Introduction

Chiara Monaco, Robert Machado and Eleni Bozia

1 Preliminary Remarks

This volume brings together studies on the most significantly attested varieties of Ancient Greek: Attic, Koine, and Atticist Greek. These varieties have a shared history, closely linked to the political vicissitudes of the Greeks—Attic as the official language of the Athenian Empire; Koine as the language of the Macedonian Empire and the Hellenistic Kingdoms; and Atticist Greek as the language of the Greek elite under the Roman rule. By the time of the rise of Attic, Greek had been written down for centuries. Still, changes in the socio-political landscape effectuated linguistic change and ensured that this time one variety would emerge as an internationally official form of Greek. Its progeny, the Koine and Atticist Greek, would be the poles around which Medieval and Modern Greek would orbit. Grammars were (and still are) built around them, the process of selection and codification based on them. Even today, the other Greek varieties are considered deviations or derivatives from these grammars.

This process has encouraged us to think of these varieties—Attic, Koine, and Atticism—in homogeneous terms within the context of standard/s and standardization, despite the complicated attestation and history of each and the diversity of texts composed in them. Many previous studies on these varieties or single aspects of them have tended to focus on what unites the language of each (Thumb 1906; Threatte 1980, 1996; Colvin 2014). Moreover, the works on the history of the Greek language as a whole (Christidis 2007; Bakker 2010; Horrocks 2010) have looked to emphasize the importance of broad political and social trends to linguistic history. Increasingly, however, works have emerged seeking to break down their apparent homogeneity and examine the role of individual texts and genres in a variety's history at any given period.[1] As a result, the questions raised by previous works about the mechanics of language change, speakers' perception, and the development of identities can be better analyzed by investigating the mutual influence of these three varieties.

We believe that the time is ripe to engage more constructively with these varieties and approach them from a novel perspective as living organisms

1 Brixhe & Hodot (1993a); Willi (2002, 2003a, 2003b, 2010); Cartlidge (2014); Vessella (2018); Colvin (2020); Bentein & Janse (2020).

 | DOI:10.1163/9789004687318_002

through their speakers and the texts composed in them. The analysis of the different aspects of the process of standardization together with a reflection on changes and innovations, anchored to these evolving standards, constitute the backbone of this volume. Each contribution looks closely at how authors starting from a familiar linguistic standard adopt changes and explore the socio-dynamics behind language usage, bringing about innovations and ultimately rethinking and reconfiguring those standards. Our approach is informed by linguistics, sociolinguistics, and literary studies as each contributor discusses the use of Greek through actual speakers and situates their linguistic particularities not within a framework of technical observations but rather as dynamically evolving entities that are conditioned by as much as they condition the linguistic and socio-cultural realities. The originality of our outlook and its challenge is to consider the varieties of Greek not as independent, monolithic entities but rather as living languages, which were deeply intertwined, and to investigate the history of the Greek language as a continuous flow of verbal and social dynamics rather than a juxtaposition of separate stages. Thematic and chronological divides in the study of Greek are often helpful and necessary, but they can prevent us from asking important questions about the relationships between the varieties. For example, what happened to Attic has significant consequences for our understanding of the Koine and Atticism, and the study of the latter two varieties inevitably informs our understanding of Attic.

Therefore, the aim of this book is to go beyond the idea of Attic and Koine as standards and to look at the varieties in relation to each other. In the confrontation between the idea of 'standards' (which can be conceived as 'anchors') and 'deviations' from those standards in the form of 'innovations', we examine how seemingly disparate ways of speaking and expressing oneself, when studied through the lens of socio-literary interconnectedness, may translate linguistic standardization and complexity into historico-linguistic and cultural continuity and language wealth. Within this framework, the contributors apply interdisciplinary perspectives to provide new insights into the complexity of Greek and language use overall. Weinreich, Labov, and Herzog (1968, pp. 100–101), in their work on dialects, speak of "orderly heterogeneity" that modulates into "structured variation". The contributions of this volume trace the process through the homogeneous heterogeneity of the speakers themselves and investigate more of what is behind and beyond the labels Attic, Koine, and Atticist Greek, drawing a new picture of the interplay between them and the amalgamated socio-literary reality they bring about. Our intention is to transcend the traditional boundaries—chronological, stylistic, and dialectal—and provide 'snapshots' from the long and complex history of Greek on the way the three

varieties interact. Our contributors redefine the so-called standards to detect, not homogeneous and unified representations, but discontinuities and breakups in a continuous and multifaceted process of standardization, which has characterized the Greek language. In the analysis of the continuities and discontinuities, the volume will also show that these standards are not objective or stable but are often deliberately constructed: what counts as 'Attic' is often a matter of perception and ideology. In this way, the standards are continuously negotiated: they can be a standard to aspire to or something to be rejected, a process that is termed as 'negative anchoring'.[2] For instance, Atticism is negatively anchored in the literary Koine, in the sense that what was considered Attic was often established on the basis of what was not used or less common in the Koine. In this respect, an important factor in the process of standardization of linguistic changes is the successful anchoring—essentially the connection between what is perceived as new and what is perceived as already familiar—through which linguistic changes become successful and therefore true 'innovations', among relevant communities and societies. Innovations may become acceptable, understandable, and desirable when relevant social groups can effectively integrate and accommodate them in their conceptual categories, values, beliefs, and ambitions.[3]

The contributions approach the topic from three perspectives. In the first section, experts in linguistics provide insights into the formation and evolution of Attic, Koine, and Atticist Greek against the backdrop of Imperial and Byzantine lexica, and papyri. In the second section, scholars examine the fashioning of language through literature and vice versa. They afford the reader unique appreciations of writers such as Xenophon, Aelius Aristides, and Christian authors, as they consider the usage of the language in these texts, the degree of literary influences, and their subsequent literary reception, as well as to what degree such ferments had an impact in setting the standards. Finally, the third section includes essays that discuss the socio-political bearings of language standards. Experts problematize the formation of the idea of 'classical' language in the fifth century BCE, the question of *paideia* in the Imperial period, and the shaping of identity through personal name modification. These are all topics that mirror social changes and definitions of citizenship. The section closes with a chapter on the setting of modern standards in teaching Greek thus bringing the concept of anchoring to contemporary perspectives on the Greek language. All approaches provide unique insights into multiple levels of anchoring. In some of the contributions, authorial

2 Sluiter (2017, p. 33).
3 Sluiter (2017, p. 23).

particularities are anchored in the connections between standards and their redefinition by focusing on the many possible relations between standards and departure from those standards. Against this backdrop, the definition of canonical authors is another way to anchor linguistic choices to models of language. Others contributions redefine those standards and situate their authors within a framework of a novel combination of old and new, or of the old recontextualized within new circumstances and literary spaces. Contributors also rethink the idea that 'old' and 'new' are not only used as anchoring labels of standardization. Instead, they propose that such concepts are also and frequently employed in an evaluative sense and the load they carry depends on the speaker, context, societal domain, and object.[4] The flexibility of these terms makes it particularly easy for them to be weaponized for argumentative and rhetorical purposes (e.g., in the Atticist movement what was old (or not new) was ideologized as correct). In this vein, some papers demonstrate how Greek authors understood and manipulated their audience's expectations regarding language standards to promote their own socio-cultural and political agendas, enhancing the idea of the ever-shifting nature of the standards. In sum, this volume rethinks the established linguistic and literary stereotypes as well as the standard anchors for what have been thus far attempts at standardization, all the while providing an innovative appreciation of the Greek language and its speakers.

2 Attic, Koine, and Atticist Greek as Standard Languages

In referring to these varieties as 'standards', we tread on controversial territory. The concept of a standard language is an intensely tricky one especially when mapping the concept onto the ancient world. Scholarship from Western traditions with long-established notions of 'national' languages, standard grammars and 'correct' and 'incorrect' forms can find it difficult to empathize with the significantly different sociolinguistic situation presented by the ancient Greco-Roman world, where literacy and education were restricted, there was no ideological association with a nation-state and the technology and institutions that enable a truly standardized national language did not exist.[5] This difference in perspectives, which often ends up in a sort of 'reading back' from modern sociolinguistic contexts, goes together with a tendency to propose a

4 Sluiter (2017, pp. 9 and 31). On the concept of new in Greek see D'Angour (2011). On the relationship between Old/New and language evaluation see Thomas (1991).

5 For further discussion of these issues, see Haugen (1966); Joseph (1987); Colvin (2009, 2011); Wardhaugh (2010); Milroy & Milroy (2012); Clackson (2015).

chronological reading of standardization as a linear process and to prioritize literary texts (Colvin 2014). This attitude has produced a polarized approach to the question of standardization, with a general oversimplification of important phenomena, i.e., the relationship between raising 'standards' and varieties, the role of language change in the process of standardization, and the lack of clarity about the relationship between codification, prescription and purism among others.

Modern studies on the concepts of standard and standardization, among which the recent *Cambridge Handbook of Language Standardization* (Ayres-Bennett & Bellamy 2021), have contributed to identifying some questions, which need to be taken into account: the problematic definition of standard(s) and standardization, the ideological nature of these concepts (Milroy & Milroy 2012), the difference between 'language standards' and 'standard language' (Joseph 1987, pp. 4–7) and so on. The first problem appears in establishing a comprehensive definition of 'standard', in the form of a codified set of linguistic forms and structures (the product of corpus planning), which has some kind of recognition and promotion (status planning) (Pountain 2016). This definition includes the crucial ideas of corpus planning, status planning,[6] recognition, and promotion. The numerous models of standardization developed in the last 30 years have dealt with these concepts in different ways, trying to enhance the complexities of the standardization process and its different manifestations in diverse linguistic, historical, and sociocultural contexts.

The traditional starting point for a general, although limited, description of the process of standardization is Haugen's (1966, then revised in 1983, p. 270 and 1987, p. 64) four stages of selection, elaboration,[7] codification, and implementation (or acceptance). These criteria continue to form the basis of most definitions of standardization, although the range and criteria vary largely from scholar to scholar as more recent studies have shown (Ayres-Bennett & Bellamy 2021).

A particular crucial point relates to the relationship between the process of codification and correctness. Garvin (1959), Stewart (1968), and more systematically Milroy and Milroy (2012) relate prescriptive attitudes to the phenomenon of standardization by focusing on the presence of an ideology of correctness. This is one of the key contributions of Milroy and Milroy together with the idea that standardization is an ideology, "a set of abstract norms to which usage may conform to a greater or lesser extent" (2012, p. 19). However, these studies do not clarify the crucial difference between codification, prescriptivism,

6 A distinction made by Kloss (1969, p. 81).

7 The concept of elaboration builds on Kloss' definition of *Ausbau* (1967).

and purism, ignoring the problematic opposition between 'descriptive' and 'prescriptive' (Ayres-Bennett 2020). The lack of clarity on these concepts is a crucial issue in understanding the process of standardization in the history of the Greek language and it is the cause of a widespread confusion between phenomena of correctness, which developed at an early stage, and the multifaced and never-ending process of standardization.

Together with this, another important aspect is the distinction between 'informal' and 'formal' standardization (Stewart 1968, p. 534), the first entailing "uncodified but socially preferred norms of usage" and the second implying "deliberate conformity to codified rules".

The different modelling of the standardization process has overall contributed to seeing standardization as a spectrum or ongoing process (Garvin 1959; Kloss 1969; Haugen 1987; Joseph 1987, p. 19; Auer 2005) with any one variety being considered as a point on that spectrum or process. Broadly speaking, however, scholarship agrees that standard languages are united by:

1) Relative homogeneity in form
2) Use in a wide variety of functions, especially more formal communicative settings (law, education, business)
3) A sense of correctness
4) A sense that the standard variety is a target for speakers of multiple different languages or varieties.

Far from aiming at an exhaustive account of the modern studies on standard/s and standardization, our aim is to raise some questions anchored in the traditional investigation of the concept of standard as applied to the ancient world and to see, through the insights of actual users of Greek in a variety of genres both literary and beyond, whether any of our varieties of Greek meet the criteria mentioned above.[8] To this end, a crucial contribution has been the volume by Georgakopoulou and Silk (2009), where some of the problematic aspects of the idea of standard in the definition of Greek are posed in particular with reference to the Koine and Atticist Greek. Specifically, the contributions explore the relationship between varieties and forming standards, the distinction between codification and correctness, and the relationship between formal and informal standardization. However, there are still some controversial points which need further discussion.

As suggested by Clackson (2015), the linguistic panorama of the ancient world is better described as a situation of competing varieties. This system of competing models constitutes the peculiarity of the Greek world, where different linguistic varieties functioned as diverse, albeit not always codified models, at different levels of the social structure, and for various purposes. Examples

8 On the process of standardization of the Greek language, see Bentein and Monaco (2024).

of competing varieties can be seen at any time in the history of the Greek language, for instance with Ionic and Attic and the different varieties of Attic in the fifth and fourth century, not to mention the other dialects that played a crucial role in the Greek literary panorama.[9] A pertinent example of this phenomenon is represented by Atticism, which, with its revitalization and attempted codification of Attic as the language of culture, replaced the Koine in its high variety by creating a state of competition between two systems—Attic (or Atticism) and Koine.[10] This is reflected in the (educated) speakers' support for one variety or the other. In these contexts of competing varieties, Versteegh (1987), Pagani (2014, 2015), and Clackson (2015, pp. 313–315) provide evidence for the development of a sense of 'correct' Greek (*Hellenismos*) already in the third century BCE, but one which allowed considerable variation, drawing on the dialectal diversity which existed from Homer until the dominance of the Koine and the literature which it produced.[11] In this respect, Clackson (2015) has explored the case of regarding Classical Latin and the Koine as examples of standard languages. He argues that, while stages of selection and, to an extent, codification had been reached both for the case of Koine and for Latin, the debate about 'correctness' had not reached a level of development such that there was general acceptance. This highlights the reality that without modern methods of communication and, perhaps crucially, publishing, the ability to move beyond the codification stage was almost impossible. Moreover, without a centralized education system, the means of persuading the population to a stage of acceptance of the new variety, which could then lead to elaboration, did not really exist. It, therefore, seems that no ancient variety could reach an understanding of a standard language as laid out by modern scholars as Haugen or Milroy and Milroy (2012). The problem can be raised at different stages of the Greek language.

With regard to Classical Greek, there are two distinct periods at which the usual criteria for a standard language may be relevant. The first is the period when Attic was chiefly the dialect of Athens, and the question emerges of whether the dialect had become a standard out of the variety of dialects which we know were spoken in the city but for which there is scanty or no evidence. The variety within contemporaneous Attic texts speaks in part to multiple dialects, as well as, naturally, different formalizations of different registers, and it is true to say that those genres which are closest to the spoken variety/ies of

9 Bubeník (1993), and Morpurgo Davies (2002 [1987]).

10 For a detailed description of the varieties of Atticism, see Kim (2017).

11 For a discussion on the developments of treatises discussing the vices of the *Hellenismos* (βαρβαρισμός *and* σολοικισμός), see Sandri (2020).

Attic differ from particular registers such as oratory or legal inscriptions which tend to be more conservative. This is certainly partly a feature of standardization, but the lack of evidential depth prevents us from being able to categorize this as such a phenomenon or rather mere register-based variation. We are also faced with an evidential problem. Whereas the range of texts in the Koine and Atticistic Greek gives us an insight into the linguistic culture which surrounds them (lexica, grammatical comments, and a wide diachronic and diastratic range in our texts) we have limited evidence of such phenomena in Attic. Nevertheless, variation between certain genres and a lack of cross-over in certain registers with certain features speak indirectly to a culture of correctness already in Attic.[12]

The second obvious moment at which Classical Attic may have attained the status of a standard language by some criteria is the stage immediately before the Koine, as Attic became a more international variety utilized by the Macedonian court *inter alia*. Here, this variety, at times known as Great Attic or 'New' Attic, which had clearly undergone a degree of de-Atticization in several important respects, seems certainly to have been moving towards the status of a standard language, even if it might not have reached all the criteria laid out by some scholars.

With regard to the Koine, Joseph (1987, p. 50) refused the notion that any stage of Greek had reached his definition of a standard, owing chiefly to the lack of evidence for his seventh criterion: that of cultural borrowing. He nevertheless saw in the Alexandrian Greek the closer form of standard language. Horrocks (2010, p. 84) called the Koine "the standard written and spoken language of the upper classes". Likewise, Colvin (2014) has suggested that the Koine can actually be interpreted as the first example of a standard. In the Hellenistic period and beyond, the Koine undoubtedly reached a level of relative uniformity, was used in a variety of functions, and was the target variety for multiple speakers of Greek and non-Greek languages (Colvin 2009). It became the spoken form of language as well as the language of administration and commerce at the expense of local dialects and was used for technical writing, such as Euclid's mathematical texts or writings not meant as high literary prose. Authors of the period, like the historian Polybius, mold an elevated version of Koine.

However, the uncontested reign of the Koine, so to speak, ended with the Second Sophistic and the belletristic Atticist revival during the Imperial centuries. The relationship between the Koine and Atticism has been well

12 Novokhatko (2015).

established and contains both diachronic and synchronic elements.[13] As the Koine became the established form of Greek and time continued to pass, the distance between it and the Attic of the Classical age, which had made up the educational canon, grew. At various points in the Post-classical period, this led to efforts to bring the Koine in literary registers closer to the ideal Attic of the inherited canon. This reached a height during the Second Sophistic with the flourishing of the Atticist movement. The continued pull of Koine and Atticist Greek and the latter's claim to purity shaped the language for many centuries afterward.[14] However, even in this case, a 'pure' Attic could not be standardized, as the Greek was now spoken by a large number of L2 speakers, each of whom decided individually the level of conservativism they would adhere to, which of the Classical Attic authors to imitate as each one came with their register of Attic, and whether new forms of Attic were adulterated or simply indications of linguistic evolution.[15] Thus, the history of the Greek language, with its diachronic and synchronic variants, hindered the creation of an established standard language, univocally defined and accepted, leaving space for a series of quasi-standards.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, the question that persists is how this variation is to be considered and appreciated. Do speakers and authors manipulate and modulate these standards or lack thereof to create a linguistic consensus, or is the reality that of a language that is a living and breathing medium of expression that adjusts to the cultural, geographical, and expressive creativity under the 'international' banner of the Greek language? In fact, as will be analyzed in different contributions in this volume, there is a close link between language standardization, identity building, and identification. Any standard that emerges creates an outlet for identity. Each speaker chooses to be identified with or against it or somewhere in between, and the tension between the monolithic standard and the natural linguistic variation within it can be utilized for this purpose. Sluiter (2017, p. 31) argues that: "'Old' and 'new' are terms that people use for what they believe is 'old' or 'new', or what they (choose to) construct as 'old' or 'new'." With this in view, the chapters in this volume rethink the very concept of standards either through innovative linguistic changes that

13 A good discussion of the issues can be found in Wahlgren (1995).

14 For Roman tendencies to learn both Koine and literary Attic, see Kaimio (1979); Biville (1992, 1993); Horrocks (2010, pp. 124–188). For difficulties to distinguish between Classical Attic and Koine and accusations of solecisms on these grounds, see Fabricius (1962). The lexicographers and the *Antiatticist* constitute proof of this oscillation (Latte 1915). On Hellenistic and early Imperial prose writing, see Wifstrand (2005) and particularly the introduction, and Wahlgren (1995).

15 Schmid (1887–1897); Swain (1996); Whitmarsh (2005).

led to their evolution or as reconsidered anchors against the backdrop of novel socio-cultural frameworks.

Therefore, speakers' perceptions and constructions about the language end up being as important as linguistic facts. The speakers' perception and the desire to opt for one form of language rather than another, according to the kind of social status associated with that particular variety, is a crucial aspect in the definition of an abstract notion of correct language that in the ancient world was not based on a set of defined grammatical rules and was definitely not universally accepted. The protracted conflict between Imperial Attic and Koine, which is formalized in the Atticist practice of establishing Attic as the correct language of the educated elite in contrast to the Koine—the contemporary, less formal language of the people—contributed to a particular perception of the two linguistic varieties that probably influenced the perception of the scholars of Greek up to our age. *Diglossia*, the idea of two forms of a language, one for 'higher' registers like education, literature, and government and one for more everyday purposes, was there in the varieties of Attic and in the registers of Koine, but reached a new and polarizing pitch in the Atticism vs. Koine divide.[16]

What is unquestionable is that these labels—Attic, the Koine, and Atticism—have been attached to the language of a variety of texts, which share a large number of features but which themselves also vary at all linguistic levels. Whether or not they were standards for the speakers and writers of their day, they have retrospectively been defined as such by teachers and scholars of the Greek language, necessarily imposing an artificial sense of unity among texts that show a significant amount of variation. When a specific form is labeled as 'Attic', it is, in fact, automatically anchored to a specific type of language, while the different forms of Attic are too often overlooked. The acts of labelling, naming, or categorizing can be therefore considered anchoring functions,[17] and this nominal homogeneity of Attic, Koine, and Atticist Greek has to be problematized.

This volume seeks to tease out variation in these varieties, both in how they were used and how they were later approached. By investigating anew different aspects of the relation between standards and varieties (onomastics, didactic, metalanguage, literature), the chapters collected in this volume show how the formation of collective and individual identities in different periods is determined by carefully selecting a specific language connected with the speakers' perception and with certain ideological and political matters. We

16 For an analysis of the idea of diglossia in the ancient world, see Ferguson (1959). However, more recent studies have proposed a more varied situation better described with the idea of 'register continuum', see Colvin 2011 and Clackson 2015 among others.

17 Sluiter (2021).

ground our approach in the well-established discussions of usage of a certain pronunciation or specific features of the language, the imitation of classical models together with the prescription of certain rules, and the fashioning of language according to socio-political issues, which are all the key aspects of our interpretation of these alleged 'standards' and their development. However, transcending the stereotypical litmus tests of those standards, our analysis is possible only when we recognize the importance of the mutual influence of the three varieties. This mutual influence is often tacitly acknowledged but rarely explored, though it underpins so much of our understanding of ancient Greek. To this end, this volume explores the innovative use and reuse of Greek throughout periods, genres, authors, and varieties against the backdrop of a reconsideration of traditional anchoring standards.

3 Attic

Attic was the dialect of Athens and its surrounding region of Attica from the Archaic period down to around 300 BCE.[18] The endpoint is always controversial, and this date is usually picked both for the new reality of Greek as a language spoken by thousands more speakers across the Hellenistic kingdoms and also as a sign of the cultural and political decline in the importance of Athens compared to its significant position in the fifth and fourth centuries.

The established narrative for this variety is intimately tied to the fortune of the Athenian state and the cultural documents that were produced within its boundaries. Attic, therefore, starts its recorded history with a distinctly conservative local epigraphic variety and a more innovative open and influenced literary variety. Throughout, the primary source of linguistic influence and prestige is chiefly the Ionic dialect. From the moment our manuscript texts come into existence in the city, they present a complex relationship with the Ionic dialect. Thucydides and tragedians both write 'Attic', but a variety that almost certainly would not have been identical to that of any speaker of the dialect on the streets of Athens, de-Atticized as it was to tap into Ionic traditions of poetry and historiography. This was a kind of Attic different, for example, from the Attic of comedy, which instead represents a form of language that is much closer to the one spoken at the time.[19] However, by the late fifth century,

18 The distinction between Attic and the Ionic dialects seems to have occurred in the first quarter of the first millennium and is usually dated to around the eleventh century (Colvin 2007, p. 35).

19 See López Eire (1991); Willi (2002, 2003a, 2003b).

the cultural prestige of the dialect had increased enough that writers began to write in a more overt Attic,[20] although a variety that seems to be representative of the educated elite within the city, not the poor or rural demes that made up the majority of its population.[21] This educated, perhaps literary Attic—a label itself, which still spans multiple registers of the language—continued to change, though in different ways as the different corpora demonstrate. Oratory changed at a slower pace than comedy, with the latter apparently keeping much closer track of the changes occurring in the spoken language in Athens and Attica.[22]

Thus, the linguistic situation of Athens in the fifth and fourth century was far from being homogeneous. Literary texts and inscriptions showed differences in language due to differences in the socio-cultural level of the speakers, the registers, and the literary genres. Variation is frequently encountered on multiple axes: diachronic changes, various registers, convergence with other dialects, and geographical factors as Attic became a pluricentric variety after the growing use of the dialect in international discourse. Furthermore, at the same time, in Athens, a growing number began to speak Attic as their non-native dialect. The arrival of foreigners, the presence of metics,[23] the contacts with other languages and dialects, and the development of the sophistic movement with its new linguistic fashion are all events that influenced contemporary Attic through the development of specific phonological and morphological traits.[24]

Some fifth-century Athenian texts testify to awareness about different variants of spoken Attic (see Machado, this volume) together with a developing idea of a prestige variety of Attic (see Novokhatko, this volume). A fragment of Aristophanes (fr. 706 K-A) contrasts the 'feminized' language of the urbane and the 'rustic' language of the countryside and recommends a middle path.[25] The so-called Old-Oligarch, the author of the treatise known as the *Constitution of*

20 See Denniston (1952); Dover (1997); Vessella (2016).

21 For more recent evidence, see Colvin (2004, 2020).

22 See Horrocks (2010, pp. 69–70); Machado (forthcoming).

23 Hansen (1999, 2006).

24 Hock (1986, p. 486) and Bubeník (1993) suggest that the ultimate origin of a de-Atticized version may have stemmed from the variety that developed in one of the most important harbors of Ancient Greece, Piraeus. It is quite conceivable that here the interdialectal variety based on Attic, West Ionic, and 'mild' Doric dialects developed. See Colvin (1999, 2020) and Willi (2003a). On the degree of linguistic diversity in Athens, see Cassio (1981) with bibliography; López-Eire (1997, pp. 85–89).

25 Aristoph. 706 K-A: [...] διάλεκτον ἔχοντα μέσην πόλεως, | οὔτ' ἀστείαν ὑποθηλυτέραν | οὔτ' ἀνελεύθερον ὑπαγροικοτέραν '[his] language is the normal dialect of the city—not the effeminate high-society accent, nor uneducated, rustic talk' (transl. Colvin 2020).

Athens (ca. 420 BCE), criticized the mixed culture of Athenians, showing his conservative attitude and his negative position towards any kind of novelty. The style, way of living, and in particular, the language spoken in Athens at that time were taken to be a mixture of diverse Greek and barbarian components (Ps. Xen. *Const. Ath.* 2.8).[26] The criticism leveled by the Old Oligarch was probably addressed to the process of Ionicization of some Attic features, which characterized the type of international Attic that would constitute one basis for the Hellenistic Koine.[27]

The growth of the Athenian Empire meant Attic and Ionic coming into contact in multiple domains and at multiple levels. The administrative aspect of this interaction is often to be found in the emergence of so-called Great Attic or *Großattisch* (Thumb 1906), a variety used in many inscriptions issued by Athens to its client states. The adoption of this variety by the Kingdom of Macedonia proved the crucial turning point in the history of Attic, removing the evolution of this language as the sole preserve of Athenians.[28] With Philip II and then Alexander the Great, Great Attic (by the time of Alexander, now virtually the Koine)[29] was spread across the Macedonian Empire, and the Koine came of age.

In barely more than a century, Attic went from being a conservative variety spoken by a few tens of thousands in a corner of Greece to the basis of an innovative new version, almost the exemplar of Greek, which would be spoken by millions. This briefest of summaries represents one view of the state of knowledge. While the broad contours are now mostly understood, much remains to be discovered about the mechanics of the change. For example, what role did Ionic play in influencing the formatively changing Attic dialect, and how? Ionic was clearly a complex anchor for Attic: some embraced it in the form of Ionicized Attic, others resisted it, defining proper Attic in contradistinction to Ionic. Was there a difference between the Ionic from which educated writers borrowed and the organic mingling of Attic and Ionic by speakers in the city? Did these processes interact?

---

26 Ath. *Pol.* 2. 7–8: [...] ἔπειτα φωνὴν πᾶσαν ἀκούοντες ἐξελέξαντο τοῦτο μὲν ἐκ τῆς, τοῦτο δὲ ἐκ τῆς· καὶ οἱ μὲν Ἕλληνες ἰδίᾳ μᾶλλον καὶ φωνῇ καὶ διαίτῃ καὶ σχήματι χρῶνται, Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ κεκραμένῃ ἐξ ἁπάντων τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ βαρβάρων. 'Further, hearing every type of language, they have taken one feature from here, another feature from there. Greeks on the whole use their own language, customs and dress; but the Athenians use a mixed bag taken from all the Greeks and barbarians' (transl. Colvin 2020).

27 See Teodorsson (1974, 1978, 1979); Willi (2002); Colvin (2009, 2011, 2020).

28 Silk (2009); Horrocks (2010, pp. 79–83).

29 See Horrocks (2010, p. 81).

Scholars now concern themselves with increasingly marking the very real differences between Attic and Koine Greek during the period when the latter emerged—itself a vexed question. As a result, our understanding of the much more nuanced nature of this process has been enhanced.[30] There are significant questions to answer here: As Attic was gradually affected, which social groups were affected first and how? How did these new varieties of Attic—which, of course, were not just Ionicizing but also developing internally in the system of Attic—spread throughout the complex social and literary milieux of the city at the time? Was the process really as teleological or linear as the narratives have sometimes made it look? These questions can only be answered through a much closer analysis of the texts that make up what we think of as Attic, especially in light of developments in linguistics.

Part of the problem of Attic, in fact, lies in tying the various strands of evidence together. This requires serious consideration of the varieties which make up our image of what 'Attic' actually was and to take manuscript texts as artifacts of the sociolinguistic landscape in which they were developed. The contributions in this volume try to deal with this last point and with the vexed question of what speakers themselves thought and how they acted.

Passages such as that of the Old Oligarch and Aristophanes mentioned above, together with other comic fragments, can provide pieces of information about different phenomena associated with linguistic varieties, for instance the existence of a general idea of correct language not universally defined and accepted and not based solely on linguistic criteria; the presence of conservative linguistic tendencies likely associated with political ideas; the socio-cultural role of linguistic varieties; and the understanding of the attitude of the speakers towards the concept of language variety and language change. In fact, through the speakers' perception, we can have an insight into the process of language evolution and the spreading of linguistic innovations (see Novokhatko and Machado, this volume).

These themes will be explored in several essays here, though as ever, with a variety spoken by long-dead speakers, the evidence is often indirect and circumstantial. Nevertheless, their import for the development of Greek is significant, and a closer examination of these issues is one of the contributions this volume hopes to make.

30 See Brixhe (1988, 1990); López-Eire (1986, 1993); Brixhe & Hodot (1993b); Willi (2002, 2003a, 2003b, 2010); Colvin (2020).

4 Koine

If there are problems identifying precisely what we mean when referring to Attic, these problems are even more extensive with the Koine. This issue has even affected the teaching of Greek to this day (see Ryan, this volume). At its heart, the term refers to the newly spread, de-Atticized but broadly Attic variety of Greek, which began to evolve in multiple different locations after the Macedonian adoption of Attic as the language of its Empire. It can be said to be a chronological term for the development of the language, roughly bracketing the end of the dominance of Athens and Attic as the centers for development and innovation in the language and the emergence of several new poles for the language to develop around. It is the Greek spoken in and around the Mediterranean during the Hellenistic and Roman periods.

The Great Attic, which had emerged as a quasi-pan-Hellenic standard, had been adopted by the court of Philip and then Alexander. As they took Greek to new lands, the importance of Attic as the center of the Greek language, and even of this Great Attic, quickly lessened. With the early death of Alexander and the break-up of his Empire, the Koine emerged as the Great Attic used by the Greeks in this new world. Decrees, letters, shopping lists, and literature were produced in this dialect from Macedon to Bactria, enabling us to understand much more broadly the role of the region and register in the use of this variety. From the end of Alexander to the early Roman Empire, the Koine was the dominant form of the language, especially outside the Old Greek world, where the dialects continued to be used for far longer.[31] The scale and range of its attestation have forced scholars to consider texts not only as part of this greater linguistic supersystem but also as documents produced in their own linguistic, social, and political context. New norms were carved out of the evolved language, its Classical past, and the new Atticist revival (see Bentein, this volume). The tension between the Koine as linguistic reality and each speaker's idiolect leaves much fertile ground for scholars still to explore and holds lessons for those working on other periods in the Greek language's history (see Smith and Bentein in this volume, on how this even applies to orthography). Koine became a spoken language and was no doubt used for literature early on. Very little of this likely popular literature survived, whereas documents concerning business and administration have survived, shaping our picture of the Koine. This is not so much a question of bankers informing poets. It is about language in evolution, where the old is prized for literary merit, and newer forms take time to reach a level of literary acceptability. Thumb (1901) early

31 See Bubeník (1989) for details.

on considered the questions of the regional variation of the language, and it is undoubtedly clear that within the corpus of documents we call Koine, there is a large mix of documents, periods, varieties, and possibly dialects.[32] Everything from Polybius[33] to the papyrological finds from Egypt,[34] Greek political inscriptions, and the Judeo-Christian texts of the Levant[35] has been referred to as an example of the Koine.[36] This naturally raises questions of register and of the attitude of speakers (many of whom are now L2 speakers of Greek who had at each instance to seek their own path in this linguistically complex environment [see Cerroni and Crellin, in this volume]). Moreover, the language used in Attica since the third century BCE represented another milieu entirely and was examined by López-Eire (2002) in his article on the relationship between Hyperides and Menander and by Teodorsson (1978). As the Koine emerged and continued to develop during the Hellenistic period in different ways and at different places, always accounting for differences of register and geography, there was once again the conflict for every speaker and writer between the language of the celebrated canon, now increasingly divorced from the present usage of the language, and what was being spoken at the time. This would eventually lead to the schismatic moment of Atticism. Still, the sheer scale of the Koine, both in its geographical spread and the variety of documents that survive, shows evidence of this almost from the start. It is a variety that was simply of a different order of magnitude compared to its Attic predecessor.

One starting point is the fact that ancient grammarians, such as Apollonius Dyscolus, Herodian, and Clemens Alexandrinus, came to define the Koine as the fifth dialect distinguished from the other four but at the same time as the universal language which subsumed all the dialects.[37] What then was the relationship between the various varieties of the Koine which speakers perceived? And was the Koine ever perceived as Greek *tout court*? Scholars such as Horrocks (2010, pp. 79–189) and Torallas Tovar (2014) have sought to bring some unity by noting the development trend over the several centuries when the Koine is the usual linguistic form. Notwithstanding this fact, however, the Koine seems to begin as a multidialectal variety even at the start. The Koine of Athens, as represented by Menander (Cartlidge 2014) and indeed by the inscriptions of the city, evolved in a different way and at a different pace to that which was exported to Syria, Egypt, and beyond. Of course, the emergence

32 Bubeník (1989).
33 De Foucault (1972).
34 See Mayser and Schmoll (1970); Gignac (1976, 1981); Teodorsson (1977).
35 Porter (2000); Lee (2018).
36 Horrocks (2010, pp. 79–188).
37 Consani (1991); Probert (2004, 2019); Van Rooy (2020, pp. 13–36).

of several powerful kingdoms from the break-up of Alexander's Empire led to several different centers around which the notion of a 'standard' Greek could gravitate. However, the corpus used in education was still centered on the canonical Attic authors of the fifth and fourth centuries.[38] This provided a centripetal force towards unity in the dialects of Greek. As time went on, however, the forces of language change operated at different paces, and without the emergence of a canon written in the Koine, regional fragmentation occurred. It became more apparent that what constituted Greek no longer was the same as what it had been in the Classical period.

These are all issues that the study of only the Koine cannot address, but once again, the links between the three varieties can help us to address them. From its emergence, the constantly developing Koine was continuously looking over its shoulder at the frozen grammar of Classical Attic. Still, the Koine came closest of the three varieties to becoming a proper standard, used in a wide array of registers, including business and government, and learned by tens of thousands of non-native speakers as a *lingua franca* in the new Greek world. It could not, however, shake free of the prestige of Attic in educational and literary affairs, and with a growing interest in grammatical and exegetical activities, the gulf between the two became something some speakers wished to address specifically. Societal use of the Koine established it as the go-to anchor either to be adopted or to be opposed.

5 Atticism

Atticism developed at the connection of our two varieties. Attic was the model language, but practitioners and theorists of the Atticist movement heatedly debated which texts constituted 'proper' Attic—another example of how anchors are constructed. Through these debates, they noticed what modern sociolinguistic studies have proven: the fact that Attic had many diachronic and diastratic varieties within its texts. Koine, whose higher varieties would be replaced by Attic, was the language against which many Atticists sought to react. Atticistic Greek was the attempt to revive Classical Attic grammatical features, though more often than not, this involved some compromise with the way the Koine had developed. In this respect, the study of Atticist Greek joins the study of Attic and the Koine—it cannot be understood without reference to both.

38 Morgan (1998); Cribiore (2001).

In fact, Atticism, which developed from the type of 'diglossia' showcasing a high, non-Atticizing register and a low colloquial one, had its roots in the growing attempts to make Koine more literary in the Hellenistic age.[39] In the second century CE, Sextus Empiricus (*Adv. Gramm.* 233–235)[40] gave a clear example of different registers in ancient Greek that were supposed to be used according to the contexts. However, he never referred to Attic or Atticist Greek to define the 'urbane and literary' language as opposed to the more colloquial variety.[41] Throughout the Hellenistic and Imperial Greek worlds, this literary Koine continued to be the language used by the elite, in which any prose writing was composed (see Huitink and Rood, this volume).[42] However, by the second century CE, the Koine started being systematically replaced by corresponding Attic forms since certain Atticizing critics no longer considered the Koine as sufficiently cultivated to be used as the written variety.[43] The main tendency of these purists was to correct the written language and take it as close as possible to the Attic of the Classical authors of the fifth century BCE. In fact, as Kim (2017, p. 49) has claimed, Atticism can be seen primarily as a reaction against the literary Koine and its non-Attic elements, which was seen as a sort of negative anchor,[44] and only at a second stage as a reaction against the 'low' colloquial speech of the masses. This is the reason why when Galen (*De differ. puls.* 583, 1–2 Kühn) ridicules the Atticists and defends the 'contemporary' Greek συνήθεια (customary usage), he does not refer to the Greek spoken on the streets by 'sailors, merchants, and traders' but the educated standard that the elite writers employ in writing and speaking.

The first consideration, therefore, places the Atticist tendency in the context of the literary belletristic production.[45] That is why Horrocks' (2010, p. 136) understanding of Atticism as a "state of mind inculcated by the education system and reinforced by the practice and prejudice of the aristocracy" thoroughly explains the socio-political aspect of this phenomenon. In fact, in the Imperial

39 This connection between the diglottic situation of the Hellenistic age and the development of Atticism is at the basis of the debate on the dating of Atticism. According to the two different schools, Attic can be understood as a Greek (cf. Norden 1898, p. 149; Dihle 1977; Hidber 1996) or as a Roman phenomenon (Wisse 1995; de Jonge 2008, pp. 14–16).

40 Blank (1998).

41 Niehoff-Panagiotidis (1994, pp. 117–118).

42 Jannaris (1903); Versteegh (2002); Colvin (2009); Blomqvist (2010).

43 On the flourishing of Atticist tendencies in the Hellenistic age, see Dihle (1977); Monaco (2021, pp. 121–175).

44 Sluiter (2017, p. 33).

45 The pervasive aspect of Atticism determined the spread of Atticizing tendencies also in the spoken language for which see Connolly (1983), Lee (2013), and Roumanis (2016).

age, language became one of the most obvious markers of elite status,[46] and the use of specific words and constructions was under the constant scrutiny of those ready to catch the mistakes of their peers.

The heart of Atticizing culture was undoubtedly the competitive sphere of Imperial Greek oratory,[47] but it also influenced different types of literary production. However, the levels of strictness in Atticist practice could vary considerably with authorial practices determining the degree of anchoring in Classical Attic and redefining the standards in the form of innovative Imperial Greek. Many Greek texts from this period continue to be written in a Koine similar to that of Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Plutarch, despite some concessions to Atticizing tastes such as Pausanias' *Periegesis*, Marcus Aurelius' *Meditations*, and the works of Galen. But one also encounters figures such as the orator Aelius Aristides (117–181 CE), undoubtedly the most rigorous extant Atticizing author (as also recognized by Phrynichus, one of the stricter lexicographers of the period, see Photius *Bibl.* 153). Other, less strict Atticists include Lucian (ca. 125–180 CE), the historian Arrian of Nicomedia (writing ca. 130–160 CE), and Philostratus of Lemnos (ca. 170–250 CE), who in turn speaks of the Atticizing skill of several second- and early third-century CE orators (Herodes Atticus and Aristocles: *VS* 568; Pollux of Naucratis: 592; Athenodorus: 594; Aelian of Praeneste: 624).

The effort of Atticizing is very much expressed in the existence of Atticist lexica—collections of Attic words and forms to be used or rejected in order to write and speak 'correct' Greek. These lexica reflect different kinds of tendencies in a more or less purist approach to the language. The two lexica written by Phrynichus from Bithynia (second century CE)—the *Selection of Attic Words* (Ἐκλογὴ ὀνομάτων)[48] and the *Sophistic Preparation* (Σοφιστικὴ προπαρασκευή)[49]—are the best representation, together with the lexicon of Moeris (probably third century CE),[50] of a strict purist attitude which tried to reconstruct an artificial Attic on the basis of opposition to the Koine. What was used in the contemporary language was to be replaced with some more sophisticated words attested in ancient sources.[51] However, even in the lexica, there was not any uniformity in the definition of a set of Atticizing rules, and a general arbitrariness characterized the promotion of Attic words. Those like

46 Swain (1996, pp. 17–42); Whitmarsh (2005, pp. 45–47).
47 Withmarsh (2005).
48 Lobeck (1820); Rutherford (1881); Fischer (1974).
49 Borries (1911).
50 Hansen (1998).
51 Monaco (forthcoming).

Pollux of Naucratis (second century CE author of *Onomasticon*)[52] undertook a more moderate position. On the other extreme, there were those like the so-called Antiatticist who, with his lexicon,[53] tried to uphold the contemporary language by demonstrating that suspected non-Attic words were already used in ancient authors.

The reproduction of an attempted Attic language had a clear social value, and the cultural aspect behind the promotion of Atticist Greek is a crucial aspect of Atticism, as language became a way of demonstrating Greekness or cultural identity (see Bozia and Crellin, this volume). This aspect has been illuminated since Wilamowitz's contribution in 1900, which was highly influential in shaping the study of the topic today. From this, studies such as Bowie (1991), Anderson (1993), Swain (1996), Schmitz (1997), Goldhill (2001, 2002), Whitmarsh (2001, 2005, 2013), Hall (2002), and Kim (2010) have all focused mostly on the cultural innovation of the Second Sophistic and have sought to understand Atticism within the cultural context of the second century. This approach brought about a comprehensive evaluation of the phenomenon by joining together the two main trends of scholarly investigations on Atticism—the analysis of discussions, and complaints about Atticizing language, on the one hand,[54] and the study of the texts written in Atticizing Greek, on the other.[55] Unfortunately, these two aspects are often kept separated, preventing the clear definition of Atticism.

The aim of this volume is to analyze Atticism in tandem with the other two varieties and to answer some of the many questions that still require investigation. While an analysis of Atticism provides information about the perception of Attic and the Koine, the knowledge of Attic and the Koine informs, in turn, that of Atticism. It requires, in fact, a more fine-grained analysis of the organic linguistic rules which lie behind the Attic of the fifth- and fourth-century dialect to know how well Atticist authors deployed the same rules (see Rubulotta, this volume). Also, an analysis of the contemporary understanding of Attic by Atticist practitioners informs our knowledge of language change in the Imperial age and our editing of Attic texts. This approach brings the following questions: What mistakes did the authors of the Imperial age make in comprehending texts from the fifth and fourth centuries? Could Atticist Greek be

52 Bethe (1900–1937). On Pollux's approach see Tribulato (2018).

53 Valente (2015). On the Antiatticist's approach see Cassio (2012); Tribulato (2021).

54 See Monaco (2021); Strobel (2005, 2009, 2012); Tribulato (2014, 2018, 2019, 2021 and the ERC project PURA); Vessella (2018).

55 See Bompaire (1994) for Lucian; Boulanger (1923) and Pernot (1981) for Aelius Aristides; de Jonge (2008) and Wiater (2011) on Dionysius of Halicarnassus; de Lannoy (2003) for Philostratus; Tonnet (1988) for Arrian.

considered itself a separate variety of Greek, with its own set of rules different from those of either Attic or the Koine and with its own internal varieties (i.e., the different Atticist Greek used in literary works and the different types of Attic promoted in the lexica)? What kind of influence did Atticism have on the later development of Greek? And what do Atticist tendencies tell us about the speakers' perception of Attic and Koine?

These questions can be answered with a look at both the literary and the lexicographical Atticist production. In fact, in the attempt to adapt the Greek as it was in the Imperial age to the Attic of the canonical texts, Imperial writers ended up creating another variety that was neither Attic nor Koine, reviving obsolete linguistic constructions and readapting them to a living language. Consequently, Atticism effectively became a revived dialect with new rules applied.[56] The way these constructions were used gives us an insight into the use of the Greek language and the understanding of specific linguistic phenomena by contemporary speakers. For instance, Imperial writers developed classical features in an unclassical way, such as the use of the dual in Lucian and the optative in Dionysius of Halicarnassus.[57] This also explains the internal variety of Atticist Greek in which the more or less accurate imitation of Attic or the more or less purist attitude in prescribing a certain language in the case of the lexica depends on the taste, the level of education, and the ideology of the practitioner and the lexicographer (see Bozia, in this volume).

This approach gives us a perception of the way Attic and Koine were perceived at that time. What, in fact, is still absent in the understanding of Atticism is a metalinguistic approach to the question of the interpretation of Attic and Koine, which goes together with a more linguistic analysis. To this end, the methodological outlook promoted by this volume in the mutual understanding of the three varieties will benefit the research on Atticism in two ways: first, in a retrospective understanding of the development of Attic and Koine and the way they developed in time, and second, in the way they were understood and used by contemporary second- and third-century writers and lexicographers.

In this respect, the prescriptions found in the lexica give us an insight into the phenomenon of language change, suggesting how much specific categories fall out of use or are not understood anymore in their original value.[58] Other than this, these Atticist prescriptions also provide interesting information about the perception the speakers had of the process of language change and

56 Horrocks (2017).
57 See Horrocks (2010, p. 141).
58 La Roi (2022).

the way they conceive Attic and Koine in relationship to each other (see Monaco, in this volume).[59] As can be detected from the structure of the lexica and the types of prescriptions promoted by them, Atticists saw Attic and Koine as sort of monolithic systems with almost no continuity and as little overlap as possible between each other. They almost, through their activities, re-created Attic and Koine, anchoring their standards on their individual perceptions. Certain linguistic features are described as Attic and others as belonging to the Koine, in a dualistic form (x is Attic, y is Koine). The result is a description provided by the lexica that is very far from the one we reconstructed above based on a general fluidity between the different varieties and that is heavily depending on the perceptions of each lexicographer. This is also the reason why the intransigent imitation of Attic, for which Phrynichus of Bithynia is perhaps the most conspicuous example, and the best performances, for instance, Aelianus who was praised for his perfect pronunciation of Greek due to his being a Roman (Philostratus *VS* 624), were actually attributed to foreigners who were the major protagonists of the Atticizing tendency, showing that learning or teaching Attic as a foreign language without any malign influence from the natural language was actually advantageous and a reason for their success (see Bozia, in this volume). This reveals the distance between the artificial Attic that was reconstructed and considered the imitable language, and the vivid contemporary Greek.

In promoting this 're-standardized' Attic language, Atticism, as expressed in the literary and lexicographical production of the second century CE, was, therefore, the zenith of the ideological process that had developed over the centuries and that had promoted the idea of a correct Greek as a shifting ideal. That ideal could not be fully defined in linguistic terms but was anchored to a particular ideology and socio-cultural background and was expressed by the most extremist Atticizing practitioners through a distinctive opposition between the two varieties and by the less extremist in the form of a compromising mixture of Attic and Koine.

These considerations take us back to the process of standardization and the malleable notion of standards as mentioned at the beginning of this introduction and explain our desire to explore a more nuanced perspective that examines the ways that Attic and Koine were conceived by Atticist practitioners, the type of Attic they sought to reproduce, and ultimately the bases on which forms could be categorized as Attic or Koine and its effect on standardization and usage. This is what the chapters in this volume will do, trying to bring together the more practical and the more theoretical aspects of Atticism as

59 For a discussion of the relationship between Koine and Atticism, see Frösén (1974), although his approach is notoriously problematic.

pragmatic manifestations of the Greek language anchors and their innovative reconstitutions in literature.

6 Summary and Goals of the Volume

This volume, therefore, has as its objectives two main aims. The first is to begin more explicitly to explore these three varieties as linguistic spectra through an in-depth study of their individual ranges and registers. The second is to tie together these varieties as quasi-standard, re-standardized, or innovative entities more closely and explore the relationship between them and the problems arising from such approaches. It may be hoped that a more fine-grained analysis coupled with a holistic approach to all three varieties may increase our understanding of the forces that drove Greek, its history, transmission, and standardization.

The first section "Setting the standards" brings together chapters that discuss norms and standards and their definition by ancient authors and in modern scholarship. The authors discuss the process of standardization, standardization as anchoring, and variations as linguistic innovations. Specifically, Bentein perceptively proposes that a more profound analysis of standards and Koine should involve the study of norms. He then analyzes norms as positive and negative anchors in Greek official writing between the first and third centuries CE and suggests different methods by which to retrieve them and study their typology. Smith's chapter complements Bentein's theoretical approach, as she examines spelling norms in Koine against the backdrop of historical orthographies. The author argues that Greek historical spelling is indeed anchored in the past, but orthographic variations in the papyri between the first and third centuries CE show how writers dealt with phonemic ambiguity, accommodating phonological innovations within the existing standard spelling. Monaco's chapter proceeds further to examine the issue of the use of Attic and non-Attic forms through the lens of Menander and the Atticist lexicographers. More importantly, she argues that the analysis of the Atticist lexicographers' critique of Menander's phonology, morphology, and syntax and their use of specific labels to describe his language give us insights into the development of the anchors of Attic and Koine and the lexicographers' reflection of ideological approaches in the setting of standards. The section on "Fashioning language through literature and vice versa", staying true to the title of the volume, goes beyond the standards to recontextualize anchors through the lens of specific authors who, through their linguistic choices, acknowledge, mirror, and accommodate contemporary literary, social, and religious realities. Huitink and Rood

focus on Xenophon's particularities not as veering from proper Attic but as displaying how literary Attic interacts with the spoken language in Athens. Ultimately, they very persuasively make the case that the author innovates stylistically while remaining anchored in contemporary Attic as well as in the historiographical tradition. Rubulotta then rethinks and challenges the anchoring idea that Xenophon is not an Attic author by displaying Aelius Aristides' emulation of the former's language. So, she pushes the standards themselves to question who it is that establishes anchors and how one can go beyond the standards by reconsidering, transcending, or even transgressing those anchors. Finally, Cerroni takes us beyond the standards in more than one way, as he examines the distinction between Classical authors and Hellenistic novelties through the author of 2 Maccabees, a work that was labeled Asianic, but which uses Attic forms to anchor itself in cultural legitimacy. Cerroni makes the case that while observing various standards—Greek literary prose, high Koine, and Hellenistic rhetorical devices—the author still transcends them by not selecting a single authoritative model while displaying a quest for grammatical correctness that at times foreshadows Dionysius of Halicarnassus. Finally, the last section on the "Socio-political aspects of language" moves beyond the standards methodologically to examine language as anchored in its linguistic specificities, but looking at it as a socio-political manifestation as well. The contributors discuss language and how it is actualized through literature, and how language and literature together become an enactment of the authors' social positioning. The last chapter actually brings us to the present to consider how academic and pedagogical choices, when it comes to selecting textbooks and authors, may still be determinants of standardization, re-standardization, and the subconscious act of arbitrating yet new anchors for the students of Greek. Novokhatko discusses how Old Comedy anchors Classical Attic as standard Greek and *attikizein* appropriates social legitimacy. With this in view, she explores the linguistic contrast of Attic and non-Attic forms as a means to shape linguistic diversity and social structures. Machado analyzes the source of the high frequency of the dual in Aristophanes and first asks whether, in light of recent scholarship, this may be down to later interpolations. Having anchored these duals in the Attic of Aristophanes, he uses the texts of the comic writer to examine both the social and linguistic factors which were used to anchor the innovation of an eroding category of the dual. This challenges our traditional understanding of the use of the dual in standard Attic. Crellin then introduces another aspect of the prowess of language, this time within the context of religion. He argues that the practices of inflection of personal names in the New Testament—the standard Greek practice of inflecting non-Greek names

and the Old Greek Biblical standard of not inflecting—are indicative of the authors' attempts at anchoring their identity either in the Greco-Roman world, or the Biblical world of their ancestors. Bozia then moves the discussion to the High Empire and argues that Imperial Attic proves to be anchored in Classical Attic while being creatively remodeled. She makes the case that, in particular, non-native speakers of Greek reinvent themselves within novel Imperial linguistic and cultural models anchored in long-standing traditions but also accommodating the more diverse citizenry. In the final chapter, Ryan fittingly brings the volume to a closure by rethinking the process of language standards in modern pedagogical settings. Her contribution discusses the teaching of New Testament Greek and asks the reader to consider the Greek anchors that the modern student builds based on our teaching standards. This chapter explores the ramifications of decisions made about the status and nature of the Greek being taught and argues that the anchoring standard, in this case, is the text selection and the type of 'standard' Greek we teach.

In closing, the process of standardization is clearly neither linear nor neat. It is rather an organic confluence of linguistic and socio-cultural factors filtered through theories, practices, everyday use, and literature, and conditioned by human perceptions and preconceptions. We hope that this volume will shed some light on these processes but more importantly open the way for more scholarly reconsiderations of language standards befitting the complexity and uniqueness of linguistic creativity.

Ghent, Cambridge, and Gainesville, 2023

Bibliography

Anderson, G. (1993). *The Second Sophistic: A Cultural Phenomenon in the Roman Empire*. Routledge.

Auer, P. (2005). Europe's Sociolinguistic Unity, or: A Typology of European Dialect/Standard Constellations. In N. Delbecque, J. van der Auwera, & D. Geeraerts (Eds.), *Perspectives on Variation: Sociolinguistic, Historical, Comparative* (pp. 7–42). De Gruyter.

Ayres-Bennett, W. (2020). From Haugen's Codification to Thomas's Purism: Assessing the Role of Description and Prescription, Prescriptivism and Purism in Linguistic Standardization. *Language Policy*, 19, 183–213.

Ayres-Bennett, W., & Bellamy, J. (Eds.). (2021). *The Cambridge Handbook of Language Standardization*. Cambridge University Press.

Bakker, E. J. (2010). *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Bentein, K., & Janse, M. (Eds.). (2020). *Varieties of Post-Classical and Byzantine Greek*. De Gruyter.

Bentein, K. & Monaco, C. (2024). Standardization, In G.K. Giannakis (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics* (EAGLL). Brill.

Bethe, E. (Ed.). (1900–1937). *Pollucis onomasticon* (Vols. 1–3). De Gruyter.

Biville, F. (1992). Le grec parlé en latin vulgaire. Domaines lexicaux, structures linguistiques d'accueil. In M. Iliescu (Ed.), *Latin vulgaire—latin tardif: Vol. 3. Actes du III ème Colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif (Innsbruck, 2–5 septembre 1991)* (pp. 25–40). De Gruyter.

Biville, F. (1993). Grec des Romains, ou latin des Grecs? Ambiguïté de quelques processus néologiques dans la Koinè. In C. Brixhe (Ed.), *La koinè grecque antique* (Vol. 1, pp. 129–140). Presses Universitaires de Nancy.

Blank, D. L. (1998). *Sextus Empiricus. Against the Grammarians (Adversus Mathematicos I)*. Oxford University Press.

Blomqvist, J. (2010). The Nature of Post-Classical (Hellenistic) Greek. In C. Caragounis (Ed.), *Greek: A Language in Evolution. Essays in Honour of Antonios N. Jannaris* (pp. 139–152). Brill.

Bompaire, J. (1994). L'atticisme de Lucien. In L. Pernot (Ed.), *Lucien de Samosate* (pp. 65–75). De Boccard.

Borries, J. von (Ed.). (1911). *Phrynichi sophistae Praeparatio sophistica*. Teubner.

Boulanger, A. (1923). *Aelius Aristide et la sophistique dans la province d'Asie au II e siècle de notre ère*. De Boccard.

Bowie, E. L. (1991). Hellenes and Hellenism in Writers of the Early Second Sophistic. In S. Saïd (Ed.), *Ἑλληνισμός: Quelques jalons pour une histoire de l'identité grecque* (pp. 183–204). Brill.

Brixhe, C. (1988). Bulletin de dialectologie grecque. *Revue des études grecques*, 101, 74–112.

Brixhe, C. (1990). Bulletin de dialectologie grecque. *Revue des études grecques*, 103, 201–230.

Brixhe, C., & Hodot, R. (1993a). A chacun sa Koine? In C. Brixhe (Ed.), *La koinè grecque antique: Vol. 1. Une langue introuvable?* (pp. 7–21). Presses Universitaires de Nancy.

Brixhe, C., & Hodot, R. (1993b). *La Koine grecque antique*. Presses Universitaires de Nancy.

Bubeník, V. (1989). *Hellenistic and Roman Greece as a Sociolinguistic Area*. John Benjamins.

Bubeník, V. (1993). Dialect Contact and Koineization: The Case of Hellenistic Greek. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 99, 9–23.

Cartlidge, B. J. (2014). *The Language of Menander Comicus and Its Relation to the Koine* [Doctoral dissertation]. University of Oxford.

Cassio, A. C. (1981). Attico 'volgare' e Ioni in Atene alla fine del v sec. a. C. *AION* (*ling.*), 3, 79–93.

Cassio, A. C. (2012). Intimation of Koiné in Sicilian Doric. The Information Provided by the Antiatticist. In O. Tribulato (Ed.), *Language and Linguistic Contact in Ancient Sicily* (pp. 251–264). Cambridge University Press.

Christidis, A.-F. (2007). *A History of Ancient Greek: From the Beginnings to Late Antiquity*. Cambridge University Press.

Clackson, J. (2015). Latinitas, Ἑλληνισμός and Standard Languages. *Studi e Saggi Linguistici*, 53, 309–330.

Colvin, S. (1999). *Dialect in Aristophanes and the Politics of Language in Ancient Greek Literature*. Oxford University Press.

Colvin, S. (2004). Social Dialect in Attica. In J. W. H. Penney (Ed.), *Indo-European Perspectives: Studies in Honour of Anna Morpurgo Davies* (pp. 95–108). Oxford University Press.

Colvin, S. (2007). *A Historical Greek Reader: Mycenaean to the Koine*. Oxford University Press.

Colvin, S. (2009). The Greek Koine and the Logic of a Standard Language. In A. Georgakopoulou & M. Silk (Eds.), *Standard Languages and Language Standards: Greek, Past and Present* (pp. 33–45). Routledge.

Colvin, S. (2011). The Koine: A New Language for a New World. In A. Erskine & L. Llewellyn-Jones (Eds.), *Creating a Hellenistic World* (pp. 31–46). Classical Press of Wales.

Colvin, S. (2014). *A Brief History of Ancient Greek*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Colvin, S. (2020). Varieties of Greek: Disorder and Continuity. *Classical Quarterly*, 70(1), 1–17.

Connolly, L. (1983). *Atticism in Non-Literary Papyri of the First Seven Centuries AD: A Study on Several Features of Ortography and Syntax* [BA thesis]. University of Sydney.

Consani, C. (1991). *Dialektos. Contributo alla storia del concetto di 'dialetto'*. Giardini.

Cribiore, R. (2001). *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*. Princeton University Press.

D'Angour, A. (2011). *The Greeks and the New. Novelty in Ancient Greek Imagination and Experience*. Cambridge University Press.

Denniston, J. D. (1952). *Greek Prose Style*. Bristol Classical Press.

Dihle, A. (1977). Der Beginn des Attizismus. *Antike und Abendland*, 23, 162–177.

Dover, K. J. (1997). *The Evolution of Greek Prose Style*. Oxford University Press.

Fabricius, C. (1962). *Zu den Jugendschriften des Johannes Chrysostomos*. De Gruyter.

Ferguson, C. A. (1959). Diglossia. *Word*, 15, 325–340.

Fischer, E. (Ed.). (1974). *Die Ekloge des Phrynichos*. De Gruyter.

Foucault, J. A. de (1972). *Recherches sur la langue et le style de Polybe*. Les Belles Lettres.

Frösén, J. (1974). *Prolegomena to a Study of the Greek Language in the First Centuries A.D.: The Problem of Koine and Atticism* [Doctoral dissertation]. University of Helsinki.

Garvin, P. L. (1959). The Standard Language Problem: Concepts and Methods. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 1, 28–31.

Georgakopoulou, A., & Silk, M. S. (Eds.). (2009). *Standard Languages and Language Standards: Greek, Past and Present*. Routledge.

Gignac, F. T. (1976). *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods: Vol. 1. Phonology*. La Goliardica.

Gignac, F. T. (1981). *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods: Vol. 2. Morphology*. La Goliardica.

Goldhill, S. (2001). *Being Greek Under Rome: Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire*. Cambridge University Press.

Goldhill, S. (2002). *Who Needs Greek? Contests in the Cultural History of Hellenism*. Cambridge University Press.

Hall, J. M. (2002). *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture*. University of Chicago Press.

Hansen, D. U. (Ed.). (1998). *Das attizistische Lexikon des Moeris: Quellenkritische Untersuchung und Edition*. De Gruyter.

Hansen, M. H. (1999). *The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes*. University of Oklahoma Press.

Hansen, M. H. (2006). *Studies in the Population of Aigina, Athens and Eretria*. Videnskabernes Selskab.

Haugen, E. (1966). Language, Dialect, Nation. *American Anthropologist*, 68, 922–935.

Haugen, E. (1983). The Implementation of Corpus Planning: Theory and Practice. In J. Cobarrubias & J. A. Fishman (Eds.), *Progress in Language Planning: International Perspectives* (pp. 269–289). De Gruyter.

Haugen, E. (1987). *Blessings of Babel: Bilingualism and Language Planning. Problems and Pleasures*. De Gruyter.

Hidber, T. (1996). *Das klassizistische Manifest des Dionys von Halikarnass. Die Praefatio zu 'De oratoribus veteribus'. Einleitung, Übersetzung, Kommentar*. De Gruyter.

Hock, H. H. (1986). *Principles of Historical Linguistics*. De Gruyter.

Horrocks, G. C. (2010). *Greek: A History of the Language and Its Speakers* (2nd ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.

Horrocks, G. C. (2017). High and Low in Medieval Greek. In K. Bentein, M. Janse, & J. Soltic (Eds.), *Variation in Ancient Greek Tense, Aspect and Modality* (pp. 219–241). Brill.

Jannaris, A. N. (1903). The True Meaning of the Κοινή. *Classical Review*, 17, 93–96.

Jonge, C. C. de (2008). *Between Grammar and Rhetoric: Dionysius of Halicarnassus on Language, Linguistics and Literature*. Brill.

Joseph, J. E. (1987). *Eloquence and Power: The Rise of Language Standards and Standard Languages*. Basil Blackwell.

Kaimio, J. (1979). *The Romans and the Greek Language*. Societas Scientiarum Fennica.

Kim, L. (2010). The Literary Heritage as Language: Atticism and the Second Sophistic. In E. J. Bakker (Ed.), *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language* (pp. 468–482). Wiley-Blackwell.

Kim, L. (2017). Atticism and Asianism. In D. Richter & W. Johnson (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook to the Second Sophistic* (pp. 41–66). Oxford University Press.

Kloss, H. (1967). 'Abstand Languages' and 'Ausbau Languages'. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 9, 29–41.

Kloss, H. (1969). *Research Possibilities on Group Bilingualism: A Report*. International Center for Research on Bilingualism.

Lannoy, L. de (2003). L'atticisme de Philostrate II: Atticisme linguistique et admiration pour le passé grec. In H. Hokwerda (Ed.), *Constructions of Greek Past: Identity and Historical Consciousness from Antiquity to the Present* (pp. 69–77). Brill.

La Roi, E. (2022). The Atticist Lexica as Metalinguistic Resource for Morphosyntactic Change in Post-Classical Greek. *Journal of Greek Linguistics*, 22, 199–231.

Latte, K. (1915). Zur Zeitbestimmung des Antiatticista. *Hermes*, 50, 373–394.

Lee, J. A. L. (2013). The Atticist Grammarians. In S. Porter & A. W. Pitts (Eds.), *The Language of the New Testament* (pp. 283–308). Brill.

Lee, J. A. L. (2018). *The Greek of the Pentateuch: Grinfield Lectures on the Septuagint 2011–2012*. Oxford University Press.

Lobeck, C. A. (Ed.). (1820). *Phrynichi Eclogae nominum et verborum Atticorum*. Georg Olms Verlag.

López Eire, A. (1986). Fundamentos sociolingüísticos del origen de la Koine. In A. López Eire (Ed.), *Estudios de lingüística, dialectología e historia de la lengua griegas* (pp. 401–431). Publicaciones de la Universidad de Salamanca.

López Eire, A. (1991). *Ático, Koine y aticismo: Estudios sobre Aristófanes y Libanio*. Publicaciones de la Universidad de Murcia.

López Eire, A. (1993). De l'attique à la Koine. In C. Brixhe (Ed.), *La Koine grecque antique: Vol. 1. Une langue introuvable?* (pp. 41–57). Presses Universitaires de Nancy.

López Eire, A. (1997). Nouvelles données à propos de l'histoire de l'attique. In A. C. Cassio (Ed.), *Kata diálekton. Atti del III Colloquio Internazionale di Dialettologia Greca* (pp. 73–107). Istituto Universitario Orientale.

López Eire, A. (2002). La lengua de Hiperides y Menandro. *Habis*, 33, 73–94.

Machado, R. J. (forthcoming). *Studies in the Linguistic Variation of Classical Attic and the Attic Orators* [Doctoral dissertation]. University of Cambridge.

Mayser, E., & Schmoll, H. (1970). *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der ptolemäer Zeit* (Vol. 1). De Gruyter.

Milroy, J., & Milroy, L. (2012). *Authority in Language: Investigating Standard English*. Routledge.

Monaco, C. (2021). *The Origins and Development of Linguistic Atticism* [Doctoral dissertation]. University of Cambridge.

Monaco, C. (forthcoming). Atticist Views on Linguistic Variation: The Case of Phrynichus' Eclogue. In G. di Bartolo & D. Koelligan (Eds.), *Postclassical Greek: Problems and Perspectives*. De Gruyter.

Morgan, T. (1998). *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds*. Cambridge University Press.

Morpurgo Davies, A. (2002 [1987]). The Greek Notion of Dialect. In T. Harrison (Ed.), *Greeks and Barbarians* (pp. 153–171). Edinburgh University Press.

Niehoff-Panagiotidis, J. (1994). *Koine und Diglossie*. Harrassowitz Verlag.

Norden, E. (1898). *Die antike Kunstprosa vom VI. Jahrhundert v. Christus bis in die Zeit der Renaissance*. De Gruyter.

Novokhatko, A. (2015). Greek Scholarship from Its Beginnings to Alexandria. In F. Montanari, S. Matthaios, & A. Rengakos (Eds.), *Brill's Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship* (pp. 3–59). Brill.

Pagani, L. (2014). Hellenismos tra filologia e grammatica, riflessioni antiche sulla correttezza della lingua. *Philologus*, 158, 235–260.

Pagani, L. (2015). The Language Correctness (Hellenismos) and Its Criteria. In F. Montanari, S. Matthaios, & A. Rengakos (Eds.), *Brill's Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship* (pp. 798–849). Brill.

Pernot, L. (1981). *Les Discours siciliens d'Aelius Aristide* (*Or. 5–6*)*: Étude littéraire et paléographique*. Arno Press.

Porter, S. E. (2000). *Diglossia and Other Topics in New Testament Linguistics*. Sheffield Academic Press.

Pountain, C. J. (2016). Standardization. In A. Ledgeway & M. Maiden (Eds.), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages* (pp. 634–643). Oxford University Press.

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* (pp. 277–291). Oxford University Press.

Probert, P. (2019). Greek Dialects in the Lexicon. In C. Stray, M. Clarke, & J. T. Katz (Eds.), *Liddell and Scott: The History, Methodology, and Languages of the World's Leading Lexicon of Ancient Greek* (pp. 200–225). Oxford University Press.

Roumanis, E. (2016). *Evidence for the Influence of Atticistic Lexica on Non-Literary Papyri of the First Three Centuries CE* [MA thesis]. Macquarie University.

Rutherford, W. G. (1881). *The New Phrynichus*. Macmillan and Co.

Sandri, M. G. (2020). *Trattati greci su barbarismo e solecismo. Introduzione ed edizione critica*. De Gruyter.

Schmid, W. (1887–1897). *Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern: Von Dionysius von Halikarnass bis auf den zweiten Philostratus*. Kohlhammer.

Schmitz, T. A. (1997). *Bildung und Macht: Zur sozialen und politischen Funktion der zweiten Sophistik in der griechischen Welt der Kaiserzeit*. Beck.

Silk, M. S. (2009). The Invention of Greek: Macedonians, Poets, Others. In A. Georgakopoulou & M. S. Silk (Eds.), *Standard Languages and Language Standards: Greek, Past and Present* (pp. 3–32). Routledge.

Sluiter, I. (2017). Anchoring Innovation: A Classical Research Agenda. *European Review*, 25(1), 20–38.

Sluiter, I. (2021). Old is the New New: The Rhetoric of Anchoring Innovation. In R. Boogaart, H. Jansen, & M. van Leeuwen (Eds.), *The Language of Argumentation* (pp. 243–260). Springer.

Stewart, W. (1968). A Sociolinguistic Typology for Describing National Multilingualism. In J. A. Fishman (Ed.), *Readings in the Sociology of Language* (pp. 531–545). De Gruyter.

Strobel, C. (2005). The Lexicographer of the Second Sophistic as Collector of Words, Quotations and Knowledge. In R. M. Piccione & M. Perkams (Eds.), *Selecta Colligere. Beiträge zur Technik des Sammelns und Kompilierens griechischer Texte von der Antike bis zum Humanismus II* (pp. 131–157). Edizioni dell'Orso.

Strobel. C. (2009). The Lexica of the Second Sophistic: Safeguarding Atticism. In A. Georgakopoulou & M. Silk (Eds.), *Standard Languages and Language Standards: Greek, Past and Present* (pp. 93–107). Routledge.

Strobel, C. (2012). *Studies in Atticistic Lexica of the Second and Third Centuries AD* [Doctoral dissertation]. University of Oxford.

Swain, S. (1996). *Hellenism and Empire: Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World, AD 50–250*. Oxford University Press.

Teodorsson, S.-T. (1974). *The Phonemic System of the Attic Dialect, 400–340 B.C.* [Doctoral dissertation]. University of Gothenburg.

Teodorsson, S.-T. (1977). *The Phonology of the Ptolemaic Koine*. Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.

Teodorsson, S.-T. (1978). *The Phonology of Attic in the Hellenistic Period*. Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.

Teodorsson, S.-T. (1979). Phonological Variation in Classical Attic and the Development of Koine. *Glotta*, 57, 61–75.

Thomas, G. (1991). *Linguistic Purism*. Longman.

Threatte, L. (1980). *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions: Phonology*. De Gruyter.

Threatte, L. (1996). *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions: Morphology*. De Gruyter.

Thumb, A. (1901). *Die griechische Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus: Beiträge zur Geschichte und Beurteilung der Κοινή*. Trübner.

Thumb, A. (1906). Prinzipienfrage der Koine-Forschung. *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum*, 17, 246–263.

Tonnet, H. (1988). *Recherches sur Arrien: Sa personnalité et ses écrits atticistes*. A. M. Hakkert.

Torallas Tovar, S. (2014). Features of Koine. In G. K. Giannakis (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics* (*EAGLL*). Brill. Consulted online on 15 January 2024 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2214-448X_eagll_COM_00000197>.

Tribulato, O. (2014). Not Even Menander Would Use This Word! In A. H. Sommerstein (Ed.), *Menander in Context* (pp. 199–214). Routledge.

Tribulato, O. (2018). Le epistole prefatorie dell'Onomasticon di Polluce: Frammenti di un discorso autoriale. *Lexis*, 36, 247–283.

Tribulato, O. (2019). Making the Case for a Linguistic Investigation of Greek Lexicography: Some Examples from the Byzantine Reception of Atticist Lemmas. In E. Passa & O. Tribulato (Eds.), *The Paths of Greek: Literature, Linguistics and Epigraphy. Studies in Honour of Albio Cesare Cassio* (pp. 241–270). De Gruyter.

Tribulato, O. (2021). (En)listing the Good Authors. The Defence of Greek Linguistic Variety in the Antiatticist Lexicon. In K. Wesselmann, R. Laemmle, & C. Scheidegger Laemmle (Eds.), *Lists and Catalogues in Ancient Literature and Beyond. Towards a Poetics of Enumeration* (pp. 169–194). De Gruyter.

Valente, S. (2015). *The Antiatticist*. De Gruyter.

Van Rooy, R. (Ed.). (2020). *Essays in the History of Dialect Studies. From Ancient Greece to Modern Dialectology*. Nodus Publikationen.

Versteegh, K. (1987). Latinitas, Hellenismos, ʿArabiyya. In D. J. Taylor (Ed.), *The History of Linguistics in the Classical Period* (pp. 251–274). John Benjamins.

Versteegh, K. (2002). Dead or Alive? The Status of the Standard Language. In J. N. Adams, M. Janse, & S. Swain (Eds.), *Bilingualism in Ancient Society: Language Contact and the Written Word* (pp. 52–74). Oxford University Press.

Vessella, C. (2016). Menandro. In A. C. Cassio (Ed.), *Storia delle lingue letterarie greche* (pp. 324–432). Le Monnier.

Vessella, C. (2018). *Sophisticated Speakers: Atticistic Pronunciation in the Atticist Lexica*. De Gruyter.

Wahlgren, S. (1995). *Sprachwandel im Griechisch der frühen römischen Kaiserzeit*. Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.

Wardhaugh, R. (2010). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* (6th ed.). Routledge.

Weinreich, U., Labov, W., & Herzog, M. I. (1968). Empirical Foundations for a Theory of Language Change. In W. P. Lehmann & Y. Malkiel (Eds.), *Directions for Historical Linguistics* (pp. 95–195). University of Texas Press.

Whitmarsh, T. (2001). *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire: The Politics of Imitation*. Oxford University Press.

Whitmarsh, T. (2005). *The Second Sophistic*. Oxford University Press.

Whitmarsh, T. (2013). *Beyond the Second Sophistic: Adventures in Greek Postclassicism*. University of California Press.

Wiater, N. (2011). *The Ideology of Classicism: Language, History, and Identity in Dionysius of Halicarnassus*. De Gruyter.

Wifstrand, A. (2005). *Epochs and Styles: Selected Writings on the New Testament, Greek Language and Greek Culture in the Post-Classical Era* (L. Rydbeck & S. Porter, Eds.; D. Searby, Transl.). Mohr Siebeck.

Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, U. von (1900). Asianismus und Atticismus. *Hermes*, 35, 1–52.

Willi, A. (2002). Languages on Stage: Aristophanic Language, Cultural History, and Athenian Identity. In idem (Ed.), *The Language of Greek Comedy* (pp. 111–150). Oxford University Press.

Willi, A. (2003a). *The Languages of Aristophanes: Aspects of Linguistic Variation in Classical Attic Greek*. Oxford University Press.

Willi, A. (2003b). New Language for a New Comedy: A Linguistic Approach to Aristophanes' Plutus. *Cambridge Classical Journal*, 49, 40–73.

Willi, A. (2010). Attic as the Language of the Classics. In C. C. Caragounis & A. N. Jannaris (Eds.), *Greek: A Language in Evolution. Essays in Honour of Antonios N. Jannaris* (pp. 101–115). Georg Olms Verlag.

Wisse, J. (1995). Greeks, Romans, and the Rise of Atticism. In J. G. J. Abbenes, S. R. Slings, & I. Sluiter (Eds.), *Greek Literary Theory After Aristotle: A Collection of Papers in Honour of D. M. Schenkeveld* (pp. 125–134). VU University Press.