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Summary

This study applies select lexical dicta of the Atticist lexicographer Phrynichus to the non-literary papyrological evidence of the first three centuries CE. I analyse the data gathered from this exercise to determine how far Atticistic usages (approved forms) penetrated the lexical choice of writers of non-literary papyri, and to ascertain the reliability of innovative words (condemned forms) in the same documents as evidence for linguistic change—either beginning or spreading from the spoken language. Additional documentary and literary comparanda are utilised to provide a fuller picture of the process of lexical change wherever the papyrological material is lacking or inadequate.

The theoretical issues surrounding the notions of the spoken and written languages are examined, with a particular emphasis on the register category of non-literary papyri. In order to approach more closely the hypothetical construct of the Koine vernacular, the proscriptions of Phrynichus are treated as evidence of lexical innovations that were more widespread in speech than in writing. These innovations, which according to the evidence we have at hand, were slow and gradual, could not more quickly manifest themselves in writing on account of the archaising tendencies arising from the Atticistic movement.
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General Introduction

1.1 Preamble: Atticism and Atticist lexicography

Because of the prestige of classical Attic literature, the Greek language has, since the rise of Atticism during 1 BCE, developed under unique circumstances. While it can be rightly claimed that Greek is not alone in having a rich literary heritage, few other living languages have been so profoundly influenced by the effects of a literary movement as old as Atticism. It was only in 1976 that the Atticising katharevousa variant of Modern Greek gave way, as an official language, to a standard based on the demotic variant used by the majority of Greek speakers. These two varieties of Modern Greek were at the heart of the ‘language question’ during the 19th and 20th centuries, and the linguistic tendencies that informed the extreme supporters of the katharevousa can be seen in the prescriptions, and proscriptions, of Atticist grammarians and lexicographers of the second and third centuries CE.

Their lexica and grammars were produced at the peak of the Atticistic movement, during the Second Sophistic—the culmination of a literary response that had by late II CE

---

1 The rise of Atticism is often framed as a ‘response’ or ‘reaction’ to the perceived decline in linguistic standards, in both the Koine more generally (e.g. Strobel, 2009: 94–5) and ‘Asianism’, which was itself a florid reaction against the ‘symmetrical periods and easy intelligibility of the classical Isocratean style.’ (Horrocks, 2010: 100, 135).

2 A written form of Greek, consisting of both ancient and modern features, that was the official language of the Greek state between 1911 and 1976. The term itself, which alludes to the ‘purification’ of Greek from foreign influences accumulated over the course of a millennium, was first used in the late 18th and early 19th centuries, but did not become common until the ‘language question’ reached its peak at the end of the latter (Mackridge, 2009: 29).

3 For a comprehensive account of the issue of linguistic identity in modern Greece see Mackridge (2009, esp. 27–31 for the long-term impact of diglossia).

4 Atticism’s contribution to the diglossia that affected Greek up until the 1980s is well noted in studies dealing with the topic, which often stress its diachronic profundity by referring to its ultimate development in the katharevousa. This is, indeed, a useful way of demonstrating how long-lived the (basic) distinction between low and high registers was; see e.g. Whitmarsh (2005: 42); Markopoulos (2009:15), who writes: ‘thus, a situation of diglossia was initiated, which would actually last till the 20th century (!)’; and Horrocks (2010: 99–100); for an overview of katharevousa’s influence on SMG (primarily through ‘learned’ vocabulary) see Papanastassiou (2010: 227–48); see further §1.5.3 for discussion of register and text types; for diglossia see further §1.3.2.

5 A potentially vague term, of which there is no consensus on a definition in the secondary literature; though it generally includes the ‘sophists’ cited in Philostratus’ definition (see e.g. Swain, 1996: 1). Swain’s study examines the period between 50 and 250 CE, noting that it should be read in both cultural and political-
evolved into a complex sociolinguistic phenomenon. The earliest expression of their linguistic purism can be traced back to the Roman Attici, whose motivation for adopting the classical Attic orators was largely stylistic, rather than linguistic. Their modus operandi was exemplified, though not purely informed, by the stylistic concerns of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, except in one critical aspect: it was at this point that the imitatio that came to epitomise later Atticistic works began to manifest itself as a guiding principle for Dionysius, in contradistinction to the aims of the Roman Attici in ‘producing orators from first principles and abstract rules of language’. The canon of ‘genuine’ classical writers subsequently created during this exercise played a crucial role in the sharp distinction drawn by the Atticist lexicographers between ‘approved’ (i.e. select Attic) authors and the usages of others that were otherwise considered inferior.

Thus, by the time of the Second Sophistic we find that, while the core value of imitation has not changed, the foci of the process are now firmly linguistic, rather than stylistic; the increasingly slavish adherence to the classical canon resulted in the creation of ideological terms (1996: 88). For a more comprehensive examination of the term in both ancient and modern scholarly contexts see Whitmarsh (2005, esp. 1–10).

Cf. Strobel (2009: 94), who sees in the Atticistic movement a re-erection, ‘by the renewed worship of Attic by the educated elite,’ of the ‘sociolinguistic boundaries’ that held before the rise of the Koine. The distance between the spoken and written languages was only intensified by the artificial barrier that was Atticism.

The Attici adopted Greek models on account of the absence of any comparable ones in Latin (Swain, 1996: 23). Caecilius of Calacte, contemporary and friend of Dionysius, also figures prominently on the intellectual scene of Rome in I BC, though his works survive only in fragments. Even Cicero may have been influenced by the Attici in making judgments about the Greek of contemporary Athens (Wisse, 1995).

This certainly aided in the spread of the Atticistic phenomenon, see Frösén (1974: 113): ‘Imitation of classical models, μίμησις or imitatio, made the literature of the classical period known among the educated classes.’

Swain (1996: 25). Dionysian imitatio is often contrasted to Aristotelian mimesis, from which it was a radical departure (Doran, 2015: 64); see also Russell (1979: 5–8).


It is important always to distinguish Atticistic Greek from the Attic Greek of V–IV BCE that was the object of imitation—Atticism, as Strobel (2011: 9) notes, could only ever aspire to imitate faithfully classical Attic literature, it could never actually reproduce it perfectly; cf. Lucian, who satirises the perceived overzealousness of the extreme Atticisers in his Lexiphanes, where it is dubbed ‘hyper-Attic’ (Luc. Lex. 25 ὑπεράττικος). If, as Lee (2013: 308) urges, a register of stylistically marked features of Atticism were to be compiled, a key desideratum would be a close examination of the practice of Atticising writers, not of the models that they were striving to imitate.
manuals, of various degrees of strictness, that seek explicitly to formulate rules for the correct deployment of syntax, vocabulary, morphology and stylistic mechanisms.\textsuperscript{12} Among these manuals, the \textit{Ecloga}\textsuperscript{13} of Phrynichus\textsuperscript{14} is one of the strictest and most subjective. Most likely composed in the 160s CE,\textsuperscript{15} it is exemplary of the extreme, yet highly refined pedantry that the Atticist program had achieved by II CE.\textsuperscript{16} Yet it is this pedantic aspect, manifested in the often peremptory nature of its glosses that makes the \textit{Ecloga} a remarkably useful metalinguistic artefact for a study aiming to test for Atticism in non-literary documents. A detailed and critical examination of the \textit{Ecloga} and Atticist lexicography more generally lies beyond the scope of this dissertation, but for the purposes of the present study we will briefly examine here the style and aims of Phrynichus’ dicta.\textsuperscript{17}

\textit{Phrynichus’ Ecloga}

Aside from the above-mentioned peremptoriness of the \textit{Ecloga}’s glosses, it is made also exceptionally useful as a window into the linguistic aspirations of its author by the inclusion of a lengthy introductory letter. This letter, addressed to a certain Cornelianus,\textsuperscript{18} functions as a

---


\textsuperscript{13} Ἐκλογὴ ὄνομάτων καὶ ὑμάτων ἀττικῶν ‘Selection of Attic Nouns and Verbs’.

\textsuperscript{14} Phrynichus the lexicographer, not the comedian or the tragedian of the classical period; cf. Dickey (2007: 96 n. 34). He is sometimes mentioned with the epithet ‘Arabius’. Most of the information we have about Phrynichus’ life has come down to us through Photius (\textit{Bibl. Cod.} 158) and the Suda (φ 764); Photius claims he was an Arab. See Strobel (2011: 89–91) for a discussion of Phrynichus’ life, and the likelihood of him having come from an area that ‘would have been thoroughly Hellenised by the second century AD’, thus making it likely that he had Greek as his first language.

\textsuperscript{15} See Swain (1996: 54, n. 43), Strobel (2009: 92–3); for a date of 178 CE see, e.g. Fischer (1974: 44), Lee (2013: 288), following Nächster (1908: 46).

\textsuperscript{16} See Lee (2013: 289); Swain (1996: 53).

\textsuperscript{17} The reader is directed to comprehensive examinations of the historical, sociolinguistic and literary issues of the lexica of Aelius Dionysius, Phrynichus, Moeris and Pollux by Strobel (2011: 78–169; 2009: 93–107).

\textsuperscript{18} The identity of Cornelianus remains, in fact, quite uncertain, though he was without doubt someone whose type of erudition Phrynichus clearly admired: Τὴν τε ἄλλην σου παιδείαν θαυμάζων ... καὶ δὴ καὶ τούτο θαυμάσας ἔχω, τὸ περὶ τὴν τῶν καλῶν καὶ δοκίμων ὄνομάτων κρίσιν. (While I admire any other aspect of your education ... this in particular I have admired, namely your power of judgment when it comes to beautiful and proper words. [trans. Strobel]); suggestions have been previously posited, but we can only assume that Phrynichus’ readership knew who this addressee was (Strobel, 2009: 115, n. 466); see Strobel (2009: 115–
kind of stylistic and terminological preface for the Ecloga, setting the tone for the terms and distinctions that the reader encounters throughout. Cornelianus had apparently previously requested from Phrynichus that he ‘collect all improper linguistic forms’¹⁹ (κελεύσαντος... τὰς ἀδοξίμους τῶν φωνῶν ἀθορησθῆναι πάσας), and in the following lines we witness the lexicographer’s response, in which Cornelianus is urged to not ‘focus on the mistakes that have been made,’ but instead ‘upon the most proper elements of the language as used by the ancients’²⁰ (ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐ πρὸς τὰ διημαρτημένα ἀφορόμεν, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὰ δοκιμότατα τῶν ἀρχαίων).

Clearly, in Phrynichus’ mind there was a select group of Attic writers, not necessarily the classical canon of Dionysius, upon which the budding Atticist was expected to model her or his own prose; in fact, immediately following the introduction readers are warned that if they wish like the ancients ‘to converse in the ancient way and properly’, then they ‘must observe the following’ (ὅστις ἀρχαίως καὶ δοξίμως ἔθελει διαλέγεσθαι, τάδε αὐτῷ φυλακτέα), to wit, the glosses which follow. While in most glosses writers are not referenced, the instances in which they are named, and sometimes shamed, are exceptionally revealing of Phrynichus’ attitude toward correct Attic. For example, in gloss 311 even Hyperides, one of the ten Attic orators, is reprimanded for using a word that is not deemed to be sufficiently Attic:²¹

ἐμπυρισμός· οὔτως Ὑπερείδης ἡμελημένος, δέον ἐμπρησμός λέγειν.

ἐμπυρισμός (‘burning’): so Hyperides carelessly, when one ought to say ἐμπρησμός. (trans. Lee)

Rather than relying upon a predetermined canon of approved writers, Phrynichus cites select authors to illustrate his own strict understanding of what constitutes good Attic Greek.²²

126) for a discussion of Cornelianus through the evidence yielded by certain glosses scattered throughout the Ecloga.

¹⁹ Translation from Strobel (2011: 114); the emphasis is mine.
²⁰ Translation from Strobel (2009: 99); the emphasis is mine.
²¹ All passages of Phrynichus referenced in this study are from Fischer’s (1974) edition.
²² Phrynichus is generally critical of contemporary public speakers and poets. He condemns ἰέτορες in gloss 289, where they are qualified as ‘courthouse speakers’ (οἱ περὶ τὰ δικαστήρια ἰέτορες). The only contemporary public orator who escapes Phrynichus’ proscription in the Ecloga is his protégé Cornelianus, who is praised in gloss 357 for being ‘a pure orator and old school’ and ‘making the imperial tribunal Greek and making it Attic(istic)’ (trans. Strobel) (ἀλλὰ σὺ καθαρὸς καὶ ἀρχαῖος ὃν ἰέτως... ἐξαλληλίζων καὶ ἐξαττικίζων τὸ βασιλικὸν δικαστήριον). As Strobel notes (2011: 149), Phrynichus places here his hopes for a
Strobel (2011: 135–7) notes that in the first book of the *Ecloga* the lexicographer employs the term οἱ Ἀττικοί more often, perhaps as early guidance and reassurance for the reader, while in the second the *glosses* become longer, and the terms used to reproach writers stronger and more varied. There are still, however, succinct prescriptions to be found in Book Two, of which *gloss* 306 is particularly instructive of the subjectivity of Phrynichus’ Atticist program:

ψύλλος βάρβαρον, ἢ δὲ ψύλλα δόκιμον ὅτι καὶ ἄρχον.

[The form] ψύλλος (masc.) is barbarous; but ψύλλα (fem.) is approved because it is also ancient. (trans. Lee)

In this example the contrast is clear; the reader is given a simple opposition between ‘barbarous’ and approved usages.23 The feminine form ψύλλα is approved because it is apparently ancient—a key distinction, since elsewhere in the *Ecloga* we find that ancient does not necessarily mean approved.24 Nevertheless, in this particular instance, as Lee (2013: 286–8) has shown, the masculine form condemned is actually attested even before Aristophanes,25 in Epicharmus, and is found also in Aristotle. On the other hand, although the feminine form appears in Herodotus and Menander, it does not reappear until its revival and subsequent artificial reuse by the Atticists from III CE onward;26 the long-term effects of this revival are evident in the retention of ψύλλα in the vocabulary of the katharevousa.27

Thus, for the present study the primary interest in utilising the *Ecloga* as a metalinguistic reference point lies in the information that we can glean from the individual *glosses*. To be sure, the linguistic information embedded within Phrynichus’ prescriptions

---

25 According to Strobel (2011: 159), Aristophanes, along with Demosthenes (and perhaps Lysias), may be thought of as key members of a Phrynichean ‘first class’ of acceptable Attic writers, although any clear grouping of this kind is ultimately difficult to assess. Writers of Middle and New Comedy, however, are generally rebuked by Phrynichus (see further §2.2.1). She notes also (2011: 160) that poets (in general ποιηταί) and New Comedy are favourite targets of Phrynichus (*glosses* 322, 332 and 358), especially Menander, who is mentioned in 17 separate entries (Lee, 2013: 290); cf. *gloss* 411, in which Phrynichus states that ἀʾχμαλωτισθῆναι is ‘so unacceptable that not even Menander uses it’ (trans. Lee) (οὕτως ἄδόκιμον ὡς μηδὲ Μένανδρον ἀυτῷ χρῆσασθαι).
cannot be divorced from its social context—the two are never mutually exclusive—but a
diachronic investigation can only begin from the Ecloga, it cannot be entirely contained
within it. Any assumption, naturally, can usually be supplemented by similar remarks in other
Atticist lexica and grammars, and it remains that numerous words and phrases in the Ecloga
are rarely attested in the extant papyrological record.28 In the words of Lee (2013: 288), ‘the
statements of the Atticists are, or may be, useful clues to the general direction, even if they
are not fully accurate as to the facts.’29

1.2 Objectives

Just as Phrynichus looked back to Attic authors in setting down strict rules for the proper
usage of Attic in his Ecloga, so have countless writers since favoured the prestige of
Atticism in literary texts, particularly those of the Second Sophistic, although the non-
literary31 material has, by comparison, been neglected. Given the sheer number of
documentary papyri32 unearthed in Egypt and the Middle East since the late 19th century, it is
a curious situation that such a gap should still exist today. The present study aims to
contribute to the study of Atticism by looking specifically in the abundant papyrological
material for reflections of the phenomenon. In order to do this, the Ecloga is used as a
primary tool of research; to wit, select dicta of Phrynichus will be applied to the papyri, so
that we might test both the condemned and approved forms that the lexicographer provides.

The entries chosen from the Ecloga for our case studies are anticipations of words that
have since become dominant, codified in the lexis of both SMG and virtually all modern

---

28 For example, of the forms cited in gloss 270, the condemned πάπυρος yields 1 attestation in the non-
literary papyri, while the approved βιβλίος only 2.
29 The emphasis is mine.
30 Cf. esp. Rutherford (1881), whose edition of the Ecloga is marked by a barely concealed admiration
of the lexicographer’s strict Atticistic standards. This admiration manifested itself more generally (particularly
during the 19th century) in an approach that considered only Attic Greek appropriate for textual criticism, even of
documentary and non-Attic literary texts.
31 The terms non-literary and documentary are used interchangeably throughout the present study; see
e.g. Bentein (2016) for use of the latter to qualify the papyri; for a discussion of this study’s data (including the
use of the terms ‘high’ and ‘low register’) see §1.5.
32 Included within this category are ostraca, which constitute a significant minority of the data in this
thesis’ lexical studies; for a definition and classification of papyrological document types and genres see §1.5.3.
dialects of Greek: αξόμα/-η (§2.2); νεόδο (§2.1); πάλι (§2.3). As will be seen, although each of these glosses condemn certain forms that are not, in the eyes of Phrynichus, correct Attic, the frequency of their occurrence in the papyri is not sensu stricto evidence of a general Atticist tendency among the authors of these documents. It will be shown, through a discussion of register and genre (§1.5.3) that an equally important distinction needs to be drawn between the attestation and transmission of forms in the written language, and the probability that the very same words may have been more common in the spoken language (§1.5.1). In fact, it is the presence of non-Atticistic words and phrases in the latter that very likely was one of the prime motivations for Phrynichus in issuing some of his prescriptions, including gloss 27.34

It is also important to note here that the entrenchment of diglossia during MKG, driven in part by the above-mentioned artificial reintroduction of Attic forms, has the potential to inflate an Atticistic form’s frequency in even the lowest of the papyrological registers (see §1.5.1), with the concomitant result of a slight, yet nonetheless observable decrease in the frequency of the opposed innovative form condemned by Phrynichus. It is therefore necessary that the role of, not only other documentary texts, but also literary texts not be neglected in attempting to ascertain whether an innovative form remained in continuous, widespread use in the spoken language. Of course, any such observation impinges upon the methodological problems inherent in the notion of spoken language, for which we have no direct evidence; this issue is discussed in §1.5. The intention of the present study is to demonstrate, without striving for definitiveness, the potential for further research into the perceivable impact of Atticistic tendencies upon the documentary material, including inscriptions and non-literary prose wherever it might be pertinent. It should be stressed here that the typological heterogeneity of the papyrological corpora, even when restricted to the first three centuries CE and with a single Atticist lexicon as comparandum, guarantees ipso facto the presence of Atticistic forms in the search results of any lexical study (see §1.5.2).

The objectives of the present study may be summarised as follows: (a) to identify, through the collation of the relevant data across all registers, the frequency of both the approved (Atticistic) and condemned (innovative) forms of Phrynichus in all types of non-literary texts; (b) to determine whether the penetration of approved forms after II CE affects

---

33 Ancient υδωρ survives in the Tsakonian dialect of Greek as ύο (see §2.1).

34 Cf. Lee (2013: 287), who notes for Phrynichus’ disapproval of φύλλας in gloss 306, that it is reasonable to assume for it a certain degree of usage during his time, ‘otherwise there would have been no reason to condemn it.’
the expected adoption of the innovative variants; and (c) to ascertain, as far as possible, the rate of the innovative form’s adoption through the spoken language by examining both its use in literature composed in lower and middle registers and the Atticistic variant’s influence on the lower registers across all periods up to EBG.

1.3 Previous Research

1.3.1 Previous studies of Atticism in the non-literary papyri

In spite of the continuous publication of non-literary papyri since the end of the 19th century, there exists only a single extensive study devoted to the presence of Atticising features within such documents.\(^{35}\) This unpublished thesis (Connolly, 1983) is an excellent example of the potential that exists for applying the prescriptions of Atticist lexicographers to the vast papyrological material at our disposal. Connolly’s work focuses on the examination of specific features of Atticistic influence, ranging from the orthographic (e.g. the use of σσ vs ττ) to the syntactical (e.g. ὑνα vs ὅπως), and his primary evidence takes in non-literary papyri of the first seven centuries CE. By comparison, the present study seeks a more focused range, although this does not preclude the gathering of data outside of I–III CE. In fact, it will be seen that the comparative paucity of data in our date range (particularly in the case of glosses 27 [§2.1] and 93 [§2.2]) necessitates the use of both papyrological and literary comparanda across the entire ‘papyrological millennium’\(^ {36}\) (§1.5).

Connolly’s statistical analyses are exceptionally useful insights into patterns of Atticistic usages in the documentary papyri, and although texts beyond VII CE do not form part of his study’s scope, there is constant reference throughout to both the New Testament and ultimate survivals in Modern Greek. His consultation of Shipp’s Modern Greek Evidence for the Ancient Greek Vocabulary (1979) for the modern attestations, rather than a standard monolingual dictionary of Modern Greek, ensures that this singular reliance is at least upon a reliable scholarly work. Shipp’s work is of an exceptionally high standard—the present study will regularly consult its detailed word histories—and provides us with valuable insights into

---

\(^{35}\) To the best knowledge of both myself and John Lee; see Lee (2013: 308, n. 4).

\(^{36}\) The period during which the extant papyri were produced (III BCE to early VIII CE) is sometimes referred to as the papyrological millennium (Palme, 2009: 61).
ancient survivals in the Modern Greek dialects. Particularly useful features of Shipp’s study are the comparisons he makes with the modern evidence and the cross-referencing with the prescriptions of Moeris and Phrynichus.

This study’s diachronic approach, inclusive of material that spans two and a half millennia, means that there are multiple categories from which the secondary literature is drawn (§1.5.3)—and many cases where there are overlaps in content—including dictionaries of Ancient and Modern Greek. Discussions of the present study’s salient issues follow, under the rubrics of *Diglossia* and *Atticism*.

### 1.3.2 Diglossia

The term ‘diglossia’ is central to the present study’s objectives. Given that it was developed for the situational characteristics of modern languages, it requires a brief examination in terms of its relevance to Atticism’s descendant, *katharevousa*. The concept was first defined with specific reference to Modern Greek by Ferguson (1959), whose influential article has been cited many times in various studies surrounding the phenomenon. Any discussion, therefore, of the development and maintenance of diglossia during the history of the language invariably cites his definition. With respect to Modern Greek, while there may be a *communis opinio* regarding the pertinence of such a concept, or something similar to it, Ferguson’s original description has nevertheless received close scrutiny. It has been revised and updated several times, of which the most notable contributions are those of Fishman (1967: 29–38) and Fasold (1984: 34–60). Critiques of their definitions, with reference to Modern Greek, stem from the Fergusonian model’s ability to be applied readily to the linguistic situation of Modern Greek (particularly after the abandonment of *katharevousa* as an official language).

---

37 According to Shipp (1979: xv), he had access to the ‘unpublished material’ of the *Historical Dictionary of the Modern Greek Language* (HD) for words after the then latest fascicle (IVα, βλεφαρίδα-γάργαρος; 1953). Fascicles IVβ (1980), Vα (1984) and Vβ (1989) have since been published.

38 For Koine see e.g. Colvin (2009: 34), and for Modern Greek Mackridge (2009: 27).

39 See e.g. Babiniotis (2000: 1–16), who maintains that diglossia refers to two different languages, and proposes the term ‘*dimorphia*’ (διμορφία) as a more accurate reference to two different forms of the same language.

40 Cf. Fernandez (1993: 129), who states that ‘this article and its subsequent revisions ... have had a profound impact on the treatment of the subject.’

41 See Daltas (1993: 341–8) for an excellent discussion of both the Fergusonian and Fasoldian models with reference to Modern Greek.
Mackridge’s (2009: 28–9) observation that the Manichaean nature of this model—distinguishing between High and Low varieties—was never entirely suitable for the complex reality of Modern Greek, is a sensible starting point from which to test its suitability for modern and—more pertinently for this study—Ancient Greek.

The views of Greek scholars differ in respect to the aptness of using the word diglossia as a label for this phenomenon, which may be considered a direct consequence of the views they hold on the ‘quality’ of Modern Greek. For Ancient Greek, naturally, and in particular MKG, it becomes increasingly difficult to apply the Fergusonian model, which originated in discussions of discrete nation-states and standardised languages. However, since our primary objectives are not concerned with the minutiae of diglossia vis-à-vis Modern Greek and katharevousa, it will suffice here to note that there are not equivalent numbers of articles or book chapters that discuss the concept of diglossia with specific regard to the ancient evidence.

Studies that cover the entire span of the language, for example Browning (1982: 49–50), which treat the establishment of the Koine and the rise of Atticism as the beginnings of diglossia, invariably devote more attention to Modern Greek and its wealth of socio-linguistic material. Swain’s (1996: 36–40) Hellenism and Empire is an example of a work that does attempt to draw parallels between Atticism and the later language question, although the definition he provides of diglossia is that of Ferguson (1972: 246); he notes that Atticism ‘fits the general definition of diglossia very well as a particular language which depends on the status of ancient texts and is a symptom of internal political division.’ Similarly, Alexiou (1982: 172–5, 181), although her study is focused on Modern Greek, compares the methods

\(^{42}\) See Ferguson (1959: 327).
\(^{43}\) See e.g. Drettas (1981: 66).
\(^{46}\) Swain outlines both the differences and similarities between katharevousa and Atticism, noting important parallels between Roman philhellenism and its modern variant; though the length of time that passed before the creation of katharevousa betrays its absurd linguistic dissonance: ‘the study of the Attic language had been continuous from classical times till the second sophistic, whereas katharevousa was an entirely artificial introduction.’

\(^{47}\) Compare Kahane and Kahane (1979: 189–90), who similarly refer to the Fergusonian definition of diglossia, and speak of the marked development of a ‘dichotomy between the idiom of the educated and the general idiom ... in the late 18\(^{th}\) century’.
of the Atticist grammarians and lexicographers to the situation that obtained during the enforcement of *katharevousa* last century; she lists several ‘traits’ that *katharevousa* encouraged, of which the following accord well with the characteristics of Atticism in antiquity (viewed as external linguistic factors impinging upon non-literary documents [§1.5.1]): (a) ‘moral judgments rather than critical evaluation of written texts and of spoken forms of language’; and (b) ‘above all’, its tendency to be ‘corrective and proscriptive’. But since we do not have the same quality of evidence for Ancient Greek, the crux of the diglossic issue for antiquity lies exclusively in the written record, through which we simultaneously seek signs of the spoken language and Atticism (see §1.5.1).

Given that the focus of the present study is the period I–III CE, the Fergusonian distinction between High and Low varieties may be viewed as adequate for the early stages of divergence between the lowest and highest registers.\(^4^8\) As is stressed throughout §1.5, the stylistic variation inherent within document types (i.e. registers) and their genres, means that we cannot readily associate either category with the spoken language without first identifying a register taxonomy.\(^4^9\) We can only here attempt to glean diglossic tendencies through the distribution of the data yielded from our case studies, whose results, as we shall see, must be viewed through the correcting lens of variationist linguistic models. As such, the term diglossia will throughout the present study refer to the gradual divergence of the two *most extreme* variants of the spoken and written varieties of Greek during the Koine and Byzantine periods, to wit, *vernacular* and *Atticistic* Greek; noting again the variation present at all points in between (i.e. a ‘continuum’; see §1.5.3).

### 1.3.3 Atticism

There are very few studies on Atticism that have examined its impact on the non-literary material, particularly the papyri. One of the earliest and most comprehensive studies of Atticism is Schmid’s compendious five volume study (1887–97), which, although still useful for its commentary on select documentary evidence, is limited by its age and overriding

\(^4^8\) See §1.5.3 for a definition of the term *register*, and its application to the various document types pertinent to the present study. For an extreme theory that places the beginning of diglossia in the period right after the campaigns of Alexander see Versteegh (1987, esp. 269).

\(^4^9\) Alexiou (1982: 163) notes the difficulty provided by similar levels of variation in attempting to assign specific functions to *katharevousa*: ‘*[T]he situation is extremely fluid ... demotic has encroached upon katharevousa over the past thirty years [before 1982] although the process has been uneven.*’
concern with issues of literature. It is only after Ferguson (1959), and the development of the concept of diglossia, that Atticism, and in particular the Atticist lexicographers, are examined with specific reference to the Modern Greek evidence. In this regard, Swain (1996: 17–64) remains the most comprehensive and useful study of linguistic purism during the Second Sophistic. His brief contrast of Atticism with the language question in Modern Greek (1996: 37–9) is illuminating in its demonstration of the value such a comparison holds. Horrocks’ (2010) overview of the language, a benchmark study, is similarly useful in providing a diachronic perspective of Atticism’s impact. He too provides excellent information on the lexicographers of the period (2010: 137–9), and is especially useful for the textual examples he provides, including from Phrynichus (Glosses 100, 402 [138–39], 10, 255 [149–50]).

Anderson (1993: 85–99) provides a good account of Atticism vis-à-vis the Second Sophistic, although this is done, understandably, at the expense of non-literary material. A less exhaustive overview of these issues is provided in the works of Whitmarsh (2005: 41–56) and Browning (1983: 44–50, 104–113), the latter of whose emphasis on the later stages of Greek makes his observations particularly pertinent for the diachronic examination of diglossia through to the katharevousa. It is, however, hindered somewhat by its brevity and age, and has been superseded in many respects by more recent overviews of the language, such as Horrocks (2010), Adrados (2005: 198–202) and Tonnet (1993: 46–7).

Similar overviews by Greek scholars are Babiniotis (2000) and Andriotis (1995), whose value lies not only in the observations they yield for Atticism and diglossia, but in their authors’ understanding of the history and development of the Greek language—they are the editors of two dictionaries of Modern Greek that are regularly consulted by scholars of Ancient Greek. There are also several edited volumes and handbooks of Ancient Greek, of

---


51 Criticisms of the first edition of Greek: A History of the Language and its Speakers (1997) focused on the handling of the mediaeval and modern sections, including the modern dialectal material (e.g. Mackridge, 2000: 77–82) and the brevity of the discussion of the ancient dialects (cf. Steele, 2011:171). As Steele (2011: 172) rightly notes, specialists are more likely to find fault with the sections most pertinent to their own discipline, which is, unfortunately, inevitable for a work with such an ambitious chronological scope.

52 Adrados (2005) and Tonnet (1993), like Horrocks (2010), are overviews of the language that go right up to Modern Greek. However, neither is as detailed and comprehensive. This brevity, particularly in the case of Adrados, leads to impressionistic observations, although it should not obscure the reliability of either.
which the two-volume *History of Ancient Greek: From the Beginnings to Late Antiquity* (2007) and the *Companion to the Ancient Greek Language* (2010) are notable for their inclusion of chapters dealing with Atticism. Kim’s (2010: 468–82) survey of Atticism, which includes a brief study of Atticism and diglossia (2010: 469–471), is noteworthy for his inference that Atticism did not cause, but rather intensified a linguistic divide that had existed when the Koine began to spread in late IV BCE (2010: 470–1).  

Of equal significance in Kim’s account are the references he provides for further reading on Atticism, and more specifically, the warning with which he prefaces a brief list of general accounts in other handbooks of Greek literature. He states, without going into further detail, that such accounts ‘are not always accurate and should be used with caution’ (2010: 481), including in this list *inter alia* Browning (1983), Adrados (2005) and Kazazis (2007: 1200–17). To be fair, Kazazis’ account is marked by a demoticist position, which is abundantly evident throughout, including his concluding remarks, where he states that Atticism’s ‘consequences at all levels proved to be completely disastrous’ (2010: 1210). It should, however, be stressed here that although such positions are indeed extreme, and need to be approached with caution, they are nevertheless instructive for understanding why the author’s views have been shaped thus. In Kazazis’ case, it is pertinent to note that he links the disdain he displays for the *katharevousa* with class distinctions he claims can be traced back to Phrynichus’ pejorative labelling of those who employed non-Attic usages (2007: 1210). Such linguistic views, therefore, on account of the language question, are still present among Greek scholars, and require that a certain wariness be maintained when consulting diachronic accounts that link the ancient and modern phases of Greek.

---

53 Kim makes the assertion that ‘the gap between written literary Greek and spoken colloquial was not ushered in by Atticism’ by drawing a contrast between the ‘higher’ register Greek of Polybius and the ‘low Koine’ of the papyri. The concept of register assumes added significance when determining the nature of the present study’s primary textual material, to wit, the non-literary papyri. Bentein’s (2016:19–20) suggestion of a ‘register continuum’ is a sensible solution to the issue of having categories of register that preclude the overlaps present in the various kinds of literary and non-literary texts; see e.g. Biber and Conrad (2009: 33) for a similar ‘continuum of variation’. This issue is taken up further in §1.5.3, where a register continuum is proposed, based largely upon the characteristics originally identified and detailed by Halliday (1978) for such a model.

54 Kim (2010: 481).

55 He quotes here some of these labels: ἀγοραῖοι, ἀμαθεῖς, σύρφακες. For a full discussion of the distinctions Phrynichus makes between different groups, including the employment of these pejorative adjectives, see Strobel (2009: 126–68).
For Greek beyond the Koine, the topic of Atticism is typically integrated into discussions of the literary material; the numbers of Greek papyri that are so useful to our study of the lower registers decrease markedly during the EBG period. There is no single, systematic study of the phenomenon for mediaeval and Modern Greek, although there are valuable observations on Byzantine Atticism during the Byzantine and mediaeval periods in Horrocks (2010: 213–14), and on the vernacular literature, including the ‘romances’, of the later mediaeval periods in Browning (1983: 69–87), Beaton (1989) and Horrocks (2010: 214–20, 273–323). For Modern Greek the discussion is firmly focused on diglossia, with Atticism as a distant causal factor whose importance is, understandably, only treated superficially. Aside from the studies noted above, Holton (2002: 169–179) and Alexiou (1982: 156–192) are two studies inter plura alia that illustrate the central role of an Atticising Greek, as a model for the katharevousa, in the development of SMG.

Finally, astute observations may be found in diachronic studies whose foci are particular features of Greek; two recent works of this kind are Markopoulos (2009), a diachronic examination of the Future tense, and Bentein (2016), a study of periphrastic have-and be-constructions. They are both excellent models of corpus-based studies, and contain exceptionally pertinent statistical analyses and typologies for the various stages of Greek.

1.3.4 Grammars and vocabularies

The treatment of the papyrological material in Greek grammars reflects its comparatively recent discovery and publication. Its piecemeal inclusion in entries of the Greek-English Lexicon (LSJ) is instructive of its underutilisation up to now, and the potential that exists in compiling a grammar or dictionary devoted to the documentary evidence. Nevertheless, there exist useful guides for this material; for the Ptolemaic period (EKG) Mayser’s Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit (1906–38), in spite of the numerous papyri published since, remains exceptionally informative; for the MKG period Palmer’s A Grammar of the Post-Ptolemaic Papyri (1945), although quite brief and notably lacking comprehensive references to papyri, is incidentally pertinent; Gignac’s Grammar of the

56 See Browning (1982: 51).
57 See Karyolemou (2014: 36–40) for a brief, but excellent discussion of the ‘linguistic duality’ of katharevousa and demotic in Modern Greek literature with reference to the Fergusonian definition of diglossia.
58 See Sinclair’s review (1945).
Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods (1976–81), which covers the MKG period, remains an excellent reference.

Moulton and Howard’s (1919–29) A Grammar of New Testament Greek and the seminal Vocabulary of the Greek Testament (1914–1930) of Moulton and Milligan, owing to their incorporation and excellent referencing of the papyri, are particularly pertinent for shifts in semantic and syntactic usage. It is noted here that for almost all words in Moulton and Milligan (1914–30), reference is made to Modern Greek, which makes the work doubly useful as a window into the definitions that academics of the period were relying upon at the height of the language question. Threatte’s The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions (1996), for Attic, and Schwyzer’s Griechische Grammatik (1939–50), for all periods of Ancient Greek, are two monumental works whose value to any diachronic, or synchronic, study of the language is substantial.

Also notable is Mandilaras’ The Verb in the Greek Non-Literary Papyri (1973), which, in spite of certain flaws, remains a useful tool for the MKG period. More recent, and reliable, treatments are to be found in diachronic surveys of Greek (see §1.3.3). Finally, mention should be made here of Preisigke’s Wörterbuch (1925–44), whose entries and references (and subsequent supplements [1991–2000]) are, even today, an excellent vocabulary of the Greek papyri, though they have been largely superseded by the electronic databases available online on the Papyrological Navigator.

For Modern Greek, the standard reference grammar (in English) is Holton, Mackridge and Philippaki-Warburton (2012). In spite of certain flaws, useful historical grammars of Modern Greek are those of Jannaris (1897) and Thumb (1901). Part of their value is derived from the context in which they were produced, to wit, the language question and its influence on the linguists’ understanding of Atticism—particularly with reference to lexicography.

---

59 See Lee’s review (1974).

60 Accessible via <http://papyri.info>, which includes the following electronic databases: DDbDP (Duke Databank of Documentary Papyri); HGV (Heidelberger Gesamtverzeichnis der griechischen Papyrusurkunden Ägyptens); BP (Bibliographie Papyrologique); and APIS (Advanced Papyrological Information System); see also §1.4.

61 Special caution should be exercised when consulting Jannaris’ Grammar, since it betrays throughout a linguistic attitude that claims an unrealistic unity between the Attic dialect and SMG—particularly on the issue of phonology, which has more recently been taken up and further expounded by Caragounis (2004). See Mayor (1898: 175–8) for a review of Jannaris’ Grammar that highlights several key problems.
Their treatment of the Modern Greek dialects, which were at the time more widely spoken, is the most salient of the many valuable observations these grammars provide for the scholar.

1.4 Methodological Problems

1.4.1 Primary comparanda

The present study utilises a controlled range (rather than discrete corpus) of documentary papyri from which the relevant data are drawn. The period I–III CE is a key methodological reference point to which supplementary documentary and literary comparanda are added to gain a fuller understanding of the diachronic linguistic picture. These additional texts are spread across a wider time period and take in all register types, and are at all times considered to be of equal linguistic value—never subordinate or inferior (see below and §1.5.2).

The primary data for the lexical studies have been collected from the papyri of the MKG period (I–III CE), although supporting material from before the EKG period (III–I BCE), and after the LKG period (IV–VI CE), has been utilised—the comparatively low numbers of data yielded from glosses 27 (§2.1) and 93 (§2.2) means that the non-papyrological comparanda are for these especially crucial. The deictic centre, in a manner of speaking, is the papyrological (and ostracological) data from which statistical data may be extracted for Atticistic usages in documentary texts. Owing to the time allowed for the carrying out of this study, the sheer number of extant papyri, and the various Atticist lexica available as comparanda, it became clear as early as the conceptual phase that the present study needed to confine itself to a strict scope, in order that it might not lose sight of its stated objectives. With these conditions in mind, it was decided: (a) to choose only one Atticist lexicon from which selected prescriptions would be drawn; (b) to collect primary papyrological data from roughly two centuries either side of when the lexicon was produced; and (c) to supplement the data yielded from the papyri with relevant attestations from literary material across the entire spectrum of registers—up to the point where the

62 It should be noted here that only gloss 247 yielded significant data for I–III CE; for the other two case studies, given their low yield, it was necessary to pay equal attention to the entire papyrological date range, i.e. the papyrological millennium.
lexical innovation under examination can be observed to become more frequent in both the lower and higher (Atticistic) registers.\textsuperscript{63}

The dictionary-like arrangement of Phrynichus’ \textit{Ecloga},\textsuperscript{64} the severity of its prescriptions (§1.1), and the availability of a comparatively modern edition of the text were all major factors in choosing the lexicon.\textsuperscript{65} Moreover, Phrynichus is almost always mentioned in studies, or descriptions of Atticism and Atticist lexicography,\textsuperscript{66} the terseness of most of his entries lends itself to such referencing.\textsuperscript{67} The time period chosen was influenced mainly by the date of the \textit{Ecloga’s} production in the 160s CE; the papyri that are dated to I–III were initially judged to be sufficient for generating substantial results, but not enough to overwhelm a study with a fairly narrow scope.

\subsection*{1.4.2 Selecting the evidence and collecting the data}

In explaining his methods of data collection, Bentein (2016: 7) emphasises the need to include texts from all register types when studying Greek. He cites variation as the main determinant for not excluding high-register texts, since, as he notes, even ‘the spoken language is likely to have varied considerably’ (Bentein, 2016: 7),\textsuperscript{68} this is a salient point when considering the

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{63}The notion of register is explored further in §1.5.3.
\item \textsuperscript{64}The issue of alphabetisation in the \textit{Ecloga} raises certain questions, in particular whether Phrynichus copied the arrangement of other lexica. For an excellent discussion see Strobel (2009: 105–13), who compares the \textit{Ecloga} to other lexica of the period, and concludes that the traces of alphabetical order are more revealing of his sources than his intentions.
\item \textsuperscript{65}According to Fischer (1974: 37), the \textit{Ecloga}, as it survives, is very likely an unabridged version. Fischer’s (1974) edition of the \textit{Ecloga}, being the most recent and up-to-date, has been used for this study. Despite their age, the editions of Lobeck (1820) and Rutherford (1881) do contain useful commentaries (cf. Strobel, 2009: 95). Rutherford’s commentary, in particular, is more useful as an example of the linguistic views that informed his era (cf. Lee, 2013: 288, n. 17); he writes of Xenophon, who comes in for sustained criticism throughout for his impure style, ‘the faults of Xenophon’s style are due [...] to the want of astringents in his early mental training, and the unsettled and migratory habits which he indulged in his manhood.’ (Rutherford, 1881: 109).
\item \textsuperscript{66}Compare e.g. Horrocks (2010: 138–9, 149–50; 154); Whitmarsh (2005: 44–5); and Swain (1996: 53–5). Individual Phrynichian glosses are also often cited in grammars of Greek, in examinations and discussions of pertinent forms; references to these are made throughout the present study, e.g. Mayser, \textit{Grammatik}, i\textsuperscript{2}/1, 213.
\item \textsuperscript{67}This is particularly the case for the entries in the \textit{Ecloga’s} first section (Book One) (glosses 1–229). See Strobel (2009: 79); cf. Lee (2013: 289).
\item \textsuperscript{68}See further §1.5.2.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
choice of texts for a study that has the potential to accommodate vast numbers of data for careful examination—the present study is obliged to focus on texts that are low-register (non-literary), since it seeks to find reflections of linguistic aspiration where it is least likely to occur (see §1.5). As will be discussed below (§§1.5.2–3), however, it is preferable—indeed, necessary—not to neglect texts that, under the strict criteria of certain methodological frameworks, might not be considered adequately representative of the lower registers, particularly the vernacular.

For example, Browning’s (1983: 4) wariness of texts that are ‘masked by a factitious, classicising uniformity,’ reflects a severe attitude that considers literary works composed in archaising Greek (e.g. Atticistic texts) as an unnecessary obstacle impeding our access to the authentic spoken language; conversely, Horrocks (2010: 4), in his diachronic examination of Greek, stresses that by failing to consider both the written and spoken versions of the language one inherently fails to understand why the state of diglossia persisted for as long as it did. For the purposes of the present study, while it may indeed be considered necessary to display a certain level of wariness in approaching literary texts, it will be seen that the variation inherent within registers and genres cannot be separated from the enduring influence of Atticism and Atticistic tendencies—Atticistic usages penetrated into the lower registers, while certain innovations starting, or spreading, from the lower registers (particularly the spoken language) eventually emerged as widespread in SMG and the modern dialects. This is, of course, a convenient reduction of the processes involved, but the theoretical issues arising from them will be addressed below (§1.5).

**Digital databases**

The bulk of the data has been collected from two online lemmatised databases, the *Duke Databank of Documentary Papyri* (DDbDP) and the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (TLG). The TLG was utilised as a supplementary database, where instances of selected words and phrases could be checked for their earliest attestation in the literary material, and to see

---

69 The DDbDP can be accessed at <http://www.papyri.info>; the TLG at <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu>. Editions of papyrus texts are continually published and their inclusion in the DDbDP may not be immediate; TLG, on the other hand, although an ongoing project, is at present an incomplete database for Greek literary texts, particularly those of the Byzantine and mediaeval periods.
whether parallels exist between later usages, including Modern Greek. The search function of the DDbDP, in spite of certain limitations, provides enough options for the purposes of this study. Its major weakness is perhaps that it sorts its results by the category of ‘hits’, which counts only the number of papyri that contain matches for the search query. In other words, if one papyrus contains three instances of the search query, it will still only count as one hit. For low-yield searches this is not an obstacle, but for words and phrases that we know are commonest in the papyri, such as those in dating formulae and filiation expressions, it renders the exercise of producing an accurate figure by confirming each instance exceptionally time-consuming and inefficient. There also seem to be discrepancies in different search types that should otherwise produce the same results; for example, a lemma query may not always produce the same hits as a substring query with word-boundaries indicated by a hash (#). These are potential issues for any study involving the DDbDP—preliminary familiarisation with its search function is essential.

Selecting the glosses

In the context of the present study’s aim of applying the dicta of the Ecloga to the papyrological evidence, the ideal set of lexical case studies would be representative of most, if not all, of the entry types. One would resolve to include not only the most basic kind of Phrynichean dictum (e.g. glosses 156, 173), but also ones with finer semantic (e.g. gloss 192) and syntactical (e.g. gloss 10) distinctions. Such an approach, however, is made difficult by the nature of our documentary material, which is often likely to not yield sufficient examples of either approved or condemned forms, and, in the cases where more complex constructions are involved, by the limitations of the DDbDP and its search function. For example, gloss 156, which gives λαγώς as the approved, Attic form and λαγός as the condemned, Ionic form, yields zero hits for 1 to 300 CE in DDbDP; gloss 163, with μύκας and μύκητας as the condemned and approved plural accusative forms respectively of μύκης, likewise returns no examples. The absence of these two nouns from our date range may be contrasted with the most productive basic entry of this study, gloss 247, the two variants of which, πάλι and πάλιν, yield 302 examples—a common adverb for which a high frequency is to be expected. While we can account for a word’s eventual widespread use in SMG and the modern dialects,

Footnote:

70 Although the TLG is generally to be considered an exceptionally valuable research tool, its single most apparent shortcoming is perhaps its omission of texts’ valuable apparatus critici (cf. Manolessou, 2014: 29, n. 36).
we are not afforded any such foresight in selecting entries that might yield large numbers of data—we must always analyse carefully, and not undervalue, the results with which we are provided. *Glosses* that yield few or no examples still have something to tell us about the natures both of the prescriptions and the papyrological material, and are therefore equally instructive for their absence within certain registers as they are for their presence in others. Finally, the total number of case studies undertaken in this thesis was conditioned primarily by the imposed word limit. While more entries from the *Ecloga* could have been included here, their examination would have inevitably been more superficial.

### 1.5 Language and Register

#### 1.5.1 Spoken language and the Variationist model

While the primary objective of this study is, on the one hand, relatively straightforward in both its preparation and prosecution, the subsequent examination of the data collated presents us with two methodological issues that stem largely from the nature of our textual material: the case of the vernacular, or ‘spoken’ language,\(^\text{71}\) and its reflection in the various register categories of the papyri. For the study of Ancient Greek, the crux of the problem surrounding spoken language is the absence of the kinds of (spoken) evidence that make language change more easily observable in modern languages; to wit, since we are forced to rely solely upon the ancient textual evidence in identifying patterns of change in grammar, syntax and lexicon, the value of written documents as genuine witnesses to the ancient Greek vernacular may, to various degrees, be called into question.\(^\text{72}\)

---

\(^{71}\) By ‘spoken’ language I mean the language that was spoken by all social classes, i.e. all social dialects; the language of the educated classes, despite being influenced by Atticism, should not be excluded from any discussion of this issue. Nevertheless, the vernacular would have likely displayed a level of variation that the artificiality of the learned language did not permit; as Frösén (1974: 109–10) notes for the EKG and MKG periods, ‘the spoken language in use changed rapidly, but the language used by the educated classes changed slowly and was strongly influenced by interference originating in the language of literature,’—the resulting uniformity in the learned language would have, naturally, precluded it from experiencing all (but not none) of the kinds of changes that are most pertinent for tracking the evolution of Greek up to SMG (see below).

\(^{72}\) Cf. e.g. the attitude of Rydbeck (1998: 364), who dismisses the identification of papyri with vernacular Greek: ‘In time, however, it became clear how difficult it was to arrive at the language of the uneducated people. It could only be identified in snippets: here and there, like the untiring dandelion, breaking through the asphalt of written standard Koine.’ (See also §1.5.2).
To overcome this deficit, we may turn to the Uniformitarian principle, and posit the following assertion: (a) modern languages exhibit greater variation in their spoken versions; therefore (b) the spoken language during the Koine period must have displayed similar levels of variation. If we accept this hypothesis, we may then reasonably assume that the non-literary papyri, and other low register texts, are not merely reflections of contemporary linguistic attitudes toward language, but, in the very least, offer glimpses of forms and features that eventually emerged as widespread in the dialects of Modern Greek. To put this in other words, just as there existed variation within the register of non-literary papyri, there probably existed considerable variation in the spoken language during the Koine period, and if we consider that the Atticistic glosses of Phrynichus may themselves have been used in speech (even widely), the notion of the spoken language as a homogeneous entity seems unlikely.

This variation, then, increases the chance that elements of the vernacular may appear in the ‘lowest’ genres of the non-literary papyri (see below); thus, as infrequent as the relevant data may be, it is necessary that each instance (within a small dataset [see §2.1]) be examined closely, particularly in the cases where the word under consideration anticipates a Modern Greek form. To be sure, the existence of a form in SMG, or the modern dialects, is itself not evidence of continuity during the Koine period, or even the mediaeval period, but if we speak of a word’s disappearance and reappearance in this regard we unconsciously ignore the very real possibility that it did not cease to be used in speech.

In assuming any kind of continuity, however, it is necessary to distinguish between forms and expressions that spread from, or primarily through, the spoken language, and those that are clearly attributable to Atticistic influence. For example, the disappearance of the enclitic particles γε (apart from fixed expressions like εἰ δὲ μὴ γε and νῦν γε) and ἄρα from non-literary papyri during the EKG period, and their subsequent reappearance in (primarily)

---

73 The Uniformitarian principle, first applied to a linguistic context by Labov (1972: 275; 1994: 21–3), assumes that ‘the forces operating to produce linguistic change today are of the same kind and order of magnitude as those which operated in the past five or ten thousand years.’ It is noted here, however, that Labov himself has expressed doubt about the ability of historical linguistics to overcome its insufficient evidence, stating that ‘[although] the art is a highly developed one ... there are some limitations of the data that cannot be compensated for.’; for a view contra see Romaine (1982: 18, 122), who adopts the Uniformitarian principle and claims that a sociolinguistic theory which cannot handle written language is very restricted in scope and application and cannot claim to be a theory of ‘language’ (see also below).

74 Cf. Manolessou (2008: 73), with reference to Mediaeval Greek, though equally applicable to the Koine.
administrative documents of the late Roman and early Byzantine periods, very likely reflects strong contemporary Atticistic tendencies in learned Greek.\textsuperscript{75} On the other hand, adverbial ἀκμήν (gloss 93)—attested first in Xenophon, then more or less continuously from Polybius onward in prose—appears in non-literary papyri for the first time in late II CE, before gradually becoming more common in non-Atticistic texts during the mediaeval period (§2.2).

Therefore, the revival of the literary forms γε and ἀρα in non-literary texts is a symptom of the emerging state of diglossia, while the increasing frequency of ἀκμήν in texts of a non-literary nature evidences the slow and gradual spread of a lexical innovation. According to the rate of diffusion represented by the S-curve,\textsuperscript{76} we would expect the adoption of such an innovation to be slow initially, before gradually building momentum, and finally flattening out as the previously dominant form either disappears completely or survives in specific (mainly literary) contexts. Naturally, since our chosen usages can only be tracked in the written record, we should expect at best only a rough correspondence between the data they actually yield and a typical S-curve; the literary and inscriptive evidence of the lower registers should exhibit a proportionate rate of adoption, although, as will be seen, the epigraphic data yielded are often comparatively meagre.\textsuperscript{77}

In the present study, the trajectory of the lexical innovations is complicated by the intrusion of Atticistic tendencies into non-literary registers, with the result that the data, particularly after II CE, display a slight increase in the frequency of the Atticistic variant and a concomitant decrease in the innovative form (cf. Table 3). If viewed as an external social factor, Atticism’s long term influence may be understood to continue via the high, archaising registers during the mediaeval period, before eventually contributing to the creation of the katharevousa in the 19\textsuperscript{th} century. This leads us to the key Labovian distinction concerning linguistic change: changes that are introduced by the dominant class (change from above); and systematic changes that appear first in the vernacular, which represent the operation of internal factors (change from below).\textsuperscript{78}

This schema accords well with the primary factors affecting lexical innovation in the present study; if, as just mentioned, Atticism is considered as the primary external factor, then

\textsuperscript{75} See Clarysse (2010: 39–40); cf. also Wahlgren (1995: 117–18) for a similar reappearance of Attic particles in literary works during I BCE, after they had largely dropped out of use during EKG.

\textsuperscript{76} See Aitchison (2013: 93–4); first used by Chen (1972: 475) to represent the phenomenon graphically.

\textsuperscript{77} See esp. §2.2.3.

\textsuperscript{78} Labov (1994: 78).
Phrynichus’ condemned forms, originating and finding continuity in the spoken language, may be easily viewed as internal, linguistic factors. Especially pertinent in this regard is Labov’s (1994: 78) specification that, for changes from above, ‘such borrowings do not immediately affect the vernacular patterns of the dominant class or other social classes, but appear primarily in careful speech, reflecting a superposed dialect learned after the vernacular is acquired’; this description can be applied to the diglossic situation that prevails after II CE, in which the increased distance between Atticistic usages and the spoken language leads to the treatment of the former as a kind of ‘prestige’ \(^79\) variety that is subsequently considered to be more suitable for the composition of certain document types on the lower end of the continuum.\(^80\)

While we may confidently assume, however, a variegated spoken language exerting internal influence, it is still the case that non-Atticistic forms are not as easily adapted to the Labovian notion of *change from below*, since we simply do not possess the requisite data to track their progress in the spoken language; in fact, it is only possible at best to posit tentative suggestions for the origins of their use. As a result, for Ancient Greek the notion of the spoken language remains largely a hypothetical construct, which can only be approached through surviving texts to which it is most proximate; although it should be stressed here that this approach does not invalidate the usefulness of literary texts, which remain invaluable comparanda in the present study’s exercise. As will be made clear below, we must locate different document types on a ‘register continuum’, so that we might delineate the variation within literary registers, which in certain cases have the potential to offer better glimpses of the spoken language than the non-literary papyri (see §2.1.5).

Nevertheless, the motivations for the individual shifts toward different forms examined in this study are largely unpredictable; though the S-curve demonstrates that linguistic change happens in a non-linear fashion, it does not represent the *a priori* assumption that these innovations are the individual acts of speakers.\(^81\) One theory that attempts to explain this unpredictability is the ‘invisible-hand explanation’, which attributes

\(^79\) This tendency was replicated in the *katharevousa*, which allowed for the use of difficult Atticistic forms and constructions, long-obsolete in the lower registers and dialects, in particular genres that placed (and in some instances continue to place) high value on displays of learned obscurity; cf. Ferguson (1959: 330–1).

\(^80\) Cf. also the genre of the vernacular mediaeval romance (§1.5.3.3); its early primary motivators, authors who were part of the metropolitan elite, had ‘seemingly forged a new literary language with a vernacular base out of the heterogeneous spoken and written varieties familiar to them.’ (Horrocks, 2010: 219).

\(^81\) Milroy (1992: 169).
individual processes of linguistic change to the ‘separate actions of individuals who are supposed to be minding their own business unaware of and a fortiori not intending to produce the ultimate overall outcome.’\textsuperscript{82} When applied to ancient documents, it provides an elegant explanation for the gaps in the extant written record, which otherwise do not accord with the notion that change occurs in a linear, systematic fashion. It is easier, under this theory, to understand the temporal isolation of certain forms that prevail in the papyri as the result of a writer’s individual choice, which need not necessarily be reflected in the macro-level of language change.

Ultimately, this model, along with those previously mentioned, is provided here primarily as a guide and reference; a theoretical crutch upon which we may lean, as it were, to conceptualise more clearly phenomena that unfortunately cannot be supported more substantially by the textual evidence we have at hand. They help account for the irregularity, and stylistic and register variation of our evidence, which, as will be seen, should not be restricted by modern views of textual ‘authenticity’.

\textit{1.5.2 Textual authenticity}

Implicit in the search for reflections of the spoken language in the written version is the notion that certain kinds of texts are better representatives of ‘authentic’ features;\textsuperscript{83} that is, there exists a tendency to identify, and focus on, particular texts that are typically considered to be the best exemplars of the original spoken vernacular(s).\textsuperscript{84} For Browning (1983: 4–5), the non-literary papyri are one such document type,\textsuperscript{85} and it is not too difficult to find similar sentiments elsewhere.\textsuperscript{86} As Bentein (2013: 6) rightly notes, however, this approach has the

---

\textsuperscript{82} Ullmann-Margalit (1978: 267); see also Keller (1994: 67–78) for an analogy and further discussion.

\textsuperscript{83} For the question of locating authentic features in Mediaeval Greek texts see Joseph (2000: 309–29, esp. 310); his observations are equally applicable to the Koine and papyrological materials.

\textsuperscript{84} Cf. Bentein (2013: 6).

\textsuperscript{85} Along with ‘world chronicles, tales of ascetics and lives of saints’; see Horrocks (2010: 222–26).

\textsuperscript{86} For an early expression of this thought see Costas (1936: 56–7); for more recent, nuanced views see Verhoogt (2010: 67) and James’ (2013) entry in \textit{EAGLL} (s.v. Papyri, Language of), where he notes that the lack of Atticistic features in papyri is one of their positive attributes, in the context of their historico-linguistic value (see also §1.5.3). Cf. also Caragounis (2010: 166) for a strongly negative view of the papyri that is exemplary of a linguistic attitude common during the 19th century: ‘The havoc played with the linguistic instrument once used with such elegance and grace by Platon and Demosthenes, can be perceived by a look at the illiterate Egyptian
potential to be problematic, if due attention is not given to the potential of literary texts as crucial comparanda in diachronic, historico-linguistic studies.

If one wilfully overlooks texts ‘compromised’ by literary influence, a dichotomy may subsequently arise, in which only ‘authentic’ texts are considered reliable witnesses to the spoken language, while the literary material (heavily influenced by archaising tendencies arising from Atticism) is subsequently thought to be unhelpful.87 If this scenario were to be diagrammatically represented, we would imagine a bipolar continuum, with ‘low’ texts (e.g. non-literary papyri) on one extreme and works composed in a ‘high’ language (e.g. Atticistic literature) on the other. Of course, this model cannot hold true, because not only can we identify kinds of texts that differ in linguistic style, but we find that variation itself exists within texts of the same document type.88 Papyri, therefore, cannot be restricted to one side of the spectrum, unless we assume that they are linguistically homogeneous.

In the case of a quantitative study dealing with large sets of data such an assumption might indeed be voluntarily made,89 but it is nevertheless instructive here to identify, and be constantly mindful of, the linguistic heterogeneity of the papyrological corpora.90 Furthermore, it is equally important to note that the degree to which the literary material may be useful varies from study to study. Linguistic studies dealing with grammatical changes, which can more or less only be tracked through texts that are most proximate to the

---

87 See e.g. Markopoulos (2009: 15–16), who claims that the diglossic situation that prevails from III CE onwards ‘forces us to include in our corpus only low-register texts that avoid Atticism.’ (See §1.5.3 for a definition of register).

88 Cf. Lee (1985: 9) and Horsley (1994: 64–5); for a case study that showcases the heterogeneity of the non-literary papyri, even within a single archive, see Bentein (2015: 461–81).

89 Cf. Bentein’s (2013: 12–14) generalising tripartite register continuum—papyri; biography / hagiography; historiography (see below)—in respect to whose homogeneity he urges caution elsewhere (2015: 462–3); see also Bentein (2012: 213–18).

90 Linguistic heterogeneity in non-literary papyri should, in my view, rightly be considered the communis opinio, although competing views have been previously posited: see Rydbeck (1991: 200–1) for the view that the non-literary papyri (esp. of Egypt) are ‘to a very low-degree documents of vernacular, vulgar language’, and, along with the New Testament, display linguistic and grammatical homogeneity; and the radical thesis of Versteegh (1987: 268–9; 2002: 74), namely, that the written sources reflect contemporary metalinguistic attitudes towards language (i.e. the standard language), rather than the spoken language, which did not manifest itself in writing until ‘many centuries’ after the campaigns of Alexander the Great (see also §1.3.2 and below).
vernacular, would, depending on the size of their control corpora, have little recourse to literary texts. On the other hand, studies such as the present one, focused primarily on the lexicon (vocabulary), cannot afford to be so isolated—the added parameter of Atticism here effectively demands the use of the literary material, since we are using metalinguistic comparanda (Atticist lexicography) in investigating the non-literary material. Let us now briefly discuss the notion of register and its dimensions, and attempt to clarify its pertinence to the sub-categories of genre (document types) in the papyri, and other non-papyrological literary registers.

1.5.3 Register

Internal variation is usually formalised in terms of ‘register’, a term that refers to a variety of linguistic features associated with a particular social context, or ‘situational characteristic’. Registers may refer to different modes of communication, with their variability determined by how many ‘situational characteristics’ can be specified for each. To wit, the more specific characteristics a register has, the more specific its situational context will be, while a more general register will have fewer specific characteristics. For convenience, we will follow here the model of Halliday (1978: 33ff.), upon which inter alia Bibe and Conrad (2009: 39–41) have built on to develop their own extended framework. This model uses three main ‘vectors’ (the situational characteristics of Bibe and Conrad) to locate the social context of the register: field (the purpose of the text, i.e. why?); mode (the manner in which interaction takes place, i.e. how?); and tenor (the relationship between participants, i.e. to whom?).

---

91 E.g. Markopoulos’ (2009) diachronic study of the Future in Greek; however, cf. Bentein’s (2016) examination of verbal periphrases, which does not as readily discount literary works.

92 For the definition of register see Bibe and Conrad (2009: 6); Hudson (1996: 23, 45). See also Willi (2010: 304) for the consideration of Pythagoras as the ‘true founder of register-variation theory’ (cf. Nicomachus FGrH(C) 1063F1 [= Porph. Vita Pyth. 20]).

93 Bibe and Conrad (2009: 32); see 40 for a table of ‘situational characteristics of registers and genres’ (and below).


95 See O’Donnell (2000: 272) for a grouping of Bibe’s (1993: 245) situational characteristics according to the three vectors of the Hallidayan model.

96 Cf. the term ‘dimension’ used by Hudson (1996: 23) for the same concept.
Papyrological registers

Biber and Conrad (2009: 33) use the example of ‘conversation’ to illustrate the variability implicit within a non-specific register: while we know that the situation is a conversation (mode), we are able to specify neither its purpose (field) nor any information concerning the conversers and their social relation (tenor); but if the register of conversation was more specific, e.g. among colleagues at a university, we could both name its purpose and describe at least some of the relations between the conversers. On the other hand, if we were attempting to identify and describe the above characteristics in a specific papyrological register, the papyri would ipso facto afford us more details of their social context; for example, while all papyri share the same mode (written communication), the more specific register of non-literary papyri shows variability in both field (mainly influencing choice of vocabulary) and tenor (the relationship between addressor and addressee).

The situational characteristics thus specified would consequently help determine the range of the register, and allow us to identify distinct genres within it. According to Biber and Conrad (2009: 33), we may regard genres as more discrete sub-categories of registers that cannot as easily be mapped onto a similar variational continuum; for example, private letters, petitions, memoranda, etc. Thus, it is essential that there exist a ‘register taxonomy’ for papyrological texts, so that we might more easily and efficiently be able to compare the lexical data yielded from our searches against the discreet genres. Most pertinent to this


\[98\] The field of discourse (called ‘topic’ in the schema of Biber and Conrad) is not as influential in determining grammatical choice (Biber and Conrad, 2009: 46–7). Thus, along with tenor, it is the characteristic most pertinent to the lexical focus of this study, since mode (written communication) remains constant across all the registers of papyri.

\[99\] The distinction between genre and text type is a vexed issue, particularly with regard to English; see Lee (2001: 37–72) for a discussion of the terms. The term ‘genre’, as used by Biber (1988: 70, 170), refers to the classification of texts on the basis of external criteria, such as intended audience, purpose and activity type, while ‘text type’ is used with reference to texts’ internal, linguistic features. In spite of the problems encountered in Biber’s restricted use of text type for English (Lee, 2001: 39), it is probably most convenient to use the term genre for ancient documents, understood as an element of the ‘context of culture’ (Halliday and Hasan, 1985: 46–7) that affects the writer’s choice of field, tenor and mode (cf. O’Donnell, 2000: 279); this allows us to identify within the register of non-literary papyri categories of genre that are defined by external factors (see below).

\[100\] See Willi (2010: 305) for a suggestion with specific reference to Ancient Greek.
study are the different genres of non-literary papyri, which are typically divided into two broad categories, private and public.\(^{101}\)

According to the register continuum of Porter (1989: 152–3)\(^{102}\) these genres are shared between two separate registers of papyri: ‘vulgar’ and ‘non-literary’; under ‘vulgar’ are classified ‘papyri concerned with personal matters, monetary accounts, letters etc.’, while ‘official business papyri’ are considered examples of non-literary papyri. These two categories broadly correspond with Palme’s (2009: 377–8) public–private distinction, although the key defining characteristic for Porter is register variation (1989: 151), not simply tenor. As has already been stressed, however, the linguistic heterogeneity of the papyri means that variation is observable even within individual genres, so it is possible to conceive of other models, which represent this difference along horizontal axes of style. For example, Bentein (2013:10), in examining verbal periphrasis, adopts a tripolar continuum with ‘low’, ‘middle’ and ‘high’ registers,\(^{103}\) and notes, significantly, that ‘two authors (or even one and the same) can both write high-level texts, but differ in degree of Atticism.’ In other words, we can identify different grades of a certain kind of genre, but they exist along a stylistic continuum that is situated entirely within a single register. For a model that focuses on the register of non-literary papyri, we may cite here Connolly’s (1983: 2) finely distinguished continuum of ‘categories of genre’, which includes sub-continua of style that attempt to account for the above-mentioned variation within each genre. He identifies the following genres:

(a) Private Correspondence (i.e. private letters); (b) Official Correspondence (letters, reports, edicts, proclamations, rescripts—when these are not specified separately—excluding petitions and applications); (c) Petitions and Applications; (c) Records of Proceedings (both judicial

\(^{101}\) Cf. e.g. Palme (2009: 377–8). See Bubeník (1989: 39–41) for a similar bipolar classification for inscriptions; private inscriptions are opposed to public ones, defined as a variety ‘whose language/dialect choice is determined by an individual, a private person’—private letters written on papyrus may be likewise defined. Bubeník also observes degrees of style within the same genre (e.g. private letters), and cites curse tablets—‘least intended to be read by others’—as the main source of ‘Vulgar’ Attic, which is the ‘lowest’ variety in his four-tier model (Attic dialect; Great Attic; Hellenistic Koine; ‘Vulgar’ Attic). O’Donnell (2000: 277) notes that this model is not quite sufficient for the linguistic range of the later Koine period, especially papyri.


\(^{103}\) Note that the same author does not adopt an explicit register model in a more recent and comprehensive study of the same subject (2016), referring only to the ‘notion of a register continuum’ (2016: 20).
and administrative, and including speeches by advocates); (d) various semi-official writing such as contracts, acknowledgements of debt or receipts, wills; (e) Accounts and Lists; other writing such as prayers and horoscopes.

Represented diagrammatically, they would form a continuum with private correspondence at one extreme, and petitions and imperial rescripts on the other. Although this model attempts to account for stylistic variation in various types of document, it is somewhat vitiated by its attempt to attribute a correspondence between genre and language type, namely, spoken language and literary language. This is largely incompatible with the stylistic variation inherent in documents that are otherwise situated within a single category of genre: for example, a letter that may use a highly formal vocabulary, but is paratactic rather than hypotactic.

Connolly’s (1983: 2) sub-continua of styles make use of a tripolar distinction between ‘low’ (with numerous errors, as judged according to literary standards), ‘medium’, and ‘high’ (showing more than average literary influence) levels. This reflects closely the register model utilised by Bentein, but on account of its registerial specificity is more useful for an examination of Phrynichean lexical approvals (and condemnations) in the non-literary papyri, which is also the primary aim of Connolly’s study: ‘This continuum of genres, therefore, helps to establish how far Atticistic influence penetrated the written language: if only as far as imperial rescripts, we know not very far; if as far as private letters, then we see that it was quite extensive.’ (1983: 2).

The present study also makes use of a tripolar model, that of Markopoulos (2009: 16–7), which distinguishes between ‘low register’ (informal register, e.g. private letters; of a writer ‘assumed to belong to the lower social/educational ranks or both’), ‘middle register’ (mainly from LKG onwards, Christian literature, Byzantine chronicles), and ‘high register’

104 The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon fit into this category, rather than that of biography/hagiography (see below).

105 Connolly (1983: 2 n. 6) notes that such terms ‘tend to imply value judgments’ and emphasises the fact that the ‘values implied’ are not his own ‘but those of the ancient Atticists’; the same caution is urged for the present study.

106 The register continuum employed by Bentein (2016: 25–9) for Post-Classical and Byzantine Greek includes, in addition to non-literary papyri, four registers: biography/hagiography; historiography; the Greek novel; and scientific prose. Of these, the biographical/hagiographical distinction contains the Sayings of the Desert Fathers (Apophthegmata Patrum), which are particularly fruitful for forms that anticipate Modern Greek usages (see further §2.1.5).
(archaising, influenced by Atticism and diglossia). Among the papyri, private letters are the most productive genre for evidence of the spoken language, although, as has been stressed, high register forms are typically found in the same documents—this is especially the case for the lexicon—and it is often not straightforward attempting to adduce isolated instances of low register words as proof of lexical change.

Classical and Hellenistic Greek

The issue of register in Classical Greek, as Willi (2010: 310) and Bentein (2013: 35) note, has, perhaps unsurprisingly, had little attention devoted to it. The traditional categories of classical literature have—and continue to be—used in lieu of a schema that identifies Hallidayan vectors. Markopoulos (2009: 17), for example, recognises the genres of historiography, philosophical writings, tragedy and comedy, although he admits internal variation in each between low and high registers. By way of contrast, Bentein’s study into verbal periphrasis (2016: 20–4) views these genres, plus two others, as registers and places them along a continuum: epic poetry; drama; historiography; scientific prose; philosophical prose; and oratory.

For the purposes of the present study, this distinction will be seen to be sufficient, since there are very few attestations of our Phrynichean disapprovals in Classical Greek; aside from the early use of ἀξιμήν as an adverb in Xenophon (§2.2), only a few fragments of Comedy turn up non-standard usages. Xenophon, in fact, stands out among Attic authors for his innovative language (lexicon, morphology and syntax), which anticipates certain usages in later writers of Koine, such as Polybius (under the register of ‘historiography’ in the continuum of Bentein).107 In the cases examined in the present study, there is a significant contribution of non-Atticistic attestations from works composed in ‘scientific prose’ (Bentein, 2016: 27–8) during the period of MKG, such as Galen,108 Pausanias and Strabo.109

107 See Gautier (1911: 142), who noted that the language of Xenophon is not too far removed from that of the vernacular: ‘filled with dialectisms and remarkably rich in various elements borrowed from hither and thither’; cf. also Bentein (2016: 22). For a brief overview of Polybius’ language see Horrock (2010: 9–8) and Langslow (2012: 85–110), noting in particular his innovative lexical usages (see §2.2.2).

108 For the complex relationship between Galen and the Atticising movement see Swain (1996: 56–63); although Galen had been ‘reared on the canonical texts, and was thus well equipped to write atticising Greek’ he instead preferred to make use of the learned language of the educated classes; cf. Tejada (2009: 59), who
**Mediaeval vernacular**

Although not forming part of the present study’s primary corpora of textual evidence, it is nevertheless instructive to note the descriptive category of Mediaeval Greek ‘vernacular literature’ (roughly XII–XVI CE), which is incidentally pertinent in the brief diachronic treatment of individual words after LKG. It will suffice here to stress the key issues inherent in the use of the term, as noted by Hinterberger (2006: 2, 12–3); to wit, the so-called vernacular used for the composition of this kind of literature is: (a) only grammatically based on the contemporary spoken language; (b) had a vocabulary enriched by features foreign to the spoken language, including the learned language; and (c) had its own coherent system, and so cannot simply be measured in terms of its distance to either Ancient or Modern Greek. On the continuum of Markopoulos, mediaeval vernacular literature would sit somewhere between the medium and high registers, depending largely on a given text’s relation to the learned language of contemporary works (including those with clear Atticising tendencies, e.g. the *Alexiad*); on Porter’s continuum, it would probably be situated somewhere between the non-literary and literary registers. In both models it would exhibit considerable internal variation.

**Concluding Remarks**

As has been stressed above, it is important that we always keep in mind the variation inherent in both register and genre when examining, not only the papyrological material, but any texts that might be thought to exhibit change at either the micro- or macro-level. Such an

---

109 Strabo sits on the linguistic boundary between EKG and MKG. See Horrocks (2010: 98) for a brief overview of the emergence of Koine as a language of technical prose.

110 For an overview of mediaeval vernacular literature see Horrocks (2010: 214–20); for a more comprehensive study see Beaton (1989, esp. 160–183).

111 The language of Byzantine romances is likely a mix of oral and literary features (Horrocks, 2010: 218–19), the result of a conscious attempt, at least initially, to ‘create a new medium that would be at once literary and vernacular’ (Beaton, 1989: 183).

112 We may note here, as many others have already, the gap that remains to be filled by a grammar of Mediaeval Greek; the long overdue *Cambridge Grammar of Medieval and Early Modern Greek* is eagerly awaited. In terms of dictionaries, the *DMVL*, an ongoing project, is one of the few specialised tools available for Mediaeval vernacular Greek, though not yet available in English.
observation might well strike us as exceptionally platitudinous, but because it remains that we only have a fraction of the non-literary papyri actually produced during antiquity—particularly private letters and petitions\textsuperscript{113}—it should not be expected that non-literary papyri alone can reveal to us the breadth of the spoken language. Conversely, we cannot dismiss the validity of these documents as witnesses to the vernacular, simply because Atticistic interference might be thought to be more evident in some than in others; it is precisely this variation, stemming largely from the non-linear progression of linguistic change and the lexical diversity of the lower registers, which makes the papyri valuable evidence for the development of the diglossic situation in Greek.

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{113} It is virtually impossible to estimate how many papyri of the private letter type have not come down to us, although for petitions we can safely assume large-scale loss (see Palme, 2009: 360–1).


Case Studies

2.1 Gloss 27

2.1.1 Introduction

νηρόν ὕδωρ μηδαμώς, ἄλλα πρόσφατον, ἀχραυνές.

[Say] νηρόν (‘fresh’) water by no means, but πρόσφατον, ἀχραυνές [water].

The importance of gloss 27 has not failed to escape scholars’ notice; it is significant for providing us with an exceedingly rare, and early, example of a word that would emerge in the later history of Greek as the dominant form νερό (TD s.v.; BD s.v.). It differs slightly, however, from other entries in the Ecloga that provide anticipations of Modern Greek forms (e.g. gloss 332 βουνός),¹ in that it only indicates a transitional phase, where νηρόν was still an adjectival component of the expression νηρόν ὕδωρ, and not a yet a substantive.² The issue of its substantivisation, since it was first noted in a lexicographical work by Sophocles (1860: 440, s.v. νερόν), has depended invariably on Phrynichus’ gloss for two primary reasons: (a) to qualify more precisely what kind of water is being referred to; and (b) to shed light on the earliest period of a development for which there is virtually no direct evidence.

While we can only use the earliest attestations of substantival νηρόν as a reliable terminus post quem, it is nevertheless reasonable to assume that gloss 27 reflects some kind of contemporary linguistic reality; what is exceptionally difficult to ascertain is whether this process was nearing completion in Phrynichus’ time, or if it remained in an incipient stage during III CE. Of course, the written record cannot contribute directly to the resolution of this problem, but it remains necessary to examine the evidence, which we have at our disposal, carefully. As will be shown, the significance of (a) is not a particularly salient issue within the papyrological evidence, which, as Dickey (2012: 189) notes, does not make apparent specific contexts for types of water; the Attic evidence, though, is typically clear in this regard, a fact that would have undoubtedly informed Phrynichus’ reference to the adjectives πρόσφατον

---

¹ A long and unusually descriptive gloss in Book Two, where Phrynichus opposes Atticism to the use of words from dialects other than Attic (ὑδόγχημον καὶ μιξοβάρβαρου, unacceptable and half-barbarian) (Strobel, 2011: 138); on the borrowing of βουνός from Doric-speaking areas see Crespo (2012: 254) and Lee (1983: 114); see also Lee (1983: 114) for its occurrence in the Pentateuch and the papyri. For its use in SMG see e.g. BD s.v. βουνό; for the modern dialects see HD s.v.

² See Jannaris, Grammar §150c, n. 2; Dickey (2012: 189).
and ἀκραυφνές in both the Ecloga and the Praeparatio Sophistica. Our primary concern for this case study, as it is for the others, is the trends that may be extrapolated from the (meagre) evidence for the nominalisation of νηρόν in the lower registers—this, naturally, predisposes us to the utilisation of non-papyrological texts composed in the lower registers as suitable comparanda. Accordingly, the comparatively high frequency of ὕδωρ in all registers up to the mediaeval period needs here to be understood in the context of Atticism and diglossia, which ipso facto guaranteed its continued prestige and influence across the register continuum.

2.1.2 Types of ὕδωρ

As the GE (s.v. 1. νηρός) notes, Phrynichus’ dictum implies that the phrase νηρὸν ὕδωρ may have already been in fairly widespread use during his lifetime. There are similar glosses in the lexicographer’s Praeparatio Sophistica (39.5 ἀκραυφνές ὕδωρ’ τὸ ὁμιγεὶς καὶ καθαρὸν ἔτερος ἐπιφονής) and the Antiatticista (Antiatt. α 102 ἀκραυφνές ὕδωρ’ Ἀριστοφάνης Ἀμφιαράω), although neither prescribes, or proscribes, the use of νηρός. Rutherford (1881: 113) rightly pointed out that the more usual phrase in Attic was καθαρὸν ὕδωρ (e.g. Eur. Hipp. 210 καθαρῶν ὑδάτων; Plat. Laws 736b καθαρῶτατον ἔσται τὸ συρρέον ὕδωρ),6 while ἀκραυφνής is a rarely attested word in Attic literature of V BCE—a single instance occurs in a fragment of Aristophanes where it qualifies ὕδωρ (fr. 34 PCG iii.2 ἀκραυφνές ὕδωρ), as indicated by the gloss of the Antiatticista. In the non-literary papyri ὕδωρ is never

3 The contraction εα > η in νηρός was not standard in Attic, cf. Doric χρής for χρέας (LSJ s.v. χρής; see Schwzyer, Grammatik, 250 and Thumb, Hellenismus, 95–6). See SM, Grammar, §51, 56 for the rules of contraction in Attic regarding εα.

4 Compare P.Oxy. LVI, 147, where the editor (Sirivianou) infers the currency of the phrase from Phrynichus’ criticism of it as ‘un-Attic’.

5 Note Rutherford’s comment that Phrynichus ‘is in error’: apart from showing (again) his own Atticistic tendency, the observation draws attention to the lexicographer’s apparent oversight (or wilful ignorance) in not considering good examples of καθαρὸν ὕδωρ in writers, such as Plato, who would for him have been prime exemplars of pure Attic (see Strobel (2011: 159–60)).

6 See LSJ s.v. καθαρός I.2 for the specific sense and more exx.

7 Parker (2007: 259–60); in Eur. Alc. 1052 the sense is ‘inviolate’ (LSJ s.v. ἀκραυφνής II), while the lexicographers refer to its primary sense, ‘pure’, for water (LSJ s.v. I). See also below for the word’s significance in dictionaries of SMG.
ἀκραιφνές or καθαρόν, since it is *inter alia* mostly water used for purposes of irrigation⁸ (see MM s.v. ὕδωρ), e.g.:  

*PFay.* 110.15, 17 (September 11, 94 CE) καὶ τὸ[...] ἑλαξίωνας τὸ δεύτερον | ὕδωρ[...] ποτ[...]άτωσαν, καὶ διάβα εἰς | Διο[...]σ[...]α] καὶ γνωθι εἰ πεπότισται ὁ [ἑ]λαξίων δυσὶ ὕδασι καὶ δεδ[...]ξ[...]ν[...].

And let them irrigate the oliveyards for the second time, and go over to Dionysias and find out whether the oliveyard has been watered twice and dug. (trans. APIS)

*SB XIV* 11938.57, 59 (ca. 246–249 CE) πηγ(α[...] β... ὕδωρ ἐπί τῆς πηγῆς | μὴ Ἴουντα δὲ | ὕδρευ(μα) [... ἐχούσης ὕδωρ καὶ οὐ Ἴουσης ...  

2 wells ... [have] water at the well but it is not running; irrigation system 9 ... [well] having water and not running ...

And, even when occasionally used with reference to potable water, there is no qualifying adjective, apart from the fixed expression εἰς πιεῖν, e.g.:  

*PFlor.* I 101.8 (April 20(?), 91 CE) καὶ χορηγῆσαις ἡμῖν ὕδωρ | εἰς πεῖν ἅχ[...] οὗ ἐξβόμεν τῷ θερισμο(ῦ) τῶν α(ύτῶν) ἁρουρ(ῶν).  

And you will supply us with drinking water until which time we withdraw from the harvest of the same arourai.

*PFouad.* I 29.5 (224 CE) τοῦ υἱοῦ μου Σατύρου περὶ δυσμή ἡλίου ἐξελθόντος εἰς τὸ γεμίσε ὕδωρ εἰς πεῖν, | διὰ τὸ ἐν τῇ προκειμένη κόμη νείλαιον ὕδωρ | μὴ εἶναι ἀλλὰ ἀπὸ μακρόθεν γεμίζεσθαι ἀπὸ πηγῶν.

My son Satyros had gone out to fill up with drinking water, since the water of the Nile no longer reaches the aforesaid village (*Βακχιάς*) but must be collected from faraway springs.

### 2.1.3 I–III CE: A Single Instance

For I–III CE DDbDP returns approximately 105 instances of ὕδωρ,⁹ but νηρόν is used neither as a substantival equivalent for ὕδωρ, nor to qualify it (i.e. Phrynichus’ νηρόν ὕδωρ).¹⁰ There

---

⁸ Note that for the substantive νηρόν (and its variant forms), the kind of water, e.g. for drinking, washing etc., is never immediately clear from the context as it is for ὕδωρ (see below); cf. Dickey (2012: 189).

⁹

¹⁰
are, however, a few examples of adjectival νηρός, modifying things that could be considered ‘fresh’ (LSJ s.v. I; GE s.v.); the earliest instances are in two III BCE papyri, PCair.Zen. IV 59616.7, 11 (ca. 263–229 BCE) νηρός, and PTebt. III(2) 867.89, 231 (ca. 225–200 BCE) νηρόν, where the adjective is used substantively with reference to fish. We also find in an ostracon of ca. 144–145 CE a single instance of ‘fresh fish’, O Claud. II 242.4 ἵθιόδια νηρά.

The only other instance of νηρός in our date range is in a list of foodstuffs; where its meaning is rendered unclear by the inventorial style and difficult vocabulary:

*SPP* XXII 75.57 (III CE) νηροῦ Ἀρχαῖ ἅ( ) ὅ

Previous attention has been given to κνηδίων (ll. 7, 16, 37, 52, 57), but other specific instances from the papyrus are not otherwise discussed anywhere, nor cited in any lexicographical work. On account of l. 28 ὁφαρίον μ( ) ολε (of fish ? 135) and the invariable repetition of other kinds of foodstuffs (e.g. ἐξέλον [9], λαχάνον [3]), it seems less likely that νηροῦ would refer to fish, particularly given the comparatively large number that follows; this is the only item in the list that includes such a large number (1322) before the unspecified measure. However, it is somewhat similar to the two instances of νηρόν (Genitives of measure) just mentioned (PTebt. III(2) 867.89, 231), both of which are accompanied by similarly large numbers (Εσος 5276, [Δεξ] 4969), although the genitive singular and the uncertain abbreviation make any translation here difficult. Alternatively, there may be a contrast implicit between νηροῦ and ὁφαρίον (cf. also l. 17 γάρου) that is simply unclear to us. The best available *comparandum*, though dating to VI–VII CE, is in *SB* XVI 12703, where νεροῦ (3 times) appears to refer to potable water (§2.1.5).

---

9 Based on a lemmatised search on DDbDP (as at 3 August 2016); the count is approximate since DDbDP counts only hits and not individual instances.

10 The Byzantine redaction of the *Physiologus* contains two instances of νερόν (15.bis.8–9 οὐδὲ πίνει νερόν καθαρόν ... ἀλλὰ θάλασσα τὸ νερόν των πτέρυξιν αὐτοῦ), although it has been variously dated between V–VI CE and XII CE (see Scott, 1998: 431 n. 5). Cf. the gloss of Orion of Thebes in the *Etym. Magn.* (597.43–49 ἔρων ... καὶ ζίσος ἡ συνήθεις τρέψασα τὸ α εἰς ε, ἔγει νερόν (= Etymol. [110.1–5]), which, on account of its complex transmission, cannot likewise be dated with certainty.


13 It is worth noting here the secondary meaning provided in *GE* (s.v. 2. νηρός ‘ichthyological, a fish’), although the editions of both of the references cited (Aelius Herodian, Oppian) are not secure, particularly that of Aelius Herodian (see Dickey, 2007: 75–6).
2.1.4 III–V CE

Aside from two instances dating to early IV CE where the adjective qualifies emmer\(^\text{14}\) (uncontracted in *PCair.Isid*. 11.42 πιστικίου | νεωφοῦ, but contracted in *PCair.Isid*. 49.6 πιστικίου | νεφοῦ),\(^\text{15}\) the remaining examples date after III CE and are used as nouns corresponding to ὅδος. The earliest such examples of νηρόν among the papyri date to 439 CE, in a sworn declaration from Karanis concerning disputes over water rights:\(^\text{16}\)

*PHaun.* III 58.8, 13 μηδὲς τῆς κώμης ἐξουσεύσει ἀναλαβίνυι νειρόν εἰς τῷ Θανεσάμην ... εἴ [τι] τινα εὐρήσκομεν κατίνον τῆς αὐτῆς κώμης Καρανίδος ἀναλαμβάνον<τα> νειρόν ...

Nobody from the village shall have the authority to draw water at Thanesamen ... if we find any basin of the same village of Karanis drawing any water ... (trans. Haug)

The next instance occurs in *PSI* III 165 (441/42 CE),\(^\text{17}\) produced only a few years later,\(^\text{18}\) where one Mousaios orders a shipment of wine for workers that had filled a newly constructed reservoir, II. 2–3 ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ | ἐν ἡ ἀπελάβαμεν τὸν νηρόν. The interchange between and η and τ (ετ), symptomatic of the process of iotacism, is common for the period;\(^\text{19}\) we may note that the only other instance of graphic interchange in *PSI* III 165, l. 3 προκιμένου, which immediately follows νηρόν, may suggest that the writer was confused between νηρόν and νεφόν, rather than νηρόν. This seems even likelier when we consider that other words with η in the document do not display any such confusion (e.g. l. 4 τηρηταῖς).

Nevertheless, this is a *hapax* spelling, and it is only in the early Byzantine period that we find our first examples of the modern form, νεφόν (§2.1.5). The only other instance among the papyri of V CE maintains the original spelling, *PΩχ.* LVI 3865.35 (475–499 CE) ἡ (=εἰ) οὖν | οἶδας ὅτι ἔδω | ἀποβή τὸ νηρόν, which we see also in the earliest epigraphic attestation, the inscription of the βασιλήσαος Silko in Nubia:\(^\text{20}\)

---

\(^\text{14}\) On the issue of the particular grain to which πιστικίου refers see Bussi (2004: 549–51).

\(^\text{15}\) *PCair.Isid.* 11: December 4, 312 CE; 49.6: November 10, 309 CE.

\(^\text{16}\) For a discussion of the papyrus, in the context of irrigation and water distribution, see Haug (2012: 114–5).

\(^\text{17}\) Noted by Palmer (Palmer, *Grammar*, 40)

\(^\text{18}\) Note the date of VI CE in LSJ s.v. νηρός 1.II; for the dating of the document to 441/42 CE see Bagnall and Worp (1982: 241 n. 2).

\(^\text{19}\) See Gignac, *Phonology*, 235–73 for all the types of interchange involving the iotacistic process. See also §2.2.5.

\(^\text{20}\) See §2.2.3.
I do not allow them (sc. οἱ δεσπόται) to sit in the shade, but in the sun outside, and they did not drink water inside their houses. (trans. Hägg)

This example has been previously cited as the earliest usage of νηρόν as a substantival equivalent to οἶδως, but given the evidence just mentioned it is clear that the earliest attestations are, in fact, in documentary papyri—at the very least, on account of the less precise date for I.Prose 67, they may be considered contemporaneous. In addition to the abovementioned papyri, there are two instances of substantival νηρόν in the Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana, whose dating is largely reliant upon the provision of a reliable terminus post quem by the papyrological occurrences:

(ME 11d Dickey) βάλε νηρόν. mitte recentem.

Put in fresh water (trans. Dickey)

(ME 11n Dickey) πίωμεν νηρόν ἐκ τοῦ βαυκίδιου. bibamus recentem de gillone.

Let’s drink fresh water from the cooler (trans. Dickey)

As Dickey (2012: 189) notes, the passages in which these two examples occur in the Hermeneumata were most likely composed no earlier than the papyri just mentioned; although it is tempting here to assume early evidence for the substantivisation of νηρόν, it is important to distinguish between the function of the papyri as original witnesses to the writer’s hand, and the manuscript tradition of the Hermeneumata. The presence in the Hermeneumata of a word that was probably in wide use in the spoken language is a likely reflection of the continued influence of native Greek speakers on the text’s process of transmission; particularly so if we consider that the words were probably spelled νερόν in the archetype. In terms of types and different uses of water, within the second ME

21 The form was suspected by earlier editors and translators to be an error on the part of the stoneworker; see I. Prose, 172, FHN III, 1151 n. 786.
22 Cf. e.g. POxy. LVI, 147, where Sirivianou, notwithstanding the previous dating of PSI III 165 to VI CE (see above), does not mention PHaun. III 58; and Cook (2009: 124).
23 Cf. Dickey (2012: 189), who states that the ‘earliest substantival uses of the word come from the fifth century AD’, citing POxy. LVI 3865.35 as an example.
colloquium of the *Hermeneumata* Dickey (2012: 188) notes a semantic division between νηρόν, referring to cold potable water, and ὕδωρ, used of all other types of water—a similarly clear indication of water type is only partially recoverable in *SB* XVI 12703 (below), but otherwise the papyri do not provide clarity on this matter. Thus, these two instances in the *Hermeneumata* necessarily derive their dating from the earliest securely datable papyri, and so they are a reflection of vernacular tendencies that likely manifested themselves well after νηρόν had become a fully-fledged substantive.

2.1.5 After VI CE

Three more papyri, dating to the early Byzantine period, yield examples of the nominal use, of which two preserve the spelling νηρόν: in an invoice of workers’ expenses, *SPP* XX 244.27, 32 (VI–VII CE) (ὑπὲρ) νηροῦ φ(όλλεις) ὡς ... νηρόν (καὶ) λάχανον φ(όλλεις) ἵ (the meaning here may plausibly be of fish; cf. *PTebt*. III(2) 867.89, 231 and *SPP* XXII 75.57), and on the slightly damaged verso of a private letter, *PMünch*. III 131verso.8, 9 (VII? CE) ἔνεκεν τοῦ νηροῦ, ὡς θέλει δοθῆναι | τὸν νηρὸν ὀλλ[.]ντος. The third document, a list of expenses, provides us with our only examples of the spelling with ε among the papyri, *SB* XVI 12703.(2)2, (3(2), (5)4 (VI–VII CE) νερ(οῦ) φ(όλλις) α ... νερ(οῦ) φ(... νεροῦ) (καὶ) λάχανον φ(όλλεις) α[...]; the reference here is most likely to potable water. The earliest attestation of the form νερόν, however, occurs not in the papyri, but in literary material composed in LKG. We find the following example in the *Sayings of the Desert Fathers*:

Ioannes o Kolobos 7 (*PG* 65:205B) Καὶ ἀνέστη τις πρεσβύτερος μεγάς δοῦναι τὸ καυκάλιον τοῦ νεροῦ· καὶ οὐδεὶς κατεδέξατο λαβεῖν αὐτὸ παρ’ αὐτό, εἰ μὴ μόνος Ἰωάννης ὁ κολοβός.

And an elder priest got up to offer a cup of water, and nobody accepted to take it from him, except Ioannes o Kolobos.


27 Compare passage 16c in the colloquium Montepessulanum (Mp) (νηράν ἐσχομεν καλήν, frigidam habuimus bonam) where it is not clear whether νηράν is an adjective or noun (again, the issue is complicated by the possibility that the text may have been irretrievably altered in transmission), and so cannot be reliably used for dating the passage (Dickey, 2015: 130).

28 Cf. Sirivianou’s uncertainty in *POxy*. LVI, 147: ‘perhaps [used of water].’

As Lee (2014: 29 n. 19, 36) observes, this example is noted in the dictionaries of Lampe (s.v. νηρός) and Sophocles (s.v. νερόν). If, as he observes, this saying does indeed represent the original words of the monk, it would not be implausible to date it to the earlier part of V CE. This accords well with the three papyri, noted above, that date to the middle of the same century, although it remains by far the earliest instance anywhere of the form with ε. There is a near contemporaneous example of νηρόν in the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon—the earliest of its kind—but only if we assume that the minutes were compiled and published around 454/5 CE:

*Acta Conc. Oec.* II, 1, 3, p. 50 μὰ τὰς δυνάμεις τοῦ θεοῦ, νηρὸν ἐζήτησα καὶ οὐκ ἔδωκάν μοι.

By the powers of God, I asked for cold water and was not given it. (trans. Price and Gaddis).

Curiously, this particular example is not cited in any significant lexicographical work; its omission in Lampe (s.v. νηρός) is especially notable, given that the Acts are cited in other entries. Nevertheless, for both of the above texts we may note that ὕδωρ remains the preferred noun for water: 166 instances in the Sayings; 109 in the Acts. This trend continues into later Byzantine literature, where νερόν is still by comparison rarely attested, only increasing in use in later demotic literature (see exx. in *DMVL* s.v. νερόν). Based on this evidence alone, the paucity of examples among both documentary and literary texts up to the mediaeval period does not provide solid support for the presupposition that νηρὸν ὕδωρ was common enough in late II CE to warrant Phrynichus’ attention—a lack of textual evidence does not, of course, mitigate the notion per se, since non-literary papyri or works composed in the lower registers of the Koine (e.g. the Sayings) are themselves only proximate witnesses to contemporary spoken Greek (see §1.5.1). The existence of Phrynichus’ dictum may well attest to an incipient stage of the nominalisation of νηρόν, but the data yielded for ὕδωρ from the non-literary evidence show clearly that through the Koine period, and beyond, it remained the preferred noun for water in these kinds of documents too.

---


31 See LBG s.v. νερόν; Cook (2009: 124 n. 54).

32 For brief notes on the history of νερό(ν) in the modern dialects see Shipp (1979: 402–3); for the remnants of ὕδωρ in the dialects see LA (s.v.). It is worth noting here the preservation in Tsakonian of ὕδωρ as ύο (DTD s.v. ύο), with a genitive υβάτου in certain local variants (cf. ύδατος).
Finally, it is instructive, in my view, to compare our evidence here to the similarly gradual adoption of ἀκμήν as an adverbial equivalent to ἐτί (§2.2). This allows us to highlight the enduring influence of forms preserved in higher registers, which accounts for the continued dominance of ὑδωρ through to the late appearance of substantial numbers of demotic literary works, and the subsequent afterlife given (mostly) to its oblique residua by various non-vernacular specialist varieties. Thus, in the HNC we find that νερό is clearly more common than ὑδωρ, with the nominative case accounting for 48 per cent of the instances of the former, but only 6.25 per cent of the latter (see Table 1).

In spite of the eventual displacement of ὑδωρ by νερό in Modern Greek, it is noteworthy that the influence of diglossia, via the literary prestige afforded to the former by Atticism, caused variation, not merely in the lower registers, but also within individual texts on this particular end of the continuum, such as the Acts and the Sayings. This factor is particularly significant in our analysis since these very same documents are our best evidence for the spoken language: given that they are only approximate witnesses to the vernacular, it is not unreasonable to assume that the periphrasis νηρὸν ὑδωρ, and its descendant νηρόν, were in fairly widespread use in speech—Phrynichus’ gloss is, in this respect, to be considered reliable evidence for this lexical innovation.

In SMG it is typically used in scientific terminology and literary expressions, e.g. βορό ὑδωρ, a semantic loan of French eau lourde ‘heavy water’ (see TD s.v. ὑδωρ, BD s.v.), and to form new (mainly scientific) compounds with the prefix υδρ- (BD s.v. υδρο- κ. υδρό- κ. υδρο-), particularly in chemistry. It should be noted that this use of the prefix in Modern Greek is itself an example of what the BD terms ελληνογενής ξένως όρος, to wit, a term formed outside of Greek (chiefly in French, English and German) with Greek constituent elements (cf. EDMG s.v. υδρο- ‘Its prevalence in scientific terms occurred through the hydro of the European languages’); the prefix υδρ- was equally productive in ancient Greek (cf. entries in LSJ with the prefix υδρ-).

---

33 In SMG it is typically used in scientific terminology and literary expressions, e.g. βορό ὑδωρ, a semantic loan of French eau lourde ‘heavy water’ (see TD s.v. ὑδωρ, BD s.v.), and to form new (mainly scientific) compounds with the prefix υδρ- (BD s.v. υδρο- κ. υδρό- κ. υδρο-), particularly in chemistry. It should be noted that this use of the prefix in Modern Greek is itself an example of what the BD terms ελληνογενής ξένως όρος, to wit, a term formed outside of Greek (chiefly in French, English and German) with Greek constituent elements (cf. EDMG s.v. υδρο- ‘Its prevalence in scientific terms occurred through the hydro of the European languages’); the prefix υδρ- was equally productive in ancient Greek (cf. entries in LSJ with the prefix υδρ-).
### Table 1 HNC: νερό and ύδωρ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>νερό</th>
<th>ύδωρ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sg.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>nom./acc.</em></td>
<td>νερό</td>
<td>3.644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>gen.</em></td>
<td>νερού</td>
<td>1.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pl.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>nom./acc.</em></td>
<td>νερά</td>
<td>1.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>gen.</em></td>
<td>νερών</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Archaic</em></td>
<td>νερόν</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>7664</td>
<td>1472</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 Gloss 93

2.2.1 Introduction

ἀκμήν ἀντὶ τοῦ ἔτη Ξενοφόντα λέγοντι ἄπαξ (Anab. 4.3.26)34 αὐτῷ κεχοήθαι, σὺ δὲ φυλάττου χρήσθαι, λέγε δὲ ἔτη.

ἀκμήν (“still”) instead of ἔτη: they say Xenophon once used it, but you beware of using it and say ἔτη. (trans. Lee)

In this gloss Phrynichus urges the reader to guard her- or himself against using ἀκμήν as an adverbial equivalent to ἔτη, citing Xenophon, an Attic writer, as an example of the condemned usage.35 As Lee (2013: 289–90) notes, it is instructive here that the lexicographer has not hesitated to name and shame one of the ἀρχαῖοι—he is responding here to the claims of other, contemporary Atticists who would have probably said (λέγοντι) that the hapax of ἀκμήν as a temporal adverb in the Anabasis qualified it as acceptable Attic.36 Phrynichus mentions Xenophon in one other gloss in the Ecloga (62), where he condemns him in even stronger terms, writing that ‘he commits an outrage against his native tongue by saying ὀδμή [instead of ὀσμή]’ (παρανομεῖ [...] εἰς τὴν πάτριος διάλεκτον λέγων ὀδμή),37 but is

34 The sense here is ‘just then’ (see further below): καὶ τὰ σκευοφόρα τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ ὃ ὀχλος ἀκμὴν διέβαινε (And now, with the Greek baggage train and the camp followers in the very act of crossing (trans. Brownson)).


36 Cf. gloss 255, in which Phrynichus warns the reader unequivocally ‘we should guard ourselves against an hapax’ (trans. Strobel) (τῷ ἄπαξ εἰρήνηθαι ἐφυλαξάμεθ’ ὃν); cf. also Strobel (2011: 164), who identifies two other instances where he condemns the validity of the hapax: glosses 64 and 129 (both of Aristophanes).

37 Cf. Rutherford (1881: 163–4), who concluded that ὀδμή ‘must be restored’ in the MSS of Xenophon, based largely on the alleged authority of the commentary of the ancient and mediaeval grammarians, but driven also by his open disdain for the historian’s supposedly corrupt, non-Attic diction, which he expresses in an appropriately Victorian manner: ‘Moreover, not only the diction, but the style [of Xenophon] as a whole lacks the masculine simplicity and manly self-restraint which marks all genuine Attic work, and has many of the characteristics of the feminine Ionic’. Rutherford’s Atticist posturing often obscures what is at times exceptional commentary for certain glosses; cf. e.g. his list of ‘un-Attic’ words in the works of Xenophon (164–74) (cf. similar sentiments on the value of Rutherford by Lee (2011: 288); and Strobel (2011: 95)).
spared the more frequent, and often intense, condemnation that the Attic comedians receive.\textsuperscript{38} The historian is also referenced in a roughly concordant entry in the lexicon of Moeris (\textit{\alpha} 149),\textsuperscript{39} but the \textit{Antiatticista (Antiatt. \alpha 21)}\textsuperscript{40} cites instead Hyperides,\textsuperscript{41} whom Phrynichus twice condemns in the \textit{Ecloga (glosses 309 and 311)}.\textsuperscript{42} Rutherford (1881: 203–4), writing many centuries after Phrynichus, is also exceedingly critical of Xenophon’s style, and by agreeing with the sentiment of \textit{gloss} 93 fails to grasp the problem inherent in simply dismissing the form as a departure from proper Attic usage.\textsuperscript{43} It may have been convenient for Phrynichus to dismiss Xenophon as a writer of genuine Attic prose—\textit{not} even Plato and Thucydides ranked in the lexicographer’s first tier of classical Attic authors\textsuperscript{44}—but the historian was nevertheless writing largely in the Attic dialect, and his adverbial use of \textit{ἀρχάμὴν} clearly anticipates a sense that is attested many times in the EKG prose of Polybius.\textsuperscript{45}

\textsuperscript{38} See Strobel (2011: 160). Xenophon is cited for more informative and descriptive reasons by Aelius Dionysius (Strobel, 2011: 50), and even cited as a witness of good Attic by the \textit{Antiatticista (Antiatt. \epsilon 24)}: εὔειδῆς· οὐτως φασιν ἀδόκιμον εἶναι τὸ ἄνθρωπος, ἀλλ’ ὁ καλὸς Ἑλεοράων ἀπομιμηθοῦσαν γ’ (3.11.4) (εὔειδῆς; so they say that this word is condemned, but the noble Xenophon (has it) 3 times in his \textit{Memorabilia}); cf. Lee (2013: 290 n. 21).

\textsuperscript{39} ἀρχάμὴν οὐδεὶς τῶν Ἀττικῶν ἄντι τοῦ ἔτη, ἣ μόνος Ἑλεοράων ἐν τῇ Ἀναβάσει (4.3.26)· "Ἐλλήνες δὲ χρόνται (No one among the Attic writers (uses) ἀρχάμην instead of ἔτη, than Xenophon alone in the \textit{Anabasis}; but Hellenes might use [it]). For a discussion of whether Moeris borrowed from Phrynichus’ \textit{gloss} in composing his, or if they both used a common source, see Strobel (2011:177)—she concludes that the brevity and clarity of the entries that are similar to Phrynichus’ in Moeris’ lexicon show that Moeris \textit{used}, rather than \textit{copied} the material. See also Strobel (2011: 210) for the unclear distinction between "Ἐλλήνες and Ἀττικοὶ in Moeris’ lexicon.

\textsuperscript{40} ἀρχάμην ἄντι τοῦ ἔτη. Υπερείδης Ἡπέρ Κρατίνου (fr. 137 S. = 116 J.) (ἀρχάμην; instead of ἔτη. Hypereides \textit{In Defence of Cratinus}).

\textsuperscript{41} Cf. Ph. α 769.

\textsuperscript{42} \textit{Gloss} 309: ἐγκάθετος· οὕτως ὑπερείδης ἀπερριμένος (Ἐγκάθετος; Hypereides (uses it) negligently in this manner). \textit{Gloss} 311: ἐμπυρισμός· οὕτως ὑπερείδης ἡμελημένος (Ἐμπυρισμός; Hypereides (uses it) negligently in this manner).

\textsuperscript{43} He writes of Xenophon, in his commentary of \textit{gloss} 93, that he ‘is past praying for’; cf. Shipp (1979: 51).

\textsuperscript{44} See §1.1 and Strobel (2011: 159).

\textsuperscript{45} See Krumbacher (1885: 501–2) for a list of the instances of ἀρχάμην in Polybius.
2.2.2 Literature and papyri BCE

As was demonstrated by Lobeck (1820: 123–4), the simple equivalence that existed between ἀκμήν and ἔτι in Phrynichus’ time in fact had an earlier, transitional stage, where ἀκμήν had a subtler meaning roughly equivalent to ἀρτι (‘just then’).\(^6\) This is most likely the sense carried in the Anabasis, although, as Krumbacher (1885: 505–7) argued, one could as easily read the sense of ‘still’ into the later examples (particularly Polybius) cited by Lobeck (1820: 123).\(^7\) There are only two fragments, of Aeschylus (Aesch. fr. 339a TrGF ἀκμήν δ’ ὀσσα τὰ κύμβαλ’ ἤχεί) and Menander\(^8\) (Men. fr. 504 PCG vi.2 ἀκμήν ἐκείνος ὑν-νέος ἄρτι ἐνσκευάζετο), where ἀκμήν seems to have a sense similar to that in Xenophon (cf. LSJ s.v. ἀκμήν A; DGE s.v. ἀκμή IV.2). Even if we were to assume the loss of other such instances elsewhere in Attic literature, they likely would have occurred in Comedy, which would not contradict Phrynichus’ general disdain for the genre, or, more generally, the ποιηταί.\(^9\)

The form ἀκμήν is overall rarely attested in the non-literary papyri: the search query #ἀκμην# yields 11 results across the entire date range in DDbDP;\(^50\) of these instances, 6 are within I–II CE, while the rest are later; for the centuries BCE there are no examples. It is noteworthy that the proliferation of the adverbial use in Polybius is not at all reflected in the contemporary vernacular papyri. Thus, it is instructive that, although we have reliable examples of the adverbial form used in the sense of ‘still’ in the prose of Polybius and the Idylls of Theocritus (4.60 ἀκμάν\(^51\) γ’, ὁ δείλαιως; 25.164 ἴν νέος ἀκμήν), there is not even a

---


\(^7\) As Krumbacher (1885: 506) points out, Lobeck cites Polybius (ὅταν ἀκμήν ἄρχηται ἔριν) incorrectly: 12.4.391 instead of 12.4.14. Cf. however Gautier (1911: 67), who states that Krumbacher ‘was wrong’ to deny Lobeck’s equation of the adverb to ἀρτι.

\(^8\) For the position of the 17 Menander glosses in the Ecloga see Strobel (2011: 160–4).

\(^9\) See Strobel (2011: 160 n. 640). New Comedy is referred to directly by Phrynichus in gloss 322 (παρὰ τινὶ τῶν νεωτέρων χωμοθέων) as a source of incorrect usages. As Strobel (2011: 159–60) notes, Old Comedy may be considered a close reflection of V BCE vernacular Attic, while the language of both Middle and New Comedy is more representative of the Attic dialect’s ‘Panhellenic status’ in IV BCE, so Phrynichus’ disapproval is understandable. Attic tragedians, however, are not nearly as often mentioned in the Ecloga: Euripides is cited once (gloss 318); Sophocles twice (glosses 157 and 351)—in each instance as examples of the condemned usage. Aeschylus is not mentioned.

\(^50\) As at 3 August 2016.

\(^51\) As Hunter (1999: 23) notes, Theocritus integrated ‘Doric’ forms and features that may never have been used ‘in any real speech community’. The Doric long ἄ, characteristic of most of Theocritus’ Idylls, may very likely have still been a feature in the Syracusan Doric of Theocritus’ day, although the form ἀκμάν (not
single analogous instance in any surviving non-literary material. Apart from the 16 instances of the adverbial use of ἄκμην noted by Krumbacher (1885: 501–2) in Polybius, there are 5 examples in Strabo’s Geography that likely date to the end of I BCE, and its frequency in literature is maintained during the first three centuries CE (see §2.2.4).

In terms of our papyrological range of I–III CE, the issue of a subtler or, as Krumbacher (1885: 507) remarks, ‘vaguer’, sense of the adverb in Xenophon, or even Polybius, is a moot one; as will be shown, the very few examples of adverbial ἄκμην in the non-literary papyri convey clearly the sense of ‘still’, ‘yet’. In spite of the evidence that we have for ἄκμην, across all the evidence types, ἕτερον is by far the more common form across all periods up to EBG—in the Demosthenic corpus alone there are 332 instances—and so we are not attempting here to collate numerous examples of adverbial ἄκμην so that we might mitigate the veracity of Phrynichus’ prescription, but rather, finding evidence of adequate significance to show that he had a reasonable motivation for issuing it. Let us now consider the inscptional and papyrological evidence.

2.2.3 Inscriptions

In the inscptional material, out of a total of 18 instances returned by the same search query on PHI, there are only three instances of the adverbial use. But in the absence of any occurrences in the papyrological evidence they constitute important evidence for the semantic development of ἄκμην. The earliest of these three examples is in a long decree from

strictly adverbial) is found in only two other places in literature: in Pindar (Pind. N. 4.63) and Aeschylus (Aesch. Eum. 374). See Hunter (1999: 21–4) for an overview of Theocritus’ language.

52 Strab. 1.3.13; 4.6.7; 7.3.1; 13.1.25; 17.1.27 (based on a lemma query for ἄκμην in TLG); cf. Krumbacher (1885: 502), who notes only a single instance (1.3.13).

53 See LSJ s.v. ἄκμην A and DGE s.v. ἄκμην IV.1 for the salient instances cited in most discussions of this adverb.

54 For the literary material, Krumbacher’s (1885: 498–521) compendious collection of instances of ἄκμην, including both the mediaeval and modern dialectal evidence, remains a mostly reliable, if slightly dated and incomplete, reference. His data may be supplemented by the electronic databases at our disposal, especially for material not discovered, or published, during his lifetime. This present study may be considered a contribution to both Krumbacher and Moulton and Milligan (s.v. ἄκμην), who, understandably, do not cite any examples from the papyri (although both reference selected inscriptions).

55 The search query #ἀκμαν#, for the Doric form ἄκμαν (cf. above the instance in Theocritus), on PHI returns 4 examples, of which none are used adverbially (as at 3 August 2016).
Pergamum in honour of the benefactor Diodoros Pasparos (MDAI(A) 32 (1907: 264) column II 61 (= IGR 4.293) καὶ ἀκμὴν ἐπ’ εὐεργεσία διουκουμένου εὐχάριστον), which Hepding (MDAI(A) 32 (1907: 264)) briefly notes is comparable to the sense applied to ἀκμὴν by Dittenberger in one of the other 3 instances, a V CE inscription from Nubia (OGIS 1 201, n. 20). This inscription remains in situ, inscribed on the wall of the temple of Mandulis at Kalabsha in southern Egypt (ancient Nubia).57

I.Prose 67.13 (= OGIS 1 201 = SB V 8536) (before ca. 450 CE) Ὅτε ἐγεγονέμην βασιλίσσα, οὐκ ἀπήλθον ὀλος ὀπίσω τῶν ἄλλων βασιλέων ἄλλα ἀκμὴν ἐμπροσθεν αὐτῶν

When I (Σιλκώ) had become king (basiliskos), I did not by any means proceed behind the other kings (basileus), but well ahead of them. (trans. Tomas Hågg)

Dittenberger’s argument, that the sense of the adverb is most likely an extension of that contained by the original meaning of the noun ἀκμή,58 to wit, ‘valde, magnopere, longe’, is maintained by LSJ (s.v. ἀκμή Α.II ‘perh., = much’), DGE (s.v. ἀκμή IV.1 ‘con mucho’) and Moulton and Milligan (s.v. ἀκμήν), who directly reference his note. It seems remarkable that this specific sense of the adverbial form only occurs in two inscriptions written five centuries apart, although they seem to have an antecedent in a fragment of Cratinus (Cratin. fr. 408 PCG iv) where the meaning is equivalent to ἀκμαίος (cf. LSJ s.v. Α.ΙΙ; GE).

In spite of the exceptionally small representation for both of these senses, they are still evidence for a semantic variation that does not accord with Phrynichus’ simple equivalency between ἀκμήν and ἔτι.59 The lexicographer may have also been aware of the few instances in literature where ἀκμήν is reinforced by ἔτι (LSJ s.v. ἀκμή Α; GE), which, on account of his stringent criteria for proper Attic, would quite easily have been dismissed as the lexical confusion of writers who were simply too far removed from the likes of contemporary Atticists like Cornelianus. This strengthening, however, does not seem to have been widely

57 For a discussion of the text, including the issues of dating and historical interpretation, see FHN III, 1147–53 (including a list of citations and discussions in previous literature); see also Bernard’s commentary in the latest standard edition of the text’s corpus (I. Prose).
58 For the original primary meaning see LSJ s.v. ἀκμή Α.ΙΙ ‘highest or culminating point of anything’; Dittenberger (OGIS 1 201, n. 20) writes: ‘Sed ei qui a nominis ἀκμή vi ac notione proficisctur, veri similius videbitur valde, magnopere, longe’ potius hic vim adverbi esse, qua indicetur eum non modo praecedere reliquis, sed longo intervallo eos post se relinquare.’.
59 See Lee (2013: 290).
used; there are only 4 examples in literary texts before II CE and a single inscription from 5 BC. Of these 5 literary instances, 3 are in the order ἀκμήν ἔτι, and the other ἔτι ἀκμήν. The earliest 2 instances of the former occur in Polybius (14.4.9; 15.6.7), while the other is in the Gynaecelia of Soranus (2.15.3); all of these examples seem to carry the sense of ‘still’, without any reference to a subtler temporal meaning. The same work of Soranus also contains the sole example of ἔτι ἀκμήν (1.26.5), and it too conveys the sense of ‘still’. The same sense is again carried in a 3 BCE inscription from Psenemphaia in the Nile Delta (I.Prose 49.34 (= I.Delta 899:2 = SB V 8267) καὶ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ Θέσου ἔτι ἀκμήν παϊδά | ὁντα ἄσπιδείωι), which also includes 3 instances where ἔτι, coupled with καί, is not used temporally, but rather as an adverb of degree (ll. 23, 26 ἔτι δὲ καί, l. 50 ἔτι καί) with the sense of ‘besides’ (LSJ s.v. ἔτι II; GE s.v. B). By comparison, the papyri within our date range yield fewer instances of ἀκμήν, and do not exhibit the same variation in sense.

2.2.4 Papyri of I–III CE

As mentioned above, the first three centuries CE yield similar numbers of adverbial ἀκμήν in the literary material; in addition to a single instance in the New Testament (Matt. 15:16), there are examples, inter alia, in Josephus (AJ 19.118.2), Plutarch (e.g. De glor. Ath 346C) and Sextus Empiricus (e.g. Pyr. 2.11.7), whose 7 examples are all of the adverbial use.\(^{61}\) Josephus and Plutarch were writing about a century earlier than Phrynichus,\(^{62}\) while Sextus Empiricus’ floruit was roughly contemporary with that of the lexicographer, which accords well with the dictum. For the papyri, as with the centuries BCE, the sample is still surprisingly small; for I–III CE DDbDP returns 6 instances of the form ἀκμήν,\(^{63}\) of which 3 are adverbial. Of the 3

---

\(^{60}\) Krumbacher (1885: 502 n. 1) records the 2 examples from Polybius, translating the phrase as ‘just now’ (‘eben noch’). He also notes that ἀκμήν ἔτι occurs nowhere else, and must therefore be dismissed as either a gloss or interlinear correction. There are, of course, other examples of this strengthening (see below).

\(^{61}\) See Krumbacher (1885: 502–3) for a complete list of all the instances.

\(^{62}\) Strobel (2011: 152) notes that it is difficult to ascertain whether Phrynichus was familiar with the works of his contemporaries, including Plutarch, who is cited twice in the Ecloga in glosses 160 and 243. Gloss 243 is noteworthy for both the lexicographer’s reprimand of Plutarch’s use of σύγκρισις and, as Strobel (2011: 152) notes, the emphasis on his philosophical work, wondering how someone who ‘has come to the highest pitch of philosophy and is seemingly prudent’ can use ‘unacceptable language’ (trans. Strobel) (θαυμάζω, πῶς φιλοσοφίας ἔπ’ ἀρχον ἀφιγμένος καὶ σαφῶς εἰδὼς ὃ, ... ἐχρήσατο ἀδοκίμῳ φωνή).

\(^{63}\) Using the wildcard search query, ‘#ακμην#’ (as at 3 August 2016).
examples that are not adverbial (i.e. nominal), 2 are used with the sense of ‘prime’;\(^{64}\) POxy. III 473.6 (138–160 CE) παρὰ τὴν πρώτην ἄκμην (after his earlier prime(?));\(^{65}\) POxy. LXXIX 5210.14 (298–99 CE) εἰς γῆρας ἀρχειμένον μετὰ τὴν ἄκμην (having arrived here at old age, after my prime);\(^{66}\) and 1 with the sense of ‘time’;\(^{67}\) PMich. III 206.12 (II CE) ἀλλὰ ἄκμην | ἡ[ρ]ήσσατο (but he [chose] the right time (trans. APIS)). In fact, a lemmatised search yields only 2 other instances of ἄκμη for I–III CE: PMich. IX 532.1 ἐν ἄκμη τῆς ἡλικίας --- (in the prime of (their) manhood(?));\(^{68}\) PHaun. II 23.6 ἀνελθε ἐπιδήτης ἐν τῇ ἄκμη αὐτός ἐστιν (come up, since it (sc. τόπος) is ripe for picking). So, out of a total of 8 instances of ἄκμη in our date range 3 are adverbial forms, and similarly to the examples just mentioned, none of them date to I CE. Two of the instances are roughly contemporary; the first, in the archive of ‘Saturnila and her sons’,\(^{69}\) occurs in a letter from Sempronios, addressed to his brother Satornikos. It concerns their brother Maximos’ mourning following his wife’s death:


I have received two letters from you, one concerning the things I have made clear to our brother Maximos, the other about our lady mother, that she has been in danger and that she is still unwell. (trans. APIS)

The second is in the minutes of a trial, which concerns the activities of a village scribe. It was both written and found in Karanis:

\(^{64}\) See LSJ s.v. ἄκμη A.II ‘prime’; GE s.v. ἄκμη B ‘peak’.

\(^{65}\) The document is a decree in honour of a gymnasiarch, but the words on line 6 before πλείωσι are quite fragmentary, and so the sense is not absolutely certain; cf. MM s.v. ἄκμη ‘in accordance with the original meaning of ἄκμη’.

\(^{66}\) Translation from Maltomini and Rathbone (POxy. LXXIX).

\(^{67}\) See LSJ s.v. ἄκμη A.III; GE s.v. ἄκμη C.

\(^{68}\) Note that APIS does not have a translation for the first line of the papyrus: <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/a/apis/x-2552> as at 3 August 2016.

\(^{69}\) See Sijpensteijn (1976: 169–81); N.B. esp. 170 n.10, where the author notes that PWisc. II 84 contained originally three letters, of which the traces of 10 lines are still visible.
Those around (the village) Syros said that the village scribe had cut down wood from public land and the imperial estate, which still lies felled on the ground.

While it is notable that these two examples are roughly contemporary with Phrynichus, the sheer preponderance of \textit{ἐτι} for the same period (184 hits from a lemmatised search on DDbDP for 150–200 CE),\footnote{With the search query ‘LEX \textit{ἐτι}’ (as at 3 August 2016). This particular lemmatised search on DDbDP turns up examples of ‘\textit{κατ} ή’, which presumably it considers instances of crasis; all such hits, which I examined, were simply examples of elided \textit{κατά}. The search query #\textit{ετι}# returns 177 hits, although some of them are non-standard spellings of \textit{ἐτι}—without attempting to count each true example, a realistic estimate of the number of instances of the adverb \textit{ἐτι} for 150–200 CE would probably be around 140. Cf. e.g. \textit{PFouad} I 43 (ca. 189–90 CE), where the adverb is used in l. 18, and the dative form of \textit{ἐτος} in ll. 22, 24, 37.} even if we take into account temporal instances only, shows that \textit{ἀκμή} was not being used by significant numbers of writers of non-literary papyri. This trend itself reflects the limited use of \textit{ἀκμή} in contemporary literature (II–III CE), where it occurs mostly in works that are not Atticistic, e.g. Sextus Empiricus, Hippolytus (\textit{Comm. Dan.} 4.10.2 \textit{ἀκμή} \textit{De Ant.}; 32.4 \textit{ἐτι} \textit{γὰρ \ακμή}), pseudo-historical letters of the Second Sophistic (e.g. Ps.-Phalaris, \textit{Ep.} 92.1.9 \textit{ἀλλὰ προσεπτῆς εἰ \ακμή}; Ps.-Aeschines, \textit{Ep.} 2.4.4 \textit{ἀκμή} \textit{ἔχει}), and early Christian literature (e.g. \textit{T. Job} 7.11 \textit{ἀκμή} καὶ \textit{τὸ τοῦ σοι ἔδωκα}; Origen, \textit{Exp. in Prov.} 17.185.39 \textit{ἀκμή} δὲ ... \textit{ὑπόμενε}).

Among the Atticising writers of the Second Sophistic \textit{ἐτι} is used exclusively, excepting a few instances in pseudepigraphic works where \textit{ἀκμή} is found: Ps.-Lucian, \textit{Ocyp}. 130 \textit{καὶ νῦν μὲν \ακμή εἰς (σε ποὺς λυπεῖ μόνον)}, and Ps.-Plutarch, \textit{De Fluv.} 9.2 \textit{Μαίανδρος \ακμή} \textit{στρατηγὸς χειροτονηθεὶς}. The sense of the latter example is, in fact, largely analogous to that in the \textit{Anabasis} (4.3.26), to wit, ‘just’. We may also note here an example from the \textit{Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana} that provides us with a contemporary Latin gloss, \textit{adhuc}, for \textit{ἀκμή}. It is found in the LS (Leidense-Stephani) colloquium, likely written around II–III CE:\footnote{See Dickey (2012: 193-200).}

\textit{(LS 2e Dickey) καταμάσσω. (ἀκμή} οὐ \textit{κατέμαξα, κατέ<μ>αξα) (adhuc non terisi, terisi)
I dry (I have not yet dried, I have dried) (trans. Dickey)

Considering the central function of the *Hermeneumata*, as a glossary for Greek speakers learning Latin, and vice versa, it is reasonable to assume that ἀκμήν may have been more widespread in speech, which would accord well with the data showing that ἔτι was simply a more common form across both private and public document types of the papyri (see further below). In support of this, we may point to the single instance of ἀκμήν in the New Testament (Matt. 15:16 Ἀκμήν καὶ ὑμεῖς ἁσύνετοι ἔστε;), which occurs in reported speech, and the later, more numerous examples from the *Sayings of the Desert Fathers* (see below). In the documentary papyri, however, the frequency of ἀκμήν is simply too low to allow for the same kind of variation found in the literary evidence, which is an unexpected result, considering that the period I–IV CE contains by far more papyri than either II BCE or IV–VII CE.

The third instance from our papyri, interestingly, is found in a private letter from Coele Syria. A certain Roumas writes to his namesake asking that he send his daughter Bithilaa in the care of Ibnan(...) (Ιβνα|ν[ ̣  ̣  ̣  ̣]), either a son or attendant of a veteran named Kassianos:

*PEuphr.* 17.5 = SB XXVI 16660.5 (225–275 CE) θεοίς εὐχῆμε εἰπολαιβίν | σε ἐρεφεμένον/οίδα, κύριε, ὁτι πάνκαλον | πρός εμὲ ἐποίησας καὶ χάριτας πολλὰς ἔχω ἀπ’ ἐσοῦ καὶ ἀκμὴν οὐδεμίαν ἀπ’ αὐτῶν οὐκ ἀπέδωκα | σε τῷ ἐμῷ κυρίῳ.

I pray to the gods to receive you in good health; I know, lord, that you have done much good for me and I have received many favours from you, (and) I have not yet returned one of them to you, my lord.

The letter shares many MKG linguistic phenomena in common with Egyptian papyri; in the above excerpt we may note two types of graphic interchange (ε for αι; ἰ for ει), and the use of the second aorist ending in the siggmatic aorist (ἐποίησας). Even the paratactic construction of lines 7–9 νῦν δέ, ἔαν θεός | θέλῃ καὶ ζῶμεν καὶ ἀλλήλους | εἵδομεν, as Feissel and Gascou (2000: 200) note, very likely reflects the contemporary Koine, rather than any kind of Semitic influence. The variation and contrast between νῦν δέ (l. 4) and ἔστι δέ (l.

---

73 Dickey (2012: 11–2).
74 Feissel and Gascou (2000: 200); see esp. 199–200 for linguistic notes.
75 For interchange between αι and ε see Gignac, *Phonology*, 192–3; for ἰ and ει see 190–1.
11) is also particularly noteworthy in suggesting that the writer had a fairly developed repertoire of adverbs at his disposal, contrasting somewhat with the use of ἀκμήν; but given that this is the only instance of either ἀκμήν or ἓτι in the entire Euphrates archive, it is not nearly significant enough for any meaningful extrapolation. Although we may have reasonably expected to find more examples of adverbial ἀκμήν in the papyri up to III CE, the overwhelming use of ἓτι clearly demonstrates that the writers of papyri were, in this regard, more Atticising than Koine writers. In the very least, it is significant that there exist instances that serve to demonstrate a common spoken form that was creeping into writing, albeit very gradually.

In all the papyri on DDbDP after III CE there are only 4 more instances of adverbial ἀκμήν:

POxy. LVI 3865.29 (475–499 CE) ἀκούω γὰρ παρὰ τοῦ | κομίζοντός σου τὸ γράμμα ὧτι ἀκμήν εἰς τοὺς | ε. . . οὺς τῇ Ἀκούτου σχολάζεις ...  

For I hear from the bearer of your letter that you are still spending your time on the ... of Akutu ... (trans. Sirivianou)

POxy. LVI 3871.9 (500–699 CE) ... εἰ ἐξεῖ ἐσίν | ἀκμήν οἱ Ἡρακλεοπολῖται †. 

... if the people from the Herakleopolis are still there. (trans. Sirivianou)


And I still owe there a share.

PStras. VII 680.5 (600–625 CE) ὑπὲρ δαὶ τοῦ λαχανω[σπέ]λμου ἀκμήν οὐκ ἐφέραμεν τὴν λαμάδα αὕτου εἰς τὸ ἄλονθέσιον | [. . . ] 

But for the vegetable seed we have not yet brought his (sc. Γεωργίου) winnowing fan to the threshing floor (?) ...  

Throughout these centuries the literary material also exhibits much the same patterns as for the preceding three centuries, namely the use of ἓτι by Atticising writers (e.g. Libanius) and the less frequent—but gradually increasing—occurrence of ἀκμήν in works composed in the Koine. This increase is observed in the more numerous Christian works of this period, e.g. Evagrius, De orat. 43 (PG 79:1176) Εὰν περιβλέπηται ὁ νοῦς σου ἀκμήν ἐν τῷ καυρῷ τῆς προσευχῆς, John Chrysostom, hom. 5.22 de paen. (PG 49:306) ἀκμήν καὶ ἀπολογεῖται, and Palladius, Hist. Laus. 18.25 Εἴτε καὶ τῷ διαβόλῳ "Μὴ ἀκμήν τί σοι χρεωστῶ;“ (cf. PGen. I(2) 14.13 above). Notably, there are 8 instances from the Sayings of
the Desert Fathers, a hitherto largely overlooked source of evidence for LKG from the sixth century, e.g. Theodoros o Phereus 28 (PG 65:196A) Καὶ λέγει μοι ὁ γέρων· Τί λέγεις μοι, ὀβρβά; ἄχμην τοὺς ἀνθρώποις δουλεύομεν;78

In the centuries following the Koine period ἄχμήν and its descendant forms eventually come to supplant ἔτι—the earliest, reliably dated79 examples of ἄκομη appear during X CE (e.g. Georg. Mon. Chron. (PG 110:1245) Μαθὸν δὲ ὡτὶ καὶ ὁ Ῥωμανὸς ἄκομη πάσχει)—so that in SMG ἄκομα/ἄκομη is not only standard, but the only form (TD s.v. ἄκομη; BD s.v.) of the adverb;80 the modern dialects likewise have only variant forms of ἄκομα/ἄκομη (see HD s.v. ἄκομη; cf. Shipp (1979: 51)).81 This is reflected by the clear disparity yielded from the HNC, which records only 68 instances of ἔτι, while counting 62,397 for ἄκομα/ἄκομη.82

77 See Lee (2014: 28–30), who draws attention to a collection of texts that in certain respects displays remarkable similitude to features now standard in SMG (particularly of the spoken language). See the discussion of gloss 27 (νηρόν) in §2.1.5 for a very early example of νερόν (Ioannes o Kolobos 7: M205B) as a substantive equivalent for ὑδωρ (cf. also Lee (2014: 30 n. 24)).

78 Cf. Lee (2014: 35); I partially follow here his system of notation for the saying, indicating the name of the Abba and the Migne column number in PG 65 (Lee, 2014: 30 n. 24).

79 TLG returns several examples of ἄκομη from the Alexander Romance, but they are all from MSS and translations produced no earlier than XI CE (see Stoneman (2009) [s.v. Alexander Romance (Pseudo-Callisthenes)] for the dates of the various recensions, MSS, editions and later translations).

80 See also Krumbacher (1885: 508–11) for exx. of ἄκομη and variants. Pace Caragounis (2004: 127), who claims ἔτι as a standard form in ‘Neohellenic’ without designating it as a katharevousa form; while ἔτι is very rarely encountered in speech, it sometimes occurs in formal documents that typically tend towards higher, archaising language (see BD s.v. ἔτι for exx.).

81 See DMVL s.v. ἄχμήν for the various forms in Mediaeval Greek vernacular literature (ἄχμη; ἄκομα; ἄκομη; ἄκομή; ἄχμη; ἄχμη; ‘κόμη), and exx. of its use.

82 ἔτι in SMG is mainly confined to certain archaic phrases, e.g. ἔτι μάλλον (=ἀχόμη περισσότερο even more); cf. Markantonatos (2002: 117). This situation is reflected in the omission of ἔτι in almost all dictionaries of SMG. The most notable of these few exceptions is the BD, which includes ἔτι under a separate headword (s.v.), although it does designate it as archaic (ἀχρισσότερον(ἔς)). The TD, by way of example, does not include ἔτι, either under a separate headword or within the ἄκομη entry.
2.2.5 Concluding remarks

Given the increased frequency and diversification of ακόμα/ακόμη in late mediaeval and early Modern Greek, it is surprising that the primary difficulty of this lexical study stems from the paucity of the data yielded from the papyrological evidence. While we should naturally expect that SMG anticipations may not necessarily manifest themselves clearly in the documentary evidence of the Koine, it is nevertheless striking that there is a complete absence of instances of adverbial ἀκομὴν in the papyri until late II CE. This gap contrasts sharply with the comparatively high frequency of examples in prose (both literary and non-literary)—displayed as early as II BCE in Polybius—and it is equally significant that the gradual take-up of the adverbial usage after IV CE by non-Atticising, almost exclusively Christian writers, does not find an analogue in the contemporaneous papyri.

The sheer scale of the ascendancy of ἔτι across all document types and periods could, not unrealistically, be indicative of wide use, not only in writing, but in the spoken language. In my view, however, it is more probable that this statistical preponderance is a symptom of the inchoate diglossia of LKG and EBG; in other words, the stylistic tendency towards Atticism ensured that ἔτι was, in effect, the only option for writers of literary works. This requirement effectively precluded the use of ἀκομὴν, which only began to appear more frequently in later vernacular literature of the mediaeval period. Moreover, if we view these few instances as the anticipation of ακόμα/ακόμη in SMG, then we can infer from the low frequency of ἀκομὴν in documents an early widespread usage in speech that eventually manifested itself in all the modern dialects, in opposition to the continuity of ἔτι in the higher registers.

83 It is difficult to compare the typological distribution of ἔτι to ἀκομὴν up to the beginning of EBG, since it occurs abundantly in private letters. Although all instances, bar one, of the latter form are found in private letters, we cannot simply assume that the former did not have a similarly wide spread across low registers more generally, particularly those to which the non-literary papyri may be considered most approximate (see above).
2.3 Gloss 247

2.3.1 Introduction

πάλιν οὕτω λέγουσιν οἱ νῦν ὤχτορες καὶ ποιηταὶ, δέον μετὰ τοῦ ν πάλιν, ὡς οἱ ἀρχαῖοι λέγουσιν.

πάλιν: the present orators and poets say (it) so; one should (say it) with the ν (as) πάλιν, as the ancients say.

The prescription of gloss 247 is representative of the brusquely imperious style of the briefer entries of the Ecloga that merely condemn one word or form and approve another (e.g. glosses 227 and 230). Unlike the majority of these entries, however, the adverb πάλιν presents us with certain difficulties in gathering and arranging our data. While the word’s comparatively high frequency in the papyri provides a much more substantial dataset from which stronger inferences may be drawn, its value as a marked Atticistic form is vitiated somewhat by its high frequency across all the genres of the register continuum. Also, in contrast with the other two case studies, we are here required to focus on a slightly different form of the word, rather than a different word altogether. As such, it is necessary here to pay close attention to the significance of the orthographical variation (final -ν), since we seek to identify signs of phonological innovation, rather than lexical choice, in the written record. This means that the literary material must also here be considered, as a crucial comparandum for the non-literary papyri, so that the frequency of both forms in gloss 247 may be measured against Phrynichus’ claim.

Although the data can be collated without considerable difficulty for all three evidence types (papyri, inscriptions and literature), the symbolic value of πάλιν as a marker of Atticistic style is made ambiguous by two significant factors: (a) the purely orthographical criterion of the prescription and (b) the lack of cross-references with other lexica and sophistic manuals when compared to other entries in the Ecloga, particularly ones of equal peremptoriness. In terms of the manuscript tradition there are no reasons to doubt the

---

84 Gloss 227: One must not say ἐπαρίστερον, but σκαιόν (ἐπαρίστερον οὐ χρῆ λέγειν, ἄλλα σκαίν). Gloss 230: Do not say ἀντίρρησιν, but ἀντιλογίαν (ἀντίρρησιν μὴ λέγει, ἀντιλογίαν δε).

85 Gloss 230, by way of example, yields similar entries in the Antiatticista (Antiatt. α 24), Photius’ Lexicon (Ph. α 2119) and the Suda (α 2680 [=Phryn. P. S. fr. 226a]); cf. Fischer (1974: 83).
authenticity of the *gloss* itself.\textsuperscript{86} Lobeck (1820: 284) rejects it on the grounds of it being a *hapax* rule among Atticist lexicographers,\textsuperscript{87} although he does concede that when used as an adverb of place, and followed by a consonant, it is possible for the final -v to be omitted (πάλιν/־_C; see §2.3.3), while Rutherford (1881: 347) cites its absence in what he believes to be key MSS and editions as a valid reason for tersely dismissing the *gloss*;\textsuperscript{88} Fischer is critical of Lobeck’s reliance upon the edition of Nunnesius and the *editio princeps* (1974: 33–34; cf. Strobel, 2011: 94), but does not doubt the authenticity of the *gloss*.\textsuperscript{89}

### 2.3.2 Form and sense

Our earliest surviving lexical gloss of πάλιν, from the I CE Homeric dictionary of Apollonius the Sophist, refers only to its earlier, primarily Homeric, topical use,\textsuperscript{90} and this also appears in the later lexicon of Hesychius with a supporting scholion of the grammarian Aristarchus.\textsuperscript{91} While it is instructive that the primary use of this adverb had, by Hesychius’ time (V–VI CE), shifted definitively to its previously secondary, temporal sense,\textsuperscript{92} it should be emphasised that the distinction made by Phrynichus is that between forms. There are no semantic distinctions

\textsuperscript{86} *Gloss* 247 is in the second book of the *Ecloga*, further away from the more fragmentary first book (Fischer, 1974: 37).

\textsuperscript{87} Crönert (1903: 140 n. 3) had brought forward evidence, including papyri, to the contrary as early as 1903 (see also §2.3.6).

\textsuperscript{88} Rutherford (1881: 347–8) notes briefly: ‘This article is not found in the Laurentian manuscript, or in the edition of Callierges, and is not given by Phavorinus. It is of no intrinsic importance, and if it really came from the hand of Phrynichus subsequent grammarians had the sense not to repeat it’. See Fischer (1974: 33–4), who rightly criticises Rutherford’s commentary on Phrynichus for both its reliance on a flawed understanding of the MSS and its barely concealed admiration of the lexicographer and his Atticistic agenda; cf. Strobel (2011: 93–5), who remarks on Fischer’s criticism: ‘Harsh but fair, one might say and yet Rutherford only did what Lobeck [1820], de Pauw [1739] and Hoeschl [1601] had done before him; they all trusted Nunnesius’ edition and that of the *editio princeps*. Fischer’s edition is a valuable corrective to the errors of Rutherford; cf. e.g. the note in MM s.v. πάλιν ‘It may be noted that the dictum ascribed to Phrynichus ... is set aside by Rutherford.’

\textsuperscript{89} See Fischer (1974: 86). Unlike Lobeck and Rutherford, Fischer, does not provide commentary for any of the entries; none provide translations.

\textsuperscript{90} Ap. S. 126.26: πάλιν εις το υπόπτισσα

\textsuperscript{91} Hsch. π 190: Ἀρίσταρχος τὸ πλέον πάλιν τοπικῶς χρήσθαι φησι τὸν ποιητήν, καὶ οὐχ ὡς ἡμεῖς, χρονικῶς (Aristarchus says that the poet (Homer) uses πάλιν mostly of place, and not, as we do, of time). The use of πάλιν as an adverb of time is rare in Homer (see LSJ s.v. II).

\textsuperscript{92} See LSJ s.v. πάλιν II, *GE* s.v. πάλιν C.
explicit, or implicit, in gloss 247; Phrynichus does not distinguish between specific authors, or certain kinds of writing, through his use of οἱ ἀρχαῖοι, leaving the defining characteristic of correct usage in this prescription to be only the presence of final -ν. Thus, the focus of this present word study is firmly on the formal aspect of Phrynichus’ prescription—any observations on potential correlation between form and sense stray too far from what can be extracted from the simple prescription of gloss 247.

2.3.3 Movable -ν

Unlike the final, movable -ν of certain endings in Classical Greek (-σι, -εν, ἐστίν),

that of πάλιν was not (at least to begin with) optionally omissible, having likely originated from an old accusative form. This is reflected to a great degree by the Attic inscriptions, which does not show the variation (for adverbs ending in both -εν and -ίν) present across all the dialectal inscriptions. By comparison, classical Attic literary prose, the touchstone of Phrynichus’ linguistic purism, does not have a single instance of πάλι, and this trend continues into the Koine period, where virtually all of the (few) instances occur in poetic works. On this evidence alone it could be reasonably argued that Phrynichus’ prescription is genuine enough: for the budding Atticist πάλι was a form not sufficiently attested in the works of the ἀρχαῖοι to be considered approved. But does the evidence from the papyri also reflect this situation, thereby further strengthening the lexicographer’s claim?

Before considering the data from the papyri (III BCE–III CE), let us briefly examine the literary (prose, including literary papyri) and inscriptionsal evidence up to the end of the Koine period.

---

93 By this is meant the correspondence between the form πάλι and the specific use as adverb of time.
94 See SM, Grammar, §134.
95 Cf. Schwyzzer, Grammatik, 619; EDG s.v. πάλιν: ‘Frozen accus. of a noun *πάλις ‘turning, turn’ … which may have first been used as an accus. of content in cases like πάλιν ἴναι, βαίνειν, διδόναι.’
96 Threatte, Morphology, §64.00. The search query παλι# in PHI yields 42 examples, of which only 2 are from Attica (see §2.3.4).
2.3.4 Literature and inscriptions

Our total reliance on the inclusion or omission of a single letter for determining ‘correct’, or Attic, usage in this word study, at variance with other prescriptions in the Ecloga that recommend the use of altogether different words (e.g. gloss 219),\(^97\) or argue against subtler distinctions in sense (e.g. gloss 235),\(^98\) compels us to pay closer attention to the frequency of particular combinations. Since the binary opposition between πάλι and πάλιν can produce results for only one kind of statistic, it is essential that the vowel-final form be scrutinised for instances of both πάλι/\_C and πάλι/\_V. Lobeck’s (1820: 284) concession, that the final -ν of πάλιν may be considered movable (§2.3.3), holds truer for the literary and inscriptive evidence than it does for the data from our papyri. This is due to the non-literary nature of the latter material, which (a) is not written any kind of metre, and (b) has, relative to the other two types, more instances of πάλι in hiatus.\(^99\) For both the literary and epigraphic material, metrical considerations often dictate the use of πάλι over the full form, and there are very few instances of it in prose outside of the papyri.\(^100\) As LSJ note, our earliest examples are from the works of Philodemus (1 BCE) and Anonymus Londiniensis (1 CE), with the latter yielding the earliest instance of πάλι/\_V in a work of prose that the author of the present study could find:

*PLond.Lit. 165 = Brit.Libr.Inv. 137.(17)20 ... καὶ μὴν καὶ ἔγραμ[τα τοῦ] | οἶκείῳ εἴδους πάλι ἐνποιείται ἐπτέροι.ζ. (50–99 CE)\(^101\)

[And further they depart from the suitable form and are made again in different forms (tr. Jones)]

---

\(^97\) *Gloss 219: ἔκθεσια is barbarous; but you say πρόγραμμα (ἔκθεσια βάρβαρον· σὺ δὲ λέγε πρόγραμμα).

\(^98\) *Gloss 235: One must guard against saying (it) in respect to time, as in “he is my friend from way back”. For the Athenians assign it to place, saying “it dropped from above” (ἀνέκαθεν· φαλακτέον ἐπὶ χρόνου λέγεν, ὁδὸν “ἀνέκαθεν μοι ἐστι φίλος”, ἐπὶ γὰρ τόπου τάττουσιν αὐτὸ ὦ Ἀθηναῖοι, λέγοντες “ἀνέκαθεν κατέπεσεν”)

\(^99\) Schwyzer notes that ‘etymological’ –ς is also common in the papyri (Schwyzer, *Grammatik*, 410); cf. *gloss 6*: μέχρις καὶ ἀχρὶς σιν τῶ σ ἀδόκιμα: μέχρις δὲ καὶ ἀχρὶ λέγε (μέχρις and ἀχρὶς with σ are unacceptable; but you say μέχρι and ἀχρὶ).\(^100\)

\(^100\) πάλι, as a metrical variant of πάλιν, is generally rare in Attic; sim. αὐθίς (cf. Threatte, *Morphology*, §64.00).

\(^101\) Cf. TM and Manetti (1999: 97); Jones (1947: 1) cites Kenyon and Diels, who both dated it to II CE, although Kenyon’s commentary, which relies largely upon that of Kenyon and Diels, has been superseded in many respects; cf. Manetti (1999: 95–141).
Notwithstanding that as a literary piece this papyrus does not appear in DDdbDP, it is still both unsurprising and fascinating that πάλι/ν is found here. The London papyrus (PLondLit 165), a prime example of medical doxography,\(^{102}\) was very likely written by the same person who composed the text,\(^{103}\) so it is interesting to note that on the only other occasion where a vowel follows the adverb the author has chosen to insert a final -ν (ll. 10–11. ὡς ἄν δὴ πάλιν <καὶ> ἐξ ἤμων γινομένης | τῇς ἀναδόσεως).\(^{104}\) This inconsistency is reflected in the overall usage of the adverb, with each form appearing 4 times in the papyrus; by comparison, in the Philodeemean corpus there are 6 instances of πάλι (of which none are πάλι/ν) and 24 of πάλιν. It will be seen that this ratio of 1:4 between πάλι and πάλιν, respectively, is a more accurate representation of the data from the non-literary papyri of I–III CE.

It remains, however, that the above instance of πάλι/ν occurs in a document dated to I CE—well after the Classical period—and it is difficult to overlook the fact that for EKG we have no examples of either πάλι/C or πάλι/ν in prose texts.\(^{105}\) The evidence from the inscriptions is equally underwhelming: a search (of all periods) for πάλι on PHI yields 42 examples, while πάλιν returns 456 matches;\(^{106}\) a ratio of approximately 1:11. Of the 42 instances of πάλι only 2 are from inscriptions found in Attica, while the combined corpora of Egypt, Nubia and Cyrenaica return none. Of the two Attic examples, one is an epigram in the form of an elegiac couplet from either I or III CE\(^{107}\) (IG II² 3816 = SEG 31:168.4 ζῆ πάλιν φαίνομένος), where, as noted by Threatte, final -ν has been omitted on metrical grounds (Threatte, Morphology, §64.033); the other is a tantalisingly early example of πάλι/ν from the 480s BCE (SEG 41:16) for which there are competing interpretations. We can, like Threatte, claim no more than mere possibility in choosing the most compelling reconstruction.


\(^{103}\) See Manetti (1999: 97). We may note here—in addition to Manetti’s (1999: 97) comments regarding the invaluableness of the text as a direct witness to the author’s process of collation (bearing in mind that the text is incomplete)—that it is also representative of the value of all papyri as genuine witnesses to the original lexical choice of the author, free of later scribal emendations.

\(^{104}\) For the weakening and dropping out of final nasals see also §2.3.5.

\(^{105}\) Based on the results of a search in TLG with the query ^pali$ (i.e. πάλι), not counting works written in metre, but including prose texts preserved on papyrus (as at 3 August 2016).

\(^{106}\) Using the search queries παλι# and παλιν# respectively (as at 3 August 2016).

\(^{107}\) The dating of this inscription is tied to that of SEG 39:951, which references the same Laetus, a Platonic philosopher, and is dated to I CE; the last two lines that form the pentameter of the elegiac couplet are near identical in both. See Horsley (1987: 70–1) for a brief discussion and references.
of the fragmentary ostracon (Threatte, Morphology, §64.033), to wit one that restores πάλι in line 3 ([πάλι] λι ἐχθρί | εἰς ἀθέτω).\(^\text{108}\)

Unfortunately, irrespective of how one chooses to restore the lacuna, this cannot be considered a secure example; although, even if we did have here a certain instance, the rest of the Attic evidence, including both inscriptions and literature, would still render it statistically insignificant. Counting 2 examples of πάλι and 86 of πάλιν\(^\text{109}\) in Attic inscriptions across all periods, we are left with a ratio of exactly 1:43, an exceptional increase on the superregional ratio of 1:11. From the rest of the regions PHI returns two instances of πάλι/\(-V\): one is in a II BCE fragmentary iama (healing miracle) from southern Crete (IC I xvii 11a.3 καὶ πάλι ἐς τὰν αὐτὸν), and the other in an inscription dated to 90 CE from ancient Neapolis, listing the achievements of pancratists (I.Napoli 50 = IG XIV 746 = IGRR I 445.10 καὶ πάλι ἀνδρῶν πανκράτιον). Within the region of Crete (including the islands of the Aegean) there are 9 other examples of πάλι/\(-C\), while for Italy and the West we may count 11. It is clear from these numbers that even within the data for the ν-less variant, πάλι/\(-V\) is uncommon, while overall πάλιν is by far the more common form in the inscriptions, as it is in prose. It would seem that these results accord with Phrynichus’ claim that the ἀρχαῖοι predominantly used the form with final -ν, with πάλι/\(-V\) the extremely rare exception and πάλι/\(-C\) occurring more frequently.

### 2.3.5 Papyri of III–I BCE

Before turning to the data of our date range (I–III CE), let us briefly consider the results provided from the preceding three centuries. Mayser states that πάλιν is the usual form in the Ptolemaic papyri, before both consonants and vowels (Mayser, Grammatik, i\(^2\)/1. 213), and this view is echoed by Gignac, who notes that both πάλι/\(-C\) and πάλι/\(-V\) occur unsystematically (Gignac, Phonology, 114).\(^\text{110}\) The predominance of πάλιν is borne out by

---

108 After PHI; see note in SEG (41:16) for a list of competing scholarly interpretations.

109 Cf. Threatte, Morphology §64.033.

110 It is worth noting here that both Mayser and Gignac treat the omission of final -ν in πάλιν as a case of movable -ν; cf. Shipp (1979: 438), who briefly states that the eventual dominance of πάλι in SMG can be traced back to the nasal weakening that began in antiquity (see further below).
our data: the search query παλι# yields 4 hits, while παλιν# returns 82.\textsuperscript{111} This is a ratio of about 1:20, less than the combined inscriptionsal ratio of 1:11, but more than the Attic of 1:43. The data collected from DDbDP is as follows:

**Table 2 πάλι (before 1 CE) on DDbDP\textsuperscript{i}**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Papyrus</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Cnt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VBP IV 48.3</td>
<td>127 BCE</td>
<td>Private Letter</td>
<td>καὶ πάλι εἰς πολεμίους ἡμᾶς ἁφεῖς ἀπελήλυθας</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLips. II 124.40</td>
<td>137 BCE(?)</td>
<td>Petition</td>
<td>πάλι προσ[ά]γειν διὰ τὸ</td>
<td>προσδοθήναι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPolit.Iud. 18.8</td>
<td>Sept 30, 142 BCE</td>
<td>Official Letter</td>
<td>[---] αὐτῶν πάλι καὶ αὐτὴς των[.]. τατος . . [---]</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSorb. III 131.13</td>
<td>Nov 9, 222 BCE</td>
<td>Official Letter</td>
<td>καὶ [[ζῆμα]] πάλι/ παράγγελον αὐτῶν</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{i} Notwithstanding the paucity of examples, it is noteworthy that only 1 is in a private letter and half occur in official letters. The insertion above the line in *PSorb.* III 131.13 is particularly prominent, since such additions do not occur in the papyri of I–III CE (apart from πάλι/ in *PWürzb.* 21.24. The data for I–III CE also show that the clear majority of both πάλι and παλιν are attested in documents of the letter type. See §2.3.6.

\textsuperscript{111} <http://www.papyri.info> as at 3 August 2016. One of these, VBP IV 48.3, is used by Mayser as an example for πάλι (Mayser, *Grammatik*, i\textsuperscript{2}1. 213). It should be noted here that πάλι occurs more frequently in the papyri of I–III CE, in spite of there being nearly three times more documents for this period than are counted before 1 CE (DDbDP counts 15,479 papyri dated to before 1 CE, while for I–III CE it counts 40,372); for before 1 CE 1 instance per 3870 papyri and for I–III CE 1 instance per 1302 (31 instances; see §2.3.6).
Of these 4 instances of πάλι, only 1 is πάλι/\_V:

\[ VBP \ IV \ 48.3 \ \dot{\circ} \ \text{καί} \ \dot{\circ} \ \text{ἐκ} \ \text{πολεμίων} \ \dot{\circ} \ \dot{\circ} \ \text{ἐφυσαι} \ \dot{\circ} \ \text{καί} \ \pi\lambda \ \epsilonις \ \text{πολεμίους} \ \dot{\circ} \ \dot{\circ} \ \text{ἀφεῖς} \ \dot{\circ} \ \dot{\circ} \ \text{ἀπελήλυθας}. \ (October \ 28, \ 127 \ BCE) \]

Because you both rescued us from enemies and left us again when you departed against the enemy. (trans. HGV)

As Bagnall and Cribiore (2006: 107) note, the fairly large vocabulary and complex syntax of the document suggest that the writer had a fairly strong command of Greek; final -\( \nu \) is faithfully observed everywhere for all forms, including two instances of χάριν, of which one is χάριν/\_C. We may add here that the not infrequent occurrence of graphic interchange (phonetic spellings), e.g. l. 1 μνήαν for μνείαν, and non-standard assimilation, e.g. l. 4 ἔξενεκκάσης for ἔξενεγκάσης, point to the possibility that the writer’s choice of πάλι was informed by their own pronunciation. The trend towards weakening of final nasals is reflected already in the Ptolemaic papyri by the absence of final -\( \nu \) for various forms. The writer’s above-mentioned consistency, however, in writing final -\( \nu \), even before consonants, is reflected by the frequent interchange between graphemes, although the interchange between \( \eta \) and \( \varepsilon \iota \) does not become as common as the others until EBG; see Gignac, *Phonology*, 242; Horrocks (2010: 168). For the specific occurrence of \( \eta \) instead of the expected \( \varepsilon \iota \) in the papyri see Mayser, *Grammatik*, \( iV/1. \ 50–1 \) and Teodorsson (1977: 218–19) for EKG, and Gignac, *Phonology*, 239–32 for the Roman period. See Horrocks (2010: 167), who concludes that monophthongisation (N.B. esp. \( \epsilon u \)/V, \( \eta \) for \( /e\iota/ \), loss of vowel length and change to a primary stress accent were mostly complete by mid-II BCE; cf. Bubeník’s (1989: 217) statement that the productiveness of the interchange between \( \eta \) and \( \varepsilon \iota \) ‘reflects the phonological raising of \( \varepsilon>\iota \)', which he claims ‘could have been accomplished in Egypt by the 2\textsuperscript{nd} c. A.D., except in the ... environments of sonorants ... the sibilant and the absolute pause.’

This is a not uncommon phenomenon in papyri of both the Ptolemaic and Roman periods; see Bubeník (1989: 221).

See Schwyzer, *Grammatik*, 410; Mayser, *Grammatik*, \( iV/1. \ 169 \); and Thumb, *Hellenismus*, 173, who cites (in his time, c. 1900) the preservation of final -\( \nu \) in areas to the east of the Modern Greek state (Asia Minor, Cyprus, Aegean islands) as evidence that the dropping of final nasals was as a phenomenon limited to certain dialects (or areas), of which the Egyptian variant was an early adopter. For the modern Cypriot dialect this does indeed remain a salient feature; see e.g. Thumb, *Handbuch*, §33; Horrocks (2010: 274, 363). As noted above, however, neither Mayser nor Gignac include discussion of πάλιν under sections dealing with the issue of final nasals.
does not accord with this instance of \( \pi\alpha\lambda\upsilon\)\( _V \), particularly when we consider that it is a *hapax* among non-literary papyri of III–I BCE.

It is difficult, more generally, to assess for this period whether weakening of a final nasal, or treatment of the -\( \nu \) as movable, or a combination of both was responsible for the omission of the final consonant in our few examples.\textsuperscript{229} But, while the evidence may be too meagre for this period, it would be expected for I–III CE that \( \pi\alpha\lambda\upsilon\)\( _C \) and \( \pi\alpha\lambda\iota\upsilon\)\( _V \) predominate in our results if it were the case that final -\( \nu \) was being analysed as movable, although a preponderance of instances of \( \pi\alpha\lambda\iota\upsilon \) can have competing interpretations: on the one hand, the dominance of the standard form could indicate that writers were consciously choosing to write ‘correctly’, in spite of their own nasal pronunciation, but on the other it could also show that this tendency had not yet spread, that the instances of final -\( \nu \) actually represent confusion over whether it was movable or not. The beginning of the non-prestige form that eventually prevailed in SMG, and all modern dialects within the geographical area of the modern Greek state,\textsuperscript{230} can undoubtedly be traced back to these early examples, but there are not nearly enough to suggest that \( \pi\alpha\lambda\iota \) had become a competing form in either literary or non-literary texts before the turn of the 1\textsuperscript{st} millennium.\textsuperscript{231}

In respect to Phrynichus’ prescription, the data from the non-literary papyri of this period continue to emphatically reflect his claim that the older form was favoured, but the ratio of 1:20, in comparison with the 1:11 of the total inscriptional evidence, is surprising. For the first three centuries CE, which take in the lexicographer’s *floruit*, we would expect, not unrealistically, a more numerous and diverse range of examples of \( \pi\alpha\lambda\iota \), especially \( \pi\alpha\lambda\upsilon\)\( _V \) (including, where available, instances in *pausa*), than what has been yielded from III–I BCE. More substantial data is clearly needed to improve the quality of our insights and conclusions thus far. Let us now examine the data for I–III CE.

\textsuperscript{229} See §2.3.4 for a potential example of deletion of final -\( \nu \) due to nasal weakening (*PLond.Lit.* 165.(17)20).

\textsuperscript{230} It is the only form even in Tsakonian; see *DTD* s.v. \( \pi\alpha\lambda\iota \) (but \( \pi\alpha\lambda\epsilon \) in the Tsakonian variant formerly spoken in the village Χαβούτσοι near the Sea of Marmara [modern Havuçça]); see §2.3.7 for the frequency of \( \pi\alpha\lambda\iota\upsilon \) in SMG.

\textsuperscript{231} Philodemus alone yields 6 examples of \( \pi\alpha\lambda\iota\)\( /C \) in texts dated to I BCE, but instances of \( \pi\alpha\lambda\iota \) are, naturally, even more heavily outnumbered by \( \pi\alpha\lambda\iota\upsilon \) in the literary evidence (cf. *LSJ* s.v. \( \pi\alpha\lambda\iota \)). It should be noted, however, that all fragments of Philodemus survive on papyrus (see §2.3.4).
2.3.6 Papyri of I–III CE

Some of the instances of πάλι in the papyri of the Roman period had already been noted by Crönert as early as the turn of the twentieth century (1903: 140 n. 3) and with the benefit of a searchable database we may here examine in greater detail a wider range of examples. Indeed, the first three centuries CE are, by comparison with the preceding three, conducive to more instances in an increased range of contexts. Nevertheless, πάλιν is still the dominant form for this period, yielding 170 examples against 32 for πάλι. The old, fuller form, it appears, continues to be used into the Roman period by most writers of non-literary papyri, although we may observe that the frequency of the ν-less variant is increased: a ratio of about 1:5 against the 1:20 for all documents on DDbDP prior to 1 CE.

Within these improved numbers are more instances of πάλιν/V and various divergent spellings, with the graphic interchange between ι and ει now present, although not frequent, in our data: 15 examples for πάλιν and 1 for πάλι. This confusion between these particular graphemes is already common in Attic inscriptions and EKG papyri, and it is not surprising that all of these instances occur in papyri that include many other examples of the same interchange (6 occur in just two: PFay. 124.3, 7, 24 (II–III CE) and PLond. III 897.5, 10, verso.25 (84 CE)—see Table 3). But what is slightly surprising is the higher frequency of graphic confusion in instances of the older form, which Phrynichus has prescribed as correct—based on the evidence, more writers were choosing to use πάλιν, but they were also more likely to confuse the spelling of the final syllable.

Among the non-standard forms are two notable orthographical variants: the form παλε in BGU II 424.3, which later becomes more common in Mediaeval Greek and survives in some modern dialects, and the unusual πελι in SB XIV 12106.9 (II–III CE). The first of these, παλε, is actually an editorial error that entered the DDbDP during the process of

---

232 See also MM s.v. πάλιν; and above §2.3.1.

233 For Attic inscriptions see Thraatte, Morphology, 710–13; for Attic during the EKG period see Teodorsson (1978: 21–4); for EKG papyri see Mayser, Grammatik, i/1. 66–70 (for ει→ι); for papyri of the Roman and EBG periods see Gignac, Phonology, 189–91.

digitisation; an examination of the original printed edition reveals this mistake. On the other hand, \(\pi\epsilon\lambda\iota\) is more difficult to explain. The interchange between \(\alpha\) and \(\epsilon\) is not exceptionally common in the papyri: for EKG Teodorsson (1977) does not list a single instance, while for the Roman and EBG periods Gignac indicates that it is confined to a limited range of words and forms, with seemingly greater variation in cases where the syllable is unaccented (Gignac, *Phonology*, 278–82), although he does not make note of this particular example. Aside from this peculiar spelling, the rest of the fragmentary letter largely adheres to standard orthography; there are only two other non-standard forms, and neither is helpful in explaining \(\pi\epsilon\lambda\iota\). It unfortunately remains an unusual hapax in the papyri.

Another errant form occurs twice in the same papyrus, *SB XII 11017.18* (12 CE) \(\varepsilon\alpha\nu\varepsilon\nu\delta\varepsilon\pi\alpha\zeta\iota\mu\eta\varepsilon\chi\eta\zeta\alpha\nu\alpha\beta\sigma\alpha\pi\alpha\varsigma\iota\nu\iota\). These two instances are noteworthy not only for their rhotacistic spelling, but also for the writer’s decision to omit the final -\(\nu\) in the first instance and

---

235 Unfortunately, the embedment of DDbDP editions in other online databases, such as TM, means that this error has potential for inadvertent propagation. I was alerted to the possibility of a mistake by the occurrence of \(\pi\alpha\zeta\iota\) in line 7; the error was first confirmed by a close examination of the document’s photograph, which reveals that the ligature \(\epsilon\iota\) is almost identical with that of the conjunction \(\epsilon\iota\) at the end of line 3, and at other places in the same document (<http://ww2.smb.museum/berlpap/Original/P_07915_R_4.jpg> [as at 3 August 2016]).

236 A close examination of the photo of the papyrus leaves little doubt that the letter in question is indeed \(\epsilon\) (APIS *PMich.Inv.* 3799 < http://quod.lib.umich.edu/a/apis/x-2116> [as at 3 August 2016]).

237 In the Attic inscriptive evidence of the EKG period Teodorsson (1978: 37) finds 4 instances of substitution of expected \(\alpha\) for \(\epsilon\), and 1 vice versa. None of these examples, however, which are all damaged and uncertain on the stones, appear as \(\epsilon\) in their latest editions (cf. PHI).

238 I. 2 \(\varepsilon\chi\iota\) for \(\varepsilon\chi\eta\iota\), I. 4 \(\varepsilon\xi\iota\) for \(\varepsilon\xi\omega\).

239 We may note here that not even Youtie’s (1977: 128) apparatus in *ZPE* acknowledges this form: ‘\(\pi\alpha\lambda\iota = \pi\alpha\lambda\iota\nu\iota\)’.

240 There are three other instances of this interchange in the same papyrus, in ll. 12–3 \(\kappa\alpha\iota\kappa\rho\iota\sigma\alpha\varsigma\varsigma\) (\(=\kappa\lambda\epsilon\iota\sigma\alpha\varsigma\varsigma\)) \(\tau\iota\kappa\rho\iota\sigma\alpha\varsigma\varsigma\) \(\kappa\lambda\epsilon\iota\sigma\alpha\varsigma\varsigma\) \(\kappa\rho\iota\sigma\alpha\varsigma\varsigma\) \(\kappa\lambda\epsilon\iota\sigma\alpha\varsigma\varsigma\) (\(=\kappa\lambda\epsilon\iota\sigma\alpha\varsigma\varsigma\)); cf. di Bitonto (1970: 40–2), who also notes that the repetition of \(\pi\alpha\iota\varsigma\iota\) here reinforces the sense of contradiction it conveys (cf. LSJ s.v. 1.2; *GE* s.v. B). The papyrus was written in Themistou Meris and found in nearby Fayum, where the majority of the documents containing instances of interchange between the liquids \(\varsigma\) and \(\lambda\) have been found; see Gignac, *Phonology*, 107, who notes the especial occurrence of this interchange in documents from the Fayum that exhibit bilingual interference (see also Gignac (2013: 404)). The Fayumic dialect of Coptic, as Gignac notes, was marked by its tendency towards ‘lambdacism’, with \(\kappa\rho\iota\iota\) often appearing where other dialects have \(\rho\iota\iota\) (see *CE* s.v. Fayyemic; Peust (1999: 130)); demotic scribes began to use a different sign for rendering Greek \(\lambda\iota\iota\) in the middle of III BCE, and by II BCE this differentiation had become regular (see Clarysse and Van der Veken
include it in the second, a case of *pausa* (πάσιν- ἐφημοσίον). In line 4 of the same document we find that the writer has chosen to use movable -ν where it would normally be avoided (φάσιν γνοῦς), reflecting the breakdown in vernacular documents of a convention still widely observed in literature. The irregular observance of this rule is illustrated also by *PTebt. II 417* (III CE), where πάλιν appears twice, but is in both instances followed by the reverse use of the movable -ν in the third person plural of φημί: l. 7 φασίν<ν> ἐν τῇ ἀφι[ν] and l. 20 φάσιν περὶ τ[ο]ῦ ν[ου].

Table 3 outlines the frequency of both πάλιν and πάλι in the following contexts: before consonants (/C); before vowels (/V); in *pausa* (/pausa), to wit, before a full stop, comma or *ano teleia* indicated in DDbDP; when the final -ν or following letter is missing and not restored (/?); and when it is the final word in the document (/φ).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3 πάλι(ν) in contextii</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/pausa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/φ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ii Note that documents that cannot be securely dated may sometimes have a date range of two centuries (e.g. 100–299 CE) on TM. Such documents dated to III–IV CE are counted under III CE, while those dated to either I–II or II–III CE are here numbered on the right side of the column of the earlier century, e.g. a papyrus dated 100–299 CE or ca. 200 CE will appear on the right side of the II CE column.

For πάλι they are the following: *BGU* II 424 (100–299 CE); *POxy*. I 119 (100–299 CE); *POxy*. XXXIII 2680 (100–299 CE); *PSI* VII 837 (200–399 CE); *SB* XVII 11148 (1–199 CE); *SB* XVI 12694 (200–399 CE).

For πάλιν they are the following: *BGU* I 93 (100–299 CE); *BGU* II 435 (50–99 CE); *BGU* II 450 (100–299 CE); *OHeid*. 430 (200–399 CE); *Onarm*. 77 (150–225 CE); *PDub*. 16 (100–299 CE); *PFreib*. IV 69 (150–299 CE); *PGiss.Univ.* III 32 (200–399 CE); *OHamb*. IV 257 (100–299 CE); *PHar*. II 235 (200–399 CE); *PHAum*. II 21 (200–399 CE); *PMich*. VI 426 (199–200(?)) CE); *PMich*. XII 657 (175–225 CE); *PNepph*. 29 (200–399 CE); *POSol*. II 58 (200–399 CE); *POxy*. XIV 1680 (275–325 CE); *POxy*. LXIX 3993 (125–299 CE); *POxy*. LXXIX 3997 (200–399 CE); *POxy*. LXXVII 5111 (150–225 CE); *PPalaouRib*. 33 (100–299 CE); *PPrinc*. II (1–199 CE); *PPrinc*. III 166 (100–299 CE); *SB* XX 14249 (1–125 CE); *PTebt*. II 417 (200–299 CE); *PWord* 24 (200–399 CE).

(1983:142). Cf. also gloss 150, where Phrynichus warns against the use of a non-Attic variant with λ: ‘You do not say κλίβανος, but κρίβανος with the q’ (κλίβανος οὐχ ἔχεις, ἀλλὰ κρίβανος διὰ τοῦ ψ).

241 The use of movable -ν is already erratic in the papyri of the Ptolemaic period (Mayser, *Grammatik*, i7/l. 210–11), more so by the Roman period (Gignac, *Phonology*, 114).
For πάλιν, the irregular omission and inclusion of final -ν in the papyri of I–III CE is confirmed by our data: after I CE, in which there are three times as many examples of πάλιν/ν (including those in pausa) as there are of /ιν, the following two centuries show a marked increase in instances where a consonant follows. More generally, we may note that there is a more even distribution in the results for πάλιν (85 exx. of /ιν, 72 of /ν) than those for πάλι (23 exx. of /ιν, 6 of /ν), although this observation is tempered by the comparatively low number of examples of the latter. In relation to Phrynichus’ prescription, it is particularly noteworthy that the century corresponding to the lexicographer’s floruit yields the highest number of examples for both forms. The data confirm writers’ adherence to the use of the older form, as per the instruction of gloss 247; the combination of more examples of πάλιν and the II–III CE increase in these instances being followed by a consonant shows that, not only had the use of πάλι not penetrated significantly in the non-literary papyri, but that its occurrence actually decreased slightly in III CE as that of πάλιν increased.

Table 4 Document Types for πάλιν

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>I CE</th>
<th>II CE</th>
<th>III CE</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official Letter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official Report</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Typesv</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

iii Note that there are less total papyri than instances of πάλιν, since the adverb occurs multiple times in some documents.
v Other types are those that include less than four examples: Account/Inventory (3); Agreement (1); Complaint (3); Contract (2); Court Ruling (1); Decree (1); Loan (1); Will (letter concerning) (1); Witness Statement (1).

Typologically, the smaller dataset of πάλι provides us with near absolute homogeneity—only one 1 example is not a letter, but a petition (PVind.Tand. 2.11)—while that of πάλιν is, naturally, more diverse, although the epistolary text type (letter genre) still
predominate. Table 4 contains a breakdown of the significant document types for the papyri containing examples of πάλιν across I–III CE. These results are in line with our reasonable expectations of what is a relatively large dataset. Although this preponderance of letters and petitions is not surprising,\(^{242}\) it is important to note here that it accords well with direct speech, the kind of linguistic context to which letters are highly conducive. If we understand that language change (here specifically lexical change) is driven by non-systemic factors, which inherently emphasise the writer’s individual agency, then it is not surprising that virtually all instances of πάλι occur in contexts where the writer’s lexical choice is likeliest to reflect the contemporary vernacular lexis.\(^{243}\)

In terms of Atticistic influence, the preponderance of πάλιν across the entire genre continuum is not particularly revealing of any correlation between specific forms of πάλιν and various kinds of register that may be present throughout all our documents.\(^{244}\) Within each document type the inclusion or omission of final -ν, whether the result of its analysis as movable or as a symptom of nasal weakening, is never consistent enough either way to suggest any kind of correlation with an Atticistic style.\(^{245}\) As Palme (2009: 361–2) notes, it is often impossible to know if private letters were, in each case, written by those who sent them, and, as we have seen with Anonymus Londiniensis and Philodemus, there was variation even in prose literary works written on papyrus (§2.3.4).

In the case of πάλιν, it is likely that the motivating factors for using either form stem from the phonological innovations that Greek was undergoing, and that the contextual variation (i.e. /_C etc.) in the above statistics is a symptom of this phenomenon. Moreover, it is instructive to compare the statistics for πάλιν to those of πάλι: the near absolute occurrence of the latter in private letters accords very well with its steady progress toward becoming the dominant form. If the category of letters, among the non-literary papyri, is considered as our best evidence for texts closest to the vernacular, then it seems reasonable to

\(^{242}\) Apart from tax receipts, petitions are the most common type of record in the papyri; cf. Palme (2009: 377–8).

\(^{243}\) The writer is understood here as the primary agent in the process of lexical change, rather than as a symptom of a wider, systemic linguistic factor (i.e. Atticism); compare the invisible-hand model (§1.5.1).

\(^{244}\) See §1.5.3 for the danger in assuming linguistic homogeneity for any one type of document.

\(^{245}\) Distinct, however, from the residual prestige that Attic forms had in Koine, especially MKG. The writers of the papyri may not have been consciously adopting an Atticistic style, but their language largely adheres to a standard that is morphologically, if not syntactically, close to classical Attic (excepting, of course, the increasing occurrence of various kinds of graphic interchange during the Koine period).
posit that they are representative of the formal concern that Phrynichus may have had in issuing his dictum.

2.3.7 Modern Greek

In SMG πάλι, save for works that deliberately seek to archaise,246 is the only form of the adverb. This exclusivity is illustrated by the omission in most dictionaries of πάλιν as a separate headword; in the instances where it does appear as a separate entry, the reader is directed to the simpler form.247 As noted above (§2.3.2), SMG maintains the temporal function as the primary sense (cf. e.g. TD s.v. πάλι I.1), although as with the Koine period this has no bearing on the word’s form. Thus, it is instructive here to note the results of search queries for both forms from the Hellenic National Corpus (HNC):248 the lemma πάλι returns 14,112 hits, of which 14,044 are of πάλι and only 68 of πάλιν. Of course, a database that includes texts written before 1976, especially during the late 19th and early 20th centuries, would naturally return a much higher count of instances of πάλιν, but the concomitant retreat of both form and register illustrates that its use was intimately bound with an archaising tendency, the continuity of which between the Classical and modern stages of Greek can only be adequately traced through literary registers.

Although the absence of a searchable database for non-literary texts of the mediaeval and early modern periods of Greek249 (or, more precisely, the absence of significant numbers of vernacular texts themselves)250 makes it difficult to measure the frequency of πάλι against that of πάλιν, the papyrological evidence of EKG and MKG is sufficiently indicative of a

---

246 Cf. BD s.v. πάλι I [the form πάλιν is] ‘ἀρχαιοπρεπεπλής’ (archaic).

247 See e.g. BD s.v. πάλιν ‘επίφο. → πάλι’.

248 Εθνικός Θησαυρός Ελληνικής Γλώσσας (ΕΘΕΓ). The HNC is the corpus of the Institute for Language and Speech Processing (Ινστιτούτο Επεξεργασίας του Λόγου), <http://www.ilsp.gr/en>. Note that the majority of texts selected for the HNC’s database date from 1990 and later, thereby excluding older works that are more likely to archaise; particularly those before the abolishment of katharevousa as the official language in 1976 (as per the HNC webpage <http://hnc.ilsp.gr/info.asp>).

249 See §2.3.6; cf. nevertheless DMVL s.v. πάλιν (for the forms πάλιν and πάλι, aside from the instances cited as examples) ‘κ(αί) π(αλλαχού) ο(λλαχού)’ (in many places elsewhere).

250 The list of mediaeval vernacular literary works consulted by the DMVL is extensive: 305 main texts and many editions of other works listed under a section containing about 1,000 ancillary texts (see DMVL Vol. 1 (Τόμος Α΄)).
steady adoption of the υ-less variant. However, it is hard to overlook the 1:16 ratio in favour of πάλιν for all papyri after III CE (16 πάλι; 263 πάλιν),\textsuperscript{251} which suggests that the diglossic state of affairs slowly taking root in Greek during this period was not allowing as widespread a graphic representation of the weakening of the final -ν as that observed for various kinds of vocalic interchange.\textsuperscript{252} For the non-literary papyri, at least, it seems that the prescription of gloss 247 was one widely observed by writers.

\textsuperscript{251} 34,852 total papyri counted on DDbDP (as at 3 August 2016).

\textsuperscript{252} See Gignac, *Phonology* for all the types.
Conclusion

In the three case studies, select prescriptions from Phrynichus’ *Ecloga* have been applied to the non-literary papyri, in an attempt to address certain linguistic issues around the penetration of Atticistic usage in these documents. We may summarise here the conclusions drawn from their results. The objectives of the present were; firstly, (a) to identify, through the collation of the relevant data across all registers, the frequency of both the approved (Atticistic) and condemned (innovative) forms of Phrynichus in all types of non-literary texts; second, (b) to determine whether the penetration of approved forms after II CE affects the expected adoption of the innovative variants; and finally, (c) to ascertain, as far as possible, the rate of the innovative form’s adoption through the spoken language by examining both its use in literature composed in lower and middle registers and the Atticistic variant’s influence on the lower registers across all periods up to EBG.

In terms of the frequency of Atticistic forms in the papyri, the results across all three dicta examined illustrate tendencies that have largely confounded preliminary expectations. In spite of the linguistic nature of the non-literary papyri and ostraca, the genres of which are situated mostly on the lower end of the register continuum, the data have shown clearly in each case an overwhelming preponderance of standard, non-Atticistic forms over innovative ones. In the cases of glosses 27 (ἀκραιψ/πρόςφατον ὑδωρ) and 93 (ἀκμήν), the ascendancy of the prescribed variants over those proscribed is exceptionally marked, while for gloss 247, although the innovative form πάλι is more frequent, the predominance of the approved form πάλιν is still considerable. Even when the data of both the documentary and literary comparanda have been taken into consideration, the dominance of the conservative words and variants remains undeniably clear throughout the entire period of the extant papyrological record. Viewed in isolation, however, this statistic has the potential to unintentionally conceal the main underlying reason for this imbalance: that is, the gradual, but linear, rate of change suggested by the written evidence does not necessarily correspond with the higher rate of lexical innovation that was most likely taking place in the spoken language. In fact, the likelihood that these changes would have manifested themselves in the non-literary papyri is vitiates by the typological heterogeneity of the latter, which, on account of our evidence, were likely being increasingly influenced across all categories of genre by Atticistic tendencies codified in prescriptive works such as the *Ecloga*.

Phrynichus himself was probably driven to issue his dicta, in part, by the widespread usage of certain forms in the speech of others, particularly those inhabiting the
lexicographer’s own linguistic milieu, although the speech of the educated classes, strongly influenced by Atticism, would not have displayed the same level of variation that characterised the lower varieties of the spoken language. On the other hand, the social dialects of the lower classes, within which lexical innovations were more likely to develop and spread, did not have the same kind of influence upon the written language that Atticism did. The linguistic aspiration fostered among writers of non-literary texts by the rise of diglossia is evident in the continued dominance of Atticistic forms, a situation which prevented the adoption of innovative forms taking place more quickly. Thus, it is significant in this regard that for νηρόν and ἀκμήν the majority of examples during LKG occur in direct speech or in papyrological genres that foster direct speech, to wit, letters; while the competing standard forms ὕδωρ and ἑτί are liable to occur virtually anywhere.

In addressing this study’s second and third objectives, it is important to highlight the context in which we have tracked the frequency of both the approved and condemned Phrynichean forms, so that we may ascertain the levels at which both forms were used through the early stages of diglossia. We cannot rely solely upon the written evidence for the uptake of vernacular forms, as provided by the papyri, but must instead differentiate between the spread of the innovative forms—mainly via the spoken language—and the lexical entrenchment of Atticistic forms across the entire register continuum. When analysed in terms of lexical change, the data from all three studies show that a slow, but gradual, adoption of innovative words (and forms) occurs from I CE through to the EBG period, which accords well with the S-curve model. A noteworthy discrepancy during this period is the slight decrease in the frequency of πάλι (gloss 247) towards the end of III CE, which may be partly attributable to the increasing influence of Atticistic tendencies upon the writers of lower register documents. Unfortunately, supporting evidence for this trend cannot be adduced from the other two case studies, since the data they yield is not adequate for this purpose. For the condemned words of glosses 27 and 93—νηρόν ὕδωρ and ἀκμήν—it is only in the EBG period that their occurrence becomes more frequent, mainly in Christian, non-literary prose; although the low frequency of the two approved forms (ἐτί and πάλι) and the preponderance of ὕδωρ over substantivised νηρόν is maintained in the non-literary papyri until the end of their production, and more generally across all register types until the advent of mediaeval vernacular literature.

Thus, before the widespread use of our case studies’ three innovative forms (and others) becomes directly observable in the written evidence during the mediaeval period, their low frequency across all documentary text types up to EBG accords with the trend towards a more conservative, Atticistic vocabulary after II CE. Although their later emergence in larger numbers can only suggest—rather than confirm—earlier, continuous usage in the spoken language, the extant attestations may nevertheless be considered reliable supporting evidence for gradual lexical innovations that, on account of the extreme nature of the Atticist program, were not able to manifest themselves more expeditiously in the written evidence.
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