



ἀρέσκω, ἀπαρέσκω (with accusative or dative)(Moer. η 6, [Hdn.] *Philet.* 88)

Brian Cluysse

Trinity College Dublin

**Abstract:** This article provides a philological and linguistic commentary on the argument structure alternation between the Nominative-Accusative and the Nominative-Dative with the Ancient Greek verbs ἀρέσκω and ἀπαρέσκω. Starting from the first recorded discussion of this alternation in the Atticist lexica Moer. η 6 and [Hdn.] *Philet.* 88, I assess the linguistic validity of the Atticists' labels κοινόν/κοινῶς ἐν Ἀττικαί/ἀττικῶς and track the diachronic development of the alternation from Homeric to Modern Greek. I pay particular attention to how animacy, diathesis, (pro)nominality and genre/register relate to a difference in case marking (Accusative or Dative).

**Keywords:** Accusative, Dative, Argument structure alternation, Diachronic change, Syntax

**Cite this:** Brian Cluysse, 'ἀρέσκω, ἀπαρέσκω (with accusative or dative) (Moer. η 6, [Hdn.] *Philet.* 88)', in Olga Tribulato (ed.), *Digital Encyclopedia of Atticism*. With the assistance of E. N. Merisio.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2025/02/031>

## A. Main sources

(1) Moer. η 6: ἤρεσέ με Ἀττικοί· ἤρεσέ μοι κοινόν.

Cf. schol. rec. Ar. *Ra.* 103 (B<sub>1</sub>). κοινόν C: om. VF

Users of Attic [say] ἤρεσέ με ('it pleased me [acc.]); ἤρεσέ μοι ('it pleased me [dat.]) [is] common.

(2) [Hdn.] *Philet.* 88: τὸ ἀρέσκει ῥῆμα οὐ μόνον τῇ αἰτιατικῇ πτώσει συντάττουσιν, οἷον ἀρέσκει με τότε καὶ οὐκ ἀρέσκει με, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῇ δοτικῇ. καὶ ὁ Δημοσθένης. εἰ μὲν ἤρεσκέ τί μοι τῶν ὑπὸ τούτων ῥηθέντων. ᾧ καὶ μάλλον χρηστέον.

Cf. [Hdn.] *Philet.* 29; *Su.* α 3827; Anon. Περὶ συντάξεως α 57 with references.

They (i.e., Attic authors) combine the verb ἀρέσκει with the accusative as ἀρέσκει με τότε ('I like that') and οὐκ ἀρέσκει με ('that does not please me') but also with the dative. Demosthenes (4.1): 'εἰ μὲν ἤρεσκέ τί μοι τῶν ὑπὸ τούτων ῥηθέντων' ('if something he has said pleased me'). This [construction] should rather be used.



## B. Other erudite sources

(1) Schol. Ar. *Ra.* 103: σὲ δὲ ταῦτ' ἀρέσκει· ἀντὶ τοῦ σοί. ἀττικῶς.

Cf. schol. Ar. *Lys.* 509 (RΓ); schol. Ar. *Pl.* 353; schol. (Tz.) Ar. *Ra.* 103; schol. Eur. *Or.* 210.02 (rec. exeg.) Mastronarde.

σὲ δὲ ταῦτ' ἀρέσκει ('you like that'): [σέ is used] instead of σοί in the Attic manner.

(2) Lesb. Gramm. *De figuris* 11.1–6: τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀσίας Ἑλλήνων· ἀρέσκει με' ἀντὶ τοῦ μοί. οὕτως δὲ γίνεται· συντασσομένης δοτικῆς πτώσεως ῥήμασιν αὐτοὶ ἐπὶ αἰτιατικὴν προφέρουσι· [...] καὶ Ἀττικοί, ὡς καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης ὁ κωμικὸς ἀρέσκει με' λέγων [...].

The Greeks in Asia [say] ἀρέσκει με ('it pleases me [acc.]) instead of μοί ('[it pleases] me [dat.]). This came to be in the following way. Although the verbs are combined with the dative, they (i.e. the Greeks in Asia) use the accusative. [...] And the Attic writers too, like the comic playwright Aristophanes (*Pl.* 353) who says ἀρέσκει με ('it pleases me [acc.]).

(3) Lesb. Gramm. *De figuris* 13B.18–22: καὶ μετὰ αἰτιατικῆς δὲ ταῦτα συντάσσουσιν, οἷον συνήνησέ με ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐμοί· ὡς καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης ὁ κωμικὸς ἀρέσκει με λέγων. καὶ ἔτι τὰ μετὰ γενικῆς συντασσόμενα ῥήματα αἰτιατικῆ συντάσσουσιν, οἷον αὐτός με ἤρετο καὶ ἀφαιρεῖταιί με ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐμοῦ.

And they combine these with the accusative as in συνήνησέ με instead of ἐμοί. Just like the comic playwright Aristophanes (*Pl.* 353), saying ἀρέσκει με'. And they also combine verbs which are constructed with the genitive, with the accusative as in 'αὐτός με ἤρετο' and 'ἀφαιρεῖταιί με' instead of 'ἐμοῦ'.

(4) AO 4.286.5: ἀρέσκω· δοτικῆ μὴ δὲ τοῖς πολλοῖς ἀρέσκων.

ἀρέσκω: With the dative. 'He who does not please many people' (Gr.Naz. *Or.* 43.64.4)

(5) Greg. Cor. *De dialectis* 2.23: ἀντὶ δοτικῆς πολλάκις τὴν αἰτιατικὴν ἠγαπήκασιν. ὡς ὁ Θουκυδίδης· εἰ οὖν τί σε τούτων ἀρέσκει, πέμπε ἄνδρα πιστὸν ἐπὶ θάλασσαν. καὶ Σοφοκλῆς· οὐ γάρ μ' ἀρέσκει γλῶσσά σου τεθηγμένη. ἀντὶ τοῦ οὐ γάρ μοι. καὶ ὄλως μυρία εὐρήσεις ἂν τῶν λεγομένων τὰ παραδείγματα, καὶ παρ' Ὀμήρω καὶ παρὰ πᾶσι τοῖς Ἀττικισταῖς.

Cf. schol. Ar. *Pl.* 72, which is probably Gregory of Corinth's source (see Hedberg 1935, 91); cf. also schol. rec. Ar. *Pl.* 73.

Instead of the dative, they often prefer the accusative like Thucydides (1.128.7): 'εἰ οὖν τί σε τούτων ἀρέσκει, πέμπε ἄνδρα πιστὸν ἐπὶ θάλασσαν' ('if something of these things pleases you, send a trustworthy man to the sea') and Sophocles (*Ai.* 584): 'οὐ γάρ μ' ἀρέσκει γλῶσσά σου τεθηγμένη' ('for I do not like your sharpened tongue.') instead of 'οὐ γάρ μοι'. And in short, you will find that the examples of what I am saying are numerous, especially in Homer and in the Atticising authors.



*PURA – PURism in Antiquity*

(6) Schol. Thuc. 1.128.7 Kleinlogel: b<sup>1</sup> (σε... ἀρέσκει:) ἀντὶ τοῦ σοί. Ἀττικὴ δὲ καὶ ἀρχαία ἢ φράσις ἀντὶ δοτικῆς αἰτιατικῆς συντάξαι (Θ [ABFC<sup>3</sup> PlUdPe<sup>3</sup>]). b<sup>2</sup> Ἀττικὴ καὶ ἀρχαία συνηθεία (Θ [G]).

(b<sup>1</sup>) (σε... ἀρέσκει:) instead of ‘σοί’. It is an Attic and ancient way of speaking to construct [the verb] with the accusative instead of the dative. (b<sup>2</sup>) in the typical Attic and ancient usage.

(7) Schol. rec. Ar. Ra. 103: σέ...ἀρέσκει] σοὶ ἀρεστὰ φαίνεται [...] καὶ συντάσσεται κοινῶς μὲν δοτικῇ ἀττικῶς δὲ αἰτιατικῇ.

σέ...ἀρέσκει]: They seem pleasing to you [...] and it is constructed with the dative in the common language but with the accusative in the Attic way.

### **C. Loci classici, other relevant texts**

(1) Hom. *Il.* 4.362–3:

ἀλλ’ ἴθι ταῦτα δ’ ὄπισθεν ἀρεσσόμεθ’ εἴ τι κακὸν νῦν  
εἴρηται [...].

But come on, we’ll amend these things later, if something bad has been said [...].

(2) Hom. *Il.* 19.179–80:

αὐτὰρ ἔπειτά σε δαιτὶ ἐνὶ κλισίῃς ἀρεσάσθω  
πιείρη.

Cf. Hom. *Il.* 9.112, 19.183; Hom. *Od.* 8.396, 8.402, 8.415, 22.55.

But then let him appease you in his hut with a rich feast.

(3) [Hes.] *Sc.* 255–6:

[...] αἶ δὲ φρένας εὖτ’ ἀρέσαντο  
αἵματος ἀνδρομέου [...].

But when they satisfied their souls with human blood [...].

(4) Thgn. 1.762–3:

ἡμεῖς δὲ σπονδὰς θεοῖσιν ἀρεσσάμενοι  
πίνωμεν [...].

Let us drink, after appeasing the gods as far as libations.

(5) Aesch. *Supp.* 655:

τοιγάρ τοι καθαροῖσι βωμοῖς θεοὺς ἀρέσσονται.



Because they will please the gods by means of clean altars.

(6) Apoll.Rh. 3.300–1:

αὐτοί τε λιαροῖσιν ἐφαιδρύναντο λοετροῖς,  
ἀσπασίως δόρπῳ τε ποτήτι τε θυμὸν ἄρεσσαν.

See also [Hes.] Sc. 255 (= [C.3](#); φρένας); Call. fr. 265.17 SH (θυμὸν); Nonn. D. 25.370 (θυμὸν); [SEG 35.1055.15–6](#) (= [C.9](#); θέμιν); *Epitomi sanctorum Flori et Lauri* 1.19 Halkin (τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ).

They (i.e. the servants) had freshened themselves up with warm baths and gladly satisfied their heart with food and drinks.

(7) D.C. 38.2.2: [...] μεταγράψειν ἢ καὶ παντελῶς ἀπαλείψειν εἴ γέ τῳ μὴ ἀρέσειέ τι,  
ὑποσχόμενος.

[...] he promised to alter or even completely erase [it] if he would not like it.

(8) D.C. 38.3.3: [...] ἐγὼ μὲν ὑμᾶς καὶ δικαστὰς τοῦ νόμου καὶ κυρίους ἐποιησάμην, ὅπως, εἴ τι  
μὴ ἀρέσειεν ὑμᾶς, μηδ' ἐς τὸν δῆμον ἐσενεχθεῖη.

[...] I have made you judges and masters of the laws so that, if something should not please you, it would not be brought before the people.

(9) [SEG 35.1055.9–16](#) [Tibur, area around Aquae Albulae, Italy, ca. 365 CE]: οὗτος <τ>οῦ κλέος  
εὐρὺ | κατὰ χθόνα καὶ κατὰ πόντον, | ὁ κλυτὸς ὡς οὔτις | καὶ σοφὸς ὡς ὀλίγοι, | γείτονας ἔδρας  
ἔχων βασιληΐδος | ἐγγύθεν αἴγλης | ἀνθ' ἑκατομβοίων | τὴν θέμιν ἠρέσατο.

This man, renowned on land and at sea, illustrious like no one and wise like few others, who, having his seat near imperial majesty, liked justice over the sacrifices of a hundred oxen.

#### D. General commentary

The metalinguistic observations collected in the sources above (see Sections [A.](#) and [B.](#)) provide valuable insights into the argument structure of the verb ἀρέσκω ('to like, to please') and its compound ἀπαρέσκω ('to dislike, to displease'), especially from a diachronic and stylistic point of view. While both verbs – but not other compounds such as συναρέσκω ('to please together') or related derivatives like εὐαρεστέω ('to be well pleasing') – alternate between taking an accusative or a dative argument alongside the nominative (i.e. Nominative–Accusative or Nominative–Dative), this variation appears to be constrained, as the entries above suggest (see also the brief mention in Monaco 2024, 55 and Cluyse, Barðdal in prep., for a larger study of these two verbs).



## PURA – PURism in Antiquity

In the texts of Classical Greek authors such as Sophocles, Aristophanes, and Thucydides, the verb ἀρέσκω governs either an accusative or a dative argument, as observed by the pseudo-Herodianic *Philetaerus* (A.2) and corroborated by further sources (B.1, B.2, B.3, B.5, B.7). The substitution of the dative for the accusative reflects a broader tendency in (Attic) Greek towards case variation in argument structures, where one case is ‘replaced’ by, or rather alternates with, another case (cf. B.2, B.3; in general see Agnostopoulou, Sevdali 2015; de la Villa 2017, 2025; Luraghi 2020, 238–9, 272–9, among others). While the Nominative–Accusative versus Nominative–Dative alternation with ἀρέσκω does not seem to entail any obvious semantic difference (cf. Schwyzer 1939, 73; Luraghi 2022, 241; *pace* Smyth 1956, 355), Atticist testimonia suggest that the two case markings are not stylistically interchangeable. Moeris (A.1), two Aristophanic scholia (B.1, B.7), and Gregory of Corinth (B.5) characterise the use of the accusative as a prototypical Attic feature, which could therefore appeal to Atticist writers. This association is articulated most explicitly by Moeris (A.1) and the scholium on Aristophanes’ *Frogs* (B.7), both of which contrast the ‘Attic accusative’ with the dative, labelling the latter as ‘κοινόν/κοινῶς’ (‘of the common language’). As Monaco (2021, 32–3; 2024, 46–69) and others (AGP 1, 68–74; Pellettieri 2024) have rightly noted, however, the term κοινόν in Moeris can cover a broad spectrum of sociolinguistic registers, and its precise interpretation must be determined on a case-by-case basis. In this instance, the label likely reflects Moeris’ subjective assessment of the construction (see also Monaco 2024, 55; Pellettieri 2024): while the accusative might have sounded more ‘Attic’ to him, its actual use is restricted to a limited group of authors (as discussed below). Moreover, the dative is significantly more frequent than the accusative in Classical Attic Greek and comes to serve as the standard case marking of the second argument in Post-Classical Greek, the period in which Moeris himself wrote. This view aligns with Moeris’ broader tendency to contrast forms widely attested across different genres and periods – which he classifies as ‘κοινόν/κοινῶς’ – with more ‘marked’ forms, perceived as distinctly Attic, whether favoured by Attic writers or simply rarer in use (Monaco 2024, 51–4, 63; Pellettieri 2024). Moreover, as case alternations of this kind (a phenomenon that ancient grammarians would have called ἀντίπτωσις) were considered a typical feature of Attic Greek, they became a point of interest for Atticist sources like Moeris. Moeris therefore dedicates his attention primarily to the general deployment of the accusative case (see Hedberg 1935, 83–96 for more on ἀντίπτωσις and Atticist scholarship). His preference for the accusative over the dative is thus not rooted in factual evidence – frequency or universality – but in a subjective assessment of the construction, likely also shaped by his choice of textual sources (see on Moeris, Sakalis 1977; Roumanis, Bentein 2023, 12–3; Monaco 2024, 39; Pellettieri 2024; and similarly on the *Antiatticist*, Tribulato 2021, 184–6). Hence, while Moeris (A.1) correctly observes that the accusative occurs in Attic Greek, his strict dichotomy between Ἀττικοί (accusative) and κοινόν (dative) oversimplifies the evidence and obscures the accusative’s limited use. On the other hand, as described in more detail below, the opposition between the two configurations does capture a real stylistic distinction (ἄττικῶς – κοινῶς): the ‘Attic’ accusative is limited to middle- and high-register texts, whereas the dative is attested consistently across all registers, including non-literary papyri, e.g., P.Sakaon 38.32 (= TM 13056)



## PURA – PURism in Antiquity

[Theadelphia, 17 Aug 312 CE]; O.Did. 415.12–3 (= [TM 144976](#)) [Didymoi, 140–150 CE]; CPR 25.14.3–4 (= [TM 92445](#)) [Arsinoites (?), 6th century CE]; and inscriptions, e.g., [IG 7.190.25](#) [Megaris, Pagai, 1st century BCE], [IG 2<sup>2</sup>.1368.17–9](#) [Attica, after 178 CE].

In contrast to Moeris' largely descriptive approach, other lexicographers and grammarians adopt a more prescriptive stance. While acknowledging that both constructions occur, the pseudo-Herodianic *Philetaerus* ([A.2](#)) explicitly prescribes the dative over the accusative, adding  $\hat{\omega}$  και μάλλον χρηστέον ('this should rather be used') after exemplifying the dative construction (on the meaning of  $\chi\rho\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$  and related expressions see Valente 2013). Notably, this entry ([A.2](#)) illustrates the 'correct' or 'preferable' dative usage with an example from Demosthenes while the dispreferred accusative equivalent is exemplified using the (formally unattested) phrase  $\acute{\alpha}\rho\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota$  με τόδε – though the expression  $\sigma\upsilon\kappa$   $\acute{\alpha}\rho\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota$  με does occur and is likely derived from Aristophanes' *Wealth* 353. Given pseudo-Herodian's strong evaluative stance in favour of the dative, his entry appears to be shaped by the overall proclivity of  $\acute{\alpha}\rho\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\kappa\omega$  to pair with the dative across Classical and Post-Classical Greek, rather than by the idiosyncrasy of the accusative. Supporting this trend, the *Anecdota Oxoniensia* ([B.4](#)) mention only the use of the dative, omitting any reference to the accusative.

The grammarian Lesbonax ([B.2](#)), by contrast, draws attention to regional variation, attributing the use of the accusative to both Greek speakers in Asia and Classical Attic writers, though no surviving evidence of this so-called 'Greek from Asia' exists to verify this claim (see Blank 1988, 139–40, 142–3). In contrast, a scholium on Thucydides ([B.6](#)) describes the accusative configuration ( $\phi\rho\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\varsigma$ ) as Ἀττικῆ ('Attic') and ἀρχαία ('ancient'), and Ἀττικῆ καὶ ἀρχαία συνηθεία ('in the typical Attic and ancient usage'). In Atticist testimonies, the labels παλαιός and ἀρχαίος refer to the use of certain constructions by 'the ancients', which sometimes coincides with those by οἱ Ἀττικοί ('the Attic writers') but can likewise be opposed to them (Sakalis 1977; Strobel 2012; Matthaios 2013, 117–24). Given that the scholium ([B.6](#)) distinguishes between both, it seems plausible that ἀρχαία here denotes the use by Greek authors before the Classical Greek Attic writers, perhaps Homer. In this regard, one may note that Atticists sometimes associated Homeric language with '(Old) Attic', grounded in Aristarchus' assumption that Homer was Athenian and that his language represented an older Attic dialect (see Probert 2004, 288–90; Montana 2015, 140–1, especially n. 371 with references; Schironi 2018; Monaco 2024, 43–6; Pellettieri 2024). This connection between Homeric and Attic usage is further corroborated by the Byzantine grammarian Gregory of Corinth (11th–12th century) ([B.5](#)), who remarks that the accusative is found in 'Homer and all Atticising/Attic authors' ( $\pi\alpha\rho$ ' Ὀμήρω καὶ παρὰ πᾶσι τοῖς Ἀττικισταῖς), explicitly acknowledging Homeric instances of the accusative construction. In this regard, the term Ἀττικισταί, rare in Atticist lexica, is used in the extant evidence to denote specifically Atticist writers (Sewell 2023, 146; *AGP* 1, 85), though it might also refer to Attic writers themselves, since Gregory does not seem to differentiate between the two labels (Hedberg 1935, 91 n.1). Taken together, these testimonies ([B.5](#), [B.6](#)) suggest that the accusative occurred in Homer as well as in



*PURA – PURism in Antiquity*

Classical Attic authors – a conclusion supported by the available evidence (see [C.1](#), [C.2](#), [F.1](#)), though largely overlooked in other Atticist sources.

These observations underscore the need for a rigorous analysis of all attestations before assessing the validity of the prescriptions found in these Atticist lexica, and highlight the differences between the interpretations offered by individual lexicographers and grammarians. A corpus-based investigation confirms that both the accusative and the dative occur with ἀρέσκω and ἀπαρέσκω in the Classical period (5th–4th century BCE), though with markedly different frequencies (K–G vol. 1, 293–4; Schwyzer 1939, 143–4; 146). Both case markings are attested in Plato, Euripides, Aristophanes, Thucydides, Xenophon, Sophocles, and (possibly) Antiphanes whereas only the dative is found in other authors such as Demosthenes, Aristotle, Herodotus, Isocrates, Lysias, the Hippocratic corpus, and Aeschines, among others. [Table 1](#) below summarises the distribution of the two configurations across Classical Greek authors.

**Table 1:** Distribution of the accusative and dative in Classical Greek authors (5th–4th century BCE)

Author	Accusative	Dative
Plato	12	39
Euripides	3 (+1)	4 (+4)
Aristophanes	5	4
Xenophon	1	29
Thucydides	1	12
Sophocles	1	6
Antiphanes	(1)	(1)
Aeschylus	1	
Demosthenes		17 (+1)
Aristotle		15 (+3)
Herodotus		14
Isocrates		9
Lysias		3
Aeneas Tacitus		2
Hippocratic corpus		2
Aeschines		1
Aristoxenus		1
Isaeus		1
Antisthenes		(5)
Callisthenes		(2)
Diocles	(1)	(2)



PURA – PURism in Antiquity

Theopompus		(2)
Alcidamas		(1)
Antiochus		(1)
Heraclides		(1)
Ion		(1)
Nicostratus		(1)
<b>Total</b>	24 (+3)	159 (+25)

[Table 1](#) includes both finite and non-finite verb forms (i.e. imperatives, participles and infinitives), including impersonal forms such as (ἀπ)ἀρέσκει, (ἀπ)ῆρεσε etc. where the subject is expressed by an infinitival construction or finite ὄτι-clause, but such forms can still occur with an accusative or dative (Viti 2017, 374–8; see also van Emde Boas *et al.* 2019, 465–7; 470; Spangenberg Yanes 2017, 136 with references). The data, taken from the online TLG database, shows that ἀρέσκω is far more frequent than ἀπαρέσκω; the latter occurs only twice among the examples gathered in [Table 1](#) (i.e. Pl. *Tht.* 202d.8 with accusative, Thuc. 1.38.4 with dative). While the accusative is attested 24 times, the dative accounts for the majority of the examples, totalling 159 cases.

Yet, the distribution of the data is affected by three main methodological constraints. First, [Table 1](#) excludes instances of passive or medio-passive verb forms where the accompanying dative clearly functions as an adjunct, since in such cases the dative does not belong to the verb’s core argument structure. Although the context generally suffices to determine the dative’s function, additional cues such as its inanimacy can further support this interpretation (see Luraghi 1987; de la Villa 1989 for detailed criteria). Second, the textual transmission of several Classical texts is highly fragmentary; many passages survive only through indirect transmission (e.g., Athenaeus, Sextus Empiricus, Plutarch). In such cases, it is impossible to verify the textual reliability or authorship of the surviving material. Despite these uncertainties, such fragments remain informative for assessing the broader distribution of the accusative and dative with (ἀπ)ἀρέσκω; they are therefore included in [Table 1](#) between brackets. Finally, certain examples from Sophocles, Euripides, and Aristophanes raise interpretative issues due to the phonological clash between the final vowel(s) of an accusative or dative pronoun and the initial vowel of a form of ἀρέσκω e.g., Soph. *Ai.* 584: οὐ γάρ μ’ ἀρέσκει γλῶσσά σου τεθηγμένῃ (‘I do not like your sharpened tongue.’). It is unclear whether μ’ here represents the accusative pronoun με or the dative μοι. Later sources like schol. rec. Ar. *Pl.* 72, schol. Ar. *Pl.* 353, and Greg. Cor. *De dialectis* 2.23 ([B.5](#)) assume the former, as do Cooper (1998, 295) and Finglass (2011, 309). Méndez Dosuna (2014, 231), while confirming that elision of -ε before ἀ- and ἦ- is common in Attic drama, questions other cases such as Ar. *Th.* 405: τὸ χρώμα τοῦτό μ’ οὐκ ἀρέσκει τῆς κόρης (‘This girl’s hue doesn’t please me’), suggesting a potential crasis of μοι and οὐκ (*pace* Cooper 1998, 295; Austin, Olson 2004, 182; see also Ar. *Ach.* 189, Ar. *Pl.* 353). Since there is no decisive evidence that μ’ + ὀ-/οὐ- represents a crasis of μοι + ὀ-/οὐ- rather than an elision of με/μοι + ὀ-/οὐ-, these examples have not been included in [Table 1](#).



## PURA – PURism in Antiquity

Even in Soph. *Ai.* 584, the assumption that  $\mu'$  results from the elision of  $\mu(\epsilon)$  rather than  $\mu(\omicron)$  remains open to question, although Méndez Dosuna (2014, 231) considers such cases to reflect elision of  $-\epsilon$ .

Examining the distribution of the accusative and dative across genres, the accusative appears predominantly in dialogic contexts – tragedy (Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides), comedy (Aristophanes, Antiphanes) and Plato's dialogues – whereas historiography and oratory overwhelmingly favour the dative construction, even though the latter is also intended for oral delivery. This pattern might indicate a genre-related preference, though such a hypothesis would need to be corroborated by investigating other linguistic phenomena (see further below).

In sum, while the Atticist entries accurately register the use of the accusative configuration in Classical Greek, they do not differentiate between writers who employ it and those who do not (see [Table 1](#)). Nevertheless, these sources reveal a distinction in register: the Attic accusative occurs in (middle-) and high-register texts, whereas the dative appears consistently across all registers, a pattern that may also reflect the influence of discourse modes, with the accusative surfacing primarily in dialogic texts, while monologic texts employ the dative in Classical Greek.

Still, beyond stylistic variation, these lexicographers and grammarians overlook the diachronic development of the argument structure with  $\acute{\alpha}\rho\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\kappa\omega$  and  $\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\kappa\omega$ . Crucially, they fail to recognise that the accusative was already in use prior to the Classical Attic period – a point likely outside their intended scope (but see [B.2](#), [B.5](#), [B.6](#)). Most strikingly, Homeric Greek presents only accusative arguments with these two verbs, which are almost exclusively attested in the aorist middle ([C.1](#), [C.2](#) and see [F.1](#)). The sole exception is a formulaic verse featuring the active aorist infinitive  $\acute{\alpha}\rho\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\alpha\iota$  (*Il.* 9.120; 19.138) – though its usage may be semantically middle (see [F.1](#)) (further discussion in Cluyse, Barðdal in prep.). Similarly, Aeschylus ([C.5](#)) provides a clear instance of a core Nominative-Accusative pattern, with  $\kappa\alpha\theta\alpha\rho\acute{\omicron}\iota\sigma\iota\ \beta\omega\mu\omicron\iota\varsigma$  behaving as an instrumental dative (Sommerstein 2019, 271), comparable to  $\pi\iota\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\eta$  in the Homeric example ([C.2](#) and cited examples) (K–G vol. 1, 439; Schwyzer 1939, 167–8). The pseudo-Hesiodic example ([C.3](#)) too demonstrates a Nominative-Accusative argument structure, unusually extending the use of the (partitive) genitive. This genitive, typically associated with verbs of satiation, appears to encroach on  $\acute{\alpha}\rho\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\kappa\omega$ 's domain, replacing the instrumental dative, which is regularly found in other instances (Luraghi 2022, 236 referring to Luraghi 2020, 101–3). In this case, the verb is best translated as 'to satiate, to satisfy' rather than 'to please, to like' (see also [C.6](#) and Hunter 1989, 132 on 'satisfy' in that verse).

By contrast, early post-Homeric evidence already features a dative constituent, attesting to the early use of the dative alongside the accusative – something that was neglected by Luraghi (2022), who claims that the dative is a novel construction first observed in Herodotus. A line by Theognis (ca. 7th century BCE) showcases an accusative alongside a dative in the same sentence ([C.4](#)). This combination can easily



## PURA – PURism in Antiquity

obscure the verb's precise argument structure, i.e. whether Nominative–Accusative or Nominative–Dative. Hudson-Williams (1910, 224), in his commentary on this line, takes the accusative *σπονδάς* as a direct object and the dative *θεοῖσιν* as a regular indirect object (cf. also K–G vol. 1, 414 who translate it as 'einem etw. angenehm machen'). To support his claim, he draws on a proposed comparison between the argument structures of *χαρίζομαι τι τινί* (Accusative–Dative) / *τινί τινι* (Dative–Dative) and *ἀρέσκομαι τινά τινι* (Accusative–Dative) / *τι τινί* (Accusative–Dative), aiming to show that different argument structures can still convey the same meaning (see also van Groningen 1966, 294). Instead, I prefer to analyse the fundamental argument structure as Nominative–Dative, taking the accusative *σπονδάς* as an accusative of respect – a specific function of the Ancient Greek accusative used to delineate the scope of the predicate's application (Romagno 2017, 2020) (see also Cluyse, Barðdal in prep.). Other instances of the Nominative–Dative pattern are likewise more economically explained by assuming an accusative of respect (e.g. NT 1Cor. 10.33).

Overall, both Homeric and post-Homeric sources already attest the presence of the accusative construction with (*ἀπ*)*ἀρέσκω*, alongside the dative which emerges almost contemporaneously (C.4), well before the Classical period. Yet, this conclusion should be supplemented by an important observation concerning the diathesis of the verb forms governing the accusative. In Archaic and (Early)-Classical Greek (i.e. Aeschylus), the accusative argument consistently depends on a middle verb form (see C.1, C.2, C.3, C.5), and invariably denotes an animate (human) referent, always expressed through a full noun. In fact, throughout the history of Greek, the accusative is almost exclusively associated with animate entities, regardless of the governing verb's diathesis, with only a handful of exceptions (see C.6 with references). Even in those rare instances where the accusative is inanimate, it frequently refers to parts of the human body, preserving an underlying human association (*φρένας* x1, *θυμόν* x3). In Classical Greek, by contrast, the accusative shows a strong correlation with *active* verb forms, is always animate, and can be expressed by either a pronoun or full noun, though pronouns cover the majority of the instances (22 pronouns vs. 2 nouns). The handful of exceptions to this always involve animate (full noun) accusatives with *middle* verb forms (see Aesch. *Supp.* 655 (C.5); Eur. fr. 948; X. *Mem.* 4.3.16). Datives in Classical Greek are likewise primarily animate with active verb forms, whether pronouns or full nouns, though they may occasionally be inanimate – Isoc. 3.16, Is. 1.34 are the only two instances out of 149 cases. With medio-passive verb forms, the dative is typically inanimate (9/16 instances), raising the issue of whether it functions as a core argument within the Nominative–Dative configuration or as an adjunct expressing instrument or reason. An interesting point in this regard is raised by the Latin grammarian Priscian who likely relied on Atticist sources when comparing the argument structure of *ἀρέσκω* with its Latin equivalent *placeo/placo*, writing 18.33.3–4 Rosellini (3.302.11–2 Hertz): *Illi 'ἀρέσκω αὐτόν' καὶ 'ἀρέσκομαι αὐτῷ'. Nos 'placo illum' et 'placor ab illo' vel 'placor illi' et 'placeo illi'*. As noted by Spangenberg Yanes (2017, 135), Priscian seems to imply a relationship between the diathesis of the verb and the case marking of the argument, with the active verb



## PURA – PURism in Antiquity

forms governing the accusative, while the medio-passive ones license a dative argument. However, as the examples in Section C. demonstrate (see also LSJ s.v. I.2–3, II, III), ἀρέσκω occurs with both case markings in the active and medio-passive, while Latin distinguishes between *placeo* with the dative and its causative counterpart *placo* which governs the accusative (see also Cluyse, Somers, Barðdal 2025, 331). In any case, not all of these subtleties are captured in the Atticist testimonies. Only three sources mention the use of the accusative in Pre-Classical Greek (B.2, B.5, B.6), and they do so solely with reference to active verb forms, as is the case in the other Atticist testimonies (A.1, A.2, B.1, B.3, B.7), despite the fact that the accusative is always governed by middle forms in Pre-Classical Greek. The Atticist testimonies thus do not seem to make a distinction between the accusative with active and middle verb forms, though this opposition proves important when assessing the degree of Atticism in later periods (see below).

Turning to the Post-Classical Greek period (3rd century BCE–6th century CE; cf. the periodisation system of Bentein 2016), the accusative remains attested throughout, although its frequency stays considerably lower than that of the dative. In the Early Post-Classical period (3rd–1st century BCE), 14 instances of the accusative construction can be identified, distributed across a diverse range of authors: Theocritus (1.60); Apollonius of Rhodes (1.353, 1.963, 2.462, 3.187, 3.301 (C.6), 3.668, 4.246); Menander (fr. 156.1); Callimachus (fr. 265.17); Herodas (4.81); Maiistas (v. 11); Dionysius of Halicarnassus (1.88, *Rh.* 8.14), and Parthenius (6.6). Unlike in the Classical Greek period, where accusatives correlate primarily with active verb forms, in Early Post-Classical Greek, it occurs predominantly with middle verbs – the only exceptions of active forms coming from Apollonius of Rhodes (C.6) and Menander fr. 156.1. This distribution thus aligns more closely with that observed in Archaic Greek than with Classical usage. Yet, whereas accusatives surface only as full nouns in Archaic Greek and Classical Greek displays a clear predominance for pronominal accusative arguments (22 pronouns vs. 2 full nouns), full nouns outnumber pronouns in Early Post-Classical Greek (9 vs. 5 cases). Moreover, as in earlier periods, most examples of the accusative are found in poetry, although the small number of attestations cautions against drawing firm generalisations. The dative, by contrast, exhibits patterns broadly consistent with those of Classical Greek: it is overwhelmingly governed by active verbs (108/117 cases), typically denotes animate referents (107/117 instances), and, when inanimate, is associated with medio-passive verbs (7/10 cases). However, it displays an almost equal split between pronouns and full nouns (56 vs. 61 instances), whereas there is clear prevalence for dative pronouns in Classical usage (58 nouns vs. 101 pronouns).

The accusative persists into the Middle Post-Classical period (1st–3rd century CE) and the Late Post-Classical period (4th–6th century CE), showing a marked increase in frequency around the Second Sophistic, where 43 instances are attested. Most of these occur in Cassius Dio (11x), Dio Chrysostom (10x), and Aelius Aristides (4x), all of whom also employ the dative construction alongside the accusative (compare C.7 and C.8; see also Anon. Περὶ συντάξεως α 57; Schmid *Atticismus* vol. 1, 108; vol. 2, 82; vol. 3,



## PURA – PURism in Antiquity

103). This co-occurrence is not unexpected, as even Atticising authors of the Second Sophistic did not consistently adhere to strict Atticist prescriptions (Kim 2011, 478–81; Kim 2017; *AGP* 1, 13–20; 64). That is, although they tend to favour more Atticising constructions, they do not entirely avoid features characteristic of the koine – perhaps to temper excessive purism or because they did not perceive such usages as dispreferred (Kim 2010, 481). In contrast to the Early-Post-Classical Greek period, which largely mirrored the patterns of Archaic Greek, the accusative in the Middle Post-Classical Period is primarily governed by active verbs (39 cases), with only a few examples involving middle (3) or medio-passive (1) verb forms, thereby aligning more closely with the Classical Greek period. The distribution between full nouns and pronouns is slightly skewed towards the latter (17 vs. 26 cases) while inanimate accusatives remain rare overall (see above and [C.6](#) with references). The dative, with 659 attestations, preserves the characteristics observed in earlier stages: it is typically licensed by an active verb form, encodes an animate referent except when paired with medio-passive verb forms, and occurs with both full nouns and pronouns in roughly equal proportions.

This trend culminates in the Late Post-Classical period, during which the accusative attains its highest attested frequency, with 69 examples. Most examples are found in the historical works of Procopius (21x) and Agathias (17x), with smaller numbers found in Proclus (5x) and Theodoretus (4x). The accusative retains a strong preference for active verb forms (60x), pairing rarely with middle (7x) and even less often with medio-passive verb forms (2x). Full nouns and pronouns are distributed with comparable frequency, though full nouns (39x) slightly exceed pronouns (30x). The accusative is not confined to literary works, as illustrated by a 4th-century inscription from Italy ([C.9](#)). This example, however, comes from a high-register metrical epigram by Eudemus of Laodicea and thus rather resembles the language of literary texts (Agosti 2020, 319–20 with references). Notably, other examples of a middle verb form governing an accusative in Late Post-Classical Greek are likewise limited to metrical texts (*Gr.Naz. AP* 8.182.4, 8.144.2; *MPG* 37.397.1; 37.1321.3; *Nonn. D.* 13.14–5; 25.370). Still, this pattern does not reflect a strict dichotomy, since datives may also occur in such contexts; Gregory of Nazianzus employs the dative in his *carmina*, though not in the same poems in which the accusative appears (see *MPG* 37.797.2; 37.864.10; 37.1188.9; 37.1341.8; 37.1353.5). Nonetheless, the line from the metrical epigram ([C.9](#)) is best regarded on par with the rare aforementioned cases of middle verbs licensing accusatives in metrical contexts and other instances with an inanimate accusative (see on [C.6](#)). As for the dative, its functional properties remain unchanged since the Early Post-Classical period, though its frequency increases further, reaching 1529 attestations.

Whether this increased use of the accusative – from 24 examples in Classical Greek to 69 in Late Post-Classical Greek – correlates with the overall decline of the dative and its replacement by other cases or prepositional phrases (see [E](#)) is difficult to determine conclusively, since such patterns of ‘substitution’ or alternation take place at different rates in literary and non-literary texts (see Stolk 2017 for instance). This is largely due to the conservative nature of literary and official writing, in which linguistic innovations tend



## *PURA – PURism in Antiquity*

to emerge much later than in colloquial or non-literary sources. Further evidence from a larger diachronic corpus study would be required to determine whether this phenomenon concerns a genuine grammatical development or a stylistic tendency limited to certain registers.

In conclusion, Atticist sources accurately record the alternating use of the accusative and dative with (ἀπ)ἀρέσσω in Classical Greek, though the former is restricted to a subset of Attic authors (see [Table 1](#)). The distinction between ἀττικόν/ἀττικῶς (accusative) and κοινόν/κοινῶς (dative) indeed carries stylistic implications, since the former is confined to texts of middle- (hagiography) or high-register (epic poetry, historiography, etc.) while the latter is employed across the full register spectrum, from low- to high-register works (cf. the register continuum of Bentein 2013). Yet, with the exception of three potential instances ([B.2](#), [B.5](#), [B.6](#)), Atticist sources do not pay attention to three main points: first, that the accusative was already in use in Pre-Classical times; second, that the accusative was restricted to middle verb forms in that period and can therefore not be treated on par with the accusatives governed by active verbs in Classical Greek (see [A.1](#), [A.2](#), [B.1](#), [B.3](#), [B.7](#)), although these testimonies equate them; and third, that there might be a genre-related preference, with accusatives occurring frequently, and at times predominantly, in poetic or dialogic texts. However, as mentioned earlier, these aspects might admittedly be outside the scope of the Atticists' interests.

### **E. Byzantine and Modern Greek commentary**

In Byzantine and Medieval Greek, the argument structure of ἀρέσσω exhibits progressive diversification, while the verb itself undergoes morphosyntactic reduction. By the time of Standard Modern Greek, only the third person present forms ἀρέσει (sing.) and ἀρέσουν (plur.) remain in use (Holton, Mackridge, Philippaki-Warbuton 2004, 240; for this section overall see also Cluyse, Barðdal in prep.).

A first major development involves the increasing use of prepositional phrases instead of bare case marking to express core syntactic or semantic functions (Horrocks 2010, 97; 107–8; 284–5; Rafiyenko, Seržant 2020, 8–10). With ἀρέσσω, the dative argument can be realised through constructions such as ἐν ('in') or ἐπί ('to') with the dative, or εἰς ('to') with the accusative. These Medieval Greek structures should, however, be distinguished from prepositional phrases like ἐνώπιον ('facing, face to face'), ἐναντίον ('opposite') or ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ('in the eyes of') with the genitive, all of which appear in the Greek Testament as word-by-word translations of the Hebrew original (see Cluyse, Barðdal in prep.).

A second significant shift concerns the gradual replacement of the dative by the genitive, supported by the general decline of the dative case (Humbert 1930; Bortone 2010, 154–5; Cooper, Effi 2012). Over time, ἀρέσσω pairs with a genitive argument instead of the traditional dative with increasing frequency, until the genitive becomes the sole option in Standard Modern Greek. However, the situation is complicated by



## PURA – PURism in Antiquity

case syncretism in several Medieval and Modern Greek dialects, where accusative and genitive forms are formally indistinguishable in certain word classes, especially within the pronominal system (Mertyris 2012, 2014; *CGMEMG* vol. 2, 861–902; Marinis 2024). This overlap makes it difficult to unambiguously determine the case marking of the non-nominative argument, since the (medieval) textual evidence appears to alternate between the accusative and the genitive, at least in those dialects where we can tell them apart.

Despite this variation, the dative remains consistently attested as a core argument of ἀρέσκω throughout the Byzantine and Medieval period. The accusative appears only marginally, as in Nicephorus' *Historia breviarium* 77.6 (8th–9th century): Βουλγάρους δὲ οὐκ ἤρεσκε τὸ πραττόμενον ('the Bulgarians did not like that'), which exhibits the Nominative-Accusative frame. Conversely, the genitive replaces the dative in cases like *Bellum Troianum* 1340 (13th–14th/15th–16th century): ὅλων ἀρέσει ἡ βουλή, ὅλοι τὴν ἐπαινοῦσιν' ('all like the plan and all praise it') (Nominative-Genitive).

This persistence of the dative, despite increasing morphological and syntactic variation, underscores the verb's long-standing alignment with the Nominative-Dative pattern, even as ancillary case-marking strategies diversified across periods and dialects (for the same alignment with the Latin equivalent *placēre* see Cluyse, Somers, Barðdal 2025).

### F. Commentary on individual texts and occurrences

(1) Hom. *Il.* 4.362–3 ([C.1](#)) – Hom. *Il.* 19.179 ([C.2](#))

The precise meaning of the verb ἀρέσκω in Homeric Greek, especially in relation to its argument structure, has been called into question by Pernée (1988) and Luraghi (2022). Whereas Pernée (1988) uses close reading to account for the distinct interpretations of the verb, Luraghi (2022, 242) proposes that the verb has undergone a gradual semantic change co-occurring with, or determined by, variations in the verb's argument structure (for the meanings in relation to the etymology of the verb see de Meyer 2024, 291–8). Though these instances are analysed in more detail in Cluyse, Barðdal (in prep.), where a more convincing proposal is advanced on the diachronic evolution of the argument structure, it's worth noting here that neither Pernée (1988) nor Luraghi (2022) have detected that in the earliest available sources, Homeric Greek, the accusative always depends on a middle verb form, when it is expressed (see also [C.3](#)). This crucial piece of evidence forms the foundation of Author, Barðdal's (in prep.) novel account, which focuses instead on the reciprocal and benefactive semantics of the middle verb forms, stemming from the fact that all Homeric examples involve situations in which one person aims to reconcile with another person (cf. Pernée 1988). Their account is advantageous in that the meaning of the verb is rooted in well-established features of the middle voice, which can then explain the formulaic instances of the active infinitive ἀρέσαι (*Il.* 9.120; 19.138) as semantically middle ('absolute') and the two examples of the middle ἀρεσσόμεθα with



inanimate accusatives (C.1; *Il.* 6.526) as middle with an accusative of respect (see also C.3; Cock 1981; Nadav 2023, 14; 41). Moreover, by taking into account the differences in diathesis between the different configurations observed in Archaic and Classical Greek, they offer a more concise and economically less demanding explanation to the diachronic evolution of the verb's argument structure.

## References

- Anagnostopoulou, E.; Sevdali, C. (2015). 'Case Alternations in Ancient Greek Passives and the Typology of Case'. *Language* 91(2), 442–81.
- Agosti, G. (2020). 'Wordplays on Proper Names in Metrical Inscriptions of Late Antiquity'. *IFilolClass* 19, 311–33.
- Austin, C.; Olson, S.D. (2004). *Aristophanes. Thesmophoriazusae*. Oxford.
- Bentein, K. (2013). 'Register and the Diachrony of Post-classical and Early Byzantine Greek'. *RBPh* 91(1), 5–44.
- Bentein, K. (2016). *Verbal Periphrasis in Ancient Greek. Have- and Be Constructions*. Oxford.
- Blank, D. L. (1988). *Lesbonax. Περὶ σχημάτων*. Edited with an Introduction. Berlin, New York.
- Bortone, P. (2010). *Greek Prepositions. From Antiquity to the Present*. Oxford.
- Cluyse, B.; Barðdal, J. (in prep). 'Argument Structure Alternations with the Greek Verb ἀρέσκειν 'like, please''.
- Cluyse, B.; Somers, J.; Barðdal, J. (2025). 'Latin *placēre* 'like, please' as an Alternating Dat-Nom/Nom-Dat Verb: A Radically New Analysis'. *IF* 130(1), 323–83.
- Cock, A.J. (1981). 'ποιεῖσθαι: ποιεῖν. Sur les critères déterminant le choix entre l'actif ποιεῖν et le moyen ποιεῖσθαι.' *Mnemosyne* 34, 1–62.
- Cooper, G. L. (1998). *Attic Greek Prose Syntax*. Vol. 1. Ann Arbor.
- Cooper, A.; Effi, G. (2012). 'Dative Loss and its Replacement in the History of Greek'. van Kemenade, A.; Nynke de Haas, J. (eds.), *Historical Linguistics 2009. Selected papers from the 19th International Conference on Historical Linguistics*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia, 277–92.
- Finglass, P.J. (2011). *Sophocles. Ajax*. Cambridge.
- Halkin, F. (1983). 'Une Passion Inédite des Saints Florus et Laurus'. *JÖB* 33, 38–44.
- Hedberg, T. (1935). *Eustathios als Atticist*. [PhD Dissertation] Uppsala.
- Holton, D.; Mackridge, P.; Philippaki-Warbuton, I. (2004). *Greek. An Essential Grammar of the Modern Language*. London.
- Horrocks, G. (2010). *Greek. A History of the Language and its Speakers*. 2nd edition. Oxford.
- Hudson-Williams, T. (1910). *The Elegies of Theognis*. London.
- Hunter, R. L. (1989). *Apollonius of Rhodes. Argonautica Book III*. Cambridge.



*PURA – PURism in Antiquity*

- Humbert, J. (1930). *La disparition du datif en grec (du Ier au Xe siècle)*. Paris.
- Kim, L. (2011). 'The Literary Heritage as Language. Atticism and the Second Sophistic'. Bakker, E. J. (ed.), *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*. Chichester, Malden, 468–82.
- Kim, L. (2017). 'Atticism and Asianism'. Richter, D.S.; Johnson, W.A. (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Second Sophistic*. Oxford, 41–66.
- Luraghi, S. (1987). 'Patterns of Case Syncretism in Indo-European Languages'. Ramat, A. G.; Carruba, O.; Bernini, G. (eds.), *Papers from the 7th International Conference on Historical Linguistics*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia, 355–71.
- Luraghi, S. (2020). *Experiential Verbs in Homeric Greek. A Constructional Approach*. Leiden.
- Luraghi, S. (2022). 'The Verb *areskein* in Ancient Greek. Constructions and Semantic Change'. *Acta Linguistica Petropolitana* 18, 226–45.
- Marinis, M. I. (2024). 'Morphological Interpretations of Syncretism in the Panorama of Greek'. *Folia Linguistica* 58, 541–62.
- Matthaios, S. (2013). 'Pollux' Onomastikon im Kontext der attizistischen Lexikographie. Gruppen 'anonymer Sprecher' und ihre Stellung in der Sprachgeschichte und Stilistik'. Mauduit, C. (ed.), *L'Onomasticon de Pollux. Aspects culturels, rhétoriques et lexicographiques*. Paris, 67–140.
- Méndez Dosuna, J. (2014). 'Sophocles, *Antigone* 787 and *Electra* 556–557. Syntax or Phonology?'. *Philologus* 158, 216–34.
- Mertyris, D. (2012). 'Accusative-Genitive Syncretism in the Nominal Inflection of Modern Greek Dialects'. *Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistics Theory* 5, 335–52.
- Mertyris, D. (2014). *The Loss of the Genitive in Greek. A Diachronic and Dialectological Analysis*. [Doctoral dissertation] La Trobe University.
- de Meyer, I. (2024). *Recherches de sémantique et d'étymologie sur gr. ἀραρίσκω "ajuster" et les mots apparentés*. [PhD dissertation] Ghent University, École Pratique des Hautes Études.
- Monaco, C. (2021). *The Origins and Development of Linguistic Atticism*. [PhD dissertation] Cambridge University.
- Monaco, C. (2024). 'The Idea of 'Common Greek' (κοινόν). A Revaluation of Moeris' Atticist Lexicon'. *RBPh* 102, 35–78.
- Montana, F. (2015). 'Hellenistic Scholarship'. Montanari, F.; Matthaios, S.; Rengakos, A. (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship*. Vol. 1. Leiden, Boston, 60–183.
- Nadav, A. (2023). *The Middle Category in the Aorist Tense in the Homeric Epics. A Study of Form vs. Function*. [PhD Dissertation] Harvard University.
- Pellettieri, A. (2024). 'Moeris. Ἀττικιστής'. Tribulato, O. (ed.), *Digital Encyclopedia of Atticism*. With the assistance of E. N. Merisio. DOI: 10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2024/02/031.
- Pernée, L. (1988). 'Ἀρέσαι dans l'Iliade et l'Odyssée'. *LEC* 56, 67–72.



*PURA – PURism in Antiquity*

- Petrova, D. (2006). *Das Lexikon "Über die Syntax". Untersuchung und kritische Ausgabe des Lexikons im Codex Paris. Coisl. gr. 345*. Wiesbaden.
- Probert, P. (2004). 'Accentuation in Old Attic, Later Attic and Attic'. Penney, J. H. M. (ed.), *Indo-European Perspectives, Studies in Honour of Anna Morpurgo Davies*. Oxford, 277–91.
- Rafiyenko, D.; Seržant I. A. (2020). 'Postclassical Greek. An Overview'. Rafiyenko, D.; Seržant, I. A. (eds.), *Contemporary Approaches to Postclassical Greek*. Berlin, 1–18.
- Romagno, D. (2017). 'The Accusative of Respect in Ancient Greek. Animacy Hierarchy, Semantic Roles and Event Type'. *SSL* 55, 65–91.
- Romagno, D. (2020). 'Strategies for Aligning Syntactic Roles and Case Marking with Semantic Properties. The Case of the Accusative of Respect in Ancient Greek'. Drinka, B. (ed.), *Historical Linguistics 2017. Selected Papers from the 23rd International Conference on Historical Linguistics*. Amsterdam, 9–28.
- Roumanis, E.; Bentein, K. (2023). 'The Power of Judgement. A Comparison of Evaluative Stance in the Atticist Lexica of Phrynichus and Moeris'. *RBPh* 101, 5–32.
- Sakalis, D. (1977). 'Ανάττικα και Ψευδαττικὰ ἀπὸ τὸν Ἀττικιστὴ Μοίρη'. *Δωδώνη* 6, 441–70.
- Schironi, F. (2018). 'Aristarchus, Greek Dialects and Homer'. Swiggers, P. (ed.), *Language, Grammar and Erudition. From Antiquity to Modern Times*. Leuven, Paris, Bristol, 167–85.
- Schwyzler, E. (1939). *Griechische Grammatik. Allgemeiner Teil, Lautlehre, Wortbildung, Flexion*. Munich.
- Sewell, B. (2023). *A Commentary on the Preface, Chapter One, and Chapter Two of Gregory of Corinth's Treatise Περὶ διαλέκτων (de dialectis)*. [PhD Dissertation] Princeton University.
- Smyth, H.W. (1956). *Greek Grammar* 3rd edition. Cambridge.
- Sommerstein, A. H. (2019). *Aeschylus. Suppliants*. Cambridge.
- Spangenberg Yanes, E. (2017). *Prisciani Caesariensis Ars. Liber XVIII. Pars altera. Vol. 2: Commento*. Hildesheim.
- Stolk, J. V. (2017). 'Dative Alternation and Dative Case Syncretism in Greek. The Use of Dative, Accusative and Prepositional Phrases in Documentary Papyri'. *TPhS* 115, 212–38.
- Strobel, C. (2012). *Studies in Atticistic Lexica of the Second and Third Centuries AD*. [PhD Dissertation] Oxford University.
- Tribulato, O. (2021). '(En)listing the Good Authors. The Defence of Greek Linguistic Variety in the Antiatticist Lexicon'. Laemmle, R.; Scheidegger Laemmle, C.; Wesselmann, K. (eds.), *Lists and Catalogues in Ancient Literature and Beyond. Towards a Poetics of Enumeration*. Berlin, 169–94.
- Valente, S. (2013). 'Osservazioni su συνήθεια e χρῆσις nell'Onomastico di Polluce'. Maduit, C. (ed.), *L'Onomasticon de Pollux: aspects culturels, rhétoriques et lexicographiques*. Paris, 147–63.
- van Emde Boas, E.; Rijksbaron, A.; Huitink, L.; De Bakker, M. (2019). *The Cambridge Grammar of Classical Greek*. Cambridge.
- van Groningen, B.A. (1966). *Theognis. Le premier livre*. Amsterdam.
- de la Villa, J. (1989). 'Caractérisation fonctionnelle du datif grec'. *Glotta* 67, 20–40.



*PURA – PURism in Antiquity*

- de la Villa, J. (2017). 'Verbal Alternations in Ancient Greek as an Interface between Lexicon and Syntax'. Logozzo, F.; Poccetti, P. (eds.), *Ancient Greek Linguistics. New Approaches, Insights, Perspectives*. Berlin, Boston, 535–50.
- de la Villa, J. (2025). 'Syntactic and Pragmatic Choices in Verbal Alternation in Ancient Greek'. Di Giovine, P.; Mancini, M. (eds.), *Lingua e storia. Walter Belardi a cento anni dalla nascita. Atti del Convegno internazionale, Roma, 14–15 dicembre 2023*. Rome, 113–31.
- Viti, C. (2017). 'Semantic and Cognitive Factors of Argument Marking in Ancient Indo-European Languages'. *Diachronica* 34, 368–419.