

Floris Bernard

“Oh the hair-splitting of schoolmasters!” Debates about linguistic standards in Byzantine poetic disputes and didactic texts (10th to 12th centuries)

In the middle Byzantine period, poetry offered a privileged space for disputes about linguistic standards. On the one hand, this can be related to the special status of writing verse, which required consummate skill and thorough knowledge of linguistic features that can be considered “obsolete” by this time, notably the quantitative meter. On the other hand, poetry was the preferred medium for disputes, contests, and invective among aspiring intellectuals, especially in school milieus. At the same time, grammatical education was often expressed in verse, touching subjects left aside by more specialized prose literature. Thus, many poetic texts are indicative of the linguistic fault lines in these centuries and voice important metalinguistic opinions about correctness (or desirable standards) that circulated among Byzantine educated people. Modern scholars on Byzantine poetry have often worked with evaluative criteria from their own perspective (either debunking bad metricians or fossilized mandarin poets). However, it can be more fruitful to investigate which standards the Byzantines themselves upheld for their peers.

The debates centered on several linguistic areas, some of them particular to metrical texts, others less so. These include the correct handling of prosodical meter, the length of vowels, especially of the so-called *dichrona* (alpha, iota, upsilon); correct accentuation and *styxis*; the orthography of *antistoicha*; syntax (especially complements of verbs); vocabulary; and even pronunciation.

I will argue that a cultural connection with *hellenismos* is not at stake in this period: rather we see in these disputes a competition to set the standards for educated written discourse in certain sociological environments. These standards are reflected not only by the grammatical commentaries of the time, but also by more practical compendia of grammatical and orthographical knowledge. These compendia, often themselves written in verse, were rooted in the practice of teaching “grammar” at Constantinopolitan schools of that time and often have a very prescriptive and even combative character. I will also connect the emergence and relevance of these linguistic debates to the sociological circumstances of that time, when a competitive educational field went hand in hand with a burgeoning bureaucratic system. The contests in schedography, an orthographical dictation exercise, are key in this regard.

This paper will base its analysis on a range of relevant texts, chiefly centering on the lampoons of Constantine the Rhodian (10th century), the disputes of Ioannes Mauropous (11th century), the *psogoi* of pseudo-Psellos (12th century), the invectives of Ioannes Tzetzes (12th century), and also various practical manuals for writing poetry, many of which have not received a proper modern edition.

The third person plural ending -ασι(v) of the aorist: diachronic and stylistic issues

Several recent studies have examined the polymorphic nature of verb endings found in many medieval Greek tenses. Martin Hinterberger (2001) in particular has demonstrated that often these are not artificial contrivances created for the benefit of poetic meter.¹ Instead, they originate in the spoken language, and can be found in prose at both an informal and a colloquial level. In this paper I plan to examine the occurrence and success within Byzantine literature of the endings -ασι(v), -ασινε, in the third person plural of the aorist tense.

In post-classical Greek, an alternative form already existed for the thematic aorist in the third person plural. Cases like ἔλαβαν, which can be found in the Septuagint, indicate an early analogical leveling of the thematic aorist over the alphathematic form with the convenient importation of endings in -αν, which had the advantage of disambiguating the third person plural endings from the first person singular. As is well known, the third person plural of the aorist in KNE was constructed on these analogical forms.

Based on the written evidence, both literary and non, the success of the -ασι ending appears to have been a later development. From the texts I have analyzed, it is clear that this form enjoyed little socio-linguistic prestige at the very beginning. It was perceived as colloquial, and avoided in *Hochsprachliche Literatur*, instead finding its place in the repertoire of works of popular literature of the Byzantine Middle Ages such as the *Digenis Akritas*. A survey of its appearance in the Escorial version produces the following data: εἶδασι 5x, ἦλθασι 2x, ἤρρασι 2x, εἶπασι 1x, ἐπήρασι 1x, ἐλάβασι 0x. The presence of such forms greatly increases in a later work like the *Chronicle of the Morea*. An analysis of rec. Π reveals the following: ἦλθασι 45x, εἶπασι 33x, ἐπήρασι 31x, ἤρρασι 10x, εἶδασι 8x, ἐλάβασι 1x. Even a poet such as Leonardo Dellaporta, the author of a number of compositions in demotic Greek dating to the end of the 14th and the beginning of the 15th century, uses many of these forms as an alternative to those ending in -ν.

The situation changes considerably when we consider prose, both literary and non. A systematic perusal leads to some interesting discoveries: for example, ἦλθασι is allowed in Ducas' *Historia turcobyzantina* (9x), but not in other historiographical works of the late Byzantine period such as those by Laonicus Chalcocondyles and Michael Critobulus. Legal and administrative writings also provide valuable documentation: the Parisian codices which contain the Greek translation of the Assizes of the Kingdom of Jerusalem (*Par. Suppl. Gr.* 465 and *Par. Gr.* 1390), for example, attest to the vitality of these forms in legal writing (ἐλάβασι 4x, εἶδασι 18x).

The aim of this study is to undertake a survey of the use of these endings by authors of the mid and late Byzantine age, principally in poetry and literary prose, in order to decipher stylistic preferences and variations in their perception of linguistic correctness.

¹ M. Hinterberger, *Το φαινόμενο της πολυτυπίας σε δημόδη κείμενα*, in: H. Eideneier - U. Moennig - N. Τουφεξής (eds.), *Θεωρία και πράξη των εκδόσεων της υστεροβυζαντινής, αναγεννησιακής και μετα-βυζαντινής δημόδους γραμματείας. Πρακτικά του Διεθνούς Συνεδρίου Neograeca Medii Aevi IVa. Αμβούργο 28-31 Ιανουαρίου 1999*. Ηράκλειο 2001, 215-244.

Geert De Mol

The hypercorrect use of $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\nu$ in Greek documentary sources: a historical-sociolinguistic approach

In my research, which is part of the ERC project *Everyday Writing in Graeco-Roman and Late Antique Egypt (I-VIII AD). A Socio-Semiotic Study of Communicative Variation*, I will develop an approach to explain spelling variation and more specifically orthographic hypercorrection in Ancient Greek papyri from a historical-sociolinguistic point of view.

As a case study, I will investigate the influence of extra-linguistic factors on the occurrence of the hypercorrect $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\nu$ instead of the correct modal particle $\acute{\alpha}\nu$. These factors are the relation between writer and addressee and their respective social positions, the genre of the text in question, ideological factors, etc. (cf. Sebba 2007). Considering the multilingual environment of Roman and Late Antique Egypt, not having Greek as a mother tongue might also have an influence (cf. Sebba, Mahootian and Jonsson 2012: 8-10).

In order to retrieve occurrences of spelling variation in the Greek documentary corpus, I will use the EVWRIT database, containing documentary papyri from Egypt, dating from the 1st up to the 8th century AD. Papyri form a particularly interesting corpus for the research question at hand, because they are autographs and were meant to be read in their original context of use. The analysis of documentary sources will provide us with a much fuller insight into the social implications of orthography in the post-classical period. The database allows for individual annotations by word and the annotations and texts are searchable. This allows us to discover patterns concerning this one feature in relatively large corpora.

Interestingly, a preliminary search in the papyrological material, displayed in the table below, shows that hypercorrect cases of $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\nu$ seem particularly likely to show up in contracts from the Roman period (first three centuries AD), even when we check for the total number of texts that remain from all of the studied periods (percentages in brackets). These results are limited to the cases where modern editors flag the use of hypercorrect $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\nu$, but other cases are also present in the corpus.

Centuries	# contracts	# letters	# petitions	# texts
III-I BC	28 (0.36%)	43 (0.55%)	30 (0.39%)	7,776
I-III AD	184 (0.65%)	119 (0.42%)	30 (0.11%)	28,427
IV-VI AD	55 (0.33%)	86 (0.51%)	7 (0.04%)	16,851

Table: occurrences of hypercorrect $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\nu$ in documentary papyri

I intend to investigate whether this difference in frequency is indeed linked to the genre of the text, or to other factors relating to the writers and receivers of the texts. I will investigate to what extent the uneven distribution of this form of hypercorrection is typical for hypercorrections in general, such as those studied by Labov (1972) and others.

References

- Gignac, F. T. (1976). *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods: Volume I: Phonology*, Milan: Cisalpino – La Goliardica.
- Labov, W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

- Sebba, M. (2007). *Spelling and Society: The Culture and Politics of Orthography Around the World*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sebba, M., Mahootian, S. and Jonsson, C. (2012). *Language Mixing and Code-Switching in Writing: Approaches to Mixed-Language wWritten Discourse*, New York: Routledge.
- Smyth, H. W. (1984). *Greek Grammar: Revised by Gordon M. Messing*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Teodorsson, S.-T. (1977). *The Phonology of Ptolemaic Koine*, Gothenburg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.

Silvio Di Cello

Writing Greek in the γραφεῖον of Soknopaiou Nesos

Greek was the main language of Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt. After the Greek conquest by Alexander the Great, Greek became the official language of the administration, while Egyptian, though still spoken by the vast majority of the population and used in private documents, was gradually replaced. After the Roman occupation, nearly all the villages of Egypt stopped using Egyptian when writing and registering documents in the notarial offices, both the local – the γραφεῖα in the κῶμαι and the ἀγορανομεῖα in the μητροπόλεις – and the central ones in Alexandria – like the Ἀδριανεῖον and the Ναυαῖον, among others.

Tebtynis and Soknopaiou Nesos in the Arsinoites were the only exceptions. In fact, in these two κῶμαι Egyptian was still used and written as Demotic in the majority of the documents which were produced here, while Greek was only used in Greek ἀντίγραφα of Demotic documents and in ὑπογραφαί, which allowed them to be registered in the notarial offices. In these two κῶμαι, Egyptian fell into disuse only in the III century. This can be explained by their demography, as their population was mainly Egyptian, and by their geographical marginality. As a result, the number of documents written in Demotic in the γραφεῖα of Tebtynis and, more prominently, of Soknopaiou Nesos, is considerable. In the case of the latter γραφεῖον, not only were 44 papyri out of the 112 which can now be recognized as produced in this notarial office written in Demotic or in Greek and Demotic, but many νομόγραφοι and scribes working in the γραφεῖον, despite being Egyptians, wrote Greek documents and worked alongside Greeks.

The purpose of my paper is to highlight the linguistic features of the Greek papyri of the γραφεῖον of Soknopaiou Nesos, by taking into account the ethnicity of the scribes who wrote them. As is widely known, deviations from the norms are very common in the grammar of documentary papyri. This phenomenon can be explained with a variety of reasons, ranging from the influence of the spoken language on the phonetics, to the competence of the scribes in writing Greek and their ethnicity. With my paper I plan to discover whether correlations can be found between these deviations from the norm and the ethnicity of the scribes and if these features are recursive among the papyri of this γραφεῖον.

Finally, these features will be compared with those of the papyri of the γραφεῖον of Tebtynis, in order to underline the similarities and differences in the use of Greek in the two γραφεῖα, considering the crucial role played by the influence of the Egyptian language in both of them and the fact that many scribes did not speak Greek as their first language.

Overall, such an analysis should provide an interesting perspective on the shapes which Greek could take as a language when used for practical purposes by people with heterogeneous levels of competence.

Cristian Gaşpar

Between Ideological Orthodoxy and Linguistic Orthopraxy: The Fathers and τὸ ἀττικίζειν

The present paper intends to explore the complex love-hate relationship several prominent fourth- and fifth-century writers known (and revered by Christian tradition) as the Fathers of the Church had with the varieties of high-register Greek they used in written communication with their Christian and non-Christian audiences. I will focus in particular on the variety these writers variously identified as τὸ ἀττικίζειν, γλῶττα Ἀττική, or λέξις ἀττικίζουσα. Patristic writers of the period oscillated between, on the one hand, disparaging such Atticist Greek in their ideological pronouncements by contrast with and in the name of an idealized Christian *sermo piscatorius*, and using it to good (if unacknowledged) effect in their written linguistic practice, on the other.

I will argue that this ambiguous relationship and the attitudes to language which inform it can be better understood in terms of a dissociation between rhetorical elaboration (*rhetorischer Atticismus*) and linguistic expression (*sprachlicher Atticismus*), with most negative patristic statements targeting the former rather than the latter. Even when ἀττικίζειν refers indistinctly to both in patristic texts, we need to distinguish carefully between actual linguistic practice and the declarative rejection of rhetoric, itself a *topos* within the rhetoric of paradox that defines the emerging Christian discourse in opposition to traditional forms of intellectual discourse. In practice, outright rejection of Atticist Greek was rare with Christian elite writers because this was not a viable option in a world of (sometimes fierce) competitive intellectual interaction, where adherence to ideal(ized) linguistic standards still functioned as a means of claiming social prestige.

A study of a few selected linguistic variables in works authored by John Chrysostom, Theodoret of Cyrrhus, Cyril of Alexandria, Sozomen, Socrates, and some of their lesser known contemporaries will illustrate the extent to which adherence to Atticist ideals was context-bound and the result of pragmatic choices in relation to generic conventions, the make-up of intended audiences (not always restricted to Christians), and linguistic and stylistic expectations rather than governed by the rigid attitudes to language reflected in dogmatic and exclusive statements, with which they often coexisted within the same text. A concentration of high-register features serves, in most cases, as a good indicator of the linguistic expectations and competence of both the authors and/or their intended audience and can be found in letters to members of the elite, hagiobiographic texts composed (sometimes with a polemical intent) for educated urban audiences, historiographic and homiletic compositions heavily informed by traditional rhetoric. When available, similar texts composed by the same author in lower registers of Greek, such as theological or exegetical treatises and even hagiobiographic narratives, indicate that performance in one or several of the registers available to speakers of Greek in Late Antiquity was a normal occurrence for elite speakers/writers living in a diglossic situation.

Most Greek Fathers could and did inhabit, in addition to the ideological community of their Christian belief, more than one community of linguistic practice. Their definitions and standards of linguistic correctness should be looked for mostly in their actual linguistic practice, and less in their ideological statements.

Chiara Monaco

Old Attic, New Attic, and Koine: a terminological dispute

Purist tendencies had a long tradition in the history of the Greek language. In the second century CE, the development of a movement known as Atticism, which searched for purity in vocabulary, morphology, and syntax, had a remarkable fossilizing effect on the form of written Greek throughout the subsequent history of the language. The Atticists' tendency to identify Ancient Greek as a whole with Attic, the interpretation of different stages of Greek as monolithic entities, and the practice of labelling deviations from Classical Greek as “mistakes” are all aspects of the Atticists' approach which had a crucial impact on the transmission of the Greek language. These ideas had important consequences both for the definition of Greeks' linguistic identity, which at different chronological stages continued to be defined in relation to the past and for the way in which the Greek language has been perceived over the centuries as a juxtaposition of separate stages, rather than as a continuum of verbal and social dynamics. This had a profound impact on the evolution and transmission of the Greek language, with the consequence of influencing the perceptions of scholars of Greek up to our age. In this respect, a detailed analysis of the methodology and the theoretical stances of Atticist lexica can shed light on ancient conceptions of language and varieties and reveal the impact that Atticist practices had on speakers' usage and the evolution and transmission of Greek.

My paper aims to investigate the use of linguistic labels in Atticist lexica to define different stages of the Greek language. The opposition between Attic and koine usages is a common practice in the Atticist lexica. This feature is clearly expressed in the binary structure of Moeris' lexicon (third century CE) in the form 'x is Attic, y is Hellenic', whilst also sometimes appearing in the tripartite form, 'x is Attic, y is Hellenic, and y/z belongs to the common language (κοινόν)'. While different meanings for the word κοινόν have already been proposed (Thumb 1901, Maidhof 1912, Versteegh 1987), a general investigation of the linguistic labels used in this lexicon is still missing. The distinction into primary Attic, middle Attic, secondary Attic, κοινόν and ἡ κοινὴ συνήθεια is a significant aspect of this lexicon that could give us insights into the Atticists' conceptions of chronological and dialectal varieties of Greek, the idea of language change and language evolution and consequently the relationship between different stages of the language, which were associated with different degrees of correctness. By comparing Moeris' system with other lexicographical sources (Probert 2004), I propose an analysis of the linguistic labels used in the Atticist lexica to see what they can tell us about Atticists' conceptualization of linguistic history and the impact this had on the transmission of the Greek language.

References

- Maidhof V.A. (1912), *Zur Begriffsbestimmung der Koine besonders aufgrund des Attizisten Moiris*, diss. Würzburg.
- Probert P. (2004), "Accentuation in Old Attic, Later Attic and Attic", in: J. H. M. Penney (ed.), *Indo-European Perspectives, Studies in Honour of Anna Morpurgo Davies*, Oxford, 277-291.
- Versteegh K. (1987), "Latinitas, Hellenismos, 'Arabiyya'", in: D. J. Taylor (ed.), *The History of Linguistics in the Classical Period*, Amsterdam, 251-274.
- Thumb A. J. G. (1901), *Die griechische Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus. Beiträge zur Geschichte und Beurteilung der KOINH*, Strasbourg.

Alessandra Palla

Hellenismós: a neglected virtus narrationis? An example in Aphthonius the Sophist

The aim of this paper is to provide a literary and critical analysis of the unconventional use of *Hellenismós* in the *Progymnasmata* of Aphthonius the Sophist. This term is usually used to describe one of the *virtutes dicendi*, but what has not been given sufficient attention in the literature is the role it plays in the *virtutes narrationis*.

The theory of *virtutes narrationis* is widely and variously discussed by ancient authors. The main three properties within which they are generally recognized are clarity (σαφήνεια), brevity (συντομία), and plausibility (πιθανότης). This is the context for the original theory articulated by Aphthonius the Sophist, who, in his *Progymnasmata* (§ 2), defines clarity (σαφήνεια), brevity (συντομία), plausibility (πιθανότης), and Hellenism (ὁ τῶν ὀνομάτων ἑλληνισμός) as narrative virtues. A similar reference to *hellenismós* is unusual in this context, but modern scholars seem to acknowledge this without paying particular attention to it. The Byzantine commentaries of the eleventh century, by contrast, do note this unconventional use and try to clarify Aphthonius' theory: the commentary on the *Progymnasmata* of Aphthonius attributed to John of Sardis and the later compendium by John Doxapatres are indeed of great value and provide a new perspective on this neglected subject.

Starting from Aphthonius' text and commentaries on it, this paper will provide a basis from which to develop a thorough and detailed study focused on the use of *hellenismós* and similar terms in the *virtutes narrationis*. This will allow us to define *hellenismós* not only as a term that is opposed to barbarism and solecism but also as connected to the main words used to define a very good narrative.

Emmanuel Roumanis

Judgement and Appreciation: Analysing the Metalanguage of Atticist Lexicographers

The value of Atticist *dicta* as witnesses to both the direct (puristic) and indirect (spoken) forces acting upon, and shaping, the postclassical norm (i.e. Koine Greek) during the period of Middle Post-Classical Greek (I-III CE) has been well noted since the nineteenth century. Since Lobeck's (1820) edition of Phrynichus' *Ecloga*, scholars (e.g. Moulton 1908, 25; Browning 1983, esp. 47-49) have given their attention to what the pre- and proscriptions of Atticists like Phrynichus and Moeris reveal about the historical development of contemporary Greek. Less attention, however, has been paid to the language of the lexicographers (or grammarians) themselves; that is, the metalanguage within which is encoded each Atticist's ideological realisation of a broad, but by no means homogeneous puristic programme (Coupland and Jaworski 2004, 36-7).

While such Atticist manuals have been closely studied in the past few decades, particularly within the wider literary and linguistic context of the Second Sophistic (e.g. Swain 1996; and Whitmarsh 2005; and Strobel 2011), during which period modern text editions of selected Atticist manuals have appeared to aid scholars (e.g. Fischer 1974; Hansen 1998; and Valente 2015), there remains much value in exploiting the (socio)linguistic potential of Atticistic metalanguage. To this end, there are various theoretical frameworks and models that are useful for analysing the ancient textual material, each with its own set of strengths and weaknesses, apropos of the corpus, or corpora, to which they are being applied (Bentein 2017).

Two of the most well-known, and today most widely cited Atticist manuals (sometimes called dictionaries or lexica) are those of Phrynichus (*Ecloga*) and Moeris (*Attic Words*). These two texts differ from each in various ways, owing partly to different textual transmissions but mostly to different aims, which, as I argue, are realised through dissimilar strategies of (linguistic) recommendation and rejection. A close analysis of the metalanguage of each lexicographer's entries allows us to identify and contrast divergent approaches to (linguistic) appraisal, or stancetaking (Martin 2000; Jaffe 2009), vis-à-vis an emergent, but unsystematically codified register of purified Attic Greek, so that we understand more precisely how diverse Phrynichus' strategies are, and how methodically objective the *dicta* of *Attic Words*.

Bibliography:

- Bentein, K. 2017. "Toward a Historical Socio-Historical Analysis of Ancient Greek? Some Problems and Aspects", in: A. M. Cuomo and E. Trapp (eds.) *Toward a Historical Sociolinguistic Poetics of Medieval Greek*, 35-45. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Browning, R. 1983. *Medieval and Modern Greek*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coupland, N. and Jaworski, A. 2004. "Sociolinguistic Perspectives on Metalanguage: Reflexivity, Evaluation and Ideology", in: A. Jaworski, N. Coupland and D. Galasiński (eds.) *Metalanguage: Social and Ideological Perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Fischer, E. (ed.). 1974. *Die Ekloge des Phrynichos*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Hansen, D. U. (ed.). 1998. *Das Attizistische Lexikon Des Moeris*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Jaffe, A. 2009. "Introduction: The Sociolinguistics of Stance", in: A. Jaffe (ed.) *Stance: Sociolinguistic Perspectives*, 1-28. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lobeck, C. A. (ed.). 1820. *Phrynichi eclogae nominum et verborum Atticorum*. Leipzig: Weidmann.
- Martin, J. R. 2000. "Beyond Exchange: APPRAISAL Systems in English", in: S. Hunston and G. Thompson (eds.) *Evaluation in text*, 275-303. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Moulton, J. H. 1908. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek. Vol. 1: Prolegomena*. 3rd ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Strobel, C. 2011. *Studies in Atticistic Lexica of the Second and Third Centuries AD*. DPhil. thesis, University of Oxford.
- Swain, S. 1996. *Hellenism and Empire: Language, Classicism and Power in the Greek World, AD 50-250*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Valente, S. (ed.). 2015. *The Antiatticist: Introduction and Critical Edition*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Whitmarsh, T. 2005. *The Second Sophistic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Maria Giovanna Sandri

**Diachronic variation in the theorization on Greek breathings.
The case study of the *Mischlexikon* περὶ πνευμάτων**

Among the Greek handbooks on language and grammar produced from the ancient through the Byzantine period, the treatises on breathings (περὶ πνευμάτων) cover peculiar ground. The importance of such textbooks lies in the fact that, as is well known, aspiration progressively disappeared during the period of the Koine, both in spoken and written practice (as a matter of fact, very little is known on the reality of medieval aspiration). Aiming at giving rules of accentuation, throughout the centuries, Greek grammarians produced several treatises on this matter. Up to now, the majority of the surviving treatises on breathings are still unpublished and, consequently, almost totally unknown.

Among the published treatises on breathings, the so-called *Mischlexikon* περὶ πνευμάτων edited by L. C. Valckenaer in 1739 (*Ammonius*, Lugduni Batavorum: 207-242) is in serious need of a new edition: the *editio princeps* is based on a single Leiden manuscript, whereas, as has already been shown by P. Egenolff (*Die orthoepischen Stücke der byzantinischen Litteratur*, Leipzig 1887: 17-28), more manuscript witnesses of the same text are available. Among these, two manuscripts – one kept in Florence (14th cent.), the other one in Copenhagen (15th cent.) – seem to be extremely promising. In fact, these two manuscripts preserve a different redaction from Valckenaer's: it is very likely that the new version is, in fact, the primary version of the *Mischlexikon*, while the other is a secondary, expanded and handled redaction.

This paper aims at offering the first study of the *Mischlexikon* in its primary version. Firstly, I would like to stress how the grammarians' approach to breathings diachronically changed throughout the centuries. The lexicon – which is probably to be dated to the 13th cent. – consists of *excerpta* taken from several grammatical works, dating from both the ancient (Trypho, 1st cent. BCE, and Herodianus, 2nd cent. AD) and the Byzantine periods (Theodoretus, maybe before the 6th cent., and Choeroboscus, second half of the 8th cent.). When the sources can be identified, it is possible to appreciate the changes in the way breathings were approached. For example, while in Trypho's doctrine analogy explicitly plays a leading role, in Theodoretus' text the analogic method is never made explicit, even if implicitly applied, with a clear shift in the grammatical language. Another sample of the diachronic variation is represented by the fact that, while the link between quantity and aspiration of the vowels is prominent in the doctrine of Trypho and Herodianus, in Theodoretus' work quantity is hardly ever taken into consideration.

The second purpose of this paper is to consider this new version of the *Mischlexikon* as a particular source for historical sociolinguistic studies in Medieval Greek (on this approach, see esp. A. M. Cuomo, "Medieval Textbooks as a Major Source for Historical Sociolinguistic Studies of (high-register) Medieval Greek", *Open Linguistics* 3.1 (2017), 442-455). In some cases, a word quoted as a specific example of aspiration is followed by a gloss which explains its meaning: the study of some of these cases often reveals peculiar lexical forms of Koine Greek, which are contrast with other lemmas pertaining to Attic or high-register Greek.

The Atticism of Libanius

In his statement of purpose concerning "Greeks and their past in the Second Sophistic", Bowie points out that "the archaism of language and style known as Atticism is only part of a wider tendency, a tendency that prevails in literature not only in style but also in choice of theme and treatment, and that equally affects other areas of cultural activities". These assumptions lead us to go beyond a strictly linguistic and literary approach to so-called Atticism and to consider this phenomenon from a wider perspective, thus taking into account a highly diversified plurality of attitudes towards it: in other words, Atticism also concerns the relationship of the Greeks, from the Hellenistic age onwards, with their past. Given these remarks, my study aims at examining the main features of the language and style of Libanius, one of the most influential and imitated rhetoricians of Late Antiquity, in order to evaluate the extent to which his work adheres to Atticism and the potential implications of his stylistic and linguistic choices with his social and political point of view. In order to achieve this goal, I focus on two historical declamations (XVII-XVIII) from Libanius' extensive corpus —my analysis also takes into account problems of authenticity concerning these writings—, dealing with classical Athens' history and politics as well as with a comparison between Aeschines and Demosthenes. These two declamations, whose rhetorical and historical sources are clearly presented to the reader, provide us with a key case study. Demosthenes is in fact an undisputed model for Libanius, thus confirming not only his well-known and already investigated predilection for this major Attic orator but also another, less explored aspect, that is Libanius' study of his Attic model (as pointed out by the *hypotheses in Dem.*).

Furthermore, another aspect should be considered: Libanius modernized his Attic models through the mediation of Aristides. In this context, I will seek to analyse the extent to which Aristides' model influenced, especially from a linguistic point of view, Libanius' Atticism. I will therefore carry out a close comparative analysis between Libanius' and Aristides' writings, with special attention given to the *Discourses to the Thebans* (orr. IX-X Lenz-Behr): as I have pointed out in my previous studies, this text directly inspired Libanius. In evaluating such linguistic phenomena, I will also compare Libanius' text with several technical handbooks that are supposed to have been used by the rhetorician within the context of late antique rhetorical schools (esp. Atticist and anti-Atticist lexica).

The aim of this study is to give further insight into the study of Libanius' language and style. Although Libanius represents a model that had a strong impact on subsequent generations of writers, especially those from the Byzantine age, the analysis of his language and style has been carried out only by some nineteenth-century scholars and, more recently, by a few specialists. From a wider perspective, this paper seeks to shed light on the significant turning point that classical orators' Atticism reached within the linguistically changed context of Late Antiquity, and how the mediation of more recent models as well as the choice of a specific literary genre affected it. Finally, after focusing on linguistically relevant issues, I will also elicit some further remarks on Libanius' recovery of Demosthenes' oratory in term of political choices by formulating several questions: 1) Is it possible to detect a specific and a distinct form of Atticism in Libanius' work? 2) Is Libanius' Atticism the result of a traditional rhetorical education or is it the outcome of his own study and personal life?

Giuseppe Ucciardello

Magistros' lexicon and its sources: new evidence from the earliest mss tradition

Magistros' dictionary (ὀνομάτων Ἀττικῶν ἐκλογή 'Selection of Attic words') stands out as the most important contribution made to lexicography by the scholars of the first Palaeologan age. It was used by the well-educated elites as a didactic tool with a prescriptive goal for those aiming to become rhetoricians, but it also plays a pivotal role in the transmission of some lexicographers of the Second Sophistic (Phrynichus, Philemo, Moeris, Ammonius, the author of the "Philetairos"), until then greatly neglected. The standard edition is that of Friedrich Ritschl (1832), but it relied exclusively on fifteenth-century witnesses. Gaul's recent re-evaluation of some of the earliest manuscripts provides an impressive contribution for better understanding the different stages of revision and expansion of the lexicon, as well as the different learned circles involved in the process. Nonetheless, a further inquiry into the tradition allows us to find new early fourteenth-century manuscripts which have hitherto been overlooked. The aim of the present paper is (a) to discuss the new evidence and what more it can tell us about the redaction of the lexicon at its earliest stage; (b) to give a fresh review of the principles governing the rearrangement of the main sources into the new lexicon in light of a more profound knowledge of the textual transmission.

Baukje van den Berg

**Teaching Atticizing Greek with Homeric Poetry:
Eustathios of Thessalonike and Language Education in Twelfth-Century Byzantium**

Eustathios of Thessalonike (c. 1115-1195) is arguably the best-known Homeric scholar of the Byzantine era. His monumental commentaries on the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* provide a rich record of Byzantine thinking on language and literature. Eustathios' target audience consists of aspiring or practising rhetors and prose writers: the aim of his commentaries is to teach excellent prose composition with Homeric poetry as a starting point. Recent studies have demonstrated how Eustathios analyses the exemplary rhetorical composition of the Homeric poems with the help of the rhetorician tradition. The grammatical and linguistic material in the commentaries has to date received less attention, even if it offers a wealth of information that can significantly advance our understanding of language education and linguistic norms in twelfth-century Byzantium. The proposed paper aims to take a step in this direction by exploring how Eustathios negotiates between the epic Greek of Homeric poetry and the Atticizing Greek of Byzantine prose: how can the twelfth-century rhetor learn correct prose usage by reading archaic poetry?

The paper focuses on three aspects of Eustathios' ideas on language and correct prose usage. First, it concentrates on the tensions that Eustathios perceives between Homer's epic Greek and the norms of Atticizing prose. Numerous times throughout the commentaries, he warns his audience of rhetors to avoid certain words and word forms in their prose writing. A systematic analysis of such comments demonstrates how Eustathios determines the norms of correct prose usage and what he perceives these norms to be. Second, the paper examines Eustathios' instructions for coining neologisms. Even if he uses ancient prose as the principal benchmark for correct prose usage, he allows – indeed encourages – contemporary prose writers to use words of their own coinage, provided they remain within the limits of good taste. The commentaries as well as Eustathios' own rhetorical prose show what kinds of neologisms were acceptable according to one of the most celebrated rhetors of his time. Third, the paper studies Eustathios' discussion of apparent solecisms in Homeric poetry. The line between grammatical mistakes and permissible novelty is a fine one, yet the good rhetor knows how and when to bend the rules to create a special effect.

Eustathios appropriates ancient notions as tools for his analysis of Homer's language. These notions belong to traditions that, notwithstanding their ancient roots, continued to shape the conceptual framework that governed Byzantine language education and grammatical scholarship. By exploring Eustathios' ideas on Homer's language, the paper therefore simultaneously advances our understanding of his conceptual framework and the texts that shaped it, including ancient and Byzantine grammatical treatises and various kinds of lexica. Eustathios' commentaries must also be studied against the background of ideas on language and grammar education in the works of his contemporaries, most importantly the influential grammarian John Tzetzes and the little-studied scholar Gregory of Corinth. By placing Eustathios' ideas on language within their relevant contexts, the proposed paper thus aims to open up a perspective on the norms and expectations governing Atticizing Greek in twelfth-century Byzantium. A perfect command of Atticizing Greek was imperative for anyone seeking social, political, economic, and professional advancement; this started in the classroom of grammarians and rhetoricians like Eustathios and his colleagues.

Raf Van Rooy

**Theodore Gaza's Greek:
A fifteenth-century grammar book and its impact**

In the fifteenth century, several late Byzantine scholars were active in Renaissance Italian cities and published Greek grammar books tailored to the needs of their Latin-oriented students. Theodore Gaza from Thessaloniki (c. 1410/15-c. 1475/76) was one of them, following in the tracks of pioneers such as Manuel Chrysoloras (c. 1350-1415). Although Federica Ciccolella (2008: 123) is no doubt right in stating that “the language taught in these grammars is the usual mixture of fifth-century Attic Greek, archaic Ionic dialect, and Hellenistic-Byzantine κοινή”, the variety of Greek described by most of these Byzantine scholars has not yet been examined in greater detail (cf. Van Rooy 2020: 105-106). I will analyze to what extent Ciccolella's assessment applies to Gaza's popular manual: what variety or varieties of Greek take center stage in his grammar? How did Gaza conceptualize the Greek linguistic norms he described? Did the grammarian make any explicit statements on this theme or do we have to guess them from his paradigms, exemplification, and passing remarks? I will focus in my analysis on the first two books of his grammar, which also circulated separately. These books describe the core of Greek grammar (i.e. the parts of speech), whereas the less accessible third and fourth books treat the more specialist topics of accentuation and syntax (see Botley 2010: 14-25 on Gaza's grammar and the references there).

Gaza's work was to have a profound influence on late fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Greek studies all over Europe, from Italy to England, from Spain to the Low Countries. It seems, moreover, that the Greek Gaza described in his grammar came to hold a normative position at certain sixteenth-century Hellenist centers. I will focus on the striking case of the Louvain Collegium Trilingue, whose first professors taught in the spirit of Girolamo Aleandro (1480-1542) and his Greek courses in Paris from the early 1510s, in which Gaza's handbook was used. Annotations taken during a course on Homer's *Odyssey*, starting in October 1543 and taught by the Limburg humanist Rutger Rescius (c. 1495-1545), reveal curious symbols which can only be understood as reflecting a normative view on the Greek language. It seems that Rescius encouraged his students to strike all unusual (i.e. non-classical or non-Koine) elements from Homer's Greek in the printed text. These annotations thus present a unique source for assessing the impact of late Byzantine notions of linguistic correctness, in particular those of Theodore Gaza, whose work was frequently printed in early sixteenth-century Louvain, both in the original Greek and in the Latin translation of Desiderius Erasmus, and moreover inspired the grammatical work of local Hellenists such as Rescius. In particular, I will compare the Greek norm promoted by Rescius both in the student notes and in the grammatical tables he composed with Gaza's conception of Greek norms. This analysis will allow me to assess the degree to which Rescius' teachings were indebted to Gaza's ideas on 'Hellenism'.

References

- Botley, Paul. 2010. *Learning Greek in Western Europe, 1396-1529: Grammars, Lexica, and Classroom Texts*. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society.
- Ciccolella, Federica. 2008. *Donati Graeci: Learning Greek in the Renaissance*. Leiden & Boston: Brill.
- Van Rooy, Raf. 2020. “A Professor at Work: Hadrianus Amerotius (c. 1495–1560) and the Study of Greek in Sixteenth-Century Louvain”, in: N. Constantinidou and H. Lamers (eds.) *Receptions of Hellenism in Early Modern Europe: 15th-17th Centuries*, 94-112. Leiden & Boston: Brill.

Staffan Wahlgren

Byzantine Grammarians and Syntactic Normativity

Byzantine writers on language, like their counterparts in Antiquity, focus most of their attention on vocabulary and morphology. Less often syntax is discussed, and only with regard to a limited set of phenomena. It is rarely presented in such a way as to suggest a negotiation of norms.

In this paper I will discuss some examples of the Byzantine grammarians' approach to syntax and whether we, after all, can derive a certain amount of normative thinking from their writings or, at least, awareness of syntactic variation. In order to do so I will explore whether, even if there is no explicit normativity, we can detect implicit norms from the presentation of facts and the discussion of linguistic alternatives.

Key word: Syntax, linguistic variation, implicit normativity

Mariarosaria Zinzi

Some socio-historical remarks on the Greek of imperial documents of the Palaiologan period

Starting from the Roman period, a dichotomy between a crystalised Attic ideal and the Koine in all its heterogeneity quickly established a formal state of diglossia which continued until the 20th century. A high-register, “Atticized” variety, which the users and audience learnt at school, is generally described as the language of literary, bureaucratic and ecclesiastical texts, while a low-register variety as that of spoken language, used for composing vernacular literature from the 12th century on. Nevertheless, as Horrocks (2010: 135) points out, “It should be stressed [...] that the notion of a clear-cut dichotomy, though ideologically vital to the educated classes, was in reality largely theoretical”.

In this paper we will deal with a less-studied, as far as we know, production in Byzantine Greek, namely with the bureaucratic texts issued from the Palaiologan court. In fact, although many studies have been devoted to vernacular Greek (see e.g. Browning 1983, Holton & Manolessou 2010, Bentein 2015) and there is a growing interest in Byzantine literary Greek (see, among others, Hinterberg 2014, Cuomo & Trapp 2017), little attention has been paid to the Greek of the Byzantine chancellery. The texts will be analysed within the framework of historical sociolinguistics (see, among others, Hernández-Campoy & Conde-Silvestre 2012, Cuomo 2017), in order to investigate if and to what extent the low-register affected the high-register variety of Byzantine Greek.

At first sight, the register of the documents issued by the imperial Palaiologan chancellery seems to be in line with an elaborated Koine tradition. Nonetheless, as Horrocks (2010: 271) already suggested, while the official Greek of the later empire shows “the archaizing verbosity” of the legal profession, its syntax and vocabulary do not fit properly the model of classical Greek. We will analyse the language used in six documents issued by the imperial chancellery between 1261 and 1451. This study aims at showing that, even though bureaucratic Greek keeps the ancient orthography and morphology (e.g. we can find “classical” synthetic future forms, infinitives, “classical” relative pronouns), the syntax does not completely adhere to the classical norm. In fact, we can, for example, find genitive absolute constructions, the insertion of modifiers between the article and the noun, accusative and infinitive clauses in a syntax which generally looks modern (for instance, the verb tends to be placed in second position and the modifiers tend to follow the modified noun). Ancient morphological elements, moreover, seem to mostly survive within the formulaic prose typical of bureaucratic documents. Finally, the lexicon of the analysed texts has been enriched by a technical vocabulary concerning political charges, diplomacy and commerce, which was not attested in classical Greek.

Considering those elements and comparing them with the “true” classical practice, we will propose that such features account for an impact of the low-register on the high-register variety of Byzantine Greek. The variety employed by the Palaiologan chancellery seems to be an antiqued version of the medieval Koine rather than a language referring to an academic, fixed style. The spoken variety, changing with time, therefore seems to influence the norms of the older grammar learnt by the copyists of the Byzantine chancellery.

Selected bibliography

- Bentein, K. 2015. "The Greek Documentary Papyri as a Linguistically Heterogeneous Corpus: The case of the katochoi of the Sarapeion-archive". *Classical World* 108, 461-484.
- Browning R. 1983. *Medieval and Modern Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cuomo A. M. 2017. "Medieval Textbooks as a Major Source for Historical Sociolinguistic Studies of (high-register) Medieval Greek". *Open Linguistics* 3, 442-455.
- Cuomo A. M. and Trapp E. 2017. *Toward a historical Sociolinguistic Poetics of Medieval Greek*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Hernández-Campoy, J. M. and Conde-Silvestre J. C. (eds.). 2012. *The Handbook of Historical Sociolinguistics*. Malden, Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Hinterberger, M. (ed.) 2014. *The Language of Byzantine Learned Literature*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Holton D. and Manolessou I. 2010. "Medieval and Modern Greek", in: E. J. Bakker (ed.), *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*, 539-563. Malden, Oxford, Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Horrocks G. C. 2010². *Greek. A history of the language and its speakers*. Malden, Oxford, Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Horrocks G. C. 2014. "High-register Medieval Greek. 'Diglossia' and What Lay Behind It", in: C. Carpinato and O. Tribulato, *Storia e storie della lingua greca*, 49-72. Venezia: Edizioni Ca' Foscari.
- Horrocks, G. C. 2017a. "High and Low in Medieval Greek", in: K. Bentein, M. Janse and J. Soltic (eds.), *Variation in Ancient Greek tense, aspect and modality*, 219-241. Leiden & Boston.