

The Original Structure, Function, and Typology of Philemon's Atticist Lexicon

Roberto Batisti

Abstract: *The Atticist lexicon ascribed to the grammarian Philemon, transmitted in two different, heavily abridged extracts, has been comparatively neglected, despite the recent surge of interest in the ideologies and practices of imperial-period linguistic purism. A peculiarity of this lexicon, attested by other scholarly sources and still discernible in the epitomes, is that it was written in iambic verse. However, the possible reasons for, and consequences of, this choice have not been discussed so far. Based on a thorough analysis of the lexicon's stylistic features, and on parallels with other late ancient and medieval metrical lexica, I suggest that Philemon's original work was structured as a dialogue between several characters – one of which possibly representing the author's own views – debating the correct usage of Attic forms. I also argue that the lexicon probably had a more 'horizontal' structure: the subdivision into short, alphabetically ordered entries would be a consequence of abridgement.*

Keywords: *Philemon, Lexicography, Atticism, Dialogue, Iambic trimeter.*

It is fair to say that the Atticist lexicon ascribed to Philemon does not rank among the best-known works in this already quite niche genre.¹ Indeed, most discussions of Atticist lexicography usually focus on Phrynichus' *Eclogue*, Moeris' Ἀττικιστής – representing the stricter, more prescriptive approach – the anonymous *Antiatticist*, or Pollux' *Onomasticon* – representing the more inclusive approach.² Compared to these relatively well-investigated works,

¹ For a general introduction to Philemon see Ucciardello, "Philemon;" Batisti, "Philemon."

² The bibliography on these lexica is vast and fast-growing. On Moeris

Philemon's lexicon remains little known, its study hampered by the lack of a standard critical edition, and – consequently – by its absence from the online *TLG*.³ Nevertheless, this lexicon offers several points of interest that would repay further study. One such reason lies in its importance as a source for later lexicography – in particular, as one of the main sources of Thomas Magister's late Byzantine Atticist lexicon – an important subject which will be left aside here.⁴ Philemon's lexicon also stands out among other imperial-period Atticist lexica for a singular fact: according to Choeroboscus' testimony, it was originally composed in iambic trimeters. The meter is indeed recognizable in several transmitted entries. While by no means unprecedented in didactic works with a linguistic or grammatical content, the choice of a metrical form is unique in Atticist lexicography; to the best of my knowledge, the possible reasons for this choice and its implications for the lexicon's structure, style, and reception have never been properly investigated. This paper aims to make a first step towards filling such a gap, also as a basis for future editorial work. Based on a close analysis of the surviving metrical passages, further hypotheses on the lexicon's original structure and style will be advanced. In particular, I will argue that several features, such as an abundance of first- and second-person forms, the presence of colloquial expressions indebted to comedy and Platonic dialogue, and the title of the work itself, may point to a format very different from that of a traditional lexicon, and possibly structured as a dialogue.

1. Sources on the title and metre of Philemon's lexicon

Philemon's lexicon has come down to us in two different, heavily

as a source on Atticism's linguistic attitudes see Swain, *Hellenism and Empire*, 52–53; on the *Antiatticist* and its agenda, see Tribulato, "(En)listing the Good Authors," with further references; on Pollux's moderate approach, see Sonnino, "Frammenti della commedia greca" and Cavarzeran, "Pollux;" on the *Eclogue*, probably the most studied Atticist lexicon, see recently Roumanis and Bentein, "Power of Judgement" and Tribulato, "Phrynichus Arabius."

³ See § 2 on partial editions of Philemon's lexicon.

⁴ See Gaul, "Twitching Shroud," 313–314; "Moschopulos, Lopadiotes," 189–190.

abridged extracts, each transmitted by a single manuscript. The version of cod. L (= Laurentianus 91 sup. 10 [14th century CE], 103v–104v), bearing the *inscriptio* Φιλήμονος and preserving 141 entries covering the letters α–δ, was first edited by Osann in 1821.⁵ The version of cod. V (= Vindobonensis phil. gr. 172 [15th century CE], 177r–177v) preserves 132 entries covering the entire alphabet, albeit in a more epitomised format; it was first edited in 1897 by Reitzenstein, who did not recognise its authorship, despite acknowledging the anonymous excerpt's antiquity and worth.⁶ Leopold Cohn promptly recognised that V was an epitome of Philemon's lexicon, on the basis of entries shared with L; he published a parallel text of L and V for the letters α–δ, along with the *loci paralleli* in Thomas Magister.⁷

The lexicon's title and metre are attested by Choeroboscus in his commentary on Hephaestion's *Enchiridion*, arguing that even though the latter treatise is concerned with metre, it is not itself a metrical work (ἔμμετρον), differently from Philemon's one:

Choerob. in Heph. 182.21–183.5 Consbruch: ἀνάγεται δὲ πάλιν καὶ τοῦτο ὡς καὶ πᾶσα τεχνικὴ ζήτησις ὑπὸ <τὸ> τεχνικὸν ὄργανον τῆς γραμματικῆς· οὐ γάρ, ὡς τινες ἠθέλησαν λέγειν, ὑπὸ τὸ μετρικόν, ἐπειδὴ περὶ μέτρων διαλαμβάνει. οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἔμμετρον αὐτὸ τὸ ποίημα (: πόνημα Studemund), ἵνα εἰπώμεν αὐτὸ ὑπὸ τὸ μετρικόν, ὡς τὸ φερόμενον δι' ἰάμβων Φιλήμονος τοῦ Ἀττικιστοῦ περὶ Ἀττικῆς ἀντιλογίας τῆς ἐν ταῖς λέξεσιν.

And again this [work] too, like every technical inquiry, is included in the technical tools of grammar: not, as some wished to claim, under that of metrics, since it discusses metres. For this work is not metrical, so that we could include [it] in the [tools] of metrics, such as the Atticist Philemon's [treatise?] on the Attic controversy about words (or: among the lexica? See § 5), [which is] transmitted in iambs.

⁵ Osann, *Philemonis grammatici*, 285–301.

⁶ Reitzenstein, *Geschichte*, 392–396.

⁷ Cohn, “Der Atticist Philemon.” The unpublished dissertation of Brown, “Atticist Lexicon,” contains the full text of both recensions as well as of Thomas Magister's entries, but is not a critical edition, and should be used with some caution. In this paper, Philemon's entries are referenced by the manuscript's *siglum* (L or V), followed by page and line number of Reitzenstein for V, and by page number alone for L, since Cohn did not number page lines.

The exact meaning and possible relevance of the work's title will be discussed further on (see § 4.2).⁸ It is important to note at once that Choeroboscus' testimony about the metre of Philemon's lexicon finds independent support in a fragment transmitted by Eustathius in a discussion about the orthography and accent of the noun λη(ι)-διον 'light summer dress', since the quoted fragment from Philemon's work is unequivocally an iambic trimeter:

Eust. in Il. 4.190.14–6: Φιλήμων δὲ τὸ λήδιον ἐρμηνεύσας εὐτελὲς τριβώνιον ἢ χλαμύδιον παλαιὸν παροξύνει αὐτὸ ὡς τὸ σταμνίον. φησὶ γὰρ ὡς σταμνίον δὲ τὴν προσφδίαν λέγω'.

Philemon, having explained λήδιον as a cheap little cloak or an old shabby *chlamys*, accents it as a paroxytone, like σταμνίον ('little wine-jar'), for he says: 'I say [it] like σταμνίον with regard to prosody'.

The same explanation of the meaning of λη(ι)διον is attributed to Philemon in the Byzantine *etymologica* (*Et. Gen.* λ 84 ~ *EM* 563.32), which refer to Choeroboscus' treatise on orthography for fuller discussion.⁹ Cohn argued that Eustathius' source for the whole debate on the spelling of λη(ι)διον, either through direct consultation or through a fuller redaction of the *etymologica*, must have been Choeroboscus' treatise on orthography, which in turn likely drew on Orus' treatise on the iota subscript (quoted by *Et. Gen.* λ 85 s.v. ληδάριον).¹⁰ Therefore, it is likely that Orus had access to Philemon's

⁸ As Federica Benuzzi (p.c.) kindly points out, *P.Turner* 39 fr. 1.1 (= TM 64217) [Apollonopolis, early 3rd c. CE] mentions Φιλήμονο(ς) λ[as the first item in a catalogue of books (mostly scholarly, including a work *On the Iliad* by Eratosthenes, a lexicon to Plato, and a *Commentary on Priscus' epic verses*). Treu suggested to restore λ[έξεις and to interpret this as a reference to the Ἀττικά λ[έξεις of the earlier lexicographer Philemon of Aexone; see Otranto, *Antiche liste*, 75. However, a reference to our Philemon's work is also possible, especially since, according to Poethke, the traces of λ could also belong to an α, which could be the first letter of ἀντιλογία. Given that the Atticist Philemon is datable around 200 CE, this would be a very early witness of his lexicon's circulation.

⁹ The existence of an entry on λη(ι)διον in Choeroboscus' *Orthography* is suggested by other cross-references in the *etymologica*: see Cohn, "Der Atticist Philemon," 362.

¹⁰ Cohn, "Der Atticist Philemon," 361–363.

work, and that Choeroboscus knew, at least through Orus, sufficient unabridged fragments of Philemon (such as the one preserved by Eustathius) to be aware of the lexicon's metrical arrangement.

2. *Writing a lexicon in metre*

The lexicon's original arrangement is confirmed by the traces of iambic metre in the surviving excerpts. Reitzenstein already identified several trimeters in V, and even went so far as to emend the text of several entries in order to restore the metre.¹¹ Although Reitzenstein's restorations may often be questionable, in at least some cases the iambic rhythm is unlikely to be a coincidence. Of special interest are two longer entries in V made up of uninterrupted sequences of 6 and 4 iambic trimeters respectively. This is a reasonable guarantee that these fragments preserve Philemon's *ipsissima uerba*, and allow us a precious glimpse into the lexicon's original style and structure. In fact, as will be discussed in greater detail below (§ 4), the fragments intriguingly hint at a possible, hitherto undetected feature of the lexicon. As we have seen, the fragment about ληδίων preserved by Eustathius is also an iambic trimeter; as pointed out by Cohn,¹² despite its brevity, this line also shows interesting traces of the lexicon's structural features (§ 6).

As already mentioned, Philemon's lexicon is a rarity among Greek lexicographical works – not only those with an Atticist inclination – for being written in verse. There is, however, an important, later parallel in the *Chrestomathy* of Helladius of Antinooupolis (1st half of the 4th century CE), which only survives through prose excerpts in Photius' *Bibliotheca* (cod. 279, 529b.24–536a.22) and in a few fragments in Orion's *Etymologicum*.¹³ The *Chrestomathy* was a miscellaneous work discussing various kinds of linguistic topics, with a focus on differences between Attic and the koine. Works such as Philemon's and Helladius' may be considered part of a wid-

¹¹ Reitzenstein, *Geschichte*, 388.

¹² Cohn, "Der Atticist Philemon," 361.

¹³ Heimannsfeld, *Helladii Chrestomathia*. For a preliminary edition see now Isépy, "Preliminary Text." Verdejo Manchado, "Métrica de las *Crestomatías*" argues that only the preface of Helladius' work was composed in iambic meter.

er tradition of iambic didactic poetry which goes back at least to Apollodorus of Athens (2nd century BCE).¹⁴ Further parallels are known from the Byzantine period. In the 11th century, Nicetas of Heraclea composed several didactic poems on specific grammatical topics in both syllabic and hymnographic metres;¹⁵ metrical lexica were composed by John Mauropous, whose *Etymologica nominum* in dodecasyllables offer thematically-arranged etymological explanations for words of the ordinary language,¹⁶ and by Psellus, who included among his didactic poems an alphabetical lexicon of rare words in political verse (*Poem.* 6, 270–490 Westerink). To these works should now be added another anonymous alphabetically-arranged lexicographical poem, transmitted in cod. Marcianus Graecus XI, 25 (early 15th c.) and possibly composed in the 14th century, whose main source appears to have been the so-called Cyril's lexicon.¹⁷ Even though the above-mentioned Byzantine works are obviously rooted in rather different social and cultural contexts, they may still provide, if handled with caution, a useful *comparandum* for Philemon's lexicon.

The reasons for composing a lexicographical work in verse may have been many: a regular metre offered an aid to memorisation, as well as helping to make an unattractive subject more likeable.¹⁸ In Philemon's case, other possible reasons for this choice, as suggested by the metrical fragments themselves, will be proposed below (§ 5). Whatever the reasons for the choice of composing a technical work in iambics, a consequence of this choice is clear enough: it would have prevented the lexicographer from employing technical expressions that did not fit the metre, as well as from quoting extensive passages from authors who wrote either in prose or in a different metre. One can only guess how Philemon would have faced the latter issue, given the almost total absence of quotations from

¹⁴ Fleischer, *Original Verses*, 90–93.

¹⁵ See now Bernard, "Didactic Poetry."

¹⁶ Reitzenstein, *Varro und Mauropus*, 3–30; Dyck, "John Mauropus."

¹⁷ Cavarzeran, "'Kosmas, non dormire'" offers a preliminary edition of the letters λ and ψ.

¹⁸ Isépy, "Towards a New Text," 192; Bernard, "Didactic Poetry," in 142–143.

both recensions of the lexicon;¹⁹ not by chance, the one quotation preserved in the longer fragments is an iambic line by Aristophanes (*Nu.* 175: see § 3.1).

As regards the first problem, it is likely that the lexicographer would have avoided certain technical terms of grammar that his colleagues, composing in prose, were freer to use (e.g., adjectives referring to accentuation like *προπαροξύτονος* 'proparoxytone', *προπερισπόμενος* 'properispomenon', etc., which could not – or hardly – fit in iambic trimeters). Instead, he could have made recourse to less precise expressions that fit the metre more easily. There is indeed a prominent example of the latter strategy in the surviving excerpts, namely the frequent use of the formula 'X ὡς Y' in order to indicate that the form discussed behaves like another form with respect to some relevant grammatical feature.²⁰ Which feature is under discussion is left unspecified (and, indeed, sometimes difficult to ascertain), due to the formula's vagueness; leaving aside ambiguous cases, it is used to refer to matters as various as vowel quantity, orthography, accentuation, nominal gender, nominal declension, verbal voice, and so on.²¹ The fact that this structure occurs 18 times in L and never in V might raise the suspicion that it was a feature of the epitomisation, rather than of the original lexicon, were it not for the fact that it also occurs in the (metrical, thus arguably not manipulated) fragment preserved by Eustathius. In the latter, in fact, the limitative expression *τὴν προσφῳδίαν* specifies

¹⁹ The quotations of classical authors in Thomas Magister's entries, of course, may have been added by the latter lexicon's compiler(s), who also supplemented many quotations from post-classical authors such as Synesius and Libanius.

²⁰ ὥσπερ occurs instead of ὡς only in L 359.

²¹ L 354 ἀρτύεται ὡς κονίεται (grammatical voice?), 355 ἄλλας ὡς κύνας (inflection), Ἀτρεία, ὡς βασιλέα, τὸ α μακρόν (orthoepy), 356 ἄθροος ὡς ἄγριος (accent, lack of contraction), 357 τοὺς βάτους, ὡς τοὺς λόφους (gender), βουλιμός [...] ὡς ἀσπασμός, οὐ βούλιμος (accent), γύλειον [...] ὡς ἄγρειον (accent), 358 ἡ γλήχων ὡς ἡ κύων (gender, inflection; see §6), γέλως, ὡς ἔρως (inflection), γαῦρον ὡς παῦρον (accent?), δικροῦν, ὡς χρυσοῦν (accent, contraction), δένδρον, ὡς ῥόδον, οὐ δένδρα ἵνα μὴ ποιήσης μακρόν τὸ δρα (orthoepy, inflection?), δασεῖ, ὡς τὸ ἀμβλεῖ καὶ βραδεῖ (accent?), 359 Διονύσιον, ὡς προβαλίσιον (word formation?), δέρειν ἐκδέρειν, ὥσπερ ἐκφέρειν (present stem formation, cf. Ion. ἐκδεῖρω?), δέλεαρ, ὡς κέαρ (inflection?), δύσεργος, ὡς ἄμουσος (accent), δύσερος, ὡς Μενέλεως (accent).

in which sense the noun ληδίων is ‘like’ (ὥς) the noun σταμνίον. It is likely that in the other entries’ original formulation a clarification was also provided, either explicitly, as here, or contextually. Using as a control Phrynichus’ *Eclogue*, a major Atticist lexicon that has reached us in a possibly unabridged form,²² one can see that such prosodic matters would have been discussed using the well-known technical terms of accentology (cf. (προ)παροξύτόνως in *Ecl.* 110, or περισπωμένων in *Ecl.* 321); Phrynichus’ *Praeparatio sophistica* and Moeris’ lexicon, despite the abridgement, offer many more such examples. Where ‘X ὥς Y’ refers to other (e.g., morphological) traits, the expressions that would have been necessary to discuss them with technical precision would have been similarly unwieldy. See, for instance, the entry prescribing the masculine gender for ὁ/ῆ βάτος ‘bramble’: whereas Moeris (β 23) and the *Antiatticist* (β 17) employ the technical terms ἀρσενικῶς ‘in the masculine’ and θηλυκῶς ‘in the feminine’, Philemon exemplifies the noun’s correct gender by pointing to another masculine *o*-stem (L 357 τοὺς βάτους, ὥς τοὺς λόφους. ‘βάτους (acc. masc. pl.), like λόφους (‘crests’, acc. masc. pl.)’).²³

3. *What can be learned from the surviving metrical fragments*

As argued above, only the entries with a clearly preserved iambic metre may be assumed to preserve the author’s original phrasing and, therefore, any clues as to the lexicon’s original features. Ideally, the entries should be several verses long to increase the likelihood that the iambic rhythm is not due to chance. While this rules out most of the surviving entries, a couple of such passages do exist, both preserved in cod. V, and may reward closer inspection.

3.1. *V 393.35–394.4*

The longest and most interesting witness to the lexicon’s original structure is the following six-line fragment:

²² As argued by Fischer, *Ekloge*, 37 and generally accepted since; but see Tribulato, “Photius, ἀναλόγητος,” 928–929, rightly stressing that the transmitted *Eclogue* “is unlikely to reflect the original without omissions or modifications, as it would then be a unique case in Greek lexicography.”

²³ See Merisio, “βάτος.”

‘ἐχθές περιελείς, τὸ δὲ χθές Ἀττικώτερον’.
 οὕτως ὄναιο τοῦ σοφοῦ τεχνυδρίου
 ὅτι καὶ τὸν Ἀριστοφάνην, τὸ τῶν Μουσῶν στόμα,
 τοῦ καταλόγου τῶν Ἀττικῶν ἐξήλασεν·
 ἐν ταῖς Νεφέλαις γὰρ ᾧδ’ ἐκεῖνός που λέγει·
 ‘ἐχθές δὲ γ’ ἡμῖν δεῖπνον οὐκ ἦν ἐσπέρας’.

5

1 δὲ V : γὰρ prop. Reitzenstein **2** οὕτως ὄναιο V : οὕτως; ὄναιο
 interpunxit Reitzenstein, vix recte **4** ἐξήλασεν Reitzenstein :
 ἐξήλασαν V **6** ἡμῖν Ar. Nu. 175 : ἐκεῖ V.

“You will reject ἐχθές (‘yesterday’), for χθές is more Attic.”

May you so enjoy your wise petty art,
 which expelled even Aristophanes, the mouth of the Muses,
 from the catalogue of Attic authors;
 for somewhere in the *Clouds* (Ar. Nu. 175) he says so:

“Yes, and yesterday (ἐχθές) night we did not have dinner.”

This passage deals with the variation between χθές and ἐχθές ‘yesterday’, a common enough topic in scholarly literature.²⁴ The prevailing opinion in grammatical thought saw ἐχθές as the original and more regular form, χθές as a peculiarity of Attic: of course, in the eyes of Atticist lexicographers such as Moeris (χ 6), this made the latter form preferable. What is interesting in Philemon’s fragment is that it opens with the same prescription given by Moeris, but then goes on to challenge it in the following lines, pointing out that such a rigid prescription would expel from the Attic canon even Aristophanes himself, who employed ἐχθές in the *Clouds*. As Brown observes, Philemon’s polemical stance against “overzealous Atticists” recalls the *Antiatticist*, as does, indeed, the strategy of defending a debated form by showing its attestation in a canonical author.²⁵ The polemical tone, in itself not unexpected in Atticist lexicography – one need only think of Phrynichus’ *Eclogue* – is also borne out by some lexical choices, which in turn show an indebtedness to Classical Attic sources and are paralleled by contemporary high-register authors.

At l. 2, οὕτως ὄναιο ‘may you (so) profit’, i.e., ‘bless thee’, is a po-

²⁴ See in detail Gerbi and Batisti, “χθές,” whose discussion is reprised and expanded here.

²⁵ Brown, “Atticist Lexicon,” 190 and 228. On the *Antiatticist*’s use of Aristophanic quotations see Fiori, *Citazioni di Aristofane*.

lite formula (apparently not recognised by Reitzenstein, who put a question mark after οὐτως), probably of colloquial character, expressing a wish on the addressee's benefit.²⁶ The formula, with or without οὐτω(ς), is found in Attic drama²⁷ and oratory,²⁸ before being revived by 2nd-century-CE writers, including Lucian (*Philops.* 27.7, *Icar.* 20.3, *Merc. Cond.* 34.3, *D. Meretr.* 4.1.3, *Symp.* 23.10) and Aulus Gellius (*NA* 14.6.5). As with other polite formulas, (οὐτως) ὄναιο may be employed straightforwardly, to soften an imperative or to make an appeal or protestation, but also sarcastically.²⁹ The best two parallels for the sarcastic usage come precisely from Lucian's *Symposium* and from Gellius; in both cases, the formula is used to disparage another scholar's learning as futile.³⁰ In Lucian, the Stoic philosopher Hetoemocles argues *per litteras* with Aristaenetus, complaining for not having been invited to the latter's dinner party. After attributing Aristaenetus' lack of judgement to the influence of the incompetent (in his opinion) philosophers Zenothemis and Diphilus 'Labyrinth', who are guests to the party, Hetoemocles adds: ἀλλὰ σὺ μὲν ὄναιο αὐτῶν. ἐγὼ δὲ ὡς ἂν μόνον τὸ καλὸν ἀγαθὸν ἡγούμενος εἶναι οἴσω ῥαδίως τὴν ἀτιμίαν "Well, may you profit from them! But I, holding as I do that only what is honourable is good, shall easily stand the slight." In the latter passage, Gellius turns down an unnamed fellow scholar's gift of a book of antiquarian curiosities with the following words:³¹

Quem cum statim properans redderem, 'ὄναιό σου (: σὺ Madvig : σὺ Ferri),' inquam, 'doctissime uirorum, ταύτης τῆς πολυμαθίας et

²⁶ See Collard, *Colloquial Expressions*, 137; Barrios-Lech, "Developments in politeness," 250, 255, and 261.

²⁷ Soph. *OC* 1042 ὄναιο (...) τοῦ τε γενναίου χάριν; Eur. *Hel.* 1418 ὄναιο, *IA* 1008 ὄναιο, 1359 ὄναιο τῶν φρενῶν; Or. 1676–7 ὄναιο καὶ σύ; Ar. *Th.* 469 οὐτως ὀναίμην τῶν τέκνων; Men. *Pc.* 400 οὐτως ὄναιο.

²⁸ D. 28.20 οὐτως ὄναισθε.

²⁹ Barrios-Lech, "Developments in politeness" 255; Gomme and Sandbach, *Menander*, 409–500.

³⁰ Ferri, "Graeca in Latin Texts," 503.

³¹ Since Nietzsche, "De Laertii Diogenis fontibus," the unnamed scholar has often been identified with Favorinus of Arles, and the book with his Παντοδαπή ἱστορία. See Holford-Strevens, *Aulus Gellius*, 116–118 for a balanced account of the controversy.

librum hunc opulentissimum recipe nil prosus ad nostras paupertinas litteras congruentem’.

And hastening shortly after to return the book, I said “Most learned of men, may you profit from this erudition of yours, and take back this very opulent book which is absolutely incomparable with our poor learning.”

It will not have escaped attention that the formula is placed by Gellius at the very beginning of a retort to an interlocutor; as a matter of fact, this collocation is by far the most frequent for the formula, either used sarcastically or not.³² In Philemon’s passage, too, the reasoning introduced by the formula sounds like a retort to the strict prescription offered at l. 1. This observation raises the possibility, which to the best of my knowledge has not been explored before, that Philemon’s lexicon originally contained dialogic features. This hypothesis’ implications will be scrutinised below (§§ 4–5). Indeed, Reitzenstein printed l. 1 between inverted commas, implying that he construed it as a section of direct speech (or a quote?), to which ll. 2–6 provide a rebuttal.

It is also worth noting that the rare diminutive τεχνύδριον ‘petty art’, again with disparaging force, comes from Plato (*R.* 475e.1–3 τούτους οὖν πάντας καὶ ἄλλους τοιούτων τινῶν μαθητικούς καὶ τοὺς τῶν τεχνυδρίων φιλοσόφους φήσομεν; “Are we going to refer to all of these as philosophers as well as others keen on learning of any sort, even those who practice minor crafts?”) and is not found again until the imperial period, when it is employed twice by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* 1.3.22.2, 1.8.41.2). On the other hand, the first attestations of the expression Μουσῶν στόμα ‘mouth(piece)/voice of the Muses’, applied by Philemon to Aristophanes, date from the Hellenistic age, starting with Theocritus (7.37 καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ Μοισᾶν καπυρὸν στόμα “I, too, am a clear-voiced mouthpiece of the Muses”). This phrase and its variants are common in epigrams as celebratory epithets of several poets, from Homer to Pindar and Stesichorus, while this is the only place where the expression is referred to Aristophanes.³³ A sarcastic undertone is discernible in these lofty words

³² Among classical attestations of this phrase, the only exception is Eur. *Or.* 1677, where it expresses a genuine well-wishing, rather than a sarcastic retort.

³³ See Skiadas, *Homer im griechischen Epigramm*, 84–85; Ercoles, *Stesicoro*,

of praise, contrasting the puristic exaltation of Aristophanes as a model of Attic diction with his use of an allegedly ‘un-Attic’ form.

Lastly, the future περιελείς from περιαιρέω is late (LXX+), but cf. Ar. *Eq.* 290 περιελῶ σ’ ἀλαζονείαις “I’ll harass you with quacker-ies,” where περιελῶ is generally agreed today to be from περιελαύνω, but may have been understood as the future of περιαιρέω by some ancient authorities, as suggested by the schol. vet. Ar. *Eq.* 290a (VEΓ³ΘΜ), where confusion is apparently made between the two explanations. Notice that the imperative περίελε occurs twice in V (393.34, 394.26), making it likely that it was part of Philemon’s critical vocabulary (this verb is not used by other Atticists). If Philemon picked up περιελείν from the above-mentioned faulty interpretation of Aristophanes, it would count as another debt towards the language of the canonical authors.

3.2. *V* 393.17–20

The second-longest metrical fragment, while lexically less remarkable, has intriguing structural similarities with the discussion of (ἐ)-χθές:

ἐρυγγάνει <λέγουσιν>, οὐκ ἐρεύγεται,
[καὶ] ἐρυγεῖν, ἀπερυγεῖν, ἥρυγεν, οὐκ ἠρεύξατο’.
ἐρυγγάνει δὲ <μᾶλλον>, ἂν ἄσιτος ἦ,
ἐρεύγεταιί, δ’ ὅταν τις ἐμπλησθῇ τροφῆς.

597. Cf. *AP* 9.184.1 (Anon., 2nd century BCE) Πίνδαρε, Μουσάων ἱερὸν στόμα “Pindar, holy mouth of the Muses;” Diosc. *AP* 7.411.5–6 ὃ στόμα πάντων ἰ δεξιόν, ἀρχαίων ἥσθ’ αὖ τις ἡμιθέων “o mouth clever in all things (Aeschylus), you were one of the ancient demigods;” Antip.Sid. *AP* 7.2.1–2 τὰν μερόπων Πειθῶ, τὸ μέγα στόμα, τὰν ἴσα Μούσαις ἰ φθεγξαμένην κεφαλάν (...) Μαρινίδεω “the Persuader of men, the mighty voice, the head of Maeonides, who sang even as the Muses;” *AP* 7.6.3–4 Μουσῶν φέγγος Ὀμηρον, ἀγήραντον στόμα κόσμου ἰ παντός “the light of the Muses, Homer, the ageless mouth of the whole world;” *AP* 7.75.1 Στασίχορον, ζαπληθὲς ἀμέτρητον στόμα Μούσης “Stesichorus, the vast, immeasurable mouth of the Muse;” *AP* 9.188.1 Ἀτθίδος εὐγλώσσου στόμα φέρτατον “Best voice of the sweet-sounding Attic (i.e., Plato);” Paul. Sil. *AP* 7.4.1 Περὶδων τὸ σοφὸν στόμα, θεῖον Ὀμηρον “the skilled mouth of the Muses, divine Homer;” and the anonymous Byzantine dodecasyllable Ὀμῆρε Μουσῶν, χαῖρε, χρύσειον στόμα “Hail, Homer, golden mouth of the Muses,” on which see Valerio, “Analecta Byzantina,” 261.

“<They say> ἐρυγγάνει (‘he belches’), not ἐρεύγεται,
[and] (aorist) ἐρυγείν, ἀπερυγείν, ἥρυγεν, not ἡρεύξατο.”
But ἐρυγγάνει [is used] <rather> if someone is fasting,
while ἐρεύγεται, when someone is full of food.

This passage is concerned with the competing present and aorist stems of the verb meaning ‘to belch, burp, vomit’. As in the previously discussed entry, here too Philemon seems to take stance against the prevailing Atticist doctrine, represented among others by Phrynichus (*PS* 73.15–7, *Ecl.* 42) and Moeris (ε 50), who preferred the nasal present ἐρυγγάνω and the thematic aorist ἥρυγον over the root thematic present ἐρεύγομαι and the sigmatic aorist ἡρευξάμην respectively.³⁴ In fact, while this standard doctrine is presented in ll. 1–2, the following lines argue for an (alleged) semantic difference: ἐρεύγομαι would refer to eructation after a meal, ἐρυγγάνω to burping on an empty stomach.³⁵ The entry is thus structured as a rebuttal to the *communis opinio* of strict Atticists, in the same way as the previously discussed one; and indeed, Reitzenstein again put ll. 1–2 between inverted commas. Now, the fact that he did not put between inverted commas the *second* part of this and of the previous entry suggests that he understood the first line of each entry as a quotation of somebody else’s opinion, followed by the lexicographer’s comment, not as lines of dialogue between two speakers. However, the presence of οὕτως ὄναι immediately after the alleged quotations in the previous fragment makes it tempting to frame the remaining lines as a direct response (correcting the erroneous rule stated in the preceding lines), and the same may be true for the fragment at hand.

3.3. Other (possibly) metrical sequences

The three following entries in V were printed by Reitzenstein as sequences of two trimeters each:

V 393.23–24:

εἰς γειτόνων βιάδιζε· ποῦ δ’ ἔστ’ ἄν λέγῃς

³⁴ See in detail Batisti, “ἐρυγγάνω.”

³⁵ Cf. Thom.Mag. 145.9–10, who ascribes this distinction to the τεχνικοί: however, it does not seem to be supported by textual evidence from the medical writers.

ἐν γειτόνων· ἐν τοῖς δὲ γειτόσι μὴ λέγῃ.

ἔστ' Reitzenstein : ἐστὶν V | ἐν τοῖς δὲ γειτόσι Kaibel : ἐν τοῖς γειτόσι δὲ V

'Go to the neighbours'; but if you say where [someone] is, [you should say] 'at the neighbours' [house]': do not say 'at the neighbours'.

V 394.20–21:

ἦρω <λέγουσιν>, οὐχ ἦρωα· ἦρωες
ἦρως <τε> ἐκατέρως ἐρεῖς.

<They say> ἦρω ('hero', acc. sing.), not ἦρωα· ἦρωες ('heroes', nom. plur.) <and> ἦρως you will say both ways.

V 395.10–11:

λημῶς σύ γ', οὐ γλημῶς <Ἀριστοφάνης λέγει>,
λημῶντα δ' οὐκέτ', ἀλλὰ <σύ γε> γλαμῶντ' <ἐρεῖς>.

Reitzenstein : γλήμμασιν οὐ γλάμμασιν γλημῶντα δὲ οὐκέτι, ἀλλὰ γλαμῶντα V

<Aristophanes says> λημῶς σύ ('you are bleary-eyed', cf. *Ar. Nu.* 327), not γλημῶς. Nevertheless, <you shall> not <say> λημῶντα, but γλαμῶντα.

I will not dwell on the second and third entries, which are textually problematic and whose metre was largely restored by Reitzenstein.³⁶ The first entry, however, dealing with the elliptical phrases εἰς/ἐν γειτόνων (scil. οἰκίαν/οἰκίᾳ) 'to/at the neighbours',³⁷ preserves two almost intact trimeters, which show the feature already identified above (see § 2): the avoidance of technical language in favour of direct exemplification.³⁸

³⁶ See Batisti, "ἦρως, ἦρωες," and Pellettieri, "Moeris, Ἀττικιστής," respectively.

³⁷ On which see Collard, *Colloquial Expressions*, 69.

³⁸ Contrast Thom.Mag. 117.6–8: εἰς γειτόνων βαδίζω, ἐν γειτόνων εἰμί. αἰὲν γὰρ ἢ ἐν πρόθεσις στάσιν δηλοῖ, ἢ δὲ εἰς κίνησιν, οἷον ἔρχομαι, βαδίζω, πορεύομαι, καταφεύγω καὶ ὅσα τοιαῦτα "[Say] 'I go to the neighbours' (εἰς γειτόνων)", 'I am at the neighbours' [house]' (ἐν γειτόνων). For the preposition ἐν always expresses state, while εἰς expresses movement, as [with the verbs] ἔρχομαι ('I go'), βαδίζω ('I walk'), πορεύομαι ('I go on'), καταφεύγω ('I flee'), and such like."

4. Other traces of dialogic features?

4.1. First- and second-person forms

The search for other possible traces of dialogic features in the remaining entries is of course made more difficult by the extensive abridgement. Lively turns of phrase such as οὕτως ὄναιο are unfortunately absent; on the other hand, a high frequency of 1st- and 2nd-person singular forms might be significant. I have found 32 verbal forms in the 2nd pers. sg. (10 in L + 22 in V)³⁹ against just one 1st sg. (λέγω in Eustathius' fragment); additionally, V preserves one 1st sg. and two 2nd sg. personal pronouns. Admittedly, the high number of 2nd sg. verbal forms is not decisive: forms such as ἐρεῖς 'you shall say' or λέγε 'say', directly addressing the lexicon's reader, are common in both Pollux and Phrynichus, as are, for that matter, authorial pronouncements in the first person. Indeed, the prominence of 1st- and 2nd-person forms in these lexica had the aim of framing the whole work as dialogue of sorts between teacher and pupil, i.e., between the author and his illustrious dedicatee(s).⁴⁰ Still, one would not consider the transmitted texts of the *Onomasticon* or the *Eclogue* as bearing the characteristics of a dialogue in the dramatic or in the Platonic sense, with several speaking roles. If we turn to the Byzantine lexica, both Nicetas of Heracleia's didactic poems and the anonymous metrical lexicon in Marc.Gr. XI, 25 set up a 'didactic plot', described by Bernard as communicative situation in which "a first person, the poet and teacher [...] speaks and instructs, addressing a second person, who is represented as a pupil," with the aim of establishing an impression of 'didactic

³⁹ (οὐκ) ἐρεῖς L 7x + V 7x, not counting two occurrences where <ἐρεῖς> was supplied by Reitzenstein; (μὴ) λέγε L 1x + V 5x; λέγῃς V 1x; περιγράφει L 1x; μὴ ποιήσῃς L 1x; βιάδιζε V 1x; βούλει V 1x; ὄναιο V 1x; πάρες V 3x; περιελεί V 3x.

⁴⁰ With regard to Pollux' *Onomasticon*, Radici Colace, "Polluce nell'*Onomasticon*," 32–33, observes that "[i]l dialogo con l'allievo [...] è punteggiato di continui usi della seconda persona, quasi una rete invisibile che non vuol fare sfuggire l'allievo inchiodandolo continuamente all'attenzione, ricordandogli che è lui il destinatario dell'*Onomasticon*," while also noticing a strong presence of the authorial first person.

simultaneity', i.e., that a lesson is unfolding as we read.⁴¹ Such a narrative naturally entails the use of the linguistic markers of dialogue, including 1st- and 2nd-person forms, imperatives, vocatives, and ethical datives.

To sum up, the evidence, given its indecisive nature, is compatible with several distinct possibilities:

- (1) a full-fledged dialogue, with two or more speakers (one of which was the author's spokesperson?), who voice different points of view;
- (2) a didactic dialogue, where the addressee makes brief questions or observations (i.e., relating a mainstream Atticist doctrine), to which the lexicographer replies with his own prescriptions;
- (3) a non-dialogic structure (with a generic 'you' addressing the reader), where, however, other scholars' opinions are occasionally quoted and commented on.

However, the longest and most revealing fragment (V 393.35–394.4) appears more compatible with the first and third hypothesis than with the second one: the sarcastic tone, as also evinced from the parallels in Gellius and Lucian, is that of a scholar disputing with a colleague, rather than of a teacher addressing his pupil.

4.2. *The significance of ἀντιλογία*

The lexicon's title as transmitted by Choeroboscus, with its reference to ἀντιλογία 'controversy, dispute', may also hint at a dialogic, or at least dialectical, nature. The noun ἀντιλογία has two well-attested basic meanings (cf. *DGE* s.v.): (1) 'criticism, reply, refutation', by an individual towards another (~ ἀντίρρησις); (2) 'debate, dispute, controversy', between two individuals or groups. In ancient philosophy, the ἀντιλογία or 'antilogy' was an argumentative technique whose 'prehistory' may be traced back at least to Zeno, but which was specifically associated with the sophistic movement.⁴² The use of the word as a title stretches back to Protagoras' two-book Ἀντιλογίαι or

⁴¹ Bernard, "Didactic Poetry," 145.

⁴² See, e.g., Kraus, "Antilogia;" Giombini, "Antilogia come forma espressiva."

Ἀντιλογικοί (cf. D.L. 9.51–53).⁴³

It is not irrelevant for our question that ἀντιλογία and the related verb ἀντιλογέω attracted the Atticists' interest, as shown by the following entries:

Phryn. Ecl. 230: ἀντίρρησιν μὴ λέγε, ἀντιλογίαν δέ.

Do not say ἀντίρρησις ('controversy'), but ἀντιλογία.

Poll. 2.120.4–6: ὁ δ' αὐτὸς καὶ ἀντιλογικὴ τέχνη φησὶν, Ἀντιφῶν δὲ ἀντιλογούμενοι, Θουκυδίδης δὲ ὅρος οὐκ ἀντίλεκτος'.

He (Pl. *Phdr.* 261D) also says ἀντιλογικὴ τέχνη ('art of disputation'), Antiphon (fr. 149 Bl.) [says] ἀντιλογούμενοι ('disputing', pres. ptcl. mid., nom. masc. plur.). Thucydides (4.92.4) [says] 'a boundary [which is] not disputable (ἀντίλεκτος)'.

Antiatt. α 24: ἀντιλογῆσαι Ἀριστοφάνης Νεφέλαις.

ἀντιλογῆσαι ('to dispute', aor. inf. act.): Aristophanes [uses it] in the *Clouds* (321).

Σ^b α 1474 (= Phot. α 2119, *Su.* α 2680, *ex* Σ''): ἀντιλογίων· Θουκυδίδης α', καὶ ἀντιλογῆσαι· Νεφέλαις Ἀριστοφάνης.

ἀντιλογίων ('controversies', gen. plur.): Thucydides [used it] in Book 1 (actually, 4.59.4). Also ἀντιλογῆσαι: Aristophanes [uses it] in the *Clouds* (321).

According to Fiori, these entries reflect both the general Atticist interest towards rhetorical terminology, and more specifically towards ἀντιλογέω, given its relative rarity in canonical authors; Phrynichus prescribed ἀντιλογία over ἀντίρρησις, which is unattested in the classical period.⁴⁴ As something of a charged term of Atticist debate, ἀντιλογία could well have been featured in Philemon's original title.

But what would exactly Ἀττικὴ ἀντιλογία mean? The *DGE* s.v. ἀντιλογία, with regard to the term's use in reference to "controversias literarias," draws a parallel between this phrase and the

⁴³ See Untersteiner, "Antilogie di Protagora" for a tentative reconstruction of the content of Protagoras' work.

⁴⁴ Fiori, *Citazioni di Aristofane*, 56–60. See also Miletto, "Antirrhesis," 222, who points out that Aelius Aristides, despite composing several works that would fall under the label of ἀντίρρησις, never used the term himself, as he probably shared Phrynichus' distrust of it.

Ὀμηρικὴ ἀντιλογία employed by Lucian (*Pisc.* 3), translating the latter as “cuestión homérica.” But this is quite wrong, since in the context of the *Piscator* it is clear enough that the expression means rather ‘Homeric reply’, i.e., a refutation on the basis of Homeric citations. In this passage, the characters of Plato and Parrhesiades are indeed engaging in a battle of Homeric quotes. After Plato quotes *Il.* 22.262 in sentencing Parrhesiades to death, the latter tries appealing to Homer’s authority in begging for mercy, by way of an Iliadic cento (*Il.* 6.46, 48; 20.65); to this, Plato replies: ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ ἡμεῖς ἀπορήσομεν πρὸς σὲ Ὀμηρικῆς ἀντιλογίας “but we ourselves will not be at a loss for a Homeric reply to you,” and goes on to quote *Il.* 10.446–448. This particular meaning seemingly cannot work for Philemon’s title, unless we assume that the participants in the dialogue adduced quotations from the canonical authors to defend usages condemned by other Atticists (as in fact it happens in the longest metrical fragment). But it seems plausible that Philemon’s ἀντιλογία refers more generally to a clash of diverging opinions on what is good Attic Greek.

As for the precise meaning of τῆς ἐν ταῖς λέξεσιν, the noun ἀντιλογία does not usually govern a prepositional phrase with ἐν + dative. When such a collocation is found, the phrase does not refer to the subject of the dispute, but to the group of people among whom the dispute takes place (Plu. *Otho* 11.3 οὔσης δὲ περὶ τούτων ἀντιλογίας ἐν τοῖς στρατηγοῖς “while there was a dispute among the generals about this matter;” Gal. *De placitis Hippocratis et Platonis* 3.7.29.6 οὐδὲ γὰρ ἂν ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἡ ἀντιλογία προῆλθε καὶ ἐν ἰατροῖς καὶ ἐν φιλοσόφοις “for the debate would not have progressed so far among both physicians and philosophers”). On the other hand, the phrase ἐν ταῖς λέξεσιν occurs in scholarly works with the expected meaning ‘in (such and such) lexicon’ (Apollon. 6.39 ἐν ταῖς λέξεσιν ἀναγέγραπται “It is written in [Bacchius’ Hippocratic] lexicon;” *Su.* λ 200 ὡς Ἰξίων ἐν ταῖς λέξεσιν “as [Demetrius] Ixion [says] in his lexicon”).

On balance, it seems possible that the title meant something like ‘Atticistic controversy in the words/manners of expression’, but in view of the just-mentioned examples, an interpretation as ‘Atticistic controversy in/among the lexica’ is not out of question. In the latter case, it would be tempting to speculate that the implication was

that the lexica (or the lexicographers?) themselves were conceived as the quarrelling parts, and perhaps as the actual speakers in the dialogue. The personification of lexica (or perhaps individual lemmata) would not be unthinkable: compare the personified letters in Lucian's *Judgment of the Vowels*, as well as similar cases from Byzantine didactic poetry.⁴⁵

5. *Parallels for a dialogic structure*

The choice of a dialogic structure for a work of grammatical interest has parallels in imperial-period literature.⁴⁶ Among erudite, albeit non-technical works, one immediately thinks of Lucian's *Solécist*, a debate on fine points of Attic grammar cast in the form of a dialogue between two characters. Another intriguing precedent, closer to Philemon's case in being the work of a professional grammarian, is Herodian's *Symposium*, whose surviving fragments deal with etymology.⁴⁷ Reitzenstein argued that the *Symposium* had an Atticistic orientation and had an influence on Athenaeus' *Deipnosophists*, where contrasting viewpoints on linguistic issues are argued for by different characters, with Ulpian embodying an uncompromising strain of Atticism similar to Phrynichus', and Cynulcus representing a more inclusive approach.⁴⁸

As already remarked above, Philemon's original text seems to

⁴⁵ Letters are also personified in Marc.Gr. XI, 25 (Cavarzeran, "Kosmas, non dormire"), as are grammatical topics in Nicetas (Bernard, "Didactic Poetry," 146). It should be noted that the personification of letters is a tradition of Greek literature going back to Callias' *Grammatical Tragedy* of the late 5th century BCE; see Moretti, "Lettere dall'alfabeto."

⁴⁶ Grammarians figure as speakers in book 9 of Plutarch's *Table Talk* (736c–748d), despite being portrayed as falling short of being the ideal symposiasts: see Eshleman, "'Then Our Symposium'."

⁴⁷ Collected by Lentz in *GG* 3,2.904–906 + addendum 1263.

⁴⁸ Reitzenstein, *Geschichte*, 371–397. Cf. in particular the exchange between Ulpian and Cynulcus in Ath. 3.89E–122D, recently discussed by Stiffler, *Lucian and the Atticists*, 100–103; Stiffler also underlines more generally the affinities between Lucian, Athenaeus, and other contemporary authors such as Fronto and Gellius, who stage linguistic debates in their works by creating "characters or *personae* who take different positions and claim expertise in support of their positions" (Stiffler, *Lucian and the Atticists*, 97).

have been characterised by a certain polemical tone and, at the same time, by the incorporation of classical words and turns of phrase.⁴⁹ If the combination of satirical aggression and iambic metre obviously points to the iambographic tradition, the traces of dialogue would show the influence of comic dialogue, which in its turn, as is well known, was indebted to iambus both in its choice of meter and in its tone of personal invective (the *ἰαμβικὴ ἰδέα* of Arist. *Po.* 1449b.7–9).⁵⁰ As Old Comedy, and Aristophanes in particular, held a privileged position in the Atticists' canon, we may wonder whether the lexicographer drew on that genre for the very format of his work, in addition to the individual phraseological borrowings discussed above.

Once again, such a choice does not look isolated in the cultural climate of Atticism: David Stifler recently argued that Lucian drew on Old Comedy as a model of humorous invective against fake linguistic expertise, “enlist[ing] Aristophanes and other Old Comedy voices as satirical allies in mocking contemporary attempts at Atticizing in language and literature.”⁵¹ Also Lucian's *Pseudologist*, albeit composed in prose and not dialogic in structure, may be said to apply a (possibly parodic) version of iambic aggression to a lexicographical theme of Atticistic interest:⁵² the text's narrator⁵³ attacks an unnamed target, addressed in the second person, about a point of Attic diction, i.e., the use of the word *ἀποφράς* ‘nefandous’ in reference to a person.

A different, but not incompatible, reason for the choice of a di-

⁴⁹ As Andrea Pellettieri points out to me (p.c.), the *figura etymologica* in V 393.22 *εὐρέματα οὐχ εὔρηται* (“*εὐρέματα* ‘inventions’, nom./acc. pl. neut.) is not found”) may be regarded as another vestige of Philemon's ironic style.

⁵⁰ On the subject, see at least Rosen, *Old Comedy*.

⁵¹ Stifler, “Lucian, Aristophanes,” 74; see also Stifler, *Lucian and the Atticists*, 81–96.

⁵² See Hawkins, *Iambic Poetics*, 220–261 for an exemplary study of the *Pseudologist* as an instance of ‘iambic poetics’ in the context of imperial-era culture.

⁵³ Which we should be perhaps wary of identifying with Lucian's own stance, as convincingly argued by Hawkins, *Iambic Poetics*, 220–261, with discussion of previous interpretations; see also Stifler, *Lucian and the Atticists*, 157–158.

alogic format could have been its pedagogical usefulness, as was probably the case, for instance, for the Platonic dialogues.⁵⁴

6. *Traces of a 'horizontal' structure?*

The above hypothesis, if correct, casts serious doubts about the lexicon's alphabetical arrangement. The metrical form alone makes it not obvious that the lexicon was originally structured as a collection of discrete entries (either alphabetised or not) of a few lines each. To be sure, any claim about alphabetisation (or lack thereof) is difficult to falsify, since no examples of ancient versified lexica remain: the fragments of Helladius' *Chrestomathy* as excerpted by Photius follow no evident order, either alphabetical or thematic.⁵⁵ The Byzantine evidence (§ 4) is indecisive: whereas Mauropous' *Etymologica* are thematically arranged, the versified lexica in Photius and in the Marc.Gr. XI, 25 are alphabetised, but both are composed of very short entries, taking up one or half a line each, while Philemon's fragments suggest longer and more structured discussions.

The hypothesis of an original dialogic structure makes an alphabetical arrangement even harder to contemplate. Surely, a dialogue in which the participants go over their subjects in alphabetical order would be a very unnatural one: a 'horizontal' structure, i.e., one arranged by topic or semantic field, would be more suited to the format.⁵⁶ An alphabetic arrangement would instead be compatible

⁵⁴ On how the Platonic dialogues may have been exploited pedagogically in the Academy's teaching, see Duque, "Performing Philosophy."

⁵⁵ Despite, on the one hand, some isolated clusters of entries suggesting an alphabetical order (e.g., the consecutive entries on μάκαρ, μακκοῖν, μακάριος, (μ)άλευρον in cod. 279, 531a.8–18), and, on the other, cases where thematically related entries appear to have been split (e.g., the very first entry in Photius' excerpt, on Moses' alleged epithet Ἄλφα in cod. 279, 529b.26–28 is followed in cod. 279, 531b.21–23 by a mention of Λάβδα as a sobriquet of Amphion's wife, and further entries concerned with the names of the Greek letters appear in cod. 279, 530a.20–26 and 532a.15–21). Several entries show indeed a thematic structure, discussing together different forms connected by meaning (e.g., kinship terms in cod. 279, 530a.2–10) or grammatical features (e.g., the adverbs in -ξ in cod. 279, 532a.36–532b.7).

⁵⁶ On the concepts of 'horizontal' (onomastic) and 'vertical' (lexicographical) structures, see Tosi, "Typology of Lexicographical Works," 623–627.

with the ‘weak’ dialogic hypothesis presented above, as demonstrated by Marc.Gr. XI, 25, where the teacher, speaking in the first person, often addresses six different characters represented as pupils, who, however, do not participate in the fictional dialogue with their own lines.

There are, indeed, independent reasons to suspect that the (rough) alphabetisation of Philemon’s transmitted text was not featured from the beginning, but rather introduced at some stage in the process of epitomisation. The evidence in this sense falls into two categories: first, we find, even within the same recension, entries that appear to have been split or duplicated; secondly, it is possible to identify several groups of entries that, while distant in the alphabetical order and dealing with different lemmas, show a certain thematic affinity, raising the suspicion that they were originally part of a single section which discussed different, albeit connected, words or phrases.⁵⁷ The most telling example is afforded by three entries in L dealing with the noun βλήχων/γλήχων ‘pennyroyal’:

L 356: βλήχων· οὐ γλήχων.

[Say] βλήχων, not γλήχων.

L 356: βλήχων· βρώμα διὰ πυρὸς καὶ γάλακτος ἠψημένον παρ’ Αἰγυπτίοις.

βλήχων: A boiled foodstuff made with wheat and milk, among the Egyptians.

L 358: ἡ γλήχων ὡς ἡ κύων.

[Say] ἡ γλήχων, like ἡ κύων.

The three entries, as they stand, discuss respectively the word’s formal variation (βλήχων being the Attic variant, γλήχων the Ionic one); its meaning (although the wrong one is reported, since the *interpretamentum* is actually about ἀθήρη ‘gruel, porridge’, and seems to have been separated from L 355: ἀθήρην· οὐκ ἀθήρα<v>: see below);

⁵⁷ A similar fate possibly befell other Atticist lexica. The repetition of the same lemma in different entries, as if an originally broader thematic discussion had been broken up, hints at a possible original onomastic structure in Phrynichus’ *Praeparatio sophistica*: see Kaibel, *De Phrynicho sophista*, 7–12; Cavarzeran, “*Praeparatio onomastica*.” For a similar hypothesis on Moeris’ lexicon, see Cavarzeran, “Riesame della tradizione manoscritta.”

and its grammatical gender, inflectional class, and/or accentuation. Although it may be difficult to reconstruct the details of the process which produced these entries as we now read them in L, it is reasonable enough to suppose that Philemon had just one entry, or passage, which discussed βλήχων/γλήχων from different perspectives. This was indeed a word which, on the one hand, displayed dialectal variation, not only in the predictable correspondence between Attic-Ionic η and Panhellenic ā, but also in the irregular one between Attic β- and the γ- of the other dialects; on the other hand, the noun appears in two inflectional variants (as an *n*-stem, but also as an *oi*-stem in Att. βληχώ, Ion. γληχώ, Dor. γλᾱχώ), and with different accentuations (final or recessive). It stands to reason that an Atticist lexicographer would have discussed all of these issues in his treatment of this word.⁵⁸

The following are other small clusters of potentially duplicated entries:

L 356: βάλλ' ἐς μακαρίαν· ἐς κόρακας.

βάλλ' ἐς μακαρίαν ('go and be blessed!'): [It corresponds to] ἐς κόρακας ('[go] and be damned!').

V 393.26: ἐς κόρακας· οὐκ εἰς κόρακας.

ἐς κόρακας, not εἰς κόρακας.

V 393.27: ἐς μακαρίαν· οὐκ εἰς μακαρίαν <λεκτέον>.

ἐς μακαρίαν: <One should> not [say] εἰς μακαρίαν.

L 356: βλαυτίον βέλτιον.

βλαυτίον ('small slipper') [is] better.

L 356: βλαυτίον· σανδάλιον, ὑπόδημα· λέγεται καὶ βλαυδίον (Dindorf cf. Hsch. β 686 : βλανδίον L).

βλαυτίον: Small sandal, shoe; one can also say βλαυδίον.

L 357: γλαμμᾶν, ἀλλ' οὐ λημμᾶν.

[Say] γλαμμᾶν ('to have bleary eyes'), but not λημμᾶν'.

V 395.10–11: λημᾶς σύ γ', οὐ γλημᾶς <Ἀριστοφάνης λέγει>.

⁵⁸ As it happens, in fact, in several other erudite sources which discuss βλήχων/γλήχων: see Batisti, "βλήχων."

λημῶντα δ' οὐκέτ', ἀλλὰ <σύ γε> γλαμῶντ' <ἐρεῖς>.

<Aristophanes says> “you have bleary eyes (λημῶς),” not γλημῶς; however, <you shall> never <say> λημῶντα, but γλαμῶντα (‘bleary-eyed’).

Other clusters of entries are concerned with words or expressions which seem somehow connected (e.g., they derive from the same lexical root and/or belong to the same semantic field). It goes without saying that such cases should be handled with great caution, since it is all too easy to see a meaningful pattern where there is actually none. Yet, the following sets of entries might be significant:

Entries dealing with **βοῦς** and its derivatives or compounds:

L 356: βόλιτα· οὐ βόλβιτα. “βόλιτα (‘cow manure’): Not βόλβιτα.” Cf. Thom.Mag. 55.14: βόλιτα λέγε τὴν τῶν βοῶν κόπρον, οὐ βόλβιτα. “Call βόλιτα the excrement of the cows, not βόλβιτα.”

L 356: βοῖδιον· οὐ βούδιον. “βοῖδιον (‘little cow’), not βούδιον.”

L 356: καὶ βόες καὶ βοῦς ἑκατέρως. “Both βόες (‘cows’, nom. plur.) and βοῦς.”

L 356: βούπαις. “Big boy (lit.: ‘ox-boy’).”

L 357: βοϊκόν· τὸ ἰ μακρόν. “βοϊκόν (‘of/for oxen’): The ἰ [is] long.”

L 357: βουλιμός, ὁ μέγας λιμός, ὡς ἀσπασμός· οὐ βούλιμος. “βουλιμός, ‘great hunger’, [is accented] like ἀσπασμός (‘embrace’); not βούλιμος.”

Entries dealing with adjectives for different kinds of **meat**:

L 357: βοϊκόν· τὸ ἰ μακρόν.

V 394.30: θήρεια κρέα· οὐκ ἀγριμαῖα. “θήρεια κρέα (‘game’), not ἀγριμαῖα.”

V 396.16: ὕειον κρέας· οὐχ ὕδς κρέας, καὶ ὑεικόν, ὡς βοεικόν. “ὕειον κρέας (‘pork’), not ὕδς κρέας (‘pig’s meat’), and ὑεικόν (‘of/for swine’), like βοεικόν.” Cf. Thom.Mag. 371.5–8: ὕειον κρέας μὴ λέγε, ἀλλ’ ὕδς κρέας, καὶ ὑεικόν ὡς βοεικόν· εἰ καὶ Συνέσιος λέγει, ὡς προέφημεν, ‘ταρίχη κρεῶν ὑείων ἀπολελαγκότα τοῦ χρόνου’. “Do not say ὕειον κρέας, but ὕδς κρέας, and ὑεικόν, like βοεικόν: even though Synesius (*Regn.* 16.7), as we said before [352.6–8], says ‘Cured pieces of pork, that had enjoyed the effects of time’.”

Entries dealing with **soups and broths**:

L 355: ἀθήρην· οὐκ ἀθάρα<ν>. “ἀθήρη (‘gruel, porridge’): Not ἀθάρα.”

L 356: βλήχων (but the *interpretamentum* actually refers to ἀθήρη, see above)· βρώμα διὰ πυρὸς καὶ γάλακτος ἡψημένον παρ’ Αἰγυπτίοις. μήποτε δὲ ὄφειλε γραφῆναι ἀθάρη, ὡς προσήκε. τὴν ἀθάρην περίγραφε. ἢ οὕτω πιστάνη πυρίνη, ἣν καὶ ἀθάρην τινὲς καλοῦσι. “A boiled foodstuff made with wheat and milk, among the Egyptians. But one should never write ἀθάρη, as it is fitting. Reject ἀθάρη. Or (it can be used) as follows, gruel made of wheat, which some also call ἀθάρη.”

V 393.34: ἔτνος <λέγουσι>, τὸν δ’ ἐρεγμὸν περίελε. “<[The Attic authors] say> ἔτνος (‘soup’), reject ἐρεγμός.”

V 394.13: ζωμὸς μέλας· οὐκ αἰμάτιον. “ζωμὸς μέλας (‘black broth’): Not αἰμάτιον.”

Entries dealing with **bread**:

L 354: ἀρτοποιῶλης. “Baker.”

L 354: ἀρτύδιον· οὐκ ἀρτίδιον. “ἀρτύδιον (‘small loaf’): Not ἀρτίδιον.”

Entries dealing with **shoes and shoemaking**:

L 356: βλανυτίον βέλτιον.

L 356: βλανυτίον· σανδάλιον, ὑπόδημα· λέγεται καὶ βλανυδίον (Dindorf cf. Hsch. β 686 : βλανυδίον L).

L 356: βαῦσις (L : βαυκίς Dindorf)· ὑπόδημα. “βαῦσις: A shoe.”

L 357: βυρσοδέψης· οὐ βυρσεύς (= Thom.Mag. 53.12). “βυρσοδέψης (‘tanner’): Not βυρσεύς.”

V 396.9: σκυτοτόμος· οὐ σκυτεύς “σκυτοτόμος (‘shoemaker’): Not σκυτεύς.” Cf. Thom.Mag. 333.1: σκυτοτόμος κρεῖττον ἢ σκυτεύς “σκυτοτόμος [is] preferable to σκυτεύς.”

Entries dealing with **textiles**:

L 355: ἀκέστριαν· οὐκ ἡπήτριαν. Ἀριστείδης ἡπημένα ἱμάτια τὰ ἐρραμμένα φησίν. “ἀκέστρια (‘seamstress’): Not ἡπήτρια. Aristides (3.664 Lenz–Behr = 46.398.11 Dindorf) calls mended cloaks ἡπημένα.”

V 392.6: ἀκέστριαν· οὐκ ἡπήτριαν. “ἀκέστρια: Not ἡπήτρια.”

V 394.16: ἤπημα περίελε· ἄκεσμα δέ. “Reject ἤπημα (‘mend’): [Say] ἄκεσμα.”

V 396.3: ῥάπτριαν <μὲν> οὐδεῖς, ἀλλ’ ἀκέστριαν <λέγει>. “No-one <says> ῥάπτρια (‘seamstress’), but ἀκέστρια.”

V 396.4: ῥαφίδα οὐδεῖς, ἀλλὰ βελόνην. “No-one [says] ῥαφίς (‘needle’), but βελόνη.” Cf. Thom.Mag. 56.16–17: βελόνη καὶ βελονοπώλης ἀρχαῖα, ἡ δὲ ῥαφίς ἀδόκιμον· ῥάπτω μέντοι καὶ ῥάμμα, αὐτὸ τὸ ἐρράφθαι, ἐν χρήσει. “βελόνη and βελονοπώλης (‘needle-seller’) [are] ancient [terms], while ῥαφίς is unapproved: however, ῥάπτω (‘to stitch’) and ῥάμμα (‘seam’), even ἐρράφθαι (‘it has been stitched’), [are] in use.”

L 357: κναφεύς· οὐ γναφεύς. “κναφεύς (‘fuller’): Not γναφεύς.”

V 393.3: γνέφαλον· οὐ τύλη. “γνέφαλον (‘cushion’ or ‘mattress’): Not τύλη.”

Entries dealing with **lamps**:

V 394.36–37: θρυαλλίς· οὐκ ἐλλύχνιον, ἥγουν τὸ περικαιόμενον τοῦ λυχνίου· ἔστι καὶ βοτάνη πρὸς λύχνον ἀρμόζουσα. “θρυαλλίς: Not ἐλλύχνιον. That is the part of the lamp that is burned. It is also a plant suitable for lamps.” Cf. Thom.Mag. 176.3: θρυαλλίς, οὐκ ἐλλύχνιον. “θρυαλλίς: Not ἐλλύχνιον.”

V 396.22: φάκελον· μικρόν <τι> δέσμιον ξυληφίων. “φάκελον (‘faggot’): <A> small bundle of sticks.” Cf. Thom.Mag. 377.4–6: φάκελος δεδεμένον φορτίον. Συνέσιος ἐν ἐπιστολῇ· ‘φάκελον ἐπιστολῶν Διογένηι δούς’. Θουκυδίδης· ‘φακέλους ὕλης ἀγρίας’. “φάκελος [is a] bound burden. Synesius [writes] in a letter (cf. *Ep.* 88.2): ‘having given a bundle of letters to Diogenes’. Thucydides (7.2.3) [writes] ‘a faggot of wild wood’.”

Entries dealing with agent nouns connected with **writing**:

L 356: βιβλιογράφος· οὐ βιβλιαγράφος. “βιβλιογράφος (‘copyist’): Not βιβλιαγράφος.” Cf. Thom.Mag. 53.9–11: βιβλιογράφος, οὐ βιβλιαγράφος. Λιβάνιος ἐν τῷ περὶ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ τύχης· ‘τρέπει μὲν ἐπὶ τοῦτο τῶν βιβλιογράφων δέκα’. “βιβλιογράφος, not βιβλιαγράφος. Libanius, in his *Autobiography* (*Or.* 1.113), [writes]: ‘he assigned ten copyists to this task’.”

V 393.28: ἐπιστολιογράφος <τε> καὶ βιβλιογράφος. “ἐπιστολιογράφος (‘letter-writer’) and βιβλιογράφος.”

It is also possible, of course, that Philemon originally discussed in a

single passage forms linked by a common grammatical, rather than semantic, feature, although this is even more difficult to prove.⁵⁹ To give but one example, the variation between the athematic presents ζεύγνυμι, δείκνυμι and their thematised counterparts ζευγνύω, δεικνύω is discussed in the entries L 359 (δείκνυμι, ζεύγνυμι· οὐ ζευγνύω), V 394.14 (ζεύγνυσιν· οὐχὶ ζευγνύει), and V 393.8 (δείκνυμι καὶ ζεύγνυμι· δεικνύω πάρες).

Two further cautionary remarks are in order here. First, thematic clusters such as the above can never be conclusive proof of an original onomastic structure, as it would be easy to find them even in lexica which were arranged alphabetically from the beginning. Secondly, even if they were not illusory, such clusters would tell us, at most, in decreasing order of certainty: (1) that Philemon's lexicon underwent heavy reworking (an uncontroversial point); (2) that its alphabetical order was possibly not an original feature, but introduced at some stage of abridgement; (3) that it possibly had a more 'horizontal' structure. They are not, per se, evidence for (or against) an earlier dialogic structure. Nonetheless, the reworking thus evidenced is compatible with the scenario suggested above. A text structured as a dialogue in iambics, rather than as a 'standard' lexicon, could hardly have maintained its metre *or* its dialogic structure as it underwent abridgement.

Remarkably, the fragment transmitted by Eustathius agrees with the hypotheses advanced so far about the lexicon's style and structure. This trimeter not only contains the structure 'X ὥς Y', but also a 1st pers. sg. form λέγω, compatible with a dialogic structure; the syntagm τὴν προσφθίαν is also of interest. The accusative of limitation could just imply that the paragon with σταμνίον only concerns prosody as opposed to other traits; however, it could also suggest that in the same passage the word ληδίον was discussed from other perspectives as well. One such perspective was surely the semantic one, as attested by Eustathius himself (Φιλήμων δὲ τὸ λήδιον

⁵⁹ Helladius may again provide a parallel for the coexistence of both strategies. Philemon's main linguistic concerns (e.g., the thematisation of athematic presents, the shift of deponent verbs to the active voice, or the formation of the future stem) are usefully collected by Brown, "Atticist Lexicon," 211–226.

έρμηνεύσας εὐτελὲς τριβώνιον ἢ χλαμύδιον παλαιόν); another very likely one would have been orthographical, i.e., the spelling with or without iota: let us recall that Eustathius' discussion about ληδῖον ultimately goes back, by way of Choeroboscus, to Orus' treatise on the iota subscript.

7. Concluding remarks and open questions

Even though the peculiarity of an Atticist lexicon written in verse is duly mentioned by the scholars who have studied Philemon's lexicon, its significance and implications were not explored in depth. According to the hypothesis presented in this paper, based on a close reading of the lexicon's surviving fragments and on parallels with extant lexicographical and Atticistic literature, the work's original structure may have been radically different from the one attested by the two surviving epitomes. In particular, several linguistic and stylistic features hint at a work which was not only composed in iambics, but was cast in the form of a dialogue, and – possibly connected with the above – had an ironic and polemical tone. Both features occur in 2nd-century CE works, notably by Lucian, taking a critical stance towards the excesses of strict Atticism: Philemon's work, far from being an oddity, would fit nicely in the landscape of contemporary intellectual discourse. At a later time, like (almost?) all the lexica produced in Atticism's heyday, also Philemon's work underwent a radical epitomisation, which almost obliterated its original features and reduced it to a more conventional format of a 'vertical', prescriptive lexicon organised in alphabetical entries.

If the dialogic hypothesis put forward in this paper were right, either in its 'weak' formulation (the lexicon quoted and discussed the opinions of several authorities, some of which the author openly disagreed with) or in its 'strong' one (the lexicon was entirely structured as a dialogue between two or more characters – one of which, possibly, standing in for the author himself), it would follow that we cannot take it for granted anymore that the doctrine apparently stated in any of the more severely abridged entries actually represented Philemon's own stance. It suffices to imagine what we would make of the (ἐ)χθές-fragment if only its first line was preserved: Philemon's opinion would seem aligned with those of Phrynichus

or Moeris. On the other hand, it would be perhaps too simplistic to claim that the entry as transmitted makes it clear that Philemon combated the opinion of the stricter Atticists: depending on the lexicon's original structure and on the accidents of the epitomisation process, the polemic retort in ll. 2–6 could theoretically have belonged to a speaker who did not express the author's own ideas. Be that as it may, the warning maintains its full force for the shorter entries, which make up the greater part of the two surviving recensions. Scholars of Atticism should therefore heed this warning when comparing Philemon's entries with their *loci paralleli* in the other, better-known Atticist lexica.

Acknowledgments

This paper is part of a project that has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement no. 865817). I would like to thank the members of the PURA team (Olga Tribulato, Federica Benuzzi, Jacopo Cavarzeran, Federico Favi, Giulia Gerbi, and Elisa Nuria Merisio) for fruitful discussion of an earlier draft of this paper, as well as the anonymous referee for her/his useful suggestions.

Università Ca' Foscari Venezia

roberto.batisti@unive.it

ORCID: 0000-0003-0232-049X

Works cited

- Barrios-Lech, P. "Developments in Politeness from Aristophanes to Menander and Beyond." In *Pragmatic Approaches to Drama. Studies in Communication on the Ancient Stage*, edited by G. Martin, F. Iurescia, S. Hof, and G. Sorrentino, pp. 234–263. Brill, 2020.
- Batisti, R. "ἥρως, ἥρωες (Phryn. *Ecl.* 129)." *Digital Encyclopedia of Atticism*, edited by O. Tribulato with the assistance of E.N. Merisio. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2024/01/015>. Last modified September 27, 2024.
- Batisti, R. "Philemon, Περὶ Ἀττικῆς ἀντιλογίας τῆς ἐν ταῖς λέξεσιν." *Digital Encyclopedia of Atticism*, edited by O. Tribulato with the assistance of E.N. Merisio. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2024/02/018>. Last modified May 21, 2025.
- Batisti, R. "ἐρυγγάνω, ἥρυγον, ἐρεύγομαι, ἥρευζάμην (Phryn. *PS* 73.15–7, Phryn. *Ecl.* 42, Moer. ε 50, Philemo [Vindob.] 393.17–20)." *Digital Encyclopedia of Atticism*, edited by O. Tribulato with the assistance of E.N. Merisio. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2024/03/008>. Last modified February 27, 2026.
- Batisti, R. "βλήχων (Phryn. *PS* 53.16–8, Philemo [Laur.] 356)." *Digital Encyclopedia of Atticism*, edited by O. Tribulato with the assistance of E.N. Merisio. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2025/02/008>. Last modified May 16, 2026.
- Bernard, F. "The Didactic Poetry of Niketas of Herakleia and the Use of Verse in Byzantine Teaching Practice." In *Poetry in Byzantine Literature and Society (1081-1204). New Texts, New Approaches*, edited by B. van den Berg and N. Zagklas, pp. 139–160. Cambridge University Press, 2024.
- Brown, C.G. "An Atticist Lexicon of the Second Sophistic. Philemon and the Atticist Movement." PhD diss., Ohio State University, 2018.
- Cavarzeran, J. "Praeparatio onomastica? Traces of Onomastic Arrangement in Phrynichus' *Praeparatio Sophistica*." In *New Approaches to Phrynichus' Praeparatio Sophistica*, edited by F. Favi, A. Pelletieri, and O. Tribulato, pp. 45–80. De Gruyter, 2025.
- Cavarzeran, J. "Un riesame della tradizione manoscritta del lessico di Meride (con una nuova edizione della lettera A)." *Rivista di Fi-*

- lologia e di Istruzione Classica* 153 (2025): 366–453.
- Cavarzeran, J. “Iulius Pollux, Ὀνομαστικόν (*Onomasticon*).” *Digital Encyclopedia of Atticism*, edited by O. Tribulato with the assistance of E.N. Merisio. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2024/02/016>. Last modified February 19, 2026.
- Cavarzeran, J. “‘Kosmas, non dormire’: imparare il lessico in versi politici.” *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 76 (forthcoming).
- Cohn, L. “Der Atticist Philemon.” *Philologus* 57 (1898): 353–367.
- Collard, C. *Colloquial Expressions in Greek Tragedy. Revised and Enlarged Edition of P. T. Stevens’s Colloquial Expressions in Euripides*. Franz Steiner Verlag, 2018.
- Duque, M. “Performing Philosophy: The Pedagogy of Plato’s Academy Reimagined.” In *Paideia and Performance. Selected Essays from the 7th Interdisciplinary Symposium on the Hellenic Heritage of Sicily and Southern Italy*, edited by H.C. Curcio, M. Ralkowski, and H.L. Reid, pp. 87–106. Parnassos Press – Fonte Aretusa, 2023.
- Dyck, A.R. “John Mauropus of Euchaita and the ‘Stoic Etymologikon.’” *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 43 (1993): 113–140.
- Ercoles, M. *Stesicoro: le testimonianze antiche*. Pàtron, 2013.
- Eshleman, K. “‘Then Our Symposium Becomes a Grammar School’. Grammarians in Plutarch’s *Table Talk*.” *Syllecta Classica* 24 (2013): 145–171.
- Ferri, R. “Graeca in Latin Texts and Other Emendations.” *Hermes* 143 (2015): 503–507.
- Fiori, S. *Le citazioni di Aristofane nel lessico dell’Antiatticista*. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2022.
- Fischer, E. *Die Ekloge des Phrynichos*. De Gruyter, 1974.
- Fleischer, K. *The Original Verses of Apollodorus’ Chronica. Edition, Translation and Commentary on the First Iambic Didactic Poem in the Light of New Evidence*. De Gruyter, 2020.
- Gaul, N. “The Twitching Shroud. Collective Construction of Paideia in the Circle of Thomas Magistros.” *Segno e testo* 5 (2007): 263–340.
- Gaul, N. “Moschopulos, Lopadiotes, Phrankopulos (?), Magistros, Staphidakes. Prosopographisches und Methodologisches zur Lexikographie des frühen 14. Jahrhunderts.” In *Lexicologica byzantina. Beiträge zum Kolloquium zur byzantinischen Lexikographie* (Bonn,

- 13.–15. *Julii* 2007), edited by E. Trapp and S. Schönauer, pp. 163–196. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008.
- Gerbi, G. and R. Batisti. “ $\chi\theta\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$, $\epsilon\chi\theta\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$, $\chi\theta\iota\zeta\acute{o}\varsigma$, $\chi\theta\iota\zeta\iota\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$, $\chi\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$ (Moer. χ 6, Phryn. *Ecl.* 294, Phryn. *PS* 127.9, Philemo [Vindob.] 393.35–394.4).” *Digital Encyclopedia of Atticism*, edited by O. Tribulato with the assistance of E.N. Merisio. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2026/01/022>. Last modified May 21, 2026.
- Giombini, S. “L’antilogia come forma espressiva dei Sofisti.” *Points of Interest* 6–7 (2020): 43–60.
- Gomme, A.W. and F.H. Sandbach. *Menander. A Commentary*. Oxford University Press, 1973.
- Hawkins, T. *Iambic Poetics in the Roman Empire*. Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Heimannsfeld, H. *De Helladii Chrestomathia quaestiones selectae*. Bonn, 1911.
- Holford-Strevens, L. *Aulus Gellius. An Antonine Scholar and his Achievement*. 2nd ed. Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Isépy, P. “Towards a New Text of Helladius. Neglected Manuscript Evidence on Photius’ *Bibliothèque*.” *Rheinisches Museum* 163 (2020): 189–230.
- Isépy, P. “A Preliminary Text of Photius’ *Bibliotheca* c. 278 [279].” *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 220 (2021): 97–117.
- Kaibel, G. *De Phrynicho sophista*. Göttingen, 1899.
- Kraus, M. “Antilogia – Zu den Grundlagen sophistischer Debatierkunst.” *Rhetorik* 25 (2006): 1–13.
- Merisio, E.N. “ $\beta\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\varsigma$ (Moer. β 23, *Antiatt.* β 17, Philemo [Laur.] 357).” *Digital Encyclopedia of Atticism*, edited by O. Tribulato with the assistance of E.N. Merisio. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2024/03/010>. Last modified June 2, 2026.
- Miletti, L. “L’antirrhesis da esercizio preparatorio a genere oratorio: in margine alle orazioni polemiche di Elio Aristide.” In *Generi senza confini. La rappresentazione della realtà nel mondo antico*, edited by G. Matino, F. Ficca, and R. Grisolia, pp. 209–225. Satura Editrice, 2022.
- Moretti, G. “Lettere dall’alfabeto in teatro, a scuola e in tribunale. Un itinerario allegorico.” In *Novom aliquid inventum. Scritti sul teatro antico per Gianna Petrone*, edited by M.M. Bianco and A. Casamento, pp. 201–231. Palermo University Press, 2018.

- Nietzsche, F. "De Laertii Diogenis fontibus." *Rheinisches Museum* 23 (1868): 632 – 653.
- Osann, F. *Philemonis grammatici quae supersunt vulgatis et emendatiora et auctiora*. Berlin, 1821.
- Otranto, R. *Antiche liste di libri su papiro*. Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 2000.
- Pellettieri, A. "Moeris, Ἀττικιστής." *Digital Encyclopedia of Atticism*, edited by O. Tribulato with the assistance of E.N. Merisio. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2024/02/031>. Last modified February 17, 2026.
- Radici Colace, P. "Polluce nell'*Onomasticon*." In *L'Onomasticon de Pollux: aspects culturels, rhétoriques et lexicographiques*, edited by C. Mauduit, pp. 25–37. Centre d'études et de recherche sur l'Occident romain, 2013.
- Reitzenstein, R. *Geschichte der griechischen Etymologika. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Philologie in Alexandria und Byzanz*. Teubner, 1897.
- Reitzenstein, R. M. *Térentius Varro und Johannes Mauropus von Euchaita. Eine Studie zur geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft*. Teubner, 1901.
- Rosen, R.M. *Old Comedy and the Iambographic Tradition*. Society for Classical Studies, 1988.
- Roumanis, E. and K. Bentein. "The Power of Judgement. A Comparison of Evaluative Stance in the Atticist Lexica of Phrynichus and Moeris." *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire* 101 (2023): 5–32.
- Skiadas, A.D. *Homer im griechischen Epigramm*. Griechische Humanistische Gesellschaft, 1965.
- Sonnino, M. "I frammenti della commedia greca citati da Prisciano e la fonte del lessico sintattico del libro XVIII dell'*Ars*." In *Greco antico nell'occidente carolingio. Frammenti di testi attici nell'Ars di Prisciano*, edited by L. Martorelli, pp. 163–204. Georg Olms Verlag, 2014.
- Stifter, D.W.F. "Lucian, Aristophanes, and the Language of Intellectuals." *Classical Philology* 118 (2023): 73–95.
- Stifter, D.W.F. *Lucian and the Atticists. Linguistic Satire in the Second Sophistic*. Bloomsbury Academic, 2025.
- Swain, S. *Hellenism and Empire. Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World, AD 50–250*. Clarendon Press, 1996.
- Tosi, R. "Typology of Lexicographical Works." In *Brill's Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship*, edited by F. Montanari, S. Matthaios, and A. Rengakos, pp. 622–636. Brill, 2015.

- Tribulato, O. "(En)listing the Good Authors. The Defence of Greek Linguistic Variety in the Antiatticist Lexicon." In *Lists and Catalogues in Ancient Literature and Beyond: Towards a Poetics of Enumeration*, edited by R. Laemmle, C. Scheidegger Laemmle, and K. Wesselmann, pp. 169–194. De Gruyter, 2021.
- Tribulato, O. "Photius, ἀναλόβητος and Atticist Lexica." *Classical Quarterly* 72 (2022): 914–933.
- Tribulato, O. "Phrynichus Arabius." In *Trends in Classics – Greek and Roman Humanities Encyclopedia (GROH) – Scholarship*, edited by F. Montanari and A. Rengakos. De Gruyter Brill, 2026. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/groh.23525650>.
- Ucciardello, G. "Philemon [3]." In *Lexicon of Greek Grammarians of Antiquity*, edited by F. Montanari, F. Montana, and L. Pagani. Brill, 2007. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2451-9278=Philemon=3=it>.
- Untersteiner, M. "Le antilogie di Protagora." *Antiquitas* 2–3 (1947/1948): 34–44 [= *Scritti minori. Studi di letteratura e filosofia greca*, pp. 388–402. Claudiana, 1971].
- Valerio, F. "Analecta Byzantina." *Medioevo Greco* 16 (2016): 255–302.
- Verdejo Manchado, J. "A propósito de la métrica de las *Crestomatías* de Heladio de Antínoe y su repercusión en la interpretación de la obra." *Emerita* 88 (2020): 257–276.