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.

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111382890-001

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 sociolinguistic 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': Rafiyenko, 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 subperiods: '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 sophistica*; 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 lexica 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-posited 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. ττ instead of σσ in words such as θάλαττα) 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 reuse 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. σσ for Attic ττ in words such as θάλασσα, or the form λαός for Attic λεώς '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 (γλῶσσαι) or notable terms (λέξεις) 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 language[43] 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–Radermacher.

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 ἀρετή) 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 Tieken-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 Plinianae* (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 Matthaios (2020a, 366–72) (= Matthaios 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 Ἀττικιστής, *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 Stifler (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 διάλεξιν ταραττούσας 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*: Kaibel (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 ἀπαίδευτον 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 diastratic 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. οὔ φασι δεῖν λέγειν ἀλλά '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 tile 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 Cotiaeum (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 Λέξεις 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 Matthaios (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 Matthaios (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 Matthaios (2006, 13–5).

140 Adler (1931, 686–700).

141 The same approach is developed in Matthaios (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 Eusthatius (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 Moschopoulean 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 lexica 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 ἀλεκτρυών, 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 *Attici*).[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 (2022l).

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 lexica 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 εἰσίναι (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 resumé 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 Matthaios (2013); Matthaios (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 metalinguistic 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 nature[186] 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 (ἑλληνισμός) 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. Matthaios (2013) and Matthaios (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 χρῆσις, 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 Matthaios 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 Ἕλληνες 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 overgeneralisation 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 Ἕλληνες 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 ἄθλιος '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 *Antatticist* 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 καινός);[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 scholarship[207]

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 milieus 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 Matthaios (2006); Matthaios (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 Τέχναι 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 (Philitas 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 standalone 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.