ATTICISM IN SECOND DECLENSION NOMINAL CATEGORIES IN THE LANGUAGE OF ACHILLES TATIUS*

Sonja Gammage
University of Pretoria

ABSTRACT

The language of the Ancient Greek novelist, Achilles Tatius, is often described as 'Atticist' (that is, imitating or recalling the Attic dialect). To date, however, no precise analysis on the Atticist nature of his language has been undertaken. This paper will look at evidence for Atticist practices in Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon* as revealed by his choices relating to two groups of second declension words: contract nouns and adjectives and those of the so-called 'Attic declension'. Qualitatively, I will look at quotations from ancient grammarians and lexicographers regarding the Atticist nature of these morphological categories and individual words in these classes. Quantitatively, I will compare Achilles' actual use and preferences with those of other authors from both the Classical Attic and Hellenistic *Koinē* periods.

KEYWORDS: Greek language, Achilles Tatius, Atticism, lexicographers, nouns

Introduction

Atticism refers to a phenomenon in which the intellectual élite of the post-Classical Greek period attempted to use language in a way that was considered more in keeping with high Classical Attic than the common everyday language.[1] From the time of Alexander the Great's expansion, Greek had become the *lingua franca* used throughout the Eastern Mediterranean, Asia Minor and Egypt. The dialect (or, more accurately, the cluster of

---

[1] See Horrocks 2014[2]:137; Silk 2009:22.

40

dialects) of Greek used in these areas during the Hellenistic and Roman periods is generally referred to as the *Koinē*. But educated Greek writers during these times, and especially in the Roman era, often made use of features of the older Classical Attic dialect associated with the height of the Athenian Empire (and with the great Attic orators, playwrights and philosophers). Linguistic Atticism specifically refers to the practice of making one's language (in terms of spelling, grammar and vocabulary) resemble the Classical Attic dialect.[2]

A modern analogy to the practice of linguistic Atticism would be that of a 21st-century writer trying to write in Shakespearean English (as has been recently attempted by Ian Doescher in his satirical 2013 play *William Shakespeare's Star Wars* and its sequels).[3] To measure how successful an author is at 'Shakespearising' their language, one would look for particular tokens like the use of *thee*, *thou* and *ye* instead of *you*, *art* for *are*, the marker *-eth* (on 3rd sg. verbs like *looketh*), *-est* (on 2nd sg. verbs like *sayest*) and archaic words like *wherefore* and so forth. The occurrence of such archaic forms and terms would point to successful 'Shakespearisation', whereas use of modern terms and forms that were unknown to Shakespeare would show a failure to do so. Forms which were used then but still continue today, however, are neutral as they do not tell us anything about the author's ability or intent to 'Shakespearise'.

In the same way, an analysis of Atticism involves identifying graphemic, morphological and lexicographical forms, as well as syntactic structures that were specifically used by Attic writers and were no longer current in the *Koinē*. Use of *Koinē* forms unknown to the Attic authors would be considered a failure to Atticise, and use of Attic forms which continued in the *Koinē* would be neutral.

---

[2] Linguistic Atticism should not be confused with stylistic or rhetorical Atticism which, while part of the same classicising trend, had slightly different origins and applications. 'Linguistic' is here used in the sense of 'grammatical' (relating to phonological, morphological, and syntactic choices) and 'lexical' (relating to word choice). This can be contrasted with the use of stylistic or rhetorical devices which are also termed 'Atticist' by e.g. Dionysius of Halicarnassus and the Roman *Attici*. For more on the differences, see Swain 1996:17–64 and Kim 2014. For this article, the term 'Atticism' is used as shorthand for 'Linguistic Atticism'.

[3] Doescher 2013.

Context and background

My interest in Atticism in Achilles Tatius is two-fold. On the one hand, there has been little recent statistical research on the phenomenon of linguistic Atticism, especially given the tools now available for analysing digital texts. Achilles serves as an interesting case study, being one of the prose novelists who wrote during the period when Atticism was prevalent among educated authors. His name is often associated with the practice of Atticism, although his language has not been studied in detail in this regard.[4] On the other hand, as part of the growing body of research on the ancient novel, a study on the language of Achilles in particular can shed new light on how the Greek novel should be viewed as a genre operating within the cultural period of the Second Sophistic.

As an example, this paper focuses on two of the morphological Atticist features, both of which relate to second declension words: contract nouns and adjectives and those of the so-called 'Attic declension'. Morphological features that are relevant to Atticism are somewhat more complex than phonological features and therefore require quite detailed examination. The findings with relation to these features are representative of other phonological and morphological features which I have examined elsewhere.[5] I will begin with a discussion of the origins and nature of these two groups.

The second declension contract words are a group of Greek nouns and adjectives built on a word stem which ends in a vowel (usually ε or o). When second declension suffixes are added to this group of words, word-internal hiatus results, which can lead to contraction in certain environments for some of the Greek dialects, including Attic. Examples of such words are masculine nominative singular νόος ('mind'), which contracts to form νοῦς, and neuter κάνεον ('basket'), which becomes κανοῦν. The contraction extends throughout the paradigm wherever two vowels are adjacent. Table 1 shows the typical paradigms for these types of words:

No./Case		Uncontracted	Contracted	Uncontracted	Contracted
sg.	nom.	νό-ος	νοῦς	κάνε-ον	κανοῦν
	voc.	νό-ε	νοῦ	κάνε-ον	κανοῦν
	acc.	νό-ον	νοῦν	κάνε-ον	κανοῦν
	gen.	νό-ου	νοῦ	κανέ-ου	κανοῦ
	dat.	νό-ῳ	νῷ	κανέ-ῳ	κανῷ

---

[4] Although see Sexauer 1899 for a now dated analysis of his language in German and Santafé Soler 2005 for a more recent study on his language in Spanish.
[5] Gammage 2018.

pl.	nom.	νό-οι	νοῖ	κάνε-α	κανᾶ
	voc.	νό-οι	νοῖ	κάνε-α	κανᾶ
	acc.	νό-ους	νοῦς	κάνε-α	κανᾶ
	gen.	νό-ων	νῶν	κανέ-ων	κανῶν
	dat.	νό-οις	νοῖς	κανέ-οις	κανοῖς

Table 1: Contracted vs. Uncontracted Forms of Contract Nouns

As a general rule, words in this category would undergo contraction in Attic, but remain uncontracted in other dialects like Ionic and Epic. The *Koinē* often adopted the uncontracted Ionic forms but, as will be seen, this was not always the case. In general, then, the use of contracted forms in a *Koinē*-period writer could be considered Atticist and use of the uncontracted forms avoidance of Atticism.

One group of the contract nouns deserves especial attention. The -όος words, like νόος ('mind'), πλόος ('voyage') and ῥόος ('stream'), developed alternate heteroclitic third declension forms in the *Koinē*. For these words, the contracted second declension forms were reanalysed as third declension words on the pattern of the noun βοῦς (gen. βοός, 'ox'). In some inflected forms, such as the nominative and accusative singular, it is not possible to tell whether contracted second or third declension forms are being used. But the contrast between genitive forms like νοῦ and νοός or dative νῷ and νοΐ is clear. Here, second declension contracted forms could be considered Atticist and third declension forms non-Attic.

Table 2 shows a typical paradigm for contracted, uncontracted and heteroclitic forms of words in this category.

Number/Case		Uncontracted 2nd	Contracted 2nd	Heteroclitic 3rd
sg.	nom.	νό-ος	νοῦς	νοῦς
	voc.	νό-ε	νοῦ	νοῦ
	acc.	νό-ον	νοῦν	νοῦν
	gen.	νό-ου	νοῦ	νοός
	dat.	νό-ῳ	νῷ	νοΐ
pl.	nom.	νό-οι	νοῖ	νόες
	voc.	νό-οι	νοῖ	νόες
	acc.	νό-ους	νοῦς	νόας
	gen.	νό-ων	νῶν	νοῶν
	dat.	νό-οις	νοῖς	νοῦσι(ν)

Table 2: Second vs. Third Declension Forms of νοῦς

The 'Attic declension', on the other hand, refers to a separate group of second declension nouns and adjectives which typically had different forms

in Attic and other dialects. Attic declension words can usually be identified by the suffix -ως (neuter -ων) in the nominative singular and -ω in the genitive singular. The resulting case endings closely resemble normal second declension endings, but -ω- appears in place of -ο- or -ου- (Table 3):[6]

Number/Case		Regular decl.	Attic decl.
sg.	nom.	-ος/-ον	-ως/-ων
	acc.	-ον	-ω(ν)
	gen.	-ου	-ω
	dat.	-ῳ	-ῳ
pl.	nom.	-οι/-α	-ῳ/-α
	voc.	-οι/-α	-ῳ/-α
	acc.	-ους/-α	-ως/-α
	gen.	-ων	-ων
	dat.	-οις	-ως

Table 3: Regular and Attic Second Declension Suffixes

There are three broad categories of Attic declension words. The first includes some of the best-known Attic declension nouns: νεώς ('temple') and λεώς ('people'). The Attic declension forms of these words developed from a two-step process of phonological change. Νεώς, for example, takes the more regular second declension form ναός in Doric. But the Attic and Ionic dialects underwent a process by which long [ā] ā changed into long [ē] η (as in Attic-Ionic μήτηρ vs. Doric μάτηρ). In Ionic, ναός takes the form νηός. But in Attic, another change occurred known as quantitative metathesis. Here, there is a swapping of quantity between two adjacent vowels by which νηός [nēos] became νεώς [neōs].

The second group of Attic declension words includes those derived from the contraction of words with an ω in the stem. For example, λαγῶς ('hare') comes from Epic λαγωός (an alternative form λαγώς also exists) and the adjective σῶς, σῶν ('safe') from σῶος, σῶον. There are also some words with -ως forms in Attic that occur alongside shortened -ος variations, as in καλῶς vs. κάλος ('rope'). In a now dated article from 1871 on 'The so-called Attic declension', Allen gives detailed discussions on how these pairs of forms may have developed which need not be repeated here.[7]

The last set of Attic second declension words alternate with heteroclitic third declension variations. The variation is evident by the different genitive forms that occur, for example: ταῶς (gen. ταῶ) vs. ταών (gen. ταῶνος):

---

[6] Inflections without -ο- in the regular second declension are not changed. The dative singular and genitive plural, which already have -ω-, retain -ω-. The neuter nominative and accusative plural, which both end in -α, retain -α.
[7] Allen 1871.

'peacock'; ἥρως (gen. ἥρω) vs. ἥρως (gen. ἥρωος): 'hero'; ἕως (gen. ἕω) vs. ἠώς (gen. ἠοῦς): 'dawn'.

These, then, are the main types of Attic declension nouns. As a general rule, Attic authors made use of the Attic declension forms, but the *Koinē* avoided the Attic declension forms, preferring the Doric -αος, uncontracted -ωος, simplified -ος or regularised third declension alternatives. It will be seen again, however, that the situation was not quite so straightforward.

Ancient evidence for Atticist forms

In order to identify Atticist markers in Achilles Tatius' novel, *Leucippe and Clitophon*, I have measured forms that are considered Atticising by modern scholars against two types of evidence: ancient testimony and ancient usage.

The first type of evidence is provided by ancient lexicographers and grammarians, who give insight into what was perceived to be Attic or Atticist at the time. My primary evidence comes from the (second- or third-century AD) lexicographers, Moeris and Phrynichus, who wrote Atticist handbooks.[8] They present the following kinds of recommendations to an aspiring Atticist regarding the use of contracted versus uncontracted second declension forms:

1. ὀστοῦν Ἀττικοί· ὀστέον Ἕλληνες.
    The Attic speakers (say) *ostoun*; the Greeks *osteon*.[9]
    (Moeris, *Atticista* o.27; ed. Hansen 1988)
2. χρυσοῦς καὶ χρυσῆ Ἀττικοί· χρύσεος καὶ χρυσέα Ἕλληνες.
    The Attic speakers (say) *chrusous* and *chrusē*; the Greeks *chruseos* and *chrusea*.
    (Moer. *Att.* χ.4)
3. ἄθρους Ἀττικοί· ἀθρόους Ἕλληνες.
    The Attic speakers (say) *athrous*; the Greeks *athrous* [for the acc. plural]
    (Moer. *Att.* α.33)
4. Χρύσεα, ἀργύρεα, χάλκεα, κυάνεα· ταῦτα Ἰακὰ διαιρούμενα. χρὴ οὖν λέγειν χρυσᾶ ἀργυρᾶ κυανᾶ τὸν ἀττικίζοντα. {χρυσοῦς λέγε· τὸ γὰρ χρύσεος Ἰακόν. ὁμοίως καὶ χρυσοῦς, ἀργυροῦς, χαλκοῦς, κυανοῦς, ἀλλὰ μὴ χρύσεος, ἀργύρεος}.
    Chrusea, argurea, chalkea, kuanea; these Ionic forms are uncontracted; and so an Atticist ought to say *chrusa, argura, kuana*. {(One should) say *chrusous*; for *chruseos* is Ionic; and in the same

---

[8] On these Ancient lexicographers, their intentions, methods and the transmission of their works, see Dickey 2007:96–98 and the dissertation by Strobel 2011:169–209 (for Moeris) and 78–158 (for Phrynichus).

[9] All translations are mine.

way (one should say) *chrusous, argurous, chalkous, kuanous*, but
not *chruseos, argureos*}.
(Phrynichus, *Eclogae* 178; ed. Fischer 1974)

Similarly, these lexicographers recommend the use of the following 'Attic
declension' forms over their regular alternatives:

> 5. νεώς τὴν εὐθεῖαν ἑνικῶς καὶ ὀξυτόνως Ἀττικοί· ναός Ἕλληνες.
>   The Attic speakers (say) *neōs* (for) nominative singular and an
>   acute accent; the Greeks *nāos*.
>   (Moer. *Att.* v.1)
> 6. σᾶ περισπωμένως Ἀττικοί τὰ σῶα.
>   The Attic speakers (say) *sa* with a circumflex for *ta sōa*
>   [nom/acc. neuter pl.]
>   (Moer. *Att.* σ.19)
> 7. τυφῶ Ἀττικοί· τυφῶνα Ἕλληνες.
>   The Attic speakers (say) *tufō* [2nd decl. acc. s.]; the Greeks *tufōna*
>   [3rd decl. acc. s.]
>   (Moer. *Att.* τ.14)
> 8. Λαγὼς ὁ Ἀττικός, διὰ δὲ τοῦ ο ὁ Ἴων λαγός· τὸ λαγωὸς δὲ οὐκ
>   ἔστιν.
>   *lagōs* is Attic, *lagos* with *o* is Ionian; and *lagōos* does not exist.
>   (Phrynichus, *Eclogae* 156)

In addition to the lexicographers, Alexandrian grammarians, in their dis-
cussions of various grammatical phenomena, often revealed certain attitudes
to and understanding of forms considered Atticist or non-Attic. Fifth-
century AD grammarians, like Aelius Herodianus (Herodian), are especially
valuable, but later grammarians also provide important insight as they were
working in the same tradition and often preserve ideas and teachings from
earlier grammarians which are now lost.

For my investigation of second declension words, it is significant to note
that the name 'the Attic declension', and its association with the Attic dia-
lect, is not a modern one. Ancient grammarians themselves frequently
described this category of words as declining in the 'Attic' manner and
undergoing an 'Attic change', as is evidenced by the quotes below:

> 9. Τὰ εἰς ως Ἀττικὰ ὁμοτονοῦσι ἐκείνοις, ἀφ' ὧν ἐσχηματίσθησαν,
>   ναός νεώς, λαός λεώς, κάλος κάλως, Τάλος Τάλως· … σεσημεί-
>   ωται τὸ ὀρφῶς καὶ λαγῶς. ταῦτα γὰρ οὐκ ἐφύλαξε τὸν τόνον τῶν
>   κοινῶν· τοῦ μὲν γὰρ ὀρφῶς τὸ κοινὸν ὄρφος ἐστὶ βαρυτόνως, τοῦ
>   δὲ λαγῶς ὀξυτόνως λαγός.
>   Attic (nouns) ending in *-ōs* have the same accent as those from
>   which they were formed: *naos/neōs, laos/leōs, kalos/kalōs,*

46

Talos/ Talōs; … *Orphōs* and *lagōs* are noted as exceptions. For the latter do not retain the accent of the common/*Koinē* (form); for *orphos*, the common/*Koinē* (form) of *orphōs*, is barytone, and *lagos*, (the common/*Koinē* form) of *lagōs* is oxytone.
(Herodian, *Prosodia Catholica* 244.32–245.4; ed. Lentz 1965)

10. Ὁ Μενέλεως τοῦ Μενέλεω· τὰ εἰς ος ὀνόματα μεταποιοῦντες Ἀττικοὶ εἰς ως καὶ τὰ παραλήγοντα τῶν φωνηέντων εἰς ε μεταβάλλουσι, κλίνουσι δὲ πάντα κατὰ ἀποβολὴν τοῦ ς, ὁ λεώς τοῦ λεώ, ὁ νεώς τοῦ νεώ·
ho Meneleōs, tou Meneleō: When the Attics remodel nouns ending in *-os* to *ōs* they also change those (nouns) with a penultimate vowel in *e*, and they decline them all [that is, form genitives] by dropping the *-s*: *ho leōs, tou leō; ho neōs tou neō;*
(Theodosius, *Canones Isagogici de Flexione Nominum* 16.1–7; ed. Hilgard 1965a)

11. εἶπον εἰ μὴ Ἀττικὴ τροπὴ παρακολουθήσει, διὰ τὸ λαὸς Μενέλαος, Μενέλεως· χρέως, ἀξιόχρεως, καὶ εἴ τι ὅμοιον.
I said 'if it does not follow the Attic change', because of (examples like) *laos, Menelaos, Meneleōs; chreos, axiochreōs*, and any others of the same sort.
(Theognostus, *Canones sive de Orthographia* 476. 5–7; ed. Cramer 1963)

12. Ταῦτα δὲ οὐκ ἔχουσι τὴν αὐτὴν κλίσιν, Τυφῶν μὲν γὰρ Τυφῶνος καὶ ταῶν ταῶνος, ὥσπερ καὶ Ποσειδῶν Ποσειδῶνος, Τυφῶς δὲ Τυφῶ καὶ ταῶς ταῶ ἀποβολῇ τοῦ ς ἀττικῶς, ὥσπερ ὁ ὀρφῶς τοῦ ὀρφῶ καὶ ὁ λαγῶς τοῦ λαγῶ·
But these do not belong to the same declension, for, on the one hand, *Tufōn* (has gen.) *Tufōnos* and *taōn* (has gen.) *taōnos*, just like *Poseidōn* (has gen.) *Poseidōnos*, [that is, 3rd decl.] but, on the other hand, *Tufōs* (has gen.) *Tufō* and *taōs* (has gen.) *taō* by dropping the *-s* in the [2nd decl.] Attic manner, just like *ho orfōs tou orfō* and *ho lagōs tou lagō*.
(Choeroboscus, *Prolegomena et Scholia in Theodosii Alexandrini Canones Isagogicos de Flexione Nominum* 248. 8–11; ed. Hilgard 1965b)

A text attributed to the fifth-century AD grammarian Theodosius also reveals a clear understanding of the difference between the contracted second declension forms and alternate heteroclitic third declension variations of the words of νόος, πλόος and ῥόος as described above.[10]

---

[10] The attribution of this text to Theodosius is spurious, but the information it provides is still of value; cf. Dickey 2007:83–84.

13. ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν ἐχόντων τὴν ου ἀπὸ συναιρέσεως διπλῆ ἐστιν ἡ
κλίσις, ποτὲ μὲν περιττοσυλλάβως, ποτὲ δὲ ἰσοσυλλάβως κλινο-
μένη· καὶ πρόσσχες, πότε μὲν περιττοσυλλάβως, πότε δὲ
ἰσοσυλλάβως τὰ τοιοῦτα κλίνονται·

τὸ γὰρ πλοῦς καὶ τὸ νοῦς καὶ τὸ ῥοῦς καὶ τὸ χοῦς ὅταν μὲν ὡς
ἀπὸ τοῦ πλόος καὶ νόος καὶ ῥόος καὶ χόος γινόμενα λάβῃς, τότε
ἰσοσυλλάβως κλῖνεπλοῦ καὶ νοῦ καὶ ῥοῦ καὶ χοῦ, ὅταν δὲ οὐχ
ὡς συνηρημένα λαμβάνῃς ταῦτα, ἀλλ᾽ ὡς ἁπλῶς πλοῦς καὶ χοῦς
καὶ τὰ λοιπά, τότε οὐκ ἰσοσυλλάβως κλινεῖς πλοῦς πλοῦ, ἀλλὰ
περιττοσυλλάβως διὰ τοῦ ος πλοῦς πλοός καὶ χοῦς χοός, ὥσπερ
καὶ τὸ βοῦς βοός.

διὰ τοῦτο διπλῆ ἐστιν ἡ κλίσις ἐπὶ τούτων, ὡς ἔφαμεν, καὶ
ποτὲμὲν πλοῦς πλοός πλοῖ κλίνεται, ποτὲ δὲ πλοῦς πλοῦ πλῷ.
The inflection in those words having *ou* from contraction has two
forms; sometimes they decline with an additional syllable, and
sometimes with the same number of syllables, and you must pay
attention to when they have an extra syllable, and when such
words decline with the same number of syllables.

For when, on the one hand, you take the (words) *plous* and
nous and *rhous* and *chous*, as being derived from *ploos* and *noos*
and *rhoos* and *choos*, then decline them [in the genitive] with the
same number of syllables as *plou* and *nou* and *rhou* and *chou*, but
when you do not take them as being contract forms, but as
simple (non-contracted) *plous* and *chous* and the rest, then you
do not decline *plous* (as) *plou* with the same number of syllables,
but with an extra syllable written as *-os*; *plous - ploos* and *chous -
choos*, just like *bous - boos*.

Because of this, the inflection has two forms for these words,
as we say, and sometimes *plous* declines as (genitive) *ploos* and
(dative) *ploi*, but other times *plous* (declines as) *plou* and *plōi*.
(Theodosius, Περὶ γραμματικῆς [sp.] 116.16–30; ed. Göttling
1822)

These passages, then, show that ancient lexicographers and grammarians
recognised the distinction between contracted and uncontracted forms,
identifying the former with the Attic dialect and the latter as non-Attic. In
addition, they saw Attic declension forms as especially 'Attic', suggesting
that use of them in favour of 'non-Attic' alternatives could be considered a
type of Atticism.

Comparative evidence for Atticist forms

The second type of evidence that I used to identify which markers should
be considered 'Atticising' is ancient usage. Here I examined whether Attic

authors actually used the contract and Attic declension forms in their writing and whether *Koinē* texts tended to maintain or replace them. On the whole, it must be noted that not all forms considered Atticist were necessarily part of a clear Attic versus *Koinē* dichotomy. Often perceived Attic forms continued to be used in the *Koinē* while *Koinē* forms sometimes already appear in Attic.

In order to make my assessment of Achilles' choices for each marker more objective, I have developed a rubric to help me determine how use of a particular form by a potentially Atticising author should be described, based on which forms were typically used in the Attic and *Koinē* dialects. Table 4 outlines the rubric, illustrating what I refer to as different 'Patterns of Use'.

Attic norm	*Koinē* norm	Use of X	Use of Y	Variations
X	Y	Simple Atticism	Simple Avoidance/ *Koinē* Preference	
Xy	Y	Mild Atticism	Strong *Koinē*-Leaning	xY : X
XY	Y	Moderate Atticism	Moderate *Koinē*-Leaning	XZ : X
xY	Y	Hyper-Atticism	Mild *Koinē*-Leaning	XY : Yz
X	xY	Strong Attic-Leaning	Mild Avoidance	Y : yZ
X	XY	Moderate Attic-Leaning	Moderate Avoidance	X : XZ Y : YZ
X	Xy	Mild Attic-Leaning *(slight Attic bias)*	Strong Avoidance	X : Xz X : Xyz *Xy : xy*
Xy	xY	Moderate Attic-leaning	Moderate *Koinē*-leaning	
X Y	X Y	Neutral	Neutral	Y : Y(xz)

Table 4: Rubric for Patterns of Use (PoU)

In this table, X generally refers to the contracted or Attic declension forms and Y to the uncontracted or non-Attic declension alternatives. Upper-case letters indicate the form found primarily in Attic or the *Koinē*, and lower case indicates that it is sometimes found. The last column indicates variations on the basic patterns which can be treated in the same way as those in the same row. Z refers to a third variant, which is often a synonym that some *Koinē* texts use in favour of both the contracted or Attic declension form

and its alternative. It can also refer to the heteroclitic third declension variants of contract nouns.

By using this rubric, I can look at each of the potentially Atticist examples in Achilles' work and, based on which form he chooses to use, make assessments regarding whether his decisions could be described as 'mildly or strongly Atticising', 'mildly or strongly avoiding Atticism', or whether the form is better described as having an 'Attic-leaning' or '*Koinē*-leaning' preference.

Statistics and analysis

In my research, I identified 16 lemmas that could potentially belong to the contract second declension and 9 that could belong to the Attic declension in Achilles Tatius' text. For each, I examined the use in ancient Attic and *Koinē*-period texts to determine the pattern of use of that particular lemma. To determine general Attic usage, I looked at the forms found in the Attic inscriptions (discussed in Leslie Threatte's *Grammar of Attic Inscriptions*) and at the usage of Aristophanes and the ten Attic orators, sometimes also consulting the use in other Attic writers like Plato and Aristotle.[11] I based this information on statistics derived from the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (henceforth *TLG*) online Text Search Tool.[12] I also consulted the preference of the tragedians Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides, but generally gave less weight to these as their language carries strong Epic, Ionic and Doric influences. To establish general *Koinē* usage, I consulted the forms from *Koinē*-era documentary papyri (given in Gignac's book on the *Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*) and in the biblical Septuagint and New Testament texts.[13] When these texts were lacking in examples of the lemma in question, I would consult other contemporary texts thought to have been affected little or only mildly by Atticist influence, such as Galen (considered strongly non-Atticist) and Plutarch and Josephus.

The following tables present my findings with respect to the second declension contract nouns and adjectives. Table 5 shows the general pattern of use in Attic and the *Koinē* for each of the contract words. The final column indicates whether they are given as examples in the lexicographers or grammarians.

---

[11] Threatte 1996.

[12] Pantelia 2017 (URL: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/indiv/tsearch.jsp).

[13] Gignac 1981. I made use of Blass, Debrunner and Funk 1961 as well as the *TLG* for details on the New Testament.

	Lemma	Meaning	Attic	*Koinē*	L/G
N	ὀστέον, τό	*bone*	Xy	xY	yes
N	κάνεον, τό	*basket*	X	Xz	
A	ἀργύρεος, εα, εον	*silver*	X	Xy	yes
A	χρύσεος, εα, εον	*gold*	X	Xy	yes
A	σιδήρεος, εα, εον	*iron*	X	Xy	yes
A	πορφύρεος, εα, εον	*purple*	XZ	X	yes
A	κυάνεος, εα, εον	*dark blue*	X	XY	yes
A	ἁπλοῦς, ῆ, οῦν	*single*	X	Xy	
A	διπλοῦς, ῆ, οῦν	*double*	X	Xy	
N	νόος, ὁ	*mind*	X	XZ	yes
N	πλόος, ὁ	*voyage*	X	XZ	yes
N	ῥόος, ὁ	*stream*	X	XZ	yes
A	ἀθρόος	*together*	xY	Y	yes
A	ὄγδοος	*eighth*	Y	Y(xz)	
N	ἔλεος, ὁ	*pity*	Y	yZ	
N	φωλεός, ὁ	*cave*	Y	Y	
	(nom./acc. pl.)		(Y)	(YZ)	

Table 5: Ancient Usage (PoU) for Contract Second Declension Words

Table 6 shows Achilles Tatius' preferences with respect to these words. It gives the number of contracted, uncontracted or heteroclitic tokens of each word in Achilles' text and gives an assessment of how I can describe his practice.[14]

	Lemma	Contract	Unct.	Hetero.	Description of use
N	ὀστέον, τό	1 (0)			Mod. Attic-leaning*
N	κάνεον, τό	2			Mild Attic-leaning
A	ἀργύρεος	1			Mild Attic-leaning
A	χρύσεος	15			Mild Attic-leaning
A	σιδήρεος	1			Mild Attic-leaning
A	πορφύρεος	3			Mod. *Koinē*-leaning (partial: 1 token of Z)
A	κυάνεος		2		Mod. avoidance of A
A	ἁπλοῦς	2			Mild Attic-leaning
A	διπλοῦς	12			Mild Attic-leaning

[14] Numerals indicate the number of individual tokens of that lemma that appear in Vilborg's edition of Achilles' text in the contracted (Contract), uncontracted (Unct.) or heterolictic (Hetero.) form. Numerals in parentheses indicate the number of tokens that do not vary in the manuscripts and are therefore more reliable. Question marks indicate ambiguous tokens for which the attribution is unclear. These are listed in both columns to which they could possibly be assigned. These conventions also apply to Table 8.

	Lemma	Contract	Unct.	Hetero.	Description of use
N	νόος, ὁ	2 + 4?		4?	Mod. Attic-leaning?
N	πλόος, ὁ	1 + 9? (8?)		9? (8?)	Mod.Attic-leaning?*
N	ῥόος, ὁ	1?		1(0) + 1?	Mod. Attic-leaning (partial)*
A	ἀθρόος		3		Mild *Koinē*-leaning
A	ὄγδοος		1		Neutral
N	ἔλεος, ὁ		6	1	Strong Attic-leaning (partial)
N	φωλεός, ὁ		1		Neutral
	Total: 16	40	13	2	

* note manuscript variation

Table 6: Examples in Achilles Tatius

The general picture that emerges is that Achilles Tatius shows a preference for Attic-leaning forms over non-Attic alternatives. While Attic authors often used only the contracted variations of these words (as seen by the X's in the Attic column), the Attic forms often continued into the *Koinē*. I describe such examples as 'Attic-leaning' rather than 'Atticist', because Atticism implies use of a form that no longer exists in the every-day *Koinē*. Contracted forms often occurred, alongside other alternate forms in the *Koinē*.

My statistics reveal that many contract nouns (especially the adjectives of metal and multiplicatives) fall into the pattern X : Xy, where the contracted form is actually continued into *Koinē* texts to a higher degree than uncontracted forms, but where uncontracted forms are starting to appear. Achilles' use of the contracted forms of these points to a 'mild Attic-leaning preference'. The same is true for the noun κάνεον (although for this lemma, synonyms, indicated by Z, rather than the uncontracted form were starting to appear). For ὀστέον, it seems that he shows a moderate Attic-leaning preference, because the contracted form already appeared occasionally in Attic and continued into the *Koinē*, although the uncontracted form had begun to dominate there. Unfortunately, the manuscript tradition for ὀστέον in Achilles' text is inconsistent.[15] While contracted ὀστοῦν appears

[15] The edition of Achilles Tatius' text which I used was that of Ebbe Vilborg 1955. It was compiled using all manuscripts and papyrus fragments known to him and has a detailed apparatus. While there is a newer edition of Achilles' text by Garnaud 1991, I made use of Vilborg's edition for a number of practical and theoretical reasons. Vilborg is more explicit regarding the choices he makes when there are manuscript variations, whereas Garnaud sometimes silently prefers one branch over the other (Consonni 2006:116). Despite there being new manuscript sections and papyri fragments available to Garnaud, the way in which they are incorporated into the text did not convince me that it resulted in a significantly superior edition. For

in all the manuscripts of what Ebbe Vilborg calls Family β of Achilles' text, and which he considers slightly more reliable, uncontracted ὀστέον appears in the manuscripts of Family α.[16] As a result, the appearance of Attic-leaning preference here must be taken with caution.

For the -οος nouns that often took heteroclitic forms in the *Koinē*, I have described the pattern of use as X : XZ, where Z is the heteroclitic form. Unfortunately, it is often hard to tell whether Achilles has used the contracted or heteroclitic form, as many examples are in the nominative and accusative singular (4 tokens of νόος, 9 of πλόος and 1 of ῥόος) which are ambiguous. One token of (τὸν) πλοῦν is not consistent in the manuscript tradition. While it is the form found in Family β, Family α has the verb πλεῖν instead. For the remaining clear and unambiguous forms of these words, Achilles generally has the contracted form pointing to 'moderate Attic-leaning preference'. There is one exceptional case of heteroclitic ῥόος, the dative ῥοΐ, but again this occurs only in the texts of manuscript Family β with ῥέει, the dative singular of a related but different third declension word (τό ῥέος), found in Family α.[17] This might point to an occasion in which Achilles has lapsed into the 'Attic-avoiding' heteroclitic form, but this one partially-attested token is insufficient to make a strong claim regarding it.

The masculine noun ὁ ἔλεος, while generally uncontracted even in Attic, also tended to take a heteroclitic third declension form τό ἔλεος (which dominated by far) in *Koinē* texts, giving it a Y : yZ pattern of use (which essentially equates to X : xY). Use of the uncontracted form here, then, actually points to 'strong Attic-leaning preference' on Achilles' part. He does also have one token of the heteroclitic neuter (gen. sg. ἐλέους), however, showing that even when he does use strongly Attic forms, he seldom does

---

more on a critical discussion of the editions, see Consonni 2006. In addition, Vilborg's text had the advantage of having a full English commentary accompanying it (Vilborg 1962). It is also the version available on the *TLG* and I was thus able to make use of the *TLG*'s online analytical tools for my research. While it is impossible to truly reconstruct Achilles' original, I have consulted the manuscript variations noted in Vilborg's apparatus as well as evidence from all the papyrus fragments (not only those known to Vilborg). When a token is invariant in all or the majority of manuscripts, I take it as likely to have been original. When it varies in a significant number of manuscripts, I recognise that it must be treated with caution. I make note of significant manuscript variation where necessary. I acknowledge that when I speak of 'the language of Achilles Tatius', I actually mean 'his language as we can best reconstruct it'.

[16] On Vilborg's categorisation of the manuscripts and division into two main families, see Vilborg 1955:xv-lxxvii.
[17] Cf. Vilborg 1955:65.

so consistently throughout his text. (This token is invariant in the manuscripts, but another example of the genitive singular appears as uncontracted second declension ἐλέου in most manuscripts, but as heteroclitic ἐλέους in a single manuscript.)

Ὄγδοος and φωλεός are also uncontracted even in Attic, and so Achilles' use of the uncontracted form of both of them is neutral and uninformative. I have included them in my list because there are a few examples of variant forms in post-Classical literature. There is very occasional evidence of contracted ὄγδους (X) as a hyper-correct form or simplified ὄγδος (Z), but Achilles uses the normal spelling and so his use is unexceptional and can be considered neutral. φωλεός has a heteroclitic neuter form sometimes found in the *Koinē*, but only ever in the neuter plural nominative/accusative inflection, τά φωλεά. Achilles' single token of the word is in the genitive singular and the variation is therefore not applicable to it.

While Achilles' application of contracted second declension forms mostly points to mild Attic-leaning preference (with limited cases of moderate or strong Attic-leaning), he does have a few examples where he uses what are primarily non-Attic forms. For the adjective πορφύρεος, he makes use of the contracted form, πορφοροῦς. But the pattern of use for this word is complicated. Though not very commonly used by Attic writers, it appears in Plato and Aristotle. An alternate word for 'purple', ἁλουργής (recommended by Moeris in *Atticista* α.116 as a more properly Attic synonym), is sometimes used instead. What is more, the Septuagint, New Testament and Roman-era papyri only have the contracted form (recommended as the non-Attic alternative to ἁλουργής by Moeris). This suggests that Achilles' use here is actually moderately *Koinē*-leaning. For κυάνεος, for which the uncontracted form seems to have already been well established in *Koinē* texts (although the word is rare), Achilles unusually makes use of the uncontracted form. This can be described as a '*Koinē* preference pointing to moderate avoidance of Atticism'. Finally, his use of the uncontracted form of the adjective ἀθρόος could be described as a mildly *Koinē*-leaning preference since the uncontracted form was already used more than the contracted alternative in Attic, and use of the contracted form would be considered hyper-Atticism.

In summary, regarding contract nouns and adjectives, Achilles' use generally shows an Attic-leaning preference. Regarding most forms, he shows chiefly mild (but sometimes moderate or strong) Attic-leaning. These are also often perceived Atticist forms as promoted by the lexicographers and grammarians. For the lemmas which are normally uncontracted, even in Attic, he generally sticks to the uncontracted form, never showing hyper-Atticism. There is only one clear instance of Achilles using a heteroclitic third declension alternative (neuter gen. sg. ἐλέους), and one partially

attested example (dat. sg. ῥοῖ), although some instances of the -οος nouns are ambiguous. The two tokens of uncontracted κυάνεος point to moderate avoidance of Atticism. His choices for πορφύρεος and ἀθρόος point to occasional instances of mild or moderate *Koinē*-leaning. His overall use, then, shows a fair amount of mild Attic preference, but little in the way of either strongly Attic or non-Attic choices.

I move now to a discussion of Achilles' preferences for the 'Attic declension' words. Table 7 shows the general pattern of use for each of these words. The final column again indicates whether they are given as examples in the lexicographers or grammarians.

Attic Form	Other	Meaning	Attic	*Koinē*	L/G
νεώς	ναός	*temple*	X	Y	yes
σῶς	σῶος	*safe*	X	Y	yes
ἵλεως	ἵλαος	*propitious*	X	Xyz	yes
ἕως	ἠός	*dawn*	X	Xyz	
κάλως	κάλος	*cable*	X	xY	yes
τυφῶς	τυφῶν	*whirlwind*	XY	Yz	yes
ταῶς	ταών	*peacock*	Xy	xy	
ἥρως (ἥρω)	ἥρως (ἥρωος)	*hero*	xY	X	
Μενέλεως	Μενέλαος	*Menelaus*	xY	Y	yes

Table 7: Ancient Usage (Patterns of Use) for Attic Declension Words

Table 8 presents my findings regarding Achilles' preferences for Attic declension nouns. It gives the number of Attic declension or non-Attic declension tokens of that word in Achilles' text and an assessment of how I can describe Achilles' use of each word.[18]

---

[18] Conventions as in Table 6. Numerals indicate the number of tokens that appear in an Attic declension (Attic) or non-Attic declension (Other) form in Achilles' text. Ambiguous (Ambig.) tokens are here listed in a separate column.

Lemma	Attic	Other	Ambig.	Description of usage
Νεώς	8	4		Simple Atticism (partial)
σῶς		1		Simple avoidance
ἵλεως	2 (0)			Mild Attic-leaning*
ἕως	10	5 (3)		Mild Attic-leaning (partial)*
κάλως	7 (0)	2	1	Strong Attic-leaning (partial)*
τυφῶς		1		Mild *Koinē*-leaning
ταῶς	6	2		Slight Attic bias (partial)
ἥρως			1	n/a
8	**33**	**15**	**2**	
Μενέλαος		53		Mild *Koinē*-leaning
9		**68**		

note manuscript variation
Table 8: Examples in Achilles Tatius

Again, my results suggest that Achilles Tatius shows a preference for Attic-leaning forms over non-Attic alternatives. My first two words fall into the simple X : Y pattern of use, where the Attic form has been almost entirely replaced in the *Koinē*. The first of these is the prototypical noun νεώς which typically takes Doric ναός in the *Koinē*. Achilles has the Attic declension spelling two-thirds of the time, which can be described as cases of simple Atticism. Although he does have four tokens of the non-Attic form, the Attic declension examples point to genuine Atticist intent on his part, but it is only partially carried out. This is not inconsistent with my general findings regarding Atticism in Achilles Tatius. He seldom succeeds in applying an Atticist form consistently throughout his text. For σῶς ('safe'), Achilles has only one token and it is in the uncontracted non-Attic declension form σῶον pointing to 'simple avoidance of Atticism' on Achilles' part.

The adjective ἵλεως and the noun ἕως fit into a pattern I am calling X : Xyz, where X is the Attic declension form, used almost exclusively in Attic and preferred in the *Koinē*, y is the non-Attic alternative (ἵλαος or ἠώς) which is sometimes found in the *Koinē*, and z is a synonym preferred at other times in *Koinē* texts. Achilles' use of the Attic declension forms for both these words points to a general 'mild Attic-leaning preference'. While ἕως has by far more cases of the Attic declension forms, the exceptions are notable. The ten Attic declension forms are all in the accusative, genitive or dative singular. All four occurrences of non-Attic ἠώς are in the nominative case. It is possible that Achilles made use of the non-Attic form in the nominative singular to avoid confusion with the homophonous particle ἕως which occurs five times in his text. There is one other token of the non-

Attic declension form, but this is the genitive singular of the personification of the Dawn, Ἠοῦς. As a proper noun, the name of the Dawn is almost always spelled with a non-Attic form. (There are one or two instances of manuscript variation for these lemmas, but they are few and of little significance).

I have categorised κάλως as having an X : xY pattern of use, since the Attic declension form sometimes continues in *Koinē* texts, but the variation κάλος has largely replaced it. Achilles' use of the Attic form can be described as 'strongly Attic-leaning'. Unfortunately, this particular lemma varies significantly in the different manuscripts of Achilles' text and all the Attic declension forms occur as the non-Attic equivalents in some manuscripts. The Attic declension forms are found in Family β, considered the marginally more reliable branch of manuscripts by Vilborg, and are adopted in his edition, but the variation for this word is too significant to ignore. Notionally, then, Achilles seems to show partial strong Attic-leaning for this lemma, but this evidence must be taken with caution.

I have described the pattern of use of the word τυφῶς as XY : Yz where X is the Attic declension form, Y the third declension heteroclitic alternative and Z a number of synonyms found in some *Koinē* texts. Since the third declension alternative appeared often in both Attic and the *Koinē*, it is hard to assess Achilles' choice as either Attic or not. I describe it as mildly *Koinē*-leaning, because the Attic declension form was sometimes found in Attic, but Achilles has avoided using it. (This token does appear in a variant form in a single manuscript, as τυφῶν, which is the accusative singular of the Attic declension or nominative singular of the third declension, but as it is only found in one manuscript, it is unlikely to have been original.)

Ταῶς I describe as having an Xy : xy pattern of use. This is because, while the Attic declension form dominates in Attic texts, the third declension alternative already occurs sometimes. The word did not appear in my standard *Koinē* texts, but in writers of the period who are not considered very strong Atticists (like Galen and Plutarch), I found examples of both forms (hence lower-case x and y). Achilles mostly uses the Attic declension form with two examples of the third declension variation. I can only describe this as a 'slight Attic bias', because both forms were found in both dialects, but there was a slight preference for the Attic declension in Attic texts.

For ἥρως, I was unable to make any conclusion, because Achilles' only token of this word is in the nominative singular which looks the same in both the Attic declension and third declension alternative.

My final Attic declension noun is the name Μενέλαος. While some names are invariant or unaffected by Atticism (we would not expect even a strict Atticist to spell Odysseus with a -ττ- for -σσ-), Μενέλαος occurred in the Attic declension -εω- and non-Attic -αο- spellings throughout Greek

history. What is more, the Μενέλαος referred to in the novel is a character (not the Epic hero) and so Achilles could have given him any name he chose in whichever spelling he chose. Although the Attic declension spelling Μενέλεως is often presented by the grammarians as an example of an Attic declension noun (as in Theodosius and Theognostus), this spelling was already used less than the -αος alternative in Attic inscriptions and literature. And so I have described the name as having an xY : Y pattern of use. Achilles' selection then, is not surprising. But, if he had had a stronger Atticist inclination, he almost certainly would have used the Attic declension spelling and so his choice shows a mild '*Koinē*-leaning preference' and reaffirms my general observation that Achilles is not an extreme Atticist.

In summary, analysis of the Attic declension in Achilles' text points to him broadly showing an Attic-leaning preference (as he often selects the so-called Attic declension forms in favour of alternatives), but for the most part, this preference is mild. It is only for the noun νεώς that Achilles shows clear examples of simple Atticism by preferring the clearly Attic form more often than the non-Attic one (but even for this he is inconsistent). For σῶς, he shows simple avoidance of the Attic form, but there is only one token of this. For τυφῶς and Μενέλαος, he avoids the Attic declension forms, preferring the variants that have mild *Koinē*-leaning association. For Μενέλαος in particular, he avoids a form which a very strict Atticist would probably have chosen. This falls in line with my general findings that, while Achilles does make attempts at Atticism, it is not an obsession and he generally uses more neutral forms (neither strongly Atticist nor strongly *Koinē*-specific) wherever possible.

Conclusion

In conclusion, my analysis of noun inflections portrays Achilles Tatius as a weak Atticist with respect to these forms. While he often shows preference for forms that might have an Attic-leaning association over those associated more with the *Koinē*, these forms tend to be Attic-leaning rather than Atticist. For more clearly Atticist forms like νεώς, he makes some attempt at Atticising but does not apply this consistently throughout. While this paper only deals with one very small aspect of his language, it reveals something of Achilles' attitudes to the use of Attic/ist forms and fits in line with his practices on the whole. With respect to other morphological features as well as phonological or spelling preferences, I have found that Achilles shows a leaning towards, but never a total adoption of, Attic-leaning and Atticist forms.

The clear mixture of forms observed with νεώς is seen in other easily identifiable Atticisms like the -ττ- over -σσ- variation, which also shows a

slight but not dominant preference for the Attic alternative. For less clear features, however, he is more likely to stay away from Atticist forms, especially when it comes to hyper-Atticisms like ἄθρους, τυφῶς or (as a phonetic example) ξύν in place of σύν. Mildly Atticist or Attic-leaning forms occur along with *Koinē*-leaning alternatives, but he makes little use of strongly *Koinē*-leaning forms or those I identified as a strong avoidance of Atticism. He appears to have had an awareness of Attic/ist forms, but did not feel pressure to use them to excess or even consistently. This gives interesting insight into questions surrounding the language, intentions and audience of the ancient novels in general and in Achilles Tatius' work in particular[19].

It is not possible to discuss the potential reasons for and implications of these results in detail at this point. But it seems unlikely that an author who is elsewhere described as sophisticated and having advanced rhetorical skill would simply be incompetent or careless in his application of Atticist forms.[20] Having ruled out the possibility of deliberate variations (based, for example, on differences in the dialect of speakers in the novel) and other epiphenomenal effects (for example, desire to avoid hiatus or metrical considerations), it seems that Achilles' use of a mild but inconsistent Atticism was deliberate. It may be that he (like his contemporaries Lucian and Galen) found himself in an awkward position, being under pressure to show knowledge of Atticist forms, but opposed to the strict way in which some imposed it.[21] This may not be entirely surprising, given the way in which Achilles' novel subverts the expected norms of his genre in other respects.[22]

References

Allen, F.D. 1871. 'On the so-called Attic second declension.' *TAPhA* 2:18–34.

Bartsch, S. 1989. *Decoding the Ancient Novel: The Reader and the Role of Description in Heliodorus and Achilles Tatius.* Princeton.

Blass, F., Debrunner, A. and Funk, R. 1961. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature.* Chicago.

---

[19] On questions of the audience of the novel see Stephens 1994 and Bowie 1994.

[20] On the sophisticated nature of the text and his skill with rhetoric, see Bartsch 1989:3–12 and Morales 2001:vii-xxxii.

[21] For detailed discussions on the uncomfortable relationships that Lucian and Galen had with Atticism, see Swain 1996:45–49, 56–63 and Whitmarsh 2005:45–49.

[22] On the ways in which Achilles' novel differs from the others, see Chew 2000 and Reardon 1999.

Bowie, E. 1994. 'The readership of Greek novels in the ancient world.' In Tatum 1994:435–59.

Chew, K.S. 2000. 'Achilles Tatius and parody'. *CJ* 96:57–70.

Consonni, C. 2006. 'On the text of Achilles Tatius.' In G. Schmeling, S. Byrne, E. Cueva and J. Alvares (edd.), *Authors, Authority, and Interpreters in the Ancient Novel: Essays in Honor of Gareth L. Schmeling*, 112–30. Groningen.

Cramer, J.A. (ed.) 1963 [1835]. 'Theognostus' Canones sive de orthographia.' In *Anecdota Graeca e codd. manuscriptis bibliothecarum Oxoniensium* 1–165. Amsterdam.

Dickey, E. 2007. *Ancient Greek Scholarship*. Classical Resources Series. New York.

Doescher, I. 2013. *William Shakespeare's Star Wars: Verily, a New Hope*. Philadelphia.

Fischer, E. (ed.) 1974. 'Die Ekloge des Phrynichos.' In *Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker* 1:60–109. Berlin.

Gammage, S. 2018. *Atticism in Achilles Tatius: An Examination of Linguistic Purism in Achilles Tatius'* Leucippe and Clitophon. Unpublished PhD dissertation: University of KwaZulu-Natal.

Garnaud, J.-P. 1991. *Le roman de Leucippé et Clitophon*. Paris.

Gignac, F.T. 1981. *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods. II. Morphology*. Milan.

Göttling, K. (ed.) 1822. 'Theodosius' Περὶ γραμματικῆς [Sp.].' In *Theodosii Alexandrini Grammatica* 1–197. Leipzig.

Hansen, D.U. (ed.) 1998. 'Das Attizistische Lexicon des Moeris.' In *Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker* 9:71–165. Berlin and New York.

Hilgard, A. (ed.) 1965a [1894]. 'Theodosius' Canones isagogici de flexione nominum.' In *Grammatici Graeci* 4.1:3–42. Hildesheim.

Hilgard, A. (ed.) 1965b [1894]. 'Choeroboscus' Prolegomena et scholia in Theodosii Alexandrini canones isagogicos de flexione nominum.' In *Grammatici Graeci* 4.1:103–417. Leipzig.

Horrocks, G.C. 2014[2] [1997]. *Greek: A History of the Language and its Speakers*. Chichester.

Kim, L. 2014. 'The literary heritage as language: Atticism and the Second Sophistic.' In E. Bakker (ed.), *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*, 468–82. Oxford.

Lentz, A. (ed.) 1965 [1867]. 'Aelius Herodian's De prosodia catholica.' In *Grammatici Graeci* 3.1:3–547. Hildesheim.

Morales, H. 2001. 'Introduction.' In T. Whitmarsh (ed), *Achilles Tatius: Leucippe and Clitophon*, vii-xxxii. Oxford.

Pantelia, C. (ed.) 2017. *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae Digital Library: Text Search Tool*. Irvine. URL: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu

Reardon, B.P. 1999. 'Achilles Tatius and ego-narrative.' In S. Swain (ed.), *Oxford Readings in the Greek Novel*, 243–58. New York.

Santafé Soler, S. 2005. *Aproximación Lingüística a la Obra de Aquiles Tacio*. Unpublished PhD dissertation. Universitat de València.

Sexauer, H. 1899. *Der Sprachgebrauch des Romanschriftstellers Achilles Tatius*. Heidelberg.

Silk, M. 2009. 'The invention of Greek: Macedonians, poets and others.' In A. Georgakopoulou and M. Silk (edd.), *Standard Languages and Language Standards: Greek, Past and Present*, 3–32. Farnham.

Stephens, S.A. 1994. 'Who read ancient novels?' In Tatum 1994:405–18.

Strobel, C. 2011. *Studies in Atticistic Lexica of the Second and Third Centuries AD*. Unpublished PhD dissertation. Oxford University.

Swain, S. 1996. *Hellenism and Empire: Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World, AD 50–250*. New York.

Tatum, J. (ed.), *The Search for the Ancient Novel*. Baltimore.

Threatte, L. 1996. *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions. II. Morphology*. Berlin and New York.

Vilborg, E. 1955. *Achilles Tatius: Leucippe and Clitophon*. Stockholm.

Vilborg, E. (ed.) 1962. *Achilles Tatius: Leucippe and Clitophon. A Commentary*. Stockholm.

Whitmarsh, T. 2005. *The Second Sophistic*. Cambridge.

sonja.gammage@up.ac.za