

## Chapter 5

# Attic in the flesh: The language of late Attic comedy and its Atticist reception

### 1 Preliminaries

In the previous chapter, we approached the history of Classical Attic from a cultural-historical perspective. We discussed the emergence of literary Attic and its interaction with other traditions (Chapter 4, Section 2) and explored the ideological aspects associated with different varieties of ‘good’ or ‘bad’ Attic in 5th-century BCE sources (Chapter 4, Section 3). We also examined changing attitudes towards the innovative features of 4th-century BCE Attic and how they relate to Athens’ changing social and cultural environment (Chapter 4, Section 4). So far, we have observed the evolution of literary Attic mostly from the point of view of three genres: comedy, historiography and, to a lesser extent, oratory. As we have shown, the 4th century BCE represents a significant turning point. The linguistic evidence from this period clearly shows the competition between innovative and conservative tendencies, which are already discernible in 5th-century BCE texts. More importantly, it also documents how this tension was increasingly overcome, and with it the emergence of a new form of Attic that gradually but inexorably acquired legitimacy. This phase precedes the affirmation of the koine, which is already a distinct entity in some of the latest sources we have discussed (see Chapter 4, Section 4.3).

The present chapter thus provides the linguistic basis for investigating what was approached from a wider perspective in Chapter 4. To this end, we have selected a self-contained corpus as a test-case – Middle and New Comedy – to examine what it can tell us about the evolution of the dialect.<sup>1</sup> This analysis selects some diagnostic features of the language of late Attic comedy and is organised

---

1 Our corpus consists of the following authors: Alexis, Amphis, Anaxandrides, Anaxilas, Anaxipus, Antidotus, Antiphanes, Apollodorus Comicus, Apollodorus Carystius *vel* Gelous, Apollodorus, Araros, Archedicus, Aristophon, Athenion, Axionicus, Baton, Charicles, Clearchus, Cratinus Junior, Crobylus, Damoxenus, Demetrius II, Demonicus, Dexicrates, Diodorus, Dionysius, Dioxippus, Diphilus, Dromon, Ephippus, Epicrates, Epigenes, Epinicus, Eriphus, Euangelus, Eubulides, Eubulus, Eudoxus, Eumedes, Euphanes, Euphron, Hegesippus, Heniochus, Heraclides, Hipparchus, Laon, Lynceus, Menander, Mnesimachus, Nausicrates, Nicon, Nicolaus, Nicomachus, Nicostratus, Ophelion, Philemon, Philemon Junior, Philetaerus, Philippides, Philippus, Philiscus, Philostephanus, Phoenicides, Posidippus, Simylus, Sophilus, Sosicrates, Sosipater, Sotades, Stephanus, Straton, Theognetus, Theophilus, Timocles, Timotheus, Xenarchus, and Xenon. No systematic examination has

according to linguistic levels: phonology (Section A), nominal morphology (Section B), verbal morphology (Section C), and syntax (Section D). As a constant point of reference, in our survey we have taken into account the contemporary data from other Attic literary genres and inscriptions. The guiding principle of this selection has been to compare this evidence with the Atticist reflections on the very same linguistic phenomena, and to analyse how comic language contributed to defining the parameters of Attic according to the Atticists.<sup>2</sup>

The choice of the language of Middle and New Comedy as a case study is justified on several grounds. Firstly, as previously remarked, the language of Middle and New Comedy contains significant innovations compared to that of Old Comedy. The more ‘realistic’ orientation of later comedy goes hand in hand with the use of a more colloquial language: this allows us to gain a reasonably faithful understanding of the evolution of late Attic and its incipient development into the koine (see Chapter 4, Section 5). Comic texts not only represent a larger and more informative body of evidence for the linguistic innovations of (late) Attic than any other literary genre, but they also represent a linguistically more uniform corpus. Oratory, on the other hand, despite its considerable number of texts, does not offer an equally suitable case study: its high degree of linguistic variation between authors does not provide a very homogeneous and consistent linguistic picture. This was recognised by the Atticists themselves: while they routinely single out orators such as Demosthenes as models of ‘good’ and ‘pure’ Attic, they sometimes treat others like Lysias and Hyperides with suspicion. Likewise, 4th-century BCE historiography would provide a relatively limited test case, since only Xenophon is preserved to an appreciable extent. Despite the great linguistic interest of Xenophon (see Chapter 4, Section 5.1), the evidence offered by Middle and New Comedy is also more varied in terms of chronology, since it ranges from the early decades of the 4th century BCE to the first half of the 3rd century BCE. Naturally, a systematic study of the language of 4th-century BCE Attic prose, including Plato, and its reception in Atticist lexicography would be highly desirable. However, the ongoing lack of comprehensive collections of data on this wide corpus makes an investigation of this kind an unmanageable undertaking.

One further reason for selecting comedy as a case study is that it was of paramount importance first to Hellenistic philologists and later to Atticist lexicographers: comic language of any period proved to be the litmus test for the definition of the Atticist canon(s). This, however, does not mean that the innovative language

---

been carried out on the comic *adespota*, but despite the general uncertainty about the date of most fragments, we have tried to include as much material as possible and appropriate.

2 A more extensive collection of the Atticist materials will be provided in *Ancient Greek Purism* Volume 2.

of late comedy did not prove challenging for the Atticists. The language of Middle and New Comedy was the battleground for the competing stances of Atticist lexicographers, divided between those who accepted a larger canon of *Musterautoren*, also including the poets of Middle and New Comedy, and those who refused to consider post-5th-century BCE comedy as a benchmark for defining ‘good’ and ‘pure’ Attic (see Chapter 1, Section 5.1).

We have already provided a historical contextualisation of the evolution of comic language in the previous chapter (Chapter 4, Section 5.2), but a few additional remarks are in order. Previous attempts to place the language of comedy within a wider cultural and historical context have largely privileged Menander and the linguistic aspects related to the characterisation of individuals according to age, gender, and social position.<sup>3</sup> There has been only a sporadic interest in locating the language of late comedy within the historical development of Attic and its reception in antiquity. In this respect, a few studies – most of them predating many of the papyrological findings – have analysed Menander’s vocabulary and other aspects of his language, partly in the wake of the ancient lexicographers’ interest.<sup>4</sup> At present, there are only a few studies to turn to for a historical placement of Menander’s language – to mention the most recent: Rosenstrauch (1967);<sup>5</sup> Horrocks (2010, 102–5); Cartlidge (2014); and Vessella (2016b).<sup>6</sup> These studies, though they differ widely in scope, all come to the conclusion that Menander’s language is still Attic, despite the increasing affinities with the koine.

Compared to these studies, we have taken a rather different approach here. Firstly, we have aimed to offer a broader view of the language of Middle and New Comedy, i.e. not to focus exclusively on Menander. Secondly, we have programmatically selected as our primary goal to investigate those linguistic traits that are diagnostically more relevant for understanding the later Atticist reception. For this reason, for instance, syntax is discussed only tangentially, since it is well known that syntax received only sporadic attention from Atticists. On the contrary, for obvious constraints of time and space, the lexicon, the Atticists’ main concern, has not been taken systematically into account, though some features

<sup>3</sup> See, e.g., Zini (1938); Sandbach (1970); Webster (1974, 99–110); Del Corno (1975); Katsouris (1975); Bain (1984); Arnott (1995); Krieter-Spiro (1997); Dickey (1995); Macua Martínez (2008); Scafuro (2013); Ferrari (2014).

<sup>4</sup> See Bruhn (1910); Durham (1913); Klaus (1936); López Eire (2002); Lamagna (2004b).

<sup>5</sup> We could not profit from Rosenstrauch (in Polish).

<sup>6</sup> Körte (1931, 751–3) and Cartlidge (2019) are also successful in condensing much information in very limited space.

are discussed in Sections B and C.<sup>7</sup> Moreover, the study of the language of later comedy is important because later Attic is a witness to many linguistic developments which remain productive throughout the later history of Greek. Therefore, our inquiry aims to place the evidence from later comedy in the wider history of Greek. Finally, beyond the primary focus on the Atticist reception, we have included a discussion of a few issues (e.g. the ‘long’ datives, see Section B.1.2) which, although they are not known to have been discussed by the Atticists, allow us to appreciate the evolution of comic language from Old Comedy to Middle and New Comedy, and also to recognise the transformations between the language of Middle Comedy and that of New Comedy.

---

<sup>7</sup> For bibliographical references on these areas of language not covered in this enquiry, especially syntax and lexicon, see Willi (2002a, 21–3).

---

**A. Phonology**

## 1 Generalities

The language of the poets of Middle and New Comedy does not show major phonological differences from standard Classical Attic. Some elements of phonological variation (see list below), attested in the manuscript tradition of the poets of Middle and New Comedy (and sometimes already of Old Comedy) and foreshadowing koine Greek, have already been discussed by earlier scholarship, and a thorough treatment of these features will not be provided here.

/oi/ > /o:/ and /o/ before a vowel: typically in ποιέω (and related forms) and τοιοῦτος (see Arnott 1996, 100 and 695–6; Arnott 2001a); genitive οἴος (from οἷς ‘sheep’) with a short first syllable in Mnes. fr. 4.47 is exceptional and probably due to literary parody. -ει and -η as the 2nd-person middle and passive ending (see Arnott 2001b). **Word-initial** /ε:u/ > /eu/ in the augmented verbs in εὔ- (see Arnott 1996, 77; Arnott 2002, 198). γιν- > γιν- (see Arnott 2002, 195–6; Favi 2022a). **Initial** κν-/γν- (see Willi 2003b, 42–3; Gerbi 2024b). /rs/ > /rr/ (see Hunter 1983, 201; Arnott 1996, 697; Arnott 2002, 207–8). /tt/ and /ss/ (see Arnott 2002, 210–4). αὔτις/αὔθις (see Arnott 2002, 194; cf. Orus fr. B 55: αὔτις καὶ αὔθις ἐκατέρως λέγουσιν, and Alpers *ad loc.*). ποδαπός, ποταπός (Arnott 1996, 248; Batisti forthcoming c). οὔδεις/οὔθεις, μηδεις/μηθεις (see Arnott 2002, 200–1). ὀλίγος > ὀλίος (see Cassio 1981, 86–7; Favi 2017, 132–6; Chapter 4, Section 3.3). **Apocopated prepositional prefixes** (see Chapter 4, Section 5.2).

Other phenomena require detailed consideration. After reviewing the functions of retained /a:/ (Section A.2), we shall examine the possible sociolinguistic relevance of retained /a:/ in oaths (Section A.2.1). We will then focus on the different treatment of the diphthongs /ai/ and /ui/ in a prevocalic position as evidence for a broader phonological change which was already underway in Attic (Section A.3; Section A.4). Finally, we shall discuss some instances of the development /oi/ > /ei/ that may also reflect the evolving phonology of Attic (Section A.5).

## 2 Retained /a:/

The so-called *alpha purum* fulfils a variety of functions in Attic comedy, from literary parody to the depiction of foreigner talk. In Middle and New Comedy, dialect parody is far less common than in Old Comedy and it tends to be associated with stock characters such as the (fake) Doric doctor (see Alex. fr. 146, Men. Asp. 439–68). Retained /a:/ may also be a lyric feature (see Men. Th. 36, 39, 41), especially in the context of the parody of dithyramb so common in Middle Comedy (see Mnes. fr. 4.59). This should prevent us from normalising cases of retained /a:/.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>8</sup> The instances of retained /a:/ in the riddle in Diph. fr. 49 are more difficult to interpret. Perhaps, this riddle, comprising the three answers to the initial question, was a story narrated by

**Anaxandr. fr. 6** is a good example. The retained /a:/ in γᾶς and hyper-Attic /a:/ in διανεκῇ (see Threatte 1980, 132) are part of a quotation from Timotheus (fr. 798 *PMG*). The MS A of Athenaeus' *Deipnosophists*, the source of our fragment, has a superscript η above α in διανεκῇ (i.e. διηνεκῇ) and γᾶς (i.e. γῆς). Millis (2015, 60) argues that while διανεκῇ is the common Attic form, one should adopt διηνεκῇ as a direct quotation from Timotheus. Accordingly, Millis also prints γῆς in place of γᾶς. This solution is unconvincing. Regarding διανεκῇ and διηνεκῇ, the superscript η is not an emendation: it simply indicates that the form used by Anaxandrides corresponds to the more common διηνεκῆς. It is also perfectly possible that Timotheus used διανεκῆς with the /a:/ vocalism, which also occurs in Corinna (fr. 657 *PMG*) and Philoxenus of Leucas (fr. 836b.22 *PMG*). The same applies for γᾶς and γῆς: Millis does not explain on what ground he restores the Attic vocalism, nor how the form with /a:/ may have come about. Here again, the superscript η indicates that γᾶς corresponds to expected γῆς. Additionally, since in the following line Anaxandrides glosses Timotheus' obscure phrasing, it is more reasonable that ἐν πυρικτίτοις γᾶς is in fact a quotation from Timotheus, as suggested by the /a:/ vocalism and the presence of an obvious poeticism like πυρικτίτος (on which see Millis 2015, 61). On this fragment see also Section C.4.9.

## 2.1 Retained /a:/ in oaths

The oaths with retained /a:/ are a more peculiar case. The first evidence is ὦ Δάματρε in Old Comedy (Ar. *Pl.* 55 and 872, Theopomp.Com. fr. 24). It is quite likely that this oath is a foreign import into colloquial Attic.<sup>9</sup> As stressed by Willi, interjections 'form part of a lexical subgroup where foreign elements are integrated most easily'.<sup>10</sup> Due to the presence of foreigners in Athens, particularly in the lower strata of the population, such 'Doric' oaths may have spread in sociolinguistically informal contexts.<sup>11</sup> However, oaths with the foreign vocalism may also have been adopted in colloquial Attic because the /a:/ was seen as an element that strengthened their power. Indeed, Willi has suggested that in the *Plutus* passage the retained /a:/ might give the utterance a comically solemn tone. Two fragments by Epicrates, a poet of Middle Comedy, may provide additional evidence.

---

one of the actors. If we assume that the riddle originated from a dialectal environment other than the Attic-Ionic one, then this story may have become popular in the form with retained /a:/.

<sup>9</sup> See Willi (2003b, 59) on *Plutus*, with previous bibliography; Farmer (2022, 89) on Theopompus. Willi convincingly argues that in *Plutus* ὦ Δάματρε was 'a usage imported from, or inspired by, other parts of the Greek world', whereas Farmer weighs the option, inevitably speculative, that ὦ Δάματρε in Theopompus Comicus may betray the speaker's provenance from a Doric-speaking area.

<sup>10</sup> Willi (2003b, 59).

<sup>11</sup> See Cassio (1981, 81).

**Epicr. fr. 8.2–3:** ἐπομνύουσα τὰν Κόραν, τὰν Ἄρτεμιν, | τὰν Φερρέφατταν. **Epicr. fr. 10.6–7:** τάδε μοι πινυτῶς, εἴ τι κατειδῶς | ἥκεις, λέξον, πρὸς Γᾶς.

In fragment 8, the speaker reports a procuress' words, including her oaths. These regularly display the non-Attic retained /a:/ vocalism. However, the common Attic form Φερρέφαττα stands out, which is also adopted by Aristophanes (*Th.* 287, *Ra.* 671), Plato (*Cra.* 404c.5, 404d.8), and Demosthenes (54.8 Φερρεφάττιον),<sup>12</sup> as opposed to Περσέφασσα/Φερσέφασσα used by the tragic poets.<sup>13</sup> Thus, this woman uses a mixed language, juxtaposing the retained /a:/ vocalism alongside the typical Attic Φερρέφαττα. It may be that the procuress is a foreigner (and possibly a former prostitute) living in Athens.<sup>14</sup> Alternatively, she may be an Athenian who uses Doric-sounding forms to emphasise the oath, but then ends up using the local Attic form of Persephone's name (and the position of this form at the end of the sequence may have heightened the comic effect).

Epicrates' fragment 10 is a dialogue between two unidentified characters, both of whom adopt regular Attic phonology elsewhere in the fragment. Hence, ll. 6–7 are no obvious evidence of foreigner talk. The line (delivered by speaker A) is an (incomplete) anapestic tetrameter, but the /a:/ vocalism does not necessarily relate to the use of this metre.<sup>15</sup> It has recently been suggested that the setting of the (unknown) play from which this fragment derives may have been a Doric city, which would explain not only the vocalism in πρὸς Γᾶς, but also speaker A's interest in Plato's Academy (see ll. 1–7) and speaker B's report about what he witnessed first-hand at the Panathenaea (see ll. 8–37).<sup>16</sup> These conclusions are sensible, although they are not the only possible ones, and we cannot rule out that the two speakers are Athenian citizens.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>12</sup> It is also defended by Atticist lexicographers (see Moer. φ 29, Thom.Mag. 378.1–2).

<sup>13</sup> On Persephone's name, its etymology, and the variant forms, see Wachter (2007–2008); Nussbaum (2022). Cf. Ὀλυττεύς/Ὀλυσσεύς for Ὀδυσσεύς and other popular spellings of literary and mythical names (see Cassio 1981, 83–4).

<sup>14</sup> See Schulze (1896, 245).

<sup>15</sup> Speaker B of this fragment later on utters Σικελᾶς ἀπὸ γᾶς to make fun of Sicilian doctors (fr. 8.28; anapestic dimeter), but this is an obviously parodic mimesis of the doctor's imagined dialect.

<sup>16</sup> See Nesselrath (2016, 241).

<sup>17</sup> Firstly, it does not look as though the speakers of Epicrates' fragment are talking about Athens as a faraway place; rather, it is the environment of the philosophers of Plato's Academy that they perceive as distant from their own. Secondly, the account of the Panathenaea is not about the festival itself, as it might be if speaker B had travelled to Athens, but about what he witnessed at the festival. Finally, from the fact that speaker A is unaware of what the philosophers of Plato's Academy talk about it does not follow that he was living in a different Greek city: for speaker B is only able to learn about these topics during the Panathenaea by overhearing a



In conclusion, in both fragments the speakers who pronounce the oaths with a retained /a:/ vocalism may well be Athenians who, like Chremylus and Carion in Aristophanes' *Plutus*, adopt forms with a retained /a:/ to emphasise their oaths. It is likely that these foreign oaths had entered the Attic dialect and functioned as emphatic markers. This may be a colloquial use. It is probably not accidental that in Epicrates' fragment 8 the forms with /a:/ vocalism are pronounced by a procurer, and that in Epicrates' fragment 10 the two speakers voice an 'anti-intellectualistic' feeling, which is particularly explicit in the adoption of coarse humour.

### 3 The diphthong /ai/ in prevocalic position

In Ionic and particularly in Attic, when the diphthong /ai/ occurs before the sounds /a/, /e/, and /i/ (but not before /o/ and /u/),<sup>18</sup> typically (but not only) in the case of -αι- and \*-αιϜ-, the diphthong has a tendency to be simplified to -ā-. Interestingly, many ancient sources, especially Atticist lexicography, present this as a typical Attic phenomenon (see below). The exact nature of this process remains uncertain.<sup>19</sup> The case of -αι-/αι(Ϝ)- has been explained as a sort of a quantitative metathesis /a(i).i/ (> /a.(i)i(?)> /a.i:/ > /a:.i/ or as a form of 'compensatory lengthening' (/a(i).i/ > /a:.i/).<sup>20</sup> For -αιϜ- > -āϜ- (except in the case of -αιϜ-, which falls into the previous group), an intermediate stage /aῡV/ or /ai̯V/ has been postulated.<sup>21</sup>

The evidence from the Attic inscriptions shows this development particularly well in the forms αἰεί, Ἀθηναία, and αἰετός, which gradually evolve into αἰ, Ἀθηνά/Ἀθηνᾶ, and αἰετός.<sup>22</sup> This overlaps with the evidence from the literary record, and comparison with Middle and New Comedy proves particularly relevant. Other cases where the diphthong /ai/ undergoes a development are the demotics in -αιεύς and the adjectives in -αιος. Unlike the other category, in this case the second element of the diphthong is treated as a glide and the result is /a/. Moreover, this development of the diphthong is less attested and more short-lived than the previous type. Further evidence that this is a separate development from the previous group is that while in these cases the ancient sources mostly

---

conversation between some members of the Academy. Thus, nothing stands in the way of thinking that the two speakers may be Athenians.

18 Lejeune (1972, 247).

19 Lejeune (1972, 247).

20 See Schwyzler (1939, 265) for the former interpretation. Since in words like αἰετός quantitative metathesis is not an option, the alternative view is more attractive; see also Fiori (2022, 67).

21 Schwyzler (1939, 266).

22 Threatte (1980, 270–94).

agree that -αι- > -α- in prevocalic position is an Attic trait (except for some forms), this is never the case with the demotics in -αιεύς and the adjectives in -αιος. Additionally, while the demotics in -αιεύς are well attested in 4th-century BCE Attic inscriptions, the treatment of the diphthong in the adjectives in -αιος is rare in both literary and inscriptional sources. Thus, the demotics in -αιεύς and the adjectives in -αιος represent two separate cases.

### 3.1 αἰετός and ἀετός (< \*αἰφετός)

While in Old Comedy the regular spelling is αἰετός (also standard in tragedy), in Middle Comedy the spelling is ἀετός with a long first syllable.

**Epicr. fr. 3.3–4:** πεπονθέναι δὲ ταῦτά μοι δοκεῖ | τοῖς ἀετοῖς. Here Athenaeus' MSS have the reading ἀετοῖς, which is also printed by Kassel, Austin (Casaubon and Nauck restored αἰετοῖς).

The evidence from Epicrates is apparently earlier than that from the Attic inscriptions, which usually retain the spelling with the diphthong in αἰετός and derived words before 300 BCE.<sup>23</sup> However, the retention of the diphthong spelling on the inscriptions was probably due to the fact that αἰετ- occurs in the technical vocabulary of architecture (αἰετός 'pediment', see LSJ s.v. IV).<sup>24</sup> Thus, the epigraphic evidence is hardly relevant to support Casaubon's and Nauck's view that αἰετοῖς should be restored in Epicrates. The form ἀετός, like ἐλαία > ἐλάα > ἐλά, Ἀθηναία > Ἀθηνάα > Ἀθηνᾶ, and the verbs κλαίω/κλάω and καίω/κάω, is defended as Attic by the ancient lexicographical sources.

**Moer. α 31:** ἀετόν Ἀττικοί· αἰετόν Ἑλληνες. Cf. Phot. *Amphilochia* 24.238–9; *Et.Gen.* α 184; *EM* 31.50; [Zonar.] 66.9–11.

<sup>23</sup> See Threaght (1980, 277–8). The spelling ἀετός is the norm in papyri (see Mayser, *Gramm.* vol. 1,1, 84–5; Gignac 1976, 196).

<sup>24</sup> See also Schwyzler (1939, 266): 'αἰ inschriftlich in der architektonischen Bedeutung, also wohl nicht einheimische Form'.

### 3.2 κλαίω and κλάω, καίω and κάω

In κλαίω (< \*κλαίρω) and καίω (< \*καίρω) the spelling of the diphthong varies considerably.<sup>25</sup> The evidence from Middle and New Comedy fragments is collected by Arnott (2002, 199). The first vowel is usually long in all metrically guaranteed cases.<sup>26</sup>

The form with monophthongisation is also regarded as the proper Attic one by Atticist lexicography.

**Moer. κ 46:** κλάειν καὶ κάειν σὺν τῷ α Ἀττικοί· μετὰ δὲ τοῦ ι Ἑλληνες.

### 3.3 ἐλαία, ἐλάα, and ἐλᾶ (< \*ἐλαίφα)

In the manuscript tradition of Middle and New Comedy, ἐλαία and ἐλάα always have a long middle syllable.

**ἐλαία:** Mnesim. fr. 4.29. **ἐλαίας:** Posidipp. fr. 37. **ἐλαῶν:** Antiph. fr. 140.3. Modern editors retain the spellings of the sources.

ἐλάα is already found in Old Comedy.<sup>27</sup> Ancient scholars also recognised ἐλάα as Attic.

**Eust. in Il. 1.266.16–8:** [ . . . ] καὶ ἐλαία, αὐτό τε τὸ φυτὸν καὶ ὁ καρπός. αὐτὸς δὲ, μάλιστα δίχα τοῦ ι. ἐλάα γὰρ Ἀττικῶς, ὁ τῆς ἐλαίας καρπός.<sup>28</sup>

Aristophanes (fr. 122) also attests to ἐλάζω, which presupposes the derivation \*ἐλαίρω > ἐλαῖζω/ἐλάζω and where the development of -αιρ- before the verbal suffix -ίζω regularly produces -ᾶ(ρ)-.<sup>29</sup>

But ἐλαία > ἐλάα gave rise to a more advanced development. The presence of two /a:/ sounds in adjoining syllables caused the contraction of /a:a:/ into /a:/ (i.e. ἐλαία > ἐλάα > ἐλᾶ). The contracted ἐλᾶ is attested in two late-4th-century BCE inscriptions,<sup>30</sup> and must also be restored in the relevant fragments of Alexis and Diphilus (see Favi 2018).

<sup>25</sup> The development -αιρV- > -ᾶV- would not normally take place before the /o/ sound (see Section A.3), but the analogy with the rest of the inflection, notably cases like -αι(ρ)ε-, must have caused this development also before the /o/ sound.

<sup>26</sup> On the evidence from papyri see Mayser (*Gramm.* vol. 1,1, 85; vol. 1,2, 119); Gignac (1981, 273).

<sup>27</sup> See Kassel, Austin (*PCG* vol. 3,2, 98–9 *ad Ar.* fr. 148.2).

<sup>28</sup> On the made-up semantic distinction between ἐλαία and ἐλάα, see Threatte (1980, 278).

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Phot. ε 551 (= *Et.Gen.* AB = *EM* 326.20–1 = *Et.Sym.* ε 270). On the other forms collected by Herodianic sources see Wackernagel (1885, 278–9); Schwyzler (1939, 265–6); Section A.3.9.

<sup>30</sup> See Favi (2018, 174–5).

**Alex. fr. 263.3:** ἐφ' ἧς ἐπέκειτ' οὐ τυρὸς οὐδ' ἐλῶν γένη. The MSS of Athenaeus' epitome have ἐλαῶν, which would require a short middle syllable. This is unlikely on several accounts (ἐλάα with a short second syllable is foreign to Attic (see below) and this option is not available in Diphilus).

**Diph. fr. 14.3–5:** οὐδὲν μὰ Δία τοῖς ἐμοῖς βλίτοις | ὅμοια πράγματ' οὐδὲ ταῖς θλασταῖς ἐλαῖς. Athenaeus' MSS have ἐλααῖς, and so Kassel, Austin (like earlier editors) print ταῖς θλασταῖς ἐλααῖς as the beginning of a new line (i.e. ὅμοια πράγματ' οὐδὲ ταῖς <x \_ \_> | θλασταῖς ἐλααῖς). In this case a short middle syllable cannot be posited, since the anapestic ἐλααῖς would be impossible in the sixth iambic element of the trimeter. In both cases the best available solution is restoring the forms of contracted ἐλᾶ, ἐλᾱς.

The contracted form ἐλᾶ appears in Ptolemaic and Roman papyri.<sup>31</sup> It is also defended by Aelius Dionysius, presumably on the basis of the comic evidence.

**Ael.Dion. ε 29:** ἐλαία καὶ ἐλάα καὶ ἐλᾶ· Ἀττικῶς ὁ τῆς ἐλαίας καρπός. καὶ ἐλαολογεῖν τὸ συλλέγειν ἐλαίας (= **Eust. in Od. 2.302.31–2:** λέγει δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς [i.e. Aelius Dionysius] καὶ ὅτι ἐλαίας καὶ ἐλάας Ἀττικοὶ τὸν καρπὸν ἔλεγον καὶ ἐλάς δισυσλλάβως καὶ ἐλαολογεῖν τὸ συλλέγειν ἐλαίας). Eustathius, probably relaying on Aelius Dionysius, regularly considers -αia > -αa an Attic development (see **Eust. in Il. 1.133.4–8:** οὕτω καὶ τὴν Ἀθήνην Ἀθηναίαν φασὶν ἄλλοι τε καὶ ὁ ποιητής. οἱ μὲντοι ὕστερον ἀποβάλλοντες τὸ ι τῆς αἰ διφθόγγου καὶ Ἀθηναίαν ποιοῦντες, ὥσπερ τὴν ἐλαίαν ἐλάαν Ἀττικῶς, οἶον· 'τίς τῆς ἐλάας παρέτραγεν;' [Ar. Ra. 988]. Ἀθηναίαν μὲν οὐ φασι, τὰ δὲ δύο α κινῶντες λέγουσιν Ἀθηναῖαν, **Eust. in Il. 1.322.7:** ἐλαία ἢ Ἀττικῶς ἐλάα, **Eust. in Il. 3.522.3–5:** τὸ δὲ ἐλαῖνον ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐλαία γέγονεν ἀποθέσει τοῦ ι τῆς διφθόγγου, ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐλάα Ἀττικοῦ, **Eust. in Od. 1.266.17–8:** ὥσπερ καὶ ἐλαία, αὐτὸ τε τὸ φυτὸν καὶ ὁ καρπός. αὐτὸς δὲ, μάλιστα δῖχα τοῦ ι. ἐλάα γὰρ Ἀττικῶς, ὁ τῆς ἐλαίας καρπός).

Moreover, it is likely that the earliest occurrence of ἐλᾶ, ἐλᾱς in Attic can be traced back to Aristophanes (Ar. fr. 408.1: θλαστὰς ποιεῖν ἐλάας according to the MSS, but there is a very good chance that ἐλᾱς should be restored).<sup>32</sup> In support of

<sup>31</sup> See Favi (2018, 175–6); Mayser (*Gramm.* vol. 1,1, 85); Gignac (1976, 196–7).

<sup>32</sup> However we try to adapt the transmitted text to the iambic trimeter or the catalectic trochaic tetrameter, there is no easy solution. It is not impossible that the metre was neither the iambic trimeter nor the catalectic trochaic tetrameter, but this is less likely on several accounts. Among other things, given that the iambic trimeter and the catalectic trochaic tetrameter are by far the most common metres in comedy, it would be a little counterintuitive to force this fragment into a different metre. Torchio (2021, 75) scans ἐλάας in Aristophanes' fragment as \_ \_ \_ (see also Torchio 2021, 72 regarding Ar. fr. 406.2). It might be a lapsus, but in any case it is foreign to Attic (ποιεῖν in Ar. fr. 408.1 must have a short first syllable, so ἐλάας must count as two syllables). The instances of ἐλάα with a short second syllable in late hexameter poetry and epigram (collected by Arnot 1996, 734) should be explained as metrical licences inspired by the exceptional treatment of -αι- in prevocalic position, rather than as rare cases where the diphthong reflects an exceptional, but somehow *sprachecht*, development with an /a/. For some words, this treatment is old and abundantly attested in Attic as well (see Section A.3.6), but for the most part this is not the case. Not only is Menander's ὠραῖζεθ' (fr. 672) the only other case in Attic texts (see Section A.3.9), but

this, we must stress that the development ἐλαία > ἐλάα > ἐλᾶ is in no way different from Ἀθηναία > Ἀθηνάα > Ἀθηνᾶ, a development which is already well underway in 5th-century BCE Attic and is attested at least once in Aristophanes (see Section A.3.4).

### 3.4 Ἀθηναία, Ἀθηνάα, and Ἀθηνᾶ

This theonym is the only case where -αι- > -ᾶ- does not occur before /u/ or /i/. However, while this process may conceivably have been triggered by analogy, this does not imply that this is a later development. Indeed, Ἀθηνᾶ is already solidly attested in 5th-century BCE sources. It occurs 1x in Aristophanes as part of an oath (while Ἀθηναία occurs 4x). Even more interestingly, Ἀθηνᾶ occurs 3x in Thucydides and 4x in Antiphon, while Ἀθηναία is unattested in either writer. In 4th-century BCE prose, Ἀθηνᾶ is predominant: it is the standard form in Xenophon (10x; Ἀθηναία occurs only in *An.* 7.3.39, but the fact that it is part of an oath formula probably makes it an archaism), Plato (20x; Ἀθηναία occurs 1x in the context of a discussion about traditional oaths; the excursus on Ἀθηνάα in *Cratylus* is the only literary occurrence of this form), and Demosthenes (11x; Ἀθηναία occurs 2x only in quotations). This picture reflects the epigraphic evidence: in the 5th century BCE Ἀθηναία is the only form attested in public inscriptions and is also the most common form in private texts, but Ἀθηνάα and Ἀθηνᾶ are also occasionally attested; from the 4th century BCE Ἀθηνᾶ becomes the standard form.<sup>33</sup> Ἀθηνᾶ is regular in Middle and New Comedy. The only occurrence of Ἀθηναία is in the plural, which makes it a special case.

**Ἀθηνᾶ:** Alex. fr. 204.1, 233.2, and 247.14; Bato fr. 7.7; Men. *Asp.* 319, *Col.* 23, *Col.* fr. 2.5, *Pc.* 113, *Sam.* 213, *Sic.* 116 and 144, fr. \*96.2, 77.1, 296.14, 362.1, 420.1; Nicostr. fr. 29.2; Philem. fr. 82.3.

**Ἀθηναία:** Philem. fr. 69.2 (τὰς Ἀθηναίας).

Ἀθηνᾶ was also regarded as the proper Attic form in antiquity.

**Phryn. PS 128.14–5:** ώραίαν· τὴν ὥραν. ἡ δὲ τοιαύτη τροπὴ Ἀττικοῖς <έστιν> ἰδίᾳ. Ἀθηνᾶ Ἀθηναία, ἴση ἰσαία, οὕτω καὶ ὥρα ώραία.

we also lack any example with nouns. In Poliochus we can retain ἐλάα without any difficulties (fr. 2.7–8: θλαστή τ' ἐλάα, καὶ πιεῖν οἰνάριον ἦν | ἀμφίβολον).

33 See Threatte (1980, 271–4).

### 3.5 The diphthong /aj/ before nominal and adjectival suffixes beginning with vocalic /i/

We will now introduce a larger category of forms, those in which the diphthong /aj/ occurs before an /i/ sound (i.e. -αι-/αιϝ- > -ᾷ-). This is typically the case in suffixed forms in -αικός/-αῖκός, -αις/-αῖς, -αῖσκος/-αῖσκος, etc. depending on adjectives (more rarely nouns) in -αιος. In these formations, both spellings are attested in the ancient sources, and modern editorial choices vary accordingly.

**Antiph. fr. 46.6:** ἐν τοῖς δ' ἐκείνων ἔθεσιν ἴσθ' ἀρχαικός (codd. ἀρχαῖκός). **Mnesim. fr. 8.3–4:** ἄρά που | ὀπτὴν κατεσθίουσι πόλιν Ἀχαικὴν. **Philem. fr. 115.3–4:** † ἐκ τοῦ Πλαταικοῦ τε παρακολουθοῦντά τινα | ταύτῃ κατιλλώπτειν. The title of **Alexis'** play Ἀχαῖς (codd. vary between Ἀχαῖς and Ἀχαῖς).

Unlike in the case of αἰετός > ἀετός, ἐλαία > ἐλάα > ἐλᾶ, Ἀθηναία > Ἀθηνάα > Ἀθηνᾶ, and of the verbs κλαίω/κλάω and καίω/κάω, Atticist lexicographers typically recommend -αι- as the Attic treatment over -ᾷ-, which in turn they consider to be the koine form.<sup>34</sup>

**Phryn. Ecl. 26:** Ἀλκαϊκὸν ἄσμα δι' ἐνὸς ι οὐ χρὴ λέγειν, ἀλλ' ἐν τοῖν δυοῖν, Ἀλκαϊκόν, τροχαϊκόν. **Phryn. Ecl. 191:** ἀρχαϊκὸν λέγε ἐν δυοῖν ι ὡς Ἀλκαϊκὸν καὶ τροχαϊκόν. **Phryn. PS 38.9–11:** ἀρχαῖκά φρονεῖν (Ar. N. 821)· ἀντὶ τοῦ εὐήθη καὶ μῶρα φρονεῖν. τὸ γὰρ ἀρχαῖον ἐπὶ τοῦ εὐήθους, ἔλεγον δὲ τοὺς ἀρχαίους καὶ Κρόνους καὶ Κόδρους. **Antiat. a 131:** ἀρχα<ι>κῶς· ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀρχαίως. Ἀριστοφάνης Νεφέλαις (821). **Eust. in Il. 3.483.19–21:** ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι κοινότερον μὲν οἱ ὕστερον ὡς ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀχαΐας Ἀχαϊκὸν λέγουσιν, οἱ δὲ παλαιοὶ ῥήτορες Ἀχαϊκὸν φασὶ δεῖν γράφειν διὰ τῶν δύο ι, ὡς καὶ ἀρχαϊκόν, φασί, καὶ γενναῖικόν καὶ δικαϊκόν. **Thom. Mag. 6.10:** Ἀλκαϊκὸν ἄσμα, οὐκ Ἀλκαϊκόν, ὡς καὶ τροχαϊκόν, οὐ τροχαϊκόν.

Kassel, Austin have generally followed the ancient lexicographers' opinion. But despite the Atticists' claims, the situation in the literary and epigraphic sources is highly dishomogeneous.<sup>35</sup> Presumably, Atticist lexicographers too noticed this confused situation and applied a general principle to impose order. The fact that these formations all depend on forms in -αιος may be another reason for the Atticist prescription, in that the adoption of -αι- would ensure better morphological clarity. To complicate things, not only are the spellings -αι- and -ᾷ- interchangeable, but the manuscript evidence is hardly reliable for assessing this variation.

<sup>34</sup> However, if we look beyond the discussion of the adjectives in -αικός, we also find evidence for the opposite view, namely, that the simplification of -αι- into -ᾷ- is an Attic feature, as discussed in Homeric scholarship by schol. (ex.) Hom. *Il.* 13.612a (bT), and by Eustathius concerning ἐλαία/ἐλλάα (see Section A.3.3).

<sup>35</sup> This was duly acknowledged in earlier scholarship (e.g. Lobeck 1820, 39; Rutherford 1881, 112).

In Antiph. fr. 46.6, the reading in Athenaeus' MS A is ἀρχαῖκός, while ἀρχαυκός is Kock's emendation (accepted by Kassel, Austin). In this case past and present editors explicitly follow the prescriptions of Atticist lexicographers, who recommend ἀρχαυκός over ἀρχαῖκός. In Aristophanes' *Clouds* (821), ἀρχαῖκά is transmitted by the MSS Rav. 429 and Ambr. C 222 inf. (the other MSS have ἀρχαῖκά), and the editors regularly print ἀρχαῖκά. Still, we have no proof that this is the original spelling: it may well be that the scribes adopted the prescribed orthography.<sup>36</sup> In 4th-century BCE Attic, ἀρχαῖκός is attested in Aristotle (*Metaph.* 1089a.2). The restoration of ἀρχαυκός in Antiphanes is in keeping with the convention upheld by Atticist lexicographers (whose main interest was probably Aristophanes, although they recommended -αι- more generally), but it tells us nothing about the original 4th-century BCE form.

The case of Mnesim. fr. 8.3–4 is different: Athenaeus' MSS read Ἀχαικὴν, but this is problematic. We may start by considering the parallel case of Alexis' title Ἀχαιῖς. The sources quoting this title give both -αι- and -αῖ-, so Kassel, Austin print Ἀχαιῖς. However, Arnott (1996, 128 n. 1) chooses to adopt the spelling -αῖ- since, he writes, 'the form with one iota was already accepted in 4th-century Attic'. We should add that while Ἀχαι- is the normal form in tragedy and Herodotus, Ἀχαιῖς is already the regular form in Thucydides and Xenophon for the choronym Ἀχαιῖα and the ktetic Ἀχαιῖκός (incidentally, Ἀχαιῖς is already in Semonides, fr. 23.1 West). Returning to Mnesimachus' Ἀχαικὴν, it may well be that Ἀχαικὴν in Athenaeus' MSS is the regularised rather than the original spelling (cf. the case of ἀρχαῖκά in Ar. *Nu.* 821 discussed above): one is therefore tempted to consider restoring Ἀχαικὴν in Mnesimachus as well.

A partially similar situation is found in the case of Philem. fr. 115.3–4. The reading of the MS of Clement of Alexandria is Πλαταικοῦ. The spelling Πλαται- is standard in Herodotus and Thucydides (Πλαταις: Thuc. 2.71.4, 2.74.2, 3.58.5), while Πλαταιῖ- appears in 4th-century BCE Attic texts (Lys. 3.5, Aeschin. 3.162, Thphr. *HP* 9.18.4). As in the case above, then, -αικ- in Philemon's fragment may be due to scribal normalisation, and the other evidence from 4th-century BCE Attic writers might suggest Πλαταικοῦ instead.

It is difficult to establish a strict chronological rule that applies to all forms. While it is true that there is a gradual evolution from -αι- to -αῖ-, one cannot generalise and say that the spelling is -αι- in 5th-century BCE Attic and -αῖ- in 4th-century BCE Attic. For, while in tragedy the adoption of -αι- seems to be consistent, in other genres the treatment of this diphthong varies from case to case. For example, Thucydides regularly uses Πλαταις (see above), just as he also uses Αἰαι-

<sup>36</sup> See Dover (1968a, 200); Fiori (2022, 68 n. 135).

ίτης (3.19.2) and Ἀναίτις (8.61.2), whereas he never uses Ἀχαι-, but only Ἀχαι- (see above).<sup>37</sup> It therefore appears that although the phonological development reflected by the spelling change -αι- > -αι̃- was probably well underway by the 5th century BCE, the fact that it surfaces in some forms earlier than in others probably reflects the different chronology of each form.<sup>38</sup>

### 3.6 αἰεί and ἀεί (< \*αι̃εί)

In all cases examined so far, the outcome of monophthongisation is a long vowel (i.e. /aĩ/ > /a:/). This is only partly the case for αἰεί > ἀεί, where /a/ is the more common treatment.

The epigraphic evidence shows that αἰεί is the standard form before 450 BCE, but αἰεί and ἀεί coexist in official inscriptions between ca. 450 and 350 BCE (with ἀεί being the more common form), and αἰεί becomes very rare after 350 BCE. This is confirmed by the literary evidence, where the regular spelling is without the iota. As for the length of the first syllable, already in Aristophanes both /a:/ and /a/ are attested. The evidence from the New Comedy papyri (mostly Menander) is collected by Arnott (2002, 192–3), who shows that in 18 cases the vowel length is /a/ and in two cases it is /a:/ (in a further nine cases the syllable is anceps). This collection can be supplemented with the evidence from the Middle and New Comedy fragments known through the indirect tradition.<sup>39</sup> Here, the occurrences of ἀεί with metrically guaranteed /a/, which typically occurs in the final iambic element of the final *metron* of the trimeter, are by far the most numerous (50 occurrences).

**αἰεί with metrically guaranteed /a:/** Dionys.Com. fr. 2.3 and 2.22; Ephipp. fr. 2.2.

**ἀεί with metrically guaranteed /a:/** Alex. fr. 63.2 and 178.14; Anaxipp. fr. 1.28; Antidot. fr. 2.4 and 227.5; Antiph. fr. 254.2; Diod.Com. fr. 2.21; Men. fr. 374.1 and 878.2; Philem. fr. 60.2 and 103.5.

**ἀεί with metrically guaranteed /a/** Alex. fr. 34.5, 35.2, 53.3, 133.4, 145.15, 165.2, 177.1 (see Arnott 1996, 518), 205.7, 219.4, 222.10, and 242.3; Anaxandr. fr. 35.1 (*4ia*<sub>A</sub>); Antiph. fr. 80.4, 121.7, 132.1, 194.11, 205.1, 228.4, 229.2, and 253.1; Apollod.Com. fr. 9.2; Axion. fr. 2.3; Demetr.Com.Nov. fr. 2.2; Diphil. fr. 95.2 and 137.1; Drom. fr. 1.3; Ephipp. fr. 2.3; Eub. fr. 9.6, 69.1 and 122.1; Men. fr. 17.1, 163.4, 219.6, 286.3, 343 (*4tr*<sub>A</sub>), 373.5, 412.3, 686.1, 760.2, 804.10, 602.3 and 655.2 (*4tr*<sub>A</sub>); Philem. fr. 31.7, 92.4, 92.10, 162, and 164; Philipp. fr. 8; Phoenic. fr. 4.8; Sophil. fr. 4.1.

<sup>37</sup> Moreover, some of the nouns and adjectives deriving from adjectives in -αιος, like Θηβαῖος and Κωπαιῖος, do not seem to have ever occurred in the form -αι- (see Wackernagel 1885, 278).

<sup>38</sup> For the treatment of these formations in the papyri, see Mayser (*Gramm.* vol. 1, 1, 85).

<sup>39</sup> These lists do not include the cases where the first syllable of ἀεί occurs in an anceps position.



The development of the diphthong /aj/ in the first syllable of αἰεῖ/ἄεῖ is a different case from the previously discussed evidence for the development of /aj/ in prevocalic position. Although there is some evidence of other (generally late) forms where the development of -αι- is a short vowel rather than the expected long one (see Section A.3.9), ἄεῖ stands out because the form with a short first syllable is as old as Homer (see Schwyzler 1939, 256). Perhaps, due to its being a high-frequency form, ἄεῖ was more subject to phonetic erosion, and the sequence of two long vowels may have undergone a shortening of the first element.

### 3.7 Other cases of prevocalic /aj/ and their treatment

In the cases discussed above, with the partial exception of αἰεῖ > ἄεῖ, the outcome of the monophthongisation of -αι- and -αιϜ-, plus -αια in Ἀθηναία, is a long vowel (i.e. /aj/ > /a:/). We will now compare two categories where the second element of the diphthong /aj/ is treated as a glide in prevocalic position.

#### 3.7.1 Demotics in -αιεύς

Epigraphic evidence shows that in demotics, ethnics, and toponyms in -αιεύς, simplification into -αεύς is less common than the preservation of the diphthong, as is also shown by the later spelling -εεύς, which presupposes the preservation of the diphthong and the development /aj/ > /e/ (Threatte 1980, 279–86). Compared with the treatment of the diphthong in the cases discussed above, another major difference, which becomes apparent in the poetic occurrences vs the prosaic ones, is that the development -αιεύς > -αεύς produced a short vowel /a/, like in Πειραιεύς with a short middle syllable. That this was not a problematic development already in 5th-century BCE Attic is also shown by Old Comedy (Ar. *Pax* 145 and fr. 683).

**Πειραιεύς** with /a/: Alex. fr. 247.1; Crito Com. fr. 3.4; Men. *Epit.* 752; Philisc. fr. 2.

At the same time, Πειραιεύς/Πειραεύς is the only demotic for which the forms without iota are almost as well attested in the Attic inscriptions as those with iota (see Threatte 1980, 282–4).

But later comedy also offers metrically guaranteed evidence for the retention of the diphthong in demotics in -αιεύς.

**Antiph. fr. 209.1:** δῆμου δ' Ἀλαιοῦς ἐστίν. (B) ἐν γὰρ τοῦτό μοι.

The epigraphic record shows that the form Ἀλαιοῦς without iota, only attested in the 4th century BCE, is comparatively much rarer than the original spelling Ἀλαιοῦς

(and, except in one case, limited to private texts: see Threatte 1980, 280–1). It is therefore particularly interesting that the title of one of Menander's plays is transmitted as Ἀλαεῖς rather than Ἀλαιεῖς (Men. test. 41.13 (P.Oxy. 27.2462.13, 2nd century CE = TM 61494) = Ἀλαεῖς test. i).<sup>40</sup> We may wonder whether this occurrence reflects Menander's spelling of the demotic.

### 3.7.2 Adjectives in -αιος

The comic evidence for the development /ai/ > /a/ collected by Arnott (1996, 695) is (almost) limited to first-class adjectives, and all the instances are from Old Comedy except one case in Eubulus and one in Menander (which is problematic).<sup>41</sup>

**Eub. fr. 115.13:** χρηστή – τίς ἦν μέντοι; τίς; οἴμοι δέιλαιος. **Men. Sic. 169:** ὦ γεραῖέ, μέινον ἐν παραστά[σιν δόμων.

Unlike the cases discussed in the previous sections, where the development of the diphthong /ai/ resulted in /a:/, in this group the second element of the diphthong is treated as a glide and re-syllabification takes place (/ai.V/ > /a.(i)V/). The fact that these forms are (nearly) all adjectives in -αιος, and that the evidence is relatively scanty, probably indicates that the comic poets adopted this treatment only occasionally and purely for metrical convenience. The evidence from Attic inscriptions confirms that the treatment of the second element of the diphthong /ai/ as a glide is extremely rare in the adjectives in -αιος (Threatte 1980, 292–4). This puts us in a better position to judge the two cases from Middle and New Comedy. Eubulus fr. 115.13 employs the traditional expression οἴμοι δέιλαιος, which often occurs at the end of the iambic trimeter in Old Comedy (10x in Aristophanes). Thus, this occurrence must probably be taken as a metrical licence in line with the earlier comic tradition, rather than as a reflection of a phonological development of 4th-century BCE Attic.<sup>42</sup> In Menander, the debated occurrence of γεραῖέ

<sup>40</sup> The other testimonia to the title of this play tend to have a corrupt form, but this is easily traced back to Ἀλαεῖς.

<sup>41</sup> The forms are Ἀθηναῖος in Eup. fr. 37, Pherecr. fr. 39, Polyzel. fr. 12, φιλαθηναῖος in Ar. V. 282 (uncertain), and οἴμοι δέιλαιος at line-end in Ar. Eq. 139, Nu. 40, 165, 202, 1150, Pax 233, Av. 990, Ec. 391, 1051, Pl. 850 (only in this last passage without οἴμοι). The only case which is not a first-class adjective is αὐταῖ in Ar. Av. 1018: φθαιῆς ἄν· ἐπίκεινται γὰρ ἐγγὺς αὐταῖ. Perpillou (1984) discusses this and other evidence to suggest that the process /ai/ > /e/ was already underway in the 5th century BCE. Note, however, that the forms he discusses often show different phonetic forms. In the case of the forms in -αιος, it is more likely that re-syllabification is taking place (see above).

<sup>42</sup> It is intriguing that οἴμοι δέιλαιος occurs at line-end and as the first words of the new speaker in all previous cases except δέιλαιος (without οἴμοι) in *Plutus*, which is the chronologically closest occurrence to Eubulus' fragment. Hunter (1983, 216) compares this with οἶας with a short first

in *Sic.* 169 is part of a passage in which tragic parody is evident.<sup>43</sup> The metre would require a short middle syllable. However, since this treatment is unparalleled in tragedy for passages in iambic trimeters and catalectic trochaic tetrameters, Arnott (1997, 26–7) has plausibly suggested deleting  $\tilde{\omega}$  (note that  $\gamma\epsilon\pi\alpha\acute{\iota}\epsilon$  may also stand alone in tragedy). Kassel, Schröder retain the transmitted text and compare the line from *Sikyonioi* with  $\tilde{\omega} \gamma\epsilon\pi\alpha\acute{\iota}\epsilon$  in *Eur. Or.* 863, the tragic passage alluded to. However, in addition to Arnott's considerations, we should also add that in the passage from Euripides' *Orestes*,  $\gamma\epsilon\pi\alpha\acute{\iota}\epsilon$  does not occur in the same metrical position, nor does it mark the beginning of a new conversation (it occurs in mid-conversation, as is typical in tragedy).<sup>44</sup> Thus, although the *Sikyonioi* passage is parodic, this does not require a close imitation of the source text.

Further, Kassel, Schröder also compare the line from *Sikyonioi* with a similarly problematic case in *Epitrepontes* 348: οὐκέτι δίκαιον· εἴ τι τῶν τούτου σε δεῖ. Here the editors actually make the opposite choice regarding the treatment of the diphthong. The Cairo codex has the reading ουκεστι, which would require δικάϊον. Kassel, Schröder rightly regard this as an unwelcome treatment and therefore print Sudhaus' οὐκέτι instead, despite the attempts of earlier scholarship to defend δικάϊον on the basis of the other evidence for -αῖος in Old Comedy (see above). Similarly, /aῖ.V/ > /a.(i)V/ may not be taken into account in *Men. Dysc.* 568: ἄξιον ἰδεῖν. ἀλλὰ <τὰ> γύναια ταῦτά μοι. The text transmitted in the Bodmer papyrus is ἄξιον ἰδεῖν τιν'. ἀλλὰ γύναια ταῦτά μοι. This requires either the split anapest in the second iambic element of the second *metron*,<sup>45</sup> or that the middle syllable in γύναια is short. But the best solution, also accepted by Kassel, Schröder, is to emend the transmitted text into ἀλλὰ <τὰ> γύναια ταῦτα.<sup>46</sup>

In conclusion, except for the demotics in -αιεύς and the comic idiom οἶμοι δέιλαιος in Eubulus, there is not a single instance in Middle and New Comedy where /aῖ.V/ > /a.(i)V/ represents a concrete possibility.<sup>47</sup> If we also consider the

---

syllable in *Eub.* fr. 67.5 (on which see Hunter 1983, 156), but the treatment of the two diphthongs is different.

<sup>43</sup> See Ingrosso (2021).

<sup>44</sup> The identification of the speakers in this section is notoriously problematic (see Favi 2021; Ingrosso 2021; Kassel, Schröder, *PCG* vol. 6,1, *ad Sic.* 169), but it is certain that at *Sic.* 169 a new speaker begins to speak with Smicrines.

<sup>45</sup> Since ἀλλά is a prepositive, the split anapest may be less obtrusive. For the anapest in this position of the iambic trimeter one may compare, e.g., *Men. Dysc.* 577: ἐκ τοῦ φρέατος βουλομένη τοῦ δεσπότου (but here, as expected, the split anapest corresponds to the three final syllables contained in a single word, and so this parallel is only partly convincing).

<sup>46</sup> See the discussion by Gomme, Sandbach (1973, 222–3).

<sup>47</sup> We leave aside the emendation Πανιστάς for the transmitted Παιανιστάς in *Men. Dysc.* 230. Handley (1965, 172–3) suggested retaining it, but the evidence he gathered in support of this suggestion concerns either the diphthong -οι- or the demotic Πειραιεύς, neither of which is really similar to the case at hand (see Section A.1; Section A.3.7.1). Furthermore, none of the other possible examples mentioned by Handley are usually accepted by the editors (see above; note that

other reasons discussed above, Arnott's deletion of  $\tilde{\omega}$  in the line from *Sikyonioidi* is therefore the likelier option.

### 3.8 Ἑρμαῖσκος

A fragment of Alexis contains an occurrence of Ἑρμαῖσκος that we can compare with the epigraphic evidence.

**Alex. fr. 120.1:** εἶθ' ὁρῶ τὸν Ἑρμαῖσκον τῶν ἀδρῶν τούτων τινά.

Alexis' Ἑρμαῖσκος is the spelling of the Athenaeus MSS and is printed by Kassel, Austin. Arnott (1996, 333) also stresses that the more common spelling in Attic inscriptions is -αι- (6x) as opposed to -αιι- (2x). The short /a/ is not just required in Alexis' fragment, but it is the regular prosody, as also shown by Ἑρμαῖκος. This is unsurprising, given the formation of the word (there never existed a stem Ἑρμαι-).<sup>48</sup> We may thus infer that the two epigraphic occurrences of Ἑρμαῖσκος with the non-etymological -ι- are the engraver's mistake. This is even more plausible if one considers that the inscription where the two occurrences of Ἑρμαῖσκος appear (*IG* 2<sup>2</sup>.1588.4–5) is also the only Athenian inscription in which the form Ἀθηναῖκος is attested (*IG* 2<sup>2</sup>.1588.14). The two examples of Ἑρμαῖσκος are probably a case of hyper-correction. However, documentary sources show that a base form Ἑρμαι- actually began to appear in late Attic (Ἑρμαῖσκος in *IG* 2<sup>2</sup>.8858.2) and in post-Classical Greek (*IG* 7.973, *FD* 3.3.95.2, *ID* 1734.1, *ID* 2622.b.col. ii.7).

### 3.9 ὠράζω and ὠραῖζω

In one instance the verb ὠράζω represents a rather complicated case.

**Men. fr. 672:** ὡς ὠραῖζεθ' ἡ Τύχη πρὸς τοὺς βίους.

The metre requires ὠραῖζεθ' with a short second syllable. However, the derivation ὠραῖος > ὠραι-ίζω would have suggested ὠραῖζω/ὠράζω. In fact, in a fragment of Eupolis and in one of the comic adespota on papyrus, the form with the

ιερέαν in Men. *Dysc.* 496 is an entirely different case: see Kassel, Austin, *PCG* vol. 7 *ad* Posidipp. fr. 28.21 and Kassel, Schröder, *PCG* vol. 6,1 *ad* *Dysc.* 496). Gomme, Sandbach (1973, 172), who accept the emendation of Παιανιστάς to Πανιστάς, are too tolerant of the possibility that -αι- could be read as a short syllable.

<sup>48</sup> See *EDG* s.v. Ἑρμῆς.

long diphthong  $\acute{\omega}\rho\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$  is metrically guaranteed.<sup>49</sup> This is the expected treatment of the verbs in  $-\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$  deriving from adjectives in  $-\acute{\alpha}\iota\varsigma$ .<sup>50</sup> The first to draw attention to this unusual treatment of  $-\acute{\alpha}\iota$ -, was Wackernagel.<sup>51</sup> It is quite remarkable that the same unusual treatment is found in  $\acute{\alpha}\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ , where it must be as old as Homer.<sup>52</sup> As regards the verbs in  $-\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$  Wackernagel compares the rare instance of  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\rho\chi\acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}\sigma\alpha\varsigma$  at the end of the pentameter in an epigram of the Hellenistic epigrammatist Dioscorides (*AP* 7.707.6, in place of the expected  $/a:/$ , as in  $\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\alpha\iota\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma/\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\acute{\alpha}\iota\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$ ).<sup>53</sup> Since Menander's  $\acute{\omega}\rho\acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\theta'$  and  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\rho\chi\acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}\sigma\alpha\varsigma$  in Dioscorides are the only examples of this treatment, one might reasonably argue that they should be regarded as occasional licences rather than as evidence of an alternative treatment of the diphthong. Indeed, one might suggest that the verbs in  $-\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$ , which were formed by attaching the verbal suffix to the  $\bar{a}$ -stems and contained an  $/a/$ , may have influenced the (occasional) adoption of forms like  $\acute{\omega}\rho\acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\theta'$ .<sup>54</sup> Moreover, although the long diphthong  $/a:\acute{\iota}/$  was still retained in Menander's time,<sup>55</sup> confusion with  $/a\acute{\iota}/$  was very much possible.

49 See Eup. fr. 393:  $\acute{\omega}\rho\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta$  καὶ  $\theta\rho\upsilon\pi\tau\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta$  and *com. adesp.* fr. \*1110.17:  $\text{ἰ}\epsilon\lambda\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$   $\acute{\omega}\rho\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\text{ἰ}$  (despite the fact that the papyrus reads  $\acute{\omega}\rho\acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}\zeta\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\text{ἰ}$ , the anapestic metre requires it to be a five-syllable word, just like in Eupolis' fragment). Based on this evidence, Kassel, Austin also print  $\acute{\omega}\rho\acute{\alpha}\zeta\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  in Cratin. fr. 298 (= *Antiatt.*  $\omega$  2) against the MS's reading  $\acute{\omega}\rho\acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  (S. Valente 2015b, 248 retains the transmitted reading, but comments that  $\acute{\omega}\rho\acute{\alpha}\zeta\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  would be more correct).

50 To the list of verbs in  $-\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$  collected by the ancient Herodianic sources, which are followed by Wackernagel (1885, 278–9) and Schwyzler (1939, 265–6), we must now add  $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$  in Aristophanes (fr. 122 (= Phot.  $\epsilon$  551 = *Et.Gen.* AB = *EM* 326.20–1 = *Et.Sym.*  $\epsilon$  270)). Note that the lemma of these lexicographical entries is always  $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu$ , which was then emended to  $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$  by Kaibel (see the above discussion of  $\acute{\omega}\rho\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$  and  $\acute{\omega}\rho\acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$  in Cratinus, Eupolis, and the comic adespoton). The verb  $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$  is an entirely different case, in that  $/a:/$  is etymological (i.e. it is the result of the laryngeal in the root \* $\acute{g}r\acute{e}h_2$ -, not of the process  $-\acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega > -\acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$  as in the previous verbs in the list; see *EDG* s.v.).

51 See Wackernagel (1885, 276–9).

52 See Section A.3.6.

53 See Section A.3.5. Compare Homeric  $\delta\acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$ , with  $/a/$  in place of  $/a:/$  (for which see  $\delta\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ ,  $\delta\alpha\delta\acute{o}\varsigma$ ), to the exceptional  $\delta\acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}\delta\alpha\varsigma$  and  $\delta\acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\nu$ , for which Wackernagel (1885, 277) envisages either a derivation from the older stem \* $\delta\alpha\acute{\iota}\varsigma$  or the same shortening he discusses in the case of the stem  $\acute{\Lambda}\acute{\iota}\delta$ -.

54 One may think of verbs like  $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\lambda\acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$  and  $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\alpha\gamma\lambda\acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$ , always with  $/a/$ , which in comedy occur, respectively, in Eup. fr. 419, Antiph. fr. 294, Ephipp. fr. 3.6, and Eub. fr. 148.3 and in Cratin. fr. 334.1, Ar. *Ec.* 575, and Ar. fr. 700.

55 See Vessella (2018, 61–2).

## 4 The diphthong /ui/ in prevocalic position

The treatment of the diphthong /ui/ in prevocalic position presents several similarities with the case of prevocalic /ai/, insofar as the process typically develops as /ui.V/ > /u:.V/. The two main pieces of evidence for this are the noun *υῖός* > *ύός* and the treatment of the ending of the feminine active perfect participle. It is useful to discuss this evidence separately since, notwithstanding the general similarities, they raise partly different problems.

### 4.1 *υῖός* and *ύός*

In Middle and New Comedy, the word *υῖός* is spelled as both *υῖός* (always in the fragments known via the indirect tradition, sometimes in the papyri) and *ύός* (mostly in the papyri).<sup>56</sup> Whatever the spelling, in Middle and New Comedy *υῖός/ύός* always has a long first syllable. In Old Comedy, instead, *ύός* may also occur with a short first syllable (Ar. *Ach.* 741, V. 36, Pl.Com. fr. 27.2–3, Pherecr. fr. 107). It seems that while *ύός* in Middle and New Comedy presupposes monophthongisation, and thus the development of a long first syllable (/hui.os/ > /hu:.os/),<sup>57</sup> in Old Comedy the second element of the diphthong is treated as a glide and the syllable boundary is shifted, resulting in a short first syllable (/hui.os/ > /hu.ios/). The fact that this was not an option in Middle and New Comedy probably reflects the data from the inscriptions, which show that by 350 BCE *ύός* had become the normal spelling.<sup>58</sup> The Atticists selected *ύός* as the Attic form.

**Orus fr. A 81** (= [Zonar.] 1765.6–9): *ύός* ἄνευ τοῦ ι οἱ Ἀττικοί. λέγω δέ, ὅποτε ἐν μιᾷ συλλαβῇ φωνήεντι ὑποτέτακται, ἐξαιρεῖται ὅλως, οἷον μῦα, ὑός, εἰρηκῦα, πεποιηκῦα, κλάειν καὶ τὰ ὅμοια.

This reminds us of similar statements concerning *αιετός* > *αετός*, *ἐλαία* > *ἐλάα* > *ἐλᾶ*, *Ἀθηναία* > *Ἀθηνάα* > *Ἀθηνᾶ*, and the verbs *κλαίω/κλάω* and *καίω/κάω*.

<sup>56</sup> See Arnott (2002, 215–6).

<sup>57</sup> See Lejeune (1972, 247).

<sup>58</sup> See Threatte (1980, 340–2). On the inflection of *υῖός* as a thematic stem, see Favi (2022w).

## 4.2 Endings of the feminine perfect participle active -υῖα, -ῦα, -εῖα

The ending of the active feminine perfect participle displays a major degree of allomorphy.<sup>59</sup> -υῖα is the standard ending in literary sources. Inscriptions show that starting from the 5th, and increasingly in the 4th century BCE, this ending developed into -ῦα. After 320 BCE, yet another ending appears, -εῖα; this is the only ending attested in 3rd- and 2nd-century BCE Attic inscriptions. The development /ui.V/ > /u:.V/ may be explained along the lines of υῖος > ὕος, which similarly presents a chronological progression from the 5th to the 4th century BCE (Lejeune 1972, 247). The case of -εῖα is more complex, and both a phonological and a morphological interpretation have been advanced.<sup>60</sup> As regards the morphological solution, it has been postulated that an analogy with the adjectives in -ύς, -εῖα, -ύ must have come into effect. However, this interpretation obviously does not explain what functional similarity might have triggered the analogy. On the contrary, the phonological explanation is based on more abundant comparative evidence, namely the fact that also in the nominal stems a similar development /ui.a/ > /eῖ.a/ seems to have occurred (the most famous examples being κῶδεια > κῶδεια > κῶδεια).<sup>61</sup>

As mentioned above, in the manuscript tradition of all Attic writers, the ending of the feminine perfect participle active is -υῖα, while neither -ῦα nor -εῖα are attested. However, Cartlidge (2017a) has recently drawn attention to the linguistic relevance of Cornelia Römer's reading ]κεῖα[ ] in P.Mich. 4752a (= TM 61496) (2nd century CE), which would allow the reconstruction of the reading of the Michigan papyrus in Men. *Epit.* 807 as ἡδικηκεῖα[v] (see Römer 2012, 118; the other papyrus witness, P.Oxy. 50.3532 (= TM 61498) (2nd century CE), has the more common ending -υῖαν). Considering it unlikely that the ἡδικηκεῖαν of the Michigan papyrus may be a scribal error caused by phonetic confusion between -υῖα and -εῖα, Cartlidge explores the possibility that this occurrence may be a lucky case in which the late papyrus preserves the ending which, as the Attic inscriptions show, was common in Menander's time and which Menander may actually have adopted. However, the reading ἡδικηκεῖα[v] is far from certain: Peter Parsons and Lucia

<sup>59</sup> See Threatte (1980, 338–9); Threatte (1996, 470–1); Cartlidge (2017a).

<sup>60</sup> Cartlidge (2017a) offers a re-examination of the whole issue and collects the relevant bibliography.

<sup>61</sup> For the evidence see Kalén (1918); Cartlidge (2017a, 37–8), with bibliography. Another example of an early development that may be compared to the perfect participle is the theonym (E)ἰλείθυ(ι)α, which appears as early as 400 BCE in the form (E)ἰλύθεια (see Threatte 1980, 342–4, who makes the comparison with the ending of the feminine perfect participle active -υῖα/-ῦα/-εῖα but rightly stresses the presence of /u/ in the antepenultimate syllable).

Prauscello (personal communication), after re-examining the original, read ἡδικη-[κ]υεῖα[ν] instead (i.e. the regular ending -υῖα with the common iotacistic spelling of /i/).

## 5 Instances of the development /oi/ > /ei/

Three forms show the rare development of the diphthong /oi/ into /ei/, namely, δυοῖν > δυεῖν, οἶκοι > οἶκει, and ποῖος > πεῖος. The latter form is unattested in ancient sources, so we cannot really discuss it. The genitive-dative dual δυεῖν is attested 3x in Middle and New Comedy, although the manuscripts are sometimes divided between this reading and the more standard δυοῖν (see Section B.1.1.2). As regards οἶκει, although this form is unattested in the papyri and book fragments of Menander, we are briefly informed by John Philoponus that it did appear somewhere in Menander.

**Men. fr. 499** = Ioannes Philoponus *Praecepta tonica* 172 Xenis: τὰ εἰς -ει δίφθογγον λήγοντα <δισύλλαβα> ἐπιρρήματα ὀξυνόμενα δύο ἐστί [. . .]. βαρύτονα δὲ τὸ ἀγρει [. . .] καὶ ἔτι τὸ οἶκει παρὰ Με- νάνδρῳ ἀντὶ τοῦ οἶκοι.

The cause of the phonetic or phonological development in these forms has rarely been identified. As regards δυεῖν, earlier scholarship speaks very vaguely of the later form as a ‘phonetic treatment’ of δυοῖν.<sup>62</sup> In the case of οἶκει, however, it has been suggested that it derives from an earlier adverbial \*οἶκεῖ, which was then distinguished from the verb οἶκεῖ after the alternative form οἶκοι.<sup>63</sup> Whatever their origin, these three forms δυεῖν, οἶκει, and πεῖος were recognised by ancient erudition as typical of (late) Attic.<sup>64</sup>

**Eust. in Od. 2.257.33–6** (= Heracl. Mil. fr. 60 Cohn): ἔτι ἰστέον καὶ ὅτι τὸ ‘ποῖοι κ’ εἴτε’ ταυτὸν ἐστὶ τῷ ‘ποταποὶ ἂν ἔσσεθε’, καὶ ὅτι τῆς ὑστέρας Ἀτθίδος ἐστὶ τὸ ποῖοι. ἡ γὰρ ἀρχαία ἑτεροίαν ἐδίδου παράληξιν τῇ τοιαύτῃ λέξει, ὥς καὶ Ἡρακλείδης δηλοῖ, ἐνθα λέγει τοὺς Ἀττικοὺς τὴν οἰ δίφθογγον εἰς τὴν εἰ μεταποιεῖν, τὸ δυοῖν λέγοντας δυεῖν, καὶ τὸ οἶκοι οἶκει, καὶ τὸ ποῖος πεῖος.

<sup>62</sup> See Schwyzler (1939, 589); Chantraine (1961, 147). Schwyzler (1939, 196) suggests that δυοῖν > δυεῖν may also be the result of dissimilation due to the progressive development from /oi/ to /u/, which he sees as already underway in the 4th century BCE, while other scholars are sceptical about so early a date for this process (see Threatte 1980, 337–8).

<sup>63</sup> Schwyzler (1939, 549).

<sup>64</sup> For the interpretation of Eustathius’ passage and Heraclides’ doctrine see Cohn (1884, 106).



---

## **B. Nominal morphology**

# 1 Nominal endings

## 1.1 Dual number

The dual number is well documented in Attic literary texts of the 5th century BCE, particularly those we think may be closer to colloquial speech (Aristophanes, Euripides).<sup>65</sup> The vitality of the dual is confirmed by inscriptions, where it is systematically employed until the late 5th century BCE.<sup>66</sup> On the contrary, the dual is avoided by writers who choose a more ‘international’ and less parochial language, such as Thucydides. In 4th-century BCE Attic, the tendency to neglect the dual is even more pronounced. Verbal inflection is the first part of speech in which the dual begins to disappear, followed by nominal inflection. According to previous calculations, Plato is one of the few authors who still use the dual to a significant extent, but he only uses it in 25% of the cases where he could have used it. In the orators, the dual occurs even more rarely. All this is evidence that the dual was rapidly dying out in the main varieties of 4th-century BCE Attic, including in both literary texts and public inscriptions. The scanty evidence for the dual in Middle and New Comedy confirms this. Yet, some aspects are worthy of attention, notably, the distribution of the extant dual forms across articles, demonstrative pronouns, and nouns (see Section B.1.1.1), and the genitive-dative case of δύο (Section B.1.1.2). Despite the uneven distribution of the dual in literary texts, Atticist lexicographers recognise it as an Attic feature.

**Moer. v 2:** νό δυϊκῶς Ἀττικοί· ἡμεῖς Ἕλληνες. **Moer. α 4:** ἀθανάτω ἀγήρῳ Ἀττικοί· ἀθάνατοι ἀγήρατοι Ἕλληνες.<sup>67</sup>

### 1.1.1 Dual nouns, adjectives, and pronouns

**Alex. fr. 60.4:** μετείχε δ’ ἀμφοῖν τοῖν ῥυθμοῖν. **Alex. fr. 172.2:** νῆ τῷ θεῷ. **Amphis fr. 9.4:** ὦ Δι-οσκόρῳ. **Antiph. fr. 75.13:** τῷ χεῖρε. **Antiph. fr. 98.2–3:** πονηρῷ ζωγράφῳ [. . .] ἀφανίζουσι (the duals are restored by Morelius). **Antiph. fr. 192.15:** πίννη καὶ τρίγλη φωνὰς ἰχθὺ δύο ἔχουσαι. **Antiph. fr. 222:** στακτὴ δυοῖν μναῖν. **Bato fr. 3.2:** χυτρίδε λαμβάνειν δύο. **Diph. fr. 72.2:** ἀξιους

<sup>65</sup> See Willi (2003a, 253–4); Willi (2003b, 46–7 and 66) with previous bibliography.

<sup>66</sup> See Threatte (1996, 18–20 specifically on θεός and θεά; 91–5); Threatte (2020). Threatte (2020, 273) indicates *IG* 1<sup>3</sup>.426.22 (dated to around 414 BCE) as the first instance of the use of the plural in place of the dual to refer to two items.

<sup>67</sup> In these entries there is an intersection with Homeric scholarship, a recurring feature of Moeris’ lexicon: see Pellettieri (2023b); Pellettieri (2023c); Pellettieri (2023d); Pellettieri (2023e); Pellettieri (2023f). On the discussion concerning Homer’s use of the dual in Alexandrian and Pergamene scholarship, see Matthaios (2018).

λίτραιν δυοῖν. **Eub. fr. 81.1:** τῷ χαλκίῳ. **Eub. fr. 117.10:** δυοῖν ποδοῖν. **Henioch. fr. 5.15:** γυναῖκε δ' αὐτὰς δύο παράττετόν τινε (on the dual verb see Section C.1.6). **Men. Georg. 24, 109; Dysc. 878; Ep. 543, 722; Mis. 576, Sic. 33:** (μὰ) τῷ θεῷ. **Men. Dysc. 192:** ὦ Διοσκόρῳ φίλῳ. **Men. fr. 200:** ἐκ δυοῖν Αἰξωνέοιν. **Men. fr. 241 and \*457:** νῶν. **Men. fr. 411.1–2:** ταῖν ἀδελφαῖν ταῖν δυεῖν | ταύταιν. **Men. fr. 491:** τοῖν δυοῖν Διοσκόροιν. **Nicostr. fr. 5.5–6:** δυοῖν | ὀβολοῖν.

Clearly, in most cases the dual is simply retained for things that naturally come in pairs, such as body parts (hands, feet), deities (the Dioscuri, on whom see below), or for the influence of ἄμφω (as in Alex. fr. 60.4). There seems to be no rule concerning currency units. Beside the examples of dual λίτρα, μνᾶ, ὀβολος, and χαλκίον, there are cases where the numeral δύο occurs with a plural rather than dual currency unit.<sup>68</sup> In the other cases, the dual seems to be used for metrical convenience (as in Antiph. fr. 192.15 and Bato fr. 3.2), or in cases where the number two may be particularly important (as in Men. fr. 411.1–2, probably a passage from a prologue explaining the story of two sisters who will be reunited at the end of the play), or it may sharpen a poignant joke (cf. e.g. Men. fr. 200, where a γραῦς τις κακολόγος is evil-speaking because both her parents were from the deme Aexone).<sup>69</sup> The numeral δύο frequently accompanies dual nouns: while unnecessary, it possibly reinforced the dual. This might also be seen as an element of colloquial speech, which ultimately led to the erosion of the use of the dual.<sup>70</sup>

The case of the name of the Dioscuri might also point to this conclusion. Interestingly, the Attic form (i.e. without the third compensatory lengthening) is the one normally found in the dual number, whereas the plural form has the third

<sup>68</sup> See Philipp. fr. 30.1–2: ὁ τραχύτατος δὲ συκοφάντης μνᾶς δύο | λαβὼν ἄπεισιν or Men. Dysc. 327–8: τούτῳ ταλάντων ἔστ' ἴσως τουτὶ δυεῖν | τὸ κτῆμα. But note that in both cases μνᾶ and ταλάντων are metrically possible. Indeed, the use of doubly marked constructions, i.e. with δύο accompanying a dual form, is truly pervasive also in Attic inscriptions with the expressions of measurement and with amounts of money: this use endures much longer than any other use of the dual (see Threatte 2020, 271; 275).

<sup>69</sup> On this characterisation of the people from Aexone, see Goebel (1915, 22–3). See also Men. fr. 491, which is the only instance in which the name of the Dioscuri is accompanied by δύο (in the Attic inscriptions too, as in the case of τῷ θεῷ, ἄμφω, and Ἄνακε, this is never the case; see Threatte 2020, 273). Considering that Menander's fragment reads ὁ θάτερος μὲν τοῖν δυοῖν Διοσκόροιν ('the other one of the two Dioscuri'), it is very likely that this exceptional case of double marking with a 'superfluous' δύο was intended to emphasise the point being made about one of the two Dioscuri. Examples of this kind confirm Threatte's (2020, 277–8) refutation of Wackernagel's claim that the presence of the numeral δύο is an indication that the two items are presented as unrelated.

<sup>70</sup> On the double marking of the dual see Threatte (2020: 271–6). On pleonastic expressions see Collard (2018, 56–60).

compensatory lengthening and is therefore influenced by literary language.<sup>71</sup> This corroborates the view that the dual was an element of colloquial Attic speech. Atticist lexicographers had different views on the name of the Dioscuri (see Batisti 2024a).

**Phryn. Ecl. 205:** Διόσκουροι· ὀρθότερον Διόσκοροι. γελάσεις οὖν τοὺς σὺν τῷ υ λέγοντας (i.e. the prescribed form of the plural is Διόσκοροι). **[Hdn.] Philet. 44:** οἱ Διόσκουροι σὺν τῷ υ ὅταν πληθυντικῶς λέγονται· τῷ Διοσκόρῳ δὲ ἐν τῷ δυικῷ ἀριθμῷ ἄνευ τοῦ υ (i.e. the prescribed form of the plural is Διόσκουροι, but Διοσκόρῳ in the dual).

### 1.1.2 Genitive-dative of δύο

The numeral δύο is a special case. The original genitive-dative form of δύο is δυοῖν. However, later Attic developed a competing form δυεῖν,<sup>72</sup> the first occurrences of which are in Aristotle's *Constitution of the Athenians* and Menander, but which is also occasionally attested in the manuscript tradition of earlier writers.<sup>73</sup> This new form was later replaced by δυσί(ν) (already common in the *corpus Hippocraticum*), which is documented in the *corpus Aristotelicum* and in Theophrastus and then becomes the koine form.<sup>74</sup> This later form is evidently analogical on the dative plural of the athematic declension, and as such is only used as a dative. The epigraphic evidence shows roughly the same distribution.<sup>75</sup> The older form δυοῖν is standard until 329/8 BCE, when δυεῖν is first attested; then, δυοῖν is abandoned, its last occurrence being in a 285/4 BCE inscription. However, the post-Classical form δυσί(ν),

<sup>71</sup> Note, however, that the plural form without the third compensatory lengthening occurs in Eur. *El.* 1239 and *Hel.* 1644, arguably for metrical convenience. The occurrence of τῶν Διοσκόρων in Thuc. 3.75.4 is not a counterexample, since Thucydides avoids the dual, although it is interesting that he effectively creates a stylistic hybrid between the Attic equivalent (cf. the lack of the third compensatory lengthening) and the more 'international' form (cf. the avoidance of the dual). Additionally, note that the plural Διόσκουροι with the third compensatory lengthening is also adopted by Xenophon (*Smp.* 8.29, but Διοσκούροι in *HG* 6.3.6), Plato (*Euthd.* 293a.2, but Διοσκόρων in *Lg.* 796b.5), and Aeneas the Tactician (24.1 and 24.13).

<sup>72</sup> On this process see Section A.5.

<sup>73</sup> Note that δυεῖν is also the reading of MS A in Thphr. *Char.* 2.3, but Diggle (2004) adopts the δυοῖν of the other manuscripts (see Diggle 2004, 187: 'The evidence of mss. counts for nothing: they regularly impute δυεῖν to fifth-century authors').

<sup>74</sup> See Mayer (*Gramm.* vol. 1,2, 71–3). The use of these forms in the koine is complex. Polybius uses δυεῖν for the genitive and δυσί(ν) for the dative (see de Foucault 1972, 66). A further case in point is the morphosyntax of δύο, δυοῖν, δυεῖν, and δυσί(ν) in LXX Greek: because of the even more advanced disappearance of the dual number in the *Septuagint*, the form δύο can be used both as a nominative-accusative and genitive-dative, whereas δυσί(ν) functions only as a dative (see Helbing 1907, 53).

<sup>75</sup> See Threaght (1996, 415–6).

which appears at the end of the 3rd century BCE and then remains in use until Late Antiquity, is attested much later in inscriptions than in literary texts, probably due to the conservative language of public inscriptions.<sup>76</sup>

**δυοῖν**: Antiph. fr. 222 and 232.2; Diph. fr. 72.2; Eub. fr. 117.10; Men. *Her.* 16, fr. 200 and 491. **δυεῖν**: Men. *Dysc.* 327; Men. fr. 411.1 (the sources are divided between the reading *δυεῖν* and *δυοῖν*, Kassel, Austin print *δυεῖν*); Hegesipp. fr. 1.6 (*δυεῖν* is the reading of Athenaeus' MS A, corrected to *δυοῖν* by Porson 1812, 94 without explanation, but later scholars rightly resist this emendation). **δυσίν**: Timocl. fr. 16.6.

Since both *δυοῖν* and *δυεῖν* are potentially at risk of being corrupted one into the other, it is difficult to always be sure of the correct reading. At any rate, the poets of New Comedy and Aristotle seem to attest to the phase in which *δυοῖν* was gradually being replaced by *δυεῖν*. The occurrence of *δυσίν* in Timocles fr. 16.6 is therefore quite remarkable. The fragment is quoted by Ath. 8.339d (only preserved by MS A). This would be the first ever occurrence of a form otherwise unattested in 4th-century BCE comedy and literary prose, except by a more 'technical' writer like Aristotle (see above). The passage in question is *σύνεστι σαπέρδαις δυσίν, | καὶ ταῦτ' ἀνάλτοις καὶ πλατυρρύγχοις τιςίν* (Timocl. fr. 16.6–7): *δυσίν* may be a copyist's mistake for *δυοῖν*, anticipating *τιςίν* at the end of the following line. Alternatively, we can consider the possibility of a copying error caused by the palaeographic similarity of *omicron* and *sigma* in majuscule writing. However, it is also possible that Timocles used *δυσίν* precisely because the context contains four other datives plural rather than dual; alliteration may also have played a role in the choice of the plural over the dual. In such a case, *δυσί(ν)* was probably already an emerging variant in colloquial Attic that simply did not find its way into written literary and documentary texts.

Atticist lexicographers, and ancient linguistic scholarship more generally, took a great interest in *δυοῖν*, *δυεῖν*, and *δυσίν*.<sup>77</sup>

**Ael.Dion.** δ 31–32 (from Eust. in *Il.* 3.60.15–22): καί, ὅτι τὸ δυοῖν καὶ ἐπὶ δοτικῆς παρὰ Ἀττικοῖς, οἷον 'δυοῖν γυναικοῖν εἷς ἀνὴρ οὐ στέργεται' (*com. adesp.* fr. 189). ἐν ἐτέρῳ δὲ τόπῳ φησὶ καί, ὅτι δύο καὶ ἐν τῷ ω δύο, ἤγουν δύο διὰ τοῦ ο μικροῦ καὶ δύο κατὰ ἑκτασιν, Ἀττικοὶ λέγουσιν ἑκατέρως, δυοῖν τε ἐπὶ γενικῆς καὶ δοτικῆς, τὸ δὲ δυεῖν σπάνιον παρὰ τοῖς παλαιοῖς, ἔστι δ' ὅμως παρὰ Θουκυδίδη (8.101.1 δυεῖν ἡμέραιν). λέγουσι δὲ καὶ τῶν δύο καὶ τοῖς δύο. τὸ δὲ δυσὶ βάρβαρον, φησί, καὶ κατὰ χρῆσιν Ἀττικὴν καὶ κατὰ λόγον γραμματικόν. λέγει δὲ καί, ὅτι νεωτέρων τὸ γράφειν δυεῖν. οὐδὲν γὰρ δυϊκὸν εἰς εἰν λήγειν φασὶν οἱ ἀναλογικοί. **Phryn. Ecl.** 180: δυσὶ μὴ λέγε, ἀλλὰ δυοῖν. **Phryn. Ecl.** 181: δυεῖν ἔστι μὲν δόκιμον, τῷ δ' ἄλλοκότως αὐτῷ χρῆσθαι τινὰς ἐπιταράττεται· ἐπὶ γὰρ μόνῃς γενικῆς τίθεται, οὐχὶ καὶ δοτικῆς. [**Hdn.**] **Philet.** 225: δυοῖν παρὰ Δημοσθένει ἀεὶ (*passim*). οἱ δὲ ἄλλοι δυεῖν λέγουσιν. **Thom.Mag.** 90.15–91.10: δυοῖν, οὐ δυσίν. ὅσα γὰρ μὴ συ-

<sup>76</sup> The first instance of *δυσί(ν)* in Attic inscriptions is in *IG* 2<sup>2</sup>.849.52–3 (see Threatte 2020, 277).

<sup>77</sup> For a brief discussion of these theories see Tosi (1988, 183–4).

νεμφαίνει γένος, οὐδὲ πτώσιν δέχεται. ὥσπερ τὸ οἱ τρεῖς, τῶν τριῶν, τοῖς τρισὶν, ἔχει τὴν κλίσιν· παράκειται γὰρ αὐτοῖς οὐδέτερον τὰ τρία· ὁμοίως καὶ τῷ τέσσαρες τὰ τέσσαρα. καὶ ταῦτα μὲν Φρύνιχος, ἀπαγορεύων καθάπαξ τὸ δυσίν. εὐρηται μέντοι καὶ τοῦτο παρὰ τοῖς ῥήτορσι. Θουκυδίδης (8.101.1)· ‘ἐπισιτισάμεναι δυσὶν ἡμέραις’. καὶ Ἀριστείδης ἐν τῷ Περὶ ῥητορικῆς πρώτῳ (2.14 Lenz-Behr (= 45.4.14 Dindorf))· ‘ἀλλ’ ἀπέδωκε δυσὶ καὶ τρισὶν ἀντειπεῖν’. κρεῖττον μέντοι τὸ δυσίν. γίνωσκε δὲ καὶ τοῦτο, ὅτι τὸ δύο οὐ μόνον ἐπὶ εὐθείας καὶ αἰτιατικῆς, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπὶ γενικῆς καὶ δοτικῆς τίθεται. Θουκυδίδης (1.82.2)· ‘διελθόντων δύο ἐτών’. καὶ Λιβάνιος (*Epist.* 339.7)· ‘δύο λιμέσι τοὺς εἰς αὐτὸν καταφεύγοντας ἐδέξατο’.

Opinions vary, but *δυσὶν* is unavoidably regarded as correct from the point of view of analogy (the dual typically ends in *-οιν*, not in *-ειν*) and because it is attested in the canonical Attic writers (e.g. Demosthenes). The new form *δυεῖν* is acceptable, because it is occasionally attested even in canonical writers (e.g. in Thucydides, though we know that it is not a genuine reading, see above),<sup>78</sup> but its use is subject to various limitations. The most recent form *δυσί(ν)* is to be avoided.<sup>79</sup>

## 1.2 ‘Long’ datives *-αισι(ν)* and *-οισι(ν)*

The poets of Old Comedy retained the use of the ‘long’ dative of the thematic declension long after this morpheme had disappeared from inscriptions. The latest occurrences of *-οισι(ν)* on Athenian public inscriptions date to the 420s BCE (Threatte 1996, 25–32): since the language of official inscriptions is rather conservative, we should probably infer that this morpheme had already disappeared from spoken Attic. The ‘short’ dative *-οις* is predominant in Aristophanes, but *-οισι(ν)* is still a well-documented recessive variant even in his later plays, and thus it constitutes an element of morphological conservatism (Willi 2003a, 241). The use of the ‘long’ datives of the *ā*-stems can be presented in very similar terms as a literary convention in the language of Old Comedy (Willi 2003, 241–2).

Various explanations have been proposed for the retention of these morphemes after their disappearance from the spoken dialect. Colvin (1999, 184) sees the long datives as “invisible” poetic licenses which did not give an aura of high poetry, and he therefore regards them as a staple of literary language whose use is purely due to metrical convenience. On the other hand, Willi (2003a, 241) thinks that metrical convenience is not a sufficient explanation, and to support this con-

<sup>78</sup> Note that while Eust. in *Il.* 3.60.18–9 quotes Thuc. 8.101.1 as evidence for the use of *δυεῖν* (the Thucydides manuscripts also have *δυεῖν ἡμέραιν*), Thom.Mag. 91.2–3 quotes the same passage with *δυσὶν ἡμέραις* as evidence that *δυσὶ* was also acceptable.

<sup>79</sup> Thomas Magister is the only Atticist source to defend it, although the evidence on which he relies is problematic (see the previous footnote).

clusion he points out that a poet like Menander clearly avoids using the long dative. These opposing interpretations can be reconciled. The ‘long’ dative is a genuine morphological archaism, the retention of which must be due to metrical convenience. The fact that this old morpheme is still common as a non-marked and non-parodic feature in Old Comedy (and in Middle Comedy too, see below) may indicate that in this part of morphology the sociolect of Old (and Middle) Comedy is less mimetic of everyday speech than the language of New Comedy.<sup>80</sup> If we compare the evidence from 4th-century BCE Attic prose, we find that the Attic orators never use the ‘long’ dative (τουτοις contains deictic -ι), and that Plato alone occasionally seems adopt this morphological archaism (most instances come from the *Laws*, a dialogue characterised by a more conservative diction in keeping with the theme of ‘old age’).<sup>81</sup> This evidence confirms that the adoption of ‘long’ datives in Old (and Middle) Comedy is an element of conventional literary language that the poets of New Comedy can do without.

### 1.2.1 -οις

The evidence for the ‘long’ datives of the thematic declension is substantial.

**Alexis:** μετρίοις [ . . . ] ποτηρίοις (fr. 9.9), ἀνθρώποις (fr. 44.2), Παναθηναίοις ἐν τοῖς ἰχθύσιν (fr. 57.3), αὐτοῖς (fr. 57.5), λεπτοῖς χλωροῖς (fr. 84.5), κοντοῖς τούτοις (fr. 103.15), τοῖς πράγμασιν δ’ αὐτοῖς (fr. 165.2), τούτοις (fr. 168.6), ὄψοις (fr. 168.7), ζωμοῖς (fr. 168.7), ἐν τοῖς μοχθηροῖς (fr. 187.2), ἐν τοῖς γάμοις (fr. 233.3). **Amphis:** ἐρίοις (fr. 27.1). **Anaxandrides:** πυρικτίοις (fr. 6.2), μύροις Μεγαλλείοις (fr. 47.2), ἑαυτοῖς (fr. 55.3). **Anaxilas:** ἐν σκυταρίοις ῥαπτοῖς (fr. 18.6). **Anaxippus:** ἐμβατίοις γλαφυροῖς (fr. \*1.35), ἐν τοῖς δ’ ἔργοις (fr. 4.3), θεοῖς (fr. 6.4). **Antiphanes:** βροτοῖς (fr. 1.3), τοῖς θεοῖς (fr. 85.1), ἀνθρώποις (fr. 94.1), ἐν βατανίοις (fr. 95.2), ἀνθρώποις (fr. 98.1), εὐξαμένοις (fr. 145.4), γενομένοις (fr. 157.2), παρὰ ἡμετέροις προγόνοις (fr. 172.4), τοῖς θεωμένοις (fr. 189.16), οἷς (fr. 192.8, hexameter), ἔργοις (fr. 195.13), λουτηρίοις (fr. 206.3), ὑποθέτοις (fr. 206.4), ιδίοις (fr. 207.3), καινοῖς (fr. 207.3), ἀνθρώποις (fr. 209.7), κοῖλοις βυθοῖς (fr. 216.3), ξιφηφόροις (fr. 216.19), τοῖς λαμπροῖς (fr. 226.6), παρὰ ρείθοις χεμάρροις (fr. 228.3), ὄσοις (fr. 244.1). **Aristophon:** αὐτοῖς (fr. 9.8), μόνοις (fr. 12.3), τούτοις (fr. 12.4), τοῖς [ . . . ] μεστοῖς (fr. 12.6), τοῖς πτωχοῖς (fr. 14.1), τοῖς κακοῖς (fr. 14.2). **Athenion:** τοῖς θεοῖς (fr. 1.18). **Cratinus Iunior:** ἄλλοις (fr. 4.2), ἐν Δελφοῖς (fr. 12.2). **Damoxenus:** ἀνθρώποις (fr. 2.22), αὐτοῖς (fr. 2.37). **Diphilus:** Κορινθίοις (fr. 31.2). **Ephippus:** τοῖς στρουθίοις (fr. 6.4), ἐν τοῖς αὐλοῖς (fr. 7.2), τοῖς ἡμετέροις παιγνίοις (fr. 7.3), κυμβίοις (fr. 9.2). **Epicrates:** παρὰ τοῖς (fr. 10.5). **Eubulus:** καυλοῖς (fr. 6.3), ἰθεοῖς (fr. 8.1), τοῖς ἐμοῖς (fr. 26.3), πρὸς τούτοις (fr. 63.1), ἐν μέσοις αὐτοῖς (fr. 71.2), σπλάγχνοις (fr. 75.5), ἀρνείοις (fr. 75.5), θεοῖς (fr. 76.2), ξυνετοῖς (fr. 106.3), ἀμαρακίνοις (fr. 107.3), ἐν μέσοις τηγάνοις (fr. 108.3), αὐτοῖς δὲ τοῖς θεοῖς (fr. 127.1). **Hipparchus:** ἀνθρώποις (fr. 2.2). **Menander:** θεοῖς (*Pk.* 268), πρὸς τοῖς ἄλλοις (*Sam.* 516), αὐτοῖς<ιν> (fr. 425), τοῖς δούλοις (fr. \*451.2). **Nausicrates:** ναυτίλοις (fr. 1.2). **Nicolaus:** ἐν τούτοις (fr. 1.27). **Philemon:** μόνοις (fr. 28.2), παρὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις (fr. 39.1), κὰν βροτοῖς κὰν θεοῖς (fr. 60.1), τυροῖς (fr.

<sup>80</sup> See also the brief remark by Wilamowitz (1925, 155).

<sup>81</sup> See Benardete (2000, 227, and n. 39), who also discusses the use of ‘long’ datives.

82.6), πρὸς τοῖς κακοῖσιν (fr. 94.9), προγόνουσιν (fr. 96.9), ἐγγόνουσιν (fr. 96.9), ἀνθρώποισι (fr. 103.2), πολλοῖσι (fr. 106.3), ἐν ἀνθρώποισι (fr. 110.2), ἐτέροισιν (fr. 110.4), τούτοις (fr. 116.1), τέκνοισιν (fr. 169). **Philemon Iunior**: τοῖς ὅπτοισι (fr. 1.2). **Philetaerus**: ἐν νεκροῖσι (fr. 13.5). **Phoenicides**: πρὸς τούτοις (fr. 3.1). **Sosipater**: κὰν ποίοισιν [. . .] ζῳδίοις (fr. 1.29), τοῖς ὄψοισιν (fr. 1.43), ἐν τοῖς στρατηγικοῖσιν (fr. 1.55). **Sotades**: θρίοισι (fr. 1.27). **Timocles**: ἐν λόγοισι (fr. 4.7), τοῖς νέοισιν (fr. 32.2). **Timotheus**: θεοῖσιν (fr. 2.3). **Xenarchus**: ἀσυντάτοισι (fr. \*1.2), ἐπὶ τοῖσι πορνείοισιν (fr. 4.4), ἀχύροισιν (fr. 4.12), θεοῖσιν (fr. 7.8), ἐπὶ μὲν παγούροις τοῖς θεοῖς ἐχθροῖσι (fr. 8.2).

A general observation that can be made is that the ‘long’ datives are clearly more common in nouns and adjectives than in pronouns and especially in the article: it is telling that while τοῖσι occurs 8x, even within this smaller sample τοῖς is attested 20x. If we examine more closely the larger *corpora*, that is, the fragments of Alexis, Antiphanes, Diphilus, Eubulus, Menander, and Philemon, some further differences seem to emerge. The poets of Middle Comedy make greater use of the ‘long’ datives of the thematic declension than the poets of New Comedy. Menander’s case is particularly revealing. Even though he is represented by the largest extant *corpus* in Middle and New Comedy, only four occurrences of the ‘long’ dative survive. This may not be entirely coincidental. There are 13 occurrences of the ‘long’ dative in Philemon. We should probably infer that the use of the ‘long’ dative is one of the features that characterises Philemon’s language as closer to that of Middle Comedy (see also Section B.1.2.2).<sup>82</sup>

### 1.2.2 -αῖσι

The ‘long’ datives of the *ā*-stems are less widely attested than the ‘long’ datives of the thematic declension.

**Alexis**: αὐταῖσι (fr. 103.13), ἐπὶ ταῖς ἀβυρτάκαισι (fr. 145.13), ταῖς πλείσταῖσι (fr. 153.1). **Amphis**: ἐτέραις τε τοιαύταισι (fr. 23.4). **Antiphanes**: στολαῖσι (fr. 38.1), ῥύμαισι (fr. 55.2), εὐφροσύναις ὁσμαιῖσι (fr. 78.3), ταῖς θεαῖς | πάσαισι (fr. 204.2–3), σικύαισιν (fr. 206.4), ξανθαῖσιν αὖραις (fr. 216.22), κλαγκταῖσι φωναῖς (fr. 231.4), πρὸς Μούσαισι (fr. 272.1). **Apollodorus of Carystus**: ἐτάραισιν (fr. 8.1). **Diphilus**: ταῖς σπονδαῖσι (fr. 42.15), ἐν ταῖς τραγωδίαῖσιν (fr. 74.5), ἐν ἡμέραισιν (fr. 98.1). **Menander**: ταῖς ἀληθείαισι (*Theoph.* 25), διαβολαῖσι (fr. 764.1), ταῖς ἀτυχίαισι (fr. 860.1). **Mnesimachus**: καταπάλταῖσι (fr. 7.9). **Philemon**: ἐν ταῖς πόλεσι πάσαις, ἐν ταῖς οἰκίαις | πάσαις (fr. 95.7–8), δόξαισιν (fr. 96.8), ταῖς ἀληθείαισιν (fr. 118.1), ἐν πολλαῖσιν οἰκίαις (fr. 148.1). **Timocles**: ἡπίας φωναῖσιν (fr. 17.2), ἐν αἴσιν (fr. 23.4), ἀπαλαῖσι χερσίν (fr. 24.6), ἀληταῖσι (fr. 31.4).

The evidence is relatively limited. The ‘long’ feminine dative only appears with nouns and adjectives, very rarely with pronouns, and never with the article. As in the case of the thematic declension, the ‘long’ feminine dative seems to be far less

<sup>82</sup> On the conservative traits of Philemon’s language, see also Section D.3.1; Favi (2022v).



common in New Comedy compared to Middle Comedy. This is particularly noticeable in the case of Menander, whose *corpus*, despite being the largest, contains only three instances of the ‘long’ feminine dative. What has been said above (see Section B.1.2.1) above Philemon’s use of the ‘long’ datives of the thematic declension holds equally true for his use of the ‘long’ datives of the *ā*-stems.

### 1.3 The neuter nominative and accusative singular of ταυτό(ν), τοιοῦτο(ν), and τοσοῦτο(ν)

The inherited nominative-accusative ending of the neuter demonstrative pronouns is \*-d (as in Latin *id, istud, aliud, quid*, etc.), which, like all word-final stops, disappears in Greek in historical times. At a later stage, the innovative form ταυτόν with analogical final -ν was created (after the neuter nominative and accusative singular of the nominal declension). In Attic, the neuter pronominal form ταυτόν appears with or without the final -ν proper to the nominal inflection. The form with final -ν is common in 5th-century BCE Attic.<sup>83</sup> Both forms are attested in Middle and New Comedy.

**ταυτό:** Antiph. fr. 54.5, fr. 229.3; Apollod.Com. fr. 14.8; Diphil. fr. 101.1; Hegesipp. fr. 1.21; Men. *Asp.* 179, *Asp.* 352, *Dysc.* 810 and 933, *Epit.* 411, *Pc.* 306.

**ταυτόν:** Alex. fr. 35.3, 63.4, 146.7; Antiph. fr. 221.5; Men. *Asp.* 124, *Pc.* 56 and 300, fr. 409.7; Philem. fr. 82.13; Theophil. fr. 7.3.

This evidence seems to suggest that later comic poets, while still using ταυτόν, are more keen on the analogical form than the poets of Old Comedy. This squares well with the evidence for two other neuter pronominal forms, τοιοῦτο(ν) and τοσοῦτο(ν), for which the poets of Middle and New Comedy use the analogical forms, which in turn are not attested in Old Comedy and in Attic inscriptions.<sup>84</sup>

**τοιοῦτο and τοιοῦτ(ο):** Alex. fr. 35.1, 275.4; Antiph. fr. 55.15, 79.1, 123.4, 192.13; Eub. fr. 40.8; Men. *Georg.* 82, *Dysc.* 76, 156, 353, 631, 752 [supplement], *Epit.* 881, *Pc.* 236, *Sam.* 210, *Sam.* 375, *Sam.* 627, *Sic.* 276; Philem. fr. 96.4; Philem.Iun. fr. 1.3; Phoenic. fr. 3.4.

**τοιοῦτον:** Alex. fr. 178.14, 24.176, 265.7, 304.1; Amphis fr. 37.2; Athenio fr. 1.3; Diphil. fr. 31.17; Men. *Asp.* 204, *Dysc.* 694, *Epit.* 476, *Heros* 6, *Sam.* 299, *Sam.* 587, fr. 858.2; Nausicr. fr. 2.2; Philem. fr. 75.3.

**τοσοῦτο and τοσοῦτ(ο):** Alex. fr. 128.2; Diph. fr. 32.8 and 96.3; Men. *Asp.* 240, *Dysc.* 402 (adverbial); Philem. fr. 94.6.

**τοσοῦτον:** Men. *Asp.* 401, *Epit.* 437, *Pc.* 293.

<sup>83</sup> See Willi (2003a, 244) who provides the data on ταυτόν in Aristophanes. See also Threatte (1996, 330) on the neuter αὔτόν, which is very rare and only attested before 400 BCE.

<sup>84</sup> See Willi (2003a, 244) on Aristophanes’ almost exclusive use of τοιοῦτον and τοσοῦτον and Threatte (1996, 329) on the neuter τοιοῦτον and τοσοῦτον as the only forms attested in the Attic inscriptions. Homer also used only the forms with final -ν.

This use of both the non-analogical and the analogical forms is reflected not only in tragedy, but also in 4th-century BCE prose, where the manuscript evidence shows a considerable oscillation between the two options.<sup>85</sup> It appears that the poets of Middle and New Comedy not only use a wider range than the poets of Old Comedy, but they also adopt a more innovative morphology (although such a distinction may become irrelevant from a synchronic point of view).

Atticist lexicographers, presumably inspired by the evidence from 5th-century BCE Attic, recommend the forms with -v:

**Moer. τ 14:** ταῦτόν Ἀττικοί· τὸ αὐτό Ἑλληνες.

## 2 Nominal stems

### 2.1 *ā-* vs *ǣ-* stems

The evidence from Middle and New Comedy is also relevant to some peculiar forms of the *a*-declension, which show an alternating *ā*- and *ǣ*-stem.<sup>86</sup>

**θέρμη** (not attested in Middle and New Comedy) vs **θέρμα** (Men. *Georg.* 94). **κολοκύντη** (Diphil. fr. 98.2; Mnes. fr. 4.30 [metrically guaranteed]) vs **κολόκυνθᾶ** (not attested in Middle and New Comedy). **νάρκη** ('stingray': Alex. fr. 38.1 and 49.1 = 115.9;<sup>87</sup> Antiph. fr. 127.3 and 130.2; Mnes. fr. 4.37)<sup>88</sup> vs **νάρκᾶ** ('numbness': Men. fr. 388.2).<sup>89</sup> **τόλμη** (not attested in Middle and New Comedy) vs **τόλμα** (Men. fr. 177.1).

This evidence is also discussed by Atticist (as well as non-Atticist) sources.

**Phryn. Ecl. 13:** ἄμυναν μὴ εἶπης, ἀλλ' εἰς ῥῆμα μεταβάλλων ἀμύνασθαι· πάντα γὰρ τὰ <τοῦ> ῥήματος δόκιμα, ἀμυνοῦμαι, ἀμύνασθαι, ἡμυνάμην, ἀμυνοῦμεν, ἀμύνομαι· τὸ δὲ ὄνομα ἀδόκιμον. **Phryn. Ecl. 304:** θέρμα· οὕτως ὁ Μένανδρος (*Georg.* 94) διὰ τοῦ α, ἀλλ' οὔτε Θουκυδίδης οὐθ' ἡ ἀρχαία κωμωδία οὔτε Πλάτων, θέρμη δέ (and see below the Herodianic passage discussing τόλμη). **Phryn. Ecl. 405:** κολόκυνθα· ἡμάρτηται ἡ ἐσχάτη συλλαβὴ διὰ τοῦ θᾶ λεγομένη, δέον διὰ τοῦ τη ὡς Ἀθηναῖοι. **Phryn. PS 114.20–1:** τόλμη καὶ τόλμα, πρύμνη καὶ πρύμνα. νάρκη δὲ διὰ τοῦ

<sup>85</sup> See K–B (vol. 1, 606–7).

<sup>86</sup> The most comprehensive collection of evidence is provided by Solmsen (1909, 236–70). His overall conclusion is that most *ǣ*-stem forms are post-Classical innovations, but some may date back to the 5th century BCE. The relationship between the inflection as *ā*-stems and *ǣ*-stems is not etymologically justified (see Chantraine 1933, 102).

<sup>87</sup> On these shared verses in multiple plays see Arnott (1996, 168; 315; 318).

<sup>88</sup> See Mastellari (2020, 419).

<sup>89</sup> The derivation of νάρκη 'stingray' from 'numbness' is obvious (one may think of the famous comparison between Socrates and the stingray in Pl. *Men.* 80a.6, 80c.6, and 84b.7).

η. **Hdn.** *Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωδίας* **GG 3,1.253.7** (= [Arc.] *Epit.* 237.6 Roussou): κολόκυνθα ἢ Ἀττικῶς κολοκύντη. **Hdn.** *Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωδίας* **GG 3,1.255.15–6** ([Arc.] *Epit.* 237.7–8 Roussou): τὰ εἰς μαθητικὰ σπάνια ὄντα βαρύνεται· τόλμα, θέρμα· Ἀττικῶς δὲ τόλμη καὶ θέρμη. **Ath. 7.314b**: Μένανδρος δ' ἐν Φανίῳ διὰ τοῦ α ἔφη (fr. 388)· ὑπελήλυθέν τέ μου | νάρκα τις ὅλον τὸ δέρμα, μηδενὸς τῶν παλαιῶν οὕτω κεκρημένον. **Moer. α 151**: ἄμυναν ἢ κοινή συνήθεια· λέγει δὲ τῶν Ἀττικῶν οὐδεὶς. **Moer. θ 6**: θοῖνη Ἀττικοί· θοῖνα Ἑλλήνες. **Moer. ρ 8**: ῥίνη Ἀττικοί· ῥίνα Ἑλλήνες. **Philemo (Vindob.) 394.16**: ζεύγλην· οὐχὶ ζεῦγλαν. **Philemo (Vindob.) 395.6**: κολοκύντην, οὐ κολόκυνθα.

These forms present different problems and thus require a separate treatment. In the case of κολοκύντη and τόλμα, the poets of Middle and New Comedy still use the standard Attic form. As regards κολοκύντη, the evidence from 5th-century BCE sources shows that this is the original form in Attic (see Ar. *Nu.* 327 and fr. 581.6, Hermipp. fr. 69.2, Metag. fr. 16.2 [but the source of this fragment trivialises the reading into κολόκυνθα]).<sup>90</sup> In the 4th century BCE, the variant form κολόκυνθα<sup>91</sup> begins to appear (e.g. in Aristotle's *Historia animalium*), in many cases as a competitive variant of κολοκύντη within the same corpus (κολόκυνθα it is a less attested form of κολοκύντη in the *corpus Hippocraticum* and Theophrastus).<sup>92</sup> However, the poets of Middle Comedy still adopt the earlier form κολοκύντη. As regards τόλμα, the form with /a/ is metrically guaranteed in Menander, and we should point out that this is precisely the standard Attic form (which occurs in Thucydides, Euripides, Sophocles, Isocrates, Xenophon, etc.; in poetry it is also metrically guaranteed).<sup>93</sup> The form with the long final syllable τόλμη (< τόλμᾱ), only occurs in non-Attic texts (e.g. Pindar) and then in post-Classical sources.<sup>94</sup>

<sup>90</sup> The original Attic form is also the *gemeingriechisch* form: cf. Alc. fr. 117b.8–9 Voigt (Aeolic), Epich. fr. 152 and Sophr. fr. 33 (Doric).

<sup>91</sup> Furnée (1972, 190) includes this among the examples of the (pre-Greek) oscillation /t/ ~ /tʰ/.

<sup>92</sup> In post-Classical times, κολοκύντη and κολόκυνθα alternate, but individual writers seem to have their idiosyncratic preferences for one or the other (e.g. LXX, Dioscorides, and Galen almost exclusively use κολόκυνθα). In late antique and Byzantine sources, we also find the form κολόκυντα, a compromise between κολοκύντη and κολόκυνθα. Furnée (1972, 190 and 365) also mentions the late masculine forms κολύκυνθος/κολόκυντος and κολύκιντος.

<sup>93</sup> Solmsen (1909, 266) believes that τόλμᾱ is secondary and may have been formed on τολμάω by analogy with cases like γέννᾱ: γεννάω, δίατᾱ: διατάω, μέρμνᾱ: μερμνάω, ἔρευνᾱ: ἐρευνάω.

<sup>94</sup> LSJ s.v. τόλμα rightly mentions that the papyrus of Sophocles' *Ichneutai* has the reading τόλμην in Soph. fr. 314.17: πρὸς τόλμαν πεσεῖν, which however is not metrically guaranteed. Solmsen (1909, 266) also mentions that the transmitted text of Eur. *Ion* 1416 requires τόλμᾱ, but the line is emended by modern scholars.

In the case of *θήρμα* and *νάρκα*, later comedy adopts the more recent form. Despite Phrynichus' claims regarding *θήρμα* in Menander's *Georgos* (whose length is metrically guaranteed), both *θήρμη* and *θήρμα* are attested in Old Comedy (*θήρμη* in Pherecr. fr. 169.2 [metrically guaranteed], *θήρμα* in Ar. fr. 346.2 [the length of /a/ cannot be confirmed by the metre, since the syllable is followed by a consonant]).<sup>95</sup> Perhaps, the evidence for *θήρμα* was not abundant enough for Phrynichus to approve of the form with /a/, which he may have regarded as late and suspicious, particularly because of its occurrence in Menander. Phrynichus thus condemns it from an ideological standpoint. Indeed, in the case of *νάρκη*/*νάρκα* 'numbness', Menander adopts the form with /a/,<sup>96</sup> but since Aristophanes uses *νάρκη* (V. 713: οἶμοι, τί πέπονθ'; ὡς *νάρκη* μου κατὰ τῆς χειρὸς καταχέϊται), it is easy for Phrynichus to prescribe *νάρκη* and proscribe Menander's *νάρκα*.<sup>97</sup>

## 2.2 'Attic' declension

The 'Attic' declension of the nouns *λεώς* and *νεώς* and of the adjective *ἴλεως* is still the norm in Middle and New Comedy.

**Alex. fr. 41.2–3:** λιθίνης ἐπεθύμησεν κόρης | ἄνθρωπος κατέκλεισέ θ' αὐτὸν τῷ νεῷ. **Ephipp. fr. 6.6–7:** εὐθέως τ' ἀφεῖλε πᾶν | αὐτοῦ τὸ λυποῦν κάπεδειξεν ἴλεων. **Epicr. fr. 3.8:** ἐπὶ τοὺς νεῶς ἵζουσι πεινῶντες κακῶς. **Men. Leuc. 5:** ἡ ζᾶκορος ἡ κοσμοῦσα τὸν νεῶ, τέκνον. **Philem. fr. 127.2–3:** εἴτ' εἰς τὸν νεῶν | κατέκλεισεν αὐτόν. **Posidipp. fr. 31.1:** ναοὶ δυ' εἰσὶν καὶ στοά (Meinke suggested restoring *νεῶς*, but Kassel, Austin retain the transmitted reading *ναοὶ*).

The occurrences in Alexis, Ephippus, Epicrates, and Philemon are all metrically guaranteed. This evidence is consistent with the other literary and documentary evidence from contemporary Attic. As regards 4th-century BCE prose, writers like Plato, Demosthenes, and Isocrates invariably use *νεῶς* rather than *ναός*. An important exception is Xenophon, who alternates *ναός* and *νεῶς* even within the

<sup>95</sup> The occurrence in Aristophanes is still treated as a neuter noun in -μα in LSJ s.v. (for this interpretation see Rutherford 1881, 414–5), while this information is corrected in *GE* s.v. *θήρμα* 1.

<sup>96</sup> After Menander, *νάρκα* 'numbness' with -α- occurs in Imperial medical texts, Marcus Aurelius (10.9.1), and Clement of Alexandria (*Paed.* 2.8.71.3). Solmsen (1909, 268) explains *νάρκα* as a later form, although no explanation of its origin is given. Solmsen (1909, 269) alternatively suggests that Menander's *νάρκα* may be due to metrical needs, but parallels in other late texts go against this view.

<sup>97</sup> Other occurrences of *νάρκη* are in the *corpus Hippocraticum*, Diodorus (2.12.3), and Imperial medical texts.

same work.<sup>98</sup> In addition, if we trust the manuscript evidence, *ναός* also occurs once in Hyperides and twice in Aeneas the Tactician.<sup>99</sup> In Hellenistic high-register koine, Polybius apparently used both *ναός* and *νεώς*.<sup>100</sup> Similarly, forms like *λαός* and *ναός* only begin to appear on the Attic inscriptions from the late decades of the 3rd century BCE.<sup>101</sup> The late date of the comic poet Posidippus, who was active in the first half of the 3rd BCE century, led Kassel and Austin to resist Meineke's restoration of *νεώ* in place of the transmitted *ναοί*. Still, considering that the newer form did not immediately take over in koine Greek, and also that the New Comedy poets seem to have retained the 'Attic' declension, Meineke's proposal for Posidipp. fr. 31.1 is worth considering.

Men. *Leuc.* 5 is a particularly important occurrence. This line is known via the indirect transmission as Men. fr. 686 Körte–Thierfelder, where the *Etymologica* have the trivialisation *ναόν* instead of the 'Attic' declension. The Attic form *νεώ* could be restored thanks to P.Oxy. 60.4024.5 (= TM 61471) (1st century CE), published by Parsons (1994), where the first reading of the papyrus was actually *νεών*, but then the final *ny* was blotted out with a dot. This reading in the Menander passage has important consequences. For a start, it shows that Menander's use of the 'Attic' declension is in line with the evidence from the inscriptions, since the accusative ending *-ω* 'is probably universal after 350 BCE' (Threatte 1996, 39, who explains *νεώς*, *νεών* > *νεώς*, *νεώ* as deriving by analogy from *ἔως*, *ἔω*). Additionally, we may wonder whether the reading *νεών* in Philem. fr. 127.2–3 too may be a copyist's normalisation.<sup>102</sup>

Atticist lexicography shows an interest in the 'Attic' declension (and related forms).

**Phryn. Ecl. 261:** φλοῦς· καὶ τοῦτο ἡμάρτηται· οἱ γὰρ Ἀθηναῖοι φλέως λέγουσιν, καὶ τὰ ἀπὸ τούτου πλεκόμενα φλέϊνα καλεῖται. **Moer. α 67:** ἀνάπλεων <Ἀττικοί>· ἀνάπλεον <Ἕλληνες>. **Moer. ν 1:**

<sup>98</sup> See Gautier (1911, 79; 152). Gautier considers *ναός* a Doric form in Xenophon rather than an 'international' archaism. On the limits of these traditional approaches to Xenophon's language, here exemplified by Gautier, see Chapter 4, Section 5.1.

<sup>99</sup> See Vela Tejada (1991, 124–5); López Eire (2002, 82).

<sup>100</sup> See de Foucault (1972, 65). Thumb (1901, 243) explains *ναός* in the koine as the result of the competition between Ionic *νηός* and Attic *νεώς*. But the spreading of *ναός* must also relate to the influence of analogy and the tendency of the koine towards simplification, that is, to avoid the word's complicated inflection in Attic (cf. the replacement of *ναῦς* with *πλοῖον* in the koine).

<sup>101</sup> See Threatte (1996, 39–40).

<sup>102</sup> In the case of Theophrastus' *Historia plantarum*, judging from the edition by Amigues (1989), the accusative *φλεών* occurs 2x (4.10.4, 4.10.6) and the accusative *φλεώ* 1x (4.8.1). The coexistence of the two forms may well be original and also partly motivated by the need to disambiguate with the genitive *τοῦ φλεώ* (which occurs 5x in the same sections: twice in 4.10.4, twice in 4.10.7, and once in 4.11.12).

νεώς τὴν εὐθεΐαν ἐνικῶς καὶ ὀξύτωνος Ἀττικοί· ναός Ἑλληνες. **Moer. π 6**: πλέων καὶ κατὰπλεων Ἀττικοί· πλήρη Ἑλληνες. **Moer. π 55**: πλέων οἶνου Ἀττικοί· πλήρη οἶνου Ἑλληνες. **Moer. π 83**: πλέω Ἀττικοί· πλήρεις Ἑλληνες. [**Hdn.**] **Philet. 29**: τὸν ἥρω, τὸν Μίνω, τὸν Ἀπόλλω, τὸν Ποσειδῶ ἄνευ τοῦ ν οἱ Ἀττικοί. τὸν λαγῶν καὶ τὸν νεών, τὸν λαγῶ καὶ τὸν νεώ, ἄνευ τοῦ ν ἢ σὺν τῷ ν. **Orus fr. A 66** (= [Zonar.] 1390.13–5): τὸν νεών, ἢ αἰτιατικὴ σὺν τῷ ν, καὶ λαγῶν καὶ Κών· ἢ δὲ γενικὴ καὶ ἡ δοτικὴ ἄνευ τοῦ ν· τοῦ νεῶ καὶ τῷ νεῶ. The fact that Orus points out that νεών is the accusative, while the (by his time) homonymous forms νεῶ and νεῶ are the genitive and the dative, may have been encouraged specifically by the late-Attic accusative singular νεῶ, which is documented in the writings of the poets of Middle and New Comedy (but cf. the more tolerant approach of the entry in *Phileterus*). **Orus fr. B 10** (= Phot. α 1305, cf. *Su.* α 1702): Ἀμφιάραος καὶ Ἀμφιάρεως· ἐκατέρως λέγουσιν· ὧ δέσποτ' Ἀμφιάραε πολυτίμητ' ἀναξ'. **Orus fr. B 26** (= Σ α 1558 = Phot. α 2176 = *Su.* α 2823, ex Σ'): ἀξιόχρεων· ἐν τῷ ω λέγουσι, καὶ λειπόνων. καὶ τὰ οὐδέτερα οἱ {γάρ} παλαιοὶ ὁμοίως. τὸ δὲ ἀξιόχρεον βάρβαρον.

### 2.3 Contracted thematic nouns and adjectives

In Attic, the declension of the thematic nouns and adjectives typically involves the contraction of the final vowel of the stem and the thematic vowel or the ending (e.g. ὅστουν < ὅστέον, ἀπλοῦς < ἀπλόος, πορφυροῦς < πορφύρεος, etc.). However, there is one rare case in Middle and New Comedy where the uncontracted form is adopted: κυανέαις (Xenarch. fr. 1.7). This example is very isolated compared to the more common contracted forms, although it finds an earlier parallel in the χρυσέαν used by Theopomp.Com. fr. 4.1. Both occurrences are used to parody poetic diction.<sup>103</sup> A comparison with Demosthenes, Isocrates, Plato, Xenophon, and Lysias also shows that the adjectives χρύσεος, ἀργύρεος, χάλκεος, and κυάνεος occur exclusively in the contracted form. Atticist lexicographers usually prescribe the contracted forms, which they probably found to be more in line with other typical Attic outcomes, such as the ‘contracted’ genitive and accusative, singular and plural, of the *eu*-stems.<sup>104</sup> A partial exception is Philemon.

**Phryn. Ecl. 178**: χρύσεια, ἀργύρεα, χάλκεα, κυάνεα· ταῦτα ἱακὰ διαιρούμενα. χρή οὖν λέγειν χρυσᾶ ἀργυρᾶ κυανᾶ τὸν ἀττικίζοντα. {χρυσοῦς λέγε· τὸ γὰρ χρύσεος ἱακόν· ὁμοίως καὶ χρυσοῦς, ἀργυροῦς, χαλκοῦς, κυανοῦς, ἀλλὰ μὴ χρύσεος, ἀργύρεος}. **Phryn. PS 43.17–9**: ἀπλᾶ, διπλᾶ, τριπλᾶ καὶ τὰ ὅμοια περισπῶσιν, <οῦ> γὰρ ὑποπίπτει τῇ Ἰωνικῇ διαιρέσει, οἷον διπλόα διπλᾶ καὶ τὰ ὅμοια. **Phryn. PS fr. \*367** (= *Su.* χ 553): χρυσᾶ· τὸ ἀπλᾶ καὶ διπλᾶ καὶ πολλαπλᾶ καὶ πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα περισπῶσιν οἱ Ἀττικοί, ἀργυρᾶ, χρυσᾶ, καὶ κεραμεῖ ἀπὸ τοῦ κεραμεοῦν, καὶ φοινικᾶ ἀπὸ τοῦ φοινικοῦν. **Antiatt. θ 1**: θροῦς· Θουκυδίδης δ' (4.66.2). **Moer. ο 27**: ὅστουν Ἀττικοί· ὀστέον

<sup>103</sup> See Kassel, Austin (*PCG* vol. 7, 710–1); Farmer (2022, 38) on Theopompus; Nesselrath (1990, 263) on Xenarchus.

<sup>104</sup> On the forms in -ινος which derive from these contracted nouns and their assessment in Atticist lexicography, see Fiori (2022, 31–9).

Ἑλληνες. **Moer. χ 3:** χαλκοῦς χαλκῇ ἀδιαίρετως Ἀττικοί· χάλκεος χαλκέα Ἑλληνες. **Moer. χ 4:** χρυσοῦς καὶ χρυσῇ Ἀττικοί· χρύσεος καὶ χρυσέα Ἑλληνες. **Moer. χ 28:** χαλκῇ χρυσῇ Ἀττικοί· διαλελυμένως δὲ Ἑλληνες. On all these entries see Batisti (2023a); Batisti (2023b). **Philemo (Laur.) 356:** ἄθροος· ὡς ἄθριος. **Philemo (Laur.) 358:** δικροῦν, ὡς χρυσοῦν. **Philemo (Vindob.) 396.28:** φοινίκεον· οὐ φοινικοῦν. **Orus fr. B 126** (= Phot. o 566): ὀστοῦν· διισλλάβως, οὐκ ὀστέον λέγουσιν οἱ Ἀττικοί. A different type of contract forms is discussed by **Philemo (Laur.) 356:** καὶ βορᾶς καὶ βορέας ἐκάτερα.

## 2.4 Genitive -εος of *i*-stems

In the genitive of *i*-stems, Attic and the high koine retain -εως (which is the outcome of -ηιος > -ηος > -εως with ‘quantitative metathesis’). Most other dialects, however, especially Ionic, developed a regularised, analogical inflection as πόλις, πόλιος or as πόλις, πόλεος, which is closer to the ending -ος of the other genitives of the third declension (-εος originates from the shortening of /ε:/ before another vowel).<sup>105</sup> Both πόλιος and πόλεος are attested in Homer, while only the former is standard in Herodotus. In Attic texts, the genitive -εος is used for metrical convenience in tragedy, while the only occurrences in Old Comedy dialogues are ὕβρεος in Ar. *Pl.* 1044 (metrically guaranteed) and φύσεος in the comic poet Theopompus (fr. 33.3; restored by Porson, whose emendation is accepted by Kassel, Austin).<sup>106</sup> Willi (2003b, 57–8) rightly sees ὕβρεος as influenced by the Ionic dialect: an analogical and de-Atticised form. Among the poets of Middle and New Comedy, the -εος genitive of *i*-stems ὕβρις and πόλις is attested only in Eubulus.

πόλεος: Eub. fr. 118.8. ὕβρεος: Eub. fr. 67.9 and 93.7.

In all three cases, the corresponding -εως genitive form would be unmetrical, and so the use of -εος is due to metrical convenience. The rarity of such forms and the fact that they are only used for metrical convenience make it likely that we should not regard them as evidence of an extensive de-Atticisation of 4th-century BCE Attic, but simply as prosodic possibilities exploited by a few poets. In 4th-century BCE Attic inscriptions, words with an *i*-stem very occasionally have -εος instead of the expected -εως (and also words with an *eu*-stem, but a genitive like δ[ι]αδόσεος, which occurs in *IG* 2<sup>2</sup>.1749.76, dated to 341/0 BCE, is unattested in

<sup>105</sup> The genitive -ιος is the most common form in most Greek dialects, particularly Ionic (see Buck 1955, § 109.1–2).

<sup>106</sup> See Willi (2003b, 57–8), who provides further references.

Middle and New Comedy).<sup>107</sup> Most likely, -ιος/-εος was admissible in spoken *Großattisch*.<sup>108</sup> Note, too, that Xenophon at least once adopts the analogical genitive -ιος of the *i*-stem common noun τύρσις ‘bastion’ (i.e. τῆς τύρσιος in place of τῆς τύρσεως in X. An. 7.8.12, whereas in the plural Xenophon always uses the older, non-analogical inflection of this noun). Given that τύρσις is a word of the military jargon, it is possible that the Ionic inflection of this term was also standard in Attic texts (hence, the retention of non-assimilated /rs/).<sup>109</sup> The fact that in the plural Xenophon retained the expected Attic inflection with apophonic alternation (i.e. τύρσεις, τυρσέων, etc.) is probably no mere coincidence. Considering that the plural of *i*-stems did not undergo an analogical remodelling in post-Classical Greek, it is quite possible that in *Großattisch* too the analogical inflection of the *i*-stems had only spread in some cases, notably the genitive singular. This may thus explain the adoption of the -εος genitives in Aristophanes, Theopompus, and Eubulus.

## 2.5 Nominative plural of *u*-stems

The older nominative plural ending -ύες, which is still common in 4th-century BCE literary Attic, is occasionally replaced by the nominative plural -ῦς in Middle and New Comedy.

ιχθῦς: Eub. fr. 108.3; Alex. frr. 47.2 and 263.9; Antiph. fr. 233.3; Men. *Sam.* 98. μῦς: Antiph. fr. 191.1.

These forms developed by analogy with the accusative plural, where -ῦς is the expected ending.<sup>110</sup> The forms in -ῦς replace the standard forms in earlier Attic, which are still attested in 4th-century BCE comedy when they can be metrically useful (ιχθύες in Telecl. fr. 1.6 and Archipp. fr. 30, μύες in Anaxandr. fr. 42.61).<sup>111</sup> This morphological development shows that later comedy aligns with a tendency already visible in Attic documentary inscriptions at the end of the 5th century

<sup>107</sup> See Threattle (1996, 213).

<sup>108</sup> In Ptolemaic papyri, the genitives -ιος and -εος are both attested in common nouns (see Mayser, *Gramm.* vol. 1.2, 23–4). In Imperial papyri, besides -ιος and -εος, the genitive singular of *i*-stems may also end in -ις (as in Modern Greek, cf. πόλη, πόλης; see Gignac 1981, 75; *CGMEMG* vol. 2, 534–5).

<sup>109</sup> On military jargon see Chapter 4, Section 4.2. On Xenophon’s language see Chapter 4, Section 5.1.

<sup>110</sup> See K–B (vol. 1, 439); Schwyzler (1939, 564, esp. on αἱ ἄρκυς in Xenophon’s *Cynegeticus*). See also Section B.2.6.

<sup>111</sup> Sommerstein (2013, 134).



BCE.<sup>112</sup> It seems that this development attracted the interest of Aelius Dionysius and other Atticist sources, who defended the admissibility of both.

**Ael.Dion. κ 17** (= Eust. *in Od.* 2.165.13–4): αἱ δὲ τοιαῦται κριθαὶ καὶ κάχρυς δισυλλάβως καὶ ἐκτεταμένως ἐλέγοντο κατὰ Αἰλίον Διονύσιον θηλυκῶς.<sup>113</sup> **Philemo (Laur.) 359**: δρῦς καὶ δρύες φαμέν, see Batisti (2023c).

In the case of *u*-stems which present an apophonic alternation (\*-*u*/-*eu*), such as πῆχυς, πῆχεως, the older nominative plural -εις (from \*-εF-εs) is retained (see ἐγγέλεις in Antiph. fr. 191.1 and 233.5, Eub. fr. 36.3, and Men. fr. 224.5).<sup>114</sup> This triggered the development of the analogical accusative plural ἐγγέλεις, which is attested in the poets of Middle and New Comedy (see Antiph. fr. 104.3, Alex. fr. 78.7, and Timocl. fr. 11.6).<sup>115</sup> This innovative accusative plural will attract the criticism of the Atticist lexicographers.

**Antiat. η 17**: ἡμίσεας· ἀντὶ τοῦ ἡμίσεις. **Phryn. PS 73.4–6**: ἡμίσεας καὶ ἡμίσεις· ἄμφω μὲν Ἀττικά. Ἀττικώτερον δὲ τὸ ἡμίσεας. ἡμίσειαν σὺν τῷ ι. ἡμισυ – ἡμίσεως – ἡμίσεα, ἀλλ’ οὐχὶ ἡμίση. See Fiori (2022, 37–8).

## 2.6 Analogical accusative plural -υας of *u*-stems

The expected accusative plural of *u*-stems is -ῦς (< \*-uns). However, in post-Classical Greek the analogical accusative ending -υας was developed, modelled on the athematic stems.<sup>116</sup> An early example of this, μῦας, occurs in Posidippus (fr. 15.3), a poet of late New Comedy (first half of the 3rd century BCE).<sup>117</sup>

Atticist lexicographers duly indicate -ῦς as the proper Attic ending.

**Phryn. PS 77.14–5**: ἰχθῦς· ἡ αἰτιατική τῶν πληθυντικῶν Ἀττικώτερον ἤπερ ἰχθυάς (see Batisti 2023c).

<sup>112</sup> See Threatte (1996, 219–20), who discusses the use of the nominative plural στάχυς in place of στάχυνες.

<sup>113</sup> This doctrine seems to have enjoyed wide diffusion. The other occurrences, most notably including Moer. κ 18: κάχρυς Ἀττικοί· κριθαὶ πεφρυγμέναι Ἑλληνες and Phot. κ 509: κάχρυς· κριθαὶ πεφρυγμέναι, are collected by Theodoridis *ad* Phot. κ 509.

<sup>114</sup> The word ἐγγελυς is obviously a special case, insofar as in the singular (ἐγγελυς, ἐγγέλυος, from \*ἐγγελυ-) it does not show the same apophonic alternation as in the plural (ἐγγέλεις, ἐγγέλεων, from \*ἐγγελεF-).

<sup>115</sup> See Section B.2.9.

<sup>116</sup> See Gignac (1981, 80).

<sup>117</sup> For early evidence of this morphology in Homer, see Batisti (2023c).

## 2.7 ‘Contracted’ genitive and accusative, singular and plural, of *eu*-stems

In 5th- and early-4th-century BCE Attic, the genitive and accusative singular and plural of *eu*-stems typically underwent a process of ‘contraction’ (especially after -Ct-, -αt-, and -εt-). This process resulted in the consonantisation of the vowel /e/ before the ending, the merging of the resulting glide with the preceding semi-vowel, and the displacement of the accent to the final syllable (Threatte 1996, 248–57).

ἐκ Πειραιῶς: Alex. fr. 247.1; Crito Com. fr. 3.4. Πειραιᾶ: Men. *Epit.* 752. χοῦ: Anaxandr. fr. 33.1; Epin. fr. 2.8; Eub. fr. 80.4; Men. fr. 442 (none of these occurrences is metrically guaranteed). χοῦς: Alex. fr. 15.19; Damox. fr. 1.3; Epin. fr. 2.5 (this last occurrence is metrically guaranteed).

The problems posed by the ‘contracted’ forms of χοεύς (i.e. χοῦς, χοός) will be discussed in Section B.2.11. As a general tendency, the non-‘contracted’ forms of *eu*-stems become increasingly common during the 4th century BCE, and then, from the 3rd century BCE onwards, the ‘contracted’ forms almost disappear. Πειραιεύς is a special case compared to the other ‘contracted’ *eu*-stems: this form is the only one that continues to appear in the ‘contracted’ form after the 3rd century BCE.<sup>118</sup> In the case of ἀλιεύς (‘fisherman’), unlike Πειραιεύς, it appears that the poets of later comedy preferred the ‘uncontracted’ forms.

ἀλιέων: Anaxandr. fr. 33.15; Alex. fr. 76.5. ἀλιέας: Antiph. fr. 188.17; Alex. fr. 155.1.

ἀλιεύς is rare, but the ‘contracted’ genitive singular ἀλιῶς is known to have occurred in the 5th-century BCE comic poet Pherecrates (fr. 215)<sup>119</sup> and the accusative plural Ἀλιᾶς of the toponym Ἀλιεῖς is attested in Thucydides (1.105.1). Overall, the poets of later comedy seem to follow the prose writers of the 4th century BCE in using the ‘uncontracted’ form, which will then become the standard inflection in post-Classical Greek.

## 2.8 Accusative singular and plural of *eu*-stems

The phonetic development behind the formation of the accusative singular and plural of *eu*-stems has been examined in a seminal article by Méndez Dosuna

<sup>118</sup> Note, for example, that the accusative Πειραιᾶ also occurs in Machon (388 Gow).

<sup>119</sup> Quoted by Σ<sup>b</sup> α 981 = Phot. α 975 (this entry was edited by de Borries as Phryn. *PS* fr. \*154). This Attic peculiarity is also commented upon by Hdn. Περὶ καθολικῆς προσφθίας *GG* 3.1.430.18–9 = Ioannes Philoponus *Praecepta tonica* 89 Xenis.

(1993b).<sup>120</sup> To put it very briefly, the encounter of the nominal stem with the case ending yields the following four options: (1) -εα(ς) in synizesis, (2) -ᾶ(ς) as the outcome of contraction, (3) bisyllabic -εα(ς) with /a:/, (4) bisyllabic -εα(ς) with /a/. The more common outcomes in Classical Attic are (1) or (3). In all dialects other than Attic, (4) is the norm, but this prosody was also occasionally adopted in Attic tragedy (though only with φονεύς). Middle and New Comedy provides evidence for all four outcomes.<sup>121</sup>

**Synizesis:** ἀλιέας (Antiph. fr. 188.17).

‘Contracted’ -ᾶ(ς):<sup>122</sup> χοᾶ (Anaxandr. fr. 33.1; Epin. fr. 2.8; Eub. fr. 80.4; Men. fr. 442) and χοᾶς (Alex. fr. 15.19; Damox. fr. 1.3; Epin. fr. 2.5) (‘contracted’ from \*χοᾶ and \*χοᾶς, accusative singular and plural of χοεύς); εἰς Πειραιᾶ (Men. *Epit.* 752, ‘contracted’ from \*Πειραιᾶ, accusative of Πειραιεύς).

/a:/: Ἀχαρνέα (Timocl. fr. 18.6); Τηρέα (2x in Timocl. fr. 19.3); Νηλέα (Men. *Epit.* 326); Προμηθέα (Men. fr. 508.2); τοὺς ἱερέας (Anaxandr. fr. 40.10).

/a/: τὸν τροφέα (Theophil. fr. 1.3); ψυγέα (Euphro fr. 3.1); γονέας (Antiph. fr. 261.2); κεστρέ(α) (Philem. fr. 83).<sup>123</sup>

The occurrence of the accusative στρωματέα in a fragment of Alexis (fr. 120.3) is a thorny case, since it would be compatible with three options: synizesis, /a:/, and /a/.<sup>124</sup>

It is perhaps no coincidence that the /a/ is predominantly attested in trisyllabic words with a tribrachic form. Not only does this hold true for the comic occurrences listed above (except Philemon’s κεστρέ(α)), but it also finds confirmation in the fact that, in tragedy, φονεύς is the only word for which an accusative φονέα with /a/ is attested (see above). One might think that in words with this form the /a/ proved to be a suitable metrical option.

Atticist lexicographers, particularly Moeris, are keen to recommend the long prosody for the accusative singular and plural.

**Moer. α 12:** ἀμφορέα ἀλιέα μακρῶς Ἀττικοί· βραχέως Ἑλληνες. **Moer. α 13:** ἀγυῖᾱ μακρῶς τὴν ἐπὶ τέλους Ἀττικοί· ἀγυῖᾱ Ἑλληνες βραχέως (on this more problematic entry Vessella 2018, 126–9).

<sup>120</sup> See further La Roche (1897, 1–4); K–B (vol. 1, 448); Schwyzler (1939, 575); Vessella (2018, 144–6).

<sup>121</sup> In the following cases the length of the final syllable in bisyllabic -έας is unknown because the syllable is closed: τοὺς ἀλιέας (Alex. fr. 159.1), κεστρέας (Henioch. fr. 3.3), Ταυρέας (Antiph. fr. 188.4). No instances of the accusative singular or plural at the end of a iambic trimeter are listed since in that position the syllable can be either short or long.

<sup>122</sup> See Section B.2.7.

<sup>123</sup> See Arnott (1996, 334). He also mentions βασιλέ(ᾱ) in Machon 171 Gow.

<sup>124</sup> Arnott (1996, 334) opts for /a/ on the basis of the parallel examples from later comedy, but there is no decisive argument in favour of this over the other two possibilities. Synizesis seems an attractive option.

**Moer. ι 4:** ἰππέα ἀλιέα βασιλέα μακρῶς Ἀττικοί. **Moer. ι 18:** ἰππέας μακρῶς Ἀττικοί· βραχέως Ἑλληνες. **Philemo (Laur.) 355:** Ἀτρέα, ὡς βασιλέα, τὸ α μακρόν. **Orus fr. B 115** (= Phot. ο 46): Ὀδυσσέα· ἡ ἐσχάτη μακρά, καὶ τὰ ὅμοια. **Orus fr. B 132** (= Phot. π 809): Περσέα καὶ Θησέα καὶ αἰγέα καὶ Ἀχιλλέα καὶ τῶν ὁμοίων πάντων ἐκτείνουσι τὸ α τὸ τελευταῖον {καὶ} ἐπὶ τῆς αἰτιατικῆς πτώσεως. A similar development is discussed regarding the accusative of the proper names in -ῆς, -οῦς (< -ῆς, -έους). See **Phryn. Ecl. 127:** Ἡρακλέα, Περικλέα, Θεμιστοκλέα ἐπεκτείνων τὴν ἐσχάτην λέγε, ἀλλὰ μὴ Ἡερακλῆν καὶ Περικλῆν καὶ Θεμιστοκλῆν (on which entry see also Section B.2.10). Other sources are collected by Alpers (1981, 248) *ad Orus fr. B 132* (= Phot. π 809).

Vessella (2018, 146) finds it somewhat surprising that the Atticist lexicographers were so concerned about forms such as ἰππέας, since they must have been very marginal in the koine. The evidence for the short prosody provided by Antiphanes' γονέας, Euphro's ψυγέα, Philemon's κεστρέ(α), and Theophilus' τροφέα suggests that it may have been the evidence from later comedy that prompted the Atticist reaction, possibly as a response to those who relied on similar cases to say that the post-Classical prosody with /a/ was also good Attic.<sup>125</sup>

## 2.9 Analogical accusative plural of *eu*-stems

The accusative plural of *eu*-stems in Attic is -έας (from βασιληF-ας). In post-Classical Greek, under the influence of the nominative plural (and perhaps also after τὰς πόλεις) a new accusative plural ending -εῖς was developed, which then became predominant in the koine.<sup>126</sup> Some early examples of this development can already be found in Middle and New Comedy.

γονεῖς (Philem. fr. 168, Men. fr. 824, *com. adesp.* fr. 237), but γονέας is still attested in comedy (Antiph. fr. 261.2) and is the norm in 4th-century BCE prose (for instance, Xenophon, Lysias, Plato, and Demosthenes regularly use γονῆς/γονεῖς in the nominative and γονέας in the accusative, but note that Isocrates alternates the older accusative γονέας, which occurs 6x, with the analogical γονεῖς, which occurs in 1.14 and 1.16).

ἰππεῖς (Men. fr. 204), as part of the proverb ἰππεῖς προκαλεῖσθαι εἰς πεδίον, but ἰππέας is also used (Apollod.Com. fr. 5.20). It is conceivable that the proverb adopted the innovative form ἰππεῖς, which was presumably more colloquial at the time. The innovative form ἰππεῖς is also variously attested as a variant reading of ἰππέας in Xenophon's manuscripts and is discussed by ancient scholars along with νομεῖς in place of νομέας.<sup>127</sup>

κεστρεῖς (Antiph. fr. 136.1), but κεστρέας is also attested in Alex. fr. 11.8, Henioch. fr. 3.3.

γραφεῖς (Alex. fr. 20.5), as opposed to the accusative ξυγγραφέας/συγγραφέας in Thucydides (8.67.1) and Isocrates (18.58).

<sup>125</sup> That the correct prosody of the accusative singular and plural of *eu*-stems is with /a:/ is also discussed in grammatical sources, collected by La Roche (1897, 1).

<sup>126</sup> See Mayser (*Gramm.* vol. 1.2, 29–30).

<sup>127</sup> See Sgobbi (2004, 234–5; 250–2).

στρωματεῖς (Apollod.Com. fr. 2), but this is a comparatively new word in 4th-century BCE Attic (the earliest attestation is in Middle Comedy),<sup>128</sup> and there is no evidence for the non-analogical ending (see also Thphr. *HP* 4.2.7: τοὺς κρίκους τορνεύουσι τοὺς εἰς τοὺς στρωματεῖς τοὺς διαποικίλους).

In principle, one cannot rule out the possibility that some of these occurrences of -εῖς may conceal instances where an original -έας scanned in synizesis.<sup>129</sup> Still, the parallel evidence from other 4th-century BCE texts suggests that these analogical endings were indeed expanding in late Attic. Atticist lexicography is critical of the analogical development.

**Antiatt.** γ 18: γονέας καὶ γραφέας καὶ τὰ ὅμοια· οὐ μὴν γονεῖς, οὐδὲ γραφεῖς, ὥς οἴονται δεῖν λέγειν. **Philemo (Vindob.)** 394.8: ἐρμηνέας· οὐχ ἐρμηνεῖς.

## 2.10 The inflection of *s*-stems as masculine *ā*-stems

Already in Attic inscriptions of the 5th century and then especially of the 4th century BCE,<sup>130</sup> *s*-stem personal names (e.g. Σωκράτης, Σωκράτους) develop new analogical forms modelled on the *ā*-stems (i.e. Σωκράτης, Σωκράτου, etc.).<sup>131</sup> The epigraphic evidence is extensive (see Threatte 1996, 154–78). These analogical forms are also attested in literary texts, such as Old Comedy – where, contrary to the practice of modern editors, they should probably be retained (see Willi 2003a, 250) – and prose.<sup>132</sup> The evidence for this analogical treatment in Middle and New

**128** See Arnott (1996, 335).

**129** See Section B.2.8.

**130** See Threatte (1996, 173–8), who points out that while the analogical accusative -ην became pervasive after the 370s/360s BCE, the vocative usually retained the inherited ending -ες.

**131** This was only possible in Ionic and Attic, since the phonological process /a:/ > /ε:/ is typical only of these two dialects. It should be noted that the opposite process may also have taken place, i.e. names with an *ā*-stem may have been inflected as if they were *s*-stems, but the evidence for this is controversial (see Threatte 1996, 89–91; López Eire 2002, 93–4).

**132** Some names, like Ὑπερίδης and Θεοκρίνης, are inflected exclusively as analogical *ā*-stems even in the literary sources. As regards Σωκράτης, the analogical accusative Σωκράτην occurs in Eup. fr. 386.1 (but the passage is textually problematic), Pl. *Phdr.* 236c.5, *Grg.* 514d.7, and apparently in Hyperides (fr. 55 Jensen). Hyperides also employs the analogical accusatives Αθηνογένην (*Ath.* 3, 4, and 5 Jensen) and Εὐθυκράτην (fr. 76 Jensen), although in the new Hyperides which has resurfaced in the Archimedes palimpsest, there is an oscillation between the analogical Δημοσθένην (*Contra Diondam* 4 (= f. 137v l. 6) Horváth) and the original Δημοσθένη (*Contra Diondam* 9 (= f. 145r l. 20) Horváth). As regards the vocative case, unlike Menander, who uses the analogical vocative in -η, Hyperides uses the older vocative Αθηνόγενης (*Ath.* 16, 20, and 26), in line with the preference for the non-analogical vocative in inscriptions (see Threatte 1996, 178).

Comedy is confined to the name Στρατοφάνης, the main character in Menander's *Sikyonioi*.

**Vocative Στρατοφάνη** for older Στρατόφανες; Men. *Sic.* 128 (integration), 135, 142, 377, 381, *Sic. fr.* 3.1.<sup>133</sup> **Accusative Στρατωφάνην** for older Στρατοφάνη; Men. *Sic.* 365.

This development points to the koine.<sup>134</sup> Atticist lexicography is obviously critical of analogical inflection. The interest of Atticist lexicography in these analogical developments of the *s*-stems also concerns the plural forms, but in this case, they recommend the analogical form modelled on the *ā*-stems.<sup>135</sup>

**Antiatt. θ 21:** Θηραμένης· τήν κλητικὴν. †Φίλιππίδης† Κοθόρνοις (Philonid. fr. 6). **Moer. δ 48:** Δημοσθένας Ἀττικοί· Δημοσθένεις <κατὰ> τὸ ἀνάλογον Ἑλληνες (see Pellettieri 2023i). **Moer. σ 23:** Σωκράτη Ἀττικῶς· Σωκράτην Ἑλληνες (see Pellettieri 2023h). For a parallel not involving *s*-stems, see **Phryn. Ecl. 127:** Ἡρακλέα, Περικλέα, Θेमιστοκλέα ἐπεκτείνων τὴν ἐσχάτην λέγε, ἀλλὰ μὴ Ἡρακλῆν καὶ Περικλῆν καὶ Θημιστοκλῆν.

## 2.11 Heteroclis and metaplasism

It is not uncommon in Greek for several nouns to have allomorphs belonging to different inflectional classes (heteroclis) or to be transferred from one inflectional class to another (metaplasm). The motivating factors vary, although analogy and morphological regularisation or simplification undoubtedly play a major part.

**γυνή:** the innovative, analogical nominative plural γυναῖ in place of γυναῖκες occurs in Men. fr. \*457 and Philipp. fr. 2, earlier examples of which in Old Comedy are the vocative γυνή in Alc.Com. fr. 32, the accusative singular γυνήν in Pherecr. fr. 96, and the accusative plural γυνάς in Pherecr. fr. 206. Since the context is missing, it is almost impossible to say whether any of these cases is unmarked.<sup>136</sup> In Attic inscriptions, γυνήν occurs in the *defixio* Peek, *Kerameikos* III.C.3.73 (4th century BCE) (see Chapter 4, Section 5.2). These forms of γυνή, reformed as an analogical *ā*-stem, at-

<sup>133</sup> The fragment known via the indirect tradition is quoted by Phot. σ 613 with the precise aim of stressing this morphological peculiarity. No attempts have been made to identify the source of the entry in Photius' lexicon. We can only surmise that it may have been an Atticist source endorsing a milder form of Atticism.

<sup>134</sup> See Mayser (*Gramm.* vol. 1,2, 37–40).

<sup>135</sup> As evidence for these forms, we may mention Ἀριστοφάνας (Pl. *Smp.* 218b.2), Δημοσθένας, and Ἐρμογένας (Plu. *Quaestiones convivales* 613d.4).

<sup>136</sup> See Cassio (1981, 84). This distinction was already considered an important one by ancient scholarship. See the sources discussing ἐμαυτός in Plat.Com. fr. 83 as well as the nominative ὁ πρόσωπος and genitive τοῦ γάλα in Pl.Com. fr. 247. On Aristophanes of Byzantium's engagement with these forms (Ar.Byz. fr. 25) see Chapter 7, Section 2.2.

tracted the interest of Atticist lexicography, see *Antiatt.* γ 1: γυναί· ἀντὶ τοῦ γυναῖκες. Φιλίππιδης Ἀδωνιαζούσαις (fr. 2), Φερεκράτης Κραπατάλλοις (fr. 96) ‘τὴν γυνήν’ (see Batisti 2023d).

**ὁ κλάδος, τοῦ κλάδου:** while Euripides and Aristophanes use the athematic accusative plural κλάδας (Eur. *Tr.* 256) and the dative singular κλαδί (Ar. *Lys.* 632) as well as the dative plural κλάδεσι (Ar. *Av.* 239) as from τὸ κλάδος, τοῦ κλάδους (*DELG* s.v. hypothesises that δένδρεσι served as a model), the evidence we have from Middle and New Comedy is limited to the form of the thematic declension (dative plural κλάδοις in Alex. fr. 124.5). We should point out that ὁ κλάδος is the better attested form already in 5th-century BCE Attic texts, not only in tragedy but also in comedy (see Cratin. fr. 105.4; Amips. fr. 24). Thus, Alexis used what we may regard as the normal Attic form.

**μάρτυς:** we know from Photius (μ 120 = Men. fr. 557) that in the accusative singular Menander adopted not just the far more common inflection as a consonantal stem, i.e. μάρτυρα (for which see Men. *Fab. incert.* 6, unless one accepts Sudhaus’ supplement μάρτυρα[ς], but also the (innovative) inflection as a *u*-stem, i.e. μάρτυν (but on the etymology and inflection of μάρτυς see *DELG* s.v.; *EDG* s.v.). The accusative μάρτυν is first attested in Simonides (fr. 11 West) and then occurs again in Imperial and late-antique prose (Josephus, Plutarch, Chariton’s *Callirhoe*, Clement of Alexandria) and poetry (Nonnus), in Byzantine texts, and in a late-antique documentary papyrus containing the deposition at a trial, where μάρτυν occurs together with μάρτυρα (P.Lips. 1.40.col. ii.8–9) (= TM 33700) (Hermoupolis, last quarter of the 4th century CE).

**ὄρνις:** the accusative plural of this form can occur either as the older *i*-stem, i.e. ὄρνεις/ὄρνις (see Men. fr. 115.1, 132.2, and 132.3 [in the latter case, the manuscripts have ὄρνιθα, which is corrected *metri causa* to the accusative of the *i*-stem], and Apollod.Car. fr. 24.4), or as a dental stem in -θ-, i.e. ὄρνιθα (Men. fr. 115.2). In post-Classical Greek the two inflections still coexist, and it appears that Phrynichus also regarded the nominative plural forms ὄρνεις and ὄρνιθες as equally acceptable (*Phryn.* *PS* 93.10: ὄρνεις καὶ ὄρνιθες διττῶς <τὸ πληθυντικόν>).

**σῆς, σεός:** the old *s*-stem form, which is still attested in an unattributed fragment of New Comedy (*com. adesp.* fr. 1084),<sup>137</sup> was later replaced by the analogical *t*-stem form σῆς, σιτός, which is first attested in the nominative plural σῆτες (as opposed to the older form σέες) in a fragment of Menander (fr. 761.5). The new *t*-stem form became a competing alternative to the *s*-stem form during the 4th century BCE and established itself as the more common inflection of this noun in post-Classical times (the *s*-stem form is only attested twice in Philo and once in Lucian, though both of them alternate it with the *t*-stem form). Unsurprisingly, the older *s*-stem form was recommended as the proper Attic one by Atticist lexicographers (see *Moer.* σ 1: σέες Ἀττικοί· σῆτες Ἑλληνας and other sources discussed by Batisti 2023e).

**σκότος:** while ὁ σκότος is the rule in Old Comedy (see Ar. *Ach.* 1168–9, *V.* 256, 275, and 911, *Pax* 691, *Av.* 1483, *Lys.* 72, *Ec.* 288, 314, 375, and fr. 156.1), in later comedy it occurs only once in a fragment of Archedicus, a poet of New Comedy (fr. 1.3 ἐν τῷ σκότῳ); τὸ σκότος is the more common option and is attested in Alexis, Diphilus, and Menander (Alex. fr. 222.12, Diph. fr. 91.3, Men. *Dysc.* 428) and also in two comic *adespota*, probably belonging to later comedy (*com. adesp.* fr. 247.9 and 1001.6; regarding the identification of the latter fragment, see the discussion by Kassel, Austin, *PCG* vol. 8 *ad loc.*). In the light of this distribution of masculine and neuter σκότος, the remark by *Moer.* σ 34: σκότος οὐδετέρως Ἀττικοί· σκοτία Ἑλληνας is rather surprising, in that it

137 On the authorship of this fragment see Favi (2019a).



completely overlooks the fact that the masculine ὁ σκότος rather than the neuter τὸ σκότος is the rule in 5th-century BCE Attic (see Batisti 2023f).<sup>138</sup> An entry in Photius' lexicon (which depends on either Aelius Dionysius or Orus) credits Ameipsias with the use of both σκότος and σκότον.<sup>139</sup> As suggested by Orth (2013, 337), this ambiguous remark must indicate either that Ameipsias used both forms, or that he was a rare example of an Old Comedy poet who used neuter τὸ σκότος; in the latter case, Orth concludes, Ameipsias may have been one of the earliest Attic writers, along with Thucydides, to use τὸ σκότος.

**σκούφος:** this form alternates between the masculine ὁ σκούφος and the neuter τὸ σκούφος already in archaic and Classical times. To take an example from an Attic text, in Euripides' *Cyclops* we have evidence of the inflection both as a masculine (Cyc. 256, 556) and as a neuter (Cyc. 390, 411). Similarly, in Middle and New Comedy we find both the masculine ὁ σκούφος (Dion.Com. fr. 5.3, Epinic. fr. 1.8) and the neuter τὸ σκούφος (Alex. fr. 135, Epig. fr. 3).

**τάριχος:** the neuter τὸ τάριχος is the norm in 5th-century BCE Attic and is still quite common in later comedy (see Antiph. fr. 27.22, 78.1, 140.4, Alex. fr. 15.13, 77.2, 178.8 [on which see Arnott 1996, 527–9], 191.5, Anaxandr. fr. 51.2, Men. *Epit.* fr. 5.2, fr. 409.11, Philipp. fr. 9.4, Athenio fr. 1.33); however, the masculine ὁ τάριχος, which is already attested in Old Comedy in Crates (fr. 19.2), Cratinus (fr. 44), Aristophanes (fr. 207.1), and Plato Comicus (fr. 49) (outside of Attic texts, it also occurs in Epicharmus, fr. 159, and Herodotus, 4x in 9.120.1–2), is also used by the poets of Middle and New Comedy (see Timocl. fr. 16.5 and Philipp. fr. 34). The preference of 5th-century BCE Attic authors for the neuter τὸ τάριχος is correctly indicated by Atticist lexicographers, although the masculine ὁ τάριχος was also acknowledged by less strict Atticist lexicographers and by other grammarians too. See **Poll. 6.48:** καὶ οὐδετέρως μὲν τὸ τάριχος οἱ Ἀττικοί, ἴωνες δὲ καὶ Δωριεῖς ἀρρενικῶς καὶ τῶν Ἀττικῶν ἐν Διονυσιαλέξανδρῳ Κρατῖνος (there follows Cratin. fr. 44) and **Moer. τ 20:** τάριχος οὐδετέρως Ἀττικοί· ἀρσενικῶς Ἕλληνες. Regarding the masculine ὁ τάριχος, see also Ath. 3.119b and Herodian quoted by Eust. in *Il.* 1.117.12–6.

**υἱός:**<sup>140</sup> the more ancient form is υἱός, whereas the thematic υἱός is secondary and probably developed by dissimilation (i.e. to avoid the repetition of /u/, see *DELG* s.v. and *EDG* s.v.). The form υἱός, which remains unattested in literary sources, is well documented in inscriptions (Threatte 1996, 221 for Attic evidence). υἱός is inflected as a *u*-stem, but with an alternation and subsequent generalisation between the full-grade \*υἱεF- and the zero-grade \*υἱυ-/ \*υἱF-. The older form as *u*-stem is progressively replaced by the thematic form υἱός. In Classical Attic, υἱός becomes predominant from the 4th century BCE. While Xenophon, Demosthenes, and Plato alternate the two types of declension, the poets of Middle and New Comedy use the thematic form almost exclusively.<sup>141</sup> The only exception is the accusative plural υἱεῖς in Alexis (fr. 77.1), but this form is not

**138** Moeris' entry may have undergone epitomisation: his original entry may have been similar to that of Phot. σ 337 (we should thus correct οὐδετέρως to ἐκατέρως or integrate <ἀρσενικῶς καὶ> before οὐδετέρως).

**139** See Phot. σ 377 (edited as Ael.Dion. σ 26 by Erbse, who compares Eust. in *Od.* 1.19.8–14, and as Orus fr. B 148 by Alpers): σκότος καὶ σκότον· ἐκατέρως. οὕτως Ἀμειψίας (fr. 38). Further references to ancient grammarians and erudite sources are collected by Alpers *ad* Orus fr. B 148.

**140** For a more detailed discussion of the phonological and morphological problems related to this form, see Favi (2022w).

**141** Similarly, in Attic inscriptions, the form as a *u*-stem disappears outside of metrical texts after the mid-4th century BCE (see Meisterhans, Schwyzer 1900, 144–5; Threatte 1996, 220–2).



without suspicion and it may be the result of corruption (see Arnott, 1996, 211). The accusative plural  $\nu\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$  which occurs in a hexameter fragment of Theopompus Comicus (fr. 30.1) is a parody of the Homeric formula  $\nu\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma \text{ Ἀχαιῶν}$ .

**χοῦς, χοός:**<sup>142</sup> building on the *o*-grade of the apophonic root of  $\chi\acute{\epsilon}\omega$  (\* $\chi\epsilon\text{F-}$ , \* $\chi\omega\text{F}$ , \* $\chi\acute{\upsilon-}$ ), this noun was sometimes inflected as a thematic stem (i.e.  $\chi\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ ,  $\chi\omicron\upsilon < * \chi\acute{o}\text{F-}\text{o}\varsigma$ , \* $\chi\acute{o}\text{F-}\text{o}\upsilon$ ), as an *ou*-stem (i.e.  $\chi\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ ,  $\chi\omicron\acute{o}\varsigma < * \chi\omega\text{F-}\varsigma$ , \* $\chi\omega\text{F-}\acute{o}\varsigma$ ), and as an *eu*-stem ( $\chi\omicron\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$ ,  $\chi\omicron\epsilon\acute{\omega}\varsigma < * \chi\omega\text{F}\eta\text{F-}\varsigma$ , \* $\chi\omega\text{F}\eta\text{F-}\text{o}\varsigma$ ; this underwent ‘contraction’ in Attic, the resulting inflection being  $\chi\omicron\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$ ,  $\chi\omicron\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ ,  $\chi\omicron\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ ,  $\chi\omicron\acute{\alpha}$ , plural  $\chi\omicron\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ ,  $\chi\omicron\acute{\omega}\nu$ ,  $\chi\omicron\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\iota$ ,  $\chi\omicron\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ ).<sup>143</sup> The thematic inflection is never attested in literature in Classical times, while it is well documented in Attic inscriptions<sup>144</sup> and in post-Classical Greek.<sup>145</sup> The inflection as an *ou*-stem is thought to have developed analogically after  $\beta\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ ,  $\beta\omicron\acute{o}\varsigma$ . In Attic inscriptions, it seems to be standard in the plural.<sup>146</sup> At some point, a new accusative was formed analogically after the development of the consonant stems, that is,  $\chi\acute{o}\alpha$  and  $\chi\acute{o}\alpha\varsigma$  (in place of the original  $\chi\omicron\upsilon\nu$  and  $\chi\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ ).<sup>147</sup> As a consequence, the *ou*-stem and *eu*-stem inflections almost overlapped in the accusative (think of  $\chi\acute{o}\alpha$  and  $\chi\omicron\acute{\alpha}$ ,  $\chi\acute{o}\alpha\varsigma$  and  $\chi\omicron\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ ). In the literary sources, this is reflected in the manuscript evidence, which oscillates between the accentuation as an *ou*-stem and as an *eu*-stem. This situation has made it difficult for the editors to decide what to print. However, since in a few passages of Aristophanes the forms  $\chi\omicron\acute{\alpha}$  and  $\chi\omicron\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$  (from the inflection as an *eu*-stem) are metrically guaranteed, the editors of Aristophanes, Menander, and the comic fragments now systematically restore the contracted forms of  $\chi\omicron\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$  in (almost) all places.<sup>148</sup> As regards Middle and New Comedy, the evidence for the inflection as an *eu*-stem is the accusative singular  $\chi\omicron\acute{\alpha}$  (Anaxandr. fr. 33.1, Epin. fr. 2.8, Eub. fr. 80.4, Men. fr. 442) and accusative plural  $\chi\omicron\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$  (Alex. fr. 15.19, Damox. fr. 1.3, Epin. fr. 2.5), but note that of all these cases only  $\chi\omicron\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$  in Epinicus is metrically guaranteed. In support of the modern editors’ choice to print  $\chi\omicron\acute{\alpha}$  and  $\chi\omicron\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ , we should add that ancient grammatical sources going back to Herodian say that Menander’s  $\chi\omicron\acute{\alpha}$  has a long vowel and a perispomenon accent, which means that it is the outcome of a contraction based on the

142 See Egli (1954, 62–3) and Perpillou (1973, 164–6), who also collect the evidence from sources other than comedy, especially the *corpus Hippocraticum*.

143 See Section B.2.7.

144 See Threattle (1996, 267–8).

145 See, e.g., Mayser (*Gramm.* vol. 1,2, 27).

146 See the discussion by Threattle (1996, 267–8), whose conclusion that the singular inflection as an *ou*-stem was a back-formation from the plural is likely (but the inference about how to interpret XOA is a less uncontroversial one).

147 It is possible that the analogical forms were created to make it easier to distinguish between the nominative singular and the accusative plural  $\chi\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ .

148 See Cratin. fr. 199.3, where Kassel, Austin also collect the evidence in Old Comedy for metrically guaranteed accusative plural  $\chi\omicron\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$  and accusative singular  $\chi\omicron\acute{\alpha}$ . To their data one must add the very interesting, and mostly neglected, occurrence of the genitive plural  $\chi\omicron\epsilon\acute{\omega}\nu$  in *com. adesp.* fr. 1035.18 (a fragment of Old Comedy?). Although the modern editors’ choice is reasonable enough, little attention has been paid to the metrically guaranteed occurrence of the dative plural  $\chi\omicron\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}$  in Ar. *Ach.* 1211. This case shows the shaky ground on which modern editors’ decisions rest. On the genitive  $\chi\omicron\acute{o}\varsigma$  and  $\chi\omicron\acute{\omega}\varsigma$  see the discussion by Kassel, Austin (*PCG* vol. 5, *ad* Eup. fr. 379).

full grade (\*χοφῆ(F)-α).<sup>149</sup> It should be noted, however, that the inflection of χοῦς as an *ou*-stem is also metrically guaranteed at least in one case, namely the dative singular χοῖ in Anaxandrides (fr. 42.13).<sup>150</sup> But since this is a passage in anapestic dimeters, one may at least wonder whether this is a one-off licence. Atticist lexicography prescribes the accusative χάα (or more likely χοᾶ?) over the koine form χοῦν (Moer. χ 26: χάα τὸ μέτρον Ἀττικοί· χοῦν Ἑλληνες).<sup>151</sup>

## 3 Comparatives and superlatives

### 3.1 Short and long primary comparatives

In Greek, besides the more widespread *n*-stem inflection of the comparative (e.g. μείζων, μείζονος, i.e. the longer forms), the old *s*-stem inflection has survived in the accusative singular of the masculine/feminine (τὸν/τὴν μείζω, i.e. the shorter forms), in the nominative and accusative plural of the masculine/feminine (οἱ/αἱ μείζους, τοὺς/τὰς μείζους), and in the nominative/accusative neuter (τὰ μείζω).<sup>152</sup> In Aristophanic comedy, the distribution of the longer and shorter forms does not easily suggest that the former had already overtaken the latter (Tab. 1).<sup>153</sup> If we analyse the evidence for the ten most common primary comparatives, the data from Middle and New Comedy generally confirm a similar conclusion, albeit with some nuances.

The longer forms seem to be slightly better attested than the shorter ones, but the tendency towards the longer forms is not particularly strong. Furthermore, as is already the case in Aristophanes, the long forms are often found at line-end in the iambic trimeter and the catalectic trochaic tetrameter, which is

<sup>149</sup> See Choerob. in Theod. GG 4.1.238.1–6 (= Hdn. Περὶ κλίσεως ὀνομάτων GG 3.2.706.1–8). The ‘contracted’ forms of the *eu*-stems are discussed by several sources which depend on Herodianic materials (see Section B.2.7).

<sup>150</sup> The metrically guaranteed /i/ makes it certain that this form derives from χοῦς, χοός (if it were a form of χοεύς, one would have χοεῖ or possibly χοῖ with /i:/). The metrical interpretation of this line as given by Millis (2015, 204) is therefore incorrect, in that the third anapestic metre of the line contains a dactylic resolution (ἐν χοῖ), not a spondee.

<sup>151</sup> In the light of what has been said above, and in view of the unreliability of the manuscript evidence, the paroxytone accent univocally transmitted in Moeris’ manuscripts should be emended into perispomenon χοᾶ. On the inflection of χοῦς and its compounds in the Imperial koine, as witnessed by the papyrological sources, see Gignac (1981, 83–4).

<sup>152</sup> See Schwyzler (1939, 536–7).

<sup>153</sup> See Willi (2003a, 243–4). As discussed by Threatte (1996, 311–2), it is only in Roman times that the longer forms become predominant over the shorter ones in Attic inscriptions.

Tab. 1: Distribution of the longer and shorter forms in Middle and New Comedy.

Singular		Plural	
Shorter	Longer	Shorter	Longer
<b>βελτίων</b>	<b>βελτίονα</b> : Men. <i>Dysc.</i> 282, <b>βελτίον'</b> : Men. fr. 273.3	<b>βελτίω</b> : Men. fr. 322.2, Apollod.Com. fr. 9.2	<b>βελτίονα</b> : Men. fr. *871.4
<b>ἐλάττων</b>			<b>ἐλάττον'</b> : Philem. fr. 145.2
<b>ἡδίων</b>			<b>ἡδίονα</b> : Apollod.Car. fr. 5.16
<b>ἥττων</b>			<b>ἥττον'</b> : Philem. fr. 31.6
<b>κρείττων</b>	<b>κρείττω</b> : Axion. fr. 8.6, Cratin.Iun. fr. 8.5 <b>κρείττονα</b> : Men. <i>Th.</i> fr. 1.13, <b>κρείττον'</b> : Philem. fr. 120.2		<b>κρείττονας</b> : Men. <i>Epit.</i> 329
<b>μείζων</b>	<b>μείζω</b> : Ephipp. fr. 5.4, Men. fr. 728.2, Men. fr. 763 <b>μείζονα</b> : Diphil. fr. 45.3, Men. <i>Sam.</i> 526, Sophil. fr. 4.2 <b>μείζον'</b> :	<b>μείζους</b> : Anaxandr. fr. 42.11, Philipp. fr. 28.4, <b>μείζω</b> : Antiph. fr. 157.5, Epicr. fr. 9.2, Men. <i>Dysc.</i> 825, Philem. fr. 94.1	<b>μείζονες</b> : Alex. fr. 294.1, <b>μείζονας</b> : Philem. fr. 98.7 (2x), <b>μείζονα</b> : Philem. fr. 31.6, <b>μείζον'</b> : Timocl. fr. 6.17
<b>πλείων</b>	<b>πλείω</b> : Alex. fr. 257.3, Damox. fr. 3.11 <b>πλείονα</b> : Alex. fr. 263.4	<b>πλείους</b> : Antiph. fr. 203.2, Men. fr. 208.5, Men. fr. 877.6, Philaet. fr. 14.2, <b>πλείω</b> : Diphil. fr. 4.3, Men. <i>Epit.</i> 656 (integration), Men. <i>Sam.</i> 230, Philaet. fr. 3.1, Posidipp. fr. 6.6 (or singular?)	<b>πλείονες</b> : Posidipp. fr. 30.1, <b>πλείονας</b> : Diphil. fr. 5.1, Eriph. fr. 2.9, <b>πλείονα</b> : Men. <i>Epit.</i> 795 (2x), Men. fr. 91.2, <b>πλείονα</b> : Sotad. fr. 1.32
<b>χείρων</b>			<b>χείρονας</b> : Men. <i>Th.</i> fr. 1.18, <b>χείρονα</b> : Diphil. fr. 84.2

possible in the case of trisyllabic forms, since Porson's bridge does not usually apply in comedy (except in paratragedy). Although the long forms are well attested in authoritative Attic writers, Atticist lexicographers unsurprisingly recommended the use of the 'short' forms as being typically Attic and foreign to the koine.

**Moer. α 75:** ἀμείνω Ἀττικοί· ἀμείνονα Ἑλληνες. **Moer. η 10:** ἤττω Ἀττικοί· ἥσσονα κοινόν. See Pellettieri (2023g).

### 3.2 Primary comparatives with /i/

The regular prosody of the primary comparative ending *-ίων* is with /i:/, as opposed to /i/ in Ionic.<sup>154</sup> Although the regular prosody is still the rule in the poets of Middle and New Comedy, it appears that /i/ is at variance with the standard Attic /i:/ in two lines of Alexis.<sup>155</sup>

**Alex. fr. 25.6:** τύρβαζε, Μάνη· γαστρός οὐδὲν ἡδίων. **Alex. fr. 158** (= *Antiatt.* η 5) ἡδίων· Ἀλεξίς Ὀδυσσεὶ ἀπονιπτομένῳ.

Beside the gloss of the *Antiatticist* (*Antiatt.* η 5), Phrynichus too may have touched upon the vowel length in the primary comparatives, but the interpretation is not univocal.

**Phryn. Ecl. 264:** ἔγγιον ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐγγύτερον μὴ λέγε, ἀλλ' ἐγγύτερον· ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ ἐν τῇ γῇ, οἷον 'ἐγγειον κτῆμα', εἴ τις χρῶτο, ἀριστα ἂν χρήσαιτο, ὥς καὶ Δημοσθένης ([D.] 34.24)· 'ἐγγειον τόκον' λέγει.<sup>156</sup>

### 3.3 Primary comparatives with alternating *-ίων/-ζων*

The treatment of the suffix of the primary comparative in Greek is complicated by the fact that the comparative suffix appears both in the form *-ίων* (as in ἡδίων), where the preceding consonant remains unaffected, and *-ζων* (as in θάσζων), where

<sup>154</sup> But the situation is not as clear-cut as is often claimed (see Barber 2013, 151–2).

<sup>155</sup> On the *Antiatticist* gloss, the interpretation of the reference to Alexis, and the relevant antecedent in Ar.Byz. fr. 347, see Tosi (1997, 173–4); Chapter 7, Section 2.2.8.

<sup>156</sup> For a collection of sources other than Atticist lexica discussing the prosody of the primary comparatives, see Callanan (1987, 31–2).

the consonantal /i/ causes the palatalisation of the preceding consonant.<sup>157</sup> This different treatment produced some doublets, that is, adjectives which have both a comparative formed with -ίων and one with -ιον (e.g. γλυχίων and γλύσσων, βραχίων and βράσσων, etc.).

**τάχιον:** Men. fr. 296.16. This occurrence is disputed. The fragment only survives in Aulus Gellius' *Noctes Atticae*, so the readings are somewhat uncertain. The passage with τάχιον is particularly thorny. Not only is the meaning uncertain,<sup>158</sup> but τάχιον is also unprecedented in Attic texts (the comparative ταχίων only begins to appear in the koine). Kock was inclined to retain τάχιον in Menander. In support of this view, we may cite two occurrences of ταχίων in the Hippocratic corpus (*Mul.* 1.27 and *Dent.* 30),<sup>159</sup> as well as the fact that, although primary comparatives are recessive in historical times, secondary formations of this type spread to replace the older forms (besides ταχίων, we may mention παχίων, βελτίων, and αἰσχίων).<sup>160</sup> On the contrary, Kassel, Austin obelise τάχιον, stressing that Menander elsewhere uses only the adverb ταχέως and adverbial ταχύ. This instance of τάχιον is probably best regarded as uncertain, and the matter requires further investigation.

**Phryn. Ecl. 52:** τάχιον Ἑλληνες οὐ λέγουσιν, θᾶπτον δέ. **Moer. θ 18:** θᾶπτον <Ἀττικοί>· τάχιον <Ἑλληνες>. **Moer. τ 7:** τάχιον οὐ λέγεται παρ' Ἀττικοῖς ἀλλὰ θᾶπτον. [**Hdn.**] **Philet. 18:** θᾶπτον ἐρεῖς, οὐχὶ τάχιον· καὶ βραδύτερον, οὐχὶ βράδιον· καὶ αἰσχίον, οὐχὶ αἰσχροτέρον· καὶ κάκιον ὁμοίως.<sup>161</sup>

### 3.4 Analogical extension of the comparative and superlative endings -έστερος, -έστατος

We have only one example where the comparative and superlative suffixes -έστερος, -έστατος are employed in an uncontracted first-class adjective.<sup>162</sup>

<sup>157</sup> For a full treatment of this issue (which falls within the realm of Sievers' Law), see Barber (2013).

<sup>158</sup> The sentence would mean something like 'the young female servant is obsequious and faster than a word', probably meaning that she is very willing to carry out orders even before she is asked.

<sup>159</sup> For the dating of these works respectively to the years between the late 5th and the early 4th century BCE and around the early 4th century BCE, see Craik (2015, 206); Craik (2015, 61) (but the dating of *De dentitione* is more uncertain).

<sup>160</sup> See Barber (2013, 175; 182; 185; 378).

<sup>161</sup> One may also compare the criticism of ἔγγιον in Phryn. *Ecl.* 264: ἔγγιον ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐγγύτερον μὴ λέγε, ἀλλ' ἐγγύτερον· ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ ἐν τῇ γῇ, οἷον ἔγγειον κτῆμα, εἰ τις χρῶτο, ἄριστα ἂν χρήσαιτο, ὡς καὶ Δημοσθένης ([D.] 34.24)· ἔγγειον τόκον λέγει (on this entry see also Section B.3.2).

<sup>162</sup> The use of the comparatives and superlatives in -έστερος, -έστατος, originating from the *s*-stems (ἀληθής > ἀληθέστερος), spread more widely to the *n*-stems (εὐδαίμων > εὐδαιμονέστερος) and to the contracted adjectives of the first class (ἀπλοῦς > ἀπλουέστερος). For a discussion of the development of these comparatives, see Wackernagel (1897, 2–3).

εὐζωρότερος: Antiph. fr. 137; Ephipp. fr. 3.11; Eub. fr. 148.8.

The regular form εὐζωρότερος is also attested in comedy (see Cratin. fr. 453 and Eup. fr. 452, both quoted by Phryn. *Ecl.* 62, and Diph. fr. 57.2), as is the simplex, ζωρότερος (Antiph. fr. 147.2, a hexametrical fragment; Ephipp. fr. 10). Metre is probably key in the use of the regular or the analogical form. Whereas εὐζωρότερος and ζωρότερος, in the only two cases where we are able to judge (Diph. fr. 57.2, Ephipp. fr. 10), occur in the first two *metra* of a iambic trimeter, all three occurrences of εὐζωρότερος are at verse-end. It seems that in the first two thirds of the line, the forms that would have required a higher number of solutions in the metre were preferred, while εὐζωρότερος was used as a metrically convenient alternative form to accommodate the adjective in the final *metron*. Perhaps, this new comparative εὐζωρότερος was perceived as less of an oddity due to the parallel development of ἄκρατος > ἄκρατέστερος (possibly due to confusion with ἀκρατής, first attested in Hyp. *Dem.* fr. 9 col. xl.34–5 Jensen, as reconstructed by the references in Ath. 10.424d and Poll. 6.24), which had a similar meaning and is far more widely documented.

We should mention that earlier comic parallels for εὐζωρότερος are the analogical εὐωνέστερος in Epicharmus (fr. 119) and ἀφθονέστατος in Eupolis (fr. 330.2). It is intriguing that Epicharmus' εὐωνέστερος has the same prosodic form as εὐζωρότερος, but since the Epicharmus line in which the analogical comparative occurred is lost, one can only wonder what position it occupied in a trochaic or iambic metre. As regards Eupolis, since ἀφθονέστερος and ἀφθονέστατος are also attested in Pindar (*O.* 2.94) and Aeschylus (fr. 72) (later also in Plato, *R.* 460b.2, and Xenophon, *Mem.* 4.3.6), it is possible that Eupolis may be using the analogical superlative not only in the wake of θεοφιλεστάτην in the previous line, but also as a means of raising the tone (possibly a tongue-in-cheek praise of a city: whether Athens or another one, it remains uncertain).<sup>163</sup> Eupolis' use of the analogical comparative may thus represent a different case from the use of such formations by later Attic writers.

In Atticist lexicography, the analogical extension of the comparative and superlative endings -έστερος, -έστατος was probably approached differently, depending on the ideological standpoint of the lexica. This subject also attracted the interest of grammarians more generally.

**Antiatt. α 74:** ἀφθονέστερον· Πίνδαρος Ἐπινικίους (*O.* 2.94). **Antiatt. α 75:** ἀρχαιέστερον· Πίνδαρος Ὕμνοις (fr. 45 Snell–Maehler). On these entries see Tribulato (2022e). It is possible that **Phryn. Ecl. 114:** 'ζωρότερον' ὁ ποιητής, σὺ δὲ λέγε 'εὐζωρον κέρασον' καὶ 'εὐζωρότερον', ὡς Ἀριστοφάνης (*Ec.*

163 See Olson (2014, 25).

137; 227) καὶ Κρατῖνος (fr. 453) καὶ Εὐπολῖς (fr. 452) originally dealt with the occurrences of εὐζω-ρέστερος in Middle and New Comedy (see Tribulato 2022h).

We should add two more examples of the analogical extension of the comparative and superlative suffix -έστερος, -έστατος in 4th-century BCE Attic texts that may be of interest for their reception in Atticist lexicography, namely ἀσμενέστατος (Pl. *R.* 329c.3–4 and 616a.7)<sup>164</sup> and ῥαδιέστερος (Hyp. fr. 86 Jensen).<sup>165</sup>

### 3.5 Comparative and superlative endings -ίστερος and -ίστατος

Comparatives and superlatives in -ίστερος and -ίστατος occur with a typically derogatory nuance in 5th-century BCE comedy.<sup>166</sup>

**λαλίστερος:** Alex. fr. 96.1; Men. fr. 309. **λαλίστατος:** Men. fr. 129.1.

These three examples still retain the derogatory nuance of comparatives and superlatives in -ίστερος and -ίστατος in earlier comedy. In earlier sources, the comparative λαλίστερος is attested twice in Aristophanes (*Ran.* 91, fr. 684); in 4th-century BCE texts it occurs in Theophrastus (*Char.* 7.7), always with a derogatory tone. The superlative λαλίστατος is rare and, apart from Menander, occurs only in Eur. *Cyc.* 315 (again, a text whose genre allowed for the use of a language perhaps closer to the colloquial register). The comparatives and superlatives in -ίστερος and -ίστατος have attracted the interest of ancient scholars, including Atticist sources.

**Poll.** 2.125: καὶ τὸ λαλεῖν δὲ καὶ ὁ λάλος καὶ λαλίστερος. [**Hdn.**] **Philet.** 297: λαλίστατοι, ὀψοφαγίστατοι, κλεπτίστατοι· τὸ ὑπερθετικόν. Further sources are collected by Theodoridis (1976) *ad* Philox.Gramm. fr. \*337 and \*350.

<sup>164</sup> The indirect tradition attests that in *R.* 329c.3–4 there was a variant reading ἀσμεναίτατα (see Philox.Gramm. fr. \*337a–b, which is reconstructed from the *Etymologica* and Eustathius). Phrynichus claims that the correct comparative of ἄσμενος is ἀσμενώτερος (*PS* 18.10: ἀσμενώτερος· διὰ τοῦ ω. τὸ δὲ ἐπίρρημα ἀσμεναίτατα), no doubt from an analogical standpoint, and this view is supported by only one occurrence in the Hippocratic corpus (*Art.* 33: ἀσμενωτάτη αὐτοῖσιν ἡ βαθεῖη ποίη φαίνεται). It is likely that in discussing these forms Phrynichus was not only concerned with the occurrence in Plato, but was also implicitly condemning ἀσμενέστερος and ἀσμενέστατος.

<sup>165</sup> This Hyperides passage is certainly alluded to by Pollux (5.107), though instead of ῥαδιέστερος Pollux gives the reading ῥαδιώτερος (otherwise unattested).

<sup>166</sup> See Willi (2003a, 243).

### 3.6 Analytic comparatives in place of synthetic comparatives

Analytic comparatives of the type μᾶλλον + positive adjective, already attested in Aristophanes,<sup>167</sup> are also occasionally attested in Middle and New Comedy.

καταφανεῖς μᾶλλον: Timocl. fr. 34.2. μᾶλλον ἀνόσιον: Xenarch. fr. 7.5.

The synthetic forms are well attested in 5th- and 4th-century BCE prose and poetry. Note that μᾶλλον καταφανής occurs 2x in Plato (*Plt.* 266d.4, *Lg.* 645c.3). The analytic construction originally belonged to a more colloquial register, but it may also be metrically convenient. ἀνοσιώτερος and καταφανέστερος have the same prosodic form, so it may not be a coincidence that these two forms are replaced by their analytic equivalents. These synthetic comparatives are long words whose position in the iambic trimeter of comedy is subject to limitations (i.e. they tend to be placed in the right part of the verse, see Orth 2015). In the fragments of Timocles and Xenarchus, analytic comparatives replace synthetic ones in places where the latter forms would not fit the metre. There is some discussion of analytical comparatives in Atticist lexicography.

**Ael.Dion. a 10** (= Eust. in *Od.* 1.9.30–1): <ἀγαθός· ἡ σύγκρισις μᾶλλον ἀγαθός καὶ ἡ ὑπέρθεσις μάλιστα ἀγαθός>. ἀγαθώτερος <δὲ> καὶ ἀγαθώτατος παρ' οὐδενὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων κείται. **Phryn. Ecl.** 65: ἀγαθός μᾶλλον λέγε, μὴ ἀγαθώτερος, καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀγαθώτατος ἀγαθός μάλιστα. See Favi (2022o).

## 4 Pronouns

### 4.1 Reflexive pronouns

#### 4.1.1 The reduplicated personal pronoun αὐτός as a reflexive pronoun (αὐτὸς αὐτόν)

To express the reflexive pronoun, Greek can reduplicate the personal pronoun αὐτός, as in αὐτὸς αὐτόν.<sup>168</sup> In addition to occurring in epichoric and literary dialects other than Attic, this use is well attested in tragedy,<sup>169</sup> while the evidence from Old Comedy is very scanty (Ar. *Ec.* 402, Crates fr. 16.2). Although Middle and

<sup>167</sup> See Willi (2003a, 243).

<sup>168</sup> See Favi (2020, 364–5). The correct spelling is the one with the smooth breathing on the second αὐτός.

<sup>169</sup> See the evidence in Favi (2020, 365 n. 786).



New Comedy provide a smaller corpus, the evidence is more abundant than for Old Comedy.

**Apollod.Car. fr. 5.9–11:** πῶς γὰρ μᾶλλον ἂν προεῖλετο | [. . .] λεπομένους ὀρᾶν | αὐτοὺς ὑφ' αὐτῶν (or should we restore ὑπ' αὐτῶν?). **Diph. fr. 92.1:** ὅστις γὰρ αὐτὸς αὐτὸν οὐκ αἰσχύνεται | συνειδὸθ' αὐτῷ φαῦλα διαπεπραγμένῳ. **Men. fr. 844.8:** αὐτοὶ παρ' αὐτῶν ἕτερα προσπορίζομεν. **Philem. fr. 113.4:** αὐτὸς δ' ἐπ' αὐτοῦ' σὺν πονηρὸς καὶ πικρὸς. **Philem. fr. 122.2:** τοὺς αὐτὸς αὐτοῦ βούλεσθ' ὑγιαίνειν φίλους. **Timocl. fr. 6.19:** τὰς αὐτὸς αὐτοῦ συμφορὰς ἤττον στένει.

The *Antiatticist* may have devoted an entry to this topic, arguably with a view to defending the admissibility of this construction, but the interpretation is uncertain.

**Antiatt. α 4:** ταῦτός† αὐτόν· ἀντὶ τοῦ ἑμαυτόν. This interpretation of the entry (and of the following two) originally goes back to Sicking, but S. Valente (2015b) now accepts a different interpretation (see Section B.4.1.2).

#### 4.1.2 The 3rd-person singular reflexive ἑαυτοῦ/αὐτοῦ in place of the other reflexive pronouns (ἑμαυτοῦ, σεαυτοῦ, etc.)

In poetry (but not in Homer) and prose, the 3rd-person singular reflexive pronoun ἑαυτοῦ/αὐτοῦ can replace the corresponding forms of the other persons (both singular and plural).<sup>170</sup> While the tragic evidence is solid, no occurrence is found in Aristophanes.<sup>171</sup> As regards prose, this use is attested only once in Herodotus and Thucydides, while it becomes more common in 4th-century BCE prose. It appears that later comedy follows 4th-century BCE prose in allowing this use of the reflexive pronoun against the common 5th-century BCE usage.

**Crobyl. fr. 1:** παράσιτον αὐτόσιτον· αὐτὸν γοῦν τρέφων | τὰ πλείστα συνερανιστὸς εἶ τῷ δεσπότη (instead of 2nd-person singular pronoun). **Men. fr. 64.5–6:** νῦν ἀληθινὸν | εἰς πέλαγος αὐτὸν ἐμβαλεῖς γὰρ πραγμάτων (instead of the 2nd-person singular pronoun). **Men. fr. 632:** ὦν οὐχ αὐτῷ παρετράφην, ἀλλὰ σοι (instead of the 1st-person singular pronoun). **Men. fr. 844.8:** αὐτοὶ παρ' αὐτῶν ἕτερα προσπορίζομεν (instead of 1st-person plural pronoun).<sup>172</sup> **Philem. fr. 116.3:** ὦν δὲ δι' ἑαυτοὺς ἐσόμεθ' ἐστερημένοι (instead of the 1st-person plural pronoun). **Posidipp. fr. 30.2–3:** σὺ μὲν ἀττικίζεις, ἡνίκ' ἂν φωνῇν λέγῃς | αὐτοῦ τιν' (instead of the 2nd-person singular pronoun).

This use of the reflexive pronoun is discussed in several entries of the *Antiatticist*, apparently in order to defend it against the criticism of more rigorous Atticist lexicographers. The *Antiatticist* may have used the poets of later comedy as a source.

<sup>170</sup> See K–G (vol. 1, 572).

<sup>171</sup> See Willi (2003a, 256).

<sup>172</sup> Here it is the reduplicated demonstrative pronoun αὐτός that is being used (see Section B.4.1.1).

**Antiatt. α 5:** αὐτοῦ· ἀντὶ τοῦ σαυτοῦ. **Antiatt. α 6:** αὐτῷ· ἀντὶ τοῦ ἑμαυτῷ. It is also possible that the entry **Antiatt. α 4:** †αὐτός† αὐτόν· ἀντὶ τοῦ ἑμαυτόν dealt with this use of αὐτός, if one agrees with S. Valente's (2015b) interpretation that †αὐτός† is either a scribal error or the remaining lemma of an entry whose *interpretamentum* has been lost (according to this interpretation, S. Valente hypothetically envisages two entries: **Antiatt. α 4a:** αὐτός· <\*\*\*> and **Antiatt. α 4b:** αὐτόν· ἀντὶ τοῦ ἑμαυτόν). S. Valente thus rejects the interpretation offered by Sicking, who thought that the three consecutive entries of the *Antiatticist* were concerned with the reflexive pronoun formed by αὐτός + αὐτοῦ/αὐτῷ/αὐτόν (see Section B.4.1.1). Among the parallel sources collected by S. Valente (2015b, *ad Antiatt.* α 4–6), see especially Priscian. 18.177 (*GL* 3.290.3–6): *ἑαυτόν proprie quidem tertiae est personae, invenitur tamen et primae et secundae adiunctum. Μένανδρος* (fr. 632): 'ὅτι οὐκ αὐτῷ παρετράφην, ἀλλὰ σοί', τουτέστιν οὐκ ἑμαυτῷ.

### 4.1.3 Personal pronoun in place of the reflexive pronoun

The replacement of reflexive pronouns with personal pronouns is not uncommon in Greek, particularly in tragedy, but it is foreign to comedy.<sup>173</sup> The evidence from Middle and New Comedy is limited.

**Philem. fr. 18:** σῶζε σαυτόν, ἐγὼ δ' ἐμέ. **Anaxandr. fr. 63:** ὑπὲρ σεαυτοῦ †πρᾶττε<sup>174</sup> ὅτι ἂν σοι δοκῇ, | ἐγὼ δ' ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ.

Both these fragments are quoted in the entry on this topic in the *Antiatticist*, which presumably meant to defend this use against its proscription by other Atticist lexicographers.

**Antiatt. ε 19:** ἐμέ· ἀντὶ τοῦ ἑμαυτόν. σέ· ἀντὶ τοῦ σαυτόν. Φιλῆμων Γαμοῦντι (fr. 18): 'σῶζε σαυτόν, ἐγὼ δ' ἐμέ'. Αναξανδρίδης (fr. 63): 'ὑπὲρ σεαυτοῦ πρᾶττε ὅτι ἂν σοι δοκῇ, | ἐγὼ δ' ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ'. S. Valente (2015b) *ad loc.* collects the parallel passages where grammatical treatises and scholia discuss the use of the personal pronoun instead of the reflexive pronoun.

## 4.2 Deictic -ί in demonstrative pronouns and adverbs

The use of deictic -ί in pronouns and adverbs is extensive in Old Comedy, with over 600 occurrences in Aristophanes alone.<sup>175</sup> According to Dover's (1997, 64) calculations, in Aristophanes the forms with deictic -ί are 1/4 of the equivalent ones

<sup>173</sup> See K–G (vol. 1, 559); Millis (2015, 298).

<sup>174</sup> Kassel, Austin (*PCG* vol. 2, 274) put the crux to signal the problematic hiatus in πρᾶττε ὅτι. To the corrections proposed in earlier scholarship and collected *ad loc.* by Kassel, Austin, one should now add πρᾶξον ὅ τι offered by Sansone *apud* Millis (2015, 297–8).

<sup>175</sup> See Willi (2003a, 244–5). Orth (2018) provides a valuable study (with earlier bibliography) of the main uses of deictic -ί in Greek Comedy, with particular attention to Aristophanes' corpus.

without deictic  $\acute{\iota}$ .<sup>176</sup> However, since the forms with deictic  $\acute{\iota}$  are virtually limited to dialogue, it is easy to infer that they are an element of colloquial language, which is confirmed by the fact that they are much less frequent in prose than in Aristophanes (besides, they are never found in tragedy).<sup>177</sup> In Middle and New Comedy these deictic forms are comparatively less common than in Old Comedy.

Forms of **ὀδί** occur 16x (126x in Aristophanes, the ratio with forms without deictic  $\acute{\iota}$  is 1:2.5). **ὀδί**: Arar. fr. 16.2; Alc.Com. fr. 22.1; Antiph. fr. 166.3; Alex. fr. 19.1. **τοδί**: Alex. fr. 191.5; Diphil. fr. 19.3; Men. *Asp.* 262, *Dysc.* 400, *Sam.* 180, *Fab.Incert.* 30. **τουδί**: Anaxandr. fr. 42.66. **τονδί**: Antiph. fr. 57.1; Diphil. fr. 45.3. **τηνδί**: Henioch. fr. 5.7; Men. *Dysc.* 212. **ταδί**: Men. *Sic.* 141. **τουσδί**: Antiph. fr. 225.11.

Forms of **οὔτοσί** occur 140x, plus four possible cases (340x in Aristophanes, the ratio with forms without deictic  $\acute{\iota}$  is ca. 1:4). **οὔτοσί**: Alex. fr. 177.3, 177.15, 245.1; Antiph. fr. 27.15, 35.1, 151.2, 212.1, 214.1, 221.8; Athenio fr. 1.27; Axionic. fr. 1.1; Eub. fr. 119.1; Euphro fr. 9.15; Men. *Asp.* 139, 527, 536, *Georg.* 106, *Georg.* fr. 6, *Dysc.* 143, 167, 212, 480, 607, 753, *Epit.* 138, 294, 299, 302, 320, 384, 386, 387, 406, 447, 576, 1105, *Car.* 19 (a likely restoration), *Mis.* \*424 (the reading of the papyrus, οὔτοσσε, may be either οὔτοσί or οὔτος εἶ), 702, *Pc.* 88, 229, 281, 338, *Sam.* 127, 549, 563, 639, 716, *Sic.* 29, 247, 260, 368, 378, *Sic.* fr. \*11.3, fr. 60.1 and 143; Philem. fr. 8 and 63.3; Posidipp. fr. 1.9. **τουτί**: Alex. fr. 140.8 and 212.2; Anaxil. fr. 3.1 and 4.1; Antiph. fr. 101.3 and \*127.7 (†τουτί); Apollod.Gel. 2.1; Ephipp. fr. 5.19; Nicostr.Com. fr. 9.2; Xenarch. fr. 12.1; Men. *Dysc.* 173, 180, 218, 224, 327, 393, 431, 464, 559, 613, *Epit.* 386, 404, \*418 (διὰ τουτί of the papyrus is often, but not always, emended to διὰ τοῦτο by the editors), *Pc.* 142, 243, 341, 344, 357, *Sam.* 399, 466 (τουτογι), 684, *Phasm.* 50, fr. 1.2, 297.2. **τουτονί**: Antiph. fr. 27.13 and 150.1; Athenio fr. 1.7; Diod.Com. fr. 3.1; Dionys.Com. fr. 2.36; Hegesipp. fr. 1.23; Men. *Asp.* 88, 247, 333, 387, 430, 467, *Dysc.* 5, 47, 412, 549 (a nearly certain restoration), 659, 964, *Epit.* 466, 514, *Col.* 66, *Mis.* 470, 537, 715, *Pc.* 226, *Sam.* 72, 155, 165 (a possible supplement), 280, 309, 322, 499, 539, *Sic.* 144, fr. 364.2, 844.3, 884.1 (a most likely supplement). **ταυτηνί**: Anaxipp. fr. 8.1; Eub. fr. 3; Sophil. fr. 6.3. **ταυτί**: Men. *Asp.* 113, *Dysc.* 419, *Epit.* 376, 526, 573, *Th.* fr. 3.2, *Mis.* 695, *Sam.* 687, *Sic.* 260, *Phasm.* 23, fr. 397.3.

Forms of **οὔτωσί** occur 3x (7 in Aristophanes, the ratio with forms without deictic  $\acute{\iota}$  is 1:15): Men. *Asp.* 401, *Sam.* 645, *Leuc.* fr. 4.

**ἐκεινοσί** is unattested (10 in Aristophanes, the ratio with forms without deictic  $\acute{\iota}$  is 1:18).

**τοιοσδί** is unattested (3x in Aristophanes, the ratio with forms without deictic  $\acute{\iota}$  is 1:2.5).

Forms of **τοιουτοσί** occur 8x, a ninth occurrence is uncertain (17x in Aristophanes, the ratio with forms without deictic  $\acute{\iota}$  is 1:4). **τοιουτοσί**: Anaxandr. fr. 34.7; Men. *Epit.* 256. **τοιουτί**: *Pc.* 107 and 339. **τοιαυτησί**: Men. *Epit.* 1060. **τοιουτονί**: Men. *Epit.* 246 and 445. \***τοιαυτί**: Epicr. fr. 10.31 (Athenaeus' MSS C and E have τοιαῦτα, which violates the metre and for which Meineke, among others, has suggested the correction τοιαῦτί).

**τοσουτοσί** occurs 1x in Anaxandr. fr. 29.2 (10x in Aristophanes, the ratio with forms without deictic  $\acute{\iota}$  is 1:2.5).

**τηλικουτοσί** is unattested (2x in Aristophanes, the ratio with forms without deictic  $\acute{\iota}$  is 1:3).

<sup>176</sup> The data concerning Aristotle's writings are collected and discussed by Martín de Lucas (2013).

<sup>177</sup> Significantly, the only occurrence of deictic  $\acute{\iota}$  in Thucydides is contained in a direct speech (see Dover 1997, 63).

**δευρί** occurs 2x in Mnes. fr. 4.23 and Men. fr. 129.2 (18x in Aristophanes, the ratio with forms without deictic -ί is 1:9).

**ἐνθαδί** occurs 15x but only in Menander (15x in Aristophanes, the ratio with forms without deictic -ί is 1:3.5): Men. *Asp.* 532, *Dysc.* 24, 89, 302, 557, 881, 919, *Her.* 21, *Thphr.* 28, *Col.* 34, *Sam.* 587, *Sic.* 130 and 195, *Phasm.* 105, fr. 893.1.

**ἐνθενδί** is unattested (1x in Aristophanes, the ratio with forms without deictic -ί is 1:10).

**ἐντευθενί** is unattested (15x in Aristophanes, the ratio with forms without deictic -ί is 1:1.5).

**νυνί** occurs 50x (77x in Aristophanes, the ratio with forms without deictic -ί is 1:3.5): Anaxil. fr. 22.15; Antiph. fr. 122.7 and 188.16 (νυνδ); Apollod.Car. fr. 5.4; Apollod.Com. fr. 4.2; Athenio fr. 1.7; Clearch. fr. 3.4; Epicr. fr. 10.3; Alex. fr. 47.3, 85.1, 130.2, 131.4, 187.5, 257.3, 287.1; Anaxipp. fr. 3.4; Men. *Asp.* 94, 137, 176, 209, 352, *Georg.* 11, *Dysc.* 25, 158, 238, 288, 382, 643, 856, *Epit.* 412, 418, 457, 463, 1121 (a certain restoration), *Her.* 27, *Cith.* 45 and *Cith.* fr. 1.6, *Col.* fr. 51, *Mis.* fr. 9.2, *Pc.* 79, 245, 330, *Perinth.* 11 (uncertain restoration), *Sam.* 93, 333, 420, 576, fr. 602.17; Philem. fr. 69.1 and 98.5.

**ὦδί** might occur 1x, but the text is uncertain (14x in Aristophanes, the ratio with forms without deictic -ί is 1:1.5): \*Apollod.Com. fr. 5.13 (Athenaeus' MS A has †ωδει†, which among other possibilities has been interpreted as ὦδῖ).

These data would require a far more detailed examination than can be provided here. We can take two forms as test cases, οὐτοσί and νυνί, both of which are sufficiently well paralleled in Aristophanes and in prose for us to make a comparison in their usage.<sup>178</sup> Due to the nature of the evidence from Middle and New Comedy, it seems best to use the data from Menander as the corpus to be tested. Regarding οὐτοσί, let us consider the evidence from Menander's five better-preserved plays (*Aspis*, *Dyscolus*, *Epitrepontes*, *Perikeiromene*, *Samia*), where most occurrences are found. In this corpus, οὐτοσί occurs 78x, whereas the form without deictic -ί occurs 532x. The ratio between οὐτοσί and οὐτος is therefore ca. 1:6.8. This figure, while distant from the ratio of 1:4 in Aristophanes, is very close to the ratio of 1:7 in Demosthenes. As for νυνί, it occurs 31 times in the fragments of papyrus plays (also including the fragments of indirect tradition which belong to these plays), as opposed to 190 occurrences of νῦν. The ratio between νυνί and νῦν is therefore ca. 1:6. This is an interesting figure: Menander ranks third among the writers who use νυνί in the least number of passages (Antiphon 1:13, Isocrates 1:7, Demosthenes 1:6, as opposed to Plato 1:4, Andocides 1:4, Isaeus 1:3.5, Aristophanes 1:3.5, Lysias 1:2.5).<sup>179</sup>

<sup>178</sup> According to the table in Dover (1997, 64), these are the only two forms which are attested in the whole corpus of texts he examined (Aristophanes, Plato, Antiphon, Andocides, Lysias, Isocrates, Isaeus, and Demosthenes).

<sup>179</sup> Interestingly, νυνί is far more common than οὐτοσί among 4th-century BCE prose writers and orators (with the exception of Demosthenes), who may have had fewer opportunities to use οὐτοσί than νυνί. Concerning the limited use of deictic -ί with demonstrative pronouns in 4th-century BCE prose and oratory, see the data in Dover (1997, 64).

To conclude, the use of deictic *-ί* in pronouns and adverbs in Middle and New Comedy is less common than in Old Comedy, but also, in the case of *νυνί*, than in certain varieties of 4th-century BCE Attic prose.<sup>180</sup> The difference in the use of deictic *-ί* compared to Old Comedy may reflect the increasingly ‘quieter’, less expressive, and more down-to-earth style of later comedy.<sup>181</sup>

## 5 Derivational morphology

Later Attic witnessed the development of several nominal categories that remained productive throughout the later history of Greek. The present overview is limited to selected phenomena which are informative about the development of Greek and which have also attracted the interest of Atticist lexicographers. This selection leaves out important categories (nouns in *-μα*, nouns in *-σις*, compound verbal adjectives in *ἀ- . . . -τός*, and the nouns, adjectives, and verbs with the prefix *δυσ-*, to mention only a few).<sup>182</sup>

### 5.1 Adjectives in *-(τ)ικός*

*-ικός* is one of the most productive suffixes in the history of Greek.<sup>183</sup> It typically denotes pertinence (in various senses) to someone or something, and it later also developed the notion of aptitude for something.<sup>184</sup> While adjectives in *-ικός* are comparatively rare in archaic Greek (except for ethnic vocabulary), the suffix

<sup>180</sup> Other extensive searches conducted during the collection of data show that the evidence for the use of other deictic pronouns and adverbs may give even more divergent results for Menander than for Aristophanes and 4th-century BCE prose.

<sup>181</sup> See Dittmar (1933); Tacho-Godi (1965). The different use of deictic *-ί* is not related to a different use of stage props. Studies of the use of props in Aristophanes and Menander have not addressed the use of deictic *-ί* (see English 2000; English 2005; English 2007; Tordoff 2013). Still, after a purely preliminary overview, it is noticeable that while the total number of props in Menander is not always very different from that in Old Comedy, props are rarely mentioned with a demonstrative with deictic *-ί*. If we take Menander’s *Dyskolos* as a test-case, only three times do the demonstrative *ὅδε* and *οὗτος* with deictic *-ί* indicate an object on stage (*τηνδί* at *Dysc.* 212, *ταυτί* at *Dysc.* 419, *τουτονί* at *Dysc.* 964).

<sup>182</sup> See Durham (1913); Vessella (2016b, 427).

<sup>183</sup> For an overview of the adjectives in *-(τ)ικός*, their derivation, functions, and history see Mayser (*Gramm.* vol. 1.3, 104–11); Buck, Petersen (1945, 636–8); Chantraine (1956, 97–171); Blass, Debrunner (1976, § 113.2); Schmid (*Atticismus* vol. 4, 699 and 701); Willi (2003a, 139–45).

<sup>184</sup> See Chantraine (1956, 119); van Emde Boas *et al.* (2019, 264).

-ικός rapidly becomes very productive in the 5th century BCE, particularly in the intellectual and technical vocabulary; this development would culminate in the 4th century BCE.<sup>185</sup>

The number of adjectives in -(τ)ικός of late comedy is substantial, as they amount to 101 different forms.<sup>186</sup> These adjectives are mostly denominal, but this is not the only possibility. In some cases, there is evidence of ancient scholarly debate about their derivation.

A good example is παλαιστρικός ('of/for the gym'). Although this adjective clearly derives from παλαίστρα 'gym', Atticist lexicographers such as Pollux and Phrynichus sought instead to recommend using παλαιστικός (**Poll.** 3.149: πάλη καὶ παλαιστής καὶ παλαιστικός, παλαίσματα παλαιστικῶς; **Phryn. Ecl.** 212: παλαιστρικός Ἀλεξίν [fr. 326] φασιν εἰρηκέναι, ὁ δὲ ἀρχαῖος παλαιστικὸν λέγει), which they regarded as 'older' – which in their mind presumably means that it was more correct – based on an alleged derivation from forms such as παλαίω and παλαιστής.

Ethnics and ktetics (28x) form a separate group (on these categories see also below).

Αἰξωνικός, Ἀρκαδικός, Ἀττικός, Ἀχαϊκός, Ἀχαρνικός, Βρυττικός, Γαδειρικός, Δεκελεικός, Ἑλληνικός, Ἑρετρικός, Εὐβοϊκός, Θετταλικός, Ἰωνικός, Καρικός, Κεραμεικός, Κρητικός, Λακωνικός, Λυβικός, Μεγαρικός, Ὀτρυνικός, Περσικός, Πλαταιϊκός, Ποντικός, Σικελικός, Ταναγρικός, Φαληρικός, Φοινικικός, Χαλκιδικός.

We can see that many forms (28x) are already attested in 5th-century BCE Attic texts or even before (but notice that, for many of these forms, the 5th-century BCE evidence is limited to one or two occurrences).

ἀνδρικός (Crates Com.; Ar.), ἀρχαῖκός (Ar.), βαρβαρικός (Hdt.; Thuc.; Metag.), βασιλικός (Hdt.; Eur.), γεννικός (Ar.), δευπηνητικός (Ar.), δημοτικός (Hdt; Thuc.), δουλικός (Ar.; Phryn.Com.), εἰρηνικός (Ar.), ἐρωτικός (Thuc.), θεωρικός (Eur.), μαγειρικός (Ar.), μανικός (Ar.), μουσικός (Ibyc.; Pi.; Thuc.; Soph.; etc.), νεανικός (Eur.; Ar.; Hermipp.; Eur.), νησιωτικός (Hdt; Thuc.; Eur.; Ar.), ξενικός (Alcm.; Aesch.; Thuc.; etc.), ὀλιγαρχικός (Thuc.), παιδικός (B.; Thuc.; Soph.; Eur.; etc.), παρθενικός (Hom.), πολεμικός (Thuc.), ποτικός (Alc.Com.), πρακτικός (Ar.), πωλικός (Aesch.; Soph.; Eur.), στρατιωτικός (Thuc.; Ar.), τραγικός (Anacr.; Ar.), φορτηγικός (Thuc.; Dionys.Com.), φορτικός (Ar.).

Most of the forms (40x) are first attested in Attic in 4th-century BCE texts (occasionally with earlier instances in the Hippocratic corpus), and a few are comic *primum dicta*.

<sup>185</sup> Willi (2003a, 142–3) provides up-to-date data and discussion.

<sup>186</sup> The adjectives in -τικός are a sub-category of those in -ικός (see Chantraine 1933, 395–6). The formations in -τικός originally depended on agent nouns in -της or verbal adjectives in -τός, but once -τικός became productive, it began to be attached to verbal roots even in cases where there was no previous agent noun in -της or verbal adjective in -τός. In the list, the occurrences of adverbs in -ῶς are grouped together with the adjectives.

αἰσθητικός (Pl.; Arist.; Alex. fr. 85.5), ἀρθριτικός (Hippocr.; Damox. fr. 2.49), ἀρμονικός (Pl.; Arist.; Damox. fr. 2.49), ἀρχιτεκτονικός (Pl.; Arist.; Sosip. fr. 1.36), ἀσθενικός (Arist.; Men. *Phasm.* 22), ἀστρολογικός (Arist.; Nicom.Com. fr. 1.18), γεροντικός (Pl.; Thphr.; Apollod.Com. fr. 7.1), γεωμετρικός (Pl.; Arist.; Nicom.Com. fr. 1.19), γραμματικός (X.; Pl.; Arist.; Eub. fr. 69.1, Men. fr. 318), διακονικός (Ar. *Pl.* 1170, Pl.; X.; Arist.; Men. fr. 110.1), ἐνθεαστικός (Pl.; Men. *Dysc.* 44 and 688 [conjecture]), εὐνοϊκός (X.; Isocr.; D.; Amphis fr. 1.1), εὐρετικός (Pl.; Arist.; Men. fr. 37.1), θεραπευτικός (X.; Pl.; Arist.; Men. fr. 296.15), ἱατρικός (Damox. fr. 2, Nicom.Com. fr. 1), ἰσχυρικός (Pl.; Alex. fr. 199), κολακικός (Pl.; Arist.; Men. *Dysc.* 492), κριτικός (Pl.; Arist.; Posidipp. fr. 1.4), κρονικός (Ar. *Pl.* 581, Pl.; Alex. fr. 63.2), κυνικός (Men. fr. 114.2), κωμικός (D.; Aeschin.; Alex. fr. 103.13), μελαγχολικός (Hippocr.; Arist.; Men. *Asp.* 339), νυκτητικός (X.; Alex. fr. 274.2), νομικός (Pl.; Arist.; Alex. fr. 40), Ὀμηρικός (Pl.; Arist.; Strato fr. 1.30), παλαιστρικός (Arist.; Alex. fr. 326, *com. adesp.* fr. 1032.23), πειστικός (X.; Pl.; Arist.; Men. fr. 362.4), πνευματικός (Arist.; Nicom.Com. fr. 1.31), ποιητικός (Isocr.; Pl.; Arist.; Alex. fr. 236.5, *com. adesp.* fr. 53.5), προνοητικός (X.; Aen.Tact.; Arist.; Men. *Epit.* 561), στρατηγικός (Isocr.; X.; Pl.; Arist.; Sosip. fr. 1.18–44–55, Men. fr. 608), συγγενικός (Hippocr.; Arist.), τακτικός (X.; Pl.; Nicom.Com. fr. 1.37), ταρακτικός (Hippocr.; Men. *Epit.* 578), τεμενικός (Anaxandr. fr. 12.2 [text uncertain]), φθισικός (Hippocr.; Men. *Asp.* 646 and fr. 761.8), φροντιστικός (Arist.; Antiph. fr. 268.2), φυλακτικός (X.; Arist.; Men. *Dysc.* 95), φυσικός (X.; Arist.; Apollod.Com. fr. 8.1), ψυχικός (Arist.; Alex. fr. 339).

Finally, a handful of forms (5x) are comic hapaxes.

προσκαυστικός (Posidipp. fr. 1.7), στρατευτικώτατος (Alex. fr. 236.2), τοπαστικός (Men. *Epit.* 557), ὕεικός (Axion. fr. 9.2), χναυστικός (Posidipp. fr. 1.7).

This distribution of the evidence fits well with what we know about the massive increase in the use of the suffix -ικός during the 4th century BCE, although it is clear that these formations are already productive from early on in the history of Greek.

Some of the uses of the adjectives in -ικός in Middle and New Comedy can be grouped into the following categories.<sup>187</sup>

**Forms existing besides or replacing other adjectives formed with a different suffixation** (ἀνδρεῖος–ἀνδρικός, ἀσθενής–ἀσθενικός, ἀστεῖος–ἀστικός, βασιλῆιος–βασιλικός, γενναῖος–γεννικός, γερόντειος–γεροντικός, ἰσχυρός–ἰσχυρικός, Ὀμήρειος–Ὀμηρικός,<sup>188</sup> ὕειος–ὕ(ε)ϊκός). The semantics of the two related adjectives does not always overlap completely (ἀστεῖος has the metaphorical meaning ‘urbane, elegant, pleasant’, while ἀστικός the literal meaning ‘urban’, as in *Dysc.* 41), but in some cases it does (e.g. ἀνδρεῖος and ἀνδρικός ‘manly’, as in the case of ἀνδρικός in Men. *Sic.* 215 which corresponds to and clarifies ἀνδρεῖος of Eur. *Or.* 918;<sup>189</sup> ἀσθενής and ἀσθενικός ‘weak, frail’ in body and mind, as in *Phasm.* 22; βασιλῆιος and βασιλικός ‘royal’; γενναῖος and γεννικός ‘noble’; γερόντειος and γεροντικός ‘of/for an old man’; ἰσχυρός and ἰσχυρικός, as in Alex. fr. 199 according to *Antiatt.* 1 8; ὕειος and ὕ(ε)ϊκός ‘of a pig’).<sup>190</sup>

<sup>187</sup> On the forms in -αἰκός/-αῖκός (ἀρχαῖκός, Ἀχαῖκός, Πλαταιῖκός), see Section A.3.5.

<sup>188</sup> This case is discussed by Fraser (2009, 203–5).

<sup>189</sup> See Chantraine (1956, 144–5); Belardinelli (1994, 177).

<sup>190</sup> But notice, for instance, that there is no βοεικός beside βόειος (Eub. fr. 6.8, Diphil. fr. 122).



Doublents of this kind attracted the interest of Atticist lexicographers, who occasionally refer to their occurrences in later comedy. **Phryn.** *PS* 35.1–2: ἀνθρωπικός μῦθος (Ar. fr. 35)· ὁ περὶ ἀνθρωπείων πραγμάτων. **Antiatt.** *ι* 9: ἰσχυρικώτερον· Πλάτων Θεαιτήτῳ (169b.6). **Antiatt.** *ι* 8: ἴσχυρίσκος†· ἀντὶ τοῦ ἰσχυρός. Ἀλεξὶς Προσκεδαννυμένῳ (fr. 199; on ἰσχυρικός as the correct lemma see also Phot. *ι* 252: ἰσχυρικοί· ἰσχυροί and Arnott 1996, 576). **Antiatt.** *π* 8: προνουύστερος· ἀντὶ τοῦ προνοητικώτερος. Σοφοκλῆς Αἴαντι μαστιγοφόρῳ (Ai. 119). **Antiatt.** *π* 16: παιδικόν· ἀντὶ τοῦ παιδαριῶδες. Ἀλεξὶς Φιλαθηναίῳ (fr. 252). [**Hdn.**] **Philet.** 106: πατρικός φίλος, οὐχὶ πατρώος. καὶ ὁ Κρατῖνος (fr. 306)· ‘πατρικός ὢν ξένος | πυνθάνομαι τάδε σου’. **Phryn.** *PS* fr. \*33 (= schol. D.T. (*scholia Vaticana*) GG 1.3.224.1–6): φασὶ δέ τινες (Αβρων καὶ Φρύνιχος add. cod. C), ὡς οὐ δεῖ λέγειν Πλατωνικὸν βιβλίον, ἀλλὰ Πλατώνειον. Πλατωνικὸν γὰρ βιβλίον λέγεται τὸ περιέχον περὶ Πλάτωνος, ὥσπερ καὶ Φιλίππικοί λόγοι λέγονται οἱ περὶ Φιλίππου <περι>έχοντες καὶ Τυρσηνικαὶ ἱστορίαι αἱ περὶ Τυρσηνῶν περιέχουσαι. ἀμαρτάνουσιν οὖν οἱ λέγοντες Ὀμηρικὸν ποίημα. Ὀμήρειον γὰρ δεῖ λέγειν, οὐ γὰρ περιέχει περὶ Ὀμήρου, ἀλλ’ Ὀμήρου ἐστὶν τὸ ποίημα.

**Ethnics and ktetics.**<sup>191</sup> This is one of the earliest uses of -ικός in Greek, which is early as Homeric poetry. In some cases, the adjectives in -ικός may indicate provenance from a generic geographical location (νησιωτικός). The ethnic and ktetic functions are also discussed by Atticist lexicography. **Antiatt.** *ι* 3: Ἰταλικόν· Πλάτων Γοργία (493a.6). **Antiatt.** *λ* 16: Λάκαιναν· τὴν παρθένον φασὶ δεῖν καλεῖν, τὴν δὲ χώραν Λακωνικήν. Ἀλεξὶς Ἐλένης ἀρπαγῇ (fr. 72). **Phryn.** *Ecl.* 318: Λάκαιναν μὲν γυναικα ἐρεῖς, Λάκαιναν δὲ τὴν χώραν οὐδαμῶς, ἀλλὰ Λακωνικήν, εἰ καὶ Εὐρυπιδῆς παραλόγως φησὶν (*Andr.* 194)· ‘ὡς ἡ Λάκαινα τῶν Φρυγῶν μείων πόλις’ (on both entries see Favi 2022l).

**Technical and professional terms:** ἀστρολογικός, γεωμετρικός, γραμματικός, ἱατρικός, μαγειρικός, μουσικός, ὀψαρτυτικός, πειστικός, στρατηγικός, τακτικός. They may also describe the person and their field of expertise (ἁρμονικός, μουσικός, νομικός, στρατευτικώτατος, στρατιωτικός) or more generally a person (or a thing) based on their personal talents, inclination, or suitability for something (also with a negative connotation) (εὐρετικός, θεραπευτικός, κολακικός, κριτικός, προσκαυστικός, τοπαστικός, φροντιστικός, χναυστικός, ψυχικός). In Middle and New Comedy, many of these adjectives in -ικός are typically used by the cooks who describe their profession.<sup>192</sup> These uses of the adjectives in -ικός are often the object of interest in Atticist lexicography: **Antiatt.** *γ* 19: γραμματικούς· ἀντὶ τοῦ γραμματιστάς· γραμματιστάς δὲ ἀντὶ τοῦ ὑπογραφεῖς. **Antiatt.** *γ* 38: γραμματικός· ὁ πολλὰ γράμματα εἰδώς. **Antiatt.** *δ* 47: διδασκαλικός· Πλάτων Γοργία (455a.3) (in the *locus classicus*, διδασκαλικός means ‘in charge of instructing, expected to teach’). **Antiatt.** *ν* 4: νομικόν· τὸν ἐπιστήμονα τῶν νόμων. <Ἀλεξὶς Γαλατεία (fr. 40)>. **Antiatt.** *ω* 3: ὠδικός· ἀντὶ τοῦ εὖ ᾄδων.

**Medical and scientific vocabulary:** ἀρθριτικός, μελαγχολικός, πνευματικός, ταρακτικός, φθισικός, φυσικός. This origin is confirmed by the early parallels in the Hippocratic corpus.

Atticist lexicographers clearly had an interest in these adjectives in -ικός, even the less obvious ones, and they criticised the forms that were clearly post-Classical.

<sup>191</sup> On these concepts, see Gschnitzer (1983, 140) (= Gschnitzer 2001, 2). See also Dittenberger (1907, 1); Fraser (2009, 39).

<sup>192</sup> See, e.g., Athenio fr. 1; Damox. fr. 2; Hegesipp. fr. 1; Nicom. fr. 1; Posidipp. fr. 28; Sosipat. fr. 1. This pre-eminence was already noticed by Peppler (1910, 435–6). The cook who discusses his τέχνη is a staple of Middle and New Comedy (see Dohm 1964).



**Phryn. PS 58.1:** γαμικά μέλη· τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς γάμοις λεγόμενα ὕμνικά. **Phryn. PS 96.1–2:** οὐκ εἰμὶ βαδιστικός (Ar. Ra. 129)· οὐκ εἴθισμαι οὐδὲ μεμελέτηκα περιπατεῖν. **Phryn. PS 104.6–7:** περαντικός ῥήτωρ (Ar. Eq. 1378)· ὁ πέρας τοῖς λόγοις ἐπιτιθεῖς ἐν ταῖς ἀποδείξεσι διὰ δύναμιν λόγων. **Phryn. PS 125.11:** χαριστικός· ὁ πολλοῖς χαριζόμενος. **Phryn. Ecl. 331:** βιωτικόν· ἀηδὴς ἢ λέξις· λέγε οὖν χρήσιμον ἐν τῷ βίῳ. **Antiatt. α 63:** ἀριστητικός· ἀντὶ τοῦ ἔθους ἔχων ἀριστᾶν. Εὐπολὶς Δήμοις. **Antiatt. β 42:** βουλευτικά· λέγεται γυμνάσια ἐν πολλαῖς πόλεσιν καὶ σύνοδοί τινες, ὅπου οἱ βουλευταὶ ἢ ἐστιῶνται ἢ περιπατοῦσιν. **Antiatt. ε 131:** ἐπιβατικά· καλοῦσιν ἃ οἱ ναυτικοὶ παρενθήκας λέγουσιν. **Antiatt. π 17:** παιδικά· ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐρώμενον. **Moer. θ 15:** θρεκτικός Ἀττικοί· τροχαστικός Ἑλληνας (τρέχω > θρεκτικός, later τροχάζω > τροχαστικός, which is also morphologically more transparent).

## 5.2 Adjectives in -ιακός

In the case of thematic stems, the suffix -ικός may be replaced by -ιακός.<sup>193</sup> The evidence in Middle and New Comedy is scarce, and the ethnics are in the majority.

**πλουσιακός** (Alex. fr. 266.5: Arnott 1996, 746 maintains that it does not imply any ‘stylistic or technical overtones’ compared to the usual adjective πλούσιος). **Κορινθιακός** (Men. Pc. 125). **Ποδιακός** (Dioxipp. fr. 4.2; Diphil. frr. 4.2 and 5.2; Epig. fr. 5.1; Steph. fr. 1.4). **Σαμιακός** (Antiph. fr. \*212.2 = Alex. fr. \*245.2).

Interestingly, these forms begin to appear with Attic writers in the 4th century BCE. This too is part of the general explosion in the use of the suffix -κός in 4th-century BCE Attic (see Section B.5.1).

## 5.3 Nouns in -(σ)μός

Within the category of the *nomina actionis* formed with the suffix -μός, the nouns ending in -σμός are the expected outcome in the forms deriving from verbs in -άζω and -ίζω with a dental stem (or with a velar stem that later merged with the dental stems), except for those forms in which the verbal stem already ends with a sibilant; but notice, too, that as soon as -άζω and -ίζω become productive suffixes for the formation of denominal verbs from any stem, new nouns in -σμός were created even when they did not rely on a dental or sibilant stem (see, e.g., ἀνάλογος > ἀναλογίζω > ἀναλογισμός).<sup>194</sup> Since the class of verbs in -άζω and -ίζω

<sup>193</sup> See Chantraine (1933, 393–4).

<sup>194</sup> See Chantraine (1933, 138–41); Buck, Petersen (1945, 184).

was already growing massively in Classical times,<sup>195</sup> many new nouns in -σμός begin to appear in the 5th and the 4th centuries BCE.<sup>196</sup> The evidence from Middle and New Comedy is substantial.

**ἀγαπησμός** (Men. fr. 338.2, hapax in Men.). **ἀκκισμός** (Philem. fr. 3.14, first in Philemon, then much later in Imperial prose). **ἀναγνωρισμός** (Men. *Epit.* 1121; Arist. 2x in *Poet.*, Satyrus in Euripides' life, Imperial and later prose). **ἀναλογισμός** (Men. fr. 333.3; Thuc., X., D.). **ἀρχαῖσμός** (Men. fr. 330.2: first occurrence in Men., see Chapter 4, Section 4.1, then Imperial and later prose). **ἀφανισμός** (Αργυρίου ἀφανισμός title of Antiphanes, Epigenes, Philippides; Αργυρίου ἀφανισμός already a title of Strattis; Arist., Plb., LXX). **βαλλισμός** (Alex. fr. 112.5, hapax in Alexis). **βασανισμός** (Alex. fr. 292.2; then LXX, NT, Christian literature). **βιασμός** Men. *Epit.* 453; Eupolis, Aeneas the Tactician, Satyrus, Imperial prose). **γαργαλισμός** (Hegesipp. fr. 1.16; Ar., Pl., *corpus Hippocraticum*, Arist.). **γαστρισμός** (Sophil. fr. 7.1). **γογγυσμός** (Anaxandr. fr. 32; then LXX, NT, Christian literature, very common in late and Byzantine texts). **ἐθισμός** (Posidipp. fr. 27; *corpus Hippocraticum*, Arist., Epicur., Plb.). **ἐπηρεασμός** (Men. *Dysc.* 178; Arist., D.S., grammatical and lexicographical sources, late and Byzantine texts). **ἐσμός** (Epin. fr. 1.7; Aesch., Eur., Hdt., Ar., X., Pl., Arist.). **θεσμός** (Alex. fr. 153.19; Hom.+). **κιγκλισμός** (Men. fr. 369; *corpus Hippocraticum* and related scholarship). **κραυγασμός** (Diphil. fr. 16, hapax). **λογισμός** (Antiph. fr. 205.2; Diod.Com. fr. 1.3; Men. *Dysc.* 344, 719, *Mis.* 803, *Sam.* 420, 620, *Sic.* 25, 115, fr. \*67.2, 191.2–5, 282, 286.3, 641.2; Philem. fr. 94.10; Thuc., Ar., Isocr., X., Pl., Lys., *corpus Hippocraticum*, D., Arist.). **μερισμός** (Men. *Epit.* 461; Pl., Aen.Tact., Arist., Thphr., Plb.). **μυκτηρισμός** (Men. fr. 615; LXX, Tryphon devoted a treatise to this, common in later prose). **νουθετησμός** (Men. fr. 629, hapax). **ὀψωνιασμός** (Men. fr. 624; Plb., Imperial prose, later and Byzantine prose). **παραλογισμός** (Men. fr. 738.1; Lycurg., Arist., Plb., LXX). **Πυθαγορισμός** (Alex. fr. 223.7, hapax). **σεισμός** (Antiph. fr. 193.6; Thuc., Soph., Eur., Hdt., Ar., X.). **σιλουρισμός** (Diph. fr. 17.11, hapax). **στασιασμός** (Men. fr. 574; Thuc., Aen.Tact., Arist.). **συγκλυσμός** (Men. fr. 420.6; Arist., Men., 1x in Alexander's *De figuris*, 1x in Ps.Callisth. *Historia Alexandri Magni [recensio vetusta]*). **τηγανισμός** (Men. fr. 195; very rare in late and Byzantine prose). **χορτασμός** (Anaxandr. fr. 79; late and Byzantine prose). **ψιθυρισμός** (Men. *Mis.* 540; LXX, NT, Phld., Imperial prose, late and Byzantine prose). **ὠθισμός** (Anaxandr. fr. 34.7; Thuc., Hdt., X., Plb., Imperial prose).

Most of these forms derive from verbs in -άζω, -ίζω, and -ύζω (the last of these only in the case of γογγυσμός and συγκλυσμός). A different case is that of the forms ἐσμός (the sibilant is part of the verbal stem: *DELG* s.v.), θεσμός (the origin of the sibilant is obscure: see Chantraine 1933, 140), and σεισμός (the sibilant is part of the verbal stem: *DELG* s.v.). Among the nouns in -σμός attested in Middle and New Comedy, several are already attested in earlier texts, particularly in Thucydides, and for Atticist lexicography this may be a confirmation that these

<sup>195</sup> See Section C.4.9.

<sup>196</sup> This category of nouns will continue to be productive in post-Classical times. See Mayser (*Gramm.* vol. 1,3, 61–4) for the evidence for these forms in Ptolemaic papyri and Schmid (*Atticismus* vol. 4, 687) on Atticist writers.

forms are good Attic. However, in other cases the opinion of the Atticists is less clear or even openly critical (e.g. γαργαλισμός).

**Antiatt.** β 12: βιασμός· Εὐπολὶς Αὐτολύκῳ (fr. 72). **Phryn.** PS 56.9–10: γάργαλος· ὁ ἐρεθισμός· καὶ γαργαλισμός· τὸ δὲ γαργαλίζεσθαι οὐκ Ἀττικόν. **Moer.** γ 23: γάργαλος Ἀττικοί· γαργαλισμός Ἑλληνες. **Poll.** 6.147 and 9.23 (ὁπ ὠθισμός). **Moer.** ω 4: ὠτισμός ὠθισμός Ἀττικοί· ὠσμός Ἑλληνες.

Several other forms are first attested in 4th-century BCE Attic prose or in the *corpus Hippocraticum* and then mostly remain in use in the koine (ἀναγνωρισμός, ἐθισμός, ἐπηρεασμός, κιγκλισμός, μερισμός, παραλογισμός, συγκλυσμός).

**Antiatt.** ε 36: ἐθισμός· ἀντὶ τοῦ ἔθος. Ποσίδιππος Φιλοπάτορι (fr. 27).

The more conspicuous category, however, consists of those forms which are hapaxes (some of them obviously created for comic purposes) or which are paralleled only in very late texts, and because of this peculiarity, they are often discussed (with a more or less tolerant approach) in Atticist lexicography.

**Moer.** α 100: ἄκκισμός Ἀττικοί· προσποιήσις Ἑλληνες, also Thom.Mag. 15.11–5 (who quotes Libanius and Synesius). **Ath.** 8.362a–d (βαλλισμός, βαλλίζω). **Poll.** 2.168 and 2.175 (γαστρισμός). **Phryn.** Ecl. 335: γογγυσμός καὶ γογγύζειν· ταῦτα ἀδόκιμα μὲν οὐκ ἔστιν, ἰακά δέ. Φωκυλίδην γὰρ οἶδα κεκρημένον αὐτῷ τὸν Μιλήσιον, ἄνδρα παλαιὸν σφόδρα (fr. 5 Diehl)· ‘καὶ τότε Φωκυλίδεω· χρή τοι τὸν ἑταῖρον ἑταίρῳ | φροντίζειν, ἄσ’ ἂν περιγογγύζωσι πολῖται’. ἀλλὰ τοῦτο μὲν Ἴωσιν ἀφείσθω, ἡμεῖς δὲ τονθρυσμὸν καὶ τονθρύζειν λέγωμεν ἢ νῆ Δία σὺν τῷ ο τονθορυσμὸν καὶ τονθορύζειν. **Antiatt.** γ 12: γογγυσμός· ἀντὶ τοῦ <τον>θρυσμός. Ἀναξανδρίδης Νηρεῖ (fr. 32). **Phryn.** Ecl. 314: κραυγασμός· παρακειμένου τοῦ κεκραγμός εἶπεῖν ἐρεῖ τις ἀμαθῶς κραυγασμός. **Antiatt.** κ 9: κραυγασμός· ἀντὶ τοῦ κραυγή. Δίφιλος Ἀποβάτη (fr. 16), Thom.Mag. 196.7–8. **Poll.** 9.139: τὰ δὲ πράγματα νουθεσία καὶ ὡς Πλάτων (?) νουθετεία· φαῦλος γὰρ ὁ Μενάνδρου νουθετισμός (fr. 629). **Poll.** 6.38: παμπόνηρον δ’ ὁ Μενάνδρου (fr. 624) ὀψωνιασμός. **Phryn.** Ecl. 394: [. . .] Βάβον τὸν ἀπὸ τῶν Τράλλεων, ὃς εἰς τοσοῦτο προθυμίας καὶ θαύματος ἤκει Μενάνδρου, ὥστε καὶ Δημοσθένους ἀμείνω ἐγχειρεῖν ἀποφαίνειν τὸν λέγοντα [. . .] ὀψωνιασμός (fr. 624). **Poll.** 10.98: λιστρίον, ὃ τινες ταγηνοστρόφιον, καὶ τάγηνον δέ. ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ τήγανον ἂν ἔχοις εὐρεῖν εἰρημένον ἐν Εἰλωσιν Εὐπόλιδος (fr. 155), καὶ ἐν Τηλεκλείδου Ἀψευδέσιν (fr. 11)· ‘τὰ δὲ τήγανα | ζέοντά σοι μολύνεται’. ὑπόφαυλοι γὰρ οἱ ἐν Ἰπποκόμῳ Μενάνδρου (fr. 195) τηγανισμοί. τὸ μέντοι ῥῆμα τὸ τηγανίζεσθαι ἔστιν ἐν Ἀποκλειομένη Ποσειδίππου (fr. 5)· καίτοι τό γε δρᾶμα Ἀριστοφάνους Ταγηνισταί. **Poll.** 6.43: τὸ δὲ χορτάζειν Ἀριστοφάνης (Pax 139) εἴρηκε, καὶ τὸ χορτάζεσθαι Ἀραρώς (fr. 21), Ἀναξανδρίδης (fr. 79) δὲ καὶ χορτασμόν.

Some of these nouns became competitive with the *nomina actionis* in -σις, of which they often represented the more recent alternative. This dualism was a focus of attention in ancient scholarship, also with reference to the forms attested in Middle and New Comedy.

**Orus fr. B 1** (= Σ<sup>b</sup> α 84 = Phot. α 123 = Su. α 152 (ex Σ’); cf. EM 8.53): ἀγαπησμός· ἀγαπησμὸν λέγουσιν (Ἀττικοί add. Phot.) καὶ ἀγάπησιν τὴν φιλοφροσύνην. Συναριστώσας Μένανδρος (fr. 338)· ‘καὶ τὸν ἐπὶ κακῷ | γινόμενον ἀλλήλων ἀγαπησμὸν οἶος ἦν’. **Antiatt.** ε 37: ἔξετασμός· ἀντὶ τοῦ

ἐξέτασις. Δημοσθένους ἐν τῷ Ὑπὲρ τοῦ στεφάνου εἰπόντος (18.16), οὐ φασὶ δόκιμον εἶναι οὕτως τιθέμενον. **Phryn. PS 65.2–3**: δέσις· ὁ δεσμός, ὡς ἄρπασις <ὁ ἀρπαγμός> καὶ λόγισις ὁ λογισμός. **Phot. σ 503**: στασιασμόν· τὴν στάσιν Μένανδρος (fr. 574).

As anticipated, the general approach of Atticist lexicographers to nouns in -σμός is permissive: these forms are approved if attested in canonical Attic writers.

**Phryn. PS 58.14**: γρυλίζειν καὶ γρυλισμός· ἐπὶ τῆς τῶν χοίρων φωνῆς. **Phryn. PS 104.5**: πιθηκισμοί (Ar. *Eq.* 887)· αἱ πανουργίαι. **Phryn. Ecl. 311**: ἐμπυρισμός· οὕτως Ὑπερείδης (or. 2 fr. 3 col. 45.29 Jensen) ἡμελημένως, δέον ἐμπρησμός λέγειν. **Antiatt. ε 126**: ἐμπυρισμός· Ὑπερείδης Ὑπὲρ Λυκόφρονος (or. 2 fr. 3 col. 45.29 Jensen). **Antiatt. γ 10**: γυναικισμός· Διοκλῆς Βάκχαις (fr. 4) γυναικίζειν φησὶ καὶ γυναικηρόν. **Antiatt. δ 57**: †δινισμόν†· Πλάτων Πολιτείας ζ' (cf. 573e.1, where δανεισμοί occurs, and 620e.3, where δίνης occurs; see S. Valente 2015b, *ad loc.*). **Antiatt. ε 37**: ἐξετασμός· ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐξέτασις, Δημοσθένους ἐν τῷ Ὑπὲρ τοῦ στεφάνου εἰπόντος (18.16), οὐ φασὶ δόκιμον εἶναι οὕτως τιθέμενον. **Antiatt. ε 111**: ἐτασμόν· τὸν ἐξετασμόν. **Antiatt. θ 4**: θερισμόν· ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀμητόν. Ἡρόδοτος δ' (4.42.3), Εὐπολὶς Μαρικᾶ (fr. 215). **Antiatt. π 30**: πλησιασμός· ἀντὶ τοῦ μίξις. **Moer. α 85**: ἀδαγμός· ἀδάξασθαι Ἀττικοί· κνησμός· κνήσασθαι Ἕλληνες. **Moer. ε 9**: ἐγχυτρισμός· ἡ τοῦ βρέφους ἐκθεσις, ἐπεὶ ἐν χύτραις ἐξετίθεντο.

However, forms that are evidently late may be proscribed even if they are attested in writers normally regarded as canonical (*Antiatt. ε 37* on Demosthenes' ἐξετασμός is an instructive example). This proves that Atticist lexicographers understood that the nouns in -σμός multiplied especially in late Attic (and then in the koine).

## 5.4 Nouns in -ότης, -ότητος

These abstract nouns are common in prose texts, particularly in philosophy and science.<sup>197</sup> Of the six nouns in -ότης that occur in Aristophanes (out of a total of 12 occurrences), several refer to sophistic or scientific vocabulary (Willi 2003a, 139). These nouns are rare in Aeschylus and Sophocles,<sup>198</sup> while they are more common in Euripides.<sup>199</sup> They are also rare in Ptolemaic papyri (Mayser, *Gramm.* vol. 1, 3, 81), while they become relatively common in the New Testament.<sup>200</sup> The evidence from Middle and New Comedy is ample.

<sup>197</sup> See Chantraine (1933, 293–8); Buck, Petersen (1945, 464–8).

<sup>198</sup> They occur 3x in Aeschylus (φιλότης, λειότης [only *Pr.*], κακότης [only *Pr.*]) and 4x in Sophocles (ὠμότης, μαργότης, φιλότης, σκαιότης).

<sup>199</sup> They occur 15x (κουφότης, νεότης, κακότης, γενναιότης, φαυλότης, μαργότης, χρηστότης, πικρότης, φιλότης, ὠμότης, παλαιότης, ἰσότης, ὑγρότης, σεμνότης, ἀβρότης).

<sup>200</sup> See Blass, Debrunner (1976, § 110.1).

**ιδιότης**: Damox. fr. 2.41 (X., Pl., Arist., Thphr.). **καινότης**: Anaxandr. fr. 55.6 (Thuc., Isocr.). **μετριότης**: Men. Asp. 257 (Thuc., Isocr., X., Pl., *corpus Hippocraticum*, Aeschines, Arist.). **νεότης**: Men. Sam. 341, fr. 57.3 (Hom.+). **οικειότης**: Men. Asp. 202, Dyc. 240 (Thuc., Hdt., Isocr., Isaeus, And., X., Pl., Lys., D., Arist.). **πιθανότης**: Men. Asp. 390 (Pl., Arist.). **σιωρότης**: Timocl. fr. 24.3 (hapax). **συγνότης**: Alex. fr. 201.6 (then Polybius). **σφοδρότης**: Alex. fr. 247.12 (X., Pl., *corpus Hippocraticum*, Arist., Thphr.). **ταπεινότης**: Men. fr. 740.12 (Thuc., Hdt., Isocr., X., Pl., Arist., Thphr.). **υγρότης**: Crobyl. fr. 4.2–3 (Eur., X., Pl., *corpus Hippocraticum*, Arist., Thphr.). **χρηστότης**: Aristophon. fr. 13.4, Timocl. fr. 8.17, Men. fr. 362.1, 754, 758, 771.1 (Eur., Isaeus, Lys., Arist.). **ωμότης**: Men. Mis. 685 (Eur., Soph., Isocr., X., D., Arist.).

These forms are regularly deadjectival from thematic stems. Many are already used in 5th-century BCE poetry and prose and even earlier. A few other forms clearly belong to the philosophical and scientific vocabulary of the 4th century BCE. Two interesting forms are σιωρότης in Timocles (fr. 24.3) and συγνότης in Alexis (fr. 201.6). The former, a hapax, is the abstract noun corresponding to the better attested adjective σιωρός, which already occurs in Aristophanes (fr. 134) and Xenophon, and then multiple times in 4th-century BCE Attic texts.<sup>201</sup> Timocles uses σιωρότης to describe the firmness of a young female body (a typical use of σιωρός, see Ar. fr. 148.3 and Men. fr. 343). Thus, the fact that σιωρότης is unparalleled may be due the fact that the abstract σιωρότης only developed in late Attic as part of the general increase of this nominal category. As for συγνότης, after Alexis this word occurs 2x in Polybius, 1x in Heraclitus the Allegorist, 4x in Plutarch, and then mostly in Christian literature. Arnott (1996, 584) considers it a mere coincidence that this typically koine form is first attested in Alexis, given that the adjective συγνός is common in earlier Attic. Yet, as suggested by the comparison with σιωρότης, it may also be that the abstract noun συγνότης did not develop in parallel with the use of συγνός, and thus συγνότης may be a genuinely late Attic form. Atticist lexicographers are interested in this category of nouns, for which they judge on a case-by-case basis whether such a form is good Attic or not.

**Phryn. PS 104.3–4**: πυκνότης τρόπου (see Ar. Eq. 1132–3: καὶ σοι πυκνότης ἔνεστ' | ἐν τῷ τρόπῳ)· ἐπὶ συνετοῦ καὶ φρονίμου. **Phryn. PS 107.15–6**: σκληρότης ὀρκων· ὁπόταν τις ὁμόση φρικώδεις τινὰς ὀρκους. **Phryn. Ecl. 84**: θερμότης λέγε, ἀλλὰ μὴ θερμασία. **Phryn. Ecl. 329**: αὐθεκαστότης ἀλόκοτον· τὸ μὲν γὰρ αὐθέκαστος κάλλιστον ὄνομα, τὸ δὲ παρὰ τοῦτο πεποιημένον αὐθεκαστότης κίβδηλον. **Antiatt. ι 11**: ικανότης· Λυσίας Πρὸς Πανταλέοντα (fr. 264 Carey). **Moer. ι 12**: ισότης ὡς ἀρότης Ἀττικοί· ισότης ὡς βραβευτής Ἕλληνες.

<sup>201</sup> On this adjective and its appraisal in Atticist sources, see Favi (2022t, 314–5).

### 5.5 Adjectives in -ώδης

The adjectives in -ώδης are interesting for observing the evolution of later Attic. This morpheme was used to create adjectives indicating what is ‘similar to’ or ‘reminiscent of’ what is expressed by the (nominal or verbal) stem.<sup>202</sup> This category of adjectives plays a crucial role in early Ionic prose, where it influences the language of philosophy and science. In turn, these formations are poorly attested in poetry, with Euripides being the one writer who uses them the most, and in the Attic orators. As regards Old Comedy, judging from Aristophanes, most occurrences are in *Plutus*, while the evidence is very limited in the first ten surviving plays. The likely conclusion is that -ώδης was an Ionic element that gradually spread in later Attic.<sup>203</sup> The evidence from Middle and New Comedy is important to assess the later development in the use of this suffix.<sup>204</sup>

**Αἰγυπτιώδης:** Crat.Iun. fr. 2 (hapax). **Ἀλεξανδρώδης:** Men. fr. 598.1 (hapax). **βλιχανώδης:** Diph. fr. 17.15 (hapax in this form, βλιχώδης in later medical texts). **βορβορώδης:** Men. fr. 27 (*corpus Hippocraticum*, Pl., Arist.). **δροσώδης:** Antiph. fr. 55.13; Alex. fr. 129.12 (Eur. *Ba.* 705, Pherecr. fr. 114.2). **ἐργώδης:** Men. *Asp.* 317, *Dysc.* 966, fr. 58.2; Philipp. fr. 9.9; Nicom. fr. 2.1; Sosip. fr. 1.24 (*corpus Hippocraticum*, Isocr., X., Arist.). **θηριώδης:** Athenio fr. 1.4 (Eur., Hdt., *corpus Hippocraticum*, X., Pl., Aesch., Arist.). **ιώδης:** Men. *Sic.* 285 (Soph. [but the text of fr. 198a is corrupt], *corpus Hippocraticum*). **κολλώδης:** Clearch. fr. 2.1 (*corpus Hippocraticum*, Pl., Arist.). **κοπώδης:** Alex. fr. 202.2 (*corpus Hippocraticum*, [Arist.] *Probl.*). **μανιώδης:** Alex. fr. 222.9 (Thuc., Eur., X., *corpus Hippocraticum*, Plb.). **μυλτώδης:** Eub. fr. 97.6 (Agatharchides, D.S., Str.). **μοιχώδης:** Men. *Sic.* 210 (Ptolemaeus’ *Apotelesmatica*). **νωκαρώδης:** Diph. fr. 18 (hapax).

A few of these forms are already paralleled in 5th-century BCE Attic, particularly in Euripidean poetry (δροσώδης, θηριώδης, ιώδης, μανιώδης). Many more appear in 4th-century BCE Attic texts and/or in the koine (βορβορώδης, ἐργώδης, κολλώδης, κοπώδης, μυλτώδης, μοιχώδης). Finally, a few are 4th-century BCE comic hapaxes (Αἰγυπτιώδης, Ἀλεξανδρώδης, βλιχανώδης, νωκαρώδης). A few remarks can be made: (1) Some forms are unmarked and generally descriptive (ἐργώδης, ιώδης, μυλτώδης, μοιχώδης); (2) The hapax forms document the potential of the suffix -ώδης to create parodic neologisms (Αἰγυπτιώδης, Ἀλεξανδρώδης, βλιχανώδης, νω-

<sup>202</sup> See Chantraine (1933, 429–32); Schmid (*Atticismus* vol. 4, 698–9). Regarding the origin of this morpheme, we probably have to agree with Wackernagel (1889, 44–7) that -ώδης originally belongs to δῶω ‘to smell (of something)’ (see also Willi 2003b, 44).

<sup>203</sup> Willi (2003b, 43–4).

<sup>204</sup> Durham (1913, 24–5); Vessella (2016b, 427) stress the importance of the adjectives in -ώδης in Menander as an indication of his evolving Attic. See also Bagordo (2013, 99–100), who also gathers the evidence from the comic adespota and Epicharmus.

καρώδης);<sup>205</sup> a parodic intention is also evident in the comic reuse of Euripides' δροσώδης;<sup>206</sup> (3) Some of these adjectives, whether or not they are attested in 5th-century BCE Attic, are also used in treatises of the Hippocratic corpus of the 5th and 4th BCE centuries and/or in Herodotus (βορβορώδης, ἐργώδης, θηριώδης, ἰώδης, κολλώδης, κοπώδης, μανιώδης).<sup>207</sup> As a result, the use of some of these adjectives in comedy, while not a direct parody of scientific and/or medical vocabulary, may well be influenced by their technical nature;<sup>208</sup> in some cases, this may add a further nuance to the philosophical tone of the passage.<sup>209</sup>

The evidence for the adjectives in -ώδης in Middle and New Comedy represents an advanced stage compared to the evidence from Old Comedy. It is highly significant that the evidence from later comedy is more substantial than that from Old Comedy (where Aristophanes is the only known writer to make some use of the adjectives in -ώδης). It therefore appears that, when Atticist lexicography discusses these formations and their stylistic usefulness, it may be quoting from the plays of Middle and New Comedy if the sources are unnamed.

**Phryn. PS 51.18–9:** ἀνδραποδῶδεις ἡδοναί (Crates Theb. *SH* 352.4)· σημαίνει τὰς εἰκαίους καὶ ἀλογίστους ἡδονάς. **Phryn. PS 52.14–5:** βορβορώδης· παρὰ τὸν βόρβορον καὶ τὸν ὀδόντα, τὸν δυσώδη τὸ στόμα. **Phryn. PS 100.9:** παγετῶδες (Soph. *Ph.* 1082) καὶ ψυχρόν. **Phryn. PS 109.19–20:** στραγγαλιώδης ἄνθρωπος (*com. adesp.* fr. \*663)· ὁ οὐχ ἄπλοῦς, ἀλλ' ἐπιτεταραγμένος. **Phryn. PS 112.15–7:** τυντλώδης καὶ ληρώδης λόγος (*com. adesp.* fr. \*670)· οἷον ὁ πεπατημένος καὶ κοινός. τύντλος γάρ ὁ [πεπατημένος] πηλός. **Phryn. PS 116.1–3:** ὑποζυγιώδης ἄνθρωπος (Ar. fr. 751 and *com. adesp.* fr. \*547)· ὁ μὴ ἐκ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ προαιρέσεως καὶ προθυμίας τι πράττων, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς ἐτέρων κελεύσεως, ὥσπερ καὶ τὰ ὑποζύγια.

<sup>205</sup> See Bagordo (2013, 99–100); M. Caroli (2014, 86).

<sup>206</sup> See Arnott (1996, 374) on Alex. fr. 129.12.

<sup>207</sup> βλιχανώδης is paralleled as βλιχώδης in later medical texts. Hesychius (β 740) claims that βλιχώδης already occurs in a Hippocratic passage (VC 19), but the manuscript tradition has γλισχρώδης.

<sup>208</sup> This interpretation may be considered for νωκαρώδης in Diph. fr. 18, even though it is a hapax. On the use of the suffix -ώδης in scientific vocabulary, as exemplified by Theophrastus, see Tribulato (2010b, 489–90).

<sup>209</sup> See Arnott (1996, 627–8; 631) on μανιώδης in Alex. fr. 222.9. The form κοπώδης in Alex. fr. 202.2 is part of the discussion about Pythagorean health prescriptions and diet. The context around θηριώδης in Athenio fr. 1.4 reminds one of the philosophical topos of the progress of mankind.



## 5.6 Diminutives

Recent approaches to diminutives in various, mostly Indo-European, languages have seen the rise of the notion of evaluative morphology, which represents a more precise way of identifying and describing the prerogatives of actual diminutive forms.<sup>210</sup> Greek evaluative morphology is limited to diminutives (there are no augmentative formations in Greek). These constitute a large and highly productive category of Greek derivational morphology, while at the same time being limited to a relatively restricted number of suffixes, particularly *-ιον* (and its derivatives *-άριον*, *-ίδιον*, *-αρίδιον*, and *-άκιον*) and *-ίσκος*. Lists of diminutive formations in Menander, with a focus on those in *-ιον*, are offered in previous bibliography,<sup>211</sup> while the corpora of the comic poets other than Aristophanes and Menander are generally less studied.<sup>212</sup> For the purposes of this selective treatment, we shall focus only on three suffixes: *-ίδιον*, *-άριον*, and *-ίσκος*. The reason for this choice is two-fold: these formations are among the most widespread in Greek, and Atticist lexicographers devoted considerable attention to them.

### 5.6.1 Suffix *-ίδιον*

This suffix, which derives from the re-segmentation of the diminutives created with the suffix *-ιον* attached to dental stems (e.g. *ἀσπίδιον* > *ἀσπ-ίδιον*), already enjoyed great popularity in the 5th century BCE (not just in comedy: e.g. *νησίδιον* occurs 3x already in Thucydides).<sup>213</sup> Among other things, the suffix was useful to create the diminutives of the nouns in *-ιον* that have no diminutive meaning, or to reinforce semantically faded diminutives. *-ίδιον* also remained productive in the koine, although it is far less common than *-ιον* and *-άριον* in the New Testament.<sup>214</sup> The presence of these diminutives in Middle and New Comedy is substantial.<sup>215</sup>

**αἰγίδιον**: Antiph. fr. 21.4; Eub. fr. 103.1. **ἀργυρίδιον**: Diphil. fr. 19.2. **βοίδιον**: Men. Sic. 184. **βιβλίδιον**: Antiph. fr. 160. **γλαυκίδιον**: Antiph. fr. 221.1. **γλαυκινίδιον**: Amphis fr. 35.2. **γράδιον**: Men. Georg. 97, Mis. 629. **γραμματείδιον**: Men. fr. 238.1. **δαπίδιον**: Hipparch. fr. 1.3. **ἐλάδιον**: Archel.

<sup>210</sup> See the overview by Grandi (2013).

<sup>211</sup> See Durham (1913, 23); Boned Colera (2015); Cartlidge (2017b, 248).

<sup>212</sup> On the diminutives in Aristophanes and their place in the history of Greek, see López Eire (1991, 11–5). See below for further bibliographic references to Aristophanes' diminutives.

<sup>213</sup> See Petersen (1910, 212–40); Chantraine (1933, 68–72).

<sup>214</sup> See Mayser (*Gramm.* vol. 1,3, 38–9); Blass, Debrunner (1976, 90); Watt (2013, 72).

<sup>215</sup> Some other cases are problematic because they are hapaxes (*ἐντερίδιον* in Alex. fr. 84.2, on which see Arnott 1996, 225–7, *ἡλεσπριδίων* in Apollod.Com. fr. 13.16) or because they have been created by a modern conjecture (*λιβανίδιον* is Bentley's conjecture in Men. Car. fr. 1.1, but since it is unattested, the restoration is not accepted by Kassel, Schröder in *PCG* vol. 6.1).



fr. 2.11. **ἐταιρίδιον**: Men. *Epit.* 985. **θεραπαινίδιον**: Men. *Dysc.* 460. **θραττίδιον**: Anaxandr. fr. 28.2. **κραμβίδιον**: Antiph. fr. 6. **κρεάδιον**: Alex. fr. 84.2. **κωβίδιον**: Anaxandr. fr. 28.2; Sotad. fr. 1.22. **κώδιον**: Men. *Col.* 31, *Sam.* 404. **λοφίδιον**: Men. *Asp.* 59, *Dysc.* 100. **οικίδιον**: Men. *Pc.* 199. **οὔσιδιον**: Nicom. fr. 3.1. **πατρίδιον**: Men. *Dysc.* 499 and 930; Theophil. fr. 4.3; Xenarch. fr. 4.15. **περκίδιον**: Anaxandr. fr. 28.2. **πηρίδιον**: Men. *Epit.* 331. **πυλίδιον**: Antiph. fr. 35.4. **πορνίδιον**: Antiph. fr. 236.3; Men. *Pc.* 150, fr. 410.4. **ποτηρίδιον**: Men. fr. 26.3. **ρόιδιον**: Men. fr. 83.2. **σανίδιον**: Men. fr. 156.3. **σηπίδιον**: Alex. fr. 159.3; Ephipp. fr. 3.9 and 15.4; Eub. fr. 109.2 and 148.6. **σπλαγχνίδιον**: Diph. fr. 14.2. **ταμειίδιον**: Men. *Sam.* 233. **τευθίδιον**: Ephipp. fr. 15.4; Eub. fr. 109.2. **τριχίδιον**: Alex. fr. 159.3. **ὕπογαστρίδιον**: Eub. fr. 137.4. **χλανίδιον**: Men. *Pc.* 392. **χοιρίδιον**: Diph. fr. 90.3; Men. fr. 409.3. **χυτρίδιον**: Alex. fr. 246.2. **χωρίδιον**: Men. *Dysc.* 23. **ψυκτηρίδιον**: Alex. fr. 2.7.

The diminutives of food items are frequent in culinary lists, which are a particularly common feature of comedy throughout the centuries. This explains why a large number of the above-forms are related to eating. Many of these forms are already attested in 5th-century BCE Attic (unsurprisingly, they are paralleled especially in comedy): αἰγίδιον, ἀργυρίδιον,<sup>216</sup> βοίδιον, γράδιον, γραμματείδιον, κρεάδιον, κώδιον, οἰκίδιον, πατρίδιον, πηρίδιον, πυλίδιον, πορνίδιον, σανίδιον, σηπίδιον, τευθίδιον, χλανίδιον, χοιρίδιον, χυτρίδιον. Others are paralleled in 4th-century BCE Attic writers, such as χυτρίδιον, but most of these are hapaxes or rare forms that are first attested in Middle and New Comedy and then live on in post-Classical Greek: βιβλίδιον,<sup>217</sup> γλαυκίδιον, γλαυκινίδιον, δαπίδιον, ἐλάδιον, ἐταιρίδιον, θεραπαινίδιον, θραττίδιον, κραμβίδιον, κωβίδιον, λοφίδιον, οὔσιδιον, περκίδιον, ποτηρίδιον, ροίδιον, σπλαγχνίδιον, ταμειίδιον, τριχίδιον, ὕπογαστρίδιον, ψυκτηρίδιον.<sup>218</sup>

The diminutives in -ίδιον attracted considerable attention from Atticist lexicographers. They do not usually find fault with these forms: on the contrary, they tend to prefer -ίδιον to other diminutive suffixes.<sup>219</sup>

<sup>216</sup> While ἀργυρίδιον normally means ‘money’ without any further implication (which is indicated as the current use of the word by Atticist sources, see Phryn. *PS* fr. \*257 (= Σ<sup>b</sup> α 2085 = *Su.* α 3789, ex Σ’)), it sometimes has a contemptuous meaning (see Eup. fr. 124 and Isocr. 8.4; cf. Olson 2017, 434).

<sup>217</sup> A rare form otherwise attested only once in Pseudo-Demosthenes and Polybius, it is discussed by Olson (2022, 225) who rightly compares it with βιβλιδάριον in Ar. fr. 795 (to be explained as -ιδ(ιον) + -άριον, see Petersen 1910, 262).

<sup>218</sup> On this form and the problems concerning the length of the vowel /i/ in the antepenultimate syllable of the suffix -ίδιον, see Arnott (1996, 59–60).

<sup>219</sup> Note, however, that Phrynichus and the *Antiatticist* discuss the admissibility of the analogical suffix -διον (e.g. they debated whether the analogical βούδιον and νούδιον may be accepted in place of the regular forms βοίδιον and νοίδιον). The suffix -διον is analogical and results from a different type of re-segmentation of dental stems like ἀσπίδ-ιον > ἀσπί-διον based on the comparison with the nominative ἀσπίς.

**Phryn. PS 6.18–9:** ἀνασπᾶν γνωμίδιον (Ar. fr. 727)· κωμωδικῶς εἴρηται, οἷον ἐκ βυθοῦ διανοίας <ἀν>άγειν. **Phryn. PS 47.19:** ἀνασπᾶν βούλευμα καὶ ἀνασπᾶν γνωμίδιον (Ar. fr. 727). **Phryn. PS 70.9–12:** ἐπ’ ἄκρων κἀθησθε τῶν πυγιδίων (Ar. Ach. 638): ἐπὶ τῶν ἐπαιρομένων καὶ καυχωμένων διὰ κολακείαν ἢ ἐπαινον. δηλοῖ γὰρ τὸ μήτε τελέως καθῆσθαι μήτε ἐστάναι, ἀλλ’ ἐν μέσῳ φέρεσθαι διὰ χαυνότητα ψυχῆς. **Phryn. PS 75.18:** θνησείδιον· μᾶλλον ῥητέον ἢ κενέβριον. **Phryn. PS 76.14:** ἱππίδιον· οὐ μόνον ἱππάριον. **Phryn. PS 84.22–3:** κυνάριον (Alc.Com. fr. 33) καὶ κυνίδιον· <ἄμφω> δόκιμα. **Phryn. PS 102.5–6:** προχοίδιον (Cratin. fr. 206.1)· ὑποκοριστικῶς, [ὥς] ἀπὸ τοῦ πρόχους, ὡς οὖν βοῦς βοίδιον, οὕτω πρόχους προχοίδιον. **Phryn. PS fr. \*257** (= Σ<sup>β</sup> α 2085 = Su. α 3789 (ex Σ)): ἀργυρίδιον· ὡς ἡμεῖς. Εὐπολὶς Δήμοις (fr. 124) ‘ἐγὼ δὲ συμψήσασα τὰργυρίδιον’. **Phryn. Ecl. 50:** κόριον ἢ κορίδιον ἢ κορίσκη λέγουσιν, τὸ δὲ κοράσιον παράλογον. **Phryn. Ecl. 61:** νοίδιον καὶ βοίδιον ἀρχαῖα καὶ δόκιμα, οὐχὶ νούδιον καὶ βούδιον. **Phryn. Ecl. 151:** κυνίδιον λέγε. Θεόπομπος δὲ ὁ κωμωδὸς ἅπαξ που (fr. 93) κυνάριον εἶπεν. **Phryn. Ecl. 223:** ροίδιον διαιροῦντες λέγουσιν οἱ ἀμαθεῖς ἡμεῖς δὲ ροίδιον. **Phryn. Ecl. 362:** στηθύδιον ὀρνιθίου λέγουσιν τινες οὐχ ὀγνῶς. εἰ γὰρ χρή ὑποκοριστικῶς λέγειν, <λέγε> στηθίδιον· εἰ δ’ οὐκ ἔστιν ὑποκοριστικόν, πόθεν εἰσεκώμασε καὶ τοῦτο τὸ κακὸν τῇ τῶν Ἑλλήνων φωνῇ;. **Phryn. Ecl. 398:** λιθάριον πάνυ φυλάττου λέγειν, λιθίδιον δὲ λέγε. **Antiat. β 37:** βοῦδια· οὐ μόνον βοῖδια. Ἑρμιππος Κέρκωψι (fr. 36.2). **Antiat. δ 10:** δακτυλίδιον· οὐ δεῖν φασὶν ὑποκορίζεσθαι, οὐδ’ ἂν μικρὸν ᾗ. **Antiat. κ 85:** κλινάρια· οὐ μόνον κλινίδια. Ἀριστοφάνης Δαιταλεῦσιν (fr. 250). **Antiat. κ 87:** κυνάριον· οὐ μόνον κυνίδιον. Ἀλκαῖος κωμικῶς (fr. 33). **Antiat. μ 18:** μοιχίδιον· τὸ ἐκ μοιχοῦ γεγεννημένον. Ὑπερείδης ἐν τῷ Κατὰ Ἀριστοφώντος (fr. 42 Jensen). [**Hdn.**] **Philet. 47:** διπλοίδιον τὸ διπλοῦν ἱμάτιον. For a discussion see Tribulato (2022f).

As regards the ancient appraisal of the diminutives in -ίδιον, it is important to note that it was mostly Middle and New Comedy that provided the main source for later scholarship, especially concerning rarer and later forms.<sup>220</sup>

### 5.6.2 Suffix -άριον

The diminutive suffix -άριον derives from the resegmentation of nouns with a stem ending in -αρ (e.g. οἶναρον > οἶνάρ-ιον οἶν-άριον, ἐσχάρα > ἐσχάρ-ιον > ἐσχ-άριον).<sup>221</sup> It can also be attached to other diminutive suffixes (e.g. νεανίσκος > νεανισκάριον). -άριον is not particularly productive in Classical times. According to Pepppler’s calculations, 31 forms in -άριον are attested up to Aristophanes, but 21 of these are only attested in Aristophanes.<sup>222</sup> However, in post-Classical Greek -άριον becomes the most productive diminutive suffix besides -ιον.<sup>223</sup> Attestations in Middle and New Comedy are substantial.<sup>224</sup>

<sup>220</sup> Many fragments of Middle and New Comedy where diminutives in -ίδιον occur are quoted by writers like Athenaeus and Pollux precisely to exemplify these diminutives.

<sup>221</sup> See Petersen (1910, 260–71); Chantraine (1933, 74–5).

<sup>222</sup> See Pepppler (1902, 11–2).

<sup>223</sup> See Mayser (*Gramm.* vol. 1.3, 43–4); Blass, Debrunner (1976, 90); Watt (2013, 73); Tribulato (2022f); Tribulato (2022g).

<sup>224</sup> We omit from the list the textually problematic forms καριδάριον, κωβιδάριον, and σκινδάριον, which are the transmitted readings in Anaxandr. fr. 28 (see Millis 2015, 135–6).

ἀφάριον: Men. fr. 652; Xenarch. fr. 4.15. δειπνάριον: Diphil. fr. 64.1. ζωδάριον: Alex. fr. 144. ιστάριον: Men. fr. 79. κωδάριον: Anaxandr. fr. 35.11. λογάριον: Theognet. fr. 1.2. μισθάριον: Diphil. fr. 42.34; Men. fr. 220.2. μναδάριον: Diphil. fr. 21. νηττάριον: Men. fr. 652. οινάριον: Alex. fr. 277.1; Antiph. fr. 132.4; Apollod.Car. fr. 30.1; Diphil. fr. 60.8. ὀνάριον: Diphil. fr. 89.1. ὀρνθάριον: Anaxandr. fr. 42.63; Nicostr.Com. fr. 2.2. ὀψάριον: Alex. fr. 159.2 and 177.2; Anaxil. fr. 28.1–2; Diphil. fr. 42.31; Lync. fr. 1.21; Men. Car. fr. 1.2, fr. 151.2; Mnesim. fr. 3.7; Philem. fr. 32.2 and 100.5. παιδάριον: Alex. fr. 212.3; Diphil. fr. 18.2; Men. Asp. 222, Epit. 245, 464, 473, 646, 986, Col. 6, Mis. 989, Sam. 411, 425, 649, fr. 323.2, fr. 764.3, fr. 832.2; Philipp. fr. 22; Xenarch. fr. 10.1–3. παιδισκάριον: Men. Mis. fr. 8.1, fr. 296.15. πλοιάριον: Men. fr. 64.9. ποδάριον: Alex. fr. 115.15. σιτάριον: Philem. fr. 100.3. σκευάριον: Diphil. fr. 19.2. σκυτάριον: Anaxil. fr. 18.6. φωνάριον: Clearch. fr. 2.3. χιτωνάριον: Men. fr. 471.2. χορδάριον: Alex. fr. 137. ψάριον: Anaxandr. fr. 80; Ephipp. fr. 24.3. ώτάριον: Anaxandr. fr. 44.

The sheer number of forms (26) is quite impressive, considering that -άριον did not enjoy much popularity among Classical Attic writers. Several of them are already paralleled in 5th-century BCE Attic, particularly in comedy (κωδάριον, μισθάριον, νηττάριον, οινάριον, ὀψάριον, παιδάριον, πλοιάριον, ποδάριον, σκευάριον, φωνάριον). Two more, ζωδάριον and λογάριον, are paralleled in 4th-century BCE Attic writers. However, most of the forms collected above are hapaxes first attested in Middle and New Comedy, and then attested in post-Classical Greek: ἀφάριον, δειπνάριον, ιστάριον, μναδάριον,<sup>225</sup> ὀνάριον, ὀρνθάριον, παιδισκάριον, σιτάριον, σκυτάριον, χιτωνάριον, χορδάριον, ψάριον, ώτάριον. Among these, we may single out παιδισκάριον, which has a double suffixation. The fact that 14 new forms are attested for the first time in Middle and New Comedy is quite remarkable compared to the fact that only 21 forms in -άριον are attested in Aristophanes' far larger corpus.<sup>226</sup> This is probably an indication that Middle and New Comedy already document the spreading of -άριον. Like those in -ίδιον, the diminutives in -άριον also attracted the interest of Atticist lexicography.

**Ael.Dion. χ 11** (= Eust. in *Il.* 4.270.2–6): χιτών<ιον>· ὁ ζωστὸς <χιτῶν> καὶ γυναικεῖος. ὁ δὲ ἀνδρεῖος χιτωνίσκος, ὃ τινες ἐπενδύτην, τὸ δὲ βραχὺ χιτωνισκάριον. χιτῶνιον δὲ καὶ χιτωνάριον λεπτὸν ἔνδυμα γυναικεῖον πολυτελές. Μένανδρος (fr. 471)· ᾿γελουμένη γὰρ ἡτέρα καὶ διαφανές | χιτωνάριον ἔχουσα'. Αἰριστοφάνης (fr. 641)· ᾿ἐνδὺς τὸ γυναικεῖον τοδὶ χιτῶνιον'. **Phryn. PS 84.22–3**: κυνάριον (Alc.Com. fr. 33) καὶ κυνίδιον· <ἀμφω> δόκιμα. **Phryn. PS 88.4–5**: λίστριον (Ar. fr. 847). τὸ ὑπὸ τῶν πολλῶν καλούμενον κοχλιάριον [. . .]. **Phryn. PS 91.13–4**: ὀψάριον (Ar. fr. 45)· τὸ ὄψον, οὐχὶ τοὺς ἰχθῦς. οἱ δὲ νῦν τοὺς ἰχθῦς <οὔτω> λέγουσιν. **Phryn. PS fr. \*197** (= Phot. α 1984): ἀνθρωπάριον· Εὐπολις. ᾿οὐκ ἐς κόρακας, ἀνθρωπάριον, ἀποφθεῖρη;'. **Phryn. Ecl. 147**: παροψὶς τὸ ὄψον, οὐχὶ δὲ τὸ ἀγγεῖον· τοῦτο δὲ τρύβλιον ἢ λεκάριον

<sup>225</sup> On the morphology of this form and the presence of the analogical suffix -δάριον, see Petersen (1910, 262).

<sup>226</sup> See Peppler (1902, 11–2).

καλοῦσιν. **Phryn. Ecl. 151:** κυνίδιον λέγε. Θεόπομπος δὲ ὁ κωμωδὸς ἀπαξ που (fr. 93) κυνάριον εἶπεν. **Phryn. Ecl. 292:** κοχλιάριον· τοῦτο λίστρον Ἀριστοφάνης ὁ κωμωδοποιὸς λέγει (fr. 847)· καὶ σὺ δὲ οὕτως λέγε. **Phryn. Ecl. 398:** λιθάριον πάνυ φυλάττου λέγειν, λιθίδιον δὲ λέγε. **Antiatt. γ 11:** γυναικάριον· Διοκλῆς Μελίτταις (fr. 11). **Antiatt. γ 34:** γιγγλάρια· οἱ αὐληταὶ λέγουσι γένος ὀργάνων. **Antiatt. ζ 6:** ζωδάριον· Ἀλεξίς Λυκίσκῳ (fr. 144). **Antiatt. κ 85:** κλινάρια· οὐ μόνον κλινίδια. Ἀριστοφάνης Δαιταλεῦσιν (fr. 250). **Antiatt. κ 87:** κυνάριον· οὐ μόνον κυνίδιον. Ἀλκαῖος κωμικῶς (fr. 33). **Antiatt. λ 24:** λογάρια· ὑποκοριστικῶς· ‘λογαρία μοι λέγει’, Φαίδων <Σωκρατικός> Ζωπύρῳ (fr. III.A.10 Giannantoni). **Antiatt. μ 41:** μναδάρια· ὑποκοριστικῶς τὰς μνάς. Δίφιλος Βαλανεῖῳ (fr. 21). **Moer. π 62:** παιδάριον καὶ τὸ θυγάτριον Ἀττικοί· παιδάριον μόνως τὸ ἄρρεν Ἑλλήνες. **Moer. σ 20:** σωδάριον Ἑρμῖππος (fr. 93) τὸ ὕφ’ ἡμῶν σουδάριον. **[Hdn.] Philet. 194:** ἀργυροθήκη, τὸ νῦν ἀργεντάριον καλούμενον· παρὰ Διοκλεῖ (fr. 15)· ἔστι δὲ οὗτος τῆς ἀρχαίας κωμωδίας ποιητής. **[Hdn.] Philet. 216:** ἰπνίον, ὃ οἱ νῦν μιλιάριον. **[Hdn.] Philet. 217:** κοχλιώρυχον, τὸ νῦν κοχλιάριον. **[Hdn.] Philet. 226:** ἀλαβαστροθήκην ἔλεγον οἱ ἀρχαῖοι καὶ ὁ Δημοσθένης (19.237)· ὃ οἱ νῦν κελλάριον. **[Hdn.] Philet. 283:** παιδισκάριον δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς δούλης· δουλάριον οὐδέποτε ἐπὶ τοῦ ἄρρενος, ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ τοῦ θήλεος.

The forms in -άριον are more likely to be regarded with suspicion by the Atticists than those in -ίδιον, no doubt because of the very high productivity of the former type in post-Classical Greek.<sup>227</sup> Indeed, while the Atticist lexicographers record and approve of some diminutives in -άριον already attested in 5th-century BCE Greek, which may also occur in Middle and New Comedy (ὀψάριον), some of the forms attested only in Middle and New Comedy attracted special interest from the *Antiatticist*, which probably sought to defend their admissibility against the views of more restrictive Atticists (κωδάριον, λογάριον, μναδάριον). Still, in some cases the Atticist prescriptions correspond to the way these diminutives are used in Middle and New Comedy (παιδισκάριον for female servants in Men. *Mis.* fr. 8.1 and Men. fr. 296.15, as prescribed by the *Philetaerus*; παιδάριον for both male and female children, as in Men. fr. 323.2 and as prescribed by Moeris, not just the male ones).

### 5.6.3 Suffix -ίσκος

Unlike -ίδιον and -άριον, -ίσκος is an IE suffix.<sup>228</sup> The semantic development of this suffix in Greek has been thoroughly investigated.<sup>229</sup> Besides the diminutive, hypocoristic, and deteriorative uses, -ίσκος also indicated similarity. Due to the existence of the competing and far more productive suffix -ιον, the forms in

<sup>227</sup> See Tribulato (2022f); Tribulato (2022g).

<sup>228</sup> It probably represents the conglomerate of \*-is (the zero grade of the comparative suffix \*-ies/-ios/-is) and \*-ko- (see Petersen 1913, 144). The IE meaning of these formations may have been ‘approximating to the condition designated by the primitive’ (thus Petersen 1913, 145–6, who rightly compares this with the primary meaning of \*-ko-), and then each language developed this further.

<sup>229</sup> See Petersen (1913); Chantraine (1933, 405–13).

-ίσκος were probably perceived as less common and therefore more expressive. -ίσκος is unattested in Homer and Aeolic lyric poetry, but it is already documented in the rest of archaic lyric poetry, and it is then quite productive in 5th-century BCE Attic writers. There is ample evidence in Middle and New Comedy.<sup>230</sup>

**γλαυκίσκος:** Arched. fr. 3.1; Damox. fr. 2.18; Bato fr. 5.16; Philem. fr. 82.21. **ιππίσκος:** Crat.Iun. fr. 5; title of one of Alexis' plays, Ἀγωνίς ἢ Ἰππίσκος. **καλαθίσκος:** Men. fr. 497. **καπρίσκος:** Crobyl. fr. 7.2. **κορίσκη:** Timocl. fr. 24.1. **κρεῖσκος:** Alex. fr. 194.1.<sup>231</sup> **κρωμακίσκος:** Antiph. fr. 214.1. **μειρακίσκος:** Alex. fr. 37.2 and 183.7; Men. *Asp.* 128, *Georg.* 4. **νεανίσκος:** Alex. fr. 116.5; Men. *Asp.* 133 and 332, *Dysc.* 39, 414, 792, *Georg.* 69, *Pc.* 9, *Th.* 20, *Fab.Incert.* 54; Theophil. fr. 4.1; title of one of Antiphanes' plays. **ὀβελίσκος:** Anaxipp. fr. 6.1; Euphro fr. 1.32; Sotad. fr. 1.10. **οἰνίσκος:** Eub. fr. 129.2. **παιδίσκη:** Anaxil. fr. 22.26; Men. *Asp.* 141, 266, 384, *Her.* 18 and 39, *Her.* fr. 6, fr. 97.3. **πινακίσκος:** Epig. fr. 1.3; Lync. fr. 1.6. **χηνίσκος:** Eub. fr. 14.3. **χιτωνίσκος:** Antiph. fr. 35.3; Apollod. Com. fr. 12; Men. *Sic.* 280.

Most of these forms are already attested in 5th-century BCE writers (mostly, but not only, in comedy): καλαθίσκος, κορίσκη, νεανίσκος, ὀβελίσκος, οἰνίσκος, παιδίσκη, πινακίσκος, χιτωνίσκος. One of them, μειρακίσκος, is first attested in the 4th century BCE (Plato). Finally, the remaining six forms are hapaxes, or they are first attested in Middle and New Comedy and then live on in post-Classical Greek: γλαυκίσκος, ιππίσκος,<sup>232</sup> καπρίσκος, κρεῖσκος, κρωμακίσκος, χηνίσκος. This distribution of the evidence, especially when compared with that of -ίδιον and -άριον, shows that -ίσκος was no longer very productive in 4th-century BCE Attic. This anticipates the fate of -ίσκος in post-Classical times: the suffix is of limited diffusion and productivity in the koine,<sup>233</sup> where it was productive only in technical texts, specifically with the meaning 'similar to' the base word.<sup>234</sup> The diminutives in -ίσκος are discussed by Atticist lexicography, usually with approval (Moer. χ 34), in relation to issues of semantics (Phryn. *PS* 22.14–5, *Ecl.* 210, Moer. π 56), morphology (Phryn. *Ecl.* 50), or both (Ael.Dion. χ 11).

**Ael.Dion. χ 11** (= Eust. in *Il.* 4.270.2–6): χιτών<ιον>· ὁ ζωστὸς <χιτῶν> καὶ γυναικεῖος. ὁ δὲ ἀνδρεῖος χιτωνίσκος, ὃ τινες ἐπενδύτην, τὸ δὲ βραχὺ χιτωνισκάριον. χιτώνιον δὲ καὶ χιτωνάριον λεπτὸν ἔνδυμα γυναικεῖον πολυτελές. Μένανδρος (fr. 471)· ὀλουμένη γὰρ ἡτέρα καὶ διαφανές | χιτωνάριον ἔχουσα'. Αἰριστοφάνης (fr. 641)· ἔνδυσ τὸ γυναικεῖον τοδὶ χιτώνιον'. **Phryn. PS 22.14–5:** ἀνθρωπίσκος

<sup>230</sup> Diminutives of personal names are not included (on these, see Petersen 1913, 189–202; Chantraine 1933, 411–2). They begin to appear in Herodotus and Thucydides and correspond to the normal uses of -ίσκος (i.e. the diminutive/hypocoristic one and that of indicating similarity).

<sup>231</sup> On the gender of this specific form and references to the earlier debate on the gender of the forms in -ίσκος, see Arnott (1996, 568 n. 1).

<sup>232</sup> This form indicates a head ornament, so -ίσκος indicates similarity (see Petersen 1913, 162).

<sup>233</sup> See Mayser (*Gramm.* vol. 1,3, 44–5); Blass, Debrunner (1976, 90); Watt (2013, 73–4).

<sup>234</sup> See Petersen (1913, 155–6, who also provides ample documentation).

φαῦλος· οἶον ὁ ἀπλοῦς καὶ μηδὲν ποικίλον ἔχων. τὸ μέντοι ἀνθρωπίσκος ἐπὶ καταφρονήσεως τίθεται. **Phryn. PS 23.6–7**: ἄπυρον πινακίσκον (Ar. fr. 547)· καινόν, μήπω πυρὶ προσενηνεγμένον. **Phryn. Ecl. 50**: κόριον ἢ κορίδιον ἢ κορίσκη λέγουσιν, τὸ δὲ κοράσιον παράλογον. **Phryn. Ecl. 210**: παιδίσκη· οἱ νῦν ἐπὶ τῆς θεραπαίνης τοῦτο τιθέασιν, οἱ δ' ἀρχαῖοι ἐπὶ τῆς νεάνιδος, οἷς ἀκολουθητέον. **Moer. π 56**: παιδίσκην καὶ τὴν ἐλευθέραν καὶ τὴν δούλην Ἀττικοί· τὴν δούλην μόνον Ἕλληνες. **Moer. χ 34**: χιτωνίσκος χιτῶν Ἀττικοί· ὑποδύτην καὶ ἐπενδύτην Ἕλληνες. **[Hdn.] Philet. 282**: παιδίσκη ἐπὶ τῆς ἐλευθέρας λέγουσι δὲ οὕτω τὴν νέαν.

---

## **C. Verbal morphology**

## 1 Verbal endings

### 1.1 1st-person plural middle-passive ending -μεσθα

The 1st-person plural ending -μεσθα, common in epic and lyric poetry, is also widely used as a metrically convenient form in 5th-century BCE tragedy and comedy (see Schwyzler 1939, 670). According to the data collected by Willi (2003a, 245), -μεσθα is attested 76 times in Aristophanes. Dunbar (1995, 147) points out that in Old Comedy -μεσθα is mostly parodic or intended to heighten the tone. In Middle and New Comedy, however, where a more colloquial language is used, -μεσθα is mostly avoided.<sup>235</sup>

ἀπωλλύμεσθα: Men. fr. 644. βουλόμεσθα: Philem. fr. 72.2; Euang. fr. 1.3. δισαυτόμεσθα: Antiph. fr. 108.1. εὐφραίνόμεσθα(α): Philem. fr. 145.2. ἡλαττόμεσθα(α): Philem. fr. 77.3. ἠθροίζόμεσθα: Men. *Asp.* 60. φεισόμεσθα(α): Philem. fr. 111.4.

Since -μεσθα does not occur in Attic prose or inscriptions, it is likely that it never belonged to spoken Attic.<sup>236</sup> When -μεσθα is used in Middle and New Comedy, it is not usually to heighten the tone. For example, in Philem. fr. 72 ἀποθανούμεθα occurs twice side by side with βουλόμεσθα, but the two endings seem to be used without any appreciable distinction, metrical convenience excepted. Similarly, in the Euangelus fragment, βουλόμεσθα fits perfectly with a trochaic *metron*. Occasionally, however, -μεσθα may not only be metrically convenient, but also contribute an element of more heightened diction alongside other features. In the opening scene of Menander's *Aspis*, Davus reports the (alleged) circumstances surrounding his master Cleostratus' death. Since Davus' narrative is full of tragic and poetic features, -μεσθα too can be considered an additional element of marked language.

<sup>235</sup> χορταζόμεσθα was restored by Porson in Amphis fr. 28.2, but Kassel, Austin retain the χορταζόμενα of Athenaeus' MS A.

<sup>236</sup> On the rare occurrences in Ptolemaic and Imperial documentary papyri, see Mayser (*Gramm.* vol. 1, 2, 92); Gignac (1981, 358). While the only known instance of -μεσθα in Ptolemaic papyri may be explained as an attempt to use a more formal language, the few occurrences of the ending -μεσθα in late-Imperial and Byzantine papyri are more plausibly interpreted as evidence of a new ending formed analogically to -σθε of the 2nd person plural (hence, the Medieval and Modern Greek personal endings -μεσθε(ν)/-μεστε(ν) and -μαστε; see *CGMEMG* vol. 3, 1449–57).



## 1.2 Optative

### 1.2.1 ‘Aeolic’ and ‘non-Aeolic’ aorist active optative endings

The ‘Aeolic’ aorist active optative endings *-(σ)ειας*, *-(σ)ειε(ν)*, and *-(σ)ειαν* were regular in 5th-century BCE Attic (see Willi 2003a, 246). In Middle and New Comedy, the ‘non-Aeolic’ 2nd-person ending *-(σ)αις* replaces *-(σ)ειας*, but the ‘Aeolic’ endings *-(σ)ειε(ν)* and *-(σ)ειαν* still hold their ground. The evidence for the ‘Aeolic’ 3rd-person singular optative ending *-(σ)ειε(ν)* in Middle and New Comedy is substantial.

*ἀποκναίσειεν*: Antiph. fr. 239.2. *ἀποκτείνειεν*: Men. *Epit.* 903. *βοηθήσειεν*: Men. *Dysc.* 620 and 621. *διακόψειεν*: Anaxandr. fr. 42.69. *διαφθείρει(ε)*: Diph. fr. 62.3. *εικάσειεν*: Men. *Epit.* 882. *ἐλεήσειε*: Men. *Epit.* 855. *ἐμβλέψειε*: Damox. fr. 3.4. *ἐναύσει(ε)*: Diph. fr. 62.3. *ἐπιτρίψειεν*: Timocl. fr. 1.4. *κατακούσειεν*: Dioxipp. fr. 2.1. *καταστήσειεν*: Alex. fr. 117.5. *κερδάνειε*: Men. *Epit.* 335. *λυπήσειε*: Alex. fr. 244.3. *ὀνομάσειε*: Philem. fr. 95.4. *πνεύσειε*: Alex. fr. 47.1. *στήσειεν*: Men. *Dysc.* 915 and 929. *σώσει(ε)*: Diph. fr. 74.4. *σώσειε(ν)*: Timocl. fr. 1.1; Philem. fr. 178.4; Apollod.Com. fr. 14.12; Euphro fr. 4.2. *ὑποκρούσειεν*: Henioch. fr. 5.4. *ὑπομείνειε*: Men. *Dysc.* 368; Aristophon fr. 12.10. *φράσει(ε)*: Diph. fr. 62.62.2.

The evidence for the 3rd-person plural ‘Aeolic’ optative *-(σ)ειαν* is more limited:

*ἀπολέσειαν*: Men. *Dysc.* 139, 221, 601, 927. *δράσειαν*: Antiph. fr. 170.2. *ποήσειαν*: Men. *Dysc.* 313.

The five occurrences of the ‘Aeolic’ 3rd-person plural optative *-(σ)ειαν* in Menander are all in oaths, but we should not infer that the ‘Aeolic’ ending was retained only in fixed formulas and expressions as opposed to the ‘non-Aeolic’ ending. In fact, the 3rd-person plural optative is a very rare form to come across: there is not a single example of ‘non-Aeolic’ *-(σ)αιεν* in the whole of Middle and New Comedy.

Atticist lexicography regarded the ‘Aeolic’ ending as Attic.<sup>237</sup>

Phot. π 997 (Ael.Dion. π 46 according to Erbse, *Phryn. PS fr. \*348* according to de Borries): ποιήσειςαι καὶ γράψειςαι καὶ ποιήσειςαι καὶ γράψειςαι· Ἀττικοὶ μᾶλλον, οἱ Ἴωνες δὲ οὕτω καὶ ποιήσειςαι καὶ γράψειςαι.

<sup>237</sup> On the use of the ‘Aeolic’ and ‘non-Aeolic’ aorist active optative endings in Atticist writers, see Schmid (*Atticismus* vol. 3, 30–2; vol. 4, 26; 588); Lucarini (2017, 18–9). The fact that the ‘Aeolic’ optative is regularly used in Roman and Byzantine papyri, while it is extremely rare in Ptolemaic papyri (Mayer, *Gramm.* vol. 1, 2, 87–8), may be due to the influence of Atticism (see Gignac 1981, 360).

### 1.2.2 Analogical extension of -η- in the plural forms of the optative

The plural forms of the optative developed new analogical forms that extended the -η- of the singular forms (see εἶην, εἶης, εἶη) to the plural. The occurrences in 5th-century BCE texts are only a handful (Thuc. 6.11.4 σφαλείμεν and 7.77.7 σωθείητε, Ar. *Ra.* 1448 σωθείμεν: note that Aristophanes uses the same syntagm as Men. fr. 644, also at the end of a iambic trimeter), but then this optative ending becomes increasingly common in a linguistically bolder writer like Antipho (*Tetr.* 1.10 εἶσαν, 2.9 εἶμεν, 4.6 εἶσαν), and then especially in 4th-century BCE prose (*passim* in Xenophon, Lysias, Demosthenes, etc.; in Isocrates only 6.57 μνησθείμεν and 19.16 πεισθείητε). Three instances of the new analogical optative occur in Middle and New Comedy:

σωθείμεν: Men. fr. 644. ἀφείητ(ε): Men. *Per.* 4 and 6.

This development was criticised as being foreign to Attic by (the stricter voices within) Atticist lexicography.

*Antiatt.* ε 74: εἶσαν· ἀντὶ τοῦ εἶεν. Ξενοφῶν Ἀπομνημονευμάτων α' (but notice that in the MSS the situation is much more fluid, that is, εἶσαν and εἶεν alternate). *Moer.* β 5: βλαβεῖμεν βλαβεῖτε βλαβεῖεν Ἀττικοί· βλαβεῖμεν βλαβεῖητε βλαβεῖσαν Ἑλληνες.

### 1.3 The imperfect and perfect 2nd-person singular active endings -θα, -ς, -θας

The 2nd-person singular imperfect ἦσθα, from εἰμί, has the characteristic ending -θα. From ἦσθα, -θα then spread to a few other forms: imperfect ἔφησθα (φημί) and ἦεισθα (εἶμι), perfect οἶσθα (οἶδα), and pluperfect ἤδεισθα (οἶδα). Since the ending -θα only applies to a limited number of verbs and is not very morphologically transparent, there was a strong tendency in Greek to replace this ending with the morphologically more easily recognisable -ς. A case in point is ἦσθα, which in post-Classical Greek typically appears as ἦς (unattested in Classical Attic).<sup>238</sup> Atticist lexicographers were interested in ἦς, which they proscribed, recommending the use of the form ἦσθα instead.<sup>239</sup> This also happens with ἔφης (see Section C.1.3.1), οἶδας (Section C.1.3.2), ἦεις (Section C.1.3.3), and ἦδεις.<sup>240</sup> Alterna-

<sup>238</sup> See Mayser (*Gramm.* vol. 1,2, 81); Gignac (1981, 403).

<sup>239</sup> Phryn. *Ecl.* 118: ἦς ἐν ἀγορᾷ σόλοικον, λέγε οὖν ἦσθα. ὀρθότερον δὲ χρῶτο ἂν ὁ λέγων ἔαν ἦς ἐν ἀγορᾷ, *Moer.* η 4: ἦσθα Ἀττικοί· ἦς Ἑλληνες.

<sup>240</sup> We will not deal with the pluperfect ἤδεισθα > ἦδεις (discussed by Atticist lexicography, see *Moer.* η 1: ἤδεισθα Ἀττικοί· ἦδεις Ἑλληνες), since it is unattested in Middle and New Comedy.

tively, the ending -θα may be re-characterised by the addition of a final -ς, as in the case of οἶσθας and ἥσθας (see Section C.1.3.4).

### 1.3.1 ἔφης

The evidence for this analogical form in place of ἔφησθα in Middle and New Comedy is limited to one example:

**ἔφης:** Dion.Com. 2.37.

However, not only is the analogical form ἔφης/φῆς already well documented in Homeric poetry (also in composition), but it also occasionally surfaces in 4th-century BCE Attic prose writers (Pl. *Grg.* 466e.6, X. *Cyr.* 4.1.23).<sup>241</sup> In post-Classical Greek, this form will then enjoy great popularity, also among Atticising authors.<sup>242</sup> These factors also explain the tolerance of ἔφης by Phrynichus.

**Phryn. Ecl.** 206: ἔφης· ἔστι μὲν παρὰ τοῖς ἀρχαίοις, ἀλλ' ὀλίγον. τὸ δὲ πλεῖον ἔφησθα.

### 1.3.2 οἶδας

This analogical form occurs two times in Middle and New Comedy:<sup>243</sup>

**οἶδας:** Philem. fr. 45.3; Phoenic. fr. 3.2.

In the perfect, the pressure to replace -θα with -ας must have been particularly strong (i.e. οἶδα, οἶδας like λέλυκα, λέλυκας, πέφνηα, πέφνηας, etc.). The analogical form is initially epic and Ionic.<sup>244</sup> Herodotus and the Hippocratic writings both have οἶδας (in *simplicia* and compounds) and the 3rd-person plural οἶδασιν in appreciable quantities. According to the current view, these analogical forms only spread in Attic in the 4th century BCE. The first undisputed instances of οἶδας are in Xenophon (*Mem.* 4.6.6) and the Aristotelian corpus (6x in *APr.* and *SE*). Similarly, οἶδαμεν is attested in Antiphon (*Tetr.* 1.3), Xenophon (*An.* 2.4.6),<sup>245</sup> and then Demosthenes (21.82, 21.93, and 21.121, i.e. only in *Against Meidias*). οἶδασιν first occurs in Xenophon (*Oec.* 20.14). Attic inscriptions are very conservative in this re-

<sup>241</sup> In Xenophon's passage, ἔφης is transmitted by all manuscripts, but some editors nevertheless restore ἔφησθα (thus Gemoll, Peters 1968 *ad loc.*, while Marchant 1910 vol. 4, *ad loc.* retains ἔφης).

<sup>242</sup> See Schmid (*Atticismus* vol. 1, 233; vol. 2, 33; vol. 4, 599).

<sup>243</sup> On the manuscript evidence see Arnott (2002, 203–4).

<sup>244</sup> Hom. *Od.* 1.337; *h.Merc.* 456 and 467; Thgn. 1.491 and 1.957; Hippon. fr. \*177 West.

<sup>245</sup> This is the reading of the manuscripts and is correctly maintained by Hude, Peters (1972, *ad loc.*), while Marchant (1903, *ad loc.*) unnecessarily corrects it to οἶδα.

gard, and there is no evidence for the analogical forms before Roman times.<sup>246</sup> In the koine (mostly, though not exclusively, in the lower registers), the analogical forms οἶδας, οἶδαμεν, οἶδατε, and οἶδασι are very common,<sup>247</sup> in some cases they are even the standard forms (e.g. in the New Testament).<sup>248</sup> The analogical forms are also attested in Atticising writers.<sup>249</sup> Finally, the earliest possible Attic occurrence of the analogical forms may be earlier than generally accepted by scholars: in Euripides' *Alcestis*, a play securely dated to 438 BCE, at line 780 we have τὰ θνητὰ πράγματ' † οἶδας † ἦν ἔχει φύσιν;<sup>250</sup> Here οἶδας is the reading of the MSS (except L), but the opinions of modern scholars vary. Stevens (1976, 60) plausibly considers it to be early evidence of the penetration of the Ionic form into Attic (see above) and concludes that οἶδας probably coexisted with οἶσθα already in the 5th century BCE.<sup>251</sup>

However early οἶδας may have been attested, Atticist lexicography is critical of such a form anyway.<sup>252</sup>

**Moer. ι 22:** ἴσασιν Ἀττικοί· οἶδασιν κοινόν. **Moer. ο 24:** οἶσθα χωρὶς τοῦ σ Ἀττικοί· οἶδας Ἑλλήνες.

### 1.3.3 ἦεις

The 2nd-person imperfect of εἶμι is ἦεισθα. As part of the same tendency discussed à propos ἦς, ἔφης, and οἶδας, ἦεισθα also developed an analogical 2nd-person form, ἦεις. The only possible occurrence in Middle and New Comedy is in a textually problematic fragment of Antiphanes:

**Antiph. fr. 278:** φαίνινδα παίζων † ἦεις ἐν Φαινεστίου.

The MSS CE of Athenaeus' epitome, which quotes Antiphanes' fragment (Ath. 1.15a), agree in this reading (i.e. ἦεις). However, ἦεις is unmetrical (the second syl-

<sup>246</sup> See Threaght (1996, 570–1).

<sup>247</sup> See Mayser (*Gramm.* vol. 1,2, 81); Gignac (1981, 409–11).

<sup>248</sup> See Blass, Debrunner (1976, 72). For further examples, see Lobeck (1820, 236–7); Schmid (*Atticismus* vol. 4, 599).

<sup>249</sup> See Schmid (*Atticismus* vol. 1, 85 and 232; vol. 3, 13 and 16; vol. 4, 38 and 599).

<sup>250</sup> Against the transmitted reading κατοιδατε in Eur. *Supp.* 1044: φράζετ' εἰ κατείδετε, see the discussion by Collard (1975 vol. 2, 376).

<sup>251</sup> Dale (1954) also retains οἶδας, which is defended even by a 'modern Atticist' like Rutherford (1881, 227). Diggle (1984) cautiously obelises †οἶδας†. L. P. E. Parker (2007) accepts Blaydes' τὰ θνητὰ πράγματ' ἦντιν' οἶσθ' ἔχει φύσιν;, although she points out that the resulting word order is unusual (see L. P. E. Parker 2007, 207–8). Collard (2018, 127) does not take a strong position himself.

<sup>252</sup> See further Batisti (forthcoming d).

lable should be short) and has therefore been variously emended.<sup>253</sup> In any case, this form would be perfectly appropriate in 4th-century BCE Attic. Prefixed forms of *ῥεις* occur in Xenophon (ἀρήεις in *Cyr.* 5.1.25), Demosthenes (διεζήεις in 18.22), Aeschines (περιήεις in 3.164), and Dinarchus (περιήεις in 4.35). *ῥεις* (in *simplicia* and prefixed forms) is later attested in the high koine (Philo, Plutarch, and Josephus), and also in Atticising writers such as Lucian (8x), Aelius Aristides (1x), and Libanius (13x). It also appears in late-antique and Byzantine writers.

### 1.3.4 οἷσθας and ῥσθας

The analogical οἷσθας and ῥσθας are part of the tendency to re-characterise the 2nd-person singular ending -θα. Despite their similarities, these forms raise partly different questions.

οἷσθας is attested multiple times in Middle and New Comedy:<sup>254</sup>

**Alex. fr. 15.11:** οὐκ οἷσθας, ὦ μακάριε. **Men. Epit. 480–1:** τὴν δὲ παῖδ' <α γ'> ἦτις ἦν | οἷσθας;. **Men. Mis. 651:** οἷσθας σὺ τοῦτον;. **Men. fr. 246.5:** οὐδὲν οἷσθας, ἄθλιε. **Men. Pc. 152:** οἷσθας] οἷ- [όν ἐ]στιν, οἷμαι (the supplement is Wilamowitz'). **Philem. fr. 45.4–5:** οὐδὲν οὔν | οἷσθας ἀγαθὸν σύγ(ε). **Posidipp. fr. 29.2:** οἷσθας, ὦ βέλτισθ(ε) (οἷσθας is Pierson's correction of transmitted οἷσθα). **Strato fr. 1.26:** Ὀμηρον οὐκ οἷσθας λέγοντα; (according to Athenaeus' text, see Kassel 1974). **Com. adesp. fr. 1017.65:** οὐκ οἷσθας.

We know from Choeroboscus that οἷσθας occurred already in Cratinus (fr. 112 (= Choerob. in *Theod. GG* 4,2.111.1–2)). Stevens (1976, 60) claims that it arose from confusion between οἷσθα and οἷδας (see Section C.1.3.2). Although comparison with ῥσθας suggests that οἷσθας may well have developed independently of οἷδας, the existence of οἷδας may have contributed to its spread (see below). In the extant texts, οἷσθας is used either to avoid hiatus or to create a long syllable: it is thus a metrically conditioned variant. Note that Philem. fr. 45 has all three forms οἷσθα, οἷσθας, and οἷδας, all used by the same speaker. Analogical οἷσθας is widely attested in Hellenistic mime (Herod. 2.55) as well as in Hellenistic and later prose.<sup>255</sup> In other literary contexts, οἷσθας has been the subject of debate among

<sup>253</sup> See Olson (2021, 246).

<sup>254</sup> On the manuscript evidence see Arnott (2002, 203–4).

<sup>255</sup> Philodemus Πρὸς τοὺς ἐταίρους 7 Angeli (P.Herc. 1005.col. xviii.14); the Ninus romance, col. A.2.22 and col. A.3.25 in Stephens, Winkler 1995 (note that in the first passage of the Ninus romance οἷσθας occurs before a consonant); Arrian *Epict.* 1.12.26, and also in a metrical oracle quoted by Plutarch (*De Pythiae oraculis* 408a = 41 in Parke, Wormell 1956 vol. 2, where the reading οἷσθας ἄρειον is at variance with οἷδας ἄρειον transmitted by Hdt. 4.157.2 and with οἷδας ἄμεινον transmitted by AP 14.84.1).

ancient critics regarding its (alleged) presence in Homer.<sup>256</sup> The form is occasionally attested in documentary papyri and once in a poetic inscription.<sup>257</sup> Atticist lexicography admits οἶσθας only as a metrically convenient option.<sup>258</sup>

*Su.* ο 173 = Phot. ο 150 (= **Ael.Dion.** ο 11): οἶσθα· ἀντί τοῦ οἶδας. λέγεται [καί] χωρίς τοῦ σ· μετὰ δὲ τοῦ σ ποτὲ ἢ διὰ μέτρον ἢ διὰ τὸ μὴ συγκροῦσαι φωνήεντα (συγκροῦσαι σύμφωνον, οἶσθας *Su.*: συγκροῦσαι ἰσύμφωνα† Phot.). Cf. **Eust. in Od.** 2.90.12–3: Αἴλιος μέντοι Διονύσιος γράφει ὅτι καὶ τὸ οἶσθα καὶ τὸ οἶσθας ἄμφω Ἑλληνικά, καθὰ καὶ ἦσθα καὶ ἦσθας. **Moer.** ο 24: οἶσθα χωρίς τοῦ σ Ἀπτικοί· οἶδας Ἑλληνες.

ἦσθας is attested twice in Menander, and a third occurrence is likely:

**Men. Epitrr.** 373: πονηρὸς ἦσθας. **Men. Pc.** 100: ἦσθας. **Men. Sic.** 129: οὐ δοκεῖς οὐκ ἦσθας ὅς, ὥς ἔοικεν (ἦσθας was suggested by several scholars, the reconstruction of the full line is Sandbach's).

In Middle and New Comedy, the regular form ἦσθα occurs 8x in Menander, and 1x each in Diphilus and Philemon. Like οἶσθας, ἦσθας prevents hiatus, but no case is preserved where it is used to create a long syllable. It is worth stressing that ἦσθας is almost unique to Menander. Unlike οἶσθας, it is unattested in documentary sources.<sup>259</sup> This difference is not easily explained. We cannot rule out the possibility that ἦσθας was developed by the analogy with οἶσθας only for metrical convenience.

Aelius Dionysius apparently discussed and admitted ἦσθας, but this may be the result of Eustathius' mistaken summary of his views (see *Eust. in Od.* 2.90.12–3 and *Ael.Dion.* ο 11 (= *Su.* ο 173, Phot. ο 150) quoted above). As with οἶσθας, he may have regarded ἦσθας merely as a metrically convenient option.<sup>260</sup>

In conclusion, οἶσθας may have been perceived as a compromise between the standard οἶσθα and the increasingly common analogical variant οἶδας. This would have made it possible for οἶσθας to be used with greater freedom already at an early date, as attested by Cratinus' use of it. In turn, the reason why ἦσθας enjoyed

<sup>256</sup> See schol. (Ariston.) *Hom. Il.* 1.85e (A).

<sup>257</sup> P.Cair.Zen. 2.59207.33 (= TM 852) (Philadelphia, 255–254 BCE); PSI 6.685 (= TM 18950) (from Oxyrhynchus, 324–327 CE); *I.Egypte métriques* 26.1 (= TM 88325) (Antinooupolis, beginning of the 3rd century CE).

<sup>258</sup> See further Batisti (forthcoming d).

<sup>259</sup> A final occurrence is in Julian's *Commentary on Job* (251.16–7 Hagedorn), where ἦσθας replaces the ἦς of the LXX text (this is just one of several modifications clearly aimed at restoring a more classicising Greek than that of the LXX). Other indirect sources quoting the same passage have ἦσθα instead of ἦσθας, and it would be worth enquiring whether this is an editorial normalisation of ἦσθας.

<sup>260</sup> The Homeric scholia also attest that ἦσθας was used to do away with the hiatus ἦσθα ἐνέρπερος in *Hom. Il.* 5.898, see the lemma of schol. (Ariston.) *Hom. Il.* 5.898: καὶ κεν δὴ πάλαι ἦσθας ἐνέρπερος Οὐρανώων (A).

a more limited diffusion may be that there was no disyllabic analogical variant of ἦσθα alongside the ‘mixed’ form. In other words, once the 2nd-person analogical imperfect ἦς was created, the opposition was only between ἦσθα and ἦς,<sup>261</sup> whereas that between οἶσθα and οἶδας favoured the use of the ‘intermediate’ form οἶσθας. This interpretation gains plausibility when one notes that imperfect ἔφησθα or pluperfect ἥδησθα were later replaced by ἔφης and ἥδεις, while ‘mixed’ forms such as \*ἔφησθας and \*ἥδησθας are unattested (see Section C.1.3.1).

#### 1.4 (Un)contracted 2nd-person middle-passive imperfect and pluperfect

In the imperfect, the final vowel of the stem of the athematic verbs δύναιμι and ἐπίσ-ταμαι may undergo contraction with the 2nd-person middle-passive ending -(σ)ο (with the result that they end up being treated like thematic verbs). However, as the outcome is not quite morphologically transparent, the uncontracted form is sometimes retained instead. Later comedy provides evidence for either treatment:

**Men. Sam. 376:** (Δη) τρυφᾶν γὰρ οὐκ ἠπίστας· (Χρ) οὐκ ἠπιστάμην; **Philipp. fr. 16.2:** ἐπειτα φουσᾶν δυστυχῆς οὐκ ἠδύνω;.

As regards ἠπίστας(ο), the uncontracted form is also attested in Sophocles (*Ai.* 1134; *El.* 394) and will reappear in Imperial and late-antique prose. However, the contracted ἠπίστω is attested in Euripides (*Her.* 344), Xenophon (*HG* 3.4.9), and Plato (*Euthd.* 296d.1–2; *Io.* 531b.9), and then in the Septuagint, Dio Chrysostom, and Christian writers (but overall ἠπίστω is less common than the uncontracted form). As regards δύναιμι, the uncontracted form ἠδύνασο/ἐδύνασο<sup>262</sup> occurs in the Hippocratic corpus (*Epist.* 16.15) and then in Imperial and late-antique prose (Josephus, Epictetus, Lucian, Marcus Aurelius, Christian writers), while the contracted form ἠδύνω/ἐδύνω is attested in the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes* (4.405), in Xenophon (*An.* 1.6.7; 7.5.5), in a fragment of Antisthenes (fr. 15.11.2, the sole parallel for Philippiades’ fragment for the 2nd-person imperfect with the long augment and contracted ending), and later in Imperial and late-antique Christian writers, but also in a 2nd-century CE private letter whose language and textual cohesion reveal a linguistically skilled writer (BGU 3.892.10 = TM 28104, Hermopolites). We can also compare this with \*πρίαιμι, for which the contracted 2nd-person singular indicative aorist is ἐπρίω (see *Ar. V.* 1440 and fr. 209.2; *Thphr. Char.* 30.8),

<sup>261</sup> See also Moer. η 4: ἦσθα Ἀττικοί· ἦς Ἑλληνες. As already mentioned, ἦς is unattested in Classical Attic texts (see Section C.1.3).

<sup>262</sup> For the alternation ἦ-/ἐ- in the augment, see Section C.2.1.

while the uncontracted ἐπρίασο is unattested.<sup>263</sup> Atticist lexicographers similarly recommended the use of the contracted forms over the uncontracted ones. Philip-pides' ἡδύνω is therefore more in line with Attic usage than Menander's ἡπίστασο.

**Moer. η 22:** ἡδύνω ἡπίστω Ἀττικοί· ἐδύνασο ἐπίστασο Ἑλληνες.

A gloss in the *Antiatticist* similarly attests that Antiphanes used the uncontracted pluperfect 2nd-person middle-passive ἡκρόασο (despite the fact that ἀκροάομαι is thematic):<sup>264</sup>

**Antiph. fr. 93** (= *Antiatt.* η 14): ἡκρόασο· ἀντὶ τοῦ ἡκροῶ. Ἀντιφάνης Ἐπιδαυρ<ι>ω.

This is the only known instance of the uncontracted pluperfect ending in Attic tragedy and comedy (see Lautensach 1896, 26). As in the case of the uncontracted imperfect 2nd-person middle-passive, ἡκρόασο was arguably developed because it was morphologically more transparent than the contracted form ἡκρώω.

## 1.5 Imperative

### 1.5.1 Imperative 2nd-person active ending of the root aorist

The 2nd-person ending -θι is replaced by the creation of new imperatives in -ᾱ by analogy with contracted verbs:

**ἀνάβα:** Men. fr. 134 (= *Antiatt.* α 99). **ἀπόστα:** Men. fr. 134 (= *Antiatt.* α 99) and fr. 278. **διάβα:** Men. fr. 134 (= *Antiatt.* α 99). **κατάβα:** Men. *Dysc.* 633 and fr. 134 (= *Antiatt.* α 99). **μετάβα:** Alex. fr. 14 (= *Antiatt.* μ 25). **παράστα:** Men. *DE* fr. 3.1 and *Th.* 28.

This development took place because the root aorists end in a vowel, thus exposing them to analogy with the contracted verbs. As pointed out by Tribulato (2014, 20) with reference to the entries in the *Antiatticist*, imperatives of this kind are already well-established in Aristophanes (ἔμβα occurs in *Ra.* 378 and *Ec.* 478, κα-τάβα in *V.* 979 and 980, πρόβα in *Ach.* 262) and Euripides (ἔμβα occurs in *El.* 113 and 128, ἐπίβα in *Ion* 167, ἔσβα in *Phoen.* 193, πρόβα alongside βᾶθι in *Alc.* 872). It would seem, then, that Middle and New Comedy reflect a development that 'belong[s] in Attic more to the spoken than to the literary language' (Arnott 1996,

<sup>263</sup> This is confirmed by the evidence for the 2nd-person singular imperative aorist πρίω over πρίασο (see Section C.1.5.3).

<sup>264</sup> The proparoxytone accent indicates that this form is a pluperfect. The imperfect would be ἡκροῖσο (\*ἐ- + ἀκροά- + -(σ)ο).



85; see also Stevens 1976, 63). This type of aorist imperative attracted the interest of ancient erudition beyond the entries in the *Antiatticist* quoted above.<sup>265</sup>

### 1.5.2 3rd-person active plural ending -τωσαν

The analogical imperative ending -τωσαν, replacing the earlier -όντων, was created by extension of the 3rd-person plural ending -σαν – which originally belonged to the aorist and later spread to the imperfect of the athematic verbs – to the imperative, where it was added to the 3rd-person singular ending -τω. The same happened in the middle-passive ending -σθων > -σθωσαν.<sup>266</sup> The first instances of this analogical imperative in literary texts are ἴτωσαν and ἔστωσαν in Euripides (respectively, *IT* 1480 and *Ion* 1131), and these analogical forms then become increasingly common in 4th-century BCE prose, as documented (to mention the most relevant examples) by Xenophon (20x), Isocrates (1x), Plato (24x in *Laws*), Demosthenes (4x), and Aeschines (9x). The new, analogical ending -τωσαν is attested only once in Middle and New Comedy:

**Men. Phasm. 29–30:** περιμαζάτωσάν σ' αἱ γυναῖκες ἐν κύκλῳ | καὶ περιθεωσάτωσαν.

Menander's use of the analogical imperative is unsurprising, especially compared to 4th-century BCE Attic literature. This is one of the many areas where literary texts are clearly ahead of the inscriptions in their use of linguistic innovations.<sup>267</sup>

Atticist lexicographers recommend the older -όντων over the newer -τωσαν.<sup>268</sup>

<sup>265</sup> See Tosi (1994a, 163–4) and especially the doxography compiled by S. Valente (2015b, 109 *ad Antiatt.* α 99). See also Chapter 7, Section 2 n. 12.

<sup>266</sup> Rosenkranz (1930, 153) refers to occurrences of the analogical ending in Thucydides, but they are not recorded in the editions by Hude (1898–1901); Jones, Powell (1942); Luschkat (1960); Alberti (1972–2000). However, one occurrence is known from Antiphon (Diels–Kranz 87 B 49: φέρε δὴ καὶ παῖδες γενέσθωσαν).

<sup>267</sup> As evidenced by Threatte (1996, 463–4), a mixed imperative -οντώσαν was developed as early as 352/351 BCE (the first occurrence is *IG* 2<sup>3</sup>.204.47–8). This ‘mixed’ ending is unattested in literature, but in inscriptions it was still used well into the 3rd century BCE. On the contrary, the endings -έτωσαν (present, thematic aorist) and -άτωσαν (sigmatic aorist), which are very common in 4th-century BCE Attic literature, are first attested in an inscription dating to 300/299 BCE (*IG* 2<sup>2</sup>.1263.44 ἀποτινέτωσαν) and then completely replace -όντων (and also -οντώσαν) during the Hellenistic period.

<sup>268</sup> The imperative ending -όντων is regarded as an Atticism (and thus proof that Homer was Athenian) by Homeric scholarship (see schol. (Ariston.) *Hom. Il.* 9.47a: <φευγόντων> ὅτι Ἀττικῶς ἀντὶ τοῦ φευγέτωσαν (A), schol. (V) *Hom. Od.* 1.273f: ἔστων] Ἀττικόν (E) / κατὰ ἀποκοπὴν τῆς -σα- (B), schol. (V (Ariston.)) *Hom. Od.* 1.340a.1: πινόντων ἀντὶ τοῦ (H) πινέτωσαν (BCEGHJM<sup>a</sup>NPVYks), Ἀττικῶς (EGHM<sup>1</sup>V), schol. (V (Ariston.?) *Hom. Od.* 4.214a: χευάντων ἐπιχεέτωσαν, Ἀττικῶς (BEM<sup>a</sup>NVYsy), schol. *Hom. Od.* 19.599: θέντων] [. . .] ἢ θεραπεινίδων θέντων κατ' Ἀττικὴν, ἢ θέτων ἀντὶ τοῦ θέτωσαν (H)).

*Su.* δ 1537 (= **Phryn. PS fr. \*302**): δρώντων, ἀντὶ τοῦ δράτῳσαν. χρήσθων, ἀντὶ τοῦ χρήσθωσαν. Ἀττικῶν δέ ἐστιν ἡ σύνταξις, ὥσπερ ποιούντων ἐκεῖνοι, ἀντὶ τοῦ ποιείτῳσαν, φρονούντων, ἀντὶ τοῦ φρονείτῳσαν, καὶ νοούντων, νοεῖτῳσαν (cf. schol. *Ar. Nu.* 439b (RVNMRs) and 453a (ENRs)). **Moer. α 27**: ἀγόντων ἁδόντων Ἀττικοί· ἀγέτῳσαν ἁδέτῳσαν Ἕλληνες.

### 1.5.3 (Un)contracted 2nd-person middle-passive imperative ending

Already in 5th-century BCE Attic there is evidence for the use of contracted middle-passive imperatives like ἴστω, τίθου, and κάθου. Such forms result from the transformation of these athematic verbs into thematic forms (i.e. ἴστημι > ἰστάω, τίθημι > τίθω, κάθημαι > κάθομαι), which caused the elimination of the intervocalic /s/ of the middle imperative ending -σο (i.e. athematic ἴστασο vs thematic ἴστα(σ)ο > ἴστω, athematic τίθεσο vs thematic τίθε(σ)ο > τίθου, athematic κάθησο vs thematic κάθε(σ)ο > κάθου). In Middle and New Comedy, the evidence for these forms is limited to κάθου:<sup>269</sup>

**κάθου**: *Alex. fr.* 226 (= *Antiatt.* κ 1); *Anaxandr. fr.* 14; *Diph. fr.* 8 (= *Antiatt.* κ 1); *Men. Dysc.* 931 and *fr.* 475.

The imperative κάθου already occurs in a fragment of Aristophanes (*fr.* 631), although he normally uses κάθησο (*Ach.* 59; *Ec.* 144, 169, 554; *Pl.* 724). Arnott (1996, 647) concludes that in Attic κάθου ‘was probably a colloquialism, confined so far to comedy’. It should be compared with the 2nd-person singular present indicative κάθη (vs athematic κάθησαι), which, as we know from Atticist sources, Hyperides also used (*fr.* 115 Jensen = *Antiatt.* κ 2). In post-Classical sources κάθου is confined to the lower koine (6x in LXX, 2x in the New Testament),<sup>270</sup> and it is also condemned by stricter Atticist lexicographers, while tolerated by Orus.<sup>271</sup>

**Moer. κ 49**: κάθησο Ἀττικοί· κάθου κοινόν. [**Hdn.**] **Philet. 90**: κάθησο ἐρεῖς, οὐχὶ κάθου. **Orus fr. A 57** (= [Zonar.] 1168.7–8): κάθου καὶ κάθησο, ἄμφω Ἑλληνικά. Ἀριστοφάνης (*fr.* 631)· ‘οὐχ ὅτι γ’ ἐκεῖνος ἔλαχεν. οἰμῶζων κάθου’. [. . .].

Aristophanes and Euripides prefer the older, athematic forms.<sup>272</sup> Except for κάθου, the poets of later comedy seem to share this preference (note ἀνίστασο in *Men.*

<sup>269</sup> For the other verbs see Lautensach (1918, 84–5; 87–8).

<sup>270</sup> See Blass, Debrunner (1976, 73).

<sup>271</sup> κάθου is indicated as an Atticism by schol. (ex.) *Hom. Il.* 2.191a1: κάθησο· κάθου Ἀττικῶς (T), schol. (ex.) *Hom. Il.* 2.191a2: τοῦτο οἱ Ἀττικοί κάθου λέγουσιν (b).

<sup>272</sup> See Lautensach (1918, 84–5 and 87–9); Willi (2003a, 247).

*Asp.* 299 and *Sic.* 363 and ἐπίστασο in *Diph. fr.* 4.1),<sup>273</sup> which will attract the criticism of Atticist lexicography.<sup>274</sup>

**Moer. α 32:** ἀνίστω Ἀττικοί· ἀνίστασο Ἑλληνες, **Moer. ε 65:** ἐπίστω Ἀττικοί· ἐπίστασο Ἑλληνες.

These elements make it difficult to agree with Lautensach (1918, 88–9) that later comedy usually favours the more recent contracted forms: the only form for which this is true is κάθου (which, however, is already used by Aristophanes).

## 1.6 Dual

A dual verb occurs only once in Middle and New Comedy:

**Henioch. fr. 5.15:** γυναῖκε δ' αὐτὰς δύο τaráττετόν τινε.

This highly uncommon case is easily explained, as it is part of a wider Aeschylean reminiscence (see Mastellari 2020, 260).<sup>275</sup>

## 2 Augment and reduplication

### 2.1 Augmented βούλομαι and δύναμαι

In Attic, βούλομαι, δύναμαι, and μέλλω occasionally have an augment ἡ-, which is analogical on ἡθελον.<sup>276</sup> In Middle and New Comedy the forms with ἐ- are still

<sup>273</sup> Another occurrence of ἀνίστασο is at least possible in *Men. Sic.* 269 (see Favi 2019b, 84–7).

<sup>274</sup> Interestingly, while κάθου was regarded as unacceptable by the Atticists, the contracted forms of ἀνίστημι and ἐπίσταμαι were recommended. Leaving aside the evidence from tragedy (which is usually problematic for the Atticists), these lexicographers were probably guided by the attestations in Aristophanes (ἐξίστω in *Ach.* 617), Ameipsias (ἀνίστω in *fr.* 31 (Σ<sup>b</sup> α 1429 = Phot. α 2009 = *Su.* α 2481, *ex* Σ)), and also Xenophon (ἐπίστω in *HG* 4.1.38, 5.4.33, *Cyr.* 3.2.16, 3.3.32). This preference for the contracted forms is confirmed by other verbs. As regards \*πρίσμαι (see Section C.1.4), the more recent contracted aorist imperative (ἀπο)πρίω is the better attested form (*Eup. fr.* 1.2; *Ar. Ach.* 34–5, *Ra.* 1227 and 1235; *Cephisod. fr.* 3.1–3; *Men. fr.* 394.1; note that Epicharmus too uses πρία in *fr.* 134.4, which means that this was a more widespread development in Greek, not just in Attic), while the older uncontracted form πρίασο is used only by the Theban merchant in Aristophanes' *Acharnians* (870) (on this detail as a means of linguistic characterisation, see Colvin 1999, 218).

<sup>275</sup> Poultney (1963, 367–8) discusses cases in Menander in which a plural verb is used where a dual might have been used instead (though with varying degrees of plausibility). For the rare case of dual verbs in Attic inscriptions, see Threatte (2020, 272; 274).

<sup>276</sup> See Batisti (forthcoming b).

predominant, and very often they are also metrically guaranteed (see Arnott 2002, 196–7). In rare cases, however, βούλομαι and δύναιμι have ἡ- instead of ἐ-:

ἡβουλ-: Alex. fr. 263.1 (Athenaeus' MSS CE); *com. adesp.* fr. 1147.31. ἡδύνω: Philipp. fr. 16.

ἡδύνω in Philippides is metrically guaranteed. ἡβουλόμην is first attested in Euripides (*Hel.* 752 and fr. 1132.28, neither metrically guaranteed) and then becomes as common as ἐβουλ- in 4th-century BCE prose. ἡδυνάμην is already metrically guaranteed in *Prometheus Bound* (206: οὐκ ἡδυνήθην) and is well-attested in 4th-century BCE prose. No instance of ἡμελλ- is known from Middle and New Comedy (the evidence for ἡμελλ- is collected by Arnott 2002, 197). The augment ἡ- is first attested on inscriptions around 350 BCE and then replaces ἐ- completely after 330 BCE (see Threatch 1996, 474). In the Imperial period the forms with ἡ- are favoured by Atticising writers and approved (but apparently not unanimously) by Atticist lexicographers (see Arnott 1996, 733).

**Moer. η 5:** ἡμελλον ἡβουλόμην ἡδυνάμην ἡῤῥάμην διὰ τοῦ ἡ· διὰ δὲ τοῦ ε Ἑλληνες. **Philemo (Vindob.) 394.10:** ἐβουλόμην· οὐκ ἡβουλόμην.

Presumably, since ἐ- is the rule in the koine, ἡ-, despite being only partly supported by occurrences in Classical Attic, was favoured because it differed from the koine form.

## 2.2 Augmented and reduplicated prefixed verbs

### 2.2.1 Augment before the prefix

Later comedy offers some examples where the augment is added before the prefix:

ἐδιακόνεις: Nicostr. fr. 34; *com. adesp.* fr. 1147.55–6. ἐκάθισαν: Men. fr. 631.5.

In some cases, this development was triggered by analogy, by the need to create morphologically transparent forms, and by the fact that the verb without the prefix is scarcely, if at all, attested. Many of these forms were already standard in 5th-century BCE Attic.<sup>277</sup> A case in point are the augmented (and reduplicated) forms of διακονέω, where the augment (or reduplication) appears before the prefix, which are standard in Attic (see esp. δεδιακόνηκεν in Archel. fr. 3.1–8),<sup>278</sup>

<sup>277</sup> See Lobeck (1820, 153–4; 155–6); K–B (vol. 2, 35); Chantraine (1961, 313).

<sup>278</sup> See Lautensach (1899, 145); Orth (2013, 64). Owing to its formation (διᾱ-, unclear derivation) and the fact that the verbal root is very opaque (see *DELG* s.v. διάκονος; *EDG* s.v. διάκονος), the verb διακονέω was probably not felt as having a prefix (indeed, if it was perceived as a denomi-

whereas forms like *διηκόνουν* belong to the koine.<sup>279</sup> As regards *καθίζω*, the earliest instances of the *ἐκάθισα* type are found in Xenophon (*An.* 3.5.17; *Cyr.* 6.1.23), Lysias (49.29), and Aeneas Tacticus (3.10), which makes it likely that *ἐκάθισα* was a ‘New’ Attic feature (but in the imperfect, see already *ἐκαθίζου* in *Ar. V.* 824 and *ἐπεκάθιζεν* in *Eup. fr.* 102.5).<sup>280</sup>

### 2.2.2 Double augment and reduplication

Double augment and double reduplication are not uncommon in literary Attic.<sup>281</sup> An example in Middle and New Comedy is represented by the imperfect and perfect forms of *παροινέω*:

*ἐπαρῶνουν*: *Men. Pc.* 410. *πεπαρῶνήκασι*: *Henioch. fr.* 5.18. *πεπαρῶνηκε*: *Men. Dysc.* 93.

Double-augmented *ἐπαρῶνουν*, both in the imperfect and in the aorist, is paralleled in Xenophon (*An.* 5.8.5) and Demosthenes (22.62, 22.63, 23.114, 54.4). The perfect with double reduplication also occurs in Aeschines (2.154) and is approved by Atticist lexicography.

**Moer. π 85:** *πεπαρῶνηκεν Ἀττικοί· παροίνικεν Ἕλληνες.*

No occurrences of the forms with only one augment or reduplication are known in Attic. The forms with a double augment or double reduplication were therefore standard.

A more problematic example of double reduplication is that of *διοικέω*:

---

nal from *διάκονος*, then the external augment is expected). See especially *Antiatt.* δ 1 and *Orus fr. A* 6a (= [Zonar.] 213.6–13), who mentions the perfect *δεδιακόνηκα* used by Demosthenes (51.7), *Moer.* δ 10, where *Moeris* opposes *δεδιακόνηκα* employed by the users of Attic with *διηκόνηκα* employed by the users of Greek, and *Philemo* (*Laur.*) 359, who records *δεδιακόνηκα*. A similar case to *διακονέω* may be made regarding *διαιτάω*, which originally is not a prefixed verb (see *Antiatt.* ε 3). See also *Phryn. Ecl.* 19 proscribing the treatment of *περισσεύω* as a prefixed verb.

<sup>279</sup> As regards *Alcaeus Comicus*, quoted by *Antiatt.* ε 2 (*ἐδιακόνουν· Ἀλκαῖος Ἐνδυμίῳ* (*fr.* 13)), *Orth* (2013, 64) envisages the possibility that *Alcaeus’* violation of the Attic norm consisted in his use of *διηκόνουν* instead of *ἐδιακόνουν* (such a hypothesis would be paralleled by *Moer.* δ 10, see the previous note). But the Atticist doctrines concerning the augmented forms of *διακονέω* are a more complicated case than it appears (see *Antiatt.* ε 2; *Moer.* δ 21; *Batisti* forthcoming e).

<sup>280</sup> On the contrary, in the case of *κάθημαι* the type *ἐκαθήμην* is already standard in the 5th century BCE (see *LSJ s.v. κάθημαι*). In Attic inscriptions, forms such as *κάθημαι* and *καθιζάνω* regularly have the augment before the prefix, but the evidence is limited and much later (see *Threatte* 1996, 498).

<sup>281</sup> See *Lobeck* (1820, 154); *K–B* (vol. 2, 35); *Lautensach* (1899, 159–65). The only double-augmented forms which occur in Attic inscriptions belong to the imperfect of *ἀμφοισβήτω* (*ήμφοισβήτου*) (see *Threatte* 1996, 496).

**δεδιωκημένα:** Antiph. fr. 153 (= *Antiatt.* δ 3). **δεδιωκηκώς:** Men. *Pc.* 82.

Unlike παροινέω, the forms of διοικέω with a regular augment are standard in 5th- and 4th-century BCE Attic (Thucydides, Isocrates, Isaeus, Demosthenes, etc.). Thus, the perfect forms with double reduplication found in Antiphanes and Menander may be an innovative development of later Attic.<sup>282</sup>

However, there are exceptions. Although ἐνοχλέω usually has a double augment (i.e. ἠνώχλουν, which is attested in 4th-century BCE prose in Isocrates, Lysias, Xenophon, Demosthenes, Aeschines, etc.), Menander uses the form with only the temporal augment.

**ἐνώχλει:** Men. *Dysc.* 680.

Atticist lexicography approved instead of the form with the double augment.

**Phot. η 200:** ἠνείχετο καὶ ἠνώχλει καὶ ἠκηκόει καὶ ἠντῆιβόλει· κοινὸν τῶν Ἀττικῶν ἰδίωμα.

The closest comparandum in literature is ἐνώχλησεν in Diodorus (19.45.1), but we should point out that the Ptolemaic papyri provide several parallels for the form used by Menander.<sup>283</sup> In this specific case, since ἠνώχλει would have been unmetrical, we may wonder whether for metrical purposes Menander used a form which otherwise belonged to a lower register or was in some way more ‘international’ because it had the standard augment.

Atticist lexicographers recommend the use of double-augmented and double-reduplicated forms over the more regular ones for other verbs as well.

**Moer. η 8:** ἠνέσχετο Ἀττικοί· ἀνέσχετο Ἕλληνες. Double-augmented verbs were discussed by Orus as part of a larger examination of the use and placing of the augment: **Orus fr. A 6a** (= [Zonar.] 213.6–13, cf. Cramer, *AP* vol. 4, 113.24–31 and 114.8–13): ἀνέωγε χρή λέγειν καὶ <\*\*\*> ἀνέωκται Φερεκράτης <\*\*\*> (fr. 91): ‘οὐδεις <\*\*\*> δ’ ἀνέωγέ μοι θύραν’, καὶ ὁ Πλάτων (*Phd.* 59d.5–6): ‘ἀνέωγετο γὰρ οὐ πρῶ’ καὶ ὁ Δημοσθένης (24.208): ‘ἀνέωκται τὸ δεσμωτήριον’ καὶ <\*\*\*> ἐν Θετταλ(ῇ) (Men. fr. 170): ‘καὶ τὸ κεράμιον | ἀνέωχας <\*\*\*>’. τὸ δὲ ἠνοίγε καὶ ἠνοίγετο καὶ ἠνοικται δεινῶς βάρβαρα, οἷς νῦν χρῶνται ἐπιεικῶς ἅπαντες. τὸ δὲ ἀνέωγε δύο σημαίνει, τὸ μὲν οἷον ἀνέωκται, τὸ δ’ οἷον ἀνέωγνυ. οὐ μὴν ἐν ἅπασί γε τοῖς συνθέτοις τὰς προθέσεις οἱ Ἀττικοὶ φυλάττουσι, ἀλλὰ εἰσιν ἀνώμαλοι καὶ ἐν τούτῳ. ἐπεὶ οὖν πολλῶν ἀναδιπλοῦσι τὰς προθέσεις, λέγουσι γοῦν καὶ ‘δεδιακόνηκα’ (D. 51.7) καὶ ‘δεδιώκηκα’ καὶ ἄλλα τοιαῦτα. καὶ † τῆς ἄνευ † προθέσεως Θουκυδίδης (7.77.2) ‘δεδιήτημαι’ καὶ Δημοσθένης (21.96 καὶ τὴν δίκην ἣν κατεδιήτησεν ἀποδεδητημένην ἀπέφηνεν?) ‘καταδεδητημένον τὴν δίκην’ (the double augment or double redu-

<sup>282</sup> See also δεδιώκηται in Machon 76 Gow and δεδιωκῆσθαι in Philodem. *Περὶ ῥητορικῆς* col. c11a.17; c11a.21.

<sup>283</sup> See ἐνώχλ[οῦμην] in P.Cair.Zen. 3.59435.3 (= TM 1075) (provenance unknown, mid-3rd century BCE), ἐνώχλει in P.Cair.Zen. 4.59637.5 (= TM 1268) (provenance unknown, mid-3rd century BCE), ἐνώχληθη in P.Hamb. 1.27.4 (= TM 2306) (Arsinoites, 250 BCE), ἐνώχληκεν PSI 5.539.4 (= TM 2161) (Arsinoites, mid-3rd century BCE).

plication is standard in the compounds of -αἰτάω, see also Thuc. 1.132.2 ἐξεδεδιήτητο and D. 55.31 καὶ νῦν αὐτὸς ἐρήμην μου καταδεδιήτηται τοιαύτην ἐτέραν δίκην) καὶ Νικόστρατος (fr. 34)· ‘εἰπέ μοι τίνι ἐδιακόνεις’. λέγουσι δὲ καὶ ‘ἡγγύησε’ καὶ ‘κατηγγύησεν’ καὶ Εὐρυπιδῆς (fr. 1104) ‘ἐπροξένει’ καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης (fr. 820) ‘ἐπροτίμων’ καὶ Ἡρόδοτος ‘ἐσυνείθικας’. καίτοι οἱ γραμματικοὶ φασιν αἱ προθέσεις οὐκ ἀναδιπλοῦνται (see also Theodoridis *ad* Phot. ε 1847 for the treatment of the augmented verbs with προ-, who also refers to the parallel doctrine contained in the short treatise on the augmented verbs in *Anecdota Graeca* vol. 2, 310.19–20, ed. Bachmann 1828); **Orus fr. A 6b** (= Σ<sup>b</sup> α 1338 (= Phot. α 1905, *Su.* α 2282, *ex* Σ<sup>γ</sup>)): ἀνέωγε, οὐχὶ ἤνοιγε, καὶ ἀνέωγετο λέγουσι, καὶ <\*\*\*> Θρασυλέοντι γ’ ἢ δ’ (Men. fr. 184)· ‘ἢ δ’ ἀνέωγε τὴν θύραν’ <καί> Θετταλῇ (Men. fr. 170)· ‘καὶ τὸ κεράμιον | ἀνέωχας· ὅζεις, ἱερόσυλ’, οἴνου πολὺ’. Εὐπολῖς Πόλεσιν (fr. 236)· ‘ὄν οὐκ ἀνέωξα πώποτ’ ἀνθρώποις ἐγώ’, Φερεκράτης Κραπατάλοις (fr. 91)· ‘οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἐδέχετ’, οὐδ’ ἀνέωγέ μοι θύραν’.

### 3 Verbal stems and verbal conjugation

#### 3.1 Thematisation of athematic verbs

##### 3.1.1 Thematisation of athematic δίδωμι, τίθημι, ἵημι, and ἴστημι

Already in archaic and Classical times, the athematic verbs δίδωμι, τίθημι, ἵημι, and ἴστημι progressively developed new forms resembling those of the thematic conjugation which arose by analogy with contracted verbs.<sup>284</sup> Early evidence of this comes from 5th- and 4th-century BCE Ionic literature (e.g. Herodotus and the *corpus Hippocraticum*). Through Ionic influence, this innovative conjugation of athematic verbs penetrated into Attic, in the first stages presumably at a more colloquial level. The fragments of later comedy testify to the use of thematic presents in place of athematic δίδωμι and ἵημι in the following two cases:

**Διδοῦσι**: Antiph. fr. 154 (= *Antiatt.* δ 8). **συνιεῖς**: Alex. fr. 129.6; Diph. fr. 31.13.<sup>285</sup>

The thematic conjugation only becomes a more widely attested development in the koine, where it was fully developed.<sup>286</sup>

Atticist lexicographers are wary of the thematised forms.<sup>287</sup>

**Phryn. Ecl. 215**: διδοῦσιν· ἐν τῷ Περὶ εὐχῆς Φαβωρίνος (fr. 8) οὕτω λέγει, δεόν διδόασιν· τὸ γὰρ διδοῦσιν ἄλλο τι σημαίνει {τὸ δεῖν}. **Phryn. PS 89.4**: μεθιστάναι καὶ ἰσθάναι· οὐχὶ μεθιστάνειν καὶ

<sup>284</sup> See Schwyzer (1939, 687–8). We have already touched upon partly related problems (see Section C.1.4; Section C.1.5.3).

<sup>285</sup> The reasons for choosing συνιεῖς over συνίης, which would be metrically equivalent, are discussed by Arnott (1996, 369–70).

<sup>286</sup> See Mayser (*Gramm.* vol. 1, 2, 122–4); Schwyzer (1939, 688). This is the context where forms such as Modern Greek δίδω, δίδεις originate.

<sup>287</sup> See Benuzzi (2024a).

ιστάνειν. **Antiatt.** § 8: διδοῦσιν· οὐ διδῶσιν. †Ἀριστοφάνης† (Antiph. fr. 154) Μητροφῶντι. **Moer.** ι 17: ιστάναι Ἀττικοί, ιστάνειν Ἑλληνες.

### 3.1.2 Thematisation of the verbs in -νυμι in -νύω

The verbs ending in -νυμι develop a new thematic conjugation in -νύω, but athematic forms also survive in Middle and New Comedy.

**δείκνυμι:** δείκνυσι (Men. fr. 693.2), ὑποδείκνυσιν (Men. *Dysc.* 840), δείκνυται/δείκνυται(αι) (Men. *Dysc.* 768 and fr. 339.2), δεικνύντες (Antiph. fr. 234.5). **δεικνύω:** δεικνύω (Men. fr. 607.3), ὑποδεικνύεις (Nicom. fr. 1.1), δεικνύει (Men. fr. 74.2), δεικνύειν (Alex. fr. 110.25). **ἐννυμι:** ἀμφιέννυται (Anaxil. fr. 34.2). **καταγνύω:** καταγνύει (Eub. fr. 107.13). **κεράννυμι:** κεράννυται (Men. *Sam.* 673; Antiph. fr. 24.3; Alex. fr. 53.4), κεραννύναι (Apollod. fr. 5.25). **κεραννύω:** ἐγκεραννύω (Eub. fr. \*93.1), κεραννύει (Theophil. fr. 2.2), κεραννύουσιν (Alc.Com. fr. 15.1). **μ(ε)ιγνύω:** μιγνύειν (Damox. fr. 2.60). **ὀλλυμι:** ἐξόλλυσιν (Men. *Pc.* 230), ἀπόλλυται (Men. fr. 64.8), ἀπωλλύμεσθ(α) (Men. fr. 644). **ὀλλύω:** ἀπολλύει (Men. *Epit.* 437 and 1106, fr. 420.3), ἀπολλύων (Men. fr. 401.3). **ὀμνυμι:** ὀμνυμι (Men. fr. 239.1; Antiph. fr. 185.1), συνόμνυται (Men. *Sam.* 474). **ὀμνύω:** ὀμνύω (Men. *Col.* 45, *Pc.* 95, fr. \*96.1), ὀμνύει (Diph. fr. 101.2), ὀμνυ(ε) (Men. *Sam.* 311), ὀμνύων (Men. fr. 747.1; Alex. fr. 133.8), ἐπομνύουσα (Epicr. fr. 8.2), ὀμνύοντος (Antiph. fr. 237.1), ὀμνύοντι (Amph. fr. 42.1), ὀμνύουσι (Alex. fr. 165.1). **ρήγνυμι:** διαρρηγνύμενον (Men. fr. 316.2). **σβέννυμι:** σβέννυ (Ephipp. fr. 5.21). **σκεδάννυμι:** δ[ια]σκεδάν[νυνται(αι)] (Men. *Epit.* 612). **στόρνυμι/στρώννυμι:** στόρνυται (Eub. fr. 132.1), ἐστρώννυτο (Men. *Dysc.* 943).

This process is already attested in late-5th- and early-4th-century BCE Attic prose (5x in Thucydides, 1x in Antiphon, 8x in Andocides, 1x in Pseudo-Xenophon's *Constitution of the Athenians*; these occurrences are collected by Rosenkranz 1930, 152; see also Chapter 4, Section 2.1). La Roche (1893, 155–60) collects a wealth of examples in Classical and post-Classical authors and concludes that the thematic conjugation can occur in any form of the present and imperfect (La Roche 1893, 155). We should point out, however, that the new thematic conjugation is limited to the active forms. As far as Old Comedy is concerned, the only evidence is κώμνύουσι in Pherecr. fr. 152.9 and συμπαραμειγνύων in Ar. *Pl.* 719 (see Willi 2003a, 248). The evidence from Middle and New Comedy is more abundant than in earlier comedy, although compared to the prose instances it seems that in comedy we have no example of the thematic conjugation in the imperfect.

The new thematic conjugation in -νύω generally attracted the criticism of Atticist lexicographers, although some adopted an approach that was more nuanced (and occasionally also tolerant, at least of ‘semi-thematic’ forms).<sup>288</sup>

<sup>288</sup> See Benuzzi (2024b). The entries in Moeris' lexicon envisage a tripartite system where the Old Attic form is δεικνύσι (< \*δείκνυ-νσι < \*δείκνυ- + -ντι), the late Attic form is δεικνύασι, and the koine form is thematic δεικνυοῦσι. However, forms like δεικνύσι are not quite common in Attic, and so the criteria regulating Moeris' doctrine require more careful scrutiny.



**Phryn. PS 10.22–3:** ἀπολλύασιν· ὥσπερ δεικνύασι καὶ ὀμνύασιν. Ἀττικῶς ἀντὶ τοῦ ὀμνύουσι καὶ δεικνύουσι καὶ ἀπολλύουσιν. **Phryn. PS 70.18–21:** ἐπιδείκνυ· τὸ προστακτικὸν Ἀττικῶς, <ἀντί> τοῦ ἐπιδείκνυε. τὸ θέμα αὐτοῦ δείκνυμι, ὥσπερ καὶ ὄλλυμι ὄλλυ καὶ τὰ ὅμοια. τὸ δ' ἐπιδείκνυε ἀπὸ τοῦ δεικνύω. **Moer. α 20:** Attic ἀπολλύς vs Greek ἀπολλύων. **Moer. α 43:** Attic ἀπολλύασιν vs Greek ἀπόλλυσιν (but the text of this entry requires re-examination). **Moer. δ 29:** Attic δεικνύσι vs Greek δεικνύουσιν (but note also late Attic δεικνύασι). **Moer. ζ 1:** Attic ζεύγνυμι vs Greek ζευγνύω. **Moer. ζ 8:** Attic ζευγνύσιν vs Greek ζευγνύουσιν (but note also late Attic ζευγνύσαιν). **Moer. ο 15:** Attic ὀλλύασιν and ὀμνύασιν vs Greek ὀλλύουσιν and ὀμνύουσιν. **Moer. ρ 5:** Attic ῥηγνύασιν vs Greek ῥηγνύουσιν and ῥήσουσιν. **Philemo (Vindob.) 393.8 = (Laur.) 359:** δείκνυμι ζεύγνυμι· οὐ ζευγνύω. **Philemo (Vindob.) 394.14:** ζεύγνυσιν· οὐχὶ ζευγνύει. Σ<sup>b</sup> α 1887 (= *Si.* α 3427 = Phot. α 2552, ex Σ; this entry was edited as **Ael.Dion. α 160** by Erbse and as **Orus fr. B 36** by Alpers): ἀπολλύειν καὶ ἀπολλύναι, διττῶς λέγουσι. καὶ ἀποδεικνύναι καὶ ἀποδεικνύειν, καὶ πάντα τὰ ὅμοια. **Philemo (Vindob.) 392.5 = (Laur.) 355:** ἀνοιγνύουσι· οὐκ ἀνοίγουσι.

### 3.2 Aorist

#### 3.2.1 Alphathematic aorist

By analogy with the sigmatic aorist, the thematic aorist developed a form in which -α- replaces the thematic vowels -ε- and -ο-. This process becomes extremely common in post-Classical Greek, but the forms εἴπα and ἤνεγκα are already attested in 5th-century BCE Attic and, indeed, in Homer.<sup>289</sup> The precociousness of this development in the case of εἴπα and ἤνεγκα is reflected in the approval of these forms by Atticist lexicography.

**Phryn. PS 73.1–3:** ἤνεγκον· ἀπὸ τῆς ἐνεγκῶν μετοχῆς, ὡς ἀπὸ τῆς (Bekker: τοῦ cod.) δραμῶν ἔδραμον. τὸ δὲ ἤνεγκα ἀπὸ τῆς ἐνέγκας. ἄμφω μὲν οὖν δόκιμα. **Phryn. PS 63.8–10:** διενέγκει καὶ διενέγκοι· ἄμφω δόκιμα. ἔστι δὲ τὸ μὲν διενέγκοι ἀπὸ τῆς ὀξυτόνου μετοχῆς, ὡς δραμῶν δράμοι, τὸ δὲ διενέγκειν ἀπὸ τῆς διενέγκας, ὡς γράψας γράψειν. Phot. η 198 (= **Ael.Dion. η 10**): ἤνεγκα καὶ ἤνεγκον· ἄμφω λέγουσιν· τὸ μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐνέγκαι, τὸ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐνεγκεῖν. Eust. in *Od.* 1.84.22–6: τὸ δὲ ἔειπες, ἔχει τις γράψαι καὶ ἔειπας. φησὶ γὰρ Αἴλιος Διονύσιος (= **Ael.Dion. ε 22**) ὅτι εἶπον καὶ εἴπα, ἀμφοτέρω παρὰ Ἀττικοῖς. μᾶλλον δὲ, τὸ πρότερον. καὶ τὰ προστακτικά δὲ, ἀμφοτέρως, εἶπε καὶ εἶπὼν. ὀξυτόνως. καὶ αἱ μετοχαί, ὁ εἰπὼν καὶ ὁ εἶπας. ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι καθάπερ εἶπον καὶ εἴπα, οὕτω καὶ ἤνεγκα καὶ ἤνεγκον (cf. **Ael.Dion. η 10**). καὶ μᾶλλον τοῦτο. ὡς ὁ κωμικὸς ἐν Λυσιστράτῃ (943)· ‘τάλαιν’ ἐγώ. τὸ ρόδιον ἤνεγκον μύρον’. τοῦ δὲ ἐτέρου, χρήσις παρ’ Εὐριπίδῃ (i.e. *Soph. El.* 13)· ‘ἤνεγκα κάξέσωσα’.

In turn, Atticist lexicographers proscribed any other alphathematic forms.

**Phryn. Ecl. 110:** εὐρασθαι οὐκ ἔρεῖς προπαροξυτόνως διὰ τοῦ α, ἀλλὰ παροξυτόνως διὰ τοῦ ε εὐρέσθαι. **Phryn. Ecl. 154:** ἀφείλατο· ὅσοι διὰ τοῦ α λέγουσιν, ἀσχημονοῦσιν, δέον διὰ τοῦ ε λέγειν ἀφείλετο· καὶ ἀφειλόμην δεῖ λέγειν διὰ τοῦ ο, ἀλλὰ μὴ διὰ τοῦ α. **Phryn. Ecl. 327:** ἀγαγον· καὶ

<sup>289</sup> See Chantraine (2013, 372–3).

τοῦτο, εἰ μὲν μετοχὴν εἶχε τὴν ἀγάγας, ἐν λόγῳ ἂν τινι ᾦν. λεκτέον οὖν ἄγαγε, καὶ γὰρ ἡ μετοχὴ ἀγαγών, ὡς ἄνελε ἀνελών. **Orus fr. A 16a** (= [Zonar.] 357.26–358.7): ἀφείλετο, οὐκ ἀφείλατο, καὶ προεί<λε>το καὶ πάντα τὰ ὅμοια, ἐφ’ ὧν καὶ τὸ δεῦτερον πρόσωπον διὰ τῆς ου συλλαβῆς καὶ τὸ πρῶτον διὰ τοῦ ο. ἐφ’ ὧν δὲ τὸ πρῶτον διὰ τοῦ α, τὸ μὲν δεῦτερον διὰ τοῦ ω, τὸ δὲ τρίτον πάλιν διὰ τοῦ α, οἶον· ἐποιήσασθην, ἐποιήσω, ἐποιήσατο· ἐγραψάμην, ἐγράψω, ἐγράψατο. ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν προτέρων· εἰλόμην, εἶλου, εἶλετο· ἡρόμην, ἦρου, ἦρετο. **Orus fr. A 16b** (= Σ<sup>b</sup> α 2504 and α 2505, which de Bories edited as **Phryn. PS fr. \*287** and **fr. \*288** based on the parallel entry in the *Eclogue*): ἀφείλετο καὶ τὰ ὅμοια διὰ τοῦ ε, ἐφ’ ὧν τὸ πρῶτον πρόσωπον διὰ τοῦ ο, τὸ δὲ δεῦτερον διὰ τῆς ου. ὅτε δὲ τὸ πρῶτον διὰ τοῦ α τότε τὸ δεῦτερον διὰ τοῦ ω. ἀφειλόμην διὰ τοῦ ο, τὰ δὲ βάρβαρα διὰ τοῦ α, οἶον ἀφειλάμην καὶ ἀφείλατο, ὁμοίως καὶ τὸ ἀφείλω. τὸ δὲ ἀνάλογον ἐπὶ πάντων ἐστὶ τῶν ὁμοίων. **Philemo (Laur.) 354**: ἀφείλετο· ἀφείλατο βάρβαρον.

Consequently, we shall discuss alphathematic εἶπα and ἡνεγκα separately from the other forms.

In Middle and New Comedy there is considerable evidence for alphathematic εἶπα and ἡνεγκα.

**εἶπα**: εἶπα (Men. *Pc.* 128; Alex. fr. 2.3; Athenio fr. 1.38; Euang. fr. 1.1; Philem. fr. 133.1), προσεἶπα (Men. *Dysc.* 106), ὑπεἶπα (Men. *Asp.* 130), εἶπας (Men. *Pc.* 119), ἀντεἶπας (Men. *Dysc.* 877), ὑπεἶπας (Men. *Asp.* 330), ἀντεἶπαμι (*com. adesp.* fr. 1000.10), εἶπας (Demon. fr. 1.3; Philem. fr. 42.3), προεἶπας (Dion.Com. fr. 2.2), <ὑπ>εἶπας (Men. *Mis.* 54), εἶπον (Men. *Dysc.* 410; Euphro fr. 3.3). **ἡνεγκα**: ἡνέγκατο (restored by Kaibel in Men. fr. 296.11), εἰσηνέγκατ(ο) (Athenio fr. 1.29), ἀπενέγκαμι (Alex. fr. 112.6), ἀπενεγκάτω (Nicostr. fr. 19.2), διενεγκάτω (Men. *Ench.* 17), ἐνεγκον (Anaxipp. fr. 8.2), εἰσενέγκας (Demetr. II fr. 1.9), ἐνέγκα[σθαι] (Men. *Epit.* 788).

ἡνεγκα is well attested in 5th-century BCE Attic literature.<sup>290</sup> As far as the Attic inscriptions are concerned, however, ἡνεγκα is first attested in the 360s (see Threatch 1996, 550–3). With regard to εἶπα, the evidence from 5th-century BCE Attic literature is scantier.<sup>291</sup> In Aristophanes, the alphathematic forms are limited to the 2nd-person indicative εἶπας and the imperative (23x), while the poets of Middle and New Comedy extend the alphathematic inflection to the 1st person (though see εἶπον in Men. *Dysc.* 410, *Sam.* 489, fr. 447, Nicol. fr. 1.19, ἀπεἶπον in Diph. fr. 31.8), the active and middle participle, and presumably also to the 2nd person of the imperative active (i.e. εἶπον in Men. *Dysc.* 410 and Euphro fr. 3.3; the latter is a difficult passage, see Chapter 4, Section 4.3). There is also an occurrence of the optative ἀντεἶπαμι in the comic *adespoton* commonly known as the *mulieris oratio* (*com. adesp.* fr. 1000), which is certainly a passage from New Comedy (the isolated use of the alphathematic optative may, but need not, indicate a later date).<sup>292</sup> We cannot exclude the possibility that εἶπα was more widespread

<sup>290</sup> The evidence from tragedy and comedy is collected by Lautensach (1911a, 101–7).

<sup>291</sup> An overview of the occurrences in tragedy and comedy is provided by Lautensach (1911a, 107–14).

<sup>292</sup> On the authorship see Stama (2017); Bonollo (2017–2018).

in the spoken language than it appears in literary texts. Although it is under-represented in Attic inscriptions from the 5th and 4th centuries BCE, the optative εἶπαι already occurs in an early Classical graffito (see Threatte 1996, 549–50).

The case of ἡνράμην is different. According to Threatte (1996, 533), ἡνράμην is more likely a true asigmatic aorist (i.e. like ἔφηναι) rather than an alphathematic one. Despite Threatte's claim, the latter interpretation remains more appealing. The evidence for εὐράμενος in Hes. fr. 235.3 Merkelbach–West, to which Threatte refers, is insufficient: editors of Hesiod do not accept the form on account of its rarity, especially at such an early date as Hesiod's. There are two relevant occurrences in Middle and New Comedy.

**ἡνράμην:** ἀνῆνράτο (Timocl. fr. 6.4; Athenaeus' MSS have -ατο, emended into -ετο by Walpole, followed by Kassel, Austin), ἐξῆνράτο (Men. fr. 125.4).

The occurrence in Menander is now generally accepted (Meineke had suggested restoring ἐξῆνράτο, although Kassel, Austin retain the unanimously transmitted alphathematic form). On the contrary, editors are generally more cautious concerning the possibility that Timocles may already have used the aorist ἀνῆνράτο.

In literary texts outside comedy, the aorist ἡνράμην only begins to appear in Hellenistic and Imperial koine (LXX 2Es. 4.19 εὐράμεν; 4Ma. 3.14 ἀνευράμενοι, often in the New Testament) and then especially in Imperial prose (*passim* in Philo, Josephus, Plutarch, etc.). The earliest occurrences available in documentary sources also date from Roman times.<sup>293</sup> Thus, to accept that Menander used ἐξῆνράτο, we would have to regard it as a very early piece of evidence for the development of the alphathematic form. If we accept this, Timocles too may have used the alphathematic form. However, since the alphathematic ἡνράμην is hard to find before much later times, the restoration of the expected thematic aorist in all places is perhaps the more balanced option.<sup>294</sup>

The aorist infinitive ὀσφρᾶσθαι (from ὠσφράμην, present ὀσφραίνομαι), in place of the expected thematic form ὀσφρέσθαι (from the thematic aorist ὠσφρόμην), is the transmitted reading of all Athenaeus MSS in Antiphanes (fr. 145.6), but ὀσφρέσθαι was restored by Elmsley and is generally accepted. Although the aorist ὠσφραντο is possibly also attested in Hdt. 1.80.5 (but the editors disagree),<sup>295</sup> the

<sup>293</sup> See Gignac (1981, 240); Threatte (1996, 533).

<sup>294</sup> For a similar conclusion concerning this and other similar forms, see Lautensach (1911a, 114–5), who also discusses ἐνέπεσαν in Philem. fr. 126.3.

<sup>295</sup> Rosén (1987–1997 vol. 1, 53) retains the unanimously transmitted reading ὠσφραντο, while Hude (1927 vol. 1, *ad loc.*) and N. G. Wilson (2015 vol. 1, 48) adopt Krüger's ὠσφροντο.

instances in Attic are very likely to be intrusions of late Greek during the transmission of the text.<sup>296</sup>

### 3.2.2 Sigmatic aorists in place of thematic aorists

A new sigmatic aorist ἔλειψα developed in place of the expected ἔλιπον as part of a more general tendency towards more regular forms, documented as early as the 5th century BCE by the use of ἔλεξα in tragedy and Thucydides and by ἄξαι in Antiphon (5.46).

λείψας: Antiph. fr. 33 (= *Antiatt.* λ 17).

This new sigmatic aorist is rare, though not unparalleled, in the high koine (see παρελείψαμεν in Plb. 12.15.12 and Str. 6.3.10, παρελείψατε in Gal. *De dignoscendis pulsibus* 8.784.16 Kühn), while it is especially common in papyri and Christian writings.<sup>297</sup>

Atticist lexicographers proscribe the new sigmatic aorists, which replace the thematic one.

**Phryn. Ecl. 250:** ἵνα ἄξωσιν οὐ χρή λέγειν, ἀλλ' ἵνα ἀγάγωσιν. **Phryn. Ecl. 326:** ἐὰν ἄξης οὐδεὶς ἂν φαίη, ἀλλ' ἐὰν ἀγάγῃς. **Phryn. Ecl. 343:** ἐκλείψας οὐ δόκιμον, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἐκλιπών. **Antiatt. λ 17:** λείψας· ἀντὶ τοῦ λιπών. ἸἈριστοφάνης† Ἀνδρομέδα (Antiph. fr. 33).

### 3.2.3 Extension of the κ-suffix to the plural forms of the athematic aorists έδωκα, έθηκα, and ήκα

A typical development of the κ-aorists in Greek is the extension of the suffix -κ- from the singular to the plural persons. This kind of analogical development is already well underway in archaic epic and then lyric poetry, but is limited to the 3rd person plural (in Homer, Hesiod, and the *Homeric Hymns* έδωκαν/-έδωκαν occurs 6x, έθηκαν/-έθηκαν 9x, ήκαν/ήκαν 2x). The phenomenon probably originated by analogy with the 3rd person plural of the sigmatic aorist (e.g. έλυσαν). In 5th-century BCE texts, these analogical aorists are common in Ionic (the evidence is abundant in Herodotus), where they also begin to occur in the 1st and 2nd person plural. As regards Attic texts, the comparatively high number of occurrences in

<sup>296</sup> Kaibel (in Kassel, Austin *PCG* vol. 5, 306 *ad* Eup. fr. 7) also suspected that the reading όσφραίνεσθαι in Eupolis (fr. 7, quoted by Prisc. *Ars* 18.252), later also corrected to όσφρέσθαι by Elmsley, indicates that Priscian found όσφράσθαι. Even if this were the case (which is uncertain), this too may be purely an ancient corruption. See also Lautensach (1911a, 94); Kassel, Austin (*PCG* vol. 5, 306 *ad* Eup. fr. 7).

<sup>297</sup> See Reinhold (1898, 75); Gignac (1981, 291–2).

Euripides is probably due to Ionic influence,<sup>298</sup> but it should be noted that some traces of these analogical forms are also found in Antiphon (ἐδῶκατε in 5.77) and Thucydides (παρῆκαν in 4.38.1, ἀφῆκαν in 7.19.4), where they should not be emended. In Aristophanes and Old Comedy, the evidence is limited to just two instances, ξυνῆκαθ(ε) (*Ach.* 101) and παρέδωκαν (*Ar. Nu.* 968; since this passage is in anapestic tetrameter, the analogical form may be either metrically convenient or, more likely, a poeticism).<sup>299</sup> The only documented occurrence of the non-analogical form is ἔδοσαν in Aristophon (fr. 11.9), probably a metrical expedient. The instances in Middle and New Comedy are not many, but they confirm that the analogical forms are increasingly common in 4th-century BCE prose, as for instance in Xenophon (e.g. ἐδώκαμεν/-εδώκαμεν, ἐδῶκατε/-εδῶκατε, ἔδωκαν/-εδωκαν occur 15x, ἔδωκαν/-εδωκαν alone 10x) and Demosthenes (see, e.g., ἐδῶκατε and -εδῶκατε in 20.85, 20.86, 20.97, 20.120, 28.8, 57.6, though note that the older forms are still the norm: ἔδομεν/-έδομεν occurs 1x, ἔδοτε/-έδοτε 4x, and ἔδοσαν/-έδοσαν 50x). The fact that the analogical aorists only begin to appear in Attic inscriptions from the mid-4th century BCE is probably due to the conservative nature of epigraphic language.<sup>300</sup>

**δίδωμι:** ἀπεδώκαμεν (Alex. fr. 212.7), ἐδῶκατε (Alex. fr. 212.5), ἔδωκαν (Antiph. fr. 159.8), ἐξεδῶκατε (Men. *Fab. Incert.* 51), παρέδωκαν (Diph. fr. 31.11). **τίθημι:** ἀνέθηκαν (Men. fr. 417.2). **ἵημι:** ἀφίγηκαθ(ε) (Men. *Pc.* 176).

The occurrences in Middle and New Comedy are part of a general trend that is probably old in spoken Attic and already well-established at least by the last decades of the 5th century BCE (see also Chapter 4, Section 2.1). The fact that the older forms are almost unattested in Middle and New Comedy may well indicate that in 4th-century BCE spoken Attic the analogical forms had (almost) taken over.

### 3.2.4 Exchange between asigmatic and sigmatic aorist

The asigmatic aorist of γαμέω (ἐγνημα) was gradually replaced by an analogical sigmatic form (ἐγάμησα).

**Men. fr. 661:** ἐγάμησεν ἦν ἐβουλόμην ἐγώ.

<sup>298</sup> See Lautensach (1911a, 118–9).

<sup>299</sup> See Willi (2003a, 248).

<sup>300</sup> See Threatte (1996, 600–2; 604; 615–9).

Menander's fragment is the first and only Classical evidence for the emerging form (and as such it has puzzled scholars, see Kassel, Austin, *PCG* vol. 6,2 *ad loc.*),<sup>301</sup> which was condemned by Atticist lexicography.

**Philemo (Laur.) 358:** γῆμαι λέγεται οὐ γαμήσαι.

The new aorist is amply documented in the koine (LXX, the New Testament, Diodorus, Josephus, Epictetus, Artemidorus, later Christian writers like Clement of Alexandria and Origen, and also papyri and inscriptions) and occasionally also in some Atticist writers (Dio Chrysostom, Lucian).

### 3.2.5 'Strong' passive aorist in place of 'weak' forms

A fragment of Menander documents the replacement of a 'weak' aorist passive with the corresponding 'strong' one:

**Men. Dysc. 950:** καί τις βραχεῖσα προσπόλων εὐήλικος προσώπου.

The aorist participle βραχεῖσα indicates a person who has been drinking. In Euripides (*El.* 326 μέθη δὲ βρεχθείς) and Eubulus (fr. 123.2 βεβρεγμένος) the verb indicates someone who is drunk and loses his sense of shame; similarly, the βραχεῖσα girl in *Dyscolus* overcomes her shyness and dares to dance. The form used by Menander thus overlaps completely in semantics with the instances of ἐβρέχθην. While ἐβρέχθην is attested in Aristophanes, Xenophon, and Demosthenes, ἐβράχην is first attested in early Hippocratic treatises, while in Attic literature it first occurs in this *Dyscolus* passage and in Theophrastus (who alternates it with ἐβρέχθην); ἐβράχην is then abundantly documented in the koine. The spread of the 'strong' aorist ἐβράχην at the expense of the 'weak' aorist ἐβρέχθην may be an Ionic influence.

Even though it is far more common for a 'weak' aorist passive to replace the corresponding 'strong' form (see Willi 2003a, 249 regarding Aristophanes), the case of ἐβρέχθην and ἐβράχην is not isolated.<sup>302</sup> The aorist passive participle ὑποταγείς in Phryn.Com. fr. 62.2 presupposes the early development of the 'strong' aorist passive ἐτάγην alongside the regular ἐτάχθην, although the first occurrences of ἐτάγην generally point to Hellenistic times.<sup>303</sup> For instance, besides the 'weak' aorist passive ἐβλάφθην (already attested in Thucydides, Sophocles, Anti-

<sup>301</sup> The fragment *trag. adesp.* fr. \*194: ἐγάμησεν Ἑλένη τὸν θεοῖς στυγούμενον must be late: one expects the middle or the passive to go with a feminine subject (see LSJ s.v. I.3).

<sup>302</sup> Only a handful of cases are discussed here. See further Lautensach (1911a, 249–67).

<sup>303</sup> On this form and the objections raised by the scholars of Phrynichus Comicus, see Stama (2014, 303–4).

phon, later also in Plato and Demosthenes), in 4th-century BCE texts the ‘strong’ form ἐβλάβην occasionally appears too (X. *HG* 6.5.48, Pl. *Apol.* 38b.2, *Lg.* 769b.6) and will attract the criticism of Atticist lexicography (see below). A similar case is κρύπτω, whose ‘weak’ aorist passive ἐκρύφθην is replaced by ἐκρύβην in the koine.<sup>304</sup>

This kind of development is also discussed by Atticist lexicographers, who recommend using the ‘weak’ aorist and also take future forms into consideration.

**Moer. β 40:** βλαφθέντες Ἀττικοί· βλαβέντες Ἑλληνες. **Moer. η 21:** ἡρπάσθη Ἀττικοί· ἡρπάγη Ἑλληνες (this ‘strong’ aorist is not attested in later comedy yet, see Men. *Asp.* 86 ἡρπάσθη and Men. *Sic.* 357 ἄρπασθέν). **Moer. δ 16:** διαλλαχθήσονται <Ἀττικοί> διαλλαγήσονται <Ἑλληνες>.

### 3.2.6 Aorist passive in place of aorist middle

The middle voice is recessive, and in post-Classical times it was increasingly replaced by the passive.<sup>305</sup> A case that is relevant to the history of Attic is the replacement of the aorist middle of ἀποκρίνομαι and γίγνομαι with the intransitive passive aorist.<sup>306</sup>

**ἀποκρίνομαι:** ἀποκριθείς (? , Men. fr. 393). **γίγνομαι:** ἐγενήθη (Philem. fr. 95.2), γεννηθῆς (Philem. fr. 167.2).

The Atticist lexicographers’ claim (see below) that ἀπεκρίθην should mean ‘I was separated’, as opposed to ἀπεκρινάμην meaning ‘I answered’, is well exemplified in Classical texts (see Rutherford 1881, 186–8). However, the use of the aorist passive gradually expanded to cover the meaning of the middle, as will be especially common in the koine.<sup>307</sup> Rutherford (1881, 188–93) plausibly postulates an analogical spread on the model of deponent verbs, which in the aorist always, or at least from very early on, had an established passive deponent. He then collects ample evidence for other verbs for which the passive progressively gained ground in the aorist at the expense of the middle (though note that he also emphasises the reverse process, whereby the passive ἐδυνήθην was later replaced by the middle ἐδυνησάμην).<sup>308</sup> As regards ἀποκρίνω, early evidence of this extension in the use of the aorist passive is provided by Pherecrates (fr. 56.2, for which any attempt to

<sup>304</sup> This also developed in a new present κρύβω, condemned by Phryn. *Ecl.* 290.

<sup>305</sup> See Lautensach (1911b); Horrocks (2010, 103).

<sup>306</sup> We wish to thank Chiara Monaco for sharing her unpublished MA thesis with us, where this subject is discussed in more detail.

<sup>307</sup> See Mayser (*Gramm.* vol. 1,2, 157–8); de Foucault (1972, 72); Gignac (1981, 322–4).

<sup>308</sup> On the semantics of ἀποκρίνω and other ‘speech act middles’, see Allan (2003, 105–12; 163–5).



emend this reading is pointless)<sup>309</sup> and Xenophon (*An.* 2.1.22)<sup>310</sup> (further evidence in Rutherford 1881, 186–7). We may plausibly conclude that ἀπεκρίθην ‘I answered’ must already have been in use in 5th-century BCE Attic, perhaps at a less formal level. In the case of γίγνομαι, while epigraphic instances are lacking before the 1st century BCE,<sup>311</sup> early evidence of ἐγενήθην in place of ἐγενόμην is provided by Epicharmus (fr. 210 (= *Phryn. Ecl.* 79)), the Hippocratic writings (7x),<sup>312</sup> Democritus (Diels–Kranz 68 B 299), and Lysias (32.18 and fr. 62 Carey).<sup>313</sup> This suggests that the instances in late Attic comedy reflect a wider development in Greek.

Atticist lexicographers proscribe the passive forms, specifying in the case of ἀποκρίνομαι that the passive should be used in the concrete sense of ‘to be separated’ and the middle in the sense of ‘to answer’. The same issue is discussed by the Atticists with regard to the future forms of these verbs (which are unattested in Attic comedy, the only instances in Attic being Pl. *Prm.* 141e.1; 141e.6).<sup>314</sup>

**Phryn. Ecl.** 78: ἀποκριθῆναι· διττὸν ἀμάρτημα, ἔδει γὰρ λέγειν ἀποκρίνασθαι, καὶ εἰδέναι, ὅτι τὸ διαχωρισθῆναι σημαίνει, ὡπεροῦν καὶ τὸ ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ, τὸ συγκριθῆναι, <τὸ> εἰς ἓν καὶ ταῦτὸν ἔλθειν. εἰδὼς οὖν τοῦτο ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ ἀποδοῦναι τὴν ἐρώτησιν ἀποκρίνασθαι λέγε, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ διαχωρισθῆναι ἀποκριθῆναι. **Phryn. Ecl.** 79: γενηθῆναι· ἀντὶ τοῦ γενέσθαι παρὰ Ἐπιχάρμῳ (fr. 210), καὶ ἔστι Δώριον· ἀλλ’ ὁ ἀττικίζων γενέσθαι λεγέτω. **Antiatt.** α 10: ἀποκριθῆναι· οὐκ ἀποκρίνασθαι. **Σ<sup>b</sup> α 1874** (= **Phot.** α 2523–4, ex Σ<sup>γ</sup>): ἀποκριθῆναι· ἀποχωρισθῆναι. ἀποκρίνασθαι δὲ τὸ λόγον δοῦναι ἐρωτώμενον. ἀνακρίνειν δὲ τὸ διὰ λόγων ἐρωτᾶν. λέγεται μέντοι πού ἀποκρίνεται καὶ τὸ ἀποχωρίζεται. **Phot.** α 2526: ἀποκριθεῖς· ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀποκρινάμενος. Μένανδρος Φανίῳ (fr. 393).

In the case of other verbs, Atticist lexicographers seem to regard the passive forms as standard, possibly as a result of the early affirmation of the passive aorist in place of the middle.<sup>315</sup>

<sup>309</sup> See Pellettieri (2024a, 73–4; 75–6).

<sup>310</sup> Rutherford (1881, 187–8) rightly compared this with Xenophon’s retention of the archaism ἀμείβομαι: in the aorist Xenophon opts for the passive ἡμείφθην in place of ἡμειψάμην. See also Gautier (1911, 124).

<sup>311</sup> See Threatte (1996, 555).

<sup>312</sup> See Willi (2008, 149).

<sup>313</sup> The authenticity of Lys. 32, the oration against Diogeiton, is extremely likely, and the speech must date to the very last years of the 5th century BCE (see Carey 1989, 204; 208).

<sup>314</sup> On the following entries see also Tribulato (2014, 208–9).

<sup>315</sup> Evidence of this is the middle aorist διελέξαμην in Aristophanes (fr. 356 (= *Antiatt.* δ 11, Poll. 2.125)) vis-à-vis διελέχθην in – to mention but a few writers – Aristophanes (*Nu.* 425), Isocrates, Xenophon, Plato, Demosthenes, and Aeschines and in Attic inscriptions (see Threatte 1996, 557, but the earliest instance is in the early 3rd century BCE). The aorist middle διελέξαμην is thought to have been used as a euphemism for having a sexual relationship with someone, but this very meaning is also attested for διελέχθην, as shown by Ar. *Pl.* 1082 (see Pierson 1759, 121–2 commenting on Moer. δ 44: διαλέγεσθαι καὶ τὸ πλησιάζειν ταῖς γυναιξίν, ὡς Ὑπερείδης (fr. 171 Jensen)). The middle aorist διελέξαμην is likely an archaism, since it is already attested in Homer. See also



Although the occurrences of the passive aorist are marginal compared to the many more occurrences of the middle aorist, that the passive forms ἀπεκρίθην and ἐγενήθην are not isolated early instances of ‘late’ Greek in Middle and New Comedy is shown by the parallel development of other aorist passive forms at the expense of the corresponding aorist middle ones, such as ὠσφράνθην in place of ὠσφρόμην in Philemon and ἀπελογήθην in place of ἀπελογησάμην in Alexis.

**Philem. fr. 79.25–6:** τοὺς ἤδη νεκρούς, | ὅταν ὠσφρανθῶσι, ποιῶ ζῆν πάλιν. **Alex. fr. 12** (= *Antiatt.* α 111): ἀπολογηθῆναι· ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀπολογήσασθαι. Ἄλεξις Ἀμπελουργῶ.

Earlier evidence for ὠσφράνθην is in the Hippocratic corpus, then in the Aristotelian corpus and in Machon.<sup>316</sup> As regards ἀπελογήθην, Arnott (1996, 82–3) points out that the only parallels are in Antiphon’s *Tetralogies*, as already discussed by Pollux.

Atticist lexicographers also discuss and proscribe other cases where the future passive replaces the middle in later Greek.

**Moer. α 24:** ἀπαλλάσσεται Ἀττικοί· ἀπαλλαγῆσεται Ἑλλήνες. **Moer. α 36:** ἀχθέσεται Ἀττικοί· ἀχθεσθήσεται Ἑλλήνες. **Moer. γ 24:** γυμνάσεται Ἀττικοί· γυμνασθήσεται Ἑλλήνες. **Moer. τ 16:** τιμῆσεται Ἀττικοί· τιμηθήσεται Ἑλλήνες. **Orus fr. B 34** (= Σ<sup>b</sup> α 1869 = *Su.* α 3367, *Phot.* α 2530, *ex Σ*): ἀποκρινεῖται λέγουσι μάλλον ἢ ἀποκριθήσεται. Μένανδρος Κανηφόρῳ (fr. 199): ‘ἃ δ’ ἀποκρινεῖται, κἂν ἐγὼ λέγοιμί σοι’. Ὑποβολιμαῖα (fr. 382): ‘ὡς μηδὲν ἀποκρινουμένῳ δ’ οὕτω λαλεῖν’.

### 3.3 Future

#### 3.3.1 Middle future replaced by active future

A fairly large number of Greek verbs which normally occur in the active voice in the present are middle in the future.<sup>317</sup> In post-Classical times, however, due to the decreasing use of the middle voice, most of these forms begin to be used in the active in the future as well. The following lists collect the available evidence for a selection of high-frequency verbs in Middle and New Comedy, taking into account the evidence for both the middle and the active voice (in order to avoid clutter, we shall not provide a systematic account of the evidence for the prefixed forms).

Phryn. *PS* 65.9: διαλέξασθαι· οὐ μόνον διαλεχθῆναι, which seems to presuppose διελέχθην as the form normally accepted as Attic, although διελεξάμην is also allowed, probably on the basis of its use by Aristophanes. See also Rutherford (1881, 189).

<sup>316</sup> See Lautensach (1911a, 248).

<sup>317</sup> A list of the more common Greek verbs which have a middle future is in K–B (vol. 2, 244–5). For a theoretical approach to these forms, see Tronci (2017).

**ἀκούσομαι:** Antiph. fr. 209.2; Men. *Epit.* 238, *Mis.* 684, *Sam.* 521, *Phasm.* 91 (partly restored), fr. 42.  
**ἄσομαι:** Theophil. fr. 7.3. **βοήσομαι:** Men. *Mis.* 721. **γνώσομαι:** Alex. fr. 1.2; Anaxipp. fr. 1.48; Men. *Epit.* 355, *Sam.* 183 and *Sam.* 397, *Phasm.* 10; Philem. fr. 178.15. **διώξομαι:** Men. *Sam.* 198. **δραμοῦμαι:** Men. *Sam.* 202. **εἴσομαι:** Antiph. fr. 57.10; Men. *Epit.* 463, *Ench.* 28, *Pc.* 145, *Sam.* 396; Nicom. fr. 1.7 and 1.20. **κλάσομαι:** Men. *Mis.* 621 (partly integrated). **λήξομαι:** Apollod.Com. fr. 19.2. **λήψομαι:** Alex. fr. 129.9 and 132.2; Antiph. fr. 27.13 and 170.3; Euphro fr. 9.13; Men. *Asp.* 185, 355, 370, *Dysc.* 205 and 791, *Epit.* 570 and 1110, *Car.* 38, *Pc.* 205, *Sam.* 569, 586, 599, and 662, fr. 804.16. **μαθήσομαι:** Men. *Asp.* 100. **οἰμώξομαι:** Alex. fr. 115.19; Diphil. fr. 42.36; Men. *Asp.* 356, *Epit.* 160, 691, and 1068, *Sam.* 427. **δύσομαι:** Alex. fr. 53.2 and 115.18; Anaxipp. fr. 1.24 and 2.3; Antiph. fr. 42.5, 175.2, 203.4, and 242.3; Epig. fr. 6.4; Hegesipp. fr. 1.21; Men. *Asp.* 231 and 325, *Dysc.* 46 (integrated), 237, and 879, *Epit.* 469 and 856, *Cith.* 65, *Con.* 12, *Pc.* 61, *Sam.* 391 and 555, *Sic.* 24 (integrated), fr. 86.2, 373.6, 373.7, 744.2, 791.2; Philem. fr. 93.9 and 94.7; Posidipp. fr. 28.6. **πείσομαι** (from *πάσχω*): Alex. fr. 115.6; Men. *Dysc.* 576 and fr. 256.4. **πесоῦμαι:** Antiph. fr. 57.11. **πίομαι:** Ephipp. fr. 11.3. **πράξομαι:** Antiph. fr. 208.3. **σιωπήσομαι:** Men. fr. 392. **φεύξομαι/φευξοῦμαι:** Men. *Cith.* fr. 3.1. **χωρήσομαι:** Men. *Col.* 117.

Many, but not all, of these forms will then develop an active future in koine texts. In some cases, Middle and New Comedy may provide early evidence of this.

**ἄξω:** Men. *Asp.* 430, *Pc.* 247, fr. 412.2. **πράξω:** Men. *Cith.* 98 (integrated), *Pc.* 441; Timocl. fr. 8.7. **τέξω** (from *τίκτω*): Men. fr. 404.2 (text uncertain). **ὑπερδραμῶ:** Philetaer. fr. 3.3.

Concerning ἄξω/ἄξομαι and πράξω/πράξομαι, we should point out that Aristophanes too uses the active future. Similarly, Aristophanes alternates between the middle future τέξομαι (*Eq.* 1037 and *Lys* 744) and the active τέξω (*Th.* 509). ὑπερδραμῶ in Philetaerus is a more interesting case. This form is the unanimous reading of the Athenaeus MS, but several scholars have doubted that it may be the correct reading because the active future δραμῶ is a later development.<sup>318</sup> Still, since no emendation suggested so far has proved more convincing than retaining the transmitted text, it is probably best to regard it as early evidence for the active future δραμῶ, otherwise attested only from koine texts.<sup>319</sup>

Atticist lexicographers, especially Moeris, are particularly keen to point out that for many verbs the correct Attic choice is the middle voice.<sup>320</sup> However, the early evidence for ἄξω, πράξω, and τέξω in Aristophanes does not suggest that we can draw a clear-cut diachronic opposition between the active and middle forms.<sup>321</sup>

<sup>318</sup> As far as later comedy is concerned, beside δραμεῖ in Men. *Sam.* 202 (on which see above) one may compare the 2nd-person middle ἐκδραμεῖ in Diphil. fr. 19.3.

<sup>319</sup> In addition, considering ὑπερβαλῶ at the end of line 2 of the Philetaerus fragment, the innovative form ὑπερδραμῶ may be used because it is functional to the word play.

<sup>320</sup> See also Georgius Lacapenus *Epistula* 8 (67.14–7, commenting on 63.26–7) (ed. by Lindstam 1924): ἀκούσομαι. ἀκούσομαι δεῖ γράφειν τὸν μέλλοντα κατ’ Ἀττικούς, καὶ οὐκ ἀκούσω. ὡς περδὴ καὶ θρύψομαι καὶ ἀποκρύψομαι. οὐ μὴν δὲ θρύψω καὶ ἀποκρύψω.

<sup>321</sup> For the evidence in papyri see Mayser (*Gramm.* vol. 1.2, 130); Gignac (1981, 321–2).

**Moer. α 81:** ἄξομαι παθητικῶς Ἀττικοί· ἄξω ἐνεργητικῶς Ἑλληνες. **Moer. α 83:** ἄσεται Ἀττικοί· ἄσει Ἑλληνες. **Moer. β 33:** βιάσεται <Ἀττικοί>· βιάσει <Ἑλληνες>. **Moer. β 36:** βοήσεται Ἀττικοί· βοήσει Ἑλληνες. **Moer. θ 7:** θηράσεται Ἀττικοί· θηράσει Ἑλληνες. **Moer. ο 8:** ὁμοῦμαι ὁμεῖ ὁμεῖται Ἀττικοί· ὁμόσω ὁμόσει Ἑλληνες. **Moer. π 2:** πράξομαι Ἀττικοί· πράξω Ἑλληνες. **Moer. π 3:** πράξε-ται Ἀττικοί· πράξει Ἑλληνες. **Philemo (Laur.) 354:** ἀποφοιτήσομαι (see Thom. Mag. 7.1–4). **Philemo (Vindob.) 392.7 = (Laur.) 355:** ἀπολαύσομαι· οὐκ ἀπολαύσω. **Philemo (Vindob.) 394.34:** θηρεῦσομαι· οὐ θηρεύσω. **P.Oxy. 15.1803.fol. ii.verso.60–9** (= TM 65081) (6th century CE): σιωπή-σομαι ἀντί τοῦ σιω|πήσω καὶ σιωπήσει καὶ | σιωπήσεται ὡς ἐν τῷ πε|ρί τοῦ στεφάνου· ‘κἀγὼ στέρ|ξω καὶ σιωπήσομαι’ (D. 12.112). καὶ | Μένανδρος ἐν Φανίῳ· | ‘σιωπήσ<ε>ι πάλιν ἐν τῷ μέ|ρει’ (Men. fr. 392). κατὰ τ[α]ῦτα δὲ καὶ ἁ|κούσομαι καὶ ἀκούσει καὶ | ἀκούσεται καὶ πηδήσομαι.

### 3.3.2 ‘Attic’ future

The ‘Attic’ future is of two types. In the verbs with a stem ending in /a/ or /e/ (in some cases after the loss of the final /s/) and in which the preceding syllable is short, the intervocalic /s/ of the suffix -σο/-σε- disappears and a contraction occurs (καλέσω > καλῶ). In the verbs where the stem ends in /i/, the suffix is -σεο/-σεε- (as in the ‘Doric’ future), and so /s/ disappears and contraction to -ιῶ, -ιεύς, etc. occurs (νομιδ- + -σεω > νομι(σ)έω > νομιῶ). The ‘Attic’ future is still common in Middle and New Comedy.

**ἀγωνίζομαι:** ἀγωνιῶ (Men. *Mis.* 673), ἀγωνιούμενον (Anaxandr. fr. 16.5). **ἄκκίζομαι:** ἄκκιοῦμαι (Men. *Epit.* 526). **ἀπαμφιέννυμι:** ἀπαμφιεῖ (Men. *Mis.* 765). **ἀπογαλακτίζω:** ἀπογαλακτιεῖ (Diph. fr. 75.3). **ἀφανίζω:** ἀφανιεύς (Alex. fr. 178.18) (integration by Dobree, revised by Arnott 1996, 533). **βαδίζω:** β[α]διοῦμαι (Men. *Mis.* 573), βαδιεῖ (Men. *Her.* fr. 7), βαδιεῖται (Men. *Sic.* 268), βαδιούμεθ(α) (Men. *Dysc.* 408). **γαμέω:** γαμεῖ (Men. *Georg.* 72), γαμεῖν (Men. *Georg.* 117). **δαιπνίζω:** δαιπνιεῖν (Diph. fr. 62.4). **διαπυτιζω:** διαπυτιοῦσι (Arched. fr. 3.12). **διατελέω:** διατελεῖς (Diph. fr. 42.2). **καλέω:** παρακαλῶ (Men. *Dysc.* 783), ἀποκαλεῖ (Men. *Dysc.* 366). **κιθαρίζω:** κιθαριεῖ (Antiph. fr. 139). **κοτταβίζω:** κοτταβιεῖτε (Antiph. fr. 57.4). **λογίζομαι:** λογιόμαι (Eriph. fr. 2.10). **μάχομαι:** μαχοῦμαι (Men. *Epit.* 551, *Sam.* 605), μαχεῖται (Men. *Dysc.* 355), μαχοῦμεθ(α) (Men. *Pc.* 192) (by analogy with τελέω, see *EDG* s.v. μάχομαι). **νομίζω:** νομιεῖς (Crat.Iun. fr. 8.2). **παννυχίζω:** παννυχιοῦμεν (Men. *Dysc.* 858). **πλουτίζω:** πλουτιεῖ (Timocl. fr. 4.8). **πορίζω:** ποριοῦ[μεν] (Men. *Dysc.* 599). **συνοικίζω:** συνοικιεῖν (Men. *Asp.* 10).

None of these future forms alternate with the later analogical ones. It thus seems that in later comedy the ‘Attic’ future is still the standard form, which is confirmed by Attic inscriptions.<sup>322</sup> Atticist lexicographers were clearly interested in registering the Attic future as the proper form.

**Phryn. PS 54.9–10:** βαδιοῦμαι· ἀντί τοῦ ἀπελεύσομαι. **Phryn. PS 97.2–5:** ὀλοκαυτεῖν· ἀπὸ τοῦ ὀλοκαυτῶ, οὗ ὁ μέλλων ὀλοκαυτήσῃ. λέγεται καὶ διὰ τοῦ ὀλοκαυτίζω, ἐξ οὗ ὀλοκαυτιῶ ὁ Ἀττικὸς

<sup>322</sup> See Threattle (1996, 526–7). For the evidence in papyri see Mayser (*Gramm.* vol. 1.2, 128); Gignac (1981, 285–7).

μέλλων, οὗ τὸ ἀπαρέμφατον ὀλοκαυτιεῖν. **Phryn. PS 104.13:** πολεμιῶ· Ἀττικόν, ἀπὸ τοῦ πολεμίζειν. **Antiat. 8 48:** δικᾶν· ἀντὶ τοῦ δικάσειν. Ἡρόδοτος α' (1.97.1): 'οὐ φησι δικᾶν ἔτι'. **Moer. β 37:** βαδιοῦμαι βαδιεῖ βαδιεῖται καὶ τὰ ὅμοια Ἀττικοί. **Moer. 8 19:** διαβιβῶ Ἀττικοί· διαβιβάσω Ἑλληνες. **Philemo (Vindob.) 395.28:** ὀρθριοῦμαι· οὐκ ὀρθρίσομαι. **[Hdn.] Philet. 230:** τῶν δὲ διὰ τοῦ -ίζω ῥημάτων τῶν ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβὰς τοὺς μέλλοντας κατὰ περιγραφὴν τοῦ ζ λέγουσιν οἱ Ἀττικοί· οἷον κομίζω κομιῶ, κιθαρίζω κιθαριῶ, λακωνίζω λακωνιῶ. πρόκειται ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβὰς διὰ τὸ πρίζω, κτίζω· διὰ τοῦ -ίζω δέ, διὰ τὸ κατάζω, πελάζω καὶ τῶν ὁμοίων· ταῦτα γὰρ ὁμοίως ἡμῖν προσφέρονται. ἀπὸ μέντοι τοῦ δανεῖζω, οὐκέτι δανεῖω λέγουσιν, οὐδὲ δανειοῦμαι, ἀλλὰ δανείσω καὶ δανείσομαι. **Orus fr. B 79** (= Phot. θ 117 = Su. θ 242): θεριῶ καὶ κομιῶ καὶ ποριῶ καὶ ὀριῶ καὶ πάντα τὰ εἰς ζω βαρύτονα καὶ ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβὰς βραχυνόμενον τὸ ι ἔχοντα, ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι ἄνευ τοῦ σ ἐκφέρουσιν Ἀττικοί· τὰ γοῦν ὀριστικά καὶ ἀπαρέμφοτα· τὰ δὲ ὑποτακτικά οὐδαμῶς· σολοικισμὸς γὰρ τὸ 'ἐὰν θεριῶ' καὶ 'ἐὰν κομιῶ'. ἐφ' ὧν δὲ τὸ ι ἐκτείνεται, καὶ σὺν τῷ σ ὁ μέλλων λέγεται χρόνος, καὶ ἐκτεινομένης τῆς παρεσχάτης συλλαβῆς, οἷον· δανεῖζω, δανείσω, οὐκέτι δὲ τὸ δανειῶ, βάρβαρον οὕτως· ὥστε καὶ τοὺς Ἀθηναίους φασὶν ἀθρόους εἰς ἐκκλησίαν συναθροισθέντας ἐπὶ τῶν διαδόχων, ἐπειδὴ εἰς ἀπορίαν καθειστήκεσαν χρημάτων, ἔπειτά τις αὐτοῖς τῶν πλουσίων ὑπισχνεῖτο ἀργύριον, οὕτω πως λέγων, ὅτι 'ἐγὼ ὑμῖν δανειῶ', θορυβεῖν καὶ οὐκ ἀνέχεσθαι λέγοντος διὰ τὸν βαρβαρισμὸν καὶ οὐδὲ λαβεῖν τὸ ἀργύριον ἐθέλιν· ἕως αἰσθανόμενος ὁ μέτοικος ἦ καὶ ὑποβαλόντος αὐτῷ τινος ἔφη· 'δανείσω ὑμῖν τοῦτο τὸ ἀργύριον'· τότε δ' ἐπαίνεσαι καὶ λαβεῖν. διὰ τοῦτο βαδίσω καὶ βαδιῶ ἀμφότερα δόκιμα, ἐπεὶ καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ ἐνεσθηκὸς ἐκατέρως λέγεται καὶ ἐκτεινομένου καὶ συστελλομένου τοῦ ἐν τῇ μέσῃ συλλαβῇ ι· οὐκέτι δὲ ἀγορῶ, οὐδὲ κολῶ· οὐδὲ γὰρ ὅλως τῷ ι παραλήγει.

### 3.3.3 'Doric' future

The 'Doric' future employs the suffix -σε- in place of the simple -σ- before the thematic vowel -ε/ο-, producing contracted forms. Only one such form occurs in Middle and New Comedy, and it is metrically guaranteed:

**Men. Cith. fr. 3:** εἰ τοὺς ἀδικηθέντας, πάτερ, φευξοῦμεθα, | τίσιν ἂν βοηθήσαιμεν ἄλλοις ραίδως;.

The 'Doric' future is common in Attic with φεύγω and its compounds. However, there is ample evidence in 4th-century BCE Attic prose for the use of 'non-Doric' sigmatic futures: for instance, Plato alternates between φευξοῦμαι and φεύξομαι. Consequently, Menander's use of φευξοῦμεθα, in addition to being metrically convenient, may not have been a strange choice. It has recently been argued that the 'Doric' future in Attic texts emphasises a more pronounced epistemic modality than the 'non-Doric' sigmatic future: that is, the 'Doric' future is typically used to indicate some degree of uncertainty on the part of the speaker about the truth of the possibility of an event (see Zinzi 2014). In the Menander fragment, φευξοῦμεθα occurs as part of a question, and so it is consistent with the interpretation of the 'Doric' future as expressing a more nuanced epistemic modality.

We also have examples of the 'non-Doric' sigmatic future, such as the metrically guaranteed κλαύσεται (certain, though partly integrated) in Men. *Mis.* 621 (as opposed to κλαυσοῦμεθα in Ar. *Pax* 1081). It should be noted, however, that in

the case of κλαίω the ‘non-Doric’ sigmatic future is far more common in Attic texts than the ‘Doric’ future.

Atticist lexicographers are wary of the ‘Doric’ futures that have entered the koine, and tend to recommend the corresponding ‘non-Doric’ forms.

**Phryn. Ecl. 22:** πιούμαι· σὺν τῷ υ λέγων οὐκ ὀρθῶς ἐρεῖς· πίομαι γάρ ἐστι τὸ ἀρχαῖον καὶ πióμενος ἄνευ τοῦ υ. Δίων δὲ ὁ φιλόσοφος σὺν τῷ υ λέγων ἁμαρτάνει. **Moer. π 64:** πίομαι πῖθι Ἀττικοί· πιούμαι πῖε Ἑλληνες. **[Hdn.] Philet. 276:** πίομαι, οὐχὶ πιούμαι· καὶ τὸ δεύτερον πῖη, καὶ τὸ τρίτον πῖεται. καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης (*Eq.* 1289)· ‘πῖεται ποτηρίου’.

### 3.3.4 Variation between contracted and/or different types of sigmatic future

Aristophanes and the poets of Old Comedy make use of forms like βαλήσω in place of βαλῶ, δοκήσω in place of δόξω, etc. (see Willi 2003a, 249–50). The fact that βαλῶ, δόξω, and δραμοῦμαι (see also ἔξω and σχήσω) are the only forms attested in Middle and New Comedy suggests that the language of later comedy is more conservative in this respect, in line with the evidence from Attic inscriptions (see Threattle 1996, 524–5).

## 3.4 Perfect and pluperfect

Goldberg (1996, with a catalogue at 30–57) provides a full list and detailed examination of the perfect forms in Menander’s *corpus*. Readers may wish to consult her study for an exhaustive illustration and assessment of the chronology of each form. Here we shall point out a few select cases.

### 3.4.1 γέγονα and γεγένημαι

The received perfect of γίγνομαι is γέγονα, whereas γεγένημαι is an innovation also attested in Middle and New Comedy.

**Alex. fr. 41.1:** γεγένηται. **Antiph. fr. 34.1:** οἱ γεγενημένοι. **Men. Epit. 306:** γεγενημένος. **Men. Col. 2:** γεγενημένος. **Men. Mis. 406:** γεγενημένον. **Men. Sam. 600:** γεγενημένον. **Philem. fr. 109.3:** γεγενημένον.

With the exception of γεγένηται in Alexis,<sup>323</sup> these occurrences are limited to the participle. Interestingly, all instances of the participle γεγεννημένος occur in the final *metron*. Thus, the older and newer forms γέγονα and γεγένημαι do not simply co-exist in 4th- and 3d-century BCE comedy, as γέγονα is still prevalent. To mention only a few examples, γέγονα occurs respectively 5x in the Alexis fragments (frr. 37.6, 47.4, 113.2, 130.1, 131.1), 8x in Antiphanes (frr. 46.2, 120.8, 120.9, 120.10, 120.12, 121.5, 203.4), 7x in Philemon (frr. 82.4, 94.6, 109.2 (NB γεγεννημένον at line 3), 124.1, 136.1, 140.1), and 70x in Menander's papyrus fragments. The innovative γεγένημαι is already well documented in 5th-century BCE Attic, but it remains far less common than γέγονα. Tragic poets are not quite so open to the use of γεγένημαι (1x in Aesch. *Ch.* 379, but the passage is corrupt, 1x in Soph. fr. 10g.13a/b.9, where the text is lacunose, 2x in Eur. *Alc.* 85 and *Cyc.* 637). In Aristophanes, on the contrary, γεγένημαι is more common than γέγονα (28x vs 11x, see Willi 2003a, 249). It seems that the poets of Middle and New Comedy are very much in line with the koine in preferring γέγονα over γεγένημαι.<sup>324</sup> This may also explain why Atticist lexicography does not seem to have any special interest in the innovative γεγένημαι.

### 3.4.2 μεμάνημαι

γεγένημαι may have been the model for the creation of a new analogical form, μεμάνημαι.

**μεμάνηται(αι):** Men. *Epit.* 879.

μεμάνημαι replaced μέμνηνα, the older perfect of μαίνομαι. Apart from the *Epitrepontes* line, the evidence is very slim, limited to a handful of mostly post-Classical occurrences (these include prefixed forms): Theocritus (10.31), the Sibylline oracles (1.172, 3.39, 11.317, fr. 3.40 Geffcken (= Theophilus *Ad Autolycum* 2.36)), Cyrillus (*Gla-phyra in Pentatheucum* MPG 69.289.39).

### 3.4.3 ἀπέκτονα and ἀπέκταγκα

Already in Classical Attic ἀποκτείνω developed a new perfect ἀπέκταγκα replacing the older form ἀπέκτονα.

**Men. Mis. fr. 13** (= Orus fr. B 35 (= Σ<sup>b</sup> α 1872 = Su. α 3372, ex Σ<sup>γ</sup>)): † πάτερ μὲν Θράσωνι, ἀπεκτάγκασι δ' οὐ.

<sup>323</sup> In place of Sudhaus' γεγένηται in Men. *Pc.* 347, Cartlidge (2022, 25–6) now rightly suggests πεπόηται, based on the consideration that γεγένηται would be the only finite form of γεγένημαι used by Menander (otherwise only γεγεννημένος, see above).

<sup>324</sup> See de Foucault (1972, 76) on Polybius' strong preference for γέγονα.

This new form probably arose by analogy with the thematic aorist ἀπέκτανον. The new perfect is also attested in Aristotle (*Pol.* 1324b.16 and 1324b.18), and it is occasionally found in koine texts (Plb. 3.86.11, 3x in LXX, Diod. 4.55.4 and 14.47.2).

Atticist lexicography disapproved of ἀπέκταγκα.<sup>325</sup>

**Moer. α 70:** ἀπέκτονεν Ἀττικοί· ἀπέκταγκεν Ἑλλήνες. **Orus fr. B 35** (= Σ<sup>b</sup> α 1872 = *Su.* α 3372, *ex* Σ'): ἀποκτίννυσι λέγουσι μάλλον ἢ ἀποκτιννύει. Κρατίνος Βουκόλοις (fr. 17): 'καὶ πρὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν σκιαμαχῶν ἀποκτίννυσι ταῖς ἀπειλαῖς'. καὶ ἀπεκτόνασιν, οὐκ ἀπεκτάγκασιν. <\*\*\*> Μισοῦ-μένω (fr. 13): 'πάτερ μὲν Θράσωι, ἀπεκτόνασι δ' οὐ'.

### 3.4.4 'Strong' perfects in place of 'weak' perfects

In late 5th century BCE and then especially in 4th century BCE, comedy provides evidence for the creation of new 'strong' perfects replacing earlier 'weak' perfects of the verbs ἀριστάω (ἡρίστηκα) and δειπνάω (δεδείπνηκα).

**ἀριστάω:** ἡρίσταμεν (Ar. fr. 513; Theopomp.Com. fr. 23), ἡριστάναι (Hermipp. fr. 60). **δειπνάω:** δεδείπναμεν (Alex. fr. 114; Eub. fr. 90), δεδειπνάναι (Ar. frr. 260 and 480.2; Pl.Com. fr. 157 = *Antiatt.* δ 32; Antiph. fr. 141.1; Eub. fr. 91, Epicr. fr. 1.1).

These forms (which attracted the attention of ancient scholarship, see *Antiatt.* δ 32, Ath. 10.422e, Phot. η 250) alternate with the 'weak' perfect forms according to metrical convenience. Although there seems to be a greater tendency to use these innovative forms in Middle and New Comedy than in Old Comedy, their comparative rarity justifies the suspicion that they are Attic colloquialisms (see Arnott 1996, 308, with further references).

### 3.4.5 Aspirated perfects

An innovative feature of the Greek perfect is the development of new aspirated forms for the verb stems ending in a velar or labial consonant. This development most probably occurred under the influence of the 2nd-person middle, where the aspirated stop is the standard outcome of the encounter between the velar or labial stem and the ending -σθε. This phenomenon is generally regarded as being peculiar to Ionic and Attic, although the matter is more complicated than it is generally assumed (see Cassio 2017). Be that as it may, the Attic evidence for the aspirated perfects usually dates starting from the 5th century BCE and then becomes more substantial in the 4th century BCE, as is also attested by Middle and New Comedy.

<sup>325</sup> See further Batisti (2024b).



**ἀλλάσσω:** ἀπὴλλάχα (Men. *Epit.* 416), διήλλαχεν (Dion.Com. fr. 2.10). **ἀνοίγνυμι:** ἀνέωχας (Men. fr. 170). **δείκνυμι:** δέδειχα (Men. *Mis.* 590), ἀποδέδειχα (Alex. fr. 263.14), δέδειχεν (Alex. fr. 270.1), ἀποδέδειχεν (Diph. fr. 73.3). **πλήσσω:** πέπληχε(ν) (Men. *Dysc.* 188, *Epit.* 906, *Sam.* 301, 367, 555). **πέμπω:** πέπομφα (Men. *Dysc.* 72), πέπομφε (Men. *Pc.* 164), ἀποπέπομφεν (Men. *Asp.* 313), ἐκπέπομφε (Men. *Pc.* 58). **πράσσω:** πεπραχότες (Men. fr. 710.2). **τρίβω:** συντέτριφεν (Eub. fr. 62.2).

Most of these perfects are widely paralleled in 5th- and 4th-century BCE Attic authors. Others deserve closer examination.

ἀνέωχα is rare indeed. Actually, Men. fr. 170 is the only certain occurrence of this aspirated perfect, besides ἀνεωχότα in the Pseudo-Demosthenic oration *Against Phaenippus* (42.30). The exceptionality of this form explains why, despite the general lack of interest in the aspirated perfect in Atticist lexicography, ancient scholars are keen to record Menander's ἀνέωχας (see Orus fr. A 6a and Orus fr. A 6b, discussed above at Section C.2.2.2).<sup>326</sup>

Menander's use of the aspirated perfect πέπληχα is the earliest available evidence for the existence of such a form. In earlier poetic texts, the unaspirated form is common (e.g. in the *Iliad*), which is also the rule in post-Classical prose (though note πεπληχότος in I. *AI* 4.277). It is more difficult to decide what the standard form was in Classical times. The evidence from Menander points to his using the aspirated perfect. The only other relevant passage, X. *An.* 6.1.6 τέλος δὲ ὁ ἕτερος τὸν ἕτερον παῖει, ὡς πᾶσιν ἐδόκει πεπληγῆναι τὸν ἄνδρα· ὁ δ' ἔπεσε τεχνικῶς πῶς, is uncertain.<sup>327</sup> The manuscripts and the indirect transmission are divided between πεπληγῆναι (MSS CBA, the Parisine family; also Ath. 1.15e) and πεπληχῆναι (MSS FM, the Italian family).<sup>328</sup> The value of the two families of manuscripts for the reconstruction of the text is basically the same, but editors usually choose the πεπληγῆναι of the Parisine family (see Masqueray 1930–1931 vol. 2, *ad loc.* and Hude, Peters 1972, *ad loc.*). However, comparing the other 4th-century BCE occurrences in Menander and considering that πεπληγῆναι may well have been an obvious normalisation (the aspirated perfect occurs only once in post-Classical Greek), we may wonder whether the πεπληχῆναι of the Italian family should not be reconsidered. Note that the verb must be transitive, which might further support πεπληχῆναι.

<sup>326</sup> The instance of ἀνέωγε in Men. fr. 184 is more likely a transitive imperfect than a transitive unaspirated perfect (see Schwyzler 1939, 772 on the distinction between intransitive unaspirated perfects and transitive aspirated perfects). See Orth (2013, 265–6) concerning the possible instance of the active intransitive unaspirated perfect of ἀνοίγω/ἀνοίγνυμι in Amips. fr. 13 (Σ<sup>b</sup> α 1339, Phot. α 1906, *Su.* α 2282). This use of the unaspirated perfect ἀνέωγα is proscribed by Phryn. *Ecl.* 128 (see also Luc. *Sol.* 8.7–13).

<sup>327</sup> Marchant (1903, *ad loc.*) suggested removing πεπληγῆναι τὸν ἄνδρα, but the editors correctly retain it.

<sup>328</sup> On the two families see Masqueray (1930–1931 vol. 1, 30–5); Hude, Peters (1972, IX–XI).



As regards πεπραχότες, the unaspirated intransitive πέπραγα is standard in 5th-century BCE Attic.<sup>329</sup> The new transitive aspirated perfect πέπραχα is very common in 4th-century BCE Attic and is attested in Xenophon (6x, 1x unaspirated),<sup>330</sup> Demosthenes (1x),<sup>331</sup> Dinarchus (1x),<sup>332</sup> and in the Aristotelian corpus (10x),<sup>333</sup> but notice the intransitive πεπραγέναι in Plato (*R.* 603c.7).

### 3.4.6 Participle ἐστώς vs ἐστηκώς

The older perfect ἐστώς is well-attested in later comedy.

**ἐστώς:** Antiph. fr. 194.21; Eub. fr. 71.2. **παρεστώς:** Men. *Dysc.* 676. **ἔφεστώς:** Damox. fr. 2.59. **ἐστῶσα:** Men. *Pc.* 40). **ἐστῶσας:** Eub. fr. 67.5 and 82.4.

The newer participle ἐστηκώς occurs 6x (Amphis fr. 3.3 ἐστηκώς, Alex. fr. 131.16 ἐστηκότας, Men. *Pc.* 291 συνεστηκώς, Sic. 222 ἐστηκότας, and Philem. fr. 138.1 καθεστηκώς). In Old Comedy the older and the newer forms co-exist, but the older one is still more clearly predominant (see Willi 2003a, 249 on Aristophanes). The evidence collected above may indicate that, although the older form is still used for metrical purposes, the newer participle is progressively becoming the standard one (4x ἐστώς-type in Middle Comedy, 3x in New Comedy; 2x ἐστηκώς-type in Middle Comedy, 4x in New Comedy).

### 3.4.7 Pluperfect: generalisation of -ει- in the indicative active

The original endings of the pluperfect active are -η (< -εα), -ης (< -εας), -ει (< -εε), -εμεν (< -εμεν), -ετε (< -ετε), -εσαν (< -εσαν). Later Attic (and then the koine) extended the 3rd-person ending -ει to the rest of the conjugation as though it were a suffix, which led to the creation of the endings -ειν, -εις, -ει, -ειμεν, -ειτε, -εισαν.<sup>334</sup>

One example of these new pluperfect endings occurs in Menander:

<sup>329</sup> For Aristophanes, see *Eq.* 683 πέπραγας, *Pax* 1255 πεπράγαμεν, *Lys.* 462 πέπραγε, *Ra.* 302 πεπράγαμεν, *Pl.* 629 πεπράγατε, *Pl.* 633 πέπραγεν. The aspirated perfect πέπραχε is the transmitted reading in *Pl.Com.* fr. 203.1, where Kassel, Austin adopt Meineke's πέπραγε. The pluperfect ἐπεπράγεσαν occurs in *Thuc.* 2.4.8 and 7.24.1. See also *Phryn.* *PS* 103.12–3: πέπραγεν· διὰ τοῦ γ, προκρίνουσι τοῦ πέπραχεν and *Moer.* π 5 πεπραγώς ἐν τῷ γ Ἀττικοί· πεπραχώς Ἕλληνες.

<sup>330</sup> See *HG* 5.2.32 ἐπεπράχει, 5.2.32 πεπραχώς, *An.* 5.7.29 διαπεπράχασιν, *Cyr.* 3.1.15 πέπραχε, 5.5.14 πεπραχώς, 7.5.42 καταπεπραχέναι. Unaspirated *HG* 1.4.3 πεπραχότες.

<sup>331</sup> See 19.17 πεπραχότων.

<sup>332</sup> See 6.21 πεπραχότων.

<sup>333</sup> See *Arist.* *EN* 1110b.21 πέπραχεν, 1111a.17 πεπραχέναι, *Pol.* 1274b.35 πεπραχέναι, *Rh.* 1367b.24 πεπραχότα, 1374a.1 πεπραχέναι, 1392b.19 πέπραχε, 1400a.38 πέπραχε, 1400b.1 πέπραχεν, *Pr.* 951b.36 πεπραχέναι, *Div. Somn.* 463a.24 πεπραχότες.

<sup>334</sup> See Schwyzler (1939, 776; 778).

**Men. fr. 206** (= *Antiatt.* ε 117): ἐπεπτώκειμεν.

As parallel evidence, K–B (vol. 2, 65) mention ἀπωλώλειτουργ, ἐδεδώκειμεν, and ἦδευτε in Demosthenes (18.49, 37.12, and 58.9), and we may add ἦδειμεν in Aeschines (3.82). As counter-examples, we should mention the metrically guaranteed instances of the 1st person plural in -εμεν in Men. fr. 391: πότων τε καὶ κώμων ἅπαντες ἦδεμεν and the 3rd person plural in -εσαν in Men. *Asp.* 26: ἐπεφεύγεσαν and Men. fr. 395.2: Πέρσαι δ' ἔχοντες μυιοσόβας ἐστήκεσαν. The new forms predominate in the koine.<sup>335</sup> Strict Atticist lexicographers recommended the use of the earlier forms.

**Antiatt. ε 117**: ἐπεπτώκειμεν· Μένανδρος Καταψευδομένω (fr. 206). **Moer. η 3**: ἦδη Ἀττικοί· ἦδειν Ἑλληνες.<sup>336</sup>

But this development is not strictly limited to 4th-century BCE Attic or even to the koine. Some early evidence can be found in the Hippocratic writings (*Epid.* 2.4.2 ἐξεπεφύκεισαν). More importantly, the *Antiatticist* tells us that Eupolis used ἐλελήθεισαν.

**Antiatt. ε 7**: ἐλελήθεισαν· μετὰ τῆς † θα †. Εὐπολὶς Αἰζίν (fr. 28).

This information has raised considerable doubts. Kock tried to defend ἐλελήθεισαν on the grounds that it is prosodically more convenient than ἐλελήθεσαν in anapests, but it is unclear why, if this is the case, we do not have more examples of the newer form. In fact, Meineke concluded that Eupolis' text used by the (source of the) *Antiatticist* was corrupt.<sup>337</sup> Although scepticism is healthy when dealing with such problematic evidence, the objections raised against ἐλελήθεισαν in Eupolis are not particularly convincing. The assumption that the *Antiatticist* used a corrupt text is unverifiable and thus remains purely speculative; moreover, the fact that ἐλελήθεισαν is isolated does not make it impossible. In addition, Tribulato (2014, 208) mentions ἐδεδοίκεῖς (in place of the expected but unattested \*ἐδεδοίκεῖς < \*ἐδεδοίκε-ας), which occurs in Aristophanes' *Plutus* 684. The use of this new pluperfect is certainly part of the distinctive trend in the *Plutus* to adopt more colloquial language (see Chapter 4, Section 5.2).

With the unsurprising exception of the *Antiatticist* (see above), these newer pluperfects are condemned by Atticist lexicographers.

<sup>335</sup> See de Foucault (1972, 76) on Polybius; Mayser (*Gramm.* vol. 1,2, 85 and n. 1) and Gignac (1981, 356) on the papyri.

<sup>336</sup> Parallel sources are collected by D. U. Hansen (1998, *ad loc.*).

<sup>337</sup> See further Olson (2017, 148) with bibliography.

**Phryn. Ecl. 119:** ἡκηκόεσαν, ἐγεγράφεσαν, ἐπεποιήκεσαν, ἐνενοήκεσαν ἐρεῖς, ἀλλ' οὐ σὺν τῷ ι, ἡκηκόεισαν. **Antiatt. ε 7:** ἐλελήθεισαν· μετὰ τῆς † θα †. Εὐπολις Αἰξίν (fr. 28). **Phot. ε 1427:** ἐπεπόνθη· ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐπεπόνθειν. καὶ ἐωράκη καὶ ἦδη, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἦδεν καὶ ἐωράκειν. **Phot. ε 2530:** ἐωράκη· τὸ πρῶτον πρόσωπον, ὡς ἐπεπόνθη καὶ ἐπεποιήκη καὶ ἦδη, τὸ ἦδεν· Πλάτων τοῖς τοιοῦτοις χρήται σχηματισμοῖς.

Even modern scholars are wary of including them in their editions of Classical Attic writers.<sup>338</sup> Indeed, K–B (vol. 2, 65) even claim that since the newer forms of the pluperfect did not completely eclipse the older ones in 4th-century BCE Attic (as shown by the metrically guaranteed ἦδεμεν in Men. fr. 391, see above), in Demosthenes the instances of ἀπωλώλιτε (18.49), ἐδεδώκειμεν (37.12), εἰώθειμεν (54.3), and ἦδειτε (55.9) should be emended.<sup>339</sup> The editors of Demosthenes, however, correctly retain the transmitted readings.

## 4 Notable cases: a (very partial) selection

The following sections are devoted to individual verbal categories or to individual verbs that are worthy of attention from different points of view. A systematic investigation of the various categories of verbal derivation and their reception in Atticist lexicography will be provided in *Ancient Greek Purism* Volume 2.

### 4.1 Prefixed verbs

A tendency that is already noticeable in later Attic is the preference for prefixed verbs over simple ones, but without any other appreciable difference in meaning other than intensification (see Vessella 2016b, 428). In addition, several new double-prefixed verbs are introduced.<sup>340</sup> A detailed investigation of the prefixed verbs used by Menander is provided in earlier scholarship (see Giannini, Pallara 1983).

<sup>338</sup> See Finglass (2018, 545) on Soph. OT 1232, where ἦδειμεν and ἦδεμεν are metrically equivalent.

<sup>339</sup> Transmitted ἦδεισαν οὐδ' of MSS SF at Dem. 27.65 (MS A has ἐδεισαν οὐδ') has been deleted by the editors since Reiske, because it makes no sense in the context (see Gernet 1954, 51; Dilts 2008, 61).

<sup>340</sup> See Durham (1913, 31–3); López Eire (2002, 75); Vessella (2016b, 428).

## 4.2 ἐθέλω vs θέλω

The standard form in 5th-century BCE Attic is ἐθέλω, which is regularly found in Old Comedy and in prose, outside of fixed expressions of the type of ἄν θεὸς θέλῃ and, only as far as comedy is concerned, outside of cases of tragic parody (see Willi 2003a, 248 n. 79). On the other hand, θέλω is first attested in tragedy and then gains ground in 4th-century BCE Attic.<sup>341</sup> The evidence from Middle and New Comedy is collected and discussed by Hunter (1983, 113) and Arnott (2002, 197), who point out that while up until Middle Comedy ἐθέλω could still be unmarked, in New Comedy it seems to have become the more formal option. The inscriptional evidence confirms this gradual development, with θέλω finally replacing ἐθέλω in the 3rd century BCE (see Threatch 1996, 637–8). In post-Classical Greek too, ἐθέλω is the marked, Atticising option (see Clarysse 2008). Indeed, Atticist lexicography prescribes ἐθέλω and proscribes θέλω.

**Phryn. Ecl. 305:** τεθειληκέναι· Ἀλεξανδρεωτικὸν τοῦνομα, διὸ ἀφετέον Ἀλεξανδρεῦσι καὶ Αἰγυπτίοις αὐτό, ἡμῖν δὲ ῥητέον ἡθειληκέναι.

## 4.3 Present ἔδω

Despite being common in epic and more generally in poetry, the active verb ἔδω is rare in Attic. The only known instances are in late Old Comedy (Alcaeus Comicus) and in Middle Comedy:

**ἔδω:** Alc.Com. fr. 30. **ἔδουσι:** Eub. fr. 27.

These instances are explained as poeticisms or Ionicisms (see Orth 2013, 134), but they may well be elements of ‘international’ Attic. Note that in Eur. Cyc. 245 the editors now adopt Heath’s δίδοντες in place of the transmitted ἔδοντος (which is still recorded in LSJ s.v. ἔδω).

## 4.4 ἐκφυγάνω

A gloss in the *Antiatticist* testifies that Diphilus used the verb ἐκφυγάνω in place of the more common ἐκφεύγω:

<sup>341</sup> This issue never concerned the augmented forms, for which ἡθελ- is standard throughout the history of Greek.

**Antiatt.** ε 80: ἐκφυγγάνω· Δίφιλος Εὐνούχῳ (fr. 7).

The form in -άνω originally had an ingressive meaning (see *DELG* s.v. φεύγω). The simplex verb φυγγάνω occurs in *Prometheus Bound* (513), in Sophocles' *Electra* (132), and in the Hippocratic corpus (*De affectionibus interioribus* 12, 7.194.13 Littré). The compound ἐκφυγγάνω also has an early attestation in *Prometheus Bound* (525), but it is especially common in the *corpus Hippocraticum* (16x). After Diphilus, it occurs just once in Polybius (18.15.12) and then only resurfaces in late-antique and Byzantine writers (Themistius, Arethas, Constantinus VII). This distribution is consistent with that of the other prefixed formations. They are also well attested in Ionic (διαφυγγάνει in Heracl. Diels-Kranz 22 B 86, καταφυγγάνουσι in Hdt. 6.16.3, ὑπεκφυγγάνω, διαφυγγάνω, and διεκφυγγάνω in the Hippocratic corpus). In Attic, apart from an isolated occurrence of διεφύγγανον in Thucydides (7.44.8), they are rarely attested in 4th-century BCE prose (D. 23.74, Aeschin. 3.10 and 3.208), and then reappear occasionally in Imperial prose (Arrian, Plutarch, Aristides). Interestingly, Moeris considers φυγγάνω to be more Attic than διαφεύγω on the basis of an isolated occurrence in Thucydides. Other forms in -άνω, such as ἐρυγγάνω, are also attested in 5th-century BCE Attic drama (Eur. *Cyc.* 523, Cratin. fr. 62.3, Eup. fr. 204, Diphil. fr. 42.21), and they are approved by Atticist lexicography.

**Phryn. Ecl.** 42: ἐρεύγεσθαι ὁ ποιητής (Hom. *Od.* 9.374)· 'ὁ δ' ἐρεύγετο οἰνοβαρείων', ἀλλ' ὁ πολιτικός ἐρυγγάνειν λεγέτω. **Moer.** δ 18: διεφύγγανον <Ἀττικοί>· διέφευγον <Ἕλληνες>. **Philemo (Vindob.)** 393.17–20: ἐρυγγάνει <λέγουσι> οὐκ ἐρεύγεται, [(καὶ)] ἐρυγεῖν ἀπερυγεῖν ἤρυγεν οὐκ ἠρεύεατο. ἐρυγγάνει δὲ <μᾶλλον> ἂν ἄσιτος ᾗ, ἐρεύγεται δ', ὅταν τις ἐμπλησθῇ τροφῆς.

## 4.5 στρηνιάω

This verb occurs three times in later comedy:

**στρηνιάω**: ἐστρηνίων (Antiph. fr. 82.3), στρηνιῶ (Sophil. fr. 6.3), unknown form of the conjugation (Diph. fr. 133 = *Antiatt.* σ 6).

στρηνιάω means 'to indulge oneself in excesses or wantonness' (*GE* s.v.). It derives from the adjective στρηνής 'shrill, piercing' (especially of sounds) (*GE* s.v.), which is also attested in Attic as στρηνός (Nicostr. fr. 38). There is also the abstract noun στρῆνος, meaning 'insolence, arrogance, extravagance, luxury, lust' (*GE* s.v.) which semantically comes closest to the meaning of στρηνιάω in the comic fragments. The denominal verb is also used by Lycophron in a satyr play (*TrGF* 100 F 2) and in the New Testament (*Apoc.* 18.7 and 18.9). The fact that all the evidence for this form points to a late date justifies the disdain for στρηνιάω among strict Atticists.

**Phryn. Ecl. 358:** στρηνιαῖν· τούτῳ ἐχρήσαντο οἱ τῆς νέας κωμωδίας ποιηταί, ὧς οὐδ' ἂν μανεῖς τις χρήσαιτο, παρὸν λέγειν τρυφᾶν. **Antiatt. σ 6:** στρηνιαῖν· καθ' οὗ ὁ βίος τάσσει. Δίφιλος (fr. 133).

One reason why στρηνιαῖω is interesting is its suffix. -ιάω is initially used to denote an illness or a bad fixation, later also a particularly strong, almost manic, desire for something (see Peppler 1921, 154–6 and Willi 2003a, 84–5). To quote the evidence from Middle and New Comedy, see ὀφθαλμιῶ ‘to suffer from ophthalmia’ (Apollod.Car. fr. 7.2, Timocl. fr. 6.13, Antiph. fr. 246.1) and ὑποβινητιάω ‘to arouse sexual desire’ (Men. fr. 351.11, which also has a causative meaning compared to the simple verb βινητιάω ‘to strive to have sex’). As regards στρηνιαῖω, however, it seems as though the suffix -ιάω has a more generic intensive function, indicating the degree to which the speaker indulges in wantonness, but this is not the expected nuance usually associated with the suffix -ιάω.

#### 4.6 Future of ζῆν

The poets of Middle and New Comedy regularly use the correct Attic form βιώσομαι for the future of ‘to live’. The innovative future ζήσω occurs in Aristophanes (*Pl.* 263) and in a comic fragment whose attribution is uncertain:

ζήσεις: Ar. fr. 976.2 = Antiph. fr. 330.2 CAF.

The future ζήσω is certainly attested, albeit to a limited extent, in 4th-century BCE Attic prose (*Pl. R.* 465d.3 and *Leg.* 792e.7, but βιώσομαι is far more common in the rest of the Platonic *corpus*; *D.* 25.82, *Arist. Pol.* 1327b.5). Hence, the attribution of Aristophanes’ fr. 976 to Antiphanes (as already suggested by Meineke) or to some comic poet of the 4th century BCE, or possibly later, clearly gains in plausibility.<sup>342</sup>

#### 4.7 Sigmatic aorist of φθάνω

This form occurs only once in later comedy:

φθάσαι: Men. *Georg.* 88.

Euripides and Aristophanes alternate between the root aorist ἔφθην and the sigmatic ἔφθασα. In Euripides the two options are more balanced (root aorist in *Herac.* 120, *Andr.* 990, *IT* 669, *Or.* 1220, sigmatic aorist in *IT* 669, *Phoen.* 975, 1280). In

<sup>342</sup> See also Willi (2003b, 57 n. 99). Kaibel (in Kassel, Austin, *PCG* vol. 3,2, 433 *ad* Ar. fr. 976) considers this fragment unworthy of both Aristophanes and Antiphanes.

Aristophanes the sigmatic aorist seems to become more common in the late play *Plutus* (root aorist in *Eq.* 935, *Nu.* 1384, *Av.* 1018, *Ec.* 596, sigmatic aorist in *Pl.* 685 and 1102; see Willi 2003b, 58 n. 104). However, the sigmatic form is regular in Thucydides (35x vs φθῆναι 4x) and in 4th-century BCE prose, as witnessed by Xenophon (29x vs ἔφθη 3x) and Demosthenes' genuine orations (6x vs ἔφθη 2x). Two early instances of the sigmatic form can be found in Aeschylus (*Pers.* 752, fr. 23.3).

#### 4.8 ἐώρακα vs ἑώρακα

While the regular Attic perfect is ἐώρακα, in 4th-century BCE Attic ἑώρακα begins to appear. The only piece of evidence in Middle and New Comedy is in a fragment of Menander where ἑώρακεν is metrically guaranteed.

**Men. fr. 187.1–2:** τηθίδα | οὐδ' ἑώρακεν τὸ σύνολον, θεῖον οὐδ' ἀκήκοεν (*4tr<sub>A</sub>*).

The MSS evidence for ἐώρακα has been carefully scrutinised by Arnott (2002, 204), who also mentions that ἑώρακα is probably necessary in some passages of Demosthenes to avoid an unwelcome and un-Demosthenic sequence of short syllables. We should add that if we take the MSS of Xenophon, Isocrates, and Plato as sample cases, it seems that ἐώρακα is the standard, while ἑώρακα is only attested in Xenophon. Interestingly, if we look at the apparatuses of modern editions, it also appears that the MSS tradition of Xenophon's writings is split: while ἐώρακα is the spelling adopted in the *Oeconomicus*, *Cyropaedia*, and *Cynegeticus*, ἑώρακα is the one we find in the *Anabasis* and *Hellenica*. This may reflect an editorial choice already made in antiquity, but it is also possible that Xenophon himself arranged this polymorphic treatment accordingly (perhaps, the older form ἑώρακα was preferred in the historical works as the more standard and international option?).

#### 4.9 Verbs in -άζω (and -ίζω)

The verbs in -άζω and -ίζω are among the most productive verbal categories in late Attic and post-Classical Greek.<sup>343</sup> The evidence from Middle and New Comedy

<sup>343</sup> See Debrunner (1917, 116): 'Auch wenn man den Überfluß aller überlieferten griechischen Wörter gebührend in Rechnung stellt, bilden die rund 2000 Verba auf -ίζειν und rund 1000 auf -άζειν einen imponierenden Bruchteil'.

for these categories is very substantial (respectively, 68x and over 130x).<sup>344</sup> For reasons of space, in this section we have decided to focus exclusively on the verbs in -άζω, whose numbers are more easily manageable.<sup>345</sup> Our aim is to provide an overview of these forms, focusing on their distribution, use, formation, and, where evidence exists, their reception in Atticist lexicography. The occurrences are arranged according to four main chronological principles: (1) forms occurring before the 4th century BCE; (2) forms appearing in Attic from the 4th century BCE (comedy and other genres); (3) forms first attested in Middle and New Comedy and then used in post-Classical Greek; (4) comic hapaxes.

The Greek verbs in -άζω were originally derived from dental stems with the addition of the verbal suffix -ῖδ (e.g. φράζω < φραδ- + \*-ῖδ, an exception being ἀρπάζω < ἀρπαγ- + \*-ῖδ).<sup>346</sup> From there, -άζω developed as a denominal verbal suffix in its own right and was added to stems ending in /a/, either *ā*-stems (e.g. ἀνάγκη > ἀναγκάζω, also alongside the formation of the *verba vocalia*, e.g. βία > βιάομαι and βιάζομαι) or others (e.g. θαῦμα > θαυμάζω), and to thematic stems (e.g. ἄτιμος > ἀτιμάζω) and occasionally, but already early on, it could also be added to verbal stems (e.g. ἀκούω > ἀκουάζομαι, στένω > στενάζω). The inflection inherited from the dental stems generally spread to the verbs formed with -άζω (e.g. ἐθαύμασα) and was also extended to the few originally velar stems (e.g. ἤρπασα in Attic as opposed to ἤρπαξα in the other dialects), but in some cases the opposite is the case (e.g. στενάζω is regularly a velar stem, possibly due to the other enlargements with a velar, i.e. -αχω, -αχέω, -αχίζω?). The semantics of the -άζω verbs is characteristically varied: these formations are generally factitive and are said to ‘activate the root’ (see Greppin 1997, 107) (e.g. ἄτιμος ‘dishonoured, without honour’ > ἀτιμάζω ‘treat with dishonour, to dishonour’), but there remains ample room for further semantic nuances and innovations.<sup>347</sup> These verbs are already widespread in archaic and Classical Greek and remain a productive category throughout the history of the language up to Modern Greek.<sup>348</sup>

<sup>344</sup> The hapax πρῶράσσε(ε) in Men. Sic. 421 is more likely to derive from πρῶράω than from πρῶράζω, as is often suggested in modern lexica (see Gallavotti 1965, 443; Belardinelli 1991; Belardinelli 1994, 233).

<sup>345</sup> A study of the Atticist approach to verbs in -άζω and -ίζω will be provided in *Ancient Greek Purism* Volume 2.

<sup>346</sup> See further K–B (vol. 2, 261–2); J. Richter (1909); Debrunner (1917, 118–27); Schwyzler (1939, 734–5); Sihler (1995, 516–7); Greppin (1997); van Emde Boas *et al.* (2019, 274–5). Regarding the verbs in -ίζω (and those in -ιάζω, which result from the dissimilation of \*-ιίζω), see also Müller (1915); Debrunner (1917, 128–39); Schwyzler (1939, 735–6); Schmoll (1955); Tronci (2010); Tronci (2012); Tronci (2013).

<sup>347</sup> For a rich exemplification see Debrunner (1917, 120–7).

<sup>348</sup> See Efthymiou, Fragaki, Markos (2012) (who also discuss the verbs in -ίζω).



The verbs in -άζω attested in later comedy amount to a total of 65 different forms. Most of the forms occurring in later comedy are already attested in earlier, and often much earlier, texts, ranging from Homer to 5th-century BCE literature.

ἀγοράζω (Pi.; Hdt.; Thuc.; Old Comedy), ἀναγκάζω (Hdt.; Thuc.; Soph.; Eur.) and εἰσαναγκάζω (Aesch.), ἀρπάζω (Hom.) and ἀναρπάζω (Hom.) and συναρπάζω (Aesch.; Soph.; Eur.; Ar.), ἀτιμάζω (Hom.), βαστάζω (Hom.), βιάζω (Hom.) and ἐκβιάζω (Soph.), βρύάζω (Aesch.; Ar.), γυμνάζω (Thgn.; Aesch.; Thuc.; Eur.), δαλεάζω (Hdt.), δικάζω (Hom.), δοκιμάζω (Hdt.; Thuc.; Antiphon) and ἀποδοκιμάζω (Hdt.; Archipp.), ἐγκωμιάζω (Hdt.), εἰκάζω (Sapph.; Thgn.; Aesch.; Thuc.), ἐξετάζω (Thgn.; Thuc.; Soph.; Eur.), ἐπιδικάζω (And.), ἐργάζομαι (Hom.) and ἀπεργάζομαι (Eur.) and ἐξεργάζομαι (Aesch.; Thuc.; Soph.; Eur.), ἐτοιμάζω (Hom.), θαυμάζω (Hom.), κα(γ)χάζω (Soph.; Ar.), κολάζω (Thuc.; Soph.; Eur.), κωμιάζω (Alc.; Thgn.; Anacr.; Pi.), μετριάζω (Thuc.; Soph.), νεάζω (Aesch.; Soph.; Eur.), νυστάζω (Ar.), ὀνομάζω (Hom.) and ἐπονομάζω (Alc.; Thuc.; Soph.; Eur.), παφλάζω (Hom.), πλησιάζω (Soph.), σκευάζω (*H.Hom.*; Thuc.; Eur.; Ar.) and ἐνσκευάζω (Hdt.; Old Comedy) and παρασκευάζω (Aesch.; Thuc.; Eur.; Old Comedy), σκυθρωπάζω (Ar.), σπουδάζω (Pi.; Soph.; Eur.), στενάζω (Sim.; Aesch.; Soph.; Eur.), φαντάζω (Aesch.; Eur.), χλευάζω (Ar.).

One consequence of the early spread of the verbs in -άζω in Greek is that some of these formations attested in Middle and New Comedy are directly reminiscent of poetic vocabulary.

**αἰχμαάζω**: epic and tragedy, a comic hapax in Men. *Sam.* 629 (see Sommerstein 2013, 293).

**δαμάζω**: it occurs in Anaxandr. fr. 6.2 and 34.15. It is already a Homeric verb, which in comedy occurs in choral sections (Ar. *Pax* 564) or in poetic quotations (Pl.Com. fr. 189.9: the line is a hexameter quoted from Philoxenus' cookbook, fr. 7 Sutton; see Pirrotta 2009, 362). Since Anaxandr. fr. 6.2 is most likely reminiscent of a passage of Timotheus (fr. 798 *PMG*),<sup>349</sup> it is an easy inference that Anaxandr. fr. 34.15 too was meant to sound like marked language.<sup>350</sup>

**πυκάζω**: a paratragic form in Men. *Sam.* 732 (see Sommerstein 2013, 320).

The opposite case is that of those verbs which, due to their crude or very concrete meaning, are limited to comedy.

**λαικάζω**: an obscene verb (see Bain 1991, 74–7; Olson 2002, 96).

**τυντλάζω**: attested in literature only in Ar. *Pax* 1176 and Sosp. fr. 1.35 (see Olson 1998, 288).

However, since the verbs in -άζω are a category in expansion, a few of those which occur in Middle and New Comedy only occur in other literary genres starting from the 4th century BCE. This may indicate that they are more recent formations. Some of these forms are relatively common in 4th-century BCE texts.

<sup>349</sup> See Section A.2.

<sup>350</sup> Regarding Anaxandr. fr. 6.2, Millis (2015, 61) comments that 'probably accidentally, the word [i.e. δαμάζω] is rare in comedy', but one cannot agree with these conclusions.

ἐπιτολάζω (Isocr.; X.; see Arnott 1996, 163–4), παρακμάζω (X.; Arist.).

Other verbs, although they are attested already in earlier texts, may be used in a somewhat different way in later comedy. Forms belonging to this category occasionally attract the interest of Atticist lexicographers.<sup>351</sup>

**ἀσπάζομαι**: already a Homeric verb, the instances in Alex. fr. 172.5 and Men. fr. 1.2 as a greeting verb are paralleled in Ar. *Pl.* 324 (see Arnott 1996, 507; Willi 2003b, 62–3).

**διπλάζω**: the verb is transitive ('to double', i.e. as if it were διπλασιάζω) in Eur. *Suppl.* 781, Alex. fr. 127 (= *Antiatt.* δ 19) and Men. fr. 224.10. As discussed by Arnott (1996, 356 and n. 1), the entry of the *Antiatticist* quoting Alexis aimed to discuss precisely this unexpected transitive use.

**δοξάζω**: already attested in 5th-century BCE Greek, it occurs in Dionys.Com. fr. 2.24 with the meaning of 'to be celebrated, magnified, held in esteem', attested mostly from koine Greek (see LSJ s.v. II).

**κατασκευάζω**: discussed by the Atticists for its semantics (*Antiatt.* κ 55: κατεσκευασμένην οἰκίαν· ἀντί τοῦ πάνθ' ὅσα ἔχουσιν, which depends on X. *Mem.* 3.11.4).

**στασιάζω**: already attested in 5th-century BCE Greek, it occurs in Men. *Epit.* 1075 with the meaning of 'to disagree', paralleled in 4th-century BCE texts (see LSJ s.v. I.4).

**σχολάζω**: already part of the 5th-century BCE vocabulary, it occurs in Men. *Epit.* 224 with the meaning of 'to devote oneself to someone', paralleled in other 4th-century BCE writers (see LSJ s.v. III.2).

**τροχάζω**: before Philetaer. fr. 3.1, it occurs already in Euripides (*Hel.* 724), Herodotus (9.66.3), and Hermippus (fr. 73.6), then in Xenophon and Aristotle; this verb was not approved by some Atticist lexicographers, as shown by *Antiatt.* τ 4: τροχάζειν· οὐ φασι δεῖν λέγειν, ἀλλὰ τρέχειν (the *Antiatticist* may have Xenophon in mind, see Lobeck 1820, 582–3, or maybe Philetaerus and Hermippus).

**χειμάζω**: already attested in 5th-century BCE texts, whether with a concrete ('to spend the winter', 'to expose to the cold', 'to raise a storm') or a metaphorical meaning ('to distress', evoking the idea of being tossed at sea and the image of the ship of state in the storm). The latter use is common in tragedy, much less so in Aristophanes and Plato. Except in one case, the verb is always used in the middle. The instance in Men. fr. 162 is exceptional in several respects; to mention but two: (i) the metaphorical meaning has developed into a faded metaphor (as opposed the metaphor being still vivid in Philem. fr. 28.6–19); (ii) instead of the middle, Menander uses the active with the reflexive pronoun. The Atticist Phrynichus did not approve the metaphorical use of χειμάζω as good Attic (*Ecl.* 367: 'τί χειμάζεις σαυτόν' (*lege* σ<ε>αυτόν). Μένανδρος (fr. 162) εἶρηκεν ἐπὶ τοῦ λυπεῖν, καὶ Ἀλεξανδρεῖς ὁμοίως. πειστέον δὲ τοῖς δοκίμοις τοῖς μὴ εἰδόσι τοῦνομα; see Favi forthcoming c).

**χορτάζω**: already attested in archaic texts, used for people rather than cattle in comedy and in koine Greek (see LSJ s.v. II).

A final group consists of forms that are either *primum dicta* (as far as Attic texts are concerned) or tout-court hapaxes. The lack of parallels may be a matter of

<sup>351</sup> One may compare the case of βιβάζω: although it is already a Homeric verb, it is used with a new meaning by Alcaeus Comicus (fr. 18 (= *Antiatt.* β 21), see Orth 2013, 85; on Alcaeus Comicus see Chapter 4, Section 5.2).

chance, but some of these forms are likely to be comic neologisms. Due to their rarity, these forms are often criticised by Atticist lexicographers.

**ἀκροάζομαι**: besides occurring, in place of ἀκροάομαι, already in Epicharmus and the Hippocratic corpus, it also occurs in the proverb preserved by Men. *Ench.* fr. 2.

**διαγιγνράζω**: a hapax in Athenio fr. 1.31 (*ad hoc*, a comic creation?), where the cook's activity of 'tuning' the food is described by a musical metaphor. The verb γιγνράζω derives from the Phoenician flute γίγγρας, a new instrument apparently introduced in Greece during the 4th century BCE (see Papachrysostomou 2016, 101; Olson 2022, 39–40).

**ἐξειδιάζομαι**: it occurs in Diph. fr. 41 (= *Antiatt.* ε 113) and is paralleled in the Hippocratic corpus, Aristotle, and koine texts. Atticist lexicographers recommend ἐξειδιόομαι, more widely attested in 4th-century BCE Attic (see *Antiatt.* ε 113: ἐξειδιάσασθαι· Δίφιλος Ἐπιτροπή [fr. 41], *Phryn. Ecl.* 172: ἐξειδιάζονται· καὶ τοῦτο Φαβωρίνος [fr. 141 Amato, maybe *de Ex.* 2 according to S. Valente 2015b, 170 *ad Antiatt.* ε 113] λέγει κακῶς· ἰδιουῖσθαι γάρ τὸ τοιοῦτον λέγουσιν οἱ ἀρχαῖοι).

**θουσιάζω**: first attested in Strato Com. fr. 1.21 (used by a character who speaks normal Attic) and then in koine texts (mostly, though not exclusively, in less formal ones).

**κωνειάζομαι**: the title of one of Menander's plays, the verb is only paralleled in Imperial Greek.

**λιθάζω**: first attested in Anaxandr. fr. 17 (= *Antiatt.* λ 7: λιθάζειν· οὐχὶ λεύειν καὶ καταλεύειν. Ἀναξανδρίδης Θετταλοῖς), in Arist. *Pr.* 881b.1, and then in koine Greek.

**λογγάζω**: it occurs in Antiph. fr. 39 (= *Antiatt.* λ 4); the Atticist sources debate whether the vowel of the first syllable is /a/ or /o/, but also doubt the admissibility of the verb, see *Antiatt.* λ 4: λαγγάζει· ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐνδίδωσιν. Ἀντιφάνης Ἀντερώση (fr. 39), *Phryn. PS* 87.12–4: λογγάζειν· τὸ διαδιδράσκειν τὸ ἔργον, προφασιζόμενόν τινα πρόφασιν καὶ τοῦτο Ἀριστοφάνης (fr. 848, but see Kassel, Austin, *PCG* vol. 3,2, 397 *ad loc.*) τίθησιν ἐπὶ ἵππων προσποιουμένων χωλεύειν, *Poll.* 9.136: φαῦλον γὰρ τὸ λογγάζειν ἐν τοῖς Κήρυξι τοῖς Αἰσχύλου (fr. 112) (other lexicographical sources are collected by S. Valente 2015b, 208 *ad Antiatt.* λ 4).

**ματτυάζω**: a hapax in Alex. fr. 50.3 (*ad hoc*, a comic creation?), it has negative overtones somehow related to the properties of the dish called ματτύη (see Arnott 1996, 171).

**παραγοράζω**: a hapax in Alex. fr. 62; Athenaeus (4.171b), who quotes the fragment, compares it with παροψωνέω in Cratin. fr. 99, of which it would represent the later (and, from an Atticist standpoint, presumably also a less approved) equivalent.

**τυρβάζω**: although attested in earlier literature with the transitive meaning of 'to trouble, to stir up' (Hes.; Soph.; Ar.), in Alex. fr. 25.6 it is apparently intransitive and has the meaning of 'to revel' (see Arnott 1996, 825–6; on the authenticity of the fragment, see Nesselrath 1990, 69 n. 13; Arnott 1996, 819–22).

**ὑπερσπουδάζω**: it occurs in Men. *Sam.* 219 and fr. 660, then rarely in Imperial and Byzantine prose.

To conclude this overview, the poets of Middle and New Comedy use verbs in -άζω, which were in (relatively) common use, but they also clearly testify to the spread and productivity of this verbal class and document the new semantic developments of these formations.

---

## D. Syntax

## 1 Use of prepositions

The use of several prepositions (notably ἀμφί, ἀνά, δίχα, χωρίς, μετά + dative) is already very limited in Aristophanes, where they are confined to ‘stylistically marked contexts (parody, lyrics, dialect parts) or to specialized usages’ (Willi 2003a, 256). Later comedy confirms this. For example, δίχα is attested only once,<sup>352</sup> and the only two instances of ἀμφί occur in one of the very rare lyric sections in Middle and New Comedy (Axionic. fr. 4.16, a lyric hexameter).<sup>353</sup> Some of the above prepositions, as well as others, are noteworthy.<sup>354</sup>

### 1.1 ἀνά + accusative

In keeping with the usage of Attic prose writers (except for Xenophon and a few rare cases),<sup>355</sup> the occurrences of ἀνά in Middle and New Comedy, though interesting, are limited in number and typology.

**Antiph. fr. 14:** ἀνά μέσον. **Men. fr. \*67.1:** ἡ δ’ ἀνά μέσον θαρούσα. **Men. fr. 602.18:** ὥστ’ ἀνά μέσον που καὶ τὸ λυπηρὸν φέρε. **Timocl. fr. 20.2–4:** ὦ τᾶν. ὁ γὰρ Τιθύμαλλος οὕτως ἀνεβίω | κομιδῇ τεθνηκώς, τῶν ἀν’ ὀκτῶ τοῦβολοῦ | θέρμους μαλάξας.

The occurrence in Timocles is an example of the distributive use of ἀν’ ὀκτώ (it indicates lupins, eight of which are sold for one obol; see Apostolakis 2019, 172). This is one of the few functions of ἀνά already found in Aristophanes and Attic prose.<sup>356</sup> The other three instances are more interesting. ἀνά μέσον ‘in the middle’, although attested in early poetry,<sup>357</sup> is unparalleled in 5th- and most 4th-century BCE Attic writers. Besides Middle and New Comedy, it is later abundantly attested in the *corpus Aristotelicum* and Theophrastus. We may infer that this idiom belonged to a colloquial register and was therefore not used in earlier Attic literature, so that it was then only allowed in less formal genres such as comedy and scientific prose. In koine Greek, ἀνά μέσον is common (also in the high koine, e.g. Polybius), and its frequency is no doubt behind the univerbation of the syn-

<sup>352</sup> See Millis (2015, 279) on δίχα in Anaxandr. fr. 46.3 and Ar. fr. 489.1.

<sup>353</sup> This exceptional use of ἀμφί is not discussed by Orth (2020, 210–1).

<sup>354</sup> On Greek prepositions and their history, see Vela Tejada (1993); Bortone (2010). On prepositions in later comedy vis-à-vis other Attic writers and the informal koine, see Kelly (1962).

<sup>355</sup> See K–G (vol. 1, 474 n. 1).

<sup>356</sup> Willi (2003a, 256) mentions Ar. *Ra.* 554: ἀν’ ἡμιωβολιαῖα ‘in half-obol portions’.

<sup>357</sup> See Alc. fr. 326.3 Lobel–Page = 208A Voigt, Thgn. 838, and Xenoph. fr. 1.11 West (= Diels–Kranz 21 B 1.11).

tagm into the Medieval Greek compound adverbs *ἀνάμεσον/ἀνάμεσα*, the ancestors of Modern Greek *ανάμεσα*.<sup>358</sup> It is quite likely that, although *ἀνά* is recessive, the idiomatic expression *ἀνὰ μέσον* expanded at the expense of *ἐν μέσῳ* in late Classical Attic and then in post-Classical Greek because of the increasing specialisation of *ἐν* + dative with an instrumental meaning.<sup>359</sup>

Atticist lexicography took this idiom into consideration. The *Antiatticist* presumably produced the occurrence in Antiphanes to disprove the claim that *ἀνὰ μέσον* was only post-Classical.<sup>360</sup>

**Antiatt.** α 86: *ἀνὰ μέσον· ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐν μέσῳ. Ἀντιφάνης Ἀδώνιδι* (fr. 14).

## 1.2 *εἰς, ἐν, and ἐκ* in place of the locative and suffixed forms of Ἀθήναι

The standard way of saying ‘to Athens’, ‘in Athens’, and ‘from Athens’ in Classical Attic texts (both literary texts and inscriptions) is *Ἀθήναζε* (an adverbial formation from the accusative *Ἀθήνας* and the suffix *-δε*), *Ἀθήνησι(ν)* (a genuine locative), and *Ἀθήνηθεν* (an adverbial formation with the suffix *-θεν*). While the only suffixed form still attested in Middle and New Comedy is locative *Ἀθήνησι(ν)* (which occurs in Amphis fr. 14.4 and Diph. fr. 67.2), the evidence for the corresponding prepositional syntagms is more substantial:

**εἰς Ἀθήνας:** Antiph. fr. 59.5, 166.1; Eub. fr. 9.5. **ἐν Ἀθήναις:** Alex. fr. 9.2, 224.2; Antiph. fr. 173.2; Eub. fr. 74.2; Philem. fr. 95.6. **ἐξ Ἀθηνῶν:** Antiph. fr. 233.5; Euphro fr. 1.7; Philosteph.Com. fr. 1.3.

This preference for the prepositional syntagm reflects the developments in the Attic dialect, although the predominance of *ἐν Ἀθήναις* over the locative form *Ἀθήνησι(ν)* is more evident in literary texts than in Attic inscriptions.<sup>361</sup>

Atticist lexicography recommended the locative and suffixed forms as more Attic.

**Moer.** α 52: *Ἀθήναζε <Ἀττικοί>· εἰς Ἀθήνας <Ἑλληνες>. **Moer.** α 53: *Ἀθήνηθεν <Ἀττικοί>· ἐξ Ἀθηνῶν <Ἑλληνες>. **Moer.** α 54: *Ἀθήνησιν <Ἀττικοί>· ἐν Ἀθήναις <Ἑλληνες>.***

<sup>358</sup> See Bortone (2010, 185; 254; 279); *CGMEMG* vol. 2, 1186; *IANE* s.v. *ἀνάμεσα*.

<sup>359</sup> See Vela Tejada (1993, 241); Bortone (2010, 192–3).

<sup>360</sup> See also Hsch. α 4440: *ἀνὰ μέσον· ἐν μέσῳ*. Only the lemma, but not the *interpretamentum*, survives of *Su.* α 1960: *ἀνὰ μέσον* (this entry is written on the margin of MS A).

<sup>361</sup> See Threatte (1996, 374–6; 401–2; 406).

### 1.3 μετά + genitive and σύν + dative with comitative function

In Classical Attic texts, the comitative constructions ('with someone/something') are μετά + genitive and σύν + dative. However, their distribution is clearly polarised, namely, μετά + genitive is the unmarked construction normally used in comedy and prose, while outside poetry and Xenophon σύν + dative is confined to fixed constructions (e.g. σύν ὄπλοις, σύν θεοῖς, etc.) and to passages adopting a (possibly parodic) poetic diction.<sup>362</sup> The evidence from post-Classical Greek confirms the preference for μετά + genitive (which continued in the Modern Greek μετά + accusative), aided by the fact that the dative is highly recessive.<sup>363</sup> The distribution of these two constructions in Classical Attic is generally continued in later comedy, where μετά + genitive is the standard construction (over 40x in Menander alone), while σύν + dative is attested only in the following passages:

**Men. Dysc. 509–10:** (Σι) ἔμοι μὲν οὐκ εἴρηκας. (Κν) ἀλλὰ νῦν λέγω. | (Σι) νῆ σύν κακῷ γ'. **Men. Dysc. 736–7:** νοῦν ἔχεις σύν τοῖς θεοῖς, | κηδεμῶν εἴ τῆς ἀδελφῆς εἰκότως. **Men. Per. fr. 8:** οὐδ' αὐτός εἰμι σύν θεοῖς ὑπόξυλος. **Philisc. fr. 4:** οὐκ ἔστιν, ὦ μάταιε, σύν ῥαθυμίᾳ | τὰ τῶν πονούντων μὴ πονήσαντας λαβεῖν.

The last two passages contain the fixed idiom σύν (τοῖς) θεοῖς (which will eventually survive until Modern Greek συν Θεώ). The fragment of Philiscus is clearly paratragic.<sup>364</sup> The case of νῆ σύν κακῷ γ(ε) ('though luck') in Menander's *Dyscolus* is more difficult to interpret.<sup>365</sup> Although the expression is not new (see LSJ s.v. 6), this pragmatic use is unparalleled. We may suppose that it is a colloquialism, perhaps retaining this ancient use of the preposition as an archaism.

### 1.4 μετά + genitive with the *verba sequendi*

In conjunction with *verba sequendi* and verbs with the prefix σύν-, μετά + genitive gradually began to replace the bare dative already in Classical Attic. This is the evidence from Middle and New Comedy:

**Antiph. fr. 120.2–3:** τὸν σπουδαῖον ἀκολουθεῖν ἔρεῖς | ἐν τῷ Λυκείῳ μετά σοφιστῶν. **Eub. fr. 8.1–2:** ἔτεροι δὲ † θεοῖσι † συμπεπλεγμένοι | μετά Καράβου σύνεισιν. **Men. DE 59–60:** μετ' ἑμοῦ δ' ἀκο-

<sup>362</sup> See K–G (vol. 1, 466–7); Willi (2003a, 237–8; 256); Vela Tejada (1993, 241–2); Bortone (2010, 166–7).

<sup>363</sup> Schmid (*Atticismus* vol. 3, 289; vol. 4, 460); Mayser (*Gramm.* vol. 2.2, 398–401); Blass, Debrunner (1976, § 221; § 227.1); Bortone (2010, 184).

<sup>364</sup> See Kassel, Austin (*PCG* vol. 7, *ad loc.*).

<sup>365</sup> On this passage see Handley (1965, 223).

λούθει και λαβέ | τὸ [χρ]υσίον. **Men. Dysc.** 969 = **Mis.** 996 = **Sic.** 423 = **fr.** 903.21: νίκη μεθ' ἡμῶν εὐμενῆς ἔποιτ' ἀεί. **Men. fr.** 293: συνακολουθεῖ μεθ' ἡμῶν.

The use of μετὰ + genitive with the *verba sequendi* is paralleled in the late phases of Old Comedy (Ar. *Pl.* 823; 1209) and more commonly in 4th-century BCE prose (Thuc. 7.57.9 is the only 5th-century BCE example, then see Lys. 12.12; Pl. *La.* 187e; *Mx.* 249d; Isoc. 5.48, 8.44, 14.15, 14.28; and D. 24.162). The only occurrence in tragedy is in Euripides (*El.* 941–4).<sup>366</sup> As for σύνειμι, the construction with μετὰ + genitive is also paralleled in the later phases of Old Comedy (Ar. *Pl.* 503–4, Aristom. fr. 2.3).

Atticist lexicography was sensitive to this construction of the *verba sequendi*.<sup>367</sup>

**Antiatt.** α 122: ἀκολουθεῖν μετ' αὐτοῦ· ἀντὶ τοῦ αὐτῷ. Λυσίας: 'τὸν παῖδα τὸν ἀκολουθοῦντα μετ' αὐτοῦ' (fr. 61 Carey). **Phryn. Ecl.** 330: 'τὸν παῖδα τὸν ἀκολουθοῦντα μετ' αὐτοῦ· Λυσίας ἐν τῷ Κατ' Αὐτοκράτους (fr. 61 Carey) οὕτω τῇ συντάξει χρήται, ἐχρῆν δὲ οὕτως εἰπεῖν· 'τὸν ἀκολουθοῦντα αὐτῷ'. τί ἂν οὖν φαίη τις, ἀμαρτεῖν τὸν Λυσίαν, ἢ νοθεύειν καινοῦ σχήματος χρήσιν; ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ ξένη ἢ σύνταξις, πάντῃ παρατιτῆα, ρητέον δὲ ἀκολουθεῖν αὐτῷ. **Σ<sup>b</sup> α 747 (= Phot. α 789, ex Σ'''; Phryn. PS fr. \*115** according to de Borries, more convincingly **Orus fr. B 7** according to Alpers) ἀκολουθεῖν μετ' αὐτοῦ· οὕτω συντάσσουσιν οἱ Ἀττικοὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀκολουθεῖν αὐτῷ. καὶ γὰρ Λυσίας οὕτω κέχρηται (fr. 61 Carey) καὶ Πλάτων (*La.* 187e.1–2; *Mx.* 249d.6). ἀλλὰ καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν Πλούτῳ (823) 'ἔπου· φησὶ 'μετ' ἐμοῦ, παιδάριον'. καὶ Μένανδρος 'νίκη μεθ' ἡμῶν εὐμενῆς ἔποιτ' ἀεί' (*Dysc.* 969 = *Mis.* 466 = *Sic.* 423 = fr. 903.21). κὰν τῇ Παρακαταθήκῃ 'συνακολουθεῖ μεθ' ἡμῶν' φησὶν (fr. 293).

While there does not seem to be an entry specifically dealing with cases like σύνειμι + μετὰ τινος, it is quite likely that this construction was also sanctioned.

## 1.5 ὑπέρ + genitive

The syntagm ὑπέρ + genitive in place of περί + genitive is well attested in Middle and New Comedy with the meaning of 'about someone/something' (Men. *Dysc.* 49 and 742; *Epit.* 128, 315; *Pc.* 273 and 325–6; *Sam.* 113, fr. 412.1; Posidipp. fr. 28.2–3; Athenio fr. 1.44).<sup>368</sup> Although ὑπέρ + genitive comes very close to the meaning of περί + genitive, it still retains part of its original meaning of 'in favour/defence of' (see especially Athenio fr. 1.44: ὑπὲρ εὐσεβείας οὖν ἀφείς παῦσαι λέγων). This evidence from comedy parallels that from 4th-century BCE Attic prose (see K–G vol. 1, 487).

<sup>366</sup> See Willi (2003b, 48–9); Olson (2022, 77).

<sup>367</sup> See also schol. Ar. *Pl.* 823: ἔπου μετ' ἐμοῦ· Πλάτων Μενεξένῳ (249d.6). On these constructions see Gerbi (2023).

<sup>368</sup> López Eire (2002, 85–6) collects some parallels in Hyperides.



## 1.6 ὥς + accusative

The syntagm ὥς + accusative, usually with a human being as the referent and meaning of ‘to someone(’s house),’<sup>369</sup> is almost exclusively Attic.<sup>370</sup> The sole instance in the *Odyssey* (17.218) has been explained as an Atticism, while only one of the occurrences in Herodotus is regarded as authentic by Hude and N. G. Wilson (2.121ε.4).<sup>371</sup> Furthermore, ὥς + accusative is absent from lyric poetry and from most of tragedy (e.g. it is very rare in Sophocles, 3x). This has been regarded as an indication that this construction originally belonged to a colloquial level. In Aristophanes, ὥς + accusative is increasingly common in the two extant 4th-century BCE plays (see Willi 2003b, 48), which ties in well with its increasing frequency in 4th-century BCE prose (see Schwyzler, Debrunner 1950, 533–4). This construction is relatively abundant only in selected high koine writers.<sup>372</sup> ὥς + accusative is solidly attested in Middle and New Comedy.

**Anaxandr. fr. 57.1–2:** χαλεπή, λέγω σοι, καὶ προσάντης, ὧ τέκνον, | ὁδός ἐστιν, ὥς τὸν πατέρ’ ἀπελθεῖν οἴκαδε | παρ’ ἀνδρός. **Apollod.Car. fr. 29.1–2:** καινόν γε φασὶ Χαιρεφῶντ’ ἐν τοῖς γάμοις | ὥς τὸν Ὀφέλαν ἀκλητον εἰσδεδυκέναι. **Crobyl. fr. 5.2–3:** ὅποι μ’ ἐρωτᾷς; ὥς Φιλουμένην, παρ’ ἧ | τάπιδόσιμ’ ἡμῖν ἐστιν. **Men. Asp. 274:** τὸν Δᾶον ὥς με πέμψατε. **Men. Epit. 876:** εἴσω λαβοῦσά μ’ ὥς σεαυτὴν εἴσαγε. **Men. Mis. 678:** ὥχεθ’ ὥς τοὺς γείτονας. **Men. Pc. 179:** ἡ δ’ οἴχεθ’ ὥς τὸν γείτον’ εὐθὺς δηλαδὴ. **Men. Pc. 212:** καὶ γὰρ οἴχεθ’ ὥς τὴν Μυρρίν[η]ν. **Men. Pc. 401:** ἀπεισιν ὥς σέ. **Men. Pc. 412:** πορεύσεθ’ ὥς σέ.

Ten occurrences is a relatively high figure, especially compared to the 46 occurrences in Aristophanes’ much larger corpus.<sup>373</sup> This confirms that ὥς + accusative became increasingly common in 4th-century BCE texts. As expected, in all these cases the referent of the accusative governed by ὥς is a human being, and the implicit sense is ‘to someone(’s house)’. It should be noted that in almost all Menander passages where ὥς + accusative is attested, the speaker is a slave or a hetaera (Habrotonon in *Epit.* 876, Sosias in *Pc.* 179, Doris in *Pc.* 212, 401, 412), which might support the idea that ὥς + accusative was a colloquial feature and that Menander used it for low-class characters. In the other two instances, the speaker is reporting a slave’s words (*Mis.* 678, where Clinias repeats to the audience what the slave Getas supposedly said before entering the stage) or is being rude (*Asp.* 274, where the speaker is Smicrines). Due to the lack of context, it is

<sup>369</sup> On two (apparent) exceptions in Sophocles see Moorhouse (1982, 133).

<sup>370</sup> For a revision of the older views about the origin of this construction and a new hypothesis, see Méndez Dosuna (2018).

<sup>371</sup> See Méndez Dosuna (2018, 319).

<sup>372</sup> See Krebs (1884–1885 vol. 2, 61–2); Bortone (2010, 186).

<sup>373</sup> No instance of ὥς + accusative is known in the fragments of Old Comedy.

difficult to verify whether  $\omega\varsigma$  + accusative is also a low-register feature in the fragments of Anaxandrides, Apollodorus of Carystus, and Crobylus.<sup>374</sup> However, the fact that  $\omega\varsigma$  + accusative is also attested in literary prose and then recessive in koine Greek may rather indicate that the social distribution of this construction in Menander is perhaps just a coincidence.

## 2 Verbal constructions

Several verbal constructions of later comedy are of interest for a study of the evolution of Attic. We will focus here on only one of them,  $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omega$  + infinitive, which the lexicographers themselves singled out as peculiar to Attic and contrasted with the usage in koine Greek.<sup>375</sup>

### 2.1 $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omega$ + infinitive

The regular construction  $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omega$  + infinitive ('I was going to/about to') requires the infinitive to be either future or present, while the aorist infinitive is very rarely attested.<sup>376</sup> The construction with the aorist infinitive is attested once in Middle Comedy.

**Eub. fr. 124:** γύναι, | ῥάφανόν με νομίσας· εἰς ἐμὲ σὺ τὴν κραυπάλην | μέλλεις ἀφεῖναι πᾶσαν, ὥς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖς.

Atticist lexicography rules out the construction with the aorist infinitive, which reflects its rarity in Classical sources.<sup>377</sup>

<sup>374</sup> The speaker in Anaxandrides' fragment may be a father or an older woman (see Millis 2015, 281). There are several ways to identify the speaker in Crobylus' fragment, but he is most definitely not a slave (is he perhaps some kind of parasite?) (see Mastellari 2020, 165). The speaker in the fragment by Apollodorus of Carystus is talking about a parasite's actions, but it is difficult to make much of this information.

<sup>375</sup> In some cases, the interpretation of the entries and of the doctrine behind them can be difficult. An example is offered by *Antiatt.* λ 11: λαβόμενος· ἀντὶ τοῦ λαβών. Ἀλεξίς Ἀρχιλόχοις (fr. 23). Arnott (1996, 114–5) plausibly concludes that the *Antiatticist* aimed to counter the objection that λαμβάνομαι could not be transitive (and Arnott cites Alex. fr. 78.6–8 as an example of this construction, but this fragment comes from a different play from the *Archilochus/Archilochoi* quoted by the *Antiatticist*). Arnott may be right, but the matter remains difficult to assess with certainty.

<sup>376</sup> See Willi (2003a, 257–8).

<sup>377</sup> See also La Roi (2022, 220–2).

**Phryn. Ecl. 313:** ἐμελλον ποιῆσαι, ἐμελλον θεῖναι· ἀμάρτημα τῶν ἐσχάτων εἴ τις οὕτω συντάττει· τετήρηται γὰρ ἡ τῷ ἐνεστῶτι συνταττόμενον ἢ τῷ μέλλοντι, οἷον ‘ἐμελλον ποιεῖν’, ‘ἐμελλον ποιήσιν’· τὰ δὲ συντελικὰ οὐδένα τρόπον ἀρμόσει τῷ ἐμελλον. **Phryn. Ecl. 347:** ἐμελλον γράψαι· ἐσχάτως βάρβαρος ἡ σύνταξις αὕτη· ἀορίστῳ γὰρ χρόνῳ τὸ ἐμελλον οὐ συντάττουσιν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι, ἀλλ’ ἤτοι ἐνεστῶτι, οἷον ‘ἐμελλον γράφειν’, ἢ μέλλοντι, οἷον ‘ἐμελλον γράψειν’.

### 3 Subordinate clauses

A detailed examination of the varieties of subordinate clauses in Middle and New Comedy is beyond the scope of this study. Atticist lexicographers very rarely, if ever, comment on subordinate clauses. Two areas where a difference between 5th- and 4th-century BCE Attic is more easily discernible are final and causal clauses introduced by διότι.

#### 3.1 Final clauses

While the preferred conjunction to introduce a positive final clause in Thucydides and Attic inscriptions is ὅπως (ἄν) + subjunctive, already in Aristophanes ἵνα + subjunctive takes over, and then the disproportion becomes even more apparent in 4th-century BCE Attic writers.<sup>378</sup> This has been explained as an element of the Ionicisation of Attic on its way to gradually evolving into the koine.<sup>379</sup> There is only one example of ὅπως + subjunctive in Middle and New Comedy, which is in line with the preference of 4th-century BCE Attic writers for ἵνα.

**Philem. fr. 141:** πολλὰ με διδάσκεις ἀφθόνως διὰ φθόνον, | ὅπως ἀκούων πολλὰ μὴδὲ ἔν μάθω.

The case of ὥς (ἄν) + subjunctive is more complicated. The construction of ὥς + subjunctive is typical of tragedy, and in comedy it is used exclusively in paratragedy, while ὥς (ἄν) + subjunctive, which is also a tragic use, may occasionally occur in comedy without any parodic intent (arguably for metrical convenience). That ὥς (ἄν) + subjunctive is marked language is also proved by the lack of attestation in Attic inscriptions and by the very scanty traces of it in 4th-century BCE Attic writers. In fact, the rare instances of ὥς (ἄν) + subjunctive in Middle and

<sup>378</sup> See Willi (2003a, 264–5); Willi (2003b, 46).

<sup>379</sup> See de Foucault (1972, 184–6) who discusses Polybius and other koine writers, though he rightly points out that while Polybius has a strong preference for ἵνα, not only do other koine writers (e.g. Diodorus) make extensive use of ὅπως (ἄν), but the koine inscriptions and papyri also show a preference for ὅπως (ἄν) over ἵνα.

New Comedy occur in paratragic sections (Men. *Sic.* 171) or in textually problematic passages (Antiph. fr. 253.2, where a syllable is missing and ὅπως may be restored instead; this would be equally remarkable as the sole other instance of final ὅπως + subjunctive in later comedy and one of the very few in 4th-century BCE Attic).

### 3.2 Causal clauses introduced by διότι

The use of διότι to introduce a causal clause is quite common in Middle and New Comedy (Alex. fr. 99.3, Amphis fr. 14.6, Anaxandr. fr. 53.2, Apollod.Com. fr. 16.4, Diph. fr. 60.11 and 137.1, Eub. fr. 106.14, Henioch. fr. 4.7, Philem. fr. 108.1, Timocl. fr. 19.4. *com. adesp.* fr. 1093.351). This use of διότι is paralleled in 4th-century BCE prose (e.g. 10x in Lysias and 12x in Isocrates). It is unattested in Aristophanes and tragedy.<sup>380</sup>

---

<sup>380</sup> See Willi (2003a, 266–7).