notion of these one adopts.⁵ In this section, we shall first define these phenomena before addressing their mutual differences and how these may apply to the case of Atticism.

Standardisation may be defined as an ongoing historical process that seeks to establish linguistic uniformity and minimise variability for political, social, or

³ In reference to Atticism itself, Schmitz employs the expressions 'normativer Charakter' (1997, 73), 'normativer Aspekt' (1997, 74), 'richtiger Sprachgebrauch' (1997, 46; 69; 74), 'korrekte Sprachform' (1997, 75), 'attizistische Korrektheit' (1997, 78), 'Sprachrichtigkeit' (1997, 89 and *passim*), and 'Sprachreinheit' (1997, 69 and *passim*). Schmitz only rarely employs 'Purismus' and 'Purist/Puristen' for his own description of Atticism (see Schmitz 1997, 76; 116; 192). In most instances, these terms are used to qualify the attitudes of contemporary intellectuals toward Atticism: see Schmitz (1997, 80–2) on Galen; Schmitz (1997, 116; 118; 192) on Philostratus.

⁴ O. Walsh (2016, 8–9).

⁵ See Brunstad (2001, 23–30); Brincat (2003, 155); O. Walsh (2016, 8); Ayres-Bennett (2020, 192).

economic needs.⁶ It aims to enforce a norm to overcome linguistic barriers within the same (political) community, to centralise language – particularly at the level of lower education – or even to plan its renewal or reconstruction from scratch, often with the additional aim of creating a community symbol.⁷ Prescriptivism is contiguous to standardisation and focuses on elaborating *prescriptions* of arbitrary norms of linguistic usage by authority while rejecting others.⁸ Purism may be provisionally defined as ‘the manifestation of a desire on the part of a speech community (or some section of it) to preserve a language from, or rid it of, putative foreign elements or other elements held to be undesirable (including those originating in dialects, sociolects and styles of the same language)’ (G. Thomas 1991, 12; see below for a further discussion of this definition).⁹

It is important to note that all forms of standardisation, prescriptivism, and purism are inherently arbitrary, since the notion of linguistic correctness itself is an ideological construct. Hence, these phenomena are usually recognised as a specific focus of sociolinguistics but not of formal linguistics which, it is assumed, should only be concerned with *describing* language. However, their study is becoming increasingly central to linguistics, as is the recognition that it is difficult to set a clear boundary between prescriptivist and descriptivist attitudes to language.¹⁰ In that which follows, we shall first highlight some areas of confusion and overlap between standardisation and prescriptivism on the one hand and purism on the other before proposing a set of criteria which may help overcome this confusion.

As a first step, it is necessary to reflect on the target of purism. Thomas’ definition (see above) proposes a broad understanding of the phenomenon, by which

6 Our elaboration of Milroy, Milroy (2012, 19). Cf. Milroy (2001, 531).

7 Langer, Nesse (2012, 611).

8 Curzan (2014, 28–32) addresses the role of prescriptivism in language standardisation. See also Ayres-Bennett (2020, 184 n. 1): ‘in broad terms, the term ‘prescriptivism’ is used, following the OED, to refer to ‘the practice or advocacy of prescriptive grammar; the belief that the grammar of a language should lay down rules to which usage must conform’, whilst ‘prescription’, itself underpinned by a prescriptive ideology, is used for the act of prescribing or the result of that prescription. In practice, some scholars use the terms more or less interchangeably’.

9 Cf. Chapter 1, Section 2. G. Thomas (1991, 115) also recognises the ‘strong calibration between purism and standardization’, given that both are concerned with the same functions of language (among them, the prestige function).

10 See Joseph (1987, 17–8); D. Cameron (1995, 3–11); Trask (2007, 48); Milroy (2001, 531); Milroy, Milroy (2012, 4–6); Curzan (2014, 12–6). Ayres-Bennett (2020, 182) notes that ‘the prescriptive norm is typically based on the descriptive norm, that is, it often begins with the observation of usage, but then a notion of what is right and wrong, correct and incorrect, is added’. This progression may also be useful to assess the evolution of Greek linguistic thought: see Chapter 6, Section 2.

purism is not primarily or solely concerned with foreign elements, but may also target internal features – namely, those that also lie at the heart of standardisation and prescriptivism.¹¹ Several scholars have criticised this definition as problematic on the grounds that Thomas’ framework is not conducive to the distinction of purism from other related sociolinguistic phenomena. Thus, more restrictive approaches associate purism with a reaction against foreign elements, which is accompanied by the (re)introduction of features native to the language in question (‘xenophobic purism’).¹² This view is ubiquitous in surveys of modern forms of purism, whereby attempts to preserve languages from the intrusion of foreign elements have gone together with nation-building and independentist stances. For instance, Brunstad’s (2001) study of purist endeavours in Danish, Swedish, Faroese, and Norwegian defines purism as ‘a normative ideology characterised by the idea of a pure language: certain foreign elements should be kept out on the grounds that they make the language impure. This perception is often combined with active efforts to replace language loans with native material or with strategies to adapt loans to native language structures’ (our translation of Brunstad 2001, 1).¹³ Similarly, other forms of purism entail a process of standardisation towards the definition of a national language as part of a wider political reclamation.

The variety of approaches summarily described here obliges us to confront several fundamental questions. The first question is whether purism is invariably rooted in processes of standardisation and whether it can exist without standardisation. In general, studies that focus on the more restrictive, ‘xenophobic’ forms of purism tend to assume that it is always a consequence of standardisation.¹⁴ Even Thomas’ looser definition (above) acknowledges that purism lies at the heart of standardisation efforts undertaken for many national languages.¹⁵ However, the recognition that purism may play a part in standardisation should not inevitably lead us to conclude that all forms of standardisation must also entail purist attitudes, and this is particularly salient in the context of Graeco-Roman

11 A similar understanding in Delveroudi, Moschonas (2003, 4).

12 Milroy, Milroy (2012) focus on the English prescriptive debate. Although they do not state this explicitly, it appears that they consider purism to be directed solely against foreign elements and not internal developments, as indicated by the fact that they only mention ‘purism’ with respect to objections to foreign borrowing in English; cf. Ayres-Bennett (2020, 193).

13 Similar notions of purism feature in works assessing purist attitudes in languages as diverse as Tamil (Annamalai 1979), Norwegian (Gerdener 1986), Quechua (Niño-Murcia 1997), and Québécois French (O. Walsh 2016), among others (see also Chapter 1, Section 2).

14 See also Langer, Nesse (2012, 612), who subscribe to the view that ‘linguistic purism only occurs in standardized languages or in languages in the process of standardization’.

15 G. Thomas (1991, 121) mentions Croatian and Modern Hebrew as examples.

theories of language correctness.¹⁶ Like prescriptivism, standardisation is not inherently conservative (although it often is); it may prescribe norms that reflect linguistic change as it occurs or even impose change from scratch.¹⁷ Purism, by contrast, is always opposed to change and emerges as a traditionalist reaction to it. Recognising that some ‘osmosis’ may occur between standardisation, prescriptivism, and purism does not preclude the establishment of boundaries between these phenomena.¹⁸ We will mention some practical ways to do this in Section 2.1.

The second fundamental question that we must preliminarily address is whether it is useful to apply a restrictive (i.e. ‘xenophobic’) definition to purism and whether this definition is helpful in allowing linguists to describe purism comprehensively and cross-linguistically. Restrictive notions of purism do not always hold true and are often inconsistent. As an example, we may cite the Quechua purist movement studied by Niño-Murcia (1997). This movement does not simply wish to purge Quechua of Spanish influence. Significantly, it also involves the promotion of a perceived ‘better’ variety of Quechua (*qhapaj simi*) that was associated with the Incan nobility over the perceived ‘dialect’ spoken by the lower classes (*runa simi* ‘language of the people’). Like Quechua purism, which involves both xenophobic and elitist elements, several other iterations of purism are also hybrid. Atticism, discussed herein, provides a further and often-neglected example of linguistic attitudes that are associated with more than one type of purism (see Section 3.2). It follows that for a cross-linguistic study it is more convenient to approach purism in terms of its broader implications: not as ‘un système d’idées clairement et explicitement formulé’ but rather as ‘une mentalité’ (Delveroudi, Moschonas 2003, 1).

2.1 Differentiating elements: An increasingly militant linguistic ideology

This discussion of various forms of purism in their relation and overlap with standardisation and prescriptivism has foregrounded the centrality of their linguistic mentality. We shall now argue that the differences between these three

¹⁶ See also Moschonas, Delveroudi (2003, 5): ‘[l]e purisme est un présupposé de la grammaire normative’.

¹⁷ This point is made by O. Walsh (2016, 9): cf. Ayres-Bennett (2020, 193). An example of non-conservative prescriptivism would be the new Norwegian method of counting, discussed by Langer, Nesse (2012, 614), which was introduced for practical (rather than ideological) purposes.

¹⁸ Ayres-Bennett, Bellamy (2021, 7) discuss efforts to resist changes to a standard language but tellingly quote evidence from instances of purism, thus involuntarily highlighting the gradient that is proposed here: protectionist attitudes are more tied with the ideology of purism than specifically with that of standardisation.

phenomena may be conveniently correlated to (1) the dialectic between pragmatism and abstractness; (2) the way these phenomena attempt to codify a language standard; and (3) the nature of the ideological discourse.

Regarding (1), standardisation tends to have more pronounced functional purposes than prescriptivism and purism, which instead exhibit a more prominent tendency towards abstractness and arbitrariness. Standardisation focuses on the concrete means of achieving uniformity and its benefits.¹⁹ Excellent examples include the debates surrounding the spelling reforms of Modern Greek (1982: an analysis in Papanastasiou 2008) and German (1996: an analysis in Johnson 2005), both instances of orthographic standardisation.²⁰ These state-imposed reforms aimed both to simplify orthography and to align it more closely with the respective phonetic realities of Greek and German while making the languages themselves easier to learn.²¹ The motivations behind these standardisations, therefore, were practical, mostly objective, and largely sustained by linguists.²² Prescriptivism and purism instead are marked by a somewhat more militant ambition towards codification, which tends to express itself in less objective terms. To pursue the same example further, opponents of the Modern Greek and German spelling reforms focus on the cultural significance of preserving the historical, traditional writing system, which they arbitrarily associate with ideas of ‘national’ character and prestige culture.²³ These opponents rarely offer rational, hardcore linguistic arguments but rather approach orthography as an expression of identity: in their discourse, concrete needs yield to arbitrariness.²⁴ On the linguistic level, the more militant the struggle of prescriptivism and purism for correct language, the narrower their notion of grammaticality. In their marked arbitrariness, prescriptivism and purism may thus pronounce a given form to be

¹⁹ See Milroy (2005, 325).

²⁰ On the spelling system as a highly regulated domain of standardisation, see Ayres-Bennett, Bellamy (2021, 5).

²¹ See Papanastasiou (2008, 166–77); Johnson (2005, 55–83). In the Greek debate, these stances are largely based on Manolis Triantaphyllidis’ positions on the Modern Greek ‘language question’ (Papanastasiou 2008, 148–59, especially 155–6).

²² Cf. conversely Milroy, Milroy (2012, 19), who, while admitting that standardisation is motivated by ‘various political, social and commercial needs’, also point out its intrinsically ideological nature, given that ‘a standard language is an idea of the mind rather than a reality’.

²³ Mackridge (2009, 323–4); Johnson (2005, 129–30).

²⁴ See e.g. Langer (2000, 26–32) on the German spelling reform. Other similar cases are mentioned by Johnson (2005, 7). She offers an interesting treatment of why linguists’ motivations for sustaining the German orthographic reform were often misinterpreted by the public and how the reformers might have improved the understanding of the implementation process (Johnson 2005, 156–62; on the stances of ‘professional’ opponents of the reform, see Johnson 2005, 120).

more linguistically logical (some examples in Milroy, Milroy 2012, 57 apropos prescriptivism) or even more beautiful (a common concern of purism: see below). However, in the dialectic between pragmatism and abstractness, purism goes a step further than prescriptivism: it imposes a moral, nostalgic, and polemical rhetoric on this dialectic.²⁵ To sum up, standardisation, prescriptivism, and purism arguably represent a continuum that progresses from concrete stances to more arbitrary ones.

Regarding (2), one of the reasons that it is difficult to distinguish between phenomena in this sociolinguistic continuum is that the category of standard language itself, with which they are all concerned, is an ill-defined notion.²⁶ It is also a particularly thorny notion when applied to the Greek situation, for which a narrow, modern understanding of linguistic standard is problematic.²⁷ Turning to Atticising Greek, while it does comply with some current definitions of ‘standard language’ – such as the fact that it entails some codification and elaboration (see below) and that it may be looked upon as the high variety, used for writing (Auer 2005, 8) – it also lacks certain characteristics that some models of standardisation identify as necessary for a variety to qualify as a standard language. These include, for instance, the speakers’ recognition that the standard is ‘set qualitatively apart from other *x* dialects’ (Joseph 1987, 6: see below for the fact that Atticism did not have unanimous recognition and acceptance), or the ‘intertranslatability’ function, which requires regular intertranslation with other standard languages (Joseph 1987, 6): in fact, Atticist lexis and other texts commenting on the Atticists’ efforts abound with remarks on the mutual unintelligibility of koine and Atticising features.

Different aspects of the current definitions of ‘standard language’ fall short on some levels or fail to account for specific forms of standardisation, to the extent that recent sociolinguistic approaches have increasingly emphasised the need for a loose notion of standardisation as an ongoing process, thus shifting the focus from the taxonomic identification of types of standardisation to the mechanisms at play therein.²⁸ Purism seeks to establish the ‘pure language’ as the linguistic standard. However, purism may be an unfulfilled aim, while standardisation, to claim this name, must be able to successfully codify a language standard. To establish objective criteria according to which the extent and success of standardisation may be

25 See Paveau, Rosier (2008, 57).

26 Some have tended to identify the standard with the written form: see Milroy, Milroy (2012, 18) on standard English. On why this is unsatisfactory, see Ayres-Bennett, Bellamy (2021, 4). Clackson (2015a, 313) discusses the issue from a Classical point of view.

27 As recognised by Colvin (2009, 36).

28 Milroy, Milroy (2012, 150), with discussion in Clackson (2015a, 314).

measured, Einar Haugen (1966b) elaborated a now classic schema according to which standardisation depends upon four processes:²⁹ (i) selection (of the linguistic norm at the basis of the standard – for Atticism this would be 5th-century BCE Attic, of course); (ii) ‘codification’ (the establishment of norms for phonology, grammar, and lexicon ideally to reduce variation in form to a minimum); (iii) ‘acceptance’ (whereby the whole speech community views a certain variety as the norm); (iv) ‘elaboration’, whereby the speech community actively extends the chosen variety (especially its vocabulary) to accommodate the standard language to various communication purposes (for instance, administration: that which Haugen called ‘maximal variation in function’).³⁰ Haugen’s schema may be fruitfully applied to Atticism to determine whether or not it may be classified as a form of standardisation. In other words, our premise is that Atticism may be described as a form of standardisation if it can be proven to have been conducive to the codification of a linguistic standard.

Atticism shares with standardisation two aspects of Haugen’s schema: ‘selection’ (it picks out Classical Attic as the norm that forms the basis of the linguistic standard) and ‘codification’ (it establishes phonological, morphological, and lexical norms through dictionaries). However, Atticism lacks the two functions that, in Haugen’s schema, qualify the true making of standardisation: ‘acceptance’ and ‘elaboration’. Beginning with the latter, we may recall that for Haugen a defining criterion of elaboration is the adaptability of the standard variety to all communication purposes. Indeed, Atticism actively strove to achieve exactly the opposite: it countered phono-morphological innovations, new vocabulary, and semantic shifts (particularly when they were connected with the administrative, technical, or scientific register) and promoted only rules, vocabulary, and meanings that were documented in Classical Attic authors. Inevitably, this means that Atticism – like most forms of purism – was focused on a past epoch of the language, which it sought to reproduce, imitate, and restore to life (the ‘Golden Age Rule’, see Section 3.2), rather than seeking to extend it so that it might accommodate new linguistic developments or communication needs.

Atticism does not appear to have fully achieved acceptance (iii) itself. The specific question in this respect is to what extent the prestige of Atticising Greek was recognised by all members of the speech community. This underpins a more general and difficult question: how should we address the notion of ‘speech community’ in ancient society? The question of whether prose writers, rhetors, and the

²⁹ See Milroy, Milroy (2012, 22–3) for an alternative model. Ayres-Bennett (2020) and Ayres-Bennett (2021) elaborate on Haugen’s schema and suggest some improvements.

³⁰ See Haugen (1966b, 931).

educated elite should be seen as being sufficiently representative of a ‘speech community’ is open to debate. The assumption that these social groups recognised Atticising Greek as the high variety is not sufficient to conclude that the rest of the speech community entertained the same view and, therefore, that Atticism *was* a form of standardisation. In their definition of standard, Milroy and Milroy (2012, 1) highlighted the ‘ideology’ that promotes it as a preferable form of language. This is also a prominent feature in purist discourse (see Section 3.1). In discussing these features as revealing of standardisation, Clackson highlights as a crucial factor the fact that ‘this ideology of the standard language is not just limited to a certain sector of society, but is generalised among all speakers, who internalise the judgement that non-standard forms as incorrect and inferior’ (Clackson 2015a, 313–4). If we apply this view to Atticism, we see that this is hardly the case. Documentary texts (both inscriptions and papyri) show a remarkable lack of uniformity in Atticising features which – if present at all – mark special high-register texts, unique examples in a much larger corpus composed in registers of the written koine. Literary texts too are not uniformly Atticising, not even those written by the authors of the Second Sophistic, where various koine features are normally tolerated and actively employed. This lack of the ‘acceptance’ function thus exposes Atticism as a failed attempt at linguistic standardisation (see also Chapter 1, Section 3).

As further proof that Atticism does not fully fall within the standardisation category, we may bring in the koine as a point of comparison. The koine ticks all the boxes of Haugen’s schema.³¹ ‘Selection’ (i) is behind its very formation: the organised promotion of Attic-Ionic to a supraregional variety, through the combined efforts of the Athenian League first (the phase of *Großattisch*) and Macedonian administration later, turned the koine into ‘the language of government [. . .] and education’ (Colvin 2009, 42). ‘Codification’ (ii) is behind the grammars and treatises which placed the koine at the core of their description of linguistic norms – thus making it the focus of ‘literate education’ (Clackson 2015a, 314) and occasionally a benchmark against which to assess non-standard forms such as the dialects. As we have argued in Chapter 1, Section 3.1, this attention to the koine on the part of Greek grammarians does not mean that they unequivocally viewed it as a standard language, a correct form of Greek that was preferable to others. Clackson makes the important point that ἐλληνισμός, as a theory of linguistic correctness, was neither the correct form of language taught in schools (*pace* Versteegh 1986) nor was it focused on only one variety of Greek (e.g. the koine) against the others but recognised virtues of correctness in all varieties of the language, considering Greek as an abstract conception, a conglomerate of competing

³¹ See Consani (1993, 25); Consani (1998, 97–8).

correct norms (see Chapter 6, Section 3.3). Clackson's view may be further refined. The very fact that the koine is acknowledged in these grammatical treatises as one of the varieties worthy of attention, on a par with the Classical dialects, attests to its gradual path towards the standardisation that, still perhaps not fully recognised by ancient scholars, would later blossom into the Byzantine perception of the koine as the 'umbrella language' that subsumed the dialects (Chapter 3, Section 2) and that all Greeks spoke (Chapter 3, Section 3). Moreover, the koine functioned as a medium of communication between speakers of different local varieties, one of the conditions upon which Haugen (1966b, 927) based his definition of (standard) language.

The codification function is also at work in the promotion of the koine as the language of administration across all regions of the Greek-speaking world and against the local dialects, which at this chronological stage represent low – mostly only spoken – varieties. The 'acceptance' function (iii), meanwhile, is evidenced by the koine's widespread use across written production in several literary and documentary registers, some of which embody the closest approximation we get to the use of the koine as a spoken medium as well. Finally, the 'elaboration' function (iv) is also fully in view: the koine developed a comprehensive set of specialised registers and vocabularies to cater to the needs of science, technology, bureaucracy, and philosophy.

In conclusion, it is reasonable to say that the koine, by and large, complies with the standardisation paradigm, embodying a variety that was subject to an ongoing process of standardisation.³² This is testified by the fact that it was the common language across different regions of the Greek-speaking world for an extended period of time and especially by the fact that it formed the basis of the Modern Greek *dimotiki*.³³ Atticism, by contrast, fell short of reaching the level of a standard language. Atticising Greek halted in the middle of its struggle for standardisation, posing a major challenge to the establishment of the koine as a norm, since it embodied an alternative competing norm.

We now come to the final aspect of our differentiation between standardisation, prescriptivism, and purism (3): the nature of their linguistic ideologies. More specifically, we shall consider the extent to which the ideological discourse that pertains to these phenomena is based on notions of 'contamination, corruption, protection, and preservation' (O. Walsh 2016, 9). Such rhetoric of endangerment and contamination has also been studied in relation to prescriptivism (D. Ca-

³² Bubeník (1989, 7) defines it as 'standard'.

³³ See Milroy and Milroy (2012, 150) on standardisation as an ongoing process and Clackson (2015a, 313) on why it makes no sense to see standardisation as a continuum.

meron 1995; Curzan 2014) but is especially prominent in purism (Ayres-Bennett 2020, 192). Standardisation mostly prescribes or proscribes linguistic forms on formal grounds (in the latter case, e.g., because they are dialectal, archaic, slang, or phonetically incoherent). Prescriptivist and purist ideological discourses, meanwhile, entail a more marked focus on social values, gradually progressing towards the extremist end of the sociolinguistic continuum and embodying – at least in modern cultures – ‘illiberal’ attitudes to language and society (see further Section 3.3).³⁴

One of the characteristics that help to identify purist discourse is its ‘unprofessional’ status.³⁵ The purist approach to language matters tends to be subjective, more pertinent to folk linguistics than to linguistic theory. This has been amply noticed cross-linguistically. As a recent example, we may cite the purist debate surrounding the Anglicisation of German, which has involved journalists, intellectuals, and laymen but not linguists.³⁶ A further characteristic of purism, tied with the former, is the prominence of emotional and aesthetic concerns, such as the fear that language is becoming ‘corrupt’; the desire to preserve the form it took at an idealised time – that of our ancestors, for example, or of some prominent writer(s) – and the notion that one’s language is ‘better’ or ‘more beautiful’ than another and must therefore be shielded against corrupting influences.³⁷ The purist ideological construction also informs the terminology adopted in reference to linguistic features: prescribed forms are marked by highly evaluative labels, while proscribed elements are accompanied by disparaging expressions.³⁸ Owing to their mostly non-technical nature, such purist concerns are widespread in many cultures’ public debates. For the same reason, however, purism frequently fails to exert an impact on governmental policies and the speech community (see

³⁴ Ayres-Bennett, Bellamy (2021, 9) highlight how some approaches have also interpreted standardisation as a means of imposing social hierarchies through language and how this runs counter to other views of standardisation as an essentially ‘democratic’ factor.

³⁵ G. Thomas (1991, 37–49), with discussion in O. Walsh (2016, 12–14). See also Langer, Nesse (2012, 611); D. Cameron (1995); Milroy, Milroy (2012) (all these studies are concerned with the linguistic ideologies of prescriptivism in a broader sense); and cf. the provocative psycholinguistic account of Pinker (1994, 373–403).

³⁶ Hohenhaus (2002, 161).

³⁷ Cf. Delveroudi, Moschonas (2003, 4). On these ‘myths’ of prescriptive ideology broadly understood, see, e.g., Watts (2000, 31–6). The collection of essays in Bauer, Trudgill (1998) addresses many more that have almost universal relevance.

³⁸ Studies that apply restrictive notions of purism attribute these attitudes to ‘prescriptivism’ instead: see, e.g., the definition in Trask (2007, 169), with the discussion in Langer, Nesse (2012, 607–8). See also Tieken-Boon van Ostade (2020, 12); Milroy, Milroy (2012); D. Cameron (1995) *passim*.

above) and to produce a real normative standardisation.³⁹ In that which follows, we shall focus further on the purist ideological discourse and address the shape that it assumes in the theorisation of Atticism.

3 Atticism within the purist framework: A checklist

The recurring folk conceptualisations of language analysed in Section 2.1 constitute the backbone of purism. Against this background, we turn here to a consideration of whether – and to what extent – the Atticist discourse complies with the purist paradigm. We shall first provide the working definition of purism that guides this consideration: we understand purism broadly as ‘the conscious rejection of elements which are considered undesirable’ (Langer, Nesse 2012, 608) – that is, not only (and, in the case of Atticism, not mostly) foreign features. Next, we propose a set of diagnostic questions that may be used as a sort of purism ‘checklist’, as follows:

- (1) Is language described/prescribed in evaluative terms (good/bad, authentic/false, etc.)?
- (2) Is language described/prescribed mostly through symbols and metaphors rather than technical language?
- (3) Is the perceived correct language identified with a past epoch (the ‘Golden Age Rule’)?
- (4) Are the features that must be avoided or cultivated in the correct language selected primarily in accordance with extra-linguistic criteria (such as cultural and social prestige)?
- (5) Is language policy the initiative of a small group of individuals whose self-representation is also symbolically loaded?
- (6) Do the language policies espoused by these groups have a perceivable societal impact?

In the next sections, we shall consider these questions to confirm which aspects of Atticism may align with purist discourse.

³⁹ See Hohenhaus (2002, 159–60) apropos the complaints against the perceived Anglicisation of German, which have failed to produce ad hoc legislation.

3.1 The Atticist discourse: Evaluative terminology and impressionistic stances

In this section, we address the first two issues – namely, (1) to what extent the Atticist view of Greek involves evaluative terminology, and (2) whether language is approached symbolically or technically. According to G. Thomas (1991, 188), ‘purism provides a set of principles on which a judgement may be made with respect to which elements are deemed to improve, and which to impair, the corpus of a given language. These principles (the purist paradigm) are based not on functional (or rational) but on aesthetic (or non-rational) criteria’. Among the aesthetic criteria, G. Thomas (1991, 39) includes those associated with the concepts of wholeness, homogeneity, and pristineness; among the psychological criteria, he includes the impulse to protect the language from threat (usually external) and disintegration (usually internal).⁴⁰

The presence of such attitudes in Atticism is confirmed by a lexical search conducted across six lexica in Tribulato (forthcoming b): Phrynichus’ *Eclogue* and *Praeparatio sophistica*, Pollux’s *Onomasticon*, the *Antiatticist*, Moeris’ lexicon, and the *Philaeterus*. The search was conducted to determine to what extent significant evaluative terms, such as the positive labels δόκιμος, ἀγαθός, καλός, ἀκριβής, and ὀρθός, and negative labels, such as ἀδόκιμος, μοχθηρός, κακός, κίβδηλος, σόλοικος, and αἰσχρός, among others, occur in the lexica and with what frequency. The results have shown that δόκιμος (72x) and ἀδόκιμος (43x), pertaining to the concept of ‘authentic, unadulterated’ language, are by far the most common, followed by the ethical and aesthetic adjectives ἀγαθός (31x), καλός (18x), μοχθηρός (13x), and κακός (8). Significantly, terms that may be considered more appropriate to linguistic discourse, such as ἀκριβής ‘exact, accurate’ and ὀρθός ‘correct’, are much less present: the former has seven occurrences, while the latter has a mere three. This confirms that Atticist discourse is heavily marked by non-rational criteria.⁴¹ To the list discussed in Tribulato (forthcoming b) we may also add that the two versions of Philemon’s lexicon (see Chapter 1, Section 4.1) preserve the equally loaded evaluative terms βάρβαρος and ξένος/ξενικός.⁴² Evaluative discourse of this nature is most prominent in Phrynichus’ *Eclogue* and particularly in the prefatory letter.

⁴⁰ G. Thomas (1991, 47). Another useful ‘checklist’ of purist attitudes is provided by Hohenhaus (2002, 155).

⁴¹ For a comparandum, see Bourdieu’s list of expressions characterising ‘linguistic excellence’ (Bourdieu 1991, 60).

⁴² See Batisti (2024c).

Phryn. *Ecl.* praef. 1–16: Φρύνιχος Κορνηλιανῶ εὖ πράττειν. τήν τε ἄλλην σου παιδείαν θαυμάζων, ἦν διαφερόντως ὑπὲρ ἅπαντας ὅσοις ἐγὼ ἐνέτυχον πεπαίδευσαι, καὶ δὴ καὶ τοῦτο θαυμάσας ἔχω, τὸ περὶ τὴν τῶν καλῶν καὶ δοκίμων ὀνομάτων κρίσιν. ταῦτ' ἄρα κελεύσαντός σου τὰς ἀδοκίμους τῶν φωνῶν ἀθροισθῆναι πάσας μὲν οὐχ οἷός τ' ἐγενόμην τὰ νῦν περιλαβεῖν, τὰς δ' ἐπιπολαζούσας μάλιστα καὶ τὴν ἀρχαίαν διάλεξιν ταραττούσας καὶ πολλὴν αἰσχύνην ἐμβαλλούσας. οὐ λανθάνει δὲ σέ, ὡσπερ οὐδ' ἄλλο τι τῶν κατὰ παιδείαν, ὡς τινες ἀποπεπτωκότες τῆς ἀρχαίας φωνῆς καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ἀμαθίαν καταφεύγοντες πορίζουσι μάρτυράς τινας τοῦ προειρηθῆναι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀρχαίων τάσδε τὰς φωνάς· ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐ πρὸς τὰ διημαρτημένα ἀφορώμεν, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὰ δοκιμώτατα τῶν ἀρχαίων. καὶ γὰρ αὐτοῖς εἴ τις αἴρεσιν προθεῖη, ποτέρως ἂν ἐθέλοιεν διαλέγεσθαι ἀρχαίως καὶ ἀκριβῶς ἢ νεοχμῶς καὶ ἀμελῶς, δέξαιντ' ἂν ἀντὶ παντός ἡμῖν σύμφηφοι γενόμενοι τῆς ἀμείνονος γενέσθαι μοίρας· οὐ γὰρ τις οὕτως ἄθλιος ὡς τὸ αἰσχρὸν τοῦ καλοῦ προτιθέναί. ἔρρωσο.

Phrynichus to Cornelianus, greetings. Besides admiring all the rest of your education, in which you are instructed in such a distinctive way from all others I chanced upon, I admire especially your ability to select beautiful and approved words. Although you requested that I collect all the unapproved expressions, I was not able to include all those that are in use nowadays but only the most current ones, which corrupt the ancient way of speaking and bring much shame to it. Certainly, it does not escape your attention – just as nothing else that concerns education escapes you – that some people, who have fallen off from ancient speech and seek refuge in ignorance, produce some witnesses in favour of the fact that these expressions have already been used by the ancients. But we should not look up at what is wrong, but at the most authentic expressions of the ancients. For, if one gave them (i.e., ancient speakers) the opportunity to choose whether they would like to speak in the ancient and accurate way or in the new and careless one, they would choose above anything else to vote like us and side with the best party. Indeed, nobody is so wretched as to prefer baseness to goodness. Farewell.

Phrynichus states that he admires his addressee, the *ab epistulis Graecis* Imperial secretary Cornelianus, for his ability to choose both ‘beautiful’ and ‘approved’ words (τὸ περὶ τὴν τῶν καλῶν καὶ δοκίμων ὀνομάτων κρίσιν). The precedence afforded to beauty in this sentence attests to the fact that the Atticist view of language is based more on arbitrary criteria than on a typological definition of linguistic correctness. In the letter’s central section, Phrynichus attacks the ‘incorrect expressions’ (τὰς ἀδοκίμους τῶν φωνῶν) that crowd contemporary language (τὰ νῦν), ‘perturbing and throwing it into much shame’ (ταραττούσας καὶ πολλὴν αἰσχύνην ἐμβαλλούσας). Speaking in an ‘innovative manner’ (νεοχμῶς) is equated to using language ‘carelessly’ (ἀμελῶς), and the recommended counteraction is to use language ‘in the ancient manner and with care’ (ἀρχαίως καὶ ἀκριβῶς). These passages contain all the typical elements of purist discourse and recur in another well-known entry in the *Eclogue* (394: see below), in which Phrynichus vents his indignation at those who admire Menander.

Other lexicographers may focus on different qualities in their evaluative discourse, as for example, Pollux’s tendency to pass judgement on certain words,

highlighting their stylistic ‘value’. Of the lexicographers, it is Pollux who most frequently uses ἀγαθός (26x) and μοχθηρός (13x), while apparently refraining from expressing his views in terms of ‘authenticity’ (δόκιμος and ἄδόκιμος thus have lower attestations than in Phrynichus: a mere 5 and 2, respectively, against the 66 and 39 in Phrynichus). Only a highly abbreviated version of the *Antiatticist* survives, but it is revealing that the evaluative terminology that it preserves complies with that used by Phrynichus, who was likely to have been the *Antiatticist*’s polemical target.⁴³ Moeris and the *Philaeterus*, meanwhile, are wholly lacking in this kind of evaluative terminology, resorting instead to other terms: Moeris prefers idiosyncratic labels, such as Ἄττικοί, Ἑλληνες, κοινόν, and ἑλληνικόν (see Pellettieri 2024b) while the *Philetaerus* has one instance of βάρβαρος (see Benuzzi, Batisti 2024). It cannot be ruled out that this different distribution partly reflects epitomisation, but a part of it must also depend on these lexica’s different orientations.⁴⁴

One might argue that this terminology is not specific to purism but also characterises prescriptivism and standardisation (see Section 2.1). To demonstrate that we are dealing with a kind of ideological discourse that is exclusive to Atticist lexicography and that should be classified within the purist framework, Tribulato (forthcoming b) conducts a further lexical search to compare several of the Atticist lexica with the grammatical fragments of Apollonius Dyscolus and Herodian and with the anonymous treatise on solecism attributed to Herodian (Sandri 2020). Since we expect grammars to be more oriented towards description than towards strict prescriptivism, the lack of proscriptions comparable to those of the lexica may not be significant. We may expect, however, that works aiming to define incorrect usage, such as the treatise on solecism, will be blunter in their criticism of mistakes. Nonetheless, the terminology and tone adopted by these texts are markedly different from those of the Atticist lexica. While all the texts compared use prescriptive expressions such as δεῖ (‘one must’) and the proscriptive φυλάσσομαι (‘to guard oneself against’) and ἀμαρτάνω (‘to be wrong’), the more ideologically charged adjectives, such as ἄδόκιμος (‘not authentic, unapproved’), ἀμαθής (‘unlearned’), and ἀγοραῖος (‘vulgar’), are confined to Atticist discourse. Phrynichus uses all of these expressions several times and may thus be identified as the most representative of the group. He is outnumbered by the *Antiatticist* only with respect to the use of the prescriptive δεῖ, which the *Antiatticist* interestingly invariably uses to refer to the prescriptions of other Atticists in the common sentence οὐ φάσι δεῖν λέγειν (‘they say that [this] should not be said’). δεῖ is also relatively common in the normative treatises of Apol-

⁴³ For an overview of the matter, see S. Valente (2015b, 52–4).

⁴⁴ On the transmission of Moeris’ lexicon, see D. U. Hansen (1998, 9–11); Dettori (2022); Pellettieri (2024b). For the *Philaeterus*, see Dain (1954, 9–13); Benuzzi, Batisti (2024).

lonius Dyscolus and Herodian as well as in the Pseudo-Herodianic treatise on solecism, as might be expected of works that establish linguistic rules (e.g. for accentuation and declension). However, these grammatical works lack the militant adjectives ἀδόκιμος, ἀμαθής, and ἀγοραῖος, which, on the whole, are more common in Phrynichus than in the rest of Atticist lexicography.

This test, despite its approximations (see *Tribulato* forthcoming b), allows us to substantiate the general impression of a different style and tone conveyed by Phrynichus and the other Atticists against the fragments of Greek grammar. Grammatical works may criticise certain linguistic usages as incorrect, but they almost never identify these as ‘corrupt’ Greek. Similarly, linguistic evolution is neither stigmatised as a threat to the pristineness of language nor presented as evidence of ‘moral’ depravity. Consider, for example, the difference between the *Eclogue’s* prefatory letter and the introductory section of the Pseudo-Herodianic treatise on solecism ([1] 1.1–12 Sandri). As we have just seen, Phrynichus equates the incorrect use of language with a perturbation of the natural order. The treatise on solecism begins by emphasising that an imprecise manner of speaking is a sign of ignorance (πᾶς λόγος μὴ ἀκριβῆ τὴν ὁμιλίαν ἔχων ἀπαιδευσίας ἱκανὰ φέρει τεκμήρια ‘any speech that does not have a precise elocution offers abundant signs of ignorance’) but nothing more than this: while mistakes must be avoided, they are not regarded as evidence of improper reasoning and behaviour. This treatise was evidently intended for the theoretical education of students of rhetoric rather than seasoned orators. Nonetheless, its prosaic descriptive tone, which eschews polemical and militant statements, distinguishes it from the Atticist lexica.

Programmatic statements are similarly absent from the introductions to Apollonius Dyscolus’ works, as may be appreciated, for instance, by reading the first paragraph of *On Syntax*:

Apoll.Dysc. *Synt.* 1.1.2–5 (GG 2,2.1.2–2.2): ἡ δὲ νῦν ῥηθισομένη ἔκδοσις περιέξει τὴν ἐκ τούτων γινομένην σύνταξιν εἰς καταλλήλοτητα τοῦ αὐτοτελοῦς λόγου, ἦν πάνυ προήρημαι, ἀναγκαιοτάτην οὖσαν πρὸς ἐξήγησιν τῶν ποιημάτων, μετὰ πάσης ἀκριβείας ἐκθέσθαι.

The study that follows will treat the construction of these sounds into a correct and complete sentence, which I shall undertake to expound with all the required precision, since it is highly necessary for the interpretation of poetic texts.

One might justifiably counter that a scholarly introduction – such as that to *On Syntax* – belongs to a different rhetorical genre to that of a prefatory letter. However, prefaces such as those by Phrynichus and Pollux are also markedly different from similar pieces, such as the prefatory letter to Hesychius’ lexicon:

Hsch. praef. 1–51: πολλοὶ μὲν καὶ ἄλλοι τῶν παλαιῶν τὰς κατὰ στοιχεῖον συνθεθείκασι λέξεις, ὧ πάντων ἐμοὶ προσφιλέστατε Εὐλόγιε· ἀλλ’ οἱ μὲν τὰς Ὀμηρικὰς μόνας ὡς Ἀπίων καὶ Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ τοῦ Ἀρχιβίου· οἱ δὲ τὰς κωμικὰς ἰδίᾳ καὶ τὰς τραγικὰς ὡς Θέων καὶ Δίδυμος καὶ ἕτεροι τοιοῦτοι· ὁμοῦ δὲ πάσας τούτων οὐδὲ εἷς. Διογενιανὸς δὲ τις μετὰ τούτους γενοῦν ἀνὴρ σπουδαῖος καὶ φιλόκαλος, τὰ τε προειρημένα βιβλία καὶ πάσας τὰς σποράδην παρὰ πᾶσι κειμένας λέξεις συναγαγών, ὁμοῦ πάσας καθ’ ἕκαστον στοιχεῖον συνθέεικε· λέγω δὴ τὰς τε Ὀμηρικὰς καὶ κωμικὰς καὶ τραγικὰς, τὰς τε παρὰ τοῖς λυρικοῖς καὶ παρὰ τοῖς ῥήτορσι κειμένας, οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ <τὰς> παρὰ τοῖς ἰατροῖς τὰς τε παρὰ τοῖς ἱστοριογράφοις. συλλήβδην δὲ [ὁμοῦ] οὐδεμίαν λέξιν ἔσθ’ ἦν παρέλιπεν οὔτε τῶν παλαιῶν οὔτε τῶν ἐπ’ ἐκείνου γεγεννημένων. προέθηκε δὲ κατ’ ἀρχὴν ἐκάστης λέξεως τριῶν ἢ τεσσάρων στοιχείων τάξιν, ἴν’ οὕτως εὐμαρεστέραν ἔχοι τὴν εὐρεσιν ἧς ἐπιζητεῖ τάξεως ὁ τοῖς βιβλίοις ἐντυγχάνειν προαιρούμενος. καὶ πρὸς τούτοις ὅσας οἷός τε ἦν παροιμίας εὐρεῖν, οὐδὲ ταύτας παρέλιπεν, ἐπιγράψας τὰ βιβλία Περιεργοπένητας, καὶ ταύτη χρησάμενος τῇ διανοίᾳ· ἠγέετο γάρ, οἷμαι, μὴ μόνους πλουσίους, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς πένησι τῶν ἀνθρώπων χρησιμεύειν τε καὶ ἀντὶ διδασκάλων ἀρκέσειν αὐτὰ, εἰ μόνον περιεργασάμενοι πανταχόθεν ἀνευρεῖν ταῦτα δυνηθεῖεν καὶ ἐγκρατεῖς αὐτῶν γενέσθαι. ἐπαινῶ μὲν ἔγωγε τὸν ἄνδρα καὶ τῆς φιλοκαλίας καὶ τῆς σπουδῆς, ὅτι χρησιμωτάτην πραγματείαν καὶ τοῖς σπουδαίοις τῶν φιλολόγων ὠφελιμωτάτην χορηγίαν πρὸς ἅπασαν παιδείαν προεἶλετο παρέχειν. ἐβουλόμην δὲ αὐτὸν μήτε τὰς πλείους τῶν παροιμιῶν ψιλῶς καὶ ἄνευ τῶν ὑποθέσεων θεθεικέναι, μήτε τὰς ἐζητημένας τῶν λέξεων οὐκ ἐχούσας τὰ τε τῶν κεκρημένων ὀνόματα καὶ τὰς τῶν βιβλίων ἐπιγραφὰς ἔνθα φέρονται, τὰς τε πολυσήμους αὐτῶν παραδραμεῖν καὶ ἀσαφεῖς παραλιπεῖν, δέον δὲ καὶ ἐν ταύταις ἐκάστης διαφόρου διανοίας τὴν παράστασιν ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν χρησαμένων μνήμης παρασχεῖν. ἄτινα σύμπαντα καὶ τῆς παρ’ ἡμῶν ἐπιμελείας δεηθέντα κατὰ δύναμιν τετύχηκε πάσης, ἐν δευτέρῳ κειμένης τῆς τῶν φιλεπιτιμητῶν μέμφεως. οὐ γὰρ ὀκνήσω μετὰ παρρησίας εἰπεῖν ὅτι τῶν Ἀριστάρχου καὶ Ἀπίωνος καὶ Ἡλιοδώρου λέξεων εὐπορήσας, καὶ τὰ βιβλία προσθείς Διογενιανοῦ, ὃ πρῶτον καὶ μέγιστον ὑπάρχει πλεονέκτημα δαιτὸς, ἰδίᾳ χειρὶ γράφων ἐγώ, μετὰ πάσης ὀρθότητος καὶ ἀκριβεστάτης γραφῆς κατὰ τὸν γραμματικὸν Ἡρωδιανόν, λέξιν μὲν οὐδεμίαν παρέλιπον κειμένην ἐν αὐτοῖς, ἀλλὰ καὶ πλείστας οὐχ εὐρῶν προστέθεικα. ἐκείνην δὲ γραφὴν ἠξίωσα, ἧς εὕρισκον καὶ τὴν διάνοιαν τέλος περιέχουσαν καὶ τὴν φράσιν μετὰ τοῦ δοκίμου σαφῆ. ταῖς παροιμίαις ἀποδέδωκα τὰς ὑποθέσεις· καὶ τῶν πλειόνων λέξεων καὶ σπανίως εἰρημένων οὐ μόνον αὐτῶν τῶν χρησαμένων τὰ ὀνόματα προσγέγραφα, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς ἐπιγραφὰς πάντων μὲν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀντιγράφων προστιθείς, οὐδαμοῦ δὲ πονεῖν παραιτησάμενος, ὡς ἂν μὴ καὶ αὐτὸς μέμψιν ὀφλήσαιμι δικαίως τινά, καὶ οἷς ἐγκαλῶ Διογενιανῶ πεπτωκὸς φανείην.

Hesychius, a grammarian of Alexandria, to his companion Eulogius, greeting. Many others also collected in the order of the letters the words of the ancients, o most beloved Eulogius: some, however, only those of Homer, as Apion, and Apollonius son of Archibius; some, separately those of the comic or of the tragic authors, as Theon, Didymus, and other such compilers; but none of these all the words together. After them arose a certain Diogenianus, a man of industry and taste, who, having brought together the aforementioned books and all the words dispersed through all, united all of them into one compilation in alphabetic order; I mean, the Homeric, the comic, and the tragic terms, as well as those which occur in the lyric poets and in the orators; nor these only, but also such as are to be found in the works of the physicians and of the historians. In short, no word, as far as we are aware of, did he omit, whether of the ancients, or of the writers of his own time. He ordered each word by the three or four letters of its beginning, so that one who chooses to read these

books can more easily find what he is looking for. And on top of this he did not omit any of the proverbs he was able to find, and he inscribed the entire work *Perieropenetes*, meaning the following: he thought, to my mind, that this work would be useful not only for the rich but also for the poor (*penetes*), and that it would serve them instead of a teacher, if only by their curiosity (*periergasamenoï*) they would be able to search for it everywhere and acquire one copy. I must praise the generosity and the learning of this man, because he has chosen to offer an exceptionally useful work and a precious viaticum towards all instruction for the most serious of scholars. However, I would have wished that he had not simply quoted the majority of the proverbs without giving the context, and that he had not quoted the rare words without the name of those who used them or without the title of the works where they occur; and, finally, that he had not run over those of them which have many meanings and leave them unclear, since it is necessary even with these words to exhibit each different meaning by mentioning those who used them. All this needed our care, and received it in full according to our possibilities, in total disregard of the reproaches of the usual fault-finders. I shall not hesitate to state overtly that, having at my disposal the Words of Aristarchus, Apion and Heliodorus, and adding Diogenianus's book (which is the first and most significant delicacy of the banquet), writing in my own hand as correctly and as exactly as I could according to Herodian the grammarian, I did not omit any single word that was to be found in those books, but I even added many that I did not find in them. I validated the word-form whose meaning I found more accomplished and whose general sense was clear and acceptable. I gave the context of the proverbs, and, for the majority of the words, even those used rarely, I gave not only the names of those who used them, but also the titles of all the works where these words recur, adding them from the editions, without ever shirking hard work, so that I myself would not rightly deserve any blame nor appear to have fallen into the same faults I blame in Diogenianus. (Translation by Pontani 2023, 255–7).

Although the latter is the longest of these prefatory texts, it does not indulge in any programmatic statements. Hesychius cites abundant sources and details the methodology that he has applied in arranging his dictionary (the inclusion of words from all kinds of literary traditions and dialects; the alphabetical criterion; the direct citation of the names of ancient authors and the titles of their works; the contexts of proverbs, etc.) and highlights the elements that differentiate it from previous works. However, he does not overtly polemicise with these predecessors over their notions regarding Greek, nor does he discuss correct and incorrect usages of language: his aim is to collect λέξεις from across all literary genres rather than to list words that should be used or avoided.

The comparison between Atticist lexica and other contemporary or later erudite works shows that the Atticists did indeed devise a lexicographical genre characterised by distinctive style and terminology. These characters go hand in hand with the sustained aesthetic and ethical imagery that Atticism employs in discussing language. On a par with the prefatory letter's indignation for those expressions that 'perturb the language' stands Phrynichus' well-known tirade against Menander and his admirers:

Phryn. *Ecl.* 394: οὐχ ὀρῶ μὰ τὸν Ἡρακλέα, τί πάσχουσιν οἱ τὸν Μένανδρον μέγαν ἄγοντες καὶ αἶροντες ὑπὲρ τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν ἅπαν. διὰ τί δὲ θαυμάσας ἔχω; ὅτι τὰ ἄκρα τῶν Ἑλλήνων ὀρῶ μανικῶς περὶ τὸν κωμωδοποιὸν τοῦτον σπουδάζοντα, πρῶτιστον μὲν ἐν παιδείᾳ μέγιστον ἀξίωμα ἁπάντων ἔχοντα σὲ καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐκ προκρίτων ἀποφανθέντα ὑπὸ βασιλέων ἐπιστολέα αὐτῶν, ἔπειτα δευτέρᾳ τιμῇ, λειπόμενον πολὺ τῆς σῆς παρασκευῆς, ἐξεταζόμενον δ' ἐν τοῖς Ἑλλήσιν, Βάλβον τὸν ἀπὸ τῶν Τράλλων, ὃς εἰς τοσοῦτο προθυμίας καὶ θαύματος ἦκει Μενάνδρου, ὥστε καὶ Δημοσθένους ἀμείνω ἐγχειρεῖν ἀποφαίνειν τὸν λέγοντα 'μεσοπορεῖν' [. . .] καὶ ἄλλα κίβδηλα ἀναρίθμητα καὶ ἀμαθῆ· τὰ αὐτὰ δὲ σοὶ καὶ Βάλβω πεπονθότα καὶ Γαϊανὸν τὸν Σμυρναῖον ῥήτορα, ἄνδρα ζηλωτὴν καὶ ἐραστήν τῆς σῆς ἐν παιδείᾳ φιλοκαλίας, ἄγε οὖν ὅπως λύσης μου τὴν ἐν τῇ τοιαύτῃ δυσχερεῖα τῶν ὧτων ἀπορίαν.

By Heracles, I do not know what the matter is with those who consider Menander great and extol him as the highest representative of all things Greek. Why am I surprised? Because I see the brightest Greeks manically busying themselves with this writer of comedies: first of all you (Cornelianus), who have the greatest worth of all in learning and for this reason have been elected secretary *ab epistulis* by the emperors themselves out of the most selected men; and then, in the second place, someone who of course is much inferior to your preparation though he is held in regard among the Greeks – I mean Balbus of Tralles, who reaches such a level of enthusiasm and admiration of Menander that he attempts to demonstrate that someone who uses words such as μεσοπορεῖν ('to be half way') [. . .] and other innumerable spurious and unlearned expressions, is better than Demosthenes. And another one who is in the same state as you and Balbus is the orator Gaianus of Smyrna, a zealous man and a devotee of your good taste in culture. Come on, release me from my bafflement in hearing such (contradictory) things! (Translation by Tribulato 2014, 201).

Phrynichus sees the most prominent Greek intellectuals admiring Menander 'in a manic way' (μανικῶς) and asks from what malady they suffer (τί πάσχουσιν). The equation between incorrect language and illness or mental deficiency is cross-culturally ubiquitous in purist discourse.⁴⁵ Phrynichus implicitly attributes a healing power for such 'linguistic illness' to the use of good literary models: the medical metaphor (another recurring feature: see G. Thomas 1991, 22) is picked up by the letter's rhetorically charged final sentence, in which Phrynichus invites Cornelianus to release him from, literally, 'the difficulty of the ears' – that is, his bafflement at hearing such (contradictory) things (λύσης μου τὴν ἐν τῇ τοιαύτῃ δυσχερεῖα τῶν ὧτων ἀπορίαν).⁴⁶

Pollux's *Onomasticon* transmits a somewhat more fragmented purist discourse, which nonetheless contains several other recurring images of purism. The first prefatory letter – an introduction to the entire work, addressed to Commodus – pivots around the concepts of eloquence, identified as one of the *moral* virtues of emperors, and of 'beautiful language' (εὐγλωττία):

45 See, e.g., Watts (2000, 31); Hohenhaus (2002, 163).

46 See the analysis in Tribulato (2014, 202).

Poll. praef. 1: Ἰούλιος Πολυδεύκης Κομμόδῳ Καίσαρι χαίρειν. ὦ παῖ πατρὸς ἀγαθοῦ, πατρῶν ἐστὶ σοι κτῆμα κατ' ἴσον βασιλεία τε καὶ σοφία. τῆς δὲ σοφίας τὸ μὲν τι ἐν τῇ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀρετῇ, τὸ δ' ἐν τῇ χρειᾷ τῆς φωνῆς. τῆς μὲν οὖν ἀρετῆς ἔχεις τὸ μάθημα ἐν τῷ πατρί, τῆς δὲ φωνῆς, εἰ μὲν ἦγεν αὐτὸς σχολήν, παρείχεν ἂν σοι τὸ ἡμῶν ἐλάχιστα δεῖσθαι· ἐπεὶ δ' ἐκείνον ἢ σωτηρία τῆς οἰκουμένης ἀπασχολεῖ, ἔγωγ' οὖν ἔν γέ τί σοι πρὸς εὐγλωττίαν συμβαλοῦμαι. ὀνομαστικὸν μὲν οὖν τῷ βιβλίῳ τὸ ἐπίγραμμα, μὴνύει δὲ ὅσα τε συνώνυμα ὡς ὑπαλλάττειν δύνασθαι, καὶ οἷς ἂν ἕκαστα δηλωθεῖη· πεφιλότημῃται γὰρ οὐ τοσοῦτον εἰς πλῆθος ὅπόσον εἰς κάλλους ἐκλογὴν. οὐ μέντοι πάντα τὰ ὀνόματα περιεῖληφε τοῦτο τὸ βιβλίον· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἦν ῥάδιον ἐνὶ βιβλίῳ πάντα συλλαβεῖν. ποιήσομαι δὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀφ' ὧν μάλιστα προσήκει τοῦς εὐσεβεῖς, ἀπὸ τῶν θεῶν· τὰ δ' ἄλλα ὡς ἂν ἕκαστον ἐπέλθῃ τάξομεν. ἔρρωσο.

Iulius Pollux to Commodus Caesar, greetings. Son of a noble father, your paternal inheritance consists equally in the kingdom and in wisdom. The heritage of wisdom for one part lies in the excellence of the soul, for the other in the exercise of eloquence. Of excellence you certainly have in your father a model; and for eloquence, if he had the time, you would have no need at all to turn to my teaching. But since the salvation of the world keeps him busy, I will be the very one to put together for you a little something useful for good speech. *Onomasticon* is the title of the book; it indicates which synonyms may be used to vary one's diction, and those by which each thing may be designated; it aspires not so much to abundance as to the selection of elegant expressions. However, this book does not encompass all the words: it was not, in fact, easy to collect them all in one book. I will begin with those that are most suitable for the pious, that is, from the gods: the others we will list as each will come. Farewell.⁴⁷

The *Onomasticon*, Pollux says, will privilege 'not amplitude but the selection of the beautiful' (πεφιλότημῃται γὰρ οὐ τοσοῦτον εἰς πλῆθος ὅπόσον εἰς κάλλους ἐκλογὴν).⁴⁸ However, no *definition* of beautiful language is provided. Just as Phrynichus' epistle never defines 'ancient language', Pollux leaves the object of his enquiry undetermined. Such indeterminacy is all the more striking in the *Onomasticon*, given the lexicon's length and level of articulation: each of its ten books is introduced by a prefatory letter in which Pollux could have clarified, had he so wished, the kind of language he intended to target in his work. Rather than discussing the notion of antiquity, these letters privilege the stylistic (but vague) notion of beauty (in the first letter), while 'precise language' (ἀκριβῆς φωνή) is mentioned only once in the second letter but in relation to the method that the lexicographer should follow in approaching medical terminology.⁴⁹ In conclusion, the stark presence of evaluative terminology that describes language in terms of common dichotomies ('good'/'bad', etc.) and the tendency to address language in sweeping, undefined statements

⁴⁷ This translation is based on that by Tribulato (2018, 251): for some of its choices, see Tribulato (2018, 251–5).

⁴⁸ See also Matthaios (2013, 80).

⁴⁹ On ἀκρίβεια in Pollux, see Matthaios (2013, 80).

that underpin the lack of any solid linguistic methodology render Atticism compliant with modern paradigms of linguistic purism.

3.2 The ‘Golden Age Rule’ of Atticism

In this section, we discuss the Atticist view of ‘language’ as corresponding to a prestige variety, that was used in the *literature* of a certain *period*: 5th- and 4th-century BCE Attic texts.⁵⁰ The lexicographers seek to build an ideal community based on the use of a past linguistic variety. Atticism thus fully embodies the so-called ‘Golden Age Rule’ of the purist paradigm, which identifies the ‘ground zero’ of pure and perfect language with a precise epoch of the past. The ideological construction behind this belief is clear: language does not have a fixed beginning, a time when it was pristine and unadulterated. Any attempt to preserve language in such a state is utopist, which is also why linguistic theory refrains from including purity among the properties of language.⁵¹

The *Eclogue’s* prefatory letter (see Section 3.1) highlights the role of the ‘Golden Age Rule’ in the Atticist view of language. Here, Phrynichus uses the adjective ἀρχαῖος no fewer than six times in a text that is 160 words long. ‘Language’ is invariably equated with ancient language (τὴν ἀρχαίαν διάλεξιν, τῆς ἀρχαίας φωνῆς, τὰ δοκιμώτατα τῶν ἀρχαίων, etc.), to the point that the value of antiquity always exceeds that of correctness (as in the expressions ἀρχαίως καὶ ἀκριβῶς ‘in an ancient and correct way’; ἀρχαίως καὶ δοκίμως ‘in an ancient and approved way’). Phrynichus’ letter thus supports the identification of Atticism as an instance of *archaising* purism – that is,

an attempt to resuscitate the linguistic material of a past golden age, an exaggerated respect for past literary models, an excessive conservatism towards innovations or a recognition of the importance of the literary tradition (G. Thomas 1991, 76).

Taking Classical Athens to be symbolic of correct language, the Atticist lexicographers apply themselves to defining those words that have an Attic literary history and those that do not. At the root of this linguistic attitude lies the belief that the past is superior to the present and that the present can compete with the past only if it complies with its defining features. The failure to conform to Classical usage is never presented as a consequence of the natural evolution of language

⁵⁰ For a modern parallel for this recurrent assumption of Atticism, see Langer, Nesse (2012, 610–1); Milroy (2000, 23–6), meanwhile, is useful for its caveats on the undefined notion of prestige in sociolinguistic accounts of language correctness.

⁵¹ Langer, Nesse (2012, 610).

but rather as contemporary Greek speakers' inability to appreciate the ancient roots of their idiom owing to the decline of their spoken variety, the koine.

The Atticist relationship with the past is thus signalled not only by adjectives such as ἀρχαῖος and παλαιός but also by an ideological opposition between the symbolic 'us' of Atticising speakers and a 'them' that encompasses unlearned contemporaries as well as the non-Attic Greeks of the past (see Section 3.3. for the social connotations of this polarity). As Phrynichus states in the prefatory letter of the *Eclogue*, 'we do not look up to the mistakes but to the most authentic expressions of the ancients' (ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐ πρὸς τὰ διημαρτημένα ἀφορῶμεν, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὰ δοκιμώτατα τῶν ἀρχαίων). Thus, e.g., in Phryn. *Ecl.* 101, ἡμεῖς marks the word θριδακίνη ('lettuce') that learned speakers must use, like the Ἀττικοί, against the disapproved usage of Herodotus (θρίδαξ). Phryn. *Ecl.* 165 expresses a similar conflict between unlearned contemporary usage (ὁ πολὺς) and the Attic model (Aristophanes) to which the well-educated contemporaries (ἡμεῖς) must adhere (νίμμα ὁ πολὺς λέγει, ἡμεῖς δὲ ἀπόνιπτρον λέγομεν ὡς Ἀριστοφάνης 'the many say 'νίμμα' ('water for washing'), but let us use ἀπόνιπτρον, like Aristophanes').

Moeris' lexicon, which is organised around the contrast between Ἀττικοί and Ἕλληνες (see Chapter 1, Section 4.1), presents an interesting case. It is evident that the Ἀττικοί embody the positive extreme, but Ἕλληνες is at times a slippery label, particularly with respect to its evaluative significance. Although Ἕλληνες clearly identifies contemporary koine usage, it is not always derogatory. Addressing this issue, Maidhof (1912), for instance, thought that Moeris' view of the koine would be polarised between a literary high-register koine, expressed by Ἕλληνες, and the vulgar common variety, sometimes expressed by κοινόν. However, κοινόν is not always associated with uncontroversial low-level features, but rather appears to be used for forms that Attic shares with post-Classical Greek.⁵²

Moeris' Ἀττικοί and other synonymic labels that symbolise correct usage are drawn from a wider and pervasive topos in Second Sophistic and Atticist discourse – that of Athens as the cultural (if not the political) 'motherland' of the Greeks, an idea that has its roots in 5th-century BCE Athenian propaganda (see Chapter 3, Section 2.6). The role that past literature plays in the construction of an ideal community is prominent in archaising forms of purism cross-culturally. As an example, we may cite 19th-century Italian purism, which – following in the footsteps of Renaissance classicism – identified the Florentine dialectal variety as the prestige language and Florence as Italy's ideal capital (see Chapter 1, Section 2).⁵³ In

⁵² See Monaco (2021, 32–3); Pellettieri (2024b).

⁵³ The 'myth' of Florence, based on language, influenced Italian culture from the late Middle Ages to the mid-20th century: see the short but acute essay by Contini (1970), as well as Nicoletti (2007), who summarises the role of Florence in the education of non-Florentine authors. Nicoletti

Atticist discourse, Athens embodies a symbolic geographic ‘centre’ whose ‘periphery’ consists of Greek-speaking regions, such as Egypt and Asia Minor, that, while politically significant, are condemned to a shaky cultural status by virtue of their extra-Hellenic location. For this reason, criticism of dialectalisms, neologisms, and low-register vocabulary is significantly more prominent in Atticist lexicography than criticism of loanwords even though, at this chronological stage, hellenophones inhabited a multilingual society where linguistic contact was the norm.⁵⁴ The lexica pay little attention to the notion of foreignness (see Section 3.1 on Philemon). It is remarkable that, unlike contemporary sophistic discourse in which the relationship Greek/Latin was fraught with anxieties,⁵⁵ the lexica almost never voice an opposition to Latin loanwords. Rather, they object to words from peripheral Greek-speaking or Hellenised areas, such as Macedonia,⁵⁶ Egypt, and Alexandria,⁵⁷ although it should be noted that many of the criticised words are not real loanwords: the terms ‘Egyptian’ and ‘Macedonian’ etc. usually symbolically represent groups of speakers rather than actual languages.⁵⁸ Atticism is thus primarily concerned with internal variation and mostly targets either dialectalisms or low-level neologisms (see Section 3.3).⁵⁹ This also finds parallels in contemporary forms of purism, whose ‘xenophobia’ tends to oppose the adoption of foreign words rather than addressing the more rarefied level of modifications in morphology (e.g. through calques) or syntax (e.g. shifts in collocation that betray a foreign origin).⁶⁰

aptly recalls a sonnet by the poet Vittorio Alfieri (born in 1749 in Asti, Piedmont) who found ‘a citizenship based on words’ (*una cittadinanza di parole*) in Florence, which he equates to Athens, ‘the seat of all elegance’ (*d’ogni eleganza* [. . .] *unica sede*).

54 The connection between purism and language contact, bilingualism, creolisation, and pidginisation is explored in G. Thomas (1991, 122–9).

55 Cf. Dickey (2023, 1–2).

56 See, especially, Phryn. *Ecl.* 354 (on παρεμβολή ‘drawing up in battle-order’) and *Ecl.* 383 (on ῥύμη ‘rush/narrow street’). Pollux registers several Macedonian technical words in 1.138, 1.139, 6.70, 10.138, and 10.162.

57 See Phryn. *Ecl.* 270 (on πάπυρος). With οἱ Ἀλεξανδρεῖς (‘Alexandrians’), the Atticists do not refer to the Greek spoken in Egypt as a diatopic variety: see Favi, Tribulato (2024); Favi (forthcoming b).

58 See Favi (forthcoming b).

59 On these categories, see G. Thomas (1991, 68–73). Delveroudi, Moschonas (2003, 19) highlight the fact that purism opposes not only the diachronic dimension of linguistic variation but also its synchronic dimension, embodied by social variation.

60 See Hohenhaus (2012, 167) on lexical Anglicisms in German. G. Thomas (1991, 63) argues that orthoepic prescriptions belong to normative attitudes linked with standardisation rather than to purism.

3.3 The Atticist linguistic theorisation and its extra-linguistic criteria

In Section 3.1, we touched on the lack of a specifically linguistic terminology in Atticist discourse, which instead prefers to resort to metaphors and impressionistic descriptions of language. In this section, we shall examine the indeterminacy of Atticist views of language to pinpoint the interpretative difficulties that they present for the modern scholar of Atticism as well as its marked elitist orientation. Atticist lexicography provides no comprehensive account of Atticising Greek but rather a series of disjointed precepts on the basis of which *we* may attempt to reconstruct their view of different linguistic levels (phonology, morphology, syntax, and the lexicon – this is the goal of Volume 2 in this series).⁶¹ We face the additional difficulty of relating Atticist rules to the grammatical theorisation of their time. It is as though Atticism existed in a vacuum, given our inability to determine the use of contemporary grammars and other manuals on the part of the lexicographers.⁶²

In attempting to define the Atticists' view of correct language, two key questions warrant further attention. The first is whether the Atticists had a notion of the diachronic evolution of language that goes beyond the polarised Attic/contemporary opposition. The second question is whether they had a linguistic perception of sociolects. Both these questions are inspired by the terminology used in the lexica. The lexicographers occasionally distinguish between the Attic of the *παλαιοί* and that of the *νέοι*. In many cases, the opposition uniquely concerns the comic canon, which occupies a central role in their description of Attic (see Chapter 1, Section 4.3; Chapter 5 *passim*; Chapter 6, Section 5.2; Chapter 7, Section 2).⁶³ In other instances, however, the opposition appears to draw on a more specific knowledge of diachronic change, although the assessment of individual forms attributed to the *νέοι* is often frustrating for the modern interpreter. For instance, in Poll. 7.24, *ὑπερμαζάω* ('to be overfull with barley bread') is identified as an older form than *κριθάω*, although our extant sources indicate that the latter was

⁶¹ For attempts in this direction, see Chapter 1, Section 5.1.

⁶² Dihle (1977, 174–5). See the different case of Roman rhetorical theories, which put Greek grammar to good use: Dihle (1977, 165–7).

⁶³ Cf., e.g., Phryn. *Ecl.* 390 and 391 (both of which contrast Menander's language with that of the *ἀρχαίοι Ἀθηναῖοι*), or Poll. 3.56, on metaphorical expressions for people of low ranking (*τὸν δὲ τοιοῦτον καὶ ὑπόξυλον ὠνόμαζον οἱ νέοι κωμικοί. καὶ ὑπόχυτον δ' οἱ παλαιότεροι τὸν κακῶς γεγονότα* 'the poets of New Comedy also called this man (the illegal citizen) *ὑπόξυλος* ('counterfeit'). And the older poets called the man of lowly birth *ὑπόχυτος* ('adulterated)').

used by Aeschylus while the former is not attested before the Imperial age.⁶⁴ Is Pollux correct, then, and have we simply lost an earlier attestation of ὑπερμαζάω? Or is Pollux confusingly referring to different *genres* rather than to linguistic stages? Monaco (2021, 40–4) discusses these linguistic labels' changing nature.

A similarly baffling terminology characterises the Atticists' description of certain forms as belonging to the language of certain social categories, those that Stephanos Matthaios (2013) aptly calls 'groups of anonymous speakers' (perhaps to avoid the term 'sociolects', which would imply that the Atticists had a clear notion of Greek's social variation). We have seen how labels such as οἱ ἀρχαῖοι, οἱ παλαιοί, οἱ δόκιμοι, and οἱ Ἀττικοί define the approved linguistic models. The expressions οἱ νῦν 'the contemporaries', οἱ πολλοί 'the masses/the common usage', οἱ ἰδιῶται 'vulgar/colloquial speakers', οἱ ἀγοραῖοι 'people from the market', and οἱ ἀμαθεῖς 'ignorant people' as well as Moeris' Ἐλληνες, meanwhile, are seemingly used with various purposes. According to Matthaios (2013), in Pollux, οἱ νῦν identifies the usage of Pollux's learned contemporaries, whereas οἱ πολλοί identifies current usage, towards which he may be expressing a neutral attitude.⁶⁵ In other passages, however, these expressions clearly identify contemporary usages that Pollux proscribes on the basis that they are vulgar, colloquial, incorrect, and – most importantly – too divergent from Attic standards.⁶⁶ The slippery nature of these terms also emerges when we compare their use in one lexicographer (e.g. Pollux) with that of another: Phrynichus routinely employs οἱ νῦν and οἱ πολλοί as synonymous with οἱ ἀμαθεῖς, while in Pollux they are not invariably negative labels.⁶⁷

For our purposes here, two elements of this terminology warrant attention. First, in accordance with the 'Golden Age Rule', the benchmark for assessing

64 'The ancients also used ὑπερμαζάω ('to be overfull of barley bread') from μᾶζα ('barley bread') for 'to be full' and 'to be replete', but the younger [authors] call it κριθάω ('to be barley-fed'), [which is the verb used] for beasts'.

65 See Matthaios (2013, 81–95; 102–4).

66 See Matthaios (2013, 114), especially on the ἰδιῶται.

67 See, e.g., Phryn. *Ecl.* 210: παιδίσκη· οἱ νῦν ἐπὶ τῆς θεραπαίνης τοῦτο τιθέασιν, οἱ δ' ἀρχαῖοι ἐπὶ τῆς νεάνιδος, οἷς ἀκολουθητέον (παιδίσκη: Our contemporaries use it to refer to the servant girl, but the ancients for a young girl. We should follow their example'; on this entry, see Merisio 2023) and *Ecl.* 240: ὄρθρος νῦν ἀκούω τῶν πολλῶν τιθέντων ἐπὶ τοῦ πρὸ ἡλίου ἀνίσχοντος χρόνου· οἱ δὲ ἀρχαῖοι ὄρθρον καὶ ὄρθρευέσθαι τὸ πρὸ ἀρχομένης ἡμέρας, ἐν ᾧ ἔτι λύχνω δύναται τις χρῆσθαι. ὁ τοίνυν οἱ πολλοὶ ἀμαρτάνοντες ὄρθρον λέγουσιν, τοῦθ' οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἔω λέγουσιν ('ὄρθρος: I hear many of our contemporaries use this word for the time that precedes the rising of the sun. The ancients however used ὄρθρος and ὄρθρευέσθαι for the time preceding the beginning of the day when one may still use a torch. The time of the day which the masses today erroneously call ὄρθρος was called ἔω by the ancients').

whether these speakers' usage is incorrect is invariably Classical Attic literature: the farther an expression is from these Classical models, the more likely it is that it will be condemned. Second, incorrect usage is associated with a lack of thorough education, which highlights the socially elitist orientation of Atticism, that which Delveroudi, Moschonas (2003, 9–13) call 'la dialectique sociale' of purism (on the social and political dimensions of linguistic classicism, see Chapter 1, Section 3.3). Atticist lexicography allows us to delve into the view of society entertained by the ancient practitioners of purism. Again, the *Eclogue* is our best source. It abounds in entries in which correct and incorrect usages are not contrasted by simply applying a binary Attic/non-Attic or correct/incorrect opposition but rather carry further social overtones. In *Ecl.* 370, common usage is identified with the elitist expression 'the masses' (ὁ πολὺς λεώς) and rejected in favour of that of the 'the few' (ὀλίγοι) and of Attic speakers.⁶⁸ In *Ecl.* 176, the language of 'vulgar people' (οἱ ἀγοραῖοι) is contrasted with that of the 'learned' (πεπαιδευμένοι) with respect to the correct expression for 'fruit-seller'.⁶⁹ The 'us/them' opposition, which we interpreted in Section 3.2 as a marker of archaising purism, now also reveals its elitist roots.

G. Thomas (1991, 78) defines elitist purism as 'a negative, proscriptive attitude to substandard and regional usage' that is often historically associated with the language of a court (G. Thomas 1991, 79). In this respect, Atticism embodies a different experience in that it does not promote the language of the ruling people (here, the Romans) but rather the prestige variety of Graeco-Roman culture. Nevertheless, Atticism symbolically subscribes to the centre/periphery and capital/regions dichotomies that are typical of elitist purism. These geographic dichotomies also express social oppositions, and it is revealing that they feature in the work of ancient scholars who, like Phrynichus and Pollux, came from Asia or Africa.⁷⁰

As a comparandum for the elitist programme sponsored by Atticism, we may consider a text discussed by Joan Beal, an expert in the English normative tradition, in her investigation of the English obsession with correct pronunciation as an element of social distinction (Beal 2008). The quotation derives from *A Disser-*

⁶⁸ Phryn. *Ecl.* 370: χρεολυτῆσαι λέγει ὁ πολὺς λεώς, ἀλλ' οἱ ὀλίγοι καὶ Ἀττικοὶ τὰ χρέα διαλύσασθαι ('Many vulgar people use χρεολυτῆσαι ('to pay one's debts'), but the few and Attic speakers use χρέα διαλύσασθαι'). On this entry, see Scomparin (2024).

⁶⁹ Phryn. *Ecl.* 176: ὀπωροπώλης· τοῦθ' οἱ ἀγοραῖοι λέγουσιν, οἱ δὲ πεπαιδευμένοι ὀπωρώνης ὡς καὶ Δημοσθένης ('ὀπωροπώλης ('fruit-seller'): Unsophisticated people use this [form], while educated people [say] ὀπωρώνης, like Demosthenes also [does]'). See Favi (2022m).

⁷⁰ Pollux came from Naucratis, in Egypt. According to Photius (*Bibl. cod.* 158.100a.33), Phrynichus was from Arabia, but this is likely to be a misunderstanding of some disparaging remarks directed against him: the *Suda* has him from Bithynia (in Asia Minor).

tation on the Causes of the Difficulties which Occur in Learning the English Tongue by Thomas Sheridan (1761), a proponent of the English ‘elocution movement’ and a representative of English 18th-century prescriptivism.⁷¹

Almost every county in England has its peculiar dialect. [. . .] One must have preference, this is the court dialect, as the court is the source of fashions of all kinds. All the other dialects are sure marks, either of a provincial, rustic, pedantic or mechanical education, and therefore have some degree of disgrace annexed to them. (Sheridan 1761, 29–30, in Beal 2008, 24).

Sheridan first identifies the preferred language variety with ‘the court dialect’, superior to all other varieties, which are disparagingly described as marks ‘of a provincial, rustic, pedantic or mechanical education’. Spatial descriptions (‘rustic’, ‘provincial’) are paired with social implications, such as ‘mechanical’, which, according to Beal’s reading, refers to ‘the more practically-based education which was available as an alternative to the Classical grammar-school curriculum’ but also carries ‘connotations of social class’ (Beal 2008, 24). The fear of speaking incorrectly is symptomatic of the fear that one will be relegated or equated to the underclass.⁷² Beal notes that, subsequent to the period of linguistic liberalisation that ensued from the 1960s onwards, English society is now regressing to a situation wherein speaking with an unfavourable regional or foreign accent is regarded as an obstacle to social improvement.⁷³

A similar social anxiety lies at the heart of Atticism, a movement that sought to replace the social and political elite with one based on education and the correct use of language (Swain 1996, 43–51; Schmitz 1997).⁷⁴ This elitist attitude also informs the kind of language that Atticism targets: neologisms, slips in pronunciation, and dialectalisms. Neologisms form a multifaceted category in Atticist discourse, one that includes not only newly coined expressions but also terms that – despite having been used for centuries in Greek – lacked the necessary literary pedigree to qualify as preferred forms and, when used in writing, came across as novel oddities: in line with the ‘Golden Age Rule’, for the Atticists, the term ‘language’ mostly corresponds to ‘written language’. This is not to say that the Atticists were not also interested in verbal language; slips in pronunciation are an

⁷¹ See also Watts (2000, 35–8).

⁷² See also Milroy, Milroy (2012, 2). For this fear in Imperial Greek culture, see Swain (1996, 44–50).

⁷³ For a thorough study of this, see Milroy, Milroy (2012).

⁷⁴ See also Whitmarsh (2001, 118–30) on the role of language in the acquisition of a Greek identity on the part of intellectuals who came from ‘barbarian’ lands, such as Favorinus of Arelate and Lucian of Samosata.

important part of the Atticist linguistic reflection (Vessella 2018). Nonetheless, the Atticists' orthoepic prescriptions were intended for orators' performances, a genre that presupposes writing and, together with correct pronunciation, appropriate lexical choices.⁷⁵

Vocabulary concerns also inform the Atticists' approach to dialectalisms. The lexicographers provide evidence that Classical terms associated with dialects other than Attic used by non-Athenian authors were to be approached with caution. Phrynichus clearly states as much in *Ecl.* 235, where, in discussing the correct meaning of the adverb ἀνέκαθεν ('from above'), he adds that his enquiry concerns not Ionic or Doric but Attic (οὐ γὰρ Ἰωνικῶν καὶ Δωρικῶν ἐξέτασις ἐστὶν ὀνομάτων, ἀλλ' Ἀττικῶν). Pollux also examines the dialectal affiliations of several Classical forms of which he approves: see, for instance, *Onomasticon* 2.8, where he expresses uncertainty about νεογνός 'newborn' in light of its Ionic phonology, or *Onomasticon* 2.142, where he informs his readers that one is permitted to use κύβιτον 'elbow', despite the word's Doric origins.⁷⁶

The impression derived from reading the lexica is that the reflections on pronunciation, sociolects, registers, and dialects do not inform a systematic reference system. The lexicographers' sensitivity towards diachronic, dialectal, and social variation – when expressed – never attains the level of a full sociolinguistic theorisation. However, before concluding that this is because the Atticists were not 'linguists' in the modern sense of the word (and see Chapter 1, Section 6 on the appropriate historical approach to Atticist thought), it should be noted that the indeterminacy evident in the Atticist lexica is not unique to Atticism but rather is one of purism's recurrent features. As noted in Section 3.1 above, while purist attitudes are widespread among laypeople and intellectuals and typically thrive in literary circles, they are rarely expressed by linguists.⁷⁷

3.4 The Atticists: Self-appointed defenders of language

Purism tends to emerge in the activities of certain individuals or small groups before it reaches learned societies, academia, and governments (if at all).⁷⁸ Atticism was not promoted by cultural or political organisations, and hellenophones enjoyed no particular representation within the political community. In the context of Graeco-Roman society, the place left vacant by a central cultural authority was

⁷⁵ For purism's strongly lexico-semantic nature, see G. Thomas (1991, 65).

⁷⁶ On the first entry and its phonological interpretation, see Batisti (forthcoming a).

⁷⁷ G. Thomas (1991, 101). See too Milroy, Milroy (2012, 7–8) (on prescriptivism).

⁷⁸ On the role of these 'actors of purism', see G. Thomas (1991, 108–12; Langer, Nesse (2012, 614).

filled by a self-defined community of ‘language lovers’ and ‘experts in education’. We would expect the Atticist lexica to abound in information on these self-appointed defenders of correct Greek, who fed on the linguistic insecurity of individuals who probably belonged to the ‘middle’ classes, were non-native Greek speakers, and entertained aspirations of social mobility.⁷⁹ They contributed to developing what James Milroy and Leslie Milroy would go on to call ‘a linguistic value system which both reflects and reinforces social class and power distinctions’ (Milroy, Milroy 2012, 77).

In reading the works of the sophists of the Imperial age, we often witness their polemics over language correctness and how they were integral to the sophists’ display of their learning and self-publicity (‘identity parades’ according to Whitmarsh 2005, 32). The lexicographers consign a different picture, one in which details about themselves are rare.⁸⁰ Of course, the primary reason for this stark difference is that lexicography is a different genre from oratory and literary prose, not to mention that we read all the lexica in abbreviated form: even the longest, Pollux’s *Onomasticon*, is likely to have lost more authorial statements than those still evidenced in its prefatory letters. Thus, ‘Moeris’ is merely a name to us,⁸¹ while the authors of the *Antiatticist* and of the *Philaeterus* remain unknown. Our knowledge even of Phrynichus and Pollux is so limited that a modern scholar, Naechster, was able to fabricate a story concerning their rivalry for the chair of rhetoric at Athens.⁸² Both Phrynichus and Pollux were sophists but – to judge at least from the meagre evidence that has survived – not of the highest rank.⁸³ What remains of their works is so sparing with information on their own lives and occupations with the exception of a single reference in the *Onomasticon* to Pollux’s intensive teaching activity (Poll. praef. 8) and several references in the *Eclogue* to Phrynichus’ contemporaries and rivals (e.g. Cornelianus, Favorinus, Balbus of Tralles, and Gaianus of Smyrne). These afford us a glimpse of Phrynichus’ polemics with other colleagues, who were guilty of the failure to properly

79 For this social value of education, see Schmitz (1997, 152–6), who distinguishes between the high-quality education afforded by aristocratic individuals and the pedantic half-knowledge of the parvenus, and Chapter 1, Section 3.3.

80 On the sophists’ frequent self-discourse, see G. Anderson (1993, 213); Whitmarsh (2005, 32–4).

81 For this and the dating of Moeris’ lexicon, see Dettori (2022).

82 See Naechster (1908), with criticism in Matthaios (2013, 71–3) and in Tribulato (2018, 249–50).

83 Pollux studied in Athens under the rhetor Hadrian of Tyre, himself a pupil of Herodes Atticus. According to Philostratus (*VA* 2.12), he secured the Athenian chair of rhetoric thanks to his sweet art of declamation, although Philostratus himself was not impressed with his Atticising style. We have no contemporary information on Phrynichus, but Photius (*Bibl. cod.* 158) demonstrates how he was connected with the sophistic milieu of west Anatolia (see C. Jones 2008).

use and defend the language.⁸⁴ Moreover, the summary that Photius gives of Phrynichus' *Praeparatio sophistica* in his *Bibliotheca* (cod. 158.100a–101a) shows how in the many prefatory letters of this lexicon – now lost to us – Phrynichus addressed several contemporary intellectuals and spoke about his work, methodology, and illnesses.⁸⁵ However, since these are merely Photius' summaries, we cannot reconstruct Phrynichus' own voice. That is the extent of the biographical information that survives on these – for us, very important – supporters of linguistic Atticism.

The lexicographers occasionally boast about their works' usefulness to their dedicatees (see, e.g., Poll. praef. 1 quoted above), but advertisements intended to attract other potential readers are uncommon: the sentence that precedes the beginning of Book 1 of the *Eclogue* (ὄστις ἀρχαίως καὶ δοκίμως ἐθέλει διαλέγεσθαι, τάδε αὐτῷ φυλακτέα 'he who wishes to speak in an ancient and approved manner should guard himself against these [expressions]') may well be a later addition.⁸⁶ Still, and notwithstanding all the philological caveats expressed above, the lexica also appear to support the idea that the lexicographers privileged a kind of symbolic self-representation, one that is achieved through metaphors rather than 'professional' presentation. Terms such as ἀττικισμός, ἀττικιστής, and ἀττικίζω are almost always absent from these texts, and evidence suggests that this terminology was mostly employed by the opponent parties.⁸⁷ It is as though the lexicographers obliterated their individuality to maximise their purist self-image, expressed through a set of standard symbols that are recurrent in purist discourse.⁸⁸

A typical situation occurs when the lexicographer casts himself as a metallurgist who can distinguish good coins from counterfeits. As we have seen, Phrynichus (*Ecl.* 394) accuses Menander of using κίβδηλα ἀναρίθμητα καὶ ἀμαθῆ ('innumerable counterfeit and unlearned') expressions, with κίβδηλα equating Menander to a forger.⁸⁹ In his seventh prefatory letter, Pollux says that the lexicographer must cultivate precision (ἀκρίβεια) so that he might pass judgement on the authenticity of certain forms (Poll. praef. 7.5). The expression he uses, εἰς βασάνου κρίσιν, is derived from metallurgical terminology: the βάσανος was the touchstone that re-

⁸⁴ For a parallel for these disputes between lay 'experts of language' and professional linguists, see Milroy, Milroy (2012, 10–6); Hohenhaus (2012, 170–1).

⁸⁵ An overview of Phrynichus' dedicatees and an analysis of the production context of the *Praeparatio* is provided in C. Jones (2008) and Bowie (forthcoming).

⁸⁶ It is attested only in the manuscripts of the b family: see Fischer (1974, 60).

⁸⁷ The only exception is Phryn. *Ecl.* 332; cf. Schmitz (1997, 80–1; 148). See also the attestations of ὑπεραττικίζω in Philostr. *VA* 1.17 and ὑπεραττικός in Luc. *Lex.* 25.2

⁸⁸ See G. Thomas (1991, 19–24); Delveroudi, Moschonas (2003) (on the metaphors of the Modern Greek purist discourse).

⁸⁹ See Lamagna (2004a); Tribulato (2014, 202); Kim (2023).

vealed pure gold. The lexicographer may also equate himself to a judge in a metaphor involving the use of terms such as κρίσις ‘judgement’ (see Phryn. *Ecl.* praef. 4: τὴν τῶν καλῶν καὶ δοκίμων ὀνομάτων κρίσιν ‘the judgement of beautiful and approved words’, Poll. praef. 10.3: ὀνόματος κρίσει), μάρτυρες ‘witnesses’ (Phryn. *Ecl.* praef. 10, Poll. praef. 6.3 and 10.10), μὴνύω ‘denounce’ (Poll. praef. 6.2), and γράφω ‘indict’ (Poll. praef. 6.2). Judicial metaphors are particularly common in the third, sixth, and tenth prefatory letters of the *Onomasticon*.⁹⁰ However, purists may also be guardians of language: Phrynichus commonly uses the middle-voice form φυλάσσομαι when indicating the incorrect forms against which his readers should guard themselves.

The scant information that we have supports the hypothesis that the Atticists’ profile aligns with Thomas’ picture of the purists as non-professional linguists and, to some extent, with an image of lower-level professionals who were not admitted to the upper echelons of contemporary literary circles. Their works are impoverished with respect to authorial self-definition and information, although their authorial *persona* is nonetheless detectable in the style of the prefatory letters and other programmatic parts of these texts that have survived epitomisation (this will be fully addressed in Volume 2 of the series).

3.5 The legacy of Atticism on Greek linguistic practices

The study of the structural discourse, terminology, and symbols adopted in Atticist lexica confirms that these texts may be fruitfully studied by applying the interpretative categories developed by sociolinguistic studies of purism. By way of conclusion, we shall now offer some preliminary thoughts on the extent to which Atticism succeeded in its attempts to purify Greek.

G. Thomas (1991, 84) identifies eight distinct yet connected activities in the purification process: recognition of need, identification of targets, censorship, eradication, prevention, replacement, reception, and evaluation. Atticism certainly fulfils the first three (recognition of need, identification of targets, and censorship). However, it is lacking in the full development of the fourth and fifth stages – eradication and prevention – because it is not an organised purist movement that has the backing of academies and governments.⁹¹ Rather, the ‘replacement’ activity (sixth stage) is prominent, both in the instructions given by the lexica and in the choices made by Atticising authors who, by and large, tend to selectively pre-

⁹⁰ On which, see Tribulato (2018, 260–5).

⁹¹ For these characteristics of the ‘prevention’ activity, see G. Thomas (1991, 92).

fer Attic features to the contemporary koine. That Atticism exerted a significant impact at least on Greek intellectual discourse is proven by the fact that its provisions received much praise and criticism from contemporary and later scholars. In this respect, the ‘reception’ (seventh) stage of Atticism is fully represented: as G. Thomas (1991, 97) explains, ‘our concern should be not so much with the fate of the purist himself [. . .] but for the extent to which his attempts are accepted, resisted, ridiculed, rejected or simply ignored’.

It is more difficult to assess whether or not Atticism enjoyed a substantial reception on the part of the speech community beyond the linguistic consciousness of the literary elite. There is some research on Atticist influences in documentary papyri,⁹² but inscriptions constitute wholly uncharted territory in this regard.⁹³ In some cases, Atticism may be identified as the cause of the loss of certain undesirable features in the history of Greek, but one might legitimately wonder about the extent to which it succeeded in profoundly reshaping the development of post-Classical Greek. By this, we mean that Atticism overall failed to promote Atticising Greek as the linguistic standard of the entire speech community, representing – at best – a competing norm that rivalled the koine in high-register written language. For this reason, as already discussed in Section 2.1, Atticism cannot be fully subsumed under the category of standardisation. Instead, its belonging to the category of purism is confirmed by the fact that Atticism mostly impacted only a section of literary and high-register language. This lack of complete success highlights that Atticism did not evolve into a form of standardisation unlike, for example, Italian Tuscanism, which began in the Renaissance as a form of archaising purism but later, in the 19th century, evolved into a form of standardisation with practical and political purposes that exerted a revolutionary impact on the history of standard modern Italian. The same did not happen with Atticism. Greek purism remained at the level of learned literary language and nobody – not even Aelius Aristides or Photius – would likely have chosen to say, for example, *θάλαττα* or *φυλάττω*, even when speaking with the educated elite.

Several rare Classical terms sanctioned by the Atticists seldom appear to have been seriously revamped even by later high-register language and scarcely at all in communication across different registers (the situation may be different with prescribed usages that were standard in Greek before the occurrence of post-Classical developments: see Roumanis 2016 for examples).⁹⁴ Morphological areas in which

⁹² Especially Luiselli (1999); see also A. L. Connolly (1983); Roumanis (2016); Vierros (2018).

⁹³ See C. Jones (2008, 259) on the *Eclogue*; Tribulato (forthcoming c).

⁹⁴ Consider, for instance, the case of the verb *ψυχορροφέω* ‘to drain somebody’s soul’, discussed in Phryn. *PS* 128.11–3 but later used only by Leo Choerosphactes (see Gerbi 2023); or the case of *πρόσφατος* (‘new’), which according to Phryn. *Ecl.* 27 should be used only in reference to corpses

archaising Atticistic Greek fails to counter post-Classical developments include, for example, the preservation of primary comparatives (e.g. ἀμείνων ‘better’ and χείρων ‘worse’) over analogical double formations (e.g. ἀμεινότερος, χειρότερος; Favi 2022q); the banning of analogical comparative adverbs in -τέρως for -τερον (Tribulato 2022b) and the synthetic comparative forms ἀγαθώτερος and ἀγαθώτατος rather than the periphrastic formations μᾶλλον ἀγαθός and μάλιστα ἀγαθός (Favi 2022o); the preference for forms of ἔρχομαι over those of εἶμι for ‘to go’ (particularly in the future tense: Favi 2022b); the predilection for σμάω ‘to smear’ over its by-form σμήγω (Favi 2022s); the preference for impersonal ἀπαρκεῖ (‘it suffices’) and ὕει (‘it rains’) over ἀρκεῖ (Favi 2022p) and βρέχει (Tribulato 2022c); and the prescription of the iussive infinitive (Favi 2022r). This is merely a selective sample of features that Atticism failed to successfully resuscitate, although they may differ in respect to their presence in various registers of later Greek. The list is also selective because we continue to lack a thorough mapping of the linguistic precepts of Atticism and their relation to the developments of post-Classical and Byzantine/Medieval Greek. The linguistic legacy of Atticism and its failure or moderate success will be addressed again in Volumes 2 and 3 of this series in the light of the lexicographic entries analysed by the PURA project in the *Digital Encyclopedia of Atticism*.

To conclude, throughout its entire history and later reception, Atticism was a matter of register (and style) rather than one of linguistic standardisation.⁹⁵ Even in literature, Atticism – despite being a prominent phenomenon in Greek intellectual discourse – never succeeded in imposing Atticising Greek as the sole recognised norm. Some genres of Greek literature continued to be written in various registers of the koine continuum (on this, see Bentein 2016, 19–20) or even in other literary dialects (such as Ionic). Byzantine high-register prose was also not simply Atticist but rather engaged in a complex negotiation between Classical language (as distinct from Attic alone) and contemporary Medieval Greek (based on the koine).⁹⁶ It may also be noted in passing that *katharevousa*, the 19th-century

(Favi 2022h); or the meaning that Phryn. *Ecl.* 56 prescribes for ἀφῆλιξ (‘old person’), which is unattested in Byzantine Greek (Favi 2022n).

95 This conclusion differs from the account offered in Frösen (1974), in which Atticism – identified as an ‘attribute of style’ (Frösen 1974, 97) – is proposed to coincide with ‘post-Classical common language’, in which the stylistic features of Classical literature are encountered in addition to the features of Classical Attic’ (Frösen 1974, 121), a formulation that replaces in terminology – but not in substance – the idea that Atticism corresponds to ‘Standard Late Greek’ (a proposition to which Frösen 1974, 95 adheres). In our view, Atticism was far from embodying any kind of real linguistic standard (see Section 2).

96 Ševčenko (1981), with expansions in Toufexis (2008); Horrocks (2010, 213–4); Wahlgren (2010, 529–30); Horrocks (2014, 50; 72).

purist form of Greek, did not represent the living legacy of Atticism, regardless of the ideological discourse that it espoused.⁹⁷ Rather, it was a form of archaising language planning based on Ancient Greek that included features of both Classical Attic and the Hellenistic koine (Holton 2002, 171; ‘a compromise’, according to Frangoudaki 1992, 367). Greek ‘diglossia’, both ancient and modern, has been rather a matter of a dichotomy between high literary language (which was certainly Atticistic but not exclusively so) and spoken varieties encompassing everything in between (Alexiou 1982).⁹⁸ In spite of its agenda, Atticism achieved no meaningful success in rendering later Greek more Attic (or less non-Attic). However, a more definitive conclusion regarding its legacy can be reached only after a comprehensive study of the relative success and failure of each proscription of the Atticist lexica in diachronic perspective and an assessment of the impact that Atticist provisions exerted on both literary and substandard Greek.

⁹⁷ Browning (1983, 104); and *pace* Kazazis (2007, 1209–10).

⁹⁸ Thus, Dihle (1977, 163) seems to overgeneralise when he states that ‘die Griechen [haben leben müssen] auf Grund der attizistischen Reform des 1. Jhs v.C. bis auf den heutigen Tag in einer zweisprachigen Zivilisation, mit einer strengen Trennung von Sprech- und Schriftsprache’.

Chapter 3

Dialect, identity, and the invention of Athenian exceptionalism

1 Language and identity

This section's title pairs two words that will be familiar to almost everyone. Indeed, one might concede that language is a key element in individual, group, political, and national (or ethnic) identities. This simple statement – in fact, possibly a universal truth – however contains two concepts that have no univocal definition. What is language? What is identity? Let us begin with the first question. Linguists have assigned to language various definitions that may place greater emphasis on the structural, social, semiotic, or even symbolic functions of it (on the latter, see below).¹ As a completely abstract concept, language may be defined as a (human) faculty. Again abstractly, language may be considered a system of formal structures made up of rules that define the grammar of an individual language. Of course, even this structuralist view of language – championed by giants of theoretical linguistics such as Ferdinand de Saussure and Noam Chomsky, among others – recognises that language has a social aspect. Thus, in Saussure's thought, the abstract system (*langage*) that makes up a language (*langue*) takes concrete shape in the individual utterances of individual speakers on individual occasions (*parole*, approximately 'language use'). Since the middle of the 20th century, sociolinguistics (the branch of linguistics that studies the relationship between language and society) has advocated for a definition of language that emphasises its communicative (semiotic) function. Language is thus seen as a system of utterances that facilitates communication between members of a given community. Sociolinguistics is particularly interested in the variation experienced by each language (*langue*), an entity that is constituted by many geographical, social, and individual varieties ('dialects', 'sociolects', and 'idiolects' respectively), which may also vary depending on the communicative situations ('registers'). There is also, of course, a temporal dimension to language, which leads linguistics (and sociolinguistics within it) to distinguish between 'synchronic' and 'diachronic' approaches.

Either a synchronic or a diachronic viewpoint may be adopted in the study of Ancient Greek (an extinct historical stage of the Greek language). The synchronic approach will define 'Ancient Greek' as a set of grammatical rules that were in use at certain social and/or geographical levels in a certain historical period (e.g. the

1 The bibliography is immense. For an orientation, see Lyons (1981, 1–11); Trask (2007, 129–31).

5th century BCE). The diachronic approach, meanwhile, will explore the ways in which Greek changed over time (e.g. in its transition from the 2nd to the 1st millennium or in the evolution from Classical Attic to the koine). When we apply the question ‘What is language?’ to Ancient Greek, we immediately encounter difficulties that are specific to this language. The first difficulty concerns the patchy knowledge that we have of individual utterances, since this knowledge is based exclusively on *written* texts that cover the Greek diachronic development only imperfectly. Ancient Greek is a *corpus language*: a variety that no longer has native speakers but for which a large number of written records survives.² The second problem that we encounter will be repeatedly highlighted and discussed in this chapter. Even after accepting that by ‘Ancient Greek’ we in fact mean only a specific variety of Greek as evidenced in the written sources at a certain chronological period and thus an abstraction, we are left with the problem that neither this nor any other variety can be reasonably defined as ‘standard Ancient Greek’ in the same way in which we speak of standard French, English, Italian, or Modern Greek. Ancient Greek culture had no prescriptive grammar that defined the standard language to be spoken by all and accepted as such. The Classical period is particularly thorny in that until the end of the 4th century BCE, Greek was not even endowed with a supraregional variety common to vast strata of the Greek population: the Greeks spoke regional dialects (‘a ground of closely related norms’: Haugen 1966b, 923). Nonetheless, this situation produced a well-known paradox: the Greeks were aware that they all spoke one language. Being speakers of the same language (ὁμόγλωσσοι) is among the criteria on which Herodotus (8.144.2) finds what is perhaps the first approximation of a cultural notion of Greek identity in ancient sources (see Sections 1.1 and 2).

Faced with the Greek paradox, the linguist might perhaps say that Herodotus’ view is in contradiction with the reality of Greek dialectal fragmentation. The cultural historian, instead, will treat Herodotus’ notion of language as a *symbol*, a brick in the construction of an ideology of identity. But what is identity? It is when we come to the second word of our title that things become both stickier and more slippery. Identity has today become so much the buzzword in most human science fields that a well-meaning colleague once offered the sensible (albeit defeatist) suggestion that in our investigation of Greek linguistic purism, we might best dispense with the word altogether to avoid running into theoretical quicksand and offending disciplinary sensitivities and dogmas. Identity, in other

2 Corpus languages are thus different from *languages of fragmentary attestation* (‘Trümmersprachen’), for which even written evidence is scarce: an example of an ancient fragmentary language is Phrygian. For the distinction, see the classic Untermann (1989).

words, is encrusted with multiple layers of meaning (hence the stickiness) and resists univocal definitions (enter the slipperiness). However, complete avoidance of this contentious and contested word will not do. In studies of linguistic ideologies (and purism, including Atticism, belongs to this category) the stigmatised word – ‘identity’ – resounds at every turn of phrase, and the avoided concept that it denotes looms over many an explanation.

In this volume, we have thus chosen to begin with a very broad definition of identity as

the confluence of the person’s self-chosen or ascribed commitments, personal characteristics, and beliefs about herself; roles and positions in relation to significant others; and her membership in social groups and categories (including both her status within the group and the group’s status within the larger context); as well as her identification with treasured material possessions and her sense of where she belongs in geographical space. (Vignoles, Schwartz, Luyckx 2011, 4).

This non-committal definition is adequate for our investigation of language ideologies in the ancient world, given that we do not aim to problematise the concept of identity nor to contribute critically to this field of study. When paired, ‘language’ and ‘identity’ ignite a semiotic explosion, as more prosaically testified by the more than 3,000 hits that their association produces in Brill’s *Linguistic Bibliography*.³ In what follows, we shall not so much look at individual identities but will instead focus on the multifaceted character of group identity at both the individual (i.e. how a person identifies with a group) and group (i.e. how that group construes its own identity) levels. Naturally, our attention will focus particularly on the role that language plays in these constructions, which we shall explore at key moments in Greek history: namely, the emergence of a reflection on Greek ethnic identity in archaic literature (see especially Sections 1.1 and 2.4), and the rise of Athenian exceptionalism in the 5th century BCE (Sections 2.5–6). In what follows, we shall consider how language relates to ethnic and social group identity, leaving aside other associations investigated in the literature (gender, religion, nation, etc.).

Shared ancestry is the first criterion of ethnic identity. In the next section (1.1) and again in Section 2.4, we shall investigate how Greek ethnicity (the representation of all the Greeks as one nation) was founded on a web of genetic affiliations that linked the individual Greek tribes, which, in turn, represented smaller-scale ethnic identities (the Dorians, the Ionians, etc.). However, ancestry is not the sole characteristic of ethnicity. Other, less straightforward criteria contribute to

³ <https://bibliographies.brill.com/LBO> (accessed 25/05/2023). For the development of studies on language and identity, see the overview in Edwards (2009, 15–9).

shaping it, thus making it ‘more plastic than solid’ (Edwards 2009, 151). Some of these other criteria are objective: shared religion, language, and laws are common examples (and it is not by chance that they also feature in Herodotus’ definition of τὸ Ἑλληνικόν: see Section 1.1). By contrast, other criteria of ethnicity, are amply subjective. However, their subjectivity is the very reason that ethnic identities persist across generations despite rapid social change, when tangible links with previous generations no longer persist and ethnic identity evolves into a *belief* of shared ancestry.⁴ We shall return to this concept below, as it proves useful for understanding evolution of Hellenicity across time and its later identification with a set of shared cultural values (including language) in the definition of which Athens played a key role.

Language itself may be layered with subjective beliefs. The definitions reviewed at the beginning of this section treat language as a tool of human communication. However, language also has a symbolic function that is activated precisely when it is used to mark identity: it becomes ‘an emblem of groupness’ that provides ‘a powerful underpinning of shared connotations’.⁵ Such symbolism commonly develops into a fully-fledged linguistic ideology, whereby the linguistic variety of an ethnic or social group is believed to be better, more correct, or more logical than all others. In Greek culture, ideology of this nature emerges most powerfully in the perception that Greek – a pillar of Hellenicity – is superior to other languages. However, this linguistic ideology also affected the perception of the Greek dialectal varieties: this is because at some point, Attic became a symbol that could eventually be promoted to the rank of prestigious variety (see Section 3.4). One variety’s construction of a status over others on the same dialectal continuum is usually linked to the power of a dominant social and political group that wishes to impose its own language and transform it into a standard.⁶ In Greek history, this is only partially the case. Athens exported Attic beyond Attica as an administrative language (*Großattisch*: see Chapter 4, Section 4), and this eventually triggered the formation of the koine and its use as a supraregional variety. However, the koine was not strictly – or at least not always – a prestige language, because it was also the language of the masses and included many subvarieties. Moreover, the later symbolic construction of Attic as the best language *par excellence* was conceived precisely as a reaction to the koine and by groups that were not politically dominant. As we shall argue in this chapter, the seeds of the linguistic ideology espoused by Atticism

⁴ Edwards (2009, 158).

⁵ Edwards (2009, 55), from which the distinction between structural and symbolic language is taken.

⁶ The ideological nature of this construction is well-captured by Uriel Weinreich’s famous dictum, ‘a language is a dialect that has an army and a navy’: cf. Edwards (2009, 5; 64).

are in fact already discernible in the more broadly cultural ideology of 5th-century Athens that – although not focused exclusively on language – fabricated the idea of Attic uniqueness that Atticism later amplified.

In exploring how Attic became a symbol of Greek identity despite having initially been the language of a single regionally defined subgroup, it is useful to move from the level of ethnic identity to that of group identity. Greek culture expressed a plethora of smaller-scale group identities: for example, the social class of the καλοὶ κάγαθοί, athletic or artistic guilds, religious confraternities bounded by the worship of some god or local hero, age groups such as the ἔφηβοι, etc. Some of these groups managed to acquire a special status that was contrasted with that of other social groups: in other words, they acquired markedness.⁷ One such example is that of the πεπαιδευμένοι, those who attained higher education and thereby gained social recognition.⁸ The Atticist linguistic archaism of the πεπαιδευμένοι, in turn, is an instance of ‘marked language’.⁹ The particular group identity that Atticism created is accompanied by four processes that Mary Bucholtz and Kira Hall (2004, 377) call ‘semiotic processes of identification’ and that are recurrent in the shaping of identities through language.¹⁰ The first of these processes is practice – that is, the sedimentation of a habitus: in our case, the repeated use of Attic as a symbolic practice. The second is performance – a marked speech event at which identity is expressed through language: Atticism has a highly performative aspect, where language and pronunciation are continuously displayed, scrutinised, and assessed.¹¹ The third process is indexicality, through which the use of a linguistic feature becomes an *index* of something else: in the Atticist ideology, using correct Attic is an index of high social status and ‘good’ ethics (see Chapter 2, Section 3.3). The fourth process is ideology, which entails distorted beliefs – in our case, that Attic is an intrinsically better form of language.¹² Interestingly, cultural ideology often diverges from actual practice (which is complex and strategic).¹³ Thus, a strict Atticist such as Phrynichus may prescribe the use of certain features based on his group’s cultural ideology but may then disattend these prescriptions in his own prose.

In our initial exploration of the relationship between language and identity in Greek society, we have hitherto focused on a snapshot of two broad historical and cultural periods. First, we have considered Greek ethnic identity and how the

7 See Bucholtz, Hall (2004, 372).

8 See Schmitz (1997) and Chapter 1, Section 3.3.

9 Bucholtz, Hall (2004, 372).

10 See further Bucholtz, Hall (2004, 377–81).

11 See Schmitz (1997); Vessella (2018); Chapter 2, Section 3.3.

12 On the Atticist purist ideology, see Chapter 2, Section 3.1.

13 See Bucholtz, Hall (2004, 381–2).

notion of a (regardless of how historically abstract) shared language was part of its construction in the late archaic age. Next, we have considered how Attic purism became the cornerstone of Greek linguistic ideology in the post-Classical age. This transition includes a prominent logical gap: why would Attic, a local dialect, become the symbol of Greekness? The process, of course, is different from that by which varieties such as the dialects of Florence or Sweden became the languages of new nations: Greece had no political central power that endorsed Attic. The answer lies exactly in the notion highlighted above: ethnic identity is based not only on objective criteria but also on subjective beliefs that allow this identity to survive through time. Classical Athens and her culture play a paramount role in this process, as this chapter argues.

During the archaic period, there developed a notion of Greek ethnicity based on shared ancestry where differences – including dialectal differences – were reconciled through the construction of a common lineage (Section 2.4). From the late 5th century BCE, the importance of common ancestry (συγγένεια) begins to recede, perhaps as the result of two initially different but ultimately cooperating factors. The first, chronologically, is the Athenians' wish to sever their ties with the other Greek tribes and claim uniqueness, which led the Athenians to devise a special narrative around their own origins, based on the myth of autochthony (Sections 2.5–6). The second factor is the new political horizon that the Greek world enjoyed after Alexander the Great. During the Hellenistic period, one's claim to Greek ethnicity could no longer be based on the claim to *real* Greek ancestry. Thus, from the late 4th century BCE onwards, Greek identity notably becomes a *presumed* identity.¹⁴ The belief that the Greeks share a common Greek lineage may survive as an abstract – but formerly objective – notion because the defining characteristics of identity now encompass new, subjective factors. The most enduring of these new factors is culture, a shared set of educational values that find their concrete embodiment in Classical literature.

Atticism is among the clearest examples of the ways in which this new cultural notion of identity functioned, allowing ethnicity to retreat into the shadows and thus reassuring newcomers and outsiders.¹⁵ However, it was 5th-century BCE Athens that established the belief that cultural Greekness could be acquired by anyone and that the best school at which to learn it could only be Athens herself. Athenian propaganda invented a novel way of thinking about identity, elevating Attic to the language of the culture that all wishing to belong must possess. This ideological construction appealed to Roman society and at the same time enabled

¹⁴ Cf. Edwards (2009, 159), who borrows the expression 'presumed identity' from Max Weber.

¹⁵ Cf. Edwards (2009, 161), quoting Joshua Fishman.

the Greeks to continue in their proud reiteration of ethnic superiority. At the end of this long historical journey, Aelius Aristides gives full emphasis to this concept in his *Panathenaic Oration*:

Aristid. 1.326–7 Lenz–Behr: οἱ τὰς μὲν πατρίους φωνὰς ἐκλελοίτασι καὶ κατασχυνθεῖεν ἂν καὶ ἐν σφίσιν αὐτοῖς διαλεχθῆναι τὰ ἀρχαῖα παρόντων μαρτύρων· πάντες δὲ ἐπὶ τήνδε ἑλληλύθασιν ὡσπερ ὄρον τινὰ παιδείας νομίζοντες. ταύτην ἐγὼ τὴν μεγάλην ἀρχὴν καλῶ τὴν Ἀθηναίων [. . .]. μόνη δὲ ἦδε πάσαις μὲν πανηγύρεσι, πᾶσι δὲ συλλόγοις καὶ βουλευτηρίοις σύμμετρος, ἔτι δὲ ἅπασι καὶ καιροῖς καὶ τόποις ἀρκεῖ καὶ δι' ἴσου πρέπει· δύο γὰρ τὰ πρῶτα σχεδὸν ὡς εἰπεῖν κέκτηται μόνη, σεμνότητα λέγω καὶ χάριν.

They (i.e. the other Greeks) abandoned the dialects of the homeland tradition and would be ashamed to speak among themselves the languages of the past in the presence of witnesses. They all came to this language (i.e. Attic), regarding it as a marking boundary of civilisation. This I call the great victory of the Athenians. [. . .] Only this dialect (i.e. Attic) is suitable to every festivity, every meeting and assembly, and again it is sufficient and adequate to every occasion and place. For it alone possesses those two things that might be said to be the most important – namely, decorum and grace.

After all, Attic was an ancient dialect, a member of the Ionian group: when needed, albeit in the shadows, genetic ties could still be perceived, and the new version of Hellenicity could appear to be happily in continuity with more archaic notions of Hellenic ethnicity. The sections that follow unravel this fascinating story up to the threshold of the Hellenistic age.

1.1 Defining Greek identity: Ethnicity, language, and culture

The birth of Greek identity as a notion and its evolution in the archaic and Classical periods, have been investigated since the 19th century. These topics received new impulse in a series of influential studies published from the late 1990s onwards, to which this section is indebted.¹⁶ Politically, ancient Greece was not a single society but a constellation of city-states, regional communities, and transregional groups.¹⁷ Each of these political entities was the expression of an ἔθνος, which may be translated as ‘population group’ but also ‘inhabitants of a certain land or πόλις’. Early Greek notions of identity were essentially *ethnic* (i.e. expressions of a given ἔθνος) and based on *genealogical* criteria: ‘the ethnic group is dis-

¹⁶ J. M. Hall (1997); Fowler (1998); Malkin (2001); J. M. Hall (2002); Gruen (2013). Vlassopoulos (2015, 1–2) summarises the history of the field, showing how it has been shaped by the historical and political events of the 19th and 20th centuries.

¹⁷ See Vlassopoulos (2015), who discusses how each fits within the ethnicity paradigm.

tinguished from other social and associative groups by virtue of association with a specific territory and a shared myth of descent'.¹⁸ In many ancient sources, the notion of ἔθνος overlaps with that of γένος ('kinship'), which denotes any group related by birth: a family but also a population group.¹⁹ As Jonathan Hall remarks, 'the Hellenes can be described as both an *ethnos* and a *genos*, since one of the defining criteria of Greekness, along with language, customs and cult, was – for Herodotos at any rate – shared blood'.²⁰ Kostas Vlassopoulos, however, correctly warns that shared blood or common descent 'is neither exclusive to ethnic groups, nor is it sufficient by itself to constitute an ethnic group'.²¹ Other factors – which may be objective or subjective: see Section 1 – also come into play.

The archaic age is largely an age of 'intrahellenic identities', dominated by four γένη: the Achaeans, the Aeolians, the Dorians, and the Ionians. Tellingly, apart from the Achaeans, the names of these ethnic groups coincide with those of dialectal groups. The connection between γένος and dialect is not usually explicit in earlier sources but is highlighted already in Heraclides Criticus (3rd century BCE, fr. 3), who first defines the Greeks as those who speak Greek (ἐλληνίζειν) and then proceeds to list the individual dialects that each γένος speaks.²²

The earliest Greek sources reveal that some of these ethnic identities were already acquired notions (the Ionians are mentioned in *Il.* 13.685 and the Dorians in *Od.* 19.177) but that their characters and mutual relationships were constantly refined throughout the archaic and early Classical periods. Whenever the various subgroups faced issues of cultural interaction with other subgroups or peoples, the need to differentiate and self-identify emerged.²³ With the passage of time, these subgroups became building blocks in the construction of an overarching Hellenic identity. A unified idea of the Greeks as a single ἔθνος – that which J. M. Hall calls 'the becoming of the Greeks' – was probably shaped in the late archaic period under the impulse of panhellenic sanctuaries and festivals.²⁴ Opposing affiliations (e.g. Ionic vs Doric) may at times be contrasted for political reasons but ultimately contributed to a significant shift in the rhetorical construction of identity from race to culture, which is a 5th-century BCE acquisition.²⁵

¹⁸ On group boundaries as essential to ethnic identity, see Edwards (2009, 157).

¹⁹ J. M. Hall (1997, 34–6); Gruen (2013, 1).

²⁰ J. M. Hall (1997, 35). On the many meanings of γένος and its overlap with ἔθνος, see Loraax (1996, 35–42).

²¹ Vlassopoulos (2015, 6).

²² See Hainsworth (1967, 65); Consani (1991, 17–23); Finkelberg (2005, 161–76); and further Section 2.4 and Chapter 4, Section 4.3.

²³ J. M. Hall (2002, 6).

²⁴ J. M. Hall (2002, 154–68); Finkelberg (2005, 37–8); Vlassopoulos (2013, 38–41).

²⁵ J. M. Hall (2002, 226–8).

This view of the evolution of Greek identity is echoed in linguistic bibliography. In discussing how in the early Classical period the idea of Ἑλλάς came to inglobate that of linguistic unity, Anna Morpurgo Davies (1987) identifies the ideological contrast between the notion of ‘Greek’ and that of ‘barbarian’ as a turning point.²⁶ The role that Athenian political propaganda played in this conceptual evolution in the wake of the Persian Wars has rightly been emphasised.²⁷ Kostas Vlassopoulos has also warned against constructing the relationship between Greeks and barbarians (and hence our perceptions of Greek identity) according to a rigid chronological division, since this relationship varied not only across time but especially across different Greek communities.²⁸ However, the topic of this volume – and, in general, of any investigation of Atticism – necessarily demands a focus on the ways in which ethnic and linguistic identities were shaped in Classical Attic sources in particular. Considered from this perspective, it is undoubtedly the case that the rhetoric of a cultural Hellenicity opposed to non-Hellenicity – a rhetoric that intensified in Athenian discourse after the Persian Wars, as Vlassopoulos also admits – became the prevailing paradigm from the 5th century BCE onwards, markedly increasing in the 4th-century construction of panhellenism.²⁹ The new model posited culture (παιδεία) as the cornerstone of Hellenicity (see Section 2.6). While still defined in mostly Athenocentric terms, this culture was nonetheless also accessible to those non-Greeks who constituted much of the leading elite of the Hellenistic (and later Roman) world. The later classicising attitude of Graeco-Roman intellectuals, who championed the mastering of high-register (Atticising) Greek as a token of belonging, is a direct consequence of the centuries-long redefinition of the relationship between identity and language that was initiated in late Classical Athens.

In sketching the evolution of Greek identity and its appropriation of linguistic characters, we face several challenges. One is the difficulty in aligning ancient literary sources with material evidence: an example is the heated debate surrounding the origins of the Dorians (see Section 2.4, n. 90). Another challenge emerges in the fact that historical and mythographic accounts are typically much later than the archaic period when Greek ethnic identity was first defined and are seldom coherent with one another: this is because ‘genealogies in oral cultures are *fluid*’ (Fowler 1998, 3). A single author may sometimes merge and adapt independent mythographic and genealogical cycles and may not be entirely familiar with certain aspects of these traditions. A prominent example of this challenge is the Pseudo-Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*, on which we will focus in Section 2.4. How-

26 Morpurgo Davies (1987, 15–7); E. Hall (1989); J. M. Hall (1997, 44–7); J. M. Hall (2002, 175–89).

27 J. M. Hall (2002, 186–9); Malkin (2001, 7).

28 Vlassopoulos (2013, 36).

29 J. M. Hall (2002, 8; 221).

ever, divergences also affect the accounts of Hellenic genealogy offered by Apollodorus (1.7.1–3) and Strabo (8.7.1), while further relevant differences concern details of Heracles' lineage (which is central to Doric identity) in Diodorus Siculus (4.57–8), and the description of Ion's parentage (which is relevant for Ionic genealogy and Athens' place within it) in the versions narrated in Hecataeus and Euripides' *Ion* respectively.³⁰

For historians of language, an additional challenge emerges in the question of how so diversified a literary tradition may be used to obtain contextual information on linguistic history and its ancient perception. It is unclear whether language (i.e. dialect) played a role in the early construction of Greek 'regional' identities since here too all relevant sources are later. The first definition of Hellenicity based on linguistic criteria (although not on these alone) occurs in the already evoked passage of Herodotus' Book 8:

Hdt. 8.144.2: πολλά τε γὰρ καὶ μεγάλα ἐστὶ τὰ διακωλύοντα ταῦτα μὴ ποιέειν μηδ' ἦν ἐθέλωμεν, πρῶτα μὲν καὶ μέγιστα τῶν θεῶν τὰ ἀγάλματα καὶ τὰ οἰκήματα ἐμπεπρησμένα τε καὶ συγκεχωσμένα, τοῖσι ἡμέας ἀναγκαίως ἔχει τιμωρέειν ἐς τὰ μέγιστα μᾶλλον ἢπερ ὁμολογέειν τῷ ταῦτα ἐργασαμένῳ, αὐθις δὲ τὸ Ἑλληνικόν, ἐὸν ὁμαιμόν τε καὶ ὁμόγλωσσον, καὶ θεῶν ἰδρύματα τε κοινὰ καὶ θυσίαι ἡθεὰ τε ὁμότροπα, τῶν προδότας γενέσθαι Ἀθηναίους οὐκ ἂν εὖ ἔχοι

For there are many and great reasons why we (i.e. the Athenians) should not do this (i.e. make an agreement with the Persians), even if we so desired; first and foremost, the burning and destruction of the statues and temples of our gods, whom we are constrained to avenge to the utmost rather than make pacts with the perpetrator of these things, and next the kinship of all Greeks in blood and speech, and the shrines of gods and the sacrifices that we have in common, and the likeness of our way of life, which it would not befit the Athenians to betray. (Translation by Godley 1920, adapted).

In Herodotus, as already noted, 'language' represents an immaterial notion, an aggregative entity constructed on the knowledge that Greek was fragmented into local dialects, 'an abstract reification that assumes the prior existence of an 'imagined community' defined according to other criteria'.³¹ These other – arguably objective – criteria are religion (θεῶν ἰδρύματά τε κοινὰ καὶ θυσίαι), culture (composed of common ἡθεα 'attitudes; temper'), and common blood (ὁμαιμόν) – that is, kinship.³² Herodotus, therefore, sits on the cusp of the transition from a purely ethnic identity to a

³⁰ Hecat. *FGrHist* 1 F 16; Eur. *Ion* (57–75; 1589–94); cf. J. M. Hall (2002, 27).

³¹ J. M. Hall (2002, 192).

³² Analyses of this famous passage and of what it tells us about identity are many: see especially R. Thomas (2001); J. M. Hall (2002, 189–94). Said (2001) explores its influence in later discussions of Hellenicity.

broader cultural understanding of the concept, which will later develop into the ideal of Hellenicity also embraced by Atticism.³³ To understand this transition, it is necessary to examine the mythographic sources in which the first views of Greek ethnicity emerge. These sources mention linguistic matters only rarely, but much of the historical and geographical information they convey was used by ancient and modern linguists alike to derive conclusions on Greek linguistic history. Therefore, in the two sections that follow, we shall first address Greece's linguistic (i.e. dialectal) landscape from approximately the 2nd millennium to the middle of the 5th century BCE, highlighting the methodological and interpretative issues that this situation entails for linguists. This specialist background – potted though it may be in a volume of this kind – supports a more in-depth engagement with the ancient mythographic accounts and a fuller appreciation of the broader *cultural* implications of these traditions and their later re-use. This particularly concerns Athens' acquisition of a privileged status in Greek linguistic and cultural history, an evolution that is foregrounded in the exacerbation of the cultural opposition between the Ionians and the Dorians and the renegotiation of relationships within the Ionic ethnic group (see Section 2.5).

2 Greek: Language and dialect

The linguistic landscape of archaic and Classical Greece is notoriously fragmented and far from unified. Each region – indeed, each city – spoke a distinctive dialect, varieties that modern dialectology subsumes under six dialectal groups: Arcado-Cypriot, Attic-Ionic, Aeolic, Doric (encompassing the Northwest group), and Pamphylian (scantly attested around modern Antalya in Turkey, and difficult to classify).³⁴ Each of these dialects embodied a norm in its own right, and Attic was not endowed with a special prestige that marked it as superior to the other dialects – a norm – nor was there a recognised standard language (*Dachsprache* 'umbrella language'). A standard variety emerged only in the Hellenistic age with the koine, itself having evolved from the convergence of two closely related subvarieties of the same group: Attic and Ionic. Other areas of the Greek world also developed similar standard varieties based on the Classical dialects. The best documented example is the Doric 'koina' that was used in hundreds of Hellenistic inscriptions from Delphi as well as from Rhodes; in Sicily, a similar regional standard was

³³ Konstan (2001, 32–5) and R. Thomas (2001, 215) discuss how Herodotus is here resounding the Athenian new ethnic discourse.

³⁴ On Pamphylian, see the classic study by Brixhe (1976), and the overview in Filos (2013b). On Northwest Greek as a subvariety of Doric, see Section 2.2.

formed starting from the Doric dialect of Syracuse (Mimbrera 2012). The West Greek dialects also provided the basis for official documents issued by the Aetolian League (Bubeník 2018). The differences between the koine and these local koinai, which were mostly written standards, are addressed by Striano (2018).

A fundamental difference between the ancient Greek situation and that of many modern languages is that in ancient Greece, ‘dialect’ (διάλεκτος) carried no sociolinguistic connotations and was not subordinated to language (γλῶσσα).³⁵ As Herodotus’ *Histories* 8.144.2 shows, Greeks in the Classical period recognised the existence of a unitarian γλῶσσα while aware that they, in fact, spoke different varieties (διάλεκτου), none of which was a standard for the other Greeks.³⁶ The perception of a Greek language constituted by dialects that are not subordinated to a standard language also appears to have persisted into the Hellenistic age, given that the ancient grammarians treat the koine as neither an umbrella language nor the sum of all the dialects (see Sections 2–3). For them, the koine was simply another idiom, common to all Greeks because it was not geographically determined (significantly, κοινή is originally an attribute of διάλεκτος).³⁷ It is only in Late Antiquity (notably in the scholia to Dionysius Thrax’s *Grammar*: Consani 1991, 43–53), and more consistently in the Byzantine period, that διάλεκτος assumes the modern meaning of regional and/or individual variety, subordinated to standard language.³⁸ A curious fact, highlighted by Morpurgo Davies (1987, 9), is that in both the Byzantine and the earlier Hellenistic-Roman periods, dialects such as those described in Gregory of Corinth’s Byzantine treatise *Περὶ διαλέκτων* had ceased to exist, having been supplanted by the koine. However, it was in its non-Classical sense of ‘regional variety’ that ‘dialect’ would be adopted by Renaissance linguistics, largely determining the way in which the linguistic notion of dialect is treated in modern dialectology³⁹ and how the term ‘dialect’ is employed in modern languages.⁴⁰

35 This initial, non-specialised meaning of διάλεκτος as ‘language, linguistic variety’ is consistent with its derivation from διαλέγομαι ‘to converse, to speak’. The fullest account of the use of διάλεκτος in Greek sources is van Rooy (2016).

36 Versteegh (1986, 431); Morpurgo Davies (1987); Consani (1998, 95–6).

37 Morpurgo Davies (1987, 18); Consani (1991, 29–32); van Rooy (2020, 13–4); van Rooy (2021a).

38 Morpurgo Davies (1987, 8); Consani (1991, 16; 67–8); a slightly different view in van Rooy (2016, 259–67) and van Rooy (2021b), criticised in Consani (2021).

39 Van Rooy (2019).

40 Haugen (1966b, 923); Consani (1991, 75–94); van Rooy (2021b). The specialisation of the notion of dialect as a local variety (sociolinguistically) subordinated to a standard language is already pervasive in 19th-century linguistics. However, in some early 19th-century works ‘dialect’ may also be used to refer to daughter languages in relation to a mother language: see for example the title of an influential volume by Antoine Meillet, *Les dialectes indo-européens* (1922). A similar

2.1 The origins of Greek: Methodological premises

In this section, we shall briefly consider several theoretical issues concerning historical linguists' approaches to the origins of Greek. Not only will the adoption of this perspective be propaedeutic to our future analysis of Attic and its linguistic traits in comparison with other Greek dialects but it also allows us to consider in a different light the phenomena that accompany the emergence of Attic as a prestige variety (Section 2.6), its internal variation (addressed in Chapter 4), and the ancient speakers' perception of this development (Section 3). Although sociolinguistics is, of course, the central discipline to which we must turn in studying these phenomena, historical linguistics and dialectology provide additional tools with which to address issues of genetic relationships between dialects (particularly Attic and Ionic) and the mechanisms of change across them, showing that convergence (for instance between Ionic and Attic in their path to the koine) and borrowing (for instance, when Classical Attic imports prestigious lexemes from Ionic) are not only phenomena of a socio-cultural nature but enjoy full citizenship within a theory of historical linguistics.⁴¹

According to the current consensus, Greek (sometimes referred to as 'Proto-Greek', though this is a tricky term) – one of the earliest-attested Indo-European languages – was brought to Greece no earlier than 2000 BCE (and more probably around 1700, although estimates vary) by Indo-European peoples.⁴² They overlapped with speakers of non-Indo-European languages living in the Greek mainland and islands and eventually imposed their language (with a shift of the pre-existing populations).⁴³ The precise dynamics of the coming of the Greeks is a

approach dominated the beginnings of Romance linguistics whose founder, Friedrich Diez, treated the Romance languages (i.e. the literary varieties of six Romance languages) as dialects, 'Mundarten' of Latin (Diez 1836, 4). In both Meillet's and Diez' case, 'dialect' is essentially a synonym of 'daughter language'. In Romance linguistics, the shift in the perception of dialects as geographically defined varieties on a par with languages took place with the generation following Diez, starting with Wilhelm Meyer-Lübke's *Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen* (1890–1902). This seminal work considers the whole dialectal variation of Romance and treats the dialects as points in a dialectal continuum rather than as inferior varieties subordinated to a more prestigious language.

⁴¹ Some of these aspects are discussed in Chapter 4.

⁴² The first documents in the Anatolian language family date back to 1700 (Hittite) and 1500 BCE (Luwian). The oldest Mycenaean tablets are dated to ca. 1450 BCE. The oldest hymns of the Rig Veda were transmitted orally until ca. 1000 BCE but date back to at least 1500 BCE.

⁴³ We have no historical name for these pre-Hellenic peoples, whom ancient sources call by various names (Pelasgians, Dryopes, Leleges, Kaukonos – they also mention historical peoples such as the Phrygians and the Phoenicians). For a recent appraisal, see Finkelberg (2005, 42–64).

thorny and heatedly debated question, which has exerted an impact on the study of the Greek dialects. The main question here is how Greek became differentiated into several local dialects, the answer to which has occupied a central position in Greek dialectology as a reflex of wider debates in Indo-European linguistics.⁴⁴ Following the tenets of the comparative method, the traditional model presupposes a linear evolution from Indo-European, through ‘Proto-Greek’, to the dialects by way of increasing splits in the branches of a linguistic family tree (*Stammbaum*).⁴⁵ Critics of this model claim that it is not adequate to explain evolution across dialect continua, where varieties of the same language are mutually intelligible, as is the case with Greek.⁴⁶ These scholars have therefore preferred the alternative ‘wave theory’ (*Wellentheorie*) model, which posits that languages (and dialects) do not differentiate through a series of vertical and regular mutations but through innovations that spread concentrically like waves in a pond, overlapping with other waves.⁴⁷ In this model, dialects are marked by imaginary lines (‘isoglosses’), which mix in a complex interlacement of linguistic traits.⁴⁸ The wave model explains language change through phenomena such as contact, language-internal diffusion, and mutual accommodation: an effect of social factors.

The alternations of these two models are evident in how Greek dialectology has approached the question of the dialectal differentiation of Greek. Anna Morpurgo Davies (1992) offered an appraisal of the problems involved in this methodological issue in an article of unsurpassed finesse and clarity.⁴⁹ The distribution of the different dialects on Greek soil has traditionally been explained through the hypothesis that Greek came into Greece from the Balkan peninsula in three

44 For an introduction to the debate in Indo-European and historical linguistics, see Gąsiorowski (1999, 41); Clackson (2022, 26–9); on its impact on Greek linguistics, see Méndez Dosuna (1985, 261–306). See also Morpurgo Davies (1992, 417–20); J. M. Hall (1997, 162–70); Finkelberg (2005, 111–4); Hajnal (2007).

45 The model was originally developed by August Schleicher (1853; 1863, 14–6): cf. Morpurgo Davies (1996, 237–46; 270–6). For a discussion of its methodological premises, see Gąsiorowski (1999, 41); François (2015, 163–6); Weiss (2015); Consani (1991, 175–9) discusses its application in 19th-century Greek dialectology.

46 Garrett (2006, 139). Cf. François (2015, 167); Colvin (2020, 71).

47 The model was developed by the Indo-Europeanist Johannes Schmidt (1872), inspired by Hugo Schuchardt’s earlier intuitions on proto-Romance (Schuchardt 1866–1868; Schuchardt 1900: the latter in fact a lecture delivered in 1870 and taken into account by Schmidt).

48 An isogloss is a linguistic trait shared by two or more varieties, which is such as to enable their distinction from other varieties. In linguistic maps, an isogloss corresponds to the line separating two areas where the given linguistic trait has distinct values. For a discussion, see Chambers, Trudgill (2004, 89–103).

49 See also García Ramón (2010); Scarborough (2023, 18–30).

migration waves (Kretschmer 1909).⁵⁰ In this model, which is indebted to ancient mythography, the dialects are considered to be branches of a family tree that share the same ancestor, ‘Proto-Greek’.⁵¹ Linguistic history and relationships between the dialects are thus described by applying the comparative method. Later studies, following the decipherment of Linear B,⁵² have instead shown that already towards the end of the 2nd millennium Greek was dialectally differentiated and that Mycenaean is the ancestor of only some Greek dialectal groups (Attic-Ionic and Arcado-Cypriot).⁵³ These studies, inspired by the diffusionist wave theory, attribute the dialectal differentiation of Greek between the 1st and 2nd millennia to contact and accommodation.

The two models may be fruitfully reconciled for the purposes of our introduction to Greek dialectal history. The genetic model is useful for reconstructing unattested phases of the language and presenting a taxonomic description of the Greek dialects (see Section 2.2),⁵⁴ enabling us to explain language change in chronological terms. Meanwhile, the wave theory diffusionist model is useful in matters of detail, highlighting the fact that mutation can also occur through mechanisms other than simple linear filiation.⁵⁵ In our case, this approach is necessary for appreciating the internal variation of Attic. The ancients themselves demonstrated some awareness of this, and modern scholarship has devoted much attention to the social and chronological variants of this dialect.⁵⁶ The diffusionist model, which accounts for change in terms of both *time* and *space*, highlights the evident truth that ‘no dialect is monogenic’ (García Ramón 2018, 34). For our purposes, this serves as a sobering counterbalance to the ancient (particularly Atticist) purist pretence that Attic could really remain untouched by contact. The attention to lexical diffusion and borrowing from neighbouring varieties also brings to the fore sociolinguistic factors such as social strata and contexts of usage. In this chapter and the next, we shall make frequent mention of Ionic influence on Attic, an influence that was more pervasive

50 This supposes an Ionic migration in the Peloponnese, Crete, and Central Greece ca. 2000 BCE; an ‘Achaean’ migration in most of the same areas, pushing the Ionians further south, ca. 1700 BCE; and the final Doric migration ca. 1200 BCE.

51 For an accessible introduction to the issue of Proto-Greek, see Filos (2013a), with a rich bibliography. The Indo-European dimension of the question is discussed in Clackson (2007, 14–5), based on Garrett (2006).

52 See Porzig (1954); Risch (1955). This theory is not universally accepted: a convenient overview of the different theories on the position of Mycenaean accessible to non-specialists is provided by Milani (2013).

53 Méndez Dosuna (1985, 292–3); Hajnal (2007, 133–9); Horrocks (2010, 15–9).

54 Morpurgo Davies (1992, 429).

55 Cf. Haugen (1966b, 925–6).

56 See Chapter 4.

in certain social strata (among the elite and the intellectuals) and contexts of usage (literary language, private inscriptions). This happened because Ionic was endowed with *prestige*, a sociolinguistic factor that affects the ways in which dialects influence one another. We shall see in the second part of this chapter that Attic itself gradually acquired a cultural prestige that later motivated, first, its evolution into the koine (no longer a local dialect, but a supraregional variety spoken by all Greeks) and, subsequently, its promotion to the idealised linguistic standard of Atticist purism.

2.2 The diachronic and the synchronic dimensions

The previous section argued that it is beneficial to think of early Greek linguistic history in terms of a dialect continuum where demarcations and boundaries may have been much less rigid than our genetic reconstruction allows. In the period between the end of the written record in Linear B (beginning of the 12th century BCE) and the first sustained use of alphabetic writing in the late 9th–early 8th century BCE,⁵⁷ many innovations occurred across the already partly differentiated dialectal continuum, leading to the situation evidenced in the archaic epigraphic record. Thus, the Greek language as we know it is largely a creation of the period that followed the collapse of Mycenaean civilisation.⁵⁸ Scholars have linked this rapid evolution to extra-linguistic factors, such as economic crisis and mass population movements, the latter mirrored in the ancient historical accounts of early Greek migration and colonisation (on which see Section 2.4).⁵⁹ At the same time, the development of new forms of economic and socio-political links between different regions of the Greek world led to the emergence of a communal Greek ethnic identity, which is reflected in the archaic mythographic accounts that seek to find a common ancestor for all the Greek γένη.⁶⁰

It is necessary to address the outline of these linguistic and social changes to appreciate how the relationship between Attic and other dialects was portrayed in ancient sources and why many of them insist on the notions of movement and migration, against which Athenian thought later held the notion of Attic autochthony. The decipherment of Mycenaean has shown that in the 2nd millennium, the Peloponnese was occupied by people who spoke a dialect (or perhaps multiple

57 Only one document earlier than the 9th century BCE is known: the personal name *o-pe-le-ta-u* in Cypriot syllabic writing (perhaps mid-10th century BCE).

58 Morpurgo Davies (1988, 76).

59 Garrett (2006, 142).

60 See Consani (1991, 17–23); Morgan (2001); Finkelberg (2005, 161–76); and further Section 2.4.

dialects) that was the ancestor of Attic-Ionic and Arcado-Cypriot. The latter may have already been differentiated into a separate linguistic group by the end of the Mycenaean era.⁶¹ This linguistic uniformity was disrupted by speakers of West Greek (Doric): probably not a real ‘invasion’ (see Section 2.4 for the ancient roots of this theory) but a gradual movement of these peoples towards the east and the south.⁶² The linguistic ancestor of Attic then moved into Attica: it is noteworthy that Classical accounts of Attic origins obscure the historical reality of this migration to fabricate the idea that Athens is an exception (see Section 2.4). Proto-Aeolic began to develop in Thessaly around, or shortly after, the Mycenaean collapse. Boeotian formed from Proto-Aeolic through contact with West Greek; until ca. 1200 BCE, Boeotia, a Mycenaean land, spoke a dialect of the southeast group.⁶³ Around 1100 BCE, Aeolic speakers migrated to Asia Minor, where the distinctive East Aeolic variety developed.⁶⁴ For some time, speakers of West Greek must have cohabited with speakers of Proto-Ionic in the Peloponnese, as indicated by the fact that Ionic and West Greek share several isoglosses that may be explained as contact phenomena. The ancients seem to have been aware of this when they speak of an Ionic presence in the Peloponnese (cf. Strabo 8.1.2). Ionic then developed independently after migration to Asia Minor around 1000 BCE, the last large migration to have taken place: later Athenian sources cite this fact to posit that Ionia is a colony of the Athenians. This outline reveals that no Greek land was wholly immune to emigration and immigration at the turn of the 1st millennium BCE.

All these movements are largely responsible for those shared innovations and contact phenomena that make Greek dialectal geography so varied and complex. This ‘animated’ historical tableau thus complements the picture painted by dialectology, which captures the dialects as though in a ‘synchronic still life’. The complete lack of linguistic data and the unreliability of later ancient historical sources poses a serious difficulty for the reconstruction of Greek linguistic history between ca. 1200 and 800 BCE.⁶⁵ Thus, the 1st-millennium map of the Greek dialects, divided into six distinct – though related – varieties, is drawn on the basis of several diagnostic phenomena: shared innovations as a first criterion, and

61 Consani (2006, 29–32); García Ramón (2010, 229).

62 See Musti (1985); Consani (2006, 32).

63 García Ramón (2018, 94; 96).

64 For a defence of the historicity of the Aeolic migration, pointing to the existence of Proto-Aeolic as a unitary group, see García Ramón (2010, 230–5), who argues against H. N. Parker (2008). The archaeological evidence for this migration is debated: see Rose (2008). The same applies to the idea of an Ionic migration: Mac Sweeney (2017).

65 García Ramón (2018, 98–9) provides an excellent description of this problem.

common conservative traits as an additional criterion.⁶⁶ Shared innovations are more informative than shared archaisms.⁶⁷ The more common a given linguistic change (e.g. devoicing of obstruents in Indo-European languages) is, the more likely it is to have been introduced independently and thus not diagnostic for subgrouping.⁶⁸ The rarer or more ‘aberrant’ a shared development is, the more probable the relationship between the languages that possess it.⁶⁹ The single most important innovation in early Greek dialectal history, linking Mycenaean with Arcado-Cypriot and Attic-Ionic, is the change of inherited /t(h)i/ (θι, τι) into /si/ (σι) (as, e.g., in φησί/φᾶσί ‘s/he says’ vs φᾶτί; cf. Mycenaean *pa-si*). Such changes are not commonplace in Greek linguistic history and constitute a truly evolutionary step within the Greek dialectal continuum. Similarly, the evolution of inherited /a:/ (ᾶ) into /ɛ:/ (η) (through /æ:/) is the exclusive isogloss linking Attic and Ionic and setting them apart from the other dialects (although in Attic /a:/ is maintained before /e/, /i/, /r/: ‘*alpha purum*’). The ancients also recognised this as a diagnostic separative element (see Section 3.1).

A second type of innovation is also known: those that may have happened in different groups independently or may have spread through time and space by contact, during the first centuries of the 1st millennium (consider the case of the East Aeolic infinitive ending -μεναι, which probably results from contact between inherited -μεν with Ionic -ναι).⁷⁰ Some of these changes and shifts caused significant divergences in the dialect continuum, since displacement and geographical distance meant that the occurrence of a certain innovation happening in a certain subvariety would not be reflected in the group’s other subvarieties (for instance, in Arcadian and Cypriot, which, though genetically related, developed into two markedly different entities).⁷¹ Nevertheless, none of these splits was so significant as to hinder intelligibility: Greek literary sources make it manifest that dialects were mutually intelligible, although the perception of dialectal differences sometimes led to negative comments or accusations of ‘extraneity’ (ξενία). Section 3.4 considers how these perceptions contributed to the progressive polarisation of

⁶⁶ For a similar synchronic grouping of dialectal varieties, see Colvin (2007); Horrocks (2010, 16). A good introduction to Greek linguistic changes (both Proto-Greek and post-Mycenaean) is provided in van Beek (2022).

⁶⁷ See Brugmann (1884) and the discussion Méndez Dosuna (1985, 264–78); Clackson (2022, 20–6); García Ramón (2018, 82–5). Cf. also García Ramón (2010, 221).

⁶⁸ Gąsiorowski (1999, 54).

⁶⁹ On the notion of ‘common aberrancy’, see Hock (1991, 563).

⁷⁰ For a different view, see García Ramón (2010, 234); Scarborough (2023, 237).

⁷¹ Risch (1949) dated these changes to between 800 and 600 BCE; cf. Hajnal (2007, 136–7).

the Greek dialectal situation, with Attic assuming a prestigious role and eventually supplanting most other dialects.

We have seen how Greek dialectology reconstructs six dialectal subgroups: in reality, however, at least thirty local varieties were in existence, sometimes down to the very vernacular of each city. This is particularly true for Doric, the most locally differentiated group. Any descriptive list of each group and its subvarieties must select features according to which the differences between the dialects may become apparent. At the same time, even the most detailed description of a Greek dialect remains merely a synchronic abstraction, portraying the dialects as though they existed on the same chronological level and as though no innovations occurred over time and space. For our purposes, two elements are worthy of attention. The first is relative geographical isolation of Attic, which ancient sources link to the myth of Athenian autochthony (see Section 2.5). The second is the fact that we know the dialects of Attica and Ionia quite well thanks to an unmatched written record. Conversely, our knowledge of other groups, their subvarieties, and mutual differences is much more limited. Also, and perhaps more importantly, when we delineate the ideas that the Greeks had on the dialects in the Classical age we almost exclusively rely on Attic sources. Attic comedy, historiography, and oratory abound in sociolinguistic reflection (see Chapter 4, devoted to this) and often treat language in the light of socio-historical factors (see, in particular, Sections 2.5–6 on the purity motif). We do not have anything comparable for Ionic and almost nothing at all for Aeolic and Doric. Thus, when addressing the later perceptions of the Classical dialects in Greek erudition (see Section 3; cf. Chapters 6 and 7), we must remain aware that a distortive effect is probably at play, an effect that we are unable to fully correct owing to the lack of appropriate information from other traditions coeval to Attic literature.

2.3 Sources: Local dialects and literary languages

The extent of Classical literary sources, the state of epigraphic corpora, and the use that later generations made of them profoundly shape our discipline. The picture of the Greek linguistic landscape that can be drawn based on epigraphic and literary sources often differs, and the two views must necessarily be complemented with one another. Epigraphy allows us to neatly distinguish between all the dialects, some of which we know sufficiently well while our knowledge of

others remains deficient.⁷² The situation described by the epigraphic record is one of fragmentation and harmony at the same time. Regional diversity was high, but this produced no conflict between regions and *poleis*: there was no attempt to superimpose one dialectal variety onto the others, nor was there a need to diminish the local dialect in a bid to foster intraregional communication or a sense of linguistic unity.⁷³ In the case of Attic, which will be the focus of the next two chapters, its considerably vaster inscriptional record allows us to detect two specific tendencies. First, it is easier to identify traits that belong to substandard Attic, which also enables us to describe the dialect in its diastratic variation (see Chapter 4, Section 2.1).⁷⁴ Second, Attic was clearly permeable to influence from other dialects, with Ionic particularly conspicuous among them.⁷⁵ From the 6th century BCE onwards, Athens welcomed Ionian artists and thinkers, some of whom wrote literature in Ionic despite their residency in Athens: two prominent examples are Herodotus and Anaxagoras (the latter's works had wide circulation in Athens: see Pl. *Ap.* 26d–e, *Phd.* 97c). Ionic certainly influenced Attic intellectual discourse: Attic comedy's frequent attacks against Ionians (see Sections 2.6 and 3.1) express the popular perception of this pervasive influence, which is discussed in Chapter 4, Section 2.1 in greater detail.⁷⁶ The Attic inscriptional record confirms that from the end of the 6th century BCE onwards, Ionic features – both linguistic and epigraphic, especially as concerns the adoption of the Ionic alphabet – were considered to be prestigious.⁷⁷ To sum up: until the 5th century BCE, the Attic written record shows a relative permeability to external influence rather than a strong linguistic insularity.

The linguistic information that literary sources provide conveys a picture that differs from that of epigraphy, with its neat division into local varieties. As is well known, only a small number of dialects contribute meaningfully to the develop-

72 See the overview in García Ramón (2018, 31–3); cf. Colvin (2020, 70) for the consequences it has on a sociolinguistic investigation of Greek.

73 For a preliminary study of these tendencies, see Morpurgo Davies (1999). The situation is different in the case of metrical inscriptions where the local dialect must interact with the rules of poetic tradition. Mickey (1981) is a classic study of this interaction. See also Morpurgo Davies (1987); Passa (2016b).

74 On sub-standard or 'vulgar' Attic, see Cassio (1981, 81–7); Colvin (1999, 281–7); Colvin (2020, 74–84). Schulze's (1896, 698–700) considerations on features of Attic vase inscriptions that intimate koine developments remain valid.

75 See Rosenkranz (1930); Willi (2002b, 121–4); Willi (2010a, 107–14).

76 Cassio (1981, 91–2).

77 On the Ionic alphabet in Attic inscriptions, see Threatte (1996, 26–49). The dedication of Iphidike (*CEG* 198, end of the 6th century BCE) is a perfect example of the mingling of graphic, monumental, and linguistic Ionicisms that lend prestige to the dedication: see Kaczko (2016a, 100–10).

ment of Greek literary languages.⁷⁸ In the absence of any univocal correspondence between one dialect and a literary variety, it is best to describe this relationship beginning with the literary genre. Epic is composed in Ionic with a prominent contribution from both continental and East Aeolic (sporadic Attic elements are late and do not necessarily become part of the fixed code of epic Greek).⁷⁹ Choral lyric employs a mixture of Doric (with features of various kinds, but with a prevalence of ‘mild’ Doric), Ionic, and Aeolic (both epic and non-epic).⁸⁰ Later on, Doric will also provide the basis for literary prose as well: a prominent example are the Pseudo-Pythagorean writings (Thesleff 1965). The presence of non-epic Aeolic elements in the language of choral lyric is best explained as an influence from a prestigious tradition that must predate the flourishing of Alcaeus and Sappho. The two poets from Lesbos are the best example of the adaptation of an epichoric dialect (East Aeolic) to the needs of high-level poetry: although distinctly Aeolic, their diction is not devoid of carefully selected epic elements.⁸¹ Elegy and iambus are markedly Ionic, with a different degree of adherence to the epic code and the epichoric dialect: prestigious non-Ionic features are carefully interspersed here as well. The use of a single dialect, with no mixing, first emerges in prose – but early Ionic prose is largely indebted to epic Ionic (this may also be the case with Herodotus’ language), and thus its language too is a literary artefact.⁸²

Even a bird’s eye view of archaic Greek literary language reveals that dialectal mixture and a degree of artificiality are the norm in Greek poetic language: no genre or individual composition is devoid of interaction with other linguistic traditions. At a first glance, such dialectal diversity may seem to mark a stark difference with later phases of Greek literary language, when the Atticising style was ubiquitous. However, this is only partly true: poetic language remained dialectically composite throughout the ages. The real difference between the archaic age – when the Greek literary languages were shaped – and subsequent periods rather lies in the degree of *openness* of the linguistic canon. Provided that post-Classical poetry used the various dialectal mixtures codified in the archaic period, prose production had to come to terms with Atticism: even when the Atticising

78 General overviews in Colvin (2007); Tribulato (2010a); see also the relevant chapters in Cassio (2016).

79 Passa (2016a).

80 Tribulato (2016b).

81 See Tribulato (2021d) apropos of Sappho.

82 On the language of early Ionic prose and its relationship with epic, see Dover (1997, 84–95); Vessella (2016a, 356–61); Vatri (2019) focuses on rhythmic elements. On Homeric elements in Herodotus and the difficult question of their origin, see Tribulato (2022d).

norm was refused, the reasons for the refusal still attest to the overpowering presence of Atticist prescriptivism.⁸³

If the Greeks of the archaic age were to assess the situation of literary language in the Imperial period, they would surely have found it paradoxical. Attic remained a marginal variety in the Greek literary scene throughout the archaic period. When it joined the group of literary languages, it was obliged to negotiate its presence in poetry by paying homage to the previous poetic traditions: there is much (epic) Ionic and (lyric) Doric in tragedy.⁸⁴ Comedy, like oratory and historiography, employs a less adulterated form of the dialect, but in these genres, too, Attic is adapted to resonate with the literary tradition (as in comedy) or to avoid parochialism (e.g. in Thucydides).⁸⁵ The Attic gradual acquisition of prestige is the outcome of Athens' carefully engineered imperialistic and cultural policy, which dispersed Attic culture and language beyond Attica while simultaneously becoming more exclusive in her separation from common Greek ancestry (see Sections 2.5–6).

2.4 The ancient accounts: Monogenetic origin and multilineal descent

Greek ancestry relies on the notion that the four Greek γένη descend from the same ancestor, the eponymous Hellen. The reality of political fragmentation in archaic Greece has shaped the narrations of Greek beginnings, resulting in their curious mixture of monogenetic vertical descent and multilineal horizontal development. This structure of Greek ancestral accounts is best represented by the genealogies of the Pseudo-Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*, a mythographic 'reference work' (Fowler 1998, 2). The *Catalogue* assembled and rewrote earlier local genealogies into a 'retrojective revision' (Fowler 2013, 125). Its final version, which probably dates to the early 6th century BCE, contains the most ancient Hellenic (in the sense of 'Panhellenic') genealogical tradition that has survived (frr. 9 + 10a Merkelbach–West).⁸⁶

⁸³ Galen is a perfect example: see Manetti (2009) and cf. Chapter 6, Section 3.1.

⁸⁴ Attic as a 'Classical' language: Willi (2010a); tragic polymorphism: Willi (2019); cf. Chapter 1, Section 4.3.

⁸⁵ Language(s) of comedy: Willi (2002a); Willi (2002b); Willi (2003a); Chapters 4 and 5; historiography and oratory: Dover (1997, 83–4); Willi (2010a, 103–4).

⁸⁶ For the text of these fragments, see West (1985, 57–60). An overview of the different views on authorship and dating of this Pseudo-Hesiodic work is in Cingano (2009, 116–8). Detailed discussions of this genealogy are Fowler (1998); J. M. Hall (2002, 25–9); Fowler (2013, 122–30).

Ἕλληνας δ' ἐγένοντο φιλοπτολέμου βασιλῆος
Δωρὸς τε Εὐϋθὸς τε καὶ Αἰόλος ἱπποχάρμης.

And from Hellen, the war-loving king, were born
Dorus and Xuthus, and Aeolus who delighted in the battle-chariot.
(Translation by Most 2018, 49)

Εὐϋθος δὲ Κ[ρείουσαν ἐπὶ]ρατον εἶδος ἔχ[ουσαν
κούρη]ν καλλ[ιπάρο]ν Ἐρε]χθῆος θεῖοιο
ἀθανά]των ἰ[ό]τητι φίλην ποι]ήσατ' ἀκ[οι]τιν,
ἦ οἱ Α]χαιὸν ἐγ[είνατ' Ἰ]άονά τε κλυ]τόπωλ[ο]ν [. .].

And [Xuthus made Creusa,] who had a lovely form,
the beautiful-cheeked daughter] of godly Erechtheus,
by the will of the immortals his dear] wife,
and she bore him] Achaeus [and Ion] of the famous horses [. .].
(Translation by Most 2018, 53)

According to Pseudo-Hesiod's Hellenic genealogy, the same ancestor (Hellen, son of Deucalion, son of Prometheus) fathers Dorus, Aeolus, and Xuthus (who is the father of Ion and Achaeus). These are the eponymous founders of the ethnic groups into which the Greeks divided themselves: the Dorians, the Aeolians, the Ionians, and the Achaeans.⁸⁷ As J. M. Hall (2002, 26–7) remarked, what makes the Pseudo-Hesiodic genealogy an 'ethnic genealogy' is its recourse to 'faceless' mythological characters to express the relationship between these groups as one of filiation from a common father.⁸⁸ The paradoxical aspect of this narrative, which describes the beginnings of the heroic age, is the explanation of a historical fact – the political and regional fragmentation of Greece and its people – through a myth that fabricates an idea of *primaeva* unity through the symbolic figure of a common ancestor (Hellen) that never existed.⁸⁹ The invention of Hellen projects the anxieties surrounding the Greeks' internal unity as an *ἔθνος* back to an earlier age. The more fine-grained details of this 'tendentious' mythical account (Fowler 2013, 123) reflect actual historical events and political aims that contributed to shaping the genealogies – and, often, also to significantly reshaping existing ones.

These short fragments alone provide important information on these myths' relevance for Greek political and linguistic history (we leave aside the questions of the relationship between the Achaeans and the Dorians, and of the latter's migration – referred to through the myth of the return of the Heraclidae – which inter-

⁸⁷ That these γένη also coincide with the main dialectal groups as recognised by the Greeks themselves does not entail that they are merely linguistic in character: see J. M. Hall (1997, 153).

⁸⁸ Cf. Hainsworth (1967, 64).

⁸⁹ Finkelberg (2005, 30–1).

sects the linguistic problem of the arrival of Doric in the 2nd-millennium Mycenaean Peloponnese).⁹⁰ We may begin with the fact that the level of detail reserved for the Aeolic lineage in the *Catalogue* suggests that the composer(s) of this part of the poem were keenly interested in making the Aeolians prominent, perhaps because they were Aeolians themselves.⁹¹ However, it is evident that this original nucleus underwent much grafting from parallel or later traditions. We see this clearly in the portrayal of Attic genealogy. The *Catalogue* includes no dedicated space for the inhabitants of Attica (Ἀττικοί): rather, they are subsumed under the Ionians. However, according to the *Catalogue*, Xuthus begets Ion through his marriage to Creusa, daughter of Erechtheus/Erichthonius, the mythical ancestor of the Athenians.⁹² The *Catalogue*, therefore, partly portrays the Ionians as descendants of the Athenians' progenitor. This is one example of 'grafting' in the *Catalogue's* structure: a (probably) originally independent Athenian lineage was included in the panhellenic myth of Hellen and his sons. Martin West (1985, 169–71) saw a 'particularly prominent' element of Athenian propaganda in the *Catalogue*, which, together with other compositional and linguistic features, made him inclined to conclude that the poet who assembled this work from earlier genealogical material was an Athenian. Indeed, West (1985, 57) remarked that 'Xouthos marriage to Kreousa [. . .] serves to establish Athens' claim to seniority over the Ionians', a political operation the first traces of which surface in Solon (fr. 4a West: see Section 2.6).

Leaving aside the question of the *Catalogue's* authorship, if an Athenian propagandist operation lies behind the story of Xuthus' marriage to Creusa, this propaganda does not yet rest on Erechtheus' principal attribute, which was soon to acquire paramount significance in later Athenian retellings of the Athenians' origins. This attribute is that Erechtheus is γηγενής 'born from the earth'. The characterisation already appears in the second book of the *Iliad*, though in the suspicious lines 547–8, part of the Athenian section of the *Catalogue of Ships* (546–56) which is most probably a late archaic Athenian addition itself.⁹³ The lack of this motif and

90 The fullest versions of the return of the Heraclidae may be found in Diod. 4.57–8 and Apoll. *Bibl.* 2.167–76. This myth appears to have been distinct from the historical traditions concerning the Doric migration, although they often become confused. For a summary, see Fowler (2013, 334–42). J. M. Hall (2002, 73–82) discusses ancient sources and their modern interpretations. For the archaeologists' view on the 'Doric migration', see Morris (2000, 198–201); Deger-Jalkotzy (2008, 389–92). For the idea that the Dorians were already living in the Peloponnese during the 2nd millennium, see Chadwick (1976). For the debate in Greek dialectology, see Méndez Dosuna (1985, 299–306).

91 Fowler (1998); Fowler (2013, 128–9).

92 These originally distinct personages soon came to be assimilated: see Loraux (1981a, 45–65); Rosivach (1987, 294–97); Loraux (1996, 51–3).

93 See West (2001, 179–81).

the grafting of Athenian lore onto the Ionian lineage demonstrate that when the poem was assembled in its present form, Attic and Ionic identities were still shifting and their lineages were not unitarian: ancient sources have the Ionians variously originating in places as diverse as Messenia, Phocis, Achaia, among others,⁹⁴ suggesting a relatively late definition of Ionic identity within the framework of Greek genealogical systematisation.⁹⁵ Athens was soon to react to this indefiniteness of the Ionic γένος and claim a unique role for herself. While the *Catalogue* enacts a complex narrative in which movement, grafting, segmentation, interconnections, and exogamy are the norm, the Classical construction of Athenian identity proposed an alternative paradigm based on autochthony and purity.

2.5 The Athenian revolution of identity

The 5th century BCE ushered in a change that would become of paramount importance for the history of Greek identity.⁹⁶ Leveraging Erechtheus' status as 'born from the earth', the Athenians recast their genealogy to portray themselves as an autochthonous γένος that had inhabited Attica since time immemorial.⁹⁷ Although other Greek πόλεις also claimed to be autochthonous, the resonance that Attic literature gives to this motif succeeded in entrenching it as a unique Athenian characteristic.⁹⁸ Athens thereby severed her ties with the other Greek γένη, opposing her narration of autochthony to the 'alterité fondatrice' (Loraux 1996, 29) of other Greek cities, whose founders originated externally.⁹⁹ The strength and pervasiveness of this piece of Athenian propaganda exerted a revolutionary impact on the definition of Greek identity as a whole, as the focus gradually shifted from genealogical relations to cultural criteria, thus preparing the ground

94 J. M. Hall (2002, 68–9).

95 Connor (1993, 196).

96 Fowler (2013, 572).

97 On Athenian autochthony, see Loraux (1981a, 35–73); E. Montanari (1981); Rosivach (1987); Connor (1993, 204–6); Loraux (1996, 27–48); E. E. Cohen (2000, 79–103). Shapiro (2005) explores iconographic evidence that may demonstrate that the autochthony motif was not entirely a product of the 5th century BCE. Hornblower (1991–2008 vol. 1, 13), dealing with Thucydides' version of Athenian autochthony, defends the historical plausibility behind the myth.

98 D.S. 1.9.3 notes that the claim to autochthony was shared by 'all Greeks' as well as barbarians. Bearzot (2007a, 13–9) summarises this motif's presence in other local traditions; see also Gruen (2013, 3–4).

99 See Gotteland (2001); J. M. Hall (2002, 203).

for a view of Hellenicity reflected in culture that afforded Athens a special status.¹⁰⁰

On the mythographic level, the best known representation of this fundamental shift is found in Euripides' *Ion*, which 'amends' the Hellenic genealogy by changing Ion's parentage.¹⁰¹ Given that Euripides has Apollo as Ion's real father, the Athenians can now profess to have no connection with the rest of the Hellenic ancestry.¹⁰² If it had previously been essential to Athenian identity to place Athens firmly within the first generations of Hellenic lineage (see the *Catalogue of Women*), by the late 5th century BCE, the claim to exceptionalism had intensified in importance. The revolution of earlier heritage finds in Euripides' *Ion* a sounding board, particularly in the subversion of the relationship with Ionia: Ion is no longer an Ionian but an Athenian who becomes the eponymous ancestor of the Ionians.¹⁰³ This masterly logical trick preserves Athens' strong ties with Ionia but reverses power relations: the Ionians are now subordinated to their motherland Athens.¹⁰⁴ This becomes the ideological justification of Athens' rule over her Ionic allies through the Delian League and the not-insignificant revenue that she elicited from allies and for public gatherings such as the Panathenaea.¹⁰⁵

Euripides' *Ion* is thus a demonstrative example of those changes in Athenian society and politics that underpin a significant shift in identity and culture: late 5th- and 4th-century BCE Attic sources also demonstrate awareness of how the rapid evolution of Athenian society may be reflected in language (see Chapter 4, especially Section 3). As Fowler (1998, 9) further notes, Euripides takes a more audacious step in making Dorus Ion's son, with a revolutionary subordination of the Dorians to the Ionians. These shifts reflect contemporary political concerns. The Athenians lay the foundations of their exceptionalism and hegemonic ambitions in the notion that they are a purer γένος than any other. This point is made, among others, by Herodotus (7.161.3), who says that the Athenians are the *oldest*

100 In this section, the terms 'revolution' and 'revolutionary' are consciously used, following Ober (1996, 4), to refer to the socio-political changes and the ideology which sustained them, which affected Athens from approximately Cleisthenes' reforms (508/7 BCE) to the beginning of Macedonian rule (322 BCE). On autochthony and intellectual superiority as central holdings in Athenian civic ideology, see Ober (1996, 148–9).

101 On Ion's myth and its political implications, see Loraux (1981a, 197–253); Zacharias (2003, 44–102); Meinel (2015, 212–4); Martin (2018, 13–23); Gibert (2019, 4–8; 40–6).

102 Fowler (1998, 9).

103 See e.g. Gibert (2019, 44–6). Cassio (1985a, 115–8) deals with the 'colonisation propaganda' in Attic 5th-century BCE literature.

104 On this reversal, see Connor (1993).

105 See J. M. Hall (1997, 55); cf. Osborne (2010, 250): 'Athens began to demand that allies perform rôles normally expected of Athenian citizens, but without citizen privileges'.

people of Greece, since they are the only ones among the Greeks who did not migrate from elsewhere (ἀρχαιότατον μὲν ἔθνος παρεχόμενοι, μοῦνοι δὲ ἐόντες οὐ μετανάσται Ἑλλήνων), a point repeated in Thucydides (1.2.5; 2.36.1; see further Section 2.6).¹⁰⁶ The context of Herodotus' passage is that of an Athenian embassy to the Syracusan tyrant Gelon, which frames autochthony as a qualifying criterion for Athenian hegemony against all other Greeks and particularly – one infers from the context – the Spartans.¹⁰⁷ However, it would be erroneous to see this remoulding of Athens' genealogy as a mere effect of the conflict with Sparta.¹⁰⁸ That it started much earlier is attested by Solon's well-known assertion that Attica was the most ancient land of Ionia (πρεσβυτάτην [. . .] γαῖαν Ἰαονίης, fr. 4a West). The tradition of the Athenian settlement in Ionia became so ubiquitous in 5th-century BCE sources that Herodotus (from Halicarnassus, where Ionic was spoken in the 5th century BCE) remarks that the Asiatic Ionians certainly had no claim to purity since they were a mixed population originating in many Greek lands, even though – as he sarcastically adds – some entertained a vision of themselves as pure Ionians (οἱ καθαρῶς γεγονότες Ἴωνες, Hdt. 1.147.2).¹⁰⁹

The political use of Athenian autochthony has impactful consequences that go beyond Athens' relations with Ionia and her interests in the Peloponnesian War. The fabric of Greek identity itself emerges as radically changed, which is why this junction of the political and cultural history of Athens is of particular interest to our investigation of the roots of Atticism. Let us focus on two broad aspects. The first aspect concerns an apparently minor point of legal interest – namely, the redefinition of Athenian citizenship in Pericles' law of 451/0 BCE, whereby 'only those born from two citizen parents would be Athenian citizens' (Blok 2009, 141).¹¹⁰ The motivations of this law are debated (including regulation of citizen numbers, demotion of mixed marriages, ethnic exclusivity, and landownership). They may, in fact, respond to a variety of factors, including the wish to boost the Athenians' self-awareness and morale following a prolonged period of unsuccessful warfare.¹¹¹ Be that as it may, the law presents itself as a means of extending equal rights to all citizens regardless of their social standing: Athens' carefully constructed demo-

106 Loraux (1996, 29).

107 Loraux (1996, 30); Vannicelli (2017, 499–500).

108 Fowler (2013, 574).

109 Hdt. 1.146.1–2 with commentary in J. M. Hall (1997, 52); Fowler (2013, 573). Cf. Hdt. 1.146.2, 1.147.2; Pherec. *FGrHist* 3 F 155.

110 Cf. Arist. *Ath.* 26.4; Plu. *Per.* 37.3. For earlier definitions of Athenian citizenship, see Frost (1994).

111 This is the thesis of Blok (2009), which should be consulted for an overview of previous interpretations. See also Patterson (2005); J. M. Hall (2002, 204 and n. 151).

cratic ideology mediates between the ideal of political equality and the reality of social inequality.¹¹² Its emphasis on the Athenians' common origin (ἰσογονία) overshadows political equality (ἰσονομία).¹¹³ In truth, seen from the perspective of those who cannot claim autochthony, the law reveals an exclusive mentality. The 'corporate' social set-up of the Athenian citizen body ensures the functioning of Athenian direct democracy, and the exclusion of various categories (slaves, women, metics, etc.) from citizenship is part of its institutional success.¹¹⁴ The reality of exclusivity is covered in Pericles' idea (Thuc. 2.37.1) that 'merit was the prerequisite of power and influence' (Osborne 2010, 251). Thus, although the citizenship law ensured that foreigners and allies were *de facto* excluded from influence, Athenian rhetoric propagated the belief that merit and shared values could afford anybody a different kind of belonging.

The second aspect of interest to us ensues from this and concerns the way in which Athens, while closing the ranks of her own identity, succeeded in the revolutionary trick of promoting a more open notion of *Greek* (as distinct from Athenian) identity. Through the myth of autochthony and non-mixedness, Attic culture and language – which, as noted in Section 2.3, had been relatively marginal in the Greek cultural arena throughout the archaic age – acquired originality and uniqueness.¹¹⁵ This shift is particularly evident in Athens' relationship with Ionic and Near Eastern cultures. Until the Persian Wars, the Athenian elite had actively promoted the imitation and adaptation of Ionic and Near Eastern practices in art, writing, and dialect: 'exotica' were markers of elite status.¹¹⁶ As the 5th century BCE progressed, anti-Ionic and anti-barbarian attitudes surfaced, going hand in hand with the propagandist narrative that the Athenians had defeated the Persians single-handedly and with a broader nostalgic promotion of 'old Athenian' values and virtues.¹¹⁷ Scholarship is now generally unanimous that this cultural change – the so-called 'invention of the barbarian' – had political roots and was consciously initiated by the Athenian δῆμος to foster political hegemony through cultural suprem-

112 Ober (1996, 149). As B. Cohen (2001, 88) incisively puts it, 'this accommodation of such apparently irreconcilable elements was facilitated at Athens by the cultural phenomenon that "truth", for the Greeks, was multifaceted: *mythos* (myth) and *logos* (reason) might be antithetical, but they were also complementary'. Meinel (2015, 236–7) detects a similar tension in the twisting ways in which otherness and purity are represented in Euripides' *Ion*.

113 See Pl. *Mx.* 239a; Rosivach (1987, 303–4); Loraux (1996, 41).

114 Ober (1989; 5–6); Bearzot (2007a, 9; 12); Osborne (2010, 30); Lape (2010, 24–5).

115 Bearzot (2007a, 11).

116 See Connor (1993, 198–201); B. Cohen (2001); and J. M. Hall (2002, 200).

117 See e.g. Carey (2013), who explores this issue in relation to comedy's use of Marathon as a symbol.

acy (but see the caveats voiced in Section 1.1).¹¹⁸ One might ask whether this change in the conception of Hellenic identity can really have resulted from the Persian Wars and Athens' growing leadership in them.¹¹⁹ That this question can be answered positively – at least, as far as Athens' role in the construction of Greek identity is concerned – is demonstrated by an earlier source, Hdt. 8.144.2. In Section 1.1, we saw how this is the earliest text in which cultural criteria flank – and perhaps override – common blood in the definition of Greek identity. Tellingly, however, this change takes place in a speech *attributed to the Athenians*. In a different section of the *Histories* (1.56.2–57.3), Herodotus further relates that the two most ancient Greek stocks are the Ionians and the Dorians. The former, originally Pelasgians, had never left their home, while the Hellenes as a whole had wandered wide and far. The Athenians thus once spoke Pelasgian, but later became Hellenes by acquiring the Greek language:

Hdt. 1.57.3: εἰ τοῖνυν ἦν καὶ πᾶν τοιοῦτο τὸ Πελασγικόν, τὸ Ἀττικόν ἔθνος ἐὼν Πελασγικὸν ἅμα τῇ μεταβολῇ τῇ ἐς Ἑλληνας καὶ τὴν γλῶσσαν μετέμαθε.

If, then, the Pelasgians were all like this (i.e. they spoke the same language), then the Attic people, being Pelasgian, also changed their language at the same time as they changed to being Greeks.

This short sentence contains a series of concepts that lead the reader to recognise Athens' shadow in Herodotus' conception of a culture-based identity in *Histories* 8.144.2. First, unlike the other Greeks who have moved a lot, the Athenians are ancient and autochthonous – in this case through their Pelasgian ancestry.¹²⁰ Second, their Hellenicity is based on *language*, not blood. Third, it follows that language, like culture, can be acquired, borrowed, and bestowed on others.¹²¹ This 'Athenian imprint' is the same as that which, *mutatis mutandis*, later leads Attic authors to claim that Athenian culture can be exported everywhere and learned

118 See E. Hall (1989); J. M. Hall (2002, 175–89).

119 See J. M. Hall (2002, 189).

120 It is a matter of interpretation whether this Herodotean passage should be read as an implication that Herodotus is here representing 'the Athenians as autochthonous but of non-Greek origin and the Spartans and the other Dorians as Greek but immigrants, thus taking the political clichés about the past endorsed by each city to their extreme (and hardly glorious) logical conclusions' (Dewald, Vignolo Munson 2022, 257).

121 See the analyses in J. M. Hall (2002, 194) and Lape (2010, 153), although the latter sees this as Herodotus' attempt 'to demolish [. . .] Athenian racial pretensions'. In considering whether modern scholarship may not be over-playing Athenian responsibility in the Greek 'invention of the barbarian', Hall concludes – based on historical, epigraphic, and archaeological sources – that the burden carried by the whole citizen body in the Persian wars made Athens more exposed to the surfacing of a barbarian stereotype than other Greek cities (J. M. Hall 2002, 182–6).

by all. The sounding pieces of this propaganda motif – for example, Thucydides’ account of Pericles’ funeral oration (Thuc. 2.35–46), Isocrates’ *Panegyric* (4.46–50), and Plato’s critical *Menexenus* (238a–239a) – are so famous and ubiquitous in the literature on Classical Athens that it is not necessary to dwell on them at length here.¹²² These texts construct Athenian exceptionalism based on shared motifs such as autochthony, military and moral value, ability to reason and to speak, and education.¹²³ As Loraux (1981b, 333) says, ‘les Athéniens ont inventé Athènes’.

In Isocrates, however, the focus gradually shifts from Athens herself to what she has done and can do for the other Greeks: the definitive defeat in the Peloponnesian War looms behind Athens’ wish to reclaim hegemony among the Greeks.¹²⁴ At 4.46, Isocrates begins by saying that the prizes bestowed by the Athenians (the context is that of an agonistic metaphor) have attained such regard that they are sought after by all other Greeks. This is an allusion to the fact that Athenian culture now carries an explicit prestige in the eyes of non-Athenians. Isocrates then touches upon the importance of philosophy (4.47) and public speaking (λόγοι, λέγειν), which is a far better gauge of superiority and freedom than wealth (4.49). The next chapter contains the famous redefinition of Greekness. No longer based on γένος but on mental disposition (διάνοια), it unites the Greeks under the banner of Athenian culture (παίδευσις, already evoked by Pericles in Thuc. 2.41):

Isoc. 4.50: τοσοῦτον δ’ ἀπολέλουπεν ἡ πόλις ἡμῶν περὶ τὸ φρονεῖν καὶ λέγειν τοὺς ἄλλους ἀνθρώπους, ὥσθ’ οἱ ταύτης μαθηταὶ τῶν ἄλλων διδάσκαλοι γεγόνασιν, καὶ τὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ὄνομα πεποίηκεν μηκέτι τοῦ γένους, ἀλλὰ τῆς διανοίας δοκεῖν εἶναι, καὶ μᾶλλον Ἑλλήνας καλεῖσθαι τοὺς τῆς παιδείσεως τῆς ἡμετέρας ἢ τοὺς τῆς κοινῆς φύσεως μετέχοντας.

So far has our city left other men behind with regard to wisdom and expression that its students have become the teachers of others. The result is that the name of the Hellenes no longer seems to indicate an ethnic affiliation but a mental disposition. Indeed, those who are called ‘Hellenes’ are those who share our culture rather than a common biological inheritance. (Translation by J. M. Hall 2002, 209, slightly modified)

A logical gap is evident in the transition from the praise of the art of speaking to the notion that Athenian culture brings together those who possess it. The missing link is the idea that those who have acquired Athenian culture have *learned* it

¹²² See the foundational study of Loraux (1981b).

¹²³ Ober (1989) reconstructs the symbols that underpin Athenian ideology, ‘the discourse of Athenian democracy’ (Ober 1989, 35). He also analyses Pericles’ role in the prominence given to rhetoric and education in the construction of the new Athenian elite (which was no ‘ruling elite’): see Ober (1989, 86–93).

¹²⁴ For a commentary on these central chapters of the *Panegyric*, see Buchner (1958, 53–65).

somewhere and not merely observed it in a passive way. It is in this implicit junction, we contend, that the foundations are laid for the future elite educational system, committed to the perpetuation of Attic culture. The idealisation of ‘Atticness’ is Athens’ legacy to later ages of Greek cultural history.

2.6 Drawing the threads: Athens and the invention of purity

In this section, we synthesise the threads that have been woven into the fabric of the linguistic and socio-historical sketch of the previous sections to discuss their significance for the later cultural trends that eventually resulted in the rise of Atticism. We have seen how the negative perception of barbarians and the promotion of Athenian exclusivity developed out of Athenian ideology after the Persian Wars because of Athens’ greater involvement in them, and essentially for political reasons. The purity motif, which also surfaces elsewhere in Greek thought and was later to become central to the linguistic ideology of Atticism, was substantially amplified and moulded by Athenian political and cultural reflection between the 5th and 4th centuries BCE.¹²⁵ In this section, we shall press this further to argue that Athens was responsible for transforming purity into a cultural value to be actively pursued.

Some have claimed that Pericles’ citizenship law, with its convergence of ethnic and civic elements, spurred reflection on purity in non-ritual terms.¹²⁶ Angelos Chaniotis (2012) has further suggested that a new concept of ‘purity of the mind’, connecting (bodily) purity with morality, developed towards the end of the archaic age, surfacing initially in Attic 5th-century BCE sources.¹²⁷ Taking her cue from Chaniotis, Saskia Peels-Matthey (2018) has explored the occurrence of metaphors for such ‘moralisation of purity’ in Attic tragedy and comedy. These two studies appear to support the hypothesis that Athenian culture contributed to a significant shift in the Greek conceptualisation of purity.

Narrowing the focus, we may consider how Attic literature employs the motif of autochthony to construct a metaphorical rhetoric opposing the semantic domains of purity/impurity and mixedness/unmixedness, which are also recurrent motifs in the purist paradigm (see Chapter 2, Section 2.1). Clear statements concerning the role of purity in Athenian civic identity all belong to the 4th century

125 On purity and pollution as central beliefs in Greek religion, see the classic R. Parker (1983) and the more recent Petrovic, Petrovic (2016).

126 Meinel (2015, 185 n. 55).

127 See, especially, Chaniotis (2012, 133). The idea is reiterated in Chaniotis (2018).

BCE.¹²⁸ However, the discourse on autochthony and ethnic origin is an evident intimation that the purist mentality was already fully in place in the late 5th century BCE. According to our reading, these texts cast movement and migration as negative attributes of non-Athenians: see, for example, Hdt. 1.56.2 (the Doric ἔθνος is characterised as πολυπλάνητον κάρτα ‘that has wandered much’ – on the context of this passage, see above n. 120), Hdt. 7.161.3 (the Athenians are the only Greeks who have not changed their place of habitation: μοῦνοι δὲ ἐόντες οὐ μετανάστατα Ἑλλήνων), and Eur. *Ion* 590 (the Athenians are not an ἐπίσασκτον γένος, a race brought from outside, echoed in Eur. fr. 360.7: λεὼς οὐκ ἐπακτὸς ἄλλοθεν). This motif is then amplified in 4th-century BCE sources: for example, Lys. 2.17 (the Athenians are unlike most other Greeks, who have gathered from all over: οἱ πολλοί, πανταχόθεν συνειλεγμένοι), Isoc. 4.24 (the Athenians are not migrants who have been collected from many other ἔθνη), Isoc. 12.124 (the Athenians are neither migrants nor invaders but the only autochthonous Greeks ὄντας δὲ μήτε μιγάδας μήτ’ ἐπήλυδας, ἀλλὰ μόνους αὐτόχθονας τῶν Ἑλλήνων), and others.

To be sure, in Greek literature at large the refusal of ethnic mixedness and the claim to purity are not only associated with the Athenians.¹²⁹ However, Attic sources express an aversion to foreigners to an extent that seems unparalleled elsewhere and that may reflect popular attitudes.¹³⁰ Thus, in his assessment of Athenian autochthony, W. R. Connor overtly speaks of

a prejudice against migrants – a prejudice that cut both against the Dorians as late-comers in Greece and against Ionians as emigrants. It could also cut against the metics, the resident foreigners in Attica who were so important to the city’s economy, but never accorded full citizen rights. (Connor 1993, 205).

It is important to recognise that Athenian autochthony was not only played against the other Greeks but also served to distinguish ‘real’ Athenians from those who had arrived in the city later. This motif is present in Ar. *V.* 1076, in which the old jurors who fought in the Persian Wars consider themselves to be the only Athenians who can claim to be natives (Ἀττικοὶ μόνου δικαίως ἐγγενεῖς αὐτόχθονοι).¹³¹ This line reveals how the vocabulary of exclusion (μόνοι) and enti-

¹²⁸ See Meinel (2015, 184–5).

¹²⁹ See Sordi (2000) for an overview, and a discussion of, the role of the συγγένεια motif in 5th-century BCE new retellings of older genealogies.

¹³⁰ See Cassio (1981, 87). Commenting on the opinions of the chorus in Euripides’ *Ion*, Meinel (2015, 218) suggests that they express the xenophobic point of view of the lower classes.

¹³¹ In these lines from *Wasps*, the Marathon motif (see Carey 2013) is paired with that of ethnic purity.

tlement (δικαίως) is profoundly paired with that of unmixedness (ἐγγενεῖς αὐτόχθονοι here serving as an antonym of μιγάδες). The step from unmixedness to purity, of course, is small. One of the Classical Attic texts in which this further step is explicitly taken is Plato's *Menexenus*, a work that plays with the traditional Attic genre of the funerary oration and its *topoi*.¹³²

Pl. *Mx.* 245c–d: οὕτω δὴ τοι τό γε τῆς πόλεως γενναῖον καὶ ἐλεύθερον βέβαιόν τε καὶ ὑγιές ἐστιν καὶ φύσει μισοβάρβαρον, διὰ τὸ εἰλικρινῶς εἶναι Ἑλληνας καὶ ἀμιγεῖς βαρβάρων. οὐ γὰρ Πέλοπες οὐδὲ Κάδοι οὐδὲ Αἴγυπτοὶ τε καὶ Δαναοὶ οὐδὲ ἄλλοι πολλοὶ φύσει μὲν βάρβαροι ὄντες, νόμῳ δὲ Ἑλληνας, συννοκοῦσιν ἡμῖν, ἀλλ' αὐτοὶ Ἑλληνας, οὐ μειξοβάρβαροι οἰκοῦμεν, ὅθεν καθαρὸν τὸ μῖσος ἐντέτηκε τῇ πόλει τῆς ἀλλοτρίας φύσεως.

So firmly-rooted and so sound is the noble and liberal character of our city and endowed also with such a hatred of the barbarian, because we are pure-blooded Greeks, unadulterated by barbarian stock. For there cohabit with us none of the type of Pelops, or Cadmus, or Aegyptus or Danaus, and numerous others of the kind, who are naturally barbarians though nominally Greeks; but our people are pure Greeks and not a barbarian blend; whence it comes that our city is imbued with a whole-hearted hatred of alien races. Nonetheless, we were isolated once again because of our refusal to perform the dishonorable and unholy act of surrendering Greeks to barbarians. (Translation by Bury 1929, 369)

The vocabulary of purity is particularly prominent in Euripides' *Ion*, the mouthpiece of Athenian autochthony.¹³³ Even when only the passages that contain the adjective καθάρως are considered, a clear association between purity and citizenship emerges. At ll. 469–71, the chorus beseech the *virgin* goddesses Athena and Artemis to bestow 'the *ancient* race of Erechtheus (τὸ παλαιὸν Ἐρεχθέως γένος) *pure* oracles of childbirth (καθαροῖς μαντεύμασι)'. The evoked oracles are those that should announce an offspring to the childless Xuthus and Creusa but will eventually reveal that Ion is Creusa's son, whom Xuthus will adopt. At l. 673, Athens is portrayed as a 'pure city' (καθαράν [. . .] πόλιν) which the stranger Ion – although a citizen (ἄστος) by name – will enter in silence, like a slave rather than as someone who can enjoy the civic privilege of παρρησία. Later (l. 1333), the priestess allows Ion to go to Athens as a ritually pure man (καθαρός), a qualification, however, that probably partakes of the semantic over-layering of καθαρότης in the play, also alluding to Ion's newly acquired Athenian status.¹³⁴ Ritual and

¹³² For the different interpretations of this elusive Platonic work, see Sansone (2020); for its criticism of Periclean rhetoric, see E. E. Cohen (2000, 100–2).

¹³³ See Meinel's (2015, 212–43) analysis.

¹³⁴ See Meinel (2015, 237–8) for a different interpretation.

ethnic purity thus continuously intertwine and overlap in the play since they share the same vocabulary.¹³⁵

Moving forward to the age of Atticism, it is telling that in the *Panathenaic Oration*, Aelius Aristides (1.14) explicitly uses the adjective καθαρός to refer to Attica. Her geographical position – surrounded by all the Greek peoples – causes her to stand out in her exclusivity: ‘for this reason, she alone wears the ornament of Greece in its pure form and is as much of another kind as is possible to be from the barbarians’ (διὸ δὴ καὶ μόνη τὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων πρόσχημα καθαρῶς ἀνήρηται καὶ τοῖς βαρβάροις ἐστὶν ἐπὶ πλεῖστον ἀλλόφυλος). The discourse of Attic purity, which 5th-century BCE literature soft-pedalled in the background, can now reach the full expression of exceptionalism because Aelius Aristides lives in an age in which cultural purity is constantly on display as a status symbol.

How does one acquire such distinctiveness in a world that is full of races and tribes? The solution, again, was already in sight in late 5th-century BCE Athens. Although the Athenians did not enforce an overt policy of ethnic discrimination, they precluded the extension of citizenship to foreigners.¹³⁶ Athenian propaganda solves the paradox of her acceptance of foreigners alongside exclusive citizenship with an authentic stroke of genius (‘une opération de langage très réussie’: Loraux 1996, 41): the invention of an imagined citizenship, a symbolic Athenian identity based on education and shared values, which is already in place in Pericles’ funeral oration.¹³⁷ By acquiring these badges of belonging, anybody can wash away the ‘original stain’ of mixedness (i.e. ethnic impurity).¹³⁸ Old aristocratic εὐγένεια (‘birth privilege’) is recast as a quality attainable by the masses in a kind of ‘communal aristocracy of merit’ that is celebrated by Attic orators.¹³⁹ Ethnic purity is no longer the focus of Greek perceptions of identity, for the ideal is now the attainment of a pure form of *cultural* identity, in which autochthony can – and will – be gradually replaced by moral nobility: a kind of εὐγένεια whereby

135 Meinel (2015, 228).

136 See Loraux (1996, 38) on this important difference.

137 The promotion of Athens as ‘the centre of the entire civilized world’ is also hidden ‘behind the clouds of condescending laughter’ against non-Greeks according to Willi (2002b, 149). On the different assessments of comedy’s attitudes towards non-Attic dialects and non-Greek languages, see Colvin (1999, 302–6), who argues for a realist, non-negative portrayal of the dialects; Willi (2002b, 125–49), who argues for the role of dialect as a linguistic strategy to integrate non-Athenians into Athenian discourse; and Willi (2003a, 222–5), on foreign talk as an expression of Greek ethnocentricity. Lape (2010, 64–71) instead focuses on Old Comedy’s portrayals of rivals and bad politicians as foreigners or speakers of bad Greek as evidence of an implicit ‘racist’ attitude. On this topos, see further Section 3.4 and Chapter 4, Section 3.3.

138 The expression ‘original stain’ is borrowed from Bearzot (2007a, 10).

139 Ober (1989, 259–61). Cf. Lape (2010, 181).

γένος has considerably looser boundaries and may encompass all who belong to an imagined community of Athenians.¹⁴⁰

Purity, we contend, is the essential characteristic of a notion of cultural identity founded on exclusion that replaces the earlier view of ethnic identity based on opposition and divergence (of lineage). Exclusivity highlights the elitist streak in the Athenian view of Hellenic identity. Parallel to the rhetoric behind the Athenian citizenship law, which sanctions inequality under the pretence of equality, Athens creates an inclusive notion of *Hellenic* identity while simultaneously closing the ranks of *Athenian* citizenship.¹⁴¹ But how inclusive is this new cultural identity? What does the acquisition of the ‘right’ παιδεία entail? Already in Isocrates, we see that Hellenicity is in fact restricted to those who have the social rank or economic means required to attain a truly Athenian education.¹⁴² While the ideal is cosmopolitan, the concrete effect is, in fact, elitist.¹⁴³

This narrative includes another development that is both logical and ideological. The notion of autochthony embodies the Athenian ideal of always remaining the same despite the passage of time.¹⁴⁴ In Thucydides, this ideal is present both in the initial chapter, in which Athens’ unicity is opposed to the continuous migrations (μεταναστάσεις) and emigrations (μετουκίσεις) of the other Greek cities (Thuc. 1.2.5), and then in Pericles’ funeral oration, in which the sentence τὴν γὰρ χώραν οἱ αὐτοὶ αἰεὶ οἰκοῦντες διαδοχῆ τῶν ἐπιγιγνομένων μέχρι τοῦδε ἐλευθέραν δ’ ἄρετὴν παρέδοσαν (‘for by always inhabiting this land in the succession of generations, [our ancestors] have delivered it free [to us] until today’, Thuc. 2.36.1) includes a telling short-circuit between the past tense παρέδοσαν used to refer to the ancestors who have inhabited the same land and the adverb αἰεὶ (occurring also at 1.2.5), which projects that action into both the present and the future. The eternal character of the Attic delineation of autochthony is not contradictory – it feeds, rather, Athens’ primacy over the centuries:

le gain essentiel du développement sur l’autochtonie est la possibilité d’exalter sereinement la pérennité d’Athènes et sa vitalité toujours renouvelée au fil de la chaîne des générations. (Loraux 1996, 33).

140 On the pre-eminence of εὐγένεια from Aristotle onwards, see Gotteland (2001).

141 J. M. Hall (2002, 204).

142 See Raaflaub (1983, 529–31) on the Classical foundations of ἐλευθέριος παιδεία.

143 See J. M. Hall (2002, 209). On the elitist character of παιδεία, see Schmitz (1997) and Chapter 1, Section 3.3.

144 This is a topical feature in all Athenian funeral orations: see Loraux (1981b, 150–1); Loraux (1996, 32) and some of the texts discussed here below.

This character lends itself to being exported beyond the geographical and historical boundaries of Classical Athens, in ‘une incessante récréation de l’origine’ (Loroux 1996, 33). Atticism, with its claim to use a dialect that has never changed, will later represent the linguistic counterpart of this eternal recreation.

The new construction of Hellenic identity is thus an expression of Athenian chauvinism.¹⁴⁵ Its cultural and linguistic seeds are already sprouting in Classical Attic literature, in which a notion of a prestige Attic variety is already in place.¹⁴⁶ Comedy mocks foreigners for their imperfect control of language and non-Athenians or citizens of lower standing for their way of speaking.¹⁴⁷ This may well be a universal feature of humour (but see further Section 3.4).¹⁴⁸ However, it is possible that this tendency in Old Comedy to mark up dialectal and linguistic variation was later interpreted as a defining feature of Athenian culture, something to be taken seriously and imitated. This is just one of the many examples of the paradigmatic role of Attic comedy (especially Old Comedy) in the later idealisation of supposedly ‘authentic’ Attic characters (see further Chapter 4, Sections 3.1, 3.3, and 4.3; and cf. Chapter 5, Section 1). The notion of exclusivity interwoven in Attic sources resurfaces in Atticist theories of linguistic correctness, which often do not rely simply on the mere opposition good/bad but also play on geographical notions of exclusivity: dialects other than Attic are excluded, as are words associated with non-Hellenic regions of the world (see Chapter 2, Section 3.3). This attitude responds, on the linguistic level, to the Athenocentric view that has replaced the earlier aggregative idea of Greek identity. In the Atticist ideology, realities beyond the perimeter of Attica no longer qualify as alternative centres of cultural prestige. The Hellenistic new cities – irrespective of their wealth and importance – are peripheries compared to Athens.

The exception, of course, is Rome.¹⁴⁹ Rome escapes this fate thanks to her acquisition of Greek culture and her recasting as the new Athens on the part of those Greeks who had a personal interest in legitimising this culture’s value in the Roman world (Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Pausanias, and Aelius Aristides

145 The term ‘chauvinism’ is used by J. M. Hall (2002, 202).

146 Colvin (1999, 282; 292).

147 On these comic sources and their different modern interpretations, see Colvin (1999, 119–281; 287–95); Colvin (2000); Willi (2003a, 198–225); Bettarini (2015, 19–20). On mockery of non-standard language and accents as a means of social and ethnic discrimination in modern societies, see e.g. Lippi-Green (2012), who focuses on the US.

148 See Evans Davies (2014), although cf. the caveats in Colvin (2000, 285–6), who concludes that ‘dialect alone was not used to attack’ (Colvin 2000, 296), and further Bettarini (2015); Colvin (2020, 73).

149 Saïd (2001, 293–5).

being three prominent examples).¹⁵⁰ In *Roman Antiquities* 1.89–90, Dionysius of Halicarnassus famously overturns the accusation of barbarity levelled against Rome to claim that the Romans, in fact, descend from the Greeks, that their language is partly a Greek dialect (Aeolic), and that they have preserved this Greek character far more than other Greeks who, living among barbarians, have become utterly barbaric.¹⁵¹ In a similarly notorious chapter of his *On Ancient Orators*, Dionysius credits Rome (not Greece!) with saving Greek oratory ('the Attic Muse') from the decay that it had experienced in the Hellenistic age and restoring it to its former glory (D.H. *Orat.Vett.* 1–3). The Roman rulers – like the Macedonian kings before them – can escape the stain of barbarity because they master Greek (i.e. essentially Athenian) παιδεία unlike the ever-changing 'truly barbaric' populations (the Thracians, the Celts, the Germans, etc.).¹⁵²

Attic linguistic purity forms the core of Athenian παιδεία. The next chapter discusses the Attic literary texts that allow us to suppose that 'proto-purist' attitudes – or, at any rate, a marked linguistic chauvinism – are already well established in 5th-century BCE sources. They mark a pivotal point in the Old Oligarch's nostalgic view of a bygone past ([X.] *Ath.* 2.7–8). In the Old Oligarch's view, late 5th-century democratic Athens, with her influx of people, goods, and languages, has irremediably lost her linguistic exclusivity and now employs a 'mixed language, which comes from [those of] all the Greeks and the non-Greeks (κεκραμένη ἐξ πάντων τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ βαρβάρων; see Chapter 4, Section 3.2). Adulterated language goes hand in hand with corrupted ethics and a diluted identity (represented by δίαίτα 'way of living' and σχῆμα 'way of dressing': on these criteria, see already Hdt. 8.144, discussed in Section 1.1).¹⁵³

The ideal of linguistic purity is essential for the elitist version of Hellenic identity embraced by the cultured classes from the Hellenistic age onwards. The return to an archaic form of language is part of their ideology of exclusion. It responds to the transformation of Attic into the koine, the language of the masses. Elite culture rejects the koine and its universality by fictitiously recreating a form of continuity between high-register post-Classical language and literary Attic. Between the Old Oligarch's begrudging remarks and the blossoming of Atticism in the 1st–2nd centuries CE, two broad phenomena take place in Greek culture. The first is the formation of the koine (see Chapter 4, Section 4). The second is the almost contemporary birth of a 'professional' reflection on the Classical dialects and their role in Greek learning (see Chapters 6 and 7). The roots of this reflection are steeped in the 4th

¹⁵⁰ See e.g. Konstan (2001, 36–43) on Pausanias.

¹⁵¹ On the theory of the Greekness of Latin, see Ascheri (2011), with previous bibliography.

¹⁵² Saïd (2001, 290).

¹⁵³ Cassio (1981, 80–1).

century BCE, and its fruits in Hellenistic scholarship are the *sine qua non* of later grammatical erudition, Atticism included. Chapters 6 and 7 will consider at length the role that these Hellenistic predecessors played in the formation of Atticist linguistic theories. To appreciate the standing that Attic attained in the context of the other dialects and literary varieties, the present chapter will now cast a final glance over the ways in which ancient erudition constructed the relationship – the power relationship, one might be tempted to say – between the Classical dialectal groups. The study of the ancient *perception* of the dialects – as opposed to their mere linguistic *description* – adds a valuable new dimension to the slow yet unstoppable acquisition of prestige on the part of Attic.

3 The Classical dialects: Ancient perceptions of linguistic diversity

Unlike modern dialectology, ancient Greek scholarship mostly deals with the Greek dialects in their literary dimension and much more rarely as geographically defined varieties.¹⁵⁴ Reflections on the dialectal form of literary language are scattered throughout Greek erudition of every epoch, although no ancient treatise has survived that addresses the issue organically.¹⁵⁵ We may take the stylistic theorisation of Dionysius of Halicarnassus as an informative example. In Chapter 5 of his rhetorical work *On Thucydides*, Dionysius makes a detour to explore the origins of the historiographical genre. The first historiographical works, he claims, were characterised by the same simple style, which privileged the use of the local dialect. In its evolution, however, historiography became more universal and elaborate, and this also brought about a change in style. Thus, Herodotus and Thucydides innovated not only in their conception of the subject matter (D.H. *Thuc.* 5–6, p. 330–3 Usener–Radermacher) but also in their choices of words and figures of speech (D.H. *Thuc.* 23–4, p. 359–64 Usener–Radermacher). Dionysius elsewhere identifies the two historians as the purest models of Ionic and Attic, respectively (D.H. *Pomp.* 3.16, p. 239.5–8). From a modern perspective, one might say that their merit was to have elevated the imperfect use of local dialects to the level of canonical literary languages. However, it is noteworthy that in *On Thucydides*, dialect is only mentioned insofar as it concerns Herodotus: in relation to Thucydides himself, Attic as such is not even discussed. This is a good example of how Greek stylistic theorisation never addresses (literary) dialects in a precise

¹⁵⁴ This and the following subsections are based on Tribulato (2019b).

¹⁵⁵ Tryphon wrote a treatise on the (literary) dialects: see Cassio (1993, 78–9).

manner and refrains from providing the kind of phono-morphological information typical of modern linguistic enquiries.¹⁵⁶

The theoretical framework that accommodates the ancient treatment of dialects has several peculiar characteristics that must be addressed to understand some of the statements that ancient grammarians made. The Alexandrian scholars had already developed a peculiar theoretical approach to the dialects, which classified their main features as variations (πάθη) from an analogical prototype: this is sometimes called συνήθεια (‘common language’), while at other times it is overtly identified with the koine or with an abstract ‘agreement between the dialects’.¹⁵⁷ Besides the theory of πάθη, the other cornerstone of ancient linguistic methodology is the identification of certain authors as representative models of each dialect. Consequently, that which remains of ancient dialectology is mostly a *theory of literary dialects*, that is, the linguistic forms handed down in Greek literary texts.¹⁵⁸ This is not to say that there was no interest in local dialects; Hellenistic scholarship often produced collections of regional notable terms (ἔθνικαὶ γλῶσσαι, λέξεις, and ὀνομασία: see Chapter 6, Section 4).¹⁵⁹ Traces of this local glossography may be detected in later sources, but for the most part, this production was wholly obliterated by the later focus on literary dialects.

Another discernible tendency that was briefly mentioned in the first part of this chapter is that dialect is seen as an expression of the character of its γένος. The most illuminating source in this respect is a (certainly late) scholium to Dionysius Thrax’s *Grammar* (schol. D.T. (Vat.) GG 1,3.117.18–27), in which four Greek γένη (Dorians, Aeolians, Ionians, and the Ἀττικοί/Athenians) are summarily differentiated based on key identifying characteristics:¹⁶⁰ the Dorians are more virile and their language is grandiose; the Ionians, by contrast, are completely relaxed and frivolous (χαῦνοι); the Athenians excel for their lifestyle and elaborate language, while the Aolians are renowned for their austerity and old-fashioned dialect.¹⁶¹ In connection to this, ancient sources ascribe an ethical and psychological function to the literary use of certain dialects. This function is described through the emotions that the language of certain literary pieces excites

¹⁵⁶ See e.g. Tribulato (2022d, 242–8) re. the assessment of Herodotus’ dialect in ancient scholarship.

¹⁵⁷ The classic study is Wackernagel (1876). See also Siebenborn (1976, 150); Consani (1991, 26–7); Cassio (1993, 85–6); van Rooy (2016, 253).

¹⁵⁸ Cassio (1984, 118); Cassio (1993, 79–81).

¹⁵⁹ Latte (1925, 157–75); Cassio (1993, 81–6); S. Valente (2014).

¹⁶⁰ There is no certainty that the scholium goes back to Choeroboscus (8th–9th century CE): see Cassio (1984, 126 n. 48).

¹⁶¹ An illuminating commentary on this scholium is found in Cassio (1984, 125–8); see also Section 3.3 below.

in their readers or listeners. The emotions are specifically linked to linguistic forms and not to the contents of the pieces, confirming that the ancients entertained a psychagogic view of literary dialects.

Another typical characteristic of ancient dialectology is its widespread neglect of a diachronic perspective. With few exceptions, mostly referable to Attic, ancient grammarians do not distinguish between different chronological stages of language.¹⁶² The most striking consequences of this unhistorical attitude are the already-mentioned facts: first, that ancient grammarians appear to ignore the fact that the koine is a later form of Greek derived from Attic and, second, that they treat it as simply another *διάλεκτος* without any recognition of its genetic relationship to older dialects.¹⁶³ The earliest traces of this theory may be found in Tryphon (second half of the 1st century BCE).¹⁶⁴ Byzantine exegesis inherits and perpetuates this division of Greek into five varieties, including the koine. In his *Περὶ διαλέκτων* (1.12 Schäfer), Gregory of Corinth defines the koine as ‘the variety that we all use’ (*διάλεκτος ἣ πάντες χρώμεθα*). This allows him to argue, on linguistic grounds, for an uninterrupted continuity between Ancient and Byzantine Greek.

A further noteworthy aspect is the way in which ancient dialectology perceives the relationship between Attic and Ionic. In parallel with the progressive emancipation of the Athenians from the Ionians, which leads to the recasting of the Ionians as *ἄποικοι* of the Athenians (see Section 2.6), the linguistic *συγγένεια* of these two varieties also evolves into the notion that Ionian is a form of *παλαιὰ Ἀθηναίικα* (‘ancient Attic’), a theory whose most influential proponents include Aristarchus (see Chapter 7, Section 3.2).¹⁶⁵ The two sides of this relationship – the political and the linguistic – are clearly merged in Strabo (8.1.2).¹⁶⁶ The Athenians’ precedence over the Ionians becomes standard in later sources, down to Byzantine exegesis.¹⁶⁷

162 For the periodisation of Attic, see Probert (2004) who focuses on Apollonius Dyscolus and Herodian. On the ancients’ lack of historical-linguistic awareness, see Lallot (2011); for exceptions to this general trend, see Nünlist (2012a) and Schironi (2018, 599–601), both on Aristarchus (see also Chapter 7, Section 3.2).

163 On the koine as a ‘fifth *διάλεκτος*’, see Consani (1991, 27–53); van Rooy (2016, 253–4). For ancient sources, see, among others, Clem.Al. *Strom.* 1.21.142.4; schol. (Marc.) D.T. *GG* 1,3.309.23–36; Greg.Cor. *Περὶ διαλέκτων* 1.12–4 Schäfer; and the anonymous Byzantine commentary on Dionysius Thrax’s *Grammar* in *GG* 1,3.567.2–3.

164 See Morpurgo Davies (1987, 14); Cassio (1993, 78–9).

165 Aristarchus and Old Attic: Schironi (2018, 620–2).

166 See Hainsworth (1967, 67–8).

167 See e.g. Eust. in *Il.* 1.14.9–11; Eust. *Comm. in Dion. Perieg.* 423.42–4.

Unlike Atticism, however, ancient dialectology never theorises the pre-eminence of Attic over other varieties (see Chapters 6 and 7 for a more detailed discussion) nor the idea that the dialects are subsumed under a standard language (which is a development of Byzantine grammar: see Section 2). Nonetheless, it would appear that for comparative purposes, Attic is often implicitly treated as a sort of linguistic benchmark against which features peculiar to the other dialects may be described. The subsections that follow, dealing with Ionic, Doric, and Aeolic, respectively, make the case for such a reading of ancient dialectological and grammatical sources. We shall see how the peculiarities of these three dialects are often contrasted with Attic and how the latter does not receive the same amount of attention in terms of ethical and psychological considerations. Thus, we shall argue, the sources themselves appear to suggest that Attic occupied a special place within ancient dialectology and that this peculiarity found distinctive reception and new resonance in Atticist theorisation.

3.1 The ancient perception of Ionic

Ancient grammatical sources devote ample space to Ionic phono-morphological characteristics. A common feature is the comparison between Ionic and Attic. Perhaps in keeping with the notion that Ionic is a form of Old Attic, typical Ionic traits are often perceived as changes from a previous (Attic) form. Two representative – albeit opposing – phenomena associated with this methodological approach are the transition of /a:/ (ᾱ) to /ɛ:/ (η), and contractions. In the first instance, grammarians correctly describe the shift of /a:/ to /ɛ:/ as a τροπή ('change'). However, their interest usually lies in the Ionic η's difference from Attic (and koine) *alpha purum*: there is no recognition that, in fact, the preservation of /a:/ is shared by all other Greek dialects, nor that /a:/ > /ɛ:/ also occurs in Attic.¹⁶⁸ The adoption of the same perspective in the treatment of contractions produces an incongruous explanation. The preservation of vocalic hiatus is seen as an essentially Ionic phenomenon (although it was widespread in many archaic Greek varieties), in opposition to Attic practice. Attic contractions are presented as the starting point from which Ionic diverges by way of 'resolution' of the contraction. For example, in a comment on the adverb ἀψευδέως 'truly' attributed to Philoxenus by the scholia to the *Odyssey*, the uncontracted adverbs ἀμεπέως and

¹⁶⁸ Cf. e.g. Hdn. *GG* 3,1.340.9–10: τὰ εἰς ρη ἰωνικώτερα κατὰ τροπὴν τοῦ α εἰς η βαρύνεται, κόρη, Ἄσκηρ πόλις Βοιωτίας, κτλ. ('Ionic nouns in -ρη, in which α mutates into η, retract the accent: (e.g.) κόρη, Ἄσκηρ – a city of Boeotia –, etc.').

ἀψευδέως are explained as forms ‘in Ionic resolution’ (ἐν Ἴωνικῇ διαλύσει) deriving from ἀμεπῶς and ἀψευδῶς.¹⁶⁹

The observation of this general trend of assessing Ionic based on Attic should not, however, lead to the conclusion that Ionic was perceived as less prestigious. On the contrary, thanks to its authoritative model authors, Ionic enjoys a status that even permeates Atticist lexicography, which notes Ionic peculiarities but rarely censures them.¹⁷⁰ The main reason for this respectful treatment of Ionic certainly is its connection with Homer, the poet *par excellence*. The perception of Homer as an Ionic authority, however, is not monolithic: already, Aristarchus thought that he was an Athenian who wrote in an ancient form of Attic, a theory that also surfaces in some of Herodian’s fragments.¹⁷¹ Several entries in the Atticist lexica seem to subscribe to the same view.¹⁷² The circulation of alternative explanations for Homer’s language does not alter this picture. Some ancient scholars, somewhat anticipating the modern theory of the ‘Aeolic phase’, thought that Homeric language mostly employed Aeolic.¹⁷³ Others still (e.g. Dio Chrysostom, the Pseudo-Plutarchean *Vita Homeri*, Philodemus, etc.) regarded Homeric language almost as a *summa* of all Greek dialects, a theory that also finds a place in Herodian.¹⁷⁴ The fact that this champion of normative grammar frequently uses Homer to exemplify linguistic norms constitutes a perfect demonstration of how foundational the Homeric text was in Greek culture and thus also in language.¹⁷⁵

After Homer, the model authors of Ionic are Herodotus and Hippocrates. The latter’s usage of Ionic is a marker of the medical genre but is also a problem for the intellectuals of the Atticist period, who must reconcile Atticist precepts with the medical tradition in Ionic. Galen discusses this problem in various places, but a hint of this linguistic controversy may also be found in the second prefatory letter of Pollux’s *Onomasticon*.¹⁷⁶ Regarding Herodotus, Ionic is often regarded as

169 Philox. fr. 2 (= schol. BHQ Vind. 133 *ad Od.* 14.485 Dindorf).

170 See the examples in Tribulato (2019b, 365–6), where Byzantine sources and their probable Hellenistic antecedents are also addressed.

171 See Chapter 7, Section 3.2. For the presence of this theory in Herodian see Probert (2004). For Herodian’s approach to dialects in Homeric language, Stephan (1889, 24–36) is still useful.

172 See e.g. the entries from Moeris’ lexicon analysed in Pellettieri (2023b); Pellettieri (2023c); Pellettieri (2023d) and Pellettieri (2023e) with further references.

173 Schironi (2018, 612–5).

174 On the origin of this theory and its use in rhetorical-grammatical sources, see Blank (1988, 141–2); Janko (2000, 377 n. 4).

175 See Pontani (2012).

176 Cf. e.g. Gal. *De differentia pulsuum libri iv* 8.635.3–5 Kühn: καὶ ἡμετέρας δὲ δύο πραγματείας ὁ βουλόμενος ἔχει, τὴν τε περὶ Ἀττικῶν ὀνομάτων καὶ τὴν περὶ τῶν ἰατρικῶν (‘Those who want [to delve into terminological matters] also have my two treatises at their disposal, one on Attic

characteristic of his distinctive pleasantness (ἡδονή), grace (χάρις), and sweetness (γλυκύτης). Herodotus' style has Dionysius of Halicarnassus as its first important supporter. In the *Letter to Pompey Geminus*, Dionysius praises the historian for the pleasantness of his narration, achieved both through a correct arrangement of the subject matter and through the style, characterised by a pure Ionic dialect, of which he is the greatest model (τῆς Ἰάδος ἄριστος κανών, D.H. *Pomp.* 3.16, p. 239.8–9 Usener–Radermacher). Language and narrative skills afford Herodotus the frequent assimilation to Homer, which is expressed in the famous definition of Herodotus as ὀμηρικώτατος ('most Homeric') of *On the Sublime* (13.3), and more fully in Hermogenes (*Id.* 336).¹⁷⁷ Through rhetorical theorisation, the notion that Ionic is sweet, pleasant, and almost ontologically poetic enjoys a wide dissemination that survives into the Byzantine age.¹⁷⁸

Several sources describe the effect that Ionic χάρις elicits in the audience, and these include Atticising authors. For instance, in describing the abilities of Scopelianus of Clazomenae (an Ionic city), Philostratus (*VS* 1.519) states that 'the ability to speak wittily is natural among the Ionians' (πρὸς φύσεως μὲν γὰρ τοῖς Ἴωνικοῖς τὸ ἀστειζεσθαι). Philostratus emphasises the pleasantness of Scopelianus' speech in a polemic with those who considered him a pompous representative of Asianism. He attributes to these detractors the criticism that Scopelianus was ἀκόλαστος 'unbridled' (Philostr. *VS* 1.514). This is a telling judgement that reveals to us the other side of the coin in Ionic characterisation. Alongside their positive qualities, the Ionians were also credited with defects such as lack of restraint, lasciviousness, moral corruption, sexual depravity, and obscenity. Characterisations of this nature already abound in Attic comedy and will be addressed in Chapter 4, for they are part of the Attic self-definition and claim to superiority. However, these judgments also surface in serious theorisations, such as those concerning music and language.¹⁷⁹ The softness of Ionic musical modes, a denotation that is replete with negative undertones, is topical in Greek literature at least since Pl. *R.* 3.398e.¹⁸⁰ A fragment of Heraclides Ponticus (163 Wehrli = 114 Schütrumpf) quoted in Ath. 14.624c–626a argues that the Ionic musical mode evolved from an initial austere character to effeminacy (τὰ τῶν νῦν Ἴώνων ἦθη τρυφερώτερα, cf. Ath. 14.625d).¹⁸¹ This derogatory topos

terms and the other on medical ones'); cf. also Chapter 1, Section 4.3; Chapter 6, Section 3.1. On the second letter of the *Onomasticon*, see Tribulato (2018, 255–8).

177 On this passage and its context, see Priestley (2014, 199–205). The role of Ionic language in the ancient comparison between Homer and Herodotus is addressed in Tribulato (2022d).

178 Cf. e.g. Phot. *Bibl.* cod. 72.45a.

179 See Cassio (1984, 119–20). Abert (1899) is still useful for his collection of key passages.

180 See Tribulato (2019b, 375).

181 On this fragment in general, see Hagel (2009, 431–4); Prauscello (2012, 68–70).

must, however, have originated as an initial appreciation of the elegance of Ionic deportment and costumes in Attic culture, which later developed into a source of ridicule in 5th-century comedy as part of the evolution of Athenian attitudes towards Ionia (see Section 2.6).¹⁸²

The transition from the ethical sphere to the theory of sounds and language is noteworthy. Thus, Aristides Quintilianus (2.13) states distinguishes ‘masculine sounding’ vowels (among them α) and ‘feminine sounding’ vowels (among them η) and asserts that the prevalence of one of these two types of vowels determines a dialect’s virile or effeminate character. Regarding Ionic, the femininity of its sounds is sometimes regarded as conducive to its pleasantness, but at other times, it assumes a negative connotation. Philostratus himself, who praises the Ionic character of Scopelianus of Clazomenae, also reports (*VS* 1.513) that Isaeus of Assyria (an orator once given to slackness and pleasures) reproached his disciple Dionysius of Miletus for the excessive *singing* of his Ionian diction (μειράκιον, ἔφη, Ἰωνικόν, ἐγὼ δέ σε ᾄδειν οὐκ ἐπαίδευσα). These sources enable us to grasp the considerable complexity of the image that Ionic evokes in ancient commentators. A dialect related to Attic, the model language of epic, lyric, medicine, and philosophy and the best dialect in terms of elegance, sweetness, pleasantness, and poeticism, Ionic may, however, also bear negative connotations when elegance yields to affectation, sweetness to effeminacy, and pleasantness to lasciviousness. Precisely in this latter, negative sense, Ionic characteristics may thus be contrasted with those typical of Doric in a scale of values that often sees the latter emerge victorious as an alternative to Attic in the competition with Ionic.

3.2 The ancient perception of Doric

Doric occupies a special place within ancient dialectology, which recognises its peculiar subdivision into local subvarieties.¹⁸³ Although most of these varieties are described through literary sources (Alcman for Laconian, Epicharmus, Sophron, and Theocritus for Syracusan, etc.), evidence suggests that ancient scholars were also interested in local varieties, such as Cretan.¹⁸⁴ Ancient dialectology adheres to the ethical and cultural polarity of Dorians and Ionians. Thus, while

¹⁸² See Cassio (1985a, 105–18); Connor (1993, 199). Because of this comic representation, ‘Ionic’ is glossed as a synonym for ‘effeminate’ in ancient Greek scholarship: see e.g. Hsch. ι 1200; *Su.* ι 495.

¹⁸³ Hainsworth (1967, 70–1); Cassio (1993, 75).

¹⁸⁴ A collection of Cretan glosses is attributed to Hermonax, who lived before the 1st century CE: see Pagani (2005a). For Hellenistic glossographic collections focused on spoken dialects, see Chapter 6, Section 4.

Ionic traits are contrasted with the reference model of Attic (see Section 3.1), Doric is contrasted with the unity of both Attic and Ionic, an entity that ancient scholars implicitly reconstruct even if they lack the theoretical concept of our Attic-Ionic group. A diagnostic example is, again, how ancient grammarians address the inherited /a:/ (ᾱ) in Doric. This phoneme is contrasted with the Ionic (and koine) /ɛ:/ (η), without any awareness of the fact that the latter is a mutation of the former and not vice versa.¹⁸⁵ Connected to this, considerable attention is paid to the inflection of 1st-declension masculine nouns in -ᾱς, particularly with regard to their genitive singular in -ᾱ (outcome of -ᾱο). The grammarians are interested in the fact that the declension of these nouns in Doric betrays some similarities with the Attic contracted declension of personal names such as Μηνᾱς, Μηνᾶ, an inflectional type preserved in the koine. Thus, it is not uncommon to find discussions of the correct definition of these inflectional patterns: Choeroboscus, for example, quoting Theodosius, notes that they are always differentiated by the accent and that it is incorrect to call ‘Doric’ the type with perispomenon accentuation.¹⁸⁶

The characteristic most frequently associated with the Dorians and their dialect is ἀνδρειότης ‘virility’, an integral element of the myth of Doric military superiority (cf. Thuc. 6.80).¹⁸⁷ Such virile character is also detected in Doric musical harmony. Plato (*La.* 188c–d) prefers the Doric musical mode to the Ionic, Phrygian, and Lydian modes as the only one suited to the true man. Plato’s judgement is widely echoed in later works and also contributes to the idea of the moral superiority of Dorian-speaking authors.¹⁸⁸ As we have seen, Aristides Quintilianus also casts the opposition between the Ionians and Dorians in a phonetic light.¹⁸⁹ Although Aristides initially classifies /a/ (α) among the ‘intermediate’ sounds, he then says that /a/ is contrasted with /ɛ:/ (η) and is masculine by nature. Aristides cites the opposition between Doric and Ionic as proof, and the two dialects are said to correspond to the ‘contrary character of their ἔθνη’ (δηλοῦσι δὲ τοῦτο καὶ αἱ τῶν διαλέκτων ἀλλήλαις ἀντιπεπονθυῖαι τῆ τῶν ἔθνῶν ἀναλόγως ἐναντιοτροπιᾷ, ἢ Δωρὶς τε καὶ Ἰάς).

As Albio Cassio has argued, much appreciation of the ‘Doric α’ is likely to depend on the prestige of choral poetry.¹⁹⁰ However, not all authors composing in

185 See e.g. St.Byz. 9.43.4–6 (= Hdn. *GG* 3,2.357.6–7): Ἰθωμῆτης διὰ τοῦ η καὶ Δωρικῆ τροπῆ Ἰθωμάτας (Ἰθωμῆτης [‘of Itome’] with η, and with Doric [vowel] mutation Ἰθωμάτας).

186 Choerob. *GG* 4,1.142.29–37. For other Doric peculiarities, see Tribulato (2019b, 369).

187 Cassio (1984, 118–9).

188 See e.g. Iamb. *VP* 241–2 on the superiority of Doric.

189 Cassio (1984, 124–5); Tartaglini (2003, 339–40); Ucciardello (2005, 42–3).

190 Cassio (1984, 122–4).

Doric are regarded equally as models of the dialect. The Greek dialectological tradition appears to have regarded more highly those authors who were Dorian in origin, such as Alcman, Epicharmus, and Sophron (but sometimes also Pindar). The dialect of those who were not born in Doric cities – such as Ibycus, Semonides, and Bacchylides – is, according to the definition given in Byzantine dialectological treatises, ‘completely slackened’ (παντελῶς ἀνεῖται).¹⁹¹

3.3 The ancient perception of Aeolic

For the ancient grammarians, Aeolic essentially corresponded to East Aeolic and its literary representation in Sappho, Alcaeus, and epic poetry. Although ancient scholarship recognises the Aeolic character of Thessalian and Boeotian, it is not interested in contrasting the different outcomes in these varieties of the Aeolic group. The rare comments on Boeotian that we find in ancient grammar reflect the fact that this dialect was used in the poetic fragments of Corinna: Boeotian in itself is of no interest, nor is Thessalian, as a dialect that is devoid of literary pedigree.¹⁹²

Ancient grammar and dialectology credit ‘Aeolic’ with many traits that modern linguistics considers to be distinctive of East Aeolic: barytonesis; psilosis; diphthongisation; the athematic conjugation of *verba vocalia*; thematic infinitives in -ην, such as λέγην ‘to say’ (where /ε:/ results from contraction); apocopated forms like κάτ for κατά; forms like βρόδον (< ρόδον ‘rose’), etc. Once again, the usual implicit benchmark for identifying these traits as typical of Aeolic is Attic (sometimes the koine), with respect to which all may be described as πάθη (‘mutations’). However, some Aeolic peculiarities cannot be easily explained as linear mutations from Attic. For these, the ancient grammarians resort to other dialects as the original starting point of the mutation.

Consider, for instance, the ancient treatment of the complex phonetic phenomenon of diphthongisation, which in East Aeolic corresponds to the so-called ‘2nd compensatory lengthening’ of other dialects. In /Vns/ sequences, the /n/ is lost in most Greek varieties; in many dialects, the vowel is lengthened to compensate for the loss of /n/ (see the feminine aorist participle λύσανσα > λύσᾱσα; or the 3rd-person plural indicative φέρονσι ‘they bring’ > φέρουσι), but in East Aeolic, the sequence instead yields /Vis/ (λύσαισα; φέροισι). The phonetic and morphological

¹⁹¹ See Consani (1991, 116); Ucciardello (2005, 52–3).

¹⁹² For rare exceptions, see the passages mentioned in Tribulato (2019b, 370 n. 29). On ancient linguistic exegesis on Corinna, see Vessella (2012), with previous bibliography.

mechanisms at work in East Aeolic diphthongisation are not understood by ancient grammarians, who prefer to devise a mechanical analogical rule by which any Aeolic *αι* corresponds to Doric *ᾱ*. Although this equation works for forms such as Doric *λύσαα* : Aeolic *λύσαισα*, both of which derive from *λύσανσα*, it appears to have been artificially extended to credit Aeolic with forms in *-αι-* corresponding to Doric *ᾱ*. This, of course, is erroneous: not all Aeolic *αι* are diphthongised forms resulting from compensatory lengthening and, conversely, Aeolic has many instances of *ᾱ* that go back to inherited */a:/*, just like Doric.

An illustration of this analogical reasoning deriving from a mechanical application of the *πάθη* theory is preserved in the famous 2nd-century CE P.Bour. 8, probably a copy of a treatise *περὶ Αἰολίδος*.¹⁹³ The papyrus clearly aims to describe the East Aeolic variety used by Sappho and Alcaeus, who are the sources of all the quotations preserved in the text. The surviving portion of the papyrus begins with a discussion of some diphthongised forms (ll. 1–24) that, among correct East Aeolic forms, such as the masculine aorist participles *λέξαις*, *γράψαις*, and *ποιήσαις* (for *λέξᾱς*, *γράψᾱς*, and *ποιήσᾱς*) or the feminine accusative plural *νύμφαις* (for *νύμφᾱς*), include hypercorrect 1st-declension masculine nominatives in *-αις* for *-ᾱς* (e.g. *Πέρσαις* ‘Persian’ for *Πέρσᾱς*). There is no compensatory lengthening in *Πέρσᾱς*, since the */a:/* of the suffix is inherited. However, the papyrus devises the rule by which ‘any form which in Doric ends in *ᾱς* is pronounced with an *ι* by the Aeolians, both in nouns and in participles’ (*πάσης* [.] *εἰς τὸ ας τεταμένον ληγούσης παρὰ Δωριεῦσι μετὰ τοῦ ι ἐκφερομένης παρ’ Αἰολεῦσι κατὰ μετοχῶν καὶ ὀνομάτων*). Of course, the same derivational rule (which the papyrus probably described as an instance of *πλεονασμός* ‘pleonasm’) could not be devised by taking Attic as a starting point since in Attic (as well as in Ionic and the koine), 1st-declension *-ᾱς* changes to *-ης*, and hence the neat analogical theory of pleonastic iota will not work. Doric is therefore needed to make this *πάθος* easy to understand.¹⁹⁴

The ancient perception of Aeolic exhibits several differences compared to that of Ionic and Doric. First, as we have already seen, the literary canon of reference is far narrower and coincides with Sappho and Alcaeus. This limitation also appears to have influenced the description of the ‘character’ of the Aeolic dialect, harmony, and *γένος*. The fragment of Heraclides Ponticus (163 Wehrli = 114 Schütrumpf) already considered above (Section 3.1), states with regard to the Aeolic musical mode that

¹⁹³ Edited in Wouters (1979, 274–97). The traditional attribution to Tryphon is uncertain: see Wouters (1979, 294–5).

¹⁹⁴ Wouters (1979, 288) instead proposes that Doric is brought into the picture because ‘the ancient grammarians always stressed the special resemblance of Aeolic and Doric’. On *πλεονασμός* in this papyrus, see Wouters (1979, 290).

the Aeolic character is haughty and turgid, and even a little vain (τὸ δὲ τῶν Αἰολέων ἦθος ἔχει τὸ γαῦρον καὶ ὀγκῶδες, ἔτι δὲ ὑπόχαινον), and this befits their (i.e. the Aeolians) love of horse-breeding and hospitality (ὁμολογεῖ δὲ ταῦτα ταῖς ἵπποτροφίαις αὐτῶν καὶ ξενοδοχίας): it is not an evil character, but is full of dignity and courage (οὐ πανοῦργον δέ, ἀλλὰ ἐξηρμένον καὶ τεθαρρηκός). Therefore, a love of drinking, sex, and any relaxation in lifestyle are typical of them (διὸ καὶ οἰκεῖόν ἐστ' αὐτοῖς ἡ φιλοποσία καὶ τὰ ἐρωτικά καὶ πᾶσα ἡ περὶ τὴν δίαιταν ἄνεσις). This is why the Aeolians have the typical character of Hypodorian harmony (διόπερ ἔχουσι τὸ τῆς Ὑποδωρίου καλουμένης ἁρμονίας ἦθος).

This statement is a perfect illustration of the way in which ancient thought combined the perceived defining characters of an ἔθνος with the effect produced in the audience by the musical mode associated with it. Heraclides delineates the Aeolic ethos using a plurality of information. The contents of Lesbian lyric, and particularly of Alcaeus' sympotic poetry, may underpin the mention of the Aeolians' passion for drinking, sex, and a relaxed lifestyle. Their love of horses, on the other hand, presupposes a broader ethnic vision, which includes the Thessalians, well-known horsemen and breeders. The attribution of haughtiness, turgidity, and vanity, however, reflects rhetorical and linguistic theories and is therefore of interest to us.

The first characteristic that Heraclides recognises in Aeolic harmony is that of being ὀγκῶδης 'turgid'. In its rhetorical meaning, the adjective is ambiguous: it can identify an over-elaborate style, whose excesses lapse into vulgarity (see e.g. D.H. *Lys.* 3, p. 12.2 Usener–Radermacher), but it can also identify the *gravitas* that was recognised as a positive element in the theories of the Greek μουσικοί and μετρικοί, a quality to be sought through specific choices of phonemes and syllabic composition.¹⁹⁵ Thus, in a passage from *Po.* 1.181.12–4 Janko, Philodemus uses precisely ὀγκῶδης to report on a theory advanced by Andromenides concerning the value of syllables and the sounds contained in them: the 'heavy' syllables uttered by poets are associated with the 'brightest' sounds (ὀγκῶδεις συλλαβὰς τῶν λαμπροτάτων φθόγγων). This passage does not discuss Aeolic but allows us to focus on another aspect of the connection between harmonic theory, phonology, and the description of a dialect's character. Aeolic harmony was recognised as having gravity, and this is paralleled in the grammatical sources' emphasis on the Aeolic phenomenon of barytonesis. In the scholium to Dionysius Thrax mentioned above (schol. D.T. (Vat.) *GG* 1,3.117.18–27, cf. Section 3), barytonesis becomes, along with psilosis, the hallmark of Aeolian archaism and antiquity: τὸ δὲ Αἰολικὸν [i.e. ἦθος] τῷ τ' αὐστηρῶ τῆς διαίτης καὶ τῷ τῆς φωνῆς ἀρχαιοτρόπῳ· διὰ τοῦτο καὶ

¹⁹⁵ On the complex theory hinted at in this passage, which may go back to Dionysius of Halicarnassus' *On Composition*, see Stanford (1967, 33–4); J. I. Porter (2010, 236–9); cf. Tribulato (2019b, 381 n. 54).

τὴν βαρύτητα τῶν τόνων καὶ τὴν ψιλότητα τοῦ πνεύματος ἐζηλώκασιν (‘the Aeolic character [is distinguished] by the austerity of the lifestyle and the antiquity of the language: for this reason, they favour the gravity of accents and the absence of aspiration’). As Cassio (1984, 127) shows, this strange statement (which the scholiast vehemently criticises: τοῦτο δὲ οὐκ ἔστι πιθανόν· τί γὰρ ἢ βαρεῖα τάσις καὶ τὸ ψιλὸν πνεῦμα πρὸς τὸ τῶν τρόπων αὐτῶν; ‘This is not credible: what do grave accents and smooth breathings have to do with the austerity of their way of being?’) must depend on the polysemy of βαρύς and τόνος, which from the perspective of grammatical thought percolate through musical theory (where they indicate low and pleasant sounds and scales), and further the ethical level (where they indicate *gravitas* and dignity).¹⁹⁶ In essence, the Aeolic character, harmony, and dialect were perceived as a middle ground between the Dorians’ severity and virility and the Ionians’ looseness and effeminacy. Aeolic possesses both strength and gravity – characters that connect it to Doric – but also a tendency towards elevation and a style that is not excessively severe, together with an ethos inclined towards life’s pleasures – characters that bring it closer to Ionic (drunkenness and slackness characterise the συμποτικάι melodies connected to Ionic harmony and condemned in Pl. R. 3.398e).¹⁹⁷

The ancient theories on the character of the non-Attic dialects have long-lasting effects that are still perceptible in Byzantine scholarship. Immediately after expressing the theory that the Ionians are ἄπαικοι of the Athenians (cf. Section 3), Eustathius also states that ‘something identical is said about the Aeolic and Doric dialects, since they also have some similarity’ (ὁμοιον δέ τι καὶ περὶ τῆς Αἰολίδος καὶ Δωρίδος διαλέκτου λέγεται, ὡς καὶ αὐτῶν ὁμοιότητά τινα ἔχουσῶν, Eust. in *Il.* 1.14.11–2). The context illuminates the reasons for this apparently incongruous statement. The passage discusses the first word of the *Iliad*, μῆνιν, attributed to ‘Attic and Ionic’, and its possible variants, including μᾶνιν – the Doric and Aeolic form, attested in Pindar and Alcaeus. Like Attic and Ionic, Doric and Aeolic ‘have something in common’: although Eustathius does not make this explicit, we infer from the passage that this similarity is based on the common retention of /a:/. We have here, then, a specifically linguistic reflection on the kinship between the Doric and Aeolic γένη, which was principally claimed on

¹⁹⁶ Cassio (1984, 125–8). In Aristides Quintilianus (see above) βαρύτης is instead associated with Doric: cf. Tartaglino (2003, 340).

¹⁹⁷ The harmonic and musical implications of the middle character of the Aeolic mode are discussed by Prauscello (2012, 74). On Greek harmonic theory and its connections with linguistics, the theory of ethos, and psychology, see the classic studies by Abert (1899) and W. D. Anderson (1966); Barker (1989) deals with the texts and Barker (2007) with the theoretical elaboration; Rossi (2000) provides an overview of the psychagogic effects of music.

mythographic and historical grounds (see Section 2.4). The further development is the comparison between the ethical attitudes – the characters – of the two γένη, both of which are endowed with strength and gravity: two qualities that, as we have seen, were linked precisely to the characteristic sound of *alpha*.

3.4 Conclusion: Inventing Attic

From the fragments of grammarians and other products of ancient scholarship, a clear view emerges of the ways in which dialects (i.e. linguistic forms) were described and placed on an evaluative grid by ancient scholars. Linguistic phenomena were selected and commented upon not on the basis of a criterion of correctness (or of preference for one variety over the other) but on the basis of the functions that they fulfilled in literary genres, essentially those of archaic and Classical poetry. From the comments on dialects that we find in many authors – in fact, from Plato to Eustathius, in a remarkable continuity of thought – emerges an equally clear idea of the function that this linguistic diversity fulfilled in the common perception of Greek poets and writers. Thus, Ionic is more poetic and pleasant because it is associated with the foundational genre of epos; Doric is more austere and virile because it is associated with choral lyric, etc.

The wreckage of much ancient linguistic and grammatical scholarship makes it impossible to understand to what extent its various products differed from one another, but some final thoughts on this topic are necessary before we proceed to assess the role of Attic in Classical literature and Greek linguistic thought. Despite the Attic prominence in both literary theory and grammar, ancient dialectological sources are remarkably silent on the ‘character’ of this dialect and its speakers (of course, Atticism – with its purist inclination – is a separate case). Many of the sources dealing with the ‘characters’ of the dialects resonate with the traditional polarity that contrasted the Dorians and the Ionians.¹⁹⁸ The Athenians, however, had invested considerable effort in delineating themselves from the Ionians in this and other respects.¹⁹⁹ The scholium to Dionysius Thrax (schol. D.T. (Vat.) *GG* 1,3.117.18–27), which consigns a stereotypical but vivid definition of the γένη and their dialects, is frustratingly vague as far as the Athenians are concerned: they always (strive to) excel (or distinguish themselves: αἰ διὰφέρειν) in their lifestyle (εἰς διαίταν) and inventiveness of speaking (φωνῆς ἐπιτέχνησιν, where ἐπιτέχνησις seems

¹⁹⁸ Connor (1993, 201).

¹⁹⁹ See Connor (1993, 203). Cassio (1984, 116) opportunely recalls Herodotus’ statement (1.143.3) that the Athenians spurned the name [of the Ionians] and did not want to be called such’ (οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἔφυγον τὸ οὖνομα, οὐ βουλόμενοι Ἴωνες κεικλῆσθαι).

to carry a further overtone of excessive artificiality).²⁰⁰ The point of view expressed in this scholium appears to inherit the long-standing tradition of Athenian self-separation and distinction that began in the 5th century BCE (see Sections 2.5–6) and was certainly enhanced by the Hellenistic reception of Attic literature. The apparent silence of dialectological sources strongly suggests the following interpretative hypothesis. With the construction of their particularity, the Athenians would appear to have succeeded in making it irrelevant to define their own character on comparative grounds: Attic is simply Attic, and enumeration of its distinctive characteristics is futile, since Attic identity per se is unique.²⁰¹

Considered in this interpretative light, some of the well-known aspects of Athenian cultural history that we addressed in this chapter acquire new significance. Beginning with the most recent, it may be claimed that when Atticism eventually emerged, it filled a natural gap in Greek linguistic thought by unapologetically elevating Attic to the role of the best linguistic variety. However, Atticism was prepared by that which we have called the 5th-century BCE Athenian ‘invention of purity’. The claim that we made in Section 2.6 can now be further refined in light of these last sections’ excursus into the ancient perceptions of the other dialects. Our first metalinguistic sources for Attic come from Attic literature itself (see Willi 2002b; Chapter 4). It is as though the Athenians, after ‘inventing Athens’ (in Nicole Loraux’s words), had also ‘invented’ their own language – that is, the way in which its image was projected to the outer world. Moreover, since this metalinguistic reflection on Attic was born in Athens, its viewpoint is *internal*: it is not Attic that is contrasted with other varieties (like, for instance, Doric is contrasted with Ionic) but rather the other varieties that are assessed on Attic terms. Thus, the Attic comic poets can take turns in ridiculing Ionic effeminate pronunciation (see Ar. *Pax* 929–34) and intellectual language (Ar. *Pax* 45–8), Spartan directness (e.g. Ar. *Lys.* 81–4), Boeotian rustic wealth (Ar. *Ach.* 860–954), and Megarian destitution (Ar. *Ach.* 729–835). Although many of these literary sources are comic in character and thus stereotypical, we argue that they also express a superior outlook with respect to the other varieties, which are perceived as more provincial.²⁰² Within a matter of decades, Strattis, a poet chronologically close to Middle

²⁰⁰ This perception might perhaps correspond to the situation, described by Edwards (2009, 68), of ‘extremely high-status varieties’ that appear ‘affected and generally over the top’.

²⁰¹ As Hainsworth (1967, 67) remarks, ‘the status of Attic does not represent even an ethnically biased linguistic argument: it is a tribute to the predominance of Attic in literature and commerce and to the national arrogance of its people’.

²⁰² Bettarini (2015, 20). Colvin (1999, 282; 292) and Colvin (2009, 39–40) instead find evidence for this superior outlook only in relation to internal varieties of Attic. See further Willi (2002b) on dialects being integral to Aristophanes’ panhellenic vision.

Comedy, can fully play on this when he mocks Thebans for their funny, incorrect, and outdated linguistic usages (fr. 49).²⁰³ The Athenocentric view that they project becomes the *internalised* vantage point from which later sources (both literary and scholarly) perceive Attic, having learnt from Attic literature a way to judge its dialect as unique.

By contextualising the evolution of Attic in relation to early Greek linguistic history and assessing the complex intertwining of dialectological details, mythographic accounts, and identity-building processes, we may conclude that the Athenians were particularly precocious in their elaboration of a purely Athenian linguistic evaluative system. Owing to the way in which Greek culture evolved in the subsequent period, with the emergence of a standard language based on Attic, Alexandrian scholarship actively contributed to elevating Attic to a privileged rank and to making it an implicit benchmark against which all other dialects should be assessed. The next – more radical and militant – step would be taken by Atticism, which further elevated the already-established advantage of Attic to the status of the preferred variety: a linguistic norm. The seeds of this Attic linguistic exclusiveness are wholly Classical, as the next two chapters will demonstrate.

²⁰³ See Bettarini (2015).

Chapter 4

The one and the many: Athenian views on Attic

1 Preliminaries

The monumentalisation of 5th- and 4th-century BCE literary Attic serves as the basis for the purist ideology of Atticist lexicography.¹ However, as already acknowledged by ancient scholarship, literary Attic is highly varied. Moreover, just like any dialect of any time, Classical Attic is not monolithic, as comparison of the information provided by the available sources reveals.² As regards literary texts, differences in genre entail language differences, as in the case of tragedy vis-à-vis comedy or prose;³ however, this is also the case within the same genre, and, for example, the language of Old Comedy differs in several respects from that of Middle and New Comedy.⁴ Additionally, Athenian literature was never impermeable to foreign influences.⁵ On the documentary side, unofficial inscriptions (ostraka, graffiti, and *defixiones*) are an important (though not unproblematic) source of information on the less formal registers of Attic; official inscriptions, while they are notoriously slower in recording the evolution of the language and require greater circumspection, remain an indispensable source for understanding the evolution of the dialect.⁶ The language of literary and documentary texts alike illustrates only a selection of the possible linguistic registers available, and the reality of the spoken language was surely far more varied.⁷ Furthermore, socio-cultural and socio-historical factors must be taken into consideration with regard to linguistic variation. Be-

1 On the position of Attic in the framework of the Greek dialects, see Chapter 3, Sections 2.2–3. For an overview of the history of the dialect, see Thumb, Scherer (1959, 284–313); Risch (1964); Crespo (2010). On the emergence of Attic as a literary language, see Adrados (2005, 142–60); Horrocks (2010, 67–78); Willi (2010a); Colvin (2014, 163–8).

2 On linguistic variation in (epichoric and literary) Attic (and more generally in Ancient Greek), see Niehoff-Panagiotidis (1994, 197–222); Willi (2003a); Colvin (2004); Crespo (2010, 126–30); Willi (2010b); Poccetti (2014); Colvin (2020). On the notion of standard language and its application to Attic and Greek, see Chapter 2, Section 2.1.

3 See Rosenkranz (1930); Willi (2002b); Willi (2019). On the language of prose, see Sections 5.1; 5.3. On the language of comedy see Section 5.2. On Greek literary languages, see the contributions included in Cassio (2016); Chapter 3, Section 2.3.

4 See Section 5.2; Chapter 5.

5 See Sections 2; 2.1. See also Chapter 3, Section 2.3.

6 See Rosenkranz (1930, 130–4) on the epigraphic evidence for Classical Attic. On the use of official inscriptions to study the evolution of Attic, see Dover (1981a) (for a critical evaluation of Dover's approach see now Prauscello 2023); López Eire (1993); López Eire (1999); see also Section 4.

7 See also Willi (2003a, 8–10).

cause of Athens' political, economic, and cultural importance, the Athenian society was never closed and isolated, and the presence of many foreigners passing through Athens for trade or living in Attica as permanent residents must have helped shape the city's linguistic landscape. Non-Athenians introduced new linguistic features, both prestigious and low-register, and they also assimilated Attic forms that they would propagate abroad.

In Chapter 3, we discussed the placement of Attic within the framework of the Greek dialects and how the Athenians constructed a rhetoric of identity around their language. In this chapter, we shall consider linguistic variation in Attic, focusing on the ongoing tension between conservation and innovation and on how this relates to the socio-historical transformations that Athens underwent during the Classical period. The Athenians were evidently perceptive as regards linguistic variation and, more saliently, recognised that different varieties of Attic enjoyed different degrees of prestige. While we shall not attempt a comprehensive study of linguistic variation in 5th- and 4th-century BCE Attic here, we shall examine several of the main factors that regulated such variation. We shall focus primarily on the historical-literary interpretation of contemporary sources while also examining some of the linguistic problems posed by literary and documentary texts. To this end, this chapter will be arranged around three more general topics.

In Section 2, we shall observe the emergence and status of literary Attic, with a special focus on early prose, its relationship with the Ionian tradition, and how literary Attic came to terms with it. Compared to Old Comedy, early Attic prose is more open to admitting elements of linguistic variation from within the Attic dialect and from other traditions, notably Ionic (tragedy proves a useful comparandum for this). We shall discuss how writers such as Thucydides consciously negotiated between traits of innovative Attic, which, in turn, are mostly avoided in Old Comedy, and the prestigious model of Ionic prose. In this section, we shall offer a first glimpse into how certain linguistic choices made in the language of 5th-century BCE comedy reflect a protectionist attitude towards the dialect and how such choices would then be re-conceived in the context of the evolution of comic language. This will allow us to already trace a general trajectory in the evolution of (selected varieties of) literary Attic, which will provide the framing of the whole chapter.

Building on this, Sections 3 and 4 will address in greater detail the question of how, respectively, 5th- and 4th-/3rd-century BCE literary texts reflect on linguistic variation, the different attitudes to which they attest, and how these changes relate to the developments of literary Attic vis-à-vis the socio-historical and cultural transformations taking place in Athens.

In Section 3, we shall focus on the valuable 5th-century BCE sources that bear witness to the relevance of language for the construction not only of an Athenian identity but more specifically of the socio-political groups associated with different forms of Attic. This has significant implications for the purposes of our enquiry into linguistic purism. The 5th-century BCE sources demonstrate that the notion of ‘good’ Attic had become a bone of contention in the contemporary debate and that this discourse had wider socio-political implications, to the effect that different forms and registers of Attic were associated with specific values and disvalues. By framing these sources within their socio-political contexts, we shall demonstrate that the notion of ‘good’ Attic is associated with traditionalist and politically moderate (even conservative) views and that conscious attempts were being made in 5th-century BCE Athens to promote and preserve a type of Attic that was considered distinctive of Athenian identity against innovative pulls operating equally at the super- and sub-standard levels.

Section 4 will be devoted to discussing the evidence from the 4th-/3rd-century BCE literary sources commenting on dialectal variation in Attic. We shall frame these texts within the new socio-political environment of late-Classical Athens, re-defined by the defeat in the Peloponnesian War and the ensuing transformations in Athens’ civic ideology. In this context, we shall also consider the rapid emergence of innovative ‘international’ Attic and the first stages of the koine. We shall demonstrate that these later sources that comment on the dialect’s evolution provide evidence of a much more open approach to innovative linguistic elements and, more importantly, that they do not appear to assess linguistic variation against the same kind of socio-politically loaded background as the 5th-century BCE sources did. While innovative linguistic features may also be singled out and criticised, 4th- and 3rd-century BCE sources reveal no traces of that actively purist attitude that is discernible in 5th-century BCE sources. Indeed, in those cases in which innovative linguistic traits are negatively appraised, such a defensive attitude is presented in a rather negative light.

Having examined the literary sources, in Section 5, we shall reflect more closely on innovative 4th-century BCE literary Attic, focusing on select writers and texts: Xenophon; Middle and New Comedy;⁸ and non-Athenian prose writers who adopt Attic as their literary language. Various reasons underlie this selection. Xenophon and the poets of Middle and New Comedy offer the clearest evidence of the emerging new tendencies in literary Attic. As such, they also represented the main battlefield between the different orientations of Atticist lexicography, as we shall

⁸ For the language of Middle and New Comedy, also framed within the history of 5th- and 4th-century BCE literary Attic, see Chapter 5.

discuss in greater detail in Chapter 5, Foreword and in Volume 2 (see also Chapter 1, Section 4.1). While ancient scholarship adopted an approach that was eminently diachronic (i.e. the language of these writers was perceived as a further stage in the evolution of the dialect compared to 5th- and 4th-century BCE ‘pure’ Attic), a more careful historical contextualisation of these writers’ language can help evaluate the peculiarities of their choices more objectively. This will help re-shape the terms of debate as established by Atticist lexicography and which, in many cases, are still adopted by modern scholarship (e.g. the idea that Xenophon’s language is a mixed bag of forms from various dialects). Finally, attention to the adoption of Attic on the part of non-Athenian prose writers will yield direct evidence for the new role that the Attic dialect came to assume as the international literary language of all Greeks, thus overcoming the contrast between localism and panhellenism which, as shall become clear, was an integral part of the dialect’s Classical history. Compared to this selection, 4th-century BCE oratory will remain mostly in the background. This choice is rooted in the nature of the language of oratory. Although orators may occasionally adopt innovative linguistic features, their language represents a rather conservative variety of Attic that deliberately sought to avoid the less ‘pure’ traits (see Section 5.1). Therefore, in this chapter and the next, it will be fruitful to read the evidence for innovative literary Attic, as evidenced, for example, in comedy, against the background of the more traditionalist language of oratory.

2 Attic at the crossroads between tradition and innovation

In the previous section, we emphasised that Classical Attic was highly varied. However, despite the fact that we can identify different registers in literary texts and that purely diachronic factors also contributed to the evolution of the dialect, the evidence for linguistic variation in Attic is comparatively limited, and so we are unable to fully appreciate Attic in all its breadth. While we do have some indications of what lay under the surface, most features of colloquial Attic scarcely entered the written record.⁹ Nonetheless, there are ways of appreciating the larger linguistic developments that Attic was undergoing. Scholars have sought early evidence of the incipient transformations of the dialect. Notably, Antonio López Eire investigated 5th-century BCE literary texts, especially Aristophanes and Thucydides, to detect innovative traits that would eventually emerge in the

⁹ For selected cases see Schulze (1896).

koine.¹⁰ In more general terms, we may identify two ideal polarities operating in the Classical dialect, one representing the more conservative pole and the higher registers, the other the more innovative pole that was open to the developments of the colloquial language. However, this sketch should not lead us to assume that the higher registers are all the same, and indeed, some varieties of literary Attic are more prone to linguistic innovation than others, being also under the influence of other literary traditions. This dialectic between innovation and conservation was active throughout the history of Attic and gave way to different results at different times.

In this section, we shall discuss the development of early Attic prose as a literary language and its relationship with the Ionian tradition. This is an amply debated topic. After revising the conclusions of previous scholarship, we shall propose a more nuanced interpretation that seeks to reconcile different approaches into a unified picture. We shall suggest that various 5th-century BCE literary genres' different degrees of openness to the adoption of 'innovative' Attic traits depend on their more or less purist approach regarding elements that might potentially be perceived as foreign-sounding. This section will provide the ideal background for Sections 3 and 4. In Section 3, we shall discuss the 5th-century BCE literary evidence for linguistic protectionism towards Attic. In Section 4, we shall see how the 4th-century BCE sources document the growing affirmation of the more open-minded approach to linguistic innovation.

2.1 The emergence of literary Attic, the influence of Ionic, and 'subterranean' Attic

The emergence of Attic as a literary variety of Greek is a relatively recent acquisition compared to the much older affirmation of literary Ionic, Aeolic, and Doric.¹¹ The better-known genres of 5th-century BCE Attic literature – tragedy, comedy, and prose – offer a variegated picture of how the Attic dialect was adapted into a literary language. These larger concerns lie beyond the scope of our research on linguistic purism. Rather, we shall focus on a much-debated aspect of the affirmation of literary Attic – namely, its relationship with literary Ionic. While our primary concern is early Attic prose, we shall also touch upon the language of tragedy and comedy.

¹⁰ See López Eire (1981–1982, 40–1); López Eire (1984); López Eire (1986); López Eire (1991); López Eire (1996b).

¹¹ See Chapter 3, Section 2.4.

Scholarship often maintains that, owing to the influence of Ionic prose, early Attic prose writers adopted several Ionicisms that functioned as prestige features that imbued their language with a sense of ‘internationality’.¹² Rosenkranz (1930) countered this view and suggested a radically different approach, which has been adopted in some more recent scholarship.¹³ According to Rosenkranz, elements of phonological, morphological, and syntactic variation attested in early Attic prose (typically, but not only, Thucydides, Antiphon, and Gorgias), if compared to Aristophanes and the other later Attic prose writers, should not be explained in the light of a gradually diminishing influence of Ionic; rather, Rosenkranz has argued that many such cases of linguistic variation may be internal to the Attic dialect (i.e. intradialectal developments) rather than proof of an external influence (i.e. interdialectal developments). Although Rosenkranz makes numerous valid points, the two positions are not mutually exclusive, and there is scope to reconsider some aspects of the traditional thesis in a positive light and to attempt a unified interpretation.

Rosenkranz’ approach is particularly reasonable insofar as it collects evidence that parallels the allegedly isolated and non-Attic features of the language of early Attic prose. It indirectly illuminates the multiple registers of 5th-century BCE Attic and reveals how only some of them acquired literary status. One might call this fluid situation underlying the language of Attic literature and Attic inscriptions a partly ‘subterranean’ (although not entirely obscure) form of Attic, to borrow the definition coined by Francisco Adrados.¹⁴ Nevertheless, some of Rosenkranz’ wider assumptions still leave room for refinement, nor can all cases he discusses be treated along the same lines. As a re-examination of Rosenkranz’ work falls beyond the scope of this chapter, we shall confine ourselves to just a single aspect: the alternation $-\sigma\sigma/-\tau\tau$. This case is particularly salient given its paradigmatic diagnostic value, and it invites us to re-consider in more explicit terms the role of Ionic and its influence on early Attic literature.

Before we begin, several preliminary considerations are necessary. First, even if in this section we attempt to give a unitarian interpretation of the available evidence, this does not mean that we do not acknowledge that some degree of variation should also be allowed for; polymorphism, indeed, is not irreconcilable with the legitimacy of proposing a consistent interpretation for the majority of the evidence available. Second, in a case such as the alternation $-\sigma\sigma/-\tau\tau$, we depend on the evidence provided by the manuscript tradition, which we cannot

¹² See Thumb, Scherer (1959, 302–4); Horrocks (2010, 70).

¹³ See, especially, Willi (2010a), but note the reservations expressed by Vessella (2016a, 364–5). See also Dover (1997, 83).

¹⁴ See Adrados (2005, 146; 177; 195).

blindly trust (or mistrust). These issues are regularly taken into account in the following discussion, but we should bear in mind that in some cases, particularly where it is more difficult to find a consistent interpretation of the evidence, polymorphism may also just be the result of perturbations in the manuscript tradition and vice versa.

One of the most conspicuous features of Attic compared to the other Greek dialects is $-\tau\tau-$ where most other dialects have $-\sigma\sigma-$. $-\sigma\sigma-$ and $-\tau\tau-$ represent two alternative outcomes of the palatalisation of voiceless, aspirated and non-aspirated, dental and velar stops in the development from Proto-Greek to historical Greek. The outcome of this process in Attic as well as in Boeotian and Euboean is rendered graphically as $-\tau\tau-$, whereas in Ionic and the remaining Greek dialects the outcome is $-\sigma\sigma-$. The Atticist tradition took an active interest in the presence of $-\tau\tau-$ and $-\sigma\sigma-$ in Attic, collected important literary evidence, and advanced broader interpretations of the sociolinguistic appraisal of so-called sigmatism.¹⁵

The distribution of these outcomes of palatalisation in Attic writers (not only prose writers) is notoriously problematic.¹⁶ Tragic poets exclusively use $-\sigma\sigma-$, whereas comic poets use $-\tau\tau-$ (except in parody).¹⁷ Prose writers offer a variegated picture and vary their chosen spelling in individual lexemes. Thucydides uses only $-\sigma\sigma-$, except for ἄττα (1.113.1 and 2.100.3, both times ἄλλ(α) ἄττα χωρία). In the speeches and the *Tetralogies*, Antiphon uses $-\sigma\sigma-$, though in his sixth speech (which is chronologically the oldest),¹⁸ he uses $-\tau\tau-$. Gorgias typically uses $-\sigma\sigma-$, but in κρείττων and πράττω, he uses $-\tau\tau-$ alongside $-\sigma\sigma-$, the variation depending in part on the work (i.e. κρείσσων 4x in *Helen* vs κρείττων 2x in *Palamedes*, πράσσω 1x in *Palamedes* vs πράττω 8x in *Palamedes*).¹⁹ The Old Oligarch usually has $-\tau\tau-$, except for θαλασσοκράτορες (2.2) and ἄσσα (2.17).²⁰ Antiphon the sophist (likely to be the same as the orator) normally adopts $-\tau\tau-$, save for ἐμφοράσσει (Diels–Kranz

¹⁵ The main evidence derives from passages of Eustathius (*in Il.* 3.96.1–11; *in Il.* 3.365.29–366.6; *in Il.* 4.283.6–9; *in Od.* 1.2.16–22), the first of which surely goes back to Aelius Dionysius (σ 15). On sigmatism, see Clayman (1987). These sources are dealt with by Batisti (forthcoming b) and in Volume 2.

¹⁶ Here, we only provide a sketchy picture; for fuller references see Rosenkranz (1930, 144–5); more briefly, Willi (2010a, 108). Notice that in ethnics, poetic quotations, and at morphological boundaries (i.e. in compounds such as προσσχών and the like), $-\sigma\sigma-$ is obviously also retained by writers who normally use $-\tau\tau-$.

¹⁷ See Willi (2003a, 237).

¹⁸ See Dover (1950).

¹⁹ On the distribution in Gorgias, see also Willi (2008, 301 n. 91, with further bibliography), who concludes that ‘insgesamt scheint σ für die Originale wahrscheinlicher’.

²⁰ On the exceptional presence of $-\sigma\sigma-$ in manuscript C, see Willi (2010, 110 n. 41, with previous bibliography).

87 B 58), δισσῶν (Diels–Kranz 87 B 49), ἐκπλήσσειντο (Diels–Kranz 87 B 61),²¹ and ἠσσωμένον (Diels–Kranz 87 B 76). Finally, Andocides makes consistent use of -ττ-, fully in line with later Attic prose (Xenophon, Plato, Demosthenes, etc.) as well as Old, Middle, and New Comedy.

An explanation was attempted by Rosenkranz, according to whom both /ss/ and /tt/ were in use in colloquial Attic with /tt/ the dominant option. Rosenkranz derived this view from the very scanty evidence for -σσ- in Attic *defixiones*.²² According to Rosenkranz, the Attic writers who adopted /ss/ aimed at imbuing their language with a more ‘international’ flavour, whereas those who had more of a local audience in mind retained the ‘local’ /tt/. It is certainly true that /tt/ could be perceived as too narrow a localism, given that it is an isogloss that is shared only with Boeotian and Euboean. However, Rosenkranz’ thesis is open to question. His view has been challenged by Willi (2010a, 108). To begin with, the use of ἄττα in Thucydides (see above) remains unexplained.²³ Additionally, Rosenkranz’ proposed motivation (that is, to address a wider audience than the strictly Athenian one) is too blurry a concept to explain the different choices that authors writing in similar genres made. For example, why does Antiphon vary between his first, fifth, and sixth orations? There is no reason to suppose that the first two of these addressed not only local audiences. Or why do the fragments of Antiphon the sophist have -ττ-, while the texts of a fellow sophist such as Gorgias appear to favour the use of -σσ- (with the exception of two forms)?

To solve this conundrum, Willi (2010a, 108–11) has revised the alternation -σσ-/ττ- in Attic writers. According to Willi, the notion that -σσ- is adopted as a Ionicising feature should be regarded more favourably than it was by Rosenkranz, albeit with some nuancing and accounting in a more satisfactory way for the exceptions. The form ἄττα in Thucydides should be explained according to the principle that, while the Ionicising -σσ- was Thucydides’ chosen spelling, in a word like ἄττα, which was part of ordinary speech and did not rely on any estab-

21 See Willi (2010, 110 n. 39).

22 See Threatte (1980, 540).

23 ἄττα is also attested in Antiphon’s sixth speech (6.14) (-ττ- is the normal spelling in this speech) and in some of his fragments (fr. 27 and 34–5 Blass–Thalheim). Fr. 27 Blass–Thalheim belongs to the oration *On the Tribute of the Inhabitants of Lindos*, which probably dates to 424/3 BCE (see Mattingly 2010); since this is even earlier than Antiphon’s sixth speech (dating to 419/8 BCE: see Dover 1950, 44), Dover’s recognition of a progressive shift from -ττ- to -σσ- is confirmed. Fr. 34–5 Blass–Thalheim is from the speech *In Defence of Myrrhus* of unknown date, although in the light of -ττ- one might argue for an early date. Regarding the distribution of -σσ-/ττ- in Antiphon, Dover (1950, 51 n. 2), after revising previous suggestions, does not ultimately formulate an explanation.

lished high literary pedigree,²⁴ Thucydides opted instead for the local Attic consonantism /tt/. Further, in the case of apparently ‘irrational’ variation, as in the case of Gorgias, Willi has stressed that the two seemingly exceptional forms in -ττ- used by Gorgias (i.e. κρείττων and πράττω, see above) are not random: since their Ionic equivalents would have been κρέισσων and πρήσσω, Gorgias chose not to use the semi-Ionicised forms κρείσσων and πράσσω. Finally, regarding the inconsistent usages exhibited by Antiphon the sophist and the Old Oligarch, Willi has suggested that -σσ- was used in words that did not belong to ordinary 5th-century BCE Attic, whether literary coinages (θαλασσοκράτορες, ἐμφράσσει) or Ionicisms (δισσῶν in place of the dual number), but also in forms that did not strictly belong to these two categories (ἄσσα).

Willi’s revision of Rosenkranz’ interpretation has the merit of giving a fairer hearing to the traditional thesis positing the influence of Ionic as a regulating factor in choosing between -σσ- and -ττ-. This different approach significantly allows us to fine-tune the correlation between the use of -σσ- and Ionic, in the sense that -σσ- becomes an ‘international’ feature consecrated by literature.²⁵ However, not only do some occurrences of -σσ- in Antiphon the sophist also remain unexplained within this interpretative framework (i.e. ἡσώμενον and ἐκπλήσσοιντο) but some of Willi’s conclusions also give rise to problems of a different kind.

First, Gorgias’ use of κρείττων and πράττω alongside the semi-Ionicised κρείσσων and πράσσω lacks an explanation. Considering that κρείσσων and πράσσω are the forms regularly adopted by Thucydides and the tragic poets precisely because they were not entirely Ionic forms (see above), it is unclear why this fact would constitute a problem for Gorgias, who was writing in Attic and not in Ionic. Is this related to Ionic being Gorgias’ native dialect? In any case, the problem becomes even more puzzling considering that -σσ- is patently the preferred option in Gorgias’ *Helen*. Unless one simply dismissed these inconsistencies as mere accidents of transmission (which is entirely possible), one may wonder

24 ἄσσα is attested only twice in Ionic, once in the *Odyssey* (19.218) and once in the Hippocratic corpus (*Mul.* 1.11 (= 8.42.15 Littré)). This evidence is regarded as insufficient to consider this form of the indefinite pronoun as characteristic of literary Ionic (see Rosenkranz 1930, 145; Willi 2010a, 109 against Wackernagel 1907, 13–4).

25 See Willi (2010a, 111): ‘When Thucydides or Gorgias used τάσσω instead of τάττω in their written Attic because the spelling with σσ was a convention, both in Ionic prose and in tragedy, they were observing a literary νόμος’. Willi comes to a similar conclusion in his discussion of -σσ- in tragedy (see Willi 2019a, 103–5, also taking in the use of -ρσ- by the tragic poets in place of Attic -ρρ-; this is a more problematic case, though, and the evidence should be re-examined).

whether κρείσσω and πράσσω were avoided since Gorgias recognised them as artificial forms that belonged to the language of tragedy.²⁶

Furthermore, Willi's views (and those of Wackernagel before him) regarding ἄττα in Thucydides (and Antiphon the orator) are entirely convincing, but one cannot accept Willi's interpretation of ἄσσα in the Old Oligarch's *Constitution of the Athenians*. Willi claims that ἄττα/ἄσσα was not ordinary 5th-century BCE Attic based on the fact that this form 'is first attested in Plato the Comedian (fr. 49), i.e. in the fourth century' and so, if it really were part of ordinary 5th-century BCE Attic, 'we would be bound to find it at least in Aristophanes'. Such claims are ill-founded. First, the poetic activity of Plato Comicus' ranged from the 420s to at least 391 BCE, and so he may not be easily dismissed as a 4th-century BCE poet.²⁷ Second, and more importantly, ἄττα is in fact attested multiple times in Aristophanes (31x).²⁸ Once we acknowledge that ἄττα is far from foreign from the perspective of ordinary 5th-century BCE Attic, Willi's conclusion regarding the inconsistent use of -σσ- in the Old Oligarch vis-à-vis the normal use of -ττ- is invalidated, and we must account differently for it.

We have accepted the view that Thucydides (and Antiphon) used -ττ- in ἄττα in place of ἄσσα because ἄττα represented an admissible 'colloquial' Attic form for which ἄσσα did not represent a rival literary alternative that should be used instead. Based on this premise, the Old Oligarch might have adopted ἄσσα as a form belonging to an even lower register than ἄττα, which, as proven by its use in Aristophanes, was the ordinary 5th-century BCE Attic form.²⁹ Given that these pronouns are forms that had no special literary pedigree in Attic (as also acknowledged by Willi regarding ἄττα in Thucydides), it is perfectly possible that they were more rapidly influenced than others by the substandard, internationalised, and Ionicised variety of Attic. In this latter case, the Old Oligarch's language, which has more limited pretence at being an example of artistic prose, would naturally signal a form of an emerging, more 'international' Attic, so that also in a literary text -σσ- will become predominant compared to -ττ- (see, e.g., Aeneas the

26 This may be irrespective of Gorgias' poetic style (see Arist. *Rhet.* 2.25.1402b.17–20 and 3.1.1404a.24–9).

27 The play to which fr. 49 belongs, entitled Ζεὺς κακούμενος, is of uncertain date. Scholars have usually suggested, but with varying degrees of plausibility, a date in the 420s BCE (see Pirrotta 2009, 124).

28 To single out just one parallel, see Ar. *Ach.* 98–9: ἄγε δὴ σύ, βασιλεὺς ἄττα σ' ἀπέπεμψεν φράσον | λέξοντ' Αθηναίοισιν, ὃ Ψευδαρτάβα vis-à-vis [X.] *Ath.* 2.17: ἄσσα δ' ἂν ὁ δῆμος σύνθηται, ἔξεστιν αὐτῷ ἐνὶ ἀνατιθέντι τὴν αἰτίαν τῷ λέγοντι καὶ τῷ ἐπιψηφίσαντι ἀρνεῖσθαι τοῖς ἄλλοις ὅτι οὐ παρῆν οὐδὲ ἀρέσκει ἔμοιγε, ἃ συγκείμενα πυνθάνονται ἐν πλήρει τῷ δήμῳ.

29 On the (comparatively limited) evidence for -σσ- on dipinti and *defixiones* see Threatte (1980, 539–40).

Tactician).³⁰ To conclude, the forms with -σσ- may be used by the Old Oligarch either as an element of marked diction (θαλασσοκράτορες) or as an element of particularly colloquial register (ἄσσα).

It thus appears that while some cases of variation, such as -σσ-/-ττ-, were certainly influenced by the model of Ionic prose (i.e. an interdialectal development), their adoption into literary Attic also goes hand in hand with the ongoing internal evolution of the dialect itself (i.e. an intradialectal development). Building on Rosenkranz' thesis that the alleged 'Ionicisms' of Attic prose were far from unfamiliar in Attic, we may attempt to determine whether the two approaches may be reconciled. Indeed, we may explore the idea that those 'innovative' Attic features shared with Ionic were adopted in some of the Attic literary languages only in cases where Ionic prose would make them also recognisably prestigious. In so doing, we shall be able to give more sustained attention to the role played by the common, ever elusive, *Sprachgut* between Ionic and Old Attic.³¹ Our suggestion is that Rosenkranz is correct in postulating that several allegedly Ionic borrowings in early Attic prose were also genuinely colloquial Attic; however, we should add that their more ready adoption into some of the literary languages (notably, historiography, sophistic writings, and tragedy) rather than others (Old Comedy) was attributable to the fact that those genres regarded literary Ionic as a prestigious term of reference. Instead, the poets of Old Comedy mostly avoided those elements because, although they were also colloquial Attic (which, of course, in the language of comedy would not be an issue), at the same time they could be perceived as foreign-sounding and belonging to a higher literary register. In other words, we should focus on the reason that such 'innovative' features, despite being genuinely in use in the dialect, are avoided in some genres while being simultaneously employed in others. Let us examine selected parallels to support this claim.

The first case-study is the extension of the κ-suffix to the plural forms of the athematic aorists ἔδωκα, ἔθηκα, and ἤκα (i.e. forms such as ἐδώκαμεν, ἐδώκατε, ἔδωκαν). These analogic forms are common in epic poetry and Ionic prose. In Attic texts, besides tragedy (only in Euripides), they are also documented in early prose (1x Antiphon, 2x Thucydides). While the analogic forms are scarcely attested in Old Comedy (2x Aristophanes, but one of these occurrences does not count since it is a poeticism), they become more common in Middle and New Comedy, despite this being a smaller corpus (7x in Alexis, Antiphanes, Diphilus,

³⁰ See Section 5.3. On the 'vulgarisms' in the Old Oligarch's *Constitution of the Athenians*, see Pfister (1916).

³¹ See Prauscello (2023, 254–5).

and Menander), and they are also documented in some 4th-century BCE prose writers, particularly Xenophon.³² It is perfectly possible, as also claimed by Rosenkranz (1930, 152), that such analogic formations of the singular forms were already common in spoken Attic in the 5th century BCE. If this was the case, however, why are the innovative forms attested so scarcely in Old Comedy compared to early prose, Euripides, Middle and New Comedy, and Xenophon? A possible interpretation would be that these forms, though integral to 5th-century BCE Attic, were adopted only by writers who aspired to the adoption of a more ‘international’ language based on the model of Ionic and corroborated by the prestigious comparison with the language of tragedy.

A similar problem attends the thematic development of the verbs in -νυμι (i.e. δείκνυμι > δεικνύω).³³ The innovative inflection is quite common in Ionic prose. In Attic literature, the distribution of these forms is even more polarised (and thus highly revealing for our purposes). The thematic conjugation is common in early Attic prose (5x in Thucydides, 1x in Antiphon, 8x in Andocides, 1x in the pseudo-Xenophontean *Constitution of the Athenians*), and while it is extremely rare in Old Comedy (1x in Pherecrates and 1x in Aristophanes’ *Plutus*, a very late play), it becomes common again in Middle and New Comedy. Interestingly, the thematic conjugation is foreign to tragedy. If the innovative forms were admissible in ordinary Attic, why do they appear so rarely in Old Comedy compared to early Attic prose, only to re-appear in *Plutus* and 4th-century BCE comedy? Why are they also foreign to tragedy?

While other case studies could be included, we shall limit ourselves to these two.³⁴ To provide an integrated interpretation of this evidence, we must consider the possibility that writers of artistic prose such as Thucydides and Antiphon regarded the innovative forms, which they knew from their spoken dialect, as acceptable because they had become established forms in literary Ionic (particularly prose);³⁵ pseudo-Xenophon’s *Constitution of the Athenians* demonstrates that innovative linguistic features could be admitted in less artistic prose. Tragedy also proves that some of those features could be admissible in high-register literary Attic. However, if those forms were admissible in prose and tragedy, why did the poets of Old Comedy, although they adopt several evidently innovative (often collo-

³² See Chapter 5, Section C.3.2.3.

³³ See Chapter 5, Section C.3.1.2.

³⁴ Another piece of evidence in support of the proposed interpretation is the analogical inflection οίδαμεν, οίδατε, οίδασι in place of ἴσμεν, ἴστε, ἴσασι (see Chapter 5, Section C.1.3.2).

³⁵ The more relevant evidence for Antiphon is from the *Tetralogies*, which contain ‘Ionic’ – or more likely ‘New’ Attic – forms to a higher degree. Dover (1950, 57–8) convincingly explains these as attributable to the imitation of Ionic models (see also López Eire 1981–1982, 24–5).

qual) features (many of which they share with Thucydides),³⁶ avoid others that, in turn, are used by Thucydides? A possible answer is that the innovative forms used by Thucydides but (mostly) avoided in Old Comedy were considered to be foreign-sounding owing to their belonging to literary Ionic and, sometimes, tragedy.

To conclude, while the outcomes of Rosenkranz' analysis are unobjectionable in many respects, this different interpretation of selected parallels (more could be added) permits a less polarised understanding of the evidence.³⁷ The language of Ionic literature, if not the source from which some forms were imported into Attic prose, may still have represented the literary criterion for early Attic prose writers to approve of the use of some emerging forms that were, in fact, already present in spoken Attic. Tragedy surely represented an additional point of reference,³⁸ although the guiding parameter remained literary Ionic, as is also proven by the fact that forms that do appear in early Attic prose (and literary Ionic) are very rare or absent from tragedy (the thematic conjugation of verbs in -νυμι is a case in point, see above).³⁹

This interpretation provides us with first-hand evidence for the conservative and purist attitude towards Attic that is clearly discernible in several 5th-century BCE sources, most notably Old Comedy (see Section 3). The results of this enquiry, particularly in terms of the change in the 4th-century BCE sources, also help to bridge the development of early literary Attic with the developments taking place in the 4th-century BCE dialect, as witnessed by the language of comedy and prose and by the emergence of 'international' Attic (see Sections 4–5).

36 See Section 2.

37 Notice, e.g., that according to Rosenkranz (1930, 155–6), abstract nouns in -μα and -σις are unrelated to any Ionic influence. While it is perfectly likely that the increased use of these forms is not solely attributable to Ionic influence (see Dover 1981a, 9), it cannot be questioned that these nouns are influenced by new intellectual trends originating from the Ionic world (see Willi 2003a, 135–9 and the discussion of ὑποθελύτερος in Ar. fr. 706 in Section 3.1).

38 See Wackernagel (1907, 14) on ἠσσοῦσθαι in Thucydides: since the conjugation ἠσσοῦμαι is an Attic innovation for which Ionic retained instead ἔσσοῦμαι (46x in Herodotus), the fact that Thucydides uses ἠσσοῦμαι rather than ἠττάομαι means that he must have derived this form from tragedy (i.e. based on the conventional or artificial equivalence of tragic language between -σσ- and -ττ-) – that is, not directly from Ionic.

39 To support Rosenkranz (1930) against other scholars' views, Willi (2010a, 107 n. 26) comments that 'if there had really been as much strictly Ionic influence on early Attic prose as is sometimes thought, one should also expect features such as ξείνος for ξένος, πόλιος for πόλεως, δικαστέω for δικαστοῦ etc.'. The interpretation put forward above would solve Willi's objection. Indeed, forms like ξείνος for ξένος and δικαστέω for δικαστοῦ were never really an option in spoken Attic (and indeed, they are also foreign to 4th-century BCE literary Attic, *Großattisch*, and the high koine); hence, their use in literary Ionic was never sufficient for an Attic writer to adopt them. Regarding πόλιος/πόλεος for πόλεως see Chapter 5, Section B.2.4.

3 The 5th-century BCE sources: The dawn of purism and its socio-political significance

While the Atticists regarded 5th-century BCE literary Attic as representing the golden standard of ‘pure’ diction, the reality of the spoken language must have been far more complex than it mostly appears from literary texts and official inscriptions. In fact, precisely when Athens reached the peak of its political, economic, military, and cultural influence, there arose among the Athenians the perception that their society was rapidly changing and that their dialect was affected accordingly. As anticipated, in this chapter we shall demonstrate that the history of Attic is innervated by an unresolved tension between traditionalism and innovation and that this tension operates at both the higher and lower levels of the language.

Undoubtedly, the Peloponnesian War marked a turning point not only in Athenian history but, owing to the rapid transformations in Athenian politics and society, it also had significant repercussions on the Attic dialect.⁴⁰ Indeed, this is also the time of the four most important literary sources explicitly commenting on the Athenians’ perception concerning their own dialect: Aristophanes’ fragment 706, section 2.8 of the pseudo-Xenophontean *Constitution of the Athenians*, a fragment of Plato Comicus’ *Hyperbolus* (fr. 183), and a fragment of Eupolis’ *Demes* (fr. 99.25).⁴¹ We shall offer a close reading of these texts to highlight their sociolinguistic and socio-political implications. The importance of these passages lies not merely in the fact that they document the speakers’ perception of the existence of multiple registers within the Attic dialect but also in the fact that they all presuppose an idea of what ‘good’ Attic is and of what values it is connected to. As we shall see, these texts, despite their differences with respect to ideology and literary genre, presuppose a similarly conservative and protectionist attitude towards the Attic dialect.

Before we begin, a brief examination of Attica’s demographics will help to put the evidence from the literary sources into perspective. Estimates of Attica’s population in the 5th century BCE vary considerably owing to the challenges inherent in such topics. Akrigg’s (2019) recent study offers a new picture of demographic change in Attica.⁴² Scholars generally agree that the population of Attica

⁴⁰ See Risch (1964, 13).

⁴¹ The passages commenting on individual people’s ways of talking or their linguistic mistakes have no bearing on the issues discussed here (see Colvin 1999, 285–7).

⁴² Akrigg does not always commit to one figure and opts instead to sketch a more fine-grained picture. The figures provided here are extracted from Akrigg’s more detailed research and should be treated with due caution.

rapidly increased between 480 and 431 BCE. While most agree that at the end of the Persian Wars, the citizen population was approximately 30,000 units, scholars have estimated that around the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War it must have increased up to 60,000, even 70,000, units. This figure would then have to be quadrupled if we consider women and children (who were not citizens), for a total figure of around 250,000 units. Akrigg's main contention is that the sharp rise in the citizen population during the Pentecontaetia, which is incompatible with natural demographic growth, was probably related to increased immigration.

Besides their relevance for the military, economical, and political history of Classical Athens (notably, Pericles' law of citizenship: see Chapter 3, Section 2.7), these data have a significant bearing on the history of the Attic dialect, as they effectively corroborate the view that immigration may have had a conspicuous influence on shaping the linguistic landscape of Attica.⁴³ However, it is important to stress that foreign influence was not only confined to the lower social strata. The higher strata of the population, besides reacting against the kind of innovation taking place at the low-register level, must also have been increasingly more exposed to other prestigious varieties of Greek. During this period, Athens became particularly attractive to foreign intellectuals, and the cultural and intellectual discourse within Athenian society was significantly enriched by linguistic influences from abroad that were regarded as prestigious, particularly Ionic. However, these trendy new influences were not passively accepted by all Athenians, as they too might have been considered a threat to the integrity of Athenian identity.

3.1 Aristophanes, fr. 706: Language, society, and Aristophanes' poetic persona

Aristophanes' fragment 706 is an impressive account of sociolinguistic variation in Classical Attic, in which Aristophanes offers a tripartite description of Attic based on diatopic and diastratic criteria. The fragment is quoted by Sextus Empiricus (2nd century CE) in *Against the Mathematicians* (S.E. M. 1.228–9):

περιδιωκόμενοι δὴ ποικίλως οἱ γραμματικοὶ θέλουσιν ἀναστρέφειν τὴν ἀπορίαν. πολλοὶ γάρ, φασίν, εἰσὶ συνήθεια, καὶ ἄλλη μὲν Ἀθηναίων ἄλλη δὲ Λακεδαιμονίων, καὶ πάλιν Ἀθηναίων διαφέρουσα μὲν ἢ παλαιὰ ἐξηλλαγμένη δὲ ἢ νῦν, καὶ οὐχ ἡ αὐτὴ μὲν τῶν κατὰ τὴν ἀγροικίαν ἢ αὐτὴ δὲ τῶν ἐν ἄστει διατριβόντων, παρὸ καὶ ὁ κωμικὸς λέγει Ἀριστοφάνης·

⁴³ See especially Cassio (1981), who also observes that foreigners, whether metics or slaves, played a key function in Athens' economy.

διάλεκτον ἔχοντα μέσην πόλεως,
 οὔτ' ἀστείαν ὑποθηλυτέραν
 οὔτ' ἀνελεύθερον ὑπαγροικότεραν.

πολλῶν οὖν οὐσῶν συνηθειῶν, {ὥς} φασί, ποῖα χρῆσόμεθα; οὔτε γὰρ πάσαις κατακολουθεῖν δυνατὸν διὰ τὸ μάχεσθαι πολλάκις, οὔτε τινὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν, ἐὰν μὴ τις τεχνικῶς προκριθῆι.

Well, being chased around in many different ways, the grammarians want to turn back the impasse. They say that there are many ordinary usages: the Athenians' is one, the Spartans' another, and again the ancient usage of the Athenians is different, while the one now has changed, and that of people in the country is not the same as that of people who spend time in the city – which is why the comic poet Aristophanes says:

Having a middle-of-the-road city dialect
 neither uptown and effeminate
 nor low-down and rustic.

Since, then, there are many usages, they say, which shall we employ? It is not possible to follow all of them, because they often conflict, nor some one of them, unless one is given preference through expertise. (Translation by Bett 2018, 97–8).

Sextus aims to counter the grammarians' attempts to establish a unified linguistic norm against the view of sceptic philosophers, who argue in favour of adhering to the common usage (συνήθεια).⁴⁴ As Sextus explains, the grammarians sought to refute the sceptics' position by highlighting the existence of several linguistic varieties that differed not only between dialects but also within the same dialectal variety; thus, it would be impossible to establish one συνήθεια as a linguistic parameter, as suggested by sceptic philosophers. To corroborate their argumentation, Sextus attributes to the grammarians the exploitation of Aristophanes' fragment to demonstrate that one of the most authoritative Attic writers already shared their linguistic concerns.⁴⁵ Given Sextus' agenda, one cannot rule out the possibility that Aristophanes' fragment had previously been quoted by one or more of the grammatical sources against which Sextus is arguing, but this remains unverifiable.

Owing to the state of preservation, many important aspects of this fragment remain impossible to ascertain. First, the comedy in which this fragment origi-

⁴⁴ On the role of συνήθεια in Sextus' sceptic doctrines, see Corti (2015, 136–8); Chapter 7, Section 3.2.

⁴⁵ Sextus never openly polemises against Atticist sources nor does he treat Atticism as an issue, as he is rather focused on the opposition between a 'lay' variety and an 'urbane' or 'literary' variety of language, which he qualifies with συνήθεια ('(standard) usage') and ἐλληνίζω ('to speak proper Greek'), respectively (see Kim 2017, 47). According to Dickey (2019, 118), 'the Atticists were clearly not a significant enough group of experts for Sextus to consider them worth attacking, but that does not mean that he was completely unaware of their movement'.

nally occurred is unknown, which makes it even harder to speculate about the potential relevance of the linguistic remarks and how they may relate to other topics. Further, the identification of whom or what the participle ἔχοντα refers to is uncertain; it may be an unspecified male figure, a plurality of people indicated in the neuter, or perhaps an abstract entity.⁴⁶ In any event, because the fragment is written in catalectic anapestic dimeters, it probably derives from a choral section; and because the anapests are typically (but not exclusively) used in the final part of the parabasis, this section of the play is a valid candidate for the context of this passage. If this supposition is correct, the chorus would speak the fragment, possibly thus conveying Aristophanes' authorial comments regarding the Attic dialect and the sociolinguistic factors behind its variety.⁴⁷ We shall return to this issue later.

Aristophanes divides Attic into three categories (the middle language of the city; the sophisticated and rather feminine version; and the crude and rustic language) based primarily on diatopic and diastratic criteria.⁴⁸ However, the seemingly diatopic distinction in fact falls to a large extent under the wider category of diastratic variation, and we should not take Aristophanes' words purely at face value.⁴⁹ Moreover, Aristophanes' fragment is not merely descriptive of the varieties of Attic but also presents markedly evaluative views. The opposition between the two extreme poles implies that the middle variety is that which Aristophanes approves. By comparison, the other two varieties represent sub- and super-standard Attic.⁵⁰

Before we examine Aristophanes' presentation of the three varieties, let us point out two general aspects. Some scholars have claimed that the linguistic features to which Aristophanes is alluding are probably connected with matters of vocabulary, syntax, and style rather than with phonology.⁵¹ In their view, one should not conclude that Aristophanes is referring to different 'accents' (in the

46 Some options are cautiously considered by Bagordo (2017, 87).

47 See Bagordo (2017, 92).

48 In principle, one might object that, in the original context, the first line of the fragment might also have been part of a negative statement (i.e. '(not) having a middle-of-the-road city dialect etc.'). However, it does appear that the μέση διάλεκτος is presented as the good middle point between two opposing extremes. This view is further corroborated by the comparatives ὑποθιγλύτερος and ὑπαγοικότερος used absolutely – that is, indicating something a little above and a little below the approved middle language.

49 See Taillardat (1965, 12–4); Dover (1970, 11), who stress that Aristophanes has a more generally cultural than strictly linguistic target in mind.

50 See Bagordo (2017, 87). Additional confirmation is the absolute use of the comparatives with the prefix ὑπο-, which indicate a slight excess compared to an ideal middle (i.e. 'a little too X', 'a little too Y').

51 See Sommerstein (1977, 62); Bagordo (2017, 89).

lay sense of the word). However, such drastic conclusions are best avoided. Among other reasons, not only is ‘pronunciation’ ostensibly used in other sources as a discriminating criterion between different registers of Attic (notably, Hyperbolus’ faulty pronunciation in Pl.Com. fr. 183, see Section 3.3), but there might even be evidence for phonetics as an element of sociolinguistic variation in Attic (see below); and why exclude morphology from among the areas of variation that Aristophanes has in mind? In sum, it seems better to take διάλεκτος in the widest possible sense. Moreover, the remarks and terminology that Aristophanes uses are vague, but although it is often difficult to find direct documentation of what he means by, for example, slavish language, we may at least compare passages from his plays in which the relevant social types are described.

The super-standard variety is qualified with the adjectives ἀστεῖος (‘urbane’, ‘elegant’) and ὑποθελύτερος (‘rather effeminate’). ἀστεῖος is ‘urbane’ in the sense of ‘elegant’ and ‘refined’ (see *DGE* s.v. I.1). Being ἀστεῖος is thus a consequence of living in the city, where one is exposed to more refined manners and becomes acquainted with the newer intellectual and cultural trends.⁵² ἀστειότης also has clear implications for language and style, despite remaining a rather unspecific word (see Willi 2003a, 93). However, ἀστεῖος and ἀστειότης may also have negative overtones. In Aristophanes’ *Frogs*, Euripides is praised early on for his linguistic creativity and boldness (*Ra.* 91–104: notice the opposition with Heracles’ more traditionalist and down-to-earth views), while at the end of the play his proclivity to chatter and philosophising will cause his defeat (*Ra.* 1491–9); in a similar vein, the pairing of ἀστεῖος with κατερρινημένος at *Ra.* 900–1 to indicate Euripides’ fine style of expression and intellectualistic snobbery already suggests a potentially negative judgement.

Similarly, ὑποθελύτερος recalls cultivated intellectuals such as Agathon in Aristophanes’ *Thesmophoriazousae*, whose over-refinement and feminine attire is integral to his theory of imitation (*Th.* 146–52), which develops into an explicit association between the composition of good poetry, the adoption of female clothing, and aiming at Ionic softness (*Th.* 159–63).⁵³ More importantly, ὑποθελύτερος relates to the popular association between Ionians, softness, and intellectualism and indicates more generally the lack of masculinity of young upper-class Athenians fascinated by the Ionian models they sought to imitate.⁵⁴ Commenting on ὑποθελύτερος, Cassio (1981,

⁵² See, e.g., Alc.Com. fr. 26: νῦν οὖν γένοιτ’ ἀστεῖος οἰκῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει, which probably concerns a man from the countryside who learns the ways of city life (see Orth 2013, 122–3).

⁵³ On Agathon’s theory of imitation see Austin, Olson (2004, 105–6; 109–12).

⁵⁴ See Willi (2003a, 161).

90–2) very plausibly reads this passage side-by-side with the Ionic influences on 5th-century BCE Attic cultivated speech.⁵⁵ Indeed, Aristophanes' presentation of the super-standard variety of Attic may be compared with the manner of talking of the young Athenians of the *jeunesse dorée* as negatively portrayed in *Knights* (1375–81), characterised by elements of 'intellectual' language, such as the suffix -ικός.⁵⁶ Similar presentations of young intellectuals are common in 5th-century BCE comedy (see Cratin. fr. 105.2–3; Pherecr. frr. 2, 70, and 138).⁵⁷ Colvin also compares Socrates' recurring use of abstract nouns in -σις in *Clouds* (see e.g. *Nu.* 317–8). Both suffixes have been carefully discussed among the innovative morphological features that were influenced by the intellectual world of Ionia.⁵⁸ Another possible indication of how these young intellectuals spoke is offered by Ar. *Nu.* 870–3, where Strepsiades reproaches Pheidippides' loose articulation of consonants.⁵⁹ Furthermore, tragedy and early Attic prose adopted Ionic or Ionicising elements as prestige features, and so the imitation of Ionic culture and language did not solely appeal to the younger generations.⁶⁰ The issue, then, may have been how to harmonise the appeal of Ionic with the more traditionalist manners.⁶¹

Regarding the sub-standard variety of Attic, Aristophanes describes it as ἀνελεύθερος and ὑπαγρικότερος. A comparatively rare adjective,⁶² ἀνελεύθερος indicates the kind of expression that would be worthy of a slave and therefore does

55 See Section 2.1; Chapter 3, Sections 2.3; 3.1.

56 See Kassel, Austin (*PCG* vol. 3.2, 362); Colvin (1999, 283).

57 For a discussion of these fragments (and other relevant sources), see Napolitano (2021, 78–82). On the language of the Athenian *jeunesse dorée*, see also Section 3.3.

58 See Willi (2003a, 134–6 and 139–45), who examines these features as part of a wider investigation of 'sophistic' language in Aristophanes.

59 See Dover (1968a, 206); Colvin (1999, 284).

60 Willi (2003a, 165) comments that ὑποθηλύτερος might allude to figures such as Euripides and Socrates and their teachings, but these are less direct comparisons. Previous studies have sought to identify linguistic features of literary Attic at large typical of female characters (see Duhoux 2004 and Sommerstein 2009, 15–42). Building on the passage of Plato's *Cratylus* (418b.7–e.4) discussing the conservative language of women (see n. 161), Willi (2003a, 157–97) examines female speech in Aristophanes to prove that the language used by Athenian women was not conservative but was open to linguistically innovative forms perceived as prestigious; these traits were then adopted by men who aimed at cultural refinement. Although this lies beyond the scope of this chapter, the results of Willi's enquiry do not counter the idea that the 'femininity' to which Aristophanes alludes is not a reference to the (innovative) language used by women but to the stereotype of Ionic softness.

61 On the emergence of literary Attic and its relationship with prestigious literary Ionic, see Section 2.1. Pericles' famous claim in Thucydides' λόγος ἐπιτάφιος that the Athenians do not indulge in softness (2.40.1) evidently reflects the perception of this problem.

62 It indicates either people who are actual slaves or people who adopt a 'servile' and 'mean' behaviour.

not suit an Athenian citizen (i.e. there is a clear opposition with ἀστεῖος in the previous line). This implies not only the use of a low-register language but also words that are foreign to the Attic dialect. We shall return to these aspects in the analysis of [X.] *Ath.* 2.7–8, where this is a central issue (see Section 3.2). Regarding ὑπαγρικότερος, Bagordo (2017, 90) rightly observes that the closest point of comparison for ὑπαγρικότερος is the comic depiction of countrymen such as Strepsiades in *Clouds*.⁶³ This parody of simple, rustic people who become acquainted with the more cultivated (and also more corrupt) society for the first time is topical.⁶⁴ Thus, the ὑπαγρικότερος, who lacks any kind of flair, is guilty in precisely the opposite manner to the ὑποθλιγότερος.⁶⁵

The association of ἀνελεύθερος and ὑπαγρικότερος is somewhat surprising at first. While the language used by slaves was surely open to foreign influences, all the more so since the slaves were often non-Greek, the language of countrymen might be expected to be more conservative. This inconsistency is illusory, however. First, Aristophanes focuses primarily on more generally low-register Attic and so old-fashioned features such as those of the language of countrymen may well lack prestige. Additionally, we cannot rule out the possibility that the language of the inland and the rural demes of Attica was also open to external influences. Sommerstein (1977, 62) stressed the possibility that, at least from the 4th century BCE, the rural population of Attica may have been exposed to a more advanced vowel system under the influence of neighbouring Boeotia.⁶⁶ We may add that something along these lines might also be detected with respect to conso-

63 Strepsiades has marital problems because, though a countryman, he married a city woman of noble descent (*Nu.* 46–8) and is repeatedly insulted for his ignorance and rusticity (e.g. *Nu.* 135–8; 492–3; 627–31). In other plays, the ἄγρικός is associated with positive values in opposition to the corrupt inhabitants of the city (see *Ar. Ach.* 32–3; *Pax* 1185–6).

64 See Aristophanes' *Banqueters* and Eupolis' *Aiges* ('Goats'); cf. Cassio (1977, 26); Olson (2017, 91 and 138).

65 Evidence for slave-like and rustic speech is more limited, although we have considerable evidence for the comic depiction of sub-standard speech (see Sections 3.2; 3.3; 4.1; 4.2; 5.2). On the lack of a specific linguistic characterisation of the slaves, and more generally the lower classes in Aristophanes, see Dover (1970, 11); Dover (1976, 362–7); Dover (1981b, 16). Colvin (1999, 283) mentions the drunk Euelpides' past vicissitudes as narrated in *Birds* (493–8) with a predominantly 'καί-style' dominated by parataxis. Bagordo (2017, 90–1) notices that the Aristophanic scholia occasionally attribute some metaphorical or analogical forms to the fact that the speaker is a countryman (see schol. *Ar. Pax* 63b and schol. *Ar. Nu.* 1206baβ). Dover (1970, 11), while tentatively (but unconvincingly) defending the repetition of δέ in *Ar. Ach.* 2 as a possible element of rustic speech (cf. Olson 2002, 65), also admits the possibility of detecting an occasional 'rural touch' in Aristophanes, mentioning πλάτις in *Ach.* 132 (whereas Olson 2002, 114 concludes that πλάτις is a poeticism).

66 See Sommerstein (1977, 62).

nantism.⁶⁷ Direct evidence of the possible external influence on rural, inland Attic is provided by informal inscriptions that have -δ- as the outcome of (de-)palatalisation, as documented by ὄστρακίδ(δ)ῶ (i.e. ὄστρακίζω) on an early-5th-century BCE ostrakon from the Ceramicus, paired with λαικάδει (i.e. λαικάζει) and ἐπιτραπέδια (i.e. ἐπιτραπέζια) on two 4th-century BCE graffiti from the agora.⁶⁸

As noted, Aristophanes' fragment centres on several polar oppositions: city vs countryside; citizens vs slaves; intellectualistic, womanish refinement vs rustic, male boorishness. But what can we say in positive terms about the 'middle language of the city', Aristophanes' recommended variety of Attic?⁶⁹ The 'middle language of the city' is probably intended to be the urban variety of Attic as spoken by the Athenian middle-class. The words ἀστεῖος and πόλις are likely to reflect an opposition between the city elites and the rest of the urban population as mirrored by the opposition between the ἄστυ, indicating the centre-most part of the city, and other urban demes, which, although they properly belong to the ἄστυ in Cleisthenes' tripartition of Athenian territory, may be perceived as other than the ἄστυ proper.⁷⁰ Thus, πόλις is intended to associate the middle variety with the largest share of the Athenian city population, whereas ἀστεῖος is associated with a far more limited social group. Similarly, the contrast with ὑποθλύτερος opposes the citizens of the πόλις with those who position themselves outside the conventional behaviour of respectable citizens and whose manners associate them with women, a social group that lacked any political rights. The dichotomisation of slaves and countrymen with the citizens of the πόλις further illustrates that these categories are either excluded by definition from the civic body (i.e. the slaves) or represented in this case as a marginal portion of Athenian society (i.e. the countrymen). In sum, Aristophanes' selection of the μέση πόλις to indicate the approved variety of Attic is purposely aimed at excluding the fringes of Athenian society which are perceived as outsiders and external to the good city order.

Kassel, Austin (*PCG* vol. 3, 2, 362) establish a useful comparison between the language of the μέση πόλις and the virtues of λέξις discussed by Aristotle in the *Rhetoric* (3.2.1404b.1–25):⁷¹ clarity; using a mode of expression that is neither

⁶⁷ See the discussion of ὀλίγος in Section 3.3. See also Section 5.2 regarding the apocope of prepositional prefixes.

⁶⁸ See Colvin (2004); Colvin (2020, 77–8).

⁶⁹ Bagordo (2017, 92) is entirely focused on what the 'middle language of the city' is not.

⁷⁰ See LSJ s.v. ἄστυ II.2 (where a reference is made to Piraeus or Phalerum). See also Pl. *Th.* 142a.1–7 for the opposition between the city centre (indicated by ἀγορά and πόλις) and the harbour (λιμὴν).

⁷¹ In these sections of the third book of *Rhetoric*, Aristotle presupposes and repeatedly refers to the examination of the virtues of speech, the means to attain these, and the functions of the parts

above nor below the subject's dignity but still capable of fascinating the listeners; adopting poetic language and more generally elevated language only when appropriate; and avoiding the risk of looking presumptuous or deceitful. Like Aristophanes, then, Aristotle also recommends a style that pursues a middle way, which is equally not too humble (as it would not attract attention from the audience) and not too elaborate (as it would run the risk of being unintelligible or make the orator's intention suspicious). The similarity to Aristotle's ethical doctrines is self-evident. Aristotle credits Euripides with the first successful attempt at using an elaborate and artistic language that seems natural and spontaneous, akin to everyday speech.

However, while Aristotle is mostly concerned with the more practical aspects of good and effective style, Aristophanes' preference for the 'middle language of the city' as his approved standard has wider implications. This fragment's socio-linguistic relevance should be considered in relation to Aristophanes' approach to and general views on Athenian society and politics and the role of the comic poet. Regardless of whether one interprets Aristophanes' political views as conservative or democratic,⁷² these views are presented to his audience as though deriving from a wise advisor.⁷³ He generally espouses a kind of balanced traditionalism and moderate views that equally shun the new socio-political trends that he identifies as base and vulgar (e.g. radical democracy and the rise of demagogues as reflecting the degeneration of the Athenian society) and the new intellectual fads that he repeatedly mocks (e.g. sophistic culture, the developments in tragedy and music). One may easily detect a continuity between these opposing tendencies and the varieties of Attic that Aristophanes condemns in fragment 706. If, as proposed above, this fragment was originally contained in the final part of a parabasis, we may easily compare it with the parabolic passages in which Aristophanes offers metaliterary reflections on the artistic qualities of his plays as well as their importance for advising his fellow-citizens.⁷⁴

Aristophanes' approbation of the 'middle language of the city' reflects the views of educated Athenians who, through language, also aimed at promoting but *de facto* defending a traditionalist civic identity and ideology against new trends perceived as threatening to the established social order. It is particularly instructive that the kind of tripartition sketched by Aristophanes in fr. 706 is not unheard of. Parallel

of speech he has offered in *Poetics* (see especially *Po.* 21.1458a.18–22.1459a.16). See also Chapter 6, Section 3.2.

⁷² For recent assessments see P. Walsh (2009); Olson (2010); Sommerstein (2015); the papers collected in Foley, Rosen (2020).

⁷³ See Heath (1987, 18–21).

⁷⁴ See, e.g., *Ar. Ach.* 628–64; *Eq.* 507–50; *Nu.* 518–27 and 537–62; *V.* 1015–59; *Pax* 734–74.

(and hitherto neglected) examples of a very similar articulation of the civic body are attested in Thucydides' excursus on the στάσις of Corcyra (3.82.8)⁷⁵ and on the counter-revolution at Samos (8.75.1), in the episode of Sphodrias' acquittal from the accusation of betrayal in Xenophon's *Hellenica* (5.4.25), and in Theseus' dialogue with Adrastus in the first episode of Euripides' *Suppliant Women* (238–45).⁷⁶ These sources would require extensive discussion, but for our purposes, it suffices to emphasise that in all these passages, the middle group is presented in positive terms, expressing wisely balanced views that are not conditioned by ideology.⁷⁷ It is particularly interesting that the opposition in Thucydides and Euripides, both contrasting the group constituted by the rich and philo-oligarchic with the group comprising the poor and the leaders of the δῆμος, nicely matches Aristophanes' sociolinguistic connotation of the super- and sub-standard varieties of Attic. It is therefore very likely that the politically moderate Aristophanes may have seen the language question as integral to this political scenario. In such cases, the sub-standard variety of Attic may not only be easily associated with the demagogues and their consensus strategies but also the young, effeminate intellectuals who speak the super-standard variety and may profitably be likened to the young ἀπράγμονες who were considered to share their oligarchic views (see Section 3.3). Thus, the tripartition that Aristophanes describes is not merely sociolinguistic in nature but probably also indicative of the speakers' socio-political alignment.

3.2 Pseudo-Xenophon, *Constitution of the Athenians* 2.7–8: The language of democratic Athens at the time of her maritime empire

The pseudo-Xenophontean (i.e. the Old Oligarch's) *Constitution of the Athenians* is a particularly problematic text.⁷⁸ At the core of this polemical pamphlet is a de-

75 Note also that, in this case, the tripartition of the citizen body described by Thucydides is not limited to the situation in Corcyra but more generally reflects the Greek cities' internal conflicts (see Hornblower 1991–2008 vol. 1, 477–9).

76 On the political resonance of this passage, see Musti (1997, 44–7); Porceddu (2023, 91–100). Collard (1975 vol. 2, 171–2) contextualises this passage in the light of the other Euripidean passages that outline a tripartition of the civic body (but in terms that differ from those used in the passages above) and also compares the passage from *Suppliant Women* with the tripartition based on wealth in Arist. *Pol.* 1295b.1–3.

77 The passage from Xenophon's *Hellenica* is instructive. People who side with Sphodrias are afraid not only of the opposing party, that of Agesilaus and his friends, but also of the moderates, who represent the middle position, since Sphodrias' crime was objectively grievous.

78 For a comprehensive treatment see Lenfant (2017). In the following, we shall focus on select topics. As regards the debated date of this text, the suggestion that it dates to the 420s remains

tailed criticism of Athenian democracy and its twistedness. However, although the author expresses downright conservative/oligarchic views, he aims to demonstrate how the Athenian δῆμος has managed to create and maintain the system of government that is best suited to their interests, and the Old Oligarch is famously open to acknowledging that the democratic system has been cunningly conceived to preserve itself and to benefit those who embrace it (see [X.] *Ath.* 1.1 and 3.1). One of the argument's focal points is the importance of the maritime empire, which is acknowledged as integral and essential to Athenian democracy. This topic is more closely addressed in Section 2 of the pamphlet. Thanks to her control over the sea, Athens imposed her political, economic, and military hegemony over the other Greek states; at the same time, the empire benefited the δῆμος ([X.] *Ath.* 2.2–16). It also brought about major transformations within inner politics: while the artisanal and commercial classes greatly benefited from trade, the countrymen and the conservative class, which typically prospered on the income of agriculture or natural resources, were instead damaged by the policies adopted to secure the control of the sea ([X.] *Ath.* 2.14). This sketchy summary of the pamphlet's ideological background serves to introduce the passage that is immediately relevant to our purposes. Among the benefits of the maritime empire, the Old Oligarch first mentions that it allowed the Athenian δῆμος to procure various delicacies and then adds that, owing to the importance of trade, Athens imported foreign linguistic usages, ways of living, and clothing on a massive scale ([X.] *Ath.* 2.7–8):⁷⁹

εἰ δὲ δεῖ καὶ μικροτέρων μνησθῆναι, διὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς θαλάττης πρῶτον μὲν τρόπους εὐωχιῶν ἐξεύρον ἐπιμισγόμενοι ἀλλήλοις ὅ τι ἐν Σικελίᾳ ἢ δὴ ἢ ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ ἢ ἐν Κύπρῳ ἢ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ ἢ ἐν Λυδίᾳ ἢ ἐν τῷ Πόντῳ ἢ ἐν Πελοποννήσῳ ἢ ἀλλοθί που, ταῦτα πάντα εἰς ἐν ἠθροῖσθαι διὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς θαλάττης. ἔπειτα φωνὴν πάσαν ἀκούοντες ἐξελέξαντο τοῦτο μὲν ἐκ τῆς, τοῦτο δὲ ἐκ τῆς, καὶ οἱ μὲν Ἕλληνες ἰδίᾳ μᾶλλον καὶ φωνῇ καὶ διαίτη καὶ σχήματι χρῶνται, Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ κεκραμένη ἐξ ἀπάντων τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ βαρβάρων.

If one should also mention lesser matters, first, through the rule of the sea [the Athenians] have mixed with other peoples in other places, and so discovered varieties of luxury foods, [to the effect that,] whatever the delicacy in Sicily or Italy or Cyprus or Egypt or Lydia or Pontus or the Peloponnese or anywhere else, all these delicacies have been gathered together in one place through their rule of the sea. Secondly, through hearing every sort of language, they have acquired for themselves this feature from one language, that from another. The other Greeks stick rather to their individual language and way of living and

the likeliest scenario and will be adopted in the discussion that follows (see in general Lenfant 2017, iv–xi; Porceddu 2023, 17–28; Occhipinti 2019 argues for a later date, but within the 390s BCE).

⁷⁹ Text by Lenfant (2017). The textual problems posed by this passage are discussed by Lenfant (2017, 115).

dress, whereas the Athenians employ a mixture, which comes from [those of] all the Greeks and the non-Greeks. (Translation by Marr, Rhodes 2008, 47, with modifications).

The first observation, that Athens imports luxury items from throughout the Mediterranean Sea, is topical in discussing Athens' thalassocracy (cf. notably Thuc. 2.38.2).⁸⁰ This passage has profitably been compared to a fragment of the comic poet Hermippus (fr. 63), from his lost play *Phormophoroi* ('The Porters'), in which an unknown speaker enumerates the many different types of goods (not merely food) that Athens imported thanks to the city's imperialistic and hegemonic role in the Mediterranean.⁸¹ The Old Oligarch also establishes a cause-and-effect relationship, whereby as a result of the importance of trade, the Athenians are exposed to hearing all manner of Greek dialects and foreign languages.⁸² Therefore, unlike most Greeks,⁸³ they no longer retain their inherited language as well as their traditional way of living (δίατα)⁸⁴ and demeanour (σχῆμα) but rather mingle them with those from abroad. In line with the pamphlet's characteristically conservative views, the implication of these paragraphs is evidently negative, and the lamented loss of purity is among many proofs offered to demonstrate the moral corruption of the δῆμος.⁸⁵ We shall return to these aspects later, as it will be profitable to investigate the relationship between the Old Oligarch's ideologically loaded views vis-à-vis the perspective of the δῆμος in greater depth.

Although in the latter paragraph language, way of living, and clothing are all mentioned, it is clear that the focus of the Old Oligarch is on language, as shown by the fact that it is the exclusive topic of the first sentence (ἔπειτα φωνὴν πᾶσαν ἀκούοντες ἐξελέξαντο τοῦτο μὲν ἐκ τῆς, τοῦτο δὲ ἐκ τῆς).⁸⁶ The formulation adopted by the Old Oligarch to describe the contamination of Attic is vague, but we may pin down a few key points. First, φωνὴν πᾶσαν ἀκούοντες must indicate hearing both foreign Greek dialects and foreign non-Greek languages.⁸⁷ Second,

⁸⁰ See Marr, Rhodes (2008, 110).

⁸¹ For a recent discussion see Vannicelli (2019); Porceddu (2023, 219–34).

⁸² This consciously hyperbolic claim does not surprise in this pamphlet.

⁸³ On Ἕλληνας as 'the majority of the Greeks' see Mosconi (2022, 49–50).

⁸⁴ On the meaning of δίατα, see Marr, Rhodes (2008, 111, who choose 'régime' or 'diet' observing that 'way of living' would be too unspecific in this context, whereas the interpretation pertaining to food is consonant with *Ath.* 2.7); V. Gray (2007, 200: 'δίατα covers eating, drinking and sexual habits'); Lenfant (2017, 118, who prefers 'way of living'); Mosconi (2022, 45, who argues in favour of a specific association with food also based on the parallel of *Hdt.* 3.98.3–4, where language, food, and clothing are among the cultural traits that define the Indians).

⁸⁵ This is what is meant here by Ἀθηναῖοι rather than the Athenians as a whole (see Mosconi 2022, 47–8).

⁸⁶ Thus, Mosconi (2022, 45).

⁸⁷ See Lapini (1997, 183–4); Mosconi (2022, 44 and n. 2).

τοῦτο μὲν [. . .] τοῦτο δέ has been taken to indicate loanwords (i.e. lexicon)⁸⁸ but has also been assigned the more general meaning of ‘feature’ or ‘characteristic’.⁸⁹ This general definition may imply any linguistic feature, from phonology to morphology, syntax, and lexicon.⁹⁰ This latter approach seems the more persuasive one, but what kind of Attic is the Old Oligarch referring to in this passage, and to what extent are his words to be trusted in light of the pamphlet’s polemical nature?

Although the picture offered by the Old Oligarch is probably untrustworthy in its representation of Athens as exceptional among the Greek communities,⁹¹ his claims and the underlying interpretation of the causes are probably correct in several respects.⁹² The variety of non-elite Attic described by the Old Oligarch has been assigned the label ‘Piraeus Attic’ by modern scholars. The passage from the Old Oligarch offers a first-hand account of the development, in parallel to the affirmation of the Athenian maritime empire and Athens’ exposition to foreign trade, of the more ‘international’ and partly de-Atticised variant of Attic that we call *Großattisch*, which represented the immediate forerunner of the koine.⁹³ This non-elite variety of Attic must have been heavily influenced by the native dialects (or, indeed, languages) spoken by metics and slaves, who represented a substantial and influential portion of Athens’ residing population during the 5th and 4th centuries BCE.⁹⁴ Foreign Greek dialects must therefore have been spoken and heard in the streets of Athens, and they may have influenced the Athenian

88 See Marr, Rhodes (2008, 110–1), who mention τῶς (‘peacock’) as the kind of loanword that, according to their view, must be intended here. This interpretation seems far too narrow, especially because the Old Oligarch not only focuses on the influences of non-Greek languages but also refers to loans from other Greek dialects.

89 See, e.g., Cassio (1981, 79), who translates τοῦτο μὲν [. . .] τοῦτο δέ with ‘elementi’.

90 See Kalinka (1913, 200–1); Mosconi (2022, 52–3 n. 34).

91 E.g. Lapini (1997, 184) and Lenfant (2017, 120) object that the Ionic communities of Asia Minor and commercial cities such as Corinth would have represented closely comparable cases, although Mosconi (2022, 48–9) rightly observes that the Old Oligarch presents Athens as a case of its own, as the only place where a φωνὴ κεκραμένη was developed.

92 See Risch (1964, 14 n. 43): ‘Die Feststellung Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία 2, 8 [. . .] charakterisiert die Situation Athens und seiner Sprache im Grunde viel treffender, als es die Modernen wahr haben wollen’.

93 See already Kalinka (1913, 199–200) and more recently Colvin (2009, 40). On *Großattisch*, see Section 4. López Eire (1981–1982, 34–6) unconvincingly claims that, since the Old Oligarch opposes the Athenians and the rest of the Greeks in their linguistic policies, this would represent the same structural opposition of the Atticist lexica (notably, Ἀττικοί vs Ἕλληνες in Moeris).

94 Recent estimates have it between 20,000 and 30,000 metics and between 60,000 and 100,000 slaves (see Akrigg 2019, 89–138). On the relevance of the demographic data for the history of the dialect, see Section 3.

Umgangssprache and the *Verkehrssprache* of sea trafficking.⁹⁵ It is easy to imagine that Ionic played a key role in this linguistic melting-pot, but the contribution of the West Greek dialects should not be underestimated.⁹⁶ It would be intriguing to investigate whether the kinds of linguistic features that the Old Oligarch claims were imported from other Greek dialects are actual loans or whether they may have developed (e.g. by analogy, as a result of de-Atticisation, etc.) from within the Attic dialect. Any more precise appreciation of what the Old Oligarch alludes to is bound to remain speculative. Anyway, the fact that the presentation given by the pamphlet is ideologically loaded makes it reasonable to imagine that phenomena such as dialectal convergence should also be taken into consideration.

We should mention that although language of this nature is more open to ‘international’ imports, this does not necessarily imply that the Old Oligarch must be referring solely to the variety spoken by the lower strata of the population; we should be cautious of the ideologically loaded presentation given in the pamphlet.⁹⁷ The Old Oligarch’s remarks may be applied to a larger and wider sociolinguistic spectrum that encompasses both lower and higher strata, which, in any case, represents the kind of people who adopted a language that was more receptive to innovative features than that of the conservative classes. Thus, the diastatic divide presupposed by the Old Oligarch also reflects a socio-political divide (i.e. the Old Oligarch opposes the different approach to language of oligarchs and democrats).⁹⁸

This observation invites us to address more closely the ideological issues underlying this passage. Scholars debate whether the Old Oligarch is offering a positive, a neutral, or a negative description of cultural mixing.⁹⁹ As we shall see, the opinions are typically polarised. We shall offer instead a middle path between these opposing approaches and interpretations.

95 According to Mosconi (2022, 69–70), the Old Oligarch hyperbolically describes the language mixture in Athens in terms comparable to the development of a creole language.

96 See Cassio (1981, 83–5).

97 E.g., Lapini (1997, 185) and Mosconi (2022, 53 n. 34) indicate the ‘popolino’ (common people, the masses) as the social stratum to which the Old Oligarch’s remark would refer.

98 See Soverini (1992, 841). Mosconi (2022, 54–5) comments that the Old Oligarch is not concerned with the correctness of the language spoken by the δῆμος, as is the case in the comic passages in which the demagogues’ inability to speak good Attic is ridiculed together with their (alleged) foreign provenance. These comic passages will be examined more closely in Section 3.3. For the time being, we simply wish to point out that speaking a type of Attic contaminated with foreign features and speaking ‘bad’ or low-register Attic are sufficiently closed concepts, and so the issues of language correctness and ‘pure’ Attic may very well be interrelated, at least implicitly, also in the passage from the Old Oligarch.

99 See Willi (2010, 106).

Most scholars conclude that the Old Oligarch espouses a negative view of the import of foreign customs and linguistic features as well as foreign living and dress practices.¹⁰⁰ The implicit but reasonably apparent contention made by the Old Oligarch would be that this process exerts a bad influence on Athenian culture and society. We have seen that cultural mixing is perceived as potentially negative in Attic sources (see Chapter 3, Section 2.5–6). Mosconi (2022) has discussed at length the passage from the Old Oligarch vis-à-vis the rich evidence for Greek approaches to multilingualism and multiculturalism¹⁰¹ and ultimately aims to demonstrate that, according to the Old Oligarch, the Athenian δῆμος has almost forfeited its ethnic identity, that it is open to the possibility of betraying the Greeks and reaching a compromise with the barbarians, and that it speaks like the slaves, whose language is a mixed bag of features collected from Greek dialects and non-Greek languages.¹⁰² The general conclusion is that the Old Oligarch presents the δῆμος as having an intrinsically servile nature and that, were it not for the democratic regime, it would be enslaved. This conclusion is consonant with the pamphlet's general aim and with several explicit claims made by the Old Oligarch.

Other scholars have argued, less convincingly, that the multiculturalism described by [X.] *Ath.* 2.8 is intended by the Old Oligarch not as a criticism of the δῆμος but as one of the positive consequences of Athenian thalassocracy.¹⁰³ In addition to emphasising that the underlying thesis in [X.] *Ath.* 2.2–16 is that the Athenian δῆμος procures himself innumerable and varied advantages thanks to Athens' control over the sea, these scholars have added that, given that the excursus on Attic multiculturalism occurs directly after the section describing the availability in Athens of any sort of foreign food delicacy ([X.] *Ath.* 2.7), the adoption of foreign linguistic usages, ways of living, and clothing should also be interpreted as among the positive consequences of Athens' maritime empire. Furthermore, Gomme (1940, 214) was the first to observe that ἐξελέξαντο implies an almost-conscious process, as though the Athenians were almost 'choosing' or 'selecting' one or the other foreign linguistic feature to adopt like the import delicacies described in the previous paragraph.

100 See, e.g., Soverini (1992, 840–1); Lenfant (2017, 120).

101 On the socio-political perception of multilingualism in antiquity, see also Mosconi (2020).

102 Mosconi (2022, 55–73).

103 See Frisch (1942, 254); Moore (1975, 53); Marr, Rhodes (2008, 110). Lapini (1997, 182–8) offers a more nuanced discussion: based on Antiphon the sophist's *On Truth* (P.Oxy. 11.1364 + 52.3647 + 15.1797 = *CPF* vol. 1,1 Antipho 1–2 = Antipho D 38 Laks–Most), he concludes that the Old Oligarch is praising the Athenians' intellectual curiosity and their cosmopolitanism as superior to those of the other Greeks.

Such polarised opinions may be partly reconciled. First, one cannot agree with the view expressed, for example, by Marr, Rhodes (2008, 110), according to whom ‘there is no moral disapproval’ in the way the Old Oligarch comments on the phenomenon of linguistic (and, more broadly, cultural) mixture allegedly taking place in Athens. Although there is no explicit condemnation, the polemical and critical tone and meaning of the passage is incontrovertible, all the more so since the very idea of cultural mixture has typically derogatory connotations in line with the general Athenian attitude.¹⁰⁴ However, this may not be the case if one adopts the perspective of the δῆμος, which is the perspective that the Old Oligarch adopts to explain the benefits of thalassocracy. The fact that the Old Oligarch presents the views and interests of the δῆμος does not necessarily indicate that he espouses these views. I shall focus on just two more relevant passages.¹⁰⁵ At [X.] *Ath.* 2.9–10, the Old Oligarch comments on the use of public money to finance public sacrifices and feasts and the building of temples, gymnasia, and baths, all things which would be beyond the reach of the (vast majority of the) δῆμος.¹⁰⁶ In these passages, the moral criticism is subtle (though easily recognised), yet both measures described by the Old Oligarch are clearly intended as positive from the perspective of the δῆμος.

An even stronger piece of evidence in support of this conclusion is offered by [X.] *Ath.* 1.19–20: the fact that the Athenians became skilled sailors and, as part of the acquisition of these abilities, they also learned (or perhaps developed, rather) the language of seafaring is also clearly represented, in the wake of a long literary tradition beginning with Hesiod (*Op.* 618–94), as morally and ideologically wrong, despite the fact that there is no explicit remark to this effect; note also that the Athenian citizens who have become experienced rowers are put on precisely the

104 See Cassio (1981, 81); Soverini (1981, 841); V. Gray (2007, 200); Lenfant (2017, 120); Mosconi (2022, 50–1).

105 To place these specific observations within the wider context of the pamphlet, we may stress that the goal of the Old Oligarch is to demonstrate beyond any disagreement regarding politics and ideology how the Athenian δῆμος is able to keep democracy in function (this is already clear at [X.] *Ath.* 1.1, but see also the opposition at [X.] *Ath.* 3.1 between the moral disapproval of the Old Oligarch, which is expressed by οὐκ ὀρθῶς, and his acknowledgement that the δῆμος act in the most congenial way to suit their needs, as indicated by γνώμη).

106 Cf. also [X.] *Ath.* 2.8 concerning the adoption of a foreign σχῆμα by the δῆμος vis-à-vis the statement in [X.] *Ath.* 1.10 that the Athenian citizens did not dress in such a way or adopt an external appearance that makes them easily distinguishable from slaves and metics. As Marr, Rhodes (2008, 112) point out, while the idea at [X.] *Ath.* 1.10 is that the common people would be indistinguishable from the δῆμος because they dress in the same way, at [X.] *Ath.* 2.8 the sense is that thanks to Athenian naval power, new and classy foreign garments were available in Athens.

same level as their slaves.¹⁰⁷ Nonetheless, these new skills represent the indispensable technical and practical abilities that, despite the (explicit or implicit) criticism levelled by the Old Oligarch, are key to enabling the δῆμος to secure its power.¹⁰⁸ Thus, from the perspective of the δῆμος, the acquisition of new linguistic skills must be intended as beneficial. Similarly, it is perfectly possible that at *Ath.* 2.8 also, language mixture was positive in the context of Athens' thalassocracy. Kalinka (1913, 198–9) already concluded that, from the perspective of the δῆμος, the influence of other dialects and foreign languages may have been beneficial. He based this conclusion on the practical observation that the ability to understand the dialect or language of foreign speakers and to adapt one's own to make it intelligible to foreign people may have been regarded by part of the population as facilitating trade and therefore as more important than any purist qualms.¹⁰⁹ As such, Kalinka astutely recognised that the passage's tone is polemical, but he also distinguished between the different perceptions that the δῆμος and the oligarchs may have had with respect to cultural mixing (including language).¹¹⁰

The key consequence of this is that language mixture (obviously in different terms from the presentation given by the Old Oligarch) may therefore have been welcomed – even sought after – by the δῆμος. This observation may testify to the more inclusive and less protectionist attitude towards the Attic dialect among part of the Athenian population. However, the polemic made by the Old Oligarch is likely addressed not only against the lower strata. It seems quite likely that the Old Oligarch may also aim to stigmatise the corrupt language of the young Athenians from elite backgrounds, who are often presented in the literary sources in opposition with traditional values. This corruption may consist in the adoption of prestige features of Ionic origin, as we have seen with regard to the super-standard variety of Attic of Ar. fr. 706 (see Section 3.1), but more may be said in this regard, and we cannot rule out the possibility of a perceived 'debasement' of their language (see Section 3.3).

In the revolutionised scenario of late-5th-century BCE Athenian society and politics, the external threats caused by democracy and thalassocracy may also have

107 See further Lenfant (2017, 102).

108 Already at [X.] *Ath.* 1.2, their ability in seafaring is the main reason why the δῆμος preserve the power. This will be a constant of the pamphlet. Note, also, that crafts and seafaring are required for the conservation of the political status quo, which urges the δῆμος to make ample concessions to the metic population (see [X.] *Ath.* 1.12).

109 Apropos this, Mosconi (2022, 53) draws attention to Pl. *Tht.* 163b.1–163c.7, which mentions teachers and interpreters of foreign languages. As Mosconi observes, these people were probably hired by traders to acquire some knowledge of the foreign language(s) they could use for their profession.

110 See Kalinka (1913, 200).

been a factor in the corruption of the young elites. This relates to some important developments of literary Attic. First, commenting on the passage from the Old Oligarch, Willi (2003a, 160) insightfully remarks that ‘there was a long tradition of ennobling Attic with foreign elements’ and that for some ‘Athenians, ‘prestige’ Attic would have meant an Attic more open to linguistic innovations’. Similarly, Colvin (2020, 79) makes an appealing comparison with the ‘international’ Attic of Xenophon’s writings. Clearly, one cannot posit any continuity between these texts and the passage of the Old Oligarch nor claim that Xenophon ever pursued any democratic agenda by adopting a rich and varied language. Nonetheless, when the Old Oligarch was writing, there were surely emerging tendencies that were willing to accept, maybe even to promote, a more open type of Attic. On the level of literary language, this process is eventually reflected, in addition to Xenophon (see Section 5.1), by the shift in the evolution from the language of Old Comedy to that of Middle and New Comedy (see Section 5.2).

3.3 ‘Bad’ Attic equals ‘bad’ politicians: Plato Comicus, fr. 183 and Eupolis, fr. 99.25

The passages from Aristophanes and the Old Oligarch examined above share an essentially ideological approach to linguistic protectionism, from both a literary and a socio-political perspective. They partake of a similar refusal to innovate, irrespective of whether this is triggered by the upper or lower social classes’ way of speaking. A fragment of Plato Comicus’ *Hyperbolus* adds another example of linguistic protectionism in the context of a socio-political attack (fr. 183):

ὁ δ’ οὐ γὰρ ἠττίκιζεν, ὦ Μοῖραι φίλαι,
 ἄλλ’ ὅποτε μὲν χρεῖη δητώμην λέγειν,
 ἔφασκε δητώμην, ὅποτε δ’ εἰπεῖν δέοι
 ὀλίγον, <ὀλίον> ἔλεγεν

For he did not speak proper Attic, dear Moirai, but whenever he should have said δητώμην, he said δητώμην, when he should have said ὀλίγος, he said ὀλίος.

Although we have no explicit indication of the sources of this fragment,¹¹¹ it is virtually certain (and scholars are unanimous on this) that the person depicted in these lines is Hyperbolus, the play’s eponymous character; as we shall see below,

¹¹¹ The fragment is transmitted in its full form by Hdn. Περὶ μονήρους λέξεως GG 3,2.926.2–8 (= 27.16–22 Papazeti), while *Et.Gen.* AB s.v. ὀλίος (= EM 621.54–5) omits the indication of the play and the text of the fragment.

further indirect pieces of evidence support this identification. According to this description, Hyperbolus would not be able to speak Attic correctly (ὁ δ' οὐ γὰρ ἠττίκιζεν), as demonstrated by his careless pronunciation of διητώμην and ὀλίγος. The context of these lines remains impossible to ascertain, but it is highly likely, as already suggested by Cobet (1840, 141), that Hyperbolus is described as having committed these pronunciation infelicities while speaking at an assembly meeting.¹¹² Let us comment briefly on the mistakes pointed out by Plato Comicus and then discuss the fragment's sociolinguistic relevance.

Plato Comicus focuses on issues of incorrect pronunciation.¹¹³ Colvin (2020, 77) comments that these examples 'could be characterized as the result of an attempt to minimize the effort of articulation'. We have already mentioned something similar with respect to Ar. Nu. 870–3, where it is likely that Strepsiades is ridiculing Pheidippides' and the young intellectuals' loose articulation of the consonants (see above n. 59), but the sociolinguistic register of the phenomena described by Plato Comicus lies at the opposite end of the spectrum from the passage of Aristophanes' *Clouds*. A more to-the-point comparison might therefore be with the fish-sellers' careless manner of speaking as depicted in Middle Comedy by Amphis fr. 30.11–3: καὶ τοτ' οὐ λαλῶν ὄλα | τὰ ρήματ', ἀλλὰ συλλαβὴν ἀφελῶν, 'τάρων | βολῶν γένοιτ' ἄν'. ἡ δὲ κέστρα; 'κτώ βολῶν' ('and then not uttering the whole words, but taking off a syllable, [he would say]: 'That would be four obols'. 'The spet?'. 'Eight obols)').¹¹⁴

The natures of the two phenomena registered by Plato Comicus are not equally clear. The process that is indicated graphically with the omission of -i- in διητώμην (from διητῶμην) proves rather difficult to interpret.¹¹⁵ The development

¹¹² Cobet (1840, 141) suggested comparing Ar. Eq. 626–7: ὁ δ' ἄρ' ἔνδον ἐλασίβροντ' ἀναρρηγνύς ἐπη | τερατευόμενος ἤρειδε κατὰ τῶν ἱππέων ('Inside, breaking out words hurled like thunder, telling tall stories he assaulted the knights'), in which the Sausage Seller describes Paphlagon's threatening speech in the βουλή. We may also compare δημηγορέω in Eup. fr. 99.23, a passage that raises similar problems to that of Plato Comicus, as shown most notably by κούδ' ἄν ἠττίκιζεν of line 25 (on Eupolis' fragment, see below).

¹¹³ We cannot rule out the possibility that Plato Comicus originally provided further examples of Hyperbolus' incorrect Attic, perhaps also including morphological phenomena.

¹¹⁴ Amphis' fragment is one of the many attacks on fish-sellers, whose arrogance and rapacity are often lamented in comedy. Amphis adds that, among other irritating things, fish-sellers also fail to enunciate correctly, being prone to apheresis (βολῶν = ὀβολῶν, κτώ = ὀκτώ) and syllable dropping (τάρων = τετάρων). These colloquial features indicate the fish-sellers' dismissive attitude and bad habits when dealing with customers (see Papachrysostomou 2016, 202–3), but such a shabby manner of speaking is probably also indicative of the fish-sellers' low social status.

¹¹⁵ According to Colvin (2020, 77), the development [i] > [j] in prevocalic position may have caused palatalisation of the dental stop, which would then develop into something similar to an alveolar affricate (Colvin compares the development of the voiced postalveolar affricate /dʒ/ in Italian, as in

implied by ὀλίον, whereby the intervocalic /g/ underwent a form of lenition and developed into [ɣ] and then [j], is more familiar. It has parallels in 4th-century BCE Attic inscriptions and is quite common already in 3rd-century BCE papyri (in either case also giving rise to the insertion of non-etymological -γ- at intervocalic position).¹¹⁶ Plato Comicus' fragment confirms that this development was well underway before it surfaced in inscriptions. In all likelihood, Hyperbolus' alleged pronunciation of ὀλίγος was regarded as a low urban trait.¹¹⁷ Interestingly, this development is also familiar outside Attic. Besides the evidence for ὀλίος in Rhinthon (fr. 2), who wrote in Tarentine Doric,¹¹⁸ the same development of intervocalic /g/ after a palatal and before a velar vowel is attested in the pronoun ἐγώ in Boeotian (see ἰώγα in Ar. *Ach.* 898, paralleled by ἰώνγα and ἰώνει in Corinn. fr. 664 *PMG*).¹¹⁹ These parallels, which concern a different word but present the same phonetic environment as ὀλίγος, may be a further indication of the kind of subterranean features shared between Boeotian and the lower varieties of Attic that only rarely surface in writing.¹²⁰

However we interpret these phonetic processes, the criticism levelled by Plato Comicus against Hyperbolus addresses a more fundamental aspect than pronunciation mistakes. Hyperbolus' use of an informal or colloquial variety of Attic indicates that he belongs to the lower stratum of the population and, therefore, that his condition borders on that of a foreigner rather than a true Athenian. This point is also made clear in Pl.Com. fr. 185 (= schol. (Γ₂Δ) Luc. *Tim.* 30, 114.28 Rabe), also from *Hy-*

Latin *diurnum* > Italian *giorno*). As Colvin (2020) acknowledges, these developments are difficult to indicate graphically, and the evidence is scanty. Omission of -t- in this linguistic context is very limited in Attic inscriptions (see Threatte 1980, 393–5, who says that Plato Comicus' fragment is the only solid evidence of this), and neither in Attica nor in Boeotia do we have solid textual evidence for the influence that the development [i] > [j] may have had on the preceding consonant. Colvin also refers to the influential study by Méndez Dosuna (1993a) to suggest that the synizesis of [i] and [e] in postconsonantal and prevocalic position was probably common in vernacular Attic and Boeotian and other dialects. However, the phenomena discussed by Méndez Dosuna differ substantially from δητῶμην > δητῶμην (note also that the omission of -t- is actually documented in Syracusan Doric after [s] – e.g. *φασέω > φασῶ via an unattested stage *[phasjɔː] – but the sibilant did not undergo palatalisation [s] > [ʃ], as suggested by Colvin regarding [dij] > [dʒj]; see Méndez Dosuna 1993b, 128 n. 71). On the development [i] > [j], its effect on the preceding consonants, and the placement of the accent, see Scheller (1951, 93–126, who at 103–4 also considers Plato Comicus' fragment); Hackstein (2002, 30–1).

116 See Threatte (1980, 440–1); Mayser (*Gramm.* vol. 1.1, 141–3). This is a phonological development characteristic of Modern Greek.

117 See Colvin (1999, 282); Colvin (2000, 290).

118 See Favi (2017, 132–6).

119 See Lejeune (1972, 56); Colvin (1999, 163–4).

120 On the role of Boeotian, see also Sections 3.1; 5.2.

perbolus, in which we are told that Plato Comicus portrayed Hyperbolus as a Lydian and that other sources ascribed him other (allegedly) foreign backgrounds. Among these further sources alluded to by the scholium to Lucian's *Timon*, we must surely include Eupolis, whose *Marikas* is the comic rendition of Hyperbolus, portrayed as a person of servile condition and Asiatic origin.¹²¹ The consequence of these allegations, irrespective of their truth, is that although Hyperbolus is active in Athenian politics, he is destitute of any right to be so and people should thus be wary of giving him any credit. These features are all characteristic of demagogue comedy.¹²² Since the new Athenian politicians did not belong to old propertied families but instead derived their recent wealth from craftsmanship, manufacturing, or trade, they were portrayed not only as belonging to a lower social classes, but their (allegedly) philistine professions also caused them to be suspected of not being genuine Athenians; hence, their widespread presentation as slaves or barbarians.¹²³

What makes Plato Comicus' fragment a more remarkable case in the context of the parody of demagogues is that ἀττικίζω is not merely another reference to Hyperbolus' foreign parentage and his lack of fluency in Greek but it specifically targets his inability to speak good Attic.¹²⁴ As noticed by Cassio (1981, 86–7) commenting on ὀλίος in this fragment, Plato Comicus may have exploited the similarity between a pronunciation that was both common in Athens among the lower strata and that was also common in foreign Greek dialects. This highlights the acknowledged existence of different sociolinguistic registers within the community of Attic speakers and their perceived relevance, which made them useful targets for political attack as only some of these registers were regarded as genuinely Attic. Plato Comicus' fragment thus presents in highly explicit terms the implicitly prescriptive attitude of Aristophanes' fragment 706.

An important parallel to the fragment of Plato Comicus is represented by a passage of Eupolis' *Demes* that also deals with the political implications of the verb ἀττικίζω. While the interpretation of ἀττικίζω in Plato Comicus is relatively

¹²¹ See especially Cassio (1985b).

¹²² Compare Cleon, the notorious Paphlagonian in Aristophanes' *Knights*, and Cleophon, who in *Frogs* (674–85) is described as a roaring Thracian nightingale whose lips are ἀμφιγλωσσός 'talking both ways' (i.e. Greek and Thracian; see Dover 1993, 277–8); the scholia (schol. Ar. Ra. 618a–b = Pl. Com. fr. 61) add that in *Cleophon*, Plato Comicus also portrayed Cleophon's mother as a Thracian woman who spoke broken Greek to him. A similar presentation of the demagogues, likely to have been influenced by Old Comedy, occurs in a passage of Plato's first *Alcibiades* (120b.1–5).

¹²³ See Wankel (1974, 87).

¹²⁴ This is not an irrelevant distinction. The sources to which we owe the fragment say that Plato Comicus describes Hyperbolus' pronunciation as βάρβαρον (see Hdn. Περὶ μονήρους λέξεως GG 3,2.926.2–8 = 27.17 Papazeti and *Et.Gen.* AB s.v. ὀλίος (= EM 621.54–5)).

straightforward, the function and meaning of the verb in the passage of Eupolis' *Demes* require closer inspection and more sustained attention (fr. 99.23–9):

]ι κάξιοῑ δημηγορεῖν,
 χθές δὲ καὶ πρόην παρ' ἡμῖν φρατέρων ἔρημιος ὢν
 κούδ' ἂν ἠττίκιζεν, εἰ μὴ τοὺς φίλους ἤσχύν[ετο.
 τῶν ἀπραγμόνων γε πόρνων κούχι τῶν σεμνῶν [
 ἀλλ' ἔδει νεύσαντα χωρεῖν εἰς τὸ κινητήρ[ιον·
 τῆς ἑταιρίας δὲ τούτων τοὺς φίλους ἔσκ[ι
 ταῖς στρατηγίαις δ' ὑφέρπει καὶ τρυγῶδο]

. . . and he thinks it appropriate to be a political leader, even though yesterday or the day before he had no phratry-brothers among us; and he would not even speak Attic, if he were not embarrassed in front of his friends. Of the apolitical whores, at any rate, and not the haughty ones . . . but he should have nodded his head and entered the brothel; but friends of the club of these people . . . and he sneaks up on the generalships, . . . and the comic . . . (Translation by Olson 2017, 316, with modifications).

Eupolis' fragment 99 is the longest fragment preserved from *Demes*.¹²⁵ Interpretation of this passage, however, is particularly thorny.¹²⁶ The chorus targets an unidentified politician, who is depicted with demagogic connotations, for his moral and political conduct. However, his profile is not immediately clear, and this complicates our understanding of the function of ἀττίκιζω. Owing to space limitations, in the following, we shall address only the exegetical issues that are more strictly relevant to this point.¹²⁷

At lines 23–9, the chorus counters the politician's claims that he is entitled to participate actively in Athenian politics based on three main allegations. First, the politician has (allegedly) only recently been admitted into a phratry, and so prior to that, he was not even a citizen; this means not only that he is young but also that someone questioned whether he had any right to become a citizen, let alone actively participate in politics.¹²⁸ Second, he would not even speak Attic were he

125 On the collocation of the fragment into the play see lastly Olson (2017, 296–310).

126 For other recent discussions see Storey (2003, 149–60); Telò (2007, 358–87); Olson (2017, 335–45).

127 Scholars normally call him a demagogue (see, e.g., Telò 2007, 318), but Sartori (1975, 32–3) argues against this. We have adopted the less loaded term 'politician'. On the politician's identification, see Storey (2003, 153–60); Telò (2007, 387–9 and 397–401); Olson (2017, 335–6 and 341–2).

128 This has been compared with the topos of the demagogues' barbaric parentage (see above Pl.Com. fr. 183; Dunbar 1995, 137–8 and 472–3 on Execestides at Ar. Av. 764–5), or it may indicate that the unidentified politician was an illegitimate son born out of wedlock or conceived by an Athenian and a slave (see Dover 1993, 248 on Archedemus in Ar. Ra. 416–21; Heracles too is de-

not ashamed not to do so in front of his friends.¹²⁹ Third, his connections are with people who are traditionally disinterested in politics and whose sexual life is promiscuous. Such allegations are topical in political comedy.¹³⁰ The demagogues' way of speaking was typically ridiculed by the comic poets, and the same *topos* may be present in our fragment. Based on the parallel use of ἀττικίζω in the comic depiction of Hyperbolus in Plato Comicus, scholars have concluded that Eupolis is saying that the unidentified politician was of foreign parentage and therefore unable to speak good Attic.¹³¹ However, as Olson (2017, 337) observed, Eupolis makes a rather different point from Plato Comicus. While Hyperbolus was unable to speak Attic properly, the politician attacked by Eupolis would not speak (good) Attic, which he eventually does to avoid being embarrassed in front of his friends. This indicates that the politician is capable of speaking 'good' or 'bad' Attic and that pressure from his peers prevents him from speaking 'bad' Attic. Olson's interpretation is sound and contributes to a more satisfactory reading of the fragment.¹³² We may expand on this point, taking in a few additional elements. The difference with Hyperbolus does not lie solely in the politician's more educated profile. As we shall suggest, his proficiency in code-switching is part of a populist strategy, a simulation by which he attempts to acquire political power through consensus.

Lines 26–8 are crucial to a better understanding of ἀττικίζω.¹³³ The sense of this passage must be that the politician's acquaintances are reproachable rather than decent people.¹³⁴ Thus, an opposition is clearly drawn between the politically

picted at Ar. Av. 1669–70 as an illegitimate son not yet enrolled in the phratry, see Dunbar 1995, 734). On the late enrolment in a phratry, see MacDowell (1993, 364–8).

129 The implied context must be that of speaking in a political assembly, as in Pl.Com. fr. 183 (see above).

130 See Storey (2003, 150).

131 See Colvin (1999, 284); Storey (2003, 150); Telò (2007, 364–5); Novokhatko (2020a, 27). Telò (2007, 374–7) also connects ἀττικίζω with νεύω of line 27 and concludes that νεύσαντα indicate non-verbal communication, since the politician is unable to speak Attic. This is unlikely and self-contradictory. Telò deals with this passage as though the chorus were saying that the unidentified politician did not speak at all, which is not the case. Additionally, the demagogues are depicted either as bilingual who speak (bad?) Greek and foreign languages (e.g. Cleophon) or as speakers of a low variety of Attic (e.g. Hyperbolus) but not as people switching from 'bad' to 'good' Attic according to political convenience, which is the situation portrayed by Eupolis (see further below). νεύω probably indicates the nod made by the prostitute/politician to indicate an agreement with a potential client and lure him into the κινητήριον.

132 See also Sartori (1975, 36), although his claim that the politician would not speak 'good' Attic gladly is unsupported.

133 On the difficulties posed by the lacuna, see Storey (2003, 151); Telò (2007, 366–8).

134 See Storey (2003, 152).

loaded categories of ἀπράγμονες πόρνοι and ἀπράγμονες σεμνοί.¹³⁵ In Eupolis, it is likely that the ἀπράγμονες σεμνοί are the respectable and honest aristocrats who represent the traditional values and stay away from corrupt politics, whereas the ἀπράγμονες πόρνοι are the younger, degenerated exponents of that category.¹³⁶ Let us briefly discuss this opposition.

The ‘good’ ἀπράγμονες are the members of the Athenian socio-economic upper strata who were scarcely active in politics and whose relationship with radical democracy was problematic.¹³⁷ They correspond to the rich quietists described by Carter (1986, 99–130). Bdelycleon in Aristophanes’ *Wasps* may well embody a ‘good’ ἀπράγμων.¹³⁸ In addition to the other features that make him an ἀπράγμων (such as his being disinterested in democratic life), he is described as having haughty manners (V. 134–5) and this reminds one closely of the ἀπράγμονες σεμνοί described by Eupolis. The ‘bad’ ἀπράγμονες are the kind of corrupt youths often described as Athens’ late-5th-century BCE decadent *jeunesse dorée*.¹³⁹ These corrupt youths are reckless with respect to both litigation and politics (Ar. *Ach.* 679–82, 685–8, 703–18; *Nu.* 1019), systematically exploit the common people in pursuit of personal profit (V. 682–95), and represent the younger antagonists of the demagogues (see Ar. *Eq.* 875–80 and fr. 424).¹⁴⁰ They are inspired by the sophists and their language: they use their linguistic skills to trick old politicians and to get themselves out of trouble (see Ar. fr. 205; *Ach.* 685–8 and 703–18; *Eq.*

135 See Telò (2007, 368–9). On ἀπραγμοσύνη see Ehrenberg (1947); Sartori (1975, 38–59); Carter (1986); Bearzot (2007b, 121–41).

136 See also Tammaro (1979, 423). Sartori (1975, 59–60) also posited an opposition between the ἀπράγμονες σεμνοί, presented in a positive light and not treated as an ethical or political threat, and the ἀπράγμονες πόρνοι, corrupt and evil, but the identification of these categories as, respectively, the orthodox and the fake followers of Anaxagoras is hazardous.

137 Figures such as Callias have been identified as the kind of ἀπράγμονες σεμνοί to whom the chorus of *Demes* is alluding (see Napolitano 2012, 50–2, who also discusses Nicias as a ‘good’ ἀπράγμων). Rich and poor ἀπράγμονες may be the victims of demagogues and sycophants (see Ar. *Eq.* 261–3, V. 1037–42, and Eup. fr. 19; see Napolitano 2012, 52–3 and Olson 2016, 181–8). Telò (2007, 368–9) says that the ἀπράγμονες are, by definition, the young Athenians of the late 5th century BCE who hang out in the gymnasias, are involved in homosexual relationships, and are imbued with philosophical teachings, but this applies only to younger figures and not to people such as Nicias or Callias (see Napolitano 2012, 52–4).

138 Carter (1986, 63–75).

139 Carter (1986, 119–25). The young, effeminate city intellectuals who speak the super-standard variety of Attic described in Ar. fr. 706 are also an example of this category (see Section 3.1). Such individuals are probably alluded to in other fragments of *Demes* (fr. *104, on which see Telò 2007, 241–57 and Olson 2017, 385–8; fr. *116, on which see Telò 2007, 207–12, and in part. 210–2 on λαλέω, and Olson 2017, 418–21).

140 See Storey (2003, 151).

1375–81).¹⁴¹ The ‘bad’ ἀπράγμονες are presented as effeminate and passive homosexuals (*Ach.* 716; *Nu.* 1022–3; *V.* 686–8), are suspected of being male prostitutes (*Eq.* 875–80), or at least of behaving as such to seduce other men (*Nu.* 979–80). They are also suspected of being of foreign parentage or of having been conceived in an adulterine relationship (see *Ach.* 704–5 and 710–2; MacDowell 1993, 262–4). Considering their aristocratic background and their sophistic inspiration, they represent oligarchic positions, and in fact, the allies of the politician attacked by Eupolis are described as his φίλοι and their group is an ἑταιρία, both of which indicate an oligarchic orientation. To support this interpretation of the passage of Eupolis’ *Demes* we may compare *Ar. Nu.* 1007, in which the Better Argument opposes the corrupt habits taught by the Worse Argument, exemplified by many of the traits collected here, with the ‘good’ ἀπραγμοσύνη, which he recommends instead to Pheidippides to practise.

The politician described by Eupolis is consonant with the profile of the corrupt Athenian youths.¹⁴² He is not the traditional demagogue, whose ‘humble’ familiar background and philistine profession would justify the claim that he is unable to speak ‘good’ Attic.¹⁴³ Indeed, as far as ἀττικίζω is concerned, it appears that Eupolis is saying that the politician would be prepared to fake a low variety of Attic to present himself as a man of the people, although he refrains from doing so to avoid embarrassment in front of his friends. Presumably, the politi-

¹⁴¹ See Cassio (1977, 32–6; 43–9).

¹⁴² For Telò (2007, 369–73), the ἀπράγμονες πόρνοι are people from the lower classes who enter the elite circles of the aristocratic ἀπράγμονες, but owing to their humble extraction must prostitute themselves. Telò’s interpretation rests on the assumption that πόρνος must be taken in the literal sense of actual male prostitutes; hence, the reference to the κινήτριον must also be taken at face value. It is preferable to take πόρνος in a less literal sense, or in any case, to consider it a typical comic slander. On πόρνος ‘male prostitute’ and more loosely indicating a passive homosexual, see Arnott (1996, 685). Storey (2003, 152) too admits that πόρνος may refer to moral corruption. In addition, notice that the *hapax* κινήτριον is a comic neologism based on the names of assembly-places such as δικαστήριον or βουλευτήριον, and so the sense of the passage is figurative rather than concrete.

¹⁴³ The reference to ἀπραγμοσύνη is also incompatible with this (see Storey 2003, 151). Telò (2007, 365 and 379–80) solves this difficulty by claiming that the demagogue and his group are a ‘twisted’ kind of oligarchic ἑταιρία. Tuci (2014) follows Telò and suggests that the politician attacked by Eupolis was originally a democrat who joined the oligarchs in the coup of 411. But how can the politician and his friends simultaneously be oligarchic ἀπράγμονες and represent a distinct group from the ‘real’ oligarchic ἀπράγμονες? And why would the politician be ashamed of speaking ‘bad’ Attic in front of his friends, if they are all from the lower classes or originally belonged to the democratic side? The ‘paradoxical’ interpretation results in a series of unnecessary complications.

cian and his friends form a linguistically coherent group, which shares the sociolect of the young intellectuals/politicians of their generation.¹⁴⁴

In sum, the politician targeted by Eupolis is aware that adopting a lower form of Attic would be a successful strategy to obtain consensus and acquire political power. The gullibility of the masses is topical in 5th-century BCE sources.¹⁴⁵ Political transformism of this nature recalls figures such as Alcibiades (an eminent example of the corrupt youths of the *jeunesse dorée*, see Ar. *Ach.* 716 and fr. 205), although he is unlikely to be the person attacked by Eupolis in this passage (although he is often satirised in comedy).¹⁴⁶ Further, the fact that the politician is associated with people called πόρνοι may well indicate a willingness to debase himself to gain material profit – in this case, to obtain a political advantage.¹⁴⁷ Pretending to speak a low form of Attic would therefore be entirely compatible with this interpretation, and we might even consider it a form of prostitution.

3.4 ‘Good’, ‘bad’, ‘low’, ‘high’: An Attic ‘purism’ *ante litteram*

Analysis of these four passages reveals that a form of proto-purism – or, at any rate, linguistic chauvinism – was an integral part of 5th-century BCE Athenian socio-political discourse. Several factors may have contributed to this including the socio-demographic changes in the Attic population, the evolving political scene, the appearance of new prominent figures, the prestige of new cultural trends and their influence on the upper strata of the population. All these elements are involved, in more or less explicit terms, in the sources examined above.

That which these sources present as a violation of ‘good’ Attic may be on both the sub- and the super-standard levels.¹⁴⁸ Either of these opposing tendencies is associated with certain demerits and may pose a threat to Athens’ socio-political well-being. The fundamental problem that the sources emphasise is that the ‘new’

144 Note that the young, intellectually trained συνήγοροι must have been renowned for their innovative way of speaking (see Ar. fr. 205; *Ach.* 685–8 and 703–18; *Eq.* 1375–81).

145 See especially Eur. *Supp.* 240–3 (see Section 3.1) and Ar. *V.* 666–8; 698–9. In the latter, compare the *hapax* verb δημίζω, indicating the politicians who pretend to be on the side of the δῆμος only to exploit it (see MacDowell 1971, 227; Biles, Olson 2015, 306).

146 See Dover (1993, 370–1). An illustrative depiction of Alcibiades’ political transformism is offered by [And.] 4 (esp. 4.16 and 4.39).

147 This parallels the presentation of the pursuit of material profit as a form of debasement in the Old Oligarch (see Section 3.2).

148 Unfortunately, the extant sources offer relatively limited exemplification of what they consider sub- or super-standard Attic. In the previous sections, we have indicated some possible interpretations, and others may be considered. See also Willi (2010a, 105).

language that was seething under the surface of traditional Attic would ultimately undermine the social cohesion of Athens, in the sense that, unlike the more reassuring traditional Attic, the new language encourages and reflects the individuals' personalistic aspirations. Therefore, these sources recommend the preservation of a moderately conservative language that poses no danger to the good order of things. This presupposes the idea of a 'neuter' or 'unmarked' variety of traditional Attic that, although it is never really defined, should represent the 'pure' language.

The socio-political implications of this are clear. On the one hand, 'bad' Attic is associated with populist values. This usually reflects the behaviour of demagogues, who nominally perform good on behalf of the δῆμος only to exploit it in the interest of personal profit. 'Bad' Attic also exposes the politicians who are unfit for office by virtue of their backgrounds, as it reflects their lack of the personal qualities required to hold a leading position on the political stage. Note also that unscrupulous politicians may also pretend to use 'bad' Attic as a way of deceiving the δῆμος. On the other hand, super-standard Attic is perceived as equally dangerous. It is typically associated with the youths of the urban elites, who are not merely effeminate or prone to question the values of traditional education under the influence of the sophists but who as politicians are aggressive, unprincipled, unreliable, ready to deceive, and often nurturing oligarchic aspirations. This evidence indicates that any deviation from a balanced and traditional form of ἀττικίζειν, whether in the direction of adopting the super- or the sub-standard, may result in a failure to do what is considered good for Athenian politics. Thus, failing to ἀττικίζειν indicates failing to represent Athens' true interests. Somehow, it is still possible to detect in the use of this verb the kind of semantic duplicity of the verbs in -ίζω, indicating the adoption of a certain political side and a certain language.¹⁴⁹

These conservative views about the Attic dialect are certainly influenced by the Athenian rhetoric of autochthony and the pride deriving from it (see Chapter 3), to the effect that the Attic dialect became a value in itself and an element of local identity that should be defended.¹⁵⁰ It is surely remarkable that two of the sources discussed above contain the first instances of ἀττικίζω in the meaning 'to speak Attic'. Interestingly, in these sources, the opposition is not drawn simply between Greek and non-Greek (e.g. according to the stereotype that the 'barbar-

¹⁴⁹ See Casevitz (1991); Tronci (2013). Novokhatko (2020a) collects examples for the use of these verbs to indicate speaking a language.

¹⁵⁰ The political and ideological relevance of preserving the Attic dialect is already an element in Solon's claim (fr. 36.7–12 West) that, thanks to his new legislation, he managed to return to Athens many Athenians who, having either gone into exile or having been sold as slaves, had forgotten how to speak Attic.

ians' are stupid),¹⁵¹ or between Attic and any other Greek dialect. In a much more poignant sense, the opposition is deeply rooted within the very notion of ἀττικίζω, whereby speaking ('good') Attic is opposed to any violation of this standard, which is simply discarded as non-Attic. It is possible that this use of ἀττικίζω may also reflect the emerging notion of the primacy of Attic in the context of the Greek dialects, as indicated by the Thucydides passage in which non-Athenian ναῦται are admired by foreign Greeks for their acquired 'Atticness' in both language and way of life.¹⁵² Moreover, since the Attic dialect and way of life serve as a model and an aspiration, they allow no half measures in the eyes of those who seek to defend them and the values they represent.¹⁵³

4 4th-century BCE Attic and beyond: A language on the move, towards the koine

The 4th century BCE marks a turning point in Athenian history and culture. In the aftermath of her defeat in the Peloponnesian War, Athenian society entered a further period of progressive, though rapid, evolution.¹⁵⁴ Two main aspects are noteworthy. The loss of her maritime empire resulted in a seismic change in Athens' economy (nor would the Second Athenian League alter this significantly), and citizen taxation became Athens' main source of public income.¹⁵⁵ Additionally, by the 360s, the Athenian state was forced to introduce military conscription according to age group. These changes affected the way in which Athenian citizens viewed their role in society, and their interests became increasingly directed towards the private sphere. Indeed, contemporary sources stigmatise the behaviour of those 'bad citizens' who are solely concerned with their personal interests to the detriment of public well-being (e.g. trying to conceal their wealth and to avoid military conscription). It is not incidental that an increased interest in the management of the household and in the writing of λόγοι οἰκονομικοί are a

151 On the different degrees of sociolinguistic acceptability of foreign speakers in Aristophanes, see Willi (2002b, 142–9).

152 See Thuc. 7.63.3. On the identification of the non-Athenian ναῦται (metics?; paid sailors?), see Hornblower (1991–2008 vol. 3, 677–9).

153 On this 'ideal' representation of 'Atticness', see Chapter 3, Sections 2.5–6.

154 On the different socio-economic and socio-political characteristics of 4th-century BCE Athens, see Christ (2006) (who usefully compared 5th- and 4th-century BCE Athens and pointed out the differences in attitude); M. Valente (2014); M. Valente (2015). For a comprehensive and far-reaching analysis of the transformations of 4th-century BCE Athenian democracy, see Musti (1997, 175–241).

155 Unsurprisingly, taxation became a comic motif (see Di Giuseppe 2014).

4th-century BCE innovation.¹⁵⁶ Of course, this is not to say that self-interest was not also a concern of 5th-century BCE Athenians, only that, owing to the mutated social conditions, the pursuit of self-interest and the declining involvement in politics (in a broad sense) are distinctive features of 4th-century BCE Athenian society.

Amid these changing circumstances, the Attic dialect did not remain unaffected. The 4th century BCE was a time of highly influential development in the history of Greek. Although the naval empire had collapsed and despite the re-enactment of the League in the 4th century BCE, Attic continued to spread beyond the borders of Attica, partly because of the literary prestige of Athenian culture,¹⁵⁷ partly because of the lasting influence of Athens on trade.¹⁵⁸ Attic thus rapidly became a prestigious supra-regional variety, also exerting an influence on other local varieties, notably Ionic. This phenomenon resulted in the gradual development of an ‘international’ form of Attic that Albert Thumb influentially called *Großattisch*.¹⁵⁹ This type of Attic was characterised by the compromise between the retention of distinctively Attic features and the loss of others for which forms taken from other dialects, mostly (but not exclusively) Ionic, were introduced. It is possible that some of these innovative traits may already have been present in spoken Attic at an earlier stage, although they were avoided in literary and epigraphic texts that adopted a more conservative language. As already discussed, the bastardised Attic lamented by the Old Oligarch’s *Constitution of the Athenians* may refer to this process at the lower end of the sociolinguistic scale, but the influence of Ionic was also detectable at the higher (literary) level (see Sections 2.1; 3.2; 3.3). The historical significance of *Großattisch* is that this new variety is the antecedent from which the koine, which has a predominant Attic basis enriched with elements of foreign (mostly Ionic) provenance, will eventually develop.¹⁶⁰

156 See Pomeroy (1994, 31–40); M. Valente (2011, 5–10).

157 On the circulation of Attic dramatic literature abroad (e.g. comedy in Isoc. 8.14), see Taplin (1993); Taplin (2007); Boshier (2012); Poli Palladini (2013); Castellaneta (2021).

158 Note, also, that the Athenian colonists and cleruchs in the Aegean islands retained the Attic dialect and Athenian customs (see, e.g., Thuc. 7.57.2). This must have been another important factor in the dissemination of Attic abroad.

159 On *Großattisch*, see Thumb (1901); Thumb (1906); Horrocks (2010, 75–7). On the evidence from Attica and abroad and what it can reveal about the evolution of Attic and its influence on other varieties (notably, Ionic), see especially López Eire (1993); López Eire (1997); Crespo (2004); Crespo (2006). On the Attic elements in early Ionic inscriptions see Dover (1997, 86–7); Adrados (2005, 138).

160 On the early koine, including its development from *Großattisch*, besides the already mentioned studies by Thumb (1901) and Thumb (1906), see López Eire (1981–1982); Brixhe (1993); Brixhe (1996); Cassio (1998); Brixhe (2001); Adrados (2005, 177–8); Colvin (2009); Kaczko (2016).

As we shall see, evidence suggests that the Athenians were perfectly aware that their language was undergoing significant changes. A series of comic fragments from the 4th and early 3rd centuries BCE comment in very eloquent terms on this (see Sections 4.1; 4.2). But transformations were also gaining ground on the literary side. The 4th century BCE is a time of experimentation and evolution in the literary language. Pulls in different directions cause different genres and authors to interpret the dialectics between innovation and conservation differently. On the one hand, attention towards linguistic realism becomes more and more detectable (notably, in the language of comedy). In the new Athenian society, in which personal concerns predominated, it is unsurprising that the divide between the more colloquial language of comedy and the language of oratory, which is suited to formal situations, grew larger. On the other hand, literary Attic progressively developed into a more ‘international’ language, both in the sense that it developed into a linguistic variety that could be adopted by writers who were not Athenians and did not write exclusively or primarily for an Athenian audience (e.g. Aeneas the Tactician) and that Attic writers also began to experiment using new linguistic resources that looked beyond the local tradition (e.g. Xenophon).

4.1 Old and New Attic: Between bewilderment and curiosity

The main sources commenting on linguistic variation in 5th-century BCE Attic express polarised views concerning ‘good’ and ‘bad’ Attic and aim to emphasise the sociolinguistic implications of linguistic variation (see Section 2). In 4th-century BCE sources, also as a consequence of Athens’ mutated conditions (see Section 4), the perception of linguistic conservatism as an element of socio-political distinction is far less evident, and the socio-political reflex of linguistic variation is not commented on.¹⁶¹ As we shall see, new and/or uncommon uses may be pointed

161 We should briefly touch on the passage of Plato’s *Cratylus* (418b.7–e.4) in which the Athenian women are credited with a more conservative language than men. The two examples discussed by Plato are the (alleged) pronunciation ἡμέρα in place of ἡμέρα and δουγόν (i.e. *δουαγόν) in place of ζυγόν, which serve to forge an etymological connection (among other options) with ἡμερος and δῶ + ἄγω (see the catalogue of etymologies in *Cratylus* in Teodorsson 1974, 254–6). Scholars have attempted to take these etymologies as evidence that /ε:/ > /i:/ and /sd/ > /dz/ took place during Plato’s lifetime (see, e.g., Willi 2003a, 161–2; Colvin 2020, 80–2). However, it remains difficult to trust Plato’s passage. The other evidence for a 5th- or 4th-century BCE development /ε:/ > /i:/ is dubious (see Teodorsson 1974, 186; Threatte 1980, 165–70; Allen 1987, 74–5; Threatte 2007, 118–9; 131–4). One fails to see how δυ- might indicate initial [dz] (on the spelling variation of the sound corresponding to -ζ- see Teodorsson 1974, 139–40 and 225–7; Threatte 1980, 546–50). Plato’s attempt to establish a

out and occasionally criticised, but this does not appear to give way to socio-political implications in terms comparable to what was observed in 5th-century BCE sources, and the discussion about such forms is not integral to a wider sociolinguistic or socio-cultural critique. It is also noteworthy that when Plato refers to a demagogic politician's lack of linguistic proficiency (*Alc.*1 120b.1–5), he clearly has in mind the stereotype of the demagogues as portrayed in 5th-century BCE comedy. This is an early example of the way in which later (even only slightly later) sources use (preferably) Old Comedy as a preferred lens through which to interpret Athens' sociolinguistic situation (and the Atticists will inherit this attitude).

For example, Demosthenes may ridicule Aeschines for his vocal mannerism (see D. 19.337–40) and his unnecessarily flowery and poetic diction despite his (allegedly) obscure birth (see, e.g., D. 18.127–8). There are, indeed, some similarities with the kind of abuse that we find in Old Comedy, but Aeschines' lack of command of 'good' Attic is not mentioned by Demosthenes, who focuses instead on his lack of refinement and good taste. Even in the case of Philip II, whose Greekness was dubious and who is often called a barbarian by Demosthenes, his command of Greek is never targeted.¹⁶² Similarly, in the oration *Against Ctesiphon*, Aeschines says that Demosthenes was born to a Scythian mother and that, although his language was Greek, his *πονηρία* was not truly Greek or Athenian (*Aeschin.* 3.172). Revealingly, and unlike 5th-century BCE sources, no connection is made between faulty language and being non-Athenian or non-Greek.

Only twice do Demosthenes' speeches refer to allegations that the citizen status of people who speak in an incorrect or foreign-sounding fashion is dubious. This is unsurprising, and indeed, one of the people involved was likely a foreigner, while the other admittedly had lived abroad for many years. Therefore, the relevant point is that the use of 'good' Attic does not play the same political role as it did in the 5th century BCE. The more relevant case is the instance of *σολοικίζω* in Demosthenes, which occurs in *Against Stephanus 1* (45.30).¹⁶³ This speech was delivered by

meaningful etymological connection is evident (Teodorsson 1974, 258–60 too admits that these materials defy evaluation). On Plato's passage, see also Cuzzolin (2017).

¹⁶² This is also reasonable considering that the Athenian audience hardly ever heard Philip speak, and so questioning his manner of speaking and taking it as further proof of his being a barbarian would perhaps be less effective.

¹⁶³ In Demosthenes' speech *Against Eubulides*, we have, in turn, an occurrence of *ξενίζω* 'to speak with a foreign accent' (57.18–9). In this speech (addressed to the Heliastic court in Athens), Euxitheus appeals against the decision of his deme, Halimus, which denied him citizen rights and reduced him to the status of metic. Euxitheus replies to a speech delivered by Eubulides, the deme's prefect. Among the motivations for doubting that Euxitheus' parents were both citizens (and, therefore, that Euxitheus too was a citizen), is the fact that Euxitheus' father had a foreign accent (cf. τὸ ξενίσειν αὐτοῦ). Euxitheus confidently refutes this allegation, explaining that his

Apollodorus of Acharnae (probably in 350/349).¹⁶⁴ The trial was a continuation of that involving Apollodorus and Phormio regarding Apollodorus' father's will, which was the object of Demosthenes' speech *For Phormio*. In *Against Stephanus 1*, Apollodorus accuses Stephanus of bearing false witness and Phormio of falsifying the will. In discussing Phormio's machinations, Apollodorus of Acharnae addresses the audience, saying that Phormio may be considered a contemptible barbarian because of his poor use of language; indeed, Phormio's non-Greek origins are repeatedly mentioned in this speech (see also 45.73 and 45.81).¹⁶⁵ However, Phormio's 'otherness' is rapidly set aside, and the speaker adds that while Phormio is in fact a barbarian insofar as he hates the people he should respect, he is second to none in committing petty crimes. The condescending remark about being a contemptible barbarian whose command of Greek is faulty is clearly secondary and only serves to introduce a rather different point (i.e. that Phormio is dishonest by nature), which also corrects the point made about being a barbarian; notice that in the final clause, it appears that being a barbarian would be the same as not being effective in committing anything.

Middle and New Comedy are undoubtedly the most important source for the growing awareness in 4th-century BCE Athenian society that the Attic dialect was undergoing important changes.¹⁶⁶ Several fragments address linguistic matters using identical or very similar formulations; a recurring scheme is to have one character use an uncommon form which the other character criticises or about whose meaning they ask for clarification. The fact that no precise parallel is known from Old Comedy might be attributable solely to chance, but the lack of any such example in Aristophanes speaks volumes, as does the fact that the only partial exception occurs in the late *Plutus*.¹⁶⁷ All this makes it tempting to consider this recurring comic scheme of Middle and New Comedy as further proof of

father's foreign accent, which he does acknowledge, is attributable to his having been taken prisoner and having lived abroad for many years.

164 On this speech, see Scafuro (2011, 215–30).

165 The oration *For Phormio* had also been recited by a supporter of Phormio (perhaps Demosthenes), according to MacDowell (2004, 151), either because of Phormio's poor Greek or because of old age.

166 See Cassio (1975, 395).

167 On the pragmatics of questions in this type of scene, see Thomson (1939, 148). The same question-and-answer scheme is possibly attested in the comic poet Alcaeus (fr. 2), where the form under discussion is *δίτυροι*. The attribution of this fragment is uncertain, though, and Eubulus (who is quoted alongside Alcaeus in one of the sources of the fragment, see Eub. fr. *17) may also be a candidate (see Orth 2013, 35–7). The lack of other parallels in Old Comedy might support the ascription to Eubulus. Yet, since Alcaeus is in several respects a representative of the transitional phase from Old to Middle Comedy, it would not be surprising that one of his fragments might

a distinctive sensibility of 4th-century BCE society towards linguistic innovation. As already discussed, the 5th-century BCE sources also show in rather explicit terms an awareness of the transformations that Attic was undergoing. However, while 5th-century BCE authors target innovation and, at the same time, hardly ever reflect on the evolution of the dialect, later sources appear to elicit the audience's curiosity and self-awareness regarding their changing language. Feigned surprise and astonishment at hearing new vocabulary is part of the comic game, and we should not consider all such cases to be faithful indications that a given form was unheard of in Athens. Rather, this evidence indicates how more modern language had become a pressing matter in 4th-century BCE Athens, so that the comic poets would relish exploiting this for dramatic purposes. Crucially, instead, such comic passages were taken at face value by later Atticist sources to extract prescriptions and proscriptions, as though the comic poet were expressing his own views about a contested linguistic topic.¹⁶⁸

Let us begin with a fragment of Antiphanes (fr. 97) concerning the name of a fish species:

contain the earliest example of a motif which would then become common starting from 4th-century BCE comedy.

168 Several other fragments, although interesting *per se*, for various reasons fall outside the aims of this discussion. Some focus primarily on *Realien* and other aspects of everyday life rather than on linguistic aspects (Amphis fr. 14.1–3; Diph. fr. 39 and 81; Philem. fr. 45). An interesting opposition between the use of *ράφανος* by 'us' (i.e. the Athenians?) and of *κράμβη* by 'you foreigners' is established in Apollod.Car. fr. 32 (on the dialectal distribution of these forms see Bagordo 2013, 156–7). We learn from Phot. π 26 (= Ael.Dion. π 2) that Philippides (fr. 37) made fun of *κοράσιον* in place of *παιδισκάριον*. Since the context is unknown, a more in-depth appreciation of this fragment is difficult. Nevertheless, it is highly likely that Philippides targeted a new formation, as is made clear by the distribution of *κοράσιον* in literary sources (*κοράσιον* is also proscribed by Phryn. *Ecl.* 50 and Poll. 2.17; on *κοράσιον vis-à-vis* its approved equivalents, see further Chapter 5, Section B.5.6.1; Section B.5.6.3). The wordplay in Alex. fr. 94 is between the older use of *ποδαπός* meaning 'from what country?' and the more recent semantic development of *ποδαπός*, meaning 'of what kind?' (see Arnott 1996, 247–9). Alex. fr. 148 contains the comic neologisms *πεφλιπιδωσαι* 'You have become a Philippides' (see Arnott 1996, 438), but this has a limited bearing for the history of the dialect. The sense of *Ἀττικιστί* [. . .] *λαλεῖν* in Alex. fr. 200 is more likely that of speaking with the Attic wit rather than speaking Attic *tout court* (see Arnott 1996, 577–9; Section 4.2). On *ἄκουσμα* and *ἄκρόαμα* in Diph. fr. 121 see Gerbi (2024a). From Men. fr. 528, quoted by Σ^b α 2381 (= Phot. α 3137, *ex Σ*"), we learn (despite some textual difficulties) that Menander used the adjective *Ἀττικουργής* to define *ρήματα*, but it remains obscure whether *Ἀττικουργής* indicates actual words, which for some reason were recognisably Attic, or an Attic manner of speaking (e.g. the topical Attic wit). Thessalian *καπάναι* in Xenarch. fr. 11 must be part of a running joke, as suggested by *καπανικός* in Ar. fr. 507 (see Taillardat 1965, 122–3; Bagordo 2020, 58–9); *καπάνη* is also not a word that survives in late Attic or the koine.

πάνυ συχνή
σφύραινα. (B) κέστραν Ἀττικιστὶ δεῖ λέγειν.

(A): A very large σφύραινα.

(B): In Attic, you should call it a κέστρα.

The identity of the speakers may not be ascertained, but συχνή with Attic-Ionic vocalism indicates that the first speaker is most likely not a foreigner. Athenaeus quotes this fragment as part of a wider discussion about σφύραινα (7.323a–c):

σφύραινα. [. . .]. ὁ δὲ Δωρίων ‘σφύραιναν’, φησὶν, ‘ἦν καλοῦσι κέστραν’. Ἐπίχαρμος δ’ ἐν Μούσαις κέστραν ὀνομάσας οὐκ ἔτι σφυραῖνας ὀνομάζει ὡς ταῦτὸν οὔσας [. . .]. καὶ οἱ Ἀττικοὶ δὲ ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ τὴν σφύραιναν καλοῦσι κέστραν, σπανίως δὲ τῷ τῆς σφυραῖνης ὀνόματι ἐχρήσαντο. Στράτις γοῦν ἐν Μακεδόσιν ἐρομένου τινὸς Ἀττικοῦ ὡς ἀγνοοῦντος τὸ ὄνομα καὶ λέγοντος ‘ἢ σφύραινα δ’ ἔστι τίς;’, φησὶν ὁ ἕτερος: ‘κέστραν μὲν ὕμμες ὠπτικοὶ κικλήσκετε’. Ἀντιφάνης ἐν Εὐθυδικῷ: ‘πάνυ συχνή | σφύραινα. (B) κέστραν ἀττικιστὶ δεῖ λέγειν’. Νικοφῶν δ’ ἐν Πανδώρα: ‘κέστραι τε καὶ λάβρακες’. Ἐπίχαρμος Ἦβας γάμῳ: ‘κέστρας τε πέρκας τ’ αἰόλας’.

σφύραινα. [. . .]. Dorion says: ‘spet, also referred to as a κέστρα’ (fr. 28 García Lázaro). Epicharmus in *Muses* (fr. 86), after mentioning a κέστρα, makes no reference to σφύραινα, since they are the same fish [. . .]. Attic authors also generally refer to the spet as a κέστρα and rarely used the name σφύραινα. In Strattis’ *Macedonians*, for example, when an Athenian character, seemingly ignorant of the name, asks about it and says: ‘(A): What’s a σφύραινα?’ (fr. 29.1), the other man says: ‘(B): You Athenians refer to it as a κέστρα’ (fr. 29.2). Antiphanes in *Euthydicus* (fr. 97): ‘(A) An enormous σφύραινα. (B): You should refer to it in Attic as a *kestra*’. Nicopho in *Pandora* (fr. 14): ‘κέστραι and sea-bass’. Epicharmus in *The Wedding of Hebe* (fr. 43.1): ‘κέστραι and speckled perch’. (Translation by Olson 2008, 523).

As witnessed by the above passage from Athenaeus, the issue of the identification, or distinction, between κέστρα and σφύραινα was acknowledged by ancient culinary writers (Dorion, 1st century BCE (?)), though the general sentiment was that the two names indicate the same species. Athenaeus first treats Epicharmus using κέστρα rather than σφύραινα as an indication that he did not yet know the latter form, and then he comments that Attic writers too very rarely mention the σφύραινα. As proof, he quotes relevant passages from Strattis and Antiphanes, who attest to the fact that σφύραινα was an uncommon word to Attic ears. Finally, the occurrence of κέστρα in Nicophon (fr. 14), a poet of Old Comedy, may be intended to confirm the relative chronology of the competing forms.¹⁶⁹

¹⁶⁹ See also Poll. 6.50: σφύραινα· ταύτην δὲ καὶ κέστραν ὀνόμαζον. Owing to epitomisation, it is difficult to say what Pollux originally meant. It is likely that he too stressed that κέστρα was the older Attic form, which would be in line with Athenaeus and with the kind of remarks that Pol-

Owing to the fragmentary context, we cannot stretch the interpretation of the fragments of Strattis and Antiphanes too far. In Strattis, an Attic-speaker asks his Aeolic interlocutor the meaning of σφύραινα and is told that it is the same as the Attic κέστρα. In Antiphanes, things are the other way round, namely, the first speaker uses σφύραινα and is corrected by the interlocutor, who points out that the expected Attic form would be κέστρα. It thus appears that while in Strattis, σφύραινα is a foreign word used by a foreign speaker, in Antiphanes, σφύραινα is taken on by a less rigid Attic speaker who is therefore reproached by the interlocutor, who recommends κέστρα as the proper Attic form. This suggests that the point raised by Strattis and Antiphanes is rather different: while Strattis ostensibly makes fun of a foreign word (which was presumably beginning to enter the Attic usage), Antiphanes emphasises the growing use of such a word by Attic speakers.

That the poets of later comedy were sensible to linguistic innovations is also proven by the early appearance of the notion of lexical archaism in a fragment of Menander (fr. 330):

- (A) οὐκ Ἐμβαρος εἶ.
 (B) Ἐμβαρος; ἀρχαῖσμός οὗτος ῥημάτων

- (A): You are no Embaros.
 (B): Embaros? This [is] an old-fashioned choice of word.

A similar formulation is employed in Men. *Phasm.* 80: οὐκ Ἐμβαρός ἐσ[τιν οὐ]τός (‘This is no Embaros’). As the ancient sources explain, Embaros was a proverbial figure of the old Athenian past, known in folklore for being smart: hence, the qualification ἀρχαῖσμός. Therefore, to say that someone is no Embaros is to say that they are slow-witted.¹⁷⁰ Despite the obscurity surrounding the speakers and the context of Menander’s fragment 330, the remark made by (B) is interesting from several perspectives.

First, this fragment contains the oldest known instance of ἀρχαῖσμός, indicating a deliberate use of old-fashioned language.¹⁷¹ That this is a new word is likely

lux himself offers in his treatment of fish names (just a few lines after the section on σφύραινα and κέστρα, he writes ὀρφός ἢ τὸ Ἀττικώτερον ὀρφός).

170 See Gomme, Sandbach (1973, 680); Kassel, Austin (*PCG* vol. 6,2, 212).

171 ἀρχαῖσμός was never a favourite word and concept in ancient literary criticism (see Lebek 1969, 70–1 n. 2; Schindel 1994, 332–4; Schindel 1997); it would become more common in late antique treatises, particularly on the Latin side, but it is also relatively poorly attested in Byzantine lexicographical and scholiastic compilations. This noun presupposes the verb ἀρχαῖζω, which is attested starting from Imperial prose in the sense of using an old-fashioned language or imitating

best seen in the light of the rapid growth in 4th-century BCE Attic of denominal/deadjectival verbs in -ίζω and, from these, deverbals in -ισμός. The awareness of the historical evolution of Greek, and especially of Attic, is well documented in Classical sources,¹⁷² and it is entirely possible that Menander derived the new word ἀρχαϊσμός from ongoing rhetorical discussions.¹⁷³ We cannot say whether the use of an old-fashioned expression was a means of characterisation of character (A); the same expression occurs in *Phasma* in the mouth of a slave, but this character's profile is almost entirely unknown.

Second, (B)'s remark closely recalls a passage of Aristophanes' *Plutus*, where the chorus says that the use of χαίρω to greet people is old-fashioned (322–5: 'χαίρειν' μὲν ὑμᾶς ἐστίν, ὦνδρες δημόται, | ἀρχαῖον ἤδη προσαγορεύειν καὶ σαπρόν· | ἀσπάζομαι δ' ὅτι προθύμως ἤκετε | καὶ συντεταμένως κοῦ κατεβλακευμένως, 'Greeting you [saying] 'Good day!' (χαίρειν), fellow demesmen, is old and rotten. But I 'salute' (ἀσπάζομαι) you for your coming willingly and earnestly and not tardily'). The late date of *Plutus* and the innovative linguistic parameters adopted by Aristophanes in this play make it hardly incidental that it shares a similar concern for old-fashioned vocabulary with Menander's fragment. This contributes to strengthening the claim made above that 4th-century BCE Athenians were particularly sensitive to the evolution of Attic and the growing divide from the more conservative language.

A further case, having wider implications, is offered by a passage of Pollux comparing the use of the word κοιτών by Aristophanes (fr. 6) and Menander (fr. 614):

Poll. 1.79: τῶν δὲ οἰκῶν (οἰκῶν MAV) πρόδομος καὶ δῶμα καὶ δωμάτιον καὶ κοιτών (defic. MBC). εἰ γὰρ καὶ Μένανδρος αὐτὸ βαρβαρικὸν οἶεται, ἀλλ' Ἀριστοφάνης ὁ κωμωποδιδάσκαλος

the language of the ancients (see LSJ s.v.). The use of ῥῆμα in a sense different from 'verb', as in Menander's fragment, where it means 'word', is unproblematic (see LSJ s.v. ῥῆμα; Thierfelder in Körte, Thierfelder 1959 vol. 2, 295–6, followed by Kassel, Austin, *PCG* vol. 6,2, 212, indicates *Ar. Pax* 930–1 and *Strat. fr.* 1.44 as comic parallels; see also *Philem. fr.* 6.1–2 where ῥῆμα refers to the interjection οἶμοι).

172 Lebek (1969, 59–63) collects many instructive examples.

173 As part of his discussion of the origins of the rhetorical concept of archaism, Lebek (1969, 68 n. 1) sought to undermine the importance of ἀρχαϊσμός in Menander's fragment. He suggested that it does not indicate that that with *Embaros* is an old-fashioned expression, but that the story of *Embaros* is old, and to prove it, he took ῥῆμα to refer to the story of *Embaros* (which is impossible per se and is even less likely given the many parallel passages of Middle and New Comedy, many of which are discussed in this paragraph, in which old and new words are singled out). Lebek's interpretation is entirely unsatisfactory and is motivated purely by Lebeck's claim that the origins of the rhetorical concept of archaism are Hellenistic at the earliest.

τὰ τοιαῦτα πιστότερος αὐτοῦ, εἰπὼν ἐν Αἰολοσίκωνι· ‘κοιτῶν ἀπάσαις εἷς, πύελος μί’ ἀρκέσει’.

[The parts] of the houses [are called] πρόδομος and δῶμα and δωμάτιον and κοιτῶν. Indeed, even though Menander (fr. 614) considers this [word] barbaric, nevertheless the comic poet Aristophanes, [who] in this kind of things [is] more reliable than him (i.e. Menander), [uses it] when he says in *Aeolosicon* (fr. 6): ‘just one bedchamber will suffice for all (fem.), [equally] just one bathing-tub’.

A similarly positive judgement about κοιτῶν is likely to be expressed by Phrynichus.¹⁷⁴ The likeliest dramatic context for Menander’s discussion of κοιτῶν is the familiar one whereby a first character uses a word that a second character criticises,¹⁷⁵ for simplicity’s sake, Pollux evidently condensed this as though Menander himself were saying that κοιτῶν is ‘barbaric’, as though it were a proscription of sorts. That κοιτῶν may have raised some suspicion is unsurprising, considering that after Aristophanes and Menander, it is first attested in the Septuagint. Thus, it must have belonged to a new, arguably lower stratum of Attic. In this regard, the fact that Aristophanes used κοιτῶν in *Aeolosicon* is perfectly consonant with the tendencies in his later plays towards the use of a ‘new’ language (see Section 5.2).¹⁷⁶ Hence, Menander’s character’s likely critical remark on this form would be entirely in line with the other cases examined above, whereby a form that had entered ‘New’ Attic was singled out. This is also a confirmation that criticism of innovative language is not to be taken at face value, and in fact, it likely presupposes that a certain form was already familiar and possibly also undergoing expansion in Attic.

174 See Phryn. *Ecl.* 222: τὸ μὲν κοιτῶν ἱάδοκιμον† (Fischer here plausibly suspects <οὐκ ἀδόκιμον>, see translation), τὸ δὲ προκοιτῶν οὐ δόκιμον. ἡμῖν δὲ καλὸν χρῆσθαι τῷ Ἀττικῷ ὀνόματι προδωμάτιον γὰρ λέγουσιν, ἐπεὶ καὶ δωμάτιον τὸν κοιτῶνα (‘κοιτῶν [is] <not> an unapproved [form], while προκοιτῶν [is] unapproved. But for us it is good to use the Attic form. For they say προδωμάτιον, since they also call δωμάτιον the κοιτῶν’). On Phrynichus’ entry see Lobeck (1820, 253); Rutherford (1881, 321).

175 See Kock *ad* Men. fr. 30 *CAF*. Monaco (2023, 25) approves this conclusion and attempts a reconstruction of Menander’s passage, but her proposed text – (A) . . . κοιτῶν . . . | (B) κοιτῶν οὐ δεῖ λέγειν, καὶ τοῦτο βαρβαρικόν – is untenable: it is metrically impossible, and βαρβαρικόν is more likely the adjective used by Pollux to condense what was in the fragment (one may compare the use of βάρβαρος and ξενικός by Ael.Dion. β 17 and Paus.Att. β 14 to comment on Philem. fr. 130, see Eust. *in Il.* 3.311.22–312.1).

176 Interestingly, a modern purist like Rutherford (1881, 321) is as baffled as the ancients and says that it is difficult to evaluate κοιτῶν in Aristophanes’ *Aeolosicon* considering that this play ‘must have teemed with para-tragedy’.

4.2 Professional languages and military jargon

One area in which later comedy shows a clear interest in new words is professional language and, more generally, the use of *voces propriae*. On the one hand, this demonstrates the growing attention to the use of more realistic language in literary Attic. On the other hand, it shows the awareness that Attic was acquiring new forms. A fragment of Menander (fr. 229) offers an interesting example with reference to the language of seafaring:

(A) οἱ δ' ἀρπάσαντες τοὺς κάδους <τοὺς> στρογγύλους
 ὕδρευον ἀνδρειότατα † κὴ πόλις † πάλιν.¹⁷⁷
 (B) ἦντλουν λέγειν δεῖ, καὶ κάδους οὐ δεῖ λέγειν,
 ἀλλ' ἀντλιαντλητήρας

(A): Others, having taken the rounded jars, drew out the water (ὕδρευον) vigorously † . . . † again.

(B): One must say 'They bailed the water out' (ἦντλουν), and one must not say 'jars', but 'bilge-water-bailers'.

This fragment is quoted in an entry of the *Synagoge* tradition devoted to ἀντλιαντλητήρ.¹⁷⁸ Although the wider context is unknown, character (A) was evidently involved in a misadventure at sea (possibly culminating in a shipwreck, as so often in New Comedy), which they are now narrating to (B).¹⁷⁹ The general sense of this exchange is that (B) opposes technical to ordinary vocabulary; it is unknown whether (B) is more knowledgeable about seafaring because of their profession or is just being pedantic.

Firstly, (B) says that ἀντλέω is the proper word for 'to bail out bilge water' (see Thgn. 673),¹⁸⁰ whereas ὕδρεύω has a more generic meaning ('to draw water'). Secondly, the character explains that ἀντλιαντλητήρ, a compound of ἀντλία 'bilge water' (see Ar. *Pax* 17 and Olson 1998, 70–1) and the *nomen agentis* of ἀντλέω ('to

177 Regarding the textual problem, the more convincing option is to attribute the corrupt section of line 2 to (B), who would offer a first critical remark about the incorrect use of language by character (A). The likeliest suggestion is κάπολεῖς πάλιν 'Do you mean to destroy me again?'; put forward by Cassio (1975) (see Antiph. fr. 169.2).

178 See Σ^β α 1535 (= Phot. α 2129, *ex Σ'''*).

179 Since the fragment belongs to a play entitled *The Messenian Woman*, the play may be about a young girl who was separated from her father after a shipwreck, later became a courtesan (?), and was finally reunited with him.

180 LSJ s.v. I.1 also add Alc. fr. 305a.12 Voigt = fr. 305.col. 1.12 Lobel–Page for ἀντλέω meaning 'the bail out bilge water', but the sense is rather 'to draw water from the sea' in the sense of procuring oneself endless problems. Additionally, ἀντλοῦντες is the verb used by the commentator to gloss Alcaeus' ἀρπητήμενοι.

bail out', i.e. bilge water),¹⁸¹ should be used in place of κάδος, which indicates a jar or vessel of a more generic nature (see LSJ s.v. I.1); notice that, as discussed by the sources of Menander's fragment, the form ἀντλίον 'bucket to bail out bilge water' was attested in Aristophanes (fr. 486) and Epylicus (fr. 6), which makes it very likely that Menander's ἀντλιαντλητήρ, an otherwise unattested form, was likely created *ad hoc* (however seriously it was taken by ancient scholarship).¹⁸²

The fact that the comic neologism ἀντλιαντλητήρ stands side-by-side with ἀντλέω, which, in turn, is attested as a true nautical term already in Theognis, creates some comic effect and helps define the profile of speaker (B). This character is likely not advocating for some form of old-fashioned purism; rather, he recommends using the *voces propriae* of seafaring.¹⁸³ In this sense, Menander is likely to be making a parody, at one time realistic and tongue-in-cheek, of an increasing sensibility for 'specialised' language.¹⁸⁴ It is also noteworthy that, owing to the first-hand experience of many Athenians, the language of seafaring was likely not too highly specialised a professional language, and so here, Menander may play with (part of) his audience's familiarity with this type of vocabulary acquired in real life. Therefore, Menander's fragment reveals how later comedy provides evidence of a distinct interest in real-life language, and while some of the *voces propriae* may have a comic connotation, the nature of the scene is distinctly unlike,

181 The use of the *nomina agnetis* in -τήρ for instruments and objects is increasingly common (see Maysen, *Gramm.* vol. 1,3, 71–2; Chantraine 1933, 327–9).

182 The form ἀντλητήρ for the bucket used to bail out bilge water is also recorded in ancient lexica (see e.g. Poll. 10.31, Hsch. α 5520, Σ^b α 1533 (= Phot. α 2127, *ex Σ''*)), but is never attested in literary texts. If this was a 'real' word, it would clearly render Menander's ἀντλιαντλητήρ, however exaggerated, even more 'realistic'. Besides Σ^b α 1535 (= Phot. α 2129, *ex Σ''*), which evidently discuss ἀντλιαντλητήρ in Menander without considering it a comic compound, Eust. *in Od.* 2.33.14–8 says that according to an unnamed ancient authority (i.e. Menander) κάδος should not be used to refer to the bucket used to bail out bilge water. On these instruments, see Torchio (2021, 277–8).

183 While ἀντλέω is a real word, ἀντλιαντλητήρ is probably not. Character (B) may be portrayed as an alleged expert of seafaring who unwillingly makes up technical words just to credit themselves with the knowledge of the professional vocabulary, or maybe they are a true expert who is just full of themselves and therefore condescendingly recommends unnecessarily complicated technical vocabulary to the layman.

184 This recalls the third of the four categories of 'technical' language identified by Dover (1970, 16): 'Words which have the same sense in technical and ordinary language but are used more scrupulously and consistently in the former'. A similar formulation to that used by (A) occurs in a fragment of Pherecrates (fr. 81: κατάρχειον αὐτῆς κάνύδρευσαι τὸν κάδον), and it must be the unmarked way of describing the action of drawing water from a well using a bucket (the verb being ἀνυδρεύομαι).

for example, the parody of the theories about the ὀρθότης ὀνομάτων in Aristophanes' *Clouds*.¹⁸⁵

Another area in which the evidence from comedy is highly significant from a historical perspective is the language of the military. This subject lends itself well to wider comparisons. Indeed, recent scholarship has discussed how Xenophon, unlike Herodotus' and Thucydides' use of a high literary register to discuss war, adopted a more realistic approach and employed real technical military terminology, which is shared with contemporary sources using 'international' Attic (i.e. Aeneas the Tactician) and with the koine (notably, Polybius).¹⁸⁶ This attention to realism clearly lends a new nuance to Xenophon's historiography compared to earlier writers, and certainly reflects the transformations in 4th-century BCE warfare. A similar case can be made for comedy. Although the military subject is pervasive in all phases of Greek comedy, Athens' continuous state of military unrest during the 4th century BCE, the fact that military conscription according to age was first introduced in the 360s, and the growing professionalisation of warfare (of which the soldiers of Menander's comedy are an excellent example) certainly contributed to making this a relevant subject and one which the audience was able to understand by virtue of their close, direct or indirect, experience.¹⁸⁷

Comic sources also offer evidence in support of this from a linguistic perspective: through imitation of military jargon, the comic poets offer a faithful representation of the evolution of Attic towards the koine.¹⁸⁸ A first example is a fragment of Philemon (fr. 130):

βουνὸν ἐπὶ ταύτῃ καταλαβὼν ἄνω τινά.
(B) τί ἐστ' ὁ βουνός; ἵνα σαφῶς σου μανθάνω.

(A): Having occupied some βουνός ('hill') up on top of this.
(B): What is a βουνός? (I ask) to understand you clearly.

The fragment is quoted in an entry of Phrynichus' *Eclogue* (Phryn. *Ecl.* 332 = *Glossarium Italicum* no. 9, *PCG* vol. 1, 304), in which Phrynichus, based on the exchange

¹⁸⁵ See Huitink, Willi (2021).

¹⁸⁶ See Huitink, Rood (2019, 31–2).

¹⁸⁷ One may consider oblique references, such as *Men. Pc.* 4–6 (see Furley 2015, 92–3). Lamagna (2014) discusses Davus' report at the beginning of Menander's *Aspis* and the military strategy of Greek mercenaries and considers the understanding that the audience may have had of such aspects.

¹⁸⁸ In some cases, the *voces propriae* of military language may present a *double entendre*, as in the case of ἀναβαίνω 'to climb (i.e. a wall)' and περικάθημαι 'to besiege' in *Men. Pc.* 232–4 (see Furley 2015, 137).

in Philemon, condemns βουνός as foreign to Attic and adds that it is a form commonly used by Syracusan writers. The other Atticist sources (Ael.Dion. β 17 and Paus.Gr. β 14), equally critical of βουνός, are known via Eustathius (*in Il.* 3.311.22–312.1). However, based on these sources, Eustathius also mentions a second instance of βουνός in Philemon's Νόθος (fr. 52), in which the word was apparently not criticised.

In Philemon's fragment quoted above, βουνός is clearly singled out as an odd choice of word to Attic ears. βουνός must have been a familiar word in Doric dialects.¹⁸⁹ Herodotus uses it as a word of the dialect of Cyrene (4.192.3, 4.199.1).¹⁹⁰ Pausanias mentions the cult of Hera Βουναία at Corinth, which likely derived its name from Βοῦνος, the son of Hermes (Paus. 2.4.7). An entry in Hesychius informs us of the existence of a Τοξίου βουνός in Sikyon – that is, a hill consecrated to Apollo (Hsch. τ 1134). The adjective βοῦνις, an early derivative of βουνός, is a Doricism in the lyric parts of Aeschylus' *Suppliant Women* (117; 129; 776).¹⁹¹ However, βουνός will later occur hundreds of times in koine texts, beginning with Polybius, before giving rise to numerous derivations.¹⁹²

The reason that the occurrence in Philemon is significant is that the fragment is likely to be part of a report from a military expedition; this conclusion is strengthened by the direct comparison with Davus' report in the prologue to Menander's *Aspis* (40–4);¹⁹³ note Menander's use of λόφος, which is in fact the

189 For Kaibel (1899b, 199), Phrynichus' claim (*Ecl.* 332 = *Glossarium Italioticum* no. 9, *PCG* vol. 1, 304) that βουνός was common in Syracusan poetry relates to its use by the Syracuse-born Philemon and by Aeschylus, who famously spent a long time in Sicily. Kaibel concludes that the attribution of βουνός to Sicilian Greek should not be taken seriously. This is likely to be incorrect. First, unlike the ascription of Sicilian words to Aeschylus in *Ath.* 9.402b, Phrynichus does not state merely that βουνός is a Sicilian word but that it was used in Syracusan poetry; while Philemon is Syracusan by birth and Aeschylus lived in Sicily, it is highly unlikely that their writings could be called Syracusan poetry. Moreover, Phrynichus mentions Philemon after pointing out that words of foreign origin should not be adopted by those who aspire to use 'pure' Attic; therefore, Philemon exemplifies 'contaminated' Attic. Hesychius (β 945) attests to the use of βουνός also in Cypriot Greek.

190 See Aly (1906, 101) and Solmsen (1906, 756–7), followed by the standard lexica (see LSJ s.v. and *DELG* s.v.) and by the commentators of Herodotus (see Asheri, Lloyd, Corcella 2011, 715).

191 Solmsen (1906, 757) inferred that they were intended to carry an Argolic colouring, which would be consistent with the subject of the tragedy, but this remains speculative.

192 See *DELG* s.v. βουνός. Some remarks on the occurrences in documentary texts are provided by Lee (1983, 114–5).

193 See also Ferrari (2001, 1056 n. 2).

‘good’ Attic equivalent of βουνός.¹⁹⁴ Dietze (1901, 44), followed by Kassel and Austin (*PCG* vol. 7, 295 *ad* Philem. fr. 130), comments that speaker (A) in Philemon fragment must be a ‘miles peregrinus’. This is an unnecessary conclusion.¹⁹⁵ The speaker is likely using the military jargon, which βουνός may well have penetrated from the Doric dialects; indeed, the use of mercenary soldiers of various provenance must have greatly favoured the ‘internationalisation’ of military language during the 4th century BCE, and it is perfectly possible that βουνός entered the koine through military language as well.¹⁹⁶ Philemon, therefore, is an early witness to this process of ‘internationalisation’ of the Attic dialect. Finally, we should not be troubled by the fact that, as witnessed by Eustathius, Philemon (fr. 52) also used βουνός in the comedy entitled Νόθος without presenting it as an odd choice of word. As already discussed in the case of κοιτών (see Section 4.1), we should not take at face value the criticism of βουνός in Philemon’s fragment 130, as though this word were truly unheard of. It is quite likely, rather, that βουνός, despite being rightly perceived as ‘new’ in Attic, had already become familiar and was also in expansion.

A comparable (but hitherto unnoticed) example of the comic use of innovative military jargon is offered by a fragment of Antiphanes (fr. 169):

(A) ἂν κελεύη μ' ἢ σταθμοῦχος (B) ἢ σταθμοῦχος δ' ἔστι τις;
 ... ἀποπνίξεις με καινήν πρός με διάλεκτον λαλῶν
 (A) ἢ τέτακταί μοι στέγαρχος.

(A): If the σταθμοῦχος orders me.

(B): Who is the σταθμοῦχος? . . . You will choke me by talking this new language to me.

(A): She who is assigned to me as στέγαρχος.

Pollux (10.20–1) quotes this fragment in a discussion about the admissibility of σταθμοῦχος (‘landlord’).¹⁹⁷ It has recently been suggested that this fragment might contain a stock scene in which a cook – in this case, character (A) – is reproached by an interlocutor, character (B), for using unfamiliar, high-sounding

194 The fact that Menander uses λόφος is probably a result of the elevated tone of the passage, an emotional monologue with poetic and tragic reminiscences (see Ingresso 2010, 125; 127; 129; 135; 155; 159–60; 161).

195 Considering ταῦτη at line 1, the character cannot be a Doric speaker.

196 Huitink, Rood (2019, 31–2) offer some useful remarks on Xenophon’s use of military jargon and its significance for the historical development of Greek.

197 Pollux’s conclusion is that σταθμοῦχος, though not free from suspicion and to be used with caution, should not be wholly rejected either in light of its occurrences in Aeschylus and Antiphanes (see S. Valente 2013, 158 n. 90).

vocabulary, which is here described as *καινή διάλεκτος*.¹⁹⁸ Indeed, the vocabulary employed by (A) is uncommon. *σταθμοῦχος* is very rare, attested in Antiphanes only for the second time after Aesch. fr. 226: *σὺ δ' ὁ σταθμοῦχος εὔ κατιλλώψας ἄθρει* ('You, housemaster, squint the eye and take a good look'; from the satyr-play *Sisyphus*); in koine texts, except for grammatical and lexicographical sources, *σταθμοῦχος* is undocumented, save for a passage of Polyaeus and of Clement of Alexandria. *στέγαρχος* is equally rare: besides Antiphanes, it is attested once in Herodotus (1.133.4) and then only in ancient erudition. According to this interpretation, *σταθμοῦχος* and *στέγαρχος* would count as poeticisms. However, this is far from the only possibility.

Olson (2022, 259) argues that *σταθμοῦχος* is elevated language in Aesch. fr. 226. However, *κατιλλώψας* (from *κατιλλώπτω* 'to squint the eye') is clearly not a poeticism (being paralleled only in Philem. fr. 115.4), and the imperative *ἄθρει* is recurrent in comedy (5x in Aristophanes).¹⁹⁹ Further, in the Herodotean passage, *στέγαρχος* indicates the person who runs a place (private or public) in which Persians meet and talk, but it does not in any way resemble elevated vocabulary. It may well be a less than ordinary word (and the fact that Herodotus uses it does not prove that it was ordinary Ionic either), but this does not imply that it is a poeticism: it may be a word of relatively general meaning to indicate the person who runs a place. More importantly, as a development of the (already Classical) use of *σταθμός* indicating the quarter in which soldiers (and travellers) reside (LSJ s.v. I.3), already in the Hellenistic period, *σταθμοῦχος* is common in documentary papyri to indicate the keeper of a house in which soldiers are assigned to sleep (18x in papyri from as early as the mid-3rd century BCE, see SB 6.9556 (= TM 5787) (Arsinoites, 245 BCE), P.Stras. 2.92 (= TM 3919) (Oxyrhynchites, 244–243), and P.Enteux. 13 (= TM 3290) (Arsinoites, 222 BCE); see also Polyaeus. 7.40.1).²⁰⁰ The early date of several of these papyri is particularly relevant as it offers a close comparandum to Antiphanes' fragment.²⁰¹

Therefore, Antiphanes' fragment is likely to involve not a wordy cook but a soldier who uses military jargon.²⁰² According to this new interpretation, *στέ-*

¹⁹⁸ See Kassel (1974, 122) (= 1991, 311); Olson (2022, 258–9). This kind of formulation does not apply exclusively to comic cooks' speech.

¹⁹⁹ In principle, one might claim that *σταθμοῦχος* is a poeticism used to create a contrast with more ordinary language, but there is no positive indication of this.

²⁰⁰ Note, however, that military jargon may not be the sole area in which the word is used in post-Classical times (see Clem. Al. *Strom.* 1.20.98.1 and *IGLS* 3,1.770.7 [Antiochia, 6th century CE]).

²⁰¹ The fact that *σταθμοῦχος* was still very much alive in military vocabulary in Imperial Greek, as documented by later papyri, explains Pollux's interest.

²⁰² Notice that, in the light of the early parallels in Aeschylus and Herodotus it would be hard to accept that *σταθμοῦχος* and *στέγαρχος* are *καινή διάλεκτος*, and the parodic neologisms of comic cooks are quite different (see Antiph. fr. 55, discussed by Olson 2023, 206–7).

γαρχος, which is unattested in documentary sources, may be either another item of specialised vocabulary that simply did not enter the koine or, more generally, another uncommon word that Antiphanes used to enhance the comic effect of this dialogue. However, as in the Herodotean passage, it may also be a generic word intended to explain σταθμοῦχος, and this is indeed the more likely conclusion; note also that Pollux (10.20) treats στέγαρχος on the same level as στεγονόμος, which he does recommend elsewhere as the good word (1.74). This new interpretation of Antiphanes' fragment would also work well with the verbs κελεύω (line 1) and particularly τέτακται (line 4).²⁰³ Thus, it appears that this fragment of Antiphanes should be placed on a par with that of Philemon containing βουνός as evidence of the dissemination of new words in 'international' Attic and subsequently in the koine via military jargon.²⁰⁴

To conclude, the comic sources discussed in this and the previous section are of considerable importance not only for our understanding of the evolution of Attic and the interest in real-life language (rather than, e.g., the sophistic parody of *Clouds*) but particularly because they document the Athenians' consciousness of the evolution of their language and of the sociolinguistic changes regulating the use of certain words. As evinced by the comparison with Demosthenes, a prerogative of these sources is that they attest to an awareness of language change that had different connotations to those of the previous century. While they do not appear to be advocating for a specific variety of Attic as 'proper' and 'distinctive', they explicitly play with the audience's sensitivity to innovative usages with which they were familiar from their own lives. Evidence of this nature cannot be taken acritically, as though the simple fact that a fragment comments on a new word should mean that no resistance was mounted against linguistic innovation. Comparison with contemporary oratory indicates that the use of more conservative language was still perfectly normal in specific contexts. Rather, these sources' importance lies in their showing the clear perception of the ongoing changes in Attic and the fact that this also resulted in a gradual shift from more conservative

203 On this verb, Olson (2022, 258–9) comments that the speaker may feel constrained to stay there and that this may be owing to the notorious unpleasantness and abusive manners of female innkeepers. This psychological nuance is difficult to detect owing to the brevity of the fragment, although it remains possible that the scene involved a contrast between a soldier and a female innkeeper (and κελεύω at line 1 might perhaps support this).

204 Additionally, the fragment derives from a comedy entitled Ὀβριμος (literally 'The Strong'), and so it has been tentatively, though plausibly, suggested that the central character may have been a *miles gloriosus* (see Olson 2022, 255). Of course, this does not mean that character (A) in Antiphanes' fragment must be the one referred to by the play's title, but it is perfectly possible that among the play's main themes were soldiers and military life.

to more open linguistic conventions in the literary language, as we shall explore in greater detail later in this chapter (see Section 5).

4.3 Speaking Attic (and) Greek: From ‘international’ Attic to the koine

The Attic dialect’s projection beyond the borders of Attica and its effects did not go unnoticed, and the Athenians surely became progressively aware of the growing divide between the (more or less) conservative Attic dialect and the new *Großattisch*, which was spreading rapidly throughout the Greek world to culminate in the koine. While in the previous section we examined the main 4th-century BCE texts that bear witness to the Athenians’ acknowledgement of the rapid evolution that the Attic dialect was undergoing, in the present section, we shall focus on two key sources that reflect the emerging awareness of the dialectic between Attic and the koine. Interestingly, these sources also voice different attitudes towards the latter. Of course, we cannot take any of these texts at face value. Nevertheless, these opposing approaches must reflect the ongoing tension between innovation and conservation.

The ideal starting point is a deservedly famous fragment of the comic poet Posidippus (fr. 30), who was active in the first half of the 3rd century BCE. In this fragment, the opposition is drawn between the verbs ἀττικίζω (‘to speak Attic’) and ἐλληνίζω (‘to speak common Greek’):

Ἑλλάς μὲν ἔστι μία, πόλεις δὲ πλείονες·
 σὺ μὲν ἀττικίζεις, ἥνικ’ ἂν φωνὴν λέγῃς
 αὐτοῦ τιν’, οἱ δ’ Ἑλληνες ἐλληνίζομεν.
 τί προσδιατρίβων συλλαβαῖς καὶ γράμμασιν
 τὴν εὐτραπελίαν εἰς ἀηδίαν ἄγεις;

Greece is just one, but the cities are multiple. You speak Attic when you speak your dialect (whichever [your native dialect may be]),²⁰⁵ we, the Greeks, instead, speak Greek. Why do you care so much for syllables and letters and turn wittiness into odiousness?

²⁰⁵ The sense of σὺ μὲν ἀττικίζεις, ἥνικ’ ἂν φωνὴν λέγῃς | αὐτοῦ τιν’ is not entirely clear. According to our interpretation, indefinite τιν(α) must have a generalising function and is key to the interpretation. One may compare τις accompanying nouns preceded by an article to indicate a specific case as reflecting a more general one (see K–G vol. 1, 662–3; LSJ s.v. A.II.10.b; Favi 2020, 370 on [Epich.] fr. *295.3–4); in Posidippus, the specifying function of the article is supplied by αὐτοῦ (one may compare the use of πᾶς in place of the article in the same type of construction in Soph. *Ph.* 174–5: ἀλύει δ’ ἐπὶ παντί τῳ | χρείας ἰσταμένῳ, translated by Schein 2013, 155 as ‘he is affected by madness by every [item] of need, whatever [it might be], as it arises’). Therefore, the

The speaker is apparently addressing someone who, we might guess, had previously advocated for the use of more conservative Attic.²⁰⁶ To judge from the fragment, the speaker's interlocutor must have been drawing a sharp opposition between 'speaking Attic' and 'speaking Greek', which is likely an opposition between parochial Attic and innovative koine Greek. The speaker criticises the pedant's fastidiousness and his unpleasant behaviour, recommending instead a more open-minded outlook: all Greeks speak (koine) Greek, irrespective of their native, local dialect, and so one must welcome this shared language. We do not know the speaker's identity, nor do we know anything about the wider context around this brief fragment. In any case, there is no reason to assume that the speaker cannot be an Athenian, since they may very well be an Athenian who is simply more open to koine Greek and thus defends this variety.²⁰⁷

Posidippus' fragment contains several remarkable features. The formulation Ἑλλάς μὲν ἔστι μία, πόλεις δὲ πλείονες (line 1), to claim that Greek language is one, notwithstanding its multiple varieties, is not new.²⁰⁸ However, the use of ἐλληγνίζω to indicate neither the opposition between Greek and a non-Greek language nor the idea of speaking 'correct' Greek but a 'common' form of Greek is new and significant, particularly considering that the local variety to which ἑλλη-

opposition is drawn (at least potentially) not only between Attic and common Greek but between any local variety (including, but not limited to, Attic) and common Greek; thus, Attic is singled out because the speaker's interlocutor is an Attic speaker, but the same observation would apply to any other variety. Alternatively, φωνή could mean 'word' or 'phrase' ('You speak Attic, when you use an expression/word of yours', i.e. of your dialect), but this is unnecessarily specific. Other scholars generally avoid assigning τιν(α) any function (see Pfister 1951, 95). McInerney (2012, 259) takes αὐτοῦ to mean 'here'.

206 The source is a passage of *On the Cities of Greece* by the 3rd-century BCE periegetic writer Heraclides Criticus (*BNJ*² 369a F 3.7; see Arenz 2006; McInerney 2012; McInerney 2019). Heraclides objects to the use of ἐλληγνίζω as meaning 'to speak correct Greek', arguing that the verb indicates speaking shared, inherited Greek. Heraclides' discussion stems from an excursus on the geographic, ethnic, and linguistic definition of Ἑλλάς: it originally pertained to Thessaly, but in more recent times it is used extensively for Greece. In light of this, some modern scholars (following Salmasius) have wrongly inferred that the speaker in Posidippus is Thessalian (see Kassel, Austin, *PCG* vol. 7, 577).

207 Indeed, their language is Attic or koine. αὐτοῦ in place of σ(ε)αυτοῦ is well-paralleled in late Attic (see Chapter 5, Section B.4.1.2). Anyway, dialectal differences are regularly passed under silence in later comedy, in which every character, irrespective of their origin, speaks Attic (e.g. the Cypriot Crateia and her father Demeas in Menander's *Misoumenos*).

208 See Chapter 3, Section 1.1.

νίζω is opposed is Attic.²⁰⁹ The remark about speaking Attic as having a local connotation (ἰνίκ' ἄν φωνήν λέγῃς | αὐτοῦ τιν') appears to acknowledge the Athenians' awareness that they must adopt a more 'internationalised' language when abroad or when dealing with foreigners, which is precisely the point about the development of *Großattisch* and then of the koine.

But does the fragment pose a sharp divide between Attic and Greek, as though speakers of Attic were an entirely different group from speakers of Greek? Or does it pursue a milder approach, one that holds that – whatever the local variety of which any Greek is a native speaker – all Greeks speak Greek, and so one should avoid overly narrow views about language and identity and accept instead the supra-regional koine? The more inclusive reading appears more convincing. While ἀττικίζω and ἐλληνίζω are discrete entities, they are not separate; rather, they are presented as opposing poles along the same linguistic continuum, so that the 'Atticiser' (and, potentially, speakers of any variety that has claims to primacy or exclusivity) is invited to maintain an open mind towards koine Greek. Therefore, the 1st personal plural in οἱ δ' Ἕλληνες ἐλληνίζομεν should be taken to include the 'Atticiser' along with any other dialectal variety, consistent with the view that, at least for some, the koine was initially perceived as not merely another dialect but as 'an abstract concept which can subsume the koine as well as the dialects' (Morpurgo Davies 1987, 18).²¹⁰

Furthermore, Posidippus' reference to εὐτραπελία as a quality that is being spoiled by Attic over-zealousness warrants closer attention. εὐτραπελία roughly overlaps with 'wittiness' and therefore is normally used (regularly in a positive sense, as a sign of mental versatility) in discussions of ethical and rhetorical subjects.²¹¹ This does not necessarily mean that, in the original context of the fragment, some witticism was the object of conversation, and εὐτραπελία may refer more in general to a certain good quality of character in which the speaker's interlocutor is evidently found to be lacking. It is crucial to point out that the Athenian wit is topical.²¹² Take the case of Alexis' fragment 200:

ἐπιπονώτερον
<ἔργον> μὰ τὸν Διόνυσον οὐκ εἶληφ' ἐγώ,
ἀφ' οὗ παρασιτῶ. μεμβράδας μοι κρείττον ἦν

²⁰⁹ See Morpurgo Davies (1987, 7; 26 n. 28), although she accepts the ill-founded connection with Thessaly (see above n. 206).

²¹⁰ See also Cassio (1993, 86–8), who examines the works and doctrines of later grammarians.

²¹¹ Good exemplification in LSJ s.v.

²¹² But note that the 'versatility' (εὐτραπέλως) of the Athenian brand of education is already praised in a well-known section of Pericles' λόγος ἐπιτάφιος, in which Athens is described as the παιδείσεις τῆς Ελλάδος (Thuc. 2.41.1).

ἔχειν μετ' Ἀττικιστὶ δυναμένου λαλεῖν.
ὄνησιφόρον ἦν τοῦτο.

By Dionysus, since I live the life of the parasite, I have never taken up a more tiresome business! It would have been better for me to eat sprats with someone who can speak in the Attic manner. That would be remunerative.

The speaker is a parasite who complains about his patron, possibly a *miles gloriosus*. According to the convincing interpretation by Arnott (1996, 577–9), the parasite is not saying that the patron is unable to speak Attic (at least, this is not the point made in the fragment) but rather that he lacks the Athenian wit. Thus, being an Athenian is not simply a racial or dialectal matter but also involves behavioural aspects, such as witticism. To return to Posidippus' fragment, even those who claim to speak proper Attic (ἀττικίζω) may fail to do so properly, as instead of the characteristic Athenian witticism, their manner of speaking is filled with unpleasantness.

An even more relevant parallel for Posidippus' fragment is offered by a passage of an earlier text: Isocrates' *Antidosis* speech (353 BCE). In praising Athens as a sort of Mecca of rhetoric, Isocrates mentions that the city promotes success thanks to its dialect, the wittiness of its inhabitants, and their fondness for discussion (Isoc. 15.295–6):

χρὴ γὰρ μηδὲ τοῦτο λανθάνειν ὑμᾶς, ὅτι πάντων τῶν δυναμένων λέγειν ἢ παιδεύειν ἢ πόλις ἡμῶν δοκεῖ γεγενῆσθαι διδάσκαλος, εἰκότως· καὶ γὰρ ἄλλα μέγιστα τιθεῖσαν αὐτὴν ὀρώσιν τοῖς τὴν δύναμιν ταύτην ἔχουσιν καὶ γυμνάσια πλεῖστα καὶ παντοδαπώτατα παρέχουσιν τοῖς ἀγωνίζεσθαι προηρημένοις καὶ περὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα γυμνάζεσθαι βουλομένοις, ἐτι δὲ τὴν ἐμπειρίαν, ἥπερ μάλιστα ποιεῖ δύνασθαι λέγειν, ἐνθένδε πάντας λαμβάνοντας· πρὸς δὲ τοῦτοις καὶ τὴν τῆς φωνῆς κοινότητα καὶ μετριότητα καὶ τὴν ἄλλην εὐτραπέλιαν καὶ φιλολογίαν οὐ μικρὸν ἡγοῦνται συμβαλέσθαι μέρος πρὸς τὴν τῶν λόγων παιδείαν. ὥστ' οὐκ ἀδίκως ὑπολαμβάνουσιν ἅπαντας τοὺς λέγειν ὄντας δεινοὺς τῆς πόλεως εἶναι μαθητάς.

You must not ignore the fact that our city is thought to be the teacher of all those who are skilled in speaking and teaching. And this is reasonable, for people see that the city makes available the greatest rewards for those who have this ability and provides the greatest number and variety of opportunities for exercising them for those who choose to compete and wish to engage in such activities. Furthermore, everyone here acquires experience, which most of all produces the ability to speak. In addition, they think that our common dialect, and its moderation, our witticism, and our fondness of discussing contribute significantly to our culture of discourse. Hence, they are right to think that all who have skill at speaking are students of Athens. (Translation by Too 2008, 79–80, with modifications).

As part of a celebration of rhetorical training, Isocrates says that Athens has become the capital of oratory. Oratory and rhetorical training are integral to Athenian society and culture and have contributed significantly to Athens' prestige.

Some typical features of Athenian culture have favoured this. Two pertain to the linguistic sphere: the fact that the Attic dialect has become prominent all over the Greek world (κοινότης) and the fact that it is more moderate (μετριότης) than other dialects.²¹³ The other two aspects are the wittiness of the Athenians and their fondness for discussion. Finally, Isocrates adapts Pericles' claim in Thucydides' funeral oration and argues that every skilled orator is a pupil of Athens.²¹⁴ All this is fully in line with Isocrates' programmatic cultural panhellenism and his views regarding the leading role that Athens and Athenian culture are expected to play in this process. Thus, the passage from *Antidosis* is frequently compared with the passage from *Panegyricus* in which Athens is celebrated as having moved far beyond every other Greek city and having turned Greekness into a cultural, rather than strictly racial, category (4.50).²¹⁵ Interestingly, this also suggests that one can learn to be Greek and that Athens played a leading role in achieving this internationalisation of Greek culture, as already discussed in Chapter 3, Section 2.5–6. In light of this, it would be entirely consistent with Isocrates' panhellenism to suspect that the μετριότης of the Attic dialect consists in its ideal balance between parochialism and internationalism.

Despite the earlier date of *Antidosis*, there exist several important similarities between this passage and Posidippus' fragment, particularly the fact that Isocrates refers to the properties of the Attic dialect and to the Athenians' witticism in a context that is concerned with the celebration of Athens.²¹⁶ These sources portray a

213 As plausibly argued by some commentators (see Norlin 1929, 349 n. d, followed by Marzi 1991, 306 n. 186), Isocrates probably opposes Attic to the proverbial softness of Ionic and the harshness of Doric. On the softness of the Ionians also from the perspective of their language, see Section 3.1; Chapter 3, Section 3.1. Too (2008, 232) comments that τὴν τῆς φωνῆς κοινότητα καὶ μετριότητα refers to 'the historical consistency of the Attic dialect' and, for this, refers to Hdt. 1.57–8. This seems to miss the point. Not only does Herodotus say that the Athenians were originally Pelasgians who then learned the Greek language to abandon their own, but he also says that it was the Greek people as a whole who consistently used the Greek language (on the Herodotus passage see Chapter 3, Section 2.5).

214 On the funeral oration see Chapter 3, Section 2.5–6.

215 See Marzi (1991, 306 n. 187); Too (2008, 232).

216 In contrast with other occurrences, this instance of εὐτραπεία has more often been taken as a reference to flexibility of mind rather than witticism (notice that Too translates it as 'flexibility', which is modified in the text above; see also Norlin 1929, 349; Marzi 1991, 306). This is an unnecessary complication. First, Athenian witticism was famous (see above). Further, εὐτραπεία, meaning 'witticism' in the sense of a mental propension towards humour and levity, is not solely a rhetorical quality, as it also has a significant ethical component; as evidence of this, we may just mention Aristotle's magnificent depiction of youth in *Rhetoric*, at the end of which the youths are described as φιλευτράπελοι and characterised by εὐτραπεία (2.12.1389a.3–1389b.12); on εὐτραπεία as an ethical virtue in Aristotle, see Walker (2019). Other translations of this sen-

picture that differs considerably from the protectionist and exclusivist attitude encountered in 5th-century BCE texts. The passage of Isocrates relates closely to Athens' new aspirations to international influence and prestige. The fragment of Posidippus would appear to represent the refusal of the more parochial attitude of conservative Athenians to embrace instead the more open-minded attitude of late-Classical Athens. However, from at least one perspective, Posidippus' fragment introduces a shift compared to Isocrates: Posidippus presents Attic as one of the dialects and the Athenians as one ethnic group among the Greeks. This does not indicate that the historical significance of the Attic dialect and of Athenian culture, as described by Isocrates, are called into question, but it is nuanced, to say the least. This recalls the ways in which Hellenistic scholarship on dialects regarded Attic as one among the other local varieties.²¹⁷

This does not mean that 'conservative' Attic was to die without fighting. A similar debate about the 'conservative' and 'innovative' language occurs in a fragment of the comic poet Euphron (fr. 3), who like Posidippus was active in the first half of the 3rd century BCE:

(Πυ.) ἐπὶ δὲ καλέσῃ ψυγέα τὸν ψυκτηρίαν,
τὸ τευτλίον δὲ σεῦτλα, φακέαν τὴν φακῆν,
τί δεῖ ποιεῖν; σὺ γὰρ εἶπον. (Β.) ὡσπερ χρυσίου
φωνῆς ἀπότισσον, Πυργόθεμι, καταλλαγὴν.

(Pyrgothemis): When he (?) calls ψυγέως a ψυκτηρίας, σεῦτλον a τευτλίον, φακέα a φακῆ, what should one do? You tell me!

(B): Pyrgothemis, return the profit (obtained) from the word, like from (the change of) gold coins.

This fragment belongs to a play entitled Ἀποδιδούσα ('The woman who gives back'), whose plot is unknown.²¹⁸ Two characters discuss language. Pyrgothemis asks what

tence evidently miss the mark (see López Eire 1981–1982, 38, who takes εὔτραπελία and φιλολογία as qualities of the φωνή, i.e. as governing τῆς φωνῆς like τὴν [. . .] κοινότητα καὶ μετριότητα; this is also unlikely because εὔτραπελία is introduced with καὶ τὴν ἄλλην, and so it represents a standalone element in the enumeration).

217 See Chapters 6 and 7.

218 Unlike other recent translations (R. Cherubina in Canfora 2001 vol. 2, 1248; Olson 2009, 459), we take καταλλαγὴ as indicating the profit made by the money changer (see LSJ s.v. I.2; speaker B metaphorically invites Pyrgothemis to return the 'profit' she made in changing 'good' with 'bad' words), καλέσῃ as the 3rd person active, εἶπον as the 2nd person imperative active of the alphathematic aorist εἶπα (see Chapter 5, Section C.3.2.1), and the sequence σὺ + γὰρ + imperative to indicate that speaker B is especially qualified to answer or that they have already discussed the subject (see Ar. *Pax* 1279; *Ec.* 607).

one should do with someone who uses forms that are unfamiliar in Attic, such as ψυγεύς (a wine vessel used to cool the beverage) in place of ψυκτηρίας, σεῦτλον ('beet') in place of τευτλίον, φακέα ('lentil soup') in place of φακῆ.²¹⁹ We shall discuss these forms shortly. Owing to the lack of τις in the protasis, it is possible that the unidentified person whom Pyrgothemis reproaches had already been mentioned; this might mean that other mistakes had also been examined, unless Pyrgothemis focused on other aspects of the person's behaviour. Speaker B replies with a metaphor derived from the practice of moneychangers – namely, he suggests that Pyrgothemis return to this person the profit made in exchanging words of unequal worth (i.e. 'good' and 'bad' forms), as a moneychanger would do when changing gold coins. Owing to the fragment's brevity and the lack of any other information about the play's plot, we are left to speculate about the identity of the speakers and the broader context of this exchange. It is possible, in any case, that Pyrgothemis was a haughty woman (as her name, or nickname, would eloquently suggest),²²⁰ whose pretence of using 'pure' Attic sounded somewhat ridiculous and pretentious.²²¹ Accordingly, we might compare the first element of her name with the metaphorical use of πυργόω in Aristophanes' *Frogs* to indicate Aeschylus' use of solemn words (*Ar. Ra.* 1004).

The forms stigmatised by Pyrgothemis are recognisably late Attic, possibly Ionicising, or quite simply already the koine forms. ψυγεύς is a rare word that is otherwise attested in literature only in Alex. fr. 65 (where it does not receive any qualification).²²² The erudite sources are keen to stress that it is the modern form

²¹⁹ Arnott (1996, 432) suspected, based on the reference to σεῦτλον in Alex. fr. 146, that Euphron's fragment was the parody of a foreign doctor. However, none of the forms discussed belongs to medical vocabulary (on σεῦτλον/τεῦτλον see Hunter 1983, 126; the ψυγεύς is a wine vessel used to cool the liquid, see Arnott 1996, 58; the φακῆ is a common dish).

²²⁰ According to *LGPN* s.vv. and *LGPN-Ling* s.vv., personal names with the first element Πυργ(o)- attested from the second half of the 6th century BCE include Πυργαλίων, Πύργαλος, Πυργέα, Πυργία, Πυργίων, Πύργος, Πυργοτέλης, Πύργων. Those with a second element -θεμεις are many more (69x). In a name of this kind, Πυργο- must function as an intensification of the base (as in Ὑψίθεμεις; see also Ἀβρόθεμεις, Ἀγνόθεμεις, Ἀριστόθεμεις, etc.). Kassel, Austin (*PCG* vol. 5, 286) describe it as 'nomen magnificum' and say that it would be more in place in Plautus than in New Comedy.

²²¹ The form ἐπάν is common in Middle and New Comedy and so is entirely compatible with Pyrgothemis being haughty. The same applies to εἶπον from the alphathematic εἶπα (see above n. 218). Pyrgothemis was perhaps coupled with an uneducated husband whose way of speaking she loathes (one may think, e.g., of Strepsiades and his wife in Aristophanes' *Clouds*). Is she, then, the Ἀποδιδοῦσα of the title, who maybe initially returned to her husband or father something that she had been given (e.g. the dowry or a gift from her husband)?

²²² Arnott (1996, 193) comments that the use of ψυγεύς in place of its more common Attic equivalents is unclear.

corresponding to ψυκτηρίας or ψυκτηίρ.²²³ Note, also, the short [a] in ψυγέα, which violates the usual Attic prosody (Chapter 5, Section B.2.8). Regarding σεῦτλον in place of Attic τευτλίον, it was definitely considered a dialectal, non-Attic feature (see Alex. fr. 146, where σεῦτλον in place of τεῦτλον is one of the hallmarks of the Doric doctor, but it is also Ionic); it is, however, also the koine form.²²⁴ Finally, φακέα is the non-contracted equivalent of φακῆ. Besides an occurrence in Epicharmus (fr. 30), φακέα is unattested in literary (also Ionic) and documentary sources.²²⁵ φακέα should perhaps represent the ‘simplified’ retention of the more transparent form (i.e. the contracted φακῆ is less clearly a nominative form than φακέα) as happens with other similar forms (i.e. κωλέα in place of κολῆ, λεοντή/λεοντέα in place of λεοντή, etc.);²²⁶ this squares well with the avoidance of a variety of contracted stems in late Attic and then predominantly in the koine (i.e. contracted thematic nouns and adjectives; ‘contracted’ genitive and accusative, singular and plural of the *eu*-stems; accusative singular and plural of the *eu*-stems).²²⁷

Euphron’s fragment provides further evidence of the growing separation between a conservative and an ‘international’ Attic, which, by Euphron’s time, is essentially the koine.²²⁸ At least one of the linguistic features highlighted in the fragment – namely, the non-contracted φακέα – is either a low late-Attic feature or must be regarded as already a koine form. In any event, it is possible that Pyrgothemis, who defended ‘good’ Attic, was not presented in an entirely positive light, and so, while the Athenians were certainly conscious of the growing divide between ‘conservative’ Attic and the koine, it is far from certain that the general view must have been consonant with the kind of indignation expressed by char-

223 See Heracleon Gramm. 7 Berndt = Ath. 11.503a (where Euphron’s fragment is quoted and which is probably the reference for Heracleon’s comment that τοὺς δ’ Ἀττικοὺς καὶ κωμωδεῖν τὸν ψυγέα ὡς ξενικὸν ὄνομα) and Hsch. ψ 264.

224 This consonantism is discussed by Lucian in *The Consonants at Law* (9). σεῦτλον is the transmitted reading at Antiph. fr. 71.1, apparently without any justification (there is no indication of foreign speech; notice too πατάνια rather than the later form βατάνια), and therefore Volkmar Schmidt (see Kassel, Austin, *PCG* vol. 2, 349) suggested restoring the expected Attic τεῦτλον (approved by Olson 2023, 267–8).

225 One would expect it to surface at least in documentary papyri, in which φακῆ is common.

226 See Lobeck (1820, 78–9); Meineke (*FCG* vol. 4, 490). Notice that the transmitted κωλέα Anaxipp. fr. 1.38 has rightly been emended into κολῆν ἢ by Kaibel. Indeed, the non-contracted inflection (which is post-Classical) is foreign to Attic.

227 See Chapter 5, Section B.2.3; Section B.2.7; Section B.2.8. One may also compare the uncontracted *s*-stems in Aeneas the Tactician (see Vela Tejada 1991, 125–6). See also Section 5.2 regarding ἔπη/ἔπεα in the 4th-century BCE *defixio* Peek, *Kerameikos* III.C.3.

228 It is also possible that Pyrgothemis concentrates specifically on the Ionicising features in the early koine, perhaps advocating for retaining the Attic equivalents.

acters such as Pyrgothemis. Interestingly, this passage represents the first, hitherto unnoticed example of the use of the metaphor of coins and money with reference to the comparative quality of words, which would also be commonly exploited in Atticist lexica.²²⁹ It is possible that exchanges of this nature and the kind of vocabulary and images adopted to express the unequal value of old and new forms may have directly inspired the later scholars who, perceiving the more and more increasing divide between Classical Attic and the koine, recommended the more conservative and archaicising language.

5 The 'new' language of a brave new world: 4th-century BCE literary Attic

As already discussed, the 4th century BCE was a key transitional phase in the evolution of Attic, during which the dialect's role as a means of expressing Athenian identity changed considerably compared to the 5th century BCE. The literary language did not remain unaffected, although some literary genres document this better than others, which in turn tend to adopt a more conservative language.

In the first place, the 'international' literary Attic used by 5th-century BCE authors such as Thucydides and Antiphon finds further development in the innovative language of Xenophon, who programmatically rejects the parochial form of Attic in favour of an ampler linguistic palette, simultaneously more inclusive and forward-looking, that welcomes colloquialisms, poeticisms, and foreign elements to create a highly variegated language that better suits the needs of his equally varied literary production. Second, already in the early 4th century BCE, the language of comedy undergoes a paradigm shift: as part of the ongoing transition towards the 'new' and 'international' Attic that precedes the koine, the poets of Middle and New Comedy employ a more realistic language, increasingly adopting elements that were previously foreign to the literary Attic and confined to informal registers. Finally, the 4th century BCE also sees the affirmation of Attic as the international literary language to be used also by non-Athenian authors, such as Aeneas the Tactician, who wrote for the wider Greek audience rather than for a primarily Athenian one. Their adoption of literary Attic constitutes proof of the dialect's emancipation from the narrowly localistic dimension and its transformation into a truly international language that rapidly became the literary language of all Greeks.

²²⁹ See Lamagna (2004a); Kim (2023). See also Chapter 2, Section 3.1 on evaluative terminology.

This picture, however schematic, reveals that the 4th century BCE was a dynamic phase of experimentation in literary Attic, and for this reason, it eluded, and partly continues to elude, attempts to rigidly define the boundaries of ‘pure’ Attic. Indeed, the terrain on which the ideological clashes between the Atticist lexicographers became more heated coincides precisely with the evaluation of the role that 4th-century BCE Attic literary sources should have for the purpose of defining the kind of Attic that is worthy of imitation. The main 4th-century BCE sources used by the Atticists are the orators, Plato, Xenophon, and the poets of Middle and New Comedy. Some of these, notably Demosthenes and Plato, are considered by the Atticists to be among the most authoritative models of Attic together with Aristophanes.²³⁰ Other orators receive a less conciliatory treatment: for example, Atticist lexicographers occasionally stigmatise the unapproved forms used by Lysias and Hyperides.²³¹ In any case, the language of Xenophon and especially that of Middle and New Comedy are undoubtedly those that created the greatest difficulties for the Atticists’ attempts to define Classical Attic. In fact, while these are Classical writers, their language is considered defective in several respects, in that it adopts ‘innovative’ forms, colloquialisms, dialectalisms, and poeticisms.

However, the expectations of ancient lexicographers and the parameters by which they judge the quality of a writer’s language presuppose an ideological and anti-historical concept of ‘pure’ Attic. In fact, neither Xenophon nor the language of Middle and New Comedy are examples of ‘contaminated’ Attic as opposed to the ‘pure’ Attic of, e.g., Demosthenes. Rather, compared with the more conservative language of oratory, these writers are more open to adopting elements of ‘New’ Attic in a way that closely mirrors the social and cultural transformations of 4th-century BCE Athens. Thus, both ancient and modern scholarship has deceptively considered the language of 4th-century BCE oratory to be the canon of ‘pure’ Attic, when, in fact, it presents a crystallised and depurated form of the dialect.²³² Of course, this does not imply that innovative traits are absent from the

230 Still, on occasion the peculiarities of their language are underlined (for Plato see, e.g., Moer. δ 33, ε 39, and σ 25).

231 On Lysias’ reception in Atticist lexicography see Phryn. *Ecl.* 90, 323, and 330. On the innovative features of the language of Hyperides, see López Eire (2002).

232 See Adrados (2005, 160), ‘we are dealing with a somewhat artificial regularisation of Attic prose, beneath which strong forces were stirring which would end up creating *koine*’. Similar conclusions are already formulated by Wilamowitz (1969, 481) (in a paper originally delivered in 1928); Thumb, Scherer (1959, 304; 311–2). On the features of 4th-century BCE prose, see Adrados (2005, 154–60). Dover (1968b, 83–6) discusses the evidence from Lysias showing that the language of oratory, despite the plain style, is more remote from comedy’s more colloquial language and style.

language of the Attic orators, but they are generally present to a lesser degree than in the language of Xenophon or in Middle and New Comedy.²³³

To conclude, the 4th-century BCE writers who adopt 'innovative' Attic embody the overcoming of the tension between conservation and innovation that was already operating during the 5th century BCE and that anticipated the affirmation of 'international' Attic as the literary language of the entire Greek-speaking world and its subsequent evolution during the Hellenistic period.

5.1 The language of Xenophon

Xenophon's language is a province of studies that, despite repeated calls to arms, has yet to attain full maturity.²³⁴ Besides a few studies that, although useful, are of comparatively more limited scope and follow in the footsteps of earlier scholarship, in recent years, important contributions by Luuk Huitink and Tim Rood have begun to change this condition of relative stasis, suggesting a new interpretative framework in which to historically place Xenophon's language. We shall provide a brief overview of the state of the art and then explain in what ways Huitink and Rood have re-defined the ways in which scholarship should approach Xenophon's Greek.

The language of Xenophon has long posed a problem for ancient and modern scholars alike. The opinion of ancient lexicographers, notably those of Atticist orientation, is instructive.²³⁵ Xenophon's language was not an undisputed model of Attic, in that he was responsible for using a 'contaminated' language that resulted in a mixture of poeticisms, dialectalisms, and koineisms. The Atticist lexica often single out forms attested only in Xenophon and more generally stress his highly 'unorthodox' language.²³⁶ Largely similar views have been upheld by modern

233 Detailed references to the language of 4th-century BCE oratory with respect to the evolution of Attic are provided in Chapter 5.

234 The standard work on Xenophon's language remains Gautier (1911). See also Rutherford (1881, 60–74); Cavenaile (1975); V. Gray (1985, 170–2); Pomeroy (1994, 9–15); Lipka (2002, 46–53); V. Gray (2006); V. Gray (2007, 22–9); V. Gray (2011); V. Gray (2017); Huitink, Rood (2019, 23–32); Huitink, Rood (2020); Favi (forthcoming a).

235 On the ancient reception of Xenophon's language, see Münscher (1920, 163–80); Sgobbi (2004). A more positive view of Xenophon's language is presupposed by the Atticist lexicon contained in the 6th-century CE P.Oxy. 15.1803 (see Favi 2022t, 319–20).

236 To mention but the most famous cases: ὀδμή in place of ὀσμῆ, which is reproached for being Ionic (Phryn. *Ecl.* 62; *PS* 97.21–2; *Poll.* 2.76; *Antiatt.* ο 13; [Hdn.] *Philet.* 304); ἥως in place of ἔως, which is reproached for being too poetic (Phot. *ε* 2535); apocopated ἀγκράτος in place of ἀνά κράτος, which is also lamented as a poeticism that one should avoid (Σ α 79 = Σ^b α 158 = *Su.* α 250 (*ex*

scholars, whose judgements regarding Xenophon's language have been cautious at best, if not downright negative.²³⁷ As is clear from the structure of the lexicon produced by Sauppe (1869) and the monograph by Gautier (1911), the two standard reference works for Xenophon's language, that which has attracted most (negative) attention is the blending of words unique to Xenophon or first attested in Xenophon and then in the koine; dialectalisms, such as Ionicisms, Doricisms, or both; poeticisms; and words used by Xenophon with a special meaning. Although this linguistic 'contamination' is particularly apparent in the lexicon, the phonology and morphology of Xenophon's language also contain some surprises, as exemplified (to mention but a few cases) by forms with Ionic and poetic phonology (according to the ancient sources, Xenophon used ὀδμή and ἠώς, and his writings also offer relatively ample evidence of apocopated prefixed verbs)²³⁸ and by the productive use of normally recessive morphemes (notably, archaisms such as the *nomina agentis* in -τηρ), and the extensive use of other suffixes to create neologisms (notably, abstract nouns in -σύνη).²³⁹

The underlying assumption shared by ancient and modern scholars is that all the seemingly 'exceptional' features in Xenophon's language should be explained according to the three main categories of dialectalisms, poeticisms, or koineisms. Therefore, the widespread view is that Xenophon falls short of adhering to an ideal notion of 'good' or 'pure' Attic, a notion first conceived by Atticist lexicography and then borrowed by default by modern scholars. The late-antique lexicographer Helladius (4th/5th century CE) already explained Xenophon's composite language as a consequence of his having travelled far and wide throughout Greece and the Near East and encountered speakers of many varieties of Greek and of non-Greek languages.²⁴⁰ Despite some critical voices,²⁴¹ this explanation has also been accepted by modern scholars.²⁴²

We owe to Huitink and Rood a fundamental change in perspective that has enabled us to re-think the approach and conclusions of ancient and modern scholar-

Σ), Σ^b α 276 = Phot. α 184 (ex Σ^m; Phryn. PS fr. *72)); ἀκμήν in place of ἔτι, which is faulted as a post-Classical usage (Moer. α 149; Phryn. Ecl. 93).

237 See the examples collected by Huitink, Rood (2019, 24). The chauvinistic analysis by Rutherford (1881, 160–1) is particularly amusing.

238 However, not all cases of apocopated prepositional prefixes are poeticisms. On καμμύων in X. Cyr. 8.3.27–8, see Section 5.2.

239 On these categories see Gautier (1911, 43–7; 77; 79; 160); Favi (forthcoming a).

240 See Helladius *ap.* Phot. *Bibl. cod.* 279.533b.25–8.

241 See Dover (1997, 110).

242 See Adrados (2005, 160).

ship.²⁴³ Huitink and Rood have demonstrated that the notion that Xenophon was unable to write 'good' or 'proper' Attic is unfounded. First, Xenophon evidently interacted with other Athenian literature, and so he cannot simply have forgotten what Attic was like. More importantly, however, the very notion of 'pure' or 'genuine' Attic, the benchmark by which Xenophon is considered unsuccessful, is clearly misguided, being an ideologically loaded and essentially anti-historical concept. Indeed, scholarship has customarily taken for granted that the language of 4th-century BCE Attic prose, especially oratory, corresponds to the 'pure' Attic vernacular, which came to maturation and developed as a literary language after the Ionic influence, which was so significant in early Attic prose, gradually waned.²⁴⁴ However, if we examine 4th-century BCE literary Attic from a wider perspective, considering the significant developments related to the emergence of 'international' Attic and the convergence of Attic and Ionic, we must conclude that the truth is actually the opposite.²⁴⁵ The language of prose, particularly oratory, is more likely a construct, a 'purified' diction which deliberately avoids marked traits, both those which belong to innovative or colloquial Attic and those which, however consecrated by literature, were considered non-strictly Attic. In this sense, the comparison between the language of Xenophon and that of Middle and New Comedy is probably more revealing about 4th-century BCE Attic than the language of Demosthenes. We should add that the idea of 4th-century BCE literary Attic as a more mature literary language that gradually emancipated itself from the influence of Ionic is misleading. Since, as we discussed above (see Section 2.1), the Ionic features of early Attic prose are not mechanical imports into literary Attic, it would be perverse to envisage a process whereby a form of Ionicising early literary Attic was then supplanted by the 'genuine' Attic of 4th-century BCE oratory.²⁴⁶ Rather, the apparently more 'genuine' Attic of 4th-century BCE oratory compared with Thucydides or Xenophon is further proof that oratory adopts a deliberately conservative and more selective language than more open-minded prose writers, such as Thucydides, Antiphon, and Xenophon and, we may add, Middle and New Comedy.

In light of this, there is no reason to assume that Xenophon failed to write good Attic or that, to successfully write in Attic, he should have adopted the same approach as the orators of his time, even more so given that the entirely different

²⁴³ Huitink, Rood (2019, 23–32); Huitink, Rood (2020). Several important observations, which go in the same direction as Huitink and Rood, were also made by López Eire (1981–1982, 28–30; 41).

²⁴⁴ See Huitink, Rood (2020, 425–6); Section 5.

²⁴⁵ On 'international' Attic see Section 4.

²⁴⁶ Commenting on the poeticism *δοῦπος* in Xenophon (*An.* 2.2.19) and Thucydides (3.22.4), Rutherford (1881, 168) remarks that the occurrence in Thucydides is 'an indication of the immaturity of Attic in the historian's time'.

literary genre(s) he practised must have presented him with different needs and possibilities (also compared to oratory).²⁴⁷ The key outcome of this change in perspective is that the very categories by which ancient and modern scholars have considered Xenophon's language exceptional ought to be systematically re-thought. Huitink and Rood offer many examples of this.²⁴⁸ To begin with, some of the words that Xenophon shares with tragedy may originally have been colloquial traits that were then excluded from literary language. Second, the forms that Xenophon shares with Ionic literature may also be Attic archaisms that Xenophon revived or that may have had a subterranean life while being kept outside the realm of literary language. Regarding dialectal forms, they may be examples of innovative 4th-century BCE Attic or may serve as the mimesis of foreign diction, but they may also imbue Xenophon's language with a more 'international' aura. Similarly, it has long been acknowledged that poeticisms often fulfil a precise function, that of creating pathos.

To conclude, we owe to the most recent scholarship the long-awaited definition of a convincing interpretative framework of Xenophon's language. Not only has this new approach proven more consistent, preventing the unwelcome consequence of having to interpret the individual features of Xenophon's language as discrete pieces of a larger jigsaw puzzle, but it also allows the definition of a more pluralistic form of literary Attic in line with the new trends of 4th-century BCE Attic literature and culture.

5.2 The language of Middle and New Comedy

Among the various Greek literary languages, the language of comedy has regularly been considered, equally in ancient and modern times, to be the closest approximation to the vernacular.²⁴⁹ However, not all phases of Attic comedy have been cred-

247 See also how Pomeroy (1994, 14), in comparing the uneven evaluations of Xenophon's language and style among ancient and modern critics, offers the important remark that 'one conclusion is obvious: not being an orator, Xenophon does not observe the restrictions and rules that the orators show; his style is characterized by diversity rather than by uniformity'. Pomeroy also refers to the praise of Xenophon's stylistic versatility by Dio Chrysostom (18.14–7), who considers Xenophon a model for every kind of oratory and for every occasion.

248 See Huitink, Rood (2019, 27–31). On military jargon, see Section 4.2.

249 Modern scholars explicitly indicate comedy, together with oratory and the inscriptions, as the most reliable source of information about spoken Attic. See Colvin (2014, 166): 'If a word or a grammatical form appears in at least two categories of the following list, which is generally regarded as conclusive evidence that it was current in spoken Attic: (a) either Lysias or Demosthenes; (b) Aristophanic comedy (not in choral sections); (c) Athenian prose inscriptions'.

ited with the same level of trustworthiness as documents written in the kind of Attic that scholars variously indicate as 'good', 'real', or 'pure'. Indeed, while the poets of Old Comedy are typically considered to constitute eminently reliable evidence of 'good' Attic (although not all of them are on the same level),²⁵⁰ the poets of the later phases of Attic comedy – namely, Middle and New Comedy – have often been regarded with suspicion even by more open-minded scholars, both ancient and modern. Nonetheless, it is precisely these later phases in the history of comedy that are worthy of closer inspection for the purposes of our research on linguistic purism. We shall analyse the peculiarities of the language of Middle and New Comedy in greater detail in the next chapter; in this section, we shall provide a more general presentation of the evolution of the language of Attic comedy.

The language of Attic comedy is especially varied, and multiple registers may be adopted for a variety of purposes. Previous scholarship has investigated this aspect thoroughly.²⁵¹ It is particularly interesting for our purposes that comic language admits of several innovative linguistic features that likely belonged to spoken Attic and point further towards the koine. However, some features of colloquial Attic admitted in early Attic prose are largely avoided by Aristophanes and the other poets of Old Comedy (see Section 2.1). Interestingly, however, these features would soon become increasingly common in Middle and New Comedy. At first glance, it would be tempting to explain these 'modern' elements in the language of Middle and New Comedy in diachronic terms – that is, as indications of the development of 'international' Attic and as a prelude to the koine. However, despite this seemingly straightforward explanation, things are more complicated.

In an important study, Willi (2003b) thoroughly investigated the language of *Plutus*, Aristophanes' most recent preserved play (388 BCE). Having collected and discussed a wealth of innovative linguistic features which occur in this play but are unparalleled in Aristophanes' earlier comedies, Willi explained that such linguistic peculiarities cannot possibly be accounted for solely in light of the play's date – that is, as a mere reflection of a sudden diachronic development of Attic. Rather, a gradual shift in the defining linguistic parameters must have occurred in the language of Attic comedy, the consequence of which was the inclusion of more colloquial (and even low-class) features and 'international' (especially Ionic) elements to achieve realism.²⁵² This process is certainly not limited to Aristo-

²⁵⁰ See Tribulato (2024).

²⁵¹ To mention just a few contributions (which also provide further references), see López Eire (1996b); Colvin (1999); Willi (2003a); Redondo (2016).

²⁵² This increased realism is also discussed by Dickey (1995) in relation to forms of address in Aristophanes and Menander. It is surely no coincidence that the only parallel in Aristophanes for the fragments of Middle and New Comedy commenting on 'new' words is the passage of *Plutus*

phanes. To mention just one other example, Alcaeus is another poet of (late) Old Comedy who appears to have used seemingly ‘deviant’ forms, and, in fact, several of his fragments are quoted by the *Antiatticist* and other open-minded Atticist sources precisely because they bear witness to forms which are unexpected in ‘pure’ Attic.²⁵³

Willi’s conclusions about the language of *Plutus* thus shed light more widely on the transitional phase from Old Comedy to Middle and then New Comedy in the context of the emerging ‘international’ Attic.²⁵⁴ This shift in linguistic paradigms also mirrors the major socio-political transformations taking place in 4th-century BCE Athens, which surely exerted a significant effect on the literary language, which, in the case of comedy, was verging towards an increased realism.²⁵⁵

That the language of Old Comedy was different from that of Middle and New Comedy was widely acknowledged in antiquity.²⁵⁶ An instructive example is provided by a passage of *Prolegomena de comoedia* 3.42–5 Koster, which states that ‘the poets of Middle Comedy did not employ the poetic style, but through familiar language they have rhetorical qualities, so that the poetic style is rare in them. Instead, they are all entirely concerned with the plots’. This is a perceptive (although possibly not neutral) observation.²⁵⁷ However, it did not find wider diffusion among ancient

in which the use of χαίρειν for greeting is described as ‘old and rotten’ (Ar. *Pl.* 322–5). See also the discussion of Men. fr. 330 at Section 4.1.

253 See Orth (2013, 15–6). Other cases are discussed by Willi (2010c, 473–6).

254 See Section 4. On Menander’s language as a form of ‘international’ Attic, see López Eire (2002).

255 See Willi (2003b, 66–8) (with previous bibliography on *Plutus*). As observed by Willi (2003a, 169), ‘the transition from Old to Middle Comedy is one of the symptoms of an increasingly ‘privatized’ and domesticized Athenian world’. This also makes the para-tragic or para-dithyrambic passages of Middle Comedy even more interesting (see Dobrov 2002).

256 The opposition between Old Comedy and (Middle and) New Comedy was thus used for the periodisation of the different stages of the Attic dialect (see Phryn. *Ecl.* 390 and *Ecl.* 391, schol. Thuc. 1.30.1a). How this may have impacted the Atticists’ perception of the chronological differentiation of Attic and their appreciation of different phases of the dialect will be discussed in *Ancient Greek Purism* Volume 2. See also Chapter 7, note 217 on how the Greek grammarians address the diachronic evolution of Attic.

257 See Nesselrath (1990, 49–50; 241–2), who discusses the various qualifications attributed by *Prolegomena de comoedia* 3 to the main poets of Greek comedy. Notice that Cratinus is described as ποιητικώτατος for his reproduction of Aeschylus’ style: since Eupolis is similarly described as δυνατός τῆ λέξει for being an imitator of Cratinus (3.34 Koster), the sense is likely that Cratinus’ powerful style was reminiscent of Aeschylus’ (see Silk 2000, 304–6). As always, the first prize is for Aristophanes, who is described as μακρῶ λογιώτατος, best of all comic poets, an imitator of Euripides, and very refined in choral songs (3.36–7 Koster). See also *Prolegomena de comoedia* 5.1–7 Koster: τῆς κωμωδίας τὸ μὲν ἔστιν ἀρχαῖον, τὸ δὲ νέον, τὸ δὲ μέσον. τῆς δὲ νέας διαφέρει ἢ παλαιὰ κωμωδία χρόνω, διαλέκτω, ὕλη, μέτρῳ, διασκευῇ. [. . .] διαλέκτω δέ, καθὸ ἢ μὲν νέα τὸ

scholars, who typically explain the peculiarities of the language used by later comic poets as a weakness rather than a sign that they may be, in fact, even closer to 'real' Attic than the poets of Old Comedy.²⁵⁸ In light of this, the role assigned to Middle and New Comedy (and to the 'minor' poets of Old Comedy) in the canon is precisely the area in which dissent between 'strict' and 'open-minded' Atticist lexicography arose.²⁵⁹

Pollux's discussion of κοιτών exemplifies this quite explicitly, demonstrating that the canon is the guiding criterium for Atticists more than any other aspects (see also Chapter 1, Section 4.3). While in an unspecified passage of Menander's (fr. 614), a character must have expressed scepticism about κοιτών (this probably being the consolidated comic scheme we discussed extensively above), Pollux concludes that since Aristophanes used κοιτών in *Aeolosicon* (fr. 6), all doubts are allayed. κοιτών is indeed a 'new' word in 4th-century BCE Attic and will only surface again in the Septuagint. Furthermore, *Aeolosicon* is Aristophanes' last play, and so it must have been part of the same linguistic shift towards the use of more realistic language that is evident in *Plutus*. As such, there is no opposition between the use of κοιτών by Aristophanes and the potentially critical remark made in the passage of Menander, whose character was simply pointing out the use of such a 'new' word. Nevertheless, the simple fact that Aristophanes used it is sufficient evidence for ancient scholars to approve its use, with little or no concern for the wider linguistic implications of the use of such a form.

σφετέρων ἔσχε τῆ νέα κεχρημένη Ἀτθίδι, ἡ δὲ παλαιὰ τὸ δεινὸν καὶ ὑψηλὸν τοῦ λόγου· ἐνίοτε δὲ καὶ ἐπιτηδεύουσι λέξεις τινάς, where it is stated that New Comedy adopts 'New Attic' with the aim to achieve clarity. On *Prolegomena de comoedia* 15.43 Koster (*Tractatus Coislinianus* 14a Janko): κωμική ἐστὶ λέξις κοινή καὶ δημώδης as referring to New Comedy, see Nesselrath (1990, 134–5).

258 See also Monaco (2023, 15) discussing Phrynichus' (*Ecl.* 393) misinterpretation (or, better, partial understanding) of σύσσημον in Men. *Sam.* 792.

259 See, e.g., Poll. 3.29: οἱ δ' ἐκ τῶν ἀνεψιαδῶν ἀλλήλοις ἐξανέψιοι τε καὶ ἐξανέψιαι. τοῦτ' ὡς δὲ τῷ ὀνόματι οὐ πάντῃ τετριμμένῳ κέχρηται Μένανδρος, ὃ ἄει μὲν οὐ χρηστότερον ὡς οὐκ ἀκριβῶς Ἑλληνικῶ, ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν ἀκατονομάστων πιστευτέον· ὧν γὰρ γενῶν ἡ πραγμάτων ἢ κτημάτων ὀνόματα παρ' ἄλλοις οὐκ ἔστι, ταῦτα ἀγαπητῶν ἂν εἴη καὶ παρὰ τούτου λαβεῖν ('Those [who are born] from second-cousins are, to one another, 'children of second-cousins' (masc. and fem.). Menander (fr. 619) uses this not quite common word (i.e. ἐξανέψιοι/ἐξανέψιαι). One must not always rely on him (i.e. Menander), since he does not use accurate Greek, but one must trust him for those things for which there is no word. Indeed, regarding the words for kinship relationships and things and possessions which are not attested in other [writers], one must be content to take these words also from him'). On the implausibility of Pollux's interpretation of ἐξανέψιος, which is more likely the same as ἀνεψιαδοί 'second-cousins, the children of first-cousins', see Nauck's observations quoted by Kassel, Austin (*PCG* vol. 6,2, 318).

The next chapter will be devoted to a closer inspection of the language of Middle and New Comedy, including in relation to how its reception in ancient scholarship defined the ancient views about ‘pure’ Attic. Here, to provide further evidence of the ‘programmatically’ linguistic shift from Old Comedy to Middle and New Comedy, we shall collect examples of continuity in the use of some ‘colloquial’ new features in Attic comedy. This discussion, however selective, aims to demonstrate that, to some degree, the colloquial Attic of the 5th and 4th centuries BCE were less discrete entities than one might suppose. Hence, when ‘new’ forms begin to surface in later comedy, they are not necessarily to be taken as ‘new’ in Attic, but simply as ‘newly’ permitted in the literary language. Of course, none of this is to say that the language of later comedy contains no truly innovative elements compared to 5th-century BCE Attic. We need only bear in mind that no sharp transition should be posited.²⁶⁰

Besides the passages of Old Comedy in which ‘low’ linguistic features are used for comic effect (see Pl.Com. fr. 183 on Hyperbolus’ careless pronunciation), the insightful observation that some innovative elements of colloquial language may be used ‘seriously’ (i.e. without a parodic aim) had already been made in antiquity. In his treatise *On the Words Suspected of Not Being Used by the Ancients*,²⁶¹ Aristophanes of Byzantium (fr. 25) discussed the ‘serious’ use (i.e. without any comic function) of the gender metaplasm ὁ πρόσωπος (i.e. in place of τὸ πρόσωπον) and the two-syllable genitive τοῦ γάλα (i.e. as though τὸ γάλα were indeclinable) by Plato Comicus (fr. 247).²⁶² Both cases are somewhat problematic, however. The former, although no other instance of ὁ πρόσωπος is known, is not impossible to believe given that declension metaplasm is common.²⁶³ The indeclinable τὸ γάλα proves highly challenging, and in the lack of any occurrence or parallel, doubts are not allayed.²⁶⁴ However, other cases are more productive for discussion.

²⁶⁰ See also Redondo (2022).

²⁶¹ See Chapter 7, Section 2.1.

²⁶² Cassio (1981, 84) draws attention to these fragments.

²⁶³ See Chapter 6, Section 5.1. Note, e.g., that the first examples of τὸ σκότος in place of expected ὁ σκότος may occur in Ameipsias (see further Chapter 5, Section B.2.11). However, Slater (1986, 22) suspects a faulty segmentation from the adjective εὐπρόσωπος.

²⁶⁴ For a possible instance of γάλατι in place of γάλακτι in Pherecr. fr. 113.18, see Kassel, Austin (*PCG* vol. 7, 158). Presumably, Aristophanes of Byzantium inferred that Plato Comicus used such forms ‘seriously’ because in the passages he found no explicit remarks on their being unacceptable, as for instance in the case of Hyperbolus in Pl.Com. fr. 183 (see Section 3.3), or any trace of parody. However, this is no guarantee, and Aristophanes may simply have been superficial or used faulty manuscripts. Slater (1986, 22) stresses that τοῦ γάλα is not included by ancient grammarians among the indeclinable nouns and suspects corruption. Kassel, Austin (*PCG* vol. 7, 535) are also unconvinced that Aristophanes of Byzantium should be taken literally.

The first such case is the analogical inflection of γυνή as an *ā*-stem, which is well documented from Old to New Comedy (Pherecr. fr. 96 and 206; Alc.Com. fr. 32; Men. fr. *457; Philippid. fr. 2; several of these fragments are preserved by the same lexicographical sources).²⁶⁵ Threatte (1996, 274) records no occurrence in Attic inscriptions, and earlier scholars have concluded that the comic poets simply made up the inflection γυνή, γυνῆς.²⁶⁶ However, the accusative γυνήν is certainly attested in a 4th-century BCE *defixio* from the Ceramicus (Peek, *Kerameikos* III.C.3.71–5: καὶ ψυχὴν | [τ]ῆν Ἐργασίω[ν] | καὶ [γ]υνήν | τὴν Ἐργασίω- | -νος καταδῶ).²⁶⁷ Therefore, γυνή, γυνῆς must actually have existed in spoken Attic in the 5th and 4th centuries BCE, although it was normally confined to ‘subterranean’ circulation.²⁶⁸ The instance of γυνήν in the *defixio* is especially revealing, even more so considering that this *defixio* is quite accurately written. The analogical γυνήν, although it would typically be relegated to the spoken language, is employed in this case as it parallels the sustained repetition of ψυχὴν throughout the text.²⁶⁹

An even more impressive case is the use of forms with an apocopated prefix, notably with a first element κατα-. This phenomenon is foreign to Attic, and in comedy, apocopated forms are usually limited to the parody of high language.²⁷⁰ However, some instances counter this. Firstly, the poet of Old Comedy Ameipsias (fr. 12.1) used καββαλῶν (= καταβαλῶν) in a passage which shows no sign of parodying the high language (see Orth 2013, 263–4). Further, the Atticist lexica inform us that Alexis (fr. 320) too used καμμύω in place of καταμύω, and this apocopated form is also likely to occur in X. *Cyr.* 8.3.27–8. In light of its widespread use in koine texts, it is highly likely that apocopated καμμύω was a colloquial element in Alexis and Xenophon, and this may well be the case of καββαλῶν in Ameipsias as well.²⁷¹ An

²⁶⁵ See Chapter 5, Section B.2.11.

²⁶⁶ See Schwyzler (1939, 582–3) and the bibliography collected at *CGMEMG* vol. 2, 533.

²⁶⁷ On this text, until recently dated to the mid-5th century BCE and considered the oldest known *defixio* from Attic, see Lamont (2023, 147–53).

²⁶⁸ This inflection is also known from Sicilian Doric (see Greg.Cor. 3.492, where γάναν must be a mistake for γυνάν). Mayser (*Gramm.* vol. 1.3, 30–1) is sceptical about the analogical inflection on the papyri and argues that γυνή may have become indeclinable. Gignac (1981, 52) is more positive and stresses that disyllabic γυνή, γυνῆς is also used in Medieval Greek (see *CGMEMG* vol. 2, 533).

²⁶⁹ The variation ἔπεα/ἔπη on this *defixio* is also revealing of a possibly ‘pluralistic’ language (i.e. partly Ionicised informal Attic; see Vela Tejada 1991, 125–6 on uncontracted *s*-stems in Aeneas the Tactician and Section 4.3 for the discussion of uncontracted φακέα in Euphron fr. 3).

²⁷⁰ See K–B (vol. 1, 180); Threatte (1980, 410–1). To the examples collected by K–B add ἀγγασκε (= ἀνάγασκε) in Pherecr. fr. 211 and καββαλῶν (= καταβαλῶν) in Amips. fr. 12.1 (on this latter see above).

²⁷¹ See Favi (2022u).

important parallel is the occurrence of *καδδίδημι* (= *καταδίδημι*, the athematic reduplicated equivalent of Attic *καταδέω*) in a *defixio* written in Boeotian but found in Attica (*DTA* 74, unspecified date).²⁷² This occurrence makes it quite possible that apocopated forms with the *κατα-* prefix were not unfamiliar in the informal language spoken in Attica.²⁷³ This inference is strengthened considering that the non-Attic verb *καταδίδημι* entered low-register Attic via Boeotian, as demonstrated by its use in *defixiones* found in Attica and undoubtedly written in Attic.²⁷⁴ This picture, whereby apocopated forms in *κατα-* entered low-register Attic, aligns with the evidence for *καββάλλω* (= *καταβάλλω*) in Old Comedy (Ameipsias) and *καμμύω* in Middle Comedy (Alexis) and Xenophon. However, while the former did not persist into the koine, the latter is widely attested in post-Classical times.

This parallel between the ‘new’ language of Middle and New Comedy and the ‘new’ language of Xenophon corroborates the interpretation suggested above concerning the special characteristics of 4th-century BCE literary Attic (see Section 5). The language of Middle and New Comedy and the factors determining its development demonstrate that the more open approach to Attic, as witnessed in early prose, would ultimately win out, not only in the ‘international’ prose of Xenophon but also in a ‘realistic’ and eminently ‘local’ genre such as comedy, whereby in the 5th century BCE, ‘pure’ Attic was prominently employed to promote a certain kind of civic identity and ideology (see Section 3).

5.3 Attic as the literary language of all Greeks

As part of the same process exemplified by Xenophon, during the 4th century BCE, Attic rapidly developed into an international literary language for use across a variety of genres. This is best documented in writers who adopt a form of literary Attic despite the fact that they themselves are not from an Athenian background and that their audiences are not primarily Athenian.

The first example that comes to mind is obviously historiography. While the language of historical prose was Ionic until the 5th century BCE, following the model of Thucydides and Xenophon, ‘international’ Attic replaced Ionic as the literary language for writing history, and non-Athenian writers, such as Philistus of Syracuse, Ephorus of Cyme, and Theopompus of Chius, adopted it as the new lin-

272 On the apocope of preposition in Boeotian and other epichoric dialects (not in the Ionic-Attic group) see Buck (1955, 81–2) and *κατ θάλατταν* in *IG* 7.2407.10.

273 This closely recalls other shared features of low-register Attic and Boeotian (see Section 3.1).

274 See the evidence collected by J. J. Bravo (2016, 136 n. 27).

guistic standard for this genre.²⁷⁵ The use of Attic by Ephorus and Theopompus is particularly significant, since, being Ionian by birth, they would have had an even greater claim to the use of their native variety of Greek in historical writing.

However, the generalisation of Attic as the literary language of historical prose to the detriment of Ionic was not invariably undisputed, and it is instructive to approach the subject with attention to nuance. Indeed, there is evidence for the continued use of Ionic in Hellenistic prose as part of a conscious attempt on the part of writers to distance themselves from the influence of Attic literary culture.²⁷⁶ A clear example is offered by Ctesias of Cnidus.²⁷⁷ A contemporary of Xenophon, Ctesias was also roughly contemporary with Philistus and one or two generations older than Ephorus and Theopompus. Of his historical writings, we are better informed about *Persiká* (in 23 books) and *Indiká* (in 1 book). In his summary of *Persiká*, Photius (*Bibl. cod.* 72.45a.5–19 = *FGrHist* 688 T 13) remarks that Ctesias' use of Ionic was not thorough, but it was limited to ἐνιαυτοὶ λέξεις, whereas he observes that the *Indiká* were written more consistently in Ionic (Phot. *Bibl. cod.* 72.45a.20–1 = *FGrHist* 688 T 10); that this information is reliable is also confirmed by the surviving fragments of *Persiká*. Such an inconsistent choice has been explained as part of a different agenda on Ctesias' part. The *Persiká* were a historical writing of broad scope, written in emulation of Herodotus' *Histories*, and so the use of a more modern language (i.e. the adoption of new Attic elements as well as more traditional Ionic ones) was yet another element that Ctesias used to distinguish himself from his illustrious rival and to present his writing as more innovative and up-to-date. By contrast, *Indiká* was a more traditional ethnographic work, and so the more consistent use of Ionic is unexceptional in a work of this scope. As Cassio (1996, 156) remarked, 4th-century BCE Ionic prose (Ctesias and others), while revealing its affiliation to the earlier phases of the historiographical tradition, is not a strictly archaïcising enterprise, neither on the level of language nor on that of the contents: the adoption of Attic elements is thus allowed in this kind of dialectal prose.

A different example of resistance towards the generalised adoption of Attic in historical writings is provided by the use of Argive Doric in the *Argoliká* by Hagias and Dercylus.²⁷⁸ Like Ctesias' *Indiká*, this too was a work of local historiography. With his examination of the scanty surviving evidence, Cassio (1989a) demonstrated not only the presence of Argive features in the preserved quotations but

²⁷⁵ See Horrocks (2010, 70); Willi (2014, 55).

²⁷⁶ On the continuing tradition of Ionic prose, see Cassio (1996).

²⁷⁷ See Cassio (1996, 153–5).

²⁷⁸ For recent scholarship on these authors and the many problems with the surviving evidence, see Engels (2011); Fowler (2013, 621–2); Ornaghi (2015); Pellé (2015).

also the peculiar blending of poeticisms, which he convincingly explains as a means of imbuing the *Argoliká* with a more international dimension.²⁷⁹

This sketchy overview of historical prose has demonstrated, on the one hand, the rapid adoption of Attic as the new intra-generic linguistic standard and, on the other hand, that this adoption did not go wholly unchallenged. However, other prose texts provide supplementary evidence that, already around the mid-4th century BCE, Attic represented the unavoidable term of reference.

Let us consider the Derveni Papyrus.²⁸⁰ As noted by Willi (2014, 54–60), the Derveni Papyrus likely aims to use an Atticising language, although in a not entirely consistent way (some Ionic elements are undeniable) and possibly with the additional intrusion of non-Attic and non-Ionic features (i.e. anaphoric $\nu\iota\nu$, which may be a West Greek element). An operation of this nature is far from obvious, in that the author does not have an Attic background and does not target a specifically Athenian audience. This choice of Attic is rendered even more striking by the fact that, unlike the historians who follow in the footsteps of Thucydides (and to a lesser extent, if only for chronological reasons, Xenophon), the author of the Derveni Papyrus did not choose Attic as the conventional language prescribed for the literary genre that he was practising.

However, the more instructive proof that, already by the mid-4th century BCE, Attic has become something of a requirement for prose writing across various genres is the consistent use of this dialect by Aeneas the Tactician in his *Poli-orcetica*. Aeneas, whom we may date to the mid-4th century BCE, was likely an Arcadian.²⁸¹ However, since his work was aimed at the wider Greek audience, he chose to adopt a form of ‘international’ Attic as the language that would allow for the widest readership.²⁸² Aeneas’ language has been the object of close examination.²⁸³ As scholars have pointed out, it is an innovative form of ‘international’ Attic, which results from the blending of features belonging to both the higher,

279 Argive Doric was no literary dialect; in the 5th century BCE, Acusilaus of Argus regularly wrote in Ionic (with just one uncertain exception: see most recently Andolfi 2019, 23–5; 88–9). For a wider assessment of Doric prose, see Cassio (1989b). We should briefly mention that the addition of a poeticising touch to historical prose was not unfamiliar in Hellenistic times, as demonstrated by exponents of tragic history, such as Duris and Phylarchus. See also the extremely interesting parody of Mnesiptolemus’ *Histories* in Epin. fr. 1.

280 The papyrus is datable to the 340s/320s BCE, but the text is probably older.

281 See Lane Fox (2018).

282 His treatise reflects the growing professionalisation of warfare which is typical of the 4th century BCE. See also Section 4.2 on the elements of military jargon in Philem. fr. 130 and Antiph. fr. 169.

283 See Behrendt (1910, 104–34); Hunter, Handford (1927, xxxvii–lxxxii); Vela Tejada (1991); Vela Tejada (2018).

literary language and the innovative, spoken variety. In this sense, Aeneas truly represents one of the earliest examples in Greek literature of the koineisation of Attic.²⁸⁴ One aspect that has garnered attention is that Aeneas' Attic is also 'international' in the sense that it may permit comparisons with formulas and vocabulary adopted in roughly contemporary non-Athenian inscriptions that deal with issues similar to those examined by Aeneas.²⁸⁵ This further indicates that quite early in the history of Greek literature, the adoption of 'international' Attic does not also presuppose the selection of Athens as one's sole cultural parameter, and the use of Attic, however freely compared with the traditional dialect, has rapidly become a means of asserting Greekness and relating to the other Greeks on equal terms. We may easily imagine some of the Aeneas' Athenian readers reacting similarly to the characters who recommend the use of more conservative, localistic Attic in Posidippus' and Euphron's fragments (see Section 4.3).

6 Conclusions

This chapter has aimed to chart the evolution of Athenian language identity through the 5th and 4th centuries BCE and to assess how it interacted with social and historical transformations and how it influenced literary language. We have sought to shed light on the dialectic between conservation and innovation in the history of Attic by examining the literary sources that comment on linguistic variation and revising the main developments that literary Attic underwent. We have demonstrated that such variation was a subject of intense discussion and that examination of these reflections on linguistic change illuminates several key moments of transition in Athenian cultural history.

The picture that emerges from 5th-century BCE sources is one in which different varieties of Attic are associated with different socio-political connotations. While we find no authoritative definition of what 'good' Attic is but are left to infer this based on the linguistic choices made by each writer, the Athenians did have a notion of a kind of unmarked or neutral Attic with respect to which the super- and the sub-standard were defined. These linguistic poles are also reflected in literary and documentary texts: while early Athenian prose writers adopt an 'internationalised' form of literary Attic more open to contamination with elements of linguistic variation from within the Attic dialect and with prestigious external elements (pre-

²⁸⁴ See Vela Tejada (2018, 99): 'after the high variety enters into conversational language, we see a development of regularization and simplification of this new combination'.

²⁸⁵ See Knoepfler (2002, 169–70); Liddel (2018, 133).

dominantly Ionic), informal documentary texts and occasionally also literary ones that are closer to the spoken language may exhibit non-standard, low-register elements that are foreign to standard Attic. However, several sources explicitly present these two competing varieties as disrupting the social order, which, in turn, is associated with the standard variety. The period of the Peloponnesian War coincided with major changes in Athenian culture and society, and the Athenians' perception that their language was under threat and had to be defended closely mirrors this time of change. This is typical in societies that undergo phases of crisis and transformation, during which the dominant class perceives the usual certainties with respect to linguistic, political, and cultural identity as lacking (see Chapter 1, Section 2; Chapter 2, Section 2). Thus, the literary sources document the conflict between traditional order and (perceived) innovative chaos; between that which is shared by all (at least, by all those who represent the dominant class) and that which, being new, is introduced in the first stages by a sub-group of the population (whether super- or sub-standard) and represents a threat to the established order.

Following Athens' defeat in the Peloponnesian War and the fall of her maritime empire, Athenian society entered a period of swift evolution that would exert a considerable influence not only on the socio-economic level but also on Athenian identity. Among other aspects, this is reflected in the affirmation of new linguistic varieties that had previously remained marginal. As witnessed by several literary sources, 4th-century BCE Attic was in rapid transformation and far more open than before to the adoption of innovative elements. This is evidenced in both documentary and literary language. With respect to the former, despite the loss of the maritime empire, the Athenian cultural and economic influence on the wider Greek world did not cease abruptly, and this coincides with the affirmation of so-called 'international' Attic or *Großattisch* (i.e. a Ionicised or de-Atticised form of Attic), which would swiftly expand throughout the Greek-speaking world and ultimately culminate in the development of the koine. Regarding the literary language, writers such as Xenophon and the poets of Middle and New Comedy exemplify a new kind of literary language, which, following an innovative trend that was already germinating before them, would gradually evolve into the standard literary language of the post-Classical period. None of these innovations in 4th-century BCE Attic are the result of a sharp divide in the history of the dialect. Rather, they are the consequence of substantial ideological changes in the way in which the Attic dialect was used in literary and documentary texts and the role that it played in shaping and defining Athenian identity. Indeed, the innovative trends of 4th-century BCE literary Attic, which increasingly adopt elements of contemporary language, overcame the dialectic between innovation and conser-

vation that had been a defining characteristic of 5th-century BCE Athenian culture and was still partly a factor in 4th-century BCE Athenian literature.

The affirmation of Attic on the international stage represents the first phase in the process whereby ‘international’ Attic would evolve into the koine. However, there is more to this process than simply a sign of the prestige of Athenian language and culture. Non-Athenian authors writing for the wider Greek audience also began to adopt literary Attic as the language that would provide them with the widest possible readership. In this sense, this responds to the claims of Athenian intellectuals such as Isocrates that Athens had a leading role in cultural panhellenism. However, besides consecrating the transformation of Attic as the language of all Greeks, this process has more significant implications if observed from an Athenian perspective. The adoption of Attic by non-Athenians and the use they make of this language to address all Greeks represents the emancipation of Attic from Athenian localism and the sublimation, at least for a period, of the purist and protectionist approaches to this dialect. However, this would also foster awareness of the growing divide between traditional Attic, which by the late 4th century BCE had almost become a crystallised literary variety, and the new ‘international’ Attic, which was on the verge of evolving into the koine. It was from this point that Hellenistic scholars would question the boundaries of literary Attic and its status vis-à-vis the common language.

Chapter 5

Attic in the flesh: The language of late Attic comedy and its Atticist reception

1 Preliminaries

In the previous chapter, we approached the history of Classical Attic from a cultural-historical perspective. We discussed the emergence of literary Attic and its interaction with other traditions (Chapter 4, Section 2) and explored the ideological aspects associated with different varieties of ‘good’ or ‘bad’ Attic in 5th-century BCE sources (Chapter 4, Section 3). We also examined changing attitudes towards the innovative features of 4th-century BCE Attic and how they relate to Athens’ changing social and cultural environment (Chapter 4, Section 4). So far, we have observed the evolution of literary Attic mostly from the point of view of three genres: comedy, historiography and, to a lesser extent, oratory. As we have shown, the 4th century BCE represents a significant turning point. The linguistic evidence from this period clearly shows the competition between innovative and conservative tendencies, which are already discernible in 5th-century BCE texts. More importantly, it also documents how this tension was increasingly overcome, and with it the emergence of a new form of Attic that gradually but inexorably acquired legitimacy. This phase precedes the affirmation of the koine, which is already a distinct entity in some of the latest sources we have discussed (see Chapter 4, Section 4.3).

The present chapter thus provides the linguistic basis for investigating what was approached from a wider perspective in Chapter 4. To this end, we have selected a self-contained corpus as a test-case – Middle and New Comedy – to examine what it can tell us about the evolution of the dialect.¹ This analysis selects some diagnostic features of the language of late Attic comedy and is organised

1 Our corpus consists of the following authors: Alexis, Amphis, Anaxandrides, Anaxilas, Anaxippus, Antidotus, Antiphanes, Apollodorus Comicus, Apollodorus Carystius *vel* Gelous, Apollodorus, Araros, Archedicus, Aristophon, Athenion, Axionicus, Baton, Charicles, Clearchus, Cratinus Junior, Crobylus, Damoxenus, Demetrius II, Demonicus, Dexicrates, Diodorus, Dionysius, Dioxippus, Diphilus, Dromon, Ephippus, Epicrates, Epigenes, Epinicus, Eriphus, Euangelus, Eubulides, Eubulus, Eudoxus, Eumedes, Euphanes, Euphron, Hegesippus, Heniochus, Heraclides, Hipparchus, Laon, Lynceus, Menander, Mnesimachus, Nausicrates, Nicon, Nicolaus, Nicomachus, Nicostratus, Ophellion, Philemon, Philemon Junior, Philetaerus, Philippides, Philippus, Philiscus, Philostephanus, Phoenicides, Posidippus, Simylus, Sophilus, Sosicrates, Sosipater, Sotades, Stephanus, Straton, Theognetus, Theophilus, Timocles, Timotheus, Xenarchus, and Xenon. No systematic examination has

according to linguistic levels: phonology (Section A), nominal morphology (Section B), verbal morphology (Section C), and syntax (Section D). As a constant point of reference, in our survey we have taken into account the contemporary data from other Attic literary genres and inscriptions. The guiding principle of this selection has been to compare this evidence with the Atticist reflections on the very same linguistic phenomena, and to analyse how comic language contributed to defining the parameters of Attic according to the Atticists.²

The choice of the language of Middle and New Comedy as a case study is justified on several grounds. Firstly, as previously remarked, the language of Middle and New Comedy contains significant innovations compared to that of Old Comedy. The more ‘realistic’ orientation of later comedy goes hand in hand with the use of a more colloquial language: this allows us to gain a reasonably faithful understanding of the evolution of late Attic and its incipient development into the koine (see Chapter 4, Section 5). Comic texts not only represent a larger and more informative body of evidence for the linguistic innovations of (late) Attic than any other literary genre, but they also represent a linguistically more uniform corpus. Oratory, on the other hand, despite its considerable number of texts, does not offer an equally suitable case study: its high degree of linguistic variation between authors does not provide a very homogeneous and consistent linguistic picture. This was recognised by the Atticists themselves: while they routinely single out orators such as Demosthenes as models of ‘good’ and ‘pure’ Attic, they sometimes treat others like Lysias and Hyperides with suspicion. Likewise, 4th-century BCE historiography would provide a relatively limited test case, since only Xenophon is preserved to an appreciable extent. Despite the great linguistic interest of Xenophon (see Chapter 4, Section 5.1), the evidence offered by Middle and New Comedy is also more varied in terms of chronology, since it ranges from the early decades of the 4th century BCE to the first half of the 3rd century BCE. Naturally, a systematic study of the language of 4th-century BCE Attic prose, including Plato, and its reception in Atticist lexicography would be highly desirable. However, the ongoing lack of comprehensive collections of data on this wide corpus makes an investigation of this kind an unmanageable undertaking.

One further reason for selecting comedy as a case study is that it was of paramount importance first to Hellenistic philologists and later to Atticist lexicographers: comic language of any period proved to be the litmus test for the definition of the Atticist canon(s). This, however, does not mean that the innovative language

been carried out on the comic *adespota*, but despite the general uncertainty about the date of most fragments, we have tried to include as much material as possible and appropriate.

² A more extensive collection of the Atticist materials will be provided in *Ancient Greek Purism* Volume 2.

of late comedy did not prove challenging for the Atticists. The language of Middle and New Comedy was the battleground for the competing stances of Atticist lexicographers, divided between those who accepted a larger canon of *Musterautoren*, also including the poets of Middle and New Comedy, and those who refused to consider post-5th-century BCE comedy as a benchmark for defining ‘good’ and ‘pure’ Attic (see Chapter 1, Section 5.1).

We have already provided a historical contextualisation of the evolution of comic language in the previous chapter (Chapter 4, Section 5.2), but a few additional remarks are in order. Previous attempts to place the language of comedy within a wider cultural and historical context have largely privileged Menander and the linguistic aspects related to the characterisation of individuals according to age, gender, and social position.³ There has been only a sporadic interest in locating the language of late comedy within the historical development of Attic and its reception in antiquity. In this respect, a few studies – most of them predating many of the papyrological findings – have analysed Menander’s vocabulary and other aspects of his language, partly in the wake of the ancient lexicographers’ interest.⁴ At present, there are only a few studies to turn to for a historical placement of Menander’s language – to mention the most recent: Rosenstrauch (1967);⁵ Horrocks (2010, 102–5); Cartlidge (2014); and Vessella (2016b).⁶ These studies, though they differ widely in scope, all come to the conclusion that Menander’s language is still Attic, despite the increasing affinities with the koine.

Compared to these studies, we have taken a rather different approach here. Firstly, we have aimed to offer a broader view of the language of Middle and New Comedy, i.e. not to focus exclusively on Menander. Secondly, we have programmatically selected as our primary goal to investigate those linguistic traits that are diagnostically more relevant for understanding the later Atticist reception. For this reason, for instance, syntax is discussed only tangentially, since it is well known that syntax received only sporadic attention from Atticists. On the contrary, for obvious constraints of time and space, the lexicon, the Atticists’ main concern, has not been taken systematically into account, though some features

³ See, e.g., Zini (1938); Sandbach (1970); Webster (1974, 99–110); Del Corno (1975); Katsouris (1975); Bain (1984); Arnott (1995); Krieter-Spiro (1997); Dickey (1995); Macua Martínez (2008); Scafuro (2013); Ferrari (2014).

⁴ See Bruhn (1910); Durham (1913); Klaus (1936); López Eire (2002); Lamagna (2004b).

⁵ We could not profit from Rosenstrauch (in Polish).

⁶ Körte (1931, 751–3) and Cartlidge (2019) are also successful in condensing much information in very limited space.

are discussed in Sections B and C.⁷ Moreover, the study of the language of later comedy is important because later Attic is a witness to many linguistic developments which remain productive throughout the later history of Greek. Therefore, our inquiry aims to place the evidence from later comedy in the wider history of Greek. Finally, beyond the primary focus on the Atticist reception, we have included a discussion of a few issues (e.g. the ‘long’ datives, see Section B.1.2) which, although they are not known to have been discussed by the Atticists, allow us to appreciate the evolution of comic language from Old Comedy to Middle and New Comedy, and also to recognise the transformations between the language of Middle Comedy and that of New Comedy.

⁷ For bibliographical references on these areas of language not covered in this enquiry, especially syntax and lexicon, see Willi (2002a, 21–3).



A. Phonology

1 Generalities

The language of the poets of Middle and New Comedy does not show major phonological differences from standard Classical Attic. Some elements of phonological variation (see list below), attested in the manuscript tradition of the poets of Middle and New Comedy (and sometimes already of Old Comedy) and foreshadowing koine Greek, have already been discussed by earlier scholarship, and a thorough treatment of these features will not be provided here.

/oi/ > /o:/ and /o/ before a vowel: typically in ποιέω (and related forms) and τοιούτος (see Arnott 1996, 100 and 695–6; Arnott 2001a); genitive οίος (from οἷς ‘sheep’) with a short first syllable in Mnes. fr. 4.47 is exceptional and probably due to literary parody. **-ει and -η** as the 2nd-person middle and passive ending (see Arnott 2001b). **Word-initial /ε:u/ > /eu/** in the augmented verbs in εὔ- (see Arnott 1996, 77; Arnott 2002, 198). **γινν- > γιν-** (see Arnott 2002, 195–6; Favi 2022a). **Initial κν-/γν-** (see Willi 2003b, 42–3; Gerbi 2024b). **/rs/ > /rr/** (see Hunter 1983, 201; Arnott 1996, 697; Arnott 2002, 207–8). **/tt/ and /ss/** (see Arnott 2002, 210–4). **αὔτις/αὔθις** (see Arnott 2002, 194; cf. Orus fr. B 55: αὔτις καὶ αὔθις: ἐκατέρως λέγουσιν, and Alpers *ad loc.*). **ποδαπός, ποταπός** (Arnott 1996, 248; Batisti forthcoming c). **οὔδεις/οὔθεις, μηδεις/μηθείς** (see Arnott 2002, 200–1). **ὀλίγος > ὀλίος** (see Cassio 1981, 86–7; Favi 2017, 132–6; Chapter 4, Section 3.3). **Apocopated prepositional prefixes** (see Chapter 4, Section 5.2).

Other phenomena require detailed consideration. After reviewing the functions of retained /a:/ (Section A.2), we shall examine the possible sociolinguistic relevance of retained /a:/ in oaths (Section A.2.1). We will then focus on the different treatment of the diphthongs /ai/ and /ui/ in a prevocalic position as evidence for a broader phonological change which was already underway in Attic (Section A.3; Section A.4). Finally, we shall discuss some instances of the development /oi/ > /ei/ that may also reflect the evolving phonology of Attic (Section A.5).

2 Retained /a:/

The so-called *alpha purum* fulfils a variety of functions in Attic comedy, from literary parody to the depiction of foreigner talk. In Middle and New Comedy, dialect parody is far less common than in Old Comedy and it tends to be associated with stock characters such as the (fake) Doric doctor (see Alex. fr. 146, Men. *Asp.* 439–68). Retained /a:/ may also be a lyric feature (see Men. *Th.* 36, 39, 41), especially in the context of the parody of dithyramb so common in Middle Comedy (see Mnes. fr. 4.59). This should prevent us from normalising cases of retained /a:/.⁸

⁸ The instances of retained /a:/ in the riddle in Diph. fr. 49 are more difficult to interpret. Perhaps, this riddle, comprising the three answers to the initial question, was a story narrated by

Anaxandr. fr. 6 is a good example. The retained /a:/ in γᾶς and hyper-Attic /a:/ in διανεκῆ (see Threatte 1980, 132) are part of a quotation from Timotheus (fr. 798 *PMG*). The MS A of Athenaeus' *Deipnosophists*, the source of our fragment, has a superscript η above α in διανεκῆ (i.e. διηνεκῆ) and γᾶς (i.e. γῆς). Millis (2015, 60) argues that while διανεκῆ is the common Attic form, one should adopt διηνεκῆ as a direct quotation from Timotheus. Accordingly, Millis also prints γῆς in place of γᾶς. This solution is unconvincing. Regarding διανεκῆ and διηνεκῆ, the superscript η is not an emendation: it simply indicates that the form used by Anaxandrides corresponds to the more common διηνεκῆς. It is also perfectly possible that Timotheus used διανεκῆς with the /a:/ vocalism, which also occurs in Corinna (fr. 657 *PMG*) and Philoxenus of Leucas (fr. 836b.22 *PMG*). The same applies for γᾶς and γῆς: Millis does not explain on what ground he restores the Attic vocalism, nor how the form with /a:/ may have come about. Here again, the superscript η indicates that γᾶς corresponds to expected γῆς. Additionally, since in the following line Anaxandrides glosses Timotheus' obscure phrasing, it is more reasonable that ἐν πυρικτίτοις γᾶς is in fact a quotation from Timotheus, as suggested by the /a:/ vocalism and the presence of an obvious poeticism like πυρικτίτος (on which see Millis 2015, 61). On this fragment see also Section C.4.9.

2.1 Retained /a:/ in oaths

The oaths with retained /a:/ are a more peculiar case. The first evidence is ὦ Δάματερ in Old Comedy (Ar. *Pl.* 55 and 872, Theopomp.Com. fr. 24). It is quite likely that this oath is a foreign import into colloquial Attic.⁹ As stressed by Willi, interjections 'form part of a lexical subgroup where foreign elements are integrated most easily'.¹⁰ Due to the presence of foreigners in Athens, particularly in the lower strata of the population, such 'Doric' oaths may have spread in sociolinguistically informal contexts.¹¹ However, oaths with the foreign vocalism may also have been adopted in colloquial Attic because the /a:/ was seen as an element that strengthened their power. Indeed, Willi has suggested that in the *Plutus* passage the retained /a:/ might give the utterance a comically solemn tone. Two fragments by Epicrates, a poet of Middle Comedy, may provide additional evidence.

one of the actors. If we assume that the riddle originated from a dialectal environment other than the Attic-Ionic one, then this story may have become popular in the form with retained /a:/.

⁹ See Willi (2003b, 59) on *Plutus*, with previous bibliography; Farmer (2022, 89) on Theopompus. Willi convincingly argues that in *Plutus* ὦ Δάματερ was 'a usage imported from, or inspired by, other parts of the Greek world', whereas Farmer weighs the option, inevitably speculative, that ὦ Δάματερ in Theopompus Comicus may betray the speaker's provenance from a Doric-speaking area.

¹⁰ Willi (2003b, 59).

¹¹ See Cassio (1981, 81).

Epicr. fr. 8.2–3: ἐπομνούουσα τὰν Κόραν, τὰν Ἄρτεμιν, | τὰν Φερρέφατταν. **Epicr. fr. 10.6–7:** τάδε μοι πιτυτῶς, εἴ τι κατειδῶς | ἦκεις, λέξον, πρὸς Γᾶς.

In fragment 8, the speaker reports a procuress' words, including her oaths. These regularly display the non-Attic retained /a:/ vocalism. However, the common Attic form Φερρέφαττα stands out, which is also adopted by Aristophanes (*Th.* 287, *Ra.* 671), Plato (*Cra.* 404c.5, 404d.8), and Demosthenes (54.8 Φερρεφάττιον),¹² as opposed to Περσέφασσα/Φερσέφασσα used by the tragic poets.¹³ Thus, this woman uses a mixed language, juxtaposing the retained /a:/ vocalism alongside the typical Attic Φερρέφαττα. It may be that the procuress is a foreigner (and possibly a former prostitute) living in Athens.¹⁴ Alternatively, she may be an Athenian who uses Doric-sounding forms to emphasise the oath, but then ends up using the local Attic form of Persephone's name (and the position of this form at the end of the sequence may have heightened the comic effect).

Epicrates' fragment 10 is a dialogue between two unidentified characters, both of whom adopt regular Attic phonology elsewhere in the fragment. Hence, ll. 6–7 are no obvious evidence of foreigner talk. The line (delivered by speaker A) is an (incomplete) anapestic tetrameter, but the /a:/ vocalism does not necessarily relate to the use of this metre.¹⁵ It has recently been suggested that the setting of the (unknown) play from which this fragment derives may have been a Doric city, which would explain not only the vocalism in πρὸς Γᾶς, but also speaker A's interest in Plato's Academy (see ll. 1–7) and speaker B's report about what he witnessed first-hand at the Panathenaea (see ll. 8–37).¹⁶ These conclusions are sensible, although they are not the only possible ones, and we cannot rule out that the two speakers are Athenian citizens.¹⁷

¹² It is also defended by Atticist lexicographers (see Moer. φ 29, Thom.Mag. 378.1–2).

¹³ On Persephone's name, its etymology, and the variant forms, see Wachter (2007–2008); Nussbaum (2022). Cf. Ὀλυττεύς/Ὀλυσσεύς for Ὀδυσσεύς and other popular spellings of literary and mythical names (see Cassio 1981, 83–4).

¹⁴ See Schulze (1896, 245).

¹⁵ Speaker B of this fragment later on utters Σικελᾶς ἀπὸ γᾶς to make fun of Sicilian doctors (fr. 8.28; anapestic dimeter), but this is an obviously parodic mimesis of the doctor's imagined dialect.

¹⁶ See Nesselrath (2016, 241).

¹⁷ Firstly, it does not look as though the speakers of Epicrates' fragment are talking about Athens as a faraway place; rather, it is the environment of the philosophers of Plato's Academy that they perceive as distant from their own. Secondly, the account of the Panathenaea is not about the festival itself, as it might be if speaker B had travelled to Athens, but about what he witnessed at the festival. Finally, from the fact that speaker A is unaware of what the philosophers of Plato's Academy talk about it does not follow that he was living in a different Greek city: for speaker B is only able to learn about these topics during the Panathenaea by overhearing a

In conclusion, in both fragments the speakers who pronounce the oaths with a retained /a:/ vocalism may well be Athenians who, like Chremylus and Carion in Aristophanes' *Plutus*, adopt forms with a retained /a:/ to emphasise their oaths. It is likely that these foreign oaths had entered the Attic dialect and functioned as emphatic markers. This may be a colloquial use. It is probably not accidental that in Epicrates' fragment 8 the forms with /a:/ vocalism are pronounced by a procurer, and that in Epicrates' fragment 10 the two speakers voice an 'anti-intellectualistic' feeling, which is particularly explicit in the adoption of coarse humour.

3 The diphthong /aj/ in prevocalic position

In Ionic and particularly in Attic, when the diphthong /aj/ occurs before the sounds /a/, /e/, and /i/ (but not before /o/ and /u/),¹⁸ typically (but not only) in the case of -αι- and *-αιϜV-, the diphthong has a tendency to be simplified to -ā-. Interestingly, many ancient sources, especially Atticist lexicography, present this as a typical Attic phenomenon (see below). The exact nature of this process remains uncertain.¹⁹ The case of -αι-/αι(Ϝ)- has been explained as a sort of a quantitative metathesis /a(i).i/ (> /a.(i)i(?) > /a.i:/ > /a:.i/ or as a form of 'compensatory lengthening' (/a(i).i/ > /a:.i/).²⁰ For -αιϜV- > -āϜV- (except in the case of -αιϜι-, which falls into the previous group), an intermediate stage /aυϜV/ or /ajjV/ has been postulated.²¹

The evidence from the Attic inscriptions shows this development particularly well in the forms αἰεῖ, Ἀθηναῖα, and αἰετός, which gradually evolve into αἰεῖ, Ἀθηναῖα/Ἀθηναῖα, and αἰετός.²² This overlaps with the evidence from the literary record, and comparison with Middle and New Comedy proves particularly relevant. Other cases where the diphthong /aj/ undergoes a development are the demotics in -αιεύς and the adjectives in -αιος. Unlike the other category, in this case the second element of the diphthong is treated as a glide and the result is /a/. Moreover, this development of the diphthong is less attested and more short-lived than the previous type. Further evidence that this is a separate development from the previous group is that while in these cases the ancient sources mostly

conversation between some members of the Academy. Thus, nothing stands in the way of thinking that the two speakers may be Athenians.

18 Lejeune (1972, 247).

19 Lejeune (1972, 247).

20 See Schwyzler (1939, 265) for the former interpretation. Since in words like αἰετός quantitative metathesis is not an option, the alternative view is more attractive; see also Fiori (2022, 67).

21 Schwyzler (1939, 266).

22 Thraette (1980, 270–94).

agree that -αι- > -α- in prevocalic position is an Attic trait (except for some forms), this is never the case with the demotics in -αιεύς and the adjectives in -αιος. Additionally, while the demotics in -αιεύς are well attested in 4th-century BCE Attic inscriptions, the treatment of the diphthong in the adjectives in -αιος is rare in both literary and inscriptional sources. Thus, the demotics in -αιεύς and the adjectives in -αιος represent two separate cases.

3.1 αἰετός and ἀετός (< *αἰφετός)

While in Old Comedy the regular spelling is αἰετός (also standard in tragedy), in Middle Comedy the spelling is ἀετός with a long first syllable.

Epicr. fr. 3.3–4: πεπονθέναι δὲ ταῦτά μοι δοκεῖ | τοῖς ἀετοῖς. Here Athenaeus' MSS have the reading ἀετοῖς, which is also printed by Kassel, Austin (Casaubon and Nauck restored αἰετοῖς).

The evidence from Epicrates is apparently earlier than that from the Attic inscriptions, which usually retain the spelling with the diphthong in αἰετός and derived words before 300 BCE.²³ However, the retention of the diphthong spelling on the inscriptions was probably due to the fact that αἰετ- occurs in the technical vocabulary of architecture (αἰετός 'pediment', see LSJ s.v. IV).²⁴ Thus, the epigraphic evidence is hardly relevant to support Casaubon's and Nauck's view that αἰετοῖς should be restored in Epicrates. The form ἀετός, like ἐλαία > ἐλάα > ἐλά, Ἀθηναία > Ἀθηνάα > Ἀθηνᾶ, and the verbs κλαίω/κλάω and καίω/κάω, is defended as Attic by the ancient lexicographical sources.

Moer. a 31: ἀετόν Ἀττικοί· αἰετόν Ἑλληνες. Cf. Phot. *Amphilochia* 24.238–9; *Et.Gen.* α 184; *EM* 31.50; [Zonar.] 66.9–11.

²³ See Threatte (1980, 277–8). The spelling ἀετός is the norm in papyri (see Mayser, *Gramm.* vol. 1,1, 84–5; Gignac 1976, 196).

²⁴ See also Schwyzer (1939, 266): 'αἰ inschriftlich in der architektonischen Bedeutung, also wohl nicht einheimische Form'.

3.2 κλαίω and κλάω, καίω and κάω

In κλαίω (< *κλαίρω) and καίω (< *καίρω) the spelling of the diphthong varies considerably.²⁵ The evidence from Middle and New Comedy fragments is collected by Arnott (2002, 199). The first vowel is usually long in all metrically guaranteed cases.²⁶

The form with monophthongisation is also regarded as the proper Attic one by Atticist lexicography.

Moer. κ 46: κλάειν καὶ κάειν σὺν τῷ α Ἀττικοί· μετὰ δὲ τοῦ ι Ἑλληνες.

3.3 ἐλαία, ἐλάα, and ἐλά (< *ἐλαίφα)

In the manuscript tradition of Middle and New Comedy, ἐλαία and ἐλάα always have a long middle syllable.

ἐλαία: Mnesim. fr. 4.29. **ἐλαίας:** Posidipp. fr. 37. **ἐλαῶν:** Antiph. fr. 140.3. Modern editors retain the spellings of the sources.

ἐλάα is already found in Old Comedy.²⁷ Ancient scholars also recognised ἐλάα as Attic.

Eust. in II. 1.266.16–8: [. . .] καὶ ἐλαία, αὐτό τε τὸ φυτὸν καὶ ὁ καρπός. αὐτὸς δὲ, μάλιστα δίχα τοῦ ι. ἐλάα γὰρ Ἀττικῶς, ὁ τῆς ἐλαίας καρπός.²⁸

Aristophanes (fr. 122) also attests to ἐλάζω, which presupposes the derivation *ἐλαίρω > ἐλαῖζω/ἐλάζω and where the development of -αιρ- before the verbal suffix -ίζω regularly produces -ᾱ(ρ)-.²⁹

But ἐλαία > ἐλάα gave rise to a more advanced development. The presence of two /a:/ sounds in adjoining syllables caused the contraction of /a:a:/ into /a:/ (i.e. ἐλαία > ἐλάα > ἐλά). The contracted ἐλά is attested in two late-4th-century BCE inscriptions,³⁰ and must also be restored in the relevant fragments of Alexis and Diphilus (see Favi 2018).

²⁵ The development -αιρV- > -ᾱV- would not normally take place before the /o/ sound (see Section A.3), but the analogy with the rest of the inflection, notably cases like -αι(ρ)ε-, must have caused this development also before the /o/ sound.

²⁶ On the evidence from papyri see Mayser (*Gramm.* vol. 1,1, 85; vol. 1,2, 119); Gignac (1981, 273).

²⁷ See Kassel, Austin (*PCG* vol. 3,2, 98–9 *ad Ar.* fr. 148.2).

²⁸ On the made-up semantic distinction between ἐλαία and ἐλάα, see Threatte (1980, 278).

²⁹ Cf. Phot. ε 551 (= *Et.Gen.* AB = *EM* 326.20–1 = *Et.Sym.* ε 270). On the other forms collected by Herodian sources see Wackernagel (1885, 278–9); Schwyzler (1939, 265–6); Section A.3.9.

³⁰ See Favi (2018, 174–5).

Alex. fr. 263.3: ἐφ' ἧς ἐπέκειτ' οὐ τυρός οὐδ' ἐλῶν γένη. The MSS of Athenaeus' epitome have ἐλαῶν, which would require a short middle syllable. This is unlikely on several accounts (ἐλάα with a short second syllable is foreign to Attic (see below) and this option is not available in Diphilus).

Diph. fr. 14.3–5: οὐδὲν μὰ Δία τοῖς ἐμοῖς βλίτοις | ὅμοια πράγματ' οὐδὲ ταῖς θλασταῖς ἐλαῖς. Athenaeus' MSS have ἐλααῖς, and so Kassel, Austin (like earlier editors) print ταῖς θλασταῖς ἐλααῖς as the beginning of a new line (i.e. ὅμοια πράγματ' οὐδὲ ταῖς <x _ _> | θλασταῖς ἐλααῖς). In this case a short middle syllable cannot be posited, since the anapestic ἐλααῖς would be impossible in the sixth iambic element of the trimeter. In both cases the best available solution is restoring the forms of contracted ἐλά, ἐλαῖς.

The contracted form ἐλά appears in Ptolemaic and Roman papyri.³¹ It is also defended by Aelius Dionysius, presumably on the basis of the comic evidence.

Ael.Dion. ε 29: ἐλαία καὶ ἐλάα καὶ ἐλά· Ἀττικῶς ὁ τῆς ἐλαίας καρπός. καὶ ἐλαολογεῖν τὸ συλλέγειν ἐλαίας (= **Eust. in Od. 2.302.31–2:** λέγει δὲ ὁ αὐτός [i.e. Aelius Dionysius] καὶ ὅτι ἐλαίας καὶ ἐλάας Ἀττικοὶ τὸν καρπὸν ἔλεγον καὶ ἐλάς δισυλλάβως καὶ ἐλαολογεῖν τὸ συλλέγειν ἐλαίας). Eustathius, probably relaying on Aelius Dionysius, regularly considers -αα > -aa an Attic development (see **Eust. in Il. 1.133.4–8:** οὕτω καὶ τὴν Ἀθήνην Ἀθηναίαν φασὶν ἄλλοι τε καὶ ὁ ποιητής, οἱ μὲντοι ὕστερον ἀποβάλλοντες τὸ ἰ τῆς αἰ διφθόγγου καὶ Ἀθηναίαν ποιοῦντες, ὡσπερ τὴν ἐλαίαν ἐλάαν Ἀττικῶς, οἷον· 'τίς τῆς ἐλάας παρέτραγεν;') [Ar. Ra. 988]. Ἀθηναίαν μὲν οὐ φασι, τὰ δὲ δύο α κερνῶντες λέγουσιν Ἀθηναῖν, **Eust. in Il. 1.322.7:** ἐλαία ἢ Ἀττικῶς ἐλάα, **Eust. in Il. 3.522.3–5:** τὸ δὲ ἐλάϊνον ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐλαία γέγονεν ἀποθέσει τοῦ ἰ τῆς διφθόγγου, ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐλάα Ἀττικοῦ, **Eust. in Od. 1.266.17–8:** ὡσπερ καὶ ἐλαία, αὐτὸ τε τὸ φυτὸν καὶ ὁ καρπός. αὐτὸς δὲ, μάλιστα δίχα τοῦ ἰ. ἐλάα γὰρ Ἀττικῶς, ὁ τῆς ἐλαίας καρπός).

Moreover, it is likely that the earliest occurrence of ἐλά, ἐλαῖς in Attic can be traced back to Aristophanes (Ar. fr. 408.1: θλαστὰς ποιεῖν ἐλάας according to the MSS, but there is a very good chance that ἐλαῖς should be restored).³² In support of

³¹ See Favi (2018, 175–6); Mayser (*Gramm.* vol. 1,1, 85); Gignac (1976, 196–7).

³² However we try to adapt the transmitted text to the iambic trimeter or the catalectic trochaic tetrameter, there is no easy solution. It is not impossible that the metre was neither the iambic trimeter nor the catalectic trochaic tetrameter, but this is less likely on several accounts. Among other things, given that the iambic trimeter and the catalectic trochaic tetrameter are by far the most common metres in comedy, it would be a little counterintuitive to force this fragment into a different metre. Torchio (2021, 75) scans ἐλάας in Aristophanes' fragment as $_ _ _$ (see also Torchio 2021, 72 regarding Ar. fr. 406.2). It might be a lapsus, but in any case it is foreign to Attic (ποιεῖν in Ar. fr. 408.1 must have a short first syllable, so ἐλάας must count as two syllables). The instances of ἐλάα with a short second syllable in late hexameter poetry and epigram (collected by Arnot 1996, 734) should be explained as metrical licences inspired by the exceptional treatment of -αι- in prevocalic position, rather than as rare cases where the diphthong reflects an exceptional, but somehow *sprachecht*, development with an /a/. For some words, this treatment is old and abundantly attested in Attic as well (see Section A.3.6), but for the most part this is not the case. Not only is Menander's ὠραῖζεθ' (fr. 672) the only other case in Attic texts (see Section A.3.9), but

this, we must stress that the development ἐλαία > ἐλάα > ἐλᾶ is in no way different from Ἀθηναία > Ἀθηνάα > Ἀθηνᾶ, a development which is already well underway in 5th-century BCE Attic and is attested at least once in Aristophanes (see Section A.3.4).

3.4 Ἀθηναία, Ἀθηνάα, and Ἀθηνᾶ

This theonym is the only case where -αι- > -ᾶ- does not occur before /u/ or /i/. However, while this process may conceivably have been triggered by analogy, this does not imply that this is a later development. Indeed, Ἀθηνᾶ is already solidly attested in 5th-century BCE sources. It occurs 1x in Aristophanes as part of an oath (while Ἀθηναία occurs 4x). Even more interestingly, Ἀθηνᾶ occurs 3x in Thucydides and 4x in Antiphon, while Ἀθηναία is unattested in either writer. In 4th-century BCE prose, Ἀθηνᾶ is predominant: it is the standard form in Xenophon (10x; Ἀθηναία occurs only in *An.* 7.3.39, but the fact that it is part of an oath formula probably makes it an archaism), Plato (20x; Ἀθηναία occurs 1x in the context of a discussion about traditional oaths; the excursus on Ἀθηνάα in *Cratylus* is the only literary occurrence of this form), and Demosthenes (11x; Ἀθηναία occurs 2x only in quotations). This picture reflects the epigraphic evidence: in the 5th century BCE Ἀθηναία is the only form attested in public inscriptions and is also the most common form in private texts, but Ἀθηνάα and Ἀθηνᾶ are also occasionally attested; from the 4th century BCE Ἀθηνᾶ becomes the standard form.³³ Ἀθηνᾶ is regular in Middle and New Comedy. The only occurrence of Ἀθηναία is in the plural, which makes it a special case.

Ἀθηνᾶ: Alex. fr. 204.1, 233.2, and 247.14; Bato fr. 7.7; Men. *Asp.* 319, *Col.* 23, *Col.* fr. 2.5, *Pc.* 113, *Sam.* 213, *Sic.* 116 and 144, fr. *96.2, 77.1, 296.14, 362.1, 420.1; Nicostr. fr. 29.2; Philem. fr. 82.3.

Ἀθηναία: Philem. fr. 69.2 (τάς Ἀθηναίας).

Ἀθηνᾶ was also regarded as the proper Attic form in antiquity.

Phryn. PS 128.14–5: ὡραίαν· τὴν ὥραν. ἡ δὲ τοιαύτη τροπὴ Ἀττικοῖς <έστιν> ἰδία. Ἀθηνᾶ Ἀθηναία, ἴση ἰσαία, οὕτω καὶ ὥρα ὡραία.

we also lack any example with nouns. In Poliochus we can retain ἐλάα without any difficulties (fr. 2.7–8: θλαστή τ' ἐλάα, καὶ πιεῖν οἰνάριον ἦν | ἀμφίβολον).

³³ See Threatte (1980, 271–4).

3.5 The diphthong /aj/ before nominal and adjectival suffixes beginning with vocalic /i/

We will now introduce a larger category of forms, those in which the diphthong /aj/ occurs before an /i/ sound (i.e. -αι-/αιφι- > -αῖ-). This is typically the case in suffixed forms in -αικός/-αῖκός, -αις/-αῖς, -αῖσκος/-αῖσκος, etc. depending on adjectives (more rarely nouns) in -αιος. In these formations, both spellings are attested in the ancient sources, and modern editorial choices vary accordingly.

Antiph. fr. 46.6: ἐν τοῖς δ' ἐκείνων ἔθεσιν ἴσθ' ἀρχαϊκός (codd. ἀρχαῖκός). **Mnesim. fr. 8.3–4:** ἄρα που | ὀπτὴν κατεσθίουσι πόλιν Ἀχαικὴν. **Philem. fr. 115.3–4:** † ἐκ τοῦ Πλαταικοῦ τε παρακολουθοῦντά τινα | ταύτη κατιλλώπτειν. The title of **Alexis'** play Ἀχαῖς (codd. vary between Ἀχαῖς and Ἀχαιῖς).

Unlike in the case of αἰετός > ἀετός, ἐλαία > ἐλάα > ἐλᾶ, Ἀθηναία > Ἀθηνᾶ > Ἀθηνᾶ, and of the verbs κλαίω/κλάω and καίω/κᾶω, Atticist lexicographers typically recommend -αι- as the Attic treatment over -αῖ-, which in turn they consider to be the koine form.³⁴

Phryn. Ecl. 26: Ἀλκαϊκὸν ἄσμα δι' ἐνὸς ι οὐ χρὴ λέγειν, ἀλλ' ἐν τοῖν δυοῖν, Ἀλκαϊκόν, τροχαϊκόν. **Phryn. Ecl. 191:** ἀρχαϊκὸν λέγε ἐν δυοῖν ι ὡς Ἀλκαϊκόν καὶ τροχαϊκόν. **Phryn. PS 38.9–11:** ἀρχαϊκὰ φρονεῖν (Ar. N. 821)· ἀντὶ τοῦ εὐήθη καὶ μῶρα φρονεῖν. τὸ γὰρ ἀρχαῖον ἐπὶ τοῦ εὐήθους ἔλεγον δὲ τοὺς ἀρχαίους καὶ Κρόνους καὶ Κόδρους. **Antiatt. α 131:** ἀρχα<ι>κῶς· ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀρχαίως. Ἀριστοφάνης Νεφέλαις (821). **Eust. in Il. 3.483.19–21:** ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι κοινότερον μὲν οἱ ὕστερον ὡς ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀχαῖας Ἀχαιῖκόν λέγουσιν, οἱ δὲ παλαιοὶ ῥήτορες Ἀχαιῖκόν φασὶ δεῖν γράφειν διὰ τῶν δύο ι, ὡς καὶ ἀρχαϊκόν, φασί, καὶ γενναῖκόν καὶ δικαϊκόν. **Thom. Mag. 6.10:** Ἀλκαϊκὸν ἄσμα, οὐκ Ἀλκαϊκόν, ὡς καὶ τροχαϊκόν, οὐ τροχαϊκόν.

Kassel, Austin have generally followed the ancient lexicographers' opinion. But despite the Atticists' claims, the situation in the literary and epigraphic sources is highly dishomogeneous.³⁵ Presumably, Atticist lexicographers too noticed this confused situation and applied a general principle to impose order. The fact that these formations all depend on forms in -αιος may be another reason for the Atticist prescription, in that the adoption of -αι- would ensure better morphological clarity. To complicate things, not only are the spellings -αι- and -αῖ- interchangeable, but the manuscript evidence is hardly reliable for assessing this variation.

³⁴ However, if we look beyond the discussion of the adjectives in -αικός, we also find evidence for the opposite view, namely, that the simplification of -αι- into -αῖ- is an Attic feature, as discussed in Homeric scholarship by schol. (ex.) Hom. *Il.* 13.612a (bT), and by Eustathius concerning ἐλαία/ἐλάα (see Section A.3.3).

³⁵ This was duly acknowledged in earlier scholarship (e.g. Lobeck 1820, 39; Rutherford 1881, 112).

In Antiph. fr. 46.6, the reading in Athenaeus' MS A is ἀρχαῖκός, while ἀρχαυκός is Kock's emendation (accepted by Kassel, Austin). In this case past and present editors explicitly follow the prescriptions of Atticist lexicographers, who recommend ἀρχαυκός over ἀρχαῖκός. In Aristophanes' *Clouds* (821), ἀρχαῖκά is transmitted by the MSS Rav. 429 and Ambr. C 222 inf. (the other MSS have ἀρχαῖκά), and the editors regularly print ἀρχαῖκά. Still, we have no proof that this is the original spelling: it may well be that the scribes adopted the prescribed orthography.³⁶ In 4th-century BCE Attic, ἀρχαῖκός is attested in Aristotle (*Metaph.* 1089a.2). The restoration of ἀρχαυκός in Antiphanes is in keeping with the convention upheld by Atticist lexicographers (whose main interest was probably Aristophanes, although they recommended -αι- more generally), but it tells us nothing about the original 4th-century BCE form.

The case of Mnesim. fr. 8.3–4 is different: Athenaeus' MSS read Ἀχαικῆν, but this is problematic. We may start by considering the parallel case of Alexis' title Ἀχαιίς. The sources quoting this title give both -αι- and -αῖ-, so Kassel, Austin print Ἀχαιίς. However, Arnott (1996, 128 n. 1) chooses to adopt the spelling -αῖ- since, he writes, 'the form with one iota was already accepted in 4th-century Attic'. We should add that while Ἀχαι- is the normal form in tragedy and Herodotus, Ἀχαιίς is already the regular form in Thucydides and Xenophon for the choronym Ἀχαιία and the ktetic Ἀχαιῖκός (incidentally, Ἀχαιῖς is already in Semonides, fr. 23.1 West). Returning to Mnesimachus' Ἀχαικῆν, it may well be that Ἀχαικῆν in Athenaeus' MSS is the regularised rather than the original spelling (cf. the case of ἀρχαῖκά in Ar. *Nu.* 821 discussed above): one is therefore tempted to consider restoring Ἀχαικῆν in Mnesimachus as well.

A partially similar situation is found in the case of Philem. fr. 115.3–4. The reading of the MS of Clement of Alexandria is Πλαταικοῦ. The spelling Πλαται- is standard in Herodotus and Thucydides (Πλαταιίς: Thuc. 2.71.4, 2.74.2, 3.58.5), while Πλαταιί- appears in 4th-century BCE Attic texts (Lys. 3.5, Aeschin. 3.162, Thphr. *HP* 9.18.4). As in the case above, then, -αικ- in Philemon's fragment may be due to scribal normalisation, and the other evidence from 4th-century BCE Attic writers might suggest Πλαταικοῦ instead.

It is difficult to establish a strict chronological rule that applies to all forms. While it is true that there is a gradual evolution from -αι- to -αῖ-, one cannot generalise and say that the spelling is -αι- in 5th-century BCE Attic and -αῖ- in 4th-century BCE Attic. For, while in tragedy the adoption of -αι- seems to be consistent, in other genres the treatment of this diphthong varies from case to case. For example, Thucydides regularly uses Πλαταιίς (see above), just as he also uses Αναί-

³⁶ See Dover (1968a, 200); Fiori (2022, 68 n. 135).

ίτης (3.19.2) and Ἀναίτις (8.61.2), whereas he never uses ἄχαι-, but only ἄχαι- (see above).³⁷ It therefore appears that although the phonological development reflected by the spelling change -αι- > -αῖ- was probably well underway by the 5th century BCE, the fact that it surfaces in some forms earlier than in others probably reflects the different chronology of each form.³⁸

3.6 αἰεί and αἰεί (< *αιφεί)

In all cases examined so far, the outcome of monophthongisation is a long vowel (i.e. /aj/ > /a:/). This is only partly the case for αἰεί > αἰεί, where /a/ is the more common treatment.

The epigraphic evidence shows that αἰεί is the standard form before 450 BCE, but αἰεί and αἰεί coexist in official inscriptions between ca. 450 and 350 BCE (with αἰεί being the more common form), and αἰεί becomes very rare after 350 BCE. This is confirmed by the literary evidence, where the regular spelling is without the iota. As for the length of the first syllable, already in Aristophanes both /a:/ and /a/ are attested. The evidence from the New Comedy papyri (mostly Menander) is collected by Arnott (2002, 192–3), who shows that in 18 cases the vowel length is /a/ and in two cases it is /a:/ (in a further nine cases the syllable is anceps). This collection can be supplemented with the evidence from the Middle and New Comedy fragments known through the indirect tradition.³⁹ Here, the occurrences of αἰεί with metrically guaranteed /a/, which typically occurs in the final iambic element of the final *metron* of the trimeter, are by far the most numerous (50 occurrences).

αἰεί with metrically guaranteed /a:/: Dionys.Com. fr. 2.3 and 2.22; Ephipp. fr. 2.2.

αἰεί with metrically guaranteed /a:/: Alex. fr. 63.2 and 178.14; Anaxipp. fr. 1.28; Antidot. fr. 2.4 and 227.5; Antiph. fr. 254.2; Diod.Com. fr. 2.21; Men. fr. 374.1 and 878.2; Philem. fr. 60.2 and 103.5.

αἰεί with metrically guaranteed /a/: Alex. fr. 34.5, 35.2, 53.3, 133.4, 145.15, 165.2, 177.1 (see Arnott 1996, 518), 205.7, 219.4, 222.10, and 242.3; Anaxandr. fr. 35.1 (*Αἰα*); Antiph. fr. 80.4, 121.7, 132.1, 194.11, 205.1, 228.4, 229.2, and 253.1; Apollod.Com. fr. 9.2; Axion. fr. 2.3; Demetr.Com.Nov. fr. 2.2; Diphil. fr. 95.2 and 137.1; Drom. fr. 1.3; Ephipp. fr. 2.3; Eub. fr. 9.6, 69.1 and 122.1; Men. fr. 17.1, 163.4, 219.6, 286.3, 343 (*Ατ*), 373.5, 412.3, 686.1, 760.2, 804.10, 602.3 and 655.2 (*Ατ*); Philem. fr. 31.7, 92.4, 92.10, 162, and 164; Philipp. fr. 8; Phoenic. fr. 4.8; Sophil. fr. 4.1.

³⁷ Moreover, some of the nouns and adjectives deriving from adjectives in -αιος, like Θηβαῖος and Κωπῆαιος, do not seem to have ever occurred in the form -αι- (see Wackernagel 1885, 278).

³⁸ For the treatment of these formations in the papyri, see Mayser (*Gramm.* vol. 1, 85).

³⁹ These lists do not include the cases where the first syllable of αἰεί occurs in an anceps position.

The development of the diphthong /aj/ in the first syllable of αἰεῖ/ἄεῖ is a different case from the previously discussed evidence for the development of /aj/ in prevocalic position. Although there is some evidence of other (generally late) forms where the development of -αι- is a short vowel rather than the expected long one (see Section A.3.9), ἄεῖ stands out because the form with a short first syllable is as old as Homer (see Schwyzler 1939, 256). Perhaps, due to its being a high-frequency form, ἄεῖ was more subject to phonetic erosion, and the sequence of two long vowels may have undergone a shortening of the first element.

3.7 Other cases of prevocalic /aj/ and their treatment

In the cases discussed above, with the partial exception of αἰεῖ > ἄεῖ, the outcome of the monophthongisation of -αι- and -αιϜ-, plus -αια in Ἀθηναία, is a long vowel (i.e. /aj/ > /a:/). We will now compare two categories where the second element of the diphthong /aj/ is treated as a glide in prevocalic position.

3.7.1 Demotics in -αιεύς

Epigraphic evidence shows that in demotics, ethnics, and toponyms in -αιεύς, simplification into -αεύς is less common than the preservation of the diphthong, as is also shown by the later spelling -εεύς, which presupposes the preservation of the diphthong and the development /aj/ > /e/ (Threatte 1980, 279–86). Compared with the treatment of the diphthong in the cases discussed above, another major difference, which becomes apparent in the poetic occurrences vs the prosaic ones, is that the development -αιεύς > -αεύς produced a short vowel /a/, like in Πειραιεύς with a short middle syllable. That this was not a problematic development already in 5th-century BCE Attic is also shown by Old Comedy (Ar. *Pax* 145 and fr. 683).

Πειραιεύς with /a/: Alex. fr. 247.1; Crito Com. fr. 3.4; Men. *Epit.* 752; Philisc. fr. 2.

At the same time, Πειραιεύς/Πειραεύς is the only demotic for which the forms without iota are almost as well attested in the Attic inscriptions as those with iota (see Threatte 1980, 282–4).

But later comedy also offers metrically guaranteed evidence for the retention of the diphthong in demotics in -αιεύς.

Antiph. fr. 209.1: δήμου δ' Ἀλαιεύς ἐστίν. (B) ἔν γάρ τοῦτό μοι.

The epigraphic record shows that the form Ἀλαιεύς without iota, only attested in the 4th century BCE, is comparatively much rarer than the original spelling Ἀλαιεύς

(and, except in one case, limited to private texts: see Threatte 1980, 280–1). It is therefore particularly interesting that the title of one of Menander’s plays is transmitted as Ἀλαεῖς rather than Ἀλαιεῖς (Men. test. 41.13 (P.Oxy. 27.2462.13, 2nd century CE = TM 61494) = Ἀλαεῖς test. i).⁴⁰ We may wonder whether this occurrence reflects Menander’s spelling of the demotic.

3.7.2 Adjectives in -αιος

The comic evidence for the development /aj/ > /a/ collected by Arnott (1996, 695) is (almost) limited to first-class adjectives, and all the instances are from Old Comedy except one case in Eubulus and one in Menander (which is problematic).⁴¹

Eub. fr. 115.13: χρηστή – τίς ἦν μέντοι; τίς; οἴμοι δειλαιος. **Men. Sic. 169:** ὦ γεραῖέ, μείνον ἐν παραστά[σιν δόμων.

Unlike the cases discussed in the previous sections, where the development of the diphthong /aj/ resulted in /a:/, in this group the second element of the diphthong is treated as a glide and re-syllabification takes place (/aj.V/ > /a.(j)V/). The fact that these forms are (nearly) all adjectives in -αιος, and that the evidence is relatively scanty, probably indicates that the comic poets adopted this treatment only occasionally and purely for metrical convenience. The evidence from Attic inscriptions confirms that the treatment of the second element of the diphthong /aj/ as a glide is extremely rare in the adjectives in -αιος (Threatte 1980, 292–4). This puts us in a better position to judge the two cases from Middle and New Comedy. Eubulus fr. 115.13 employs the traditional expression οἴμοι δειλαιος, which often occurs at the end of the iambic trimeter in Old Comedy (10x in Aristophanes). Thus, this occurrence must probably be taken as a metrical licence in line with the earlier comic tradition, rather than as a reflection of a phonological development of 4th-century BCE Attic.⁴² In Menander, the debated occurrence of γεραῖέ

⁴⁰ The other testimonia to the title of this play tend to have a corrupt form, but this is easily traced back to Ἀλαεῖς.

⁴¹ The forms are Ἀθηναῖος in Eup. fr. 37, Pherecr. fr. 39, Polyzel. fr. 12, φιλαθηναῖος in Ar. V. 282 (uncertain), and οἴμοι δειλαιος at line-end in Ar. Eq. 139, Nu. 40, 165, 202, 1150, Pax 233, Av. 990, Ec. 391, 1051, Pl. 850 (only in this last passage without οἴμοι). The only case which is not a first-class adjective is αὐταῖ in Ar. Av. 1018: φθαιῆς ἄν· ἐπίκεινται γὰρ ἐγγὺς αὐταῖ. Perpillou (1984) discusses this and other evidence to suggest that the process /aj/ > /e/ was already underway in the 5th century BCE. Note, however, that the forms he discusses often show different phonetic forms. In the case of the forms in -αιος, it is more likely that re-syllabification is taking place (see above).

⁴² It is intriguing that οἴμοι δειλαιος occurs at line-end and as the first words of the new speaker in all previous cases except δειλαιος (without οἴμοι) in *Plutus*, which is the chronologically closest occurrence to Eubulus’ fragment. Hunter (1983, 216) compares this with οἶας with a short first

in *Sic.* 169 is part of a passage in which tragic parody is evident.⁴³ The metre would require a short middle syllable. However, since this treatment is unparalleled in tragedy for passages in iambic trimeters and catalectic trochaic tetrameters, Arnott (1997, 26–7) has plausibly suggested deleting $\tilde{\omega}$ (note that $\gamma\epsilon\rho\alpha\acute{\iota}\epsilon$ may also stand alone in tragedy). Kassel, Schröder retain the transmitted text and compare the line from *Sikyonioi* with $\tilde{\omega}$ $\gamma\epsilon\rho\alpha\acute{\iota}\epsilon$ in Eur. *Or.* 863, the tragic passage alluded to. However, in addition to Arnott's considerations, we should also add that in the passage from Euripides' *Orestes*, $\gamma\epsilon\rho\alpha\acute{\iota}\epsilon$ does not occur in the same metrical position, nor does it mark the beginning of a new conversation (it occurs in mid-conversation, as is typical in tragedy).⁴⁴ Thus, although the *Sikyonioi* passage is parodic, this does not require a close imitation of the source text.

Further, Kassel, Schröder also compare the line from *Sikyonioi* with a similarly problematic case in *Epitrepontes* 348: οὐκέτι δίκαιον· εἴ τι τῶν τούτου σε δεῖ. Here the editors actually make the opposite choice regarding the treatment of the diphthong. The Cairo codex has the reading ουκεστι, which would require δικάϊον. Kassel, Schröder rightly regard this as an unwelcome treatment and therefore print Sudhaus' οὐκέτι instead, despite the attempts of earlier scholarship to defend δικάϊον on the basis of the other evidence for -αῖος in Old Comedy (see above). Similarly, /aῖ.V/ > /a.(i)V/ may not be taken into account in Men. *Dysc.* 568: ἄξιον ἰδεῖν. ἀλλὰ <τὰ> γύναια ταῦτά μοι. The text transmitted in the Bodmer papyrus is ἄξιον ἰδεῖν τιν'. ἀλλὰ γύναια ταῦτά μοι. This requires either the split anapest in the second iambic element of the second *metron*,⁴⁵ or that the middle syllable in γύναια is short. But the best solution, also accepted by Kassel, Schröder, is to emend the transmitted text into ἀλλὰ <τὰ> γύναια ταῦτα.⁴⁶

In conclusion, except for the demotics in -αιεύς and the comic idiom οἴμοι δέιλαιος in Eubulus, there is not a single instance in Middle and New Comedy where /aῖ.V/ > /a.(i)V/ represents a concrete possibility.⁴⁷ If we also consider the

syllable in Eub. fr. 67.5 (on which see Hunter 1983, 156), but the treatment of the two diphthongs is different.

⁴³ See Ingresso (2021).

⁴⁴ The identification of the speakers in this section is notoriously problematic (see Favi 2021; Ingresso 2021; Kassel, Schröder, *PCG* vol. 6,1, *ad Sic.* 169), but it is certain that at *Sic.* 169 a new speaker begins to speak with Smicrines.

⁴⁵ Since ἀλλά is a prepositive, the split anapest may be less obtrusive. For the anapest in this position of the iambic trimeter one may compare, e.g., Men. *Dysc.* 577: ἐκ τοῦ φρέατος βουλομένη τοῦ δεσπότου (but here, as expected, the split anapest corresponds to the three final syllables contained in a single word, and so this parallel is only partly convincing).

⁴⁶ See the discussion by Gomme, Sandbach (1973, 222–3).

⁴⁷ We leave aside the emendation Πανιστάς for the transmitted Παιανιστάς in Men. *Dysc.* 230. Handley (1965, 172–3) suggested retaining it, but the evidence he gathered in support of this suggestion concerns either the diphthong -οι- or the demotic Πειραιεύς, neither of which is really similar to the case at hand (see Section A.1; Section A.3.7.1). Furthermore, none of the other possible examples mentioned by Handley are usually accepted by the editors (see above; note that

other reasons discussed above, Arnott's deletion of $\tilde{\omega}$ in the line from *Sikyonioi* is therefore the likelier option.

3.8 Ἐρμαῖσκος

A fragment of Alexis contains an occurrence of Ἐρμαῖσκος that we can compare with the epigraphic evidence.

Alex. fr. 120.1: εἶθ' ὀρῶ τὸν Ἐρμαῖσκον τῶν ἀδρῶν τούτων τινά.

Alexis' Ἐρμαῖσκος is the spelling of the Athenaeus MSS and is printed by Kassel, Austin. Arnott (1996, 333) also stresses that the more common spelling in Attic inscriptions is -αι- (6x) as opposed to -αιι- (2x). The short /a/ is not just required in Alexis' fragment, but it is the regular prosody, as also shown by Ἐρμαῖκός. This is unsurprising, given the formation of the word (there never existed a stem Ἐρμαι-).⁴⁸ We may thus infer that the two epigraphic occurrences of Ἐρμαῖσκος with the non-etymological -ι- are the engraver's mistake. This is even more plausible if one considers that the inscription where the two occurrences of Ἐρμαῖσκος appear (*IG* 2².1588.4–5) is also the only Athenian inscription in which the form Ἀθηναῖκός is attested (*IG* 2².1588.14). The two examples of Ἐρμαῖσκος are probably a case of hyper-correction. However, documentary sources show that a base form Ἐρμαι- actually began to appear in late Attic (Ἐρμαῖσκος in *IG* 2².8858.2) and in post-Classical Greek (*IG* 7.973, *FD* 3.3.95.2, *ID* 1734.1, *ID* 2622.b.col. ii.7).

3.9 ὠράζω and ὠραῖζω

In one instance the verb ὠράζω represents a rather complicated case.

Men. fr. 672: ὡς ὠραῖζεθ' ἢ Τύχη πρὸς τοὺς βίους.

The metre requires ὠραῖζεθ' with a short second syllable. However, the derivation ὠραῖος > ὠραι-ίζω would have suggested ὠραῖζω/ὠράζω. In fact, in a fragment of Eupolis and in one of the comic adespota on papyrus, the form with the

ιερέαν in Men. *Dysc.* 496 is an entirely different case: see Kassel, Austin, *PCG* vol. 7 *ad* Posidipp. fr. 28.21 and Kassel, Schröder, *PCG* vol. 6,1 *ad* *Dysc.* 496). Gomme, Sandbach (1973, 172), who accept the emendation of Παιανιστάς to Πανιστάς, are too tolerant of the possibility that -αι- could be read as a short syllable.

⁴⁸ See *EDG* s.v. Ἐρμηής.

long diphthong $\acute{\omega}\rho\acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$ is metrically guaranteed.⁴⁹ This is the expected treatment of the verbs in $-\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$ deriving from adjectives in $-\acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$.⁵⁰ The first to draw attention to this unusual treatment of $-\acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}$ -, was Wackernagel.⁵¹ It is quite remarkable that the same unusual treatment is found in $\acute{\alpha}\epsilon\acute{\iota}$, where it must be as old as Homer.⁵² As regards the verbs in $-\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$ Wackernagel compares the rare instance of $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\rho\chi\acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}\sigma\alpha\varsigma$ at the end of the pentameter in an epigram of the Hellenistic epigrammatist Dioscorides (*AP* 7.707.6, in place of the expected $/a:/$, as in $\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\alpha\iota\kappa\acute{\omicron}\varsigma/\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\acute{\alpha}\iota\kappa\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$).⁵³ Since Menander's $\acute{\omega}\rho\acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\theta'$ and $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\rho\chi\acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}\sigma\alpha\varsigma$ in Dioscorides are the only examples of this treatment, one might reasonably argue that they should be regarded as occasional licences rather than as evidence of an alternative treatment of the diphthong. Indeed, one might suggest that the verbs in $-\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$, which were formed by attaching the verbal suffix to the \bar{a} -stems and contained an $/a/$, may have influenced the (occasional) adoption of forms like $\acute{\omega}\rho\acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\theta'$.⁵⁴ Moreover, although the long diphthong $/a:\bar{i}/$ was still retained in Menander's time,⁵⁵ confusion with $/a\bar{i}/$ was very much possible.

49 See Eup. fr. 393: $\acute{\omega}\rho\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta$ και $\theta\rho\upsilon\pi\tau\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta$ and *com. adesp.* fr. *1110.17: $\text{]}\epsilon\lambda\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ $\acute{\omega}\rho\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\text{[}$ (despite the fact that the papyrus reads $\acute{\omega}\rho\acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}\zeta\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\text{[}$, the anapestic metre requires it to be a five-syllable word, just like in Eupolis' fragment). Based on this evidence, Kassel, Austin also print $\acute{\omega}\rho\acute{\alpha}\zeta\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ in Cratin. fr. 298 (= *Antiatt.* ω 2) against the MS's reading $\acute{\omega}\rho\acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ (S. Valente 2015b, 248 retains the transmitted reading, but comments that $\acute{\omega}\rho\acute{\alpha}\zeta\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ would be more correct).

50 To the list of verbs in $-\acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$ collected by the ancient Herodianic sources, which are followed by Wackernagel (1885, 278–9) and Schwyzer (1939, 265–6), we must now add $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$ in Aristophanes (fr. 122 (= Phot. ϵ 551 = *Et.Gen.* AB = *EM* 326.20–1 = *Et.Sym.* ϵ 270)). Note that the lemma of these lexicographical entries is always $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu$, which was then emended to $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$ by Kaibel (see the above discussion of $\acute{\omega}\rho\acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$ and $\acute{\omega}\rho\acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$ in Cratinus, Eupolis, and the comic adespoton). The verb $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$ is an entirely different case, in that $/a:/$ is etymological (i.e. it is the result of the laryngeal in the root * $\acute{g}r\acute{e}h_2$ -, not of the process $-\acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$ > $-\acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$ as in the previous verbs in the list; see *EDG* s.v.).

51 See Wackernagel (1885, 276–9).

52 See Section A.3.6.

53 See Section A.3.5. Compare Homeric $\delta\acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$, with $/a/$ in place of $/a:/$ (for which see $\delta\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$, $\delta\alpha\delta\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$), to the exceptional $\delta\acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}\delta\alpha\varsigma$ and $\delta\acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\nu$, for which Wackernagel (1885, 277) envisages either a derivation from the older stem * $\delta\alpha\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ or the same shortening he discusses in the case of the stem $\acute{\Lambda}\acute{\iota}\delta$ -.

54 One may think of verbs like $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\lambda\acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$ and $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\alpha\gamma\lambda\acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$, always with $/a/$, which in comedy occur, respectively, in Eup. fr. 419, Antiph. fr. 294, Ephipp. fr. 3.6, and Eub. fr. 148.3 and in Cratin. fr. 334.1, Ar. *Ec.* 575, and Ar. fr. 700.

55 See Vessella (2018, 61–2).

4 The diphthong /ui/ in prevocalic position

The treatment of the diphthong /ui/ in prevocalic position presents several similarities with the case of prevocalic /ai/, insofar as the process typically develops as /ui.V/ > /u:.V/. The two main pieces of evidence for this are the noun *υῖος* > *ύος* and the treatment of the ending of the feminine active perfect participle. It is useful to discuss this evidence separately since, notwithstanding the general similarities, they raise partly different problems.

4.1 *υῖος* and *ύος*

In Middle and New Comedy, the word *υῖος* is spelled as both *υῖος* (always in the fragments known via the indirect tradition, sometimes in the papyri) and *ύος* (mostly in the papyri).⁵⁶ Whatever the spelling, in Middle and New Comedy *υῖος/ύος* always has a long first syllable. In Old Comedy, instead, *ύος* may also occur with a short first syllable (Ar. *Ach.* 741, V. 36, Pl.Com. fr. 27.2–3, Pherecr. fr. 107). It seems that while *ύος* in Middle and New Comedy presupposes monophthongisation, and thus the development of a long first syllable (/hui.os/ > /hu:.os/),⁵⁷ in Old Comedy the second element of the diphthong is treated as a glide and the syllable boundary is shifted, resulting in a short first syllable (/hui.os/ > /hu.ios/). The fact that this was not an option in Middle and New Comedy probably reflects the data from the inscriptions, which show that by 350 BCE *ύος* had become the normal spelling.⁵⁸ The Atticists selected *ύος* as the Attic form.

Orus fr. A 81 (= [Zonar.] 1765.6–9): *ύος* ἀνευ τοῦ ι οἱ Ἀττικοί. λέγω δέ, ὅποτε ἐν μιᾷ συλλαβῇ φωνήεντι ὑποτέτακται, ἐξαιρεῖται < ὄλωσ, οἶον μῦα, ὑός, εἰρηκῦα, πεποιηκῦα, κλάειν καὶ τὰ ὅμοια.

This reminds us of similar statements concerning *αιετός* > *αετός*, *ἐλαία* > *ἐλάα* > *ἐλά*, *Ἀθηναία* > *Ἀθηνάα* > *Ἀθηνᾶ*, and the verbs *κλαίω/κλάω* and *καίω/κάω*.

⁵⁶ See Arnott (2002, 215–6).

⁵⁷ See Lejeune (1972, 247).

⁵⁸ See Threatte (1980, 340–2). On the inflection of *υῖος* as a thematic stem, see Favi (2022w).

4.2 Endings of the feminine perfect participle active -υῖα, -ῦα, -εῖα

The ending of the active feminine perfect participle displays a major degree of allomorphy.⁵⁹ -υῖα is the standard ending in literary sources. Inscriptions show that starting from the 5th, and increasingly in the 4th century BCE, this ending developed into -ῦα. After 320 BCE, yet another ending appears, -εῖα; this is the only ending attested in 3rd- and 2nd-century BCE Attic inscriptions. The development /uῖ.V/ > /u:.V/ may be explained along the lines of υῖός > ὑός, which similarly presents a chronological progression from the 5th to the 4th century BCE (Lejeune 1972, 247). The case of -εῖα is more complex, and both a phonological and a morphological interpretation have been advanced.⁶⁰ As regards the morphological solution, it has been postulated that an analogy with the adjectives in -ύς, -εῖα, -ύ must have come into effect. However, this interpretation obviously does not explain what functional similarity might have triggered the analogy. On the contrary, the phonological explanation is based on more abundant comparative evidence, namely the fact that also in the nominal stems a similar development /uῖ.a/ > /eῖ.a/ seems to have occurred (the most famous examples being κώδυσια > κώδυσια > κώδεια).⁶¹

As mentioned above, in the manuscript tradition of all Attic writers, the ending of the feminine perfect participle active is -υῖα, while neither -ῦα nor -εῖα are attested. However, Cartlidge (2017a) has recently drawn attention to the linguistic relevance of Cornelia Römer's reading]κεῖα[] in P.Mich. 4752a (= TM 61496) (2nd century CE), which would allow the reconstruction of the reading of the Michigan papyrus in Men. *Epit.* 807 as ἡδικηκεῖα[ν] (see Römer 2012, 118; the other papyrus witness, P.Oxy. 50.3532 (= TM 61498) (2nd century CE), has the more common ending -υῖαν). Considering it unlikely that the ἡδικηκεῖαν of the Michigan papyrus may be a scribal error caused by phonetic confusion between -υῖα and -εῖα, Cartlidge explores the possibility that this occurrence may be a lucky case in which the late papyrus preserves the ending which, as the Attic inscriptions show, was common in Menander's time and which Menander may actually have adopted. However, the reading ἡδικηκεῖα[ν] is far from certain: Peter Parsons and Lucia

⁵⁹ See Threatte (1980, 338–9); Threatte (1996, 470–1); Cartlidge (2017a).

⁶⁰ Cartlidge (2017a) offers a re-examination of the whole issue and collects the relevant bibliography.

⁶¹ For the evidence see Kalén (1918); Cartlidge (2017a, 37–8), with bibliography. Another example of an early development that may be compared to the perfect participle is the theonym (E)λειθυ(Ο)α, which appears as early as 400 BCE in the form (E)ιλύθεια (see Threatte 1980, 342–4, who makes the comparison with the ending of the feminine perfect participle active -υῖα/-ῦα/-εῖα but rightly stresses the presence of /u/ in the antepenultimate syllable).

Prauscello (personal communication), after re-examining the original, read ἡδικη-[κ]υεῖα[ν] instead (i.e. the regular ending -υῖα with the common iotacistic spelling of /i/).

5 Instances of the development /oi/ > /ei/

Three forms show the rare development of the diphthong /oi/ into /ei/, namely, δυοῖν > δεῖν, οἶκοι > οἶκει, and ποῖος > πεῖος. The latter form is unattested in ancient sources, so we cannot really discuss it. The genitive-dative dual δεῖν is attested 3x in Middle and New Comedy, although the manuscripts are sometimes divided between this reading and the more standard δυοῖν (see Section B.1.1.2). As regards οἶκει, although this form is unattested in the papyri and book fragments of Menander, we are briefly informed by John Philoponus that it did appear somewhere in Menander.

Men. fr. 499 = Ioannes Philoponus *Praecepta tonica* 172 Xenis: τὰ εἰς -ει δίφθογγον λήγοντα <δισύλλαβα> ἐπιρρήματα ὄξυνόμενα δύο ἐστί [. . .]. βαρύτερα δὲ τὸ ἀγρεῖ [. . .] καὶ ἔτι τὸ οἶκει παρὰ Μεγάνδρω ἀντὶ τοῦ οἴκοι.

The cause of the phonetic or phonological development in these forms has rarely been identified. As regards δεῖν, earlier scholarship speaks very vaguely of the later form as a ‘phonetic treatment’ of δυοῖν.⁶² In the case of οἶκει, however, it has been suggested that it derives from an earlier adverbial *οἶκεῖ, which was then distinguished from the verb οἶκεῖ after the alternative form οἶκοι.⁶³ Whatever their origin, these three forms δεῖν, οἶκει, and πεῖος were recognised by ancient erudition as typical of (late) Attic.⁶⁴

Eust. in Od. 2.257.33–6 (= Heracl. Mil. fr. 60 Cohn): ἔτι ἰστέον καὶ ὅτι τὸ ‘ποῖοί κ’ εἶτε’ ταυτὸν ἐστὶ τῷ ‘ποταποὶ ἂν ἔσεσθε’, καὶ ὅτι τῆς ὑστερας Ἀτθίδος ἐστὶ τὸ ποῖοι. ἢ γὰρ ἀρχαία ἑτεροίαν ἐδίδου παράληξιν τῇ τοιαύτῃ λέξει, ὡς καὶ Ἡρακλείδης δηλοῖ, ἐνθα λέγει τοὺς Ἀττικοὺς τὴν οἰ δίφθογγον εἰς τὴν εἰ μεταποιεῖν, τὸ δυοῖν λέγοντας δεῖν, καὶ τὸ οἶκοι οἶκει, καὶ τὸ ποῖος πεῖος.

⁶² See Schwyzer (1939, 589); Chantraine (1961, 147). Schwyzer (1939, 196) suggests that δυοῖν > δεῖν may also be the result of dissimilation due to the progressive development from /oi/ to /u/, which he sees as already underway in the 4th century BCE, while other scholars are sceptical about so early a date for this process (see Threatte 1980, 337–8).

⁶³ Schwyzer (1939, 549).

⁶⁴ For the interpretation of Eustathius’ passage and Heraclides’ doctrine see Cohn (1884, 106).

B. Nominal morphology

1 Nominal endings

1.1 Dual number

The dual number is well documented in Attic literary texts of the 5th century BCE, particularly those we think may be closer to colloquial speech (Aristophanes, Euripides).⁶⁵ The vitality of the dual is confirmed by inscriptions, where it is systematically employed until the late 5th century BCE.⁶⁶ On the contrary, the dual is avoided by writers who choose a more ‘international’ and less parochial language, such as Thucydides. In 4th-century BCE Attic, the tendency to neglect the dual is even more pronounced. Verbal inflection is the first part of speech in which the dual begins to disappear, followed by nominal inflection. According to previous calculations, Plato is one of the few authors who still use the dual to a significant extent, but he only uses it in 25% of the cases where he could have used it. In the orators, the dual occurs even more rarely. All this is evidence that the dual was rapidly dying out in the main varieties of 4th-century BCE Attic, including in both literary texts and public inscriptions. The scanty evidence for the dual in Middle and New Comedy confirms this. Yet, some aspects are worthy of attention, notably, the distribution of the extant dual forms across articles, demonstrative pronouns, and nouns (see Section B.1.1.1), and the genitive-dative case of δύο (Section B.1.1.2). Despite the uneven distribution of the dual in literary texts, Atticist lexicographers recognise it as an Attic feature.

Moer. v 2: νό δυϊκῶς Ἀττικοί· ἡμεῖς Ἕλληνες. **Moer. α 4:** ἀθανάτω ἀγήρω Ἀττικοί· ἀθάνατοι ἀγήρατοι Ἕλληνες.⁶⁷

1.1.1 Dual nouns, adjectives, and pronouns

Alex. fr. 60.4: μετεῖχε δ’ ἀμφοῖν τοῖν ῥυθμοῖν. **Alex. fr. 172.2:** νῆ τῷ θεῷ. **Amphis fr. 9.4:** ὦ Δι-οσκόρω. **Antiph. fr. 75.13:** τῷ χεῖρε. **Antiph. fr. 98.2–3:** πονηρῷ ζωγράφῳ [. . .] ἀφανίζουσι (the duals are restored by Morelius). **Antiph. fr. 192.15:** πίννη καὶ τρίγλη φωνὰς ἰχθῦ δύο ἔχουσαι. **Antiph. fr. 222:** στακτῆ δυοῖν μναῖν. **Bato fr. 3.2:** χυτρίδε λαμβάνειν δύο. **Diph. fr. 72.2:** ἀξιους

⁶⁵ See Willi (2003a, 253–4); Willi (2003b, 46–7 and 66) with previous bibliography.

⁶⁶ See Threatte (1996, 18–20 specifically on θεός and θεά; 91–5); Threatte (2020). Threatte (2020, 273) indicates *IG* 1³.426.22 (dated to around 414 BCE) as the first instance of the use of the plural in place of the dual to refer to two items.

⁶⁷ In these entries there is an intersection with Homeric scholarship, a recurring feature of Moeris’ lexicon: see Pellettieri (2023b); Pellettieri (2023c); Pellettieri (2023d); Pellettieri (2023e); Pellettieri (2023f). On the discussion concerning Homer’s use of the dual in Alexandrian and Pergamene scholarship, see Matthaïos (2018).

λίτραιν δυοῖν. **Eub. fr. 81.1:** τῷ χαλκίῳ. **Eub. fr. 117.10:** δυοῖν ποδοῖν. **Henioch. fr. 5.15:** γυναῖκε δ' αὐτὰς δύο παράττετόν τινε (on the dual verb see Section C.1.6). **Men. Georg. 24, 109; Dysc. 878; Ep. 543, 722; Mis. 576, Sic. 33:** (μὰ) τῷ θεῷ. **Men. Dysc. 192:** ὦ Διοσκόρω φίλω. **Men. fr. 200:** ἐκ δυοῖν Αἰξωνέοιν. **Men. fr. 241 and *457:** νῶν. **Men. fr. 411.1–2:** ταῖν ἀδελφαῖν ταῖν δυεῖν | ταύταιν. **Men. fr. 491:** τοῖν δυοῖν Διοσκόροιν. **Nicostr. fr. 5.5–6:** δυοῖν | ὀβολοῖν.

Clearly, in most cases the dual is simply retained for things that naturally come in pairs, such as body parts (hands, feet), deities (the Dioscuri, on whom see below), or for the influence of ἄμφω (as in Alex. fr. 60.4). There seems to be no rule concerning currency units. Beside the examples of dual λίτρα, μνᾶ, ὄβολος, and χαλκίον, there are cases where the numeral δύο occurs with a plural rather than dual currency unit.⁶⁸ In the other cases, the dual seems to be used for metrical convenience (as in Antiph. fr. 192.15 and Bato fr. 3.2), or in cases where the number two may be particularly important (as in Men. fr. 411.1–2, probably a passage from a prologue explaining the story of two sisters who will be reunited at the end of the play), or it may sharpen a poignant joke (cf. e.g. Men. fr. 200, where a γραῦς τις κακολόγος is evil-speaking because both her parents were from the deme Aexone).⁶⁹ The numeral δύο frequently accompanies dual nouns: while unnecessary, it possibly reinforced the dual. This might also be seen as an element of colloquial speech, which ultimately led to the erosion of the use of the dual.⁷⁰

The case of the name of the Dioscuri might also point to this conclusion. Interestingly, the Attic form (i.e. without the third compensatory lengthening) is the one normally found in the dual number, whereas the plural form has the third

⁶⁸ See Philipp. fr. 30.1–2: ὁ τραχύτατος δὲ συκοφάντης μνᾶς δύο | λαβῶν ἄπεισιν or Men. Dysc. 327–8: τούτῳ ταλάντων ἔστ' ἴσως τουτὶ δυεῖν | τὸ κτῆμα. But note that in both cases μνᾶ and ταλάντων are metrically possible. Indeed, the use of doubly marked constructions, i.e. with δύο accompanying a dual form, is truly pervasive also in Attic inscriptions with the expressions of measurement and with amounts of money: this use endures much longer than any other use of the dual (see Threatte 2020, 271; 275).

⁶⁹ On this characterisation of the people from Aexone, see Goebel (1915, 22–3). See also Men. fr. 491, which is the only instance in which the name of the Dioscuri is accompanied by δύο (in the Attic inscriptions too, as in the case of τῷ θεῷ, ἄμφω, and Ἄνακε, this is never the case; see Threatte 2020, 273). Considering that Menander's fragment reads ὁ θάτερος μὲν τοῖν δυοῖν Διοσκόροιν ('the other one of the two Dioscuri'), it is very likely that this exceptional case of double marking with a 'superfluous' δύο was intended to emphasise the point being made about one of the two Dioscuri. Examples of this kind confirm Threatte's (2020, 277–8) refutation of Wackernagel's claim that the presence of the numeral δύο is an indication that the two items are presented as unrelated.

⁷⁰ On the double marking of the dual see Threatte (2020: 271–6). On pleonastic expressions see Collard (2018, 56–60).

compensatory lengthening and is therefore influenced by literary language.⁷¹ This corroborates the view that the dual was an element of colloquial Attic speech. Atticist lexicographers had different views on the name of the Dioscuri (see Batisti 2024a).

Phryn. Ecl. 205: Διόσκουροι· ὀρθότερον Διόσκοροι. γελάσεις οὖν τοὺς σὺν τῷ υ λέγοντας (i.e. the prescribed form of the plural is Διόσκοροι). **[Hdn.] Philet. 44:** οἱ Διόσκουροι σὺν τῷ υ ὅταν πληθυντικῶς λέγονται· τῷ Διοσκόρῳ δὲ ἐν τῷ δυικῷ ἀριθμῷ ἄνευ τοῦ υ (i.e. the prescribed form of the plural is Διόσκουροι, but Διοσκόρῳ in the dual).

1.1.2 Genitive-dative of δύο

The numeral δύο is a special case. The original genitive-dative form of δύο is δυοῖν. However, later Attic developed a competing form δυεῖν,⁷² the first occurrences of which are in Aristotle's *Constitution of the Athenians* and Menander, but which is also occasionally attested in the manuscript tradition of earlier writers.⁷³ This new form was later replaced by δυσί(ν) (already common in the *corpus Hippocraticum*), which is documented in the *corpus Aristotelicum* and in Theophrastus and then becomes the koine form.⁷⁴ This later form is evidently analogical on the dative plural of the athematic declension, and as such is only used as a dative. The epigraphic evidence shows roughly the same distribution.⁷⁵ The older form δυοῖν is standard until 329/8 BCE, when δυεῖν is first attested; then, δυοῖν is abandoned, its last occurrence being in a 285/4 BCE inscription. However, the post-Classical form δυσί(ν),

⁷¹ Note, however, that the plural form without the third compensatory lengthening occurs in Eur. *El.* 1239 and *Hel.* 1644, arguably for metrical convenience. The occurrence of τῶν Διοσκόρων in Thuc. 3.75.4 is not a counterexample, since Thucydides avoids the dual, although it is interesting that he effectively creates a stylistic hybrid between the Attic equivalent (cf. the lack of the third compensatory lengthening) and the more 'international' form (cf. the avoidance of the dual). Additionally, note that the plural Διόσκουροι with the third compensatory lengthening is also adopted by Xenophon (*Smp.* 8.29, but Διοσκούροι in *HG* 6.3.6), Plato (*Euthd.* 293a.2, but Διοσκόρων at *Lg.* 796b.5), and Aeneas the Tactician (24.1 and 24.13).

⁷² On this process see Section A.5.

⁷³ Note that δυεῖν is also the reading of MS A in Thphr. *Char.* 2.3, but Diggle (2004) adopts the δυοῖν of the other manuscripts (see Diggle 2004, 187: 'The evidence of mss. counts for nothing: they regularly impute δυεῖν to fifth-century authors').

⁷⁴ See Mayser (*Gramm.* vol. 1,2, 71–3). The use of these forms in the koine is complex. Polybius uses δυεῖν for the genitive and δυσί(ν) for the dative (see de Foucault 1972, 66). A further case in point is the morphosyntax of δύο, δυοῖν, δυεῖν, and δυσί(ν) in LXX Greek: because of the even more advanced disappearance of the dual number in the *Septuagint*, the form δύο can be used both as a nominative-accusative and genitive-dative, whereas δυσί(ν) functions only as a dative (see Helbing 1907, 53).

⁷⁵ See Threatte (1996, 415–6).

which appears at the end of the 3rd century BCE and then remains in use until Late Antiquity, is attested much later in inscriptions than in literary texts, probably due to the conservative language of public inscriptions.⁷⁶

δυοῖν: Antiph. fr. 222 and 232.2; Diph. fr. 72.2; Eub. fr. 117.10; Men. *Her.* 16, fr. 200 and 491. **δυεῖν**: Men. *Dysc.* 327; Men. fr. 411.1 (the sources are divided between the reading *δυεῖν* and *δυοῖν*, Kassel, Austin print *δυεῖν*); Hegesipp. fr. 1.6 (*δυεῖν* is the reading of Athenaeus' MS A, corrected to *δυσί(v)* by Porson 1812, 94 without explanation, but later scholars rightly resist this emendation). **δυσί(v)**: Timocl. fr. 16.6.

Since both *δυοῖν* and *δυεῖν* are potentially at risk of being corrupted one into the other, it is difficult to always be sure of the correct reading. At any rate, the poets of New Comedy and Aristotle seem to attest to the phase in which *δυοῖν* was gradually being replaced by *δυεῖν*. The occurrence of *δυσί(v)* in Timocles fr. 16.6 is therefore quite remarkable. The fragment is quoted by Ath. 8.339d (only preserved by MS A). This would be the first ever occurrence of a form otherwise unattested in 4th-century BCE comedy and literary prose, except by a more 'technical' writer like Aristotle (see above). The passage in question is *σύνεστι σαπέρδαις δυσί(v), | καὶ ταῦτ' ἀνάλοις καὶ πλατυρρύγχοις τισί(v)* (Timocl. fr. 16.6–7): *δυσί(v)* may be a copyist's mistake for *δυοῖν*, anticipating *τισί(v)* at the end of the following line. Alternatively, we can consider the possibility of a copying error caused by the palaeographic similarity of *omicron* and *sigma* in majuscule writing. However, it is also possible that Timocles used *δυσί(v)* precisely because the context contains four other datives plural rather than dual; alliteration may also have played a role in the choice of the plural over the dual. In such a case, *δυσί(v)* was probably already an emerging variant in colloquial Attic that simply did not find its way into written literary and documentary texts.

Atticist lexicographers, and ancient linguistic scholarship more generally, took a great interest in *δυοῖν*, *δυεῖν*, and *δυσί(v)*.⁷⁷

Ael.Dion. δ 31–32 (from Eust. *in Il.* 3.60.15–22): καὶ, ὅτι τὸ *δυσί(v)* καὶ ἐπὶ *δοτικῆς* παρὰ *Ἀττικοῖς*, οἷον 'δυσί(v) γυναικοῖν εἶς ἀνὴρ οὐ στέργεται' (*com. adesp.* fr. 189). ἐν ἐτέρῳ δὲ τόπῳ φησὶ καὶ, ὅτι δύο καὶ ἐν τῷ ω δύο, ἦγουν δύο διὰ τοῦ ο μικροῦ καὶ δύο κατὰ ἕκτασιν, Ἀττικοὶ λέγουσιν ἐκατέρως, *δυοῖν* τε ἐπὶ *γενικῆς* καὶ *δοτικῆς*, τὸ δὲ *δυεῖν* σπάνιον παρὰ τοῖς παλαιοῖς, ἔστι δ' ὅμως παρὰ *Θουκυδίδη* (8.101.1 *δυεῖν* ἡμέραιν). λέγουσι δὲ καὶ τῶν δύο καὶ τοῖς δύο. τὸ δὲ *δυσί* βάρβαρον, φησὶ, καὶ κατὰ χρῆσιν Ἀττικὴν καὶ κατὰ λόγον γραμματικόν. λέγει δὲ καὶ, ὅτι νεωτέρων τὸ γράφειν *δυεῖν*. οὐδὲν γὰρ *δυϊκόν* εἰς εἰν λήγειν φασὶν οἱ ἀναλογικοί. **Phryn. Ecl. 180**: *δυσί* μὴ λέγε, ἀλλὰ *δυοῖν*. **Phryn. Ecl. 181**: *δυεῖν* ἔστι μὲν *δόκιμον*, τῷ δ' ἀλλοκότως αὐτῷ χρῆσθαι τινὰς ἐπιπαράττεται· ἐπὶ γὰρ *μόνης γενικῆς* τίθεται, οὐχὶ καὶ *δοτικῆς*. [**Hdn.**] **Philet. 225**: *δυοῖν* παρὰ *Δημοσθένει* αἰεὶ (*passim*). οἱ δὲ ἄλλοι *δυεῖν* λέγουσιν. **Thom.Mag. 90.15–91.10**: *δυοῖν*, οὐ *δυσί(v)*. ὅσα γὰρ μὴ συ-

76 The first instance of *δυσί(v)* in Attic inscriptions is in *IG* 2².849.52–3 (see Threatte 2020, 277).

77 For a brief discussion of these theories see Tosi (1988, 183–4).

νεμφαίνει γένος, οὐδὲ πτώσιν δέχεται. ὡσπερ τὸ οἱ τρεῖς, τῶν τριῶν, τοῖς τρισίν, ἔχει τὴν κλίσιν· παράκειται γὰρ αὐτοῖς οὐδέτερον τὰ τρία· ὁμοίως καὶ τῷ τέσσαρες τὰ τέσσαρα. καὶ ταῦτα μὲν Φρύνιχος, ἀπαγορεύων καθάπαξ τὸ δυσίν. εὐρηται μέντοι καὶ τοῦτο παρὰ τοῖς ῥήτορσι. Θουκυδίδης (8.101.1)· ‘ἐπισιτισάμεναι δυσίν ἡμέραις’. καὶ Ἀριστείδης ἐν τῷ Περί ῥητορικῆς πρώτῳ (2.14 Lenz-Behr (= 45.4.14 Dindorf))· ‘ἀλλ’ ἀπέδωκε δυσὶ καὶ τρισὶν ἀντειπεῖν’. κρεῖττον μέντοι τὸ δυσίν. γίνωσκε δὲ καὶ τοῦτο, ὅτι τὸ δύο οὐ μόνον ἐπὶ εὐθείας καὶ αἰτιατικῆς, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπὶ γενικῆς καὶ δοτικῆς τίθεται. Θουκυδίδης (1.82.2)· ‘διελθόντων δύο ἐτῶν’. καὶ Λιβάνιος (*Epist.* 339.7)· ‘δύο λιμέσι τοὺς εἰς αὐτὸν καταφεύγοντας ἐδέξατο’.

Opinions vary, but *δυσὶν* is unavoidably regarded as correct from the point of view of analogy (the dual typically ends in *-οιν*, not in *-ειν*) and because it is attested in the canonical Attic writers (e.g. Demosthenes). The new form *δυσείν* is acceptable, because it is occasionally attested even in canonical writers (e.g. in Thucydides, though we know that it is not a genuine reading, see above),⁷⁸ but its use is subject to various limitations. The most recent form *δυσί(ν)* is to be avoided.⁷⁹

1.2 ‘Long’ datives *-αισι(ν)* and *-οισι(ν)*

The poets of Old Comedy retained the use of the ‘long’ dative of the thematic declension long after this morpheme had disappeared from inscriptions. The latest occurrences of *-οισι(ν)* on Athenian public inscriptions date to the 420s BCE (Threatte 1996, 25–32): since the language of official inscriptions is rather conservative, we should probably infer that this morpheme had already disappeared from spoken Attic. The ‘short’ dative *-οις* is predominant in Aristophanes, but *-οισι(ν)* is still a well-documented recessive variant even in his later plays, and thus it constitutes an element of morphological conservatism (Willi 2003a, 241). The use of the ‘long’ datives of the *ā*-stems can be presented in very similar terms as a literary convention in the language of Old Comedy (Willi 2003, 241–2).

Various explanations have been proposed for the retention of these morphemes after their disappearance from the spoken dialect. Colvin (1999, 184) sees the long datives as “invisible’ poetic licenses which did not give an aura of high poetry’, and he therefore regards them as a staple of literary language whose use is purely due to metrical convenience. On the other hand, Willi (2003a, 241) thinks that metrical convenience is not a sufficient explanation, and to support this con-

⁷⁸ Note that while Eust. *in Il.* 3.60.18–9 quotes Thuc. 8.101.1 as evidence for the use of *δυσείν* (the Thucydides manuscripts also have *δυσείν ἡμέραιν*), Thom.Mag. 91.2–3 quotes the same passage with *δυσὶν ἡμέραις* as evidence that *δυσὶ* was also acceptable.

⁷⁹ Thomas Magister is the only Atticist source to defend it, although the evidence on which he relies is problematic (see the previous footnote).

clusion he points out that a poet like Menander clearly avoids using the long dative. These opposing interpretations can be reconciled. The ‘long’ dative is a genuine morphological archaism, the retention of which must be due to metrical convenience. The fact that this old morpheme is still common as a non-marked and non-parodic feature in Old Comedy (and in Middle Comedy too, see below) may indicate that in this part of morphology the sociolect of Old (and Middle) Comedy is less mimetic of everyday speech than the language of New Comedy.⁸⁰ If we compare the evidence from 4th-century BCE Attic prose, we find that the Attic orators never use the ‘long’ dative (τουτοισί contains deictic -ί), and that Plato alone occasionally seems adopt this morphological archaism (most instances come from the *Laws*, a dialogue characterised by a more conservative diction in keeping with the theme of ‘old age’).⁸¹ This evidence confirms that the adoption of ‘long’ datives in Old (and Middle) Comedy is an element of conventional literary language that the poets of New Comedy can do without.

1.2.1 -οισι

The evidence for the ‘long’ datives of the thematic declension is substantial.

Alexis: μετρίοισι [. . .] ποτηρίοισι (fr. 9.9), ἀνθρώποισι (fr. 44.2), Παναθηναίοισιν ἐν τοῖς ἰχθύσιν (fr. 57.3), αὐτοῖσι (fr. 57.5), λεπτοῖσι χλωροῖς (fr. 84.5), κοντοῖσι τούτοις (fr. 103.15), τοῖς πράγμασιν δ’ αὐτοῖσι (fr. 165.2), τούτοισι (fr. 168.6), ὄψοισι (fr. 168.7), ζῶμοῖσι (fr. 168.7), ἐν τοῖσι μοχθηροῖσιν (fr. 187.2), ἐν τοῖς γάμοισιν (fr. 233.3). **Amphis:** ἐρίοισι (fr. 27.1). **Anaxandrides:** πυρικτιοῖσι (fr. 6.2), μύροισι Μεγαλλείοισι (fr. 47.2), εἰαυτοῖσιν (fr. 55.3). **Anaxilas:** ἐν σκυταρίοις ῥαπτοῖοσι (fr. 18.6). **Anaxippus:** ἐμβατῖοις γλαφυροῖσι (fr. *1.35), ἐν τοῖσι δ’ ἔργοις (fr. 4.3), θεοῖσιν (fr. 6.4). **Antiphanes:** βροτοῖσι (fr. 1.3), τοῖς θεοῖσι (fr. 85.1), ἀνθρώποισιν (fr. 94.1), ἐν βατανίοισιν (fr. 95.2), ἀνθρώποισι (fr. 98.1), εὐξαμένοισιν (fr. 145.4), γενομένοισιν (fr. 157.2), παρὰ ἡμετέροις προγόνοισιν (fr. 172.4), τοῖς θεωμένοισι (fr. 189.16), οἷσι (fr. 192.8, hexameter), ἔργοισι (fr. 195.13), λουτηρίοισιν (fr. 206.3), ὑποθέτοισιν (fr. 206.4), ιδίοισι (fr. 207.3), καινοῖσι (fr. 207.3), ἀνθρώποισιν (fr. 209.7), κοῖλοισι βυθοῖσι (fr. 216.3), ξιφηφόροισι (fr. 216.19), τοῖς λαμπροῖσι (fr. 226.6), παρὰ ρείθροισι χεμάρροισι (fr. 228.3), ὄσοισι (fr. 244.1). **Aristophon:** αὐτοῖσιν (fr. 9.8), μόνοισι (fr. 12.3), τούτοισι (fr. 12.4), τοῖς [. . .] μεστοῖσιν (fr. 12.6), τοῖς πτωχοῖσι (fr. 14.1), τοῖς κακοῖσι (fr. 14.2). **Athenion:** τοῖς θεοῖσιν (fr. 1.18). **Cratinus Iunior:** ἄλλοισι (fr. 4.2), ἐν Δελφοῖσιν (fr. 12.2). **Damoxenus:** ἀνθρώποισιν (fr. 2.22), αὐτοῖσι (fr. 2.37). **Diphilus:** Κορινθίοισιν (fr. 31.2). **Ephippus:** τοῖσι στρουθίοισι (fr. 6.4), ἐν τοῖσιν αὐλοῖς (fr. 7.2), τοῖς ἡμετέροισι παιγνίοισι (fr. 7.3), κυμβίοισι (fr. 9.2). **Epicrates:** παρὰ τοῖσιν (fr. 10.5). **Eubulus:** καυλοῖσιν (fr. 6.3), †θεοῖσι† (fr. 8.1), τοῖς ἐμοῖσιν (fr. 26.3), πρὸς τούτοισιν (fr. 63.1), ἐν μέσοισι αὐτοῖσιν (fr. 71.2), σπλάγγνοισιν (fr. 75.5), ἀρνεῖοισι (fr. 75.5), θεοῖσιν (fr. 76.2), ξυνετοῖσι (fr. 106.3), ἀμαρακίνοισι (fr. 107.3), ἐν μέσοισι τηγάνοισι (fr. 108.3), αὐτοῖς δὲ τοῖς θεοῖσι (fr. 127.1). **Hipparchus:** ἀνθρώποισιν (fr. 2.2). **Menander:** θεοῖσι (*Pk.* 268), πρὸς τοῖσιν ἄλλοις (*Sam.* 516), αὐτοῖσι<ιν> (fr. 425), τοῖσι δούλοισι (fr. *451.2). **Nausicrates:** ναυτίλοισι (fr. 1.2). **Nicolaus:** ἐν τούτοισι (fr. 1.27). **Philemon:** μόνοισι (fr. 28.2), παρὰ τοῖς ἄλλοισιν (fr. 39.1), κἂν βροτοῖσι κἂν θεοῖς (fr. 60.1), τυροῖσιν (fr.

⁸⁰ See also the brief remark by Wilamowitz (1925, 155).

⁸¹ See Benardete (2000, 227, and n. 39), who also discusses the use of ‘long’ datives.

82.6), πρὸς τοῖς κακοῖσιν (fr. 94.9), προγόνοισιν (fr. 96.9), ἐγγόνοισιν (fr. 96.9), ἀνθρώποισι (fr. 103.2), πολλοῖσι (fr. 106.3), ἐν ἀνθρώποισι (fr. 110.2), ἐτέροισιν (fr. 110.4), τούτοις (fr. 116.1), τέκνοισιν (fr. 169). **Philemon Iunior**: τοῖς ὀπτοῖσι (fr. 1.2). **Philetaerus**: ἐν νεκροῖσι (fr. 13.5). **Phoenicides**: πρὸς τούτοις (fr. 3.1). **Sosipater**: κὰν ποίοισιν [. . .] ζῳδίοις (fr. 1.29), τοῖς ὄψοισιν (fr. 1.43), ἐν τοῖς στρατηγικοῖσιν (fr. 1.55). **Sotades**: θρίοισι (fr. 1.27). **Timocles**: ἐν λόγοισι (fr. 4.7), τοῖς νέοισιν (fr. 32.2). **Timotheus**: θεοῖσιν (fr. 2.3). **Xenarchus**: ἀσυντάτοισι (fr. *1.2), ἐπὶ τοῖσι πορνείοισιν (fr. 4.4), ἀχῦροισιν (fr. 4.12), θεοῖσιν (fr. 7.8), ἐπὶ μὲν παγούροις τοῖς θεοῖς ἐχθροῖσι (fr. 8.2).

A general observation that can be made is that the ‘long’ datives are clearly more common in nouns and adjectives than in pronouns and especially in the article: it is telling that while τοῖσι occurs 8x, even within this smaller sample τοῖς is attested 20x. If we examine more closely the larger *corpora*, that is, the fragments of Alexis, Antiphanes, Diphilus, Eubulus, Menander, and Philemon, some further differences seem to emerge. The poets of Middle Comedy make greater use of the ‘long’ datives of the thematic declension than the poets of New Comedy. Menander’s case is particularly revealing. Even though he is represented by the largest extant *corpus* in Middle and New Comedy, only four occurrences of the ‘long’ dative survive. This may not be entirely coincidental. There are 13 occurrences of the ‘long’ dative in Philemon. We should probably infer that the use of the ‘long’ dative is one of the features that characterises Philemon’s language as closer to that of Middle Comedy (see also Section B.1.2.2).⁸²

1.2.2 -αισι

The ‘long’ datives of the *ā*-stems are less widely attested than the ‘long’ datives of the thematic declension.

Alexis: αὐταῖσι (fr. 103.13), ἐπὶ ταῖς ἀβυρτάκαισι (fr. 145.13), ταῖς πλείσταισι (fr. 153.1). **Amphis**: ἐτέρας τε τοιαύταισι (fr. 23.4). **Antiphanes**: στολαῖσι (fr. 38.1), ῥύμαισι (fr. 55.2), εὐφροσύναις ὀσμαιῖσι (fr. 78.3), ταῖς θεαῖς | πάσαισι (fr. 204.2–3), σικύαισιν (fr. 206.4), ξανθαῖσιν αὐραῖς (fr. 216.22), κλαγκταῖσι φωναῖς (fr. 231.4), πρὸς Μούσαισι (fr. 272.1). **Apollodorus of Carystus**: ἐτάραισιν (fr. 8.1). **Diphilus**: ταῖς σπονδαῖσι (fr. 42.15), ἐν ταῖς τραγωδίασιν (fr. 74.5), ἐν ἡμέραισιν (fr. 98.1). **Menander**: ταῖς ἀληθείαισι (*Theoph.* 25), διαβολαῖσι (fr. 764.1), ταῖς ἀτυχίασι (fr. 860.1). **Mnesimachus**: καταπάλταισι (fr. 7.9). **Philemon**: ἐν ταῖς πόλεσι πάσαις, ἐν ταῖς οἰκίαις | πάσαις (fr. 95.7–8), δόξαισιν (fr. 96.8), ταῖς ἀληθείαισιν (fr. 118.1), ἐν πολλαῖσιν οἰκίαις (fr. 148.1). **Timocles**: ἠπίαις φωναῖσιν (fr. 17.2), ἐν αἴσιν (fr. 23.4), ἀπαλαῖσι χερσίν (fr. 24.6), ἀληταῖσι (fr. 31.4).

The evidence is relatively limited. The ‘long’ feminine dative only appears with nouns and adjectives, very rarely with pronouns, and never with the article. As in the case of the thematic declension, the ‘long’ feminine dative seems to be far less

⁸² On the conservative traits of Philemon’s language, see also Section D.3.1; Favi (2022v).

common in New Comedy compared to Middle Comedy. This is particularly noticeable in the case of Menander, whose *corpus*, despite being the largest, contains only three instances of the ‘long’ feminine dative. What has been said above (see Section B.1.2.1) above Philemon’s use of the ‘long’ datives of the thematic declension holds equally true for his use of the ‘long’ datives of the \bar{a} -stems.

1.3 The neuter nominative and accusative singular of ταυτό(ν), τοιοῦτο(ν), and τοσοῦτο(ν)

The inherited nominative-accusative ending of the neuter demonstrative pronouns is *-d (as in Latin *id, istud, aliud, quid*, etc.), which, like all word-final stops, disappears in Greek in historical times. At a later stage, the innovative form ταυτόν with analogical final -ν was created (after the neuter nominative and accusative singular of the nominal declension). In Attic, the neuter pronominal form ταυτόν appears with or without the final -ν proper to the nominal inflection. The form with final -ν is common in 5th-century BCE Attic.⁸³ Both forms are attested in Middle and New Comedy.

ταυτό: Antiph. fr. 54.5, fr. 229.3; Apollod.Com. fr. 14.8; Diphil. fr. 101.1; Hegesipp. fr. 1.21; Men. *Asp.* 179, *Asp.* 352, *Dysc.* 810 and 933, *Epit.* 411, *Pc.* 306.

ταυτόν: Alex. fr. 35.3, 63.4, 146.7; Antiph. fr. 221.5; Men. *Asp.* 124, *Pc.* 56 and 300, fr. 409.7; Philem. fr. 82.13; Theophil. fr. 7.3.

This evidence seems to suggest that later comic poets, while still using ταυτόν, are more keen on the analogical form than the poets of Old Comedy. This squares well with the evidence for two other neuter pronominal forms, τοιοῦτο(ν) and τοσοῦτο(ν), for which the poets of Middle and New Comedy use the analogical forms, which in turn are not attested in Old Comedy and in Attic inscriptions.⁸⁴

τοιοῦτο and τοιοῦτ(ο): Alex. fr. 35.1, 275.4; Antiph. fr. 55.15, 79.1, 123.4, 192.13; Eub. fr. 40.8; Men. *Georg.* 82, *Dysc.* 76, 156, 353, 631, 752 [supplement], *Epit.* 881, *Pc.* 236, *Sam.* 210, *Sam.* 375, *Sam.* 627, *Sic.* 276; Philem. fr. 96.4; Philem.Iun. fr. 1.3; Phoenic. fr. 3.4.

τοιοῦτον: Alex. fr. 178.14, 24.176, 265.7, 304.1; Amphis fr. 37.2; Athenio fr. 1.3; Diphil. fr. 31.17; Men. *Asp.* 204, *Dysc.* 694, *Epit.* 476, *Heros* 6, *Sam.* 299, *Sam.* 587, fr. 858.2; Nausicr. fr. 2.2; Philem. fr. 75.3.

τοσοῦτο and τοσοῦτ(ο): Alex. fr. 128.2; Diph. fr. 32.8 and 96.3; Men. *Asp.* 240, *Dysc.* 402 (adverbial); Philem. fr. 94.6.

τοσοῦτον: Men. *Asp.* 401, *Epit.* 437, *Pc.* 293.

⁸³ See Willi (2003a, 244) who provides the data on ταυτόν in Aristophanes. See also Threatte (1996, 330) on the neuter αὔτόν, which is very rare and only attested before 400 BCE.

⁸⁴ See Willi (2003a, 244) on Aristophanes’ almost exclusive use of τοιοῦτον and τοσοῦτον and Threatte (1996, 329) on the neuter τοιοῦτον and τοσοῦτον as the only forms attested in the Attic inscriptions. Homer also used only the forms with final -ν.

This use of both the non-analogical and the analogical forms is reflected not only in tragedy, but also in 4th-century BCE prose, where the manuscript evidence shows a considerable oscillation between the two options.⁸⁵ It appears that the poets of Middle and New Comedy not only use a wider range than the poets of Old Comedy, but they also adopt a more innovative morphology (although such a distinction may become irrelevant from a synchronic point of view).

Atticist lexicographers, presumably inspired by the evidence from 5th-century BCE Attic, recommend the forms with *-v*:

Moer. τ 14: ταυτόν Ἀττικοί· τὸ αὐτό Ἑλληνες.

2 Nominal stems

2.1 *ā-* vs *ǎ-* stems

The evidence from Middle and New Comedy is also relevant to some peculiar forms of the *a*-declension, which show an alternating *ā-* and *ǎ-* stem.⁸⁶

θέρμη (not attested in Middle and New Comedy) vs **θέρμᾶ** (Men. *Georg.* 94). **κολόκυντη** (Diphil. fr. 98.2; Mnes. fr. 4.30 [metrically guaranteed]) vs **κολόκυνθᾶ** (not attested in Middle and New Comedy). **νάρκη** ('stingray': Alex. fr. 38.1 and 49.1 = 115.9;⁸⁷ Antiph. fr. 127.3 and 130.2; Mnes. fr. 4.37)⁸⁸ vs **νάρκᾶ** ('numbness': Men. fr. 388.2).⁸⁹ **τόλμη** (not attested in Middle and New Comedy) vs **τόλμᾶ** (Men. fr. 177.1).

This evidence is also discussed by Atticist (as well as non-Atticist) sources.

Phryn. Ecl. 13: ἄμυναν μὴ εἶπης, ἀλλ' εἰς ῥῆμα μεταβάλλων ἀμύνασθαι· πάντα γὰρ τὰ <τοῦ> ῥήματος δόκιμα, ἀμυνοῦμαι, ἀμύνασθαι, ἡμυνάμην, ἀμυνοῦμεν, ἀμύνομαι· τὸ δὲ ὄνομα ἀδόκιμον. **Phryn. Ecl. 304:** θέρμα· οὕτως ὁ Μένανδρος (*Georg.* 94) διὰ τοῦ α, ἀλλ' οὔτε Θεουκυδίδης οὐθ' ἡ ἀρχαία κωμῳδία οὔτε Πλάτων, θέρμη δέ (and see below the Herodianic passage discussing τόλμη). **Phryn. Ecl. 405:** κολόκυνθα· ἡμάρτηται ἢ ἐσχάτη συλλαβὴ διὰ τοῦ θα λεγομένη, δέον διὰ τοῦ τη ὡς Ἀθηναῖοι. **Phryn. PS 114.20–1:** τόλμη καὶ τόλμα, πρύμνη καὶ πρύμνα. νάρκη δὲ διὰ τοῦ

⁸⁵ See K–B (vol. 1, 606–7).

⁸⁶ The most comprehensive collection of evidence is provided by Solmsen (1909, 236–70). His overall conclusion is that most *ǎ*-stem forms are post-Classical innovations, but some may date back to the 5th century BCE. The relationship between the inflection as *ā*-stems and *ǎ*-stems is not etymologically justified (see Chantraine 1933, 102).

⁸⁷ On these shared verses in multiple plays see Arnott (1996, 168; 315; 318).

⁸⁸ See Mastellari (2020, 419).

⁸⁹ The derivation of νάρκη 'stingray' from 'numbness' is obvious (one may think of the famous comparison between Socrates and the stingray in Pl. *Men.* 80a.6, 80c.6, and 84b.7).

η. **Hdn.** **Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωδίας** *GG* 3,1.253.7 (= [Arc.] *Epit.* 237.6 Roussou): κολόκυνθα ἢ Ἀττικῶς κολοκύντη. **Hdn.** **Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωδίας** *GG* 3,1.255.15–6 ([Arc.] *Epit.* 237.7–8 Roussou): τὰ εἰς μαθηλυκὰ σπάνια ὄντα βαρύνεται· τόλμα, θέρμα· Ἀττικῶς δὲ τόλμη καὶ θέρμη. **Ath.** 7.314b: Μένανδρος δ' ἐν Φανίῳ διὰ τοῦ α ἔφη (fr. 388): ὑπελήλυθέν τέ μου | νάρκα τις ὄλον τὸ δέρμα', μηδενὸς τῶν παλαιῶν οὔτω κεχρημένου. **Moer.** α 151: ἄμυναν ἢ κοινή συνήθεια· λέγει δὲ τῶν Ἀττικῶν οὐδεὶς. **Moer.** θ 6: θοῖνη Ἀττικοί· θοῖνα Ἑλληνες. **Moer.** ρ 8: ῥίνη Ἀττικοί· ῥίνα Ἑλληνες. **Philemo (Vindob.)** 394.16: ζεύγλην· οὐχὶ ζεῦγλαν. **Philemo (Vindob.)** 395.6: κολοκύντην, οὐ κολόκυνθα.

These forms present different problems and thus require a separate treatment. In the case of κολοκύντη and τόλμα, the poets of Middle and New Comedy still use the standard Attic form. As regards κολοκύντη, the evidence from 5th-century BCE sources shows that this is the original form in Attic (see Ar. *Nu.* 327 and fr. 581.6, Hermipp. fr. 69.2, Metag. fr. 16.2 [but the source of this fragment trivialises the reading into κολόκυνθα]).⁹⁰ In the 4th century BCE, the variant form κολόκυνθα⁹¹ begins to appear (e.g. in Aristotle's *Historia animalium*), in many cases as a competitive variant of κολοκύντη within the same corpus (κολόκυνθα it is a less attested form of κολοκύντη in the *corpus Hippocraticum* and Theophrastus).⁹² However, the poets of Middle Comedy still adopt the earlier form κολοκύντη. As regards τόλμα, the form with /a/ is metrically guaranteed in Menander, and we should point out that this is precisely the standard Attic form (which occurs in Thucydides, Euripides, Sophocles, Isocrates, Xenophon, etc.; in poetry it is also metrically guaranteed).⁹³ The form with the long final syllable τόλμη (< τόλμᾱ), only occurs in non-Attic texts (e.g. Pindar) and then in post-Classical sources.⁹⁴

⁹⁰ The original Attic form is also the *gemeingriechisch* form: cf. Alc. fr. 117b.8–9 Voigt (Aeolic), Epich. fr. 152 and Sophr. fr. 33 (Doric).

⁹¹ Furnée (1972, 190) includes this among the examples of the (pre-Greek) oscillation /t/ ~ /tʰ/.

⁹² In post-Classical times, κολοκύντη and κολόκυνθα alternate, but individual writers seem to have their idiosyncratic preferences for one or the other (e.g. LXX, Dioscorides, and Galen almost exclusively use κολόκυνθα). In late antique and Byzantine sources, we also find the form κολόκυντα, a compromise between κολοκύντη and κολόκυνθα. Furnée (1972, 190 and 365) also mentions the late masculine forms κολύκυνθος/κολόκυντος and κολύκιντος.

⁹³ Solmsen (1909, 266) believes that τόλμᾱ is secondary and may have been formed on τολμάω by analogy with cases like γέννᾱ: γεννάω, διαίτᾱ: διαιτάω, μέριμνᾱ: μερμινάω, ἔρευνᾱ: ἐρευνάω.

⁹⁴ LSJ s.v. τόλμα rightly mentions that the papyrus of Sophocles' *Ichneutai* has the reading τόλμην in Soph. fr. 314.17: πρὸς τόλμαν πεσεῖν, which however is not metrically guaranteed. Solmsen (1909, 266) also mentions that the transmitted text of Eur. *Ion* 1416 requires τόλμᾱ, but the line is emended by modern scholars.

In the case of *θήρμα* and *νάρκα*, later comedy adopts the more recent form. Despite Phrynichus' claims regarding *θήρμα* in Menander's *Georgos* (whose length is metrically guaranteed), both *θήρμη* and *θήρμα* are attested in Old Comedy (*θήρμη* in Pherecr. fr. 169.2 [metrically guaranteed], *θήρμα* in Ar. fr. 346.2 [the length of /a/ cannot be confirmed by the metre, since the syllable is followed by a consonant]).⁹⁵ Perhaps, the evidence for *θήρμα* was not abundant enough for Phrynichus to approve of the form with /a/, which he may have regarded as late and suspicious, particularly because of its occurrence in Menander. Phrynichus thus condemns it from an ideological standpoint. Indeed, in the case of *νάρκη/νάρκα* 'numbness', Menander adopts the form with /a/,⁹⁶ but since Aristophanes uses *νάρκη* (*V.* 713: οἴμοι, τί πέπονθ'; ὡς νάρκη μου κατὰ τῆς χειρὸς καταχέϊται), it is easy for Phrynichus to prescribe *νάρκη* and proscribe Menander's *νάρκα*.⁹⁷

2.2 'Attic' declension

The 'Attic' declension of the nouns *λεώς* and *νεώς* and of the adjective *ἕλεως* is still the norm in Middle and New Comedy.

Alex. fr. 41.2–3: λιθίνης ἐπεθύμησεν κόρης | ἄνθρωπος κατέκλεισέ θ' αὐτὸν τῷ νεῷ. **Ephipp. fr. 6.6–7:** εὐθέως τ' ἀφεῖλε πᾶν | αὐτοῦ τὸ λυποῦν κάπεδειξεν ἕλεων. **Epicr. fr. 3.8:** ἐπὶ τοὺς νεῶς ἴζουσι πεινῶντες κακῶς. **Men. Leuc. 5:** ἡ ζάκορος ἡ κοσμοῦσα τὸν νεῶ, τέκνον. **Philem. fr. 127.2–3:** εἴτ' εἰς τὸν νεῶν | κατέκλεισεν αὐτόν. **Posidipp. fr. 31.1:** ναοὶ δὲ εἰσὶν καὶ στοά (Meinke suggested restoring νεῶ, but Kassel, Austin retain the transmitted reading ναοί).

The occurrences in Alexis, Ephippus, Epicrates, and Philemon are all metrically guaranteed. This evidence is consistent with the other literary and documentary evidence from contemporary Attic. As regards 4th-century BCE prose, writers like Plato, Demosthenes, and Isocrates invariably use *νεῶς* rather than *ναός*. An important exception is Xenophon, who alternates *ναός* and *νεῶς* even within the

⁹⁵ The occurrence in Aristophanes is still treated as a neuter noun in -μα in LSJ s.v. (for this interpretation see Rutherford 1881, 414–5), while this information is corrected in *GE* s.v. *θήρμα* 1.

⁹⁶ After Menander, *νάρκα* 'numbness' with -α- occurs in Imperial medical texts, Marcus Aurelius (10.9.1), and Clement of Alexandria (*Paed.* 2.8.71.3). Solmsen (1909, 268) explains *νάρκα* as a later form, although no explanation of its origin is given. Solmsen (1909, 269) alternatively suggests that Menander's *νάρκα* may be due to metrical needs, but parallels in other late texts go against this view.

⁹⁷ Other occurrences of *νάρκη* are in the *corpus Hippocraticum*, Diodorus (2.12.3), and Imperial medical texts.

same work.⁹⁸ In addition, if we trust the manuscript evidence, *ναός* also occurs once in Hyperides and twice in Aeneas the Tactician.⁹⁹ In Hellenistic high-register koine, Polybius apparently used both *ναός* and *νεός*.¹⁰⁰ Similarly, forms like *λαός* and *ναός* only begin to appear on the Attic inscriptions from the late decades of the 3rd century BCE.¹⁰¹ The late date of the comic poet Posidippus, who was active in the first half of the 3rd BCE century, led Kassel and Austin to resist Meineke's restoration of *νεώ* in place of the transmitted *ναοί*. Still, considering that the newer form did not immediately take over in koine Greek, and also that the New Comedy poets seem to have retained the 'Attic' declension, Meineke's proposal for Posidipp. fr. 31.1 is worth considering.

Men. *Leuc.* 5 is a particularly important occurrence. This line is known via the indirect transmission as Men. fr. 686 Körte–Thierfelder, where the *Etymologica* have the trivialisation *ναόν* instead of the 'Attic' declension. The Attic form *νεώ* could be restored thanks to P.Oxy. 60.4024.5 (= TM 61471) (1st century CE), published by Parsons (1994), where the first reading of the papyrus was actually *νεών*, but then the final *ny* was blotted out with a dot. This reading in the Menander passage has important consequences. For a start, it shows that Menander's use of the 'Attic' declension is in line with the evidence from the inscriptions, since the accusative ending *-ω* 'is probably universal after 350 BCE' (Threatte 1996, 39, who explains *νεός*, *νεών* > *νεώς*, *νεώ* as deriving by analogy from *ἔως*, *ἔω*). Additionally, we may wonder whether the reading *νεών* in Philem. fr. 127.2–3 too may be a copyist's normalisation.¹⁰²

Atticist lexicography shows an interest in the 'Attic' declension (and related forms).

Phryn. Ecl. 261: φλοῦς· καὶ τοῦτο ἡμάρτηται· οἱ γὰρ Ἀθηναῖοι φλέως λέγουσιν, καὶ τὰ ἀπὸ τούτου πλεκόμενα φλέϊνα καλεῖται. **Moer. a 67:** ἀνάπλεων <Ἀττικοί>· ἀνάπλεον <Ἕλληνες>. **Moer. v 1:**

98 See Gautier (1911, 79; 152). Gautier considers *ναός* a Doric form in Xenophon rather than an 'international' archaism. On the limits of these traditional approaches to Xenophon's language, here exemplified by Gautier, see Chapter 4, Section 5.1.

99 See Vela Tejada (1991, 124–5); López Eire (2002, 82).

100 See de Foucault (1972, 65). Thumb (1901, 243) explains *ναός* in the koine as the result of the competition between Ionic *νηός* and Attic *νεός*. But the spreading of *ναός* must also relate to the influence of analogy and the tendency of the koine towards simplification, that is, to avoid the word's complicated inflection in Attic (cf. the replacement of *ναῦς* with *πλοῖον* in the koine).

101 See Threatte (1996, 39–40).

102 In the case of Theophrastus' *Historia plantarum*, judging from the edition by Amigues (1989), the accusative *φλεών* occurs 2x (4.10.4, 4.10.6) and the accusative *φλεώ* 1x (4.8.1). The coexistence of the two forms may well be original and also partly motivated by the need to disambiguate with the genitive *τοῦ φλεώ* (which occurs 5x in the same sections: twice in 4.10.4, twice in 4.10.7, and once in 4.11.12).

νεώς τὴν εὐθεΐαν ἐνικῶς καὶ ὀξυτόνως Ἀττικοί· ναός Ἑλληνες. **Moer. π 6:** πλέων καὶ κατάπλεων Ἀττικοί· πλήρη Ἑλληνες. **Moer. π 55:** πλέων οἴνου Ἀττικοί· πλήρη οἴνου Ἑλληνες. **Moer. π 83:** πλέω Ἀττικοί· πλήρεις Ἑλληνες. [**Hdn.**] **Philet. 29:** τὸν ἦρω, τὸν Μίνω, τὸν Ἀπόλλω, τὸν Ποσειδῶ ἄνευ τοῦ ν οἱ Ἀττικοί. τὸν λαγών καὶ τὸν νεών, τὸν λαγῶ καὶ τὸν νεώ, ἄνευ τοῦ ν ἢ σὺν τῷ ν. **Orus fr. A 66** (= [Zonar.] 1390.13–5): τὸν νεών, ἢ αἰτιατική σὺν τῷ ν, καὶ λαγών καὶ Κών· ἢ δὲ γενική καὶ ἡ δοτική ἄνευ τοῦ ν· τοῦ νεῶ καὶ τῷ νεῶ. The fact that Orus points out that νεών is the accusative, while the (by his time) homonymous forms νεῶ and νεῶ are the genitive and the dative, may have been encouraged specifically by the late-Attic accusative singular νεῶ, which is documented in the writings of the poets of Middle and New Comedy (but cf. the more tolerant approach of the entry in *Phileterus*). **Orus fr. B 10** (= Phot. α 1305, cf. *Su.* α 1702): Ἀμφιάραος καὶ Ἀμφιάρεως· ἐκατέρως λέγουσιν· ὃ δέσποτ' Ἀμφιάραε πολυτίμητ' ἀναξ'. **Orus fr. B 26** (= Σ α 1558 = Phot. α 2176 = *Su.* α 2823, *ex* Σ'): ἀξιόχρεων· ἐν τῷ ω λέγουσι, καὶ λειπόνων. καὶ τὰ οὐδέτερα οἱ {γάρ} παλαιοὶ ὁμοίως. τὸ δὲ ἀξιόχρεον βάρβαρον.

2.3 Contracted thematic nouns and adjectives

In Attic, the declension of the thematic nouns and adjectives typically involves the contraction of the final vowel of the stem and the thematic vowel or the ending (e.g. ὄστουν < ὄστέον, ἀπλοῦς < ἀπλόος, πορφυροῦς < πορφύρεος, etc.). However, there is one rare case in Middle and New Comedy where the uncontracted form is adopted: κυανέαις (Xenarch. fr. 1.7). This example is very isolated compared to the more common contracted forms, although it finds an earlier parallel in the χρυσέαν used by Theopomp.Com. fr. 4.1. Both occurrences are used to parody poetic diction.¹⁰³ A comparison with Demosthenes, Isocrates, Plato, Xenophon, and Lysias also shows that the adjectives χρύσεος, ἀργύρεος, χάλκεος, and κυάνεος occur exclusively in the contracted form. Atticist lexicographers usually prescribe the contracted forms, which they probably found to be more in line with other typical Attic outcomes, such as the ‘contracted’ genitive and accusative, singular and plural, of the *eu*-stems.¹⁰⁴ A partial exception is Philemon.

Phryn. Ecl. 178: χρύσεια, ἀργύρεα, χάλκεα, κυάνεα· ταῦτα ἰακὰ διαιρούμενα. χρῆ οὖν λέγειν χρυσᾶ ἀργυρᾶ κυανᾶ τὸν ἀττικίζοντα. {χρυσοῦς λέγε· τὸ γὰρ χρύσεος Ἰακόν· ὁμοίως καὶ χρυσοῦς, ἀργυροῦς, χαλκοῦς, κυανοῦς, ἀλλὰ μὴ χρύσεος, ἀργύρεος}. **Phryn. PS 43.17–9:** ἀπλᾶ, διπλᾶ, τριπλᾶ καὶ τὰ ὅμοια περισπῶσιν, <οὐ> γὰρ ὑποπίπτει τῇ Ἰωνικῇ διαιρέσει, οἷον διπλόα διπλᾶ καὶ τὰ ὅμοια. **Phryn. PS fr. *367** (= *Su.* χ 553): χρυσᾶ· τὸ ἀπλᾶ καὶ διπλᾶ καὶ πολλαπλᾶ καὶ πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα περισπῶσιν οἱ Ἀττικοί, ἀργυρᾶ, χρυσᾶ, καὶ κεραμεῖᾶ ἀπὸ τοῦ κεραμεοῦν, καὶ φοινικᾶ ἀπὸ τοῦ φοινικοῦν. **Antiatt. θ 1:** θροῦς· Θουκυδίδης δ' (4.66.2). **Moer. ο 27:** ὄστουν Ἀττικοί· ὄστέον

¹⁰³ See Kassel, Austin (*PCG* vol. 7, 710–1); Farmer (2022, 38) on Theopompus; Nesselrath (1990, 263) on Xenarchus.

¹⁰⁴ On the forms in -ινος which derive from these contracted nouns and their assessment in Atticist lexicography, see Fiori (2022, 31–9).

Ἑλληνες. **Moer. χ 3**: χαλκοῦς χαλκῆ ἀδιαιρέτως Ἀττικοί· χάλκεος χαλκέα Ἑλληνες. **Moer. χ 4**: χρυσοῦς καὶ χρυσῆ Ἀττικοί· χρύσεος καὶ χρυσέα Ἑλληνες. **Moer. χ 28**: χαλκῆν χρυσῆν Ἀττικοί· διαλελυμένως δὲ Ἑλληνες. On all these entries see Batisti (2023a); Batisti (2023b). **Philemo (Laur.) 356**: ἄθροος· ὡς ἄθριος. **Philemo (Laur.) 358**: δικροῦν, ὡς χρυσοῦν. **Philemo (Vindob.) 396.28**: φοινίκεον· οὐ φοινικοῦν. **Orus fr. B 126** (= Phot. o 566): ὄστοῦν· διισλλάβως, οὐκ ὄστέον λέγουσιν οἱ Ἀττικοί. A different type of contract forms is discussed by **Philemo (Laur.) 356**: καὶ βορᾶς καὶ βορέας ἐκάτερα.

2.4 Genitive -εος of *i*-stems

In the genitive of *i*-stems, Attic and the high koine retain -εως (which is the outcome of -ηιος > -ηος > -εως with ‘quantitative metathesis’). Most other dialects, however, especially Ionic, developed a regularised, analogical inflection as πόλις, πόλιος or as πόλις, πόλεος, which is closer to the ending -ος of the other genitives of the third declension (-εος originates from the shortening of /ε:/ before another vowel).¹⁰⁵ Both πόλιος and πόλεος are attested in Homer, while only the former is standard in Herodotus. In Attic texts, the genitive -εος is used for metrical convenience in tragedy, while the only occurrences in Old Comedy dialogues are ὕβρεος in Ar. *Pl.* 1044 (metrically guaranteed) and φύσεος in the comic poet Theopompus (fr. 33.3; restored by Porson, whose emendation is accepted by Kassel, Austin).¹⁰⁶ Willi (2003b, 57–8) rightly sees ὕβρεος as influenced by the Ionic dialect: an analogical and de-Atticised form. Among the poets of Middle and New Comedy, the -εος genitive of *i*-stems ὕβρις and πόλις is attested only in Eubulus.

πόλεος: Eub. fr. 118.8. **ὕβρεος**: Eub. fr. 67.9 and 93.7.

In all three cases, the corresponding -εως genitive form would be unmetrical, and so the use of -εος is due to metrical convenience. The rarity of such forms and the fact that they are only used for metrical convenience make it likely that we should not regard them as evidence of an extensive de-Atticisation of 4th-century BCE Attic, but simply as prosodic possibilities exploited by a few poets. In 4th-century BCE Attic inscriptions, words with an *i*-stem very occasionally have -εος instead of the expected -εως (and also words with an *eu*-stem, but a genitive like δ[ι]αδόσεος, which occurs in *IG* 2².1749.76, dated to 341/0 BCE, is unattested in

¹⁰⁵ The genitive -ιος is the most common form in most Greek dialects, particularly Ionic (see Buck 1955, § 109.1–2).

¹⁰⁶ See Willi (2003b, 57–8), who provides further references.

Middle and New Comedy).¹⁰⁷ Most likely, -ιος/-εος was admissible in spoken *Großattisch*.¹⁰⁸ Note, too, that Xenophon at least once adopts the analogical genitive -ιος of the *i*-stem common noun τύρσις ‘bastion’ (i.e. τῆς τύρσιος in place of τῆς τύρσεως in *X. An.* 7.8.12, whereas in the plural Xenophon always uses the older, non-analogical inflection of this noun). Given that τύρσις is a word of the military jargon, it is possible that the Ionic inflection of this term was also standard in Attic texts (hence, the retention of non-assimilated /rs/).¹⁰⁹ The fact that in the plural Xenophon retained the expected Attic inflection with apophonic alternation (i.e. τύρσεις, τυρσέων, etc.) is probably no mere coincidence. Considering that the plural of *i*-stems did not undergo an analogical remodelling in post-Classical Greek, it is quite possible that in *Großattisch* too the analogical inflection of the *i*-stems had only spread in some cases, notably the genitive singular. This may thus explain the adoption of the -εος genitives in Aristophanes, Theopompus, and Eubulus.

2.5 Nominative plural of *u*-stems

The older nominative plural ending -ύες, which is still common in 4th-century BCE literary Attic, is occasionally replaced by the nominative plural -ῦς in Middle and New Comedy.

ιχθῦς; Eub. fr. 108.3; Alex. fr. 47.2 and 263.9; Antiph. fr. 233.3; Men. *Sam.* 98. μῦς; Antiph. fr. 191.1.

These forms developed by analogy with the accusative plural, where -ῦς is the expected ending.¹¹⁰ The forms in -ῦς replace the standard forms in earlier Attic, which are still attested in 4th-century BCE comedy when they can be metrically useful (ιχθύες in Telecl. fr. 1.6 and Archipp. fr. 30, μύες in Anaxandr. fr. 42.61).¹¹¹ This morphological development shows that later comedy aligns with a tendency already visible in Attic documentary inscriptions at the end of the 5th century

¹⁰⁷ See Threatte (1996, 213).

¹⁰⁸ In Ptolemaic papyri, the genitives -ιος and -εος are both attested in common nouns (see Mayer, *Gramm.* vol. 1.2, 23–4). In Imperial papyri, besides -ιος and -εος, the genitive singular of *i*-stems may also end in -ις (as in Modern Greek, cf. πόλη, πόλης; see Gignac 1981, 75; *CGMEMG* vol. 2, 534–5).

¹⁰⁹ On military jargon see Chapter 4, Section 4.2. On Xenophon’s language see Chapter 4, Section 5.1.

¹¹⁰ See K–B (vol. 1, 439); Schwyzler (1939, 564, esp. on αἱ ἄρκυς in Xenophon’s *Cynegeticus*). See also Section B.2.6.

¹¹¹ Sommerstein (2013, 134).

BCE.¹¹² It seems that this development attracted the interest of Aelius Dionysius and other Atticist sources, who defended the admissibility of both.

Ael.Dion. κ 17 (= Eust. *in Od.* 2.165.13–4): αἱ δὲ τοιαῦται κριθῆαι καὶ κάχρυς δυσυλλάβως καὶ ἐκτεταμένως ἐλέγοντο κατὰ Αἴλιον Διονύσιον θηλυκῶς.¹¹³ **Philemo (Laur.) 359**: δρυς καὶ δρύες φαμέν, see Batisti (2023c).

In the case of *u*-stems which present an apophonic alternation (*-*u*/-*eu*), such as πῆχυς, πῆχεως, the older nominative plural -εις (from *-εF-ες) is retained (see ἐγγέλεις in Antiph. fr. 191.1 and 233.5, Eub. fr. 36.3, and Men. fr. 224.5).¹¹⁴ This triggered the development of the analogical accusative plural ἐγγέλεις, which is attested in the poets of Middle and New Comedy (see Antiph. fr. 104.3, Alex. fr. 78.7, and Timocl. fr. 11.6).¹¹⁵ This innovative accusative plural will attract the criticism of the Atticist lexicographers.

Antiatt. η 17: ἡμίσεας ἀντὶ τοῦ ἡμίσεις. **Phryn. PS 73.4–6**: ἡμίσεας καὶ ἡμίσεις ἄμφω μὲν Ἀττικά. Ἀττικώτερον δὲ τὸ ἡμίσεας. ἡμίσειαν σὺν τῷ ι. ἡμισυ – ἡμίσεως – ἡμίσεια, ἀλλ’ οὐχὶ ἡμίση. See Fiori (2022, 37–8).

2.6 Analogical accusative plural -υας of *u*-stems

The expected accusative plural of *u*-stems is -ῦς (< *-*uns*). However, in post-Classical Greek the analogical accusative ending -υας was developed, modelled on the athematic stems.¹¹⁶ An early example of this, μύας, occurs in Posidippus (fr. 15.3), a poet of late New Comedy (first half of the 3rd century BCE).¹¹⁷

Atticist lexicographers duly indicate -ῦς as the proper Attic ending.

Phryn. PS 77.14–5: ἰχθῦς ἢ αἰτιατικῆ τῶν πληθυντικῶν Ἀττικώτερον ἤπερ ἰχθύας (see Batisti 2023c).

¹¹² See Threatte (1996, 219–20), who discusses the use of the nominative plural στάχυς in place of στάχυες.

¹¹³ This doctrine seems to have enjoyed wide diffusion. The other occurrences, most notably including Moer. κ 18: κάχρυς Ἀττικοί· κριθῆαι πεφρυγμένα Ἑλληγες and Phot. κ 509: κάχρυς κριθῆαι πεφρυγμένα, are collected by Theodoridis *ad* Phot. κ 509.

¹¹⁴ The word ἐγγελυς is obviously a special case, insofar as in the singular (ἐγγελυς, ἐγγέλυος, from *ἐγγελυ-) it does not show the same apophonic alternation as in the plural (ἐγγέλεις, ἐγγέλεων, from *ἐγγελεF-).

¹¹⁵ See Section B.2.9.

¹¹⁶ See Gignac (1981, 80).

¹¹⁷ For early evidence of this morphology in Homer, see Batisti (2023c).

2.7 ‘Contracted’ genitive and accusative, singular and plural, of *eu*-stems

In 5th- and early-4th-century BCE Attic, the genitive and accusative singular and plural of *eu*-stems typically underwent a process of ‘contraction’ (especially after -Ct-, -αt-, and -εt-). This process resulted in the consonantisation of the vowel /e/ before the ending, the merging of the resulting glide with the preceding semi-vowel, and the displacement of the accent to the final syllable (Threatte 1996, 248–57).

ἐκ Πειραιῶς: Alex. fr. 247.1; Crito Com. fr. 3.4. Πειραιᾶ: Men. *Epit.* 752. χοῦ: Anaxandr. fr. 33.1; Epin. fr. 2.8; Eub. fr. 80.4; Men. fr. 442 (none of these occurrences is metrically guaranteed). χοῦς: Alex. fr. 15.19; Damox. fr. 1.3; Epin. fr. 2.5 (this last occurrence is metrically guaranteed).

The problems posed by the ‘contracted’ forms of χοεὺς (i.e. χοῦς, χοός) will be discussed in Section B.2.11. As a general tendency, the non-‘contracted’ forms of *eu*-stems become increasingly common during the 4th century BCE, and then, from the 3rd century BCE onwards, the ‘contracted’ forms almost disappear. Πειραιεύς is a special case compared to the other ‘contracted’ *eu*-stems: this form is the only one that continues to appear in the ‘contracted’ form after the 3rd century BCE.¹¹⁸ In the case of ἀλιεύς (‘fisherman’), unlike Πειραιεύς, it appears that the poets of later comedy preferred the ‘uncontracted’ forms.

ἀλιέων: Anaxandr. fr. 33.15; Alex. fr. 76.5. ἀλιέα: Antiph. fr. 188.17; Alex. fr. 155.1.

ἀλιεύς is rare, but the ‘contracted’ genitive singular ἀλιῶς is known to have occurred in the 5th-century BCE comic poet Pherecrates (fr. 215)¹¹⁹ and the accusative plural Ἀλιᾶς of the toponym Ἀλιεῖς is attested in Thucydides (1.105.1). Overall, the poets of later comedy seem to follow the prose writers of the 4th century BCE in using the ‘uncontracted’ form, which will then become the standard inflection in post-Classical Greek.

2.8 Accusative singular and plural of *eu*-stems

The phonetic development behind the formation of the accusative singular and plural of *eu*-stems has been examined in a seminal article by Méndez Dosuna

¹¹⁸ Noted, for example, that the accusative Πειραιᾶ also occurs in Machon (388 Gow).

¹¹⁹ Quoted by Σ^b α 981 = Phot. α 975 (this entry was edited by de Borries as Phryn. *PS* fr. *154). This Attic peculiarity is also commented upon by Hdn. Περὶ καθολικῆς προσφῶδιας *GG* 3.1.430.18–9 = Ioannes Philoponus *Praecepta tonica* 89 Xenis.

(1993b).¹²⁰ To put it very briefly, the encounter of the nominal stem with the case ending yields the following four options: (1) -εα(ς) in synizesis, (2) -ᾶ(ς) as the outcome of contraction, (3) bisyllabic -εα(ς) with /a:/, (4) bisyllabic -εα(ς) with /a/. The more common outcomes in Classical Attic are (1) or (3). In all dialects other than Attic, (4) is the norm, but this prosody was also occasionally adopted in Attic tragedy (though only with φονεύς). Middle and New Comedy provides evidence for all four outcomes.¹²¹

Synizesis: ἀλιέας (Antiph. fr. 188.17).

‘Contracted’ -ᾶ(ς):¹²² χοᾶ (Anaxandr. fr. 33.1; Epin. fr. 2.8; Eub. fr. 80.4; Men. fr. 442) and χοᾶς (Alex. fr. 15.19; Damox. fr. 1.3; Epin. fr. 2.5) (‘contracted’ from *χοέα and *χοέας, accusative singular and plural of χοεύς); εἰς Πειραιᾶ (Men. *Epit.* 752, ‘contracted’ from *Πειραιέα, accusative of Πειραιεύς).

/a:/: Ἀχαρνέα (Timocl. fr. 18.6); Τηρέα (2x in Timocl. fr. 19.3); Νηλέα (Men. *Epit.* 326); Προμηθεά (Men. fr. 508.2); τοὺς ἱερέας (Anaxandr. fr. 40.10).

/a/: τὸν τροφέα (Theophil. fr. 1.3); ψυγέα (Euphro fr. 3.1); γονέας (Antiph. fr. 261.2); κεστρέ(α) (Philem. fr. 83).¹²³

The occurrence of the accusative στρωματέα in a fragment of Alexis (fr. 120.3) is a thorny case, since it would be compatible with three options: synizesis, /a:/, and /a/.¹²⁴

It is perhaps no coincidence that the /a/ is predominantly attested in trisyllabic words with a tribrachic form. Not only does this hold true for the comic occurrences listed above (except Philemon’s κεστρέ(α)), but it also finds confirmation in the fact that, in tragedy, φονεύς is the only word for which an accusative φονέα with /a/ is attested (see above). One might think that in words with this form the /a/ proved to be a suitable metrical option.

Atticist lexicographers, particularly Moeris, are keen to recommend the long prosody for the accusative singular and plural.

Moer. α 12: ἀμοφρέα ἀλιέα μακρῶς Ἄττικοί· βραχέως Ἑλληνες. **Moer. α 13:** ἀγυῖα μακρῶς τὴν ἐπὶ τέλους Ἄττικοί· ἀγυῖα Ἑλληνες βραχέως (on this more problematic entry Vessella 2018, 126–9).

120 See further La Roche (1897, 1–4); K–B (vol. 1, 448); Schwyzer (1939, 575); Vessella (2018, 144–6).

121 In the following cases the length of the final syllable in bisyllabic -έας is unknown because the syllable is closed: τοὺς ἀλιέας (Alex. fr. 159.1), κεστρέας (Henioch. fr. 3.3), Ταυρέας (Antiph. fr. 188.4). No instances of the accusative singular or plural at the end of a iambic trimeter are listed since in that position the syllable can be either short or long.

122 See Section B.2.7.

123 See Arnott (1996, 334). He also mentions βασιλέ(ᾶ) in Machon 171 Gow.

124 Arnott (1996, 334) opts for /a/ on the basis of the parallel examples from later comedy, but there is no decisive argument in favour of this over the other two possibilities. Synizesis seems an attractive option.

Moer. ι 4: ἰπέα ἀλιέα βασιλέα μακρῶς Ἀττικοί. **Moer. ι 18:** ἰπέας μακρῶς Ἀττικοί· βραχέως Ἑλληνες. **Philemo (Laur.) 355:** Ἀτρέα, ὡς βασιλέα, τὸ α μακρόν. **Orus fr. B 115** (= Phot. ο 46): Ὀδυσσεά· ἡ ἐσχάτη μακρά, καὶ τὰ ὅμοια. **Orus fr. B 132** (= Phot. π 809): Περσέα καὶ Θησέα καὶ αἰγέα καὶ Ἀχιλλέα καὶ τῶν ὁμοίων πάντων ἐκτείνουσι τὸ α τὸ τελευταῖον {καὶ} ἐπὶ τῆς αἰτιατικῆς πτώσεως. A similar development is discussed regarding the accusative of the proper names in -ῆς, -οῦς (< -έης, -έους). See **Phryn. Ecl. 127:** Ἡρακλέα, Περικλέα, Θεμιστοκλέα ἐπεκτείνων τὴν ἐσχάτην λέγε, ἀλλὰ μὴ Ἡρακλήν καὶ Περικλήν καὶ Θεμιστοκλήν (on which entry see also Section B.2.10). Other sources are collected by Alpers (1981, 248) *ad Orus fr. B 132* (= Phot. π 809).

Vessella (2018, 146) finds it somewhat surprising that the Atticist lexicographers were so concerned about forms such as ἰπέᾶς, since they must have been very marginal in the koine. The evidence for the short prosody provided by Antiphanes' γονέας, Euphro's ψυγέα, Philemon's κεστρέ(α), and Theophilus' τροφέα suggests that it may have been the evidence from later comedy that prompted the Atticist reaction, possibly as a response to those who relied on similar cases to say that the post-Classical prosody with /a/ was also good Attic.¹²⁵

2.9 Analogical accusative plural of *eu*-stems

The accusative plural of *eu*-stems in Attic is -έας (from βασιληF-ας). In post-Classical Greek, under the influence of the nominative plural (and perhaps also after τὰς πόλεις) a new accusative plural ending -εῖς was developed, which then became predominant in the koine.¹²⁶ Some early examples of this development can already be found in Middle and New Comedy.

γονεῖς (Philem. fr. 168, Men. fr. 824, *com. adesp.* fr. 237), but γονέας is still attested in comedy (Antiph. fr. 261.2) and is the norm in 4th-century BCE prose (for instance, Xenophon, Lysias, Plato, and Demosthenes regularly use γονῆς/γονεῖς in the nominative and γονέας in the accusative, but note that Isocrates alternates the older accusative γονέας, which occurs 6x, with the analogical γονεῖς, which occurs in 1.14 and 1.16).

ἰππεῖς (Men. fr. 204), as part of the proverb ἰππεῖς προκαλεῖσθαι εἰς πεδίον, but ἰπέας is also used (Apolod.Com. fr. 5.20). It is conceivable that the proverb adopted the innovative form ἰππεῖς, which was presumably more colloquial at the time. The innovative form ἰππεῖς is also variously attested as a variant reading of ἰπέας in Xenophon's manuscripts and is discussed by ancient scholars along with νομεῖς in place of νομέας.¹²⁷

κεστρεῖς (Antiph. fr. 136.1), but κεστρέας is also attested in Alex. fr. 11.8, Henioch. fr. 3.3.

γραφεῖς (Alex. fr. 20.5), as opposed to the accusative ξυγγραφέας/συγγραφέας in Thucydides (8.67.1) and Isocrates (18.58).

¹²⁵ That the correct prosody of the accusative singular and plural of *eu*-stems is with /a:/ is also discussed in grammatical sources, collected by La Roche (1897, 1).

¹²⁶ See Mayser (*Gramm.* vol. 1,2, 29–30).

¹²⁷ See Sgobbi (2004, 234–5; 250–2).

στρωματεῖς (Apollod.Com. fr. 2), but this is a comparatively new word in 4th-century BCE Attic (the earliest attestation is in Middle Comedy),¹²⁸ and there is no evidence for the non-analogical ending (see also Thphr. *HP* 4.2.7: τοὺς κρίκους τὸρνεύουσι τοὺς εἰς τοὺς στρωματεῖς τοὺς διαποικίλους).

In principle, one cannot rule out the possibility that some of these occurrences of -εῖς may conceal instances where an original -έας scanned in synizesis.¹²⁹ Still, the parallel evidence from other 4th-century BCE texts suggests that these analogical endings were indeed expanding in late Attic. Atticist lexicography is critical of the analogical development.

Antiat. γ 18: γονέας καὶ γραφέας καὶ τὰ ὅμοια· οὐ μὴν γονεῖς, οὐδὲ γραφεῖς, ὡς οἴονται δεῖν λέγειν. **Philemo (Vindob.)** 394.8: ἐρμηνεάς· οὐχ ἐρμηνεῖς.

2.10 The inflection of *s*-stems as masculine *ā*-stems

Already in Attic inscriptions of the 5th century and then especially of the 4th century BCE,¹³⁰ *s*-stem personal names (e.g. Σωκράτης, Σωκράτους) develop new analogical forms modelled on the *ā*-stems (i.e. Σωκράτης, Σωκράτου, etc.).¹³¹ The epigraphic evidence is extensive (see Threatte 1996, 154–78). These analogical forms are also attested in literary texts, such as Old Comedy – where, contrary to the practice of modern editors, they should probably be retained (see Willi 2003a, 250) – and prose.¹³² The evidence for this analogical treatment in Middle and New

128 See Arnott (1996, 335).

129 See Section B.2.8.

130 See Threatte (1996, 173–8), who points out that while the analogical accusative -ην became pervasive after the 370s/360s BCE, the vocative usually retained the inherited ending -ες.

131 This was only possible in Ionic and Attic, since the phonological process /a:/ > /e:/ is typical only of these two dialects. It should be noted that the opposite process may also have taken place, i.e. names with an *ā*-stem may have been inflected as if they were *s*-stems, but the evidence for this is controversial (see Threatte 1996, 89–91; López Eire 2002, 93–4).

132 Some names, like Ὑπερείδης and Θεοκρίνης, are inflected exclusively as analogical *ā*-stems even in the literary sources. As regards Σωκράτης, the analogical accusative Σωκράτην occurs in Eup. fr. 386.1 (but the passage is textually problematic), Pl. *Phdr.* 236c.5, *Grg.* 514d.7, and apparently in Hyperides (fr. 55 Jensen). Hyperides also employs the analogical accusatives Ἀθηνογένην (*Ath.* 3, 4, and 5 Jensen) and Εὐθυκράτην (fr. 76 Jensen), although in the new Hyperides which has resurfaced in the Archimedes palimpsest, there is an oscillation between the analogical Δημοσθένην (*Contra Diondam* 4 (= f. 137v l. 6) Horváth) and the original Δημοσθένη (*Contra Diondam* 9 (= f. 145r l. 20) Horváth). As regards the vocative case, unlike Menander, who uses the analogical vocative in -η, Hyperides uses the older vocative Ἀθηνόγενες (*Ath.* 16, 20, and 26), in line with the preference for the non-analogical vocative in inscriptions (see Threatte 1996, 178).

Comedy is confined to the name Στρατοφάνης, the main character in Menander's *Sikyonioi*.

Vocative Στρατοφάνη for older Στρατόφανες; Men. *Sic.* 128 (integration), 135, 142, 377, 381, *Sic. fr.* 3.1.¹³³ **Accusative Στρατωφάνην** for older Στρατοφάνη; Men. *Sic.* 365.

This development points to the koine.¹³⁴ Atticist lexicography is obviously critical of analogical inflection. The interest of Atticist lexicography in these analogical developments of the *s*-stems also concerns the plural forms, but in this case, they recommend the analogical form modelled on the *ā*-stems.¹³⁵

Antiatt. θ 21: Θηραμένης: τὴν κλητικὴν. †Φίλιππίδης† Κοθόρνοις (Philonid. fr. 6). **Moer. δ 48:** Δημοσθένας Ἀττικοί· Δημοσθένεις <κατὰ> τὸ ἀνάλογον Ἑλληνες (see Pellettieri 2023i). **Moer. σ 23:** Σωκράτη Ἀττικῶς· Σωκράτην Ἑλληνες (see Pellettieri 2023h). For a parallel not involving *s*-stems, see **Phryn. Ecl. 127:** Ἡρακλέα, Περικλέα, Θεμιστοκλέα ἐπεκτείνων τὴν ἐσχάτην λέγε, ἀλλὰ μὴ Ἡρακλῆν καὶ Περικλῆν καὶ Θεμιστοκλῆν.

2.11 Heteroclis and metaplasm

It is not uncommon in Greek for several nouns to have allomorphs belonging to different inflectional classes (heteroclis) or to be transferred from one inflectional class to another (metaplasm). The motivating factors vary, although analogy and morphological regularisation or simplification undoubtedly play a major part.

γυνή: the innovative, analogical nominative plural γυναῖ in place of γυναῖκες occurs in Men. fr. *457 and Philipp. fr. 2, earlier examples of which in Old Comedy are the vocative γυνή in Alc.Com. fr. 32, the accusative singular γυνή in Pherecr. fr. 96, and the accusative plural γυνάς in Pherecr. fr. 206. Since the context is missing, it is almost impossible to say whether any of these cases is unmarked.¹³⁶ In Attic inscriptions, γυνήν occurs in the *defixio* Peek, *Kerameikos* III.C.3.73 (4th century BCE) (see Chapter 4, Section 5.2). These forms of γυνή, reformed as an analogical *ā*-stem, at-

¹³³ The fragment known via the indirect tradition is quoted by Phot. σ 613 with the precise aim of stressing this morphological peculiarity. No attempts have been made to identify the source of the entry in Photius' lexicon. We can only surmise that it may have been an Atticist source endorsing a milder form of Atticism.

¹³⁴ See Maysen (*Gramm.* vol. 1,2, 37–40).

¹³⁵ As evidence for these forms, we may mention Ἀριστοφάνας (Pl. *Smp.* 218b.2), Δημοσθένας, and Ἐρμογένας (Plu. *Quaestiones convivales* 613d.4).

¹³⁶ See Cassio (1981, 84). This distinction was already considered an important one by ancient scholarship. See the sources discussing ἐμαυτός in Plat.Com. fr. 83 as well as the nominative ὁ πρόσωπος and genitive τοῦ γάλα in Pl.Com. fr. 247. On Aristophanes of Byzantium's engagement with these forms (Ar.Byz. fr. 25) see Chapter 7, Section 2.2.

tracted the interest of Atticist lexicography, see *Antiatt.* γ 1: γυναί· ἀντί τοῦ γυναῖκες. Φιλίππιδης Ἀδωνιαζούσας (fr. 2), Φερεκράτης Κραπατάλλοις (fr. 96) ‘τὴν γυνήν’ (see Batisti 2023d).

ὁ κλάδος, τοῦ κλάδου: while Euripides and Aristophanes use the athematic accusative plural κλάδας (Eur. *Tr.* 256) and the dative singular κλαδί (Ar. *Lys.* 632) as well as the dative plural κλάδουσι (Ar. *Av.* 239) as from τὸ κλάδος, τοῦ κλάδου (DELG s.v. hypothesises that δένδρεσι served as a model), the evidence we have from Middle and New Comedy is limited to the form of the thematic declension (dative plural κλάδοις in Alex. fr. 124.5). We should point out that ὁ κλάδος is the better attested form already in 5th-century BCE Attic texts, not only in tragedy but also in comedy (see Cratin. fr. 105.4; Amips. fr. 24). Thus, Alexis used what we may regard as the normal Attic form.

μάρτυς: we know from Photius (μ 120 = Men. fr. 557) that in the accusative singular Menander adopted not just the far more common inflection as a consonantal stem, i.e. μάρτυρα (for which see Men. *Fab. incert.* 6, unless one accepts Sudhaus’ supplement μάρτυρα[ς]), but also the (innovative) inflection as a *u*-stem, i.e. μάρτυν (but on the etymology and inflection of μάρτυς see DELG s.v.; EDG s.v.). The accusative μάρτυν is first attested in Simonides (fr. 11 West) and then occurs again in Imperial and late-antique prose (Josephus, Plutarch, Chariton’s *Callirhoe*, Clement of Alexandria) and poetry (Nonnus), in Byzantine texts, and in a late-antique documentary papyrus containing the deposition at a trial, where μάρτυν occurs together with μάρτυρα (P.Lips. 1.40.col. ii.8–9) (= TM 33700) (Hermoupolis, last quarter of the 4th century CE).

ὄρνις: the accusative plural of this form can occur either as the older *i*-stem, i.e. ὄρνεις/ὄρνις (see Men. fr. 115.1, 132.2, and 132.3 [in the latter case, the manuscripts have ὄρνιθας, which is corrected *metri causa* to the accusative of the *i*-stem], and Apollod.Car. fr. 24.4), or as a dental stem in -θ-, i.e. ὄρνιθας (Men. fr. 115.2). In post-Classical Greek the two inflections still coexist, and it appears that Phrynichus also regarded the nominative plural forms ὄρνεις and ὄρνιθες as equally acceptable (**Phryn.** PS 93.10: ὄρνεις καὶ ὄρνιθες διττῶς <τὸ πληθυντικόν>).

σῆς, σεός: the old *s*-stem form, which is still attested in an unattributed fragment of New Comedy (*com. adesp.* fr. 1084),¹³⁷ was later replaced by the analogical *t*-stem form σῆς, σητός, which is first attested in the nominative plural σῆτες (as opposed to the older form σέες) in a fragment of Menander (fr. 761.5). The new *t*-stem form became a competing alternative to the *s*-stem form during the 4th century BCE and established itself as the more common inflection of this noun in post-Classical times (the *s*-stem form is only attested twice in Philo and once in Lucian, though both of them alternate it with the *t*-stem form). Unsurprisingly, the older *s*-stem form was recommended as the proper Attic one by Atticist lexicographers (see **Moer.** σ 1: σέες Ἀττικοί· σῆτες Ἑλληνας and other sources discussed by Batisti 2023e).

σκότος: while ὁ σκότος is the rule in Old Comedy (see Ar. *Ach.* 1168–9, *V.* 256, 275, and 911, *Pax* 691, *Av.* 1483, *Lys.* 72, *Ec.* 288, 314, 375, and fr. 156.1), in later comedy it occurs only once in a fragment of Archedicus, a poet of New Comedy (fr. 1.3 ἐν τῷ σκότῳ); τὸ σκότος is the more common option and is attested in Alexis, Diphilus, and Menander (Alex. fr. 222.12, Diph. fr. 91.3, Men. *Dysc.* 428) and also in two comic *adespota*, probably belonging to later comedy (*com. adesp.* fr. 247.9 and 1001.6; regarding the identification of the latter fragment, see the discussion by Kassel, Austin, *PCG* vol. 8 *ad loc.*). In the light of this distribution of masculine and neuter σκότος, the remark by **Moer.** σ 34: σκότος οὐδετέρως Ἀττικοί· σκοτία Ἑλληνας is rather surprising, in that it

137 On the authorship of this fragment see Favi (2019a).

completely overlooks the fact that the masculine ὁ σκότος rather than the neuter τὸ σκότος is the rule in 5th-century BCE Attic (see Batisti 2023f).¹³⁸ An entry in Photius' lexicon (which depends on either Aelius Dionysius or Orus) credits Ameipsias with the use of both σκότος and σκότον.¹³⁹ As suggested by Orth (2013, 337), this ambiguous remark must indicate either that Ameipsias used both forms, or that he was a rare example of an Old Comedy poet who used neuter τὸ σκότος; in the latter case, Orth concludes, Ameipsias may have been one of the earliest Attic writers, along with Thucydides, to use τὸ σκότος.

σκούφος: this form alternates between the masculine ὁ σκούφος and the neuter τὸ σκούφος already in archaic and Classical times. To take an example from an Attic text, in Euripides' *Cyclops* we have evidence of the inflection both as a masculine (*Cyc.* 256, 556) and as a neuter (*Cyc.* 390, 411). Similarly, in Middle and New Comedy we find both the masculine ὁ σκούφος (*Dion.Com.* fr. 5.3, *Epinic.* fr. 1.8) and the neuter τὸ σκούφος (*Alex.* fr. 135, *Epig.* fr. 3).

τάριχος: the neuter τὸ τάριχος is the norm in 5th-century BCE Attic and is still quite common in later comedy (see *Antiph.* fr. 27.22, 78.1, 140.4, *Alex.* fr. 15.13, 77.2, 178.8 [on which see Arnott 1996, 527–9], 191.5, *Anaxandr.* fr. 51.2, *Men. Epit.* fr. 5.2, fr. 409.11, *Philipp.* fr. 9.4, *Athenio* fr. 1.33); however, the masculine ὁ τάριχος, which is already attested in Old Comedy in Crates (fr. 19.2), Cratinus (fr. 44), Aristophanes (fr. 207.1), and Plato Comicus (fr. 49) (outside of Attic texts, it also occurs in Epicharmus, fr. 159, and Herodotus, 4x in 9.120.1–2), is also used by the poets of Middle and New Comedy (see *Timocl.* fr. 16.5 and *Philipp.* fr. 34). The preference of 5th-century BCE Attic authors for the neuter τὸ τάριχος is correctly indicated by Atticist lexicographers, although the masculine ὁ τάριχος was also acknowledged by less strict Atticist lexicographers and by other grammarians too. See **Poll.** 6.48: καὶ οὐδετέρως μὲν τὸ τάριχος οἱ Ἀττικοί, Ἴωνες δὲ καὶ Δωριεῖς ἀρρενικῶς καὶ τῶν Ἀττικῶν ἐν Διονυσσαλεξάνδρῳ Κρατῖνος (there follows *Cratin.* fr. 44) and **Moer.** τ 20: τάριχος οὐδετέρως Ἀττικοί· ἀρρενικῶς Ἕλληνες. Regarding the masculine ὁ τάριχος, see also *Ath.* 3.119b and *Herodian* quoted by *Eust. in Il.* 1.117.12–6.

υἰός:¹⁴⁰ the more ancient form is υἰύς, whereas the thematic υἰός is secondary and probably developed by dissimilation (i.e. to avoid the repetition of /u/, see *DELG* s.v. and *EDG* s.v.). The form υἰύς, which remains unattested in literary sources, is well documented in inscriptions (*Threatte* 1996, 221 for Attic evidence). υἰύς is inflected as a *u*-stem, but with an alternation and subsequent generalisation between the full-grade *υἰεF- and the zero-grade *υἰυ-/ *υἰF-. The older form as *u*-stem is progressively replaced by the thematic form υἰός. In Classical Attic, υἰός becomes predominant from the 4th century BCE. While Xenophon, Demosthenes, and Plato alternate the two types of declension, the poets of Middle and New Comedy use the thematic form almost exclusively.¹⁴¹ The only exception is the accusative plural υἰεῖς in *Alexis* (fr. 77.1), but this form is not

138 Moeris' entry may have undergone epitomisation: his original entry may have been similar to that of *Phot.* σ 337 (we should thus correct οὐδετέρως to ἐκατέρως or integrate <ἀρρενικῶς καὶ> before οὐδετέρως).

139 See *Phot.* σ 377 (edited as *Ael.Dion.* σ 26 by Erbse, who compares *Eust. in Od.* 1.19.8–14, and as *Orus* fr. B 148 by Alpers): σκότος καὶ σκότον· ἐκατέρως· οὕτως Ἀμειψίας (fr. 38). Further references to ancient grammarians and erudite sources are collected by Alpers *ad Orus* fr. B 148.

140 For a more detailed discussion of the phonological and morphological problems related to this form, see *Favi* (2022w).

141 Similarly, in Attic inscriptions, the form as a *u*-stem disappears outside of metrical texts after the mid-4th century BCE (see *Meisterhans, Schwyzer* 1900, 144–5; *Threatte* 1996, 220–2).

without suspicion and it may be the result of corruption (see Arnott, 1996, 211). The accusative plural $\nu\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$ which occurs in a hexameter fragment of Theopompus Comicus (fr. 30.1) is a parody of the Homeric formula $\nu\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$ Ἀχαιῶν .

$\chi\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, $\chi\omicron\acute{o}\varsigma$:¹⁴² building on the *o*-grade of the apophonic root of $\chi\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (* $\chi\epsilon\text{F}$ -, * $\chi\omicron\text{F}$ -, * $\chi\acute{\upsilon}$ -), this noun was sometimes inflected as a thematic stem (i.e. $\chi\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, $\chi\omicron\upsilon$ < * $\chi\acute{o}\text{F}$ -ος, * $\chi\acute{o}\text{F}$ -ου), as an *ou*-stem (i.e. $\chi\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, $\chi\omicron\acute{o}\varsigma$ < * $\chi\omicron\text{F}$ -ς, * $\chi\omicron\text{F}$ -ός), and as an *eu*-stem ($\chi\omicron\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$, $\chi\omicron\epsilon\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ < * $\chi\omicron\text{F}\eta\text{F}$ -ς, * $\chi\omicron\text{F}\eta\text{F}$ -ος; this underwent ‘contraction’ in Attic, the resulting inflection being $\chi\omicron\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$, $\chi\omicron\acute{\omega}\varsigma$, $\chi\omicron\epsilon\acute{\iota}$, $\chi\omicron\acute{\alpha}$, plural $\chi\omicron\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$, $\chi\omicron\acute{\omega}\nu$, $\chi\omicron\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\iota$, $\chi\omicron\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$).¹⁴³ The thematic inflection is never attested in literature in Classical times, while it is well documented in Attic inscriptions¹⁴⁴ and in post-Classical Greek.¹⁴⁵ The inflection as an *ou*-stem is thought to have developed analogically after $\beta\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, $\beta\omicron\acute{o}\varsigma$. In Attic inscriptions, it seems to be standard in the plural.¹⁴⁶ At some point, a new accusative was formed analogically after the development of the consonant stems, that is, $\chi\acute{o}\alpha$ and $\chi\acute{o}\alpha\varsigma$ (in place of the original $\chi\omicron\upsilon\nu$ and $\chi\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$).¹⁴⁷ As a consequence, the *ou*-stem and *eu*-stem inflections almost overlapped in the accusative (think of $\chi\acute{o}\alpha$ and $\chi\omicron\acute{\alpha}$, $\chi\acute{o}\alpha\varsigma$ and $\chi\omicron\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$). In the literary sources, this is reflected in the manuscript evidence, which oscillates between the accentuation as an *ou*-stem and as an *eu*-stem. This situation has made it difficult for the editors to decide what to print. However, since in a few passages of Aristophanes the forms $\chi\omicron\acute{\alpha}$ and $\chi\omicron\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ (from the inflection as an *eu*-stem) are metrically guaranteed, the editors of Aristophanes, Menander, and the comic fragments now systematically restore the contracted forms of $\chi\omicron\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$ in (almost) all places.¹⁴⁸ As regards Middle and New Comedy, the evidence for the inflection as an *eu*-stem is the accusative singular $\chi\omicron\acute{\alpha}$ (Anaxandr. fr. 33.1, Epin. fr. 2.8, Eub. fr. 80.4, Men. fr. 442) and accusative plural $\chi\omicron\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ (Alex. fr. 15.19, Damox. fr. 1.3, Epin. fr. 2.5), but note that of all these cases only $\chi\omicron\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ in Epinicus is metrically guaranteed. In support of the modern editors’ choice to print $\chi\omicron\acute{\alpha}$ and $\chi\omicron\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$, we should add that ancient grammatical sources going back to Herodian say that Menander’s $\chi\omicron\acute{\alpha}$ has a long vowel and a perispomenon accent, which means that it is the outcome of a contraction based on the

142 See Egli (1954, 62–3) and Perpillon (1973, 164–6), who also collect the evidence from sources other than comedy, especially the *corpus Hippocraticum*.

143 See Section B.2.7.

144 See Threatte (1996, 267–8).

145 See, e.g., Maysen (*Gramm.* vol. 1,2, 27).

146 See the discussion by Threatte (1996, 267–8), whose conclusion that the singular inflection as an *ou*-stem was a back-formation from the plural is likely (but the inference about how to interpret XOA is a less uncontroversial one).

147 It is possible that the analogical forms were created to make it easier to distinguish between the nominative singular and the accusative plural $\chi\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$.

148 See Cratin. fr. 199.3, where Kassel, Austin also collect the evidence in Old Comedy for metrically guaranteed accusative plural $\chi\omicron\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ and accusative singular $\chi\omicron\acute{\alpha}$. To their data one must add the very interesting, and mostly neglected, occurrence of the genitive plural $\chi\omicron\acute{\epsilon}\omega\nu$ in *com. adesp.* fr. 1035.18 (a fragment of Old Comedy?). Although the modern editors’ choice is reasonable enough, little attention has been paid to the metrically guaranteed occurrence of the dative plural $\chi\omicron\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}$ in Ar. *Ach.* 1211. This case shows the shaky ground on which modern editors’ decisions rest. On the genitive $\chi\omicron\acute{o}\varsigma$ and $\chi\omicron\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ see the discussion by Kassel, Austin (*PCG* vol. 5, *ad Eup.* fr. 379).

full grade (*χοφῆ(F)-α).¹⁴⁹ It should be noted, however, that the inflection of χοῦς as an *ou*-stem is also metrically guaranteed at least in one case, namely the dative singular χοῖ in Anaxandrides (fr. 42.13).¹⁵⁰ But since this is a passage in anapestic dimeters, one may at least wonder whether this is a one-off licence. Atticist lexicography prescribes the accusative χόα (or more likely χόᾶ?) over the koine form χοῦν (Moer. χ 26: χόα τὸ μέτρον Ἀττικοί: χοῦν Ἑλληνες).¹⁵¹

3 Comparatives and superlatives

3.1 Short and long primary comparatives

In Greek, besides the more widespread *n*-stem inflection of the comparative (e.g. μείζων, μείζονος, i.e. the longer forms), the old *s*-stem inflection has survived in the accusative singular of the masculine/feminine (τὸν/τὴν μείζω, i.e. the shorter forms), in the nominative and accusative plural of the masculine/feminine (οἱ/αἱ μείζους, τοὺς/τὰς μείζους), and in the nominative/accusative neuter (τὰ μείζω).¹⁵² In Aristophanic comedy, the distribution of the longer and shorter forms does not easily suggest that the former had already overtaken the latter (Tab. 1).¹⁵³ If we analyse the evidence for the ten most common primary comparatives, the data from Middle and New Comedy generally confirm a similar conclusion, albeit with some nuances.

The longer forms seem to be slightly better attested than the shorter ones, but the tendency towards the longer forms is not particularly strong. Furthermore, as is already the case in Aristophanes, the long forms are often found at line-end in the iambic trimeter and the catalectic trochaic tetrameter, which is

¹⁴⁹ See Choerob. in Theod. GG 4.1.238.1–6 (= Hdn. Περὶ κλίσεως ὀνομάτων GG 3.2.706.1–8). The ‘contracted’ forms of the *eu*-stems are discussed by several sources which depend on Herodianic materials (see Section B.2.7).

¹⁵⁰ The metrically guaranteed /i/ makes it certain that this form derives from χοῦς, χόός (if it were a form of χοεύς, one would have χοεῖ or possibly χοῖ with /i:/). The metrical interpretation of this line as given by Millis (2015, 204) is therefore incorrect, in that the third anapestic metre of the line contains a dactylic resolution (ἐν χοῖ), not a spondee.

¹⁵¹ In the light of what has been said above, and in view of the unreliability of the manuscript evidence, the paroxytone accent univocally transmitted in Moeris’ manuscripts should be emended into perispomenon χόᾶ. On the inflection of χοῦς and its compounds in the Imperial koine, as witnessed by the papyrological sources, see Gignac (1981, 83–4).

¹⁵² See Schwyzler (1939, 536–7).

¹⁵³ See Willi (2003a, 243–4). As discussed by Threatte (1996, 311–2), it is only in Roman times that the longer forms become predominant over the shorter ones in Attic inscriptions.

Tab. 1: Distribution of the longer and shorter forms in Middle and New Comedy.

	Singular		Plural	
	Shorter	Longer	Shorter	Longer
βελτίων		βελτίονα : Men. <i>Dysc.</i> 282, βελτίον' : Men. fr. 273.3	βελτίω : Men. fr. 322.2, Apollod.Com. fr. 9.2	βελτίονα : Men. fr. *871.4
ἐλάττων				ἐλάττων' : Philem. fr. 145.2
ἡδίων				ἡδίονα : Apollod.Car. fr. 5.16
ἦττων				ἦττων' : Philem. fr. 31.6
κρείττων	κρείττω : Axion. fr. 8.6, Cratin.Iun. fr. 8.5	κρείττονα : Men. <i>Th.</i> fr. 1.13, κρείττων' : Philem. fr. 120.2		κρείττονας : Men. <i>Epit.</i> 329
μείζων	μείζω : Ephipp. fr. 5.4, Men. fr. 728.2, Men. fr. 763	μείζονα : Diphil. fr. 45.3, μείζον' : Men. <i>Sam.</i> 526, Sophil. fr. 4.2	μείζους : Anaxandr. fr. 42.11, Philipp. fr. 28.4, μείζω : Antiph. fr. 157.5, Epicr. fr. 9.2, Men. <i>Dysc.</i> 825, Philem. fr. 94.1	μείζονες : Alex. fr. 294.1, μείζονας : Philem. fr. 98.7 (2x), μείζονα : Philem. fr. 31.6, μείζον' : Timocl. fr. 6.17
πλείων	πλείω : Alex. fr. 257.3, Damox. fr. 3.11	πλείονα : Alex. fr. 263.4	πλείους : Antiph. fr. 203.2, Men. fr. 208.5, Men. fr. 877.6, Philaet. fr. 14.2, πλείω : Diphil. fr. 4.3, Men. <i>Epit.</i> 656 (integration), Men. <i>Sam.</i> 230, Philaet. fr. 3.1, Posidipp. fr. 6.6 (or singular?)	πλείονες : Posidipp. fr. 30.1, πλείονας : Diphil. fr. 5.1, Eriph. fr. 2.9, πλείονα : Men. <i>Epit.</i> 795 (2x), Men. fr. 91.2, πλείονα : Sotad. fr. 1.32
χείρων				χείρονας : Men. <i>Th.</i> fr. 1.18, χείρονα : Diphil. fr. 84.2

possible in the case of trisyllabic forms, since Porson's bridge does not usually apply in comedy (except in paratragedy). Although the long forms are well attested in authoritative Attic writers, Atticist lexicographers unsurprisingly recommended the use of the 'short' forms as being typically Attic and foreign to the koine.

Moer. α 75: ἀμείνω Ἀττικοί· ἀμείνονα Ἑλληνες. **Moer. η 10:** ἦττω Ἀττικοί· ἦσσονα κοινόν. See Pellettieri (2023g).

3.2 Primary comparatives with /i/

The regular prosody of the primary comparative ending *-ίων* is with /i:/, as opposed to /i/ in Ionic.¹⁵⁴ Although the regular prosody is still the rule in the poets of Middle and New Comedy, it appears that /i/ is at variance with the standard Attic /i:/ in two lines of Alexis.¹⁵⁵

Alex. fr. 25.6: τύρβαζε, Μάνη· γαστρός οὐδὲν ἦδιον. **Alex. fr. 158** (= *Antiatt.* η 5) ἦδιον· Ἄλεξις Ὀδυσσεὶ ἀπονιπτομένῳ.

Beside the gloss of the *Antiatticist* (*Antiatt.* η 5), Phrynichus too may have touched upon the vowel length in the primary comparatives, but the interpretation is not univocal.

Phryn. Ecl. 264: ἔγγιον ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐγγύτερον μὴ λέγε, ἀλλ' ἐγγύτερον· ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ ἐν τῇ γῆ, οἷον 'ἐγγειον κτῆμα', εἴ τις χρῶτο, ἀριστα ἂν χρήσαιτο, ὡς καὶ Δημοσθένης ([D.] 34.24)· 'ἐγγειον τόκον' λέγει.¹⁵⁶

3.3 Primary comparatives with alternating *-ίων/-ζων*

The treatment of the suffix of the primary comparative in Greek is complicated by the fact that the comparative suffix appears both in the form *-ίων* (as in *ἠδίων*), where the preceding consonant remains unaffected, and *-ζων* (as in *θάσζων*), where

¹⁵⁴ But the situation is not as clear-cut as is often claimed (see Barber 2013, 151–2).

¹⁵⁵ On the *Antiatticist* gloss, the interpretation of the reference to Alexis, and the relevant antecedent in Ar.Byz. fr. 347, see Tosi (1997, 173–4); Chapter 7, Section 2.2.8.

¹⁵⁶ For a collection of sources other than Atticist lexica discussing the prosody of the primary comparatives, see Callanan (1987, 31–2).

the consonantal /i/ causes the palatalisation of the preceding consonant.¹⁵⁷ This different treatment produced some doublets, that is, adjectives which have both a comparative formed with -ίων and one with -ιων (e.g. γλυχίων and γλύσσων, βραχίων and βράσσων, etc.).

τάχιον: Men. fr. 296.16. This occurrence is disputed. The fragment only survives in Aulus Gellius' *Noctes Atticae*, so the readings are somewhat uncertain. The passage with τάχιον is particularly thorny. Not only is the meaning uncertain,¹⁵⁸ but τάχιον is also unprecedented in Attic texts (the comparative ταχίων only begins to appear in the koine). Kock was inclined to retain τάχιον in Menander. In support of this view, we may cite two occurrences of ταχίων in the Hippocratic corpus (*Mul.* 1.27 and *Dent.* 30),¹⁵⁹ as well as the fact that, although primary comparatives are recessive in historical times, secondary formations of this type spread to replace the older forms (besides ταχίων, we may mention παχίων, βελτίων, and αίσχίων).¹⁶⁰ On the contrary, Kassel, Austin obelise τάχιον, stressing that Menander elsewhere uses only the adverb ταχέως and adverbial ταχύ. This instance of τάχιον is probably best regarded as uncertain, and the matter requires further investigation.

Phryn. Ecl. 52: τάχιον Ἑλληνες οὐ λέγουσιν, θᾶπτον δέ. **Moer. θ 18:** θᾶπτον <Ἀττικοί>· τάχιον <Ἑλληνες>. **Moer. τ 7:** τάχιον οὐ λέγεται παρ' Ἀττικοῖς ἀλλὰ θᾶπτον. [**Hdn.**] **Philet. 18:** θᾶπτον ἐρεῖς, οὐχὶ τάχιον· καὶ βραδύτερον, οὐχὶ βράδιον· καὶ αἰσχίον, οὐχὶ αἰσχροτέρων· καὶ κάκιον ὁμοίως.¹⁶¹

3.4 Analogical extension of the comparative and superlative endings -έστερος, -έστατος

We have only one example where the comparative and superlative suffixes -έστερος, -έστατος are employed in an uncontracted first-class adjective.¹⁶²

¹⁵⁷ For a full treatment of this issue (which falls within the realm of Sievers' Law), see Barber (2013).

¹⁵⁸ The sentence would mean something like 'the young female servant is obsequious and faster than a word', probably meaning that she is very willing to carry out orders even before she is asked.

¹⁵⁹ For the dating of these works respectively to the years between the late 5th and the early 4th century BCE and around the early 4th century BCE, see Craik (2015, 206); Craik (2015, 61) (but the dating of *De dentitione* is more uncertain).

¹⁶⁰ See Barber (2013, 175; 182; 185; 378).

¹⁶¹ One may also compare the criticism of ἔγγιον in Phryn. *Ecl.* 264: ἔγγιον ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐγγύτερον μὴ λέγε, ἀλλ' ἐγγύτερον· ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ ἐν τῇ γῆ, οἶον ἔγγειον κτήμα', εἴ τις χρῶτο, ἄριστα ἂν χρήσαιτο, ὡς καὶ Δημοσθένης ([D.] 34.24)· ἔγγειον τόκον' λέγει (on this entry see also Section B.3.2).

¹⁶² The use of the comparatives and superlatives in -έστερος, -έστατος, originating from the *s*-stems (ἀληθής > ἀληθέστερος), spread more widely to the *n*-stems (εὐδαίμων > εὐδαιμονέστερος) and to the contracted adjectives of the first class (ἀπλοῦς > ἀπλοῦστερος). For a discussion of the development of these comparatives, see Wackernagel (1897, 2–3).

εὐζωρότερος: Antiph. fr. 137; Ephipp. fr. 3.11; Eub. fr. 148.8.

The regular form εὐζωρότερος is also attested in comedy (see Cratin. fr. 453 and Eup. fr. 452, both quoted by Phryn. *Ecl.* 62, and Diph. fr. 57.2), as is the simplex, ζωρότερος (Antiph. fr. 147.2, a hexametrical fragment; Ephipp. fr. 10). Metre is probably key in the use of the regular or the analogical form. Whereas εὐζωρότερος and ζωρότερος, in the only two cases where we are able to judge (Diph. fr. 57.2, Ephipp. fr. 10), occur in the first two *metra* of a iambic trimeter, all three occurrences of εὐζωρότερος are at verse-end. It seems that in the first two thirds of the line, the forms that would have required a higher number of solutions in the metre were preferred, while εὐζωρότερος was used as a metrically convenient alternative form to accommodate the adjective in the final *metron*. Perhaps, this new comparative εὐζωρότερος was perceived as less of an oddity due to the parallel development of ἄκρατος > ἀκρατέστερος (possibly due to confusion with ἀκρατής, first attested in Hyp. *Dem.* fr. 9 col. xl.34–5 Jensen, as reconstructed by the references in Ath. 10.424d and Poll. 6.24), which had a similar meaning and is far more widely documented.

We should mention that earlier comic parallels for εὐζωρότερος are the analogical εὐωνέστερος in Epicharmus (fr. 119) and ἀφθονέστατος in Eupolis (fr. 330.2). It is intriguing that Epicharmus' εὐωνέστερος has the same prosodic form as εὐζωρότερος, but since the Epicharmus line in which the analogical comparative occurred is lost, one can only wonder what position it occupied in a trochaic or iambic metre. As regards Eupolis, since ἀφθονέστερος and ἀφθονέστατος are also attested in Pindar (*O.* 2.94) and Aeschylus (fr. 72) (later also in Plato, *R.* 460b.2, and Xenophon, *Mem.* 4.3.6), it is possible that Eupolis may be using the analogical superlative not only in the wake of θεοφιλεστάτην in the previous line, but also as a means of raising the tone (possibly a tongue-in-cheek praise of a city: whether Athens or another one, it remains uncertain).¹⁶³ Eupolis' use of the analogical comparative may thus represent a different case from the use of such formations by later Attic writers.

In Atticist lexicography, the analogical extension of the comparative and superlative endings -έστερος, -έστατος was probably approached differently, depending on the ideological standpoint of the lexica. This subject also attracted the interest of grammarians more generally.

Antiatt. α 74: ἀφθονέστερον· Πίνδαρος Ἐπινικίους (*O.* 2.94). **Antiatt. α 75:** ἀρχαιέστερον· Πίνδαρος Ὑμνοῖς (fr. 45 Snell–Maehler). On these entries see Tribulato (2022e). It is possible that **Phryn. Ecl. 114:** 'ζωρότερον' ὁ ποιητής, σὺ δὲ λέγε 'εὐζωρον κέρασον' καὶ 'εὐζωρότερον', ὡς Ἀριστοφάνης (*Ec.*

¹⁶³ See Olson (2014, 25).

137; 227) καὶ Κρατῖνος (fr. 453) καὶ Εὐπολις (fr. 452) originally dealt with the occurrences of εὐζωρέστερος in Middle and New Comedy (see Tribulato 2022h).

We should add two more examples of the analogical extension of the comparative and superlative suffix *-έστερος*, *-έστατος* in 4th-century BCE Attic texts that may be of interest for their reception in Atticist lexicography, namely *ἀσμενέστατος* (Pl. *R.* 329c.3–4 and 616a.7)¹⁶⁴ and *ῥαδιέστερος* (Hyp. fr. 86 Jensen).¹⁶⁵

3.5 Comparative and superlative endings *-ίστερος* and *-ίστατος*

Comparatives and superlatives in *-ίστερος* and *-ίστατος* occur with a typically derogatory nuance in 5th-century BCE comedy.¹⁶⁶

λαλίστερος: Alex. fr. 96.1; Men. fr. 309. *λαλίστατος*: Men. fr. 129.1.

These three examples still retain the derogatory nuance of comparatives and superlatives in *-ίστερος* and *-ίστατος* in earlier comedy. In earlier sources, the comparative *λαλίστερος* is attested twice in Aristophanes (*Ran.* 91, fr. 684); in 4th-century BCE texts it occurs in Theophrastus (*Char.* 7.7), always with a derogatory tone. The superlative *λαλίστατος* is rare and, apart from Menander, occurs only in Eur. *Cyc.* 315 (again, a text whose genre allowed for the use of a language perhaps closer to the colloquial register). The comparatives and superlatives in *-ίστερος* and *-ίστατος* have attracted the interest of ancient scholars, including Atticist sources.

Poll. 2.125: καὶ τὸ λαλεῖν δὲ καὶ ὁ λάλος καὶ λαλίστερος. [**Hdn.**] **Philet.** 297: λαλίστατοι, ὀψοφαγίστατοι, κλεπτίστατοι· τὸ ὑπερθετικόν. Further sources are collected by Theodoridis (1976) *ad Philox.Gramm.* fr. *337 and *350.

¹⁶⁴ The indirect tradition attests that in *R.* 329c.3–4 there was a variant reading *ἀσμεναίτατα* (see Philox.Gramm. fr. *337a–b, which is reconstructed from the *Etymologica* and Eustathius). Phrynichus claims that the correct comparative of *ἄσμενος* is *ἄσμενώτερος* (*PS* 18.10: *ἄσμενώτερος*: διὰ τοῦ ω. τὸ δὲ ἐπίρρημα *ἀσμεναίτατα*), no doubt from an analogical standpoint, and this view is supported by only one occurrence in the Hippocratic corpus (*Art.* 33: *ἄσμενωτάτη* αὐτοῖσιν ἢ βαθείη πῶϊη φαίνεται). It is likely that in discussing these forms Phrynichus was not only concerned with the occurrence in Plato, but was also implicitly condemning *ἄσμενέστερος* and *ἄσμενέστατος*.

¹⁶⁵ This Hyperides passage is certainly alluded to by Pollux (5.107), though instead of *ῥαδιέστερος* Pollux gives the reading *ῥαδιώτερος* (otherwise unattested).

¹⁶⁶ See Willi (2003a, 243).

3.6 Analytic comparatives in place of synthetic comparatives

Analytic comparatives of the type μᾶλλον + positive adjective, already attested in Aristophanes,¹⁶⁷ are also occasionally attested in Middle and New Comedy.

καταφανεῖς μᾶλλον: Timocl. fr. 34.2. μᾶλλον ἀνόσιον: Xenarch. fr. 7.5.

The synthetic forms are well attested in 5th- and 4th-century BCE prose and poetry. Note that μᾶλλον καταφανής occurs 2x in Plato (*Plt.* 266d.4, *Lg.* 645c.3). The analytic construction originally belonged to a more colloquial register, but it may also be metrically convenient. ἀνοσιώτερος and καταφανέστερος have the same prosodic form, so it may not be a coincidence that these two forms are replaced by their analytic equivalents. These synthetic comparatives are long words whose position in the iambic trimeter of comedy is subject to limitations (i.e. they tend to be placed in the right part of the verse, see Orth 2015). In the fragments of Timocles and Xenarchus, analytic comparatives replace synthetic ones in places where the latter forms would not fit the metre. There is some discussion of analytical comparatives in Atticist lexicography.

Ael.Dion. a 10 (= Eust. *in Od.* 1.9.30–1): <ἀγαθός· ἡ σύγκρισις μᾶλλον ἀγαθός· καὶ ἡ ὑπέρθεις μάλιστα ἀγαθός>. ἀγαθώτερος <δὲ> καὶ ἀγαθώτατος παρ' οὐδενὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων κέϊται. **Phryn. Ecl.** 65: ἀγαθός μᾶλλον λέγε, μὴ ἀγαθώτερος, καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀγαθώτατος ἀγαθός μάλιστα. See Favi (2022o).

4 Pronouns

4.1 Reflexive pronouns

4.1.1 The reduplicated personal pronoun αὐτός as a reflexive pronoun (αὐτός αὐτόν)

To express the reflexive pronoun, Greek can reduplicate the personal pronoun αὐτός, as in αὐτός αὐτόν.¹⁶⁸ In addition to occurring in epichoric and literary dialects other than Attic, this use is well attested in tragedy,¹⁶⁹ while the evidence from Old Comedy is very scanty (*Ar. Ec.* 402, Crates fr. 16.2). Although Middle and

¹⁶⁷ See Willi (2003a, 243).

¹⁶⁸ See Favi (2020, 364–5). The correct spelling is the one with the smooth breathing on the second αὐτός.

¹⁶⁹ See the evidence in Favi (2020, 365 n. 786).

New Comedy provide a smaller corpus, the evidence is more abundant than for Old Comedy.

Apollod.Car. fr. 5.9–11: πῶς γὰρ μᾶλλον ἂν προείλετο | [. . .] λεπόμενους ὄραν | αὐτοὺς ὑφ' αὐτῶν (or should we restore ὑπ' αὐτῶν?). **Diph. fr. 92.1:** ὅστις γὰρ αὐτὸς αὐτὸν οὐκ αἰσχύνεται | συνειδῶθ' αὐτῶ φαῦλα διαπεπραγμένῳ. **Men. fr. 844.8:** αὐτοὶ παρ' αὐτῶν ἕτερα προσπορίζομεν. **Philem. fr. 113.4:** αὐτὸς δ' ἐπ' αὐτοῦ' στιν πονηρὸς καὶ πικρὸς. **Philem. fr. 122.2:** τοὺς αὐτὸς αὐτοῦ βούλεσθ' ὑγιαίνειν φίλους. **Timocl. fr. 6.19:** τὰς αὐτὸς αὐτοῦ συμφορὰς ἤττον στένει.

The *Antiatticist* may have devoted an entry to this topic, arguably with a view to defending the admissibility of this construction, but the interpretation is uncertain.

Antiatt. α 4: ἑαυτοῦσ' αὐτόν· ἀντὶ τοῦ ἑμαυτόν. This interpretation of the entry (and of the following two) originally goes back to Sicking, but S. Valente (2015b) now accepts a different interpretation (see Section B.4.1.2).

4.1.2 The 3rd-person singular reflexive ἑαυτοῦ/αὐτοῦ in place of the other reflexive pronouns (ἑμαυτοῦ, σεαυτοῦ, etc.)

In poetry (but not in Homer) and prose, the 3rd-person singular reflexive pronoun ἑαυτοῦ/αὐτοῦ can replace the corresponding forms of the other persons (both singular and plural).¹⁷⁰ While the tragic evidence is solid, no occurrence is found in Aristophanes.¹⁷¹ As regards prose, this use is attested only once in Herodotus and Thucydides, while it becomes more common in 4th-century BCE prose. It appears that later comedy follows 4th-century BCE prose in allowing this use of the reflexive pronoun against the common 5th-century BCE usage.

Crobyl. fr. 1: παράσιτον αὐτόσιτον· αὐτὸν γοῦν τρέφων | τὰ πλείστα συνεραμιστὸς εἶ τῷ δεσπότη (instead of 2nd-person singular pronoun). **Men. fr. 64.5–6:** νῦν ἀληθινὸν | εἰς πέλαγος αὐτὸν ἐμβαλεῖς γὰρ πραγμάτων (instead of the 2nd-person singular pronoun). **Men. fr. 632:** ὤϊν' οὐχ αὐτῶ παρετράφην, ἀλλὰ σοι (instead of the 1st-person singular pronoun). **Men. fr. 844.8:** αὐτοὶ παρ' αὐτῶν ἕτερα προσπορίζομεν (instead of 1st-person plural pronoun).¹⁷² **Philem. fr. 116.3:** ὦν δὲ δι' ἑαυτοὺς ἐσόμεθ' ἐστερημένοι (instead of the 1st-person plural pronoun). **Posidipp. fr. 30.2–3:** σὺ μὲν ἀττικίζεις, ἠνίκ' ἂν φωνῆν λέγῃς | αὐτοῦ τιν' (instead of the 2nd-person singular pronoun).

This use of the reflexive pronoun is discussed in several entries of the *Antiatticist*, apparently in order to defend it against the criticism of more rigorous Atticist lexicographers. The *Antiatticist* may have used the poets of later comedy as a source.

¹⁷⁰ See K–G (vol. 1, 572).

¹⁷¹ See Willi (2003a, 256).

¹⁷² Here it is the reduplicated demonstrative pronoun αὐτός that is being used (see Section B.4.1.1).

Antiatt. α 5: αὐτοῦ· ἀντί τοῦ σαυτοῦ. **Antiatt. α 6:** αὐτῶ· ἀντί τοῦ ἑμαυτῶ. It is also possible that the entry **Antiatt. α 4:** †αὐτόσ† αὐτόν· ἀντί τοῦ ἑμαυτόν dealt with this use of αὐτός, if one agrees with S. Valente’s (2015b) interpretation that †αὐτόσ† is either a scribal error or the remaining lemma of an entry whose *interpretamentum* has been lost (according to this interpretation, S. Valente hypothetically envisages two entries: **Antiatt. α 4a:** αὐτός· <***> and **Antiatt. α 4b:** αὐτόν· ἀντί τοῦ ἑμαυτόν). S. Valente thus rejects the interpretation offered by Sicking, who thought that the three consecutive entries of the *Antiatticist* were concerned with the reflexive pronoun formed by αὐτός + αὐτοῦ/αὐτῶ/αὐτόν (see Section B.4.1.1). Among the parallel sources collected by S. Valente (2015b, *ad Antiatt.* α 4–6), see especially Priscian. 18.177 (*GL* 3.290.3–6): ἑαυτόν *proprie quidem tertiae est personae, invenitur tamen et primae et secundae adiunctum*. Μένανδρος (fr. 632): ἴν’ οὐχ αὐτῶ παρετράφην, ἀλλά σοί, τουτέστιν οὐκ ἑμαυτῶ.

4.1.3 Personal pronoun in place of the reflexive pronoun

The replacement of reflexive pronouns with personal pronouns is not uncommon in Greek, particularly in tragedy, but it is foreign to comedy.¹⁷³ The evidence from Middle and New Comedy is limited.

Philem. fr. 18: σῶξε σαυτόν, ἐγὼ δ’ ἐμέ. **Anaxandr. fr. 63:** ὑπὲρ σεαυτοῦ †πρᾶττε¹⁷⁴ ὅτι ἂν σοι δοκῆ, | ἐγὼ δ’ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ.

Both these fragments are quoted in the entry on this topic in the *Antiatticist*, which presumably meant to defend this use against its proscription by other Atticist lexicographers.

Antiatt. ε 19: ἐμέ· ἀντί τοῦ ἑμαυτόν. σέ· ἀντί τοῦ σαυτόν. Φιλίμων Γαμοῦντι (fr. 18): ὠῶξε σαυτόν, ἐγὼ δ’ ἐμέ’. Αναξανδρίδης (fr. 63): ὑπὲρ σεαυτοῦ πρᾶττε ὅτι ἂν σοι δοκῆ, | ἐγὼ δ’ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ’. S. Valente (2015b) *ad loc.* collects the parallel passages where grammatical treatises and scholia discuss the use of the personal pronoun instead of the reflexive pronoun.

4.2 Deictic -ί in demonstrative pronouns and adverbs

The use of deictic -ί in pronouns and adverbs is extensive in Old Comedy, with over 600 occurrences in Aristophanes alone.¹⁷⁵ According to Dover’s (1997, 64) calculations, in Aristophanes the forms with deictic -ί are 1/4 of the equivalent ones

¹⁷³ See K–G (vol. 1, 559); Millis (2015, 298).

¹⁷⁴ Kassel, Austin (*PCG* vol. 2, 274) put the crux to signal the problematic hiatus in πρᾶττε ὅτι. To the corrections proposed in earlier scholarship and collected *ad loc.* by Kassel, Austin, one should now add πρᾶξον ὅ τι offered by Sansone *apud* Millis (2015, 297–8).

¹⁷⁵ See Willi (2003a, 244–5). Orth (2018) provides a valuable study (with earlier bibliography) of the main uses of deictic -ί in Greek Comedy, with particular attention to Aristophanes’ corpus.

without deictic $\acute{\iota}$.¹⁷⁶ However, since the forms with deictic $\acute{\iota}$ are virtually limited to dialogue, it is easy to infer that they are an element of colloquial language, which is confirmed by the fact that they are much less frequent in prose than in Aristophanes (besides, they are never found in tragedy).¹⁷⁷ In Middle and New Comedy these deictic forms are comparatively less common than in Old Comedy.

Forms of **ὄδι** occur 16x (126x in Aristophanes, the ratio with forms without deictic $\acute{\iota}$ is 1:2.5). **ὄδι**: Arar. fr. 16.2; Alc.Com. fr. 22.1; Antiph. fr. 166.3; Alex. fr. 19.1. **τοδί**: Alex. fr. 191.5; Diphil. fr. 19.3; Men. *Asp.* 262, *Dysc.* 400, *Sam.* 180, *Fab.Incert.* 30. **τουδί**: Anaxandr. fr. 42.66. **τονδί**: Antiph. fr. 57.1; Diphil. fr. 45.3. **τηνδί**: Henioch. fr. 5.7; Men. *Dysc.* 212. **ταδί**: Men. *Sic.* 141. **τουσδί**: Antiph. fr. 225.11.

Forms of **οὔτοσί** occur 140x, plus four possible cases (340x in Aristophanes, the ratio with forms without deictic $\acute{\iota}$ is ca. 1:4). **οὔτοσί**: Alex. fr. 177.3, 177.15, 245.1; Antiph. fr. 27.15, 35.1, 151.2, 212.1, 214.1, 221.8; Athenio fr. 1.27; Axionic. fr. 1.1; Eub. fr. 119.1; Euphro fr. 9.15; Men. *Asp.* 139, 527, 536, *Georg.* 106, *Georg.* fr. 6, *Dysc.* 143, 167, 212, 480, 607, 753, *Epit.* 138, 294, 299, 302, 320, 384, 386, 387, 406, 447, 576, 1105, *Car.* 19 (a likely restoration), *Mis.* *424 (the reading of the papyrus, οὔτοσσε, may be either οὔτοσί or οὔτος εἶ), 702, *Pc.* 88, 229, 281, 338, *Sam.* 127, 549, 563, 639, 716, *Sic.* 29, 247, 260, 368, 378, *Sic.* fr. *11.3, fr. 60.1 and 143; Philem. fr. 8 and 63.3; Posidipp. fr. 1.9. **τουτί**: Alex. fr. 140.8 and 212.2; Anaxil. fr. 3.1 and 4.1; Antiph. fr. 101.3 and *127.7 (†τουτί); Apollod.Gel. 2.1; Ephipp. fr. 5.19; Nicostr.Com. fr. 9.2; Xenarch. fr. 12.1; Men. *Dysc.* 173, 180, 218, 224, 327, 393, 431, 464, 559, 613, *Epit.* 386, 404, *418 (διὰ τουτί of the papyrus is often, but not always, emended to διὰ τοῦτο by the editors), *Pc.* 142, 243, 341, 344, 357, *Sam.* 399, 466 (τουτογι), 684, *Phasm.* 50, fr. 1.2, 297.2. **τουτονί**: Antiph. fr. 27.13 and 150.1; Athenio fr. 1.7; Diod.Com. fr. 3.1; Dionys.Com. fr. 2.36; Hegesipp. fr. 1.23; Men. *Asp.* 88, 247, 333, 387, 430, 467, *Dysc.* 5, 47, 412, 549 (a nearly certain restoration), 659, 964, *Epit.* 466, 514, *Col.* 66, *Mis.* 470, 537, 715, *Pc.* 226, *Sam.* 72, 155, 165 (a possible supplement), 280, 309, 322, 499, 539, *Sic.* 144, fr. 364.2, 844.3, 884.1 (a most likely supplement). **ταυτηνί**: Anaxipp. fr. 8.1; Eub. fr. 3; Sophil. fr. 6.3. **ταυτί**: Men. *Asp.* 113, *Dysc.* 419, *Epit.* 376, 526, 573, *Th.* fr. 3.2, *Mis.* 695, *Sam.* 687, *Sic.* 260, *Phasm.* 23, fr. 397.3.

Forms of **οὔτωσί** occur 3x (7 in Aristophanes, the ratio with forms without deictic $\acute{\iota}$ is 1:15): Men. *Asp.* 401, *Sam.* 645, *Leuc.* fr. 4.

έκεινοσί is unattested (10 in Aristophanes, the ratio with forms without deictic $\acute{\iota}$ is 1:18).

τοισοδί is unattested (3x in Aristophanes, the ratio with forms without deictic $\acute{\iota}$ is 1:2.5).

Forms of **τοιουτοσί** occur 8x, a ninth occurrence is uncertain (17x in Aristophanes, the ratio with forms without deictic $\acute{\iota}$ is 1:4). **τοιουτοσί**: Anaxandr. fr. 34.7; Men. *Epit.* 256. **τοιουτί**: *Pc.* 107 and 339. **τοιαυτησί**: Men. *Epit.* 1060. **τοιουτονί**: Men. *Epit.* 246 and 445. ***τοιαυτί**: Epicr. fr. 10.31 (Athenaeus' MSS C and E have τοιαῦτα, which violates the metre and for which Meineke, among others, has suggested the correction τοιαῦτί).

τοσουτοσί occurs 1x in Anaxandr. fr. 29.2 (10x in Aristophanes, the ratio with forms without deictic $\acute{\iota}$ is 1:2.5).

τηλικουτοσί is unattested (2x in Aristophanes, the ratio with forms without deictic $\acute{\iota}$ is 1:3).

¹⁷⁶ The data concerning Aristotle's writings are collected and discussed by Martín de Lucas (2013).

¹⁷⁷ Significantly, the only occurrence of deictic $\acute{\iota}$ in Thucydides is contained in a direct speech (see Dover 1997, 63).

δευρί occurs 2x in Mnes. fr. 4.23 and Men. fr. 129.2 (18x in Aristophanes, the ratio with forms without deictic -ί is 1:9).

ἐνθαδί occurs 15x but only in Menander (15x in Aristophanes, the ratio with forms without deictic -ί is 1:3.5): Men. *Asp.* 532, *Dysc.* 24, 89, 302, 557, 881, 919, *Her.* 21, *Thphr.* 28, *Col.* 34, *Sam.* 587, *Sic.* 130 and 195, *Phasm.* 105, fr. 893.1.

ἐνθενδί is unattested (1x in Aristophanes, the ratio with forms without deictic -ί is 1:10).

ἐντευθενί is unattested (15x in Aristophanes, the ratio with forms without deictic -ί is 1:1.5).

νυví occurs 50x (77x in Aristophanes, the ratio with forms without deictic -ί is 1:3.5): Anaxil. fr. 22.15; Antiph. fr. 122.7 and 188.16 (νυνδ); Apollod.Car. fr. 5.4; Apollod.Com. fr. 4.2; Athenio fr. 1.7; Clearch. fr. 3.4; Epicr. fr. 10.3; Alex. fr. 47.3, 85.1, 130.2, 131.4, 187.5, 257.3, 287.1; Anaxipp. fr. 3.4; Men. *Asp.* 94, 137, 176, 209, 352, *Georg.* 11, *Dysc.* 25, 158, 238, 288, 382, 643, 856, *Epit.* 412, 418, 457, 463, 1121 (a certain restoration), *Her.* 27, *Cith.* 45 and *Cith.* fr. 1.6, *Col.* fr. 51, *Mis.* fr. 9.2, *Pc.* 79, 245, 330, *Perinth.* 11 (uncertain restoration), *Sam.* 93, 333, 420, 576, fr. 602.17; Philem. fr. 69.1 and 98.5.

ὠδί might occur 1x, but the text is uncertain (14x in Aristophanes, the ratio with forms without deictic -ί is 1:1.5): *Apollod.Com. fr. 5.13 (Athenaeus' MS A has †ωδει†, which among other possibilities has been interpreted as ὠδί).

These data would require a far more detailed examination than can be provided here. We can take two forms as test cases, οὔτοσί and νυví, both of which are sufficiently well paralleled in Aristophanes and in prose for us to make a comparison in their usage.¹⁷⁸ Due to the nature of the evidence from Middle and New Comedy, it seems best to use the data from Menander as the corpus to be tested. Regarding οὔτοσί, let us consider the evidence from Menander's five better-preserved plays (*Aspis*, *Dyscolus*, *Epitrepontes*, *Perikeiromene*, *Samia*), where most occurrences are found. In this corpus, οὔτοσί occurs 78x, whereas the form without deictic -ί occurs 532x. The ratio between οὔτοσί and οὔτος is therefore ca. 1:6.8. This figure, while distant from the ratio of 1:4 in Aristophanes, is very close to the ratio of 1:7 in Demosthenes. As for νυví, it occurs 31 times in the fragments of papyrus plays (also including the fragments of indirect tradition which belong to these plays), as opposed to 190 occurrences of νῦν. The ratio between νυví and νῦν is therefore ca. 1:6. This is an interesting figure: Menander ranks third among the writers who use νυví in the least number of passages (Antiphon 1:13, Isocrates 1:7, Demosthenes 1:6, as opposed to Plato 1:4, Andocides 1:4, Isaeus 1:3.5, Aristophanes 1:3.5, Lysias 1:2.5).¹⁷⁹

¹⁷⁸ According to the table in Dover (1997, 64), these are the only two forms which are attested in the whole corpus of texts he examined (Aristophanes, Plato, Antiphon, Andocides, Lysias, Isocrates, Isaeus, and Demosthenes).

¹⁷⁹ Interestingly, νυví is far more common than οὔτοσί among 4th-century BCE prose writers and orators (with the exception of Demosthenes), who may have had fewer opportunities to use οὔτοσί than νυví. Concerning the limited use of deictic -ί with demonstrative pronouns in 4th-century BCE prose and oratory, see the data in Dover (1997, 64).

To conclude, the use of deictic *-ί* in pronouns and adverbs in Middle and New Comedy is less common than in Old Comedy, but also, in the case of *νυνί*, than in certain varieties of 4th-century BCE Attic prose.¹⁸⁰ The difference in the use of deictic *-ί* compared to Old Comedy may reflect the increasingly ‘quieter’, less expressive, and more down-to-earth style of later comedy.¹⁸¹

5 Derivational morphology

Later Attic witnessed the development of several nominal categories that remained productive throughout the later history of Greek. The present overview is limited to selected phenomena which are informative about the development of Greek and which have also attracted the interest of Atticist lexicographers. This selection leaves out important categories (nouns in *-μα*, nouns in *-σις*, compound verbal adjectives in *ἀ-* . . . *-τός*, and the nouns, adjectives, and verbs with the prefix *δυσ-*, to mention only a few).¹⁸²

5.1 Adjectives in *-(τ)ικός*

-ικός is one of the most productive suffixes in the history of Greek.¹⁸³ It typically denotes pertinence (in various senses) to someone or something, and it later also developed the notion of aptitude for something.¹⁸⁴ While adjectives in *-ικός* are comparatively rare in archaic Greek (except for ethnic vocabulary), the suffix

180 Other extensive searches conducted during the collection of data show that the evidence for the use of other deictic pronouns and adverbs may give even more divergent results for Menander than for Aristophanes and 4th-century BCE prose.

181 See Dittmar (1933); Tacho-Godi (1965). The different use of deictic *-ί* is not related to a different use of stage props. Studies of the use of props in Aristophanes and Menander have not addressed the use of deictic *-ί* (see English 2000; English 2005; English 2007; Tordoff 2013). Still, after a purely preliminary overview, it is noticeable that while the total number of props in Menander is not always very different from that in Old Comedy, props are rarely mentioned with a demonstrative with deictic *-ί*. If we take Menander’s *Dyskolos* as a test-case, only three times do the demonstrative *ὅδε* and *οὗτος* with deictic *-ί* indicate an object on stage (*τηνδί* at *Dysc.* 212, *ταυτί* at *Dysc.* 419, *τουτονί* at *Dysc.* 964).

182 See Durham (1913); Vessella (2016b, 427).

183 For an overview of the adjectives in *-(τ)ικός*, their derivation, functions, and history see Mayser (*Gramm.* vol. 1,3, 104–11); Buck, Petersen (1945, 636–8); Chantraine (1956, 97–171); Blass, Debrunner (1976, § 113.2); Schmid (*Atticismus* vol. 4, 699 and 701); Willi (2003a, 139–45).

184 See Chantraine (1956, 119); van Emde Boas *et al.* (2019, 264).

-ικός rapidly becomes very productive in the 5th century BCE, particularly in the intellectual and technical vocabulary; this development would culminate in the 4th century BCE.¹⁸⁵

The number of adjectives in -(τ)ικός of late comedy is substantial, as they amount to 101 different forms.¹⁸⁶ These adjectives are mostly denominal, but this is not the only possibility. In some cases, there is evidence of ancient scholarly debate about their derivation.

A good example is παλαιστρικός ('of/for the gym'). Although this adjective clearly derives from παλαίστρα 'gym', Atticist lexicographers such as Pollux and Phrynichus sought instead to recommend using παλαιστικός (**Poll.** 3.149: πάλη και παλαιστής και παλαιστικός, παλαίσματα παλαιστικῶς; **Phryn. Ecl.** 212: παλαιστρικός: Ἀλεξίν [fr. 326] φασιν εἰρηκέναι, ὁ δὲ ἀρχαῖος παλαιστικὸν λέγει), which they regarded as 'older' – which in their mind presumably means that it was more correct – based on an alleged derivation from forms such as παλαίω and παλαιστής.

Ethnics and ktetics (28x) form a separate group (on these categories see also below).

Αἰξωνικός, Ἀρκαδικός, Ἀττικός, Ἀχαϊκός, Ἀχαρνικός, Βρυττικός, Γαδειρικός, Δεκελεικός, Ἑλληνικός, Ἑρετρικός, Εὐβοϊκός, Θετταλικός, Ἴωνικός, Καρικός, Κεραμεικός, Κρητικός, Λακωνικός, Λυβικός, Μεγαρικός, Ὀτρυνικός, Περσικός, Πλαταιϊκός, Ποντικός, Σικελικός, Ταναγραϊκός, Φαληρικός, Φοινικικός, Χαλκιδικός.

We can see that many forms (28x) are already attested in 5th-century BCE Attic texts or even before (but notice that, for many of these forms, the 5th-century BCE evidence is limited to one or two occurrences).

ἀνδρικός (Crates Com.; Ar.), ἀρχαῖικός (Ar.), βαρβαρικός (Hdt.; Thuc.; Metag.), βασιλικός (Hdt.; Eur.), γεννικός (Ar.), δειπνητικός (Ar.), δημοτικός (Hdt, Thuc.), δουλικός (Ar.; Phryn.Com.), εἰρηνικός (Ar.), ἐρωτικός (Thuc.), θεωρικός (Eur.), μαγειρικός (Ar.), μανικός (Ar.), μουσικός (Ibyc.; Pi.; Thuc.; Soph.; etc.), νεανικός (Eur.; Ar.; Hermipp.; Eur.), νησιωτικός (Hdt.; Thuc.; Eur.; Ar.), ξενικός (Alcm.; Aesch.; Thuc.; etc.), ὀλιγαρχικός (Thuc.), παιδικός (B.; Thuc.; Soph.; Eur.; etc.), παρθενικός (Hom.), πολεμικός (Thuc.), ποτικός (Alc.Com.), πρακτικός (Ar.), πωλικός (Aesch.; Soph.; Eur.), στρατιωτικός (Thuc.; Ar.), τραγικός (Anacr.; Ar.), φορηγικός (Thuc.; Dionys.Com.), φορτικός (Ar.).

Most of the forms (40x) are first attested in Attic in 4th-century BCE texts (occasionally with earlier instances in the Hippocratic corpus), and a few are comic *primum dicta*.

¹⁸⁵ Willi (2003a, 142–3) provides up-to-date data and discussion.

¹⁸⁶ The adjectives in -τικός are a sub-category of those in -ικός (see Chantraine 1933, 395–6). The formations in -τικός originally depended on agent nouns in -της or verbal adjectives in -τός, but once -τικός became productive, it began to be attached to verbal roots even in cases where there was no previous agent noun in -της or verbal adjective in -τός. In the list, the occurrences of adverbs in -ῶς are grouped together with the adjectives.

αίσθητικός (Pl.; Arist.; Alex. fr. 85.5), ἀρθριτικός (Hippocr.; Damox. fr. 2.49), ἀρμονικός (Pl.; Arist.; Damox. fr. 2.49), ἀρχιτεκτονικός (Pl.; Arist.; Sosip. fr. 1.36), ἀσθενικός (Arist.; Men. *Phasm.* 22), ἀστρολογικός (Arist.; Nicom.Com. fr. 1.18), γεροντικός (Pl.; Thphr.; Apollod.Com. fr. 7.1), γεωμετρικός (Pl.; Arist.; Nicom.Com. fr. 1.19), γραμματικός (X.; Pl.; Arist.; Eub. fr. 69.1, Men. fr. 318), διακονικός (Ar. *Pl.* 1170, Pl.; X.; Arist.; Men. fr. 110.1), ἐνθραυστικός (Pl.; Men. *Dysc.* 44 and 688 [conjecture]), εὐνοϊκός (X.; Isocr.; D.; Amphis fr. 1.1), εὐρετικός (Pl.; Arist.; Men. fr. 37.1), θεραπευτικός (X.; Pl.; Arist.; Men. fr. 296.15), ἰατρικός (Damox. fr. 2, Nicom.Com. fr. 1), ἰσχυρικός (Pl.; Alex. fr. 199), κολακικός (Pl.; Arist.; Men. *Dysc.* 492), κριτικός (Pl.; Arist.; Posidipp. fr. 1.4), κρονικός (Ar. *Pl.* 581, Pl.; Alex. fr. 63.2), κυνικός (Men. fr. 114.2), κωμικός (D.; Aeschin.; Alex. fr. 103.13), μελαγχολικός (Hippocr.; Arist.; Men. *Asp.* 339), νικητικός (X.; Alex. fr. 274.2), νομικός (Pl.; Arist.; Alex. fr. 40), Ὀμηρικός (Pl.; Arist.; Strato fr. 1.30), παλαιστρικός (Arist.; Alex. fr. 326, *com. adesp.* fr. 1032.23), πειστικός (X.; Pl.; Arist.; Men. fr. 362.4), πνευματικός (Arist.; Nicom.Com. fr. 1.31), ποιητικός (Isocr.; Pl.; Arist.; Alex. fr. 236.5, *com. adesp.* fr. 53.5), προνοητικός (X.; Aen.Tact.; Arist.; Men. *Epit.* 561), στρατηγικός (Isocr.; X.; Pl.; Arist.; Sosip. fr. 1.18–44–55, Men. fr. 608), συγγενικός (Hippocr.; Arist.), τακτικός (X.; Pl.; Nicom.Com. fr. 1.37), ταρακτικός (Hippocr.; Men. *Epit.* 578), τεμενικός (Anaxandr. fr. 12.2 [text uncertain]), φθισικός (Hippocr.; Men. *Asp.* 646 and fr. 761.8), φροντιστικός (Arist.; Antiph. fr. 268.2), φυλακτικός (X.; Arist.; Men. *Dysc.* 95), φυσικός (X.; Arist.; Apollod.Com. fr. 8.1), ψυχικός (Arist.; Alex. fr. 339).

Finally, a handful of forms (5x) are comic hapaxes.

προσκαυστικός (Posidipp. fr. 1.7), στρατευτικώτατος (Alex. fr. 236.2), τοπαστικός (Men. *Epit.* 557), ὑεικός (Axion. fr. 9.2), χναυστικός (Posidipp. fr. 1.7).

This distribution of the evidence fits well with what we know about the massive increase in the use of the suffix -ικός during the 4th century BCE, although it is clear that these formations are already productive from early on in the history of Greek.

Some of the uses of the adjectives in -ικός in Middle and New Comedy can be grouped into the following categories.¹⁸⁷

Forms existing besides or replacing other adjectives formed with a different suffixation (ἀνδρεῖος–ἀνδρικός, ἀσθενής–ἀσθενικός, ἀστεῖος–ἀστικός, βασιλείος–βασιλικός, γενναῖος–γεννικός, γερόντειος–γεροντικός, ἰσχυρός–ἰσχυρικός, Ὀμήρειος–Ὀμηρικός,¹⁸⁸ ὑειος–ὑ(ε)λικός). The semantics of the two related adjectives does not always overlap completely (ἀστεῖος has the metaphorical meaning ‘urbane, elegant, pleasant’, while ἀστικός the literal meaning ‘urban’, as in *Dysc.* 41), but in some cases it does (e.g. ἀνδρεῖος and ἀνδρικός ‘manly’, as in the case of ἀνδρικός in Men. *Sic.* 215 which corresponds to and clarifies ἀνδρεῖος of Eur. *Or.* 918;¹⁸⁹ ἀσθενής and ἀσθενικός ‘weak, frail’ in body and mind, as in *Phasm.* 22; βασιλείος and βασιλικός ‘royal’; γενναῖος and γεννικός ‘noble’; γερόντειος and γεροντικός ‘off for an old man’; ἰσχυρός and ἰσχυρικός, as in Alex. fr. 199 according to *Antiatt.* 18; ὑειος and ὑ(ε)λικός ‘of a pig’).¹⁹⁰

¹⁸⁷ On the forms in -αἰτικός/-αῖικός (ἀρχαῖτικός, Ἀχαιαῖικός, Πλαταιαῖικός), see Section A.3.5.

¹⁸⁸ This case is discussed by Fraser (2009, 203–5).

¹⁸⁹ See Chantraine (1956, 144–5); Belardinelli (1994, 177).

¹⁹⁰ But notice, for instance, that there is no βοεικός beside βόειος (Eub. fr. 6.8, *Diphil.* fr. 122).

Doublents of this kind attracted the interest of Atticist lexicographers, who occasionally refer to their occurrences in later comedy. **Phryn.** *PS* 35.1–2: ἀνθρωπικός μῦθος (Ar. fr. 35) ὁ περὶ ἀνθρωπείων πραγμάτων. **Antiatt.** ι 9: ἰσχυρικώτερον· Πλάτων Θεαιτήτῳ (169b.6). **Antiatt.** ι 8: ἴσχυρικός· ἀντὶ τοῦ ἰσχυρός. Ἀλεξὶς Προσκεδαννυμένῳ (fr. 199; on ἰσχυρικός as the correct lemma see also Phot. ι 252: ἰσχυρικοί· ἰσχυροί and Arnott 1996, 576). **Antiatt.** π 8: προυνούστερος· ἀντὶ τοῦ προνοητικώτερος. Σοφοκλῆς Αἴαντι μαστιγοφόρῳ (Ai. 119). **Antiatt.** π 16: παιδικόν· ἀντὶ τοῦ παιδαριῶδες. Ἀλεξὶς Φιλαθηναίῳ (fr. 252). [**Hdn.**] **Philet.** 106: πατρικός φίλος, οὐχὶ πατρῶος, καὶ ὁ Κρατῖνος (fr. 306) ‘πατρικός ὢν ξένος | πυνθάνομαι τάδε σου’. **Phryn.** *PS* fr. *33 (= schol. D.T. (*scholia Vaticana*) GG 1,3.224.1–6): φασὶ δὲ τινες (Ἀβρων καὶ Φρύνιχος add. cod. C), ὡς οὐ δεῖ λέγειν Πλατωνικὸν βιβλίον, ἀλλὰ Πλατώνειον. Πλατωνικὸν γὰρ βιβλίον λέγεται τὸ περιέχον περὶ Πλάτωνος, ὡσπερ καὶ Φιλίππικοί λόγοι λέγονται οἱ περὶ Φιλίππου <περι>έχοντες καὶ Τυρσηνικαὶ ἱστορία αἱ περὶ Τυρσηνῶν περιέχουσαι. ἀμαρτάνουσιν οὖν οἱ λέγοντες Ὀμηρικὸν ποίημα. Ὀμήρειον γὰρ δεῖ λέγειν, οὐ γὰρ περιέχει περὶ Ὀμήρου, ἀλλ’ Ὀμήρου ἐστὶν τὸ ποίημα.

Ethnics and ktetics:¹⁹¹ This is one of the earliest uses of -ικός in Greek, which is early as Homeric poetry. In some cases, the adjectives in -ικός may indicate provenance from a generic geographical location (νησιωτικός). The ethnic and ktetic functions are also discussed by Atticist lexicography. **Antiatt.** ι 3: Ἰταλικόν· Πλάτων Γοργία (493a.6). **Antiatt.** λ 16: Λάκαιναν· τὴν παρθένον φασὶ δεῖν καλεῖν, τὴν δὲ χώραν Λακωνικήν. Ἀλεξὶς Ἐλένης ἀρπαγῇ (fr. 72). **Phryn.** *Ecl.* 318: Λάκαιναν μὲν γυναικα ἐρεῖς, Λάκαιναν δὲ τὴν χώραν οὐδαμῶς, ἀλλὰ Λακωνικήν, εἰ καὶ Εὐρυπιδῆς παραλόγως φησὶν (*Andr.* 194) ‘ὡς ἢ Λάκαινας τῶν Φρυγῶν μείων πόλις’ (on both entries see Favi 2022l).

Technical and professional terms: ἀστρολογικός, γεωμετρικός, γραμματικός, ἱατρικός, μαγειρικός, μουσικός, ὀψαρτυτικός, πειστικός, στρατηγικός, τακτικός. They may also describe the person and their field of expertise (ἄρμονικός, μουσικός, νομικός, στρατευτικώτατος, στρατιωτικός) or more generally a person (or a thing) based on their personal talents, inclination, or suitability for something (also with a negative connotation) (εὐρετικός, θεραπευτικός, κολακικός, κριτικός, προσκαυστικός, τοπαστικός, φροντιστικός, χναυστικός, ψυχικός). In Middle and New Comedy, many of these adjectives in -ικός are typically used by the cooks who describe their profession.¹⁹² These uses of the adjectives in -ικός are often the object of interest in Atticist lexicography: **Antiatt.** γ 19: γραμματικούς· ἀντὶ τοῦ γραμματιστάς· γραμματιστάς δὲ ἀντὶ τοῦ ὑπογραφεῖς. **Antiatt.** γ 38: γραμματικός· ὁ πολλὰ γράμματα εἰδώς. **Antiatt.** δ 47: διδασκαλικός· Πλάτων Γοργία (455a.3) (in the *locus classicus*, διδασκαλικός means ‘in charge of instructing, expected to teach’). **Antiatt.** ν 4: νομικόν· τὸν ἐπιστήμονα τῶν νόμων. <Ἀλεξὶς Γαλατεία (fr. 40)>. **Antiatt.** ω 3: ὠδικός· ἀντὶ τοῦ εὖ ᾄδων.

Medical and scientific vocabulary: ἀρθριτικός, μελαγχολικός, πνευματικός, ταρακτικός, φθισικός, φυσικός. This origin is confirmed by the early parallels in the Hippocratic corpus.

Atticist lexicographers clearly had an interest in these adjectives in -ικός, even the less obvious ones, and they criticised the forms that were clearly post-Classical.

¹⁹¹ On these concepts, see Gschnitzer (1983, 140) (= Gschnitzer 2001, 2). See also Dittenberger (1907, 1); Fraser (2009, 39).

¹⁹² See, e.g., Athenio fr. 1; Damox. fr. 2; Hegesipp. fr. 1; Nicom. fr. 1; Posidipp. fr. 28; Sosipat. fr. 1. This pre-eminence was already noticed by Peppler (1910, 435–6). The cook who discusses his τέχνη is a staple of Middle and New Comedy (see Dohm 1964).

Phryn. PS 58.1: γαμικά μέλη· τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς γάμοις λεγόμενα ὕμνικά. **Phryn. PS 96.1–2:** οὐκ εἰμί βαδιστικός (Ar. Ra. 129)· οὐκ εἶθισμα οὐδὲ μεμελέτηκα περιπατεῖν. **Phryn. PS 104.6–7:** περαντικός· ῥήτωρ (Ar. Eq. 1378)· ὁ πέρας τοῖς λόγοις ἐπιτιθεῖς ἐν ταῖς ἀποδείξεσι διὰ δύναμιν λόγων. **Phryn. PS 125.11:** χαριστικός· ὁ πολλοῖς χαριζόμενος. **Phryn. Ecl. 331:** βιωτικόν· ἀηδὴς ἢ λέξις· λέγε οὖν χρήσιμον ἐν τῷ βίῳ. **Antiatt. α 63:** ἀριστητικός· ἀντὶ τοῦ ἔθους ἔχων ἀριστᾶν. Εὐπολις Δήμοις. **Antiatt. β 42:** βουλευτικά· λέγεται γυμνάσια ἐν πολλαῖς πόλεσιν καὶ σύνοδοι τινες, ὅπου οἱ βουλευταὶ ἢ ἐστιῶνται ἢ περιπατοῦσιν. **Antiatt. ε 131:** ἐπιβατικά· καλοῦσιν ἃ οἱ ναυτικοὶ παρενθήκας λέγουσιν. **Antiatt. π 17:** παιδικά· ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐρώμενον. **Moer. θ 15:** θρεκτικός Ἀττικοί· τροχαστικός Ἑλληνας (τρέχω > θρεκτικός, later τροχάζω > τροχαστικός, which is also morphologically more transparent).

5.2 Adjectives in -ιακός

In the case of thematic stems, the suffix -ικός may be replaced by -ιακός.¹⁹³ The evidence in Middle and New Comedy is scarce, and the ethnics are in the majority.

πλουσιακός (Alex. fr. 266.5: Arnott 1996, 746 maintains that it does not imply any ‘stylistic or technical overtones’ compared to the usual adjective πλούσιος). **Κορινθιακός** (Men. Pc. 125). **Ποδιακός** (Dioxipp. fr. 4.2; Diphil. fr. 4.2 and 5.2; Epig. fr. 5.1; Steph. fr. 1.4). **Σαμιακός** (Antiph. fr. *212.2 = Alex. fr. *245.2).

Interestingly, these forms begin to appear with Attic writers in the 4th century BCE. This too is part of the general explosion in the use of the suffix -ικός in 4th-century BCE Attic (see Section B.5.1).

5.3 Nouns in -(σ)μός

Within the category of the *nomina actionis* formed with the suffix -μός, the nouns ending in -σμός are the expected outcome in the forms deriving from verbs in -άζω and -ίζω with a dental stem (or with a velar stem that later merged with the dental stems), except for those forms in which the verbal stem already ends with a sibilant; but notice, too, that as soon as -άζω and -ίζω become productive suffixes for the formation of denominal verbs from any stem, new nouns in -σμός were created even when they did not rely on a dental or sibilant stem (see, e.g., ἀνάλογος > ἀναλογίζω > ἀναλογισμός).¹⁹⁴ Since the class of verbs in -άζω and -ίζω

¹⁹³ See Chantraine (1933, 393–4).

¹⁹⁴ See Chantraine (1933, 138–41); Buck, Petersen (1945, 184).

was already growing massively in Classical times,¹⁹⁵ many new nouns in -σμός begin to appear in the 5th and the 4th centuries BCE.¹⁹⁶ The evidence from Middle and New Comedy is substantial.

ἀγαπησμός (Men. fr. 338.2, hapax in Men.). **ἀκκισμός** (Philem. fr. 3.14, first in Philemon, then much later in Imperial prose). **ἀναγνωρισμός** (Men. *Epit.* 1121; Arist. 2x in *Poet.*, Satyrus in Euripides' life, Imperial and later prose). **ἀναλογισμός** (Men. fr. 333.3; Thuc., X., D.). **ἀρχαϊσμός** (Men. fr. 330.2: first occurrence in Men., see Chapter 4, Section 4.1, then Imperial and later prose). **ἀφανισμός** (Αργυρίου ἀφανισμός title of Antiphanes, Epigenes, Philippides; Αργυρίου ἀφανισμός already a title of Strattis; Arist., Plb., LXX). **βαλλισμός** (Alex. fr. 112.5, hapax in Alexis). **βασανισμός** (Alex. fr. 292.2; then LXX, NT, Christian literature). **βιασμός** Men. *Epit.* 453; Eupolis, Aeneas the Tactician, Satyrus, Imperial prose). **γαργαλισμός** (Hegesipp. fr. 1.16; Ar., Pl., *corpus Hippocraticum*, Arist.). **γαστρισμός** (Sophil. fr. 7.1). **γογγυσμός** (Anaxandr. fr. 32; then LXX, NT, Christian literature, very common in late and Byzantine texts). **ἔθισμός** (Posidipp. fr. 27; *corpus Hippocraticum*, Arist., Epicur., Plb.). **ἐπηρεασμός** (Men. *Dysc.* 178; Arist., D.S., grammatical and lexicographical sources, late and Byzantine texts). **ἔσμός** (Epin. fr. 1.7; Aesch., Eur., Hdt., Ar., X., Pl., Arist.). **θεσμός** (Alex. fr. 153.19; Hom.+). **κιγκλισμός** (Men. fr. 369; *corpus Hippocraticum* and related scholarship). **κραυγασμός** (Diphil. fr. 16, hapax). **λογισμός** (Antiph. fr. 205.2; Diod.Com. fr. 1.3; Men. *Dysc.* 344, 719, *Mis.* 803, *Sam.* 420, 620, *Sic.* 25, 115, fr. *67.2, 191.2–5, 282, 286.3, 641.2; Philem. fr. 94.10; Thuc., Ar., Isocr., X., Pl., Lys., *corpus Hippocraticum*, D., Arist.). **μερισμός** (Men. *Epit.* 461; Pl., Aen.Tact., Arist., Thphr., Plb.). **μυκτηρισμός** (Men. fr. 615; LXX, Tryphon devoted a treatise to this, common in later prose). **νουθετησμός** (Men. fr. 629, hapax). **ὀψωνιασμός** (Men. fr. 624; Plb., Imperial prose, later and Byzantine prose). **παραλογισμός** (Men. fr. 738.1; Lycurg., Arist., Plb., LXX). **Πυθαγορισμός** (Alex. fr. 223.7, hapax). **σεισμός** (Antiph. fr. 193.6; Thuc., Soph., Eur., Hdt., Ar., X.). **σιλουρισμός** (Diph. fr. 17.11, hapax). **στασιασμός** (Men. fr. 574; Thuc., Aen.Tact., Arist.). **συγκλυσμός** (Men. fr. 420.6; Arist., Men., 1x in Alexander's *De figuris*, 1x in Ps.Callisth. *Historia Alexandri Magni [recensio vetusta]*). **τηγανισμός** (Men. fr. 195; very rare in late and Byzantine prose). **χορτασμός** (Anaxandr. fr. 79; late and Byzantine prose). **ψιθυρισμός** (Men. *Mis.* 540; LXX, NT, Phld., Imperial prose, late and Byzantine prose). **ὠθισμός** (Anaxandr. fr. 34.7; Thuc., Hdt., X., Plb., Imperial prose).

Most of these forms derive from verbs in -άζω, -ίζω, and -ύζω (the last of these only in the case of γογγυσμός and συγκλυσμός). A different case is that of the forms ἔσμός (the sibilant is part of the verbal stem: *DELG* s.v.), θεσμός (the origin of the sibilant is obscure: see Chantraine 1933, 140), and σεισμός (the sibilant is part of the verbal stem: *DELG* s.v.). Among the nouns in -σμός attested in Middle and New Comedy, several are already attested in earlier texts, particularly in Thucydides, and for Atticist lexicography this may be a confirmation that these

¹⁹⁵ See Section C.4.9.

¹⁹⁶ This category of nouns will continue to be productive in post-Classical times. See Mayser (*Gramm.* vol. 1,3, 61–4) for the evidence for these forms in Ptolemaic papyri and Schmid (*Atticismus* vol. 4, 687) on Atticist writers.

forms are good Attic. However, in other cases the opinion of the Atticists is less clear or even openly critical (e.g. γαργαλισμός).

Antiatt. β 12: βιασμός: Εὐπολις Αὐτολύκῳ (fr. 72). **Phryn. PS 56.9–10:** γάργαλος: ὁ ἐρεθισμός. καὶ γαργαλισμός. τὸ δὲ γαργαλίζεσθαι οὐκ Ἀττικόν. **Moer. γ 23:** γάργαλος Ἀττικοί: γαργαλισμός Ἑλληνες. **Poll. 6.147 and 9.23** (ὁπ ὠθισμός). **Moer. ω 4:** ὠτισμός ὠθισμός Ἀττικοί: ὠσμός Ἑλληνες.

Several other forms are first attested in 4th-century BCE Attic prose or in the *corpus Hippocraticum* and then mostly remain in use in the koine (ἀναγνωρισμός, ἐθισμός, ἐπιρρασμός, κιγκλισμός, μερισμός, παραλογισμός, συγκλυσμός).

Antiatt. ε 36: ἐθισμός: ἀντί τοῦ ἔθος. Ποσίδιππος Φιλοπάτορι (fr. 27).

The more conspicuous category, however, consists of those forms which are hapaxes (some of them obviously created for comic purposes) or which are paralleled only in very late texts, and because of this peculiarity, they are often discussed (with a more or less tolerant approach) in Atticist lexicography.

Moer. α 100: ἀκκισμός Ἀττικοί: προσποιήσις Ἑλληνες, also Thom.Mag. 15.11–5 (who quotes Libanius and Synesius). **Ath. 8.362a–d** (βαλλισμός, βαλλίζω). **Poll. 2.168 and 2.175** (γαστρισμός). **Phryn. Ecl. 335:** γογγυσμός καὶ γογγύζειν· ταῦτα ἀδόκιμα μὲν οὐκ ἔστιν, ἰακά δέ. Φωκυλίδην γὰρ οἶδα κεκρημένον αὐτῷ τὸν Μιλήσιον, ἄνδρα παλαιὸν σφόδρα (fr. 5 Diehl)· καὶ τότε Φωκυλίδεω χρή τοι τὸν ἑταῖρον ἑταίρω | φροντίζειν, ἄσ' ἂν περιγογγύζωσι πολῖται'. ἀλλὰ τοῦτο μὲν Ἴωσιν ἀφείσθω, ἡμεῖς δὲ τονθρυσμὸν καὶ τονθρῦζειν λέγωμεν ἢ νῆ Δία σὺν τῷ ο τονθορυσμὸν καὶ τονθορῦζειν. **Antiatt. γ 12:** γογγυσμός: ἀντί τοῦ <τον>θρυσμός. Ἀναξανδρίδης Νηρεῖ (fr. 32). **Phryn. Ecl. 314:** κραυγασμός: παρακειμένου τοῦ κεκραγμός εἶπεῖν ἐρεῖ τις ἀμαθῶς κραυγασμός. **Antiatt. κ 9:** κραυγασμός: ἀντί τοῦ κραυγή. Δίφιλος Ἀποβάτη (fr. 16), Thom.Mag. 196.7–8. **Poll. 9.139:** τὰ δὲ πράγματα νουθεσία καὶ ὡς Πλάτων (?) νουθετεία· φαῦλος γὰρ ὁ Μενάνδρου νουθετισμός (fr. 629). **Poll. 6.38:** παμπόνηρον δ' ὁ Μενάνδρου (fr. 624) ὀψωνιασμός. **Phryn. Ecl. 394:** [. .] Βάλβον τὸν ἀπὸ τῶν Τράλλεων, ὃς εἰς τοσοῦτο προθυμίας καὶ θαύματος ἤκει Μενάνδρου, ὥστε καὶ Δημοσθένους ἀμείνω ἐγγχειρεῖν ἀποφαίνειν τὸν λέγοντα [. .] ὀψωνιασμός (fr. 624). **Poll. 10.98:** λιστριόν, ὃ τινες ταγνηοστρόφιον, καὶ τάγνηον δέ. ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ τήγανον ἂν ἔχοις εὐρεῖν εἰρημένον ἐν Εἰλωσιν Εὐπόλιδος (fr. 155), καὶ ἐν Τηλεκλείδου Ἀψευδέσιν (fr. 11)· τὰ δὲ τήγανα | ζέοντά σοι μολύνεται'. ὑπόφαυλοι γὰρ οἱ ἐν Ἴπποκόμῳ Μενάνδρου (fr. 195) τηγανισμοί. τὸ μέντοι ῥῆμα τὸ τηγανίζεσθαι ἔστιν ἐν Ἀποκλειομένη Ποσειδίππου (fr. 5)· καίτοι τό γε δρᾶμα Ἀριστοφάνους Ταγνησταί. **Poll. 6.43:** τὸ δὲ χορτάζειν Ἀριστοφάνης (*Pax* 139) εἶρηκε, καὶ τὸ χορτάζεσθαι Ἀραρώς (fr. 21), Ἀναξανδρίδης (fr. 79) δὲ καὶ χορτασμός.

Some of these nouns became competitive with the *nomina actionis* in -σις, of which they often represented the more recent alternative. This dualism was a focus of attention in ancient scholarship, also with reference to the forms attested in Middle and New Comedy.

Orus fr. B 1 (= Σ^b α 84 = Phot. α 123 = *Su.* α 152 (*ex Σ'*); cf. *EM* 8.53): ἀγαπησμός: ἀγαπησμός λέγουσιν (Ἀττικοί add. Phot.) καὶ ἀγάπησιν τὴν φιλοφροσύνην. Συναριστώσις Μένανδρος (fr. 338)· καὶ τὸν ἐπὶ κακῷ | γινόμενον ἀλλήλων ἀγαπησμός οἷος ἦν'. **Antiatt. ε 37:** ἐξετασμός: ἀντί τοῦ

ἐξέτασις. Δημοσθένους ἐν τῷ Ὑπὲρ τοῦ στεφάνου εἰπόντος (18.16), οὐ φασι δόκιμον εἶναι οὕτως τιθέμενον. **Phryn. PS 65.2–3**: δέσις· ὁ δεσμός, ὡς ἄρπασις <ὁ ἀρπαγμός> καὶ λόγισις ὁ λογισμός. **Phot. σ 503**: στασιασμόν· τὴν στάσιν Μένανδρος (fr. 574).

As anticipated, the general approach of Atticist lexicographers to nouns in -σμός is permissive: these forms are approved if attested in canonical Attic writers.

Phryn. PS 58.14: γρυλίζειν καὶ γρυλισμός· ἐπὶ τῆς τῶν χοίρων φωνῆς. **Phryn. PS 104.5**: πιθηκισμοί (Ar. Eq. 887)· αἱ πανουργία. **Phryn. Ecl. 311**: ἐμπυρισμός· οὕτως Ὑπερείδης (or. 2 fr. 3 col. 45.29 Jensen) ἡμελημένως, δέον ἐμπρησμός λέγειν. **Antiatt. ε 126**: ἐμπυρισμός· Ὑπερείδης Ὑπὲρ Λυκόφρονος (or. 2 fr. 3 col. 45.29 Jensen). **Antiatt. γ 10**: γυναικισμός· Διοκλῆς Βάκχαις (fr. 4) γυναικίζειν φησὶ καὶ γυναικηρόν. **Antiatt. δ 57**: †δινισμόν†· Πλάτων Πολιτείας ζ' (cf. 573e.1, where δανεισμοί occurs, and 620e.3, where δίνης occurs; see S. Valente 2015b, *ad loc.*). **Antiatt. ε 37**: ἐξέτασμός· ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐξέτασις, Δημοσθένους ἐν τῷ Ὑπὲρ τοῦ στεφάνου εἰπόντος (18.16), οὐ φασι δόκιμον εἶναι οὕτως τιθέμενον. **Antiatt. ε 111**: ἔτασμόν· τὸν ἐξετασμόν. **Antiatt. θ 4**: θερισμόν· ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀμητόν. Ἡρόδοτος δ' (4.42.3), Εὐπολις Μαρικᾶ (fr. 215). **Antiatt. π 30**: πλησιασμός· ἀντὶ τοῦ μίξις. **Moer. α 85**: ἀδαγμός ἀδάξασθαι Ἀττικοί· κνησμός κνήσασθαι Ἕλληνες. **Moer. ε 9**: ἐγχυτρισμός ἢ τοῦ βρέφους ἐκθεσις, ἐπεὶ ἐν χύτραις ἐξετίθεντο.

However, forms that are evidently late may be proscribed even if they are attested in writers normally regarded as canonical (*Antiatt. ε 37* on Demosthenes' ἐξέτασμός is an instructive example). This proves that Atticist lexicographers understood that the nouns in -σμός multiplied especially in late Attic (and then in the koine).

5.4 Nouns in -ότης, -ότητος

These abstract nouns are common in prose texts, particularly in philosophy and science.¹⁹⁷ Of the six nouns in -ότης that occur in Aristophanes (out of a total of 12 occurrences), several refer to sophistic or scientific vocabulary (Willi 2003a, 139). These nouns are rare in Aeschylus and Sophocles,¹⁹⁸ while they are more common in Euripides.¹⁹⁹ They are also rare in Ptolemaic papyri (Mayer, *Gramm.* vol. 1,3, 81), while they become relatively common in the New Testament.²⁰⁰ The evidence from Middle and New Comedy is ample.

¹⁹⁷ See Chantraine (1933, 293–8); Buck, Petersen (1945, 464–8).

¹⁹⁸ They occur 3x in Aeschylus (φιλότης, λειότης [only *Pr.*], κακότης [only *Pr.*]) and 4x in Sophocles (ὠμότης, μαργότης, φιλότης, σκαιότης).

¹⁹⁹ They occur 15x (κουφότης, νεότης, κακότης, γενναιότης, φαυλότης, μαργότης, χρηστότης, πικρότης, φιλότης, ὠμότης, παλαιότης, ισότης, ὑγρότης, σεμνότης, ἀβρότης).

²⁰⁰ See Blass, Debrunner (1976, § 110.1).

ιδιότης: Damox. fr. 2.41 (X., Pl., Arist., Thphr.). **καινότης:** Anaxandr. fr. 55.6 (Thuc., Isocr.). **μετριότης:** Men. Asp. 257 (Thuc., Isocr., X., Pl., *corpus Hippocraticum*, Aeschines, Arist.). **νεότης:** Men. Sam. 341, fr. 57.3 (Hom.+). **οικειότης:** Men. Asp. 202, Dyc. 240 (Thuc., Hdt., Isocr., Isaeus, And., X., Pl., Lys., D., Arist.). **πιθανότης:** Men. Asp. 390 (Pl., Arist.). **σιωρότης:** Timocl. fr. 24.3 (hapax). **στυγνότης:** Alex. fr. 201.6 (then Polybius). **σοφοδρότης:** Alex. fr. 247.12 (X., Pl., *corpus Hippocraticum*, Arist., Thphr.). **ταπεινότης:** Men. fr. 740.12 (Thuc., Hdt., Isocr., X., Pl., Arist., Thphr.). **ύγρότης:** Crobyl. fr. 4.2–3 (Eur., X., Pl., *corpus Hippocraticum*, Arist., Thphr.). **χρηστότης:** Aristophon. fr. 13.4, Timocl. fr. 8.17, Men. fr. 362.1, 754, 758, 771.1 (Eur., Isaeus, Lys., Arist.). **ώμότης:** Men. Mis. 685 (Eur., Soph., Isocr., X., D., Arist.).

These forms are regularly deadjectival from thematic stems. Many are already used in 5th-century BCE poetry and prose and even earlier. A few other forms clearly belong to the philosophical and scientific vocabulary of the 4th century BCE. Two interesting forms are σιωρότης in Timocles (fr. 24.3) and στυγνότης in Alexis (fr. 201.6). The former, a hapax, is the abstract noun corresponding to the better attested adjective σιωρός, which already occurs in Aristophanes (fr. 134) and Xenophon, and then multiple times in 4th-century BCE Attic texts.²⁰¹ Timocles uses σιωρότης to describe the firmness of a young female body (a typical use of σιωρός, see Ar. fr. 148.3 and Men. fr. 343). Thus, the fact that σιωρότης is unparalleled may be due the fact that the abstract σιωρότης only developed in late Attic as part of the general increase of this nominal category. As for στυγνότης, after Alexis this word occurs 2x in Polybius, 1x in Heraclitus the Allegorist, 4x in Plutarch, and then mostly in Christian literature. Arnott (1996, 584) considers it a mere coincidence that this typically koine form is first attested in Alexis, given that the adjective στυγνός is common in earlier Attic. Yet, as suggested by the comparison with σιωρότης, it may also be that the abstract noun στυγνότης did not develop in parallel with the use of στυγνός, and thus στυγνότης may be a genuinely late Attic form. Atticist lexicographers are interested in this category of nouns, for which they judge on a case-by-case basis whether such a form is good Attic or not.

Phryn. PS 104.3–4: πυκνότης τρόπου (see Ar. Eq. 1132–3: καί σοι πυκνότης ἔνεστ' | ἐν τῷ τρόπῳ) ἐπὶ συνετοῦ καὶ φρονίμου. **Phryn. PS 107.15–6:** σκληρότης ὄρκων· ὁπόταν τις ὁμόση φρικώδεις τινὰς ὄρκους. **Phryn. Ecl. 84:** θερμότης λέγε, ἀλλὰ μὴ θερμασία. **Phryn. Ecl. 329:** αὐθεκαστότης ἀλόκοτον· τὸ μὲν γὰρ αὐθέκαστος κάλλιστον ὄνομα, τὸ δὲ παρὰ τοῦτο πεποιημένον αὐθεκαστότης κίβδηλον. **Antiatt. ι 11:** ικανότης· Λυσίας Πρὸς Πανταλέοντα (fr. 264 Carey). **Moer. ι 12:** ισότης ὡς ἀρότης Ἀττικοί· ισότης ὡς βραβευτής Ἕλληνες.

²⁰¹ On this adjective and its appraisal in Atticist sources, see Favi (2022t, 314–5).

5.5 Adjectives in -ώδης

The adjectives in -ώδης are interesting for observing the evolution of later Attic. This morpheme was used to create adjectives indicating what is ‘similar to’ or ‘reminiscent of’ what is expressed by the (nominal or verbal) stem.²⁰² This category of adjectives plays a crucial role in early Ionic prose, where it influences the language of philosophy and science. In turn, these formations are poorly attested in poetry, with Euripides being the one writer who uses them the most, and in the Attic orators. As regards Old Comedy, judging from Aristophanes, most occurrences are in *Plutus*, while the evidence is very limited in the first ten surviving plays. The likely conclusion is that -ώδης was an Ionic element that gradually spread in later Attic.²⁰³ The evidence from Middle and New Comedy is important to assess the later development in the use of this suffix.²⁰⁴

Αἰγυπτιώδης: Crat.Iun. fr. 2 (hapax). **Ἀλεξανδρώδης:** Men. fr. 598.1 (hapax). **βλιχανώδης:** Diph. fr. 17.15 (hapax in this form, βλιχώδης in later medical texts). **βορβορώδης:** Men. fr. 27 (*corpus Hippocraticum*, Pl., Arist.). **δροσώδης:** Antiph. fr. 55.13; Alex. fr. 129.12 (Eur. *Ba.* 705, Pherecr. fr. 114.2). **ἐργώδης:** Men. *Asp.* 317, *Dysc.* 966, fr. 58.2; Philipp. fr. 9.9; Nicom. fr. 2.1; Sosip. fr. 1.24 (*corpus Hippocraticum*, Isocr., X., Arist.). **θηριώδης:** Athenio fr. 1.4 (Eur., Hdt., *corpus Hippocraticum*, X., Pl., Aesch., Arist.). **ιώδης:** Men. *Sic.* 285 (Soph. [but the text of fr. 198a is corrupt], *corpus Hippocraticum*). **κολλώδης:** Clearch. fr. 2.1 (*corpus Hippocraticum*, Pl., Arist.). **κοπώδης:** Alex. fr. 202.2 (*corpus Hippocraticum*, [Arist.] *Probl.*). **μανιώδης:** Alex. fr. 222.9 (Thuc., Eur., X., *corpus Hippocraticum*, Plb.). **μιλτώδης:** Eub. fr. 97.6 (Agatharchides, D.S., Str.). **μοιχώδης:** Men. *Sic.* 210 (Ptolemaeus’ *Apotelesmatica*). **νωκαρώδης:** Diph. fr. 18 (hapax).

A few of these forms are already paralleled in 5th-century BCE Attic, particularly in Euripidean poetry (δροσώδης, θηριώδης, ιώδης, μανιώδης). Many more appear in 4th-century BCE Attic texts and/or in the koine (βορβορώδης, ἐργώδης, κολλώδης, κοπώδης, μιλτώδης, μοιχώδης). Finally, a few are 4th-century BCE comic hapaxes (Αἰγυπτιώδης, Ἀλεξανδρώδης, βλιχανώδης, νωκαρώδης). A few remarks can be made: (1) Some forms are unmarked and generally descriptive (ἐργώδης, ιώδης, μιλτώδης, μοιχώδης); (2) The hapax forms document the potential of the suffix -ώδης to create parodic neologisms (Αἰγυπτιώδης, Ἀλεξανδρώδης, βλιχανώδης, νω-

²⁰² See Chantraine (1933, 429–32); Schmid (*Atticismus* vol. 4, 698–9). Regarding the origin of this morpheme, we probably have to agree with Wackernagel (1889, 44–7) that -ώδης originally belongs to δῶω ‘to smell (of something)’ (see also Willi 2003b, 44).

²⁰³ Willi (2003b, 43–4).

²⁰⁴ Durham (1913, 24–5); Vessella (2016b, 427) stress the importance of the adjectives in -ώδης in Menander as an indication of his evolving Attic. See also Bagordo (2013, 99–100), who also gathers the evidence from the comic adespota and Epicharmus.

καρώδης);²⁰⁵ a parodic intention is also evident in the comic reuse of Euripides' δροσώδης;²⁰⁶ (3) Some of these adjectives, whether or not they are attested in 5th-century BCE Attic, are also used in treatises of the Hippocratic corpus of the 5th and 4th BCE centuries and/or in Herodotus (βορβορώδης, ἐργώδης, θηριώδης, ἰώδης, κολλώδης, κοπώδης, μανιώδης).²⁰⁷ As a result, the use of some of these adjectives in comedy, while not a direct parody of scientific and/or medical vocabulary, may well be influenced by their technical nature;²⁰⁸ in some cases, this may add a further nuance to the philosophical tone of the passage.²⁰⁹

The evidence for the adjectives in -ώδης in Middle and New Comedy represents an advanced stage compared to the evidence from Old Comedy. It is highly significant that the evidence from later comedy is more substantial than that from Old Comedy (where Aristophanes is the only known writer to make some use of the adjectives in -ώδης). It therefore appears that, when Atticist lexicography discusses these formations and their stylistic usefulness, it may be quoting from the plays of Middle and New Comedy if the sources are unnamed.

Phryn. PS 51.18–9: ἀνδραποδώδεις ἡδοναί (Crates Theb. *SH* 352.4)· σημαίνει τὰς εἰκαίους καὶ ἀλογίστους ἡδονάς. **Phryn. PS 52.14–5:** βορβορώδης παρὰ τὸν βόρβορον καὶ τὸν ὄδοντα, τὸν δυσώδη τὸ στόμα. **Phryn. PS 100.9:** παγετῶδες (Soph. *Ph.* 1082) καὶ ψυχρόν. **Phryn. PS 109.19–20:** στραγγαλιώδης ἄνθρωπος (*com. adesp.* fr. *663)· ὁ οὐχ ἄπλοῦς, ἀλλ' ἐπιτεταραγμένος. **Phryn. PS 112.15–7:** τυντλώδης καὶ ληρώδης λόγος (*com. adesp.* fr. *670)· οἷον ὁ πεπατημένος καὶ κοινός. τύντλος γάρ ὁ [πεπατημένος] πηλός. **Phryn. PS 116.1–3:** ὑποζυγιώδης ἄνθρωπος (Ar. fr. 751 and *com. adesp.* fr. *547): ὁ μὴ ἐκ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ προαιρέσεως καὶ προθυμίας τι πράττων, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς ἐτέρων κελεύσεως, ὥσπερ καὶ τὰ ὑποζύγια.

205 See Bagordo (2013, 99–100); M. Caroli (2014, 86).

206 See Arnott (1996, 374) on Alex. fr. 129.12.

207 βλιχανώδης is paralleled as βλιχώδης in later medical texts. Hesychius (β 740) claims that βλιχώδης already occurs in a Hippocratic passage (*VC* 19), but the manuscript tradition has γλισχρώδης.

208 This interpretation may be considered for νωκαρώδης in *Diph.* fr. 18, even though it is a hapax. On the use of the suffix -ώδης in scientific vocabulary, as exemplified by Theophrastus, see Tribulato (2010b, 489–90).

209 See Arnott (1996, 627–8; 631) on μανιώδης in Alex. fr. 222.9. The form κοπώδης in Alex. fr. 202.2 is part of the discussion about Pythagorean health prescriptions and diet. The context around θηριώδης in Athenio fr. 1.4 reminds one of the philosophical topos of the progress of mankind.

5.6 Diminutives

Recent approaches to diminutives in various, mostly Indo-European, languages have seen the rise of the notion of evaluative morphology, which represents a more precise way of identifying and describing the prerogatives of actual diminutive forms.²¹⁰ Greek evaluative morphology is limited to diminutives (there are no augmentative formations in Greek). These constitute a large and highly productive category of Greek derivational morphology, while at the same time being limited to a relatively restricted number of suffixes, particularly *-ιον* (and its derivatives *-άριον*, *-ίδιον*, *-αρίδιον*, and *-άκιον*) and *-ίσκος*. Lists of diminutive formations in Menander, with a focus on those in *-ιον*, are offered in previous bibliography,²¹¹ while the corpora of the comic poets other than Aristophanes and Menander are generally less studied.²¹² For the purposes of this selective treatment, we shall focus only on three suffixes: *-ίδιον*, *-άριον*, and *-ίσκος*. The reason for this choice is two-fold: these formations are among the most widespread in Greek, and Atticist lexicographers devoted considerable attention to them.

5.6.1 Suffix *-ίδιον*

This suffix, which derives from the re-segmentation of the diminutives created with the suffix *-ιον* attached to dental stems (e.g. *ἀσπίδ-ιον* > *ἀσπ-ίδιον*), already enjoyed great popularity in the 5th century BCE (not just in comedy: e.g. *νησίδιον* occurs 3x already in Thucydides).²¹³ Among other things, the suffix was useful to create the diminutives of the nouns in *-ιον* that have no diminutive meaning, or to reinforce semantically faded diminutives. *-ίδιον* also remained productive in the koine, although it is far less common than *-ιον* and *-άριον* in the New Testament.²¹⁴ The presence of these diminutives in Middle and New Comedy is substantial.²¹⁵

αἰγίδιον: Antiph. fr. 21.4; Eub. fr. 103.1. **ἀργυρίδιον:** Diphil. fr. 19.2. **βοίδιον:** Men. Sic. 184. **βιβλίδιον:** Antiph. fr. 160. **γλαυκίδιον:** Antiph. fr. 221.1. **γλαυκινίδιον:** Amphis fr. 35.2. **γρᾶδιον:** Men. *Georg.* 97, *Mis.* 629. **γραμματείδιον:** Men. fr. 238.1. **δαπίδιον:** Hipparch. fr. 1.3. **ἐλάδιον:** Arched.

²¹⁰ See the overview by Grandi (2013).

²¹¹ See Durham (1913, 23); Boned Colera (2015); Cartlidge (2017b, 248).

²¹² On the diminutives in Aristophanes and their place in the history of Greek, see López Eire (1991, 11–5). See below for further bibliographic references to Aristophanes' diminutives.

²¹³ See Petersen (1910, 212–40); Chantraine (1933, 68–72).

²¹⁴ See Mayser (*Gramm.* vol. 1,3, 38–9); Blass, Debrunner (1976, 90); Watt (2013, 72).

²¹⁵ Some other cases are problematic because they are hapaxes (*ἐντερίδιον* in Alex. fr. 84.2, on which see Arnott 1996, 225–7, *ἴλεσπριδίων†* in Apollod.Com. fr. 13.16) or because they have been created by a modern conjecture (*λιβανίδιον* is Bentley's conjecture in Men. *Car.* fr. 1.1, but since it is unattested, the restoration is not accepted by Kassel, Schröder in *PCG* vol. 6.1).

fr. 2.11. **ἔταιρίδιον**: Men. *Epit.* 985. **θεραπαινίδιον**: Men. *Dysc.* 460. **θραττίδιον**: Anaxandr. fr. 28.2. **κραμβίδιον**: Antiph. fr. 6. **κρεάδιον**: Alex. fr. 84.2. **κωβίδιον**: Anaxandr. fr. 28.2; Sotad. fr. 1.22. **κώδιον**: Men. *Col.* 31, *Sam.* 404. **λοφίδιον**: Men. *Asp.* 59, *Dysc.* 100. **οικίδιον**: Men. *Pc.* 199. **οὔσιδιον**: Nicom. fr. 3.1. **πατρίδιον**: Men. *Dysc.* 499 and 930; Theophil. fr. 4.3; Xenarch. fr. 4.15. **περκίδιον**: Anaxandr. fr. 28.2. **πηρίδιον**: Men. *Epit.* 331. **πιλίδιον**: Antiph. fr. 35.4. **πορνίδιον**: Antiph. fr. 236.3; Men. *Pc.* 150, fr. 410.4. **ποτηρίδιον**: Men. fr. 26.3. **ρόιδιον**: Men. fr. 83.2. **σανίδιον**: Men. fr. 156.3. **σηπίδιον**: Alex. fr. 159.3; Ephipp. fr. 3.9 and 15.4; Eub. fr. 109.2 and 148.6. **σπλαγχνίδιον**: Diph. fr. 14.2. **ταμειίδιον**: Men. *Sam.* 233. **τευθίδιον**: Ephipp. fr. 15.4; Eub. fr. 109.2. **τριχίδιον**: Alex. fr. 159.3. **ὑπογαστρίδιον**: Eub. fr. 137.4. **χλανίδιον**: Men. *Pc.* 392. **χοιρίδιον**: Diph. fr. 90.3; Men. fr. 409.3. **χυτρίδιον**: Alex. fr. 246.2. **χωρίδιον**: Men. *Dysc.* 23. **ψυκτηρίδιον**: Alex. fr. 2.7.

The diminutives of food items are frequent in culinary lists, which are a particularly common feature of comedy throughout the centuries. This explains why a large number of the above-forms are related to eating. Many of these forms are already attested in 5th-century BCE Attic (unsurprisingly, they are paralleled especially in comedy): αἰγίδιον, ἀργυρίδιον,²¹⁶ βοίδιον, γράδιον, γραμματείδιον, κρεάδιον, κώδιον, οικίδιον, πατρίδιον, πηρίδιον, πιλίδιον, πορνίδιον, σανίδιον, σηπίδιον, τευθίδιον, χλανίδιον, χοιρίδιον, χυτρίδιον. Others are paralleled in 4th-century BCE Attic writers, such as χυτρίδιον, but most of these are hapaxes or rare forms that are first attested in Middle and New Comedy and then live on in post-Classical Greek: βιβλίδιον,²¹⁷ γλαυκίδιον, γλαυκινίδιον, δαπίδιον, ἐλάδιον, ἔταιρίδιον, θεραπαινίδιον, θραττίδιον, κραμβίδιον, κωβίδιον, λοφίδιον, οὔσιδιον, περκίδιον, ποτηρίδιον, ροίδιον, σπλαγχνίδιον, ταμειίδιον, τριχίδιον, ὑπογαστρίδιον, ψυκτηρίδιον.²¹⁸

The diminutives in -ίδιον attracted considerable attention from Atticist lexicographers. They do not usually find fault with these forms: on the contrary, they tend to prefer -ίδιον to other diminutive suffixes.²¹⁹

216 While ἀργυρίδιον normally means ‘money’ without any further implication (which is indicated as the current use of the word by Atticist sources, see Phryn. *PS* fr. *257 (= Σ^ρ α 2085 = *Su.* α 3789, ex Σ^ρ)), it sometimes has a contemptuous meaning (see Eup. fr. 124 and Isocr. 8.4; cf. Olson 2017, 434).

217 A rare form otherwise attested only once in Pseudo-Demosthenes and Polybius, it is discussed by Olson (2022, 225) who rightly compares it with βιβλιδάριον in Ar. fr. 795 (to be explained as -ιδ(ιον) + -άριον, see Petersen 1910, 262).

218 On this form and the problems concerning the length of the vowel /i/ in the antepenultimate syllable of the suffix -ίδιον, see Arnott (1996, 59–60).

219 Note, however, that Phrynichus and the *Antiatticist* discuss the admissibility of the analogical suffix -διον (e.g. they debated whether the analogical βούδιον and νούδιον may be accepted in place of the regular forms βοίδιον and νοίδιον). The suffix -διον is analogical and results from a different type of re-segmentation of dental stems like ἀσπίδιον > ἀσπί-διον based on the comparison with the nominative ἀσπίς.

Phryn. PS 6.18–9: ἀνασπᾶν γνωμίδιον (Ar. fr. 727)· κωμωδικῶς εἴρηται, οἷον ἐκ βυθοῦ διανοίας <ἀν>ἀγειν. **Phryn. PS 47.19:** ἀνασπᾶν βούλευμα καὶ ἀνασπᾶν γνωμίδιον (Ar. fr. 727). **Phryn. PS 70.9–12:** ἐπ’ ἄκρων κήθησθε τῶν πυγιδίων (Ar. Ach. 638): ἐπὶ τῶν ἐπαιρομένων καὶ καυχωμένων διὰ κολακείαν ἢ ἐπαινον. δηλοῖ γὰρ τὸ μήτε τελέως καθῆσθαι μήτε ἐστάναι, ἀλλ’ ἐν μέσῳ φέρεσθαι διὰ χαυνότητα ψυχῆς. **Phryn. PS 75.18:** θησειδιον· μᾶλλον ῥητέον ἢ κενέβριον. **Phryn. PS 76.14:** ἰππίδιον· οὐ μόνον ἰππᾶριον. **Phryn. PS 84.22–3:** κυνᾶριον (Alc.Com. fr. 33) καὶ κυνίδιον· <ἄμφω> δόκιμα. **Phryn. PS 102.5–6:** προχοίδιον (Cratin. fr. 206.1)· ὑποκοριστικῶς, [ὡς] ἀπὸ τοῦ πρόχους, ὡς οὖν βοῦς βοίδιον, οὕτω πρόχους προχοίδιον. **Phryn. PS fr. *257** (= Σ^β α 2085 = Su. α 3789 (ex Σ)): ἀργυρίδιον· ὡς ἡμεῖς. Εὐπολις Δήμοις (fr. 124) ‘ἐγὼ δὲ συμψήσασα τὰργυρίδιον’. **Phryn. Ecl. 50:** κόριον ἢ κορίδιον ἢ κορίσκη λέγουσιν, τὸ δὲ κοράσιον παράλογον. **Phryn. Ecl. 61:** νοίδιον καὶ βοίδιον ἀρχαῖα καὶ δόκιμα, οὐχὶ νούδιον καὶ βούδιον. **Phryn. Ecl. 151:** κυνίδιον λέγε. Θεόπομπος δὲ ὁ κωμωδὸς ἅπαξ που (fr. 93) κυνᾶριον εἶπεν. **Phryn. Ecl. 223:** ροίδιον διαιροῦντες λέγουσιν οἱ ἀμαθεῖς· ἡμεῖς δὲ ροίδιον. **Phryn. Ecl. 362:** στηθύδιον ὀρνιθίου λέγουσὶ τινες οὐχ ὀνίως. εἰ γὰρ χρὴ ὑποκοριστικῶς λέγειν, <λέγε> στηθίδιον· εἰ δ’ οὐκ ἔστιν ὑποκοριστικόν, πόθεν εἰσεκώμασε καὶ τοῦτο τὸ κακὸν τῇ τῶν Ἑλλήνων φωνῇ;. **Phryn. Ecl. 398:** λιθάριον πάνυ φυλάττου λέγειν, λιθίδιον δὲ λέγε. **Antiatt. β 37:** βοῦδια· οὐ μόνον βοῦδια. Ἑρμιππος Κέρκωψι (fr. 36.2). **Antiatt. δ 10:** δακτυλίδιον· οὐ δεῖν φασὶν ὑποκορίζεσθαι, οὐδ’ ἂν μικρὸν ἦ. **Antiatt. κ 85:** κλινάρια· οὐ μόνον κλινίδια. Ἀριστοφάνης Δαιταλεῦσιν (fr. 250). **Antiatt. κ 87:** κυνᾶριον· οὐ μόνον κυνίδιον. Ἀλκαῖος κωμικῶς (fr. 33). **Antiatt. μ 18:** μοιχίδιον· τὸ ἐκ μοιχοῦ γεγεννημένον. Ὑπερείδης ἐν τῷ Κατὰ Ἀριστοφώντος (fr. 42 Jensen). [**Hdn.**] **Philet. 47:** διπλοῖδιον τὸ διπλοῦν ἱμάτιον. For a discussion see Tribulato (2022f).

As regards the ancient appraisal of the diminutives in *-ιδιον*, it is important to note that it was mostly Middle and New Comedy that provided the main source for later scholarship, especially concerning rarer and later forms.²²⁰

5.6.2 Suffix *-άριον*

The diminutive suffix *-άριον* derives from the resegmentation of nouns with a stem ending in *-αρ* (e.g. οἶναρον > οἶνάρ-ιον οἶν-άριον, ἐσχάρα > ἐσχάρ-ιον > ἐσχά-ριον).²²¹ It can also be attached to other diminutive suffixes (e.g. νεανίσκος > νεανισκάριον). *-άριον* is not particularly productive in Classical times. According to Peppler’s calculations, 31 forms in *-άριον* are attested up to Aristophanes, but 21 of these are only attested in Aristophanes.²²² However, in post-Classical Greek *-άριον* becomes the most productive diminutive suffix besides *-ιον*.²²³ Attestations in Middle and New Comedy are substantial.²²⁴

²²⁰ Many fragments of Middle and New Comedy where diminutives in *-ιδιον* occur are quoted by writers like Athenaeus and Pollux precisely to exemplify these diminutives.

²²¹ See Petersen (1910, 260–71); Chantraine (1933, 74–5).

²²² See Peppler (1902, 11–2).

²²³ See Mayser (*Gramm.* vol. 1.3, 43–4); Blass, Debrunner (1976, 90); Watt (2013, 73); Tribulato (2022f); Tribulato (2022g).

²²⁴ We omit from the list the textually problematic forms καριδάριον, κωβιδάριον, and σκινδάριον, which are the transmitted readings in Anaxandr. fr. 28 (see Millis 2015, 135–6).

ἀφάριον: Men. fr. 652; Xenarch. fr. 4.15. δειπνάριον: Diphil. fr. 64.1. ζωδάριον: Alex. fr. 144. ιστάριον: Men. fr. 79. κωδάριον: Anaxandr. fr. 35.11. λογάριον: Theognet. fr. 1.2. μισθάριον: Diphil. fr. 42.34; Men. fr. 220.2. μναδάριον: Diphil. fr. 21. νηττάριον: Men. fr. 652. οινάριον: Alex. fr. 277.1; Antiph. fr. 132.4; Apollod.Car. fr. 30.1; Diphil. fr. 60.8. ὄνάριον: Diphil. fr. 89.1. ὀρνιθάριον: Anaxandr. fr. 42.63; Nicostr.Com. fr. 2.2. ὀψάριον: Alex. fr. 159.2 and 177.2; Anaxil. fr. 28.1–2; Diphil. fr. 42.31; Lync. fr. 1.21; Men. Car. fr. 1.2, fr. 151.2; Mnesim. fr. 3.7; Philem. fr. 32.2 and 100.5. παιδάριον: Alex. fr. 212.3; Diphil. fr. 18.2; Men. Asp. 222, Epit. 245, 464, 473, 646, 986, Col. 6, Mis. 989, Sam. 411, 425, 649, fr. 323.2, fr. 764.3, fr. 832.2; Philipp. fr. 22; Xenarch. fr. 10.1–3. παιδισκάριον: Men. Mis. fr. 8.1, fr. 296.15. πλοιάριον: Men. fr. 64.9. ποδάριον: Alex. fr. 115.15. σιτάριον: Philem. fr. 100.3. σκευάριον: Diphil. fr. 19.2. σκυτάριον: Anaxil. fr. 18.6. φωνάριον: Clearch. fr. 2.3. χιτωνάριον: Men. fr. 471.2. χορδάριον: Alex. fr. 137. ψάριον: Anaxandr. fr. 80; Ephipp. fr. 24.3. ώτάριον: Anaxandr. fr. 44.

The sheer number of forms (26) is quite impressive, considering that -άριον did not enjoy much popularity among Classical Attic writers. Several of them are already paralleled in 5th-century BCE Attic, particularly in comedy (κωδάριον, μισθάριον, νηττάριον, οινάριον, ὀψάριον, παιδάριον, πλοιάριον, ποδάριον, σκευάριον, φωνάριον). Two more, ζωδάριον and λογάριον, are paralleled in 4th-century BCE Attic writers. However, most of the forms collected above are hapaxes first attested in Middle and New Comedy, and then attested in post-Classical Greek: ἀφάριον, δειπνάριον, ιστάριον, μναδάριον,²²⁵ ὄνάριον, ὀρνιθάριον, παιδισκάριον, σιτάριον, σκυτάριον, χιτωνάριον, χορδάριον, ψάριον, ώτάριον. Among these, we may single out παιδισκάριον, which has a double suffixation. The fact that 14 new forms are attested for the first time in Middle and New Comedy is quite remarkable compared to the fact that only 21 forms in -άριον are attested in Aristophanes' far larger corpus.²²⁶ This is probably an indication that Middle and New Comedy already document the spreading of -άριον. Like those in -ίδιον, the diminutives in -άριον also attracted the interest of Atticist lexicography.

Ael.Dion. χ 11 (= Eust. in Il. 4.270.2–6): χιτών<ιον>· ὁ ζωστὸς <χιτῶν> καὶ γυναικεῖος. ὁ δὲ ἀνδρεῖος χιτωνίσκος, ὃ τινες ἐπενδύτην, τὸ δὲ βραχὺ χιτωνισκάριον. χιτῶνιον δὲ καὶ χιτωνάριον λεπτὸν ἔνδυμα γυναικεῖον πολυτελές. Μένανδρος (fr. 471)· Ἰελομένη γὰρ ἡτέρα καὶ διαφανές | χιτωνάριον ἔχουσα'. Αἰριστοφάνης (fr. 641)· ἔνδύς τὸ γυναικεῖον τοδὶ χιτῶνιον'. **Phryn. PS 84.22–3**: κυνάριον (Alc.Com. fr. 33) καὶ κυνίδιον· <ἄμφω> δόκιμα. **Phryn. PS 88.4–5**: λίστριον (Ar. fr. 847). τὸ ὑπὸ τῶν πολλῶν καλούμενον κοχλιάριον [. . .]. **Phryn. PS 91.13–4**: ὀψάριον (Ar. fr. 45)· τὸ ὄψον, οὐχὶ τοὺς ἰχθῦς. οἱ δὲ νῦν τοὺς ἰχθῦς <οὔτω> λέγουσιν. **Phryn. PS fr. *197** (= Phot. α 1984): ἀνθρωπάριον· Εὐπολις. 'οὐκ ἐς κόρακας, ἀνθρωπάριον, ἀποφθεῖρη'. **Phryn. Ecl. 147**: παροψὶς τὸ ὄψον, οὐχὶ δὲ τὸ ἀγγεῖον· τοῦτο δὲ τρύβλιον ἢ λεκάριον

225 On the morphology of this form and the presence of the analogical suffix -δάριον, see Petersen (1910, 262).

226 See Pepler (1902, 11–2).

καλοῦσιν. **Phryn. Ecl. 151:** κυνίδιον λέγε. Θεόπομπος δὲ ὁ κωμωδὸς ἅπαξ που (fr. 93) κυνάριον εἶπεν. **Phryn. Ecl. 292:** κοχλιάριον· τοῦτο λίστρον Ἀριστοφάνης ὁ κωμωδοποιὸς λέγει (fr. 847)· καὶ σὺ δὲ οὕτως λέγε. **Phryn. Ecl. 398:** λιθάριον πάνυ φυλάττου λέγειν, λιθίδιον δὲ λέγε. **Antiatt. γ 11:** γυναικάριον· Διοκλῆς Μελίτταις (fr. 11). **Antiatt. γ 34:** γιγγάρια· οἱ αὐληταὶ λέγουσι γένος ὀργάνων. **Antiatt. ζ 6:** ζφδάριον· Ἀλεξίς Λυκίσκῳ (fr. 144). **Antiatt. κ 85:** κλινάρια· οὐ μόνον κλινίδια. Ἀριστοφάνης Δαιταλεῦσιν (fr. 250). **Antiatt. κ 87:** κυνάριον· οὐ μόνον κυνίδιον. Ἀλκαῖος κωμικῶς (fr. 33). **Antiatt. λ 24:** λογάρια· ὑποκοριστικῶς· Ἰογάριά μοι λέγει, Φαίδων <Σωκρατικός> Ζωπύρω (fr. III.A.10 Giannantoni). **Antiatt. μ 41:** μναδάρια· ὑποκοριστικῶς τὰς μνάς. Δίφιλος Βαλανεῖῳ (fr. 21). **Moer. π 62:** παιδάριον καὶ τὸ θυγάτριον Ἀττικοί· παιδάριον μόνως τὸ ἄρρεν Ἑλλήνες. **Moer. σ 20:** σωδάριον Ἐρμυππος (fr. 93) τὸ ὑφ' ἡμῶν σουδάριον. [**Hdn.**] **Philet. 194:** ἀργυροθήκη, τὸ νῦν ἀργεντάριον καλούμενον· παρὰ Διοκλεῖ (fr. 15)· ἔστι δὲ οὗτος τῆς ἀρχαίας κωμωδίας ποιητῆς. [**Hdn.**] **Philet. 216:** ἰπνίνον, ὃ οἱ νῦν μιλιάριον. [**Hdn.**] **Philet. 217:** κοχλιώρυχον, τὸ νῦν κοχλιάριον. [**Hdn.**] **Philet. 226:** ἀλαβαστροθήκην ἔλεγον οἱ ἀρχαῖοι καὶ ὁ Δημοσθένης (19.237)· ὃ οἱ νῦν κελλάριον. [**Hdn.**] **Philet. 283:** παιδισκάριον δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς δούλης· δουλάριον οὐδέποτε ἐπὶ τοῦ ἄρρενος, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τοῦ θήλεος.

The forms in -άριον are more likely to be regarded with suspicion by the Atticists than those in -ίδιον, no doubt because of the very high productivity of the former type in post-Classical Greek.²²⁷ Indeed, while the Atticist lexicographers record and approve of some diminutives in -άριον already attested in 5th-century BCE Greek, which may also occur in Middle and New Comedy (ὄψάριον), some of the forms attested only in Middle and New Comedy attracted special interest from the *Antiatticist*, which probably sought to defend their admissibility against the views of more restrictive Atticists (κωδάριον, λογάριον, μναδάριον). Still, in some cases the Atticist prescriptions correspond to the way these diminutives are used in Middle and New Comedy (παιδισκάριον for female servants in Men. *Mis.* fr. 8.1 and Men. fr. 296.15, as prescribed by the *Philetaerus*; παιδάριον for both male and female children, as in Men. fr. 323.2 and as prescribed by Moeris, not just the male ones).

5.6.3 Suffix -ίσκος

Unlike -ίδιον and -άριον, -ίσκος is an IE suffix.²²⁸ The semantic development of this suffix in Greek has been thoroughly investigated.²²⁹ Besides the diminutive, hypocoristic, and deteriorative uses, -ίσκος also indicated similarity. Due to the existence of the competing and far more productive suffix -ιον, the forms in

²²⁷ See Tribulato (2022f); Tribulato (2022g).

²²⁸ It probably represents the conglomerate of *-is (the zero grade of the comparative suffix *-ies/-ios/-is) and *-ko- (see Petersen 1913, 144). The IE meaning of these formations may have been ‘approximating to the condition designated by the primitive’ (thus Petersen 1913, 145–6, who rightly compares this with the primary meaning of *-ko-), and then each language developed this further.

²²⁹ See Petersen (1913); Chantraine (1933, 405–13).

-ίσκος were probably perceived as less common and therefore more expressive. -ίσκος is unattested in Homer and Aeolic lyric poetry, but it is already documented in the rest of archaic lyric poetry, and it is then quite productive in 5th-century BCE Attic writers. There is ample evidence in Middle and New Comedy.²³⁰

γλαυκίσκος: Arched. fr. 3.1; Damox. fr. 2.18; Bato fr. 5.16; Philem. fr. 82.21. **ιπίσκος:** Crat.Iun. fr. 5; title of one of Alexis' plays, Ἀγωνίς ἢ Ἰπίσκος. **καλαθίσκος:** Men. fr. 497. **καπρίσκος:** Crobyl. fr. 7.2. **κορίσκη:** Timocl. fr. 24.1. **κρείσκος:** Alex. fr. 194.1.²³¹ **κρωμακίσκος:** Antiph. fr. 214.1. **μειρακίσκος:** Alex. fr. 37.2 and 183.7; Men. *Asp.* 128, *Georg.* 4. **νεανίσκος:** Alex. fr. 116.5; Men. *Asp.* 133 and 332, *Dysc.* 39, 414, 792, *Georg.* 69, *Pc.* 9, *Th.* 20, *Fab.Incert.* 54; Theophil. fr. 4.1; title of one of Antiphanes' plays. **ὀβελίσκος:** Anaxipp. fr. 6.1; Euphro fr. 1.32; Sotad. fr. 1.10. **οίνίσκος:** Eub. fr. 129.2. **παιδίσκη:** Anaxil. fr. 22.26; Men. *Asp.* 141, 266, 384, *Her.* 18 and 39, *Her.* fr. 6, fr. 97.3. **πινακίσκος:** Epig. fr. 1.3; Lync. fr. 1.6. **χηνίσκος:** Eub. fr. 14.3. **χιτωνίσκος:** Antiph. fr. 35.3; Apollod. Com. fr. 12; Men. *Sic.* 280.

Most of these forms are already attested in 5th-century BCE writers (mostly, but not only, in comedy): καλαθίσκος, κορίσκη, νεανίσκος, ὀβελίσκος, οίνίσκος, παιδίσκη, πινακίσκος, χιτωνίσκος. One of them, μειρακίσκος, is first attested in the 4th century BCE (Plato). Finally, the remaining six forms are hapaxes, or they are first attested in Middle and New Comedy and then live on in post-Classical Greek: γλαυκίσκος, ιπίσκος,²³² καπρίσκος, κρείσκος, κρωμακίσκος, χηνίσκος. This distribution of the evidence, especially when compared with that of -ίδιον and -άριον, shows that -ίσκος was no longer very productive in 4th-century BCE Attic. This anticipates the fate of -ίσκος in post-Classical times: the suffix is of limited diffusion and productivity in the koine,²³³ where it was productive only in technical texts, specifically with the meaning 'similar to' the base word.²³⁴ The diminutives in -ίσκος are discussed by Atticist lexicography, usually with approval (Moer. χ 34), in relation to issues of semantics (Phryn. *PS* 22.14–5, *Ecl.* 210, Moer. π 56), morphology (Phryn. *Ecl.* 50), or both (Ael.Dion. χ 11).

Ael.Dion. χ 11 (= Eust. in *Il.* 4.270.2–6): χιτών<ιον>· ὁ ζωστὸς <χιτῶν> καὶ γυναικεῖος. ὁ δὲ ἀνδρεῖος χιτωνίσκος, ὃ τινας ἐπενδύτην, τὸ δὲ βραχὺ χιτωνισκάριον. χιτῶνιον δὲ καὶ χιτωνάριον λεπτὸν ἔνδυμα γυναικεῖον πολυτελές. Μένανδρος (fr. 471) ἄελομένη γὰρ ἡτέρα καὶ διαφανές | χιτωνάριον ἔχουσα'. Αἰριστοφάνης (fr. 641) 'ἐνδὺς τὸ γυναικεῖον τοδὶ χιτῶνιον'. **Phryn. PS 22.14–5:** ἀνθρωπίσκος

230 Diminutives of personal names are not included (on these, see Petersen 1913, 189–202; Chantaine 1933, 411–2). They begin to appear in Herodotus and Thucydides and correspond to the normal uses of -ίσκος (i.e. the diminutive/hypocoristic one and that of indicating similarity).

231 On the gender of this specific form and references to the earlier debate on the gender of the forms in -ίσκος, see Arnott (1996, 568 n. 1).

232 This form indicates a head ornament, so -ίσκος indicates similarity (see Petersen 1913, 162).

233 See Maysen (*Gramm.* vol. 1, 3, 44–5); Blass, Debrunner (1976, 90); Watt (2013, 73–4).

234 See Petersen (1913, 155–6, who also provides ample documentation).

φαῦλος· οἶον ὁ ἀπλοῦς καὶ μηδὲν ποικίλον ἔχων. τὸ μέντοι ἀνθρωπίσκος ἐπὶ καταφρονήσεως τίθεται. **Phryn. PS 23.6–7**: ἄπυρον πινακίσκον (Ar. fr. 547)· καινόν, μήπω πυρὶ προσσηνεγμένον. **Phryn. Ecl. 50**: κόριον ἢ κορίδιον ἢ κορίσκη λέγουσιν, τὸ δὲ κοράσιον παράλογον. **Phryn. Ecl. 210**: παιδίσκη· οἱ νῦν ἐπὶ τῆς θεραπαίνης τοῦτο τιθέασιν, οἱ δ' ἀρχαῖοι ἐπὶ τῆς νεάνιδος, οἷς ἀκολουθητέον. **Moer. π 56**: παιδίσκην καὶ τὴν ἐλευθέραν καὶ τὴν δούλην Ἀττικοί· τὴν δούλην μόνον Ἑλληνες. **Moer. χ 34**: χιτωνίσκος χιτών Ἀττικοί· ὑποδύτην καὶ ἐπενδύτην Ἑλληνες. **[Hdn.] Philet. 282**: παιδίσκη ἐπὶ τῆς ἐλευθέρας λέγουσι δὲ οὕτω τὴν νέαν.

C. Verbal morphology

1 Verbal endings

1.1 1st-person plural middle-passive ending -μεσθα

The 1st-person plural ending -μεσθα, common in epic and lyric poetry, is also widely used as a metrically convenient form in 5th-century BCE tragedy and comedy (see Schwyzler 1939, 670). According to the data collected by Willi (2003a, 245), -μεσθα is attested 76 times in Aristophanes. Dunbar (1995, 147) points out that in Old Comedy -μεσθα is mostly parodic or intended to heighten the tone. In Middle and New Comedy, however, where a more colloquial language is used, -μεσθα is mostly avoided.²³⁵

ἀπωλλόμεσθα: Men. fr. 644. **βουλόμεσθα:** Philem. fr. 72.2; Euang. fr. 1.3. **δαιτώμεσθα:** Antiph. fr. 108.1. **εὐφραϊνόμεσθ(α):** Philem. fr. 145.2. **ἠλαττόμεσθ(α):** Philem. fr. 77.3. **ἠθροϊζόμεσθα:** Men. *Asp.* 60. **φεισόμεσθ(α):** Philem. fr. 111.4.

Since -μεσθα does not occur in Attic prose or inscriptions, it is likely that it never belonged to spoken Attic.²³⁶ When -μεσθα is used in Middle and New Comedy, it is not usually to heighten the tone. For example, in Philem. fr. 72 ἀποθανούμεθα occurs twice side by side with βουλόμεσθα, but the two endings seem to be used without any appreciable distinction, metrical convenience excepted. Similarly, in the Euangelus fragment, βουλόμεσθα fits perfectly with a trochaic *metron*. Occasionally, however, -μεσθα may not only be metrically convenient, but also contribute an element of more heightened diction alongside other features. In the opening scene of Menander's *Aspis*, Davus reports the (alleged) circumstances surrounding his master Cleostratus' death. Since Davus' narrative is full of tragic and poetic features, -μεσθα too can be considered an additional element of marked language.

²³⁵ χορταζόμεσθα was restored by Porson in Amphis fr. 28.2, but Kassel, Austin retain the χορταζόμενα of Athenaeus' MS A.

²³⁶ On the rare occurrences in Ptolemaic and Imperial documentary papyri, see Mayser (*Gramm.* vol. 1,2, 92); Gignac (1981, 358). While the only known instance of -μεσθα in Ptolemaic papyri may be explained as an attempt to use a more formal language, the few occurrences of the ending -μεσθα in late-Imperial and Byzantine papyri are more plausibly interpreted as evidence of a new ending formed analogically to -σθε of the 2nd person plural (hence, the Medieval and Modern Greek personal endings -μεσθε(ν)/-μεστε(ν) and -μαστε; see *CGMEMG* vol. 3, 1449–57).

1.2 Optative

1.2.1 ‘Aeolic’ and ‘non-Aeolic’ aorist active optative endings

The ‘Aeolic’ aorist active optative endings $-(\sigma)\epsilon\iota\alpha\varsigma$, $-(\sigma)\epsilon\iota\epsilon(\nu)$, and $-(\sigma)\epsilon\iota\alpha\nu$ were regular in 5th-century BCE Attic (see Willi 2003a, 246). In Middle and New Comedy, the ‘non-Aeolic’ 2nd-person ending $-(\sigma)\alpha\iota\varsigma$ replaces $-(\sigma)\epsilon\iota\alpha\varsigma$, but the ‘Aeolic’ endings $-(\sigma)\epsilon\iota\epsilon(\nu)$ and $-(\sigma)\epsilon\iota\alpha\nu$ still hold their ground. The evidence for the ‘Aeolic’ 3rd-person singular optative ending $-(\sigma)\epsilon\iota\epsilon(\nu)$ in Middle and New Comedy is substantial.

ἀποκναίσειεν: Antiph. fr. 239.2. **ἀποκτείνειεν:** Men. *Epit.* 903. **βοηθήσειεν:** Men. *Dysc.* 620 and 621. **διακόψειεν:** Anaxandr. fr. 42.69. **διαφθείρει(ε):** Diph. fr. 62.3. **εικάσειεν:** Men. *Epit.* 882. **ἐλεήσειε:** Men. *Epit.* 855. **ἐμβλέψειε:** Damox. fr. 3.4. **ἐναύσει(ε):** Diph. fr. 62.3. **ἐπιτρίψειεν:** Timoccl. fr. 1.4. **κατακούσειεν:** Dioxipp. fr. 2.1. **καταστήσειεν:** Alex. fr. 117.5. **κερδάνειε:** Men. *Epit.* 335. **λυπήσειε:** Alex. fr. 244.3. **ὀνομάσειε:** Philem. fr. 95.4. **πνεύσειε:** Alex. fr. 47.1. **στήσειεν:** Men. *Dysc.* 915 and 929. **σώσει(ε):** Diph. fr. 74.4. **σώσειε(ν):** Timoccl. fr. 1.1; Philem. fr. 178.4; Apollod.Com. fr. 14.12; Euphro fr. 4.2. **ὑποκρούσειεν:** Henioch. fr. 5.4. **ὑπομείνειε:** Men. *Dysc.* 368; Aristophon fr. 12.10. **φράσει(ε):** Diph. fr. 62.62.2.

The evidence for the 3rd-person plural ‘Aeolic’ optative $-(\sigma)\epsilon\iota\alpha\nu$ is more limited:

ἀπολέσειαν: Men. *Dysc.* 139, 221, 601, 927. **δράσειαν:** Antiph. fr. 170.2. **ποιήσειαν:** Men. *Dysc.* 313.

The five occurrences of the ‘Aeolic’ 3rd-person plural optative $-(\sigma)\epsilon\iota\alpha\nu$ in Menander are all in oaths, but we should not infer that the ‘Aeolic’ ending was retained only in fixed formulas and expressions as opposed to the ‘non-Aeolic’ ending. In fact, the 3rd-person plural optative is a very rare form to come across: there is not a single example of ‘non-Aeolic’ $-(\sigma)\alpha\iota\epsilon\nu$ in the whole of Middle and New Comedy.

Atticist lexicography regarded the ‘Aeolic’ ending as Attic.²³⁷

Phot. π 997 (**Ael.Dion.** π 46 according to Erbse, **Phryn.** **PS fr.** *348 according to de Borries): ποιήσειςαι καὶ γράψειςαι καὶ ποιήσειςαι καὶ γράψειςαι· Ἄττικοὶ μᾶλλον, οἱ Ἴωνες δὲ οὕτω καὶ ποιήσειςαι καὶ γράψειςαι.

²³⁷ On the use of the ‘Aeolic’ and ‘non-Aeolic’ aorist active optative endings in Atticist writers, see Schmid (*Atticismus* vol. 3, 30–2; vol. 4, 26; 588); Lucarini (2017, 18–9). The fact that the ‘Aeolic’ optative is regularly used in Roman and Byzantine papyri, while it is extremely rare in Ptolemaic papyri (Mayer, *Gramm.* vol. 1, 2, 87–8), may be due to the influence of Atticism (see Gignac 1981, 360).

1.2.2 Analogical extension of -η- in the plural forms of the optative

The plural forms of the optative developed new analogical forms that extended the -η- of the singular forms (see εἶην, εἶης, εἶη) to the plural. The occurrences in 5th-century BCE texts are only a handful (Thuc. 6.11.4 σφαλείμεν and 7.77.7 σωθείητε, Ar. *Ra.* 1448 σωθείμεν: note that Aristophanes uses the same syntagm as Men. fr. 644, also at the end of a iambic trimeter), but then this optative ending becomes increasingly common in a linguistically bolder writer like Antipho (*Tetr.* 1.10 εἶσαν, 2.9 εἶμεν, 4.6 εἶσαν), and then especially in 4th-century BCE prose (*passim* in Xenophon, Lysias, Demosthenes, etc.; in Isocrates only 6.57 μνησθείμεν and 19.16 πεισθείητε). Three instances of the new analogical optative occur in Middle and New Comedy:

σωθείμεν: Men. fr. 644. ἀφείητ(ε): Men. *Per.* 4 and 6.

This development was criticised as being foreign to Attic by (the stricter voices within) Atticist lexicography.

Antiatt. ε 74: εἶσαν· ἀντί τοῦ εἶεν. Ξενοφῶν Ἀπομνημονευμάτων α' (but notice that in the MSS the situation is much more fluid, that is, εἶσαν and εἶεν alternate). *Moer.* β 5: βλαβεῖμεν βλαβεῖτε βλαβεῖεν Ἀττικοί· βλαβεῖμεν βλαβεῖητε βλαβεῖσαν Ἕλληνας.

1.3 The imperfect and perfect 2nd-person singular active endings -θα, -ς, -θας

The 2nd-person singular imperfect ἦσθα, from εἰμί, has the characteristic ending -θα. From ἦσθα, -θα then spread to a few other forms: imperfect ἔφησθα (φημί) and ἦεισθα (εἶμι), perfect οἶσθα (οἶδα), and pluperfect ἠδειςθα (οἶδα). Since the ending -θα only applies to a limited number of verbs and is not very morphologically transparent, there was a strong tendency in Greek to replace this ending with the morphologically more easily recognisable -ς. A case in point is ἦσθα, which in post-Classical Greek typically appears as ἦς (unattested in Classical Attic).²³⁸ Atticist lexicographers were interested in ἦς, which they proscribed, recommending the use of the form ἦσθα instead.²³⁹ This also happens with ἔφης (see Section C.1.3.1), οἶδας (Section C.1.3.2), ἦεις (Section C.1.3.3), and ἦδεις.²⁴⁰ Alterna-

²³⁸ See Mayer (Gramm. vol. 1, 2, 81); Gignac (1981, 403).

²³⁹ Phryn. *Ecl.* 118: ἦς ἐν ἀγορᾷ σόλοικον, λέγε οὖν ἦσθα. ὀρθότερον δὲ χρῶτο ἂν ὁ λέγων ἔαν ἦς ἐν ἀγορᾷ, *Moer.* η 4: ἦσθα Ἀττικοί· ἦς Ἕλληνας.

²⁴⁰ We will not deal with the pluperfect ἠδειςθα > ἦδεις (discussed by Atticist lexicography, see *Moer.* η 1: ἠδειςθα Ἀττικοί· ἦδεις Ἕλληνας), since it is unattested in Middle and New Comedy.

tively, the ending -θα may be re-characterised by the addition of a final -ς, as in the case of οἶσθας and ἦσθας (see Section C.1.3.4).

1.3.1 ἔφης

The evidence for this analogical form in place of ἔφησθα in Middle and New Comedy is limited to one example:

ἔφης: Dion.Com. 2.37.

However, not only is the analogical form ἔφης/φῆς already well documented in Homeric poetry (also in composition), but it also occasionally surfaces in 4th-century BCE Attic prose writers (Pl. *Grg.* 466e.6, X. *Cyr.* 4.1.23).²⁴¹ In post-Classical Greek, this form will then enjoy great popularity, also among Atticising authors.²⁴² These factors also explain the tolerance of ἔφης by Phrynichus.

Phryn. Ecl. 206: ἔφης· ἔστι μὲν παρὰ τοῖς ἀρχαίοις, ἀλλ' ὀλίγον. τὸ δὲ πλεῖον ἔφησθα.

1.3.2 οἶδας

This analogical form occurs two times in Middle and New Comedy:²⁴³

οἶδας: Philem. fr. 45.3; Phoenic. fr. 3.2.

In the perfect, the pressure to replace -θα with -ας must have been particularly strong (i.e. οἶδα, οἶδας like λέλυκα, λέλυκας, πέφηνα, πέφηνας, etc.). The analogical form is initially epic and Ionic.²⁴⁴ Herodotus and the Hippocratic writings both have οἶδας (in *simplicia* and compounds) and the 3rd-person plural οἶδασι in appreciable quantities. According to the current view, these analogical forms only spread in Attic in the 4th century BCE. The first undisputed instances of οἶδας are in Xenophon (*Mem.* 4.6.6) and the Aristotelian corpus (6x in *APr.* and *SE*). Similarly, οἶδαμεν is attested in Antiphon (*Tetr.* 1.3), Xenophon (*An.* 2.4.6),²⁴⁵ and then Demosthenes (21.82, 21.93, and 21.121, i.e. only in *Against Meidias*). οἶδασι first occurs in Xenophon (*Oec.* 20.14). Attic inscriptions are very conservative in this re-

²⁴¹ In Xenophon's passage, ἔφης is transmitted by all manuscripts, but some editors nevertheless restore ἔφησθα (thus Gemoll, Peters 1968 *ad loc.*, while Marchant 1910 vol. 4, *ad loc.* retains ἔφης).

²⁴² See Schmid (*Atticismus* vol. 1, 233; vol. 2, 33; vol. 4, 599).

²⁴³ On the manuscript evidence see Arnott (2002, 203–4).

²⁴⁴ Hom. *Od.* 1.337; *h.Merc.* 456 and 467; Thgn. 1.491 and 1.957; Hippon. fr. *177 West.

²⁴⁵ This is the reading of the manuscripts and is correctly maintained by Hude, Peters (1972, *ad loc.*), while Marchant (1903, *ad loc.*) unnecessarily corrects it to οἶδα.

gard, and there is no evidence for the analogical forms before Roman times.²⁴⁶ In the koine (mostly, though not exclusively, in the lower registers), the analogical forms οἶδας, οἶδαμεν, οἶδατε, and οἶδασι are very common,²⁴⁷ in some cases they are even the standard forms (e.g. in the New Testament).²⁴⁸ The analogical forms are also attested in Atticising writers.²⁴⁹ Finally, the earliest possible Attic occurrence of the analogical forms may be earlier than generally accepted by scholars: in Euripides' *Alcestis*, a play securely dated to 438 BCE, at line 780 we have τὰ θνητὰ πράγματ' † οἶδας † ἦν ἔχει φύσιν.²⁵⁰ Here οἶδας is the reading of the MSS (except L), but the opinions of modern scholars vary. Stevens (1976, 60) plausibly considers it to be early evidence of the penetration of the Ionic form into Attic (see above) and concludes that οἶδας probably coexisted with οἶσθα already in the 5th century BCE.²⁵¹

However early οἶδας may have been attested, Atticist lexicography is critical of such a form anyway.²⁵²

Moer. ι 22: ἴσασιν Ἄττικοί· οἶδασιν κοινόν. **Moer. ο 24:** οἶσθα χωρὶς τοῦ σ Ἄττικοί· οἶδας Ἑλληνας.

1.3.3 ἦεις

The 2nd-person imperfect of εἶμι is ἦεισθα. As part of the same tendency discussed à propos ἦς, ἔφης, and οἶδας, ἦεισθα also developed an analogical 2nd-person form, ἦεις. The only possible occurrence in Middle and New Comedy is in a textually problematic fragment of Antiphanes:

Antiph. fr. 278: φαίνινδα παίζων † ἦεις ἐν Φαινεστίου.

The MSS CE of Athenaeus' epitome, which quotes Antiphanes' fragment (Ath. 1.15a), agree in this reading (i.e. ἦεις). However, ἦεις is unmetrical (the second syl-

²⁴⁶ See Threatte (1996, 570–1).

²⁴⁷ See Mayser (*Gramm.* vol. 1,2, 81); Gignac (1981, 409–11).

²⁴⁸ See Blass, Debrunner (1976, 72). For further examples, see Lobeck (1820, 236–7); Schmid (*Atticismus* vol. 4, 599).

²⁴⁹ See Schmid (*Atticismus* vol. 1, 85 and 232; vol. 3, 13 and 16; vol. 4, 38 and 599).

²⁵⁰ Against the transmitted reading κατοῖδατε in Eur. *Supp.* 1044: φράζετ' εἰ κατεῖδατε, see the discussion by Collard (1975 vol. 2, 376).

²⁵¹ Dale (1954) also retains οἶδας, which is defended even by a 'modern Atticist' like Rutherford (1881, 227). Diggle (1984) cautiously obelises †οἶδας†. L. P. E. Parker (2007) accepts Blaydes' τὰ θνητὰ πράγματ' ἦντιν' οἶσθ' ἔχει φύσιν;, although she points out that the resulting word order is unusual (see L. P. E. Parker 2007, 207–8). Collard (2018, 127) does not take a strong position himself.

²⁵² See further Batisti (forthcoming d).

lable should be short) and has therefore been variously emended.²⁵³ In any case, this form would be perfectly appropriate in 4th-century BCE Attic. Prefixed forms of ἦεις occur in Xenophon (ἀπήεις in *Cyr.* 5.1.25), Demosthenes (διεξήεις in 18.22), Aeschines (περιήεις in 3.164), and Dinarchus (περιήεις in 4.35). ἦεις (in *simplicia* and prefixed forms) is later attested in the high koine (Philo, Plutarch, and Josephus), and also in Atticising writers such as Lucian (8x), Aelius Aristides (1x), and Libanius (13x). It also appears in late-antique and Byzantine writers.

1.3.4 οἶσθας and ἦσθας

The analogical οἶσθας and ἦσθας are part of the tendency to re-characterise the 2nd-person singular ending -θα. Despite their similarities, these forms raise partly different questions.

οἶσθας is attested multiple times in Middle and New Comedy:²⁵⁴

Alex. fr. 15.11: οὐκ οἶσθας, ὦ μακάριε. **Men. *Epit.* 480–1:** τὴν δὲ παῖδ<α γ> ἦτις ἦν | οἶσθας;. **Men. *Mis.* 651:** οἶσθας σὺ τοῦτον;. **Men. fr. 246.5:** οὐδὲν οἶσθας, ἄθλιε. **Men. *Pc.* 152:** οἶσθας] οἶ- [όν ἐ]στιν, οἶμαι (the supplement is Wilamowitz'). **Philem. fr. 45.4–5:** οὐδὲν οὔν | οἶσθας ἀγαθὸν σύγ(ε). **Posidipp. fr. 29.2:** οἶσθας, ὦ βέλτισθ(ε) (οἶσθας is Pierson's correction of transmitted οἶσθα). **Strato fr. 1.26:** Ὀμηρον οὐκ οἶσθας λέγοντα; (according to Athenaeus' text, see Kassel 1974). **Com. *adesp.* fr. 1017.65:** οὐκ οἶσθας.

We know from Choeroboscus that οἶσθας occurred already in Cratinus (fr. 112 (= Choerob. in *Theod. GG* 4,2.111.1–2)). Stevens (1976, 60) claims that it arose from confusion between οἶσθα and οἶδας (see Section C.1.3.2). Although comparison with ἦσθας suggests that οἶσθας may well have developed independently of οἶδας, the existence of οἶδας may have contributed to its spread (see below). In the extant texts, οἶσθας is used either to avoid hiatus or to create a long syllable: it is thus a metrically conditioned variant. Note that Philem. fr. 45 has all three forms οἶσθα, οἶσθας, and οἶδας, all used by the same speaker. Analogical οἶσθας is widely attested in Hellenistic mime (Herod. 2.55) as well as in Hellenistic and later prose.²⁵⁵ In other literary contexts, οἶσθας has been the subject of debate among

²⁵³ See Olson (2021, 246).

²⁵⁴ On the manuscript evidence see Arnott (2002, 203–4).

²⁵⁵ Philodemus Πρὸς τοὺς ἐταίρους 7 Angeli (P.Herc. 1005.col. xviii.14); the Ninus romance, col. A.2.22 and col. A.3.25 in Stephens, Winkler 1995 (note that in the first passage of the Ninus romance οἶσθας occurs before a consonant); Arrian *Epict.* 1.12.26, and also in a metrical oracle quoted by Plutarch (*De Pythiae oraculis* 408a = 41 in Parke, Wormell 1956 vol. 2, where the reading οἶσθας ἄρειον is at variance with οἶδας ἄρειον transmitted by Hdt. 4.157.2 and with οἶδας ἄμεινον transmitted by AP 14.84.1).

ancient critics regarding its (alleged) presence in Homer.²⁵⁶ The form is occasionally attested in documentary papyri and once in a poetic inscription.²⁵⁷ Atticist lexicography admits οἶσθας only as a metrically convenient option.²⁵⁸

Su. ο 173 = Phot. ο 150 (= **Ael.Dion.** ο 11): οἶσθα· ἀντί τοῦ οἶδας. λέγεται [καί] χωρίς τοῦ σ· μετὰ δὲ τοῦ σ ποτὲ ἢ διὰ μέτρον ἢ διὰ τὸ μὴ συγκροῦσαι φωνήεντα (συγκροῦσαι σύμφωνον, οἶσθας *Su.*: συγκροῦσαι τὸ σύμφωνον Phot.). Cf. **Eust. in Od.** 2.90.12–3: Αἴλιος μέντοι Διονύσιος γράφει ὅτι καὶ τὸ οἶσθα καὶ τὸ οἶσθας ἄμφω Ἑλληνικά, καθὰ καὶ ἦσθα καὶ ἦσθας. **Moer.** ο 24: οἶσθα χωρίς τοῦ σ Ἀττικοί· οἶδας Ἑλληνες.

ἦσθας is attested twice in Menander, and a third occurrence is likely:

Men. Epitrr. 373: πονηρὸς ἦσθας. **Men. Pc.** 100: ἦσθας. **Men. Sic.** 129: οὐ δοκεῖς οὐκ ἦσθας ὄς, ὡς ἔοικεν (ἦσθας was suggested by several scholars, the reconstruction of the full line is Sandbach's).

In Middle and New Comedy, the regular form ἦσθα occurs 8x in Menander, and 1x each in Diphilus and Philemon. Like οἶσθας, ἦσθας prevents hiatus, but no case is preserved where it is used to create a long syllable. It is worth stressing that ἦσθας is almost unique to Menander. Unlike οἶσθας, it is unattested in documentary sources.²⁵⁹ This difference is not easily explained. We cannot rule out the possibility that ἦσθας was developed by the analogy with οἶσθας only for metrical convenience.

Aelius Dionysius apparently discussed and admitted ἦσθας, but this may be the result of Eustathius' mistaken summary of his views (see *Eust. in Od.* 2.90.12–3 and *Ael.Dion.* ο 11 (= *Su.* ο 173, Phot. ο 150) quoted above). As with οἶσθας, he may have regarded ἦσθας merely as a metrically convenient option.²⁶⁰

In conclusion, οἶσθας may have been perceived as a compromise between the standard οἶσθα and the increasingly common analogical variant οἶδας. This would have made it possible for οἶσθας to be used with greater freedom already at an early date, as attested by Cratinus' use of it. In turn, the reason why ἦσθας enjoyed

²⁵⁶ See schol. (Ariston.) *Hom. Il.* 1.85e (A).

²⁵⁷ P.Cair.Zen. 2.59207.33 (= TM 852) (Philadelphia, 255–254 BCE); PSI 6.685 (= TM 18950) (from Oxyrhynchus, 324–327 CE); *I.Egypte métriques* 26.1 (= TM 88325) (Antinooupolis, beginning of the 3rd century CE).

²⁵⁸ See further Batisti (forthcoming d).

²⁵⁹ A final occurrence is in Julian's *Commentary on Job* (251.16–7 Hagedorn), where ἦσθας replaces the ἦς of the LXX text (this is just one of several modifications clearly aimed at restoring a more classicising Greek than that of the LXX). Other indirect sources quoting the same passage have ἦσθα instead of ἦσθας, and it would be worth enquiring whether this is an editorial normalisation of ἦσθας.

²⁶⁰ The Homeric scholia also attest that ἦσθας was used to do away with the hiatus ἦσθα ἐνέρτερος in *Hom. Il.* 5.898, see the lemma of schol. (Ariston.) *Hom. Il.* 5.898: καὶ κεν δὴ πάλαι ἦσθας ἐνέρτερος Οὐρανόων (A).

a more limited diffusion may be that there was no disyllabic analogical variant of ἦσθα alongside the ‘mixed’ form. In other words, once the 2nd-person analogical imperfect ἦς was created, the opposition was only between ἦσθα and ἦς,²⁶¹ whereas that between οἶσθα and οἶδας favoured the use of the ‘intermediate’ form οἶσθας. This interpretation gains plausibility when one notes that imperfect ἔφησθα or pluperfect ἤδησθα were later replaced by ἔφης and ἤδεις, while ‘mixed’ forms such as *ἔφησθας and *ἤδησθας are unattested (see Section C.1.3.1).

1.4 (Un)contracted 2nd-person middle-passive imperfect and pluperfect

In the imperfect, the final vowel of the stem of the athematic verbs δύναμαι and ἐπίσ-ταμαι may undergo contraction with the 2nd-person middle-passive ending -(σ)ο (with the result that they end up being treated like thematic verbs). However, as the outcome is not quite morphologically transparent, the uncontracted form is sometimes retained instead. Later comedy provides evidence for either treatment:

Men. Sam. 376: (Δη) τρυφᾶν γὰρ οὐκ ἠπίστασ'. (Χρ) οὐκ ἠπιστάμην;. **Philipp. fr. 16.2:** ἐπειτα φουσᾶν δυστυχῆς οὐκ ἠδύνω;.

As regards ἠπίστασ(ο), the uncontracted form is also attested in Sophocles (*Ai.* 1134; *El.* 394) and will reappear in Imperial and late-antique prose. However, the contracted ἠπίστω is attested in Euripides (*Her.* 344), Xenophon (*HG* 3.4.9), and Plato (*Euthd.* 296d.1–2; *Io.* 531b.9), and then in the Septuagint, Dio Chrysostom, and Christian writers (but overall ἠπίστω is less common than the uncontracted form). As regards δύναμαι, the uncontracted form ἠδύνασσο/ἔδύνασσο²⁶² occurs in the Hippocratic corpus (*Epist.* 16.15) and then in Imperial and late-antique prose (Josephus, Epictetus, Lucian, Marcus Aurelius, Christian writers), while the contracted form ἠδύνω/ἔδύνω is attested in the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes* (4.405), in Xenophon (*An.* 1.6.7; 7.5.5), in a fragment of Antisthenes (fr. 15.11.2, the sole parallel for Philippiades’ fragment for the 2nd-person imperfect with the long augment and contracted ending), and later in Imperial and late-antique Christian writers, but also in a 2nd-century CE private letter whose language and textual cohesion reveal a linguistically skilled writer (BGU 3.892.10 = TM 28104, Hermopolites). We can also compare this with *πρίαμαι, for which the contracted 2nd-person singular indicative aorist is ἐπρίω (see *Ar. V.* 1440 and fr. 209.2; *Thphr. Char.* 30.8),

²⁶¹ See also Moer. η 4: ἦσθα Ἀττικοί· ἦς Ἑλληνας. As already mentioned, ἦς is unattested in Classical Attic texts (see Section C.1.3).

²⁶² For the alternation ἠ-/ἔ- in the augment, see Section C.2.1.

while the uncontracted ἐπρίασο is unattested.²⁶³ Atticist lexicographers similarly recommended the use of the contracted forms over the uncontracted ones. Philip-pides' ἡδύνω is therefore more in line with Attic usage than Menander's ἡπίστασο.

Moer. η 22: ἡδύνω ἡπίστω Ἀττικοί· ἐδύνασο ἐπίστασο Ἑλληνας.

A gloss in the *Antiatticist* similarly attests that Antiphanes used the uncontracted pluperfect 2nd-person middle-passive ἡκρόασο (despite the fact that ἀκροάομαι is thematic):²⁶⁴

Antiph. fr. 93 (= *Antiatt.* η 14): ἡκρόασο· ἀντὶ τοῦ ἡκροῶ. Ἀντιφάνης Ἐπιδαυρ<ι>ω.

This is the only known instance of the uncontracted pluperfect ending in Attic tragedy and comedy (see Lautensach 1896, 26). As in the case of the uncontracted imperfect 2nd-person middle-passive, ἡκρόασο was arguably developed because it was morphologically more transparent than the contracted form ἡκροῶ.

1.5 Imperative

1.5.1 Imperative 2nd-person active ending of the root aorist

The 2nd-person ending -θι is replaced by the creation of new imperatives in -ᾱ by analogy with contracted verbs:

ἀνάβα: Men. fr. 134 (= *Antiatt.* α 99). **ἀπόστα:** Men. fr. 134 (= *Antiatt.* α 99) and fr. 278. **διάβα:** Men. fr. 134 (= *Antiatt.* α 99). **κατάβα:** Men. *Dysc.* 633 and fr. 134 (= *Antiatt.* α 99). **μετάβα:** Alex. fr. 14 (= *Antiatt.* μ 25). **παράστα:** Men. *DE* fr. 3.1 and *Th.* 28.

This development took place because the root aorists end in a vowel, thus exposing them to analogy with the contracted verbs. As pointed out by Tribulato (2014, 20) with reference to the entries in the *Antiatticist*, imperatives of this kind are already well-established in Aristophanes (ἔμβα occurs in *Ra.* 378 and *Ec.* 478, κατάβα in *V.* 979 and 980, πρόβα in *Ach.* 262) and Euripides (ἔμβα occurs in *El.* 113 and 128, ἐπίβα in *Ion* 167, ἔσβα in *Phoen.* 193, πρόβα alongside βᾶθι in *Alc.* 872). It would seem, then, that Middle and New Comedy reflect a development that 'belong[s] in Attic more to the spoken than to the literary language' (Arnott 1996,

²⁶³ This is confirmed by the evidence for the 2nd-person singular imperative aorist πρίω over πρίασο (see Section C.1.5.3).

²⁶⁴ The proparoxytone accent indicates that this form is a pluperfect. The imperfect would be ἡκροᾶσο (*ἔ- + ἀκροά- + -ε(σ)ο).

85; see also Stevens 1976, 63). This type of aorist imperative attracted the interest of ancient erudition beyond the entries in the *Antiatticist* quoted above.²⁶⁵

1.5.2 3rd-person active plural ending -τωσαν

The analogical imperative ending -τωσαν, replacing the earlier -όντων, was created by extension of the 3rd-person plural ending -σαν – which originally belonged to the aorist and later spread to the imperfect of the athematic verbs – to the imperative, where it was added to the 3rd-person singular ending -τω. The same happened in the middle-passive ending -σθων > -σθωσαν.²⁶⁶ The first instances of this analogical imperative in literary texts are ἴτωσαν and ἔστωσαν in Euripides (respectively, *IT* 1480 and *Ion* 1131), and these analogical forms then become increasingly common in 4th-century BCE prose, as documented (to mention the most relevant examples) by Xenophon (20x), Isocrates (1x), Plato (24x in *Laws*), Demosthenes (4x), and Aeschines (9x). The new, analogical ending -τωσαν is attested only once in Middle and New Comedy:

Men. Phasm. 29–30: περιμαζάτωσάν σ' αἱ γυναῖκες ἐν κύκλῳ | καὶ περιθεωσάτωσαν.

Menander's use of the analogical imperative is unsurprising, especially compared to 4th-century BCE Attic literature. This is one of the many areas where literary texts are clearly ahead of the inscriptions in their use of linguistic innovations.²⁶⁷

Atticist lexicographers recommend the older -όντων over the newer -τωσαν.²⁶⁸

²⁶⁵ See Tosi (1994a, 163–4) and especially the doxography compiled by S. Valente (2015b, 109 *ad Antiatt.* α 99). See also Chapter 7, Section 2 n. 12.

²⁶⁶ Rosenkranz (1930, 153) refers to occurrences of the analogical ending in Thucydides, but they are not recorded in the editions by Hude (1898–1901); Jones, Powell (1942); Luschnat (1960); Alberti (1972–2000). However, one occurrence is known from Antiphon (Diels–Kranz 87 B 49: φέρε δὴ καὶ παῖδες γενέσθωσαν).

²⁶⁷ As evidenced by Threatte (1996, 463–4), a mixed imperative -οντώσαν was developed as early as 352/351 BCE (the first occurrence is *IG* 2³.204.47–8). This 'mixed' ending is unattested in literature, but in inscriptions it was still used well into the 3rd century BCE. On the contrary, the endings -έτωσαν (present, thematic aorist) and -άτωσαν (sigmatic aorist), which are very common in 4th-century BCE Attic literature, are first attested in an inscription dating to 300/299 BCE (*IG* 2².1263.44 ἀποτινέτωσαν) and then completely replace -όντων (and also -οντώσαν) during the Hellenistic period.

²⁶⁸ The imperative ending -όντων is regarded as an Atticism (and thus proof that Homer was Athenian) by Homeric scholarship (see schol. (Ariston.) *Hom. Il.* 9.47a: <φευγόντων> ὅτι Ἀττικῶς ἀντὶ τοῦ φευγέτωσαν (A), schol. (V) *Hom. Od.* 1.273f: ἔστων] Ἀττικόν (E) / κατὰ ἀποκοπὴν τῆς -σα- (B), schol. (V (Ariston.)) *Hom. Od.* 1.340a.1: πινόντων' ἀντὶ τοῦ (H) πινέτωσαν (BCEGHJM^aNPVYks), Ἀττικῶς (EGHM¹V), schol. (V (Ariston.?.)) *Hom. Od.* 4.214a: χευάντων' ἐπιχεέτωσαν, Ἀττικῶς (BEM^aNVYsy), schol. *Hom. Od.* 19.599: θέντων] [. . .] ἢ ἑραπαινίδων θέντων κατ' Ἀττικὴν, ἢ θέτων ἀντὶ τοῦ θέτωσαν (H)).

Su. δ 1537 (= **Phryn. PS fr. *302**): δρώντων, ἀντὶ τοῦ δράτῳσαν. χρήσθων, ἀντὶ τοῦ χρήσθωσαν. Ἀττικῶν δέ ἐστιν ἡ σύνταξις, ὡσπερ ποιούντων ἐκεῖνοι, ἀντὶ τοῦ ποιείτῳσαν, φρονούντων, ἀντὶ τοῦ φρονείτῳσαν, καὶ νοούντων, νοεῖτῳσαν (cf. schol. *Ar. Nu.* 439b (RVNMRs) and 453a (ENRs)). **Moer. a 27**: ἀγόντων ἁδόντων Ἀττικοί· ἀγέτῳσαν ἁδέτῳσαν Ἑλληνες.

1.5.3 (Un)contracted 2nd-person middle-passive imperative ending

Already in 5th-century BCE Attic there is evidence for the use of contracted middle-passive imperatives like ἴστω, τίθου, and κάθου. Such forms result from the transformation of these athematic verbs into thematic forms (i.e. ἴστημι > ἰστάω, τίθημι > τίθω, κάθημαι > κάθομαι), which caused the elimination of the intervocalic /s/ of the middle imperative ending -σο (i.e. athematic ἴστασο vs thematic ἴστα(σ)ο > ἴστω, athematic τίθεσο vs thematic τίθε(σ)ο > τίθου, athematic κάθησο vs thematic κάθε(σ)ο > κάθου). In Middle and New Comedy, the evidence for these forms is limited to κάθου:²⁶⁹

κάθου: *Alex. fr.* 226 (= *Antiatt.* κ 1); *Anaxandr. fr.* 14; *Diph. fr.* 8 (= *Antiatt.* κ 1); *Men. Dysc.* 931 and *fr.* 475.

The imperative κάθου already occurs in a fragment of Aristophanes (*fr.* 631), although he normally uses κάθησο (*Ach.* 59; *Ec.* 144, 169, 554; *Pl.* 724). Arnott (1996, 647) concludes that in Attic κάθου ‘was probably a colloquialism, confined so far to comedy’. It should be compared with the 2nd-person singular present indicative κάθη (vs athematic κάθησαι), which, as we know from Atticist sources, Hyperides also used (*fr.* 115 Jensen = *Antiatt.* κ 2). In post-Classical sources κάθου is confined to the lower koine (6x in LXX, 2x in the New Testament),²⁷⁰ and it is also condemned by stricter Atticist lexicographers, while tolerated by Orus.²⁷¹

Moer. κ 49: κάθησο Ἀττικοί· κάθου κοινόν. [**Hdn.**] **Philet. 90**: κάθησο ἐρεῖς, οὐχὶ κάθου. **Orus fr. A 57** (= [Zonar.] 1168.7–8): κάθου καὶ κάθησο, ἄμφω Ἑλληνικά. Ἀριστοφάνης (*fr.* 631)· ‘οὐχ ὅτι γ’ ἐκεῖνος ἔλαχεν. οἰμῶζων κάθου’. [. . .].

Aristophanes and Euripides prefer the older, athematic forms.²⁷² Except for κάθου, the poets of later comedy seem to share this preference (note ἀνίστασο in *Men.*

²⁶⁹ For the other verbs see Lautensach (1918, 84–5; 87–8).

²⁷⁰ See Blass, Debrunner (1976, 73).

²⁷¹ κάθου is indicated as an Atticism by schol. (ex.) *Hom. Il.* 2.191a1: κάθησο· κάθου Ἀττικῶς (T), schol. (ex.) *Hom. Il.* 2.191a2: τοῦτο οἱ Ἀττικοὶ κάθου λέγουσιν (b).

²⁷² See Lautensach (1918, 84–5 and 87–9); Willi (2003a, 247).

Asp. 299 and *Sic.* 363 and ἐπίστασο in *Diph. fr.* 4.1),²⁷³ which will attract the criticism of Atticist lexicography.²⁷⁴

Moer. α 32: ἀνίστω Ἀττικοί· ἀνίστασο Ἑλληνες, **Moer. ε 65:** ἐπίστω Ἀττικοί· ἐπίστασο Ἑλληνες.

These elements make it difficult to agree with Lautensach (1918, 88–9) that later comedy usually favours the more recent contracted forms: the only form for which this is true is κάθου (which, however, is already used by Aristophanes).

1.6 Dual

A dual verb occurs only once in Middle and New Comedy:

Henioch. fr. 5.15: γυναῖκε δ' αὐτάς δύο τaráττετόν τινε.

This highly uncommon case is easily explained, as it is part of a wider Aeschylean reminiscence (see Mastellari 2020, 260).²⁷⁵

2 Augment and reduplication

2.1 Augmented βούλομαι and δύναμαι

In Attic, βούλομαι, δύναμαι, and μέλλω occasionally have an augment ἡ-, which is analogical on ἡθελον.²⁷⁶ In Middle and New Comedy the forms with ἐ- are still

²⁷³ Another occurrence of ἀνίστασο is at least possible in *Men. Sic.* 269 (see Favi 2019b, 84–7).

²⁷⁴ Interestingly, while κάθου was regarded as unacceptable by the Atticists, the contracted forms of ἀνίστημι and ἐπίσταμαι were recommended. Leaving aside the evidence from tragedy (which is usually problematic for the Atticists), these lexicographers were probably guided by the attestations in Aristophanes (ἐξίστω in *Ach.* 617), Ameipsias (ἀνίστω in fr. 31 (Σ^b α 1429 = Phot. α 2009 = *Su.* α 2481, *ex* Σ)), and also Xenophon (ἐπίστω in *HG* 4.1.38, 5.4.33, *Cyr.* 3.2.16, 3.3.32). This preference for the contracted forms is confirmed by other verbs. As regards *πρίαμαι (see Section C.1.4), the more recent contracted aorist imperative (ἀπο)πρίω is the better attested form (*Eup.* fr. 1.2; *Ar. Ach.* 34–5, *Ra.* 1227 and 1235; *Cephisod.* fr. 3.1–3; *Men.* fr. 394.1; note that Epicharmus too uses πρία in fr. 134.4, which means that this was a more widespread development in Greek, not just in Attic), while the older uncontracted form πρίασο is used only by the Theban merchant in Aristophanes' *Acharnians* (870) (on this detail as a means of linguistic characterisation, see Colvin 1999, 218).

²⁷⁵ Poultney (1963, 367–8) discusses cases in Menander in which a plural verb is used where a dual might have been used instead (though with varying degrees of plausibility). For the rare case of dual verbs in Attic inscriptions, see Threatte (2020, 272; 274).

²⁷⁶ See Batisti (forthcoming b).

predominant, and very often they are also metrically guaranteed (see Arnott 2002, 196–7). In rare cases, however, βούλομαι and δύνωμαι have ἦ- instead of ἐ-:

ἦβουλ-: Alex. fr. 263.1 (Athenaeus' MSS CE); *com. adesp.* fr. 1147.31. ἦδύνω: Philipp. fr. 16.

ἦδύνω in Philippides is metrically guaranteed. ἦβουλόμην is first attested in Euripides (*Hel.* 752 and fr. 1132.28, neither metrically guaranteed) and then becomes as common as ἐβουλ- in 4th-century BCE prose. ἦδυνάμην is already metrically guaranteed in *Prometheus Bound* (206: οὐκ ἦδυσνήθην) and is well-attested in 4th-century BCE prose. No instance of ἦμελλ- is known from Middle and New Comedy (the evidence for ἔμελλ- is collected by Arnott 2002, 197). The augment ἦ- is first attested on inscriptions around 350 BCE and then replaces ἐ- completely after 330 BCE (see Threatte 1996, 474). In the Imperial period the forms with ἦ- are favoured by Atticising writers and approved (but apparently not unanimously) by Atticist lexicographers (see Arnott 1996, 733).

Moer. η 5: ἦμελλον ἦβουλόμην ἦδυνάμην ηὔξάμην διὰ τοῦ ἦ· διὰ δὲ τοῦ εἴ· Ἑλληνες. **Philemo (Vindob.) 394.10:** ἐβουλόμην· οὐκ ἦβουλόμην.

Presumably, since ἐ- is the rule in the koine, ἦ-, despite being only partly supported by occurrences in Classical Attic, was favoured because it differed from the koine form.

2.2 Augmented and reduplicated prefixed verbs

2.2.1 Augment before the prefix

Later comedy offers some examples where the augment is added before the prefix:

ἐδιακόνεις: Nicostr. fr. 34; *com. adesp.* fr. 1147.55–6. ἐκάθισαν: Men. fr. 631.5.

In some cases, this development was triggered by analogy, by the need to create morphologically transparent forms, and by the fact that the verb without the prefix is scarcely, if at all, attested. Many of these forms were already standard in 5th-century BCE Attic.²⁷⁷ A case in point are the augmented (and reduplicated) forms of διακονέω, where the augment (or reduplication) appears before the prefix, which are standard in Attic (see esp. δεδιακόνηκεν in *Arched.* fr. 3.1–8),²⁷⁸

²⁷⁷ See Lobeck (1820, 153–4; 155–6); K–B (vol. 2, 35); Chantraine (1961, 313).

²⁷⁸ See Lautensach (1899, 145); Orth (2013, 64). Owing to its formation (διᾶ-, unclear derivation) and the fact that the verbal root is very opaque (see *DELG* s.v. διάκονος; *EDG* s.v. διάκονος), the verb διακονέω was probably not felt as having a prefix (indeed, if it was perceived as a denomi-

whereas forms like *διηκόνουν* belong to the koine.²⁷⁹ As regards *καθίζω*, the earliest instances of the *ἐκάθισα* type are found in Xenophon (*An.* 3.5.17; *Cyr.* 6.1.23), Lysias (49.29), and Aeneas Tacticus (3.10), which makes it likely that *ἐκάθισα* was a ‘New’ Attic feature (but in the imperfect, see already *ἐκαθίζου* in Ar. *V.* 824 and *ἐπεκάθιζεν* in Eur. fr. 102.5).²⁸⁰

2.2.2 Double augment and reduplication

Double augment and double reduplication are not uncommon in literary Attic.²⁸¹ An example in Middle and New Comedy is represented by the imperfect and perfect forms of *παροινέω*:

ἐπαρώνουν: Men. *Pc.* 410. *πεπαρώνηκασι*: Henioch. fr. 5.18. *πεπαρώνηκε*: Men. *Dysc.* 93.

Double-augmented *ἐπαρώνουν*, both in the imperfect and in the aorist, is paralleled in Xenophon (*An.* 5.8.5) and Demosthenes (22.62, 22.63, 23.114, 54.4). The perfect with double reduplication also occurs in Aeschines (2.154) and is approved by Atticist lexicography.

Moer. π 85: *πεπαρώνηκεν Ἀττικοί· παροίνικεν Ἕλληνες.*

No occurrences of the forms with only one augment or reduplication are known in Attic. The forms with a double augment or double reduplication were therefore standard.

A more problematic example of double reduplication is that of *διοικέω*:

nal from *διάκονος*, then the external augment is expected). See especially *Antiatt.* δ 1 and Orus fr. A 6a (= [Zonar.] 213.6–13), who mentions the perfect *δεδιακόνηκα* used by Demosthenes (51.7), Moer. δ 10, where Moeris opposes *δεδιακόνηκα* employed by the users of Attic with *διηκόνηκα* employed by the users of Greek, and Philemo (Laur.) 359, who records *δεδιακόνηκα*. A similar case to *διακονέω* may be made regarding *διαιτάω*, which originally is not a prefixed verb (see *Antiatt.* ε 3). See also Phryn. *Ecl.* 19 proscribing the treatment of *περισσεύω* as a prefixed verb.

²⁷⁹ As regards Alcaeus Comicus, quoted by *Antiatt.* ε 2 (*ἐδιακόνουν· Ἀλκαῖος Ἐνδυμίῳνι* (fr. 13)), Orth (2013, 64) envisages the possibility that Alcaeus’ violation of the Attic norm consisted in his use of *διηκόνουν* instead of *ἐδιακόνουν* (such a hypothesis would be paralleled by Moer. δ 10, see the previous note). But the Atticist doctrines concerning the augmented forms of *διακονέω* are a more complicated case than it appears (see *Antiatt.* ε 2; Moer. δ 21; Batisti forthcoming e).

²⁸⁰ On the contrary, in the case of *κάθημαι* the type *ἐκαθήμην* is already standard in the 5th century BCE (see LSJ s.v. *κάθημαι*). In Attic inscriptions, forms such as *κάθημαι* and *καθιζάνω* regularly have the augment before the prefix, but the evidence is limited and much later (see Threatte 1996, 498).

²⁸¹ See Lobeck (1820, 154); K–B (vol. 2, 35); Lautensach (1899, 159–65). The only double-augmented forms which occur in Attic inscriptions belong to the imperfect of *ἀμφοσβήτω* (*ἡμφοσβήτου*) (see Threatte 1996, 496).

δεδιωκημένα: Antiph. fr. 153 (= *Antiatt.* δ 3). **δεδιωκηκώς:** Men. *Pc.* 82.

Unlike παροινέω, the forms of διοικέω with a regular augment are standard in 5th- and 4th-century BCE Attic (Thucydides, Isocrates, Isaeus, Demosthenes, etc.). Thus, the perfect forms with double reduplication found in Antiphanes and Menander may be an innovative development of later Attic.²⁸²

However, there are exceptions. Although ἐνοχλέω usually has a double augment (i.e. ἠνώχλουν, which is attested in 4th-century BCE prose in Isocrates, Lysias, Xenophon, Demosthenes, Aeschines, etc.), Menander uses the form with only the temporal augment.

ἐνώχλει: Men. *Dysc.* 680.

Atticist lexicography approved instead of the form with the double augment.

Phot. η 200: ἠνείχετο καὶ ἠνώχλει καὶ ἠκηκόει καὶ ἠντιτῖβόλει· κοινὸν τῶν Ἀττικῶν ἰδίωμα.

The closest comparandum in literature is ἐνώχλησεν in Diodorus (19.45.1), but we should point out that the Ptolemaic papyri provide several parallels for the form used by Menander.²⁸³ In this specific case, since ἠνώχλει would have been unmetrical, we may wonder whether for metrical purposes Menander used a form which otherwise belonged to a lower register or was in some way more ‘international’ because it had the standard augment.

Atticist lexicographers recommend the use of double-augmented and double-reduplicated forms over the more regular ones for other verbs as well.

Moer. η 8: ἠνέσχετο Ἀττικοί· ἀνέσχετο Ἕλληνες. Double-augmented verbs were discussed by Orus as part of a larger examination of the use and placing of the augment: **Orus fr. A 6a** (= [Zonar.] 213.6–13, cf. Cramer, *AP* vol. 4, 113.24–31 and 114.8–13): ἀνέωγε χρῆ λέγειν καὶ <***> ἀνέωκται Φερεκράτης <***> (fr. 91): ‘οὐδεις <***> δ’ ἀνέωγέ μοι θύραν’, καὶ ὁ Πλάτων (*Phd.* 59d.5–6): ‘ἀνέωγετο γὰρ οὐ πρῶ’ καὶ ὁ Δημοσθένης (24.208): ‘ἀνέωκται τὸ δεσμοπήριον’ καὶ <***> ἐν Θετταλ(̄) (Men. fr. 170): ‘καὶ τὸ κεράμιον | ἀνέωχας <***>’. τὸ δὲ ἠνοιγε καὶ ἠνοίγετο καὶ ἠνοικται δεινῶς βάρβαρα, οἷς νῦν χρῶνται ἐπιεικῶς ἅπαντες. τὸ δὲ ἀνέωγε δύο σημαίνει, τὸ μὲν οἷον ἀνέωκται, τὸ δ’ οἷον ἀνέωγγνυ. οὐ μὴν ἐν ἅσασί γε τοῖς συνθέτοις τὰς προθέσεις οἱ Ἀττικοὶ φυλάττουσι, ἀλλὰ εἰσιν ἀνώμαλοι καὶ ἐν τούτῳ. ἐπεὶ οὖν πολλῶν ἀναδιπλοῦσι τὰς προθέσεις, λέγουσι γοῦν καὶ ‘δεδιακόνηκα’ (D. 51.7) καὶ ‘δεδιώκηκα’ καὶ ἄλλα τοιαῦτα. καὶ † τῆς ἄνευ † προθέσεως Θουκυδίδης (7.77.2) ‘δεδιήτημαι’ καὶ Δημοσθένης (21.96 καὶ τὴν δίκην ἣν κατεδιήτησεν ἀποδεδητημένην ἀπέφηεν?) ‘καταδεδητημένον τὴν δίκην’ (the double augment or double reduplication).

282 See also δεδιώκηται in Machon 76 Gow and δεδιωκῆσθαι in Philodem. *Περὶ ῥητορικῆς* col. c11a.17; c11a.21.

283 See ἐνωχλ[οῦμην] in P.Cair.Zen. 3.59435.3 (= TM 1075) (provenance unknown, mid-3rd century BCE), ἐνώχλει in P.Cair.Zen. 4.59637.5 (= TM 1268) (provenance unknown, mid-3rd century BCE), ἐνωχλήθη in P.Hamb. 1.27.4 (= TM 2306) (Arsinoites, 250 BCE), ἐνώχληκεν PSI 5.539.4 (= TM 2161) (Arsinoites, mid-3rd century BCE).

plication is standard in the compounds of -αιτάω, see also Thuc. 1.132.2 ἐξεδεδιήτητο and D. 55.31 καὶ νῦν αὐτὸς ἐρήμην μου καταδεδιήτηται τοιαύτην ἐτέραν δίκην) καὶ Νικόστρατος (fr. 34)· ‘εἶπέ μοι τίνι ἐδιακόνεις’. λέγουσι δὲ καὶ ἠγγύησε’ καὶ ‘κατηγγύησεν’ καὶ Εὐριπίδης (fr. 1104) ‘ἐπροξένει’ καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης (fr. 820) ‘ἐπροτίμων’ καὶ Ἡρόδοτος ‘ἐσυνείθικας’. καίτοι οἱ γραμματικοὶ φασιν αἰ προθέσεις οὐκ ἀναδιπλοῦνται (see also Theodoridis *ad* Phot. ε 1847 for the treatment of the augmented verbs with προ-, who also refers to the parallel doctrine contained in the short treatise on the augmented verbs in *Anecdota Graeca* vol. 2, 310.19–20, ed. Bachmann 1828); **Orus fr. A 6b** (= Σ^b α 1338 (= Phot. α 1905, *Su.* α 2282, *ex* Σ’)): ἀνέωγε, οὐχὶ ἤνοιγε, καὶ ἀνέωγετο λέγουσι, καὶ <***> Θρασυλέοντι γ’ ἢ δ’ (Men. fr. 184)· ‘ἦ δ’ ἀνέωγε τὴν θύραν’ <καὶ> Θετταλῆ (Men. fr. 170)· ‘καὶ τὸ κεράμιον | ἀνέωχας· ὄζεις, ἱερόσυλ’, οἴνου πολὺ’. Εὐπολις Πόλεσιν (fr. 236)· ‘ὄν οὐκ ἀνέωξα πώποτ’ ἀνθρώποις ἐγώ’, Φερεκράτης Κραπατάλοις (fr. 91)· ‘οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἐδέχετ’, οὐδ’ ἀνέωγέ μοι θύραν’.

3 Verbal stems and verbal conjugation

3.1 Thematisation of athematic verbs

3.1.1 Thematisation of athematic δίδωμι, τίθημι, ἵημι, and ἴστημι

Already in archaic and Classical times, the athematic verbs δίδωμι, τίθημι, ἵημι, and ἴστημι progressively developed new forms resembling those of the thematic conjugation which arose by analogy with contracted verbs.²⁸⁴ Early evidence of this comes from 5th- and 4th-century BCE Ionic literature (e.g. Herodotus and the *corpus Hippocraticum*). Through Ionic influence, this innovative conjugation of athematic verbs penetrated into Attic, in the first stages presumably at a more colloquial level. The fragments of later comedy testify to the use of thematic presents in place of athematic δίδωμι and ἵημι in the following two cases:

Διδοῦσι: Antiph. fr. 154 (= *Antiatt.* δ 8). **συνιεῖς**: Alex. fr. 129.6; Diph. fr. 31.13.²⁸⁵

The thematic conjugation only becomes a more widely attested development in the koine, where it was fully developed.²⁸⁶

Atticist lexicographers are wary of the thematised forms.²⁸⁷

Phryn. Ecl. 215: διδοῦσιν· ἐν τῷ Περὶ εὐχῆς Φαβωρίνος (fr. 8) οὕτω λέγει, δεόν διδόασιν· τὸ γὰρ διδοῦσιν ἄλλο τι σημαίνει {τὸ δεῖν}. **Phryn. PS 89.4**: μεθιστάναι καὶ ἰσθάναι· οὐχὶ μεθιστάνειαι καὶ

²⁸⁴ See Schwyzer (1939, 687–8). We have already touched upon partly related problems (see Section C.1.4; Section C.1.5.3).

²⁸⁵ The reasons for choosing συνιεῖς over συνίης, which would be metrically equivalent, are discussed by Arnott (1996, 369–70).

²⁸⁶ See Maysen (*Gramm.* vol. 1.2, 122–4); Schwyzer (1939, 688). This is the context where forms such as Modern Greek δίδω, δίδεις originate.

²⁸⁷ See Benuzzi (2024a).

ιστάνειν. **Antiatt. § 8:** διδοῦσιν· οὐ διδάσιν. †Ἀριστοφάνη† (Antiph. fr. 154) Μητροφῶντι. **Moer. ι 17:** ιστάναι Ἀττικοί, ιστάνειν Ἑλληνας.

3.1.2 Thematisation of the verbs in -νυμι in -νύω

The verbs ending in -νυμι develop a new thematic conjugation in -νύω, but athematic forms also survive in Middle and New Comedy.

δείκνυμι: δείκνυσι (Men. fr. 693.2), ὑποδείκνυσιν (Men. *Dysc.* 840), δείκνυται/δείκνυται (Men. *Dysc.* 768 and fr. 339.2), δεικνύντες (Antiph. fr. 234.5). **δεικνύω:** δεικνύω (Men. fr. 607.3), ὑποδεικνύεις (Nicom. fr. 1.1), δεικνύει (Men. fr. 74.2), δεικνύειν (Alex. fr. 110.25). **ἔννυμι:** ἀμφιέννυται (Anaxil. fr. 34.2). **καταγνύω:** καταγνύει (Eub. fr. 107.13). **κεράννυμι:** κεράννυται (Men. *Sam.* 673; Antiph. fr. 24.3; Alex. fr. 53.4), κεραννύναι (Apollod. fr. 5.25). **κεραννύω:** ἐγκεραννύω (Eub. fr. *93.1), κεραννύει (Theophil. fr. 2.2), κεραννύουσιν (Alc.Com. fr. 15.1). **μ(ε)ιγνύω:** μιγνύειν (Damoxy. fr. 2.60). **ᾄλλυμι:** ἐξόλλυσιν (Men. *Pc.* 230), ἀπόλλυται (Men. fr. 64.8), ἀπωλλύμεσθ(α) (Men. fr. 644). **ᾄλλύω:** ἀπολλύει (Men. *Epit.* 437 and 1106, fr. 420.3), ἀπολλύων (Men. fr. 401.3). **ᾄνυμι:** ᾄνυμι (Men. fr. 239.1; Antiph. fr. 185.1), συνᾄνυται (Men. *Sam.* 474). **ᾄνύω:** ᾄνύω (Men. *Col.* 45, *Pc.* 95, fr. *96.1), ᾄνύει (Diph. fr. 101.2), ᾄνυ(ε) (Men. *Sam.* 311), ᾄνύων (Men. fr. 747.1; Alex. fr. 133.8), ἔπομνύουσα (Epicr. fr. 8.2), ᾄνύοντος (Antiph. fr. 237.1), ᾄνύοντι (Amph. fr. 42.1), ᾄνύουσι (Alex. fr. 165.1). **ῥήγνυμι:** διαρρηγνύμενον (Men. fr. 316.2). **σβέννυμι:** σβέννυ (Ephipp. fr. 5.21). **σκεδάννυμι:** δ[ια]σκεδάν[νυται] (Men. *Epit.* 612). **στόρνυμι/στρώννυμι:** στόρνυται (Eub. fr. 132.1), ἐστρώννυτο (Men. *Dysc.* 943).

This process is already attested in late-5th- and early-4th-century BCE Attic prose (5x in Thucydides, 1x in Antiphon, 8x in Andocides, 1x in Pseudo-Xenophon's *Constitution of the Athenians*; these occurrences are collected by Rosenkranz 1930, 152; see also Chapter 4, Section 2.1). La Roche (1893, 155–60) collects a wealth of examples in Classical and post-Classical authors and concludes that the thematic conjugation can occur in any form of the present and imperfect (La Roche 1893, 155). We should point out, however, that the new thematic conjugation is limited to the active forms. As far as Old Comedy is concerned, the only evidence is κώμνύουσι in Pherecr. fr. 152.9 and συμπαραμειγνύων in Ar. *Pl.* 719 (see Willi 2003a, 248). The evidence from Middle and New Comedy is more abundant than in earlier comedy, although compared to the prose instances it seems that in comedy we have no example of the thematic conjugation in the imperfect.

The new thematic conjugation in -νύω generally attracted the criticism of Atticist lexicographers, although some adopted an approach that was more nuanced (and occasionally also tolerant, at least of ‘semi-thematic’ forms).²⁸⁸

²⁸⁸ See Benuzzi (2024b). The entries in Moeris' lexicon envisage a tripartite system where the Old Attic form is δεικνύσι (< *δείκνυ-νσι < *δείκνυ- + -ντι), the late Attic form is δεικνύσσι, and the koine form is thematic δεικνύουσι. However, forms like δεικνύσι are not quite common in Attic, and so the criteria regulating Moeris' doctrine require more careful scrutiny.

Phryn. PS 10.22–3: ἀπολλάσιν· ὡσπερ δεικνύσασι καὶ ὀμνύσασιν. Ἀττικῶς ἀντὶ τοῦ ὀμνύουσι καὶ δεικνύουσι καὶ ἀπολλύουσιν. **Phryn. PS 70.18–21:** ἐπιδείκνυ' τὸ προστακτικὸν Ἀττικῶς, <ἀντὶ> τοῦ ἐπιδείκνυε. τὸ θέμα αὐτοῦ δείκνυμι, ὡσπερ καὶ ὄλλυμι ὄλλυ καὶ τὰ ὅμοια. τὸ δ' ἐπιδείκνυε ἀπὸ τοῦ δεικνύω. **Moer. α 20:** Attic ἀπολλάς vs Greek ἀπολλύων. **Moer. α 43:** Attic ἀπολλάσιν vs Greek ἀπόλλυσιν (but the text of this entry requires re-examination). **Moer. δ 29:** Attic δεικνύσι vs Greek δεικνύουσιν (but note also late Attic δεικνύσασι). **Moer. ζ 1:** Attic ζεύγνυμι vs Greek ζευγνύω. **Moer. ζ 8:** Attic ζευγνύσιν vs Greek ζευγνύουσιν (but note also late Attic ζευγνύσασιν). **Moer. ο 15:** Attic ὀλλάσασιν and ὀμνύσασιν vs Greek ὀλλύουσιν and ὀμνύουσιν. **Moer. ρ 5:** Attic ῥηγνύσασιν vs Greek ῥηγνύουσιν and ῥήσσοσιν. **Philemo (Vindob.) 393.8 = (Laur.) 359:** δείκνυμι ζεύγνυμι· οὐ ζευγνύω. **Philemo (Vindob.) 394.14:** ζεύγνυσι· οὐχὶ ζευγνύει. Σ⁹ α 1887 (= *Su.* α 3427 = Phot. α 2552, ex Σ; this entry was edited as **Ael.Dion. α 160** by Erbse and as **Orus fr. B 36** by Alpers): ἀπολλύειν καὶ ἀπολλύναι, διττῶς λέγουσι. καὶ ἀποδεικνύναι καὶ ἀποδεικνύειν, καὶ πάντα τὰ ὅμοια. **Philemo (Vindob.) 392.5 = (Laur.) 355:** ἀνοιγνύουσι· οὐκ ἀνοίγουσι.

3.2 Aorist

3.2.1 Alphathematic aorist

By analogy with the sigmatic aorist, the thematic aorist developed a form in which -α- replaces the thematic vowels -ε- and -ο-. This process becomes extremely common in post-Classical Greek, but the forms εἶπα and ἤνεγκα are already attested in 5th-century BCE Attic and, indeed, in Homer.²⁸⁹ The precociousness of this development in the case of εἶπα and ἤνεγκα is reflected in the approval of these forms by Atticist lexicography.

Phryn. PS 73.1–3: ἤνεγκον· ἀπὸ τῆς ἐνεγκῶν μετοχῆς, ὡς ἀπὸ τῆς (Bekker: τοῦ cod.) δραμῶν ἔδραμον. τὸ δὲ ἤνεγκα ἀπὸ τῆς ἐνέγκας. ἄμφω μὲν οὖν δόκιμα. **Phryn. PS 63.8–10:** διενέγκειε καὶ διενέγκοι· ἄμφω δόκιμα. ἔστι δὲ τὸ μὲν διενέγκοι ἀπὸ τῆς ὀξυτόνου μετοχῆς, ὡς δραμῶν δράμοι, τὸ δὲ διενέγκειεν ἀπὸ τῆς διενέγκας, ὡς γράψας γράψειεν. Phot. η 198 (= **Ael.Dion. η 10**): ἤνεγκα καὶ ἤνεγκον· ἄμφω λέγουσιν· τὸ μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐνέγκα, τὸ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐνεγκεῖν. Eust. *in Od.* 1.84.22–6: τὸ δὲ ἔειπες, ἔχει τις γράψαι καὶ ἔειπας. φησὶ γὰρ Αἴλιος Διονύσιος (= **Ael.Dion. ε 22**) ὅτι εἶπον καὶ εἶπα, ἀμφοτέρω παρὰ Ἀττικοῖς. μᾶλλον δὲ, τὸ πρότερον. καὶ τὰ προστακτικά δὲ, ἀμφοτέρως, εἶπε καὶ εἶπὸν. ὀξυτόνως. καὶ αἰ μετοχαί, ὁ εἶπὼν καὶ ὁ εἶπας. ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι καθάπερ εἶπον καὶ εἶπα, οὕτω καὶ ἤνεγκα καὶ ἤνεγκον (cf. **Ael.Dion. η 10**). καὶ μᾶλλον τοῦτο. ὡς ὁ κωμικὸς ἐν Λυσιστράτῃ (943)· 'τάλαιν' ἐγώ. τὸ ῥόδιον ἤνεγκον μύρον'. τοῦ δὲ ἐτέρου, χρῆσις παρ' Εὐριπίδῃ (i.e. *Soph. El.* 13)· 'ἤνεγκα κάξέσωσα'.

In turn, Atticist lexicographers proscribed any other alphathematic forms.

Phryn. Ecl. 110: εὐρασθαὶ οὐκ ἔρεῖς προπαροξυτόνως διὰ τοῦ α, ἀλλὰ παροξυτόνως διὰ τοῦ ε εὐρέσθαι. **Phryn. Ecl. 154:** ἀφείλατο· ὅσοι διὰ τοῦ α λέγουσιν, ἀσημιονοῦσιν, δέον διὰ τοῦ ε λέγειν ἀφείλετο· καὶ ἀφειλόμην δεῖ λέγειν διὰ τοῦ ο, ἀλλὰ μὴ διὰ τοῦ α. **Phryn. Ecl. 327:** ἀγαγον· καὶ

²⁸⁹ See Chantraine (2013, 372–3).

τοῦτο, εἰ μὲν μετοχὴν εἶχε τὴν ἀγάγας, ἐν λόγῳ ἄν τιτι ἦν. λεκτέον οὖν ἄγαγε, καὶ γὰρ ἡ μετοχὴ ἀγαγών, ὡς ἄνελε ἀνελών. **Orus fr. A 16a** (= [Zonar.] 357.26–358.7): ἀφείλετο, οὐκ ἀφείλατο, καὶ προεί<λε>το καὶ πάντα τὰ ὅμοια, ἐφ' ὧν καὶ τὸ δεύτερον πρόσωπον διὰ τῆς ου συλλαβῆς καὶ τὸ πρῶτον διὰ τοῦ ο. ἐφ' ὧν δὲ τὸ πρῶτον διὰ τοῦ α, τὸ μὲν δεύτερον διὰ τοῦ ω, τὸ δὲ τρίτον πάλιν διὰ τοῦ α, οἶον· ἐποιήσαμην, ἐποιήσω, ἐποιήσατο· ἐγραψάμην, ἐγράψω, ἐγράψατο. ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν προτέρων· εἰλόμην, εἶλου, εἶλετο· ἠρόμην, ἦρου, ἦρετο. **Orus fr. A 16b** (= Σ^b α 2504 and α 2505, which de Bories edited as **Phryn. PS fr. *287** and **fr. *288** based on the parallel entry in the *Eclogue*): ἀφείλετο καὶ τὰ ὅμοια διὰ τοῦ ε, ἐφ' ὧν τὸ πρῶτον πρόσωπον διὰ τοῦ ο, τὸ δὲ δεύτερον διὰ τῆς ου. ὅτε δὲ τὸ πρῶτον διὰ τοῦ α τότε τὸ δεύτερον διὰ τοῦ ω. ἀφειλόμην διὰ τοῦ ο, τὰ δὲ βάρβαρα διὰ τοῦ α, οἶον ἀφειλάμην καὶ ἀφειλάτο, ὁμοίως καὶ τὸ ἀφείλω. τὸ δὲ ἀνάλογον ἐπὶ πάντων ἐστὶ τῶν ὁμοίων. **Philemo (Laur.) 354**: ἀφείλετο· ἀφείλατο βάρβαρον.

Consequently, we shall discuss alphathematic εἶπα and ἤνεγκα separately from the other forms.

In Middle and New Comedy there is considerable evidence for alphathematic εἶπα and ἤνεγκα.

εἶπα: εἶπα (Men. *Pc.* 128; Alex. fr. 2.3; Athenio fr. 1.38; Euang. fr. 1.1; Philem. fr. 133.1), προσεἶπα (Men. *Dysc.* 106), ὑπέἶπα (Men. *Asp.* 130), εἶπας (Men. *Pc.* 119), ἀντεἶπας (Men. *Dysc.* 877), ὑπέἶπας (Men. *Asp.* 330), ἀντεἶπαιμι (*com. adesp.* fr. 1000.10), εἶπας (Demon. fr. 1.3; Philem. fr. 42.3), προεἶπας (Dion.Com. fr. 2.2), <ὑπ>εἶπας (Men. *Mis.* 54), εἶπον (Men. *Dysc.* 410; Euphro fr. 3.3). **ἤνεγκα**: ἠνέγκατο (restored by Kaibel in Men. fr. 296.11), εἰσηνέγκατο (Athenio fr. 1.29), ἀπενέγκαμι (Alex. fr. 112.6), ἀπενεγκάτω (Nicostr. fr. 19.2), διενεγκάτω (Men. *Ench.* 17), ἔνεγκον (Anaxipp. fr. 8.2), εἰσενέγκας (Demetr. II fr. 1.9), ἐνέγκα[σθαι (Men. *Epit.* 788).

ἤνεγκα is well attested in 5th-century BCE Attic literature.²⁹⁰ As far as the Attic inscriptions are concerned, however, ἤνεγκα is first attested in the 360s (see Threatte 1996, 550–3). With regard to εἶπα, the evidence from 5th-century BCE Attic literature is scantier.²⁹¹ In Aristophanes, the alphathematic forms are limited to the 2nd-person indicative εἶπας and the imperative (23x), while the poets of Middle and New Comedy extend the alphathematic inflection to the 1st person (though see εἶπον in Men. *Dysc.* 410, *Sam.* 489, fr. 447, Nicol. fr. 1.19, ἀπεἶπον in Diph. fr. 31.8), the active and middle participle, and presumably also to the 2nd person of the imperative active (i.e. εἶπον in Men. *Dysc.* 410 and Euphro fr. 3.3; the latter is a difficult passage, see Chapter 4, Section 4.3). There is also an occurrence of the optative ἀντεἶπαιμι in the comic *adespoton* commonly known as the *mulieris oratio* (*com. adesp.* fr. 1000), which is certainly a passage from New Comedy (the isolated use of the alphathematic optative may, but need not, indicate a later date).²⁹² We cannot exclude the possibility that εἶπα was more widespread

²⁹⁰ The evidence from tragedy and comedy is collected by Lautensach (1911a, 101–7).

²⁹¹ An overview of the occurrences in tragedy and comedy is provided by Lautensach (1911a, 107–14).

²⁹² On the authorship see Stama (2017); Bonollo (2017–2018).

in the spoken language than it appears in literary texts. Although it is under-represented in Attic inscriptions from the 5th and 4th centuries BCE, the optative εἶπαι already occurs in an early Classical graffito (see Threatte 1996, 549–50).

The case of ἡϋράμην is different. According to Threatte (1996, 533), ἡϋράμην is more likely a true asigmatic aorist (i.e. like ἔφηναι) rather than an alphathematic one. Despite Threatte's claim, the latter interpretation remains more appealing. The evidence for εϋράμενος in Hes. fr. 235.3 Merkelbach–West, to which Threatte refers, is insufficient: editors of Hesiod do not accept the form on account of its rarity, especially at such an early date as Hesiod's. There are two relevant occurrences in Middle and New Comedy.

ἡϋράμην: ἀνηϋράτο (Timocl. fr. 6.4; Athenaeus' MSS have -ατο, emended into -ετο by Walpole, followed by Kassel, Austin), ἐξηϋράτο (Men. fr. 125.4).

The occurrence in Menander is now generally accepted (Meineke had suggested restoring ἐξηϋρέτο, although Kassel, Austin retain the unanimously transmitted alphathematic form). On the contrary, editors are generally more cautious concerning the possibility that Timocles may already have used the aorist ἀνηϋράτο.

In literary texts outside comedy, the aorist ἡϋράμην only begins to appear in Hellenistic and Imperial koine (LXX 2Es. 4.19 εϋράμεν; 4Ma. 3.14 ἀνεϋράμενοι, often in the New Testament) and then especially in Imperial prose (*passim* in Philo, Josephus, Plutarch, etc.). The earliest occurrences available in documentary sources also date from Roman times.²⁹³ Thus, to accept that Menander used ἐξηϋράτο, we would have to regard it as a very early piece of evidence for the development of the alphathematic form. If we accept this, Timocles too may have used the alphathematic form. However, since the alphathematic ἡϋράμην is hard to find before much later times, the restoration of the expected thematic aorist in all places is perhaps the more balanced option.²⁹⁴

The aorist infinitive ὀσφραῖσθαι (from ὀσφράμην, present ὀσφραίνομαι), in place of the expected thematic form ὀσφρέσθαι (from the thematic aorist ὀσφρόμην), is the transmitted reading of all Athenaeus MSS in Antiphanes (fr. 145.6), but ὀσφρέσθαι was restored by Elmsley and is generally accepted. Although the aorist ὀσφραντο is possibly also attested in Hdt. 1.80.5 (but the editors disagree),²⁹⁵ the

²⁹³ See Gignac (1981, 240); Threatte (1996, 533).

²⁹⁴ For a similar conclusion concerning this and other similar forms, see Lautensach (1911a, 114–5), who also discusses ἐνέπεσαν in Philem. fr. 126.3.

²⁹⁵ Rosén (1987–1997 vol. 1, 53) retains the unanimously transmitted reading ὀσφραντο, while Hude (1927 vol. 1, *ad loc.*) and N. G. Wilson (2015 vol. 1, 48) adopt Krüger's ὀσφροντο.

instances in Attic are very likely to be intrusions of late Greek during the transmission of the text.²⁹⁶

3.2.2 Sigmatic aorists in place of thematic aorists

A new sigmatic aorist ἔλειψα developed in place of the expected ἔλιπον as part of a more general tendency towards more regular forms, documented as early as the 5th century BCE by the use of ἔλεξα in tragedy and Thucydides and by ἄξει in Antiphon (5.46).

λείψας: Antiph. fr. 33 (= *Antiatt.* λ 17).

This new sigmatic aorist is rare, though not unparalleled, in the high koine (see παρελείψαμεν in Plb. 12.15.12 and Str. 6.3.10, παρελείψατε in Gal. *De dignoscendis pulsibus* 8.784.16 Kühn), while it is especially common in papyri and Christian writings.²⁹⁷

Atticist lexicographers proscribe the new sigmatic aorists, which replace the thematic one.

Phryn. Ecl. 250: ἴνα ἀξωσιν οὐ χρὴ λέγειν, ἀλλ' ἴνα ἀγάωσιν. **Phryn. Ecl. 326:** ἐὰν ἄξης οὐδεὶς ἂν φαίη, ἀλλ' ἐὰν ἀγάγης. **Phryn. Ecl. 343:** ἐκλείψας οὐ δόκιμον, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἐκλιπών. **Antiatt. λ 17:** λείψας· ἀντὶ τοῦ λιπών. ἸΑριστοφάνησ' Ἀνδρομέδα (Antiph. fr. 33).

3.2.3 Extension of the κ-suffix to the plural forms of the athematic aorists ἔδωκα, ἔθηκα, and ἤκα

A typical development of the κ-aorists in Greek is the extension of the suffix -κ- from the singular to the plural persons. This kind of analogical development is already well underway in archaic epic and then lyric poetry, but is limited to the 3rd person plural (in Homer, Hesiod, and the *Homeric Hymns* ἔδωκαν/-έδωκαν occurs 6x, ἔθηκαν/-έθηκαν 9x, ἤκαν/ἤκαν 2x). The phenomenon probably originated by analogy with the 3rd person plural of the sigmatic aorist (e.g. ἔλυσαν). In 5th-century BCE texts, these analogical aorists are common in Ionic (the evidence is abundant in Herodotus), where they also begin to occur in the 1st and 2nd person plural. As regards Attic texts, the comparatively high number of occurrences in

²⁹⁶ Kaibel (in Kassel, Austin *PCG* vol. 5, 306 *ad* Eup. fr. 7) also suspected that the reading ὀσφραίνεσθαι in Eupolis (fr. 7, quoted by Prisc. *Ars* 18.252), later also corrected to ὀσφρέσθαι by Elmsley, indicates that Priscian found ὀσφρᾶσθαι. Even if this were the case (which is uncertain), this too may be purely an ancient corruption. See also Lautensach (1911a, 94); Kassel, Austin (*PCG* vol. 5, 306 *ad* Eup. fr. 7).

²⁹⁷ See Reinhold (1898, 75); Gignac (1981, 291–2).

Euripides is probably due to Ionic influence,²⁹⁸ but it should be noted that some traces of these analogical forms are also found in Antiphon (ἐδώκατε in 5.77) and Thucydides (παρήκαν in 4.38.1, ἀφήκαν in 7.19.4), where they should not be emended. In Aristophanes and Old Comedy, the evidence is limited to just two instances, ξυνήκαθ(ε) (*Ach.* 101) and παρέδωκαν (*Ar. Nu.* 968; since this passage is in anapestic tetrameter, the analogical form may be either metrically convenient or, more likely, a poeticism).²⁹⁹ The only documented occurrence of the non-analogical form is ἔδοσαν in Aristophon (fr. 11.9), probably a metrical expedient. The instances in Middle and New Comedy are not many, but they confirm that the analogical forms are increasingly common in 4th-century BCE prose, as for instance in Xenophon (e.g. ἐδώκαμεν/-εδώκαμεν, ἐδώκατε/-εδώκατε, ἔδωκαν/-εδωκαν occur 15x, ἔδωκαν/-εδωκαν alone 10x) and Demosthenes (see, e.g., ἐδώκατε and -εδώκατε in 20.85, 20.86, 20.97, 20.120, 28.8, 57.6, though note that the older forms are still the norm: ἔδομεν/-έδομεν occurs 1x, ἔδοτε/-έδοτε 4x, and ἔδοσαν/-έδοσαν 50x). The fact that the analogical aorists only begin to appear in Attic inscriptions from the mid-4th century BCE is probably due to the conservative nature of epigraphic language.³⁰⁰

δίδομι: ἀπεδώκαμεν (*Alex. fr.* 212.7), ἐδώκατε (*Alex. fr.* 212.5), ἔδωκαν (*Antiph. fr.* 159.8), ἐξεδώκατε (*Men. Fab.Incert.* 51), παρέδωκαν (*Diph. fr.* 31.11). **τίθημι:** ἀνέθηκαν (*Men. fr.* 417.2). **ἴημι:** ἀφήκαθ(ε) (*Men. Pc.* 176).

The occurrences in Middle and New Comedy are part of a general trend that is probably old in spoken Attic and already well-established at least by the last decades of the 5th century BCE (see also Chapter 4, Section 2.1). The fact that the older forms are almost unattested in Middle and New Comedy may well indicate that in 4th-century BCE spoken Attic the analogical forms had (almost) taken over.

3.2.4 Exchange between asigmatic and sigmatic aorist

The asigmatic aorist of γαμέω (ἔγημα) was gradually replaced by an analogical sigmatic form (ἐγάμησα).

Men. fr. 661: ἐγάμησεν ἦν ἐβουλόμην ἐγώ.

²⁹⁸ See Lautensach (1911a, 118–9).

²⁹⁹ See Willi (2003a, 248).

³⁰⁰ See Threatte (1996, 600–2; 604; 615–9).

Menander's fragment is the first and only Classical evidence for the emerging form (and as such it has puzzled scholars, see Kassel, Austin, *PCG* vol. 6,2 *ad loc.*),³⁰¹ which was condemned by Atticist lexicography.

Philemo (Laur.) 358: γῆμαι λέγεται οὐ γαμῆσαι.

The new aorist is amply documented in the koine (LXX, the New Testament, Diodorus, Josephus, Epictetus, Artemidorus, later Christian writers like Clement of Alexandria and Origen, and also papyri and inscriptions) and occasionally also in some Atticist writers (Dio Chrysostom, Lucian).

3.2.5 'Strong' passive aorist in place of 'weak' forms

A fragment of Menander documents the replacement of a 'weak' aorist passive with the corresponding 'strong' one:

Men. *Dysc.* 950: καί τις βραχεῖσα προσπόλων εὐήλικος προσώπου.

The aorist participle βραχεῖσα indicates a person who has been drinking. In Euripides (*El.* 326 μέθη δὲ βρεχθεῖς) and Eubulus (fr. 123.2 βεβρεγμένος) the verb indicates someone who is drunk and loses his sense of shame; similarly, the βραχεῖσα girl in *Dyscolus* overcomes her shyness and dares to dance. The form used by Menander thus overlaps completely in semantics with the instances of ἐβρέχθην. While ἐβρέχθην is attested in Aristophanes, Xenophon, and Demosthenes, ἐβράχην is first attested in early Hippocratic treatises, while in Attic literature it first occurs in this *Dyscolus* passage and in Theophrastus (who alternates it with ἐβρέχθην); ἐβράχην is then abundantly documented in the koine. The spread of the 'strong' aorist ἐβράχην at the expense of the 'weak' aorist ἐβρέχθην may be an Ionic influence.

Even though it is far more common for a 'weak' aorist passive to replace the corresponding 'strong' form (see Willi 2003a, 249 regarding Aristophanes), the case of ἐβρέχθην and ἐβράχην is not isolated.³⁰² The aorist passive participle ὑποταγεῖς in Phryn.Com. fr. 62.2 presupposes the early development of the 'strong' aorist passive ἐτάγην alongside the regular ἐτάχθην, although the first occurrences of ἐτάγη generally point to Hellenistic times.³⁰³ For instance, besides the 'weak' aorist passive ἐβλάφθην (already attested in Thucydides, Sophocles, Anti-

³⁰¹ The fragment *trag. adesp.* fr. *194: ἐγάμησεν Ἑλένη τὸν θεοῖς στυγούμενον must be late: one expects the middle or the passive to go with a feminine subject (see LSJ s.v. I.3).

³⁰² Only a handful of cases are discussed here. See further Lautensach (1911a, 249–67).

³⁰³ On this form and the objections raised by the scholars of Phrynichus Comicus, see Stama (2014, 303–4).

phon, later also in Plato and Demosthenes), in 4th-century BCE texts the ‘strong’ form ἐβλάβην occasionally appears too (X. *HG* 6.5.48, Pl. *Apol.* 38b.2, *Lg.* 769b.6) and will attract the criticism of Atticist lexicography (see below). A similar case is κρύπτω, whose ‘weak’ aorist passive ἐκρύφθην is replaced by ἐκρύβην in the koine.³⁰⁴

This kind of development is also discussed by Atticist lexicographers, who recommend using the ‘weak’ aorist and also take future forms into consideration.

Moer. β 40: βλαφθέντες Ἀττικοί· βλαβέντες Ἕλληνες. **Moer. η 21:** ἠρπάσθη Ἀττικοί· ἠρπάγη Ἕλληνες (this ‘strong’ aorist is not attested in later comedy yet, see *Men. Asp.* 86 ἠρπάσθη and *Men. Sic.* 357 ἄρπασθέν). **Moer. δ 16:** διαλλαγήσομαι <Ἀττικοί> διαλλαγήσομαι <Ἕλληνες>.

3.2.6 Aorist passive in place of aorist middle

The middle voice is recessive, and in post-Classical times it was increasingly replaced by the passive.³⁰⁵ A case that is relevant to the history of Attic is the replacement of the aorist middle of ἀποκρίνομαι and γίγνομαι with the intransitive passive aorist.³⁰⁶

ἀποκρίνομαι: ἀποκριθείς (?), *Men.* fr. 393). **γίγνομαι:** ἐγενήθη (*Philem.* fr. 95.2), γενηθῆς (*Philem.* fr. 167.2).

The Atticist lexicographers’ claim (see below) that ἀπεκρίθην should mean ‘I was separated’, as opposed to ἀπεκρινάμην meaning ‘I answered’, is well exemplified in Classical texts (see Rutherford 1881, 186–8). However, the use of the aorist passive gradually expanded to cover the meaning of the middle, as will be especially common in the koine.³⁰⁷ Rutherford (1881, 188–93) plausibly postulates an analogical spread on the model of deponent verbs, which in the aorist always, or at least from very early on, had an established passive deponent. He then collects ample evidence for other verbs for which the passive progressively gained ground in the aorist at the expense of the middle (though note that he also emphasises the reverse process, whereby the passive ἐδυνήθην was later replaced by the middle ἐδυνησάμην).³⁰⁸ As regards ἀποκρίνω, early evidence of this extension in the use of the aorist passive is provided by Pherecrates (fr. 56.2, for which any attempt to

³⁰⁴ This also developed in a new present κρύβω, condemned by Phryn. *Ecl.* 290.

³⁰⁵ See Lautensach (1911b); Horrocks (2010, 103).

³⁰⁶ We wish to thank Chiara Monaco for sharing her unpublished MA thesis with us, where this subject is discussed in more detail.

³⁰⁷ See Maysen (*Gramm.* vol. 1,2, 157–8); de Foucault (1972, 72); Gignac (1981, 322–4).

³⁰⁸ On the semantics of ἀποκρίνω and other ‘speech act middles’, see Allan (2003, 105–12; 163–5).

emend this reading is pointless)³⁰⁹ and Xenophon (*An.* 2.1.22)³¹⁰ (further evidence in Rutherford 1881, 186–7). We may plausibly conclude that ἀπεκρίθην ‘I answered’ must already have been in use in 5th-century BCE Attic, perhaps at a less formal level. In the case of γίγνομαι, while epigraphic instances are lacking before the 1st century BCE,³¹¹ early evidence of ἐγενήθην in place of ἐγενόμην is provided by Epicharmus (fr. 210 (= *Phryn. Ecl.* 79)), the Hippocratic writings (7x),³¹² Democritus (Diels–Kranz 68 B 299), and Lysias (32.18 and fr. 62 Carey).³¹³ This suggests that the instances in late Attic comedy reflect a wider development in Greek.

Atticist lexicographers proscribe the passive forms, specifying in the case of ἀποκρίνομαι that the passive should be used in the concrete sense of ‘to be separated’ and the middle in the sense of ‘to answer’. The same issue is discussed by the Atticists with regard to the future forms of these verbs (which are unattested in Attic comedy, the only instances in Attic being Pl. *Prm.* 141e.1; 141e.6).³¹⁴

Phryn. Ecl. 78: ἀποκριθῆναι· διττὸν ἀμάρτημα, ἔδει γὰρ λέγειν ἀποκρίνασθαι, καὶ εἰδέναι, ὅτι τὸ διαχωρισθῆναι σημαίνει, ὡσπεροῦν καὶ τὸ ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ, τὸ συγκριθῆναι, <τ> εἰς ἓν καὶ ταυτὸν ἐλθεῖν. εἰδῶς οὖν τοῦτο ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ ἀποδοῦναι τὴν ἐρώτησιν ἀποκρίνασθαι λέγε, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ διαχωρισθῆναι ἀποκριθῆναι. **Phryn. Ecl. 79:** γενηθῆναι· ἀντὶ τοῦ γενέσθαι παρὰ Ἐπιχάρμῳ (fr. 210), καὶ ἔστι Δώριον· ἀλλ’ ὁ ἀττικίζων γενέσθαι λεγέτω. **Antiatt. α 10:** ἀποκριθῆναι· οὐκ ἀποκρίνασθαι. **Σ^b α 1874** (= **Phot. α 2523–4**, ex Σ^γ): ἀποκριθῆναι· ἀποχωρισθῆναι. ἀποκρίνασθαι δὲ τὸ λόγον δοῦναι ἐρωτώμενον. ἀνακρίνειν δὲ τὸ διὰ λόγων ἐρωτᾶν. λέγεται μέντοι που ἀποκρίνεται καὶ τὸ ἀποχωρίζεται. **Phot. α 2526:** ἀποκριθεῖς· ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀποκρινάμενος. Μένανδρος Φανίῳ (fr. 393).

In the case of other verbs, Atticist lexicographers seem to regard the passive forms as standard, possibly as a result of the early affirmation of the passive aorist in place of the middle.³¹⁵

309 See Pellettieri (2024a, 73–4; 75–6).

310 Rutherford (1881, 187–8) rightly compared this with Xenophon’s retention of the archaism ἀμείβομαι: in the aorist Xenophon opts for the passive ἡμειφθην in place of ἡμειψάμην. See also Gautier (1911, 124).

311 See Threatte (1996, 555).

312 See Willi (2008, 149).

313 The authenticity of Lys. 32, the oration against Diogeiton, is extremely likely, and the speech must date to the very last years of the 5th century BCE (see Carey 1989, 204; 208).

314 On the following entries see also Tribulato (2014, 208–9).

315 Evidence of this is the middle aorist διελεξάμην in Aristophanes (fr. 356 (= *Antiatt.* δ 11, *Poll.* 2.125)) vis-à-vis διελέχθην in – to mention but a few writers – Aristophanes (*Nu.* 425), Isocrates, Xenophon, Plato, Demosthenes, and Aeschines and in Attic inscriptions (see Threatte 1996, 557, but the earliest instance is in the early 3rd century BCE). The aorist middle διελεξάμην is thought to have been used as a euphemism for having a sexual relationship with someone, but this very meaning is also attested for διελέχθην, as shown by Ar. *Pl.* 1082 (see Pierson 1759, 121–2 commenting on Moer. δ 44: διαλέγεσθαι καὶ τὸ πλησιάζειν ταῖς γυναιξίν, ὡς Ὑπερείδης (fr. 171 Jensen)). The middle aorist διελεξάμην is likely an archaism, since it is already attested in Homer. See also

Although the occurrences of the passive aorist are marginal compared to the many more occurrences of the middle aorist, that the passive forms ἀπεκρίθην and ἐγενήθην are not isolated early instances of ‘late’ Greek in Middle and New Comedy is shown by the parallel development of other aorist passive forms at the expense of the corresponding aorist middle ones, such as ὠσφράνθην in place of ὠσφρόμην in Philemon and ἀπελογήθην in place of ἀπελογησάμην in Alexis.

Philem. fr. 79.25–6: τοὺς ἤδη νεκρούς, | ὅταν ὄσφρανθῶσι, ποιῶ ζῆν πάλιν. **Alex. fr. 12** (= *Antiatt.* α 111): ἀπολογηθῆναι· ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀπολογήσασθαι. Ἄλεξις Ἀμπελουργῶ.

Earlier evidence for ὠσφράνθην is in the Hippocratic corpus, then in the Aristotelian corpus and in Machon.³¹⁶ As regards ἀπελογήθην, Arnott (1996, 82–3) points out that the only parallels are in Antiphon’s *Tetralogies*, as already discussed by Pollux.

Atticist lexicographers also discuss and proscribe other cases where the future passive replaces the middle in later Greek.

Moer. α 24: ἀπαλλάξεται Ἀττικοί· ἀπαλλαγῆσεται Ἑλληνας. **Moer. α 36:** ἀχθέσεται Ἀττικοί· ἀχθεσθήσεται Ἑλληνας. **Moer. γ 24:** γυμνάσεται Ἀττικοί· γυμνασθήσεται Ἑλληνας. **Moer. τ 16:** τιμήσεται Ἀττικοί· τιμηθήσεται Ἑλληνας. **Orus fr. B 34** (= Σ^b α 1869 = *Su.* α 3367, *Phot.* α 2530, *ex Σ*): ἀποκρινεῖται λέγουσι μάλλον ἢ ἀποκριθήσεται. Μένανδρος Κανηφόρω (fr. 199): ‘ἄ δ’ ἀποκρινεῖται, κἂν ἐγὼ λέγοιμί σοι’. Ὑποβολιμαία (fr. 382): ‘ὡς μηδὲν ἀποκρινουμένω δ’ οὔτω λαλεῖν’.

3.3 Future

3.3.1 Middle future replaced by active future

A fairly large number of Greek verbs which normally occur in the active voice in the present are middle in the future.³¹⁷ In post-Classical times, however, due to the decreasing use of the middle voice, most of these forms begin to be used in the active in the future as well. The following lists collect the available evidence for a selection of high-frequency verbs in Middle and New Comedy, taking into account the evidence for both the middle and the active voice (in order to avoid clutter, we shall not provide a systematic account of the evidence for the prefixed forms).

Phryn. *PS* 65.9: διαλέξασθαι· οὐ μόνον διαλεχθῆναι, which seems to presuppose διελέχθην as the form normally accepted as Attic, although διελεξάμην is also allowed, probably on the basis of its use by Aristophanes. See also Rutherford (1881, 189).

316 See Lautensach (1911a, 248).

317 A list of the more common Greek verbs which have a middle future is in K–B (vol. 2, 244–5). For a theoretical approach to these forms, see Tronci (2017).

ἀκούσομαι: Antiph. fr. 209.2; Men. *Epit.* 238, *Mis.* 684, *Sam.* 521, *Phasm.* 91 (partly restored), fr. 42.
ἄσομαι: Theophil. fr. 7.3. **βοήσομαι:** Men. *Mis.* 721. **γνώσομαι:** Alex. fr. 1.2; Anaxipp. fr. 1.48; Men. *Epit.* 355, *Sam.* 183 and *Sam.* 397, *Phasm.* 10; Philem. fr. 178.15. **διώξομαι:** Men. *Sam.* 198. **δραμοῦμαι:** Men. *Sam.* 202. **εἴσομαι:** Antiph. fr. 57.10; Men. *Epit.* 463, *Ench.* 28, *Pc.* 145, *Sam.* 396; Nicom. fr. 1.7 and 1.20. **καύσομαι:** Men. *Mis.* 621 (partly integrated). **λήξομαι:** Apollod.Com. fr. 19.2. **λήψομαι:** Alex. fr. 129.9 and 132.2; Antiph. fr. 27.13 and 170.3; Euphro fr. 9.13; Men. *Asp.* 185, 355, 370, *Dysc.* 205 and 791, *Epit.* 570 and 1110, *Car.* 38, *Pc.* 205, *Sam.* 569, 586, 599, and 662, fr. 804.16. **μαθήσομαι:** Men. *Asp.* 100. **οἰώξομαι:** Alex. fr. 115.19; Diphil. fr. 42.36; Men. *Asp.* 356, *Epit.* 160, 691, and 1068, *Sam.* 427. **ὄψομαι:** Alex. fr. 53.2 and 115.18; Anaxipp. fr. 1.24 and 2.3; Antiph. fr. 42.5, 175.2, 203.4, and 242.3; Epig. fr. 6.4; Hegesipp. fr. 1.21; Men. *Asp.* 231 and 325, *Dysc.* 46 (integrated), 237, and 879, *Epit.* 469 and 856, *Cith.* 65, *Con.* 12, *Pc.* 61, *Sam.* 391 and 555, *Sic.* 24 (integrated), fr. 86.2, 373.6, 373.7, 744.2, 791.2; Philem. fr. 93.9 and 94.7; Posidipp. fr. 28.6. **πείσομαι** (from *πάσχω*): Alex. fr. 115.6; Men. *Dysc.* 576 and fr. 256.4. **πεσοῦμαι:** Antiph. fr. 57.11. **πίομαι:** Ephipp. fr. 11.3. **πράξομαι:** Antiph. fr. 208.3. **σιωπήσομαι:** Men. fr. 392. **φεύξομαι/φευξοῦμαι:** Men. *Cith.* fr. 3.1. **χωρήσομαι:** Men. *Col.* 117.

Many, but not all, of these forms will then develop an active future in koine texts. In some cases, Middle and New Comedy may provide early evidence of this.

ἄξω: Men. *Asp.* 430, *Pc.* 247, fr. 412.2. **πράξω:** Men. *Cith.* 98 (integrated), *Pc.* 441; Timocl. fr. 8.7. **τέξω** (from *τίκτω*): Men. fr. 404.2 (text uncertain). **ὑπερδραμῶ:** Philetaer. fr. 3.3.

Concerning ἄξω/ἄξομαι and πράξω/πράξομαι, we should point out that Aristophanes too uses the active future. Similarly, Aristophanes alternates between the middle future τέξομαι (*Eq.* 1037 and *Lys* 744) and the active τέξω (*Th.* 509). ὑπερδραμῶ in Philetaerus is a more interesting case. This form is the unanimous reading of the Athenaeus MS, but several scholars have doubted that it may be the correct reading because the active future δραμῶ is a later development.³¹⁸ Still, since no emendation suggested so far has proved more convincing than retaining the transmitted text, it is probably best to regard it as early evidence for the active future δραμῶ, otherwise attested only from koine texts.³¹⁹

Atticist lexicographers, especially Moeris, are particularly keen to point out that for many verbs the correct Attic choice is the middle voice.³²⁰ However, the early evidence for ἄξω, πράξω, and τέξω in Aristophanes does not suggest that we can draw a clear-cut diachronic opposition between the active and middle forms.³²¹

³¹⁸ As far as later comedy is concerned, beside δραμεῖ in Men. *Sam.* 202 (on which see above) one may compare the 2nd-person middle ἐκδραμεῖ in Diphil. fr. 19.3.

³¹⁹ In addition, considering ὑπερβαλῶ at the end of line 2 of the Philetaerus fragment, the innovative form ὑπερδραμῶ may be used because it is functional to the word play.

³²⁰ See also Georgius Lacapenus *Epistula* 8 (67.14–7, commenting on 63.26–7) (ed. by Lindstam 1924): ἀκούσομαι. ἀκούσομαι δεῖ γράφειν τὸν μέλλοντα κατ' Ἀττικοῦς, καὶ οὐκ ἀκούσω. ὡσπερδὴ καὶ θρύψομαι καὶ ἀποκρύψομαι. οὐ μὴν δὲ θρύψω καὶ ἀποκρύψω.

³²¹ For the evidence in papyri see Mayser (*Gramm.* vol. 1,2, 130); Gignac (1981, 321–2).

Moer. α 81: ἄξομαι παθητικῶς Ἀττικοί· ἄξω ἐνεργητικῶς Ἕλληνες. **Moer. α 83:** ἄσεται Ἀττικοί· ἄσει Ἕλληνες. **Moer. β 33:** βιάσεται <Ἀττικοί>· βιάσει <Ἕλληνες>. **Moer. β 36:** βοήσεται Ἀττικοί· βοήσει Ἕλληνες. **Moer. θ 7:** θηράσεται Ἀττικοί· θηράσει Ἕλληνες. **Moer. ο 8:** ὁμοῦμαι ὁμεῖ ὁμεῖται Ἀττικοί· ὁμόσω ὁμόσει Ἕλληνες. **Moer. π 2:** πράξομαι Ἀττικοί· πράξω Ἕλληνες. **Moer. π 3:** πράξε-ται Ἀττικοί· πράξει Ἕλληνες. **Philemo (Laur.) 354:** ἀποφοιτήσομαι (see Thom. Mag. 7.1–4). **Philemo (Vindob.) 392.7 = (Laur.) 355:** ἀπολαύσομαι· οὐκ ἀπολαύσω. **Philemo (Vindob.) 394.34:** θηρεῦσομαι· οὐ θηρεύσω. **P.Oxy. 15.1803.fol. ii.verso.60–9** (= TM 65081) (6th century CE): σιωπή-σομαι ἀντί τοῦ σιω|πήσω καὶ σιωπήσει καὶ | σιωπήσεται ὡς ἐν τῷ πε|ρί τοῦ στεφάνου· ‘κἀγὼ στέρ|ξω καὶ σιωπήσομαι’ (D. 12.112). καὶ | Μένανδρος ἐν Φανίῳ· | ‘σιωπήσ<ε>ι πάλιν ἐν τῷ μέ|ρει’ (Men. fr. 392). κατὰ τ[α]ῦτα δὲ καὶ ἄ|κούσομαι καὶ ἀκούσει καὶ | ἀκούσεται καὶ πηδήσομαι.

3.3.2 ‘Attic’ future

The ‘Attic’ future is of two types. In the verbs with a stem ending in /a/ or /e/ (in some cases after the loss of the final /s/) and in which the preceding syllable is short, the intervocalic /s/ of the suffix -σο-/-σε- disappears and a contraction occurs (καλέσω > καλῶ). In the verbs where the stem ends in /i/, the suffix is -σεο-/-σεε- (as in the ‘Doric’ future), and so /s/ disappears and contraction to -ῶ, -τεῖς, etc. occurs (νομιδ- + -σεω > νομι(σ)έω > νομιῶ). The ‘Attic’ future is still common in Middle and New Comedy.

ἀγωνίζομαι: ἀγωνιῶ (Men. *Mis.* 673), ἀγωνιούμενον (Anaxandr. fr. 16.5). **ἀκκίζομαι:** ἀκκιοῦμαι (Men. *Epit.* 526). **ἀπαμφοιέννυμι:** ἀπαμφοιέ (Men. *Mis.* 765). **ἀπογαλακτίζω:** ἀπογαλακτιέ (Diph. fr. 75.3). **ἀφανίζω:** ἀφανιέεις (Alex. fr. 178.18) (integration by Dobree, revised by Arnott 1996, 533). **βαδίζω:** β[α]διοῦμαι (Men. *Mis.* 573), βαδιέ (Men. *Her.* fr. 7), βαδιέται (Men. *Sic.* 268), βαδιούμεθ(α) (Men. *Dysc.* 408). **γαμέω:** γαμεῖ (Men. *Georg.* 72), γαμεῖν (Men. *Georg.* 117). **δειπνίζω:** δειπνιέ (Diph. fr. 62.4). **διαπτνίζω:** διαπτνιοῦσι (Arched. fr. 3.12). **διατελέω:** διατελεῖς (Diph. fr. 42.2). **καλέω:** παρακαλῶ (Men. *Dysc.* 783), ἀποκαλεῖ (Men. *Dysc.* 366). **κιθαρίζω:** κιθαριέ (Antiph. fr. 139). **κοτταβίζω:** κοτταβιέετε (Antiph. fr. 57.4). **λογίζομαι:** λογιόμαι (Eriph. fr. 2.10). **μάχομαι:** μαχοῦμαι (Men. *Epit.* 551, *Sam.* 605), μαχεῖται (Men. *Dysc.* 355), μαχοῦμεθ(α) (Men. *Pc.* 192) (by analogy with τελέω, see *EDG* s.v. μάχομαι). **νομίζω:** νομιέεις (Crat.Iun. fr. 8.2). **παννυχιζω:** παννυχιόμην (Men. *Dysc.* 858). **πλουτίζω:** πλουτιέ (Timocl. fr. 4.8). **πορίζω:** ποριοῦ[μεν] (Men. *Dysc.* 599). **συνοικίζω:** συνοικιέ (Men. *Asp.* 10).

None of these future forms alternate with the later analogical ones. It thus seems that in later comedy the ‘Attic’ future is still the standard form, which is confirmed by Attic inscriptions.³²² Atticist lexicographers were clearly interested in registering the Attic future as the proper form.

Phryn. PS 54.9–10: βαδιοῦμαι· ἀντί τοῦ ἀπελεύσομαι. **Phryn. PS 97.2–5:** ὀλοκαυτεῖν· ἀπό τοῦ ὀλοκαυτῶ, οὗ ὁ μέλλον ὀλοκαυτήσω. λέγεται καὶ διὰ τοῦ ἰ ὀλοκαυτιζῶ, ἐξ οὗ ὀλοκαυτιῶ ὁ Ἀττικὸς

³²² See Threatte (1996, 526–7). For the evidence in papyri see Maysers (*Gramm.* vol. 1, 2, 128); Gignac (1981, 285–7).

μέλλων, οὗ τὸ ἀπαρέμφατον ὀλοκαυτιεῖν. **Phryn. PS 104.13:** πολεμιῶ· Ἀττικόν· ἀπὸ τοῦ πολεμί-
ζειν. **Antiatt. § 48:** δικᾶν· ἀντὶ τοῦ δικάσειν. Ἡρόδοτος α' (1.97.1)· 'οὐ φησι δικᾶν ἔτι'. **Moer. β 37:**
βαδιοῦμαι βαδιεῖ βαδιεῖται καὶ τὰ ὅμοια Ἀττικοί. **Moer. § 19:** διαβιβῶ Ἀττικοί· διαβιβᾶσω Ἑλ-
ληνες. **Philemo (Vindob.) 395.28:** ὀρθριοῦμαι· οὐκ ὀρθρίσομαι. **[Hdn.] Philet. 230:** τῶν δὲ διὰ
τοῦ -ίζω ῥημάτων τῶν ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβὰς τοὺς μέλλοντας κατὰ περιγραφὴν τοῦ ζ λέγουσιν οἱ
Ἀττικοί· οἷον κομίζω κομιῶ, κιθαρίζω κιθαριῶ, λακωνίζω λακωνιῶ. πρόκειται ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβὰς
διὰ τὸ πρίζω, κτίζω· διὰ τοῦ -ίζω δέ, διὰ τὸ κατάζω, πελάζω καὶ τῶν ὁμοίων· ταῦτα γὰρ ὁμοίως
ἡμῖν προσφέρονται. ἀπὸ μέντοι τοῦ δανείζω, οὐκέτι δανείω λέγουσιν, οὐδὲ δανειοῦμαι, ἀλλὰ δα-
νεῖσω καὶ δανείσομαι. **Orus fr. B 79** (= Phot. θ 117 = Su. θ 242): θεριῶ καὶ κομιῶ καὶ ποριῶ καὶ
ὀριῶ καὶ πάντα τὰ εἰς ζω βαρύτερα καὶ ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβὰς βραχυνόμενον τὸ ἔχοντα, ἐν τῷ μέλ-
λοντι ἄνευ τοῦ σ ἐκφέρουσιν Ἀττικοί· τὰ γοῦν ὀριστικά καὶ ἀπαρέμφοτα· τὰ δὲ ὑποτακτικά οὐδα-
μῶς· σολοικισμὸς γὰρ τὸ 'ἐὰν θεριῶ' καὶ 'ἐὰν κομιῶ'. ἐφ' ὧν δὲ τὸ ἰ ἐκτείνεται, καὶ σὺν τῷ σ ὁ
μέλλων λέγεται χρόνος, καὶ ἐκτεινομένης τῆς παρεσχάτης συλλαβῆς, οἷον· δανείζω, δανείσω, οὐ-
κέτι δὲ τὸ δανειῶ, βάρβαρον οὕτως· ὥστε καὶ τοὺς Ἀθηναίους φασὶν ἀθρόους εἰς ἐκκλησίαν συ-
ναθροισθέντας ἐπὶ τῶν διαδόχων, ἐπειδὴ εἰς ἀπορίαν καθειστήκεσαν χρημάτων, ἔπειτά τις αὐτοῖς
τῶν πλουσίων ὑπισχνεῖτο ἀργύριον, οὕτω πως λέγων, ὅτι 'ἐγὼ ὑμῖν δανειῶ', θορυβεῖν καὶ οὐκ
ἀνέχεσθαι λέγοντος διὰ τὸν βαρβαρισμὸν καὶ οὐδὲ λαβεῖν τὸ ἀργύριον ἐθέλειν· ἕως αἰσθανόμενος
ὁ μέτοικος ἢ καὶ ὑποβαλόντος αὐτῷ τινος ἔφη· 'δανείσω ὑμῖν τοῦτο τὸ ἀργύριον'· τότε δ' ἐπαίνε-
σαι καὶ λαβεῖν. διὰ τοῦτο βαδίσω καὶ βαδιῶ ἀμφοτέρα δόκιμα, ἐπεὶ καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ ἐνεσθηκὸς ἐκα-
τέρως λέγεται καὶ ἐκτεινομένου καὶ συστελλομένου τοῦ ἐν τῇ μέσῃ συλλαβῇ ἰ· οὐκέτι δὲ ἀγορῶ,
οὐδὲ κολῶ· οὐδὲ γὰρ ὅλως τῷ ἰ παραλήγει.

3.3.3 'Doric' future

The 'Doric' future employs the suffix -σε- in place of the simple -σ- before the the-
matic vowel -ε/ο-, producing contracted forms. Only one such form occurs in Mid-
dle and New Comedy, and it is metrically guaranteed:

Men. Cith. fr. 3: εἰ τοὺς ἀδικηθέντας, πάτερ, φευξοῦμεθα, | τίσιν ἂν βοηθήσαιμεν ἄλλοις ραίδως;

The 'Doric' future is common in Attic with φεύγω and its compounds. However,
there is ample evidence in 4th-century BCE Attic prose for the use of 'non-Doric'
sigmatic futures: for instance, Plato alternates between φευξοῦμαι and φεύξομαι.
Consequently, Menander's use of φευξοῦμεθα, in addition to being metrically con-
venient, may not have been a strange choice. It has recently been argued that the
'Doric' future in Attic texts emphasises a more pronounced epistemic modality
than the 'non-Doric' sigmatic future: that is, the 'Doric' future is typically used to
indicate some degree of uncertainty on the part of the speaker about the truth of
the possibility of an event (see Zinzi 2014). In the Menander fragment, φευξοῦμεθα
occurs as part of a question, and so it is consistent with the interpretation of the
'Doric' future as expressing a more nuanced epistemic modality.

We also have examples of the 'non-Doric' sigmatic future, such as the metri-
cally guaranteed κλαύσεται (certain, though partly integrated) in Men. *Mis.* 621
(as opposed to κλαυσοῦμεθα in Ar. *Pax* 1081). It should be noted, however, that in

the case of κλαίω the ‘non-Doric’ sigmatic future is far more common in Attic texts than the ‘Doric’ future.

Atticist lexicographers are wary of the ‘Doric’ futures that have entered the koine, and tend to recommend the corresponding ‘non-Doric’ forms.

Phryn. Ecl. 22: πιούμαι· σὺν τῷ υ λέγων οὐκ ὀρθῶς ἐρεῖς· πίομαι γάρ ἐστι τὸ ἀρχαῖον καὶ πίομενος ἄνευ τοῦ υ. Δίων δὲ ὁ φιλόσοφος σὺν τῷ υ λέγων ἁμαρτάνει. **Moer. π 64:** πίομαι πίθι Ἀττικοί· πιούμαι πίε Ἑλληνας. [**Hdn.] Philet. 276:** πίομαι, οὐχὶ πιούμαι· καὶ τὸ δευτέρον πίη, καὶ τὸ τρίτον πίεται· καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης (*Eq.* 1289)· ‘πίεται ποτηρίου’.

3.3.4 Variation between contracted and/or different types of sigmatic future

Aristophanes and the poets of Old Comedy make use of forms like βαλήσω in place of βαλῶ, δοκήσω in place of δόξω, etc. (see Willi 2003a, 249–50). The fact that βαλῶ, δόξω, and δραμοῦμαι (see also ἔξω and σχήσω) are the only forms attested in Middle and New Comedy suggests that the language of later comedy is more conservative in this respect, in line with the evidence from Attic inscriptions (see Threatte 1996, 524–5).

3.4 Perfect and pluperfect

Goldberg (1996, with a catalogue at 30–57) provides a full list and detailed examination of the perfect forms in Menander’s *corpus*. Readers may wish to consult her study for an exhaustive illustration and assessment of the chronology of each form. Here we shall point out a few select cases.

3.4.1 γέγονα and γεγένημαι

The received perfect of γίγνομαι is γέγονα, whereas γεγένημαι is an innovation also attested in Middle and New Comedy.

Alex. fr. 41.1: γεγένηται. **Antiph. fr. 34.1:** οἱ γεγενημένοι. **Men. Epit. 306:** γεγενημένος. **Men. Col. 2:** γεγενημένος. **Men. Mis. 406:** γεγενημένον. **Men. Sam. 600:** γεγενημένον. **Philem. fr. 109.3:** γεγενημένον.

With the exception of γεγένηται in Alexis,³²³ these occurrences are limited to the participle. Interestingly, all instances of the participle γεγεννημένος occur in the final *metron*. Thus, the older and newer forms γέγονα and γεγένημαι do not simply co-exist in 4th- and 3d-century BCE comedy, as γέγονα is still prevalent. To mention only a few examples, γέγονα occurs respectively 5x in the Alexis fragments (frr. 37.6, 47.4, 113.2, 130.1, 131.1), 8x in Antiphanes (frr. 46.2, 120.8, 120.9, 120.10, 120.12, 121.5, 203.4), 7x in Philemon (frr. 82.4, 94.6, 109.2 (NB γεγεννημένον at line 3), 124.1, 136.1, 140.1), and 70x in Menander's papyrus fragments. The innovative γεγένημαι is already well documented in 5th-century BCE Attic, but it remains far less common than γέγονα. Tragic poets are not quite so open to the use of γεγένημαι (1x in Aesch. *Ch.* 379, but the passage is corrupt, 1x in Soph. fr. 10g.13a/b.9, where the text is lacunose, 2x in Eur. *Alc.* 85 and *Cyc.* 637). In Aristophanes, on the contrary, γεγένημαι is more common than γέγονα (28x vs 11x, see Willi 2003a, 249). It seems that the poets of Middle and New Comedy are very much in line with the koine in preferring γέγονα over γεγένημαι.³²⁴ This may also explain why Atticist lexicography does not seem to have any special interest in the innovative γεγένημαι.

3.4.2 μεμάνημαι

γεγένημαι may have been the model for the creation of a new analogical form, μεμάνημαι.

μεμάνηται(αι): Men. *Epit.* 879.

μεμάνημαι replaced μέμηνα, the older perfect of μαίνομαι. Apart from the *Epitrepontes* line, the evidence is very slim, limited to a handful of mostly post-Classical occurrences (these include prefixed forms): Theocritus (10.31), the Sibylline oracles (1.172, 3.39, 11.317, fr. 3.40 Geffcken (= Theophilus *Ad Autolyicum* 2.36)), Cyrillus (*Gla-phyra in Pentatheucum* MPG 69.289.39).

3.4.3 ἀπέκτονα and ἀπέκταγκα

Already in Classical Attic ἀποκτείνω developed a new perfect ἀπέκταγκα replacing the older form ἀπέκτονα.

Men. *Mis.* fr. 13 (= Orus fr. B 35 (= Σ^b α 1872 = Su. α 3372, ex Σ')): † πάτερ μὲν Θράσωνι, ἀπεκτάγκασι δ' οὐ.

³²³ In place of Sudhaus' γεγένηται in Men. *Pc.* 347, Cartlidge (2022, 25–6) now rightly suggests πεπόηται, based on the consideration that γεγένηται would be the only finite form of γεγένημαι used by Menander (otherwise only γεγεννημένος, see above).

³²⁴ See de Foucault (1972, 76) on Polybius' strong preference for γέγονα.

This new form probably arose by analogy with the thematic aorist ἀπέκτανον. The new perfect is also attested in Aristotle (*Pol.* 1324b.16 and 1324b.18), and it is occasionally found in koine texts (Plb. 3.86.11, 3x in LXX, Diod. 4.55.4 and 14.47.2).

Atticist lexicography disapproved of ἀπέκταγα.³²⁵

Moer. α 70: ἀπέκτονεν Ἀττικοί· ἀπέκταγεν Ἑλληνες. **Orus fr. B 35** (= Σ^β α 1872 = *Su.* α 3372, ex Σ): ἀποκτίννυσι λέγουσι μάλλον ἢ ἀποκτιννύει. Κρατίνος Βουκόλοις (fr. 17): 'καὶ πρὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν σκιαμαχῶν ἀποκτίννυσι ταῖς ἀπειλαῖς'. καὶ ἀπεκτόνασιν, οὐκ ἀπεκτάγκασιν. <***> Μισομένω (fr. 13): 'πάτερ μὲν Θράσωνι, ἀπεκτόνασι δ' οὐ'.

3.4.4 'Strong' perfects in place of 'weak' perfects

In late 5th century BCE and then especially in 4th century BCE, comedy provides evidence for the creation of new 'strong' perfects replacing earlier 'weak' perfects of the verbs ἀριστάω (ἠρίστηκα) and δειπνάω (δεδείπνηκα).

ἀριστάω: ἠρίσταμεν (Ar. fr. 513; Theopomp.Com. fr. 23), ἠριστάναι (Hermipp. fr. 60). **δειπνάω:** δεδείπναμεν (Alex. fr. 114; Eub. fr. 90), δεδείπνάναι (Ar. fr. 260 and 480.2; Pl.Com. fr. 157 = *Antiatt.* δ 32; Antiph. fr. 141.1; Eub. fr. 91, Epicr. fr. 1.1).

These forms (which attracted the attention of ancient scholarship, see *Antiatt.* δ 32, Ath. 10.422e, Phot. η 250) alternate with the 'weak' perfect forms according to metrical convenience. Although there seems to be a greater tendency to use these innovative forms in Middle and New Comedy than in Old Comedy, their comparative rarity justifies the suspicion that they are Attic colloquialisms (see Arnott 1996, 308, with further references).

3.4.5 Aspirated perfects

An innovative feature of the Greek perfect is the development of new aspirated forms for the verb stems ending in a velar or labial consonant. This development most probably occurred under the influence of the 2nd-person middle, where the aspirated stop is the standard outcome of the encounter between the velar or labial stem and the ending -σθε. This phenomenon is generally regarded as being peculiar to Ionic and Attic, although the matter is more complicated than it is generally assumed (see Cassio 2017). Be that as it may, the Attic evidence for the aspirated perfects usually dates starting from the 5th century BCE and then becomes more substantial in the 4th century BCE, as is also attested by Middle and New Comedy.

³²⁵ See further Batisti (2024b).

ἀλλάσσω: ἀπήλλαχα (Men. *Epit.* 416), διήλλαχεν (Dion.Com. fr. 2.10). **ἀνοίγνυμι:** ἀνέωχας (Men. fr. 170). **δείκνυμι:** δέδειχα (Men. *Mis.* 590), ἀποδέδειχα (Alex. fr. 263.14), δέδειχεν (Alex. fr. 270.1), ἀποδέδειχεν (Diph. fr. 73.3). **πλήσσω:** πέπληχε(ν) (Men. *Dysc.* 188, *Epit.* 906, *Sam.* 301, 367, 555). **πέμπω:** πέπομφα (Men. *Dysc.* 72), πέπομφε (Men. *Pc.* 164), ἀποπέπομφεν (Men. *Asp.* 313), ἐκπέπομφε (Men. *Pc.* 58). **πράσσω:** πεπραχότες (Men. fr. 710.2). **τρίβω:** συντέτριφεν (Eub. fr. 62.2).

Most of these perfects are widely paralleled in 5th- and 4th-century BCE Attic authors. Others deserve closer examination.

ἀνέωχα is rare indeed. Actually, Men. fr. 170 is the only certain occurrence of this aspirated perfect, besides ἀνεωχότα in the Pseudo-Demosthenic oration *Against Phaenippus* (42.30). The exceptionality of this form explains why, despite the general lack of interest in the aspirated perfect in Atticist lexicography, ancient scholars are keen to record Menander's ἀνέωχας (see Orus fr. A 6a and Orus fr. A 6b, discussed above at Section C.2.2.2).³²⁶

Menander's use of the aspirated perfect πέπληχα is the earliest available evidence for the existence of such a form. In earlier poetic texts, the unaspirated form is common (e.g. in the *Iliad*), which is also the rule in post-Classical prose (though note πεπληχότος in I. *AI* 4.277). It is more difficult to decide what the standard form was in Classical times. The evidence from Menander points to his using the aspirated perfect. The only other relevant passage, X. *An.* 6.1.6 τέλος δὲ ὁ ἕτερος τὸν ἕτερον παίει, ὡς πᾶσιν ἐδόκει πεπληγέναι τὸν ἄνδρα· ὁ δ' ἔπεσε τεχνικῶς πωρ, is uncertain.³²⁷ The manuscripts and the indirect transmission are divided between πεπληγέναι (MSS CBA, the Parisine family; also Ath. 1.15e) and πεπληχέναι (MSS FM, the Italian family).³²⁸ The value of the two families of manuscripts for the reconstruction of the text is basically the same, but editors usually choose the πεπληγέναι of the Parisine family (see Masqueray 1930–1931 vol. 2, *ad loc.* and Hude, Peters 1972, *ad loc.*). However, comparing the other 4th-century BCE occurrences in Menander and considering that πεπληγέναι may well have been an obvious normalisation (the aspirated perfect occurs only once in post-Classical Greek), we may wonder whether the πεπληχέναι of the Italian family should not be reconsidered. Note that the verb must be transitive, which might further support πεπληχέναι.

³²⁶ The instance of ἀνέωγε in Men. fr. 184 is more likely a transitive imperfect than a transitive unaspirated perfect (see Schwyzler 1939, 772 on the distinction between intransitive unaspirated perfects and transitive aspirated perfects). See Orth (2013, 265–6) concerning the possible instance of the active intransitive unaspirated perfect of ἀνοίγω/ἀνοίγνυμι in Amips. fr. 13 (Σ^b α 1339, Phot. α 1906, Su. α 2282). This use of the unaspirated perfect ἀνέωγα is proscribed by Phryn. *Ecl.* 128 (see also Luc. *Sol.* 8.7–13).

³²⁷ Marchant (1903, *ad loc.*) suggested removing πεπληγέναι τὸν ἄνδρα, but the editors correctly retain it.

³²⁸ On the two families see Masqueray (1930–1931 vol. 1, 30–5); Hude, Peters (1972, IX–XI).

As regards *πεπραχότες*, the unaspirated intransitive *πέπραγα* is standard in 5th-century BCE Attic.³²⁹ The new transitive aspirated perfect *πέπραχα* is very common in 4th-century BCE Attic and is attested in Xenophon (6x, 1x unaspirated),³³⁰ Demosthenes (1x),³³¹ Dinarchus (1x),³³² and in the Aristotelian corpus (10x),³³³ but notice the intransitive *πεπραγέναι* in Plato (*R.* 603c.7).

3.4.6 Participle *έστώς* vs *έστηκώς*

The older perfect *έστώς* is well-attested in later comedy.

έστώς: Antiph. fr. 194.21; Eub. fr. 71.2. *παρεστώς*: Men. *Dysc.* 676. *έφεστώς*: Damox. fr. 2.59. *έστῶσα*: Men. *Pc.* 40). *έστῶσας*: Eub. fr. 67.5 and 82.4.

The newer participle *έστηκώς* occurs 6x (Amphis fr. 3.3 *έστηκώς*, Alex. fr. 131.16 *έστηκότας*, Men. *Pc.* 291 *συνεστηκώς*, Sic. 222 *έστηκότας*, and Philem. fr. 138.1 *καθεστηκώς*). In Old Comedy the older and the newer forms co-exist, but the older one is still more clearly predominant (see Willi 2003a, 249 on Aristophanes). The evidence collected above may indicate that, although the older form is still used for metrical purposes, the newer participle is progressively becoming the standard one (4x *έστώς*-type in Middle Comedy, 3x in New Comedy; 2x *έστηκώς*-type in Middle Comedy, 4x in New Comedy).

3.4.7 Pluperfect: generalisation of *-ει-* in the indicative active

The original endings of the pluperfect active are *-η* (< *-εα*), *-ης* (< *-εας*), *-ει* (< *-εε*), *-εμεν* (< *-εμεν*), *-ετε* (< *-ετε*), *-εσαν* (< *-εσαν*). Later Attic (and then the koine) extended the 3rd-person ending *-ει* to the rest of the conjugation as though it were a suffix, which led to the creation of the endings *-ειν*, *-εις*, *-ει*, *-ειμεν*, *-ειτε*, *-εισαν*.³³⁴ One example of these new pluperfect endings occurs in Menander:

³²⁹ For Aristophanes, see *Eq.* 683 *πέπραγας*, *Pax* 1255 *πεπράγαμεν*, *Lys.* 462 *πέπραγε*, *Ra.* 302 *πεπράγαμεν*, *Pl.* 629 *πεπράγατε*, *Pl.* 633 *πέπραγεν*. The aspirated perfect *πέπραχε* is the transmitted reading in Pl.Com. fr. 203.1, where Kassel, Austin adopt Meineke's *πέπραγε*. The pluperfect *έπεπράγεσαν* occurs in Thuc. 2.4.8 and 7.24.1. See also Phryn. *PS* 103.12–3: *πέπραγεν· δια τῷ γ, προκρίνουσι τοῦ πέπραχεν* and Moer. π 5 *πεπραγός ἐν τῷ γ Ἀττικοί· πεπραχός Ἑλληνας*.

³³⁰ See *HG* 5.2.32 *έπεπράχει*, 5.2.32 *πεπραχός*, *An.* 5.7.29 *διαπεπράχασιν*, *Cyr.* 3.1.15 *πέπραχε*, 5.5.14 *πεπραχός*, 7.5.42 *καταπεπραχένα*. Unaspirated *HG* 1.4.3 *πεπραχότες*.

³³¹ See 19.17 *πεπραχότων*.

³³² See 6.21 *πεπραχότων*.

³³³ See Arist. *EN* 1110b.21 *πέπραχεν*, 1111a.17 *πεπραχένα*, *Pol.* 1274b.35 *πεπραχένα*, *Rh.* 1367b.24 *πεπραχότα*, 1374a.1 *πεπραχένα*, 1392b.19 *πέπραχε*, 1400a.38 *πέπραχε*, 1400b.1 *πέπραχεν*, *Pr.* 951b.36 *πεπραχένα*, *Div. Somn.* 463a.24 *πεπραχότες*.

³³⁴ See Schwyzler (1939, 776; 778).

Men. fr. 206 (= *Antiatt.* ε 117): ἐπεπτώκειμεν.

As parallel evidence, K–B (vol. 2, 65) mention ἀπωλώλαιτε, ἐδεδώκειμεν, and ἦδειτε in Demosthenes (18.49, 37.12, and 58.9), and we may add ἦδειμεν in Aeschines (3.82). As counter-examples, we should mention the metrically guaranteed instances of the 1st person plural in -εμεν in Men. fr. 391: πότων τε καὶ κώμων ἅπαντες ἦδεμεν and the 3rd person plural in -εσαν in Men. *Asp.* 26: ἐπεφεύγεσαν and Men. fr. 395.2: Πέρσαι δ' ἔχοντες μυιοσόβας ἐστήκεσαν. The new forms predominate in the koine.³³⁵ Strict Atticist lexicographers recommended the use of the earlier forms.

***Antiatt.* ε 117:** ἐπεπτώκειμεν· Μένανδρος Καταψευδομένω (fr. 206). **Moer. η 3:** ἦδη Ἀττικοί· ἦδειν Ἑλληνες.³³⁶

But this development is not strictly limited to 4th-century BCE Attic or even to the koine. Some early evidence can be found in the Hippocratic writings (*Epid.* 2.4.2 ἐξεπεφύκεισαν). More importantly, the *Antiatticist* tells us that Eupolis used ἐλελήθεισαν.

***Antiatt.* ε 7:** ἐλελήθεισαν· μετὰ τῆς † θα †. Εὐπολις Αἰξίν (fr. 28).

This information has raised considerable doubts. Kock tried to defend ἐλελήθεισαν on the grounds that it is prosodically more convenient than ἐλελήθεσαν in anapests, but it is unclear why, if this is the case, we do not have more examples of the newer form. In fact, Meineke concluded that Eupolis' text used by the (source of the) *Antiatticist* was corrupt.³³⁷ Although scepticism is healthy when dealing with such problematic evidence, the objections raised against ἐλελήθεισαν in Eupolis are not particularly convincing. The assumption that the *Antiatticist* used a corrupt text is unverifiable and thus remains purely speculative; moreover, the fact that ἐλελήθεισαν is isolated does not make it impossible. In addition, Tribulato (2014, 208) mentions ἐδεδοίκες (in place of the expected but unattested *ἐδεδοίκης < *ἐδεδοίκε-ας), which occurs in Aristophanes' *Plutus* 684. The use of this new pluperfect is certainly part of the distinctive trend in the *Plutus* to adopt more colloquial language (see Chapter 4, Section 5.2).

With the unsurprising exception of the *Antiatticist* (see above), these newer pluperfects are condemned by Atticist lexicographers.

³³⁵ See de Foucault (1972, 76) on Polybius; Mayser (*Gramm.* vol. 1,2, 85 and n. 1) and Gignac (1981, 356) on the papyri.

³³⁶ Parallel sources are collected by D. U. Hansen (1998, *ad loc.*).

³³⁷ See further Olson (2017, 148) with bibliography.

Phryn. Ecl. 119: ἠκηκόεσαν, ἐγεγράφεσαν, ἐπεποιήκεσαν, ἐνενοήκεσαν ἐρεῖς, ἀλλ' οὐ σὺν τῷ ι, ἠκηκόεισαν. **Antiatt. ε 7:** ἐλελήθεισαν· μετὰ τῆς † θ α †. Εὐπολις Αἰξίν (fr. 28). **Phot. ε 1427:** ἐπεπόνθη· ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐπεπόνθειν. καὶ ἐωράκη καὶ ἦδη, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἦδειν καὶ ἐωράκειν. **Phot. ε 2530:** ἐωράκη· τὸ πρῶτον πρόσωπον, ὡς ἐπεπόνθη καὶ ἐπεποιήκη καὶ ἦδη, τὸ ἦδειν· Πλάτων τοῖς τοιοῦτοῖς χρῆται σχηματισμοῖς.

Even modern scholars are wary of including them in their editions of Classical Attic writers.³³⁸ Indeed, K–B (vol. 2, 65) even claim that since the newer forms of the pluperfect did not completely eclipse the older ones in 4th-century BCE Attic (as shown by the metrically guaranteed ἦδεμεν in Men. fr. 391, see above), in Demosthenes the instances of ἀπωλώλιτε (18.49), ἐδεδώκειμεν (37.12), εἰώθειμεν (54.3), and ἦδειτε (55.9) should be emended.³³⁹ The editors of Demosthenes, however, correctly retain the transmitted readings.

4 Notable cases: a (very partial) selection

The following sections are devoted to individual verbal categories or to individual verbs that are worthy of attention from different points of view. A systematic investigation of the various categories of verbal derivation and their reception in Atticist lexicography will be provided in *Ancient Greek Purism* Volume 2.

4.1 Prefixed verbs

A tendency that is already noticeable in later Attic is the preference for prefixed verbs over simple ones, but without any other appreciable difference in meaning other than intensification (see Vessella 2016b, 428). In addition, several new double-prefixed verbs are introduced.³⁴⁰ A detailed investigation of the prefixed verbs used by Menander is provided in earlier scholarship (see Giannini, Pallara 1983).

³³⁸ See Finglass (2018, 545) on Soph. *OT* 1232, where ἦδειμεν and ἦδεμεν are metrically equivalent.

³³⁹ Transmitted ἦδεισαν οὐδ' of MSS SF at Dem. 27.65 (MS A has ἐδεισαν οὐδ') has been deleted by the editors since Reiske, because it makes no sense in the context (see Gernet 1954, 51; Dilts 2008, 61).

³⁴⁰ See Durham (1913, 31–3); López Eire (2002, 75); Vessella (2016b, 428).

4.2 ἐθέλω vs θέλω

The standard form in 5th-century BCE Attic is ἐθέλω, which is regularly found in Old Comedy and in prose, outside of fixed expressions of the type of ἄν θεός θέλη and, only as far as comedy is concerned, outside of cases of tragic parody (see Willi 2003a, 248 n. 79). On the other hand, θέλω is first attested in tragedy and then gains ground in 4th-century BCE Attic.³⁴¹ The evidence from Middle and New Comedy is collected and discussed by Hunter (1983, 113) and Arnott (2002, 197), who point out that while up until Middle Comedy ἐθέλω could still be unmarked, in New Comedy it seems to have become the more formal option. The inscriptional evidence confirms this gradual development, with θέλω finally replacing ἐθέλω in the 3rd century BCE (see Threatte 1996, 637–8). In post-Classical Greek too, ἐθέλω is the marked, Atticising option (see Clarysse 2008). Indeed, Atticist lexicography prescribes ἐθέλω and proscribes θέλω.

Phryn. Ecl. 305: τεθειληκέναι· Ἀλεξανδρεωτικὸν τοῦνομα, διὸ ἀφετέον Ἀλεξανδρεῦσι καὶ Αἰγυπτίοις αὐτό, ἡμῖν δὲ ῥητέον ἠθειληκέναι.

4.3 Present ἔδω

Despite being common in epic and more generally in poetry, the active verb ἔδω is rare in Attic. The only known instances are in late Old Comedy (Alcaeus Comicus) and in Middle Comedy:

ἔδω: Alc.Com. fr. 30. **ἔδουσι:** Eub. fr. 27.

These instances are explained as poeticisms or Ionicisms (see Orth 2013, 134), but they may well be elements of ‘international’ Attic. Note that in Eur. Cyc. 245 the editors now adopt Heath’s δίδοντες in place of the transmitted ἔδοντος (which is still recorded in LSJ s.v. ἔδω).

4.4 ἐκφυγγάνω

A gloss in the *Antiatticist* testifies that Diphilus used the verb ἐκφυγγάνω in place of the more common ἐκφεύγω:

³⁴¹ This issue never concerned the augmented forms, for which ἠθειλ- is standard throughout the history of Greek.

Antiatt. ε 80: ἐκφυγγάνω· Δίφιλος Εὐνούχῳ (fr. 7).

The form in -άνω originally had an ingressive meaning (see *DELG* s.v. φεύγω). The simplex verb φυγγάνω occurs in *Prometheus Bound* (513), in Sophocles' *Electra* (132), and in the Hippocratic corpus (*De affectionibus interioribus* 12, 7.194.13 Littré). The compound ἐκφυγγάνω also has an early attestation in *Prometheus Bound* (525), but it is especially common in the *corpus Hippocraticum* (16x). After Diphilus, it occurs just once in Polybius (18.15.12) and then only resurfaces in late-antique and Byzantine writers (Themistius, Arethas, Constantinus VII). This distribution is consistent with that of the other prefixed formations. They are also well attested in Ionic (διαφυγγάνει in Heracl. Diels–Kranz 22 B 86, καταφυγγάνουσι in Hdt. 6.16.3, ὑπεκφυγγάνω, διαφυγγάνω, and διεκφυγγάνω in the Hippocratic corpus). In Attic, apart from an isolated occurrence of διεφύγγανον in Thucydides (7.44.8), they are rarely attested in 4th-century BCE prose (D. 23.74, Aeschin. 3.10 and 3.208), and then reappear occasionally in Imperial prose (Arrian, Plutarch, Aristides). Interestingly, Moeris considers φυγγάνω to be more Attic than διαφεύγω on the basis of an isolated occurrence in Thucydides. Other forms in -άνω, such as ἐρυγγάνω, are also attested in 5th-century BCE Attic drama (Eur. *Cyc.* 523, Cratin. fr. 62.3, Eup. fr. 204, Diphil. fr. 42.21), and they are approved by Atticist lexicography.

Phryn. Ecl. 42: ἐρεύγεσθαι ὁ ποιητής (Hom. *Od.* 9.374)· ‘ὁ δ’ ἐρεύγετο οἰνοβαρείων’, ἀλλ’ ὁ πολιτικός ἐρυγγάνειν λεγέτω. **Moer. δ 18:** διεφύγγανον <Αττικοί>· διεφευγον <Ἕλληνες>. **Philemon (Vindob.) 393.17–20:** ἐρυγγάνει <λέγουσι> οὐκ ἐρεύγεται, [(καὶ)] ἐρυγεῖν ἀπερυγεῖν ἦρυγεν οὐκ ἠρεύξατο. ἐρυγγάνει δὲ <μᾶλλον> ἂν ἄσιτος ἦ, ἐρεύγεται δ’, ὅταν τις ἐμπλησθῆ τροφῆς.

4.5 στρηνιάω

This verb occurs three times in later comedy:

στρηνιάω: ἐστρηνίων (Antiph. fr. 82.3), στρηνιῶ (Sophil. fr. 6.3), unknown form of the conjugation (Diph. fr. 133 = *Antiatt.* σ 6).

στρηνιάω means ‘to indulge oneself in excesses or wantonness’ (*GE* s.v.). It derives from the adjective στρηνής ‘shrill, piercing’ (especially of sounds) (*GE* s.v.), which is also attested in Attic as στρηνός (Nicostr. fr. 38). There is also the abstract noun στρηῆνος, meaning ‘insolence, arrogance, extravagance, luxury, lust’ (*GE* s.v.) which semantically comes closest to the meaning of στρηνιάω in the comic fragments. The denominal verb is also used by Lycophron in a satyr play (*TrGF* 100 F 2) and in the New Testament (*Apoc.* 18.7 and 18.9). The fact that all the evidence for this form points to a late date justifies the disdain for στρηνιάω among strict Atticists.

Phryn. Ecl. 358: στρηνιαῖν· τούτω ἐχρήσαντο οἱ τῆς νέας κωμωδίας ποιηταί, ᾧ οὐδ' ἂν μανεῖς τις χρήσαιτο, παρὸν λέγειν τρυφᾶν. **Antiatt. σ 6:** στρηνιαῖν· καθ' οὗ ὁ βίος τάσσει. Δίφιλος (fr. 133).

One reason why στρηνιαῖω is interesting is its suffix. -ιάω is initially used to denote an illness or a bad fixation, later also a particularly strong, almost manic, desire for something (see Peppler 1921, 154–6 and Willi 2003a, 84–5). To quote the evidence from Middle and New Comedy, see ὀφθαλμιῶ ‘to suffer from ophthalmia’ (Apollod.Car. fr. 7.2, Timocl. fr. 6.13, Antiph. fr. 246.1) and ὑποβινητιάω ‘to arouse sexual desire’ (Men. fr. 351.11, which also has a causative meaning compared to the simple verb βινητιάω ‘to strive to have sex’). As regards στρηνιαῖω, however, it seems as though the suffix -ιάω has a more generic intensive function, indicating the degree to which the speaker indulges in wantonness, but this is not the expected nuance usually associated with the suffix -ιάω.

4.6 Future of ζῆν

The poets of Middle and New Comedy regularly use the correct Attic form βιώσομαι for the future of ‘to live’. The innovative future ζήσω occurs in Aristophanes (*Pl.* 263) and in a comic fragment whose attribution is uncertain:

ζήσεις: Ar. fr. 976.2 = Antiph. fr. 330.2 CAF.

The future ζήσω is certainly attested, albeit to a limited extent, in 4th-century BCE Attic prose (*Pl. R.* 465d.3 and *Leg.* 792e.7, but βιώσομαι is far more common in the rest of the Platonic *corpus*; *D.* 25.82, *Arist. Pol.* 1327b.5). Hence, the attribution of Aristophanes’ fr. 976 to Antiphanes (as already suggested by Meineke) or to some comic poet of the 4th century BCE, or possibly later, clearly gains in plausibility.³⁴²

4.7 Sigmatic aorist of φθάνω

This form occurs only once in later comedy:

φθάσαι: Men. *Georg.* 88.

Euripides and Aristophanes alternate between the root aorist ἔφθην and the sigmatic ἔφθασα. In Euripides the two options are more balanced (root aorist in *Heracle.* 120, *Andr.* 990, *IT* 669, *Or.* 1220, sigmatic aorist in *IT* 669, *Phoen.* 975, 1280). In

³⁴² See also Willi (2003b, 57 n. 99). Kaibel (in Kassel, Austin, *PCG* vol. 3,2, 433 *ad* Ar. fr. 976) considers this fragment unworthy of both Aristophanes and Antiphanes.

Aristophanes the sigmatic aorist seems to become more common in the late play *Plutus* (root aorist in *Eq.* 935, *Nu.* 1384, *Av.* 1018, *Ec.* 596, sigmatic aorist in *Pl.* 685 and 1102; see Willi 2003b, 58 n. 104). However, the sigmatic form is regular in Thucydides (35x vs φθῆναι 4x) and in 4th-century BCE prose, as witnessed by Xenophon (29x vs ἔφθη 3x) and Demosthenes' genuine orations (6x vs ἔφθη 2x). Two early instances of the sigmatic form can be found in Aeschylus (*Pers.* 752, fr. 23.3).

4.8 ἑώρακα vs ἑώρακα

While the regular Attic perfect is ἑώρακα, in 4th-century BCE Attic ἑώρακα begins to appear. The only piece of evidence in Middle and New Comedy is in a fragment of Menander where ἑώρακεν is metrically guaranteed.

Men. fr. 187.1–2: τηθίδα | οὐδ' ἑώρακεν τὸ σύνολον, θεῖον οὐδ' ἀκήκοεν (*Atr.*_A).

The MSS evidence for ἑώρακα has been carefully scrutinised by Arnott (2002, 204), who also mentions that ἑώρακα is probably necessary in some passages of Demosthenes to avoid an unwelcome and un-Demosthenic sequence of short syllables. We should add that if we take the MSS of Xenophon, Isocrates, and Plato as sample cases, it seems that ἑώρακα is the standard, while ἑώρακα is only attested in Xenophon. Interestingly, if we look at the apparatuses of modern editions, it also appears that the MSS tradition of Xenophon's writings is split: while ἑώρακα is the spelling adopted in the *Oeconomicus*, *Cyropaedia*, and *Cynegeticus*, ἑώρακα is the one we find in the *Anabasis* and *Hellenica*. This may reflect an editorial choice already made in antiquity, but it is also possible that Xenophon himself arranged this polymorphic treatment accordingly (perhaps, the older form ἑώρακα was preferred in the historical works as the more standard and international option?).

4.9 Verbs in -άζω (and -ίζω)

The verbs in -άζω and -ίζω are among the most productive verbal categories in late Attic and post-Classical Greek.³⁴³ The evidence from Middle and New Comedy

³⁴³ See Debrunner (1917, 116): 'Auch wenn man den Überfluß aller überlieferten griechischen Wörter gebührend in Rechnung stellt, bilden die rund 2000 Verba auf -ίζειν und rund 1000 auf -άζειν einen imponierenden Bruchteil'.

for these categories is very substantial (respectively, 68x and over 130x).³⁴⁴ For reasons of space, in this section we have decided to focus exclusively on the verbs in -άζω, whose numbers are more easily manageable.³⁴⁵ Our aim is to provide an overview of these forms, focusing on their distribution, use, formation, and, where evidence exists, their reception in Atticist lexicography. The occurrences are arranged according to four main chronological principles: (1) forms occurring before the 4th century BCE; (2) forms appearing in Attic from the 4th century BCE (comedy and other genres); (3) forms first attested in Middle and New Comedy and then used in post-Classical Greek; (4) comic hapaxes.

The Greek verbs in -άζω were originally derived from dental stems with the addition of the verbal suffix -ιῶ (e.g. φράζω < φραδ- + *-ιῶ, an exception being ἀρπάζω < ἀρπαγ- + *-ιῶ).³⁴⁶ From there, -άζω developed as a denominal verbal suffix in its own right and was added to stems ending in /a/, either *ā*-stems (e.g. ἀνάγκη > ἀναγκάζω, also alongside the formation of the *verba vocalia*, e.g. βία > βιάομαι and βιάζομαι) or others (e.g. θαῦμα > θαυμάζω), and to thematic stems (e.g. ἄτιμος > ἀτιμάζω) and occasionally, but already early on, it could also be added to verbal stems (e.g. ἀκούω > ἀκούάζομαι, στένω > στενάζω). The inflection inherited from the dental stems generally spread to the verbs formed with -άζω (e.g. ἐθαύμασα) and was also extended to the few originally velar stems (e.g. ἤρπασα in Attic as opposed to ἤρπαξα in the other dialects), but in some cases the opposite is the case (e.g. στενάζω is regularly a velar stem, possibly due to the other enlargements with a velar, i.e. -αχω, -αχέω, -αχίζω?). The semantics of the -άζω verbs is characteristically varied: these formations are generally factitive and are said to ‘activate the root’ (see Greppin 1997, 107) (e.g. ἄτιμος ‘dishonoured, without honour’ > ἀτιμάζω ‘treat with dishonour, to dishonour’), but there remains ample room for further semantic nuances and innovations.³⁴⁷ These verbs are already widespread in archaic and Classical Greek and remain a productive category throughout the history of the language up to Modern Greek.³⁴⁸

344 The hapax πρῶράσσε(ε) in Men. *Sic.* 421 is more likely to derive from πρῶράω than from πρῶράζω, as is often suggested in modern lexica (see Gallavotti 1965, 443; Belardinelli 1991; Belardinelli 1994, 233).

345 A study of the Atticist approach to verbs in -άζω and -ίζω will be provided in *Ancient Greek Purism* Volume 2.

346 See further K–B (vol. 2, 261–2); J. Richter (1909); Debrunner (1917, 118–27); Schwyzer (1939, 734–5); Sihler (1995, 516–7); Greppin (1997); van Emde Boas *et al.* (2019, 274–5). Regarding the verbs in -ίζω (and those in -ιάζω, which result from the dissimilation of *-ιίζω), see also Müller (1915); Debrunner (1917, 128–39); Schwyzer (1939, 735–6); Schmoll (1955); Tronci (2010); Tronci (2012); Tronci (2013).

347 For a rich exemplification see Debrunner (1917, 120–7).

348 See Efthymiou, Fragaki, Markos (2012) (who also discuss the verbs in -ίζω).

The verbs in -άζω attested in later comedy amount to a total of 65 different forms. Most of the forms occurring in later comedy are already attested in earlier, and often much earlier, texts, ranging from Homer to 5th-century BCE literature.

ἀγοράζω (Pi.; Hdt.; Thuc.; Old Comedy), ἀναγκάζω (Hdt.; Thuc.; Soph.; Eur.) and εἰσαναγκάζω (Aesch.), ἀρπάζω (Hom.) and ἀναρπάζω (Hom.) and συναρπάζω (Aesch.; Soph.; Eur.; Ar.), ἀτιμάζω (Hom.), βαστάζω (Hom.), βιάζω (Hom.) and ἐκβιάζω (Soph.), βρῶνάζω (Aesch.; Ar.), γυμνάζω (Thgn.; Aesch.; Thuc.; Eur.), δελεάζω (Hdt.), δικάζω (Hom.), δοκιμάζω (Hdt.; Thuc.; Antiphon) and ἀποδοκιμάζω (Hdt.; Archipp.), ἐγκωμιάζω (Hdt.), εικάζω (Sapph.; Thgn.; Aesch.; Thuc.), ἐξετάζω (Thgn.; Thuc.; Soph.; Eur.), ἐπιδικάζω (And.), ἐργάζομαι (Hom.) and ἀπεργάζομαι (Eur.) and ἐξεργάζομαι (Aesch.; Thuc.; Soph.; Eur.), ἐτοιμάζω (Hom.), θαυμάζω (Hom.), κα(γ)χάζω (Soph.; Ar.), κολάζω (Thuc.; Soph.; Eur.), κωμιάζω (Alc.; Thgn.; Anacr.; Pi.), μετριάζω (Thuc.; Soph.), νεάζω (Aesch.; Soph.; Eur.), νυστάζω (Ar.), ὀνομάζω (Hom.) and ἐπονομάζω (Alc.; Thuc.; Soph.; Eur.), παφλάζω (Hom.), πλησιάζω (Soph.), σκευάζω (*H.Hom.*; Thuc.; Eur.; Ar.) and ἐνσκευάζω (Hdt.; Old Comedy) and παρασκευάζω (Aesch.; Thuc.; Eur.; Old Comedy), σκυθρωπάζω (Ar.), σπουδάζω (Pi.; Soph.; Eur.), στενάζω (Sim.; Aesch.; Soph.; Eur.), φαντάζω (Aesch.; Eur.), χλευάζω (Ar.).

One consequence of the early spread of the verbs in -άζω in Greek is that some of these formations attested in Middle and New Comedy are directly reminiscent of poetic vocabulary.

αἰχμαζώ: epic and tragedy, a comic hapax in Men. *Sam.* 629 (see Sommerstein 2013, 293).

δαμάζω: it occurs in Anaxandr. fr. 6.2 and 34.15. It is already a Homeric verb, which in comedy occurs in choral sections (Ar. *Pax* 564) or in poetic quotations (Pl.Com. fr. 189.9: the line is a hexameter quoted from Philoxenus' cookbook, fr. 7 Sutton; see Pirrotta 2009, 362). Since Anaxandr. fr. 6.2 is most likely reminiscent of a passage of Timotheus (fr. 798 *PMG*),³⁴⁹ it is an easy inference that Anaxandr. fr. 34.15 too was meant to sound like marked language.³⁵⁰

πυκάζω: a paratragic form in Men. *Sam.* 732 (see Sommerstein 2013, 320).

The opposite case is that of those verbs which, due to their crude or very concrete meaning, are limited to comedy.

λαϊκάζω: an obscene verb (see Bain 1991, 74–7; Olson 2002, 96).

τυντλάζω: attested in literature only in Ar. *Pax* 1176 and Sosp. fr. 1.35 (see Olson 1998, 288).

However, since the verbs in -άζω are a category in expansion, a few of those which occur in Middle and New Comedy only occur in other literary genres starting from the 4th century BCE. This may indicate that they are more recent formations. Some of these forms are relatively common in 4th-century BCE texts.

³⁴⁹ See Section A.2.

³⁵⁰ Regarding Anaxandr. fr. 6.2, Millis (2015, 61) comments that 'probably accidentally, the word [i.e. δαμάζω] is rare in comedy', but one cannot agree with these conclusions.

ἐπιτολάζω (Isocr.; X.; see Arnott 1996, 163–4), παρακμάζω (X.; Arist.).

Other verbs, although they are attested already in earlier texts, may be used in a somewhat different way in later comedy. Forms belonging to this category occasionally attract the interest of Atticist lexicographers.³⁵¹

ἀσπάζομαι: already a Homeric verb, the instances in Alex. fr. 172.5 and Men. fr. 1.2 as a greeting verb are paralleled in Ar. *Pl.* 324 (see Arnott 1996, 507; Willi 2003b, 62–3).

διπλάζω: the verb is transitive ('to double', i.e. as if it were διπλασιάζω) in Eur. *Suppl.* 781, Alex. fr. 127 (= *Antiatt.* δ 19) and Men. fr. 224.10. As discussed by Arnott (1996, 356 and n. 1), the entry of the *Antiatticist* quoting Alexis aimed to discuss precisely this unexpected transitive use.

δοξάζω: already attested in 5th-century BCE Greek, it occurs in Dionys.Com. fr. 2.24 with the meaning of 'to be celebrated, magnified, held in esteem', attested mostly from koine Greek (see LSJ s.v. II).

κατασκευάζω: discussed by the Atticists for its semantics (*Antiatt.* κ 55: κατεσκευασμένην οἰκίαν· ἀντί τοῦ πάνθ' ὅσα ἔχουσιν, which depends on X. *Mem.* 3.11.4).

σασσιάζω: already attested in 5th-century BCE Greek, it occurs in Men. *Epit.* 1075 with the meaning of 'to disagree', paralleled in 4th-century BCE texts (see LSJ s.v. I.4).

σχολάζω: already part of the 5th-century BCE vocabulary, it occurs in Men. *Epit.* 224 with the meaning of 'to devote oneself to someone', paralleled in other 4th-century BCE writers (see LSJ s.v. III.2).

τροχάζω: before Philetaer. fr. 3.1, it occurs already in Euripides (*Hel.* 724), Herodotus (9.66.3), and Hermippus (fr. 73.6), then in Xenophon and Aristotle; this verb was not approved by some Atticist lexicographers, as shown by *Antiatt.* τ 4: τροχάζειν· οὐ φασὶ δεῖν λέγειν, ἀλλὰ τρέχειν (the *Antiatticist* may have Xenophon in mind, see Lobeck 1820, 582–3, or maybe Philetaerus and Hermippus).

χειμάζω: already attested in 5th-century BCE texts, whether with a concrete ('to spend the winter', 'to expose to the cold', 'to raise a storm') or a metaphorical meaning ('to distress', evoking the idea of being tossed at sea and the image of the ship of state in the storm). The latter use is common in tragedy, much less so in Aristophanes and Plato. Except in one case, the verb is always used in the middle. The instance in Men. fr. 162 is exceptional in several respects; to mention but two: (i) the metaphorical meaning has developed into a faded metaphor (as opposed the metaphor being still vivid in Philem. fr. 28.6–19); (ii) instead of the middle, Menander uses the active with the reflexive pronoun. The Atticist Phrynichus did not approve the metaphorical use of χειμάζω as good Attic (*Ecl.* 367: 'τί χειμάζεις σαυτόν' (*lege* σ<ε>αυτόν). Μένανδρος (fr. 162) εἶρηκεν ἐπὶ τοῦ λυπεῖν, καὶ Ἀλεξανδρεῖς ὁμοίως. πειστέον δὲ τοῖς δοκίμοις τοῖς μὴ εἰδόσι τοῦνομα; see Favi forthcoming c).

χορτάζω: already attested in archaic texts, used for people rather than cattle in comedy and in koine Greek (see LSJ s.v. II).

A final group consists of forms that are either *primum dicta* (as far as Attic texts are concerned) or tout-court hapaxes. The lack of parallels may be a matter of

³⁵¹ One may compare the case of βιβάζω: although it is already a Homeric verb, it is used with a new meaning by Alcaeus Comicus (fr. 18 (= *Antiatt.* β 21), see Orth 2013, 85; on Alcaeus Comicus see Chapter 4, Section 5.2).

chance, but some of these forms are likely to be comic neologisms. Due to their rarity, these forms are often criticised by Atticist lexicographers.

ἀκροάζομαι: besides occurring, in place of ἀκροόομαι, already in Epicharmus and the Hippocratic corpus, it also occurs in the proverb preserved by Men. *Ench.* fr. 2.

διαγιγγράζω: a hapax in Athenio fr. 1.31 (*ad hoc*, a comic creation?), where the cook's activity of 'tuning' the food is described by a musical metaphor. The verb γιγγράζω derives from the Phoenician flute γίγγρας, a new instrument apparently introduced in Greece during the 4th century BCE (see Papachrysostomou 2016, 101; Olson 2022, 39–40).

ἐξειδιάζομαι: it occurs in Diph. fr. 41 (= *Antiatt.* ε 113) and is paralleled in the Hippocratic corpus, Aristotle, and koine texts. Atticist lexicographers recommend ἐξειδιόομαι, more widely attested in 4th-century BCE Attic (see *Antiatt.* ε 113: ἐξειδιάσασθαι· Δίφιλος Ἐπιτροπή [fr. 41], *Phryn. Ecl.* 172: ἐξειδιάζονται· καὶ τοῦτο Φαβωρίνος [fr. 141 Amato, maybe *de Ex.* 2 according to S. Valente 2015b, 170 *ad Antiatt.* ε 113] λέγει κακῶς· ἰδιουῖσθαι γάρ τὸ τοιοῦτον λέγουσιν οἱ ἀρχαῖοι).

θουσιάζω: first attested in Strato Com. fr. 1.21 (used by a character who speaks normal Attic) and then in koine texts (mostly, though not exclusively, in less formal ones).

κωνειάζομαι: the title of one of Menander's plays, the verb is only paralleled in Imperial Greek.

λιθάζω: first attested in Anaxandr. fr. 17 (= *Antiatt.* λ 7: λιθάζειν· οὐχὶ λεύειν καὶ καταλεύειν. Ἀναξανδρίδης Θετταλοῖς), in Arist. *Pr.* 881b.1, and then in koine Greek.

λογγάζω: it occurs in Antiph. fr. 39 (= *Antiatt.* λ 4); the Atticist sources debate whether the vowel of the first syllable is /a/ or /o/, but also doubt the admissibility of the verb, see *Antiatt.* λ 4: λαγγάζει· ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐνδιδωσιν. Ἀντιφάνης Ἀντερῶση (fr. 39), *Phryn. PS* 87.12–4: λογγάζειν· τὸ διαδιδράσκειν τὸ ἔργον, προφασισζόμενόν τινα πρόφασιν καὶ τοῦτο Ἀριστοφάνης (fr. 848, but see Kassel, Austin, *PCG* vol. 3,2, 397 *ad loc.*) τίθησιν ἐπὶ ἵππων προσποιουμένων χωλεύειν, *Poll.* 9.136: φαῦλον γὰρ τὸ λογγάζειν ἐν τοῖς Κήρυξι τοῖς Αἰσχύλου (fr. 112) (other lexicographical sources are collected by S. Valente 2015b, 208 *ad Antiatt.* λ 4).

ματτυάζω: a hapax in Alex. fr. 50.3 (*ad hoc*, a comic creation?), it has negative overtones somehow related to the properties of the dish called ματτύη (see Arnott 1996, 171).

παραγοράζω: a hapax in Alex. fr. 62; Athenaeus (4.171b), who quotes the fragment, compares it with παροψωνέω in Cratin. fr. 99, of which it would represent the later (and, from an Atticist standpoint, presumably also a less approved) equivalent.

τυρβιάζω: although attested in earlier literature with the transitive meaning of 'to trouble, to stir up' (Hes.; Soph.; Ar.), in Alex. fr. 25.6 it is apparently intransitive and has the meaning of 'to reveal' (see Arnott 1996, 825–6; on the authenticity of the fragment, see Nesselrath 1990, 69 n. 13; Arnott 1996, 819–22).

ὑπερσπουδάζω: it occurs in Men. *Sam.* 219 and fr. 660, then rarely in Imperial and Byzantine prose.

To conclude this overview, the poets of Middle and New Comedy use verbs in -άζω, which were in (relatively) common use, but they also clearly testify to the spread and productivity of this verbal class and document the new semantic developments of these formations.

D. Syntax

1 Use of prepositions

The use of several prepositions (notably ἀμφί, ἀνά, δίχα, χωρίς, μετά + dative) is already very limited in Aristophanes, where they are confined to ‘stylistically marked contexts (parody, lyrics, dialect parts) or to specialized usages’ (Willi 2003a, 256). Later comedy confirms this. For example, δίχα is attested only once,³⁵² and the only two instances of ἀμφί occur in one of the very rare lyric sections in Middle and New Comedy (Axionic. fr. 4.16, a lyric hexameter).³⁵³ Some of the above prepositions, as well as others, are noteworthy.³⁵⁴

1.1 ἀνά + accusative

In keeping with the usage of Attic prose writers (except for Xenophon and a few rare cases),³⁵⁵ the occurrences of ἀνά in Middle and New Comedy, though interesting, are limited in number and typology.

Antiph. fr. 14: ἀνά μέσον. **Men. fr. *67.1:** ἡ δ' ἀνά μέσον θραύουσα. **Men. fr. 602.18:** ὥστ' ἀνά μέσον που καὶ τὸ λυπηρὸν φέρε. **Timocl. fr. 20.2–4:** ὦ τᾶν. ὁ γὰρ Τιθύμαλλος οὕτως ἀνεβίω | κομιδῇ τεθηγκῶς, τῶν ἀν' ὀκτῶ τούβολοῦ | θέρμους μαλάξας.

The occurrence in Timocles is an example of the distributive use of ἀν' ὀκτώ (it indicates lupins, eight of which are sold for one obol; see Apostolakis 2019, 172). This is one of the few functions of ἀνά already found in Aristophanes and Attic prose.³⁵⁶ The other three instances are more interesting. ἀνά μέσον ‘in the middle’, although attested in early poetry,³⁵⁷ is unparalleled in 5th- and most 4th-century BCE Attic writers. Besides Middle and New Comedy, it is later abundantly attested in the *corpus Aristotelicum* and Theophrastus. We may infer that this idiom belonged to a colloquial register and was therefore not used in earlier Attic literature, so that it was then only allowed in less formal genres such as comedy and scientific prose. In koine Greek, ἀνά μέσον is common (also in the high koine, e.g. Polybius), and its frequency is no doubt behind the univerbation of the syn-

352 See Millis (2015, 279) on δίχα in Anaxandr. fr. 46.3 and Ar. fr. 489.1.

353 This exceptional use of ἀμφί is not discussed by Orth (2020, 210–1).

354 On Greek prepositions and their history, see Vela Tejada (1993); Bortone (2010). On prepositions in later comedy vis-à-vis other Attic writers and the informal koine, see Kelly (1962).

355 See K–G (vol. 1, 474 n. 1).

356 Willi (2003a, 256) mentions Ar. *Ra.* 554: ἀν' ἡμιωβολιαῖα ‘in half-obol portions’.

357 See Alc. fr. 326.3 Lobel–Page = 208A Voigt, Thgn. 838, and Xenoph. fr. 1.11 West (= Diels–Kranz 21 B 1.11).

tagm into the Medieval Greek compound adverbs *ἀνάμεσον/ἀνάμεσα*, the ancestors of Modern Greek *ἀνάμεσα*.³⁵⁸ It is quite likely that, although *ἀνά* is recessive, the idiomatic expression *ἀνὰ μέσον* expanded at the expense of *ἐν μέσῳ* in late Classical Attic and then in post-Classical Greek because of the increasing specialisation of *ἐν* + dative with an instrumental meaning.³⁵⁹

Atticist lexicography took this idiom into consideration. The *Antiatticist* presumably produced the occurrence in Antiphanes to disprove the claim that *ἀνὰ μέσον* was only post-Classical.³⁶⁰

Antiatt. α 86: ἀνὰ μέσον· ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐν μέσῳ. Ἀντιφάνης Ἀδώνιδι (fr. 14).

1.2 εἰς, ἐν, and ἐκ in place of the locative and suffixed forms of Ἀθήναι

The standard way of saying ‘to Athens’, ‘in Athens’, and ‘from Athens’ in Classical Attic texts (both literary texts and inscriptions) is *Ἀθήναζε* (an adverbial formation from the accusative *Ἀθήνας* and the suffix *-δε*), *Ἀθήνησι(ν)* (a genuine locative), and *Ἀθήνηθεν* (an adverbial formation with the suffix *-θεν*). While the only suffixed form still attested in Middle and New Comedy is locative *Ἀθήνησι(ν)* (which occurs in Amphis fr. 14.4 and Diph. fr. 67.2), the evidence for the corresponding prepositional syntagms is more substantial:

εἰς Ἀθήνας: Antiph. fr. 59.5, 166.1; Eub. fr. 9.5. **ἐν Ἀθήναις:** Alex. fr. 9.2, 224.2; Antiph. fr. 173.2; Eub. fr. 74.2; Philem. fr. 95.6. **ἐξ Ἀθηνῶν:** Antiph. fr. 233.5; Euphro fr. 1.7; Philosteph.Com. fr. 1.3.

This preference for the prepositional syntagm reflects the developments in the Attic dialect, although the predominance of *ἐν Ἀθήναις* over the locative form *Ἀθήνησι(ν)* is more evident in literary texts than in Attic inscriptions.³⁶¹

Atticist lexicography recommended the locative and suffixed forms as more Attic.

Moer. α 52: Ἀθήναζε <Ἀττικοί>· εἰς Ἀθήνας <Ἑλληνες>. **Moer. α 53:** Ἀθήνηθεν <Ἀττικοί>· ἐξ Ἀθηνῶν <Ἑλληνες>. **Moer. α 54:** Ἀθήνησιν <Ἀττικοί>· ἐν Ἀθήναις <Ἑλληνες>.

³⁵⁸ See Bortone (2010, 185; 254; 279); *CGMEMG* vol. 2, 1186; *IANE* s.v. *ἀνάμεσα*.

³⁵⁹ See Vela Tejada (1993, 241); Bortone (2010, 192–3).

³⁶⁰ See also Hsch. α 4440: ἀνὰ μέσον· ἐν μέσῳ. Only the lemma, but not the *interpretamentum*, survives of *Su.* α 1960: ἀνὰ μέσον (this entry is written on the margin of MS A).

³⁶¹ See Threatte (1996, 374–6; 401–2; 406).

1.3 μετά + genitive and σύν + dative with comitative function

In Classical Attic texts, the comitative constructions (‘with someone/something’) are μετά + genitive and σύν + dative. However, their distribution is clearly polarised, namely, μετά + genitive is the unmarked construction normally used in comedy and prose, while outside poetry and Xenophon σύν + dative is confined to fixed constructions (e.g. σύν ὄπλοις, σύν θεοῖς, etc.) and to passages adopting a (possibly parodic) poetic diction.³⁶² The evidence from post-Classical Greek confirms the preference for μετά + genitive (which continued in the Modern Greek μετά + accusative), aided by the fact that the dative is highly recessive.³⁶³ The distribution of these two constructions in Classical Attic is generally continued in later comedy, where μετά + genitive is the standard construction (over 40x in Menander alone), while σύν + dative is attested only in the following passages:

Men. Dysc. 509–10: (Σι) ἔμοι μὲν οὐκ εἰρηκας, (Κν) ἀλλὰ νῦν λέγω. | (Σι) νῆ σύν κακῶ γ'. **Men. Dysc. 736–7:** νοῦν ἔχεις σύν τοῖς θεοῖς, | κηδεμῶν εἰ τῆς ἀδελφῆς εἰκότως. **Men. Per. fr. 8:** οὐδ' αὐτός εἰμι σύν θεοῖς ὑπόζυλος. **Philisc. fr. 4:** οὐκ ἔστιν, ὦ μάταιε, σύν ῥαθυμιά | τὰ τῶν πονούντων μὴ πονήσαντας λαβεῖν.

The last two passages contain the fixed idiom σύν (τοῖς) θεοῖς (which will eventually survive until Modern Greek συν Θεῶ). The fragment of Philiscus is clearly paratragic.³⁶⁴ The case of νῆ σύν κακῶ γ(ε) (‘though luck’) in Menander’s *Dyscolus* is more difficult to interpret.³⁶⁵ Although the expression is not new (see LSJ s.v. 6), this pragmatic use is unparalleled. We may suppose that it is a colloquialism, perhaps retaining this ancient use of the preposition as an archaism.

1.4 μετά + genitive with the *verba sequendi*

In conjunction with *verba sequendi* and verbs with the prefix σύν-, μετά + genitive gradually began to replace the bare dative already in Classical Attic. This is the evidence from Middle and New Comedy:

Antiph. fr. 120.2–3: τὸν σπουδαῖον ἀκολουθεῖν ἔρεῖς | ἐν τῷ Λυκείῳ μετά σοφιστῶν. **Eub. fr. 8.1–2:** ἔτεροι δὲ † θεοῖσι † συμπεπλεγμένοι | μετά Καραβου σύνεισιν. **Men. DE 59–60:** μετ' ἐμοῦ δ' ἀκο-

³⁶² See K–G (vol. 1, 466–7); Willi (2003a, 237–8; 256); Vela Tejada (1993, 241–2); Bortone (2010, 166–7).

³⁶³ Schmid (*Atticismus* vol. 3, 289; vol. 4, 460); Maysner (*Gramm.* vol. 2.2, 398–401); Blass, Debrunner (1976, § 221; § 227.1); Bortone (2010, 184).

³⁶⁴ See Kassel, Austin (*PCG* vol. 7, *ad loc.*).

³⁶⁵ On this passage see Handley (1965, 223).

λούθει και λαβέ | τὸ [χρ]υσίον. **Men. Dysc. 969 = Mis. 996 = Sic. 423 = fr. 903.21:** νίκη μεθ' ἡμῶν εὐμενῆς ἔποιτ' ἀεί. **Men. fr. 293:** συνακολούθει μεθ' ἡμῶν.

The use of μετὰ + genitive with the *verba sequendi* is paralleled in the late phases of Old Comedy (Ar. *Pl.* 823; 1209) and more commonly in 4th-century BCE prose (Thuc. 7.57.9 is the only 5th-century BCE example, then see Lys. 12.12; Pl. *La.* 187e; *Mx.* 249d; Isoc. 5.48, 8.44, 14.15, 14.28; and D. 24.162). The only occurrence in tragedy is in Euripides (*El.* 941–4).³⁶⁶ As for σύνειμι, the construction with μετὰ + genitive is also paralleled in the later phases of Old Comedy (Ar. *Pl.* 503–4, Aristom. fr. 2.3).

Atticist lexicography was sensitive to this construction of the *verba sequendi*.³⁶⁷

Antiatt. α 122: ἀκολουθεῖν μετ' αὐτοῦ· ἀντὶ τοῦ αὐτῶ. Λυσίας: 'τὸν παῖδα τὸν ἀκολουθοῦντα μετ' αὐτοῦ' (fr. 61 Carey). **Phryn. Ecl. 330:** 'τὸν παῖδα τὸν ἀκολουθοῦντα μετ' αὐτοῦ· Λυσίας ἐν τῷ Κατ' Αὐτοκράτους (fr. 61 Carey) οὕτω τῇ συντάξει χρῆται, ἐχρῆν δὲ οὕτως εἶπειν· 'τὸν ἀκολουθοῦντα αὐτῶ'. τί ἂν οὖν φαίη τις, ἀμαρτεῖν τὸν Λυσίαν, ἢ νοθεύειν καινοῦ σχήματος χρῆσιν; ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ ξένη ἢ σύνταξις, πάντῃ παρατητέα, ρητέον δὲ ἀκολουθεῖν αὐτῶ. **Σ^b α 747 (= Phot. α 789, ex Σ'''; Phryn. PS fr. *115** according to de Borries, more convincingly **Orus fr. B 7** according to Alpers) ἀκολουθεῖν μετ' αὐτοῦ· οὕτω συντάσσοσιν οἱ Ἀττικοὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀκολουθεῖν αὐτῶ. καὶ γὰρ Λυσίας οὕτω κέχρηται (fr. 61 Carey) καὶ Πλάτων (*La.* 187e.1–2; *Mx.* 249d.6). ἀλλὰ καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν Πλούτῳ (823) 'ἔπου' φησὶ 'μετ' ἐμοῦ, παιδάριον'. καὶ Μένανδρος 'νίκη μεθ' ἡμῶν εὐμενῆς ἔποιτ' ἀεί' (*Dysc.* 969 = *Mis.* 466 = *Sic.* 423 = fr. 903.21). κὰν τῇ Παρακαταθήκῃ 'συνακολούθει μεθ' ἡμῶν' φησὶν (fr. 293).

While there does not seem to be an entry specifically dealing with cases like σύνειμι + μετὰ τινος, it is quite likely that this construction was also sanctioned.

1.5 ὑπέρ + genitive

The syntagm ὑπέρ + genitive in place of περί + genitive is well attested in Middle and New Comedy with the meaning of 'about someone/something' (Men. *Dysc.* 49 and 742; *Epit.* 128, 315; *Pc.* 273 and 325–6; *Sam.* 113, fr. 412.1; Posidipp. fr. 28.2–3; Athenio fr. 1.44).³⁶⁸ Although ὑπέρ + genitive comes very close to the meaning of περί + genitive, it still retains part of its original meaning of 'in favour/defence of' (see especially Athenio fr. 1.44: ὑπὲρ εὐσεβείας οὖν ἀφεις παῦσαι λέγων). This evidence from comedy parallels that from 4th-century BCE Attic prose (see K–G vol. 1, 487).

³⁶⁶ See Willi (2003b, 48–9); Olson (2022, 77).

³⁶⁷ See also schol. Ar. *Pl.* 823: ἔπου μετ' ἐμοῦ· Πλάτων Μενεξένῳ (249d.6). On these constructions see Gerbi (2023).

³⁶⁸ López Eire (2002, 85–6) collects some parallels in Hyperides.

1.6 ὡς + accusative

The syntagm ὡς + accusative, usually with a human being as the referent and meaning of ‘to someone(s) house’,³⁶⁹ is almost exclusively Attic.³⁷⁰ The sole instance in the *Odyssey* (17.218) has been explained as an Atticism, while only one of the occurrences in Herodotus is regarded as authentic by Hude and N. G. Wilson (2.121ε.4).³⁷¹ Furthermore, ὡς + accusative is absent from lyric poetry and from most of tragedy (e.g. it is very rare in Sophocles, 3x). This has been regarded as an indication that this construction originally belonged to a colloquial level. In Aristophanes, ὡς + accusative is increasingly common in the two extant 4th-century BCE plays (see Willi 2003b, 48), which ties in well with its increasing frequency in 4th-century BCE prose (see Schwyzer, Debrunner 1950, 533–4). This construction is relatively abundant only in selected high koine writers.³⁷² ὡς + accusative is solidly attested in Middle and New Comedy.

Anaxandr. fr. 57.1–2: χαλεπή, λέγω σοι, καὶ προσάντης, ὧ τέκνον, | ὁδός ἐστιν, ὡς τὸν πατέρ’ ἀπελθεῖν οἴκαδε | παρ’ ἀνδρός. **Apollod.Car. fr. 29.1–2:** καινόν γε φασὶ Χαιρεφῶντ’ ἐν τοῖς γάμοις | ὡς τὸν Ὀφέλαν ἀκλιητον εἰσδεδुकέναι. **Crobyl. fr. 5.2–3:** ὅποι μ’ ἐρωτᾷς; ὡς Φιλουμένην, παρ’ ἧ | τάπιδοσιμ’ ἡμίτην ἐστιν. **Men. Asp. 274:** τὸν Δᾶον ὡς με πέμψατε. **Men. Epit. 876:** εἶσω λαβοῦσά μ’ ὡς σεαυτὴν εἶσαγε. **Men. Mis. 678:** ὦχεθ’ ὡς τοὺς γείτονας. **Men. Pc. 179:** ἡ δ’ οἴχεθ’ ὡς τὸν γείτον’ εὐθὺς δηλαδῆ. **Men. Pc. 212:** καὶ γὰρ οἴχεθ’ ὡς τὴν Μυρρίν[η]ν. **Men. Pc. 401:** ἀπεισιν ὡς σέ. **Men. Pc. 412:** πορεύεσθ’ ὡς σέ.

Ten occurrences is a relatively high figure, especially compared to the 46 occurrences in Aristophanes’ much larger corpus.³⁷³ This confirms that ὡς + accusative became increasingly common in 4th-century BCE texts. As expected, in all these cases the referent of the accusative governed by ὡς is a human being, and the implicit sense is ‘to someone(s) house’. It should be noted that in almost all Menander passages where ὡς + accusative is attested, the speaker is a slave or a hetaera (Habrotonon in *Epit.* 876, Sosias in *Pc.* 179, Doris in *Pc.* 212, 401, 412), which might support the idea that ὡς + accusative was a colloquial feature and that Menander used it for low-class characters. In the other two instances, the speaker is reporting a slave’s words (*Mis.* 678, where Clinias repeats to the audience what the slave Getas supposedly said before entering the stage) or is being rude (*Asp.* 274, where the speaker is Smicrines). Due to the lack of context, it is

³⁶⁹ On two (apparent) exceptions in Sophocles see Moorhouse (1982, 133).

³⁷⁰ For a revision of the older views about the origin of this construction and a new hypothesis, see Méndez Dosuna (2018).

³⁷¹ See Méndez Dosuna (2018, 319).

³⁷² See Krebs (1884–1885 vol. 2, 61–2); Bortone (2010, 186).

³⁷³ No instance of ὡς + accusative is known in the fragments of Old Comedy.

difficult to verify whether $\omega\varsigma$ + accusative is also a low-register feature in the fragments of Anaxandrides, Apollodorus of Carystus, and Crobylus.³⁷⁴ However, the fact that $\omega\varsigma$ + accusative is also attested in literary prose and then recessive in koine Greek may rather indicate that the social distribution of this construction in Menander is perhaps just a coincidence.

2 Verbal constructions

Several verbal constructions of later comedy are of interest for a study of the evolution of Attic. We will focus here on only one of them, $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omega$ + infinitive, which the lexicographers themselves singled out as peculiar to Attic and contrasted with the usage in koine Greek.³⁷⁵

2.1 $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omega$ + infinitive

The regular construction $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omega$ + infinitive ('I was going to/about to') requires the infinitive to be either future or present, while the aorist infinitive is very rarely attested.³⁷⁶ The construction with the aorist infinitive is attested once in Middle Comedy.

Eub. fr. 124: γύναι, | ράφανόν με νομίσασ' εἰς ἐμέ σὺ τὴν κραυπάλην | μέλλεις ἀφεῖναι πᾶσαν, ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖς.

Atticist lexicography rules out the construction with the aorist infinitive, which reflects its rarity in Classical sources.³⁷⁷

³⁷⁴ The speaker in Anaxandrides' fragment may be a father or an older woman (see Millis 2015, 281). There are several ways to identify the speaker in Crobylus' fragment, but he is most definitely not a slave (is he perhaps some kind of parasite?) (see Mastellari 2020, 165). The speaker in the fragment by Apollodorus of Carystus is talking about a parasite's actions, but it is difficult to make much of this information.

³⁷⁵ In some cases, the interpretation of the entries and of the doctrine behind them can be difficult. An example is offered by *Antiatt.* λ 11: λαβόμενος· ἀντί τοῦ λαβών. Ἄλεξις Ἀρχιλόχοις (fr. 23). Arnott (1996, 114–5) plausibly concludes that the *Antiatticist* aimed to counter the objection that λαβόμεναι could not be transitive (and Arnott cites Alex. fr. 78.6–8 as an example of this construction, but this fragment comes from a different play from the *Archilochus/Archilochoi* quoted by the *Antiatticist*). Arnott may be right, but the matter remains difficult to assess with certainty.

³⁷⁶ See Willi (2003a, 257–8).

³⁷⁷ See also La Roi (2022, 220–2).

Phryn. Ecl. 313: ἐμελλον ποιῆσαι, ἐμελλον θεῖναι· ἀμάρτημα τῶν ἐσχάτων εἴ τις οὕτω συντάττει· τετήρηται γὰρ ἢ τῷ ἐνεστώτι συνταττόμενον ἢ τῷ μέλλοντι, οἷον ‘ἐμελλον ποιεῖν’, ‘ἐμελλον ποιήσιν’· τὰ δὲ συντελικὰ οὐδένα τρόπον ἀρμόσει τῷ ἐμελλον. **Phryn. Ecl. 347:** ἐμελλον γράψαι· ἐσχάτως βάρβαρος ἢ σύνταξις αὐτῆ· ἀορίστῳ γὰρ χρόνῳ τὸ ἐμελλον οὐ συντάττουσιν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι, ἀλλ’ ἦτοι ἐνεστώτι, οἷον ‘ἐμελλον γράφειν’, ἢ μέλλοντι, οἷον ‘ἐμελλον γράψειν’.

3 Subordinate clauses

A detailed examination of the varieties of subordinate clauses in Middle and New Comedy is beyond the scope of this study. Atticist lexicographers very rarely, if ever, comment on subordinate clauses. Two areas where a difference between 5th- and 4th-century BCE Attic is more easily discernible are final and causal clauses introduced by *διότι*.

3.1 Final clauses

While the preferred conjunction to introduce a positive final clause in Thucydides and Attic inscriptions is *ὅπως* (ἄν) + subjunctive, already in Aristophanes *ἵνα* + subjunctive takes over, and then the disproportion becomes even more apparent in 4th-century BCE Attic writers.³⁷⁸ This has been explained as an element of the Ionicisation of Attic on its way to gradually evolving into the koine.³⁷⁹ There is only one example of *ὅπως* + subjunctive in Middle and New Comedy, which is in line with the preference of 4th-century BCE Attic writers for *ἵνα*.

Philem. fr. 141: πολλὰ με διδάσκεις ἀφθόνως διὰ φθόνον, | ὅπως ἀκούων πολλὰ μὴδὲ ἔν μάθω.

The case of *ὡς* (ἄν) + subjunctive is more complicated. The construction of *ὡς* + subjunctive is typical of tragedy, and in comedy it is used exclusively in paratragedy, while *ὡς* (ἄν) + subjunctive, which is also a tragic use, may occasionally occur in comedy without any parodic intent (arguably for metrical convenience). That *ὡς* (ἄν) + subjunctive is marked language is also proved by the lack of attestation in Attic inscriptions and by the very scanty traces of it in 4th-century BCE Attic writers. In fact, the rare instances of *ὡς* (ἄν) + subjunctive in Middle and

³⁷⁸ See Willi (2003a, 264–5); Willi (2003b, 46).

³⁷⁹ See de Foucault (1972, 184–6) who discusses Polybius and other koine writers, though he rightly points out that while Polybius has a strong preference for *ἵνα*, not only do other koine writers (e.g. Diodorus) make extensive use of *ὅπως* (ἄν), but the koine inscriptions and papyri also show a preference for *ὅπως* (ἄν) over *ἵνα*.

New Comedy occur in paratragic sections (Men. *Sic.* 171) or in textually problematic passages (Antiph. fr. 253.2, where a syllable is missing and ὅπως may be restored instead; this would be equally remarkable as the sole other instance of final ὅπως + subjunctive in later comedy and one of the very few in 4th-century BCE Attic).

3.2 Causal clauses introduced by διότι

The use of διότι to introduce a causal clause is quite common in Middle and New Comedy (Alex. fr. 99.3, Amphis fr. 14.6, Anaxandr. fr. 53.2, Apollod.Com. fr. 16.4, Diph. fr. 60.11 and 137.1, Eub. fr. 106.14, Henioch. fr. 4.7, Philem. fr. 108.1, Timocl. fr. 19.4. *com. adesp.* fr. 1093.351). This use of διότι is paralleled in 4th-century BCE prose (e.g. 10x in Lysias and 12x in Isocrates). It is unattested in Aristophanes and tragedy.³⁸⁰

³⁸⁰ See Willi (2003a, 266–7).

Chapter 6

Before Atticism: Early Hellenistic scholarship on Attic

1 Preliminaries

In the previous chapters, we saw how the cultural and, above all, linguistic construction of an Attic identity (to be Athenian *is* to speak Attic, and a particular register of it) was far from a monolithic reality. Chapter 4 (Sections 3.1–2), has demonstrated that already in the heyday of Athens' undisputed cultural supremacy, 'speaking Attic' and speaking it 'properly' were a matter of social and cultural negotiation between centripetal (exclusiveness) and centrifugal (inclusiveness) tendencies in a society that was finding itself within an ever-increasingly international world. The importance of defining what it meant to be Attic in all its nuances became particularly urgent with the spread of 'international Attic' (*Großattisch*) within a supra-regional context and even more so in the changed political scenario of the mid-4th century BCE, when Athens could no longer credibly claim a position of political and economic hegemony within the Greek world (see Chapter 1, Section 3.1 and Chapter 4, Section 4). Hitherto, we have observed the evolution of this process from the inside: Attic writers (comedy, orators, and more general prose writers) on Attic and its cultural capital. In this chapter and the next, we shall move progressively away from this insider's view and investigate, however selectively, how Attic was perceived, viewed, and evaluated from the outside, and from a highly distinctive, if in some respects limited, perspective: that of Hellenistic scholarship (from the second half of the 4th to the end of the 2nd century BCE, with some occasional incursions into the first half of the 1st century BCE), which developed in new centres of political and economic power (above all Ptolemaic Alexandria, but also Pergamon).

Scholarly reflection on Attic as a distinct (spoken) dialect *and* a literary language – its orthographic, phonetic, prosodic, morphological, and lexical peculiarities (syntax will play a very minor part, mainly – but not only – for reasons of space) – will form the main subject of the final two chapters of the present volume. Exhaustiveness will be neither pursued nor attempted:¹ rather, we shall at-

¹ Recent systematic studies of Hellenistic scholarship in all its varieties of approaches and disciplines can be found in F. Montanari, Matthaios, Rengakos (2015); F. Montanari (2020), and in many of the entries of *LGA*. Equally indispensable are the commented editions of *SGG*. For Eratosthenes, see now the website <http://www.eratosthenica.it> (accessed 17/07/2024) by Maria Brog-

tempt to guide the reader through what we believe to be the main significant stages of erudite reflection on (and reception of) the Attic dialect, considered mainly as a literary language but also as a contemporary educated idiom. As such, this chapter's purpose is twofold: (1) to set out the premises, methodology, and scope that will inform, across the volume's final two chapters, our approach to Hellenistic scholarly activity on Greek language in general and Attic in particular; (2) to focus on the early stages of this erudite reflection, with special attention to the framework within which it developed (the concept of γλῶσσα in the Aristotelian tradition, its declination in the first preserved collections of unusual or rare words) and to those strands of grammatical and linguistic studies (above all lexicography and dialectology) that exercised the most durable impact in orienting later Atticist theories and practices.² Our focus on lexicography and dialectology does not, of course, entail a denial of the importance of the τεχνικὸν μέρος of the γραμματική in the development of Atticist doctrines:³ again, we shall see that the two elements (the lexical and grammatical proper) go hand in hand in the ancients' reflection. It remains true, however, that prescription at the level of lexical and dialectal choice is one of the most marked and visible features of Atticist theorisation.

In sketching the rise of the first Hellenistic reflection on lexicographical matters, we shall follow, for the most part, a linear diachronic dimension. However, the continuity of some thematic concerns over different periods of time will sometimes (cf. Section 3.1 below) take us backwards and forwards: this contrastive comparison will allow us to more clearly elucidate the points of convergence and divergence between Hellenistic and Atticist scholarship. Starting with Philitas of Cos and Simmias of Rhodes, via Zenodotus and Callimachus, this chapter will end with an extended overview of Eratosthenes' scholarly activity in the fields of grammar and philology, paying special attention to the lexical and linguistic observations on Attic contained in his work *On Old Comedy*, an enduring point of reference for comic studies in the Hellenistic and Imperial periods. In keeping with the volume's main themes, the final section (Section 5.3) will give particular attention to the role played by Eratosthenes' linguistic studies in the process of canon formation. Within this context, we shall also attempt to reassess the validity and interpretative usefulness, for Eratosthenes, of the claims of 'strict Atticism'

giato. The extent to which we are indebted to these essential resources will be clear at every turn of the page of Chapters 6 and 7.

2 In the Hellenistic conceptualisation of language as a system, that which we moderns call lexicography was perceived as a distinct part of the γραμματική from the very beginning: cf. Dionysius Thrax's definition of grammar in Section 3 below.

3 Cf. e.g. Probert (2011).

or ‘purist tendencies’ *ante litteram* that have been voiced by some strands of modern and less modern scholarship.

2 Methodology and scope

Notwithstanding its obvious limitations, there are several reasons for adopting a focus on Hellenistic scholarship on Attic rather than Attic literature as a whole. First, it has the immediate practical advantage of quantitatively limiting the field of enquiry, which even so remains quite daunting. Given the cultural capital acquired by Athenian literature in the course of the 5th and first half of the 4th century BCE, Alexandrian scholars worked for the major part on Attic texts (with some notable exceptions: Homer, Herodotus, the Hippocratic tradition, and lyric poetry to cite the most prominent cases), that is, on texts written in what was perceived, rightly or wrongly, as an Attic idiom of some sort, however composite and artificial (above all, Attic drama, historiography, oratory, and philosophical prose).⁴ While an international language based on Attic was becoming the linguistic standard, Alexandrian philology on Attic literary texts strongly encouraged, even if only implicitly, the promotion of Attic to an undoubtedly prestigious rank. An explicit theorisation of Attic as the ‘best’, ‘more correct’, or even only ‘more elevated’ among the Greek dialects is not attested for this period; nevertheless, it is true that Attic remained the point of reference with which the other dialects were also required to confront themselves (cf. Chapter 3, Section 3.4). Second, but most importantly for the purpose of our focus on ancient Greek purism, this selective approach will allow us to better highlight the differences and continuities with the later Atticist reception (and partly revision) of Attic as the ‘gold standard’ of pure diction among well-bred, educated speakers (and writers). By focusing on some of the criteria adopted by Alexandrian scholars (e.g. language usage in a broadly comparative way, across authors and genres but also across time and space), we shall see that not only was the range of authors studied by Alexandrian

⁴ Historiography: Nicolai (2015), especially at 1094 on how in the 2nd century BCE historians ‘had become a rightful component of the literary canons’. On the likely Alexandrian origin of this process, see already Nicolai (1992, 190–3; 297–311) and Matijašić (2018). Oratory: Montana (2020b, 167–9) (= Montana 2015, 95–7) and Montana (2020a) on Didymus as recipient of early Alexandrian scholarship on oratory (especially Demosthenes) rather than as starting point of a new development; Matijašić (2018, 147–60).

philology ampler than the canons promoted by the Atticists⁵ but also that, as has been increasingly recognised by recent scholarship, attempts at projecting *sic et simpliciter* Atticist concerns (purity of the canon(s); heavily prescriptive and proscriptive attitudes) back to the philological and linguistic inquiries of the 3rd and 2nd centuries BCE are fundamentally unproductive and misguided.⁶

This brings us directly to the heart of the two main interconnected questions informing this chapter's enquiry: (1) the usefulness or even meaningfulness of applying a strictly binary opposition descriptivism vs prescriptivism in reconstructing the various historical and cultural stages of the ancients' reflection on Attic; and (2) the extent to which a rhetorical and stylistic classicising/archaising approach can or should be separated from the minutiae of linguistic and grammatical usage.

Let us begin with the second point. A highly influential tradition going back to Schmid and Wilamowitz has identified two distinct Atticist strands in antiquity that differ considerably with respect to both chronology and goals (see Chapter 1, Section 3.2):⁷ (1) a so-called 'rhetorical (or stylistic) Atticism', already promoted by literary critics and historians of the mid-1st century BCE, inviting imitation of the style of Attic Classical authors;⁸ and (2) a later 'grammatical (or linguistic) Atticism', strictly prescriptive in character and orientation, mandating the use of a rigorous Attic phonology, prosody, morphology, and vocabulary. This clear-cut distinction has been challenged by Kim (2010) and, more recently, by O'Sullivan (2015). Both Kim and O'Sullivan based their arguments primarily on the classicising prose style of Dionysius of Halicarnassus (1st century BCE): Dionysius, in comparison with pre-

5 For the existence of multiple, concurrent 'canons' within the Atticist movement, see Chapter 1, Section 4; cf. also Matthaïos (2015a); Tribulato (2014); Tribulato (2021a); de Jonge (2022a) and (2022b). On the varieties of Atticist prose among the writers of the Second Sophistic, see the general survey by Kim (2017).

6 For this criticism, see, above all, Tosi (2015, esp. 632); Tosi (1994a, 162–6; 202–3); Tosi (1997); S. Valente (2015b, 31–4); with the exception of Tosi (2015), these contributions are mostly focused on Aristophanes of Byzantium's Λέξεις and its relationship with the *Antiatticist*, on which see Chapter 7, Section 2.1. For a general assessment of whether the lexicographical activity of the first Alexandrian grammarians may be considered to anticipate the trends of later Atticist reflections on language, see O'Sullivan (2015, 139); Montana (2020b, 198 with n. 318) (= Montana 2015, 135 with n. 31); Ascheri (2010, 127–8 n. 10), all with previous bibliography. Cf. also Monaco (2021, ch. 3), though conceptually rather opaque.

7 See Kim (2010, 473); Kim (2017); and O'Sullivan (2015) on the history of this bipartition in Classical scholarship.

8 For convenience's sake, we maintain the traditional terminology, even if Kim (2017, 50) has recently highlighted how 'stylistic Atticism', at least when applied to Dionysius of Halicarnassus, is a somewhat misleading term, since Dionysius did not restrict the authors for imitation to Attic literature only; to speak of 'stylistic classicism' would be more appropriate: see Wiater (2011).

vious Hellenistic prose writers (e.g. Polybius), exhibits, albeit inconsistently, more classicistic (read ‘Atticist’) features in terms of phonology and morphology.⁹ O’Sullivan has taken the argument further by observing that already from Aristotle onwards, ‘to think about “style” was necessarily to think about its “linguistic” elements as well’, and that such a dichotomy style/grammar posited by modern scholarship is not an ancient one.¹⁰ These qualifications are wholly justified: stylistic choices clearly cannot be disjoined from their linguistic counterparts, particularly when one considers the robust common basis shared by rhetoric and grammar in Classical antiquity.¹¹ With that said, it seems to us that a distinction, however broad-stroke, between an early, mostly (but not uniquely) stylistic phase of classicising tendencies (both at a theoretical and a practical level) and a later phase systematically oriented to police the boundaries of a pure Attic idiom in all its most minute linguistic components (phonology, morphology, lexicon, and even prosody at times), retains an important heuristic and diagnostic value, at least when the field of ancient lexicographical studies is approached in its *longue durée*. This distinction, with all its imprecisions and generalities, still allows us to appreciate a fundamental difference: namely, the recognition that even if the tools of grammatical analysis used by Atticist lexicographers have their ultimate origins in the lexicographical tradition of the early Hellenistic period, the aims and underpinning premises of early Alexandrian philology and Atticism differ substantially. While the Atticist lexicographers sought to help the would-be cultured speaker and orator to cultivate (and imitate) the purity of Attic idiom in all its finest grammatical nuances, by both promoting the positive adoption of Attic dialectal features and prohibiting any deviations from it (be they non-Attic or simply post-Classical Attic),¹² the theoretical framework of grammatical thinking for Alexandrian lexicography was philology (*Textpflege*).¹³

9 Kim (2010, 473–4): a proportionally increased usage of the historical present, a more widespread occurrence of the optative mood; avoidance of later conjunctions, substitution of koine forms with their Attic morphological equivalent; attraction of the relative pronouns; O’Sullivan (2015, 141) adds to the list the admittedly modest revival of the dual in Dionysius’ prose.

10 O’Sullivan (2015, 136).

11 On overlaps between grammar and rhetoric, in both Greece and Rome, see the detailed treatment in Nicolai (1992, 197–215) and de Jonge (2015, 981–4). One of the most apparent points of contact is their shared preoccupation for λέξις (Lat. *elocutio*), ἐλληνισμός (‘correctness’) included.

12 Cf. Chapter 1, Section 4 and more broadly Chapter 2.

13 Tosi (1994a); S. Valente (2015b, 602); Dubischar (2015, 583–4); Montana (2020b) (= Montana 2015) to mention only the most recent contributions. For a strongly philological orientation of Hellenistic studies on grammar, showing that the Alexandrian philologists had developed, within their philological framework, an advanced knowledge of a ‘Grammatik im Kopf’, see the various works by Ax (1982); Ax (1986); Ax (1990); Ax (1991).

This brings us back to our first question (1): the usefulness of adopting a mutually exclusive opposition descriptivism vs prescriptivism when approaching lexicographical studies. A clear-cut separation between prescriptivism and descriptivism as a useful hermeneutic tool when applied to works reflecting on language and usage has recently been challenged from many quarters and across different disciplines.¹⁴ In contemporary literature, the distinction is increasingly regarded as artificial and limiting: it has instead been argued that we should see descriptive and prescriptive approaches as discrete end-points in a much broader continuum rather than as a dichotomy.¹⁵ In particular, Wolf Peter Klein (2004) has identified four parameters to grade the slippery glides between descriptivism and prescriptivism in grammatical and lexicographical works: (i) the authorial intention (*Author-dimension*), (ii) its reception (*Rezipientendimension*), (iii) its articulation as text (*Textdimension*), and (iv) its methodology (*Datendimension*: how it gathers and interprets data). On the basis of these parameters, Klein has demonstrated how any descriptive practice almost always involves some prescriptive component, even if low-grade, so to speak. This is particularly the case when one considers the third diagnostic feature, the *Rezipientendimension*. This insight may also be productively applied to ancient Greek reflection on language, particularly if one adopts a long-term rather than a short-term historical perspective: again, analysis of our sources will reveal that those linguistic observations and descriptions, originally made without an implicit or explicit value-judgement, acquire a *Nachleben* of their own. Over time, either because of genuine misunderstanding, intentional twisting, the vagaries of textual transmission (abridgement, epitomisation, excerpting), or simply because of changed cultural perceptions and expectations, originally descriptive observations morphed into prescriptive (and proscriptive) rules.¹⁶

Let us give just one example, and this time in the reverse direction (i.e., a later reinterpretation, with a polemical anti-purist gist, of a Hellenistic source), to complicate the matter further. Aristophanes of Byzantium's fr. 36 (on κόλλοψ, usually 'winding peg'), which in all likelihood belongs to his Λέξεις, has come down to us thanks solely to the indirect tradition – namely, Eustathius (12th century CE). In his commentary on the *Odyssey*, the archbishop of Thessalonica relates the following:

14 On the current debate in contemporary linguistics on the meaningfulness (or lack thereof) of the opposition descriptivism vs prescriptivism, see Joseph (2020); Chapman (2020).

15 See W. P. Klein (2004); Mugglestone (2014).

16 This process is quite frequent, for instance, for many of the glosses shared between Aristophanes of Byzantium and the *Antiatticist*: see Chapter 7, Section 2.1.

Eust. in *Od.* 2.267.1–5: ἐν δὲ τοῖς τοῦ γραμματικοῦ Ἀριστοφάνους φέρεται ταῦτα· κόλλοπα τὸ παχὺ δέρμα φασὶ λέγεσθαι καὶ τὸν τῶν ὀργάνων κόλλαβον, παρατιθέμενοι Ὅμηρον καὶ ἄλλους τινάς· ἕτεροι δὲ οὕτω καλοῦσι τὸν περιτρέχοντα καὶ ἑταιροῦντα, ὡς καὶ Εὐπολις (lege Εὐβουλος) ἐν τῷ· Ἐκαλλίστρατος †¹⁷ ἔστι τις οὗτος οὖν | μεγάλην πυγὴν εἶχεν, ὧ Χαριάδη, καὶ καλήν. | τοῦτον καταλεκτέον ἐς τοὺς κόλλοπας | τοὺς ἐκδρομάδας·

In the writings of Aristophanes the grammarian, it is transmitted thus: they say that the thick skin and the κόλλαβος (i.e. the winding peg, made of tough animal skin, holding stretched the strings of the lyre) of [musical] instruments are called κόλλοψ, quoting Homer (*Od.* 21.407) and some other [authorities]. But others call κόλλοψ those who go around prostituting themselves, as also Eupolis (read Eubulus) [says] in [this passage]: ‘Callistratus † . . . is then someone here who had big, beautiful buttocks, Chariades. This one should be listed among the κόλλοπες who ran away’ (Eub. fr. 10)’.

The entry κόλλοψ in the *Antiatticist* (2nd century CE), clearly dependent on Aristophanes of Byzantium, is instead the following:

Antiatt. κ 36: κόλλοπας· φασὶ δεῖ<ν> κυρίως λέγειν τοὺς τῶν ὀργάνων, οὓς καλοῦσι κολλάβους, οὐ τοὺς ἀνδρογύνους. Εὐβο<υ>λος Ἀντιόπη ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀνδρογύνου.

κόλλοπας: They say that it should be used properly of the [pegs] of [musical] instruments, which [others] call κολλάβους, but not with reference to effeminate men. [But] Eubulus in his *Antiope* (Eub. fr. 10) uses it of a male prostitute’.

As observed by S. Valente, following Tosi (1997, 176), ‘here, the author of this lexicon probably modified Aristophanes’ descriptive observation on a peculiar word-meaning of the comic poet Eubulus to reply against those lexicographers who supported the traditional meaning of κόλλοψ’.¹⁸ This interpretation receives further support if one considers that, in the Atticist tradition, only the first two meanings of κόλλοψ mentioned by Aristophanes of Byzantium, that is, those of ‘thick (animal) skin’ and, metonymically, ‘winding peg’, are attested.¹⁹ Slater, in his edition of Aristophanes of Byzantium’s fragments, suggested that ‘the structure of the argument has been obscured by Eustathius’,²⁰ but an unbiased reader of Eustathius is reasonably drawn to infer that Aristophanes duly recorded the three attested meanings of κόλλοψ, the sexual one included, without adopting a stance on the correctness of their usage (cf. κυρίως of the *Antiatticist*). It is widely recognised that the *Antiatticist* generally assumes a critical stance towards the ex-

¹⁷ The passage is irremediably corrupt: see Hunter (1983, 99).

¹⁸ S. Valente (2015b, 33); cf. now also Fiori (2022, 19–20).

¹⁹ Cf. Ael.Dion. κ 34, Paus.Gr. ε 25, and Phryn. *Ecl.* 164, on which see now Benuzzi (2023a).

²⁰ Slater (1986, 27).

cesses of a hyper-purist agenda.²¹ In this entry the *Antiatticist* reformulated Aristophanes' observations as though the Alexandrian scholar had defended the propriety of the sexual meaning only. This example of how a prescriptive intention, originally absent, is created at the point of its reception along the chain of transmission, exemplarily highlights the multiple, interrelated difficulties facing students of Hellenistic lexicography, too often only fragmentarily preserved by later and non-impartial sources.²²

Throughout this chapter, we shall therefore adopt a rather loose concept of both descriptivism and prescriptivism, highlighting gradients and nuances of approach rather than adhering to a strictly binary categorisation that cannot do justice to the richness and variety of the ancient sources. This approach is also warranted by the fact that, as we have seen above, the framework within which Hellenistic lexicography operated was essentially philological in nature and was thus strongly text-oriented. From the outset, Hellenistic lexical studies developed as ancillary to philology (the constitution and interpretation of literary texts). The philological *Textpflege* does inevitably require decision-making: one must consider the appropriateness of word-choice and expressions, *Echtheitskritik* (the inner consistency of an author's style from the perspective of his linguistic choices; avoidance of anachronism in lexicon, morphology and syntax), appropriate dialect usage, and so on; however, to call this attitude 'prescriptivism' is to miss the broader context. The same applies, more generally, to the acknowledgment that Alexandrian philologists had their own apparatus of grammatical categories (e.g. their system of word classes) and rules by which to investigate and assess the correctness of linguistic usage in literary texts – that is, what Wolfram Ax most famously defined as 'Grammatik im Kopf'.²³ As observed by Matthaios (2014, 68), 'under this designation, Ax does not mean the competence of any given speaker in speaking correctly in terms of grammar rules, but the grammarian's ability to use the grammatical categories for his philological and interpretative purposes without prior elaboration in specialized treatises'. To label this approach to language 'prescriptive', with a nod to later Atticist prescriptivism, only because Alexandrian scholars of the first Hellenistic period inevitably recognised in Greek the underlying

21 For the ideological orientation and methodology of the *Antiatticist*, see Tribulato (2014); Tribulato (2021a).

22 For other examples, in Atticist lexica, of normative interpretations superimposed on meta-linguistic observations present in Classical authors (above all comedy), see Chapter 4, Sections 3.1; 3.3; 4.1; 4.2; 5.2. It is worth remembering that the process of transmission (epitomisation) may have tampered with the original ideological orientation of the *Antiatticist*.

23 Ax (1991, 288) (= Ax 2000, 17).

ing tendency towards normativity that is proper to any given language at any given time, is equally unhelpful and conceptually confusing.²⁴

One case in point, which amply illustrates how misleading this labelling habit can be, is Ar.Byz. fr. 23 AB, preserved by both the direct (the MSS P and M) and indirect traditions (Eust. *in Il.* 2.635.5–9 and *in Od.* 2.74.3–5). Codex P (= Par. gr. 1630) of Aristophanes' *On Words Suspected not to Have Been Used by the Ancients* (henceforth *OWS*) tells us that Aristophanes of Byzantium recommended the feminine form *στίμμης* rather than the neuter *στίμμι* for the substance (powdered antimony) used for eye-paint (ἡ *στίμμης*, οὐχὶ τὸ *στίμμι*). Eustathius repeats the same (Eust. *in Il.* 2.635.8–9: ἀμαρτάνειν φησὶ τοὺς λέγοντας τὸ *στίμμι*) adding that the word came from Egypt (Αἰγυπτίων φωνῆ)²⁵ and that Aristophanes cited Ion *TrGF* 19 F 25 in support of his observation. Is this evidence for a systematic prescriptive attitude on the part of Aristophanes of Byzantium,²⁶ or, better put, is it useful to frame the question in these terms? Hardly so. Callanan (1987, 105–6) already observed that ἀμαρτάνειν is likely to be Eustathius' own interpretation of Aristophanes' original words and that which Aristophanes must have said is that both forms are attested (*στίμμι*, the neuter, is the predominant form in the Hellenistic period, as confirmed by documentary texts) but that only the feminine form (*στίμμης*) occurs in Classical authors.²⁷ This, in our view, is further supported by the fact that the codex M (= Par. suppl. gr. 1164) reads *στίμμης καὶ στίμμι· τὰ εἰς τὰ ὄμματα χρήσιμα. λέγεται δὲ καὶ θηλυκῶς καὶ οὐδετέρως* ('*στίμμης* and *στίμμι*: Things used for the eyes. It is used in the feminine and neuter'). Slater (1986, 18) takes M as having misinterpreted Aristophanes' wording: this may be true to the extent that Aristophanes, while stating that only *στίμμης* was used by Classical authors, nevertheless also mentioned its koine equivalent (*στίμμι*). To sum up, that which Aristophanes was likely saying did not involve a generalised, absolute censure of the later form; rather, he qualified that *στίμμι* was not used by Classical authors (hence, the use of the prescriptive

24 This approach is ubiquitous in Monaco (2021). For a clear exposition of the limitations of such an approach, see Callanan (1987, 103–6).

25 Latte (1915, 385 n. 1) understood Αἰγυπτίων as referring to Hellenistic Egyptian koine. *στίμμι* (*στίμμις*) is historically an Egyptian loan-word, see *EDG* s.v.

26 Tosi (1994a, 163), usually willing to excuse Aristophanes away from normative tendencies, almost regretfully remarks that 'non si può altresì negare che per quanto riguarda *στίμμι/στίμμης* sia stata tramandata una chiara ed indubbia prescrizione'.

27 Cf. also more generally Callanan (1987, 39–40), with the important observation that when Aristophanes of Byzantium gives a preference in 'Genusfragen', 'in den meisten Fällen muß allerdinge unter "Richtigkeit" Ursprünglichkeit im textkritischen Sinne verstanden werden' (39), especially when there is the possibility that the evidence ultimately derives from Aristophanes' Homeric recensio (this, of course, does not apply to the particular case of *στίμμης/στίμμι*).

ἀμαρτάνειν by Eustathius, for whom the lack of attestation among the ‘golden authors’ rendered the word unacceptable).

The adoption of this perspective also explains the temporal range chosen for our inquiry – that is, from the end of the 4th to the end of the 2nd century BCE, with some selective inroads also into the first half of the 1st century BCE (above all in Chapter 7). That is, we have decided to focus our investigation on the period *before* the proliferation, beginning as early as the 1st century BCE, of the treatises on ἑλληνισμός (also called τέχνην περι ἑλληνισμοῦ, ‘handbooks on ἑλληνισμός’), written by various grammarians (Philoxenus (1st century BCE), Tryphon (second half of the 1st century BCE), Seleucus and Irenaeus (both 1st century CE)), which already show, at least in part, a different orientation under changed cultural circumstances.²⁸

In the next sections, we shall begin by contextualising the meaning of γραμματική in the Hellenistic period and its relationship with lexical studies (glossography and lexicography). To do so, we shall have to turn *ad fontes* (Aristotle) and closely examine the concepts of λέξις, γλῶσσα, and ἑλληνισμός in this earlier phase.

3 Hellenistic ‘grammar’ and the glossographical tradition

The ancient Greeks conceptualised γραμματική as a domain of knowledge in which the components that we moderns commonly understand under the separate rubrics of grammar and philology could not be easily distinguished from one another: from the very beginning of Greek thought on language, grammar and philology were intimately intertwined.²⁹ Already by the early Hellenistic period (first quarter of the 3rd century BCE), γραμματικός was used to designate a scholar ‘expert in the interpretation of literature and textual criticism’ (Matthaios 2011, 65).³⁰ Throughout the Hellenistic and early Imperial periods, the epistemological status of γραμματική and the precise nature of its domain were the object of intense scholarly scrutiny

²⁸ Cf. Chapter 1, Section 3.1. See especially Schenkeveld (1994, 287–91); S. Valente (2015a, 615–9); Pagani (2015, 814–5).

²⁹ Among the recent contributions on the subject, see above all Pagani (2011); Pagani (2014a); Pagani (2015); and the concise but informative survey by Matthaios (2014a).

³⁰ On the complex issue of the Hellenistic terminology to indicate philological scholarship (κριτικός, γραμματικός, φιλόλογος) and its different stages, see the detailed discussion by Matthaios (2011, 60–7) with previous bibliography; Matthaios (2014a).

and debate.³¹ Definitions (and practices) of γραμματική in the Hellenistic period came in different shades of competence and cognitive value, with a clear trend towards the increasing specialisation of the field over time. Beginning with the 3rd century BCE down to the early stages of the Roman era, we see a varied range of stances, from Eratosthenes' (3rd century BCE) claim to grammar's universal domain (schol. D.T. (*Vat.*) *GG* 1,3.160.10–1 γραμματική ἐστὶν ἕξις παντελής ἐν γράμμασι, γράμματα καλῶν τὰ συγγράμματα, 'Grammar is the most complete mastery of letters, with letters signifying writings'),³² emphasising both the encyclopedic nature of its competence and the importance of the written medium, to Dionysius Thrax's (2nd century BCE) definition of it as 'practical knowledge' (ἐμπειρία) limited to literary texts only (*GG* 1,1.5.1: γραμματική ἐστὶν ἐμπειρία τῶν παρὰ ποιηταῖς τε καὶ συγγραφεῦσιν ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ³³ λεγομένων), to Asclepiades of Myrlea's (second half of the 2nd century BCE) polemical rebuttal that grammar is a specific 'expertise' (τέχνη) of that which is said in poets and writers and is thus free from the arbitrary features inherent in an empirical exercise (*S.E. M.* 1.74: τέχνη τῶν παρὰ ποιηταῖς καὶ συγγραφεῦσι λεγομένων).³⁴ It is only with Demetrius Chlorus (mid-1st century BCE) that a very important addition, extraneous to the tradition of both Dionysius Thrax and Asclepiades, is made: grammar becomes not only the 'expertise of the things <said> by poets and <prose writers>' but also 'the knowledge of the words in common usage' (*S.E. M.* 1.84: τέχνη τῶν παρὰ ποιηταῖς τε καὶ <συγγραφεῦσι λεγομένων καὶ> τῶν κατὰ κοινὴν συνήθειαν λέξεων εἰδησις).³⁵ The expansion of the scope of grammar to the knowledge of the words in 'common use', possibly influenced by the Stoic theories of the Pergamene school on the correctness of literary usage of the *spoken* language, represents a definitive step towards the emancipation of grammar to autonomous status, at the level of theoretical reflection, within the

31 See Wouters, Swiggers (2015), particularly 533–4, for a brief sketch of the main stages of the debate; see also Matthaios (2012, 256–63), Matthaios (2020b) on the opposition ἐμπειρία and τέχνη, and Pagani (2011).

32 For the cultural and historical background (mostly Aristotelian) of Eratosthenes' definition, see the illuminating treatment by Matthaios (2011, 68–79) and Wouters, Swiggers (2015, 515–22). For the importance of the two qualifications of ἐν γράμμασι and παντελής, see esp. Matthaios (2011, 78–9): 'the subject area of this discipline is broadened by Eratosthenes so as to encompass writings in their entirety. The expression γράμματα covers all written works of any type and without further specification, everything that is written down and passed on by writing'. For greater detail on the cultural context that enabled Eratosthenes' definition, see Chapter 6, Section 5.1.

33 On the interpretative difficulty posed by ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ, see below.

34 On the definition of 'grammar' by Dionysius Thrax and Asclepiades, see Pagani (2011, 18–9); see Wouters, Swiggers (2015, 522–5) on the first and (529–30) on the latter.

35 The text given here is that established by Di Benedetto (1966, 322).

framework of a discipline that was originally strongly oriented towards philology.³⁶ More precisely, the overture to the κοινή συνήθεια of the educated spoken language implies a model for the analysis and interpretation of Greek language, which is at least partly independent from its implementation in literary texts.

While acknowledging that the status and domain of ‘grammar’ in the 3rd and 2nd centuries BCE was still in the making, it is important for our purposes to recognise that γραμματική, up to Demetrius Chlorus, whether understood as ἐμπειρία (‘empirical knowledge’) or τέχνη (‘systematic expertise’), subordinated grammar and philology to the interpretation of literature (starting, as always, with Homer). What is for us moderns the rather technical and sectorial aspect of *Textpflege* was for the ancients not only textual criticism in its driest and most forbidding sense but also a comprehensive effort to understand *and* explain the literary tradition in its multifarious aspects.³⁷ The text-oriented meaning, in its broader sense, of grammar is very clearly articulated by Dionysius Thrax, a pupil of Aristarchus, in his famous definition of the γραμματική given in his Τέχνη. While it is now generally (but not universally) recognised that the majority of the Τέχνη as we know it must date to a much later period (3rd to 5th centuries CE), the authenticity, and thus early Hellenistic origin, of the definition of the γραμματική and its subdivision into parts is not in doubt, since it was also known and quoted, with some slight differences, by Sextus Empiricus (2nd century CE) in his *M.* 1.57 (definition of grammar) and 1.250 (its subdivision into parts).³⁸ This is the text as printed by Uhlig:

D.T. *GG* 1.1.5.1–6.3: γραμματική ἐστὶν ἐμπειρία τῶν παρὰ ποιηταῖς τε καὶ συγγραφεῦσιν ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ³⁹ λεγομένων. μέρη δὲ αὐτῆς ἐστὶν ἕξ· πρῶτον ἀνάγνωσις ἐντριβῆς κατὰ προσωδίαν, δεῦτερον ἐξήγησις κατὰ τοὺς ἐνυπάρχοντας ποιητικούς τρόπους, τρίτον γλωσσῶν τε

³⁶ See Matthaios (2014a).

³⁷ Cf. Matthaios (2020a, 266) (= Matthaios 2015b, 190) with previous literature on the topic.

³⁸ On the authenticity and Hellenistic origin of the first four chapters of the Τέχνη, see above all Pagani (2011, 18–21; 30–2). On the contemporary debate on the authenticity of the Τέχνη as a whole, see Pagani (2011, 30–7), esp. 35–6 n. 79 on the more recent scholarly contributions on the subject. Cf. also Pagani (2014a, 241–3).

³⁹ ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ is generally translated by scholars, ancient and modern, with ‘usually’: it would thus indicate ‘a restriction of the domain of grammar, which would have as its object only the current, normal usage of Greek authors’ (so Wouters, Swiggers 2015, 525). The text of S.E. *M.* 1.57 instead of ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ reads ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πλεῖστον, ‘as far as possible’, ‘for the most part’. For a thorough analysis of the different twist that the two concurrent adverbial expressions give to the domain and epistemological status of the γραμματική, see Wouters, Swiggers (2015, 524–6) and Matthaios (2011, 77–8 n. 83) with further bibliography. The scholia to the Τέχνη do not seem to differentiate sharply between the two options. Whatever text and interpretation one chooses, the choice does not prejudice the overall reading of the passage proposed here.

καὶ ἱστοριῶν πρόχειρος ἀπόδοσις, τέταρτον ἐτυμολογίας εὔρεσις, πέμπτον ἀναλογίας ἐκλογισμός, ἕκτον κρίσις ποιημάτων, ὃ δὴ κάλλιστόν ἐστι πάντων τῶν ἐν τῇ τέχνῃ.

Grammar is the empirical knowledge of the expressions commonly used among poets and prose writers. Its parts are six: first, the skilful reading in conformity with the prosody; second, the exegesis of the occurring poetic tropes; third, the readily understandable⁴⁰ rendering of rare words and realia; fourth, the discovery of the etymology; fifth, the calculation of analogy [that is of the analogical proportions]; and sixth, the judgement on poems, which is the finest part of all those [contained] in the art [of grammar]. (Modified translation after Wouters, Swiggers 2015, 523).

It is important to observe that the different ‘parts’ of grammar are presented by Dionysius Thrax in increasing order of complexity: the sixth part of the γραμματική, that is, the κρίσις ποιημάτων, is defined as ‘the most beautiful’ of all, and so, in a sense, its culmination.⁴¹ The ‘judgement of poems’ is a much-debated expression, whose precise meaning (aesthetic-literary evaluation and/or philological-textual activity) remains debated.⁴² However, the very fact that it is said to be the last part of grammar and its apex suggests that it encompasses all its previous parts – that is, linguistic explanation (at the level of morphology, syntax, and lexicon), exegesis of the content (realia), and stylistic features. It is more likely, therefore, that the ‘judgement of poems’ part included both a textual assessment of the work at hand (authenticity or not) and a literary appreciation (style).

In Dionysius Thrax’s definition, we also meet another crucial element for our inquiry: ‘the readily understandable rendering of glosses and realia’ (γλωσσῶν τε καὶ ἱστοριῶν πρόχειρος ἀπόδοσις) as part and parcel of the third constituent of grammar’s specific aim. In the next section, we shall see in greater detail what a γλῶσσα was thought to be, as a linguistic category, in the Aristotelian and the early Hellenistic tradition. For the time being, suffice it to say that the formal *and* semantic explanation of difficult, antiquated or unusual words as isolated lexical items was, by the middle of the 2nd century BCE, a formally recognised part of grammar’s job. The explanation of γλῶσσαί in Dionysius Thrax’s definition refers

⁴⁰ For this translation of πρόχειρος, see Wouters, Swiggers (2015, 527).

⁴¹ For a concise but up-to-date analysis of Dionysius Thrax’s six parts of grammar, see Schironi (2018, 93–7).

⁴² Both interpretations find support in some of the ancient scholia to the Τέχνη: see Wouters, Swiggers (2015, 528–9). Schironi (2018, 99) and Schenkeveld (1994, 264 n. 3), with reference to S.E. M. 1.93 τὰ τε ὑγιῆ καὶ τὰ μὴ τοιαῦτα κρίνουσι, τὰ τε γνήσια ἀπὸ τῶν νόθων διορίζουσιν (‘they judge what is sound and what is not and separate the authentic from the spurious’), support the view that the ‘judgement of poems’ was conceived within a strictly philological framework: it mainly concerned issues of authenticity (*athetesis* etc.).

exclusively to *written* texts (παρὰ ποιηταῖς τε καὶ συγγραφεῦσιν) and hence to the literary Greek tradition taught in an educational context.

At the same time, however, in the Hellenistic period, the known Greek world was increasingly expanding. The Ptolemies’ aggressive pursuit of a policy of international cultural supremacy is at its most visible in the establishment of institutions such as the Museum and Library of Alexandria: huge financial resources were employed to monumentalise the Greek past and its cultural achievements with the support of royal patronage.⁴³ This promoted what can legitimately be called ‘Alexandrian encyclopaedism’ – that is, the effort to collect and organise *all* available knowledge (and not only in the Greek language: genuine attempts were made to gather ‘world literature’, hence the importance of translations).⁴⁴ The combination of new synchronic and diachronic developments (and, last but not least, the levelling pressure of the incipient koine),⁴⁵ promoted, as observed, among many others, by Parsons (2011, 149), a ‘systematic interest in the byways of language: a synchronic appreciation of the wide range of dialects and foreign languages more easily encountered in the new Hellenistic world, and a diachronic accumulation of literature more or less archaic now being sorted and interpreted as a common inheritance of Hellenism’. It is in this context that, alongside the time-honoured explanation of obscure literary words in schools (above all Homer) and the scholarly interpretation of the poets in general,⁴⁶ a second important strand of Hellenistic lexicography developed: the interest in *Dialektwörter* from contemporary spoken vernaculars *without* a literary tradition.⁴⁷ In particular, according to Wackernagel (1876, 56–7) and Latte (1925), the first Hellenistic treatises *On Dialects* (Περὶ διαλέκτων) were repertoires of spoken vernaculars, without the input of literary sources.⁴⁸ From Athenaeus, for instance, we know that Dionysius Iambus (3rd century BCE), one of the teachers of Aristophanes of Byzantium, in his Περὶ διαλέκτων, not only approached spoken language from a diachronic perspective but also offered diastatic observations on the idioms ‘of special social groups of native

⁴³ Cf. Hatzimichali (2013); Thompson (2008).

⁴⁴ See again Hatzimichali (2013, 66–7); Thompson (2008, 71–2).

⁴⁵ See Chapter 4, Section 4 and Section 5.

⁴⁶ Cf. Dubischar (2015, 582): ‘Glossography for exegetical purposes, that is, to help understand and interpret a text, is the earliest Greek dictionary type. Its beginnings date back to the 6th century BC, and its roots may reach back even farther’.

⁴⁷ On the importance of dialectal glossography in Hellenistic scholarship, Latte (1925) remains fundamental. See also Dettori (2000, 37 n. 105); Schironi (2009, 28–38); Pagani (2011, 37 n. 81); Ucciardello (2012, 23–4 n. 31) (= Ucciardello 2006, 44 n. 29); F. Montanari (2012, esp. 123–9); Hatzimichali (2019, 34–5).

⁴⁸ Much about these early treatises remains unclear (lexicographical repertoire or more of a grammar-oriented framework? Or a combination of both?): see S. Valente (2015a, 618).

speakers like fishermen and sailors' (Hatzimichali 2019, 35).⁴⁹ This particular development of lexicography ('spoken' dialectology) can therefore be at least partly seen as a tangible manifestation of the Ptolemies' international aspirations.⁵⁰ In the present chapter, while keeping constantly in mind the importance of this strand of lexicographical enquiry, we shall delve into it only when Attic matters come to the fore. We shall now move to the kernel of Hellenistic lexical studies: ἡ γλῶσσα.

3.1 What is a gloss? Continuity and discontinuity in the *longue durée*

The explanation of γλῶσσα (unfamiliar items of vocabulary) was one of the core elements of Greek education from the outset. Inevitably, Homer enjoyed the lion's share in this respect too: rhapsodes were the first interpreters of his idiolect,⁵¹ and comedy's snapshots informed by schoolroom teaching (esp. Ar. fr. 233 from *Banquetters*, transmitted by Gal. *Gloss. prooem.* 146.1–8 Perilli = 19.66.1–8 Kühn) reveal that by the late 5th century BCE, the explanation of γλῶσσα (mainly but *not* uniquely Homeric) was a well-established practice in elementary education. The scene portrayed in Ar. fr. 233 is worth dwelling on: an old father requests his 'bad' son to explain some Homeric γλῶσσα (ll. 1–2 πρὸς δὲ ταύτας δ' αὖ λέξον Ὀμήρου γλώττας; τί καλοῦσι κόρυμβα; < . . . > τί καλοῦσ' ἀμενηνὰ κάρηνα; 'And next tell me some Homeric γλῶσσα: what does κόρυμβα ('ship-sterns') mean? < . . . > what does ἀμενηνὰ κάρηνα ('fleeting heads') mean?'). His demand is countered by the 'bad' son's challenge to ask instead his 'good' brother the meanings of some old (Solonian) legal terms (ll. 3–4 . . . τί καλοῦσιν ιδύους (= Solon fr. 41a–c Leão-Rhodes),⁵² < . . . > τί πο-

⁴⁹ Ucciardello (2008) has suggested that the Περὶ διαλέκτων by Dionysius Iambus may also have drawn on dialectal literary sources, but see Dettori's scepticism (2019, 20–1). Dionysius Iambus' fragments have now received a detailed commentary by Dettori (2019, 21–46).

⁵⁰ On the difference between Alexandrian lexicography and its encyclopedic aspirations and the more systematic Imperial 'universal' lexicography, see Matthaïos (2020a, 363–4) (= Matthaïos 2015b, 288).

⁵¹ Novokhatko (2020b, 44–5) (= Novokhatko 2015, 30–1); Ford (2002, 68–72); see already Latte (1925, 147–9).

⁵² ιδύους is Fritzsche's virtually certain emendation of the corrupted wording of Galen's MSS (ιδου σι A; ιδου σι CD, ιδου σι N, ειδουσι ERU). At Solon's time the original orthography must have had the diphthongised form -υι- (see Threatte 1980, 338). Yet to restore it in Galen's quotation of Aristophanes smacks of hypercorrection, the more so since in the Atticist tradition, of which Galen was certainly cognisant, the spelling with -ι- instead of -υι- was perceived as genuinely 'Attic': cf. Ael.Dion. ι 4, Hdn. *GG* 3,2,281.4–6. Whether in 427 BCE Athens (the date of the first performance of the *Banquetters*) Aristophanes actually intended to retain the archaïsing spelling is impossible to say.

τ’ἔστιν ὀπίειν (= Solon fr. 52c Leão-Rhodes);⁵³ ‘what does ἰδύοι (‘witnesses’) mean? < . . . > and what does ὀπίειν (‘to marry’) mean?’.⁵⁴ While the mention of Homeric γλῶσσοι has monopolised the attention of most ancient and modern scholarship on the fragment,⁵⁵ the ‘bad’ son’s counter-offer of having his brother explain old legal language has, with rare exceptions,⁵⁶ gone unremarked by literary critics.⁵⁷ However, as pointedly observed by Willi (2003a, 71), in this quick exchange, ‘technical terminology and poetic (Homeric) language are treated as comparable kinds of specialist discourse’: they are seamlessly juxtaposed with one another without any apparent solution of continuity, implying only, if anything, a ‘higher’ effort for the trouble of expounding legal terms (an enhancement of the stake on the part of the ‘wicked’ son, so to speak). Was this juxtaposition of Homer’s lofty language and Solonian terms simply a way of exerting a de-familiarising, comic effect on the audience? Would the contemporary audience have been shocked by the smooth transition, in a schoolroom setting, from the pinnacle of poetry (Homer) to legal jargon? This cannot be entirely ruled out, given the highly fragmentary nature in which Aristophanes’ *Banqueters* has come down to us, but at least *prima facie* Aristophanes’ passage seems to suggest that in the second half of the 5th century BCE it was parents’ common expectation that the texts studied by their children, both poetic (notably Homer) and prosaic (Solon’s legislation), were subjected to the same exegetical practice of explaining the meanings of difficult or obscure words.⁵⁸ It is important here to highlight the double attention, within a 5th century BCE Athenian school setting, to both poetic and prose texts: we shall see this same practice institutionalised in the schooling system of the Hellenistic and Imperial periods.

⁵³ Dobree’s emendation for the MSS εὖ ποιεῖν. The 6th-century BCE spelling of ὀπίειν would obviously have been ὀπιεῖν (see above n. 52). It is debated whether the τί ποτ’ ἔστιν of the MSS tradition is Galen’s own wording or genuinely part of the Aristophanic quotation: see Perilli (2017, 296–7).

⁵⁴ On the possible context of the fragment, see Cassio (1977, 75–7).

⁵⁵ Interesting in this respect is the wording of Poll. 2.109, who quotes only the first verse of the Aristophanic fragment: καὶ τὰς ποιητικὰς φωνὰς γλώττας ἐκάλουν, ὡς Ἀριστοφάνης, entirely omitting to mention the Solonic glosses. For the importance of this fragment for the study of Homeric glossography in ancient and modern scholarship, see Novokhatko (2023, 152–3) and Matthaios (2010, 167 n. 7), both with further bibliography.

⁵⁶ See e.g. Alpers (1990, 16) and Alpers (2001, 195) on Ar. fr. 233 as evidence for the early existence of ‘juristische Glossare’ and Dettori (2000, 26); cf. also Bonanno (1986) on the double glossed nature (epicism and a Solonian technical term) of ὀπίειν.

⁵⁷ Likewise, Solonian scholarship has focused exclusively on the legal glosses of Ar. fr. 233.

⁵⁸ Cf. also at Ar. fr. 233.1 the suggestive πρὸς δὲ ταύτας (‘in addition’): some other difficult expressions (non-Homeric and non-legal, presumably) had already had their turn.

Educational practices are by definition conservative, and it is no surprise that an image similar to that sketched by Ar. fr. 233 can be gained for the 4th century BCE from yet another famous comic passage, Straton's humorous depiction of a master distraught at his inability to understand the high-flown vocabulary (mostly Homeric) used by his hired cook (Strato fr. 1.40–4 from his *Phoinikides*):

. . . ἔθουεν, ἔλεγεν ἕτερα μυρία
 τοιαῦθ' ἄ, μὰ τὴν Γῆν, οὐδὲ εἷς συνῆκεν ἄν,
 μίστυλλα, μοίρας, δίπτυχ', ὀβελούς, ὥστ' ἔδει
 τὰ τοῦ Φιλίτα λαμβάνοντα βιβλία
 σκοπεῖν ἕκαστον τί δύναιται τῶν ῥημάτων

. . . [the cook] made the sacrifice and spoke other countless words of such a kind that, by Earth, not a single person could have understood: μίστυλλα ('dicings'), μοῖραι ('lots'), δίπτυχα ('double-folds'), ὀβελοί ('spits') so that I should have fetched Philitas' books and examined what each word means.

While most of the words mentioned by the cook are epicisms, they are far from rare:⁵⁹ the scene's humour certainly lies in exposing the exaggerated ignorance of the master, who has difficulty in understanding words that would not have taxed well-taught schoolchildren (learning basic Homeric vocabulary) and who clearly has no idea of what Philitas' Ἀτακτοὶ γλῶσσαι were about (certainly not a schoolbook, whatever it may have been).⁶⁰ As several scholars have remarked, the scanty remains of Philitas' glossographical work (cf. Section 4.1) do not suggest the image of a scholar uniquely dedicated to the study of Homeric diction: the fun of the passage consists rather in juxtaposing the name of an erudite poet who was, at the time, also the *avantgarde* of lexicographical studies (Philitas' Ἀτακτοὶ γλῶσσαι are usually dated to ca. 300 BCE) with the traditional Homeric glossographical practice *tout court*, primary education included.⁶¹ Thus, while we do not need infer from Straton's parody that Philitas' lexical work was an educational hit on the book stalls,⁶² we may reasonably assume that the time-honoured practice of explaining Homeric vocabulary continued unchanged in 4th-century BCE schoolrooms. In fact, if we also consider the extra-textual information avail-

⁵⁹ For a detailed analysis of the lexicon of Straton's Homerising cook, see Dettori (2000, 10–1).

⁶⁰ For an illuminating analysis of Straton's fragment and its import for the reception of Philitas' glossographical work, see above all Bing (2003, 343–6). On the much-discussed meaning of the title of Philitas' lexicographical work, see Section 4.2.

⁶¹ Dettori (2000, 11); Bing (2003, 346).

⁶² Thus, correctly, Bing (2003, 346); on the dissemination of early glossographical works outside the great libraries, see Hatzmichali (2019, esp. p. 32 n. 8 on Philitas).

able, it is almost a fitting coincidence that Straton’s fr. 1 is transmitted not only by Athenaeus (9.382c–d) but, with some slight textual divergences, also by a 3rd-century BCE papyrus from the Arsinoites nomos, P.Cair. JdE 65445 (= TM 59942), most probably a schoolmaster’s text with a series of exercises in increasing order of difficulty to be used in his classes (from a syllabary to lists of words, shorter and longer excerpts for copying and reading, and even mathematical tables).⁶³

Likewise, the enduring practice of glossing difficult words (especially Homeric ones) in the schools of Hellenistic and Graeco-Roman Egypt is confirmed by the many lists of word, lexica (general and author specific) attested in several papyri from the Egyptian χώρα.⁶⁴ A very clear example of this practice is represented by the so-called *scholia minora* preserved on papyri: obscure vocabulary was ‘translated’ into the corresponding koine usage of the time.⁶⁵ Most importantly, as already seen in Section 3, in the 2nd century BCE, the explanation of γλῶσσαί (γλωσσῶν ἀπόδοσις) was codified by Dionysius Thrax as the third task of the γραμματική. Just as in Ar. fr. 233, also in Dionysius Thrax’s definition of grammar, equal attention is paid to *both* poetic and prose texts (ἐμπειρία τῶν παρὰ ποιηταῖς τε καὶ συγγραφεῦσιν [. . .] λεγομένων). Both categories are also exposed to the *same* teaching method: a readily accessible explanation of the linguistic element (γλωσσῶν [. . .] πρόχειρος ἀπόδοσις), that which we would call *Sprachphilologie*, and the underlying *realia* (ἱστοριῶν), that is, characters, myths, plots, geographical and historical information, and customs, etc. The application of the same methodology to both poetry and prose also reveals another important element of Hellenistic exegesis in general: the fluid permeability of linguistic usage between the media of poetry and prose; often in Alexandrian scholarship, prose passages are explained with reference to poetic ones (especially Homer) and *vice versa*.⁶⁶

Hitherto, none of the evidence discussed here has clearly conveyed what a γλῶσσα is. Galen, the illustrious physician and polymath writing in the 2nd century CE, had no doubt about what qualified (and what did not qualify) as a gloss, as his dedicatory preamble to his *Interpretation of Hippocratic Glosses* (τῶν παρ’ Ἱπποκράτει γλωττῶν⁶⁷ ἐξήγησις) makes clear (Gal. *Gloss.* prooem. 142.1–12 Perilli

⁶³ Cribiore (1996, 269) no. 379, on which, see Parsons (2011, 140–1).

⁶⁴ For the Hellenistic period, see, above all, the survey by Parsons (2011, 146–9).

⁶⁵ See Cribiore (1996, 50–1); Cribiore (2005, 207–8). For the practice of this ‘intra-lingual translation’ in the *scholia minora*, see also Schironi (2018, 218).

⁶⁶ On this exegetical practice, see Montana (2020b, 169–70) (= Montana 2015, 96–7).

⁶⁷ The MSS of the *classis prior* have the Ionic γλωσσῶν: on the authenticity of the Attic spelling γλωττῶν, see Perilli (2017, 92).

= 19.63.1–12 Kühn). To his young friend and fellow citizen Teuthras, eager to learn from him, in the most concise way possible, Hippocrates' γλῶσσαί (τὰς παρ' Ἴπποκράτει γλώττας, ὃ Τεῦθρα, βουληθέντι σοι διὰ βραχυτάτων ἡμᾶς ἐξηγήσασθαι), Galen is more than willing to oblige. First, however, he must dispense with several common misconceptions about what a gloss is and the way in which it differs from the πᾶσα λέξις (in this particular case 'the vocabulary')⁶⁸ of an author as a whole:

Gal. *Gloss. prooem.* 142. 5–12 Perilli = 19.63.5–12 Kühn: ἔσται δὲ ὡς αὐτὸς ἐκέλευσας ἡ τάξις τῷ λόγῳ κατὰ τὴν τῶν γραμμάτων τάξιν, ἀφ' ὧν <αι> γλώτται τὴν ἀρχὴν ἔχουσι, πρότερόν γε διορισμένοις ἡμῖν ὅπη διαφέρει τοῦ πᾶσαν ἐξηγήσασθαι τὴν Ἴπποκράτους λέξιν τὸ τὰς γλώττας μόνως. ὅσα τοίνυν τῶν ὀνομάτων ἐν μὲν τοῖς πάλοι χρόνοις ἦν συνήθη, νυνὶ δ' οὐκέτι ἐστὶ, τὰ μὲν τοιαῦτα γλώττας καλοῦσι καὶ ταύτας ἐξηγησόμενος ἔρχομαι· τὰ δὲ ἄλλα πάντα ὅσα ζητήσεως μὲν οὐχ ἥττονος προσδεῖται, συνήθη δὲ ἐστὶν ἔτι καὶ εἰς τόδε, κατὰ τὰς τῶν συγγραμμάτων αὐτῶν ἐξηγήσεις ἀμεινον ἐπισκοπεῖσθαι.

As you have asked, the order of my exposition will follow that of the letters [of the alphabet] with which the glosses begin, but before that, I must first define how the interpretation of the whole vocabulary of Hippocrates differs from interpreting his glosses only. For those words that in ancient times were current but nowadays are not so anymore, these [they] call glosses, and these are those which I am going to explain. All the other words that require an explanation no less than these, but that are still in use up to now, it is better to look them up in the interpretative works on those very same writings.

Galen sharply distinguishes between two sets of words: (1) words needing an explanation because they have become obsolete with time (ὅσα τοίνυν τῶν ὀνομάτων ἐν μὲν τοῖς πάλοι χρόνοις ἦν συνήθη, νυνὶ δ' οὐκέτι ἐστὶ) and (2) words that may also require explanation but are nevertheless still currently in use in his own time (τὰ δὲ ἄλλα πάντα ὅσα ζητήσεως μὲν οὐχ ἥττονος προσδεῖται, συνήθη δὲ ἐστὶν ἔτι καὶ εἰς τόδε). Of these two word-groups, only the first can legitimately be called γλῶσσαί, whereas the other represents simply λέξεις ('expressions'). Galen insists on this distinction repeatedly in his proem.⁶⁹ His Hippocratic glossary, we are told (Gal. *Gloss. prooem.* 144.21–5 Perilli = 19.65.21–5 Kühn), will contain not only those words that were familiar to the other ancients but have now fallen out of use (οὐ μόνον ὅσα τοῖς ἄλλοις παλαιοῖς ὑπάρχοντα συνήθη τῶν ὀνομάτων οὐκέτι ἐστὶν ἐν ἔθει νῦν) but also those employed idiosyncratically by Hippocrates himself, either by using a familiar word in a transferred sense, or

⁶⁸ For this meaning of πᾶσα λέξις in Galen's proem, see Perilli (2017, 103; 291–2).

⁶⁹ Cf. Gal. *Gloss. prooem.* 144.27–9 Perilli = 19.65.27–9 Kühn: ὑπὲρ τοῦ γινώσκων ἐναργέστερον, οἷον μὲν τι ἢ γλώττα ἐστὶν, οἷον δὲ τι καὶ τὸ παραπλήσιον αὐτῇ τὸ γεγονός ὑπὸ τινος τῶν παλαιῶν and *Gloss. prooem.* 148.16 Perilli = 19.68.16 Kühn: διωρισμένου δὲ σαφῶς τί μὲν ἐστὶ γλῶττα, τί δὲ λέξις.

construing a new syntagm or changing its meaning (ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅσα κατὰ τινα τρόπον ἴδιον αὐτὸς ἐποίησεν ὁ Ἱπποκράτης ἢ μετενεγκὼν ἀπὸ τοῦ συνήθους ἢ σχῆμα περιθείς ἕτερον ἢ τὸ σημαινόμενον ὑπαλλάξας). Before quoting as a concrete example what is for us Aristophanes fr. 233, Galen introduces a further refinement:

Gal. *Gloss. proem.* 148.3–9 Perilli = 19.67.3–9 Kühn: δῆλον οὖν ἐκ τούτων οἴμαι σοι γεγενέσθαι διπλοῦν⁷⁰ εἶναι τρόπον τῶν γλωττῶν, ἢ τοῦ κοινοῦ πᾶσιν ὀνόματος ἐκπεσόντος τῆς ἐπικρατούσης συνηθείας ἢ τοῦ γενομένου πρὸς τινος τῶν παλαιῶν μὴ παραδεχθέντος ὅλως εἰς τὴν συνήθειαν. οὕτως οὖν καὶ Ἱπποκράτης τὰ μὲν ἐκ τῶν ὄντων τότε συνήθων ὀνομάτων παραλαμβάνει, τὰ δὲ αὐτὸς ποιεῖ, τὰ δὲ καὶ τοῖς σημαινόμενοις ὑπαλλάττει, καὶ δίκαιον ἕκαστον αὐτῶν ἡμᾶς ἐξηγεῖσθαι μετὰ τῶν γλωττῶν, ὅταν γε φαίνεται τοῦ νῦν ἔθους ἐκπεπτωκός.

I believe that, from these examples, it has thus become clear to you that there are two kinds of glosses: either the word that was once familiar to all but has fallen out from the prevalent usage or the word coined by an ancient author that has not altogether been accepted into the common usage. So, therefore, Hippocrates also adopts some of the words then current, creates some himself, and alters the meaning of others. And it is right that we explain each of these (i.e. the second set of words) together with the glosses, whenever such words have fallen out of current usage.

Here, Galen distinguishes two types of gloss: words once familiar *to all* but that have become now obscure and words already used by a given ancient author in an idiosyncratic way (that is, a deviant usage compared to the συνήθεια of the time) and that are now obsolete.⁷¹ Strictly speaking, Galen's wording (δίκαιον ἕκαστον αὐτῶν ἡμᾶς ἐξηγεῖσθαι μετὰ τῶν γλωττῶν) may suggest that only the first category is a gloss proper, whereas the second is an extension *a latere* of the first. Both types of gloss, however, share one and the same necessary condition: they must be or be perceived by contemporary speakers and/or readers as archaisms. The diriment criterion for Galen is clearly the diachronic dimension: a

⁷⁰ διπλοῦν is Ilberg's brilliant correction for the transmitted δ' εἶπον (A); Aldus Manutius emended it into ὡς εἶπον (accepted by Kühn); διπτόν was suggested by Mewaldt.

⁷¹ Partially comparable (but only partially, since the diachronic dimension is not explicitly spelled out) is the sense of γλωσσηματικῶς in Timaeus' preface to his collection of *Platonic Glosses* at *Tim. Lex. praef.*: ἐξέλεξα τὰ παρὰ τῷ φιλοσόφῳ γλωσσηματικῶς ἢ κατὰ συνήθειαν Ἀττικὴν εἰρημένα, οὐχ ὑμῖν μόνοις τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις ὄντ' ἀσαφῆ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων τοῖς πλείστοις, τάξας τε ταῦτα κατὰ στοιχείου καὶ μεταφράσας ἀπέστειλά σοι ('I selected in Plato those words which are said γλωσσηματικῶς or in keeping with Attic usage, words whose meaning is unclear not only to you Romans but also to very many Greek natives; I sent them to you after having ordered them according to the letters of the alphabet, accompanied by a paraphrase'). S. Valente (2009, 71) argues that γλωσσηματικῶς probably encompasses both the sense of epichoric glosses and of rare meanings ascribed by Plato to otherwise common words. This is correct but at no point we are told that the diatopic feature is a necessary requirement: unattested usage of common words may include dialectal words but need not to.

γλώσσα is by definition a word that has become obsolete in current usage (at least from the reader's perspective: when used by a non-ancient author is thus a deliberate stylistic choice).⁷² This, of course, does *not* imply that this was the meaning of γλώσσα in Aristophanes' passage (Ar. fr. 233) quoted by Galen in support of his explanation: as rightly remarked already by Lebek, '[d]och steht Galen hier gewiß unter dem Eindruck der primär auf die Vergangenheit gerichteten Sprachbetrachtung seiner Zeit; seine Auslegung kann für den Sinn, den Aristophanes mit dem Substantiv verbindet, nichts lehren'.⁷³

Two further points of Galen's explanation warrant attention here. First, the very same fact that Galen feels the need to clarify at great length to his friend Teuthras (an educated physician like himself, and a Greek native speaker too)⁷⁴ the way in which a γλώσσα differs from a λέξις implies that such a distinction was not so self-evident after all. It is important to remember that in early Hellenistic scholarship, a certain degree of fluctuation between λέξις and γλώσσα was present from the outset (after all, as we shall see later, in Aristotle the latter is a subtype of the former), even if it is especially with the Roman era that λέξις supplants γλώσσα even as far as Homeric vocabulary is concerned.⁷⁵

The nature of a γλώσσα proper may have been a subject of dispute or at least discussion in early Imperial scholarship, Atticist circles included. Lebek, in fact, identified in our passage of Galen the first secure attestation of γλώσσα strictly understood as an archaism.⁷⁶ Moreover, with his repeated insistence on the need to

72 Cf. also Gal. *Gloss. prooem.* 147.8–9 Perilli = 19.66.8–9 Kühn: ἐξ ὧν δῆλον ὡς ἡ γλώττα παλαιόν ἐστιν ὄνομα τῆς συνήθειας ἐκπεπωκός. On Galen's concept of συνήθεια (mostly, but not uniquely, contemporary educated usage), see Manetti (2003, 223–4); Manetti (2009).

73 Lebek (1969, 63 n. 1).

74 On Teuthras' background, see Perilli (2017, 92–3). The addressee of Timaeus' Platonic glossary instead is not a Greek native speaker: whatever real name may hide beneath the corrupted Γαιατιανῶ of the MSS, the person in question was a Roman by birth, cf. S. Valente (2012, 55–6).

75 On this terminological fluctuation, see Henrichs (1971, 231–2 with nn. 7–8). A case in point is that of e.g. Apollodorus of Athens (2nd/1st century BCE), whose lexicographical work is variously mentioned as Γλώσσαι in schol. (ex.?) Hom. *Il.* 1.244d (A) (= Apollod. *BNJ* 244 F 221) but as Λέξεις in schol. Apoll.Rh. 1.1089a ἀφλάστοιο· Ἀπολλόδωρος ἐν ταῖς Λέξεσι ἀποδέδωκεν ἀφλαστον τὸ ἀκροστόλιον (= Apollod. *BNJ* 244 F 240). On Apollodorus' contribution to Hellenistic glossography, see Chapter 7, Section 5.

76 Lebek (1969, 63 n. 1). Cf. also Lebek (1969, 65 n. 4), where he correctly dismisses the passage of D.H. *Comp.* 3, p. 11.14–9 Usener–Radermacher: λυθέντος γοῦν τοῦ μέτρου φαῦλα φανήσεται τὰ αὐτὰ ταῦτα καὶ ἄζηλα· οὔτε γὰρ μεταφοραὶ τινες ἐνεισιν εὐγενεῖς οὔτε ὑπαλλαγαὶ οὔτε καταχρήσεις οὔτ' ἄλλη τροπικὴ διάλεκτος οὐδεμία, οὐδὲ δὴ γλώτται πολλαὶ τινες οὐδὲ ξένα ἢ πεποιημένα ὀνόματα ('Indeed, if the metre is broken up, these very same lines will appear ordinary and unworthy of admiration: for there are no noble metaphors in them, nor instances of hypallage or catachresis, nor any other form of figurative language; nor again many recondite, strange

differentiate between γλῶσσα and λέξεις, Galen may, at first glance, appear to simply replicate a distinction that some scholars have seen as already operating in early Hellenistic lexicographical studies (the usual term of reference quoted is Aristophanes of Byzantium's Λέξεις).⁷⁷ However, as we shall see in greater detail in Chapter 7, Section 1, we should be wary of projecting this categorisation back to early Hellenistic times: some of the words commented in the Λέξεις of Aristophanes are undoubtedly archaisms, but some are not. That is, for Aristophanes of Byzantium, archaism was a sufficient but *not* necessary condition for a gloss, differently from Galen.⁷⁸ Where, then, did Galen get his definition of γλῶσσα from? The most obvious answer is the cultural and intellectual climate of the Second Sophistic. Even if Galen was highly critical of the extremes of the Atticist trend of his own time, he nevertheless shared its uncompromising veneration of οἱ παλαιοί as educational pillars and masters of style.⁷⁹ Galen was acutely aware that language develops through time and that words may become obsolete; he himself acknowledged that even the Attic dialect, idolised by the strictest Atticists, changed over time and that the most successful authors were invariably those who followed the linguistic habits of their own period.⁸⁰ However, the classicising veneer in his definition of γλῶσσα is transparent: in this sense, Galen could not help being a child, however

or newly-coined words', transl. Usher (1985, 29); the reference is to the excellence of a Homeric passage: its perfection is ascribable to its σύνθεσις ὀνομάτων rather than to its ἐκλογή). Usener's emended the unanimously transmitted πολλαί into παλαιαί (an emendation accepted by Latte 1925, 148 n. 26 and 158 n. 43). However, Usener's correction has been rightly rejected by modern editors (e.g. Roberts, Usher) as a comparison with Arist. *Po.* 21.2 clearly shows: see below Section 3.2.

77 So e.g. Pfeiffer (1968, 198): 'A collection of γλῶσσαί was usually limited to obsolete and obscure terms; but under the neutral title Λέξεις every word which was peculiar in form or significance and therefore in need of explanation could be listed, whether it was out of date or still in use'; cf. also F. Montanari (1993, 251).

78 It is also worth noting that what we know under the title of Zenodotus' Ἐθνικαὶ λέξεις may simply have been a subsection of his Γλῶσσαί, cf. Section 4.3. This would further weaken the re-jection of the sharp distinction between γλῶσσα and λέξεις to the early Hellenistic period.

79 On the complex relationship between Galen and Atticism, see Sluiter (1995, 530 with n. 69); Swain (1996, 56–64); Manetti (2003, 172); Manetti (2009) *passim*. For Galen and the Second Sophistic, see von Staden (1997); Mattern (2017).

80 Cf. Gal. *De comp. med. per gen.* 13.408.1–6 Kühn: ἐπιδέδεικται γάρ μοι κατὰ τὰ πρὸς τοὺς ἐπιτιμῶντας τοῖς σολοικίζουσι καὶ αὐτοὺς Ἀττικοὺς ἀνδρας ἠκολουθηκέναι τῇ κρατούσῃ συνηθείᾳ. δέδεικται γάρ καὶ ἄλλοις πρὸ ἐμοῦ τῆς Ἀτθίδος αὐτῆς διαλέκτου μετὰπτωσις γεγονέναι πολυειδῆς, ἐπεσθαί τε τῷ καθ' ἑαυτοὺς ἔθει πάντας, ὧν δόξα μεγίστη παρὰ τοῖς Ἑλλησίν ἐστιν ἐπὶ λόγων δεινότητι ('In my work against those who censure those who commit solecisms I have shown that also Attic men themselves followed the prevailing usage. For others too before me have shown that the same Attic dialect has gone through many changes and all those whose reputation for eloquence is greatest among the Greeks followed the usage of their own time').

critical, of his own time.⁸¹ Had the term γλῶσσα always been understood as an archaism by Greek educated people? A word's meaning is not a transhistorical or inalienable property: as we shall see, in the 4th and 3rd centuries BCE, the heyday of Hellenistic scholarship, the term γλῶσσα designated a considerably more capacious and 'open' linguistic category, a tool for the study of the Greek language at the level of both textual and, more broadly, stylistic analysis. Therefore, we must now turn, unsurprisingly, to Aristotle and his concept of γλῶσσα.

3.2 Aristotle's concept of γλῶσσα

Notwithstanding Pfeiffer's influential scepticism, in the last twenty years, modern scholars have increasingly recognised the important role that Aristotle's reflection on language and literature played in establishing the conceptual framework within which early Hellenistic philology developed.⁸² This is also the case for the birth of grammar as an independent field of inquiry: Aristotle's treatment of linguistic issues, particularly (though not uniquely) in his *Poetics* (chapters 20–1), although short of a systematic theorisation of the 'parts of expression' (μέρη τῆς λέξεως), clearly demonstrates that Aristotle had identified and defined the 'basic units' of language mapping them out into an ascending order of complexity.⁸³ This is so much the case that today, Dio Chrysostom's mention, in his *Περὶ Ὀμήρου* (= D.Chr. 53.1.8–10), of Aristotle among the founders of literary criticism and grammar (καὶ δὴ καὶ αὐτὸς Ἀριστοτέλης, ἀφ' οὗ φασι τὴν κριτικὴν τε καὶ γραμματικὴν ἀρχὴν), with specific reference to his Homeric studies, scarcely raises an eyebrow.⁸⁴ It will come as no surprise, therefore, if our enquiry into the nature of linguistic variation as conceived of and studied in the early Hellenistic

⁸¹ Also, Phrynichus, for example, if the ascription by de Borries of fr. 6a to the *PS* is trustworthy, while exhorting the educated to avoid using γλῶσσαί (Phryn. *PS* fr. 6a.18: φεύγειν μὲν οὖν χρὴ τὸ τῶν γλωττῶν), seems to consider them as examples of ἀρχαία φωνή (in *PS* fr. 6a Phrynichus acknowledges the Attic character of ἄγω and ἀγάλλω when used as synonyms to τὸ τιμᾶν, 'to honour'; of the two verbs the first is πολιτικόν, whereas the second is κωμωδικόν καὶ ἐγγυὸς γλώττης. Both however are subsumed under the label ἀρχαίας φωνῆς σπουδή).

⁸² See Schironi (2018, 414–5 n. 5; 742–3 with n. 22) with previous bibliography; an overview is also found in Bouchard (2016).

⁸³ On Aristotle's influence on the later linguistic studies of Alexandrian grammarians and the Stoics, see Ax (1993); Swiggers, Wouters (2002, 117 with nn. 56–8).

⁸⁴ The anonymous source of φασί has been traced back to Asclepiades of Myrlea: Pfeiffer (1968, 67 n. 5; 157–8) was very sceptical about Dio's reliability; far more positive is Matthaios (2011, 67); cf. also Fornaro (2002, 87–8) on the fact that Dio's passage must depend on widespread and non-controversial notions circulating within the Greek educational system of the time.

period brings us back first to Aristotle's definition of γλῶσσα and his observations regarding its stylistic advantages and/or disadvantages according to the various literary genres in which it may be deployed.⁸⁵

Aristotle defines what a γλῶσσα is at *Po.* 21.1457b.1–7, within a broader excursus on the building blocks of verbal expression in general (20.1456b.20: τῆς δὲ λέξεως ἀπάσης), whether in prose or verse,⁸⁶ and on word types according to their usage (ch. 21).⁸⁷ Before we turn directly to Aristotle's chapter 21, it is important to note that chapters 20 (the constitutive elements of language in terms of phonetics, phonology, and grammar) and 21 (stylistics) of the *Poetics* are intimately interconnected. Aristotle considers language and style to be *coextensive* inasmuch as style is the result of a heightened consciousness of linguistic choices made possible by the underlying 'grammatical' system: as Kotarcic (2021, 35) observed, '*lexis* as linguistic choice builds on the premises established as part of *lexis* as a language system'.⁸⁸ Therefore, chapter 20 deals with the 'parts of expression', that is, as observed by de Jonge, Ophuijsen (2010, 495), with 'all and only items that may be considered as "components of diction," whether these are words, less than words [. . .], or combinations of words'. For Aristotle, these 'components of diction' are στοιχεῖον or 'speech sound',⁸⁹ syllable (both less than words), conjunction, noun, verb, connective,⁹⁰ declination, and sen-

⁸⁵ On Aristotle's concept of γλῶσσα, see recently Kotarcic (2021, 81–4); Mayhew (2019, 103–9); cf. also Schironi (2018, 218–9); Tosi (1994a, 144–5); F. Montanari (2012, 125–8).

⁸⁶ Cf. *Po.* 6.1450b.13–5: λέγω δέ, ὡσπερ πρότερον εἴρηται, λέξιν εἶναι τὴν διὰ τῆς ὀνομασίας ἐρμηνείαν, ὃ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἐμμέτρων καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν λόγων ἔχει τὴν αὐτὴν δύναμιν ('By 'diction', I mean, as we said earlier, communication by means of language, which has the same potential in case of both verse and [prose] speeches': translation after Janko 1987, 10).

⁸⁷ On the function of chapters 20–1 within the argumentative structure of the *Poetics*, see Schramm (2019) with previous bibliography.

⁸⁸ See also Kotarcic (2021, 31–2) on Aristotle's multifaceted but nevertheless consistent use of λέξις across his oeuvre and at 32 n. 47 on the broader semantic spectrum covered by λέξις in Aristotle (and Plato) when compared to its post-Aristotelian development in philosophical and grammatical writings.

⁸⁹ For the adoption of this translation of στοιχεῖον, see Kotarcic's detailed argumentation at Kotarcic (2021, 434).

⁹⁰ On the problematic nature of ἄρθρον (here translated as 'connective') in *Po.* 20, especially with respect to its relationship with σύνδεσμος, see Kotarcic (2021, 46–7). The soundness of the transmitted text has long been suspected: for ἄρθρον as a possible interpolation generated in the later grammatical tradition, see Matthaios (1999, 494 with nn. 300–2) with further bibliography; for a recent and persuasive defence of the transmitted text, see Schramm (2005) and Schramm (2019, 183–4), followed by Hose (2022, 334–6).

tence/utterance.⁹¹ In chapter 21, Aristotle turns to language (λέξις) in its concrete use, by analysing ‘the manner in which the linguistic elements are used as a communicative means in everyday conversation. [. . .] Aristotle discusses everyday language usage by implicitly, and in some cases explicitly, positing a series of dichotomies which imply the *juxtaposition of a standard and other varieties*, or rather the identification of a standard by juxtaposing it to another’ (Kotarctic 2021, 73; our italics). It is within this conceptual framework (that which is and is not standard) that Aristotle offers his definition of γλώσσα:

Arist. *Po.* 21.1457b.1–7: ἅπαν δὲ ὄνομά ἐστιν ἢ κύριον ἢ γλώττα ἢ μεταφορὰ ἢ κόσμος ἢ πεποιημένον ἢ ἐπεκτεταμένον ἢ ὑφηρημένον ἢ ἐξηλλαγμένον. λέγω δὲ κύριον μὲν ὃ χρώνται ἕκαστοι, γλώτταν δὲ ὃ ἕτεροι· ὥστε φανερόν ὅτι καὶ γλώτταν καὶ κύριον εἶναι δυνατὸν τὸ αὐτό, μὴ τοῖς αὐτοῖς δέ· τὸ γὰρ σίγυνον Κυπρίοις μὲν κύριον, ἡμῖν δὲ γλώττα.⁹²

Each word is either standard, or γλώσσα, or a metaphor, or an embellishment, or made up or lengthened or reduced or altered. By standard, I mean what each group of speakers uses, by γλώσσα, what others use. It is therefore obvious that it is possible for the same word to be both γλώσσα and standard but not for the same speakers. For σίγυνον (‘spear’) is standard for Cypriots, but a γλώσσα for us.

Several elements stand out in this definition. Perhaps the most striking, at least from the perspective of modern linguistics, is that Aristotle, in distinguishing between different sets of speakers or language-users, clearly acknowledges that ‘applied’ λέξις is ‘a distinctly social phenomenon, as it allows for the grouping of speakers into a single speech community due to the similarities their use of language displays’ (Kotarctic 2021, 79). Equally noteworthy is that in explaining what γλώσσαί are, Aristotle cites as an example an instance of an ethnic/dialectal word that is not Attic and that, in so doing, he does not hint at a hierarchical or pre-established order among Greek dialects: Attic dialect is not said to be ‘better’ or ‘more correct’ than the Cypriot, even if in terms of literary tradition and historical

⁹¹ For this sense of λόγος, see Hose (2022, 332). From the perspective adopted in the *Poetics* (a stylistic rather than a rhetorical one), the ‘utterance’ (λόγος) belongs to the μέρος τῆς λέξεως: cf. the definition of λόγος at *Po.* 20.1457a.23–4. On how ‘parts of expression’ (μέρη τῆς λέξεως: *Poetics*) and ‘parts of speech’ (μέρη τοῦ λόγου: *Rhetoric*) represent two very different approaches to language, see de Jonge, van Ophuijsen (2010, 495–6).

⁹² The Arabic translation of the *Poetics* goes on quoting the reverse example: ‘while δόρυ (‘spear’) is standard for us but foreign [sc. for the Cypriots]’: this sentence is probably a ‘learned marginal gloss which was later added to the text of Σ [i.e. the Greek uncial manuscript from which the Syriac translation was made] or of its ultimate source’, cf. Tarán in Tarán, Gutas (2012, 286–7) and Gutas (ibid. 431), followed by Hose (2022, 344–5).

contingency, the former was already unquestionably more prestigious than the latter. At least in this passage,⁹³ Aristotle's observation is formulated in a matter-of-fact manner, deprived of any value judgement: Attic is one dialect among many, and it just happens to be that used by the speech community to which Aristotle and his immediate potential readers belong, and for this reason, it is used as the point of reference for what is 'standard' (κύριον).⁹⁴

A third element worth noting is that the very basic distinction between 'standard' linguistic usage (κύριον) and that which is not 'standard' (not only γλώσσα, but also metaphor, embellishments, etc.) is not framed within a prescriptive grid: 'standard' usage is not 'more correct' *per se* than non-standard usage. Different contexts (read 'genres' when it comes to literary tradition) allow for different usages, each with its own peculiarities. So, for instance, poetry, and especially epic (*Po.* 22.1459a.9–10: τῶν δ' ὀνομάτων [. . .] αἱ δὲ γλῶτται (i.e. μάλιστα ἀρμόττει) τοῖς ἠρωικοῖς),⁹⁵ needs γλῶσσαί because they confer a certain grandiosity on diction by differentiating it from ordinary conversation (*Po.* 22.1458a.21–2: σεμνή δὲ καὶ ἐξαλλάττουσα τὸ ἰδιωτικὸν ἢ τοῖς ξενικοῖς κεχρημένη· ξενικὸν δὲ λέγω γλῶτταν καὶ μεταφορὰν καὶ ἐπέκτασιν καὶ πᾶν τὸ παρὰ τὸ κύριον, 'A diction using exotic language is grand and remote from the ordinary. By exotic I mean γλῶσσαί, metaphor, lengthening and everything which deviates from the standards'). At the same time, one must avoid excessive use of them on the grounds that such a hypertrophic use of γλῶσσαί will lead to βαρβαρισμός ('gibberish'), that is, the opposite of 'speaking good Greek' (ἐλληνίζειν), just as an excessive use of metaphors will result in a riddling style (*Po.* 22.1.1458a.22–3: ἀλλ' ἂν τις ἅπαντα τοιαῦτα ποιήσῃ, ἢ αἰνίγμα ἔσται ἢ βαρβαρισμός· ἂν μὲν οὖν ἐκ μεταφορῶν, αἰνίγμα, ἐὰν δὲ ἐκ γλῶπτῶν, βαρβαρισμός, 'But if one composes only in this way, the result will be either a riddle or a barbarism; a riddle if made if metaphors, a barbarism if made of γλῶσσαί').

Let us now attempt to pin down more precisely the exact nature of Aristotle's γλῶσσα: does the term designate a diatopic variant only ('what the Cypriots say')?

⁹³ Things will be different when Aristotle discusses ἐλληνίζειν vs βαρβαρίζειν: see below Section 3.3.

⁹⁴ In this direction see already Kotarcic (2021, 85). Gasser's recent treatment of Aristotle's concept of λέξις in the *Poetics* does not expound at all on γλῶσσα (Gasser 2024, above all 143–5).

⁹⁵ Cf. also *Po.* 24.1459b.32–5: τὸ γὰρ ἠρωικὸν στασιμώτατον καὶ ὀγκωδέστατον τῶν μέτρων ἔστιν· διὸ καὶ γλῶττας καὶ μεταφορὰς δέχεται μάλιστα and *Rhet.* 3.3.1406b.1–3: διὸ χρησιμωτάτη ἢ διπλῆ λέξις τοῖς διθυραμβοποιῶσι (οὗτοι γὰρ ψοφῶδεις), αἱ δὲ γλῶτται τοῖς ἐποποιῶσι (σεμνὸν γὰρ καὶ αὐθαδές).

Some scholars have limited Aristotle's γλῶσσα to just that: a *Fremdwort* or a *Dialektform*.⁹⁶ Aristotle's recognition of diatopic variations in speech is indeed obvious in our passage, as the ensuing Cypriot example of σίγυνον ('spear') makes clear. This, by the way, is also not the only place where Aristotle explicitly acknowledges regional variations in speech: at Arist. *HA* 536b.8–9, within a broader physiological excursus on the phonatory apparatus of men and animals, Aristotle states that in the case of human beings and animals possessed of tongue and lips (alongside lungs and pharynx: e.g. birds but not dolphins), their 'voices' (φωναί) and 'modes of speech' (διάλεκτοι)⁹⁷ 'differ according to locality' (διαφέρουσι δὲ κατὰ τοὺς τόπους καὶ αἱ φωναὶ καὶ αἱ διάλεκτοι). Wolfram Ax pointed out that in this passage of the *History of Animals*, we can already see *in nuce* the seeds of the later semantic development of διάλεκτος, meaning 'regional dialect',⁹⁸ whose first attestation is usually identified in fr. 20 *SVF* III (= D.L. 7.59) of the Stoic philosopher Diogenes of Babylon (3rd/2nd century BCE).⁹⁹ But does this 'spatial' sense exhaust the possibilities of what Aristotle calls a γλῶσσα? Closer examination of the wording of *Po.* 21.2.1457b.1–7 reveals instead that Aristotle's concept of γλῶσσα is considerably more capacious. As formulated by Aristotle in the *Poetics*, a γλῶσσα is everything that differs from the speech habit of a given speech community: from a theoretical perspective, such a definition encompasses *every* possible deviation from what is considered the standard usage, be it diatopic, diachronic, diastatic, or diaphasic. The open nature of Aristotle's definition of γλῶσσα remains valid even if all but two of the specific examples given at *Po.* 21.2 (the Cypriot word σίγυνον) and later on at *Po.* 25.1461a.10–5 (the two exceptions are Homeric

⁹⁶ Thus, for instance, Lebek (1969, 65), who rules out any possible reference to the temporal dimension ('archaism'). Lebek is now followed by Hose (2022, 344).

⁹⁷ In *HA* 353a.31–2 διάλεκτος is the voice articulated by means of the tongue (διάλεκτος δ' ἡ τῆς φωνῆς ἐστὶ τῆ γλώττη διάρθρωσις).

⁹⁸ Ax (1986, 128 and n. 45): 'In dieser Passage kündigt sich bereits die spätere Bedeutungsentwicklung διάλεκτος = Dialekt an'; cf. also Ax (1978, 258) (= Ax 2000, 23).

⁹⁹ Diog.Bab.Stoic. fr. 20 *SVF* III: διάλεκτος δὲ ἐστὶ λέξις κεχαραγμένη ἔθνικῶς τε καὶ Ἑλληνικῶς, ἢ λέξις ποταπῆ, τουτέστι ποιά κατὰ διάλεκτον, οἷον κατὰ μὲν τὴν Ἀτθίδα θάλαττα, κατὰ δὲ τὴν Ἰάδα ἡμέρη ('A dialect is a form of speech characterised as ethnic and Greek, or a form of speech from a certain place, that is, having a certain quality according to a dialect, as for instance θάλαττα according to the Attic [dialect] and ἡμέρη according to the Ionic [dialect]'). On this passage see van Rooy (2016, 250–1) with previous bibliography. We are inclined to agree with Consani (1991, 19–21) vs Ax (1986, 201–2) in taking Ἑλληνικῶς as complementary – and not contrastive – to ἔθνικῶς; that is to say, there is no opposition between Greek speakers and non-Greek speakers: the focus is entirely Hellenocentric, or better, intra-Hellenic, from the very beginning. Cf. also Section 3.3.

passages: the use of ὀρεύς for φύλαξ and of ζωρότερον in the sense of ‘faster’)¹⁰⁰ are cases of ethnic/regional variations. Discrete instantiations limited to the illustration of diatopic variants do not nullify the capaciousness of the general principle. This comprehensiveness of the category of γλώσσα, which, for Aristotle, also includes that which will be called λέξις in later terminology – that is, ‘any expression in need of a clarification’¹⁰¹ – is made explicitly clear by the examples given not in the *Poetics* but in the *Rhetoric* (*Rhet.* 3.3.1406a.6–10), within a discussion of the virtues (ἀρεταί) of prose style (in opposition to poetry). This *Rhetoric* passage from Book 3 is explicitly cross-referenced by Aristotle himself to his *Poetics*’ chapter 21.¹⁰² It is legitimate, therefore, to complement the examples of γλώσσα given in the *Poetics* with those produced in the *Rhetoric*, even if the context is obviously different. In the passage of the *Rhetoric*, γλώσσαί are identified as one of the four sources of ‘frigidity’ (τὰ ψυχρά) in prose (the other three being an excessive use of compounds, epithets, and metaphors). The text is as follows:

Arist. *Rhet.* 3.3.1406a.6–10: μία δὲ τὸ χρήσθαι γλώτταις, οἷον Λυκόφρων Ξέρηην ‘πέλωρον ἄνδρα’, καὶ Σκίρων ‘σίνας ἀνήρ’, καὶ Ἀλκιδάμας ‘ἄθυρμα τῆ ποιήσσει’, καὶ ‘τὴν τῆς φύσεως ἀτασθαλίαν’, καὶ ‘ἀκράτῳ τῆς διανοίας ὀργῇ τεθηγμένον’.

100 *Po.* 25.6.1461a.10–5: τὰ δὲ πρὸς τὴν λέξιν ὀρώντα δεῖ διαλύειν, οἷον γλώττη τὸ ‘οὐρήας μὲν πρῶτον’ (*Il.* 1.50). ἴσως γὰρ οὐ τοὺς ἡμίονους λέγει ἀλλὰ τοὺς φύλακας· καὶ τὸν Δόλωνα, ‘ὅς ῥ’ ἦ τοι εἶδος μὲν ἔην κακός’ (*Il.* 10.316), οὐ τὸ σῶμα ἀσύμμετρον ἀλλὰ τὸ πρόσωπον αἰσχροῦν, τὸ γὰρ εὐεῖδες οἱ Κρήτες τὸ εὐπρόσωπον καλοῦσι· καὶ τὸ ‘ζωρότερον δὲ κέραιε’ (*Il.* 9.203) οὐ τὸ ἄκρατον ὡς οἰνόφλυξιν ἀλλὰ τὸ θάττον (‘Some [sc. problems] must be solved by looking at the diction, for example the expression ‘mules first’ (*Il.* 1.50) [must be explained] via a γλώσσα: for perhaps [Homer] means not mules but ‘guards’. And [when he says] about Dolon ‘who was indeed ugly in his appearance (εἶδος)’ (*Il.* 10.316) he may mean not that his body was misshapen but that his face was ugly, for the Cretans call fair of face ‘shapely formed’ (εὐεῖδες). And the expression ‘mix purer wine’ (*Il.* 9.203) refers not to unmixed wine as if for drunkards but to [mix it] faster’). On this passage and the use of glosses to resolve (λύσις) Homeric problems, see Mayhew (2019, 107–8).

101 See above Section 3.1. Lack of clarity is the major discrimen already in Aristotle: *Rh.* 3.10.1410b.10–3: τὸ γὰρ μανθάνειν ῥαδίως ἡδὺ φύσει πᾶσιν ἐστί, τὰ δὲ ὀνόματα σημαίνει τι, ὥστε ὅσα τῶν ὀνομάτων ποιεῖ ἡμῖν μάθησιν, ἡδιστα. αἱ μὲν οὖν γλώτται ἀγνώτες, τὰ δὲ κύρια ἴσμεν (‘For to learn easily is naturally pleasant to everyone: words signify something, so whatever words make us learn (and understand) are most pleasant. Now, *glossai* are unintelligible, whereas we do know and understand standard words’); cf. also *Top.* 140a.5: πᾶν γὰρ ἀσαφές τὸ μὴ εἰωθός (‘everything which is not usual is obscure’).

102 Cf. *Rhet.* 3.2.1404b.7: ὅσα εἰρηται ἐν τοῖς περὶ ποιητικῆς, 1404b.28: τῶν δὲ ὀνομάτων τσαυτ’ ἐχόντων εἶδη ὅσα τεθεώρηται ἐν τοῖς περὶ ποιήσεως; 1405a.5: καθάπερ ἐλέγομεν, ἐν τοῖς περὶ ποιητικῆς). On these cross-references, see Kotarcic (2021, 102).

Another source [of frigidity in style] is the use of γλῶσσαί, such as Lycophron's calling Xerxes 'a giant man' and Sciron 'a bane of a man' (Lyc.Soph. Diels–Kranz 83 A 5 = 38 D6 Laks–Most); Alcidas too speaks of 'toys for poetry' (Alcid. fr. 11 Muir), 'the wickedness of nature' (Alcid. fr. 12 Muir), and of one 'whetted by the unmixed anger of his thought' (Alcid. fr. 13 Muir).

Five examples of γλῶσσαί are given, two by the sophist Lycophron, and three by Alcidas: none of them entails the use of a *Dialektwort* or 'ethnic' expression. Scholars have variously attempted to identify the 'glossographic' nature of these examples in archaisms, epicisms, syntactic alterations (nouns used adjectivally), or use of abstract nouns.¹⁰³ However, the occurrences of πέλωρον, σίνις, ἄθυρμα, ἀτασθαλία, and τεθηγγμένον do not all fit easily into any of these categories.¹⁰⁴ All these idiosyncrasies (archaism, alleged syntactic innovations, excessive use of abstract nouns) identified by modern scholars in the five examples of γλῶσσαί given by Aristotle in *Rhet.* 3.3 may have contributed to the defamiliarising effect of the ξενικόν of which the γλῶσσαί clearly partake; however, given the definition of γλῶσσαί at *Po.* 21.2, their least common denominator is the broad category of 'poeticisms': all of these are predominantly (Alcid. fr. 11 ἄθυρμα, 12 ἀτασθαλία, and 13 Muir θήγω) if not uniquely (Lycophron's πέλωρος, σίνις in Diels–Kranz 83 A 5) poetic words, mostly epicisms. In *Rhet.* 3.3, Aristotle is concerned with the shortcomings, in prose, of an excessive use of γλῶσσαί (a generic difference: prose vs poetry): given the specific context, the linguistic habit of the speech community referred to at *Po.* 21.2 (λέγω δὲ κύριον μὲν ὧ̄ χρῶνται ἕκαστοι, γλῶτταν δὲ ὧ̄ ἕτεροι) becomes here, *mutatis mutandis*, the speech habit *within a given genre* (prose vs poetry, specifically epic poetry). This is, in our opinion, the most eco-

103 Archaisms: Kennedy (2007, 203 n. 39) surmises that πέλωρον 'could be called a gloss because it was archaic'; epicisms: Rapp (2002, 847); Muir (2001, 88); nouns used adjectivally: Freese, Stricker (2020, 365 n. 21); Laks, Most (2016 vol. 9, 131 n. 1) and Nelson, Molesworth (2021, 214 n. 65) identify Lycophron's glossographical features in the adjectival use of nouns (cf. respectively Freese, Stricker and Laks, Most on σίνις and Nelson, Molesworth on πέλωρον); abstract nouns: O' Sullivan (1992, 33) suggests that one element that might have contributed to Aristotle's criticism of Alcidas was the orator's predilection for abstract expression (cf. fr. 12 Muir τὴν τῆς φύσεως ἀτασθαλίαν).

104 As for the adjectival use of nouns, on closer inspection, nothing hinders the possibility that in Lycophron πέλωρον may well be used as an apposition *more Homeric*: the lack of definite article is not an impediment; see the detailed analysis of the alleged adjectival occurrence of πέλωρον in Homer by Troxler (1964, 174–82) – ignored by V. Langholf, *LfggrE* s.v. πέλωρ, πέλωρον –, who identifies the adjectival use of πέλωρος as a distinctively Hesiodic innovation; similarly also Risch (1974, 113, §40b) 'πέλωρον neben πελώριος ist bei Horn, wahrscheinlich noch Substantiv', and *EDG* s.v. πέλωρ; (*DELG* s.v. πέλωρ quotes as possible Homeric examples only *Il.* 12.202 = 220, *Od.* 9.527, and *Od.* 15.161). Likewise, σίνις too may be used appositionally by Lycophron.

nomical way of explaining this apparent shift in focus (that is, the absence of dialectal/regional or ethnic features) in Aristotle’s conceptualisation of γλῶσσα if compared with *Po.* 21.2.

The definition of γλῶσσα given in the *Poetics* is, anthropologically speaking, all-encompassing: time, space, situation, and social stratum are all variables included in the general juxtaposition of κύριον and γλῶττα. Hence, Lebek’s criticism of Vahlen’s interpretation of the Aristotelian definition of γλῶσσα as archaism (‘das aus dem lebendigen Gebrauch der herrschenden Sprache verschollene Wort’) is at least partly unjustified.¹⁰⁵ With that said, it remains true that Aristotle never explicitly mentions variation through time as a criterion for a γλῶσσα, and Lebek is therefore correct in saying that archaism is not expressly thematised as one of the criteria for a gloss. We have already seen in Section 3.1 that the reduction of γλῶσσα to an antiquated word outside current usage is a historically determined interpretation deeply indebted to Atticist trends; this, however, does not mean that the temporal dimension was not included among the criteria envisaged by Aristotle’s definition: simply, it was not the only criterion, nor the overruling one.¹⁰⁶

To sum up, Aristotle’s definition of γλῶσσα, both as exegetical method and parameter of stylistic analysis, did not come from a vacuum: behind Aristotle’s definition lies is a lengthy tradition, both in school classes but also in different cultural environments (e.g. rhapsodic performances, scholarly reflections, and philosophical inquiries).¹⁰⁷ As we shall see in Section 4.1, Aristotle’s treatment of γλῶσσα will continue to exercise a dominant influence in early Hellenistic lexicographical inquiries at Alexandria. Let us now turn to a second linguistic category that, in Aristotle, is in some respects related to that of gloss: ἐλληνισμός in as much as it involves κυριόλεξις (‘employment of a word in its proper sense’).¹⁰⁸

105 The exact reference is Vahlen (1865, 248); Lebek (1969, 65 with n. 2, 66): ‘Die Möglichkeit, daß die Menschengruppe, für die ein Wort eine γλῶττα ist, von der, für die es ein κύριον ὄνομα ist, zeitlich getrennt ist, wird in der aristotelischen Erklärung nicht in Betracht gezogen. [. . .] Der Archaismus als solcher wäre dabei nicht in den Blick gefaßt’.

106 Aristotle was obviously aware that languages change through time, cf. e.g. *Rhet.* 1.2.27.1357b.9–10: τὸ γὰρ τέκμαρ καὶ πέρας ταυτὸν ἐστὶ κατὰ τὴν ἀρχαίαν γλῶτταν ‘*tekmar* and *peras* means the same in the old language’, and *Pol.* 1272a.2–3 (Spartan φιδίτια were once (τό γε ἀρχαῖον) called ἄνδρεῖα). It remains undisputed that some words can be archaism and dialectalism at the same time: see e.g. the use of αἴσα among the Argives to designate the individual contribution towards the cost of a symposium, as explained by Hegesander of Delphi (2nd century CE) at Ath. 8.365d (= Heges. fr. 31 Müller, *FHG* vol. 4, 419).

107 See F. Montanari (2012, 129); cf. also Novokhatko (2023, 153 n. 13).

108 Cf. Siebenborn (1976, 48–50).

3.3 Ἑλληνισμός between grammar and style

We have already seen that at *Po.*22.1458a.22–3 Aristotle firmly places glosses within the domain of τὸ ξενικόν ('the exotic'), perceived positively as an element that, if moderately used, lends charm to the diction.¹⁰⁹ At *Rhet.* 3.2.1404b.8–12, in discussing the virtues of an appropriately elevated diction that deviates only slightly from the standard, Aristotle offers an anthropological explanation of why that which is ξενικόν naturally appeals to humans:

Arist. *Rhet.* 3.2.1404b.8–12: τὸ γὰρ ἐξαλλάξει ποιεῖ φαίνεσθαι σεμνοτέραν· ὡσπερ γὰρ πρὸς τοὺς ξένους οἱ ἄνθρωποι καὶ πρὸς τοὺς πολίτας, τὸ αὐτὸ πάσχουσιν οἱ πρὸς τὴν λέξιν· διὸ δεῖ ποιεῖν ξένην τὴν διάλεκτον· θαυμάσται γὰρ τῶν ἀπόντων εἰσίν, ἡδὺ δὲ τὸ θαυμάσιον ἔστιν.

For its deviating from the standard makes it more dignified. For human beings feel the same in relation to diction as they do in relation to fellow-citizens and strangers: that is why one should make his diction exotic: they marvel at what is far away, and that which causes one to wonder is pleasant.

De-familiarisation, if employed sensibly and to a moderate extent, is a positive feature. At *Rh.* 3.2.1404b.35–7, with reference to the prose diction (λέξεις τῶν ψιλῶν λόγων), Aristotle repeats the lesson: if one composes his speech well, there will be something effortlessly exotic about it and yet its meaning will be clear (ἔσται τε ξενικόν καὶ λανθάνειν ἐνδέξεται καὶ σαφηνιεῖ), because such is the virtue of good rhetorical diction (αὕτη δ' ἦν ἡ τοῦ ῥητορικοῦ λόγου ἀρετή). All this, however, must be done in moderation, without the speaker actually seeming to be doing it (λανθάνειν): key to Aristotle's theory of verbal communication is effortless clarity and intelligibility (σαφήνεια).¹¹⁰ Clarity and intelligibility, in turn, strike at the core of Aristotle's notion of ἐλληνίζειν ('to speak correct Greek'):¹¹¹ unlike his disciple Theophrastus of Eresus (371–287 BCE), who would make clarity a separate virtue of style in his quadripartite theory (Theophr. fr. 684 Fortenbaugh = Cic. *Orat.* 79), in

109 For τὸ ξενικόν in Aristotle, see Kotarcic (2021, 82–4).

110 This also has an anthropological reason: cf. *Rh.* 3.10.1410b.10–3: τὸ γὰρ μανθάνειν ῥαδίως ἡδὺ φύσει πᾶσιν ἔστί, τὰ δὲ ὀνόματα σημαίνει τι, ὥστε ὅσα τῶν ὀνομάτων ποιεῖ ἡμῖν μάθησιν, ἡδιστα. αἱ μὲν οὖν γλῶτται ἀγνώτες, τὰ δὲ κύρια ἴσμεν (see also *Top.* 140a.5 πᾶν γὰρ ἀσαφές τὸ μὴ εἰωθός).

111 It is with Aristotle that, for the first time, ἐλληνίζειν acquires a prescriptive nuance: not simply 'to speak Greek' (like e.g. in Thucydides) but 'to speak correct Greek'. On the semantic evolution of ἐλληνίζειν, see Casevitz (1991). Cf. also Chapter 4, Section 4.3.

Aristotle, ἑλληνισμός is not yet distinct from σαφήνεια.¹¹² At *Po.* 22.1458a.22–3, we were told that an excessive use of γλῶσσαι leads to βαρβαρισμός, which for Aristotle, together with σολοικίζειν, is the polar opposite of ἑλληνίζειν.¹¹³ This is clearly spelled out in *Arist. S.E.* 165b.20–1, where the fourth aim of a contentious argument (the first three being refutation, fallacy, and paradox) is σολοικίζειν ποιεῖν – that is, to make the opponent commit a solecism, where solecism is defined as ‘to induce the answerer to βαρβαρίζειν (i.e. to speak ungrammatically) as a result of the argument’ (τοῦτο δ’ ἐστὶ τὸ ποιῆσαι τῇ λέξει βαρβαρίζειν ἐκ τοῦ λόγου τὸν ἀποκρινόμενον).¹¹⁴

Aristotle gives a positive definition of ἑλληνίζειν not in the *Poetics* but in the *Rhetoric*:

Rh. 3.5.1407a.19–b10: ἐστὶ δ’ ἀρχὴ τῆς λέξεως τὸ ἑλληνίζειν· τοῦτο δ’ ἐστὶν ἐν πέντε, πρῶτον μὲν ἐν τοῖς συνδέσμοις [. . .] δεῦτερον δὲ τὸ τοῖς ἰδίους ὀνόμασι λέγειν καὶ μὴ τοῖς περιέχουσιν· τρίτον μὴ ἀμφιβόλοις [. . .] τέταρτον, ὡς Πρωταγόρας τὰ γένη τῶν ὀνομάτων διήρει, ἄρρενα καὶ θήγεια καὶ σκευή· [. . .] πέμπτον ἐν τῷ τὰ πολλὰ [καὶ ὀλίγα: del. Kassel] καὶ ἐν ὀρθῶς ὀνομάζειν.

The foundation of diction is to speak correct Greek: this consists of five parts: first, the use of connecting particles; [. . .] second, to employ specific, and not generic terms. Third, to avoid ambiguous terms [. . .]. Fourth, as Protagoras did, to distinguish among the genders – masculine, feminine, and neuter. [. . .] Fifth, [by observing the number], to correctly use the plural and the singular.

It is important to observe that of the five criteria that Aristotle mentions, only the first (correct use of connectives), together with the fourth and fifth (correct agreement of gender and number), are strictly grammatical, whereas the second and third criteria (use of appropriate vocabulary and avoidance of ambiguity) are related to style in general and to the (for Aristotle) overriding principle of clarity in particular.¹¹⁵ This alerts us to an important caveat: we should be cautious before identifying ἑλληνισμός with that which in contemporary linguistics is typically called ‘standard language’. As observed by Clackson (2015a, 309), the Greek term ἑλληνισμός covered ‘a wider range of linguistic varieties’ than those included by

¹¹² See Siebenborn (1976, 24); Pagani (2015, 804).

¹¹³ For σολοικισμός as the negation of speaking correct Greek, see *S.E.* 182a.14: οὐκ ἄν δοκοίη ἑλληνίζειν.

¹¹⁴ In this passage, Aristotle seems somehow not yet to fully differentiate, as the later grammatical tradition will do, starting with Diogenes of Babylon (D.L. 7.59 = Diog.Bab.Stoic. fr. 24 SVF III), between barbarism (a phonetic, prosodic, or morphological error limited to the single word) and solecism (syntactical error): see Sandri (2020, 19–27). It should, however, be noted that at *Arist. S.E.* 173b.17–174a.16, all examples of solecism given by Aristotle are instances of syntactical inaccuracy (that is, ‘solecism’ proper in the later grammatical tradition).

¹¹⁵ Cf. Schenkeveld (1994, 281); Pagani (2015, 803–4).

the modern standards of linguistic normativity (our concept of ‘correct use of a given language’). Just as for the other ‘virtues’ of style (clarity, appropriateness, etc.), the criteria employed to define ἑλληνισμός were, for the ancients, as much stylistic (read rhetorical) as they were grammatical.

As for the γραμματική, the Hellenistic period saw an intense debate about the true nature of ἑλληνισμός, involving philologists, grammarians, and philosophers alike.¹¹⁶ Treatment of the full range of opinions proposed by ancient scholars on ἑλληνισμός lies beyond the scope of the present chapter.¹¹⁷ Just as we have seen for the γραμματική, the theoretical reflection on ἑλληνισμός offered a wide palette of interpretative possibilities: from the radical view of Heraclides Criticus (probably dating to the third quarter of the 3rd century BCE), who denied any specifically linguistic reality underlying the concept of ‘speaking good Greek’, limiting it to mere ethnic descent,¹¹⁸ to a certain Pausimachus (ca. 200 BCE),¹¹⁹ an advocate of a euphonic theory of diction according to which the peak of ἑλληνισμός is found not in word-choice (ὀνομασία) or composition (σύνθεσις) but in sound (ἦχος).¹²⁰ Both Heraclides and Pausimachus represented minority positions, which will leave no

116 On ἑλληνισμός in Alexandrian scholarship (before the advent of a systematic theorisation of the concept within grammatical and rhetorical studies), see Sandri (2020, 6–8); Pagani (2015, esp. 806–14).

117 The most detailed and up-to-date treatment is that by Pagani (2015).

118 Cf. Heracl.Crit. *BNJ*² 369A F 3.2: Ἑλληνας μὲν γὰρ εἰσιν τῷ γένει καὶ ταῖς φωναῖς ἑλληνίζουσιν ἄφ’ Ἑλληνος (‘So Hellenes are those who are descended from Hellen and speak the Hellenic language inherited from Hellen’) and F 3.5: ἡ δὲ καλουμένη νῦν Ἑλλάς λέγεται μὲν, οὐ μέντοι ἐστὶ. τὸ γὰρ ἑλληνίζειν ἐγὼ εἶναι φημι οὐκ ἐν τῷ διαλέγεσθαι ὀρθῶς ἀλλ’ ἐν τῷ γένει τῆς φωνῆς. αὕτη <δ> ἐστὶν ἄφ’ Ἑλληνος ἡ δὲ Ἑλλάς ἐν Θερραλία κείται. ἐκείνους οὖν ἐροῦμεν τὴν Ἑλλάδα κατοικεῖν καὶ ταῖς φωναῖς ἑλληνίζειν (‘What is presently called Greece is a word, but not a reality, for I maintain that ‘to hellenize’ or ‘speak Greek’ is not a matter of correct pronunciation but concerns the language’s descent’; all translations are after McInerney 2019). On Heraclides’ particular take on ἑλληνισμός, see Ucciardello (2012, 28) with previous literature.

119 Pausimachus is the author of a treatise whose content is summarised and criticised by Philodemus in *Po.* 1–2; the possible title of this treatise may have been *On the Elements of Diction* (Περὶ τῶν στοιχείων τῆς λέξεως): see Janko (2020, 143–4).

120 Pausimachus fr. 46 Janko (= Philod. *Po.* 2.180.20–181.1 Janko): τὰ μὲν [γὰρ] (ὀνόματα) ἀνομο[οίως] θεωρ[εῖται] ξίνεκα τῶν ὑπ[ο]κειμένων, [τὰ] δὲ κα[τὰ] τὸν ἦχον, ἀνέσει καὶ [ἐ]πιτάσει καὶ προσπνε[ύ]σει καὶ ψιλότητι καὶ ἐκ[τ]άσει καὶ συσ[το]λ[ή]ι καὶ προθέσει καὶ πτώσει· [ὧ]ν πάντων ὀρθῶς π[λ]ε[ο]κομένων ἑλλην[ισ]μός ἀποτελεῖται, καὶ ἀρμογή τις ἐστὶ τούτων κτλ. (‘For some [words] are regarded anomalous because of their sense, others according to their sound, with lax and tense accents, aspiration and lack thereof, lengthening and shortening [of vowels], prefixation and change of ending. When all these things [that is, both sense and sound] are correctly interwoven, pure Greek is produced and there is a kind of attunement of them, etc.’; transl. after Janko 2020, 569); cf. also fr. 56 (= Philod. *Po.* 1.100.7–15) and fr. 58 (= *Po.* 2.185.13–26) Janko (the latter with a comparison between βαρβαρίζειν and ἑλληνίζειν).

enduring legacy behind them. Nonetheless, they help us to understand that the cultural and linguistic ‘reality’ underlying ‘speaking correct Greek’ was a hotly contested domain. We shall therefore limit ourselves here to the conclusions reached by the detailed survey offered by Laura Pagani, which are worth quoting in full:

ἑλληνισμός became a field of contention between different but interconnected constituencies, each with its own agenda to pursue but ultimately all sharing some common ground, historically and culturally, with each other: philologists aiming at reconstructing *and* interpreting literary texts (with Homer at the fore-front), rhetoricians looking for the most authoritative and effective way of speaking, philosophers investigating the ontological relationship between language and reality, ‘grammarians’ interested in specific linguistic phenomena. Reflections on ἑλληνισμός in the early Hellenistic period embraced both poetry and prose, written and oral, and required a constant process of negotiation between different and at times mutually incompatible needs. (Pagani 2015, 848–9).

It is within this historical and cultural scenario that one crucial aspect (for our present inquiry) of the ancient reflection on ἑλληνισμός must be contextualised: ἑλληνισμός implied, for the Alexandrian scholars, a somewhat ‘abstract’ concept of Greek as language, a concept that included within it all its various dialectal forms without an *a priori* hierarchical order between them.¹²¹ Thus, in the London scholia to Dionysios Thrax, we read the following:

Schol. D.T. (Lond.) *GG* 1,3.446.12–4: ἔστι δὲ ἑλληνισμός λέξις ὑγιῆς καὶ ἀδιάστροφος λόγου μερῶν πλοκῆ κατάλληλος κατὰ τὴν παρ’ ἐκάστοις ὑγιῆ καὶ γνησίαν διάλεκτον.

ἑλληνισμός is appropriate speech and correct in the congruent construction of the parts of speech, according to the appropriate and native dialect respectively. (Translation by Clackson 2015a, 316).

Conformity to local dialectal usage (κατάλληλος κατὰ τὴν παρ’ ἐκάστοις ὑγιῆ καὶ γνησίαν διάλεκτον) was not only tolerated but expected: this openness to local variations (and generic too: for Aristarchus’ view that Homeric language represented the peak of ἑλληνισμός, see Chapter 7 Section 3.3) clearly reveals that the notion of ‘correctness’, at least in the Hellenistic period, was relatively loose. It admitted, to say the least, a certain relativisation: what is correct in one context might not be so in a different locality. This absence of an internal hierarchy between the Greek dialects is also apparent in Diogenes of Babylon’s definition of διάλεκτος.¹²²

¹²¹ Important observations à propos are in Clackson (2015a, 314–7).

¹²² Cf. also above Section 3.2 n. 99.

Diog.Bab.Stoic. fr. 20 SVF III (= D.L. 7.56): διάλεκτος δέ ἐστι λέξις κεχαραγμένη ἔθνικῶς τε καὶ Ἑλληνικῶς, ἢ λέξις ποταπή, τουτέστι ποιά κατὰ διάλεκτον, οἶον κατὰ μὲν τὴν Ἀθίδια θάλαττα, κατὰ δὲ τὴν Ἰάδα ἡμέρη.

A dialect is a form of speech characterised as *ethnic* and *Greek*, or a form of speech *from a certain place*, that has a certain quality according to a dialect, as, for instance, θάλαττα according to the Attic [dialect] and ἡμέρη according to the Ionic [dialect].

This passage is often taken by modern scholarship to be the first ‘modern’ attestation of the equivalence διάλεκτος = regional/ethnic dialect. It is worth noting that the Attic dialect is not considered superior to Ionic: all are forms of acceptable Greek.

According to Clackson (2015a, 316), it is within this understanding of dialectal variation that Diogenes’ definition of ἔλλητισμός, (by now, one of the five virtues of speech together with clarity, concision, propriety, and elevation) must be understood (D.L. 7.59 = Diog.Bab.Stoic. fr. 24 SVF III): ἔλλητισμός μὲν οὖν ἐστὶ φράσις ἀδιάπτωτος ἐν τῇ τεχνικῇ καὶ μὴ εἰκαία συνηθείᾳ (‘ἔλλητισμός is thus faultless speech according to expert and non-ordinary usage’). In Diogenes, ‘correctness’ does indeed require a lack of grammatical mistakes (morphological or syntactical) and must have as its benchmark not the ordinary linguistic usage of low-bred people but the ‘competent’ usage of well-educated Greeks (ἐν τῇ τεχνικῇ καὶ μὴ εἰκαία συνηθείᾳ). However, *pace* Clackson, correctness of expression is not explicitly linked here to the notion that each dialect has its own ἔλλητισμός, and the two strands (dialectology and ‘correctness’) tend to be two separate constituencies.¹²³

We return to Diogenes’ definition of διάλεκτος, abstract and anachronistic as this view may seem to us: be this as it may, for the Stoic philosopher the Attic dialect was then no better or more prestigious than Aeolic or Doric. In the sections that follow, we shall have to keep this constantly in mind: ‘correctness’ in the Hellenistic reflection on language was strikingly different from the later notion of correctness in Imperial times, often linked as it was to a specific dialectal variety (Attic) thought to embody the most prestigious and cultivated realisation of the Greek language.¹²⁴ Both Alexandrian scholars and Atticists used several different methods as criteria to identify language correctness: both resorted to etymology, analogy, observation of the usage (συνήθεια), and range of linguistic and

¹²³ This does not mean, of course, that in the treatises on correctness one cannot find a tolerant attitude to dialectal variation. This is attested also in the first treatises *περὶ ἔλλητισμοῦ* of the Roman era: see Hintzen (2011) and Pagani (2014a, 248–50) on Philoxenus, Tryphon, and Seleucus.

¹²⁴ Cf. Chapter 3, Section 6. Embryonic traces of this attitude can be seen in Minucius Pacatus Irenaeus (1st century CE): see Pagani (2014a, 252–3); Matthaios (2020a, 367–8) (= Matthaios 2015b, 291–2).

stylistic variations within a single author or a literary genre. Philologists and grammarians thus used similar sets of criteria but in different ways: the former had the edition and interpretation of texts as their primary goal, whereas the latter were concerned with the minute details of phonological, morphological, and lexical ‘correctness’ to help would-be orators to enhance their social capital. For the philologist, *συνήθεια* meant, above all, the linguistic usage of a given author, and hence *παράδοσις* referred primarily to its textual transmission; for the grammarian, *συνήθεια* instead meant mostly contemporary educated linguistic usage, while *παράδοσις* designated the literary tradition broadly conceived.¹²⁵ These two traditions, for the most part, followed separate trajectories, but some intersections were unavoidable, and the tension between these two approaches to *συνήθεια* and *παράδοσις* permeates both Hellenistic and Imperial scholarship.¹²⁶ With these premises, we shall now turn to the early phase of Alexandrian scholarship on language, in its oscillation between spoken vernaculars and literature.

4 The roots of scholarship at Alexandria: Lexicography between literature and vernaculars

In the following sections, the focus will be on the earliest stages of lexicographical studies, spanning from the second half of the 4th to the first half of the 3rd century BCE. Dialectal interest in the contemporary spoken varieties of Greek and attention to the literary heritage play an equally important role in this early phase of erudite scholarship on Greek language; and the former is frequently brought to bear upon the latter, as we shall presently see. Attention to dialects in early Alexandrian scholarship was not strictly normative (there was no explicit prestige hierarchy among dialectal variants): Philitas, Simmias, Zenodotus, and Callimachus describe and collect evidence rather than prescribe the ‘correct form’.¹²⁷ In this sense, the Aristotelian tradition, with its encompassing approach to *λέξις*, remains a significant point of reference, both in theory and in practice. The geopolitical centre had however shifted from Athens to Alexandria and its sphere of influence: Cos (Philitas), Rhodes (Simmias), and

¹²⁵ A clear survey of the analogies and differences of these two traditions can be found in Sluiter (1990, 60).

¹²⁶ See Pagani (2015, 841–4); Schenkeveld (1994, 287); Siebenborn (1976, 27–31; 85–9).

¹²⁷ See Consani (1991, 31–2). Consani appears to limit the possible source of dialectal information to written texts of the literary canon, particularly given the Alexandrians’ interest in orthography. However, attention to orthography need not be considered mutually exclusive of a concomitant interest in contemporary diatopic variants: the written medium of communication partly explains *per se* the attention to orthography.

Cyrene (Callimachus, Eratosthenes) were important cultural hubs gravitating around Alexandria, with Cos and Rhodes at the centre of the Ptolemies' international ambitions.¹²⁸ This new international dimension is, to some extent, mirrored in the wide range of linguistic interests present in these early lexicographical writings.

Finally, given that in the following sections of this chapter (and in Chapter 7) we shall be dealing with a body of evidence that is extremely fragmentary, several preliminary caveats concerning the dynamics of transmission of our texts are in order:

(1) Unlike Aristophanes' *Λέξεις*, an unparalleled case of a Hellenistic lexicographical collection preserved through both direct and indirect tradition (see more in detail Chapter 7, Section 2.1), no unabridged treatise or lexicographical writing of the Hellenistic period (on the Attic dialect or any other dialect) has been directly transmitted to us. We must thus rely on more or less substantial quotations or paraphrases found in later works of various character: miscellaneous literary collections (such as that of Athenaeus, himself compiling from a large array of previous sources), lexicographical, etymological, or other erudite works of the Roman, Late Antique, and Byzantine periods, handed down through papyri and Medieval MSS (many of whom are still in need of a reliable modern edition). Despite their relationships to one another, these compilations may be seen as stand-alone works produced by scholars and erudite scribes in specific cultural milieux.

Let us clarify this point with one specific example, representative of the various chains of abridgement with which one must reckon while consulting these later sources: the relationship between Athenaeus and Hesychius, two of the most frequently quoted sources in Chapters 6 and 7. We know that both ultimately rely on Pamphilus' encyclopedic *Lexicon* (*Περὶ γλωσσῶν ἤτοι λέξεων*, first half of the 1st century CE) in 95 books, alphabetically arranged and partially compiled by an otherwise unknown Zopyrion (cf. *Su.* π 142).¹²⁹ This monumental work soon underwent several epitomisations: Iulius Vestinus (first half of the 2nd century CE) is credited with the 64-book collection entitled *Ἑλληνικὰ ὀνόματα* (*Greek Nouns*) derived from Pamphilus.¹³⁰ At approximately the same time, Diogenianus compiled the *Λέξις παντοδαπή* (*Expressions of Any Kind*) in five books and its later revision entitled *Περίεργον ἔργον* (*Handbook for Those Without Means?*). It re-

128 From the last decade of the 4th century BCE, Cos was the Ptolemies' major naval centre in the Mediterranean and their main bulwark in the ongoing rivalry with the Antigonids (Huss 2001, 171–2; 302–3); on the cultural life of Cos under the Ptolemies, see the handy and concise survey by Spanoudakis (2002, 28). On Rhodes as an intellectual powerhouse in Hellenistic times, see now Matijašić (2020, 21–31).

129 See Hatzimichali (2006, 22–51); Hatzimichali (2019).

130 Cf. Matthaïos (2020a, 364–5) (= Matthaïos 2015b, 289–90).

mains a topic for debate as to (i) whether Diogenianus relied on Pamphilus directly or through Vestinus' epitome and (ii) whether Περιεργοπένητες is a later augmented or shorter version of the first collection.¹³¹ Hesychius' *Lexicon* (around 500 CE), known to us in an epitomised redaction, is mainly based on Diogenianus' Περιεργοπένητες. In turn, Athenaeus also used Pamphilus' dictionary (sometimes he simply refers to it with ὡς φησι Πάμφιλος, in other instances he inconsistently quoted his work as ἐν τοῖς Περί ὀνομάτων, Περί γλωσσῶν καὶ ὀνομάτων, which may also be titles of selected chapters of his work). Furthermore, to complicate the matter even further, we cannot rule out the possibility that, in some passages, Athenaeus also made use of Didymus through Pamphilus. We shall thus have to bear in mind the possibility of alternative scenarios, depending on the different stages of transmission one tries to reconstruct.

(2) The broader loss of these collections on dialectal varieties (among which the Attic) makes our picture quite partial and often prevents us from properly assessing how the methodological premises underlying these Hellenistic collections were perceived and conceivably partly reshaped by later users according to their different evaluative and ideological parameters.

(3) As we have just seen, many of our extant repertoires have been preserved only in the form of epitomes and manipulated excerpts – that is, a material that is textually highly unstable from one copy to the next. Consequently, any attempt to identify the boundaries of the quotations of previous authors, their original context, the inner arrangement of the material (organised by alphabetical order or by semantic groups?), and the way in which it was reshaped by later sources is difficult, and certainty is rarely within reach. Likewise, commented editions of the fragmentary evidence of several grammarians are still a desideratum. Space constraints prevent us from providing fully fledged editions of the fragments under scrutiny, for which we shall mainly limit ourselves to the standard texts of reference.

(4) Scholia and learned works usually quoted earlier sources by assembling what scholarly jargon calls *Zitatennest* ('a nest of quotations'): it is thus likely that when Roman or Late antique authors quoted a long list of authorities, they relied directly only on the latest quoted work, in which they probably found the previous references. Hence the overall picture may become somehow misleading, because the material provided by earlier sources is mediated through a *Mittelquelle* in which the original fragment might have undergone additional rearrangements. The apparent carelessness of these sometimes crowded clusters of quotations is

131 See further Hatzimichali (2006, 45–51).

thus partially attributable to their tortuous transmission and to the mixture of direct and indirect usage of material.¹³²

(5) In several instances, the survival of a lexicographical doctrine, although deprived of the relevant scholar's name, is guaranteed by its overlap with items that are usually identical in content and form, preserved in later strands of the lexicographical tradition, sometimes of different nature and scope.

(6) Other thorny questions involve the reliability of the titles and the self-consistency of these collections of glosses: in some instances, the bio-bibliographical tradition (mainly represented by entries in the *Suda*), preserves multiple titles attributed to the same work or subheadings of a larger collection.¹³³ In some cases, we are not entitled to assume that titles such as Ἀττικάι φωναί or Ἀττικάι λέξεις represented stand-alone works contained in book-rolls with independent circulation. Rather, they may represent sub-sections of larger works, such as the treatises on dialects or more general onomastic repertoires, which were copied in a single bookroll as part of a set of multiple *volumina* and eventually recorded as independent headings in the pinacographical tradition.¹³⁴

With the above in mind, let us now address our extant evidence, beginning with the Peripatetic tradition.

4.1 The Peripatetic tradition

That the discussion of γλῶσσαι as a category of stylistic discourse was still very much a hot topic, liable to refinements and modifications, in the literary circles of Ptolemaic Egypt at the end of the 3rd century BCE, has been confirmed by the publication of P.Hamb. II.128 (= TM 62832), an anonymous *Ars poetica* dated to the end of the 3rd century BCE, with interesting similarities to and differences from Aristotle's *Poetics*. In particular, Schenkeveld has plausibly argued that fr. (a) col. i.33–7 is a section on γλῶσσα (as opposed to ὄνομα κύριον), that incorporates, unlike Aristotle, several observations on synonyms.¹³⁵ This indicates that the debate surrounding the elements that were distinctive of a γλῶσσα was ongoing.

¹³² For the *Zitatennest* technique a classic example is that of Harpocration's lexicon. Harpocration is likely to have consulted directly only Didymus, while other earlier sources were probably quoted through the intermediation of Didymus, who therefore is a *Mittelquelle*.

¹³³ Cf. e.g. the case of Aristophanes' Λέξεις in Chapter 7, Sections 2.1 and 2.2.

¹³⁴ On the book titles and the pinacographical tradition, see D. Caroli (2007, 61–79).

¹³⁵ Schenkeveld (1993, 69).

A specific lexicographical and glossographical interest after Aristotle within the Peripatetic school is only sporadically attested but nonetheless confirms the master's enduring influence.¹³⁶ Two names stand out in our sources: Clearchus of Soli (born before 340 BCE), with his Γλώτται (Clearch. fr. 111–2 Wehrli = fr. 124–5 Dorandi–White)¹³⁷ and Heraclides Ponticus (ca. 390–320 BCE) with his Περὶ ὀνομάτων (Heraclid.Pont. fr. 22 Wehrli). Evidence for the latter is not unambiguous: the title of the work Περὶ ὀνομάτων (and nothing more) is preserved in Diogenes Laertius' lists of works by Heraclides (D.L. 5.87); the title is sandwiched between ἠθικά and διάλογοι, a collocation that may suggest not a lexicographical work proper but rather one on ὀρθοέπεια ('correctness of diction').¹³⁸ The case of Clearchus rests on more solid ground. In Clearch. fr. 111 Wehrli (= fr. 124 Dorandi–White)¹³⁹ we are told that Rhianus (born around the first third of the 3rd century BCE) and Aristophanes of Byzantium read εὐηφενέων ('wealthy') vs the vulgate εὐηγενέων ('noble') and that Clearchus also knew this variant and etymologised it in his Γλώτται with εὖ τῷ ἀφένει χρωμένων ('using nobly their wealth'). In this sense, Clearchus' interest in Homeric exegesis is perfectly in line with Aristotle's own interest in Homer. Clearchus' second gloss (without specific attribution to the Γλώτται) – that is, Clearch. fr. 112 Wehrli (= fr. 125 Dorandi–White) – deals with a sacrificial vessel, λοιβάσιον.¹⁴⁰

136 Fragments with lexicographical and glossographical features (interest in unidiomatic use of words and *Dialektwörter*) in Aristotle's Πολιτεῖα are collected by Dettori (2000, 41 n. 121). Evidence for the explanation of words within the Peripatetic school can be found in Dettori (2000, 40 n. 120).

137 Both fragments are dubious according to Wehrli, but see the detailed, persuasive defence by Matthaïos (2005).

138 See Dettori (2000, 40 with n. 116); Ippolito (2009) is sceptic. Matthaïos (2005, 74) is more optimistic.

139 Clearch. fr. 111 Wehrli = fr. 124 Dorandi–White (= schol. [Did.] Hom. *Il.* 23.81a [A]): {τεῖχει ὑπὸ Τρώων} <εὐηγενέων> ἐν τῇ Πριανοῦ καὶ Ἀριστοφάνους εὐηφενέων διὰ τοῦ <φ>, εὖ τῷ ἀφένει χρωμένων, ὡς Κλείταρχος (codd.: Κλείταρχος Schweighäuser) ἐν ταῖς Γλώτταις ('Under the wall of the noble (εὐηγενέων) Trojans': in the [edition] of Rhianus (fr. 11 Leurini) also Aristophanes [of Byzantium: Slater (1986, 111)] reads εὐηφενέων ('wealthy') with the φ, that is, using their wealth nobly, just as Clearchus in his Γλώτται'; the context is Patroclus' prophecy of Achilles' death). Matthaïos (2005, 61–8; see also 51 nn. 21–2) has forcefully shown that Schweighäuser's emendation Κλείταρχος must be rejected: the glossographer Cleitarchus of Aegina (3rd/2nd or 2nd century BCE) was interested only in *Dialektwörter*, most often preserved through spoken vernaculars without a literary tradition behind them; there is no evidence that Cleitarchus dealt with literary texts and their exegesis; cf. also Dettori (2020b).

140 Clearch. fr. 112 Wehrli = fr. 125 Dorandi–White (= Ath. 11.486a): λοιβάσιον· κύλιξ, ὡς φησι Κλείταρχος καὶ Νίκανδρος ὁ Θυατειρηνός, ᾧ τὸ ἔλαιον ἐπισπένδουσι τοῖς ἱεροῖς, σπονδεῖον δὲ ᾧ τὸν οἶνον, καλεῖσθαι λέγων καὶ λοιβίδας τὰ σπονδεῖα ὑπὸ Ἀντιμάχου τοῦ Κολοφωνίου ('λοιβάσιον: A κύλιξ, as Cleitarchus (Cleitarch. *BNJ*² 343 F 16) and Nicander of Thyateira (Nicand.Hist. *BNJ*² 343 F 16) say, in which they pour oil for sacrifices, while a σπονδεῖον is the type in which they pour wine, although he says that σπονδεῖα are called λοιβίδες by Antimachus of Colophon

The term λοιβάσιον is rare: its only literary attestation is in Epich. fr. 69.2 (= Ath. 8.362b–c), from the comedy *Θεαροί*. The origin of the suffix -άσιον remains obscure, as does its function (a diminutive value is attested with certainty only for κοράσιον); it appears to have enjoyed a certain spread in northwest Doric, yet besides its occurrence in Epicharmus, one cannot detect anything specifically Doric about this term.¹⁴¹ As Matthaios has shown, both of Clearchus' fragments (fr. 111 and 112 Wehrli) attest to a linguistic practice that was perfectly aligned with Aristotle's definition of and interest in glosses.¹⁴²

4.2 Philitas of Cos and Simmias of Rhodes

Moving beyond the Peripatetic school, it is the poet and scholar Philitas of Cos (born ca. 340 BCE), teacher of Zenodotus (Philitt. test. 10 Dettori = test. 15 Spanoudakis), who is traditionally considered to be the founder of Hellenistic lexicographical studies, putting them on a more rigorous footing compared to the lexical exegesis practised by the contemporary γλωσσογράφοι.¹⁴³ A native of the Doric island of Cos, Philitas arrived at Alexandria ca. 305–300 BCE to serve as tutor (διδάσκαλος) to the future king Ptolemy II Philadelphus. His involvement in the project of the Alexandrian Library and Museum is possible and even likely, but there is no direct evidence of any official role.¹⁴⁴ The nature and aim of Philitas' major lexicographical work, the Ἄτακτοι γλῶσσαι, remains largely unclear (a combination of both exegetical help and a repertoire of recondite words for his own literary production? or a collection more oriented to merely documenting local linguistic varieties without exegetical aims?), as does the

(Antim. fr. 26 Matthews: on Nicander of Thyateira, see Chapter 7, Section 4.3); translation after Sickinger (2018). Kaibel posited a lacuna after Θυσιατηρηνός; for the unnecessary nature of this intervention, see now Matthaios (2005, 48–9 n. 8).

141 See Chantraine (1933, 75). Plutarch (*Aem.* 33.3, *Marcell.* 2.8) mentions a λοιβεῖον, used like the λοιβάσιον for pouring libations of olive oil (cf. Poll. 10.65). It may be observed that the term κοράσιον, stigmatised by Atticists as ξενικόν (see e.g. Phot. π 26 = Ael.Dion. π 2; cf. also Poll. 2.17: τὸ γὰρ κοράσιον εἴρηται μὲν, ἀλλὰ εὐτελές and Phryg. *Ecl.* 50: τὸ δὲ κοράσιον παράλογον), is deemed to be of Macedonian origin in schol. (ex.) Hom. *Il.* 20.404c (T).

142 Matthaios (2005, 69–70).

143 Recent critical surveys of Philitas' lexicographical interests can be found in Tosi (1994a, 142–6); Montana (2020b, 142–3) (= Montana 2015, 71–2); Matthaios (2014b, 505–6, 517–8); Dettori (2021). The best and most detailed treatment of Philitas' grammatical and lexical activity remains Dettori (2000) (with some updates in Dettori 2021); cf. also Spanoudakis (2002, 347–403). On the elementary methodology of the γλωσσογράφοι (mostly an autoschediastic interpretation of lexical items on the basis of their immediate context, the so-called ἐν καθ' ἑνός principle, a limited use of etymology and dialects), see Dettori (2019, 16–21).

144 See Spanoudakis (2002, 28).

meaning of its title.¹⁴⁵ Suffice it here to say that Philitas' collection of unusual words was probably not ordered alphabetically, and its ἄτακτος character may simply imply that the glosses did not refer to a single given text (or to a homogeneous group of texts) from which they were taken.¹⁴⁶ What is certain is that Philitas' work showed the three main different strands of early Hellenistic lexicography already unified.¹⁴⁷ explanation of Homeric glosses;¹⁴⁸ a marked interest in dialectal words (and their underlying realia); and technical expressions. For our purposes, it is important to emphasise that Philitas drew his glosses from *both* literary sources and spoken vernaculars (other than Attic), with an apparent predilection for the latter.¹⁴⁹ His interests were not only literature-oriented but also embraced a historic-antiquarian dimension, with particular attentiveness for the rural, agrarian world (unless this impression is not irremediably skewed by the fact that the majority of his glosses come, for us, from Athenaeus). In this sense, it may well be that productions by contemporary local historians, now mostly lost, were an important source of Philitas' grammatical work.¹⁵⁰

Philitas' dialectal glosses include words from Aeolic (Philit. fr. 7 Dettori = fr. 35 Spanoudakis σκάλλιον, a small libation cup), Argive (fr. 9 Dettori = fr. 37 Spanoudakis κρήϊον,¹⁵¹ a type of nuptial bread cake), Boeotian (fr. 5 Dettori = fr. 33 Spanoudakis πέλλα, a type of κύλιξ), Cypriot (fr. 2 Dettori = fr. 30 Spanoudakis ἄωτον, some sort of drinking ware), Cyrenean (fr. 4 Dettori = fr. 21 Spanoudakis δῖνος, a foot-

145 For an updated overview of the different interpretations advanced by modern scholarship, see Dettori (2021) with previous bibliography; cf. also Montana (2020b, 142–3 n. 33) (= Montana 2015, 72–3 and n. 33).

146 Tosi (1994a, 148–9) has argued that the ἄτακτοι γλώσσαί may have had some sort of sub-grouping based on formal features as in P.Hibeh II.172 (= TM 65730), a mid-3rd century BCE poetic onomasticon or 'genre lexicon' (a list of epithets mainly from epic, choral, and tragic poetry, organised in families linked not by semantic but formal features; each family is alphabetically ordered). This may be the case, but the typology of P.Hibeh (probably a school text: cf. Esposito 2009, 260) significantly weakens the cogency of the comparison.

147 See Alpers (2001, 195).

148 Dettori (2000, 30–1) somewhat over-minimises Philitas' contribution to Homeric studies: see Kerkhecker (2004, 302).

149 Dettori (2000, 21 n. 52 and 36–7) with previous bibliography; of particular significance is the fact that Philitas often offers an altogether different meaning for the words that are also attested in the literary tradition. For a different but less persuasive view, see Spanoudakis (2002, 388–90), who emphasises instead the role of written, literary sources (mostly comedy).

150 The importance of *Lokalhistoriker* for early Hellenistic glossography was already highlighted by Latte (1925, 148–53).

151 This is the (not unproblematic) reading of Athenaeus' MS A at 14.645d. Kaibel's emendation κρήιον (on the basis of Hsch. κ 2546: κρήιον· τὸ τῶν μελισσῶν· καὶ εἶδος πλακοῦντος) remains equally unsatisfactory: see Dettori (2000, 88–9); Spanoudakis (2002, 363).

washing basin), Lesbian (fr. 14 Dettori = fr. 42 Spanoudakis ὑποθυμῖς, a twig of myrtle with violets and other flowers intertwined around it), Megarean (fr. 3 Dettori = fr. 31 Spanoudakis γυάλα, a drinking vessel), Sicyonian (fr. 12 Dettori = fr. 40 Spanoudakis ἱαχχα, a well-perfumed garland), and Syracusan (fr. 10 Dettori = fr. 38 Spanoudakis κύπελλον, remnants of barley cakes and bread left on the table).

Only three glosses can be traced back to a specific Attic context via their Demetriad cultic link: fr. 16 Dettori = fr. 44 Spanoudakis (= schol. Apoll.Rh. 4.982–92i) στάχυν ὄμπνιον,¹⁵² rendered by Philitas with the hendiadys εὐχυλον καὶ τρόφιμον (‘a juicy and nourishing ear-corn’). The adjective ὄμπνιος, mainly used as an epithet of Demeter or, by extension, applied to agricultural produce, is well documented in Attic literature (Soph. fr. 246 ὄμπνιου νέφους, significantly from the *Theseus*; Moschion *TrGF* 97 F 6.9 καρποῦ [. . .] ὄμπνιου) and has a handful of epigraphic attestations in Attica.¹⁵³ Fr. 17 Dettori = fr. 45 Spanoudakis (= *Et.Gud.* 248.13) ἀχαιά: within a discussion of the term as Attic epiclesis of Demeter (Ἀχαιά ἢ Δημήτηρ παρὰ Ἀττικοῖς) we are informed that Philitas said that also female field labourers are called ἀχαιαί ([. . .] ἢ ὡς Φιλητᾶς, τὰς ἐρίθους ἀχαιαῖς ἐκάλου). Fr. 18 Dettori = fr. 46 Spanoudakis (= Hsch. δ 3417) ἄμαλλα ‘sheaf, bundle of ears of corns (δράγματα)’: the mention, in Hesychius’ entry, of Sophocles’ *Triptolemos* (Soph. fr. 607) and of the 3rd-century BCE antiquarian Ister (*BNJ* 334 F 62) guarantees the word’s Attic pedigree (on Ister, see Chapter 7, section 4.1). Dettori (2000) has provided a thorough commentary on these three Attic glosses, and his conclusions need not be repeated here in any detail. For us, it is sufficient to note that even if ὄμπνιος and its derivatives occupy a specific place in later Atticist lexicography (Paus.Gr. ο 16 = Phot. ο 318 with reference to Athenian sacrificial cakes of meal and honey: Ἀθηναῖοι ὅτ’ ἂν τὸν νεῶν ἰδρύνονται πυροῦς μέλιτι δεύσαντες, ἐμβαλόντες εἰς καδίσκον, εἶθ’ οὕτως ἐπιθέντες τὸ ἱερεῖον, συντελοῦσι τὰ ἐξῆ κτλ.), as apparently also ἄμαλλα (cf. Philem. (Vindob.) 393.11: ἀμάλας <λέγουσιν Ἀττικῶς>, οὐ δράγματα, and Ael.Dion. α 91), nothing in Philitas fr. 16–8 Dettori leads us to suppose that Attic enjoyed a privileged status within Philitas’ glossographical work. The Attic dialect and antiquarian customs were, for him, as worthy of investigation as those of any other Greek dialect.

A collection of glosses in three books (*Su.* σ 431: ἔγραψε Γλώσσας βιβλία γ’) is also attested for the poet and scholar Simmias¹⁵⁴ of Rhodes (4th–3rd century BCE), a

¹⁵² Dettori (2000, 121–3) rightly argues for the status of gloss of the whole syntagm στάχυν ὄμπνιον, not only of the adjective ὄμπνιον.

¹⁵³ For the inscriptional evidence, see Dettori (2000, 122 with n. 370). It is not unlikely that Philitas may have used this word in his own *Demeter*, as observed by both Dettori (2000, 123) and Spanoudakis (2002, 370).

¹⁵⁴ For the spelling of the name with two μ instead of one, see Dettori (2019, 344).

contemporary of Philitas. This is, in itself, unsurprising: Simmias' poetic oeuvre, even if only scantily preserved, reveals an abundant use of obscure and rare words.¹⁵⁵ Only four glosses of his scholarly work survive, all transmitted by Athenaeus, possibly through Pamphilus.¹⁵⁶ Of these, only one deals with dialectal features, *Simm. fr. 1 Dettori* (= Ath. 7.327f) ἐστὶ δὲ καὶ γένος λίθου φάγγρος· ἡ γὰρ ἀκόνη κατὰ Κρήτας φάγγρος, ὡς φησι Σιμμίας: according to Simmias φάγγρος is the Cretan *terminus technicus* for the whetstone, ἀκόνη (in the other Greek dialects φάγγρος denotes some kind of fish).¹⁵⁷ The source of this piece of dialectal lore is debated: Wilamowitz (1924, 112 n. 2) tentatively opted for a poetic source, yet spoken vernacular cannot be ruled out (cf. Latte 1925, 162–3). In *fr. 2 Dettori* (= Ath. 11.472e): κάδος, Σιμμίας ποτήριον, παρατιθέμενος Ἀνακρέοντος (*Anacr. fr. 373.1–2 PMG*): ἠρίστησα μὲν ἰτρίου λεπτοῦ <μικρὸν> ἀποκλάς, | οἴνου δ' ἐξέπιον κάδον,¹⁵⁸ Simmias evidently missed the point of Anacreon's hyperbolic expression (κάδος usually means 'jug', not 'cup')¹⁵⁹ and over-interpreted the poet's expression as evidence for an otherwise unattested semantic equivalence κάδος = 'cup'. Even if Simmias' interpretation of κάδος is not defensible, *fr. 2* is important in that it assures us that literary sources were also used in the glossographical work. *Fr. 3 Dettori* (= Ath. 11.479c): Σιμμίας δὲ ἀποδίδωσι τὴν κοτύλην ἄλεισον, tells us that Simmias glossed κοτύλη ('cup') with ἄλεισον. The synonymic couple δέπας/ἄλεισον on the basis of *Od.* 3.40–63 is well attested in Homeric exegesis (see Dettori 2019, 257), and it is likely that, here, as well, Simmias drew on a literary source that is now lost to us. In *fr. 4 Dettori* (= Ath. 15.677c), Τιμαχίδας (*Timach.Rh. fr. 16 Matijašić*) δὲ καὶ Σιμμίας οἱ Ῥόδιοι ἀποδιδόασιν ἐν ἀνθ' ἑνός: Ἴσθμιον· στέφανον, the term Ἴσθμιον is glossed with the simple 'garland' (στέφανος). This fragment appears to reveal some common ground between Simmias' (and Timachidas') methodology and that of the Hellenistic γλωσσογράφοι much blamed by Aristarchus: Simmias also used the 'one-for-one' principle (ἐν ἀνθ'

¹⁵⁵ See Di Gregorio (2008, 54–9).

¹⁵⁶ So Matthaios (2008, 580). The grammatical fragments of Simmias have been edited and commented on in detail by Dettori (2019, 394–423), to whom this section is heavily indebted. Kwapisz (2019, 18–26) provides a concise (but not entirely reliable: on Kwapisz' idiosyncratic interpretation of the principle ἐν ἀνθ' ἑνός at 21–3 see Dettori 2019, 346 n. 15) overview of Simmias' grammatical work.

¹⁵⁷ Cf. also Eust. in *Od.* 2.103.5–7: πάντως δὲ καὶ ὁ κατὰ διάλεκτον Κρητῶν φάγγρος ἢ ἀκόνη, ὡς ἱστορεῖ ὁ παρὰ τῷ Ἀθηναίῳ Σιμμίας. ἔργον γὰρ καὶ πάθος δὲ ἀκόνης τὸ φαγεῖν, ἐσθιούσης τε δηλαδὴ τὰ τριβόμενα καὶ ἐσθιομένης ὑπ' αὐτῶν.

¹⁵⁸ 'κάδος: Simmias [says that it is] a cup and quotes Anacreon (*fr. 373.1–2 PMG*): 'I broke off a little piece of thin sesame-cake and had a meal, and I drank a κάδος of wine'.

¹⁵⁹ As observed by Bernsdorff (2020 vol. 2, 520), the *pointe* of οἴνου δ' ἐξέπιον κάδον is the 'grossely disproportionate amount of wine-drinking' (a whole jar) if compared with the meagre eating. For Simmias' misunderstanding of Anacreon's verse, see also Dettori (2019, 358–9).

ένός; i.e. the rather mechanical substitution of one word for another) in his interpretation of glosses, if we are to believe Athenaeus.¹⁶⁰ In this case, again, it is difficult to identify the precise source of Simmias: some scholars have suggested a possible *interpretatio Homerica* (*Od.* 18.300), but there are grounds for doubting this, since, in general, the gloss in Athenaeus is not centred on Homer.¹⁶¹ All in all, Simmias' lexical interests are partially comparable to those of Philitas¹⁶² (three of the four glosses deal with *realia*: but here again, the fact that the only source is Athenaeus may skew our perspective), but unlike the Coan scholar, Simmias' collection of glosses mentions specific literary sources (fr. 2), and the dialectal interest does not appear to be predominant (only fr. 1), unless this assessment has been dramatically distorted by the random process of survival of the available evidence.¹⁶³ The underlying aim of Simmias' collection of glosses remains equally unclear: perhaps partly an aid for poetic composition, partly an attempt at poetic exegesis, and possibly also a record of spoken vernaculars.¹⁶⁴

4.3 Zenodotus of Ephesus and Agathocles of Cyzicus

Another important stepping stone in the development of Hellenistic lexicography, and again one about which we are unfortunately very poorly informed, must have been Zenodotus' Γλώσσα. Zenodotus of Ephesus (ca. 330–260 BCE), the first director of the newly founded Alexandrian library and first 'editor' of Homer, was also the author of a collection of Γλώσσα that were alphabetically ordered (unlike that of his teacher Philitas). Only one fragment that is securely ascribable to his Γλώσσα survives, Zenod. fr. 1 Pusch (= schol. (Ariston.) *Hom. Od.* 3.444b.1): ἀμνίον· ἀγγεῖον εἰς ὃ τὸ αἷμα τοῦ ἱερείου ἐδέχοντο. (BHM^a) Ζηνόδοτος δὲ ἐν ταῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ Δ Γλώσσαις τίθησι τὴν λέξιν. ἅπαξ δὲ ἐνταῦθα παρ' Ὀμήρῳ ἢ λέξις ΗΜ^a ('ἀμνίον: A vase in which [they] gathered the victim's blood. But Zenodotus lists the word in his Γλώσσα under the entries beginning with delta. This word is found only here in Homer'). In *Od.* 3.444, Nestor and Telemachus are about to offer a sacrifice to Athena, and 'Perseus was holding the bowl' (Περσεὺς δ' ἀμνίον εἶχε in the vulgate), presumably to collect

¹⁶⁰ On the 'one for one' principle in ancient lexicography, see Dettori (2004); Matijašić (2020, 124).

¹⁶¹ See Dettori (2019, 247–50).

¹⁶² Thus, for instance, already Latte (1925, 162–3); Pfeiffer (1968, 89–90).

¹⁶³ Dettori (2019, 345–6). On the other hand, it is hardly coincidental that both Philitas and Simmias were natives of islands (Cos and Rhodes) where the local Doric dialect of the Aegean area persistently opposed the spread of the koine well into Hellenistic times: Bubeník (1989, 94–8).

¹⁶⁴ For the first hypothesis, see Latte (1925, 163); for the second, Matthaïos (2014b, 518).

the blood of the sacrifice. The scholium quoted above informs us that Zenodotus in his Γλώσσαι read, with a different word division, δάμνιον instead of the vulgate δ' ἀμνίων; since he placed the word under the entries beginning with the letter δ, his Γλώσσαι must have been alphabetically organised. The word δάμνιον is said by schol. (Hrd?) Hom. *Od.* 3.444f (HM^a) to have also been known to Nicander (second half of the 2nd century BCE) and Theodoridas (second half of the 3rd century BCE; a Syracusan poet), both of whom derive it from δάμνασθαι.¹⁶⁵ We are not told explicitly in which sense they understood δάμνιον; however, since this piece of information comes immediately after the definition of ἀμνίων as τὸ ἀγγεῖον τοῦ ὑποσφάγματος, it is likely that they understood it in the 'traditional way', as a sacrificial bowl for collecting the blood of the animal. Otherwise, in extant Greek, the word δάμνιον is attested (in the plural) only in Hsch. δ 205: δάμνια· θύματα, σφάγια. The scholium to *Od.* 3.444b.1 does not specify which meaning Zenodotus ascribed to δάμνιον, but it is likely that Hesychius' *interpretamentum* ('sacrificial offerings') was intended to explain Zenodotus' reading.¹⁶⁶ How Zenodotus himself understood δάμνια, whether as 'vessel for the blood' or 'sacrificial offering', remains ultimately unclear.

All remaining ten fragments ascribed by Pusch to Zenodotus' Γλώσσαι are conjectural, since the title of Zenodotus' work is nowhere mentioned except, as we have seen, in fr. 1 Pusch: the rationale for such an ascription is that, since Zenodotus with all probability did not write commentaries (ὑπομνήματα), he must have dealt with longer textual and exegetical issues not in the marginal annotations of his ἔκδοσις but in his Γλώσσαι.¹⁶⁷ The fragments collected by Pusch are as follows:

- fr. 2 Pusch = Porph. *Quaest. Hom.* 115.22–5 Sodano:¹⁶⁸ a semantic observation. Zenodotus apparently invented a non-existent bird named βότρυς to explain the adverb βοτρυδόν at *Il.* 2.89 βοτρυδόν δὲ πέτονται (indicating, in reality, the bees' whirling flight in clusters: Pusch 1890, 193–4);

¹⁶⁵ Schol. (Hrd?) Hom. *Od.* 3.444f (~ Eust. *in Od.* 1.138.12–9): ἀμνίων· τὸ ἀγγεῖον τοῦ ὑποσφάγματος. Νίκανδρος [fr. 133 Schneider] δὲ καὶ Θεοδορίδας [*SH* 747] ἀπὸ τοῦ 'δάμνασθαι' προφέρονται ἀσυνδέτως 'δάμνιον' κτλ. (HM^a); on this scholium see below.

¹⁶⁶ Pusch (1890, 192–3); Nickau (1977, 44 n. 7).

¹⁶⁷ See already Pfeiffer (1968, 115); Nickau (1972, 39–40); Tosi (1994a, 151) and most recently Le Feuvre (2022, 29). This, however, is one possibility among others: lectures' notes taken by his pupils (cf. e.g. the case of Ptolemy Epithetes, 2nd century BCE, who in a monograph defended Zenodotus' Homeric textual choices against Aristarchus' criticism: see F. Montanari 1988, 83–5), oral transmission, or other *syntagmata* that have not come down to us. On the oral character of the ecdotic and exegetical work of the first Alexandrian philologists, cf. also Nickau (1977, 15–7).

¹⁶⁸ Zenod. fr. 2 Pusch: θαυμάσαι δὲ ἔστι Ζηνόδοτον τὸ 'βοτρυδόν' ἐκλαβόντα ἐοικότως βότρυϊ τῷ ὄρνέῳ, ὃ ἑαυτὸ συστρέφει ἐν τῇ πτήσει ('One wonders that Zenodotus understood βοτρυδόν as if it were similar to the bird βότρυς, which gathers itself together while flying').

- fr. 3 Pusch = schol. (Hrd.) Hom. *Il.* 1.567b1 (A):¹⁶⁹ a textual and interpretative issue (orthography and meaning). Zenodotus, like Aristarchus, read at *Il.* 1.567 *ἀάπτου* with smooth breathing but interpreted the adjective in the sense of ‘strong’ rather than ‘undaunted’ (Aristarchus’ own explanation);
- fr. 4 Pusch = schol. (Hrd.) Hom. *Il.* 13.450a¹ (A):¹⁷⁰ a textual and interpretative issue (word division and meaning). Zenodotus read at *Il.* 13.450 *Κρήτη ἐπίουρον* (and not *Κρήτη ἐπι οὔρον*, ‘watcher over Krete’) and interpreted the term (referring to Minos) in the sense of ‘lord and protector’ (*βασιλέα καὶ φύλακα*);
- fr. 5 Pusch = schol. (Hrd.) Hom. *Il.* 11.754 (A):¹⁷¹ again, both a textual and interpretative issue (word division and meaning). Herodian quotes various authorities (Aristarchus, Crates, and Zenodotus) on the possible readings suggested for the sequence *ΔΙΑΣΠΠΔΕΟΣΠΕΔΙΟΙΟ* at *Il.* 11.754.¹⁷² *Scriptio continua* enables two different segmentations: (i) *δι’ ἀσπιδέος πεδίοιο* (variously interpreted as ‘through the shield-like (i.e. rounded) plain’, or ‘covered by shields’); (ii) *διὰ σπιδέος πεδίοιο*. Zenodotus, along with Crates, sided with (ii) and interpreted the adjective *σπιδής* (unattested) as synonymous with *ἄπορος καὶ τραχύς* (‘impassable and harsh’);
- fr. 6 Pusch = schol. (ex.) Hom. *Il.* 18.564 (T):¹⁷³ a semantic explanation. As argued by Pusch (1890, 196–7), Zenodotus must have commented not on the

169 Zenod. fr. 3 Pusch: <ἀάπτου χειρας>· οὔτως ψιλῶς προενεκτέον· οὔτως δὲ καὶ Ἀρίσταρχος ἤκουε δὲ τὰς δεινὰς καὶ ἀπτοήτους. ὁ δὲ Ζηνόδοτος καὶ αὐτὸς ὁμοίως τῷ πνεύματι, εἰς τὰς ἰσχυρὰς δὲ μετελάμβανεν (<ἀάπτου χειρας>: One must pronounce so, with smooth breathing. So also Aristarchus; he understood [hands] terrible and undaunted’. Zenodotus himself, like Aristarchus, had the same breathing as well but took the adjective to mean ‘strong’ (sc. hands’). On Aristarchus’ etymological interpretation of the adjective *ἄαπτος* as deriving from privative *α* + *πτοεῖν*, see Schironi (2018, 117).

170 Zenod. fr. 4 Pusch: <Κρήτη ἐπίουρον>· τοῦτο τριχῶς ἀνεγνώσθη. Ζηνόδοτος γὰρ ὡς ἐπίκουρον, ἐκδεχόμενος βασιλέα καὶ φύλακα. καὶ Ἀρίσταρχος δὲ οὔτως, ἐκδεχόμενος τὸν φύλακα κτλ. (<Κρήτη ἐπίουρον>: This has been read in three ways (i.e. ἐπίουρος, ἐπιούρος, ἐπι οὔρος). In fact, Zenodotus takes it as ἐπίκουρος (‘guard’) interpreting it as ‘lord and protector’; and so also Aristarchus, taking it as ‘the protector’). On ἐπίουρος, see Lehrs (1882, 107–11 and 309). ἐπιούρος was preferred by Ptolemy of Ascalon, a grammarian of the 1st century CE, as the rest of the scholium above quoted shows: ὁ δὲ Ἀσκαλωνίτης (p. 53 Baege) παρέλκειν ἡγέεται τὴν ἐπί· διὸ καὶ τὸν τόνον φυλάσσει τῆς προ<σ>θέσεως; see Pusch (1890, 195 n. 1).

171 Zenod. fr. 5 Pusch: <δι’ ἀσπιδέος πεδίοιο>· [. . .] Ζηνόδοτος δὲ συναινεῖ τῇ δίχα τοῦ <α> γραφῆ καὶ φησι ‘σπιδέος’ τοῦ ἀπόρου καὶ τραχέος {καὶ μεγάλου} (del. Lehrs: see Pusch (1890, 195)) (<δι’ ἀσπιδέος πεδίοιο>: [. . .] Zenodotus agrees with the reading without *α* and says that *σπιδέος* means ‘impassable and harsh’).

172 The scholium is analysed in detail by Schironi (2018, 368–70).

173 Zenod. fr. 6 Pusch: <κυανῆν> κάπετον· τὴν ληνόν· Ζηνόδοτος δὲ φησιν ἀπὸ χαλκοῦ κεκαυμένου κτλ. (<κυανῆν> κάπετον: The watering tub: Zenodotus says that it was made of smelted bronze etc.’).

- noun κάπετον ('field-ditch') but on its adjective κυανέην, specifying that it indicated not the colour (or not only the colour) but the material ('made of molten bronze': ἀπὸ χαλκοῦ κεκαυμένου);¹⁷⁴
- fr. 7 Pusch = Ath. 1.13d:¹⁷⁵ another semantic remark. Thanks to internal parallels (*Od.* 8.98 and *Il.* 9.225), Zenodotus interpreted the adjective ἕϊσος ('equal') in the *iunctura* δαῖτα εἶσιν as meaning 'good', probably etymologising it from εὖς ('good, noble');
 - fr. 8 Pusch = Ath. 11.478e:¹⁷⁶ a lexical explanation. Zenodotus, together with the glossographers Silenus (cf. Chapter 7, Section 5) and Cleitarchus (both datable to the 3rd or 3rd/2nd century BCE), defended the equivalence κοτύλη = κύλιξ on the basis of *Il.* 23.34 (the blood of the sacrificial victims flowing by the cupful (κοτυλήρυτον) – that is, abundantly, at the funeral banquet for Patroclus) – and of a proverbial saying (Zenob. 5.71). The synonymic equivalence κοτύλη = κύλιξ is otherwise attested only in Ath. 11.480f as a Cypriot gloss quoted by Glaucōn (of uncertain date) in his *Γλῶσσαι* and in Hsch. κ 4502. An indirect support for this semantic equivalence may be provided by Call. *inc. auct.* fr. 773 Pfeiffer κυλικήρυτον αἶμα, where κυλικήρυτον clearly alludes to the Homeric κοτυλήρυτον;
 - fr. 9 Pusch = *Epim. Hom.* ι 13:¹⁷⁷ a semantic observation of Zenodotus on the adjective ἰφθιμος, which he took to mean 'noble', on the basis of *Il.* 5.415, where the epithet is referred to Diomedes' wife. As van Thiel argued (2014 vol. 1, 44), it

174 Cf. *LfggrE* s.v. κύανος.

175 Zenod. fr. 7 Pusch: ἐκ τούτων δ' ἐπέισθη Ζηνόδοτος δαῖτα εἶσιν τὴν ἀγαθὴν λέγεσθαι. ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἡ τροφή τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἀγαθὸν ἀναγκαῖον ἦν, ἐπεκτείνας, φησίν, εἰρηκεν εἶσιν ('Through these passages [i.e. *Od.* 8.98 and *Il.* 9.225] Zenodotus was persuaded that a good meal is said to be 'equal' (εἶσιν): for since food is a necessary good for men, [Homer], he says, by extension said 'equal' (εἶσιν)').

176 Zenod. fr. 8 Pusch: Σιληνὸς καὶ Κλείταρχος ἔτι τε Ζηνόδοτος τὴν κύλικα: 'πάντη δ' ἀμφὶ νέκυν κοτυλήρυτον ἔρρεεν αἶμα' (*Il.* 23.34) καί: 'πολλὰ μεταξύ πέλει κοτύλης καὶ χειλέος ἄκρου' (Zenob. 5.71). ('Silenus (fr. 7 Dettori), Cleitarchus, and also Zenodotus, [say that the κοτύλη] is a κύλιξ: 'and blood was flowing everywhere around the corpse by the cupful' [*Il.* 23.24] and also 'there is much between the κοτύλη and the lip' [Zenob. 5.71]'). See Dettori (2019, 275), who rightly defends the transmitted ἔτι τε against Dindorf's emendation ἔτι δέ: the emphasis conferred by ἔτι τε may suggest that in the original source used by Athenaeus, Zenodotus' stance differed from that of Silenus and Cleitarchus, even if he too identified the κοτύλη with the κύλιξ.

177 Zenod. fr. 9 Pusch: ἰφθιμος (*Il.* 1.3 *alibi*): ὄνομα ἐπιθετικόν. ἰφθίμους Τρύφων ἀπεδήλωσε τοὺς ἰσχυροὺς, Ζηνόδοτος τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς: τί γάρ, φησίν, ἐροῦμεν 'ἰφθίμη ἄλοχος Διομήδεος' (*Il.* 5.415); κτλ. ('ἰφθιμος: Adjective. Tryphon (fr. 125 Velsen) took ἰφθίμους to mean 'strong', Zenodotus 'noble'. Why, he says, should we say 'the noble wife of Diomedes' (*Il.* 5.415)?'). The entry goes on quoting Crates' interpretation of ἰφθιμος as *vox media* (Crates Gr. fr. 51 Broggiato): on whether (or not) Crates knew of Zenodotus' interpretation, see Broggiato (2001, 219 with n. 283).

seems likely that Tryphon (1st century BCE) fr. 125 Velsen is the source of Zenodotus' quotation;

- fr. 10 Pusch = schol. Theocr. 5.2d:¹⁷⁸ another semantic note on the meaning of Homeric *νάκη* ('sheepskin, fleece') based on *Od.* 14.530 *ἄν δὲ νάκην ἔλετ' αἰγὸς εὐτρεφῆος μεγάλοιο*. The transmission of the scholium is far from clear and may have been tampered with by a copyist eager to flesh out Zenodotus' notes (Pusch 1890, 199). If the text is trustworthy, Zenodotus apparently gave two different meanings for *νάκη*: τὸ κώδιον, that is, 'fleece' (the only otherwise attested in post-Homeric literature) and the more puzzling one, judged by Pusch to be incorrect, of τὸ μαρσύπιον: 'leather pouch';
- fr. 11 Pusch = schol. Hes. *Theog.* 116c1:¹⁷⁹ an interpretative point. Zenodotus did edit Hesiod's *Theogony* (cf. the mention of τὰ Ζηνοδότεια, i.e. ἀντίγραφα, at schol. Hes. *Theog.* 5b2), but it is far from certain that the Zenodotus' mentioned in this Hesiodic scholium is our scholar from Ephesus.¹⁸⁰ Be that as it may, Zenodotus explained the Hesiodic *χάος* as τὸν κεχυμένον ἀέρα ('the mist shed around').

As this brief survey has indicated, the fragments collected by Pusch and ascribed to Zenodotus' *Γλῶσσαι* deal mainly, if not almost uniquely, with *Homererklärung* (word division, orthography but also semantics) and poetic diction in general (Hesiod, if fr. 11 is to be ascribed to our Zenodotus).¹⁸¹ Previous scholarship has made

178 Zenod. fr. 10 Pusch: <νάκος χθῆς> Ζηνόδοτος τὸ κώδιον, τὸ μαρσύπιον. καὶ νάκος αἰγὸς δορὰν καὶ Ὀμηρος (*Od.* 14.530): 'νάκος ἔλετ' αἰγὸς ὀρειτρόφου'. καὶ Θεόκριτος ἐν τοῖς ἐξῆς (v. 12) αἰγὸς φησιν. ('<νάκος χθῆς>: Zenodotus [says that νάκος means] 'fleece, leather pouch'. Also Homer [says that] νάκος is the goats' skin (*Od.* 14.530): '[Eumaeus] picked up the fleece of a mountain-bred goat'. And Theocritus says the same in the following verses (*Id.* 5.12)'). The maladroit quotation from *Od.* 14.530 (νάκος instead of νάκην and ὀρειτρόφου instead of εὐτρεφῆος) is ascribed by Pusch not to Zenodotus but to a zealous copyist: see Pusch (1890, 199–200).

179 Zenod. fr. 11 Pusch: χάος γένετ'. [. .] χάος λέγει τὸν κεχυμένον ἀέρα· καὶ γὰρ Ζηνόδοτος <οὕτως> φησίν. Βακχυλίδης (5. 26–7 Snell–Maehler) δὲ χάος τὸν ἀέρα ὠνόμαζε κτλ. ('χάος γένετ': [. .] [the poet] calls chaos the ἀήρ ('mist' in the translation of Pfeiffer 1968, 117) shed around; and in fact, also Zenodotus says <so>. Bacchylides (5.26–7 Snell–Maehler) called chaos the expansion of the air etc.'). The textual tradition of this scholium is disrupted: the information about Zenodotus is found in a part of the scholium transmitted by some MSS but judged by di Gregorio to be extraneous to the archetype.

180 See F. Montanari (2009, 333–5) with previous bibliography for the other possible candidates: Zenodotus of Alexandria (2nd–1st century BCE), author of a work entitled *Εἰς τὴν Ἡσιόδου Θεογονίαν*; Zenodotus of Mallus (2nd–1st century BCE), also known in the Homeric scholia as Zenodotus ὁ Κρατήτειος; and Zenodotus the Stoic philosopher (2nd century BCE?), a disciple of Diogenes of Babylon.

181 Cf. Pusch (1890, 201); Nickau (1972, 40); Latte (1925, 154); Tosi (1994a, 151).

much of the fact that Zenodotus' collection, unlike that of Philitas, was alphabetically ordered, claiming that this new ordering was an important step ('a model for the future', in Pfeiffer's words) for the development of lexicographical studies.¹⁸² Esposito (2009, 259–60), though without specific reference to Zenodotus' Γλῶσσαί, also detects in the shift from a broadly onomasiological to a progressively perfected alphabetical ordering a developmental progress of the genre.¹⁸³ However, this assumption is debatable: more than forty years ago, Alpers (1975, 116–7) observed that a thematic arrangement should not be conceptualised as a less sophisticated approach to ordering knowledge than the rather more mechanical process of alphabetisation.¹⁸⁴ The two systems simply served different purposes and should not be regarded as mutually exclusive. On the basis of the fragments collected by Pusch, it would appear that in Zenodotus' Γλῶσσαί, unlike those of his teacher Philitas, no marked dialectal interest emerges, nor is any sustained attention to realia evident. However, the evidence at our disposal does admit other interpretations. Zenodotus also authored a work entitled Ἐθνικαὶ λέξεις (*Ethnic Expressions*):¹⁸⁵ the title is preserved by Gal. *Gloss.* π 12 πέζαι and π 13 πέλλα Perilli. In π 12 we are told that in his *Ethnic Expressions* Zenodotus said that Arcadians and Dorians call the foot πέζα ([. . .] Ζηνόδοτος μὲν οὖν ἐν ταῖς Ἐθνικαῖς λέξεσι πέζαν φησὶ τὸν πόδα καλεῖν Ἀρκάδας καὶ Δωριεῖς).¹⁸⁶ the mention of the Arcadians appears to imply a non-literary source. Analogous is also the case of π 13 πέλλα: here, too, Zenodotus' authority is said to vouch for the Sicynian use of πέλλος (an adjective usually

¹⁸² Cf. e.g. Pfeiffer (1968, 115).

¹⁸³ Esposito wrote before the publication by Vecchiato (2022) of P.Köln inv. 22323 (= TM 977097), a 3rd/2nd century BCE lexicon already fully alphabetically ordered (that is, throughout all the letters); on P.Köln inv. 22323 see Chapter 7, Section 7.6. Previous to the publication of the Cologne lexicon the *communis opinio* among scholars was that the alphabetical ordering beyond the third letter was an innovation introduced by Diogenianus and fundamentally linked to the prescriptive character of Atticist trends: see Vecchiato (2022, 5 with nn. 19–20).

¹⁸⁴ See more recently also Hatzimichali (2013, 36 n. 17), who quotes as a telling example of critique of alphabetical arrangement as inferior to the onomasiological arrangement the evidence offered by Dioscorides (1st century CE), *Dsc. Materia medica* I Prol. 3.7–9: ἡμαρτον δὲ καὶ περὶ τὴν τάξιν, οἱ μὲν ἀσυμφύλους δυνάμεις συγκρούσαντες, οἱ δὲ κατὰ στοιχεῖον καταγράφαντες, διέξυξαν <τε> τῆς ὁμογενείας τὰ τε γένη καὶ τὰς ἐνεργείας αὐτῶν, ὡς διὰ τοῦτο ἀσυμνημόνευτα γίνεσθαι (within a critique of Niger and other physicians): '[Niger and the rest of them] have also blundered regarding organization: some have brought into collision disconnected properties, while others an alphabetical arrangement, separating materials and their properties from those closely connected to them. The outcome of this arrangement is that it is difficult to commit to memory', transl. after Beck (2017).

¹⁸⁵ Pusch (1890, 174–80); Latte (1925, 167–9).

¹⁸⁶ According to Pusch (1890, 176–7) the peculiar usage of Arcadians and Dorians consisted in the fact that, whereas in *gemeingriechisch* πέζα meant a specific sub-part of the foot (either the malleolus or the foot's sole), they used πέζα to designate the whole foot.

meaning ‘dark-coloured’, cf. *EDG* s.v. *πελιδνός*) to designate what is tawny-orange in colour ([. . .] Ζηνόδοτος δὲ ἐν ταῖς Ἐθνικαῖς λέξεισι Σικυωνίους φησι τὸ κίρρον πέλλον ὀνομάζειν). Finally, Pusch ascribed a third diatopic gloss to Zenodotus’ Ἐθνικαὶ λέξεις, even if the title of the work is not mentioned: at Ath. 7.327b, we are told that, according to Zenodotus, the Cyreneans call the sea-fish usually known as ἐρυθρίνος ‘ὔκης’ (Ζηνόδοτος δὲ φησι Κυρηναίους τὸν ὔκην ἐρυθρίνον καλεῖν). In these three passages, Zenodotus’ dialectal interest comes to the fore in a way that does not differ substantially from that of Philitas (spoken *Mundarten* as sources, attention to realia). Even more interesting is the case of schol. Apoll.Rh. 2.1005–6a: <στυφελήν>· τραχεῖαν καὶ σκληράν· οὕτως Κλειτόριοι λέγουσιν, ὡς φησι Ζηνόδοτος ἐν Γλώσσαις, Κυρηναῖοι δὲ τὴν χέρσον (<στυφελήν>: Harsh and hard; so the inhabitants of Cleitoria [in Achaia], as Zenodotus says in his Γλώσσα. The Cyreneans call so the mainland’). Here, the dialectal gloss is ascribed to Zenodotus’ Γλώσσα *tout court*: unless one assumes a mistake (facilitated by a certain degree of fluctuation between λέξις and γλώσσα already in the early Hellenistic period) as Pusch does,¹⁸⁷ it is not implausible to suspect that the Ἐθνικαὶ λέξεις were an inner section of the Γλώσσα themselves.¹⁸⁸

On both explanations (two different works or only one with internal thematic subdivisions), Zenodotus’ methodological approach in his lexical studies does not appear, all in all, substantially different from that of his predecessors, with the obvious exception of the lion’s share accounted for by the *Homererklärung* in his Γλώσσα: his lexicographical interests extend from literary text to spoken vernaculars, and there is no sign that the Attic dialect played any special part in his studies. This is even more the case if one considers the later history of ἀμνίον (a sacrificial vessel used to collect the blood of the victim). In Zenod. fr. 1 Pusch (= schol. (Ariston.) Hom. *Od.* 3.444b.1 (HM^a)), we have seen that Zenodotus at *Od.* 3.444b1 read δάμνιον instead of δ’ ἀμνίον of the vulgate. In the Homeric scholium, we were not told which sense Zenodotus ascribed to δάμνιον, whether ‘vessel for collecting blood’ or, on the basis of Hsch. δ 205 (δάμνια· θύματα, σφάγια), ‘sacrificial offerings’. Interestingly, other Homeric scholia (schol. Hom. *Od.* 3.444c, e1 and f1) report that Attic speakers (οἱ Ἀττικοὶ) did not use ἀμνίον for the sacrificial bowl but rather the term σφάγιον (possibly an itacistic spelling for σφάγειον), an observation that smacks of Atticistic flavour.¹⁸⁹ The text of these scholia is as follows:

¹⁸⁷ Pusch (1890, 175–6).

¹⁸⁸ See Nickau (1972, 40–3), followed by Tosi (1994a, 152) and Montana (2021a).

¹⁸⁹ Nickau’s statement that ‘Die Bedeutungsgleichung ἀμνίον = σφάγιον wird in den Odysseescholien den Ἀττικοὶ zugeschrieben (im Gegensatz zu der akzeptierten Bedeutung “Gefäß zum Auffangen des Blutes des Opfertieres” (Nickau 1977, 44 n. 7) is misleading inasmuch as it suggests an alleged shift of meaning of the term in Attic. That is, however, not what the scholium says: the

- (1) Schol. (V) Hom. *Od.* 3.444c: ἀμνίον· ἔστι μὲν τῶν ἅπαξ εἰρημένων ἢ λέξεις. σημαίνει δὲ τὸ ἀγγεῖον, ὅπου τὸ αἷμα τοῦ ἱερείου δέχονται. (MaTV) καὶ ἔστι κατὰ τὸ ἔτυμον ‘ἀμένιον’, ὃ ἔστι στερητικὸν τοῦ μένουσιν τούτεστι τῆς ψυχῆς. οἱ Ἀττικοὶ δὲ ‘σφάγιον’ αὐτὸ καλοῦσιν (HMaTVY). (‘ἀμνίον: A hapax. The term designates the vessel where the blood of the sacrificial victim is collected; its etymology is from ἀμένιον, that is, that which deprives the soul of its strength). Attic speakers call it σφάγιον’);
- (2) Schol. (ex.) Hom. *Od.* 3.444e1 (E) [. . .]: ἔστι δὲ τῶν ἅπαξ εἰρημένων ἢ λέξεις. ἄλλοι δὲ μικρὸν μαχαιρίδιον, ὃ καὶ ‘σφάγιον’ καλοῦσιν οἱ Ἀττικοί. ([. . .] a hapax. Other say that it means a small knife, which Attic speakers call also σφάγιον’),¹⁹⁰
- (3) Schol. (Hrd.) Hom. *Od.* 3.444f (HM^a) (~ Eust. *in Od.* 1.138.12–9): ἀμνίον· τὸ ἀγγεῖον τοῦ ὑποσφάγματος. Νικάνδρος δὲ καὶ Θεοδωρίδας ἀπὸ τοῦ ‘δάμνασθαι’ προφέρονται ἀσυνδέτως ‘δάμνιον’. Πορσίλος¹⁹¹ δὲ ὁ Ἱεραπύτνιος παρὰ Ἱεραπυτνίοις ἔτι σώζεσθαι τὴν φωνὴν ‘αἴμνιον’, δασέως μετὰ τοῦ ι κατ’ ἀρχὴν προφερομένην, παρὰ τὸ ‘αἷμα’. καὶ Ἀπολλόδωρος φησιν ὡς εἰκὸς ἦν παρὰ τῷ ποιητῇ οὕτως αὐτὸ <προ>φέρεσθαι, ὑπὸ δὲ τινῶν περιηρῆσθαι τὸ ι. Ἀττικοὶ δὲ ‘σφάγιον’ αὐτὸ καλοῦσιν. εἰς τοῦτο δὲ πρῶτον αἷμα δεχόμενοι τοῖς βωμοῖς ἐπιχέουσιν. (‘ἀμνίον: The vessel for the blood of the sacrificial victim. Nicander [fr. 133 Schneider] and Theodoridas [SH 747] say δάμνιον without word division, deriving it from δάμνασθαι (‘to overpower’). Porsilus of Hierapytna [says] that among the Hierapytνιοὶ the word αἴμνιον is still kept, with rough breathing and with the iota at the beginning of the word, from αἷμα (‘blood’). And Apollodorus (Apollod. *BNJ* 244 F 288) says that it is reasonable that it is cited thus by the poet, but the iota is taken away by some. The Attic writers call it σφάγιον, and they catch the first blood into it when they pour it on the altars’).

The correct Attic diction for the bowl used in sacrifices to collect the first blood of the sacrificial victim was σφάγιον/σφάγειον. It is worth observing that, according to the scholia quoted above, no concern about the proper Attic word for ἀμνίον can be traced back to Zenodotus. Like other contemporary glossographers, it appears that Attic terminology was not a privileged field of inquiry for him.

Zenodotus’ interest in both literary exegesis (Homer) and dialectal glosses was further pursued by his pupil Agathocles of Cyzicus (*Su.* π 3035), best known in antiq-

scholium specifies that Attic speakers called the ἀμνίον ‘σφάγιον’: different name but same underlying realia. This is also confirmed by Eust. *in Od.* 1.138.18: Ἀττικοὶ δὲ σφάγιον τὸ τοιοῦτον ἀγγεῖον ἐκάλουν. On σφάγειον as a blood vessel in sacrificial practice, see Ekroth (2002, 244–7).

190 In the apparatus *ad loc.*, Pontani (2007, vol. 2) notes that the equivalence σφάγιον = μαχαιρίδιον is nowhere else attested. The origin of this equivalence remains obscure, aside from the obvious fact that σφάζω denotes the sacrificial killing of the victim with a knife.

191 Πορσίλος is Jacoby’s emendation for the mss. Πορσίλλος (Σ^{HM}) and Πορσίαλος (Σ^Q). Eustathius has Πόσιλος. Latte (1925, 151 n. 33) proposed to emend Πόρσιλλος (not an attested Greek proper name) into Πορθέσιλλος, the *Kurzform* of Πορθεσίλας, on the basis of inscriptional evidence from Crete (of Hellenistic date).

uity for his work on local historiography.¹⁹² From the scanty remains, it appears that Agathocles' interest in Homer centred primarily on passages of mythographic and cosmological relevance: the application of cosmological and allegorical interpretations on the Homeric text suggests a Stoic influence (not present in Zenodotus) and an affinity with the method of Crates of Mallos.¹⁹³ However, we also have fragments that suggest a closer relationship with the two strands characteristic of early Hellenistic lexicography: literary exegesis and dialectal glosses. Particularly interesting for us in this respect, in that it synthesises Homeric textual criticism and dialectal features,¹⁹⁴ is Agatochl. *BNJ* 472 F 10 = fr. 10 Montanari (= Eust. *in Il.* 3.668.1–6).¹⁹⁵ The text of our fragment is as follows:

Agatochl. *BNJ* 472 F 10: τὸ δὲ ἄρουσιν ὑψικόμοισιν Ἄγαθοκλῆς, ὡς οἱ παλαιοὶ φασί, ἄρουσιν ἰξοφόροισι γράφει· αἱ μὲν γὰρ ἄκαρποι, φησί, καὶ πλατύφυλλοι ἐρίφλοιοι καλοῦνται παρὰ Περγαμηνοῖς, αἱ δὲ λεπτόφυλλοι καὶ καρποφόροι ἡμερίδες, ὡς καὶ ὁ ποιητὴς ἐν Ὀδυσσεΐα ἡμερίς ἡβώωσα· καὶ τοὺς ἐπὶ τούτων εὐανθοῦντας βότρυς σταφυλάς καλοῦσιν, ἐξ ὧν καὶ ὁ ἰξὸς γίνεται. ἡ γὰρ ἄκαρπος δρυς, φησί, κηκιδοφόρος ἐστίν, ὅτι δὲ δρυὲς τινὲς ἡμερίδες εἰσὲτι καὶ νῦν λέγονται, οἱ περὶ Θράκην οἶδασιν.

Instead of 'oaks with lofty foliage' Agathokles, as the ancient authorities report, writes 'oaks with mistletoe growing on them'. For, he says, trees which do not bear fruit and are broad-leaved are called ἐρίφλοιοι by the Pergamenians, but those which have thin leaves and do bear fruit are called ἡμερίδες, as also the poet does in the *Odyssey*: 'a luxuriant ἡμερίς' (*Od.* 5.69). And the blooming bunches of grapes on these trees they call σταφυλαί, from which also birdlime (ἰξός) is made. For the oak which does not bear fruit, he says, bears gall-nuts (κηκιδοφόρος). People who live in Thrace know that certain kinds of oaks are still called ἡμερίδες. (Transl. after Engels 2008).

Commenting on *Il.* 14.398 δρουσιν ὑψικόμοισιν, Eustathius tells us that Agathocles read instead δρουσιν ἰξοφόροισι, a reading that is not otherwise preserved by the manuscript tradition and may represent a conjecture on the part of Agathocles himself on the basis of his profound botanical knowledge.¹⁹⁶ Agathocles supports ἰξοφόροισι by referring to different varieties of oaks, among which he includes those that do not bear fruit and have broad leaves and are called ἐρίφλοιοι [. . .]

¹⁹² For an overview of Agathocles' historical and philological works, see F. Montanari (1988, 20–4).

¹⁹³ F. Montanari (1988, 23).

¹⁹⁴ This connection was already highlighted by Latte (1925, 156).

¹⁹⁵ Cf. also Eust. *in Od.* 1.200.39–44 on *Od.* 5.69, basically a repetition of *in Il.* 3.668.1–6.

¹⁹⁶ Cf. Agatochl. *BNJ* 472 F 4 (= fr. 4 Montanari = Ath. 14.649e) where, in a discussion on rare Mediterranean plants called at Alexandria κόνναρος and παλιούρος, the name of Agathocles is quoted as an authority on such flora as shown by his remarks on it in the third book of his *Περὶ Κυζίκου* (μνημονεύει δ' αὐτῶν Ἄγαθοκλῆς ὁ Κυζικηνὸς ἐν γ' τῶν *Περὶ τῆς πατρίδος*).

παρὰ Περγαμηνοῖς.¹⁹⁷ In Agathocles, we see thus synthesised *Textpflege* and an interest in local vernaculars, perhaps mediated by his expertise in natural sciences: Latte (1925, 156 and 161) was also one of the first to recognise the importance of the ‘naturwissenschaftliche Forschung’, with its taxonomical and descriptive drive (above all ‘Synonymenlisten’), in the development of Hellenistic lexicography.

4.4 Callimachus between poetry and scholarship: Glosses for a multicultural Greek world

Callimachus of Cyrene (ca. 303–240 BCE), poet and scholar, was active in Alexandria during the reign of Ptolemy II Philadelphus (284–246 BCE) and Ptolemy III Euergetes (262–222 BCE). His literary and scholarly output was vast, amounting to more than 800 books, according to the *Suda* (κ 227). Although not formally in charge of the Library of Alexandria, Callimachus certainly wrote his bibliographical masterpiece, the Πίνακες, and his other antiquarian-scholarly works by taking full advantage of the collection of all extant Greek literature in the Library, an enterprise sponsored by the Ptolemies’ policy of cultural supremacy.¹⁹⁸ Alexandria was not only the capital of scholarship, with its Museum and Library, but was also a melting pot of people coming from the most far-flung regions of the Greek world and beyond: it was the ideal place for Callimachus’ linguistic experimentalism – for his ‘multiple *koinai*’, to use Parsons’ expression.¹⁹⁹ Callimachus’ linguistic πολυειδεία, and his strong interest in aetiology and historical-antiquarian research, a recurrent *Leitmotif* in his literary works, represents an important trait d’union between his creative production and his antiquarian and philological studies.

Callimachus’ extraordinary range of writings, in terms of both quality and quantity, makes it impossible to survey in any meaningful detail his engagement, as a poet and a scholar, with what we have highlighted hitherto as the two main strands of early Hellenistic lexicography: literary exegesis and dialectology. His same creative oeuvre constantly intertwines, in a highly sophisticated and allusive way, learned exegesis of obscure poetical words and attention to spoken vernacu-

¹⁹⁷ Engels (2008) translates παρὰ Περγαμηνοῖς with ‘by scholars from Pergamon’, following apparently Helck’s erroneous interpretation: see F. Montanari (1988, 39 n. 27). The mention of a local botanical gloss suggests direct knowledge of the Pergamon dialect according to Montanari (*ibid.*). The reference to Thracian linguistic contemporary usage is likely Eustathius’ own addition.

¹⁹⁸ On the importance of the Alexandrian library and its royal sponsorship for the development of Hellenistic lexicography, see above Section 3.

¹⁹⁹ Parsons (2011).

lars. This is particularly true, for example, of his *Hecale*, an aetiological epyllion on the Attic cult of Zeus Hecaleios (Call. fr. 230–377 Pfeiffer): with its Attic setting, the *Hecale* is replete with references and allusions to Attic customs, lore, mythology, and topography, for which Callimachus drew heavily on the Atthidographers.²⁰⁰ This also has clear repercussions for the language used in the epyllion, which betrays a heavy indebtedness to Attic vocabulary in general and Attic comedy in particular.²⁰¹ Does this mean that Callimachus considered Attic to be superior to other Greek dialects? Not necessarily. As Hollis (2009, 13) demonstrated, in the *Hecale*, Callimachus ‘is receptive to influences from all over the Greek world’: ἄλλιξ (fr. 42.5 Hollis), a kind of cloak, is according to ancient sources a Thessalian word (*Et.Gen.* α 515); γέντρα (fr. 127 Hollis), ‘entrails’, comes from Thrace (Ael.Dion. γ 6*); σῦφαρ (fr. 74.11 Hollis), a piece of ‘wrinkled skin’, is possibly a Sicilian idiom (schol. Nic. *Alex.* 91g; first attested in Sophron fr. 55) and so on.²⁰² Athens and Attica were clearly an important political *and* cultural asset for the Ptolemies during the greatest part of the 3rd century BCE.²⁰³ Attic literature constituted the largest share of the Library’s collection, and Attic ‘themes’ were increasingly popular among Hellenistic poets.²⁰⁴ However, we do not perceive in Callimachus any privileged treatment of Attic dialect as such or any prescriptive attitude.

As hinted above, we shall therefore limit our brief survey to Callimachus’ Ἐθνικαὶ ὀνομασίαι (*Local Nomenclatures*, fr. 406 Pfeiffer), the only work in the *Suda*’s entry that is explicitly marked as lexicographical. Prior to tackling this work, however, it is important for our purposes to recall that Callimachus has often been considered the ‘father’ of ‘modern’ bibliography.²⁰⁵ He wrote three major bibliographical works: (1) Πίνακες τῶν ἐν πάσῃ παιδείᾳ διαλαμπάντων καὶ ὧν συνέγραψαν (*Tables of Persons Eminent in Every Branch of Learning, Together with a List of their Books*), in 120 book-rolls (fr. 429–53 Pfeiffer): judging from the extant fragments, the *Pinakes* were intended not only to provide (and systematically classify) information on the biographical data and literary outputs of the selected authors but also to discuss problems of attribution and authorship. In other words, it was a reasoned bibliographical guide to the most eminent authors

200 Benedetto (2011); aetiology and etymology were fundamental methods of investigation for the Atthidographers.

201 Hollis (2009, 9); A. Cameron (1995, 443).

202 The examples are taken from Hollis (2009, 13).

203 For the Ptolemies’ intense interests in making Athens the stronghold of their offensive against the Antigonids, see Asper (2011, 157–8) with previous bibliography. The Ptolemies’ cultural policy was also central to preserving the Atthidographers’ writing; see Benedetto (2011, 366); Costa (2007, 5–7).

204 See Hollis (1992).

205 See Blum (1991, 244–7).

(both in prose and poetry): its main internal division was apparently by genre (εἶδος) and within each genre by alphabetical order (first letter only) of the relevant authors;²⁰⁶ (2) Πίναξ καὶ ἀναγραφὴ τῶν κατὰ χρόνους καὶ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς γενομένων διδασκάλων (*Table and Register of Dramatic Poets in Chronological Order from the Beginning*, fr. 454–6 Pfeiffer): a record and catalogue of dramatic authors and their victories, organised chronologically, probably an updated version of Aristotle's dramatic διδασκαλία;²⁰⁷ (3) Πίναξ τῶν Δημοκρίτου²⁰⁸ γλωσσῶν καὶ συνταγμάτων (*Table of Democritus' Glosses and his Syntagmata*, fr. 350 Pfeiffer): apparently some kind of glossary of Democritus' diction, even if the meaning of the second part of the title, συντάγματα, remains hotly debated.²⁰⁹ Callimachus' encyclopedic classificatory effort in his multiple *Tables* represents a momentous event in the history of Classical scholarship: it was the much needed and necessary premise for the subsequent development, on a more systematic basis, of literary, lexical and dialectal studies.²¹⁰ His 'bibliographical' tools enabled for the first time comprehensive cross-references and comparisons between sources and provided 'a background and an ideal of the totality of knowledge' (Hatzimichali 2013, 70): the practice of ordering knowledge systematically and in more or less new formats (and contexts) profoundly shaped the future of the discipline.²¹¹

As for the Ἐθνικαὶ ὀνομασίαι, only one fragment of this work has come to us via Athenaeus (fr. 406 Pfeiffer). It has long been suspected that the other nomenclature-oriented titles mentioned in the *Suda* may well have been subheadings of the *Local Nomenclatures*. Bentley suggested that this may have been the case for the treatise entitled Περὶ μετονομασίας ἰχθύων (*On Fishes and Their Name Changes*); Fabricius included Μηνῶν προσηγορίαι κατὰ ἔθνος καὶ πόλεις (*Appellations of the*

206 The most detailed treatment remains Blum (1991, 150–60). Attested are the following generic labels, as detailed by Meliadò (2018): ῥητορικά (fr. 430–2 Pfeiffer), νόμοι (fr. 433 Pfeiffer), παντοδαπὰ συγγράμματα (fr. 434–5 Pfeiffer), epic (fr. 452–3 Pfeiffer), lyric (fr. 441 and 450), tragedy (fr. 449?, 451 Pfeiffer), comedy (fr. 439–40 Pfeiffer), philosophy (fr. 438?, 442 Pfeiffer), history (fr. 437 Pfeiffer), and medicine (fr. 429? Pfeiffer).

207 See Blum (1991, 138–42).

208 The MSS of the *Suda* read Δημοκράτης; the emendation Δημοκρίτου is universally accepted by modern scholarship.

209 See Blum (1991, 143–4). The interpretations offered for συντάγματα range from 'writings' (Pfeiffer 1968, 132), to 'index of works' (Diels–Kranz), and more recently 'syntactic units' (Navaud 2006); West (1969) suggested emending γλωσσῶν into γνωμῶν (that is, Callimachus would have written a collection not of Democritus' rare words but of his sentences, his famous *dicta*). Dettori (2000, 43 n. 128) has proposed to emend the transmitted text into Πίναξ τῶν Δημοκρίτου γλωσσῶν κατὰ συντάγματα: we should then have a list of glosses whose order follows Democritus' series of writings).

210 See Krevans (2011, 121–4).

211 Cf. also Jacob (2013, 76–8).

Months according to Peoples and Cities, fr. 412 Pfeiffer), Schneider Περὶ ἀνέμων (*On Winds*, fr. 404 Pfeiffer); Daub added to the list Περὶ ὀρνέων (*On Birds*, fr. 414–28 Pfeiffer), and, more recently, Navaud (2006, 224) suggested the same for Κτίσεις νήσων καὶ πόλεων καὶ μετονομασίαι (*Foundations of Islands and Cities and their Name Changes*, fr. 412 Pfeiffer).²¹² That is, Callimachus' *Local Nomenclatures* may have had a structure that did not differ significantly from that of an onomasticon, a collection of words and idioms organised according to semantic categories.²¹³ This, at least, is what is suggested by its only extant fragment, fr. 406 Pfeiffer (= Ath. 7.329a),²¹⁴ which deals with local (Chalcedonian and Athenian) names for fish:

Call. fr. 406 Pfeiffer (= Ath. 7.329a): Καλλιμαχος δ' ἐν ἐθνικαῖς ὀνομασίαις γράφει οὕτως· ἔγκρασίχολος, ἐρίτιμος Χαλκηδόνιοι. τριχίδια, χαλκίς, ἰκταρ, ἀθερίνη (post ἀθερίνη <Ἀθηναῖοι> add. Meineke). ἐν ἄλλῳ δὲ μέρει καταλέγων ἰχθύων ὀνομασίας φησὶν· ὄζαινα, ὀσμύλιον Θουῦριοι. ἰωπες, ἐρίτιμοι Ἀθηναῖοι.'

Callimachus in his *Local Nomenclatures* writes thus: ἔγκρασίχολος (anchovy): the Chalcedonians [call it] ἐρίτιμος; τριχίδια ('pilchardlets'), χαλκίς ('sardine'), ἰκταρ ('bristling'), ἀθερίνη ('sand-smelt'). In another section while listing the terms for fish he says: ὄζαινα (a kind of octopus): the inhabitants of Thurii [call it] ὀσμύλιον; ἰωπες: the Athenians [call them] ἐρίτιμοι.' (Translation by Olson 2008 slightly modified).

As observed by Tosi (1994a, 149–50), in this fragment we have recorded ten names of fishes, three of which (four if we accept Meineke's addendum <Ἀθηναῖοι>) are accompanied by a specific local tag. The fact that no *auctoritas* is quoted to support the tags may simply be ascribable to the process of transmission to which this kind of works are most liable, or Athenaeus may simply have had access to an already epitomised version of Callimachus' work. This appears to be supported by the fact that both Hsch. ο 1410 (ὀσμύλια· τῶν πολυπόδων αἱ ὄζαινα λεγόμενα. καὶ ἰχθύδια ποῖ ἄττα εὐτελεῖ) and Poll. 2.76 (ὀσμύλια ἰχθύων τι γένος, ἢ ὑπὸ τῶν πολλῶν ὄζαινα καλουμένη) identify the ὄζαινα with the ὀσμύλιον, as Callimachus does. Furthermore, Pollux quotes as evidence for this semantic equivalence Ar. fr. 258.2 (ὀσμύλια καὶ μαινίδια καὶ σηπίδια), a quotation that resurfaces also in Phot. ο 558 (ὀσμύλια ἰχθύδια εὐτελεῖ· ὀσμύλια καὶ μαινίδια καὶ σηπίδια φησὶν Ἀριστοφάνης). Tosi rightly noted that there is a good chance, even if unprovable, that Aristophanes' quotation may be traced directly to Callimachus' *Local Nomenclatures*.²¹⁵ What is certain is that in this single preserved entry of Callimachus' otherwise lost lexicographical work, no sense of hierarchy is discernible in the discussion of the dialects spoken by

212 For bibliographical details, see Meliàdò (2018); cf. also Krevans (2011, 120–1; 129).

213 See Montana (2020b, 181) (= Montana 2015, 108).

214 Cf. also Eust. in *Od.* 2.290.30–5.

215 Tosi (1994a, 150).

the inhabitants of Calchedon, Thurii, or Attica. This is even more remarkable when one considers that two of them – that is, the dialects of Calchedon and Thurii – did not have their own literary traditions, unlike Attic. One fragment is clearly very little to go by, yet if we must make sense of what we have, however meagre and partial, it is worth noting that, at least in this single extant case, Callimachus' attitude towards Greek dialects in his lexicographical work *Local Nomenclatures* appears to be as oecumenic and all-inclusive as that observed in his creative poetic work.

5 Eratosthenes of Cyrene

The truly encyclopedic breadth of Eratosthenes of Cyrene's (ca. 275–194 BCE) knowledge was widely renowned in antiquity. A pupil of Callimachus and the successor to Apollonius of Rhodes as head of the Alexandrian Library, Eratosthenes was first a scholar and a scientist in his own right and only secondarily a poet.²¹⁶ His scholarly output was prodigious: he wrote on an impressive range of subjects, making foundational contributions to topics as different as geography, chronology, mathematics, astronomy, philosophy, and literary criticism.²¹⁷ In this section, our attention will be directed exclusively towards Eratosthenes' scholarly activity in the fields of grammar and philology.²¹⁸ The selectivity of our focus must not, however, allow us to forget the constant interaction, both in terms of methodology and content, between Eratosthenes' philology and his more strictly scientific work (mathematics, astronomy, chronology). What we would nowadays call humanities and sciences were not, for Eratosthenes and his contemporaries, rigidly compartmentalised fields of inquiry: mutual exchange between the two disciplines was possible. Benuzzi (2022a) has recently demonstrated that, on a methodological level, Eratosthenes' 'intertextual' comparison between authors (also *across* literary genres), a fundamental heuristic tool in his linguistic and literary studies, has its roots in our scholar's engagement with sciences. Put otherwise, his philological 'intertextuality' (the use of a web of parallel passages to establish the semantics, morphol-

216 See Matthaïos (2011, 81–2) on the 'shift of context' in which Callimachus and Eratosthenes articulated their respective pleas for knowledge: while Callimachus claimed an epistemic status for poetry, Eratosthenes claimed it, first, for scholarship/philology. See, in this direction, already Pfeiffer (1968, 152; 170).

217 For a general overview of Eratosthenes' scholarly activity, see Montana (2020b, 185–91) (= Montana 2015, 111–8). A modern comprehensive study of Eratosthenes' polymathy in its historical context is provided by Geus (2002).

218 An excellent survey of Eratosthenes' grammatical and linguistic output is now offered by Dettori (2023).

ogy and even orthography of a given expression)²¹⁹ must be understood as an extension of the application of a *universal* scientific criterion based on ἀναλογία as an instrument for solving complex problems in the exact sciences. In this sense, Eratosthenes' lexicographical explanations go well beyond the autoschediastic interpretation of words on the basis of their immediate context (the ἐν καθ' ἑνός principle of the γλωσσογράφοι: see Section 4.2) and mark a new phase in the development of Hellenistic lexicography.

In the sections that follow, we shall thus first briefly outline Eratosthenes' definition of γραμματική, providing the theoretical basis for the implicit but all-important link between philology and science within Eratosthenes' scholarly activity. We shall then proceed to examine Eratosthenes' engagement in the fields of grammar and philology, paying special attention to the lexical and linguistic observations contained in his monograph *On Old Comedy*, a work destined to exercise a highly influential impact on subsequent Hellenistic and Imperial studies of Attic comedy (Didymus of Alexandria *in primis*).²²⁰ As in the previous sections, priority will be given to that body of linguistic evidence that better helps us to highlight possible continuities and divergences with the later Atticist tradition.

5.1 Eratosthenes' definition of γραμματική and his philological activity

For the modern scholar, the first attested definition of γραμματική, which also coincides with the 'philological' origin of grammar as a science, is Eratosthenes' own formulation as reported by the scholia Vaticana to Dionysius Thrax's Τέχνη (cf. Section 3):

Schol. D.T. (Vat.) GG 1,3.160.10–2: [. . .] Ἐρατοσθένης ἔφη, 'γραμματική ἐστὶν ἕξις παντελῆς ἐν γράμμασι', γράμματα καλῶν τὰ συγγράμματα.

Eratosthenes said that 'grammar is the complete mastery [of the necessary skills to examine] γράμματα', with γράμματα signifying writings.

In his seminal 2011 article, Matthaïos has thoroughly unravelled the historical, cultural, and possibly theoretical (especially Aristotelian) premises within which Eratosthenes' definition of γραμματική ('scholarship' or 'philology' broadly understood) should be contextualised.²²¹ What is unprecedented in Eratosthenes' conceptualisa-

²¹⁹ This 'scientific' aspect of Eratosthenes' philology has also been repeatedly emphasised also by Tosi (1998a, 338); Tosi (1998b, 135–6). Cf. also Broggiato (2023, 126).

²²⁰ See Benuzzi (2018) and now esp. Benuzzi (2023c, 277–8).

²²¹ Matthaïos (2011). See also Wouters, Swiggers (2015, 515–22).

tion of γραμματική as an epistemic acquired condition (ἔξις)²²² is the double qualification conveyed by the prepositional phrase ἐν γράμμασι and by the adjective παντελής: ‘through both characteristics of the term ἔξις, Eratosthenes connected the potential of the philological discipline with a demand for *universal* knowledge’ (Matthaios 2011, 79; emphasis ours). The bare ἐν γράμμασι, without definite article, is not poor style: it purposely covers not just literary oeuvres (as, for instance, the definition of Asclepiades of Myrlea does)²²³ but all manner of writings. For Eratosthenes, everything that is written down and conveyed through the written medium is the proper object of γραμματική: he thus extends the domain of philology to a potentially universal knowledge, without further specifications or disciplinary boundaries. As Matthaios remarked (2011, 79), ‘there is no mention of ‘canonic authors’ in Eratosthenes’ definition of grammar: the Cyrenean speaks of γράμματα as universally as possible’. It is precisely this universal and all-embracing claim to knowledge advocated by Eratosthenes for ‘grammar’ that explains and facilitates the transferral of methodological skills across disciplines (humanities and exact sciences). This is also why Eratosthenes, from a self-identification perspective, refused the title of γραμματικός (‘man of letters’), a ‘title’ that was already well established at the time, as too reductive, choosing instead to style himself as φιλόλογος – that is, a person open to learning and knowledge in all its breadth (Suet. *Gram. et rhet.* 10 = Eratosth. *BNJ*² 241 T 9).²²⁴

Turning to Eratosthenes’ scholarly activity in the fields of grammar and philology, his output is for us almost entirely represented by the indirect tradition (quotations or paraphrases in scholia and lexicographical repertoires). In the various chains of transmission that determined the survival of Eratosthenes’ philological work, Didymus of Alexandria (1st BCE/1st century CE) emerges as a key figure. This is especially true for one of his monographs, Περὶ τῆς ἀρχαίας κωμωδίας (*On Old Comedy*). As acknowledged by modern scholarship, Didymus is likely

222 Matthaios (2011, 73) rightly observed that Eratosthenes, by deliberately choosing the term ἔξις, a word already current in the contemporary philosophy of science, ‘granted scholarship the status of a τέχνη and managed to integrate this discipline into the ancient system of sciences’.

223 S.E. *M.* 1.74: γραμματική ἐστὶ τέχνη τῶν παρὰ ποιηταῖς καὶ συγγραφεῦσι λεγομένων (‘grammar is a τέχνη of things said by poets and prose authors’).

224 Suet. *Gram. et rhet.* 10: *philologi appellationem assumpsisse videtur quia – sic ut Eratosthenes, qui primus hoc cognomen sibi vindicavit – multiplici variaque doctrina censebatur*: cf. Pfeiffer (1968, 158–9); Geus (2002, 39–41). The evidence of Suetonius is only superficially contradictory with the title of γραμματικός attributed to Eratosthenes according to Clem. Al. *Strom.* 1.16.79.3, where the context is, typically, that of identifying who is the first to have been called γραμματικός, ‘scholar’, rather than κριτικός (on the evidence provided by Clemens Alexandrinus, see below). As argued by Matthaios (2011, 64–5), a φιλόλογος is *a priori* also a γραμματικός, since the former ‘title’ encompasses the latter (a hyponym). Cf. now also Dettori (2023) *ad loc.*

to be the original source of the majority of the Eratosthenic quotations from *On Old Comedy* that we find in Athenaeus, Harpocration, Hesychius, and the Medieval scholia to Aristophanes.²²⁵

The direct tradition (papyri) is unfortunately quite limited and postdates both the (only) complete edition of Eratosthenes' fragments by Bernhardt (1822) and Strecker's (1884) collection of the fragments believed to belong to *On Old Comedy*.²²⁶ The evidence is as follows: (i) P.Oxy. 35.2737 (= TM 59248; 2nd century CE), an Aristophanic commentary, possibly of Didymean origin, that preserves an extensive quotation from Eratosthenes at fr. 1 col. ii.10–7 (= Ar. fr. 590. 44–51 = *CLGP* 1.1.4 Aristophanes no. 27 = Eratosth. fr. 18 Bagordo): Eratosthenes is here discussing the dramatic career of Plato Comicus (= Pl.Com. test. 7);²²⁷ (ii) PSI 2.144 (= TM 63455; 2nd/3rd century CE) (= Eratosth. fr. 19 Bagordo = fr. 4 Broggiato), containing excerpts from a biographical oeuvre of uncertain origin: Eratosthenes appears to report some anecdotal evidence, possibly drawn from comedy (Antiphanes and Timocles) and from Demetrius of Phalerum, on the orator Demosthenes; he also deals with some aspect of Crates Comicus' oeuvre;²²⁸ and, finally, (iii) P.Turner 39 (= TM 64217; 3rd century CE), a list of book titles, including an otherwise unknown Eratosthenian work on the *Iliad*.²²⁹

The *Suda*, together with the general remark that Eratosthenes wrote γραμματικά συγγνά ('many grammatical works'), also gives us the titles of five philological works (*Su. ε* 2898):

(1) the monograph Περί τῆς ἀρχαίας κωμωδίας (*On Old Comedy*), in at least 12 books;²³⁰ Strecker's (1884) edition includes 55 fragments judged to be certain by

225 For the indirect transmission of Eratosthenes' *On Old Comedy*, see Benuzzi (2018); Benuzzi (2019); Benuzzi (2023c, 277–8), with previous literature.

226 Bagordo (1998) contains a small selection of Eratosthenes' fragments pertaining to Attic drama, together with some of the new papyrological evidence. Broggiato (2023) has recently re-edited 24 fragments (from Eratosthenes' *On Old Comedy*, Ἀρχιτεκτονικός, and Σκευογραφικός). To facilitate the reader's navigation through the various partial re-editions of Eratosthenes' fragments, we shall first give Strecker's numeration, followed, when available, by Bagordo's and Broggiato's.

227 See Bagordo (1998, 133–4); Montana (2012) *ad loc.*

228 See Bagordo (1998, 134–5); Perrone (2020, 332–4; 341–4); Broggiato (2023, 25–32).

229 See Geus (2002, 291; 302–3) and more below. The evidence of P.Oxy. 13.1611 (= TM 64211; 3rd century CE), a collection of exegetical excerpts apparently gathered from various sources, is of uncertain attribution: Grenfell and Hunt suggested Eratosthenes' Περί τῆς ἀρχαίας κωμωδίας or Didymus' Σύμμικτα as possible titles: cf. Montana (2012, 238–9).

230 The full title is preserved by D.L. 7.5, Gal. 19.65 Kühn (= *Gloss.* 144 Perilli), Harp. δ 13 and μ 25; the titles Περί κωμωδίας (Poll. 10.60 = Eratosth. fr. 11 Strecker; Ath.11.510d = Eratosth. fr. 25 Strecker; Phot. ε 2227 = Eratosth. fr. 47 Strecker = fr. 11 Bagordo; Harp. μ 16 = Eratosth. fr. 91 Strecker = fr. 4 Bagordo) or Περί κωμωδιῶν (Eratosth. fr. 109 Strecker = fr. 6 Bagordo) are clearly

the editor (but only eight preserve the mention of the title) and further 28 of uncertain attribution (marked by Strecker with an asterisk),²³¹

(2) Ἀρχιτεκτονικός (i.e. λόγος: something like *Description of Construction Tools*): an onomastic work collecting technical terms used by craftsmen. Sometimes thought to be not an independent work but a subheading or subchapter of the monograph *On Old Comedy*, the Ἀρχιτεκτονικός is now considered by modern scholarship to be a self-standing glossographical work arranged by subject matter, probably a by-product of Eratosthenes' studies on Old Comedy.²³² Two fragments of certain ascription survive: schol. Apoll.Rh. 1.564–7c (= Eratosth. fr. 60 Strecker = fr. 22 Bagordo = fr. 2 Broggiato), on the different constituents of a ship's mast,²³³ and schol. Apoll.Rh. 3.232 (= Eratosth. fr. 17 Strecker = fr. 21 Bagordo = fr. 9 Broggiato) detailing the parts of the plough,²³⁴ it is also likely that Pollux's description of the ἔμβολος (Poll. 1.145 = Eratosth. fr. 39 Strecker = fr. 3 Broggiato) – that is, the linchpin at the end of a wagon's axle preventing the wheel from falling off – can be traced back to the Ἀρχιτεκτονικός,²³⁵

(3) Σκευογραφικός (i.e. λόγος: *Description of Household Tools*): also likely to be an onomasticon, this time of household implements,²³⁶ and most probably one of the main sources of Pollux's Book 10 (cf. Poll. 10.1 = Eratosth. fr. 23 Bagordo = Strecker 1884, 13);²³⁷

(4) A commentary on some aspect(s) of the *Iliad* (= P.Turner 39 [= TM 64217; 3rd century CE] fr. A.2 Ἐρατοσθένους) Εἰς τὸν ἐν τῇ Ἰλ[ιάδῃ];²³⁸

abbreviated forms of the original. Critical overviews of the work can be found in Nesselrath (1990, 172–80); Geus (2002, 291–301); Mureddu (2017); Benuzzi (2018); Broggiato (2023, 125–6).

²³¹ From the outset, Strecker's *recensio* was deemed over-confident: see Tosi (1994a, 168–9 n. 46).

²³² Sub-chapter of *On Old Comedy*: Bernhardt (1822, 205–6); autonomous onomasticon: Strecker (1884, 13–4), followed by Latte (1925, 163 n. 56); Geus (2002, 290 nn. 7–8; 301); Mureddu (2017, 161–2); Broggiato (2023, 123).

²³³ See Broggiato (2023, 19–22).

²³⁴ See Broggiato (2023, 51–6).

²³⁵ Cf. Geus (2002, 302 n. 102); Broggiato (2023, 23–4).

²³⁶ The Σκευογραφικός was also suspected by Bernhardt (1822, 204–5) of being part of *On Old Comedy*; in this direction, still Nesselrath (1990, 88), but see Geus (2002, 300–1 n. 8) and more recently Tribulato (2019c, 247); Broggiato (2023, 126).

²³⁷ On Eratosthenes' Σκευογραφικός as an important source for Pollux's Book 10, see Nesselrath (1990, 87–8; 94–5); Tosi (2007, 4–5); Tosi (2015, 624).

²³⁸ See Matthaios (2011, 57 n. 12) on the possible nature of this work (Homeric geography, according to Poethke 1981, 165; explanation of obsolete words and word-formations, according to Geus 2002, 302–3, or, as a further alternative, a monograph on the dual (Geus 2002, 310 n. 105)).

(5) A grammatical work entitled Γραμματικά, in two books, according to Clem.Al. *Strom.* 1.16.79.3: Ἀπολλόδωρος δὲ ὁ Κυμαῖος πρῶτος <τοῦ γραμματικοῦ ἀντι> τοῦ κριτικοῦ εἰσηγήσατο τοῦνομα καὶ γραμματικός προσηγορεύθη. ἔνιοι δὲ Ἐρατοσθένη τὸν Κυρηναῖόν φασιν, ἐπειδὴ ἐξέδωκεν οὗτος βιβλία δύο ‘γραμματικά’ ἐπιγράψας (‘Apollodorus of Cyma was the first to introduce the name of γραμματικός in substitution for κριτικός and was the first to be called γραμματικός. But according to some, Eratosthenes was [the first to be called γραμματικός] because he published two books entitled Γραμματικά’).²³⁹ It is highly likely that Eratosthenes’ definition of γραμματική in the *scholia Vaticana* to Dionysius Thrax’s Τέχνη discussed in the previous pages originally belonged to this work. Another likely candidate for the Γραμματικά is Eratosthenes’ observation that the circumflex accent ‘inclined from an acute first part to a grave second part’ (*Eratosthenes ex parte priore acuta in grauem posteriorem* [sc. *flecti putavit*]) according to the *Explanationes in artem Donati* by Pseudo-Sergius, quoting Varro who, in his turn, must have drawn on Tyrannion ([Sergius], *Ex. in Don. GL* 4.530.17–531.1 = Varro fr. 84.15–29 Goetz–Schoell = Tyrannion fr. 59 Haas).²⁴⁰

Within Eratosthenes’ extant philological production, items (1), (2), and (3) all exhibit a dominant interest in Attic comedy in general,²⁴¹ with (3) more specifically focused on Old Comedy, which, as we have already seen (cf. Chapter 1, Section 4.1; Chapter 4, Section 5.2), will be of paramount importance for the later Atticist theorisation, especially in terms of canon formation. We shall now examine more closely Eratosthenes’ treatise Περὶ τῆς ἀρχαίας κωμωδίας in its scholarly context, trying in particular to see to which extent the claim of ‘strict Atticism’ or ‘purist tendencies’ advocated by some modern scholarship for this work is justified, and whether it is at all a useful hermeneutical tag to apply to Eratosthenes’ scholarly agenda.²⁴²

²³⁹ Cf. above n. 224. On the trustworthiness of Clemens’ evidence (doubted by Geus 2002, 305) see Matthaïos (2011, 53 n. 13; 57–8).

²⁴⁰ An illuminating analysis of Eratosthenes’ own concept of the circumflex accent (defined uniquely through the acute and grave accents, with the exclusion of the existence of a μέση προσωπίδα, differently from Varro) is now offered by Matthaïos (2022). On Varro’s fragment and its context within the Latin grammarians’ reflection of the circumflex accent, see Probert (2019, 195–200; our translation of the Latin text follows hers). It is unclear whether Eratosthenes’ comment must be related to the spoken or written accent: see Tosi (2006, section C), who favours the spoken thesis. For the ascription of this piece of evidence to the Γραμματικά of Eratosthenes, see already Knaack (1907, 385); Geus (2002, 304 n. 110); Matthaïos (2011, 62–3).

²⁴¹ This holds true, irrespective of the view that one is inclined to take for the Ἀρχιτεκτονικός and Σκευογραφικός (standalone works or subchapters or annexes to *On Old Comedy*).

²⁴² Strict Atticism: Slater (1976, 237; 241), in the wake of Strecker (1884, 19); Geus (2002, 295 with n. 50). Purist tendencies: Tosi (1994a, 168; 171); Tosi (1998a, 335), followed by Montana (2020b,

5.2 Eratosthenes on comic language

Eratosthenes' *On Old Comedy*, despite clearly representing a new stage in Hellenistic scholarship on drama given the adoption of a more 'scientific' approach to its subject,²⁴³ did not emerge from thin air, but could rely on a long tradition of studies on Attic comedy, especially, though not exclusively, within the Aristotelian and Peripatetic schools.²⁴⁴ An important predecessor against whom Eratosthenes, in his studies on Attic comedy, measured himself, often mercilessly pointing out his forerunner's inaccuracies, was the poet and scholar Lycophron of Chalcis (4th/3rd century BCE).²⁴⁵ Lycophron was entrusted by Ptolemy Philadelphus with the διόρθωσις of the comic poets²⁴⁶ and was himself author of a treatise entitled *Περὶ κωμῳδίας* in at least 9 books (cf. Lyc. fr. 13 Strecker = fr. 1 Pellettieri). From the twenty or so extant fragments that are ascribable with a reasonable degree of certainty to Lycophron, we know that the Chalcidian scholar covered both Old and Middle Comedy (cf. Ath. 13.555a = Lyc. fr. 2 Pellettieri on Antiphanes). However, the structure and inner articulation of his *On Comedy* remains largely uncertain: Strecker thought it was a collection of comic glosses, perhaps even in alphabetical order,²⁴⁷ and without any systematic method behind it, but in the last decade, this rather negative judgement on Lycophron's scholarship has been questioned. Recent studies have, in fact, shown that Lycophron's *On Comedy* must have been a work covering a broader range of topics than that expected by a

186–7) (= Montana 2015, 113–4). Schenkeveld in Tosi (1994a, 202–3) had already expressed his scepticism towards both attitudes; cf. now also Dettori (2023).

243 See Section 5.1 on Eratosthenes' scientific analogical method.

244 See the overview by Lowe (2013, 343–7). Theophrastus of Eresus was author of a treatise entitled *On Comedy* (Theophr. fr. 1–2 Bagordo; see Nesselrath 1990, 149–61), as also Chamaeleon (Chamael. fr. 10–11 Bagordo; see Nesselrath 1990, 163–4; Bagordo 1998, 26–8), while the Peripatetic philosopher Eumelus wrote specifically on Old Comedy (Eumelus phil. fr. 1 Bagordo; see Nesselrath 1990, 165; Bagordo 1998, 32).

245 Two recent contributions on Lycophron's philological activity (Lowe 2013, 351–3 and Pellettieri 2020, esp. 237–4) have offered a more charitable interpretation of the Chalcidian's accomplishments: the indirect tradition, mostly via Didymus' *Λέξεις κωμικῆς*, offers a very partial (if not, at times, deforming) perspective, since it almost uniquely records Lycophron's mistakes.

246 See Tzetzes *Proll. Com.* 11a.1.22–3.1–7 (= Lyc. test. 6a Pellettieri), 11a.2.31–32.1–4, 33.22–5 (= Lyc. test. 6b Pellettieri), the *scholium Plautinum* 48.1–6 Koster (= Lyc. test. 6c Pellettieri), and the *Anonymus Cramerii* II, *Proll. Com.* 11c.43.1–4, 17–8 (= Lyc. test. 6d Pellettieri). The precise nature of Lycophron's editorial work has been much disputed: cf. Lowe (2013, 350 with n. 29), and now, in greater detail, Pellettieri (2020, 261; 264–5, with previous bibliography), inclined to ascribe to Lycophron an activity of revision and emendation of the copies of the comic texts, comparable to that of Zenodotus for Homer.

247 Strecker (1884, 4); cf. also Pfeiffer (1968, 119–20), and more recently Dubischar (2015, 566).

mere glossary: in the extant fragments, we find not only lexical explanations but also issues of stagecraft, relative chronology, and literary criticism.²⁴⁸

Returning to Eratosthenes' *On Old Comedy*, its structure also remains unclear, and this notwithstanding the fact that a higher number of fragments has been preserved by the indirect tradition. The only reasonably safe conclusion that we may draw is that Eratosthenes' *On Old Comedy* does not appear to have been ordered either alphabetically or chronologically.²⁴⁹ What is also certain, as is already clear from the title, is that Eratosthenes recognised at least two stages in the development of Attic comedy: an older and a newer phase, with the first broadly coterminous with our notion of Old Comedy.²⁵⁰ In particular, in Cic. *Att.* 6.1.18 (= Eratosth. fr. 48 Strecker = fr. 12 Bagordo = fr. 19 Broggiato) we are informed that Eratosthenes employed chronological arguments to debunk the trustworthiness of the tradition that held that Eupolis had been murdered in 415 BCE by Alcibiades (as revenge for having been attacked in Eupolis' comedies): Eratosthenes pointed out that some of Eupolis' productions postdated that date (*adfert enim quas ille post id tempus fabulas docuerit*).²⁵¹ In late antique and Byzantine treatises on Attic comedy, this anecdote about Eupolis' death at the hands of Alcibiades (= Eup. test. 3) is frequently considered as the dividing line between Old Comedy and Middle Comedy, when the ὄνομαστί κωμῳθεῖν was not allowed.²⁵² However, this later use of the anecdote does not necessarily imply that Eratosthenes himself used this evidence in a discussion of the periodisation of Attic comedy in general: just as in other surviving fragments, we might simply be dealing with an isolated observation on the relative chronology of Cratinus' comic performances, as recently restated by Broggiato (2023, 96).

Regarding the content of *On Old Comedy*, the variety of topics treated by Eratosthenes testifies to the breadth and diversity of his scholarly interests. The same may be said for the range of authors quoted: alongside Aristophanes, we find

248 See Lowe (2013, 352–4); Broggiato (2019b, 279–80); Pellettieri (2020, 237–8).

249 Nesselrath (1990, 177 with n. 78) speaks of a loose collection of miscellaneous items, comparable to modern *Adversaria*; Geus (2002, 292) suggests a thematic principle as a possible ordering criterion but offers no further details. For an overview of the various hypotheses advanced by previous scholarship on the subject, see Benuzzi (2018, 336 n. 4).

250 See Montana (2013). Nesselrath (1990, 180) is willing to ascribe to Eratosthenes the tripartition of Attic comedy into Old, Middle and New, but see the objections by Geus (2002, 292), and in more detail by Broggiato (2019b, 280–2). Cf. also Montana (2020b, 186 n. 252) (= Montana 2015, 113 n. 240). On the likely Hellenistic origin of the tripartition of Attic comedy, first explicitly attested in 2nd century CE sources, see Montana (2020b, 175 n. 178) (= Montana 2015, 102 n. 168) with relative bibliography.

251 This anecdote was reported, among others, also by Duris of Samos (Duris *BNJ* 76 F 73).

252 See e.g. Platon. *Diff. com.* 21–5 Perusino.

Crates Comicus, Cratinus, Eupolis, Lysippus (perhaps), Pherecrates, Phrynichus, Plato Comicus, Strattis, but also quotations from tragedians (Aeschylus, Euripides), epic poetry (Hesiod), lyric (Archilochus, Simonides, Lamprocles the dithyrambographer),²⁵³ and prose authors such as Plato, and perhaps Lysias and Demosthenes.²⁵⁴ If we keep to the fragments whose attribution to Eratosthenes' treatise is more solidly grounded,²⁵⁵ we find a wide array of observations on various subjects:²⁵⁶

Dramatic chronology: alongside general chronological remarks,²⁵⁷ many of Eratosthenes' observations within this category are intertwined with issues of (re-)performance, revision, and stagecraft. Cf. e.g. Ar. *Pax* Arg. II a2 (= Eratosth. fr. 38 Strecker = fr. 10 Bagordo): Eratosthenes claimed that it was unclear (ἄδηλον) whether Aristophanes' second *Peace* was simply a revival of the first *Peace* (the extant version) or a completely new play not preserved at Alexandria (ἤτις οὐ σώζεται); schol. Ar. *Nu.* 553 (= Eratosth. fr. 97 Strecker = fr. 14 Bagordo): Eratosthenes rectifies Callimachus' mistaken judgement on the relative chronology of Aristophanes' *Clouds* and Eupolis' *Maricas*. Callimachus apparently found fault with the Aristotelian production lists (διδασκαλῖαι) but, in so doing, Eratosthenes tells us, he did not take into consideration Aristophanes' revised version of the *Clouds*; schol. Ar. *Ra.* 1028f (= Eratosth. fr. 109 Strecker = fr. 6 Bagordo = fr. 18 Broggiato): an allegedly revised version of Aeschylus' *Persians* at Syracuse on Hieron's instigation. As Benuzzi (2023c, 277–8) has argued, Eratosthenes possibly also discussed the wording of *Ra.* 1028 in this context: this evidence is important because it demonstrates how a remark on reperformance probably originated from a narrow textual observation; schol. Ar. *Pl.* 1194 (= Eratosth. fr. 7 Strecker = fr. 10 Broggiato = Lyc. fr. 13 Pellettieri): Lycophron thought that Aristophanes' *Wealth* (staged in 388 BCE) was the first play in which torches had been brought on stage (see Pellettieri 2020, 319–24); Eratosthenes corrected Lycophron, quoting as evidence Aristophanes' *Assemblywomen* (staged between 393 and 389 BCE), Stratt. fr. 38, and Philyll. fr. 29 (both active at the turn of the century, ca. 410–400 BCE).

Attic realia (especially legal and religious customs): cf. e.g. Hsch. π 513 (= Eratosth. fr. 3 Strecker = fr. 7 Broggiato) on **παρ' αἴγειρον θέα**, 'a viewing place be-

²⁵³ For these last two poets, see the detailed treatment by Benuzzi (2019).

²⁵⁴ Full list in Geus (2002, 292–4).

²⁵⁵ That is, those not marked by an asterisk in Strecker's edition.

²⁵⁶ The following division of topics is merely *exempli gratia*; some categories, needless to say, overlap.

²⁵⁷ Cf. e.g. schol. Ar. *Pax* 48e–f (= Eratosth. fr. 70 Strecker) on Cleon's death, important to contextualise *Peace*, and P.Oxy. 35.2737, in which Eratosthenes treated some aspect of literary-historic interest connected with the dramatic career of Plato Comicus (= Ar. fr. 590.44–51 = Pl.Com. test. 7).

side a poplar' (a quotation from Cratin. fr. 372), explained by Eratosthenes as the viewing place for theatregoers close to the end of the wooden scaffolding, the ἴκρια (see Broggiato 2023, 43–7; the reference is obviously to the old 5th-century BCE wooden auditorium and not to the stone one built in the 4th century BCE); schol. Apoll.Rh. 4.279–81c and *Et.Gen.* (A) 213v–214r, (B) 168r, s.v. κύρβεις (~ *EM* 547.45–58) (= Eratosth. fr. 80 Strecker = fr. 1 Broggiato) on the form and nature of the Solonian ἄξωνες and κύρβεις (cf. also Ar.Byz. fr. 410), on which see the detailed treatment by Broggiato (2023, 9–17); Harp. α 166 (= also part of Eratosth. fr. 80 Strecker just quoted above) on the link between the γένος of the Eupatridae and the cult of the Eumenides in Athens (cf. schol. Soph. *OC* 489 = Polemon fr. 49 Preller); Harp. δ 13 (= Eratosth. fr. 89 Strecker = fr. 3 Bagordo) on δεκάζω 'to corrupt (judges)' and the proverbial expression Λύκου δεκάς; for the transmission of these two expressions in the lexicographical tradition, see Benuzzi (2018, 338–42); Harp. μ 16 (= Eratosth. fr. 91 Strecker = fr. 4 Bagordo) on μεῖον and μειαγωγός; the reference is to the Athenian practice of introducing the sons of male citizens into their respective phratries by bringing a sacrificial victim of the required weight (that is, not inferior (μεῖον) to a given measure): at the presentation of the offering, the members of the phratry would ritually shout 'too small' (μεῖον): cf. Benuzzi (2018, 335–8) for the Didymean origin of this entry.

Miscellaneous matters of antiquarian interest: cf. e.g. schol. Ar. Av. 806a (= Eratosth. fr. 6 Strecker) on κῆπος, a particular kind of 'hair-do' (cf. Benuzzi 2018, 342–6 on the textual dislocation of this gloss within the scholiastic tradition); cf. also the chronology of historical events in schol. Ar. Av. 556b (= Eratosth. fr. 59* Strecker = fr. 13 Bagordo) on the sacred war between the Athenians and Phoceans for the sanctuary of Delphi (448 BCE).

Dialectal glosses (other than Attic): Arcadian: cf. below Eust. *in Il.* 1.302.27–30 (= Eratosth. fr. 16 Strecker) under the rubric 'proverb'. **Cyrenean:** cf. schol. Ar. *Pax* 70a (= Eratosth. fr. 18 Strecker = fr. 15 Broggiato) on ἀναρριχᾶσθαι 'to climb up with hands and feet' (the ultimate source of the scholium is Didymus: see Benuzzi 2022c); for the Atticist doctrine on this lexical item, see below Section 5.3; schol. Ar. Av. 122a (= Eratosth. fr. 125 Strecker) on a goat-hide garment called σίσυρνα (τὴν δὲ σίσυρναν οἱ κατὰ Λιβύην λέγουσι τὸ ἐκ τῶν κωδίων ραπτόμενον ἀμπεχόνιον) on which see Pellettieri (2020, 357). Strecker also ascribed to Eratosthenes other glosses of allegedly Cyrenean origin, but the evidence is doubtful: Hsch. β 1152 (= Eratosth. fr. 29* Strecker = Lyc. fr. dub. 36 Pellettieri) on βρίκελος, of uncertain meaning (Strecker followed M. S. Schmidt 1854, 30 in considering this gloss Cyrenean on the basis of Hsch. β 1156: βρικόν· ὄνον, Κυρεναῖοι. βάρβαρον), and Hsch. μ 351 (= Eratosth. fr. 90* Strecker = Lyc. fr. dub. 21 Pellettieri) on μασταρίζω 'to gnash with teeth', 'to mumble' (cf. Phot. μ 129). **Sicilian:** *Et.Gen.* (A) 113r–v, (B) 83r s.v. δραζών

(~ *EM* 286. 33–7 = Eratosth. fr. 37 Strecker = fr. 17 Broggiato) on the terms **δραξών** ‘snatcher’ and **καψιπήδαλος** (of obscure meaning): both terms refer to a ritual game practised in Sicily during the festival in honour of the goddess Cotyto (see Broggiato 2023, 83–8). Broggiato (2023, 87–8) suggests that the original context of Eratosthenes’ comment on these Sicilian words must have been a passage of Eupolis’ *Dyers*, whereas Tosi (1994a, 170 n. 48) and Geus (2002, 294 n. 31) hypothesise some comment on Doric comedy (Kaibel 1899b, 180 thought that Eratosthenes was discussing the vexed question of the origin of comedy).

Literary criticism: cf. e.g. schol. Pi. *O.* 9.1k (= Eratosth. fr. 136 Strecker = fr. 16 Bagordo) on the literary genre to which the onomatopoeic refrain **τήνελλα καλλίνικε** (= Archil. fr. 324 West) belonged (see in this connection also schol. Ar. *Av.* 1764, where, however, Eratosthenes’ name is not mentioned); issues of disputed authorship also arise: cf. e.g. Harp. μ 25 (= Eratosth. fr. 93 Strecker) on the authorship of Pherecrates’ *Miners*, with the closely related entry of Phot. ε 2203 (= Eratosth. fr. 46 Strecker); Eratosth. fr. 149 Strecker (= 17 Bagordo) on the presence in Aristophanes’ MSS of spurious Attic idioms. For a detailed treatment of these last two fragments and what they can or cannot tell us about the supposed ‘purist tendencies’ of Eratosthenes’, see Section 5.3 below.

Explanation of unusual or difficult words/expressions: this category, unsurprisingly, represents the overwhelming majority of the extant fragments: cf. e.g. Gal. *Gloss.* prooem. 144, 25–6 Perilli (= p. 17 Strecker) on neologisms in comedy; schol. Ar. *Eq.* 963a and schol. Hes. *Op.* 590b (= Eratosth. fr. 9 Strecker = fr. 12 Broggiato) on **(ἀ)μολγός** ‘embezzler’ and **ἀμολγαίη**, ‘a loaf fit for shepherds’: on the long exegetical history of these terms in ancient and modern scholarship, see Tosi (1998b), and Broggiato (2023, 65–9); Poll. 10.60 (= Eratosth. fr. 11 Strecker = fr. 1 Bagordo = fr. 13 Broggiato) on **ἀναλογεῖον**, ‘lectern’ (on the importance of this fragment for the range of authors consulted by Eratosthenes, see Section 5.3 below); Ath. 4.140a (= Eratosth. fr. 26 Strecker = Lyc. fr. 15 Pellettieri) on **βάραξ/βήρηξ**, apparently a kind of μᾶζα eaten at the Spartan festival of the Kopides, but erroneously understood by Lycophron as τολύπη ‘ball’ and by Eratosthenes as προφυράματα, ‘doughs kneaded in advance’; schol. Ar. *V.* 704b (= Eratosth. fr. 43 Strecker = Lyc. fr. 8 Pellettieri) on **ἐπισίζω**: both Lycophron and Eratosthenes (οἱ περὶ Ἐρατοσθένην) glossed ἐπισίζω with ‘to hiss at a dog to set it on someone’, possibly betraying an interest in onomatopoeic word formation and euphonic theories (cf. Pellettieri 2020, 308–9). On its Atticist survival, see Section 5.3 below; Ath. 11.501d (= Eratosth. fr. 25 Strecker = fr. 21 Broggiato = Lyc. fr. 4 Pellettieri) on the compound adjective **βαλανειόμαλος**, ‘with bath-like bosses’, with reference to bowls (φιάλαι): the navel-like protuberances inside the bowls are explained by Eratosthenes as being like the domes of the bathing rooms (βαλανεῖον), hence the iunctura φιάλας τᾶσδε βαλανειομάλους in

Cratin. fr. 54 (*Fugitive Women*): see Broggiato (2023, 102–7); Phot. η 8 and Eust. *In Od.* 1.97.30–1 (= Eratosth. fr. 55 Strecker) on ἤϊα ‘provisions for the journey’ or ‘chaff’ in Homer, interpreted by Eratosthenes as indicating ‘properly’ (κυρίως) the stalks of pulses (όσπρίων καλάμια). Eustathius, after mentioning Eratosthenes’ understanding of the term, adds καὶ δισυλλάβως ἐν συναϊρέσει, ἥα ὡς καὶ Φερεκράτης (‘and by contraction there is disyllabic ἥα, as Pherecrates [says] (fr. 172)). The bisyllabic scansion ἥα instead of ἥϊα is said to be proper of the ‘newer Attic’ in schol. (Did. *vel* Hdn.) Hom. *Od.* 2.410a (HM^a): δεῦτε φίλοι. Καλλίστρατος [p. 208 Barth] ‘δεῦτε φίλοι, ὄφρ’ ἥα φερώμεθα’. καὶ ἔστι τῆς νεωτέρας Ἀτθίδος τὸ οὕτως συναϊρεῖν. Barth (1984, 211 n. 4) ascribes the observation on the bisyllabic scansion in Eustathius *in Od.* 1.97.30–1 directly to Callistratus (a 2nd-century BCE grammarian, pupil of Aristophanes of Byzantium), but Eratosthenes himself may indeed have already remarked on this feature. Whether the remark on the linguistically ‘younger’ character of ἥα vs Homeric ἥϊα (trissyllabic) goes back to Eratosthenes is impossible to say (cf. Barth 1984, 212). To us, it rather smacks of Aristarchean doctrine, perhaps filtered through Herodian (see Chapter 7, Section 3.2); Hsch. ε 1590 (= Eratosth. fr. 63 Strecker = Lyc. fr. 11 Pellettieri) on **κατειλυσπωμένην**, interpreted by Eratosthenes as derived from κατὰ + εἰλεῖν ‘to coil’ + σπᾶσθαι ‘to be drawn’, vs Lycophron’s καταρτωμένην, ‘hung’: cf. Pellettieri (2020, 315–6), and Tosi (1998a, 345); for the Didymean origin of Hesychius’ entry, see now Benuzzi (2023c, 162–3 n. 489); Hdn. Περὶ παθῶν *GG* 3,2.295.13–9 (= Eratosth. fr. 68 Strecker) on the colloquialism **ποῖ κῆχος**, understood by Eratosthenes as ποῦ ἐγγύς; (‘where nearby?’) and εἰς τίνα τόπον; (‘to which place?’); schol. Ar. *V.* 239a (= Eratosth. fr. 74 Strecker = Lyc. fr. 7 Pellettieri) on **κόρκορος**: not a fish, as Lycophron argued, but a wild and cheap vegetable from the Peloponnese; it was also part of a proverbial expression (κόρκορος ἐν λαχάνοις), on which see below; schol. Ar. *Pax* 199b (= Eratosth. fr. 81 Strecker = Lyc. fr. 9 Pellettieri) on **κῦτταρος**, indicating, according to Eratosthenes, the ‘holes’ of wasps’ and bees’ nests vs Lycophron’s botanical explanation (cf. Pellettieri 2020, 310–2); Phot. σ 498 (= Eratosth. fr. 121 Strecker) on **σάμαξ**, understood by Eratosthenes as ‘rush-mat’; schol. Ar. *Pax* 702a (= Eratosth. fr. 152 Strecker = Lyc. fr. 10 Pellettieri) on **ώρακιάω** ‘to have the sight darkened while fainting’, vs Lycophron’s ὠχριάω, ‘to become pallid’ (cf. Benuzzi 2018, 346–8; Pellettieri 2020, 313–4).

Disambiguation of semi-synonyms: cf. e.g. schol. Ar. *Av.* 122a, schol. Pl. *Erx.* 400e, and Ph.Bybl. *Diff. sign.* 169 Palmieri (= Eratosth. fr. 125 Strecker) on **σισύρα** = βαίτη, that is, a ‘goat-fleece cloak’ (cf. Chapter 7, Section 4.4 n. 269), vs **σίσυρνα**, ‘goat-hide coat’ (see also σισύρα in Lyc. fr. dub. 28 Pellettieri); *Et.Gud.* 171.17–9 (= Eratosth. fr. 20 Broggiato) on **ἀποκήρυκτος** (someone disowned by his own kin because of an offending act) and **ἐκποίητος** (someone given up to adoption), both technical terms in Attic law: see Broggiato (2023, 97–101). Interestingly, ἀποκήρυκτος is not attested

in extant Greek poetry but only in oratory; Poll. 4.93–4 says that the term ἀποκλήρυκτος was not used by ancient authors since its first attestation was in the 4th-century BCE historian Theopompus (Theop.Hist. *BNJ* 115 F 339), who, always according to Pollux, ‘is nothing to judge by’ in linguistic matters (τὸ μέντοι ὄνομα ‘ὁ ποκλήρυκτος’ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν χρήσει τῇ παλαιᾷ, Θεόπομπος δ’ αὐτῷ κέχρηται ὁ συγγραφεύς· ἀλλ’ οὐδὲν Θεοπόμπῳ σταθμητὸν εἰς ἐρμηνείας κρίσιν). However, Broggiato (2023, 99–100) has rightly observed that the verbs ἀποκηρύττω and ἐκποιέω are well attested in comedy, hence the suggestion that this fragment belongs to *On Old Comedy*: Eratosthenes might thus have commented on a lesser known or later author whose text has not survived.

Proverbs:²⁵⁸ cf. e.g. schol. Ar. V. 239a = (Eratosth. fr. 74 Strecker) on which see above: cf. Zen. 4.57 καὶ κόρκωρος ἐν λαχάνοις, Diogenian. 5.36, *Su.* κ 1404; Eust. *in Il.* 1.302.27–30 (= Eratosth. fr. 16 Strecker) includes the quotation of the Atticist Pausanias for a type of oak called by the Arcadians φελλός, ‘cork-oak’ (Paus.Gr. α 153: a word attested in Hermesian. fr. 10 Lightfoot = Paus. 8.12.1), a kind of hat worn in Arcadia (Ἀρκᾶς κυνῆ.²⁵⁹ Paus.Gr. α 152; cf. Hsch. α 7273), and the proverb Ἀρκάδας μιμούμενος (= Paus.Gr. α 151): see Tosi (1998a, 344–5) and now Broggiato (2023, 73–6). See also *Proverbia* in the Florentine MS Pl. 58. 24 (= Eratosth. fr. 20 Bagordo) for the expression μὴ ὑπὲρ τὸν καλόποδα.

Attic orthography and accentuation. Orthography: Phot. ε 100 (= Eratosth. fr. *novum* Broggiato): ἔγχουσαν οἱ Ἄττικοι λέγουσι τὴν ρίζαν, οὐ δὴ ἄγχουσαν, ἣν ἀπείρωσ Ἐρατοσθένης φυκίον. Ἀμειψίας Αποκοτταβίζουσι· ‘δυσοῖν ὀβολοῖν ἔγχουσα καὶ ψιμύθιον’ (‘Attic speakers call the root (alkanet) ἔγχουσα, not ἄγχουσα, which Eratosthenes out of ignorance [thinks is] a seaweed. Ameipsias in the *Cottabusers* (Amips. fr. 3): ‘alkanet and white lead at the price of two obols’).²⁶⁰ Alka-

²⁵⁸ On the important role that paroemiography played in the development of Hellenistic lexicography, see Tosi (1994a, 179–93); it is worth remembering that Aristotle and the Peripatus also had a particular interest in proverbial expressions: cf. Benuzzi (2018, 340 n.18). On the role played by proverbs in Eratosthenes’ philology, see Tosi (1998a, 344–5).

²⁵⁹ For the ascription to Eratosthenes of the explanation of the expression Ἀρκᾶς κυνῆ, see Langella (2014); the original Classical reference must have been Ar. Av. 1203 πλοῖον ἢ κυνῆ (cf. schol. Ar. Av. 1203a.α).

²⁶⁰ The lemma is preserved only in the codex Zavordensis (z) of Photius, a manuscript discovered by Linos Politis in the monastery of Zavorda in 1959. For the ascription of this fragment to *On Old Comedy*, see the detailed argumentation by Broggiato (2019a): in the extant literature of the 5th and 4th century BCE ἔγχουσα (and perhaps the denominative ἔγχουσίζομαι: cf. *com. adesp.* fr. *170) are attested only in comedy (Ar. *Lys.* 48, *Ec.* 929, Ar. fr. 322.3, and Ameipsias fr. 3) and in Xenophon (2x in the *Oeconomicus*). According to Broggiato (2019a) the accusation of ἀπειρία against Eratosthenes may have originated in Polemon of Ilium, an antiquarian of the first

net is a vegetable root used as red pigment by Greek women: the entry in Photius compares and contrasts the Attic form and the common Greek spelling of the word (cf. also Hdn. *Περὶ ὀρθογραφίας* GG 3,2.495.29–30: ἔγχουσα· εἶδος βοτάνης, ἢ καὶ διὰ τοῦ α λέγεται ἄγχουσα, Ἀττικοὶ δὲ διὰ τοῦ ε and Moeris ε 30 ἔγχουσα διὰ τοῦ ε <Ἀττικοί>· ἄγχουσα διὰ τοῦ α <Ἑλληνες>) and explains that ἔγχουσα was the root of a herb, hence finding fault with Eratosthenes, who thought it was a type of seaweed. As observed by Broggiato (2019a, 452), Eratosthenes may have been misled by the fact that φῦκος (*Roccella tinctoria*), a water plant, was also used for cosmetic purposes, and that φῦκος is mentioned together with ἔγχουσα in Ar. fr. 322.3, a list of toiletry items (cf. also Poll. 5.101: ἴσως δ' ἂν τοῖς κόσμοις προσήκοι καὶ τὸ ἔντριμμα, ψιμύθιον, ἔγχουσα, φῦκος, κτλ.). **Accentuation:** Phot. ε 2227 = Ael.Dion. ε 71 (= Eratosth. fr. 47 Strecker = fr. 24 Broggiato): **εὐκλεία καὶ τὰ ὁμοία**· μακρὰ ἢ τελευταία καὶ παροξύνεται, ὡσπερ καὶ Ἐρατοσθένης ἐν ἰβ' *Περὶ <κωμωδίας>* (suppl. Porson). Eratosthenes commented on the long quantity of the final vowel (and the consequent paroxytone accentuation) of abstract nouns in -εία in Attic; Ael.Dion. α 21 (= Eust. *in Od.* 1.579.28–31) mentions also other abstract nouns in -εία and -οῖα (ἀγνοία, ἱερεία, ἀναιδεία, προνοία), together with a quotation from Ar. fr. 238 (*Banqueters*). Strecker (1884, 38) ascribed the discussion of all these terms to Eratosthenes together with the remarks on the pronunciation on ἀγνοία in Σ^b α 74 (= Eratosth. fr. 1* Strecker) and ἀδολεσχία (schol. Ar. *Nu.* 1480d = Eratosth. fr. 2* Strecker), but see the caution recommended by Tosi (1994a, 168) and now Broggiato (2023, 120). Eustathius, quoting Ael.Dion. α 21, specifies that the paroxytone accentuation was a characteristic of the παλαιοὶ Ἀττικοί.²⁶¹ In Attic dialect abstract nouns in -εία deriving from adjectives in -ής and -ους may have either a long α (with the Ionic equivalent ending in -η) or a short one. Modern scholarship has usually considered the form in -εία as the original (older)

half of the 2nd century BCE, author of a work entitled *On Eratosthenes' Sojourn at Athens* (*Περὶ τῆς Ἀθήνησιν Ἐρατοσθένους ἐπιδημίας*), where Eratosthenes was criticised for his approximative knowledge of Attic customs and realia.

261 Eust. *in Od.* 1.579.28–31 (commenting on *Od.* 7.297): οἱ γὰρ παλαιοὶ Ἀττικοὶ κατὰ Αἴλιον Διονύσιον ἐξέτεινον τὰς τῶν τοιούτων ὀνομάτων ληγούσας· διὸ καὶ παρόξυναν αὐτὰ· ἢ ἀγνοία γάρ, φησί, ἔλεγον καὶ ἢ εὐκλεία καὶ ἢ ἱερεία καὶ ἢ διανοία, καὶ ἢ ἀναιδεία δέ, φησί, καὶ ἢ προνοία· ὧν πάντων ἐκτείνεται μὲν ἢ τελευταία, ἢ δὲ πρὸ αὐτῆς ὀξύνεται. Ἀριστοφάνης Δαιταλεῦσιν· 'ὦ προνοία καὶ ἀναιδεία' ('For the ancient speakers of Attic, according to Aelius Dionysius, lengthened the final syllables of nouns of this sort, and as a consequence they put an acute accent on the penultimate; because they used to say ἀγνοία ('ignorance'), he says, and εὐκλεία ('glory') and ἱερεία ('sacrifice') and διανοία ('thought'), as well as ἀναιδεία ('shamelessness'), he says, and προνοία ('forethought'). The final syllable of all of these is lengthened, and the syllable before that gets an acute accent. Aristophanes in the *Banqueters* (Ar. fr. 238): 'Ὀ προνοία ('forethought') and ἀναιδεία ('shamelessness')!').

one, with -ειᾶ being the later form (cf. K–B vol. 1, 126; Schwyzer 1939, 469; Chantraine 1933, 87–8), thus apparently backing up Eustathius’ testimony. This interpretation has, however, been disputed.²⁶² Be this as it may, Aristophanes used both the form in -ειᾶ and the one in -ειᾷ (cf. e.g. Ar. *Eq.* 323 ἀναίδειᾶν, metrically guaranteed) according to metrical convenience (see Cassio 1977, 82). It is difficult to assess whether the diachronic argument (older -ειᾶ vs younger -ειᾷ) was already present in Eratosthenes and was simply omitted in Phot. ε 2227 = Ael.Dion. ε 71 through a process of epitomisation and excerption. As observed by Vessella (2018, 124), Herodian records both spellings and corresponding accentuations (-ῖᾶ; -ῖᾷ), commenting on the first as ‘poetic’ (Hdn. *Περὶ ὀρθογραφίας* GG 3,2.453.10: λέγεται δὲ καὶ ποιητικώτερον ἀναΐδία, εὐγενία, ἀπαθία, εὐμαθία and Hdn. *Περὶ ὀρθογραφίας* GG 3,2.453.20: καὶ τὸ <ι> ποιητικόν). Vessella tentatively identifies the reason for such a diastratic evaluation in ‘its attestations in Attic theatre’. Again, it is impossible to say whether this observation on the ‘poetic’ feature of the nouns in in -ειᾶ vs -ειᾷ also went back to Eratosthenes.

Idioms peculiar to the Attic dialect: cf. e.g. Phot. η 51 and *Et.Gen.* (A) 165v, (B) 125v (~ *EM* 416.31-8) s.v. ἦ δ’ ὅς (= Eratosth. fr. 52 Strecker = fr. 22 Broggiato): ἦ δ’ ὅς (or ἦν δ’ ἐγώ) was correctly understood by Eratosthenes as ‘he said’ (or ‘I said’); on the ancient exegesis of this expression, already Homeric, and well attested in Attic comedy and above all in Plato, see Schironi (2004, 545–53); Broggiato (2023, 111–3). The idiom is explicitly recognised as Attic in schol. Ar. *Eq.* 634b: <ἦν δ’ ἐγώ> ἔφην ἐγώ. Ἀττικὴ δὲ ἡ λέξις καὶ ἡ σύνταξις, μάλιστα δὲ αὐτῇ συνεχῶς κέχρηται καὶ κατακόρως ὁ Πλάτων. In Phot. η 51 we find a quotation from the comic poet Hermippus (fr. 2), shared also by the *Et.Gen.*, and from Plato (*Pl. R.* 327c.10): both quotations probably go back to Eratosthenes. Our scholar attended the Academy while in Athens and wrote a treatise entitled Πλατωνικός (cf. Geus 2002, 20–1), mostly of philosophical nature. It seems more likely, therefore, that Eratosthenes’ strictly grammatical remark on ἦ δ’ ὅς (ἦ explained as a form of the verb ἡμί = φημί followed by the qualification that the pronoun ὅς has a rough breathing because it is used as a (demonstrative) pronoun, cf. Phot. η 51: ἦ δ’ ὅς: οἱ μὲν περὶ Ἐρατοσθένην ἀντὶ τοῦ ἔφη δὲ ὅς: διὸ καὶ δασύνουσι τὴν ἐσχάτην ἐντετάχθαι γὰρ ἄρθρον τὸ ὅς. καὶ ἦ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἔφη) was to be found not in his *Platonikos* but in his *On Old Comedy*: see Broggiato (2023, 112–3).

A second Attic form commented on by Eratosthenes is the indefinite pronoun (neuter plural) ἄρτα, that according to schol. *Pl. Sph.* 220a (= Eratosth. fr. 22 Strecker) Eratosthenes interpreted ‘temporally’ (χρονικῶς), presumably quoting

²⁶² See Dettori (1996, 304–7).

Ar. fr. 617 πυθοῦ χελιδῶν πηνίκ' ἄττα φαίνεται, and 618 ὀπηνίκ' ἄτθ' ὑμεῖς κοπιᾷτ' ὀρχούμενοι. The later lexicographical tradition, Atticists included (cf. e.g. Ael. Dion. α 193; Phryn. *PS* fr. 274; Σ^b α 2372), usually records four possible meanings for ἄττα: (i) τινά ('something'), when it has smooth breathing; (ii) ἅτινα ('anything which') or ἅπερ ἄν ('the very thing which'), when it has rough breathing; (iii) a 'superfluous' use, often after numerals (cf. Ael. Dion. α 193: [. . .] ἐνίστε δὲ καὶ ὡς παρέλκον ἐστί), often exemplified by the quotation of Pherecr. fr. 161.2; (iv) a temporal value, similar to that of πότε, πηνικά, and the like (that is, the use remarked upon by Eratosthenes).²⁶³ We do not know whether Eratosthenes too discussed the three other meanings of ἄττα/ἅττα.

Finally, in Ath. 2.41d (= Eratosth. fr. 92 Strecker), we are informed that Eratosthenes said that the Athenians (Ἀθηναῖοι) called **μετάκερας** ('intermixed', often of water, that is, 'lukewarm') that which the other Greeks called τὸ χλιαρόν (καλοῦσι τὸ χλιαρόν, ὡς Ἐρατοσθένης φησίν. ὑδαρῆ φησί καὶ μετάκερας), and the Platonic glossary by [Did.] *De dubiis apud Platonem lectionibus* 20 Valente (= Eratosth. fr. 75 Strecker) attests that the idiom **ἐπὶ κόρρη** (τύπτειν) was glossed by Eratosthenes as (to be beaten) 'on the head'. On Eratosthenes' interpretation of ἐπὶ κόρρη in the context of the relevant Atticist doctrine, see Section 5.3 below.

As the above examples attest, Eratosthenes' treatise covered almost every imaginable aspect pertaining to Old Comedy, from minute textual issues to performance and stagecraft; in his comments and observations, the point of departure is frequently a detail of the text, from which he then proceeds to expound on broader topics. In the overwhelming majority of cases, Eratosthenes' 'scientific' method includes an extensive and appropriate use of parallels both within and beyond the comic corpus, a comparative method that jars strongly with the impromptu explanation offered by the so-called γλωσσογράφοι.

5.3 Eratosthenes and linguistic purism

We noted that previous scholars have detected in Eratosthenes' philological activity signs of either a strict Atticism *ante litteram* (the strong claim: Strecker, Slater, Geus) or traces of 'purist' tendencies (the weak claim: Tosi, Montana), albeit in a descriptive rather than prescriptive manner (see Section 5.1 above). In this sec-

²⁶³ Dunbar (1995, 699), with reference to at Ar. Av. 1514, comments that 'the neut. plur. ἄττα may have been illogically added to adv. πηνικά on the analogy of ποῖ' ἄττα (Ra. 936), πόσ' ἄττα (Pax 704, Ra. 173)'.

tion, we shall once more examine the evidence adduced in support of either the strong or weak version of these claims.

The fragments most frequently invoked by scholars in this respect are Eratosth. fr. 46 (= Phot. ε 2203) and 93 (= Harp. μ 25) Strecker, both dealing with Pherecrates' *Miners*.²⁶⁴

Eratosth. fr. 46 (= Phot. ε 2203): εὐθύ Λυκείου· τὸ εἰς Λύκειον· ὄθεν Ἐρατοσθένης καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ὑποπτεύει τοὺς Μεταλλεῖς· καὶ Εὐριπίδης οὐκ ὀρθῶς· ἄτην εὐθὺς Ἄργους καὶ Ἐπιδαυρίας ὁδόν'.

Straight to (εὐθύ) the Lykeion' (Pl. *Ly.* 203a): [It means] towards the Lykeion. Hence, for this reason as well, Eratosthenes suspects [the authenticity of] the *Miners* (Pherecr. fr. 116 and *PCG*, vol. 7, 155 test. ii). And Euripides, not correctly, [says]: 'the road straight to (εὐθὺς) Argos and Epidaurus' (Eur. *Hipp.* 1197).

Eratosth. fr. 93 (= Harp. μ 25): Μεταλλεῖς [. . .] ἔστι δὲ καὶ δρᾶμα Φερεκράτους Μεταλλεῖς, ὅπερ Νικόμαχόν φησι πεποιηκέναι Ἐρατοσθένης ἐν ζ' Περὶ τῆς ἀρχαίας κωμῶδιᾶς.

Miners: There is also a play by Pherecrates entitled *Miners*, which Eratosthenes in the 7th book of his *On Old Comedy* says was composed by Nicomachus.

The use of the adverbs εὐθύ, usually meaning 'straight to', and εὐθὺς, usually meaning 'immediately', has a long exegetical presence in the erudite tradition. As Benuzzi (2022b) has recently demonstrated, in the Classical period, both adverbs εὐθύ and εὐθὺς could, on occasion, overlap semantically, with either used in the temporal or spatial sense alongside their standard use.²⁶⁵ In the Hellenistic period (3rd to 1st century BCE), the situation remains apparently unchanged as far as literary texts are concerned, with the exception of a wider use of εὐθύ with temporal value and no instances of εὐθὺς + genitive in the spatial sense (the temporal εὐθέως increasingly becomes dominant in documentary texts).²⁶⁶ Whereas the evidence from literature, as just seen, appears to allow for a certain degree of flexibility between usages across a substantial span of time (Classical and Hellenistic Greek), the later Atticist tradition drew a much more rigid distinction between the 'correct' and 'incorrect' uses of both adverbs. For instance, for Phrynichus (*Ecl.* 113) only the ignorant 'many' (οἱ πολλοί) would ever use εὐθύ temporally; the correct usage was only one: εὐθύ + genitive in the spatial sense of 'straight to-

²⁶⁴ Both fragments have a long interpretative history: see Slater (1976, 235–7 and 241); Tosi (1994a, 169); Tosi (1998a); Tosi (2022), and most recently Benuzzi (2022b). They are also briefly discussed by Montana (2020b 186–7) (= Montana 2015, 112–4).

²⁶⁵ The use of εὐθὺς + genitive in the spatial sense ('straight to') is attested twice in Euripides: Eur. *Hipp.* 1197 and Eur. fr. 727c.29–30. The cases of temporal εὐθύ (Soph. *OT* 1242; Eur. *IT* 1409; Eup. fr. 392.2; Men. *Pc.* 155) are, however, not entirely unambiguous: see Benuzzi (2022b).

²⁶⁶ These data rely on the thorough survey by Benuzzi (2022b).

ward', while εὐθύς had only temporal value ('immediately'), with no room for overlap between the two idioms.²⁶⁷ The same 'correct' use of the two adverbs was upheld by Photius;²⁶⁸ the only Imperial lexicographical source to admit an exception and record the extended use of εὐθύ meaning 'immediately', is, unsurprisingly, the *Antiatt.* ε 96 (εὐθύ· ἀντὶ τοῦ εὐθέως), probably drawing on Aristophanes of Byzantium (fr. 369) to defend its more flexible stance.²⁶⁹

It is against this background that we must evaluate Eratosth. fr. 46 and 93 Strecker. Both fragments tell us that Eratosthenes doubted the authenticity of the *Miners* by Pherecrates. Fr. 93 adds that according to Eratosthenes, the author of the *Miners* was not Pherecrates but Nicomachus, correctly identified by modern scholars with a 3rd-century BCE dramatist (a New Comedy poet).²⁷⁰ Only fr. 46 (that is, Photius' entry) articulates, albeit in an obscurely abridged form, one of the reasons (καὶ διὰ τοῦτο) for Eratosthenes' doubt. Photius is unfortunately rather elliptic: the abrupt transition from the lemma, a quotation from the beginning of Plato's *Lysis* 203a (εὐθὺ Λυκείου), to the inference drawn by Eratosthenes about the spuriousness of Pherecrates' *Miners* (ὁθεν Ἐρατοσθένης καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ὑποπτεῦει τοὺς Μεταλλεῖς) reveals a blatant logical gap.²⁷¹ As cogently argued by Tosi (1998a, 329), the only way of restoring some logical consequentiality in Photius' entry is to suppose that the *interpretamentum* in its originally unabridged form is likely to have included a more extended remark, on the part of Eratosthenes, on the different usages of εὐθύς and εὐθύ: this would then explain the following censure of the Euripidean passage (*Hipp.* 1197) for the 'improper' use of εὐθύς + genitive indicating motion towards.²⁷²

267 Phryn. *Ecl.* 113: εὐθύ· πολλοὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ εὐθύς, διαφέρει δέ· τὸ μὲν γὰρ τόπου ἐστίν, εὐθὺ Ἀθηνῶν, τὸ δὲ χρόνου καὶ λέγεται σὺν τῷ σ.

268 Phot. ε 2185: εὐθύς λέγουσι καὶ εὐθέως· τὸ δὲ εὐθὺ χωρὶς τοῦ σ ἐπὶ τόπου τιθέασιν ('They say εὐθύς and εὐθέως, but they use εὐθὺ without sigma to indicate a place'): cf. also *Su.* ε 3523. A full list of the occurrences of the two idioms in the lexicographical and grammatical tradition can be found in Benuzzi (2022b).

269 For the evidence provided by Ar.Byz. fr. 369 = Herenn.Phil. 81 ([Ammon.] 202) and its relation to Eratosthenes' evaluation, see Benuzzi (2022b) and Chapter 7, Section 2.1.

270 Two comic poets (New Comedy) with this name are attested in the 3rd century BCE: see Kassel, Austin, *PCG* vol. 7, 56 and 62. The identification by Nesselrath (1990, 179 n. 88) of our Nicomachus with an alleged 5th-century BCE comic poet thus named, and seemingly attested at Ath. 8.364a (a passage concerning the authenticity of Pherecrates' *Chiron*: [. . .] τὰ εἰρημένα ὑπὸ τοῦ τὸν Χείρωνα πεποηκότος, εἴτε Φερεκράτης ἐστίν εἴτε Νικόμαχος ὁ ῥυθμικός ἢ ὅστις δὴ ποτε Νικόμαχος ὁ ῥυθμικός), has been rightly refuted by Tosi (1998a, 330–1): Νικόμαχος ὁ ῥυθμικός is to be identified with Nicomachus of Gerasa, the 2nd-century CE Neoplatonic philosopher.

271 See Tosi (1998a, 328–30) for the textual clues indicating the bad epitomisation suffered by the *interpretamentum* of our lemma.

272 The quotation of Eur. *Hipp.* 1197 (with εὐθύς) would have made less sense if Eratosthenes had limited himself to expound on the usage of sole adverb εὐθύ.

It thus follows that Eratosthenes faulted the *Miners* with an improper use of either εὐθύ or εὐθύς. Various scholars have advanced different proposals. According to Slater (1986, 136), initially followed by Tosi (1994a, 169; 1998a, 329), what Eratosthenes would have censured in the *Miners* is the use of εὐθύς with genitive in the spatial sense, just as in the Euripidean passage quoted immediately after in Photius (that is, the Euripidean usage would not have been valid proof for Eratosthenes for its acceptability in Pherecrates). More recently, Tosi (2022, 43) has changed his mind, and on the basis of evidence provided by Ar.Byz. fr. 369 = Herenn.Phil. 81 ([Ammon.] 202) has argued that it was the temporal use of εὐθύς that Eratosthenes faulted (Herennius/Ammonius recommends εὐθέως for ‘immediately’). This solution, however, is highly counterintuitive: as argued in detail by Benuzzi (2022b), not only is the temporal use of εὐθύς ubiquitous in 5th-century BCE literature (and in comedy of *any* period), but such a use occurs in many other plays by Pherecrates (fr. 40, 71, 75, 113, 153, 162). Benuzzi’s alternative explanation (Eratosthenes objected to the temporal use of εὐθύ, whose attestation in the Classical period is open to contrasting interpretations) is, in our opinion, much more likely to be the correct one: Eratosthenes’ censure of temporal εὐθύ in a 5th-century BCE comic poet (Pherecrates) and its admissibility in a 3rd-century BCE New Comedy poet (Nicomachus) would be in keeping with the linguistic data outlined above for the Hellenistic period, when a markedly increased use of temporal εὐθύ is recorded (Benuzzi 2022b).

To take stock of what we have argued so far, we saw that Strecker (1884, 19) considered fr. 46 and 93 to constitute evidence of an Atticist tendency *ante litteram* in Eratosthenes, and that almost a century later, Slater strongly assented to this judgement, followed by Geus.²⁷³ Various scholars have since criticised this claim; Tosi especially has repeatedly argued that we cannot speak of a fully-blown Atticism (the strong claim) for Eratosthenes but only of a ‘purist tendency’ (the weak claim), partly determined by the subject matter (Old Comedy), and that Eratosthenes’ allegedly ‘purist’ tendency grows anyway out of philological concerns (*Textpflege*).²⁷⁴ However, even more importantly for our purposes, and this independently from whatever solution one may be inclined to adopt for fr. 46

273 See Slater (1976, 237): ‘[. . .] we are justified in thinking of him as one of the first Atticists’; and Slater (1976, 241): ‘We can also see that arguments concerning atticistic rules grew up around the attribution of works in the library, and the movement can therefore be said to begin at least 230 B.C. Eratosthenes appears as a strict atticist, Aristophanes as a milder follower of the συνήθεια’. Cf. also Geus (2002, 295 with n. 50): ‘Eratosthenes scheint hier einem strikten Attizismus verpflichtet gewesen zu sein’.

274 See Tosi (1994a, 168; 171); Tosi (1998a, 335), followed by Montana (2020b, 186–7) (= Montana 2015, 113–4). It is worth quoting Tosi (1994a, 171) in full: ‘Appare, infatti, probabile che per lui si debba parlare di una tendenza purista, dovuta innanzi tutto all’argomento trattato; si tratta però solo di una tendenza, e non lo si può ovviamente accostare a coloro che nell’ambito del movi-

(Eratosthenes suspected the use of εὐθύς + genitive indicating motion towards or that of εὐθύ in a temporal sense), it is important to highlight what has so far gone practically unnoticed by modern scholarship (perhaps because of its obviousness): that is, a notable difference of attitude between Eratosthenes and the later Atticist tradition (with the exception of the *Antiatticist*) vis-à-vis the usage of the two idioms discussed so far. What our evidence (frr. 46 and 93 Strecker) tells us is not that Eratosthenes denied in absolute terms the linguistic possibility of using εὐθύ in a temporal sense (or εὐθύς in a spatial one): rather, he simply deemed it unsuitable for a given play by a given author – namely, Pherecrates (an Old Comedy poet) – but possible, and hence admissible, in a play by Nicomachus, most probably a later New Comedy poet. This stance is a far cry from that embraced by Phrynichus or Photius. We are, in fact, not dealing with an absolute veto: Eratosthenes simply recognised that different authors (possibly of different chronological periods) also have different linguistic usages. What is inadmissible in Pherecrates may be accepted in Nicomachus.²⁷⁵ That is, in exercising his judgement on the κρίσις ποιημάτων, Eratosthenes employed linguistic criteria, distinguishing between different authors' various styles and usages. This, rather than the later Atticist prescription regarding the 'correct' use (in absolute and not relative terms) of εὐθύ and εὐθύς, is the context within which Eratosthenes' evaluation of the authenticity of the *Miners* must be located. Moreover, to recognise the original conceptual framework of Eratosthenes' linguistic observation on the usage of the two adverbial idioms further contributes to undermine also the 'weak' claim of 'purist tendencies'. To speak of linguistic purism (see Chapter 1, Section 3) with reference to Eratosthenes' distinction between the admissible uses of εὐθύ(ς) in Pherecrates and Nicomachus is, in itself, unwarranted: purism presupposes an *a priori* selection of approved authors and a prescriptive attitude, while Eratosthenes is not saying that Pherecrates is 'more Attic' or 'better' than Nicomachus (even if to judge by the quantitative ratio of their textual survivals it was probably so).²⁷⁶ He is drawing a distinction between different linguistic usages that are peculiar to two given comic poets: he is not drawing up a 'canon' of approved and non-approved authors.²⁷⁷

mento atticista svolgeranno una vera e propria funzione purista, su un piano decisamente e programmaticamente prescrittivo'.

275 This holds true, by the way, irrespective of the date that is assigned to Nicomachus himself.

276 In the 2nd century CE Pherecrates had already acquired the status of ὁ ἄττικώτατος ('the most Attic'): cf. Ath. 6.268e (quoting from the *Miners*: Pherecr. fr. 113) and Phryn. PS fr. 8 (~ Phot. α 466).

277 This dovetails neatly with the fact that also in Eratosthenes' definition of grammar 'there is no mention of 'canonic authors', as already observed by Matthaios (2011, 79): see above Section 5.1.

Another piece of evidence often quoted to substantiate claims of Atticism or linguistic purism in Eratosthenes is fr. 149 Strecker (= 17 Bagordo):

Eratosth. fr. 149 Strecker (= schol. Ar. *Ra.* 1263c VEΘBarb(Ald.)): τῶν ψήφων λαβῶν· Ἐρατοσθένης τῶν ψευδαττικῶν τινὰς γράφειν φησὶ † τῷ ψήφῳ λαβῶν (τῷ ψήφῳ Barb: τῷ ψήφῳ Θ, τῷ ὁ ψήφῳ V, τῶν ψήφων E(Ald), τῷ ψήφῳ Dindorf), ἵνα καὶ τὰ πεπλασμένα δράματα ἐν οἷς τὸ παράπαν τοῦτο ἠγνόηται δοκῆ μὴ σεσσοικίσθαι.†

τῶν ψήφων λαβῶν ('having taken some pebbles'): Eratosthenes says that some of the ψευδαττικοί read † τῷ ψήφῳ λαβῶν in order that (or with the consequence that: see below with n. 279) also spurious comedies, in which this [construction] is entirely unknown, might seem not to contain solecisms†.

At Ar. *Ra.* 1262, Euripides has just stated that he will offer a parodied version of Aeschylus' choral lyrics to illustrate how repetitive and poor they are. Xanthias promptly replies (1263) καὶ μὴν λογιῶμαι ταῦτα τῶν ψήφων λαβῶν ('and I shall indeed take some pebbles and count them off'). The partitive genitive τῶν ψήφων (after λαβῶν)²⁷⁸ is unanimously attested in all the MSS; our scholium instead substitutes the correct τῶν ψήφων with some unidentified 'wrong' form criticised by Eratosthenes. Unfortunately, much in the transmitted *Wortlaut* of this scholium is problematic and is still awaiting a satisfactory solution, as the cruces of Chantry make clear. The main points of contention among modern scholars are (i) the precise wording of the variant (or conjecture?) ascribed by Eratosthenes to some of the ψευδαττικοί; (ii) the identity of these ψευδαττικοί (professional forgers/interpolators, or scholars ignorant of the proper Attic idiom?); and (iii) the syntactical referent of τοῦτο in the relative clause introduced by ἐν οἷς.

Let us start from ψευδαττικοί. The two different interpretations put forward (intentional forgers or erudites not well versed in Attic dialect) are strictly linked to the meaning one attributes to ἵνα. If ἵνα is taken as introducing a final clause, the intentionality of the linguistic falsification is blatant and the ψευδαττικοί must be Ptolemaic forgers active in the librarian market: their interest was therefore to pass as 'Aristophanic' plays that were not genuinely by Aristophanes. If one instead takes ἵνα + subjunctive in the well-attested post-Classical meaning of ὥστε, the 'falsification' is not an intended consequence, but rather the clumsy result of ignorance: the ψευδαττικοί would then be scholars not properly acquainted with correct Attic usage. Owing to their incompetence, they inadvertently allowed solecisms to creep

²⁷⁸ See Dover (1993, 345). The use of the genitive with both the active and middle forms of λαμβάνω is well attested in the later grammatical tradition: Cf. e.g. [Hdn.] *Philet.* 257: καὶ τὸ <λαβέσθαι> μᾶλλον γενικῆ συντάττουσιν (for which *Antiatt.* λ 11 with the quotation from Alexis fr. 23 might be relevant); Eust. *in Il.* 1.229.7: ὅτι κείται καὶ ἐνταῦθα τὸ λαβεῖν ἐπὶ γενικῆς and 2.610.10: πολλαχοῦ δὲ τὸ λαβεῖν γενικῆ συντάσσεται ταῦτὸν ὄν τῷ ἄψασθαι (cf. also *Su.* λ 82).

into Aristophanes' text.²⁷⁹ Both interpretations are possible: forgers of literary texts certainly existed in Eratosthenes' own time, and so did sloppy scholars.

As for (iii), it is likely that the text of our scholium has undergone some form of abridgement, thus obliterating an important logical intermediate step: Tosi reasonably suggested that, to restore some logical sense to the text of the scholium, one must assume that some essential information specifying the meaning of τοῦτο (presumably referring to some linguistic norm) has at a certain point been omitted (Tosi 1998a, 334).²⁸⁰ Issue (i) proves more challenging: the precise reading discussed by the scholium and criticised by Eratosthenes on the grounds of solecism remains unclear. Tosi (1998a, 332–3) argues for a gender metaplasm, adopting Dobree's τὸν ψῆφον (ψῆφος being notoriously feminine),²⁸¹ whereas Broggiato (2017, 281–2) supports Dindorf's accusative dual τῶ ψήφω: Eratosthenes, who admitted the use of the dual for the plural in Homer, would not have accepted it in Attic and condemned it as a solecism.²⁸²

Notwithstanding all these uncertainties, the general sense conveyed by the scholium is clear enough: Eratosthenes faulted some persons for accepting in Aristophanes' text an incorrect linguistic usage (σεσολοκίσθαι: be it gender, number, or case), a usage that, to more competent eyes, was immediately perceived as incorrect and, as such, could be used to tell apart genuine and spurious plays (cf. τὰ πεπλασμένα δράματα). Just as in the case of Pherecrates' *Miners*, we find Eratosthenes involved in a question of *Echtheitskritik* and, once more, his criterion for determining the authenticity of a given expression is strictly linguistic in nature. That is, whatever was the proper Attic 'norm' (congruence of gender or number) to which Eratos-

279 The supporters of the 'forgery' hypothesis are, among others, Fritzsche (1845, 337), Strecker (1884, 16), and Wilamowitz (1900, 42). Tosi (1998a, 331–5, with previous bibliography), followed by Broggiato (2017), interprets instead ψευδαττικοί as a reference to ignorant scholars on the basis of the only two other extant occurrences of ψευδαττικός, that is, Phryn. *Ecl.* 45 (υἱέως· οἱ ψευδαττικοί φασιν οἴμενοι ὅμοιον εἶναι τῷ Θησέως καὶ τῷ Πηλέως) and Luc. *Sol.* 7 (καὶ χρᾶσθαι δε τινος εἰπόντος, ψευδαττικόν, ἔφη, τὸ ῥῆμα). For the post-Classical use of ἴνα = ὥστε, see Di Bartolo (2021, 5 n. 19 and 123; 127); for just an example of this use of ἴνα in the Aristophanic scholia, cf. e.g. schol. Ar. *Ach.* 200 REΓ: χαίρειν κελεύων: κατ' εὐφημισμὸν τὸ χαίρειν: τοῦτο δὲ τὸ χαίρειν κελεύων τὸν Ἀμφίθεον <λέγειν> οἴονται τινες, ἴνα γραφῆ τὸ κελεύω χωρὶς τοῦ ν. τὸ δὲ ἐξῆς <“ἐγὼ δὲ πολέμου”> τὸν Δικαιοπόλιν.

280 See also the textual discussion on ἐν οἷς τὸ παράπαν τοῦτο ἠγνόηται in Nesselrath (1990, 180 n. 90).

281 For Eratosthenes' interest in change of gender, see Eratosth. fr. 82 Strecker (ἡ πέτασος, ἡ στάμνος according to 'some').

282 For Eratosthenes' defence of the use of the Homeric dual *pro* plural, see schol. (Ariston.) Hom. *Il.* 24.282 (A) and schol. (Ariston.) Hom. *Il.* 10.364b (A) (= Eratosth. fr. 35 Strecker). Fritzsche proposed instead the dative τῷ ψήφω, for which see Tosi (1998a, 330 n. 20) with the parallel of Aeschin. 1.161: ἴνα [. . .] δίκην λάβῃ τῇ ψήφω παρὰ τοῦ παραβάντος.

thenes referred in passing his judgement on the ψευδαττικοί, our scholar was not formulating a systematic rule but commenting on a specific passage of a specific author (Aristophanes), with his own linguistic συνήθεια. Strecker (1884, 16–7; 19) considered this fragment, together with fr. 93, to constitute evidence that Eratosthenes was ‘Atticismi tam accuratus observator’. If this was intended to convey the idea that Eratosthenes’ knowledge of the Attic dialect was extremely proficient and that he used it, as any editor would do, to judge questions of authenticity on a sound linguistic basis (the usage of a given author: in this specific case Attic authors), this is correct. If, instead, we want to see in this definition, as Slater (1976, 236–7 and 241) does, a declaration of affiliation *ante litteram* to the Atticist tenets, this is misleading. For one, it is important to emphasise that there is no guarantee that the dismissive label of ψευδαττικοί in our scholium can be traced directly back to Eratosthenes’ *ipsissima verba*. Rather, it is highly likely that he did not use this formulation and that what we have here is a rendition, in Atticist terminology, of Eratosthenes’ original wording. The fact that the only two other occurrences of the term ψευδαττικός in extant Greek literature are Phryn. *Ecl.* 45 and Luc. *Sol.* 7 (see n. 279 above) strongly suggest that the use of ψευδαττικοί to denigrate those who pretend to know Attic but really do not, makes much more sense in the cultural climate of the Second Sophistic in the second century CE rather than in 3rd-century BCE Alexandria.

A more complex case, as remarked by Tosi,²⁸³ is that of Eratosth. fr. 35 Strecker (= schol. (Aristonic.) Hom. *Il.* 10.364b (A)), whose ascription to *On Old Comedy* remains doubtful (and with good reasons).²⁸⁴ However, regardless of whether Eratosthenes’ observation in the scholium should be traced back to *On Old Comedy* or to some other work of his, this witness is compelling in that it offers a grammatical observation by Eratosthenes that was apparently re-interpreted in an Atticist sense later on in the chain of transmission (Byzantine etymologica). The text of our fragment is as follows:

²⁸³ Tosi (1994a, 171).

²⁸⁴ Pfeiffer (1968, 161) suggested that it could belong to a lost Homeric σύγγραμμα by Eratosthenes; see in this direction also Tosi (1994a, 171), and Geus (2002, 310 n. 105), both on the basis of schol. (Ariston.) Hom. *Il.* 24.282 (A), where Eratosthenes, together with Crates (Crates Gr. fr. 36 Broggiato), is mentioned among those who want the dual to be used ‘confusedly’ (that is, *pro plurali*) in Homer (οἱ θέλοντες συγγεῖσθαι τὰ δυϊκὰ παρ’ Ὀμήρω: on this scholium see Schironi 2018, 589). Geus, in particular, has suggested that P. Turner 39 (see above Section 2.1) may be Eratosthenes’ monograph on the dual.

Eratosth. fr. 35 Strecker (= schol. (Aristonic.) Hom. *Il.* 10.364b (A)): <διώκετον>· ὅτι τὸ <διώκετον> σημαίνει διώκουσιν ἢ διώκετε, οὐ τὸ <ἐ>διωκέτην,²⁸⁵ ὡς Ἐρατοσθένης. ἔστιν οὖν τὸ Δόλωνα διώκουσιν ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐδίωκον, ὃν τρόπον ‘αἱ μὲν ἀλετρεύουσι μύλης ἐπι’ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἠλέτρευον.

<διώκετον>: [Note] that <διώκετον> (‘the two of them pursue’) means διώκουσιν (‘they pursue’) or διώκετε (‘you pursue’), and not <ἐ>διωκέτην (‘the two of them pursued’) as Eratosthenes [says]. [The expression] Δόλωνα διώκουσιν (‘they pursue Dolon’) is used for ἐδίωκον (‘they pursued’), just as we have ‘some of the female servants grind (ἀλετρεύουσι) at the mill’ (*Od.* 7.104) instead of ‘they ground’ (ἠλέτρευον).

Diomedes and Odysseus have just caught sight of the Trojan spy Dolon and decided to pursue him relentlessly. Here, Aristonicus probably preserves Aristarchean doctrine, according to which Homer intentionally used the present third-person dual διώκετον (‘the two of them pursue’) rather than the (unmetrical) imperfect (διωκέτην) as an example of the historic present.²⁸⁶ Eratosthenes instead argued that Homer, while writing διώκετον, really meant the imperfect διωκέτην (-την being the secondary ending for the dual of the third person).²⁸⁷ This poetic licence, usually attributed to metrical convenience by modern scholars, is found in two further instances in the *Iliad*, at 13.346 (ἐτεύχετον), and 18.583 (λαφύσσετον).²⁸⁸ Ancient grammarians explained this Homeric licence in various ways.²⁸⁹ For διώκετον at *Il.* 10.364, Apollonius Dyscolus speaks not of ‘enallage of tense’, as does Aristarchus, but of ‘enallage of persons’ (ἐναλλαγή προσώπων), although with evident scepticism (this explanation advanced by some is οὐ πιθανή ἀπολογία: Apoll.Dysc. *Pron. GG* 2,1.1.110.3–5).²⁹⁰ Similarly, the explanation given in *Epim.Hom.* τ 55 observes that the poet ‘does not keep to the analogy of persons’ (μὴ φυλάξαντα τὴν τῶν προσώπων ἀναλογίαν). In the Byzantine etymologica, we find two motivations, both different from the Aristarchean one:

285 Erbse ascribes the emendation (<ἐ>διωκέτην) to Friedlaender but this is incorrect: Friedlaender (1851, 370–1) prints throughout διωκέτην, that is, the unaugmented form of the imperfect, and rightly so in our opinion.

286 Translated into Aristarchean terminology, Homer would here be resorting to an ‘enallage of tense’ (the use of the present for the past): see Schironi (2018, 195–6); Matthaios (1999, 334).

287 Cf. West (2001, 77 and n. 98): ‘He (i.e. Aristarchus) scolds Eratosthenes at K 364b for another inaccuracy concerning a dual, namely his construing διώκετον as an imperfect instead of as a historic present. Eratosthenes was right in this case and Aristarchus wrong’. Both explanations are reported in Hsch. δ 2043: διώκετον· ἐδίωκον. δυϊκῶς. ἢ διώκουσι.

288 See e.g. Chantraine (2013, 96 and 457); K–B (vol. 2, 69).

289 Cf. Friedlaender (1851, 671); Matthaios (1999, 334 n. 280).

290 Apoll.Dysc. *Pron. GG* 2,1.1.110.3–5: οὐ πιθανὴν ἀπολογίαν τινέας φασιν, ὡς ἐν ῥήμασι παραλλαγῇ προσώπων· ‘διώκετον’ (K 364) γὰρ ἀντὶ τοῦ διωκέτην. Cf. Brandenburg (2005, 549).

EM 280.30–5 (~ *Et.Gen.* (AB) s.v. διώκετον: cf. Erbse's apparatus to schol. Hom. *Il.* 10.364b): διώκετον· ὅτι οἱ Ἀττικοὶ καὶ ἐν τοῖς τρίτοις προσώποις τῶν δυϊκῶν τοῖς δευτέροις χρόνται, ὡς Ἀριστοφάνης· 'καταντιβολεῖτον αὐτὸν ὑποπεπτωκότες. | ἐκμαίνετον τὸν πατέρα τοῖς ὀρχήμασι'. τοιαῦτα καὶ τὰ παρὰ τῷ ποιητῇ 'διώκετον ἐμμενὲς αἰεῖ'. ἄπερ ἔνιοι φασὶ διὰ τὸν κρητικὸν πόδα, ἤγουν τὸν ἀμφίμακρον, μὴ δυνάμενον παραλαμβάνεσθαι (Stephanus: παραλαμβάνειν MSS), † εἰς σύμφωνον λήγειν†· οὐκ ἠδύνατο γὰρ εἶναι διωκέτην· ἀκάθαρτον γὰρ ἂν ἦν ἀμφίμακρος.

διώκετον: [This is] because Attic writers use the second person of the dual also for the third person, as in Aristophanes (Ar. fr. 603): 'Falling down before him, you do entreat him! With your dances you two are making your father mad'. Such things [are found] also in Homer: 'the two of them pursued (διώκετον) relentlessly' (*Il.* 10.364). These forms, some say, because of the cretic foot, that is, the one with a long syllable at both ends (i.e. – ∨ –), not being acceptable, † end in a consonant†.²⁹¹ For it could not be διωκέτην: the cretic foot would be troublesome (?).²⁹²

This entry, in poor textual shape, appears to carelessly merge heterogeneous pieces of information.²⁹³ Notwithstanding its many inconsistencies,²⁹⁴ we are given two explanations for διώκετον: (i) Attic writers use the ending for the second person of the dual also for the third person, and this is already the case in Homer (with reference to our passage in *Il.* 10. 364) and (ii) διώκετον is a metrical licence. The first explanation, which seems to imply that Homer also wrote in some form of Attic, is not supported by either literary or documentary evidence. As observed by Kühner and Blass, with the exception of the three Homeric examples, Attic writers (poetry and prose) provide no certain cases of the past ending -τον of the second-person dual used for the third-person dual (whose proper ending is -την),²⁹⁵ whereas

²⁹¹ σύμφωνον has been suspected (cf. Gaisford *ad loc.*: 'videtur mendosum'); the *Wortlaut* may be corrupt but the sense that διωκέτην is totally unacceptable because it ends in a consonant, that is, without possibility of abbreviation in hiatus of η, makes sense. Friedlaender read συστολήν, but even so the syntax still remains perplexing. We have put between cruces also λήγειν because of the syntactic oddity.

²⁹² The translation of the last sentence is merely *exempli gratia*, since the overall syntax of the last period is convoluted and almost certainly corrupt: see Gaisford *ad loc.* The transmitted ἀκάθαρτον literally means 'unpure': Erbse suggested correcting it into ἀκαίρον, Friedlaender (1851, 371 n. 6) into ἀπαράδεκτον.

²⁹³ Cf. Friedlaender (1851, 371 n. 6).

²⁹⁴ The most blatant of which is the quotation of Ar. fr. 603 where καταντιβολεῖτον is a second-person dual present imperative and ἐκμαίνετον second-person dual present indicative: see K–B (vol. 2, 69), and Kassel, Austin *PCG* vol. 7, 321 in their apparatus *ad loc.* ('καταντιβολεῖτον et ἐκμαίνετον quomodo pro formis tertiae personae (imperfecti, cf. exemplum Homericum) haberi poterint non liquet [. . .]. ἐκμαίνετον secundae personae indicativus praesentis esse videtur, καταντιβολεῖτον imperativus est, cf. Pac. 113, Vesp. 978').

²⁹⁵ Only three extant instances are known, all corrected by modern editors into -την (ἔφατον in Pl. *Euthd.* 274a, Isae. 4.7 ἤλθετον, and Thuc. 2.86 διέχετον/διείκετον): see Keck (1882, 52–4).

many examples of the reverse are known: the use of the third-person dual (-την) for the second person, in both poetry and prose.²⁹⁶ Similarly, no instances of the use of the past ending -τον of the second-person dual for the third-person are attested in Attic inscriptions, with the exception of two metrical texts, the first (of the Roman period) being a direct quotation of Hes. *Op.* 199 ἴτον, and the second (post 350 BCE) most likely a Homeric imitation.²⁹⁷

What justification did Eratosthenes adduce in defence of his interpretation (διώκετον for διωκέτην)? Metrical licence or παραλλαγή προσώπων? Once again, we cannot tell for sure. We saw that Eratosthenes believed that Homer did use the dual with a certain liberty, extending it to a plurality of agents (that is, more than two). Did he also believe that Homer was equally loose in the use of the personal endings, swapping the second and third persons of the dual? Again, we cannot tell. However, even in the case that he did and was not simply explaining this licence on metrical grounds, we must remember that Eratosthenes was commenting on a specific Homeric passage and not on an Attic writer (οἱ Ἀττικοί of the *EM*). Aristarchus did believe that Homer wrote in an old form of Attic, and Aristophanes of Byzantium may have shared (or not) his opinion (see Chapter 7, Section 2.2). Nothing of the kind is however attested for Eratosthenes. If we keep this in mind along with the fact that the claim about the παραλλαγή προσώπων by Attic writers in *EM* 280.30–5 runs against the extant evidence (poetry *and* prose), it seems more economical to suppose, with Tosi (1994a, 171),²⁹⁸ that what we have in the *EM* is an Atticist reinterpretation of whatever the original material may have been, possibly filtered through an ill-digested Aristarchean lens (Homer as an Attic author).

Other, scattered pieces of evidence contribute to the impression that to label Eratosthenes as either a fully-fledged ‘Atticist’ *ante litteram*, or a budding ‘purist’, is equally misleading. Let us take, for instance, the case of schol. Ar. *Pax* 70a–e (= Eratosth. fr. 18 Strecker = fr. 15 Broggiato) on ἀναρριχᾶσθαι ‘to climb up with hands and feet’:²⁹⁹

Schol. Ar. *Pax* 70a–e: πρὸς τὸ ὕψος ἀνέβαινε. πρὸς δένδρα καὶ τοίχους ἢ σχοινίον ταῖς χερσὶ καὶ τοῖς ποσὶν ἀνα-βαίνειν ἀνα>ρριχᾶσθαι λέγεται. φησὶ δὲ Ἐρατοσθένης Κυρηναίου οὕτω λέγειν. (V) εἰρηται δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρρίχων, ὃ ἐστὶ κοφίνων, οὗς εἰώθασι διὰ σχοινίων ἀνιμᾶν. ἢ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀραχνῶν, καὶ ἔστιν οἷον ἀραχνᾶσθαι. αἱ δὲ ἀράχναι πολλάκις νήθουσι κατακτάς ἐναερίουσ ὁδοῦς. (RV) ἄλλως. καὶ τὸ ἀναρριχᾶσθαι δὲ τοῖς Ἀττικοῖς παρὰ τὸ ἀράχνιον ἐστὶ

²⁹⁶ See the discussion in K–B (vol. 2, 69–70); cf. also Monro (1891, 6 n. 3).

²⁹⁷ Cf. Threatte (1996, 454) with details.

²⁹⁸ Tosi is most succinct in his treatment, but he does observe that ‘gli etimologici bizantini (*Etym. Gen.* - *EM* 280, 28) lo (i.e. Eratosthenes’ remark) riprendevano attribuendogli una connotazione atticista’.

²⁹⁹ Text and translation are by Benuzzi (2022c).

γενόμενον, ἀραχνῶ, καὶ ἐν ὑπερθέσει τῶν στοιχείων ἀναρριχῶ τοῦ μὲν ν εἰς τὴν χώραν τοῦ ρ τεθέντος, τοῦ δὲ [ι] ἀμοιβαίως [καὶ τοῦ ρ] εἰς τὴν χώραν τοῦ ν, τοῦ δὲ χ πλησίον τοῦ ω. ταῦτα Ἡρωδιανὸς ἐν τῷ <ι>ς' τῆς καθόλου. ἄλλως. (V) κτλ.

He climbed upwards. The act of climbing along trees and walls or a small rope with the hands and the feet is called ἀναρριχᾶσθαι. Eratosthenes states that the Cyrenaeanes say so. It comes from the ἄρριχοι, that is the baskets, which they used to draw up with small ropes. Or from the spiders (ἀράχνη), as if it were ἀραχνᾶσθαι. The spiders often spin fragile paths in the air. Alternatively, the ἀναρριχᾶσθαι [found] in Attic authors comes from ἀράχνη (‘spider’s web’), ἀραχνῶ and, with transposition of the letters, ἀναρριχῶ, with ν taking the place of ρ, ι and ρ in turn taking the place of ν, and χ close to ω. So [says] Herodian in the sixteenth book of the *General* [*Prosody*] etc.³⁰⁰

Immediately after the *interpretamentum* (ἀναρριχᾶσθαι = ταῖς χερσὶ καὶ τοῖς ποσὶν ἀναβαίνειν), we are told that according to Eratosthenes, this expression was a Cyrenaean gloss. Afterwards, we are given a first etymology: ἀναρριχᾶσθαι derives from ἄρριχος, a wicker basket apparently lifted upwards using ropes (the term is attested, within the comic corpus, only in *Ar. Av.* 1309).³⁰¹ A second etymology follows, clumsily repeated twice: ἀναρριχᾶσθαι derives from ἀράχνη (‘spider’). The second time, this alternative etymology from ‘spider’ is explicitly framed within a specifically Attic context (καὶ τὸ ἀναρριχᾶσθαι δὲ τοῖς Ἀττικοῖς κτλ.) and traced back to Herodian, who, according to the grammatical doctrine of pathology, had ἀναρριχᾶσθαι derive from ἀράχνη via *ἀραχνῶ (through multiple transpositions of letters).³⁰²

It appears that, in antiquity, there were thus two competing etymologies for the verb: one from ἄρριχος (and hence ἀναρριχᾶσθαι with gemination of ρ), going back at least to Pausanias the Atticist but perhaps even to Didymus (Benuzzi) or Eratosthenes himself (Strecker), and a second from ἀράχνη ‘spider’ (and hence ἀναρριχᾶσθαι, with only one ρ). This appears to be supported by the witness of Phrynichus in his *PS* 32.2–4:

³⁰⁰ Cf. *Et.Gen.* α 805 (= *EM* 99.14–25) quoting instead Hdn. Περὶ παθῶν (*GG* 3,2.387.5) for the etymology.

³⁰¹ Strecker also attributed to Eratosthenes the etymology from ἄρριχος. On the basis of Eust. *in Od.* 1.213.31–2, who ascribes the etymology to Paus.Gr. α 158, Benuzzi (2022c) is more cautious: the etymology from ἄρριχος ‘goes back at least to Pausanias, but possibly even to Didymus (as it occurs right after the reference to Eratosthenes in the scholium to *Pax* 70)’.

³⁰² Benuzzi (2022c), following Vessella (2018, 150), rightly observes that ‘Herodian’s proposed etymology should result in *ἀναρριχῶ, without geminate ρ’. Benuzzi inclines for the second of the two possible explanations for the lack of the geminate in the Herodian’s transposition of letters (‘either a duplication of ρ went missing in the transmission of the scholium, or the spelling with ρρ was applied by analogy to the text of the entire annotation at some point in its transmission, obscuring Herodian’s original ἀναρριχᾶσθαι’), also on the basis of Phryn. *PS* 32.2–4 attesting a spelling with only one ρ.

Phryn. *PS* 32.2–4: ἀναριχᾶσθαι· πάνυ Ἀττικὴ ἡ φωνή. σημαίνει δὲ τὸ τοῖς ποσὶ καὶ ταῖς χερσὶν ἀντεχόμενον ἀναβαίνειν, οἷον ἀνέρποντα. οἱ δὲ δύο ρρ γράφοντες ἀμαρτάνουσιν.

ἀναριχᾶσθαι: The word is very Attic. It means to climb up holding on by the feet and the hands, as if creeping upwards. Those who write it with two ρ are wrong.

Phrynichus explicitly specifies that the verb in question is ‘very Attic’ (πάνυ Ἀττικὴ ἡ φωνή)³⁰³ and that the correct spelling is with only one ρ, whereby those who write it with two are in error. The evidence presented hitherto reveals that at least in Imperial times (Herodian, Phrynichus), the word’s correct spelling was disputed (with the orthography with a single ρ approved as ‘correct’ by the strict Atticist Phrynichus). Not only is there no trace of this debate in Eratosthenes, who, incidentally, from Phrynichus’ perspective would have sided with those he criticised for ἀμαρτία (since they spelled the term with two ρ), but he explicitly considered the term a feature of the Cyrenean dialect.

Likewise, there are other cases in which Eratosthenes would have ended up, if not on the ‘blacklist’ of later Atticists, at least among those who did not propose a wholly sound doctrine. Take the case of Eratosth. fr. 75 Strecker on the Attic expression ἐπὶ κόρρη, which is probably a colloquialism:³⁰⁴

Eratosth. fr. 75 Strecker (= [Did.] *De dubiis apud Platonem lectionibus* 20 Valente): ἐπὶ κόρρης· οἱ μὲν τὸ κατὰ κεφαλὴν τύπτεσθαι· τῶν γὰρ Ἰώνων, ὡς φησὶν Ἐρατοσθένης, τὴν κεφαλὴν καλοῦντων κόρρη, οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι καθάπερ μυρρίνην τὴν μυρσίνην καὶ τὰ ὅμοια, κόρρη τὴν κεφαλὴν ὠνόμασαν, ὡς Πλάτων ἐν Γοργία καὶ Δημοσθένης ἐν τῷ κατὰ Μειδίου· οἱ δὲ τὸ ἐπὶ κόρρης ἐξηγοῦνται τὸ εἰς τὰς γνάθους τύπτεσθαι, ὡς Ὑπερ(ε)ίδης ἐν τῷ κατὰ Δωροθέου· ῥαπίζειν αὐτὸν Ἱππόνικον κατὰ κόρρης, ἔπειτα καὶ Ἱππόνικος ὕπ’ Αὐτοκλέους ἔρραπίσθη τὴν γνάθον· καὶ Φερεκράτης· ‘τό δ’ Ἀχιλεὺς εὐ πῶς ἐπὶ κόρρης αὐτὸν ἐπέταξεν, ὥστε πῦρ ἀπέλαμψεν ἐκ τῶν γνάθων’.

ἐπὶ κόρρης: Some [say that it means] to be beaten on the head, for, as Eratosthenes says, while the Ionians call the head κόρρη, the Athenians called it κόρρη, just like (they call) μυρσίνη (‘myrtle’) μυρρίνη and the likes, as Plato in *Gorgias* (Pl. *Grg.* 646c.3) and Demosthenes in *Against Meidias* (D. 21.71, 147). Others instead say that ἐπὶ κόρρης means to be beaten on the jaw, as Hyperides in *Against Dorotheus* (Hyp. fr. 97 Jensen): ‘Hipponicus beats him on the jaw, and then Hipponicus is beaten on the jaw by Autocles’. And Pherecrates (Pherecr. fr. 165): ‘† Achilles gave him a good stroke on the jaw, so that fire sparkled from his jaws’.

303 Moer. α 115 also explicitly speaks of an Attic word, but the spelling of the MSS is with the double ρρ (ἀναριχᾶσθαι Ἀττικοί· προβαίνειν ἀνέρπων Ἑλληνας). Single ρ is attested in Hsch. α 4549: *ἀναριχᾶσθαι· ἀναβαίνειν, but the gemination reappears in at a 7444: ἀρριχᾶσθαι: see Benuzzi (2022c).

304 In *Grg.* 486.c3 Plato explicitly says that the expression is ‘rather rustic’: τὸν δὲ τοιοῦτον, εἶ τι καὶ ἀγροικότερον εἰρήσθαι, ἔξεστιν ἐπὶ κόρρης τύπτοντα μὴ διδόναι δίκην.

Eratosthenes correctly characterises the development /rs/> /rr/ as typically Attic and apparently adduces passages from Plato and Demosthenes to support his interpretation of ἐπὶ κόρρη (τύπτειν) meaning ‘(to be beaten) on the head’. The expression’s meaning was disputed among ancient grammarians, who offered a variety of interpretations for κόρρη, including ‘head’ (like Eratosthenes), ‘jaw’, and ‘temples’.³⁰⁵ The stricter Atticists, however, accepted as ‘correct’ only the interpretation ἐπὶ κόρρης = ἐπὶ γνάθου (‘on the jaw’), as testified by Phryn. *Ecl.* 146,³⁰⁶ Harp. ε 100,³⁰⁷ and Phot. ε 483.³⁰⁸ That is, once again, *not* Eratosthenes’ explanation.³⁰⁹

Particularly interesting from a non-purist perspective is Poll. 10.60 (= Eratosth. fr. 11 Strecker = fr. 1 Bagordo = fr. 13 Broggiato) on ἀναλογεῖον (‘lectern’, ‘bookstand’):³¹⁰

Eratosth. fr. 11 Strecker (= Poll. 10.60): εἰ δὲ καὶ τὸ ἀναλογεῖον ἐθέλοις προσονομάζειν, οὕτω μὲν ἐπὶ τοῦ τοῖς βιβλίοις ὑποκεισομένου παρ’ οὐδενὶ τῶν κεκριμένων εὖρον, Αθήνησι δὲ ἦν ὑπὲρ ὕδρειου τινός, οὗ τὸ ὕδωρ ἐπεξεχείτο, ποίημα καὶ ἀνάθημα Διογένους, ὃ καὶ Διογένειον ἀναλογεῖον ἐκαλεῖτο. παρὰ μέντοι Ἐρατοσθένει ἐν τοῖς περὶ κωμωδίας, ὡς ἔχοιμὲν τινα τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦδε ἀποστροφῆν, εὐροῖς ἂν τοῦνομα ἐπὶ τοῦ σκεύους τοῦ τοῖς βιβλίοις χρησίμου.

If you wish to mention also the ἀναλογεῖον, I did not find the word with reference to the stand that supports books in any of the selected authors. But in Athens there was a sculpture and votive inscription by Diogenes on a fountain from which water poured out, and it was called the ἀναλογεῖον of Diogenes. Nevertheless, in Eratosthenes’ *On Comedy*, to have

305 Cf. Ael.Dion. ε 55 (from Σ ε 691~ Su. ε 2400): ἐπὶ κόρρης· ἐπὶ κεφαλῆς ἢ γνάθου ἢ κροτάφου. κόρρη γὰρ καὶ κόρησιν τὴν ὅλην κεφαλὴν σὺν τῷ αὐχένι λέγουσιν. τινὲς δὲ καὶ ῥάπισμα λέγουσι τὸ ἐπὶ τῆς γνάθου ἴλαμβάνειν ἄπτόμενον καὶ τοῦ κροτάφου; Poll. 2.40: τοὺς δὲ κροτάφους ἔνιοι καὶ κόρρας καλοῦσιν· καὶ τοῦτο εἶναι τὸ ἐπὶ κόρρης παίειν.

306 Phryn. *Ecl.* 146: τὸ ῥάπισμα οὐκ ἐν χρήσει· χρῶ οὖν τῷ καθαρῷ· τὸ γὰρ τὴν γνάθον πλατεῖα τῆ χειρὶ πλῆξαι ἐπὶ κόρρης πατάξει Αθηναῖοι φασιν (‘The word ῥάπισμα (‘slap on the face’) is not in usage (i.e. literary fashionable usage). Do use thus the pure idiom: for the Athenians call to strike the jaw with the flat of your hand ἐπὶ κόρρης πατάξει’).

307 Harp. ε 100: ἐπὶ κόρρης· Δημοσθένης ἐν τῷ κατὰ Μειδίου. ἄλλοι μὲν ἄλλως ἀπέδοσαν, βέλτιον δὲ ὑπολαμβάνειν ἐπὶ κόρρης λέγεσθαι τὸ ἐπὶ τῆς γνάθου, ὃ λέγομεν ἐν τῷ βίῳ ῥάπισμα (‘ἐπὶ κόρρης· Demosthenes in *Against Meidias*. Different scholars have given different interpretations, but it is better to take ἐπὶ κόρρης as referring to the jaw, which, in real life, we call ῥάπισμα’).

308 Phot. ε 483: ῥάπισαι· πατάξει τὴν γνάθον ἀπλῆ τῆ χειρὶ, ὃ λέγουσι καὶ ἐπὶ κόρρης (‘ῥάπισαι: To strike the jaw with the bare hand, which they also call ἐπὶ κόρρης’).

309 Also ἐπισίζω (schol. Ar. V. 704b = Eratosth. fr. 43 Strecker = Lyc. fr. 8 Pellettieri), glossed by Eratosthenes with ‘to hiss to a dog to set it on someone’: cf. above Section 5.1) has an Atticist *Nachleben*: ἐπισίζω and not ἐπιστίζω is the correct Attic spelling (cf. Moer. ε 53: ἐπισίξας Ἀττικαί· ἐπιστίξας Ἑλλήνες; Phot. ε 194: ἐπισίττειν καὶ ἐπισίζειν, οὐκ ἐπιστίζειν). In Eratosthenes’ fragment there is no trace of this prescription.

310 For this translation of ἀναλογεῖον, rather than ‘reading-desk’ (Broggiato 2023, 71), see Dickey (2015b, 208), following Dionisotti (1982, 111). For bookstands in antiquity, see Turner, Parsons (1987, 6 with notes 16–7) and Sukenik (1933).

some kind of loophole for this term, you might find the word with reference to the object that is useful for holding books. (Translation by Broggiato 2023, 71 with some modifications).

While listing a series of implements relating to learning γράμματα, Pollux observes that he could not find the word ἀναλογεῖον to denote a bookstand/lectern in any of the ‘chosen’ authors – that is, the authorised ‘classics’. Having mentioned a sculpture atop a fountain (by an otherwise unknown Diogenes) resembling an ἀναλογεῖον,³¹¹ Pollux adds that you could however find the word attested in Eratosthenes’ *On Old Comedy*, if you needed some support (ἄποστροφή) for this expression.³¹² Scholars have astutely inferred that Eratosthenes, in *On Old Comedy*, thus extended his range of philological activity to include authors beyond the ‘enlisted’ ones (οἱ κεκριμένοι). In particular, Nesselrath (1990, 180 n. 91), followed by Broggiato (2023, 72), has suggested that Eratosthenes may have dealt with what we would now call ‘post-Classical’ authors. The authority to whom Eratosthenes refers may also simply have been a minor 5th-century BCE author. Be this as it may, what is certain is that according to Pollux, Eratosthenes’ work also contained references to non-canonical authors (that is, ‘non-canonical’ from the point of view of the 2nd century CE).

Overall, if our argument hitherto is sound, the general impression is that Eratosthenes did introduce new rigour and ‘scientific-like’ precision to the field of philological studies (extensive use of linguistic *comparanda*; distinction between stylistic usages by different authors). This more exact and exacting attitude, however, does not appear to justify labelling Eratosthenes as a proto-Atticist or proto-purist.

311 Theodoridis (2003, 76–8) provides a specimen (found at Philippi) of what the fountain mentioned by Pollux may have looked like.

312 This passage of Pollux is insightfully commented on by S. Valente (2013b, 158). The term ἀναλογεῖον is for us attested only in the grammatical and lexicographical tradition (e.g. Hsch. α 4240: ἀναγνωστήριον· ἀναλογεῖον, where the term is used as *interpretamentum*, not as lemma; *Su.* α 1942: ἀναλογεῖον· ἐν ᾧ τίθενται τὰ βιβλία); for a full list of its occurrences, see Broggiato (2023, 70 and 71–2 with nn. 147–8). Burzacchini (1995–1996) remarks that the concurrent spelling ἀναλόγιον is attested from the 2nd century CE.

Chapter 7

Towards Atticism: The blossoming of Hellenistic scholarship on Attic

1 Preliminaries

We concluded the previous chapter with an extended survey of Eratosthenes' engagement with Attic as documented by Old Comedy. Eratosthenes' work on Attic comedy represented an important benchmark for any future scholarly activity not only in comedy but in Attic language in particular. It is not wholly by chance that it is mostly in the wake of Eratosthenes' contribution that at the end of the 3rd and above all in the 2nd century BCE a proliferation of studies specifically dedicated to Attic dialect emerges. We noted that in the 3rd century BCE the geopolitical centre of power had clearly shifted from Athens to Alexandria and its sphere of influence (particularly the cultural hubs of Cos, Rhodes, and Cyrene). Nonetheless, the importance of Athens and Attica as symbols of cultural capital remained largely unchallenged (cf. Chapter 6, Section 4): from the outset, Attic literature played a qualitatively and quantitatively predominant role in the royal Library and more generally in the policy of cultural hegemony pursued by the Ptolemies, and it is no wonder that Attic 'themes' became increasingly *en vogue* among Hellenistic poets.¹ It is unsurprising, therefore, that already in the first half of the 3rd century BCE we can see evidence attesting to an enduring interest in Attic vocabulary and idioms as a distinct niche within Greek lexicography at large (consider, for instance, the case of Aristophanes of Byzantium's and Ister's Ἀττικάι λέξεις: cf. Sections 2.2 and 4.1 respectively).

This chapter will continue to trace the development of Hellenistic lexicography on Attic down to the first half of the 1st century BCE – that is, before the proliferation of the treatises *Περὶ ἑλληνισμοῦ* (starting with Philoxenus, Tryphon, and Seleucus), which reflect a partially different cultural climate: *ἑλληνισμός* persists in referring to an abstract notion of linguistic correctness (that is, not to the correctness of a given dialectal variety, the Attic as the more prestigious literary one), but the first signs of a more prescriptive attitude are discernible, even if they are still qualitatively different from the fully fledged prescriptivism of Impe-

¹ For the marked interest in matters Attic by Hellenistic poets, see the still seminal paper by Hollis (1992).

rial Atticism.² This chapter, like the previous one, will be primarily ordered in a loosely chronological way: some forays into Atticist doctrine will be made when useful for highlighting the main continuities and divergences between this phase of Hellenistic lexicography and its later reception in the Roman era. In the first part of this chapter, we shall survey the engagement with Attic and its grammar, from a lexicographical perspective, on the part of the two philological giants of the mature Hellenistic age, both heirs to Eratosthenes' scientific method of linguistic research: his pupil Aristophanes of Byzantium (Section 2), author of a lexicographical work entitled *Λέξεις*, with a subsection specifically dedicated to Attic idioms (*Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις*, Section 2.1) and Aristarchus of Samothrace who, although he did not write a stand-alone lexicographical oeuvre, showed a marked interest in Attic language mainly within the framework of his studies on comedy and Homer (Section 3).

The majority of the first part of this chapter will thus be given over to Aristophanes' *Λέξεις* (Section 2.1) for several sound reasons. Aristophanes' *Λέξεις* are for us the first product of Hellenistic lexicography that is preserved in a quantitatively and qualitatively appreciable form. While the work's inner organisation and ultimate goal remain partly unclear, the sheer richness, variety, and quantity of the extant material (transmitted by both direct and indirect tradition – a unique case within Alexandrian studies on lexicographical matters)—make it the first sizable corpus of Hellenistic lexicography that is conducive to a continuous and sustained enquiry. Aristophanes' *Λέξεις* therefore represents the inevitable point of departure for any study on the context, purpose, and shape of mature Hellenistic reflection on lexicographical matters. In addition to these extra-textual considerations, and more importantly, the 'open' interpretative nature of Aristophanes' lexicographical work as a whole warrants an extended treatment. A distinctive feature of Aristophanes' *Λέξεις* is their receptivity to multiple linguistic dimensions (the spoken vernacular alongside the literary language, the 'high' register of literature and the 'lower' one of the contemporary *συνήθεια*, the attention to regional and diachronic variations in vocabulary and morphology, etc.). It is this openness, which does not impose the straitjacket of an all-encompassing agenda, that qualifies Aristophanes' *Λέξεις* as belonging conceptually to a phase of reflection on language not yet predominantly or uniquely centred on those authors and language phenomena that will later become the core elements of the Atticist 'canons'.

Having dealt with Aristophanes of Byzantium's lexicographical work and Aristarchus' reflection on the Attic dialect and its import for Homer's language,

2 On ἑλληνισμός in the second half of the 1st century BCE, see Pagani (2015, 816–8). Cf. also Chapter 6, Section 2.

the second part of the chapter will focus on two parallel phenomena: (i) the appearance, from the 3rd century BCE onwards, of autonomous or semi-autonomous works (that is, subheadings of larger lexicographical works) dedicated specifically to Attic vocabulary (Section 4) and (ii) what we call ‘lexicography in a minor key’: isolated reflections by grammarians and scholars on Attic (literary and spoken vernacular) within a broader framework (often but not only in oeuvres entitled *On Dialects*) (Section 5). As for (i), in our sources, these stand-alone collections are variously entitled Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις or γλῶσσαι (sometimes also Ἀττικά ὀνόματα or Περί τῆς Ἀττικῆς λέξεως).³ As we shall see, even if the titles of these works clearly announce a marked and specific interest in Attic vocabulary, the centrality of this interest does not typically prevent their authors from making occasional references to other dialects (literary and non-literary). Most saliently for us, with the partial exception of Crates of Athens (cf. Section 4.4), who probably belongs to the end of the chronological spectrum investigated here (the second/first half of the 1st century BCE), these remarks almost invariably do not presuppose an internalised ranking order among the Greek dialects: the overall impression is that of a descriptive framework aimed at recording and documenting the linguistic possibilities offered by a given dialect (in this case, Attic) rather than at prescribing an authoritative list of ‘chosen’ words.

For (ii), the state of preservation of these isolated remarks, all invariably from the indirect tradition, does not allow us to reconstruct with any certainty (and, at times, even probability) the overarching scope of these lexicographical works. Quite often, however, the comparative nature of their observations reveals an ‘open’ approach to Attic as one of the many possible Greek dialectal varieties. Finally, we shall conclude the chapter with a concise overview of the kinds of contribution that anonymous Hellenistic lexica or onomastica on papyri can bring to our understanding of the processes by which Attic linguistic material was transmitted within the later lexicographical tradition (Section 6).

2 Aristophanes of Byzantium

Aristophanes of Byzantium (ca. 265/57–190/80 BCE) is legitimately considered by ancient and modern scholars to be a product of the most mature phase of Alexandrian scholarship on the basis of both the range of his interests (textual criticism, bibliography, lexicography, paroemiography, and paradoxography, to quote just

³ On this terminological interchangeability between λέξεις and γλῶσσαι in early Hellenistic scholarship, see Chapter 6, Section 3.1.

a few) and the varieties of authors and genres (prose and poetry) that are the objects of his philological inquiries.⁴ We shall focus here on just a single aspect of Aristophanes' multifarious scholarly activity, his lexicographical inquiries, mainly (though not uniquely) represented by his *Λέξεις* (Ar.Byz. fr. 1–353).⁵ Our approach to Aristophanes' *Λέξεις* will necessarily be highly selective, since there is virtually no single fragment of this work in which matters Attic (in whatever form they may appear: literature quotations – prose and verse –, contemporary linguistic usage, explanation of local realia, cultic customs, etc.) do not feature, if only as a point of comparison with other linguistic customs. We have chosen, therefore, to begin with a brief sketch of the content and range of linguistic observations present in the *Λέξεις*, highlighting, where possible, points of convergence and divergence with the later Atticist traditions (Section 5.1). This targeted introduction, while obviously very partial, provides the framework within which we may take a closer look at what is probably one subsection of Aristophanes' lexicographical work, though not transmitted to us by the direct tradition, that is, the *Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις* (Ar.Byz. fr. 337–47: Section 5.2), before we can attempt to draw some general conclusions (Section 5.3).

2.1 Aristophanes' *Λέξεις*: Scope and structure

In Chapter 6, Section 2, we traced the emergence of Hellenistic lexicography and individuated three main areas of research: the explanation of literary glosses; a marked interest in dialectal words (and their underlying realia), within a framework which validates both literary texts and non-literary sources (read contemporary vernacular, koine included); and technical expressions. All three fields of inquiry find ample representation in Aristophanes' *Λέξεις*: in this sense, already in antiquity, Aristophanes was appropriately regarded as the culmination of a lexicographical tradition that could already rely on the work of Zenodotus, Callimachus, and Eratosthenes.⁶ While thus continuing a time-honoured practice with

⁴ For a comprehensive, updated survey, see Montana (2020b, 191–204) (= Montana 2015, 118–26), and more concisely, Montana (2021b).

⁵ We shall address Aristophanes of Byzantium's acquaintance with some of the tenets of word-class theory only when germane to our inquiry regarding his perception of the Attic dialect. On Aristophanes' knowledge of some form of rudimentary word-class theorisation, see the useful syntheses by Pagani (2011, 45–8) and Matthaios (2014a); a detailed analysis of the development of the word-class theorisation by Alexandrian grammarians in general is offered by Matthaios (2002).

⁶ For this intellectual, and partly biographical (Callimachus as teacher of Aristophanes) continuity (Zenodotus > Callimachus > Aristophanes), see Montana (2021b) on *Su. α 3933*.

illustrious predecessors, the Λέξεις at the same time represent a new point of departure in Hellenistic lexicography, not only by virtue of the sheer richness of linguistic observations and range of authors treated by Aristophanes.⁷

Prior to discussing the work's overall structure and scope, it is important to acknowledge that Aristophanes' Λέξεις represent, within Hellenistic lexicography, an absolute *unicum* in terms of textual transmission: it is the only scholarly work that has been handed down to us by both direct and indirect transmission (paraphrases or quotations mainly from the later lexicographical tradition: Eustathius *in primis*).⁸ In principle, this situation should simplify our task (comparison between the direct and indirect tradition should help us to reconstruct the *ipsissima verba* of Aristophanes); however, there are various reasons as to why this is often not the case. All three MSS transmitting Aristophanes' Λέξεις (M, L, and P)⁹ date to the 14th century, and a comparison with Eustathius' text clearly reveals that each represents a strongly epitomised and abridged copy of Aristophanes' original work, which was still accessible in a much more complete form to Eustathius himself in the 12th century. It is often difficult, therefore, and unavoidably speculative to establish when the contribution of the indirect tradition (e.g. explicit quotations by Eustathius and Erotianus, implicit borrowings in the *Antiatticist*, etc.) expands on the subject, drawing on original material that is no longer available to us via the direct tradition, and when these same later sources simply fill in the gaps of our documentation out of their own resourcefulness. This uncertainty constitutes the circumstances that any attempt at reconstructing the original form and intent of the Λέξεις must confront from the outset. Moreover, this is why, as we shall see repeatedly in Section 5.2, a range of multiple interpretations must often be simultaneously entertained, depending on the plausibility of the various transmission scenarios that one posits. Furthermore, some secondary sources, as we have already seen in Chapter 6, Section 2 with the case of the *Antiatticist*, have their own agendas to promote, and it is not uncommon for later authors to attempt to superimpose, consciously or unconsciously, their conceptual framework onto Aristophanes' original wording: the possibility of implicit bias must also be consistently borne in mind, alongside the usual accidents of any *Überlieferungsgeschichte*.

Let us return to the content and underlying organising principle(s) of Aristophanes' Λέξεις as preserved to us by the direct tradition. The MS M (= Par. suppl.

⁷ The best overall introduction to Aristophanes' Λέξεις remains that by Tosi (1994a, 155–67).

⁸ See the overview by Slater (1986, xii–xviii) on the sources and transmission of Aristophanes' Λέξεις.

⁹ P, the only witness available to Nauck (1848), comes from a tradition partially different to that of ML: see Slater (1986, xiv).

gr. 1164), our fuller witness, presents the following series of chapters: it opens with a section entitled *Περὶ τῶν ὑποπτευομένων μὴ εἰρησθαι τοῖς παλαιοῖς* (*On Words Suspected not to Have Been Used by the Ancients* = *OWS*; Ar.Byz. fr. 1–36),¹⁰ followed by two other sections, respectively *Ὄνόματα ἡλικιῶν* (*Names of Age Groups*: Ar.Byz. fr. 37–219) and *Περὶ συγγενικῶν ὀνομάτων* (*On Names of Kinship*: Ar.Byz. fr. 220–336); there follow several lexical items that are clearly out of the intended order but equally traceable back to Aristophanes' work (Ar.Byz. fr. 230–40, 245, 309–11, and 330–1).¹¹ It is immediately apparent that, at least in the form preserved by M, Aristophanes' *Λέξεις* had a composite structure: first *OWS*, without a recognisable overarching order (certainly not alphabetical; possibly partly organised in series of words sharing semantic or morphological features)¹² and a second part organised according to onomastic principles (Ar.Byz. fr. 37–336). The nature of the first section of M, that is, *OWS*, has been and still is a matter of intense debate in modern scholarship: Slater (1976, 236–7, 241; 1986, *passim*) has seen in *OWS* an anti-purist work, devoted to collecting evidence of the 'Classical' nature of words otherwise somehow not recognised as 'ancient', while Callanan (1987, 75–89), who denies a prescriptive or proto-purist intent to the *Λέξεις* as a whole, has rejected any chronological dimension for this subsection and has seen in it the application of a rather loose 'semantic character' as the main organising principle.¹³

10 There is no guarantee that the title transmitted by M goes back directly to Aristophanes of Byzantium: the very phrasing (insistence on an opposition between *παλαιοί* and *non-παλαιοί*) may well have been a later addition; see Callanan (1987, 77–8).

11 L (= Laur. 80.13) preserves only the section *Ὄνόματα ἡλικιῶν*, this time with the title *Περὶ ὀνομασίας ἡλικιῶν* (*On the Nomenclature of Age Groups*). P (= Par. gr. 1630) preserves under the generic rubric *Ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοφάνους τοῦ περὶ λέξεων διαλαβόντος* (*[Excerpts] from those Works of Aristophanes Giving his own Interpretation of Expressions*) various lexical items overlapping with *OWS*, *Names of Age Groups*, and *On Kinship Names*.

12 Cf. Tosi (1994a, 166–7); Montana (2020b, 198) (= Montana 2015, 124). Series exhibiting etymological and/or semantic affinity: Ar.Byz. fr. 6 (*μοιχί, μοιχίς, μοιχαλῖς, μοιχίδιον**), 9 (*ἐπικοκκάζω, ἐπικηκάζω*, ἐπικοκκαστρία**), 15 (*βαυβᾶν, βαυβαλίζω*, συοβαύβαλος*), 16 (*βλακεύεσθαι, βλάξ*, βλακεύειν*, βλάκες, βλακικῶς**: for a similar sequence in *Antiatt.* β 4, see Fiori 2022, 168–75), 18 (*ἄρδα, ἀρδαῶσαι*), 20 (*κοκκίζω, κόκκυξ, κόκκυ, κοκκυβόας*, ὄβριοκόκκυξ*), 23 (*στίμις, στίμι, στίβη**), 24 (*μαγίς, μάγειρος*), 29 (*λεπύχανον, λόπισμα*), 32 (*μόμφος, μομφή*, μομφίς**), 34 (*ἐπικύλλωμα, κατακύλλωμα*); series with similar morphological pattern: Ar.Byz. fr. 19 (*ἐσχάζοσαν, ἐλέγοσαν, ἐφεύγοσαν, ἐγράφοσαν**), 25 C (*γερόντοις, παθημάτοις*), 28 (*ἀπόστα, κατάβα, ἀνάβα*, διάβα**: on a very similar sequence in *Antiatt.* α 99, see Tribulato 2014, 207; see also Chapter 5, Section C.1.5.1).

13 Callanan's denial (Callanan 1987, 75–82) of any awareness of a diachronic dimension in Aristophanes of Byzantium's linguistic reflections has been rightly rejected not only by Tosi but also by Ax (1990, 13–5); Pagani (2011, 37 n. 81 and 48 n. 121); Nünlist (2012a, 154 n. 10); F. Montanari (2012, 124). Cf. also Willi (2014, 66). Where Callanan is right, is in pointing out that in Aristophanes the category of *οἱ παλαιοί vel sim.* is somehow underdetermined, encompassing authors whose lifetimes stretch over centuries and cutting across different genres. On the awareness of Alexan-

Tosi framed the possible underlying purposes of Aristophanes' λέξεις in a more nuanced way that does better justice to the varieties of linguistic observations and 'open' nature of Aristophanes' reflections on language.¹⁴ Tosi rightly observed that, while some fragments do appear to argue for the 'Classical' attestation of words that, by some quarters, must have been objects of suspicion, possibly because they did not apparently have a 'Classical' pedigree, others do not fit into this simple Classical vs non-Classical opposition and reflect instead a wider interest in language (primarily, but not exclusively, literary language) *per se* as a medium of communication. An intention to demonstrate the 'Classical' nature of single lexical items is, for instance, clearly discernible in Ar.Byz. fr. 3,¹⁵ where we are informed that Aristophanes defended the appropriateness of calling Athenian female citizens Ἀθηναῖαι like their male counterparts. The direct tradition does not tell us against whom Aristophanes may have reacted in defending the use of Ἀθηναῖα, but we know from later Atticist sources (esp. Ael.Dion. α 43 ~ Phot. α 466, *Su.* α 729; Phryn. *PS* fr. 8) that Megaclides, a Peripatetic grammarian of the second half of the 4th century BCE, was among those who rejected the use, for Athenian women, of Ἀθηναῖα as disrespectful towards the deity and recommended instead the use of ἀσπί or Ἀττική. As far as we can see, Megaclides' censure was not motivated by concerns of linguistic correctness (like the Atticists) but rather by local piety. In this case, too, it is the indirect tradition only (Phot. α 466) that allows us to recover the *auctoritates* quoted by Aristophanes to motivate his more flexible approach (followed by *Antiatt.* α 2–3 and the milder Atticist Orus in fr. B 4b): not only the Old Comedy poets Pherecrates (Pherecr. fr. 24) and Cantharus (Canthar. fr. 5) but also the 4th-century BCE Philemon (Philem. fr. 69), and hence New Comedy, were adduced as evidence. The same intention to defend a word as 'Classical' may also be inferred from other fragments: this is the case, for example, for Ar.Byz. fr. 5 ἄσιλλα ('yoke for basket'), with the citation of a Simonidean epigram (of debated authenticity);¹⁶ for Ar.Byz. fr. 8 καταφαγᾶς ('glutton'; P: καὶ καταφαγᾶς, ὁ ἀδηφάγος), a word

drian scholars that language evolved through time, see Lallot (2011) and Nünlist (2012a) (mainly on Aristarchus).

14 See above all Tosi (1994a, 155–62; 202–4); cf. also Tosi (1994b); Tosi (1997). Tosi's conclusions are shared by S. Valente (2015b, 31–4). What follows in this section is heavily indebted to Tosi (1994a).

15 P reads ὅτι ἐστὶν Ἀθηναῖα γυνή, ὥσπερ Ἀθηναῖος. For the indirect transmission, see esp. Phot. α 466 and the relevant passages of Eustathius, extensively quoted by Slater (1986, 6–7).

16 On the authenticity of Sim. *ep.* 35 Sider = 41 *FGE*, see Sider (2020, 158–9). ἄσιλλα is otherwise attested only in Alciph. 1.1.4 (Hemsterhuys' emendation) and in the lexicographical tradition (cf. Hsch. φ 311: φέριμα· ἄς ἐνιοὶ ἀσίλλας τὰς ἐκ σχοίνων πλεκομένας, καὶ ἰχθυηρὰ ἀγγεῖα, οἷον σπυρίδια (Men. fr. 468.2)). The compound ἀσιλλοφόρος is attested in documentary papyri of the Hellenistic (e.g. P.Lond. 44.32 = TM 3399) and Imperial era.

censured by Phryn. *Ecl.* 402 and by Poll. 6.40 but defended by the *Antiatticist* (κ 104) quoting Men. fr. 320 (perhaps already mentioned by Aristophanes of Byzantium?); and most likely also for Ar.Byz. fr. 1 σάννας ('idiot'), a word that Eustathius includes among the unusual terms (ἀσυνήθης/καινόφωνος λέξις),¹⁷ and Ar.Byz. fr. 26 τάγηνον· τὸ τήγανον (a kind of frying pan), where Aristophanes probably recorded the less usual form τήγανον (censured by later Atticists: e.g. Phryn. *PS* 112.11, Moer. τ 3) alongside the more frequent τάγηνον. Other fragments more broadly attest Aristophanes' interest in semantic change, without a specific purist or anti-purist agenda. This appears to be the case for στεγανόμιον in Ar.Byz. fr. 7. While part of the direct tradition (M) simply records the word's two possible meanings, both otherwise unattested in extant Classical Greek – that is, ἀριστητήριον ('refectory, dining-hall') and ὁ μισθὸς τοῦ πανδοκείου ('the payment of the inn')¹⁸ – Eustathius tells us that Aristophanes apparently distinguished between the Attic and the koine (παρ' ἡμῖν) usage (Eust. *in Od.* 2.73.42–3: προφέρει δὲ [. . .] καὶ τὸ στεγανόμιον, ὃ δηλοῖ, φησί,¹⁹ παρ' ἡμῖν μὲν τὸν τόπον ἐν ᾧ ἐστῶνται, παρ' Ἀττικοῖς δὲ τὸν μισθὸν τοῦ πανδοχείου).²⁰

Another set of fragments records an interest in semantic extension: this appears to be the case with μεγαλοψυχεῖν (Ar.Byz. fr. 11 A), which, Aristophanes tells us, may also be used in a negative sense, as a synonym for 'to be arrogant' (M: τὸ μεγαλοψυχεῖν τάττουσι καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ ὑπερφανεύεσθαι);²¹ or with ἄρχειν (Ar.Byz. fr. 12), also used in the sense of τυραννεῖν (M: τὸ ἄρχειν· καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ τυραννεῖν), and πλεονεξία (Ar.Byz. fr. 13), with a quotation from Isoc. 15.281–4 to illustrate that πλεονεξία (usu-

17 On the meaning of ἀσυνήθης/καινόφωνος in this passage of Eustathius, denoting not a chronological level but the unusual nature of an expression, see Tosi (1994b) on Ar.Byz. fr. 6.

18 Ar.Byz. fr. 7, M: στεγανόμιον· τὸ ἀριστητήριον καὶ ὁ μισθὸς τοῦ πανδοχείου. P reads only καὶ στεγανόμιον.

19 Slater (1986, 9) unsuccessfully tries to defend the transmitted φασί vs Nauck's φησί: cf. Tosi (1990–1993, 303).

20 This interpretation holds only if παρ' ἡμῖν does in fact refer to the Hellenistic koine and not to Eustathius' contemporary συνήθεια (which may or may not coincide with it). Previous scholars have taken παρ' ἡμῖν as part of Aristophanes' *ipsissima verba* rather than an intrusive aside from Eustathius. This seems plausible overall, given that part of the direct tradition (M) already refers to the two different meanings. It remains questionable, however, whether the phrasing παρ' Ἀττικοῖς may go back to Aristophanes: it sounds very much like Eustathius' own paraphrase, imposing his own conceptual framework on Aristophanes' original wording. For a detailed analysis of this most interesting fragment, see Bühler (1968, 236–8). It is highly likely that Aristophanes quoted what is now for us Men. fr. 455. On στεγανόμιος see Chapter 4, Section 4.2.

21 The same applies for the noun μεγαλοψυχία, Ar.Byz. fr. 11 B.

ally meaning ‘greed’) can also have a positive meaning, that of εὐπορία (‘advantage’).²² Likewise, also in Ar.Byz. fr. 31, Aristophanes, most probably drawing on Eur. Cyc. 104,²³ records an extension of the use of the adjective δριμύς (‘piercing’) to designate the intellectual quality of being ‘sharp-witted’ (M: δριμύ· καὶ τὸ συνετόν). The same applies to Ar.Byz. fr. 35 (= Eust. in Od. 2.155.2–5), where Aristophanes, in disagreement with other scholars,²⁴ defends the use of ἐπιστάτης (literally ‘one who stands upon another person’, ‘overseer’) as synonym to παιδοτριβῆς (‘gymnastic teacher’).²⁵ Finally, when Aristophanes quotes morphological or semantic doublets, he typically does so without passing judgement: rather, he simply records the common form alongside the less common one.²⁶

As observed by Tosi (1994a, 162), the overall impression is that of a product and conceptual framework ‘molto lontani dal rigoroso purismo impositivo della futura lessicografia postfrinichea’. This impression is further corroborated, as many scholars have observed, beginning with Fresenius (1875, 15–7), by the fact that the *Antiatticist* seems to use Aristophanes of Byzantium’s Λέξεις repeatedly, particularly the section OWS, in fighting his cause against the hyper-purist trends

22 The case of ψευδολογία (Ar.Byz. fr. 14) is slightly different because here it is the same Isocrates in his *Panathenaic Oration* (Isoc. 12.246) who already explicitly speaks of a ψευδολογίας, οὐ τῆς εἰθισμένης μετὰ κακίας βλάπτειν τοὺς συμπολιτευομένους, ἀλλὰ τῆς δυναμένης μετὰ παιδείας ὠφελεῖν ἢ τέρπειν τοὺς ἀκούοντας.

23 Cf. Eust. in Od. 1.110.46–7: Εὐριπίδης γὰρ, ἐπὶ συνετοῦ εἶρηκε τὸ δριμύ ὡς λέγει Ἀριστοφάνης ὁ γραμματικός.

24 See Callanan (1987, 105) on the target of Aristophanes’ polemical remark (οἱ πολλοὶ) [. . .] ἀγνοοῦσι in Eustathius’ text. The ‘majority’ knew only two meanings of ἐπιστάτης: ‘prot-stand’ and ‘beggar’ (a Homeric usage): [. . .] ἐπιστάτης ἐπὶ μόνου τοῦ χυτρόποδος δοκεῖ τοῖς πολλοῖς τάττεσθαι καὶ τοῦ μεταιτητοῦ (see Tosi 1997, 171 n. 2 rightly in favour of emending Eustathius’ μεταιτητοῦ (the Byzantine Greek form) into μεταίτου, as already observed by Nauck 1848, 215 n. 51).

25 For the relationship of Ar.Byz. fr. 35 with *Antiatt.* ε 100: ἐπιστάτης· ἀντὶ τοῦ διδάσκαλος ὁμολογουμένως. Ἀντίφρανης (Antiph. fr. 306), see Tosi (1997, 71–2) and Benuzzi (2023b).

26 Semantic doublets: see e.g. Ar.Byz. fr. 29 AB on λεπύχανον καὶ λόπισμα (the skin of the onion: in later texts it is used as a generic term for the external rind or shell of legumes, pomegranates, and other vegetables), where both the direct (M) and indirect traditions (Eust. in Od. 2.201.8–10) simply juxtapose the two forms. Morphological doublets: Ar.Byz. fr. 6 AB μοιχή, μοιχίς (fr. 6 C μοιχαλῖς* is probably Eustathius’ addition; the terms are commented upon by Aristophanes as ἀσυνήθη, probably referring to literary συνήθεια: see Tosi 1994b), 25 AB and D (δόκος and δόκησις; βάδος and βάδισις; πρόσωπος and πρόσωπον), 32 AC (μόμφος, μομφή*, μόμφις*); on heteroclis in 5th and 4th century BCE comic language, see Chapter 5, Section B.2.11. On Ar.Byz. fr. 23 AB (στίμις, στίμι) see Chapter 6, Section 2. For morphological doublets in the Homeric text and Aristophanes’ attitude to it (etymology as the decisive factor), see Callanan (1987, 23–4) on Ar.Byz. fr. dub. 418 ἄεπτος (on Il. 1.567); cf. also Chapter 6, Section 4.3.

of his own time.²⁷ A detailed survey of these convergences (very often with a polemical intent) between Aristophanes of Byzantium and the *Antiatticist* is beyond the scope of this chapter.²⁸ We shall limit ourselves to noting that the sheer quantity of these similarities (the *Antiatticist* helps us to recover 15 fragments (plus 3 uncertain) out of the 36 constituting Aristophanes' *OWS*) weakens *a fortiori* the case of those who have argued in favour of a proto-atticist Aristophanes of Byzantium.

If we concentrate exclusively on *OWS*, it becomes apparent that the authors enlisted to illustrate the respectable pedigree of words were far more varied than those that we may find, for instance, in Phrynichus.²⁹ In *OWS*, if we accept Slater's conjectural attributions marked by an asterisk,³⁰ we have 42 quotations of comic poets (*adespota* included). Of these 42 citations, 37 come from Old Comedy (Aristophanes, Cantharus, Cratinus, Eupolis, Hermippus, Pherecrates, Phrynichus, Plato Comicus, Teleclides, and Theopompus; with Aristophanes representing the majority of quotations: 8x) and Doric comedy (Epicharmus 1x); 9 from Middle and New Comedy (Middle: Alexis 1x; Eubulus: 1x; New Comedy: Diphilus 2x, Menander 3x, Philemon 2x); 3 are *adespota*. As expected, comic poetry plays a prominent role in assessing linguistic usage, but Aristophanes of Byzantium's 'list' of good authors interestingly also includes representatives of New Comedy like Menander, who would instead be much criticised by strict Atticists, such as Phrynichus.³¹ Furthermore, in *OWS* we find quotations not only from poets but also from prose authors:³² Demos-

27 See above all Tosi (1994a, 162–6); Tosi (1997); S. Valente (2015b, 31–4) with previous bibliography. Cf. now also Fiori (2022, 26–9) and *passim* for the many individual entries of the *Antiatticist* where the anonymous compiler likely draws on Aristophanes of Byzantium's Δέξεις.

28 S. Valente (2015b, 31–2 n. 193) provides an updated list of the entries where the *Antiatticist* most likely is borrowing from Aristophanes' lexicographical oeuvre.

29 See Tribulato (2024) on comic citations in Phrynichus.

30 These are Alex. fr. 231 in Ar.Byz. fr. 15 C* (βαυβαλίζω) and Telecl. fr. 68 in Ar.Byz. fr. 32 C* (μόμφις).

31 On Phrynichus' marked dislike for Menander, see Tribulato (2014). For Aristophanes of Byzantium's fondness for Menander and his scholarly activity on him, a notorious *crux*, see the balanced assessment by Montana (2007).

32 We know that Aristophanes worked on Plato, see Ar.Byz. fr. 403 (= D.L. 3.61–2): he grouped Plato's dialogues into trilogies (instead of tetralogies). The exact nature of Aristophanes' scholarly activity on Plato is debated: a critical edition or a classificatory activity of the type to be assumed in his Πρὸς τοὺς Πίνακας τοῦ Καλλιμάχου? The latter seems much more likely: cf. Carlini (1972, 18). For Aristophanes' engagement with Epicurus, see Ar.Byz. fr. 404 (= D.L. 10.13): κέχρηται δὲ λέξει κυρία κατὰ τῶν πραγμάτων, ἦν ὅτι ιδιωτάτη ἐστίν, Ἀριστοφάνης ὁ γραμματικὸς αἰτιᾶται ('[Epicurus] uses standard diction for things, a diction with which Aristophanes the grammarian finds faults because it is highly idiosyncratic'). Slater (1986, 158) takes Aristophanes' criticism as a general critique of the koine, but it seems more probable that what Aristophanes found peculiar and not commendable (if αἰτιᾶται is a faithful representation of his opinion) was the use of

thenes (56.3) is mentioned by Aristophanes in support of the equivalence γόμος = φόρτος τῆς νεώς ('cargo') in Ar.Byz. fr. 27,³³ as too is Hyperides (Hyp. fr. 42 Jensen) in Ar.Byz. fr. 6 D* for the diminutive μοιχίδιον,³⁴ Isocrates in Ar.Byz. fr. 11A (Isoc. 15.281–4) and 13 (= Isoc. 12.246) for the unusual meaning, respectively, of μεγαλοψυχεῖν/μεγαλοψυχία and πλεονεξία in given contexts (on which see above); and Thucydides (Thuc.1.42.1) in Ar.Byz. fr. 33 for ἀμύνεσθαι as synonymous to ἀμείψασθαι ('to answer', 'to reward') – all 'respectable' prose authors. However, we also have two quotations from the more linguistically problematic Xenophon (see Chapter 4, Section 5.1): in Ar.Byz. fr. 16, Xenophon is mentioned for some form in βλακ- (it is uncertain which one), and in Ar.Byz. fr. 17 he is quoted as *auctoritas* for the compound σπανοσιτία (X. *HG* 4.8.7) glossed with ἡ τῶν τροφῶν ἔνδεια ('lack of food').³⁵

Furthermore, in *OWS*, Aristophanes does not limit himself to quoting only Classical authors but also quotes from contemporary Hellenistic writers:³⁶ Callimachus fr. 224 Pfeiffer is invoked by our scholar in Ar.Byz. fr. 25 A to support the 'seriousness' of the form δόκος 'opinion',³⁷ alongside the well-attested δόκησις, and Lycophron's *Alexandra* 21 is mentioned in Ar.Byz. fr. 19 A for the koine form

κύρια ὀνόματα in a technical, philosophical sense (that is, in a transferred way). For Hellenistic scholarship on prose authors (mostly historians), see Nicolai (1992, 265–75); Montana (2020b, 167–9) (= Montana 2015, 95–97); Montana (2020a) (Didymus and historians); Matijašić (2018, 147–60). Prose authors were mainly used as source of linguistic and factual knowledge (*Sprachphilologie* and *Sachphilologie*, i.e. *realia*) to help in the interpretation of literary texts: cf. Nicolai (2015, 1092–3).

33 Slater (1986, 23) comments that 'perhaps the aim of the note was to show that γόμος was used of ships rather than beasts of burden: both are Hellenistic usages'. This observation can be further qualified. Lee (1983, 62) has shown that it is only from the *Septuagint* onwards that γόμος begins to be used of any load, no longer restricted to a nautical usage. A comparison with Ar.Byz. fr. 7 allows us to entertain the possibility that Aristophanes might originally have drawn attention to this shift in usage between 'Classical' authors (γόμος referred only to the freight of a ship) and later ones (γόμος extended to any 'weight', 'burden').

34 If indeed *Antiatt.* μ 18 (μοιχίδιον· τὸ ἐκ μοιχοῦ γεγεννημένον. Ὑπερείδης ἐν τῷ Κατὰ Ἀριστοφῶντος) preserves here genuine Aristophanic material.

35 In the 4th century BCE, the word is also epigraphically attested: cf. *IG* 2³.1.367.9–10 (325/4 BCE).

36 On the interest of the Alexandrian scholars toward contemporary poetry, F. Montanari (2002) with previous literature is still an important point of reference; cf. also Montana (2020b, 170–1) (= Montana 2015, 97–8).

37 Cf. Eust. in *Od.* 1.340.27–8: καὶ οὐδέν τι τούτων, φησί, πεπαιγμένον ἐστίν, ἀλλὰ πάντα ἐσπούδασται. In *Et.Gen.* B s.v. Σκείρων (see Callanan 1987, 24; this piece of evidence is omitted by Slater 1986) we are told that Aristophanes of Byzantium, against Callimachus (fr. 296 Pfeiffer), spelled the personal name with ει rather than ι. In Ar.Byz. fr. 48 E, Call. fr. 543 Pfeiffer is quoted for the use of ἀπόθριξ = ἄνηβος.

of the third-person plural imperfect ἐσχάζουσιν erroneously interpreted by Aristophanes as a dialectal feature of the Chalcidians.

A dialectal interest also emerges in Ar.Byz. fr. 25 C, where Aristophanes cites the athematic dative plural in -οις γερόντοις (Attic γέρουσι) and παθημάτοις (Attic παθήμασι) as shorthand for the Aetolian dialect (a variety of Northwest Greek). Slater (1986, 21), while recognising, following Meineke, that the source of παθημάτοις is likely to be a comic passage (*com. adesp.* fr. 182 μὴ καταγελάτε τοῖς ἐμοῖς παθημάτοις), suggests that γερόντοις ‘must come from an official letter of the Aetolian league to Miletus’. However, Latte (1933, 402–3 n. 3), taking up a suggestion by Fraenkel, had already persuasively argued in favour of a comic attribution for Μιλασίοις καὶ τοῖς συναρχαῖαις καὶ τοῖς γερόντοις: we know of no γερουσία in Miletus, and the speaking character must have been an Aetolian mixing things up. There is no need, then, to see in Ar.Byz. fr. 25 C a direct use of inscriptional evidence on the part of Aristophanes of Byzantium.³⁸

Attention to non-literary dialects is also well represented outside *OWS*: for example, we are told that the Cyreneans called the ephebes τριακάτιοι (Ar.Byz. fr. 47), the sons of sons ἄμναμοι (Ar.Byz. fr. 235), and brothers ἀγαλάκται (Ar.Byz. fr. 236) and that the Rhodians called their illegitimate sons ματρόξενοι (Ar.Byz. fr. 232).³⁹ A string of Cretan glosses is recorded in Ar.Byz. fr. 48 A–F (ἀπόδρομος, ἄπιχθος, ἄποινος, ἀποβώμιος, ἀπόμουσος, ἀπόθριξ, ἀπόμαχος) and in Ar.Byz. fr. 233 B (the Cretans use the term σκότιοι to indicate τὰ νεώτατα παιδία, ‘the youngest children’). Ar.Byz. fr. 49–50, if authentic (they are missing in M and in Eustathius), preserve an Achaean and a Thracian gloss for ἐφηβοί and in Ar.Byz. 103, the form ἄπτιγος (of Anatolian origin) is said to be the Ionic word used to indicate a male goat (M: παρὰ δὲ Ἰωνικοῖς). Furthermore, Ar.Byz. fr. 348–53⁴⁰ transmit a series of Laconian words, apparently of non-literary provenance, which, according to our indirect sources, were part of a work (or, perhaps more likely, a subchapter of his *Λέξεις*) entitled Λακωνικαὶ γλῶσσαι (Ath. 3.77a and 3.83a).⁴¹ Finally, in the recently published treatise *On Prosody*, that shows direct knowledge of and dependence from Tryphon’s doctrine (1st century BCE), Sandri (2023b) has been able to recover a further piece of information about Aristophanes of Byzantium. At l. 92 of this treatise, preserved by the 14th-century cod. Par. gr. 2646, one may now read: (Ar. Byz. fr. novum Sandri): κάνθον· Ἀριστοφάνης βαρύνει ἐν τῇ περὶ τῆς τῶν Ἀλεξαν-

³⁸ This conclusion is shared also by Dyck (1989, 259).

³⁹ If our interpretation of ἄμβων in Ar.Byz. fr. 337 (Ἀπτικαὶ λέξεις) is correct (see Section 2.2), Aristophanes also recorded the Rhodian ἄμβωνες = ‘projecting crests of mountains’.

⁴⁰ Callanan (1987, 87 n. 27) adds the case of γεροντίας in Eust. *in Il.* 3.590.9. See also the Laconic glosses ἰπτεῖς, and ἰππαγρέται in Ar.Byz. fr. 55–6.

⁴¹ Cf. Hsch. π 3175: ἐν ἐξηγήσει Λακωνικῶν.

δρέων διαλέκτου (‘κάνθον (‘eye): Barytone, according to Aristophanes in his *On the Dialect of the Alexandrians*).⁴² That Aristophanes wrote a treatise *Περὶ τῆς τῶν Ἀλεξανδρέων διαλέκτου* is not otherwise attested, and it may simply be a scribal error, as suggested by Sandri herself (we would have expected Demetrius Ixion to have authored such a work: see Section 4.2) but an Aristophanic authorship cannot be ruled out either.⁴³ The notion of an Alexandrian dialect is itself quite elusive and has been variously interpreted (a local variety or, more likely, a particular diastatic register of the koine).⁴⁴ However, the fact that this late Byzantine codex ascribes such a work to Aristophanes of Byzantium shows a perception of Aristophanes’ activity that is in keeping with what we have observed so far in his *Λέξεις*: attention not only to the *Kunstsprache* of literary texts, whatever their genre, but also to the spoken language of his own time, whether koine (e.g. στεγανόμιον Ar.Byz. fr. 7) or local vernaculars (e.g. Cyrenaic, Cretan, Ionic, Laconic, Rhodian, and obviously Attic).⁴⁵

How, then, should we consider Aristophanes’ approach to language issues in the *Λέξεις* overall? It is important here to reiterate a distinction already highlighted by Callanan (1987, 103–6): that is, that while studying the *Λέξεις*, we should consistently try to distinguish between Aristophanes’ role in the development of theoretical reflections on normative grammar and the contribution that he made, if any, towards the emergence of strictly prescriptive, Atticist tendencies.⁴⁶ This distinction

42 As argued by Favi (forthcoming b), the point of highlighting the paroxytone accentuation of the word under discussion (κάνθος instead of κανθός) probably lies in κανθός being an exception to the analogical rule that we find formulated later in [Arcad.] *De prosodia catholica epitome* 174.1–4 Roussou: τὰ εἰς ΘΟΣ δισύλλαβα μονογενῆ ἔχοντα τὴν πρὸ τέλους συλλαβὴν εἰς σύμφωνον καταλήγουσαν βαρύνεται. πτόρθος, γόνθος (ὁ κόγχος), γρόρθος (τὸ ἐπὶ τῆς αὐλήσεως), σμίνθος (ὁ μῦς). τὸ δὲ ξανθός καὶ τυτθός τριγενῆ.

43 Aristophanes’ interest in accentuation, although not ample, is however attested: see Sandri (2023b, 92–3) with further bibliography.

44 See Favi, Tribulato (2024) and Favi (forthcoming b); cf. Section 4.2.

45 This was already clearly thematised by Pfeiffer (1968, 202), following Wackernagel’s brief comments in Wackernagel (1876, 56–7).

46 This distinction is not taken into full consideration by Ax (1990) in his most interesting discussion of the alleged normative analogical tendencies of Aristophanes as attested, in his opinion, by Varro, *De Ling. Lat.* 9.12: = Ar.Byz. fr. 374 Slater *artifices egregii non reprehendundi, quod consuetudinem [. . .] superiorum non sunt secuti, Aristophanes improbandus, qui potius in quibusdam veritatem quam consuetudinem secutus?* According to Ax this passage attests that Aristophanes intervened prescriptively in the *συνήθεια* of his day (see also Pagani 2015, 808). The Varro passage obviously deserves a fuller treatment than what we can offer in this chapter. Let us only make some brief remarks: (1) in *quibusdam* is an important limitation which must not be forgotten; (2) there is *consuetudo* and *consuetudo*: we have seen that *συνήθεια* can be used with reference to both literary and contemporary spoken language; (3) Varro has just pitched the artists

is of fundamental importance for our purposes. We have already seen (Chapter 6, Section 2) that any theoretical reflection on grammar as a system inevitably implies a normative component, which is proper to any language at any given time, if one considers grammar as a complex whole of interrelated parts. Yet to automatically equate this stance to the wholesale adoption of a prescriptivist agenda, anticipating that of later Atticist lexicographers, is a misconceived operation. From this perspective, it is also important to observe that later sources (esp. Eustathius, as we have already seen) often paraphrase Aristophanes' linguistic observations by unconsciously recasting them into current Atticist terminology and evaluative parameters ('correctness' or 'incorrectness'), using terms such as ὀρθότερον or ἀμαρτάνειν (see e.g. the case of στίμις/στίμι in Ar.Byz. fr. 23 AB discussed in Chapter 6, Section 2). However, it is highly unlikely that Aristophanes of Byzantium ever used such terminology himself. We can identify clear examples of this (un)conscious alteration, particularly when we are able to compare direct and indirect tradition. This is the case, for instance, for Ar.Byz. fr. 282 (παράνυμφος/ παρανυμφίος), which belongs to the section of the Λέξεις entitled Περί συγγενικῶν ὀνομάτων in our MSS. This is Eustathius' text:

Ar.Byz. fr. 282 (= Eust. *in Il.* 2.351.3–6): [. . .] καὶ ὅτι παρώνυμος τῇ νύμφῃ ὁ νυμφίος, καὶ ὅτι ὁ παράνυμφος εἰκαιότερον οὕτω λέγεται. ὀρθότερον γάρ ἐστι παρανυμφίον καλεῖσθαι τὸν συναπάγοντα τῷ νυμφίῳ τὴν νύμφην ἢ πεζῇ ἢ ἐφ' ἀμάξης ὡς παρ' Ἀθηναίους ὑφ' ὧν καὶ πάροχος καλεῖται κτλ.

[One must also know] that νυμφίος ('bridegroom') derives from νύμφη ('bride') and that παράνυμφος ('the bridegroom's best man') is so called rather carelessly. For it is more correct to call παρανυμφίος him who, together with the bridegroom, carries off the bride either by foot or on a wagon as the Athenians do, who call him also πάροχος, etc.

Eustathius' ὀρθότερον may raise an alarm: is Aristophanes here being prescriptive in an Atticist sense? If we turn to the direct tradition (MS P), we read the following: καὶ παράνυμφος κυριώτερον δὲ παρανύμφιος.⁴⁷ Thanks to P, we can see that Eustathius' ὀρθότερον is an Atticist rendering of Aristophanes' far more neutral (at least from an evaluative point of view) κυριώτερον. Aristophanes was thus not proscribing παράνυμφος and prescribing παρανυμφίος; he was simply saying, in a descriptive way, that the latter form, in terms of what we would call derivational morphology, was 'more proper' because he analysed the word, ety-

Apelles and Protogenes against other earlier artists (Micon, Dioces, Arimmas). Analogy would require that Aristophanes is here pitched against not οἱ πολλοί but his peers, that is, scholars: we are dealing with a comparison between different scholarly habits.

47 For the difference in accents between P and Eustathius, see Nauck (1848, 148–9).

mologically, as from ὁ παρὰ τῷ νυμφίῳ.⁴⁸ Callanan has already shown that the use of κυρίως, ἀκύρωσ, κυριώτερον and related expressions in Aristophanes of Byzantium must not be confused with the more rigorous use of the ‘correct/incorrect’ categories of the Atticists.⁴⁹ The qualification κυριώτερον indicates in a matter-of-fact way that the a word can be used in its primary (κυρίως) or derivative/secondary (that is, transferred: ἀκύρωσ) meaning: the former is not *per se* ‘more correct’ than the latter; both are equally possible (and admissible) within the wider linguistic glide. In the case of Ar.Byz. fr. 282 we should thus not speak of ‘analogistisch normierende Absicht’.⁵⁰ Aristophanes’ intention was far simpler – to draw attention to extant morphological anomalies or doublets without censuring them.

In sum, the impression that one gets of Aristophanes’ Λέξεις in general, and of *OWS* in particular, is that of a work that is receptive to multiple linguistic dimensions: the majority of lexical items studied do belong to the literary language of ‘old’ authors, but we also find the literary usage of quasi-contemporaries (Callimachus, Lycophron), the spoken vernacular (Cretan, Rhodian, Laconian), the ‘high’ register of literature in all its genres (comedy – Old, Middle, and New – oratory, historiography), and the ‘lower’ register of the contemporary συνήθεια, with attention to semantic and diachronic variations in vocabulary and morphology. These are all features that are consistent with an ‘open’ phase of linguistic reflection, appropriate to the early Hellenistic period, when Attic, although undoubtedly a prestige language with an unrivalled literary tradition behind it, was not yet the overwhelming predominant or unique object of scholarly endeavour. Aristophanes’ Λέξεις, from Pfeiffer (1968, 203) onwards, have typically been regarded as a work subsidiary to the edition of texts. This may well be part of the story, yet the range of linguistic interests exhibited by Aristophanes, and particularly his attention to contemporary language and local dialects, appear to us to also suggest a broader ‘documentary’ scope: to record, mostly in an impartial way, what the available evidence tells us about language in general, not only with an eye to the edition of texts. From this perspective, the relatively ‘open’ approach to language underlying the Λέξεις becomes more easily understandable.

Before moving to a closer analysis of the Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις, let us briefly consider one further passage (Ar.Byz. fr. 369) that, though not belonging to the Λέξεις but

⁴⁸ See Callanan (1987, 25; 48).

⁴⁹ Callanan (1987, 103–4): ‘Auch an der einzigen Stelle, an der Aristophanes einen vergleichbaren Verstoß gegen seine semantischen Distinktionen dem Volk ankreidet, bezeichnet er den Sprachgebrauch lediglich als ἀκύρωσ. Er empfiehlt nicht den streng unterscheidenden attischen Gebrauch der Wörter, sondern notiert ihn nur’.

⁵⁰ Thus Callanan (1987, 112).

to Aristophanes' Πρὸς τοὺς Πίνακας Καλλιμάχου (*In Addition to Callimachus' Pinakes*),⁵¹ is highly revealing of Aristophanes' open approach to language issues.⁵² Fr. 369 is a passage from the synonymic lexicon Περί ὁμοίων καὶ διαφόρων λέξεων ascribed to Herennius Philo (1st BCE/1st century CE)/Ammonius,⁵³ where the use of the adverbial forms εὐθύ (usually spatial: 'straight forward') and εὐθύς (usually temporal: 'immediately') is discussed.⁵⁴ The text, as established by Federica Benuzzi (2022b), reads as follows:

Ar.Byz. fr. 369 = Herenn.Phil. 81 ([Ammon.] 202 = *Et.Gud.* d^l 556.1–3, d² 556.24–8, 557.14–20; ~ Ptol.Ascal. *Diff.* 390.20–3 Heylbut): εὐθύς, εὐθύ καὶ εὐθέως διαφέρουσι. εὐθύς μὲν γὰρ ἔστιν ὁ κανὼν, εὐθύ δὲ το<ῦ> γυμνασίου, ἀντὶ τοῦ κατ'εὐθείαν τοῦ γυμνασίου, ἢ εὐθεῖ τῷ κανόνι. τὸ δ'εὐθέως ἀντὶ τοῦ χρονικοῦ ἐπιρρήματος, ὁ οὖν ἐναλλάσσω ἀμαρτάνει, καθὰ καὶ Μένανδρος ἐν Δυσκόλῳ· τί φήσ; ἰδὼν ἐνταῦθα παῖδ' ἐλευθέραν | ἐρῶν ἀπῆλθες εὐθύς; <εὐθύς.> ὡς ταχύ'. καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης ὁ γραμματικὸς ἐν τῷ Πρὸς τοὺς Πίνακας Καλλιμάχου περὶ Ἀντιφάνους διαστέλλει τὴν λέξιν. τινὰς μέντοι τῶν ἀρχαίων φησὶ καὶ τὸ εὐθύ (mal. Benuzzi: εὐθύς codd.) ἀντὶ χρονικοῦ κεχρηθῆσθαι. φησὶ γοῦν κατὰ λέξιν· 'δεῖ δὲ τὸ μὲν εὐθύ λέγειν ἐπί τινος εὐθέος, οἷον ἂν μὲν ἦ θῆλυ τὸ ὄνομα <ἢ εὐθεῖα ὁδός>', ἢ εὐθεῖα βακτηρία', ἂν δὲ ἄρσεν 'εὐθύς ὁ κανὼν', ἂν δὲ τὸ σὺδέτερον καλούμενον 'εὐθύ τὸ ξύλον'. οἱ δὲ ἀρχαῖοι ἐνίστε τὸ εὐθύ ἐτίθεσαν ἐφ' ὁδοῦ τῆς τεινούσης ἐπὶ τινα τόπον· <εὐθύ τῆς στοᾶς, εὐθύ τῶν ἀρωμάτων>'. τὸ δὲ κατὰ <τοὺς χρόνους οὐ λέγεται, ἀλλ' εὐθύς, οἷον 'γῆμαντος αὐτοῦ δ'> εὐθύς ἔσοι' ἐλευθερός· καὶ 'ὡς τοῦτ<ο> δ'> εἶδεν, εὐθύς ἦν τάνω κάτω'.

Εὐθύς, εὐθύ and εὐθέως are different. Indeed, εὐθύς ('straight') is [said of] the ruler, while [you can say] 'εὐθύ ('straight') to school' in the sense of 'on a straight road to the school', or 'with a straight ruler'. εὐθέως, instead, [is used] as a temporal adverb. Therefore, the person who swaps them makes a mistake, also like Menander in the *Dyscolus* (Men. *Dysc.* 50, 52): 'What are you saying? You saw a girl there, from a respectable family, | and you immediately fell in love?' <'Immediately'>. 'How fast!'. And the grammarian Aristophanes in the book *In addition to Callimachus' Catalogues* (Ar.Byz. fr. 369) in the section on Antiphanes defines the term. Indeed, he says that some of the ancients also used εὐθύ in a temporal sense. He literally says: 'One needs to use εὐθύ with regard to a straight object, for instance, if the name is feminine, 'the straight (εὐθεῖα) road', 'the straight (εὐθεῖα) cane', while if the noun is masculine 'the straight (εὐθύς) ruler', and if the noun is neuter 'the straight (εὐθύ) log'. And the ancients sometimes used εὐθύ in relation to a road that leads towards a place: 'straight (εὐθύ) to the portico' (*com. adesp.* fr. *79), 'straight to the spice sellers' (Eup. fr. 327.3). But εὐθύ is not used for time, while εὐθύς is, for instance: 'If he marries, I will be free at once' (*com. adesp.* fr. 249). (Translation by Benuzzi 2022b, slightly modified).

51 For this rendering of the title, see Nickau (1967, 346 n. 3).

52 This part relies heavily on the excellent article by Benuzzi (2022b).

53 For this double attribution, see Savio (2023).

54 In the Atticist tradition proper, with the exception of *Antiatt.* ε 96, this distinction becomes a rigid prescription: cf. Phynr. *Ecl.* 113, Moer. ε 11.

Prior to Aristophanes, Eratosthenes had discussed, probably in his work *On Ancient Comedy*, the temporal and spatial usages of εὐθύς and εὐθύ in relation to the authenticity of Pherecrates' *Miners* (see Chapter 6, Section 5.3).⁵⁵ The bone of contention appears to have been whether the use of the neuter adverbial εὐθύ in a temporal sense ('immediately') might have been deemed acceptable. The textual transmission of our fragment is highly complex and almost certainly corrupt in various respects (through abridgements, epitomisation, etc.), as remarked by all previous commentators. On the basis of a systematic analysis of the occurrences of εὐθύς, and εὐθύ in 5th- and 4th-century BCE literature and of the internal consistency of the passage of Herennius Philo/Ammonius, Benuzzi has persuasively argued that τὸ εὐθύς ἀντὶ χρονικοῦ κεχρηθῆσθαι must be emended into τὸ εὐθύ ἀντὶ χρονικοῦ κεχρηθῆσθαι. That is, in a section relative to the 4th-century BCE comic poet Antiphanes, Aristophanes of Byzantium, possibly within the context of a debated authorship, would have recognised that, even if the general rule was to use εὐθύς in a temporal sense and εὐθύ in a spatial one, *some* ancient authors (τινὰς μέντοι τῶν ἀρχαίων), and possibly but not necessarily Antiphanes among them,⁵⁶ did use εὐθύ as an adverb of time ('immediately') rather than space ('straight forward').⁵⁷ Later Atticist doctrine will distinguish between a proper and improper use of the two adverbs: Phrynichus (Phryn. *Ecl.* 113)⁵⁸ draws a clear-cut distinction between εὐθύς and εὐθύ, without space for exceptions, and so too apparently does Photius (Phot. ε 2185).⁵⁹ Only the *Antiatticist* (*Antiatt.* ε 96:

55 The Eratosthenic fragments are Eratosth. fr. 46 (= Phot. ε 2203) and 93 Strecker (= Harp. μ 25). They both have been intensely studied: see Slater (1976, 235–7 and 241); Tosi (1994a, 169); Tosi (1998a); Tosi (2022).

56 In the extant fragments of Antiphanes, no occurrences of εὐθύ are known so far. In Antiph. fr. 189.8–12: ἄν πάλιν | εἶπη τις Ἀλκμέωνα, καὶ τὰ παιδιά | πάντ'εὐθύς εἶρηχ', ὅτι μανεὶς ἀπέκτονεν | τὴν μητέρ', ἀγανακτῶν δ' Ἄδραστος εὐθέως | ἤξει πάλιν τ'ἄπεισι ('And, if someone says, in turn, 'Alcmeon', even the children will say all [his story] immediately, that he went mad and killed his mother, and that Adrastus, in his fury, will immediately come and go away again'), εὐθύς and εὐθέως are used interchangeably.

57 See Benuzzi (2022b) for the disturbed order in which Aristophanes' fragment has come down to us in Herennius Philo/Ammonius (the part on adverbial εὐθύς and εὐθύ must originally have preceded – and not followed – the remark on the exceptional use of εὐθύ 'immediately' in some authors).

58 Phryn. *Ecl.* 113: εὐθύ· πολλοὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ εὐθύς, διαφέρει δέ· τὸ μὲν γὰρ τόπου ἐστίν, εὐθύ Ἀθηνῶν, τὸ δὲ χρόνου καὶ λέγεται σὺν τῷ σ (εὐθύ: Many use [it] instead of εὐθύς, but it is different. For one is [an adverb] of place, 'straight to Athens', while the other is [an adverb] of time and is said with the sigma').

59 Phot. ε 2185: εὐθύς λέγουσι καὶ εὐθέως· τὸ δὲ εὐθύ χωρὶς τοῦ σ ἐπὶ τόπου τιθέασιν ('They say εὐθύς and εὐθέως, but they use εὐθύ without sigma to indicate a place').

εὐθύ· ἀντὶ τοῦ εὐθέως) records as admissible the temporal value of εὐθύ, likely depending on Aristophanes of Byzantium to support his ‘eccentric’ position.

Aristophanes thus would have adopted a less rigid stance, particularly compared to that of his predecessor Eratosthenes, ready to deny to Pherecrates the authorship of the *Miners* because of the use of εὐθύ with temporal value. However, also in the case of Eratosthenes’ stricter approach, it is important to observe that Eratosthenes did not refute in absolute terms the use of εὐθύ in a temporal sense: he simply deemed it unsuitable for a play by a specific author – namely, Pherecrates, but possible and admissible in a play by the later comedian Nicomachus.⁶⁰ In fr. 369 Aristophanes of Byzantium seems thus to display a generally ‘open’ attitude to linguistic usage: while he recognises the most common usages of the literary συνήθεια, he also allows for some exceptions and deems it instructive to record them. In other words, in his *Πρὸς τοὺς Πίνακας Καλλιμάχου*, we find the same open, possibilist attitude to linguistic variation that we saw in his *Λέξεις*.⁶¹

2.2 Ἀττικαὶ Λέξεις

We shall now focus on Aristophanes’ Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις, a body of lexical items (frr. 337–47) that has come down to us only via the indirect tradition.⁶² The overwhelming majority of the fragments edited by Slater under this title have, in fact, been transmitted to us by Erotian, a grammarian and lexicographer datable to the mid-/second half of the 1st century CE, author of a *Glossary* of Hippocratic words.⁶³ It is

⁶⁰ Pace Slater (1976, 241; 237), who wants to see in the fragments of Eratosthenes just discussed a ‘strict Atticist’ *avant la lettre*. See Chapter 6, Section 5.3.

⁶¹ In the only other fragment certainly ascribable to *Πρὸς τοὺς Καλλιμάχου Πίνακας*, Ar.Byz. fr. 368 (= Ath. 9.408f) Aristophanes addresses an issue of usage/custom in Attic writers, with no particular linguistic implications (the custom of saying ‘(water) over the hand’ (κατὰ χειρὸς) before meals but ‘washing up’ (ἀπονίψασθαι) afterwards ([. . .] εἶοικε δ’ ὁ γραμματικὸς τοῦτο πεφυλαχένα παρὰ τοῖς Ἀττικοῖς κτλ.). Cf. also Ath. 9.410b: σημειωτέον δὲ ὅτι καὶ μετὰ τὸ δειπνήσαι κατὰ χειρὸς ἔλεγον, οὐχ ὡς Ἀριστοφάνης ὁ γραμματικὸς φησὶν ὅτι πρὶν φαγεῖν οἱ Ἀττικοὶ κατὰ χειρὸς ἔλεγον, μετὰ δὲ τὸ δειπνήσαι ἀπονίψασθαι. See also Slater’s comment: ‘Whether those whom Aristophanes attacked were poets or grammarians or both, we cannot tell, but evidently question of authenticity raised by Callimachus were at issue’ (Slater 1986, 135).

⁶² Aristophanes of Byzantium also concerned himself with Attic dialect in his Homeric studies: cf. schol. (Ariston.) Hom. *Od.* 2.294b1 (HM^a): ἐπιόψομαι Ἀττικὸν λῖαν φησὶν ὁ Ἀριστοφάνης τὸ ‘ἐπιόψομαι’ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐποπτεύσομαι, περιβλέψω (on which see Prauscello 2023, 262–3) and μάμμα/μαμμία in Ar. Byz. fr. 241 DE.

⁶³ For an up-to-date critical assessment of Erotian’s lexicographical work, see Perilli (2021).

unsurprising, therefore, that many (but not all) of the glosses ascribed to the Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις bear some relationship, directly or indirectly, to ancient medicine. Modern scholarship has disagreed as to (1) whether Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις is the title of a stand-alone work by Aristophanes of Byzantium, independent of his collection entitled Λέξεις⁶⁴ or the heading of a subsection of that very same work⁶⁵ and as to (2) which of Aristophanes' fragments not explicitly ascribed by our sources to the Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις may have originally belonged to it. Regarding the first question, Cohn (1881, 323–4), in the wake of Fresenius (1875), cogently demonstrated that the Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις are considerably more likely to have been the heading of a subchapter of Aristophanes' Λέξεις (that is, just like *OWS*, *On Kinship Names*, etc.) rather than the title of a stand-alone, independent work. The second issue (which of the extant fragments can be traced back to the Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις?) is a far more troublesome and ultimately unsolvable question (at least, based on present evidence) that cannot be addressed here in all its complexity and ramifications. In this section, therefore, for practical reasons, we shall follow Slater's ascription of the fragments to the subsection Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις; however, this must not be taken as our definitive judgement on the issue, which would deserve a thorough reassessment.⁶⁶

The title Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις is explicitly mentioned by Erotian three times (Ar.Byz. fr. 337, 338, and 342) and once in Athenaeus (Ath. 14.619b–c = Ar.Byz. fr. 340). In Ar.Byz. fr. 347 (= Hdn. Περὶ διχρόνων, *GG* 3,2.13.14–7) the MSS tradition reads ἐν Ἀττικαῖς διαλέξεσιν, most probably a scribal corruption of the original title, as already observed by Lehrs (1857, 359). Ar.Byz. fr. 339, 341, and 344, also transmitted by Erotian, were first ascribed to Aristophanes' Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις by Cohn (1881, 323). In his glossary, Erotian mentions Aristophanes of Byzantium eight times overall: three times (Ar.Byz. fr. 337, 338, and 342), as we have seen, with explicit reference to his Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις; in two other passages Aristophanes, without mention of the work, is said to have dealt with Attic usage (Ar.Byz. fr. 343 = Erot. α 142 and 345 = Erot. χ 4). Of the remaining three other mentions of Aristophanes by Erotian (Ar.Byz. fr. 339, 341, and 344), fr. 341, unknown to Nauck, was first added by Fresenius to Aristophanes' Λέξεις in general, and by Cohn to the Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις in particular; Ar.Byz. fr. 344 was also reclaimed by Cohn to the Attic section. As a matter of fact, Slater's (and previously also Cohn's) attribution of these three fragments to the Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις is mainly based on the claim that 'there is no certainty that any of the quotations from Aristophanes by Erotian are from any other work than the Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις. [. . .] I have therefore attributed all the eight glosses to the work on Attic glosses' (Slater 1986, xv). It is obviously correct to say that 'there is no certainty' that Erotian, or his source, did draw also on other sections of Aristophanes' lexicographical collection, or indeed on any other work of our grammarian. Yet previous scholars of Erotian (above all Strecker 1891, 276–9) have shown, with varying degrees of plausibility but with

⁶⁴ See Rohde (1870, 16 n. 1).

⁶⁵ See Nauck (1848, 76; 181–2); Fresenius (1875, 23–4); Cohn (1881, 323–4).

⁶⁶ Slater's selection is conservative compared to Cohn's additions to Nauck's initial *recensio*: see Cohn (1881, 288 n. 6 and 323).

an overall persuasive cumulative force, that Erotian in his original version must have consulted a larger corpus of Aristophanes' work than the sole subheading Ἀττικά λῆξεις.⁶⁷

That Erotian had direct access to Aristophanes of Byzantium's oeuvre has been rightly doubted.⁶⁸ Rather, it is far more likely that most of the Aristophanic material came to Erotian in an already mediated form through Baccheius of Tanagra (3rd century BCE, a younger contemporary of Aristophanes of Byzantium), most probably known to him in the version revised by Epicles the Cretan (1st century BCE).⁶⁹ This tortuous transmission history should be constantly kept in mind when interpreting Aristophanes' Ἀττικά λῆξεις: one of the most difficult tasks, as will presently become apparent, is in fact that of ascertaining which portions of the attested quotations go directly back to Aristophanes and which do not (this problem is most acute in the case of *Zitatennest*).

In the next part of this section, we shall analyse in some detail most of the fragments commonly ascribed to the Ἀττικά λῆξεις.⁷⁰ For each fragment, we shall first highlight its general relevance to our inquiry (contextual meaning, spread of occurrences, and general underlying argument), including, where possible, the survival of these Attic expressions in the later lexicographical tradition, with a special attention to the Atticist doctrine; we shall then proceed to the often laborious task of reconstructing, when feasible, the broader context of Aristophanes' linguistic reflections. For the readers' convenience, we shall print textual and interpretative minutiae either in footnotes or in a section in smaller font to facilitate a swifter consultation of this section for those not interested in the more fine-grained aspects of interpreting fragments.

2.2.1 Ar.Byz. fr. 337

Ar.Byz. fr. 337 concerns the term ἄμβη (Ionic)/ἄμβων (Attic), the name of the medical tool (a wooden board) used to reduce dislocated joints. One of our two indirect sources, Erotian and Apollonius of Citium, a 1st-century BCE author, ascribes

⁶⁷ Cf. also Manetti (2015, 1143 n. 81).

⁶⁸ See Strecker (1891, 279) 'Dass Erotian seine Werke selbst geplündert hat, wird wohl niemand glauben'. Cf. already Nauck (1848, 78).

⁶⁹ Strecker (1891, 279–91) is still fundamental. For Erotian's knowledge of Baccheius' work in the abridged version by Epicles, see van Staden (1992, 551; 553–6). On the strong presence of Aristophanes of Byzantium's λῆξεις in Baccheius, see Manetti (2015, 1143–4); van Staden (1992, 567–9). On Erotian's presence in Hesychius, see Perilli (2008).

⁷⁰ We shall omit: Ar. Byz. fr. 339 ἰθρίσσει(ν)† (= Erot. θ 6) because too textually uncertain, and fr. Ar. Byz. 343 προκῶνια (= Harp. π 96), and 344 φορίνης (= Erot. φ 17), which are less significant from a merely linguistic perspective (fr. 343 deals with cultic Athenian realia; fr. 344 with possible synonyms for φορίνη 'thick skin').

this piece of information to Aristophanes' Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις (Erotian). Both Erotian and Apollonius offer three competing explanations of ἄμβων while discussing Baccheius' interpretation of the term: (1) the projecting crest/slope of a mountain (as in Aeschylus but also in Rhodian epichoric usage); (2) the rim at the very outer edge of the hollow part of a shield (Democritus); and (3) a pan's outer rim (comedy). The main challenge in this fragment is to try and extrapolate what is likely to be genuine Aristophanic material within a multi-layered *Zitatennest*. We shall argue that not only the first explanation of the term ἄμβων ('the projecting crest/slope of a mountain') but also (2) and (3), that is, 'outer rim of a shallow object', be it a shield or a pan, are likely to go back to Aristophanes of Byzantium. If our interpretation is correct, Aristophanes of Byzantium, in a section of his lexicographical work reserved for Attic glosses, recorded that not only Attic authors but also Rhodian speakers used the form ἄμβων (vs Ionic ἄμβη). It also illustrates the breadth of sources quoted by Aristophanes (local dialects; Aeschylus, Democritus, comedy). Furthermore, a further piece of evidence, the scholl. (Did.) in Hom. *Il.* 8.441a1 (A) and b2/a2 (T), makes it highly likely that Aristophanes of Byzantium first encountered the term ἄμβων not in Aeschylus (cf. Erotian) but in his Homeric studies. Finally, the observation of a common usage between dialects (one of them Attic)⁷¹ appears to reinforce the impression that for Aristophanes, as for other early Hellenistic scholars, Attic was simply one dialect among many, without the *a priori* privileged status that it would later acquire.

Ar.Byz. fr. 337 (= Erot. a 103): ἄμβη. [. .] ἡμεῖς δὲ τούτους πάντας παρατησάμενοι Βακχείω συγκατατιθέμεθα, ὅς ἐν τῷ τρίτῳ φησὶν ἄμβην καλεῖσθαι τὴν ὄφρυώδη ἐπανάστασιν. καὶ γὰρ οἱ Ρόδιοι ἄμβωνας καλοῦσι τὰς ὄφρυώδεις τῶν ὀρων ἀναβάσεις. μέμνηται τῆς λέξεως καὶ Αἰσχύλος καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης (codd.: ὡς Ἀριστοφάνης Nauck) ὁ γραμματικὸς ἐν ταῖς Ἀττικαῖς λέξεσι. †θήρσι† (Ἐπιθέρησης Meinecke) δ' ἐν β' τῶν Λέξεων ἄμβωνά φησι χεῖλος εἶναι σκεύους καὶ τῆς ἀσπίδος τὸ πρὸς αὐτῇ τῇ ἴτι. Ἀριστοφάνης δὲ ὁ κωμικὸς (sed lege Eupolis) ἐν Αὐτολύκῳ φησὶν· 'ἐπὶ καινοτέρας ιδέας ἀσεβῆ βίον (Hermann: ἀσέβιον codd.), ὧ μοχθηρός, ἔτριβες. | πῶς ὧ πολλῶν ἤδη λοπάδων τοὺς ἄμβωνας περιλείξας'. τουτέστι τὰ περὶ τοὺς ἄμβωνας⁷² χεῖλη. λέγεται δὲ οἷον ἀνάβη τις οὖσα.

71 Cf. Cohn (1881, 324 n. 87), commenting on Rohde's hypothesis of a whole work (that is, not only a chapter or subheading) entitled Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις: 'Quod vocem Rhodiacam ἄμβων Aristophanes ἐν Ἀττικαῖς λέξεσιν explicavit [. .], id Rohdei coniecturam minime adiuuat; ἄμβων enim et ab Atticis scriptoribus usurpatum est'.

72 Slater (but not Nachmanson) rightly puts ἄμβωνας between *obeloi* (perhaps considering it an intruded gloss?). Various solutions have been attempted: Olson (2017, 211) retains the transmitted text and translates, rather tautologically, with 'the parts around the *ambōnes* are the rims', while Ross (1971, 256 n. 29) perceives a confusion caused by the transference of sense of ἄμβων from 'bulge' to that of 'rim', 'lip'. The most satisfactory emendation proposed to date is that offered by

ἄμβη: [. . .] But we reject all these authorities (i.e. for the explanation of the term) and agree with Baccheius, who, in his third book, says that ἄμβη is the term for a projecting edge. For the Rhodians also call the projecting crests of mountains ἄμβωνες. Aeschylus mentions this expression (Aesch. fr. 103; 231) and so too the grammarian Aristophanes in his Ἄττικαὶ λέξεις. Ἰθέρσις† in the second book of his Λέξεις says that ἄμβων is the rim of a vessel, and, when referred to [the hollow of] a shield, the rim at the very outer edge. In the *Autolytus*, the comic poet Aristophanes [read Eupolis] says (Eup. fr. *60): ‘(A) You wretch spent your impious life on rather new-fangled forms. (B) What do you mean, you who have already licked the rims of many pans?’; that is, the parts around the ἰθέρσις† are the rims. It is so named as if it were some sort of ἀνάβη (‘rising’).

Apollonius Citiensis, *Comm. in περί ἄρθρων* p. 28.2–14 Kollesch–Kudlien: [. . .] ὁ Βακχεῖος τὴν ἐπὶ τοῦ μοχλοειδοῦς ξύλου λεγομένην ἄμβην ἐν τοῖς περὶ τῶν Ἱπποκρατείων λέξεων οὕτως ἐξηγεῖται ἰον† (del. Schoene: ὅτι Diels)· ‘ἐν ταῖς Λέξεσιν ἀναγέγραπται, ὡς (Schoene ex Erot.: ὡς ὅτι cod.) Ῥόδιοι ἄμβωνας καλοῦσιν τοὺς τῶν ὀρῶν λόφους καὶ καθόλου τὰς προσαναβάσεις’. καὶ διὰ τούτων φησὶν πάλιν· ‘ἀναγέγραπται δὲ καὶ ὡς ὁ Δημόκριτος εἶη καλῶν τῆς ἴτους τὴν τῷ κοίλῳ περικειμένην ὀφρὺν ἄμβην’. ἔχει δὲ παρ’ αὐτῷ καὶ οὕτως· ‘ἀναγέγραπται δὲ ὁμοίως ἄμβων τῆς λοπάδος τὸ περικειμένον χεῖλος. Ἀριστοφάνης· ‘ὁ πολλῶν λοπάδων τοὺς ἄμβωνας περιλείξας’. ταῦτα <τὰ> (add. Kollesch–Kudlien) κομιζόμενα μαρτύρια παντελῶς ἔστιν εὐήθη κεχωρισμένα, ὅτι Κῶοι τοὺς τῶν κλιμάκων ἀναβαθμοὺς ἄμβωνας καλοῦσιν, ὥστ’ εἰρησθαι τὴν ἐν τῷ ξύλῳ ὑπεροχὴν τοιαύτην εἶναι, ὁμοίαν ἀναβαθμῷ εἰς τὸ βάθος ἐκκοπήν ἔχουσαν.

[. . .] Baccheius in his *On Hippocratic Vocabulary* explains the so-called ἄμβη (that is, a protruding edge) on a lever-like board thus: ‘in the Λέξεις it is recorded that the Rhodians call ἄμβωνες the crests of mountains and in general rising projections’. And through the following examples, he says again: ‘it is also recorded that Democritus (Democr. Diels–Kranz 68 B 29) called the brow-like rim running around the hollow part of a shield ἄμβη’. He also says: ‘it is likewise recorded that the rim running around a pan is an ἄμβων. Aristophanes (read Eup. fr. *60): ‘he who licked around the ἄμβωνες of many pans’. The witnesses adduced here are completely silly, since they are separated from their relevant context. Who has undertaken this research should have instead put down to record this, that the Coans call the steps of ladders ἄμβωνες, with the consequence that the projection in the wooden board is said to be such because it has a downward cut-out similar to that of a step.

The term ἄμβων, of uncertain etymology, up to the 10th century CE has only a handful of attestations in extant Greek literature, leaving aside medical and lexicographical writings.⁷³ Both Erotian and Apollonius ultimately draw on the *On*

Strecker (1891, 283), followed by Wellmann (1931, 27 n. 1), that is, *τουτέστι τὰ περὶ τοὺς λοπάδας χεῖλη* (Strecker’s proposal is not mentioned either by Slater or Ross).

⁷³ Etymology: see *DELG* s.v. (either a loanword or somehow connected to ἀναβαίνω) and *EDG* s.v. (‘probably a loanword’). For the extant attestations of the term, see Ross (1971) and below. In Modern Greek ἄμβωνας means the ‘pulpit’ in a church, cf. Triantaphyllides *AKN* s.v. The underlying

Hippocratic Vocabulary by Baccheius of Tanagra who, in turn, depends on Aristophanes of Byzantium (Erot.: ἐν ταῖς Ἀττικαῖς λέξεσι; Apoll.: ἐν ταῖς Λέξεσιν), with the difference that, whereas Erotian adopts Baccheius' explanation of ἄμβων, Apollonius sharply criticises it. Likewise, both Erotian and Apollonius, when reporting Baccheius' opinion, present a threefold explanation of the term: (1) the projecting crest/slope of a mountain; (2) the rim at the very outer edge of the hollow part of a shield; and (3) a pan's outer rim (observe that (2) and (3) are somehow compressed together in Erotian).⁷⁴

For (1), both our sources mention the Rhodians, with Erotian quoting explicitly Aeschylus⁷⁵ and Aristophanes of Byzantium as *auctoritates*,⁷⁶ while Apollonius, though mentioning Aristophanes of Byzantium's Λέξεις, does not give any specific example. As for (2), Apollonius mentions Democritus (Democr. Diels–Kranz 68 B 29), whereas Erotian's text is clearly corrupt: for our purposes, suffice it to say that, though the text as transmitted by the MSS seems to mention a different source from that cited by Apollonius (whether Meineke's Ἐπιθέρησης or something else), the *interpretamentum* remains the same (outer rim of a shield).⁷⁷ For (3), both quote erroneously the comic poet Aristophanes rather than Eupolis as the author of the (same) comic passage adduced as example (only the second line is quoted by Apollonius), a sign that the mistaken ascription was perhaps already in Baccheius' text.⁷⁸ All subsequent lexicographical sources on ἄμβη/ἄμβων ultimately derive from Baccheius who, as we saw, relied on Aristophanes of Byzantium's (Ἀττικαῖ) Λέξεις (see Manetti 2009, 166): cf.

ing Hippocratic passage commented by Erotian and Apollonius of Citium has been identified with Hp. *Art.* 7 (= 4.88.19 Littré): ἄμβην δὲ ἐχέτω.

74 See already Wellmann (1931, 27), who rightly comments that something must be amiss in the text of Erotian since we would expect not Ἀριστοφάνης δέ but rather <καί> Ἀριστοφάνης δέ or ὡς καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης.

75 So also Hsch. α 3536: ἄμβωνες· αἱ προσαναβάσεις τῶν ὄρων. Αἰσχύλος Κερκύωνι (Aesch. fr. 103) καὶ Σισύφῳ (Aesch. fr. 231). Presumably, the details on the specific tragedies of Aeschylus in which the term occurred ('Aeschylus in his *Kerkyon* and *Sisyphus*') also go back to Aristophanes of Byzantium but were not preserved in the abridged extant version of Erotian's glossary.

76 Nauck (1848, 186), not implausibly, proposed emending the transmitted μέμνηται [. . .] καὶ Αἰσχύλος καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης ὁ γραμματικός into μέμνηται [. . .] καὶ Αἰσχύλος ὡς Ἀριστοφάνης ὁ γραμματικός (sc. ἔφη *vel sim.*). The parallelism καὶ [. . .] καὶ does indeed lead us to expect the mention, after Aeschylus, of another Classical author, and not that of a scholar; yet μιμνήσκω in Erotian's glossary can equally refer to an author proper or to a learned authority.

77 Meineke's Ἐπιθέρησης (second half of the 1st century CE, author of a work entitled Περὶ λέξεων Ἀττικῶν καὶ κωμικῶν καὶ τραγικῶν) has been accepted by Nachmanson (1918) and Wellmann (1931, 26–7); Wellmann, however, considers (2) in Erotian a later interpolation which must have substituted at an advanced stage Democritus' original quotation. More pessimistic is instead Strecker (1891, 283), who considers the passage 'unheilbar verdorben' and suggests seeing in ἐν β' τῶν Λέξεων a clumsy reference to Aristophanes of Byzantium's own Λέξεις.

78 See recently Olson (2017, 213) on the problem of the authorship of the fragment in question. In comedy ἄμβων occurs also in Ephipp. (4th century BCE) fr. 5.16 (said generically of the banks of an imaginary lake).

Ael.Dion. α 96 (from Eust. *in Od.* 1.353.2–5, who at the end of the excursus adds [Slater: by himself? Strecker: via Aristophanes of Byzantium?]) also the otherwise unattested meaning of female genitals: [. . .] ἐρρέθη δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ μορίου γυναικείου ὀ ἄμβων), Philox.Gramm. fr. *38, P.Oxy. 17.2087 (= TM 63597) ll. 38–9 (a 2nd century CE alphabetic glossary), Gal. *in Hp. Art.* 18a.340.10–8 Kühn and *Gloss.* α 76 Perilli (on which see Perilli 2006, 182–4 and Perilli 2017 *ad loc.*), Phryn. *PS* 18.3–5, Hsch. α 3536 (cf. also α 4213), Phot. α 1173–4, *Et.Gen.* AB α 613 (on which see below) ~ *EM* 81.9–5, [Zonar.] 142.3–7. Poll. 6.97 uses the term with reference to the Spartan drinking vessel κώθων, probably via Critias Diels–Kranz 88 B 34 (= Ath. 11.483c; cf. also Plu. *Lyc.* 9); on Pollux’s apparent misunderstanding of the term ἄμβων, see Ross (1971, 254). The lexicographical tradition is briefly surveyed by Olson (2017, 212–3); see also Ross (1971).

The present state of our evidence invites three main interconnected questions: (A) how far does the quotation of Aristophanes of Byzantium extend in the texts of both Erotian and Apollonius? Or, put otherwise, did Aristophanes mention for ἄμβων only the meaning (1), i.e. ‘projecting crest’ of a mountain⁷⁹ or did he include in his Δέξεις also the meaning (2), i.e. ‘outer circular edge of the concave part of a shield’, and (3), i.e. pan’s rim?⁸⁰ (B) Where did Aristophanes of Byzantium first encounter this word: in his lexical studies or in his Homeric exegesis? (C) What is the word’s dialectal veneer (Rhodian? Attic? Coan?).

Regarding the actual extension of the Aristophanic quotation (A), Slater does not explicitly motivate his decision, but limits himself to stating that ‘Nauck was correct to attribute only argument A [i.e. mountain’s crest] to Aristophanes’. Yet Strecker (1891, 282–3), followed by Wellmann (1931, 26–7), had already rightly observed that the threefold repetition, in Apollonius’ text, of ἀναγέγραπται (used the first time by Apollonius with explicit reference to Baccheius’ quotation from Aristophanes’ Δέξεις) strongly suggests that all the three meanings (1), (2), and (3), jointly recorded by Erotian and Apollonius, must ultimately go back to the Alexandrian scholar.⁸¹ The fact that Democritus is not otherwise mentioned in the extant fragments of Aristophanes of Byzantium is in itself not a sufficient argument against this conclusion: that Aristophanes was not entirely alien to philosophical prose is confirmed by his observation on the idiosyncratic nature of Epicurus’

79 So Nauck (1848, 186) tacitly, followed by Slater (1986, 113).

80 Cf. Strecker (1891, 281–2); Wellmann (1931, 26). See, also, more recently Olson (2017, 213): ‘Aristophanes of Byzantium must be responsible for the references to Aeschylus, Democritus and Eupolis (or Aristophanes)’, although he does not refer to either Strecker or Wellmann.

81 Strecker (1891, 283) also ascribed to Aristophanes the final pseudo-etymology preserved in Erotian’s text (λέγεται δὲ οἶον ἀνάβη τις οὔσα). Etymology is amply attested as one of the exegetical tools used by Aristophanes of Byzantium, yet there is no way of knowing whether the etymological explanation offered here antedated the Alexandrian scholar, as correctly observed by Slater (1986, 113). For the use of etymology as hermeneutical tool in Aristophanes’ Δέξεις, see *Ar. Byz.* fr. 24 AB on μαγίς, μάγειρος. Cf. also Callanan (1987, 97–102).

prose (Ar.Byz. fr. 404 = D.L. 10.13) and by his subdivision of Plato's dialogues into trilogies instead than into tetralogies (Ar.Byz. fr. 403 = D.L. 3.61–2).

As for (B), the comparison of our two main witnesses makes it abundantly clear that ἄμβων was a widely discussed term in antiquity, and not only among physicians (Erotian in his lemma mentions seventeen different authorities). This impression is corroborated by two further pieces of evidence. First, the scholl. (Did.) in Hom. *Il.* 8.441a1 (A) and b2/a2 (T) (both ultimately going back to Didymus) attest that at *Il.* 8.441 (ἄρματα δ' ἄμ βωμοῖσι τίθει, κατὰ λίτα πετάσσας) a certain Diogenes, who must therefore have antedated Didymus, favoured the variant reading (or conjecture?) ἄμβώνεσσι, against the *vulgata* ἄμ βωμοῖσι defended by Aristarchus.⁸² The contextual meaning of the ἄμβώνεσσι supported by Diogenes is not immediately clear,⁸³ but what is important for us is that this piece of evidence reveals that Aristophanes of Byzantium may have first encountered this word not while perusing Aeschylus (cf. Erotian and Hsch. α 3536) but in his Homeric studies.⁸⁴

Second, ἄμβώνεσσι, although not with reference to chariots, is also attested in Callimachus *Aitia* fr. 75.34 Harder ἐπ' οὐρεος ἄμβώνεσσιν,⁸⁵ that is, within Apollo's oracular response praising the illustrious Coan genealogy of Acontius, a descendant of the priests serving in the cult of Zeus Aristaeus the Icmian on Ceos. The fact that Callimachus, Aristophanes of Byzantium's teacher, opts to define ἄμβων as the 'rising projection of a mountain top' must certainly be put into the context of a learned debate existing around that very same word, a discussion already present in Homeric circles, as we have seen.⁸⁶ Does the Callimachean quotation mentioned in *Et.Gen.* α 613, an entry that would fit very well within the lexicographical tradition of ἄμβων, ultimately go back to Aristophanes of Byzantium?

⁸² Schol. (Did.) Hom. *Il.* 8.441a1 (A) <ἄμβωμοῖσι> οὕτως Ἀρίσταρχος 'ἴβωμοῖσι'. A^{im} ἐν τοῖς Διογένους ἄμβώνεσσι'. A^{im} and 8.441b2/a2 (T) ἄμ βωμοῖσι: διὰ τοῦ μ ἢ γραφή· ὅμοιον γάρ ἐστι τῷ 'ἄμ φόνον' (*Il.* 10.298). φησὶ δὲ 'ἐϋδημήτων ἐπὶ βωμῶν' (*Od.* 7.100). | Ἀρίσταρχος 'ἴβωμοῖσι', Διογένης 'ἄμβώνεσι' | τοῖς ἀναβαθοῖσι. The schol. (Did.) Hom. *Od.* 7.100d1 (HP¹) explains that 'Ὀμηρος γὰρ βωμοὺς τὰς βάσεις φησὶ: Aristarchus must thus have understood '[Zeus] puts the chariot on its supports' (cf. G. Busch, *Lfgre* s.v. ἄμβ(ων)).

⁸³ See Pagani (2014b).

⁸⁴ Cf. Rengakos (1993, 144); Olson (2017, 213).

⁸⁵ Cf. *Et.Gen.* α 613: ἄμβων· κυρίως τὸ χεῖλος τῆς λοπάδος· παρὰ τὸ ἐν ἀναβάσει εἶναι, οἶον· πολλῶν [. . .] περιλείξας (Eup. fr. *60). λέγονται δὲ καὶ οἱ ὄρεινοι καὶ ὑψηλοὶ τόποι, οἶον 'ἐπ' οὐρεος ἄμβώνεσσι' (Call. fr. 75.34 Harder). παρὰ τὸ βῶ βῶν, ὡς γηρῶ Γηρῶν, καὶ ἀνάβων, καὶ κατὰ συγκοπὴν ἄμβων. According to Reitzenstein (1897, 20 ll. 20–4), this entry of the *Et.Gen.* is derived from Methodius.

⁸⁶ See Harder (2012, vol. 2, 617).

tium too, via the mediation of Baccheius, also originally present in Aristophanes' Λέξεις?⁸⁷

The dialectal facies (C) of ἄμβων vs Ionic ἄμβη is difficult to ascertain: apart from Erotian, the only witness stating explicitly that ἄμβων is the Attic (masculine) form, while the Ionians use the feminine ἄμβη,⁸⁸ is Gal. *In Hp. Art.* 18a.340.17–8 Kühn (ἀρρενικῶς μὲν οὖν ἄμβωνας οἱ Ἀττικοί, θηλυκῶς δὲ οἱ Ἴωνες τὰ τοιαῦτα σχήματα καλοῦσιν ἄμβας).⁸⁹ We have also seen that according to Apollonius' text, the information that the Rhodians also use ἄμβωνες to refer to the rising tops of mountains (just as Aeschylus in Erotian and Hsch. α 3536) and projections in general, apparently derives from Aristophanes' Λέξεις.⁹⁰ Furthermore, always in Apollonius' text, but this time *outside* the Aristophanic quotation, Apollonius himself also mentions a Coan usage of ἄμβωνες to indicate the steps of a ladder.⁹¹ According to our sources, as we have seen, Aristophanes in his Λέξεις mentioned that ἄμβωνες instead of ἄμβη was used both by Rhodians and by Attic authors (tragedians and comedians), with Aeschylus apparently using the word in the same sense as the Rhodians. Overall, the situation is far from clear. However, if what we have reconstructed so far is correct, one thing stands out: Aristophanes of Byzantium mentioned that not only Attic literary authors but also Rhodian speakers used the form ἄμβων (vs Ionic ἄμβη). This remark of a shared linguistic usage between Attic and Rhodian⁹² goes in the same 'open' direction that we have seen in operation throughout Aristophanes' Λέξεις. For him, as for other early Hellenistic lexicographers, Attic was simply one dialect among many others that had not acquired the superior hierarchical position later sanctioned by the Atticist tradition.

⁸⁷ Callimachus is also quoted by Aristophanes of Byzantium in *Ar.Byz.* fr. 25 A (δόκος) and 48 E (ἀπόθριξ): see above Section 2.1. Slater is sceptical, observing that the Callimachean quotation in *Et.Gen.* may be a 'learned addition' since 'it has no obvious place in Attic vocabulary'. However, we have just seen that the notion of 'Attic vocabulary' of Aristophanes of Byzantium is often more capacious than expected.

⁸⁸ On ἄμβη as an Ionic word in ancient and modern scholarship, see Ross (1971, 246 n. 8).

⁸⁹ In terms of word formation, the etymology for ἄμβη/ἄμβων given in Erotian's text (λέγεται δὲ οἷον ἀνάβη τις οὔσα), may well be correct: see Bechtel (1924, 275), followed by Schwyzer (1939, 460), both interpreting ἄμβη as a backformation from ἀναβαίνω with apocope of the preposition and ἄμβων as a secondary modification of ἄμβη. On Galen's treatment of Ionic ἄμβη/Attic ἄμβων, see Manetti (2009, 165–6).

⁹⁰ A Rhodian gloss is also mentioned by Aristophanes of Byzantium in *Ar.Byz.* fr. 232 (ματρόξευος = 'illegitimate son').

⁹¹ How this may or may not relate to the Callimachean passage of the *Aitia* above quoted is unclear: see Harder (2012, vol. 2, 617) *ad loc.*

⁹² Cf. Cohn (1881, 324 n. 87); see above n. 71.

2.2.2 Ar.Byz. fr. 338

Ar.Byz. fr. 338, explicitly ascribed by Erotian to the Ἀττικάι λέξεις, deals with the word δίοπος ('overseer', 'commander', particularly of a ship), in support of which meaning, Aristophanes of Byzantium quotes from Aeschylus' *Sisyphus* (Aesch. fr. 232) and Euripides' *Hippolytus* (Eur. fr. 447). Etymology may have been one of Aristophanes' concerns while dealing with this lexical item (see the *Nachleben* of δίοπος in the Atticist tradition); likewise, it cannot be ruled out, but it cannot be proven either, that he intended to demonstrate that the word had a Classical pedigree (as he did for many entries of *OWS*). The extant occurrences of the term suggest that by the mid-4th century BCE δίοπος had already acquired a specialised nautical and mercantile meaning (the conveyor of the cargo, or more generally the overseer of the ship, cargo and crew included), and that at the time of Aristophanes (early 3rd century BCE) δίοπος was already being superseded by ἐπίπλους/ἐπίπλων. If the text of Erotian is sound and has not been drastically abridged, Aristophanes apparently did not quote the literary examples in Aeschylus and Euripides (Aesch. *Pers.* 44 and [Eur.] *Rh.* 741) in which δίοπος had the broader, transferred meaning of 'person in charge' *tout court* – that is, without specific reference to ships. This may suggest but does not prove that it was not morphology or orthography that identified the word as specifically Attic for Aristophanes and his readers but rather the term's use and semantic development within the Attic dialect. The word δίοπος has a place in the later Atticist tradition (particularly its etymology: the Pseudo-Demosthenic passage ([D.] 35.20, 34) quoted by Harp. δ 69 and Phot. δ 645 may or may not go back to Aristophanes of Byzantium), but we do not have any strictly prescriptive or proscriptive remarks on its usage.

Ar. Byz. fr. 338 (= Erot. δ 2): δίοψω· τῷ τῆς νηὸς ἐπιμελητῆι, παρὰ τὸ διοπτεῦειν. Ἀττικὴ δὲ ἡ λέξις, κειμένη καὶ παρὰ Ἀριστοφάνει ἐν Ἀττικαῖς λέξεσι καὶ παρὰ Αἰσχύλῳ ἐν Σισύφῳ καὶ Εὐρυπίδῃ ἐν Ἰππολύτῳ.

δίοψω: The captain of the ship, from διοπτεῦειν ('to keep watch'). The term is Attic, attested also in Aristophanes' Ἀττικάι λέξεις, in Aeschylus' *Sisyphus* (Aesch. fr. 232), and in Euripides' *Hippolytus* (Eur. fr. 447).

To the *loci classici* quoted by Aristophanes of Byzantium, already, Nauck (1848, 187) added Aesch. *Pers.* 44 βασιλῆς δίοποι (cf. also Aesch. fr. 269 ἀδίοπον = Hsch. α 1144: ἀδίοπον· ἀναρχον, καὶ ἀφύλακτον. Αἰσχύλος Φρυγί. δίοποι γὰρ οἱ τῆς νεῶς φύλακες ('ἀδίοπον: Without a leader, and unguarded. Aeschylus in the *Phrygians* (Aesch. fr. 269). For δίοποι are the guardians of the ship'); cf. *EM* 18.28) and [Eur.] *Rh.* 741: τίνι σημῆνω δίοπων στρατιᾶς (Portus: δίοπτων MSS.); on this latter see Fantuzzi (2020, 533). In prose, δίοπος is found in Hippocrates (2x: *Hr. Epid.* 5.74, 7.36 (= 5.246.13 and 5.404.9 Littré respectively) referring to the commander of a ship), Philo Iudaeus (3x: always metaphorically, twice with reference to the godhead, *Ph. De cherub.* 36: ὁ δίοπος καὶ κυβερνήτης τοῦ παντός λόγος θεῖος and *Ph. De spec. leg.* 4.200: τὸν δὲ πάντων ἔφορον καὶ δίοπον θεόν; once with reference to the priest Phinehas as 'the controller

of the inlets and outlets of the body' in Ph. *De post. Cain.* 183: ὁ τῶν σωματικῶν στομιῶν καὶ τρημάτων δίοπος), and once in Plutarch (Plu. *Rom.* 6.4: ἐπιστάτας δὲ καὶ δίοπους βασιλικούς) to indicate royal underlings at the time of Rome's early mythical monarchy.⁹³

Apparently, although its etymology was the object of attention in the later Atticist tradition, δίοπος was not a particularly contested word (we do not have positive prescriptions or proscriptions relating to it). In antiquity, two different etymologies were proposed, making the noun derive either from διέπω or from διοπτεύω/διοπεύω.

From διέπω: Harp. δ 69, cf. Paus.Gr. *δ 15 = Eust. *in Il.* 1.309.26: δίοποι· οἱ βασιλεῖς καὶ οἱ διέποντες; cf. also [Zonar.] 46.23 ἀδίοπον and *Lex. Synon.* α 40 Palmieri. From διοπτεύω/διοπεύω: Ael.Dion. δ 26 ~ Eust. *in Il.* 1.309.26–8: ὁ οἰκονόμος· Αἰσχύλος ἐν Σισύφῳ. καὶ ὁ τῆς νεῶς ἐπιμελητής, παρὰ τὸ διοπτεῦν ὡς ἐπισκοπῶν αὐτὴν καὶ ἐφορῶν. Ἀριστοφάνης δὲ ἐν Λημνίαις εἶρηκε καὶ 'ναυφύλαξ' (ὁ οἰκονόμος: Aeschylus in *Sisyphus* (Aesch. fr. 232) and also the caretaker of the ship, from διοπτεῦν, since he watches and oversees it. Aristophanes in the *Women from Lemnos* (= Ar. fr. 388) used also the word ναυφύλαξ); cf. Poll. 7.139. Both etymologies are mentioned by Galen (*Gal. Gloss.* δ 19 Perilli: δίοπ[τ]ος· νεῶς ἐπιμελητής, παρὰ τὸ διοπ[τ]εῦν ἢ διέπειν τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ), Photius (Phot. δ 644: δίοποι· βασιλεῖς. παρὰ τὸ δίοπτειν ἢ διοπτεῦν), and *EM* 278.7: δίοπος· ὁ βασιλεὺς, ἢ ὁ ἐπιμελητής καὶ ἐπόπτης, ἀπὸ τοῦ διέπειν· ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ διοπτεῦν, παρὰ τοὺς ὄπας κτλ).

Accordingly, its exact meaning was also discussed, see Phot. δ 645: δίοπος· ναυφύλαξ, ἄρχων, ναύαρχος, οὐχὶ πρῶρεύς, ὡς τινες νομίζουσιν· οὐ γὰρ ὡς προόπτης τις ὠνόμασται, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐπισκοπῶν καὶ ἐφορῶν. ἔστι καὶ παρὰ Δημοσθένει ὁ διϋθύνων τὴν ναῦν ('δίοπος: One who keeps watch on board of ships, the one in charge, the commander of a ship, not the officer in command at the bow [i.e. as opposed to that on the stern] as some think: for it has not been called so for his role of scout but because he watches over and oversees [the ship]). It occurs also in Demosthenes ([D.] 35.20, 34) to indicate the person who directs the course of the ship by steering)⁹⁴ and Harp. δ 69: διοπτέων· Δημοσθένης ἐν τῷ Κατὰ Λακρί-

⁹³ According to the *LGPn-Ling* online *Diopos* as a personal name is attested three times (see also <https://lgnp-ling.huma-num.fr/Diopos>): Plin. *NH* 35.152 (the name of a 7th-century BCE Corinthian potter), *IGDS* 112 (an artist's signature (*nomen ex arte?*) on an antefix with palmette decoration; ca. 560–550 BCE, from Camarina) and *BCH* 45 (1921) 16 III, 23 (Delphi, ca. 230–220 BCE). the Packard Humanities Institute database, however, also records a certain *Diopos* among the winners at the Coan Asclepeia: *IG* 12,4 2.453.65 (second half of the 3rd century BCE).

⁹⁴ In the Demosthenic corpus δίοπος occurs at [D.] 35.20 and 34, both times in the expression διοπτέων (Meursius: διοπτέων MSS) τὴν ναῦν. The speech *Against Lacritus*, commonly considered spurious on linguistic grounds, represents an important witness for the history of Athenian mercantile practice and naval contracts since it preserves numerous genuine documents: cf. MacDowell (2009, 262–3). The speech was written in ca. 350 BCE, and in any case, it cannot antedate

του (35.20). δίοπος λέγεται νεὼς ὁ διέπων καὶ ἐποπτεύων τὰ κατὰ τὴν ναῦν, ὁ καθ' ἡμᾶς λεγόμενος ἐπίπλους ('διοπτεύων: Demosthenes in *Against Lacritus*. The δίοπος of a ship is the person who is in charge and oversees the management of the ship, our so-called ἐπίπλους'). The evidence thus suggests that by the mid-4th century BCE, the term had already acquired its specialised nautical and mercantile meaning, although it is debated in modern scholarship as to whether it indicates the function of 'the conveyor of the cargo' – that is, a third party paid by the money-lenders with the role of ensuring that the vessel itself and its cargo were safely delivered,⁹⁵ or that of simple 'overseer' of the ship, cargo and crew, and hence almost synonymous with ναυφύλαξ.⁹⁶ What is certain is that the δίοπος was a co-navigator (συμπλέων), that is, a paid member of the crew on Athenian mercantile vessels, with specific duties onboard (however vague they may appear to us nowadays). By the 4th century BCE, it had become a technical term in Athenian naval commercial enterprise and sufficiently official to appear in maritime contracts (cf. [D.] *Against Lacritus* 35.20 and 34). It is reasonable, therefore, to infer that it was not its word formation (probably a back-formation from διέπω, cf. Hom. *Il.* 2.207: ὁ γε κοιρανέων διέπε στρατόν; 24.247: σκηπανίῳ διέπ' ἀνέρα; see Clay 1960 s.v.) or orthography that marked it as distinctively Attic but its use as a technical maritime term. Attic dramatists (tragedians) used the word repeatedly both in its 'nautical' sense (ὁ τῆς νεὼς ἐπιμελητής; Aesch. fr. 232 and 269; Eur. fr. 447) and in its broader meaning of 'person in charge', a usage probably still influenced by the context of the Homeric passages where διέπω occurs.⁹⁷ As we have seen, Attic oratory (Pseudo-Demosthenes; cf. also Phot. δ 645 and Harp. δ

the new mercantile law of 355 BCE: see MacDowell (2009, 262). Both sections of the speech in which the term δίοπος appears are part of the deposition of the witnesses: we are told that Herasicles was the helmsman of the boat (35.20: κυβερνᾶν τὴν ναῦν), Hyblesius its skipper (ἦν Ὑβλήσιος ἐναυκλήρει), and that Hippias 'sailed in Hyblesius' ship as its commander' (μαρτυρεῖ συμπλεῖν ἐν τῇ Ὑβλησίου νηὶ διοπτεύων τὴν ναῦν). The Demosthenic scholia have the following (schol. D. 35.20): διοπτεύων· ὁ δισπύων, εὖ ἐποπτεύων τὰ κατὰ τὴν ναῦν, οἷον δισπύος τις ὢν ('διοπτεύων: The one who administers it, overseeing with care what goes on in the ship, as if it were some sort of δισπύος').

⁹⁵ Thus, Gofas (1989, 426–7, esp. with n. 5), discussing the Demosthenic passages here quoted and defending Harpocration's assimilation of the δίοπος to the later term ἐπίπλους.

⁹⁶ As, for instance, does B. Bravo (1974, 168), followed by Vélissaropoulos (1980, 86): 'un membre de l'équipage d'un navire commercial, qui est l'aide du naukleros (du magister, en latin) et qui est chargé spécialement de veiller à la paix et à l'ordre à bord, de tenir les registres des quantités de marchandises que chacun des marchands naviguant sur le navire embarque et débarque aux divers ports, de faire en sorte qu'aucun des marchands à bord ne s'approprie une partie des marchandises appartenant à d'autres'.

⁹⁷ Cf. *Il.* 2.207 and 24.247 quoted above; see also *Lfgre* s.v. ἔπω 2b and cf. Aesch. *Pers.* 44: βασιλῆς δίοποι 'kingly commanders' (the word refers to Persian overlords: see Garvie 2009, 64 on the sub-

69) appears to use the term in a more technical way. Gofas (1989) has shown that δίοπος in its maritime meaning started being replaced by ἐπίπλους/ἐπίπλων as early as the 3rd century BCE.

Did Aristophanes of Byzantium in his Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις refer only to the poetic usages of the term (some of which, as we have seen, did anyway include a reference to a nautical activity of some sort) or did he quote also from the orators? The ensuing quotations of Aeschylus and Euripides in Erotian's entry may suggest the former case; it is not unlikely that by Aristophanes' time (see Gofas above) δίοπος' more modern equivalent ἐπίπλους had already gained the upper hand in the commercial and nautical language and the older term may have been indeed in need of some explanation. It is also worth observing that, if the text of Erotian as we have it is a faithful exposition of Aristophanes' gloss and has not undergone a substantial abridgement disfiguring it, Aristophanes appears not to have cited the instances in Aeschylus or Euripides in which δίοπος carried the broader, general sense of 'commander', without a specific reference to ships: that is, Aesch. *Pers.* 44 and [Eur.] *Rh.* 741. This, if not due to a later abridgement of a fuller text of Erotian, may corroborate the hypothesis that it was not morphology or orthography that identified the word as Attic for Aristophanes but its use and semantic development within the Attic dialect.

2.2.3 Ar.Byz. fr. 340

Ar.Byz. fr. 340, explicitly ascribed by Athenaeus to Aristophanes Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις, ostensibly deals with genre classification (ἱμαῖος, ὑμέναιος, ἰάλεμος, λίνος, and αἰλινος), a notoriously fiddling and controversial issue. In particular, Aristophanes seems to have sided with the interpretation of ἱμαῖος, literally 'rope-song', as 'miller's song' (ψῆδὴ μλωθρῶν) vs a concurrent explanation of it as 'well-song' (the latter supported by Callimachus: cf. Call. *Hec.* fr. 74.25 Hollis). Both interpretations resurface in the later lexicographical tradition. Based on the present state of the evidence, we do not know why Aristophanes included these song names in his Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις. While one might argue, on the basis of Call. *Hec.* fr. 74.25 Hollis, that one of the attested interpretations of ἱμαῖος (but not Aristophanes' one) might have had a specifically Attic colour, this is generally not so for ὑμέναιος, ἰάλεμος (with the exception Moeris ι 1), λίνος, and αἰλινος. Either Aristophanes recorded these words simply because they were used by Attic authors (cf. the quotation of Eur. *HF* 348–9), or he may originally have intended to comment on

ordinate status of these satraps *vis à vis* the Persian King of Kings) and [Eur.] *Rh.* 741: τίνι σημήνω δίοπων στρατιάς (to indicate a subordinate commander of the infantry).

the supposedly Attic colour of ἱμαῖος only (as miller-song), and this gave him the opportunity for an excursus on other (non-specifically Attic) genres of songs.

Ar.Byz. fr. 340 (= Ath. 14.619b–c): Ἀριστοφάνης δ' ἐν Ἀττικαῖς φησιν Λέξεσιν ἱμαῖος ὥδῃ μυλωθρῶν ἐν δὲ γάμοις ὑμέναιος· ἐν δὲ πένθεσιν ἰάλεμος. λίνος δὲ καὶ αἴλινος οὐ μόνον ἐν πένθεσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπ' εὐτυχεῖ μολπᾷ κατὰ τὸν Εὐριπίδη.

In his Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις, Aristophanes says: ἱμαῖος is the song sung by millers; ὑμέναιος is sung at weddings whereas ἰάλεμος on mourning occasions; λίνος and αἴλινος are sung not only on mourning occasions but also 'at a happy dance' according to Euripides (Eur. *HF* 348–9).

Genre classification was often a controversial issue among Alexandrian philologists. Even if song types in ancient Greek culture were defined by their occasions and by the way in which the roles of the performers were assigned according to gender and social status, their classification was not always straightforward. In this fragment, in which we have a string of song types mentioned one after the other, Aristophanes appears to have agreed with the interpretation of ἱμαῖος, literally 'rope-song', as 'miller's song' (ὥδῃ μυλωθρῶν), as argued a century later also by Tryphon (fr. 113 Velsen = Ath. 14.618d, perhaps belonging to his work *On Terminology*),⁹⁸ against those who instead wanted it to be a 'well-song'. Among the latter, there was also Aristophanes' teacher Callimachus: in his *Hecale* fr. 74.25 Hollis ἀεΐδει καὶ πού τις ἀνήρ ὕδατηγός ἱμαῖον he clearly interpreted ἱμαῖος as the song sung by the water-drawers, most likely on the basis of Ar. *Ra.* 1297 ἰμονιοστρόφου μέλη and its ancient interpretation (cf. schol. Ar. *Ra.* 1297 quoting Callimachus' fragment).⁹⁹ Callimachus' *Hecale* displays abundant Attic lore and vocabulary mostly drawn from Old Comedy, and it is tempting, therefore, to con-

⁹⁸ Tryphon fr. 113 Velsen: καὶ ὥδῃς δὲ ὀνομασίας καταλέγει ὁ Τρύφων τάσδε· ἱμαῖος ἢ ἐπιμύλιος καλουμένη, ἦν παρὰ τοὺς ἀλέτους ἦδον, ἴσως ἀπὸ τῆς ἱμαλίδος. ἱμαλὶς δ' ἐστὶν παρὰ Δωριεῦσιν ὁ νόστος καὶ τὰ ἐπίμετρα τῶν ἀλεύρων κτλ. ('And Tryphon lists also these names for songs: ἱμαῖος, the song for milling (ἐπιμύλιος), which they sang while grinding; possibly derived from ἱμαλὶς, which is the Dorians' word for the return (νόστος) and the over-measures (ἐπίμετρα) of ground barley flour etc.'). We do not know whether Aristophanes of Byzantium shared Tryphon's etymology. Winkler (1978–1979, 237) has shown that νόστος in Tryphon means 'return', that is, 'crop's yield', and that Hsch. ι 600, where we are given a three-fold definition of ἱμαῖος as ὥδῃ ἐπιμύλιος καὶ ἐπάντλιος, καὶ ἐπίνοστος, must have misunderstood Tryphon's gloss (he or some intermediary source: Diogenianus?). For ἱμαῖος as a miller's song cf. also Poll. 4.53: ἐπιμύλιος ὥδῃ ἱμαλὶς καὶ ἱμαῖος, ὁ δ' ἄδων ἱμασιδός and *EM* 470.257 <ἱμαῖος>: ἢ ἐπιμύλιος ὥδῃ.

⁹⁹ Schol. Ar. *Ra.* 1297: <ἰμονιοστρόφου μέλη> οἷον σχοινοστρόφου μέλη· ἰμονιά γὰρ καλεῖται τὸ τῶν ἀντλημάτων σχοινίον, καὶ τὸ ἄσμα, ὃ ἄδουσιν οἱ ἀντληταί, ἱμαῖον ('<ἰμονιοστρόφου μέλη> That is, rope-makers' songs. For the rope of the buckets for drawing water is called ἰμονιά and the song sung by those who draw waters [is called] ἱμαῖος'). Cf. Hollis (2009, 9); A. Cameron (1995, 443–4).

nect this possible ‘Attic’ colour regarding ἱμαῖος to our fragment, even if Aristophanes ultimately opted for the alternative explanation (miller-song).¹⁰⁰ This connection would explain why Aristophanes’ generic discussion recorded by Athenaeus takes place in the subsection ἐν Ἀττικαῖς λέξεσιν of Aristophanes’ lexicographical work and not elsewhere. However, the same cannot be said for the other ‘generic’ names of songs mentioned by Athenaeus via Aristophanes: our literary and lexicographical tradition does not record anything specifically ‘Attic’ (be it fact or fiction) for ὑμεναῖος, λίνος, and αἴλινος, whereas ἰάλεμος is said to be ‘Attic’ only by Moeris 1: ἰάλεμος Ἀττικοί. The precise type of song indicated by λίνος and αἴλινος was much debated in antiquity and the point of departure, as commonly acknowledged, must certainly have been the λίνος song at *Il.* 18.570 and its interpretative tradition (schol. (Ariston.) *Hom. Il.* 18.570a (A)).¹⁰¹ The (most probably erroneous)¹⁰² interpretation put forward by Aristophanes for Eur. *HF* 348–9 (λίνος as a joyous song) does not say anything about the alleged ‘Attic’ nature or origin of λίνος; rather, it is just a quotation from an Attic tragedian (and in a lyric section to boot, but probably this consideration did not worry Aristophanes). It may well be, as Slater (1986, 115) observed, that ‘the title of the chapter must indicate only: words found in Attic authors’, unsatisfactory as this solution may seem to a modern reader. Alternatively, Aristophanes may have intended to comment on the allegedly Attic colour of ἱμαῖος as miller-song and this occasioned an excursus on other (non-specifically Attic) genres of songs.

2.2.4 Ar.Byz. fr. 341

Ar.Byz. fr. 341 concerns the meaning of κοχώνη, a term clearly indicating a bodily part around the bottom but whose exact meaning was debated among both philologists and physicians, as attested by the various authorities (literary and medical) quoted by Erotian. Aristophanes of Byzantium, together with others, apparently interpreted the term as referring to the sockets of the hip-joints (τὰς κοτύλας τῶν ἰσχίων), a usage never attested in ancient comedy (in which it denotes the buttock, just as in Hippocrates and Galen). Aristophanes’ original context for discussing the

¹⁰⁰ Slater (1986, 115) is silent about the possible Attic background of ἱμαῖος.

¹⁰¹ To the secondary bibliography quoted by Slater (1986, 115) one can now add Ford (2019, 73–80) and Favi (2020, 43–5), esp. on λίνος as a ‘flax-song’ in Epich. fr. 14: ἡ δὲ τῶν ἰστουργῶν (Kaibel: ἰστοροῦντων A) ὡδὴ αἴλινος (ἐλίνος A), ὡς Ἐπίχαρμος ἐν Ἀταλάνταις ἰστορεῖ (= Tryphon fr. 113 Velsen; cf. also Eust. *in Il.* 4.502.18–20) and its possible exegetical nature via Zenodotus’ v.l. λίνος in *Il.* 18.570. In this direction see already Tosi (1987–1988, 20–1 n. 56), seemingly unknown to Favi.

¹⁰² See Slater (1986, 115), quoting Wilamowitz (1909, 84–5); Tosi (1987–1988, 20–1); Tosi (2008, 9–12).

precise meaning of κοχώνη remains ultimately unclear, as do the sources he may have adduced for supporting his interpretation of the word.

Ar.Byz. fr. 341 (= Erot. fr. 17): κοχώνη· οἱ μὲν τὸ ἱερὸν ὄστουν· οἱ δὲ τὰς κοτύλας τῶν ἰσχιῶν, ἐξ ὧν ἔστιν Ἀριστοφάνης ὁ γραμματικός, Γλαυκίας δὲ καὶ Ἰσχύμαχος καὶ Ἴππωνάξ τὰ ἰσχία. οὐ γάρ, ὡς τινες ἔφασαν, αἱ ὑπογλουτίδες εἰσὶ κοχῶναι, ἀλλὰ τὰ σφαιρώματα καλούμενα. σάρκες δ' εἰσὶν αὐταὶ περιφερεῖς, ἐφ' αἷς καθήμεθα. ὡς καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης ὁ κωμικός ἐν Τριφάλητί φησι· [. . .] καὶ Εὐπολῖς ἐν Κόλαξιν· [. . .] καὶ ἐν Βάπταις [. . .] καὶ Κράτης ἐν Σαλαμινίοις [. . .]. μένηται καὶ Στράτις ἐν Χρυσίππῳ καὶ Εὐβουλος ἐν Σκυτεῖ.

κοχώνη: Some [say it means] the sacral bone. Others, among whom there is Aristophanes the grammarian, the sockets of the hip-joints. Glaukias, Isomachus, and Hipponax¹⁰³ the hip-joints (ἰσχία). For the κοχῶναι are not the exterior junction of the buttocks and thighs (ὑπογλουτίδες) but the so-called σφαιρώματα: these are the rounded bits of flesh on which we sit as also Aristophanes the comic poet says in his *Triphales* (Ar. fr. 558.2) [. . .] Eupolis in the *Flatterers* (Eup. fr. 159.2) [. . .] and *Dippers* (Eup. fr. 88.2) [. . .], Crates in the *Salaminians* (Crates Com. fr. 34.2) [. . .]. Also Strattis in the *Chrysippus* (Stratt. fr. 56) and Eubulus in the *Cobbler* (Eub. fr. 96) mention it.

This fragment of Erotian escaped Nauck's attention and was first added to the Aristophanic *Λέξεις* as *fragmentum incertae sedis* by Fresenius (1875, 20 n. 4). It was Cohn (1881, 88 n. 6) who first tentatively ('fortasse') ascribed the passage to the subsection Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις, followed by Slater. Cohn does not give an explicit explanation for his attribution, but it may well be that he shared Slater's view that Erotian quoted only from this subsection of the *Λέξεις*.

The term κοχώνη is frequently attested in Attic comedy as Erotian's text testifies (five comic quotations ranging from Old to Middle Comedy),¹⁰⁴ all the comic texts quoted, however, support a meaning ('buttocks', 'ass-cheeks') quite different from that apparently defended by Aristophanes of Byzantium (the sockets of the hip-joints: in medical language, the *acetabulum*). The comic usage of κοχώνη as 'buttocks, ass-cheeks' coincides with the meaning of the term in Hippocrates (Hr. *Epid.* 5.7 = 5.208.2 Littré and *Mul.* 1.8. = 8.34.21 Littré) and Galen (*Gloss.* κ 67 Perilli: κοχώνη· τὴν σύζευξιν τῶν ἐν τοῖς ἰσχίοις τὴν πρὸς τὴν ἔδραν, δι' ἣν καὶ πᾶς ὁ περὶ τὴν ἔδραν τόπος οὕτως ὀνομάζεται, 'κοχώνη: The joints of those parts of the hips nearby the bum; hence the whole area of the bum is so called').¹⁰⁵ Aristophanes of Byzantium's interpretation remains for us unparalleled, but Erotian tells us that his interpretation was shared by others (οἱ δὲ [. . .] ἐξ ὧν ἔστιν Ἀρισ-

¹⁰³ The first two are learned physicians, datable respectively to the first half of the 2nd century BCE (Glaukias) and to the 1st century BCE (Isomachus); Hipponax, as observed by Wellmann (1931, 23 n. 3) is not the poet Hipponax of Ephesus but either an otherwise unknown doctor so named or a scribal mistake for the physician Hippon.

¹⁰⁴ For a complete list of the comic passages in which the term occurs, see Olson (2016, 54 with n. 24).

¹⁰⁵ Etymologically, this seems probable: see *EDG* s.v. κοχώνη.

τοφάνης ὁ γραμματικός).¹⁰⁶ The scholium to Ar. *Eq.* 424a¹⁰⁷ gives us yet another meaning (= *perineum*); the disparate views of the medical authorities reported by Erotian illustrate that the term was likely to have been an object of discussion among both philologists and physicians (such a variety of opinions is also evident in Hsch. κ 3886–7, which essentially repeats the information given by Erotian but without quoting examples or authorities).¹⁰⁸ Are the comic quotations in Erotian drawn from Aristophanes of Byzantium (possibly via Baccheius)? Wellmann deems it unlikely, since those quotations do not support Aristophanes' interpretation of the term in question,¹⁰⁹ yet it would not have been out of place for Aristophanes to motivate his own diverging interpretation by also giving convenient examples of other possible explanations according to different contexts.

2.2.5 Ar.Byz. fr. 342

Ar.Byz. fr. 342 is expressly ascribed by Erotian to Aristophanes' Ἀττικάι λέξεις, κρησέρα, a particular type of sieve or colander, occurs for us, among Classical authors, only once in Ar. *Ec.* 991; we find it otherwise attested in the medical (Hippocrates, Galen etc.) and lexicographical tradition, the latter mostly but not exclusively commenting on the relevant passage of Aristophanes' *Assemblywomen*. This gloss testifies to Aristophanes of Byzantium's antiquarian interest in everyday realia, and it is highly likely that the comic passage of Ar. *Ec.* 991 served as his starting point.

Ar.Byz. fr. 342 (= Erot. κ 65): κρησέρης (Klein: κνησέρης MSS): κρησέραν (Klein: κνησέρου AMO: κνησέρα H: κνησέρης L) λέγει ράκος χονδρόν και άραιόν, δι' ού διηθοῦσι τινα ως δι' ήθμοῦ. μέμνηται και Άριστοφάνης έν Αττικάις λέξεσι.

κρησέρης: [?] says that κρησέρα is a coarse and thin piece of cloth, through which they filter some substances as if through a colander. It is also mentioned by Aristophanes in his *Attic Lexeis*.

106 Wellmann (1931, 23) remains silent on the identity of οἱ δέ.

107 Schol. Ar. *Eq.* 424a (VEΓΘM): εἰς τὰ κόχωνα· κοχώνη τόπος ὑπὸ τὸ αἰδοῖον, <τὸ μεταξύ> (Kuster) τῶν μηρῶν καὶ τῆς κοτύλης καὶ τῶν ἰσχίων· μέμνηται δὲ τῆς κοχώνης καὶ ἐν Σκηνάς Καταλαμβάνουσαις ἄλλα συσπάσαι δεῖ τὰς κοχώνας'. οὐδετέρως δὲ ἔφη τὰ κόχωνα ('In the κόχωνα: κοχώνη is the area beneath the genitals, that between the thighs, the socket and the hip-joints. It is mentioned also in the *Women Claiming Tent-sites*: 'but you must contract your buttocks!' (Ar. fr. 496). He used the expression τὰ κόχωνα in the neuter'). Slater (1986, 116) deems the text of the scholium corrupt, as if 'several explanations appear to have been run together'.

108 Wellmann (1931, 23) thinks that Erotian's own rejection of the explanation κοχώνη = 'buttock' is part of his polemics against Didymus (1st century BCE/1st century CE), whom he also considers the main underlying authority for the Aristophanic scholium.

109 Wellmann (1931, 23).

The first attestation of κρησέρα is for us Ar. *Ec.* 991, where the schol. Ar. *Ec.* 991a glosses it as τὸ περιβόλαιον τῶν κοφίνων· ἔστι δὲ διερρωγός, ‘piece of cloth enclosing wicket baskets; it is torn’. This is also its only literary occurrence in Classical authors, and understandably so, given its semantics. Otherwise, we find the term only in medical writings (twice in Hippocrates: Hp. *Mul.* 2.118 = 8.256.13 Littré, the *locus classicus* underlying Erotian’s lemma,¹¹⁰ and Hp. *Steril.* 222 = 8.430.1 Littré; once in Galen, that is, Gal. *Gloss.* κ 74 Perilli; six times in Aretaeus) and in the lexicographical tradition.

The term is attested in Poll. 6.74 (cf. also 10.114), Hsch. κ 2804 as the *interpretamentum* of the lemma κιττάναλον and κ 3899 in its Elean form κραῖρα; Phot. κ 1083; Su. κ 2398; *EM* 538.5, 8, mostly but not uniquely commenting on Ar. *Ec.* 991. Poll. 6.74 distinguishes between three different kinds of sieves, according to their material component and their function: τὸ δ’ ἐργαλεῖον, ἐν ᾧ τὰ ἄλευρα διεσθήθητο, τὸ μὲν ἐκ σχοίνων πλέγμα κόσκινον, εἰ δὲ τῷ τοῦ κοσκίνου κύκλῳ ἀντὶ τοῦ σχοίνου λινοῦν τι σινδόνιον εἶη ἐξημμένον, ὡς ἀκριβέστερον τὸ ἄλευρον καθαίροιτο, ἀλευρόττησις ἐκαλεῖτο, εἰ δ’ ἐξ ἐρίου εἶη, κρησέρα. ἐνθα δὲ ἐπλάττοντο οἱ ἄρτοι, πλάθανον (‘The tool in which the meal was sieved was called κόσκινον if the weaving was made of plaited rushes; if to its rounded frame was hung a web made of linen instead of plaited rushes, to filter the meal with greater precision, it was called ἀλευρόττησις; if made of wool, κρησέρα. The tool where the loaf-dough was kneaded, was called πλάθανον’). Pollux’s more rigid classification has recently been questioned by Nicosia (2005) on the basis of the epigraphic and literary evidence: the criterium underlying Pollux’s distinction (or that of his sources) is not so much a desire to faithfully mirror the underlying realia but to give a pseudo-etymological explanation (κόσκινον from σχοῖνος;¹¹¹ κρησέρα from κρησ-ἔρια: cf. also the diminutive κρησέριον in Poll. 7.28).

Wellmann (1931, 56) identifies the source of Erotian’s quotation of Aristophanes of Byzantium as Artemidorus of Tarsos, father of the grammarian Theon (1st century BCE), himself a scholar, and author, among other things, of a lexicographical work entitled Ὀψαρτυτικά γλῶσσαι (*Culinary Glosses*: Ath. 9.387d).¹¹²

2.2.6 Ar.Byz. fr. 345

Ar.Byz. fr. 345 deals with the plural term χεδροπά, a word of disputed meaning in antiquity (generic ‘pulse’ or some subvariety thereof). According to Erotian’s entry, χεδροπά was the Attic term for ‘pulse’ (ὄσπρια), and our grammarian Aris-

¹¹⁰ See Perilli (2017, 347).

¹¹¹ Nicosia (2005, 311 and 312, with n. 21) quotes as para-etymology of κόσκινον < σχοῖνος also Horap. *Hieroglyphica* 1.38, p. 84 Sbord.: κόσκινον δὲ ἐπειδὴ τὸ κόσκινον πρῶτον ὑπάρχον σκευὸς ἀρτοποιίας ἐκ σχοίνου γίνεται and *AP* 6.91.7–8: τρητὸν γὰρ θεμένα χερὶ κόσκινον εὖ διὰ πυκνῶν σχοίνων ἡελίουσ πλείονας ἠγύασατο.

¹¹² Slater (1986, 116) is sceptical. On Artemidorus of Tarsos, see Wentzel (1895c).

tophanes spelt it with χ rather than κ. Aristophanes also specified that these χεδροπά were called ὄσπρια by others (παρ' ἄλλοις). This observation suggests that he was distinguishing between linguistic usages among different communities of speakers, and it is not unlikely that his point of departure was Attic vs non-Attic custom. Once again, it is interesting to note that Aristophanes appears to discuss Attic in a matter-of-fact way, without ascribing an *a priori* heightened status to Attic vis-à-vis the other Greek dialects. The ensuing quotation, in Erotian's entry, from Nic. *Th.* 752 (with a folk-etymology of χεδροπά < χεῖρ + δρέπω) may or may not go back to Aristophanes (etymology was among the interpretative tools of his lexicographical activity, and we saw that Aristophanes occupied himself also with contemporary poets: cf. Section 2.1).

The later lexicographical tradition knows both spellings (χεδρ- and κεδρ-) and offers two different accentuations (oxytone and proparoxytone) and some discussion on the nominative singular (second or third declension?). However, no explicit trace of this discussion is found in Erotian.

At.Byz. fr. 345 (= Erot. χ 4): χεδροπά· τὰ ὄσπρια οὕτω καλοῦσιν οἱ Ἄττικοί. ἔνιοι δὲ διὰ τοῦ κ γράφουσι κεδροπά. Ἀριστοφάνης ὁ γραμματικὸς διὰ τοῦ χ γράφων φησὶν χεδροπά τὰ παρ' ἄλλοις ὄσπρια. εἴρηται γὰρ παρὰ τὸ τῆ χειρὶ αὐτὰ δρέπεσθαι, ὡς καὶ Νικάνδρος ἐν Γεωργικοῖς φησὶ· χειροδρόποι δ' ἵνα φῶτες ἀνευ δρεπάνοιο λέγονται.

χεδροπά: Attic speakers call thus the ὄσπρια ('pulse'). Some write κεδροπά with kappa. The grammarian Aristophanes, who spells the term with chi, says that χεδροπά is what others call ὄσπρια. For they are so called because they are handpicked, as is also attested by Nicander in his *Georgics* (Nic. *Th.* 752): 'Where men go plucking with their hands, not using sickles'.

This fragment too was first ascribed to Aristophanes' Ἄττικαὶ λέξεις by Cohn (1881, 288 n. 6). The underlying *locus classicus* has been identified with Hp. *Nat.puer.* 12 (= 7.488.3 Littré) καὶ χέδροπα (*sic*: on the accent see below) καὶ σῖτος καὶ ἀκρόδρυα ('pulse, and grain and hard-shell fruits'), the only occurrence of the term in the whole Hippocratic corpus (see Giorgianni 2020, 121). If we leave aside for a moment the erudite tradition, the word χεδροπά, with oscillations in its accentuation (oxytone and proparoxytone), is mainly attested in prose authors: up to the 2nd century CE we find it 5x in the Aristotelian corpus, 69x in Theophrastus – all but one occurrence unsurprisingly in his botanical works –, 5x in Plutarch, and 7x in Galen. In poetic texts it is first attested in the 5th-century BCE comic poet Thucydes fr. 7 (= *Su.* χ 181: χέδροπας· ὄσπρια. καὶ ἐνικῶς χέδροψ, τὸ ὄσπριον. οὕτως Θουγενίδης (Adler: Θουκυδίδης MSS)),¹¹³ then in a satyr play of the 4th-century BCE tragic poet Python

¹¹³ *Su.* χ 181: χέδροπας· ὄσπρια. καὶ ἐνικῶς χέδροψ, τὸ ὄσπριον. οὕτως Θουγενίδης ('χέδροπας: Pulse. And in the singular χέδροψ, that is, τὸ ὄσπριον. Thus Thucydes'). The fragment is considered among the *dubia* by Kassel–Austin but Bagordo (2014, 107) plausibly defends Adler's emendation: Thucydes' name is confused with that of Thucydides also in other fragments of indirect tradition (fr. 3–6).

(*TrGF* 91 F 1.12–3 = Ath. 13.596a: νῦν δὲ τὸν χέδροπα μόνον | καὶ τὸν μάραθον ἔσθουσι, πυρούς δ' οὐ μάλα),¹¹⁴ in Nicander's *Theriaka* 752: χειροδρόποι δ' ἵνα φώτες ἄτερ¹¹⁵ δρεπάνοιο λέγονται | ὄσπρια χέδροπά τ' ἄλλα μεσογλόου ἐντὸς ἀρούρης ('Where men go plucking with their hands, not using sickles, gathering pulse and other legumes amid the fields while still green'; transl. by Gow in Schofield, Gow 1953, 79), and once in Nonnus, *Dion.* 26.63: χέδροπα καρπὸν ἔδειν βιοτήσιον (said of the tribes of Salagoi, who are used 'to eat pulse, a life-supporting fruit'). Lexicographical works know both spellings (the form with κ is found in Hsch. κ 1985: κέδροπα· τὰ ὄσπρια ~ Phot. κ 518; cf. also Hsch. κ 2313), with χεδρ- representing the overwhelming majority of the attestations (Hsch. χ 244: χεδροπά· ὄσπριόν τι. οἱ δὲ πανσπερμίαν and χ 245: χέδροψ· πᾶν ὄσπριον. σπέρμα; Poll. 6.60: τὰ ὄσπρια, ἃ καὶ χέδροπα ὠνόμαζον; Phot. κ 518: κέδροπα· ὄσπρια· καὶ οἶον χέδροπα; *Su.* χ 181 [see above]; *EM* 808.14–5: χέδροπας· ὄσπρια· χέδροψ γὰρ τὸ ὄσπριον· ἀπὸ τοῦ χειρίδροψ κατὰ συγκοπὴν ~ [Zonar.] 1846.12: χέδροπας. ὄσπρια. [καὶ ἐνικῶς χέδροψ. οἶον εἰ χειρίδροψ καὶ συγκοπῆ χέδροψ]).¹¹⁶

As is clear from the evidence quoted above, the ancients discussed the declension of χεδροπά (neuter plural *tantum* or nominative singular, and, if the latter, second declension as attested as v.l. in Arist. *HA* 594b.7, or third? For the latter, cf. Hsch. χ 245, *Su.* χ 181, *EM* 808.14–5), accentuation (oxytone or proparoxytone?) and meaning. The latter seems to oscillate between that of a specific subgroup or variety of ὄσπρια (cf. Hsch. χ 244; apparently this difference was already known to Nicander, as corroborated by the scholiastic tradition),¹¹⁷ and implying the folk etymology χεῖρ + δρέπω (already active in Nicander), or a generic synonym of pulse *tout court* (Poll. 6.60, Hsch. κ 1985: κέδροπα· τὰ ὄσπρια ~ Phot. κ 518, Hsch. χ 245, *EM* 808.14–5, *Su.* χ 181), or any kind of seed (cf. πανσπερμία in Hsch. χ 244). As already observed

114 'Now they eat only pulse (χέδροπα) and fennel, certainly not wheat'.

115 The quotation in Erotian χ 4 has the v.l. ἄνευ for the poetic ἄτερ of the direct tradition. Erotian's ascription of the lines to Nicander's *Georgics* shows that either he was incorrect or that Nicander used the same verse twice in two different works (cf. Overduin 2014, 464): the former is more likely.

116 Modern linguists tend to see the alternation κ/χ as a sign that the term is of non-Greek origin: cf. *EDG* s.v.; Masson (1988, 26–7) supports a Semitic origin.

117 See schol. Nic. *Th.* 753b, where after a list of the various possible meanings of χέδροπα (παρά τισι μὲν τὰ ἄγρια λάχανα, παρὰ δὲ ἑτέροις τὰ ὄσπρια καὶ ἔτι παρ' ἑτέροις τὰ ἀπὸ χλωρᾶς κριθῆς) it is explicitly said that in Nicander's text ὄσπρια are distinguished from χέδροπα ([. . .] ἐνταῦθα, ὡς ἔουκε, διαστέλλει τὰ ὄσπρια ἀπὸ τοῦ χεδροποῦ). This distinction is recorded also by Galen at *Vict.Att.* 30 Kalbfleisch: ἀλλ' αὔθις ἐπὶ τὸ τῶν ἄλλων σπερμάτων ἐπάνειμι γένος, ἃ δὴ καὶ Δημήτρια τινες ὀνομάζουσι· συνηθεστέρα μέντοι κλησίς ἐστι τοῖς Ἑλλησιν ἐπὶ τοῦ γένους αὐτῶν ἅπαντος ἢ τῶν ὄσπριων· ἔνιοι μέντοι χεδροπά ταῦτα καλοῦσιν· εἰσὶ δὲ οἱ τὸ μὲν σύμπαν γένος ὄσπρια, μόνα δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν ὅσα τῇ χειρὶ δρέπονται, χεδροπά προσαγορεύουσι, τὰ δ' ἄλλα πάντα τὰ διὰ τῶν δρεπάνων θεριζόμενα σίτον ('But now I shall return again to the species of the other seeds, called by someone also Δημήτρια. The most common name among the Greeks for the whole class is ὄσπρια but some indeed call them χεδροπά. There are then those who call the whole class ὄσπρια but χεδροπά only those pulses which are hand-picked and σίτος all that is reaped with sickles').

by Slater (1986, 118), the folk etymology in Erotian is directly ascribed to Nicander (second half of the 2nd century BCE), a poet who does not otherwise figure in our extant sources among those discussed by Aristophanes of Byzantium, although other quasi-contemporary Hellenistic poets (Callimachus, Lycophron) are cited by our scholar in his *Λέξεις* (see Section 2.1). This, however, does not mean that Aristophanes was unaware of the learned discussion surrounding the word's origin, spelling, morphology, and meaning: it is indeed highly likely that in his own lexicographical entry, he positioned himself within the current debate, possibly touching on some if not all of the features discussed by later sources. As to the specific Attic nature of the term, Erotian is the only source explicitly labelling *χεδροπά* as the 'Attic' equivalent to the common *ὄσπρια* 'pulses' (*τὰ ὄσπρια οὕτω καλοῦσιν οἱ Ἄττικοί*), yet Aristophanes' remark that *χεδροπά τὰ παρ' ἄλλοις ὄσπρια* strongly suggests that he too was drawing a distinction between linguistic usages among different communities. That *ὄσπρια* was the most commonly used form in the Greek-speaking world is also confirmed by the Galen passage quoted above at n. 117, although he does not identify as specifically Attic those who use the word *χεδροπά* (*ἐνίοι μὲντοι χεδροπά ταῦτα καλοῦσιν*). Here too, as also elsewhere in the *Λέξεις*, Aristophanes appears to treat the Attic dialect in a matter-of-fact way, without ascribing to it a privileged status in comparison to the other Greek dialects.

2.2.7 Ar.Byz. fr. 346

Ar.Byz. fr. 346 consists of two passages on prosody, addressing the quantity of the middle vowel in the genitives *πέρδικος* and *χοϊνικός*, one from Herodian (*GG* 3,2.9.10–4) and one from Athenaeus (*Ath.* 9.388f–89a). Only the former explicitly mentions Aristophanes of Byzantium as indirect source (Herodian is reporting the opinion of Ptolemy of Ascalon (early 1st century CE), who, in his turn, is quoting our Aristophanes: a two-remove quotation, so to speak). Modern scholarship has demonstrated that it is highly likely that Athenaeus also drew on Aristophanes of Byzantium for at least part of his argument (see below). Herodian says that, according to Ptolemy of Ascalon and Aristophanes of Byzantium, the genitives of *πέρδιξ* and *χοῖνιξ* have a short iota in 'the poets'; Athenaeus, instead, states that some authors, such as Archilochus and Epicharmus, shorten the iota, but Attic writers often do not: examples from Attic drama follow. There are clear inconsistencies between these two witnesses, probably owing to their different sources and/or partial misunderstanding of the original intent of the works consulted. The most probable explanation is that Aristophanes of Byzantium did acknowledge the use of the short iota in some (*Ath.*: *ἐνίοι*) poets (that is, not specifically Attic poets), while recording that Attic authors (dramatists) often, but not always, scan long the middle iota of the words under consideration. If this interpretation is correct, we have here another

example of how Aristophanes, while treating prosodic matters in Attic and non-Attic poets, did not censure exceptions but recorded them in an evaluatively neutral way.

Ar.Byz. fr. 346 (= Hdn. *Περὶ διχρόνων*, *GG* 3,2.9.10–4): Πτολεμαῖος δὲ ὁ Ἀσκαλωνίτης φησὶν ὡς τῆς πέρδικος καὶ χοίνικος γενικῆς ἡ μέση συστέλλεται, πεισθεὶς Ἀριστοφάνει τῷ γραμματικῷ καὶ τοῖς οὕτω χρησαμένοις ποιηταῖς διὰ μέτρον (διὰ μέτρον *suspectum*): ἀλλὰ ταῦτα διὰ μέτρον ἐγένετο. ἔστι γὰρ αὐτὰ εὐρεῖν ἐκτεταμένα πολλάκις.

Ptolemaeus of Ascalon, persuaded by the grammarian Aristophanes and the same use by the poets for metrical reasons (?), says that the middle syllable of the genitives πέρδικος ('partridge') and χοίνικος (a dry measure) is short. But this happened because of the metre. For you can often find examples with long iota.

Ath. 9.388f–89a: πέρδιξ. τούτων πολλοὶ μὲν μέμνηται, ὡς καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης. τοῦ δὲ ὀνόματος αὐτῶν ἔνιοι συστέλλουσι τὴν μέσην συλλαβὴν, ὡς Ἀρχίλοχος: '< . . . > πτώσουσαν ὥστε πέρδικα'. οὕτως καὶ ὄρτυγα καὶ χοίνικα: πολὺ δὲ ἔστι τὸ ἐκτεινόμενον παρὰ τοῖς Ἀττικοῖς. Σοφοκλῆς Καμικοῖς: 'ὄρνιθος ἦλθ' ἐπόνυμος | πέρδικος ἐν κλεινοῖς Ἀθηναίων πάγοις'. Φερεκράτης ἡ ὁ πεποικῶς τὸν Χείρωνα: 'ἔξεισιν ἄκων δεῦρο πέρδικος τρόπον'. Φρύνιχος Τραγωδοῖς: 'τὸν Κλεόμβροτόν τε τοῦ Πέρδικος υἱόν'. τὸ δὲ ζῶον ἐπὶ λαγνείας συμβολικῶς παρεἰληπται. Νικοφῶν ἐν Ἐγγειρογάστορσι: '< . . . > τοὺς ἐψητοὺς καὶ τοὺς πέρδικας ἐκέινους'. Ἐπίχαρμος δ' ἐν Κωμιασταῖς βραχέως: 'σηπίας τ' ἄγον νεούσας πέρδικάς τε πετομένους'.

πέρδιξ ('partridge'). Many authors mention these (birds), for example Aristophanes (i.e. the comic poet). Some shorten the middle syllable of the name, for example Archilochus (Archil. fr. 224 West): 'like a cowering πέρδικα'. Compare ὄρτυγα (acc.: 'quail') and χοίνικα (acc.: a dry measure), although the syllable is often long in Attic authors. Sophocles in *Camicians* (Soph. fr. 323): 'The man who shares the name of the partridge (πέρδικος: gen.) arrived in Athens' famous hills.' Pherecrates (Pherecr. fr. 160), or whoever is the author of *Chiron*: 'He shall come out here unwillingly, just like a partridge (πέρδικος: gen.)'. Phrynichus in *Tragic Actors* (Phryn.Com. fr. 55): 'and Cleombrotus the son of Perdix (Πέρδικος: gen.)'. The animal is taken to symbolise lust. Nicophon in *The Men Who Live from Hand to Mouth* (Nicopho fr. 9): '< . . . > the boiled fish and those partridges (πέρδικας: acc.)'. But Epicharmus in *The Revellers* (Epich. fr. 73) has it short: 'they brought swimming cuttlefish and flying partridges (πέρδικας: acc.)'.

This fragment was first ascribed to Aristophanes' Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις by Nauck (1848, 182–3) on the basis of the similarity of subject matter (prosodic features) with fr. XXV Nauck (= Hdn. *Περὶ διχρόνων* *GG* 3,2.13.1), now Ar.Byz. fr. 347.

In Herodian's passage, we are told that the grammarian Ptolemy of Ascalon considered as short the quantity of the iota in the genitives πέρδικος and χοίνικος. He did so on the authority (πεισθεὶς) of Aristophanes of Byzantium and because

that was the use ‘in poets for metrical reasons’.¹¹⁸ On this, Herodian comments that the short scansion of the iota is simply a metrical licence (that is, an occasional phenomenon) and that one can, in fact, find several examples with long iota. Whereas the extant evidence at our disposal proves Ptolemy right as far as χοίνικος is concerned,¹¹⁹ this is not the case for πέρδικος (see below). Two points are worth observing: (1) if Herodian is reporting his source correctly and the latter is not already corrupt, according to Ptolemy of Ascalon, Aristophanes of Byzantium considered the iota in the second syllable of πέρδιξ and χοϊνιξ to be short not throughout the whole inflection but only in the genitive singular (πέρδικος and χοίνικος); (2) the ‘poets’ (presumably adduced also by Aristophanes?) who are said to use this scansion as a metrical licence (διὰ μέτρον) are *not* explicitly distinguished as Attic poets: they are simply poets in general.

The passage of Athenaeus tells us a somewhat different story. Its source, at least for the first part up to the quotation of Archilochus, has been reasonably traced back to Demetrius Ixion’s (2nd century BCE) treatise *On the Dialect of the Alexandrians*, quoted by Athenaeus at 9.393e for the supposedly long quantity of the middle υ in δοίδυκα, ὄρτυγα and κήρυκα in Attic (= Demetr.Ix. fr. 40 Staesche: see also Section 4.2).¹²⁰ Discussing the quantity of the middle vowel of πέρδικ-, Athenaeus (or his source) does not restrict himself to the genitive singular but, as can be seen from the examples quoted, appears to be referring to the entire declension, without distinguishing between direct and oblique cases. He (or his source) does however differentiate between those (ἔνιοι) who scan the middle vowel short, like Archilochus and Epicharmus, and Attic writers who often (πολύ), but not always, scan it as long, quoting among the latter Sophocles, Pherecrates, Phrynichus Comicus and Nicophon (all authors of dramatic texts, tragedy and comedy).¹²¹ Slater (1986, 121) already observed that the divergences between the two accounts (that of

118 This, if the first διὰ μέτρον is correct and not instead a mistake on the part of the scribe erroneously anticipating what comes in the following sentence.

119 Cf. Hom. *Od.* 19.28, Pherecr. fr. 110 (iambic tetrameters), Ar. *Ach.* 817 (iambic trimeters), *Lys.* 1207 (in a lyric section). This was already observed by Slater (1986, 119): ‘χοίνικος has a short iota at Pherecr. fr. 105 K., and nowhere has it demonstrably long. Since Athenaeus and Ptolemaeus do not explicitly say that χοίνικος with long iota is found or is Attic, it is to be disassociated from πέρδιξ and from Aristophanes’), although Slater quotes only the passage by Pherecrates.

120 See Ascheri (2010, 139–41, esp. 139 n. 56); Slater (1986, 119).

121 In all these passages, with the exception of Pherecrates, the long quantity of the vowel is metrically guaranteed (one could also add the comic poet Mnesimachus fr. 4.49 (anapaestic dimeters); in Pamph. fr. 549.1 *SH* the iota of πέρδικος is in anceps position). Cf. Slater (1986, 119): ‘Pherecrates fr. 150 does not prove that the middle syllable is short or long; perhaps Aristophanes phrased himself negatively: i.e. there was no Attic writer who certainly used πέρδικος with a short iota’.

Herodian and that of Athenaeus) may betray somewhat different sources (Demetrius of Ixion for the former; Demetrius of Ixion *and* Aristophanes of Byzantium for the latter). Slater, not implausibly, summed up the current situation of our two witnesses as follows: ‘Herodian’s statement is easily explained. Ptolemaeus certainly will have found citations in Aristophanes (or more probably in Demetrius Ixion) to guarantee a short central vowel, but these will be from non-Attic authors. Herodian understands Ptolemaeus’ authorities to be Attic or at least Classical, and so the original doctrine of Aristophanes is reversed’ (Slater 1986, 121).¹²²

2.2.8 Ar.Byz. fr. 347

Ar.Byz. fr. 347 also deals with prosody, namely the long quantity of the iota (/i:/) in Attic writers for the suffix ι of the comparative adjectives in -ίων (as opposed to /i/ in Ionic), cf. Chapter 5, Section B.3.2. The main interest in this fragment lies in its reception.¹²³ Some scholars have sought here traces of a prescriptive and rigidly normative attitude towards linguistic usage on the part of Aristophanes of Byzantium, particularly when compared with *Antiatt.* η 5, which, if correctly interpreted, is likely to record the scansion ἡδίον for Alexis fr. 158. However, as shown by Tosi (1997), Aristophanes’ observation regarding the long quantity of the iota in the comparatives in -ίων was probably in origin descriptive of the *predominant* (that is, not unique) linguistic usage among Attic authors, where exceptions may be found (possibly as a homage to the previous literary tradition: Homer *in primis*) that were certainly known to Aristophanes. His intention in the Ἀττικάι λέξεις was probably that of registering a distinctively Attic feature (vs the *gemeingriechisch* -ίων with ι). In this sense, Aristophanes appears to have been more interested in recording peculiarities proper to Attic *only* than in formulating prescriptive rules.

Ar.Byz. fr. 347 (= Hdn. Περὶ διχρόνων, *GG* 3,2.13.14–7, cf. *GG* 3,2.471.3 and 3,2.600.15): τὰ εἰς ὧν λήγοντα καθαρὰ συγκριτικά, ὅποτε παραλήγοιτο τῷ ι, ἐκτεταμένῳ αὐτῷ παραλήγεται (Nauck: παραλήγοιτο Slater: παραλήγονται MSS), καλλίων, ἡδίων, βελτίων, γλυκίων, κακίων. Ἀριστοφάνης δὲ ἐν Ἀττικάῃς λέξεσιν (Lehrs: διαλέξεσιν MSS) Ἀττικούς ἰστορεῖ προφέρεσθαι <ἐκτεταμένως> (add. Nauck).

The comparatives ending in -ίων preceded by a vowel, when they have the penultimate syllable in *iota*, have it long: καλλίων (‘more beautiful’), ἡδίων (‘more pleasant’), βελτίων (‘better’), γλυκίων (‘sweeter’), κακίων (‘worse’). Aristophanes in the Ἀττικάι λέξεις attests that Attic speakers pronounce the *iota* long.

¹²² Cf. also Callanan (1987, 32) on how Ar.Byz. fr. 346 neither proves nor disproves that Aristophanes formulated systematic rules on vowel quantity, censuring exceptions.

¹²³ It is uncertain whether Phryn. *Ecl.* 264 might also have discussed the quantity of the primary comparatives, see Chapter 5, Section B.3.2.

Modern scholarship's interest in this fragment has mainly been determined by the fact that *Antiatt.* η 5 (ἦδιον Ἀλεξίς (Alex. fr. 158) Ὀδύσσει ἄπονιπτομένω), plausibly interpreted by Kock (*CAF* vol. 2, 354) and Schulze (1892, 300–1 n. 4) as evidence of the scansion ἦδιον,¹²⁴ appears to contradict Aristophanes of Byzantium's alleged 'rule', at least as reported by Herodian, on the long quantity of the iota in Attic writers for the comparative adjectives in -ίων. Some have thus seen in our fragment a rigidly prescriptive attitude, on the part of Aristophanes, towards linguistic usage.¹²⁵ If Aristophanes did formulate a systematic rule concerning the long quantity of the iota in the comparatives in -ίων in Attic writers, what about the exceptions (i.e. the scansion ἴων) present in extant Attic literature?¹²⁶ Tosi has demonstrated that a prescriptive interpretation of Herodian's text is not the only possible reading and, when subjected to closer scrutiny, not even the most likely.¹²⁷ If one considers the heavy influence of Aristophanes of Byzantium's lexicographical work on the *Antiatticist*, and the fact that the *Antiatticist* regularly 'converted the original character of Aristophanes' work into an Atticist and polemic structure',¹²⁸ it is overall more plausible, in terms of dynamics of transmission and reception, that Aristophanes' observation on -ίων was merely descriptive in origin – that is, a mere record (cf. the use of the verb ἰστορεῖ in Herodian: hardly a verb indicating a normative agenda) of the predominant linguistic usage among Attic authors. As Tosi suggests, it is conceivable that it was not the exceptions to this predominant and exclusively Attic prosodic feature that interested Aristophanes.¹²⁹ He was certainly aware that other non-Attic authors (beginning with Homer) normally scanned the comparative forms of the adjectives in -ίων with ἴ – witness the fact that he himself read κάλλιον εἴη at verse

124 See S. Valente (2015b, 177) in app. For ἦδιον in Alexis, cf. also Alex. fr. 25.6 (from the *Asotodaskalos*). Arnott (1989), following Naber, wrongly emended the MS reading ἦδιον into ἴδιον: see Tosi (1997, 173 n. 7).

125 Cf. the discussion in Callanan (1987, 31–2).

126 For an exhaustive list, notwithstanding the rather sceptical approach, see Diggle (1981, 29–30). On the possible origin of the oscillating quantity of the iota in the Greek comparative suffix -ίων/-ιον, that is, a mutual analogical remodelling between different categories of primary comparative stems (comparatives in *-ίος-, -ων/-ον and -ίων/-ιον), see Nikolaev (2022).

127 Tosi (1997, 172–4); Vessella (2018, 196–7). In particular, Tosi (1997, 173) rightly observes that the use of ἰστορεῖ is more in keeping with the description of a phenomenon rather than with a prescriptive attitude.

128 S. Valente (2015b, 32). Cf. Chapter 6, Section 2.

129 Tosi (1997, 173), esp. 'il filologo alessandrino avrà semplicemente notato, come peculiarità dell'attico, il fatto che in tale ambito, contrariamente a quanto accade nella precedente tradizione poetica, lo iota è per lo più lungo; delle numerose eccezioni probabilmente non si sarà interessato, proprio perché rientranti nella "norma" generale, e non appartenenti a ciò che ai suoi occhi, era degno di nota, cioè la strana quantità lunga frequente negli autori attici'.

end at *Il.* 15.197.¹³⁰ Likewise, Aristophanes was likely to have also been aware that the short scansion could find its place in an Attic text as a tribute to a previous literary tradition. His scope in the Ἀττικά λέξεις must thus have been that of documenting a uniquely Attic trait vis-à-vis the other Greek dialects (ἰων with ἱ).

2.3 Conclusions

We have just seen that in the Ἀττικά λέξεις one finds the same open approach to language issues that characterise other sections of Aristophanes' Λέξεις. In a manner not very different from *OWS*, *Attic Expressions* reveals the same wide-ranging breadth of interests: we find discussed literary and spoken dialects (e.g. Ar.Byz. fr. 337 ἄμβων); semantics (and possibly etymology: e.g. Ar.Byz. fr. 345 χεδροπά), attention to extensions/changes in linguistic usage (e.g. Ar.Byz. fr. 338 δίοπτος), various kinds of realia (bodily parts: Ar.Byz. fr. 341 κοχώνη, 'sockets of the hip-joints'; household tools: Ar.Byz. fr. 342 κρησέρα, 'sieve'; food related to cultic customs: Ar.Byz. fr. 343 προκώνια); issues of literary classification, possibly also led by antiquarian interests (Ar.Byz. fr. 340 Α ἱμαῖος, if the comparison with Call. *Hec.* fr. 74.25 Hollis hits the mark), prosody (Ar.Byz. fr. 346–7). Equally remarkable is the range of sources (comedy, tragedy, orators, and spoken dialects; perhaps even contemporary poetry, cf. Ar. Byz. fr. 345 and the possible mention of Nicander's *Theriaka* already on the part of our scholar and not of a later intermediary source). And just like in *OWS*, when comparison, explicit or implicit, with other (than Attic) dialectal forms takes place, Aristophanes' attitude is generally neutral: Attic forms or peculiarities are registered in a descriptive way without hinting at a hierarchical order among the dialects or at the higher degree of correctness of one of them over the others (cf. e.g. Ar.Byz. fr. 337, 346, 347). All this is consistent with the broader picture of Aristophanes of Byzantium that we have attempted to reconstruct so far: a keen eye for language (mostly, but not uniquely, literary language) as a communicative medium, with a remarkable receptivity to document the variety of linguistic and stylistic possibilities that forms the glides of the linguistic continuum, from literature to the vernacular.

¹³⁰ Cf. schol. (Did.) Hom. *Il.* 15.197c (A), on which see Callanan (1987, 32 with n. 7).

3 Aristarchus of Samothrace

Aristarchus of Samothrace's (ca. 216–144 BCE) scholarly activity was in every respect as monumental as that of Eratosthenes, even if not equal to his predecessor's almost unlimited range of scientific interests.¹³¹ Like Eratosthenes, no ancient sources credit Aristarchus with an independent collection of γλῶσσαι or λέξεις.¹³² However, a marked glossographical interest, in the Aristotelian sense of the word (non-standard meaning of common words, unusual morphology or syntax, dialectal features), characterises his studies on both Attic comedy and Homer's language.¹³³ In the first part of this section, we shall thus offer a concise survey of Aristarchus' interest in Attic comic language as attested by the extant available evidence, with particular attention to those features picked up by the later grammatical and lexicographical tradition. Just as we have done for Aristophanes of Byzantium, issues of normative grammar will be addressed here only when directly relevant to our purposes.¹³⁴ We shall then move to Aristarchus' well-known understanding of the Homeric idiolect as an older variety of Attic (παλαιὰ Ἀτθίς) and attempt to gauge the broader import of this particular conceptualisation of Homer's language for Aristarchus' idea of 'correct Greek' (ἑλληνισμός).

131 Setting aside his ecdotic work and individual monographs (συγγράμματα), the *Suda* reckons that Aristarchus wrote more than 800 commentaries on literary texts (*Su.* α 3892). For an up-to-date critical survey of Aristarchus' textual and interpretative activity (on both poetry and prose texts), see Montana (2020b, 204–17) (= Montana 2015, 130–43) and Montana (2021c). For Aristarchus' ecdotic and hermeneutical work on Homer, Schironi (2018) is now the ultimate port of call.

132 Nünlist (2012b, 211–2) has suggested that Aristarchus may have compiled a word index of Homeric glosses but no sign of it survives in the scholia: see Schironi (2018, 263 with n. 167).

133 For Aristarchus' glossographical interests across genres, see the concise overview by Montana (2021c); on Aristarchus' glossographical approach in his Homeric studies, see Schironi (2018, 217–64). Both scholars rightly highlight Aristarchus' reliance on Aristotle's definition of γλῶσσα (on which see Chapter 6, Section 3.2), especially for his treatment of non-Ionic features in Homer's idiolect: cf. Montana (2020b, 214 n. 389) (= Montana 2015, 140 n. 371). On Aristarchus' view of the Ionic veneer of Homer's language, see Schironi (2018, 602–5).

134 Recent scholarship has conclusively shown that Aristarchus operated within a grammatical conceptual framework far more complex and sophisticated than that of his predecessors (especially as far as the theorisation of the word-class system is concerned): see Ax (1991); Matthaios (1999); Matthaios (2002); Matthaios (2012) and the concise but helpful summary by Matthaios (2014a). Whether this implies that Aristarchus also adopted a systematically normative approach to language as a whole remains a moot point: for a moderately sceptical view, see Schironi (2018, 213–6), following Schenkeveld (1994, 274).

3.1 Aristarchus on comic language

Ancient sources inform us that, in addition to Homer and lyric poetry, Aristarchus also worked on drama (both tragedy and comedy).¹³⁵ His engagement with Attic comedy, and Old Comedy in particular (with a penchant, if the random nature of the extant evidence does not mislead us, for Aristophanes),¹³⁶ is of particular interest for our purposes, since it was Old Comedy that was indisputably the main staple of the Atticist reflection on admissible or inadmissible linguistic usage (cf. Chapter 1, Section 4.1; Chapter 4, Section 5.2; Chapter 5). The Medieval scholiastic corpus on Aristophanes' comedies explicitly mentions Aristarchus 25 times; to these passages, modern scholars have added another four, of uncertain attribution (Aristarch. fr. 4*, 9*, 16*, 20* M.), for a total of 29 fragments.¹³⁷ The plays commented on by Aristarchus include *Frogs* (18x), *Knights* (3x), *Peace* (2x), *Birds* (2x), *Clouds* (1x), *Wasps* (1x), *Women at the Thesmophoria* (1x), and *Wealth* (1x) – that is, almost all 11 plays of the MSS tradition, with the exception of *Acharnians*, *Lysistrata*, and *Assemblywomen*.¹³⁸

The topics addressed by Aristarchus cover the traditional range expected in a learned commentary.¹³⁹ His observations extend from textual criticism,¹⁴⁰ to stagecraft,¹⁴¹ identification of quotations from or allusions to previous authors,¹⁴²

135 For Aristarchus' activity on tragedy, see Pfeiffer (1968, 222–3); Montana (2020b, 212) (= Montana 2015, 138).

136 Aristarchus seems to have worked also on Eupolis: in P.Oxy. 78.5160 (= TM 171095; 2nd/3rd centuries CE) col. ii.29–30, an anonymous commentary on Eupolis' *Goats*, we read ἐν τοῖς Ἀριστάρχειοις ('in the [commentaries] of Aristarchus') with reference to the use of the reflexive third-person pronoun αὐτοῦ instead of the reflexive second-person σαυτοῦ: see Olson (2017, 101–2).

137 In this section, Aristarchus' fragments on Attic Comedy will be quoted according to the numeration of Muzzolon (hereafter M.). Muzzolon (2005) is, to the best of our knowledge, the only comprehensive study on the subject. We have only one piece of evidence mentioning Aristarchus from the extant direct tradition, that is, P.Oxy. 35.2737 (= TM 59248; 2nd century CE), apparently a commentary to Aristophanes' *Anagyros* (= Ar. fr. 590 = *CLGP* 1.1.4 Aristophanes no. 27; a Didyman origin, through epitomisation, is possible: see Montana 2012 *ad loc.*).

138 Cf. Pfeiffer (1968, 224), who inclines to think that Aristarchus must originally have written commentaries on all the Aristophanic comedies come down to us via the Medieval tradition. It is usually assumed that Aristarchus did not edit Aristophanes but relied on the edition by his predecessor Aristophanes of Byzantium: see Muzzolon (2005, 56) with further bibliography.

139 As will become obvious, some fragments belong to more than one topic; the classification proposed here is purely *exempli gratia*.

140 Atheteseis: schol. Ar. Ra. 1437–441a = Aristarch. fr. 28 M.

141 The splitting of the chorus into corypheus and semichorus or into two semichoruses: schol. Ar. Ra. 354a–c and 372c–d = Aristarch. fr. 15 and 17 M.

142 Schol. Ar. Ra. 1141–3 = Aristarch. fr. 21 M.; schol. Ar. Ra. 1206c = Aristarch. fr. 23 M.; schol. Ar. Ra. 1269c = Aristarch. fr. 24 M.; schol. Ar. Ra. 1400a = Aristarch. fr. 25 M.

interpretative issues of a miscellaneous nature,¹⁴³ observations on realia and historical figures,¹⁴⁴ and grammatical and lexical questions. The fragments pertaining to these last two categories are as follows:

Grammar: oxytone accentuation of the neuter accusative adjective **κραγόν** ‘vociferous’ used adverbially (schol. Ar. *Eq.* 487a = Aristarch. fr. 1 M.); orthography of **ἦν** < **έάν** (schol. *Pl.* 3b = Aristarch. fr. 29 M.: Aristarchus called **άντίστροφος** what other grammarians usually called **άπόστροφος**); use of the dual **θρίω** ‘fig’ (schol. Ar. *Ra.* 134 = Aristarch. fr. 11 M.); grammatical number of **άφύη** ‘anchovy’ (schol. Ar. *Av.* 76a = Aristarch. fr. 8 M.); grammatical gender of the singing cicada (vs the non-singing one: schol. *Pax* 1159c = Aristarch. fr. 6 M.); the use of **κατά** + **accusative** to indicate motion (schol. Ar. *Av.* 1178a = Aristarch. fr. 9* M.);¹⁴⁵

Lexicon: explanation of a proverb (schol. Ar. *Eq.* 1279a = Aristarch. fr. 3 M.); **φασιανοί** referring to a particular breed of birds, not horses (schol. Ar. *Nu.* 109a = Aristarch. fr. 4* M.);¹⁴⁶ etymological analysis of the hapax **άρχαιομελισιδωνοφρυνιχήρατα** (schol. Ar. *V.* 220c = Aristarch. fr. 5 M.); semantically extended use of **κρέα**, literally ‘pieces of meat’, in the sense of **σώματα** ‘bodies’, ‘lives’ (schol. Ar. *Ra.* 191c = Aristarch. fr. 12 M.); meaning of **έμποδίζω** in the obscure expression **έμποδίζων ισχάδας** (schol. Ar. *Eq.* 755a = Aristarch. fr. 2 M.);¹⁴⁷ an extended meaning of the adjective **προθέλυμος**

143 Deictics: schol. Ar. *Ra.* 308a = Aristarch. fr. 13 M.; comic irony: schol. Ar. *Ra.* 134 = Aristarch. fr. 11 M. and schol. Ar. *Ra.* 320b = Aristarch. fr. 14 M.; disambiguation of the primary referent: schol. Ar. *Ra.* 970b = Aristarch. fr. 18 M.; schol. Ar. *Ra.* 1413a = Aristarch. fr. 26 M.; division of lines among the actors: schol. Ar. *Ra.* 1449 = Aristarch. fr. 22 M.; Aeschylus’ *Oresteia* as trilogy rather than tetralogy: schol. Ar. *Ra.* 1124 = Aristarch. fr. 20* M. (the MS tradition is split between **Άρίσταρχος** and **Άριχος**).

144 Alcibiades’ career: schol. Ar. *Ra.* 1422d = Aristarch. fr. 27 M.; Agathon: schol. Ar. *Th.* 31 = Aristarch. fr. 10 M.; Theramenes: schol. Ar. *Ra.* 970b = Aristarch. fr. 18 M.; Arignotus: schol. Ar. *Eq.* 1279a = Aristarch. fr. 3 M.; the tragedian Phrynichus: schol. Ar. *V.* 220c = Aristarch. fr. 5 M.; Diagoras: schol. Ar. *Ra.* 320b = Aristarch. fr. 14 M.; the underlying realia of the adjective **ταυρόφαγος** (the prize at the Great Dionysia): schol. Ar. *Ra.* 357d = Aristarch. fr. 16* M. (of uncertain attribution: the MSS of the scholia read **Άριστόξενον**; *Su.* τ 169 has **Άρίσταρχον**).

145 The ascription of this fragment to Aristarchus is uncertain: the MSS of the scholium have an inflected form of **Άριστοφάνης** (E has the accusative; I³ the genitive). This scholium is Ar. Byz. fr. *inc. sed.* 393 in Slater’s edition: see Slater (1986, 152–3) and Muzzolon (2005, 87–8). A very lucid discussion of this scholium can be found in Ascheri (2003, 44–5).

146 The ascription to Aristarchus is uncertain. R, *codex unicus* for this scholium, reads **Άρχιλοχον**: **Άρίσταρχον** is Ruhnken’s emendation, see Muzzolon (2005, 82).

147 In schol. Ar. *Eq.* 755a II (VEI³ΘM), we are told that Aristarchus takes **έμποδίζων** to mean **μασώμενος** ή **έμφορούμενος** (‘chewing or stuffing oneself with’) – that is, not paying attention to what one should pay attention to; yet in schol. Ar. *Eq.* 755a III VEI³ΘM, we are also informed that

(schol. Ar. *Pax* 1210c = Aristarch. fr. 7 M.) in the sense of ‘compacted’, ‘piled upon one another’ (τὸ συνεχῆς καὶ ἄλλο ἐπ’ ἄλλῳ) on the basis of two Homeric parallels (*Il.* 13.130, 15.479; the standard meaning of προθέλυμνος is that of πρόρριζος ‘from the foundation’, ‘by the roots’); onomatopoeic effect of μαμμάκουθος ‘blockhead’ (schol. Ar. *Ra.* 990a–b = Aristarch. fr. 19 M.), apparently a neologism according to Aristarchus, if the criticism of Demetrius Ixion in schol. Ar. *Ra.* 990b (μαμμάκουθος is such a common word (σύνηθεος) that the comedian Plato gave it as title to one of his comedies: Pl.Com. test. 2) has our scholar as a polemical target.

In both categories, we find what we would normally expect to be addressed in a scholarly commentary on a literary text: a detailed treatment of matters of orthography, accentuation, morphology, and syntax but also broader issues concerning etymology,¹⁴⁸ the semantics of obscure expressions or proverbial sayings,¹⁴⁹ and the analysis of stylistic features (e.g. onomatopoeia). In none of these passages does Aristarchus comment on the semantics, phonology, or morphology of a word or on a syntactic construction as being specifically Attic as distinct from other dialectal varieties (as he does in his Homeric studies: see below Section 3.2). However, some of his observations, unsurprisingly, percolated through the later grammatical tradition and ended up providing the basis for the formal ‘Attic’ status of certain linguistic phenomena, thereby acquiring an additional, prescriptive validation of ‘correctness’.¹⁵⁰ An example of this process may be glimpsed, if not directly seen, in schol. Ar. *Eq.* 487a (= Aristarch. fr. 1 M.):

Schol. Ar. *Eq.* 487a (VEΓΘ): κραγὸν¹⁵¹ κεκράζεται· Ἀρίσταρχος ὄξυτόνως ἀντὶ τοῦ κραυγασι-
κῶς, καὶ Ἡρωδιανὸς ἐν Ἀττικῇ προσωδία.

Aristarchus, just like Symmachus (a grammarian of the 1st/2nd century CE), saw in the expression a reference to the behaviour of beekeepers: they chewed the figs up or trampled them with their feet. Cf. also Hsch. ε 2482 and 2485 and *Su.* κ 1464.

148 On Aristarchus and his use of etymology, see Schironi (2018, 340–76); Nünlist (2019).

149 On the importance of paroemiography for the development of Hellenistic lexicographical studies, see Tosi (1994a, 179–93).

150 An excellent example of this process in relation to Herodian and its later epitomisations, can be found in Probert (2011).

151 The overall majority of the MSS of the *Knights* have κραγὸν (AΘ read κραγῶν; for other minority readings of some MSS, see Muzzolon 2005, 79). Meineke’s correction of the transmitted κραγὸν (the accusative neuter of the adjective κραγός used adverbially) into κράγον (the accusative of the noun ὁ κράγος; see the note below), on the basis of similar *figurae etymologicae* (e.g. Ar. *Av.* 42 τόνδε τὸν βάδον βαδίζομεν) is generally accepted by modern editors.

He will scream a scream (κραγὸν κεκράζεται): Aristarchus has κραγὸν oxytone in the sense of (the adverb) κραυγαστικῶς ('vociferously'). So also Herodian in his *Attic Prosody* (Hdn. Περὶ Ἀττικῆς προσωδίας GG 3.2.20.18–20).¹⁵²

Pseudo-Arcadius, in his epitome of Herodian, records the following prescription:

[Arcad.] *De prosodia catholica epitome* 170.15–7 Roussou: τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΑΓΟΣ διβράχεια ἐπιθετικά καὶ μὴ ἔθνικὰ ὀξύνεται· φαγός, κραγός (ὁ κραυγαστικός). τὸ δὲ Κράγος βαρύνεται,¹⁵³ καὶ τὸ Μάγος ἔθνικόν.

Adjectives with two short (syllables) (ending) in -αγος, but not the ethnic designations, are oxytone: φαγός, κραγός ('one who is vociferous'). But Κράγος (i.e. the Lycian mountain so named: cf. above n. 152) is recessive, and Μάγος is an ethnic designation. (Translation by Roussou 2018, 71).

Aristarchus is not explicitly mentioned either in the text of Herodian as reconstructed by Lentz or in Pseudo-Arcadius' epitome, yet Aristarchus' observation on Ar. *Eq.* 487 is likely to be the source, directly or indirectly, of both. Was Aristarchus dictating a general rule on adjectives with two short syllables ending in -αγος that did not designate an ethnic origin? It seems unlikely: more likely probably, Herodian or someone else before him transformed what was originally a textual discussion on a precise passage of Aristophanes (according to Aristarchus, at *Eq.* 487 we should read κραγὸν because we are dealing with an accusative neuter adjective used adverbially and not with the accusative of the noun ὁ κράγος) into a prescriptive grammatical narrative.

Quite interesting from this perspective is also the schol. Ar. *Av.* 1178a (= Aristarch. fr. 9* M.), where we have a comment on the use of κατὰ + accusative to indicate motion toward something/someone (a syntactical construction which was perceived by ancient scholars as 'Attic'):

Schol. Ar. *Av.* 1178a (EΓ³): κατ' αὐτὸν· πρὸς τὴν ἐν Ἰλιάδι γραφὴν τὴν 'χθιζὸς ἔβη κατὰ δαῖτα'. οὕτως ἀξιοῦσιν ἸΑριστοφάνην† γράφειν.

κατ'αὐτὸν: Compare the reading in the *Iliad* 'yesterday (sc. Zeus) went to feast' (*Il.* 1.424). They judge that ἸΑριστοφάνην† (Ar.Byz. fr. *inc. sed.* 393) wrote thus.

¹⁵² Cf. Lentz's collage (omitting Aristarchus' mention) in Hdn. Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωδίας GG 3.1.140.4–6: τὰ διὰ τοῦ αγος διβράχεια ἐπιθετικά καὶ μὴ ἔθνικὰ ὀξύνεται, φαγός, κραγός ὁ κραυγαστικός. τὸ δὲ κράγος ὁ κραυγασμός βαρύνεται καὶ τὸ Κράγος ὄρος Λυκίας.

¹⁵³ The MSS tradition is perturbed: the section ὁ κραυγαστικός – καὶ τὸ is printed as restored by Schmidt (MO read τὸ δὲ κράγος ὁ κραυγαστικός, τὸ δὲ). For Lobeck's different textual arrangement, see the apparatus of Roussou (2018, 170).

The attribution of this fragment is much debated, and it is indeed possible that Aristophanes of Byzantium may, after all, be the likeliest candidate, not Aristarchus.¹⁵⁴ In this scholium to Aristophanes' *Birds*, we would thus have Aristophanes of Byzantium rather than Aristarchus quoting a Homeric passage in support of the construction κατ'αὐτόν in Aristophanes to indicate motion toward. However, if we return to the ancients' exegesis of *Il.* 1.423–4, the plot thickens, and we can see that Aristarchus, after all, did play some role in defending this construction (κατά + accusative = ἐπί + accusative) in the Homeric text. The text of the Homeric scholia to *Il.* 1.423–4 is as follows:

Schol. (Did.) Hom. *Il.* 1.423–4 (A) = Aristarch. fr. 185 A¹ Matthaios: Ζεὺς [. . .] μετ' ἀμύμονας Αἰθιοπῆας > | χθιζὸς ἔβη <κατὰ δαῖτα, θεοὶ δ' ἅμα πάντες ἔπονται> λέξις Ἀριστάρχου ἐκ τοῦ Α τῆς Ἰλιάδος ὑπομνήματος· '[. . .] τὸ δὲ κατὰ δαῖτα ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐπὶ δαῖτα· οὕτως γὰρ νῦν Ὅμηρος τέθεικεν. ἔνιοι δὲ ποιῶσι 'μετὰ δαῖτα', ὅπως ἢ αὐτοῖς αὐτόθεν τὸ μετὰ ἐπὶ. χρώνται δὲ καὶ πλείονες ἄλλοι τῶν ποιητῶν τῇ κατὰ ἀντὶ τῆς ἐπὶ. Σοφοκλῆς· 'ἐγὼ κατ' αὐτόν, ὡς ὀρᾶς, ἐξέρχομαι' κτλ.

<Zeus [. . .] went yesterday to the excellent Ethiopians κατὰ δαῖτα and all the gods are following suit>: These are Aristarchus' words from his commentary on Book 1 of the *Iliad*: '[. . .] κατὰ δαῖτα (l. 424) [is used] instead of ἐπὶ δαῖτα. For this is the meaning with which Homer has used it now (i.e. in this verse). Others instead make it μετὰ δαῖτα so that in the same passage (cf. l. 423 μετ' ἀμύμονας Αἰθιοπῆας) they can find μετὰ in the sense of ἐπὶ. And many other poets too use κατὰ in the sense of ἐπὶ. Sophocles [for instance writes]: 'As you can see, I'm going to him' (Soph. fr. 898)' etc.

The Didymus scholium informs us that Aristarchus did read κατὰ δαῖτα (and not μετὰ δαῖτα as the vulgate), just as his predecessor Aristophanes of Byzantium (and other ancient scholars) did.¹⁵⁵ Moreover, we discover that Aristarchus defended the equivalence κατὰ δαῖτα = ἐπὶ δαῖτα in Homer with reference to a line of Sophocles (Soph. fr. 898) as an example of the fact that 'also many other poets' used κατὰ in the spatial sense of 'toward'. That is, Aristarchus supported the Homeric reading κατὰ δαῖτα by quoting, among other examples, an Attic author, the

¹⁵⁴ See the excellent analysis by Ascheri (2003, 44–5), to whom we are greatly indebted.

¹⁵⁵ The scholium goes on to say that the reading κατὰ δαῖτα can also be found in the Massaliotic edition, in that of Sinope and Cyprus, and in those by Antimachus (fr. 168 Matthews) and Aristophanes of Byzantium (cf. Slater 1986, 175); it also adds that the same opinion was held by Callistratus in Πρὸς τὰς ἀθετήσεις (cf. Barth 1984, 21–31), Sidonius, and Demetrius Ixion (Demetr.Ix.fr. 27 Staesche) in the sixth book of his Πρὸς τὰς ἐξηγήσεις (οὕτως δὲ εὐρομεν καὶ ἐν τῇ Μασσαλιωτικῇ καὶ Σινωπικῇ καὶ Κυπρία καὶ Ἀντιμαχείῳ καὶ Ἀριστοφανεῖῳ. Καλλίστρατος δὲ ἐν τῷ Πρὸς τὰς ἀθετήσεις ὁμοίως, καὶ ὁ Σιδώνιος καὶ ὁ Ἰξίων ἐν τῷ ἕκτῳ Πρὸς τὰς ἐξηγήσεις). According to West (2001, 54), Didymus' quotation of Aristarchus ends with the Sophoclean citation: what follows is Didymus', not Aristarchus', material; see Ascheri (2003, 33–5).

tragedian Sophocles (that is, just the reverse of what Aristophanes of Byzantium did in *Ar.Byz.* fr. 393). If one recalls that, according to Aristarchus, Homer was originally an Athenian who lived at the time of the Ionic migration and thus spoke a version of ‘Old Attic’ (see below), it is not difficult to see why Aristarchus quoted Sophocles: as already observed by van der Valk (1963–1964 vol. 2, 130–1) and Matthaïos (1999, 593), among others, for our grammarian such an extended use of *κατά* + accusative to indicate motion toward was an ‘Attic usage’ (whereas *μετά* + accusative = ‘toward’ was not).¹⁵⁶

Only in one case does Aristarchus appear to express a more generalised preference for a given grammatical usage (*ἀφύη* ‘anchovy’, ‘sprat’, in the singular vs the plural *ἀφύαι*). This occurs in *schol. Ar. Av.* 76a (= fr. 8 M.):

Schol. Ar. Av. 76a: ἀφύας (V) ὅτι πληθυντικῶς λέγουσι τὰς ἀφύας. Ἀρίσταρχος δὲ οὐκ ἀποδέχεται πληθυντικῶς, διὸ τὸ χ (VEFLh).

ἀφύας: [The critical sign *χ* occurs] because they say τὰς ἀφύας in the plural. But Aristarchus does not accept the plural form, hence the *χ*.¹⁵⁷

This passage is problematic not so much because Aristarchus expresses a preference (*οὐκ ἀποδέχεται*) for one form over the other¹⁵⁸ but because, as noted by Muzzolon (2005, 86), our text, which must have suffered from epitomisation, is likely to be corrupt: the use of the plural form is absolutely majoritarian – that is, 20x vs 11x for the singular,¹⁵⁹ and this is not only across the comic corpus of every period (Old, Middle and New Comedy) but especially in Aristophanes’ oeuvre. In fact, the plural form is attested 11 times in Aristophanes, whereas the singular is

¹⁵⁶ Cf., in particular, Matthaïos (1999, 592–3); see also Ascheri (2003, 43; 45). The alternative hypothesis that Aristarchus considered the construction *κατά* + accusative to indicate motion toward a mere poeticism (vs. a specific Atticism) seems less likely to us.

¹⁵⁷ The critical sign *χ* (corresponding to our NB) is transmitted only by the MSS Lh. The only other attestation of the use of *χ* by Aristarchus is in *Eust. in Od.* 2.275.21–2 (commenting on *Hom. Od.* 22.144): σημείωσαι δὲ καὶ ὅτι τὸ περὶ τῶν δώδεκα σακέων καὶ τὸ ἐφεξῆς Ἀρίσταρχος ἀθετήσας κεχίακεν, ἀδύνατον εἶναι εἰπὼν τοσαῦτα βαστάσαι ἄνθρωπον. As observed by Schironi (2018, 57 n. 39) following McNamee (1992, 19 n. 60), Eustathius is discussing a case of athetesis: it is hence likely that *χιάζω* here is used in the general meaning of ‘mark with a critical sign’ rather than ‘mark with a *χ*’ (see also Pontani 2018, 53–4). Schironi (2018) does not mention the case of *schol. Ar. Av.* 76a.

¹⁵⁸ The reason for this preference cannot be the metre because *ἀφύας* Φαληρικός (the transmitted reading of *Av.* 76) and a hypothetical *ἀφύαν* Φαληρικήν are metrically equivalent.

¹⁵⁹ Note that the singular form might have been interesting for grammarians also because of its featuring overwhelmingly in Attic comic texts in the Ionic form *ἀφύη* (the only exception is the 4th-century BCE comic poet Sotades *Com. fr.* 1.30).

recorded only once in Ar. fr. 520.1 ἄλις ἀφύης μοι (from a lyric section in the *Tage-nistai*), where the singular is possibly also motivated by the fact that the expression is a playful variation of the proverb ἄλις δρυός (Zenob. 2.40).¹⁶⁰ ἀφύη indicates a very small fish: you never eat just one but a whole bunch of them (like with ‘small fries’). It is possible, therefore, that Aristarchus meant that the singular was to be preferred because ἀφύη represented a collective noun, but this is just one possibility among many, and until new clarifying evidence comes to light, a *non liquet* is in order. What is certain is that (1) Aristarchus did not propose a textual emendation to the passage of the *Birds* and (2) the later Atticist tradition itself was in two minds about the admissibility of the singular form ἀφύη: Phrynichus admitted both the plural and the singular as good Greek (both are attested in Aristophanes),¹⁶¹ and so did also the *Synagoge*, Photius, the *Suda*,¹⁶² and the *EM* (all acknowledging the plural form as the majority usage),¹⁶³ whereas Hesychius admitted the plural only.¹⁶⁴

To sum up, with the partial exception of schol. Ar. Av. 76a (= fr. 8 M.), where much remains unclear, we do not find in Aristarchus’ reflection on comic language marked prescriptive tendencies. In this sense, Aristarchus does not appear to differentiate himself from his predecessor Aristophanes of Byzantium. We also saw that what in Aristarchus were probably punctual textual comments on a specific Aristophanic passage were incorporated by the later grammatical tradition into a prescriptive framework that may not have originally been present in Aristarchus (schol. Ar. Eq. 487a = fr. 1 M.). Furthermore, even if we ascribe the schol. Ar. Av. 1178a (= fr. 9* M.) to Aristophanes of Byzantium, in our analysis of a related passage, that is, schol. (Did.) Hom. *Il.* 1.423–4 (A), we saw that Aristarchus could defend a Homeric construction (κατά + accusative to indicate motion toward) with a quotation from Attic drama (Sophocles), most probably because Homer, in his opinion, spoke an older version of Attic (schol. (Did.) Hom. *Il.* 1.423–4 (A)).

160 See Bagordo (2020, 84). On Ar. fr. 520.1 cf. also *Su.* α 4660: ἀφύα ἐς πῦρ· ἐπὶ τῶν τέλος ὀξὺ λαμβανόντων ἢ παροιμία· παρόσον καὶ τὴν ἀφύαν τάχιστα ἔψεσθαι συμβαίνει. ἐνικῶς δὲ παρὰ Ἀριστοφάνει λέγεται ἐν Ταγηνισταῖς ἀφύη· ἀλλ’ αἰεὶ πληθυντικῶς τὰς ἀφύας.

161 Phryn. *PS* 17.10: ἀφύη· καὶ ἐνικῶς λέγεται καὶ πληθυντικῶς ἀφύαι.

162 See n. 160 above.

163 Σ^b α 2576 (= Phot. α 3407): ἀφύας· πληθυντικῶς λέγουσι. σπανιώτατα δὲ ἀφύην; *Et.Gen.* α 1495: ἀφύη· ἰχθύδιον μικρὸν καὶ σύννηθες· εἴρηται δὲ ἐνικῶς σπανίως, πλεονάκις δὲ πληθυντικῶς.

164 Hsch. α 8804: ἀφύων τιμή· τὸ ἔλαιον, ἐπεὶ ἐν τούτῳ ἔψονται (*Ar. Ach.* 640) λέγουσι δὲ Ἀττικοὶ πληθυντικῶς τὰς ἀφύας, ἐνικῶς δὲ οὐδέποτε.

3.2 Aristarchus, Homer's παλαιὰ Ἀτθίς, and ἑλληνισμός

This brings us neatly to our second point: Aristarchus' view of the Homeric language as an older variety of Attic (παλαιὰ Ἀτθίς). We shall first briefly review the features of Homer's language that Aristarchus identified as specifically Attic before attempting to understand how this particular view of the Homeric idiolect informed his idea of 'correct Greek' (ἑλληνισμός).

The first point to observe is that, as convincingly argued by recent scholarship, Aristarchus was generally aware not only that Homer's Greek was different from the current linguistic usage of his own time (Hellenistic koine) but also that Greek language as a whole (its semantics, syntax, and morphology) had evolved through time.¹⁶⁵ In the Homeric scholia, we are repeatedly told that Aristarchus compared the Homeric συνήθεια to the contemporary linguistic usage of his own time.¹⁶⁶ In this sense, he was also aware of the presence of different chronological layers within the epic corpus and differentiated, in terms of relative chronology, between Homer and οἱ νεώτεροι/οἱ μεθ' Ὀμηρον (a category that included not only Hesiod and the epic cycle but also all the poets after Homer, tragedians included).¹⁶⁷ More specifically, for Aristarchus, Homer's 'base-language' was essentially Ionic and Attic, with a limited amount of admixture from Doric and Aeolic.¹⁶⁸

The linguistic features of Homer's language explicitly singled out as distinctly Attic by Aristarchus are as follows:¹⁶⁹

165 See Nünlist (2012a); Schironi (2018, 597–622). To quote just one example, Aristarchus considered the construction of δέχεσθαι + dative 'to receive/take something from someone' (instead of the usual δέχεσθαι + παρά + genitive) as a syntactic archaism in Homer: cf. schol. (Ariston.) Hom. *Il.* 2.186a (A): δέξατο οἱ σκῆπτρον· ὅτι ἀρχαϊκώτερον δέξατο αὐτῷ τὸ σκῆπτρον ἀντὶ τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ).

166 On Aristarchus' use of expressions such as ἡ (ἡμετέρα) συνήθεια/χρῆσις, συνήθως ἡμῖν, τὸ νῦν λεγόμενον, ἡμεῖς δέ, νῦν δέ to refer to Hellenistic koine, see, above all, Schironi (2018, 226–9; 599–601).

167 See Nünlist (2012a, 152–3).

168 This part of the section closely follows Schironi's thorough overview of the 'dialectal nuances' in Homer as they were perceived and interpreted by Aristarchus (Schironi 2018, 601–16).

169 Items 1–6 are covered in greater detail by Schironi (2018, 605–6). As Schironi herself observed (2018, 619), it is sometimes quite difficult to determine whether the 'Attic' label attached to some grammatical phenomena in our scholia is a later classification or actually dates back to Aristarchus. One instance is the use of μή + aorist imperative (rather than aorist subjunctive; modern linguistics interprets it as an archaic form of injunctive: cf. Chantraine 2015, 230) in schol. (Hdn.) Hom. *Il.* 4.410a (A): <ὁμοίη> ἔνθεο· Ἀρίσταρχος ἐν ποιεῖ τὸ ἐνθεο ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐνθου, ἵνα γένηται Ἀττικόν, ὁμοιον τῷ 'μὴ ψεῦσον, ὦ Ζεῦ, <τῆς ἐπιούσης ἐλπίδος>' (Ar. *Th.* 870). The immediate context is a discussion concerning how to segment words in *scriptio continua* (i.e. whether one should read ὁμοίη ἔνθεο τιμῆ (with the compound verb ἐντίθημι) or ὁμοίη ἐν θεο τιμῆ (with

(1) The use of the nominative *pro* vocative (in modern terms, an inherited IE feature: that is, *not* a peculiarity of Greek, and certainly, within Greek, not of the Attic dialect only): cf. e.g. schol. (Ariston.) Hom. *Il.* 3.277a2 (T): Ἡέλιος {τε} Ἀττικῶς ἄλλά, φίλος, θάνε καὶ σύ' (*Il.* 21.106).

(2) The use of ἐπί + genitive to indicate movement toward a place (as attested also in Thucydides and Xenophon) instead of εἰς or ἐπί + accusative: cf. e.g. schol. (Ariston. | exc.) Hom. *Il.* 3.5 (AbT): <κλαγγῆ ταί γε πέτονται> ἐπ' Ὠκεανοῖο ῥοάων ἀντί τοῦ εἰς ῥοάς, Ἀττικῶς.

(3) The construction of κελεύειν, 'to order', + accusative instead of dative to indicate the recipient of the command: cf. e.g. schol. (Ariston.) Hom. *Il.* 20.4b3 (B): τὸ δὲ Θέμιστα Ἀττικῶς ἀντί τοῦ Θέμιστι. Likewise, the construction ἀφαιρέομαι + double accusative ('to deprive someone of something'), though not strictly an Atticism by modern linguistic standards (cf. Schwyzer 1953, 82 δ), was also apparently perceived by Aristarchus as Attic: cf. schol. (ex. | Ariston.) Hom. *Il.* 1.275a (T): μήτε σὺ <τόνδ' ἀγαθός περ ἔων ἀποαίρεο κούρηγ>· τὸ δὲ ἀποαίρεο Ἀττικόν and 1.275b (A): <τόνδ' ἀποαίρεο> ὅτι ἰάρχαϊκῶς† (fort. Ἀττικῶς Erbse) τόνδε ἀφαιροῦ, οὐχὶ τοῦδε.¹⁷⁰ It is also worth noticing that in these two scholia, the same syntactic phenomenon is *prima facie* described differently: as an Atticism in the T scholium (strictly speaking, in T it is the single verbal form ἀποαίρεο that is remarked upon as Attic, but the context and the grammatical tradition make clear that the construction of ἀφαιρέομαι + accusative is intended); as an archaism in the A scholium (Erbse deems the reading corrupt). According to Nünlist (2012a, 163–4), this might suggest that at a certain point in time, dialectal explanations attained the upper hand over the earlier diachronic ones.¹⁷¹ A second possibility, however, is that the different nomenclature may, after all, be coeval, since Aristarchus himself considered some archaisms to be Atticisms (see Schironi 2018, 620–1 with n. 109) and that the emphasis on one 'label' rather than the other in different branches of the tradition may be simply attributable to the accidents of transmission.

(4) The use of the ending -ντων of the third-person plural of the present imperative instead of the koine form -τωσαν (φευγόντων 'let them flee' is used Ἀττικῶς instead of φευγέτωσαν): cf. e.g. schol. (Ariston.) Hom. *Il.* 9.47a (A): <φευγόντων> ὅτι Ἀττικῶς ἀντί τοῦ φευγέτωσαν.

the simplex τίθημι). Schironi rightly argues in favour of Herodian (rather than Aristarchus) as the probable origin of the 'Attic' tag of this σχῆμα.

¹⁷⁰ Cf. also Nünlist (2012a, 161–2).

¹⁷¹ See Nünlist (2012a, 163–4): 'the hypothesis that arguments based on dialect superseded diachronic explanations is plausible'.

(5) The use of the dual, a trait that is specifically referred to as proper of οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι: cf. schol. (Ariston.) Hom. *Il.* 13.197 (A): {ἔμβριον αὐτῶ} Αἴαντε <μεμαότε>· ὅτι συνεχῶς κέχρηται τοῖς δυϊκοῖς. ἡ δὲ ἀναφορά πρὸς τὰ περὶ τῆς πατρίδος. Ἀθηναίων γὰρ ἴδιον. ‘The two Ajaxes eager [of furious strength]: because (the poet) has used the dual throughout. The reference is to the issue of [his] homeland: for [this feature is] typical of the Athenians’.

(6) The use of ἤμαι ‘to sit’ in the sense of διατρίβω ‘to spend time’: schol. Hom. *Il.* 21.122 (= P.Oxy. 2.221, ll. 6–10 = TM 60508; 2nd century CE; commenting on the line ἐνταυθοῖ νῦν ἦσο μετ’ ἰχθύσιν): Ἀ[ρίσταρχος] δὲ Ἀττικόν φη[σι τ]ὸ ἦσο | [ἀντι τοῦ] διάτριβε. ἐὰν δὲ [ψιλή] ἦ<ι>, εἰς | [τὸ ὑπαρχε] μεταφραστέον, . . .]φ | [.] ἦσο.¹⁷²

Particularly telling for us are items (5) and (6). In Chapter 5, Section C.1.5.1–2, we saw that already at the end of the 5th century BCE, in literary Attic, the third-person plural active and middle/passive endings -ντων and -σθων of the present imperative are waning and that the first attestations of the koine forms -τωσαν and -σθωσαν are roughly coeval. Against this backdrop, item (5) allows us to say, with Schironi (2018, 606), that ‘[t]herefore, by ‘Attic’ Aristarchus must have meant an older form of Attic, used before the middle of the fifth century BCE’. Even more interesting for our purposes is item (6): the reference to the dual, well attested in Attic literary texts of the 5th century BCE (and epigraphically until the last decade of the 4th century BCE), but already disappearing in 4th-century BCE Attic (both in literary texts and inscriptions: cf. Chapter 5, Section B.1.1), permits us not only to confirm the inference that by Attic, Aristarchus meant an ‘old form’ of Attic,¹⁷³ but it also gives an all-important piece of information: Homer came from Athens. His consistent use (συνεχῶς) of the dual was, for Aristarchus, direct proof that the poet was originally an Athenian¹⁷⁴ who lived during the colo-

¹⁷² Aristarchus’ name is almost entirely in lacuna, but its restoration seems likely (this example is omitted by Schironi 2018). The Medieval scholia comment on the Attic nature of the adverb ἐνταῦθοι but not on that of ἤμαι as synonym to διατρίβω: cf. schol. (ex.) Hom. *Il.* 21.122a1 (T): <ΕΝΤΑΥΘΟΙ νῦν ἦσο> †περισπαστέον τὸ ΕΝΤΑΥΘΟΙ· ἔστι γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐνταῦθα Ἀττικοῦ. τὸ δὲ ἦσο δασυντέον· τινὲς δὲ ψιλοῦσιν, ἔν’ ἢ ἀντι τοῦ ἴσθι. ἐνιοὶ δὲ γράφουσιν ‘ἐνταῦθοι νῦν κείσο’· ἀμεινον δὲ τὸ πρῶτον. The tradition is split between κείσο and ἦσο (schol. (ex.) Hom. *Il.* 21.122b1 (TT¹¹): [. . .]<ἦσο> δὲ δίαγε ἡ ὑπαρχε) and schol. (Did.) Hom. *Il.* 21.122c1 (A): <κείσο> διχῶς, κείσο καὶ ‘ἦσο’): see van der Valk (1963–1964 vol. 1, 594–6).

¹⁷³ On the dual in Homer according to Aristarchus, see also Matthaios (1999, 378–82); Ascheri (2004). On the debate among Hellenistic Homeric scholarship on the use (and abuse) of the dual in Homer, see now Schironi (2018, 587–91; 607–11).

¹⁷⁴ Cf. *Vita Homeri* V, p. 247.7–8 Allen: (Ὀμηρος) [. . .] κατὰ Ἀρίσταρχον καὶ Διονύσιον τὸν Θράκη Ἀθηναῖος (D.T. fr. 47 Linke); cf. also [Plu.] *Vit. Hom.* 2.2: (Ὀμηρον) [. . .] Ἀρίσταρχος δὲ καὶ

nisation of Ionia¹⁷⁵ and thus spoke an old form of Attic – that is, παλαιὰ Ἀτθίς – as confirmed by Choerob. *In Theod. GG* 4,2.86.20 (~ Hdn. Περὶ παθῶν *GG* 3,2.236.16) ὄντος δὲ τοῦ ποιητοῦ τῆς παλαιᾶς Ἀτθίδος).¹⁷⁶ This brings us to a much-discussed passage of Apollonius Dyscolus in which the 2nd-century CE grammarian, within a discussion of the plural forms of the third-personal reflexive pronouns, reports Aristarchus' opinion that Homer's language embodied the perfection of 'correct Greek' (ἑλληνισμός):

Apoll.Dysc. *Pron. GG* 2,1.71.22–9 (= Aristarchus fr. 125 A¹ Matthaios): τὸν μὲν οὖν Ἀρίσταρχον ἐπιμέμψεσθαι φασὶ τὰ σχήματα, καθὼς ἄφ' ἐνικῆς συντάξεως τῆς 'ἐαυτὸν' πληθυντικῆ ἐγένετο ἢ 'ἐαυτοῦς', μάρτυρά τε ἐπάγεσθαι τὸν ποιητὴν, 'παρ' ᾧ τὰ τοῦ Ἑλληνισμοῦ ἠκρίβωται, ἐν οἷς πάντοτε ἐν διαλύσει ἐστὶ τὰ τρίτα, ὁμοίως τοῖς πρώτοις καὶ δευτέροις, 'σφᾶς αὐτοῦς' καὶ 'σφῶν αὐτῶν'. πρὸς οἷς καὶ τῶν πρώτων καὶ δευτέρων οὐκ ὄντων ἐν συνθέσει πληθυντικῆ, ἐξ ἀνάγκης καὶ τοῖς τρίτοις παρηκολούθει ταῦτόν'.

They say that Aristarchus finds fault with the forms, because out of a singular compositional form ἐαυτὸν a plural ἐαυτοῦς has been made, and that he adduces as a witness the poet (Homer), 'in whose works matters of good Greek are perfect, (and) in which (works) the third person (plural reflexive pronouns) are always separated, like the first and second persons: σφᾶς αὐτοῦς and σφῶν αὐτῶν. In addition, since the first and second persons do not exist in composition in the plural, the same has necessarily followed for the third persons'. (Translation by Probert 2011, 271).

That Homer is the poet παρ' ᾧ τὰ τοῦ Ἑλληνισμοῦ ἠκρίβωται is stated in a context in which Aristarchus defends Homer's usage of the parathetic forms σφῶν αὐτῶν, σφᾶς αὐτοῦς of the third-person plural of the reflexive pronouns against the compound forms ἐαυτῶν, ἐαυτοῦς. Aristarchus' reasoning is twofold: (1) the first argument is *ex*

Διονύσιος ὁ Θραξ (sc. οὐκ ὠκνήσαν δὲ εἰπεῖν) Ἀθηναῖον. Aristarchus himself wrote a monograph entitled Περὶ τῆς πατρίδος, i.e. Ὀμήρου (*On Homer's Fatherland*): see Pfeiffer (1968, 228). West (2017, 28–29; 42) thinks that the idea that Homer was an Athenian and spoke Attic may go back to Aristophanes of Byzantium. In antiquity, various cities claimed, with varying degrees of success, to be the homeland (πατρίς) of Homer: see Hillgruber (1994, 84–6); Graziosi (2002, 83–6). Cf. also Chapter 3, Section 3.1.

175 Aristarchus dated Homer to the Ionian migration, that is, ca. 140 years after the Trojan War: cf. Tat. *Orat.* 32.4–6; Clem.Al. *Strom.* 1.117.2; [Plu.] *Vit. Hom.* 2.17–19; Procl. *Vita Homeri* p. 101.13–6 Allen.

176 See, however, Probert's caveats on the evidence of Choeroboscus, where non-Herodianic material may also be detected: Probert (2004, 286–7 with n. 16). Herodian himself seems to have entertained a similar, but not identical, view: as Probert (2004) demonstrated, Herodian distinguished between four 'distinct linguistic varieties' in Homer: Homer's language, 'Old Attic' (παλαιός), 'later Attic' (μεταγενέστερος; the dividing line being ca. 400 BCE), and the koine (ἡ κοινὴ διάλεκτος).

auctoritate (the literary tradition or παράδοσις):¹⁷⁷ Homer, who represents the pinnacle of ‘correct Greek’, does not use the synthetic form ἐαυτῶν, ἐαυτούς; (2) the second argument is formulated *ex analogia*: Aristarchus appeals to the absence of compound forms for the plural of the first- and second-person pronouns to analogically regulate that of the plural third-person pronouns.¹⁷⁸ This is one of the cases in which Aristarchus does not have the *paradosis* overrule analogy, but the two criteria harmoniously supplement one another.¹⁷⁹

Once again, we must begin by asking the same, old question: is Aristarchus being systematically prescriptive here? Some scholars have rightly observed that to frame Aristarchus’ observations on compositional pronouns and ἑλληνισμός in terms of rigidly prescriptive grammar may be misleading: for all that we know, ‘in principle the arguments may even have been transferred from an original discussion of Homeric textual criticism to a later discussion of prescriptive grammar’ (Probert 2011, 273). What is even more interesting for us, however, is the apparent *seamless* transition, in Aristarchus’ observation on ‘correct Greek’, from a highly literary language (Homer’s idiolect) to Greek language *tout court*, educated spoken Greek included. That is, for Aristarchus, the literary tradition as instantiated by Homer, its most perfect model, also constitutes the core repertoire of grammatical knowledge. Does this mean that Aristarchus somehow accepted a status of widespread and unbridgeable diglossia between contemporary linguistic

177 Two other passages are also relevant: (1) Apoll.Dysc. *Synt.* GG 2,2.244.12–246.5 (= fr. 125 A² Matthaios), where the grammarian Habron (1st century CE), alongside other counter-arguments (first- and second-person pronouns are not a good parallel to third-person pronouns, because the former also behave differently from the latter in other respects), answers Aristarchus’ critique by objecting that it is instead possible to construct analogically from a singular compositional form (the example is the adjective ἐνδέκατος) a plural compositional one (ἐνδέκατοι) and adduces as proof the Platonic usage (ἐκ παραθέσεων Πλατωνικῶν); (2) Apoll.Dysc. *Pron.* GG 2,1.72.16–9: [. . .] παντί τῷ δῆλον ὑπὲρ ἀκριβείας ἐξετάσαντι τῆς ἐν τοῖς μέρεσι τοῦ λόγου, ὡς ἡ Ὀμηρικὴ ποιησις μᾶλλον τῶν ἄλλων ἠγύσθη. ὅθεν οὐ μᾶλλον ἢ Πλάτωνος χρήσις ἀξιοπιστοτέρα τῆς οὐκ οὔσης παρὰ τῷ ποιητῇ. ([. . .] And to everyone who investigates with accuracy the word classes it is clear that Homer’s poetry was more accomplished than that of others. Hence the existence of a linguistic use in Plato is no more trustworthy than its absence in Homer). That is, both Aristarchus and his opponent, Habron, enlist ‘good authors’ (respectively, Homer and Plato), and both argue in terms of analogical behaviour, yet for Apollonius Dyscolus (passage 2) Plato (prose!) as evidence is less trustworthy than Homer (poetry).

178 See Matthaios (1999, 479–80); Probert (2011, 272).

179 See Blank (1982, 61 n. 19) on how ‘Aristarchus is represented in the *Iliad Scholia* as frequently allowing the *paradosis* to overrule analogy’; this feature was already observed by Ludwig (1885 vol. 2, 108–15). On Aristarchus’ use of analogy as an ecdotic tool (to emend and choose between different variant readings: mainly issues pertaining to accentuation, morphology, and orthography), see Schironi (2018, 377–410).

usage and ‘high’ literature, present and past? Not really: as noted by scholars, the very fact that Aristarchus extended the authority of Homer’s language to the domain of ἑλληνισμός as *a whole*, shows that, for him, the ‘best’ contemporary linguistic usage should not be conceived of as radically severed from the literary tradition.¹⁸⁰ We have noted that Aristarchus was acutely aware of diachronic variations in the history of the Greek language, in terms of semantics, morphology, and syntax: paradoxically, it was this same awareness that facilitated a transitivity (the existence of continuum in evolution that still preserved some ‘common ground’) for him, which, from a modern perspective, may sound inherently contradictory and fundamentally anachronistic.¹⁸¹

As already argued in Chapter 6, Section 3.3, the linguistic ‘reality’ underlying ‘speaking correct Greek’ was a matter of debate throughout the early Hellenistic period. Treatments of ἑλληνισμός encompassed both poetry and prose, the written text and the spoken language, and could move smoothly across genres and media with a surprising (at least from our present-day perspective) ease and insouciance. We also saw that Hellenistic scholars frequently employed the literary tradition (παράδοσις) to establish what is or is not ‘correct’ Greek: if one considers Homer’s centrality to Greek culture and language in antiquity (cf. Chapter 3, Section 3.1), it is unsurprising that ‘the poet’ also played an important role as master of ἑλληνισμός and that to Homer’s linguistic usage may be ascribed a normative value, even above that of Attic prose, as far as grammatical forms are concerned.¹⁸²

This, however, does not mean that there were not tensions, at times irreconcilable, between the language of the παράδοσις and contemporary συνήθεια.¹⁸³ If

180 See, especially, Matthaios (1999, 480): ‘Wie bei jenem Zeugnis liegt die besondere Bedeutung dieser Äußerung darin, daß sich Aristarch über textbezogene Probleme hinaus, die direkt aus seiner philologischen Tätigkeit entstanden, auch mit Fragestellungen auseinandergesetzt hat, die die Korrektheit der zeitgenössischen Sprachgebrauchs betrafen’. Cf. also Ax (1982, 106).

181 Cf. Nünlist (2012a, 161).

182 Pontani (2011) remains the best treatment of the subject. Aristarchus’ opinion of Homer as the pinnacle of ‘correct Greek’ must have exerted some influence: the 2nd-century CE grammarian Telephus of Pergamum is credited with a work entitled Ὅτι μόνος Ὅμηρος τῶν ἀρχαίων ἑλληνίζει (*Of the Ancients Only Homer Spoke Correct Greek*) according to *Su.* τ 495: Pagani (2009) suggests that the work ‘probably presented Homer as the representative of a πρώτη Ἀτθίς’. That Homer was according to some (anonymous) sources *the* embodiment of ἑλληνισμός is recorded in an excerpt of uncertain provenance found displaced in some 15th-century MSS at the end of Pseudo-Herodian’s treatise *On Solecism*: [Hdn.] Περὶ σολοικισμοῦ 311.5 Nauck: ἔνιοι μὲν λέγουσιν ἑλληνισμὸν εἶναι τὸν ποιητὴν (MSS: τὴν ποιητικὴν (sc. τέχνην) Boissonade: τὴν ποιητῶν Nauck). See Pontani (2011, 96–8); Pagani (2014a, 245); Pagani (2015, 842–3). On Ptolemy Pindarion, see below.

183 On the complex dynamics between common usage and tradition in Alexandrian and Imperial scholarship, see Pagani (2015, 841–4).

we are to trust Sextus Empiricus' programmatically scathing remarks about Alexandrian analogists (S.E. *M.* 1.202–8 = fr. 12 Boatti), Ptolemy Pindarion, a pupil of Aristarchus active during the second half of the 2nd century BCE, pitched the Ὀμηρικὴ συνήθεια directly *against* the κοινὴ συνήθεια – the common usage of contemporary speakers – favouring the former over the latter. In particular, Sextus presents Pindarion and his followers (οἱ ἀπὸ Πινδαρίωνος)¹⁸⁴ as those who disingenuously promote one συνήθεια (in this case, the Homeric one) over another (current common usage), causing analogy to re-enter via the back door.¹⁸⁵ According to Sextus, the grotesque consequence of such a linguistic policy would make whoever adopted it a universal laughing stock:

S.E. *M.* 1.206: τῇ δὲ Ὀμηρικῇ κατακολουθοῦντες οὐ χωρὶς γέλωτος ἐλληνοῦμεν 'μάρτυροι'¹⁸⁶ λέγοντες καὶ 'σπάρτα λέλυνται' καὶ ἄλλα τούτων ἀτοπώτερα.

If we follow Homer's usage, the good Greek we produce will not be free from laughter, when we say μάρτυροι ('witnesses', i.e. instead of μάρτυρες) and σπάρτα λέλυνται (*Od.* 2.135: 'the ropes were loosened', i.e. instead of σπάρτα λέλυνται) and other things even more absurd than these. (Translation by Bett 2018, 92).

But did Pindarion actually propose such a nonsensical revival of Homeric Greek as a living spoken language? This is what Sextus would have us believe. However, if we can effect a closer look at the context and attempt to look beyond Sextus' distorting account, Pindarion's original argument must have been quite different.¹⁸⁷ The broader context is Sextus' criticism of Alexandrian scholarship using analogy, rather than common usage, to determine what 'proper Greek' (ἐλληνισμός) should be. It is within this specific framework (use of analogy to justify linguistic practices) that Pindarion's stance is mentioned. Pindarion, according to Sextus, belongs to those who recognise that analogy indeed stems from usage, inasmuch as it is 'the contemplation of similar and dissimilar' (S.E. *M.* 1.202–3: [. . .] ἀναλογία, φασίν, ὁμολογουμένως ἐκ τῆς συνηθείας ὀρμᾶται· ἔστι γὰρ ὁμοίου τε καὶ ἀνομοίου θεωρία), but, rather disingenuously, argue that there is usage *and* usage:

¹⁸⁴ For this expression, not to be confused with οἱ περὶ τινα, see Boatti (2000, 266 n. 6).

¹⁸⁵ S.E. *M.* 1.202: ἐκτός εἰ μὴ τι φήσουσι μὴ τὴν αὐτὴν συνήθειαν ἐκβάλλειν ἅμα καὶ προσίεσθαι, ἀλλ' ἄλλην μὲν ἐκβάλλειν, ἄλλην δὲ προσίεσθαι.

¹⁸⁶ Attested 5x in the *Iliad* (*Il.* 1.338; 2.302; 3.280; 14.274; 22.255) and 2x in the *Odyssey* (*Od.* 1.273; 14.394).

¹⁸⁷ See F. Montanari (1995, 45–9); Boatti (2000); Boatti (2002).

S.E. *M.* 1.203–4: τὸ δὲ ὅμοιον καὶ ἀνόμοιον ἐκ τῆς δεδοκιμασμένης λαμβάνεται συνηθείας, δεδοκιμασμένη δὲ καὶ ἀρχαιοτάτη ἐστὶν ἡ Ὀμήρου ποίησις· [. . .] διαλεξόμεθα ἄρα τῆ Ὀμήρου κατακολουθοῦντες συνηθεία.

The similar and dissimilar are grasped from *approved* ordinary usage, and what is *approved* and *most ancient* is the poetry of Homer; [. . .] therefore we will talk following the ordinary usage of Homer. (Translation by Bett 2018, 91; our emphasis).

Pindarion, therefore, was not advocating an artificial revamp of Homeric language in everyday speech: rather, he was defending the analogy principle on the basis of the best and most ancient authority, Homer, in whom, in his opinion, this principle was already visible at its best.¹⁸⁸

To sum up, Aristarchus regarded Homer's language as an older form of Attic (hence very similar to Ionic) and as the benchmark of 'correct Greek'. Aristarchus' own understanding of Homer's Greek was not the only theory put forward: a competing view, dating back at the very least to the Peripatetic Andromenides (3rd century BCE), saw Homer's idiolect as a blending of all the dialectal varieties of Greek in a single shared language, a notion that acquired a very widespread diffusion in antiquity.¹⁸⁹ However, history is replete with unexpected ironies. The same Pseudo-Plutarch, who at *Vit. Hom.* 2.8 claimed that Homer merged together all the dialectal varieties of Greek, was also prepared to concede that the poet used 'above all the Attic dialect', adding a very intriguing reason: he did so because the Attic dialect itself was a 'mixture' of all the other dialects ([Plu.] *Vit. Hom.* 2.12: μάλιστα δὲ τῆ Ἀτθίδι διαλέκτῳ κέχρηται· καὶ γὰρ ἐπίμικτος ἦν).¹⁹⁰ The same notion is also found in the scholia to Aelius Aristides' *Panathenaic Oration*:

Schol. Aristid. 3.98.17 Dindorf: εἰλικρινῆ δὲ καὶ καθόλου· ἀχάριστοι γὰρ αἱ ἄλλαι διάλεκτοί εἰσιν, [. . .] εὐρίσκειται γὰρ ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ διαλέκτῳ τινὰ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων διαλέκτων, οἷον Ἰωνικά καὶ Δωρικά, τῷ πάντως πρεσβυτέραν ταύτην εἶναι καὶ ἀπὸ ταύτης ἐκείνας ταῦτα λαβεῖν.

εἰλικρινῆ δὲ καὶ καθόλου: For the other dialects are unpleasant [. . .]; in the Attic dialect are in fact found some features of the other dialects too, for instance, of the Ionic and Doric,

¹⁸⁸ See already Reitzenstein (1897, 380). Cf. also Blank (1998, 228); Pagani (2015, 815, 842).

¹⁸⁹ For the dating of this theory, not of Stoic origin, to the 3rd century BCE at the very least, see Janko (2000, 377 with n. 4). Cf. e.g. [Plu.] *Vit. Hom.* 2.8: λέξει δὲ ποικίλῃ κερημένον, τοὺς ἀπὸ πάσης διαλέκτου τῶν Ἑλληνίδων χαρακτήρας ἐγκατέμιξεν and D.Chr. 12.66: [. . .] Ὀμήρου [. . .] ὅς οὐχ ἓνα εἶλετο χαρακτήρα λέξεως, ἀλλὰ πᾶσαν τὴν Ἑλληνικὴν γλῶτταν διηρημένην τέως ἀνέμιξε, Δωριέων τε καὶ Ἰώνων, ἔτι δὲ τὴν Ἀθηναίων, εἰς ταῦτόν κεράσας πολλῶν μᾶλλον ἢ τὰ χρώματα οἱ βαφεῖς.

¹⁹⁰ Cf. Hillgruber (1994, 115).

because this dialect (i.e. the Attic) is by all means older and it is from it that those (other dialects) take these features.

It may seem paradoxical that the scholium, with its emphasis on the ‘mixed nature’ of the Attic dialect, is in fact commenting on the passage in which Aristides praises Athens for producing a dialect that is ‘uncontaminated, pure and pleasant, and a model for all communication between Greek’ (Aristid. 1.15 Lenz–Behr: εἰλικρινῆ δὲ καὶ καθαρὰν καὶ ἄλυπον καὶ παράδειγμα πάσης τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς ὁμιλίας φωνὴν εἰσηνέγκατο).¹⁹¹ However, the paradox is illusory: the reason the scholium claims that the Attic dialect contains features of other dialects is its chronological priority. Attic existed when the other dialects had not yet developed: it is treated as the Ur-Greek *par excellence*, in a historical dimension. Or, put otherwise, it is not that Attic includes Ionic or Doric elements: it is that the Ionic and Doric dialects have borrowed from the Attic. Finally, if we recall Aelius Aristides’ assertion that Homer’s hometown was Smyrna, an Attic colony,¹⁹² and thus that ‘the poet’ too spoke Attic,¹⁹³ we are returned full circle to Aristarchus: Attic, Homer’s language, was the benchmark of ἑλληνισμός *tout court*.

4 Collections of Attic words in the Hellenistic period: A survey

In the 3rd and 2nd centuries BCE, mostly taking the lead from Aristophanes of Byzantium’s influential Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις, dialectal studies witnessed an increased production of stand-alone or quasi-stand-alone works dedicated specifically to the dialect. In our sources, these collections are variously entitled Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις (*Attic Expressions*), Ἀττικαὶ γλῶσσαι (*Attic Glosses*),¹⁹⁴ sometimes also Ἀττικά ὀνόματα (*Attic Words*), Περὶ τῆς Ἀττικῆς λέξεως (*On Attic Idiom*) or Περὶ τῆς Ἀττικῆς διαλέκτου (*On Attic Dialect*). As we shall see, even if the titles of these works obviously herald a sustained and specific interest in Attic idioms, the centrality of this interest does not usually preclude their authors from occasionally comparing or juxtaposing Attic forms with their equivalents in the other Greek dialects (literary

¹⁹¹ Translation by M. Trapp (2017, 33).

¹⁹² On Ionia as an Athenian colony, see Chapter 3, Section 2.5.

¹⁹³ Cf. Aristid. 1.328 Lenz–Behr: εἰ δὲ δεῖ καὶ τῆς Ὀμήρου μνησθῆναι, μετέχει καὶ ταύτης τῆς φιλοτιμίας ἢ πόλις οὐ μόνον διὰ τῆς ἀποίκου πόλεως, ἀλλ’ ὅτι καὶ ἡ φωνὴ σαφῶς ἐνθένδε (‘And if Homer’s poetry demands a mention as well, Athens can claim a share of this source of honor too, not only because his city was her colony, but also because his language also clearly derives from here’; translation after M. Trapp 2017, 275–7).

¹⁹⁴ On the terminological interchangeability between λέξις and γλῶσσα in early Hellenistic scholarship, see Chapter 6, Section 3.1.

and non-literary; cf., e.g., the possible case of Nicander *BNJ*² 343 F 19 on *σκληγγίς* ‘scraper’, which makes mention of old Spartan customs). Most importantly, their observations are almost always value-free in terms of a supposed internal pecking order among the Greek dialects: the overall impression is that of a descriptive framework aimed at recording and documenting the linguistic possibilities offered by a given dialect (in our case, Attic) rather than prescribing a list of approved words and/or idioms to be avoided (with the partial exception of Crates, who, however, is likely to have been active at the very end of the chronological span under investigation: between the first and the second halves of the 1st century BCE, see below Section 4.4).¹⁹⁵

As in the case of other fragmentary corpora, the usual caveats highlighted in Chapter 6, Section 2 apply here as well: our treatment will follow a broadly chronological order, but it must be constantly borne in mind that the reconstructed chronology and, at times, the identity of some of these authors rest on uncertain ground and is unfortunately not immune to a certain degree of circularity of arguments.¹⁹⁶ For the reasons already stated in Section 1 and Chapter 6, Section 2, we shall chronologically limit our survey to the lower limit of the first half of the 1st century BCE.

4.1 Ister and Philemon

Ister (first half of the 3rd century BCE), probably from Paphos, was mainly active at Alexandria: a pupil of Callimachus, he was both a poet and a scholar (*Su.* ι 706). The titles of his works preserved by ancient sources reveal that Ister had strong antiquarian and historical interests, which also explains why he is frequently mentioned as a *συγγραφεύς* (cf. e.g. Ister *BNJ* 334 T 6) rather than as a grammarian.¹⁹⁷ Ister’s antiquarian interest in things Attic is attested by his *Ἄττικά*, which

¹⁹⁵ The grammarians Heracleon of Ephesus and Theodorus (on whom, see, respectively, Ippolito 2009 and Meliadò 2019) also showed a distinct interest in Attic *λέξεις* (the latter is credited by Athenaeus with a collection of Attic idioms variously quoted under the title of *Ἄττικά γλώσσα* (Ath.14.646c and 15.678d) or *Ἄττικά φωναί* (Ath.15.677b)). They are, however, not treated in the present volume because their overall chronology is too uncertain: we have no internal means of establishing Heracleon’s chronology; as to Theodorus, the only certain *terminus ante quem* is his use by Pamphilus (second half of the 1st century CE).

¹⁹⁶ Uncertain chronology: the glossographer Philemon of Aixone, Demetrius Ixion, and Nicander of Thyateira. Uncertain identity and date: Crates of Athens, on which see Section 4.4.

¹⁹⁷ For a survey of Ister’s antiquarian works, see Berti, Jackson (2015); Berti (2009); Regali (2008b).

comprised at least 14 books (*BNJ* 334 FF 1–16):¹⁹⁸ unlike the various contemporary *Atticides*, however, Ister's Ἀττικά was not devoted to the full coverage of the history of Athens and Attica but only to the archaic period (his dominant interests were local lore – above all, Attic festivals, heroes, and institutions).¹⁹⁹ Attic traditions, however, were only one among his antiquarian interests, on a par with matters Elean (cf. his Ἡλιακά in at least four books: FF 40–2), Argolic (Ἀργολικά: F 39), and Egyptian (Ἀποικίαι Αἰγυπτίων or τῆς Αἰγύπτου or Περὶ τῆς Αἰγυπτίων ἀποικίας: FF 43–6, and Περὶ Πτολεμαίδος in at least two books: F 47).²⁰⁰ More to the point for our purposes, Ister also seems to have had a specifically linguistic interest in Attic: Eustathius ascribes to him a collection of Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις (Eust. *in Od.* 1.339.37–8),²⁰¹ but modern scholars have wondered whether Eustathius' title indicates a stand-alone, independent collection or rather a subheading of a larger work.²⁰² Only one fragment of Ister's Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις survives:

Ister *BNJ* 334 F 23 (= Eust. *in Od.* 1.339.34–8 = Paus.Gr. α 89): φασὶ γοῦν οἱ παλαιοὶ, ὅτι οὐ μόνον τρεῖς ἡλικίαι, ἀρήν, ἀμνός, ἀρνειός· [. . .] ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅτι Ἰστρος ἐν Ἀττικαῖς λέξεσιν, ἄρνα φησὶν, εἶτα ἀμνόν, εἶτα ἀρνειόν, εἶτα λειπογνώμονα. ἐλέγετο δὲ καὶ μοσχίας ὁ τριέτης κριός κτλ.²⁰³

Indeed, the ancients say not only that the ages [of the sheep] are three: ἀρήν (a lamb under one year), ἀμνός (a one-year-old lamb), and ἀρνειός (a mature ram) [. . .] but also that Ister in his *Attic Lexeis* says ἀρήν, then ἀμνός, then ἀρνειός, and then λειπογνώμων ('without teeth'). A three-year old ram was also called μοσχίας etc.

198 This work is referred to in our sources also as Ἀτθίδες (F 2a), Συναγωγαί (F 3), Συναγωγή (FF 5 and 13), Ἀττικαὶ συναγωγαί (F 9), Συναγωγή τῶν Ἀτθίδων (F 14), and Συναγωγή τῆς Ἀτθίδος (F 15).

199 On Ister's independence from the Atthidographic tradition, see Regali (2008b); Berti (2009, 11–6).

200 On the ideological import, in keeping with the Ptolemies' cultural propaganda, of Ister's work on Egypt, see, above all, Berti, Jackson (2015) *ad loc.*

201 The title preserved by Phot. α 1232 and *Su.* α 1614 is ἐν ταῖς Ἀττικαῖς. Jacoby *FGrHist* IIIb (Suppl.), 642 wondered whether Ister may have been the first to entitle his work Λέξεις rather than Γλώσσα (cf. also Berti 2009, 11 n. 27): see however Chapter 6, Section 3.1 on the terminological fluidity between λέξεις and γλώσσα in early Hellenistic scholarship.

202 See Berti, Jackson (2015) *ad loc.*; Berti (2009, 9–11).

203 Phot. α 1232 and *Su.* α 1614, after reporting Ister's age sequence in precisely the same order as Eustathius (that is, ἄρνα, ἀμνόν, ἀρνειόν, λειπογνώμονα), specify, however, that the term μοσχίας (Phot.)/μοσχίων (*Su.*) refers to the youngest age group (μ. δὲ τὸν πρῶτον); hence Erbse's correction, in his entry of Paus.Gr. α 89, of Eustathius' transmitted text into μοσχίαν δὲ τὸν πρῶτον. <ἀρνειός> δὲ καὶ ὁ τριέτης κριός.

Setting aside the possibly corrupted text in relation to μωσχίαις,²⁰⁴ according to Eustathius, Ister, contrary to the common opinion of οἱ παλαιοί, argued in favour of a quadripartite (instead of tripartite) division of age groups for sheep. Unfortunately, this does not tell us very much about Ister's possible theoretical allegiances or conceptual framework in his study of Attic, but it is worth noting that the nomenclature for domestic animals of different age groups was also addressed by Aristophanes of Byzantium in his *Περὶ ὀνομασίας ἡλικιών*, a subdivision of his *Λέξεις* (cf. Section 2.1). According to Aristophanes, the terms κριοί and ἀρνείοί both referred to the fully grown animal (τὰ τέλεια: Ar.Byz. fr. 113–4) whereas ἄρνες and ἄμνοί referred to the 'young' (τὰ δὲ νέα: fr. 115–6); furthermore, in Ar. Byz. fr. 137 (Eustathius again) Aristophanes mentioned a sacrifice in the Attic calendar that required twelve victims called λειπογνῶμων because they were fully grown (Ἀριστοφάνης λέγει καὶ Ἄττικὴν τινα δωδεκαῆδα θύεσθαι λευπογνώμωνα, οἷον τελείαν). Ister and Aristophanes thus shared the same interpretation of λειπογνῶμων as referring to an old sheep – that is, a sheep that had lost its teeth because of its advanced age. However, the term λειπογνῶμων was not unambiguous: Hansen (1973) convincingly demonstrated that in the Athenian religious calendar, the term could also be used to indicate younger animals still waiting for their milk teeth to grow (and hence temporarily lacking them). There were thus at least two periods in the life of an animal (be it a sheep or a cow) when it could be said to be 'without teeth': at birth, before the appearance through the gum of the first milk teeth, and when it was very old, when his teeth had been lost because of old age.²⁰⁵ This might well explain why the later lexicographical tradition is divided in its interpretation of the term: whereas, for instance, Phrynichus, in his *PS* 85.19–86.2, took a view opposite to that of Ister and Aristophanes (λειπογνῶμων, according to him, referred to those animals who had not yet had the first dentition),²⁰⁶ Hesychius registered both options without committing to either (Hsch. λ 541).²⁰⁷

²⁰⁴ It is likely that the correct explanation is that of Photius and *Suda*: see Berti (2009, 153 with n. 3).

²⁰⁵ Cf. esp. H. Hansen (1973, 330–3); van der Ben (1995–1996) seemingly ignores Hansen's contribution.

²⁰⁶ Phryn. *PS* 85.19–86.2: λειπογνῶμων· σημαίνει τὸν μηδέπω τὸν ὀδόντα βεβληκότα, δι' οὗ ἡλικία τῶν ἵππων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τετραπόδων γνωρίζεται (λειπογνῶμων·: It refers to [the animal] that has not yet pushed forth its teeth, a means by which one recognises the age of horses and other quadrupeds').

²⁰⁷ For a full discussion of the lexicographical evidence, see H. Hansen (1973).

Philemon, an Athenian glossographer from the deme of Aixone, reasonably dated on internal grounds to the 3rd or 2nd century BCE,²⁰⁸ is explicitly referred to six times by Athenaeus as author of a collection of *Attic Words*, whose title is variously transmitted in the MSS as Ἀττικάι λέξεις (Ath. 3.76f), Περὶ Ἀττικῶν ὀνομάτων ἢ γλωσσῶν (Ath. 11.468e; cf. 11.473b), Ἀττικάι φωναί (Ath. 11.483a), and Ἀττικά ὀνόματα (Ath. 14.646c; 652e).²⁰⁹ We cannot tell for certain whether Athenaeus had direct access to Philemon's work,²¹⁰ or, perhaps more likely, whether he found Philemon's references in Pamphilus, his main treasure trove for lexicographical information, and the same may be said for the Classical authors quoted in the relevant passages.²¹¹ Most of Philemon's glosses refer to realia (above all, drinking vessels and food items: their ultimate source is probably Attic comedy),²¹² but there are also four instances (one apparently ascribed to his *Attic Words*) in which Philemon appears to show a distinct interest in Attic prosody:²¹³

(1) [Amm.] 405: [. . .] εἰ δὲ πόνος καὶ μόχθος τὰ πρωτότυπα, πονηρὸς καὶ μοχθηρὸς ῥητέον ὄξυτόνως. εἰ δὲ οἱ Ἀττικοὶ βαρυτονοῦσιν, οὐ θαυμαστὸν ἐστὶ χαιρούσι γὰρ τῇ βαρύτητι.

208 The only secure *terminus ante quem* is his being cited twice by the grammarian Tryphon (second half of the 1st century BCE; the quotations are found respectively at [Ammon.] 405 = Tryph. fr. 15 Velsen and Hdn. Περὶ καθολικῆς προοδίας fr. 53 Hunger). A thorough survey of Philemon's philological activity can be found in Ucciardello (2007).

209 Twice (Ath. 7.323c; 11.476f) Athenaeus mentions Philemon without specifying from which work he is quoting. Philemon is also credited, again by Athenaeus (Ath. 3.114d), with a second lexicographical work, in more than one book, entitled Παντοδαπά χρηστήρια (*Tools of Every Kind*): Cohn (1898, 366) thought that the Philemon author of this oeuvre should be rather identified with the Atticist Philemon (3rd century CE): see however the compelling objections raised by Wendel (1938) and Ucciardello (2007). The only extant fragment of Παντοδαπά χρηστήρια deals with different varieties of bread (πύρνος, βωμίλιος, βραττίμη).

210 If Treu's reading for P.Turner 39 l. 2 (= TM 64217; 3rd century CE: for this papyrus see Chapter 6, Section 5.2) Φιλίμονο(ς) λ[έξεις] hits the mark, this would mean that at the time of Athenaeus it was still possible to have direct access to Philemon's collection of glosses.

211 See Ucciardello (2007) *ad loc.* The overwhelming majority of the authors quoted are comic poets: cf. Steph. Com. fr. 1 at Ath. 11.469a; Stratt. fr. 23 at Ath. 11.473b; Theopomp.Com. fr. 12, Ar. fr. 68, and Pherecr. fr. 74 at Ath. 14.652f.

212 Drinking vessels: Ath. 11.468e–f on καλίς; Ath. 11.469a on ἔφρηβος as an alternative name for a cup known also as ἐμβασικοίτας; Ath. 11.473b on καδίσκος; Ath. 11.476f on κισσύβιον; Ath. 11.483a on κύμβη (a kind of κύλιξ: on the fortune of κύμβη/κυμβία/κύββη in Greek lexicography, see Dettori 2019, 326–40). Food: Ath. 3.76f on different kind of figs (σῦκα βασίλεια, βασίλιδες ἰσχάδες, κόλυθρα); Ath. 14.646c on ἐπίδαιτρον, a small barley-cake eaten at dinner (πλακουνητῶδες μάζιον ἐπὶ τῷ δείπνῳ ἐσθιόμενον); Ath. 14.652e–f on varieties of Attic dried figs known as Αἰγυλίδες and χηλιδόναι ('swallow-figs').

213 We follow Ucciardello (2007) in ascribing the accentuation of λήδιον in *Et.Gen.* λ 84 and Eust. *in Il.* 4.190.14–6 to Philemon the Atticist.

‘ἄδελφε’ γοῦν λέγουσι τὴν πρώτην ὀξυτονοῦντες ὡς ‘ἄπελθε’, φησὶν ὁ Τρύφων παρατιθέμενος Φιλήμονα τὸν Αἰξωνέα (Frellonius: †ἀγξωνέα† MSS).

[. . .] if the original forms are πόνος (‘toil’) and μόχθος (‘hardship’), one must pronounce πονηρός (‘toilsome’) and μοχθηρός (‘suffering hardship’) with an acute accent; if the Attic speakers pronounce them instead without accent on the last syllable,²¹⁴ this is nothing strange: for they like it. Indeed Tryphon (= Tryph. fr. 15 Velsen), quoting Philemon of Aixone, claims that they (that is, the Attic speakers) say ἄδελφε (‘brother’, voc.) with acute accent on the first syllable just as in ἄπελθε (‘go away!’).

(2) Ath. 7.323c: σπηρία. Ἀριστοφάνης Δαναίσι· ‘καὶ ταῦτ’ ἔχοντα πουλύπους καὶ σπηρίας’. ὡς αἰτίας ἢ παραλήγουσα παροξύνεται, ὡς Φιλήμων ἱστορεῖ, ὁμοίως καὶ ταῦτα· τηλία (corr. Kaibel coll. Hdn. Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωδίας GG 3,1.300.39: παιδία A), ταινία, οἰκία.

Cuttlefish. Aristophanes in the *Danaids* (Ar. fr. 195): ‘and this when he’s got octopuses and cuttlefish!’ The penultimate [syllable] takes an acute accent, according to Philemon, like αἰτίας (‘causes’, here acc. pl.), as well as the following words: τηλία (‘baker’s board’), ταινία (‘ribbon’), and οἰκία (‘house’).

(3) Hdn. Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωδίας fr. 52 Hunger (cf. Hdn. GG 3,1.377.20): Φιλήμων ἐν τοῖς Ἀττικισταῖς²¹⁵ διάφορον προσωδίαν ἰστόρησεν· τὸ μὲν γὰρ περιστύφον φησὶν παρ’ Ἀττικοῖς προπαροξύνεσθαι, τὸ δὲ προστύφον προπερισπᾶσθαι.

Philemon in his *Atticist* (?) [*Words*] reports a difference in accentuation: for he says that περιστύφον (‘peristyle’) among Attic speakers is proparoxytone, whereas προστύφον (‘portico’) is propepispomenon.

(4) Hdn. Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωδίας fr. 53 Hunger: Τρύφων δὲ ἐν α’ περὶ Ἀττικῆς προσωδίας ἱστορεῖ παρ’ Ἀττικοῖς βαρύνεσθαι τὴν λέξιν· ‘βαῦνον γάρ’, φησι, ‘λέγουσιν ὡς φαῦλον. οὕτως δὲ καὶ Φιλήμων ὁ μείζων που ἱστορεῖ καὶ ἡμεῖς δὲ παρεθέμεθα ταῦτ’ ἐν α’ περὶ Ἀττικῆς προσωδίας’ κτλ.²¹⁶

Tryphon in the first book of his *Attic Prosody* says that among Attic speakers, the word is pronounced with a grave accent: ‘for’, he says, ‘they pronounce βαῦνον (‘furnace’) just like φαῦλον (‘mean’). Also, Philemon the senior says so somewhere and we reported the same in the first book of *Attic Prosody*’, etc.

²¹⁴ On this meaning of βαρύνω/βαρυτονέω as ‘a cover term for different groups of non-final-syllable accented words’, see Roussou (2018, 58–9).

²¹⁵ See Ucciardello (2007) *ad loc.*: ‘perhaps a further variation of the title of the glossographical work [. . .], or rather indicating a particular section of it (the connection is, however, not clear: a revision of the palimpsest to check the faithfulness of the transcription is a *desiderandum*).’

²¹⁶ Cf. [Arcadius] *De prosodia catholica epitome* 195.4–7 Roussou: τὰ εἰς ΝΟΣ διφθόγγω παραληγόμενα τῇ διὰ τοῦ Υ μονογενῆ ὀξύνεται: κανός, γλανός, βανός (ὅπερ οἱ Ἀττικοὶ βαρύνουσι), κρουνός, βουνός, κεραυνός. (cf. Hdn. Περὶ μονήρους λέξεως GG 3,2.939.32–40.4).

All four examples above exemplify the well-known phenomenon, in contemporary linguistics, of retraction of the accent as a specific feature of the Attic dialect.²¹⁷ What is particularly interesting is that Tryphon's sustained interest in this phenomenon finds a precursor in Philemon: before the publication of the *scriptura inferior* of the Vienna palimpsest by Hunger (1967), we had only the evidence of [Amm.] 405 referring to Philemon's use by Tryphon. The words mentioned in these four fragments are mostly common, high-frequency words (πόνηρος/μόχθηρος, ἄδελφος, σηπία, βαῦνος; only προστώον and περίστων sound like more technical items), and it is almost impossible to determine whether as his main source, Philemon used the contemporary spoken vernacular of his fatherland, literary texts (mostly comedy), or a combination of both.²¹⁸ Nonetheless, it is clear that, as observed by previous scholars, we cannot discern in Philemon the strict orthoepic prescriptivism of later Atticism.²¹⁹

4.2 Demetrius Ixion

Demetrius Ixion, Aristarchus' pupil, was active at both Alexandria and Pergamum and is commonly dated to the 2nd century BCE.²²⁰ His linguistic interests encompassed a broad range of topics, from textual criticism to literary interpretation, grammatical, etymological, dialectal, and lexicographical issues, mostly (but not exclusively) in relation to Homer and Aristophanes.²²¹ Our focus will be on Demetrius' dialectal studies, in particular, his interest in Attic as testified indirectly in

217 See the illuminating article by Probert (2004) on the chronological and diastatic dimensions of this phenomenon in Attic and its reception by Herodian. In particular, Probert (2004, 288–90) shows that there is high probability that Herodian's distinction between 'Old Attic' (παλαιός), 'later Attic' (μεταγενέστερος), and koine (ἡ κοινὴ διάλεκτος) may go back to Philemon via Tryphon.

218 Probert (2004, 289) is inclined towards the former: 'My suspicion is 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'.

219 See Tosi (1994a, 172); Ucciardello (2007) *ad loc.*

220 For the dating (mostly based on *Su.* δ 430, and the mention of Demetrius by Tryphon fr. 4 Velsen), see Ascheri (2009) *ad loc.*

221 Grammar: *Su.* δ 430 records two titles, Περὶ τῶν εἰς -μι ληγόντων ῥημάτων (*On the Verbs Ending in -μι*), and Περὶ ἀντωνυμιῶν (*On Pronouns*); etymology: Athenaeus mentions a work alternatively entitled Ἑτυμολογία (*Etymology*: Ath. 2.50a = Demetr.Ix. fr. 42 Staesche) and Ἑτυμολογούμενα (*Etymological Studies*: Ath. 3.74b = Demetr.Ix. fr. 41 Staesche), see Ascheri (2010, 126 n. 6). For Demetrius' Homeric studies, see Ascheri (2004); for a concise yet informative survey, cf. also Ascheri (2009); Ascheri (2010, 126 n. 3). Given that Demetrius is quoted several times in the scholia

his Homeric studies and the treatise *Περὶ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων διαλέκτου* (*On the Dialect of the Alexandrians*)²²² and directly in his *Ἀττικάι λέξεις*.²²³

Only one fragment of Demetrius' *Ἀττικάι λέξεις* has come down to us, via a scholium to Aristophanes' *Birds*:

Demetr.Ix. fr. 39 Staesche (= schol. Ar. Av. 1569b): Λαισποδίας εἶ· R Λαισποδίας καὶ Δαμασίας ὡς κακόκνημοι διαβάλλονται. RVEM μνημονεύει δὲ αὐτῶν καὶ Εὐπολις ἐν Δήμοις [. . .] Δημήτριος δέ, VELh ὄν πάντες τὸν Ἰξίωνα λέγουσιν, ἐν ταῖς Ἀττικαῖς λέξεσιν ὡς γλώσσαν ἐξηγεῖται, VE ὅτι λαισποδίας ἐστὶν ὁ ἀκρατῆς περὶ τὰ ἀφροδίσια, ὥστε καὶ κτήνη σποδεῖν VELh.

'Are you a Laispodias?': Laispodias and Damasias are slandered for having bad shins. Also, Eupolis in his *Demes* (Eup. fr. 107) mentions them [. . .] but in his *Attic Lexeis*, Demetrius, whom all call Ixion, explains it as a gloss, [saying] that a Laispodias is someone unable to control his sexual urges, to the extent that he has intercourse even with domestic animals.²²⁴

Laispodias was a well-known political figure in Athens in the mid-410s BCE: Eupolis and other comic poets (mentioned by our scholium in the part omitted here: Philyll. fr. 8, Stratt. fr. 19, Theopomp.Com. fr. 40) ridiculed him for some physical defect concerning his shins, implying that Laispodias was at the time a common byword for someone with bad legs.²²⁵ Demetrius, however, gives a different explanation: he considered *λαισποδίας* a peculiar (evidently Attic) idiom (ὡς γλώσσαν) used to indicate someone so intemperate in his sexual desires that he would engage in sexual intercourse with farm-animals (the metaphorical sexual sense of *σποδεῖν* = *βινεῖν* 'to fuck', is well attested in Attic comedy). According to Ascheri (2010, 129–30), there are two possible etymological explanations for Demetrius' interpretation: either Demetrius etymologised the personal name as deriving from

to Aristophanes' *Frogs* and *Wasps*, it is likely that he also wrote a commentary or a monograph on the comic poet: see Ascheri (2010, 126 n. 4).

222 The nature and aim of the ancient treatises *Περὶ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων διαλέκτου* have recently been addressed by Fournet (2009), Ascheri (2010), and Favi (forthcoming b). In particular, Favi has persuasively argued that the label 'Alexandrian' does not indicate a local variant of the koine but is used as an umbrella term to indicate generally low-register forms, in opposition not only to standard Classical Attic but also to the standard koine. On the relationship between ancient treatises on the so-called 'Alexandrian' dialect and issues of language correctness, see now Favi (forthcoming b) qualifying Ascheri's (2010) conclusions.

223 For Demetrius' specific interest in Attic, see Ascheri (2010), to whom this section is partly indebted.

224 Cf. *Su.* λ 200: Λαισποδίας τὴν φύσιν· ἀντὶ τοῦ τὴν κνήμην ἔχει σαπράν· [. . .] ἢ ὡς Ἰξίων ἐν ταῖς Λέξεσιν ὁ ἀκρατῆς περὶ τὰ ἀφροδίσια ὥστε καὶ κτήνη σποδεῖν.

225 On the nature of Laispodias' physical deformity, see Olson (2017, 396–7).

the intensifying prefix λα-/λαι-²²⁶ + σποδεῖν ‘to shag’, thus conveying the general sense of excess in sexual matters, or he understood it as formed by the Ionic ληῖς (‘spoil’ > ‘cattle’)²²⁷ + σποδεῖν. While Ascheri (2010, 130) favours the latter interpretation (notwithstanding the problematic Doric vocalism λᾱ-; in Attic one would expect λει- or λη-; cf. Attic λεία), the former explanation seems to us more likely for several reasons. First, it does not require us to assume that Demetrius attempts to demonstrate that the word is Attic while simultaneously proposing an etymological derivation that presupposed a non-Attic vocalism’,²²⁸ and second, the mention of κτήνη (domestic animals), *pace* Staesche (1883, 56: ‘verba ὥστε καὶ κτήνη σποδεῖν cur adiecta sint, non perspicitur’), does not appear to us so peregrine: intercourse with animals may indeed be considered a form of sexual intemperance. For all that we know, ὥστε καὶ κτήνη σποδεῖν may refer to extratextual anecdotal evidence and need not to be ‘incorporated’ into the etymology of the name. All in all, this single extant fragment from Demetrius’ Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις tells us very little that might help us to recover the conceptual framework of Demetrius’ lexicographical work, which is almost entirely lost to us: we know only that he used etymology to explain a personal name that in Athens, by the mid-410s BCE, must have been a proverbial means of denoting an uncontrollable sexual appetite.

More interesting (for us) is the only extant evidence from Demetrius’ treatise *On the Dialect of the Alexandrians*:

Demetr.Ix. fr. 40 Staesche (= Ath. 9.393b): τὴν μέσῃν δὲ τοῦ ὀνόματος [i.e. ὄρτυξ, ὄρτυγος] συλλαβὴν ἐκτείνουσιν Ἀττικοὶ ὡς δοῖδουκα καὶ κήρυκα, ὡς ὁ Τξίων φησὶ Δημήτριος ἐν τῷ περὶ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων διαλέκτου. Ἀριστοφάνης δ’ ἐν Εἰρήνῃ συνεσταλμένως ἔφη διὰ τὸ μέτρον ‘ὄρτυγες οἰκογενεῖς’.

Attic authors lengthen the middle syllable of the word [ὄρτυξ, ὄρτυγος, that is, ‘quail’] in the same way they do with δοῖδουκα (‘pestle’) and κήρυκα (‘herald’), according to Demetrius

226 Some modern linguists are sceptical about the existence of such a prefix: see Le Feuvre (2007, 329–30); cf. also the database *LGN-Ling* online s.v. Λαισποδίας at <https://lgpn-ling.humanum.fr/index.html?filter> (accessed 17/07/2024) for the various possible semantic interpretations of this personal name. Irrespective of the ‘correct’ interpretation of λα(ι)- in terms of historical linguistics, our ancient sources do appear to have believed in the existence of λα(ι)- as an intensifying prefix: see the lexicographical evidence quoted by Ascheri (2010, 129 n. 16), that is, Hsch. λ 111 and *Su.* λ 188, and now also Olson (2017, 397–8).

227 On the transition from ‘spoil’ to ‘flock, cattle’, see Edgerton (1925).

228 Ascheri (2010, 130). This difficulty is, of course, not insurmountable: ‘errors’ of this kind, that is, the attribution of ‘wrong’ epicchoric features to a given local dialect is not unparalleled in ancient Hellenistic scholarship. The point is, rather, that this time we do not need to suppose it, since a second, more linear explanation is already available.

Ixion in his treatise *On the Dialect of the Alexandrians*. But Aristophanes in *Peace* (Ar. *Pax* 788) has it short for the sake of the metre: ‘domestically-bred ὄρτυγες’ (quails).

If we are to trust Athenaeus’ text, Demetrius claimed that the middle syllable of ὄρτυξ, ὄρτυγος was originally long in Attic, as was indeed the case for δοῖδυξ, δοῖδυκος and κῆρυξ, κήρυκος, but that Aristophanes in *Peace* shortened it *metri causa*. This statement is, at first glance, at least, quite perplexing, since in all the extant occurrences of ὄρτυξ, ὄρτυγος, irrespective of the dialect, the /u/ in the middle syllable is invariably short.²²⁹ To avoid charging Demetrius with gross ignorance, Ascheri tentatively suggests interpreting Demetrius’ claim in Athenaeus as a case of intentional manipulation of the Attic evidence on the part of our scholar.²³⁰ According to Ascheri, Demetrius would have observed that in the Alexandrian dialect (understood, in the wake of Staesche, as the local vernacular spoken by the inhabitants of the Ptolemaic capital), the quantity of the middle syllable /u/ of ὄρτυγ- was long. Demetrius would thus have purposely created a ‘false’ Attic pedigree for such a vocalic quantity (hence the false observation that Aristophanes shortened it *metri causa*) to culturally promote an alleged affinity between the Alexandrian dialect and Attic, an agenda that we find explicitly espoused in the early Imperial period by the grammarian Irenaeus (mid-1st century CE).²³¹ If this were the case, Demetrius Ixion, in the 2nd century BCE, would have been the forerunner of an ideological stance that we otherwise find attested first only in the Roman era.²³² Favi (forthcoming b), however, raises significant objections to this hypothesis, offering instead what we consider a more likely, alternative explanation. First, Favi demonstrates that it is not unlikely that some form of epitomisation in Athenaeus’ transmission of Demetrius’ *ipsissima verba* must have occurred, modifying, if not distorting, Demetrius’ original meaning. In particular, in a previous passage (Ath. 9.388f–389a), Athenaeus, explicitly quoting only Aristophanes of Byzantium (= Ar. Byz. fr. 346: see Section 2.2.7) but most

²²⁹ Cf. the ancient evidence quoted by Ascheri (2010, 140 nn. 60 and 61), to which can be added Phot. ο 531: ὄρτυγας· συστέλλοντες οἱ Ἀττικοὶ λέγουσιν τὸ υ· καὶ τὸν ὄρτυγοκόπον βραχέως, δηλοῖ Ἀριστοφάνης Δαιταλεῦσιν (Ar. fr. 253).

²³⁰ Ascheri (2010, 141–2; 144–5).

²³¹ According to our sources Irenaeus wrote a treatise entitled Περὶ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων διαλέκτου (see Iren.Gr. fr. 1–3 Haupt), for which the *Suda* gives also the alternative title ἡ Περὶ ἑλληνισμοῦ (*Su.* π 29); furthermore, at *Su.* εἰ 190, the title Περὶ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων διαλέκτου is explicitly explained as ὅτι ἔστιν ἐκ τῆς Ἀτθίδος: according to Irenaeus, the dialect of Alexandria would have derived from the Attic. On Irenaeus’ concept of linguistic correctness, see Pagani (2015, 819–20); Regali (2015); Favi (forthcoming b).

²³² Ascheri (2010, 145–7). Ascheri, however, is rightly cautious: Demetrius might also simply have been one of the first scholars to start the debate on the assumed relationship between the Alexandrian dialect and Attic.

likely also drawing on Demetrius Ixion,²³³ had remarked that in the case of *πέρδιξ*, *πέρδικος* ('partridge'), some authors, e.g. Archilochus and Epicharmus (that is, non-Attic authors), shortened the iota, but Attic writers often did not (with extensive quotations from Attic drama). It thus appears more likely that Demetrius must have meant that, on the basis of the analogy principle (the ambivalent case of *πέρδιξ* and the straightforward ones *δοῖδυξ*, *δοίδυκος* and *κήρυξ*, *κήρυκος*), one would also have expected the middle /u/ of *ὄρτυξ*, *ὄρτυγος* to be long; the short form, in Demetrius' narrative, was 'introduced' in Attic by Aristophanes. That is, Favi argues, Demetrius must have been making a purely abstract argument to explain the violation of analogy, intending to justify what he perceived, on a theoretical level, as a 'deviant' form: that is, once Demetrius Ixion advanced the theory that Aristophanes innovated compared to analogy, the fact that *ὄρτυξ*, *ὄρτυγος* has a short /u/ also in post-Classical Greek becomes justifiable as well (Favi forthcoming b). The main point here is that the 'innovation' by Aristophanes is such *only* if compared to the analogical principle on a theoretical level: it does *not* imply that the form *ὄρτυγ-* ever actually existed in Attic. Furthermore, the mention of Aristophanes as witness to the short scansion of *ὄρτυγ-* (a perceived exception within a merely theoretical framework) must have played an important role in explaining why analogy was violated: it is not by chance that Phot. o 531 also quotes an Aristophanic example (Ar. fr. 253) for *ὄρτυγ-*. To sum up, Demetr. Ix. fr. 40 Staesche need not be interpreted as an *ante litteram* precursor to Irenaeus' defence of the Alexandrian dialect as derived from Attic: rather, it attests that Demetrius Ixion did not deal exclusively with problems of accentuation or prosody but more specifically with forms that were perceived as violating the analogical principle, in a way that is similar to that which we find in the Ar.Byz. (?) fr. *novum* Sandri (2023b) on *κάνθος* 'eye' (another reason to suspect that the author of this observation was not Aristophanes of Byzantium but Demetrius Ixion: see Section 2.1 above).

Finally, while commenting on the Homeric text, Demetrius Ixion twice singles out as Attic a given vocabulary or linguistic usage. In the schol. Hom. *Od.* (hyp) 18.17.1–3 (= Demetr.Ix. fr. 25 Staesche = fr. 28* Ascheri), Demetrius labels as Attic (*ἀττικίζων*) the use, on the part of the poet, of *χανδάνω* for *δέχομαι* in the sense of 'to be capacious, to hold':

Demetr.Ix. fr. 25 Staesche = fr 28* Ascheri: οὐδὸς δ'ἀμφοτέρους ὅδε χεῖσεται· χωρήσει, ἔνθεν καὶ χεῖρά ἢ κατάδυσσις τῶν ὄψεων. Δημήτριος δέ φησιν ὅτι ἀττικίζων ὁ ποιητὴς ἀντὶ τοῦ δέξεσθαι χεῖσεται εἶπεν.

233 See the detailed argumentation in this direction by Ascheri (2010, 139–40, with nn. 56–7).

This threshold will hold (χείσεται) us both: [χείσεται means] ‘it will contain’ (χωρήσει), from which [derives] also χειά, the serpents’ lair. Demetrius says that the poet used here the Attic expression χείσεται instead of δέξεται.

For us χανδάνω is overwhelmingly attested as a poetic, and most specifically, epic lexeme (9 x in Homer; 1x in the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*; 1x in Aratus; 5x in Nicander; 5x in Q.S.; 1x in Tryphiodorus; 2x in Nonnus; it is attested 1x in Pindar, 1x in Theocritus and 1x in Lycophron), with a couple of attestations in prose (2x in the Hippocratic corpus). Among the extant Attic authors of any period, it is attested uniquely at Ar. *Ra.* 258a–60 (ἀλλὰ μὴν κεκραξόμεσθ’ ἢ ὅπόσον ἢ φάρυξ ἂν ἡμῶν | χανδάνη δὲ ἡμέρας, ‘But indeed we shall shout as loud as our throats will hold, throughout the whole day!’), a lyric passage that is clearly modelled on a Homeric image,²³⁴ and in the moderately Atticising rhetor Aelian (2nd/3rd century CE), fr. 86 Domingo-Forasté (= *Su.* κ 2098), in what is a direct borrowing from Homer (ὡσπερ κεκρυμμένον θησαυρὸν καὶ κεχανδότα πολλὰ καὶ ἐσθλά, τὸ τοῦ Ὀμήρου: cf. Hom. *Od.* 4.96: κεχανδότα πολλὰ καὶ ἐσθλά).²³⁵ From a linguistic perspective, there is nothing specifically Attic in χανδάνω in its meaning ‘to be capacious’, and we can only wonder on what basis (lost texts? Spoken vernacular? Subjective opinion?) Demetrius Ixion identified this usage as an example of Homer’s Atticising tendency.²³⁶

The second example (Apollon. 131.8 = Demetr.Ix. fr. 26 Staesche = fr. 31 Ascheri)²³⁷ is much more straightforward. Commenting on Homer’s use of the in-

²³⁴ See Taillardat (1965, 278) comparing Hom. *Il.* 11.462: ἦρυσεν ὅσον κεφαλή χάδε φωτός.

²³⁵ Ascheri (2010, 134 n. 33) says that χανδάνω is attested in Attic texts ‘anche se molto raremente’ but quotes only Ar. *Ra.* 260. We have just seen that for the classic period Ar. *Ra.* 260 is the only example, explicitly built upon a Homeric image; for the post-Classical period, the only extant occurrence in ‘Attic’ literature is in Aelian’s fragment from the *VH* quoted above, an unmistakable adaptation of a Homeric quotation.

²³⁶ Ascheri (2010, 134) rightly observes that in other Homeric passages, Demetrius Ixion, unlike Aristarchus, appears unwilling to admit features perceived as ‘Attic’ in the text of Homer: cf. Demetr.Ix. fr. 27 Staesche = fr. 4 Ascheri (on which see above Section 3.1), fr. 21, 47 Staesche = fr. 29 Ascheri (on the reflexive pronoun of the third-person singular εαυτόν in Homer), and fr. 26 Staesche (= fr. 31 Ascheri), on which see below. Ascheri thus argues that the expression ἀττικίζων in schol. Hom. *Od.* (hyp) 18.17.1–3 should probably be understood within a context in which Ionic was recognised by Demetrius Ixion as the default language (‘dialetto base’) of Homer, a recognition that allowed the concomitant presence of a superficial sprinkling of non-Ionic dialect features (on this conceptual framework, see above all Cassio 1993). Unfortunately, the schol. Ar. *Ra.* 260: χανδάνη· ἀντὶ τοῦ δύνηται καὶ ἐξισχύη. χωρῆ does not help to clarify the matter.

²³⁷ Demetr.Ix. fr. 26 Staesche = fr. 31 Ascheri: πῆ· εἰς τίνα τόπον· ‘πῆ ἔβη Ἀνδρομάχη;’ (*Il.* 6.377) καὶ ‘πῆ δὴ τόνδε μολοβρόν ἄγεις;’ (*Od.* 17.219). ὁ δὲ Δημήτριος ὁ Ἰξίων τοῦ ποῖ τῶν Ἀττικῶν ὄντος ἰδίου τὸ {δὲ} (del. Staesche) πῆ Ἰακὸν καὶ Ὀμήρω σὺνηθες (λέγει add. Vill.). Apollonius’ passage

terrogative πῆ ('whither?'), Demetrius compares Attic ποῖ to Ionic πῆ, which, he says, is 'common in Homer' (Ἰακὸν καὶ Ὀμήρω σὺνήθες).

All in all, the cumulative evidence attesting to Demetrius Ixion's interest in Attic dialect is relatively thin and does not allow us to identify a specific underlying agenda. However, it is interesting to observe that, if Favi's recent interpretation of Demetr.Ix. fr. 40 Staesche is correct, Demetrius, not wholly unlike Aristophanes of Byzantium in his *Λέξεις*, appears to have been interested in what he perceived as exceptions to linguistic rules (in our case, the principle of analogy) and justified them by tracing their use back to a Classical author.

4.3 Nicander of Thyateira

Nicander of Thyateira (northern Lydia), usually dated to the 2nd or the 1st century BCE (the only certain *terminus post quem* is 222 BCE),²³⁸ is a particularly elusive figure, given the scarcity of the available evidence. However, we do know that he was the author of a work entitled *Περὶ τῶν δήμων* (*On (Attic) Demes*), of which only two fragments survive (Nicand.Thyat. *BNJ*² 343 FF 1–2), and of a lexical work (in at least 18 books), variously quoted by Harpocration and Athenaeus as *Explanations on the Attic Dialect* (Ἐξηγητικά Ἀττικῆς διαλέκτου: Harp. μ 14 = Nicand.Thyat. *BNJ*² 343 F 6), *Attic Dialect* (Ἀττικὴ διάλεκτος, only in Harp. β 16, τ 29 and ξ 4 = Nicand.Thyat. *BNJ*² 343 FF 3–5), or *Attic Words* (Ἀττικά ὀνόματα in Ath. 15.678f = Nicand.Thyat. *BNJ*² 343 F 7). The ultimate source of Nicander's quotations in Athenaeus is highly likely to be, once again, Pamphilus, whereas the origin of

goes on to say that when the form is enclitic, it has an indefinite value, quoting *Od.* 13.207: νῦν δ' ἄρ οὐτ' ἄρ' πῆ θέσθαι ἐπίσταμαι as the equivalent to (ἀντὶ τοῦ) εἰς οὐδένα τόπον ἐπίσταμαι.

238 At Nicand.Thyat. *BNJ*² 343 F1 (= Harp. θ 33) Nicander mentions the Athenian phyle/tribe of Ptolemais, created in 224/3 BCE. For the dating of Nicander, see, in general, Sickinger (2018), who, while observing that in our sources the name of Nicander of Thyateira is often juxtaposed with authors of the 2nd and 1st centuries BCE (Polemon, Demetrius of Scepsis, Didymus), does not rule out the possibility of a later date. In particular, with reference to Nicand.Thyat. *BNJ*² 343 F 5 (= Harp. ξ 4): [. . .] ξηραλοιφεῖν ἐλέγετο τὸ χωρὶς λουτρῶν ἀλείφεσθαι, ὡς Δίδυμος ἐν κῆ Τραγικῆς λέξεως καὶ Νίκανδρος ἐν πῆ Ἀττικῆς διαλέκτου, προστιθείς ὅτι μήποτε καὶ τὸ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀλειπτῶν λεγόμενον ξηροτριβεῖσθαι οὕτως ἐλέγετο, 'They used to call anointing without washing 'rubbing dry with oil', as Didymus (argues) in Book 28 of his *Tragic Expression* (Did. p. 84 Schmidt = fr. 47 Coward-Prodi) and Nicander in Book 18 of his *Attic Dialect*, adding that maybe also what is called 'dry-rubbing' by trainers (ξηροτριβεῖσθαι) used to be so called', Sickinger (2018) *ad loc.* correctly observes that the claim that Nicander 'added' (προστίθεις) to the definition given by Didymus necessarily implies that Nicander used Didymus' work (thus for instance Nesselrath 1990, 77 n. 38 is groundless: see already Kroll 1936, 265–6).

Harpocration's quotation of Nicander is either Didymus or the so-called 'Attic Onomasticon', the common 'pool' hypothesised by Wentzel to explain similarities in many Attic lexica of the Imperial age.²³⁹

If we turn to Nicander's extant body of evidence on Attic dialect (18 fragments overall), it immediately becomes evident that the majority of his observations relate mainly to everyday objects and customs,²⁴⁰ with a marked preference for drinking vessels and food.²⁴¹ This, of course, may be primarily a result of the particular interests of the later sources (Athenaeus, Harpocration) where he is quoted, and we cannot tell whether Nicander also had a specific grammatical interest like Philemon and Demetrius of Ixion, for instance. What we can tell on the basis of the available evidence is that Nicander appears to have based his linguistic interpretations mostly on comic authors of all periods (Old and New Comedy: Aristophanes, Eupolis, Teleclides, Theopompus, Philemon, and Apollodorus of Carystus), followed by oratory (e.g. Dinarchus in *Nicand.Thyat.* *BNJ*² 343 FF 3 and 6, Isaeus in F 4) and perhaps tragedy (cf. *Nicand.Thyat.* *BNJ*² 343 F 5).

²³⁹ See Wentzel (1895b).

²⁴⁰ *Nicand.Thyat.* *BNJ*² 343 F 3 (= Harp. β 16) on βολεών, 'a place where one throws dung' (see also Amerias, below in Section 5): the quotations of Dinarchus (*Din. fr.* 3.3 Conomis) and the comic poet Philemon (*Philem. fr.* 186) are likely to derive directly from Nicander rather than being an independent addition by Harpocration; *BNJ*² 343 F 4 (= Harp. τ 29) on τριπτήρ, a kind of flat casket similar to those used for wine barrels; *BNJ*² 343 F 5 (= Harp. ξ 4) on ξηραλοιφεῖν, the practice, in gymnasia, of rubbing oneself with oil without washing; *BNJ*² 343 F 6 (= Harp. μ 14) on μέδιμνος, a measure of dry goods; *BNJ*² 343 F 7 (= Ath. 15.678f) on ἐκκύλιστος, a type of wreath made of roses (on ἐκκύλιστος in the lexicographical tradition, see Miccolis 2017, 256–7); *BNJ*² 343 F 18 (= Ath. 14.651c) on σάγδα, a type of unguent of Egyptian origin; *BNJ*² 343 F 19 (= schol. *Pl. Carm.* 161e.13 (T) Cufalo) on the alleged difference between στλεγγίς, a scraper (ξύστρα), and στλαγγίς, a small golden crown. *BNJ*² 343 F 12 (= Ath. 11.461e–f) does not mention the work from which the information is taken: in this passage, Nicander traces the origin of the Kylikranes, a semi-servile population below Mount Oita in Heracleia Trachinia, back to Lydia, where they and their leader named Kylix are said to have been the companions of Herakles. Given its content, it is doubtful whether F 12 originally belonged to Nicander's work on Attic dialect.

²⁴¹ Drinking vessels: *BNJ*² 343 F 13 (= Ath. 11.479c) on a type of ritual drinking cup called κοτυλίσκος, quoting *Ar. fr.* 395; *BNJ*² 343 F 14 (= Ath. 11.481d) on κυμβία, a drinking cup without handles; *BNJ*² 343 F 15 (= Ath. 11.485f) on the size of λεπαστή, a limpet-shaped drinking-cup; *BNJ*² 343 F 16 (= Ath. 11.486a) on a type of kylix called λοιβάσιον (cf. Chapter 6, Section 4.1); *BNJ*² 343 F 17 (= Ath. 11.503c) on ψυκτήριον, 'cooling ritual places' set up for the gods, a word derived from ψυκτήρ, a vessel used for cooling wine in antiquity. Food: *BNJ*² 343 F 8 (= Ath. 3.76a) on a fig known as ὀξάλειον, 'sharp'; *BNJ*² 343 F 9 (= Ath. 3.81c–d) on quinces (τὰ κυδώνια μῆλα) being also called στρούθια; *BNJ*² 343 F 10 (= Ath. 3.114d) on a variety of Egyptian bread called κυλλαστις; *BNJ*² 343 F 11 (= Ath. 7.320c) on two subvarieties of parrotfish (σκάροξ).

Of particular interest owing to its diachronic dimension, if the attribution to Nicander is correct,²⁴² is a gloss on Attic administrative procedure preserved by Hsch. α 962 (= Nicand.Thyat. *BNJ*² 343 F 20):

Hsch. α 962 (= Nicand.Thyat. *BNJ*² 343 F 20): ἀγωναθέτης· ἀρχῆς ὄνομα Ἀθήνησιν. ὡς δὲ Νικανδρος, ἀθλοθέτης μόνα γυμνικά, ἀγωναθέτης δὲ ὁ τὰ μουσικά ἀκροάματα διατιθέμενος.

ἀγωναθέτης: Name of a magistracy at Athens. But as Nicander (says), an ἀθλοθέτης administered only athletic contests, while an ἀγωναθέτης musical competitions.

Both terms belong to Attic custom and administration, although these two public ἀρχαί date to different chronological periods: the ἀθλοθέται were responsible for the Panathenaic festival (which included both musical and athletic contests) since the 5th century BCE, whereas the figure of the ἀγωναθέτης is first attested in the late 4th century BCE as a consequence of the reform of the system for financing the choregia at state festivals, an intervention traditionally attributed to Demetrius of Phaleron.²⁴³ As observed by Sickinger (2018, *ad loc.*), it seems likely that the responsibility of the ἀγωναθέτης may initially have been restricted only to that of the dramatic and dithyrambic performances at the Dionysia to the exclusion of athletic contests: this would explain Nicander's formulation in his distinction between ἀγωναθέτης and ἀθλοθέτης, thus revealing an interest in the historic development of the magistracy and possibly, but not necessarily, in extra-literary sources (both terms are attested in oratory). If we examine the later lexicographical tradition, we can see that both Σ α 18 (= Phot. α 320, *Su.* α 338): ἀγωναθέτης· ἀγωναθέτης μὲν κυρίως ὁ ἐν τοῖς σκηνακοῖς, ἀθλοθέτης δὲ ὁ ἐν τοῖς γυμνακοῖς ('ἀγωναθέτης in its proper sense is the judge of dramatic contests, ἀθλοθέτης of the athletic competitions') and similar entries in rhetorical lexica (*Fr.Lex.II, Exc.Vat. 17*, and *Anon.Paris.11*) seem to echo Nicander's distinction.²⁴⁴

²⁴² The passage was first ascribed to Nicander of Thyateira by the 16th-century Dutch scholar G. Sopingius; see Latte, Cunningham (2020, 46). Sickinger (2018) *ad loc.* is sceptical about the attribution.

²⁴³ See Sickinger (2018) *ad loc.* for details. On the ἀγωναθέται, see P. Wilson (2000, 270–6).

²⁴⁴ Cf. also [Ammon.] 9. Moeris α 135: ἀθλοθέτης Ἀττικοί· ἀγωναθέτης Ἑλληνας may simply reflect the fact that ἀθλοθέτης was the older magistracy in Athens.

4.4 Crates' *Περὶ τῆς Ἀττικῆς διαλέκτου*

In his *Sophists at Dinner*, Athenaeus repeatedly mentions a work (in at least five books) entitled *Περὶ τῆς Ἀττικῆς διαλέκτου*, and ascribes it to a certain Crates.²⁴⁵ Judging from the scanty remains of the work, *On Attic Dialect* was most likely organised thematically: all the extant quotations from Book 2 (Crates Hist. *BNJ*² 362 FF 6–9) relate to cultic and religious matters.²⁴⁶ Since the 1830s, modern scholarship has been divided as to the identity of Athenaeus' Crates, oscillating between Crates of Mallus, the Pergamene philosopher and scholar of the first half of the 2nd century BCE,²⁴⁷ and the lesser-known Crates of Athens,²⁴⁸ of uncertain date but likely to have been active in the first or second half of the 1st century BCE.²⁴⁹ Crates of Athens was an erudite figure with antiquarian interests, author of a treatise entitled *Περὶ τῶν Ἀθήνησι θυσιῶν* (*On Athenian Sacrifices*)²⁵⁰ and of a work quoted by Harp. ο 19 under the title of *Ἱεροποιία* (*Sacred Ceremonies*). It is not appropriate here to rehearse in detail all the arguments in favour of Crates of Mallus or Crates of Athens as author of *On Attic Dialect*; it is sufficient here to observe that the presence of the term 'Asiatic' (Ἀσιανός, Ἀσιαγενής) in some of Crates' fragments strongly suggests a cultural scenario of the 1st century rather than the 2nd century BCE (on this, see further below).²⁵¹ We therefore accept the

245 Cf. Ath. 3.114a; 6.235b; 9.366d; 11.495a; 11.497e; and 14.653b. At Ath. 9.366d (= Crates Gr. fr. 111 Broggiato) a Crates author of a *Περὶ τῆς Ἀττικῆς λέξεως* is said to be mentioned by Seleucus (first half of the 1st century CE) in his work *On Correctness* (καθὰ φησι Σέλευκος ἐν τοῖς Περὶ ἑλληνισμοῦ: Seleucus fr. 69 Müller). It is highly likely that this Crates mentioned by Seleucus coincides with the Crates author of *Περὶ τῆς Ἀττικῆς διαλέκτου* and that the title *Περὶ τῆς Ἀττικῆς λέξεως* is Seleucus' sloppy way of referring to Crates' treatise on the Attic dialect: see, most recently, Ascheri (2023, *ad loc.* with previous bibliography), rightly refuting N. F. Jones (2021), who posits the existence of two different works.

246 Thus, already Latte (1915, 388 n. 1); cf. also Broggiato (2001, xlii).

247 Thus Wegener (1836, 148–9); Wachsmuth (1860, 33–4; 63–4); Mette (1952, 48–53); Broggiato (2000) and Broggiato (2001, xlii–xlvi); cf. also Montana (2020b, 225) (= Montana 2015, 150) who inclines, though tentatively, towards Crates of Mallus.

248 Cf. Preller (1838, 61 n. 12); Müller *FHG* 4, 369–70; Latte (1915, 387–9), Jacoby *FGrHis* 362, 3b, 121–22; Pfeiffer (1968, 243 n. 4); Cassio (2000, 103). For the ethnic Ἀθηναῖος for Crates as author of *On Athenian Sacrifices*, see *Su. ε* 184.

249 See now Ascheri (2023) *ad loc.*, with good arguments against the split chronology for the antiquarian (4th century BCE) and glossographical (1st century BCE) works proposed by N. F. Jones (2021). The *terminus ante quem* is Crates' use made by Didymus (1st century BCE/1st century CE) in the Sophoclean scholia and by Seleucus (beginning of the 1st century CE) in Harp. ο 19.

250 See Phot. κ 1210 (= Crates Hist. *BNJ*² 362 F 2), *Su. ε* 184 and κ 2706.

251 See already Latte (1915, 387–9); on Asianism and Atticism as stylistic categories, see Kim (2020). Broggiato (2000) and Broggiato (2001, xliiv–v) are not persuasive: it is not sufficient to observe that interest in Attic idioms is already attested in the 3rd century BCE and that already in

ascription of the treatise *On Attic Dialect* to Crates of Athens, following Ascheri's (2023) balanced assessment of the available evidence.

If we turn to the extant fragments (directly and indirectly) ascribed to Crates' *Περὶ τῆς Ἀττικῆς διαλέκτου*, most of the time, we are dealing with glosses pertaining to realia; references to various types of food (in both cultic and non-cultic contexts)²⁵² and drinking vessels²⁵³ are particularly prominent in a way that is not dissimilar to that encountered, for instance, in Nicander of Thyateira and other Attic lexicographers whose main indirect source is for us Athenaeus. However, two sets of passages stand out. The first set is represented by two fragments explicitly ascribed to Crates' *On Attic Dialect* by Athenaeus:

Ath. 6.235b–c (= Crates Hist. *BNJ*² 362 F 7 = Crates Gr. fr. 107 Broggiato): Κράτης δ' ἐν δευτέρῳ Ἀττικῆς διαλέκτου φησί· 'καὶ ὁ παράσιτος νῦν ἐπ' ἄδοξον μετὰκειται (Wilamowitz: μὲν κεῖται A) πρᾶγμα, πρότερον δ' ἐκαλοῦντο παράσιτοι οἱ ἐπὶ τὴν τοῦ ἱεροῦ σίτου ἐκλογὴν αἰρούμενοι καὶ ἦν ἀρχεῖόν τι παρασίτων. διὸ καὶ ἐν τῷ τοῦ βασιλέως νόμῳ γέγραπται ταυτί· κτλ.

In the second book of his *Attic Dialect*, Crates says, 'the term παράσιτος has changed in meaning and now refers to something disreputable, whereas previously παράσιτοι were

that period we find discussions on the nature of ἑλληνισμός (cf. esp. Broggiato 2000, 369–70). As for the latter, we have already seen in Chapter 6, Section 3.3 that ἑλληνισμός ('correct Greek') meant very different things not only at different times but also in different *contemporary* contexts. Hence, the fact that Crates of Mallus participated in the Hellenistic debate on ἑλληνισμός (see above all Janko 1995) tells us, *per se*, nothing in favour of the ascription of a treatise on the Attic dialect to the Pergamene scholar. Nor can the exceptionality of the remarks on the Asianic origin of some words vs their Attic counterparts be brushed away by simply quoting the occurrence of the adjective Ἀσιατογενής already in Aesch. *Pers.* 12 (πᾶσα γὰρ ἰσχύς Ἀσιατογενής, with reference to the Persian contingent): this proves nothing in relation to the use of Ἀσιαγενής in a linguistic context.

252 Ath. 14.653b (= Crates Hist. *BNJ*² 362 F 9 = Crates Gr. fr. 109 Broggiato) on σταφυλή, 'grape', and Ath. 9.366d–67a on σίναπτι, 'mustard' (= Crates *BNJ*² 362 F 11 = Crates Gr. fr. 111 Broggiato), on which, see below in greater detail; Ath. 3.114a (= Crates Hist. *BNJ*² 362 F 6 = Crates Gr. fr. 106 Broggiato) on a kind of bread made from the first harvest called θάρρηλος, obviously connected with the Athenian festival of the Thargelia. Cf. also (but without the name of the work) Harp. π 96 (= Crates Hist. *BNJ*² 362 F 3a = Crates Gr. fr. 121* Broggiato; cf. also Ar.Byz. fr. 343 on προκῶνια) and Phot. π 1255 (= Crates Hist. *BNJ*² 362 F 3b = Crates Gr. fr. 121* Broggiato) on προκῶνια, some sort of ritual offering made, according to Crates, of grains from unroasted barley corns (that the expression προκῶνια was specifically Attic is mentioned by Erot. α 142; cf. also Ar.Byz. fr. 343); Ath.14.640c–d (= Crates Hist. *BNJ*² 362 F 12 = Crates Gr. fr. 112 Broggiato) on various sorts of τραγήματα ('desserts'), quoting Philippid. fr. 20 (and perhaps also Diph. fr. 80).

253 Cf. Ath. 11.495a–c (= Crates Hist. *BNJ*² 362 F 8 = Crates Gr. fr. 108 Broggiato) on πελίκη, quoting Ion of Chios *TrGF* 19 F 10 (see more below); Ath. 11.497f (= Crates Hist. *BNJ*² 362 F 10 = Crates Gr. fr. 110 Broggiato) on σαννάκια, a kind of Persian drinking cup, with quotation from Philem. fr. 90.

called those chosen to collect the sacred grain: there was in fact a public board of παράσιτοι. This is why the following is written in the law concerning the archon basileus etc.’

Ath. 11.495a–c (= Crates Hist. *BNJ*² 362 F 8 = Crates Gr. fr. 108 Broggiato): πελίκαι· Καλλίστρατος ἐν Ὑπομνήμασι Θρατῶν Κρατίνου ἀποδίδωσι κύλικα. Κράτης δ’ ἐν δευτέρῳ Ἀττικῆς διαλέκτου γράφει οὕτως· ‘οἱ χόες πελίκαι, καθάπερ εἶπομεν, ὠνομάζοντο. ὁ δὲ τύπος ἦν τοῦ ἀγγείου πρότερον μὲν τοῖς Παναθηναϊκοῖς ἐοικώς, ἡνίκα ἐκαλεῖτο πελίκη, ὕστερον δὲ ἔσχεν οἰνοχόης σχῆμα, οἷοί εἰσιν οἱ ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ παρατιθέμενοι, ὁποῖους δὴ ποτε ὄλλας ἐκάλουν, χρώμενοι πρὸς τὴν τοῦ οἴνου ἐγχυσιν, καθάπερ Ἴων ὁ Χίος ἐν Εὐρυτιδαῖς φησὶν [. . .]. νυνὶ δὲ τὸ μὲν τοιοῦτον ἀγγεῖον καθιερωμένον τινὰ τρόπον ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ παρατίθεται μόνον, τὸ δ’ ἐς τὴν χρεῖαν πίπτου μετεσχημάτισται, ἀρυταίνη μάλιστα ἐοικός, ὃ δὴ καλοῦμεν χάα’.

πελίκαι: Callistratus, in his *Commentaries on Women of Thrace* by Cratinus (*PCG* 4, 166 no. 88) understands πελίκη as a κύλιξ (‘cup’). But Crates, in the second book of his *Attic Dialect*, writes the following: ‘χόες (‘pitchers’), as we have said, used to be called πελίκαι. Early on, the form of the vessel was similar to the Panathenaic, when it was called πελίκη, but later it acquired the shape of a wine jug (οἰνοχόη), the kind that are set out during the festival (i.e. the Choes festival), the very sort that they once called ὄλλαι, used for the pouring of wine, just as Ion of Chios says in the *Eurytidai* (Ion *TrGF* 19 F 10): [. . .] But nowadays, such a vessel, consecrated in some fashion, is set out only during the festival, while the (vessel) devolving to daily use has undergone a change of form, most resembling a dipper and which we call χῶς (‘pitcher’)’. (Translation by N. H. Jones 2021).

Despite dealing with different categories of realia (the sacred office of the παράσιτος and the terminology of cultic drinking cups), both passages reveal an equal interest in the diachronic evolution of the semantics of the terms concerned: παράσιτος, now (νῦν) a disrespectful designation (just like our modern ‘parasite’), was once used (πρότερον δ’) to indicate a public cultic magistracy,²⁵⁴ ‘pitchers’ (χόες) were once called πελίκαι (cf. ὠνομάζοντο, πρότερον μὲν [. . .], ὕστερον δέ), just as a wine jug (οἰνοχόη) was once (δὴ ποτε) called ὄλλη. Furthermore, in the first passage, Crates quotes not a literary text but a legal document (the law of the archon basileus) to support his claim: how Crates obtained access to this piece of legal and cultic Athenian history, is difficult, if not impossible, to ascertain.²⁵⁵ It is noteworthy, however, that subsequent discussions of the term παράσιτος in the later lexicographical tradition do not appear to dwell on the semantic shift undergone by the word (cf. Hsch. π 665: παράσιτοι· ἀρχὴ ἐπὶ τὴν τοῦ ἱεροῦ σίτου ἐκλογὴν and Phot. π 297: παράσιτοι· οἱ ἐπὶ τὴν τοῦ σίτου ἐκλογὴν αἰρούμενοι· κεῖται ἡ λέξις ἐν τῷ τοῦ βασιλέως νόμῳ).

²⁵⁴ For this meaning of παράσιτος, see N. H. Jones (2021) *ad loc.*

²⁵⁵ According to N. H. Jones (2021), it is unlikely that Crates quoted the law about the archon basileus firsthand: it is more probable that ‘he was indeed working from some intermediate compilation, lexicographical or otherwise’; for a different perspective, cf. Schlaifer (1943, 66).

The second set of passages is even more interesting for our purposes: as already observed by Latte (1915, 386–9), it is the only evidence we have, before the fully fledged development of Atticism in the Roman period, of a polemic stance (Latte speaks of ‘polemische Beziehung’) towards an overly restrictive concept of what counts as admissible Attic. Let us begin with a fragment whose ascription to Crates’ *On Attic Dialect* is certain, that is, Ath. 9.366d–7a:

Ath. 9.366d–7a (= Crates Hist. *BNJ*² 362 F 11 = Crates Gr. fr. 111 Broggiato): Κράτης δ’ ἐν τοῖς Περὶ τῆς Ἀττικῆς Λέξεως Ἀριστοφάνη παριστᾷ λέγοντα· ‘κάβλεπε σίναπυ καὶ τὰ πρόσωπ’ ἀνέσπασε’ καθὰ φησι Σέλευκος ἐν τοῖς Περὶ Ἑλληνισμοῦ· ἐστὶ δ’ ὁ στίχος ἐξ Ἰππέων καὶ ἔχει οὕτως· κάβλεψε νᾶπυ. οὐδεὶς δ’ Ἀττικῶν σίναπυ ἔφη· ἔχει δὲ ἐκάτερον λόγον. νᾶπυ μὲν γὰρ οἶον νᾶφου, ὅτι ἐστέρηται φύσεως· ἀφυὲς γὰρ καὶ μικρόν, ὡσπερ καὶ ἡ ἀφύη. σίναπυ δὲ ὅτι σίνεταί τοὺς ὤπας ἐν τῇ ὀδμῇ, ὡς καὶ τὸ κρόμμυον ὅτι τὰς κόρας μύομεν.

Crates in his *On Attic Diction*²⁵⁶ cites Aristophanes, who says: ‘and he was giving me a σίναπυ (‘mustard’) look and raised his eyebrows’, according to Seleucus in his *On Correct Greek* (Seleuc. fr. 69 Müller). But the line comes from *Knights* (Ar. Eq. 631) and runs as follows: ‘and he was giving me a νᾶπυ (‘mustard’) look.’ No Attic author ever used σίναπυ; but either form makes sense. νᾶπυ is, as it were, νᾶφου, because it has been deprived of growth (ἐστέρηται φύσεως), for it is stunted (ἀφυὲς) and small, like ἀφύη (‘small-fry’). But [it might be] σίναπυ because the smell hurts (σίνεταί) our eyes (ὤπας), just as we say κρόμμυον (‘onion’) because we close (μύομεν) our eyes (κόρας).

If we are to trust Seleucus, Crates knew a version of Aristophanes’ *Knights* that at l. 631 read κάβλεπε σίναπυ instead of κάβλεψε νᾶπυ, the reading unanimously transmitted by our Medieval MSS. Before allowing both forms to exist on the basis of far-fetched etymologies,²⁵⁷ Athenaeus’ objection to σίναπυ in Aristophanes’ text is in line with his Atticist tendencies: no real Attic author ever used σίναπυ for ‘mustard’, because νᾶπυ is the correct form (cf. e.g. also Phryn. *Ecl.* 252: σίναπι οὐ λεκτέον, νᾶπυ δε, ὅτι Ἀττικὸν καὶ δόκιμον; Moer. v 16: νᾶπυ Ἀττικοί· σίνηπι Ἑλληνες). Crates, then, would be defending the presence, in a literary text of the 5th-century BCE Attic ‘champion’ Aristophanes, of a form that the stricter Atticist tradition shunned.

In the same direction – that of a more ‘relaxed’ concept of Attic – point two further items of evidence, the first explicitly assigned to Crates’ *On Attic Dialect*, the second ascribed to Crates without mention of the work’s name:

²⁵⁶ On this title, see above n. 246.

²⁵⁷ νᾶπυ/σίναπυ is likely to be a pre-Greek term deriving from *s^hnāpi, with initial *s^h yielding both σιναπ- and σναπ- > ναπ-, see *EDG* s.v. σίναπι. On the distribution of the two forms in Attic comedy, with σίναπυ being the minority form (Anaxipp. (4th century BCE) fr. 1.45; σίναπυ is implied in Xenarch. (also 4th century BCE) fr. 12.2 σεσινάπικεν (Dalecampius: -ηκεν codd.)), see Olson, *Sens* (1999, 126).

Ath. 14.653b (= Crates Hist. *BNJ*² 362 F 9 = Crates Gr. fr. 109 Broggiato): βότρυς δὲ ὅτι μὲν κοινὸν δῆλον. σταφυλῆς δὲ μέμνηται, καίτοι δοκοῦντος τοῦ ὀνόματος Ἀσιαγενοῦς εἶναι, Κράτης ἐν δευτέρῳ Ἀττικῆς διαλέκτου, ἐν τοῖς ὕμνοις τοῖς ἀρχαίοις φάσκων ἀντὶ τοῦ βότρυος τὴν σταφυλὴν κείσθαι διὰ τούτων· αὐτῆσι σταφυλῆσι μελαίνησιν κομόωντες· ὅτι δὲ καὶ παρ' Ὀμήρῳ ἔστιν παντὶ δῆλον.

That βότρυς is a common term (i.e. for grape-cluster) is obvious. Crates in the second book of his *Attic Dialect* mentions the word σταφυλή, even though the term appears to be of Asian origin, and claims that σταφυλή is attested in place of βότρυς in the ancient hymns,²⁵⁸ in the following passage: ‘with long hair consisting of the black σταφυλαί themselves’.²⁵⁹ That the word is also found in Homer is apparent to anyone.

Schol. Ar. *Pax* 259 (V) (= Crates Hist. *BNJ*² 362 F 13 = Crates Gr. fr. 119 Broggiato): οἴσεις ἀλετριβανὸν τρέχων· Κράτης παρατηρεῖν ἀξιοῖ πρὸς τοὺς λέγοντας ὅτι ὁ μὲν δοῖδυξ Ἀττικός, ὁ δὲ ἀλετριβανὸς Ἀσιανός, καὶ σκυτοδέψης μὲν Ἀττικός, βυρσοδέψης δὲ Ἀσιανός.

‘Will you run and fetch a pestle (ἀλετριβανόν)?’: To those that say that δοῖδυξ (‘pestle’) is Attic, whereas ἀλετριβανός (‘pestle’) is Asianic, just like σκυτοδέψης (‘tanner’) is Attic but βυρσοδέψης (‘tanner’) is Asianic, Crates deems it right to observe [its use in Aristophanes].²⁶⁰

In both passages, Crates apparently defended, or found no objection against, words that, in some Atticist quarters, were considered ‘Asianic’ (Ἀσιαγενής, Ἀσιανός), a term clearly loaded with a negative connotation, in comparison to (proper) Attic (Ἀττικός).²⁶¹ In an extended, tucked-away footnote to his seminal 1915 article, Latte lucidly demonstrated that the label ‘Asianic’ almost invariably occurs in a context of explicit comparison with a ‘positive’ pole represented by ‘pure Attic’, and this within a chronological range in keeping with a fully developed linguistic Atticism.²⁶² Terms like Ἀσιαγενής, Ἀσιανός and *similia* are, of course, not wholly unambiguous: in some cases, they do designate expressions whose origin is actually

²⁵⁸ On the nature of these ἀρχαῖοι ὕμνοι, most likely hexametric Orphic hymns of Ionic origin (also linguistically) but fully naturalised at Athens at an early date, see Cassio (2000, 103–4).

²⁵⁹ Possibly from the lost portion of the Homeric *Hymn to Dionysus* (= fr. B in West’s Loeb edition).

²⁶⁰ Latte (1915, 386 n. 3) rightly remarked that, since βυρσοδέψης does not occur in *Peace*, it is unlikely that this piece of information derives from a running commentary on Aristophanes; rather, it is much more likely that it stems from Crates’ *On Attic Dialect*. In Aristophanes ἀλετριβανός occurs 4x in *Peace* (Ar. *Pax* 259, 265, 269, 282); βυρσοδέψης 2x in *Knights* (Ar. *Eq.* 44 and 581) and 1x in *Clouds* (Ar. *Nu.* 581).

²⁶¹ It is remarkable that Galen, alien to Atticist excesses, always positively qualifies the Greek spoken in Asia Minor by the educated classes: see Manetti (2009, 167–8).

²⁶² Latte (1915, 387 n. 1). On similar terminology in the Atticist lexica, see Chapter 2, Section 3.3.

eastern or non-Greek,²⁶³ but in the majority of cases, they appear to indicate a diastatic and diatopic macro-variant of Greek: basically, the koine of the Greek speakers of Asia Minor, broadly speaking, so often disparaged by the strictest promoters of a pure Attic idiom.²⁶⁴ This is also clearly the case for the two passages of Crates quoted above: in the first passage, Ἀσιαγενής, predicated of σταφυλή in the sense of ‘grape’, may be Athenaeus’ own rendition of Crates’ original wording, and the same cannot be entirely ruled out for the Ἀσιανός of the Aristophanic scholium. However, the cultural context is clear enough: Crates was defending as Attic lexical items (σταφύλη meaning ‘grape’, ἀλετριβανός ‘pestle’, and βυρσοδέψης ‘tanner’) that to others did not appear to enjoy a pure Attic pedigree.²⁶⁵ With Crates’ *On Attic*

263 Among the instances quoted by Latte, cf. e.g. Phryn. *Ecl.* 238 on γάλλος, Hsch. κ 788 and Ael. Dion. κ 11 on κάρδακες, foreign mercenary soldiers of Persian origin (Strabo 15.3.18 derived the term from Persian *karda* = τὸ ἀνδρῶδες καὶ πολεμικόν). One might add the border-line case of Poll. 10.68: τὸ δὲ καλούμενον κυρίλλιον (a kind of narrow-necked jug; the word is not otherwise attested in Greek except as a personal name) πρὸς τῶν Ἀσιανῶν βομβύλιον μὲν Ἀντισθένης εἶρηκεν ἐν τῷ Προτρεπτικῷ, οἱ δὲ καὶ σύστομον αὐτὸ ὀνομάζουσιν (‘What is called κυρίλλιον by the Asians, Antisthenes in the *Protrepticus* (= Antisth. test. 64D Prince = 18A Declava Caizzi) has called it βομβύλιον, others refer to the same as σύστομον (with a narrow mouth)’). κυρίλλιον may be either a Persian loan from Old Persian /Kuruš/ (Schmitt 1978, 27 n. 29) or a Greek folk etymology from κύρ(ι)ος; Pollux’s ascription of this word to the Ἀσισοί seems, at any rate, to indicate the Greek-speaking community of Asia Minor, a term broadly synonymous with koine speakers.

264 Cf. e.g. *Antiatt.* κ 40 on κέρκους with a quotation from Pl.Com. fr. 158 (see S. Valente 2015b, 50); *EDG* s.v.; but notice the more tolerant approach by Poll. 1.190). Or cf. also the lexicographical tradition of κράμβη ‘cabbage’ vis-à-vis ράφανος, ‘radish’ (e.g. Phot. κ 1051; Hsch. ρ 143 ~ Su. ρ 55). The first literary attestations of κράμβη are of Ionic provenance (with a clear iambic pedigree: Ananius fr. 4 West ναὶ μὰ τὰς κράμβας and Hippon. fr. 104.47 West), but the word is thereafter well attested in Attic comedy (cf. e.g. Telecl. fr. 29; Eup. fr. 84.2 (both examples of the oath ναὶ μὰ τὰς κράμβας), Epich. fr. 22; Polyzel. fr. 10, Apollodorus Car. fr. dub. 32.2. For a full list of κράμβη/ράφανον in Greek lexicography, see Olson (2023, 56–7). It seems likely that κράμβη was soon perceived as a ‘lower word’ than ράφανος, perhaps also because of its Ionic and iambic origin; in Photius and the Atticists it is used as the standard koine form. Other examples quoted by Latte include *Antiatt.* α 19 βαίτας (on βαίτη see Section 2.2.5); Phot. σ 307 on σκηνή (with the quotation of Men. fr. 572), and Heracl.Mil. (ca. 100 CE) fr. 50 Cohn (probably from the work entitled Περὶ δυσκλίτων ῥημάτων, *On Irregular Words*) = Eust. in *Od.* 2.70.41–71.3 on ἔα as the imperfect of εἰμί, analogical to other alphathematic forms (ἔλαβα and ἔφαγα) ascribed to the Greeks of Asia. We thank A. C. Cassio for drawing our attention to the hapax ἀσιανίζω in Phot. *Ep.* 242.11, on which see entry by D. Papanikolaou at <http://www.aristarchus.unige.net/Wordsinprogress/it-IT/Database/View/1805> (accessed 17/07/2024).

265 For σταφυλή, cf. e.g. Hsch. σ 1669: σταφυλή. [. . .] Ἀττικοὶ δὲ τὴν ἐν τῷ στόματι κίονα σταφυλήν, βότρυν δὲ καὶ ὀπώραν τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀμπέλου (‘σταφυλή: Attic speakers calls σταφυλή the pillar (i.e. uvula) in the mouth, βότρυν for the fruit of the vine’); cf. also Phot. κ 753. For once, Phryn. *PS* 109.5, if the text is correctly reconstructed, is more permissive: σταφυλαὶ καὶ βότρυες <ἐκατέρω> χρῶ (‘σταφυλαί and βότρυες (both meaning ‘grape’): use both’). For ἀλετριβανός, cf.

Dialect, we can thus for the first time recover a taste, however vague, of what the budding of linguistic Atticism must have looked like in its first production.

5 Lexicography in a minor key: Isolated Attic glosses in grammarians from the 3rd to the first half of the 1st century BCE

We shall now offer a brief sketch of grammarians and lexicographers who, between the third and first half of the 1st century BCE, only occasionally engaged with Attic lexical material (mostly but not exclusively *realia*) within a broader linguistic framework.²⁶⁶ In the overwhelming majority of cases, the state of the available evidence regarding the linguistic interests of these minor or lesser-known scholars is very lacunose, and chronological inferences about their activity are, in some cases, no more than plausible guesswork based on the apparent nature of their oeuvres. This also means that it is often impossible to reconstruct their underlying framework with any exactitude; more often than not, what we seem to find is a general combination of exegesis of Attic literary texts, recordings of the spoken vernacular, and an antiquarian interest broadly conceived, without being able to recover a strongly oriented agenda. However, what these figures appear to share is an interest in Attic (literary and spoken) as just one of the possible dialectal varieties of Greek, not necessarily deserving of more attention than other dialects. Without any pretension to comprehensiveness, we mention here, in what is only an approximative chronological order, the most significant of these ‘minor’ scholarly figures for the successive development of late Hellenistic and then Imperial lexicography:

(1) **Lysanias of Cyrene**, usually dated to the end of the 4th century BCE and the first half of the 3rd century BCE,²⁶⁷ one of Eratosthenes’ teachers according to the *Suda*

Phot. *Bibl.* cod. 279.30–2: ὅτι ὁ τῆς θυίας τριβεὺς δοῖδουξ μὲν παρὰ τοῖς Ἀττικοῖς ὀνομάζεται, ἀλετριβανος δὲ παρὰ τῆ συνηθείᾳ, καὶ οὐδὲν ἦττον παρὰ Ἀθηναίους. For *βυρσοδέψης*, cf. *Su.* β 593: [. . .] *βυρσοδέψης Ἀττικόν, βυρσοδέψης δὲ Ἀσιανόν* (Poll. 6.128 and 7.80 juxtapose interchangeably *βυρσοδέψης* and *βυρσοδέψης*).

²⁶⁶ We omit here the Atthidographers and antiquarian writers such as, for instance, Polemon of Ilium (datable to the 3rd/2nd century BCE). For a general overview of the antiquarian interest in Attic lore (history, geography, customs) from the 4th century BCE to the early Roman era, see R. Thomas (2019, 420–3). On the important role that Alexandrian scholarship played in preserving Atthidographic material, see Benedetto (2011, 366); Costa (2007, 5–7). On Atthidography as a literary genre, see Nicolai (2010).

²⁶⁷ For the dating of Lysanias, see Dettori (2019, 86–8). However, on the basis of a newly published commentary on *Iliad* 1 (= Bodl. MS. Gr. class. f. 110, col. ii ll. 10–3 in which Lysanias is

(*Su.* ε 2898 = *Lysan.* test. 1 Dettori) and probably active between Cyrene and Alexandria (and perhaps Athens). We know the titles of two monographs: *Περὶ ἰαμβοποιῶν* (*On Iambic Poets*), and *Περὶ ποιητῶν* (*On Poets*). The extant fragments dedicated to Homeric exegesis (fr. 5–8 Dettori) seem to suggest the existence of a third monograph, possibly on Homer (cf. Dettori 2019, 88–90). Only one of the surviving fragments deals with an alleged Attic expression: schol. *Apoll.Rh.* 4.1187 (= fr. 11 Dettori): ἄλλοι δ' ἀμφοροῦρας· Θεόπομπος ἀμφοροεῖς λέγεσθαι φησι τοὺς ὑπ' ἐνίων μετρητάς, Λυσανίας δέ φησι τὸν ἀμφοροεῖς ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων ἀμφοροεῖς καλεῖσθαι ('Theopompus (*Theop.Hist. BNJ* 115 F 405) records that some call ἀμφοροεῖς the μετρητής (a jar/liquid measure), whereas Lysanias claims that the Athenians call the ἀμφοροεῖς ἀμφορεύς').²⁶⁸ This scholium presents several textual problems (beginning with the identification of Theopompus: the historian or the comic poet?).²⁶⁹ For our purposes, let it suffice to say that (i) the origin of the equivalence ἀμφορεύς = ἀμφοροεῖς (the latter already attested in Homer) is likely to be sought in Lysanias' Homeric studies (cf. e.g. *Apollon.* 29.21: ἀμφοροεῦσιν· ἀμφορεῦσιν: see Dettori 2019, 162–3); (ii) the 'Athenian' equivalent given by Lysanias has nothing specifically Attic in terms of phonology or morphology: ἀμφορεύς is a form attested in both Attic (e.g. *Philyll.* fr. 6) and non-Attic texts (e.g. *Pind.* fr. 104b.4 Snell–Maehler; *Epich.* fr. 130; *Call.* fr. 399.2 Pfeiffer; in prose, it occurs several times in Herodotus and in the *corpus Hippocraticum*). ἀμφορεύς, compared to the older form ἀμφοροεῖς, is a common Greek form that simply happened to be current *also* at Athens, notwithstanding *Moer.* α 92: ἀμφοροεῖς Ἀττικοί· μητρητής Ἑλληνας; see Dettori (2019, 162–3).

(2) **Parmenon of Byzantium**, probably to be identified with the author of choliambic poems so named (cf. *CA* 287 and *SH* 604A), was both a poet and a scholar, active at Alexandria in the 3rd century BCE.²⁷⁰ He wrote a treatise whose title in the MSS is *Περὶ διαλέκτου* but which has often been corrected by modern scholars into *Περὶ διαλέκτων* (see Dettori 2019, 174–6). The inner structure and articulation of his work remains obscure; what is certain is a marked dialectal interest, mostly applied to the field of Homeric exegesis.²⁷¹ cf. e.g. schol. (ex.) *Hom. Il.* 21.259d (Ge) (= fr. 1 Dettori) on the Thessalian ἀμάρα (already Homeric) and Ambraciotan καλαρύα,

quoted immediately after the mention of Aristarchus), Benaïssa (forthcoming) has raised the possibility of a later date (2nd century BCE) for our scholar.

²⁶⁸ For the apparent interchangeable nature, already attested in 3rd- and 2nd-century BCE lexica on papyrus, between Ἀττικοί and Ἀθηναῖοι to designate Attic speakers, see Ucciardello (2012, 28–9; 71–9).

²⁶⁹ We owe this observation to G. Ucciardello.

²⁷⁰ See Dettori (2019, 173–7) for a detailed discussion of the likely date of Parmenon's activity.

²⁷¹ Parmenon seems to have adopted a method not wholly dissimilar to that of the various γλώσσα κατὰ πόλεις; see Dettori (2019, 176–7).

both epichoric variants for ὄχετός ('water-channel'); schol. (ex.) Hom. *Il.* 21.262c (Ge) (= fr. 5 Dettori) on προαλές, said to be the local form of Cypriots, Arcadians, and Spartans for κάταντες ('steep', 'sloping downwards'); for a non-Homeric context, see Ath. 11.500b (= fr. 2 Dettori) on the Methymnean σκούθος for σκύφος, 'cup'. As far as Attic material is concerned, in P.Oxy. 53.3710 (= TM 60566), a 2nd-century CE commentary to Book 20 of the *Odyssey*, at col. iib ll. 24–6 (= fr. 4 Dettori), Parmenon said that the Athenians (παρ' Ἀθηναίους) call καλλύνειν, here in the sense of 'to sweep clean',²⁷² κορεῖν (first attested in *Od.* 20.149 ἄγρειθ', αἱ μὲν δῶμα κορήσατε πσιπνύσασαι, then almost exclusively a *vox comica*).²⁷³ The present state of our evidence does not allow us to ascertain whether Parmenon was commenting on the verbal form in *Od.* 20.149, quoting *en passant* a specifically Attic usage (a colloquialism?), or whether the anonymous commentator (through an intermediate source?) re-used Parmenon's collection of local λέξεις.²⁷⁴ Part of the later Atticist tradition recognised only (παρα)κορέω as the 'correct' Attic form vs the 'incorrect' σαρώω: cf. Phryn. *Ecl.* 55: κόρημα χρῆ λέγειν, οὐχί σάρων, καὶ κορεῖν καὶ παρακορεῖν, ἀλλὰ μὴ σαροῦν ('One must say κόρημα ('broom') and not σάρων, and κορεῖν and παρακορεῖν but not σαροῦν').²⁷⁵ In Parmenon's fragment, however, there is no trace at all of this Atticist debate (see Dettori 2019, 202–3).

(3) **Amerias of Macedon**, a 3rd-century BCE γλωσσογράφος, author of a work entitled Γλῶσσαι (cf. Ath. 4.176c; e), of which the Ῥιζοτομικόν mentioned at Ath. 15.681f may or may not be a botanic subsection.²⁷⁶ To judge from the extant fragments, Amerias' *Glosses* included Homeric material alongside dialectal (e.g. Epehsian, Rhodian, Macedonian, Attic) and non-dialectal words. Among the dialectal glosses, two are recognised as Attic in the lexicographical tradition: (i) βολεών, a synonym for κοπρεών (both 'cesspit' and 'manure deposit')²⁷⁷ as recorded by P. Oxy. 35.2744 (= TM 63615; 2nd century CE), col. ii. 9–11 βο[λε]ῶ[ν]ας δὲ καὶ τοὺς κο[π]

272 The simplex καλλύνω ('to beautify') is first attested in Archil. fr. 82 West. ἀνακαλλύνω = 'to sweep up' is first attested in Phryn.Com. fr. 39.2 (cf. Stama 2014, 234) and becomes very common in the koine.

273 A full list of the comic occurrences of the term may be found in Napolitano (2012, 95 n. 224).

274 We owe this observation to G. Ucciardello.

275 Poll. 10.29 is more tolerant: εἰ δὲ καὶ καλλύνειν φαίης ἂν τὸ κορεῖν, ἢ που καὶ τὸ κόρημα κάλλυντρον. εἰ δὲ καὶ σαίρειν φήσεις τὸν θυρωρόν. Puzzlingly less severe is however also Phrynichus in *PS* 22.10–1: ἀνακαλλύνειν (Phryn.Com. fr. 39.2): τὸ σαίρειν, ὃ καὶ ἀνακορεῖν <λέγεται>. ἐξ οὗ καὶ κάλλυντρον καὶ κόρημα τὸ σάρων.

276 Amerias' fragments, mainly transmitted by Athenaeus and Hesychius, are collected by Hoffmann (1906, 2–17). To Hoffmann's collection, S. Valente (2005) has added five new fragments. For a general survey of Amerias' activity as glossographer, see Pagani (2005b).

277 Cf. Ault (1999, esp. 550–9); Pernin (2014, 279).

πρεῶνας καλεῖσθαί φησιν Ἀμερ[ί]ας; cf. Section 4.3);²⁷⁸ and (ii) διακόνιον, a ritual cake made for the harvest wreath in honour of Apollo (*Su.* δ 589 ~ *Phot.* δ 344).²⁷⁹ In both cases, we are dealing with realia that also have a literary attestation (*βολεῶν* is attested in *Din. fr.* 3.3 *Conomis*, and *Philem. fr.* 186; *διακόνιον* in *Pherecr. fr.* 167). There is no evident sign of a prescriptive attitude in either case.

(4) **Silenus**, of uncertain date but probably active in the early or mid-Hellenistic age (3rd/2nd century BCE), is credited with a collection of Γλῶσσαι (see Dettori 2019, 233–4). Silenus shows a clear profile of a glossographer with a marked interest in dialectal glosses: cf. e.g. *Ath.* 11.468b (= fr. 1 Dettori) on the Arcadian (more specifically, Cleitorian) word δέπαστρον ‘cup’; *Ath.* 14.644f (= fr. 2 Dettori) on Ionic ἄμην (a kind of milk-cake): the Ionic gloss is cited by Silenus as a morphological variant (metaplasm) vis-à-vis the Attic ἄμης (for such metaplasmata -ητα/-ην in Ionic area, see Dettori 2019, 244 with n. 31); *Ath.* 11.475c–f (= fr. 6 Dettori) on Aeolic κελέβη, ‘cup’, and *Ath.* 15.699d–f (= fr. 9 Dettori) on Attic φανός, ‘torch’. For Silenus Attic was just one dialect among others without enjoying a privileged status (see his comparison between Ionic and Attic forms in fr. 2 Dettori). His analysis of φανός (‘torch’) as a specifically ‘Athenian’ idiom (Ἀθηναίους λέγειν τὰς λαμπάδας φανούς) in *Ath.* 15.699d–f (= fr. 9 Dettori)²⁸⁰ later became the focus of Atticist reflections, especially with reference to the (alleged) difference between λαμπάς/λαμπτήρ and φανός: cf. e.g. *Phryn. PS* 87.1–5: λυχνούχος, λαμπτήρ, φανός διαφέρει. λυχνούχος μὲν ἐστὶ σκευὸς τι ἐν κύκλῳ ἔχον κέρατα, ἔνδον δὲ λύχνον ἡμμένον, διὰ τῶν κεράτων τὸ φῶς πέμποντα. λαμπτήρ δὲ χαλκοῦν ἢ σιδηροῦν ἢ ξύλινον λαμπάδιον ὅμοιον, ἔχον θρυαλλίδα. φανός δὲ φάκελός τινων συνδεδεμένος καὶ ἡμμένος, ὃ καὶ διὰ τοῦ <π> ([‘The terms] λυχνούχος, λαμπτήρ, and φανός have different meanings: λυχνούχος [lit. ‘lamp holder’] is a circular object with horns and a kindled lamp inside emanating light through the horns; λαμπτήρ is like a small torch of bronze, iron or wood, with a wick; φανός is a bundle of things bound together and then kindled’; it can be spelled also with π’). A less strict strand of the Atticist tradition seems instead to have agreed with Silenus: cf. e.g. *Poll.* 6.103: καὶ λυχνούχος ὁ νῦν φανός and 10.17: ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ καὶ λαμπτήρ ὁ λυχνούχος [. . .] ὑποδηλοῖ δὲ τὸν ἐκ κέρατος φανόν.

278 What follows in the papyrus is the quotation of *Dinarchus Or.* 3, fr. 3*, ll. 1–8 *Conomis*: it is likely, although not certain, that this quotation also goes back to *Amerias*: see S. Valente (2005, 284–5). The Attic nature of *βολεῶν* is confirmed by *Nicander of Thyateira (BNJ)*² 343 F3 = *Harp.* β 16), on which, see above.

279 See S. Valente (2005, 285 n. 11).

280 *Athenaeus’* context is that of a synonymic series on torches. φανός is attested in comic poets and Attic prose spanning from *Xenophon* to *Plutarch*; its presence in the New Testament and in documentary texts shows that it was probably perceived as a colloquialism: see Dettori (2019, 299).

πανός μέντοι καὶ φανός ἢ λαμπάς; Ptol. *Diff.voc.* 390.34 Palmieri: λυχνούχον καὶ λαμπτήρα τὸν νῦν φανόν· φανὸν δὲ τὴν λαμπάδα. Of this debate, there is no trace in Silenus (for a full list of the ancient grammatical sources, see Dettori 2019, 300; 301; cf. also Lorenzoni 2000).

(5) **Apollodorus of Athens** (ca. 185/0–110 BCE), a disciple of the Stoic Diogenes of Babylon at Athens and then of Aristarchus at Alexandria, probably moved to Pergamum (his work *Χρονικά* is dedicated to king Attalus II) after the persecution of scholars under Ptolemy VIII. Very much like Eratosthenes, Apollodorus was an encyclopedic scholar with vast scientific and literary interests, both with a tinge of Stoic orientation.²⁸¹ On the literary and linguistic side, apart from his Homeric and mythographic studies, he worked intensively on comedy, both Attic and Doric: he wrote a monograph entitled *On Athenian Courtesans* (Περὶ τῶν Ἀθήνησιν ἐταφίδων: *BNJ* 244 FF 208–12), one on Sophron's mimes (Περὶ Σώφρονος in at least four volumes: *BNJ* 244 FF 214–8), and one on Epicharmus (Περὶ Ἐπιχάρμου in ten volumes: *BNJ* 244 F 213a), perhaps accompanied by an edition of the text (cf. Pfeiffer 1968, 264). To the Alexandrian tradition of lexicography belong his *Ἑτυμολογία* in two books (*BNJ* 244 FF 223–5; also known under the title of *Ἑτυμολογούμενα*: *BNJ* 244 F 222, cf. Pfeiffer 1968, 260) and a collection of rare words, entitled *Γλῶσσαι* (*BNJ* 244 F 221). Already Jacoby, not without reasons, suspected that *Ἑτυμολογία* and *Γλῶσσαι* might be alternative titles of the same work. In his *Glosses* and *Etymologies*, we find a miscellaneous array of interests ranging from grammatical analysis (in *BNJ* 244 F 221 = schol. (ex.?) Hom. *Il.* 1.244d (A) Apollodorus defended οὐδέν < οὐ + δέ + ἔν against Aristarchus' interpretation of οὐδέν = οὐ, if indeed this passage does belong to his *Glosses* and not to Apollodorus' *Schiffskatalog*), culinary glosses possibly from Attic comedy (*BNJ* 244 F 222 on μαπτύη, a sweet dish, a term said to derive from μασάομαι 'to chew' rather than from μάττω 'to knead'; *BNJ* 244 F 223 on a variety of edible snails called κωλυσίδειπνοι), dialectal terms possibly of non-literary origin (*BNJ* 244 F 224 on the Paphian κύββα = Attic κύμβα, a drinking cup) and, obviously, etymology (*BNJ* 244F 225: Κρηῆτες are so called because the local air is well temperate: παρὰ τὸ εὖ κεκραῖσθαι). The only gloss explicitly said to be Attic is ψωθία, 'bred-crumbs' in *BNJ* 244 F 283 (= Ath. 14.646c): ψωθία· τὰ ψαθύρια. Φερεκράτης Κραπατάλλοις [. . .] Ἀπολλόδωρος δ' ὁ Ἀθηναῖος καὶ Θεόδωρος δ' ἐν Ἀττικαῖς Γλῶσσαις τοῦ ἄρτου τὰ ἀποθραυόμενα (ἀποθραυόμενα Kaibel: ἀποψαυόμενα ACE: ἀποψώμενα B Meineke) ψωθία καλεῖσθαι, ἃ τινες ὀνομάζουσιν ἀτταράγους ('ψωθία: small crumbs. Thus Pherecrates in his *Kratapalloi* (Pherecr. fr. 86) [. . .] Apollodorus of Athens and Theodorus in his *Attic Glosses* (Theod.Hist. *BNJ*²

²⁸¹ For an informative and up-to-date synthesis, see Montana (2020b, 232–4) (= Montana 2015, 157–9); Williams (2018).

346 F 2)²⁸² [say] that are so called the morsels of bread, which [they claim] some call ἀττάραγοι). Apollodorus may have derived this word from a literary source (Attic comedy: cf. the quotation of Pherecr. fr. 86 by Athenaeus) or from the spoken everyday language: here too, as in many other cases, it is impossible to decide one way or another.²⁸³ Finally, in *BNJ* 244 F 282 = Hdn. Περὶ μονήρους λέξεως *GG* 3,2.946.3–6 = 40.16 Papazeti Apollodorus dealt with the accentuation of the word ΨΑΛΤΗΡ ('cantor'). According to Herodian, masculine disyllabic nouns ending in -της are paroxytone: Apollodorus apparently recorded as an exception to the rule the Attic form ψαλτής (τὸ δὲ ψαλτής Ἀττικόν ἐστὶν ὀξύνομενον, ὡς ἰστορεῖ Ἀπολλόδωρος). Neither in F 283 nor in F 282 does Attic seem to have been treated by Apollodorus as the 'default' prestige dialectal variety deserving more attention than other regional dialects.

(6) **Timachidas of Rhodes** was a poet and a grammarian active between the second half of the 2nd century BCE and the first half of the 1st century CE (that is, before Pamphilus).²⁸⁴ He is author of a work entitled Γλώσσαι, which shows a clear interest in a variety of local dialects: cf. Ath. 2.53b–c (= fr. 9 Matijašić) on the Pontic 'nut' (κάρυον) called 'Zeus' acorn'; Ath. 15.678a (= fr. 15 Matijašić) on the Sicyonian ἰάκχα, a 'wreath' used in the cult of Dionysus; Ath. 1.31e (= fr. 20 Matijašić) on ὑπόχυτος, a variety of Rhodian wine. The evidence of Harp. σ 18 (= fr. 19 Matijašić) also shows a specific interest in the Attic dialect: σῖτος Δημοσθένης (ἐν τῷ) κατ' Ἀφόβου α'. σῖτος καλεῖται ἡ διδομένη πρόσδος εἰς τροφήν ταῖς γυναῖξιν ἢ τοῖς ὀρφανοῖς, ὡς ἐξ ἄλλων (τε) μαθεῖν ἐστὶ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Σόλωνος α' ἄξονος καὶ ἐκ τῆς Ἀριστοτέλους Ἀθηναίων πολιτείας. Τιμαχίδας δὲ ἡγεῖται παρὰ τοῖς Ἀττικοῖς σῖτον λέγεσθαι τὸν τόκον, ἀγνοεῖ δὲ ὅτι ἐν ἀνθ' ἐνὸς οὐδέποτε παρ' αὐτοῖς ὁ τόκος σῖτος καλεῖται (σῖτος: Demosthenes <in the> first speech *Against Aphobus* (D. 27.15). σῖτος is the public revenue for the sustenance of women and orphans, as it is known among others both from the first axon of Solon (test. 10 Ruschenbusch) and from Aristotle's *Constitution of Athens* (Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 56.7). Timachidas claims that among Attic

²⁸² As already seen by Schwartz (1894, 2871), followed by Jacoby, ἐν Ἀττικαῖς Γλώσσαις probably refers only to Theodorus (of uncertain date: at any rate, before the second half of the 1st century CE: cf. Meliadò 2019): therefore, there is no need to infer that Apollodorus also wrote a book specifically devoted to Attic Λέξεις only.

²⁸³ See Franchini (2020, 25). The doublet ψωθία/ἀττάραγοι is also in Poll. 7.23, where the former are said to refer to the blisters on the bottom of a loaf (αἱ δ' ἐκ τοῦ κάτω), and the latter to those on the upper surface (τοῦ γε μὴν ἄρτου αἱ μὲν κατὰ τὸ ἄνω μέρος. If this distinction was known to Apollodorus is impossible to say. For ψωθία/ψωθίον and ἀττάραγος in the lexicographical tradition, see Franchini (2020, 17 and 25). One may also add the comic lexicon of P.Sorb. 2243 (= TM 63918, 2nd/3rd CE) ψωθία τὰ ὑποκάτω τοῦ ἄρτου.

²⁸⁴ For the dating, see Matijašić (2020, 12).

speakers, the interest is called *σίτος*: but he ignores the fact that in Athens, *σίτος* (that is, ‘public revenue’) is never one-for-one for *τόκος* (‘interest’). Timachidas’ interpretation of *σίτος* as ‘interest’, judged by Harpocration to be incorrect, is unparalleled. Again, just as for Silenus, one has the impression that Attic was, for Timachidas, one of the many dialectal varieties of Greek without an *a priori* superior prestige. The overall framework, as far as it is recoverable from the scanty fragments available, appears to have been descriptive rather than prescriptive.

6 Attic words in anonymous BCE collections of glosses on papyri

The earliest lexica on papyri, although largely fragmentary, can also help us to try to recover additional evidence on the ways in which regional and/or rare idioms, deriving from both literary texts and spoken language, were collected.²⁸⁵ As in the previous sections, we shall limit ourselves to examine only evidence directly concerning the Attic dialect, in an attempt to gauge which role, if any, these early lexical aids may have played in the subsequent lexicographical tradition on Attic.

P.Berol. inv.9965 (= TM 65774) is a papyrus fragment from Abusir-el-Melek, written on the *recto* and reasonably dated to between the 3rd and 2nd centuries BCE.²⁸⁶ It consists of an alphabetical list of poetic expressions mostly attested in epic, tragedy, and possibly Hellenistic poetry. As observed by Ucciardello (2012), many lemmata and *interpretamenta* show a clear correspondence with the relevant entries in Hesychius and the scholia D to the *Iliad*: this strongly suggests that this dictionary was arranged for a public with strong interest in poetic diction. In particular, two items in P.Berol. are commented on as specifically ‘Athenian’, that is ‘Attic’. The first is at col. ii.7, where we read βλάξ· μωρός· Ἀθηναῖοι (‘βλάξ: [it means] stupid; [so say] the Athenians’). The same explanation occurs again in later Attic lexicography, for instance in Hsch. β 671: βλάξ· μωρός (= Σ β 56, Phot. β 160) and Ael.Dion. β 16: βλάξ· μαλακός, χαῦνος, ἐκκελυμένος ἢ μωρός.²⁸⁷ In all

²⁸⁵ Earlier papyrus glossaries or lexica (for a terminological distinction between glossary and lexicon, see Esposito 2009, 257) include: (i) P.Hib.2.175 (= TM 65730; ca. 260–40 BCE), an epic glossary likely to be a school text: see Esposito (2017, 13–34); (ii) P.Heid.I.200 (= TM 61252; mid- or second half of 3rd century BCE): see Vecchiato 2020, 12–6; (iii) P.Freib.I.1c (= TM 64050, of unknown provenance, 1st century BCE: for this dating, see Vecchiato 2020, 17).

²⁸⁶ Ucciardello (2012, 15–8); Vecchiato (2022, 66–9).

²⁸⁷ A complete list of passages may be found in the apparatus of *loci similes* in Cunningham, Latte (2020, 443).

these later instances, however, the ethnic is lacking, but the etymological tradition that probably derives from *Et.Gen.* β 129: βλάξ· ὁ εὐήθης καὶ ἀργὸς καὶ ἀνόητος· Ἀριστοφάνης records an Aristophanic quotation (Ar. fr. 443). This makes it quite likely that our entry in P.Berol. also implied an underlying comic expression. The mention of the ethnic Ἀθηναῖοι must thus likely be understood as a byword for Aristophanes as the champion of the 5th-century-BCE literary Attic.²⁸⁸

The second item pointed out as Attic is at col. ii.9: †βλε[ι]μ[ά]ξει· βαστάσει† Ἀθηναῖοι (‘†He feels/handles: he will carry; [so say] the Athenians’).²⁸⁹ Once again, the item betrays a distinct comic origin (one can compare Ar. Av. 530 or, in a more obscene sense, Ar. Lys.1164 and Cratin. fr. 335), which justifies the label of Ἀθηναῖοι and the perception of the Attic nature of the rare verb βλιμάζω. Unfortunately, it remains unclear whether this ethnic label was intended to define 5th-century-BCE Attic alone as the more prestigious variety of Attic to differentiate it from its post-Classical developments.

The second lexicon that interests us is P.Köln inv. 22323 (= TM 977097; ca. 3rd/2nd centuries BCE), recently published by Vecchiato (2022). P.Köln contains a list of poetic words followed by one or two explanations, often marked by the corresponding ethnic/dialectal label. More importantly, it exhibits a full alphabetical order of all the letters, thus modifying the common previous opinion that a complete alphabetization was first introduced by Diogenianus or by someone else influenced by Atticist trends during the first centuries CE.²⁹⁰ This lexicon contains both literary words (from Homer, lyric, and tragic poetry) and local rarities on realia or names of animals, which suggests attention to local spoken vernaculars (Aetolians, Argives, Dorians, Laconians are quoted among others).²⁹¹ The text does not deal with items explicitly qualified as Attic or ‘Athenian’, but some passages nevertheless deserve closer attention.²⁹² For instance, at fr. 4 col. i.5, we read κλάσαι· τεμεῖν τοὺς ἀμπέλους without any ethnic label. The verb κλάω here is explained in its more technical meaning (‘to prune vines’), well attested in bo-

²⁸⁸ On Ἀττικοί/Ἀθηναῖοι as an interchangeable designation for the Attic dialect, see Ucciardello (2012, 28–9; 71–9).

²⁸⁹ The text is clearly corrupt: we can emend either the explanation βαστάσει to βαστάζει or the lemma to βλε[ι]μ[ά]ξει. The latter solution is paleographically more appealing (the corruption ξ > ζ (and vice versa) is well attested in Ptolemaic handwritings); meanwhile, βαστάζει would match Ar. Av. 530 οἱ δ’ ὠνοῦνται βλιμάζοντες (with a lemmatization in the third person); the interchange ζ/σ (even if seldom before vowel) would thus be a matter of pronunciation: see Ucciardello (2012, 24–5) and Vecchiato (2022, 67–8, n. 155).

²⁹⁰ As assumed by Tosi (1994a, 174) and Esposito (2007, 260): see now Vecchiato (2022, 4–6): cf. also Chapter 6, Section 4.3.

²⁹¹ See Vecchiato (2022, 12–4).

²⁹² This part is deeply indebted to G. Ucciardello.

tanical texts. The closest *comparanda* in the later lexicographical tradition are Moer. κ 41: κλάσαι Ἀττικοί· κλαδεῦσαι Ἕλληνες, Phryn. *Ecl.* 143: κλ{αδ}ᾶν ἀμπέλους φαθί, ἀλλὰ μὴ κλαδεύειν, Poll. 1.224: ἐρεῖς δὲ ἄμπελον τεμεῖν, γυρῶσαι, ταφρεῦσαι, ἀμῆσαι, κλάσαι, κλαδεῦσαι (Pollux, as usual, is more relaxed than Phrynichus in his list of permitted expressions), and Phot. κ 754: κλᾶν ἄμπελον· τὸ τέμνειν. From this array of passages, we may reasonably infer that κλάω in the specific sense of κλαδεύω ('to prune') was regarded as Attic, while the latter is the more common form (cf. Hsch. κ 2862: κλᾶν· κάμπτειν. ἐμποδίζειν. τέμνειν ἀμπέλους, ὅπερ ἡμεῖς κλαδεύειν), prohibited by more severe Atticists such as Phrynichus. Two observations are in order: (i) it is indeed remarkable that already in the 3rd century BCE, this peculiar use of the verb κλάω was deemed to be Attic (this is may be owing to its occurrence in an Attic literary source); (ii) the lexicon of P.Köln seems to be mainly intended to be primarily a collection of rare terms singled out from different regional and local dialects, without any reference to the spoken contemporary usage (koine).

As we have seen, both papyri share the same attitude to indicate, even if erratically, the regional or local provenance of the lexical items. In this respect, they closely resemble a much later dialectological list of 101 glosses divided into 21 Greek regions and cities, which has come down to us in a handful of MSS. This list is entitled ποῖα γλῶσσα κατὰ πόλεις and assembles glosses from both regional varieties, such as Arcadians, Cretans, Thessalians, and Ambraciotans, and from cities (Athens, Corinth, Cleitor, Hermione, Corcyra, Phlius, and Argos), mentioned in alphabetical order according to the ethnicity. The authorship and chronology of this short work are unknown: Latte (1925), not unreasonably, suggested Diogenianus as the ultimate source, even though the final arrangement is in all likelihood ascribable to a later compiler.²⁹³ It is worth noting that several of categories used in this later *excerptum* are the same as those found in Parmenon (Cypriots, Ambraciotas, Thessalians, Arcadians, and Lacedaemonians, here called Laconians), Silenus (Cleitorians, Aeolians, Athenians) or Zenodotus (Cleitorians), as well as in our two lexica (Athenians in P.Berol. 9965, col.ii. 7 and 9; and see P. Köln, fr. 1 col. i.12 Arcadians, col. i.16 and fr. 4 col. i.2 Cleitorians, col. i. 17 Argives).

All in all, there are undisputable points of convergence between such chronologically different texts: all display a classificatory attitude to distinguish linguistic varieties according to regional dialects at a macro-level and, at a micro-level, to epichoric idioms of various localities, a disposition that ultimately goes back to the earliest Hellenistic scholars, including Zenodotus and Parmenon, and that we can see as still operational during later stages of Greek lexicography. In a sense,

²⁹³ Latte (1925) and Bowra (1959) are still the best treatments of this list.

this is reassuring: even at the level of anonymous lexical aids, we may see some continuity between the Hellenistic and the Imperial periods, in terms of methodology, even across the chronological divide of Atticism.

7 Conclusions

In this chapter, we have attempted to reconstruct the cultural and scholarly environment that prepared the way for the later development of the so-called linguistic Atticism, highlighting differences from and analogies with mature Hellenistic lexicography. From the 3rd century BCE onwards, sustained attention to the Attic dialect in particular appears to be thriving: Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις appear to become less of a niche subject and more of a mainstream field of investigation. The analysis conducted here, if not wide off the mark, suggests that in the 3rd and 2nd centuries BCE, we do not find significant traces of an attitude towards the Attic dialect that may be described as Atticist or purist *ante litteram*: the majority of the evidence under scrutiny rather appears to suggest an expansion of the ‘open’ approach to the possibilities of the Attic language, exemplified at its best by Aristophanes of Byzantium’s Λέξεις. This seems to be true both in the case of lexicographical studies explicitly dedicated to the Attic dialect only and in the isolated Attic glosses that we can occasionally find in minor and lesser-known scholars. The transition from the second to the first half of the 1st century BCE must have represented a veritable watershed in the long history of Greek lexicography: the case of Crates of Athens (Section 4.4) has just offered us a foretaste of that momentous change, paving the way towards the age of Atticism, which will be the focus of this work’s next volume. We hope that our incursions, sporadic though they might have been, into the beginning of this later phase, will encourage others to tackle the challenge that lies ahead.

References

- Abert, H. (1899). *Die Lehre vom Ethos in der griechischen Musik. Ein Beitrag zur Musikästhetik des klassischen Altertums*. Leipzig.
- Adler, A. (1928–1938). *Suidae lexicon*. 5 vols. Leipzig.
- Adler, A. (1931). 'Suidas'. *RE* 4.A.1, 675–717.
- Adrados, F. R. (2005). *A History of the Greek Language. From Its Origins to the Present*. Leiden, Boston.
- Akrigg, B. (2019). *Population and Economy in Classical Athens*. Cambridge.
- Alberti, G. B. (1972–2000). *Thucydidis historiae*. 3 vols. Rome.
- Alexiou, M. (1982). 'Diglossia in Greece'. In: Haas, W. (ed.), *Standard Languages. Spoken and Written*. Manchester, 156–92.
- Allan, R. J. (2003). *The Middle Voice in Ancient Greek. A Study in Polysemy*. Amsterdam.
- Allen, S. (1987). *Vox Graeca. A Guide to the Pronunciation of Classical Greek*. 3rd edition. Cambridge.
- Alonso Déniz, A. (2014). 'L'esprit du temps, dialecte et hyperdialecte dans les inscriptions agonistiques du sanctuaire d'Artémis Orthia à Sparte'. In: Minon, S. (ed.), *Diffusion de l'attique et expansion des koinai dans le Péloponnèse et en Grèce centrale*. Actes de la journée internationale de dialectologie grecque du 18 mars 2011, Université Paris-Ouest Nanterre. Geneva, 141–68.
- Alpers, K. (1975). Review of L. W. Daly, *Contributions to a History of Alphabetisation in Antiquity and the Middle Ages* (Brussels, 1967). *Gnomon* 47, 113–8.
- Alpers, K. (1981). *Das attizistische Lexicon des Oros. Untersuchung und kritische Ausgabe*. Berlin, New York.
- Alpers, K. (1990). 'Griechische Lexikographie in Antike und Mittelalter. Dargestellt an ausgewählten Beispielen'. In: Koch, H. A. (ed.), *Welt und Information. Wissen und Wissenvermittlung in Geschichte und Gegenwart*. Stuttgart, 14–38.
- Alpers, K. (1991). 'Eine byzantinische Enzyklopädie des 9. Jahrhunderts. Zu Hintergrund, Entstehung und Geschichte des griechischen Etymologicon in Konstantinopel und im italogriechischen Bereich'. In: Cavallo, G.; De Gregorio, G.; Maniaci, M. (eds.), *Scrittura, libri e testi nelle aree provinciali di Bisanzio*. 2 vols. Spoleto, 235–69.
- Alpers, K. (1998). 'Lexicographica minora'. In: Collatz, F.-C.; Dummer, J.; Kollesch, J.; Werlitz, M.-L. (eds.), *Dissertationunculae criticae. Festschrift für Günther Christian Hansen*. Würzburg, 93–108.
- Alpers, K. (2001). 'Lexikographie, griechische'. In: Ueding, G. (ed.), *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*. Vol. 5: *L–Musik*. Tübingen, 194–210.
- Alpers, K. (2013). *Untersuchungen zu Johannes Sardinianus und seinem Kommentar zu den Progygmasmata des Aphthonios*. 2nd edition. Braunschweig.
- Alpers, K. (2015). 'Difficult Problems in the Transmission and Interrelation of the Greek Etymologica'. In: Xenis, G. (ed.), *Literature, Scholarship, Philosophy, and History. Classical Studies in Memory of Ioannis Taifacos*. Stuttgart, 293–314.
- Aly, W. (1906). *De Aeschylī copia verborum*. Berlin.
- Amigues, S. (1989). *Théophraste. Recherches sur les plantes*. Vol. 2. Paris.
- Anderson, G. (1993). *The Second Sophistic. A Cultural Phenomenon in the Roman Empire*. London, New York.
- Anderson, W. D. (1966). *Ethos and Education in Greek Music. The Evidence of Poetry and Philosophy*. Cambridge, MA.
- Andolfi, I. (2019). *Acusilaus of Argos' Rhapsody in Prose. Introduction, Text, and Commentary*. Berlin, Boston.
- Annamalai, E. (1979). *Movements for Linguistic Purism. The Case of Tamil*. Mysore.

- Apostolakis, K. (2019). *Timokles. Translation and Commentary*. Göttingen.
- Arenz, A. (2006). *Herakleides Kritikos „Über die Städte in Hellas“: Eine Periegesis Griechenlands am Vorabend des Chremonideischen Krieges*. Munich.
- Argyle, S. (1989). 'A New Greek Grammarian'. *CQ* 39, 524–35.
- Arnott, W. G. (1989). 'A Note on the *Antiatticist* (98.17 Bekker)'. *Hermes* 117, 374–6.
- Arnott, W. G. (1995). 'Menander's Manipulation of Language for the Individualisation of Character'. In: De Martino, F.; Sommerstein, A. H. (eds.), *Lo spettacolo delle voci*. Bari, 147–64.
- Arnott, W. G. (1996). *Alexis. The Fragments. A Commentary*. Cambridge.
- Arnott, W. G. (1997). 'Further Notes on Menander's *Sikyonioid* (vv. 110–322)'. *ZPE* 117, 21–34.
- Arnott, W. G. (2001a). 'Some Orthographical Problems in the Papyri of Later Greek Comedy I. πο(ι)ειν (Along with Compounds and Congeners)'. *ZPE* 134, 43–51.
- Arnott, W. G. (2001b). 'Some Orthographical Problems in the Papyri of Later Greek Comedy II. -ει or -η(ι) as the Ending of the Second Person Singular Middle and Passive in the Present and Other Tenses of Verbs in -ω'. *ZPE* 135, 36–40.
- Arnott, W. G. (2002). 'Some Orthographical Variants in the Papyri of Later Greek Comedy'. In: Willi, A. (ed.), *The Language of Greek Comedy*. Oxford, 191–218.
- Ascheri, P. (2003). *I frammenti degli scritti omerici del grammatico Demetrio Issione*. [Ph.D. dissertation]. University of Genoa.
- Ascheri, P. (2004). 'Demetrio Issione, Aristarco e il duale omerico'. In: Pretagostini, R.; Dettori E. (eds.), *La cultura ellenistica. L'opera letteraria e l'esegesi antica*. Rome, 335–51.
- Ascheri, P. (2009). 'Demetrius [14] Ixion'. *LGGA*. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2451-9278_Demetrius_14_Ixion.
- Ascheri, P. (2010). 'Demetrio Issione "dialettologo". L'attico e il dialetto degli Alessandrini'. In: Montana, F. (ed.), *Aner polytropos. Ricerche di filologia greca antica dedicate dagli allievi a Franco Montanari*. Rome, 125–52.
- Ascheri, P. (2011). 'The Greek Origins of the Romans and the Roman Origins of Homer in the Homeric Scholia and in *POxy.* 3710'. In: Montanari, F.; Pagani, L. (eds.), *From Scholars to Scholia. Chapters in the History of Ancient Greek Scholarship*. Berlin, Boston, 65–86.
- Ascheri, P. (2023). 'Crates [2]'. *LGGA*. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2451-9278_Crates_2_it.
- Asheri, D.; Lloyd, A.; Corcella, A. (2011). *A Commentary on Herodotus. Books I–IV*. Edited by O. Murray and A. Moreno. With a Contribution by M. Brosius. Translated by B. Graziosi, M. Rossetti, C. Dus, and V. Cazzato. Oxford.
- Asper, M. (2011). 'Dimensions of Power. Callimachean Geopoetics and the Ptolemaic Empire'. In: Acosta-Hughes, B.; Lehnus, L.; Stephens S. (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Callimachus*. Leiden, Boston, 155–77.
- Auer, P. (2005). 'Europe's Sociolinguistic Unity, or: A Typology of European Dialect/Standard Constellations'. In: Delbecque, N.; van der Auwera, J.; Geeraerts, D. (eds.), *Perspectives on Variation. Sociolinguistic, Historical, Comparative*. Berlin, New York, 7–42.
- Ault, B. A. (1999). 'Koprones and Oil Presses at Halieis. Interactions of Town and Country and the Integration of Domestic and Regional Economies'. *Hesperia* 68, 549–73.
- Austin, C.; Olson, S. D. (2004). *Aristophanes. Thesmophoriazusaë*. Edited with Introduction and Commentary. Oxford.
- Ayres-Bennett, W. (2020). 'From Haugen's Codification to Thomas's Purism. Assessing the Role of Description and Prescription, Prescriptivism and Purism in Linguistic Standardisation'. *Language Policy* 19, 183–213.
- Ayres-Bennett, W. (2021). 'Modelling Language Standardization'. In: Ayres-Bennett, W.; Bellamy, J. (eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Language Standardization*. Cambridge, 27–64.

- Ayres-Bennett, W.; Bellamy, J. (2021). 'Introduction'. In: Ayres-Bennett, W.; Bellamy, J. (eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Language Standardization*. Cambridge, 1–24.
- Ax, W. (1978). 'Ψόφος, φωνή und διάλεκτος als Grundbegriffe aristotelischer Sprachreflexion'. *Glotta* 56, 245–71. (Reprinted in *Lexis und Logos. Studien zur antiken Grammatik und Rhetorik*. Hrsg. von Farouk Grewing. Stuttgart 2000, 19–39).
- Ax, W. (1982). 'Aristarch und die "Grammatik"'. *Glotta* 60, 96–109. (Reprinted in *Lexis und Logos. Studien zur antiken Grammatik und Rhetorik*. Hrsg. von Farouk Grewing. Stuttgart 2000, 128–39)
- Ax, W. (1986). *Laut, Stimme und Sprache. Studien zu drei Grundbegriffen der antiken Sprachtheorie*. Göttingen.
- Ax, W. (1990). 'Aristophanes von Byzanz als Analogist. Zu Fragment 374 Slater (= Varro, de lingua Latina 9, 12)'. *Glotta* 68, 4–18. (Reprinted in *Lexis und Logos. Studien zur antiken Grammatik und Rhetorik*. Hrsg. von Farouk Grewing. Stuttgart 2000, 116–27).
- Ax, W. (1991). 'Sprache als Gegenstand der alexandrinischen und pergamenischen Philologie'. In: Schmitter, P. (ed.), *Sprachtheorien der abendländischen Antike*. Tübingen, 275–301. (Reprinted in *Lexis und Logos. Studien zur antiken Grammatik und Rhetorik*. Hrsg. von Farouk Grewing. Stuttgart 2000, 95–115).
- Ax, W. (1993). 'Der Einfluss des Peripatos auf die Sprachtheorie der Stoa'. In: Döring, K.; Ebert, T. (eds.), *Dialektiker und Stoiker. Zur Logik der Stoa und ihrer Vorläufer*. Stuttgart, 11–32 (Reprinted in *Lexis und Logos. Studien zur antiken Grammatik und Rhetorik*. Hrsg. von Farouk Grewing. Stuttgart 2000, 73–94).
- Bachmann, L. (1828). *Anecdota Graeca*. 2 vols. Leipzig.
- Bagordo, A. (1998). *Die antiken Traktate über das Drama. Mit einer Sammlung der Fragmente*. Stuttgart, Leipzig.
- Bagordo, A. (2013). *Telekleides. Einleitung, Übersetzung, Kommentar*. Heidelberg.
- Bagordo, A. (2014). *Leukon-Xenophilos. Einleitung, Übersetzung, Kommentar*. Heidelberg.
- Bagordo, A. (2017). *Aristophanes fr. 675–820. Übersetzung und Kommentar*. Heidelberg.
- Bagordo, A. (2020). *Aristophanes fr. 487–589. Übersetzung und Kommentar*. Göttingen.
- Bain, D. (1984). 'Female Speech in Menander'. *Antichthon* 18, 24–42.
- Bain, D. (1991). 'Six Greek Verbs of Sexual Congress (βινῶ, κινῶ, πυγίζω, ληκῶ οἴφω, λαικάζω)'. *CQ* 41, 51–77.
- Barber, P. J. (2013). *Sievers' Law and the History of Semivowel Syllabicity in Indo-European and Ancient Greek*. Oxford.
- Barker, A. (1989). *Greek Musical Writings*. Vol. 2: *Harmonic and Acoustic Theory*. Cambridge.
- Barker, A. (2007). *The Science of Harmonics in Classical Greece*. Cambridge.
- Barth, H. L. (1984). *Die Fragmente aus den Schriften des Grammatikers Kallistratos zu Homers Ilias und Odyssee. Edition und Kommentar*. [Ph.D. dissertation]. Bonn.
- Batisti, R. (2023a). 'χρύσεος, χάλκεος, φοινίκεος' (Phryn. *Ecl.* 178, Moer. χ 3, Philemo (Vindob.) 396.28). *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2023/02/015>.
- Batisti, R. (2023b). 'ἀπλᾶ, διπλᾶ, τριπλᾶ (Phryn. *PS* 43.17–9, Moer. τ 22)'. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2023/02/035>.
- Batisti, R. (2023c). 'ἰχθῦς, δρῦς' (Phryn. *PS* 77.14–5, Philem. [Laur.] 359 Cohn). *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2023/02/010>.
- Batisti, R. (2023d). 'γυναῖ (Antiatt. γ 1)'. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2022/01/012>.
- Batisti, R. (2023e). 'ᾠεές (Moer. σ 1, Phot. σ 110 [~ Orus fr. B 145, Σ σ 40], Phot. σ 161, Thom.Mag. 328.14–5)'. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2022/01/018>.

- Batisti, R. (2023f). ‘σκότος (Moer. σ 34, Phot. σ 377, Thom.Mag. 333.9–10)’. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2023/02/009>.
- Batisti, R. (2024a). ‘Διόσκοροι, Διόσκοροι, Διοσκόρω (Phryn. *Ecl.* 205, [Hdn.] *Philet.* 44)’. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2024/01/026>.
- Batisti, R. (2024b). ‘ἀπέκτονεν, ἀπέκταγκεν (Moer. α 70, Philemo (Laur.) 355, Thom.Mag. 8.9)’. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2024/01/019>.
- Batisti, R. (2024c). ‘Philemon. Περὶ Ἀττικῆς ἀντιλογίας τῆς ἐν ταῖς λέξεσιν’. *DEA*. DOI: 10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2024/02/018.
- Batisti, R. (forthcoming a). ‘νοσός, νοσίουν, νεοτός, νεοτίον (Phryn. *Ecl.* 177, *Antiatt.* ν 12)’. *DEA*.
- Batisti, R. (forthcoming b). ‘ἤμελλον, ἠβουλόμην, ἠδυνάμην (Moer. η 5, Philem. (Vindob.) 394.10)’. *DEA*.
- Batisti, R. (forthcoming c). ‘ποταπός, ποδαπός (Phryn. *Ecl.* 36)’. *DEA*.
- Batisti, R. (forthcoming d). ‘οἶσθα, οἶσθας, οἶδας (Moer. ο 24)’. *DEA*.
- Batisti, R. (forthcoming e). ‘δεδιακόνηκα, διηκόνηκα, ἐδιακόνου, διηκόνου (*Antiatt.* δ 1, *Antiatt.* ε 2, Moer. δ 10, Moer. δ 21)’. *DEA*.
- Bauer, L.; Trudgill, P. (eds.) (1998). *Language Myths*. London.
- Beal, J. C. (2008). “Shamed by Your English?”. The Market Value of a ‘Good’ Pronunciation’. In: Beal, J. C.; Nocera, C.; Sturiale, M. (eds.), *Perspectives on Prescriptivism*. Bern, 21–40.
- Bearzot, C. (2007a). ‘Autoctonia, rifiuto della mescolanza, civilizzazione. Da Isocrate a Megastene’. In: Gnoli, T.; Ravenni, F. (eds.), *Incontri tra culture nell’Oriente ellenistico e romano*. Atti del convegno di studi. Mucca, 11–12 marzo 2005. Milan, 7–28.
- Bearzot, C. (2007b). *Vivere da democratici. Studi su Lisia e la democrazia ateniese*. Rome.
- Bearzot, C.; Landucci, F.; Zecchini, G. (eds.) (2007). *L’Onomasticon di Giulio Polluce. Tra lessicografia e antiquaria*. Milan.
- Bechtel, F. (1924). *Die Griechischen Dialekte*. Vol. 3. Berlin.
- Beck, H.-G. (1971) *Geschichte der byzantinischen Volksliteratur*. Munich.
- Beck, L. Y. (2017). *Dioscorides, de materia medica*. Hildesheim.
- Behrendt, K. (1910). *De Aeneae Tactici commentario poliorcetico quaestiones selectae*. Königsberg.
- Bekker, I. (1814–1821). *Anecdota Graeca*. 3 vols. Berlin.
- Bekker, I. (1833). *Harpocraton et Moeris*. Berlin.
- Bekker, I. (1846). *Iulii Pollucis Onomasticon*. Berlin.
- Belardinelli, A. M. (1991). ‘Nota a Men. *Sicyon.* 421’. *Eikasmos* 2, 163–6.
- Belardinelli, A. M. (1994). *Menandro. I Sicioni*. Bari.
- Benaissa, A. (forthcoming). ‘Commentary on *Iliad* 1.582, 584, 591’. In: Del Corso, L.; Luiselli, R. (eds.), *Literary Papyri of the Bodleian Library and Other Collection*. Florence.
- Benardete, S. (2000). *Plato’s “Laws”. The Discovery of Being*. Chicago, London.
- Benedetto, G. (2011). ‘Callimachus and the Attidographers’. In: Acosta-Hughes, B.; Lehnus, L.; Stephens S. (eds.), *Brill’s Companion to Callimachus*. Leiden, Boston, 349–67.
- Bentein, K. (2013). ‘Register and the Diachrony of Post-classical and Early Byzantine Greek’. *RBA* 91, 5–44.
- Bentein, K. (2016). *Verbal Periphrases in Ancient Greek. Have- and Be- Constructions*. Oxford.
- Bentein, K. (2021). ‘The Distinctiveness of Syntax for Varieties of Post-classical and Byzantine Greek. Linguistic Upgrading from the Third Century BCE to the Tenth Century CE’. In: Bentein, K.; Janse, M. (eds.), *Varieties of Post-classical and Byzantine Greek*. Berlin, Boston, 381–414.
- Bentein, K.; Janse, M. (2021a). ‘Varieties of Post-classical and Byzantine Greek. Novel Questions and Approaches’. In: Bentein, K.; Janse, M. (eds.), *Varieties of Post-classical and Byzantine Greek*. Berlin, Boston, 1–13.

- Bentein, K.; Janse, M. (eds.) (2021b). *Varieties of Post-classical and Byzantine Greek*. Berlin, Boston.
- Benuzzi, F. (2018). 'Osservazioni sulla trasmissione degli *studia Aristophanica* di Eratostene nella lessicografia e negli scolî'. *Eikasmos* 29, 335–51.
- Benuzzi, F. (2019). 'Eratosthenes' *studia Aristophanica*. The Case of Schol. Ar. *Nub.* 967α-β, βα-β Holwerda'. In: Berardi, R.; Bruno, N.; Fizzarotti, L. (eds.), *On the Track of the Books. Scribes, Libraries and Textual Transmission*. Berlin, New York, 125–41.
- Benuzzi, F. (2022a). 'Cosa c'è di scientifico nella filologia di Eratostene? Contatti contenutistici e metodologici tra scienza e *grammatikē* nel trattato *Sulla commedia antica*'. In: Bergamo, M.; Tondini, R. (eds.), *Filosofia, filologia e scienza in età ellenistica*. Milan, 113–28.
- Benuzzi, F. (2022b). 'εὐθύς, εὐθύ, εὐθέως (Phryn. *Ecl.* 113, *Antiatt.* ε 96, Moer. ε 11)'. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2021/01/021>.
- Benuzzi, F. (2022c). 'ἀναρχιχάομαι (Phryn. *PS* 32.2–4, Moer. α 129)'. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2021/01/044>.
- Benuzzi, F. (2023a). 'κόλλοψ, κόλλαβος (Phryn. *Ecl.* 164, *Antiatt.* κ 36, Thom. *Mag.* 202.3–4)'. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2023/02/019>.
- Benuzzi, F. (2023b). 'ἐπιστάτης (*Antiatt.* ε 100)'. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2023/02/027>.
- Benuzzi, F. (2023c). *Didymus Alexandrinus. The Fragments of the Commentaries on Comedy*. Leiden, Boston.
- Benuzzi, F. (2024a). 'διδόσσι, διδοῦσι (Phryn. *Ecl.* 215, *Antiatt.* δ 8)'. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2024/01/032>.
- Benuzzi, F. (2024b). 'ἀπολλύασιν, ἀπολλούουσιν, and other 3rd person plurals of -νυμι verbs (Phryn. *PS* 10.22–3, Moer. δ 29, Moer. ζ 8, Moer. ο 15, Moer. ρ 5)'. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2024/01/018>.
- Benuzzi, F. (2024c). 'Aelius Dionysius. Ἀττικὰ ὀνόματα'. *DEA*. DOI: [10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2024/02/053](https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2024/02/053).
- Benuzzi, F. (2024d). 'Pausanias Atticista. Ἀττικῶν ὀνομάτων συναγωγή'. *DEA*. <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2024/02/025>.
- Benuzzi, F.; Batisti, R. (2024). [Herodian], Φιλέταιρος (*Philetaerus*). *DEA*. DOI: [10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2024/02/041](https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2024/02/041).
- Berardi, E. (2016). 'Maestri di atticismo. La lingua e i suoi modelli in tre testi di ambiente scolastico di Elio Aristide (or. 30–32)'. In: Pernot, L.; Abbamonte, G.; Lamagna, M. (eds.), *Ælius Aristide écrivain*. Turnhout, 245–62.
- Bernhardy, G. B. (1822). *Eratosthenica*. Berlin.
- Bernsdorff, H. (2020). *Anacreon of Teos. Testimonia and Fragments*. 2 vols. Oxford.
- Berti, M. (2009). *Istro il callimacheo*. Vol. 1. Rome.
- Berti, M.; Jackson, S. (2015). 'Istros (334)'. *BNJ*. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1873-5363_bnj_a334.
- Bethe, E. (1895). 'Die Überlieferung des *Onomastikon* des Julius Pollux'. *Nachrichten von der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse*, 322–48.
- Bethe, E. (1900–1937). *Pollucis Onomasticon*. 3 vols. Leipzig.
- Bethe, E. (1918). 'Iulius (398) Pollux'. *RE* 10.1, 773–9.
- Bett, R. (2018). *Sextus Empiricus. Against Those in the Disciplines. Translated with Introduction and Notes*. Oxford.
- Bettarini, L. (2015). 'Stratti fr. 49 K.-A. Ma come parlano i Tebani?'. In: Bettarini, L. (ed.), *A più mani. Linee di ricerca tracciate in "Sapienza"*. Rome, 19–28.
- Bianconi, D. (2005). *Tessalonica nell'età dei Paleologi. Le pratiche intellettuali nel riflesso della cultura scritta*. Paris.

- Biber, D.; Conrad, S. (2009). *Register, Genre, and Style*. Cambridge.
- Biles, Z. P.; Olson, S. D. (2015). *Aristophanes. Wasps. Edited with Introduction and Commentary*. Oxford.
- Bing, J. (2003). 'The Unruly Tongue. Philitas of Cos as Scholar and Poet'. *CPh* 98, 330–48.
- Blank, D. L. (1982). *Ancient Philosophy and Grammar. The Syntax of Apollonius Dyscolus*. Chico.
- Blank, D. L. (1988). *Lesbonax. Περὶ σχημάτων*. Edited with an Introduction. Berlin, New York.
- Blank, D. L. (1998). *Sextus Empiricus. Against the Grammarians*. Oxford.
- Blass, F.; Debrunner, A. (1976). *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*. Revised ed. by F. Rehkopf. Göttingen.
- Blok, J. H. (2009). 'Perikles' Citizenship Law. A New Perspective'. *Historia* 58, 141–70.
- Blum, R. (1991). *Kallimachos, the Alexandrian Library and the Origins of Bibliography*. Madison. (English translation by H. H. Wellish of Blum, R. *Kallimachos und die Literaturverzeichnis bei den Griechen. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Biobibliographie*. Frankfurt am Main, 1977).
- Boatti, A. (2000). 'Il grammatico Tolomeo Pindarione e l'analogia'. In: Arrighetti, G. (ed.), *Letteratura e riflessione sulla letteratura nella cultura classica. Tradizione, erudizione, critica letteraria, filologia e riflessione filosofica nella produzione letteraria antica*. Atti del convegno, Pisa, 7–9 giugno 1999. Pisa, 265–79.
- Boatti, A. (2002). 'Ptolemaeus [8] Pindarion'. *LGGA*. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2451-9278_Ptolemaeus_8_Pindarion.
- Bonanno, M. G. (1986). 'Solone chiosato da Aristofane (Δαιταλῆς fr. 28 C. = 222 K.)'. *Sileno* 10, 93–6.
- Boned Colera, P. (2015). 'Los diminutivos en Menandro'. In: De La Villa Polo, J. et al. (eds.), *Ianua Classicorum. Temas y formas del Mundo Clásico*. Vol. 1. Madrid, 477–84.
- Bonollo, E. (2017–2018). 'La mulieris oratio del papiro Didot (= *adesp. com.* fr. 1000 K.-A.) come esercizio di scuola. A proposito di un'attribuzione dibattuta'. *IFilolClass* 17, 245–66.
- Borg, B. E. (ed.) (2004). *Paideia. The World of the Second Sophistic*. Berlin, New York.
- Bortone, P. (2010). *Greek Prepositions. From Antiquity to the Present*. Oxford.
- Bosher, K. G. (ed.) (2012). *Theater Outside Athens. Drama in Greek Sicily and South Italy*. Cambridge.
- Botley, P. (2010). *Learning Greek in Western Europe, 1396–1529. Grammars, Lexica, and Classroom Texts*. Philadelphia.
- Bouchard, E. (2016). *Du lycée au musée. Théorie poétique et critique littéraire à l'époque hellénistique*. Paris.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and Symbolic Power*. Edited and introduced by John B. Thompson. (Translated by Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson). Cambridge.
- Bowersock, G. W. (1969). *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire*. Oxford.
- Bowie, E. L. (1970). 'Greeks and Their Past in the Second Sophistic'. *P&P* 46, 3–41.
- Bowie, E. L. (1982). 'The Importance of Sophists'. *YCS* 27, 29–60.
- Bowie, E. L. (forthcoming). 'Praeparatio sophistica and Eclogue. Logic and Chronology'. In: Favi, F.; Pellettieri, A.; Tribulato, O. (eds.), *New Approaches to Phrynichus' Praeparatio sophistica*. Berlin, Boston.
- Bowra, M. C. (1959). 'Γλώσσαια κατὰ πόλεις'. *Glotta* 38, 43–60.
- Brandenburg, P. (2005). *Apollonios Dyskolos. Über das Pronomen. Einführung, Text, Übersetzung und Erläuterungen*. Munich, Leipzig.
- Bravo, B. (1974). 'Une lettre sur plomb de Berezan. Colonisation et modes de contact dans le Pont'. *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne* 1, 111–87.
- Bravo, J. J., II (2016). 'Erotic Curse Tablets from the Heroon of Opheltas at Nemea'. *Hesperia* 85, 121–52.
- Brincat, J. (2003). 'Purism and Neologism in Contemporary Maltese'. In: Brincat, J.; Boeder, W.; Stolz, T. (eds.), *Purism in Minor Languages, Endangered Languages, Regional Languages, Mixed*

- Languages. Papers from the Conference on 'Purism in the Age of Globalisation', Bremen, September 2001.* Bochum, 155–70.
- Brixhe, C. (1976). *Le dialecte grec de Pamphylie. Documents et grammaire.* Paris.
- Brixhe, C. (ed.) (1993). *La Koiné grecque antique I. Une langue introuvable?* Nancy.
- Brixhe, C. (ed.) (1996). *La Koiné grecque antique II. La concurrence.* Nancy, Paris.
- Brixhe, C. (ed.) (2001). *La Koiné grecque antique IV. Les koinés littéraires.* Nancy, Paris.
- Brixhe, C.; Hodot, R. (1993). 'A chacun sa koinè'. In: Brixhe, C. (ed.), *La koiné grecque antique I. Une langue introuvable?* Nancy, 7–21.
- Broggiato, M. (2000). 'Athenaeus, Crates and Attic Glosses. A Problem of Attribution'. In: Braund, D.; Wilkins, J. (eds.), *Athenaeus and His World. Reading Greek Culture in the Roman Empire.* Exeter, 364–71.
- Broggiato, M. (2001). *Cratete di Mallo. I frammenti.* La Spezia.
- Broggiato, M. (2003). 'The Use of Etymology as an Exegetical Tool in Alexandria and Pergamum. Some Examples from the Homeric Scholia'. In: Nifadopoulos, C. (ed.), *Etymologia. Studies in Ancient Etymology.* Proceedings of the Cambridge Conference on Ancient Etymology, 25–27 September 2000. Münster, 65–70.
- Broggiato, M. (2017). 'Una nota allo schol. ad Aristoph. Ran. 1263c Chantry'. *SemRom* 6, 277–83.
- Broggiato, M. (2019a). 'A Fragment of Eratosthenes, on Old Comedy (Photius, *Lexicon* ε 100 Theodoridis)'. *CQ* 69, 451–3.
- Broggiato, M. (2019b). 'Licofrone, Eratostene e l'evoluzione della commedia antica'. *SemRom* 8, 273–84.
- Broggiato, M. (2023). *Eratosthenica 1. A Selection of Eratosthenes' Fragments Collected and Commented.* Torrazza Piemonte.
- Brown, C. G. (2008). *An Atticist Lexicon of the Second Sophistic. Philemon and the Atticist Movement.* [Ph.D. dissertation]. Ohio State University.
- Browning, R. (1983). *Medieval and Modern Greek.* 2nd edition. Cambridge.
- Brugmann, K. (1884). 'Zur Frage nach den Verwandtschaftsverhältnissen der indo-germanischen Sprachen'. *Internationale Zeitschrift für allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft* 1, 226–56.
- Bruhn, C. (1910). *Über den Wortschatz des Menander.* Jena.
- Brunstad, E. (2001). *Det reine språket. Om purisme i dansk, svensk, færøysk og norsk.* [Ph.D. dissertation]. Universitetet i Bergen.
- Bubeník, V. (1989). *Hellenistic and Roman Greece as a Sociolinguistic Area.* Amsterdam, Philadelphia.
- Bubeník, V. (2018). 'North-West Doric Koina and the Issue of 'Koineization'. Sociolinguistic Concerns'. In: Giannakis, G. K.; Crespo, E.; Filos, P. (eds.), *Studies in Ancient Greek Dialects. From Central Greece to the Black Sea.* Berlin, Boston, 149–66.
- Buchner, E. (1958). *Der Panegyrikos des Isokrates. Eine historisch-philologische Untersuchung.* Wiesbaden.
- Bucholtz, M.; Hall, K. (2004). 'Language and Identity'. In: Duranti, A. (ed.), *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology.* Chichester, Malden, MA, 369–94.
- Buck, C. D. (1955). *The Greek Dialects. Grammar, Selected Inscriptions, Glossary.* Chicago, London.
- Buck, C. D.; Petersen, W. (1945). *A Reverse Index of Greek Nouns and Adjectives Arranged by Terminations with Brief Historical Introductions.* Chicago.
- Bühler, W. (1968). 'Ein neues Archilochosfragment und ein neues Wort für Menander aus einer Oxforder Kyriillhandschrift'. *Hermes* 96, 232–8.
- Bury, R. G. (1929). *Plato. Vol. 7: Timaeus, Critias, Cleitophon, Menexenus, Epistles.* Translated by R. G. Bury. Cambridge, MA.
- Burzacchini, G. (1995–1996). 'Ἀναλογεῖον / ἀναλόγιον "leggio"'. *Studi orientali e linguistici* 6, 135–6.

- Bussès, S. (2011). *Marcatore e criteri di estetica in Polluce. La dinamica della scelta lessicografica*. Bari.
- Callanan, C. K. (1987). *Die Sprachbeschreibung bei Aristophanes von Byzanz*. Göttingen.
- Cameron, A. (1995). *Callimachus and His Critics*. Princeton.
- Cameron, D. (1995). *Verbal Hygiene*. London, New York.
- Canfora, L. (1995). 'Libri e biblioteche'. In: Cambiano, G.; Canfora, L.; Lanza, D. (eds.), *Lo spazio letterario nella Grecia antica*. Vol. 2: *La ricezione e l'attualizzazione del testo*. Rome, 11–93.
- Canfora, L. (ed.) (2001). *Ateneo. I deipnosofisti*. 4 vols. Rome.
- Carey, C. (1989). *Lysias. Selected Speeches*. Cambridge.
- Carey, C. (2013). 'Marathon and the Construction of the Comic Past'. Carey, C.; Edwards, M. (eds.), *Marathon – 2,500 Years*. London, 123–42.
- Carlini, A. (1972). *Studi sulla tradizione antica e medievale del Fedone*. Rome.
- Caroli, D. (2007). *Il titolo iniziale nel rotolo librario greco-egizio. Con un catalogo delle testimonianze iconografiche greche e di area vesuviana*. Bari.
- Caroli, M. (2014). *Cratino il Giovane e Ofelione poeti della commedia di mezzo. Edizione critica e commento, con un'appendice su Cratino il Giovane nei Fragmenta Poetarum Graecorum di Dirk Canter*. Bari.
- Carter, L. B. (1986). *The Quiet Athenian*. Oxford.
- Cartlidge, B. J. (2014). *The Language of Menander Comicus and its Relation to the Koiné*. [Ph.D. dissertation]. University of Oxford.
- Cartlidge, B. J. (2017a). 'Menander, *Epitrepontes* 807 and the Suffix of the Feminine Perfect Active Participle in Fourth-Century Athens'. *ZPE* 201, 32–9.
- Cartlidge, B. J. (2017b). 'Menander *Epitrepontes* 366'. *CPh* 112, 246–52.
- Cartlidge, B. J. (2019). 'Language of New Comedy'. In: Sommerstein, A. H. (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Greek Comedy*. 3 vols. London, 485–6.
- Cartlidge, B. J. (2022). 'Language and Tradition. Three Studies on the Text of Menander'. *ZPE* 221, 20–7.
- Casevitz, M. (1991). 'Hellenismos. Formation et fonction des verbes en -ΙΩ et de leurs dérivés'. In: Saïd, S. (ed.), ΕΛΛΗΝΙΣΜΟΣ. *Quelques jalons pour une histoire de l'identité grecque*. Actes du Colloque de Strasbourg, 25–27 octobre 1989. Leiden, 10–6.
- Cassio, A. C. (1975). 'Menandro, fr. 269 K.-Th.'. *RFIC* 103, 394–8.
- Cassio, A. C. (1977). *Aristofane. Banchettanti (Δαιταλής). I frammenti*. Pisa.
- Cassio, A. C. (1981). 'Attico 'volgare' e Ioni in Atene alla fine del 5. secolo a.C.'. *AION* (ling.) 3, 79–93.
- Cassio, A. C. (1984). 'Il 'carattere' dei dialetti greci e l'opposizione Dori – Ioni. Testimonianze antiche e teorie di età romantica (su Arist. Quint. 2. 13, Iambl. v. *Pyth.* 241 sgg., sch. in *Dion. Thr.* p. 117, 18 sgg. Hilgard'. *AION* (ling.) 6, 113–36.
- Cassio, A. C. (1985a). *Commedia e partecipazione. La Pace di Aristofane*. Naples.
- Cassio, A. C. (1985b). 'Old Persian *Marika-*, Eupolis *Marikas* and Aristophanes *Knights*'. *CQ* 35, 38–42.
- Cassio, A. C. (1986). 'Continuità e riprese arcaizzanti nell'uso epigrafico dei dialetti greci. Il caso dell'eolico d'Asia'. *AION* (ling.) 8, 131–46.
- Cassio, A. C. (1989a). 'Storiografia locale di Argo e dorico letterario. Agia, Dercillo ed il Pap. Soc. Ital. 1091r'. *RFIC* 117, 257–75.
- Cassio, A. C. (1989b). 'Lo sviluppo della prosa dorica e le tradizioni occidentali della retorica greca'. In: Cassio, A. C.; Musti, D. (eds.), *Tra Sicilia e Magna Grecia. Aspetti di interazione culturale nel IV sec. a.C.* Atti del convegno (Napoli, 19–20 marzo 1987). Rome, 137–57.
- Cassio, A. C. (1993). 'Parlate locali, dialetti delle stirpi e fonti letterarie nei grammatici greci'. In: Crespo, E.; García Ramón, J. L.; Striano, A. (eds.), *Dialectologica Graeca. Actas del II Coloquio Internacional de Dialectología Griega*. Madrid, 73–90.

- Cassio, A. C. (1996). 'La prose ionienne postclassique et la culture de l'Asie Mineure à l'époque hellénistique'. In: Brixhe, C. (ed.), *La koiné grecque antique II. La concurrence*. Nancy, Paris, 147–70.
- Cassio, A. C. (1998). 'La lingua greca come lingua universale'. In: Settis, S. (ed.), *I Greci. Storia, Cultura, Arte, Società*. Vol. 2.III: *Una storia greca. Trasformazioni*. Turin, 991–1013.
- Cassio, A. C. (2000). 'Esametri orfici, dialetto attico e musica dell'Asia Minore'. In: Cassio, A. C.; Musti, D.; Rossi, L. E. (eds.), *Synaulía. Cultura musicale in Grecia e contatti mediterranei*. Naples, 97–110.
- Cassio, A. C. (2012). 'Intimations of Koine in Sicilian Doric'. In: Tribulato, O. (ed.), *Language and Linguistic Contact in Ancient Sicily*. Cambridge, 251–64.
- Cassio, A. C. (2016). *Storia delle lingue letterarie greche*. 2nd edition. Florence.
- Cassio, A. C. (2017). 'Trinacria perfecta. Some Unusual Greek Perfects and Pluperfects in Ancient Sicily'. In: Willi, A. (ed.), *Sprachgeschichte und Epigraphik. Festgaben für Rudolf Wachter zum 60. Geburtstag*. Innsbruck, 39–47.
- Castellaneta, S. (2021). *Euripide e la Macedonia*. Alessandria.
- Cavarzeran, J. (forthcoming). *The Textual Tradition of Pollux's Onomasticon. Studies Towards a New Edition*. Berlin, Boston.
- Cavenaile, R. (1975). 'Aperçu sur la langue et le style de Xénophon'. *LEC* 43, 238–52.
- Chadwick, J. (1976). 'Who Were the Dorians?' *PP* 31, 103–17.
- Chambers, J. K.; Trudgill, P. (2004). *Dialectology*. 2nd edition. Cambridge.
- Chaniotis, A. (2012). 'Greek Ritual Purity from Automatism to Moral Distinctions'. In: Rösch, P.; Simon, U. (eds.), *How Purity is Made*. Wiesbaden, 123–39.
- Chaniotis, A. (2018). 'Greek Purity in Context. The Long Life of a Ritual Concept, or Defining the Cs of Continuity and Change'. In: Carbon, J.-M.; Peels-Matthey, S. (eds.), *Purity and Purification in the Ancient Greek World*. Liège, 35–48.
- Chantraine, P. (1933). *La formation des noms en grec ancien*. Paris.
- Chantraine, P. (1956). *Études sur le vocabulaire grec*. Paris.
- Chantraine, P. (1961). *Morphologie historique du grec*. 2nd edition. Paris.
- Chantraine, P. (2013). *Grammaire homérique*. Vol. 1: *Phonétique et morphologie*. Nouvelle édition revue et corrigée par M. Casevitz. Paris.
- Chantraine, P. (2015). *Grammaire homérique*. Vol. 2: *Syntaxe*. Nouvelle édition revue et corrigée par M. Casevitz. Paris.
- Chapman, D. (2020). 'Are You a Descriptivist or a Prescriptivist? The Meaning of the Term Descriptivism and the Values of Those Who Use It'. In: Chapman, D.; Rawlins, J. D. (eds.), *Language Prescription. Values, Ideologies and Identity*. Bristol, 46–72.
- Christ, M. R. (2006). *The Bad Citizen in Classical Athens*. Cambridge, New York.
- Chronopoulos, S. (2016). 'Logical Categories and the Parts of Speech System as Structuring Devices in Pollux' *Onomasticon*'. *CHS Research Bulletin* 5 (1). http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:hln:essay:ChronopoulosS.Logical_Categories_and_Parts_of_Speech_as_Structuring_Devices.2016.
- Ciccolella, F.; Silvano, L. (eds.) (2017). *Teachers, Students, and Schools of Greek in the Renaissance*. Leiden, Boston.
- Cingano, E. (2009). 'The Hesiodic Corpus'. In: Montanari, F.; Rengakos, A.; Tsagalis, C. (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Hesiod*. Leiden, Boston, 91–130.
- Clackson, J. (2007). *Indo-European Linguistics. An Introduction*. Cambridge.
- Clackson, J. (2015a). 'Latinitas, Ἑλληνισμός and Standard Languages'. *SSL* 53, 309–30.
- Clackson, J. (2015b). *Language and Society in the Greek and Roman Worlds*. Cambridge.
- Clackson, J. (2022). 'Methodology in Linguistic Subgrouping'. In: Olander, T. (ed.), *The Indo-European Language Family. A Phylogenetic Perspective*. Cambridge, 18–32.

- Clarysse, W. (2008). 'The Democratisation of Atticism. $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omega$ and $\acute{\epsilon}\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omega$ in Papyri and Inscriptions'. *ZPE* 167, 144–8.
- Clay, D. M. (1960). *A Formal Analysis of the Vocabularies of Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides*. Vol. 1. Minneapolis.
- Clayman, D. L. (1987). 'Sigmatism in Greek Poetry'. *TAPhA* 117, 69–84.
- Cobet, C. G. (1840). *Observationes criticae in Platonis Comici reliquias*. Amsterdam.
- Cohen, B. (2001). 'Ethnic Identity in Democratic Athens and the Visual Vocabulary of Male Costume'. In: Malkin, I. (ed.), *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity*. Cambridge, MA, London, 235–74.
- Cohen, E. E. (2000). *The Athenian Nation*. Princeton.
- Cohn, L. (1881). 'De Aristophane Byzantio et Suetonio Tranquillo Eustathii auctoribus'. *Jahrbücher für klassische Philologie*, Suppl. 12, 283–374.
- Cohn, L. (1884). *De Heraclide Milesio grammatico*. Berlin.
- Cohn, L. (1898). 'Der Atticist Philemon'. *Philologus* 57, 353–67.
- Cohn, L. (1900). 'Griechische Lexikographie'. In: Brugmann, K. (ed.), *Griechische Grammatik*. 3rd edition. Munich, 577–616.
- Collard, C. (1975). *Euripides. Supplices. Edited with Introduction and Commentary*. 2 vols. Groningen.
- Collard, C. (2018). *Colloquial Expressions in Greek Tragedy. Revised and Enlarged Edition of P. T. Stevens's Colloquial Expressions in Euripides*. Stuttgart.
- Colvin, S. (1999). *Dialect in Aristophanes and the Politics of Language in Ancient Greek Literature*. Oxford.
- Colvin, S. (2000). 'The Language of non-Athenians in Old Comedy'. In: Harvey, D.; Wilkins, J. (eds.), *The Rivals of Aristophanes. Studies in Athenian Old Comedy*. London, 285–98.
- Colvin, S. (2004). 'Social Dialect in Attica'. In: Penney, J. H. W. (ed.), *Indo-European Perspectives. Studies in Honour of Anna Morpurgo Davies*. Oxford, 95–108.
- Colvin, S. (2007). *A Historical Greek Reader. Mycenaean to the Koiné*. Oxford.
- Colvin, S. (2009). 'The Greek Koine and the Logic of a Standard Language'. In: Georgakopoulou, A.; Silk, M. S. (eds.), *Standard Languages and Language Standards. Greek, Past and Present*. London, 33–45.
- Colvin, S. (2014). *A Brief History of Ancient Greek*. Chichester, Malden, MA.
- Colvin, S. (2020). 'Varieties of Greek. Disorder and Discontinuity'. *CQ* 70, 68–84.
- Connolly, A. L. (1983). *Atticism in Non-literary Papyri of the First Seven Centuries AD. A Study in Several Features of Orthography and Syntax*. [B.A. dissertation]. University of Sydney.
- Connolly, J. (2022). 'Imagining Belonging. The Use of Athens in Hellenistic Rome'. König, J.; Wiater, N. (eds.), *Late Hellenistic Greek Literature in Dialogue*. Cambridge, 211–30.
- Connor, W. R. (1993). 'The Ionian Era of Athenian Civic Identity'. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 137, 194–206.
- Consani, C. (1991). *ΔΙΑΛΕΚΤΟΣ. Contributo alla storia del concetto di «dialetto»*. Pisa.
- Consani, C. (1993). 'La koiné et les dialectes grecs dans la documentation linguistique et la réflexion métalinguistique des premiers siècles de notre ère'. In: Brixhe, C. (ed.), *La koiné grecque antique I. Une langue introuvable?* Nancy, 23–39.
- Consani, C. (1998). 'Continuità e discontinuità nel greco post-classico'. In: Melazzo, L. (ed.), *Continuità e discontinuità nella storia del greco*. Atti del Convegno della Società Italiana di Glottologia. Palermo 24–26 ottobre 1994. Pisa, 95–113.
- Consani, C. (2006). 'La dialettologia greca oggi. Acquisizioni, problemi, prospettive'. *Studi linguistici* 29, 11–38.
- Consani, C. (2021). Review of van Rooy (2021b). *Histoire Épistémologie Langage* 43, 196–201.
- Conti Bizzarro, F. (2014). 'Alcune osservazioni di critica della lingua in Polluce'. *Commentaria classica* 1, 39–53.

- Conti Bizzarro, F. (2017). 'Polluce. Critica della lingua ed immagini poetiche'. In: Matino, G.; Ficca, F.; Grisolia, R. (eds.), *La lingua e la società. Forme della comunicazione letteraria fra antichità ed età moderna*. Naples, 75–88.
- Conti Bizzarro, F. (2018). *Giulio Polluce e la critica della lingua greca*. Alessandria.
- Contini, G. (1970). 'La parte di Firenze'. In: Contini, G., *Varianti e altra linguistica. Una raccolta di saggi (1938–1968)*. Turin, 628–32.
- Corti, L. (2015). 'Scepticism, Number and Appearances. The ἀριθμητική τέχνη and Sextus' Targets in *M. I-VI*'. *PhilosAnt* 15, 121–45.
- Costa, V. (2007). *Filocoro di Atene*. Vol. 1: *Testimonianze e frammenti dell'Atthis*. Tivoli.
- Coward, T.; Prodi, E. (eds.) (2020). *Didymus and Graeco-Roman Learning*. London.
- Craik, E. M. (2015). *The 'Hippocratic' Corpus. Content and Context*. London, New York.
- Crespo, E. (2004). 'The Attitude of the Athenian State Towards the Attic Dialect in the Classical Era'. In: Penney, J. W. H. (ed.), *Indo-European Perspectives. Studies in Honour of Anna Morpurgo Davies*. Oxford, 109–18.
- Crespo, E. (2006). 'The Language Policy of the Athenian State in the Fifth Century B.C.'. *ILing* 29, 91–101.
- Crespo, E. (2010). 'The Significance of Attic for the Continued Evolution of Greek'. In: Caragounis, C. C. (ed.), *Greek. A Language in Evolution. Essays in Honour of Antonios N. Jannaris*. Hildesheim, 119–36.
- Cribiore, R. (1996). *Writing, Teachers and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt*. Atlanta.
- Cribiore, R. (2005). *Gymnastics of the Mind. Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*. Princeton.
- Cufalo, D. (2007). *Scholia Graeca in Platonem*. Vol. 1. Rome.
- Cunningham, I. C. (2003). *Synagoge. Συναγωγή λέξεων χρησίμων. Texts of the Original Version and of Manuscript B*. Berlin, New York.
- Cuomo, A. M. (2017). 'Medieval Textbooks as a Major Source of Historical Sociolinguistic Studies of (High-Register) Medieval Greek'. *Open Linguistics* 3, 442–55.
- Cuomo, A. M.; Trapp, E. (eds.) (2017). *Toward a Historical Sociolinguistic Poetics of Medieval Greek*. Turnhout.
- Curzan, A. (2014). *Fixing English. Prescriptivism and Language History*. Cambridge.
- Cuzzolin, P. (2017). 'Le donne e la lingua. Una nota a Platone, *Cratilo* 418B7–418C2'. In: De Meo, A.; et al. (eds.), *Al femminile. Scritti linguistici in onore di Cristina Vallini*. Florence, 187–97.
- Dain, A. (1954). *Le «Philétæros» attribué à Hérodien*. Paris.
- Dale, A. M. (1954). *Euripides. Alcestis. Edited with Introduction and Commentary*. Oxford.
- De Borries, I. (1911). *Phrynichi Sophistae Praeparatio sophistica*. Leipzig.
- Debrunner, A. (1917). *Griechische Wortbildungslehre*. Heidelberg.
- Deger-Jalkotzy, S. (2008). 'Decline, Destruction, Aftermath'. In: Shelmerdine, C. W. (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Aegean Bronze Age*. Cambridge, New York, 387–415.
- De Jonge, C. C. (2008). *Between Grammar and Rhetoric. Dionysius of Halicarnassus on Language, Linguistics and Literature*. Leiden, Boston.
- De Jonge, C. C. (2015). 'Grammatical Theory and Rhetorical Teaching'. In: Montanari, F.; Matthaios, S.; Rengakos, A. (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship*. Leiden, Boston, 981–1011.
- De Jonge, C. C. (2022a). 'Greek Reading Lists from Dionysius to Dio. Rhetorical Imitation in the Augustan Age and the Second Sophistic'. In: König, J.; Wiater, N. (eds.), *Late Hellenistic Greek Literature in Dialogue*. Cambridge, 319–50.
- De Jonge, C. C. (2022b). 'Challenging the Canon of the Ten Attic Orators. From *kanōn* to Canon'. In: Agut-Labordère, D.; Versluys, M. J. (eds.), *Canonisation as Innovation. Anchoring Cultural Formation in the First Millennium BCE*. Leiden, Boston, 218–42.

- De Jonge, C. C.; van Ophuijsen, J. M. (2010). 'Greek Philosophers on Language'. In: Bakker, E. J. (ed.), *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*. Chichester, Malden, MA, 485–98.
- Del Corno, D. (1975). 'Alcuni aspetti del linguaggio di Menandro'. *SCO* 24, 13–48.
- Delveroudi, R.; Moschonas, S. A. (2003). 'Le purisme de la langue et la langue du purisme'. *Philologie im Netz* 24, 1–26.
- Dench, E. (2017). 'Ethnicity, Culture, and Identity'. In: Richter, D. S.; Johnson, W. A. (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Second Sophistic*. Oxford, 99–114.
- Dettori, E. (1996). 'Testi "orfici" dalla Magna Grecia al Mar Nero'. *PdP* 189, 292–310.
- Dettori, E. (2000). *Filita grammatica, Testimonianze e frammenti*. Rome.
- Dettori, E. (2004). 'Hesych. ε 3470 La.'. *Nέα Πύλη* 1, 45–58.
- Dettori, E. (2019). *Antidorus, Dionysius Iambus, Epigenes, Lysanias, Parmenon, Silenus, Simaristus, Simmias*. Leiden, Boston.
- Dettori, E. (2020a). 'Glossographi'. In: Dettori, E.; Pellettieri, A. *Glossographi. Lycophron Chalcidensis*. Leiden, Boston, 1–235.
- Dettori, E. (2020b). 'Clitarchus'. *LGGA*. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2451-9278_Clitarchus_it.
- Dettori, E. (2021). 'Philitas'. *LGGA*. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2451-9278_Philitas_it.
- Dettori, E. (2022). 'Moeris'. *LGGA*. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2451-9278_Moeris_it.
- Dettori, E. (2023). 'Eratosthenes'. *LGGA*. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2451-9278_Eratosthenes_it.
- Dewald, C.; Vignolo Munson, R. (2022). *Herodotus. Histories. Book I*. Cambridge.
- Di Bartolo, G. (2021). *Studien zur griechischen Syntax dokumentarischer Papyri der römischen Zeit*. Paderborn.
- Di Benedetto, V. (1966). 'Demetrio Cloro e Aristone di Alessandria'. *ASNP* 35, 321–4.
- Dickey, E. (1995). 'Forms of Address and Conversational Language in Aristophanes and Menander'. *Mnemosyne* 48, 257–71.
- Dickey, E. (2007). *Ancient Greek Scholarship. A Guide to Finding, Reading, and Understanding Scholia, Commentaries, Lexica, and Grammatical Treatises, from their Beginnings to the Byzantine Period*. Oxford.
- Dickey, E. (2014). 'A Catalogue of Works Attributed to the Grammarian Herodian'. *CPh* 104, 325–45.
- Dickey, E. (2015a). 'The Sources of our Knowledge of Ancient Scholarship'. In: Montanari, F.; Matthaios, S.; Rengakos, A. (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship*. Leiden, Boston, 459–514.
- Dickey, E. (2015b). *The Colloquia of the Hermeneumata Pseudodositheaana*. Vol. 2: *Colloquium Harleianum, Colloquium Montepessulanum, Colloquium Celtis, and Fragments*. Cambridge.
- Dickey, E. (2019). 'What Does a Linguistic Expert Know? The Conflict Between Analogy and Atticism'. In: Adams, S. A. (ed.), *Scholastic Culture in the Hellenistic and Roman Eras. Greek, Latin, and Jewish*. Berlin, Boston, 103–18.
- Dickey, E. (2023). *Latin Loanwords. A Lexicon and Analysis*. Cambridge.
- Dietze, A. (1901). *De Philemone comico*. [Ph.D. dissertation]. Göttingen.
- Diez, F. (1836). *Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen*. Vol. 1. Bonn.
- Diggle, J. (1981). *Studies in the Text of Euripides*. Oxford.
- Diggle, J. (1984). *Euripidis fabulae*. Vol. 1. Oxford.
- Diggle, J. (2004). *Theophrastus. Characters. Edited with Introduction, Translation and Commentary*. Cambridge.
- Di Giuseppe, L. (2014). 'Tasse, redditometri e evasori in Difilo (frr. 31 e 37 K.-A.)'. *DeM* 5, 93–113.
- Di Gregorio, L. (2008). 'Sui frammenti di Simia di Rodi, poeta alessandrino'. *Aevum(ant)* 82, 51–117.
- Dihle, A. (1977). 'Der Beginn des Attizismus'. *A&A* 23, 162–77.
- Dindorf, W. (1824). *Iulii Pollucis Onomasticon cum annotationibus interpretum*. 5 vols. Leipzig.

- Dilts, M. R. (2008). *Demosthenis orationes*. Vol. 3. Oxford.
- Dionisotti, A. C. (1982) 'From Ausonius' Schooldays? A Schoolbook and its Relatives'. *JRS* 72, 83–125.
- Dittenberger, W. (1907). 'Ethnika und Verwandtes (III–IV)'. *Hermes* 42, 1–34; 161–234.
- Dittmar, W. (1933). *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Aristophanes und Menander*. [Ph.D. dissertation]. University of Leipzig, Weida in Thüringen.
- Dobrov, G. W. (2002). 'Μάγειρος ποιητής. Language and Character in Antiphanes'. In: Willi, A. (ed.), *The Language of Greek Comedy*. Oxford, 169–90.
- Dohm, H. (1964). *Mageiros. Die Rolle des Kochs in der griechisch-römischen Komödie*. Munich.
- Domingo-Forasté, D. (2012). *Claudii Aeliani Epistulae et fragmenta*. Leipzig.
- Dover, K. J. (1950). 'The Chronology of Antiphon's Speeches'. *CQ* 44, 44–60. (Reprinted in *The Greeks and their Legacy. Collected Papers*. Vol. 2: *Prose Literature, History, Society, Transmission, Influence*. Oxford 1988, 13–35).
- Dover, K. J. (1968a). *Aristophanes. Clouds. Edited with Introduction and Commentary*. Oxford.
- Dover, K. J. (1968b). *Lysias and the Corpus Lysiacum*. Berkeley, Los Angeles.
- Dover, K. J. (1970). 'Lo stile di Aristofane'. *QUCC* 9, 7–23. (Reprinted in *Greek and the Greeks. Collected Papers*. Vol. 1: *Language, Poetry, Drama*. Oxford 1987, 224–36).
- Dover, K. J. (1976). 'Linguaggio e caratteri aristofanei'. *RCCM* 18, 357–71. (Reprinted in *Greek and the Greeks. Collected Papers*. Vol. 1: *Language, Poetry, Drama*. Oxford 1987, 237–48).
- Dover, K. J. (1981a). 'The Language of Classical Attic Documentary Inscriptions'. *TPhS* 79, 1–14. (Reprinted in *Greek and the Greeks. Collected Papers*. Vol. 1: *Language, Poetry, Drama*. Oxford 1987, 31–41).
- Dover, K. J. (1981b). 'The Colloquial Stratum in Classical Attic Prose'. In: Shrimpton, G. S.; McCargar, D. J. (eds.), *Classical Contributions. Studies in Honour of Malcolm Francis McGregor*. Locust Valley, 15–25. (Reprinted in *Greek and the Greeks. Collected Papers*. Vol. 1: *Language, Poetry, Drama*. Oxford 1987, 16–30).
- Dover, K. J. (1993). *Aristophanes. Frogs. Edited with Introduction and Commentary*. Oxford.
- Dover, K. J. (1997). *The Evolution of Greek Prose Style*. Oxford.
- Dubischar, M. C. (2015). 'Typology of Philological Writings'. In: Montanari, F.; Matthaios, S.; Rengakos, A. (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship*. Leiden, Boston, 545–99.
- Duhoux, Y. (2004). 'Langage de femmes et d'hommes en grec ancien. L'exemple de Lysistrata'. In: Penney, J. H. W. (ed.), *Indo-European Perspectives. Studies in Honour of Anna Morpurgo Davies*. Oxford, 131–45.
- Dunbar, N. (1995). *Aristophanes. Birds. Edited with Introduction and Commentary*. Oxford.
- Durham, D. B. (1913). *The Vocabulary of Menander*. [Ph.D. dissertation]. University of Princeton.
- Dyck, A. R. (1989). Review of Slater (1986). *CPh* 84, 256–60.
- Dyck, A. R. (1993). 'Aelius Herodian. Recent Studies and Prospects for Future Research'. *ANRW* 2.34.1, 772–94.
- Edgerton, E. F. (1925). 'ΛΕΙΑ = "Flock", "Herd"'. *AJPh* 46, 177–8.
- Edwards, J. (2009). *Language and Identity. An Introduction*. Cambridge.
- Efthymiou, A.; Fragaki, G.; Markos, A. (2012). 'Productivity of Verb-Forming Suffixes in Modern Greek. A Corpus-Based Study'. *Morphology* 22, 515–43.
- Egli, J. (1954). *Heteroklisie im Griechischen mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Fälle von Gelenkheteroklisie*. Zurich.
- Ehrenberg, V. (1947). 'Polypragmonsyne. A Study in Greek Politics'. *JHS* 67, 46–67.
- Ekroth, G. (2002). *The Sacrificial Rituals of Greek Hero-Cults in the Archaic to the Early Hellenistic Periods*. Liège.
- Engels, J. (2008). 'Agathokles (472)'. *BNJ*. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1873-5363_bnj_a472.

- Engels, J. (2011). 'Agias and Derkylos (305)'. *BNJ*. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1873-5363_bnj_a305.
- English, M. (2000). 'The Diminishing Role of Stage Properties in Aristophanic Comedy'. *Helios* 27, 149–62.
- English, M. (2005). 'The Evolution of Aristophanic Stagecraft'. *Leeds International Classical Studies* 4, 1–16.
- English, M. (2007). 'Reconstructing Aristophanic Performance. Stage Properties in *Acharnians*'. *CW* 100, 199–227.
- Erbse, H. (1950). *Untersuchungen zu den attizistischen Lexika*. Berlin.
- Erbse, H. (1980). 'Zur normativen Grammatik der Alexandrinen'. *Glotta* 58, 236–58.
- Esposito, E. (2009). 'Fragments of Greek Lexicography in the Papyri'. *TiC* 1, 255–97.
- Esposito, E. (2017). *Tra filologia e grammatica. Ricerche di papirologia e lessicografia greche*. Bologna.
- Esposito, E. (2024). 'The Contribution of Greek Papyrus Lexica to the Tradition and Understanding of Ancient Texts'. In: Favi, F.; Mastellari, V. (eds.), *Treasuries of Literature. Anthologies, Lexica, Scholia and the Indirect Tradition of Classical Texts in the Greek World*. Berlin, Boston, 43–74.
- Evans Davies, C. (2014). 'Dialect Humor'. In: Attardo, S. (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Humor Studies*. Vol. 1. Los Angeles, 201–3.
- Fantuzzi, M. (2020). *The Rhesus Attributed to Euripides*. Cambridge.
- Farmer, M. (2022). *Theopompus. Introduction, Translation, Commentary*. Göttingen.
- Favi, F. (2017). *Fiaci. Testimonianze e frammenti*. Heidelberg.
- Favi, F. (2018). 'La declinazione ἑλά, ἑλάς in Diph. fr. 14,4–5 K.-A. e Alex. fr. 263,3 K.-A.'. *Philologus* 162, 171–7.
- Favi, F. (2019a). 'Note linguistiche a P. Ant. I 15 (com. adesp. fr. 1084 K.-A.)'. *Analecta Papyrologica* 31, 163–8.
- Favi, F. (2019b). 'Note critico-testuali ai Sicioni'. *Prometheus* 45, 79–88.
- Favi, F. (2020). *Epicarmo e pseudo-Epicarmo (fr. 240-297). Introduzione, traduzione e commento*. Göttingen.
- Favi, F. (2021). 'The Staging of Menander's *Sikyonioid*'. *CCJ* 67, 51–65.
- Favi, F. (2022a). 'ἄλεκτορίς (Phryn. *Ecl.* 200)'. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2021/01/028>.
- Favi, F. (2022b). 'εἶμι, ἐλεύσομαι (Phryn. *Ecl.* 24, Phryn. *Ecl.* 161, Poll. 5.155, Moer. α 29)'. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2021/01/001>.
- Favi, F. (2022c). 'ἵναι and Compounds (Phryn. *Ecl.* 7, Philemo 395.33, [Hdn.] *Philet.* 288)'. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2021/01/038>.
- Favi, F. (2022d). 'εἰσιέτω, ἰέτω (Phryn. *Ecl.* 141)'. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2021/01/024>.
- Favi, F. (2022e). 'ἄτεγκτος (Phryn. *PS* 7.7–9)'. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2021/01/049>.
- Favi, F. (2022f). 'δυσέριστος (Phryn. *PS* 65.13)'. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2021/01/048>.
- Favi, F. (2022g). 'κυναγός, κυνηγός, κυνηγέτης (Phryn. *Ecl.* 401)'. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2021/01/034>.
- Favi, F. (2022h). 'πρόσφατος (Phryn. *Ecl.* 351, Phryn. *Ecl.* 27)'. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2021/01/033>.
- Favi, F. (2022i). 'ἀρχῆθεν (Phryn. *Ecl.* 66, Phryn. *PS* 9.9–11, *Antiatt.* α 138, Σ^α α 2201)'. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2022/01/009>.
- Favi, F. (2022j). 'Λάκαινα, Λακωνική (*Antiatt.* λ 16, Phryn. *Ecl.* 318)'. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2021/01/008>.
- Favi, F. (2022m). 'ὀπωροπώλης, ὀπωρώνης (Phryn. *Ecl.* 176, Poll. 6.128)'. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2021/01/026>.
- Favi, F. (2022n). 'ἀφῆλιξ, ἀφηλικέστερος (Phryn. *Ecl.* 56, Phryn. *PS* 1.1–6, Poll. 2.17, Moer. α 153, [Hdn.] *Philet.* 168)'. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2021/01/036>.

- Favi, F. (2022a). ‘ἀγαθώτερος, ἀγαθώτατος (Phryn. *Ecl.* 65)’. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2021/01/037>.
- Favi, F. (2022b). ‘ἀπαρκεῖ, ἀπήρκει (Moer. ο 34, Poll. 9.154)’. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2021/01/019>.
- Favi, F. (2022c). ‘ἀμεινότερος, ῥαότερος (Phryn. *Ecl.* 106, Phryn. *Ecl.* 382)’. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2021/01/020>.
- Favi, F. (2022d). ‘αὐτοσχεδιάζειν, ἤκειν, λαμβάνειν (Phryn. *PS* 3.11–6, Moer. λ 1)’. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2021/01/002>.
- Favi, F. (2022e). ‘σμήγμα, σμήχω, σμήμα, σμάω (Phryn. *Ecl.* 224, Moer. σ 35)’. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2021/01/029>.
- Favi, F. (2022f). ‘A Contribution to the Study of *P.Oxy.* 1803 (Atticist Lexicon)’. *GRBS* 62, 309–27.
- Favi, F. (2022g). ‘καμμύω (*Antiatt.* κ 54, Phryn. *Ecl.* 316)’. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2021/01/006>.
- Favi, F. (2022h). ‘γίγνομαι, γινώσκω (Moer. γ 3)’. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2021/01/018>.
- Favi, F. (2022i). ‘υἰεύς, υἰέως, υἰέα (Phryn. *Ecl.* 45, Phryn. *Ecl.* 234, Phryn. *PS* 118.3–4, Phryn. *PS* 118.5–6)’. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2021/01/035>.
- Favi, F. (forthcoming a). ‘Il testo di Senofonte e la lessicografia atticista’. *SemRom*.
- Favi, F. (forthcoming b). ‘Unlicensed Greek’. The ‘Dialect of Alexandria’ in Ancient Greek Scholarship’. In: Probert, P.; Willi, A. (eds.), *Perceptions and Social Uses of the Ancient Greek Dialects*. Berlin, Boston.
- Favi, F. (forthcoming c). ‘χημάζω (Phryn. *Ecl.* 367)’. *DEA*.
- Favi, F.; Pellettieri, A.; Tribulato, O. (eds.) (forthcoming). *New Approaches to Phrynichus’ Praeparatio Sophistica*. Berlin, Boston.
- Favi, F.; Tribulato, O. (2024). ‘Ancient Greek as a Fragmentary Language. What Is ‘Alexandrian Greek’?’. In: Baglioni, D.; Rigobianco, L. (eds.), *Fragments of Languages. From «Restsprachen» to Contemporary Endangered Languages*. Leiden, Boston, 82–100.
- Ferguson, C. (1959). ‘Diglossia’. *Word* 15, 325–40.
- Ferguson, C. (1991). ‘Diglossia Revisited’. *Southwest Journal of Linguistics* 10, 214–34.
- Ferrari, F. (2001). *Menandro e la commedia nuova. Edizione con testo greco a fronte*. Turin.
- Ferrari, F. (2014). ‘Nell’officina di Menandro. Idioletto femminile e marginalità sociale’. In: Casanova, A. (ed.), *Menandro e l’evoluzione della commedia greca*. Florence, 159–71.
- Filos, P. (2013a). ‘Proto-Greek and Common Greek’. *EAGLL*. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2214-448X_eagll_COM_00000298.
- Filos, P. (2013b). ‘Pamphylian’. *EAGLL*. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2214-448X_eagll_COM_00000267.
- Finglass, P. J. (2018). *Sophocles. Oedipus the King. Edited with Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*. Cambridge.
- Finkelberg, M. (2005). *Greeks and Pre-Greeks. Aegean Prehistory and the Greek Heroic Tradition*. Cambridge.
- Fiori, S. (2022). *Le citazioni di Aristofane nel lessico dell’Antiatticista*. Göttingen.
- Fischer, E. (1974). *Die Ekloge des Phrynichos*. Berlin, New York.
- Fishman, J. A. (1991). *Reversing Language Shift. Theoretical and Empirical Foundations of Assistance to Threatened Languages*. Clevedon.
- Foley, H. P.; Rosen, R. M. (eds.) (2020). *Aristophanes and Politics*. Leiden.
- Ford, A. (2002). *The Origins of Criticism. Literary Culture and Poetic Theory in Classical Greece*. Princeton.

- Ford, A. (2019). 'Linus. The Rise and Fall of Lyric Genres'. In: Foster, M.; Kurke, L.; Weiss, N. (eds.), *Genre in Archaic and Classical Greek Poetry. Theories and Models*. Leiden, 57–81.
- Fornaro, S. (2002). 'Un encomio di Omero in Dione Crisostomo (*Or.* LIII)'. *SemRom* 5, 83–104.
- de Foucault, J.-A. (1972). *Recherches sur la langue et le style de Polybe*. Paris.
- Fournet, J.-L. (2009). *Alexandrie. Une communauté linguistique? Ou la question du grec alexandrin*. Le Caire.
- Fowler, R. L. (1998). 'Genealogical Thinking, Hesiod's "Catalogue", and the Creation of the Hellenes'. *PCPS* 44, 1–19.
- Fowler, R. L. (2013). *Early Greek Mythography*. Vol. 2: *Commentary*. Oxford.
- Franchini, E. (2020). *Ferecrate. Krapataloi–Pseudherakles (fr. 85–163)*. Edizione, traduzione e commento. Heidelberg.
- François, A. (2015). 'Trees, Waves and Linkages. Models of Language Diversification'. In: Bowern, C.; Evans, B. (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Historical Linguistics*. Abingdon, New York, 161–89.
- Frangoudaki, A. (1992). 'Diglossia and the Present Language Situation in Greece. A Sociological Approach to the Interpretation of Diglossia and Some Hypotheses on Today's Linguistic Reality'. *Language in Society* 21, 365–81.
- Fraser, P. M. (2009). *Greek Ethnic Terminology*. Oxford.
- Freese, J. H.; Stricker, G. (2020). *Aristotle. The Art of Rhetoric*. Cambridge, MA.
- Fresenius, A. (1875). *De λέξεων Aristophanearum et Suetonianarum excerptis Byzantinis*. Wiesbaden.
- Friedlaender, L. (1851). 'Die gärten des Alkinoos und der gebrauch des praesens bei Homer'. *Philologus* 6, 669–81.
- Frisch, H. (1942). *The Constitution of the Athenians. A Philological-Historical Analysis of Pseudo-Xenophon's Treatise De re publica Atheniensium*. Copenhagen.
- Fritzsche, F. V. (1845). *Aristophanis Ranae*. Zurich.
- Frösén, J. (1974). *Prolegomena to a Study of the Greek Language in the First Centuries A.D. The Problem of Koiné and Atticism*. [Ph.D. dissertation]. Helsinki University.
- Frost, F. J. (1994). 'Aspects of Early Athenian Citizenship'. In: Boegehold, A. L.; Scafuro, A. C. (eds.), *Athenian Identity and Civic Ideology*. Baltimore, London, 45–56.
- Fryde, E. (2000). *The Early Palaeologan Renaissance*. Leiden.
- Furley, W. (2015). *Menander. Perikeiromene or The Shorn Head. Edited with Introduction and Commentary*. London.
- Furnée, E. J. (1972). *Die wichtigsten konsonantischen Erscheinungen des Vorgriechischen. Mit einem Appendix über den Vokalismus*. The Hague, Paris.
- Gallavotti, C. (1965). 'Un lemma di Esichio da Menandro'. *RFIC* 93, 443–5.
- Gammage, S. (2018). *Atticism in Achilles Tatius. An Examination of Linguistic Purism in Achilles Tatius' Leucippe and Clitophon*. [Ph.D. dissertation]. University of KwaZulu-Natal.
- Gammage, S. (2019). 'Atticism in the Second Declension Nominal Categories in the Language of Achilles Tatius'. *AClass* 62, 40–61.
- García Ramón, J. L. (2006). 'La fragmentación dialectal griega. Limitaciones, posibilidades y falsos problemas'. *ILing* 29, 61–82.
- García Ramón, J. L. (2010). 'On the Genetic Classification of Ancient Greek Dialects. Comparative Reconstruction versus Hypercriticism and Atomism at Work'. *Μελέτες για την ελληνική γλώσσα* 30. Πρακτικά της 30ης ετήσιας συνάντησης του Τομέα Γλωσσολογίας του Τμήματος Φιλολογίας της Φιλοσοφικής σχολής του Αριστοτελείου Πανεπιστημίου Θεσσαλονίκης, 2–3 Μαΐου, 2009. Μνήμη Μ. Τριανταφυλλίδη. Thessaloniki, 219–36.

- García Ramón, J. L. (2018). 'Ancient Greek Dialectology. Old and New Questions, Recent Developments'. In: Giannakis, G. K.; Crespo, E.; Filos, P. (eds.), *Studies in Ancient Greek Dialects. From Central Greece to the Black Sea*. Berlin, Boston, 29–106.
- García Ramón, J. L. (2020). 'Change in Grammatical and Lexical Structures in Postclassical Greek. Local Dialects and Supradialectal Tendencies'. In: Rafiyenko, D.; Seržant, I. A. (eds.), *Postclassical Greek. Contemporary Approaches to Philology and Linguistics*. Berlin, Boston, 303–36.
- Garrett, A. (2006). 'Convergence in the Formation of Indo-European Subgroups. Phylogeny and Chronology'. In: Forster, P.; Renfrew, C. (eds.), *Phylogenetic Methods and the Prehistory of Languages*. Cambridge, 139–51.
- Garvie, A. F. (2009). *Aeschylus. Persae*. Oxford.
- Gąsiorowski, P. (1999). 'The Tree of Language. A Cladistic Look at the Genetic Classification of Languages'. *Dialectologia et Geolinguistica* 7, 39–57.
- Gasser, A.-M. (2024). 'Form, Terminology, and Clarity in Aristotle'. In: Asper, M. (ed.), *Coming to Terms. Approaches to (Ancient) Terminologies*. Berlin, Boston, 131–82.
- Gaul, N. (2007). 'The Twitching Shroud. Collective Construction of *Paideia* in the Circle of Thomas Magistros'. *S&T* 5, 263–340.
- Gaul, N. (2008). 'Moschopoulos, Lopadiotes, Phrankopulos (?), Magistros, Staphidakes. Prosopographisches und Methodologisches zur Lexikographie des frühen 14. Jahrhunderts'. In: Trapp, E.; Schönauer, S. (eds.), *Lexicologica byzantina. Beiträge zum Kolloquium zur byzantinischen Lexikographie* (Bonn, 13.–15. Juli 2007). Göttingen, Bonn, 163–96.
- Gaul, N. (2011). *Thomas Magistros und die spätbyzantinische Sophistik. Studien zum Humanismus urbaner Eliten in der frühen Palaiologenzeit*. Wiesbaden.
- Gautier, L. (1911). *La langue de Xénophon*. Geneva.
- Geanakoplos, D. J. (1962). *Greek Scholars in Venice. Studies in the Dissemination of Greek Learning from Byzantium to Western Europe*. Cambridge, MA.
- Gemoll, W.; Peters, J. (1968). *Xenophontis institutio Cyri*. 2nd edition. Leipzig.
- Gerbi, G. (2023). 'ψυχροποφεῖν (Phryn. PS 128.11–3)'. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2022/01/026>.
- Gerbi, G. (2024a). 'ἄκουσμα, ἀκρόαμα (Moer. α 134, Philem. 354 [Laur.])'. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2024/01/033>.
- Gerbi, G. (2024b). 'ἄκναπτος (Moer. α 71)'. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2024/01/023>.
- Gerbi, G. (forthcoming). 'καυνῶς εἶρηται. The Concept of Novelty (καυνότης) in the *Praeparatio sophistica*'. In: Favi, F.; Pellettieri, A.; Tribulato, O. (eds.), *New Approaches to Phrynichus' Praeparatio sophistica*. Berlin, Boston.
- Gerdener, W. (1986). *Der Purismus im Nynorsk. Historische Entwicklung und heutiger Sprachgebrauch*. Münster.
- Gernet, L. (1954). *Démosthène. Plaidoyers civils. Tome I (Discours XXVII–XXXVIII)*. Paris.
- Geus, K. (2002). *Eratosthenes von Kyrene. Studien zur hellenistischen Kultur- und Wissenschaftsgeschichte*. Munich.
- Giannini, P.; Pallara, E. (1983). 'I verbi composti con preposizione'. Prato, C.; et al., *Ricerche sul trimetro di Menandro. Metro e verso*. Rome, 163–313.
- Gibert, J. C. (2019). *Euripides. Ion*. Cambridge.
- Gignac, F. T. (1976). *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Times*. Vol. 1: *Phonology*. Milan.
- Gignac, F. T. (1981). *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Times*. Vol. 2: *Morphology*. Milan.

- Giorgianni, F. (2020). 'Glosse mediche (embriologica) in Esichio. Una ricognizione'. *Galenos* 14, 107–29.
- Godley, A. D. (1920). *Herodotus. The Persian Wars*. Vol. 1: *Books 1–2*. Cambridge, MA.
- Goebel, M. (1915). *De Graecarum civitatum proprietatibus proverbio notatis*. [Ph.D. dissertation]. Bratislava.
- Goetz, G.; Schoell, F. (1910). *M. Terenti Varronis De lingua latina quae supersunt*. Leipzig.
- Gofas, D. C. (1989). 'Epiplous, une institution du droit maritime grec, antique, hellénistique, byzantin et postbyzantin'. In: Tuher, G. (ed.), *Symposion 1985. Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte (Ringberg, 24.-26. Juli 1985)*. Cologne, 425–44.
- Goldberg (Shalev), D. (1996). *Studies in the Language of Menander*. [Ph.D. dissertation]. University of Oxford.
- Goldhill, S. (ed.) (2001). *Being Greek under Rome. Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire*. Cambridge.
- Gomme, A. W. (1940). 'The Old Oligarch'. *HSPh* (suppl. 1) 51, 211–45.
- Gomme, A. W.; Sandbach, F. H. (1973). *Menander. A Commentary*. Oxford.
- Gotteland, S. (2001). 'L'origine des cités grecques dans les discours athéniens'. In: Fromentin, V.; Gotteland, S. (eds.), *Origines gentium*. Bordeaux, Paris, 79–93.
- Gow, A. S. F.; Schofield, A. F. (1953). *Nicaner. The Poems and Poetical Fragments*. Cambridge.
- Grandi, N. (2013). 'Diminutives/Augmentatives (Syntax and Morphology)'. *EAGLL*. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2214-448X_eagll_COM_00000108.
- Gray, B. (2022). 'Civic and Counter-Civic Cosmopolitanism. Diodorus, Strabo and the Later Hellenistic Polis'. In: König, J.; Wiater, N. (eds.), *Late Hellenistic Greek Literature in Dialogue*. Cambridge, 149–77.
- Gray, V. (1985). 'Xenophon's 'Cynegeticus''. *Hermes* 113, 156–72.
- Gray, V. (2006). 'The Linguistic Philosophies of Prodicus in Xenophon's 'Choice of Heracles'?. *CQ* 56, 426–35.
- Gray, V. (2007). *Xenophon. On Government*. Cambridge.
- Gray, V. (2011). 'Work in Progress on Xenophon's Language'. In: Mackay, E. A. (ed.), *ASCS 32 Selected Proceedings*. <https://www.ascs.org.au/news/ascs32/Gray.pdf> (accessed 17/07/2024).
- Gray, V. (2017). 'Xenophon's Language and Expression'. In: Flower, M. A. (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Xenophon*. Cambridge, 223–40.
- Graziosi, B. (2002). *Inventing Homer*. Cambridge.
- Greppin, J. A. C. (1997). 'Greek Verbs in -άζω and -ίζω'. *AOrientHung* 50, 107–9.
- Gruen, E. (2013). 'Did Ancient Identity Depend on Ethnicity? A Preliminary Probe'. *Phoenix* 67, 1–22.
- Gschnitzer, F. (1983). 'Zur Geschichte des Systems der griechischen Ethnika'. In: Heubeck, A.; Neumann, G. (eds.), *Res Mycenaee*. Akten des VII. Internationalen Mykenologischen Colloquiums in Nürnberg vom 6.-10. April 1981. Göttingen, 140–54.
- Gschnitzer, F. (2001). *Kleine Schriften zum griechischen und römischen Altertum*. Vol. 1: *Frühes Griechentum. Historische und sprachwissenschaftliche Beiträge*. Hrsg. von Catherine Trümper und Tassilo Schmitt. Stuttgart.
- Guida, A. (2018). *Lexicon Vindobonense*. Florence.
- Haas, W. (1977). *Die Fragmente der Grammatiker Tyrannion und Diokles*. Berlin.
- Hackstein, O. (2002). *Die Sprachform der homerischen Epen. Faktoren morphologischer Variabilität in literarischen Frühformen: Tradition, Sprachwandel, sprachliche Anachronismen*. Wiesbaden.
- Hagel, S. (2009). *Ancient Greek Music. A New Technical History*. Cambridge.
- Hainsworth, J. B. (1967). 'Greek Views of Greek Dialectology'. *TPhS* 66, 62–76.

- Hajnal, I. (2007). 'Die Vorgeschichte der griechischen Dialekte. Ein methodischer Rück- und Ausblick'. In: Hajnal, I. (ed.), *Die altgriechischen Dialekte. Wesen und Werden*. Akten des Kolloquiums Freie Universität Berlin, 19. – 22. September 2001. Innsbruck, 131–56.
- Hall, E. (1989). *Inventing the Barbarian. Greek Self-Definition through Tragedy*. Oxford.
- Hall, J. M. (1997). *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*. Cambridge.
- Hall, J. M. (2002). *Hellenicity. Between Ethnicity and Culture*. Chicago, London.
- Handley, E. W. (1965). *The Dyskolos of Menander*. London.
- Hansen, D. U. (1998). *Das attizistische Lexicon des Moeris. Quellenkritische Untersuchung und Edition*. Berlin, New York.
- Hansen, H. (1973). 'The Meaning of λειπογνώμων'. *GRBS* 14, 325–32.
- Harder, A. (2012). *Callimachus. Aitia*. 2 vols. Oxford.
- Hatzimichali, M. (2006). *Greek Scholarship of the Early Imperial Period. The Work of Pamphilus of Alexandria*. [Ph.D. dissertation]. University of Oxford.
- Hatzimichali, M. (2013). 'Encyclopaedism in the Alexandrian Library'. In: König, J.; Woolf, G. (eds.), *Encyclopaedism from Antiquity to the Renaissance*. Cambridge, 64–83.
- Hatzimichali, M. (2019). 'Circulation of Lexica in the Hellenistic and Early Imperial Period'. In: Adams, S. A. (ed.), *Scholastic Culture in the Hellenistic and Roman Era*. Berlin, New York, 31–50.
- Haugen, E. (1966a). *Language Conflict and Language Planning. The Case of Modern Norwegian*. Cambridge.
- Haugen, E. (1966b). 'Language, Dialect, Nation'. *American Anthropologist* 68, 922–35.
- Heath, M. (1987). *Political Comedy in Aristophanes*. Göttingen.
- Heinimann, F. (1992). 'Vergessene Fragmente des Attizisten Pausanias?'. *MH* 49, 74–87.
- Helbing, R. (1907). *Grammatik der Septuaginta. Laut- und Wortlehre*. Göttingen.
- Henderson, I. (2011). 'The Second Sophistic and Non-Elite Speakers'. In: Schmidt, T.; Fleury, P. (eds.), *Perceptions of the Second Sophistic and its Times – Regards sur la seconde sophistique et son époque*. Toronto, 23–35.
- Henrichs, A. (1971). 'Scholia Minora zu Homer II'. *ZPE* 7, 229–60.
- Hernández Lara, C. (1994). *Estudios sobre et aticismo de Caritón de Afrodiasias*. Amsterdam.
- Hidber, T. (1996). *Das klassizistische Manifest des Dionys von Halikarnass. Die Praefatio zu De oratoribus veteribus. Einleitung, Übersetzung, Kommentar*. Berlin, New York.
- Hillgruber, M. (1994). *Die pseudo-plutarchische Schrift De Homero*. Vol. 1. Stuttgart, Leipzig.
- Hinterberger, M. (ed.) (2014). *The Language of Byzantine Learned Literature*. Turnhout.
- Hintzen, B. (2011). 'Latin, Attic, and other Greek Dialects. Criteria of ἑλληνισμός in Grammatical Treatises of the First Century BCE'. In: Schmitz, T. A; Wiater, N. (eds.), *The Struggle for Identity. Greeks and their Past in the First Century BCE*. Stuttgart, 127–41.
- Hock, H. H. (1991). *Principles of Historical Linguistics*. 2nd edition. Berlin, New York.
- Hodot, R. (1990). *Le dialecte éolien d'Asie. La langue des inscriptions VIIe s. a.C. – IVe s. p.C.* Paris.
- Hoffmann, O. (1906). *Die Makedonen, ihre Sprache und ihr Volkstum*. Göttingen.
- Hohenhaus, P. (2002). 'Standardization, Language Change, Resistance and the Question of Linguistic Threat. 18th-Century English and Present German'. In: Linn, A. R.; Mclelland, N. (eds.), *Standardization. Studies from the Germanic Languages*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia, 153–78.
- Hollis, A. (1992). 'Attica in Hellenistic Poetry'. *ZPE* 93, 1–15.
- Hollis, A. (2009). *Callimachus. Hecale*. 2nd edition. Oxford.
- Holton, D. (2002). 'Modern Greek. Towards a Standard Language or a New Diglossia?'. In: Jones, M. C.; Esch, E. (eds.), *Language Change. The Interplay of Internal, External and Extra-Linguistic Factors*. Berlin, New York, 169–80.
- Hörandner, W.; Trapp, E. (eds.) (1991). *Lexicographica Byzantina*. Vienna.

- Hornblower, S. (1991–2008). *A Commentary on Thucydides*. 3 vols. Oxford.
- Horrocks, G. (2010). *Greek. A History of the Language and Its Speakers*. 2nd edition. Chichester, Malden, MA.
- Horrocks, G. (2014). 'High-register Medieval Greek'. In: Carpinato, C.; Tribulato, O. (eds.), *Storia e storie della lingua greca*. Venice, 49–72.
- Horrocks, G. (2021). 'Byzantine Literature in 'Classified' Genres. Some Grammatical Realities (V–XIV CE)'. In: Bentein, K.; Janse, M. (eds.), *Varieties of Post-classical and Byzantine Greek*. Berlin, Boston, 163–78.
- Hose, M. (2022). *Aristoteles. Poetik*. 2 vols. Berlin.
- Hude, K. (1898–1901). *Thucydidis historiae*. 2 vols. Leipzig.
- Hude, K. (1927). *Herodoti Historiae*. 2 vols. 2nd edition. Oxford.
- Hude, C.; Peters, J. (1972). *Xenophontis expeditio Cyri. Anabasis*. 2nd edition. Leipzig.
- Hudson, A. (2002). 'Outline of a Theory of Diglossia'. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 157, 1–48.
- Hudson, J. (1712). *Μοίριδος ἀπικιστοῦ λέξεις ἀπικῶν καὶ ἐλλήνων κατὰ στοιχείον*. Oxford.
- Huitink, L.; Rood, T. (2019). *Xenophon. Anabasis. Book III*. Cambridge.
- Huitink, L.; Rood, T. (2020). 'Xenophon de *Halbattiker*? Xenophons woordenschat, 'zuiver' Attisch en de ontwikkeling van de Griekse historiografie'. *Lampas* 53, 420–36.
- Huitink, L.; Willi, A. (2021). 'Protagoras and the Beginnings of Grammar'. *CCJ* 67, 66–92.
- Hunger, H. (1959). 'Von Wissenschaft und Kunst der frühen Palaiologenzeit'. *JÖByz* 8 123–55.
- Hunger, H. (1967). 'Palimpsest-Fragmente aus Herodians Καθολικὴ προσῶδια, Buch 5–7', *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinischen Gesellschaft* 16, 1–33.
- Hunger, H. (1978). *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*. 2 vols. Munich.
- Hunter, L. W.; Handford, S. A. (1927). *Aeneas. On Siegecraft*. Oxford.
- Hunter, R. L. (1983). *Eubulus. The Fragments*. Cambridge.
- Huss, W. (2001). *Ägypten in hellenistischer Zeit, 332–30 v. Chr.* Munich.
- Ingresso, P. (2010). *Menandro. Lo scudo. Introduzione, testo, traduzione e commento*. Bari.
- Ingresso, P. (2021). 'Riprese tragiche e allusioni comiche in Menandro, *Sicioni* 176–271'. *InvLuc* 43, 35–56.
- Ippolito, A. (2008a). 'Orion'. *LGGA*. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2451-9278_Orion.
- Ippolito, A. (2008b). 'Orus'. *LGGA*. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2451-9278_Orus.
- Ippolito, A. (2009). 'Heraclides [1]'. *LGGA*. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2451-9278_Heraclides_1.
- Jacob, C. (2013). 'Fragments of a History of Ancient Libraries'. In: König, J.; Oikonomopoulou, K.; Wolf, G. (eds.), *Ancient Libraries*. Cambridge, 57–81.
- Janko, R. (1987). *Aristotle. Poetics*. Indianapolis, Cambridge.
- Janko, R. (1995). 'Crates of Mallus, Dionysius Thrax and the Tradition of Stoic Grammatical Theory'. In: Ayres, L. (ed.), *The Passionate Intellect. Essays on the Transformation of Classical Tradition Presented to Professor I. G. Kidd*. London, 213–33.
- Janko, R. (2000). *Philodemus. On Poems. Book 1*. Oxford.
- Janko, R. (2020). *Philodemus, On Poems. Books 3–4, with the Fragments of Aristotle, On Poets*. Oxford.
- Johnson, S. (2005). *Spelling Trouble? Language, Ideology and the Reform of German Orthography*. Clevedon.
- Johnson, W. A.; Richter, D. S. (2017). 'Periodicity and Scope'. In: Richter, D. S.; Johnson, W. A. (eds.) (2017). *The Oxford Handbook of the Second Sophistic*. Oxford, 3–9.
- Jones, C. (2008). 'Aristides' First Admirer'. In: Harris, W. V.; Holmes, B. (eds.), *Aelius Aristides between Greece, Rome and the Gods*. Leiden, Boston, 253–62.
- Jones, H. S.; Powell, J. E. (1942). *Thucydidis historiae*. 2 vols. 2nd edition. Oxford.

- Jones, N. F. (2021). 'Krates of Athens (362)'. BNJ². DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1873-5363_bnj2_a362.
- Joseph, J. E. (1987). *Eloquence and Power. The Rise of Language Standards and Standard Languages*. London.
- Joseph, J. E. (2020). 'Is/Ought. Hume's Guillotine, Linguistics and Standards of Language'. In: Chapman, D; Rawlins, J. D. (eds.), *Language Prescription. Values, Ideologies and Identity*. Bristol, 15–31.
- Juhl, J.; Biskas, M. (2023). 'Nostalgia. An Impactful Social Emotion'. *Current Opinion in Psychology* 49, 101545. DOI: 10.1016/j.copsyc.2022.101545.
- Kaczko, S. (2016a). *Archaic and Classical Attic Dedicatory Epigrams. And Epigraphic, Literary, and Linguistic Commentary*. Berlin, Boston.
- Kaczko, S. (2016b). 'La prosa'. In: Cassio, A. C. (ed.), *Storia delle lingue letterarie greche*. 2nd edition. Florence, 385–423.
- Kaibel, G. (1899a). *De Phrynicho sophista*. Göttingen.
- Kaibel, G. (1899b). *Comicorum Graecorum fragmenta*. Vol. 1: *Doriensium comoedia, mimi, phylakes*. Berlin.
- Kalén, T. (1918). *Quaestiones grammaticae Graecae*. Göteborg.
- Kalinka, E. (1913). *Die pseudoxenophontische Αθηναίων πολιτεία. Einleitung, Übersetzung, Erklärung*. Berlin, Leipzig.
- Kassel, R. (1974). 'Ärger mit dem Koch (Com.Gr.Fr. 219 Austin)'. *ZPE* 14, 121–7.
- Kassel, R. (1991). *Kleine Schriften*. Hrsg. von Heinz-Günther Nesselrath. Berlin, New York.
- Katsouris, A. G. (1975). *Linguistic and Stylistic Characterization. Tragedy and Menander*. Ioannina.
- Kazasis, J. N. (2007). 'Atticism'. In: Christidis, A. F. (ed.), *A History of Ancient Greek. From the Beginnings to the Late Antiquity*. Cambridge, 1200–17.
- Keck, S. (1882). *Ueber den Dual bei den griechischen Rednern mit Berücksichtigung der Attischen Inschriften*. Würzburg.
- Kelly, M. N. (1962). 'L'emploi des prépositions dans la comédie moyenne et nouvelle d'Athènes'. *Phoenix* 16, 29–40.
- Kennedy, G. A. (2007). *Aristotle. On Rhetoric. A Theory of Civic Discourse*. 2nd edition. Oxford.
- Kerkhecker, A. (2004). Review of Dettori (2000). *Gnomon* 76, 301–5.
- Kim, L. (2010). 'The Literary Language as Heritage'. In: Bakker, E. J. (ed.), *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*. Chichester, Malden, MA, 468–82.
- Kim L. (2017). 'Atticism and Asianism'. In: Richter, D.; Johnson, W. (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Second Sophistic*. Oxford, New York, 41–66.
- Kim, L. (2020). 'Asianism and Atticism'. *Oxford Classical Dictionary*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780199381135.013.862>.
- Kim, L. (2022). "Asianist" Style in Hellenistic Oratory and Philostratus' *Lives of the Sophists*. In: Wiater, N.; König, J. (eds.), *Late Greek Hellenistic Literature in Dialogue*. Cambridge, 272–318.
- Kim, L. (2023). 'Imperial Greek Atticism. A Culture of Forgery? Phrynichus and the Terminology of "Authenticity"'. In: Hopkins, J. N.; McGill S. (eds.), *Forgery Beyond Deceit. Fabrication, Value, and the Desire for Ancient Rome*. Oxford, 121–44.
- Klaus, K. (1936). *Die Adjektiva bei Menander*. Leipzig.
- Klein, I. (1865). *Erotiani vocum Hippocraticarum conlectio*. Leipzig.
- Klein, W. P. (2004). 'Deskriptive statt Präskriptiver Sprachwissenschaft!?' *Zeitschrift für Germanistische Linguistik* 32, 376–405.
- Kloss, H. (1967). "Abstand Languages" and "Ausbau Languages". *Anthropological Linguistics* 9 (7), 29–41.
- Knaack, G. K. (1907). 'Eratosthenes'. *RE* 6.1, 358–89.

- Knoepfler, D. (2002). 'Loi d'Érétrie contre la tyrannie et l'oligarchie (deuxième partie)'. *BCH* 126, 149–204.
- Kollesch, J.; Kudlien, F. (1965). *Apollonios von Kition. Kommentar zu Hippokrates über das Einrenken der Gelenke*. Berlin.
- Konstan, D. (2001). 'To Hellenikon ethnos. Ethnicity and the Construction of Ancient Greek Identity'. In: Malkin, I. (ed.), *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity*. Cambridge, MA, London, 29–50.
- Körte, A. (1931). 'Menandros'. *RE* 15.1, 707–61.
- Körte, A.; Thierfelder, A. (1959). *Menandri quae supersunt*. Vol. 2. 2nd edition. Leipzig.
- Kotarčić, A. (2021). *Aristotle on Language and Style. The Concept of Lexis*. Cambridge.
- Kretschmer, P. (1909). 'Zur Geschichte der griechischen Dialekte'. *Glotta* 1, 9–59.
- Krevans, N. (2011). 'Callimachus' Philology'. In: Acosta-Hughes, B.; Lehnus, L.; Stephens, S. (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Callimachus*. Leiden, Boston, 119–33.
- Krieter-Spiro, M. (1997). *Sklaven, Köche und Hetären. Das Dienstpersonal bei Menander. Stellung, Rolle, Komik und Sprache*. Stuttgart.
- Kristoffersen, T. R. (2019). 'The Artemis Orthia Inscriptions and Spoken Laconian in the Imperial Period. In Defence of Dialect Survival at Sparta'. *Glotta* 95, 169–89.
- Kroll, W. (1936). 'Nikandros (14)'. *RE* 17.1, 265–6.
- Kwapisz, J. (2019). *The Paradigms of Simmias. Essays on Poetic Eccentricity*. Berlin, Boston.
- Laks, A.; Most, G. W. (2016). *Early Greek Philosophy*. Vol. 9: *Sophists. Part 2*. Cambridge, MA.
- Lallot, J. (2011). 'Did the Alexandrian Grammarians Have a Sense of History?'. In: Montanari, F.; Matthaios, S.; Rengakos, A. (eds.), *Ancient Scholarship and Grammar. Archetypes, Concepts and Contexts*. Berlin, Boston, 241–50.
- Lamagna, M. (2004a). 'Una metafora numismatica atticista. Le parole "falsificate"'. In: Criscuolo, U. (ed.), *Societas studiorum per S. D'Elia*. Naples, 83–97.
- Lamagna, M. (2004b). 'Il lessico di Menandro nella disputa sull'atticismo'. In: López Férez, J. A. (ed.), *La lengua científica griega*. Vol. 3. Madrid, 195–208.
- Lamagna, M. (2014). 'Military Culture and Menander'. In: Sommerstein, A. H. (ed.), *Menander in Contexts*. New York, 58–71.
- Lamont, J. L. (2023). *In Blood and Ashes. Curse Tablets and Binding Spells in Ancient Greece*. Oxford.
- Lane Fox, R. (2018). 'Aineias the Author. Who, Where and When?'. In: Pretzler, M.; Barley, N. (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Aineias Tacticus*. Leiden, Boston, 33–48.
- Langella, E. (2014). 'Hesych. κ 4581 L. e uno scolio aristofaneo'. *Eikasmos* 25, 257–62.
- Langer, N. (2000). 'The Rechtschreibreform. A Lesson in Linguistic Purism'. *German as a Foreign Language* 3, 15–35.
- Langer, N. (2001). *Linguistic Purism in Action. How Auxiliary Tun Was Stigmatized in Early New High German*. Berlin, New York.
- Langer, N.; Nesse, A. (2012). 'Linguistic Purism'. In: Hernández-Campoy, J. M.; Conde-Silvestre, J. C. (eds.), *The Handbook of Historical Sociolinguistics*. London, New York, 607–25.
- Lape, S. (2010). *Race and Citizen Identity in the Classical Athenian Democracy*. Cambridge, New York.
- Lapini, W. (1997). *Commento all'Athenaion politeia dello pseudo-Senofonte*. Florence.
- La Roche, J. (1893). *Beiträge zur griechischen Grammatik*. Vol. 1. Leipzig.
- La Roche, J. (1897). 'Zur griechischen und lateinischen Prosodie und Metrik'. *WS* 19, 1–14.
- La Roi, E. (2022). 'The Atticist Lexica as Metalinguistic Resource for Morphosyntactic Change in Post-Classical Greek'. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 22, 199–231.
- Latte, K. (1915). 'Zur Zeitbestimmung des Antiatticista'. *Hermes* 50, 373–94. (Reprinted in *Kleine Schriften*. Munich 1968, 612–30).

- Latte, K. (1925). 'Glossographika'. *Philologus* 80, 136–75. (Reprinted in *Kleine Schriften*. Munich 1968, 631–66).
- Latte, K. (1933). 'Besprechung von Inscriptiones Graecae IX 12,1 (Ätolien)'. *Gnomon* 9, 491–14. (Reprinted in *Kleine Schriften*. Munich 1968, 759–84).
- Latte, K.; Cunningham, I. C. (2020). *Hesychi Alexandrini Lexicon*. Vol. 2: E–O. Berlin, Boston.
- Lautensach, O. (1896). *Grammatische Studien zu den griechischen Tragikern und Komikern*. Vol. 1: *Personalendungen*. Gotha.
- Lautensach, O. (1899). *Grammatische Studien zu den griechischen Tragikern und Komikern. Augment und Reduplikation*. Hannover, Leipzig.
- Lautensach, O. (1911a). *Die Aoriste bei den attischen Tragikern und Komikern*. Göttingen.
- Lautensach, O. (1911b). 'Der Gebrauch des Aor. Med. und Aor. Pass. bei den attischen Tragikern und Komikern'. *Glotta* 3, 221–36.
- Lautensach, O. (1918). 'Grammatische Studien zu den attischen Tragikern und Komikern [Imperativ, Nachtrag]'. *Glotta* 9, 69–94.
- Layton, E. (1994). *The Sixteenth Century Greek Book in Italy. Printers and Publishers for the Greek World*. Venice.
- Leão, D. F.; Rhodes, P. J. (2015). *The Laws of Solon. A New Edition with Introduction, Translation and Commentary*. London, New York.
- Lebek, W.-D. (1969). 'Zur rhetorischen Theorie des Archaismus'. *Hermes* 97, 57–78.
- Lee, J. A. L. (1983). *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch*. Chico.
- Lee, J. A. L. (2007). 'Ἐξαποστῆλλω'. In: Joosten, J.; Tomson, P. J. (eds.), *Voces Biblicae. Septuagint Greek and its Significance for the New Testament*. Leuven, 99–113.
- Lee, J. A. L. (2013). 'The Atticist Grammarians'. In: Porter, S. E.; Pitts, A. (eds.), *The Language of the New Testament. Context, History and Development*. Leiden, 283–308.
- Le Feuvre, C. (2007). 'ἈΚΑΤΑΠΥΓΩΝ (Aristophane, *Ach.* 664), hom. ΑΙΨΗΡΟΣ, ΛΑΙΨΗΡΟΣ et le prétendu préfixe intensif ΛΑ-'. *RPh* 81, 323–42.
- Le Feuvre, C. (2022). *Homer from Z to A. Metrics, Linguistics, and Zenodotus*. Leiden, Boston.
- Lehrs, K. (1857). *Herodiani scripta tria emendatiore*, ed. K. Lehrs. *Accedunt analecta*. 2nd edition. Berlin.
- Lehrs, K. (1882). *De Aristarchi studiis Homericis*. 3rd edition. Leipzig.
- Lejeune, M. (1972). *Phonétique historique du mycénien et du grec ancien*. 2nd edition. Paris.
- Lemerle, P. (1971). *Le premier Humanisme byzantin. Notes et remarques sur enseignement et culture à Byzance des origines au X^e siècle*. Paris.
- Lenfant, D. (2017). *Pseudo-Xénophon. Constitution des athéniens*. Paris.
- Laurini, L. (2007). *L'edizione omerica di Riano di Creta*. Rome.
- Liddel, P. (2018). 'Writing and Other Forms of Communication in Aineias' *Poliorketika*'. In: Pretzler, M.; Barley, N. (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Aineias Tacticus*. Leiden, Boston, 123–45.
- Lightfoot, J. L. (2009). *Hellenistic Collection. Philitas, Alexander of Aetolia, Hermesianax, Euphorion, Parthenius*. Cambridge, MA.
- Lillo, A. (2015). 'Aspectos sintácticos de la lengua de Galeno'. In: López Férez, J. A. (ed.), *Galeno. Lengua, composición literaria, léxico, estilo*. Madrid, 11–27.
- Lindstam, S. (1924). *Georgii Lacapeni et Andronici Zaridae Epistulae XXXII cum Epimerismis Lacapeni. Accedunt duae epistulae Michaelis Gabrae ad Lacapenum*. Göteborg.
- Linke, K. (1977). *Die Fragmente des Grammatikers Dionysios Thrax*. Berlin, New York.
- Lipka, M. (2002). *Xenophon's Spartan Constitution. Introduction. Text. Commentary*. Berlin, New York.
- Lippi-Green, R. (2012). *English with an Accent. Language, Ideology, and Discrimination in the United States*. 2nd edition. London, New York.
- Lobeck, C. A. (1820). *Phrynichi Eclogae nominum et verborum Atticorum*. Leipzig.

- López Eire, A. (1981–1982). ‘Fundamentos sociolingüísticos del origen de la koiné’. *CFC(G)* 17, 21–54.
- López Eire, A. (1984). ‘Tucidides y la koiné’. In: Bernabé, A.; et al. (eds.), *Athlon. Saturae grammatica in honorem Francisci R. Adrados*. Vol. 1. Madrid, 245–61.
- López Eire, A. (1986). ‘La lengua de la comedia aristofánica’. *Emerita* 54, 237–74.
- López Eire, A. (1991). *Ático, koiné y aticismo. Estudios sobre Aristófanes y Libanio*. Murcia.
- López Eire, A. (1993). ‘De l’attique à la koiné’. In: Brixhe, C. (ed.), *La koiné grecque antique I. Une langue introuvable?* Nancy, 41–57.
- López Eire, A. (1996a). ‘Influence de l’ionien-attique sur les autres dialectes épigraphiques et l’origine de la koiné’. In: Brixhe, C. (ed.), *La koiné grecque antique II. La concurrence*. Nancy, Paris, 7–42.
- López Eire, A. (1996b). *La lengua coloquial de la comedia aristofánica*. Murcia.
- López Eire, A. (1999). ‘Nouvelles données à propos de l’histoire de l’attique’. In: Cassio, A. C. (ed.), *Kata Dialekton*. Atti del III Colloquio internazionale di dialettologia greca. Napoli – Faiano d’Ischia, 25–28 settembre 1996. Naples, 73–107.
- López Eire, A. (2002). ‘La lengua de Hiperides y Menandro’. *Habis* 33, 73–94.
- Loroux, N. (1981a). *Les enfants d’Athéna. Idées athéniennes sur la citoyenneté et la division des sexes*. Paris.
- Loroux, N. (1981b). *L’invention d’Athènes. Histoire de l’oraison funèbre dans la «cité classique»*. Paris, The Hague, New York.
- Loroux, N. (1996). *Né de la Terre. Mythe et politique à Athènes*. Paris.
- Lorenzoni, A. (2000). ‘Una torcia in Filippide e Menandro’. *Eikasmos* 11, 155–65.
- Lowe, N. (2013). ‘Comedy and the Pleiad. Alexandrian Tragedians and the Birth of Comic Scholarship’. In: Bakola, E.; Prauscello, L.; Telò, M. (eds.), *Greek Comedy and the Discourse of Genres*. Cambridge, 343–56.
- Lucarini, C. M. (2017). ‘Erodiano e l’atticismo’. Galimberti, A. (ed.), *Erodiano. Tra crisi e trasformazione*. Milan, 3–37.
- Ludwich, A. (1884–1885). *Aristarchs homerische Textkritik nach den Fragmenten des Didymos dargestellt und beurtheilt*. 2 vols. Leipzig.
- Luiselli, R. (1999). *A Study of High Level Greek in the Non-Literary Papyri from Roman and Byzantine Egypt*. [Ph.D. dissertation]. University College London.
- Luschnat, O. (1960). *Thucydides historiae*. 2nd edition. Leipzig.
- Lyons, J. (1981). *Language and Linguistics*. Cambridge.
- MacDowell, D. M. (1971). *Aristophanes, Wasps. Edited with Introduction and Commentary*. Oxford.
- MacDowell, D. M. (1993). ‘Foreign Birth and Athenian Citizenship in Aristophanes’. In: Sommerstein, A. H.; Halliwell, S.; Henderson, J.; Zimmermann, B. (eds.), *Tragedy, Comedy and the Polis. Papers from the Greek Drama Conference*. Bari, 359–71.
- MacDowell, D. M. (2004). *Demosthenes. Speeches 27–38*. Austin.
- MacDowell, D. M. (2009). *Demosthenes the Orator*. Oxford.
- Mackridge, P. (2009). *Language and National Identity in Greece (1766–1976)*. Oxford.
- Mac Sweeney, N. (2017). ‘Separating Fact from Fiction in the Ionian Migration’. *Hesperia* 86, 379–421.
- Macua Martínez, E. (2008). *Técnicas de caracterización en Menandro (Samia, Perikeiromene y Epitrepontes)*. Vitoria.
- Magdalino, P. (2011). ‘Orthodoxy and History in Tenth-Century Byzantine ‘Encyclopedism’’. In: Van Deun, P.; Macé, C. (eds.), *Encyclopedic Trends in Byzantium?*. Leuven, 143–59.
- Maidhof, A. (1912). *Zur Begriffsbestimmung der Koine besonders auf Grund des Attizisten Moiris*. Würzburg.
- Malkin, I. (2001). ‘Introduction’. In: Malkin, I. (ed.), *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity*. Cambridge, MA, London, 1–28.

- Manetti, D. (2003). 'Galeno, la lingua di Ippocrate e il tempo'. In: Barnes, J.; Jouanna, J. (eds.), *Galien et la philosophie*. Geneva, 171–220.
- Manetti, D. (2009). 'Galen and Hippocratic Medicine. Language and Practice'. In: Gill, C.; Whitmarsh, T.; Wilkins, J. (eds.), *Galen and the World of Knowledge*. Cambridge, 157–74.
- Manetti, D. (2015). 'Medicine and Exegesis'. In: Montanari, F.; Matthaïos, S.; Rengakos, A. (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship*. Leiden, Boston, 1126–215.
- Manolessou, I. (2014) 'Learned Byzantine Literature and Modern Linguistics'. In: Hinterberger, M. (ed.), *The Language of Byzantine Learned Literature*. Turnhout, 13–33.
- Marchant, E. C. (1903). *Xenophontis opera*. Vol. 3: *Expediatio Cyri*. Oxford.
- Marchant, E. C. (1910). *Xenophontis opera*. Vol. 4: *Institutio Cyri*. Oxford.
- Marr, J. L.; Rhodes, P. J. (2008). *The Constitution of the Athenians Attributed to Xenophon. Edited with an Introduction, Translation and Commentary*. Oxford.
- Martin, G. (2018). *Euripides, Ion. Edition and Commentary*. Berlin, Boston.
- Martín de Lucas, I. (2013). 'Los demostrativos con partícula deíctica en el *Corpus Aristotelicum*. Razones del uso exclusivo de ὅδι'. *Emerita* 81, 83–109.
- Marzi, M. (1991). *Opere di Isocrate*. Vol. 2. Turin.
- Masqueray, P. (1930–1931). *Xénophon. Anabase*. 2 vols. Paris.
- Masson, M. (1988). 'À propos de quelques mots grecs relatifs à l'alimentation'. *RPh* 62, 25–39.
- Mastellari, V. (2020). *Calliade – Mnesimaco. Introduzione, traduzione e commento*. Göttingen.
- Matijašić, I. (2108). *Shaping the Canons of Ancient Greek Historiography. Imitation, Classicism, and Literary Criticism*. Berlin, Boston.
- Matijašić, I. (2020). *Timachidas Rhodius*. Leiden, Boston.
- Mattern, S. (2017). 'Galen'. In: Richter, D. S.; Johnson, W. A. (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Second Sophistic*. Oxford, 371–88.
- Matthaïos, S. (1999). *Untersuchungen zur Grammatik Aristarchs. Texte und Interpretation zur Wortartenlehre*. Göttingen.
- Matthaïos, S. (2002). 'Neue Perspektiven für die Historiographie der antiken Grammatik. Das Wortartensystem der Alexandriner'. In: Swiggers, P. Wouters, A. (eds.), *Grammatical Theory and Philosophy of Language in Antiquity*. Leuven 161–220.
- Matthaïos, S. (2005). 'ΚΛΕΑΡΧΟΣ oder ΚΛΕΙΤΑΡΧΟΣ? Zur Urheberchaft zweier Worterklärungen und zur Autorschaft eines Glossenwerkes in der Überlieferung des Klearchos aus Soloi'. *RhM* 148, 47–79.
- Matthaïos, S. (2006). 'Suda. The Character and Dynamics of an Encyclopedic Byzantine Dictionary'. In: Kazazis, I. N. (ed.), *Η λεξικογράφηση του ελληνικού πολιτισμού, αρχαίου, μεσαιωνικού και νέου. Τα σύγχρονα εγκυκλοπαιδικά λεξικά*. Thessaloniki, 1–40.
- Matthaïos, S. (2010). 'Lexikographen über die Schulter geschaut. Traditionsbruch in der griechischen Lexikographie'. In: Horster, M.; Reitz, C. (eds.), *Condensing Texts – Condensed Texts*. Stuttgart, 165–207.
- Matthaïos, S. (2011). 'Eratosthenes of Cyrene. Readings of his 'Grammar' Definition'. In: Matthaïos, S.; Montanari, F.; Rengakos, A. (eds.), *Ancient Scholarship and Grammar. Archetypes, Concepts and Contexts*. Berlin, Boston, 55–85.
- Matthaïos, S. (2012). 'Zwischen ἀμπειρία und τέχνη. Textinterpretation und grammatische Argumentation bei den alexandrinischen Grammatikern'. *RhM* 155, 254–90.
- Matthaïos, S. (2013). 'Pollux' *Onomastikon* im Kontext der attizistischen Lexikographie. Gruppen «anonymer Sprecher» und ihre Stellung in der Sprachgeschichte und Stilistik'. In: Mauduit, C. (ed.), *L'Onomasticon de Pollux. Aspects culturels, rhétoriques et lexicographiques*. Lyon, 67–140.

- Matthaios, S. (2014a). 'Philological-Grammatical Tradition in Ancient Linguistics'. *EAGLL*. DOI: https://doi-org/10.1163/2214-448X_eagll_COM_00000025.
- Matthaios, S. (2014b). 'Fachliteratur. Philologie'. In: Zimmermann, B.; Rengakos, A. (eds.), *Handbuch der griechischen Literatur der Antike*. Vol. 2. Munich, 502–53.
- Matthaios, S. (2015a). 'Zur Typologie des Publikums in der Zweiten Sophistik nach dem Zeugnis der Attizisten. „Zeitgenössische“ Sprechergruppen im *Onomastikon* des Pollux'. In: Tziatzi, M.; Billerbeck, M.; Montanari, F.; Tsantsanoglou, K. (eds.), *Lemmata. Beiträge zum Gedenken an Christos Theodoridis*. Berlin, Boston, 286–313.
- Matthaios, S. (2015b). 'Greek Scholarship in the Imperial Era and Late Antiquity'. In: Montanari, F.; Matthaios, S.; Rengakos, A. (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship*. Leiden, Boston, 184–96.
- Matthaios, S. (2018). 'Eratosthenes, Crates and Aristarchus on the Homeric Dual. Rethinking the Origins of the 'Analogy vs. Anomaly Controversy''. In: Ercoles, M.; Pagani, L.; Pontani, F.; Ucciardello, G. (eds.), *Approaches to Greek Poetry*. Berlin, Boston, 25–49.
- Matthaios, S. (2020a). 'Greek Scholarship in the Imperial Era and Late Antiquity'. In: Montanari, F. (ed.), *History of Ancient Greek Scholarship. From the Beginnings to the End of the Byzantine Age*. Leiden, Boston, 260–372.
- Matthaios, S. (2020b). 'Εμπειρία, τέχνη, and Beyond. Recent Controversies on the 'Analogy vs. Anomaly Quarrel' in Historical and Theoretical Context'. In: Coticelli-Kurras, P. (ed.), *Word, Phrase, and Sentence in Relation Ancient Grammars and Contexts*. Berlin, Boston, 95–116.
- Matthaios, S. (2022). 'Den griechischen Akzenten auf der Spur. Der Varro-Traktat de accentibus und Eratosthenes' Zirkumflex-Definition'. In: Denecker, T. et al. (eds.), *The Architecture of Grammar. Studies in Linguistic Historiography in Honor of Pierre Swiggers*. Leuven, Paris, 15–35.
- Mattingly, H. (2010). 'Methodology in Fifth-Century Attic Epigraphy'. In: Reger, G.; Ryan, F. X.; Winters, T. F. (eds.), *Studies in Greek Epigraphy and History in Honour of Stephen V. Tracy*. Bordeaux, 97–106.
- Mauduit, C. (ed.) (2013). *L'Onomasticon de Pollux. Aspects culturels, rhétoriques et lexicographiques*. Lyon.
- Mayhew, R. J. (2019). *Aristotle's Lost Homeric Problems. Textual Studies*. Oxford.
- McInerney, J. (2012). 'Heraclides Criticus and the Problem of Taste'. In: Sluiter, I.; Rosen, R. M. (eds.), *Aesthetic Value in Classical Antiquity*. Leiden, Boston, 243–64.
- McInerney, J. (2019). 'Herakleides Kritikós (369A)'. *BN²*. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1873-5363_bnj2_a369A.
- McNamee, K. (1992). *Sigla and Selected Marginalia in Greek Literary Papyri*. Brussels.
- Meillet, A. (1922). *Les dialectes indo-européens*. 2nd edition. Paris.
- Meillet, A. (1930). *Aperçu d'une histoire de la langue grecque*. 3rd edition. Paris.
- Meineke, A. (1843). *Analecta Alexandrina*. Berlin.
- Meinel, F. (2015). *Pollution and Crisis in Greek Tragedy*. Oxford.
- Meisterhans, K.; Schwyzler, E. (1900). *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften*. 3rd edition. Berlin.
- Meliadò, C. (2018). 'Callimachus [1]'. *LGA*. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2451-9278_Callimachus_1.
- Meliadò, C. (2019). 'Theodoros [2]'. *LGA*. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2451-9278_Theodoros_2.
- Méndez Dosuna, J. V. (1985). *Los dialectos dorios del Noroeste. Gramática y estudio dialectal*. Salamanca.
- Méndez Dosuna, J. V. (1993a). 'El cambio de <ε> en <ι> ante vocal en los dialectos griegos'. In: Crespo, E.; García Ramón, J. L.; Striano, A. (eds.), *Dialectologica Graeca. Actas del II Coloquio Internacional de Dialectología Griega*. Madrid, 237–59.
- Méndez Dosuna, J. V. (1993b). 'Metátesis de cantidad en jónico-ático y heracleota'. *Emerita* 61, 95–134.

- Méndez Dosuna, J. V. (2018). 'El origen de la preposición $\omega\varsigma$ 'a casa de'. In: Vallejo, J. M.; Iguarta, I.; García Castillero, C. (eds.), *Studia Philologica et Diachronica in Honorem Joaquín Gorrochategui. Indoeuropaea et Palaeohispanica*. Vitoria, 313–30.
- Merisio, E. N. (2023). 'παίδισκη (Phryn. *Ecl.* 210, Moer. π 56, Poll. 2.17, Poll. 3.76)'. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2023/02/006>.
- Mette, H. J. (1952). *Parateresis. Untersuchungen zur Sprachtheorie des Krates von Pergamon*. Halle.
- Miccolis, E. (2017). *Archippus. Einleitung Übersetzung, Kommentar*. Heidelberg.
- Mickey, K. (1981). 'Dialect Consciousness and Literary Language. An Example from Ancient Greek'. *TPhS* 79, 35–66.
- Milani, C. (2013). 'Variation in Mycenaean Greek'. *EAGLL*. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2214-448X_eagll_COM_00000363.
- Millis, B. (2015). *Anaxandrides. Introduction, Translation and Commentary*. Heidelberg.
- Milroy, J. (2000). 'Historical Description and the Ideology of the Standard Language'. In: Wright, L. (ed.), *The Development of Standard English 1300–1800. Theories, Descriptions, Conflicts*. Cambridge, 11–28.
- Milroy, J. (2001). 'Language Ideologies and the Consequences of Standardization'. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 5, 530–55.
- Milroy, J. (2005). 'Some Effects of Purist Ideologies on Historical Descriptions of English'. In: Langer, N.; Davies, W. N. (eds.), *Linguistic Purism in the Germanic Languages*. Berlin, New York, 324–42.
- Milroy, J.; Milroy, L. (2012). *Authority in Language. Investigating Standard English*. 4th edition. London.
- Mimbrera, S. (2012). 'The Sicilian Doric Koina'. In: Tribulato, O. (ed.), *Language and Linguistic Contact in Ancient Sicily*. Cambridge, 223–250.
- Monaco, C. (2021). *The Origins and Development of Linguistic Atticism*. [Ph.D. dissertation]. University of Cambridge.
- Monaco, C. (2023). 'Atticist Lexica and the Interpretation of Comic Language'. *TiC* 15, 9–30.
- Monaco, C. (forthcoming). 'Comic Constructions or *Hapax Legomena*? Observations on Some Rare Expressions in Phrynichus' *Praeparatio sophisticated*'. In: Favi, F.; Pellettieri, A.; Tribulato, O. (eds.), *New Approaches to Phrynichus' Praeparatio sophisticated*. Berlin, Boston.
- Monro, D. B. (1891). *Homeric Grammar*. Oxford.
- Montana, F. (2004). 'Valerius [3] Harpocration'. *LGGA*. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2451-9278_Valerius_3_Harpocration.
- Montana, F. (2007). 'Menandro (e Aristofane) ad Alessandria. Qualche riflessione'. In: Pretagostini, R.; Dettori, E. (eds.), *La cultura letteraria ellenistica. Persistenza, innovazione, trasmissione*. Atti del convegno COFIN 2003, "Università di Roma Tor Vergata", 19–21 settembre 2005. Rome, 257–69.
- Montana, F. (2012). 'Aristophanes'. In: Bastianini, G.; Haslam, M.; Maehler, H.; Montanari, F.; Römer, C. (eds.), *Commentaria et Lexica Graeca in Papyris Reperta*. Vol. I.1.4: *Aristophanes–Bacchylides*. Berlin, Boston, 3–241.
- Montana, F. (2013). 'Aristotle, Eratosthenes and the Beginnings of Alexandrian Scholarship on the *Archaia*'. *TiC* 5, 144–58.
- Montana, F. (2015). 'Hellenistic Scholarship'. In: Montanari, F.; Matthaios, S.; Rengakos, A. (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship*. Leiden, Boston, 60–183.
- Montana, F. (2018a). 'Aelius [1] Dionysius'. *LGGA*. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2451-9278_Aelius_1_Dionysius.
- Montana, F. (2018b). 'Alexander of Cotiaeum. Teacher, Exegete, *Diorthotes*'. *AION(filol.)* 40, 7–22.
- Montana, F. (2020a). 'Didymus and the Greek Historians'. In: Prodi, E.; Coward, T. (eds.), *Didymus and Graeco-Roman Learning*, BICS suppl. 63. London, 62–78.

- Montana, F. (2020b). 'Hellenistic Scholarship'. In: Montanari, F. (ed.), *History of Ancient Greek Scholarship. From the Beginnings to the End of the Byzantine Age*. Leiden, Boston, 132–259.
- Montana, F. (2021a). 'Zenodotus [1] Ephesius'. *LGGA*. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2451-9278_Zenodotus_1_Ephesius_it.
- Montana, F. (2021b). 'Aristophanes Byzantius'. *LGGA*. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2451-9278_Aristophanes_Byzantius_it.
- Montana, F. (2021c). 'Aristarchus Samothrax'. *LGGA*. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2451-9278_Aristarchus_Samothrax_it.
- Montanari, E. (1981). *Il mito dell'autoctonia. Linee di una dinamica mitico-politica ateniese*. Rome.
- Montanari, F. (1993). 'L'erudizione, la filologia e la grammatica'. In: Cambiano, G.; Canfora, L.; Lanza, D. (eds.), *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica*. Vol. 1: *La produzione e la circolazione del testo*. Tome 2: *L'Ellenismo*. Rome, 235–81.
- Montanari, F. (1995). *Studi di filologia omerica antica*. Vol. 2. Pisa.
- Montanari, F. (2002). 'Callimaco e la filologia'. In: Montanari, F.; Lehnus, L. (eds.), *Callimaque*. Geneva, 59–92.
- Montanari, F. (2009). 'Ancient Scholarship on Hesiod'. In: Montanari, F.; Rengakos, A.; Tsagalis, C. (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Hesiod*. Leiden, Boston, 313–42.
- Montanari, F. (2011). 'Ancient Scholarship and Classical Studies'. In: Matthaios, S.; Montanari, F.; Rengakos, A. (eds.), *Ancient Scholarship and Grammar. Archetypes, Concepts and Contexts*. Berlin, Boston, 11–24.
- Montanari, F. (2012). 'Glosse dialettali negli scholia omerici'. In: Meier-Brügger, M. (ed.), *Homer, gedeutet durch ein großes Lexikon*. Akten des Hamburger Kolloquiums vom 6.-8. Oktober 2010 zum Abschluss des Lexikons des frühgriechischen Epos. Berlin, Boston, 123–40.
- Montanari, F. (ed.) (2020). *History of Ancient Greek Scholarship. From the Beginnings to the End of the Byzantine Age*. Leiden, Boston.
- Montanari, F.; Matthaios, S.; Rengakos, A. (eds.) (2015). *Brill's Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship*. 2 vols. Leiden, Boston.
- Moore, J. M. (1975). *Aristotle and Xenophon on Democracy and Oligarchy*. Berkeley, Los Angeles.
- Moorhouse, A. C. (1982). *The Syntax of Sophocles*. Leiden.
- Morgan, C. (2001). 'Ethne, Ethnicity, and Early Greek States, ca. 1200–480 B.C. An Archaeological Perspective'. In: Malkin, I. (ed.), *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity*. Cambridge, MA, London, 75–111.
- Morin, J. (2001). *Latinitas. Permanence et transformations d'une formule de norme linguistique latine*. Villeneuve d'Ascq.
- Morpurgo Davies, A. (1987). 'The Greek Notion of Dialect'. *Verbum* 10, 7–28.
- Morpurgo Davies, A. (1988). 'Mycenaean and Greek Language'. In: Morpurgo Davies, A.; Duhoux, Y. (eds.), *Linear B. A 1984 Survey*. Louvain-La-Neuve, 75–125.
- Morpurgo Davies, A. (1992). 'Mycenaean, Arcadian, Cyprian and Some Questions of Method in Dialectology'. In: Olivier, J. P. (ed.), *Mykenaiika*. Actes du IXe Colloque international sur les textes mycéniens et égéens organisé par le Centre de l'Antiquité Grecque et Romaine de la Fondation Hellénique des Recherches Scientifiques et l'École française d'Athènes (Athènes, 2–6 octobre 1990). Athens, 415–32.
- Morpurgo Davies, A. (1996). *La linguistica dell'Ottocento*. Bologna. (English translation in: Lepschy, G. (ed.), *History of Linguistics*. Vol. 4. London, 1998).
- Morpurgo Davies, A. (1999). 'Contatti interdialektali. Il formulario epigrafico'. In: Cassio, A. C. (ed.), *Kata Dialekton*. Atti del III Colloquio internazionale di dialettologia greca. Napoli – Faiano d'Ischia, 25–28 settembre 1996. Naples, 7–33.

- Morris, I. (2000). *Archaeology as Cultural History. Words and Things in Iron Age Greece*. Malden, MA.
- Mosconi, G. (2020). 'Il multilinguismo e il suo significato sociopolitico secondo i greci. Alcuni *topoi* fra Omero e l'età ellenistica'. *A&R* n.s. II 14, 148–74.
- Mosconi, G. (2022). 'La lingua creola del *demos*. Sul Vecchio Oligarca (*Ath. resp.* 2, 8) e sui significati sociopolitici del plurilinguismo nel pensiero antico'. *Historika* 11, 43–82.
- Most, G. W. (2006). 'Athens as the School of Greece'. In: Porter, J. I. (ed.), *Classical Pasts. The Classical Traditions of Greece and Rome*. Princeton, 377–88.
- Most, G. W. (2018). *Hesiod. The Shield, Catalogue of Women, Other Fragments*. Edited and Translated by G. W. Most. Cambridge, MA, London.
- Mugglestone, L. (2014). 'Description and Prescription in Dictionaries'. In: Durkin, P. (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Lexicography*. Oxford, 546–60.
- Muir, J. V. (2001). *Alcidamas. The Works and Fragments*. London.
- Müller, A. (1915). *Zur Geschichte der Verba auf -ιζω im Griechischen*. [Ph.D. dissertation]. University of Freiburg im Breisgau.
- Münscher, K. (1920). *Xenophon in der griechisch-römischen Literatur*. Leipzig.
- Mureddu, P.M. (2017). 'Eratostene sulla *archaia komoidia*'. In: Mastromarco, G.; Totaro, P.; Zimmermann, B. (eds.), *La commedia attica antica. Forme e contenuti*. Lecce, 151–72.
- Musti, D. (1985). 'Continuità e discontinuità tra Achei e Dori'. In: Musti, D. (ed.), *Le origini dei Greci*. Bari, 37–71.
- Musti, D. (1997). *Demokratía. Origini di un'idea*. Revised edition. Rome, Bari.
- Muzzolon, M. L. (2005). 'Aristarco negli scoli ad Aristofane'. In: Montana, F. (ed.), *Interpretazioni antiche di Aristofane*. La Spezia, 55–109.
- Nachmanson, E. (1918). *Erotiani vocum Hippocraticarum collectio cum fragmentis*. Göteborg.
- Naechster, M. (1908). *De Pollucis et Phrynichi controversiis*. Leipzig.
- Napolitano, M. (2012). *I Kolakes di Eupoli. Introduzione, traduzione, commento*. Mainz.
- Napolitano, M. (2021). 'I frammenti degli *Agathoi* di Ferecrate, o dei limiti della ricostruzione'. *Lexis* 39, 63–88.
- Nauck, A. (1848). *Aristophanis Byzantii grammatici Alexandrini fragmenta*. Halle.
- Navaud, G. (2006). 'Les maximes de Démocrate et Callimaque'. *REG* 119, 114–38.
- Nelson, T. J.; Molesworth, K. (2021). 'Tragic Noise and Rhetorical Frigidity in Lycophron's *Alexandra*'. *CQ* 71, 200–15.
- Nesselrath, H.-G. (1990). *Die attische Mittlere Komödie. Ihre Stellung in der antiken Literaturkritik und Literaturgeschichte*. Berlin, New York.
- Nesselrath, H.-G. (1998). Review of Schmitz (1997). *BMCR* 1998.06.18. <https://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/1998/1998.06.18/>
- Nesselrath, H.-G. (2010). 'Comic Fragments. Transmission and Textual Criticism'. In: Dobrov, G. W. (ed.), *Brill's Companion to the Study of Greek Comedy*. Leiden, Boston, 423–53.
- Nesselrath, H.-G. (2016). 'A Minor but not Uninteresting Poet of Athenian Middle Comedy. Epicrates of Ambracia'. *Logeion* 6, 231–44.
- Nickau, K. (1967). 'Aristophanes von Byzanz zu den Pinakes des Kallimachos'. *RhM* 110, 346–53.
- Nickau, K. (1972). 'Zenodotos von Ephesos'. *RE* 10A, 23–45.
- Nickau, K. (1977). *Untersuchungen zur textkritischen Methode des Zenodotos von Ephesos*. Berlin.
- Nikolaev, A. (2022). 'Notes on Greek Primary Comparatives'. In: Kisilier, M. L. (ed.), *Verus convictor, verus academicus. К 70-летию Николая Николаевича Казанского*. Saint Petersburg, 549–63.
- Nicolai, R. (1992). *La storiografia nell'educazione antica*. Pisa.
- Nicolai, R. (2010). 'L'attidografia come genere letterario'. In: Bearzot, C.; Landucci, F. (eds.), *Storie di Atene, storia dei Greci. Studi e ricerche di attidografia*. Milan, 3–27.

- Nicolai, R. (2015). 'Historiography, Ethnography, Geography'. In: Montanari, F.; Matthaios, S.; Rengakos, A. (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship*. Leiden, Boston, 1090–125.
- Nicoletti, G. (2007). 'Il mito di Firenze nei poeti di primo Ottocento'. In: Maraschio, N. (ed.), *Firenze e la lingua italiana tra nazione ed Europa*. Atti del convegno di studi (Firenze, 27–28 maggio 2004). Florence, 59–77.
- Nicosia, S. (2005). 'Di crivelli, buratti, stacci, e d'altro (Poll. VI 74, Hesych. κ 58 L.)'. *Eikasmos* 16, 307–16.
- Niehoff-Panagiotidis, J. (1994). *Koine und Diglossie*. Wiesbaden.
- Niño-Murcia, M. (1997). 'Linguistic Purism in Cuzco, Peru. A Historical Perspective'. *Language Problems & Language Planning* 21, 134–61.
- Norlin, G. (1929). *Isocrates*. Vol. 2. Cambridge, MA, London.
- Novokhatko, A. A. (2015). 'Greek Scholarship from its Beginnings to Alexandria'. In: Matthaios, S.; Montanari, F.; Rengakos, A. (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship*. Leiden, Boston, 3–59.
- Novokhatko, A. A. (2020a). 'Awareness of Linguistic Variation in Archaic and Classical Greece'. In: Van Rooy, R. (ed.), *Essays in the History of Dialect Studies. From Ancient Greece to Modern Dialectology*. Münster, 10–32.
- Novokhatko, A. A. (2020b). 'The Origins and Growth of Scholarship in Pre-Hellenistic Greece'. In: Montanari, F. (ed.), *History of Ancient Greek Scholarship from the Beginnings to the End of the Byzantine Age*. Leiden, Boston, 9–131.
- Novokhatko, A. A. (2023). *Greek Comedy and Embodied Scholarly Discourse*. Berlin, New York.
- Nünlist, R. (2012a). 'A Chapter in the History of Greek Linguistics. Aristarchus' Interest in Language Development'. *RhM* 155, 152–65.
- Nünlist, R. (2012b). 'Aristarch und das Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos'. In: Meier-Brügger, M. (ed.), *Homer; gedeutet durch ein großes Lexikon*. Akten des Hamburger Kolloquiums vom 6.-8. Oktober 2010 zum Abschluss des Lexikons des frühgriechischen Epos. Berlin, Boston, 193–214.
- Nünlist, R. (2019). 'Aristarchus and Etymology'. *Glotta* 19, 201–26.
- Nussbaum, A. J. (2022). 'Persephonology and Persemorphology. Περσεφώνη/Φερροφάττα etc. 'Sheaf Thresher' Reanalyzed'. In: Fellner, H. A.; Malzahn, M.; Peyrot, M. (eds.), *Lyke Wmer Ra. Indo-European Studies in Honour of Georges-Jean Pinault*. Ann Arbor, New York, 391–408.
- Ober, J. (1989). *Mass and Elite in Democratic Athens. Rhetoric, Ideology, and the Power of the People*. Princeton.
- Ober, J. (1996). *The Athenian Revolution. Essays on Ancient Greek Democracy and Political Theory*. Princeton.
- Occhipinti, E. (2019). '(Ps)Xenophon's AP. Genre, Audience, and Fourth-Century Themes of Debate'. *Politica antica* 9, 11–42.
- O'Donnell, M. B. (2000). 'Designing and Compiling a Register-balanced Corpus of Hellenistic Greek for the Purpose of Linguistic Description and Investigation'. In: Porter, S. E. (ed.), *Diglossia and Other Topics in New Testament Linguistics*. Sheffield, 255–97.
- Odorico, P. (1990). 'La cultura della συλλογή'. *ByzZ* 83, 1–21.
- Odorico, P. (2011). 'Cadre d'exposition / cadre de pensée. La culture du recueil'. In: Van Deun, P.; Macé, C. (eds.), *Encyclopedic Trends in Byzantium?* Leuven, 89–107.
- Olson, S. D. (1998). *Aristophanes. Peace. Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary*. Oxford.
- Olson, S. D. (2002). *Aristophanes. Acharnians. Edited with Introduction and Commentary*. Oxford.
- Olson, S. D. (2008). *Athenaeus. The Learned Banqueters*. Vol. 3: *Books 6–7*. Cambridge, MA.
- Olson, S. D. (2009). *Athenaeus. The Learned Banqueters*. Vol. 5: *Books 10.420e–11*. Cambridge, MA.

- Olson, S. D. (2010). 'Comedy, Politics, and Society'. In: Dobrov, G. W. (ed.), *Brill's Companion to the Study of Greek Comedy*. Leiden, Boston, 35–69.
- Olson, S. D. (2014). *Eupolis frs. 326–497. Translation and Commentary*. Heidelberg.
- Olson, S. D. (2016). *Eupolis. Heilotes – Chrysou Genos (frs. 147–235). Translation and Commentary*. Heidelberg.
- Olson, S. D. (2017). *Eupolis. Testimonia and Aiges – Demoi (frs. 1–146). Translation and Commentary*. Heidelberg.
- Olson, S. D. (2021). *Antiphanes. Sappho – Chrysis, Fragmenta incertarum fabularum, Fragmenta dubia. Translation and Commentary*. Göttingen.
- Olson, S. D. (2022). *Antiphanes. Zakyntios – Progonoi. Translation and Commentary*. Göttingen.
- Olson, S. D. (2023). *Antiphanes. Agroikos – Ephesia. Introduction, Translation and Commentary*. Göttingen.
- Olson, S. D.; Sens, A. (1999). *Matro of Pitane and the Tradition of Epic Parody in the Fourth Century BCE*. Atlanta.
- Ornaghi, M. (2015). 'Antimaco, Callimaco e le fonti di Argo. note critiche a PMilVogl. I 17, col. II 16-23, e alla memoria callimachea di Agia e Dercilo'. *SEP* 12, 37–52.
- Orth, C. (2013). *Alkaios – Apollonophanes. Einleitung, Übersetzung, Kommentar*. Heidelberg.
- Orth, C. (2015). 'Vier- und mehrsilbige Wörter in den iambischen Trimetern von Aristophanes' *Acharnern*'. In: Tauffer, M. (ed.), *Studi sulla commedia attica*. Freiburg i.Br., Berlin, Wien, 103–28.
- Orth, C. (2018). 'Visual and Non-visual Uses of Demonstratives with the Deictic ι in Greek Comedy'. In: Kampakoglou, A.; Novokhatko, A. (eds.), *Gaze, Vision, and Visuality in Ancient Greek Literature*. Berlin, Boston, 233–41.
- Osborne, R. (2010). *Athens and Athenian Democracy*. Cambridge.
- O'Sullivan, N. (1992). *Alcidas, Aristophanes, and the Beginnings of Greek Stylistic Theory*. Stuttgart.
- O'Sullivan, N. (1997). 'Caecilius, the Canons of Writers, and the Origins of Atticism'. In: Dominik, W. J. (ed.), *Roman Eloquence. Rhetoric in Society and Literature*. London, 32–49.
- O'Sullivan, N. (2015). "'Rhetorical" vs "Linguistic" Atticism. A False Dichotomy?'. *Rhetorica* 33, 134–46.
- Overduin, F. (2014). *Nicanor of Colophon's Theriaca. A Literary Commentary*. Leiden.
- Pagani, L. (2005a). 'Hermonax'. *LGGA*. DOI: 10.1163/2451-9278_Hermonax_it.
- Pagani, L. (2005b). 'Amerias'. *LGGA*. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2451-9278_Amerias_it.
- Pagani, L. (2009). 'Telephus'. *LGGA*. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2451-9278_Telephus.
- Pagani, L. (2011). 'Pioneers of Grammar. Hellenistic Scholarship and the Study of Language'. In: Montanari, F.; Pagani, L. (eds.), *From Scholars to Scholia. Chapters in the History of Ancient Greek Scholarship*. Berlin, Boston, 17–64.
- Pagani, L. (2014a). 'Hellenismos tra filologia e grammatica. Riflessioni antiche sulla correttezza della lingua'. *Philologus* 158, 235–60.
- Pagani, L. (2014b). 'Diogenes [3]'. *LGGA*. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2451-9278_Diogenes_3.
- Pagani, L. (2015). 'Language Correctness (*Hellenismos*) and Its Criteria'. In: Montanari, F.; Matthaios, S.; Rengakos, A. (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship*. Leiden, Boston, 798–849.
- Papachrysostomou, A. (2016). *Amphis. Introduction, Translation, Commentary*. Heidelberg.
- Papanastasiou, G. (2008). *Νεοελληνική ορθογραφία. Ιστορία, θεωρία, εφαρμογή*. Thessaloniki.
- Parker, L. P. E. (2007). *Euripides. Alcestis. Edited with Introduction and Commentary*. Oxford.
- Parker, H. N. (2008). 'The Linguistic Case for the Aiolian Migration Reconsidered'. *Hesperia* 77, 431–64.
- Parker, R. (1983). *Miasma. Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion*. Oxford.
- Parsons, P. J. (1994). '4024. Menander, *Leukadia*?'. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. Vol. 60. London, 42–6.

- Parsons, P. J. (2011). 'Callimachus and his Koinai'. In: Acosta-Hughes, B.; Lehnus, L.; Stephens, S. (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Callimachus*. Leiden, Boston, 133–52.
- Passa, E. (2016a). 'L'epica'. In: Cassio, A. C. (ed.), *Storia delle lingue letterarie greche*. 2nd edition. Florence, 139–96.
- Passa, E. (2016b). 'L'elegia e dell'epigramma su pietra'. In: Cassio, A. C. (ed.), *Storia delle lingue letterarie greche*. 2nd edition. Florence, 260–88.
- Patterson, C. B. (2005). 'Athenian Citizenship Law'. In: Gagarin, M.; Cohen, D. J. (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Greek Law*. Cambridge, New York, 267–89.
- Paveau, M.-A.; Rosier, L. (2008). *La langue française. Passions et polémiques*. Paris.
- Peels-Matthey, S. (2018). 'Moral Purity in the Athenian Theatre'. In: Carbon, J.-M.; Peels-Matthey, S. (eds.), *Purity and Purification in the Ancient Greek World*. Liège, 93–109.
- Pellé, N. (2015). 'Agia e Dercilo nella testimonianza dei papiri. La tradizione indiretta'. *SEP* 12, 53–61.
- Pellettieri, A. (2020). 'Lycophron Chalcidiensis'. In: Dettori, E.; Pellettieri, A. *Glossographi. Lycophron Chalcidensis*. Leiden, Boston, 243–396.
- Pellettieri, A. (2023a). 'ἄθλιος (Moer. α 96)'. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2022/01/001>.
- Pellettieri, A. (2023b). 'ἦρω (Moer. η 9)'. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2022/01/013>.
- Pellettieri, A. (2023c). 'οἶσε (Moer. ο 31)'. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2022/01/017>.
- Pellettieri, A. (2023d). 'ἰδρῶ, κικεῶ, Ἀπόλλω, τυφῶ (Moer. ι 13, Moer. κ 15, Moer. α 73, Moer. τ 14)'. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2023/02/033>.
- Pellettieri, A. (2023e). 'χολάς, χόλιξ' (Moer. χ 12, Phryn. *Ecl.* 282, Phryn. *PS* 125.3–4, Phryn. *PS* 126.5–7)'. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2023/02/005>.
- Pellettieri, A. (2023f). 'ἐντέλλω, ἐπισκίπτω, ἐπιτέλλω (Moer. ε 4, Moer. ε 62, *Antiatt.* ε 49, [Hdn.] *Philet.* 247, Thom. Mag. 121.1–12)'. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2023/02/024>.
- Pellettieri, A. (2023g). 'ἀμείνω, ἦττω (Moer. α 75, Moer. η 10)'. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2022/01/004>.
- Pellettieri, A. (2023h). 'Σωκράτη, Σώκρατες (Moer. σ 23)'. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2023/02/037>.
- Pellettieri, A. (2023i). 'Δημοσθένας, Δημοσθένης (Moer. δ 48)'. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2023/02/018>.
- Pellettieri, A. (2024a). *Ferecrate. Doulodidaskalos – Korianno (fr. 43–84). Traduzione e commento*. Göttingen.
- Pellettieri, A. (2024b). 'Moeris. Ἀττικιστής'. *DEA*. DOI: [10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2024/02/031](https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2024/02/031).
- Peppler, C. W. (1902). *Comic Terminations in Aristophanes and the Comic Fragments. Part I: Diminutives, Character Names, Patronymics*. Baltimore.
- Peppler, C. W. (1910). 'The Termination -κος as Used by Aristophanes for Comic Effect'. *AJPh* 31, 428–44.
- Peppler, C. W. (1921). 'Comic Terminations in Aristophanes. Part V'. *AJPh* 40, 152–61.
- Perilli, L. (2006). 'Da medico a lessicografo. Galeno e il Glossario ippocratico'. In: Müller, C. W.; Brockmann, C.; Brunschön, C. W. (eds.), *Ärzte und ihre Interpreten. Medizinische Fachtexte der Antike als Forschungsgegenstand der klassischen Philologie*. Munich, Leipzig, 165–202.
- Perilli, L. (2008). 'Su Esichio e i cosiddetti "frammenti" del "Glossario ippocratico" di Erotiano'. *Galenos* 2, 35–55.
- Perilli, L. (2017). *Galeno. Interpretazione delle parole difficili di Ippocrate*. Berlin.
- Perilli, L. (2021). 'Erotianus'. *LGGA*. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2451-9278_Erotianus_it.

- Pernin, I. (2014). *Les baux ruraux en Grèce ancienne. Corpus épigraphique et étude*. Lyon.
- Perpillou, J.-L. (1973). *Les substantifs grecs en -εύς*. Paris.
- Perpillou, J.-L. (1984). 'La diphtongue ai en Attique'. *Glotta* 62, 152–7.
- Perrone, S. (2020). 'Demostene e i *rhetores* in commedia. PSI II 144 e l'esegesi comica da Demetrio Falereo a Eratostene e oltre'. In: Bastianini, G.; Maltomini, F.; Manetti, D.; Minutoli, D.; Pintaudi, R. (eds.), *E me l'ovrare appaga. Papiri e saggi in onore di Gabriella Messeri (P. Messeri)*. Florence, 329–44.
- Petersen, W. (1910). *Greek Diminutives in -ION. A Study in Semantics*. Weimar.
- Petersen, W. (1913). *The Greek Diminutive Suffix -ιακο-, -ιακη*. New Haven, CT.
- Petrovic, A.; Petrovic, I. (2016). *Inner Purity and Pollution in Greek Religion*. Vol. 1: *Early Greek Religion*. Oxford.
- Pfalzgraf, F. (2006). *Neopurismus in Deutschland nach der Wende*. Frankfurt am Main.
- Pfalzgraf, F. (2009). 'Linguistic Purism in the History of the German Language'. In: Horan, G.; Langer, N.; Watts, S. (eds.), *Landmarks in the History of the German Language*. Frankfurt am Main, 137–68.
- Pfeiffer, R. (1968). *History of Classical Scholarship. From the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age*. Oxford.
- Pfister, F. (1916). 'Vulgärgriechisches in der ps.-xenophontischen Αθηναίων πολιτεία'. *Philologus* 73, 558–62.
- Pfister, F. (1951). *Die Reisebilder des Herakleides. Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar mit einer Übersicht über die Geschichte der griechischen Volkskunde*. Vienna.
- Pierson, J. (1759). *Moeridis Atticistae Lexicon Atticum*. Leiden.
- Pinker, S. (1994). *The Language Instinct. The New Science of Language and Mind*. London.
- Pirrotta, S. (2009). *Plato comicus. Die fragmentarischen Komödien ein Kommentar*. Berlin.
- Pocetti, P. (2014). 'Linguistic Variation in Classical Attic'. *EALL*. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2214-448X_eagll_COM_00000222.
- Poethke, G. (1981). 'Inventarliste'. *Papyri Greek and Egyptian Edited by Various Hands in Honour of Eric Gardner Turner On the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*. London, 163–6.
- Poli Palladini, L. (2013). *Aeschylus at Gela. An Integrated Approach*. Alessandria.
- Pomeroy, S. (1994). *Xenophon. Oeconomicus. A Social and Historical Commentary. With a New English Translation*. Oxford.
- Pontani, F. (2007–). *Scholía Graeca in Odysseam*. Rome.
- Pontani F. (2011). 'Ex Homero grammatica'. In: Matthaïos, S.; Montanari, F.; Rengakos, A. (eds.), *Ancient Scholarship and Grammar. Archetypes, Concepts and Contexts*. Berlin, New York, 87–103.
- Pontani, F. (2012). "Only God Knows the Correct Reading!" – The Role of Homer, the Quran and the Bible in the Rise of Philology and Grammar'. In: Niehoff, M. R. (ed.), *Homer and the Bible in the Eyes of Ancient Interpreters*. Leiden, 43–83.
- Pontani, F. (2015). 'Scholarship in the Byzantine Empire (529–1453)'. In: Montanari, F.; Matthaïos, S.; Rengakos, A. (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship*. Leiden, Boston, 297–455.
- Pontani F. (2018). 'Chi'. In: Ercoles, M.; Pagani, L.; Pontani, F.; Ucciardello, G. (eds.), *Approaches to Greek Poetry*. Berlin, New York, 51–60.
- Pontani, F. (2020). 'Scholarship in the Byzantine Empire (529–1453)'. In: Montanari, F. (ed.), *History of Ancient Greek Scholarship. From the Beginnings to the End of the Byzantine Age*. Leiden, Boston, 373–529.
- Pontani, F. (2023). 'The Making of Monolingual Dictionaries. The Prefaces to the Lexica of Hesychius (6th Century CE) and Photius (9th Century CE)'. In: Most, G. W.; Schäfer, D.; Söderblom Saarela, M. (eds.), *Plurilingualism in Traditional Eurasian Scholarship. Thinking in Many Tongues*. Leiden, Boston, 252–63.

- Porceddu, M. L. (2023). *L'Athenaion Politeia dello Pseudo-Senofonte e il suo tempo. Contesto, lessico e ideologia*. Göttingen.
- Porson, R. (1812). *Adversaria. Notae et emendationes in poetas Graecos*. Cambridge.
- Porson, R. (1823). *Photii Lexicon e codice Galeano*. Leipzig.
- Porter, J. I. (2006). 'Feeling Classical. Classicism and Ancient Literary Classicism'. In: Porter, J. I. (ed.), *Classical Pasts. The Classical Traditions of Greece and Rome*. Princeton, 301–52.
- Porter, J. I. (2010). *The Origins of Aesthetic Thought in Ancient Greece. Matter, Sensation, and Experience*. Cambridge.
- Porter, S. E. (1989). *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament, with Reference to Tense and Mood*. New York.
- Porter, S. E. (2000). *Diglossia and Other Topics in New Testament Linguistics*. Sheffield.
- Porzig, W. (1954). 'Sprachgeographische Untersuchungen zu den altgriechischen Dialekten'. *IF* 61, 147–69.
- Poultney, J. W. (1963). 'Studies in the Syntax of Attic Comedy'. *AJPh* 84, 359–76.
- Prauscello, L. (2012). 'Epinician Sounds. Pindar and Musical Innovation'. In: Agócs, P.; Carey, C.; Rawles, R. (eds.), *Reading the Victory Ode*. Cambridge, 58–82.
- Prauscello, L. (2023). 'No Stone Unturned. Dover as Historian of Greek Language between Epigraphy and Literature'. In: Halliwell, S.; Stray, C. (eds.), *Scholarship and Controversy. Centenary Essays on the Life and Work of Sir Kenneth Dover*. London, 251–70.
- Preller, L. (1838). *Polemonis Periegetae fragmenta*. Leipzig.
- Priestley, J. (2014). *Herodotus and Hellenistic Culture. Literary Studies in the Reception of the Histories*. Oxford.
- Probert, P. (2004). 'Accentuation in Old Attic, Later Attic, and Attic'. In: Penney, J. H. W. (ed.), *Indo-European Perspectives. Studies in Honour of Anna Morpurgo Davies*. Oxford, 277–91.
- Probert, P. (2011). 'Attic Irregularities. Their Reinterpretation in the Light of Atticism'. In: Matthaios, S.; Montanari, F.; Rengakos, A. (eds.), *Ancient Scholarship and Grammar. Archetypes, Concepts and Contexts*. Berlin, Boston, 269–90.
- Probert, P. (2019). *Latin Grammarians on the Latin Accent. The Transformation of Greek Grammatical Thought*. Oxford.
- Pusch, H. (1890). 'Quaestiones Zenodoteae'. *Dissertationes philologicae Halenses*, 119–216.
- Raaflaub, K. (1983). 'Democracy, Oligarchy, and the Concept of the "Free Citizen" in Late Fifth-Century Athens'. *Political Theory* 11, 517–44.
- Rafiyenko, D.; Seržant, I. A. (2020a). 'Postclassical Greek. An Overview'. In: Rafiyenko, D.; Seržant, I. A. (eds.), *Postclassical Greek. Contemporary Approaches to Philology and Linguistics*. Berlin, Boston, 1–15.
- Rafiyenko, D.; Seržant, I. A. (eds.) (2020b). *Postclassical Greek. Contemporary Approaches to Philology and Linguistics*. Berlin, Boston.
- Ramaswamy, S. (1997). *Passions of the Tongue. Language Devotion in Tamil India, 1891–1970*. Berkeley, Los Angeles.
- Rapp, C. (2002). *Aristoteles. Rhetorik*. Berlin.
- Reardon, B. P. (1971). *Courants littéraires grecs des II^e et III^e siècles après J.-C.* Paris.
- Redondo, J. (2016). 'Osservazioni sociolinguistiche sulla commedia di Aristofane'. *Hermes* 144, 265–78.
- Redondo, J. (2022). 'New Linguistic Uses on the Comic Stage. Non-standard Devices'. *Frammenti Sulla Scena (online)* 2, 153–73.
- Regali, M. (2008a). 'Phrynichus Arabius'. *LGGA*. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2451-9278_Phrynichus_Arabius.
- Regali, M. (2008b). 'Ister [1]'. *LGGA*. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2451-9278_Ister_1.

- Regali, M. (2015). 'Minucius Pacatus Irenaeus'. *LGGA*. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2451-9278_Minucius_Pacatus_Irenaeus.
- Reinhold, H. (1898). *De graecitate Patrum Apostolicorum librorumque apocryphorum Novi Testamenti quaestiones grammaticae*. Halle.
- Reitzenstein, R. (1897). *Geschichte der griechischen Etymologika. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Philologie in Alexandria und Byzanz*. Leipzig.
- Reitzenstein, R. (1907). *Der Anfang des Lexikons des Photios*. Leipzig, Berlin.
- Rengakos, A. (1993). *Der Homertext und die hellenistischen Dichter*. Stuttgart.
- Reynolds, L. D.; Wilson, N. G. (1968). *Scribes and Scholars*. Oxford.
- Richter, J. (1909). *Ursprung und analogische Ausbreitung der Verba auf -άζω*. [Ph.D. dissertation]. University of Münster, Leipzig.
- Richter, D. S.; Johnson, W. A. (eds.) (2017). *The Oxford Handbook of the Second Sophistic*. Oxford.
- Risch, E. (1949). 'Altgriechische Dialektgeographie?'. *MH* 6, 19–28. (Reprinted in: Etter, A.; Looser, M. (eds.), *Ernst Risch. Kleine Schriften zum siebzigsten Geburtstag*. Berlin, New York 1981, 196–205).
- Risch, E. (1955). 'Die Gliederung der griechischen Dialekte in neuer Sicht'. *MH* 12, 61–76. (Reprinted in: Etter, A.; Looser, M. (eds.), *Ernst Risch. Kleine Schriften zum siebzigsten Geburtstag*. Berlin, New York 1981, 206–21).
- Risch, E. (1964). 'Das Attische im Rahmen der griechischen Dialekte'. *MH* 21, 1–14. (Reprinted in: Etter, A.; Looser, M. (eds.), *Ernst Risch. Kleine Schriften zum siebzigsten Geburtstag*. Berlin, New York 1981, 222–35).
- Risch, E. (1974). *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache*. 2nd edition. Berlin.
- Ritschl, F. (1832). *Thomae Magistri sive Theoduli monachi Ecloga vocum Atticarum*. Halle.
- Robins, R. H. (1993). *The Byzantine Grammarians. Their Place in History*. Berlin, New York.
- Rodríguez-Noriega Guillén, L. (2005). 'Aelian and Atticism. Critical Notes on the Text of *De Natura Animalium*'. *CQ* 55, 455–62.
- Rohde, E. (1870). *De Julii Pollucis in apparatu scaenico enarrando fontibus*. Leipzig.
- Römer, C. (2012). 'New Fragments of Act IV, *Epitrepontes* 786 – 823 Sandbach (P. Mich. 4752 a, b and c)'. *ZPE* 182, 112–20.
- Rose, C. B. (2008). 'Separating Fact from Fiction in the Aiolian Migration'. *Hesperia* 77, 399–430.
- Rosén, H. B. (1987–1997). *Herodotus. Historiae*. 2 vols. Leipzig.
- Rosenkranz, B. (1930). 'Der lokale Grundton und die persönliche Eigenart in der Sprache des Thucydides und der älteren attischen Redner'. *IF* 48, 127–78.
- Rosenmeyer, P. (2008). 'Greek Verse Inscriptions in Roman Egypt. Julia Balbilla's Sapphic Voice'. *CA* 27, 334–58.
- Rosenstrauch, H. (1967) *Studia nad językiem Menandra*. Wrocław.
- Rosivach, V. T. (1987). 'Autochthony and the Athenians'. *CQ* 37, 294–306.
- Ross, R. C. (1971). 'ἄμβων/ἄμβη and Latin *umbo*'. *Glotta* 49, 244–59.
- Rossi, L. E. (2000). 'Musica e psicologia nel mondo antico e nel mondo moderno. La teoria antica dell'*ethos* musicale e la moderna teoria degli affetti'. In: Cassio, A. C.; Musti, D.; Rossi, L. E. (eds.), *Synaulía. Cultura musicale in Grecia e contatti mediterranei*. Naples, 57–96.
- Roumanis, E. (2016). *Evidence for the Influence of Atticist Lexica on Non-literary Papyri of the First Three Centuries CE*. [M.A. dissertation]. Macquarie University, Sydney.
- Roussou, S. (2018). *Pseudo-Arcadius' Epitome of Herodians' De prosodia catholica*. Oxford.
- Routledge, J. et al. (2011). 'The Past Makes the Present Meaningful. Nostalgia as an Existential Resource'. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 101, 638–52.
- Routledge, J. (2016). *Nostalgia. A Psychological Resource*. New York, London.

- Rutherford, W. G. (1881). *The New Phrynichus. Being a Revised Text of the Ecloga of the Grammarian Phrynichus*. London.
- Said, S. (2001). 'The Discourse of Identity in Greek Rhetoric from Isocrates to Aristides'. In: Malkin, I. (ed.), *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity*. Cambridge, MA, London, 275–99.
- Said, S. (2006). 'The Rewriting of the Athenian Past. From Isocrates to Aelius Aristides'. In: Konstan, D.; Said, S. (eds.), *Greeks on Greekness. Viewing the Greek Past under the Roman Empire*. Cambridge, 47–60.
- Sandbach, F. H. (1970). 'Menander's Manipulation of Language for Dramatic Purposes'. In: Turner, E. G. (ed.), *Ménandre. Sept exposés suivis de discussions*. Geneva, 111–43.
- Sandri, M. G. (2020). *Trattati greci su barbarismo e solecismo. Introduzione ed edizione critica*. Berlin, Boston.
- Sandri, M. G. (2023a). *Trattati greci sui tropi. Introduzione ed edizione critica*. Berlin, Boston.
- Sandri, M. G. (2023b). 'Two New Lexica on Accentuation and Vowel Quantities (with New Fragments of Eupolis, Aristophanes of Byzantium (?), Aristarchus of Samothrace and Seleucus of Alexandria (?))'. *CCJ* 69, 75–119.
- Sansone, D. (2020). *Plato. Menexenus*. Cambridge.
- Sanz Morales, M. (2014). 'La lengua de Caritón de Afrodiasias. Características fonológicas'. In: Martínez Fernández, A. et al. (eds.), *Ágalma. Ofrenda desde la Filología Clásica a Manuel García Teijeiro*. Valladolid, 291–301.
- Sanz Morales, M. (2015). 'La lengua de Caritón de Afrodiasias. Características morfológicas'. *CFC(G)* 25, 39–66.
- Sartori, F. (1975). *Una pagina di storia ateniese in un frammento dei "Demi,, eupolidei*. Rome.
- Sauppe, G. (1869). *Lexilogus Xenophonteus*. Leipzig.
- Savio, M. (2023). 'Ammonius [1]'. *LGGA*. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2451-9278_Ammonius_1_it.
- Scafuro, A. C. (2011). *Demosthenes, Speeches 39–49*. Austin.
- Scafuro, A. C. (2013). 'Menander. Personal Address and Addressing the Audience'. *Tokyo Classical Studies* 8, 103–33.
- Scarborough, M. (2023). *The Aeolic Dialects of Ancient Greek. A Study in Historical Dialectology and Linguistic Classification*. Leiden, Boston.
- Schein, S. L. (2013). *Sophocles. Philoctetes*. Cambridge.
- Scheller, M. (1951). *Die Oxytonierung der griechischen Substantiva auf -ia*. [Ph.D. dissertation]. University of Zurich.
- Schenkeveld, D. M. (1993). 'Pap.Hamburg.128. A Hellenistic *Ars Poetica*'. *ZPE* 97, 67–80.
- Schenkeveld, D. M. (1994). 'Scholarship and Grammar'. In: Montanari, F. (ed.), *La philologie grecque à l'époque hellénistique et romaine. Sept exposés suivis de discussions*. Geneva, 263–306.
- Schiffman, H. F. (1997). 'Diglossia as a Sociolinguistic Situation'. In: Coulmas, F. (ed.), *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. London, 205–16.
- Schiffman, H. F. (2008). 'The *Ausbau* Issue in the Dravidian Languages. The Case of Tamil and the Problem of Purism'. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 191, 45–63.
- Schindel, U. (1994). 'Archaismus als Epochenbegriff. Zum Selbstverständnis des 2. Jhs'. *Hermes* 122, 327–41.
- Schindel, U. (1997). 'Neues zur Begriffsgeschichte von Archaismus'. *Hermes* 125, 249–52.
- Schironi, F. (2004). *I frammenti di Aristarco di Samotracia negli etimologici bizantini. Etymologicum Genuinum, Magnum, Symeonis, Μεγάλη Γραμματική, Zonarae Lexicon. Introduzione, edizione critica, commento*. Göttingen.
- Schironi, F. (2009). *From Alexandria to Babylon. Near Eastern Languages and Hellenistic Erudition in the Oxyrhynchus Glossary (P.Oxy. 1802 + 4812)*. Berlin, Boston.

- Schironi, F. (2018). *The Best of the Grammarians. Aristarchus of Samothrace on the Iliad*. Ann Arbor.
- Schleicher, A. (1853). 'Die ersten Spaltungen des indogermanischen Urvolkes'. *Allgemeine Monatsschrift für Wissenschaft und Literatur* 1853, 786–87.
- Schleicher, A. (1863). *Die Darwinsche Theorie und die Sprachwissenschaft*. Weimar.
- Schlaifer, R. (1943). 'The Cult of Athena Pallenis (Athenaeus VI 234–235)'. *HSCPh* 54, 35–67.
- Schmidt, J. (1872). *Die Verwandtschaftsverhältnisse der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Weimar.
- Schmidt, M. S. (1854). *Didymi Chalcenteri grammatici Alexandrini fragmenta quae supersunt omnia*. Leipzig.
- Schmidt, T.; Fleury, P. (eds.) (2011). *Perceptions of the Second Sophistic and its Times – Regards sur la seconde sophistique et son époque*. Toronto.
- Schmitt, R. (1978). *Die Iranier-Namen bei Aeschylus*. Vienna.
- Schmitz, T. (1997). *Bildung und Macht. Zur sozialen und politischen Funktion der zweiten Sophistik in der griechischen Welt der Kaiserzeit*. Munich.
- Schmitz, T. A.; Wiater, N. (2011a). 'Introduction. Approaching Greek Identity'. In: Schmitz, T. A.; Wiater, N. (eds.), *The Struggle for Identity. Greeks and their Past in the First Century BCE*. Stuttgart, 15–45.
- Schmitz, T. A.; Wiater, N. (eds.) (2011b). *The Struggle for Identity. Greeks and their Past in the First Century BCE*. Stuttgart.
- Schmoll, H. (1955). *Die griechischen Verba auf -ιζω einschließlich der von-ιo-Stämmen abgeleiteten Verba auf -ιαζω nach Herkunft und Bedeutung untersucht*. [Ph.D. dissertation]. University of Tübingen.
- Schramm, M. (2005). 'Σύνδεσμος und ἄρθρον in Aristoteles' *Poetik*'. *Glotta* 81, 187–213.
- Schramm, M. (2019). 'Gedanke, Sprache und Stil (Kap. 19–22)'. In: Höffe, O. (ed.), *Aristoteles. Poetik*. Berlin, 177–94.
- Schreiner, P. (2011). 'Die enzyklopädische Idee in Byzanz'. In: Van Deun, P.; Macé, C. (eds.), *Encyclopedic Trends in Byzantium?* Leuven, 3–25.
- Schuchardt, H. (1866–1868). *Der Vokalismus des Vulgärlateins*. 3 vols. Leipzig.
- Schuchardt, H. (1900). *Über die Klassifikation der romanischen Mundarten. Probe-Vorlesung gehalten zu Leipzig am 30. April 1870*. Graz.
- Schulze, W. (1892). *Quaestiones epicae*. Gütersloh.
- Schulze, W. (1896). Review of P. Kretschmer, *Die griechischen Vaseninschriften ihrer Sprache nach untersucht* (Gütersloh 1894). *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* 1896, 228–56. (Reprinted in *Kleine Schriften*. Göttingen 1934, 692–717).
- Schwartz, E. (1894). 'Apollodorus no. 61'. *RE* 1.2, 2855–86.
- Schwyzer, E. (1939). *Griechische Grammatik. Allgemeiner Teil, Lautlehre, Wortbildung, Flexion*. Munich.
- Schwyzer, E.; Debrunner, A. (1950). *Griechische Grammatik. Syntax und syntaktische Stilistik*. Munich.
- Scomparin, G. (2024). 'χρεολυτέω (Phryn. *Ecl.* 370)'. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2024/01/027>.
- Ševčenko, I. (1981). 'Levels of Style in Byzantine Prose'. *JÖByz* 3, 289–312.
- Sgobbi, A. (2004). 'Lingua e stile di Senofonte nel giudizio degli antichi'. In: Daverio Rocchi, G.; Cavalli, M. (eds.), *Il Peloponneso di Senofonte*. Milan, 219–55.
- Shapiro, H. A. (2005). 'Autochthony and the Visual Arts in Fifth-Century Athens'. In: Boedecker, D.; Raaflaub, K. A. (eds.), *Democracy, Empire, and the Arts in Fifth-Century Athens*. Cambridge, MA, London, 127–51.
- Sheridan, T. (1761). *A Dissertation on the Causes of the Difficulties Which Occur, in Learning the English Tongue*. London.
- Sickingler, J. P. (2018). 'Nikandros of Thyateira (343)'. *BNJ*². DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1873-5363_bnj2_a343.

- Sider, D. (2020). *Simonides. Epigrams & Elegies. Edited with Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*. Oxford.
- Siebenborn, E. (1976). *Die Lehre von der Sprachrichtigkeit und ihre Kriterien. Studien zur antiken normativen Grammatik*. Amsterdam.
- Sihler, A. L. (1995). *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*. New York, Oxford.
- Silk, M. (2000). 'Aristophanes versus the Rest. Comic Poetry in Old Comedy'. In: Harvey, D.; Wilkins, J. (eds.), *The Rivals of Aristophanes. Studies in Athenian Old Comedy*. London, 299–315.
- Slater, W. J. (1976). 'Aristophanes of Byzantium on the *Pinakes* of Callimachus'. *Phoenix* 30, 234–41.
- Slater, W. J. (1977). Review of Fischer (1974). *Gnomon* 49, 258–62.
- Slater, W. J. (1986). *Aristophanis Byzantii Fragmenta*. Berlin, New York.
- Sluiter, I. (1990). *Ancient Grammar in Context. Contributions to the Study of Ancient Linguistic Thought*. Amsterdam.
- Sluiter, I. (1995). 'The Embarrassment of Imperfection. Galen's Assessment of Hippocrates' Linguistic Merits'. In: Van der Eijk, P.; Horstmanshoff, H. S. J.; Schrijvers, P. H. (eds.), *Ancient Medicine in its Socio-Cultural Context*. Vol. 2. Amsterdam, 519–35.
- Sluiter, I. (1998). 'Metatexts and the Principle of Charity'. In: Schmitter, P.; van der Wal, M. (eds.), *Metahistoriography. Theoretical and Methodological Aspects of the Historiography of Linguistics*. Münster, 11–27.
- Solmsen, F. (1906). Review of W. Prellwitz, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der Griechischen Sprache* (2nd edition. Göttingen 1905). *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift* 24, 752–61.
- Solmsen, F. (1909). *Beiträge zur griechischen Wortforschung. Erster Teil*. Strassburg.
- Sommerstein, A. H. (1977). 'Attic Phonemes' (Review of Teodorsson (1974)). *CR* 27, 60–2.
- Sommerstein, A. H. (2009). *Talking about Laughter and other Studies in Greek Comedy*. Oxford, New York.
- Sommerstein, A. H. (2013). *Menander. Samia (The Woman from Samos)*. Cambridge.
- Sommerstein, A. H. (2015). 'The Politics of Greek Comedy'. In: Revermann, M. (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Comedy*. Cambridge, 291–305.
- Sonnino, M. (2014). 'I frammenti della commedia greca citati da Prisciano e la fonte del lessico sintattico del libro XVIII dell'*Ars*'. In: Martorelli, L. (ed.), *Greco antico nell'occidente carolingio. Frammenti di testi attici nell'Ars di Prisciano*. Hildesheim, Zurich, 163–204.
- Sordi, M. (2000). 'Integrazione, mescolanza, rifiuto nell'Europa antica. Il modello greco e il modello romano'. In: Urso, G. (ed.), *Integrazione, mescolanza, rifiuto. Incontri di popoli, lingue e culture in Europa dall'Antichità all'Umanesimo*. Atti del convegno internazionale, Cividale del Friuli, 21–23 settembre 2000. Rome, 17–26.
- Soverini, L. (1992). 'Parole, voci, gesti del commerciante nella Grecia classica'. *ASNP* s. III 22, 811–84.
- Spanoudakis, K. (2002). *Philitas of Cos*. Leiden.
- Staesche, T. (1883). *De Demetrio Ixione grammatico*. [Ph.D. dissertation]. Halle.
- Stama, F. (2014). *Frinico. Introduzione, Traduzione e Commento*. Heidelberg.
- Stama, F. (2017). 'Per una riedizione della cosiddetta *Mulieris oratio* (= P.Didot, coll. I-III^{r-v} = *Com. Adesp.* fr. 1000 K.-A.)'. *Aegyptus* 97, 3–39.
- Stanford, W. B. (1967). *The Sound of Greek. Studies in the Greek Theory and Practice of Euphony*. Berkeley.
- Stephan, H. (1889). *De Herodiani technici dialectologia*. Strasbourg.
- Stephens, S.; Winkler, J. J. (1995). *Ancient Greek Novels. The Fragments. Introduction, Text, Translation, and Commentary*. Princeton.
- Stevens, P. T. (1976). *Colloquial Expressions in Euripides*. Wiesbaden.

- Stifler, D. W. F. (2019). *Lucian and the Atticists. A Barbarian at the Gates*. [Ph.D. dissertation]. Duke University.
- Storey, I. (2003). *Eupolis. Poet of Old Comedy*. Oxford.
- Strecker, K. (1884). *De Lycophrone, Euphronio, Eratosthene comicorum interpretibus*. [Ph.D. dissertation]. Greifswald.
- Strecker, K. (1891). 'Zu Erotian'. *Hermes* 26, 262–307.
- Striano, A. (2018). 'Koiné, Koiná, Koináí. Are we Talking About the Same Thing?'. In: Giannakis, G. K.; Crespo, E.; Filos, P. (eds.), *Studies in Ancient Greek Dialects. From Central Greece to the Black Sea*. Berlin, Boston, 131–48.
- Strobel, C. (2009). 'The Lexica of the Second Sophistic. Safeguarding Atticism'. In: Georgakopoulou, A.; Silk, M. (eds.), *Standard Languages and Language Standards. Greek, Past and Present*. Farnha, Burlington, 93–107.
- Strobel, C. (2011). *Studies in Atticistic Lexica of the Second and Third Centuries AD*. [Ph.D. dissertation]. University of Oxford.
- Strout, D.; French, R. (1941). 'Phrynichus (n. 8)'. *RE* 20.1, 920–5.
- Sukenik, E. L. (1933). 'Design of the Lectern (ἀναλοῦεῖον) in Ancient Synagogues in Palestine'. *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society*, 222–5.
- Swain, S. (1996). *Hellenism and Empire. Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World AD 50–250*. Oxford.
- Swiggers, P.; Wouters, A. (2002). 'Grammatical Theory in Aristotle's *Poetics* Chapter XX'. In: Swiggers, P.; Wouters, A. (eds.), *Grammatical Theory and Philosophy of Language in Antiquity*. Leuven, 101–20.
- Tacho-Godi, (1965). 'Die Alltagslexik in Menanders *Dyskolos*'. In: Zucker, F. (ed.), *Menanders Dyskolos als Zeugnis seiner Epoche*. Berlin, 85–102.
- Taillardat, T. (1965). *Les images d'Aristophane. Études de langue et de style*. Paris.
- Tammaro, V. (1979). Review of F. Sartori, *Una pagina di storia ateniese in un frammento dei "Demi, eupolidei"* (Rome 1975). *Gnomon* 51, 420–4.
- Taplin, O. (1993). *Comic Angels and Other Approaches to Greek Drama through Vase-Paintings*. Oxford.
- Taplin, O. (2007). *Pots & Plays. Interactions between Tragedy and Greek Vase-Painting of the Fourth Century B.C.* Los Angeles.
- Tarán, L.; Gutas, D. (2012). *Aristotle, Poetics. Editio Maior of the Greek Text with Historical Introductions and Philological Commentaries*. Leiden, Boston.
- Tartaglino, C. (2003). 'Ethos del lamento e ethos simposiale'. In: Nicolai, R. (ed.), *ΠΥΣΜΟΞ. Studi di poesia, metrica e musica greca offerti dagli allievi a Luigi Enrico Rossi per i suoi settant'anni*. Rome, 319–45.
- Telò, M. (2007). *Eupolidis Demi*. Florence.
- Teodorsson, S.-T. (1974). *The Phonemic System of the Attic Dialect 400–340 B.C.* Lund.
- Theodoridis, C. (1976). *Die Fragmente des Grammatikers Philoxenos*. Berlin, New York.
- Theodoridis, C. (1982–2013). *Photii Patriarchae Lexicon*. 3 vols. Berlin, New York.
- Theodoridis, C. (2003). 'Weitere Bemerkungen zum Onomastikon des Iulius Pollux'. *ZPE* 143, 71–8.
- Thesleff, H. (1965). *The Pythagorean Texts of the Hellenistic Period*. Åbo.
- Thomas, G. (1991). *Linguistic Purism*. London.
- Thomas, R. (2001). 'Ethnicity, Genealogy, and Hellenism in Herodotus'. In: Malkin, I. (ed.), *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity*. Cambridge, MA, London, 213–33.
- Thomas, R. (2019). *Polis Histories, Collective Memories and the Greek World*. Cambridge.
- Thompson, D. (2008). 'The Ptolemaic Library Project'. *AAntHung* 48, 67–72.
- Thomson, G. (1939). 'The Postponement of Interrogatives in Attic Drama'. *CQ* 33, 147–52.

- Threatte, L. (1980). *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions*. Vol. 1: *Phonology*. Berlin, New York.
- Threatte, L. (1996). *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions*. Vol. 2: *Morphology*. Berlin, New York.
- Threatte, L. (2007). *The Inscribed Schist Fragments from the Athens Academy Excavations*. Athens.
- Threatte, L. (2020). 'Remarks on the Dual Number in Attic Prose Inscriptions'. In: Rocca, G.; Bevilacqua, G. (eds.), *Gift of a Book. Studi in memoria di David Jordan*. Alessandria, 271–81.
- Thumb, A. (1901). *Die griechische Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus. Beiträge zur Geschichte und Beurteilung der koinḗ*. Strassbourg.
- Thumb, A. (1906). 'Prinzipienfragen der Koine-Forschung'. *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum* 17, 246–63.
- Thumb, A.; Scherer, A. (1959). *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte*. Vol. 2. 2nd edition. Heidelberg.
- Tieken-Boon van Ostade, I. (2020). *Describing Prescriptivism. Usage Guides and Usage Problems in British and American English*. London, New York.
- Tolkiehn, J. (1925). 'Lexikographie'. *RE* 12.2, 2432–82.
- Too, Y. L. (2008). *A Commentary on Isocrates' Antidosis*. Oxford.
- Torchio, M. C. (2021). *Aristofane. Nephelai protai – Proagon (fr. 392–486). Traduzione e commento*. Göttingen.
- Tordoff, R. (2013). 'Actors' Properties in Ancient Greek Drama. An Overview'. In: Harrison, G. W. M.; Liapis, V. (eds.), *Performance in Greek and Roman Theatre*. Leiden, Boston, 89–110.
- Tosi, R. (1987–1988). 'Glosse dell'Agamennone di Eschilo nel lessico di Esichio'. *Museum Criticum* 21–22, 1–27.
- Tosi, R. (1988). *Studi sulla tradizione indiretta dei classici greci*. Bologna.
- Tosi, R. (1990–1993). 'Lexicographica Alexandrina'. *Museum Criticum* 25–28, 297–304.
- Tosi, R. (1994a). 'La lessicografia e la paremiografia'. In: Montanari, F. (ed.), *La philologie grecque à l'époque hellénistique et romaine*. Geneva, 141–97.
- Tosi, R. (1994b). 'Aristoph. Byz. fr. 6 Sl.'. *Eikasmos* 5, 233–5.
- Tosi, R. (1997). 'Osservazioni sul rapporto fra Aristofane di Bisanzio e l'Antiatticista'. In: D'Alessandro, P. (ed.), *ΜΟΥΣΑ. Scritti in onore di Giuseppe Morelli*. Bologna, 171–7.
- Tosi, R. (1998a). 'Appunti sulla filologia di Eratostene, di Cirene'. *Eikasmos* 9, 327–46.
- Tosi, R. (1998b). 'Gli Ateniesi μοιλοῖ. Da Aristofane ad Eratostene'. *SemRom* 1, 123–36.
- Tosi, R. (2006). 'Eratosthenes [2]'. In: Cancik, H.; Schneider, H. (eds.), *Brill Neue Pauly Online*. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1574-9347_bnp_e400790.
- Tosi, R. (2007). 'Polluce. Struttura onomastica e tradizione lessicografica'. In: Bearzot, C; Landucci, F.; Zecchini, G. (eds.), *L'Onomasticon di Giulio Polluce. Tra lessicografia e antiquaria*. Milan, 3–16.
- Tosi, R. (2015). 'Typology of Lexicographical Works'. In: Montanari, F.; Matthaios, S.; Rengakos, A. (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship*. Leiden, Boston, 622–36.
- Tosi, R. (2022). 'Su alcuni frammenti comici greci tramandati dalla lessicografia'. De Poli, M.; Rallo, G. E.; Zimmermann, B. (eds.), *Sub palliolo sordido. Studi sulla commedia frammentaria greca e latina – Studies on Greek and Roman fragmentary comedies*. Göttingen, 39–47.
- Toufexis, N. (2008). 'Diglossia and Register Variation in Medieval Greek'. *BMGs* 32, 203–17.
- Trapp, E. (1993). 'Learned and Vernacular Literature in Byzantium. Dichotomy or Symbiosis?'. *DOP* 47, 115–29.
- Trapp, M. (2017). *Aelius Aristides. Orations*. Vol. 1. Cambridge, MA.
- Trapp, E.; Fatouros, G.; Hörandner, W. (eds.) (1988). *Studien zur byzantinischen Lexikographie*. Vienna.
- Trask, R. L. (2007). *Key Concepts in Language and Linguistics*. 2nd edition. Edited by P. Stockwell. Abingdon.
- Tribulato, O. (2010a). 'Literary Dialects'. In: Bakker, E. J. (ed.), *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*. Chichester, Malden, MA, 388–400.

- Tribulato, O. (2010b). 'Per una 'tipologia' delle lingue scientifiche antiche. Lessico e morfologia nei trattati di botanica di Teofrasto'. In: Putzu, I. et al. (eds.), *La morfologia del greco tra tipologia e diacronia*. Milan, 479–94.
- Tribulato, O. (2014). 'Not even Menander Would Use this Word! Perceptions of Menander's Language in Greek Lexicography'. In: Sommerstein, A. H. (ed.), *Menander in Contexts*. New York, London, 199–214.
- Tribulato, O. (2016a). 'Herodotus' Reception in Ancient Greek Lexicography and Grammar. From the Hellenistic to the Imperial Age'. In: Priestley, J.; Zali, V. (eds.), *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Herodotus in Antiquity and Beyond*. Leiden, Boston, 169–92.
- Tribulato, O. (2016b). 'La lirica corale'. In: Cassio, A. C. (ed.), *Storia delle lingue letterarie greche*. 2nd edition. Florence, 230–59.
- Tribulato, O. (2018). 'Le lettere prefatorie dell'*Onomasticon* di Polluce. Frammenti di un discorso autoriale'. *Lexis* 36, 247–83.
- Tribulato, O. (2019a). 'Making the Case for a Linguistic Investigation of Greek Lexicography. Some Examples from the Byzantine Reception of Atticist Lemmas'. In: Passa, E.; Tribulato, O. (eds.), *The Paths of Greek. Literature, Linguistics and Epigraphy Studies in Honour of A. C. Cassio*. Berlin, Boston, 241–70.
- Tribulato, O. (2019b). 'Lingue letterarie e dialetti nell'esegesi antica'. In: Willi, A. (ed.), *Formes et fonctions des langues littéraires en Grèce ancienne. Neuf exposés suivis de discussions*. Geneva, 359–96.
- Tribulato, O. (2019c). 'Two notes on the Text of Pollux 1.1–5'. *Philologus* 163, 237–49.
- Tribulato, O. (2021a). '(En)listing the Good Authors. The Defence of Greek Linguistic Variety in the *Antiatticist* Lexicon'. In: Wesselmann, K.; Laemmle, R.; Scheidegger Laemmle, C. (eds.), *Lists and Catalogues in Ancient Literature and Beyond. Towards a Poetics of Enumeration*. Berlin, Boston, 169–94.
- Tribulato, O. (2021b). '*Antiatticist* η 6 Valente (ήσυχιος). A Proposal for a Different Textual Arrangement'. *CCJ* 67, 119–34.
- Tribulato, O. (2021c). 'ἀφθόνητος αἴνος. Su tre lemmi pindarici dell'*Antiatticista*'. In: Prodi, E. E.; Vecchiato, S. (eds.), *ΦΑΙΔΙΜΟΣ ΕΚΤΩΠ. Studi in onore di Willy Cingano per il suo 70° compleanno*. Venice, 564–84.
- Tribulato, O. (2021d). 'Sappho's Dialect'. In: Finglass, P.; Kelly, A. (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Sappho*. Cambridge, 135–46.
- Tribulato, O. (2022a). 'Photius, ἀναγράφτος and Atticist lexica'. *CQ* 2022, 914–33.
- Tribulato, O. (2022b). 'ἀληθεστέρως, καταδεστέρως (*Antiatt.* α 39, *Antiatt.* κ 48)'. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2021/01/010>.
- Tribulato, O. (2022c). 'βρέχει (Phryn. *Ecl.* 255)'. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2021/01/030>.
- Tribulato, O. (2022d). 'The Homericness of Herodotus' Language (with a Case-Study on -έειν Aorist Infinitives in the *Histories*)'. In: Matijašić, I. (ed.), *Herodotus—The Most Homeric Historian? (Histos Supplement no. 14)*. Oxford, Edmonton, Tallahassee, 241–85.
- Tribulato, O. (2022e). 'ἀφθονέστερον, ἀρχαιέστερον (*Antiatt.* α 74, *Antiatt.* α 75)'. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2021/01/003>.
- Tribulato, O. (2022f). 'κυνίδιον, κυνάριον (Phryn. *Ecl.* 151, *Antiatt.* κ 87, Phryn. *PS* 84.22)'. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2021/01/025>.
- Tribulato, O. (2022g). 'γυναικίζω, γυναικισμός, γυναικηρός, γυναικάριον (Phryn. *PS* 56.6–7, Phryn. *PS* 55.16, *Antiatt.* γ 10, *Antiatt.* γ 11)'. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2021/01/046>.
- Tribulato, O. (2022h). 'ζωρότερος, εὐζωρος, εὐζωρότερος (Phryn. *Ecl.* 114)'. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2021/01/022>.

- Tribulato, O. (2023a). ‘ἄπαρνος, ἔξαρνος (Phryn. *PS* 11.13, Poll. 5.104)’. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2022/01/006>.
- Tribulato, O. (2023b). ‘αἰκάλλοντες (Phryn. *PS* 36.1–4)’. *DEA*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2022/01/002>.
- Tribulato, O. (2024). “‘Aristophanes with His Chorus”. Citations and Uses of Comedy in the Lexica of Phrynichus Atticista’. In: Favi, F.; Mastellari, V. (eds.), *Treasuries of Literature. Anthologies, Lexica, Scholia and the Indirect Tradition of Classical Texts in the Greek World*. Berlin, Boston, 75–96.
- Tribulato, O. (forthcoming a). ‘Stylistic Terminology in the *Praeparatio Sophistica*’. In: Favi, F.; Pellettieri, A.; Tribulato, O. (eds.) *New Approaches to Phrynichus’ Praeparatio sophistica*. Berlin, Boston.
- Tribulato, O. (forthcoming b). ‘Correctness, Prescriptivism, Purism. The Case of Atticism’. In: Bentein, K.; Cuomo, A. M. (eds.), *Correctness in Comparison*. Turnhout.
- Tribulato, O. (forthcoming c). ‘Sounding Attic in Imperial Inscriptions’. In: Probert, P.; Willi, A. (eds.), *Perceptions and Social Uses of the Ancient Greek Dialects*. Berlin, Boston.
- Tronci, L. (2010). ‘Funzioni, forme, categorie. Una nota su costrutti con verbi in -ίζω’. In: Putzu, I. et al. (eds.), *La morfologia del greco tra tipologia e diacronia*. Milan, 495–511.
- Tronci, L. (2012). ‘Valori differenziali di costrutti con forme verbali in -ίζω’. In: Lorenzetti, L.; Mancini, M. (eds.), *Discontinuità e creolizzazione nella formazione dell’Europa linguistica*. Rome, 273–89.
- Tronci, L. (2013). ‘Identità di forme, diversità di interpretazioni. ελληνίζω, βαρβαρίζω e la lingua come *habitus*’. In: De Rogatis, T. et al. (eds.), *Identità/diversità*. Pisa, 197–207.
- Tronci, L. (2017). ‘Quelques suggestions pour une nouvelle analyse de la diathèse (et du TAM) dans le système du futur en grec ancien’. *BSL* 112, 77–122.
- Troxler, H. (1964). *Sprache und Wortschatz Hesiods*. Zurich.
- Tsantsanoglou, K. (1984). *New Fragments of Greek Literature from the Lexicon of Photius*. Athens.
- Tuci, P. A. (2014). ‘Tre osservazioni sui *Demi* di Eupoli (fr. 17 Telò = 99 Kassel – Austin). La datazione della commedia, l’identificazione del demagogo e la figura di Solone’. *Aevum* 88, 19–35.
- Turner, E. G.; Parsons, P. J. (1987). *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*. London.
- Ucciardello, G. (2005). ‘Sulla tradizione del testo di Ibico’. In: Grandolini, S. (ed.), *Lirica e Teatro in Grecia. Il Testo e la sua ricezione*. Naples, 21–88.
- Ucciardello, G. (2006). ‘Esegesi linguistica, glosse e interpretamenta tra hypomnemata e lessici. Materiali e spunti di riflessione’. In: Avezzù, G.; Scattolin, P. (eds.), *I classici greci e i loro commentatori. Dai papiri ai marginalia rinascimentali*. Rovereto, 35–83.
- Ucciardello, G. (2007). ‘Philemon [1]’. *LGGA*. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2451-9278_Philemon_1.
- Ucciardello, G. (2008). ‘Dionysius [11] Iambus’. *LGGA*. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2451-9278_Dionysius_11_Iambus.
- Ucciardello, G. (2012). *Hypomnemata papiracei e lessicografia. Tra Alessandria e Bisanzio*. Messina.
- Ucciardello, G. (2015). ‘Philemon [3]’. *LGGA*. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2451-9278_Philemon_3_it.
- Ucciardello, G. (2018). ‘Insegnamento della sintassi e strumenti lessicografici in epoca paleologa. Alcuni esempi’. In: Conti Bizzarro, F. (ed.), *ΛΕΞΙΚΟΝ ΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΙΚΗΣ*. Atti della Giornata di lessicografia e grammatica greca (Napoli, 30 maggio 2017). Naples, 97–124.
- Ucciardello, G. (2019a). ‘Atticismo’, excerpta lessicografici e prassi didattiche in età paleologa’. In: Rollo, A.; Zorzi, N. (eds.), *Il greco bizantino di registro alto. Studi linguistici e filologici / High-Register Byzantine Greek. Linguistic and Philological Studies*. Naples, 208–34.
- Ucciardello, G. (2019b). ‘Un misconosciuto frammento del grammatico Ireneo nell’*Ecloga* di Frinico’. *Eikasmos* 30, 171–9.

- Ucciardello, G. (2021). 'Un estratto dal *Philetairos* pseudoerodiano nel Darms. 2773 (con appunti sulla tradizione manoscritta del lessico)'. In: Cantore, R.; Montemurro, F.; Telesca, C. (eds.), *Mira varietas lectionum*. Potenza, 51–80.
- Untermann, J. (1989). 'Zu den Begriffen 'Restsprachen' und 'Trümmersprachen''. In: Beck, H. (ed.), *Germanische Rest- und Trümmersprachen*. Berlin, New York, 15–9.
- Usher, S. (1985). *Dionysius of Halicarnassus. Critical Essays*. Vol. 2. Cambridge, MA.
- Vahlen, J. (1865). *Beiträge zur Aristoteles Poetik*. Vienna.
- Valente, M. (2011). [*Aristotele*], *Economici. Introduzione, testo rivisto, traduzione e commento*. Alessandria.
- Valente, M. (2014). 'Aspetti finanziari dell'egemonia nelle rappresentazioni speculari di Tucidide e Demostene'. *Historikà* 4, 115–41.
- Valente, M. (2015). 'Nicia *oikonomos*. Politica e *oikonomia* nell'Atene del IV secolo'. *Incidenza dell'Antico* 13, 121–37.
- Valente, S. (2005). 'Osservazioni sul glossografo Ameria'. *Eikasmos* 16, 283–91.
- Valente, S. (2009). 'Sul significato di γλωσσηματικῶς in Timeo Sofista'. *ZPE* 170, 65–72.
- Valente, S. (2012). *I lessici a Platone di Timeo Sofista e Pseudo-Didimo*. Berlin.
- Valente, S. (2013a). 'Etymological Dictionaries. From Antiquity to the Byzantine Period'. *EAGLL*. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2214-448X_eagll_COM_00000124.
- Valente, S. (2013b). 'Osservazioni su συνήθεια e χρήσις nell'*Onomastico* di Polluce'. In: Mauduit, C. (ed.), *L'Onomasticon de Pollux. Aspects culturels, rhétoriques et lexicographiques*. Lyon, 147–63.
- Valente, S. (2014). 'Dictionaries of Dialects. From Antiquity to the Byzantine Period'. *EAGLL*. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1163/2214-448X_eagll_COM_00000101.
- Valente, S. (2015a). 'Typology of Grammatical Treatises'. In: Matthaios, S.; Montanari, F.; Rengakos, A. (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship*. Leiden, Boston, 600–21.
- Valente, S. (2015b). *The Antiatticist. Introduction and Critical Edition*. Berlin, Boston.
- Van Beek, L. (2022). 'Greek'. In: Olander, T. (ed.), *The Indo-European Language Family. A Phylogenetic Perspective*. Cambridge, 173–201.
- Van der Ben, N. (1995–1996). 'The meaning of ΓΝΩΜΑ'. *Glotta* 73, 35–55.
- Van der Valk, M. (1963–1964). *Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad*. 2 vols. Leiden.
- Van Emde Boas, E. et al. (eds.) (2019). *The Cambridge Grammar of Classical Greek*. Cambridge.
- Vannicelli, P. (2017). *Erodoto. Le storie*. Vol. 7: *Serse e Leonida*. A cura di Pietro Vannicelli. Testo critico di Aldo Corcella. Traduzione di Giuseppe Nenci. Milan.
- Vannicelli, P. (2019). 'Commerci comici. A proposito di Ermippo fr. 63 K.-A.'. *SemRom* n.s. 8, 165–79.
- Van Rooy, R. (2016). "What is a 'Dialect'?. Some New Perspectives on the History of the Term διάλεκτος and its Interpretations in Ancient Greece and Byzantium'. *Glotta* 92, 244–92.
- Van Rooy, R. (2019). 'Διάλεκτος, *Dialectus*, Dialect. A Word's Curious Journey from Ancient Greek to (Neo-)Latin and Beyond'. *Latomus* 78, 733–77.
- Van Rooy, R. (2020). *Greece's Labyrinth of Language. A Study in the Early Modern Discovery of Dialect Diversity*. Berlin.
- Van Rooy, R. (2021a). 'From Koine to Standard. The Early Modern Origin of a Key Linguistic Term'. *Journal of Historical Sociolinguistics*, 283–302.
- Van Rooy, R. (2021b). *Language or Dialect? The History of a Conceptual Pair*. Oxford.
- van Staden, H. (1992). 'Lexicography in the third century B. C. : Bacchius of Tanagra, Erotian, and Hippocrates'. López-Férez, J. A. (ed.), *Tratados hipocráticos: estudios acerca de su contenido, forma y influencia*. Madrid, 549–69.
- Van Thiel, H. (2014). *Aristarch, Aristophanes Byzantios, Demetrios Ixion, Zenodot. Fragmente zur Ilias gesammelt, neu herausgegeben und kommentiert*. 4 vols. Berlin.

- Vatri, A. (2019). 'Early Dactylic Prose in the History of Greek Prose Rhythm'. In: Passa, E.; Tribulato, O. (eds.), *The Paths of Greek. Literature, Linguistics and Epigraphy. Studies in Honour of Albio Cesare Cassio*. Berlin, Boston, 175–96.
- Vecchiato, R. (2020). 'Osservazioni sui lessici papiracei P.Heid. I 200, P.Berol. inv. 9965 e P.Freib. I 1c'. *ZPE* 216, 12–8.
- Vecchiato, R. (2022). *Eine frühhellenistische Lexikon poetischer und dialektaler Wörter (P.Köln Lexikon)*. Paderborn.
- Vela Tejada, J. (1991). *Estudio sobre la lengua de la Poliorcética de Eneas el Tático*. Zaragoza.
- Vela Tejada, J. (2015). 'Koiné y aticismo. Pautas de análisis lingüístico en Galeno, *De antidotis*'. In: López Férez, J. A. (ed.), *Galeno. Lengua, composición literaria, léxico, estilo*. Madrid, 29–44.
- Vela Tejada, J. (2018). 'Creating Koine. Aineias Tacticus in the History of the Greek Language'. In: Pretzler, M.; Barley, N. (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Aineias Tacticus*. Leiden, Boston, 96–122.
- Vélissaropoulos, J. (1980). *Les nauclères grecs*. Geneva.
- Versteegh, K. (1986). 'Latinitas, Hellenismos, 'Arabiyya''. *Historiographia Linguistica* 13, 425–48.
- Versteegh, K. (2014). *The Arabic Language*. 2nd edition. Edinburgh.
- Vessella, C. (2010). 'Reconstructing Phonologies of Dead Languages. The Case of Late Greek <η>'. *Rivista di Studi Orientali* (n.s.) 84, 257–71.
- Vessella, C. (2012). 'Lettori di Corinna in Egitto'. In: Schubert, P. (ed.), *Actes du 26e Congrès international de papyrologie, Genève, 16–21 août 2010*. Geneva, 809–16.
- Vessella, C. (2016a). 'La prosa'. In: Cassio, A. C. (ed.), *Storia delle lingue letterarie greche*. 2nd edition. Florence, 354–84.
- Vessella, C. (2016b). 'Menandro'. In: Cassio, A. C. (ed.), *Storia delle lingue letterarie greche*. 2nd edition. Florence, 424–33.
- Vessella, C. (2018). *Sophisticated Speakers. Atticistic Pronunciation in the Atticist Lexica*. Berlin, Boston.
- Vierros, M. (2018). 'The Greek of the Petra Papyri'. In: Arjava, A.; Frösén, J.; Kaimio, J. (eds.), *The Petra Papyri V*. Amman, 8–34.
- Vignoles, V. L.; Schwartz, S. J.; Luyckx, K. (2011). 'Introduction. Toward an Integrative View of Identity'. In: Schwartz, S. J.; Luyckx, K.; Vignoles, V. L. (eds.), *Handbook of Identity Theory and Research*. Vol. 1. New York, Dordrecht, 1–27.
- Vikør, L. S. (2010). 'Language Purism in the Nordic Countries'. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 204, 9–30.
- Vitale, M. (1978). *La questione della lingua*. 2nd edition. Palermo.
- Vlassopoulos, K. (2013). *Greeks and Barbarians*. Cambridge.
- Vlassopoulos, K. (2015). 'Ethnicity and Greek History. Re-Examining Our Assumptions'. *BICS* 58, 1–13.
- Von Staden, H. (1997). 'Galen and the "Second Sophistic"'. *BICS* 68, 33–54.
- Wachsmuth, C. (1860). *De Cratete Mallota*. Leipzig.
- Wachter, R. (2007–2008). 'Persephone, the Threshing Maiden'. *Sprache* 47, 163–81.
- Wackernagel, J. (1876). *De pathologiae veterum initiis*. Basel.
- Wackernagel, J. (1885). 'Miscellen zur griechischen Grammatik'. *ZVS* 27, 262–80. (Reprinted in *Kleine Schriften*. Vol. 1. Göttingen 1953, 573–91).
- Wackernagel, J. (1889). 'Das Dehnungsgesetz der griechischen Composita'. *Rektoratsprogramm Basel*, 1–65. (Reprinted in *Kleine Schriften*. Vol. 2. Göttingen 1953, 897–961)
- Wackernagel, J. (1897). 'Vermischte Beiträge zur griechischen Sprachkunde'. *Programm zur Rektoratsfeier der Universität Basel 1897*, 3–62. (Reprinted in *Kleine Schriften*. Vol. 1. Göttingen 1953, 764–823).
- Wackernagel, J. (1907). 'Hellenistica'. *Programm Göttingen*, 3–27. (Reprinted in *Kleine Schriften*. Vol. 2. Göttingen 1953, 1034–58)

- Wahlgren, S. (2010). 'Byzantine Literature and the Classical Past'. In: Bakker, E. J. (ed.), *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*. Chichester, Malden, MA, 527–38.
- Walker, M. D. (2019). 'Aristotle on Wittiness'. In: Destrée, P.; Trivigno, F. V. (eds.), *Laughter, Humor, and Comedy in Ancient Philosophy*. New York, 104–21.
- Walsh, O. (2016). *Linguistic Purism. Language Attitudes in France and Quebec*. Amsterdam.
- Walsh, P. (2009). 'A Study in Reception. The British Debates over Aristophanes' Politics and Influence'. *CRJ* 1, 55–72.
- Wankel, H. (1974). 'Die Rolle der griechischen und lateinischen Epigraphik bei der Erklärung literarischer Texte'. *ZPE* 15, 79–97.
- Watt, J. M. (2013). 'Diminutive Suffixes in the Greek New Testament. A Cross-Linguistic Study'. *Biblical and Ancient Greek Linguistics* 2, 29–74.
- Watts, R. J. (2000). 'Mythical Strands in the Ideology of Prescriptivism'. In: Wright, L. (ed.), *The Development of Standard English 1300–1800. Theories, Descriptions, Conflicts*. Cambridge, 29–48.
- Webster, T. B. L. (1974). *An Introduction to Menander*. Manchester.
- Wegener, C. F. (1836). *De Aula Attalica literarum artiumque faultrice libri sex. Pars prior*. Copenhagen.
- Weiss, M. (2015). 'The Comparative Method'. In: Bownern, C.; Evans, B. (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Historical Linguistics*. Abingdon, New York, 127–45.
- Wellmann, M. (1931). *Hippokratesglossare*. Berlin.
- Wendel, C. (1929). 'Die Überlieferung des Attizisten Moiris'. *Philologus* 84, 179–200.
- Wendel, C. (1932). 'Moiris (n. 2)'. *RE* 15.2, 2501–12.
- Wendel, C. (1938). 'Philemon (13)'. *RE* 19.2, 2150–1.
- Wentzel, G. (1893). Review of C. Boysen, *Lexici Segueriani Συναγωγή λέξεων χρησίων inscripti pars prima* (Marburg, 1891–1892). *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* 1893, 27–46.
- Wentzel, G. (1895a). 'Zu den Atticistischen Glossen in dem Lexikon des Photios'. *Hermes* 30, 367–84.
- Wentzel, G. (1895b). 'Beiträge zur Geschichte der griechischen Lexikographen'. *Sitzungsberichte der königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* 1895, 477–87. (Reprinted in: Latte, K.; Erbse, A. (eds.), *Lexica Graeca Minora*. Hildesheim, 1–11).
- Wentzel, G. (1895c). 'Artemidorus (31)'. *RE* 2a, 1331–2.
- West, M. L. (1969). 'The Sayings of Democritus'. *CR* 83, 142.
- West, M. L. (1985). *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women. Its Nature, Structure, and Origins*. Oxford.
- West, M. L. (2001). *Studies in the Text and Transmission of the Iliad*. Munich.
- West, M. L. (2017). 'Aristophanes of Byzantium's Text of Homer'. *CPh* 112, 20–44.
- Whitmarsh, T. (2001). *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire. The Politics of Imitation*. Oxford.
- Whitmarsh, T. (2005). *The Second Sophistic*. Cambridge.
- Wiater, N. (2011). *The Ideology of Classicism. Language, History, and Identity in Dionysius of Halicarnassus*. Berlin, Boston.
- Wilamowitz, von Moellendorff, U. (1900). 'Asianismus und Atticismus'. *Hermes* 35, 1–52.
- Wilamowitz, von Moellendorf, U. (1909). *Herakles*. Vol. 3. Berlin.
- Wilamowitz, von Moellendorf, U. (1924). *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos*. Vol. 1. Berlin.
- Wilamowitz, von Moellendorf, U. (1925). *Menander. Das Schiedsgericht (Epitrepontes)*. Berlin.
- Wilamowitz, von Moellendorf, U. (1969). *Kleine Schriften*. Vol. 3. Berlin.
- Willi, A. (2002a). 'The Language of Greek Comedy. Introduction and Bibliographical Sketch'. In: Willi, A. (ed.), *The Language of Greek Comedy*. Oxford, 1–32.
- Willi, A. (2002b). 'Languages on Stage. Aristophanic Language, Cultural History, and Athenian Identity'. In: Willi, A. (ed.), *The Language of Greek Comedy*. Oxford, 111–49.

- Willi, A. (2003a). *The Languages of Aristophanes. Aspects of Linguistic Variation in Classical Attic Greek*. Oxford.
- Willi, A. (2003b). 'New Language for a New Comedy. A Linguistic Approach to Aristophanes' "Plutus". *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 49, 40–73.
- Willi, A. (2008). *Sikelismos. Sprache, Literatur und Gesellschaft im griechischen Sizilien (8. – 5. Jh. v. Chr.)*. Basel.
- Willi, A. (2010a). 'Attic as the Language of the Classics'. In: Caragounis, C. C. (ed.), *Greek. A Language in Evolution*. Hildesheim, 101–18.
- Willi, A. (2010b). 'Register variation'. In: Bakker, E. J. (ed.), *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*. Chichester, Malden, MA, 297–310.
- Willi, A. (2010c). 'The Language of Old Comedy'. In: Dobrov, G. W. (ed.), *Brill's Companion to the Study of Greek Comedy*. Leiden, Boston, 471–510.
- Willi, A. (2014). 'Creating 'Classical' Greek. From Fourth-Century Practice to Atticist Theory'. *RFIC* 142, 44–74.
- Willi, A. (2019). 'Der Sprachraum der Tragödie'. In: Willi, A. (ed.), *Formes et fonctions des langues littéraires en Grèce ancienne. Neuf exposés suivis de discussions*. Geneva, 97–131.
- Williams, M. F. (2018). 'Apollodoros of Athens (244)'. *BNJ*. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1873-5363_bnj_a244.
- Wilson, N. G. (1996). *Scholars of Byzantium*. Revised edition. London.
- Wilson, N. G. (2015). *Herodoti Historiae*. 2 vols. Oxford.
- Wilson, N. G. (2017). *From Byzantium to Italy. Greek Studies in the Italian Renaissance*. 2nd edition. London.
- Wilson, P. (2000). *The Athenian Institution of the Khoregia*. Cambridge.
- Winkler, J. J. (1978–1979). 'Callimachus fr. 260. 66 Pf.'. *CW* 72, 237–8.
- Wisse, J. (1995). 'Greeks, Romans, and the Rise of Atticism'. In: Abbenes, J. G. J.; Slings, S. R.; Sluiter, I. (eds.), *Greek Literary Theory after Aristotle. A Collection of Papers in Honour of D.M. Schenkeveld*. Amsterdam, 65–82. (Reprinted in: G. Nagy (ed.), *Greek Literature in the Roman Period and in Late Antiquity*. London 2002, 125–34).
- Wouters, A. (1979). *The Grammatical Papyri from Graeco-Roman Egypt. Contributions to the Study of the 'Ars Grammatica' in Antiquity*. Brussels.
- Wouters, A.; Swiggers, P. (2015). 'Definitions of Grammar'. In: Montanari, F.; Matthaios, S.; Rengakos, A. (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship*. Leiden, Boston, 515–44.
- Young, C.; Gloning, T. (2004). *A History of the German Language Through Texts*. Cambridge.
- Zecchini, G. (2007). 'Polluce e la politica culturale di Commodo'. In: Bearzot, C; Landucci, F.; Zecchini, G. (eds.), *L'Onomasticon di Giulio Polluce. Tra lessicografia e antiquaria*. Milan, 17–26.
- Zini, S. (1938). *Il linguaggio dei personaggi nelle commedie di Menandro*. Florence.
- Zinzi, M. (2014). 'Doric Future in Attic Prose'. In: Bartolotta, A. (ed.), *The Greek Verb. Morphology, Syntax, and Semantics*. Proceedings of the 8th Meeting in Greek Linguistics. Louvain-la-Neuve, Walpole, MA, 317–28.

Index locorum

Ancient authors

Aelianus		<i>Supp.</i>	
fr. 86	513	117	195
Domingo-Forasté		129	195
		776	195
Aelius Aristides (Lenz–Behr)		<i>Fragmenta</i>	
1.14	123	fr. 103	465 n. 75
1.15	502	fr. 226	197
1.328	502 n. 193	fr. 231	465 n. 75
1.326–7	96	fr. 232	469, 470
Aelius Dionysius		fr. 269	469
α 10	279	Agatochles	
α 21	426	<i>BNJ</i> 472 F 10	408
α 43	449	Alcaeus Comicus	
α 91	398	fr. 2	186 n. 167
α 96	466	fr. 32	217, 269
α 160	320	Alcidamas (Muir)	
α 193	428	fr. 11	384
β 16	529	fr. 12	384
β 17	191 n. 175, 195	fr. 13	384
γ 6*	410	Alciphron	
δ 26	470	1.1.4	449 n. 16
δ 31	251	Alexis	
δ 32	251	fr. 23	433 n. 278
ε 22	320	fr. 25.6	484 n. 124
ε 29	235	fr. 65	205
ε 55	441 n. 305	fr. 94	187 n. 168
ε 71	426, 427	fr. 120.3	266
η 10	320	fr. 146	205 n. 219, 206, 229
ι 4	370 n. 52	fr. 148	187 n. 168
κ 11	522 n. 263	fr. 158	483, 484
κ 17	264	fr. 200	187 n. 168
κ 34	362 n. 19	fr. 201.6	292
ο 11	309	fr. 231	452 n. 30
π 2	187 n. 168, 396 n. 141	fr. 263.3	234–5
π 46	304	fr. 320	217–8
σ 26	271 n. 139	Amipsias	
χ 11	298, 300	fr. 3	425
Aeschines		fr. 12.1	217–8
1.161	434 n. 282	fr. 13	335 n. 326
3.172	185	[Ammonius]	
Aeschylus		9	516 n. 244
<i>Pers.</i>		202	430 n. 269, 431,
12	518 n. 251		458, 459
44	469, 471 n. 97, 472	405	506, 508

Amphis		δ 1	315–6 n. 278
fr. 14.1–3	187 n. 168	δ 3	317
fr. 30.11–3	173	δ 8	318, 319
Anacreon (<i>PMG</i>)		δ 10	297
fr. 373.1–2	399	δ 11	317 n. 315
Ananias (West)		δ 19	345
fr. 4	522 n. 264	δ 32	334
Anaxandrides Comicus		δ 47	287
fr. 6	230	δ 48	331
fr. 6.2	344	δ 57	291
fr. 34.15	344	ε 2	316 n. 279
Anaxippus		ε 3	315–6 n. 278
fr. 1.38	206 n. 226	ε 7	337, 338
fr. 1.45	520 n. 257	ε 19	281
[Andocides]		ε 36	290
4	180 n. 146	ε 37	290, 291
4.16	180 n. 146	ε 74	305
4.39	180 n. 146	ε 80	339–40
<i>Anthologia Palatina</i>		ε 96	430, 458 n. 54, 459
6.91.7–8	477 n. 111	ε 100	451 n. 25
7.707.6	244	ε 111	291
<i>Antiatticist</i>		ε 113	346
α 2–3	449	ε 117	336–7
α 4	280, 281	ε 126	291
α 5	281	ε 131	288
α 6	281	ζ 6	299
α 10	327	η 5	275, 483, 484
α 19	522 n. 264	η 14	311
α 63	288	η 17	264
α 74	277	θ 1	261
α 75	277	θ 4	291
α 86	349	θ 21	269
α 99	311, 448 n. 12	ι 3	287
α 122	351	ι 8	286, 287
α 131	237	ι 9	287
β 4	448 n. 12	ι 11	292
β 12	290	κ 9	290
β 37	297	κ 36	362
β 42	288	κ 40	522 n. 264
γ 1	270	κ 55	345
γ 10	291	κ 85	297, 299
γ 11	299	κ 87	297, 299
γ 12	290	κ 104	450
γ 18	268	λ 4	346
γ 19	287	λ 7	346
γ 34	299	λ 11	344 n. 375, 433 n. 278
γ 38	287	λ 16	287

λ 17	323	<i>BNJ</i> 244 FF 223–5	
λ 24	299	<i>BNJ</i> 244 F 224	527
μ 18	297, 453 n. 24	<i>BNJ</i> 244 F 225	527
μ 25	311	<i>BNJ</i> 244 F 240	376 n. 75
μ 41	299	<i>BNJ</i> 244 F 282	528
ν 4	287	<i>BNJ</i> 244 F 283	527, 528
ο 13	209 n. 236	<i>BNJ</i> 244 F 288	407
π 8	287	Apollodorus Carystius	
π 16	287	fr. 32	187 n. 168, 522 n. 264
π 17	288	Apollonius Citiensis	
π 30	291	(Kollesch–Kudlien)	
σ 6	340, 341	<i>Comm. in περι ἄρθρων</i>	
τ 4	345	p. 28.2–14	464
ω 2	244 n. 49	Apollonius Dyscolus	
ω 3	287	<i>GG</i> 2,1.71.22–9	497
Antimachus (Matthews)		<i>GG</i> 2,1.72.16–9	498 n. 177
fr. 26	491 n. 155	<i>GG</i> 2,1.1.110.3–5	436 with n. 290
Antiphanes		<i>GG</i> 2,2.1.2–2.2	71
fr. 46.6	237, 238	<i>GG</i> 2,2.244.12–246.5	498 n. 177
fr. 55	197 n. 202	Apollonius Sophista	
fr. 71.1	206 n. 224	29.21	524
fr. 97	187–9	131.8	513
fr. 169	196–8	[Arcadius] (Roussou)	
fr. 189.8–12	459 n. 56	170.15–7	490
fr. 306	451 n. 25	174.1–4	455 n. 42
Antiphon		195.4–7	507 n. 216
6.14	149 n. 23	237.6	258
fr. 27 Blass–Thalheim	149 n. 23	237.7–8	258
frr. 34–5		Archilochus (West)	
Blass–Thalheim	149 n. 23	fr. 82	525 n. 272
Antiphon Sophista		fr. 224	481
Diels–Kranz 87 B 49	149, 312 n. 266	Aristarchus	
Diels–Kranz 87 B 58	148–9	<i>Fragmenta</i> (Matthaios)	
Diels–Kranz 87 B 61	149	fr. 185 A ¹	491
Diels–Kranz 87 B 76	149	fr. 125 A ¹	497
D 38 Laks–Most	169 n. 103	fr. 125 A ²	498 n. 177
Antisthenes (Prince)		<i>Fragmenta</i> (Muzzolon)	
test. 64D	522 n. 263	fr. 1	488
Apollodorus		fr. 2	488 with n. 147
1.7.1–3	99	fr. 3	488 with n. 144
Apollodorus Atheniensis		fr. 4*	487, 488
<i>BNJ</i> 244 FF 208–12	527	fr. 5	488 with n. 144
<i>BNJ</i> 244 F 213a	527	fr. 6	488
<i>BNJ</i> 244 FF 214–8	527	fr. 7	489
<i>BNJ</i> 244 F 221	376 n. 75, 527	fr. 8	488, 492, 493
<i>BNJ</i> 244 F 222	527	fr. 9*	487, 488 with n. 145
<i>BNJ</i> 244 F 223	527	fr. 10	488 n. 144

fr. 11	488 with n. 143	1309	439
fr. 12	488	1514	428 n. 263
fr. 13	488 n. 143	1669–70	176–7 n. 128
fr. 14	488 nn. 143–4	<i>Ec.</i>	
fr. 15	487 n. 141	391	241 n. 41
fr. 16*	487, 488 n. 144	607	204 n. 218
fr. 17	487 n. 141	929	425 n. 260
fr. 18	488 nn. 143–4	991	476, 477
fr. 19	489	1051	241 n. 41
fr. 20*	487, 488 n. 143	<i>Eq.</i>	
fr. 21	487 n. 142	44	521 n. 260
fr. 22	488 n. 143	139	241 n. 41
fr. 23	487 n. 142	261–3	178 n. 137
fr. 24	487 n. 142	323	427
fr. 25	487 n. 142	487	488, 489,
fr. 26	488 n. 143		490, 493
fr. 27	488 n. 144	507–50	163 n. 74
fr. 28	487 n. 140	581	521 n. 260
fr. 29	488	626–7	173 n. 112
Aristides Quintilianus		631	520
2.13	133	875–80	178, 179
Aristophanes		1375–81	160, 178–9, 180 n. 144
<i>Ach.</i>		<i>Lys.</i>	
32–3	161 n. 63	48	425 n. 260
98–9	151 n. 28	81–4	140
628–64	163 n. 74	1164	530
640	493 n. 164	1207	482 n. 119
679–82	178	<i>Nu.</i>	
685–8	178, 180 n. 144	40	241 n. 41
703–18	178, 180 n. 144	46–8	161 n. 63
704–5	179	135–8	161 n. 63
710–2	179	165	241 n. 41
716	179, 180	202	241 n. 41
729–835	140	317–8	160
741	245	327	258
817	582 n. 119	492–3	161 n. 63
860–954	140	518–27	163 n. 74
898	174	537–62	163 n. 74
1211	272 n. 148	581	521 n. 260
<i>Av.</i>		627–31	161 n. 63
42	489 n. 151	821	238
493–8	161 n. 65	870–3	160, 173
530	530 with n. 289	979–80	179
764–5	176 n. 128	1007	179
990	241 n. 41	1019	178
1018	241 n. 41, 342	1022–3	179
1203	425 n. 259	1150	241 n. 41

Pax

Arg. II a2	421
45–8	140
233	241 n. 41
259	521 n. 260
265	521 n. 260
269	521 n. 260
282	521 n. 260
734–74	163 n. 74
788	511
929–34	140
930–1	189–90 n. 171
1185–6	161 n. 73
1279	204 n. 218

Pl.

55	280
322–5	190, 213–4 n. 252
850	241 n. 41
872	280
1044	262

Ra.

91–104	159
258a–60	513
416–21	176 n. 128
674–85	175 n. 122
900–1	159
1004	205
1028	421
1262	433
1263	433
1297	473
1491–9	159

Th.

146–52	159
159–63	159
870	494 n. 169

V.

36	245
134–5	178
282	241 n. 41
666–8	180 n. 145
686–8	179
713	259
1015–59	163 n. 74
1037–42	178 n. 137
1076	121–2

Fragmenta

fr. 6	190, 191, 215
fr. 68	506 n. 211
fr. 122	234 with n. 50
fr. 195	507
fr. 205	178, 180 with n. 144
fr. 233	370, 371, 372, 373, 375, 376
fr. 238	426 with n. 261
fr. 253	511 n. 229, 512
fr. 258.2	412
fr. 322.3	425 n. 260
fr. 346.2	259
fr. 388	470
fr. 406.2	235 n. 32
fr. 408.1	235–6 with n. 32
fr. 424	178
fr. 496	476 n. 107
fr. 507	187 n. 168
fr. 520.1	493
fr. 558.2	475
fr. 581.6	258
fr. 590	487 n. 136
fr. 603	437 with n. 294
fr. 617	428
fr. 618	428
fr. 706	154 n. 37, 155, 156–64, 171, 178 n. 139

Aristophanes Byzantius (Slater)

fr. 1	450
fr. 3	449
fr. 5	449
fr. 6	451 n. 26, 453 with n. 34, 488 n. 12
fr. 7	450 with nn. 18–20, 455
fr. 8	449
fr. 9	488 n. 12
fr. 11	450 with n. 21, 453
fr. 12	450
fr. 13	450, 453
fr. 14	451 n. 22
fr. 15	452 n. 30, 488 n. 12
fr. 16	453, 488 n. 12
fr. 17	453

- fr. 18 488 n. 12
fr. 19 453, 488 n. 12
fr. 20 488 n. 12
fr. 23 364, 451 n. 26, 456,
488 n. 12
fr. 24 466 n. 81, 488 n. 12
fr. 25 216, 269 n. 136, 453,
454, 488 n. 12, 451
n. 26, 468 n. 87
fr. 26 450
fr. 27 453 with n. 33
fr. 28 488 n. 12
fr. 29 451 n. 26, 488 n. 12
fr. 31 451
fr. 32 451 n. 26, 452 n. 30,
488 n. 12
fr. 33 453
fr. 34 488 n. 12
fr. 35 451 with n. 25
fr. 36 361–2
fr. 47 454
fr. 48 453 n. 37, 454, 468
n. 87
frr. 49–50 454
frr. 55–6 454 n. 40
fr. 103 454
frr. 113–4 505
frr. 115–6 505
fr. 137 505
fr. 232 454, 468 n. 90
fr. 233 454
fr. 235 454
fr. 236 454
fr. 241 460 n. 62
fr. 282 456–7
fr. 337 454 n. 39, 461, 462–
8, 485
fr. 338 461, 469–72, 485
fr. 339 461, 462 n. 70
fr. 340 461, 372–4, 485
fr. 341 461, 474–6, 485
fr. 342 461, 476–7, 485
fr. 343 461, 462 n. 70, 485,
518 n. 252
fr. 344 461, 462 n. 70
fr. 345 477–80, 485
fr. 346 480–83, 485, 511
fr. 347 275 n. 155, 461, 481,
483–5
frr. 348–53 454 with n. 40
fr. 368 460 n. 61
fr. 369 430 with n. 269, 431,
457–60
fr. 374 455 n. 46
fr. 393 488 n. 145, 490, 492
fr. 403 452 n. 32, 467
fr. 404 452 n. 32, 467
fr. 410 422
fr. dub. 418 451 n. 26
fr. nov. (Sandri) 454–5, 512
Aristoteles
Ath. Pol.
56.7 528
HA
353a.31–2 382 n. 97
536b.8–9 382
594b.7 479
Po.
6.1450b.13–5 379 n. 86
20.1456b.20 379
20.1457a.23–4 380 n. 91
21.1457b.1–7 379, 380
21.1458a.18–22.
1459a.16 162–3 n. 71
22.1458a.21–2 381
22.1458a.22–3 386, 387
22.1459a.9–10 381
24.1459b.32–5 381 n. 95
25.1461a.10–5 382
Pol.
1272a.2–3 385 n. 106
1291b.28–30 13 n. 45
1295b.1–3 164 n. 76
Rhet.
1.2.27.1357b.9–10 385 n. 106
2.12.1389a.3
–1389b.12 203–4 n. 216
2.25.1402b.17–20 151 n. 26
3.1.1404a.24–9 151 n. 26
3.2.1404b.1–25 162–3
3.2.1404b.35–7 386
3.2.1404b.8–12 386
3.2.1404b.7 383 n. 102
3.2.1404b.35–7 386

3.3.1406a.6–10	383	9.366d–367a	518 n. 252
3.3.1406b.1–3	381 n. 95	9.382c–d	373
3.5.1407a.19–b10	387	9.387d	477
3.10.1410b.10–3	383 n. 101, 386 n. 110	9.388f–389a	480, 481
<i>S.E.</i>		9.393b	510
165b.20–1	387	9.393e	482
173b.17–174a.16	387 n. 114	9.402b	195 n. 189
182a.14	387 n. 113	9.408f	460 n. 61
<i>Top.</i>		9.410b	460 n. 61
140a.5	383 n. 101, 386 n. 110	10.422e	334
Athenaeus		11.461e–f	515 n. 240
1.13d	403 with n. 175	11.468e	506
1.31e	528	11.468e–f	506 n. 212
2.41d	428	11.469a	506 nn. 211–2
2.50a	508 n. 221	11.472e	399
2.53b–c	528	11.473b	506 with nn. 211–2
3.74b	508 n. 221	11.475c–f	526
3.76a	515 n. 241	11.476f	506 nn. 209 and 212
3.76f	506 with n. 212	11.478e	403 with n. 176
3.77a	454	11.479c	399, 515 n. 241
3.81c–d	515 n. 241	11.480f	403
3.83a	454	11.481d	515 n. 241
3.114a	517 n. 245, 518 n. 252	11.483a	506 with n. 212
3.114d	506 n. 209, 515 n. 241	11.483c	466
3.119b	271	11.485f	515 n. 241
4.140a	423	11.486a	515 n. 241, 395 n. 140
4.176c	525	11.495a	517 n. 245, 518 n. 253
4.176e	525	11.495a–c	519
6.235b	517 n. 245	11.497e	517 n. 245
6.235b–c	518	11.497f	518 n. 253
7.314b	258	11.500b	525
7.320c	515 n. 241	11.501d	423
7.323a–c	188	11.503a	206 n. 223
7.323c	507	11.503c	515 n. 241
7.327b	406	13.555a	419
7.327f	399	13.596a	479
7.329a	412	14.618d	473
8.362a–d	290	14.619b–c	461, 473
8.362b–c	396	14.624c–626a	132
8.364a	430 n. 270	14.640c–d	518 n. 252
8.365d	385 n. 106	14.644f	526
9.366d	517 n. 245	14.646c	503 n. 195, 506 with n. 212, 527
9.366d–367a	520	14.649e	408 n. 196
		14.651c	515 n. 240

14.652e	506 n. 212		
14.652f	506 n. 211		
14.653b	517 n. 245, 518 n. 252, 521		
15.677b	503 n. 195		
15.677c	399		
15.678a	528		
15.678d	503 n. 195		
15.678f	514, 515 n. 240		
15.681f	525		
15.699d–f	526		
Callimachus			
<i>Aet.</i> (Harder)			
fr. 75.34	467 with n. 85		
<i>Hec.</i> (Hollis)			
fr. 42.5	410		
fr. 74.11	410		
fr. 74.25	472, 473, 485		
fr. 127	410		
<i>Fragmenta</i> (Pfeiffer)			
fr. 224	453		
fr. 296	453 n. 37		
fr. 350	411		
fr. 399.2	524		
fr. 404	412		
fr. 406	410, 411, 412		
fr. 412	412		
frr. 414–28	412		
frr. 429–53	410		
frr. 454–6	411		
fr. 543	453 n. 37		
fr. 773	403		
Cantharus			
fr. 5	449		
Choeroboscus			
GG 4,1.142.29–37	134 n. 186		
GG 4,2.86.20	497		
Cicero			
<i>Att.</i>			
6.1.18	420		
<i>Or.</i>			
79	386		
Clearchus (Wehrli)			
fr. 111	395 with n. 139, 396		
fr. 112	395 with n. 140, 396		
Clemens Alexandrinus			
<i>Strom.</i>			
1.16.79.3		415 n. 224, 418	
1.20.98.1		197 n. 200	
1.117.2		497 n. 175	
Cleitarchus			
<i>BNJ</i> ² 343 F 16		395 n. 140	
Comica <i>adespota</i> (PCG)			
fr. *79		458	
fr. *170		425 n. 270	
fr. 182		454	
fr. 249		458	
fr. 1035.18		272 n. 148	
fr. *1110.17		244 n. 49	
Corinna (PMG)			
fr. 657		230	
fr. 664		174	
Crates Comicus			
fr. 34.2		475	
Crates Grammaticus (Broggiato)			
fr. 36		435 n. 284	
fr. 51		403 n. 177	
fr. 106		518 n. 252	
fr. 107		518	
fr. 108		518 n. 253, 519	
fr. 109		518 n. 252, 521	
fr. 110		518 n. 253	
fr. 111		517 n. 245, 518 n. 252, 520	
fr. 112		518 n. 252	
fr. 119		521	
fr. 121*		518 n. 252	
Crates Historicus			
<i>BNJ</i> ² 362 F 2		517 n. 250	
<i>BNJ</i> ² 362 F 3a		518 n. 252	
<i>BNJ</i> ² 362 F 3b		518 n. 252	
<i>BNJ</i> ² 362 FF 6–9		517	
<i>BNJ</i> ² 362 F 6		518 n. 252	
<i>BNJ</i> ² 362 F 7		518	
<i>BNJ</i> ² 362 F 8		518 n. 253, 519	
<i>BNJ</i> ² 362 F 9		518 n. 252, 521	
<i>BNJ</i> ² 362 F 10		518 n. 253	
<i>BNJ</i> ² 362 F 11		520	
<i>BNJ</i> ² 362 F 12		518 n. 252	
<i>BNJ</i> ² 362 F 13		521	

Cratinus			
fr. 54	424		
fr. 105.2–3	160		
fr. 112	308		
fr. 298	244 n. 49		
fr. 335	530		
fr. 372	422		
Critias (Diels–Kranz)			
88 B 34	466		
Ctesias			
<i>FGrHist</i> 688 T 10	219		
<i>FGrHist</i> 688 T 13	219		
Demetrius Ixion (Staesche)			
fr. 25	512		
fr. 26	513 with n. 237		
fr. 27	491 n. 155, 513 n. 236		
fr. 39	509		
fr. 40	482, 510, 512, 514		
fr. 41	508 n. 221		
fr. 42	508 n. 221		
Democritus (Diels–Kranz)			
68 B 29	464		
Demosthenes			
18.49	337, 338		
18.127–8	185		
19.337–40	185		
21.71	440		
21.147	440		
27.15	528		
37.12	337, 338		
45.30	185–6		
45.73	186		
45.81	186		
54.3	338		
55.9	338		
56.3	453		
57.18–9	185 n. 163		
[Demosthenes]			
35.20	469, 470 with n. 94, 471		
35.34	469, 470 with n. 94, 471		
Didymus (Coward–Prodi)			
fr. 47	514 n. 238		
[Didymus]			
<i>De dubiis apud Platonem lectionibus</i> (Valente)			
20	428		
Dinarchus (Conomis)			
<i>Or.</i> 3, fr. 3*	526 n. 278		
fr. 3.3	515 n. 240, 526		
Dio Chrysostomus			
12.66	501 n. 189		
18.14–7	212 n. 247		
53.1.8–10	378		
Diodorus Siculus			
4.57–8	113 n. 90		
Diogenes Babylonius			
fr. 20 <i>SVF</i> III	382 with n. 99		
fr. 24 <i>SVF</i> III	387 n. 114, 390		
Diogenes Laertius			
3.61–2	452 n. 32, 467		
5.87	495		
7.5	416 n. 230		
7.56	390		
7.59	382, 387 n. 114, 390		
10.13	452 n. 32, 467		
Diogenianus			
5.36	425		
Dionysius Halicarnassensis (Usener–Radermacher)			
<i>Antiquitates Romanae</i>			
1.89–90	126		
<i>Comp.</i>			
3, p. 9.17–12.3	15		
3, p. 12.4–15.2	15		
22, p. 99.2–5	15		
3, p. 11.14–9	376 n. 76		
<i>Lys.</i>			
3, p. 12.2	137		
<i>Orat.vett.</i>			
1–3, p. 3–6	14 n. 50		
1–3, p. 3–6	14 n. 50		
<i>Pomp.</i>			
3.2, p. 233.2–3	15		
3.16, p. 239.5–8	15		
3.16, p. 239.8–9	132		
3.16, p. 239.8–10	15		
<i>Thuc.</i>			
5–6, p. 330–3	127		
23, p. 360.12–24	15		
24, p. 360.25–364.2	15		
23–4, p. 359–64	127		

Dionysius Thrax		fr. 18	422, 438–9
GG 1,1.5.1	366	fr. 22	427
GG 1,1.5.1–6.3	367	fr. 25	416 n. 230, 423
fr. 47 Linke	496 n. 174	fr. 26	423
Dioscorides		fr. 29*	422
<i>Materia medica</i> I		fr. 35	434 n. 282, 435, 436–8
Prol. 3.7–9	405 n. 184		
Diphilus		fr. 37	423
fr. 14.3–5	235	fr. 38	421
fr. 39	187 n. 168	fr. 39	417
fr. 49	229–30 n. 8	fr. 43	423, 441 n. 309
fr. 80	518 n. 252	fr. 46	429–33, 459 n. 55
fr. 81	187 n. 168	fr. 47	416 n. 230, 426
fr. 121	187 n. 168	fr. 48	420
Duris		fr. 52	427
<i>BNJ</i> 76 F 73	420 n. 251	fr. 55	424
		fr. 59*	422
Ephippus		fr. 60	417
fr. 5.16	465 n. 78	fr. 63	424
Epicharmus		fr. 68	424
fr. 14	474 n. 101	fr. 70	421 n. 257, 440–1
fr. 22	522 n. 264	fr. 74	424, 425
fr. 30	206	fr. 75	428, 440
fr. 69.2	396	fr. 80	422
fr. 73	481	fr. 81	424
fr. 130	524	fr. 82	434 n. 281
[Epicharmus]		fr. 89	422
fr. *295.3–4	199–200 n. 205	fr. 90*	422
Epicrates		fr. 91	416 n. 230, 422
fr. 8.2–3	231–2	fr. 92	428
fr. 10.6–7	231–2	fr. 93	423, 429–33, 459 n. 55
<i>Epimerismi Homerici</i> (Dyck)		fr. 97	421
ι 13	403 with n. 177	fr. 109	416 n. 230, 421
τ 55	436	fr. 121	424
Epinius		fr. 125	422, 424
fr. 1	220 n. 279	fr. 136	423
Eratosth. (Strecker)		fr. 149	423, 433–5
fr. 1*	426	fr. 152	424
fr. 2*	426	<i>Fragmenta nova</i>	
fr. 3	421	fr. 20 Broggiato	424–5
fr. 6	422	fr. 20 Bagordo	425
fr. 7	421	fr. sine numero	
fr. 9	423	Broggiato	425–6
fr. 11	416 n. 230, 423, 441–2	Erotianus	
fr. 16	422, 425	α 103	463
fr. 17	417	α 142	461
		θ 6	462 n. 70

κ 65	476	fr. 84.2	522 n. 264
φ 17	462 n. 70	fr. 88.2	475
χ 4	461	fr. 99	176 e n. 125
fr. 17	475	fr. 99.23	173 n. 112
<i>Etymologicum Genuinum</i>		fr. 99.23–9	175–80
α 184	233	fr. 99.25	155, 175–80
α 515	410	fr. 99.26–8	177–8
α 613	466, 467 with n. 85	fr. *104	178 n. 139
α 805	439 n. 300	fr. 107	509
α 1495	493 n. 163	fr. *116	178 n. 139
β 129	530	fr. 159.2	475
λ 84	506 n. 213	fr. 327.3	458
<i>Et.Gen. (A) 113r–v,</i>		fr. 392.2	429
<i>(B) 83r s.v. δραξίων</i>	422	fr. 393	244 n. 49
<i>Et.Gen. (A) 165v,</i>		Euripides	
<i>(B) 125v s.v. ἦ δ' ὄς</i>	427	<i>Alc.</i>	
<i>Et.Gen. (A) 213v–214r,</i>		780	307
<i>(B) 168r s.v. κύρβεις</i>	422	<i>Cyc.</i>	
<i>Etymologicum Gudianum</i>		104	451
171.17–9	424	<i>HF</i>	
248.13	398	348–9	472, 473, 474
<i>Etymologicum Magnum</i>		<i>Hipp.</i>	
18.28	469	1197	429 with n. 265, 430 with n. 272
31.50	233	<i>Ion</i>	
81.9–5	466	57–75	99 n. 30
99.14–25	439 n. 300	469–71	122
278.7	470	590	121
280.30–5	437	673	122
286.33–7	423	1333	122
416.31–8	427	1589–94	99 n. 30
470.257	473 n. 98	<i>IT</i>	
538.5	477	1409	429 n. 265
538.8	477	<i>Or.</i>	
547.45–58	422	863	242
808.14–5	479	<i>Supp.</i>	
Eubulus		238–45	164
fr. 10	362	240–3	180 n. 145
fr. *17	186–7 n. 167	<i>Fragmenta</i>	
fr. 67.5	241–2 n. 42	fr. 360.7	121
fr. 96	475	fr. 447	469, 471
fr. 115.13	241–2	fr. 727c.29–30	429 n. 265
Euphro		[Euripides]	
fr. 3	204–7	<i>Rh.</i> 741	469, 472
Eupolis		Eustathius	
fr. 19	178 n. 137	<i>in Il.</i>	
fr. 37	241 n. 41	1.14.11–2	138
fr. *60	464, 467 n. 85		

δ 13	416 n. 230, 422	GG 3,2.9.10–4	480, 481
δ 69	469, 470	GG 3,2.13.1	481
ε 100	441 with n. 307	GG 3,2.13.14–7	461, 483
θ 33	514 n. 238	GG 3,2.20.18–20	490
μ 14	514, 515 n. 240	GG 3,2.236.16	497
μ 16	416 n. 230, 422	GG 3,2.281.4–6	370 n. 52
μ 25	416 n. 230, 423, 429, 459 n. 55	GG 3,2.295.13–9 GG 3,2.357.6–7	424 134 n. 185
ξ 4	514	GG 3,2.387.5	439 n. 300
ο 19	517	GG 3,2.453.10	427
π 96	462 n. 70, 518 n. 252	GG 3,2.453.20	427
σ 18	528	GG 3,2.471.3	483
τ 29	514	GG 3,2.495.29–30	426
Hecataeus Milesius		GG 3,2.939.32–40.4	507 n. 216
<i>FGrHist</i> 1 F 16	99 n. 30	GG 3,2.946.3–6	528
Hegesander (Müller)		fr. 52 Hunger	507
fr. 31	385 n. 106	fr. 53 Hunger	506 n. 208, 507
Heracleo Grammaticus (Berndt)		[Herodianus]	
fr. 7	206 n. 223	<i>Philetaerus</i>	
Heraclides Criticus		18	276
<i>BNJ</i> ² 369A F 3.2	388 n. 118	29	261
<i>BNJ</i> ² 369A F 3.5	388 n. 118	44	251
<i>BNJ</i> ² 369A F 3.7	200 n. 206	47	297
Heraclides Milesius (Cohn)		90	313
fr. 50	522 n. 264	106	287
fr. 60	247	194	299
Heraclides Ponticus (Wehrli)		216	299
fr. 22	395	217	299
fr. 163	132–3	225	252
Herennius Philo (Palmieri)		226	299
<i>Diff. sign.</i>		230	331
81	430 n. 269, 431, 458	257	433 n. 278
169	424	276	332
Hermippus		282	301
fr. 2	427	283	299
fr. 63	166	297	278
fr. 69.2	258	304	209–10 n. 236
Hermogenes		<i>Soloe.</i>	
<i>Id.</i> 336	132	[1] 1.1–12 Sandri	71
Herodianus		311.5 Nauck	499 n. 182
GG 3,1.140.4–6	490 n. 152	Herodotus	
GG 3,1.253.7	258	1.56.2–57.3	118
GG 3,1.255.15–6	258	1.57–8	203 n. 213
GG 3,1.340.9–10	130 n. 168	1.57.3	118–9
GG 3,1.377.20	507	1.133.4	197
GG 3,1.430.18–9	265 n. 119	1.143.3	139 n. 199
		1.146.1–2	116 n. 109

1.147.2	116	π 513	421
3.98.3–4	166 n. 84	π 665	519
4.192.3	195	π 3175	454 n. 41
4.199.1	195	ρ 143	522
7.161.3	115–6, 121	σ 1669	522 n. 265
8.144.2	91, 99–100, 101, 118	τ 1134	195
Hesiodus		φ 311	449 n. 16
<i>Op.</i>		χ 244	479
199	438	χ 245	479
618–94	170	ψ 264	206 n. 223
[Hesiodus] (Merkelbach–West)		Hippocrates	
frr. 9–10a	111–2	<i>Art.</i>	
Hesychius		7 (= 4.88.19 Littré)	465 n. 73
praef. 1–51	72–3	<i>Epid.</i>	
α 962	516	5.7 (= 5.208.2 Littré)	469, 475
α 1144	469	5.74 (= 5.246.13 and	
α 3536	465 n. 75, 466, 467, 468	5.404.9 Littré)	469
α 4213	466	7.36 (= 5.404.9	
α 4240	442 n. 312	Littré)	469
α 4549	440 n. 303	<i>Mul.</i>	
α 7273	425	1.8 (= 8.34.21 Littré)	475
α 7444	440 n. 303	1.11 (= 8.42.15 Littré)	150 n. 24
α 8804	493 n. 164	2.118	
β 671	529	(= 8.256.13 Littré)	477
β 945	195 n. 189	<i>Nat.puer.</i>	
β 1152	422	12 (= 7.488.3 Littré)	478
β 1156	422	<i>Steril.</i>	
δ 205	401, 406	222 (= 8.430.1 Littré)	477
δ 2043	436 n. 287	Hipponax (West)	
δ 3417	398	fr. 104.47	522 n. 264
ε 1590	424	Homerus	
ε 2482	489 n. 147	<i>Il.</i>	
ε 2485	489 n. 147	1.423–4	491, 493
ι 600	473 n. 98	1.567	402
κ 788	522 n. 263	2.89	401
κ 1985	479	2.207	471 with n. 97
κ 2313	479	8.441	467
κ 2546	397 n. 151	10.364	434 n. 282, 435
κ 2804	477	11.754	436, 437
κ 2862	531	13.130	489
κ 3886–7	476	13.346	436
κ 3899	477	14.398	408
λ 541	505	15.197	485
μ 351	422	15.479	489
ο 1410	412	18.570	474 with n. 101
		18.583	436
		23.34	403 with n. 176

24.247	471 with n. 97	<i>BNJ</i> 334 F 39	504
<i>Od.</i>		<i>BNJ</i> 334 FF 40–2	504
3.44	400	<i>BNJ</i> 334 FF 43–6	504
4.96	513	<i>BNJ</i> 334 F 47	504
13.207	514 n. 237	<i>BNJ</i> 334 F 62	398
14.530	404 with n. 178		
19.28	482 n. 119	Lucianus	
19.218	150 n. 24	<i>Iud.Voc.</i>	
20.149	525	9	206 n. 224
Horapollon		<i>Sol.</i>	
<i>Hieroglyphica</i> 1.38	477 n. 111	7	434 n. 279, 435
Hyperides (Jensen)		8.7–13	335 n. 326
fr. 42	453	Lycophron	
fr. 97	440	<i>Alexandra</i>	
		21	453
Iohannes Philoponus		<i>Testimonia</i> (Pellettieri)	
<i>Praecepta tonica</i> 89		test. 6a–d	419 n. 246
Xenis	265 n. 119	<i>Fragmenta</i> (Pellettieri)	
Ion Chius		fr. 1	419
<i>TrGF</i> 19 F 10	518 n. 253, 519	fr. 2	419
<i>TrGF</i> 19 F 25	364	fr. 4	423
Irenaeus Grammaticus (Haupt)		fr. 7	424
fr. 1–3	511 n. 231	fr. 8	423, 441 n. 309
Isaeus		fr. 9	424
4.7	437 n. 295	fr. 10	424
Isocrates		fr. 11	424
4.24	121	fr. 13	421
4.46	119	fr. 15	423
4.46–50	119	fr. dub. 21	422
4.47	119	fr. dub. 28	424
4.49	119	fr. dub. 36	422
4.50	10, 119–20, 203	Lycophron Sophista (Diels–Kranz)	
8.14	183 n. 157	83 A 5	384
12.124	121	Lysias	
12.246	451 n. 22, 453	2.17	121
15.281–4	450	Lysanias (Dettori)	
15.295–6	202–4	test. 1	524
Ister		fr. 5–8	524
<i>BNJ</i> 334 T 6	503	fr. 11	524
<i>BNJ</i> 334 F 2a	504 n. 198		
<i>BNJ</i> 334 F 3	504 n. 198	Menander	
<i>BNJ</i> 334 F 5	504 n. 198	<i>Asp.</i>	
<i>BNJ</i> 334 F 9	504 n. 198	40–4	195–6
<i>BNJ</i> 334 F 13	504 n. 198	<i>Dysc.</i>	
<i>BNJ</i> 334 F 14	504 n. 198	50	458
<i>BNJ</i> 334 F 15	504 n. 198	52	458
<i>BNJ</i> 334 F 23	504–5	230	242–3 n. 47

496	242–3 n. 47	α 32	314
568	242	α 36	328
<i>Epit.</i>		α 43	320
807	346	α 52	349
<i>Leuc.</i>		α 53	349
5	259, 260	α 54	349
<i>Pc.</i>		α 67	260
4–6	194 n. 187	α 70	334
155	429 n. 265	α 75	275
232–4	194 n. 188	α 81	330
<i>Phasm.</i>		α 83	330
80	189	α 85	291
<i>Sam.</i>		α 92	524
792	215 n. 258	α 100	290
<i>Sic.</i>		α 115	440 n. 303
169	241, 242	α 135	516 n. 244
269	314 n. 273	α 149	209–10 n. 236
<i>Testimonia</i>		α 151	258
41.13 = Ἀλαεῖς test. i 241		β 5	305
<i>Fragmenta</i>		β 33	330
fr. 125.4	322	β 36	330
fr. 229	192–4	β 37	331
fr. 296.16	276	β 40	326
fr. 320	450	γ 23	290
fr. 330	189–90	γ 24	328
fr. 455	450 n. 20	δ 10	315–6 n. 278, 316
fr. *457	217, 269		n. 279
fr. 468.2	449 n. 16	δ 16	326
fr. 491	250 n. 69	δ 18	340
fr. 499	247	δ 19	331
fr. 528	187 n. 168	δ 21	316 n. 279
fr. 572	552 n. 264	δ 29	320
fr. 614	190–1, 215	δ 33	208 n. 230
fr. 672	235–6 n. 32, 243–4	δ 44	327–8 n. 315
<i>Metagenes</i>		δ 48	269
fr. 16.2	258	ε 9	291
<i>Mnesimachus</i>		ε 11	458 n. 54
fr. 4.49	482 n. 121	ε 39	208 n. 230
fr. 8.3–4	238	ε 53	441 n. 309
<i>Moeris</i>		ε 65	314
α 4	249	ζ 1	320
α 12	266–7	ζ 8	320
α 13	266–7	η 1	305 n. 240
α 20	320	η 3	337
α 24	328	η 4	305 n. 239, 310 n. 261
α 27	313	η 5	315
α 31	233	η 8	317

η 10	275	χ 4	262
η 21	326	χ 26	273
η 22	311	χ 28	262
θ 6	258	χ 34	300, 301
θ 7	330	ω 4	290
θ 15	288	Moschio	
θ 18	276	<i>TrGF</i> 97 F 6.9	398
ι 1	472, 474	Nicander	
ι 4	267	<i>Th.</i> 752	478
ι 12	292	fr. 133 Schneider	401 n. 165, 407
ι 17	319	Nicander Thyatirius	
ι 18	267	<i>BNJ</i> ² 343 F 1	514 n. 238
ι 22	307	<i>BNJ</i> ² 343 F 3	526 n. 278
κ 18	264 n. 113	<i>BNJ</i> ² 343 F 4	515 n. 240
κ 41	531	<i>BNJ</i> ² 343 F 5	515 n. 240, 514 n. 238
κ 46	234	<i>BNJ</i> ² 343 F 6	514, 515 n. 240
κ 49	313	<i>BNJ</i> ² 343 F 7	514, 515 n. 240
ν 1	260–1	<i>BNJ</i> ² 343 F 8	515 n. 241
ν 2	249	<i>BNJ</i> ² 343 F 9	515 n. 241
ν 16	520	<i>BNJ</i> ² 343 F 10	515 n. 241
ο 8	330	<i>BNJ</i> ² 343 F 11	515 n. 241
ο 15	320	<i>BNJ</i> ² 343 F 12	515 n. 240
ο 24	307, 309	<i>BNJ</i> ² 343 F 13	515 n. 241
ο 27	261–2	<i>BNJ</i> ² 343 F 14	515 n. 241
π 2	330	<i>BNJ</i> ² 343 F 15	515 n. 241
π 3	330	<i>BNJ</i> ² 343 F 16	395 n. 140, 515 n. 241
π 6	261	<i>BNJ</i> ² 343 F 17	515 n. 241
π 55	261	<i>BNJ</i> ² 343 F 18	515 n. 240
π 56	300, 301	<i>BNJ</i> ² 343 F 19	515 n. 240
π 62	299	<i>BNJ</i> ² 343 F 20	516
π 64	332	Nicophon	
π 83	261	fr. 9	481
π 85	316	fr. 14	188
ρ 5	320	Nonnus	
ρ 8	258	<i>Dion.</i>	
σ 1	270	26.63	479
σ 20	299	Orus	
σ 23	269	fr. A 6a	315–6 n. 278, 317, 335
σ 25	208 n. 230	fr. A 6b	318, 335
σ 34	270–1	fr. A 16a	321
τ 3	450	fr. A 16b	321
τ 7	276	fr. A 57	313
τ 14	257	fr. A 66	261
τ 16	328	fr. A 81	245
τ 20	271	fr. B 1	290
φ 29	231 n. 12		
χ 3	262		

fr. B 4b	449	fr. 113	431, 432 n. 279
fr. B 7	351	fr. 113.18	216 n. 264
fr. B 10	261	fr. 116	429
fr. B 26	261	fr. 138	160
fr. B 34	328	fr. 153	431
fr. B 35	333, 334	fr. 160	481
fr. B 36	320	fr. 161.2	428
fr. B 79	331	fr. 162	431
fr. B 115	267	fr. 165	440
fr. B 126	262	fr. 167	526
fr. B 132	267	fr. 169.2	259
fr. B 148	271 n. 139	fr. 172	424
		fr. 206	269
Pamphilus		fr. 211	217 n. 270
fr. 549.1 <i>SH</i>	482 n. 121	fr. 215	265
Parmenon (Dettori)		Philemo Comicus	
fr. 1	524	fr. 6.1–2	189–90 n. 171
fr. 2	525	fr. 45	187 n. 168, 308
fr. 4	525	fr. 52	195, 196
fr. 5	525	fr. 69	449
Pausanias		fr. 90	518 n. 253
2.4.7	195	fr. 115.3–4	237, 238
8.12.1	425	fr. 115.4	197
Pausanias Atticista		fr. 127.2–3	259, 260
α 89	504 with n. 203	fr. 130	191 n. 175, 194–6, 220 n. 282
α 151	425	fr. 186	515 n. 240
α 152	425	Philemo Grammaticus	
α 153	425	(Laur.) 354	
α 158	439 n. 301	(ἀποφοιτήσομαι)	330
β 14	191 n. 175, 195	(Laur.) 354 (ἀφείλετο)	321
*δ 15	470	(Laur.) 355	
ε 25	362 n. 19	(ἀπολαύσομαι)	330
ο 16	398	(Laur.) 355	
Pherecrates		(ἀνοιγνύουσι)	320
fr. 2	160	(Laur.) 355 (Ἀτρέα)	267
fr. 24	449	(Laur.) 356 (ἄθροος)	262
fr. 39	241 n. 41	(Laur.) 356	
fr. 40	431	(βορᾶς, βορέας)	262
fr. 70	160	(Laur.) 358 (γῆμαι)	325
fr. 71	431	(Laur.) 358 (δικροῦν)	262
fr. 74	506 n. 211	(Laur.) 359	
fr. 75	431	(δεδιακόνηκα)	315–6 n. 278
fr. 81	193 n. 184	(Laur.) 359 (δείκνυμι)	320
fr. 86	527, 528	(Laur.) 359	
fr. 96	269, 270	(δρῦς, δρύες)	264
fr. 107	245	(Vindob.) 392.5	320
fr. 110	482 n. 119		

(Vindob.) 392.7	330		
(Vindob.) 393.8	320		
(Vindob.) 393.11	398		
(Vindob.) 393.17–20	340		
(Vindob.) 394.8	268		
(Vindob.) 394.10	315		
(Vindob.) 394.14	320		
(Vindob.) 394.16	258		
(Vindob.) 394.34	330		
(Vindob.) 395.6	258		
(Vindob.) 395.28	331		
(Vindob.) 396.28	262		
Philippides			
fr. 2	217, 269		
fr. 20	518 n. 252		
fr. 37	187 n. 168		
Philitas (Dettori)			
fr. 2	395		
fr. 3	398		
fr. 4	395		
fr. 5	397		
fr. 7	397		
fr. 9	397		
fr. 10	398		
fr. 12	398		
fr. 14	398		
fr. 16	398		
fr. 17	398		
fr. 18	398		
Philo Iudaeus			
<i>De cherub.</i> 36	469		
<i>De spec. leg.</i> 4.200	469		
<i>De post. Cain.</i> 183	470		
Philodemus			
<i>Po.</i> (Janko)			
1.100.7–15	388 n. 120		
1.181.12–4	137		
2.180.20–181.1	388 n. 120		
2.185.13–26	388 n. 120		
Philostratus			
VS			
1.481	16		
1.513	133		
1.514	132		
1.519	132		
Philoxenus Lyricus (PMG)			
fr. 836b.22	230		
Philoxenus Grammaticus (Theodoridis)			
fr. 2	131 n. 169		
fr. *38	466		
fr. *337a–b	278 n. 164		
Philyllius			
fr. 6	524		
fr. 8	509		
fr. 29	421		
Photius			
<i>Amphilochia</i>			
24.238–9	233		
<i>Bibl.</i>			
cod. 72.45a.5–19	219		
cod. 72.45a.20–1	219		
cod. 158.100a–101a	85		
cod. 158.100a.33	81 n. 70		
cod. 279.30–2	523 n. 265		
cod. 279.533b.25–8	210 n. 240		
<i>Ep.</i>			
242.11	522 n. 264		
<i>Lex.</i>			
α 123	290		
α 184	209–10 n. 236		
α 320	516		
α 466	432 n. 276, 449		
	with n. 15		
α 789	351		
α 975	265 n. 119		
α 1173–4	466		
α 1232	504 nn. 201 and 203		
α 1305	261		
α 1905	318		
α 1984	298		
α 2176	261		
α 2523	327		
α 2524	327		
α 2526	327		
α 2530	328		
α 2552	320		
α 3407	493 n. 163		
β 160	529		
δ 344	526		
δ 644	470		
δ 645	470		

ε 100	425	19	315–6 n. 278
ε 194	441 n. 309	22	332
ε 483	441 with n. 308	24	37
ε 1427	338	26	237
ε 2185	430 n. 268, 459 n. 59	27 42	87 n. 94 340
ε 2203	423, 429, 459 n. 55	45	434 n. 279, 435
ε 2227	416 n. 230, 426, 427	50	187 n. 168, 297, 300, 396 n. 141
ε 2530	338		
ε 2535	209–10 n. 236	52	276
η 8	424	55	525
η 51	427	56	87 n. 94
η 198	320	61	297
η 200	317	62	209–10 n. 236, 277
η 250	334	64	39
θ 117	331	65	279
κ 509	164 n. 113	78	327
κ 518	479	79	327
κ 753	522 n. 265	84	292
κ 754	531	90	208 n. 231
κ 1051	522 n. 264	93	209–10 n. 236
κ 1083	477	101	77
κ 1210	517 n. 250	110	310
μ 129	422	113	37, 429, 430 n. 267, 458 n. 54, 459 with n. 58
ο 46	167		
ο 150	309		
ο 318	398	114	277–8
ο 531	511 n. 229	118	305 n. 239
ο 558	412	119	338
ο 566	262	127	267, 269
π 26	187 n. 168, 396 n. 141	128 140	335 n. 326 43, n. 179
π 297	519	141	41
π 809	267	143	531
π 997	304	146	441 with n. 306
π 1255	518 n. 252	147	298–9
σ 307	522 n. 264	151	297, 299
σ 377	271 n. 139	154	320
σ 498	424	164	362 n. 19
σ 503	291	165	77
Phrynichus Atticista		172	346
<i>Ecl.</i>		176	81
praef. 1–16	69	178	261
praef. 4	86	180	252
praef. 10	86	181	252
7	41	191	237
13	257	200	39, 57

205	251	<i>PS</i>	
206	306	6.18–9	297
210	80 n. 67, 300, 301	10.22–3	320
212	285	17.10	493 n. 161
215	318	18.3–5	466
222	191 n. 174	18.10	278 n. 164
223	297	22.10–1	525 n. 275
235	83	22.14–5	300–1
236	3 n. 3	23.6–7	301
238	522 n. 263	32.2–4	439 with n. 302,
240	80 n. 67		440
250	323	35.1–2	287
252	520	38.9–11	237
261	260	43.17–9	261
264	275, 483 n. 123	47.19	297
290	326 n. 304	51.18–9	294
292	299	52.14–5	294
304	257	54.9–10	330
305	339	56.9–10	290
311	291	58.1	288
313	354	58.14	291
314	290	63.8–10	320
318	287	65.2–3	291
323	208 n. 231	65.9	327–8 n. 315
326	323	70.9–12	297
327	320–1	70.18–21	320
329	292	73.1–3	320
330	208 n. 231, 351	73.4–6	264
331	288	75.18	297
332	194–5	76.14	297, 298
335	290	77.14–5	264
343	323	84.22–3	297, 298
347	354	85.19–86.2	505 with n. 206
354	78 n. 56	87.1–5	526
358	341	87.12–4	346
362	297	88.4–5	298
367	345	89.4	318–9
370	81	91.13–4	298
383	78 n. 56	93.10	270
390	79 n. 63, 214 n. 357	96.1–2	288
391	79 n. 63, 214 n. 357	97.2–5	330–1
393	215 n. 258	97.21–2	209–10 n. 236
394	74, 85, 290	100.9	294
398	297, 299	102.5–6	297
402	450	104.3–4	292
405	257	104.5	291

104.6–7	288	239a	117 n. 113
104.13	331	245c–d	122
107.15–6	292	<i>R.</i>	
109.5	522 n. 265	327c.10	427
109.19–20	294	329c.3–4	278 with n. 164
112.11	450	398e	132
112.15–7	294	616a.7	278
114.20–1	257–8	<i>Tht.</i>	
116.1–3	294	142a.1–7	162 n. 70
125.11	288	163b.1–163c.7	171 n. 109
128.11–3	87 n. 94	Plato Comicus	
128.14–5	236	fr. 27.2–3	245
fr. 6a	378 n. 81	fr. 49	151 with n. 27, 271
fr. 8	432 n. 276, 449	fr. 61	175 n. 122
fr. *33	287	fr. 158	522 n. 264
fr. *72	209–10 n. 236	fr. 183	155, 159, 172–5, 176 n. 128, 177 n. 129, 216 with n. 264
fr. *115	351		174–5
fr. *154	265 n. 119	fr. 185	216, 269 n. 136
fr. *197	298	fr. 247	
fr. *257	296 n. 216	Platonius (Perusino)	
fr. 274	428	<i>Diff. com.</i> 21–5	420 n. 252
fr. *287	321	Plinius	
fr. *288	321	<i>NH</i> 35.152	470 n. 93
fr. *302	313	Plutarchus	
fr. *348	304	<i>Aem.</i>	
fr. *367	261	33.3	396 n. 141
Phrynichus Comicus		<i>Lyc.</i>	
fr. 39.2	525 nn. 272 and 275	9	466
fr. 55	481	<i>Marcell.</i>	
Pindarus (Snell–Maehler)		2.8	396 n. 141
fr. 104b.4	524	<i>Rom.</i>	
Plato		6.4	470
<i>Alc.</i> 1		[Plutarchus]	
120b.1–5	175 n. 122	<i>Vit. Hom.</i>	
<i>Cra.</i>		2.2	496
418b.7–e.4	184–5 n. 161	2.8	501 with n. 189
<i>Euthd.</i>		2.12	501
274a	437 n. 295	2.17–9	497 n. 175
<i>Grg.</i>		Poliochus	
646c.3	440	fr. 2.7–8	235–6 n. 32
486.c3	440 n. 304	Pollux	
<i>La.</i>		praef. 1	75
188c–d	134	praef. 6.2	86
<i>Ly.</i>		praef. 6.3	86
203a	429, 430	praef. 7.5	85
<i>Mx.</i>		praef. 10.3	86
238a–239a	119		

praef. 10.10	86	10.20–1	196
1.74	198	10.29	525 n. 275
1.79	190–1	10.60	416 n. 230, 423, 441
1.138	78 n. 56		522 n. 263
1.139	78 n. 56	10.68	290
1.145	417	10.98	477
1.190	522 n. 264	10.114	78 n. 56
1.224	531	10.138	78 n. 56
2.17	290, 396 n. 141	10.162	78 n. 56
2.8	83	Polyaenus	
2.40	441 n. 305	7.40.1	197
2.76	209–10 n. 236, 412	Polyzelus	
2.109	371 n. 55	fr. 10	522 n. 264
2.125	278, 327–8 n. 315	fr. 12	241 n. 41
2.142	83	Porphyrius	
2.168	290	<i>Quaest. Hom.</i> 1 (Sodano)	
2.175	290	15.22–5	401 with n. 168
3.29	215 n. 259	Posidippus Comicus	
3.56	79 n. 63	fr. 30	199–204
3.149	285	fr. 31.1	260
4.53	473 n. 98	Priscianus (Rosellini)	
4.93–4	425	18.177 (<i>GL</i> 3.290.3–6)	281
5.101	426	<i>Prolegomena de comoedia</i> (Koster)	
5.107	278 n. 165	3	214–5 n. 257
6.38	290	3.34	214–5 n. 257
6.40	450	3.36–7	214–5 n. 257
6.43	290	3.42–5	214
6.48	271	5.1–7	214–5 n. 257
6.50	188–9 n. 169	15.43 (<i>Tractatus</i>)	
6.60	479	<i>Coislinianus</i> 14a Janko)	214–5 n. 257
6.70	78 n. 56	Ptolemaeus Ascalonita	
6.74	477	<i>Diff.</i>	
6.97	466	390.20–3 Heylbut	458
6.103	526	390.34 Palmieri	527
6.128	523 n. 265	Python	
6.147	290	<i>TrGF</i> 91 F 1.12–3	479
7.23	528 n. 283	Rhianus	
7.24	79	fr. 11 Leurini	395 n. 139
7.28	477	Rhinthon	
7.80	523 n. 265	fr. 2	174
7.139	470	Schol. Aristid. (Dindorf)	
9.23	290	3.98.17	501
9.136	346	Schol. Apoll.Rh.	
9.139	290	1.1089a	376 n. 75
10.1	417	1.564–7c	417
10.17	526		
10.20	198		

2.1005–6a	406	357d	488 n. 144
3.232	417	372c–d	487 n. 141
4.279–81c	422	970b	488 nn. 143–4
4.1187	524	990a–b	489
Schol. Ar.		1028f	421
Av.		1141–3	487 n. 142
76a	488, 492 with n. 157, 493	1124	488 n. 143
122a	422, 424	1206c	487 n. 142
239a	424, 425	1263c	433
556b	422	1269c	487 n. 142
806a	422	1297	473 with n. 99
1178a	488, 490, 493	1400a	487 n. 142
1203a.α	425 n. 259	1413a	488 n. 143
1569b	509	1422d	488 n. 144
1764	423	1437–441a	487 n. 140
Eq.		1449	488 n. 143
424a	476 with 107	<i>Th.</i>	
487a	488, 489, 493	31	488 n. 134
634b	427	<i>V.</i>	
755a	488 with n. 147	220c	488 with n. 144
963a	423	239a	424, 425
1279a	488 with n. 144	704b	423, 441 n. 309
<i>Nu.</i>		Schol. D.T. (Vat.)	
109a	488	GG 1,3.117.18–27	128, 137, 139
553	421	GG 1,3.160.10–1	366
1206baβ	161 n. 65	GG 1,3.160.10–2	414
1480d	426	GG 1,3.224.1–6	287
<i>Pax</i>		Schol. D.T. (Lond.)	
48e–f	421 n. 257	GG 1,3.446.12–4	389
63b	161 n. 65	Schol. Hes.	
70a–e	438	<i>Op.</i>	
199b	424	590b	423
259	521	<i>Theog.</i>	
702a	424	5b2	404
1159c	488	116c1	404 with n. 179
1210c	489	Schol. Hom.	
<i>Pl.</i>		<i>Il.</i>	
3b	488	1.244d	476 n. 75, 527
1194	421	1.275a	495
<i>Ra.</i>		1.275b	495
134	488 with n. 143	1.423–4	491, 493
191c	488	1.567b1	402 with n. 160
260	513 n. 236	2.186a	494 n. 165
308a	488 n. 143	2.191a1	313 n. 271
320b	488 nn. 143–4	2.191a2	313 n. 271
354a–c	487 n. 141	3.5	495
		3.277a2	495

4.410a	494 n. 169	Schol. Thuc.	
5.898	309 n. 260	1.30.1a	214 n. 256
8.441a1	463, 467 with n. 82	Seleucus (Müller)	
8.441b2/a2	463, 467 with n. 82	fr. 69	517 n. 245, 520
9.47a	312 n. 268, 495	[Sergius]	
10.364b	434 n. 282	<i>Ex. in Don.</i>	
11.754	402 n. 171	<i>GL</i> 4.530.17–531.1	418
13.197	496	Sextus Empiricus	
13.450a ¹	402 with n. 170	<i>M.</i>	
13.612a	237 n. 34	1.57	367 with n. 39
15.197c	485 n. 130	1.74	415 n. 223, 366
18.564	402 with n. 173	1.84	366
18.570a	474	1.93	368 n. 42
20.4b3	495	1.202	500 n. 185
20.404c	396 n. 141	1.202–3	500
21.122a1	496 n. 172	1.202–8	500
21.122b1	496 n. 172	1.203–4	501
21.122c1	496 n. 172	1.206	500
21.259d	524	1.228–9	156–7
21.262c	525	1.250	367
23.81a	395 n. 139	Silenus (Dettori)	
24.282	434 n. 282, 435 n. 284	fr. 1	526
<i>Od.</i>		fr. 2	526
1.273f	312 n. 268	fr. 6	526
1.340a.1	312 n. 268	fr. 7	403 n. 176
2.410a	424	fr. 9	526
2.294b1	460 n. 62	Simmias (Dettori)	
3.444b.1	406	fr. 1	399, 400
3.444c	406, 407	fr. 2	399, 400
3.444e1	407	fr. 3	399
3.444f	401 with n. 165, 407	fr. 4	399
4.214a	312 n. 268	Simonides (Sider)	
7.100d1	467 n. 82	<i>ep.</i> 35	449 n. 16
(hyp) 18.17.1–3	512, 513 n. 236	Solon	
19.599	312 n. 268	test. 10 Ruschenbusch	528
Schol. Nic.		fr. 4a West	113, 116
<i>Alex.</i> 91g	410	fr. 6.7–12 West	181 n. 150
<i>Th.</i> 753b	479 n. 117	fr. 41a–c Leão-Rhodes	370
Schol. Pi.		fr. 52c Leão-Rhodes	371
<i>O.</i> 9.1k	423	Sophocles	
Schol. Pl.		<i>OT</i>	
<i>Carm.</i> 161e.13	515 n. 240	1242	429 n. 265
<i>Erx.</i> 400e	424	<i>Ph.</i>	
<i>Sph.</i> 220a	427	174–5	199–200 n. 205
Schol. Theocr.		<i>Fragmenta</i>	
5.2d	404 with n. 178	fr. 246	398
		fr. 323	481

fr. 607	398	ε 3523	430 n. 268
fr. 898	491	ελ 190	511 n. 231
Sophon		θ 242	331
fr. 55	410	κ 1404	425
Sotades Comicus		κ 1464	489 n. 147
fr. 1.30	492 n. 159	κ 2098	513
Stephanus Byzantius		κ 2398	477
9.43.4–6	134 n. 185	κ 2706	517 n. 250
Stephanus Comicus		λ 82	433 n. 278
fr. 1	506 n. 211	λ 200	509 n. 224
Strabo		ο 173	309
8.1.2	106	π 29	511 n. 231
8.7.1	99	ρ 55	522 n. 264
15.3.18	522 n. 263	τ 169	488 n. 144
Strato Comicus		χ 181	478 with n. 113,
fr. 1.40–4	372		479
fr. 1.44	189–90 n. 171	χ 553	261
Strattis		Suetonius	
fr. 19	509	<i>Gram. et rhet.</i> 10	415 with n. 224
fr. 23	506 n. 211	<i>Synagoge</i>	
fr. 38	421	Σ α 18	516
fr. 49	140–1	Σ α 79	209–10 n. 236
fr. 56	475	Σ α 1558	261
<i>Suda</i>		Σ β 56	529
α 152	290	Σ ε 691	441 n. 305
α 250	209–10 n. 236	Σ ^b α 74	426
α 338	516	Σ ^b α 84	290
α 729	449	Σ ^b α 158	209–10 n. 236
α 1614	504 nn. 201 and 203	Σ ^b α 276	209–10 n. 236
α 1702	261	Σ ^b α 747	351
α 1942	442 n. 312	Σ ^b α 981	265 n. 119
α 2282	318	Σ ^b α 1338	318
α 2823	261	Σ ^b α 1869	328
α 3367	328	Σ ^b α 1872	333
α 3372	333	Σ ^b α 1874	327
α 3427	320	Σ ^b α 1887	320
α 3789	296 n. 216	Σ ^b α 2085	296 n. 216
α 3892	486 n. 131	Σ ^b α 2504	321
α 3933	446 n. 6	Σ ^b α 2505	321
α 4660	493 n. 160	Σ ^b α 2576	493 n. 163
β 593	523 n. 265	Σ ^b α 2372	428
δ 430	508 nn. 220–1		
δ 589	526	Tatianus	
δ 1537	313	<i>Orat.</i> 32.4–6	497 n. 175
ε 184	517 nn. 248 and 250	Teleclides	
ε 2400	441 n. 305	fr. 29	522 n. 264
ε 2898	416, 524	fr. 68	452 n. 30

Theodoridas			
<i>SH</i> 747	401 n. 165, 407		
Theodorus Historicus			
<i>BNJ</i> ² 346 F 2	528		
Theopompus Comicus			
fr. 4.1	261		
fr. 12	506 n. 211		
fr. 24	230		
fr. 33.3	262		
fr. 40	519		
Theopompus Historicus			
<i>BNJ</i> 115 F 339	425		
<i>BNJ</i> 115 F 405	524		
Theophrastus			
<i>HP</i>			
4.8.1	260 n. 102		
4.10.4	260 n. 102		
4.10.6	260 n. 102		
4.10.7	260 n. 102		
4.11.12	260 n. 102		
fr. 684 Fortenbaugh			
Thomas Magister			
6.10	237		
7.1–4	330		
90.15–91.10	252–3		
378.1–2	231 n. 12		
Thucydides			
1.42.1	453		
1.105.1	265		
1.113.1	148		
1.2.5	116		
2.35–46	119		
2.36.1	116		
2.38.2	166		
2.40.1	160 n. 61		
2.41.1	10, 201 n 212		
2.86	437 n. 295		
2.100.3	148		
3.22.4	211 n. 246		
3.82.8	164		
7.57.2	183 n. 158		
7.63.3	182 n. 152		
8.75.1	164		
Thugenides			
frr. 3–6	478 n. 113		
fr. 7	478		
Timachidas Rhodius (Matijašić)			
fr. 9	528		
fr. 15	528		
fr. 16	399		
fr. 19	528		
fr. 20	528		
Timaeus Grammaticus (Valente)			
<i>Lex. praef.</i>	375 n. 71		
Timocles			
fr. 6.4	322		
fr. 16.6	252		
fr. 24.3	292		
Timotheus Lyricus			
fr. 798 <i>PMG</i>	344		
Tryphon (Velsen)			
fr. 4	508 n. 220		
fr. 15	506 n. 208, 507		
fr. 113	473 with n. 98, 474 n. 101		
fr. 125	403 n. 177, 404		
Tyrannio (Haas)			
fr. 59	418		
Tzetzes			
<i>Proll. Com.</i>			
11a.1.22–3.1–7	419 n. 246		
11a.2.31–32.1–4,			
33.22–5	419 n. 246		
Varro			
<i>De Ling. Lat.</i>			
9.12	455 n. 46		
fr. 84.15–29			
Goetz–Schoell	418		
Xenarchus			
fr. 1.7	261		
fr. 11	187 n. 168		
fr. 12.2	520 n. 257		
Xenophon			
<i>An.</i>			
2.2.19	211 n. 246		
7.3.39	236		
7.8.12	263		
<i>Cyr.</i>			
8.3.27–8	210 n. 238		

<i>HG</i>			<i>FD</i> 3.3.95.2	243
4.8.7	453		<i>ID</i> 1734.1	243
5.4.25	164		<i>ID</i> 2622.b.col. ii.7	243
[Xenophon]			<i>IG</i> 1 ³ .426.22	249 n. 66
<i>Ath.</i>			<i>IG</i> 2 ² .1588.4–5	243
1.1	165		<i>IG</i> 2 ² .1588.14	243
1.2	171 n. 108		<i>IG</i> 2 ² .1749.76	262
1.10	170 n. 106		<i>IG</i> 2 ² .8858	243
1.12	171 n. 108		<i>IG</i> 2 ³ .1.367.9–10	453 n. 35
1.19–20	170–1		<i>IG</i> 7.973	243
2.2–16	165, 169		<i>IG</i> 7.2407.10	218 n. 272
2.7	166 n. 84, 169		<i>IG</i> 12,4 2.453.65	470 n. 93
2.7–8	126, 161, 164–72		<i>IGDS</i> 112	470 n. 93
2.8	169, 170 n. 106, 171		<i>IGLS</i> 3,1.770.7	197 n. 200
2.9–10	170		Peek, <i>Kerameikos</i> III.C.3	206 n. 227
2.14	165		Peek, <i>Kerameikos</i> III.C.3.73	269
2.17	151 n. 28			
3.1	170 n. 105			
Zenobius			Papyri	
2.40	493		P.Berol. inv. 9965	529
5.71	403 with n. 171		P.Bour. 8.1–24	136
Zenodotus (Pusch)			P.Cair. JdE 65445	373
fr. 1	400, 406		P.Enteux. 13	197
fr. 2	401 with n. 168		P.Hamb. II.128	394
fr. 3	402 with n. 169		P.Hibeh II.172	397 n. 146
fr. 4	402 with n. 170		P.Köln inv. 22323	405 n. 183, 530
fr. 5	402 with n. 171		P.Lond. 44.32	449 n. 16
fr. 6	402 with n. 173		P.Oxy. 2.221	496
fr. 7	403 with n. 175		P.Oxy. 13.1611	416 n. 299
fr. 8	403 with n. 176		P.Oxy. 15.1803.fol. ii.verso.	60–9, 330
fr. 9	403 with n. 177		P.Oxy. 17.2087	466
fr. 10	404 with n. 178		P.Oxy. 35.2737	416, 421 n. 257, 487 n. 137
fr. 11	404 with n. 179		P.Oxy. 35.2744	525
[Zonaras]			P.Oxy. 53.3710	525
66.9–11	233		P.Oxy. 60.4024.5	260
142.3–7	466		P.Oxy. 78.5160	487 n. 136
213.6–13	315–6 n. 278		PSI 2.144	416
357.26–358.7	321		P.Sorb. 2243	528 n. 283
1168.7–8	313		P.Stras. 2.92	197
1390.13–5	261		P.Turner 39	416, 417, 435 n. 284, 506 n. 210
1765.6–9	245		<i>SB</i> 6.9556	197
1846.12	479			
Inscriptions				
<i>BCH</i> 45 (1921) 16 III, 23	470 n. 93			
<i>DTA</i> 74	217–8			

Index nominum et rerum

- Aelius Aristides 96, 123
Aelius Dionysius 22, 35
Aeneas the Tactician (language of) 151–2, 184,
194, 206 n. 227, 207, 217 n. 269, 220–1,
260, 316
Aeolic (dialect) 106, 110, 128
– ancient perception of 135–9
Aeschines 185
– language of 308, 312, 316, 337
Agathocles of Cyzicus 407–9
Alcaeus 136
Alexander of Cotiaeum 29
Alexandria 78, 356, 369, 385, 391, 392, 396,
408 n. 196, 409, 421, 435, 443, 503, 508,
524, 527
– dialect of 454–5, 509 with n. 222, 510, 511 with
nn. 231–2, 512
Amerias 515 n. 240, 525–6
Ancient Greek 102–11
– definition and corpus 90–1
Andocides (language of) 147–54, 319
Antiatticist 9, 26–7, 48, 70
– and Aristophanes of Byzantium 359 n. 6,
361–3, 447, 449, 450, 451, 452 with nn.
27–8, 459, 484
– and Eratosthenes 430, 432
Antimachus 395 n. 140, 491 n. 155
Antiphon (language of) 147–54, 207, 211, 236,
305, 306, 312 n. 266, 319, 323, 324, 328
Apollodorus of Athens 376 n. 75, 407, 527–8
Apollodorus of Cyma 418
Apollonius Dyscolus 45, 71, 436, 497–8
Apollonius of Citium 462, 462–8 *passim*
apragmones (ἀπράγμονες) 177–80
Arcado-Cypriot (dialect) 106
Aristarchus of Samothrace 55, 367, 389, 399,
401 n. 167, 402, 436 with n. 287, 438, 444,
467 with n. 82, 486–502, 508, 513 n. 236,
524 n. 267, 527
– and analogy 498 with n. 179
– and critical sign χ 492 with n. 157
– and etymology 488, 489 with n. 148
– and glossographical interest 486 with n. 133
– and normative grammar 486 with n. 134
– on Attic comic language 487–94
– accentuation 488
– dual 488
– grammatical gender 488
– grammatical number 488
– lexicon 488–9
– orthography 488
– use of κατά + acc. to indicate motion 488,
490–2, 493
– on Homer’s language 494–502
– as an older variety of Attic (παιαῖα
Ἀτθίς) 129, 494, 495, 496–7
– Attic features in Homer 494–7, 496 with
n. 173 (dual), 495–6 (present imperative
endings -ντων and -σθων)
– awareness of diachronic change in
languages 494 with nn. 165–6, 498–9
– Homer as an Athenian 496–7, 497–9 and
502 (as embodiment of ἑλληνισμός), 494
with n. 167 (οἱ νεώτεροί/οἱ μὲθ’ Ὀμηρον)
Aristophanes 48
– *Aeolosicon* 190, 215
– on linguistic variation in Attic and its
socio-political significance 156–64
– *Plutus* 186, 190, 215
Aristophanes of Byzantium 21, 55, 216, 359 n. 6,
361–4, 369, 377, 392, 395 with n. 139, 424,
430, 431 n. 273, 438, 443, 444, 445–85, 486,
487 n. 138, 491 with n. 155, 492, 493, 497
n. 174, 502, 505, 506, 512, 514, 532
– and accentuation 454–5, 512
– and analogy 455 with n. 46
– and *Antiatticist* 359 n. 6, 361–4, 449, 452 with
nn. 27–8, 483–4
– and awareness of diachronic change in
language 448 with n. 13
– and dialect of Alexandria 454–5
– and etymology 466 n. 81, 469, 478
– and Eustathius 362, 364, 456
– and Menander 452 with n. 31
– and word-class theorisation 446 n. 5, 455
– Λέξεις 444, 446–85
– Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις 21, 460–85
– and comic authors 452

- and Hellenistic writers 453–4, 480
- and non-literary dialects 454, 455, 457
- and prose authors 452–3
- and prosody 480–3, 484–5
- Λακωνικά γλώσσα 454
- Πρὸς τοὺς Πίνακας Καλλιμάχου 458–60
- Aristotle 360, 365, 376, 378–87, 394, 395, 398, 411, 425 n. 258
- founder of grammar 378
- on βαρβαρισμός/βαρβαρίζω 381, 387
- on γλώσσα 378–85, 486 with n. 133
- on ἑλληνισμός/ἑλληνίζω 381, 386–7
- on λέξις 379–81
- on ξενικόν 381, 384, 386
- on σαφήνεια 386–7
- on σολοικισμός 387
- on ψυχρόν 383
- virtues of λέξις in *Rhetoric* 162–3
- Artemidorus of Tarsos 477
- Asclepiades of Myrlea 366, 378 n. 84, 415
- Asianism 517–8 n. 251
- assibilation 107
- Athens (including Athenian propaganda) 10, 13, 77–8, 95, 98, 111, 113, 115 n. 100, 117, 119
- demographics 155–6
- foreigners and metics and their influence on language 142–3, 156, 167–8
- maritime empire 164–72, 222
- Naval League (first and second) 164–72, 182, 183
- social classes 156–64
- Atthidography, Atthidographers 410 with nn. 200 and 203, 504 nn. 198–9, 523 n. 266
- Attic (dialect) 10, 53, 100, 106, 108, 109, 111
- ancient perception of 139
- ancient scholarship on the phases in the history of the dialect 130, 214–5, nn. 256–7, 424, 486, 494, 495, 496–7, 497 n. 176, 508 n. 217
- as a mixture of all the dialects 501–2
- as a symbol of Greek identity 93–4, 95, 96
- city language, according to Aristophanes 162–4
- common *Sprachgut* with Ionic 152
- internal variation 129 n. 162
- ‘international’ Attic (*Großattisch*) 11, 64, 93, 144, 167–8, 183–4, 214–5, 222–3, 356
- linguistic features (see also ToC and Index of notable Greek words below)
- adjectival suffix -ικός as an element of ‘intellectual’ language 160
- *alpha purum* 107, 130
- analogical inflection of γυνή 217
- analogical plural forms of ἔδωκα, ἔθηκα, and ἤκα 152–3
- apocopated prefixed verbs (esp. κατα-) 210, 217–8, 229
- Attic declension 12
- careless manner of speaking of fish-sellers 173
- comparatives 88, 483–5 (/i:/ in -ίων)
- δμ > σμ in Attic 210
- -ει and -η as the 2nd-person middle and passive ending 229
- /ε:u/ > /eu/ at word-beginning in the augmented verbs in εὐ- 229
- gender metaphors in nouns 216
- γιγν- > γιν- 229
- indeclinable nouns 216
- κν- > γν- 229
- loose articulation of consonants 160, 173
- *nomina agentis* in -τηρ 192–3, 210
- nominal suffix -σις (as an element of ‘intellectual’ language) 154 n. 37, 160
- nominal suffix -συνη (its productivity in Xenophon) 210
- /oi/ > /o:/ and /o/ before a vowel 229
- retraction of the accent (βαρυστόνησις) 506–8
- /rs/ > /rr/ 229
- τ/σ and ττ/σσ 12, 147–54, 206, 229
- thematisation of athematic verbs 153
- ‘subterranean’ Attic 147, 154
- Atticism (see also under Atticist lexis and canon) 1, 8–10, 12, 13–6, 40–9, 56–7, 62, 63, 67, 76–89, 93, 95, 139, 141
- ‘grammatical or linguistic’ 16, 359–60
- ‘stylistic or rhetorical’ 13–4, 359–60
- Atticist lexis 1, 8–9, 10, 18, 20–30, 37–49, 50
- diachronic change in 26, 79
- dialectalisms in 83
- evaluative terminology in 26, 67–73
- sociolects in 80
- symbolic language 85

- Atticist lexicographers (see also under individual names) 83–6
- autochthony 53, 95, 114 with n. 97, 116, 117, 120–1, 124, 181
- Baccheius of Tanagra 462, 463, 465, 476
- Balbus of Tralles 74, 84
- barbarians 98, 117
- Boeotian (dialect) 135, 148
- influence on Attic 161–2, 218
- Byzantine Greek 4, 52
- Byzantine lexicography 31–6, 51–2
- Callimachus 357, 391, 392, 409–13, 421, 446, 453
- with n. 37, 457, 467–8, 472, 473, 480, 503
- and Atthidography 410
- and pinacology 410–1
- Ἐθνικαὶ ὀνομασίαι 410, 411–3
- Callistratus 424, 491 n. 155, 519
- canon(s) 3, 27, 28, 37, 38–9, 48, 208, 212–3, 215, 253, 291, 358, 359 with n. 5
- Catalogue of Women* 98, 111–4
- Chamaeleon 419 n. 144
- Cicero 15
- classicism 13–4
- Clearchus of Soli 395–6
- Cleitarchus of Aegina 395 nn. 139 and 140, 403
- with n. 176
- comedy
- comic characters 229, 231, 232
- language of 48, 53, 54
- Old Comedy 38–9, 41, 152–4, 213, Chapter 5 *passim*
- Middle and New Comedy 27, 38, 44–5, 152–3, 207, 208, 211, 212–8, 222, Chapter 5 *passim*
- literary parody 229–30, 242, 261, 294, 303, 314
- on Attic and its evolution:
- Old Comedy 125, 156–64, 172–82
- Middle and New Comedy 186–207
- parody of sophistic theories of language correctness 193–4, 198
- countryside, countrymen 161–2
- Corinna 135
- Cornelianus 29, 69
- corpus language 91
- Crates of Athens 445, 503 with n. 196, 517–23, 532
- Crates of Mallus 402, 403 n. 176, 408, 435 n. 284, 517–8
- Ctesias of Cnidus (language of) 219
- Cyril see under Pseudo-Cyril
- Demagogues (their language) 174–5, 185
- Demetrius Chlorus 366, 367
- Demetrius Ixion 455, 482, 483, 489, 491 n. 155, 503 n. 196, 508–14, 515
- Democritus 411 with n. 206, 463, 464, 465, 466
- with n. 80
- Demosthenes 185–6, 358 n. 4, 416, 421, 440, 441
- with n. 306, 452–3, 471, 529
- language of 208, 211, 236, 253, 259, 271, 291, 305, 306, 308, 312, 316, 324, 336, 337–8, 342
- Derveni papyrus (language of) 220
- descriptivism vs prescriptivism 359–65
- dialects, Greek 2, 8, 65, 91, 100–1, 103–5
- ancient perception of 108, 127–39, 203 n. 213
- connection with γένη 97
- dialectal glosses
- Achaean 454
- Aeolic 397, 526
- Aetolian 454, 530
- Ambraciotan 524, 531
- Arcadian 405, 422, 425, 525, 526, 531
- Argive 385 n. 106, 397, 530, 531
- Boeotian 397
- Chalcidonian 412
- Chalcidian 454
- Cleitorian 406, 526, 531
- Coan 464, 466, 468
- Cretan 383 n. 100, 399, 454, 455, 457, 531
- Cypriot 380, 397, 403, 525, 531
- Cyrenean 397, 406, 422, 439, 454
- Ephesian 525
- Ionic 454, 455, 462, 468, 522 n. 264, 526
- Laconic 454, 455, 525, 531
- Lesbian 398
- Macedonian 396 n. 141, 525
- Megarean 398
- Methymnean 525
- Paphian 527
- Pontic 529
- Rhodian 454, 455, 457, 463, 464, 465, 466, 468, 525, 528

- Sicilian 217 n. 268, 410, 422–3;
- Sicyonian 398, 405, 528
- Syracusan 195 n. 189, 398
- Thessalian 410, 524, 531
- Thracian 410, 454
- Thurian 412, 413
- literary varieties of 109–11, 128
- Didymus 358 n. 4, 393, 394 n. 132, 414, 415, 416
n. 229, 419 n. 245, 422, 439, 467, 491, 514
n. 238, 517 n. 249
- diglossia 8, 9, 52, 89
- Diogenes of Babylon
 - on barbarism and solecism 387 n. 114, 527
 - on διάλεκτος 382, 387 n. 114, 389–90
- Diogenianus 392–3, 405 n. 183, 473 n. 98
- Dionysius of Halicarnassus 14–5, 18, 50, 359–60
with nn. 8–9
- Dionysius Iambos 369–70
- Dionysius Thrax 357 n. 2
 - definition of grammar 366 with n. 34,
367–9, 373
- diphthongisation 135–6
- Dorians 128
 - origins of 98, 106, 112, 113 n. 90
- Doric (dialect) 108, 110
 - ancient perception of 133–5, 139
 - as the language of choral poetry 134–5
 - koina 100
- Egypt 78
- Ephorus of Cyme 218–9
- Epicurus 452 n. 32, 466
- Eratosthenes 357, 392, 413–42, 443, 444, 446,
459, 460, 486, 523, 527
 - complementarity of philological and scientific
methods 413–4
 - definition of γραμματική 366 with n. 32,
414–5, 418
 - on Attic accentuation 426–7
 - on Attic orthography 425–6
 - on Attic realia 421–2
 - on circumflex accent 418
 - on Old Comedy and comic language 419–42
 - antiquarian issues 422
 - dialectal glosses (other than Attic) 422–3,
439–40
 - dramatic chronology 421
- dual 434 with n. 282, 435 n. 284, 436–8
- explanation of unusual or difficult words/
expressions 423–5
- idioms peculiar to the Attic dialect 427–8,
440–1
- linguistic purism 428–42
- literary criticism 423
- non-canonical authors 441–2
- Pherecrates' *Miners* 429–33, 459–60
- proverbs 425
- ψευδαπτικοί 433–5
- scholarly activity in the fields of grammar and
philology 415–8
- Αρχιτεκτονικός 416 with n. 224, 417, 418
n. 241
- Γραμματικά 418
- on the *Iliad* (P.Turner 39) 416, 417, 435
n. 284
- Περί τῆς ἀρχαίας κωμωδίας 414, 415, 416–7,
418, 419, 420–7
- Πλατωνικός 427, 454
- Σκευογραφικός 416 with n. 224, 417, 418
n. 241
- Erotian 460, 461, 462–9 *passim*, 472, 474, 475,
476, 477, 478, 479 n. 115, 480
- ethnicity 2, 93, 95, 97
- ethnos* (ἔθνος) 2, 96, 97
- Etymologicum Genuinum* 31, 32, 33 n. 132, 35
- Etymologicum Gudianum* 35
- Etymologicum Magnum* 35
- Etymologicum Symeonis* 35
- Euboean (dialect) 148
- Euripides
 - *Ion* 115, 117 n. 112, 122–3
- Eustathius 35
- Favorinus of Arelate 20 n. 75, 82 n. 74, 84
- Florence 77, 95
- foreigner talk (in Attic comedy) 229, 231
- Galen
 - and Atticism 376–8
 - on γλώσσα and λέξις 373–8
 - on contemporary Greek of Asia Minor
521 n. 261
- genealogy
 - Athenian 113, 116, 140

- Hellenic 111–4
- Ionic 99
- genos* (γένος, including γένη) 2, 97, 119, 128
- *eugeneia* (εὐγένεια) 123, 124 n. 140
- *suggeneia* (συγγένεια) 121
- Golden Age Rule 63, 75–8, 80–1, 155
- Gorgias (language of) 147–54
- grammar (γραμματική)
 - and γλώσσαί 365–70
 - and philology 360 with n. 13, 365–8, 391, 414–5
 - and rhetoric 360 with n. 11
 - definitions of 365–8
 - Eratosthenes' definition 366 with n. 32, 414–5, 418
 - parts of 357, 367–8
 - practical knowledge (ἐμπειρία) vs expertise (τέχνη) 366
- Gregory of Corinth 101

- Habron 498 n. 177
- Hagias and Dercylus 218–9
- Harpocration 23, 29–30, 394 n. 132, 416, 470–1, 514, 515 with n. 240, 529
- Haugen, Einar 63
- Helladius 210
- Hellenicity (including Greekness) 2, 11, 18, 20, 91, 92, 93, 95, 96–100, 114, 115, 118, 125
- Hellenistic scholarship 12, 54, 127, 141, 223, Chapters 6–7 *passim*
- Heracleon of Ephesus 503 n. 195
- Heraclides Criticus 388
- Heraclides Ponticus 395
- Herodian 45, 131 n. 171, 402, 424, 427, 439 with n. 302, 440, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 489 with n. 150, 490, 495 n. 169, 497 n. 176, 508 n. 217, 528
- Herodotus 99
 - language of (see also under Ionic culture) 27, 48, 127, 131–2, 194
- Hesychius 72–3
- Hippocrates (language of) 131
- historiography (language of) 145–54, 218–20
- Homer
 - and παλαιὰ Ἀτθίς 28, 486, 491–2, 494, 496–7
 - as an Athenian 28, 131, 496–7
 - Attic features according to Aristarchus 438, 486, 491, 493, 494–7
 - language of, as a blending of all the dialectal varieties 501 with n. 189
- Hyperbolus 172–3
- Hyperides 15, 38
 - language of 208, 260, 268 n. 132, 278 n. 165, 313, 351 n. 368
- identity 89–93
 - Athenian 114–20, 123, 140
 - cultural 95–6, 100, 119–20, 123, 124
 - ethnic see under ethnicity
 - expressed through language 93, 94
 - Greek see under Hellenicity
 - group 94
- infinitive, iussive 88
- inscriptions 108
 - their relevance for the study of Attic 109, 142, Chapter 5 *passim*
 - *defixiones* 149, 217
 - *ostraka* and graffiti 162
- Ionic (dialect) 11, 105, 106, 110, 128
 - $\alpha > \eta$ 107, 133
 - ancient perception of 128, 130–3, 139, 140, 159–60
 - as the literary language of prose 147–54
 - common *Sprachgut* with Attic 152
 - influence on Attic 109, 117, 147–54, 156, 159–60, 171–2
- Irenaeus, Minucius Pacatus 22, 365, 390 n. 124, 511 with n. 231, 512
- Isaeus of Assyria 133
- Isocrates 119
 - panhellenism 202–4
 - language of 259, 267, 305, 312, 342, 355
- isogloss 103
- Ister 398, 443, 503–5

- jeunesse dorée* (Athenian, their language and political tendencies) 160, 178–80

- katharevousa* 8, 88
- koine 8, 9, 11, 64–5, 100, 101, 126, 128, 199, 200, 206, 222–3
 - ancient scholarship on 129
 - chronological boundaries 3, 4
 - internal variation 3, 4, 10, 50–1

- Latin
 – loanwords in Greek 78
Latinitas 16
Lexicon Vindobonense 35–6
logoi oikonomikoi (λόγοι οικονομικοί) 182–3
 Lokalhistoriker
 – and glossography 397 with n. 150
 Lopadiotes, Andreas 36
 Lucian 20 n. 75, 38, 82 n. 74
 Lycophron 419–20, 421, 423, 424, 453, 480, 513
 Lycophron the sophist 384 with n. 104
 Lysanias of Cyrene 523–4
 Lysias (language of) 38, 208, 305, 316, 327, 355
- Macedonia 78
 manuscripts 52
 – cod. Par. Coisl. 345 25, 27, 28
 – cod. Par. Coisl. 347 32
 – cod. Zavordensis 95 33 n. 133, 425 n. 260
 Marathon 121 n. 131
 medical and scientific language 287, 294
 Medieval Greek 3 n. 6, 4, 52
 Meillet, Antoine 101 n. 40
 Menander (see also Attic comedy, language of)
 30, 38, 48, 73–4, 191, 215, 450 with n. 20,
 452 with n. 31, 458
 migrations, early Greek 105–6
 military jargon 194–8, 263
mimesis (μίμησις) 13
 Moeris 9, 28, 39, 47, 70, 77
 monetary metaphors (referring to
 language) 85, 204–7
 Moschopoulos, Manuel 35
 Mycenaean 102 n. 42, 104, 105
- New Testament 10
 Nicander of Colophon 401, 407, 479, 480,
 485, 513
 Nicander of Thyateira 503, 504 with n. 196,
 514–6
 Nicomachus 429, 430 with n. 270, 431,
 432, 460
 nostalgia (and purism) 14
- Old Oligarch see Pseudo-Xenophon
 onomastic lexica 26
 oratory
 – language of 49, 145, 208–9, 211
 Orus of Alexandria 30
- paideia* (παιδεία) 18, 19, 98, 119, 126
 Pamphilus 392, 393, 399, 503 n. 195, 506,
 514, 528
 papyri 10
 Parmenon of Byzantium 524–5, 531
 paroemiography 425 with n. 258, 489
 with n. 149
 Pausanias Atticista 22, 35
 Pausimachus 388 with nn. 119–20
 Peloponnesian War 144, 155, 182, 222
 Pergamon/Pergamene 249, 356, 409 n. 197,
 508, 517, 518 n. 251, 527
 – and Stoicism 366
 Pericles, citizenship law 116–7, 120, 124, 156
 Persian Wars 117–8, 121
 Philemon 23, 29, 46
 Philemon of Aixone 503 n. 196, 506–8, 515
Philetaerus 23, 28–9, 70
 Philistus of Syracuse 218–9
 Philitas 357, 372, 391, 396–8, 399, 400 with
 n. 163, 405, 406
 Philodemus 388 nn. 119–20
 Philostratus, Flavius 16, 132
 Philoxenus (grammarian) 365, 390 n. 123, 443
 Photius
 – *Lexicon* 32, 33–4
 – *Bibliotheca* 34, 85
 Phrynichus Atticista 9, 23, 24, 38
 – *Eclogue* 23, 24–25, 36, 39, 41–2, 47, 68–9,
 73–4, 76, 77, 81, 85
 – *Praeparatio sophistica* 23, 25, 34, 39, 49
 Pindar 48
 Planudes, Maximus 35
 Plato
 – and Aristophanes of Byzantium 452 n. 32, 467
 – language of 208, 236, 249, 254, 259, 271, 279,
 312, 331, 341, 342
 Polemon of Ilium 422, 425 n. 260, 514 n. 238,
 523 n. 266
 Pollux, Iulius 9, 26, 69–70
 – *Onomasticon* 23, 26, 39, 46, 49, 75
 Polybius (language of) 194
 post-Classical Greek
 – definition and chronological boundaries 3, 4–5

- prescriptivism 53, 57–9, 61
 – vs descriptivism 359–65
 professional languages 192–8
 pronunciation 46
 Proto-Greek 103, 104
 Pseudo-Arcadius 490, 507 n. 216
 Pseudo-Cyril 32, 36
 Pseudo-Xenophon (Old Oligarch) 164–72
 – language of 147–54, 319
 Pseudo-Zonaras 30
 Ptolemies
 – and Athens 410
 – and Attic literature 358, 443
 – and Cos 391–2
 – and policy of cultural hegemony 369–70, 409, 504 n. 200
 – and Rhodes 391–2
 Ptolemy Epithetes 401 n. 167
 Ptolemy of Ascalon 402 n. 170, 480, 481, 482
 Ptolemy Pindarion 500–1
 purism 2, 5–8, 9, 14, 19, 20, 37, Chapter 2 *passim*
 – archaising 7, 20, 76–7
 – discourse of 20, 67
 – elitist 20, 81
 – French 7
 – German 5
 – imagery and symbolism 73–6, 85–6
 – Italian 7–8
 – Norwegian 6
 – Quechua 60
 – Tamil 7
 – ‘xenophobic’ 5, 7, 59, 60
 purity 120–1, 122, 123, 124, 126, 140

 register 90
 Rome (and Greek culture) 125–6
 Rutherford, W. Gunion 40, 41–2, 191 n. 176, 211 n. 246

 Sappho 136
 Saussure, Ferdinand de 90
 Schleicher, August 103 n. 45
 Schmid, Wilhelm 40–1
 Schmidt, Johannes 103 n. 47
 Schmitz, Thomas 17, 40, 43
 Schuchardt, Hugo 103 n. 47

 Scopelianus of Clazomenae 132
 seafaring (language of) 170–1, 192–4
 Second Sophistic 16–20
 Seleucus of Alexandria (grammarian) 365, 390
 n. 123, 443, 517 n. 245, 518 n. 249, 520
 Sextus Empiricus 156–7
 Sheridan, Thomas 82
 Silenus 403 with n. 176, 526–7, 529, 531
 Simmias 357, 391, 398–400
 slaves (language of) 161
 sociolinguistics 90
 spelling reform
 – German 61
 – Modern Greek 61
 stage props (in Attic comedy) 284 n. 181
Stammbaumtheorie (genetic model) 103, 104
 standard language 62
 standardisation 53, 57–9, 61, 62–3, 87, 88
 status-planning 6, 7
Suda 34–5
 Συναγωγή λέξεων χρησίμων 32–3
 Swain, Simon 17, 40, 42–3

 technical and professional language(s) 193, 287–8
 Telephus of Pergamum 499 n. 182
 Theodoridas 401, 407
 Theodorus 503 n. 195, 527, 528 with n. 282
 Theophrastus 386, 419 n. 144
 – language of 260 n. 102
 Theopompus of Chius 218–9
 Thomas Magister 23, 36
 Thucydides
 – language of 147–54, 194, 207, 211, 218, 236, 249, 251 n. 71, 253, 271, 280, 289, 295, 305, 312 n. 265, 319, 323, 324, 340, 342, 351
 – λόγος ἐπιτάφιος 10, 119, 123, 124, 160 n. 61, 203
 Timachidas of Rhodes 528–9
 tragedy (language of) 39, 41, 48, 147–54
 Tryphon 136 n. 193, 365, 390, n. 123, 403 n. 176, 404, 443, 473 with n. 98, 506 n. 208, 507, 508 with nn. 217 and 220
 Tzetzes, John 35

Vestinus, Iulius 392

Xenophon 30, 38, 49, 54

– (language of) 38, 144–5, 194, 207, 208,
209–12, 218, 222, 236, 238, 251 n. 71,
259–60, 263, 267, 271, 305, 306, 308, 310,
312, 316, 324, 342, 348, 350

Wellentheorie (wave model in linguistics)
103, 104

women (language of) 160 n. 60, 184 n. 161

Zenodotus of Alexandria 404 n. 180

Zenodotus of Ephesus 357, 391, 396, 400–7, 419
n. 246, 446, 474 n. 101, 532

– Γλώσσαί 400–5

– Ἐθνικαὶ λέξεις 377 n. 78, 405–7

Zenodotus of Mallus 404 n. 180

Zopyrion 392

Index of notable Greek terms relating to ancient exegesis

This index provides a selection of the most important Greek terms occurring in ancient literary and linguistic exegesis. Greek words are mostly listed in their standard form (e.g. nominative masculine singular for adjectives and 1st-person indicative singular for verbs).

- ἀγοραῖος/οἱ ἀγοραῖοι 70, 71, 80, 81
 ἀδόκιμος 68, 70, 71, 191 n. 174
 Ἀθηναῖος/οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι 412, 428, 440, 456, 496, 523 n. 265, 524 n. 268, 525, 529, 530 with n. 288
 ἀκριβής 68
 ἀκύρωσ 457
 ἀμαθής/οἱ ἀμαθεῖς 70, 71, 80
 ἀμαρτάνω 70, 80 n. 67, 287, 332, 364, 365, 440, 456, 458
 ἀμαρτία 440
 ἀνελεύθερος 160–1
 ἀρχαῖζω 189–90 with n. 171
 ἀρχαῖος 76, 77
 ἀρχαῖσμός 189–90 with n. 171, 190 n. 173
 Ἀσιαγενής/Ἀσιανός 517 with n. 251, 521–2
 ἀσιανίζω 522 n. 264
 ἀστεῖος 159
 Ἀτθίς, παλαιά/ὑστέρα 28, 129, 215 n. 257, 247, 486, 494, 497; νεωτέρα: 424
 ἀττικίζω 85, 175, 177, 181–2, 199–201, 202, 512, 513 n. 236
 ἀττικισμός 85
 ἀττικιστής 85, 507 with n. 215
 Ἀττικιστί 188, 201–2
 Ἀττικός/οἱ Ἀττικοί 28, 70, 77, 167 n. 93, 377 n. 80, 398, 406, 407, 425, 426, 437, 438, 439, 441 n. 309, 450 with n. 20, 460 n. 61, 468, 474, 478, 481, 493 n. 174, 506, 507, 510, 520, 521, 522 n. 265, 524 n. 268, 528, 530 n. 288, 531
 Ἀττικουργής 187 n. 168
 βαρβαρίζω 381 n. 93, 387, 388 n. 120
 βαρβαρικός 190–1
 βαρβαρισμός 381, 387
 βάρβαρος 68, 422
 βαρύνω/βαρυτονέω 507 with n. 214, 508
 βαρύς 138
 γλώσσα/γλώσσαί 12, 54, 357, 365, 368, 370, 394
 – and archaism 376–8, 385
 – and Greek educational system 370–3
 – and Hellenistic grammar 365–70
 – and Homer 370–3, 397
 – and λέξις ('word'/expression') 374, 376–7, 383, 386–7, 406, 445 n. 3, 502 n. 194, 504 n. 201
 – and Phrynichus 378 n. 81
 – and Solon 370–1
 – Aristotle's definition of 378–86, 487 n. 133
 – Galen's definition of 373–8
 γλωσσηματικῶς 375 n. 71
 γλωσσογράφοι 396 with n. 143, 399, 428
 διάλεκτος 101, 129, 158–9, 382, 386, 389–90
 – καινή διάλεκτος 196–7
 δόκιμος/οἱ δόκιμοι 68, 70, 191 n. 174
 Ἕλληνες 28, 47, 70, 77, 80, 167 n. 93, 199–201
 ἐλληνίζω 157 n. 45, 199–201, 381 with n. 93, 386 with n. 111, 387 with n. 113, 388 nn. 118 and 120
 ἐλληνικός 47, 70
 ἐλληνισμός 16, 45, 47, 64, 360 n. 11, 365, 381, 390, 386–91, 444 n. 2, 487, 494, 498–9, 500 with n. 182, 501, 503, 518 n. 251
 – treatises on 54, 365, 390 n. 123, 443, 512 n. 231
 ἐν καθ' ἑνός/ἀνθ' ἑνός 396 n. 143, 399–400, 414
 εὐτραπελία 201–4
 ιδιώτης/οἱ ιδιώται 80
 καινόφωνος 450 with n. 17
 κοινός 47, 70
 κοινότης 203
 κρίσις ποιημάτων 368 with n. 42, 432
 κύριος 362, 380, 381, 383 n. 101, 384, 385, 386 n. 110, 394, 424, 452 n. 32, 456, 457, 467, 516

- λέξεις/λέξεις 12, 30, 54
 – as ‘diction’ in Aristotle 379–81, 383, 387
 – as ‘word’/‘expression’ vs γλώσσα 374, 376–7, 383, 406, 445 n. 3, 504 n. 201
- μεταγενέστερος 497 n. 176, 508 n. 217
 μετριότης 203
- νέος/οί νέοι 79
 νύν (οί νύν) 80, 494 n. 166
- ξενίζω 185–6 n. 163
 ξένος/ξενικός 68, 381, 384, 386, 396 n. 141
- ὄγκωδης 137
 ὀλίγος/οί ὀλίγοι 81
 ὀρθός 68, 456
- παλαιός/οί παλαιοί 77, 79, 374, 377, 408, 426, 448 n. 13, 504, 505
 πάθη 128, 136
 παράδοσις 391, 498 with n. 177, 499
 πεπαιδευμένοι, οἱ 94
 πολὺς/οἱ πολλοί 80, 81
- ῥῆμα 189–90 n. 173
- σαπρός 190
 σαφήνεια 386, 387
 σολοικίζω 185–6, 377 n. 80, 387, 433, 434
 σολοικισμός 388 n. 113
 συνήθεια 27, 128, 156–7, 367, 375, 376 n. 72, 377 n. 80, 390, 391, 435, 444, 450 n. 20, 451 n. 26, 455 n. 46, 494 with n. 160, 499, 500
 συνήθης 374, 494 n. 166, 514
- ὑπαγοικότερος 160–1
 ὑπεραττικίζω 85 n. 87
 ὑπεραττικός 85 n. 87
 ὑποθιλήτερος 159–60
- τόνος 138
- φωνή 166–7
- χρησις 46, 494 n. 166

Notable Greek words

Other words or linguistic features used or discussed in ancient texts can be retrieved by consulting the *Index locorum* and the ToC.

- άάπτος 402 with n. 169
 άγχουσα vs έγχουσα 425–6
 άγω 323 (ήξα vs ήγαγον), 329 (άξω vs άξομαι)
 άγνωθέτης 516
 άδελφος vs άδελφός 507
 Άθηναι 349 (Άθήναζε, Άθήνηθεν, Άθήνησι(v))
 Άθηναία 236 (Άθηναία, Άθηνάα, Άθηνά), 449
 (vs άστή, Άττική)
 άθλοθέτης 516
 αεί/άεί 239–40
 αϊετός 233
 αϊλινος 472, 473, 474
 αιχμάζω 344
 άκρατέστερος 277
 άκροάζομαι 346
 άκροάομαι 311 (ήκρόασο vs ήκροώ)
 Άλαιεύς 240–1
 άλεισον 399
 άλετριβανος vs δοΐδυξ 521–2
 άλιεύς 265–6
 άλλιξ 410
 άμαλλα 398
 άμβη/άμβων 462–8
 άμνίον 400–1, 406–7
 άμνός 504
 (ά)μολγός/άμολγαή 423
 άμύνομαι 453
 άμφορεύς vs άμφοφορεύς 524
 άνά 348–9
 άναλογεΐον 423, 441–2
 άναρριχάομαι 422, 438–40
 άνοιγνυμι/άνοιγω 335 (άνέωχα)
 άνοσιώτερος 279
 άξων 422
 άπαρκεί 88
 άποκήρυκτος 424–5
 άποκρίνω 326–8 (άπεκρινάμην vs άπεκρίθην)
 άποκτείνω 333–4 (άπέκτονα vs άπέκταγκα)
 άπόλλυμι 337–8 (pluperfect ending)
 – άπολογέομαι 328 (άπελογησάμην vs
 άπελογήθην)
 άπονίπτομαι 460 n. 61
 άρήν 504
 άριστάω 334 (ήρίσταμεν-type vs
 ήριστήκαμεν-type)
 Άρκάδας μιμούμενος 425
 Άρκάς κυνή 425
 άρνειός 504
 άρχαιικός 238–9
 άρχω 450
 άσυλλα 449 with n. 16
 άσμενέστατος 278
 άσπάζομαι 345
 άττα 427–8
 άττάραγος 528
 άττιγος 454
 αυΐτις/αυΐθις 229
 αυΐτος αυΐτόν 279–80
 άφαιρέομαι 495
 άφηήλιξ 88 n. 91
 άφθονέστατος 277
 άφύη 488, 492–3, 520
 άχαιά 398
 Άχαιικός 238
 Άχαρνεύς 266
 βάδισις/βάδος 451 with n. 26
 βαίνω 311–2 (ανάβα, διάβα, κατάβα, μετάβα vs
 –βήθι), 448 n. 12
 βαίτη 424, 522 n. 264
 βαλανειόμφολος 423–4
 βάλλω 332 (βαλώ vs βαλήσω)
 βάραξ/βήρηξ 423
 βαϋνος 508
 βελτίων 273–5
 βλάξ 448 n. 12, 529–30
 βλιμάζω 530
 βολεών 515 n. 240, 525
 βοτρυδόν 401 with n. 168
 βούλομαι 314–5 (ήβουλόμην vs
 έβουλόμην)

- βρέχω 88 (βρέχει), 325–6 (ἐβρέχθην vs ἐβράχην)
 βρίκελος 422
 βυρσοδέψης vs σκυτοδέψης 521–2
- γαμέω 324–5 (ἔγλημα vs ἐγάμησα)
 γέντα 410
 γεραῖός 241–3
 γερόντοις 448 n. 12, 454
 γίγνομαι 326–7 (ἐγενόμην vs ἐγενήθην), 332–3
 (γέγονα vs γεγένημαι)
 γόμος 453 with n. 33
 γονεύς 266, 267
 γραφεύς 267
 γυνή 217, 269–70
- δαμάζω 344
 Δάματερ 230
 δάμνιον 401, 406–7
 δέλαιος 241–3
 δειπνέω 334 (δεδειπναμεν-type vs δεδειπνήκαμεν-type)
 δεκάζω 422
 δεκάς 422
 δεῦρο/δευρί 283
 διαγγιγράζω 346
 διακονέω 315–6 (ἐδιακόνουν, δεδιακόνηκα)
 διακόνιον 526
 δίδωμι 318–9 (thematization), 323–4
 (ἐδώκαμεν-type vs ἔδομεν-type), 337–8
 (pluperfect ending)
 διητώμην/δητώμην 172–4
 διοικέω 316–7 (διώκηκα vs δεδιώκηκα)
 δίσπος 469–72
 διότι 355 (introducing a causal clause)
 διπλάζω 345
 διώκετον 436–8
 δοῖδυξ 511, 512, 521, 523 n. 265
 δοκέω 332 (δόξω vs δοκήσω)
 δόκησις/δόκος 451 n. 26, 453
 δοξάζω 345
 δραξίων 422–3
 δριμύς 451
 δύναμαι 310–1 (ἠδύνασο/ἔδύνασο vs ἠδύνω/
 ἔδύνω), 314–5 (ἠδυνάμην vs ἔδυνάμην)
 δύο, δυοῖν, δυεῖν, δυσίην 247, 251–3
- ἐαυτοῦ/αὐτοῦ 280–1
 ἔγγελος 264
 ἔδω 339
 ἐθέλω 339 (ἐθέλω vs θέλω)
 ἔθω 338 (pluperfect ending)
 εἰμί 305 (ἦς), 308–10 (ἦσθας), 310 (ἦς)
 εἶμι 88, 307–8 (ἦεις)
 εἰς 349 (with Ἀθῆναι)
 εἴσος 403 with n. 175
 ἔκ 349 (with Ἀθῆναι)
 ἐκεῖνος/ἐκεινοσί 282
 ἐκκύλιστος 515 n. 240
 ἐκποίησης 424–5
 ἐκφυγγάνω 339–40
 ἐλαία, ἐλάα, ἐλά 234–6
 ἐλάττων 273–5
 ἔμαυτοῦ 280–1
 ἐμποδίζω 489 with n. 147
 ἐν 349 (with Ἀθῆναι)
 ἐνθάδε/ἐνθαδί 283
 ἐνθένδε/ἐνθενδί 283
 ἐνοχλέω 317 (ἠνώχλου vs ἐνώχλου)
 ἐντεῦθεν/ἐντευθενί 283
 ἐξειδιάζομαι 346
 ἐπί κόρης 428, 440–1
 ἐπίουρος 402 with n. 170
 ἐπιόψομαι 460 n. 62
 ἐπισίζω 423
 ἐπίσταμαι 310–1 (ἠπίστασο vs ἠπίσω)
 ἐπιστάτης 451 with nn. 24–5
 ἐρίφλοιος 408
 Ἐρμαῖσκος 243
 ἔρχομαι 88, 337 (pluperfect ending)
 εὐζωρέστερος 276–7
 εὐηφηνής 395 with n. 139
 εὐθύς/εὐθύ/εὐθέως 429–33, 458–60
 εὐκλεία 426–7
 εὐρίσκω 322 (ἠυράμην vs ἠϋρον)
 εὐωνέστερος 277
 ἔχω 332 (ἔξω vs σχήσω)
- ζῆν 341 (sigmatic future)
- ἠδίων 273–5
 ἦ δ' ὅς 427
 ἦτα 424

- ἦμαι 496 with n. 172
 ἦττων 273–5
- θέρμα/θέρμη 257–9
 θουσιάζω 346
- ί deictic 281–4
 ἰάλεμος 473, 474
 ἱερεύς 266
 ἴημι 318–9 (thematisation), 323–4 (ἦκαμεν-type vs εἶμεν-type)
 ἴλεως 259
 ἱμαῖος 473–5
 ἴνα 354 (with subjunctive)
 ἰξοφόρος 408
 ἵππεύς 267
 ἴσθμιος 399
 ἴσθημι 311–2 (ἀπόστα, παράστα vs -στήθι), 318–9 (thematisation), 336 (perfect participle)
 ἴφθιμος 403 with n. 177
 ἰχθύς 263–4
- κάδος 399
 κάθημαι 313–4 (κάθου vs κάθησο)
 καθίζω 315–6 (ἐκάθιζον, ἐκάθισα)
 καίω/κάω 234
 καλλύνω vs κορέω 525
 κάνθος 454–5 with n. 42, 512
 κατασκευάζω 345
 καταφαγᾶς 449
 καταφανέστερος 279
 κατὰ χειρός 460 n. 61
 κατελιυσιωμένοις 424
 καψιπήδαλος 423
 κεστρεύς 266–7
 κῆπος 422
 κῆρυξ 482, 511, 512
 κλάδος 270
 κλαίω/κλάω 234, 331–2, 531
 κόλλοψ 361–2
 κολόκυνθα/κολοκύνθη 257–8
 κόρκορος 424, 425
 κοτύλη 399, 403 with n. 176
 κοτυλήρυτος 403
 κοχώνη 474–6
 κραγόν 488–90
- κράμβη (vs ῥάφανος) 187 n. 168, 522 n. 264
 κρέα 488
 κρείττων 273–5
 κρησέρα 476–7
 κυάνεος 261–2, 403
 κυλικήρυτος 403
 κύρβις 422
 κυρίλλιον vs βομβύλιον 522 n. 263
 κύτταρος 424
 κωνειάζομαι 346
- λαικάζω 344
 λαισποδίας 509–10
 λαλίστερος, λαλίστατος 278
 λέγω 320–2 (εἶπα vs εἶπον), 323 (ἔλεξα vs εἶπον)
 λειπογνώμων 504–5
 λείπω 323 (ἔλειψα vs ἔλιπον)
 λεπύχανον 448 n. 12, 451 n. 26
 λεώς 259–60
 λιθάζω 346
 λίνος 472, 473, 474
 λίτρα 250
 λογγάζω 346
 λοιβάσιον 395–6, with nn. 140–1
 λόπισμα 451 n. 26
- μαγίς/μάγειρος 467 n. 81
 μαίνομαι 333 (μέμηνα vs μεμάνημαι)
 μάλλον + positive adjective 279
 μαμμάκουθος 489
 μάρτυς 270
 μασταρίζω 422
 ματτυάζω 346
 μεγαλοψυχέω/μεγαλοψυχία 450 with n. 21, 453
 μέδιμος 515 n. 240
 μειαγωγός 422
 μείζων 273–5
 μείων 422
 μέλλω 314–5 (ἦμελλον vs ἐμελλον), 353–4 (with infinitive)
 μετά 350–1
 μετάκερας 428
 μηδεῖς/μηθεις 229
 μνᾶ 250
 μοιχή/μοιχίς/μοιχαλῖς/μοιχίδιον 451 n. 26, 453
 μοσχίας/μοσχίων 504 with n. 203

- μόχθηρος vs μοχθηρός 506–8
 μῦς 263–4
- νάκη 404 with n. 178
 νάρκα/νάρκη 257–9
 νεώς 259–61
 Νηλεύς 266
 νομέας/νομείς 267
 νῦν/νυνί 283
- ξηραλοιφέω/ξηροτριβέω 514 n. 238, 515 n. 240
- ὄβολος 250
 ὄδε/ὀδί 282
 ὄζαινα 412
 οἶδα 306–7 (οἶδας), 308–10 (οἶσθας), 309–10 (οἶδας), 337–8 (pluperfect ending)
 οἶκει 247
 οἰνοχόη 519
 ὀλίγος/ὀλιός 172–4, 229
 ὀλπη 519
 ὄμπνιος 398
 ὄπως 354–5 (conjunction with subjunctive, with or without ἄν)
 ὀράω 342 (έόρακα vs έώρακα)
 ὄρνις 270
 ὄρτυξ 481, 482, 510, 511, 512
 ὀσμήλιον 412
 ὀσφραίνομαι 322–3 (ὠσφράμην vs ὠσφρόμην), 328 (ὠσφράνθην vs ὠσφρόμην)
 οὐδεῖς/οὐθείς 229
 οὗτος/ούτοσί 282–3
 οὕτως/ούτωσί 282
- παθημάτοις 454
 παραγοράζω 346
 παρ'αἵγειρον θέα 421–2
 παράθυμος/παραθυμῖος 456–7
 παράσιτος 518–9
 παροινέω 316 (έπαρῶνουν, πεπαρῶνηκα)
 πέζα 405 with n. 186
 Πειραιεύς 240, 265–6
 πελίκη 518 n. 253, 519
 πέλλος 405–6
 πέριξι 480–2, 512
 περίστων 507, 508
 πίπτω 336–7 (pluperfect ending)
- Πλαταιϊκός 238–9
 πλείων 273–5
 πλεονεξία 450, 453
 πλήσω 335 (πέπληγα vs πέπληχα)
 ποδαπός/ποταπός 229
 ποῖ κῆχος 424
 ποῖος/πέιος 247
 πόνηρος vs πονηρός 506, 508
 πράσσω 329 (πράξω vs πράξομαι), 336 (πέπραγα vs πέπραχα)
 προθέλυμος 488–9
 προκῶνια 462 n. 70, 518 n. 252
 Προμηθεύς 266
 πρὸς Γᾶς 231
 προστῶν 507–8
 πρόσωπος/πρόσωπον 451 with n. 26
 πυκάζω 344
- ῥαδιέστερος 278
- σάμαξ 424
 σάννας 450
 σεαυτοῦ 280–1
 σηπία 507, 508
 σῆς 270
 σίγυνον 380, 382
 σίναπυ vs νᾶπυ 518 n. 252, 520
 σισύρα 424
 σίσυρνα 422, 424
 σῖτος 528–9
 σκότος 270–1
 σκύφος 271
 σμάω 88
 σμήχω 88
 σπανοσιτία 453 with n. 35
 σπιδῆς 402 with n. 171
 σποδέω 509–10
 στασιάζω 345
 σταφυλή vs βότρυς 518 n. 252, 521–2
 στάχυς 398
 στεγανόμιον 450 with nn. 18–20
 στίμμς/στίμμι 364, 448 n. 12, 451 n. 26, 456
 στιφρότης 292
 στλεγγίς/σπλαγγίς 503, 515 n. 240
 Στρατοφάνης 269
 στρηνιάω 340–1
 στρωματεύς 266, 268

- στυγνότης 292
 στυφελή 406
 σύν 350–1
 σύφαρ 410
 σφάγιον/σφάγειον 406, 407
 σφῶν αὐτῶν, σφᾶς αὐτούς vs ἑαυτῶν,
 ἑαυτούς 497
 σχολάζω 345
- τάγηνον 450
 τὰν Ἄρτεμιν 231
 τὰν Κόραν 231
 τάριχος 271
 ταυτό(ν) 256–7
 τάχιον 276
 τηλικούτος/τηλικουτοσί 282
 τίθημι 318–9 (thematization), 323–4 (ἐθήκαμεν-
 type vs ἔθεμεν-type)
 τίκτω 329 (τέξω vs τέξομαι)
 τοιόσδε/τοιόσδι 282
 τοιοῦτο(ν) 256–7
 τοιοῦτος/τοιουτοσί 282
 τόλμα/τόλμη 257–9
 τοσοῦτο(ν) 256–7
 τοσοῦτος/τοσουτοσί 283
 τρέχω 329 (δραμῶ vs δραμοῦμαι), 332
 (δραμοῦμαι vs θρέξομαι)
 τροφεύς 266–7
 τροχάζω 345
 τυντλάζω 344
 τυρβάζω 346
 τύρις 263
- ὕβρις 262
 ὕει 88
 υἱός 245, 271–2
 ὕκης 406
- ὑμέναιος 472, 473, 474
 ὑπέρ 351
 ὑπερσπουδάζω 346
- φάγρος 399
 φανός 526–7
 φελλός 425
 Φερρέφαττα 231
 φέρω 320–2 (ἦνεγκα vs ἦνεγκον)
 φεύγω 331 (φεύξομαι vs φευξοῦμαι)
 φημί 306 (ἔφης), 310 (ἔφη)
 φθάνω 341–2 (sigmatic aorist)
 φύσις 262
- χαλκίον 250
 χανδάνω 512–3
 χάος 404 with n. 179
 χειμάζω 345
 χείρων 273–5
 χεδροπά 477–80
 χοῖνιξ 480–2
 χορτάζω 345
 χοῦς, χοεύς 266, 272–3, 519
- ψαλτής 529
 ψευδαττικοί 433–5
 ψευδολογία 451 n. 22
 ψυγεύς 205–6, 266–7
 ψωθία 527, 528 n. 283
- ὦδε/ὠδί 283
 ὠρίζω 243–4
 ὠρακιάω 424
 ὠς 352–3 (preposition with accusative) 354–5
 (conjunction with subjunctive, with or
 without ἄν)

