

Chapter 7

Towards Atticism: The blossoming of Hellenistic scholarship on Attic

1 Preliminaries

We concluded the previous chapter with an extended survey of Eratosthenes' engagement with Attic as documented by Old Comedy. Eratosthenes' work on Attic comedy represented an important benchmark for any future scholarly activity not only in comedy but in Attic language in particular. It is not wholly by chance that it is mostly in the wake of Eratosthenes' contribution that at the end of the 3rd and above all in the 2nd century BCE a proliferation of studies specifically dedicated to Attic dialect emerges. We noted that in the 3rd century BCE the geopolitical centre of power had clearly shifted from Athens to Alexandria and its sphere of influence (particularly the cultural hubs of Cos, Rhodes, and Cyrene). Nonetheless, the importance of Athens and Attica as symbols of cultural capital remained largely unchallenged (cf. Chapter 6, Section 4): from the outset, Attic literature played a qualitatively and quantitatively predominant role in the royal Library and more generally in the policy of cultural hegemony pursued by the Ptolemies, and it is no wonder that Attic 'themes' became increasingly *en vogue* among Hellenistic poets.¹ It is unsurprising, therefore, that already in the first half of the 3rd century BCE we can see evidence attesting to an enduring interest in Attic vocabulary and idioms as a distinct niche within Greek lexicography at large (consider, for instance, the case of Aristophanes of Byzantium's and Ister's Ἀττικάι λέξεις: cf. Sections 2.2 and 4.1 respectively).

This chapter will continue to trace the development of Hellenistic lexicography on Attic down to the first half of the 1st century BCE – that is, before the proliferation of the treatises *Περὶ ἑλληνισμοῦ* (starting with Philoxenus, Tryphon, and Seleucus), which reflect a partially different cultural climate: *ἑλληνισμός* persists in referring to an abstract notion of linguistic correctness (that is, not to the correctness of a given dialectal variety, the Attic as the more prestigious literary one), but the first signs of a more prescriptive attitude are discernible, even if they are still qualitatively different from the fully fledged prescriptivism of Impe-

¹ For the marked interest in matters Attic by Hellenistic poets, see the still seminal paper by Hollis (1992).

rial Atticism.² This chapter, like the previous one, will be primarily ordered in a loosely chronological way: some forays into Atticist doctrine will be made when useful for highlighting the main continuities and divergences between this phase of Hellenistic lexicography and its later reception in the Roman era. In the first part of this chapter, we shall survey the engagement with Attic and its grammar, from a lexicographical perspective, on the part of the two philological giants of the mature Hellenistic age, both heirs to Eratosthenes' scientific method of linguistic research: his pupil Aristophanes of Byzantium (Section 2), author of a lexicographical work entitled *Λέξεις*, with a subsection specifically dedicated to Attic idioms (*Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις*, Section 2.1) and Aristarchus of Samothrace who, although he did not write a stand-alone lexicographical oeuvre, showed a marked interest in Attic language mainly within the framework of his studies on comedy and Homer (Section 3).

The majority of the first part of this chapter will thus be given over to Aristophanes' *Λέξεις* (Section 2.1) for several sound reasons. Aristophanes' *Λέξεις* are for us the first product of Hellenistic lexicography that is preserved in a quantitatively and qualitatively appreciable form. While the work's inner organisation and ultimate goal remain partly unclear, the sheer richness, variety, and quantity of the extant material (transmitted by both direct and indirect tradition – a unique case within Alexandrian studies on lexicographical matters)—make it the first sizable corpus of Hellenistic lexicography that is conducive to a continuous and sustained enquiry. Aristophanes' *Λέξεις* therefore represents the inevitable point of departure for any study on the context, purpose, and shape of mature Hellenistic reflection on lexicographical matters. In addition to these extra-textual considerations, and more importantly, the 'open' interpretative nature of Aristophanes' lexicographical work as a whole warrants an extended treatment. A distinctive feature of Aristophanes' *Λέξεις* is their receptivity to multiple linguistic dimensions (the spoken vernacular alongside the literary language, the 'high' register of literature and the 'lower' one of the contemporary *συνήθεια*, the attention to regional and diachronic variations in vocabulary and morphology, etc.). It is this openness, which does not impose the straitjacket of an all-encompassing agenda, that qualifies Aristophanes' *Λέξεις* as belonging conceptually to a phase of reflection on language not yet predominantly or uniquely centred on those authors and language phenomena that will later become the core elements of the Atticist 'canons'.

Having dealt with Aristophanes of Byzantium's lexicographical work and Aristarchus' reflection on the Attic dialect and its import for Homer's language,

2 On ἑλληνισμός in the second half of the 1st century BCE, see Pagani (2015, 816–8). Cf. also Chapter 6, Section 2.

the second part of the chapter will focus on two parallel phenomena: (i) the appearance, from the 3rd century BCE onwards, of autonomous or semi-autonomous works (that is, subheadings of larger lexicographical works) dedicated specifically to Attic vocabulary (Section 4) and (ii) what we call ‘lexicography in a minor key’: isolated reflections by grammarians and scholars on Attic (literary and spoken vernacular) within a broader framework (often but not only in oeuvres entitled *On Dialects*) (Section 5). As for (i), in our sources, these stand-alone collections are variously entitled Ἀττικά λέξεις or γλῶσσαι (sometimes also Ἀττικά ὀνόματα or Περὶ τῆς Ἀττικῆς λέξεως).³ As we shall see, even if the titles of these works clearly announce a marked and specific interest in Attic vocabulary, the centrality of this interest does not typically prevent their authors from making occasional references to other dialects (literary and non-literary). Most saliently for us, with the partial exception of Crates of Athens (cf. Section 4.4), who probably belongs to the end of the chronological spectrum investigated here (the second/first half of the 1st century BCE), these remarks almost invariably do not presuppose an internalised ranking order among the Greek dialects: the overall impression is that of a descriptive framework aimed at recording and documenting the linguistic possibilities offered by a given dialect (in this case, Attic) rather than at prescribing an authoritative list of ‘chosen’ words.

For (ii), the state of preservation of these isolated remarks, all invariably from the indirect tradition, does not allow us to reconstruct with any certainty (and, at times, even probability) the overarching scope of these lexicographical works. Quite often, however, the comparative nature of their observations reveals an ‘open’ approach to Attic as one of the many possible Greek dialectal varieties. Finally, we shall conclude the chapter with a concise overview of the kinds of contribution that anonymous Hellenistic lexica or onomastica on papyri can bring to our understanding of the processes by which Attic linguistic material was transmitted within the later lexicographical tradition (Section 6).

2 Aristophanes of Byzantium

Aristophanes of Byzantium (ca. 265/57–190/80 BCE) is legitimately considered by ancient and modern scholars to be a product of the most mature phase of Alexandrian scholarship on the basis of both the range of his interests (textual criticism, bibliography, lexicography, paroemiography, and paradoxography, to quote just

³ On this terminological interchangeability between λέξεις and γλῶσσαι in early Hellenistic scholarship, see Chapter 6, Section 3.1.

a few) and the varieties of authors and genres (prose and poetry) that are the objects of his philological inquiries.⁴ We shall focus here on just a single aspect of Aristophanes' multifarious scholarly activity, his lexicographical inquiries, mainly (though not uniquely) represented by his *Λέξεις* (Ar.Byz. fr. 1–353).⁵ Our approach to Aristophanes' *Λέξεις* will necessarily be highly selective, since there is virtually no single fragment of this work in which matters Attic (in whatever form they may appear: literature quotations – prose and verse –, contemporary linguistic usage, explanation of local realia, cultic customs, etc.) do not feature, if only as a point of comparison with other linguistic customs. We have chosen, therefore, to begin with a brief sketch of the content and range of linguistic observations present in the *Λέξεις*, highlighting, where possible, points of convergence and divergence with the later Atticist traditions (Section 5.1). This targeted introduction, while obviously very partial, provides the framework within which we may take a closer look at what is probably one subsection of Aristophanes' lexicographical work, though not transmitted to us by the direct tradition, that is, the *Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις* (Ar.Byz. fr. 337–47: Section 5.2), before we can attempt to draw some general conclusions (Section 5.3).

2.1 Aristophanes' *Λέξεις*: Scope and structure

In Chapter 6, Section 2, we traced the emergence of Hellenistic lexicography and individuated three main areas of research: the explanation of literary glosses; a marked interest in dialectal words (and their underlying realia), within a framework which validates both literary texts and non-literary sources (read contemporary vernacular, koine included); and technical expressions. All three fields of inquiry find ample representation in Aristophanes' *Λέξεις*: in this sense, already in antiquity, Aristophanes was appropriately regarded as the culmination of a lexicographical tradition that could already rely on the work of Zenodotus, Callimachus, and Eratosthenes.⁶ While thus continuing a time-honoured practice with

⁴ For a comprehensive, updated survey, see Montana (2020b, 191–204) (= Montana 2015, 118–26), and more concisely, Montana (2021b).

⁵ We shall address Aristophanes of Byzantium's acquaintance with some of the tenets of word-class theory only when germane to our inquiry regarding his perception of the Attic dialect. On Aristophanes' knowledge of some form of rudimentary word-class theorisation, see the useful syntheses by Pagani (2011, 45–8) and Matthaios (2014a); a detailed analysis of the development of the word-class theorisation by Alexandrian grammarians in general is offered by Matthaios (2002).

⁶ For this intellectual, and partly biographical (Callimachus as teacher of Aristophanes) continuity (Zenodotus > Callimachus > Aristophanes), see Montana (2021b) on *Su.* α 3933.

illustrious predecessors, the Λέξεις at the same time represent a new point of departure in Hellenistic lexicography, not only by virtue of the sheer richness of linguistic observations and range of authors treated by Aristophanes.⁷

Prior to discussing the work's overall structure and scope, it is important to acknowledge that Aristophanes' Λέξεις represent, within Hellenistic lexicography, an absolute *unicum* in terms of textual transmission: it is the only scholarly work that has been handed down to us by both direct and indirect transmission (paraphrases or quotations mainly from the later lexicographical tradition: Eustathius *in primis*).⁸ In principle, this situation should simplify our task (comparison between the direct and indirect tradition should help us to reconstruct the *ipsissima verba* of Aristophanes); however, there are various reasons as to why this is often not the case. All three MSS transmitting Aristophanes' Λέξεις (M, L, and P)⁹ date to the 14th century, and a comparison with Eustathius' text clearly reveals that each represents a strongly epitomised and abridged copy of Aristophanes' original work, which was still accessible in a much more complete form to Eustathius himself in the 12th century. It is often difficult, therefore, and unavoidably speculative to establish when the contribution of the indirect tradition (e.g. explicit quotations by Eustathius and Erotianus, implicit borrowings in the *Antiatticist*, etc.) expands on the subject, drawing on original material that is no longer available to us via the direct tradition, and when these same later sources simply fill in the gaps of our documentation out of their own resourcefulness. This uncertainty constitutes the circumstances that any attempt at reconstructing the original form and intent of the Λέξεις must confront from the outset. Moreover, this is why, as we shall see repeatedly in Section 5.2, a range of multiple interpretations must often be simultaneously entertained, depending on the plausibility of the various transmission scenarios that one posits. Furthermore, some secondary sources, as we have already seen in Chapter 6, Section 2 with the case of the *Antiatticist*, have their own agendas to promote, and it is not uncommon for later authors to attempt to superimpose, consciously or unconsciously, their conceptual framework onto Aristophanes' original wording: the possibility of implicit bias must also be consistently borne in mind, alongside the usual accidents of any *Überlieferungsgeschichte*.

Let us return to the content and underlying organising principle(s) of Aristophanes' Λέξεις as preserved to us by the direct tradition. The MS M (= Par. suppl.

⁷ The best overall introduction to Aristophanes' Λέξεις remains that by Tosi (1994a, 155–67).

⁸ See the overview by Slater (1986, xii–xviii) on the sources and transmission of Aristophanes' Λέξεις.

⁹ P, the only witness available to Nauck (1848), comes from a tradition partially different to that of ML: see Slater (1986, xiv).

gr. 1164), our fuller witness, presents the following series of chapters: it opens with a section entitled *Περὶ τῶν ὑποπτευομένων μὴ εἰρησθαι τοῖς παλαιοῖς* (*On Words Suspected not to Have Been Used by the Ancients* = *OWS*; Ar.Byz. fr. 1–36),¹⁰ followed by two other sections, respectively *Ὀνόματα ἡλικιῶν* (*Names of Age Groups*; Ar.Byz. fr. 37–219) and *Περὶ συγγενικῶν ὀνομάτων* (*On Names of Kinship*; Ar.Byz. fr. 220–336); there follow several lexical items that are clearly out of the intended order but equally traceable back to Aristophanes' work (Ar.Byz. fr. 230–40, 245, 309–11, and 330–1).¹¹ It is immediately apparent that, at least in the form preserved by M, Aristophanes' *Λέξεις* had a composite structure: first *OWS*, without a recognisable overarching order (certainly not alphabetical; possibly partly organised in series of words sharing semantic or morphological features)¹² and a second part organised according to onomastic principles (Ar.Byz. fr. 37–336). The nature of the first section of M, that is, *OWS*, has been and still is a matter of intense debate in modern scholarship: Slater (1976, 236–7, 241; 1986, *passim*) has seen in *OWS* an anti-purist work, devoted to collecting evidence of the 'Classical' nature of words otherwise somehow not recognised as 'ancient', while Callanan (1987, 75–89), who denies a prescriptive or proto-purist intent to the *Λέξεις* as a whole, has rejected any chronological dimension for this subsection and has seen in it the application of a rather loose 'semantic character' as the main organising principle.¹³

10 There is no guarantee that the title transmitted by M goes back directly to Aristophanes of Byzantium: the very phrasing (insistence on an opposition between *παλαιοί* and *non-παλαιοί*) may well have been a later addition; see Callanan (1987, 77–8).

11 L (= Laur. 80.13) preserves only the section *Ὀνόματα ἡλικιῶν*, this time with the title *Περὶ ὀνομασίας ἡλικιῶν* (*On the Nomenclature of Age Groups*). P (= Par. gr. 1630) preserves under the generic rubric *Ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοφάνους τοῦ περὶ λέξεων διαλαβόντος* (*[Excerpts] from those Works of Aristophanes Giving his own Interpretation of Expressions*) various lexical items overlapping with *OWS*, *Names of Age Groups*, and *On Kinship Names*.

12 Cf. Tosi (1994a, 166–7); Montana (2020b, 198) (= Montana 2015, 124). Series exhibiting etymological and/or semantic affinity: Ar.Byz. fr. 6 (*μοιχί, μοιχίς, μοιχαλῖς, μοιχίδιον**), 9 (*ἐπικοκκάζω, ἐπικηκάζω*, ἐπικοκκαστρία**), 15 (*βαυβᾶν, βαυβαλίζω*, συοβαύβαλος*), 16 (*βλακεύεσθαι, βλάξ*, βλακεύειν*, βλάκες, βλακικῶς**: for a similar sequence in *Antiatt.* β 4, see Fiori 2022, 168–75), 18 (*ἄρδα, ἄρδαλωσαι*), 20 (*κοκκίζω, κόκκυξ, κόκκυ, κοκκυβόας*, ὄβριοκόκκυξ*), 23 (*στίμις, στίμι, στίβη**), 24 (*μαγίς, μάγειρος*), 29 (*λεπύχανον, λόπισμα*), 32 (*μόμφος, μομφή*, μομφίς**), 34 (*ἐπικύλλωμα, κατακύλλωμα*); series with similar morphological pattern: Ar.Byz. fr. 19 (*ἐσχάζοσαν, ἐλέγοσαν, ἐφεύγοσαν, ἐγράφοσαν**), 25 C (*γερόντοις, παθημάτοις*), 28 (*ἀπόστα, κατάβα, ἀνάβα*, διάβα**: on a very similar sequence in *Antiatt.* α 99, see Tribulato 2014, 207; see also Chapter 5, Section C.1.5.1).

13 Callanan's denial (Callanan 1987, 75–82) of any awareness of a diachronic dimension in Aristophanes of Byzantium's linguistic reflections has been rightly rejected not only by Tosi but also by Ax (1990, 13–5); Pagani (2011, 37 n. 81 and 48 n. 121); Nünlist (2012a, 154 n. 10); F. Montanari (2012, 124). Cf. also Willi (2014, 66). Where Callanan is right, is in pointing out that in Aristophanes the category of *οἱ παλαιοί vel sim.* is somehow underdetermined, encompassing authors whose lifetimes stretch over centuries and cutting across different genres. On the awareness of Alexan-

Tosi framed the possible underlying purposes of Aristophanes' λέξεις in a more nuanced way that does better justice to the varieties of linguistic observations and 'open' nature of Aristophanes' reflections on language.¹⁴ Tosi rightly observed that, while some fragments do appear to argue for the 'Classical' attestation of words that, by some quarters, must have been objects of suspicion, possibly because they did not apparently have a 'Classical' pedigree, others do not fit into this simple Classical vs non-Classical opposition and reflect instead a wider interest in language (primarily, but not exclusively, literary language) *per se* as a medium of communication. An intention to demonstrate the 'Classical' nature of single lexical items is, for instance, clearly discernible in Ar.Byz. fr. 3,¹⁵ where we are informed that Aristophanes defended the appropriateness of calling Athenian female citizens Ἀθηναῖαι like their male counterparts. The direct tradition does not tell us against whom Aristophanes may have reacted in defending the use of Ἀθηναῖαι, but we know from later Atticist sources (esp. Ael.Dion. α 43 ~ Phot. α 466, Su. α 729; Phryn. PS fr. 8) that Megaclides, a Peripatetic grammarian of the second half of the 4th century BCE, was among those who rejected the use, for Athenian women, of Ἀθηναῖαι as disrespectful towards the deity and recommended instead the use of ἀστίη or Ἀττική. As far as we can see, Megaclides' censure was not motivated by concerns of linguistic correctness (like the Atticists) but rather by local piety. In this case, too, it is the indirect tradition only (Phot. α 466) that allows us to recover the *auctoritates* quoted by Aristophanes to motivate his more flexible approach (followed by *Antiatt.* α 2–3 and the milder Atticist Orus in fr. B 4b): not only the Old Comedy poets Pherecrates (Pherecr. fr. 24) and Cantharus (Canthar. fr. 5) but also the 4th-century BCE Philemon (Philem. fr. 69), and hence New Comedy, were adduced as evidence. The same intention to defend a word as 'Classical' may also be inferred from other fragments: this is the case, for example, for Ar.Byz. fr. 5 ἄσλλα ('yoke for basket'), with the citation of a Simonidean epigram (of debated authenticity);¹⁶ for Ar.Byz. fr. 8 καταφαγᾶς ('glutton'; P: καὶ καταφαγᾶς, ὁ ἀδηφάγος), a word

drian scholars that language evolved through time, see Lallot (2011) and Nünlist (2012a) (mainly on Aristarchus).

14 See above all Tosi (1994a, 155–62; 202–4); cf. also Tosi (1994b); Tosi (1997). Tosi's conclusions are shared by S. Valente (2015b, 31–4). What follows in this section is heavily indebted to Tosi (1994a).

15 P reads ὅτι ἐστὶν Ἀθηναῖα γυνή, ὡσπερ Ἀθηναῖος. For the indirect transmission, see esp. Phot. α 466 and the relevant passages of Eustathius, extensively quoted by Slater (1986, 6–7).

16 On the authenticity of Sim. ep. 35 Sider = 41 FGE, see Sider (2020, 158–9). ἄσλλα is otherwise attested only in Alciph. 1.1.4 (Hemsterhuys' emendation) and in the lexicographical tradition (cf. Hsch. φ 311: φέριμα· ἄς ἐνιοὶ ἀσίλλας τὰς ἐκ σχοίνων πλεκομένας, καὶ ἰχθυηρὰ ἀγγεῖα, οἷον σπυρίδια (Men. fr. 468.2)). The compound ἀσίλλοφόρος is attested in documentary papyri of the Hellenistic (e.g. P.Lond. 44.32 = TM 3399) and Imperial era.

censured by Phryn. *Ecl.* 402 and by Poll. 6.40 but defended by the *Antiatticist* (κ 104) quoting Men. fr. 320 (perhaps already mentioned by Aristophanes of Byzantium?); and most likely also for Ar.Byz. fr. 1 σάννας ('idiot'), a word that Eustathius includes among the unusual terms (ἀσυνήθης/καινόφωνος λέξις),¹⁷ and Ar.Byz. fr. 26 τάγηνον· τὸ τήγανον (a kind of frying pan), where Aristophanes probably recorded the less usual form τήγανον (censured by later Atticists: e.g. Phryn. *PS* 112.11, Moer. τ 3) alongside the more frequent τάγηνον. Other fragments more broadly attest Aristophanes' interest in semantic change, without a specific purist or anti-purist agenda. This appears to be the case for στεγανόμιον in Ar.Byz. fr. 7. While part of the direct tradition (M) simply records the word's two possible meanings, both otherwise unattested in extant Classical Greek – that is, ἀριστητήριον ('refectory, dining-hall') and ὁ μισθὸς τοῦ πανδοκείου ('the payment of the inn')¹⁸ – Eustathius tells us that Aristophanes apparently distinguished between the Attic and the koine (παρ' ἡμῖν) usage (Eust. *in Od.* 2.73.42–3: προφέρει δὲ [. . .] καὶ τὸ στεγανόμιον, ὃ δηλοῖ, φησί,¹⁹ παρ' ἡμῖν μὲν τὸν τόπον ἐν ᾧ ἐστῶνται, παρ' Ἀττικοῖς δὲ τὸν μισθὸν τοῦ πανδοχείου).²⁰

Another set of fragments records an interest in semantic extension: this appears to be the case with μεγαλοψυχεῖν (Ar.Byz. fr. 11 A), which, Aristophanes tells us, may also be used in a negative sense, as a synonym for 'to be arrogant' (M: τὸ μεγαλοψυχεῖν τάττουσι καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ ὑπερφανεύεσθαι),²¹ or with ἄρχειν (Ar.Byz. fr. 12), also used in the sense of τυραννεῖν (M: τὸ ἄρχειν· καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ τυραννεῖν), and πλεονεξία (Ar.Byz. fr. 13), with a quotation from Isoc. 15.281–4 to illustrate that πλεονεξία (usu-

17 On the meaning of ἀσυνήθης/καινόφωνος in this passage of Eustathius, denoting not a chronological level but the unusual nature of an expression, see Tosi (1994b) on Ar.Byz. fr. 6.

18 Ar.Byz. fr. 7, M: στεγανόμιον· τὸ ἀριστητήριον καὶ ὁ μισθὸς τοῦ πανδοχείου. P reads only καὶ στεγανόμιον.

19 Slater (1986, 9) unsuccessfully tries to defend the transmitted φασί vs Nauck's φησί: cf. Tosi (1990–1993, 303).

20 This interpretation holds only if παρ' ἡμῖν does in fact refer to the Hellenistic koine and not to Eustathius' contemporary συνήθεια (which may or may not coincide with it). Previous scholars have taken παρ' ἡμῖν as part of Aristophanes' *ipsissima verba* rather than an intrusive aside from Eustathius. This seems plausible overall, given that part of the direct tradition (M) already refers to the two different meanings. It remains questionable, however, whether the phrasing παρ' Ἀττικοῖς may go back to Aristophanes: it sounds very much like Eustathius' own paraphrase, imposing his own conceptual framework on Aristophanes' original wording. For a detailed analysis of this most interesting fragment, see Bühler (1968, 236–8). It is highly likely that Aristophanes quoted what is now for us Men. fr. 455. On στεγανόμιος see Chapter 4, Section 4.2.

21 The same applies for the noun μεγαλοψυχία, Ar.Byz. fr. 11 B.

ally meaning ‘greed’) can also have a positive meaning, that of εὐπορία (‘advantage’).²² Likewise, also in Ar.Byz. fr. 31, Aristophanes, most probably drawing on Eur. Cyc. 104,²³ records an extension of the use of the adjective δριμύς (‘piercing’) to designate the intellectual quality of being ‘sharp-witted’ (M: δριμύ· καὶ τὸ συνετόν). The same applies to Ar.Byz. fr. 35 (= Eust. in Od. 2.155.2–5), where Aristophanes, in disagreement with other scholars,²⁴ defends the use of ἐπιστάτης (literally ‘one who stands upon another person’, ‘overseer’) as synonym to παιδοτριβῆς (‘gymnastic teacher’).²⁵ Finally, when Aristophanes quotes morphological or semantic doublets, he typically does so without passing judgement: rather, he simply records the common form alongside the less common one.²⁶

As observed by Tosi (1994a, 162), the overall impression is that of a product and conceptual framework ‘molto lontani dal rigoroso purismo impositivo della futura lessicografia postfrinichea’. This impression is further corroborated, as many scholars have observed, beginning with Fresenius (1875, 15–7), by the fact that the *Antiatticist* seems to use Aristophanes of Byzantium’s Δέξεις repeatedly, particularly the section OWS, in fighting his cause against the hyper-purist trends

22 The case of ψευδολογία (Ar.Byz. fr. 14) is slightly different because here it is the same Isocrates in his *Panathenaic Oration* (Isoc. 12.246) who already explicitly speaks of a ψευδολογίας, οὐ τῆς εἰθισμένης μετὰ κακίας βλάπτειν τοὺς συμπολιτευομένους, ἀλλὰ τῆς δυναμένης μετὰ παιδείας ὠφελεῖν ἢ τέρπειν τοὺς ἀκούοντας.

23 Cf. Eust. in Od. 1.110.46–7: Εὐριπίδης γὰρ, ἐπὶ συνετοῦ εἶρηκε τὸ δριμύ ὡς λέγει Ἀριστοφάνης ὁ γραμματικός.

24 See Callanan (1987, 105) on the target of Aristophanes’ polemical remark (οἱ πολλοὶ) [. . .] ἀγνοοῦσι in Eustathius’ text. The ‘majority’ knew only two meanings of ἐπιστάτης: ‘rot-stand’ and ‘beggar’ (a Homeric usage): [. . .] ἐπιστάτης ἐπὶ μόνου τοῦ χυτρόποδος δοκεῖ τοῖς πολλοῖς τάττεσθαι καὶ τοῦ μεταιτητοῦ (see Tosi 1997, 171 n. 2 rightly in favour of emending Eustathius’ μεταιτητοῦ (the Byzantine Greek form) into μεταίτου, as already observed by Nauck 1848, 215 n. 51).

25 For the relationship of Ar.Byz. fr. 35 with *Antiatt.* ε 100: ἐπιστάτης· ἀντὶ τοῦ διδάσκαλος ὁμολογουμένως. Ἀντίφανης (Antiph. fr. 306), see Tosi (1997, 71–2) and Benuzzi (2023b).

26 Semantic doublets: see e.g. Ar.Byz. fr. 29 AB on λεπύχανον καὶ λόπισμα (the skin of the onion: in later texts it is used as a generic term for the external rind or shell of legumes, pomegranates, and other vegetables), where both the direct (M) and indirect traditions (Eust. in Od. 2.201.8–10) simply juxtapose the two forms. Morphological doublets: Ar.Byz. fr. 6 AB μοιχή, μοιχίς (fr. 6 C μοιχαλῖς* is probably Eustathius’ addition; the terms are commented upon by Aristophanes as ἀσυνήθη, probably referring to literary συνήθεια: see Tosi 1994b), 25 AB and D (δόκος and δόκησις; βάδος and βάδις; πρόσωπος and πρόσωπον), 32 AC (μόφος, μομφή*, μόμφις*); on heteroclis in 5th and 4th century BCE comic language, see Chapter 5, Section B.2.11. On Ar.Byz. fr. 23 AB (στίμις, στίμι) see Chapter 6, Section 2. For morphological doublets in the Homeric text and Aristophanes’ attitude to it (etymology as the decisive factor), see Callanan (1987, 23–4) on Ar.Byz. fr. dub. 418 ἄεπτος (on Il. 1.567); cf. also Chapter 6, Section 4.3.

of his own time.²⁷ A detailed survey of these convergences (very often with a polemical intent) between Aristophanes of Byzantium and the *Antiatticist* is beyond the scope of this chapter.²⁸ We shall limit ourselves to noting that the sheer quantity of these similarities (the *Antiatticist* helps us to recover 15 fragments (plus 3 uncertain) out of the 36 constituting Aristophanes' *OWS*) weakens *a fortiori* the case of those who have argued in favour of a proto-atticist Aristophanes of Byzantium.

If we concentrate exclusively on *OWS*, it becomes apparent that the authors enlisted to illustrate the respectable pedigree of words were far more varied than those that we may find, for instance, in Phrynichus.²⁹ In *OWS*, if we accept Slater's conjectural attributions marked by an asterisk,³⁰ we have 42 quotations of comic poets (*adespota* included). Of these 42 citations, 37 come from Old Comedy (Aristophanes, Cantharus, Cratinus, Eupolis, Hermippus, Pherecrates, Phrynichus, Plato Comicus, Teleclides, and Theopompus; with Aristophanes representing the majority of quotations: 8x) and Doric comedy (Epicharmus 1x); 9 from Middle and New Comedy (Middle: Alexis 1x; Eubulus: 1x; New Comedy: Diphilus 2x, Menander 3x, Philemon 2x); 3 are *adespota*. As expected, comic poetry plays a prominent role in assessing linguistic usage, but Aristophanes of Byzantium's 'list' of good authors interestingly also includes representatives of New Comedy like Menander, who would instead be much criticised by strict Atticists, such as Phrynichus.³¹ Furthermore, in *OWS* we find quotations not only from poets but also from prose authors:³² Demos-

27 See above all Tosi (1994a, 162–6); Tosi (1997); S. Valente (2015b, 31–4) with previous bibliography. Cf. now also Fiori (2022, 26–9) and *passim* for the many individual entries of the *Antiatticist* where the anonymous compiler likely draws on Aristophanes of Byzantium's *Δέξεις*.

28 S. Valente (2015b, 31–2 n. 193) provides an updated list of the entries where the *Antiatticist* most likely is borrowing from Aristophanes' lexicographical oeuvre.

29 See Tribulato (2024) on comic citations in Phrynichus.

30 These are Alex. fr. 231 in Ar.Byz. fr. 15 C* (βαυβαλίζω) and Telecl. fr. 68 in Ar.Byz. fr. 32 C* (μόμφις).

31 On Phrynichus' marked dislike for Menander, see Tribulato (2014). For Aristophanes of Byzantium's fondness for Menander and his scholarly activity on him, a notorious *crux*, see the balanced assessment by Montana (2007).

32 We know that Aristophanes worked on Plato, see Ar.Byz. fr. 403 (= D.L. 3.61–2): he grouped Plato's dialogues into trilogies (instead of tetralogies). The exact nature of Aristophanes' scholarly activity on Plato is debated: a critical edition or a classificatory activity of the type to be assumed in his *Πρὸς τοὺς Πίνακας τοῦ Καλλιμάχου*? The latter seems much more likely: cf. Carlini (1972, 18). For Aristophanes' engagement with Epicurus, see Ar.Byz. fr. 404 (= D.L. 10.13): κέχρηται δὲ λέξει κυρία κατὰ τῶν πραγμάτων, ἦν ὅτι ιδιωτάτη ἐστίν, Ἀριστοφάνης ὁ γραμματικὸς αἰτιᾶται ('[Epicurus] uses standard diction for things, a diction with which Aristophanes the grammarian finds faults because it is highly idiosyncratic'). Slater (1986, 158) takes Aristophanes' criticism as a general critique of the koine, but it seems more probable that what Aristophanes found peculiar and not commendable (if αἰτιᾶται is a faithful representation of his opinion) was the use of

thenes (56.3) is mentioned by Aristophanes in support of the equivalence γόμος = φόρτος τῆς νεώς ('cargo') in Ar.Byz. fr. 27,³³ as too is Hyperides (Hyp. fr. 42 Jensen) in Ar.Byz. fr. 6 D* for the diminutive μοιχίδιον,³⁴ Isocrates in Ar.Byz. fr. 11A (Isoc. 15.281–4) and 13 (= Isoc. 12.246) for the unusual meaning, respectively, of μεγαλοψυχεῖν/μεγαλοψυχία and πλεονεξία in given contexts (on which see above); and Thucydides (Thuc.1.42.1) in Ar.Byz. fr. 33 for ἀμύνεσθαι as synonymous to ἀμείψασθαι ('to answer', 'to reward') – all 'respectable' prose authors. However, we also have two quotations from the more linguistically problematic Xenophon (see Chapter 4, Section 5.1): in Ar.Byz. fr. 16, Xenophon is mentioned for some form in βλακ- (it is uncertain which one), and in Ar.Byz. fr. 17 he is quoted as *auctoritas* for the compound σπανοσιτία (X. *HG* 4.8.7) glossed with ἡ τῶν τροφῶν ἔνδεια ('lack of food').³⁵

Furthermore, in *OWS*, Aristophanes does not limit himself to quoting only Classical authors but also quotes from contemporary Hellenistic writers:³⁶ Callimachus fr. 224 Pfeiffer is invoked by our scholar in Ar.Byz. fr. 25 A to support the 'seriousness' of the form δόκος 'opinion',³⁷ alongside the well-attested δόκησις, and Lycophron's *Alexandra* 21 is mentioned in Ar.Byz. fr. 19 A for the koine form

κύρια ὀνόματα in a technical, philosophical sense (that is, in a transferred way). For Hellenistic scholarship on prose authors (mostly historians), see Nicolai (1992, 265–75); Montana (2020b, 167–9) (= Montana 2015, 95–97); Montana (2020a) (Didymus and historians); Matijašić (2018, 147–60). Prose authors were mainly used as source of linguistic and factual knowledge (*Sprachphilologie* and *Sachphilologie*, i.e. *realia*) to help in the interpretation of literary texts: cf. Nicolai (2015, 1092–3).

33 Slater (1986, 23) comments that 'perhaps the aim of the note was to show that γόμος was used of ships rather than beasts of burden: both are Hellenistic usages'. This observation can be further qualified. Lee (1983, 62) has shown that it is only from the *Septuagint* onwards that γόμος begins to be used of any load, no longer restricted to a nautical usage. A comparison with Ar.Byz. fr. 7 allows us to entertain the possibility that Aristophanes might originally have drawn attention to this shift in usage between 'Classical' authors (γόμος referred only to the freight of a ship) and later ones (γόμος extended to any 'weight', 'burden').

34 If indeed *Antiatt.* μ 18 (μοιχίδιον· τὸ ἐκ μοιχοῦ γεγεννημένον. Ὑπερείδης ἐν τῷ Κατὰ Ἀριστοφῶντος) preserves here genuine Aristophanic material.

35 In the 4th century BCE, the word is also epigraphically attested: cf. *IG* 2³.1.367.9–10 (325/4 BCE).

36 On the interest of the Alexandrian scholars toward contemporary poetry, F. Montanari (2002) with previous literature is still an important point of reference; cf. also Montana (2020b, 170–1) (= Montana 2015, 97–8).

37 Cf. Eust. in *Od.* 1.340.27–8: καὶ οὐδέν τι τούτων, φησί, πεπαιγμένον ἐστίν, ἀλλὰ πάντα ἐσπούδασται. In *Et.Gen.* B s.v. Σκείρων (see Callanan 1987, 24; this piece of evidence is omitted by Slater 1986) we are told that Aristophanes of Byzantium, against Callimachus (fr. 296 Pfeiffer), spelled the personal name with ει rather than ι. In Ar.Byz. fr. 48 E, Call. fr. 543 Pfeiffer is quoted for the use of ἀπόθριξ = ἄνηβος.

of the third-person plural imperfect ἐσχάζουσιν erroneously interpreted by Aristophanes as a dialectal feature of the Chalcidians.

A dialectal interest also emerges in Ar.Byz. fr. 25 C, where Aristophanes cites the athematic dative plural in -οις γερόντοις (Attic γέρουσι) and παθημάτοις (Attic παθήμασι) as shorthand for the Aetolian dialect (a variety of Northwest Greek). Slater (1986, 21), while recognising, following Meineke, that the source of παθημάτοις is likely to be a comic passage (*com. adesp.* fr. 182 μὴ καταγελάτε τοῖς ἐμοῖς παθημάτοις), suggests that γερόντοις ‘must come from an official letter of the Aetolian league to Miletus’. However, Latte (1933, 402–3 n. 3), taking up a suggestion by Fraenkel, had already persuasively argued in favour of a comic attribution for Μιλασίοις καὶ τοῖς συναρχαῖαις καὶ τοῖς γερόντοις: we know of no γερουσία in Miletus, and the speaking character must have been an Aetolian mixing things up. There is no need, then, to see in Ar.Byz. fr. 25 C a direct use of inscriptional evidence on the part of Aristophanes of Byzantium.³⁸

Attention to non-literary dialects is also well represented outside *OWS*: for example, we are told that the Cyreneans called the ephebes τριακάτιοι (Ar.Byz. fr. 47), the sons of sons ἄμναμοι (Ar.Byz. fr. 235), and brothers ἀγαλάκται (Ar.Byz. fr. 236) and that the Rhodians called their illegitimate sons ματρόξενοι (Ar.Byz. fr. 232).³⁹ A string of Cretan glosses is recorded in Ar.Byz. fr. 48 A–F (ἀπόδρομος, ἄπιχθος, ἄποινος, ἀποβώμιος, ἀπόμουσος, ἀπόθριξ, ἀπόμαχος) and in Ar.Byz. fr. 233 B (the Cretans use the term σκότιοι to indicate τὰ νεώτατα παιδία, ‘the youngest children’). Ar.Byz. fr. 49–50, if authentic (they are missing in M and in Eustathius), preserve an Achaean and a Thracian gloss for ἐφηβοί and in Ar.Byz. 103, the form ἄπτιγος (of Anatolian origin) is said to be the Ionic word used to indicate a male goat (M: παρὰ δὲ Ἰωνικοῖς). Furthermore, Ar.Byz. fr. 348–53⁴⁰ transmit a series of Laconian words, apparently of non-literary provenance, which, according to our indirect sources, were part of a work (or, perhaps more likely, a subchapter of his *Λέξεις*) entitled *Λακωνικαὶ γλῶσσαι* (Ath. 3.77a and 3.83a).⁴¹ Finally, in the recently published treatise *On Prosody*, that shows direct knowledge of and dependence from Tryphon’s doctrine (1st century BCE), Sandri (2023b) has been able to recover a further piece of information about Aristophanes of Byzantium. At l. 92 of this treatise, preserved by the 14th-century cod. Par. gr. 2646, one may now read: (Ar. Byz. fr. novum Sandri): κάνθον· Ἀριστοφάνης βαρύνει ἐν τῇ περὶ τῆς τῶν Ἀλεξαν-

³⁸ This conclusion is shared also by Dyck (1989, 259).

³⁹ If our interpretation of ἄμβων in Ar.Byz. fr. 337 (Ἀπτικαὶ λέξεις) is correct (see Section 2.2), Aristophanes also recorded the Rhodian ἄμβωνες = ‘projecting crests of mountains’.

⁴⁰ Callanan (1987, 87 n. 27) adds the case of γεροντίας in Eust. *in Il.* 3.590.9. See also the Laconic glosses ἰπτεῖς, and ἰπαγρέται in Ar.Byz. fr. 55–6.

⁴¹ Cf. Hsch. π 3175: ἐν ἐξηγήσει Λακωνικῶν.

δρέων διαλέκτου (‘κάνθον (‘eye): Barytone, according to Aristophanes in his *On the Dialect of the Alexandrians*).⁴² That Aristophanes wrote a treatise *Περὶ τῆς τῶν Ἀλεξανδρέων διαλέκτου* is not otherwise attested, and it may simply be a scribal error, as suggested by Sandri herself (we would have expected Demetrius Ixion to have authored such a work: see Section 4.2) but an Aristophanic authorship cannot be ruled out either.⁴³ The notion of an Alexandrian dialect is itself quite elusive and has been variously interpreted (a local variety or, more likely, a particular diastatic register of the koine).⁴⁴ However, the fact that this late Byzantine codex ascribes such a work to Aristophanes of Byzantium shows a perception of Aristophanes’ activity that is in keeping with what we have observed so far in his *Λέξεις*: attention not only to the *Kunstsprache* of literary texts, whatever their genre, but also to the spoken language of his own time, whether koine (e.g. στεγανόμιον Ar.Byz. fr. 7) or local vernaculars (e.g. Cyrenaic, Cretan, Ionic, Laconic, Rhodian, and obviously Attic).⁴⁵

How, then, should we consider Aristophanes’ approach to language issues in the *Λέξεις* overall? It is important here to reiterate a distinction already highlighted by Callanan (1987, 103–6): that is, that while studying the *Λέξεις*, we should consistently try to distinguish between Aristophanes’ role in the development of theoretical reflections on normative grammar and the contribution that he made, if any, towards the emergence of strictly prescriptive, Atticist tendencies.⁴⁶ This distinction

42 As argued by Favi (forthcoming b), the point of highlighting the paroxytone accentuation of the word under discussion (κάνθος instead of κανθός) probably lies in κανθός being an exception to the analogical rule that we find formulated later in [Arcad.] *De prosodia catholica epitome* 174.1–4 Roussou: τὰ εἰς ΘΟΣ δισύλλαβα μονογενῆ ἔχοντα τὴν πρὸ τέλους συλλαβὴν εἰς σύμφωνον καταλιγούσαν βαρύνεται. πτόρθος, γόνθος (ὁ κόγχος), γρόρθος (τὸ ἐπὶ τῆς αὐλήσεως), σμίνθος (ὁ μῦς). τὸ δὲ ξανθός καὶ τυτθός τριγενῆ.

43 Aristophanes’ interest in accentuation, although not ample, is however attested: see Sandri (2023b, 92–3) with further bibliography.

44 See Favi, Tribulato (2024) and Favi (forthcoming b); cf. Section 4.2.

45 This was already clearly thematised by Pfeiffer (1968, 202), following Wackernagel’s brief comments in Wackernagel (1876, 56–7).

46 This distinction is not taken into full consideration by Ax (1990) in his most interesting discussion of the alleged normative analogical tendencies of Aristophanes as attested, in his opinion, by Varro, *De Ling. Lat.* 9.12: = Ar.Byz. fr. 374 Slater *artifices egregii non reprehendendi, quod consuetudinem* [. . .] *superiorum non sunt secuti, Aristophanes improbandus, qui potius in quibusdam veritatem quam consuetudinem secutus?* According to Ax this passage attests that Aristophanes intervened prescriptively in the *συνήθεια* of his day (see also Pagani 2015, 808). The Varro passage obviously deserves a fuller treatment than what we can offer in this chapter. Let us only make some brief remarks: (1) *in quibusdam* is an important limitation which must not be forgotten; (2) there is *consuetudo* and *consuetudo*: we have seen that *συνήθεια* can be used with reference to both literary and contemporary spoken language; (3) Varro has just pitched the artists

is of fundamental importance for our purposes. We have already seen (Chapter 6, Section 2) that any theoretical reflection on grammar as a system inevitably implies a normative component, which is proper to any language at any given time, if one considers grammar as a complex whole of interrelated parts. Yet to automatically equate this stance to the wholesale adoption of a prescriptivist agenda, anticipating that of later Atticist lexicographers, is a misconceived operation. From this perspective, it is also important to observe that later sources (esp. Eustathius, as we have already seen) often paraphrase Aristophanes' linguistic observations by unconsciously recasting them into current Atticist terminology and evaluative parameters ('correctness' or 'incorrectness'), using terms such as ὀρθότερον or ἀμαρτάνειν (see e.g. the case of στίμις/στίμι in Ar.Byz. fr. 23 AB discussed in Chapter 6, Section 2). However, it is highly unlikely that Aristophanes of Byzantium ever used such terminology himself. We can identify clear examples of this (un)conscious alteration, particularly when we are able to compare direct and indirect tradition. This is the case, for instance, for Ar.Byz. fr. 282 (παράνυμφος/ παρανυμφίος), which belongs to the section of the Λέξεις entitled Περί συγγενικῶν ὀνομάτων in our MSS. This is Eustathius' text:

Ar.Byz. fr. 282 (= Eust. *in Il.* 2.351.3–6): [. . .] καὶ ὅτι παρώνυμος τῇ νύμφῃ ὁ νυμφίος, καὶ ὅτι ὁ παράνυμφος εἰκαιότερον οὕτω λέγεται. ὀρθότερον γάρ ἐστι παρανυμφίον καλεῖσθαι τὸν συναπάγοντα τῷ νυμφίῳ τὴν νύμφην ἢ πεζῇ ἢ ἐφ' ἀμάξης ὡς παρ' Ἀθηναίους ὑφ' ὧν καὶ πάροχος καλεῖται κτλ.

[One must also know] that νυμφίος ('bridegroom') derives from νύμφη ('bride') and that παράνυμφος ('the bridegroom's best man') is so called rather carelessly. For it is more correct to call παρανυμφίος him who, together with the bridegroom, carries off the bride either by foot or on a wagon as the Athenians do, who call him also πάροχος, etc.

Eustathius' ὀρθότερον may raise an alarm: is Aristophanes here being prescriptive in an Atticist sense? If we turn to the direct tradition (MS P), we read the following: καὶ παράνυμφος κυριώτερον δὲ παρανύμφιος.⁴⁷ Thanks to P, we can see that Eustathius' ὀρθότερον is an Atticist rendering of Aristophanes' far more neutral (at least from an evaluative point of view) κυριώτερον. Aristophanes was thus not proscribing παράνυμφος and prescribing παρανυμφίος; he was simply saying, in a descriptive way, that the latter form, in terms of what we would call derivational morphology, was 'more proper' because he analysed the word, ety-

Apelles and Protogenes against other earlier artists (Micon, Dioces, Arimmas). Analogy would require that Aristophanes is here pitched against not οἱ πολλοί but his peers, that is, scholars: we are dealing with a comparison between different scholarly habits.

47 For the difference in accents between P and Eustathius, see Nauck (1848, 148–9).

mologically, as from ὁ παρὰ τῷ νυμφίῳ.⁴⁸ Callanan has already shown that the use of κυρίως, ἀκύρωσ, κυριώτερον and related expressions in Aristophanes of Byzantium must not be confused with the more rigorous use of the ‘correct/incorrect’ categories of the Atticists.⁴⁹ The qualification κυριώτερον indicates in a matter-of-fact way that the a word can be used in its primary (κυρίως) or derivative/secondary (that is, transferred: ἀκύρωσ) meaning: the former is not *per se* ‘more correct’ than the latter; both are equally possible (and admissible) within the wider linguistic glide. In the case of Ar.Byz. fr. 282 we should thus not speak of ‘analogistisch normierende Absicht’.⁵⁰ Aristophanes’ intention was far simpler – to draw attention to extant morphological anomalies or doublets without censuring them.

In sum, the impression that one gets of Aristophanes’ Λέξεις in general, and of *OWS* in particular, is that of a work that is receptive to multiple linguistic dimensions: the majority of lexical items studied do belong to the literary language of ‘old’ authors, but we also find the literary usage of quasi-contemporaries (Callimachus, Lycophron), the spoken vernacular (Cretan, Rhodian, Laconian), the ‘high’ register of literature in all its genres (comedy – Old, Middle, and New – oratory, historiography), and the ‘lower’ register of the contemporary συνήθεια, with attention to semantic and diachronic variations in vocabulary and morphology. These are all features that are consistent with an ‘open’ phase of linguistic reflection, appropriate to the early Hellenistic period, when Attic, although undoubtedly a prestige language with an unrivalled literary tradition behind it, was not yet the overwhelming predominant or unique object of scholarly endeavour. Aristophanes’ Λέξεις, from Pfeiffer (1968, 203) onwards, have typically been regarded as a work subsidiary to the edition of texts. This may well be part of the story, yet the range of linguistic interests exhibited by Aristophanes, and particularly his attention to contemporary language and local dialects, appear to us to also suggest a broader ‘documentary’ scope: to record, mostly in an impartial way, what the available evidence tells us about language in general, not only with an eye to the edition of texts. From this perspective, the relatively ‘open’ approach to language underlying the Λέξεις becomes more easily understandable.

Before moving to a closer analysis of the Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις, let us briefly consider one further passage (Ar.Byz. fr. 369) that, though not belonging to the Λέξεις but

⁴⁸ See Callanan (1987, 25; 48).

⁴⁹ Callanan (1987, 103–4): ‘Auch an der einzigen Stelle, an der Aristophanes einen vergleichbaren Verstoß gegen seine semantischen Distinktionen dem Volk ankreidet, bezeichnet er den Sprachgebrauch lediglich als ἀκύρωσ. Er empfiehlt nicht den streng unterscheidenden attischen Gebrauch der Wörter, sondern notiert ihn nur’.

⁵⁰ Thus Callanan (1987, 112).

to Aristophanes' Πρὸς τοὺς Πίνακας Καλλιμάχου (*In Addition to Callimachus' Pinakes*),⁵¹ is highly revealing of Aristophanes' open approach to language issues.⁵² Fr. 369 is a passage from the synonymic lexicon Περί ὁμοίων καὶ διαφόρων λέξεων ascribed to Herennius Philo (1st BCE/1st century CE)/Ammonius,⁵³ where the use of the adverbial forms εὐθύ (usually spatial: 'straight forward') and εὐθέως (usually temporal: 'immediately') is discussed.⁵⁴ The text, as established by Federica Benuzzi (2022b), reads as follows:

Ar.Byz. fr. 369 = Herenn.Phil. 81 ([Ammon.] 202 = *Et.Gud.* d¹ 556.1–3, d² 556.24–8, 557.14–20; ~ Ptol.Ascal. *Diff.* 390.20–3 Heylbut): εὐθύς, εὐθύ καὶ εὐθέως διαφέρουσι. εὐθύς μὲν γὰρ ἔστιν ὁ κανὼν, εὐθύ δὲ <ῶ> γυμνασίου, ἀντὶ τοῦ κατ'εὐθείαν τοῦ γυμνασίου, ἢ εὐθεῖ τῶ κανόνι. τὸ δ'εὐθέως ἀντὶ τοῦ χρονικοῦ ἐπιρρήματος, ὁ οὖν ἐναλλάσσω ἀμαρτάνει, καθὰ καὶ Μένανδρος ἐν Δυσκόλῳ· 'τί φῆς; ἰδὼν ἐνταῦθα παῖδ' ἔλευθέραν | ἐρῶν ἀπῆλθες εὐθύς; <εὐθύς.> ὡς ταχύ'. καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης ὁ γραμματικὸς ἐν τῷ Πρὸς τοὺς Πίνακας Καλλιμάχου περὶ Ἀντιφάνους διαστέλλει τὴν λέξιν. τινὰς μέντοι τῶν ἀρχαίων φησὶ καὶ τὸ εὐθύ (mal. Benuzzi: εὐθύς codd.) ἀντὶ χρονικοῦ κεχρησθαι. φησὶ γοῦν κατὰ λέξιν· 'δεῖ δὲ τὸ μὲν εὐθύ λέγειν ἐπί τινος εὐθέος, οἷον ἂν μὲν ἦ θῆλυ τὸ ὄνομα <ἢ εὐθεῖα ὁδός>, ἢ εὐθεῖα βακτηρία', ἂν δὲ ἄρσεν 'εὐθύς ὁ κανὼν', ἂν δὲ τὸ σὺδέτερον καλούμενον 'εὐθύ τὸ ξύλον'. οἱ δὲ ἀρχαῖοι ἐνίστη τὸ εὐθύ ἐτίθεσαν ἐφ' ὁδοῦ τῆς τεινούσης ἐπὶ τινα τόπον· <εὐθύ τῆς στοᾶς, 'εὐθύ τῶν ἀρωμάτων>. τὸ δὲ κατὰ <τοὺς χρόνους οὐ λέγεται, ἀλλ' εὐθύς, οἷον 'γῆμαντος αὐτοῦ δ'> εὐθύς ἔσοι' ἔλευθερός' καὶ 'ὡς τοῦτ'ο δ'> εἶδεν, εὐθύς ἦν τάνω κάτω'.

Εὐθύς, εὐθύ and εὐθέως are different. Indeed, εὐθύς ('straight') is [said of] the ruler, while [you can say] 'εὐθύ ('straight') to school' in the sense of 'on a straight road to the school', or 'with a straight ruler'. εὐθέως, instead, [is used] as a temporal adverb. Therefore, the person who swaps them makes a mistake, also like Menander in the *Dyscolus* (Men. *Dysc.* 50, 52): 'What are you saying? You saw a girl there, from a respectable family, | and you immediately fell in love?' <'Immediately>. 'How fast!'. And the grammarian Aristophanes in the book *In addition to Callimachus' Catalogues* (Ar.Byz. fr. 369) in the section on Antiphanes defines the term. Indeed, he says that some of the ancients also used εὐθύ in a temporal sense. He literally says: 'One needs to use εὐθύ with regard to a straight object, for instance, if the name is feminine, 'the straight (εὐθεία) road', 'the straight (εὐθεία) cane', while if the noun is masculine 'the straight (εὐθύς) ruler', and if the noun is neuter 'the straight (εὐθύ) log'. And the ancients sometimes used εὐθύ in relation to a road that leads towards a place: 'straight (εὐθύ) to the portico' (*com. adesp.* fr. *79), 'straight to the spice sellers' (Eup. fr. 327.3). But εὐθύ is not used for time, while εὐθύς is, for instance: 'If he marries, I will be free at once' (*com. adesp.* fr. 249). (Translation by Benuzzi 2022b, slightly modified).

51 For this rendering of the title, see Nickau (1967, 346 n. 3).

52 This part relies heavily on the excellent article by Benuzzi (2022b).

53 For this double attribution, see Savio (2023).

54 In the Atticist tradition proper, with the exception of *Antiatt.* ε 96, this distinction becomes a rigid prescription: cf. Phynr. *Ecl.* 113, Moer. ε 11.

Prior to Aristophanes, Eratosthenes had discussed, probably in his work *On Ancient Comedy*, the temporal and spatial usages of εὐθύς and εὐθύ in relation to the authenticity of Pherecrates' *Miners* (see Chapter 6, Section 5.3).⁵⁵ The bone of contention appears to have been whether the use of the neuter adverbial εὐθύ in a temporal sense ('immediately') might have been deemed acceptable. The textual transmission of our fragment is highly complex and almost certainly corrupt in various respects (through abridgements, epitomisation, etc.), as remarked by all previous commentators. On the basis of a systematic analysis of the occurrences of εὐθύς, and εὐθύ in 5th- and 4th-century BCE literature and of the internal consistency of the passage of Herennius Philo/Ammonius, Benuzzi has persuasively argued that τὸ εὐθύς ἀντὶ χρονικοῦ κεχρηῆσθαι must be emended into τὸ εὐθύ ἀντὶ χρονικοῦ κεχρηῆσθαι. That is, in a section relative to the 4th-century BCE comic poet Antiphanes, Aristophanes of Byzantium, possibly within the context of a debated authorship, would have recognised that, even if the general rule was to use εὐθύς in a temporal sense and εὐθύ in a spatial one, *some* ancient authors (τινὰς μέντοι τῶν ἀρχαίων), and possibly but not necessarily Antiphanes among them,⁵⁶ did use εὐθύ as an adverb of time ('immediately') rather than space ('straight forward').⁵⁷ Later Atticist doctrine will distinguish between a proper and improper use of the two adverbs: Phrynichus (Phryn. *Ecl.* 113)⁵⁸ draws a clear-cut distinction between εὐθύς and εὐθύ, without space for exceptions, and so too apparently does Photius (Phot. ε 2185).⁵⁹ Only the *Antiatticist* (*Antiatt.* ε 96:

55 The Eratosthenic fragments are Eratosth. fr. 46 (= Phot. ε 2203) and 93 Strecker (= Harp. μ 25). They both have been intensely studied: see Slater (1976, 235–7 and 241); Tosi (1994a, 169); Tosi (1998a); Tosi (2022).

56 In the extant fragments of Antiphanes, no occurrences of εὐθύ are known so far. In Antiph. fr. 189.8–12: ἄν πάλιν | εἶπη τις Ἀλκμέωνα, καὶ τὰ παιδία | πάντ'εὐθύς εἶρηχ', ὅτι μανεὶς ἀπέκτονεν | τὴν μητέρ', ἀγανακτῶν δ' Ἄδραστος εὐθέως | ἤξει πάλιν τ'ἄπεισι ('And, if someone says, in turn, 'Alcmeon', even the children will say all [his story] immediately, that he went mad and killed his mother, and that Adrastus, in his fury, will immediately come and go away again'), εὐθύς and εὐθέως are used interchangeably.

57 See Benuzzi (2022b) for the disturbed order in which Aristophanes' fragment has come down to us in Herennius Philo/Ammonius (the part on adverbial εὐθύς and εὐθύ must originally have preceded – and not followed – the remark on the exceptional use of εὐθύ 'immediately' in some authors).

58 Phryn. *Ecl.* 113: εὐθύ· πολλοὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ εὐθύς, διαφέρει δέ· τὸ μὲν γὰρ τόπου ἐστίν, εὐθύ Ἀθηνῶν, τὸ δὲ χρόνου καὶ λέγεται σὺν τῷ σ (εὐθύ: Many use [it] instead of εὐθύς, but it is different. For one is [an adverb] of place, 'straight to Athens', while the other is [an adverb] of time and is said with the sigma').

59 Phot. ε 2185: εὐθύς λέγουσι καὶ εὐθέως· τὸ δὲ εὐθύ χωρὶς τοῦ σ ἐπὶ τόπου τιθέασιν ('They say εὐθύς and εὐθέως, but they use εὐθύ without sigma to indicate a place').

εὐθύ· ἀντὶ τοῦ εὐθέως) records as admissible the temporal value of εὐθύ, likely depending on Aristophanes of Byzantium to support his ‘eccentric’ position.

Aristophanes thus would have adopted a less rigid stance, particularly compared to that of his predecessor Eratosthenes, ready to deny to Pherecrates the authorship of the *Miners* because of the use of εὐθύ with temporal value. However, also in the case of Eratosthenes’ stricter approach, it is important to observe that Eratosthenes did not refute in absolute terms the use of εὐθύ in a temporal sense: he simply deemed it unsuitable for a play by a specific author – namely, Pherecrates, but possible and admissible in a play by the later comedian Nicomachus.⁶⁰ In fr. 369 Aristophanes of Byzantium seems thus to display a generally ‘open’ attitude to linguistic usage: while he recognises the most common usages of the literary συνήθεια, he also allows for some exceptions and deems it instructive to record them. In other words, in his Πρὸς τοὺς Πίνακας Καλλιμάχου, we find the same open, possibilist attitude to linguistic variation that we saw in his Λέξεις.⁶¹

2.2 Ἀττικαὶ Λέξεις

We shall now focus on Aristophanes’ Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις, a body of lexical items (frr. 337–47) that has come down to us only via the indirect tradition.⁶² The overwhelming majority of the fragments edited by Slater under this title have, in fact, been transmitted to us by Erotian, a grammarian and lexicographer datable to the mid-/second half of the 1st century CE, author of a *Glossary* of Hippocratic words.⁶³ It is

⁶⁰ Pace Slater (1976, 241; 237), who wants to see in the fragments of Eratosthenes just discussed a ‘strict Atticist’ *avant la lettre*. See Chapter 6, Section 5.3.

⁶¹ In the only other fragment certainly ascribable to Πρὸς τοὺς Καλλιμάχου Πίνακας, Ar.Byz. fr. 368 (= Ath. 9.408f) Aristophanes addresses an issue of usage/custom in Attic writers, with no particular linguistic implications (the custom of saying ‘(water) over the hand’ (κατὰ χειρὸς) before meals but ‘washing up’ (ἀπονίψασθαι) afterwards ([. . .] εἶοικε δ’ ὁ γραμματικὸς τοῦτο πεφυλαχένα παρὰ τοῖς Ἀττικοῖς κτλ.). Cf. also Ath. 9.410b: σημειωτέον δὲ ὅτι καὶ μετὰ τὸ δειπνήσαι κατὰ χειρὸς ἔλεγον, οὐχ ὡς Ἀριστοφάνης ὁ γραμματικὸς φησὶν ὅτι πρὶν φαγεῖν οἱ Ἀττικοὶ κατὰ χειρὸς ἔλεγον, μετὰ δὲ τὸ δειπνήσαι ἀπονίψασθαι. See also Slater’s comment: ‘Whether those whom Aristophanes attacked were poets or grammarians or both, we cannot tell, but evidently question of authenticity raised by Callimachus were at issue’ (Slater 1986, 135).

⁶² Aristophanes of Byzantium also concerned himself with Attic dialect in his Homeric studies: cf. schol. (Ariston.) Hom. Od. 2.294b1 (HM^a): ἐπιόψομαι Ἀττικὸν λιάν φησὶν ὁ Ἀριστοφάνης τὸ ‘ἐπιόψομαι’ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐποπτεύσομαι, περιβλέψω (on which see Prauscello 2023, 262–3) and μάμμα/μαμμία in Ar. Byz. fr. 241 DE.

⁶³ For an up-to-date critical assessment of Erotian’s lexicographical work, see Perilli (2021).

unsurprising, therefore, that many (but not all) of the glosses ascribed to the Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις bear some relationship, directly or indirectly, to ancient medicine. Modern scholarship has disagreed as to (1) whether Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις is the title of a stand-alone work by Aristophanes of Byzantium, independent of his collection entitled Λέξεις⁶⁴ or the heading of a subsection of that very same work⁶⁵ and as to (2) which of Aristophanes' fragments not explicitly ascribed by our sources to the Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις may have originally belonged to it. Regarding the first question, Cohn (1881, 323–4), in the wake of Fresenius (1875), cogently demonstrated that the Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις are considerably more likely to have been the heading of a subchapter of Aristophanes' Λέξεις (that is, just like *OWS*, *On Kinship Names*, etc.) rather than the title of a stand-alone, independent work. The second issue (which of the extant fragments can be traced back to the Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις?) is a far more troublesome and ultimately unsolvable question (at least, based on present evidence) that cannot be addressed here in all its complexity and ramifications. In this section, therefore, for practical reasons, we shall follow Slater's ascription of the fragments to the subsection Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις; however, this must not be taken as our definitive judgement on the issue, which would deserve a thorough reassessment.⁶⁶

The title Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις is explicitly mentioned by Erotian three times (Ar.Byz. fr. 337, 338, and 342) and once in Athenaeus (Ath. 14.619b–c = Ar.Byz. fr. 340). In Ar.Byz. fr. 347 (= Hdn. Περὶ διχρόνων, *GG* 3,2.13.14–7) the MSS tradition reads ἐν Ἀττικαῖς διαλέξεσιν, most probably a scribal corruption of the original title, as already observed by Lehrs (1857, 359). Ar.Byz. fr. 339, 341, and 344, also transmitted by Erotian, were first ascribed to Aristophanes' Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις by Cohn (1881, 323). In his glossary, Erotian mentions Aristophanes of Byzantium eight times overall: three times (Ar.Byz. fr. 337, 338, and 342), as we have seen, with explicit reference to his Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις; in two other passages Aristophanes, without mention of the work, is said to have dealt with Attic usage (Ar.Byz. fr. 343 = Erot. α 142 and 345 = Erot. χ 4). Of the remaining three other mentions of Aristophanes by Erotian (Ar.Byz. fr. 339, 341, and 344), fr. 341, unknown to Nauck, was first added by Fresenius to Aristophanes' Λέξεις in general, and by Cohn to the Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις in particular; Ar.Byz. fr. 344 was also reclaimed by Cohn to the Attic section. As a matter of fact, Slater's (and previously also Cohn's) attribution of these three fragments to the Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις is mainly based on the claim that 'there is no certainty that any of the quotations from Aristophanes by Erotian are from any other work than the Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις. [. . .] I have therefore attributed all the eight glosses to the work on Attic glosses' (Slater 1986, xv). It is obviously correct to say that 'there is no certainty' that Erotian, or his source, did draw also on other sections of Aristophanes' lexicographical collection, or indeed on any other work of our grammarian. Yet previous scholars of Erotian (above all Strecker 1891, 276–9) have shown, with varying degrees of plausibility but with

⁶⁴ See Rohde (1870, 16 n. 1).

⁶⁵ See Nauck (1848, 76; 181–2); Fresenius (1875, 23–4); Cohn (1881, 323–4).

⁶⁶ Slater's selection is conservative compared to Cohn's additions to Nauck's initial *recensio*: see Cohn (1881, 288 n. 6 and 323).

an overall persuasive cumulative force, that Erotian in his original version must have consulted a larger corpus of Aristophanes' work than the sole subheading Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις.⁶⁷

That Erotian had direct access to Aristophanes of Byzantium's oeuvre has been rightly doubted.⁶⁸ Rather, it is far more likely that most of the Aristophanic material came to Erotian in an already mediated form through Baccheius of Tanagra (3rd century BCE, a younger contemporary of Aristophanes of Byzantium), most probably known to him in the version revised by Epicles the Cretan (1st century BCE).⁶⁹ This tortuous transmission history should be constantly kept in mind when interpreting Aristophanes' Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις: one of the most difficult tasks, as will presently become apparent, is in fact that of ascertaining which portions of the attested quotations go directly back to Aristophanes and which do not (this problem is most acute in the case of *Zitatennest*).

In the next part of this section, we shall analyse in some detail most of the fragments commonly ascribed to the Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις.⁷⁰ For each fragment, we shall first highlight its general relevance to our inquiry (contextual meaning, spread of occurrences, and general underlying argument), including, where possible, the survival of these Attic expressions in the later lexicographical tradition, with a special attention to the Atticist doctrine; we shall then proceed to the often laborious task of reconstructing, when feasible, the broader context of Aristophanes' linguistic reflections. For the readers' convenience, we shall print textual and interpretative minutiae either in footnotes or in a section in smaller font to facilitate a swifter consultation of this section for those not interested in the more fine-grained aspects of interpreting fragments.

2.2.1 Ar.Byz. fr. 337

Ar.Byz. fr. 337 concerns the term ἄμβη (Ionic)/ἄμβων (Attic), the name of the medical tool (a wooden board) used to reduce dislocated joints. One of our two indirect sources, Erotian and Apollonius of Citium, a 1st-century BCE author, ascribes

⁶⁷ Cf. also Manetti (2015, 1143 n. 81).

⁶⁸ See Strecker (1891, 279) 'Dass Erotian seine Werke selbst geplündert hat, wird wohl niemand glauben'. Cf. already Nauck (1848, 78).

⁶⁹ Strecker (1891, 279–91) is still fundamental. For Erotian's knowledge of Baccheius' work in the abridged version by Epicles, see van Staden (1992, 551; 553–6). On the strong presence of Aristophanes of Byzantium's Λέξεις in Baccheius, see Manetti (2015, 1143–4); van Staden (1992, 567–9). On Erotian's presence in Hesychius, see Perilli (2008).

⁷⁰ We shall omit: Ar. Byz. fr. 339 ἰθρίσσει(ν)† (= Erot. θ 6) because too textually uncertain, and fr. Ar. Byz. 343 προκῶνια (= Harp. π 96), and 344 φορίνης (= Erot. φ 17), which are less significant from a merely linguistic perspective (fr. 343 deals with cultic Athenian realia; fr. 344 with possible synonyms for φορίνη 'thick skin').

this piece of information to Aristophanes' Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις (Erotian). Both Erotian and Apollonius offer three competing explanations of ἄμβων while discussing Baccheius' interpretation of the term: (1) the projecting crest/slope of a mountain (as in Aeschylus but also in Rhodian epichoric usage); (2) the rim at the very outer edge of the hollow part of a shield (Democritus); and (3) a pan's outer rim (comedy). The main challenge in this fragment is to try and extrapolate what is likely to be genuine Aristophanic material within a multi-layered *Zitatennest*. We shall argue that not only the first explanation of the term ἄμβων ('the projecting crest/slope of a mountain') but also (2) and (3), that is, 'outer rim of a shallow object', be it a shield or a pan, are likely to go back to Aristophanes of Byzantium. If our interpretation is correct, Aristophanes of Byzantium, in a section of his lexicographical work reserved for Attic glosses, recorded that not only Attic authors but also Rhodian speakers used the form ἄμβων (vs Ionic ἄμβη). It also illustrates the breadth of sources quoted by Aristophanes (local dialects; Aeschylus, Democritus, comedy). Furthermore, a further piece of evidence, the scholl. (Did.) in Hom. *Il.* 8.441a1 (A) and b2/a2 (T), makes it highly likely that Aristophanes of Byzantium first encountered the term ἄμβων not in Aeschylus (cf. Erotian) but in his Homeric studies. Finally, the observation of a common usage between dialects (one of them Attic)⁷¹ appears to reinforce the impression that for Aristophanes, as for other early Hellenistic scholars, Attic was simply one dialect among many, without the *a priori* privileged status that it would later acquire.

Ar.Byz. fr. 337 (= Erot. a 103): ἄμβη. [. .] ἡμεῖς δὲ τούτους πάντας παρατηρήσαντες Βακχείω συγκατατιθέμεθα, ὅς ἐν τῷ τρίτῳ φησὶν ἄμβην καλεῖσθαι τὴν ὄφρυώδη ἐπανάστασιν. καὶ γὰρ οἱ Ρόδιοι ἄμβωνας καλοῦσι τὰς ὄφρυώδεις τῶν ὀρῶν ἀναβάσεις. μέμνηται τῆς λέξεως καὶ Αἰσχύλος καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης (codd.: ὡς Ἀριστοφάνης Nauck) ὁ γραμματικὸς ἐν ταῖς Ἀττικαῖς λέξεσι. †θήρσις† (Ἐπιθέρησης Meinecke) δ' ἐν β' τῶν Λέξεων ἄμβωνά φησι χεῖλος εἶναι σκεύους καὶ τῆς ἀσπίδος τὸ πρὸς αὐτῇ τῇ ἴττι. Ἀριστοφάνης δὲ ὁ κωμικὸς (sed lege Eupolis) ἐν Αὐτολύκῳ φησὶν· 'ἐπὶ καινοτέρας ἰδέας ἀσεβῆ βίον (Hermann: ἀσέβιον codd.), ὦ μοχθηρὸς, ἔτριβες. | πῶς ὦ πολλῶν ἤδη λοπάδων τοὺς ἄμβωνας περιλείξας'. τουτέστι τὰ περὶ τοὺς ἄμβωνας⁷² χεῖλη. λέγεται δὲ οἷον ἀνάβη τις οὖσα.

71 Cf. Cohn (1881, 324 n. 87), commenting on Rohde's hypothesis of a whole work (that is, not only a chapter or subheading) entitled Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις: 'Quod vocem Rhodiacam ἄμβων Aristophanes ἐν Ἀττικαῖς λέξεσιν explicavit [. .], id Rohdei coniecturam minime adiuuat; ἄμβων enim et ab Atticis scriptoribus usurpatum est'.

72 Slater (but not Nachmanson) rightly puts ἄμβωνας between *obeloi* (perhaps considering it an intruded gloss?). Various solutions have been attempted: Olson (2017, 211) retains the transmitted text and translates, rather tautologically, with 'the parts around the *ambōnes* are the rims', while Ross (1971, 256 n. 29) perceives a confusion caused by the transference of sense of ἄμβων from 'bulge' to that of 'rim', 'lip'. The most satisfactory emendation proposed to date is that offered by

ἄμβη: [. . .] But we reject all these authorities (i.e. for the explanation of the term) and agree with Baccheius, who, in his third book, says that ἄμβη is the term for a projecting edge. For the Rhodians also call the projecting crests of mountains ἄμβωνες. Aeschylus mentions this expression (Aesch. fr. 103; 231) and so too the grammarian Aristophanes in his Ἄττικαὶ λέξεις. Ἰθέρσις† in the second book of his Λέξεις says that ἄμβων is the rim of a vessel, and, when referred to [the hollow of] a shield, the rim at the very outer edge. In the *Autolytus*, the comic poet Aristophanes [read Eupolis] says (Eup. fr. *60): ‘(A) You wretch spent your impious life on rather new-fangled forms. (B) What do you mean, you who have already licked the rims of many pans?’; that is, the parts around the ἰθέρσις† are the rims. It is so named as if it were some sort of ἀνάβη (‘rising’).

Apollonius Citiensis, *Comm. in περί ἄρθρων* p. 28.2–14 Kollesch–Kudlien: [. . .] ὁ Βακχεῖος τὴν ἐπὶ τοῦ μοχλοειδοῦς ξύλου λεγομένην ἄμβην ἐν τοῖς περὶ τῶν Ἱπποκρατείων λέξεων οὕτως ἐξηγεῖται ἰον† (del. Schoene: ὅτι Diels)· ‘ἐν ταῖς Λέξεσιν ἀναγέγραπται, ὡς (Schoene ex Erot.: ὡς ὅτι cod.) Ῥόδιοι ἄμβωνας καλοῦσιν τοὺς τῶν ὀρῶν λόφους καὶ καθόλου τὰς προσαναβάσεις’. καὶ διὰ τούτων φησὶν πάλιν· ‘ἀναγέγραπται δὲ καὶ ὡς ὁ Δημόκριτος εἶη καλῶν τῆς ἴτυος τὴν τῷ κοίλῳ περικειμένην ὀφρὺν ἄμβην’. ἔχει δὲ παρ’ αὐτῷ καὶ οὕτως· ‘ἀναγέγραπται δὲ ὁμοίως ἄμβων τῆς λοπάδος τὸ περικειμένον χεῦλος. Ἀριστοφάνης· ‘ὁ πολλῶν λοπάδων τοὺς ἄμβωνας περιλείξας’. ταῦτα <τὰ> (add. Kollesch–Kudlien) κομιζόμενα μαρτύρια παντελῶς ἐστὶν εὐθήη κεχωρισμένα τῆς ἀπὸ τῶν συμβαινόντων χρείας. ἔδε<ι> δὲ ἱστορικότα τοῦτο κατακεχωρικένας, ὅτι Κῶοι τοὺς τῶν κλιμάκων ἀναβαθμοὺς ἄμβωνας καλοῦσιν, ὡστ’ εἰρησθαὶ τὴν ἐν τῷ ξύλῳ ὑπεροχὴν τοιαύτην εἶναι, ὁμοίαν ἀναβαθμῷ εἰς τὸ βάθος ἐκκοπήν ἔχουσαν.

[. . .] Baccheius in his *On Hippocratic Vocabulary* explains the so-called ἄμβη (that is, a protruding edge) on a lever-like board thus: ‘in the Λέξεις it is recorded that the Rhodians call ἄμβωνες the crests of mountains and in general rising projections’. And through the following examples, he says again: ‘it is also recorded that Democritus (Democr. Diels–Kranz 68 B 29) called the brow-like rim running around the hollow part of a shield ἄμβη’. He also says: ‘it is likewise recorded that the rim running around a pan is an ἄμβων. Aristophanes (read Eup. fr. *60): ‘he who licked around the ἄμβωνες of many pans’. The witnesses adduced here are completely silly, since they are separated from their relevant context. Who has undertaken this research should have instead put down to record this, that the Coans call the steps of ladders ἄμβωνες, with the consequence that the projection in the wooden board is said to be such because it has a downward cut-out similar to that of a step.

The term ἄμβων, of uncertain etymology, up to the 10th century CE has only a handful of attestations in extant Greek literature, leaving aside medical and lexicographical writings.⁷³ Both Erotian and Apollonius ultimately draw on the *On*

Strecker (1891, 283), followed by Wellmann (1931, 27 n. 1), that is, τούτέστι τὰ περὶ τοὺς λοπάδας χεῖλη (Strecker’s proposal is not mentioned either by Slater or Ross).

⁷³ Etymology: see *DELG* s.v. (either a loanword or somehow connected to ἀναβαίνω) and *EDG* s.v. (‘probably a loanword’). For the extant attestations of the term, see Ross (1971) and below. In Modern Greek ἄμβωνας means the ‘pulpit’ in a church, cf. Triantaphyllides *AKN* s.v. The underlying

Hippocratic Vocabulary by Baccheius of Tanagra who, in turn, depends on Aristophanes of Byzantium (Erot.: ἐν ταῖς Ἀττικαῖς λέξεσι; Apoll.: ἐν ταῖς Λέξεσιν), with the difference that, whereas Erotian adopts Baccheius' explanation of ἄμβων, Apollonius sharply criticises it. Likewise, both Erotian and Apollonius, when reporting Baccheius' opinion, present a threefold explanation of the term: (1) the projecting crest/slope of a mountain; (2) the rim at the very outer edge of the hollow part of a shield; and (3) a pan's outer rim (observe that (2) and (3) are somehow compressed together in Erotian).⁷⁴

For (1), both our sources mention the Rhodians, with Erotian quoting explicitly Aeschylus⁷⁵ and Aristophanes of Byzantium as *auctoritates*,⁷⁶ while Apollonius, though mentioning Aristophanes of Byzantium's Λέξεις, does not give any specific example. As for (2), Apollonius mentions Democritus (Democr. Diels–Kranz 68 B 29), whereas Erotian's text is clearly corrupt: for our purposes, suffice it to say that, though the text as transmitted by the MSS seems to mention a different source from that cited by Apollonius (whether Meineke's Ἐπιθέρησης or something else), the *interpretamentum* remains the same (outer rim of a shield).⁷⁷ For (3), both quote erroneously the comic poet Aristophanes rather than Eupolis as the author of the (same) comic passage adduced as example (only the second line is quoted by Apollonius), a sign that the mistaken ascription was perhaps already in Baccheius' text.⁷⁸ All subsequent lexicographical sources on ἄμβη/ἄμβων ultimately derive from Baccheius who, as we saw, relied on Aristophanes of Byzantium's (Ἀττικαῖ) Λέξεις (see Manetti 2009, 166): cf.

ing Hippocratic passage commented by Erotian and Apollonius of Citium has been identified with Hp. *Art.* 7 (= 4.88.19 Littré): ἄμβην δὲ ἐχέτω.

74 See already Wellmann (1931, 27), who rightly comments that something must be amiss in the text of Erotian since we would expect not Ἀριστοφάνης δέ but rather <καί> Ἀριστοφάνης δέ or ὡς καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης.

75 So also Hsch. α 3536: ἄμβωνες· αἱ προσαναβάσεις τῶν ὀρῶν. Αἰσχύλος Κερκύωνι (Aesch. fr. 103) καὶ Σισύφῳ (Aesch. fr. 231). Presumably, the details on the specific tragedies of Aeschylus in which the term occurred ('Aeschylus in his *Kerkyon* and *Sisyphus*') also go back to Aristophanes of Byzantium but were not preserved in the abridged extant version of Erotian's glossary.

76 Nauck (1848, 186), not implausibly, proposed emending the transmitted μέμνηται [. . .] καὶ Αἰσχύλος καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης ὁ γραμματικός into μέμνηται [. . .] καὶ Αἰσχύλος ὡς Ἀριστοφάνης ὁ γραμματικός (sc. ἔφη *vel sim.*). The parallelism καὶ [. . .] καὶ does indeed lead us to expect the mention, after Aeschylus, of another Classical author, and not that of a scholar; yet μιμνήσκω in Erotian's glossary can equally refer to an author proper or to a learned authority.

77 Meineke's Ἐπιθέρησης (second half of the 1st century CE, author of a work entitled Περὶ λέξεων Ἀττικῶν καὶ κωμικῶν καὶ τραγικῶν) has been accepted by Nachmanson (1918) and Wellmann (1931, 26–7); Wellmann, however, considers (2) in Erotian a later interpolation which must have substituted at an advanced stage Democritus' original quotation. More pessimistic is instead Strecker (1891, 283), who considers the passage 'unheilbar verdorben' and suggests seeing in ἐν β' τῶν Λέξεων a clumsy reference to Aristophanes of Byzantium's own Λέξεις.

78 See recently Olson (2017, 213) on the problem of the authorship of the fragment in question. In comedy ἄμβων occurs also in Ephipp. (4th century BCE) fr. 5.16 (said generically of the banks of an imaginary lake).

Ael.Dion. α 96 (from Eust. *in Od.* 1.353.2–5, who at the end of the excursus adds [Slater: by himself? Strecker: via Aristophanes of Byzantium?]) also the otherwise unattested meaning of female genitals: [. . .] ἐρρέθη δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ μορίου γυναικείου ὀ ἄμβων), Philox.Gramm. fr. *38, P.Oxy. 17.2087 (= TM 63597) ll. 38–9 (a 2nd century CE alphabetic glossary), Gal. *in Hp. Art.* 18a.340.10–8 Kühn and *Gloss.* α 76 Perilli (on which see Perilli 2006, 182–4 and Perilli 2017 *ad loc.*), Phryn. *PS* 18.3–5, Hsch. α 3536 (cf. also α 4213), Phot. α 1173–4, *Et.Gen.* AB α 613 (on which see below) ~ *EM* 81.9–5, [Zonar.] 142.3–7. Poll. 6.97 uses the term with reference to the Spartan drinking vessel κώθων, probably via Critias Diels–Kranz 88 B 34 (= Ath. 11.483c; cf. also Plu. *Lyc.* 9); on Pollux's apparent misunderstanding of the term ἄμβων, see Ross (1971, 254). The lexicographical tradition is briefly surveyed by Olson (2017, 212–3); see also Ross (1971).

The present state of our evidence invites three main interconnected questions: (A) how far does the quotation of Aristophanes of Byzantium extend in the texts of both Erotian and Apollonius? Or, put otherwise, did Aristophanes mention for ἄμβων only the meaning (1), i.e. ‘projecting crest’ of a mountain⁷⁹ or did he include in his Δέξεις also the meaning (2), i.e. ‘outer circular edge of the concave part of a shield’, and (3), i.e. pan’s rim?⁸⁰ (B) Where did Aristophanes of Byzantium first encounter this word: in his lexical studies or in his Homeric exegesis? (C) What is the word’s dialectal veneer (Rhodian? Attic? Coan?).

Regarding the actual extension of the Aristophanic quotation (A), Slater does not explicitly motivate his decision, but limits himself to stating that ‘Nauck was correct to attribute only argument A [i.e. mountain’s crest] to Aristophanes’. Yet Strecker (1891, 282–3), followed by Wellmann (1931, 26–7), had already rightly observed that the threefold repetition, in Apollonius’ text, of ἀναγέγραπται (used the first time by Apollonius with explicit reference to Baccheius’ quotation from Aristophanes’ Δέξεις) strongly suggests that all the three meanings (1), (2), and (3), jointly recorded by Erotian and Apollonius, must ultimately go back to the Alexandrian scholar.⁸¹ The fact that Democritus is not otherwise mentioned in the extant fragments of Aristophanes of Byzantium is in itself not a sufficient argument against this conclusion: that Aristophanes was not entirely alien to philosophical prose is confirmed by his observation on the idiosyncratic nature of Epicurus’

79 So Nauck (1848, 186) tacitly, followed by Slater (1986, 113).

80 Cf. Strecker (1891, 281–2); Wellmann (1931, 26). See, also, more recently Olson (2017, 213): ‘Aristophanes of Byzantium must be responsible for the references to Aeschylus, Democritus and Eupolis (or Aristophanes)’, although he does not refer to either Strecker or Wellmann.

81 Strecker (1891, 283) also ascribed to Aristophanes the final pseudo-etymology preserved in Erotian’s text (λέγεται δὲ οἶον ἀνάβη τις οὔσα). Etymology is amply attested as one of the exegetical tools used by Aristophanes of Byzantium, yet there is no way of knowing whether the etymological explanation offered here antedated the Alexandrian scholar, as correctly observed by Slater (1986, 113). For the use of etymology as hermeneutical tool in Aristophanes’ Δέξεις, see Ar. Byz. fr. 24 AB on μαγίς, μάγειρος. Cf. also Callanan (1987, 97–102).

prose (Ar.Byz. fr. 404 = D.L. 10.13) and by his subdivision of Plato's dialogues into trilogies instead than into tetralogies (Ar.Byz. fr. 403 = D.L. 3.61–2).

As for (B), the comparison of our two main witnesses makes it abundantly clear that ἄμβων was a widely discussed term in antiquity, and not only among physicians (Erotian in his lemma mentions seventeen different authorities). This impression is corroborated by two further pieces of evidence. First, the scholl. (Did.) in Hom. *Il.* 8.441a1 (A) and b2/a2 (T) (both ultimately going back to Didymus) attest that at *Il.* 8.441 (ἄρματα δ' ἄμ βωμοῖσι τίθει, κατὰ λίτα πετάσσας) a certain Diogenes, who must therefore have antedated Didymus, favoured the variant reading (or conjecture?) ἄμβώνεσσι, against the *vulgata* ἄμ βωμοῖσι defended by Aristarchus.⁸² The contextual meaning of the ἄμβώνεσσι supported by Diogenes is not immediately clear,⁸³ but what is important for us is that this piece of evidence reveals that Aristophanes of Byzantium may have first encountered this word not while perusing Aeschylus (cf. Erotian and Hsch. α 3536) but in his Homeric studies.⁸⁴

Second, ἄμβώνεσσι, although not with reference to chariots, is also attested in Callimachus *Aitia* fr. 75.34 Harder ἐπ' οὐρεος ἄμβώνεσσιν,⁸⁵ that is, within Apollo's oracular response praising the illustrious Coan genealogy of Acontius, a descendant of the priests serving in the cult of Zeus Aristaeus the Icmian on Ceos. The fact that Callimachus, Aristophanes of Byzantium's teacher, opts to define ἄμβων as the 'rising projection of a mountain top' must certainly be put into the context of a learned debate existing around that very same word, a discussion already present in Homeric circles, as we have seen.⁸⁶ Does the Callimachean quotation mentioned in *Et.Gen.* α 613, an entry that would fit very well within the lexicographical tradition of ἄμβων, ultimately go back to Aristophanes of Byzantium?

⁸² Schol. (Did.) Hom. *Il.* 8.441a1 (A) <ἄμβωμοῖσι> οὕτως Ἀρίσταρχος 'ἴβωμοῖσι'. A^{im} ἐν τοῖς Διογένοους 'ἄμβώνεσσι'. A^{im} and 8.441b2/a2 (T) ἄμ βωμοῖσι: διὰ τοῦ μ ἢ γραφῆ· ὅμοιον γάρ ἐστι τῷ 'ἄμ φόνον' (*Il.* 10.298). φησὶ δὲ 'ἐϋδημήτων ἐπὶ βωμῶν' (*Od.* 7.100). | Ἀρίσταρχος 'ἴβωμοῖσι', Διογένης 'ἄμβώνεσι' | τοῖς ἀναβαθοῖσι. The schol. (Did.) Hom. *Od.* 7.100d1 (HP¹) explains that 'Ὀμηρος γὰρ βωμοὺς τὰς βάσεις φησὶ: Aristarchus must thus have understood '[Zeus] puts the chariot on its supports' (cf. G. Busch, *Lfgre* s.v. ἄμβ(ων)).

⁸³ See Pagani (2014b).

⁸⁴ Cf. Rengakos (1993, 144); Olson (2017, 213).

⁸⁵ Cf. *Et.Gen.* α 613: ἄμβων· κυρίως τὸ χεῖλος τῆς λοπάδος· παρὰ τὸ ἐν ἀναβάσει εἶναι, οἶον· πολλῶν [. . .] περιλείξας (Eup. fr. *60). λέγονται δὲ καὶ οἱ ὄρεινοι καὶ ὑψηλοὶ τόποι, οἶον 'ἐπ' οὐρεος ἄμβώνεσσι' (Call. fr. 75.34 Harder). παρὰ τὸ βῶ βών, ὡς γηρῶ Γηρῶν, καὶ ἀνάβων, καὶ κατὰ συγκοπὴν ἄμβων. According to Reitzenstein (1897, 20 ll. 20–4), this entry of the *Et.Gen.* is derived from Methodius.

⁸⁶ See Harder (2012, vol. 2, 617).

tium too, via the mediation of Baccheius, also originally present in Aristophanes' Λέξεις?⁸⁷

The dialectal facies (C) of ἄμβων vs Ionic ἄμβη is difficult to ascertain: apart from Erotian, the only witness stating explicitly that ἄμβων is the Attic (masculine) form, while the Ionians use the feminine ἄμβη,⁸⁸ is Gal. *In Hp. Art.* 18a.340.17–8 Kühn (ἀρρενικῶς μὲν οὖν ἄμβωνας οἱ Ἀττικοί, θηλυκῶς δὲ οἱ Ἴωνες τὰ τοιαῦτα σχήματα καλοῦσιν ἄμβας).⁸⁹ We have also seen that according to Apollonius' text, the information that the Rhodians also use ἄμβωνες to refer to the rising tops of mountains (just as Aeschylus in Erotian and Hsch. α 3536) and projections in general, apparently derives from Aristophanes' Λέξεις.⁹⁰ Furthermore, always in Apollonius' text, but this time *outside* the Aristophanic quotation, Apollonius himself also mentions a Coan usage of ἄμβωνες to indicate the steps of a ladder.⁹¹ According to our sources, as we have seen, Aristophanes in his Λέξεις mentioned that ἄμβωνες instead of ἄμβη was used both by Rhodians and by Attic authors (tragedians and comedians), with Aeschylus apparently using the word in the same sense as the Rhodians. Overall, the situation is far from clear. However, if what we have reconstructed so far is correct, one thing stands out: Aristophanes of Byzantium mentioned that not only Attic literary authors but also Rhodian speakers used the form ἄμβων (vs Ionic ἄμβη). This remark of a shared linguistic usage between Attic and Rhodian⁹² goes in the same 'open' direction that we have seen in operation throughout Aristophanes' Λέξεις. For him, as for other early Hellenistic lexicographers, Attic was simply one dialect among many others that had not acquired the superior hierarchical position later sanctioned by the Atticist tradition.

⁸⁷ Callimachus is also quoted by Aristophanes of Byzantium in *Ar.Byz.* fr. 25 A (δόκος) and 48 E (ἀπόθριξ): see above Section 2.1. Slater is sceptical, observing that the Callimachean quotation in *Et.Gen.* may be a 'learned addition' since 'it has no obvious place in Attic vocabulary'. However, we have just seen that the notion of 'Attic vocabulary' of Aristophanes of Byzantium is often more capacious than expected.

⁸⁸ On ἄμβη as an Ionic word in ancient and modern scholarship, see Ross (1971, 246 n. 8).

⁸⁹ In terms of word formation, the etymology for ἄμβη/ἄμβων given in Erotian's text (λέγεται δὲ οἷον ἀνάβη τις οὔσα), may well be correct: see Bechtel (1924, 275), followed by Schwyzler (1939, 460), both interpreting ἄμβη as a backformation from ἀναβαίνω with apocope of the preposition and ἄμβων as a secondary modification of ἄμβη. On Galen's treatment of Ionic ἄμβη/Attic ἄμβων, see Manetti (2009, 165–6).

⁹⁰ A Rhodian gloss is also mentioned by Aristophanes of Byzantium in *Ar.Byz.* fr. 232 (ματρόξευος = 'illegitimate son').

⁹¹ How this may or may not relate to the Callimachean passage of the *Aitia* above quoted is unclear: see Harder (2012, vol. 2, 617) *ad loc.*

⁹² Cf. Cohn (1881, 324 n. 87); see above n. 71.

2.2.2 Ar.Byz. fr. 338

Ar.Byz. fr. 338, explicitly ascribed by Erotian to the Ἀττικάι λέξεις, deals with the word δίοπος ('overseer', 'commander', particularly of a ship), in support of which meaning, Aristophanes of Byzantium quotes from Aeschylus' *Sisyphus* (Aesch. fr. 232) and Euripides' *Hippolytus* (Eur. fr. 447). Etymology may have been one of Aristophanes' concerns while dealing with this lexical item (see the *Nachleben* of δίοπος in the Atticist tradition); likewise, it cannot be ruled out, but it cannot be proven either, that he intended to demonstrate that the word had a Classical pedigree (as he did for many entries of *OWS*). The extant occurrences of the term suggest that by the mid-4th century BCE δίοπος had already acquired a specialised nautical and mercantile meaning (the conveyor of the cargo, or more generally the overseer of the ship, cargo and crew included), and that at the time of Aristophanes (early 3rd century BCE) δίοπος was already being superseded by ἐπίπλους/ἐπίπλων. If the text of Erotian is sound and has not been drastically abridged, Aristophanes apparently did not quote the literary examples in Aeschylus and Euripides (Aesch. *Pers.* 44 and [Eur.] *Rh.* 741) in which δίοπος had the broader, transferred meaning of 'person in charge' *tout court* – that is, without specific reference to ships. This may suggest but does not prove that it was not morphology or orthography that identified the word as specifically Attic for Aristophanes and his readers but rather the term's use and semantic development within the Attic dialect. The word δίοπος has a place in the later Atticist tradition (particularly its etymology: the Pseudo-Demosthenic passage ([D.] 35.20, 34) quoted by Harp. δ 69 and Phot. δ 645 may or may not go back to Aristophanes of Byzantium), but we do not have any strictly prescriptive or proscriptive remarks on its usage.

Ar. Byz. fr. 338 (= Erot. δ 2): δίοψω· τῷ τῆς νηὸς ἐπιμελητῆι, παρὰ τὸ διοπτεῦειν. Ἀττικὴ δὲ ἡ λέξις, κειμένη καὶ παρὰ Ἀριστοφάνει ἐν Ἀττικαῖς λέξεσι καὶ παρὰ Αἰσχύλῳ ἐν Σισύφῳ καὶ Εὐρυπίδῃ ἐν Ἰππολύτῳ.

δίοψω: The captain of the ship, from διοπτεῦειν ('to keep watch'). The term is Attic, attested also in Aristophanes' Ἀττικάι λέξεις, in Aeschylus' *Sisyphus* (Aesch. fr. 232), and in Euripides' *Hippolytus* (Eur. fr. 447).

To the *loci classici* quoted by Aristophanes of Byzantium, already, Nauck (1848, 187) added Aesch. *Pers.* 44 βασιλῆς δίοποι (cf. also Aesch. fr. 269 ἀδίοπον = Hsch. α 1144: ἀδίοπον· ἀναρχον, καὶ ἀφύλακτον. Αἰσχύλος Φρυγί. δίοποι γὰρ οἱ τῆς νεῶς φύλακες ('ἀδίοπον: Without a leader, and unguarded. Aeschylus in the *Phrygians* (Aesch. fr. 269). For δίοποι are the guardians of the ship'); cf. *EM* 18.28) and [Eur.] *Rh.* 741: τίνι σημήνω δίοπων στρατιᾶς (Portus: δίοπων MSS.); on this latter see Fantuzzi (2020, 533). In prose, δίοπος is found in Hippocrates (2x: *Hr. Epid.* 5.74, 7.36 (= 5.246.13 and 5.404.9 Littré respectively) referring to the commander of a ship), Philo Iudaeus (3x: always metaphorically, twice with reference to the godhead, Ph. *De cherub.* 36: ὁ δίοπος καὶ κυβερνήτης τοῦ παντός λόγος θεῖος and Ph. *De spec. leg.* 4.200: τὸν δὲ πάντων ἔφορον καὶ δίοπον θεόν; once with reference to the priest Phinehas as 'the controller

of the inlets and outlets of the body' in Ph. *De post. Cain.* 183: ὁ τῶν σωματικῶν στομιῶν καὶ τρημάτων δίοπος), and once in Plutarch (Plu. *Rom.* 6.4: ἐπιστάτας δὲ καὶ δίοπους βασιλικούς) to indicate royal underlings at the time of Rome's early mythical monarchy.⁹³

Apparently, although its etymology was the object of attention in the later Atticist tradition, δίοπος was not a particularly contested word (we do not have positive prescriptions or proscriptions relating to it). In antiquity, two different etymologies were proposed, making the noun derive either from διέπω or from διοπτρεύω/διοπεύω.

From διέπω: Harp. δ 69, cf. Paus.Gr. *δ 15 = Eust. *in Il.* 1.309.26: δίοποι· οἱ βασιλεῖς καὶ οἱ διέποντες; cf. also [Zonar.] 46.23 ἀδίοπον and *Lex. Synon.* α 40 Palmieri. From διοπτρεύω/διοπεύω: Ael.Dion. δ 26 ~ Eust. *in Il.* 1.309.26–8: ὁ οἰκονόμος· Αἰσχύλος ἐν Σισύφῳ. καὶ ὁ τῆς νεῶς ἐπιμελητής, παρὰ τὸ διοπτρεύειν ὡς ἐπισκοπῶν αὐτὴν καὶ ἐφορῶν. Ἀριστοφάνης δὲ ἐν Λημνίαις εἶρηκε καὶ 'ναυφύλαξ' (ὁ οἰκονόμος; Aeschylus in *Sisyphus* (Aesch. fr. 232) and also the caretaker of the ship, from διοπτρεύειν, since he watches and oversees it. Aristophanes in the *Women from Lemnos* (= Ar. fr. 388) used also the word ναυφύλαξ); cf. Poll. 7.139. Both etymologies are mentioned by Galen (*Gal. Gloss.* δ 19 Perilli: δίοπ[τ]ος· νεῶς ἐπιμελητής, παρὰ τὸ διοπ[τ]εύειν ἢ διέπειν τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ), Photius (Phot. δ 644: δίοποι· βασιλεῖς. παρὰ τὸ δίοπτειν ἢ διοπτρεύειν), and *EM* 278.7: δίοπος· ὁ βασιλεὺς, ἢ ὁ ἐπιμελητής καὶ ἐπόπτης, ἀπὸ τοῦ διέπειν· ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ διοπτρεύειν, παρὰ τοὺς ὄπας κτλ).

Accordingly, its exact meaning was also discussed, see Phot. δ 645: δίοπος· ναυφύλαξ, ἄρχων, ναύαρχος, οὐχὶ πρῶρεύς, ὡς τινες νομίζουσιν· οὐ γὰρ ὡς προόπτης τις ὠνόμασται, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐπισκοπῶν καὶ ἐφορῶν. ἔστι καὶ παρὰ Δημοσθένει ὁ διθύρωνων τὴν ναῦν ('δίοπος: One who keeps watch on board of ships, the one in charge, the commander of a ship, not the officer in command at the bow [i.e. as opposed to that on the stern] as some think: for it has not been called so for his role of scout but because he watches over and oversees [the ship]). It occurs also in Demosthenes ([D.] 35.20, 34) to indicate the person who directs the course of the ship by steering)⁹⁴ and Harp. δ 69: διοπτρεύων· Δημοσθένης ἐν τῷ Κατὰ Λακρί-

⁹³ According to the *LGPn-Ling* online *Diopos* as a personal name is attested three times (see also <https://lgnp-ling.huma-num.fr/Diopos>): Plin. *NH* 35.152 (the name of a 7th-century BCE Corinthian potter), *IGDS* 112 (an artist's signature (*nomen ex arte?*) on an antefix with palmette decoration; ca. 560–550 BCE, from Camarina) and *BCH* 45 (1921) 16 III, 23 (Delphi, ca. 230–220 BCE). the Packard Humanities Institute database, however, also records a certain *Diopos* among the winners at the Coan Asclepeia: *IG* 12,4 2.453.65 (second half of the 3rd century BCE).

⁹⁴ In the Demosthenic corpus δίοπος occurs at [D.] 35.20 and 34, both times in the expression διοπτρεύων (Meursius: διοπτρεύων MSS) τὴν ναῦν. The speech *Against Lacritus*, commonly considered spurious on linguistic grounds, represents an important witness for the history of Athenian mercantile practice and naval contracts since it preserves numerous genuine documents: cf. MacDowell (2009, 262–3). The speech was written in ca. 350 BCE, and in any case, it cannot antedate

του (35.20). δίοπος λέγεται νεὼς ὁ διέπων καὶ ἐποπτεύων τὰ κατὰ τὴν ναῦν, ὁ καθ' ἡμᾶς λεγόμενος ἐπίπλους ('διοπτεύων: Demosthenes in *Against Lacritus*. The δίοπος of a ship is the person who is in charge and oversees the management of the ship, our so-called ἐπίπλους'). The evidence thus suggests that by the mid-4th century BCE, the term had already acquired its specialised nautical and mercantile meaning, although it is debated in modern scholarship as to whether it indicates the function of 'the conveyor of the cargo' – that is, a third party paid by the money-lenders with the role of ensuring that the vessel itself and its cargo were safely delivered,⁹⁵ or that of simple 'overseer' of the ship, cargo and crew, and hence almost synonymous with ναυφύλαξ.⁹⁶ What is certain is that the δίοπος was a co-navigator (συμπλέων), that is, a paid member of the crew on Athenian mercantile vessels, with specific duties onboard (however vague they may appear to us nowadays). By the 4th century BCE, it had become a technical term in Athenian naval commercial enterprise and sufficiently official to appear in maritime contracts (cf. [D.] *Against Lacritus* 35.20 and 34). It is reasonable, therefore, to infer that it was not its word formation (probably a back-formation from διέπω, cf. Hom. *Il.* 2.207: ὁ γε κοιρανέων διέπε στρατόν; 24.247: σκηπανίῳ διέπ' ἀνέρας; see Clay 1960 s.v.) or orthography that marked it as distinctively Attic but its use as a technical maritime term. Attic dramatists (tragedians) used the word repeatedly both in its 'nautical' sense (ὁ τῆς νεὼς ἐπιμελητής; Aesch. fr. 232 and 269; Eur. fr. 447) and in its broader meaning of 'person in charge', a usage probably still influenced by the context of the Homeric passages where διέπω occurs.⁹⁷ As we have seen, Attic oratory (Pseudo-Demosthenes; cf. also Phot. δ 645 and Harp. δ

the new mercantile law of 355 BCE: see MacDowell (2009, 262). Both sections of the speech in which the term δίοπος appears are part of the deposition of the witnesses: we are told that Herasicles was the helmsman of the boat (35.20: κυβερνᾶν τὴν ναῦν), Hyblesius its skipper (ἦν Ὑβλήσιος ἐναυκλήρει), and that Hippias 'sailed in Hyblesius' ship as its commander' (μαρτυρεῖ συμπλεῖν ἐν τῇ Ὑβλησίου νηὶ διοπτεύων τὴν ναῦν). The Demosthenic scholia have the following (schol. D. 35.20): διοπτεύων· ὁ διαιτῶν, εὖ ἐποπτεύων τὰ κατὰ τὴν ναῦν, οἷον δίοπος τις ὢν ('διοπτεύων: The one who administers it, overseeing with care what goes on in the ship, as if it were some sort of δίοπος').

⁹⁵ Thus, Gofas (1989, 426–7, esp. with n. 5), discussing the Demosthenic passages here quoted and defending Harpocration's assimilation of the δίοπος to the later term ἐπίπλους.

⁹⁶ As, for instance, does B. Bravo (1974, 168), followed by Vélissaropoulos (1980, 86): 'un membre de l'équipage d'un navire commercial, qui est l'aide du naukleros (du magister, en latin) et qui est chargé spécialement de veiller à la paix et à l'ordre à bord, de tenir les registres des quantités de marchandises que chacun des marchands naviguant sur le navire embarque et débarque aux divers ports, de faire en sorte qu'aucun des marchands à bord ne s'approprie une partie des marchandises appartenant à d'autres'.

⁹⁷ Cf. *Il.* 2.207 and 24.247 quoted above; see also *Lfgre* s.v. ἔπω 2b and cf. Aesch. *Pers.* 44: βασιλῆς δίοποι 'kingly commanders' (the word refers to Persian overlords: see Garvie 2009, 64 on the sub-

69) appears to use the term in a more technical way. Gofas (1989) has shown that δίοπος in its maritime meaning started being replaced by ἐπίπλους/ἐπίπλων as early as the 3rd century BCE.

Did Aristophanes of Byzantium in his Ἀττικάι λέξεις refer only to the poetic usages of the term (some of which, as we have seen, did anyway include a reference to a nautical activity of some sort) or did he quote also from the orators? The ensuing quotations of Aeschylus and Euripides in Erotian's entry may suggest the former case; it is not unlikely that by Aristophanes' time (see Gofas above) δίοπος' more modern equivalent ἐπίπλους had already gained the upper hand in the commercial and nautical language and the older term may have been indeed in need of some explanation. It is also worth observing that, if the text of Erotian as we have it is a faithful exposition of Aristophanes' gloss and has not undergone a substantial abridgement disfiguring it, Aristophanes appears not to have cited the instances in Aeschylus or Euripides in which δίοπος carried the broader, general sense of 'commander', without a specific reference to ships: that is, Aesch. *Pers.* 44 and [Eur.] *Rh.* 741. This, if not due to a later abridgement of a fuller text of Erotian, may corroborate the hypothesis that it was not morphology or orthography that identified the word as Attic for Aristophanes but its use and semantic development within the Attic dialect.

2.2.3 Ar.Byz. fr. 340

Ar.Byz. fr. 340, explicitly ascribed by Athenaeus to Aristophanes Ἀττικάι λέξεις, ostensibly deals with genre classification (ιμαῖος, ὑμέναιος, ἰάλεμος, λίνος, and αἰλινος), a notoriously fiddling and controversial issue. In particular, Aristophanes seems to have sided with the interpretation of ιμαῖος, literally 'rope-song', as 'miller's song' (ψῆδη μλωθρῶν) vs a concurrent explanation of it as 'well-song' (the latter supported by Callimachus: cf. Call. *Hec.* fr. 74.25 Hollis). Both interpretations resurface in the later lexicographical tradition. Based on the present state of the evidence, we do not know why Aristophanes included these song names in his Ἀττικάι λέξεις. While one might argue, on the basis of Call. *Hec.* fr. 74.25 Hollis, that one of the attested interpretations of ιμαῖος (but not Aristophanes' one) might have had a specifically Attic colour, this is generally not so for ὑμέναιος, ἰάλεμος (with the exception Moeris ι 1), λίνος, and αἰλινος. Either Aristophanes recorded these words simply because they were used by Attic authors (cf. the quotation of Eur. *HF* 348–9), or he may originally have intended to comment on

ordinate status of these satraps *vis à vis* the Persian King of Kings) and [Eur.] *Rh.* 741: τίνι σημῆνω δίοπων στρατιάς (to indicate a subordinate commander of the infantry).

the supposedly Attic colour of ἱμαῖος only (as miller-song), and this gave him the opportunity for an excursus on other (non-specifically Attic) genres of songs.

Ar.Byz. fr. 340 (= Ath. 14.619b–c): Ἀριστοφάνης δ' ἐν Ἀττικαῖς φησιν Λέξεσιν ἱμαῖος ὥδῃ μυλωθρῶν ἐν δὲ γάμοις ὑμέναιος· ἐν δὲ πένθεσιν ἰάλεμος. λίνος δὲ καὶ αἴλινος οὐ μόνον ἐν πένθεσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπ' εὐτυχεῖ μολπᾷ κατὰ τὸν Εὐριπίδη.

In his Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις, Aristophanes says: ἱμαῖος is the song sung by millers; ὑμέναιος is sung at weddings whereas ἰάλεμος on mourning occasions; λίνος and αἴλινος are sung not only on mourning occasions but also 'at a happy dance' according to Euripides (Eur. *HF* 348–9).

Genre classification was often a controversial issue among Alexandrian philologists. Even if song types in ancient Greek culture were defined by their occasions and by the way in which the roles of the performers were assigned according to gender and social status, their classification was not always straightforward. In this fragment, in which we have a string of song types mentioned one after the other, Aristophanes appears to have agreed with the interpretation of ἱμαῖος, literally 'rope-song', as 'miller's song' (ὥδῃ μυλωθρῶν), as argued a century later also by Tryphon (fr. 113 Velsen = Ath. 14.618d, perhaps belonging to his work *On Terminology*),⁹⁸ against those who instead wanted it to be a 'well-song'. Among the latter, there was also Aristophanes' teacher Callimachus: in his *Hecale* fr. 74.25 Hollis ἀεΐδει καὶ πού τις ἀνήρ ὕδατηγός ἱμαῖον he clearly interpreted ἱμαῖος as the song sung by the water-drawers, most likely on the basis of Ar. *Ra.* 1297 ἰμονιοστρόφου μέλη and its ancient interpretation (cf. schol. Ar. *Ra.* 1297 quoting Callimachus' fragment).⁹⁹ Callimachus' *Hecale* displays abundant Attic lore and vocabulary mostly drawn from Old Comedy, and it is tempting, therefore, to con-

⁹⁸ Tryphon fr. 113 Velsen: καὶ ὥδῃς δὲ ὀνομασίας καταλέγει ὁ Τρύφων τάσδε· ἱμαῖος ἢ ἐπιμύλιος καλουμένη, ἣν παρὰ τοὺς ἀλέτους ἦδον, ἴσως ἀπὸ τῆς ἱμαλίδος. ἱμαλὶς δ' ἐστὶν παρὰ Δωριεῦσιν ὁ νόστος καὶ τὰ ἐπίμετρα τῶν ἀλεύρων κτλ. ('And Tryphon lists also these names for songs: ἱμαῖος, the song for milling (ἐπιμύλιος), which they sang while grinding; possibly derived from ἱμαλὶς, which is the Dorians' word for the return (νόστος) and the over-measures (ἐπίμετρα) of ground barley flour etc.'). We do not know whether Aristophanes of Byzantium shared Tryphon's etymology. Winkler (1978–1979, 237) has shown that νόστος in Tryphon means 'return', that is, 'crop's yield', and that Hsch. ι 600, where we are given a three-fold definition of ἱμαῖος as ὥδῃ ἐπιμύλιος καὶ ἐπάντλιος, καὶ ἐπίνοστος, must have misunderstood Tryphon's gloss (he or some intermediary source: Diogenianus?). For ἱμαῖος as a miller's song cf. also Poll. 4.53: ἐπιμύλιος ὥδῃ ἱμαλὶς καὶ ἱμαῖος, ὁ δ' ἄδων ἱμασιδός and *EM* 470.257 <ἱμαῖος>: ἢ ἐπιμύλιος ὥδῃ.

⁹⁹ Schol. Ar. *Ra.* 1297: <ἰμονιοστρόφου μέλη> οἷον σχοινοστρόφου μέλη· ἰμονιά γὰρ καλεῖται τὸ τῶν ἀντλημάτων σχοινίον, καὶ τὸ ἄσμα, ὃ ἄδουσιν οἱ ἀντληταί, ἱμαῖον (<ἰμονιοστρόφου μέλη> That is, rope-makers' songs. For the rope of the buckets for drawing water is called ἰμονιά and the song sung by those who draw waters [is called] ἱμαῖος'). Cf. Hollis (2009, 9); A. Cameron (1995, 443–4).

nect this possible ‘Attic’ colour regarding ἱμαῖος to our fragment, even if Aristophanes ultimately opted for the alternative explanation (miller-song).¹⁰⁰ This connection would explain why Aristophanes’ generic discussion recorded by Athenaeus takes place in the subsection ἐν Ἀττικαῖς λέξεσιν of Aristophanes’ lexicographical work and not elsewhere. However, the same cannot be said for the other ‘generic’ names of songs mentioned by Athenaeus via Aristophanes: our literary and lexicographical tradition does not record anything specifically ‘Attic’ (be it fact or fiction) for ὑμεναῖος, λίνος, and αἴλινος, whereas ἰάλεμος is said to be ‘Attic’ only by Moeris τ 1: ἰάλεμος Ἀττικοί. The precise type of song indicated by λίνος and αἴλινος was much debated in antiquity and the point of departure, as commonly acknowledged, must certainly have been the λίνος song at *Il.* 18.570 and its interpretative tradition (schol. (Ariston.) *Hom. Il.* 18.570a (A)).¹⁰¹ The (most probably erroneous)¹⁰² interpretation put forward by Aristophanes for Eur. *HF* 348–9 (λίνος as a joyous song) does not say anything about the alleged ‘Attic’ nature or origin of λίνος; rather, it is just a quotation from an Attic tragedian (and in a lyric section to boot, but probably this consideration did not worry Aristophanes). It may well be, as Slater (1986, 115) observed, that ‘the title of the chapter must indicate only: words found in Attic authors’, unsatisfactory as this solution may seem to a modern reader. Alternatively, Aristophanes may have intended to comment on the allegedly Attic colour of ἱμαῖος as miller-song and this occasioned an excursus on other (non-specifically Attic) genres of songs.

2.2.4 Ar.Byz. fr. 341

Ar.Byz. fr. 341 concerns the meaning of κοχώνη, a term clearly indicating a bodily part around the bottom but whose exact meaning was debated among both philologists and physicians, as attested by the various authorities (literary and medical) quoted by Erotian. Aristophanes of Byzantium, together with others, apparently interpreted the term as referring to the sockets of the hip-joints (τὰς κοτύλας τῶν ἰσχίων), a usage never attested in ancient comedy (in which it denotes the buttock, just as in Hippocrates and Galen). Aristophanes’ original context for discussing the

¹⁰⁰ Slater (1986, 115) is silent about the possible Attic background of ἱμαῖος.

¹⁰¹ To the secondary bibliography quoted by Slater (1986, 115) one can now add Ford (2019, 73–80) and Favi (2020, 43–5), esp. on λίνος as a ‘flax-song’ in Epich. fr. 14: ἡ δὲ τῶν ἰστοργῶν (Kaibel: ἰστοροῦντων A) ὡδὴ αἴλινος (ἐλίνος A), ὡς Ἐπίχαρμος ἐν Ἀταλάνταις ἰστορεῖ (= Tryphon fr. 113 Velsen; cf. also Eust. *in Il.* 4.502.18–20) and its possible exegetical nature via Zenodotus’ v.l. λίνος in *Il.* 18.570. In this direction see already Tosi (1987–1988, 20–1 n. 56), seemingly unknown to Favi.

¹⁰² See Slater (1986, 115), quoting Wilamowitz (1909, 84–5); Tosi (1987–1988, 20–1); Tosi (2008, 9–12).

precise meaning of κοχώνη remains ultimately unclear, as do the sources he may have adduced for supporting his interpretation of the word.

Ar.Byz. fr. 341 (= Erot. fr. 17): κοχώνη· οἱ μὲν τὸ ἱερὸν ὄστουν· οἱ δὲ τὰς κοτύλας τῶν ἰσχιῶν, ἐξ ὧν ἔστιν Ἀριστοφάνης ὁ γραμματικὸς, Γλαυκίας δὲ καὶ Ἰσχύμαχος καὶ Ἴππωνας τὰ ἰσχία. οὐ γάρ, ὡς τινες ἔφασαν, αἱ ὑπογλουτίδες εἰσὶ κοχῶναι, ἀλλὰ τὰ σφαιρώματα καλούμενα. σάρκες δ' εἰσὶν αὐταὶ περιφερεῖς, ἐφ' αἷς καθήμεθα. ὡς καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης ὁ κωμικὸς ἐν Τριφάλητί φησι· [. . .] καὶ Εὐπολις ἐν Κόλαξιν· [. . .] καὶ ἐν Βάπταις [. . .] καὶ Κράτης ἐν Σαλαμινίοις [. . .]. μένηται καὶ Στράτις ἐν Χρυσίππῳ καὶ Εὐβουλος ἐν Σκυτεῖ.

κοχώνη: Some [say it means] the sacral bone. Others, among whom there is Aristophanes the grammarian, the sockets of the hip-joints. Glaukias, Isomachus, and Hipponax¹⁰³ the hip-joints (ἰσχία). For the κοχῶναι are not the exterior junction of the buttocks and thighs (ὑπογλουτίδες) but the so-called σφαιρώματα: these are the rounded bits of flesh on which we sit as also Aristophanes the comic poet says in his *Triphales* (Ar. fr. 558.2) [. . .] Eupolis in the *Flatterers* (Eup. fr. 159.2) [. . .] and *Dippers* (Eup. fr. 88.2) [. . .], Crates in the *Salaminians* (Crates Com. fr. 34.2) [. . .]. Also Strattis in the *Chrysippus* (Stratt. fr. 56) and Eubulus in the *Cobbler* (Eub. fr. 96) mention it.

This fragment of Erotian escaped Nauck's attention and was first added to the Aristophanic *Λέξεις* as *fragmentum incertae sedis* by Fresenius (1875, 20 n. 4). It was Cohn (1881, 88 n. 6) who first tentatively ('fortasse') ascribed the passage to the subsection Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις, followed by Slater. Cohn does not give an explicit explanation for his attribution, but it may well be that he shared Slater's view that Erotian quoted only from this subsection of the *Λέξεις*.

The term κοχώνη is frequently attested in Attic comedy as Erotian's text testifies (five comic quotations ranging from Old to Middle Comedy),¹⁰⁴ all the comic texts quoted, however, support a meaning ('buttocks', 'ass-cheeks') quite different from that apparently defended by Aristophanes of Byzantium (the sockets of the hip-joints: in medical language, the *acetabulum*). The comic usage of κοχώνη as 'buttocks, ass-cheeks' coincides with the meaning of the term in Hippocrates (Hr. *Epid.* 5.7 = 5.208.2 Littré and *Mul.* 1.8. = 8.34.21 Littré) and Galen (*Gloss.* κ 67 Perilli: κοχώνη· τὴν σύζευξιν τῶν ἐν τοῖς ἰσχίοις τὴν πρὸς τὴν ἔδραν, δι' ἣν καὶ πᾶς ὁ περὶ τὴν ἔδραν τόπος οὕτως ὀνομάζεται, 'κοχώνη: The joints of those parts of the hips nearby the bum; hence the whole area of the bum is so called').¹⁰⁵ Aristophanes of Byzantium's interpretation remains for us unparalleled, but Erotian tells us that his interpretation was shared by others (οἱ δὲ [. . .] ἐξ ὧν ἔστιν Ἀρισ-

¹⁰³ The first two are learned physicians, datable respectively to the first half of the 2nd century BCE (Glaukias) and to the 1st century BCE (Isomachus); Hipponax, as observed by Wellmann (1931, 23 n. 3) is not the poet Hipponax of Ephesus but either an otherwise unknown doctor so named or a scribal mistake for the physician Hippon.

¹⁰⁴ For a complete list of the comic passages in which the term occurs, see Olson (2016, 54 with n. 24).

¹⁰⁵ Etymologically, this seems probable: see *EDG* s.v. κοχώνη.

τοφάνης ὁ γραμματικός).¹⁰⁶ The scholium to Ar. *Eq.* 424a¹⁰⁷ gives us yet another meaning (= *perineum*); the disparate views of the medical authorities reported by Erotian illustrate that the term was likely to have been an object of discussion among both philologists and physicians (such a variety of opinions is also evident in Hsch. κ 3886–7, which essentially repeats the information given by Erotian but without quoting examples or authorities).¹⁰⁸ Are the comic quotations in Erotian drawn from Aristophanes of Byzantium (possibly via Baccheius)? Wellmann deems it unlikely, since those quotations do not support Aristophanes' interpretation of the term in question,¹⁰⁹ yet it would not have been out of place for Aristophanes to motivate his own diverging interpretation by also giving convenient examples of other possible explanations according to different contexts.

2.2.5 Ar.Byz. fr. 342

Ar.Byz. fr. 342 is expressly ascribed by Erotian to Aristophanes' Ἀττικάι λέξεις, κρησέρα, a particular type of sieve or colander, occurs for us, among Classical authors, only once in Ar. *Ec.* 991; we find it otherwise attested in the medical (Hippocrates, Galen etc.) and lexicographical tradition, the latter mostly but not exclusively commenting on the relevant passage of Aristophanes' *Assemblywomen*. This gloss testifies to Aristophanes of Byzantium's antiquarian interest in everyday realia, and it is highly likely that the comic passage of Ar. *Ec.* 991 served as his starting point.

Ar.Byz. fr. 342 (= Erot. κ 65): κρησέρης (Klein: κνησέρης MSS): κρησέραν (Klein: κνησέρου AMO: κνησέρα H: κνησέρης L) λέγει ράκος χονδρόν και άραιόν, δι' ού διηθοῦσι τινα ως δι' ήμου. μέμνηται και Άριστοφάνης έν Αττικάις λέξεσι.

κρησέρης: [?] says that κρησέρα is a coarse and thin piece of cloth, through which they filter some substances as if through a colander. It is also mentioned by Aristophanes in his *Attic Lexeis*.

106 Wellmann (1931, 23) remains silent on the identity of οἱ δέ.

107 Schol. Ar. *Eq.* 424a (VEΓΘM): εἰς τὰ κόχωνα· κοχώνη τόπος ὑπὸ τὸ αἰδοῖον, <τὸ μεταξὺ> (Kuster) τῶν μηρῶν και τῆς κοτύλης και τῶν ἰσχίων· μέμνηται δὲ τῆς κοχώνης και έν Σκηνάς Καταλαμβάνουσαις 'ἀλλὰ συσπάσαι δεῖ τὰς κοχώνας'. οὐδετέρως δὲ ἔφη τὰ κόχωνα ('In the κόχωνα: κοχώνη is the area beneath the genitals, that between the thighs, the socket and the hip-joints. It is mentioned also in the *Women Claiming Tent-sites*: 'but you must contract your buttocks!' (Ar. fr. 496). He used the expression τὰ κόχωνα in the neuter'). Slater (1986, 116) deems the text of the scholium corrupt, as if 'several explanations appear to have been run together'.

108 Wellmann (1931, 23) thinks that Erotian's own rejection of the explanation κοχώνη = 'buttock' is part of his polemics against Didymus (1st century BCE/1st century CE), whom he also considers the main underlying authority for the Aristophanic scholium.

109 Wellmann (1931, 23).

The first attestation of κρησέρα is for us Ar. *Ec.* 991, where the schol. Ar. *Ec.* 991a glosses it as τὸ περιβόλαιον τῶν κοφίνων· ἔστι δὲ διερρωγός, ‘piece of cloth enclosing wicket baskets; it is torn’. This is also its only literary occurrence in Classical authors, and understandably so, given its semantics. Otherwise, we find the term only in medical writings (twice in Hippocrates: Hp. *Mul.* 2.118 = 8.256.13 Littré, the *locus classicus* underlying Erotian’s lemma,¹¹⁰ and Hp. *Steril.* 222 = 8.430.1 Littré; once in Galen, that is, Gal. *Gloss.* κ 74 Perilli; six times in Aretaeus) and in the lexicographical tradition.

The term is attested in Poll. 6.74 (cf. also 10.114), Hsch. κ 2804 as the *interpretamentum* of the lemma κιττάναλον and κ 3899 in its Elean form κραῖρα; Phot. κ 1083; Su. κ 2398; *EM* 538.5, 8, mostly but not uniquely commenting on Ar. *Ec.* 991. Poll. 6.74 distinguishes between three different kinds of sieves, according to their material component and their function: τὸ δ’ ἐργαλεῖον, ἐν ᾧ τὰ ἄλευρα διεσθήθητο, τὸ μὲν ἐκ σχοίνων πλέγμα κόσκινον, εἰ δὲ τῷ τοῦ κοσκίνου κύκλῳ ἀντὶ τοῦ σχοίνου λινοῦν τι σινδόνιον εἶη ἐξημμένον, ὡς ἀκριβέστερον τὸ ἄλευρον καθαίροιτο, ἀλευρόττησις ἐκαλεῖτο, εἰ δ’ ἐξ ἐρίου εἶη, κρησέρα. ἐνθα δὲ ἐπλάττοντο οἱ ἄρτοι, πλάθανον (‘The tool in which the meal was sieved was called κόσκινον if the weaving was made of plaited rushes; if to its rounded frame was hung a web made of linen instead of plaited rushes, to filter the meal with greater precision, it was called ἀλευρόττησις; if made of wool, κρησέρα. The tool where the loaf-dough was kneaded, was called πλάθανον’). Pollux’s more rigid classification has recently been questioned by Nicosia (2005) on the basis of the epigraphic and literary evidence: the criterium underlying Pollux’s distinction (or that of his sources) is not so much a desire to faithfully mirror the underlying realia but to give a pseudo-etymological explanation (κόσκινον from σχοῖνος;¹¹¹ κρησέρα from κρησ-ἔρια: cf. also the diminutive κρησέριον in Poll. 7.28).

Wellmann (1931, 56) identifies the source of Erotian’s quotation of Aristophanes of Byzantium as Artemidorus of Tarsos, father of the grammarian Theon (1st century BCE), himself a scholar, and author, among other things, of a lexicographical work entitled Ὀψαρτυτικά γλῶσσαι (*Culinary Glosses*: Ath. 9.387d).¹¹²

2.2.6 Ar.Byz. fr. 345

Ar.Byz. fr. 345 deals with the plural term χεδροπά, a word of disputed meaning in antiquity (generic ‘pulse’ or some subvariety thereof). According to Erotian’s entry, χεδροπά was the Attic term for ‘pulse’ (ὄσπρια), and our grammarian Aris-

¹¹⁰ See Perilli (2017, 347).

¹¹¹ Nicosia (2005, 311 and 312, with n. 21) quotes as para-etymology of κόσκινον < σχοῖνος also Horap. *Hieroglyphica* 1.38, p. 84 Sbord.: κόσκινον δὲ ἐπειδὴ τὸ κόσκινον πρῶτον ὑπάρχον σκευὸς ἀρτοποιίας ἐκ σχοίνου γίνεται and *AP* 6.91.7–8: τρητὸν γὰρ θεμένα χερὶ κόσκινον εὐ διὰ πυκνῶν σχοίνων ἡελίουσ πλείονας ἠγύασατο.

¹¹² Slater (1986, 116) is sceptical. On Artemidorus of Tarsos, see Wentzel (1895c).

tophanes spelt it with χ rather than κ. Aristophanes also specified that these χεδροπά were called ὄσπρια by others (παρ' ἄλλοις). This observation suggests that he was distinguishing between linguistic usages among different communities of speakers, and it is not unlikely that his point of departure was Attic vs non-Attic custom. Once again, it is interesting to note that Aristophanes appears to discuss Attic in a matter-of-fact way, without ascribing an *a priori* heightened status to Attic vis-à-vis the other Greek dialects. The ensuing quotation, in Erotian's entry, from Nic. *Th.* 752 (with a folk-etymology of χεδροπά < χεῖρ + δρέπω) may or may not go back to Aristophanes (etymology was among the interpretative tools of his lexicographical activity, and we saw that Aristophanes occupied himself also with contemporary poets: cf. Section 2.1).

The later lexicographical tradition knows both spellings (χεδρ- and κεδρ-) and offers two different accentuations (oxytone and proparoxytone) and some discussion on the nominative singular (second or third declension?). However, no explicit trace of this discussion is found in Erotian.

At.Byz. fr. 345 (= Erot. χ 4): χεδροπά· τὰ ὄσπρια οὕτω καλοῦσιν οἱ Ἄττικοί. ἔνιοι δὲ διὰ τοῦ κ γράφουσι κεδροπά. Ἀριστοφάνης ὁ γραμματικὸς διὰ τοῦ χ γράφων φησὶν χεδροπά τὰ παρ' ἄλλοις ὄσπρια. εἴρηται γὰρ παρὰ τὸ τῆ χειρὶ αὐτὰ δρέπεσθαι, ὡς καὶ Νικάνδρος ἐν Γεωργικῶς φησι· χειροδρόποι δ' ἵνα φῶτες ἀνευ δρεπάνοιο λέγονται.

χεδροπά: Attic speakers call thus the ὄσπρια ('pulse'). Some write κεδροπά with kappa. The grammarian Aristophanes, who spells the term with chi, says that χεδροπά is what others call ὄσπρια. For they are so called because they are handpicked, as is also attested by Nicander in his *Georgics* (Nic. *Th.* 752): 'Where men go plucking with their hands, not using sickles'.

This fragment too was first ascribed to Aristophanes' Ἄττικαὶ λέξεις by Cohn (1881, 288 n. 6). The underlying *locus classicus* has been identified with Hp. *Nat.puer.* 12 (= 7.488.3 Littré) καὶ χέδροπα (*sic*: on the accent see below) καὶ σῖτος καὶ ἀκρόδρυα ('pulse, and grain and hard-shell fruits'), the only occurrence of the term in the whole Hippocratic corpus (see Giorgianni 2020, 121). If we leave aside for a moment the erudite tradition, the word χεδροπά, with oscillations in its accentuation (oxytone and proparoxytone), is mainly attested in prose authors: up to the 2nd century CE we find it 5x in the Aristotelian corpus, 69x in Theophrastus – all but one occurrence unsurprisingly in his botanical works –, 5x in Plutarch, and 7x in Galen. In poetic texts it is first attested in the 5th-century BCE comic poet Thucydes fr. 7 (= *Su.* χ 181: χέδροπας· ὄσπρια. καὶ ἐνικῶς χέδροψ, τὸ ὄσπριον. οὕτως Θουγενίδης (Adler: Θουκυδίδης MSS)),¹¹³ then in a satyr play of the 4th-century BCE tragic poet Python

¹¹³ *Su.* χ 181: χέδροπας· ὄσπρια. καὶ ἐνικῶς χέδροψ, τὸ ὄσπριον. οὕτως Θουγενίδης ('χέδροπας: Pulse. And in the singular χέδροψ, that is, τὸ ὄσπριον. Thus Thucydes'). The fragment is considered among the *dubia* by Kassel–Austin but Bagordo (2014, 107) plausibly defends Adler's emendation: Thucydes' name is confused with that of Thucydides also in other fragments of indirect tradition (fr. 3–6).

(*TrGF* 91 F 1.12–3 = Ath. 13.596a: νῦν δὲ τὸν χέδροπα μόνον | καὶ τὸν μάραθον ἔσθουσι, πυρούς δ' οὐ μάλα),¹¹⁴ in Nicander's *Theriaka* 752: χειροδρόποι δ' ἵνα φώτες ἄτερ¹¹⁵ δρεπάνοιο λέγονται | ὄσπρια χέδροπά τ' ἄλλα μεσογλόου ἐντὸς ἀρούρης ('Where men go plucking with their hands, not using sickles, gathering pulse and other legumes amid the fields while still green'; transl. by Gow in Schofield, Gow 1953, 79), and once in Nonnus, *Dion.* 26.63: χέδροπα καρπὸν ἔδειν βιοτήσιον (said of the tribes of Salagoi, who are used 'to eat pulse, a life-supporting fruit'). Lexicographical works know both spellings (the form with κ is found in Hsch. κ 1985: κέδροπα· τὰ ὄσπρια ~ Phot. κ 518; cf. also Hsch. κ 2313), with χεδρ- representing the overwhelming majority of the attestations (Hsch. χ 244: χεδροπά· ὄσπριόν τι. οἱ δὲ πανσπερμίαν and χ 245: χέδροψ· πᾶν ὄσπριον. σπέρμα; Poll. 6.60: τὰ ὄσπρια, ἃ καὶ χέδροπα ὠνόμαζον; Phot. κ 518: κέδροπα· ὄσπρια· καὶ οἶον χέδροπα; *Su.* χ 181 [see above]; *EM* 808.14–5: χέδροπας· ὄσπρια· χέδροψ γὰρ τὸ ὄσπριον· ἀπὸ τοῦ χειρίδροψ κατὰ συγκοπὴν ~ [Zonar.] 1846.12: χέδροπας. ὄσπρια. [καὶ ἐνικῶς χέδροψ. οἶον εἰ χειρίδροψ καὶ συγκοπῆ χέδροψ]).¹¹⁶

As is clear from the evidence quoted above, the ancients discussed the declension of χεδροπά (neuter plural *tantum* or nominative singular, and, if the latter, second declension as attested as v.l. in Arist. *HA* 594b.7, or third? For the latter, cf. Hsch. χ 245, *Su.* χ 181, *EM* 808.14–5), accentuation (oxytone or proparoxytone?) and meaning. The latter seems to oscillate between that of a specific subgroup or variety of ὄσπρια (cf. Hsch. χ 244; apparently this difference was already known to Nicander, as corroborated by the scholiastic tradition),¹¹⁷ and implying the folk etymology χεῖρ + δρέπω (already active in Nicander), or a generic synonym of pulse *tout court* (Poll. 6.60, Hsch. κ 1985: κέδροπα· τὰ ὄσπρια ~ Phot. κ 518, Hsch. χ 245, *EM* 808.14–5, *Su.* χ 181), or any kind of seed (cf. πανσπερμία in Hsch. χ 244). As already observed

114 'Now they eat only pulse (χέδροπα) and fennel, certainly not wheat'.

115 The quotation in Erotian χ 4 has the v.l. ἄνευ for the poetic ἄτερ of the direct tradition. Erotian's ascription of the lines to Nicander's *Georgics* shows that either he was incorrect or that Nicander used the same verse twice in two different works (cf. Overduin 2014, 464): the former is more likely.

116 Modern linguists tend to see the alternation κ/χ as a sign that the term is of non-Greek origin: cf. *EDG* s.v.; Masson (1988, 26–7) supports a Semitic origin.

117 See schol. Nic. *Th.* 753b, where after a list of the various possible meanings of χέδροπα (παρά τισι μὲν τὰ ἄγρια λάχανα, παρά δὲ ἑτέροις τὰ ὄσπρια καὶ ἔτι παρ' ἑτέροις τὰ ἀπὸ χλωρᾶς κριθῆς) it is explicitly said that in Nicander's text ὄσπρια are distinguished from χέδροπα ([. . .] ἐνταῦθα, ὡς ἔουκε, διαστέλλει τὰ ὄσπρια ἀπὸ τοῦ χεδροποῦ). This distinction is recorded also by Galen at *Vict.Att.* 30 Kalbfleisch: ἀλλ' αὐθὶς ἐπὶ τὸ τῶν ἄλλων σπερμάτων ἐπάνειμι γένος, ἃ δὴ καὶ Δημήτρια τινες ὀνομάζουσι· συνθησετέρα μέντοι κλησίς ἐστι τοῖς Ἑλλησιν ἐπὶ τοῦ γένους αὐτῶν ἅπαντος ἢ τῶν ὄσπριων· ἐνιοὶ μέντοι χεδροπά ταῦτα καλοῦσιν· εἰσὶ δὲ οἱ τὸ μὲν σύμπαν γένος ὄσπρια, μόνα δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν ὅσα τῇ χειρὶ δρέπονται, χεδροπά προσαγορεύουσι, τὰ δ' ἄλλα πάντα τὰ διὰ τῶν δρεπάνων θερίζομενα σίτον ('But now I shall return again to the species of the other seeds, called by someone also Δημήτρια. The most common name among the Greeks for the whole class is ὄσπρια but some indeed call them χεδροπά. There are then those who call the whole class ὄσπρια but χεδροπά only those pulses which are hand-picked and σίτος all that is reaped with sickles').

by Slater (1986, 118), the folk etymology in Erotian is directly ascribed to Nicander (second half of the 2nd century BCE), a poet who does not otherwise figure in our extant sources among those discussed by Aristophanes of Byzantium, although other quasi-contemporary Hellenistic poets (Callimachus, Lycophron) are cited by our scholar in his *Λέξεις* (see Section 2.1). This, however, does not mean that Aristophanes was unaware of the learned discussion surrounding the word's origin, spelling, morphology, and meaning: it is indeed highly likely that in his own lexicographical entry, he positioned himself within the current debate, possibly touching on some if not all of the features discussed by later sources. As to the specific Attic nature of the term, Erotian is the only source explicitly labelling *χεδροπά* as the 'Attic' equivalent to the common *ὄσπρια* 'pulses' (*τὰ ὄσπρια οὕτω καλοῦσιν οἱ Ἄττικοί*), yet Aristophanes' remark that *χεδροπά τὰ παρ' ἄλλοις ὄσπρια* strongly suggests that he too was drawing a distinction between linguistic usages among different communities. That *ὄσπρια* was the most commonly used form in the Greek-speaking world is also confirmed by the Galen passage quoted above at n. 117, although he does not identify as specifically Attic those who use the word *χεδροπά* (*ἐνίοι μὲντοι χεδροπά ταῦτα καλοῦσιν*). Here too, as also elsewhere in the *Λέξεις*, Aristophanes appears to treat the Attic dialect in a matter-of-fact way, without ascribing to it a privileged status in comparison to the other Greek dialects.

2.2.7 Ar.Byz. fr. 346

Ar.Byz. fr. 346 consists of two passages on prosody, addressing the quantity of the middle vowel in the genitives *πέρδικος* and *χοῖνικος*, one from Herodian (*GG* 3,2.9.10–4) and one from Athenaeus (*Ath.* 9.388f–89a). Only the former explicitly mentions Aristophanes of Byzantium as indirect source (Herodian is reporting the opinion of Ptolemy of Ascalon (early 1st century CE), who, in his turn, is quoting our Aristophanes: a two-remove quotation, so to speak). Modern scholarship has demonstrated that it is highly likely that Athenaeus also drew on Aristophanes of Byzantium for at least part of his argument (see below). Herodian says that, according to Ptolemy of Ascalon and Aristophanes of Byzantium, the genitives of *πέρδιξ* and *χοῖνιξ* have a short iota in 'the poets'; Athenaeus, instead, states that some authors, such as Archilochus and Epicharmus, shorten the iota, but Attic writers often do not: examples from Attic drama follow. There are clear inconsistencies between these two witnesses, probably owing to their different sources and/or partial misunderstanding of the original intent of the works consulted. The most probable explanation is that Aristophanes of Byzantium did acknowledge the use of the short iota in some (*Ath.*: *ἐνίοι*) poets (that is, not specifically Attic poets), while recording that Attic authors (dramatists) often, but not always, scan long the middle iota of the words under consideration. If this interpretation is correct, we have here another

example of how Aristophanes, while treating prosodic matters in Attic and non-Attic poets, did not censure exceptions but recorded them in an evaluatively neutral way.

Ar.Byz. fr. 346 (= Hdn. *Περὶ διχρόνων*, *GG* 3,2.9.10–4): Πτολεμαῖος δὲ ὁ Ἀσκαλωνίτης φησὶν ὡς τῆς πέρδικος καὶ χοίνικος γενικῆς ἡ μέση συστέλλεται, πεισθεὶς Ἀριστοφάνει τῷ γραμματικῷ καὶ τοῖς οὕτω χρησαμένοις ποιηταῖς διὰ μέτρον (διὰ μέτρον *suspectum*): ἀλλὰ ταῦτα διὰ μέτρον ἐγένετο. ἔστι γὰρ αὐτὰ εὐρεῖν ἐκτεταμένα πολλάκις.

Ptolemaeus of Ascalon, persuaded by the grammarian Aristophanes and the same use by the poets for metrical reasons (?), says that the middle syllable of the genitives πέρδικος ('partridge') and χοίνικος (a dry measure) is short. But this happened because of the metre. For you can often find examples with long iota.

Ath. 9.388f–89a: πέρδιξ. τούτων πολλοὶ μὲν μέμνηται, ὡς καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης. τοῦ δὲ ὀνόματος αὐτῶν ἔνιοι συστέλλουσι τὴν μέσην συλλαβὴν, ὡς Ἀρχίλοχος: '< . . . > πτώσουσαν ὥστε πέρδικα'. οὕτως καὶ ὄρυγα καὶ χοίνικα: πολὺ δὲ ἔστι τὸ ἐκτεινόμενον παρὰ τοῖς Ἀττικοῖς. Σοφοκλῆς Καμικοῖς: 'ὄρνιθος ἦλθ' ἐπώνυμος | πέρδικος ἐν κλεινοῖς Ἀθηναίων πάγοις'. Φερεκράτης ἡ ὁ πεποικῶς τὸν Χείρωνα: 'ἔξεισιν ἄκων δεῦρο πέρδικος τρόπον'. Φρύνιχος Τραγωδοῖς: 'τὸν Κλεόμβροτόν τε τοῦ Πέρδικος υἱόν'. τὸ δὲ ζῶον ἐπὶ λαγνείας συμβολικῶς παρ-εἴληπται. Νικοφῶν ἐν Ἐγγειρογάστορσι '< . . . > τοὺς ἐψητοὺς καὶ τοὺς πέρδικας ἐκέινους'. Ἐπίχαρμος δ' ἐν Κωμιασταῖς βραχέως: 'σηπίας τ' ἄγον νεούσας πέρδικάς τε πετομένους'.

πέρδιξ ('partridge'). Many authors mention these (birds), for example Aristophanes (i.e. the comic poet). Some shorten the middle syllable of the name, for example Archilochus (Archil. fr. 224 West): 'like a cowering πέρδικα'. Compare ὄρυγα (acc.: 'quail') and χοίνικα (acc.: a dry measure), although the syllable is often long in Attic authors. Sophocles in *Camicians* (Soph. fr. 323): 'The man who shares the name of the partridge (πέρδικος: gen.) arrived in Athens' famous hills.' Pherecrates (Pherecr. fr. 160), or whoever is the author of *Chiron*: 'He shall come out here unwillingly, just like a partridge (πέρδικος: gen.)'. Phrynichus in *Tragic Actors* (Phryn.Com. fr. 55): 'and Cleombrotus the son of Perdix (Πέρδικος: gen.)'. The animal is taken to symbolise lust. Nicophon in *The Men Who Live from Hand to Mouth* (Nicopho fr. 9): '< . . . > the boiled fish and those partridges (πέρδικας: acc.)'. But Epicharmus in *The Revellers* (Epich. fr. 73) has it short: 'they brought swimming cuttlefish and flying partridges (πέρδικας: acc.)'.

This fragment was first ascribed to Aristophanes' Ἀττικά λέξεις by Nauck (1848, 182–3) on the basis of the similarity of subject matter (prosodic features) with fr. XXV Nauck (= Hdn. *Περὶ διχρόνων* *GG* 3,2.13.1), now Ar.Byz. fr. 347.

In Herodian's passage, we are told that the grammarian Ptolemy of Ascalon considered as short the quantity of the iota in the genitives πέρδικος and χοίνικος. He did so on the authority (πεισθεὶς) of Aristophanes of Byzantium and because

that was the use ‘in poets for metrical reasons’.¹¹⁸ On this, Herodian comments that the short scansion of the iota is simply a metrical licence (that is, an occasional phenomenon) and that one can, in fact, find several examples with long iota. Whereas the extant evidence at our disposal proves Ptolemy right as far as χοίνικος is concerned,¹¹⁹ this is not the case for πέρδικος (see below). Two points are worth observing: (1) if Herodian is reporting his source correctly and the latter is not already corrupt, according to Ptolemy of Ascalon, Aristophanes of Byzantium considered the iota in the second syllable of πέρδιξ and χοϊνιξ to be short not throughout the whole inflection but only in the genitive singular (πέρδικος and χοίνικος); (2) the ‘poets’ (presumably adduced also by Aristophanes?) who are said to use this scansion as a metrical licence (διὰ μέτρον) are *not* explicitly distinguished as Attic poets: they are simply poets in general.

The passage of Athenaeus tells us a somewhat different story. Its source, at least for the first part up to the quotation of Archilochus, has been reasonably traced back to Demetrius Ixion’s (2nd century BCE) treatise *On the Dialect of the Alexandrians*, quoted by Athenaeus at 9.393e for the supposedly long quantity of the middle υ in δοίδυκα, ὄρτυγα and κήρυκα in Attic (= Demetr.Ix. fr. 40 Staesche: see also Section 4.2).¹²⁰ Discussing the quantity of the middle vowel of πέρδικ-, Athenaeus (or his source) does not restrict himself to the genitive singular but, as can be seen from the examples quoted, appears to be referring to the entire declension, without distinguishing between direct and oblique cases. He (or his source) does however differentiate between those (ἔνιοι) who scan the middle vowel short, like Archilochus and Epicharmus, and Attic writers who often (πολύ), but not always, scan it as long, quoting among the latter Sophocles, Pherecrates, Phrynichus Comicus and Nicophon (all authors of dramatic texts, tragedy and comedy).¹²¹ Slater (1986, 121) already observed that the divergences between the two accounts (that of

118 This, if the first διὰ μέτρον is correct and not instead a mistake on the part of the scribe erroneously anticipating what comes in the following sentence.

119 Cf. Hom. *Od.* 19.28, Pherecr. fr. 110 (iambic tetrameters), Ar. *Ach.* 817 (iambic trimeters), *Lys.* 1207 (in a lyric section). This was already observed by Slater (1986, 119): ‘χοίνικος has a short iota at Pherecr. fr. 105 K., and nowhere has it demonstrably long. Since Athenaeus and Ptolemaeus do not explicitly say that χοίνικος with long iota is found or is Attic, it is to be disassociated from πέρδιξ and from Aristophanes’), although Slater quotes only the passage by Pherecrates.

120 See Ascheri (2010, 139–41, esp. 139 n. 56); Slater (1986, 119).

121 In all these passages, with the exception of Pherecrates, the long quantity of the vowel is metrically guaranteed (one could also add the comic poet Mnesimachus fr. 4.49 (anapaestic dimeters); in Pamph. fr. 549.1 *SH* the iota of πέρδικος is in anceps position). Cf. Slater (1986, 119): ‘Pherecrates fr. 150 does not prove that the middle syllable is short or long; perhaps Aristophanes phrased himself negatively: i.e. there was no Attic writer who certainly used πέρδικος with a short iota’.

Herodian and that of Athenaeus) may betray somewhat different sources (Demetrius of Ixion for the former; Demetrius of Ixion *and* Aristophanes of Byzantium for the latter). Slater, not implausibly, summed up the current situation of our two witnesses as follows: ‘Herodian’s statement is easily explained. Ptolemaeus certainly will have found citations in Aristophanes (or more probably in Demetrius Ixion) to guarantee a short central vowel, but these will be from non-Attic authors. Herodian understands Ptolemaeus’ authorities to be Attic or at least Classical, and so the original doctrine of Aristophanes is reversed’ (Slater 1986, 121).¹²²

2.2.8 Ar.Byz. fr. 347

Ar.Byz. fr. 347 also deals with prosody, namely the long quantity of the iota (/i:/) in Attic writers for the suffix *ι* of the comparative adjectives in *-ίων* (as opposed to /i/ in Ionic), cf. Chapter 5, Section B.3.2. The main interest in this fragment lies in its reception.¹²³ Some scholars have sought here traces of a prescriptive and rigidly normative attitude towards linguistic usage on the part of Aristophanes of Byzantium, particularly when compared with *Antiatt.* η 5, which, if correctly interpreted, is likely to record the scansion ἡδίον for Alexis fr. 158. However, as shown by Tosi (1997), Aristophanes’ observation regarding the long quantity of the iota in the comparatives in *-ίων* was probably in origin descriptive of the *predominant* (that is, not unique) linguistic usage among Attic authors, where exceptions may be found (possibly as a homage to the previous literary tradition: Homer *in primis*) that were certainly known to Aristophanes. His intention in the Ἀττικάι λέξεις was probably that of registering a distinctively Attic feature (vs the *gemeingriechisch* *-ίων* with *i*). In this sense, Aristophanes appears to have been more interested in recording peculiarities proper to Attic *only* than in formulating prescriptive rules.

Ar.Byz. fr. 347 (= Hdn. Περὶ διχρόνων, *GG* 3,2.13.14–7, cf. *GG* 3,2.471.3 and 3,2.600.15): τὰ εἰς ὧν λήγοντα καθαρὰ συγκριτικά, ὅποτε παραλήγοιτο τῷ *ι*, ἐκτεταμένῳ αὐτῷ παραλήγεται (Nauck: παραλήγοιτο Slater: παραλήγονται MSS), καλλίων, ἡδίων, βελτίων, γλυκίων, κακίων. Ἀριστοφάνης δὲ ἐν Ἀττικάῃς λέξεσιν (Lehrs: διαλέξεσιν MSS) Ἀττικούς ἰστορεῖ προφέρεσθαι <ἐκτεταμένως> (add. Nauck).

The comparatives ending in *-ίων* preceded by a vowel, when they have the penultimate syllable in *iota*, have it long: καλλίων (‘more beautiful’), ἡδίων (‘more pleasant’), βελτίων (‘better’), γλυκίων (‘sweeter’), κακίων (‘worse’). Aristophanes in the Ἀττικάι λέξεις attests that Attic speakers pronounce the *iota* long.

¹²² Cf. also Callanan (1987, 32) on how Ar.Byz. fr. 346 neither proves nor disproves that Aristophanes formulated systematic rules on vowel quantity, censuring exceptions.

¹²³ It is uncertain whether Phryn. *Ecl.* 264 might also have discussed the quantity of the primary comparatives, see Chapter 5, Section B.3.2.

Modern scholarship's interest in this fragment has mainly been determined by the fact that *Antiatt.* η 5 (ἦδιον Ἀλεξίς (Alex. fr. 158) Ὀδυσσεῖ ἀπονιπτομένῳ), plausibly interpreted by Kock (*CAF* vol. 2, 354) and Schulze (1892, 300–1 n. 4) as evidence of the scansion ἦδιον,¹²⁴ appears to contradict Aristophanes of Byzantium's alleged 'rule', at least as reported by Herodian, on the long quantity of the iota in Attic writers for the comparative adjectives in -ίων. Some have thus seen in our fragment a rigidly prescriptive attitude, on the part of Aristophanes, towards linguistic usage.¹²⁵ If Aristophanes did formulate a systematic rule concerning the long quantity of the iota in the comparatives in -ίων in Attic writers, what about the exceptions (i.e. the scansion ἴων) present in extant Attic literature?¹²⁶ Tosi has demonstrated that a prescriptive interpretation of Herodian's text is not the only possible reading and, when subjected to closer scrutiny, not even the most likely.¹²⁷ If one considers the heavy influence of Aristophanes of Byzantium's lexicographical work on the *Antiatticist*, and the fact that the *Antiatticist* regularly 'converted the original character of Aristophanes' work into an Atticist and polemic structure',¹²⁸ it is overall more plausible, in terms of dynamics of transmission and reception, that Aristophanes' observation on -ίων was merely descriptive in origin – that is, a mere record (cf. the use of the verb ἰστορεῖ in Herodian: hardly a verb indicating a normative agenda) of the predominant linguistic usage among Attic authors. As Tosi suggests, it is conceivable that it was not the exceptions to this predominant and exclusively Attic prosodic feature that interested Aristophanes.¹²⁹ He was certainly aware that other non-Attic authors (beginning with Homer) normally scanned the comparative forms of the adjectives in -ίων with ἴ – witness the fact that he himself read κάλλιον εἴη at verse

124 See S. Valente (2015b, 177) in app. For ἦδιον in Alexis, cf. also Alex. fr. 25.6 (from the *Asotodaskalos*). Arnott (1989), following Naber, wrongly emended the MS reading ἦδιον into ἴδιον: see Tosi (1997, 173 n. 7).

125 Cf. the discussion in Callanan (1987, 31–2).

126 For an exhaustive list, notwithstanding the rather sceptical approach, see Diggle (1981, 29–30). On the possible origin of the oscillating quantity of the iota in the Greek comparative suffix -ίων/-ιον, that is, a mutual analogical remodelling between different categories of primary comparative stems (comparatives in *-ίος-, -ων/-ον and -ίων/-ιον), see Nikolaev (2022).

127 Tosi (1997, 172–4); Vessella (2018, 196–7). In particular, Tosi (1997, 173) rightly observes that the use of ἰστορεῖ is more in keeping with the description of a phenomenon rather than with a prescriptive attitude.

128 S. Valente (2015b, 32). Cf. Chapter 6, Section 2.

129 Tosi (1997, 173), esp. 'il filologo alessandrino avrà semplicemente notato, come peculiarità dell'attico, il fatto che in tale ambito, contrariamente a quanto accade nella precedente tradizione poetica, lo iota è per lo più lungo; delle numerose eccezioni probabilmente non si sarà interessato, proprio perché rientranti nella "norma" generale, e non appartenenti a ciò che ai suoi occhi, era degno di nota, cioè la strana quantità lunga frequente negli autori attici'.

end at *Il.* 15.197.¹³⁰ Likewise, Aristophanes was likely to have also been aware that the short scansion could find its place in an Attic text as a tribute to a previous literary tradition. His scope in the Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις must thus have been that of documenting a uniquely Attic trait vis-à-vis the other Greek dialects (ἰων with ἱ).

2.3 Conclusions

We have just seen that in the Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις one finds the same open approach to language issues that characterise other sections of Aristophanes' Λέξεις. In a manner not very different from *OWS*, *Attic Expressions* reveals the same wide-ranging breadth of interests: we find discussed literary and spoken dialects (e.g. Ar.Byz. fr. 337 ἄμβων); semantics (and possibly etymology: e.g. Ar.Byz. fr. 345 χεδροπά), attention to extensions/changes in linguistic usage (e.g. Ar.Byz. fr. 338 δίοπτος), various kinds of realia (bodily parts: Ar.Byz. fr. 341 κοχώνη, 'sockets of the hip-joints'; household tools: Ar.Byz. fr. 342 κρησέρα, 'sieve'; food related to cultic customs: Ar.Byz. fr. 343 προκώνια); issues of literary classification, possibly also led by antiquarian interests (Ar.Byz. fr. 340 Α ἱμαῖος, if the comparison with Call. *Hec.* fr. 74.25 Hollis hits the mark), prosody (Ar.Byz. fr. 346–7). Equally remarkable is the range of sources (comedy, tragedy, orators, and spoken dialects; perhaps even contemporary poetry, cf. Ar. Byz. fr. 345 and the possible mention of Nicander's *Theriaka* already on the part of our scholar and not of a later intermediary source). And just like in *OWS*, when comparison, explicit or implicit, with other (than Attic) dialectal forms takes place, Aristophanes' attitude is generally neutral: Attic forms or peculiarities are registered in a descriptive way without hinting at a hierarchical order among the dialects or at the higher degree of correctness of one of them over the others (cf. e.g. Ar.Byz. fr. 337, 346, 347). All this is consistent with the broader picture of Aristophanes of Byzantium that we have attempted to reconstruct so far: a keen eye for language (mostly, but not uniquely, literary language) as a communicative medium, with a remarkable receptivity to document the variety of linguistic and stylistic possibilities that forms the glides of the linguistic continuum, from literature to the vernacular.

¹³⁰ Cf. schol. (Did.) Hom. *Il.* 15.197c (A), on which see Callanan (1987, 32 with n. 7).

3 Aristarchus of Samothrace

Aristarchus of Samothrace's (ca. 216–144 BCE) scholarly activity was in every respect as monumental as that of Eratosthenes, even if not equal to his predecessor's almost unlimited range of scientific interests.¹³¹ Like Eratosthenes, no ancient sources credit Aristarchus with an independent collection of γλῶσσαι or λέξεις.¹³² However, a marked glossographical interest, in the Aristotelian sense of the word (non-standard meaning of common words, unusual morphology or syntax, dialectal features), characterises his studies on both Attic comedy and Homer's language.¹³³ In the first part of this section, we shall thus offer a concise survey of Aristarchus' interest in Attic comic language as attested by the extant available evidence, with particular attention to those features picked up by the later grammatical and lexicographical tradition. Just as we have done for Aristophanes of Byzantium, issues of normative grammar will be addressed here only when directly relevant to our purposes.¹³⁴ We shall then move to Aristarchus' well-known understanding of the Homeric idiolect as an older variety of Attic (παλαιὰ Ἀτθίς) and attempt to gauge the broader import of this particular conceptualisation of Homer's language for Aristarchus' idea of 'correct Greek' (ἑλληνισμός).

131 Setting aside his ecdotic work and individual monographs (συγγράμματα), the *Suda* reckons that Aristarchus wrote more than 800 commentaries on literary texts (*Su.* α 3892). For an up-to-date critical survey of Aristarchus' textual and interpretative activity (on both poetry and prose texts), see Montana (2020b, 204–17) (= Montana 2015, 130–43) and Montana (2021c). For Aristarchus' ecdotic and hermeneutical work on Homer, Schironi (2018) is now the ultimate port of call.

132 Nünlist (2012b, 211–2) has suggested that Aristarchus may have compiled a word index of Homeric glosses but no sign of it survives in the scholia: see Schironi (2018, 263 with n. 167).

133 For Aristarchus' glossographical interests across genres, see the concise overview by Montana (2021c); on Aristarchus' glossographical approach in his Homeric studies, see Schironi (2018, 217–64). Both scholars rightly highlight Aristarchus' reliance on Aristotle's definition of γλῶσσα (on which see Chapter 6, Section 3.2), especially for his treatment of non-Ionic features in Homer's idiolect: cf. Montana (2020b, 214 n. 389) (= Montana 2015, 140 n. 371). On Aristarchus' view of the Ionic veneer of Homer's language, see Schironi (2018, 602–5).

134 Recent scholarship has conclusively shown that Aristarchus operated within a grammatical conceptual framework far more complex and sophisticated than that of his predecessors (especially as far as the theorisation of the word-class system is concerned): see Ax (1991); Matthaïos (1999); Matthaïos (2002); Matthaïos (2012) and the concise but helpful summary by Matthaïos (2014a). Whether this implies that Aristarchus also adopted a systematically normative approach to language as a whole remains a moot point: for a moderately sceptical view, see Schironi (2018, 213–6), following Schenkeveld (1994, 274).

3.1 Aristarchus on comic language

Ancient sources inform us that, in addition to Homer and lyric poetry, Aristarchus also worked on drama (both tragedy and comedy).¹³⁵ His engagement with Attic comedy, and Old Comedy in particular (with a penchant, if the random nature of the extant evidence does not mislead us, for Aristophanes),¹³⁶ is of particular interest for our purposes, since it was Old Comedy that was indisputably the main staple of the Atticist reflection on admissible or inadmissible linguistic usage (cf. Chapter 1, Section 4.1; Chapter 4, Section 5.2; Chapter 5). The Medieval scholiastic corpus on Aristophanes' comedies explicitly mentions Aristarchus 25 times; to these passages, modern scholars have added another four, of uncertain attribution (Aristarch. fr. 4*, 9*, 16*, 20* M.), for a total of 29 fragments.¹³⁷ The plays commented on by Aristarchus include *Frogs* (18x), *Knights* (3x), *Peace* (2x), *Birds* (2x), *Clouds* (1x), *Wasps* (1x), *Women at the Thesmophoria* (1x), and *Wealth* (1x) – that is, almost all 11 plays of the MSS tradition, with the exception of *Acharnians*, *Lysistrata*, and *Assemblywomen*.¹³⁸

The topics addressed by Aristarchus cover the traditional range expected in a learned commentary.¹³⁹ His observations extend from textual criticism,¹⁴⁰ to stagecraft,¹⁴¹ identification of quotations from or allusions to previous authors,¹⁴²

135 For Aristarchus' activity on tragedy, see Pfeiffer (1968, 222–3); Montana (2020b, 212) (= Montana 2015, 138).

136 Aristarchus seems to have worked also on Eupolis: in P.Oxy. 78.5160 (= TM 171095; 2nd/3rd centuries CE) col. ii.29–30, an anonymous commentary on Eupolis' *Goats*, we read ἐν τοῖς Ἀριστάρχειοις ('in the [commentaries] of Aristarchus') with reference to the use of the reflexive third-person pronoun αὐτοῦ instead of the reflexive second-person σαυτοῦ: see Olson (2017, 101–2).

137 In this section, Aristarchus' fragments on Attic Comedy will be quoted according to the numeration of Muzzolon (hereafter M.). Muzzolon (2005) is, to the best of our knowledge, the only comprehensive study on the subject. We have only one piece of evidence mentioning Aristarchus from the extant direct tradition, that is, P.Oxy. 35.2737 (= TM 59248; 2nd century CE), apparently a commentary to Aristophanes' *Anagyros* (= Ar. fr. 590 = *CLGP* 1.1.4 Aristophanes no. 27; a Didyman origin, through epitomisation, is possible: see Montana 2012 *ad loc.*).

138 Cf. Pfeiffer (1968, 224), who inclines to think that Aristarchus must originally have written commentaries on all the Aristophanic comedies come down to us via the Medieval tradition. It is usually assumed that Aristarchus did not edit Aristophanes but relied on the edition by his predecessor Aristophanes of Byzantium: see Muzzolon (2005, 56) with further bibliography.

139 As will become obvious, some fragments belong to more than one topic; the classification proposed here is purely *exempli gratia*.

140 Atheteseis: schol. Ar. Ra. 1437–441a = Aristarch. fr. 28 M.

141 The splitting of the chorus into corypheus and semichorus or into two semichoruses: schol. Ar. Ra. 354a–c and 372c–d = Aristarch. fr. 15 and 17 M.

142 Schol. Ar. Ra. 1141–3 = Aristarch. fr. 21 M.; schol. Ar. Ra. 1206c = Aristarch. fr. 23 M.; schol. Ar. Ra. 1269c = Aristarch. fr. 24 M.; schol. Ar. Ra. 1400a = Aristarch. fr. 25 M.

interpretative issues of a miscellaneous nature,¹⁴³ observations on realia and historical figures,¹⁴⁴ and grammatical and lexical questions. The fragments pertaining to these last two categories are as follows:

Grammar: oxytone accentuation of the neuter accusative adjective **κραγόν** ‘vociferous’ used adverbially (schol. Ar. *Eq.* 487a = Aristarch. fr. 1 M.); orthography of **ἦν** < **έάν** (schol. *Pl.* 3b = Aristarch. fr. 29 M.: Aristarchus called **άντίστροφος** what other grammarians usually called **άπόστροφος**); use of the dual **θρίω** ‘fig’ (schol. Ar. *Ra.* 134 = Aristarch. fr. 11 M.); grammatical number of **άφύη** ‘anchovy’ (schol. Ar. *Av.* 76a = Aristarch. fr. 8 M.); grammatical gender of the singing cicada (vs the non-singing one: schol. *Pax* 1159c = Aristarch. fr. 6 M.); the use of **κατά** + **accusative** to indicate motion (schol. Ar. *Av.* 1178a = Aristarch. fr. 9* M.);¹⁴⁵

Lexicon: explanation of a proverb (schol. Ar. *Eq.* 1279a = Aristarch. fr. 3 M.); **φασιανοί** referring to a particular breed of birds, not horses (schol. Ar. *Nu.* 109a = Aristarch. fr. 4* M.);¹⁴⁶ etymological analysis of the hapax **άρχαιομελισιδωνοφρυνιχήρατα** (schol. Ar. *V.* 220c = Aristarch. fr. 5 M.); semantically extended use of **κρέα**, literally ‘pieces of meat’, in the sense of **σώματα** ‘bodies’, ‘lives’ (schol. Ar. *Ra.* 191c = Aristarch. fr. 12 M.); meaning of **έμποδίζω** in the obscure expression **έμποδίζων ισχάδας** (schol. Ar. *Eq.* 755a = Aristarch. fr. 2 M.);¹⁴⁷ an extended meaning of the adjective **προθέλυμος**

143 Deictics: schol. Ar. *Ra.* 308a = Aristarch. fr. 13 M.; comic irony: schol. Ar. *Ra.* 134 = Aristarch. fr. 11 M. and schol. Ar. *Ra.* 320b = Aristarch. fr. 14 M.; disambiguation of the primary referent: schol. Ar. *Ra.* 970b = Aristarch. fr. 18 M.; schol. Ar. *Ra.* 1413a = Aristarch. fr. 26 M.; division of lines among the actors: schol. Ar. *Ra.* 1449 = Aristarch. fr. 22 M.; Aeschylus’ *Oresteia* as trilogy rather than tetralogy: schol. Ar. *Ra.* 1124 = Aristarch. fr. 20* M. (the MS tradition is split between **Άρισταρχος** and **Άριχος**).

144 Alcibiades’ career: schol. Ar. *Ra.* 1422d = Aristarch. fr. 27 M.; Agathon: schol. Ar. *Th.* 31 = Aristarch. fr. 10 M.; Theramenes: schol. Ar. *Ra.* 970b = Aristarch. fr. 18 M.; Arignotus: schol. Ar. *Eq.* 1279a = Aristarch. fr. 3 M.; the tragedian Phrynichus: schol. Ar. *V.* 220c = Aristarch. fr. 5 M.; Diagoras: schol. Ar. *Ra.* 320b = Aristarch. fr. 14 M.; the underlying realia of the adjective **ταυρόφαγος** (the prize at the Great Dionysia): schol. Ar. *Ra.* 357d = Aristarch. fr. 16* M. (of uncertain attribution: the MSS of the scholia read **Άριστόξενον**; *Su.* τ 169 has **Άρίσταρχον**).

145 The ascription of this fragment to Aristarchus is uncertain: the MSS of the scholium have an inflected form of **Άριστοφάνης** (E has the accusative; I³ the genitive). This scholium is Ar. Byz. fr. *inc. sed.* 393 in Slater’s edition: see Slater (1986, 152–3) and Muzzolon (2005, 87–8). A very lucid discussion of this scholium can be found in Ascheri (2003, 44–5).

146 The ascription to Aristarchus is uncertain. R, *codex unicus* for this scholium, reads **Άρχιλοχον**: **Άρίσταρχον** is Ruhnken’s emendation, see Muzzolon (2005, 82).

147 In schol. Ar. *Eq.* 755a II (VEI³ΘM), we are told that Aristarchus takes **έμποδίζων** to mean **μασώμενος** ή **έμφορούμενος** (‘chewing or stuffing oneself with’) – that is, not paying attention to what one should pay attention to; yet in schol. Ar. *Eq.* 755a III VEI³ΘM, we are also informed that

(schol. Ar. *Pax* 1210c = Aristarch. fr. 7 M.) in the sense of ‘compacted’, ‘piled upon one another’ (τὸ συνεχές καὶ ἄλλο ἐπ’ ἄλλῳ) on the basis of two Homeric parallels (*Il.* 13.130, 15.479; the standard meaning of προθέλυμνος is that of πρόρριζος ‘from the foundation’, ‘by the roots’); onomatopoeic effect of μαμμάκουθος ‘blockhead’ (schol. Ar. *Ra.* 990a–b = Aristarch. fr. 19 M.), apparently a neologism according to Aristarchus, if the criticism of Demetrius Ixion in schol. Ar. *Ra.* 990b (μαμμάκουθος is such a common word (σύνηθεος) that the comedian Plato gave it as title to one of his comedies: Pl.Com. test. 2) has our scholar as a polemical target.

In both categories, we find what we would normally expect to be addressed in a scholarly commentary on a literary text: a detailed treatment of matters of orthography, accentuation, morphology, and syntax but also broader issues concerning etymology,¹⁴⁸ the semantics of obscure expressions or proverbial sayings,¹⁴⁹ and the analysis of stylistic features (e.g. onomatopoeia). In none of these passages does Aristarchus comment on the semantics, phonology, or morphology of a word or on a syntactic construction as being specifically Attic as distinct from other dialectal varieties (as he does in his Homeric studies: see below Section 3.2). However, some of his observations, unsurprisingly, percolated through the later grammatical tradition and ended up providing the basis for the formal ‘Attic’ status of certain linguistic phenomena, thereby acquiring an additional, prescriptive validation of ‘correctness’.¹⁵⁰ An example of this process may be glimpsed, if not directly seen, in schol. Ar. *Eq.* 487a (= Aristarch. fr. 1 M.):

Schol. Ar. *Eq.* 487a (VEΓΘ): κραγὸν¹⁵¹ κεκράξεται· Ἀρίσταρχος ὄξυτόνωσ ἀντὶ τοῦ κραυγασι-
κῶσ, καὶ Ἡρωδιανὸς ἐν Ἀττικῇ προσωδία.

Aristarchus, just like Symmachus (a grammarian of the 1st/2nd century CE), saw in the expression a reference to the behaviour of beekeepers: they chewed the figs up or trampled them with their feet. Cf. also Hsch. ε 2482 and 2485 and *Su.* κ 1464.

148 On Aristarchus and his use of etymology, see Schironi (2018, 340–76); Nünlist (2019).

149 On the importance of paroemiography for the development of Hellenistic lexicographical studies, see Tosi (1994a, 179–93).

150 An excellent example of this process in relation to Herodian and its later epitomisations, can be found in Probert (2011).

151 The overall majority of the MSS of the *Knights* have κραγὸν (AΘ read κραγῶν; for other minority readings of some MSS, see Muzzolon 2005, 79). Meineke’s correction of the transmitted κραγὸν (the accusative neuter of the adjective κραγός used adverbially) into κράγον (the accusative of the noun ὁ κράγος; see the note below), on the basis of similar *figurae etymologicae* (e.g. Ar. *Av.* 42 τόνδε τὸν βάδον βαδίζομεν) is generally accepted by modern editors.

He will scream a scream (κραγὸν κεκράζεται): Aristarchus has κραγὸν oxytone in the sense of (the adverb) κραυγαστικῶς ('vociferously'). So also Herodian in his *Attic Prosody* (Hdn. *Περὶ Ἀττικῆς προσωδίας* GG 3.2.20.18–20).¹⁵²

Pseudo-Arcadius, in his epitome of Herodian, records the following prescription:

[Arcad.] *De prosodia catholica epitome* 170.15–7 Roussou: τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΑΓΟΣ διβράχεια ἐπιθετικά καὶ μὴ ἔθνικὰ ὀξύνεται· φαγός, κραγός (ὁ κραυγαστικός). τὸ δὲ Κράγος βαρύνεται,¹⁵³ καὶ τὸ Μάγος ἔθνικόν.

Adjectives with two short (syllables) (ending) in -αγος, but not the ethnic designations, are oxytone: φαγός, κραγός ('one who is vociferous'). But Κράγος (i.e. the Lycian mountain so named: cf. above n. 152) is recessive, and Μάγος is an ethnic designation. (Translation by Roussou 2018, 71).

Aristarchus is not explicitly mentioned either in the text of Herodian as reconstructed by Lentz or in Pseudo-Arcadius' epitome, yet Aristarchus' observation on Ar. *Eq.* 487 is likely to be the source, directly or indirectly, of both. Was Aristarchus dictating a general rule on adjectives with two short syllables ending in -αγος that did not designate an ethnic origin? It seems unlikely: more likely probably, Herodian or someone else before him transformed what was originally a textual discussion on a precise passage of Aristophanes (according to Aristarchus, at *Eq.* 487 we should read κραγὸν because we are dealing with an accusative neuter adjective used adverbially and not with the accusative of the noun ὁ κράγος) into a prescriptive grammatical narrative.

Quite interesting from this perspective is also the schol. Ar. *Av.* 1178a (= Aristarch. fr. 9* M.), where we have a comment on the use of κατὰ + accusative to indicate motion toward something/someone (a syntactical construction which was perceived by ancient scholars as 'Attic'):

Schol. Ar. *Av.* 1178a (EΓ³): κατ' αὐτὸν· πρὸς τὴν ἐν Ἰλιάδι γραφὴν τὴν 'χθιζὸς ἔβη κατὰ δαίτα'. οὕτως ἀξιοῦσιν ἸΑριστοφάνην† γράφειν.

κατ'αὐτὸν: Compare the reading in the *Iliad* 'yesterday (sc. Zeus) went to feast' (*Il.* 1.424). They judge that ἸΑριστοφάνην† (Ar.Byz. fr. *inc. sed.* 393) wrote thus.

¹⁵² Cf. Lentz's collage (omitting Aristarchus' mention) in Hdn. *Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωδίας* GG 3.1.140.4–6: τὰ διὰ τοῦ αγος διβράχεια ἐπιθετικά καὶ μὴ ἔθνικὰ ὀξύνεται, φαγός, κραγός ὁ κραυγαστικός. τὸ δὲ κράγος ὁ κραυγασμὸς βαρύνεται καὶ τὸ Κράγος ὄρος Λυκίας.

¹⁵³ The MSS tradition is perturbed: the section ὁ κραυγαστικός – καὶ τὸ is printed as restored by Schmidt (MO read τὸ δὲ κράγος ὁ κραυγαστικός, τὸ δὲ). For Lobeck's different textual arrangement, see the apparatus of Roussou (2018, 170).

The attribution of this fragment is much debated, and it is indeed possible that Aristophanes of Byzantium may, after all, be the likeliest candidate, not Aristarchus.¹⁵⁴ In this scholium to Aristophanes' *Birds*, we would thus have Aristophanes of Byzantium rather than Aristarchus quoting a Homeric passage in support of the construction κατ'αὐτόν in Aristophanes to indicate motion toward. However, if we return to the ancients' exegesis of *Il.* 1.423–4, the plot thickens, and we can see that Aristarchus, after all, did play some role in defending this construction (κατά + accusative = ἐπί + accusative) in the Homeric text. The text of the Homeric scholia to *Il.* 1.423–4 is as follows:

Schol. (Did.) Hom. *Il.* 1.423–4 (A) = Aristarch. fr. 185 A¹ Matthaios: Ζεὺς [. . .] μετ' ἀμύμονας Αἰθιοπῆας > | χθιζὸς ἔβη <κατὰ δαῖτα, θεοὶ δ' ἅμα πάντες ἔπονται> λέξις Ἀριστάρχου ἐκ τοῦ Α τῆς Ἰλιάδος ὑπομνήματος· '[. . .] τὸ δὲ κατὰ δαῖτα ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐπὶ δαῖτα· οὕτως γὰρ νῦν Ὅμηρος τέθεικεν. ἔνιοι δὲ ποιῶσι 'μετὰ δαῖτα', ὅπως ἢ αὐτοῖς αὐτόθεν τὸ μετὰ ἐπὶ. χρώνται δὲ καὶ πλείονες ἄλλοι τῶν ποιητῶν τῇ κατὰ ἀντὶ τῆς ἐπὶ. Σοφοκλῆς· 'ἐγὼ κατ' αὐτόν, ὡς ὀρᾶς, ἐξέρχομαι' κτλ.

<Zeus [. . .] went yesterday to the excellent Ethiopians κατὰ δαῖτα and all the gods are following suit>: These are Aristarchus' words from his commentary on Book 1 of the *Iliad*: '[. . .] κατὰ δαῖτα (l. 424) [is used] instead of ἐπὶ δαῖτα. For this is the meaning with which Homer has used it now (i.e. in this verse). Others instead make it μετὰ δαῖτα so that in the same passage (cf. l. 423 μετ' ἀμύμονας Αἰθιοπῆας) they can find μετὰ in the sense of ἐπὶ. And many other poets too use κατὰ in the sense of ἐπὶ. Sophocles [for instance writes]: 'As you can see, I'm going to him' (Soph. fr. 898)' etc.

The Didymus scholium informs us that Aristarchus did read κατὰ δαῖτα (and not μετὰ δαῖτα as the vulgate), just as his predecessor Aristophanes of Byzantium (and other ancient scholars) did.¹⁵⁵ Moreover, we discover that Aristarchus defended the equivalence κατὰ δαῖτα = ἐπὶ δαῖτα in Homer with reference to a line of Sophocles (Soph. fr. 898) as an example of the fact that 'also many other poets' used κατὰ in the spatial sense of 'toward'. That is, Aristarchus supported the Homeric reading κατὰ δαῖτα by quoting, among other examples, an Attic author, the

¹⁵⁴ See the excellent analysis by Ascheri (2003, 44–5), to whom we are greatly indebted.

¹⁵⁵ The scholium goes on to say that the reading κατὰ δαῖτα can also be found in the Massaliotic edition, in that of Sinope and Cyprus, and in those by Antimachus (fr. 168 Matthews) and Aristophanes of Byzantium (cf. Slater 1986, 175); it also adds that the same opinion was held by Callistratus in Πρὸς τὰς ἀθετήσεις (cf. Barth 1984, 21–31), Sidonius, and Demetrius Ixion (Demetr.Ix.fr. 27 Staesche) in the sixth book of his Πρὸς τὰς ἐξηγήσεις (οὕτως δὲ εὐρομεν καὶ ἐν τῇ Μασσαλιωτικῇ καὶ Σινωπικῇ καὶ Κυπρία καὶ Ἀντιμαχείῳ καὶ Ἀριστοφανεῖῳ. Καλλίστρατος δὲ ἐν τῷ Πρὸς τὰς ἀθετήσεις ὁμοίως, καὶ ὁ Σιδώνιος καὶ ὁ Ἰξίων ἐν τῷ ἕκτῳ Πρὸς τὰς ἐξηγήσεις). According to West (2001, 54), Didymus' quotation of Aristarchus ends with the Sophoclean citation: what follows is Didymus', not Aristarchus', material; see Ascheri (2003, 33–5).

tragedian Sophocles (that is, just the reverse of what Aristophanes of Byzantium did in *Ar.Byz.* fr. 393). If one recalls that, according to Aristarchus, Homer was originally an Athenian who lived at the time of the Ionic migration and thus spoke a version of ‘Old Attic’ (see below), it is not difficult to see why Aristarchus quoted Sophocles: as already observed by van der Valk (1963–1964 vol. 2, 130–1) and Matthaïos (1999, 593), among others, for our grammarian such an extended use of *κατά* + accusative to indicate motion toward was an ‘Attic usage’ (whereas *μετά* + accusative = ‘toward’ was not).¹⁵⁶

Only in one case does Aristarchus appear to express a more generalised preference for a given grammatical usage (*ἀφύη* ‘anchovy’, ‘sprat’, in the singular vs the plural *ἀφύαι*). This occurs in *schol. Ar. Av.* 76a (= fr. 8 M.):

Schol. Ar. Av. 76a: ἀφύας (V) ὅτι πληθυντικῶς λέγουσι τὰς ἀφύας. Ἀρίσταρχος δὲ οὐκ ἀποδέχεται πληθυντικῶς, διὸ τὸ χ (VEFLh).

ἀφύας: [The critical sign *χ* occurs] because they say τὰς ἀφύας in the plural. But Aristarchus does not accept the plural form, hence the *χ*.¹⁵⁷

This passage is problematic not so much because Aristarchus expresses a preference (*οὐκ ἀποδέχεται*) for one form over the other¹⁵⁸ but because, as noted by Muzzolon (2005, 86), our text, which must have suffered from epitomisation, is likely to be corrupt: the use of the plural form is absolutely majoritarian – that is, 20x vs 11x for the singular,¹⁵⁹ and this is not only across the comic corpus of every period (Old, Middle and New Comedy) but especially in Aristophanes’ oeuvre. In fact, the plural form is attested 11 times in Aristophanes, whereas the singular is

¹⁵⁶ Cf., in particular, Matthaïos (1999, 592–3); see also Ascheri (2003, 43; 45). The alternative hypothesis that Aristarchus considered the construction *κατά* + accusative to indicate motion toward a mere poeticism (vs. a specific Atticism) seems less likely to us.

¹⁵⁷ The critical sign *χ* (corresponding to our NB) is transmitted only by the MSS Lh. The only other attestation of the use of *χ* by Aristarchus is in *Eust. in Od.* 2.275.21–2 (commenting on *Hom. Od.* 22.144): σημείωσαι δὲ καὶ ὅτι τὸ περὶ τῶν δώδεκα σακέων καὶ τὸ ἐφεξῆς Ἀρίσταρχος ἀθετήσας κεχίακεν, ἀδύνατον εἶναι εἰπῶν τοσαῦτα βαστάσαι ἄνθρωπον. As observed by Schironi (2018, 57 n. 39) following McNamee (1992, 19 n. 60), Eustathius is discussing a case of athetesis: it is hence likely that *χιάζω* here is used in the general meaning of ‘mark with a critical sign’ rather than ‘mark with a *χ*’ (see also Pontani 2018, 53–4). Schironi (2018) does not mention the case of *schol. Ar. Av.* 76a.

¹⁵⁸ The reason for this preference cannot be the metre because *ἀφύας* Φαληρικός (the transmitted reading of *Av.* 76) and a hypothetical *ἀφύαν* Φαληρικήν are metrically equivalent.

¹⁵⁹ Note that the singular form might have been interesting for grammarians also because of its featuring overwhelmingly in Attic comic texts in the Ionic form *ἀφύη* (the only exception is the 4th-century BCE comic poet Sotades *Com. fr.* 1.30).

recorded only once in Ar. fr. 520.1 ἄλις ἀφύης μοι (from a lyric section in the *Tage-nistai*), where the singular is possibly also motivated by the fact that the expression is a playful variation of the proverb ἄλις δρυός (Zenob. 2.40).¹⁶⁰ ἀφύη indicates a very small fish: you never eat just one but a whole bunch of them (like with ‘small fries’). It is possible, therefore, that Aristarchus meant that the singular was to be preferred because ἀφύη represented a collective noun, but this is just one possibility among many, and until new clarifying evidence comes to light, a *non liquet* is in order. What is certain is that (1) Aristarchus did not propose a textual emendation to the passage of the *Birds* and (2) the later Atticist tradition itself was in two minds about the admissibility of the singular form ἀφύη: Phrynichus admitted both the plural and the singular as good Greek (both are attested in Aristophanes),¹⁶¹ and so did also the *Synagoge*, Photius, the *Suda*,¹⁶² and the *EM* (all acknowledging the plural form as the majority usage),¹⁶³ whereas Hesychius admitted the plural only.¹⁶⁴

To sum up, with the partial exception of schol. Ar. Av. 76a (= fr. 8 M.), where much remains unclear, we do not find in Aristarchus’ reflection on comic language marked prescriptive tendencies. In this sense, Aristarchus does not appear to differentiate himself from his predecessor Aristophanes of Byzantium. We also saw that what in Aristarchus were probably punctual textual comments on a specific Aristophanic passage were incorporated by the later grammatical tradition into a prescriptive framework that may not have originally been present in Aristarchus (schol. Ar. Eq. 487a = fr. 1 M.). Furthermore, even if we ascribe the schol. Ar. Av. 1178a (= fr. 9* M.) to Aristophanes of Byzantium, in our analysis of a related passage, that is, schol. (Did.) Hom. Il. 1.423–4 (A), we saw that Aristarchus could defend a Homeric construction (κατά + accusative to indicate motion toward) with a quotation from Attic drama (Sophocles), most probably because Homer, in his opinion, spoke an older version of Attic (schol. (Did.) Hom. Il. 1.423–4 (A)).

160 See Bagordo (2020, 84). On Ar. fr. 520.1 cf. also *Su.* α 4660: ἀφύα ἐς πῦρ· ἐπὶ τῶν τέλος ὀξὺ λαμβανόντων ἢ παροιμία· παρόσον καὶ τὴν ἀφύαν τάχιστα ἔψεσθαι συμβαίνει. ἐνικῶς δὲ παρὰ Ἀριστοφάνει λέγεται ἐν Ταγηνισταῖς ἀφύη· ἀλλ’ αἰεὶ πληθυντικῶς τὰς ἀφύας.

161 Phryn. *PS* 17.10: ἀφύη· καὶ ἐνικῶς λέγεται καὶ πληθυντικῶς ἀφύαι.

162 See n. 160 above.

163 Σ^b α 2576 (= Phot. α 3407): ἀφύας· πληθυντικῶς λέγουσι. σπανιώτατα δὲ ἀφύην; *Et.Gen.* α 1495: ἀφύη· ἰχθύδιον μικρὸν καὶ σύννηθες· εἴρηται δὲ ἐνικῶς σπανίως, πλεονάκις δὲ πληθυντικῶς.

164 Hsch. α 8804: ἀφύων τιμή· τὸ ἔλαιον, ἐπεὶ ἐν τούτῳ ἔψονται (*Ar. Ach.* 640) λέγουσι δὲ Ἀττικοὶ πληθυντικῶς τὰς ἀφύας, ἐνικῶς δὲ οὐδέποτε.

3.2 Aristarchus, Homer's παλαιὰ Ἀτθίς, and ἑλληνισμός

This brings us neatly to our second point: Aristarchus' view of the Homeric language as an older variety of Attic (παλαιὰ Ἀτθίς). We shall first briefly review the features of Homer's language that Aristarchus identified as specifically Attic before attempting to understand how this particular view of the Homeric idiolect informed his idea of 'correct Greek' (ἑλληνισμός).

The first point to observe is that, as convincingly argued by recent scholarship, Aristarchus was generally aware not only that Homer's Greek was different from the current linguistic usage of his own time (Hellenistic koine) but also that Greek language as a whole (its semantics, syntax, and morphology) had evolved through time.¹⁶⁵ In the Homeric scholia, we are repeatedly told that Aristarchus compared the Homeric συνήθεια to the contemporary linguistic usage of his own time.¹⁶⁶ In this sense, he was also aware of the presence of different chronological layers within the epic corpus and differentiated, in terms of relative chronology, between Homer and οἱ νεώτεροι/οἱ μεθ' Ὀμηρον (a category that included not only Hesiod and the epic cycle but also all the poets after Homer, tragedians included).¹⁶⁷ More specifically, for Aristarchus, Homer's 'base-language' was essentially Ionic and Attic, with a limited amount of admixture from Doric and Aeolic.¹⁶⁸

The linguistic features of Homer's language explicitly singled out as distinctly Attic by Aristarchus are as follows:¹⁶⁹

165 See Nünlist (2012a); Schironi (2018, 597–622). To quote just one example, Aristarchus considered the construction of δέχεσθαι + dative 'to receive/take something from someone' (instead of the usual δέχεσθαι + παρά + genitive) as a syntactic archaism in Homer: cf. schol. (Ariston.) Hom. *Il.* 2.186a (A): δέξατο οἱ σκῆπτρον· ὅτι ἀρχαϊκώτερον δέξατο αὐτῷ τὸ σκῆπτρον ἀντὶ τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ).

166 On Aristarchus' use of expressions such as ἡ (ἡμετέρα) συνήθεια/χρῆσις, συνήθως ἡμῖν, τὸ νῦν λεγόμενον, ἡμεῖς δέ, νῦν δέ to refer to Hellenistic koine, see, above all, Schironi (2018, 226–9; 599–601).

167 See Nünlist (2012a, 152–3).

168 This part of the section closely follows Schironi's thorough overview of the 'dialectal nuances' in Homer as they were perceived and interpreted by Aristarchus (Schironi 2018, 601–16).

169 Items 1–6 are covered in greater detail by Schironi (2018, 605–6). As Schironi herself observed (2018, 619), it is sometimes quite difficult to determine whether the 'Attic' label attached to some grammatical phenomena in our scholia is a later classification or actually dates back to Aristarchus. One instance is the use of μή + aorist imperative (rather than aorist subjunctive; modern linguistics interprets it as an archaic form of injunctive: cf. Chantraine 2015, 230) in schol. (Hdn.) Hom. *Il.* 4.410a (A): <ὀμοίη> ἔνθεο· Ἀρίσταρχος ἐν ποιεῖ τὸ ἐνθεο ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐνθου, ἵνα γένηται Ἀττικόν, ὁμοιον τῷ 'μὴ ψεῦσον, ὦ Ζεῦ, <τῆς ἐπιούσης ἐλπίδος>' (Ar. *Th.* 870). The immediate context is a discussion concerning how to segment words in *scriptio continua* (i.e. whether one should read ὀμοίη ἔνθεο τιμῆ (with the compound verb ἐντίθημι) or ὀμοίη ἐν θέο τιμῆ (with

(1) The use of the nominative *pro* vocative (in modern terms, an inherited IE feature: that is, *not* a peculiarity of Greek, and certainly, within Greek, not of the Attic dialect only): cf. e.g. schol. (Ariston.) Hom. *Il.* 3.277a2 (T): Ἡέλιος {τε} Ἀττικῶς· ἀλλά, φίλος, θάνε καὶ σὺ' (*Il.* 21.106).

(2) The use of ἐπί + genitive to indicate movement toward a place (as attested also in Thucydides and Xenophon) instead of εἰς or ἐπί + accusative: cf. e.g. schol. (Ariston. | exc.) Hom. *Il.* 3.5 (AbT): <κλαγγῆ ταί γε πέτονται> ἐπ' Ὠκεανοῖο ῥοάων· ἀντί τοῦ εἰς ῥοάς, Ἀττικῶς.

(3) The construction of κελεύειν, 'to order', + accusative instead of dative to indicate the recipient of the command: cf. e.g. schol. (Ariston.) Hom. *Il.* 20.4b3 (B): τὸ δὲ Θέμιστα Ἀττικῶς ἀντί τοῦ Θέμιστι. Likewise, the construction ἀφαιρέομαι + double accusative ('to deprive someone of something'), though not strictly an Atticism by modern linguistic standards (cf. Schwyzer 1953, 82 δ), was also apparently perceived by Aristarchus as Attic: cf. schol. (ex. | Ariston.) Hom. *Il.* 1.275a (T): μήτε σὺ <τόνδ' ἀγαθός περ ἔων ἀποαίρεο κούρην>· τὸ δὲ ἀποαίρεο Ἀττικόν and 1.275b (A): <τόνδ' ἀποαίρεο> ὅτι ἰαρχαϊκῶς† (fort. Ἀττικῶς Erbse) τόνδε ἀφαιροῦ, οὐχὶ τοῦδε.¹⁷⁰ It is also worth noticing that in these two scholia, the same syntactic phenomenon is *prima facie* described differently: as an Atticism in the T scholium (strictly speaking, in T it is the single verbal form ἀποαίρεο that is remarked upon as Attic, but the context and the grammatical tradition make clear that the construction of ἀφαιρέομαι + accusative is intended); as an archaism in the A scholium (Erbse deems the reading corrupt). According to Nünlist (2012a, 163–4), this might suggest that at a certain point in time, dialectal explanations attained the upper hand over the earlier diachronic ones.¹⁷¹ A second possibility, however, is that the different nomenclature may, after all, be coeval, since Aristarchus himself considered some archaisms to be Atticisms (see Schironi 2018, 620–1 with n. 109) and that the emphasis on one 'label' rather than the other in different branches of the tradition may be simply attributable to the accidents of transmission.

(4) The use of the ending -ντων of the third-person plural of the present imperative instead of the koine form -τωσαν (φευγόντων 'let them flee' is used Ἀττικῶς instead of φευγέτωσαν): cf. e.g. schol. (Ariston.) Hom. *Il.* 9.47a (A): <φευγόντων> ὅτι Ἀττικῶς ἀντί τοῦ φευγέτωσαν.

the simplex τίθημι). Schironi rightly argues in favour of Herodian (rather than Aristarchus) as the probable origin of the 'Attic' tag of this σχῆμα.

¹⁷⁰ Cf. also Nünlist (2012a, 161–2).

¹⁷¹ See Nünlist (2012a, 163–4): 'the hypothesis that arguments based on dialect superseded diachronic explanations is plausible'.

(5) The use of the dual, a trait that is specifically referred to as proper of οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι: cf. schol. (Ariston.) Hom. *Il.* 13.197 (A): {ἱμβριον αὐτ'} Αἴαντε <μεμαότε>· ὅτι συνεχῶς κέχρηται τοῖς δυϊκοῖς. ἡ δὲ ἀναφορά πρὸς τὰ περὶ τῆς πατρίδος. Ἀθηναίων γὰρ ἴδιον. 'The two Ajaxes eager [of furious strength]: because (the poet) has used the dual throughout. The reference is to the issue of [his] homeland: for [this feature is] typical of the Athenians'.

(6) The use of ἦμαι 'to sit' in the sense of διατρίβω 'to spend time': schol. Hom. *Il.* 21.122 (= P.Oxy. 2.221, ll. 6–10 = TM 60508; 2nd century CE; commenting on the line ἐνταυθοῖ νῦν ἦσο μετ' ἰχθύσιν): Ἀ[ρίσταρχος] δὲ Ἀττικόν φη[σι τ]ὸ ἦσο | [ἀντί τοῦ] διάτριβε. ἐὰν δὲ [ψιλή] ἦ<ι>, εἰς | [τὸ ὑπαρχε] μεταφραστέον, . . .]φ | [.] ἦσο.¹⁷²

Particularly telling for us are items (5) and (6). In Chapter 5, Section C.1.5.1–2, we saw that already at the end of the 5th century BCE, in literary Attic, the third-person plural active and middle/passive endings -ντων and -σθων of the present imperative are waning and that the first attestations of the koine forms -τωσαν and -σθωσαν are roughly coeval. Against this backdrop, item (5) allows us to say, with Schironi (2018, 606), that '[t]herefore, by 'Attic' Aristarchus must have meant an older form of Attic, used before the middle of the fifth century BCE'. Even more interesting for our purposes is item (6): the reference to the dual, well attested in Attic literary texts of the 5th century BCE (and epigraphically until the last decade of the 4th century BCE), but already disappearing in 4th-century BCE Attic (both in literary texts and inscriptions: cf. Chapter 5, Section B.1.1), permits us not only to confirm the inference that by Attic, Aristarchus meant an 'old form' of Attic,¹⁷³ but it also gives an all-important piece of information: Homer came from Athens. His consistent use (συνεχῶς) of the dual was, for Aristarchus, direct proof that the poet was originally an Athenian¹⁷⁴ who lived during the colo-

¹⁷² Aristarchus' name is almost entirely in lacuna, but its restoration seems likely (this example is omitted by Schironi 2018). The Medieval scholia comment on the Attic nature of the adverb ἐνταῦθοι but not on that of ἦμαι as synonym to διατρίβω: cf. schol. (ex.) Hom. *Il.* 21.122a1 (T): <ΕΝΤΑΥΘΟΙ νῦν ἦσο> †περισπαστέον τὸ ΕΝΤΑΥΘΟΙ· ἔστι γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐνταῦθα Ἀττικοῦ. τὸ δὲ ἦσο δασυντέον· τινὲς δὲ ψιλοῦσιν, ἴν' ἦ ἀντί τοῦ ἴσθι. ἐνιοὶ δὲ γράφουσιν 'ἐνταῦθοι νῦν κείσο'· ἀμεινον δὲ τὸ πρῶτον. The tradition is split between κείσο and ἦσο (schol. (ex.) Hom. *Il.* 21.122b1 (TT¹¹): [. . .] <ἦσο> δὲ δίαγε ἡ ὑπαρχε) and schol. (Did.) Hom. *Il.* 21.122c1 (A): <κείσο> διχῶς, κείσο καὶ 'ἦσο': see van der Valk (1963–1964 vol. 1, 594–6).

¹⁷³ On the dual in Homer according to Aristarchus, see also Matthaios (1999, 378–82); Ascheri (2004). On the debate among Hellenistic Homeric scholarship on the use (and abuse) of the dual in Homer, see now Schironi (2018, 587–91; 607–11).

¹⁷⁴ Cf. *Vita Homeri* V, p. 247.7–8 Allen: (Ὀμηρος) [. . .] κατὰ Ἀρίσταρχον καὶ Διονύσιον τὸν Θρᾷκα Ἀθηναῖος (D.T. fr. 47 Linke); cf. also [Plu.] *Vit. Hom.* 2.2: (Ὀμηρον) [. . .] Ἀρίσταρχος δὲ καὶ

nisation of Ionia¹⁷⁵ and thus spoke an old form of Attic – that is, παλαιὰ Ἀτθίς – as confirmed by Choerob. *In Theod. GG* 4,2.86.20 (~ Hdn. Περὶ παθῶν *GG* 3,2.236.16) ὄντος δὲ τοῦ ποιητοῦ τῆς παλαιᾶς Ἀτθίδος).¹⁷⁶ This brings us to a much-discussed passage of Apollonius Dyscolus in which the 2nd-century CE grammarian, within a discussion of the plural forms of the third-personal reflexive pronouns, reports Aristarchus' opinion that Homer's language embodied the perfection of 'correct Greek' (ἑλληνισμός):

Apoll.Dysc. *Pron. GG* 2,1.71.22–9 (= Aristarchus fr. 125 A¹ Matthaïos): τὸν μὲν οὖν Ἀρίσταρχον ἐπιμέμψεσθαι φασὶ τὰ σχήματα, καθὼ ἀφ' ἐνικῆς συντάξεως τῆς 'ἐαυτὸν' πληθυντικῆ ἐγένετο ἢ 'ἐαυτοῦς', μάρτυρά τε ἐπάγεσθαι τὸν ποιητὴν, 'παρ' ᾧ τὰ τοῦ Ἑλληνισμοῦ ἠκρίβωται, ἐν οἷς πάντοτε ἐν διαλύσει ἐστὶ τὰ τρίτα, ὁμοίως τοῖς πρώτοις καὶ δευτέροις, 'σφᾶς αὐτοῦς' καὶ 'σφῶν αὐτῶν'. πρὸς οἷς καὶ τῶν πρώτων καὶ δευτέρων οὐκ ὄντων ἐν συνθέσει πληθυντικῆ, ἐξ ἀνάγκης καὶ τοῖς τρίτοις παρηκολούθει ταῦτόν'.

They say that Aristarchus finds fault with the forms, because out of a singular compositional form ἐαυτόν a plural ἐαυτοῦς has been made, and that he adduces as a witness the poet (Homer), 'in whose works matters of good Greek are perfect, (and) in which (works) the third person (plural reflexive pronouns) are always separated, like the first and second persons: σφᾶς αὐτοῦς and σφῶν αὐτῶν. In addition, since the first and second persons do not exist in composition in the plural, the same has necessarily followed for the third persons'. (Translation by Probert 2011, 271).

That Homer is the poet παρ' ᾧ τὰ τοῦ Ἑλληνισμοῦ ἠκρίβωται is stated in a context in which Aristarchus defends Homer's usage of the parathetic forms σφῶν αὐτῶν, σφᾶς αὐτοῦς of the third-person plural of the reflexive pronouns against the compound forms ἐαυτῶν, ἐαυτοῦς. Aristarchus' reasoning is twofold: (1) the first argument is *ex*

Διονύσιος ὁ Θραξ (sc. οὐκ ὠκνήσαν δὲ εἰπεῖν) Ἀθηναῖον. Aristarchus himself wrote a monograph entitled Περὶ τῆς πατρίδος, i.e. Ὀμήρου (*On Homer's Fatherland*): see Pfeiffer (1968, 228). West (2017, 28–29; 42) thinks that the idea that Homer was an Athenian and spoke Attic may go back to Aristophanes of Byzantium. In antiquity, various cities claimed, with varying degrees of success, to be the homeland (πατρίς) of Homer: see Hillgruber (1994, 84–6); Graziosi (2002, 83–6). Cf. also Chapter 3, Section 3.1.

175 Aristarchus dated Homer to the Ionian migration, that is, ca. 140 years after the Trojan War: cf. Tat. *Orat.* 32.4–6; Clem.Al. *Strom.* 1.117.2; [Plu.] *Vit. Hom.* 2.17–19; Procl. *Vita Homeri* p. 101.13–6 Allen.

176 See, however, Probert's caveats on the evidence of Choeroboscus, where non-Herodianic material may also be detected: Probert (2004, 286–7 with n. 16). Herodian himself seems to have entertained a similar, but not identical, view: as Probert (2004) demonstrated, Herodian distinguished between four 'distinct linguistic varieties' in Homer: Homer's language, 'Old Attic' (παλαιός), 'later Attic' (μεταγενέστερος: the dividing line being ca. 400 BCE), and the koine (ἡ κοινὴ διάλεκτος).

auctoritate (the literary tradition or παράδοσις):¹⁷⁷ Homer, who represents the pinnacle of ‘correct Greek’, does not use the synthetic form ἐαυτῶν, ἐαυτούς; (2) the second argument is formulated *ex analogia*: Aristarchus appeals to the absence of compound forms for the plural of the first- and second-person pronouns to analogically regulate that of the plural third-person pronouns.¹⁷⁸ This is one of the cases in which Aristarchus does not have the *paradosis* overrule analogy, but the two criteria harmoniously supplement one another.¹⁷⁹

Once again, we must begin by asking the same, old question: is Aristarchus being systematically prescriptive here? Some scholars have rightly observed that to frame Aristarchus’ observations on compositional pronouns and ἑλληνισμός in terms of rigidly prescriptive grammar may be misleading: for all that we know, ‘in principle the arguments may even have been transferred from an original discussion of Homeric textual criticism to a later discussion of prescriptive grammar’ (Probert 2011, 273). What is even more interesting for us, however, is the apparent *seamless* transition, in Aristarchus’ observation on ‘correct Greek’, from a highly literary language (Homer’s idiolect) to Greek language *tout court*, educated spoken Greek included. That is, for Aristarchus, the literary tradition as instantiated by Homer, its most perfect model, also constitutes the core repertoire of grammatical knowledge. Does this mean that Aristarchus somehow accepted a status of widespread and unbridgeable diglossia between contemporary linguistic

177 Two other passages are also relevant: (1) Apoll.Dysc. *Synt.* GG 2,2.244.12–246.5 (= fr. 125 A² Matthaios), where the grammarian Habron (1st century CE), alongside other counter-arguments (first- and second-person pronouns are not a good parallel to third-person pronouns, because the former also behave differently from the latter in other respects), answers Aristarchus’ critique by objecting that it is instead possible to construct analogically from a singular compositional form (the example is the adjective ἐνδέκατος) a plural compositional one (ἐνδέκατοι) and adduces as proof the Platonic usage (ἐκ παραθέσεων Πλατωνικῶν); (2) Apoll.Dysc. *Pron.* GG 2,1.72.16–9: [. . .] παντί τῷ δῆλον ὑπὲρ ἀκριβείας ἐξετάσαντι τῆς ἐν τοῖς μέρεσι τοῦ λόγου, ὡς ἡ Ὀμηρικὴ ποιησις μᾶλλον τῶν ἄλλων ἠγύσθη. ὅθεν οὐ μᾶλλον ἢ Πλάτωνος χρήσις ἀξιπιστοτέρα τῆς οὐκ οὔσης παρὰ τῷ ποιητῇ. ([. . .] And to everyone who investigates with accuracy the word classes it is clear that Homer’s poetry was more accomplished than that of others. Hence the existence of a linguistic use in Plato is no more trustworthy than its absence in Homer). That is, both Aristarchus and his opponent, Habron, enlist ‘good authors’ (respectively, Homer and Plato), and both argue in terms of analogical behaviour, yet for Apollonius Dyscolus (passage 2) Plato (prose!) as evidence is less trustworthy than Homer (poetry).

178 See Matthaios (1999, 479–80); Probert (2011, 272).

179 See Blank (1982, 61 n. 19) on how ‘Aristarchus is represented in the *Iliad Scholia* as frequently allowing the *paradosis* to overrule analogy’; this feature was already observed by Ludwig (1885 vol. 2, 108–15). On Aristarchus’ use of analogy as an ecdotic tool (to emend and choose between different variant readings: mainly issues pertaining to accentuation, morphology, and orthography), see Schironi (2018, 377–410).

usage and ‘high’ literature, present and past? Not really: as noted by scholars, the very fact that Aristarchus extended the authority of Homer’s language to the domain of ἑλληνισμός as *a whole*, shows that, for him, the ‘best’ contemporary linguistic usage should not be conceived of as radically severed from the literary tradition.¹⁸⁰ We have noted that Aristarchus was acutely aware of diachronic variations in the history of the Greek language, in terms of semantics, morphology, and syntax: paradoxically, it was this same awareness that facilitated a transitivity (the existence of continuum in evolution that still preserved some ‘common ground’) for him, which, from a modern perspective, may sound inherently contradictory and fundamentally anachronistic.¹⁸¹

As already argued in Chapter 6, Section 3.3, the linguistic ‘reality’ underlying ‘speaking correct Greek’ was a matter of debate throughout the early Hellenistic period. Treatments of ἑλληνισμός encompassed both poetry and prose, the written text and the spoken language, and could move smoothly across genres and media with a surprising (at least from our present-day perspective) ease and insouciance. We also saw that Hellenistic scholars frequently employed the literary tradition (παράδοσις) to establish what is or is not ‘correct’ Greek: if one considers Homer’s centrality to Greek culture and language in antiquity (cf. Chapter 3, Section 3.1), it is unsurprising that ‘the poet’ also played an important role as master of ἑλληνισμός and that to Homer’s linguistic usage may be ascribed a normative value, even above that of Attic prose, as far as grammatical forms are concerned.¹⁸²

This, however, does not mean that there were not tensions, at times irreconcilable, between the language of the παράδοσις and contemporary συνήθεια.¹⁸³ If

180 See, especially, Matthaïos (1999, 480): ‘Wie bei jenem Zeugnis liegt die besondere Bedeutung dieser Äußerung darin, daß sich Aristarch über textbezogene Probleme hinaus, die direkt aus seiner philologischen Tätigkeit entstanden, auch mit Fragestellungen auseinandergesetzt hat, die die Korrektheit der zeitgenössischen Sprachgebrauchs betrafen’. Cf. also Ax (1982, 106).

181 Cf. Nünlist (2012a, 161).

182 Pontani (2011) remains the best treatment of the subject. Aristarchus’ opinion of Homer as the pinnacle of ‘correct Greek’ must have exerted some influence: the 2nd-century CE grammarian Telephus of Pergamum is credited with a work entitled Ὅτι μόνος Ὅμηρος τῶν ἀρχαίων ἑλληνίζει (*Of the Ancients Only Homer Spoke Correct Greek*) according to *Su.* τ 495: Pagani (2009) suggests that the work ‘probably presented Homer as the representative of a πρώτη Ἀτθίς’. That Homer was according to some (anonymous) sources *the* embodiment of ἑλληνισμός is recorded in an excerpt of uncertain provenance found displaced in some 15th-century MSS at the end of Pseudo-Herodian’s treatise *On Solecism*: [Hdn.] Περὶ σολοικισμοῦ 311.5 Nauck: ἔνιοι μὲν λέγουσιν ἑλληνισμὸν εἶναι τὸν ποιητὴν (MSS: τὴν ποιητικὴν (sc. τέχνην) Boissonade: τὴν ποιητῶν Nauck). See Pontani (2011, 96–8); Pagani (2014a, 245); Pagani (2015, 842–3). On Ptolemy Pindarion, see below.

183 On the complex dynamics between common usage and tradition in Alexandrian and Imperial scholarship, see Pagani (2015, 841–4).

we are to trust Sextus Empiricus' programmatically scathing remarks about Alexandrian analogists (S.E. *M.* 1.202–8 = fr. 12 Boatti), Ptolemy Pindarion, a pupil of Aristarchus active during the second half of the 2nd century BCE, pitched the Ὀμηρικὴ συνήθεια directly *against* the κοινὴ συνήθεια – the common usage of contemporary speakers – favouring the former over the latter. In particular, Sextus presents Pindarion and his followers (οἱ ἀπὸ Πινδαρίωνος)¹⁸⁴ as those who disingenuously promote one συνήθεια (in this case, the Homeric one) over another (current common usage), causing analogy to re-enter via the back door.¹⁸⁵ According to Sextus, the grotesque consequence of such a linguistic policy would make whoever adopted it a universal laughing stock:

S.E. *M.* 1.206: τῇ δὲ Ὀμηρικῇ κατακολουθοῦντες οὐ χωρὶς γέλωτος ἐλληνιοῦμεν 'μάρτυροι'¹⁸⁶ λέγοντες καὶ 'σπάρτα λέλυνται' καὶ ἄλλα τούτων ἀτοπώτερα.

If we follow Homer's usage, the good Greek we produce will not be free from laughter, when we say μάρτυροι ('witnesses', i.e. instead of μάρτυρες) and σπάρτα λέλυνται (*Od.* 2.135: 'the ropes were loosened', i.e. instead of σπάρτα λέλυνται) and other things even more absurd than these. (Translation by Bett 2018, 92).

But did Pindarion actually propose such a nonsensical revival of Homeric Greek as a living spoken language? This is what Sextus would have us believe. However, if we can effect a closer look at the context and attempt to look beyond Sextus' distorting account, Pindarion's original argument must have been quite different.¹⁸⁷ The broader context is Sextus' criticism of Alexandrian scholarship using analogy, rather than common usage, to determine what 'proper Greek' (ἐλληνισμός) should be. It is within this specific framework (use of analogy to justify linguistic practices) that Pindarion's stance is mentioned. Pindarion, according to Sextus, belongs to those who recognise that analogy indeed stems from usage, inasmuch as it is 'the contemplation of similar and dissimilar' (S.E. *M.* 1.202–3: [. . .] ἀναλογία, φασίν, ὁμολογουμένως ἐκ τῆς συνηθείας ὀρμᾶται· ἔστι γὰρ ὁμοίου τε καὶ ἀνομοίου θεωρία), but, rather disingenuously, argue that there is usage *and* usage:

¹⁸⁴ For this expression, not to be confused with οἱ περὶ τινα, see Boatti (2000, 266 n. 6).

¹⁸⁵ S.E. *M.* 1.202: ἐκτός εἰ μὴ τι φήσουσι μὴ τὴν αὐτὴν συνήθειαν ἐκβάλλειν ἅμα καὶ προσίεσθαι, ἀλλ' ἄλλην μὲν ἐκβάλλειν, ἄλλην δὲ προσίεσθαι.

¹⁸⁶ Attested 5x in the *Iliad* (*Il.* 1.338; 2.302; 3.280; 14.274; 22.255) and 2x in the *Odyssey* (*Od.* 1.273; 14.394).

¹⁸⁷ See F. Montanari (1995, 45–9); Boatti (2000); Boatti (2002).

S.E. *M.* 1.203–4: τὸ δὲ ὅμοιον καὶ ἀνόμοιον ἐκ τῆς δεδοκιμασμένης λαμβάνεται συνηθείας, δεδοκιμασμένη δὲ καὶ ἀρχαιοτάτη ἐστὶν ἡ Ὀμήρου ποίησις· [. . .] διαλεξόμεθα ἄρα τῆ Ὀμήρου κατακολουθοῦντες συνηθεία.

The similar and dissimilar are grasped from *approved* ordinary usage, and what is *approved* and *most ancient* is the poetry of Homer; [. . .] therefore we will talk following the ordinary usage of Homer. (Translation by Bett 2018, 91; our emphasis).

Pindarion, therefore, was not advocating an artificial revamp of Homeric language in everyday speech: rather, he was defending the analogy principle on the basis of the best and most ancient authority, Homer, in whom, in his opinion, this principle was already visible at its best.¹⁸⁸

To sum up, Aristarchus regarded Homer's language as an older form of Attic (hence very similar to Ionic) and as the benchmark of 'correct Greek'. Aristarchus' own understanding of Homer's Greek was not the only theory put forward: a competing view, dating back at the very least to the Peripatetic Andromenides (3rd century BCE), saw Homer's idiolect as a blending of all the dialectal varieties of Greek in a single shared language, a notion that acquired a very widespread diffusion in antiquity.¹⁸⁹ However, history is replete with unexpected ironies. The same Pseudo-Plutarch, who at *Vit. Hom.* 2.8 claimed that Homer merged together all the dialectal varieties of Greek, was also prepared to concede that the poet used 'above all the Attic dialect', adding a very intriguing reason: he did so because the Attic dialect itself was a 'mixture' of all the other dialects ([Plu.] *Vit. Hom.* 2.12: μάλιστα δὲ τῆ Ἀτθίδι διαλέκτῳ κέχρηται· καὶ γὰρ ἐπίμικτος ἦν).¹⁹⁰ The same notion is also found in the scholia to Aelius Aristides' *Panathenaic Oration*:

Schol. Aristid. 3.98.17 Dindorf: εἰλικρινῆ δὲ καὶ καθόλου· ἀχάριστοι γὰρ αἱ ἄλλαι διάλεκτοί εἰσιν, [. . .] εὐρίσκειται γὰρ ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ διαλέκτῳ τινὰ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων διαλέκτων, οἷον Ἰωνικά καὶ Δωρικά, τῷ πάντως πρεσβυτέραν ταύτην εἶναι καὶ ἀπὸ ταύτης ἐκείνας ταῦτα λαβεῖν.

εἰλικρινῆ δὲ καὶ καθόλου: For the other dialects are unpleasant [. . .]; in the Attic dialect are in fact found some features of the other dialects too, for instance, of the Ionic and Doric,

¹⁸⁸ See already Reitzenstein (1897, 380). Cf. also Blank (1998, 228); Pagani (2015, 815, 842).

¹⁸⁹ For the dating of this theory, not of Stoic origin, to the 3rd century BCE at the very least, see Janko (2000, 377 with n. 4). Cf. e.g. [Plu.] *Vit. Hom.* 2.8: λέξει δὲ ποικίλῃ κερημένον, τοὺς ἀπὸ πάσης διαλέκτου τῶν Ἑλληνίδων χαρακτήρας ἐγκατέμιξεν and D.Chr. 12.66: [. . .] Ὀμήρου [. . .] ὅς οὐχ ἓνα εἶλετο χαρακτήρα λέξεως, ἀλλὰ πᾶσαν τὴν Ἑλληνικὴν γλῶτταν διηρημένην τέως ἀνέμιξε, Δωριέων τε καὶ Ἰώνων, ἔτι δὲ τὴν Ἀθηναίων, εἰς ταῦτό κεράσας πολλῶ μᾶλλον ἢ τὰ χρώματα οἱ βαφεῖς.

¹⁹⁰ Cf. Hillgruber (1994, 115).

because this dialect (i.e. the Attic) is by all means older and it is from it that those (other dialects) take these features.

It may seem paradoxical that the scholium, with its emphasis on the ‘mixed nature’ of the Attic dialect, is in fact commenting on the passage in which Aristides praises Athens for producing a dialect that is ‘uncontaminated, pure and pleasant, and a model for all communication between Greek’ (Aristid. 1.15 Lenz–Behr: εἰλικρινῆ δὲ καὶ καθαρὰν καὶ ἄλυτον καὶ παράδειγμα πάσης τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς ὁμιλίας φωνὴν εἰσηνέγκατο).¹⁹¹ However, the paradox is illusory: the reason the scholium claims that the Attic dialect contains features of other dialects is its chronological priority. Attic existed when the other dialects had not yet developed: it is treated as the Ur-Greek *par excellence*, in a historical dimension. Or, put otherwise, it is not that Attic includes Ionic or Doric elements: it is that the Ionic and Doric dialects have borrowed from the Attic. Finally, if we recall Aelius Aristides’ assertion that Homer’s hometown was Smyrna, an Attic colony,¹⁹² and thus that ‘the poet’ too spoke Attic,¹⁹³ we are returned full circle to Aristarchus: Attic, Homer’s language, was the benchmark of ἑλληνισμός *tout court*.

4 Collections of Attic words in the Hellenistic period: A survey

In the 3rd and 2nd centuries BCE, mostly taking the lead from Aristophanes of Byzantium’s influential Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις, dialectal studies witnessed an increased production of stand-alone or quasi-stand-alone works dedicated specifically to the dialect. In our sources, these collections are variously entitled Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις (*Attic Expressions*), Ἀττικαὶ γλῶσσαι (*Attic Glosses*),¹⁹⁴ sometimes also Ἀττικά ὀνόματα (*Attic Words*), Περὶ τῆς Ἀττικῆς λέξεως (*On Attic Idiom*) or Περὶ τῆς Ἀττικῆς διαλέκτου (*On Attic Dialect*). As we shall see, even if the titles of these works obviously herald a sustained and specific interest in Attic idioms, the centrality of this interest does not usually preclude their authors from occasionally comparing or juxtaposing Attic forms with their equivalents in the other Greek dialects (literary

¹⁹¹ Translation by M. Trapp (2017, 33).

¹⁹² On Ionia as an Athenian colony, see Chapter 3, Section 2.5.

¹⁹³ Cf. Aristid. 1.328 Lenz–Behr: εἰ δὲ δεῖ καὶ τῆς Ὀμήρου μνησθῆναι, μετέχει καὶ ταύτης τῆς φιλοτιμίας ἢ πόλις οὐ μόνον διὰ τῆς ἀποίκου πόλεως, ἀλλ’ ὅτι καὶ ἡ φωνὴ σαφῶς ἐνθῆνδε (‘And if Homer’s poetry demands a mention as well, Athens can claim a share of this source of honor too, not only because his city was her colony, but also because his language also clearly derives from here’; translation after M. Trapp 2017, 275–7).

¹⁹⁴ On the terminological interchangeability between λέξις and γλῶσσα in early Hellenistic scholarship, see Chapter 6, Section 3.1.

and non-literary; cf., e.g., the possible case of Nicander *BNJ*² 343 F 19 on *σκληγγίς* ‘scraper’, which makes mention of old Spartan customs). Most importantly, their observations are almost always value-free in terms of a supposed internal pecking order among the Greek dialects: the overall impression is that of a descriptive framework aimed at recording and documenting the linguistic possibilities offered by a given dialect (in our case, Attic) rather than prescribing a list of approved words and/or idioms to be avoided (with the partial exception of Crates, who, however, is likely to have been active at the very end of the chronological span under investigation: between the first and the second halves of the 1st century BCE, see below Section 4.4).¹⁹⁵

As in the case of other fragmentary corpora, the usual caveats highlighted in Chapter 6, Section 2 apply here as well: our treatment will follow a broadly chronological order, but it must be constantly borne in mind that the reconstructed chronology and, at times, the identity of some of these authors rest on uncertain ground and is unfortunately not immune to a certain degree of circularity of arguments.¹⁹⁶ For the reasons already stated in Section 1 and Chapter 6, Section 2, we shall chronologically limit our survey to the lower limit of the first half of the 1st century BCE.

4.1 Ister and Philemon

Ister (first half of the 3rd century BCE), probably from Paphos, was mainly active at Alexandria: a pupil of Callimachus, he was both a poet and a scholar (*Su.* ι 706). The titles of his works preserved by ancient sources reveal that Ister had strong antiquarian and historical interests, which also explains why he is frequently mentioned as a *συγγραφεύς* (cf. e.g. Ister *BNJ* 334 T 6) rather than as a grammarian.¹⁹⁷ Ister’s antiquarian interest in things Attic is attested by his *Ἄττικά*, which

¹⁹⁵ The grammarians Heracleon of Ephesus and Theodorus (on whom, see, respectively, Ippolito 2009 and Meliadò 2019) also showed a distinct interest in Attic *λέξεις* (the latter is credited by Athenaeus with a collection of Attic idioms variously quoted under the title of *Ἄττικά γλώσσα* (Ath.14.646c and 15.678d) or *Ἄττικά φωναί* (Ath.15.677b)). They are, however, not treated in the present volume because their overall chronology is too uncertain: we have no internal means of establishing Heracleon’s chronology; as to Theodorus, the only certain *terminus ante quem* is his use by Pamphilus (second half of the 1st century CE).

¹⁹⁶ Uncertain chronology: the glossographer Philemon of Aixone, Demetrius Ixion, and Nicander of Thyateira. Uncertain identity and date: Crates of Athens, on which see Section 4.4.

¹⁹⁷ For a survey of Ister’s antiquarian works, see Berti, Jackson (2015); Berti (2009); Regali (2008b).

comprised at least 14 books (*BNJ* 334 FF 1–16):¹⁹⁸ unlike the various contemporary *Atticides*, however, Ister's Ἀττικά was not devoted to the full coverage of the history of Athens and Attica but only to the archaic period (his dominant interests were local lore – above all, Attic festivals, heroes, and institutions).¹⁹⁹ Attic traditions, however, were only one among his antiquarian interests, on a par with matters Elean (cf. his Ἡλιακά in at least four books: FF 40–2), Argolic (Ἀργολικά: F 39), and Egyptian (Ἀποικίαι Αἰγυπτίων or τῆς Αἰγύπτου or Περὶ τῆς Αἰγυπτίων ἀποικίας: FF 43–6, and Περὶ Πτολεμαίδος in at least two books: F 47).²⁰⁰ More to the point for our purposes, Ister also seems to have had a specifically linguistic interest in Attic: Eustathius ascribes to him a collection of Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις (Eust. *in Od.* 1.339.37–8),²⁰¹ but modern scholars have wondered whether Eustathius' title indicates a stand-alone, independent collection or rather a subheading of a larger work.²⁰² Only one fragment of Ister's Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις survives:

Ister *BNJ* 334 F 23 (= Eust. *in Od.* 1.339.34–8 = Paus.Gr. α 89): φασὶ γοῦν οἱ παλαιοὶ, ὅτι οὐ μόνον τρεῖς ἡλικίαι, ἀρήν, ἀμνός, ἀρνειός· [. . .] ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅτι Ἴστρος ἐν Ἀττικαῖς λέξεσιν, ἄρνα φησὶν, εἶτα ἀμνόν, εἶτα ἀρνειόν, εἶτα λειπογνώμονα. ἐλέγετο δὲ καὶ μοσχίας ὁ τριέτης κριός κτλ.²⁰³

Indeed, the ancients say not only that the ages [of the sheep] are three: ἀρήν (a lamb under one year), ἀμνός (a one-year-old lamb), and ἀρνειός (a mature ram) [. . .] but also that Ister in his *Attic Lexeis* says ἀρήν, then ἀμνός, then ἀρνειός, and then λειπογνώμων ('without teeth'). A three-year old ram was also called μοσχίας etc.

198 This work is referred to in our sources also as Ἀτθίδες (F 2a), Συναγωγαί (F 3), Συναγωγή (FF 5 and 13), Ἀττικαὶ συναγωγαί (F 9), Συναγωγή τῶν Ἀτθίδων (F 14), and Συναγωγή τῆς Ἀτθίδος (F 15).

199 On Ister's independence from the Atthidographic tradition, see Regali (2008b); Berti (2009, 11–6).

200 On the ideological import, in keeping with the Ptolemies' cultural propaganda, of Ister's work on Egypt, see, above all, Berti, Jackson (2015) *ad loc.*

201 The title preserved by Phot. α 1232 and *Su.* α 1614 is ἐν ταῖς Ἀττικαῖς. Jacoby *FGrHist* IIIb (Suppl.), 642 wondered whether Ister may have been the first to entitle his work Λέξεις rather than Γλώσσα (cf. also Berti 2009, 11 n. 27): see however Chapter 6, Section 3.1 on the terminological fluidity between λέξεις and γλώσσα in early Hellenistic scholarship.

202 See Berti, Jackson (2015) *ad loc.*; Berti (2009, 9–11).

203 Phot. α 1232 and *Su.* α 1614, after reporting Ister's age sequence in precisely the same order as Eustathius (that is, ἄρνα, ἀμνόν, ἀρνειόν, λειπογνώμονα), specify, however, that the term μοσχίας (Phot.)/μοσχίων (*Su.*) refers to the youngest age group (μ. δὲ τὸν πρώτον); hence Erbse's correction, in his entry of Paus.Gr. α 89, of Eustathius' transmitted text into μοσχίαν δὲ τὸν πρώτον. <ἀρνειός> δὲ καὶ ὁ τριέτης κριός.

Setting aside the possibly corrupted text in relation to μωσχίαις,²⁰⁴ according to Eustathius, Ister, contrary to the common opinion of οἱ παλαιοί, argued in favour of a quadripartite (instead of tripartite) division of age groups for sheep. Unfortunately, this does not tell us very much about Ister's possible theoretical allegiances or conceptual framework in his study of Attic, but it is worth noting that the nomenclature for domestic animals of different age groups was also addressed by Aristophanes of Byzantium in his *Περὶ ὀνομασίας ἡλικιῶν*, a subdivision of his *Λέξεις* (cf. Section 2.1). According to Aristophanes, the terms κριοί and ἀρνειοί both referred to the fully grown animal (τὰ τέλεια: Ar.Byz. fr. 113–4) whereas ἄρνες and ἄμνοι referred to the 'young' (τὰ δὲ νέα: fr. 115–6); furthermore, in Ar. Byz. fr. 137 (Eustathius again) Aristophanes mentioned a sacrifice in the Attic calendar that required twelve victims called λειπογνώμων because they were fully grown (Ἀριστοφάνης λέγει καὶ Ἀττικὴν τινα δωδεκαῆδα θύεσθαι λευπογνώμονα, οἷον τελείαν). Ister and Aristophanes thus shared the same interpretation of λειπογνώμων as referring to an old sheep – that is, a sheep that had lost its teeth because of its advanced age. However, the term λειπογνώμων was not unambiguous: Hansen (1973) convincingly demonstrated that in the Athenian religious calendar, the term could also be used to indicate younger animals still waiting for their milk teeth to grow (and hence temporarily lacking them). There were thus at least two periods in the life of an animal (be it a sheep or a cow) when it could be said to be 'without teeth': at birth, before the appearance through the gum of the first milk teeth, and when it was very old, when his teeth had been lost because of old age.²⁰⁵ This might well explain why the later lexicographical tradition is divided in its interpretation of the term: whereas, for instance, Phrynichus, in his *PS* 85.19–86.2, took a view opposite to that of Ister and Aristophanes (λειπογνώμων, according to him, referred to those animals who had not yet had the first dentition),²⁰⁶ Hesychius registered both options without committing to either (Hsch. λ 541).²⁰⁷

204 It is likely that the correct explanation is that of Photius and *Suda*: see Berti (2009, 153 with n. 3).

205 Cf. esp. H. Hansen (1973, 330–3); van der Ben (1995–1996) seemingly ignores Hansen's contribution.

206 Phryn. *PS* 85.19–86.2: λειπογνώμων· σημαίνει τὸν μηδέπω τὸν ὀδόντα βεβληκότα, δι' οὗ ἡλικία τῶν ἵππων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τετραπόδων γνωρίζεται (λειπογνώμων· It refers to [the animal] that has not yet pushed forth its teeth, a means by which one recognises the age of horses and other quadrupeds').

207 For a full discussion of the lexicographical evidence, see H. Hansen (1973).

Philemon, an Athenian glossographer from the deme of Aixone, reasonably dated on internal grounds to the 3rd or 2nd century BCE,²⁰⁸ is explicitly referred to six times by Athenaeus as author of a collection of *Attic Words*, whose title is variously transmitted in the MSS as Ἀττικάι λέξεις (Ath. 3.76f), Περὶ Ἀττικῶν ὀνομάτων ἢ γλωσσῶν (Ath. 11.468e; cf. 11.473b), Ἀττικάι φωναί (Ath. 11.483a), and Ἀττικά ὀνόματα (Ath. 14.646c; 652e).²⁰⁹ We cannot tell for certain whether Athenaeus had direct access to Philemon's work,²¹⁰ or, perhaps more likely, whether he found Philemon's references in Pamphilus, his main treasure trove for lexicographical information, and the same may be said for the Classical authors quoted in the relevant passages.²¹¹ Most of Philemon's glosses refer to realia (above all, drinking vessels and food items: their ultimate source is probably Attic comedy),²¹² but there are also four instances (one apparently ascribed to his *Attic Words*) in which Philemon appears to show a distinct interest in Attic prosody.²¹³

(1) [Amm.] 405: [. . .] εἰ δὲ πόνος καὶ μόχθος τὰ πρωτότυπα, πονηρὸς καὶ μοχθηρὸς ῥητέον ὄξυτόνωσ. εἰ δὲ οἱ Ἀττικοὶ βαρυτονοῦσιν, οὐ θαυμαστὸν ἐστὶ χαιρούσι γὰρ τῇ βαρύτητι.

208 The only secure *terminus ante quem* is his being cited twice by the grammarian Tryphon (second half of the 1st century BCE; the quotations are found respectively at [Ammon.] 405 = Tryph. fr. 15 Velsen and Hdn. Περὶ καθολικῆς προσημωδίας fr. 53 Hunger). A thorough survey of Philemon's philological activity can be found in Ucciardello (2007).

209 Twice (Ath. 7.323c; 11.476f) Athenaeus mentions Philemon without specifying from which work he is quoting. Philemon is also credited, again by Athenaeus (Ath. 3.114d), with a second lexicographical work, in more than one book, entitled Παντοδαπά χρηστήρια (*Tools of Every Kind*): Cohn (1898, 366) thought that the Philemon author of this oeuvre should be rather identified with the Atticist Philemon (3rd century CE): see however the compelling objections raised by Wendel (1938) and Ucciardello (2007). The only extant fragment of Παντοδαπά χρηστήρια deals with different varieties of bread (πύρνος, βωμίλιος, βραττίμη).

210 If Treu's reading for P.Turner 39 I. 2 (= TM 64217; 3rd century CE: for this papyrus see Chapter 6, Section 5.2) Φιλίμονο(ς) λ[έξεις] hits the mark, this would mean that at the time of Athenaeus it was still possible to have direct access to Philemon's collection of glosses.

211 See Ucciardello (2007) *ad loc.* The overwhelming majority of the authors quoted are comic poets: cf. Steph. Com. fr. 1 at Ath. 11.469a; Stratt. fr. 23 at Ath. 11.473b; Theopomp.Com. fr. 12, Ar. fr. 68, and Pherecr. fr. 74 at Ath. 14.652f.

212 Drinking vessels: Ath. 11.468e–f on καλίς; Ath. 11.469a on ἔφρηβος as an alternative name for a cup known also as ἐμβασικοίτας; Ath. 11.473b on καδίσκος; Ath. 11.476f on κισσύβιον; Ath. 11.483a on κύμβη (a kind of κύλιξ; on the fortune of κύμβη/κυμβία/κύββη in Greek lexicography, see Dettori 2019, 326–40). Food: Ath. 3.76f on different kind of figs (σῦκα βασίλεια, βασίλιδες ισχάδες, κόλυθρα); Ath. 14.646c on ἐπίδαιτρον, a small barley-cake eaten at dinner (πλακουνητῶδες μάζιον ἐπὶ τῷ δείπνῳ ἐσθιόμενον); Ath. 14.652e–f on varieties of Attic dried figs known as Αἰγυλίδες and χηλιδόναι ('swallow-figs').

213 We follow Ucciardello (2007) in ascribing the accentuation of λήθιδιον in *Et.Gen.* λ 84 and Eust. *in Il.* 4.190.14–6 to Philemon the Atticist.

‘ἄδελφε’ γοῦν λέγουσι τὴν πρώτην ὀξυτονοῦντες ὡς ‘ἄπελθε’, φησὶν ὁ Τρύφων παρατιθέμενος Φιλήμονα τὸν Αἰξωνέα (Frellonius: †ἀγξωνέα† MSS).

[. . .] if the original forms are πόνος (‘toil’) and μόχθος (‘hardship’), one must pronounce πονηρός (‘toilsome’) and μοχθηρός (‘suffering hardship’) with an acute accent; if the Attic speakers pronounce them instead without accent on the last syllable,²¹⁴ this is nothing strange: for they like it. Indeed Tryphon (= Tryph. fr. 15 Velsen), quoting Philemon of Aixone, claims that they (that is, the Attic speakers) say ἄδελφε (‘brother’, voc.) with acute accent on the first syllable just as in ἀπελθε (‘go away!’).

(2) Ath. 7.323c: σπηρία. Ἀριστοφάνης Δαναίσι· ‘καὶ ταῦτ’ ἔχοντα πουλύπους καὶ σπηρίας’. ὡς αἰτίας ἢ παραλήγουσα παροξύνεται, ὡς Φιλήμων ἱστορεῖ, ὁμοίως καὶ ταῦτα· τηλία (corr. Kaibel coll. Hdn. Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωδίας GG 3,1.300.39: παιδία A), ταινία, οἰκία.

Cuttlefish. Aristophanes in the *Danaids* (Ar. fr. 195): ‘and this when he’s got octopuses and cuttlefish!’ The penultimate [syllable] takes an acute accent, according to Philemon, like αἰτίας (‘causes’, here acc. pl.), as well as the following words: τηλία (‘baker’s board’), ταινία (‘ribbon’), and οἰκία (‘house’).

(3) Hdn. Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωδίας fr. 52 Hunger (cf. Hdn. GG 3,1.377.20): Φιλήμων ἐν τοῖς Ἀττικισταῖς²¹⁵ διάφορον προσωδίαν ἰστόρησεν· τὸ μὲν γὰρ περιστύφον φησὶν παρ’ Ἀττικοῖς προπαροξύνεσθαι, τὸ δὲ προστύφον προπερισπᾶσθαι.

Philemon in his *Atticist* (?) [*Words*] reports a difference in accentuation: for he says that περιστύφον (‘peristyle’) among Attic speakers is proparoxytone, whereas προστύφον (‘portico’) is propeispomenon.

(4) Hdn. Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωδίας fr. 53 Hunger: Τρύφων δὲ ἐν α’ περὶ Ἀττικῆς προσωδίας ἱστορεῖ παρ’ Ἀττικοῖς βαρύνεσθαι τὴν λέξιν· ‘βαῦνον γάρ’, φησι, ‘λέγουσιν ὡς φαῦλον. οὕτως δὲ καὶ Φιλήμων ὁ μείζων που ἱστορεῖ καὶ ἡμεῖς δὲ παρεθέμεθα ταῦτ’ ἐν α’ περὶ Ἀττικῆς προσωδίας’ κτλ.²¹⁶

Tryphon in the first book of his *Attic Prosody* says that among Attic speakers, the word is pronounced with a grave accent: ‘for’, he says, ‘they pronounce βαῦνον (‘furnace’) just like φαῦλον (‘mean’). Also, Philemon the senior says so somewhere and we reported the same in the first book of *Attic Prosody*’, etc.

²¹⁴ On this meaning of βαρύνω/βαρυτονέω as ‘a cover term for different groups of non-final-syllable accented words’, see Roussou (2018, 58–9).

²¹⁵ See Ucciardello (2007) *ad loc.*: ‘perhaps a further variation of the title of the glossographical work [. . .], or rather indicating a particular section of it (the connection is, however, not clear: a revision of the palimpsest to check the faithfulness of the transcription is a *desiderandum*).’

²¹⁶ Cf. [Arcadius] *De prosodia catholica epitome* 195.4–7 Roussou: τὰ εἰς ΝΟΣ διφθόγγω παραληγόμενα τῇ διὰ τοῦ Υ μονογενῆ ὀξύνεται· κανός, γλανός, βανός (ὅπερ οἱ Ἀττικοὶ βαρύνουσι), κρουνός, βουνός, κεραυνός. (cf. Hdn. Περὶ μονήρους λέξεως GG 3,2.939.32–40.4).

All four examples above exemplify the well-known phenomenon, in contemporary linguistics, of retraction of the accent as a specific feature of the Attic dialect.²¹⁷ What is particularly interesting is that Tryphon's sustained interest in this phenomenon finds a precursor in Philemon: before the publication of the *scriptura inferior* of the Vienna palimpsest by Hunger (1967), we had only the evidence of [Amm.] 405 referring to Philemon's use by Tryphon. The words mentioned in these four fragments are mostly common, high-currency words (πόνηρος/μόχθηρος, ἄδελφος, σηπία, βαῦνος; only προστῶον and περίστων sound like more technical items), and it is almost impossible to determine whether as his main source, Philemon used the contemporary spoken vernacular of his fatherland, literary texts (mostly comedy), or a combination of both.²¹⁸ Nonetheless, it is clear that, as observed by previous scholars, we cannot discern in Philemon the strict orthoepic prescriptivism of later Atticism.²¹⁹

4.2 Demetrius Ixion

Demetrius Ixion, Aristarchus' pupil, was active at both Alexandria and Pergamum and is commonly dated to the 2nd century BCE.²²⁰ His linguistic interests encompassed a broad range of topics, from textual criticism to literary interpretation, grammatical, etymological, dialectal, and lexicographical issues, mostly (but not exclusively) in relation to Homer and Aristophanes.²²¹ Our focus will be on Demetrius' dialectal studies, in particular, his interest in Attic as testified indirectly in

217 See the illuminating article by Probert (2004) on the chronological and diastatic dimensions of this phenomenon in Attic and its reception by Herodian. In particular, Probert (2004, 288–90) shows that there is high probability that Herodian's distinction between 'Old Attic' (παλαιός), 'later Attic' (μεταγενέστερος), and koine (ἡ κοινὴ διάλεκτος) may go back to Philemon via Tryphon.

218 Probert (2004, 289) is inclined towards the former: 'My suspicion is that [. . .] these grammarians had access to information about the pronunciation of Athenians and to some sort of folk memory of Athenian accentuations that were no longer in use or perhaps used only by older or more linguistically conservative speakers'.

219 See Tosi (1994a, 172); Ucciardello (2007) *ad loc.*

220 For the dating (mostly based on *Su.* δ 430, and the mention of Demetrius by Tryphon fr. 4 Velsen), see Ascheri (2009) *ad loc.*

221 Grammar: *Su.* δ 430 records two titles, Περὶ τῶν εἰς -μι ληγόντων ῥημάτων (*On the Verbs Ending in -μι*), and Περὶ ἀντωνυμιῶν (*On Pronouns*); etymology: Athenaeus mentions a work alternatively entitled Ἑτυμολογία (*Etymology*: Ath. 2.50a = Demetr.Ix. fr. 42 Staesche) and Ἑτυμολογούμενα (*Etymological Studies*: Ath. 3.74b = Demetr.Ix. fr. 41 Staesche), see Ascheri (2010, 126 n. 6). For Demetrius' Homeric studies, see Ascheri (2004); for a concise yet informative survey, cf. also Ascheri (2009); Ascheri (2010, 126 n. 3). Given that Demetrius is quoted several times in the scholia

his Homeric studies and the treatise *Περὶ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων διαλέκτου* (*On the Dialect of the Alexandrians*)²²² and directly in his *Ἀττικάι λέξεις*.²²³

Only one fragment of Demetrius' *Ἀττικάι λέξεις* has come down to us, via a scholium to Aristophanes' *Birds*:

Demetr.Ix. fr. 39 Staesche (= schol. Ar. Av. 1569b): Λαισποδίας εἶ· R Λαισποδίας καὶ Δαμασίας ὡς κακόκνημοι διαβάλλονται. RVEM μνημονεύει δὲ αὐτῶν καὶ Εὐπολις ἐν Δήμοις [. . .] Δημήτριος δέ, VELh ὄν πάντες τὸν Ἰξίωνα λέγουσιν, ἐν ταῖς Ἀττικαῖς λέξεσιν ὡς γλώσσαν ἐξηγεῖται, VE ὅτι λαισποδίας ἐστὶν ὁ ἀκρατῆς περὶ τὰ ἀφροδίσια, ὥστε καὶ κτήνη σποδεῖν VELh.

'Are you a Laispodias?': Laispodias and Damasias are slandered for having bad shins. Also, Eupolis in his *Demes* (Eup. fr. 107) mentions them [. . .] but in his *Attic Lexeis*, Demetrius, whom all call Ixion, explains it as a gloss, [saying] that a Laispodias is someone unable to control his sexual urges, to the extent that he has intercourse even with domestic animals.²²⁴

Laispodias was a well-known political figure in Athens in the mid-410s BCE: Eupolis and other comic poets (mentioned by our scholium in the part omitted here: Philyll. fr. 8, Stratt. fr. 19, Theopomp.Com. fr. 40) ridiculed him for some physical defect concerning his shins, implying that Laispodias was at the time a common byword for someone with bad legs.²²⁵ Demetrius, however, gives a different explanation: he considered *λαισποδίας* a peculiar (evidently Attic) idiom (ὡς γλώσσαν) used to indicate someone so intemperate in his sexual desires that he would engage in sexual intercourse with farm-animals (the metaphorical sexual sense of *σποδεῖν* = *βινεῖν* 'to fuck', is well attested in Attic comedy). According to Ascheri (2010, 129–30), there are two possible etymological explanations for Demetrius' interpretation: either Demetrius etymologised the personal name as deriving from

to Aristophanes' *Frogs* and *Wasps*, it is likely that he also wrote a commentary or a monograph on the comic poet: see Ascheri (2010, 126 n. 4).

222 The nature and aim of the ancient treatises *Περὶ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων διαλέκτου* have recently been addressed by Fournet (2009), Ascheri (2010), and Favi (forthcoming b). In particular, Favi has persuasively argued that the label 'Alexandrian' does not indicate a local variant of the koine but is used as an umbrella term to indicate generally low-register forms, in opposition not only to standard Classical Attic but also to the standard koine. On the relationship between ancient treatises on the so-called 'Alexandrian' dialect and issues of language correctness, see now Favi (forthcoming b) qualifying Ascheri's (2010) conclusions.

223 For Demetrius' specific interest in Attic, see Ascheri (2010), to whom this section is partly indebted.

224 Cf. *Su.* λ 200: Λαισποδίας τὴν φύσιν· ἀντὶ τοῦ τὴν κνήμην ἔχει σαπράν· [. . .] ἢ ὡς Ἰξίων ἐν ταῖς Λέξεσιν ὁ ἀκρατῆς περὶ τὰ ἀφροδίσια ὥστε καὶ κτήνη σποδεῖν.

225 On the nature of Laispodias' physical deformity, see Olson (2017, 396–7).

the intensifying prefix λα-/λαι-²²⁶ + σποδεῖν ‘to shag’, thus conveying the general sense of excess in sexual matters, or he understood it as formed by the Ionic ληῖς (‘spoil’ > ‘cattle’)²²⁷ + σποδεῖν. While Ascheri (2010, 130) favours the latter interpretation (notwithstanding the problematic Doric vocalism λᾱ-; in Attic one would expect λει- or λη-; cf. Attic λεία), the former explanation seems to us more likely for several reasons. First, it does not require us to assume that Demetrius attempts to demonstrate that the word is Attic while simultaneously proposing an etymological derivation that presupposed a non-Attic vocalism’,²²⁸ and second, the mention of κτήνη (domestic animals), *pace* Staesche (1883, 56: ‘verba ὥστε καὶ κτήνη σποδεῖν cur adiecta sint, non perspicitur’), does not appear to us so peregrine: intercourse with animals may indeed be considered a form of sexual intemperance. For all that we know, ὥστε καὶ κτήνη σποδεῖν may refer to extratextual anecdotal evidence and need not to be ‘incorporated’ into the etymology of the name. All in all, this single extant fragment from Demetrius’ Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις tells us very little that might help us to recover the conceptual framework of Demetrius’ lexicographical work, which is almost entirely lost to us: we know only that he used etymology to explain a personal name that in Athens, by the mid-410s BCE, must have been a proverbial means of denoting an uncontrollable sexual appetite.

More interesting (for us) is the only extant evidence from Demetrius’ treatise *On the Dialect of the Alexandrians*:

Demetr.Ix. fr. 40 Staesche (= Ath. 9.393b): τὴν μέσην δὲ τοῦ ὀνόματος [i.e. ὄρτυξ, ὄρτυγος] συλλαβὴν ἐκτείνουσιν Ἀττικοὶ ὡς δοῖδουκα καὶ κήρυκα, ὡς ὁ Ἰξίων φησὶ Δημήτριος ἐν τῷ περὶ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων διαλέκτου. Ἀριστοφάνης δ’ ἐν Εἰρήνῃ συνεσταλμένως ἔφη διὰ τὸ μέτρον ‘ὄρτυγες οἰκογενεῖς’.

Attic authors lengthen the middle syllable of the word [ὄρτυξ, ὄρτυγος, that is, ‘quail’] in the same way they do with δοῖδουκα (‘pestle’) and κήρυκα (‘herald’), according to Demetrius

226 Some modern linguists are sceptical about the existence of such a prefix: see Le Feuvre (2007, 329–30); cf. also the database *LGN-Ling* online s.v. Λαισποδίας at <https://lgpn-ling.humanum.fr/index.html?filter> (accessed 17/07/2024) for the various possible semantic interpretations of this personal name. Irrespective of the ‘correct’ interpretation of λα(ι)- in terms of historical linguistics, our ancient sources do appear to have believed in the existence of λα(ι)- as an intensifying prefix: see the lexicographical evidence quoted by Ascheri (2010, 129 n. 16), that is, Hsch. λ 111 and *Su.* λ 188, and now also Olson (2017, 397–8).

227 On the transition from ‘spoil’ to ‘flock, cattle’, see Edgerton (1925).

228 Ascheri (2010, 130). This difficulty is, of course, not insurmountable: ‘errors’ of this kind, that is, the attribution of ‘wrong’ epicchoric features to a given local dialect is not unparalleled in ancient Hellenistic scholarship. The point is, rather, that this time we do not need to suppose it, since a second, more linear explanation is already available.

Ixion in his treatise *On the Dialect of the Alexandrians*. But Aristophanes in *Peace* (Ar. *Pax* 788) has it short for the sake of the metre: ‘domestically-bred ὄρτυγες’ (quails).

If we are to trust Athenaeus’ text, Demetrius claimed that the middle syllable of ὄρτυξ, ὄρτυγος was originally long in Attic, as was indeed the case for δοῖδυξ, δοῖδυκος and κῆρυξ, κήρυκος, but that Aristophanes in *Peace* shortened it *metri causa*. This statement is, at first glance, at least, quite perplexing, since in all the extant occurrences of ὄρτυξ, ὄρτυγος, irrespective of the dialect, the /u/ in the middle syllable is invariably short.²²⁹ To avoid charging Demetrius with gross ignorance, Ascheri tentatively suggests interpreting Demetrius’ claim in Athenaeus as a case of intentional manipulation of the Attic evidence on the part of our scholar.²³⁰ According to Ascheri, Demetrius would have observed that in the Alexandrian dialect (understood, in the wake of Staesche, as the local vernacular spoken by the inhabitants of the Ptolemaic capital), the quantity of the middle syllable /u/ of ὄρτυγ- was long. Demetrius would thus have purposely created a ‘false’ Attic pedigree for such a vocalic quantity (hence the false observation that Aristophanes shortened it *metri causa*) to culturally promote an alleged affinity between the Alexandrian dialect and Attic, an agenda that we find explicitly espoused in the early Imperial period by the grammarian Irenaeus (mid-1st century CE).²³¹ If this were the case, Demetrius Ixion, in the 2nd century BCE, would have been the forerunner of an ideological stance that we otherwise find attested first only in the Roman era.²³² Favi (forthcoming b), however, raises significant objections to this hypothesis, offering instead what we consider a more likely, alternative explanation. First, Favi demonstrates that it is not unlikely that some form of epitomisation in Athenaeus’ transmission of Demetrius’ *ipsissima verba* must have occurred, modifying, if not distorting, Demetrius’ original meaning. In particular, in a previous passage (Ath. 9.388f–389a), Athenaeus, explicitly quoting only Aristophanes of Byzantium (= Ar.Byz. fr. 346: see Section 2.2.7) but most

²²⁹ Cf. the ancient evidence quoted by Ascheri (2010, 140 nn. 60 and 61), to which can be added Phot. ο 531: ὄρτυγας· συστέλλοντες οἱ Ἀττικοὶ λέγουσιν τὸ υ· καὶ τὸν ὄρτυγοκόπον βραχέως, δηλοῖ Ἀριστοφάνης Δαιταλεῦσιν (Ar. fr. 253).

²³⁰ Ascheri (2010, 141–2; 144–5).

²³¹ According to our sources Irenaeus wrote a treatise entitled Περὶ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων διαλέκτου (see Iren.Gr. fr. 1–3 Haupt), for which the *Suda* gives also the alternative title ἡ Περὶ ἑλληνισμοῦ (*Su.* π 29); furthermore, at *Su.* εἰ 190, the title Περὶ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων διαλέκτου is explicitly explained as ὅτι ἔστιν ἐκ τῆς Ἀτθίδος: according to Irenaeus, the dialect of Alexandria would have derived from the Attic. On Irenaeus’ concept of linguistic correctness, see Pagani (2015, 819–20); Regali (2015); Favi (forthcoming b).

²³² Ascheri (2010, 145–7). Ascheri, however, is rightly cautious: Demetrius might also simply have been one of the first scholars to start the debate on the assumed relationship between the Alexandrian dialect and Attic.

likely also drawing on Demetrius Ixion,²³³ had remarked that in the case of *πέρδιξ*, *πέρδικος* ('partridge'), some authors, e.g. Archilochus and Epicharmus (that is, non-Attic authors), shortened the iota, but Attic writers often did not (with extensive quotations from Attic drama). It thus appears more likely that Demetrius must have meant that, on the basis of the analogy principle (the ambivalent case of *πέρδιξ* and the straightforward ones *δοῖδυξ*, *δοίδυκος* and *κήρυξ*, *κήρυκος*), one would also have expected the middle /u/ of *ὄρτυξ*, *ὄρτυγος* to be long; the short form, in Demetrius' narrative, was 'introduced' in Attic by Aristophanes. That is, Favi argues, Demetrius must have been making a purely abstract argument to explain the violation of analogy, intending to justify what he perceived, on a theoretical level, as a 'deviant' form: that is, once Demetrius Ixion advanced the theory that Aristophanes innovated compared to analogy, the fact that *ὄρτυξ*, *ὄρτυγος* has a short /u/ also in post-Classical Greek becomes justifiable as well (Favi forthcoming b). The main point here is that the 'innovation' by Aristophanes is such *only* if compared to the analogical principle on a theoretical level: it does *not* imply that the form *ὄρτυγ-* ever actually existed in Attic. Furthermore, the mention of Aristophanes as witness to the short scansion of *ὄρτυγ-* (a perceived exception within a merely theoretical framework) must have played an important role in explaining why analogy was violated: it is not by chance that Phot. o 531 also quotes an Aristophanic example (Ar. fr. 253) for *ὄρτυγ-*. To sum up, Demetr. Ix. fr. 40 Staesche need not be interpreted as an *ante litteram* precursor to Irenaeus' defence of the Alexandrian dialect as derived from Attic: rather, it attests that Demetrius Ixion did not deal exclusively with problems of accentuation or prosody but more specifically with forms that were perceived as violating the analogical principle, in a way that is similar to that which we find in the Ar.Byz. (?) fr. *novum* Sandri (2023b) on *κάνθος* 'eye' (another reason to suspect that the author of this observation was not Aristophanes of Byzantium but Demetrius Ixion: see Section 2.1 above).

Finally, while commenting on the Homeric text, Demetrius Ixion twice singles out as Attic a given vocabulary or linguistic usage. In the schol. Hom. *Od.* (hyp) 18.17.1–3 (= Demetr.Ix. fr. 25 Staesche = fr. 28* Ascheri), Demetrius labels as Attic (*ἀττικίζων*) the use, on the part of the poet, of *χανδάνω* for *δέχομαι* in the sense of 'to be capacious, to hold':

Demetr.Ix. fr. 25 Staesche = fr 28* Ascheri: οὐδὸς δ'ἀμφοτέρους ὄδε χεῖσεται· χωρήσει, ἔνθεν καὶ χεῖρά ἢ κατάδυσσις τῶν ὄψεων. Δημήτριος δέ φησιν ὅτι ἀττικίζων ὁ ποιητὴς ἀντὶ τοῦ δέξεσθαι χεῖσεται εἶπεν.

233 See the detailed argumentation in this direction by Ascheri (2010, 139–40, with nn. 56–7).

This threshold will hold (χείσεται) us both: [χείσεται means] ‘it will contain’ (χωρήσει), from which [derives] also χειά, the serpents’ lair. Demetrius says that the poet used here the Attic expression χείσεται instead of δέξεται.

For us χανδάνω is overwhelmingly attested as a poetic, and most specifically, epic lexeme (9 x in Homer; 1x in the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*; 1x in Aratus; 5x in Nicander; 5x in Q.S.; 1x in Tryphiodorus; 2x in Nonnus; it is attested 1x in Pindar, 1x in Theocritus and 1x in Lycophron), with a couple of attestations in prose (2x in the Hippocratic corpus). Among the extant Attic authors of any period, it is attested uniquely at Ar. *Ra.* 258a–60 (ἀλλὰ μὴν κεκραξόμεσθ’ ἢ ὅπόσον ἢ φάρυξ ἂν ἡμῶν | χανδάνη δὲ ἡμέρας, ‘But indeed we shall shout as loud as our throats will hold, throughout the whole day!’), a lyric passage that is clearly modelled on a Homeric image,²³⁴ and in the moderately Atticising rhetor Aelian (2nd/3rd century CE), fr. 86 Domingo-Forasté (= *Su.* κ 2098), in what is a direct borrowing from Homer (ὡσπερ κεκρυμμένον θησαυρὸν καὶ κεχανδότα πολλὰ καὶ ἐσθλά, τὸ τοῦ Ὀμήρου: cf. Hom. *Od.* 4.96: κεχανδότα πολλὰ καὶ ἐσθλά).²³⁵ From a linguistic perspective, there is nothing specifically Attic in χανδάνω in its meaning ‘to be capacious’, and we can only wonder on what basis (lost texts? Spoken vernacular? Subjective opinion?) Demetrius Ixion identified this usage as an example of Homer’s Atticising tendency.²³⁶

The second example (Apollon. 131.8 = Demetr.Ix. fr. 26 Staesche = fr. 31 Ascheri)²³⁷ is much more straightforward. Commenting on Homer’s use of the in-

²³⁴ See Taillardat (1965, 278) comparing Hom. *Il.* 11.462: ἦρυσεν ὅσον κεφαλὴ χάδε φωτός.

²³⁵ Ascheri (2010, 134 n. 33) says that χανδάνω is attested in Attic texts ‘anche se molto raremente’ but quotes only Ar. *Ra.* 260. We have just seen that for the classic period Ar. *Ra.* 260 is the only example, explicitly built upon a Homeric image; for the post-Classical period, the only extant occurrence in ‘Attic’ literature is in Aelian’s fragment from the *VH* quoted above, an unmistakable adaptation of a Homeric quotation.

²³⁶ Ascheri (2010, 134) rightly observes that in other Homeric passages, Demetrius Ixion, unlike Aristarchus, appears unwilling to admit features perceived as ‘Attic’ in the text of Homer: cf. Demetr.Ix. fr. 27 Staesche = fr. 4 Ascheri (on which see above Section 3.1), fr. 21, 47 Staesche = fr. 29 Ascheri (on the reflexive pronoun of the third-person singular ἐαυτὸν in Homer), and fr. 26 Staesche (= fr. 31 Ascheri), on which see below. Ascheri thus argues that the expression ἀττικίζων in schol. Hom. *Od.* (hyp) 18.17.1–3 should probably be understood within a context in which Ionic was recognised by Demetrius Ixion as the default language (‘dialetto base’) of Homer, a recognition that allowed the concomitant presence of a superficial sprinkling of non-Ionic dialect features (on this conceptual framework, see above all Cassio 1993). Unfortunately, the schol. Ar. *Ra.* 260: χανδάνη· ἀντὶ τοῦ δύνηται καὶ ἐξισχύη. χωρῆ does not help to clarify the matter.

²³⁷ Demetr.Ix. fr. 26 Staesche = fr. 31 Ascheri: πῆ· εἰς τίνα τόπον· ‘πῆ ἔβη Ἀνδρομάχη;’ (*Il.* 6.377) καὶ ‘πῆ δὴ τόνδε μολοβρόν ἄγεις;’ (*Od.* 17.219). ὁ δὲ Δημήτριος ὁ Ἰξίων τοῦ ποῖ τῶν Ἀττικῶν ὄντος ἰδίου τὸ {δὲ} (del. Staesche) πῆ Ἰακὸν καὶ Ὀμήρω σύνηθες (λέγει add. Vill.). Apollonius’ passage

terrogative πῆ ('whither?'), Demetrius compares Attic ποῖ to Ionic πῆ, which, he says, is 'common in Homer' (Ἰακὸν καὶ Ὀμήρῳ σύνθηες).

All in all, the cumulative evidence attesting to Demetrius Ixion's interest in Attic dialect is relatively thin and does not allow us to identify a specific underlying agenda. However, it is interesting to observe that, if Favi's recent interpretation of Demetr.Ix. fr. 40 Staesche is correct, Demetrius, not wholly unlike Aristophanes of Byzantium in his *Λέξεις*, appears to have been interested in what he perceived as exceptions to linguistic rules (in our case, the principle of analogy) and justified them by tracing their use back to a Classical author.

4.3 Nicander of Thyateira

Nicander of Thyateira (northern Lydia), usually dated to the 2nd or the 1st century BCE (the only certain *terminus post quem* is 222 BCE),²³⁸ is a particularly elusive figure, given the scarcity of the available evidence. However, we do know that he was the author of a work entitled *Περὶ τῶν δήμων* (*On (Attic) Demes*), of which only two fragments survive (Nicand.Thyat. *BNJ*² 343 FF 1–2), and of a lexical work (in at least 18 books), variously quoted by Harpocration and Athenaeus as *Explanations on the Attic Dialect* (Ἐξηγητικά Ἀττικῆς διαλέκτου: Harp. μ 14 = Nicand.Thyat. *BNJ*² 343 F 6), *Attic Dialect* (Ἀττικὴ διάλεκτος, only in Harp. β 16, τ 29 and ξ 4 = Nicand.Thyat. *BNJ*² 343 FF 3–5), or *Attic Words* (Ἀττικά ὀνόματα in Ath. 15.678f = Nicand.Thyat. *BNJ*² 343 F 7). The ultimate source of Nicander's quotations in Athenaeus is highly likely to be, once again, Pamphilus, whereas the origin of

goes on to say that when the form is enclitic, it has an indefinite value, quoting *Od.* 13.207: νῦν δ' ἄρ οὐτ' ἄρ' πῆ θέσθαι ἐπίσταμαι as the equivalent to (ἀντὶ τοῦ) εἰς οὐδένα τόπον ἐπίσταμαι.

238 At Nicand.Thyat. *BNJ*² 343 F1 (= Harp. θ 33) Nicander mentions the Athenian phyle/tribe of Ptolemais, created in 224/3 BCE. For the dating of Nicander, see, in general, Sickingler (2018), who, while observing that in our sources the name of Nicander of Thyateira is often juxtaposed with authors of the 2nd and 1st centuries BCE (Polemon, Demetrius of Scepsis, Didymus), does not rule out the possibility of a later date. In particular, with reference to Nicand.Thyat. *BNJ*² 343 F 5 (= Harp. ξ 4): [. . .] ξηραλοιφεῖν ἐλέγετο τὸ χωρὶς λουτρῶν ἀλείφεσθαι, ὡς Δίδυμος ἐν κῆ Τραγικῆς λέξεως καὶ Νίκανδρος ἐν πῆ Ἀττικῆς διαλέκτου, προστιθείς ὅτι μήποτε καὶ τὸ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀλειπτῶν λεγόμενον ξηροτριβεῖσθαι οὕτως ἐλέγετο, 'They used to call anointing without washing 'rubbing dry with oil', as Didymus (argues) in Book 28 of his *Tragic Expression* (Did. p. 84 Schmidt = fr. 47 Coward-Prodi) and Nicander in Book 18 of his *Attic Dialect*, adding that maybe also what is called 'dry-rubbing' by trainers (ξηροτριβεῖσθαι) used to be so called', Sickingler (2018) *ad loc.* correctly observes that the claim that Nicander 'added' (προστίθεις) to the definition given by Didymus necessarily implies that Nicander used Didymus' work (thus for instance Nesselrath 1990, 77 n. 38 is groundless: see already Kroll 1936, 265–6).

Harpocration's quotation of Nicander is either Didymus or the so-called 'Attic Onomasticon', the common 'pool' hypothesised by Wentzel to explain similarities in many Attic lexica of the Imperial age.²³⁹

If we turn to Nicander's extant body of evidence on Attic dialect (18 fragments overall), it immediately becomes evident that the majority of his observations relate mainly to everyday objects and customs,²⁴⁰ with a marked preference for drinking vessels and food.²⁴¹ This, of course, may be primarily a result of the particular interests of the later sources (Athenaeus, Harpocration) where he is quoted, and we cannot tell whether Nicander also had a specific grammatical interest like Philemon and Demetrius of Ixion, for instance. What we can tell on the basis of the available evidence is that Nicander appears to have based his linguistic interpretations mostly on comic authors of all periods (Old and New Comedy: Aristophanes, Eupolis, Teleclides, Theopompus, Philemon, and Apollodorus of Carystus), followed by oratory (e.g. Dinarchus in *Nicand.Thyat.* *BNJ*² 343 FF 3 and 6, Isaeus in F 4) and perhaps tragedy (cf. *Nicand.Thyat.* *BNJ*² 343 F 5).

²³⁹ See Wentzel (1895b).

²⁴⁰ *Nicand.Thyat.* *BNJ*² 343 F 3 (= Harp. β 16) on βολεών, 'a place where one throws dung' (see also Amerias, below in Section 5): the quotations of Dinarchus (*Din. fr.* 3.3 Conomis) and the comic poet Philemon (*Philem. fr.* 186) are likely to derive directly from Nicander rather than being an independent addition by Harpocration; *BNJ*² 343 F 4 (= Harp. τ 29) on τριπτήρ, a kind of flat casket similar to those used for wine barrels; *BNJ*² 343 F 5 (= Harp. ξ 4) on ξηραλοιφεῖν, the practice, in gymnasia, of rubbing oneself with oil without washing; *BNJ*² 343 F 6 (= Harp. μ 14) on μέδιμνος, a measure of dry goods; *BNJ*² 343 F 7 (= Ath. 15.678f) on ἐκκύλιστος, a type of wreath made of roses (on ἐκκύλιστος in the lexicographical tradition, see Miccolis 2017, 256–7); *BNJ*² 343 F 18 (= Ath. 14.651c) on σάγδα, a type of unguent of Egyptian origin; *BNJ*² 343 F 19 (= schol. *Pl. Carm.* 161e.13 (T) Cufalo) on the alleged difference between στλεγγίς, a scraper (ξύστρα), and στλαγγίς, a small golden crown. *BNJ*² 343 F 12 (= Ath. 11.461e–f) does not mention the work from which the information is taken: in this passage, Nicander traces the origin of the Kylikranes, a semi-servile population below Mount Oita in Heracleia Trachinia, back to Lydia, where they and their leader named Kylix are said to have been the companions of Herakles. Given its content, it is doubtful whether F 12 originally belonged to Nicander's work on Attic dialect.

²⁴¹ Drinking vessels: *BNJ*² 343 F 13 (= Ath. 11.479c) on a type of ritual drinking cup called κοτυλίσκος, quoting *Ar. fr.* 395; *BNJ*² 343 F 14 (= Ath. 11.481d) on κυμβία, a drinking cup without handles; *BNJ*² 343 F 15 (= Ath. 11.485f) on the size of λεπαστή, a limpet-shaped drinking-cup; *BNJ*² 343 F 16 (= Ath. 11.486a) on a type of kylix called λοιβάσιον (cf. Chapter 6, Section 4.1); *BNJ*² 343 F 17 (= Ath. 11.503c) on ψυκτήριον, 'cooling ritual places' set up for the gods, a word derived from ψυκτήρ, a vessel used for cooling wine in antiquity. Food: *BNJ*² 343 F 8 (= Ath. 3.76a) on a fig known as ὀξάλειον, 'sharp'; *BNJ*² 343 F 9 (= Ath. 3.81c–d) on quinces (τὰ κυδώνια μῆλα) being also called στρούθια; *BNJ*² 343 F 10 (= Ath. 3.114d) on a variety of Egyptian bread called κυλλᾶστις; *BNJ*² 343 F 11 (= Ath. 7.320c) on two subvarieties of parrotfish (σκάροξ).

Of particular interest owing to its diachronic dimension, if the attribution to Nicander is correct,²⁴² is a gloss on Attic administrative procedure preserved by Hsch. α 962 (= Nicand.Thyat. *BNJ*² 343 F 20):

Hsch. α 962 (= Nicand.Thyat. *BNJ*² 343 F 20): ἀγωνοθέτης· ἀρχῆς ὄνομα Ἀθήνησιν. ὡς δὲ Νικανδρος, ἀθλοθέτης μόνα γυμνικά, ἀγωνοθέτης δὲ ὁ τὰ μουσικά ἀκροάματα διατιθέμενος.

ἀγωνοθέτης: Name of a magistracy at Athens. But as Nicander (says), an ἀθλοθέτης administered only athletic contests, while an ἀγωνοθέτης musical competitions.

Both terms belong to Attic custom and administration, although these two public ἀρχαί date to different chronological periods: the ἀθλοθέται were responsible for the Panathenaic festival (which included both musical and athletic contests) since the 5th century BCE, whereas the figure of the ἀγωνοθέτης is first attested in the late 4th century BCE as a consequence of the reform of the system for financing the choregia at state festivals, an intervention traditionally attributed to Demetrius of Phaleron.²⁴³ As observed by Sickinger (2018, *ad loc.*), it seems likely that the responsibility of the ἀγωνοθέτης may initially have been restricted only to that of the dramatic and dithyrambic performances at the Dionysia to the exclusion of athletic contests: this would explain Nicander's formulation in his distinction between ἀγωνοθέτης and ἀθλοθέτης, thus revealing an interest in the historic development of the magistracy and possibly, but not necessarily, in extra-literary sources (both terms are attested in oratory). If we examine the later lexicographical tradition, we can see that both Σ α 18 (= Phot. α 320, *Su.* α 338): ἀγωνοθέτης· ἀγωνοθέτης μὲν κυρίως ὁ ἐν τοῖς σκηνικοῖς, ἀθλοθέτης δὲ ὁ ἐν τοῖς γυμνικοῖς ('ἀγωνοθέτης in its proper sense is the judge of dramatic contests, ἀθλοθέτης of the athletic competitions') and similar entries in rhetorical lexica (*Fr.Lex.II, Exc.Vat.* 17, and *Anon.Paris.11*) seem to echo Nicander's distinction.²⁴⁴

²⁴² The passage was first ascribed to Nicander of Thyateira by the 16th-century Dutch scholar G. Sopingius; see Latte, Cunningham (2020, 46). Sickinger (2018) *ad loc.* is sceptical about the attribution.

²⁴³ See Sickinger (2018) *ad loc.* for details. On the ἀγωνοθέται, see P. Wilson (2000, 270–6).

²⁴⁴ Cf. also [Ammon.] 9. Moeris α 135: ἀθλοθέτης Ἀττικοί· ἀγωνοθέτης Ἑλληνας may simply reflect the fact that ἀθλοθέτης was the older magistracy in Athens.

4.4 Crates' *Περὶ τῆς Ἀττικῆς διαλέκτου*

In his *Sophists at Dinner*, Athenaeus repeatedly mentions a work (in at least five books) entitled *Περὶ τῆς Ἀττικῆς διαλέκτου*, and ascribes it to a certain Crates.²⁴⁵ Judging from the scanty remains of the work, *On Attic Dialect* was most likely organised thematically: all the extant quotations from Book 2 (Crates Hist. *BNJ*² 362 FF 6–9) relate to cultic and religious matters.²⁴⁶ Since the 1830s, modern scholarship has been divided as to the identity of Athenaeus' Crates, oscillating between Crates of Mallus, the Pergamene philosopher and scholar of the first half of the 2nd century BCE,²⁴⁷ and the lesser-known Crates of Athens,²⁴⁸ of uncertain date but likely to have been active in the first or second half of the 1st century BCE.²⁴⁹ Crates of Athens was an erudite figure with antiquarian interests, author of a treatise entitled *Περὶ τῶν Ἀθήνησι θυσιῶν* (*On Athenian Sacrifices*)²⁵⁰ and of a work quoted by Harp. ο 19 under the title of *Ἱεροποιία* (*Sacred Ceremonies*). It is not appropriate here to rehearse in detail all the arguments in favour of Crates of Mallus or Crates of Athens as author of *On Attic Dialect*; it is sufficient here to observe that the presence of the term 'Asiatic' (Ἀσιανός, Ἀσιαγενής) in some of Crates' fragments strongly suggests a cultural scenario of the 1st century rather than the 2nd century BCE (on this, see further below).²⁵¹ We therefore accept the

245 Cf. Ath. 3.114a; 6.235b; 9.366d; 11.495a; 11.497e; and 14.653b. At Ath. 9.366d (= Crates Gr. fr. 111 Broggiato) a Crates author of a *Περὶ τῆς Ἀττικῆς λέξεως* is said to be mentioned by Seleucus (first half of the 1st century CE) in his work *On Correctness* (καθὰ φησι Σέλευκος ἐν τοῖς Περὶ ἑλληνισμοῦ: Seleucus fr. 69 Müller). It is highly likely that this Crates mentioned by Seleucus coincides with the Crates author of *Περὶ τῆς Ἀττικῆς διαλέκτου* and that the title *Περὶ τῆς Ἀττικῆς λέξεως* is Seleucus' sloppy way of referring to Crates' treatise on the Attic dialect: see, most recently, Ascheri (2023, *ad loc.* with previous bibliography), rightly refuting N. F. Jones (2021), who posits the existence of two different works.

246 Thus, already Latte (1915, 388 n. 1); cf. also Broggiato (2001, xlii).

247 Thus Wegener (1836, 148–9); Wachsmuth (1860, 33–4; 63–4); Mette (1952, 48–53); Broggiato (2000) and Broggiato (2001, xlii–xlvi); cf. also Montana (2020b, 225) (= Montana 2015, 150) who inclines, though tentatively, towards Crates of Mallus.

248 Cf. Preller (1838, 61 n. 12); Müller *FHG* 4, 369–70; Latte (1915, 387–9), Jacoby *FGrHis* 362, 3b, 121–22; Pfeiffer (1968, 243 n. 4); Cassio (2000, 103). For the ethnic Ἀθηναῖος for Crates as author of *On Athenian Sacrifices*, see *Su. ε* 184.

249 See now Ascheri (2023) *ad loc.*, with good arguments against the split chronology for the antiquarian (4th century BCE) and glossographical (1st century BCE) works proposed by N. F. Jones (2021). The *terminus ante quem* is Crates' use made by Didymus (1st century BCE/1st century CE) in the Sophoclean scholia and by Seleucus (beginning of the 1st century CE) in Harp. ο 19.

250 See Phot. κ 1210 (= Crates Hist. *BNJ*² 362 F 2), *Su. ε* 184 and κ 2706.

251 See already Latte (1915, 387–9); on Asianism and Atticism as stylistic categories, see Kim (2020). Broggiato (2000) and Broggiato (2001, xlii–v) are not persuasive: it is not sufficient to observe that interest in Attic idioms is already attested in the 3rd century BCE and that already in

ascription of the treatise *On Attic Dialect* to Crates of Athens, following Ascheri's (2023) balanced assessment of the available evidence.

If we turn to the extant fragments (directly and indirectly) ascribed to Crates' *Περὶ τῆς Ἀττικῆς διαλέκτου*, most of the time, we are dealing with glosses pertaining to realia; references to various types of food (in both cultic and non-cultic contexts)²⁵² and drinking vessels²⁵³ are particularly prominent in a way that is not dissimilar to that encountered, for instance, in Nicander of Thyateira and other Attic lexicographers whose main indirect source is for us Athenaeus. However, two sets of passages stand out. The first set is represented by two fragments explicitly ascribed to Crates' *On Attic Dialect* by Athenaeus:

Ath. 6.235b–c (= Crates Hist. *BNJ*² 362 F 7 = Crates Gr. fr. 107 Broggiato): Κράτης δ' ἐν δευτέρῳ Ἀττικῆς διαλέκτου φησί: 'καὶ ὁ παράσιτος νῦν ἐπ' ἄδοξον μετὰκειται (Wilamowitz: μὲν κεῖται A) πρᾶγμα, πρότερον δ' ἐκαλοῦντο παράσιτοι οἱ ἐπὶ τὴν τοῦ ἱεροῦ σίτου ἐκλογὴν αἰρούμενοι καὶ ἦν ἀρχεῖόν τι παρασίτων. διὸ καὶ ἐν τῷ τοῦ βασιλέως νόμῳ γέγραπται ταυτί: κτλ.

In the second book of his *Attic Dialect*, Crates says, 'the term παράσιτος has changed in meaning and now refers to something disreputable, whereas previously παράσιτοι were

that period we find discussions on the nature of ἑλληνισμός (cf. esp. Broggiato 2000, 369–70). As for the latter, we have already seen in Chapter 6, Section 3.3 that ἑλληνισμός ('correct Greek') meant very different things not only at different times but also in different *contemporary* contexts. Hence, the fact that Crates of Mallus participated in the Hellenistic debate on ἑλληνισμός (see above all Janko 1995) tells us, *per se*, nothing in favour of the ascription of a treatise on the Attic dialect to the Pergamene scholar. Nor can the exceptionality of the remarks on the Asianic origin of some words vs their Attic counterparts be brushed away by simply quoting the occurrence of the adjective Ἀσιατογενής already in Aesch. *Pers.* 12 (πᾶσα γὰρ ἰσχύς Ἀσιατογενής, with reference to the Persian contingent): this proves nothing in relation to the use of Ἀσιαγενής in a linguistic context.

252 Ath. 14.653b (= Crates Hist. *BNJ*² 362 F 9 = Crates Gr. fr. 109 Broggiato) on σταφυλή, 'grape', and Ath. 9.366d–67a on σίναπτι, 'mustard' (= Crates *BNJ*² 362 F 11 = Crates Gr. fr. 111 Broggiato), on which, see below in greater detail; Ath. 3.114a (= Crates Hist. *BNJ*² 362 F 6 = Crates Gr. fr. 106 Broggiato) on a kind of bread made from the first harvest called θάρρηλος, obviously connected with the Athenian festival of the Thargelia. Cf. also (but without the name of the work) Harp. π 96 (= Crates Hist. *BNJ*² 362 F 3a = Crates Gr. fr. 121* Broggiato; cf. also Ar.Byz. fr. 343 on προκῶνια) and Phot. π 1255 (= Crates Hist. *BNJ*² 362 F 3b = Crates Gr. fr. 121* Broggiato) on προκῶνια, some sort of ritual offering made, according to Crates, of grains from unroasted barley corns (that the expression προκῶνια was specifically Attic is mentioned by Erot. α 142; cf. also Ar.Byz. fr. 343); Ath.14.640c–d (= Crates Hist. *BNJ*² 362 F 12 = Crates Gr. fr. 112 Broggiato) on various sorts of τραγήματα ('desserts'), quoting Philippid. fr. 20 (and perhaps also Diph. fr. 80).

253 Cf. Ath. 11.495a–c (= Crates Hist. *BNJ*² 362 F 8 = Crates Gr. fr. 108 Broggiato) on πελίκη, quoting Ion of Chios *TrGF* 19 F 10 (see more below); Ath. 11.497f (= Crates Hist. *BNJ*² 362 F 10 = Crates Gr. fr. 110 Broggiato) on σαννάκια, a kind of Persian drinking cup, with quotation from Philem. fr. 90.

called those chosen to collect the sacred grain: there was in fact a public board of παράσιτοι. This is why the following is written in the law concerning the archon basileus etc.’

Ath. 11.495a–c (= Crates Hist. *BNJ*² 362 F 8 = Crates Gr. fr. 108 Broggiato): πελίκαι· Καλλίστρατος ἐν Ὑπομνήμασι Θρατῶν Κρατίνου ἀποδίδωσι κύλικα. Κράτης δ’ ἐν δευτέρῳ Ἀττικῆς διαλέκτου γράφει οὕτως· ‘οἱ χόες πελίκαι, καθάπερ εἶπομεν, ὠνομάζοντο. ὁ δὲ τύπος ἦν τοῦ ἀγγείου πρότερον μὲν τοῖς Παναθηναϊκοῖς ἐοικώς, ἠνίκα ἐκαλεῖτο πελίκη, ὕστερον δὲ ἔσχεν οἰνοχόης σχῆμα, οἷοί εἰσιν οἱ ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ παρατιθέμενοι, ὁποῖους δὴ ποτε ὄλλας ἐκάλουν, χρώμενοι πρὸς τὴν τοῦ οἴνου ἐγχυσιν, καθάπερ Ἴων ὁ Χίος ἐν Εὐρυτιδαῖς φησὶν [. . .]. νυνὶ δὲ τὸ μὲν τοιοῦτον ἀγγεῖον καθιερωμένον τινὰ τρόπον ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ παρατίθεται μόνον, τὸ δ’ ἐς τὴν χρεῖαν πίπτου μετεσχημάτισται, ἀρυταίνη μάλιστα ἐοικώς, ὃ δὴ καλοῦμεν χάα’.

πελίκαι: Callistratus, in his *Commentaries on Women of Thrace* by Cratinus (*PCG* 4, 166 no. 88) understands πελίκη as a κύλιξ (‘cup’). But Crates, in the second book of his *Attic Dialect*, writes the following: ‘χόες (‘pitchers’), as we have said, used to be called πελίκαι. Early on, the form of the vessel was similar to the Panathenaic, when it was called πελίκη, but later it acquired the shape of a wine jug (οἰνοχόη), the kind that are set out during the festival (i.e. the Choes festival), the very sort that they once called ὄλλαι, used for the pouring of wine, just as Ion of Chios says in the *Eurytidai* (Ion *TrGF* 19 F 10): [. . .] But nowadays, such a vessel, consecrated in some fashion, is set out only during the festival, while the (vessel) devolving to daily use has undergone a change of form, most resembling a dipper and which we call χούς (‘pitcher’)’. (Translation by N. H. Jones 2021).

Despite dealing with different categories of realia (the sacred office of the παράσιτος and the terminology of cultic drinking cups), both passages reveal an equal interest in the diachronic evolution of the semantics of the terms concerned: παράσιτος, now (νῦν) a disrespectful designation (just like our modern ‘parasite’), was once used (πρότερον δ’) to indicate a public cultic magistracy,²⁵⁴ ‘pitchers’ (χόες) were once called πελίκαι (cf. ὠνομάζοντο, πρότερον μὲν [. . .], ὕστερον δέ), just as a wine jug (οἰνοχόη) was once (δὴ ποτε) called ὄλλη. Furthermore, in the first passage, Crates quotes not a literary text but a legal document (the law of the archon basileus) to support his claim: how Crates obtained access to this piece of legal and cultic Athenian history, is difficult, if not impossible, to ascertain.²⁵⁵ It is noteworthy, however, that subsequent discussions of the term παράσιτος in the later lexicographical tradition do not appear to dwell on the semantic shift undergone by the word (cf. Hsch. π 665: παράσιτοι· ἀρχὴ ἐπὶ τὴν τοῦ ἱεροῦ σίτου ἐκλογὴν and Phot. π 297: παράσιτοι· οἱ ἐπὶ τὴν τοῦ σίτου ἐκλογὴν αἰρούμενοι· κεῖται ἡ λέξις ἐν τῷ τοῦ βασιλέως νόμῳ).

²⁵⁴ For this meaning of παράσιτος, see N. H. Jones (2021) *ad loc.*

²⁵⁵ According to N. H. Jones (2021), it is unlikely that Crates quoted the law about the archon basileus firsthand: it is more probable that ‘he was indeed working from some intermediate compilation, lexicographical or otherwise’; for a different perspective, cf. Schlaifer (1943, 66).

The second set of passages is even more interesting for our purposes: as already observed by Latte (1915, 386–9), it is the only evidence we have, before the fully fledged development of Atticism in the Roman period, of a polemic stance (Latte speaks of ‘polemische Beziehung’) towards an overly restrictive concept of what counts as admissible Attic. Let us begin with a fragment whose ascription to Crates’ *On Attic Dialect* is certain, that is, Ath. 9.366d–7a:

Ath. 9.366d–7a (= Crates Hist. *BNJ*² 362 F 11 = Crates Gr. fr. 111 Broggiato): Κράτης δ’ ἐν τοῖς Περὶ τῆς Ἀττικῆς Λέξεως Ἀριστοφάνη παριστᾷ λέγοντα· ‘κάβλεπε σίναπυ καὶ τὰ πρόσωπ’ ἀνέσπασε’ καθά φησι Σέλευκος ἐν τοῖς Περὶ Ἑλληνισμοῦ· ἐστὶ δ’ ὁ στίχος ἐξ Ἰππέων καὶ ἔχει οὕτως· κάβλεψε νᾶπυ. οὐδεὶς δ’ Ἀττικῶν σίναπυ ἔφη· ἔχει δὲ ἐκάτερον λόγον. νᾶπυ μὲν γὰρ οἶον νᾶφου, ὅτι ἐστέρηται φύσεως· ἀφυσὲς γὰρ καὶ μικρόν, ὡσπερ καὶ ἡ ἀφύη. σίναπυ δὲ ὅτι σίνεται τοὺς ὤπας ἐν τῇ ὀδμῇ, ὡς καὶ τὸ κρόμμυον ὅτι τὰς κόρας μύομεν.

Crates in his *On Attic Diction*²⁵⁶ cites Aristophanes, who says: ‘and he was giving me a σίναπυ (‘mustard’) look and raised his eyebrows’, according to Seleucus in his *On Correct Greek* (Seleuc. fr. 69 Müller). But the line comes from *Knights* (Ar. Eq. 631) and runs as follows: ‘and he was giving me a νᾶπυ (‘mustard’) look.’ No Attic author ever used σίναπυ; but either form makes sense. νᾶπυ is, as it were, νᾶφου, because it has been deprived of growth (ἐστέρηται φύσεως), for it is stunted (ἀφυσὲς) and small, like ἀφύη (‘small-fry’). But [it might be] σίναπυ because the smell hurts (σίνεται) our eyes (ὤπας), just as we say κρόμμυον (‘onion’) because we close (μύομεν) our eyes (κόρας).

If we are to trust Seleucus, Crates knew a version of Aristophanes’ *Knights* that at l. 631 read κάβλεπε σίναπυ instead of κάβλεψε νᾶπυ, the reading unanimously transmitted by our Medieval MSS. Before allowing both forms to exist on the basis of far-fetched etymologies,²⁵⁷ Athenaeus’ objection to σίναπυ in Aristophanes’ text is in line with his Atticist tendencies: no real Attic author ever used σίναπυ for ‘mustard’, because νᾶπυ is the correct form (cf. e.g. also Phryn. *Ecl.* 252: σίναπι οὐ λεκτέον, νᾶπυ δε, ὅτι Ἀττικὸν καὶ δόκιμον; Moer. v 16: νᾶπυ Ἀττικοί· σίνηπι Ἑλληνες). Crates, then, would be defending the presence, in a literary text of the 5th-century BCE Attic ‘champion’ Aristophanes, of a form that the stricter Atticist tradition shunned.

In the same direction – that of a more ‘relaxed’ concept of Attic – point two further items of evidence, the first explicitly assigned to Crates’ *On Attic Dialect*, the second ascribed to Crates without mention of the work’s name:

²⁵⁶ On this title, see above n. 246.

²⁵⁷ νᾶπυ/σίναπυ is likely to be a pre-Greek term deriving from *s^ynāpi, with initial *s^y yielding both σίναπ- and σναπ- > ναπ-, see *EDG* s.v. σίναπι. On the distribution of the two forms in Attic comedy, with σίναπυ being the minority form (Anaxipp. (4th century BCE) fr. 1.45; σίναπυ is implied in Xenarch. (also 4th century BCE) fr. 12.2 σεσινάπικεν (Dalecampius: -ηκεν codd.)), see Olson, *Sens* (1999, 126).

Ath. 14.653b (= Crates Hist. *BNJ*² 362 F 9 = Crates Gr. fr. 109 Broggiato): βότρυς δὲ ὅτι μὲν κοινὸν δῆλον. σταφυλῆς δὲ μέμνηται, καίτοι δοκοῦντος τοῦ ὀνόματος Ἀσιαγενοῦς εἶναι, Κράτης ἐν δευτέρῳ Ἀττικῆς διαλέκτου, ἐν τοῖς ὕμνοις τοῖς ἀρχαίοις φάσκων ἀντὶ τοῦ βότρυος τὴν σταφυλὴν κείσθαι διὰ τούτων· ‘αὐτῆσι σταφυλῆσι μελαίνησιν κομώντες’. ὅτι δὲ καὶ παρ’ Ὀμήρῳ ἔστιν παντὶ δῆλον.

That βότρυς is a common term (i.e. for grape-cluster) is obvious. Crates in the second book of his *Attic Dialect* mentions the word σταφυλή, even though the term appears to be of Asian origin, and claims that σταφυλή is attested in place of βότρυς in the ancient hymns,²⁵⁸ in the following passage: ‘with long hair consisting of the black σταφυλαί themselves’.²⁵⁹ That the word is also found in Homer is apparent to anyone.

Schol. Ar. *Pax* 259 (V) (= Crates Hist. *BNJ*² 362 F 13 = Crates Gr. fr. 119 Broggiato): οἴσεις ἀλετριβανὸν τρέχων· Κράτης παρατηρεῖν ἀξιοῖ πρὸς τοὺς λέγοντας ὅτι ὁ μὲν δοῖδυξ Ἀττικός, ὁ δὲ ἀλετριβανὸς Ἀσιανός, καὶ σκυτοδέψης μὲν Ἀττικός, βυρσοδέψης δὲ Ἀσιανός.

‘Will you run and fetch a pestle (ἀλετριβανόν)?’: To those that say that δοῖδυξ (‘pestle’) is Attic, whereas ἀλετριβανός (‘pestle’) is Asianic, just like σκυτοδέψης (‘tanner’) is Attic but βυρσοδέψης (‘tanner’) is Asianic, Crates deems it right to observe [its use in Aristophanes].²⁶⁰

In both passages, Crates apparently defended, or found no objection against, words that, in some Atticist quarters, were considered ‘Asianic’ (Ἀσιαγενής, Ἀσιανός), a term clearly loaded with a negative connotation, in comparison to (proper) Attic (Ἀττικός).²⁶¹ In an extended, tucked-away footnote to his seminal 1915 article, Latte lucidly demonstrated that the label ‘Asianic’ almost invariably occurs in a context of explicit comparison with a ‘positive’ pole represented by ‘pure Attic’, and this within a chronological range in keeping with a fully developed linguistic Atticism.²⁶² Terms like Ἀσιαγενής, Ἀσιανός and *similia* are, of course, not wholly unambiguous: in some cases, they do designate expressions whose origin is actually

²⁵⁸ On the nature of these ἀρχαῖοι ὕμνοι, most likely hexametric Orphic hymns of Ionic origin (also linguistically) but fully naturalised at Athens at an early date, see Cassio (2000, 103–4).

²⁵⁹ Possibly from the lost portion of the Homeric *Hymn to Dionysus* (= fr. B in West’s Loeb edition).

²⁶⁰ Latte (1915, 386 n. 3) rightly remarked that, since βυρσοδέψης does not occur in *Peace*, it is unlikely that this piece of information derives from a running commentary on Aristophanes; rather, it is much more likely that it stems from Crates’ *On Attic Dialect*. In Aristophanes ἀλετριβανός occurs 4x in *Peace* (Ar. *Pax* 259, 265, 269, 282); βυρσοδέψης 2x in *Knights* (Ar. *Eq.* 44 and 581) and 1x in *Clouds* (Ar. *Nu.* 581).

²⁶¹ It is remarkable that Galen, alien to Atticist excesses, always positively qualifies the Greek spoken in Asia Minor by the educated classes: see Manetti (2009, 167–8).

²⁶² Latte (1915, 387 n. 1). On similar terminology in the Atticist lexica, see Chapter 2, Section 3.3.

eastern or non-Greek,²⁶³ but in the majority of cases, they appear to indicate a diastatic and diatopic macro-variant of Greek: basically, the koine of the Greek speakers of Asia Minor, broadly speaking, so often disparaged by the strictest promoters of a pure Attic idiom.²⁶⁴ This is also clearly the case for the two passages of Crates quoted above: in the first passage, Ἀσιαγενής, predicated of σταφυλή in the sense of ‘grape’, may be Athenaeus’ own rendition of Crates’ original wording, and the same cannot be entirely ruled out for the Ἀσιανός of the Aristophanic scholium. However, the cultural context is clear enough: Crates was defending as Attic lexical items (σταφύλη meaning ‘grape’, ἀλετριβανός ‘pestle’, and βυρσοδέψης ‘tanner’) that to others did not appear to enjoy a pure Attic pedigree.²⁶⁵ With Crates’ *On Attic*

263 Among the instances quoted by Latte, cf. e.g. Phryn. *Ecl.* 238 on γάλλος, Hsch. κ 788 and Ael. Dion. κ 11 on κάρδακες, foreign mercenary soldiers of Persian origin (Strabo 15.3.18 derived the term from Persian *karda* = τὸ ἀνδρῶδες καὶ πολεμικόν). One might add the border-line case of Poll. 10.68: τὸ δὲ καλούμενον κυρίλλιον (a kind of narrow-necked jug; the word is not otherwise attested in Greek except as a personal name) πρὸς τῶν Ἀσιανῶν βομβύλιον μὲν Ἀντισθένης εἶρηκεν ἐν τῷ Προτρεπτικῷ, οἱ δὲ καὶ σύστομον αὐτὸ ὀνομάζουσιν (‘What is called κυρίλλιον by the Asians, Antisthenes in the *Protrepticus* (= Antisth. test. 64D Prince = 18A Declava Caizzi) has called it βομβύλιον, others refer to the same as σύστομον (with a narrow mouth)’). κυρίλλιον may be either a Persian loan from Old Persian /Kuruš/ (Schmitt 1978, 27 n. 29) or a Greek folk etymology from κύρ(ι)ος; Pollux’s ascription of this word to the Ἀσισαί seems, at any rate, to indicate the Greek-speaking community of Asia Minor, a term broadly synonymous with koine speakers.

264 Cf. e.g. *Antiatt.* κ 40 on κέρκους with a quotation from Pl.Com. fr. 158 (see S. Valente 2015b, 50); *EDG* s.v.; but notice the more tolerant approach by Poll. 1.190). Or cf. also the lexicographical tradition of κράμβη ‘cabbage’ vis-à-vis ράφανος, ‘radish’ (e.g. Phot. κ 1051; Hsch. ρ 143 ~ Su. ρ 55). The first literary attestations of κράμβη are of Ionic provenance (with a clear iambic pedigree: Ananius fr. 4 West ναὶ μὰ τὰς κράμβας and Hippon. fr. 104.47 West), but the word is thereafter well attested in Attic comedy (cf. e.g. Telecl. fr. 29; Eup. fr. 84.2 (both examples of the oath ναὶ μὰ τὰς κράμβας), Epich. fr. 22; Polyzel. fr. 10, Apollodorus Car. fr. dub. 32.2. For a full list of κράμβη/ράφανον in Greek lexicography, see Olson (2023, 56–7). It seems likely that κράμβη was soon perceived as a ‘lower word’ than ράφανος, perhaps also because of its Ionic and iambic origin; in Photius and the Atticists it is used as the standard koine form. Other examples quoted by Latte include *Antiatt.* α 19 βαίτας (on βαίτη see Section 2.2.5); Phot. σ 307 on σκηνή (with the quotation of Men. fr. 572), and Heracl.Mil. (ca. 100 CE) fr. 50 Cohn (probably from the work entitled Περὶ δυσκλίτων ῥημάτων, *On Irregular Words*) = Eust. in *Od.* 2.70.41–71.3 on ἔα as the imperfect of εἰμί, analogical to other alphathematic forms (ἔλαβα and ἔφαγα) ascribed to the Greeks of Asia. We thank A. C. Cassio for drawing our attention to the hapax ἀσιανίζω in Phot. *Ep.* 242.11, on which see entry by D. Papanikolaou at <http://www.aristarchus.unige.net/Wordsinprogress/it-IT/Database/View/1805> (accessed 17/07/2024).

265 For σταφυλή, cf. e.g. Hsch. σ 1669: σταφυλή. [. . .] Ἀττικοὶ δὲ τὴν ἐν τῷ στόματι κίονα σταφυλήν, βότρυν δὲ καὶ ὀπώραν τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀμπέλου (‘σταφυλή: Attic speakers call σταφυλή the pillar (i.e. uvula) in the mouth, βότρυν for the fruit of the vine’); cf. also Phot. κ 753. For once, Phryn. *PS* 109.5, if the text is correctly reconstructed, is more permissive: σταφυλαὶ καὶ βότρυες <ἐκατέρω> χρῶ (‘σταφυλαί and βότρυες (both meaning ‘grape’): use both’). For ἀλετριβανός, cf.

Dialect, we can thus for the first time recover a taste, however vague, of what the budding of linguistic Atticism must have looked like in its first production.

5 Lexicography in a minor key: Isolated Attic glosses in grammarians from the 3rd to the first half of the 1st century BCE

We shall now offer a brief sketch of grammarians and lexicographers who, between the third and first half of the 1st century BCE, only occasionally engaged with Attic lexical material (mostly but not exclusively *realia*) within a broader linguistic framework.²⁶⁶ In the overwhelming majority of cases, the state of the available evidence regarding the linguistic interests of these minor or lesser-known scholars is very lacunose, and chronological inferences about their activity are, in some cases, no more than plausible guesswork based on the apparent nature of their oeuvres. This also means that it is often impossible to reconstruct their underlying framework with any exactitude; more often than not, what we seem to find is a general combination of exegesis of Attic literary texts, recordings of the spoken vernacular, and an antiquarian interest broadly conceived, without being able to recover a strongly oriented agenda. However, what these figures appear to share is an interest in Attic (literary and spoken) as just one of the possible dialectal varieties of Greek, not necessarily deserving of more attention than other dialects. Without any pretension to comprehensiveness, we mention here, in what is only an approximative chronological order, the most significant of these ‘minor’ scholarly figures for the successive development of late Hellenistic and then Imperial lexicography:

(1) **Lysanias of Cyrene**, usually dated to the end of the 4th century BCE and the first half of the 3rd century BCE,²⁶⁷ one of Eratosthenes’ teachers according to the *Suda*

Phot. *Bibl.* cod. 279.30–2: ὅτι ὁ τῆς θυίας τριβεὺς δοῖδουξ μὲν παρὰ τοῖς Ἀττικοῖς ὀνομάζεται, ἀλετριβανος δὲ παρὰ τῆ συνηθείᾳ, καὶ οὐδὲν ἦττον παρὰ Ἀθηναίους. For βυρσοδέψης, cf. *Su.* β 593: [. . .] βυρσοδέψης Ἀττικόν, βυρσοδέψης δὲ Ἀσιανόν (Poll. 6.128 and 7.80 juxtapose interchangeably βυρσοδέψης and βυρσοδέψης).

²⁶⁶ We omit here the Atthidographers and antiquarian writers such as, for instance, Polemon of Ilium (datable to the 3rd/2nd century BCE). For a general overview of the antiquarian interest in Attic lore (history, geography, customs) from the 4th century BCE to the early Roman era, see R. Thomas (2019, 420–3). On the important role that Alexandrian scholarship played in preserving Atthidographic material, see Benedetto (2011, 366); Costa (2007, 5–7). On Atthidography as a literary genre, see Nicolai (2010).

²⁶⁷ For the dating of Lysanias, see Dettori (2019, 86–8). However, on the basis of a newly published commentary on *Iliad* 1 (= Bodl. MS. Gr. class. f. 110, col. ii ll. 10–3 in which Lysanias is

(*Su.* ε 2898 = *Lysan.* test. 1 Dettori) and probably active between Cyrene and Alexandria (and perhaps Athens). We know the titles of two monographs: *Περὶ ἰαμβοποιῶν* (*On Iambic Poets*), and *Περὶ ποιητῶν* (*On Poets*). The extant fragments dedicated to Homeric exegesis (frs. 5–8 Dettori) seem to suggest the existence of a third monograph, possibly on Homer (cf. Dettori 2019, 88–90). Only one of the surviving fragments deals with an alleged Attic expression: schol. *Apoll.Rh.* 4.1187 (= fr. 11 Dettori): ἄλλοι δ' ἀμφοροῦρας· Θεόπομπος ἀμφοροεῖς λέγεσθαι φησι τοὺς ὑπ' ἐνίων μετρητάς, Λυσανίας δέ φησι τὸν ἀμφοροεῖς ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων ἀμφοροεῖς καλεῖσθαι ('Theopompus (*Theop.Hist. BNJ* 115 F 405) records that some call ἀμφοροεῖς the μετρητής (a jar/liquid measure), whereas Lysanias claims that the Athenians call the ἀμφοροεῖς ἀμφορεύς').²⁶⁸ This scholium presents several textual problems (beginning with the identification of Theopompus: the historian or the comic poet?).²⁶⁹ For our purposes, let it suffice to say that (i) the origin of the equivalence ἀμφορεύς = ἀμφοροεῖς (the latter already attested in Homer) is likely to be sought in Lysanias' Homeric studies (cf. e.g. *Apollon.* 29.21: ἀμφοροεῖσιν· ἀμφορεῖσιν: see Dettori 2019, 162–3); (ii) the 'Athenian' equivalent given by Lysanias has nothing specifically Attic in terms of phonology or morphology: ἀμφορεύς is a form attested in both Attic (e.g. *Philyll.* fr. 6) and non-Attic texts (e.g. *Pind.* fr. 104b.4 Snell–Maehler; *Epich.* fr. 130; *Call.* fr. 399.2 Pfeiffer; in prose, it occurs several times in Herodotus and in the *corpus Hippocraticum*). ἀμφορεύς, compared to the older form ἀμφοροεῖς, is a common Greek form that simply happened to be current *also* at Athens, notwithstanding *Moer.* α 92: ἀμφοροεῖς Ἀττικοί· μητρητής Ἑλληνας; see Dettori (2019, 162–3).

(2) **Parmenon of Byzantium**, probably to be identified with the author of choliambic poems so named (cf. *CA* 287 and *SH* 604A), was both a poet and a scholar, active at Alexandria in the 3rd century BCE.²⁷⁰ He wrote a treatise whose title in the MSS is *Περὶ διαλέκτου* but which has often been corrected by modern scholars into *Περὶ διαλέκτων* (see Dettori 2019, 174–6). The inner structure and articulation of his work remains obscure; what is certain is a marked dialectal interest, mostly applied to the field of Homeric exegesis:²⁷¹ cf. e.g. schol. (ex.) *Hom. Il.* 21.259d (Ge) (= fr. 1 Dettori) on the Thessalian ἀμάρα (already Homeric) and Ambraciotan καλαρύα,

quoted immediately after the mention of Aristarchus), Benaïssa (forthcoming) has raised the possibility of a later date (2nd century BCE) for our scholar.

²⁶⁸ For the apparent interchangeable nature, already attested in 3rd- and 2nd-century BCE lexica on papyri, between Ἀττικοί and Ἀθηναῖοι to designate Attic speakers, see Ucciardello (2012, 28–9; 71–9).

²⁶⁹ We owe this observation to G. Ucciardello.

²⁷⁰ See Dettori (2019, 173–7) for a detailed discussion of the likely date of Parmenon's activity.

²⁷¹ Parmenon seems to have adopted a method not wholly dissimilar to that of the various γλώσσαις κατὰ πόλεις; see Dettori (2019, 176–7).

both epichoric variants for ὄχετός ('water-channel'); schol. (ex.) Hom. *Il.* 21.262c (Ge) (= fr. 5 Dettori) on προαλές, said to be the local form of Cypriots, Arcadians, and Spartans for κάταντες ('steep', 'sloping downwards'); for a non-Homeric context, see Ath. 11.500b (= fr. 2 Dettori) on the Methymnean σκύθος for σκύφος, 'cup'. As far as Attic material is concerned, in P.Oxy. 53.3710 (= TM 60566), a 2nd-century CE commentary to Book 20 of the *Odyssey*, at col. iib ll. 24–6 (= fr. 4 Dettori), Parmenon said that the Athenians (παρ' Ἀθηναίους) call καλλύνειν, here in the sense of 'to sweep clean',²⁷² κορεῖν (first attested in *Od.* 20.149 ἄγρειθ', αἱ μὲν δῶμα κορήσατε πσιπνύσασαι, then almost exclusively a *vox comica*).²⁷³ The present state of our evidence does not allow us to ascertain whether Parmenon was commenting on the verbal form in *Od.* 20.149, quoting *en passant* a specifically Attic usage (a colloquialism?), or whether the anonymous commentator (through an intermediate source?) re-used Parmenon's collection of local λέξεις.²⁷⁴ Part of the later Atticist tradition recognised only (παρα)κορέω as the 'correct' Attic form vs the 'incorrect' σαρώω: cf. Phryn. *Ecl.* 55: κόρημα χρή λέγειν, οὐχί σάρων, καὶ κορεῖν καὶ παρακορεῖν, ἀλλὰ μὴ σαροῦν ('One must say κόρημα ('broom') and not σάρων, and κορεῖν and παρακορεῖν but not σαροῦν').²⁷⁵ In Parmenon's fragment, however, there is no trace at all of this Atticist debate (see Dettori 2019, 202–3).

(3) **Amerias of Macedon**, a 3rd-century BCE γλωσσογράφος, author of a work entitled Γλῶσσαι (cf. Ath. 4.176c; e), of which the Ῥιζοτομικόν mentioned at Ath. 15.681f may or may not be a botanic subsection.²⁷⁶ To judge from the extant fragments, Amerias' *Glosses* included Homeric material alongside dialectal (e.g. Epehian, Rhodian, Macedonian, Attic) and non-dialectal words. Among the dialectal glosses, two are recognised as Attic in the lexicographical tradition: (i) βολεών, a synonym for κοπρεών (both 'cesspit' and 'manure deposit')²⁷⁷ as recorded by P. Oxy. 35.2744 (= TM 63615; 2nd century CE), col. ii. 9–11 βο[λε]ῶ[ν]ας δὲ καὶ τοὺς κο[π]

272 The simplex καλλύνω ('to beautify') is first attested in Archil. fr. 82 West. ἀνακαλλύνω = 'to sweep up' is first attested in Phryn.Com. fr. 39.2 (cf. Stama 2014, 234) and becomes very common in the koine.

273 A full list of the comic occurrences of the term may be found in Napolitano (2012, 95 n. 224).

274 We owe this observation to G. Ucciardello.

275 Poll. 10.29 is more tolerant: εἰ δὲ καὶ καλλύνειν φαίης ἂν τὸ κορεῖν, ἢ που καὶ τὸ κόρημα κάλλυντρον. εἰ δὲ καὶ σαίρειν φήσεις τὸν θυρωρόν. Puzzlingly less severe is however also Phrynichus in *PS* 22.10–1: ἀνακαλλύνειν (Phryn.Com. fr. 39.2): τὸ σαίρειν, ὃ καὶ ἀνακορεῖν <λέγεται>. ἐξ οὗ καὶ κάλλυντρον καὶ κόρημα τὸ σάρων.

276 Amerias' fragments, mainly transmitted by Athenaeus and Hesychius, are collected by Hoffmann (1906, 2–17). To Hoffmann's collection, S. Valente (2005) has added five new fragments. For a general survey of Amerias' activity as glossographer, see Pagani (2005b).

277 Cf. Ault (1999, esp. 550–9); Pernin (2014, 279).

πρεῶνας καλεῖσθαί φησιν Ἀμερ[ί]ας; cf. Section 4.3);²⁷⁸ and (ii) διακόνιον, a ritual cake made for the harvest wreath in honour of Apollo (*Su.* δ 589 ~ *Phot.* δ 344).²⁷⁹ In both cases, we are dealing with realia that also have a literary attestation (*βολεῶν* is attested in *Din. fr.* 3.3 *Conomis*, and *Philem. fr.* 186; *διακόνιον* in *Pherecr. fr.* 167). There is no evident sign of a prescriptive attitude in either case.

(4) **Silenus**, of uncertain date but probably active in the early or mid-Hellenistic age (3rd/2nd century BCE), is credited with a collection of Γλῶσσαι (see Dettori 2019, 233–4). Silenus shows a clear profile of a glossographer with a marked interest in dialectal glosses: cf. e.g. *Ath.* 11.468b (= fr. 1 Dettori) on the Arcadian (more specifically, Cleitorian) word δέπαστρον ‘cup’; *Ath.* 14.644f (= fr. 2 Dettori) on Ionic ἄμην (a kind of milk-cake): the Ionic gloss is cited by Silenus as a morphological variant (metaplasm) vis-à-vis the Attic ἄμης (for such metaplasmata -ητα/-ην in Ionic area, see Dettori 2019, 244 with n. 31); *Ath.* 11.475c–f (= fr. 6 Dettori) on Aeolic κελέβη, ‘cup’, and *Ath.* 15.699d–f (= fr. 9 Dettori) on Attic φανός, ‘torch’. For Silenus Attic was just one dialect among others without enjoying a privileged status (see his comparison between Ionic and Attic forms in fr. 2 Dettori). His analysis of φανός (‘torch’) as a specifically ‘Athenian’ idiom (Ἀθηναίους λέγειν τὰς λαμπάδας φανούς) in *Ath.* 15.699d–f (= fr. 9 Dettori)²⁸⁰ later became the focus of Atticist reflections, especially with reference to the (alleged) difference between λαμπάς/λαμπτήρ and φανός: cf. e.g. *Phryn. PS* 87.1–5: λυχνοῦχος, λαμπτήρ, φανός διαφέρει. λυχνοῦχος μὲν ἐστὶ σκευὸς τι ἐν κύκλῳ ἔχον κέρατα, ἔνδον δὲ λύχνον ἡμμένον, διὰ τῶν κεράτων τὸ φῶς πέμποντα. λαμπτήρ δὲ χαλκοῦν ἢ σιδηροῦν ἢ ξύλινον λαμπάδιον ὅμοιον, ἔχον θρυαλλίδα. φανός δὲ φάκελός τινων συνδεδεμένος καὶ ἡμμένος, ὃ καὶ διὰ τοῦ <π> ([‘The terms] λυχνοῦχος, λαμπτήρ, and φανός have different meanings: λυχνοῦχος [lit. ‘lamp holder’] is a circular object with horns and a kindled lamp inside emanating light through the horns; λαμπτήρ is like a small torch of bronze, iron or wood, with a wick; φανός is a bundle of things bound together and then kindled’; it can be spelled also with π’). A less strict strand of the Atticist tradition seems instead to have agreed with Silenus: cf. e.g. *Poll.* 6.103: καὶ λυχνοῦχος ὁ νῦν φανός and 10.17: ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ καὶ λαμπτήρ ὁ λυχνοῦχος [. . .] ὑποδηλοῖ δὲ τὸν ἐκ κέρατος φανόν.

278 What follows in the papyrus is the quotation of *Dinarchus Or.* 3, fr. 3*, ll. 1–8 *Conomis*: it is likely, although not certain, that this quotation also goes back to *Amerias*: see S. Valente (2005, 284–5). The Attic nature of *βολεῶν* is confirmed by *Nicanor of Thyateira (BNJ)*² 343 F3 = *Harp.* β 16), on which, see above.

279 See S. Valente (2005, 285 n. 11).

280 *Athenaeus’* context is that of a synonymic series on torches. φανός is attested in comic poets and Attic prose spanning from *Xenophon* to *Plutarch*; its presence in the New Testament and in documentary texts shows that it was probably perceived as a colloquialism: see Dettori (2019, 299).

πανός μέντοι καὶ φανός ἢ λαμπάς; Ptol. *Diff.voc.* 390.34 Palmieri: λυχνούχον καὶ λαμπτήρα τὸν νῦν φανόν· φανὸν δὲ τὴν λαμπάδα. Of this debate, there is no trace in Silenus (for a full list of the ancient grammatical sources, see Dettori 2019, 300; 301; cf. also Lorenzoni 2000).

(5) **Apollodorus of Athens** (ca. 185/0–110 BCE), a disciple of the Stoic Diogenes of Babylon at Athens and then of Aristarchus at Alexandria, probably moved to Pergamum (his work *Χρονικά* is dedicated to king Attalus II) after the persecution of scholars under Ptolemy VIII. Very much like Eratosthenes, Apollodorus was an encyclopedic scholar with vast scientific and literary interests, both with a tinge of Stoic orientation.²⁸¹ On the literary and linguistic side, apart from his Homeric and mythographic studies, he worked intensively on comedy, both Attic and Doric: he wrote a monograph entitled *On Athenian Courtesans* (Περὶ τῶν Ἀθήνησιν ἐταφίδων: *BNJ* 244 FF 208–12), one on Sophron's mimes (Περὶ Σώφρονος in at least four volumes: *BNJ* 244 FF 214–8), and one on Epicharmus (Περὶ Ἐπιχάρμου in ten volumes: *BNJ* 244 F 213a), perhaps accompanied by an edition of the text (cf. Pfeiffer 1968, 264). To the Alexandrian tradition of lexicography belong his *Ἑτυμολογία* in two books (*BNJ* 244 FF 223–5; also known under the title of *Ἑτυμολογούμενα*: *BNJ* 244 F 222, cf. Pfeiffer 1968, 260) and a collection of rare words, entitled *Γλῶσσαι* (*BNJ* 244 F 221). Already Jacoby, not without reasons, suspected that *Ἑτυμολογία* and *Γλῶσσαι* might be alternative titles of the same work. In his *Glosses* and *Etymologies*, we find a miscellaneous array of interests ranging from grammatical analysis (in *BNJ* 244 F 221 = schol. (ex.?) Hom. *Il.* 1.244d (A) Apollodorus defended οὐδέν < οὐ + δέ + ἔν against Aristarchus' interpretation of οὐδέν = οὐ, if indeed this passage does belong to his *Glosses* and not to Apollodorus' *Schiffskatalog*), culinary glosses possibly from Attic comedy (*BNJ* 244 F 222 on μαπτύη, a sweet dish, a term said to derive from μασάομαι 'to chew' rather than from μάττω 'to knead'; *BNJ* 244 F 223 on a variety of edible snails called κωλυσίδειπνοι), dialectal terms possibly of non-literary origin (*BNJ* 244 F 224 on the Paphian κύββα = Attic κύμβα, a drinking cup) and, obviously, etymology (*BNJ* 244F 225: Κρηῖτες are so called because the local air is well temperate: παρὰ τὸ εὖ κεκραῖσθαι). The only gloss explicitly said to be Attic is ψωθία, 'bred-crumbs' in *BNJ* 244 F 283 (= Ath. 14.646c): ψωθία· τὰ ψαθύρια. Φερεκράτης Κραπατάλλοις [. . .] Ἀπολλόδωρος δ' ὁ Ἀθηναῖος καὶ Θεόδωρος δ' ἐν Ἀττικαῖς Γλῶσσαις τοῦ ἄρτου τὰ ἀποθραυόμενα (ἀποθραυόμενα Kaibel: ἀποψαυόμενα ACE: ἀποψώμενα B Meineke) ψωθία καλεῖσθαι, ἃ τινες ὀνομάζουσιν ἀτταράγους ('ψωθία: small crumbs. Thus Pherecrates in his *Kratapalloi* (Pherecr. fr. 86) [. . .] Apollodorus of Athens and Theodorus in his *Attic Glosses* (Theod.Hist. *BNJ*²

²⁸¹ For an informative and up-to-date synthesis, see Montana (2020b, 232–4) (= Montana 2015, 157–9); Williams (2018).

346 F 2)²⁸² [say] that are so called the morsels of bread, which [they claim] some call ἀττάραγοι). Apollodorus may have derived this word from a literary source (Attic comedy: cf. the quotation of Pherecr. fr. 86 by Athenaeus) or from the spoken everyday language: here too, as in many other cases, it is impossible to decide one way or another.²⁸³ Finally, in *BNJ* 244 F 282 = Hdn. Περὶ μονήρους λέξεως *GG* 3,2.946.3–6 = 40.16 Papazeti Apollodorus dealt with the accentuation of the word ΨΑΛΤΗΡ ('cantor'). According to Herodian, masculine disyllabic nouns ending in -της are paroxytone: Apollodorus apparently recorded as an exception to the rule the Attic form ψαλτής (τὸ δὲ ψαλτής Ἀττικόν ἐστὶν ὀξύνομενον, ὡς ἰστορεῖ Ἀπολλόδωρος). Neither in F 283 nor in F 282 does Attic seem to have been treated by Apollodorus as the 'default' prestige dialectal variety deserving more attention than other regional dialects.

(6) **Timachidas of Rhodes** was a poet and a grammarian active between the second half of the 2nd century BCE and the first half of the 1st century CE (that is, before Pamphilus).²⁸⁴ He is author of a work entitled Γλώσσαι, which shows a clear interest in a variety of local dialects: cf. Ath. 2.53b–c (= fr. 9 Matijašić) on the Pontic 'nut' (κάρυον) called 'Zeus' acorn'; Ath. 15.678a (= fr. 15 Matijašić) on the Sicyonian ἰάκχα, a 'wreath' used in the cult of Dionysus; Ath. 1.31e (= fr. 20 Matijašić) on ὑπόχυτος, a variety of Rhodian wine. The evidence of Harp. σ 18 (= fr. 19 Matijašić) also shows a specific interest in the Attic dialect: σῖτος Δημοσθένης (ἐν τῷ) κατ' Ἀφόβου α'. σῖτος καλεῖται ἡ διδομένη πρόσσδος εἰς τροφήν ταῖς γυναῖξιν ἢ τοῖς ὀρφανοῖς, ὡς ἐξ ἄλλων (τε) μαθεῖν ἐστὶ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Σόλωνος α' ἄξονος καὶ ἐκ τῆς Ἀριστοτέλους Ἀθηναίων πολιτείας. Τιμαχίδας δὲ ἠγεῖται παρὰ τοῖς Ἀττικοῖς σῖτον λέγεσθαι τὸν τόκον, ἀγνοεῖ δὲ ὅτι ἐν ἀνθ' ἐνὸς οὐδέποτε παρ' αὐτοῖς ὁ τόκος σῖτος καλεῖται (σῖτος: Demosthenes <in the> first speech *Against Aphobus* (D. 27.15). σῖτος is the public revenue for the sustenance of women and orphans, as it is known among others both from the first axon of Solon (test. 10 Ruschenbusch) and from Aristotle's *Constitution of Athens* (Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 56.7). Timachidas claims that among Attic

²⁸² As already seen by Schwartz (1894, 2871), followed by Jacoby, ἐν Ἀττικαῖς Γλώσσαις probably refers only to Theodorus (of uncertain date: at any rate, before the second half of the 1st century CE: cf. Meliadò 2019): therefore, there is no need to infer that Apollodorus also wrote a book specifically devoted to Attic Λέξεις only.

²⁸³ See Franchini (2020, 25). The doublet ψωθία/ἀττάραγοι is also in Poll. 7.23, where the former are said to refer to the blisters on the bottom of a loaf (αἱ δ' ἐκ τοῦ κάτω), and the latter to those on the upper surface (τοῦ γε μὴν ἄρτου αἱ μὲν κατὰ τὸ ἄνω μέρος. If this distinction was known to Apollodorus is impossible to say. For ψωθία/ψωθίον and ἀττάραγος in the lexicographical tradition, see Franchini (2020, 17 and 25). One may also add the comic lexicon of P.Sorb. 2243 (= TM 63918, 2nd/3rd CE) ψωθία τὰ ὑποκάτω τοῦ ἄρτου.

²⁸⁴ For the dating, see Matijašić (2020, 12).

speakers, the interest is called *σίτος*: but he ignores the fact that in Athens, *σίτος* (that is, ‘public revenue’) is never one-for-one for *τόκος* (‘interest’). Timachidas’ interpretation of *σίτος* as ‘interest’, judged by Harpocration to be incorrect, is unparalleled. Again, just as for Silenus, one has the impression that Attic was, for Timachidas, one of the many dialectal varieties of Greek without an *a priori* superior prestige. The overall framework, as far as it is recoverable from the scanty fragments available, appears to have been descriptive rather than prescriptive.

6 Attic words in anonymous BCE collections of glosses on papyri

The earliest lexica on papyri, although largely fragmentary, can also help us to try to recover additional evidence on the ways in which regional and/or rare idioms, deriving from both literary texts and spoken language, were collected.²⁸⁵ As in the previous sections, we shall limit ourselves to examine only evidence directly concerning the Attic dialect, in an attempt to gauge which role, if any, these early lexical aids may have played in the subsequent lexicographical tradition on Attic.

P.Berol. inv.9965 (= TM 65774) is a papyrus fragment from Abusir-el-Melek, written on the *recto* and reasonably dated to between the 3rd and 2nd centuries BCE.²⁸⁶ It consists of an alphabetical list of poetic expressions mostly attested in epic, tragedy, and possibly Hellenistic poetry. As observed by Ucciardello (2012), many lemmata and *interpretamenta* show a clear correspondence with the relevant entries in Hesychius and the scholia D to the *Iliad*: this strongly suggests that this dictionary was arranged for a public with strong interest in poetic diction. In particular, two items in P.Berol. are commented on as specifically ‘Athenian’, that is ‘Attic’. The first is at col. ii.7, where we read βλάξ· μωρός· Ἀθηναῖοι (‘βλάξ: [it means] stupid; [so say] the Athenians’). The same explanation occurs again in later Attic lexicography, for instance in Hsch. β 671: βλάξ· μωρός (= Σ β 56, Phot. β 160) and Ael.Dion. β 16: βλάξ· μαλακός, χαῦνος, ἐκκελυμένος ἢ μωρός.²⁸⁷ In all

²⁸⁵ Earlier papyrus glossaries or lexica (for a terminological distinction between glossary and lexicon, see Esposito 2009, 257) include: (i) P.Hib.2.175 (= TM 65730; ca. 260–40 BCE), an epic glossary likely to be a school text: see Esposito (2017, 13–34); (ii) P.Heid.I.200 (= TM 61252; mid- or second half of 3rd century BCE): see Vecchiato 2020, 12–6; (iii) P.Freib.I.1c (= TM 64050, of unknown provenance, 1st century BCE: for this dating, see Vecchiato 2020, 17).

²⁸⁶ Ucciardello (2012, 15–8); Vecchiato (2022, 66–9).

²⁸⁷ A complete list of passages may be found in the apparatus of *loci similes* in Cunningham, Latte (2020, 443).

these later instances, however, the ethnic is lacking, but the etymological tradition that probably derives from *Et.Gen.* β 129: βλάξ· ὁ εὐήθης καὶ ἀργὸς καὶ ἀνόητος· Ἀριστοφάνης records an Aristophanic quotation (Ar. fr. 443). This makes it quite likely that our entry in P.Berol. also implied an underlying comic expression. The mention of the ethnic Ἀθηναῖοι must thus likely be understood as a byword for Aristophanes as the champion of the 5th-century-BCE literary Attic.²⁸⁸

The second item pointed out as Attic is at col. ii.9: †βλε[ι]μ[ά]ξει· βαστάσει† Ἀθηναῖοι (‘†He feels/handles: he will carry; [so say] the Athenians’).²⁸⁹ Once again, the item betrays a distinct comic origin (one can compare Ar. Av. 530 or, in a more obscene sense, Ar. Lys.1164 and Cratin. fr. 335), which justifies the label of Ἀθηναῖοι and the perception of the Attic nature of the rare verb βλιμάζω. Unfortunately, it remains unclear whether this ethnic label was intended to define 5th-century-BCE Attic alone as the more prestigious variety of Attic to differentiate it from its post-Classical developments.

The second lexicon that interests us is P.Köln inv. 22323 (= TM 977097; ca. 3rd/2nd centuries BCE), recently published by Vecchiato (2022). P.Köln contains a list of poetic words followed by one or two explanations, often marked by the corresponding ethnic/dialectal label. More importantly, it exhibits a full alphabetical order of all the letters, thus modifying the common previous opinion that a complete alphabetization was first introduced by Diogenianus or by someone else influenced by Atticist trends during the first centuries CE.²⁹⁰ This lexicon contains both literary words (from Homer, lyric, and tragic poetry) and local rarities on realia or names of animals, which suggests attention to local spoken vernaculars (Aetolians, Argives, Dorians, Laconians are quoted among others).²⁹¹ The text does not deal with items explicitly qualified as Attic or ‘Athenian’, but some passages nevertheless deserve closer attention.²⁹² For instance, at fr. 4 col. i.5, we read κλάσαι· τεμεῖν τοὺς ἀμπέλους without any ethnic label. The verb κλάω here is explained in its more technical meaning (‘to prune vines’), well attested in bo-

²⁸⁸ On Ἀττικοί/Ἀθηναῖοι as an interchangeable designation for the Attic dialect, see Ucciardello (2012, 28–9; 71–9).

²⁸⁹ The text is clearly corrupt: we can emend either the explanation βαστάσει to βαστάζει or the lemma to βλε[ι]μ[ά]ξει. The latter solution is paleographically more appealing (the corruption ξ > ζ (and vice versa) is well attested in Ptolemaic handwritings); meanwhile, βαστάζει would match Ar. Av. 530 οἱ δ’ ὠνοῦνται βλιμάζοντες (with a lemmatization in the third person); the interchange ζ/σ (even if seldom before vowel) would thus be a matter of pronunciation: see Ucciardello (2012, 24–5) and Vecchiato (2022, 67–8, n. 155).

²⁹⁰ As assumed by Tosi (1994a, 174) and Esposito (2007, 260): see now Vecchiato (2022, 4–6): cf. also Chapter 6, Section 4.3.

²⁹¹ See Vecchiato (2022, 12–4).

²⁹² This part is deeply indebted to G. Ucciardello.

tanical texts. The closest *comparanda* in the later lexicographical tradition are Moer. κ 41: κλάσαι Ἀττικοί· κλαδεῦσαι Ἕλληνες, Phryn. *Ecl.* 143: κλ{αδ}ᾶν ἀμπέλους φαθί, ἀλλὰ μὴ κλαδεύειν, Poll. 1.224: ἐρεῖς δὲ ἄμπελον τεμεῖν, γυρῶσαι, ταφρεῦσαι, ἀμῆσαι, κλάσαι, κλαδεῦσαι (Pollux, as usual, is more relaxed than Phrynichus in his list of permitted expressions), and Phot. κ 754: κλᾶν ἄμπελον· τὸ τέμνειν. From this array of passages, we may reasonably infer that κλάω in the specific sense of κλαδεύω ('to prune') was regarded as Attic, while the latter is the more common form (cf. Hsch. κ 2862: κλᾶν· κάμπτειν. ἐμποδίζειν. τέμνειν ἀμπέλους, ὅπερ ἡμεῖς κλαδεύειν), prohibited by more severe Atticists such as Phrynichus. Two observations are in order: (i) it is indeed remarkable that already in the 3rd century BCE, this peculiar use of the verb κλάω was deemed to be Attic (this is may be owing to its occurrence in an Attic literary source); (ii) the lexicon of P.Köln seems to be mainly intended to be primarily a collection of rare terms singled out from different regional and local dialects, without any reference to the spoken contemporary usage (koine).

As we have seen, both papyri share the same attitude to indicate, even if erratically, the regional or local provenance of the lexical items. In this respect, they closely resemble a much later dialectological list of 101 glosses divided into 21 Greek regions and cities, which has come down to us in a handful of MSS. This list is entitled ποῖα γλῶσσα κατὰ πόλεις and assembles glosses from both regional varieties, such as Arcadians, Cretans, Thessalians, and Ambraciotans, and from cities (Athens, Corinth, Cleitor, Hermione, Corcyra, Phlius, and Argos), mentioned in alphabetical order according to the ethnicity. The authorship and chronology of this short work are unknown: Latte (1925), not unreasonably, suggested Diogenianus as the ultimate source, even though the final arrangement is in all likelihood ascribable to a later compiler.²⁹³ It is worth noting that several of categories used in this later *excerptum* are the same as those found in Parmenon (Cypriots, Ambraciotas, Thessalians, Arcadians, and Lacedaemonians, here called Laconians), Silenus (Cleitorians, Aeolians, Athenians) or Zenodotus (Cleitorians), as well as in our two lexica (Athenians in P.Berol. 9965, col.ii. 7 and 9; and see P. Köln, fr. 1 col. i.12 Arcadians, col. i.16 and fr. 4 col. i.2 Cleitorians, col. i. 17 Argives).

All in all, there are undisputable points of convergence between such chronologically different texts: all display a classificatory attitude to distinguish linguistic varieties according to regional dialects at a macro-level and, at a micro-level, to epichoric idioms of various localities, a disposition that ultimately goes back to the earliest Hellenistic scholars, including Zenodotus and Parmenon, and that we can see as still operational during later stages of Greek lexicography. In a sense,

²⁹³ Latte (1925) and Bowra (1959) are still the best treatments of this list.

this is reassuring: even at the level of anonymous lexical aids, we may see some continuity between the Hellenistic and the Imperial periods, in terms of methodology, even across the chronological divide of Atticism.

7 Conclusions

In this chapter, we have attempted to reconstruct the cultural and scholarly environment that prepared the way for the later development of the so-called linguistic Atticism, highlighting differences from and analogies with mature Hellenistic lexicography. From the 3rd century BCE onwards, sustained attention to the Attic dialect in particular appears to be thriving: Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις appear to become less of a niche subject and more of a mainstream field of investigation. The analysis conducted here, if not wide off the mark, suggests that in the 3rd and 2nd centuries BCE, we do not find significant traces of an attitude towards the Attic dialect that may be described as Atticist or purist *ante litteram*: the majority of the evidence under scrutiny rather appears to suggest an expansion of the ‘open’ approach to the possibilities of the Attic language, exemplified at its best by Aristophanes of Byzantium’s Λέξεις. This seems to be true both in the case of lexicographical studies explicitly dedicated to the Attic dialect only and in the isolated Attic glosses that we can occasionally find in minor and lesser-known scholars. The transition from the second to the first half of the 1st century BCE must have represented a veritable watershed in the long history of Greek lexicography: the case of Crates of Athens (Section 4.4) has just offered us a foretaste of that momentous change, paving the way towards the age of Atticism, which will be the focus of this work’s next volume. We hope that our incursions, sporadic though they might have been, into the beginning of this later phase, will encourage others to tackle the challenge that lies ahead.