

**A ‘norm’ in the Ancient Greek dialectal lexicon?
A comparative study of Gregory of Corinth’s Περὶ Αἰολίδος
and the anonymous Γλῶσσαι κατὰ πόλεις (Urb. Gr. 157)***

Wojciech Sowa

Jagiellonian University in Kraków
wojciech.sowa@uj.edu.pl | ORCID: 0000-0002-3425-8435

Abstract: This paper examines how ancient and Byzantine scholars may have conceptualised a “dialectal” lexicon of Greek, with particular attention to the problem of linguistic normativity. It offers a comparative discussion of two markedly different sources: Gregory of Corinth’s *Περὶ Αἰολίδος* and the anonymous lexicographical compilation *Γλῶσσαι κατὰ πόλεις* (Urb. Gr. 157). Both works seek to illustrate dialectal variation primarily through lexical material, yet they do so within distinct scholarly frameworks and with differing assumptions about linguistic correctness. The analysis draws on criteria developed in modern Ancient Greek dialectology (notably by García Ramón) in order to assess how far the lexical items presented in these sources can be regarded as genuinely dialect specific. Given the secondary nature of the evidence, these criteria cannot be applied mechanically; rather, they serve as a heuristic tool for evaluating the internal logic and reliability of the lexicographical traditions under consideration. Particular attention is paid to the role of literary language, poetic diction, and interdialectal influence in shaping what ancient scholars classified as “dialectal”. The study shows that Gregory of Corinth operates with an implicit normative baseline, ultimately rooted in Attic and the learned tradition, against which other dialects are evaluated, whereas the *Γλῶσσαι κατὰ πόλεις* lack any explicit reference to a standard variety and instead reflect classificatory practices derived largely from literary authority. In both cases, dialectal normativity emerges as prescriptive and scholarly rather than descriptive of vernacular usage. The findings underline the difficulty of defining a “dialectal” lexicon for Ancient Greek and suggest that modern lexicographical approaches must take greater account of the literary, chronological, and scholarly filters through which dialectal material has been transmitted.

Keywords: Ancient Greek dialectology, lexical variation, linguistic normativity, secondary linguistic tradition, literary dialect

* The following paper has been prepared as a part of a research project BPN/BEK/2021/1/00104/DEC/1 financed by NAWA (Narodowa Agencja Wymiany Akademickiej) during a research stay at Departamento de Filología Clásica e Indoeuropeo, Universidad de Salamanca.

One of the central difficulties in researching Ancient Greek dialectal varieties lies in determining how to interpret the lexical items attested in, or attributed to, specific dialects. In particular, the question arises whether these should be regarded merely as ‘Greek words of one region’ or whether they ought to be considered ‘specifically dialectal’ (cf. García Ramón 1999: 524). The criteria proposed – such as those put forward by García Ramón, which attempt to compare attested forms in one dialect with their synonyms in others – may be effective in epigraphical contexts. Such contexts allow for variation in chronology, potential influences from outside the region, and factors such as stylisation mimicking other dialects or poetic idioms. However, these criteria are not operational when examining the more elaborate literary varieties arising in different dialectal regions or the grammatical and lexicographical sources that preserve many rare words (*γλῶσσαι*) or notable terms (*λέξεις*). In many cases, these sources transmit words without contextual commentary – for example, without identifying their ultimate source or commenting on their regional distribution. There is also a persistent tendency in scholarship to treat these secondary sources as mere ancillary tools rather than as scholarly works in their own right. Generally, little attention is paid to the reasons why certain lemmas were quoted or included in a lexicon, or to the methodology and linguistic reasoning behind specific *interpretamenta* (Tribulato 2019).

The conception of what constitutes a dialect is clearly crucial in this context. In the case of Ancient Greece, defining the notion of dialect with any precision is notoriously problematic. The existence of different dialects in the first millennium BCE cannot be understood against the background of any form of standard language prior to the emergence of the *κοινή*. This situation contrasts with that of most modern languages, where one variety frequently attains dominance.¹ Greek dialects are not simply regional variations of a single language, and they differ notably in the chronology of their formation. Nevertheless, “Greek dialects often follow parallel lines of development, but they follow them at different times and different speeds. No correct exegesis of epigraphical – and one may add, literary – texts can be attempted if this is not kept in mind” (Morpurgo Davies 1968: 85).

It also seems likely that the Greeks experienced some degree of ‘ethnic unity’ despite the evident differences in their speech. They probably possessed an abstract notion of the ‘Greek language’ (at least by the fifth century BCE; cf. Thucydides, who uses the verb *ἔλληνίζειν* in the sense of ‘to speak Greek’) and, as Morpurgo Davies emphasises, “an extensive passive knowledge of different dialects” (Morpurgo Davies 1987: 13). They were certainly aware of

¹ ‘dialect: variety of speech differing from the standard or literary language’ (OED 599). Compare this with the views of ancient scholars, who recognised only four dialects, aligned with the historical and cultural divisions of the Greek tribes. For example, Clem. Alex. Strom. 1.21.142 states: διάλεκτος δὲ ἐστι λέξις ἕδιον χαρακτῆρα τόπου ἐμφαίνουσα, ἡ λέξις ἕδιον ἡ κοινὸν (4) έθνους ἐπιφαίνουσα χαρακτῆρα. φασὶ δὲ οἱ Ἕλληνες διαλέκτους εἶναι τὰς παρὰ σφίσι ε', Ατθίδα, Ἰέδα, Δωρίδα, Αιολίδα καὶ πέμπτην τὴν κοινήν, ἀπεριλήπτους δὲ οὖσας τὰς βαρβάρων φωνὰς μηδὲ διαλέκτους, ἀλλὰ γλώσσας λέγεσθαι... ‘A dialect is speech that displays the distinctive character of a place, or speech that displays the distinctive – or common – character of a people. The Greeks say that there are five dialects among them: Attic, Ionic, Doric, Aeolic, and, as a fifth, the Koine. The speech of the ‘barbarians’, however, being unlimited in variety, is not called dialects but languages...’ Also note the difference between the terms ‘dialect’ and ‘vernacular’/‘accent’ (e.g. German *Dialekt* vs. *Mundart*), which in many languages reflects the number of shared isoglosses among smaller dialectal units, contrasted with larger regional groupings.

the existence of distinct regional varieties and displayed various attitudes towards them.² The exact situation of spoken, everyday Greek in the Archaic and Classical periods, however, is difficult to reconstruct, as literary sources very rarely preserve genuine dialectal forms or passages. It is nevertheless likely that, in official-political discourse, representatives of individual poleis addressed one another in their own dialects, and that official documents were often prepared in a ‘bilingual’ (or rather ‘bi-dialectal’) manner.³ A separate issue is the use of dialectal features or forms in poetic performance, such as in Attic comedies. One must assume a certain degree of recognition of particular linguistic features as dialectal, which could then be exploited to provoke a comic effect (cf. Colvin 1999 on the use of ‘dialects’ in Greek literature).

The Attic dialect was certainly not the medium of communication outside the Ionic part of the Greek world before the age of Alexander, even though it exercised a hegemonic role in certain political environments at particular points in time (Bonner 1909: 363). Whether this process can be associated with the concept of ‘normativity’ – understood as the set of rules, conventions and standards governing language usage within a specific community or region – remains unclear, at least before the rise of grammatical scholarship several centuries later.

If one assumes that linguistic normativity establishes a framework for what is considered correct or acceptable within a given social or cultural context – embracing both formal and informal norms and reflecting conventions developed within a community over time (e.g., grammatical rules or conventions of pronunciation, accent, intonation, vocabulary, idiomatic expressions and politeness strategies) – then it is doubtful whether we may speak of any such framework in Classical times. However, if one instead assumes that the notion of a ‘norm’ provides a shared set of guidelines, expectations and concepts enabling speakers to communicate effectively and to be understood by others, then the situation appears different.

This paper addresses the broader question of what was – and what should be – considered a genuinely ‘dialectal’ lexicon, especially in the case of secondary evidence (glosses). It does so through a comparison of two markedly different works: the systematic treatment of the Aeolic dialect by Gregory of Corinth, and the anonymous list of lexical items attributed to various Greek dialects known as the *Γλῶσσαι κατὰ πόλεις*. Both works attempt to illustrate

² Cf. the persistent belief that Greek tribes in remote, less urbanised areas developed distinctive linguistic traits that made their speech difficult for neighbouring groups to understand. For instance, the Eurytanians of mountainous Aetolia were reportedly ‘most ignorant of the language and savage in habits’ (*ἀγνωστότατοι δὲ γλῶσσαν καὶ ὠμοφάγοι εἰσίν*; Thuc. 3.94). Their archaic way of life led contemporaries to question – and even contest – their Greek identity.

³ E.g. Demosthenes notes the difficulty Arcadians and Laconians had in speaking Attic (Dem. Μεγαλοπ. 16.2). Similarly, the vernacular of Lesbos – though celebrated in Aeolic poetry, which was edited, read, and transmitted in Athens during the 5th and 4th centuries BCE – was considered inferior, even ‘barbaric’ (*ἐν φωνῇ βαρβάρῳ τεθραμμένος*; Plato Protagoras 341C). For the reception of Sappho, see Yatromanalakis (2007), summarised in Coo (2021: 264–276). While some Athenians may have possessed passive comprehension of other dialects, the extent to which Greeks understood regional varieties remains unclear. Literary sources do not attest individuals fluent in multiple Greek dialects, although multilingualism in foreign languages certainly existed (Bonner 1909: 356–363).

dialectal differences extensively through lexical examples. Whether they do so successfully is, of course, another matter.

In this contribution, I apply the criteria for examining Ancient Greek vocabulary formulated by García Ramón (1999: 522f.; reiterated with slight refinement in García Ramón 2018: 58-60). Particular attention is given to forms that are attested exclusively in one dialect without corresponding forms elsewhere, or that may be specific to one dialect with different, synonymous forms being employed contemporaneously in others. The use of these theoretical premises is challenging, given that the material is not drawn from primary sources. The dialectological analysis serves to assess the general reliability of the sources, and the overarching aim is to clarify expectations concerning what may legitimately be termed a ‘dialectal’ word.

Gregory of Corinth, Περὶ Αἰολίδος

Gregorios Pardos (Gregory of Corinth) is generally regarded as a representative Byzantine scholar, active in both theological composition and grammatical scholarship, and likely working in the eleventh or twelfth century, although his chronology has long been the subject of debate (cf. Laurent 1963, Becares 1988, Montana 1995: xlviii–xlix, Dickey 2007: 82f.). In addition to his treatises on syntax and rhetorical figures (drawing upon Trypho), and his didactic commentaries on classical literature, he is most widely known for his treatise on the Ancient Greek dialects. This work is the only surviving dialectological treatise transmitted neither anonymously nor with uncertain attribution.⁴

Drawing upon earlier grammatical treatises and traditions (cf. Bolognesi 1953: 101), as well as on his own extensive reading (Bolognesi 1953: 107), Gregory provides an account of the Attic, Ionic, Doric, and Aeolic dialects, formulating general grammatical rules, supplying illustrative examples, and – particularly in his treatment of Attic and Ionic – offering substantial quotations from literary authors (Schoubben 2019: 1-2). He discusses both divergences and affinities among the principal dialects of Ancient Greek, occasionally referring to ‘minor’ varieties such as Boeotian and Thessalian. His work situates itself within the established grammatical tradition, exemplified by figures such as Dionysius Thrax and Apollonius Dyscolus, who classified dialects primarily on phonetic, morphological, and syntactic grounds. Gregory nonetheless introduces several original elements, including the systematic use of examples drawn from both poetry and prose, the comparison of dialectal forms with what he treats as standard Attic, and the explicit evaluation of dialectal usage in terms of correctness and stylistic elegance (cf. Wilson 1996: 188).

In the chapter devoted to Aeolic (specifically the Lesbian variety, *kleinasiatisch-aiolisch*), the dialect is described in a formalised and schematic manner. Gregory presents a series of rules defining the dialect, drawing attention to those features that he interprets as deviations from an underlying linguistic ‘norm’. The structure of this account reflects its

⁴ Cf. the presentation of the oeuvre in Kominis (1960), Donnet (1966, 1967), Wilson (1983a: 184-90), Bolognesi (1953), Glucker (1970), Montana (1995), Robins (1993: 163-72), and Hunger (1982).

principal source, namely the fragments of Johannes Grammaticus (Philoponus) preserved in the *Compendia Περὶ Αἰολίδος* (for the textual tradition see Hoffmann 1897: 204-222). Priority is accorded to the phonetic and phonological system, followed by the morphology of nouns and verbs. A final section lists lexical items which, in Gregory's view and according to earlier authorities, are peculiar to the Lesbian dialect. These appear in §§57-67, cf.

57	Tὸ ἐγὼ περισπῶσιν, ἐγῶν λέγοντες, καὶ ἐμὼ ἐμών	'The form ἐγὼ is twisted into ἐγῶν, and ἐμὼ becomes ἐμών.'
58	Tὸ σὺ τὸ ὁμοίως τοῖς Δωριεῦσι λέγοντι	'The form σὺ corresponds to τὸ, as the Dorians also say.'
59	Καὶ τὸ ἡμῖν ἄμμιν, ἡμεῖς ἄμμες	'Similarly, ἡμῖν corresponds to ἄμμιν, and ἡμεῖς to ἄμμες.'
60	Tὸ ἐνθάδε, τῇδε	'The form ἐνθάδε corresponds to τῇδε.'
61	Tὸ ἄλλοσε, ἐτέροσε	'The form ἄλλοσε corresponds to ἐτέροσε.'
62	Τὰ χείρονα, χέρρονα	'The form χείρονα appears as χέρρονα.'
63	Tὸ ἐπαινῶ, αἴνημι	'The verb ἐπαινῶ is rendered as αἴνημι.'
64	Τὰ ἰμάτια, ἔμματα	'The word ἰμάτια appears as ἔμματα.'
65	Ἡ μία, ῥα	'The feminine form μία corresponds to ῥα.'
66	Ἡ ψῆφος, ψᾶφαξ	'The noun ψῆφος is rendered as ψᾶφαξ.'
67	Tὸ ἔστρωται, ἔστόρηται	'The verb ἔστρωται appears as ἔστόρηται.'

Although this structure is not markedly different from that employed in many modern treatments of the Greek dialects, it must be emphasised that Gregory's categorical distinctions are frequently imprecise. Lexical items are at times deployed to abstract phonological or morphological rules, and certain purely morphological alternations are misinterpreted as dialectal phonetic processes. Moreover, some lexical items (e.g. §22 ἔδοντας: ὁδόντας, ἔδύνας: ὁδύνας) are cited despite now being recognised as morphological or phonological variants rather than genuine dialectal forms.

A close examination of the lexical section of the Aeolic chapter demonstrates that only four of the ten items cited may be regarded as authentically dialectal. These are primarily associated with the poetic register of the dialect – a predictable outcome, given that the sources upon which Gregory and earlier lexicographers rely are largely literary.

ἄμμες (§ 59)

One such form, frequently cited as characteristic of the Lesbian dialect, is the nominative plural ἄμμες 'we'. Gregory presents it together with the dative plural ἄμμιν (Καὶ τὸ ἡμῖν ἄμμιν, ἡμεῖς ἄμμες), thereby conflating two observations in the *Compendium* of John Philoponus (Comp. III §§60 and 61). This brief entry conveys linguistically reliable information with a solid foundation in both inscriptional and literary Aeolic (Buck 1955: 98ff., Thumb & Scherer 1959: 99ff.; cf. the attestations in Hamm 1957: 107 and Voigt 1971: 385).

In the epigraphical record the first-person plural pronoun appears, for example, in the genitive αμμεων and dative αμμι,⁵ and functions also as a possessive adjective, as in the formula τας αμμας πολιος (MAT 010, 35; ERE 010, 73.90; MYT 163, 14), which is attested as late as the Tiberian period.⁶

Both ἄμμες and ἄμμιν occur in Homer⁷ and Hesiod,⁸ and appear also in non-epic poetic authors such as Pindar (ἄμμιν 4×, e.g. *Hymn* 42.2 μόχθος ἄμμιν – τοῦτο γέ τοι ἐρέω) and Theognis (ἄμμιν 2×, e.g. *Elegiae* 418 χρυσός, ὑπερτερίης δ' ἄμμιν ἔνεστι λόγος). In the ancient grammatical tradition these forms are consistently assigned to Aeolic, e.g. Herodian (Περὶ ὄρθογραφίας 3.2.517.14f.): ήμεῖς· ἀμές γὰρ λέγουσι οἱ Δωριεῖς καὶ ἄμμες οἱ Αἰολεῖς.⁹ The entire Aeolic paradigm (i.e. Lesbian and Boeotian) is discussed in detail by Apollonius Dyscolus (*De pron.* 93.23-103.12). A geminated form of ἄμμες is even erroneously described as Doric in certain scholia (cf. *Schol. Hom. Il.* 8.352.1-3. 1-3 οὐκέτι νῷ] κοινῇ ἡμῖν- Δωριεῖς γάρ φασιν ἄμμες, Ἀττικοὶ δὲ νῷ, Ἰωνεῖς ἡμέας. ἔστι δὲ ἀντωνυμία δυϊκὴ ὄρθης καὶ αἰτιατικῆς πτώσεως. ἐὰν δὲ σὺν τῷ ν., ἡμῶν καὶ ἡμῖν).

The dialectal evidence appears to confirm the use of /a/ and of a geminate /m/ in Lesbian. The personal pronouns of the first- and second-person plural attracted particular interest among ancient grammarians owing to their presence in Homer and in Lesbian lyric. In the Homeric poems two plural paradigms coexist: one based on ἄμμες, conventionally labelled ‘Aeolic’ (with aspiration and recessive accent), and one based on ἡμεῖς, conventionally labelled ‘Ionic’. The Aeolic series comprises nom. ἄμμες, acc. ἄμμε, dat. ἄμμι(v), with no distinct genitive (only ἡμέων is attested). The Ionic series includes nom. ἡμεῖς, acc. ἡμέας, and dat. ἡμῖν (Chantraine 1948: 268; for additional forms, such as acc. ἡμεας/ἡμας, dat. ἡμιν/ἡμιν, and the artificially extended gen. ἡμειω, cf. Chantraine 1948: 268-271).

Although both Aeolic and Ionic forms derive from the same proto-form, they reflect different outcomes of the so-called ‘first compensatory lengthening’. Aeolic diverges markedly from the Ionic-Attic treatment of *-Vsm-, yielding a short vowel plus a geminate (Lejeune 1972: 122f., Thumb & Scherer 1959: 95f., Scarborough 2023: 131-134). Thus

⁵ Cf. gen. μεταπεμπομενων αμμεων και Ερεσιων δικαστηριον MAT 010.29 (mid-2nd century BC; cf. also MYT 026.8, 11; 209.4; 225.15); παραγεγοναν εις ταμ πολιν αμμων ERE 010.61; dat. εοντες αμμι συγγγε[νεες] LES 01.8 (late 3rd century BCE; cf. also MAT 010.30.51; ERE⁰10.68.96); [απεστελλεν] αμμι LES 05.5 (1st cent. AD); δεδοσθα δε (...) πολιτειαι παρ' αμμιν MAT 010.48.

⁶ Cf. also [π]ροξενος τας πολιος αμ[μεων] EOL 05, c. 3 (late 3rd cent. BCE); κτ<ι>σταν τας πολιος αμμεων MYT 225.15 (1st century AD). See also the catalogue of forms in Hodot (1990: 134). A similar situation occurs in Thessalian and Boeotian: Thess. gen. αμμεον, acc. αμμε; Boeot. gen. αμεων (αμιων Ap. Dysc. *De pron.* 95.21; Blümel 1982: 267).

⁷ ἄμμες occurs 4×, e.g. Il. 21.432 τώ κεν δὴ πάλαι ἄμμες ἐπανσάμεθα πτολέμοιο; ἄμμιν occurs 4×, e.g. Il. 13.379 Ἀργεος ἐξαγαγόντες ὄπωιέμεν, εἴ κε σὺν ἄμμιν, but ἄμμι appears as many as 16×.

⁸ E.g. *Scutum* 88: ἡ ἀλόχῳ – τάχα δ' ἄμμες ἐπιπλομένων ἐνιαυτῶν, etc.

⁹ Also Apoll. Soph. *Lex. homericum* 24.26-28: ἄμμε Αιολικῶς ἀντὶ τοῦ ἡμᾶς: [...] τὸ δὲ ἄμμι ἡμῖν. Eustath. *Comm. ad Hom. Il.* 1.172.26: εἰμι ἔμμιτ' ἡμεῖς ἄμμες. Eustath. *Comm. ad Hom. Il.* 4.73.16-74.4: τὸ ἡμῖν ἄμμι λέγουσιν οἱ Αἰολεῖς, βαρύνοντες αὐτὸν καὶ συστέλλοντες τὴν λήγουσαν. Ἀπολλόνιος: ἄμμι γε μὴν νόος ἔνδον ἀτύχεταιν. Δωριεῖς δὲ ἡμίν, συστέλλοντες τὸν καὶ οὖνοντες [...] ὅτι τὸ ἡμεῖς ἄμμες λέγουσιν οἱ Δωριεῖς, ἄμμες δὲ οἱ Αἰολεῖς.

**ŋs-mé* > **asmé* > Aeolic /amme/ ἄμμε¹⁰ stands in contrast to Ionic-Attic /a:me/ ἄμέ-, whence ἄμε-, to which case endings were subsequently added: **ŋs-mé-es* > ἄμεῖς in Ionic-Attic; **ŋs-mé-s* > ἄμές (Doric) and ἄμμες (Lesbian) (Rix 1992: 178, Dunkel 2004: 18ff.).

It is plausible that the retention of both sets of forms in the Epic tradition reflects metrical constraints: Lesbian ἄμμες(ς) is metrically equivalent to Proto-Ionic *ἄμέ(ς) (Wyatt 1992: 170f.). Yet there remains a substantial difference between the two series, e.g. ἄμμες vs. ἄμεῖς and ἄμμε vs. ἄμέας. Ionic forms tend to be spondaic, whereas Lesbian forms are predominantly trochaic (particularly in the third foot) and may even be monosyllabic. As Miller observes, dialectal (non-Ionic) forms may in certain cases occupy analogous metrical positions, e.g. ἄμιν (8×) ~ ἄμμι(v) (7×) at the beginning of the third foot, and ἄμιν (21×) ~ ἄμμι(v) (4×) at the beginning of the sixth foot. In the latter case, the Aeolic forms may serve to raise the stylistic level of the verse (Miller 2014: 316; cf. Meier-Brügger 1986: 127-143 for a comprehensive documentation and interpretation of Aeolic pronoun forms in Homer). Yet the question remains whether the ‘Aeolic’ forms of the personal pronoun in Homer – despite being normalised in accentuation and psilosis under the influence of the transmission of Sappho and Alcaeus – should be interpreted as genuine survivals of an Aeolic linguistic substrate and of an ‘Aeolic phase’ in the development of Greek epic, or whether they are in fact archaisms inherited from the pre-alphabetic stage of the tradition. A definitive answer remains elusive.¹¹

αῖνημι (§ 63)

In paragraph 63 (Τὸ ἐπαινῶ, αῖνημι), Gregory cites the athematic verb form αῖνημι as specifically Aeolic in contrast to the thematic αἰνέω, which is the regular Greek form (cf. e.g. *Hom. αἰνεῖτ' Θ* 9). The verb αἰνέω (‘to praise, glorify, approve’) is frequent in poetic diction but appears only rarely in Attic prose, where the derivative ἐπαινέω is strongly preferred.

The form αῖνημι does not occur in the surviving Lesbian lyric corpus, nor is it attested in epigraphic material from Lesbos, Thessaly, or Boeotia. From a formal perspective, it represents a shift from the class of so-called *verba vocalia* (contract verbs) to athematic forms – a development characteristically associated with the Aeolic dialect (cf. Scarborough

¹⁰ With /am/ < *[ŋ] (Rix 1992: 66).

¹¹ See Miller (2014: 317), who assumes that a treatment similar to the Aeolic ‘first compensatory lengthening’ can already be observed in Mycenaean and in archaic Arcadian forms from the Peloponnese. Cf. the document from Megalopolis, 207/6 BCE (I.v. Magn. 38, see Dubois 1986 II: 273 ff.): line 24: εχοντες ευνοως προς αμμε; line 22: προς παντας τος κα αμε εαρημενος; line 18: ται δε πολι ται αμετηραι αμε (accusative ‘us’). Another interpretation is offered by Dubois (1986 I: 79), according to whom αμε is a regular form with lengthened /a:/, whereas αμμε represents an Aeolic form erroneously recorded by an Ionic scribe. If in Mycenaean there indeed existed a treatment analogous to the Aeolic (geminated sonant; compare a-ke-ra2-te PY Vn 493.1 /agerrantes/ or /angellantes/, see Peters 1986: 3068, 313), then one may also postulate the existence at this stage of the form ἄμμε. In this scenario, the Homeric ἄμμε could similarly be regarded as an archaic Mycenaean element. Within the Mycenaean-Ionic poetic tradition, ἄμμε(ς) may have been preserved precisely because of its metrically distinctive structure. Subsequently, forms such as ἄμμε(ς), later modified to ἄμμες(ς), entered poetic usage under the influence of Lesbian poets. For ordinary speakers, however, the archaic and artificial ἄμμε(ς) was naturally replaced by forms still current in the living dialect of the Aeolians of Asia Minor.

2023: 136-142). The grammatical tradition itself acknowledges this tendency, citing the pair αἰνέω : αἴνημι alongside forms such as φιλῶ : φίλημι.¹²

The verb αἰνέω functions in parallel with the thematic noun αἶνος ‘story, tale’ (*Il. Ψ* 652), which could suggest that, as in many other cases of *-eo:-*-forms, we are dealing with a denominative formation (cf. Risch 1974: 300-319). The situation is, however, complicated by the aorist formation: Ionic-Attic αἰνέω constructs an aorist in *-e(σ)σα*, whereas Homer consistently employs a form in *-ησα*.

Morphologically, verbs of the type φιλέω – ήσω – ησα derive from *-o*-stems (whence αἶνος might be expected), while the aorist in *-e(σ)σα* is largely restricted to *-es*-stems (cf. e.g. αἰδέομαι). Consequently, it is difficult to determine decisively whether αἰνέω is a denominative formation or whether αἶνος and related nouns are instead back-formations from the verb (cf. Tucker 1990: 37²⁵, 94). Matters are further complicated by the fact that αἰνέω itself lacks a convincing etymology (cf. Frisk 1960: 40-41, Beekes 2010: 39-40). Comparative evidence from Tocharian and Hittite may, however, appear promising – cf. Hitt. *enant* ‘tame’ (MAŠ.GAL *enanza* ‘tame goat’), an intransitive participle in *-ant-* from *en-* (< *ain-* ‘to be agreeable’; Puhvel 1984 II: 271), and Toch. A/B *en-* ‘to instruct, teach, chastise’, e.g. *tumem lyama asānne enṣṣate-me* ‘then he sat down on his seat and taught them’ (Adams 2013: 87). Should these comparanda indeed relate to Greek αἰνέω (αἶνος), they must be explained as continuants of PIE **h₂e₁i-n-* (Peters 1980: 80).

Setting aside these etymological questions, it seems clear that Gregory quotes αἴνημι because of its morphological character, which the ancient tradition viewed as typically Aeolic. Interesting in this regard is its single literary attestation outside Homer, namely *Hes. Op.* 683: οὐ μιν ἔγωγε || αἴνημι', οὐ γάρ ἐμῷ θυμῷ κεχαρισμένος ἔστιν. This form has been interpreted as a specifically Hesiodic Aeolism (Thumb & Scherer 1959: 8), given that the Iliad and Odyssey consistently employ the thematic forms. It almost certainly entered the grammatical tradition via the scholiastic commentaries; cf. *Schol.* in *Op.* (Prolegom. Schol. 681.1-2): ΑΙΝΗΜ'. Αἴνημι, αἰνῶ, καὶ κατὰ παραγωγὴν Ἀττικὴν αἴνημι.

ἔμματα (§ 64)

The noun ἔμμα, meaning ‘dress, garment’, is cited twice by Gregory: in paragraph 64 and again in paragraph 20. The form appears in grammatical and lexicographic sources; cf. *Hsch. E* 2355 ἔμμα· ἴματιον ‘garment’, and *Hsch. Γ* 319 γέμματα· ἴματια, which preserves an orthographic tradition employing Γ rather than the expected *F (*φέμματα). For the spelling <Γ> in place of digamma <F> and the historical development of PIE */w/ in Aeolic dialects, see Sowa (2011: 166-167). Herodian explicitly classifies the word as Lesbian, cf. *Περὶ ὄρθ.*

¹² E.g. Eustath. *Comm. in Hom. Od.* 1.80.11-13: ὁμοίως τῷ διζῷ δίζημι [...] καὶ τῷ φιλῷ φίλημι [...] καὶ τῷ αἰνῷ αἴνημι... Od. 2.247.31 ff.:ώς τοῦ αἰτῶ τὸ αἴτημι καὶ τοῦ φιλῶ τὸ φίλημι, καὶ τοῦ αἰνῶ τὸ αἴνημι... “Just as διζῷ gives rise to δίζημι, and φιλῷ to φίλημι, so αἰνῷ gives rise to αἴνημι; likewise, αἰτῶ forms αἴτημι, φιλῶ forms φίλημι, and αἰνῷ forms αἴνημi.”

3.2.500.28: εἵμα τὸ ιμάτιον διὰ τῆς εἰ διφθόγγου· ἔμμα γάρ φασιν οἱ Αἰολεῖς.¹³ Likewise Compendium III §54 lists τὸ ιμάτια ἔμματα as Aeolic.

Although the word does not occur in surviving Lesbian inscriptions, it appears three times in the transmitted Lesbian poets, e.g. *Alc.* fr. 58.21: []τ' ὄνάρταις χέρρῃ ἀπό μῃ ἔμμάτων; *Sapph.* fr. 62.12: τὰ τ' ἔμματα κα[;] *Sapph.* fr. 276 (2) col. 3.41: κων[.]φιλ[.] Ἐρίγυιοσ[.]πέρ ἔμμάτ[ω]ν. It is also classified as an Aeolism in *Lyrica Adespota* fr. 9.2 (Ps.-Alcman): παίσαι παρθενικάι, παίσαι καλὰ ἔμματ' ἔχοίσα[ι].

Related forms appear in Doric, particularly in Crete (e.g. *IC* IV Gortyn 72 V 40; 75 B 3: φεμας, φεμας κ' ἀνπιδέμας), and in East Ionic inscriptions, e.g. Chios 505 (4th c. BCE): ανηρ εμα πυρι κατεκα, where εμα is plausibly equivalent to εἵμα (Hernández Vázquez 1994: 205).¹⁴

ἔμμα is a regular equivalent of Ionic εἵμα /he:ma/ and should be interpreted as a neuter formation with the suffix *-m_η* (cf. Risch 1974: 49f., Rix 1992: 33), compare OInd. *vásma*. The derivational base is the verbal root *ués-* (cf. Greek ἔννυμι <*ués-nu-mi*> ‘to be clothed, to dress oneself’,¹⁵ also attested in other Indo-European languages, such as Hittite *wēsta-* ‘to be dressed in (something)’ and Vedic imperfect *váste* ‘he had on’ (see LIV²: 692f. for comparative material).

From the perspective of dialectal phonology, ᔁμμα exhibits the typical Aeolic treatment of the consonant cluster */sm/, which regularly develops into the geminate /mm/. The orthography found in lexicographical sources, using gamma <Γ> instead of digamma <Ϝ>, can be considered a result of textual transmission. Although (γ/Ϝ)ἔμμα does not appear in epigraphic material from Lesbos or neighbouring areas of Asia Minor, the form should still be interpreted as part of the actual dialectal layer in Lesbian lyric poetry. It cannot be considered an element of the Homeric epic tradition, as all examples of the noun in epic consistently display the expected Ionic form εἵμα.

The plural ᔁμματα is attested in poetry, for example Sappho fr. 62, 12 (τὰ τ' ᔁμματα κα[...]) and in Pseudo-Alcman (*Lyr. Adesp.* fr. 9, 2), in a distinctly dialectal literary verse, yielding traces of the Lesbian variety (παίσαι παρθενικάι, παίσαι καλὰ ᔁμματ' ἔχοίσα[ι]), with a dialectal treatment of the group */ns/ – παίσαι (instead of πᾶσαι), ἔχοίσα[ι] (for ἔχουσαι). This evidence further supports the interpretation of ᔁμμα/ἔμματα as typical dialectal forms.

¹³ Cf. the context 28 ff.: εἵμα τὸ ιμάτιον διὰ τῆς εἰ διφθόγγου· ἔμμα γάρ φασιν οἱ Αἰολεῖς ἀποβάλλοντες τὸ ι καὶ διπλασιάζοντες τὸ σύμφωνον, ὥσπερ κείρω κέρω, φθείρω φθέρρω. τὸ δὲ ιμάτιον καὶ τὰ παρ' αὐτὸ πάντα διὰ τοῦ ι γράφεται, οἷον ιματίζω, ιματισμός, ιματιοφόρος καὶ ιματιοπόλης... ‘The word εἵμα (‘garment’) is written with ι rather than ει because of the way Aeolic treated diphthongs. The Aeolians, it is said, would drop the ι and double the following consonant, as in κείρω → κέρρω or φθείρω → φθέρρω. All words related to ιμάτιον – such as ιματίζω, ιματισμός, ιματιοφόρος, and ιματιοπόλης – are likewise written with ι.’

¹⁴ Cf. however the use of ιμάτιον in the East-Ionic dialect (Samos 3x, 346-345 BCE, Samos 133 = IG XII, 6 1:261, lines 27, 31,33) ιμάτιον λευκόν, ή ὅπισθε θεός ἔχει, ιμάτια Ἐρμέω ‘A white garment, which the goddess holds behind her; garments of Hermes’ (Hernández Vázquez 1994: 338).

¹⁵ This nasal infix present is a Greek innovation, not attested in other IE languages, cf. however, Hom.-Ion. pres. εἵματ *< *ués-mai>*, used as a perfect to ἔννυμι, which should, therefore, be considered more archaic (LIV²: 692 f.); cf. also Hsch. A 1363: ἄεμμα· τόξον (Call. *Hymn.* 2,33), ιμάτιον.

Therefore, it appears that the information provided by Gregory is accurate and that the quoted form is genuinely dialectal. Nevertheless, doubts remain regarding the context and interpretation proposed by the author. From a modern perspective, one cannot claim that a graphic sign such as iota (or its equivalent) changes into another letter, for example to represent a liquid or nasal sound. Rather, the ‘rule’ offered by the author should be understood as an application of the ancient theory of πάθη (modifications), whereby one letter could be substituted for another to explain a word’s etymology. This paragraph, which groups various forms as the result of different phonological laws, is a typical example of such a ‘change’ (μετάληψις; cf. Dickey 2007: 246, 250).

ἴα (§ 65)

In this paragraph Gregory introduces the Lesbian feminine form of the numeral ‘one’, ḥα, in place of the Ionic-Attic form μία. This observation is supported in the grammatical tradition and is quoted directly from §55 of *Compendium III*. Gregory correctly situates the form within the Aeolic context, as the feminine ḥα/ἴα constitutes an isogloss uniting Boeotian, Thessalian, and Lesbian (Buck 1955: 94, Thumb & Scherer 1959: 4, Blümel 1982: 271).¹⁶ The psilotic Lesbian variant ḥα is regarded as a secondary innovation, comparable to Boeotian forms such as the genitive ḥας (SEG 3:359.10) and the accusative ḥαν in Corinna;¹⁷ and to Thessalian accusative ḥαν (IG IX² 517.22, 44; SEG 13:3958). In Lesbian, the form is attested only in literary contexts (acc. sg. ḥαν in Sappho 56.1 and Alcaeus fr. 350.6). The epigraphic record is sparse: Mytilene yields one nominative form, μῆδεια (MYT 04, 12), alongside Koine forms [οὐδε]μίας (MYT 024.56, 2nd c. BCE) and [μῆδε]μίας (MYT 026.10, 12, 1st c. CE), which renders its interpretation ambiguous. It is equally plausible that μῆδεια represents a feminine form of the adjectival pronoun ḥος (Hodot 1990: 152; literary attestations in Hamm 1957: 109).

Forms of this type also occur in Homeric Epic: nominative ḥα (Δ 437), accusative ḥαν (ξ 435), genitive ḥῆς (Ο 173, Ω 496), and dative ḥῆ (Ι 319). A metrically motivated neuter dative iῶτ (Ζ 422) is also attested. This raises the question of whether such forms represent dialectal innovations (perhaps indicating an ‘Aeolic’ element in Epic diction; cf. Thumb & Scherer 1959: 210), archaisms, or analogical developments. According to García Ramón, reflexes of the inherited feminine *smih₂- (cf. Arm. *mi < *smiha-) lost the initial */m/ to align the feminine with the masculine and neuter forms εῖς and ἐν (García Ramón 1975: 65; similarly, Ruijgh 1971: 601). Yet this model of proportional analogy is problematic – it presupposes the development of ḥ- /i-/ from masculine nominative εῖ- /he:-/ or oblique ἐ- /he-/, instead of the historically expected ὑξα (< εῖς, ὑξα, ἐν). The motivation for such alignment is unclear (Parker 2008: 448; cf. already Schmidt 1900: 391-399), particularly as other Greek

¹⁶ The consistent placement of ḥα in editions of Boeotian and Thessalian inscriptions is influenced by the Lesbian and Homeric ḥα. This contradicts both the etymology of the form and the phonology of Thessalian and Boeotian, neither of which are psilotic dialects (Scarborough 2023: 122²⁴⁰).

¹⁷ Cf. τὰν δ' ḥαν Μή[ας] ἀγαθὸς (Corinna iii.17; cf. Page 1953: 57).

dialects did not attempt to regularise the paradigm and continued to employ the suppletive feminine *μία*.

An alternative explanation for the emergence of the feminine form *ἴα/ία* has been proposed by Parker, building on Schmidt's assumptions. Parker argues that, due to phonological developments between the Proto-Indo-European (PIE) period and the Proto-Greek stage, the inherited feminine form took the shape nom./acc. **smia-*, obl. **sia-*. This allomorphism later gave rise to the forms *μία/ία* through analogical alignments during the formation of the Greek dialects (Parker, *ibidem*). He proposes a generalisation of the zero-grade form **sm-iéh₂* from dependent cases at an early stage. The disappearance of the /m/ segment between the spirant /s/ and the non-vocalic /i/ resulted in **síeh₂-*, as seen in Hittite *ši-* 'one' (Kloekhorst 2008: 750f.), reflecting a parallel development in the Indo-Iranian pronominal system. In Proto-Greek, this process produced the allomorphism **smia-* in the nominative/accusative and **sia-* in the dependent cases. In the nominative/accusative, regular assimilation yielded **sm- > *m-* (*μία, μίαν*; see Lejeune 1972: 120f.), whereas the development of *ία-* from **sia-* is less straightforward. It is likely that the sequence **sí-* assimilated to **ií-*, analogous to the treatment of the intervocalic group **-sí-*, producing forms such as *ιᾶς, ιᾶ* (or, via metathesis, **iia- > *iha- > *hia-*).

Alternatively, the Lindeman variant suggests that monosyllabic forms developed into bisyllabic forms (**smia-/sia > *mija-/hija*), comparable to bisyllabic variants attested in the Balkan area, for example in Albanian and Armenian.¹⁸ Thus, at the stage of dialectal differentiation, Greek inherited an allomorphic alternation **smia- : *sia-*. The Aeolic and Homeric forms *ἴα/ία* are best understood as levellings from dependent-case **sia-* to the nominative/accusative, whereas *μία, μίαν* exhibit the opposite direction of analogical spread. Gregory, therefore, correctly identifies a noteworthy phenomenon, albeit one limited in its distribution. The rarity of *ἴα/ία* in Greek is unsurprising – analogical levelling typically proceeds from the main cases to the dependent ones and not vice versa (Scarborough 2023: 122-126).

The remaining forms adduced by Gregory as exclusive lexical items cannot, for several reasons, be regarded as dialectal. Many belong to the literary dialect, others derive directly from Homeric diction, and several are unattested in epigraphic or literary sources. Their inclusion as 'typical' Lesbian forms is therefore difficult to justify.¹⁹ The examples cited by Gregory reflect a strong dependence on the grammatical and literary tradition, which serves as his principal source. Throughout the treatise, Gregory demonstrates a consistent preference for Attic as the most refined and authoritative dialect of Greek. Attic is implicitly

¹⁸ Arm *mi*, gen. *mioy* < **smijo-*; Alb. *një* < PAlb **smio-s* < IE **smijo-*, both form understood as secondary masculine formations derived from feminine **sm(i)ja* < **smi(j)ə-* < **smih₂-*. This has been interpreted as one of the isoglosses supporting the assumption of a Balkan-Indo-European linguistic area (Matzinger 2012: 151).

¹⁹ See, for example, paragraphs 60 and 61, where Gregory draws attention to allegedly dialectal forms of the adverbs *τῆδε* and *έτέρος*, which, however, cannot be attested for Lesbian. In both epigraphic and literary evidence, the alternative forms *τοῦδε* and *ἄλλων/ἄλλοι* should be considered the genuinely dialectal ones (Sowa 2024: 229-231). This observation is corroborated by the evidence and observations of ancient grammarians and lexicographers (e.g., Hsch. T 1615 notes: *τῦδε- ἐνταῦθα. Αἰολεῖς; Schol. In Il. Ξ 298 μήτοτε δὲ ισοδυναμεῖ τῷ παρ' Αἰολεῦσι τοῦδε'*; Alc. Fr. 392 οὐδέ τι μυνάμενος ἄλλοι τὸ νόημα). For the formation of adverbs in the Lesbian dialect, see Bechtel (1921: 103), Buck (1955: 103), Thurm & Scherer (1959: 109), Hamm (1957: 113), Risch (1974: 358), Rix (1992: 170), Rodríguez Somolinos (1998: 101, 205).

treated as the normative standard against which other dialects are evaluated; hence, the frequent remarks such as “contrary to Attic” or “against Attic usage”. Gregory occasionally criticises forms diverging from Attic norms (“they... falsely... with regard to pronunciation”). He praises Attic for its richness, clarity, and harmony, attributing its excellence to the cultural achievements of Athens in literature, philosophy, and politics. He regards Attic as the language of educated Greeks and advises his students to imitate its style and vocabulary. The normative role of Classical Attic is thus maintained, even though Gregory is aware that the linguistic standard of his own day is the Byzantine κοινή (cf. remarks such as “in our dialect/use”).

However, Gregory does not dismiss the other dialects entirely. He recognises that different dialects are suited to different genres: Ionic for Epic, Doric for choral lyric, and Aeolic for erotic poetry. He allows some degree of contextual variation and acknowledges that dialects possess their own merits and peculiarities. He also accepts that Doric and Aeolic appear to share elements of a common linguistic history distinct from Ionic or Attic and even proposes that the Lesbian dialect is a precursor of Latin (cf. §29 τοῦτοι... καθὰ δὴ καὶ οἱ Ψωμαῖοι, τούτων ὄντες ἄποικοι). Overall, the material he cites reflects a tendency – characteristic of late antique and Byzantine scholarship – to interpret archaic or irregular forms, especially those found in early poetry, as dialectal, and often specifically as Aeolic.

Γλῶσσαι κατὰ πόλεις

The anonymous lexical list transmitted under the title Ποῖαι γλῶσσαι κατὰ πόλεις constitutes an intriguing document relevant to the study of dialectal vocabulary. It presents a list of one hundred forms assigned to various dialects, regions, and even specific cities, and is preserved in Urb. gr. 157 of the Vatican Library. Bekker published the text in *Anecdota Graeca* III (1095–1096) without commentary, and subsequent scholars of the Greek dialects – notably Hoffmann, Meister and Bechtel – have consulted the list principally as supplementary material for regional vocabularies. A critical edition is still lacking (cf. Latte 1925: 136 for the essential information on its textual tradition). Beyond the Vatican witness, at least two further copies survive in Madrid (Royal Library, cod. XL and cod. XCV; cf. Iriarte 1769, 146 and 378), together with three later exemplars in Italian libraries.²⁰ With the exception of short studies by Latte (1925: 136–147) and Bowra (1959: 43–60), the document has attracted little scholarly attention; the occasional references that do occur typically treat the list as a reliable source of dialectal evidence (e.g., Peters 1994: 210).

²⁰ The two copies preserved in Madrid were transcribed within the circles of disciples of the Greek humanist Konstantinos Laskaris and form part of codices containing various grammatical writings, including Philoponus and the grammar prepared by Laskaris himself. Two further manuscripts are held in Italian libraries: Bibl. Laur. Plut. 58.19, fol. 188r-191 (copied by Francesco Filelfo), and Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, gr. X. 026 (coll. 1305), fol. 202v-203v. An additional copy of the list by Filelfo is preserved in the Biblioteca Ambrosiana in Milan (Ambr. F 14 sup., ff. 161v-165v) – an exemplar unknown to Latte in 1925. The fact that the list circulated and was copied in humanistic circles in the later 15th century already indicates a concrete interest in the didactics of Greek dialects at that time, and, consequently, an awareness that Greek appeared in various forms in the literary texts transmitted to the Renaissance.

Unlike other extant ancient sources reflecting on Greek dialects – preserved mainly in Byzantine lexicographical tradition, such as Gregory of Corinth's *Περὶ διαλέκτων* or Johannes Grammaticus' *Compendia Περὶ Αἰολίδος*, which approach the dialects primarily in terms of phonetic or morphological differences – this document attempts to assign particular lexical items to specific regions of Greece. This feature alone renders the list noteworthy.

Although the collection may appear unimpressive at first glance, it raises several questions that remain unresolved: What exactly is the nature of the list, and for what purpose was it compiled? What might be inferred regarding its origins and sources? Can any of the forms be plausibly regarded as genuinely ancient or reliably attributed to specific dialects? Finally, to what extent is the list a trustworthy source for dialectological research? Bowra's suggestion – that although the items are poetic, the compiler regards them as current in various local vernaculars (Bowra 1959: 45) – deserves consideration, though it remains difficult to substantiate.

From a strictly dialectological perspective, the list cannot be treated as a dependable source of data. The overwhelming majority of the items are archaic and predominantly poetic. Poetic register appears to have been a decisive factor – of the hundred forms, eighty-five are attested in Homer, though they also occur elsewhere in poetry. Eleven additional forms belong to poetic vocabulary outside traditional Epic diction – appearing in choral lyric, iambus, tragedy, or Hellenistic epic – and most of these have no attestations in prose (Bowra 1959: 46). According to Latte and Bowra, three items appear corrupted through the history of transmission: φύς, given as Doric; a supposed Aeolic κεκρυφάλεος (but see Sowa 2011: 173f.); and the Aetolian οὐλας (Bowra following Latte, *ibidem*). Of the whole collection, only one form – ἔστιοι, glossed with the puzzling meaning 'dead' and attributed to the Arcadian city of Cleitor (Κλειτορίων ἔστιοι = νεκροί) – lacks any parallels in literary sources. Whether this constitutes genuine evidence for the vernacular of the region remains doubtful.

The entries are arranged according to twenty-two geographical areas, some corresponding to recognised dialect regions, others referring to single cities – an interesting feature in itself.²¹ For example, within the Arcadian group, a general dialectal label (Αρκάδων) appears alongside separate subgroups assigned specifically to the speech of Cleitor and Phlius. These cities belong, of course, to the Arcadian sphere, but they are not otherwise treated separately in lexicographical sources. A similar situation arises in the case of Argos, which appears both as a dialectal region (Αργείων: αῖσα ~ μοῖρα, κτύπος ~ ψόφος, μῆλα ~ πρόβατα) and, independently, through the forms attributed to the Argive city of Hermione, which likewise receives a pair of lexical items.

Κυπρίων τόργος ~ γύψ

In modern scholarship, Cypriot dialectal vocabulary has generally been regarded as belonging to a particularly archaic stratum of Greek, directly continuing a number of Myce-

²¹ The list includes the following regions and towns (in the order presented): Athens, Argos, Arcadia, Achaea, Aetolia, Acarnania, Ambracia, Aeolis (referring to Lesbos and the Aeolic cities of Asia Minor), Hermione, Thessalia, Cyprus, Boeotia, Doris, Ionia, Cleitor, Crete, Corinth, Corcyra, Laconia, Magnesia (in Thessaly), Sicily, and Phlius.

naean forms. This has led to the frequent characterisation of the Cypriot dialect – alongside Arcadian – as among the most archaic of the Greek linguistic varieties. Numerous archaic formations attested both in Homer and in Cypriot (or Arcadian) have been traced back to the so-called ‘Achaean’ layer of Epic diction. According to Ruijgh, this label denotes elements in the language of Homer that predate both the Aeolic and the Ionic strata. On this view, the ‘Achaean’ dialect represents forms of Greek spoken in the Peloponnese and the adjacent Aegean islands during the Mycenaean period; its remnants persisted into classical times chiefly in Arcadia and Cyprus, while its earliest attestations are to be sought in the Linear B tablets (cf. Ruijgh 1957).

Under the heading ‘Cypriots’, the anonymous compiler of the *Γλῶσσαι* includes the form *τόργος*, glossed as ‘γύψ’, the name of a bird (‘vulture’). The noun is also attested in other lexicographical sources, though occasionally assigned to different dialect regions. Thus, Hesychius T 1161 attributes the form to Sicily: *τόργος· εῖδος γυπὸς αἰματορ<ρ>όφου. ἔστι δὲ καὶ ὁ γύψ παρὰ Σικελιώτας*. Without dialectal specification the term appears in Suda T 788, *τόργος· παρὰ Λυκόφρονι ὁ κύκνος· λέγεται δὲ καὶ ὁ γύψ*, and in Photios T 388, *τόργος· ὁ γύψ*.

The word is found exclusively in learned Alexandrian poetry. It appears in Callimachus (fr. 647: *τὰ καθνώδει τόργος ἔκοπτε νέκυν* ‘*torgos* struck the corpse with its beak’) and in Lycophron (*Alexandra* 88): *ἡν τόργος ὑγρόφοιτος ἐκλοχεύεται* ‘the wet-nesting *torgos* broods over it’). The scholia to Lycophron further comment on the semantic development from ‘vulture’ to ‘swan’ and the scholiast’s elaborate mythological explanation is well known.²² The glosses, however, reflect literary interpretation rather than living vernacular usage.

The form is exceedingly rare in Greek. It is unattested in the epigraphic material of any region. Consequently, there is no evidence to support the compiler’s attribution of the word to the Cypriot dialect (cf. Egetmeyer 2010: 245). From a formal perspective, its etymology is highly uncertain. Attempts to derive it from **tréh₃g/ḡ-* ‘to gnaw’ are unconvincing on phonological grounds; one would expect a reflex **tr̥h₃g/ḡ- > trōg-* with lengthened vowel (cf. Greek *τραχεῖν* ‘to gnaw’), or a remodelled zero-grade aorist **treh₃g/ḡ- :: *tr̥h₃g/ḡ-* (LIV² 651; see also DELG s.v.; Hadjioannou 1977: no. 237, van Windekkens 1986, Beekes 2010:

²² Schol. in Lycoph. 88: *τόργος ὑγρόφοιτος – ὁ Ζεὺς ἡ ἡ Νέμεσις, παρόσον κύκνῳ ἀπεικασθεῖς ὁ Ζεὺς Νεμέσει τῇ Ὁκεανῷ συνῆλθεν, ἔξ ἡς γεννᾶται φόν, ὅπερ λαβοῦσα ἡ Λήδα ἐθέρμανε καὶ ἔτεκε τὴν Ἐλένην καὶ τοὺς Διοσκούρους, τὸ δὲ ὑγρόφοιτος γράφεται καὶ ὑψίφοιτος. τόργος κυρίως ὁ γύψ· νῦν δὲ τὸν κύκνον λέγει, ὃν μιμησάμενος ὁ Ζεὺς συνεμίγη τῇ Λήδᾳ. ὑγρόφοιτος δὲ ὁ ἐν τοῖς ὑγροῖς φοιτῶν καὶ ἀναστρεφόμενος. ὁ γύψ νῦν δὲ τὸν ἀετὸν ἡ τὸν κύκνον λέγει. ἔλαβε δὲ ζῶν ἀντὶ ζώου. Ζεὺς γὰρ ὄμοιωθεῖς κύκνῳ Νεμέσει τῇ τοῦ Ὁκεανοῦ θυγατρὶ συνῆλθεν εἰς γῆνα, ὡς ληροῦστον (Ap. III 127), αὐτὴν μεταβαλόν· ἡ δὲ τεκοῦσα ὡὸν ἐν τῷ νικῆς ἡ διότι πολλοὶ δι’ αὐτὴν ἀπέθανον. ‘The moisture-loving (ὑγρόφοιτος) *torgos* – either Zeus or Nemesis, since Zeus, appearing in the form of a swan, united with Nemesis, daughter of Oceanus. From this union an egg was produced, which Leda, having taken it, warmed and gave birth to Helen and the Dioscuri. The term ὑγρόφοιτος is also written ὑψίφοιτος. *torgos* properly means the vulture, but now refers to the swan, which Zeus, imitating it, adopted when he united with Leda. ‘Moisture-loving’ refers to one who moves about and frequents watery places. The word *gyps* now also denotes the eagle or the swan. He (the scholiast) has taken ‘animal’ for another ‘animal’. For Zeus, having assumed the form of a swan, united with Nemesis, daughter of Oceanus, as a goose, according to the mythographers (Apollodorus III 127), transforming her; and she, after giving birth, produced an egg on account of which many perished.’*

1494). Thompson (1895: s.v.) proposed a Coptic origin (Coptic *t(o)re, ere* ‘kite’), which remains speculative. A putative connection with Proto-Germanic **sturkaz* (German *Storch*, English *stork*) is likewise highly improbable.

The reasons why such a rare form was selected for inclusion in a supposedly dialectal list remain obscure. What can be stated with certainty is that its designation as specifically Cypriot is untenable.

Σικελῶν κόρσας – κεφαλᾶς

The forms from Sicily are not very frequent in the ancient lexicographical sources (cf. four glosses of Sicilian origin in the *Lexicon* of Hesychius). It is, therefore, interesting to find words ascribed to this island in the List. One should observe from the outset that the form κόρσας occurs alongside formations such as μέλαθρον· οἰκία, ναίει· οἰκεῖ, or φόρμιγξ· κιθάρα, which doubtless entered the List via Epic poetry (cf. Bowra 1959: 53, on ναίει).

The noun is attested from Homeric times, although in Epic, the Ionic form κόρση is generally preferred. In Attic, the form κόρρη is applied, and in Doric, the related κόρρα is also attested (cf. Theoc. 14.34). Aeolic poetry employed the form κόρσα (cf. Alc. 34: αὐτὰρ ὅμηρί κόρσα). The noun has several meanings, of which the glossed ‘head’ is only one; it may also denote the ‘temple’ or ‘side of the forehead’ (e.g., E 584: ξίφει ἥλασε κόρσην), the ‘jaw’ (especially Attic expressions πατάξαι ἐπὶ κόρρης ‘smack on the jaw’; Pherecr. 155b [CAF iii, p. 716]; cf. Plato, *Gorgias* 486c, 508d, 527a: ἐπὶ κόρρης τύπτειν), ‘hair’ (e.g., Aesch. *Agamemnon* 282: λευκὰς δὲ κ. τῇδ' ἐπαντέλλειν), and ‘head’ (Empedocles 57.1: κ. ἀναύχενες; cf. Nic. *Th.* 905; Opp. C. 3.25). In Attic, the meaning may extend to the whole head and neck, whereas in Ionic, it refers only to the head.

The form is primarily poetic, with a prose counterpart in κρόταρος, though Attic usage demonstrates possible application in prose. The meaning ‘hair’ should likely be interpreted metaphorically (Frisk 1960: 923), with a primary semantic sense of ‘haircut on the head’. Hesychius, however, lists the various meanings, e.g. ‘hair of the eyebrows, jaws, summits, headlocks, ramparts, bulwarks, crowns of towers, temple, staircases’ without reference to any particular dialect (cf. K 3660ff.).²³

There is broad consensus that the form derives from an o-grade *kors-ó-* ‘that which is shaven’, linked to the verb κείρειν (cf. Hsch. K 3665ff. κορσόν· κορμόν, κορσοῦν· κείρειν) < (s)ker- ‘to shave’ (cf. Alb. *shqerr*; LIV²: 560f.). However, some forms may derive from the root *kers-* (LIV²: 358f.), as indicated by the presence of /s/ in compounds such as ἀκερσεκόμης ‘with unshaven hair’ (DELG: 568, Frisk 1960: 923, Beekes 2010: 755). Since the form exhibits an /o/ vowel via apophony, this cannot serve as proof of its dialectal affiliation, e.g. as an Aeolic or Arcado-Cypriot treatment of the sonorant *γ*.

²³ κόρσαι· αἱ τῶν ὄφρύων τρίχες καταφέρουσαι εἰς τοὺς ὄφθαλμούς. ἡ γνάθοι. ἡ κορυφαί... κεφαλίδας, ἐπάλξεις, προμαχῶναις. στεφάναι πύργων. ἡ κρόταροι. ἡ κλίμακες; κόρση· κεφαλή. ἐπαλξίς. κλημαξ. κρόταρος. Cf. however *Schol. In Il.* 4, 502a, 502b attributing the meaning ‘jaw’ to Attic, cf. κόρσην: τὸν κρόταρον· ἐπὶ κόρσης γὰρ λέγουσιν Ἀττικοὶ τὴν γνάθον.

Considering internal developments of Greek, the form exhibits no distinct Doric features, as might be expected for Sicily,²⁴ and the Doric variant κόρρα appears in Theocritus (14.34: τᾶμος ἔγώ, τὸν ἴσας τύ, Θυώνιχε, πὺξ ἐπὶ κόρρας). The alternative form κόρσης occurs in the work of the same author (25.255: κόρσης ὑπερ αὖν ἀείρας) likely for stylistic variation to avoid repeating κεφαλή.²⁵ The forms κόρρη or κόρση are semantically indistinguishable from κρόταφος (Pollux 2.40: *κράνιον*, with some calling κροτάφους or κόρρας; Rufinus, *Eph. Onom.* 13: τὰ δὲ ἐκατέρωθεν τοῦ βρέγματος κόρσαι καὶ κρόταφοι). The expression ἐπὶ κόρρης denotes striking someone's ears with the flat of the hand (Demosth. 21.72).

It is difficult to decide which form should be considered more 'authentic' in Theocritus' literary dialect. Conversely, the nominative plural κόρσαι in Alcaeus should be treated as Aeolic. The cluster /rs/ cannot be assigned to the literary Lesbian dialect. In Aeolic, -Vrs- generally develops into a short vowel plus a geminated sonorant, whereas other dialects yield a long vowel plus a single sonorant (cf. Lesb. στελλεῖν vs. non-Aeolic στειλεῖν; Lesb. ορρανος vs. non-Aeolic ουρανος). In literary Lesbian, further simplification of geminated resonants for metrical reasons also occurs (Blümel 1982: 102). Forms retaining /rs/ and /ls/ are widely spread in certain words (e.g., Hom. κέλσαι, ἔκερσεν, ἄρσην, and ἔρσην), whereas in some dialects the cluster /rs/ assimilated to /rr/ without affecting the preceding vowel (Attic ἄρρην, θάρρος), sometimes under the influence of Ionic. Similar phenomena occur in Western Ionic and Arcadian (e.g., φθεραι < φθερσαι; Lycophr.), Elean, Doric (Thera, Delphi), and authors such as Alcman, Epicharmus, Sophron, and Plutarch. Even in dialects that regularly have /rr/, original /rs/ may be retained by analogy (e.g., Attic καθάρσις), reflecting Ionic (Homeric) or later Koine influence.

Thus, the form κόρσας in the List, allegedly Sicilian, likely represents a form retaining the consonant cluster. It is plausible that it is in fact Ionic or Homeric, erroneously ascribed to Sicily. While a memory of Ionic presence in Sicily may have survived in grammatical tradition, this is unlikely, given that Ionic usage in Chalcidian colonies (Zancle, Himera, Leontinoi, etc.) ceased after the fifth century BCE, with only Doric traces thereafter. The true rationale for classifying κόρσας as Sicilian remains obscure. It is possible that the form κόρση was used by Empedocles (B 57: κόρσαι ἀναύχενες ἐβλάστησαν) and became associated with him (e.g. ἀναύχενος κόρση and other phrases attributed to Empedocles, Simplicius in *Cael.* 586.30; cf. Cat. 337.2;²⁶ Joh. Philoponus, *In libros de generatione animalium* 14.3,

²⁴ Cf. Mimbrera (2012: 191-222) for the description of dialectal situation in Sicily in Classical period.

²⁵ Scholia in Theocr. 14, 34a 2 κόρρην γάρ τὴν γνάθον καὶ σιαγόνα οἱ Ἀττικοί. <κόρρας:> τὰς σιαγόνας η τὰς μήνιγγας

²⁶ Arist. *De caelo* Γ 2. 300b 25

ἢι πολλαὶ μὲν κόρσαι ἀναύχενες ἐβλάστησαν
γυμνοὶ δ' ἐπλάζοντο βραχίονες εὔνιδες ὄμοιον,
ὅμματά τ' οἴ(α) ἐπλανάτο πενητεύοντα μετώπων.

'On it (the earth) many heads sprung up without necks and arms wandered bare and bereft of shoulders. Eyes strayed up and down in want of foreheads' R. P. 173 a.'; cf. also Simpl. *De caelo* 586, 29 ἀν εἴη μίξεως σημαντικὸν ἡ ἀναύχενος κόρση καὶ τάλλα τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἐμπεδοκλέους λεγόμενα 'γυμνοὶ ... μετώπων' καὶ πολλὰ ἄλλα, ἀπερ οὐκ ἔστι μίξεως παραδείγματα.

27, 31ff.: *τὰς ἀναύχενας κόρσας*).²⁷ Given Empedocles' Sicilian origin, the Homeric/Ionic form he used may have been mistakenly associated with Sicily as the ultimate source.

Setting aside the dialectological assessment of individual items, the principal issue concerns the rationale behind the Compiler's ordering of forms and, more broadly, the relationship between the List and the lexicon of Hesychius – the most substantial surviving lexicographical source. All items in the List (with the exception of *οὐλας* and *ἔστιοι*) are found in Hesychius, though without dialectal labels. As argued elsewhere (Sowa 2011: 172–179), these labels reflect neither linguistic reality nor vernacular usage. They derive instead from Homeric diction and have been arbitrarily, even randomly, assigned to dialects by the Compiler. This does not preclude the possibility that certain words are genuinely dialectal, but if so, their dialectal affiliation seldom corresponds to that suggested in the List (Sowa 2023: 122 ff.). Taken together, the analysis of the List and its relationship to Gregory of Corinth illustrates that ancient conceptions of dialectal 'normativity' were literary and prescriptive rather than descriptive in the modern sense. Both works illuminate ancient conceptions of Greek dialects, showing how literary and scholarly authority, rather than spoken practice, shaped perceptions of dialect correctness. The Compiler's assignment of forms to dialects reflects an interpretive tradition rooted in poetic and scholarly authority, rather than observation of vernacular usage. This reinforces the need to distinguish between ancient notions of dialect correctness and modern dialectological methodology.

The works of Gregory of Corinth and the anonymous *Γλῶσσαι* are fundamentally different, yet both illuminate ancient conceptions of Greek dialects. Returning to the initial question – whether a form of normativity can be posited in the lexical systems of Ancient Greek dialects – one must distinguish clearly between the ancient grammatical tradition and modern dialectological analysis. From the modern perspective, dialectal texts exhibit highly heterogeneous forms: vernacular dialectal items intermingle with literary or poetic usage, particularly in metrical funerary inscriptions; obsolete forms are replaced by newer or more frequent ones, or by forms belonging to a prestigious dialect (e.g. Attic or the *κοινή*). Greek dialects undoubtedly possessed social varieties, like any language, though the epigraphic record seldom allows such nuances to be recovered (García Ramón 2018: 64).

Linguistic variation continued to be conspicuous well into the Classical and Hellenistic periods, as inscriptions with vernacular features demonstrate. Literary practice also shaped contemporary expectations – Homer, studied intensively in education, familiarised

²⁷ ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ ὄπ' τοῦ Ἐμπεδοκλέους λεγόμενα ἀδύνατά ἔστι, καν συμφωνότερα τοῖς φαινομένοις τυχάνη. καὶ πῶς ἀδύνατα, ἐπάγει· ὥσπερ γάρ, φησι, καὶ μεγάλα ὄντα τὰ ἀνομοιομερῆ, ἡνίκα τὸ νεῖκος τῆς φιλίας ἐπεκράτησεν, οὐκ ἡδύνατο ἐμψυχα εἶναι (ἐμψύχους γάρ καὶ αἰσθησιν ἐχούσας ἔλεγε τὰς ἀναύχενας κόρσας) ὥσπερ οὖν αἱ μεγάλαι ἐκεῖναι κεφαλαὶ οὐκ ἡδύναντο ἐμψυχοι εἶναι 'Even what Empedocles says is impossible, even if it seems more in line with appearances. How so? He explains that large, heterogeneous things, when dominated by the strife of friendship, cannot be living beings. For example, he claimed that the "neckless *kórsai*" had life and sensation – but in reality, just as those enormous heads could not be alive, these too could not truly possess life or feeling.'

Athenians with non-Attic forms; the Doric of tragic choruses and mélos exposed audiences to further dialect features. Phonological contrasts such as the Ionic-Attic shift /a:/ → /e:/ or dialectal pronominal forms were readily perceptible to such educated readers. Only local slang and specialised vocabulary may have posed difficulty.

Gregory of Corinth's approach to dialectal 'normativity' is neither rigid nor absolute; he does not enforce a single standard but provides criteria for choosing among alternatives. He acknowledges and explains linguistic diversity rather than suppressing it and treats normativity as a tool for clarity and stylistic refinement. By contrast, the Γλῶσσαι do not refer to any standard form; instead, they consistently classify forms rooted in poetic diction as dialectal. As with modern languages, a dialect may constitute a complete linguistic system, but in Ancient Greek the high degree of shared material makes it difficult to determine what constitutes a specifically dialectal item, what merits lexicographical inclusion, and what is 'non-standard' relative to a presumed norm. In effect, the entire corpus is 'non-standard', and lexicographical treatment must therefore accommodate interdialectal influence, stylistic or functional variation, and chronological stratification. Ancient grammatical and lexicographical sources largely treat Homer as the repository of all non-standard Greek forms. By the time of Diogenianus, Hesychius, and Kyrillos – prior to the Atticist movement and its purist ideology – the dialects appear to have become an abstract construct – a storage place for all rare, obsolete, or otherwise anomalous words.

References

The Lesbian inscriptions are quoted by a number after Hodot 1990, pp. 272-317 using the specification of the finding place of Lesbian inscriptions as: MYT Mytilene, MAT Methymna, ERE Eressos, LES Lesbos without determination of a city and NAS the island of Nessos. The ancient authors have been quoted according to the electronic editions in Thesaurus Linguae Graecae Project. The abbreviations follow the model as in LSJ. The Lesbian poets, however, have been quoted according to the edition of E. Lobel and D. L. Page, *Poetarum Lesbiorum fragmenta*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1955, and according to D. L. Page, *Supplementum lyricis Graecis*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1974. The non-Aeolic Inscriptions and Papyri have been quoted after the electronic edition in PHI CD 6/7 (prepared by the Greek Epigraphy Project at Cornell University). The abbreviations follow the standard model.

Adams, D. Q. 2013. *A dictionary of Tocharian B, revised and greatly enlarged*. Amsterdam – New York: Rodopi.

Becares, V. 1988. Ein unbekanntes Werk des Gregorios von Korinth und seine Lebenszeit. *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 81. 247-248.

Bechtel, F. 1921. *Die griechischen Dialekte*. Erster Band: *Der lesbische, thessalische, böötische, arkadische und kyprische Dialekt*. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.

Beekes, R. 2010. *Etymological dictionary of Greek* (with the assistance of L. van Beek). Boston – Leiden: Brill.

Bekker, I. 1821. *Anecdota Graeca III*. Berlin: Typis et impensis G. Reimeri.

Blümel, W. 1982. *Die aiolischen Dialekte: Phonologie und Morphologie der inschriftlichen Texte aus generativer Sicht*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Bolognesi, G. 1953. Sul Περὶ διαλέκτων di Gregorio di Corinto. *Aevum* 27. 97-120.

Bonner, J. 1909. The mutual intelligibility of Greek dialects. *The Classical Journal* 4. 356-363.

Bowra, C. M. 1959. Γλῶσσαι κατά πόλεις. *Glotta* 38(1-2). 43-60.

Brandenburg, P. 2005. *Apollonios Dyskolos: Über das Pronomen: Einführung, Text, Übersetzung und Erläuterungen*. München – Leipzig: K. G. Saur.

Buck, C. D. 1955. *The Greek dialects: grammar, selected inscriptions, glossary*, Chicago.

Chantraine, P. 1948. *Grammaire homérique. Tome I : Phonétique et morphologie*. Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck.

Colvin, S. 1999. *Dialect in Aristophanes: The politics of language in Ancient Greek literature*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Coo, L. 2021. Sappho in fifth- and fourth-century Greek literature. In Finglass, P. J. & Kelly, A. (eds.), *The Cambridge companion to Sappho*, 263-276. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

de Andres, G. 1986. *Catálogo de los códices griegos de la Biblioteca Nacional*. Madrid: Ministerio de Cultura Dirección General del Libro y Bibliotecas.

DELG = Chantraine, P. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: Histoire des mots*. Tome I: (A-D) 1968, Tome II: (E-K) 1970, Tome III: (L-P) 1974. Paris: Klincksieck.

Dickey, E. 2007. *Ancient Greek scholarship: A guide to finding, reading and understanding scholia, commentaries, lexica and grammatical treatises, from their beginnings to the Byzantine Period*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Donnet, D. 1966. Précisions sur les œuvres profanes de Grégoire de Corinthe. *Bulletin de l'Institut Historique Belge de Rome* 37. 81-97.

Donnet, D. 1967. *Le traité Peri suntaxeōs logou de Grégoire de Corinthe: Étude de la tradition manuscrite*. Bruxelles – Rome: L'Institut historique belge de Rome.

Dubois, L. 1986. *Recherches sur le dialecte arcadien. I. Grammaire. II. Corpus dialectal. III. Notes – index – bibliographie*. Louvain-La-Neuve: Cabay.

Dunkel, G. E. 2004. Particles and personal pronouns: Inclusive *me and exclusive *ye. In Penney, J. H. W. (ed.), *Indo-European perspectives: Studies in honour of Anna Morpurgo Davies*, 18-29. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Egetmeyer, M. 2010. *Le dialecte grec ancien de Chypre*. Berlin – New York: de Gruyter.

Frisk, H. 1960. *Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: C. Winter.

García Ramón, J. L. 1975. *Les origines postmycéniennes du groupe dialectal éolien*. Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca.

García Ramón, J. L. 1999. Cuestiones de léxico y onomástica tessalios. In Cassio, A. C. (ed.), *Katà diálekton: Atti del III Colloquio Internazionale di Dialettopologia Greca – Napoli – Fiaiano d'Ischia, 25-28 settembre 1996*, 521-552. Napoli: Istituto Universitario Orientale.

García Ramón, J. L. 2018. Ancient Greek dialectology: Old and new questions, recent developments. In Giannakis, G. & Crespo, E. & Filos, P. (eds.), *Studies in Ancient Greek dialects from Central Greece to the Black Sea*, 29-106. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Glucker, J. 1970. Thucydides I 29, 3, Gregory of Corinth and the *ars interpretandi*. *Mnemosyne* 4th series. 23. 127-149.

Hadjioannou, K. P. 1977. *Ἡ ἀρχάia Κύπρος εἰς τὰς ἐλληνικὰς πηγάς*. Τόμος 3.2: *Κυπρίων Γλῶσσαι*. Nicosie: Ἐκδοσις ἱερᾶς ἀρχιεπισκοπῆς Κύπρου.

Hamm, E.-M. 1957. *Grammatik zu Sappho und Alkaios*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Hernández Vázquez, A. 1994. *Estudio léxico del jonio minorasiático*. Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca. (Doctoral dissertation.)

Hesych. = *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*. Vol. I A-Δ ed. Latte, K. & Cunningham, I. C. 2018; Vol. II E-O ed. Latte, K. & Cunningham, I. C. 2020; Vol. III Π-Σ ed. Hansen, P. A. 2005; Vol. IV Τ-Ω ed. Hanses, P. A. & Cunningham, I. C. 2009; Berlin – New York: Walter de Gruyter (Sammlung Griechischer und Lateinischer Grammatiker 11, 1-4).

Hodot, R. 1990. *Le dialecte éolien d'Asie: La langue des inscriptions vii^e s. a.C. iv^e s. p.C.* Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les civilisations.

Hoffmann, O. 1893. *Die griechischen Dialekte in ihrem historischen Zusammenhange*. 2. Band: *Der nord-achäische Dialekt*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.

Hunger, H. 1982. Gregorios von Korinth, Epigramme auf die Feste des Dodekaortos. *Analecta Bollandiana* 100. 637-651.

Iriarte, J. 1769. *Regiae bibliothecae matritensis codices graeci mss*. Madrid.

Kloekhorst, A. 2008. *Etymological dictionary of the Hittite inherited lexicon*. Leiden – Boston: Brill.

Kominis, A. 1960. *Gregorio Pardos, metropolita di Corinto, e la sua opera* (Testi e Studi Bizantino-neoellenici 2). Rome – Athens.

Latte, K. 1925. *Glossographika. Philologus* 80. 136-175.

Laurent, V. 1963. Review of Kominis (1960). *Revue des études byzantines* 21. 290-291.

Lejeune, M. 1972. *Phonétique historique du mycénien et du grec ancien*. Paris: Klincksieck.

LIV² = Rix, H. & Kümmel, M. & Zehnder T. & Lipp, R. & Schirmer, B. (eds.) 2001. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben: Die Wurzeln und ihren Primärstammbildungen*. 2nd edn. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Matzinger, J. 2012. 'ZwischenSprachen' – Areallinguistische Bemerkungen aus dem Bereich des Balkanindogermanischen. In Sadovski, V. & Stifter, D. (eds.), *Iranistische und indogermanistische Beiträge in memoriam Jochen Schindler (1944-1994)*, 137-159. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Meier-Brügger, M. 1986. Homerische Kunstsprache: Synchron und diachron. *Glotta* 64. 127-143.

Miller, D. G. 2014. *Ancient Greek dialects and early authors: Introduction to the dialect mixture in Homer, with notes on lyric and Herodotus*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Mimbrera, S. 2012. Sicilian Greek before the fourth century BCE. In Tribulato, O. (ed.), *Language and linguistic contact in Ancient Sicily*, 191-222. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Montana, F. 1995. *Gregorio di Corinto: Esegesi al Canone Giambico per la Pentecoste attribuito a Giovanni Damasceno*. Pisa: Giardini.

Morpurgo Davies, A. 1968. Article and demonstrative: A note. *Glotta* 46. 76-85.

Morpurgo Davies, A. 1987. The Greek notion of dialect. *Verbum* 10. 7-28.

OED = Simpson, J. A. & Weiner, E. S. C. 1989. *The Oxford English dictionary*. 2nd edn. Vol. 4. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Parker, H. N. 2008. The linguistic case for the Aiolian migration reconsidered. *Hesperia* 77. 431-464.

Peters, M. 1980. *Untersuchungen zur Vertretung der Indogermanischen Laryngale im Griechischen*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Peters, M. 1986. Zur Frage einer "achäischen" Phase des griechischen Epos. In Etter, A. (ed.), *O-o-pe-ro-si: Festschrift für Ernst Risch zum 75. Geburtstag*, 304-319. Berlin – New York: de Gruyter.

Peters, M. 1994. Griech. γῆ, γῆς, armen. erkir 'Erde'. In Vavroušek, P. (ed.), *Iranian and Indo-European studies: Memorial volume of Otakar Klima*, 203-213. Praha: Enigma Corporation.

Puhvel, J. 1984-. *Hittite etymological dictionary*. Vol. 1: *Words beginning with A*. Vol. 2: *Words beginning with E and I*. Berlin – New York – Amsterdam: Mouton.

Risch, E. 1974. *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache*. 2nd edn. Berlin – New York: de Gruyter.

Rix, H. 1992. *Historische Grammatik der griechischen: Laut- und Formenlehre*. 2nd edn. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Robins, R. H. 1993. *The Byzantine grammarians: Their place in history*. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Rodríguez Somolinos, H. 1998. *El léxico de los poetas lesbios*. Madrid: Instituto de Filología – Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.

Ruijgh, C. J. 1957. *L'élément achéen dans la langue épique*. Assen: Van Gorcum.

Ruijgh, C. J. 1971. *Autour de 'τε épique'*. Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert.

Scarborough, M. 2023. *The Aeolic dialects of Ancient Greek: A study in historical dialectology and linguistic classification*. Leiden – Boston: Brill.

Schäfer, G. H. (ed.). 1811. *Gregorii Corinthii et aliorum grammaticorum libri de dialectis linguae graecae, quibus additur nunc primus editus Manuels Moschopuli libellus de vocum passionibus*. Leipzig: A. G. Weigel.

Schmidt, J. 1900. Das Zahlwort πία, ἴα. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen* 36. 391-399.

Schoubben, N. 2019. *Byzantine descriptive linguistics: Introduction, translation and commentary of Gregory of Corinth on Aeolic*. Leiden: University of Leiden. (Seminar paper.)

Sowa, W. 2011. Griechische Dialekte, dialektale Glossen und die antike lexikographische Tradition. *Glotta* 87. 159-183.

Sowa, W. 2023. Γλῶσσαι κατὰ πόλεις: Greek dialects through the lenses of the ancient lexicography. In Machajdíková, B. & Eliášová Buzássyová, L. (eds.), *Greek – Latin – Slavic: Aspects of linguistics and grammaticography*, 115-144. Tübingen: Narr Francke Attempto.

Sowa, W. 2024. *Aioliká: Studia nad dialektem eolskim na podstawie Περὶ Αἰολίδος Grzegorza z Koryntu*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.

Thompson, D. W. 1895. *A glossary of Greek birds*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Thumb, A. & Scherer, A. 1959. *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte*. Bd. II. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.

Tribulato, O. 2019. Making the case for a linguistic investigation of Greek lexicography: Some examples from the Byzantine reception of Atticist lemmas. In Passa, E. & Tribulato, O. (eds.), *The paths of Greek: Literature, linguistics and epigraphy*, 241-270. Berlin – Boston: de Gruyter.

Tucker, E. F. 1990. *The creation of morphological regularity: Early Greek verbs in -éō, -áō, -óō, -úō, and -iō*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

van Windekkens, A. J. 1952. *Le Pélasgique: Essai sur une langue indo-européene préhellénique*. Louvain: Institut Orientaliste.

Wilson, N. G. 1996. *Scholars of Byzantium*. London: Duckworth & Co. Ltd.

Wyatt, W. F. 1992. Homer's linguistic forebears. *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 112. 167-173.

Yatromanolakis, D. 2007. *Sappho in the making: The early reception*. Washington: Centre for Hellenic Studies.