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Greek lexicography was central to classical philology in the nineteenth century. The grammatical and lexical traditions of antiquity and Byzantium have been relatively unexplored since then, despite their importance both for understanding the ancient authors and as traditions in their own right. Atticistic lexica in particular provide insight into the development of the Greek language and a programme of Sprachausbau whose outcome can be better understood with the help of new lexicographical resources and advances in linguistics.

Interest in lexicography dates back to Homer and the literary dialects transmitted through Greek paideia. Lexica were first composed as an aid to understanding obsolescent γλώσσαι, but seem to have also been used prescriptively. In Alexandria scholars such as Aristophanes of Byzantium developed κοινα of ancient literature through the study of canonical usage.

From the fifth century into the Roman period the Greek language was restructured in its phonology, morphology, syntax, and vocabulary. This was the result of language contact brought about by expansion of the Athenian and Macedonian empires. This change may have been brought about by creole formation as the language was imposed on new populations. Spoken koine dialects, characterized by simplification and reduction, diverged widely through the Hellenistic period.
The new koine itself became a metalanguage, the first Greek dialect that appeared common to all speakers. Plato’s criticism of the Sophists and the Lyceum’s development of prescriptive standards were part of a tradition of theoretical reflection on language; elements of this tradition entered the Stoic system that identified purity of language with morality and wisdom.

Linguistic purism, linked with notions of prescriptivity, is a nearly universal phenomenon. 

Diglossia refers specifically to situations where a prestige language H has different functions from a colloquial language L with which it coexists. H should be understood as a target on one end of a continuum of usage. The importance to the development of Greek of the reintroduction of old forms through puristic usage should not be underestimated. Classical purism involves translation and linguistic assimilation into the idiom of an ancient speech community imagined as diachronic.

Atticism arose from the Roman encounter with Hellenism; the frame of classicism made possible Roman assimilation of Greek achievements in art and literature. Developed as a tool for the analysis of texts, Alexandrian κρισις transmitted in Atticist lexica became the foundation for the active appropriation of Athenian language and thought by Greek-speaking Romans.

Philemon, author of an Atticist lexicon, was a scholar and poet in the late second century AD. His fragments can be pieced together from two different manuscript traditions. Analysis of his work provides evidence for language change in the second century and for the outcome of the Atticist programme.
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INTRODUCTION

In a review published in 1983 M.L. West wonders in what respects the field of classical studies might progress over the next hundred years. While dubious that general knowledge of Greek and Latin will improve, or that new interpretations will add substantially to the appreciation of classical literature, he concludes that not least of reasons for envying scholars of the next century “is the expectation that the grammatical and lexical traditions of later antiquity and the Middle Ages, which are such an important source of classical fragments besides being of interest in their own right, will have been much more fully opened up.” (West 1983, 20). West recognizes that Wilamowitz’s hope for progress in lexicography remains unfulfilled; a field of study that was close to the center of classical philology in the nineteenth century has been relatively neglected since then, notwithstanding the fundamental work of Klaus Alpers, Hartmut Erbse, William Slater, and others.

1“Wie gut wird es die Generation haben, die Cyrill und Hesych, Bekkers Anekdota und die Etymologika im Stile dieses Suidas besitzen wird, hoffentlich auch recht benutzen denn dann hebt die Arbeit erst an, die Herstellung der antiken Werke.” (Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1928, 2158).

2Alpers describes the “kaum wieder erreichte Muster” of late nineteenth-century lexicography: “Durch Reitzensteins Handschriftenkunde und durch seine und Wentzels Arbeiten (dessen mit höchster Akribie und jeweils auf breitester Basis geführten Untersuchungen, die stets den spröden Stoff glassklar behandeln, sind kaum wieder erreichte Muster; man vgl. die aus der 1894 gekrönten Preisarbeit über die Quellen des Suidas fast wörtlich übernommenen Passagen in GGA 159, 1897, 618-624) sind die älteren Arbeiten zu den Quellenverhältnissen der griechischen Lexikographen so gut wie wertlos geworden...” (Alpers 1981, 102 note 1).
Students of ancient Greek today rarely look beyond the lexicon of Liddell-Scott-Jones, a work deficient even by the standards of Victorian lexicography (Chadwick 1996, 5). Based on the German lexicon of Passow, the work was edited without substantial revision in the twentieth century by McKenzie and Jones. Rather than spelling out definitions LSJ generally provides a series of translation equivalents, often proliferating meanings. Proper names, suppletive and dialect forms are treated haphazardly. Translations of words from the Septuagint may assume that ancient Greek translators understood the Hebrew in the same way modern scholars do. The etymological notes are often out of date, non-Attic dialects are subordinated to Attic, and the definitions often rely uncritically on the lexicographical tradition (Chadwick 1994; Chadwick 1996, 1–30).

By contrast with the Oxford Latin Dictionary (Glare 1982), LSJ is based on the ancient lexicographical tradition, a tradition with which its users are often unfamiliar and which contemporary classics scholarship generally overlooks. Scholarship in lexicography is often regarded as derivative (Chadwick 1996, 2); the work of Jean Perpillou, for example, is little known among classicists (Perpillou 2004; Perpillou 1996; Perpillou 1973). Greek studies are often compartmentalized into faculties of classics oblivious to the post-classical lexicographical tradition and later development of the Greek language, itself often useful in understanding the

---

3The standard Latin dictionaries of the period (Andrews and Freund 1851; Lewis, Freund, Andrews, et al. 1879) were also translations from the German (Freund 1834); Monier-Williams’ Sanskrit-English dictionary was criticized for duplicating the work of Böhtlingck and Roth (Monier-Williams, Leumann and Cappeller 1899, v ff; Böhtlingk and Roth 1855).
4“the principal charge which must be brought against LSJ is its failure to provide a clear account of the range of meanings which each word covers.” (Chadwick 1994, 3) Chadwick proposes an Occam’s razor of lexicography: *sensus non sunt multiplicandi praeter necessitatem* (Chadwick 1996, 23).
5“LSJ has all too often entered the opinion of an ancient scholar as a positive fact, when research and judgement lead us to believe that it was an erroneous or at least misleading view.” (Chadwick 1996, 14)
ancient language. While sources such as the Suda, Harpocration, pseudo-Zonaras and other lexica have been mined for fragments, the lexica themselves have received less attention. The Etymologicum Symeonis and much of the Etymologicum genuinum, the lexicon of Cyril, and other lexica remain unpublished; other important lexica such as that ascribed to the Antiatticista have not been published since the early 19th century. Even a source as important as Hesychius has been the object of few major studies (Dickey 2007, 89).

At the same time, important new resources are now available to scholars of Greek lexicography. The Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker (SGLG) extends to ten volumes, including new editions of the Συναγωγὴ λέξεων χρησίμων (Cunningham 2003), Aristophanes of Byzantium (Slater, W. J. 1986), and Oros (Alpers 1981); a new volume of Hesychius has been added (Hansen, P. A. 2005), and the work is being completed by Ian C. Cunningham. The online Thesaurus linguae graecae (TLG) now makes dozens of lexicographical texts readily searchable as well as a Greek corpus extending towards 1453 and prospectively beyond. The PHI database of Greek inscriptions approaches completion, as does the Oxford Lexicon of Greek personal names (Fraser, Matthews and British Academy 1987). These are invaluable new resources for the study of Greek vocabulary, morphology, and onomastics. Louis Robert saw the potential of onomastics, together with the study of medieval and modern Greek, for future research in ancient Greek vocabulary: “l’enrichissement de notre connaissance du vocabulaire antique viendra des anthroponymes anciens, interprétés par le grec moderne...”

http://www.tlg.uci.edu/
http://epigraphy.packhum.org/inscriptions/
http://www.lgpn.ox.ac.uk/
The LGPN has sponsored two recent collections of essays in Greek onomastics (Matthews, Hornblower, Fraser, et al. 2000; Matthews 2007).

Cf. Shipp’s study of modern Greek evidence for ancient Greek vocabulary (Shipp 1979). Robert: “On voit quel secours l’anthroponymie peut apporter à l’étude du vocabulaire grec... On verra ci-après que l’on peut faire des observations semblables pour bien des adjectifs, faiblement attestés...”
Another reason for the decline of lexicographical studies over the last century has been the separation of classics from linguistics, two fields that were closely associated in the nineteenth century. No longer focused primarily on philology, classical studies have moved in different directions. Only a few university programs, such as the University of Zürich, still integrate linguistics into the study of classics.

The field of linguistics has changed even more radically. Historical linguistics no longer plays the same role within the broader field that it did in the nineteenth century; after the publications of Wundt and Sausurre (Wundt 1900; Saussure 1916) descriptive studies and the synchronic study of language came to predominate. Noam Chomsky’s influence has tended to move the field away from historically oriented empirical approaches.

The development of linguistic science has, however, made the field more, not less, relevant to classical philology. Classics and linguistics remain complementary disciplines. As Anttila puts it, “Das Verhältnis von Linguistik und Philologie ist wie das von Typus und konkreten Fall.” (Anttila 1973) Language change is now much better understood than it was in the nineteenth century.


9See the introduction to Bloomfield’s Language (Bloomfield 1933, 17 ff.).

10See the summary by Beyer and Cherubim and the comments of Frösén (Beyer and Cherubim 1973; Frösén 1974, 2 ff.).
The complementary relationship Anttila describes is relatively unexploited in Greek and Latin studies today. As Bubeník puts it, “Dead languages and dialects are certainly not being overworked by contemporary sociolinguists, and classical scholars do not appear to be overexploiting the theoretical insights of their colleagues in general linguistics.” (Bubeník, V. 1989, 301) Brixhe comments, “Il y a donc une sociolinguistique de la koine à écrire. Certains d’entre nous s’y emploient déjà; mais il reste beaucoup à faire.” (Brixhe and Hodot 1993, 20)

Students of Anna Morpurgo Davies such as Eleanor Dickey, Stephen Colvin, and Simon Swain have made important contributions (Penney 2004; Dickey 1996; Dickey 2002; Colvin, S. 1999; Swain, S. 1996). But in the area of lexicography, perhaps the most explicit evidence we have for Greek language change, little has been done. Atticist lexicography of the second century AD in particular, concerned as it was with the quixotic restoration of an already ancient language, provides a wealth of evidence for understanding how the Greek language had changed, continued to change, and the nature, motivation, and outcome of the programme to change it back again.
Lexicography is as much a characteristic branch of Greek letters as is epic, lyric, or tragedy (Alpers 1990, 14). Greek interest in lexicography derives from the nature of the Greek language itself. In its dialects as much as politics Greek history was shaped by physical geography. Irregular highlands separating most of the mainland into irregular cantons made land communication difficult, favoring the development of many independent communities or poleis. This in turn was conducive to the preservation of a multiplicity of dialects, differing from canton to canton (Sealey 1976, 10–13).

Those who were literate were confronted not only with a variety of dialects, but also with a variety of local alphabets. Although graffiti in Greek are attested from the early eighth century, the diversity of alphabets suggests the existence of several contributors and centers of diffusion

---

11 The fundamental surveys of the history of Greek lexicography are those of Alpers (Alpers 1992; Alpers 1990). Also useful is Cohn’s comprehensive survey (Cohn 1913), the discussions of Montanari (Montanari 1992), Tossi (Tossi 1994), Lara, whose brief historical survey is followed by an introduction to lexicographical methodology (Lara 1997), and the new survey of ancient scholarship by Dickey (Dickey 2007). Pfeiffer’s history is the standard reference for scholarship in the Hellenistic period (Pfeiffer 1968).
for the alphabet. “It would take the weight of two imperialisms (the Athenian and the Macedonian), the shattering of the framework of the city-state and the beginnings of linguistic unity in the Greek world to establish, in the fourth century, a unified writing system... and with it a standard orthography (Brixhe, C. 2007a, 286).”

These separate linguistic communities nevertheless understood themselves to share a common language (Davies 2002), by contrast with the βάρβαροι. This word belongs in its origin to the vocabulary of linguistics and refers particularly to pronunciation (Skoda 1983, 112). The oldest attested form of the word is βαρβαρόφωνος in the Iliad (2.867). Skoda like others sees the word as referring to foreign languages; Letoublon following Strabo (Geogr. 14.2.28) interprets the word as signifying Greek that has undergone phonological change by barbarian mouths (Saïd 2002, 68). Galen compares the speech of barbarians with the sounds of animals: some languages resemble the sounds of pigs, frogs, jackdaws, or crows (de differentia pulsuum 8.586.2-12) (Kotzia 2007, 1412 f.).

The Greek perception of speaking a common language was reflected in the designation of Greeks by a single name, Ἕλληνες and the designation of non-Greeks as βάρβαροι. It was fostered by the tendency called Panhellenism, marked by Greek colonization, panhellenic athletic and religious festivals, and the emergence of the polis. The collective designation of Greeks by a single name develops in the sixth and fifth centuries (cf. Thucydides 1.3 re. Homer); by the fifth and fourth centuries all non-Greeks were classified as barbarians. As late as the Persian Wars the

12 Brixhe’s study refutes the thesis of Powell regarding the invention of the alphabet to preserve Homeric poetry (Powell 1991; Powell 2002).
13 For a dissenting view, see Hall’s discussion with accompanying references (Hall 2002, 111 ff.).
14 One hears other languages with the phonology of one’s own (Weinreich 1974).
15 On this subject see J.H. Hall’s study Hellenicity: between ethnicity and culture (Hall 2002).
Spartans did not call the Persians barbaroi (Herodotus 9.11), and Herodotus himself, chronicler of the event, is criticized by Plutarch centuries later as philobarbaros. Anacreon in the sixth century uses the term barbaros of incorrect speech in general; ca. 500 Heraclitus (DK, 1951-1952, I.175) says that eyes and ears are bad witnesses for people with barbarian souls. Isocrates’s famous statement ca. 380 that they are called Greeks who share Greek paideia probably means not that barbarians sharing Greek culture were Greeks, but that Greeks not trained in it were barbarians (Diller 1937, 29). Plato criticizes the prevailing division of humanity into τό Ἑλληνικόν and all others (Politics 262d); Aristotle says that barbarians are like slaves by nature, fit only to be ruled (Politics 1252a34).

The same period that saw the conceptual assimilation of barbarians to slaves saw the development of the Greek ideology of independence. The Athenian Stranger in Plato’s Laws (693a) says that if Athenians and Lacedaemonians had not joined together against the Persians the Greek states would have dissolved into a mixture of gene—Greeks mingling indiscriminately amongst themselves and with barbarians; they would then be deprived of political freedom and would live as subjects of the Persians, split up and promiscuously mixed into scattered communities with no inner coherence. The homonoia of small communities with their own histories was understood as the condition for self-government.

This localism favored the preservation of local languages or dialects. Athenian Old Comedy in the fifth century represents Laconian, Megarian, and Boeotian dialects on the stage and, unlike the "remarkably undifferentiated" speech of barbarians, "[t]here is no implication that the other

---

16 Vide Coleman (Coleman 1997).
17 κοίμησον δὲ, Ζεῦ, σόλοικον φθόγγον/ μὴ πῶς βάσορα αβάξης (Page and Lobel 1974, 313, p. 103).
18 Vide (Coleman 1997, 192)
Greeks speak 'bad Greek'" (Colvin, S. 2004, 299f.). Aeschylus's *Choephoroi* (563-4) suggests that dialect switching was possible when Orestes says that he will use the Phocian dialect to address the porter. Socrates words in Plato’s *Apology* (17d) may show that the use of other dialects was common in Athens: εἰ τῷ ὄντι ξένος ἐτύχανον ἄν, συνεγιγνώσκετε δήποι ἄν μοι εἰ ἐν ἐκείνη τῇ φωνῇ τε καὶ τῷ τρόπῳ ἑλεγον ἐ σύσπερ ἐ τεθράμμην.

Greek awareness of dialect was fostered by the study of Homer, who conspicuousely fails to divide humanity into Greeks and barbarians—notwithstanding the reference to the Carians (*Il. 2.867*); nowhere in the *Iliad*, or in Odysseus’ travels, is any language spoken but Greek; only the gods are described as having a vocabulary of their own. The diffusion of Homer as panhellenic *epos* seems to have played the fundamental role in Greek education from the beginning. The earliest preserved long inscriptions show that not only bards but laymen participated in this traditional oral *paideia* (Robj 1994, 44–73; Marrou 1964, 29–34; Havelock 1963).

The language of *epos* was a *Kunstsprache*, a metalanguage combining elements of the Ionic and Aeolic dialects. Greeks from the earliest times were taught a form of the language that differed substantially from their spoken idiom. The recognition imposed itself that the Greek language had changed significantly since the time of Homer. The bard himself seems to have recognized the need to explain words or concepts that might be difficult for his listeners; as Pfeiffer puts it, Homeric *epos* contains a philological element, whereby the poetry paves the way for its own understanding. In his view this reflects a characteristic Greek preoccupation with lexicography:

------------------------------------

19The first mention of interpreters in Greek is in Herodotus (2.154, 4.24) (Householder 1995a, 90). On the language of the gods in Indo-European languages, see the classic study by Watkins (Watkins 1970).
20A metalanguage can be defined as a reified language.
21See the observations by Lebek under the heading “Frühe Beobachtungen des Sprachwandels” (Lebek, W. D. 1969, 58–63).
“it was part of the poetical technique in the epic age to elucidate difficult and ambiguous expressions by exegetical or etymological additions. There was hardly any following age in which the Greek mind was not attracted by this problem of explaining λέξεις. Their origin and their changes, the differentiation of kindred words, the comparison between Greek dialects or between Greek and foreign words were discussed by the Sophists, by Democritus, and by the great Attic philosophers.” (Pfeiffer 1968, 197–198)

Already by the fifth century many words in the canonical Homeric corpus could not be understood by average speakers without special instruction; Wilamowitz and Wackernagel have documented cases where Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, and the author of the Homeric hymn to Hermes misinterpreted older Homeric words (Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1886b, 112; Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1909, 253; Wackernagel 1955, 728ff; Latte 1968, 641).22

The title of a lost work by Democritus --Περὶ Ὠμῆρου ἡ Ὀρθοπεδία καὶ γλωσσέων--confirms the need for explanation of γλῶσσαι or unfamiliar words in Homer in the fifth century.23 The reference to ὀρθοπεδία also suggests that such explanations were already linked to prescriptivity--the effort necessary to understand obscure words went hand in hand with the need to distinguish unusual words from mistaken usage, and thus to prescribe correct usage.

The identification of Homeric words was a first step towards establishing a prescriptive norm; the next step was to impart this prescriptive knowledge through formal instruction. The existence of such instruction is well-documented from the archaic period onwards, through

22E.g. τοῖος = ἀγαθός Aesch. Hiket. 400; ἄπτερος = προσηνής Aesch Agam. 288λ; λισσός "schroff" Aesch. Hik. 695, Herakl. 1148; ἰψαφθαί = βλάψαι Aesch. Choeph. 184, Soph Ixion fr. 274N. etc.

23Testimonia Fragment 33 line 37 = Fragmenta Fragment 20a = Diogenes Laertius IX 48. Like Latin lingua, the word γλῶσσα means first of all the muscle that is used in speech, then the word that is spoken, and finally by extension a language as a whole. The didactic meaning of glossa refers to the word that is explained, by contrast with modern usage, where a gloss is the explanation itself.
representations on vases as well as literary testimonia. Sappho is supposed to have run a school for girls. Aeschines cites a law of Solon forbidding schools to open before dawn or to close before sunset (In Timarchum 8-12). Herodotus recalls how at the time of the Ionian revolt (494 BC) the roof of a schoolhouse in Chios fell down on students who were “learning their letters” (6.27.2); Pausanias (6.9.6-7) describes how the boxer Cleomedes, enraged at being denied recognition for an Olympic boxing victory in which he killed his opponent, returned to his home town of Astypalaia and overturned the pillar holding up the roof of a schoolhouse (διδασκαλειον), killing the sixty boys inside. Thucydides describes (7.29.5) how Thracian mercenaries broke into the largest διδασκαλειον in the town of Mycalessus in Boeotia at the beginning of the Decelean War (413 BC). Education was state-sponsored at Sparta, but private in Athens. The several vase depictions of students learning to read and write from the beginning of the fifth century include a Durix cylix in the Berlin museum illustrating students engaged in µουσική, γυμναστική, and the study of γράμματα, with a writing tablet (δέλτος) and a stylus (γραφίς) stylus for writing (Missiou 2007, 1183–1185).

Their studies were occupied with spoken reading, copying, study, and recitation of the poets. Protagoras’ comment to Socrates in the Protagoras likely reflects common practice in the fifth century: Ἡγούμαι, ἐφη, ὦ Σωκράτες, ἐγὼ ἀνδρὶ παιδείας μέγιστον μέρος εἶναι περὶ ἐπών δεινὸν εἶναι: ἔστιν δὲ τούτο τὰ ὑπὸ τῶν ποιητῶν λεγόμενα οἷον τ’ εἶναι συνιέναι ἂ τε ὄρθως πεποίηται καὶ ἂ μὴ, καὶ ἐπίστασθαι διελείν τε καὶ ἐρωτώμενον λόγον δοῦναι (338e-339a). Since few of the poets Athenians were likely to study, beginning with Homer, had composed in Attic, students would make use of glossae listing in order the unusual words in a given passage, much as some students still compose word lists corresponding to their readings in ancient languages.
A fragment of Aristophanes’s Δαιταλῆς provides evidence for the didactic procedure used in teaching letters in the fifth century. To check on his wayward son’s studies, a father asks the boy for the correct interpretation of the Homeric glosses κορυμβα and ἀμενήνα κάρηνα.24

Two lists of such Homeric glossai have been preserved on papyrus from antiquity.25 These lists are clearly correlated to the Homeric text: the meaning given corresponds to the specific passage and inflected form in question; the same word may reappear with a different meaning in a different context. Thus the semantics of each entry is limited to the context in which the word appears. These works may be compared with the texts of glossographoi collected by Dyck, Gebrauchstexte that probably circulated anonymously (Dyck, A. R. 1987).26

Impetus for the collection of glossai was also provided by the association of other Greek dialects besides the Homeric Kunstsprache with literary genres, and by the development of technical language. Students required glossary help to understand the Doric dialect in the choral lyric of Pindar and Bacchylides, Aeolic in the monody of Sappho and Alcaeus, Ionic in the histories of Herodotus. Passages in Lysias and Demosthenes show that the legal terminology of Solon and

24Normally such instruction was the work of a γραμματιστής, unless we are to take this as an early example of home-schooling. The words are attested at Il. 9.241 and Od. 10.521. The play was performed in 427 BC. Fragment 233 (Kassel and Austin 1983, Vol. III.2 pp. 140–141): πρὸς ταῦτας δ’αὖ λέξον Ὄμηρου γλώττας· τί καλοῦσι κόρυμβα; οὐκ ἢ μὲν ὄνομα τὸ ὄνομα ἁδελφὸς φρασάτω· τί καλοῦσι ἰδίους; οὐκ ἢ μὲν ὄνομα τὸ ὄνομα ἁδελφὸς φρασάτω· τί ποι’ ἐστι ὅπις. Cf. Phrynichus’s reference to a word from Plato’s Euthydemus 276c: ἀποστοματίζειν: τὸ ἀπὸ στομάτως ἐφοτισμένους ἐν διδάσκαλον ἢ γλώσσας ἢ ἄλλο τι τῶν μαθημάτων λέγειν. Praeparatio sophistica (epitome) p. 45 line 8.

25P. Oslo II 12, col. 1, 15- col. II, 15, a word list corresponding to line 9-12 of the first book of the Iliad (Kramer 1996, 50); Berliner Papyr. n. 5014 is a word-by-word gloss of the first twelve lines of the Iliad (Ziebarth 1913, 13–14).

26On these texts see also Latte (Latte 1968). Dyck criticizes Wilamowitz’ attempt (Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1886a) to determine the influence of the glossographoi on later Greek poetry.
Draco was no longer comprehensible in the fourth century.27 In the passage from Aristophanes cited at note 22 above, the boy responds to his father’s reproach by suggesting that his brother should be made to give the meaning of ἰδύους and ὀπύειν, two words from Solon’s laws. Lysias and Demosthenes also felt obliged to explain legal terminology to their audience; the obscurity of legal terms gave rise to technical legal glossaries (Alpers 1990, 16).28

For Aristotle a γλώττα refers a word that is marked as unusual or belonging to a different Greek dialect (ξενικόν Poet. 1458º22), by contrast with the words belonging to everyday speech (τὰ κύρια = propria).29 Galen defines glotta as follows in a discussion of the passage from Aristophanes’s Δαιταλείς discussed above: η γλώττα παλαιόν ἐστιν ὄνομα τῆς συννθείας ἐκπττωκώς.30 Dyck notes that this is the only attested definition of γλώττα as designating an antiquated word (Dyck, A. R. 1987, 120 note 4). In Plato’s Cratylus Socrates describes several words as ξενικόν: ωφελίμων (417c), ἀλγηδῶν (419c), κίειν (426c). The first of these Socrates specifies as Homeric; Aristotle notes that γλώτται are appropriate to the language of poetry (Poet. 1459º8, Rhet. 1406b3).31

The first identifiable lexicographer is Philitas of Cos (320-270), an early example of the Hellenistic type of the poeta doctus: he was the first to be described as ποιητής ἄμα καὶ

28Lysias 10.15 ff., Demosthenes 23.33 ff.
29Poet. 1457º4 ff.: λέω δὲ κύριον μὲν ὑ χωνται ἐκαστοι, γλώτταν δὲ ὑ ὑ ὑ ὑ ὑ ὑ ὑ ὑ ὑ ρυγον ὅτι καὶ γλώτταν καὶ κύριον εἶναι δυνατόν τὸ αὐτό, μή τοῖς αὐτοῖς δὲ τὸ γάρ σύγνων Κυρούοις μὲν κύριον, ἵμαν δὲ γλώττα. Rhet. 1410b12: αἱ μὲν οὖν γλώτται ἄγνωτες, τὰ δὲ κύρια ἴσιμεν. λέξεις is also used in the sense of κύριον. Matthaios discusses the concept of κύριον ὄνομα (Matthaios, S. 1996).
30Linguarum seu dictionum exoletarum Hippocratis explicatio vol. 19, p. 66, line 12.
31“dans l’analyse que fait Aristote le mot γλώττα désigne non pas n’importe quel mot, mais le mot marqué, ou plutôt si je puis dire, le mot qui se fait remarquer parce qu’il est étranger.” (Holtz 1996, 2).
κριτικός. His lexicographical activity was an adjunct to his own poetic production; Theocritus praises him in the Thalysia, a work about the harvest festival on Cos, as does Callimachus in his Aitia (fr. 1.9-12) (Pfeiffer 1968, 89). Philitas included all the three kinds of glossai—words from Homer, dialect, and technical vocabulary—in his unsystematic handbook, Ἄτακτοι γλώσσαι (Pfeiffer 1968, 88–93); Homer was often the starting point of his analyses. A fragment of a play by Straton suggests that Philitas’ work was widely used, both as an aid to reading and as a help in composition or even in spoken language.34

The combination of scholarship and poetry displayed by Philitas would become synonymous with Alexandria, and in fact a student of Philitas, Zenodotus of Ephesus, was the first head of the Ptolemaic library in Alexandria. Scholarship in Alexandria put the study of Greek language on a new footing through the systematic study of the Greek literary record. The semantic naïveté of the glossographers was replaced by sophisticated analysis of the provenance and history of λέξεις. In particular Aristarchus of Samothrace (c. 216-145), the sixth librarian of Alexandria, is notable for his caustic criticism of the earlier glossographers, although they did apparently

32Fragments collected by Kuchenmüller (Kuchenmüller 1928). Preoccupied with lexicography Philitas seems to have been the model for a new kind of comic type, “the spindle-thin professor so engrossed in study that he quite forgets to eat and drink, being himself rather consumed by his researches until he becomes a feeble shadow of a man.” (Bing 2003, 331)

33The work was also referred to as Ἄτακτα or Γλώσσαι (Pfeiffer 1968, 90). Lebek believes the glosses are dialectal (Lebek, W. D. 1969, 65 note 4). Bing suggests an alternate interpretation of the word Ἄτακτοι in the title: “...our examination suggests that one could also take it to refer to words that are ‘disorderly’ in themselves individually.” (Bing 2003, 338)

34A character in the play comments on a cook’s use of unusual words such as μίστουλλα, so that to converse with him one needs to revert to Philitas’s manual (Alpers 1990, 16). This is a striking example, albeit parodic, of the active use of glossai in everyday speech long before the Atticist rhetorical declamation of the Second Sophistic (Austin 1973, frg. 219 42–44): ἄστε γει τα τοῦ Φιλίτα λαμβάνοντα βιβλία σκοπεῖν ἐκαστὸν τί δύναται τῶν ὁμιλάτων. = (Kassel, et al. 1983, VII 618 ff.) Bing discusses the passage in an appendix (Bing 2003, 343 ff.)

35For a survey of these glossographers, “Den umfassendsten (allerdings stark veraltet) Überblick bietet immer noch Tolkiehn.” (Alpers 1992, 196; Tolkiehn 1925, 2435–2453). Dyck asserts that it “is one measure of Aristarchus’ greatness that he succeeded in freeing himself from the tyranny of the Γλώσσογραφοί.” Aristarchus criticized “the simplistic underlying assumption ἐν
influence scholars like Zenodotus and Callimachus, and poets such as Apollonius Rhodius, Theocritus, Lycophron, and the same Callimachus.

The Περί γλώσσαι of Zenodotus was perhaps the first lexicon composed in alphabetical order (Alpers 1975, 113). At about the same time Neoptolemus of Parion composed three books Περί γλώσσαιν Όμήρου (Mette 1980). Zenodotus’ successor at the library was Callimachus of Cyrene, the preeminent poet, father of literary history, and apparently the inventor of lexicographical studies organized by semantic field. The Suda allows partial reconstruction of the table of contents of his Εθνικαί ονομασίαι, which covered the names of the months organized by people and city, the local names of rivers, winds, birds, and fish. The Εθνικαί ονομασίαι was perhaps the first example of the Ὄνομαστικόν style of lexicon, listing words by semantic field; the work was not arranged alphabetically (Pfeiffer 1968, 135; Pfeiffer 1949). Another work of Callimachus listed the preeminent Greek authors alphabetically but subdivided according to genre of composition: this work is called by the Suda the Πίνακες τῶν ἐν πάσῃ παιδείᾳ διαλαμψάντων, καὶ ἄν συνέγραψαν, ἐν βιβλίοις κ’ καὶ ρ’. These 120 books did not merely catalogue the library of

άνθ’ ἐνός, that is, that Homer’s text can be interpreted merely by mechanical substitution of one word for another (frr. 8 and 14).” He cites passages where “one-for-one substitutions result in absurdity (frr. 1, 5, 10, 23a, 27; sch. A ad Π 41a et Ξ 117) or oversimplification (frr. 8 and 14).” Aristarchus also criticizes the etymologies of the glossographoi, (frr. 1 and 7) and their anachronistic approach to history (fr. 15) (Dyck, A. R. 1987, 128). Dyck defines the glossographoi as those who are (1) opposed by Aristarchus and who (2) “propound interpretations of difficult words tailored to specific Homeric passages.” (Dyck, A. R. 1987, 121).

Alexandria, but evidently included the names of works that Callimachus himself did not possess.37

The lexicographical works of Aristophanes of Byzantium (ca. 257-180), the third Alexandrian librarian, were also organized by subject matter.38 Aristophanes composed works Περὶ όνομασίας ἥλικων, Περὶ συγγενικῶν όνομάτων, and works on Attic and Spartan vocabulary. The former was titled Αττικαί λέξεις, the latter Λακωνικαί γλώσσαι. The unusual words (γλώσσαι) of Spartan dialect contrast with the well-known vocabulary (λέξεις) of Attic.39 He was perhaps the first of the Alexandrians to pay attention to the Volksprache (Ax 2000, 123).40

Aristophanes and his successor at the library Aristarchus both sought to establish rules for declension by the principle of analogy (Ax 2000).41 Similar words were expected to have similar endings. Charisius says that Aristophanes identified five features to be used in determining analogies between words: gender, case, ending, number of syllables, and accent. To this list

37See Blum’s study on Callimachus’s Πινακες (Blum 1991).
38On Aristophanes see Slater (Slater, W. J. 1986; Slater, W. J. 1976; Slater, W. J. 1982); cf. comments by Dyck and Blank (Blank and Dyck 1984).
39Lexicography in antiquity is the study of either γλώσσαι or λέξεις; Henrichs discusses the loss of the distinction between the two words (Henrichs 1971, 232). The word λεξικόν with the meaning “lexicon” first appears in the ninth century (the title of Photius’s work is spurious (Alpers 1990, note 2, p. 32)) in the work of Theodore Stoudites, epistle 152 line 49: οὐκ οἴδα ἐάν τὸ λεξικόν καὶ τὸ τετράδιον, ἐν ὧ διὰ σημείων λόγον ἐποίησα. The word λεξικογράφος is first attested in the ninth century in the Etymologicum Genuinum s.v. Γάργαρος, repeated in the Etymologicum magnum (221.33), with reference to Κλείταρχον Αἰγινήτην λεξικογράφον. In the sixth century Johannes Lydus gives the anomalous form λεξιγράφος (De magistratibus populi Romani p. 14 line 18; p. 30 line 20), rather than λεξιγράφος, which appears in the twelfth century Aristophanes scholia of Tzetzes with reference to τούς λεξιγράφους Ὀμήρου (Prolegomena de comedia Aristophanic, section 1 line 157) (Alpers 1992, 194). Dyck conjectures that γλώσσογραφοι at Suda α 2674 is used with the meaning “lexicographers” (Dyck, A. R. 1987, 120).
40Ax doubts the view of Callanan’s view that Aristophanes was not interested in the history of language (Callanan 1987; Ax 2000, 124).
41Frede, who believes the Stoics made the major contribution to the development of ancient grammar, believes this interest in analogy may have been more philological than grammatical (Frede 1977, 54).
Aristarchus is supposed to have added a sixth, figure i.e. whether a word is simple or composite (Barwick and Kühnert 1964, 149, 26ff.). Words with the same features in all these categories could be expected to have the same declension.

Quintilian (1.4.20) attributes to Aristarchus the identification of eight parts of speech, a development carried over into the work of his student Dionysius Thrax. Frede questions whether this Aristarchus in fact thought in these terms, noting that Quintilian does not seem to regard the canon of eight parts of speech as a major achievement of Aristarchus, and that his students Dionysius Thrax and Apollodorus seem sometimes at variance with this view (Frede 1987, 341). Aristarchus composed works in etymology in addition to his studies of Homer.42

The central question in the study of the history of ancient Greek grammar is the authenticity of the grammatical manual composed by Dionysius Thrax, a student of Aristarchus who taught at Alexandria and Rhodes.43 This manual, called the $\text{Tēχνη}$, was in use for centuries as a primary text; Fuhrmann calls it the paradigm for elementary handbooks used throughout the ancient world (Fuhrmann 1960). The work enumerates eight parts of speech, and six parts of grammar. The fact that the items in this second list, appearing at the beginning of the $\text{Tēχνη}$, are not treated in the rest of the work is a longstanding argument against its authenticity. On the basis of Egyptian grammatical papyri Di Benedetto argues that the work is too sophisticated to be attributed to the Alexandrian period, and was likely composed several hundred years later; the fact that Apollonius Dyscolus makes no mention of it in the second century AD is another

42Erbse’s studies and monumental edition of the Iliadic scholia (Erbse 1959; Erbse 1960; Erbse 1969–88), has been followed by several new studies of Aristarchus, including publication of the fragments from his $\text{Etymologica}$ (Schironi 2004) and of his grammatical writings (Matthaios, S. 1999) and studies of the Aristarchan recension of Homer (Lührs 1992; Aphantorp 1980).

43Blank and Atherton regard the attribution as “almost certainly wrong” (Blank and Atherton 2003, 311); Frede accepts the attribution (Frede 1987, 339).
important factor (Di Benedetto 1958–59; di Benedetto 2000); Di Benedetto’s argument has been accepted by Pinborg and Taylor among others (Pinborg 1975; Taylor 1987); Wouters’s study of the papyri, however, suggests that grammar was widely taught in Egypt along the lines of the Τέχνη by the first century AD, and thus that a text much like this must have been circulating in the first century BC (Wouters 1979). Erbse follows the view upheld by Schmidt and others that the grammatical work of Aristarchus was a sufficient foundation for Dionysius Thrax to build upon (Erbse 1980; Schmidt, M. 1852–1853; Steinthal 1890).

Hellenistic pedagogy divided formal education into two levels of study, grammar followed by rhetoric. The fundamental curriculum of the grammar school was the reading of classical texts, primarily poetry, with commentary. This exercise was later called at Rome the enarratio poetarum. For the Alexandrians lexicography belonged as much to the field of γραμματική as did what we call grammar (Holtz 1996, 8–9). At the beginning of the Ars grammatica, ascribed to Dionysius Thrax even by many who doubt the authenticity of later parts of the work (Robins 1993, 42 ff.), grammar is defined as follows: Γραμματική ἐστιν ἐμπειρία τῶν παρα ποιηταῖς τε καὶ συγγραφεύσιν ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ λεγομένων. (I, vol. 1, p. 4, l. 2) Grammar by definition pertains not to the spoken language but to the works of the poets and best-known writers. The continuation of the same passage lists γλώσσαι as the third of six parts of grammar, together with the historical context of the narrative: Μέρη δὲ αὐτῆς ἦστιν ἐξ· πρῶτον ἀνάγνωσιν ἐν τῇ τέχνῃ κατὰ προσῳδίαν, δεύτερον ἔξήγησιν κατὰ τοὺς ἐνυπάρχοντας ποιητικοὺς τρόπους, τρίτον γλωσσῶν τε καὶ ἱστοριῶν πρόχειρος ἀπόδοσις, τέταρτον ἐτυμολογίας εὔφρεσις, πέμπτον ἀναλογίας ἐκλογησμός, ἐκτὸς κρίσεις ποιημάτων, ὁ δὴ κάλλιστον ἦστι πάντων τῶν ἐν τῇ τέχνῃ. This may be a development of an earlier list of four parts mentioned, in different sequence, in the scholia and Varro (Keil 2007, 1.426): διόρθωσις; ἀνάγνωσις; ἔξήγησις; κρίσις. All four of these elements reflect known preoccupations of the Alexandrian school; more
theoretical elements mentioned in Dionysius’s list are ἐτυμολογίας εὔφεσις and ἀναλογίας ἐκλογισμός (Frede 1987a, 340 ff.)

κρίσις (judicium) was perhaps the characteristic activity of Alexandrian scholarship. It was the judgment, based on everything that could be known, of the authenticity of works attributed to an author, and the critical evaluation of those works. The basis for textual criticism, it could then lead to διώκθωσις if it was decided that a word or passage had been altered in the tradition. The adoption by Zenodotus of Aristotle’s κρίσις that the Iliad and the Odyssey were the works of Homer, and that the other poems of the epic cycle were not, was decisive for the later tradition (Pfeiffer 1968, 117).

κρίσις was also the basis for the acceptance of certain authors as canonical44 in the different genres of poetry; this in turn largely determined which authors had the best chance of surviving to the present day. Aristarchus accepted three iambographers, like Aristophanes of Byzantium giving Archilochus pride of place (Pfeiffer 1968, 204); similar lists were compiled for the lyric and dramatic poets and, importantly for the history of prose and rhetoric, the ten Attic orators. Fragmentary evidence shows that ἰητορικά were included in Callimachus’s Πίνακες, but Aristophanes and Aristarchus seem to have been the most important figures in establishing the canons that would serve as a foundation for the later Atticist movement (Flashar 1979, 84). Aristophanes’s comments on the Πίνακες, show that judgments concerning κρίσις required the development and application of Atticistic rules. In this sense of the word Atticist—someone

44The word canon in this sense is a neologism of Ruhnken (Pfeiffer 1968, 207); the Greek term for such approved authors was ἐγκριθέντες, from the decision of the critics ἐγκρίνειν; in Latin the term cohors was used.
capable of discerning authentic Attic usage, and of interpolating correct Attic forms—Slater argues that the Atticistic movement could already be said to have begun in Alexandria.\footnote{If my analysis is right, Aristophanes’ ἀναγραφὴ πρὸς τοὺς πίνακας τοῦ Καλλιμάχου consisted not only of possible corrections to the details there given but also of notes concerning other scholars’ attempts to criticize them. We can see that the arguments concerning atticistic rules grew up around the attribution of the works in the library, and the movement can therefore be said to begin at least 230 B.C. Eratosthenes appears as a strict atticist, Aristophanes as a milder follower of the συνήθεια.” (Slater, W. J. 1976, 241)}

Alexandrian κρίσις reflected an attitude towards language that was shaped by study of the Homeric Kunstsprache, a language composed in a mixture of dialects that was no one’s vernacular. Epigraphical verse composed before 400 was generally in no recognizable dialect, suggesting that, in writing verse, authors sought to purify the local dialect of specifically local forms (Mickey 1981). The link that writers and speakers saw between the various “Greek” dialects was reflected in the development of a kind of standard metalanguage. Thucydides’s use of the verb ἐλληνίζειν (2.68) in the fifth century, even when no such common language existed, is another illustration that Greeks identified themselves as speakers of a common language. The speaker’s assessment of the speech of the community appears to abstract from the variety of performance. We have seen that the study of grammar in antiquity, as described by Dionysius Thrax, is concerned not with the language as actually spoken but as recorded in the works of canonical poets and writers. For ancient grammarians language was identified with an abstract metalanguage. Examples abound, such as the first century BC grammarian Herodian’s analysis of forms such as Τελχίς and δελφίς as ending “by nature” in n, with the underlying form having been changed to -s in the Doric manner.\footnote{(Wackernagel 1876, 57 ff.) Cited in (Davies 2002, 162).} Twentieth-century generative grammar shows the prevalence of such assumptions about language.
Genres of literature were associated with metalanguages, the conventionalized dialects of their preeminent auctores. This, perhaps more than the transition from orality to literacy, shaped Greek literary usage.\textsuperscript{47} It is unlikely that the language of tragedy, oratory and other genres was very different in performance than in written versions. Epic was composed in an Ionic-based dialect, following Homer, Athenian tragedy in Attic, choruses in Doric; lyric could be Aeolic, literary prose could not. This usage transcended the author’s origin: Pindar, from Thebes, uses Doric, Hesiod from Boeotia uses Ionic; the Hippocratic corpus was in Ionic, though Hippocrates came from Doric Cos. These literary dialects were apparently intelligible throughout Greece; the Spartans listened to Tyrtaeus in language of epic. Use of epic language by the oracle at Delphi confirmed its panhellenic status. Literary dialects such as Doric were as abstract concepts as Greek itself; the Doric of Attic choruses is less Doric than Peloponnesian inscriptions (Davies 2002, 169). Complicated dialect switching was thus practiced in the absence of a common language; extensive passive knowledge of other dialects, at least in their conventionalized forms, must have been widespread.\textsuperscript{48}

The variety of Greek dialects in everyday commerce and in panhellenic literature made Greeks sensitive to the history of their language. Lexicography developed to come to grips with this variety. But even while the Alexandrian scholars developed the κρισις of already ancient texts, the Greek language in use became more remote from the object of their studies.

\textsuperscript{47}Aristotle’s Poetics (1447\textsuperscript{a}) suggests the Greeks themselves thought genre more important, vide Dickey (Dickey 1996, 31).

\textsuperscript{48}The significance of verbs meaning to “speak in a particular dialect”, e.g. αἰολίζειν (attested from 4th century BC in language-related meaning) and δωριζειν (3rd century BC), and also adverbs with a specific dialect-related meaning, e.g. αἰολιστι, δωριστι, etc. is discussed by Joseph (Joseph, B. D. 2005c; Joseph, B. D. 2005d).
While stylized dialects achieved canonical status, authentic local dialects were disappearing. Beginning in the fifth century the Greek language underwent rapid and profound change over the period of several centuries; this language change is bound up with the new status and expansion of the Athenian and Macedonian empires. As Greek states lost their independence and were relegated to a status comparable to that the Athenian Stranger attributed to subjects of the Persians (Plato, *Laws* 693a), a standard common (*κοινή*) Hellenistic language tended to replace local dialects (Brixhe, C. 1993).

Herodotus mentions four dialects in Ionia alone that are not known to us, whether by epigraphy or literature;⁴⁹ Greek theorists of dialect in the third century believed in the existence of only four dialects, those canonized by literature (Doric, Ionic, Aeolic, Attic). Because ancient γραμματική

---

was limited to metalanguages, it was generally not interested in purely vernacular dialects.  

Hainsworth describes ancient dialectology as a patchwork of ethnography, glossography, literary exegesis: “No attempt was made to establish dialect groups, and very little indeed to extract points of phonology or morphology, for glossography was an auxiliary of grammar and literary exegesis, not of dialectology.” (Hainsworth 1967, 70)

The documentary record in Greek literature, papyrology, and epigraphy provides a unique corpus of documentation for diachronic language change from classical into Roman imperial times. In some ways language change over this period was more striking than over the intervening 2000 years. Greek phonology (Petrounias 2007; Bubeník, V. 1983), morphology (Papanastassiou 2007a), and syntax (Horrocks, G. 2007) were all radically restructured beginning in the fifth century. Papanastassiou summarizes the many changes to Greek vocabulary over the same period (Papanastassiou 2007b). While much dialectal vocabulary was lost, there were lexical borrowings from Hebrew and Latin, and semantic loans. There was a large increase in derivative nouns ending in -της, -σις, -μος, -μα, ισσα; in derivative adjectives ending in -ικος, -ινος, -τος; and verbs ending in -ευω, -ιζω. The Latin suffixes -αριος, -ιανος, -ατος were imported. The remodeling of the inflectional system affected the lexicon; the proliferation of diminutives played an important role in changing the nominal system. The old diminutives in -ιον lost their diminutive force and came to replace the original words, most systematically in the third declension: “as soon as παις and παιδιον became semantically equivalent the former

More striking is the fact that modern thinking in dialectology as in lexicography has often tended to adopt the ancient tradition unreflectively (Hainsworth 1967, 62); valuable for the study of dialects in the last three centuries BC is Latte’s “Glossographika” (Latte 1968). Cf. Brixhe’s proposals for a modern dialectology of ancient Greek (Brixhe, C. 2007b).

Horrocks gives a survey of changes over the Hellenistic period (Horrocks, G. C. 1997, 32–70); Joseph shows how many of these developments anticipated modern Greek (Joseph, B. 2007).

Hult studies syntactic variation within fifth century Greek (Hult 1990).
retreated.” Words with varied morphology were replaced by more regular words with similar meaning, e.g. ναὸς by πλοῖον, ὕς yielding to χοῖρος, and ἀφίν to ἀμνός. Third declension adjectives ending in -ης, -ων adopted the simpler -ος declension. New present verb forms were created from the aorist stem, and -ιμ conjugations were replaced by -ω endings.

The restructuring of Greek was the outcome of imperial expansion within and then beyond Greek lands. Speakers of other Greek dialects were radically affected by the expansion of the Athenian empire; the subsequent spread of the Macedonian empire then imposed Greek on speakers of other languages throughout the eastern Mediterranean world. The change was underway in the fifth century: “The koineizing (or rather ’Attic-Ionicizing’) habits of the speakers of non-Attic-Ionic dialects must have been of an early date to judge from the early penetration of Attic-Ionic forms into local inscriptions, which in the majority of cases precedes the period of Macedonian domination.” The high proportion of mixed inscriptions in almost all dialect regions in Greek shows that “that the social diffusion of the prestigious Hellenistic Koine must have created a large number of bidialectal speakers throughout continental Greece.” (Bubeník, V. 1998, 289)

Bubeník follows Hock’s view that the interdialectal variety, sometimes called a “de-Atticized Attic” and otherwise known as the koine, may have originated in the Peiraeus. In the port of Athens Attic was in frequent contact with the Doric dialects of the Megaris, Corinthia, and eastern Argolis, and with the Western Ionic dialects of Euboia and the Cyclades. For example, the Attic cluster --tt-- was replaced by --ss-- as found in the neighboring dialects (Bubeník, V. 1993, 13; Hock 1986, 486).
The Delian League enforced language contact: its members served in the Athenian army, while Athenian *episkopoi* and soldiers were resident among them. This relationship with the Ionic islands was renewed in 387. Siegel describes the initial period of bilateral accomodation between dialects within Greek as a *prekoine* state; koine as it emerged from the mutual influence of Attic and Ionic in the fourth century through phonological and morphological leveling has the features of a *stabilized koine*. This was followed by an *expanded koine* after the exportation of the Attic-Ionic koine throughout the eastern Mediterranean, to Mesopotamia and points further east, after the conquests of Alexander (Bubeník, V. 1993, 19–20; Siegel 1985). At this time there was a massive emigration of Greeks--mercenary soldiers, settlers, actors, doctors, athletes-- from old Greece to the new royal cities from the Nile to the Indus, as new Greek cities were created often *ex nihilo*, where Greeks were often a ruling elite among an alien majority (Browning 2002, 251). The dialect of Attica was in some respects more conservative than that of Euboia, the Ionic Cyclades, and the Asia Minor coast--by the third century Ionic inscriptions in the Cyclades are almost completely koineized: “80% of all inscriptions are now in Hellenistic Koine, 16% in koineized Ionic and only approximately 4% in pure Ionic” (Bubeník, V. 1993, 12). Bubeník agrees with Teodorsson that the Macedonians not only spread the administrative Attic language abroad, but in several respects helped conserve its conservative phonology for centuries (Bubeník, V. 1993, 20; Teodorsson 1977).

Hock describes the Greek *koine* as a partially de-Atticized Attic. This de-Atticization, as seen above in the example of *-ss-* for Attic *-tt-* (from PIE *-ky-, -khy-), may yield a form that appears older than the Attic form, which was an innovation within Greek. Other *koine* forms are more conservative than their Attic equivalents: the older cluster *-rs-* was assimilated to *-rr-* in Attic, West Ionic, Arcadian, and Northwest Greek (e.g. *arrēn/arsēn*); Attic and parts of Ionic changed earlier *-* *-ayw-* into *-ā-* before a vowel, where most dialects had *-ai-* (*elāi/elaiā*). On the other hand,
Attic retained the dual number where most Greek dialects, including koine, did not. The so-called Doric long alpha was in fact the more conservative form, the vowel being replaced in Attic, Ionic, and later koine by eta. In some cases, however, koine reverted to the alpha form in nouns that appear in Attic and ionic with an eta, such as the Attic/Ionic nouns leōs and neōs that appear in koine as lāos and nāos. Hock suggests that these forms may have changed because of their Homeric and Delphic associations, or because of their synchronically anomalous declensions (Hock 1991, 486 ff.).

It is not possible, however, to speak of a single koine dialect prevailing through the Hellenistic period, since some ancient dialects held on much longer than old Attic, and koinai themselves showed a great deal of regional variation. A comprehensive study by Niehoff-Panagiotidis has shown that the spoken koine was in any case much more varied than the written record might suggest (Niehoff-Panagiotidis 1994). Predictably Doric dialects such as Laconian, Messenian, Cretan, and Cyrenean were most resistant to the Hellenistic koine--about half of the inscriptions from Laconia and Messenia in the third century were still written in the epichoric dialect, the other half in Doric contaminated by the Hellenistic koine (Bourguet 1927). At Rhodes a “middle” Doric dialect was used throughout the Hellenistic period, and koine inscriptions do not appear until the Christian era.

The prevalence of the Hellenistic koine can be directly correlated with the presence of soldiers, prevailing for example at Thera where a garrison under the Ptolemies was stationed, but not at nearby Astypalea. Proximity to Athens is also a factor: the Doric dialects of the Saronic Gulf yielded quickly. A North-West Doric Koine arose in the areas under the Aetolian League (Bubeník, V. 1983). The Phocian dialectic competed for centuries with the Attic koine, presumably thanks to the prestige of Delphi. Aeolic areas held strongly to their dialects, including Lesbos.
where the dialect was used into the first century AD (Hodot 1976). Inscriptions from Cyprus attest to the coexistence of the Cypriot dialect with the Hellenistic koine (Bubenik 2007b). Besides Attic-Ionic and North-West Doric koinai there were Ionic, Aegean-Doric and Achaean-Doric varieties. Although only Ionic and Attic-Ionic were used in literature, the others are all attested by inscriptions (Bubenik, V. 1989, 296). There was a distinct Syro-Palestinian Koine, and several koinai in Anatolia (Bubenik 2007c).

The fundamental characteristics of a koine are reduction and simplification, where reduction is defined as "those processes that lead to a decrease in the referential or non-referential potential of a language," and simplification as either an increase in regularity or a decrease in markedness (Mühlhäusler 1980, 21; Siegel 1985, 358). Koine type dialects have been identified in over 36 different languages that share these features (Siegel 1985, 359). If the Greek koine is a de-Atticized Attic, koine dialects in general can be described as deregionalized regional dialects, and koineization as a process of deregionalization (Hock 1991, 485). Bubeník has criticized the "pointlessly broad scope of the term koine" as applied to many languages where the parallels with Greek developments are less than transparent, preferring instead the traditional term "convergence" to describe such situations (Bubeník 2007a, 342).53

Diachronic language change has its origin in synchronic variation.54 According to Bubeník’s

52Trudgill prefers the term leveling, defining a koine as the result leveling and simplification, yielding a historically mixed but synchronically stable dialect (Trudgill 1986, 107).
53In an earlier publication he suggested that sociolinguistics use the term koine in the sense of as the ‘educated spoken variety’ of any language (Bubeník, V. 1989, 302).
54"It is generally possible to see the seeds of future directions of development present in any synchronic stage of a language, often manifesting themselves as synchronic variation in the realization of a sound or morpheme, in the meaning of a word, and the like, and thus as competition between the innovative variant and an older variant. Change, in a sense then, comes about through the resolution of this competition, often, but importantly not always, in the direction of the innovative form.” (Joseph, B. 2007, 693).
analysis, the Greek language was changed by speakers who spoke both the koine and the local
dialect and, in non-Greek speaking areas, by bilingual speakers of Greek and the local
language.55 Based on what is known about language contact, we may surmise that new speakers
would hear and thus reproduce the sounds of Greek according to the phonology of their own
language, thus introducting variants into the language that might lead to change (Brixhe, C.
2007a; Weinreich 1974). The imposition of Greek on epichoric languages would produce other
kinds of variants that might lead to change.56

Versteegh proposes a more radical model, based on the premise that drastic linguistic change
happens only when there is a sudden break in the process of language acquisition, as happened
with respect to Latin in the West at the time of the Roman conquests, and later in the East for
Arabic after the Islamic conquests. In the Hellenistic East, Versteegh argues, rapid change
likewise occurred when Greek was acquired by new populations, first as a pidgin language for
necessary commerce and contact with the new dominant elite, then as a creole language.57
“Depending on the degree of multilingualism in the colonized areas and the number of mixed
marriages between native speakers of Attic and new speakers who had learnt it as a simplified
second language, this language of wider communications became the mother tongue for some of

---------------------------------------------------------------------

55 “The carriers of synchronic variation in Hellenistic and Roman Greece were bidialectal speakers
of Hellenistic Koine and of one of the epichoric dialects; in the context of the territories
conquered by Alexander the carriers of synchronous variation were bilingual speakers of
Hellenistic Greek and of one of the adstratal languages.” (Bubeník, V. 1989, 289).
56 According to the typology of van Coetsem, there are two basic kinds of cross-linguistic
influence or transfer: borrowing and imposition. Language features are transferred from a source
language to a recipient language: in borrowing the recipient language is typically the dominant
language of the speaker, in imposition the source language is dominant (Winford 2007, 5;
Coetsem 2000).
57 Others have also argued that Greek was acquired by the peoples of the Hellenistic kingdoms
through a process of creole formation; this can be compared to the development of the lingua
franca, the common language of the Crusaders (Frösén 1974, 73–74; Costas 1936, 42–43; Schneider
the communities involved, a process normally called 'creolization'.

This radical change—really the development of a new language—would not be evident in the written record, since the written language was still identified with Attic, and the new speakers did not belong to the elite that appears in the inscripational record. Schooling and the attraction of the new elite language would gradually smooth over this rupture in the history of the language, as the creole came to approximate the standard language in the form of the *koine*. The extent to which this development was confined to those in contact with the elite is still a point of contention.

Versteegh’s analysis may help explain the state of the language in some remote regions where the cultural attraction of Attic was not perhaps as great. For Bubeník, for example, the dialect of peripheral Pamphylia was subject to rapid change because of its heterogeneous urban population and its lack of contact with the Hellenistic centers, which “resulted necessarily in a relaxation of linguistic norms” (Bubeník, V. 1989, 289). By Versteegh’s account isolated areas such as Pamphylia do not show accelerated change, but rather represent more accurately the earlier situation; rather than there being a “relaxation of linguistic norms”, those norms were never so rigorously imposed on the creole language in the first place. But, as Bubeník argues, the changes in question—the reduction of *io* to *i*, postnasal voicing (*pente* > *pande*) and the frication of

58 The term “creole formation” is preferable to “creolization.”
59 Rostovtzeff argued that “complete unity was never achieved in the Oriental monarchies of the Hellenistic world. The mass of natives was never absorbed by Greek civilization and never became hellenized.” (Rostovtzeff 1953, 1106) But, as Sartre observes, in Syria Greek established linguistic predominance, and not only at the expense of Latin (Sartre 2005, 276); evidence for bilingualism in Jerusalem includes Paul’s speaking to the Roman tribune in Greek, to the crowd in Hebrew (*Acts* 21.17-22) (Millar 1993, 365); evidence for the use of Greek in Palestine is compiled by Schürer (Schürer 1979, 60–80).
intervocalic /d/ and /g/--took place at a later time elsewhere in the Greek world, suggesting that Pamphylia was in the vanguard precisely because of its “relaxation of linguistic norms.”

For Bubeník the decisive argument against the theory that Greek--or indeed all languages--have a creolized history is the fact that the conservative phonology of the upper classes was brought to Egypt by the Macedonians.60 Niehoff-Panagiotides sharply criticizes Versteegh’s interpretation, mostly with respect to Arabic and Latin, in part because it presupposes language change more radical than actually took place (Niehoff-Panagiotidis 1994, 566 ff.).

The process by which the Greek language changed in the Hellenistic period remains hidden from us. What is clear is that language contact brought about by expansion of the Athenian and Macedonian empires contributed to a restructuring of the Greek language in its phonology, morphology, syntax, and vocabulary. This process of koineization--simplification and reduction--was perceived by many as a contamination, perhaps leading some philosophers to speculate on the purity of language.

60 My analysis of the ‘Great’ and ‘Vulgar’ Attic as sources of Hellenistic Koine takes issue with the hypothesis that all languages have probably had a creolized history (as maintained by Bailey, 1973). The decisive factor here is the fact that the Macedonians brought to Egypt the conservative phonology of the upper classes. The term ‘Koine’, defined as the ‘educated spoken variety’ of any language, should find its rightful place in theoretical discussions of contemporary sociolinguistics. The present study had demonstrated that this term is as indispensable for the analysis of the data of Hellenistic Greek as it is for the study of Modern Greek and Arabic.” (Bubeník, V. 1989, 302; Bailey 1973)
Whether the *koineization* of Greek was a radical sudden change due to pidgin and creole formation among new speakers, or a more gradual process, the response to this linguistic upheaval was to assimilate the emergent language to the stable metalanguages canonized by literary tradition. The *koine* came to play the role of a standard language that had previously only been supposed to exist.\[^{61}\] It is an indication of how ancient grammatical thinking categorized language in metalinguistic terms that the *koine* dialect was ultimately assimilated to the other four literary dialects. Clement of Alexandria identifies Attic, Ionic, Doric, Aeolic, and *koine* as the canonical dialects. Galen and Apollonius Dyscolus treat the *koine* as a dialect in the second century AD. Grammarians gave *koine* a literary pedigree by attributing it to Pindar. Quintilian (11.2.50) describes the Roman orator Crassus as having mastered the *quinque Graeci sermonis differentias* (five dialects of the Greek language; cf. Valerius Maximus viii.7.6) (Davies 2002).

For Dionysius Thrax such literary metalanguages were the object of grammatical study; we have seen that lexicographical studies developed in Alexandria with a view to the analysis and recension of texts. But pedagogical prescriptivism and textual criticism were not the only facets of thinking about language during the classical and Hellenistic periods. Precisely because there

\[^{61}\]“La koiné est venue jouer le rôle de ce standard qui faisait défaut.” (Brixhe, et al. 1993, 9)
was no separate science of linguistics, language study in Greece was always a part of some larger project. It belonged not only to the fields of philology and criticism, but was also studied for purposes of composition, in poetics and rhetoric, as part of the study of theoretical grammar, logic, dialectic, and philosophy in general (Blank 2000, 400).

Conspicuous among the sophists for his linguistic analysis is Protagoras, who distinguished four different types of sentence\(^62\) and blamed Homer for using the imperative instead of the optative in prayer, implying an understanding of mood (Arist. *Poetics* 1456b, 15-18). He also used the concepts of grammatical gender and number.\(^63\)

Aspects of later grammatical τέχνη apparent in Plato include the four πάθη or transformations (Desbordes 1983),\(^64\) the words ὄνομα and ὁδήμα; the word πτώσις indicating inflected form, and others (Householder 1995a, 92). The distinction between vowels and consonants and among certain kinds of consonants is clearly made; Plato assigns this subject to γραμματική (Crat. 431-432).

More fundamentally, the conflict with the sophists that runs through Plato’s work centers around the challenge λόγον δίδοναι, an examination of the adequacy of speech and its correspondence with reality. Plato’s fundamental criticism of rhetoricians such as Gorgias and Thrasymachus is that their language is deceptive and inconsistent. Philosophy from its inception is concerned with ὀρθὸς λόγος (Ildefonse 1997, 47). The eponymous protagonist of the *Cratylus* argues for what

-----------------------------

\(^{62}\) Wish or prayer, question, answer, and command (Diog. Laert. 9.53; Quint. 3.4.10).

\(^{63}\) Arist. *Rhet.* 1407b; *Sophistici elenchi* 173b. Grammatical numbers are identified as the many, the few, and the one.

\(^{64}\) Addition (pleonasm, redundancy, insertion, epenthesis); subtraction (deletion, ellipsis, etc.); substitution (enallage, hypallage, etc.); permutation (metathesis, transmutation, etc.)
today would be called iconicity, the correspondence of words to nature, against Hermogenes who takes a Saussurian position on the arbitrariness of signifiers. Plato’s *Cratylus* seems to show the impossibility of using language as direct evidence for the nature of things; linguistics cannot replace philosophy or dialectics (Pinborg 1975, 71). Nevertheless Socrates’s second sailing in Plato’s *Phaedo* represents a philosophic turning away from the study of nature as espoused by the Ionian physicists towards λόγος as the preoccupation of philosophy. As Detienne remarks, secularization of thought during the archaic period in Greece both sealed the decline of old magicoreligious speech and “determined the emergence of an autonomous world of speech and thought about language as an instrument.” (Detienne 1996, 104)

Aristotle comes down clearly on the side of Hermogenes, indicating repeatedly in the *de interpretatione* that the words derive their meaning κατὰ συνθήκην, and not φύσει (*de interpr*. 19) Aristotle’s discussion of language builds on the frame of grammatical reference already apparent from Plato. In the *Poetics* (1456a-1459a) he enumerates four parts of speech (συνδεσμός, ὄνομα, ὄνομα, ἄρθρον), though he does not name them as such; he mentions voiced stops, shapes of the mouth, places of articulation, and aspiration. He names the cases (1457a17-22) with the forms οὗτος, τοῦτον, and τῷ τω indicating nominative, genitive, and dative--the Sanskrit grammarian Pāṇini sometimes does the same (Householder 1995b, 94). Perhaps most notable in Aristotle’s grammar is his analysis of predicates in the *Categories*, the only extensive classification of predicates not by a Stoic.

Aristotle is the first to discuss the concept of solecism, and provides some eleven examples illustrating the corresponding prescriptive rules. The analysis of solecisms is intended, like

[---]
Plato’s depictions of the sophists, to show how language may be used to deceive, and to arm interlocutors against sophisms (Householder 1995b, 94).

A σολοκισμός is an error of syntax, while βαρβαρισμός indicates an error of pronunciation, spelling, inflection, or word choice. They are offenses against what came to be called ἴλληνισμός, pure Greek usage. The verbs βαρβαρίζειν and σολοκιζεῖν appear early on, the former in Herodotus, Xenophon, Plato, and Aristotle, the latter in Herodotus, the testimonia to Protagoras, Demosthenes and Aristotle. The verb ἴλληνιζεῖν in Plato and Aristotle implies a criterion of correctness—the principle of clear style (λέξεις), as a scholiast on Aristotle’s Rhetoric observes, is τὸ ἴλληνιζεῖν, which means using clear, Greek words and avoiding barbarisms.

In Book III of the Rhetoric Aristotle identifies the preeminent virtues of good λέξεις or style: σαφή εἶναι, μήτε ταπεινήν μήτε ύπέρ τὸ ἀξίωμα, ἀλλὰ πρέπουσαν. Clarity is what makes

accusative subject of infinitive; gender of noun sometimes independent of the gender of its referent; agreement of relative pronoun with antecedent; agreement of a predicate noun with its subject with verbs such as εἶναι; adjectives such as ἴσος take the dative; adjectives such as διπλάσιος take the genitive; transitive verbs take the accusative (Householder 1995b, 94).

66Herodotus 2.57.6; Xenophon, Hellenica 5.2.35.7; Plato Alcibiades i 120b4, Lysis 223a7; Arist. Sophistici elenchi 165b21.

67Herodotus 4.117.1; Protagoras Testimonia frg. 28.3 and 28.4; Demosthenes, In Stephanum 1 30.6; Aristoteles et Corpus Aristotelicum, Sophistici elenchi 165b20, 173b20 et 22, 174a8; Rhetorica 1407b.18; De memoria et reminiscientia 452b5.

68At Meno 82b the adverb σφόδρα is used with ἴλληνιζεῖν, indicating excellent use of the Greek language. Aristotle uses the word at Rhet. 1407a19 in citing Herodotus and Homer as models of good usage.

69Anonymi in Aristotelis Artem Rhetoricam 3.5, In Aristotelis artem rhetoricam commentarium 180.18,1120: ἄρχη δὲ τῆς λέξεως τῆς σαφείς τὸ ἴλληνιζεῖν ἦτοι ἴλληνικάς λέξεως λέγειν καὶ σαφείς, μὴ βαρβαρικάς.

70 ὃσιεσθω λέξεως ἄρετη σαφή εἶναι (σμησειον γὰρ τι ὁ λόγος ὄν, ἐὰν μὴ δηλοῖ οὐ ποιήσαι τὸ ἑαυτοῦ ἔργον), καὶ μήτε ταπεινήν μήτε ὑπέρ τὸ ἀξίωμα, ἀλλὰ πρέπουσαν· ἡ γὰρ ποιητικὴ ἴσως οὐ ταπεινή, ἀλλ’ οὐ πρέπουσα λόγῳ. τῶν δ’ ὀνομάτων καὶ ῥημάτων σαφῆ μὲν ποιεῖ τὰ κύρια, μὴ ταπεινήν δὲ ἀλλὰ κεκοσιμισμένην τάλλα ὀνόματα δεδε εἴηται ἐν τοῖς περὶ ποιητικῆς τὸ γὰρ ἐξαλλάξαι ποιεῖ φαίνεται σεμνοτέραν· 1404b
language effective; decorum adapts it to a suitable style, neither pompous nor base. κόμη or common words should abound in prose, unusual words in poetry. Theophrastus apparently elaborated these two criteria into a list of four, incorporating Aristotle’s dictum that ἐλληνίζειν is the basis for diction: Ἐλληνισμός; σαφήνεια; πρέπον; κατασκευή.71 As Frede observes, “Of these virtues obviously the most important is the first, Hellenism.” (Frede 1987c, 310)

This prescriptive criterion for usage, as developed and theorized by the Stoics, would be the foundation of Atticism. This despite the fact that, unlike in Alexandria, where grammar developed as an autonomous field in connection with the analysis and copying of texts, for the Stoics grammar was not an independent field but subordinate to a broader philosophical system. For the Stoics study of language came under logic, τὸ λογικόν, which together with ethics, τὸ ἠθικόν and natural science, τὸ φυσικόν, made up an integrated system. The Stoa vaunted itself on the unity and coherence of its system; all three of its parts were bound up with each other, one consequence being that their ethics had a scientific basis (Sluiter 2000, 375).

For the Stoa the purpose of life is to achieve wisdom, which depends on the recognition that only ἀρετή brings happiness; in a state of ἀπάθεια the soul achieves indifference to everything but virtue. The attainment of virtue also depends on correct evaluation of experience; sense impressions (φαντασίαι) act on the soul, which withholds or grants assent to them based on its capacity to distinguish clear and distinct impressions (notably Cartesian terminology) from false and misleading ones, a faculty called κατάληψις or understanding. The crucial discernment of sense-impressions depends on διάνοια, the inner discourse which the Stoics called λόγος ἐνδιάθετος, which according to Chrysippus is the source of the outer discourse of speech, λόγος

71 sermo purus erit et Latinus, dilucide planeque dicetur, quid debeat circumspicietur. unum aberit quod quartum numerat Theophrastus in orationis laudibus: ornatum illud suave et affluens. Cicero Orator 79.
προφορικός (Chiesa 1992). Thus correct exercise of the faculty of language is essential to the Stoic’s attainment of wisdom.

The Stoics divide τὸ λογικὸν into two parts: rhetoric and dialectic. Rhetoric involves speaking well in continuous discourses, where dialectic entails questions and answers. Alexander of Aphrodisias defined dialectic as the science of εὐ λέγειν (Ildefonse 1997, 142). Dialectic was itself divided into two areas: semantics and voice (DL 7.41-43) (Frede 1987, 344). The division of logic into two parts reflects the fact that there was no Stoic grammar per se (Ildefonse 1997, 140); only later would grammar be added to form the trivium of the artes sermocinales (Weijers 2000; Fredborg 2000; Rastier, Auroux, Deledalle, et al. 1990). Nor did von Arnim systematically include testimonia on grammar in his publication of the Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta (Arnim and Adler 1903; Frede 1987c, 301). The Stoic subordination of grammar to logic is apparent in the approach of the Pergamene scholar Crates of Mallos, a contemporary of Aristarchus and student of Diogenes of Babylon, himself a student of Chrysippus. Crates defined the γραμματικὸς as merely an exegète of γλώσσαι and expert on prosody, by contrast with the κριτικὸς who is knowledgeable in the whole field of logic.

Stoic semantics involves the combination of three elements, the utterance or signifier (σημαίνον), the object to which it refers (τυχνάνον), and its meaning (λεκτόν). In the Stoic system everything that can act or suffer is a body; as Frede puts it, “strikingly along the lines of the Earth-born giants in Plato’s Sophist... everthing which is real, including qualities, is corporeal...

72 Cf. Plato, Sophist 263e.

73 καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖνος ἔλεγε διαφέρειν τὸν κριτικὸν τὸν γραμματικὸν, καὶ τὸν μὲν κριτικὸν πάσης, φησὶ, δὲ λογικὴς ἐπιστήμης ἐμπειρον εἶναι, τὸν δὲ γραμματικὸν ἀπλῶς γλωσσῶν ἐξηγητικὸν καὶ προσωπικὰς ἀποδοτικὸν καὶ τῶν τούτων παραπλησίων εἰδήμονα· Sextus Empiricus, Adversus mathematicos 1.79.

74 This and the following paragraph relies on Sluiter’s account (Sluiter 2000, 378–384)
and... it is the test for the reality of something whether it can act upon or be affected by something.” (Frede 1987, 344) Only time, place, the void, and λεκτά are incorporeal. The λεκτόν is not a being (όν) but a “something” (τι); completely distinct from the sources of impression (φαντασίαι) and from thoughts, it nevertheless depends on them. A λεκτόν is essentially a predicate (κατηγορία) supplemented by a nominative case (ὁθη πτώς) to form a complete proposition. λεκτά include axioms, questions, oaths, commands, and other speech-acts (Schenkeveld 1984).

Numerous difficulties arise from the fact that λεκτά are not bodies, since the Stoic system is based on the principle that only bodies can act and be acted upon. The other elements of language are bodily: the Stoic Diogenes of Babylon held that λόγος, διάνοια, and φωνή were closely connected and joined in the heart, and that language derives from thought--λόγος is temporally coextensive with both thinking and speaking. But Diogenes’s account has little to say about how these bodily activities yield a meaning that is incorporeal. φαντασίαι are generally described as sense-impressions, but an exception must be made for those deriving from λεκτά, which raises the further difficulty of how something incorporeal can act on a body. How can proofs (ἀποδείξεις) composed of incorporeal propositions impress themselves on the mind? How can λεκτά function as signs? In what sense can they be causes? These problems are addressed with subtlety but without definitive resolution by Stoic authors attested in Diogenes Laertius and Sextus Empiricus.

That part of dialectic concerning voice was codified in several handbooks called τέχναι περὶ φωνῆς mentioned by Diogenes Laertius and attributed to Archedemus and Diogenes of Babylon (DL 7.44). This part of dialectic was divided into five sub-topoi: (1) περὶ αὐτῆς τῆς φωνῆς, ἐν ᾧ δείκνυται ἡ ἐγγράμματος φωνῆ καὶ τίνα τὰ τοῦ λόγου μέρη; (2) περὶ σολοκίσμον καὶ
Vocabulary and ideas drawn from Diogenes of Babylon and possibly also Posidonius and Antipater (7.59).

The σολοικιστοιχεῖα πράκτορες of Varro's presentation of arguments for resolving grammatical problems based on forms either "anomalistic grammar" is a chimera of 19th century scholarship. This picture derived from include the principle of anomaly often attributed to them; the association of the Stoa with an What were the criteria of linguistic purity or Έλληνισμός endorsed by the Stoics? They did not include the principle of anomaly often attributed to them; the association of the Stoa with an "anomalistic grammar" is a chimera of 19th century scholarship. This picture derived from Varro's presentation of arguments for resolving grammatical problems based on forms either
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αρεται δὲ λόγου εἰσὶ πέντε, Ἔλληνισμός, σαφήνεια, συντομία, πρέπον, κατασκευή. Ἔλληνισμός μὲν οὖν ἐστὶ φράσις ἀδιάπτωτος ἐν τῇ τεχνικῇ καὶ μή εἰκαίς συνῆθειας; σαφήνεια δὲ ἐστὶ λέξις γνωριμίως παριστάσα τὸ νοούμενον· συντομία δὲ ἐστὶ λέξις αὐτὰ τὰ ἀναγκαῖα περιέχουσα πρὸς δήλωσιν τοῦ πράγματος· πρέπον δὲ ἐστὶ λέξις οἷκε τῷ πράγματι· κατασκευή δὲ λέξις ἐκπεφύγει τὸν ἰδιωτικόν· ὁ δὲ βαρβαρισμός ἐκ τῶν κακῶν λέξεως ἐστὶ παρὰ τὸ ἔθος τῶν εὐθυκομικῶν Ἐλλήνων, συνοικίσμος δὲ ἐστὶ λόγος ἀκαταλλήλως συντεταγμένος. Ἔλληνισμός and συντομία are defined specifically with reference to prose, not poetry (Schenkeveld 1990, 99).
similar to or different from already accepted forms (de lingua latina VIII-X). Crates is depicted as arguing against Aristarchus and analogy, relying on Chrysippus’s discussion of some cases of semantic anomaly, such as the α-privative in the ἀθάνατος, implying that death is a good the gods are lacking (Simplicius In. Ar. Cat. 396.ff.), and the gendered forms of genderless objects such as the moon-god (SVF 2.1076). While it does appear that Aristophanes of Byzantium sometimes followed analogical patterns against established usage (vetus consuetudo) (Ax 2000, 121), Varro himself says that Aristarchus did not advocate the use of analogical forms against established usage (consuetudo). Nor could the Stoics, for whom language was a manifestation of divine λόγος, have upheld the fundamental irregularity of language, however many exceptions Chrysippus might have found (Blank, et al. 2003, 318–320).

The doctrine of analogy seems to have played no role in the formation of inflectional theory (Pinborg 1975, 109 ff.); the issue of anomaly arose as part of a larger controversy between rationalists and empiricists (Blank, et al. 2003, 319). Analogy was important, however, to the development of Atticism insofar as it suggested the means of picking a correct form (Dihle, A. 1957). In treatises on Ἐλληνισμός and Latinitas analogy, like etymology, was a major criterion in the choice of the correct form (Frede 1987, 342).

Diogenes Laertius’s account of Stoic teaching on barbarism and solecism suggests how Ἐλληνισμός was understood: ὁ δὲ βαρβαρισμὸς ἐκ τῶν κακῶν λέξεων ἐστὶ παρὰ τὸ ἔθος τῶν εὐδοκιμοῦντων Ἐλλήνων, σολοικισμὸς δὲ ἐστὶ λόγος ἀκαταλλήλου συντεταγμένος (7.59). The definition of barbarism as an expression “against the use of those Greeks who have a good reputation” shows that Hellenism, “beyond the doctrine of parts of speech and syntax, is not a technical matter, to be covered by rules and theorems, but rather a matter of long familiarity with good authors.” (Frede 1987c, 333) Only such familiarity could assure correct choice of words and phrases.
By contrast with the Saussurian analysis of signs as composed of *signifiant* (the utterance or written form) and *signifié* (the concept), the Stoic sign is not fundamentally arbitrary; like everything else in the Stoic system, it supposes a natural order to which it belongs. The Stoic account of the origins of language implied “the natural suitability of signifiers to significations (cf. Augustine *de dialectica* Ch. vi).” (Blank, et al. 2003, 316)

The Stoics took the side of Cratylus against Hermogenes. Names bear a natural relationship to what they signify, because they were originally imposed by wise men who understood the nature of things. There were two basic schools of theory about the origins of language among the Greeks: the attribution of language to the work of a mythical εὐφρετης such as Orpheus, some original giver of names, and another school that regarded language as the collective creation of society (Fehling 1965, 219 ff.). The latter view arose with the emergence of a more scientific approach that emerged in the fifth century and was associated with the Epicureans. The Stoics held that the names for things were imposed by man, but in such a way that they imitated nature (cf. Origen, *Contra Celsum* 1.24. p. 74.13K; Philo, *De opif. mundi* 148; *Quaest. in Genes.* 1.20) (Frede 1987c, 333). The wise men who founded language lived perfectly in accord with nature, and thus knew the suitable names for things.

---

76 Frede cites Origen, *Contra Celsum* 1.24. p. 74.13K, Philo, *De opif. mundi* 148; *Quaest. in Genes.* 1.20 (Frede 1987c, 333).
77 The Société de linguistique in the second article of its bylaws formally interdicts any papers or articles regarding the origin of speech, since such discussions lead nowhere (Versteegh, K. 1996, 27).
78 At Cratylus 400c Socrates attributes the invention of the name σῆμα to the Orphic poets.
79 Compare Tambiah’s conclusion that religious traditions generally explain the foundation of language through three interrelated notions: “It is clear that we are dealing with three notions which form an interrelated set: deities or first ancestors or their equivalents instituted speech and the classifying activity; man himself is the creator and user of this propensity; language as such has an independent existence and has the power to influence reality.” (Tambiah 1985, 28)
This conception of the origins of language explains the importance for the Stoics of choosing words regarded as purely Greek, since only such words could be traced back to the linguistic founders. It also explains the importance of etymology as a means of returning to the original, pure sense of words, and overcoming their historical degradation. Etymology was anyway a characteristic interest of the Greeks, since it implied that a phenomenon could be understood by knowing its origin (Pinborg 1975, 70). But the Stoics were the main proponents of the study of etymology, which was the most promising tool to discern whether a word was in accord with Ἑλληνισµός (cf. Sext. Emp., Adv. Math. 1.241.ff.).

The identification of founding figures is a recurring theme in the development of puristic or standard languages going back to Sanskrit (Cardona 1990). Such metalanguages often do have founders—poets or scholars, whose authority is sanctioned by the state—whose rules and usage are taken as prescriptive. Adamantios Korais played such a role in the formation of καθαρεύουσα. Recent examples abound from the standardization of the Balkan languages, where Serbian and Croatian where formalized in the 19th century, and other standard languages have proliferated since the dissolution of Yugoslavia (Auty 1973; Greenberg, R. D. 2004).81

80 Davon kommen hier vor allem zwei in Frage: die Ansicht, daß es einen Stamm nicht analysierbarer Grundwörter gebe, die onomatopoetisch oder durch Lautsymbolik zu deuten seien, und zweitens die Theorie von Veränderungen, die die Wörter erlitten haben und die zu durchschauen und so rückwärts gehend zum Ursprung des Wortes zurückzufinden eben die Aufgabe der Eymologie ist.” (Fehling 1965, 222).

81 Serbian was codified by Vuk Karadzic in the nineteenth century; Ljudevit Gaj (last name pronounced like English "guy") was the main force behind the Croatian language in the 19th century and his writing system with special diacritic marks came into use and is still largely in place for Croatian. Senahid Halilovic developed a codification of Bosnian in the late 20th century, especially after 1992. Vojislav Nikcevic has attempted to codify Montenegrin during the same period as Halilovic i.e., mostly in the 1990s and early 2000s. Blaze Konesi codified Macedonian in 1944 and he is considered the founder of the modern standard (Greenberg, R. 2008).
The Stoics had a fully developed theory of purism before Atticism ever arose. Ελληνισμός mandated language that was neither arbitrary nor common, but in conformance with technical usage. In Frede’s view, what we call grammar developed as part of this general theory of expression, the Stoic origins of which are spelled out in Diogenes Laertius (VII.59) (Frede 1987; Siebenborn 1977). Sextus Empiricus contrasts the καθαριότης of true Ελληνισμός with βαρβαρισμός and σολοικισμός (Vassilaki 2007, 1122). This purism was already implicit in the linguistic understanding of the word βάρβαρος from the beginning of the Greek tradition (chapter 1).

The Stoic tradition was formative for the entire western grammatical tradition. Varro’s de lingua latina betrays many Stoic elements, such as the division of pronouns by their definiteness of reference, or in his syntax, which follows the Stoic doctrine of λεκτά; Apollonius Dyscolus, the best-preserved ancient grammarian, whose work was transmitted through Priscian to the mediaeval tradition (Luhtala 2005; Hovdhaugen 1995), likewise follows the Stoic view of syntax (Blank, et al. 2003, 313). The Stoic doctrine of Ελληνισμός applied not only to Greek. Adapted as Latinitas it proved influential in the development of Latin literature; as a theoretical construct it is relevant to purism in all languages.
Greek purism, whether Atticism or καθαρευόμενα, is usually treated as a highly artificial and characteristically Greek phenomenon. While the psychology of Greek purism may be unusual, purism or prescriptivism in one form or another affects virtually any language with commercial, civilizational, or national status (Mirambel, A. 1964, 406). If purism is defined as the belief that one form of a language is more pure, correct, or authoritative than more colloquial language, the phenomenon is widespread if not universal. Speakers are often inclined to judge language as good or bad.

Neither are such judgements confined to literate cultures with traditions of prescriptive grammar. Bloomfield’s study of Menomini Indian language shows that standards of correctness exist even in the absence of language contact and a written language. “The nearest approach to an explanation of ‘good’ and ‘bad’ language seems to be this, then, that by a cumulation of obvious superiorities, both of character and standing, as well as of language, some persons are felt to be better models of conduct and speech than others...This may be a generally human state of affairs, true in every group and applicable to all languages, and the factor of Standard and Literary language versus dialect may be a superadded secondary one.” (Bloomfield 1927, 441) The recognition of exemplary models in Greek Atticism is not an unusual phenomenon;
something similar happens in preliterate as well as literate communities. The tendency to imitate authoritative figures within a speech community has been corroborated by sociolinguistics.\textsuperscript{82}

Nor are pejorative concepts such as βάρβαρος uniquely Greek. The belief that one’s own language is inherently better than others is widespread. The separating function—including non-members of a group from communication—is a universal social function of language (Thomas 1991, 53). Foreign languages are often perceived as inferior or unintelligible, which of course they are to most non-native speakers. For Russians Germans are dumb (немецкий); the Sanskrit expression mlecchāh indicating barbaric usage has similar overtones to Greek βαρβαρισμός; Albanians call their language shqip (“to speak clearly” < Latin excipare) (Hamp 1999).\textsuperscript{83} Outside of the Indo-European language family, the Amazon Pirahã tribe designates all other languages as “crooked head.” (Colapinto 2007, 121) Joseph suggests that this tendency may go back to Proto-Indo-European, tracing the Greek word βάρβαρος to PIE *barbaro-, yielding also Sanskrit barbara- (stammering), Latin baburrus (foolish), Serbian brboljiti (chatter) (Joseph, B. D. 2007a).\textsuperscript{84} The PIE root itself may mimic unintelligible speech, indicating a language alien to PIE linguistic norms.

It was in the context of the debate over purism in Greece that J. Psycharis, an advocate of demoticism against purism, introduced the term διγλωσσία in 1885 (Zaborski 2000, 97). In 1930 W. Marçais borrowed the term diglossie from the Greek debate and applied it to Arabic, another case where the vernacular is everyone’s first language, but another, related language is used at

\textsuperscript{82}Phonetic variables may be selected as socially significant markers of group identification through their adoption by influential speakers (Hock 1991, 646–649).

\textsuperscript{83}Joseph has discussed the ideological implications of the word βάρβαρος in several recent papers (Joseph, B. D. 2005a; Joseph, B. D. 2005b).

\textsuperscript{84}Strabo 14.2.28 cites barbaros as onomatopoetic. Cf. the derivation of barbaros from Sumerian barbaru in e.g Lefkowitz (Lefkowitz 1996, 10).
school (Marçais 1930; Versteegh, K. 1997, 189). Ferguson was the first to formalize discussion of
the term within linguistics, taking Swiss-German, Arabic, Greek, and Haitian creole as examples
of the coexistence in formal and institutional functions of a high prestige language (H) with
another, related, low prestige language (L) used colloquially (Ferguson 1959). Ferguson’s
dichotomy is endoglossic—it presupposes that both H and L are forms of the same language.

Fishman and others have pointed out that this strict definition excludes many comparable
situations where H and L are not the same language, such as the use of Greek and Latin at Rome
for different functions. Fishman extends the definition of diglossia to non-genetic, exoglossic
situations such as the coexistence of Guarini and Spanish in Paraguay (Fishman, J. 1967). In
other cases L may be descended from an antecedent of H, and is thus not its daughter but a
cousin. This is true for Swiss-German, which derives from Middle High German, not from
High German, the antecedent of the Swiss-German H. In cases of exoglossic diglossia speakers
may be inclined to project a genetic relation between H and L, as when Mingrels consent to
Georgian as the H variety of their vernacular even though the two are unrelated; similarly
Latin was described as a dialect of Greek in the first century BC (see chapter 5). Speakers of H on
the other hand may profess an inability to speak L, regarded as the language of women, children
and servants, though they can be heard to speak it. The Indian census regularly reports speakers
who claim to have Sanskrit or the H variety of Tamil as their mother tongue (Schiffman
1996, 244). Kalabari speakers in the East Niger Delta claim that the closely related language of the
less prosperous Nembe is unintelligible to them (Davies 2002, 155).

------------------------------------

85(Schiffman 2002, 248)
Versteegh goes farther to argue that Ferguson’s definition needs to be expanded even for the situations of classic, endoglossic diglossia on which it was based (Versteegh, K. 1997, 190–191). Even when H and L are genetically related, their functional distribution in the language community is far from universal. Some or most speakers may command only L, and comprehensive knowledge of H may be limited to a small elite. This tendency is more pronounced in cases of exoglossic diglossia where L may be unknown to the elite. In Algeria before independence most people knew only a little French, while some intellectuals with perfect command of French were unable to speak Arabic.

A more fundamental criticism of Ferguson’s definition, however, regards the claim that H and L are mutually exclusive. Although some media, such as newspapers, may present relatively pure forms of H, usage generally represents a continuum of speech between H and L at opposite ends. In Greek as in Arabic there are many intermediate levels between H and L: until recently at least five such levels were recognized in Greek, from καθαρέυσα to μικτή, καθομιλουμένη, δημοτική, and μαθηματική (Mirambel, A. 1938). Badawī comparably divides Egyptian Arabic into five different registers (Badawī 1973). Nor is a single function confined to one register: the speeches of Gamal Abdel Nasser, for example, might begin using H in slow and rhythmic cadences, but conclude in a colloquial variety of the language (Versteegh, K. 1997, 196). Ferguson’s strict dichotomy is not adequate to the actual linguistic situations on which it is based (Versteegh 2002, 55).

------------------------------------

86 Daltas defends Ferguson’s original definition against attempts to broaden it (Daltas 1994).
87 For such cases the distinction was proposed between diglossia as indicating sociolinguistic distribution of functions and bilingualism to indicate the speakers’s psycholinguistic command of each language (Gumperz 1962; Fishman, J. 1967; Fishman, J. A. 1972).
But the continuum between H and L is also evident in the written record, as is evident from the wide ranging variation in the documentary record of Atticizing Greek. As Anlauf argues, the rubric of Atticism indicates nothing more than the authors’ intention of writing what they call Attic (Anlauf 1960). “Anyone using a written form of speech—from the almost illiterate scribe to the most polished author—had to aim at the highest level of the Attic literary language.” (Versteegh, K. 1987, 253) In practice, of course, a shared target language did not yield a similar result. The different levels apparent in post-Classical texts, Versteegh argues, should not be understood as discrete varieties of the language, but as more or less succesful imitations of the Attic standard.

Brixhe describes diglossia in terms of the dichotomy “langue courante/langue cible (celle des grands auteurs du passé)” (Brixhe, et al. 1993, 13). H is best understood as a target at one end of a continuum of usage, rather than as a codified standard language.89 As a target it may be missed, attained, or overshot, as when hypercorrection and pedantry may lead Atticist writers into greater complexity than their classical models. The target may remain an unattainable ideal, as in Arabic: “un lettré musulman ne lit jamais très couramment une page d’arabe.” (Marçais 1930, 404) But even the humblest form of writing shows the interplay of two codes; the Schriftsprache does not provide direct evidence for the history of the spoken language but rather for the history of a metalinguistic attitude (Brixhe, C. 2007b, 490)

89“the term 'standard language' stands for at least two different notions. Sometimes it is used as a synonym for 'the codified norm of the language', as, for instance, when 'standard French' is used in the sense of 'the French language as it is laid down in the grammar of the Académie Française'. At other times the standard indicates the target of the speakers in a speech community, the linguistic aim of all speakers who aim at a cultivated language. In the former sense it corresponds to the high variety in Ferguson's original scheme, in the latter sense it corresponds with the idea of a linguistic continuum.” (Versteegh 2002, 55)
Linguistics, as the science of language, cannot take puristic claims of linguistic superiority at face value. They count as extralinguistic statements, useful to sociolinguistics in understanding language ideology and social causes of language change. For historical linguistics the history of language is the history of vernaculars, not of standard languages. “Present-day vernaculars evolved from earlier ones that differed remarkably from present-day textbook-variants...These earlier vernaculars, rather than the standard, clearly must be... the focus of research into the history of... [languages].” (Bailey, Maynor and Cukor-Avila 1989, 299) Written languages are of interest to linguistics insofar as they provide evidence for spoken language history. Linguistics is interested in language in its functional aspect as living discourse.

Ernst Cassirer warns against the objectification of language. “Language is misjudged if it is taken in some way or other as a thinglike being, as a substantial medium which interposes itself between man and the reality surrounding him.” (Schilpp 1949, 878) For Cassirer language is fundamentally an activity; to reify it by metaphorical descriptions is to transform a function into a substance. Paul Valéry contrasts the practical or abstract uses of language, which are essentially transitory, with the immobility of poetry: “Poetic language must preserve itself, through itself, and remain the same, not to be altered by the act of intelligence that finds or gives it a meaning.” (Valéry 1961, 171)

Gerald Bruns elaborates the contrast between these two conceptions of language, the first scientific and empirical, the second poetic and rhetorical. Post-Saussurian linguistics takes the

90Purism is a matter of ideology, not grammar or syntax, and the important thing is the belief that one’s language is ‘pure’.” (Swain, S. 2004, 356)
91Cited in the introduction to the *Handbook of Historical Linguistics* (Joseph and Janda 2003, 17).
92Cited by Bruns (Bruns 2001, 11).
93Cited by Bruns (Bruns 2001, 13).
first view in analyzing language in terms of process, system, and function. The ancient grammatical tradition, deriving as we have seen from the study of Ἐλληνισμός, takes the latter. The problem of literary language, Bruns observes, “underlies the ancient controversy between Asianism and Atticism, the Renaissance dispute concerning Ciceronianism... It is the problem of art’s ability (or even compulsion) to distort its content—a problem that is intimately bound up with the Sophist’s question of whether language is at all commensurate with those things it is said to convey.” Rhetorical language tends to create a kind of world of words (Bruns 2001, 21f.).

The invention of the alphabet and writing contributed to the objectification of language; literacy is closely associated with prescriptive language and H. In most cases of diglossia H is a Schriftsprache, though it may also be spoken. Writing is often its primary function. The inflexibility of written language makes all languages potentially diglottic (Niehoff-Panagiotidis 1994). Robins calls the invention of the alphabet the first Greek accomplishment in linguistics; to the time of Plato and Aristotle a γραμματικός simply meant a literate person (Robins 1997, 17).

The development of prescriptive grammar (γραμματική) may be taken as an outgrowth of writing (γράμματα); since writing generally recognizes only one correct form, the advent of writing fostered the concept of “incorrect” speech. The expression “illiterate speech” used e.g. by

94Bruns contrasts twentieth-century linguistics with the Neo-Grammarians in this respect: “The nineteenth-century linguistic tradition has almost uniformly approach language from the standpoint of the isolated word conceived as a physical or psychical entity—an item in a mechanical system or a natural object possessed of its own life cycle or a psychic unit within a larger bundle of psychics called images and ideas.” (Bruns 2001, 14) with note 9 on pp. 264-5: “The notion that words are units of a mechanical system is usually associated with Neo-Grammarians such as Karl Brugmann and Hermann Osthoff, in their Morphologische Untersuchungen (1878); the application of the organic analogy to language is a nineteenth century commonplace, but an important work in this connection is August Schleicher’s Die Darwinische Theorie und die Sprachwissenschaft (1863); the approach to language from the standpoint of “mathematical psychology,” in which the contents of the mind are regarded as discrete and isolatable units, was taken by H. Steinthal, in Einleitung in die Philosophie der Sprachwissenschaft (1871).” Brun also references Cassirer’s essay on structuralism in modern linguistics (Cassirer 1945).
Bloomfield to indicate the speech of someone who is illiterate suggests the extent to which literacy conditions our understanding of spoken language (Bloomfield 1927).

Literacy tends to reify language, as Plato warned in the *Phaedrus*. The literate no longer perceive language solely as a temporal and auditory phenomenon but also as a spatial and visual one. The written word has a permanence that may foster prescriptivism and purism. As Tambiah notes, “writing per se, made possible by the alphabet, by giving a physical existence to-words, may lend added veneration to written texts.” In his view this helps explain the name for the Sanskrit alphabet, *Devanāgarī* (“the abode of the Gods.”) (Tambiah 1985, 26)

Metalanguages are reified languages. The Atticist shares Paul Valéry’s goal of creating--or participating in--a permanent language. Religious and ritual language, puristic language, and standard languages in general can be classified as metalanguages, endowed by their speakers with extralinguistic value.

Religious language is perhaps the metalanguage *par excellence*, since it seems to be universal in traditional societies and often claims divine origin; even secular forms of purism, such as modern Greek *καθαρευσούσα*, suggest a religious psychology (Mirambel, A. 1964; Schiffman 1996). Most religious traditions employ sacred languages different from everyday speech: Buddhists chant in Pali, Latin is historically the language of the Catholic Church; *κοινή* Greek and Old Church Slavonic of the Orthodox Church, Ge‘ez, Coptic, and Grabar/Krapar of the non-Chalcedonian Churches; liturgical Jewish prayers are said in Biblical Hebrew; the Hindus use Vedic Sanskrit, and Koranic Arabic, “l’arabe «éternel»” (Marçais 1930, 402), is also distant from the vernacular. As Tambiah observes, “in all these cases it could be said that texts tend to acquire authority because they are ancient, but that it is authority that matters more than antiquity” (Tambiah
1985, 25). The status of these languages owes something to their preservation in written
documents, but even in preliterate societies ritual language tends to employ archaic speech,
considered more authoritative because unchanged over time.95 This is the case in a tradition as
ancient and venerable as Vedic, but also for the spells the illiterate Trobriand islanders believe
arrived with their first ancestors (Tambiah 1985, 25). Greek purism in Roman times seems to
have had no specifically religious sanction, although from Byzantine times a form of purism has
been associated with Greek ecclesiastical usage.

Writing requires schooling of some kind, and thus language contact is always at work in the
written record (Brixhe, C. 2007b, 487). The school is always reintroducing prescriptive, archaic, or
puristic forms that might otherwise fall out of use. Little work has been done on the impact of
writing on linguistic change (Joseph, B. D. 2008) It has been documented that “learnedisms” in
modern Greek have different phonotactics from the demotic forms (Kazazis 1993, 13)

The variation in the usage of the Greek genitive or dative in the epigraphic and literary record
through the first Christian millennium is one example of the effect such prescriptivism can have:
“il ne faut pas y voir une lente agonie du datif, mais admettre que le datif, mort très tôt, a été
constamment réintroduit par l’école.” (Brixhe, et al. 1993, 13) The liturgical use of the prestige
language may expose even the illiterate to archaic forms and vocabulary. The prose of A.

95 "The sharp disjunction between the case of a written holy language and a secular language in
higher religion is paralleled in the Trobriands by a weaker disjunction, nevertheless of the same
kind, between the elements of archaic or esoteric language in the orally transmitted spells and
the language of ordinary use. Many "primitive" peoples who recite their religious mythology in
saga form do so in an "archaic" form of speech which is only barely comprehensible to
contemporary speakers; this is the case among the Kachin. The point is that as long as religion
both in literate or preliterate societies harks back to a period of revelation and insists on the
authority of properly transmitted true texts either orally or in written form, its sacred language
will contain an archaic component, whether this be represented by a totally different language or
older elements of the same language.” (Tambiah 1985, 26)
Papadiamantis abounds with examples of liturgical Greek in the everyday language of his time; Callahan has shown how preaching and church singing introduced illiterate slaves to Biblical language.96

The constant reintroduction of older forms and usage through the school and church has surely been a factor in the apparent continuity of the Greek language over centuries, at least at the lexical level. It may mislead modern scholars into supposing that words in the modern vocabulary go back to antiquity, when in fact they were reintroduced in the nineteenth century. But the process long antedates Korais; various forms of purism have existed in Greek since the Atticist movement began in the first century BC.

Versteegh suggests that in fact the more unusual development may be not the persistence of diglossia in the Greek East as its absence in the Latin West. Moderns, steeped in the legacy of Bacon’s critique of language and the Romantic movement, may have difficulty accepting or even understanding the premises of puristic diglossia based on the mimesis of classical authors. The preoccupation with imitation may seem morbid or at least unimaginative.

Until thinking about language and literature was changed at the time of the Romantic movement, innovation was generally understood pejoratively. This negative attitude towards innovation was based on a conception of intellectual and spiritual life based on the imitation of stable models (Girard 2002, 298); Greek purism is simply another reflection of this nearly universal pre-modern attitude. If it is true that nihil novi sub sole, creativity may involve the

96“Slaves were rarely introduced to the Bible through the medium of the printed page. For many slaves biblical literacy began with spontaneous aural memorization and oral recall. Slaves mimicked what they heard in sermons...” Callahan also describes the importance of choral response singing in memorization of Biblical language (Callahan 2006, 11–12).
assimilation of ancient wisdom and its translation into contemporary language rather than the
discovery of new truths.\textsuperscript{97} Ancient theories about the Biblical origins of Platonic and Homeric
wisdom reflect the premise that wisdom has a genealogy.\textsuperscript{98} Atticism was an attempt to translate
contemporary experience into the language of a hypostasized classical Athens, perceived as
abidingly present through the continuity of Greek \textit{paideia}.

Lawrence Venuti describes translation as either domestication (rendering foreign concepts with
familiar terms) or foreignization (preserving foreign words in their original form to preserve
their sense);\textsuperscript{99} the latter style implies that certain words cannot be translated without losing their
full sense. Typically Biblical translation has been the most foreignized, piously calqued on the
syntax and vocabulary of the original; this resistance to translation may be codified in a
prohibition against translating some religious texts, believed to be the literal word of God, such
as the Koran. The status of religious metalanguages may reflect the belief that to translate them
into contemporary idiom would change their content.

This resistance to translation reflects an attitude closely associated with the Romantic movement,
what in linguistics is called linguistic relativism or the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis (Whorf 1973;
Unlike linguistic determinism, linguistic relativism does not suppose that thought is utterly determined by language, but does hold that language influences thought and that certain concepts may be more accessible than others in accordance with the Grundbegriffe that each language makes available to its speakers. Wilhelm von Humboldt, following Herder and Hamann, was “the first to combine ideas of comparative structuralism with ideas of the identity of language, perception, and thought...” in a strong version of linguistic relativity (Brown 1967, 109). This conception was consistent with the concept of a Sprachnation already implicit in Rousseau’s observation that *l’ésprit en chaque langue a sa forme particulière* (Moschonas 2004, 175–176). This concept influenced the Romantic nationalisms of the nineteenth century including the demoticist movement in Greek.

The close connection between language and thought in Stoic logic was the basis for the Stoic doctrine of Ἑλληνισμός. Its antonym, βαρβαρισμός, had connotations not only for language but also for thought and conduct. The Persian/Greek antithesis developed in fifth century Attic tragedy identified ὅβρις with the barbarian, and with those transgressive Greeks who acted like barbarians (Saïd 2002, 87 f.). The perceived decline in language since the classical period--indeed, since the time of language’s founding by prototypical wise men--was correlated with a decline in morals, conduct, and thought. Atticism, like all metalanguages that resist translation--religious, poetic, rhetorical, puristic--supposes that form and content are inextricable, that word and thought are closely bound, that language has a substantial reality. It is no accident that Sapir was a published poet (Hill 1988, 15).

Classics as a field presupposes linguistic relativism, insofar as it claims that study of ancient languages gives access to a new world of thought and meaning. Modern linguistics has generally
been suspicious of linguistic relativism and the prestige it would impart to certain languages.\footnote{Sankoff presents what has been the prevailing view: "... there is no evidence that in terms of the basic machinery of a language considered as a code for transmitting messages, i.e. the phonology, morphology, syntax, or even the overall semantic organization, any one language is inherently superior, more logical, accurate or efficient, or in any way preferable to any other language. Thus stereotypes such as that French is a particularly beautiful or precise language, that English is inherently better suited to scientific thinking, that non-standard English is illogical, etc., have no basis in linguistic science. No language, by virtue of its inherent structure, bestows any general cognitive advantage on its speakers." (Sankoff 1976, 284).}

Resistance to linguistic relativism was strengthened by the tendency since the 1960’s to replace empiricism with rationalistic assumptions. Recent work in linguistics, however, has looked on linguistic relativism more favorably (Gumperz and Levinson 1996; Gentner and Goldin-Meadow 2003).

Linguistic relativism stresses the differences between languages; it accords with the approach to translation that Venuti calls foreignization, transliteration of a foreign word on the premise that the target language must make room for new concepts that its native vocabulary lacks. This introduction of new vocabulary is a kind of language contact that may take the form of adoption or nativization. Totem and taboo are words that have been foreignized into English; to the extent that these words have been assimilated to English vocabulary they have been not merely adopted but nativized. Languages may systematically adopt or nativize borrowings from different languages; for example Greek has tended to adopt French words but to nativize Turkish ones (Joseph, B. D. 2007b).

If foreignization is a minimalist approach to translation, domestication is maximalist. Foreignization is translation that is conscious of its limits; domestication seeks to present the foreign text entirely in the target language. Domestication implies the intellectual appropriation and assimilation of the work translated in such a way that it can be reproduced in a different...
form but somehow lay claim to the same content; it implies a separation of language from thought, insofar as thought is believed to be universal beneath the veil of language.

Foreignization insists on the distance between the two languages; domestication would bridge that distance. The latter runs the risk of reductionism, the former of incomprehensibility. As Schleiermacher put it, the translator’s choice is to take the reader to the text or vice versa (Schleiermacher 1992). The romantic Schleiermacher, like Venuti, takes the side of foreignization on the grounds that domestication does violence to the translated language. But without some domestication there is no translation at all.

This dichotomy confronts not only literary translators, but other fields in the humanities as well. The metaphor of cultural translation was introduced by B. Malinowski and developed by A.E. Pritchard and his students (Malinowski 1922; Beidelman 1971); the anthropologist is limited by the same poles of domestication and foreignization, with the attendant risks of reductionism and incomprehensibility, in the attempt to explain one culture to another. Peter Burke observes that, if the past is a foreign country, history itself is an art of translation (Burke, P. 2007).

The Atticistic movement in both Greek and Latin was concerned with translation into a puristic idiom. Greek Atticism, like καθαρευόμενα, meant translation of a degraded language into an earlier idiom of the same language. Burke describes this process as a kind of domestication in reverse; contemporary language and experience is assimilated to that of antiquity, on the premise that the ancient language is completely adequate to contemporary experience.

The cultural translation of Hellenism into Roman form was a process that had been long underway when the Attici appeared in Rome. The Atticist movement adapted into Latin prose rhetoric grammatical, aesthetic, and moral principles that had been elaborated by the Stoics. A
Hellenized Roman elite domesticated the Attic tradition in such a way that it fostered a new literature that was immediately recognized as classical.
As remarkable as the fact that the documentary record of Greek spans over 3000 years is the fact that for at least 2000 years belief in the continuity of this language has been important to many of its speakers.

This sense of connection to a glorious and ancient past is evident long before the Atticist movement. From its beginnings Greek literature has a retrospective outlook. The works of Homer look back to a great civilization that has been lost, a heroic age beyond comparison with the present. Cyclopean walls and Mycenaean sites reminded the Greeks of the Geometric and Archaic periods of past glories; the growth of hero cult shows that this reverence for the past was more than a literary trope (Antonaccio 1995).

Greek paideia was always based on a canon of poetry. Within the Homeric poems the bards Demodocus and Phemius have repertoires of songs that are familiar to their audience. The symposium culture that developed in the archaic period supposed that participants could readily perform passages from Homer and the lyric poets (Slater, W. J. 1991). Xenophanes indicates that all Greeks from the beginning learned Homer (frg. 10). We have seen that the lexicographical tradition begins with glosses on Homer, glosses that, if Strato’s comic depiction is at all reliable,
might actually have been used in everyday speech. Homer served as a model in the way Attic prose would later. As the Alexandrian grammarian Pindarion comments, δεδοκιµασµένη καὶ ἀρχαίοτατη (scil. συνήθεια) ἐστὶν ἢ Ὄµήρου ποίησις (SE adv. gr. 202). The elegies of Solon and Theognis and the Attic skolia had something like canonical status since all participants in the symposia were expected to know them. Already in the classical period Athenian society was imbued with a poetic and musical heritage that might be called classicizing (D’Angour, A. 2006).

If Atticism is knowledge of Athenian language and imitation of Athenian mores, a speech of Nicias in Thucydides shows that such assimilation was prevalent in the classical period itself among Athenian allies: οἱ τέως Ἀθηναῖοι νοµιζόµενοι καὶ µὴ ὄντες ἡµῶν τῆς τε φωνῆς τῆς ἑπιστήµης καὶ τῶν τρόπων τῇ µιµήσει ἑθαυµάζεσθε κατὰ τὴν Ἑλλάδα (7.63). Plato’s Phaedrus depicts the young protagonist studying Lysias as a rhetorical model, as Atticists would do for generations (257b ff, 266c-267d). In the fifth century Hellanicus created the genre of Atthidography that, continued by Cleidemus, Androtion, Phanodemus, and Philochorus, amounted to a thesaurus of local history for later students of Atticism.

The Athenian schools in Athens were the institutional foundation for Attic paideia. Plato’s Academy was founded in 387; in 335 Aristotle founded the Lyceum. While the work of the Academy and the Lyceum would be important to the classicist movement in the first century BC, it was Isocrates’s school, founded around 390, that developed a doctrine of paideia that already foreshadowed the apotheosis of Athenian culture. On this account Gelzer calls Isocrates the father of Atticism. Jaeger sees Isocrates’s famous declaration at Panegyricus 50 as a praeparatio

101Cited by Fehling (Fehling 1965, 221).
102Andersseits ist aber auch zu bedenken, dass der Attizismus sich wohl als einen Neubeginn, gleichzeitig aber auch als Rückkehr zu dem Ideal des echten alten Attischen versteht -das ist ja das typisch Klassizistische daran -und dass er in der Formulierung seines Ideals sich ständig auf
for the Macedonian diffusion of Hellenism\textsuperscript{103} (Jaeger 1944, III.79 ff.), although the passage may have been more concerned with restricting Hellenism to an educated elite than with expanding it to non-Greeks.\textsuperscript{104} At a time when the liberty and autonomy of the city-states was at odds with Greek unity, Isocrates preached a crusade against Persia as a remedy to divisions within the Greek world (Walbank 2002, 237). Here too was an anticipation of the role the Persians would play in imperial Roman imagery contemporary with Atticism from the time of Augustus through the Second Sophistic (Spawforth 1994). Isocrates established rhetorical and literary mastery as the most important ingredient of general education (Dihle, A. 1977, 163).

Notwithstanding the Greek tradition of Attic emulation and prescriptivism, continued in Alexandria and Pergamum, the first reference to an Atticist movement appears in Latin and at Rome. “Der Attizismus ist wohl in dem Jahrzehnt vor 46 in Rom und für Römer konzipiert worden” (Gelzer 1979, 16); Atticism first emerges as a movement in Latin literature. Cicero mentions a group of \textit{isti novi Attici}, imitators of Lysias (\textit{Orator} 89). These Atticists were critics of Cicero’s style. Tacitus cites Brutus and Calvus by name: “Ciceronem a Calvo quidem male

\textsuperscript{103}Τοσούτον δ’ ἀπολέομεν ἡ πόλις ἡμῶν περί τὸ φρονεῖν καὶ λέγειν τοὺς ἄλλους ἀνθρώπους, ὥσθ’ οἱ ταῖτις μαθηταὶ τῶν ἄλλων διδάσκαλοι γεγόνασιν, καὶ τὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων όνομα πεπόιηκεν μηκὲτι τὸ γένος, ἀλλὰ τῆς διανοίας δοκεῖν εἶναι, καὶ μᾶλλον Ἑλλήνας καλείθιν τοὺς τῆς παιδεύσεως τῆς ἐμετέρας ἢ τοὺς τῆς κοινῆς φύσεως μετέχοντας.

\textsuperscript{104}it has been shown that in this passage Isocrates is not extending the term Hellene to non-Greeks, but restricting its application; he is in effect saying, ‘Hellenes are no longer all who share in the γένος of the Greek people, as hitherto, but only those who have gone to school to Athens; henceforth “Greece” is equivalent to Athens and her cultural following.’” Walbank citing Wilcken, \textit{SBBerlin} (1922) 114 n. 3 and Jüthner (Jüthner 1994, 34 ff; Walbank 2002, 239–240). Cartledge takes Jaeger’s view that Isocrates went farther than Herodotus in breaking down prejudice against the barbarians by interpreting Hellenism in a cultural rather than a racial sense (Cartledge 2007, 387).
audisse tamquam solutum et enervem, a Bruto autem, ut ipsius verbis utar, tamquam fractum atque elumbem.”

Calvus called Cicero’s style formless and flabby, Brutus called it fractured and disjointed. In the Brutus and Orator Cicero defends himself against these aspersions and the implication of Asianism, a term of abuse stigmatizing the bombastic style associated with the rhetorical schools of Asia Minor.

Little Asianist rhetoric has survived; the success of the Atticist movement has contributed to the loss of the works of the Hellenistic rhetoricians they criticized. Wilamowitz argued that Asianism was essentially a term of abuse, and not a style that anyone would have espoused (Wilamowitz-Moellendorf 1900, 1–8). Oratory of the Hellenistic period apparently lacked the disciplined word choice characteristic of the Attic orators and Plato (Wooten 1975). Cicero himself provides evidence for Asianism; he criticizes Hortensius for his adherence to both kinds of Asiatica dictio—the first a “genus sententiosum et argutum, sententiis non tam gravibus et severis quam concinnis et venustis” found in the historian Timaeus, and the brothers Hierocles and Menocles; the second exemplified by Aeschylus of Cnidus and Aeschines of Miletus, “non tam sententiis frequentatum quam verbis volucre atque incitatum... exornato et faceto genere verborum,” and lacking “ornata sententiarum concinnitas” (Brutus 325). Cicero argues that Asianism was suited to the young Hortensius but not to a mature speaker; he too had been influenced by Hellenistic rhetoric in his youth (Brutus 313 ff.; Plutarch, Cicero 4.5).

Cicero says that his excessive Asianism was corrected by his teacher Apollonius Molon at Rhodes (Brutus 316). The orator Emporius identifies the Rhodian figura as a temperate style in between expansive Asianism and humble Atticism. Cicero’s principle criticism of the Attici is that they

105 Tacitus Dialogus 18.5.5-6.1. Cf. Quintilian XII.1.22.
106 de ethopoeia (Halm 1863, 561).
single out a single model, Lysias,\textsuperscript{107} and fail to do justice to the great variety amongst the Attic orators themselves--the differences between Demosthenes and Lysias, Hyperides and Aeschines, who had himself criticized Demosthenes as an unattic speaker (Brutus 285; Orator 26-7).\textsuperscript{108} He accuses Atticists of singling out the simple style--the genus tenue--while neglecting the grand and middle styles, all of which are found in his model Demosthenes (Brutus 284 ff.; Orator 75-99).\textsuperscript{109} To these three different styles correspond the three functions of rhetoric: docere/probare, delectare, and movere/flectere/excitare (Orator 69 ff.; cf. Brutus 184-185).

The leader of the Attici appears to have been C. Licinius Calvus, who, as Cicero puts it, ipse errabat et alios etiam errare cogebat (Brutus 284).\textsuperscript{110} Calvus, who seems to have died by 53, was active in politics, and by no means an adversary of Cicero (Gruen, E. S. 1966). Only scant remains survive of the twenty-one books of his speeches that were well-known in antiquity (Tacitus, Dialogi 21.1). He was best known for his attacks on P. Vatinius and his friendship with Catullus (advertised in Catullus 14, 50, 96). The studied concision and simplicity of the novi Attici have affinities with the aesthetic of the poetae novi, whose number included Calvus himself. In the Brutus (283-4) Cicero describes Calvus as well-read, with a meticulous and elegant style that appealed to the learned; his faults were excessive self-criticism and lack of force and vitality (ad fam. 15.21.4). Although Cicero concedes Calvus’s oratory learning and eloquence, he criticizes his

\textsuperscript{107}Lebek argues against the communis opinio, represented e.g. by Norden (Norden 1923, 221) that opposes Atticists such as Calvus to Cicero as emulators of Lysias and Demosthenes respectively. For example, Seneca noted the resemblance of Calvus’s compositio to that of Demosthenes ((7.4.8) (Lebek, W. D. 1970, 84 ff.)
\textsuperscript{108}Gaines and Wisse discuss the similarities between this argument in Cicero and a passage in Philodemus’s On rhetoric (Gaines 2001; Wisse, J. 2001).
\textsuperscript{109}See Weische’s study of Cicero’s imitation of Attic models (Weische 1972).
\textsuperscript{110}On Cicero and the circle of Calvus see discussions by Kennedy and Hendrickson (Kennedy 1972, 244f; Hendrickson 1926).
self-consciousness, diffidence and bloodlessness.111 This criticism may however be somewhat polemical, since Quintilian praises in particular the vehementia of Calvus’s speeches (10.1.114) and Attic diction was thought particularly conducive to vis, gravitas and concitatio. Dihle suggests that Cicero’s claim that Attic speakers failed to move their audiences is “nur als erbitterte Verteidigung der eigenen Kunst zu verstehen” (Dihle, A. 1957, 192). H. Heck showed that Cicero characterizes the speech of individual Atticist speakers such as Calvus, Calidius, and Caesar—a sermo purus, integer, and dilucidus, but lacking ornatus, lumina, and vis—in the same terms as he describes an earlier puristic movement at Rome (Heck 1917). It may be that Cicero’s criticisms in the Brutus and Orator are partly concerned with denying the originality of Calvus’s Atticism.

This earlier purist movement took its bearings from members of the Scipionic Circle of Cicero’s dialogues, whose leading figures included Lucilius, Scipio, Laelius, and Panaetius, teacher of Crates of Mallos and an intimate of the Stoic Diogenes of Babylon. This was a period when, by the account of Pomponius in the Brutus (258), “confluxerunt enim et Athenas et in hanc urbem multi inquinate loquentes ex diversis locis.” In Rome, as in Athens, the city’s attraction of immigrants had led to a deterioration of the spoken language. Pomponius contrasts the purity of speech of Laelius and Scipio with that of Pacuvius and Caecilius: “sed omnes tum fere, qui nec extra urbem hanc vixerant neque eos aliqua barbaries domestica infuscaverat, recte loquebantur.” Among the speakers Cicero’s Pomponius praises for their elegantia sermonis (Brutus 63).

---

111 Sed ad Calvum is enim nobis erat propositus revertamur; qui orator fuit cum litteris eruditor quam Curio tum etiam accuratus quoddam dicendi et exquisitus adferet genus; quod quamquam scintet eleganterque tractatam, nimium tamen inquirens in se atque ipse se observans metuensque, ne vitiosum conligeret, etiam verum sanguinem deperdebat. Itaque eius oratio nimia religione attenuata doctis et attente audientibus erat inlustris, a multitudine autem et a foro, cui nata eloquentia est, devorabatur. Tum Brutus: Atticum se, inquit, Calvus noster dici oratorem volebat: inde erat ista exilitas quam ille de industria consequebatur. (Brutus 283-284).
258-260) are Laelius, Scipio, Titus Flamininus, Q. Lutatius Catulus, and C. Aurelius Cotta. Each of these exemplified the puristic principle *non dicere sed loqui latine*.

This stylistic ideal may have originated with the Stoic Panaetius; Cicero (*Brutus* 258) traces the principle *latine loqui* to the Scipionic Circle (Kaimio 1979, 297). It entails avoiding Greek loan words, and is accordingly rendered by the term *Latinitas* calqued on the Stoic ideal of Ἑλληνισμός. *Latinitas* is defined in the *rhetorica ad Herennium* (4.12.17): “Latinitas est, quae sermonem purum conservat ab omni vitio remotum.” (Smiley 1906) Cicero’s discussion of the virtues of speaking *Latine, plane, apte, ornate* illustrates the Theophrastean and Stoic genealogy of these canons of style (*de oratore* 3.37-46). The principle of speaking grammatically and avoiding Greek vocabulary entered Latin through the Greek tradition itself.

To avoid Greek terms Latin purists had to reckon with the *patrii sermonis egestas*--the Latin language’s relative poverty of vocabulary.112 The plain style espoused by the Atticists, adapted to Latin’s relatively limited vocabulary, made a virtue of necessity.113 The Atticist Brutus defined *dilectus verborum*--ἐκλογή τῶν ὀνόματων--as the basis of *eloquentia*. This reflects the Stoic emphasis on exactness of diction as the fundamental virtue of style. In the absence of a canonical corpus of literature, *Latinitas* was dictated by the *consuetudo bene loquendi*. In earlier times models of such usage were found in in the *innocentia*, the uninstructed usage, of the best speakers; in the case of C. Gracchus the *usus domesticus* of his mother Cornelia was the basis of his eloquence.

112 “Quanta uerborum nobis paupertas, immo egestas sit, numquam magis quam hodierno die intellexi” Seneca *ep.* 58.1. A comprehensive study by Fögen documents the sense of inferiority Romans felt towards the Greek language, and the efforts of authors such as Lucretius and Catullus to overcome this impediment (Fögen 2000).

113 Cicero’s claim that “Latinam linguam non modo non inopem, ut uulgo putarent, sed locupletiorem etiam esse quam Graecam” (*de finibus* 1.10) reflects not only his bravado but his differences with the *Attici*, whose own project for *Sprachausbau* involved not the expansion of Latin vocabulary but its restriction.
Thus the avoidance of unusual words became a watchword of purism; the preference for *verba usitata* was the key to *elegantia* or ἀστείωτης. As Caesar put it in his lost work *de analogia*, “tamquam scopulum sic fugias inauditum atque insolens verbum.”

The title of Caesar’s work suggests that *consuetudo* or συνήθεια was not enough to achieve the Atticist goals of clarity and simplicity. Pure diction was associated not only with *Latinitas*, but also with the grammatical principle of analogy—a doctrine aiming at simplicity and purity of grammatical inflection (Kennedy 1972, 240). As Cicero describes Caesar’s linguistic efforts, “Caesar autem rationem adhibens consuetudinem vitiosam et corruptam pura et incorrupta consuetudinem emendat” (*Brutus* 261). Although radical proponents of analogy such as Sisenna took analogy to the point of obscurity with their neologisms and abolition of irregular declensions (*Brutus* 259 f., Quint. 1.6.27), Caesar simplified speech on the basis of grammatical ἀναλογία, rendered in Latin variously as *proportio, ratio, or analogia*.

Thus grammar was important for Latin rhetoric in a way that it was not for Greek rhetoric, precisely because Rome lacked the “reiche, vorbildliche Kunstprosa” of the Attic corpus (Dihle, A. 1957, 178). Stoic grammar was particularly suited to Roman needs, since it belonged together with rhetoric under τὸ λογικὸν. Grammatical study in Latin begins with the purism of Lucilius and his contemporaries; Suetonius was struck by fact that the *veteres grammatici* at Rome, such as Gnepho or Stilo, mostly slaves or freedmen, also taught rhetoric (*de gramm 4*). Stoic grammarians included Brutus’s teacher Staterius Eros, author of a treatise *de proportione* (Quint. 1.6.3, Prisc GL II 385 1) and the orators Aelius Stilo, the teacher of Varro, characterized by his *oratio brevis et aperta* (Diog. Laert. 7.59), and Aurelius Opilius (Suet. *de gramm. 6*) (Dihle, A. 1957, 179, 188).
Cicero’s polemic against the Atticists goes hand in hand with his criticism of reliance on grammar. In the Brutus he criticizes those who rely on Stoic grammar for correct usage; he describes Chrysippus’s rhetoric as an *ars obmutescendi* (Dihle, A. 1957, 173). In his view the older purists, Stoics and Atticists were better suited to few listeners than many, and to γραφικὴ λέξις rather than ἀγωνιστικὴ λέξις (Brut. 289). Although Latin Atticism is not much heard from after Cicero’s attacks in the Brutus and Orator, the lasting legacy of Caesar’s prose, the influence of later Atticists such as Asinius Pollio and Messala Corvinus, and that of other purists such as Sallust is not to be underestimated. More effective than Cicero’s criticisms in these theoretical works was the impact of his oratorical production, which supplied Latin literature with the *reiche, vorbildliche Kunstprosa* it had lacked.

From its beginnings in Naevius and Ennius, Latin literature had been a project of translating Greek works into Latin. These translations followed the strategy of domestication, which seeks to accommodate and assimilate foreign concepts to the target language. By adopting Attic style as a model for Latin prose, Roman Atticists continued this process of domestication. It was part of a classicizing movement, a project in cultural translation that adopted Attic models in philosophy, art, and other domains. This was not blind imitation: “being in the role of pupils for centuries, the Romans learned to make forms, ideas, or values from the Greek tradition entirely their own and to adapt them so as to make them means of expressing their own experiences and their own ideas in their own language, in a manner which gave them validity beyond the historical situation to which they belonged.” (Dihle, A. 1994, 44f.)

114 By contrast with foreignization, which tends to calque the syntax and transliterate the vocabulary of the source language to emphasize the gulf separating the two idioms.
This project of cultural translation emerged in an atmosphere of bilingualism; the Greek language had been assimilated by the Roman elite, and Rome itself was a center of Greek learning. Licinius Crassus, the proconsul to Asia in 131 BC who spoke five Greek dialects, was exceptional, but Rome’s status as a center of Greek learning in the first century BC reflects the importance of Greek to the Roman elite. The princeps himself promoted such cultural translation, as illustrated by Suetonius’s anecdote of his final days on the Bay of Naples, when Augustus distributed gifts to his companions, on the condition that the Romans should dress and speak as Greeks, and that the Greeks should dress and speak as Romans (Aug. 98).115 As Wallace-Hadrill argues, this ritual symbolized the longstanding contact between Greeks and Romans at Rome, not so much a process of Hellenization as a profound bilingualism that found expression in characteristic areas of public and private life (Wallace-Hadrill, A. 1998, 79). For Momigliano “it was precisely the Roman willingness to master Greek, unreciprocated by Greeks, that allowed them to transform into a world power.” (Momigliano 1975, 38) The contribution of Greek teachers was as indispensable as the docility of their Roman students: it was “the cooperation of Greek intellectuals with Italian politicians and writers in creating a new bilingual culture which gave sense to life under Roman rule.” (Momigliano 1975, 1)

The Atticist/Asianist controversy itself reflected the Roman experience of the schools of Athens and Asia Minor; Rhodes in particular was a point of convergences for Roman and Greeks students and teachers including Tyrannion, Aelius Stilo, Cicero, Caesar, Dionysius Thrax, Posidonius. But at least from the eighth century Rome itself was in contact with the Greek world (Cornell 1995, 86 ff.); after Pydna and Corinth Rome became a Greek intellectual center. Abortive attempts to establish monolingual training in Latin rhetoric at Rome in the 90’s BC showed the

115 The plain and direct style of Augustus’s writing as described by Suetonius suggests that he was something of an Atticist; he criticized Antonius for Asianism, as Tiberius would criticize Augustus in turn for κακοζηλία (Suet., Aug. 86).
importance of the Greek language to education at Rome (Schmidt, P. 1975). Heliodorus, known to us only by Horace’s description as “Graecorum longe doctissimus” (Serm. I.5.3), was but one of many Greek teachers who thronged Rome in the first century.

Parthenius of Alexandria was the intellectual guide of the neoteric movement in poetry. Scholars have conjectured that other Greek intellectuals played a similar role in the emergence of Atticism. Wilamowitz suggests that Apollodorus of Pergamum, teacher of Augustus and the Atticists Dionysius of Pergamum and Caecilius of Caleacte, played an important role in Greek Atticism (Wilamowitz-Moellendorf 1900, 46). Albrecht Dihle sees Philoxenus of Alexandria as the leading figure in Latin Atticism, in part because his theory of etymology has affinities with the analogical element evident in the Atticism of Brutus, Calvus, and Caesar (Dihle, A. 1977; Bowersock 1979, 63). Philoxenus argued that all Greek vocabulary derived from one-syllable roots, by contrast with the Stoic view of ὀνόματα as the basis of language. He and Trypho developed the method of explaining dialectal variation through pathology (Blank 1982, 42; Wackernagel 1876). Philoxenus was one of several Greek grammarians, including Hypsicrates of Amisus and Tyrannio, who saw Latin as a Greek dialect akin to Aeolic (Wisse, J. 1995, 79; Rawson 1985, 69; Fögen 2000, 49–51).

The concept of a prestige dialect may be taken to the extreme of suggesting that a single dialect is the basis for all forms of the language. Aristarchus of Alexandria had argued that Homer was the primordial form of the Greek language (Dihle, A. 1977); his student Aristonicus argued that Homer was an Athenian, and thus that most important Greek literature was Attic (Friedländer 1853). Philoxenus argued on the basis of analogy that Attic was in fact the original form of the Greek language (Theodorides 1976, frgs. 339, 353). Trypho likewise made an analogical argument for the preeminence of the Attic dialect (Velsen 1965; Dihle, A. 1992, 1173).
The most influential figure in the rise of Greek Atticism was Dionysius of Halicarnassus, together with his friend Caecilius of Caleacte. Caecilius compiled treatises entitled κατὰ Φρονήμα καὶ τίνι διαφέρει ο̣ Αττικὸς ἔξλος το̣ Ασιανοῦ, and was perhaps the first Greek to discuss Latin style in his celebrated comparison of Demosthenes and Cicero, a theme soon taken up again by “Longinus.” Dionysius arrived in Rome about 30 BC. His magnum opus is a Roman history in Greek, the Antiquitātes Romanae, where he mentions his mastery of the Latin dialect: διάλεκτον τινον βαράθρων τῆς Ἀσίας ἐχθές καὶ πρῶτην ἄφικμένη. Мισή ἤ Φρονίμα τις ἢ Καρικόν τι κακόν, unphilosophical and unrestrained, like a chaste Athenian matron supplanted by an Asiatic harlot.116 But Dionysius does not yield to deplorism. ο̣ καθ’ ἡμᾶς χρόνος, he says, ἀπέδωκε τῇ μὲν ἀρχαίᾳ καὶ σώφρονι ὑπεροκίᾳ τὴν δικαίαν τιμήν (2.7-8). The cause of this restoration is the ascendancy of Rome, and her enlightened and learned rulers with their concern for the general welfare, who have fostered the sensible part of each city under Roman rule, and compelled the foolish to be rational: αἰτία δ’ οἴμαι καὶ ἀρχή τῆς τοσσαύτης μεταβολῆς ἐγένετο ἢ πάντων κρατοῦσα Ῥώμη πρὸς ἐαυτὴν ἀναγκάζουσα τὰς ὅλας πόλεις ἀποβλέπειν καὶ ταύτης δὲ αὐτῆς οἱ δυναστεύόντες κατ’ ἀρετὴν καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ κρατίστου τά κοινά διοικοῦντες, εὑραίδευτοι πάνω καὶ γενναίοι τάς κρίσεις γενόμενοι, ύστ’ ἄν κοιμούμενον τὸ τε φρόνιμον

116 ἢ μὲν ἐλευθέρα καὶ σώφρων γαμητή κάθηται μηδενός οὐσα τῶν αὐτῆς κυρία, ἑταῖρα δὲ τις ἄφωρον ἐπὶ ὀλέθρῳ τοῦ βίου παραδόσα πάσης ἀξίως τῆς οὐσίας ἄρχειν, σκυβαλίζουσα καὶ δεδιπτομένη τὴν ἐτέραν.
result is nothing less than an incipient literary renaissance among both Greeks and Romans.117

His purpose in the *de antiquis oratoribus* is to set forth the notable ancient speakers and their predilections both in life and in oratory, and to show what in their example is to be emulated or avoided.118 Following the Stoic tradition also evident e.g. in Sallust, Dionysius sees a relation between moral conduct and rhetorical style. He chooses six orators in particular as his models: Lysias, Isocrates, Isaeus, Demosthenes, Hyperides, and Aeschines.119

The movement to restore the Attic Muse, as Dionysius describes it, has been going on for some time already among both Greeks and Romans. He either is referring to the Atticist movement in both Greek and Latin, or to the restoration of Attic dialect among Greeks and Greek-speaking Romans. German scholars have generally seen the Atticist movement as originally Greek. Bowersock, however, argues that the Atticism of Calvus was transmitted to Dionysius through his patron Q. Aelius Tubero (Bowersock 1979, 67 ff.), and Kennedy also sees Latin Atticism as formative for Dionysius (Kennedy 1972, 242, 351 ff.). Wisse argues that the movement was Roman from its inception (Wisse, J. 1995).

The principle of *mimesis* was of course deeply-rooted in Greek oratory and *paideia*.

117 τοιχάρτου πολλαί μὲν ἰστιορεῖ σπουδῆς ἄξιαι γράφονται τοῖς νόμις, πολλοὶ δὲ λόγοι πολιτικοὶ χαρίζοντες ἐκφέρονται φιλόσοφοι τε συντάξεις οὐ μᾶ Δία εὐκαταφρόνητοι ἄλλα τε πολλαὶ καὶ καλαὶ πραγματεῖαι καὶ Ρωμαῖοι καὶ Ἕλληνες καὶ μέλλων διεσπούδασμέναι προσθηκήσαντι τε καὶ προελεύσονται κατὰ τὸ εἰκός. (3.9-14)

118 τίνες εἰσιν ἀξιολογοῦσα τῶν ἄρχων ῥητόρων τε καὶ συγγραφέων καὶ τίνες αὐτῶν ἐγένοντο προορισμοὶ τοῦ τε βίου καὶ τῶν λόγων καὶ τί παρ’ ἐκάστου δεῖ λαμβάνειν ἢ φυλάττεσθαι (4.9-12).

119 ἔσονται δὲ οἱ παραλαμβανόμενοι ῥήτορες τρεῖς μὲν ἐκ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, Λυσίας Ἰσοκράτης Ἰσαίας, τρεῖς δὲ ἐκ τῶν ἐπαικμασάντων τούτως, Δημοσθένης Ὑπερείδης Ἀισχύνης, οὓς ἐγὼ τῶν ἄλλων ἠγούμαι κρατίστους (4.28-4.32).
As Flashar observes, “die klassizistische Theorie der Mimesis... steht zu allererst in der Tradition der rhetorischen *imitatio* von Stilvorbildern, deren Wurzeln schon bei den Rednern des 4. Jhdts. liegen... Aber diese Gedanken sind nicht systematisiert, es gibt noch keine Theorie der Mimesis im Sinne einer stilistischen oder gedanklichen *imitatio* literarischer Vorbilder.” (Flashar 1979, 83 f.) The exemplary status of Attic orators was recognized by their contemporaries. Phaedrus’ study of Lysias has already been mentioned. Clearches’ *σύγκρωσις* between Isocrates and Demosthenes by Cleochares (RE XI 672f.) takes for granted that their works were being imitated (Dihle, A. 1957, 176); third-century papyri give examples of schoolboy efforts at emulation (Jander 1913). But models of Attic style were not systematized until after Aristophanes of Byzantium and Aristarchus had established the canon of ten orators on a philological basis (Flashar 1979, 84). Arguments about Atticistic rules must have arisen already in Alexandria (Slater, W. J. 1976, 241). Norden sought to date Atticism as early as 200 BC on the basis of stylistic criticism by the Alexandrian Agatharchides and the Pergamene Neanthes (Norden 1923, I.150). Isocrates already gave μίμησις pride of place against the Protagorean trinity of φύσις, ἀσκησις, and ἐπιστήμη/τέχνη that was transmitted through the Peripatetics to Cicero through Philo and Antiochus; from the moment λέξις was taken up by rhetorical theory it too was understood as subject to *imitatio* (Dihle, A. 1957, 175).

What sets Greek Atticism beginning with Dionysius apart is its programmatic and didactic character. The *Praefatio* makes it clear that Dionysius aims at nothing less than a restoration of the Attic dialect, “eine durchgehende Repristinierung der ganzen Schriftsprache” (Dihle, A. 1977, 164); the pedagogical function of *de antiquis rhetoribus* is to help bring that about. As William Slater puts it, Atticism emerged from the didactic application of Alexandrian κρίσις. Although Isocrates and Demosthenes had always been important to rhetorical education, Dionysius was the first to advocate the “deliberate and conscious imitation of qualities learned
by historically sophisticated study.” (Kennedy 1972, 354) Rather than the occasional imitation of Attic authors, as Hegesias himself had professed to emulate Lysias, correct Attic usage was established as the only legitimate form of oratory. For the first time since Ionic was the genre of medicine, ethnography, and philosophy in the sixth and fifth centuries, the principle of a genre-specific *Kunstsprache* that had ruled Greek poetry from the beginning was applied systematically to literary prose (Dihle, A. 1977, 163).

By Cicero’s account, Calvus took as his models only Lysias and Hyperides. Dionysius, by contrast, names six orators worthy of emulation. As Nassal showed, in this respect Dionysius’s doctrine of imitation is close to that of Cicero (Nassal 1910). In the *Brutus* Cicero argues that Attic rhetoric includes more styles than the Atticist *genus tenue*. Similarly, at *de oratore* 2.90.5 Cicero urges emulators not to single out conspicuous or obvious features for imitation. In fragment 31.1 from the *de imitatione* Dionysius offers the parable of the painter Zeuxis, who created an image of Helen by gathering all the women of Croton and choosing the most beautiful feature of each (Perry 2002, 158 ff.). Since *imitatio* must always fall short of any one prototype, it is better to assimilate many worthy models. This makes possible the latter of the two kinds of *mimesis* Dionysius identifies—δύο τρόπους τῆς διαφοράς ὡς πρός τὰ ἀρχαία μιμήσεως—σὲ ἕκ ποτε lacks the grace of its ἀρχέτυπος, the other *φυσικός* is based on experience and long exposure (*de Dinarcho* 7).

Greek Atticism involved selection from a vast literature; it was not concerned with style so much as word choice. Lexicography played the role in Greek Atticism that grammar did among the Latins. Greek rhetoric, unlike Latin, had developed independently of grammar. Gorgias and Isocrates were concerned with πρέπον and κατασκευή, not ἐλληνισμός and σαφήνεια. Systematic discussion of λέξις in Greek begins with Aristotle (*Rhetorica* III) and Theophrastus,
after the Greek rhetorical tradition was established. The Academic rhetoric of Philo and Antiochus represented by Cicero in de oratore seems to have held grammar superfluous beyond the elementary level of schooling; the orator needs only a ordinary mastery of language (3.37, 3.150). For Greek Atticism grammar was helpful in education and analysis, but it did not play the formative role it did in Latin (Dihle, A. 1957, 172). From the beginning Greek Atticists relied on lexicography. The first Atticist lexicon, Ἀττικὰ ὀνόματα, was composed by Irenaeus of Alexandria, also known as Minucius Pacatus.

Peter Burke classifies modern European puristic languages as either transformative and progressive, aiming at a kind of separatism through standardization, or defensive and conservative, seeking to conserve the existing language out of fear of contamination (Burke, P. 2004). In these terms Latin purism might be called transformative, since it looked forward to the development of a new literature on the basis of a standard language; Greek Atticism was more defensive, seeking to reclaim and restore an established standard. A striking parallel can be found in the literary revival of Biblical Hebrew at this same time (Schürer 1979, 26). Greek purism involved what Dihle calls an Epigonenbewußtsein, by contrast with Latin purism, whose "effect on language was not to freeze it, but to clarify it and make it vigorous." (Kennedy 1972, 242)

Atticism, in Gelzer’s formulation, is the Leitmotiv of classicism (Gelzer 1979, 2). It epitomized the return to chaste and classic models characteristic of the Augustan age. The return to models from a distant past and the renunciation of intervening degeneration are the defining movements of

120 Thomas offers a more detailed taxonomy of purisms: archaising, ethnographic, elitist, reformist, playful, xenophobic, and anti-purism (Thomas 1991, 75–81). An example of the latter is Psycharis’s demoticism.
classicism. It divides history into three ages: a glorious past, decline, and contemporary restoration.\textsuperscript{1} Peculiar to Atticism was the rescue of an Athenian past from Asian decadence by Greek and Latin-speaking Romans.

The first century BC saw a return to Athenian models in philosophy and the visual arts as well. Antiochus of Ascalon attempted a refoundation of the Old Academy and a return to the teachings of Plato; Andronicus of Rhodes revived the Peripatos and published rediscovered texts of Aristotle.\textsuperscript{2} In epigraphy early Athenian letter forms were revived in the Augustan period.\textsuperscript{3} Preisshofen takes the classicizing movement in sculpture ca. 150 BC as evidence for an early dating of Atticism.\textsuperscript{4} Fullerton dates the beginnings of Neo-Attic sculpture to well into the first century BC, a date more coincident with the literary movement. Zanker’s study of Augustan iconography shows many parallels with contemporary Atticism (Zanker, P. 1988a). For Zanker the Roman adoption of Greek models was not merely aesthetic but the deliberate outcome of a lengthy acculturation through which Greek forms came to express a Roman message. Revival of

\textsuperscript{1}\textsuperscript{Gelzer and Wisse discuss the tripartite division of history implicit in Atticism (Gelzer 1979, 9–12; Wisse, J. 1995, 71); this is no different from what Voegelin regards as the characteristically modern division of history into three ages (Voegelin 1952, 111 ff.).

\textsuperscript{2}\textsuperscript{Hahm and Sedley have both recently published on the revival of classical philosophy at this time (Hahm 2007; Sedley 2003). Kennedy observes that the unphilosophical character of Hellenistic rhetoric decried in Dionysius’s praefatio went along with Hellenistic philosophy’s rejection of rhetoric; this separation led to stylistic excess in the schools and the corruption of prose style that was to be remedied by the Stoic appreciation for diction and simplicity (Kennedy 1972, 351)

\textsuperscript{3}\textsuperscript{(Bowersock 1979, 73; Raubitschek 1949, 147 ff; Wilhelm 1909, 29; Graindor 1927, 147).

\textsuperscript{4}\textsuperscript{Cf. Pliny, Nat. 34.49-52 (Preisshofen 1979; Wisse, J. 1995, 72).
the Roman *mos maiorum* went together with the revival of Greek classical models. An Attic and Apollonian Augustus contrasted with the Dionysian and Asiatic Antonius. Intemperate eastern barbarians were a favorite subject of early imperial art (Zanker, P. 1988b, 8). Classicism was concerned with morality as much as aesthetics.

The conscious emulation of classical Greek models in Latin literature led to the development within two generations of a body of literature that was recognized to have classical status. T.S. Eliot sees Virgil’s *Aeneid* as a more classical work than its Homeric models, precisely because its language and mind is more mature (Eliot 1975). Caesar’s puristic vocabulary has long been recognized as exemplary. Already in the next century Velleius Paterculus looks back to the literary canon of late Republican and early imperial Rome as to a golden age. Because Rome lacked a classical past Romans were obliged to emulate Greek models; “succeeding years revealed that the Ciceronian and Augustan ages were themselves the long desired classical time.” (Bowersock 1979, 74)

------------------------------------

5 Consulatui Ciceronis non mediocre adiecit decus natus eo anno diuus Augustus, abhinc annos LXXXII, omnibus omnium gentium uiris magnitudine sua inducturus caliginem. Iam paene superuacaneum uideri potest eminentium ingeniorum notare tempora. Quis enim ignorat diremptos gradibus aetatis floruisse hoc tempore Ciceronem, Hortensium, antequae Crassum, Cottam, Sulpicium, moxque Brutum, Calidium, Caelium, Caluum et proximum Ciceroni Caesarum, eorumque uelut alumnos, Coruinum ac Pollionem Asinum, aemulumque Thucydidis Sallustium, auctoresque carminum Varronem ac Lucretium nequeullo in suspecti operis sui carmine minorem Catullum? *Historia Romana* 2.36.
By assimilating the Greek past to Rome classicism helped forge a new polity that was open to both Greeks and Romans. For all its pretensions to restoring the *res publica*, the principate was neither the old Roman Republic, nor was it a Hellenistic kingdom. Greek *paideia* became part of a new Roman identity which afforded *droit de cité* to both Greeks and Romans on the basis of participation in an imaginary shared past. Hellenism came to represent an ideal by which Romans could aspire to become Greeks in the full cultural sense (Whitmarsh 2005, 14), just as a schoolboy could aspire to mastery of Attic Greek. The attraction of this ideal should not be underestimated. Zanker has shown how the visual language of Augustan propaganda worked not, as Syme’s chapter “The Organisation of Opinion” might suggest (Syme 1960, 459–475), by simple imposition of a state apparatus, but by a sort of dialogue to which Augustus’s admirers contributed as much as the *princeps* himself (Zanker, P. 1988b, 3); Simon Price shows how imperial cult spread in the east by popular response to the new regime (Price 1984). By making the Athenian past the common possession of all Romans, Atticism made Hellenes of Romans whom Greeks might consider barbarous, and lent prestige to those whom Romans might have seen as *Graeculi*. The Orientalism of its day, Asianism offered the unifying *Feindbild* of an ancient Persian enemy. Atticism was taught throughout the empire, and some of its most brilliant exponents came from Asia Minor. Aristides’s recomposition of Isocrates’s *Panegyricus* illustrates this Romanization of the Athenian past--while Athenian hegemony was understood as a harbinger of Rome, and panhellenism gave way to imperial universalism, the Attic dialect remained the model for Greek speech (Saïd 2006).

Atticist writers preferred to read literature that would improve their own power of expression; even Plato was often read as a model of style. One result was the loss of most Hellenistic prose, with the exception of some scientific works and Polybius, whose Roman history in Greek remained compelling. Attic *mimesis* dominated shool teaching so that even mundane writing might be composed in the writer’s approximation of Attic idiom.
The separation of spoken and written language seems to have deepened through the imperial period as Atticism came to dominate all levels of education. The Attic model was so pervasive that even authors such as Plutarch, Galen, and Lucian who criticized Atticist pretensions did so in puristic Greek. By the second century AD Atticist orators such as Aelius Aristides would themselves become model authors; had there been a Philostratus in the first century this development might not appear so characteristic of the Second Sophistic.

Simon Swain has studied how Atticist usage, correlated with education, became a marker of elite identity during the Second Sophistic (Swain, S. 1996); there was a social danger to the use of barbarisms and solecisms, as illustrated by Philostratus’ anecdote of Philagrus who let slip an unattested word and then claimed himself as its authority (Vitae 578K) (Whitmarsh 2005, 33f, 43). Even Christians such as Isidore of Pelusium, who characterized pagan Greek paideia as the mistaken path of Atticism (Ep. 4.28), wrote in puristic Greek, and the Church Fathers were classicizers to greater or lesser degree (Fabricius 1967).

Far from replicating Attic Greek of the fourth century BC, writers inevitably varied greatly in their approximation of the Atticist ideal. Although Polybius and the κοινή of early Christian writings may be closest to the spoken vernacular, few texts do not betray evidence for the spoken language at some level. By the same token puristic usage in oratory and liturgy must have in turn affected the vernacular. Recent scholars have abandoned the hunt for Atticisms exemplified by Schmid’s Attizismus in pursuit of a more systematic understanding of Greek usage in this
A broad spectrum of puristic and vernacular usage has characterized the Greek language through Byzantine up to modern times.

In the Latin West Renaissance humanism fostered a puristic movement comparable to Atticism. The Latin language turn, as Ann Moss describes it, replaced the technical metalanguage of scholastic philosophy with a humanistic metalanguage modelled on ancient authors (Moss 2003). The humanists stigmatized mediaeval Latin as barbaric, and reformed Latin usage by means of a rhetorical and pedagogical programme comparable to that of Dionysius of Halicarnassus. Schoolboys were taught to read, write, and speak as though they belonged to the speech community as Cicero, Horace, and Virgil, the res publica litterarum. Strict Ciceronians like Longolius contended with more eclectic writers such as Erasmus and Politian; Terence Tunberg has shown that much of what passed for Ciceronianism was restricted to the lexical level, to calques and set phrases (Tunberg 1997; Croll 1969).

---

6 Including Higgins, Anlauf, Zilliacus, Frösén, Horrocks, Brixhe (Higgins 1945; Anlauf 1960; Zilliacus 1967; Frösén 1974; Horrocks, G. C. 1997; Brixhe, C. 1993); studies based on individual authors include Schmid, Psaltes, Böhil, Weierholt (Schmid 1887; Psaltes 1913; Weierholt 1963).

7 Among many studies on Attic usage in Byzantium see Dagron and Aujac (Dagron 1969; Aujac 1975).

8 This puristic controversy continued until “Galileo demonstrated that the language of nature is mathematics. That shift created an even bigger chasm than the one that Latin humanists had opened up between themselves and the language world of late medieval Latin. From now on, language, whatever its idiom, ceased to be a fully adequate medium for grasping the truths of science.” (Moss 2003, 279)
Humanistic Latin developed as a vehicle for the assimilation of the classical past in Renaissance Europe; it reflects the Renaissance preoccupation with the possibilities and limits of cultural translation. Similarly Atticism arose out of the Roman encounter with Hellenism; the frame of classicism made possible Roman assimilation of Greek achievements in art and literature. Developed as a tool for the analysis of texts, Alexandrian κρισις transmitted in Atticist lexica became the foundation for the active appropriation of Athenian language and thought by Greek-speaking Romans.
An Atticist, lexicographer, and poet prominent around 200 AD has gone unmentioned in the voluminous scholarship that P.A. Brunt calls “the bubble of the Second Sophistic.” (Brunt 1994) His name is Philemon; a rival of the tutor of Marcus Aurelius, polymath Alexander of Cotyaeum, he is discussed by Porphyry, Choeroboscus, Eustathius, and the *Etymologica*. The remains of Philemon’s work, identified in the nineteenth century, have not been studied since then. Examination of his work may be instructive for the history of Atticism and lexicography.

In 1898 Leopold Cohn identified a small excerpt from a lexicon published at the end of Reitzenstein’s *Geschichte der griechischen Etymologika* (Reitzenstein 1897, 392–396) as the work of an Atticist lexicographer called Philemon (Cohn 1898). The fragments in *Vindobonensis phil. gr.* 172 represent brief excerpts from a lexicon. There are 132 fragments, ranging over the whole alphabet from Ἄπαντησαι to Ὑχόους. The fragments are alphabetized only by the first letter.
Friedrich Osann had published a volume in 1821 entitled *Philemonis grammatici quae supersunt*, including two works attributed to Philemon: a λεξικον τεχνολογικόν, and an appendix entitled *Locutionum Atticarum Philemonis nomine inscriptarum fragmentum*, taken from the fourteenth-century *Codex Laurentianus 91 super. 10* (Osann 1821). Cohn had established that the principal text, the λεξικον τεχνολογικόν, was a late forgery by Jacob Diassorinos (Cohn 1888). The appendix represents only a fragment of Philemon’s work, covering the first four letters of the alphabet, but each of the first four letters is covered in greater detail than in the Vienna manuscript. There are 141 fragments ranging from ἀφέιλετο to δείλης, alphabetized only to the first letter.

In the introduction to his publication of Thomas Magister’s *Ecloga vocum Atticarum* (Ritschl 1832) Ritschl observed that this fourteenth-century lexicographer had relied on Philemon’s text: *itaque quum nunc Philemonem voco, non cogito de lexici technologici scriptore, sed illud dico, cuius fragmentum lexici quoddam ex libro Laurentiano descriptum Osannus p. 287 sqq. posuit. Quod etsi specie est vilissimum, tamen manifestum est excerptum ex ampliore esse... Ex illis igitur vocibus, quas Philemoni tribuimus, etsi aliae apud alios grammaticos dispersae reperiuntur, omnis tamen dubitatio dirimitur eo, quod in illius lexici fragmento connuncta extant universae* (Ritschl 1832, LXXV-LXXVI). Thomas used a much abbreviated epitome of Philemon, in its range however closer to the *Laurentianus* than to the *Vindobonensis*.9

9Reitzenstein discusses Thomas’s use of Philemon without identifying Philemon by name (Reitzenstein 1897, 390): “Thomas benutzt sowohl die beiden Schriften Herodians und das Phrynichos -Excerpt, als auch in umfassendstem Maße den zwischen beiden im Vindobon. 172 erhaltenen neuen Traktat, der allerdings in vielen Glossen noch vollständiger war, als ihn die junge Handschrift uns bietet, die jambische Form aber im wesentlichen wohl schon verloren
Just as Thomas copied selections from Philemon together with passages from the lexica of Phrynichus, Moeris, Ammonius, and others, so too the Codex Laurentianus fragment published by Osann appears in between folios drawn from Moeris and Phrynichus.

Philemon’s importance to the Atticistic and lexicographical tradition has been recognized by Wendel, Hansen, and Alpers (Wendel, C. 1938; Hansen, D. U. 1998, 40–42; Alpers 1981, 113f.), but no study of his work has appeared since Cohn’s article 110 years ago. Philemon is not included in the TLG.

Other Philemons

One reason Philemon remains an obscure figure even in the field of lexicography is the fact that various persons of the same name are attested as poets, scholars, and glossographers.

The nasal suffix -μων in the proper name Φιλήμων and in many other nouns such as ἡγεμῶν, κηδεμῶν, πλεύμων, and χειμῶν, goes back to PIE; in Greek it formed agentive nouns that derive from verbs or are related to neuter nouns ending in -μα.10 The noun φίλημα is first found in

hatte. Er benutzt sogar die Bemerkung des Redactors dieser συλλογή zu der Vorschrift des neuen Traktates über die Formen "Ηω, ἡωα, ἡωες, nur dafs er sie etwas besser mit dem Hauptteil verbindet (vgl. Thom. Mag. 169, 6 Ri., Phryn. 158, 1 Lo. und die unten abgedruckte Bemerkung)."

10Dérivés en -men-, -mon-, -mni (Chantraine 1933, 174): "morphe d’origine indo-européenne, il a fourni en grec des noms d’agents en liaison, d’une part avec des neutres en -μα, d’autre part avec
Aeschylus, but the derivative form φιλήµοσύνη (Chantraine 1933, 174) found at Theognis 284 shows that it is older. Since the noun means osculum/basium Forcellini interprets the name Φιλήµον as quasi sit basiator (Forcellini, Furlanetto, Corradini, et al. 1940, VI.473), but the Etymologicum magnum (p. 259.57) interprets the adjective φιλήµον as deverbal: Δειδήµον: Παρά τὸ δειδῶ δειδήσω, δειδήµον, ὡς φιλῶ φιλήσω, φιλήµον. This more plausible interpretation gives the proper name the connotation “kindly, affectionate.”

Philemon is a typically but not exclusively Attic name. The PHI database of Greek inscriptions yields 161 matches for the nominative form Φιλήµον, of which 76 are in Attica, though many of the others may in fact be Attic persons. Out of 203 separate persons with this name identified by the Lexicon of Greek Personal Names 102 are in Attica. The earliest attestations of the name are in Attica, three persons in the fifth century, and thirteen in the fourth and third centuries.

des racines verbaux. Quelques-uns de ces dérivés sont entrés dans le trésor commun du vocabulaire grec: γνώµον, ἡγεµόν, etc... mais d’une manière générale le suffixe semble avoir été peu productif en prose et ce sont surtout les poètes qui en ont tiré parti. Dans ces limites, il a connu une certaine fortune et il a fourni encore des formations nouvelles dans la poésie et dans l’Anthologie. Dans la κοινή le suffixe athématique -µόν/-µον- n’est plus productif et en grec moderne il a disparu.”

11Brunck (Brunck 1784) reads συνηµµοσύνη.
12http://epigraphy.packhum.org/inscriptions/
13(Fraser, et al. 1987) For other regions the totals are as follows: Aegean Islands, Cyprus, and Cyrenaica (23); Peloponnese, western Greece, Sicily, and Magna Graecia (23); central Greece, from the Megarid to Thessaly (14); Macedonia, Thrace, and northern shores of the Black Sea (16); coastal Asia Minor, including Pontos and Ionia (23; provisional number).
14The name is attested in the fourth-third centuries at Eretria (3), Thasos (2), Thyrreion in Akarnania, Pallantion in Arkadia, Apollonia, Epidamnos, Syracuse, Amphipolis, Olbia, and
In Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* the name Philemon belongs to the pious Phrygian temple-keeper and husband of Baucis, a rustic exemplar of φιλοξενία who receives Zeus and Hermes when others turn them away (VIII 611-724; RE 1).

The name Φιλήμων is associated with several Athenian comic poets. Aristophanes alludes to τοῦ γένους Φιλημώνος (*Aves* 763); a comic actor Philemon (RE 10) is attested in the fourth century. Three poets with this name produced comedies at Athens. The most prominent poet of New Comedy after Menander and alongside Diphilos was called Philemon (RE 7); he was apparently more successful on the stage than Menander, though less popular with posterity. The son of Damon of Syracuse, his first Dionysiac victory was attested in 327 BC. Plautus adapted several of his works: the *Mercator* is based on the Ἐμπαρος, the *Trinummus* on the Ὑπαυγός, and

Thrace.

15Other notable persons who bore the name include an Athenian archon in the year 158/59 and στρατηγὸς ἐπὶ τὰ ὅπλα in 167/8 (RE 2); a praefectus of Ptolemy I (RE 3); a slave of Caesar executed for conspiring against him (RE 4); a freedman of T. Vinius who saved him during the proscriptions of 43 BC (RE 5); a Roman priest and addressee of letters by Dionysius of Alexandria (RE 6); a stonemason in Lycia ca. 100 BC (RE 18), and the Augustan carver of a sardonyx in the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna showing Theseus with the dead Minotaur (RE 19).


17(Adler 1928, IV.722): (327.) Φιλήμων, Συρακούσιος, νιὸς Δάμωνος, καὶ αὐτὸς κωμικὸς τῆς νέας κωμῳδίας, ἥκμαζεν ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρου βασιλείας, βραχεὶ Μενάνδρου πρότερος, ἐγραψε δὲ κωμῳδίας πρὸς θ’ καὶ ἐβίωσεν ἐτη 90’. εἰσὶ δὲ οἱ λέγουσιν α’ καὶ θ’ ἐτελεύτησε δὲ ὑπὸ σφοδροῦ γέλωτος.
the *Mostellaria* on the Φάσμα. Out of Philemon’s (*RE* 7) 97 plays only 198 fragments survive, over 40% of which come from Stobaeus’s anthology.

This poet’s son was also a writer of Athenian comedy, also named Philemon (*RE* 8).\(^{18}\) Four of his victories are commemorated on a monument dated to 279/78; he apparently won two more. Körte observes (*RE* 8) “Es ist auffallend, daß ein in seiner Zeit so erfolgreicher Dichter außer von Suidas nur zweimal literarisch erwähnt wird: Athen. VII 291d leitet neun Verse eines philosophierenden Kochs mit den Worten ein ὁ δὲ παρὰ τῷ νεωτέρῳ Φιλήμονι μάγειρος διδασκαλικὸς τις εἶναι θέλει und Stob. ecl. IV 38, 6 zitiert zwei, vielleicht auch vier, Verse Φιλήμονος νεωτερον.”

A didascalic inscription of comedies performed at the Dionysia in the second century BC names a second Φιλήμων νεώτερος or -τατος) whose Μιλήσια finished sixth in the Dionysian contest of 183 BC (*IG II^2^ 2325 line 85). He may have been of the same family as the other two homonymous poets (*RE* 9).\(^{19}\)

Sometime before 77 AD a Greek geographer named Philemon (*RE* 11) wrote a work entitled Περιπλοῦς τῆς ἔκτος θαλάττης or Περὶ Ωκεανοῦ, an account of the seas, islands, and coasts of northern Europe based on Tiberius’ expedition to Jutland in the year 5. His work mentioned Ireland, Scandinavia, and the Cimbri of Jutland.

----


Besides Philemon the Atticist (RE 14) several Philemons are on record as glossographers or grammarians: a Homer scholar of the third and second centuries BC mentioned by Didymus, perhaps of the Pergamene school (RE 12); Philemon Αἰξωνεύς (Ἀθηναῖος) from the deme Aixone, author of a a lost treatise Περὶ Ἀττικῶν ὁνομάτων ἢ γλώσσων, and often cited by Athenaeus (RE 13; ca. 200 BC); the author of a Λεξικών τεχνολογικόν (RE 16), now identified as Jacobus Diassorinus (Cohn 1888); a grammarian who is supposed to have taught Latin to the young C. Iulius Verus Maximus (RE 15)20; and a Latin lexicographer of the third century (RE 17).

The Byzantine teacher George Choeroboscus is the source, both directly and indirectly, for much of what we know about Philemon the author of our lexicon. Although Choeroboscus was long dated to the sixth century, more recent scholarship places him in the ninth century.21 His

20 The unreliable Hist. aug. Maximin. 27 says that the the young Maximinus grammatico Latino usus est Filemone.
21 (Kaster 1988, 395f.) “A date for C in s.IX 1/2 has now been established by Theodoridis, “Hymnograph,” who notes C’s citations of the hymnograph Clemens and of Andreas Peras. Bühler and Theodoridis, ”Johannes von Damaskos,” already inferred a term. p. q. of s.VIII 1/2 from C’s knowledge of the Κανόνες of John the Damascene; likewise earlier Papadopulos-Kerameus, ”Zur Geschichte,” noted by Alpers, Attizistische Lexikon 91 n. 25. A term. a. q. is implied by the citations of the Ἐπιμερισμοί and Περὶ ὀρθογραφίας in Etym. Gen. and by the excerpts of the scholia to Theodosius in the Περὶ τόνων published by Koster, ”De accentibus,” both compiled sometime in s.IX med. -2/2. This date in turn is consistent with the style οἰκουμενικὸς διδάσκαλος; cf. Speck, Kaiserliche Universität 74ff. (although Speck places C in s. VI); Theodoridis, ”Hymnograph” 344 (Theodoridis, C. 1980). A date in s.IX is also consistent with C’s use of the
commentary on the *Enchiridion* of Hephaistion identifies Philemon the Atticist and gives the title of his work: οὐ γὰρ ἐστίν ἐξεμετρὼν αὐτὸ τὸ πόνημα, ἕνα εἰπώμεν αὐτὸ ὑπὸ τὸ μετρικόν, ὡς τὸ φερόμενον δὲ ἰάμβων Φιλήμονος τοῦ Ἀττικιστοῦ περὶ Ἀττικῆς ἀντιλογίας τῆς ἐν ταῖς λέξεσιν (Hoerschelmann 1989, 36.16; Consbruch 1971, 183.1ff.). This treatise was perhaps unique among Atticist lexica in being composed in iambic trimeters.22

One vestige of the iambic form of the original lexicon was the basis for Cohn’s identification of Philemon the Atticist, mentioned together with the grammarian Tryphon and the prolific Didymus Chalcenterus βιβλιολάθας in a passage of Eustathius.23 The passage—a discussion of Psalter as a grammatical text, which we should hardly expect in the Constantinople of s.VI, and with the form of C.’s name: "Ein Familiename Choiro- ist in den Jahrhunderten 6 und 7 schwer glaublich" (P. Maas, private communication, quoted by Di Benedetto, "Techne" 797 n. 2).” Robins dates Choeroboscus c. 750-825 (Robins 1993, 112).

22As Reitzenstein notes in note 1 supra, few surviving lemmata show traces of iambic meter.
23εἰληφθαί δὲ τὸ λίτη κατὰ τοὺς παλαιώς ἄντι τοῦ ἀπαλῶς, ἢ ἀντὶ τοῦ λιτῆς, ἢ τούναντίον πουκάλω ἐξ ἀντιφράσεως, ὅπερ οἱ Ἀττικοὶ ληδίδον φασὶ τετρασυλλάβως. περὶ οὗ Τρόφιον φησίν, ὡς ἐστὶ λείον λείου, ἐξ οὗ παραγωγῆ διὰ τοῦ διον λείιον διὰ διφθόγγου, ὡς γραφείων, ἀγγείων, καὶ ἐκτάσει τοῦ εἰς η ληδίον σὺν καὶ τῷ προσεγγραμμένῳ κατὰ τὸ εἰκαζὸν ἥκαζον, εἰδεὶν ἥδειν. Φιλήμων δὲ τὸ ληδίον ἐμμηνεύσας εὐτελὲς τυμβῶν ἢ χλαμύδιον παλαιὸν παροξύνει αὐτὸ ὡς τὸ σταμνίον. φησί γὰρ «ὡς σταμνίον δὲ τὴν προσωδίαν λέγω». Δίδυμος δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς οὕτω δοξάζων φησί, ὡς ἄλογός ἐστιν ἢ προπαροξύτων τάσις τοῦ ληδίου, ἐπεὶ αἱ διὰ τοῦ ἵν παραγογαῖ, εἰ μὲν ὁσίν ἐν τριῇ βραχείας, προπαροξύνουσαν τὸ διόν τοῦ τῆς, οἰον, ψιμίον, ὡτίον, ἔτι δὲ καὶ κλειδίον, παιδίον, δαίδιον, οὐ διὰ τοῦ διον ὅτα να νόε ὀὐδὲ ταῦτα, ἀλλὰ διὰ τοῦ ἵν τὸ γὰρ δ τοῦ πρωτοτύπου ἐστίν. εἰ
the orthography and accent of the word ληδιόν--includes the following line attributed to Philemon: ὃς σταμνίον δὲ τὴν προσωπιάν λέγω. This iambic trimeter line "zeigt unwiderleglich" that the Philemon in question is in fact the Atticist mentioned by Choeroboscus and not Philemon Αἰξωνεύς (Cohn 1898, 361f.).

The source of Eustathius’s discussion is indicated, as Cohn observes, by the Etymologica. The Etymologicum genuinum and the Etymologicum magnum cite Philemon as the source for the definition of ληδιόν: EG (84.) Ληδιόν: Φιλήμων. σημαίνει εὐτελές τριβόνιον ἢ χλανίδιον παλαιόν. ζήτει εἰς τὴν Ἀκτίνα Γεωργίου. The phrase εἰς τὴν ἀκτίνα refers the reader to the Orthographia of Choeroboscus for a more detailed account of Philemon’s treatment of the word οὖν, φησίν, ἐν τῷ ληδιόν δακτυλικὴ ἢ λεξις, δῆλον ὡς πρὸ μιᾶς ὄφειλεν ἔχειν τὸν τόνον. καὶ οὕτω παροξύνεθαι θελήσας τὸ ληδιόν ὁ Δίδυμος ἀποστειρεῖ αὐτὸ καὶ τοῦ κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν προσγεγραμμένου 1. ἐπεῖ, φησί, λῆδος τὸ πρωτότυπον, ὃ Δωριεὶς λάδος φασίν, ὡς Ἀλκμάν «Λάδος εἰμένα καλόν», ὁ ἐστι ληδιόν ἐνδεδυμένη εὐειδές. ἀπὸ γοῦν τοῦ λήδος, φησί, μὴ ἔχοντας τὸ το γεγονός τὸ ληδίον οὐδ’ αὐτὸ ἄν ἔχοι τὸ 1 (van der Valk 1971, IV.190).

24Cf. Etymologicum Magnum Ληδιόν: Φιλήμων φησί σημαίνει εὐτελές χιτώνιον, ἢ χλανίδα παλαιάν. Ζήτει εἰς τὸ ἀκτίνα (Gaisford 1848, 563).

25The first article of the Orthographia is the word ἀκτίς (Cramer 1963 (1835), II.167ff.). All of the Etymologica repeatedly refer the reader to Choeroboscus, e.g. Etymologicum genuinum λ 171 = Etymologicum magnum p. 562 Λειώδης... ζήτει εἰς τὴν Ἀκτίνα. Etymologicum magnum p. 28: Τινὲς δὲ διὰ τῆς Εἰ διφθόγγον χράφθοιον αὐτῷ· οἷον Απ’ αἰγεῖρῳ ἵπποι τρώγοις. Οὕτως ὁ Χοιροβοσκός εἰς τὸ ἀκτίνα. Etymologicum magnum p. 230: Γῆδιον: ... Περὶ δὲ τούτου ζήτει εἰς τὴν ἀκτίνα τοῦ Χοιροβοσκοῦ. Etymologicum Symeonis Ι.116 οὕτως ὁ Χοιροβοσκός εἰς τὴν ἀκτίνα; Ι.180 ὁ δὲ Χοιροβοσκός εἰς τὴν Ὁρθογραφίαν αὐτοῦ, etc.
Thus it appears that the lengthy discussion in Eustathius goes back to Choeroboscus, whether
directly or mediated by the Etymologica. In turn the lemma in the Etymologicum genuinum directly
following Λήδιον (λ84) suggests Choeroboscus’s source: (λ85) Ληδάριον: <σύν τῷ ἰ-
καὶ εἰρήται ἀνωτέρω. Ὡρος ὁ Μελήσιος. Reitzenstein remarks on this passage, “Die
Verweisung muß nach der Stellung des Namens dem Oros selbst gehören...” (Reitzenstein
1897, 294), and Cohn draws the further conclusion: “Wir werden schwerlich fehlgehen, wenn
wir annehmen, daß die Verweisung sich auf den Artikel λήδιον bezieht. Choeroboskos wird also
wohl die ganze Auseinandersetzung über die Ansichten des Tryphon, Philemon und Didymos
aus der Orthographie des Oros entlehnt haben.” (Cohn 1898, 363) This in turn shows the
importance of Philemon and Tryphon as sources for Orus. 28

26 There is no lemma for Λήδιον in the surviving fragments of the Orthographia.
27 s.v. κλείδιον. εἰρήται εἰς τὸ λήδιον. s.v. λάδιος (lies λάδος) εἰς τὸ λήδιον. s.v. θρόνιον- εἰρήται
εἰς τὸ λήδιον, ὅτι προσπαροξύνεται (Cohn 1898, 362).
28a Ohne Zweifel richtig ist auch der Schluß Cohns55, daß Eustathios 1146, 55-1147,1 (über
Λήδιον), wo Tryphon, Philemon und Didymos zitiert werden, aus Choireboskos' Orthographie
schöpfte, der seinerseits die genannten Zitate aus Oros übernahm. Cohn bewies diese Ansicht
zutreffend mit der Et.-Gen.-Glosse λ84 (λήδιον)56, in der Choireboskos zitiert wird, und Et. Gen.
λ85 (ληδάριον, aus Oros mit Subscription), die auf eine andere, nicht erhaltene Glosse λήδιον in
der Orthographie des Oros verweist. Cohns Erkenntnis ist für die Quellenanalyse der
attizistischen Schrift des Oros von noch weiter reichender Bedeutung, da somit urkundlich
probably drawing firsthand on a text of Philemon, although the extent of this dependence is unclear because of the fragmentary remains of both authors and their shared reliance on Phrynichus.29

Philemon’s evident dependence on Phrynichus provides a *terminus post quem* in the mid-second century (Heimannsfeld 1911, 50–52); Philemon’s direct citation of Aelius Aristides (s.v. Ἀκέστριον) provides a second *terminus post quem* ca. 181.30 A *terminus ante quem* in the late third century derives from Porphyry’s discussion of Philemon in the *Quaestiones Homericae*.31 Porphyry cites a work of Philemon entitled the Σύμμεικτα featuring textual criticism of Homer and Herodotus. Porphyry prescinds from adjudicating Philemon’s respectful criticism of the polymath Alexander of Cotyaeum’s reading of Herodotus. As Weber already recognized, this reference chronologically precludes any identification of Porphyry’s Philemon with the Αἰξωνεύς (Weber 1888, 443). Alexander of Cotyaeum is known to us by a reference in Stephanus of Byzantium,32 who calls him a γραμματικὸς πολυμαθέστατος, and from the twelfth speech of his student Aelius Aristides (Wentzel 1938). He served as tutor to the emperor Marcus Aurelius

bezeugt wird, daß Oros Tryphon und Philemon zitierte.” (Alpers 1981, 112)

29”Indirekte Benutzung des Philemon ist wegen des wörtlichen Zitates eines ganzen Verses und deswegen, weil ein Autor, der möglicherweise hätte vermitteln können, nicht kenntlich ist, nicht anzunehmen, zumal wenn man bedenkt, daß noch Thomas ihn exzerpieren konnte.” (Alpers 1981, 114 n.61)

3039 *infra* Ἀκέστριον, οὐκ ἤπτητοιαν. Ἀριστείδης ἦπιεμένα ἰμάτια τὰ ἐφαρμένα φησίν. L.

31Full text and translation is given in the Appendix.

32*Ethnica* 379: Κοτιάεων, πόλις τῆς ἐπικτῆτος Φρυγίας. Στράβων 16. τινὲς δὲ φασὶ Κοσιάεων ὀφείλει, δοκεῖ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ Κόστα Κόσσιαον, ὡς τοῦ Μίδα Μίδαιον, καὶ προσθέσει τοῦ τοῦ Κοσιαίων, καὶ τροπῆ Κοτιάεων. τὸ ἐθνικὸν Κοτιαεύς, ἐνθὰ ἤν Ἁλέξανδρος ὁ Ἀσκληπιάδου γραμματικὸς πολυμαθέστατος χρηματίζων, ὡς περὶ παντοδαπῆς ὑλῆς κῦ ἐγραψε βιβλίους.
and received heroic honors in his town of origin. He is known to have been engaged with questions of Atticism (Dyck, A. 1991, fr. 13; Alpers 1981, 228). Alpers upholds Reitzenstein’s view that Alexander of Cotyaeum “mit der Vorstufe des ps.-herodianischen Philetairos in Verbindung zu bringen ist” (Alpers 1998, 108).33

Cohn’s more tentative identification of Philemon the Atticist with the Philemon mentioned in Athenaeus III.8134 provides further grounds for associating him with Alexander of Cotyaeum, since the work there attributed to him, entitled Παντοδαπα Χρηστηρις—perhaps another title for the Σύμμικτα—suggests further grounds for associating him with the Cotyaean scholar who, Stephanus tells us, περὶ παντοδαπῆς ὕλης κδ’ ἔγραψε βιβλιοὺς.

Philemon the Atticist thus appears as a scholar of wide learning and critical acuteness, engaged in an aemulatio with the prominent Alexander, albeit young enough to cite Alexander’s student Aristides. Alpers dates Philemon’s work to ca. 200 (Alpers 1992, 198). Examination of the remains of this neglected work will provide a basis for addressing many questions pertinent both to Philemon and the Atticistic movement in general. What authorities does he cite? How accurate

33In an article refuting Argyle’s identification of the author of the Philetaerus with the imperial secretary Cornelius (Argyle 1989).
34Φιλήμων δ’ ἐν α’ Παντοδαπῶν Χρηστηριῶν ΠΥΡΝΟΝ φησι καλεῖσθαι τὸν ἐκ πυρῶν ἀσήμων γινόμενον ἄρτον καὶ πάντα ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἑχοντα, ΒΛΩΜΙΑΙΟΥΣ τε ἄρτους ὀνομάζεσθαι λέγει τοὺς ἑχοντας ἑντομα, οὔς Ρωμαιοὶ κοδράτους λέγουσι, ΒΡΑΤΤΙΜΗΝ τε καλεῖσθαι τὸν πιτυρίτην ἄρτον, ὃν εὐκονόν τευκρον ὀνομάζουσιν Ἀμερίας καὶ Τιμαχίδας.
are his corrections? What is the typology of the lemmata? What evidence do they provide for
lexical, morphological, and sound change in the second century?
The following text lists as individual lemmata all identifiable fragments of Philemon appearing in *Vindobonensis phil. gr. 172* (Osann 1821, 287–301), *Codex Laurentianus 91 super. 10* (Reitzenstein 1897, 392–396), and Thomas Magister (Ritschl 1832, passim). Passages drawn from the Vienna manuscript are identified by a V at the end of the line; those from the Florentine manuscript by an L, and those drawn from Thomas Magister by TM. Variant readings or corrections made by Cohn (Cohn 1898) or others are identified by the editors name in parentheses after the reading; where there is a significant difference from the published text the initial reading also appears with the editor’s name in parentheses. Unless otherwise noted all citations of classical authors refer to the editions used by the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*.

1 Ἀπαντήσαι ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐντυγχάνειν καθ’ όδόν τινι, ὑπαντήσαι δὲ λόγῳ. V
“Ἀπαντήσαι is to fall in with someone on the road, ὑπαντήσαι is to converse with someone in speech.”

In Attic and Ionic ἀπαντάω is the most frequent of the compound verbs derived from the adverb ἀντα; others include καταντᾶω, συναντᾶω, and ὑπαντᾶω and the deponent ἀντομαι (Chantraine 1968a, 91–92). All of these verbs share the root sense of coming face to face with someone or something. In modern Greek the basic sense of meeting someone is expressed most frequently with συναντᾶω, but ἀπαντᾶω, now with the primary meaning “to answer,” is also used in this sense, particularly in Apulian and Calabrian Greek and the Pontic dialects (Akademia Athenon 1933, 348). Rural and literary Greek may use the verb in this sense, as in the sentence Στὸ γύρωνα τοῦ δρόμου ἀπάντησαν δυο καλογέρους (Aristoteleio Panepistemio Thessalonikes 1998, 157) and in the proverb ὅσοι ἀγαπιοῦνται συχνὰ ἀπαντοῦνται.

ὑπαντῆσαι and ἀπαντῆσαι share with other verbs compounded from ἀντα the primary meaning obviam procedo (Estienne 1831). They can mean “to go to meet” in either a friendly or a hostile sense. Like the Homeric idiom ἀντα μάχεσθαι “to meet in battle” ἀπαντᾶ (e.g. ἀ. δορί Eur. Ph. 1392, ἀ. ὑπαντῆσαι συναντᾶ Pind. Pyth. 8.59, Xen. Cyr. 1.4.22) could refer to armed conflict. ἀπαντᾶω developed the legal meaning “to meet in open court” (LSJ A3; Plato, Demosthenes). Although unrecognized by LSJ, the primary modern meaning of ἀπαντᾶω “to respond” existed in antiquity, albeit often in juridical contexts, as the Firmin-Didot Thesaurus explains: Ἀπαντᾶω, Respondeo, quod est Occurrere, sensu eo quod dicitur occurrere objectioni (Estienne 1831, 1176), with citations from Isocrates, Aristotle, and others. ὑπαντᾶω could also refer to responding mentally (agreement: Posidon. 36 J) or in speech by reply or objecting (E. Suppl. 398; cf. LSJ II).
In keeping with the title of Philemon’s work Περι Ἀττικῆς ἀντιλογίας τῆς ἐν ταῖς λέξεσιν, it is characteristic that he defines words in contrasting pairs. This often means overlooking shared ranges of meaning in favor of a pointed semantic contrast. Here he schematizes the distinction between the ἀπαντήσαι and υπαντήσαι as the difference between encountering someone physically on a road versus engaging someone in speech. The same passage is found in the Philetaerus: (318.) Ἀπήντησε, οὐχὶ ἀπηντάτοι ἱωνικόν γάρ. Ἀπαντήσαι ἐπὶ τοῦ τυχείν καθ’ ὁδὸν τινι, ὑπαντήσαι δὲ λόγον.35 As seen above, however, the contrast can mislead, since in ancient as in modern Greek the verb ἀπαντῶ can mean “I respond.” The general contrast between these two specialized senses of the two verbs is accurate, however, as reflected in LSJ.

Like Philemon’s Περι ἀντιλογίας, Ammonius’s lexicon “consists primarily of pairs of words that are similar or identical in some way, with an explanation of the difference between them.” (Dickey 2007, 95) Ammonius contrasts these two words differently: υπαντήσαι καὶ ἀπαντήσαι διαφέρει. υπαντήσαι μὲν γὰρ ἐπὶ ὁδὸν λέγουσιν· ἀπαντήσαι δὲ τὸ περιτυχεῖν δύση, οἷον ἀπήντησε κατὰ τὴν δύσην, ἀντὶ τοῦ περιέτυχεν (Nickau 1966). Similarly, the De differentia vocabulorum (= Περὶ διαφοράς λέξεων) ascribed to Ptolemy reads: υπαντήσαι μὲν ἐπὶ ὁδὸν λέγουσιν· ἀπαντήσαι δὲ τὸ περιτυχεῖν δύση, οἷον ἀπήντησε κατὰ τὴν δύσην ἀντὶ τοῦ περιέτυχεν (Palmieri 1981–1982).36

35(Dain 1954, 72) Re. the Ionic form cf. (Lobeck 1965, 288).
36Nickau and Palmieri cite a parallel at 153v in the lexicon synonymicum in cod. Barberino I 70 (Alpers 1970, 210) and Palmieri cites another in the unpublished Symeonis Synagoge Sym. 741 (aliter pergens).
Where the Philetairos and Philemon contrast the spatial sense of ἀπαντήσαι with the verbal meaning of ὑπαντήσαι, the lexica attributed to Ptolemy and Ammonius define ἀπαντήσαι by its juridical meaning, τὸ περιτυχεῖν δίκη, prominent in widely read Attic authors like Demosthenes. Strikingly, both these sources define ὑπαντήσαι by the spatial formula ἐπί ὀδόν that Philetairos and Philemon used to define ἀπαντήσαι.

A lexicographical tradition that appears to derive from Phrynichus draws a different contrast: Praeparatio sophistica (frg. 232²) ἀπαντάν καὶ συναντάν: λέγουσιν ἐκατέρως. This lemma is repeated in Orus fragment B 27 (Alpers 1981, 205) and again by Photius (A 2247) supplemented by A 2251: Ἀπαντάν· τὸ παραγίνεσθαι εἰς τινὰ τόπον. "Eine Konsequenz des ‘milden’ Attizismus des Oros ist es, daß er verhältnismäßig häufig mehrere Möglichkeiten nebeneinander gelten läß und dabei sagt „...ἐκατέρως λέγεται“ oder „ἀμφότερα Ἑλληνικά“, „ἀμφότερα Ἑλληνικά, „ἐκάτερον αὐτῶν“ oder einfach „...χρή λέγειν καὶ...“ (Alpers 1981, 68). If de Borries’s attribution of this fragment to Phrynichus is correct, this liberality would predate Orus.

Suidas combines the two glosses in Photius: (2900.) Ἀπαντάν καὶ συναντάν: λέγουσιν ἐκατέρως, τὸ παραγίνεσθαι εἰς τινὰ τόπον. καὶ Ἀπαντήσαντος, γενέσθαι φθάσαντι Αἰλιανός· ἀνεσταύρωτο δὲ ὁ πολιορκῶν· καὶ ἐς τοῦτό οἶ τὸ τοῦ χειμώνος, τοῦ μή καθ’ ὀργῇ ἀπαντήσαντος, τὸ τέλος ὁμήρατο. καὶ Ἀπαντώσις, ἀντὶ τοῦ παραγίνονται. ἀμα τῷ περὶ ὄρθρον εἰς τοὺς τῶν δεσποτῶν οἰκους ἀπαντώσι. καὶ Ἀπαντωμένων, ἀντὶ τοῦ συμβαινόντων, γιγνομένων. οὐ μὴν ἄλλα τοιούτων ἀπαντωμένων οὐδὲν ἰκανὸν ἦν πρὸς τὸ καλέσαι τὴν όρμην τῶν Ῥωμαίων. The Photian glosses are amplified by a citation from Aelian (ἀνεσταύρωτο... ὁμήρατο. frg. 65), from John of Antioch (ἀμα...ἀπαντώσι, frg. 146), and from Polybius (οὐ sq. 10.13.10) (Adler 1928, I.262).
Higher and lower. But say not “more within,” but rather “within.”

The Philetairos gives almost an identical entry, but with Εγγυτέρω in the place of Ανωτέρω: (319.) Εγγυτέρω καὶ κατωτέρω: ἐνδοτέρω δὲ οὐκέτι, ἀλλὰ ἐνδον μᾶλλον. . The fact that lemmata 1-2 in the Vindobensis manuscript of Philemon are duplicated in the same order at the end of the Philetairos collection suggests that both were copied from a common source, or that Philemon was a source for the Philetairos. Although proscribed in the Philetairos, ἐνδοτέρω is frequently used in Herodian’s De prosodia catholica as published by Lentz (Herodianus, Lentz and Ludwich 1965, 3.1 pp. 48, 175, 207, 226, 288).

In this passage Philemon censures the comparative form of ἐνδον already attested as an adjective in Hecataeus (Jacoby F 1a,1,F fragment 93 line 1) and in Apollodorus in the second century BC (frg. 11 Müller). The adverb ἐνδοτέρω is attested in the Hippocratic corpus, Ctesias and Sophaenetus (fifth-fourth centuries BC), Epicurus’ Epistula ad Herodotum (43.1, 4; 44.7) and Pytheas (frg. 14) in the fourth century BC, in Theophrastus, Chrysippus (Fragmenta logica et physica frg. 555), and Strabo in the third century BC, and somewhat later in Aristophanes of Byzantium, Posidonius (frg. 283, 285 Theiler, frg. 78 Jacoby), Diodorus Siculus, Dionysius of Halicarnassus (Antiquitates Romanae 3.4.1; 13.7.4), Nicolaus of Damascus (frg. 93) and Strabo. It is used twenty times by Josephus, nine times in Plutarch,\textsuperscript{37} and twice by Pollux. The Etymologicum

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{37}Cato Maior 5.1; Alexander 30.8; Antonius 78.2; Aratus 43.3; Quomodo adulator ab amico internoscatur 53F; Quomodo quis suos in virtute sentiat profectus 82D; Apophthegmata Laconica 224E; De defectu
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*magnum* uses ἐνδοτέρω to define προτέρω. Attestations of this word before Diodorus Siculus are mostly in fragments transmitted by later authors, so some of these attestations may be anachronistic.

The form was not originally a comparative, the -τερ- suffix indicating one thing as opposed to another. Philemon presumably condemns ἐνδοτέρω on Atticist grounds; it is not attested in any of the classical Athenian authors of the fifth and fourth centuries, by contrast with the forms he accepts, ἀνωτέρω, attested in Aeschylus (PV 312) and κατωτέρω, attested in Herodotus (Hist. 8.132). As usual the Atticist is fighting a losing battle, since the comparative and superlative adverbs and adjectives of ἐνδὸν became widely used in later Greek. ἐνδοτέρω is frequently used in medical texts, Stobaeus, Iamblichus, and very frequently in Chrysostom, Georgius Pachymeres, and other later writers. In the fourth century Dositheus glosses ἐνδοτέρω as *penitus* (AG 40.38).

The superlative adverb ἐνδότατω is found in a fragment of Aeschylus  (*Fragmenta* (Mette) Tetralogy 19 play A fragment 150e), in Theophrastus’ *De causis plantarum* (3.14.6), Josephus, Pausanias (*Graeciae descriptio* 5.15.6), Pollux, Sextus Empiricus, and abundantly in Eusebius and later writers. Forms of the superlative adjective ἐνδότατος are attested somewhat later and also appear frequently in Byzantine literature (the superlative adverb appears 98 times in the TLG corpus, forms of the superlative adjective 156 times). The adjectives ἐνδότερος and ἐνδότατος are still used in modern Greek.

*oraculorum* 411A; *Quaestiones convivales* 656F.
Philemon’s juxtaposition of the two forms Ἄφειλετο and ἂφειλατο is the most succinct of many discussions in the Atticist lexica of the gradual encroachment of weak (athematic) aorists on strong (thematic) aorist conjugations.

Orus offers a lengthy discussion of the distinction between the strong and weak aorist conjugations beginning with the same verb form here discussed by Philemon: (16a.) Ἄφειλετο, οὐκ ἂφειλατο, καὶ προειλετο καὶ πάντα τὰ ὁμοια, ἐφ’ ὄν καὶ τὸ δεύτερον πρόσωπον διὰ τῆς ού συλλαβῆς καὶ τὸ πρῶτον διὰ τοῦ ο. ἐφ’ ὄν δὲ τὸ πρῶτον διὰ τοῦ α, τὸ μὲν δεύτερον διὰ τοῦ ω, τὸ δὲ τρίτον πάλιν διὰ τοῦ α, οἷον· ἑποιήσαμην, ἑποιήσαμην, ἑγραφάμην, ἑγράψαμην, ἑγράφατο. ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν προτέρων· εἰλόμην, εἰλοῦ, εἰλετο· ἠρόμην, ἠροῦ, ἠρετο. Alpers also attributes a comparable fragment from the Synagoge to Orus (Alpers 1981, A 16b): Ἄφειλετο καὶ τὰ ὁμοια διὰ τοῦ ε, ἐφ’ ὄν τὸ πρῶτον πρόσωπον διὰ τοῦ ο, τὸ δὲ δεύτερον διὰ τῆς ου. διὸ δὲ τὸ πρῶτον διὰ τοῦ α τότε τὸ δεύτερον διὰ τοῦ ω.

Whether or not Orus is here drawing on Phrynichus, the issue had already been raised at Eclogues 154 Ἄφειλατο· ὅσοι διὰ τοῦ α λέγουσιν, ἁγγιμνούσιν, δέον διὰ τοῦ ε λέγειν ἂφειλετο· καὶ ἂφειλομήν δεί λέγειν διὰ τοῦ ο, ἀλλὰ μή διὰ τοῦ α, and in the T family of the same lemma: Ἄφειλετο, ἂφειλομεν, οὐκ ἂφειλατο καὶ ἂφειλαμεν.

38Re. de Borries’ attribution of these fragments to Phrynichus, Praep. Soph., cf. (Alpers 1981, 65, n. 44).
The replacement of thematic by athematic (usually sigmatic) aorist endings had been in progress since the Hellenistic period (Schwyzer and Brugmann 1953, 753–754). The De locutionum pravitatibus attributed to Aelius Herodianus notes the persistent wide usage of the new form: "Ετι πλημμελοῦσαν οἱ λέγοντες ἀφειλάμην, καὶ ἀφείλατο, δέον λέγειν διὰ τοῦ ὁ ἀφειλόμην, καὶ διὰ τοῦ ἐ ἀφείλετο· τοῦ γὰρ ὑμίατος ὄντος εἰλόμην, εἶλου, ἣν ἀνάγκης τὸ σύνθετον ἐφύλαξε τὰ βραχέα, τὸ τε ε καὶ τὸ ο· μόνως οὖν ὦτευν, ἀφειλόμην, ἀφείλετο. (20) The Philetairos pleads for a retention of the distinction between the two aorists: (1.) Εἰλόμην, εἶλου, εἰλεῖτο· οὕτως ἢ κλίσις. Καὶ ἐν τῷ συνθέτῳ προειλόμην, προεῖλου, προείλετο. Εἰ δὲ τι ἀπὸ τοῦ πρώτου τὸ α ἔξει, φυλάξει αὐτὸ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ τρίτου· ἥλειψάμην, ἥλειψῳ, ἥλειψατο. The indicative middle form of ἀλείψω is cited by contrast as a weak aorist to be conjugated with the α endings. The forms προεῖλετο and προείλου are likewise defended by Hesychius (π3403, 3406) against προεῖλατο and προεῖλῳ, where the Souda (4597) simply glosses the strong aorist form of ἀφαιρέω but cites the weak form as a variant: ἀφείλετο· αἰτιατική, ἐρπασεν, ἀνέσπαση. λέγεται καὶ ἀφείλατο. διὰ διφθόγγου.

The contrarian Antiatticist notes the form Ἐξαφείλατο: Ἡρόδοτος πρώτω, where it does not in fact appear. Alpers observes that there has been a scribal misreading of the book number in Herodotus, confusing H with A. Most likely the Antiatticist was referring to the form ἀνείλατο which does appear in the “a” family of manuscripts at Herodotus VII.190 (Alpers 1981, 159).

------------------------------------

39Rutherford notes that χέζω and perhaps φθάνω are among the few Attic verbs to admit undisputably of both a weak (athematic) and strong (thematic) aorist (Rutherford 1881, 215–221).
Wackernagel observes that the replacement of thematic aorists by forms in \( \alpha \) took place in several stages, beginning in environments after \( \varphi, \upsilon, \lambda, \sigma \) (Wackernagel 1897, 48). Debrunner further details this development, beginning “1. \( \xi\pi\sigma\epsilon\sigma\epsilon-\xi\pi\sigma\sigma\sigma\nu \) (I. Sing. und 3. PI.) wird durch Anschluß an den Typus \( \epsilon\tau\ell\epsilon\sigma\epsilon-\epsilon\tau\ell\epsilon\sigma \), \( \epsilon\tau\ell\epsilon\sigma\sigma\nu\) zu \( \xi\pi\sigma\epsilon\sigma\epsilon-\xi\pi\sigma\sigma\sigma\nu \), \( \xi\pi\sigma\sigma\sigma\nu\) umgestaltet. 2. Entsprechend wird \( \epsilon\iota\ell-\epsilon\iota\nu\), \( \epsilon\iota\ell\epsilon\tau\sigma\), \( \epsilon\iota\nu\) durch den Typus \( \epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\ell-\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\ell\alpha, \epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\ell\alpha\), \( \epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\ell\alpha\tau\), \( \epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\ell\alpha\tau\nu\) zu \( \epsilon\iota\ell-\epsilon\iota\ell\alpha\), \( \epsilon\iota\nu\) usw. These developments are clearly visible in the Septuagint and New Testament, where the forms \( \xi\pi\sigma\sigma\alpha, -\epsilon\iota\nu\alpha\), and \( -\epsilon\iota\nu\alpha\tau\nu\) are frequent (Debrunner 1926, 16–17).

With regard to the replacement of strong aorist forms such as \( \epsilon\iota\nu\sigma\nu \) by weak aorists such as \( \epsilon\iota\alpha, \epsilon\iota\nu\alpha \), Hatzidakis observes that “Dadurch hat aber die Sprache an Deutlichkeit vielmehr gewonnen als verloren” since the ambiguity of first-person singular and third-person plural forms was resolved (Hatzidakis 1892, 185–186). Joseph notes that spread of the \( \alpha \)-endings made it easier to distinguish present from preterite forms. The verb \( \alpha\phi\alpha\iota\omega \) is still be used in modern Greek, but like other verbs of the -\( \alpha\omega \) class it is rendered \( \alpha\phi\alpha\iota\epsilon\sigma\alpha \) in the aorist active.

40(Joseph, B. D. 1980, 179–180): “The spread of the \( \alpha \)-endings at the expense of the thematic endings had its origin in Late Classical Greek (cf. Attic \( \epsilon\iota\pi\alpha \) occasionally for \( \epsilon\iota\pi\nu\) ‘I said’), and was no doubt enhanced in the Post-Classical era by the functional need to distinguish present from preterite forms, especially in the first person and second person plural. With the loss of the augment when unstressed (as part of the general loss of unstressed initial vowels in the period roughly 600-1100 A.D., a putative imperfect *\( \phi\epsilon\gamma\gamma\sigma\mu\epsilon\nu \) or *\( \phi\epsilon\gamma\gamma\epsilon\tau\epsilon \) would easily have been confused with present \( \phi\epsilon\gamma\gamma\sigma\mu\epsilon\nu\nu \)/\( \phi\epsilon\gamma\gamma\epsilon\tau\epsilon \). The generalization of the endings -\( \alpha\mu\nu/-\alpha\tau\epsilon \) would then have served a differentiating function.”
κονίεται provides an analogy for the conjugation of ἀρτύεται meaning “it is arranged, prepared.” The verb ἀρτύω mainly occurs in compounds in Attic.

This lemma in Philemon has no parallel in Atticistic lexicography, though Cohn relates it to the following passage in Thomas Magister which begins a sequence of comparable lemmata ἀρτύομαι οὐκ ἀρτύω (Osann 1821, 6.12). This lemma in Thomas Magister begins an interrupted series of twenty comparable lemmata, ending with ἀναπετῶ, which follow the same order as the text of Philemon.41 Ritschl had already observed the correspondence between these passages (Ritschl 1832, LXXV ff.), and Cohn further documents “daß Thomas Magister diesen Philemon in fortlaufenden Reihen ebenso wie die Lexika des Phrynichos, Moeris, Ammonius, etc.

41This first (and interrupted) series in Philemon of entries that appear consecutively in the text of Thomas Magister includes the following passages in Ritschel’s text of Thomas: 6.12 ἀρτύομαι...; 6.13 ἀλεύομαι...; [interrupted by 6.14 αἰκίζομαι, not in Philemon]; 6.16 ἀκούσματα...; 7.1 ἀποφοιτήσομαι...; 7.5 ἀνάθημα...; 7.7 ἀπεισιν...; [interrupted by 7.9 ἀφανίζεται, not in Philemon]; 41.1 ἀθυροστομεῖν... (out of sequence); 7.14 ἀλλάζ...; 7.15 ἀποσκοποῦμαι...; 7.16 ἀφοί...; 7.18 ἀλμάδες...; (10.11 ἀμυγδάλαι... out of sequence); 8.1 οἱ ἄλες...; (41.14 ἀλάβαστον... out of sequence); 8.2 ἀλοάσω...; 8.4 ἀναβαθμός...; 8.9 ἀπέκτονα...; 8.10 ἀνοίγνυμι...; (cf. 7.1 ἀποφοιτήσομαι...ἀπολαύσομαι...); 8.13 ἀνεβαλόμην... 9.7 ἄξιω...; 9.8 ἀθροος...; 9.12 ἀναψυχήναι... 10.1 ἀναπετῶ...
ausgeschrieben hat." (Cohn 1898, 353) This particular lemma in Thomas Magister urges use of the middle form of the verb over the active; Philemon simply compares the forms ἀρτύεται and κονίεται.

Although the word is not frequently discussed in the Atticist lexica, the lexicographical tradition reflects Attic use of the verb ἀρτύω with respect to the seasoning of food.42

Like Homeric ἀρτύνω it may refer to preparation in general,43 ordering or ruling.44 Much of the

42(Chantraine 1999, 102). Philoxenus μάγευρος... καὶ Φιλόξενος ἐν τῷ Περὶ ἀναδιπλασιασμοῦ πλεονασμὸν λέγει τὸν μ. παρὰ τὸ ἀγείρειν, τὸ ἀθροίζειν, ἥτοι εἰ, ὅν ἀρτύει ἢ ἢν παρασκευάζει ὄψων. Pollux: καὶ τὸ ἀρτύειν δὲ ἡδύνειν ἐλεγον (6.71); τὰ δὲ τῶν μαγείων ἐγγα ἀφεύσαι, εὐσαι, καθήσαι, κόψαι, τεμεῖν διατεμεῖν, ὤθεσαι, ἐψῆσαι, ὀστήσαι, ἐπανθρακώσαι, μάξαι, διηθεῖν, διατάν, ἀποβράττειν, τρίβειν ἐν θύμῃ, σταθεὺσειν, ἡδύνειν, ἄρτυειν, σκευάζειν, ὀνθυλεύειν. (6.91) Hesychius: ; (806.) ἣβομβυθυλεύματα· τὰ μαγεικά ἀρτύματα· κατασκευασμένα· ἐννοι τὸ σὺν τῇ ὀνθῷ ἄρτυειν; Suda: (435.) Καρυκεύων: ἄρτυών, ἡδύλων. Etymologicum Gudianum: Ἀρτύω καὶ ἀρτυσία· ὁ νόστος τοῦ ἄλατος· οἴνοι ἀλλιτώ καὶ ἀλιτυσία καὶ κατὰ μεταπλασμὸν ἄρτυω καὶ ἀρτυσίᾳ. Ἀρτύνῳ in the same sense:

Hesychius(7533.) ἄρτυνε· ἡδύνει; (913.) καρυκεύει· ἄρτυνε, ἡδύνει.
43Photius Lexicon (2908.) ἄρτυειν· σκευάζειν. (2910.) ἄρτυναντες· παρασκευάσαντες. Suda, (4056.) ἄρτυειν· σκευάζειν. καὶ ἄρτυαντες, παρασκευάζοντες. καὶ ἄρτυναντες.

Etymologicum Genuinum (1236) Ἀρτύνθη (Λ 216)· κατασκευάσθη· ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄρτυνω. Re. the preparation of medicine or charms: Hesychius: (178.) φαρμακεύεται· σκευάζεται, ἀρτύεται.
44Photius (2909.) ἄρτυεν· ἐβασίλευεν. Etymologicum Genuinum (1239.) Ἀρτύνῳ (Β 55)· τὸ ἄμοζω, ἢ εὔπητίζω. Ὄμηρος = Etymologicum Magnum s.v.
lexicographical discussion centers around the relation between the primarily Homeric form ἀρτύνω and ἀρτύω. The Etymologica interpret ἀρτύνω as derived πλεονασμῷ τοῦ ν from ἀρτύω;\(^{45}\) the Etymologicum Genuinum (691) notes that this happens frequently after ν: τὸ γὰρ ν τῇ εὖ διερθόγγῳ οὐκ ἐπεντίθεται, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ ν γίνεται πικνῶς, οἶνον δῶ νόνω, πῦρ πῦνω, ἀρτύω ἀρτύνω. In fact the above forms in -ν- are all Homeric, though they may be formed by analogy from δῶ, ἀρτύω, etc.\(^{46}\) At least θῦνω may predate θῦω: "Il est probable que θῦνω de *θῦν-φ-ω (avec l’impf. ἐθῦνεον de *ἐθῦν-φ-온) recouvre un présent en -ν- que l’on retrouve dans skr. dhū-nō-śi «secouer» (Chantraine 1999, 448).

The verbs ἀρτύεται and κοινεῖται are both denominative. κοινεῖται derives from κόνις, as both ἀρτύω and ἀρτύνω derive from a noun attested only in Hesychius: (7544.) ἀρτύς- σύνταξες (Schwyzer, et al. 1953, 724, 727).\(^{47}\)

\(^{45}\)Etymologicum Genuinum α 1239, Etymologicum Magnum 150.45, Etymologicum Synoecis 1.230.19.
\(^{46}\)Die älterne Fälle von denominativen -νω neben -φω entstanden wohl in Analogiezu primären Verben wie δῶνω neben δῶ, ὀτρύνω u.a." (Schwyzer, et al. 1953, 728).
\(^{47}\)Cf. ἀχλίω from ἀχλίς, πληθύω from πληθός etc. The conjecture *κοιμᾶ as a source of denominative κοιμάω (Schwyzer, et al. 1953, 725 n.9; Risch 1937, 44; Chantraine 1999, 509) may be unnecessary. Theognostus derives κοιμάω, κιμάς, ἀπὸ τοῦ κοίμη (Canones sive De orthographia 558). The noun κοίμη, not mentioned in LSJ, appears four times in Theognostus, in Herodian’s de prosodia catholica, the Etymologicum Gudianum, Etymologicum magnum, the lexicon attributed to Zonaras and the scholia to Aristophanes. (230.) The Etymologicum Gudianum gives the following etymology: ἀρτύνω- ἐκ τοῦ ἀρτύω- τοῦτο παρά τὸ ἀρτύω- τοῦτο παρά τὸ ἀρτίω, τὸ ἀρτύω, τὸ ἀρτύμω, ὁ μέλλων ἀρτίω, καὶ Αἰολικῶς ἀρσω, καὶ ἀρτός ὄνομα ἰδιματικόν, ἐκ δὲ τοῦ ἀρτώ ἀρτίωῳ καὶ καταρτίῳ καὶ ἀρτύω. Some modern linguists (Prellwitz 1905; Georgacas 1957, 115) support this interpretation of ἀρτός as a deverbal noun.
In neither case does the middle/passive form seem more Attic than the active. ἀφτύειν does not belong to that group of verbs which Atticism sought to restore to an earlier deponent usage.

Thomas Magister's approbation of the form ἀφτύωμαι is the only appearance of the form in the TLG corpus; the form ἀφτύω that he rejects appears 32 times, twice in the classical Attic comic writer Anaxippus. The passive infinitive ἀφτύεσθαι appears only five times in the TLG corpus, first in Eutropius; the active infinitive ἀφτύειν twenty-nine times, first in a fragment of the philosopher Clearchus (fourth-third centuries). κονίεται is attested three times in the TLG and not before Philo, κονίει is attested seven times, as early as Aeschylus’ Seven against Thebes (60).

Philemon seems to be drawing attention to the similar conjugation of the two verbs rather than urging the use of the middle form as Thomas Magister does.

5 Ἀπεργάσομαι, οὐκ Ἀπεργώμαι.(Cohn)

Ἀπεργάσομαι, the future of Ἀπεργάζομαι, is attested in Galen, Lucian, Didymus Caecus, twice in Chrysostom and Theodoretus, and Acropolites. The form Ἀπεργώμαι is attested only here. ἐργώμαι is an α-contract first-person future form of ἐργάζομαι, following the pattern of κρεμάννυμι, κρεμώ but in a deponent conjugation (Schwyzer, et al. 1953, 785).

Philemon promotes the Attic future Ἀπεργάσομαι against this alternate form that derives from the Septuagint. The future second-person singular deponent form ἐργά appears at Genesis 4.12, 29.27, and at five other places in the Septuagint. These passages are then quoted by Philo and extensively in Christian authors (ἐργά τὴν γῆν, ἐξ ἡμέρας ἐργά). The form is explained by the
An active form ἐργάζομαι appears as a variant of ἐργάζομαι as early as the Hellenistic period.

The verb ἐργάζομαι appears in the twelfth-century Byzantine chronicler Constantine Manasses in the sense of χρησιμοποιών: ποικίλον τῶν πραγμάτων δὲ τοῦτον (ἐν τὸν λόγον) ἐργάζομαι ὁ φύσις (Miller 1875, 771). The seventeenth-century saga of King Rodolinos by I.A. Troilos uses ἐργάζομαι in the sense of αποσχολοῦμαι: ὁ, τί ὥρα σε στοχαζόμαι καὶ μετὰ σένα ἐργάζομαι, το σφάλμα ουδὲ τὴν πρίκα μου μητεσσός λογιάω and in the sense μηχανεύομαι: Τώρα να σάσε βλάψουσι καιρές ἄλλο καρτηροῦσι· είναι θαρρεῖς ἐργάζομαι, Πάρθοι καὶ Βαβυλώνοι (Troilos 1976).

6 Ἅλιεύομαι, οὖν ἅλιεύω. L (Osann)

ἀλιεύομενος· οὖν ἅλιεύων L (Cohn)

‘Ἄλιεύομαι, οὖν ἅλιεύω· εἰ καὶ Λουκιανὸς ἄπαξ ἐχρήσατο. TM

---------------------------------------------------------------

48Cf. Etymologicum magnum Ἑργα: Ὁτι ἐργάτο τὴν γήν. Ἐστιν ἐργάζομαι ἐργάζομαι καὶ ἐπειδὴ πᾶς μέλλον βραχεία παραληγόμενος περισπάοι θέλει, οἶνον περῶ, κερῶ, γίνεται ἀποβολή τοῦ σι, ἐργαδώ περισπώμενον, καὶ μετάγεται εἰς ἑνεστώτα, ἐργό, ἐργᾶς, ἐργά· ὁ παθητικός, ἐργώμαι, ἐργά. Cf. the gloss by Hesychius(5657.): ἐργά· ἐργάζη.

In this passage, repeated and elaborated in Thomas Magister, Philemon shows himself more Atticist even than Phrynichus. A corresponding lemma in Phrynichus reads: ἀλιεύεσθαι τὸ ἀλιεῦειν. λέγουσι δὲ καὶ ὡς ἥμεις. (But they also say it as we do sc. ἀλιεύειν. Praeparatio sophistica frg. 158). The Phrynichus fragment asserts that both the deponent form espoused by Philemon and the active form were used by Attic writers; καὶ ὡς ἥμεις may suggest that the active form was more common in his day. Some Atticistic writers subscribed to Phrynichus’ more lenient view, as Fix notes acerbically with reference to this passage as found in Thomas Magister: Contra Thomam nihil valet Luciani auctoritas, aut Plutarchi, Ἀλιανι, et qui similes sunt scriptores. Antiquissimum activi exemplum extra Atticam dialectum Epicharmi est ap. Athen. 7, 319, F, s. 320, C ἄλιεύομεν σπάρους (Estienne 1831, s.v.).

Attestations of the active form can found going back to the classical period and before. The form ἄλιεύσω is attributed to Solon (Mullach, Fragmenta philosophorum Graecorum 2.39) and in the sixth century Aesop used ἄλιεύειν (219.8, cf. 219.2); Pherecydes uses the active participle in the fifth century (26.29); Philochorus, Posidonius, Diodorus Siculus, Arrian, and Artemidorus among others use the active forms (2.14). The Atticist Aelian uses the active form (NA 10.43), Plutarch uses it repeatedly (Antonius 29.5 ἄλιεύον; De sollertia animalium 965. B, 966.A bis), and Lucian uses it not once, as Thomas Magister says, but twice (Revivescentes sive piscator 47, Hermotimus 65). The active form appears in the Septuagint (Jerem. 16.16) and in the New Testament (Johan. 21.3). Among Christian writers the active form is the norm, with the active infinitive attested twenty

51This fragment does not appear in Kaibel (Kaibel 1958).
times from the time of Clement of Alexandria. The Biblical topos Δεύτε ὁπίσω μου, καὶ ποιήσω ὑμᾶς ἁλιεῖσ ἀνθρώπων (Matt. 4.19, Mk 1.17) gave ample occasion for ecclesiastical writers to use the verb in both active and passive forms.

LSJ agrees with Philemon s.v. that only the middle form is used by Attic authors. The Synagoge (Cunningham 2003, B 373) cites Plato the Athenian comic poet for the deponent form: ἀλιεύομενος: ἀντί τοῦ ἁλιεύων. Πλάτων. The form appears twice in Plato (frg. 2, 44)) and as the title of of a play by Antiphanes in the fourth century (Ἀλιεύομενη, Athen. 7.338). The deponent participle is further attested in the Aristotelian Historia animalium (569b), Ephorus (FGrH 70 frg. 56) and Phaenias in the fourth century (frg. 15), and is later used by Hegesander, Posidonius, Philo, Strabo, Polyaeus, and frequently by Athenaeus.

The lexicographers treat the active form as usual, as Hesychius ((920.) γριπίζει· ἁλιεύει, γριπεύ... ὁ ἁλιεύων; (1139) ἱχθύαται· ἁλιεύει; (1141.) ἱχθύα· ἱχθύας ἁλιεύει; σαγηνεύειν· θηρεύειν. αἰχμαλωτίζειν. ἢ ἁλιεύειν. Photius’s lexicon (74.21), the Souda, and the Synagoge (Cunningham 2003, 593) all repeat Phrynichus’ lemma given above: ἁλιεύεσθαι· τὸ ἁλιεύειν. Λέγουσι δὲ καὶ ὡς ήμεῖς. The Etymologicum Gudianum presents a fanciful etymology of Πειραιεύς (s.v.): τυραιεύς ὁ μετὰ πύρος ἁλιεύων, διὰ τοῦ τοῦ ψυλοῦ, and the Etymologicum Magnum defines ἐλλοπεύειν (s.v.) as τὸ ἁλιεύειν.

Risch derives the noun ἁλιεῦς zu τὰ ἄλια (Risch 1937, §57b)52 The pseudo-Zonaras lexicon defines a related verb: ἀσταλιεύειν. ἐκ τῆς ἁλίς σπάν τούς ἱχθύας, ὁ ἔστιν ἁλιεύειν (cf.

52Schwyzer derives ἁλιεῦς from Locrian ἄλι (Schwyzer, et al. 1953, 476).
Etymologicum Genuinum 1289 = Etymologicum Symeonis 1.252), but Hesychius derives it from the noun ἀσπάλους-τοῦς ἵχθυας.\textsuperscript{53} By the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries the noun ψάρι < ὀψάριον < ὁψον is attested, and at some time thereafter the verb ψαρεύω replaced ἀσπαλεύειν, although the active form ἀλιεύω remains in use in modern Greek.

7 Ἄπονύχισον, οὐκ ὄνυχισον. L

The verb ἀπονυχίζειν is well-attested in the Attic comic writers, including Aristophanes, Cratinus, and Menander (frg. 996). The form ἀπονυχίω appears in a passage from Aristophanes’ Equites that is taken up by the scholiasts and lexicographers: Ἄπονυχίω σου τὰν πρυτανείῳ σιτίᾳ (709). Here the Sausage-seller threatens “I’ll scratch your name off the prytany dining lists!” Marginalia in the scholia vetera ad loc. explains the usage as a metaphor from fingernail clippings: ἀπονυχίω σου τὰν πρυτανείῳ σιτίᾳ ἀφαιρήσομαι σου, φησί, τὴν σίτησιν, ἀποφράξω, ἀποκλείσω ἀπὸ μεταφοράς τῶν ὀνυχιζομένων. This passage appears twice in the Suda and again in the the lexicon of Pseudo-Zonaras.

The form ἀπονύχισον given by Philemon is not elsewhere attested; the form ὄνυχισον is used only by St. Athanasius (Historia de Melchisedech vol. 28 p. 529) and by Phrynichus, who reproves its usage to indicate fingernail-cutting (Eclogai 253): Ὅνυχίζειν καὶ ἔξωνυχίζειν ταύτῳ σημαίνει ἐκάτερα καὶ τίθεται ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀκριβολογεῖσθαι. τὸ δ’ ἀπονυχίζειν τὸ τάς ύπεραυξήσεις τῶν ὀνύχων ἀφαιρεῖν σημαίνει. ἐπειδὴ δὲ ὁ πολὺς συρφεῖτός λέγουσιν „ὄνυχισόν με” καὶ

\textsuperscript{53}Schwyzer follows (Schwyzer, et al. 1953, 476) but cf. Chantraine (Chantraine 1968a, 126).
"όνυχσάμην", σημαινόμεθα τά ονόματα καὶ φαμεν ὅτι, εἰ μὲν ἐπὶ τοῦ τοὺς ὀνυχὰς ἀφαίρειν τίθει τις, χρῆσατο ἀν τῷ ἀπονυχίζειν, εἰ δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀκριβολογεῖσθαι καὶ ἔξετάζειν ἀκριβῶς, τῷ ὀνυχίζειν χρῆσαιτ' ἀν. Phrynichus censures the συφετός—literally, the “trash” or rabble—who use ὀνυχίζω in this sense. He prescribes that ἀπονυχίζειν should be used with reference to cutting fingernails, but ὀνυχίζω with regard to precise language and accurate examination.

Several lemmata in Phrynichus' Praeparatio sophistica touch on the distinction between the literal sense of ἀπονυχίζειν and the figurative sense of ὀνυχίζειν and ἔξονυχίζειν as τὸ περὶ τι ἀκριβολογείσθαι (ep. p. 95.10, frg. 310) or ἔξετάζειν τοῖς ὀνυξίν (frg. 310). The epitome further elaborates (20, 6): ἀπονυχίζεσθαι τοῦ ὀνυχίζεσθαι Ἀττικῶς διαφέρει, τὸ μὲν γὰρ σημαίνει τὸ τοὺς ὀνυχὰς ἀφαίρεσθαι, τὸ δὲ ὀνυχίζειν καὶ ἔξονυχίζειν ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐρευνάν ἀκριβῶς καὶ ἔξετάζειν τὸ ὑποκείμενον πράγμα τίθηται. Κρατίνος μέντοι (fr. 455) ὁ ὀνυχṣιμένον ἐπὶ τοῦ τετμημένου τοὺς ὀνυχᾶς τέθεικεν.

Photius’ Lexicon echoes this same distinction, drawing on other passages from Aristophanes: Ὅνυχίζεται: ἀκριβολογεῖται· οὕτως Ἀριστοφάνης ὁνυχίζεομεν καὶ ὀνυχίζειν καὶ ἔξονυχίζειν διαφέρουσι· τὸ μὲν οὖν ἀπονυχίζειν μετὰ τῆς ἀπὸ προθέσεως σημαίνει τὸ τοὺς ὀνυχὰς ἀφαίρειν. τὸ δὲ ὀνυχίζειν καὶ ἔξονυχίζειν τιθέασιν ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐρευναν ἀκριβῶς καὶ ἔξετάζειν τὸ ὑποκείμενον πράγμα. Ἀριστοφάνης Ὀλκάσιν (fr. novum) „ἔξονυχίζω γὰρ ἐγὼ γε τοῦτ' ἀρκίβως“. This distinction is repeated by the Suda (Ἀπονυχίσαι μᾶλλον λέγουσιν ἢ ὀνυχίσαι (411, 3461) and Thomas Magister, perhaps alluding to Synesius’ use of ἔξονυχίζειν

---

54Cf. the Synagoge s.v.: ὀνυχίζεσθαι: ἀκριβολογεῖσθαι.
with regard to careful study of a book (Dion 12). Hesychius defines ουνχιει as ἐπιμελῶς ἔξετάσει.

ἐξονυχίζειν is more strongly marked than ουνχιει in the sense of careful examination. Pollux contrasts the metaphorical sense of ἐξονυχίζοσθαι with the literal sense of both ουνχίζοσθαι καὶ ἀπονυχίζοσθαι (II.146; cf. VII.65). The astrologer Vettius Valens contrasts ὁ γὰρ ἐμμελής ἐξονυχίζων with ὁ δὲ βλακεύων καὶ ἐπιτόλαιος. Pseudo-Zonaras glosses Ἐφείσθω τούτως ἐξονυχίζειν as ἀντὶ τοῦ συγκεχωρήσθω ἀκριβολογεῖσθαι.

The usage of ουνχιει and ἐξονυχίζειν with reference to precision in language and meticulousness in general recalls the proverbial uses of unguis and ονυξ (Otto 1971, 355–357). Horace in his Ars poetica identifies the failure to cut one’s fingernails with those inspired poets who rely solely on ingenium and scorn meticulous ars (295-298). For Horace an ad unguem factus homo suggests perfection (Serm. 1.63-65), as Ps.-Acro and Porphyrio elaborate (ad AP 294). Persius refers to severos ungues that closely inspect a smooth surface (1.63-65). A study by D’Angour argues that “the nail in Horace’s ad unguem is not to be thought of as the nail on the artisan’s

55 Ὀνυχίζειν καὶ ἐξονυχίζειν ταυτόν. [Συνέσιος ἐν τῷ Δίων ἦ περὶ τῆς κατ’ αὐτὸν διαγωγῆς ἀνάγκην ἔχων βιβλίον ἐξονυχίζειν.] τίθεται δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ [πρὸς μνῆμην διανίστασθαι ἦ] ἀκριβολογεῖσθαι. τὸ δ’ ἀπονυχίζειν τὸ τάς ὑπερανάξεσις τῶν ούνχων ἄφαιρεν σημαίνει.

56 Appendices ad anthologiarum libros 22. 1: ὁ γὰρ ἐμμελής ἐξονυχίζων εἰς τὸ λεπτότατον πάσας τὰς μεθόδους καὶ μὴ περιβλέπων ὀρθῶς, ἀλλὰ πάνυ ἀκριβολογούμενος ταύτας, ἀπαίσιον εὑρήσει τὸν ὅρον τῆς ζωῆς, ὁ δὲ βλακεύων καὶ ἐπιτόλαιος αὐτάς περιθεωρῶν καὶ ἀμμελής, διὰ τούτο ὡς τὸ εἰκός ἀμαρτάνων, αὐτός ἐαυτὸν αἰτάσεται τῆς ἀταλαπάσου περὶ τὸν τοιούτου διαθέσεως. οὐδὲ γὰρ οἱ ἀμβλυωποτεντες περὶ τὴν τοῦ Ἡλίου αὐγὴ τοῦτο πάσχουσιν, ἀλλὰ περὶ τὴν οἰκείαν ἀνεπιτηδειότητα τῶν ὁμολογῶν αὐτῶν.
exploratory finger. Symbolic, rather, of the precise and ultimate details of true craftsmanship, the unguis must be sought not on the craftsman himself, but on the hands and feet of his sculpted figure.” (D’Angour, A. J. 1999, 417) D’Angour argues that the sense of examining an object closely with the fingernail only developed later, by the time of Persius. This interpretation is based on the Canon of the sculptor Polyclitus (frg. 1): ἐστι χαλεπώτατον αὐτῶν τὸ ἔργον, οἷς ἀν εἰς ὄνυχα ὁ πηλὸς ἀφίκηται, a reference to hollow-casting by cire perdue. This passage “refers to the difficulty of applying clay piece-molds around the fully modeled statue, or working the clay into the crannies of the fingernail so that the finished bronze would come out absolutely clear-cut and sharp” (Stewart 1978, 161). But the use of ὄνυχίζειν and ἐξονυχίζειν already in the classical period in the sense of precise language and meticulous examination suggests that the interpretation of Horace’s ad unguem as given by the scholiasts is no anachronism. ἐξονυχίζειν could also be understood in a pejorative sense as hair-splitting or formal pedantry, as in the Philetairos (38): Ἀπονυχίζεσθαι λέγουσι τὸ ἀφαιρεῖσθαι τοὺς ὄνυχας τῶν δακτύλων· ἐξονυχίζειν δὲ τὸ λεπτολογεῖσθαι, ὅπερ καὶ τερθεῖν λέγουσιν. Captious and legalistic overtones seem to have been present already in Aristophanes (frg. 834), as cited by the Suda (411) Ὅνυχίζεται: ἀκριβολογεῖται, οὕτως Ἀριστοφάνης. ἔν δὲ τῇ συνηθείᾳ τὸ ἐπὶ βλάβη τινι ἔξαπατηθήναι. Artemidorus indicates (I.22) that having one’s fingernails clipped could be applied to financial loss or swindles: τὸ δὲ ὄνυχίζοντα χρεώστη μὲν ἀποδοῦναι τόκον σημαίνει, τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς βλάβην ἀπὸ τῶν ὄνυχισάντων, ἕαν γε ἰδώσιν ἑαυτοὺς ὑπ’ ἄλλων τινῶν ὀνυχισθέντας· καὶ γὰρ ἐν τῇ συνηθείᾳ ὄνυχίζεσθαι φαμεν τὸν ἐπὶ βλάβη ὑπὸ τινὸς ἔξαπατηθῆναι. Strikingly the atticizing emperor Julian uses ἄπονυχίζων in this pejorative, literary sense.  

57 Ε Flavius Claudius Julianus Imperator Phil., Περὶ τῶν τοῦ αὐτοκράτορος πράξεων ἢ περὶ  
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The use of ὀνυξίζειν in the active voice to indicate cutting fingernails is frequent in the Septuagint. It is also used in this sense with reference to cutting fingernails, as in the explanations of Hesiod’s prohibition against cutting one’s fingernails at a religious festival (Opera et dies 742-743) in the Etymologica (all lemmata under ἀπὸ πεντόξιω: Etymologicum genuinum = Etymologicum magnum 1649 = Etymologicum Symeonis = Pseudo-Zonaras, Lexicon).

From the ancient noun ὀνυξ arose the derivative ὀνυχίων, yielding the modern form νύχι. Neither of the two verbs discussed by Philemon remains in Greek usage, though the noun ἀπονύχι derived from ἀπονυχίω remains in use. The verb ἐξονυχίζω retains its sense in modern Greek of scrutinize, examine closely, together with the adjective ἐξονυχιστικός, close, minute, thorough.

This lemma is the third in the series corresponding to a sequence in Thomas Magister. He makes the same point and adds a parallel set of nouns: Ἄκουσματα κάλλιον ἢ ἀκροάματα. ἀκρόαςις δὲ, οὐκ ἄκουσις· κοινὸν γάρ (Ritschl 1832, 6.16). There are no exact parallels to these two lemmata in the tradition, but Moeris likewise cites Ἀκουσμα as good Attic usage, and relegates ἑισιλεις: Ἐργάτης γάρ ἐστι καὶ τούτων ἀγαθός, οὐκ ἀποσημιεύων οὐδὲ ἀπονυχίζων τὰ ὀψιματα οὐδὲ ἀποτορυνέων τὰς περιόδους καθάπερ οἱ κοιμοί οὕτως, σεμνὸς δὲ ἀμα καὶ καθαρὸς καὶ τοῖς ὀνόμασι ἰνν καιρῷ χρώμενος...
Militating against this hyperatticism is a passage that appears in Photius' *Lexicon*, the *Synagoge*, and that Reitzenstein identified as a fragment from Phrynichus' *Praeparatio sophistica*. Phrynichus attacks those who go utterly astray (διαμαρτάνοντι) by maintaining that ἀκρόαμα is incorrect Attic usage when in fact the word is widely used (πλεονάζουσι). He cites passages

(Praeparatio sophistica (frag. 135) = Photius Lexicon (A—Δ) 4040 = Synagoge B α810)

(Cunningham 2003): Ἀκουσμα, οὐκ ἀκρόαμα φασί τινες λέγειν τούς Ἀττικοὺς, διαμαρτάνοντι δε- καί γάρ πλεονάζουσι μὲν ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ φωνῇ, χράνται δὲ ὀμίσω καὶ τῷ ἀκροάματι, ὡς Αἰσχύνης ἐν τῷ κατὰ Κτησιφῶντος: „βαρύτερον τῶν ἔργων, ὡς πεπόθιμον, τὸ ἀκρόαμα γίνεται“. καὶ Ξενοφῶν δὲ χρώμενος τῷ ἀκούσματι οὐδὲν ἤπτον καὶ τῷ ἀκροάματι κέχρηται ἀλλαχοῦ τε λέγων (Hier. 1, 14) καὶ ἐν τῷ Συμποσίῳ (2, 2) τὸν Σωκράτην εἰσάγων λέγοντα: „νὴ Δία, ὢ Καλλία, τελέως ἡμᾶς ἐστιάζει· οὐ γὰρ μόνον τὸ δείπνον ἀμεμπτὸν παρέθηκας, ἀλλὰ καὶ θεάματα καὶ ἄκροάματα ἑδιστά παρέχεις“. Δίφιλος δὲ ἐκ παραλλήλου τέθεικε τὰς λέξεις (fr. 122 K.): „μόνος γὰρ ἦν λέγων, ἀκουσμα καὶ ἄκροαμα“.  

58a Schwierig wird die Benutzung des Werkes vor allem dadurch, daß Moeris häufig auch nichtattische Wendungen und Wörter aufnimmt und seinem starren Schema folgend den Ἀττικοί zuschreibt; diese Glossen sind in der vorliegenden Edition aufgrund des Fundstellenapparates leicht zu erkennen. Eine zweite Schwierigkeit bereitet die Eigenart unseres Lexikons, den Ἑλληνες nicht nur die verworfenen Wörter zuzuschreiben; auch Glossen, in denen in seiner Vorlage nur zwei Wörter ähnlicher Bedeutung oder Form gegeneinandergehalten werden sollten, preßt Moeris in das Ἀττικοὶ/Ἑλληνες schema.“


59 Praeparatio sophistica (frag. 135) = Photius Lexicon (A—Δ) 4040 = Synagoge B α810.

(Διαμαρτάνοντι δὲ καὶ γάρ πλεονάζουσι μὲν ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ φωνῇ, χράνται δὲ ὀμίσω καὶ τῷ ἀκροάματι, ὡς Αἰσχύνης ἐν τῷ κατὰ Κτησιφῶντος) = Synagoge B α810.  

810 (Hier. 1, 14) καὶ ἐν τῷ Συμποσίῳ (2, 2) τὸν Σωκράτην εἰσάγων λέγοντα: „νὴ Δία, ὢ Καλλία, τελέως ἡμᾶς ἐστιάζει· οὐ γὰρ μόνον τὸ δείπνον ἀμεμπτὸν παρέθηκας, ἀλλὰ καὶ θεάματα καὶ ἄκροάματα ἑδιστά παρέχεις“. Δίφιλος δὲ ἐκ παραλλήλου τέθεικε τὰς λέξεις (fr. 122 K.): „μόνος γὰρ ἦν λέγων, ἀκουσμα καὶ ἄκροαμα“. 

ἀκρόαμα to wider Hellenic usage (Hansen, D. U. 1998, α134)
from Aeschines, Xenophon, and Diphilus as counterexamples to Philemon’s view. Pollux also cites Aeschines’ and Xenophon’s usage of this word, and even censures Menander for using ἀκουστής instead of ἀκροατής. 60

In fact the words ἀκουσμα is somewhat more frequent than ἀκρόαμα in Attic usage, appearing first in Aeschylus (frg. 17.70), then twice in Isocrates, three times in Xenophon, and twice in Plato. ἀκρόαμα appears three times in Xenophon, once in Gorgias and Aeschines. In the TLG corpus forms of ἀκουσμα appear 599 times, of ἀκρόαμα 238 times. In practice it is difficult to establish any clear distinction in meaning between the words; perhaps this semantic overlap accounts for the desire of Atticists such as Philemon to prescribe a single correct form.

While both ἀκουσμα and ἀκρόαμα refer to things heard, the latter may perhaps more often have the overtone of something heard in a performance context, although both appear in this sense. Gorgias 61 and Xenophon (supra) pair the words ἀκρόαμα and θέαμα; the historian Herodian pairs ἀκουσμα and θέαμα. 62 The Etymologicum Symeonis compares an ἀκροατής to a θεατής. 63

-----------------------------

60 Julius Pollux Gramm., Onomasticon. (81.) ἀκουσμα: Αἰσχύνης δ’ ὁ ἄτης (III 241) καὶ ἀκρόαμα εἴπεν, ὡσπερ καὶ Ξενοφών (Conviv II 2, Hier I 14). φαύλον δ’ ὁ Μενάνδρου (III frg 988 Ko) ἀκουστής ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀκροατής.

61 frg. 23: ἤνθησε δ’ ἡ τοσαυτία καὶ διεβοήθη, θαυμαστόν ἀκρόαμα καὶ θέαμα τῶν τότ’ ἄνθρωπων γενομένη

62 Ab excessu divi Marci (1.6.1) θεάματα τε καὶ ἀκούσματα τεσπνά; 4.6.2 πᾶν τε ὁπερ ἐκείνος δι’ ἤδονης ἐσχε θέαμα ἢ ἀκουσμα.

63 4311.001 ἀκούσματα πληθυντικῶς Ἀττικοῖ, τῷ δὲ ἀκροάματι κέχρηται: ἀκούειν μὲν φασιν, ἀκουστεῖν δὲ σύκετε· ἀλλ’ ἀκροατήν, καίτοι θεάσασθαι φασι καὶ θεατήν ὀμοίως. λέγουσιν <ἀκέραιον δύναμιν> (Thuc. III 3, 1) <ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀκροατάν> καὶ βέβαιον κόλασιν καὶ
Strikingly Cicero cites the word ἀκούσμα in Greek in a letter to Atticus, and transliterates the word acroama into his oration Pro Archia, perhaps because the Latin word auditio lacks the connotations of praise poetry found in the Greek tradition. Hesychius defines αὐληταί as ἀκροάματα, αὐλοῦντες (8288); he glosses ἀκούσμα as φήμη (2512), while the scholia to Theocritus gloss αοιδή as ἀκούσμα.\(^\text{64}\) For the Suda the verb ἀκροάσθαι has the overtone of listening deferentially or obediently.\(^\text{65}\) The Suda glosses ἀκρόμα as equivalent to ἀκούσμα, but in a context where the related noun and verb pertain to learning from a teacher.\(^\text{66}\) But references to ἀκουστής and ἀκούσματα in the context of learning or listening to lectures are also frequent.\(^\text{67}\)

φαύλον πράξειν <και ἄλλα θηλυκά όνόματα διὰ τοῦ αἱ κοινῶς προφερόμενα Ἀττικοῖ διὰ τοῦ ος λέγουσι.
\(^\text{64}\)Scholia in Theocritum 10/11d: ἐπὶ ἔσομένους δὲ: ἐπὶ πᾶσι δὲ τοῖς ἐσομένοις καὶ μέλλουσιν ἔσεσθαι, ἢτοι τοῖς μεταγενεστέροις, γενοίμεθα αοιδή, ἢτοι ἀκούσμα.
\(^\text{65}\)993 Ἀκροάσθαι: γενικῇ, ἀντὶ τοῦ ὑπακούειν, οὕτως Ἀντιφών.
\(^\text{66}\)(994.) Ἀκροατής καὶ Ἀκροάσθαι: ὁ μαθητής καὶ τὸ μανθάνειν. Δαμάσκιος: ὁ δὲ ἦκροᾶτο λόγων γεγρακότων καὶ σοφίᾳ τινὶ κεκραμένων. καὶ Ἀκροαμάτων, τούτοστιν ἀκουσμάτων.

καὶ διαμένει καὶ νῦν παρ’ αὐτοῖς πολιτευόμενον τὸ πράγμα, ἦπερ ἄλλο τί τῶν ἀκροαμάτων, αὐλὸς ἢ κιβάρα, τέφεσις ἑνεκα καὶ ψυχαγωγίας.
\(^\text{67}\)Εἰς Ἰσοκράτης Orat., Ad Dæmonium (19.) Ηγοῦ τῶν ἀκουσμάτων πολλὰ πολλῶν εἶναι χρημάτων κρείττων, idem (12) Οὕτω δὲ τὴν γνώμην οὐ δυνατόν διατεθῆναι τὸν μὴ πολλῶν καὶ καλῶν ἀκουσμάτων πεπληρωμένον.
Continuing the sequence, Thomas Magister duplicates this lemma exactly and then again mentions an exception to the rule: 'Ἀνάθημα, οὐκ ἀνάθεμα. εἰ καὶ Φιλόστρατος ἀνάθεμα τῆς Σμυρναίων ἁγορᾶς λέγει.68 Once again Moeris echos Philemon’s view: ἀνάθημα Ἀττικόι, ἀνάθεμα Ἑλληνες (Hansen, D. U. 1998, 57).

In Greek religion, and sometimes in the LXX, ἀνάθημα designates a votive offering.69 ἀνάθημα

69Burkert discusses at II.5.4 Anathemata (Burkert 1985, 92–95). Cf. Behm: “ἀνάθημα is a new Hell. constr. for the Att. ἀνάθημα with no change of meaning. It denotes ‘something dedicated or consecrated to the deity.’ It is used a. of the consecrated offerings laid up in the temple: CIG, 2693d, 12; Plut. Pelop., 25. 7 (I. 291b); 2 Macc. 2:13; Ἰδτ. 16:19 A; elsewhere in the LXX we have ἀνάθημα, cf. also Philo Migr. Abr. 98; Rer. Div. Her., 200.” (Kittel and Friedrich 1933, 1.354)
is used in Herodotus of the dedications Gyges made at Delphi, and by Plato in tandem with sacrifices.70 Dionysius of Halicarnassus describes Demosthenes’ work as composed εἰς χρήσιν by contrast with an ἀνάθημα composed for all time.71

In the LXX the spelling ἀνάθημα was commonly used in the context of the Biblical ban, and this meaning and spelling came to be identified.72 The word appears 22 times in the Septuagint. Leviticus 27.28-29 defines an ἀνάθημα—what the King James translation calls “a devoted thing”—as a man or beast dedicated to God and put to death. This too is a consecration, but also a curse that separates an animal or human being from the community and leads to death.73

70Τύγχας δὲ τυραννεύσας ἀπέπεμψε ἀναθήματα ἐς Δελφοὺς οὐκ ὀλίγα (Hdt. 1.14);
καὶ θεοὶ θυσίας καὶ ἀναθήματα ἰκανώς καὶ μεγαλοπρεπῶς θύειν τε καὶ ἀναστιθέναι (Rep 362 c).
71De Demosthenis dictione (10): ὁ δὲ φήμω τοῦ τε ἀρκοῦντος στοχάζεται καὶ τοὺς καυροὺς
συμμετρεῖται οὐκ εἰς ἀνάθημα καὶ κτήμα κατασκευάζων> τὴν λέξιν μόνον ὁσπερ ὁ
συγγραφεὺς, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς χρήσιν.
72Behm: “It is also used b. of "something delivered up to divine wrath, dedicated to destruction and brought under a curse." In the latter sense ἀνάθημα (more rarely ἀνάθημα) is found only in IG, III. 3, App., XIVb. 17 (a table of curses from Megara dating from the 1st or 2nd century A.D.) outside the LXX etc., where it is used for the Heb. ֶחֶךְם (Lv. 27:28 f.; Dt.7:26; 13:17; Jos. 6:17 f.; 7:11 ff.; Zech. 14: 11 etc.). What comes under the "ban" is taken out of ordinary human circulation and given up to destruction. Hence in the LXX we find such variants for ֶחֶךְם as ἀπώλεια (Is. 34:5),
ἐξολόθρευμα (1 Βασ. 15:21), ἐκθλιβή (Μι. 7:2) and ἀφόρισμα (Εz. 44:29).” (Kittel, et al. 1933, I 354).
73(28.) πάν δὲ ἀνάθημα, ὁ ἐὰν ἀναθήμα ἀνθρώπως τῷ κυρίῳ ἀπὸ πάντων, ὡσα αὐτῷ ἐστιν, ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων ἐως κτίνους καὶ ἀπὸ ἀγγείου κατασχέσεως αὐτοῦ, οὐκ ἀποδώσεται οὐδὲ
evident in Hesychius’ definition of ἀνάθεμα as ἐπάρατος, ἀκοινώνιτος (4298). The biblical background of the word ἀνάθεμα is evident from its subsequent appearances in Philo and the five Pauline epistles.74 Perhaps the first to define the distinction is Ptolemy, in a passage duplicated in Herennius Philo and the Etymologicum Gudianum.75 Theodoret explains that, where common usage explains the sense of ἀνάθημα, Paul “taught us” the second meaning of ἀνάθεμα.76

Laurocist: πάν ἀνάθεμα ἄγιον ἁγίῳ ἐστι τῷ κυρίῳ. (29.) καὶ πάν, ὁ ἐὰν ἀνατεθῇ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, οὐ λαυροθήκεται, ἀλλὰ θανάτῳ θανατωθήκεται. Cf. the Greek φάρμακος (Burkert 1985, 82–84).


76 Theodoretus, Interpretatio in xiv epistulas sancti Pauli (82.149): Ηὐχόμην γὰρ αὐτὸς ἐγὼ ἁναθεμα εἶναι ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ύπερ τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου, τῶν συγγενῶν μου τῶν κατὰ σάρκα. Τὸ ἁναθεμα διπλῆν ἔχει τὴν διάνοιαν. Καὶ γὰρ τὸ ἁφιερωμένον τῷ Θεῷ, ἁναθημα
The distinction between the two words cannot be rigidly maintained, however, since the two words derive from same verb and there is frequent alternation between η and ε in many words. The Septuagint uses ἀνάθεμα 22 times, but it also uses ἀνάθημα on five occasions. Semantically ἀνάθημα and ἀνάθεμα overlapped. The Suda distinguishes the two words while acknowledging that both could be used in either sense. The Etymologicum magnum defines ἀνάθεμα in the sense of ἀνατίθημι rather than the biblical sense.

...
The ἀντιλογία Philemon construes between ἀνάθημα and ἀνάθεμα may be understood as Atticistic resistance to Biblical vocabulary and concepts.

This entry is unique in the lexicographical corpus. The association between ἀκοντί “unwillingly” and ἀπνευστί “breathlessly” is unusual.

Zeus describes his unwilling assent to Hera as follows: καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ σοὶ δῶκα ἐκὼν ἀέκοντι γε θυμῷ (Iliad 4.43); the expression ἐκὼν ἀέκοντι γε θυμῷ became proverbial.

Of the fifty-two later appearances of the word ἀέκοντι in the TLG forty-nine are in the formulation ἀέκοντι θυμῷ, usually a direct quote of the Homeric proverb. θυμός can be defined as breath, comparable in its development to Latin anima (Chantraine 1933, 134; Frisk 1960, 693–694). Thus the expression ἀέκοντι θυμῷ might be illuminated by Philemon’s gloss ἀκοντί (ἀέκοντι) = ἀπνευστί. To act under compulsion, as Zeus did, is to act with a breathless spirit.

------------------------------------

80Suda: (531.) Ἐκοντί: ἑθελοντί. καὶ παροιμία· ἐκὼν ἀέκοντι γε θυμῷ. (549.) Ἐκὼν ἀέκοντι γε θυμῷ. ἐστω γὰρ μοι νόν τῆς ἐκείνου γνώμης ζωγράφος ὁμηρίζουσα γλώττα. Appendix Proverbiorum, (51.) Ἐκὼν ἀέκοντι γε θυμῷ: ἐτὶ τῶν κατ’ ἀνάγκην ποιοῦντων τί.
Homeric Ækow contracts in Attic to Ækōn; it is the privative formation of Ækōn, with which it is frequently contrasted. A noun Ækontēs appears in Epictetus and Herodian.81 (De prosodia catholica part 3, vol. 1 pp. 79-79, 508, part 3, vol. 2, p. 683), Hesychius, and the Suda, not to be confused with the adverb spelled Ækontēn.82 Aelius Dionysius, Phrynichus, and Thomas Magister all reprehend Ækontēs as unattic, prescribing Ætelenontēs instead.83

The forms Ækonti and Æntepusti are discussed by Herodian and Theodosius in the context of

---


82Schwyzer treats the three related adverbs Ækonti, Ækontēn, and Ækontηδόν (Schwyzer, et al. 1953, II.175).

adverbial terminations in -ι.84

A comparable idiom exists in modern Greek and other languages in the Balkan Sprachbund: θέλει ἐπειδή θέλει, Bulgarian ste ne ste, Romanian vrea nu vrea, Albanian donin s’donin, Turkish ister istemez (Joseph, B. D. 2000a). Comparable idioms exist in many languages, such as Latin volens nolens and English willy-nilly.

12 Ἀρτοπώλης. L

The masculine form is unattested in literature before Philostratus in the nominative singular; readers might confuse it with the well-attested feminine Ἀρτόπωλις. The difference in frequency suggests that selling bread was an occupation of women. It appears in Anacreon (frg. 43), as the title of a play by the comic author Hermippus (ἈΡΤΟΠΩΛΙΔΕΣ), in Archippus (frg. 31) and in Aristophanes (Ranae 858, Vespae 238, cf. Lysistrata 458. σκοροδοστανδοκεντρῳαρτοτοπώλιδες). There are five references to ἀρτοπώλια in Aristophanes. The masculine noun appears first in the Ath.

Pol. and later in Philostratus\textsuperscript{85}, but also in later antiquity the feminine ἀρτόπωλις is more common in literature.\textsuperscript{86}

Herodian discusses the accentuation of the feminine noun\textsuperscript{87}, while Pollux discusses the constellation of related words: ἀρτοπώλαι ἀρτοπώλιδες, σιτουργοί, ἀρτοποιοὶ ἀρτοπότοι (\textit{Onomasticon} 21). Before Pollux the word σιτουργός is attested only in Plato (\textit{Pol.} 267e); ἀρτοποιός is attested in Xenophon, twice in Posidonius, in Diodorus Siculus, Josephus, five times in Plutarch and twice in Aelius Aristides.\textsuperscript{88} Pollux associates bread-sellers with bakers as, for example, does Hesychius: (1054.) πᾶς[σ]άνος· ἀρτοπώλις, ἡ ἀρτόπτης.\textsuperscript{89}

The nouns ἀρτοπότος and ἀρτοποιός appear to be prescribed Atticistic usage, although the former does not appear until the \textit{Philetairos}. Pollux’s list then cites Xenophon as witness for the

\textsuperscript{85}Ath. Pol. 51.3: οἱ ἀρτοπώλαι. Flavius Philostratus Soph., \textit{Vitae sophistarum} Olearius p. 526:

„Λολλιανός οὐκ ἔστιν ἀρτοπώλις, ἀλλὰ λογοπώλις“

\textsuperscript{86}twice in Lucian (\textit{Demonax} 23, 63); Demonax Phil., frg. 28; Athenaeus Soph., \textit{Deipnosophistae} v. 2, 2 p. 87; bk 3 Kaib. par. 74; bk 3 Kaib. par. 89 l. 13; bk 12 Kaib. par. 46 l. 12, Alciphron, \textit{Epistulae} bk 3 ep. 24 sect. 1; Arcadius, \textit{De accentibus} p. 34 l. 9; p. 38 l. 19.

\textsuperscript{87}Herodianus \textit{De prosodia catholica} p. 361 = Arcadius Gramm., \textit{De accentibus} προσπαραξύνεται καὶ τὸ ἀρτόπωλις.

\textsuperscript{88}Cyropædia 5.5.39; Posidonius frg. 146, frg. 108a Jacoby; D.S. Bibliotheca historiae bk. 34/35.2.22; Josephus 15.310; Plutarch, Cato Minor 12.3; \textit{De Pythiae oraculis} 401.E ter; Alexander 22.8; Aelius Aristides Rhet., \textit{Πρὸς Πλάτανα περὶ ῥητορικῆς} p. 86, p. 196.

\textsuperscript{89}ἀρτόπτης appears only here and at Pollux 112. Cf. Zonaras \textit{Lexicon} (4050.) Ἀρτοπώλειον: τὸ μαγκυπεῖον, ἐν ψ οἱ ἄρτοι γίνονται. Ἀρτοπώλιον δὲ ὁ τόπος, ἐνθὰ οἱ ἄρτοι πνεύμακτον.
noun ἀρτοκόπος,90 which is in fact attested in Herodotus, Xenophon, and Plato.91 The Philetairos prescribes ἀρτοτόπος and excludes ἀρτοκόπος on etymological grounds.92 Phrynichus rejects ἀρτοκόπος in favor of ἀρτοτόπος or ἀρτοποίος.93 Libanius uses ἀρτοτόπος seven times.94 Thomas Magister goes farther than Herodian and Phrynichus, arguing that ἀρτοκόπος is preferable to ἀρτοποίος.95

---

90 Ξενοφών (Anab IV 4.21) δὲ καὶ ἀρτοκόπους ἐφη· τὸ δὲ ὡμα τὸ ἀρτοκοπεῖν ἐν Φρυνίχου Μονοτρόπῳ (I 378. 27 Κο), ἐν δ’ Ἀριστοφάνους “Ἡρώδην (fg 313) ἀρτοτόποια (Onomasticon 21).
91 Herodotus 1.51; 9.82; Xenophon, Anabasis 4.4; Hellenica 7.1; Plato, Gorgias 518b.
92 (177) Ἀρτοτόπος, ο":"χι ἀρτοκόπος· ἕγειται γὰρ τὸ πέπτειν, ο":"χι ὁ κόπος, rejecting the etymologies found in Orion and Etymologicum Gudianum: 9 Ἀρτοκόπος>9· διὰ τὸν τὸν ἄρτον ἔχον κόπον. (Orion, Etymologicum excerpta e cod. regio 2610 p. 175 = excerpta e cod. Vat. gr. 1456 §17); Ἀρτοκόπος· διὰ τὸν τὸν ἄρτον κόπον (EG p. 209). The verb ἀρτοποπεῖν appears first in the comic poet Phrynichus (frg. 27). Regarding the etymology, see Frisk: “ἀρτοκόπος “Brotbäcker” (ion. att.); das Hinterglied zu πέσσω, πέπων... wohl mit Metathese derselben Art wie in lit. kepù ‘backen’ für "peki..." (Frisk 1960, 156) and Schwzyzer: “ἀρτοκόπος, neben und für ἀρτοτόπος (aus *pok'os, zu πότανον πέσσω ai. pácati usw.) aus *-πόπος...oder für *-k'opos (als Metathese von *-pok'os) oder *-k'ok'os...” (Schwyzer, et al. 1953, 298–9).
94 Seven times: Or. 4.29; 27.2; 27.11; 27.27; 29.16; 29.19; 31.12.
95 (4) Ἀρτοτόπος κάλλιον ἦ ἀρτοποίος καὶ σιτοποίος. Λιβάνιος ἐν τῷ κατὰ Ἰκαρίων· ἐχθροὺς δὲ ἐχθροῖς προούτειν ἀρτοποποῦς. καὶ πάλιν ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ· ἑπὶ τὰς τῶν ὁρέων κορυφὰς τοὺς ἀρτοποποῦς ἀνήγαγεν. καὶ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ πάλιν· διὰ πάντων ἦ ὡσπερ χειμάρρους τῶν
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The nouns κρίβανος, φούρνος and καθαρούργειον do not appear to have produced any agentive nouns through the Byzantine period.96

The future participle from ἀρπάζω ἄρτομενος appears only here in Greek literature, so Philemon’s efforts to proscribe the form may have met with success. The Attic future participle ἄρπασόμενος is well attested, in Hellanicus, Aristophanes, Xenophon, and later in Plutarch, Onasander, Appian, Polyaeus, Claudius Aelianus, Libanius, Philostorgius, Theodoretus, Procopius, and Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopulus.97 Other forms of the same future conjugation are attested in Philostratus, Libanius, Chrysostom and Procopius.98
Like so many of the forms Philemon repudiates, the form ἀρπάζων derives from the Septuagint, where it is the future tense form of ἀρπάζω (Muraoka 2002, 30). The second person singular future form appears in the Codex Vaticanus text of Levit. 19.13: οὐκ ἀδικήσεις τὸν πλησίον καὶ οὐχ ἀρπάζω (Akademia Athenon 1933, 107 s.v.). The second person singular future form appears in the Codex Vaticanus text of Levit. 19.13: ὦκ ἀδικήσεις καὶ πορεύσουμε καὶ Ωμψομαι, καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ὀ ἐξαιρούμενος. The only other appearances of this form are in commentaries on this passage and in Hesychius’s gloss on this passage. The form ἀρπάζων appears at Hosea 5:14: καὶ ἔγω ἀρπάζων καὶ πορεύσουμε καὶ Ωμψομαι, καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ὀ ἐξαιρούμενος.

The etymological tradition imagined that ἀρπάζω derived from a verb ἀρπαζω, itself derived from ἄρπιη, a bird of prey. Philoxenus, our earliest source for this etymology, confesses ignorance of an attestation for ἀρπαζω; he generates the verb by analogy with other noun-verb pairs: ὁς φωνή φωνώ, αὐθή αὐθῷ, σιγὴ σιγώ, οὕτως ἄρπη ἄρπῳ. This etymology appears also in Orion.
and in Herodian, *de prosodia catholica* (3.1 p.281). A passage in the *Etymologicum genuinum* shows how the conjectured verb ἀρπαῶ was inspired by attempts to explain the name of the Harpies by analogy.107

Use of the present indicative of εἰμι to represent the future of ἔρχομαι was a characteristic features of Attic prose,108 one repeatedly insisted on by Atticist lexicographers.109 This passage is

107α 241 Ἄρπακτικαί ἄρπακτικαί θεαί: παρὰ τὸ ἄρπα, τὸ ἄρπαζω, Ἁρπυια, ὡς αἰθωνία καὶ ἄγω ἄγνω = *Etymologicum magnum* (148.31) = *Etymologicum Symeonis* p. 222.

128
one of 25 where Philemon agrees closely with Phrynichus (Heimannsfeld 1911, 51), notably with Eclogues (24). Απελέυσομαι παντάπασι φιλάττου· οὕτε γὰρ οἱ δόκιμοι ῥήτορες οὕτε ἡ ἀρχαία κωμιδία οὕτε Πλάτων κέχρηται τῇ φωνῇ· ἀντὶ δὲ αὐτοῦ τῷ ἀπειμὶ χρώ καὶ τοῖς ὁμοιοειδέσιν ὀσαύτως. In fact finite forms of ἀπελέυσομαι are first attested in fragments of Teles and Protagoras, but most frequently in the Septuagint, where they appear 45 times. They appear in Dionysius of Halicarnassus, four times in Philo, three times in the New Testament, in Josephus, three times in Clement, four times in Epictetus, in Dio Chrysostom, twenty-four times in Origen and frequently in later Christian literature including 190 times in Chrysostom, who is sometimes accused of atticizing. The proscription of ἀπελέυσομαι appears to have been scrupulously observed by Atticistic writers. ἐπεξελέυσομαι, also attacked by Phrynichus, did not come into use until the Hellenistic period.110

die Formen von εἰμί eintreten. In der Dichtersprache aber hat der Indikativ auch Präsenzbewertung, als: εἰσι Aesch. S. 355. πρόσεμι Eum. 237,9) sehr häufig auch bei den späteren Prosaisten (aber Thuc. 4, 61, 8 ἐπιασίν ist futurischen Sinnes). Die Futurbedeutung findet sich übrigens bereits bei Homer, wenn auch nicht ausschließlich; desgl. hat bei Herodot εἰμί diese Bedeutung. --Τῶν und ἦναι gehören sowohl zu εἰμί ich werde gehen als zu ἔρχομαι ich gehe.” 109Pollux ε 155 acknowledges that Homer frequently used ἐλέυσομαι, but he does not number among the established authors: τό γὰρ ἐλέυσομαι Ὁμήρος μὲν εἰτηκέν, τῶν δὲ καταλογάδην οὗχ οἱ κεκριμένοι. The TGL glosses κεκριμένοι as “Probatus, Exploratus, ex Epigr. ἀσπίδα δ’έσχον Σωθείς κεκριμένην ὑδατι καὶ πολέμῳ: ["κεκριμένοι ἄνδρες, Probati viri, Herod. 3.31” Schw. Mss.” (Estienne 1816, 5332c).
110Eclogae (161.) Ἐπεξελευσομένος ἄλλος οὖτος [ gridView: 'grid_view'] Ὑπακλής· τοῦτ’ οὖν ἔσωρεν ἐκ τριώδου Φαβωρίνος (fr. 133 Bar.). χρῆ γὰρ ἐπεξών εἰπεῖν· καὶ γὰρ ἐπέξειμι λέγεται, ἀλλ’ οὖκ ἐπεξελευσομαι. Alpers (Alpers 1981, 218) recognizes this passage as the source for Thomas.
If Philemon was working from a text of Phrynichus in compiling this lemma, so too was Moeris, who contrasts Attic and Hellenistic usage: ἀπεισιν Ἀττικοὶ, ἀπελεύσεται Ἑλληνες (Hansen, D. U. 1998, #29). Many such parallel lemmata suggest that Philemon and Moeris were working from the same model; “Wirklich lassen sich eine Reihe von Übereinstimmungen durch gemeinsame Benutzung des Phrynichus erklären” (Hansen, D. U. 1998, 42). Orus similarly advocates ἔξειμι against ἔξελευσομαι.111 The Philetairos says that πρόεισι and ἐξεισιν are to be used exclusively in the future tense, for προέχεται and ἐξέρχεται in the present.112 Lucian’s Soloecista broaches this theme; scholia to this passage and to Sophocles show that the Attic forms had become incomprehensible to many.113

Philemon discusses two other compound forms of εἰμι below: Εἰσεῖμι <κακαῖειμί'> ἔξελευσομαι πάρες (151), and Πρόσειμι· οὖ προσελεύσομαι (219).

ἀπήμην is attested only here.

Magister (p.109.11) ἐπεξελευσόμενος φασί τινες [καὶ ὁ Φαβωρίνος]· σὺ δὲ ἐπεξίων καὶ ἐπέξειμι, ὡς Ἀττικά.

111Orus B 62 ἐξειμί, οὖκ ἔξελευσομαι λέγουσιν Ἀττικοί.

112Philetaerus (287) Πρόσειμι καὶ ἐξεισιν ἐπὶ τοῦ μέλλοντος μόνον, ἀντὶ τοῦ προῆξει καὶ ἐξήξει· ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ ἐνεστότος προέχεται καὶ ἐξέρχεται.

Cohn corrects Osann’s reading. A comparable lemma appears in Thomas Magister, but out of the sequence of quoted passages; where Thomas’ lemma ἀπειςιν followed ἀνάθημα on page 7 of Ritschl’s text, the following lemma appears on page 41.1: Ἀθυροστομεῖν μή εἰτης, ἀλλὰ λοιδοφεῖν.

The basic sense of ἀθυροστόμος and words built on it is evoked by the TGL as qui dicenda tacenda loquitur, though at Sophocles Philoctetes 1888 it may be understood as simply garrula.¹¹⁴ This is the only appearance of a word in this family before Plutarch, leading Wakefield to conjecture ἀθυρόγλωσσος,¹¹⁵ which appears in Euripides’ Orestes (903). Phrynichus glosses this entry and defines ἀθυρόγλωσσος as follows: σημαίνει δὲ τὸν ἀθυρόστομον, τὸν μὴ κατέχοντα τὸ στόμα.¹¹⁶ Hesychius similarly glosses ἀθυρόγλωσσος, confirmation that the word was less

¹¹⁴Horace Epist. 1.7.72; cf. Ennius Annales 8.724 cuncta malaque et bona dictu Euomeret (Skutsch 1985) (Estienne 1831, s.v.).
¹¹⁵(Estienne 1831, ibid; Erfurdt 1824).
current than ἀθυροστόμος in later antiquity.\textsuperscript{117}

λοιδοφέω and related words are widely attested in Attic writers, including Aeschylus, Thucydidès, Euripides, Antiphon, Pherecrates, Isocrates, Aristophanes, Xenophon, and Plato, and continue in use by by virtually all authors including Atticists such as Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Dio Chrysostom, Lucian, Aelius Aristides, Pausanias, Cassius Dio, Philostratus, Themistius, and Julian. Some indication of the vast Greek vocabulary of derision can be found in the number of scopic words defined by λοιδοφεῖν in Hesychius alone.\textsuperscript{118} Lucian’s derision of the

\textsuperscript{117}Hesychius (1641.) ἀθυρόγλωσσος- βλάσφημος, φλίταρχος, ἀθυρόστομος (Eur. Or. 903).

\textsuperscript{118}Cf. Phrynichus, \textit{Praeparatio sophistica} 52.12 βάλλειν σκώμμασιν: τὸ σκώπτειν. καὶ βάλλειν λοιδοφάις ἢ τοις λοιδοφεῖν. καὶ βάλλειν ἁραῖς; ibid. p. 99.18 Πλάτων δὲ ἐν Πεισάνθρῳ (fr. 105) τὸ πολιτοκοπεῖν ἀντὶ τοῦ λοιδοφεῖν καὶ κωμαδεῖν εἴπεν. Hesychius: (924.) σκέββολλε· λοιδοφεῖ (5195.) ἐπισμή· ἐπιτριβεῖ, ἀπὸ τοῦ σμῆχειν ἢ τρίβειν ἢ πλύνειν· λοιδοφεῖ, πλήττει. σμώδαι γὰρ τὸ πατάξαι (Ar. Thesm. 351.) κακοφοθεῖ· κακολογεῖ,

?λοιδοφεῖ, ύβοίζει (Eur. Alc. 707) (2480.) κηκάδει· λοιδοφεῖ. χλενάζει (2848.) [κλαδεῖ· λοιδοφεῖ. φθέγγεται] (4398.) κυδάσσει· ταράσσει. λοιδοφεῖ (1734.) τωθάζει· χλενάζει, μετὰ κενοδοξίας σκόπτει. ἐρεθίζει. κατακαυχάται. λοιδοφεῖ. θωπεύει. κακολογεῖ (7434.) ἀρέθηνεν· λοιδοφεῖν S καὶ <έπι> γυναικὶ· πρὸς ἄνδρα διαφέρεσθαι (3124.) ἐνίπτειν· κακοῦν. ψέγειν. λοιδοφεῖν (677.) θραίειν· λοιδοφεῖν. Λάκωνες (44.) ἰαμβίζειν· τὸ λοιδοφεῖν, κακολογεῖν· ἀπὸ Ίάμβης τῆς λοιδόρου (4676.) κυρηβάτης καὶ κυρηβος· ὁ ἀσελγὴς ἐν τῷ λοιδοφεῖν (355.) λάσθαι· παίειν. ὀλιγωρεῖν· λοιδοφεῖν (1323.) λυβάζειν· λοιδοφεῖν (r) (1733.) στεμβάζειν· λοιδοφεῖν, χλενάζειν (2265.) (σ)συμβαλεῖν· λοιδοφεῖν (416.) ἀγείρεσθαι· ἐκπορευέσθαι. *λοιδοφείσθαι A συναθροίζεσθαι (537.) δειράν· λοιδοφείσθαι. Λάκωνες (82.) καθάπτεσθαι· λοιδοφείσθαι, *ʔόνειδίζειν (s). πραίνειν (A 582). n. ἐφάπτεσθαι. ἐγγίζειν (4399.) κυδάζεσθαι· λοιδοφείσθαι
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neologism βρωμολόγοι suggests the productivity of this semantic field.\textsuperscript{119}

16 Ἀντέχειν· οὐκ ἀντέχου, ἀλλ’ ἀνέχου. L

This passage has no parallel in extant lexica.

In the active voice Ἀντέχειν can mean to hold against, hold out against or withstand, as in Xenophon τῷ πόνῳ οὗ δύναται Ἀντέχειν (Cynegeticus 9.10). The second-century historian Herodian writes Ἀντέχειν πρὸς τοὺς καμάτους (Ab excessu divi Marci 3.6.10). Phrynichus uses the expression μὴ Ἀντέχειν δι’ αἰδώ (Eclogae 160). The Suda and the Etymologica give numerous examples of Ἀντέχειν in this sense.\textsuperscript{120}

119Α ἀπαξ: βρωμολόγοι, οἱ Pseudol. 24: σὲ δὲ οὐδές ἥτιάσατο ἤμων ’βρωμολόγους’ λέγοντα...

Lucianus adversarium, quod tali voce usus sit, incusat, quo iure nescimus. Neque usquam alibi invenitur, significat „foetida verba faciens“ (Doehring 1916, 14).

\textsuperscript{120}Suda: κρύει Ἀντέχειν (α 2642); οὐ γὰρ ἔθ’ οἶος ἕ’ ἔμα’ ὑπερέχειν τῆς ἀντλίας, ἀντὶ τοῦ Ἀντέχειν καὶ περιγινεσθαι τοῦ πράγματος (α 2750; cf. οἱ 154); οἱς ἀπασι τοῖς ἀνιαροῖς Ἀντέχειν (α 4329); Ἀντέχειν τῆς ὁμής (α 4329). Etymologicum Gudianum Ἰσχυρός, ὃ Ἰσχεὶ καὶ Ἀντέχειν δυνάμενος (p. 284); Etymologicum magnum Ἰσχυρός, ὃ Ἰσχεὶ καὶ Ἀντέχειν δυνάμενος (p. 479).
ἀντέχεσθαι in the middle voice means Retineo, quasi contra teneo, usually with a genitive
(Estienne 1831, 882 s.v.). This is close to the original sense of the verb ἐχω itself.121 In Attic
authors the imperative ἀντέχου is an injunction to take hold of or to cling to something;122 the
Suda notes that in Demosthenes and Hyperides the verb means ἀντυλαμβάνεται.123 It can also
mean to hold on to a quality.124

Aelius Dionysius in his Ἀττικὰ ὁνόματα defines ἀνέχει as πάρεχε125 and ἀνέχειν126 as τὸ

121 “Ce développement du sens «avoir» est issu d’un sens originel de «posséder, tenir, retenir»
confirmé par l’étymologie, le sens de «retenir» étant bien conservé dans les présents du type
ἄσχω, -ἀνω, -ἀνάω...” (Chantraine 1968a, 392). For IE languages generally, “Le verbe qui signifie
„j’ai“ au sens de „je possède“, diffère d’une langue indo-européenne à l’autre... L’étymologie de
la plupart de ces mots est transparente. Les racines sont en général „prendre“, „prendre“. Et les
présents sont des duratifs exprimant l’idée de „garder une chose prise, tenir“ (Meillet 1923, 9–10).
122Euripides ἀντέχου θυγατρῶς (IA 1367); Aristophanes Ἀντέχον σὺ τῶν θυρῶν (Lys. 161);
τοῦτον ἀντέχου (Acharnenses 1121); Menander ἀντέχου τῶν σχοινίων (frg. 536.7).
123α 2642. Demosthenes: παρακαλεῖν δὲ αὐτοὺς μηδὲν καταπλαγέντας τὸν Φίλιππον
ἀντέχεσθαι τῆς ἐαυτῶν καὶ τῆς τῶν ἄλλων Ἑλλήνων ἑλευθερίας (De corona 185.2); ἀπιστία.

ταύτην φυλάττετε, ταύτης ἀντέχεσθε: (Phil. 2.24).
124τῆς ἀρέτης ἀντέχεσθαι = adhaerere virtuti (Hdt. 1.134).
125(135.) ἀνέχει· ἀντὶ τοῦ πάρεχε. Θεόπομπος (II 821 M. = fr. 82 K.) = Photius (α 1903.) = Souda α
126α (136.) ἀνέχειν· τὸ ἀνατέλλειν τῶν ἠλιῶν ἢ τὴν σελήνην. λέγεται δὲ ἀνέχειν καὶ τὸ ἐξέχειν
καὶ προέχειν, ὡς Θουκυδίδης ἐν τετάρτῃ (53, 3): ἕν πᾶσα γὰρ ἀνέχει ὡς τὸ Σικελικὸν καὶ
Κρητικὸν πέλαγος, καὶ τὸ κωλύειν, ὡς ὁ αὐτὸς ἐν ἐκτῇ (86, 4): τοὺς ταῦτα κωλύοντας καὶ
ἀνέχοντας. καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης (II 1191 M. = fr. 621 K.): ἕν δ’ ὅπτε ἀνέχες αὐτῶν ὑστερ ἐκός
ἤν. καὶ τὸ διαβαστάζειν καὶ φέρειν, δ’ καὶ ἀνέχεσθαι καὶ ἐπανέχειν λέγεται. cf. Photius α
άνατέλλειν τὸν ἠλιον ἢ τὴν σελήνην,127 τὸ ἐξέχειν καὶ προέχειν,128 τὸ κωλύειν,129 and τὸ διαβαστάζειν καὶ φέρειν,130 elsewhere the word is defined as ἄνυψοι, τιμά,131 σῷζειν,132 ἀνατέταται,133 and ἄνεσιν ἔχειν.134

1899.

127Photius (1899.) Ἀνέχειν· τὸ ἀνατέλλειν τὸν ἠλιον ἢ τὴν σελήνην. Λέγεται ἄνεχειν καὶ τὸ ἐξέχειν καὶ προέχειν. Θουκυδίδης δ’ (53, 3). Λέγεται ἄνεχειν καὶ τὸ κωλύειν, ὡς ὁ αὐτός ἐν ζ’ (86, 4). καὶ ἀνέχειν τὸ διαβαστάζειν καὶ φέρειν, ὃ καὶ ἄνεχεσθαι καὶ ἑπανέχειν λέγεται. Etymologicum Synemion 8 ἀνέχειν... σημαίνει δὲ καὶ τὸ ἀνατέλλειν. Cf. Synagoge B α 1341 (Cunningham 2003, 613).


129Hesychius (5019.) ἀνέχο· κωλύω Souda (2363).κωλύειν. ἄνεχειν τε αὐτοῦ τὰς ἐπὶ πλείων ὀρμάς καὶ ἐκδρομὰς καὶ πρὸς ἑαυτόν τὴν σχολὴν ἀγείν. Etymologicum Synemion 8 ἀνέχειν... καὶ ἀνέχοντας (Thuc. 6, 86, 4) ἀντὶ τοῦ κωλύοντας· Ἀριστοφάνης (Fr. 632). Cf. Synagoge B α 1341 (Cunningham 2003, 613).


131Souda (2363.) Ἀνέχει· ἄνυψοι, τιμά. Σοφοκλῆς· ἐπεὶ σε λέχος δοριάλωτον στέρεσας ἀνέχει θούριος Αίας, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐπεὶ σε τιμά· Ο Αίας δοριάλωτον, στέρεσας τὸ λέχος σου. ἢ οὕτως· ἀλλ’ ἐπεὶ σε ἀνέχει ο Αίας δοριάλωτον λέχος σου στέρεσαι· πρὸς Τέκμησαν δὲ ὁ λόγος, γνωσία Ἀιαντος αἰχμάλωτον. Cf. Pseudo–Zonaras Lexicogr., Lexicon 211.3.

132Photius α 1900 (1900.) <9Ἀνέχει>9· σῷζει· οὐχ ὡς τινες ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐπέχει· καὶ Θουκυδίδης (1, 141, 5)· „αἱ περιουσίαι τῶν χρημάτων τοὺς πολέμους ἀνέχουσιν“, ἀντὶ τοῦ σῶξουσιν. Cf. Souda α 2362, Pseudo–Zonaras Lexicogr., Lexicon 210.21, Synagoge B α 1337 (Cunningham 2003, 613).

133Hesychius (α 5009) ἀνέχει· ἀνατέταται A

134Hesychius (5010.) ἀνέχειν· ἄνεσιν ἔχειν A
Middle-voice ἀνέχεσθαι generally means sustineo, tolero, patior, much like active voice ἀντέχειν\textsuperscript{135} (Estienne 1831, s.v. 729 ff.). Isocrates\textsuperscript{136} and Demosthenes\textsuperscript{137} pair ἀνέχεσθαι and ὑπομένειν.

17 Ἀρτύδιον- οὐκ Ἀρτύδιον. L

The form Ἀρτύδιον which Philemon here commends, inepte as Dindorff observes (Estienne 1831, s.v.), is otherwise unattested. The diminutive Ἀρτύδιον is first attested in the second century in Soranus, Galen, Apollonius Dyscolus, and Iamblichus.\textsuperscript{138}

Diminutive suffixes in -ὐδιον generally derive from nouns with a final υ, such as ἰχθύδιον (Hippocrates, De morbis popularibus 7.1.3 etc.) from ἰχθύς. But σκύδιον (Phrynichus Comic. frg.

\textsuperscript{135}The active form can sometimes have the meaning of ἀντέχω as the Souda indicates: (2363) καὶ πόνοις τε ἀνέχους ὡστα, καὶ σκηληρῷ βίῳ καὶ τραχεῖ ἑνεπιθυμεῖνος, καὶ Σοφοκλῆς- οὐκ ἀνέχουσι τῶν πόνων.

\textsuperscript{136}Ως ἔστιν ἐν τῶν αἰχμών πρότερον μὲν μηδὲ τὰς τῶν ἐλευθέρων ἱσηγορίας ἀνέχεσθαι, νῦν δὲ καὶ τὴν τῶν δούλων παροφοσίαν ὑπομένοντας φαίνεσθαι (Archidamus 97.4.)

\textsuperscript{137}εἰ ἕγω μὲν τὰ ἐργα τῶν ὑπὲρ υἱῶν πόνων ὑπέμειναι, ὑμεῖς δὲ μηδὲ τοὺς λόγους αὐτῶν ἀνέξεσθε (De corona 160-161).

\textsuperscript{138}N.b. the etymology proposed by van Windekens: “Le sens premier de ἂρτος < *ἄτρος a donc été celui de «(ce qui est) desséché, cuit»” (Windekens 1986, 20).
25) might as well derive from σικυός as from σικύς; σμινύδιον in Aristophanes (frg. 855) is from σμινύη (Pollux 7.148)

At §62 below Philemon follows Phrynichus in advocating the diminutive βοΐδιον against βούδιον.139

18 Ἄμαξα μόνος ἀφιθμός (?) L (Cohn)

Cohn could not make sense of this lemma; though Ἄμαξαί are frequently discussed in the lexicographers, no reference parallel to this one appears.

Theophrastus in his Historia plantarum (5.7.6) describes πρίνος—the ilex—as suitable for μονοστρόφοις Ἀμάξαις. Schneider proposes the unattested reading μονοστρόχους (Schneider and Link 1818, ad loc.). Neither reading can be paralleled.

19 Ἁλλὰς, οὐκ ἀλλάντιον. L

-----------------------------

In this lemma, copied by Thomas Magister after ἀπειςὶν (Ritschl 1832, 7),140 Philemon rejects the diminutive form of ἀλλᾶς, a kind of sausage frequently mentioned in Athenian comic literature. ἀλλᾶς appears in Hipponax, twice in Crates and Metagenes, six times in Aristophanes, in Nicophon, Axionicus, and Eubulus, and Euphro. The prohibition of the diminutive form ἀλλάντων in Philemon and Moeris may have been effective; it does not appear again until Hesychius, who glosses (1938.) αἱμαλέα and (38.) γάθια as ἀλλάντα, and the Etymologicum magnum, which glosses Ἀἰμάτια: Ἀλλάντια (p. 35).

Moeris writes: ἀλλᾶς Ἀττικοὶ, ἀλλάντων Ἔλληνες (Hansen, D. U. 1998, 187). This gloss is one of several that indicates a close kinship between Moeris and Philemon. This kinship is suggested by the fact that the excerpts from Philemon α-δ published by Cohn immediately follow those of Moeris in the Laurentianus 91 sup. 10 manuscript (Cohn 1898). Hansen observes that “Zwischen Moer. und den wenigen uns erhaltenen Auszugen aus dem Werk des Philemon lassen sich eine Reihe von Gemeinsamkeiten ausmachen. Schon Heimannsfeld (52 f.) und Wendel (Moeris, 2508 f.) erkannten, daß beide häufig in Doktrin und Wortlaut zusammengehen” (Hansen, D. U. 1998, 40). Both incline to brevity and tend to name the recommended Attic word first, by contrast with Phrynichus. The nature of the resemblance suggests not so much that one was copying the other, as that both relied on a common source, likely Phrynichus,141 although this particular

140 An identical lemma: Ἀλλᾶς, οὐκ ἀλλάντων.
141 “Quamquam autem nonnullis glossis Philemon et Moeris ita consentiunt, ut artiorem necessitudinem inter eos aliquis coniecerit 1), tamen aliae glossae... obstant. Itaque verisimillimum videtur esse ex eadem vel simili epitoma Phrynichi glossas et ad Philemonem et ad Moeridem pervenisse...” “1 Saepius Moeris ad Phrynichum propius accedit” (Heimannsfeld 1911, 53), followed by Wendel, Erbse, and Hansen (Wendel, C. 1932, 2509; Erbse 1950, 58; Hansen, D. U.
lemma has no parallel among the surviving fragments of Phrynichus.

20  ἀποσκόπεῖμαι, οὐκ ἀποσκοπῶ. L

Thomas Magister slightly varies this citation from Philemon in succession on the previous lemma: ἀποσκοποῦμαι κάλλιον ἢ ἀποσκοπῶ. As seen at §9 above and §44 below, this is another example of the Atticistic preference for deponent over active voice forms, often to the extent of hypercorrection. In fact forms of active voice ἀποσκοπέω are attested in Aeschylus and Plato, and later in Diophilus, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Philo, Josephus, Lucian, and Aelius Aristides.\textsuperscript{142} Forms of ἀποσκοποῦμαι are not attested before Pollux and Synesius.\textsuperscript{143}

Chantraine describes σκοπέω as a “verbe dénominatif de sens duratif issu de σκόπος,...«fixer longuement ses yeux sur, examiner» (Pl., ion.-att.)...” (Chantraine 1999, 1014). The verb was used by early authors exclusively in the present and imperfect, with much the same sense in the active and middle voices (“perh. implying a more deliberate consideration” \textit{LSJ}). ἀποσκοπῶ adds the sense of looking from a distance.

\textsuperscript{142}Notably Aeschylus, Tetralogy 2, play D, fragments 20a and 20b (twice); Plato, \textit{Politicus} 291e, \textit{Respublica} 460a.
\textsuperscript{143}Pollux 5.17; Synesius, \textit{De insomniis} 19.35.
A lemma in Orus, repeated by Photius, the Souda, and the Synagoge, likewise urges the form ἀποσκοπεῖσθαι against οὐκοπεύειν, a form with much the same meaning as οὐκοπεύειν.¹⁴⁴ This despite the fact that ἀποσκοπεῖσθαι appears relatively late, while οὐκοπεύειν is found in Herodotus and Xenophon.¹⁴⁵ Lobeck notes the apparent perversity of the Atticistic preference for ἀποσκοπεῖσθαι.¹⁴⁶

Here Philemon refers to the quantity of a vowel in the word ἀρά; if ἀρά is to be read as printed by Osann, it must distinguish the long α of the penult of this word comparable to Latin num from the short α of ἁρά, comparable to Latin igitur, itaque, and utique. If, as A. Kaldellis suggests, the lemma refers to the noun meaning curse it may refer to the long quantity of the final vowel in ᾃρά.¹⁴⁷

Hesychius α 6922 distinguishes the noun from the conjunction: ἀρά· εὐχή· κατάρα βλάβη· καὶ

¹⁴⁵Herodotus I.8; Xenophon, Hipparchicus 7.6.
¹⁴⁷Leopold notes the variable accent on the penult of ἁρά, ἃρα. ἁρά· εὐχή· κατάρα βλάβη· καὶ (in arsi ἁρά, in thesi ἁρά) (Leopold 1869, 130).
As an adverb frequently used by comic poets\(^{149}\) and Plato, ἀτεχνῶς attracted the interest of lexicographers.\(^{150}\) Cohn corrects Osann’s reading ἀτεχνῶς καὶ βεβαίως as Ἀτεχνῶς [ὡς] βεβαίως and replaces the unattested καθάπεξ by καθάπαξ. LSJ mistakenly derives ἀτεχνῶς < ἀτεχνής, which appears only late (e.g., Babrius, *Mythiambi Aesopici* 1.75); ἀτεχνῶς derives from ἀτεχνος, attested in Plato, Gorgias, and Hippocrates (Schwyzer, et al. 1953, II 414; Hofmann 1930, 104–151). The difference in accentuation between Ἀτεχνῶς and Ἀτεχνῶς attracted the

\(^{148}\) Cf. Hesychius a 6920, 6921; Photius a 2763 Ἄρα· συλλογιστικὸς σύνδεσμος. καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ δῆ καὶ ὡς ἐοικεν καὶ ὡς φαίνεται. οὖν Πλάτων (Reip. 2, 358c, al.); *Etymologicium Genuinum* 1108 Ἄρα· ἡ εὐχή· παρὰ τὸ αἴρειν τὰς χεῖρας εὐχομένους AB, and *Sym*. 1314, EM 1709, Orion 11.6, 19.6 (Sturz 1973).

\(^{149}\) Chionides (2), Cratinus (2), Eupolis (3), Pherecrates (2), Aristophanes (16), Plato (79).

Manuscripts of Plato’s *Phaedo* (100d), *Sophist* (225c), and *Gorgias* (501a) read ἀτεχνῶς; otherwise all of these early readings are ἀτεχνῶς.

\(^{150}\) e.g. Timaeus’s *Lexicon Platonicum* s.v. Ἀτεχνῶς, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀληθῶς καὶ χωρὶς πανουργίας καὶ οἰον ἀπλάστως. Ἀτεχνῶς, περισπομένως, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀληθῶς, ἀπλῶς, χωρὶς πανουργίας, σαφῶς, ἡ βεβαίως, ἡ ἀσφαλῶς, ἡ φανερῶς· οἰονεὶ ἀτενῶς, περισσοῦ ὄντος τοῦ χ. ἡ ἀντὶ τοῦ τελείως, καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἰσχυρῶς, καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ καθάπαξ, καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ παντελῶς. οὔτω Πλάτων.
attention of ancient lexicographers, who sought to distinguish the two forms. Following Cohn’s
accentuation, it would appear that Philemon is here creating an ἀντιλογία out of this contrasting
pair.

Harpocration clearly distinguishes the two pronunciations, defining ἀτεχνῶς in virtually
identical terms as Philemon.151 Where Philemon describes Ἀτέχνως as ἀπλάστως, ἀδόλως,
Harpocration calls it ἀμελῶς καὶ ἀνευ τέχνης. Philemon’s definition Ἀτέχνως· ἀπλάστως,
ἀδόλως· τέχνη γάρ ὁ δόλος appears in exactly the same terms in Orion152 and the
Etymologica.153 This distinction is amplified by the Philetairos,154 Ammonius,155 the
Etymologicum Gudianum,156 and the Excerptum Casanatense.157

151 Ἀτεχνῶς: περισπωμένως μὲν ἀντὶ τοῦ σαφῶς ἢ βεβαιῶς ἢ ἀσφαλῶς ἢ φανερῶς,
παροξυτόνως δὲ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀμελῶς καὶ ἀνευ τέχνης (63).
152 (29.) Ἀτέχνως: ἀδόλως· δόλος γάρ ἡ τέχνη. Etymologicum (excerpta e cod. Vat. gr. 1456) but
accented Ἀτεχνῶς in Etymologicum (excerpta e cod. regio 2610) p. 175, line 24. Cf. Hesychius α
(722.) τέχνη· ἐπιστήμη. ἡ δόλος. καὶ ἀτέχνως· ἀδόλως.
153 Etymologicum genuinum (α 1350) but accented Ἀτεχνῶς, with reference to Homer 8.296-7 =
Etymologicum Gudianum α p. 226 = Etymologicum Symeonis I p. 282 =
154 (243.) Ἀτεχνῶς· οὐτω λέγουσιν οἱ Ἀττικοὶ περισπωμένως· σημαίνει τὸ ἀπλῶς. Τὸ δὲ
ἀτέχνως βαρυτόνως λεγόμενον τὸ ἀνευ τέχνης σημαίνει.
155 De adfinium vocabulorum differentia. (84.) ἀτεχνῶς καὶ ἀτεχνῶς διαφέρει. τὸ μὲν γάρ
παροξυτόνον σημαίνει τὸ χωρίς τέχνης καὶ ἀμαθῶς· τὸ δὲ περισπωμένον τίθεται ἀντὶ τοῦ
ἀπλῶς καὶ ἀδόλως καὶ καθάπαξ καὶ καθόλου, ἀντικύρως.
156 α (226.) Ἀτέχνως καὶ ἀτεχνῶς διαφέρει. Ἀτεχνῶς· σημαίνει τὸ ἀπλάστως. εἰρήται δὲ παρὰ
πασί τοῖς κωμικοῖς κατακόρως. γέγονε δὲ ἡ παρὰ τὸ ἀτεχνῆς ἀτεχνῶς· τὰ γάρ τοιαῦτα
ἐπιφορίματα παρὰ τῶν γενικῶν γινόμενα καὶ τοὺς τόνους αὐτῶν φυλάττει τῶν γενικῶν· ἡ
παρὰ τὸ ἀτενές οὖν ἀτενῶς, καὶ ἐν πλεονασμῷ τοῦ χ ἀτεχνῶς. οὕτως Ἀπολλάνιος καὶ

As usual Moeris here indicates the most Attic form first, as does Philemon. He glosses ἀπλῶς as a form that is acceptable both in Attic and later usage (κοινὸν).¹⁵⁸

Cohn substitutes λέγοντες for Osann’s reading λέγεται. This lemma in Philemon is the only testimony in the lexicographers to a syncopated pronunciation of ἄριθμος which might have led to confusion with the noun ἄριθμος, meaning connection, link, or friendship.

Ὑπωδιανὸς
¹⁵⁷ sive Ecloga diaφόρων λέξεων (33.) ἀτέχνως καὶ ἀτεχνῶς διαφέρει, τὸ μὲν γὰρ παραξεινόμενον σημαίνει τὸ χωρίς <τέχνης> καὶ ἀμαθῶς· τὸ δὲ περισσώμενον τὸ ἀπλῶς καὶ ἀδόλως ἢ λίαν.
¹⁵⁸ "...bietet allein Moeris neben der Unterscheidung von attischer und nicht attischer Sprache als dritte Kategorie das κοινὸν" (Hansen, D. U. 1998, 10).
The author of the Περι παθων—supposed to be Herodian--derived ἀριθμός from ἀριθμός by pleonasm of 1. Modern etymology does not exclude that ἀριθμός like ἀριθμός might derive from the family of ἀραῤῥίς (Chantraine 1968a, 102, 109).

This usage, treated by the Antiatticist, is discussed by Jacoby (Jacoby 1944).

This lemma in Philemon is elaborated by Thomas Magister immediately after ἀποσκοποῦμαι above: Άφι τών νυκτῶν, οὐκ ἀφρία. Λοσκιανός ἐν Δημοσθένεως ἐγκωμίῳ ἀφι τῶν νυκτῶν ἔξαναστάς. Though the passage cited in Lucian is not otherwise attested, Antiphon does use the expression ἀφι τῶν νυκτῶν. The expression Άφι τών νυκτῶν, however, is not attested before the

---

seventh century. Philemon is correct to identify ἄωρι as the more Attic form: it is attested not only in Antiphon but also in Euripides (fr. 921), Aristophanes and twice in the comic poet Heraclides. The form ἄωρια appears first in the Septuagint (Ps. 118.147, Is. 59.9), in Aelius Aristides, and is frequently used by Christian writers such as Origen.

Once again Philemon’s comment is matched by Moeris, lemma 72: ἄωρι Ἀττικοί, ἄωρια.


-------------------

161 In Joannes, Miracula sancti Demetrii, miracle 12 p. 128.13; Vita sancti Fantini iunioris sect. 34; Eustathius, Commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam vol. 2 p. 215; eiusdem, De emendanda vita monachica ch. 66, ch. 204.

162 Ecclesia zusa (741) cf. scholia vetera ad loc. ἄωρι νύκτωρ ὁρθοῦν.

163 Aelius Aristides, Πρὸς Πλάτωνα ὑπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων (181): ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις μέντοι καιροῖς καὶ τοιαύτῃ προγμάτων ἄωρια καὶ συγχύσει τῶν πάντων...

164 Synagoge B α 2638 ἄωρι, ἄωρια: τὸ παρὰ τὸν προσήκοντα καιρὸν καὶ τὴν ὀραν. λέγονσι δὲ ἄωρι τῶν νυκτῶν καὶ ἄωρι νύκτωρ. Ἀριστοφάνης (fr. 668) δὲ ἐφή καὶ ἄωροθάνατος ἀπέθανεν, τουτέστι πρὸ τῆς προσηκούσης ὀρας (Cunningham 2003, 701).

165 α 3492 (3492.) ἄωρι, ἄωρια: Φερεκράτης Κραπατάλιος (fr. 6 Dem.): „ἐβάδιζον δὲ ἀπὸ δείπνου· κνέφας δ’ ἦν ἄρτι κοῦκ ἄωριά“. λέγονσι δὲ [καὶ] ἄωριαν καὶ τὴν ὀραν.


166 α (2854.) ἄωρια: ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀκαίρου καὶ παρὰ τὸν δεόντα καιρόν. ἄωρα γὰρ τὰ παρὰ τὸν καιρὸν τρυγώμενα. Ἀριστοφάνης: οἱ δὲ πρυτάνεις ἦκονσιν, ἄλλ’ ἄωρια. οὐκ ἔξεστι γὰρ Βασιλείων ἄωρα τάφον ὑπερβῆναι. σημαίνει δὲ καὶ τὴν σκοτάν. καὶ Αἰλιανός: ἐπεὶ δὲ ἄωρια ἦν, ο μὲν ἔπι τὸν φόνον ὑπεθήγετο. καὶ Ἀωρὶ τῶν νυκτῶν.
This lemma is closely duplicated by Thomas Magister, following on ἀωφι ἄλμαδες ἐλαἰα, οὐ κολυμβάδες (7.18). Moeris (α 105) also has a parallel reference: ἄλμαδες Ἀττικοί, κολυμβάδες ἐλαἰα Ἐλληνες (Hansen, D. U. 1998, 79). Phrynichus also discusses these words in the Eclogues (87): Κολυμβάδες ἐλάαι οὐ λέγονται, ἀλλά ἄλμαδες ἐλάαι χωφίς τοῦ 1. Characteristically the passage from the Eclogues begins with the stigmatized word, where Moeris and Philemon begin their lemmata with the recommended word. This is one of twenty-five lemmata identified by Heimannsfeld where “Philemon congruit Phrynicho”; he further recognized the transmission of comparable fragments in Moeris as evidence that “verisimilium videtur esse ex eadem vel simili epitoma Phryniichi glossas et ad Philemonem et ad Moeridem pervenisse” (Heimannsfeld 1911, 51, 53). A fragment from Phrynichus’ Praeparatio sophistica (163) is very close to the lemmata in Philemon and Thomas Magister: ἄλμαδες: κολυμβάδες ἐλαἰα; it appears again in Photius (α 1017), Hesychius (α 3194), the Souda (α 1302), and the Synagoge (A 333) (Cunningham 2003, 92).

The word ἄλμας from the family of ἄλς (Chantraine 1968b, 65) means sea-water or brine and thus olives steeped in brine. The word is used in this sense in Athenian comic writers, such as Aristophanes Aristoph. vol 1 Kock frg. 141.) ὀ πρεσβύτα, πότερα φιλεῖς τὰς δρυπετεῖς ἐταίρας

168 Closely matched at Etymologicum magnum p. 69: ἄλμαδες: Ἐλάαι κολυμβάδες.
η σύ τάς υποπαρθένους, ἀλμάδας ὡς ἐλάς, στυφάς, κολυμβίς is a diving water-bird, mentioned in Aristophanes as brought to market from Boeotia (Av. 304, Ach. 875). Athenaeus cites the third-century comic poet Diphilus of Siphnos as using κολυμβίς with respect to olives, though this sense is not widely attested until the medical writers of the first century. The medical literature often combines the two terms as αἱ δὲ ἀλμάδες τε καὶ κολυμβάδες. Pollux gives νηκτρίδες as a synonym for ἀλμάδες (VI 45).

The insistence on Attic usage with reference to commonplace words drawn from Aristophanes shows that the Atticists were not merely concerned with Attic style in rhetorical declamation but also in everyday speech.

170 esp. a grebe or dabchick (Thompson, D. W. 1947, 158). κολυμβίς formed by “Rückbildung von κολυμβάω... gewöhnlich von eingepökelten Oliven” (Frisk 1960, 905–906).
171 Deipnosophistae 2,47: Δίφυλος δὲ φησιν ὁ Σίφνιος τὰς ἐλάς ὀλιγοτρόφους εἶναι καὶ κεφαλαλγεῖς, τὰς δὲ μελαίνας καὶ κακοστομαχωτέρας καὶ βαρύνειν τὴν κεφαλὴν, τὰς δὲ κολυμβάδας καλομεμένας εὐστομαχωτέρας εἶναι καὶ κοιλίας στατικάς, τὰς δὲ θλαστὰς μελαίνας εὐστομαχωτέρας εἶναι.
172 Dioscorides Pedanius Book 1, chapters 74, 75, 105, 106 etc. Erotianus, Vocum Hippocratarum collectio p. 91; Soranus, Gynaeciorum libri iv. Book 1, ch. 51; Galenus, De compositione medicamentorum secundum locos libri x. vol. 12 p. 1000, etc.
173 Galenus, De alimentorum facultatibus libri iii vol. 6 p. 609: τὰς ἀλμάδας τε καὶ κολυμβάδας όνομαζομένας; Paulus Med., Epitomae medicæ libri septem bk. 1 ch. 81.3; Oribasius, Collectiones medicæ, bk. 1, ch. 54.1; Aëtius Med., Iatricorum liber i ch. 99: αἱ δὲ κολυμβάδες καὶ ἀλμάδες.
Philemon and Thomas Magister are the only lexicographers to discuss this word, though it appears in Photius and the *Etymologicum Gudianum*. The quantity of the final υ in ἀντικρό is also mentioned by the *Etymologicum magnum*. At Iliad 5.130 and 819 the final υ is short.

At the beginning of Thomas Magister’s *Eclogue* (p. 1, 4) appears an extended discussion of this word. He notes the preference of the λογογράφοι for the compound forms ἀπαντικρό and καταντικρό, and cites Libanius’s use of the former (61.4). ἀπαντικρό is characteristically Attic, appearing for the first time in Xenophon and several times in Demosthenes. Phrynichus shows an Atticistic preference for the compound form over ἀντικρό at *Eclogue* (418.), while

---

---

17479. Photius α 503 = *Synagoge* B 601 (Cunningham 2003, 570) Αἰγάλεως δόρος ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ ἀπαντικρῷ Σαλαμίνος; *Additamenta in Etymologicum Gudianum* ε 552: Εὐβοία: νῆσος ἀπαντικρῷ τῆς Ἀττικῆς.
175. p. 114 Ἀντικρός: Σημαίνει τὸ φανερῶς ἀντικρό δὲ, τὸ ἐξεναντίας...Τὸ ΚΡΥ, μακρὸν φύσει τὰ εἰς υ λήγοντα ἐπιροήματα συστέλλουσι τὸ υ, μεταξύ, μεσημβρία: ἄντι τοῦ ἀντικρός παρὰ τισι τιθέμενον ἀμαθές.
176. *LSJ* 157 s.v.
177. Ἀπαντικρό τοῦ δείνος καὶ καταντικρό, λογογράφοι. Λιβάνιος ἐν τῇ εἰς τὴν Νικομήδειαν μοναρχίᾳ ἀπαντικρῷ τῆς νῦν οὐδῆς, μᾶλλον δὲ τῆς οὐκέτ’ οὕτης. ἀντικρό δὲ ποιηταῖ ὁ δὴ ἀντί τοῦ ἀντικρός παρὰ τισι τιθέμενον ἀμαθές.
178. Xen. *Hellenica* 6.4.4; Dem. *De Chersoneso* 36; Phil. 4.8; Contra Polyclem 47.
179. Ἀντικρός: τοῦτο τοπικόν καὶ ἐπιεικῶς ποιητικόν ἄνευ τοῦ σ λεγόμενον, οἶτε ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀντικρός τιθέντες ἀμαρτάνοντον. οἱ μέντοι τις προθετή τὴν πρόθεσιν τῷ ἀντικρό καὶ εἴποι καταντικρό, ὁρθῶς ἔρει.
καταντικρυ was both a Homeric and an Attic form, ἀπαντικρυ was more strictly Attic.\(^{180}\)

Thomas concludes by noting the poetic preference for ἀντικρυ, well attested in Homer, and the distinction between ἀντικρυ and ἀντικρυς. “Les grammariens anciens distinguent entre ἀντικρυ = ἐξ ἐναντίας et ἀντικρυς = φανερώς, διαφόρησην, mais ἀντικρυ a les deux sens chez Homer” (Chantraine 1968b, 93) Aelius Dionysius makes the distinction in a lemma that reappears in Photius.\(^{181}\) A fragment from Phrynichus’ Praeparatio Sophistica rejects the use of ἀντικρυ meaning to speak openly.\(^{182}\) Passages from Hesychius, Photius, the Etymologica, the lexicon attributed to Zonaras, the Lexicon Vindobonense, the Synagoge, and the Excerptum Casanatense repeat and amplify this distinction.\(^{183}\)

\(^{180}\) Chantraine s.v. ἀντικρυ: “En outre les composés en attique ἀπαντικρυ (avec l’altération phonét. ἀπαντροκυ, IG II\(^2\), 1672, 25) «en face de» et καταντικρυ chez Hom. et en att. (avec καταντροκυ IG II\(^2\) 1668, 88) «tout droit, en face de». Avec un s adverbial on a en attique ἀντικρυς, avec finale brève comme l’indique l’accent... «tout droit, overtément, tout de suite, en face de» (ce dernier sens plus tardif).

\(^{181}\) Aelius Dionysius, Ἀριττικά ὀνόματα(147.) ἀντικρυς: τὸ φανερῶς καὶ διαφόρης, στάνιον δὲ τὸ ἐξ ἐναντίας: τὰ δὲ πολλὰ τὸ ἐξ ἐναντίας ἀντικρυ ἀνευ τοῦ σ. = Photius α 2110.

\(^{182}\) fr. 225 ἀντικρυς σημαίνει τὸ κατ’ ἐναντίας καὶ ἐξ ἐναντίας καὶ κατ’ εὐθῦς. σημαίνει καὶ τὸ ταχέως καὶ ὀλοσχερῶς. ἀντικρυ δ’ ἀπόφημι· φανερῶς λέει\(\)o\.

Nowhere else in Greek literature are the words ἄπφυς or ἄφαν and ἄδολεσχος identified with each other, as in Osann’s reading of Philemon, despite fairly extensive discussion of all three words in the lexicographers.

Discussions of ἄδολεσχος can be found in Phrynichus184, Moeris,185 the Etymologica,186 and from ἀντικρύς· Ἀντικρύ· ὁ μὲν Βοσθός ἐν τῇ τῶν λέξεων αὐτοῦ Συναγωγῆ δέκα φησὶ σημαίνειν τὴν λέξιν· κατέναντι καὶ ἐς ἐναντίας καὶ διάμπερες καὶ ἰδίες καὶ εὐθὺς καὶ ἐπ’ εὐθείας καὶ ἰσχυρός καὶ σαφῶς καὶ ἀκριβῶς καὶ ἀπλῶς, οἱ δὲ φασίν, ἀκριβέστερον οἶμαι λέγοντες, ὅτι μετὰ μὲν τοῦ σεγομένη τὰ πολλὰ τῶν εἰρημένων δηλοῦ, ἀνευ δὲ τοῦ σ, ὅτε καὶ ὃξίνεται, οἷον ἀντικρύ, τὸ κατέναντι καὶ ἐς ἐναντίας μόνων.

184Praeparatio sophistica (epitome) 36 ἄδολεσχεῖν καὶ ἄδολέσχης· σημαίνει μὲν τὸ φιλοσοφεῖν περὶ τε φύσεως καὶ τοῦ παντὸς διαλειασχάνοντα. λεγομένην δὲ ἔστι τὸ διαλέγεσθαι, καὶ λέσχα ὁ τόπος, εἰς οὓς συνιώντες δημιέρουν <διαλογίζοντο>. λέγεται δὲ τὸ ἄδολεσχεῖν ἦτοι ἀπό τοῦ ἄδην καὶ τοῦ λεσχηνειν. ἀλλ’ εἰ μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄδειν, προσγράφοι τὸ ἐν τῷ ἄδολέσχης. εἰ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄθετος, οὕτως <ἀνευ τοῦ ῥ. οἱ γὰρ Ἰωνες τὴν ἀπεικόνισαν συναλείφουντες τρισυλλάβως γράφοντοιν, διὸ καὶ ἔζετάθη.

185Moeris, p. 188 line 26: ἄδολέσχης Ἄττικοι, ἄδολεσχος Ἑλληνες.

186Etymologicum Genuinum α 81· Ἀδολέσχης ἄδολέσχου· ὁ κανών· τὰ ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς η. θηλυκῶν εἰς ἔκ γινόμενα ἄρσενικά μη ἔχοντα οὐδέτερον εἰς ης εἰς οὐ ἔχει τὴν γενεικὴν. σημαίνει δ’· τὸ φιλοσοφῶ (Ps. 118, 23)· ὁ δὲ δοῦλός σου ἡδολέσχει, καὶ τὸ παίζω (lx gen. 24,
indirectly in Hesychius. If Osann’s reading is correct, Philemon is contradicting Attic usage as defined by Moeris, and is presumably confusing Greek ἀδολέσχος with Latin adolescens.

Cohn’s emendation does not resolve all difficulties, since ἀπφυς is not otherwise attested as referring to a brother. Hesychius, the Etymologika, and other lexica all define it as a child’s word for “father,” as in Theocritus 15.

The Laurentian lemma distinguishes the singular forms, Thomas Magister the plural forms of two nouns that differ only in accentuation.
The form ἀμυγδαλὴ is a contraction from ἀμυγδαλέα. The text in Thomas Magister goes beyond the distinction between the tree and the fruit to reprove the neuter form ἀμύγδαλα which was replacing the feminine ἀμύγδαλας and which has prevailed in modern Greek. The neuter form appeared first after the classical period, in Aristotle, Hippocrates, Hermippus and in the Septuagint. The feminine form is attested in Phrynichus the poet of Old Comedy.

For Moeris the distinction between the feminine and the neuter forms is a distinction between Attic and wider Hellenic usage: ἀμυγδάλας θηλυκῶς Ἄττικοί, ἀμύγδαλα ύδατέρως Ἑλληνες. (p. 187, l. 14). He further contrasts ἀμυγδάλας τὰ χλωρὰ κάρυα Ἄττικοί, κάρυα δὲ Ἑλληνες, indicating that the generic neuter form κάρυα meaning “nuts” was being used parallel to ἀμύγδαλα.

Hesychius glosses Διὸς βάλανοι in Hermippus as oily almonds, ἀμύγδαλα σιγάλοι, τὰ καστάνεια, Ποντικά or Ἡσακλεωτικὰ (Δ 1922.2.)

30 Ἁθήσην, οὐκ ἀθάραν. L

Ἅθήσην, οὐκ ἀθάραν<ν>. (Cohn)

Philemon is warning his reader not to confuse the adjective ἄθηρῆς (not in LSJ) meaning, according to the Etymologicum magnum, Ἄκωρῆς, θαυμαστός, ύπερῴπτης, αὐθάδης. These four words represent quite a range of meaning: precise, admirable, condescending, stubborn. Photius frankly conjectures ἵσως μὲν ὁ ἄτερης, ἢ ὁ ἀγαν θεριστικός, while the Synagoge hazards: ἄθηρῆς: ἵσως μὲν ὁ ἄτερης, ἢ ὁ ἀντεριστικός, citing Aeschylus. The word refers to wheat.
porridge; the form ἀθάρη appears in the fifth-century comic poets Aristophanes, Pherecrates, Crates, Nicopho, and in the third century BC historian Anaxandrides.

The forms ἀθάρη and ἀθάρα appear in Hellanicus, Sophron in the fifth century, Dioscorides Medicus in the first century AD, and Eustathius. Pliny identifies the form ἀθάρα as Egyptian (HN 22.121), and the form was in fact found on one of the Tebtunis papyri (PTesb 131). Hesychius glosses ἀθήρα as Egyptian porridge: ἀθήρα διὰ τυρών καὶ γάλακτος ἡψημένων παρ’ Αἰγυπτίως (α 1581).

The lengthiest testimonium is in Photius, who cites Sophron and Hellanicus. Less prescriptive than Philemon, he admits four different spellings of the word, but not the form ἀθήρη: Ἀθάρη καὶ ἀθήρα καὶ ἀθέρα καὶ ἀθάρα τὸ αὐτὸ φασίν, and defines it as ἥ ἀθάρη ἢ ἐκ τυρών ἡψημένων καὶ διακεχυμένων ἀστερ ἕτος τροφῆ, with the difference that ἕτος is made from beans or peas. He notes that the word is frequently used by the Atticists in the form ἀθάρη, but many others such as Hellanicus and Sophron lengthen the α and use the form ἀθήρα. Photius conjectures that they imagined that the word was originally ἀθέρα and that the ε had lengthened as in ἐθος > ἕθος. Photius states that τὸ μέντοι ἀθέρα εἰς τὸ ἀθάρα Δωρικῶς; he seems to be claiming that the “Doric alpha” arose from the ε form. He identifies the penult of the the Attic form ἀθάρην as Doric, the ultima as Ionic.

Phrynichus cites the form ἀθήρη in the Praeparatio Sophistica (frg. 98.1) but no further comment is attested.
'Αδελφιδήν αἰτήσομαι ἐπὶ τοῦ χρήσομαι. L

'Αδελφιδή is an Attic contraction for the form ἀδελφιδή meaning niece; this form could equally derive from ὁ ἀδελφίδης meaning nephew.

The forms αἰτήσομαι is glossed by χρήσομαι in Photius, the Suda, pseudo-Zonaras, and the Synagoge with reference to Menander, e.g. Suda a (364.) Αἰτήσομαι: τὸ χρήσομαι. Μένανδρος Τίτθη: ἢν ἄν τις ὑμὸν παιδίον ἠτήσατο ἢ κέχρηκεν, ἄνδρες γλυκύτατοι καὶ ἐν 'Ὑμνίῳ: οὐ πῦρ γὰρ αἰτῶν οὐδὲ λοπάδα αἰτούμενος.

32 Ἄλας· ὡς κύνας. L

Οἱ ἀλες καὶ τοὺς ἀλας δεῖ λέγειν, οὐ τὸ ἀλας. TM

ἄλας is the accusative plural of the masculine noun ἄλς, like κύνας from κύων.

33 Ἄλαβαστρος, οὐκ ἀλάβαστρον. L

Ἄλαβαστρον, οὐκ ἀλάβαστρον. (Cohn)

Ἄλαβαστρον δίχα τοῦ ὁ Ἀττικοὶ, μετὰ δὲ τοῦ ἀπλῶς Ἑλληνες. TM
In the Ἀττικὰ ὄνοματα Aelius Dionysius cites τὴν ἄλαβαστρον as carried like myrrh in a lekythos. He then adds: ἀρσενικῶς δὲ τὸν ἄλαβαστρον εἶπεν Ἰρόδοτος (III 20, 1).

Pseudo-Zonaras also mentions the pleonastic ὅ.

34 Ἄλοσομαι ἐφ' ἄλωνος. L

'Αλοάζ[σ]ομαι ἐφ' ἄλωνος. L (Cohn)

'Αλοάω, σύχ ἄλοῇσω. TM

ἄλων (ἡ) is apparently close to ἄλως (ἡ) indicating something round, such as a threshing floor or a disk, referring to the sun, moon or a shield; Ἄλοάω means “to thresh.”

35 Ἄλμυρον, τὸ μῦ μακρόν. L

'Αλμυρόν, τὸ μῦ μακρόν. (Cohn)

Moeris identifies this form with Hellenic usage, by contrast with Attic. LSJ glosses the ν as short.

36 Ἀναβασμός, σύκ ἀναβαθμός. L
'Αναβασμός, ούκ ἀναβαθμός. Συνέσιος ἐν τῷ Δίων ἢ περὶ τῆς κατ' αὐτὸν
dιαγωγῆς· ἐπείτα μέντοι ἀναβασμὸς χρήση. Ἀριστείδης ἐν πέμπτῳ τῶν ἱερῶν·
kai ἐδει ἀναβάινειν ἀναβασμοὺς τινας πρὸς τὸ ἱερόν. TM

37 'Απέκτονας, ούκ ἀπέκτεινας. L

'Απέκτονας· <ούκ> ἀπέκτανας. (Cohn)

'Απέκτονας, <ούκ> ἀπέκτακας (Lies)

'Απέκτονας· οὐχὶ ἀπέκτανες. V

'Απέκτονας, οὐχὶ ἀπέκτακας (Lies)

'Απέκτονα κάλλιον ἢ ἀπέκτεινα· ἀπέκτανον δὲ ἀδόκιμον πάντη. TM

cf. Ritschl

ἀποκτείνω is a stronger form of κτείνω and the standard Attic word; the passive form of the
verb develops only late, being supplied by ἀποθνήσκω in the classical period. Philemon urges
the perfect form ἀπέκτονας against the forms, otherwise unattested, ἀπέκτανας (Cohn) or
ἀπέκτανες and ἀπέκτακας (Lies).

38 'Ανοιγνύσσιν, οὐκ ἀνοίγνυσσιν. L

'Ανοιγνύσσιν· οὐκ ἀνοίγνυσσιν. (Cohn)
'Ανοιγόσωνι- οὐκ ἀνοίγουσιν. V

'Ανοίγνυμι κάλλιον ἢ ἀνοίγω· καὶ ἀναπεμπάζομαι, τὸ ἀναλογίζομαι, ἢ ἀναπεμπάζω. Συνέσιος ἐν τῷ περὶ βασιλεία· ἀναπέμπασαι τὸν πατέρα. TM

ἀνοίγνῦμι meaning “to open” is attested in Lysias (12.1), ἀνοίγῳ in Pindar and Herodotus, and is still in use in modern Greek. ἀνοιγνῦὀ is a later form attested in Pausanias (8.41.4). By Cohn’s correction of L Philemon advocates the third person plural of ἀνοίγνῦμι over that of ἀνοίγω. A note by Thomas Magister observes that the -μι form is preferable to the -ω conjugation just as the deponent forms of three other verbs are to the active.

39 'Ακέστριαν, οὐκ ἡπίτριαν. Ἀριστείδης ἡπιμένα ἱμάτια τὰ ἐφασμένα φησίν. L

'Ακέστριαν- οὐκ ἡπίτριαν. V

cf. 223 below, where ἀκέστριαν is preferred to ὄπτρια. Ἀκέστρια or “seamstress” is the title of a play by AntiPhanes, and in the plural the title of a mime by Sophron. ἡπίτρια is a feminine form of ἡπιτής, a mender of clothes, from ἡπάομαι (to mend, repair), a rare word for the more common ἀκεύομαι and source of the participle used by Aristides (2.307) in ἡπιμένα ἱμάτια, a learnedism for ἐφασμένα ἱμάτια (< ὄπττω).
This form, not listed in LSJ, is apparently the same as ἀλις, an adverb meaning “in crowds, plenty > enough.” It is attested in Didymus, Ephraem Syrus in the fourth century, Cyril of Alexandria, Orion, and others.

The word, attested in Dioscorides in the first century, means anguish, distress, from ἀλύω, “to be distraught;” the fact that Philemon regards the smooth breathing as Attic suggests association with the more common noun ἀλυσις meaning “chain.”

Both of the words read by Cohn are adjectives meaning “exchanged.”
‘Απολαύσομαι· οὐκ ἀπολαύσω. V

‘Αποφοιτήσομαι κάλλιον ἢ ἀποφοιτήσω, ἀπολαύσομαι ἢ ἀπολαύσω, ἀγνοήσομαι ἢ ἀγνοήσω, καὶ ἄξομαι, ἢ ἄξω· ὡσαύτως καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν ἐχόντων μέσους μέλλοντας. (TM)

Philemon indicates some 14 deponents that are being lost.

45 ‘Ανεβαλλόμην, οὐχ ὑπερθέμην. L

‘Ανεβαλλόμην, οὕχ ὑπερθέμην. (Cohn)

υπερθέμην is the aorist middle of ὑπερτίθημι, which in the middle voice means to set oneself above, therefore to excel; to outlast; and to defer in papyri and inscriptions, overlapping in sense with ἀναβάλλω.

46 ‘Αξίου, οὐ καταξίου· βάρβαρον γάρ. L

‘Αξίω, τὸ ἄξιον κρίνω, οὕτω καταξιῶ. TM
’Αξιώ το παρακαλώ, το ἄξιον κρίνω, καὶ τὸ τιμῶ· ἄφ’ οὐ καὶ ἀξιοῦμενος ὁ τιμῶμενος. Εὐφιππίδης ἐν Ἐκάβη· ΤΜ

(65.) Καὶ τὸ βιάζω δὲ καὶ τὸ ἀναγκάζω. Θουκυδίδης ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ὁμολογίᾳ ἀναγκάζοντες ἀποδοῦναι τὴν πόλιν. καὶ αὐθίς ἐν τῇ τετάρτῃ οὐκ ἀνέμειναν ἀνάγκην σφίσει γενέσθαι. Καὶ τὸ ἐπιθυμῶ δὲ καὶ τὸ ἀξιῶ καὶ τὸ δέομαι καὶ τὸ ἱκετεύω καὶ τὸ ποιῆ. ὁ αὐτὸς ἐν τῇ ἐκτῇ ἔτερους ἐπιθυμεῖν ἐκεῖσε πλεύσαντας δεύτερον ἐπαγαγέσθαι. ὁ αὐτὸς αὐθίς ἐν τῇ πέμπτῃ ἥξιον σφίσιν ἀποδοῦναι. καὶ αὐθίς ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ ἐδέοντο σφίσι Πάνακτόν τε καὶ τοὺς Ἀθηναίων δεσμώτας παραδοῦναι. Λουκιανός ἐν τῷ ἤθοροι διδάσκαλος· ἐπιθυμῶν δηλαδὴ ὅτι τἀχιστα γενέσθαι ἐπὶ τῆς ἀκρας, ὁ αὐτὸς ἐν τοῖς ἀληθινοῖς· ἥξιον ἀποσεμφθῆναι κάτω. καὶ αὐθίς ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς· ἱκέτευον εἰπεῖν τὰ μέλλοντα· καὶ πάλιν ἐν τῷ ἤθοροι διδάσκαλος· οὔπερ ἐξ ἄρχης ἐπόθεις ἐλθείν. ΤΜ

47 ὡς ἅγιος. L

Αθήνας Ἀττικοὶ, οὐκ ἄθροις· ἄθροις δὲ, ὁ μὴ θόρυβον ποιῶν, δόκιμον.
Λουκιανός ἐν δευτέρῳ τῶν ἀληθινῶν· βοή σύμμικτος ἠκούετο ἄθροις καὶ [οὗ] θορυβώδης· καὶ ἀντίξους, οὐκ ἀντίξους. ΤΜ

48 Ἀναψυχήναι, οὐκ ἀναψύξαι. L
ἀναψυχήναι, οὔκ ἀναψῦξαι. (Cohn)

ἀναψυχήναι καὶ ἀναψυχῶναι, οὔκ ἀναψυγήναι, οὐδ᾽ ἀναψῦξαι. ΤΜ

ἀναψύχω, attested in Homer, Hesiod, Herodotus, and Euripides, means to cool or refresh. Photius glosses ἀναψυχήναι ἀναπαύσασθαι. ἢ ἀναψῦξαι. Ἀμειψίας Μοιχοῖς (fr. 13 K.), and the Souda Ἀναψυχήναι: τὸ ἀναψῦξαι λέγουσιν. Ἀμειψίας Μοιχοῖς:

49 Ἀναπετάσω, οὔκ ἀναπετῶ. Λ

Ἀναπετῶ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀναπετάσω, Ἀττικῷ· τὸ δὲ ἀναπετάσω, ἀπλῶς Ἐλληνες. ΤΜ

50 Βλάβη καὶ βλάβος, ἀμφότερος Ἀττικῷ. Λ

Βλάβη καὶ βλάβος· ἀμφότερα Ἀττικά. (Cohn)

Βλάβος ἐπὶ οὐδετέρου δοκιμώτερον ἢ βλάβη. ΤΜ

51 Βλαυτίων βέλτιον. Λ

See 59 below. The diminutive form of βλαύτη representing a kind of slipper is presumably being preferred to words such as σανδάλιον, ὑπόδημα, or even the otherwise unattested βλανδίον.
52 Βόλιτα· οὐ βόλβιτα. L

Βόλιτα λέγε τὴν τῶν βοῶν κόπτον, μὴ βόλβιτα. TM

53 Τὴν βώλον, οὐ τὸν βώλον. L

The word meaning a clump of earth appears occasionally in the masculine. The feminine form is likely older, since feminine -ο- stems are the synchronic anomaly, while moving an -ο- stem into the masculine gender is a trivial sort of analogy.

54 Βουλευτήριον, οὐ βολείον. L

Βουλευτήριον, οὐ βολείον. (Cohn)

Βουλευτήριον, οὐ βουλείον δήθεν ἀπὸ τοῦ βουλῆ. ἔστι δὲ βουλευτήριον οὐ μόνον ὁ τόπος ἐν ὧ βουλεύονται, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοὶ οἱ βουλεύται. Συνέσσοις ἐν ἑπιστολῇ 

ἐπειδὴ μοι παρὰ παντὸς συνέστη τοῦ βουλευτήριον. ἀλλὰ δὴ καὶ τὸ σχολεῖον ἐν ὧ ἐδίδασκον καὶ ἤγγον τοῖς οἱ διδάσκαλοι. Ἀριστείδης ἐν τῇ ἐπὶ Σμύρνη 

μονοφιδία: ποῦ μοι τὸ βουλευτήριον; ποῦ νέων καὶ πρεσβυτέρων σύνοδοι καὶ 

θόρυβοι; Λιβάνιος ἐν ἑπιστολῇ τοῦτον ἕκοντα μὲν εὐθὺς εἰσήγαγεν εἰς τὸ 

βουλευτήριον. TM

55 Καὶ βορᾶς καὶ βορέας, ἑκατέρως. L
Και βορᾶς καὶ βορέας, ἐκάτερα <Ἀττικά>. (Cohn)

56 Βρύκειν καὶ οὐ βρύχειν. L

Moeris holds to the same distinction, maintaining that only βρύκειν is Attic. ¹⁸⁹ LSJ mistakenly claims that Ammonius makes the same distinction, where in fact he identifies the χ form with a lion’s teeth. ¹⁹⁰

Hesychius (β 1238) defines βρύκειν as to eat violently, with gnashing of the teeth. ¹⁹¹

57 Βάρβαρον γυναῖκα ἐροῦσιν, οὐ βαρβάραν. L

Philemon here pleads for retention of the adjectival declension in two terminations.

------------------------------------
¹⁸⁹Moeris p. 192: βρύκειν ᾍττικοι, βρύχειν Ὕλληνες. (35)

¹⁹⁰(112.) βρύκειν καὶ βρύχειν διαφέρει. βρύκειν μὲν γὰρ διὰ τοῦ κ τὸ πρόειν τοῖς ὀδόντοις, βρύχειν δὲ διὰ τοῦ χ ἐπὶ τοῦ λέοντος τοῦ βρύχεσθαι.

¹⁹¹Λάβρως ἐσθείειν. ἀπὸ τοῦ τρίζειν τοὺς ὀδόντας.
Philemon urges the Attic form βλήχων against Ionic γλήχων used by Theophrastus. Phrynichus distinguishes the Attic from the Dorian from the Ionic spellings of the same word.192

The word refers to pennyroyal or Mentha pulegium, a European perennial mint with small aromatic leaves. See 60 below.

See 51 above. βλαυτιόν appears in the Knights at 899; it is the diminutive of βλατη, a word normally occurring in the plural that refers to the slippers worn by Socrates in the Symposium (174a).

βλήχων, βρώμα διὰ πυρὸς καὶ γάλακτος ἤψημένον παρ’ Αἴγυπτιοις. L

βλήχων: ὁ οἱ Δωριεῖς γλαχών λέγουσιν. οἱ δὲ Ἰωνεῖς γληχών. ἀμφότεροι δὲ θηλυκῶς. οἱ μὲν τὰν γλαχόνα, οἱ δὲ τὴν γληχόνα. Praeparatio Sophistica 53.
Βλήχων at 58 was identified by Thomas Magister as an herb; here the word refers to a kind of porridge. The word seems to be found only here in this sense.

Aristophanes uses the word βληχωνίας with reference to a kind of potion or κυκεών including the mint (Pax 712).

61 Μήτοτε δὲ ὠφελε γραφήναι ἀθάρη ὡς προσήκε· τὴν ἀθάρην περίγραψε. ἦ οὕτω πτισάνη πυρίνη, ἦν καὶ ἀθάρην τινὲς καλοῦσιν. L

62 Βοίδιον, οὐ βούδιον. L

This diminutive form of βοῦς appears in Anacreon, Simonides, Hermippus, Aristophanes and Plato. βούδια is found in a fragment of Hermippus (frg. 35), but seems to have become the current pronunciation through synaeresis by the second century; it appears also in the Περὶ ἀρθογραφίας of Pseudo-Herodian. Phrynichus also opposes this kind of synaeresis: Νοίδιον καὶ βοίδιον ἀρχαία καὶ δόκιμα, οὐκὶ νούδιον καὶ βούδιον (Eclogae 61). The modern Greek form is βούδι.

63 Καὶ βόες καὶ βοῦς ἑκατέρως. L

For βοῦς by contrast with βοίδιον the synaeresis is acceptable; consuetudo takes precedence over analogia.
Pollux (7.211) identifies the form βιβλιαγράφος in Crates. Phrynichus prefers the form βιβλιαγράφος pronounced in five syllables to the form with an omicron which, he says, was pronounced in four syllables. He may be referring not to the form Βιβλιογράφος urged by Philemon but to the form βιβλογράφος prefed by Orus and Pseudo-Zonaras. In modern Greek there is often synezisis with io > jo, so that the most colloquial pronunciation of βιβλιογράφος has four syllables.

In Aristophanes Vespae 1206 and in Eupolis the word means a “big boy.”
The Attic present ἐλαύνω is contrasted with the Ἑλληνες usage ἐλάω, which Attic uses for the future.

ἐς κόρακας is attested 38 times in Attic Old Comedy; the form εἰς κόρακας is attested five times in Aristophanes’ Nubes. ες μακαρίαν is a euphemism for ες κόρακας (Equites 1151, Hippias Maior 293a), and εις μακαρίαν not until the second century AD.

In Homer and the tragedians both εἰς and ες appear, presumably for metrical convenience. ες is found in Herodotus, Thucydides, and Ionian inscriptions, while εἰς is fixed in Attic inscriptions from the fourth century. The two forms both derive from ἐνς, a form attested in Cretan and Argive; ἐς resulted in front of a consonant, εἰς in front of a vowel (Chantraine 1999, 326).

67 Βαῦσις: ὑπόδημα. L ? (Cohn)

This word is a ἀπαξ, appearing only here in Greek literature.

68 Οὐκ ἐμβακίζεται.
<βακίζεται> οὐκ ἐμβακίζεται. (Cohn)
βακίζω in Aristophanes (Pax 1072) means to prophecy like the Boeotian prophet Bacis. No form related to the rejected form ἐμβακίζεται is attested.

Both words may mean eyebrows, but Philemon’s restriction οὐκ ἐπὶ τῶν τριχῶν suggests that the former refers only to eyelids, as in Aristophanes’ Ecclesiazusae 402 and Equites 303.

Βυρσοδέψης, οὐ βυρσεύς. L

Βυρσοδέψης, οὐ βυρσεύς. TM

Βυρσοδέψης meaning tanner appears four times in Aesop and twice in Aristophanes (Equites 44; Nubes 581); the allegedly later word βυρσεύς, however, is already attested in Aesop (fabula 220.1), but not again until the New Testament, suggesting that it may have been felt to be a non-literary word in the classical period.

Η βῆς καὶ ὁ βῆς, καὶ βήσετε καὶ βηχός. L ? (Cohn)

Βῆς καὶ ἐπὶ θηλυκοῦ καὶ ἐπὶ ἀρσενικοῦ. Ἀριστείδης [ἐν τρί-
τῳ τῶν ιερῶν:] βῆς βαρεία. Θουκυδίδης ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ· κατέβαινεν ἐς τὰ στήθη ὁ πόνος μετὰ βηχὸς ἰσχυροῦ. TM
Βῆς is a cough, a word that can appear in either gender already in the classical period.

72 Βομβύκιον, οὐ βαμβύκιον. L

Βομβύκιον, οὐ βαμβύκιον. TM

A βομβύκιον is a kind of bee or a small buzzing insect; the word appears in the plural in Aristotle and the scholia to the *Nubes*. The form βαμβύκιον is attested only here.

73 Τοὺς βάτους, ὡς τοὺς λόφους. L

Οἱ κυρίως Ἀττικοὶ ἐπὶ ἀραμικοῦ ὁ βάτος λέγουσιν, οὐχ ἢ βάτος. TM

The confusion of gender arises from the existence of two separate nouns, the masculine ὁ βάτος designating a kind of fish or the Hebrew liquid measure “bath”, and ἢ βάτος indicating a bramble or rubus Idaeus, a raspberry.

74 Ἡειν, οὐ βρέχειν. L

Βρέχειν οὐδεὶς τῶν ἀρχαίων εἶπεν ἐπὶ ύπερτο, ἀλλὰ ἡειν. Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν νεφέλαις· ἀλλὰ τίς ἦν καὶ δεῖθαι παθητικάς. Ἀριστείδης ἐν τῷ Ἀἰγυπτίῳ·

169
πάντες γάρ ύονται· καὶ οὕς εἰκάσαι γε ἡμᾶς ὅτι ύονται. τὸ βρέχω μέντοι ἐπὶ τῶν ἀπαλυκωμένων ὑπὸ ὕδατος φασὶν· σημεῖον δὲ, ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ παθητικοῦ παρακειμένου καὶ τῶν ἔξ αὐτοῦ πάντων χρόνων χώραν ἔχει τὸ βρέχω καὶ ἐπὶ ὑέτου λαμβάνεσθαι. Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν νεφέλαις· TM

ὑο is used principally in the impersonal form ὤιε after Homer. βρέχει in the classical period is a transitive verb meaning to wet, or in the passive to get wet. βρέχεσθαι ἐν ὕδατι (Hdt. 3.104) means to be bathed in sweat; Polybius uses the passive form in the sense “to be rained upon.” (16.12.3) The active meaning “to rain” is attested in the LXX and the NT (e.g. Ex. 9.23; Matt. 5.45).

75 Τὸ τῶν κηρίων τρύγημα βλίττειν λέγουσι. L

“They speak of taking the honey from the honey-crop of the honeycombs.” This lemma gives a context for the verb βλίττειν, which appears in a fragment of Sophocles, Aristophanes’s Equites 794, and in the Republic 564e. It appears in Pollux (1.254), Hesychius, Photius, and the Etymologica.

76 Βαγχαν, οὐ βαγχαν. L

Βαγχαν, οὐ βαγχαν. (Cohn)

Βαγχαν, οὐ βαγχαν· καὶ βραγχος οὐδετέρως. TM

βαγχαν is to have a sore throat. The fragment in Thomas Magister identifies the noun as neuter, although the masculine form appears in Aristotle and Thucydides (2.49).
A βέμβις is an instrument for spinning or whipping, like a top. A ρόμβος is an instrument whirled at the end of a string, used in the mysteries or as a love-charm.

The two definitions of βλάξ given here differ widely; the fragment from the Laurentianus cites the noun in the accusative plural, glossing simply as “rustics”; Thomas Magister discussion is closer to Hesychius (β 676 τρυφερώδης) and others.

This adjective from βούς is less frequent than βοεικός, which appears in Thucydides (4.128), Xenophon (Anabasis 7.5), and Aristophanes’ frg. 109. The adjective Βοικόν is attested in Hesiod (frg. 188a), Megasthenes (frg. 36a.36) but not again until Diodorus Siculus and Dionysius of Halicarnassus.
This lemma defines βουλιμός as great hunger; supplies an analogous declension; and corrects a mistaken accentuation. Philemon’s preferred accentuation βουλιμός is not otherwise attested. The word appears first in Diocles, Metrodorus, and a fragment of Alexis.

Γ.

Γελοιος, γέλοιος· ὁ ἀπειρος. L
Γελοιος· γέλοιος ὁ ἀπειρος. (Cohn)

The accentuation γέλοιος is attested in a fragment of Antiphanes, the fourth century comic poet (80.10). Ptolemy and Ammonius distinguish the two words\footnote{γέλοιος μὲν ὡς μέτοικος ὁ καταγέλαστος, γελοίος δὲ ὡς ἀλλοίος ὁ γελωτοποιός. Ptolemy, De differentia vocabulorum 409.8. 119. γέλοιος καὶ γελοίος διαφέρει. γέλοιος μὲν ὁ καταγέλαστος, γελοίος δὲ ὁ γελωτοποιός. Ammonius, De adfinium vocabulorum differentia 119.}; γέλοιος, declined like μέτοικος, indicates an object of ridicule, γελοίος declined like ἀλλοίος is someone who makes ridicule.
82  Γρίφος· οὗ γρίπτους. L

γρίφος, here in the accusative plural, is a fishing basket or, at Aristophanes’s *Vespae* 20, a dark saying or riddle.

83  Αἱ γράξες, οὐχὶ αἱ γραῦς. L

Philemon here gives the nominative plural as it appears in the comic poets Pherecrates, Timocles and at Aristophanes *Lysistrata* 637. The form γραῦς “old woman” is the nominative singular and the accusative plural, as at Euripides *Andromache* 612.

84  Γραῦν Ἀττικοῖ, οὗ γραῦν. L

Another noun, γραῦα, also meaning “old woman;” γραῦς is also the scum that forms over boiled milk (Aristotle *Pr.* 893b32).

85  Γυμνάσσομαι, οὗ γυμνασθῆσομαι. L

Γυμνάσσομαι· οὗ γυμνασθῆσομαι. V

γυμνασθῆσομαι is not attested; γυμνάσσομαι appears in Xenophon’s *Symposium* (2.18). In the middle voice (here in the future) the verb has the sense not only of training in a gymnasium but also of practicing; ὁ γυμνασθήσειν· is the well-trained orator.
Forms of παλαίστρα appear twice in Euripides, in Antiphon, Bacchylides, Aristias, twice in Cratinus, seven times in Aristophanes, twice in Xenophon, nine times in Plato, and four times in Lysias—a virtual canon of the standard Attic authors. Forms of γυμνάσιον appear in Anacreon, Pythagoras, five time in Euripides, in Herodotus, twice in Antiphon, in Bacchylides, seven time in Isocrates, and three times in Aristophanes. Thus the exclusion of γυμνάσιον seems extreme, although παλαίστρα is the better attested Attic form.

This word for a Persian vase is attested only here.

Ossan’s reading is difficult to construe: “You will not speak of an in-law, but rather of fine meal, millet, or barley meal.” Cohn resolves the issue by reading κηδεστής, the more Attic word for a relation by marriage. γαμβρός is attested in this sense in Pindar, Aeschylus, Herodotus, and in Sophocles’ OT—confirming Thomas Magister’s judgment that it is a more poetic form.
γύριν σύκ ἐρείξ, ἀλλὰ πασπάλην· ἢ κέγχρον ἢ ἀλευρὸν κρίθινον. (Cohn)

γύρις like πασπάλη refers to very fine meal; it is attested in Dioscorides Petanius in the first century AD.

Γαύνακα, οὐ γαυνάκιον. L

The form γαύνακας appears in Clement of Alexandria (Paedagogus 2.9.77) and later in Photius, the Souda, and the lexicon of Pseudo-Zonaras. Like γαυνάκη it means a thick cloak like καύνακας, καυνάκη, καυνάκης and Latin gaunaca. The diminutive form γαυνάκιον is attested in papyri; neuter forms in -ιον were highly productive in the Roman period.

Γένυς, ἡ σιαγών. Γένειον, αἱ τρίχες. L

γένυς meaning “jaw” is attested in the Odyssey, Pindar, five times in Euripides, twice in Sophocles, and in Aristophanes’s Aves. σιαγών is a later form, first attested in Aristotle and five times in Melampus. γένειον appears three times in Homer, in Tyrtaeus, Solon, Anacreon, Pindar, twice in Aeschylus, four times in Euripides, in Sophocles, Herodotus, twice in Aristophanes, and twice in Xenophon.

Γήγειον οὐκ ἐρείξ· ἀλλὰ κήτειον. L
The form γήγειον is otherwise unattested; κήτειον is derived from κήτος (τό) meaning sea-monster.

93  Γύπας· τὰς ὑποξήρους πέτρας. L

94  Γυμνασόμενος μόνον. L

95  Γλαμμᾶν, ἀλλ' οὐ λημμᾶν. L
    Γλαμμᾶν, ἀλλ' οὐ λημμᾶν. (Cohn)

These words, mentioned by Pollux and Moeris, refer to being bleary-eyed.

96  Γομφίων, οὗ γόμφιος. L
    Γομφίως· (l. γομφίος?) οὗ γόμφιος. (Cohn)

Γομφίων is a molar tooth.

97  Κναφεύς· οὗ γναφεύς. L

"Ακναπττον, οὐκ ἄγναφον, ἀσπερ καὶ κναφεύς, οὗ γναφεύς. TM
Κναφεύς designates a fuller or clothes-cleaner.

98  Γήδιον ἐφεῖς. L

The diminutive for a piece of land.

99  Γάμους, οὺ γάμον. L

Γάμους <ποιεῖν λέγουσιν> οὐ γάμον <ποιεῖν>. V
Γάμους· οὐ γάμον.(Cohn)

Γάμους ποιεῖν Ἀττικοὶ λέγουσιν, οὐχὶ γάμον. TM

The word appears more frequently in the plural in Attic usage.

100  Κνέφαλον· οὐ τύλη.

(κνέφαλον Ἀττικοὶ λέγουσιν, οὐ γνέφαλον· ἐστὶ δὲ ἢ τύλη.) TM 210, 14

The words refer to a callus or swelling.

101  Γαῦλος παρ’ Ἀττικοῖς πλοῖον λῃστικόν. L
Γαύκος παρ’ αὐληστρι τοῖς (sic) πλοίοι περσικῶν. (Cohn)

102 Η γλήχων ὡς ἡ κόων. L

See 58 and 60 above. γλήχων is the same as βλήχων.

103 Γέλως ὡς ἔρως. L

Another analogical declension

104 Γαύρον, ὡς παύρον. L

gαύρος means haughty or disdainful.

105 Γήμαι λέγεται· οὐ γαμῆσαι. L

Γήμαι, οὐ γαμῆσαι. Λιβάνιος ἐν μελέτη τῇ περί τῆς λάλου· ἔδει μὲν, ὡς βουλη, τεθνάναι με πρὶν ἢ γῆμαι. TM

106 Γύνης οὐκ ἐρεῖς, ἀλλ’ ἀνδρόγυνος. L

Γυνίς οὐκ ἐρεῖς, ἀλλ’ ἀνδρόγυνος. (Cohn)
'Ανδρόγυνος ἔρεις, οὐ γύνις. TM

γύνις does not appear before Theophrastus and γύνις is a poetic word, attested six times in Aeschylus, once in Aristophanes’s Thesmophorios, and then in Theophrastus and later authors. ἀνδρόγυνος appears in Herodotus, twice in Plato, in Hippocrates, Aeschines, and six times in Menander.

107 Γρῦ· τὸν ὑπὸ τοῖς ὄνυξι ὄψιν, περισπωμένως. L

γρῦ refers to dirt under the fingernails, though Hesychius also glosses the word as a morsel or a bit.

108 Διακονεῖσθαι· οὐ διακονεῖν.

Διακονοῦμαι καὶ διακονομένους· οὐ διακονῶ. L

Διακονοῦμαι· οὐ διακονῶ. V

Καὶ διακονοῦμαι καὶ διακονῶ. Λουκιανὸς ἐν τῷ φιλοσοφεῖν· δής ἡ ἀπιστῶν· δεξιός ὑπηρέτει καὶ δικονο- νεῖτο ἡμῖν. TM

diaconouμαι is to minister to oneself or serve one’s own needs.

109 Δικροῦν, ὡς χρυσοῦν. L
Δικροῦν, οὐ δικρουν· ἀπὸ τοῦ δικρόου γὰρ. TM

Δικροῦς is forked or cloven.

110 Διασπάσεσθαι, οὐ διεσπάσθαι. (?) L

111 Δελφίς μετα τοῦ ζ. L

Δελφίς, οὐ δελφίν, καὶ ὅσα τῆς αὐτῆς εἰσὶ κλίσεως· πλὴν τοῦ θίς καὶ θίν· καὶ ἀμφότερα γὰρ ἐν χρήσει· τὸ μὲν ἀρ τὸν σωρὸν, τὸ δὲ θίν τὸν αἰγαλὸν σημαίνει. ἔστι μὲντοι δελφίς οὐ μόνον τὸ ζώον, ἀλλὰ καὶ μολίβδινον τὶ ὀργανὸν ναυμαχουσῶν νεών, ὅθεν καὶ Θουκυδίδης νῆμα δελφινοφόρους. TM

Thomas is referring to a mass of lead shaped like a dolphin that would be lowered onto enemy ships from the yardarm.

112 Δέσμα, μὴ δεσμὸν ἐρεῖς· οὐ γὰρ δεῖ ἁρφενικὸν ποιεῖν. L

Δεσμὰ κάλλιον ἢ δεσμοὶ. ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν ἐνικῶν τὰ τοῦ ἁρφενικοῦ μόνα ἐν χρήσει· ὁ δεσμὸς γὰρ καὶ τοῦ δεσμοῦ καὶ ὅσα μέχρι τῶν πληθυντικῶν. TM
Δένδρον, ὡς ὄδον, οὖ δένδρα· ἵνα μῆ ποίησις μακρὸν τὸ δῆ. L

114 Δεδήσεται, οὖ δεσμωθήσεται. L
Δεδήσεται· οὖ δεσμευθήσεται. (Cohn)
Δεθήσεται· οὖ δεσμευθήσεται. V

Δεδήσσομαι, οὖ δεθήσομαι. ἀπορήσειε δ’ ἂν τις, πώς ἀπό τοῦ δέδεμαι, δέδεσαι, τὸ δεδήσσομαι γινόμενον οὖ δεδέσσομαι γράφεται. φαμέν οὖν, ὅτι τοῦ δεῦ, δῶ τὸ δεσμῷ οἱ μέλλοντες διὰ τοῦ ἡ ἑκφέρονται· δήσω γὰρ καὶ δήσομαι, διὰ τοῦτο καὶ δεδήσσομαι· οἱ δὲ ἄλλοι χρόνοι διὰ τοῦ ε, δέδεκα, δέδεμαι, ἐδέθην καὶ οἱ ἐξ αὐτοῦ, πλὴν τοῦ ἐνεργητικοῦ αἰφνίστου τοῦ ἑδήσα καὶ τῶν ἐξ αὐτοῦ. τοῦτο δὲ γίνεται διὰ τὸ τὴν πρώτην συζυγίαν [τῶν περιστασιών] ἐπὶ τοῦ μέλλοντος ἔχειν ἢ τὸ ἡ ἡ τὸ ε, ποτὲ δὲ καὶ ἁμφότερα. Ἁριστεῖς ἐν Διονύσῳ· οὐδὲν ἄρα οὕτως βεβαιῶς δεδήσεται. καὶ Συνεσίος ἐν ἐπιστολῇ· ἂν ἐκεῖνοι σωφρονόσι, δεδήσεται. ΤΜ

115 Διελύσατο· οὖ συνελύσατο. L

116 Διηλλάγη· οὖ κατηλλάγη. L
Διηλλάγη μοι <μᾶλλον>· οὖ κατηλλάγη. V
Διηλλάγη μοι· οὖ κατηλλάγη. (Cohn)
Διηλλάγη δοκιμώτερον ἢ κατηλλάγη, καὶ διαλαγαὶ πληθυντικῶς, οὐ διαλαγὴ·
tὸ δὲ καταλλαγῆ εἰ καὶ εὐρηται, ΤΜ

Διηλλάγη δοκιμώτερον ἢ κατηλλάγη, καὶ διαλαγαὶ πληθυντικῶς, οὐ διαλαγὴ·
tὸ δὲ καταλλαγῆ εἰ καὶ εὐρηται, ἀλλ’ οὐ δόκιμον. ὡσαύτως καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ
dιαλλάττω καὶ καταλλάττω νόει. Θουκυδίδης δὲ καὶ ἐνηλλάγη ἀντὶ τοῦ
dυηλλάγη λέγει· ὅσοι μὲν Ἀθηναῖοι ήδη ἐνηλλάγησαν. καὶ συνηλλάγη ὡσαύτως
ἐν τῇ ὕγδοι· ἐπιστείλαντες ξυναλλαγῆναι πρὸς τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίους. καὶ πάλιν
ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ· καὶ ὅρκοι εἰ ποῦ ἄρα γένοιτο ξυναλλαγῆς. διαλαχθήσομαι δὲ
κάλλιον ἢ διαλαχὴσομαι· ὡς ἐπιτοπολύ γὰρ οἱ μέλλοντες πρῶτοι προτιμῶνται
τῶν δευτέρων μελλόντων. ΤΜ

117 Διέπαιξεν· οὐ κατέπαιξεν. L

Διέπαιξεν· οὐ κατέπαιξεν. V

Διαπαίξει, οὐ καταπαίξει. TM

118 Δασεὶ ὡς τὸ ἀμβλεῖ καὶ βραδεῖ. L

119 Δασῦ, οὐ δάσος. L
Δασύ Ἀττικός τὸ δὲ δάσος κοινός. TM

120 Καὶ δεδίττεται καὶ ἐκφοβεῖ. L

Δεδίττομαι τὸν δείνα, ἦγουν ἐκφοβῶ, καὶ παρὰ ποιηταῖς καὶ παρὰ λογογράφοις: ἀντὶ δὲ τοῦ ἐκφοβοῦμαι παρὰ ποιηταῖς μόνοις. Ὅμηρος ἐν β΄ Ἰλιάδος· οὐ σε ἐσικε κακὸν ὡς δειδίσσεσθαι. TM

121 Δεί τοῦδε ἀντὶ τοῦ προσδεί. L

122 Δείκνυμι, ζεύγνυμι· οὐ ζευγνύω. L

Δείκνυμι καὶ ζεύγνυμι· δεικνύω πάρες· V

Ἰστέον ὅτι ἡ τετάρτη συζυγία τῶν εἰς μι πρωτιμοτέρα τοῖς Ἀττικοῖς τῆς βαρυτόνοι. δείκνυμι γὰρ καὶ ζεύγνυμι λέγουσιν, οὐ δεικνύω οὐδὲ ζευγνύω. TM

Philemon is resisting the loss of -μι conjugations.

123 Δισκευτής· οὐ δισκοβόλος. L

Δισκοβόλος οὐ δεῖ λέγειν, ἀλλὰ δισκευτής. TM
The aorist middle form \( \text{Διελέξατο} \) is attested in Homer and Alcaeus, but not again until the NT and Josephus. The aorist passive \( \text{διηλέχθη} \) is in fact much better attested in Attic authors—it is found in Aesop, Herodotus, Antiphon, Protagoras, Isocrates, Isaeus, Xenophon, Plato, Gorgias and Demosthenes. In this lemma Thomas disagrees with the lemmata in L and V.

\( \text{Διαγραφε} \cdot \mu\, \text{περίγραφε}. \text{L} \)
\( \text{Διαγράφω, όυκ ἀπαλείψω}. \text{TM} \)

\( \text{Δρύς καὶ δρύας φάμεν}. \text{L} \)
\( \text{Δρύς καὶ δρύες φαμέν}. \text{(Cohn)} \)

\( \text{Διέλαβε κρείττον· όυχ ὑπέλαβε}. \text{L} \)

\( \text{Διέδραμον όυκ ἐρείς Ἅττικός, ἀλλὰ συνέδραμον}. \text{L} \)
129 Διονύσιον, ώς προβαλίσιον. L

130 Δοῦλος, θεράπων, οἰκέτης. L
Δοῦλος, θεράπων, οἰκέτης. (Cohn)

131 Δράγματα, οὐ χάμαλας. L

'Αμάλας <λέγουσιν 'Αττικώς>, οὐ δράγματα. V
'Αμάλας, οὐ δράγματα. (Cohn)

A δράγμα is the quantity of stalks a reaper can gather in his left hand.

132 Δέρειν ἐκδέρειν, ὡστερ ἐκφέρειν. L

133 Δέλεο, ὡς κέαρ. L

134 Δύνασαι λέγεται· τὸ γὰρ δύνη βάρβαρον. L
Δύνασαι λέγε· τὸ γὰρ δύνη βάρβαρον. (Cohn)
Δύνασαι· τὸ δὲ δύνη βάρβαρον. V

Δύναμαι, δύνασαι· δύνη δὲ οὐδεὶς τῶν δοκίμων εἶπεν, εἰ καὶ Συνέσιος ἐν ἑπιστολῇ· σὺ μὲν οὖν καὶ δύνη καὶ πειρώ ως ἂν δύνη ἀκριβέστατα διελθεῖν πάντα. TM

135 Διχῇ· οὐ δίχα. L

Διχῇ διελών, ἢ δίχα. TM

The adverb means “in two ways, asunder.”

136 Δύσεργος, ὡς ἀμουσος. L

137 Δύσερως, ὡς Μενέλεως. L

138 Διέδρα διαφέρει τοῦ ἀπέδρα. διέδρα φυλακῆν· ἀπέδρα, ὅταν ἄφυλακτος ἦ. L

Διέδρα φυλακῆν· ἀπέδρα δὲ ὅταν ἄφυλακτος ἦ. V

Διέδρα τις φυλακῆν· ἀπέδρα, ὅταν ἄφυλακτος ἦ. TM
Δεικακόνηκα

Καὶ διενεκάμην, οὐ διειλόμην. L
Καὶ διενεμάμην, οὐ διειλόμην. (Cohn)

Διενεμάμην λέγουσιν, οὐ διειλόμην. V
Διενεμάμην· οὐ διειλόμην. (Cohn)

Διενεμάμην καὶ ἐνειμάμην, οὐ διειλόμην. Ἀριστείδης ἐν τῇ πρὸς τοὺς βασιλέας
eπιστολῇ πρὸς δὲ τοὺς στρατιώτας τοὺς χιτῶνας ἐνείματο. TM

Διεπαυσε· <οὐ> κατέπαυσε. L

Διεπαυσεν· οὐ κατέπαυσεν. V

Διεπαυσέ τις τινα καὶ διεπαύσατο αὐτός, καὶ ἔπαυσε καὶ ἐπαύσατο, καὶ
ἀνέπαυσε καὶ ἀνεπαύσατο. Λιβάνιος ἐν μελέτῃ τῇ Διέσωσε τις ἐμπρήσμοι
γενομένου τὸν έαυτοῦ πατέρα· μόλις, ὡς ἀνδρες δικασταί, τῶν ἐπὶ τῷ πατρὶ θρήνων
[όλιγον] ἀναπαυσάμενος, τὸ δὲ μετὰ τῆς κατὰ ἐκφέρειν ταῦτα ἀδόκιμον. TM

Δείλης ὁψίας οὐδεῖς ἐρεί. L

Δείλης <ὁψίας· οὐκ ὁψίας. V
Δείλης· οὔκ ὁψίας. (Cohn)
142 Ἐλέξαι· σύχ ἐλκύσαι. V

143 „Ερυγάναι <λέγουσιν>, σύκ ἐρεύγεται, Ἰ(καί) ἐρυγεῖν, ἀπερυγεῖν, ἱρυγεν σύκ ἱρεύδατο.“ ἐρυγγάναι δὲ <μᾶλλον>, ἀν ἄσιτος ἤ, ἐρεύγεται δ′, ὅταν τις ἐμπλησθῇ τροφῆς. V

144 Ἐνιπτε καὶ ἐνιζέν ἑκατέρῳ ἑρείς. V

Νίπτω is in fact a later and non-Attic form of νίζω, which is generally contrasted with λούομαι: νίζω is to wash a part of the body, such as the feet, λούομαι is to bathe.

Strikingly the non-Attic form is not here proscribed but merely distinguished from νίζω, with no elaboration of the alleged difference in meaning.

145 Εὐφέματα σύχ εὑρήται. V

εὑρέμα is a later form of εὑρήμα, meaning “discovery.” This lemma may have originated as a contrast between the two forms.
146 Ἐις γειτόνων βάδιζε· ποῦ δ’ ἐστὶν λέγης, ἐν γειτόνων· ἐν τοῖς δὲ γειτόσι μὴ λέγε. V

147 Ἐντυγνάνειν <λέγουσιν> οὐ συγτυγχάνειν. V

148 Ἐς κόρακας· οὐκ εἰς κόρακας. V

149 Ἐς μακαρίαν· οὐκ εἰς μακαρίαν <λέκτεον>. V

150 Ἐπιστολιογόρος <τε> καὶ βιβλιογράφος. V

151 Εἴσειμι <κάξειμ’>· ἐξελεύσομαι πάσης. V

152 Ἐχεσθαι· οὐκ ἀντέχεσθαι. V

153 Ἐπίτηδες [καὶ] ἐξεπίτηδες, ὡς βούλει, λέγε. V

154 Ἐκπομα· τὴν μέσην μακρὰν ποιητέον. V
An ἐκπώμα is a beaker or drinking cup, attested in Herodotus and Thucydides.

155 "Ελξω οὐχὶ ἐλκύσω. note above V

156 "Ετνος <λέγουσι>, τὸν δ’ ἐρεγμόν περίελε. V

"Ετνος is a thick soup, made with beans or peas, mentioned in Aristophanes (Arch. 246; Ra. 62, 506). ἐρεγμός is equivalent to ἐρεγμα meaning “bruised corn;” it is mentioned in Moeris as equivalent to ἐρυγμός, “belching.”

157 „Εχθές περιελεῖς, τὸ [δὲ] χθές Ἄττικώτερον.“
οὔτως; ὅνως τοῦ σοφοῦ τεχνυδρίου,
ὁ τι καὶ τὸν Ἀριστοφάνην, τὸ τῶν Μουσῶν στόμα,
tοῦ καταλόγου τῶν Ἄττικῶν ἐξήλασεν·
ἐν ταῖς Νεφέλαις γάρ ὃδ’ ἐκεῖνος που λέγει· (V. 175)
„ἐχθές δὲ γ’ ἡμῖν δεύτερον σώκ ἢν ἐσπέρας“. V

This is one of the few remains of Philemon’s verse. Notable is the deprecating reference the wise τεχνυδρίον (diminutive of τέχνη) which drove out even Aristophanes, τὸ τῶν Μουσῶν στόμα, from the κατάλογος τῶν Ἄττικῶν. Philemon appears to be taking a critical view of conventional Atticist typology here in the spirit of the Antiatticist.
The form ἐχθές is more frequent than χθές in comedy and the LXX, and appears exclusively in the NT. Moeris distinguishes the two forms as Attic and Hellenic, the Etymologicum magnum s.v. Ἐχθές makes the same distinction, but identifies the Ἐλληνες with the κοινοί. He observes that ἐκθές is the original form, since he derives the word from τὸ ἐκτὸς γεγενήσθαι τῆς σήμερον. ἐχτές refers to that which arises outside of time, with the dental then aspirated to form ἐχθές.

Other hypotheses were put forward for this etymology that remains problematic (Chantraine, Blanc, Lamberterie, et al. 1999, 1258). The Etymologicum Gudianum derives ἐχθές from ἐκθέω, and thus considers the form ἀναλογώτερον than χθές (s.v. ἐχθες).

Modern Greek preserves the alteration between χτές and ἐχτές as between χθές and ἐχθές.

158 Ἐξήμεσεν· οὐκ ἢμεσεν. V

159 Ἐξωμίς <ἐστιν> ἐπερομάσχαλος χιτῶν. V

------------------------------------------

196χθές καὶ χθιζόν Ἀττικοί, ἐχθές καὶ ἐχθεσινόν Ἐλληνες (p. 212).
197Ἐχθές καὶ Χθές: Οἱ Ἀττικοί, χθές· οἱ δὲ κοινοί, ἐχθές. Πρῶτον δὲ τὸ ἐχθές τοῦ χθές· καὶ δήλων, πρῶτον μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐτυμολογίας, ότι ἐχθές εἰρηται παρὰ τὸ ἐκτὸς γεγενήσθαι τῆς σήμερον. Παρὰ τὸ ἐκτὸς τοῦ χρόνου γεγονός κατάστημα, ἐκτές· καὶ τροπὴ τῶν ψυλῶν εἰς δασεία, ἐχθές· τὸ γάρ ἀπόβλητον ἐκτὸς ἢμῶν. Δεύτερον δὲ, ότι πᾶν μονοσύλλαβον ἐπίροσθη ἤ φύσει ἢ θέσει γίνεται κατ᾿ ἰδίαν μακρόν· οίον ναι, νή, πλήν, γνυξ, μάψ.
This was an informal tunic with only one hole for the arm (μασχάλη is the arm-pit) leaving one shoulder bare.

160  <Βέλτιον> ες νέωτα, ούκ εις τούπιον. V

161  Ἐρμηνέας· ούχ ἐρμηνεῖς. V

162  Ἐπιστρέφω βέλτιον, ούχ ύποστρέφω. V

163  Ἐβουλόμην· ούκ ἠβουλόμην. V

164  Ἐφεσ· ούκ ἐφεσ. V

In Homer ἐφαε has the meaning “to wander about, go slowly;” it can then mean, “to come to harm,” and in Attic it frequently means “to be lost, to perish.”

165  Ζάκορον, ἔπει τι σεμνότερον νεωκόρου. V

A ζάκορος was a temple servant, a somewhat more dignified office than a νεωκόρος, a temple custodian.
166 Ζωμός μέλας· οὐχ αίματιον. V

Ζωμός μέλας is the black broth of the Spartans.

167 Ζεύγνυσιν· οὐχὶ ζευγνύει. V

168 Ζωγλύφος· οὐχὶ ζωγλύφος. V

169 Ζεύγλην· οὐχὶ ζεύγλαν. V

170 Ζόρκας· οὐ δορκάδας. V

171 Ἡττήσομαι σου· μὴ γὰρ ἤττηθήσομαι. V

172 Ἡν· μὴ λέγ᾽ ἡμῖν. V

173 Ἡρω <λέγουσιν>, οὐχ ἦρως· ἦρως. ἦρως <τε>......... ἐκατέρως ἔρεις. [ἀλλ᾽ ὁ Φρύνιχος φησιν· ἦρως οὐ λέγουσιν, εἰ καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης εἰς ἐκείνη βιοσθεῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ μέτρου. τῷ δ᾽ ἠγακασμένῳ οὐ χρηστέον.] V
174 Ἡλωκεν οὐ χρῆ· ἐάλωκε δέ. V

175 Ἡκω ὄνκ ἐληλυθα. V

176 Ἡπημα περίλε· ἀκεσμα δέ. V

177 Ἡφίέσαν· οὐκ ἀφίέσαν. V

178 Θεμέλιον· οὐ θεμέλιος. V

179 Θορυβήσωμαι δεῖ, οὐ<χ> θορυβήθησομαι. V

180 Θήρεια κρέα· οὐκ ἄγριμαία. V

181 Θριάσιν πεδίων Ἀττικῆς· ἐκλήθη δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν βληθεισῶν ἐν αὐτῷ. θριῶν ὑπ’ Ἀθηνᾶς. θρίαι δὲ εἷςιν αἱ μαντὶ καὶ ψήφοι. V
Read: Θημόνας θημονίας.

The form preferred by Philemon is not attested; θημονία, which LSJ claims should be accented on the ultima, appears 28 times with the penultimate accent and 13 times with the accent on the ultima. The word means a heap of δράγματα.

Most likely θωμόνας should be read θημόνας; Philemon is here recommending the more common noun θημών meaning “heap” attested in Homer, Aesop, and Philoxenus against the more unusual θημονία first attested in the Christian era. θημόνας

183 Θηρεύσομαι οὐ θηρεύσω. V

184 Θέρεται οὐ θερμαίνεται. V

185 Θυραλλίς οὐκ ἐλλύχνιον, ἦγουν τὸ περικαϊόμενον τοῦ λυχνίου ἐστὶ καὶ βοτάνη πρὸς λύχνον ἀρμόζουσα. V

186 Κατεδύετο οὐ κατέδυε. V
Κακῶς λέγει· οὐ κακολογεῖ. V

Κατάβα· οὐ κατάβηθι. V

Καταξιῶσον πάρες· αέιώσον λέγε. V

Κατεντρυφά· ξένον <τόδ’>· έντρυφά λέγε. V

Κολοκύντην· οὐ κολόκυνθα. V

Κόνδυλον· οὐ κόλαφον. V

Κορυδός· ὁ κορυδαλός. V

Κάκη· ἡ κάκωσις. V

Λημάς σύ γ’, οὐ γλαμάς <Ἀριστοφάνης λέγει>,
λημόντα δ’ οὐκέτ’, ἀλλὰ <σ’ γε> γλαμώντ’ ἐφείς. V

196 Λαμπράν ἡμέραν· οὐχὶ καθαράν. V

197 Λάχωμεν μὴ· κληροσώμεθα δὲ. V

198 Λέλογχε μὴ· εὐλήχε δέ. V

199 Λέμφος· ὁ μυξώδης καί μάταιος καὶ ἀνόητος. V

The word λέμφος appears four times in both Aristophanes and Menander, is glossed here as mucous-like, vain, and senseless.

200 Μεμάθηκα καί μετήλθον. V

201 Μάλη μὲν ἐστι ξενικόν· ύπὸ μάλης δ’ ἐφείς. V

197
Philemon is indicating that the noun μάλη meaning arm-pit is confined almost exclusively to the phrase ὑπὸ μάλης, “under the arm,” generally as a place for concealing a weapon or adverbially as “underhandedly, secretly.”

202 Μαχοῦμαι· οὐ μαχήσομαι. V

μαχοῦμαι is the Attic future form, appearing three times in Aristophanes, twice in Menander, in Euripides and Sophocles. μαχήσομαι appears four times in Homer, twice in Posidippus in the third century.

203 Μελίπηκτα· οὗ μελιτώματα. V

Both words indicate a honey-cake; the first appears four times in the fourth-century comic poet Antiphanes and four times in Menander, the second in Hippocrates, Diocles, and Philetas. As usual comic usage takes precedence for Philemon.

204 Μίνθαν· οὐχ ἱδύσσων. V

205 Νυκτῶν μέσων <λέγουσιν>, οὐ νυκτὸς μέσης. V

νυκτὸς μέσης appears once in the fifth century, in a fragment of Pherecydes, but not again until the second century BC. μέσων νυκτῶν appears in Thucydides, Empedocles, in Aristophanes’s
Vespae, in Demosthenes and Aristotle. The given combination νυκτών μέσων does not appear before St. John Chrysostom.

206  Νῆσαι πυράν· οὐ συνθεῖναι. V

Νῆσαι πυράν is to pile up a funeral pyre; the verb νείν meaning “to heap” might have been confused with two other words with the same spelling, one meaning “to spin” and the other appearin in 207 below.

207  Νείν καὶ κολυμβᾶν. V

The older meaning of κολυμβᾶν is to dive; νείν is the more Attic word meaning to swim.

208  Νεογνὸν οὐδείς, ἀλλὰ νεόγυον <λέγει>. V

Νεόγυονος, attested in Euripides, is less common than the standard Attic νεογένης.

209  Ξύστων καὶ σπλεγγίδα. V

Both words refer to a scraper, in particular used after bathing, ξύστωα appears in a fragment of the fifth century comic poet Archippus, in Hippocrates, and in the middle Comedy poet
Diphilus. στλεγγις appears in Hippias, in the *Thesmophoriazusae* and two fragments of Aristophanes, in Xenophon’s *Anabasis* and twice in Plato. Erotian cites the word’s appearance in Menander and claims it as equally ancient with ξυστροχ (Vocum Hippocraticarum collectio 115.9).

σύντεχνον does appear in a fragment of Aristophanes (183) and in Plato’s *Politicus* (274d), but forms of ὀμότεχνον are more frequent—in Herodotus, four times in Plato, Gorgias, Hippocrates, and Demosthenes.

This is an irregular superlative of ὁψιος, meaning “late.” The first form is elsewhere attested only in Eustathius, *Commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam* I.73.39. ὀψαίτερον is attested in Aesop, Plato’s *Cratylus* 433b, and Hippocrates.

This is the only attestation of the form ὀφθαλμόμαι; ὀφθαλμόμαι is not attested.

Οἰκοδόμον ὁμί λέγουσιν, ἄλλα τέκτωνα.
The word τέκτων appears five times in Homer, in Hesiod, Aeschylus, Euripides, the comic poet Crates, Aristophanes, and eight times in Plato in the nominative singular form alone; οἰκοδόμος does appear three times in Plato in the nominative.

214 Ὅτι Ἰπτετοι καὶ ὁτὲ δήποτε. V

The form Ὅτι Ἰπτετοι is not attested; the combination ὁτὲ δήποτε appears in Euripides, Herodian’s Partitiones, and other later writers.

215 Πεπληγμένος· οὐ πεπληγώς. V

The perfect middle/passive participle of πλήσσειν “to strike” is opposed to the perfect active participle. In Attic the present, future, and aorist active of this verb appears only in compounds. πεπληγώς appears in a fragment of Ion from the fifth century and not again until the LXX; πεπληγμένος appears in Aeschylus, Euripides, twice in Aristophanes, and in Plato, Aristotle and Menander.

216 Πετεινόν οὐδείς· πτηνόν δὲ. V

The former adjective meaning “winged” is poetic; πτηνός is more frequent in the classical period, however, appearing in prose in Plato’s Phaedrus 246e. The latter adjective is frequently used as a substantive for “bird,” and contrasted with τὰ πεζά.
Correction of a contracted form of the infinitive.

Retention of the uncontracted genitive is Attic.

Another example of preferring classical \textit{είμι} to the future of \textit{ἔχωμαι}.

\textit{πεσσοί} are oval-shaped stones for games such as backgammon, attested in Aristophanes and other classical authors. \textit{κύβος} meaning cube or dice appears in the tragedians.
The accusative of ὁ πρίων meaning “saw.” The form is not attested, though πρίονα is attested frequently in Hippocrates, Aristotle, Polybius, and later authors.

222 Πάροχος· οὐ παράνυμφος. V

παράνυμφος is cited in Pollux (3.40) as “best man;” in the feminine παράνυμφος is a bridesmaid (Aristophanes, Acharn. 1048). Moeris identifies this usage as non-Attic: νυμφεύτριαν Ἀττικόν, παράνυμφον Ἑλληνες. (p. 204). Hesychius glosses παράνυμφος as νυμφεύτρια (π. 604) but also glosses πάροχος as παράνυμφος (π. 999).

223 Ἄρτηρια <μὲν> οὐδείς, ἀλλ’ ἀκέστριαν <λέγει>. V

cf. 39 above, where ἀκέστριαν is preferred to ἡπήτριαν. Ἄρτηρια is a late feminine form attested in Eustathius and derived from ἄρτηρις meaning “clothes-mender.”

224 Ῥαφίδα οὐδείς, ἀλλὰ βελόνην. V

βελόνη meaning “needle” appears in Eupolis, Aeschines and others. It has the secondary meaning “garfish.” Ῥαφίς is a well-attested but post-classical word for “needle.” It appears in Hippocrates and later writers, but in Aristophanes and Epicharmus also with the meaning “garfish.”
In the classical period ἰδειμένοι means primarily to bind in chains (Eur. Bacchae 616, Plato Leges 808e); ἰν δέω has the more neutral sense of binding or tying two things together from Homer to Plato (e.g. Euthyphro 4c).

The Attic form of the adjective "safe and sound" is preferred to ἰσιος, attested in Homer.

The assimilated form ἰνλαμβάνειν is to be used exclusively.

The perfect active of ἰνλέγω, "to collect, gather," is preferred to a form not elsewhere attested.

The former word appears in the Iliad, Aristophanes Knights and Lysistrata, Plato's Republic and Xenophon; the latter however is also attested in Aristophanes's Birds, Plato, and Xenophon.
Σύζυγα· ού τόν σύζυγον.  V

Σύζυγος is preferred to σύζυγος as the word for spouse, as in Plato’s Phaedrus 254a.

Συφορβος· ούδεις· συβώτην δέ.  V

Συβώτης appears in Homer, Herodotus, and in Plato, συφορβός in Homer and Theocritus.

Τό τάριχος· ούχ ὁ τάριχος.  V

The word stands for a dead body preserved by embalming in Herodotus (9.120), generally for preserved meat, or metaphorically of a stupid person. The neuter form predominates in Attic, as in Aristophanes, but the masculine does appear in Cratinus and Plato Comicus. The masculine is supposed Ionic; Herodotus uses only the masculine, Hippocrates uses both forms.

"Ὑδερον ἔρεις <σὺ> τό πάθος, οὔκ ἔρεις ύδρωψ.  V

The adjectival expression is preferred to the technical term for “dropsy.” The word ύδρωψ is attested in Hippocrates (Aph. 3.22) and Epicurus (fr. 190); it appears in an Epidaurus inscription from the fourth century BC.
Here ὑπόποους is given in the genitive form with ἑρεῖν, “you will speak of something as furnished with feet.” Aristotle uses the term of ἄνον in the Metaphysics and speaks of τὰ ὑπόποδα (ἄνα) in the HA 511a32. The form ἕκποος is not attested but might have arisen through confusion with ἕκποδῶν ⇔ ἐμποδῶν, a word frequently used in the classical period meaning “out of the way.”

“Speech failed him,” ὑπολείπειν with the sense of “to leave remaining” by contrast with ἐπιλείπειν “to leave behind.”

Pork is properly designated by the adjective ὕειος, “of or belonging to swine,” and not by the genitive of ὑς = σῦς. The adjective ὕειος appears in the classical period, in Aristophanes (Eq. 356) and Aristotle (HA 519a24). ὕεικός is glossed in Pollux and Photius as ὕκός. ὕεικός < βοῦς is equivalent to ὑβειος, “having to do with oxen;” Philemon would presumably prefer the latter form as here ὕειος to ὕεικός.
The adjective ὑπαίθριος “in the open air”, sub divo, is preferred to ὑπαίθρος with the same meaning. The former is attested in Pindar, Herodotus, Aeschylus, Euripides, Thucydides, Plato, and Xenophon; the latter in Hippocrates with the same meaning, but often as in a third century BC inscription from Smyrna by contrast with κάτωκοι (OGI 229.14).

There are substantive expressions ἐν ὑπαίθριῳ and ἐν ὑπαίθρῳ with the same meaning as the adjective; the substantive τὸ ὑπαίθρον means an open enclosure.

238 Φοινίκεον· οὐ φοινικοῦν. V

Preference for the uncontracted form φοινίκεον of the adjective “crimson,” which appears in Xenophanes of νέφος and Pindar of ὄφα, and repeatedly in Herodotus. The contracted form appears in Xenophon’s Anabasis (1.2.16) and the Cyropaideia (7.1.2).

239 Φθόην· οὐ φθίνων. V

φθόη is Attic for φθίνω, “decay” ⇔ αὐξήως; the former appears in Plato’s Laws, Plato Comicus and Isocrates.

240 Φροίμα· οὐ προοίμια. V

φροίμιον is a contraction of προοίμιον, appearing frequently in tragedy and with the metaphorical meaning of “prelude, beginning,” extended from “proem, exordium,”
Clarification of semantic confusion between φαρμακός and φαρμακίς.

Φαρμακίς is the nominative form indicating the feminine of φαρμακεύς, a witch. Aristophanes in the Clouds (749) uses it as an adjective with γυνη. It is here contrasted not with the neuter φάρμακον “drug” but with the accusative of φαρμακός, indicating a scapegoat.

Φάκελος is masculine, meaning a bundle; the accusative form is given. This form is ξυληφίον is the diminutive of ξύλον, meaning a piece of wood or a stick. οἱ φάκελοι τῶν ὀξάδων were the fasces.

The Attic form is here preferred to the Ionic, although χλιερός does appear in Alcman 33.5. Generally the adjective means “warm” but in the Apocalypse 3.16 it stands for “lukewarm.”
Here the two-ending second-declension adjective is insisted on against the three-ending adjective that took its place.

245 Χορτάσματ', ἀν ἡ πολυτελὴ <τὰ> βρῶματα. V

χορτάσματα appears mostly in the plural as fodder for cattle, or in the Acta Apostolorum 7.11 as human food. βρῶμα as “food” is contrasted with ὄψα in the third century comic writer Sosipater, perhaps as meat to fish.

246 Χρέως τὸ δάνειον, οὐδὲ εἰς ἑρεῖ χρέος. V

χρέως was the Attic form for χρεος; the latter form appears in the Odyssey together with the usual Homeric form χρεῖος.

Phrynichus and Moeris insist on the Attic form which was being lost in part thanks to loss of the phonological distinction of quantity.

247 Χλωρόν λέγουσι τυρόν ἀπαλὸν <Ἀττικὸι>. V

In Attic χλωρός τυρός meant “fresh cheese” Lysias uses the expression by metonymy to stand for “the cheese market.” With a basic meaning of soft to the touch or tender, ἀπαλὸς could be used of delicate children, fresh flowers, soft-boiled eggs, or raw fruit.
Philemon gives the adjective and the agentive noun related to ψιθυρίζω, to whisper or slander.

Philemon protests against use of the verb ἀγοράζω, preferring ὄνεομαι. He gives both verbs in the future tense. ἀγοράζω has prevailed in modern Greek.

He glosses the verb meaning to faint or swoon; χασμωδῶς < χασμώδης yawning, gaping.

Philemon marks the distinction between ὀχρος, from ὀχρος, indicating a kind of pea, and φάσηλος, a kind of bean, source of the Latin phaselus.
Philemon’s lexicon presents a great deal of evidence for language change at work in the late second century. His primary concern is vocabulary: some 117 of the 251 lemmata are intended to purify and restore Attic vocabulary. But the whole spectrum of linguistic change is represented, including morphology, accent, vowel quantity and quality, and other kinds of sound change.

The lemmata fall broadly into three categories: correction of non-Attic usage; explanation or definition of an Attic word or expression; simple listing of a word or form, implicitly asserting its Attic legitimacy. Words and forms that Philemon rejects are often those that have found their way into modern Greek usage at the expense of the recommended form.

The largest group consists of the correction of non-Attic vocabulary. In 53 cases the Attic form is given first, followed by the rejected form:

8 Ἀκούσματα, οὐκ ἀκροάματα.
15 Λοιδορεῖν· οὐκ ἄθυροστομεῖν
19 Ἄλλαξ, οὐκ ἄλλαντιον.
24 Ἀστὴ, οὐκ Ἀθηναία.
26 Ἀλμάδας: οὐ κολυμβάδας
39 Ἀκέστιοιαν, οὐκ ἕπτίτιοιαν.
Αντάλλος, οὐκ ἀντάλλαγος.

Βουλευτήριον, οὐ βο<ε>λείον

Βυσσοδέψης, οὐ βυσσεῖς.

"Τειν, οὐ βρέχειν.

Βραγχάν, οὐ βραχνάν.

Βέμβικα, οὐ όμβιον

Γαύνακα, οὐ γαυνάκιον.

Κνέφαλον· οὐ τύλη.

Δεθήσεται· οὐ δεσμευθήσεται

Διηλλάγη· οὐ κατηλλάγη.

Διέπαιξεν· οὐ κατέπαιξεν

Δασύ· Α' ττικοί· τὸ δεσεται· οὐ δεσμευθήσεται

Διαγράφω, οὐκ ἀπαλείφω· Λ

Διέλαβε κρείττον· οὐχ ὑπέλαβε.

'Αμάλας <λέγουσιν 'Αττικός>, οὐ δράγματα.

Διχή· οὐ δίχα.

Δείλης· οὐκ ὑψίας.

'Ετνος <λέγουσι>, τὸν δ' ἑρεγμὸν περίελε.

<Βέλτιον> ἐς νέωτα, οὐκ εἰς τούτιόν.

Ζωμός μέλας· οὐχ αἰμάτιον.

Ζόρκας· οὐ δορκάδας.

"Ηκω· οὐκ ἐλήλυθα.

Θήρεια κρέα· οὐκ ἀγριμαία.

Θημώνας· θημωνίας.

Θέρεται· οὐ θεραίνεται.
Κακῶς λέγει· οὐ κακολογεῖ
Κολοκύντην· οὐ κολόκουνθα
Κόνδυλον· οὐ κόλαφον.
Λημάς σὺ γ', οὐ γλαμάς <Αριστοφάνης λέγει>,
λημώντα δ' οὐκέτ', ἀλλὰ <σῦ γε> γλαμάντ' <έρεις>
Λαμπρὰν ἡμέραν· οὐχὶ καθαρὰν. Υ
Μελίπηκτα· οὐ μελιτώματα.
Μίνθαν· οὐχ ἡδύοσμον.
Νῆσαι πυρὰν· οὐ συνθεῖναι.
'Όμότεχνον· οὐχὶ σύντεχνον.
Πεστοῦς <λέγουσιν>, τοὺς κύβους δ' οὔδείς <έρει>
Πάροχος· οὐ παράνυμφος.
Συνδεῖτε· οὐ δεσμεύετε. καὶ συνδούμενος.
Σκυτότομος· οὐ σκυτεύς.
Συζυγα· οὐ τὸν συζυγόν.
'Υδερὸν έρεῖς <σὺ> τὸ πάθος, οὐκ έρεῖς ὕδραψ.
'Υπόποδος έρεῖς <μέν>, ἐκποδὸς <δ' οὔ> οὔδείς έρει.
'Υπέλιπεν ὁ λόγος, οὐκ ἐπέλιπε <λεκτέων>.
Φθορή· οὐ φθίνων.
Φαρμακία· οὐ φαρμακόν.
Χρέως· τὸ δάνειον, οὔδε εἰς έρεῖ χρέος.
'Ωνήσομαι βέλτιον, οὔδείς δ' ἄγοράσω.

Eleven times the rejected word is given first:

γύριν οὐκ έρεῖς, ἀλλὰ πασπάλην· ἡ κέγχρον ἢ ἄλευρον κρίθινον
Γήγειον οὐκ έρεῖς· ἀλλὰ κήτειον.
106 Γύνις οὐκ ἔρεις, ἀλλ’ ἀνδρόγυνος
157 Ἔχονες περιελείς, τὸ [δὲ] χθές Ἀττικώτερον.
176 "Ἡτημα περίελε· ἄκεσμα δὲ.
197 Λάχωμεν μὴ· κληροσώμεθα δὲ.
213 Οἰκοδόμοιν οὐ λέγουσιν, ἀλλὰ τέκτονα.
216 Πετεινόν οὐδείς· πτηνόν δὲ.
223 Ράπτηρα <μὲν> οὐδείς, ἀλλ’ ἄκεστριαν <λέγει>.
224 Ὁρφίδα οὐδείς, ἀλλὰ βελόνην.
231 Σφυροβόν οὐδείς· συβώτην δὲ.

The second category includes 24 definitions or explanations of vocabulary. These words tend to be more unusual or archaic, and are often explained by the words that have replaced them in modern usage:

11 Ἀκοντί· ἀπνευστί.
28 Ἀπφαν τὴν ἀδελφήν, ὡς ἀπφύς ὁ ἀδελφός.
59 Βλαυτίον· σανδάλιον, ύπόδημα. λέγεται καὶ βλανδίον.
60 Βλήχων, βρώμα διὰ πυρὸς καὶ γάλακτος ἐρημένον παρ’ Ἀιγυπτίοις.
67 Βαύσις· ύπόδημα.
75 Τὸ τῶν κηρίων τρύγημα βλήτετιν λέγουσι L.
78 Βλάκας· τοὺς ἀγροίκους.
80 Βουλιμὼς· ὁ μέγας λιμός, ὡς ἀσπασμός· οὐ βούλιμος.
87 Γύλειον, ἄγγειον τι Περσικόν, ὡς ἄγγειον.
93 Γύπας· τὰς υποδήσους πέτρας.
101 Γαῦλος παρ’ Ἀττικοῖς πλοῖον λιμητικὸν.
107 Γρυ· τὸν ὑπὸ τοῖς ὀνυξὶ ρύπων, περισπωμένως
137 Δύστερρως, ὡς Μενέλεως
159 Ἐξωμίς <ἐστιν> ἐτερομάσχαλος χιτῶν.
165 Ζάκορον, ἐπεὶ τι σεμνότερον νεωκόρου.
181 Θριά οἰκίαν πεδίον Ἀττικής· ἐκλήθη δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν βληθεισῶν ἐν αὐτῷ.
185 Θριαλλής· οὐκ ἐλλύχνιον, ἔγον τὸ περικαϊόμενον τοῦ λυχνίου·
193 Κορυδός· ὁ κορυδαλὸς.
194 Κάκη· ἡ κάκωσις.
199 Λέμφος· ὁ μυζώδης καὶ μάταιος καὶ ἀνόητος.
242 Φάκελον· μικρὸν <τι> δέσμιον ξυληφίων
247 Χλωρόν λέγουσι τυρόν ἀπαλόν <Αττικοῦ>.
250 Ὄρακιαν, τούτεστι χασμωδῶς ἔχειν.

Three lemmata identify idiomatic usage:

99 Γάμους, οὐ γάμον.
201 Μάλῃ μὲν ἐστὶ ξενικῶν· ὑπὸ μάλης δὲ ἐρεῖς.
205 Νυκτῶν μέσων <λέγουσιν>, οὐ νυκτῶς μέσης.

In one case a word specified as poetic is given first, followed by the word recommended for rhetorical usage:

88 Γαμβρός ποιητικότερον· κηδεστής δὲ παρὰ τοῖς ὀήτοροι. TM
Six lemmata define words by contrast; neither word is rejected, but the difference in sense is asserted. Sometimes it is a distinction in meaning between two words that is being lost; as we saw regarding (1) above, the contrast may be schematic and not entirely in accord with Attic usage:

1 'Απαντήσαι ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐντυγχάνειν καθ’ ὅδον τινι, ὑπαντήσαι δὲ λόγῳ. V
29 Ἀμυγδαλή ὁ καρπὸς, ἀμυγδαλὴ τὸ δένδρον.
91 Γένυς, ἢ σιαγών. Γένειον, αἱ τρίχες
138 Διέδρα φυλακὴν· ἀπέδρα δὲ ὅταν ἀφύλακτος ἦ
143 ἐρυγγάνει δὲ <μᾶλλον>, ἀν ἄσιτος ἦ, ἐρεύγεται δ’, ὅταν τις ἐμπληθῇ τροφῆς.
245 Χορτάσματ’, ἢν ἦ πολυτελὴ <τὰ> βρώματα.

Sometimes the distinction is merely asserted:

144 Ἠνίπτε καὶ ἐνίζεν ἐκατέρως ἐρείς.
251 Ὁχροὺς λέγουσι καὶ φασῆλους ἐκατέρως.

An acceptable word may be simply stated, with no contrasting word:

12 Ἄρτοπώλης. L
51 Βλαυτίον βέλτιον.
65 Βούταις.
98 Γῆδιον ἐρείς
Ten lemmata list two acceptable words, often synonyms:

55 Καὶ βορᾶς καὶ βορέας, ἐκατέρως.
120 Καὶ δεδίττεται καὶ ἐκφοβεῖ.
126 Δρύς καὶ δρύς φαμέν
150 Ἐπιστολισμόρφος <τε> καὶ βιβλισμόρφος.
153 Ἐπιτήδες [καὶ] ἐξεπιτήδες, ὡς βούλει, λέγε.
200 Μεμάθηκα καὶ μετήλθον.
207 Νεῖν καὶ κολιμβάν.
209 Ξύστοιαν καὶ στλεγγίδα.
214 Ὀτιήποτε καὶ ὅτε δήποτε.
248 Ψιθυρός καὶ ψιθυριστής

In one case two acceptable words are named and a third rejected:

2 Ἁνωτέρω καὶ κατωτέρω· ἐνδοτέρω δὲ οὐκέτι, ἀλλ᾽ ἐνδόν μᾶλλον.

Or a list of three acceptable synonyms may appear:

22 Ἀτέχνως· ἀπλάστως, ἀδόλως.
130 Δοῦλος, θεράπων, οἰκέτης.

Morphology is also normally corrected by juxtaposition with a rejected form, as in these cases of change in conjugation:

3 Ἀφείλετο· ἀφεῖλατο βάρβαρον. L
The future tense shows great variability:

- ἀπεκτόνας· ὁ ἀπεκτόνας.
- ἀναψυχήναι, ὁ ἀναψύξαι.
- Γῆμαι λέγεται· ὁ γαμῆσαι.
- Διελέξατο· ὁ διελέξῃ.
- ἔρχεται· ὁ ἔρχεται.
- Κατάβα· ὁ κατάβηθι. V
- Λέσσε μὴ· έληξε δὲ.
- Συνείλοχα· ὁ συλλέλοχα.

And the verb εἶμι is being lost:

- ἀπεισιν· ὁ ἀπεισιν· ἀπεισιν. ἀπέλευσσεται. Ἀπῆν, ὁ ἀπήμνιν
- Εἰσείμι <κάξειμ>'· εξελεύσομαι πάρεις.
The most frequent verbal change confronting Philemon is the assimilation of 14 deponents and -3
-μι verbs into regular -ω conjugations:

4 Ἄρτυέται, ὡς κονίεται. ΤΜ Ἄρτυσμαι· οὐκ ἄρτω
6 ἀλευόμενος· οὐχ ἀλιεύων
9 Ἀποφοιτήσομαι κάλλιον ἢ ἀποφοιτήσω, ἀπολαύσομαι ἢ ἀπολαύσω, ἀγνοήσομαι ἢ ἀγνοήσω, καὶ ἅξομαι, ἢ ἅξω·
20 Ἀποσκοπῶμαι, οὐκ ἀποσκοπῶ.
38 Ἀνοίγνυμι κάλλιον ἢ ἀνοίγω· καὶ ἀναπεμπάζομαι, τὸ ἀναλογίζομαι, ἢ ἀναπεμπάζω. ΤΜ
44 Ἀπολαύσομαι· οὐκ ἀπολαύσω.
108 Διακονόθμαι· οὗ διακονῶ.
122 Δείκνυμι, ζεύγνυμι· οὗ ζευγνύω. Ἰστέον ὅτι ἡ τετάρτη συζύγα τῶν εἰς μι προτιμιτέρα τοῖς Ἀττικοῖς τῆς βαρυτοῦν. δείκνυμι γάρ καὶ ζεύγνυμι λέγουσιν, οὗ δεικνῶ οὔδε ζευγνύω. ΤΜ
134 Δύνασαι λέγε· τὸ γάρ δύνη βάρβαρον.
167 Ζεύγνυσιν· οὐχί ζευγνύει.
183 Ὁθρεύσομαι· οὗ θηρεύσω.
186 Κατέδυετο· οὗ κατέδυε.
215 Πεπληγμένος· οὗ πεπληγάως.
Twice augments have been hypercorrected:

163 Ἐβουλόμην· οὐκ ἠβουλόμην.
177 Ἡφίεσαν· οὐκ ἄφιεσαν.

In ten cases the prefixes of compound verbs conflict with Attic usage:

16 Ἀντέχειν· οὐκ ἀντέχου, ἀλλ' ἀνέχου
45 Ἀνεβαλλόμην, οὐχ ὑπερεθέμην
68 <βακίζεται>· οὐκ ἐμβακίζεται
115 Διελύσατο· οὐ συνελύσατο.
125 Διάγραφε· μὴ περίγραφε
128 Διέδραμον οὐκ ἑρείς Ἀττικὸς, ἀλλὰ συνέδραμον.
139 Διενεμάμην· οὐ διείλομην.
140 Διέπαυσεν· οὐ κατέπαυσεν.
147 Ἐντυγγάνειν <λέγουσιν>· οὐ συγγυγάνειν.
162 Ἐπιστρέφω βέλτιον, οὐχ ὑποστρέφω.

There are five cases where contemporaries are using compound verbs where Attic uses only a simple verb:

46 Ἀξίου, οὐ καταξίου· βάρβαρον γάρ.
121 Δεὶ τούδε ἀντὶ τοῦ προσδεί.
Twice a simple verb is being used where Atticism prescribes a compound:

7 'Απονύχισον, ούκ ὀνύχισον.
158 'Εξήμεσεν· ούκ ἠμεσεν.

Two cases correct faulty noun formation:

64 Βιβλιογράφον, οὐ βιβλιαγράφον.
168 Ζωγλύφος· οὐχὶ ἡφογλύφος.

Adjective formation:

236 Ὅτειον κρέας· οὐχ ὑός κρέας, καὶ υεικόν, ὡς βοεικόν.

Seven lemmata correct faulty noun declension:

83 Αἰ γραῖς, οὐχὶ αἱ γραῖς
84 Γραῖν Ἀττικοὶ, οὐ γραίαν.
161 Ἐρμηνέας· οὐχ ἐρμηνεῖς.
169 Ζεύγλην· οὐχὶ ζεύγλαν.
173 Ὅρω <λέγουσιν> οὐχ ἡρωα· ἡρωες· ἡρως <τε>......... ἐκατέρως ἐρεῖς.
218 Πηχῶν ἀπίθανον, πηχεων δ’ ὀρθῶς <ἐρεῖς>.

221
Πρὶν καλεῖν δεῖ, οὐ πρίονα.

Three correct adjective declensions:

57 Βάρβαρον γυναῖκα ἐρεῖς, οὐ βαρβάραν.
226 Σῶν, οὐχὶ σῶν; τὰ σῶ ὁ δὲ δεῖ λέγειν.
244 Χώραν ἐρημοῦ, οὐκ ἐρήμην <λέκτεων>.

Adverbial usage:

25 Ἀρι, οὐκ ἀρίσι

There are two glosses for the preposition εἰς or ἐς, and two restorations of the more Attic ἐς in idioms:

146 Εἰς γειτόνων βάδιζε· ποῦ δ’ ἔστ’ ἄν λέγης, ἐν γειτόνων· ἐν τοῖς δὲ γειτόσι μὴ λέγε.
66 Βάλλ᾽ ἐς μακαρίαν· ἐς κόρακας. L
148 Ἐς κόρακας· οὐκ εἰς κόρακας.
149 Ἐς μακαρίαν· οὐκ εἰς μακαρίαν <λέκτεων>.

There are seven clarifications of noun gender:

53 Τῆν βῶλον, οὐ τὸν βῶλον.
71 Βῆς καὶ ἐπὶ θηλυκοῦ καὶ ἐπὶ ἀρσενικοῦ.
73 Οἱ κυρίως Ἀττικοὶ ἐπὶ ἀρσενικοῦ ὁ βάτος λέγουσιν, οὐχ ἢ βάτος.
76 βράγχος οὐδετέρως.
Not all morphological issues are handled by juxtaposition with rejected forms.

Sometimes a single correct form is given:

94 Γυμνασόμενος μόνον.
227 Συλλαμβάνειν βέλτιον· ἄλλως μὴ λέγειν.

Sometimes two alternate forms are acceptable:

50 Βλάβη καὶ βλάβος· ἀμφότερα Ἀττικά.
55 Καὶ βορᾶς καὶ βορέας, ἐκάτερα <Ἀττικά>
63 Καὶ βόες καὶ βοῦς ἑκατέρως.
69 Βλεφαρίς καὶ βλέφαρον ἀμφότερα

There are twelve examples of analogy, apparently the preferred means of clarifying declension and accentuation:

32 ᾿Αλας· ὡς κύνας.
47 ᾿Αθρωος· ὡς ἀγριος.
73 Τοὺς βάτους, ὡς τοὺς λόφους.
80 Βουλιμός· ὁ μέγας λιμός, ὡς ἀσπασμός· οὗ βούλιμος.
102 ᾿Η γλήχαν ὡς ἢ κόνων
103 Γέλως ὡς ἐρως
In four cases correct accentuation is indicated by contrast with a mistaken form:

80 Βουλιμός: ὁ μέγας λιμός, ὡς ἀσπασμός· οὐ βούλιμος.
81 Γελοῖος· γέλοιος ὁ ἀπειρός.
96 Γομφίως· (I. γομφίως?) οὐ γόμφιος.
109 Δικροῦν, οὐ δικροῦν· ἀπὸ τοῦ δικρόν γάρ.

Or rarely it may be indicated by accentual terminology:

107 Γρῦ· τὸν ὑπὸ τοῖς ὑποκεφαλισμένως.

Likewise breathing:

40 Ἄλις ψιλοῦται.
41 Ἀλίπης Ἄττικοι ψιλοῦσιν

Vowel quantity is indicated explicitly:

21 Ἄρα γε μακρός.
Changes in vowel quality are indicated by contrast:

10 Ἀνάθημα, οὐκ ἀνάθεμα
17 Ἀρτύδιον· οὐκ ἄρτύδιον.
30 Ἀθῆρην, οὐκ ἀθάραν.
34 Ἀλοάσω, οὐχ ἀλοήσω. TM
72 Βομβύκιον, οὗ βαμβύκιον.
110 Διασπάσεσθαι, οὗ διεσπάσθαι.
243 Χλιαφόν· μὴ χλιερόν.

As are consonantal sound changes:

36 Ἀναβασιμός, οὐκ ἀναβαθμός. L
56 Βρύκειν [καὶ] οὗ βρύχειν.
58 Βλήχων, οὗ γλήχων.
82 Γρίφους· οὗ γρίπτους.
97 Κναφεύς· οὗ γναφεύς
240 Φροῦμα· οὐ προοίμια
Other sound changes Philemon opposes are synairesis:

47 Ἰθής ἀττικοὶ, οὐκ ἄθρους.
62 Βοίδιον, οὐ βοίδιον.
174 Ἡλωκεν οὖ χρῆ ἐάλωκε δέ.
238 Φοινίκεον οὐ φοινικοῦν.

Syncope:

23 Ἀριθμός ἐκφωνεῖσθαι ὁλα τὰ γράμματα προσήκει:
208 Νέογνον οὐδείς, ἀλλὰ νεόγνον <λέγει>.
211 Ὁψαίτερον οὐδείς· ὁψαίτερον δέ.
237 Ὡπαϊθριον· οὐχ ὑπαϊθρον.

Epenthesis (from an Attic standpoint):

33 Ἀλάβαστον, οὐκ ἀλάβαστρον.
52 Βόλιτα· οὖ βόλβιτα.

Aphaeresis:

95 Γλαμμαν, ἀλλ’ οὐ λημμαν.

Apocope:

111 Δελφις μετὰ τοῦ ζ.
The lemmata generally begin with the recommended word or form, often in the accusative case, followed by the rejected word preceded by οὖκ. The reverse order is used in correcting vocabulary, but rarely in correcting morphology.

In identifying verbs the third person singular form is most commonly used, followed by the first person singular and the infinitive. Adjectives or nouns appear both in the nominative and the accusative.

Expressions used to proscribe usage include οὖ χῡ (174); περίελε (156, 157, 176), πάρες (122, 151) and οὖκ ἐρείς (88, 89, 92). Proscribed usage may be described as ἄδόκιμον (37), literally “counterfeit” usage or βάρβαρον (46), ξένον (190), or ξενικόν (201). Someone who speaks in this way is ἀπειρος (81). Expressions used to encourage usage include λέγουσι (251), λέγε (153), βέλτιον (162), ἔρεις (233), κρείττον (127), but most often the contrast alone indicates the prescriptive usage.

In the surviving fragments alphabetization is fairly superficial, rarely extending more than one letter.

Moeris’s distinction between Attic and wider Hellenic usage is repeated several times by Thomas Magister (33, 49); he also contrasts usage of the Ἀττικοί with that of the κοινοὶ (119). He designates the most authoritative Atticist sources as οἱ κυρίως Ἀττικοί (73).

Thomas Magister cites Lucian (6) and sources later than Philemon such as Synesius (38, 54), and Libanius (140). Philemon himself cites Aristides (39) and praises Aristophanes as τὸ τῶν
Mousoının stoma (157)—this vestige of Philemon’s original verse casts a cold eye on overzealous Atticists.

There are several ἀπαξ λεγόμενα in Philemon not known to us from other sources, such as ἀρπώμενος (13), ἀπήμην (14), Ἀρτύδιον (17), ἀπέκτανας (Cohn), ἀπέκτανες, ἀπέκτακας (Lies) (37), and Γύλειον (87). The reading at (182) is to be corrected to Θημώνας· θημωνίας, and (40) Ἄλις ψιλούται is mistaken.
Quaestionum Homericarum liber i (recensio V). (A.D. 3) 35-40 (Sodano 1970)

Ἐν τοῖς Φιλήμονος Συμμίκτοις περὶ Ἡροδοτεῖον διορθώματος ὁ γραμματικὸς διαλεγόμενος πειράται καὶ Ὄμηρικα τινα σαφηνίζειν. ούδὲν δὲ χείρον καὶ τὸν Ἡρόδοτον φιλοθυμίν οὐ καὶ τὴν πάσαν τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἀναγράψαι ζήτησιν. φησὶ γὰρ ὅτι ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ Ἡρόδοτος τῶν ἱστοριῶν περὶ Κροίσου τοῦ Λυδοῦ πολλὰ τε ἄλλα διεῖλεται, καὶ μὴν ὅτι θεοσβέστατος γένοιτο καὶ διαπρεπῶς τιμήσαι τὰ Ἑλληνικὰ μαντεία, τὰ ἐν Δελφοῖς, τὰ ἐν Θήβαις, τὸ τοῦ Ἀμιωνος, τὸ τοῦ Ἀμψιμάραου· τοῦτο μὲν δὴ ἄλλας ἄλλα πέμψε δώρα, ἀνέθηκε δὲ τινα καὶ «ἐν Βραγχίδῃ τῆς Μιλησίων». καὶ γέγραπται ἢδη κατὰ πάντα ἀπλῶς τὰ ἀντίγραφα τὸ «τῆς» ἄρθρον σὺν τῷ ἱδα ἱσοδυναμοῦν τῷ «ταῖς». οὐδένα γε μὴν Ἑλλήνων ύπομείναι θελυκῶς τὰς Βραγχίδας ἀν εἴην, Ἡρόδοτον δὲ μᾶλλον ἀν ἐτέρων φυλάξασθαι, ἀκριβῆ τε ὅντα περὶ τὰ ὀνόματα καὶ πάνυ ἐπιεικῶς φροντιστικόν. «τοῦτο δὴ θεραπεύων τις οὐχ Ἡροδότου, φησὶν, ἀμάρτημα γεγονέναι, μᾶλλον δὲ τὸν συγγραφέα φησὶ διαμαρτείν παρεμβαλόντα τὸ σι, πολλὰ δὲ
φέρεσθαι μέχρι νόν ἀμαρτήματα κατὰ τὴν �uations τοιοῦτος ἐγγραφῆν καὶ ἔτι τὴν Θουκυδίδου καὶ
Φιλίστου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀξιολόγων ἐγγραφέων. τί δ’ οὕτω καὶ τὰ ποίημα σχεδόν
ἀνάπλεω πάντα τυχάναι ἀμαρτημάτων γραφικῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων παραδοσιοθεμάτων πάνυ
ἀγροίκων; καὶ ἕνα μή περαιτέρο τις προβαίνων ἐνοχὴ διερευνώμενος τάς ἐν τοῖς
ἀντιγράφοις ἐμμεμενεκυτίας ἀμαρτημένας γραφᾶς, ἔξεστι σοι σκοπεῖν καὶ τῶν Ὀμηρικών
ταῦτα: «ὅς τ’ ἐπεί ἐκ πολέων πίστις συναγείρεται ἵππους / ...λαοφόρον καθ’ οἶόν». ἐνταῦθα
γὰρ πρὸς οὖν ἀναγκαίον ἐγγράφη διὰ τοῦ γ’ νυθρόν οὖν τὸ σημαίνομενον καὶ σφόδρα
ὑπόκωφον προσπίπτειν έσοκε, τὸ δὲ χωρίς τοῦ γ’ γράφειν Ὀμηρικόν πάνυ τῇ χρήσει καὶ τῷ
λόγῳ πάντη συνάδον ἐπικεκός, τὸ γὰρ «συναείρεται» μᾶλλον προσεχῶς σημαίνει τὸ
συνάγειν καὶ συναρμόζειν. καὶ ἐν ἄλλως- «σὺν δ’ ἡμερν ἐμάσι», συνήγαγε τοὺς ἵππους, ὁ δὲ
βέλτιστος Ὀμηροφάνης κάκεινό τὸ ἐν ταῖς Παραποταμίαις [λεγόμενον: «θρώσκων τις κατὰ
κύμα μέλαιαν φρίξ’ ὑπαλύζει / ἰχθὺς, ὃς κε [φάγησι Λυκάνων ἀργήτα δημόν],» δείκνυσι ως
ἡμαρτημένον υπολείποντα ἐκ τῆς παλαιᾶς γραμματικῆς. οὐ γὰρ χρῆ τὸ «ὡς κε φάγησιν»
[ἀ]κούνει ὡς ἄρθον υποτακτικῶν, μᾶλλον δὲ ἄντ’ ἐπιφημικοὶ παρειλήφθαι τοῦ ὡς, ἢ
μᾶλλον σύνδε[σμον] αἰτιώθη, δηλοῦται γὰρ· ἵνα φάγη· σκο[π]ὸν δὴ (ὡς τὸ σύμπαν
προσεχῶς συντετακται), κατὰ τὴν τοῦ[του] γνώμην, ἀκολούθως υποδύσεται τὸν ἄρθον ὁ
ἵθες. καὶ τοῦτο ἀναγκασθῆσαι πράξαι καὶ ἔπι[πολ]ιαίως υπονῆσαι τοῦ ὑδατος
ὑποδεδυκός, ἐπεὶ καὶ τῶν ἀποθανόντων τὰ σώματα, ἐὼς ἢ πρόσφατα καὶ διωδηκότα,
ἀνωθεν ἐπιπλεῖν εἰωθεν». ὃτι μὲν οὖν τῶν ἐπιπλεῖν εἰωθεν». ὃτι μὲν οὖν τῶν παλαιῶν
βιβλίων ἐπί τὸ χείρον κειμένη ἡ γραφή, φησιν οὖθες διὰ πλειόν[ων] ἐπιδείξει. ἐπενάγωμεν
δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἡρόδοτον καὶ τὸν διορθωθῆν τὸν Κοσάκα τ’ Ἄλεξανδρον. ἥξιον γὰρ ὁ ἀνήρ γράφειν
«τῆς Μιλησίων» χωρίς τοῦ ἱωτᾶ «τῆς Μιλησίων», υποκειμένης ἐξωθεν χώρης ἡ γῆς. καὶ ἐγὼ
δὲ, φησίν, ἐπειθόμην οὔτως ἐχειν τὰ τῆς γραφῆς, τὸν δὲ ἀνδρα τῆς ἀκρίβειας συνέσεως
ἐτεβαυμάκειν. ὑπευχόν <δὲ> τοῖς Ἡρόδοτείοις αὐτοῖς ἐπεσι καὶ γενόμενος ἐπὶ τέλει τῆς
Ἀγιοπταπής βιβλίου, ὅτις ἐστὶ δευτέρα τῇ τάξει, εὐφρίσκω πάλιν κατὰ τὴν αἰτιατικὴν πτώσιν
εἰπόντα τὸν Ηρόδοτον- «ἀνέθηκεν εἰς Βραγχίδας τὰς Μιλησίων». σύκετο οὖν ἡμιν
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During his discussion of an emendation in Herodotus in his *Miscellanea*, Philemon the Grammarian attempts to clarify certain points in Homer as well. Since you are also fond of Herodotus, it will be none the worse if I record for you the whole of the scholar’s investigation. He says that in Book I (92) of the *Histories*, Herodotus narrated many things about the Lydian, Croesus, among them that he was very pious and that he had magnificently endowed the oracles of the Greeks at Delphi and Thebes as well as those of Ammon and Amphiareus: “for this reason, he sent various gifts to various places and also made some dedications in Branchidai of the Milesians (ἐν Βραγχίδαι τῆς Μιλήσιων).” Now, in all editions without exception, the article “τής” was written with an iota, making it the equivalent of “ταῖς”; (dative plural, feminine). No Greek, however, would have said that Branchidai can be feminine, he says, and Herodotus would be more on his guard than others since he was precise and extremely careful with names. “Mindful of this,” (Philemon) says, “someone (explained) that the error was not Herodotus’ but rather that a scribe erred by inserting the -σι, and that many errors are still being committed throughout Herodotus’ history as well as in Thucydides, Philistus, and other prominent
historians. Why, then, should it not also happen that virtually all poetry is full of errors of transcription and other blundering (attempts at) correction, which are perfectly insensitive?

"So as not to trouble yourself further in proceeding (sic) to track down errors that have persisted in transcription, you might consider the following lines in Homer [II. XV, 680-2]: "(even as a man) who, when he had συναγείηται ('gathered together')...four horses out of a herd along a well-traveled road.' Here, for no compelling reason the verb was spelled with a gamma; the meaning consequently seems to strike the ear as flat and rather absurd. To spell the word, however, without the gamma is perfectly Homeric in usage as well as in agreement with his thought, since «συναείηται» more aptly indicates 'to harness,' 'to suit them to each other.' In another passage [II. X, 499]: «σον δ' ἠειεν» them with reins,' means 'he harnessed the horses together.'

'The distinguished Aristophanes points out that what was said in 'The Battle Beside the River' remained misunderstood because of the ancient alphabet [II. XXI, 126-7]: 'one of the fish, leaping κατά the wave, will ὑπαλύξει the dark ripple, «ὀς κε φάγησιν» ('eat') the glistening flesh of Lycaon.' It is not necessary to understand ὅς as a relative pronoun but rather, it should be taken as the adverb, ὅς, or better still, as the causal (final?) conjunction since it has the meaning 'in order to eat (ἵνα φάγῃ).' The fish, according to his view, on the watch for Lycaon -how carefully everything has been arranged!- will consequently dive beneath the foam. It will have to do so and will swim beneath the surface after it has dived underwater, since as long as corpses are not decomposed and are filled with air, they tend to float up." (Philemon) says, then, that he will later show with more examples that the copying of ancient texts is changing for the worse. (Philemon continues:) "Let us return to Herodotus and his editor, Alexander of Kotiaion. The learned gentleman thought it fit to write «τῆς Μιλησίων», without the iota, «τῆς Μιλησίων», with χώρης or γῆς (i.e., "region" or "land") understood. And I," he says, "was persuaded that his reading was correct, and I admired the learned man for his keen intelligence. However, I happened upon these same Herodotean words at the end of the book on Egypt, which is the
second book (159), and again I find Herodotus using them in the accusative case: ‘Branchidae τὰς
of the Milesians.’ I no longer thought that it was a spelling error but rather that it was an Ionic
idiom. (The Ionians) are fond of expressing many nouns in the feminine, such as ‘stone,’ ‘column,’
and even ‘Marathon.’ Cratinus [fr. 346, Edmonds]: ‘Marathon, most famed for (her) horses;’ and
Nicander [fr. 111, Gow-Scholfield]: ‘well-built (f.) Marathon.’ This, then, is what we have
discovered and we have judged it sound.” Such were the words of Philemon, but I do not judge it
appropriate for the present discussion to examine closely what he said against Alexander
concerning the correction in Herodotus.”
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