

ASPECTS OF THE VOCABULARY OF CHARITON OF APHRODISIAS*

There has been little research on the vocabulary of the Greek novelists. Gasda studied that of Chariton in the last century.¹ He compared some of his terms with those of other authors and he concluded he should be placed in the sixth century A.D. Then Schmid considered that Chariton's language was not Atticist, and dated his novel in the second century or beginning of the third.² In 1973 Chariton's language was studied by Papanikolaou.³ His research dealt above all with several syntactic aspects and the use of some vocabulary, which led him to conclude that this language was closer to the *koiné* than that of the other novelists. But Papanikolaou went further in his conclusions: finding no trace of Atticism in Chariton, he considered him a pre-Atticist writer and, using extra-linguistic data, such as the citing of the Seres, the Chinese (6.4.2), placed him in the second half of the first century B.C. This chronology has been accepted by some, but already Giangrande has observed that this lack of Atticisms could have been intentional, in which case that date would be questionable.⁴

However, there is no global study which takes into consideration the vocabulary as a whole. I have begun that task and here present part of my findings, still in progress, such as comparing Chariton's vocabulary with that of those literary authors who could be his contemporaries and for whom we have already indexes or lexica. These authors are Diodorus of Sicily, Philo of Alexandria, Flavius Josephus, Dio of Prusa and Plutarch.⁵ All but Diodorus have been considered Atticists in different degrees, since Plutarch is not so considered as much as Dio, although he is regarded by Schmid as an important forerunner of the more strict later Atticism.⁶ For his part, Diodorus manifests an acquaintance with the rhetoric of his time.⁷ I have also taken into account the New Testament and papyri, as well as various data from Atticist lexica.⁸

* Paper presented at the international conference *The Ancient Novel: Classical Paradigms and Modern Perspectives*, held at Dartmouth College, Hanover (U.S.A.), 23–29 July 1989.

¹ A. Gasda, *Quaestiones Charitoneae* (Diss. Olesnae, 1860), which includes some data on syntax and textual criticism.

² See 'Chariton', *RE* iii.2.2168–70.

³ A. Papanikolaou, *Chariton-Studien* (Göttingen, 1973).

⁴ See his review of Papanikolaou in *JHS* 94 (1974), 197–8.

⁵ J. I. MacDougall, *Lexicon in Diodorum Siculum* (Hildesheim, 1983); G. Mayer, *Index Philoneus* (Berlin, 1974); K. H. Rengtorg, *A Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus*, 4 vols. (Leiden, 1973–83); R. Koolmeister–T. Tallmeister, *An Index to Dio Chrysostomus* (Uppsala, 1981); D. Wytttenbach, *Lexicon Plutarcheum*, 2 vols. (Hildesheim, 1962). I have used Blake's edition, *Charitonis Aphrodisiensis, De Chaerea et Callirhoe amatoriarum narrationum libri octo* (Oxford, 1938). I have also checked, where necessary, the recent *Chariton. Le roman de Chairéas et Callirhoé*, texte établi et traduit par G. Molinié, révisé par A. Billault (Paris, 1989).

⁶ See S. Sandmel, 'Philo Judaeus: An Introduction to the Man, his Writings, and his Significance', *ANRW* ii.21, 2 (Berlin–New York, 1984), pp. 3–46; T. M. Conley, 'Philo's Rhetoric: Argumentation and Style', *ANRW* iii.343–71; A. Pelletier, *Flavius Josephus, adaptateur de la lettre d'Aristée* (Paris, 1962); L. H. Feldman, 'Flavius Josephus Revisited: the Man, his Writings and his Significance', *ANRW* iii.763–862; B. Weissenberger, *Die Sprache Plutarchs* (Würzburg, 1895); W. Schmid, *Der Atticismus*, 4 vols. (Hildesheim, 1964).

⁷ See J. Palm, *Über Sprache und Styl des Diodors von Sizilien* (Lund, 1955); F. Lasserre, 'Prose grecque classicisante' in *Le classicisme à Rome*, ed. H. Flashar (Vandoeuvres–Genève, 1979), pp. 135–63; here 169.

⁸ See W. Bauer, *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments*⁶ (Berlin, 1988). Cf. also F. Preisigke, *Wörterbuch des griechischen Papyrusurkunden*, 3 vols. (Berlin, 1925–31); H. G. Liddell–R. Scott–H. S. Jones, *A Greek–English Lexicon* (Oxford,

My intention is to obtain data that will lead us to determine the nature of Chariton's language, and its relation to other kinds of language. In this paper I shall present some global data concerning his vocabulary and then analyse a certain number of words by cluster groups. However, not only do we have no statistical data of the five authors mentioned above, to help us in the comparison, but we have no studies on the language of the inscriptions and papyri of the period. All these difficulties warn us to be very careful about any definite conclusions. However, my findings reflect some clear tendencies.

1. *Chariton's vocabulary*

Chariton's vocabulary consists of nearly 3,000 words. Nearly 2,000 of these occur in the New Testament and some 2,200 in the papyri. These figures give us an idea of the level of language which prevails in the novel. Papanikolaou was right in pointing out the close ties of Chariton with the *koiné*. However, before drawing rash conclusions about his language, we must point out that the majority of those words appear also in at least three of the five cited literary authors: 77% of the words are common to three of these authors, the New Testament and/or papyri. Among those authors, Chariton's vocabulary has more lexical similarities with Plutarch, followed by Josephus and Philo.

We turn now to the less common vocabulary, that in which Chariton coincides only with two literary authors, with one author only, with none, or only with the New Testament and/or papyri. I believe that this reduced number of words is the one which can provide us with significant data for differentiating his language.

The figures are these: Chariton coincides with two literary authors in 89 terms; with one author only in 63 terms; and with the New Testament or papyri or both in 15 terms. And finally there are 40 terms which do not appear in any text. So we are going to deal with 207 terms, sorting them into different categories which are not always easy to delimit.

2. *Colloquialisms*

Papanikolaou observed colloquialisms in certain syntactical uses that an Atticist would avoid.⁹ Also we notice colloquial expressions in forms such as *πανδοχείον*, *ὑποδοχεύς* (instead of the forms with *-κ-*); or forms such as *σαλπιστής* (instead of *σαλπιγκτής*); in terms such as *γραῖς* or *πορθμίς*; or in compounds such as *καθέκαστος*, *καθημέραν*. But *ὑποδοχεύς* appears also in Lucian, and Chariton himself also uses *γραῖς* and *πορθμεῖον*, the latter in preference to *πορθμίς*. Schmid had already observed the presence of colloquialisms in the Atticists he studied.¹⁰

3. *Atticisms*

Certain words present not a classical meaning, but rather the typical late meaning of the *koiné*. Papanikolaou gives a good many examples.¹¹ However, as Carlos Hernández-Lara has reported¹² after consulting Atticist lexica, no fewer than 28 doublets, that is, uses of double, Attic and *koiné* forms, are observed together, of the type *ἡμιθνής/ἡμιθανής*, *ἀναβιώω/ἀναζάω*, *φιλογυνής/φιλογύναιος*, etc.

1968); E. A. Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*² (New York, 1983). I have also used *Ibicus Computer System*. On Atticist lexica see C. Hernández Lara, 'Rhetorical Aspects in Chariton of Aphrodisias', paper presented at the Dartmouth Conference, in *GIF* 42 (1989), 267–74.

⁹ Op. cit. (n. 3), pp. 161–2.

¹⁰ Schmid, op. cit. (n. 6), iv.597ff.; A. Thumb, *Die griechische Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus* (Berlin–New York, 1974), pp. 206ff.

¹¹ Op. cit. (n. 3), pp. 30ff.

¹² See his paper mentioned above, note 8.

Collation of Atticist lexica is revealing. According to Schmid's criteria, there would be a total of 409 Atticisms in Chariton. However, some of Schmid's Atticisms appear in the New Testament, papyri, Ionic prose or authors such as Polybius, which means the list is reduced considerably. But, even eliminating these terms, Hernández-Lara counts 174 expressions which are in keeping with Atticist lexica. A problem arises when we observe that terms called Atticist in Lexica appear in papyri and the New Testament, but I consider that the purest Atticisms correspond to those mentioned in the lexica, and if they appear in the *koiné* texts it must be concluded either that the lexicographers are wrong or that the Atticism was more widespread than we think.¹³

In the group of 207 words we are studying are 48 terms which Schmid and the lexica mention as Atticisms and which do not appear in the New Testament or papyri, most of them shared by Chariton and two other literary authors: those who show most similarities with Chariton are Plutarch and Josephus. Those 48 terms are: ἄβρα, ἀγχώματος, ἀκκίζομαι, ἀνταπαιτέω, ἀντεραστής, ἀποπληξία, ἀποσεμνύνω, ἄποτος, ἀργυρογνώμων, ἀσφοδητή, γραμματιδίων, δέσμα, δημαγωγός, δημώδης, ἐκπυστος, ἐμπλεως, ἐντρεχής, ἐξελεύθερος, ἐπαποθνήσκω, ἐρύθημα, εὐεξαπάτητος, εὐχαρις, ζάκωρος, ἡμιθνής, θαλαττεύω, θειασμός, θεραπευτήρ, καιρίαν, κατανανμαχέω, κωπήρης, λεχώ, λιποψυχέω, μείραξ, νεώνητος, ὁμόσκηνος, παλινωδία, παρανοίγω, προμνήστρια, προστερνίδιον, σοβαρός, συμφοιτητής, ὑποκορίζομαι, ὑποκρύπτω, ὑπολάμπω, ὑποφθέγγομαι, ὕφαιμος, φθέγγμα, φιλογυνής.

The Atticist varnish of Chariton is observed in the -ττ- of θαλαττεύω, which in Thucydides, his model, appears as -σσ-;¹⁴ or in the use of the feminine adjective καιρίαν without the corresponding noun, referred to as a poeticism by Papanikolaou and Schmid.¹⁵ Even in other uses mentioned in lexica, it can be seen that Chariton uses Attic correctly.

4. Unmentioned literary terms

Together with Atticisms we must mention a considerable number of words from Attic prose and comedy which Schmid does not mention, namely 32 literary terms taken from Thucydides (περίορθρον), Aristophanes (φυλλοβολέω), Plato (ιδιολογέω), Xenophon (ὑακινθινοβαφής), etc., which increase the list of ancient literary terms. Those 32 terms are: ἀνδραποδιστής, ἀσαφώς, ἀφιλία, ἀφιππεύω, βασανιστήριον, διωλύγιος, ἐπικωμάζω, ἐπιψηφίζω, ιδιολογέω, καταγορεύω, καταμείγνυμι, καταπροδίδωμι, λογοποιός, μεταμανθάνω, ὁμιλητικώς, ὀπισθοφύλαξ, ὀποιοσδήποτε, παιδαριώδης, περιβραχιόνιον, περίορθρον, πορνείον, προαγωγός, προμετωπίδιον, προσκύπτω, προσμείγνυμι, συγγυμναστής, συνδικάζω, συνεξευρίσκω, συσπειράω, ὑακινθινοβαφής, φυλλοβολέω, χόω. These terms are not necessarily Attic, but many may be Ionisms: the important thing is that they belong to the Attic literary tradition and do not appear in the New Testament or papyri.

5. Poeticisms

The so-called poeticisms are of the same order. If we follow Schmid's criteria, Chariton contains some 250 poetic terms which appear in the Atticist authors he studied. This would be less than 9% of our author's vocabulary. According to Boulanger's figures, poeticisms constitute 22% of Aristides' vocabulary.¹⁶ But

¹³ Evidence of the optative in papyri raises a similar question: see G. Anlauf, *Standard Late Greek oder Attizismus?* (Diss. Köln, 1960), pp. 122ff. Atticism, as a whole, should be revised. I hope to focus on this field in the near future.

¹⁴ Char. 3.3.11; 4.9; Th. 7.12.3.

¹⁵ Char. 1.1.7. Papanikolaou, op. cit. (n. 3), p. 29; Schmid, op. cit. (n. 6), iii.204; iv.306.

¹⁶ A. Boulanger, *Aelius Aristide et la Sophistique dans la province d'Asie au II^e siècle de notre ère* (Paris, 1968).

Boulanger himself admits that there are few terms taken directly from poetry. Papanikolaou notes that some of Chariton's poeticisms are really *koiné* terms, although they may originally have appeared in poetry.¹⁷

The same might be said of the terms considered poeticisms by Schmid. In short, of the 207 terms we are studying he would consider 27 poeticisms: *ἄβρός, ἀνακωκύω, ἀποκλαίω, ἀπολάμπω, γυναιμανής, δονέω, θήραμα, κατατρύχω, κελαδέω, κωκύω, καιρίαν, μελανείμων, μείραξ, νεμεσητός, νυμφαγωγός, νεολαία, ὀλολύζω, πορθμής, προσπτύσσομαι, τυμβωρύχος, τρικυμία, τρύχω, ὑποδηλώω, ὑποχθόνιος, φθέγμα, φρενήρης, χρυσήλατος*. But no less than 18 are documented in classical or Hellenistic prose. Therefore, they are terms of poetic origin but which have an established prose use, or which have even passed into the *koiné*. Thus of the 27, only 10 could be considered real poetic loan terms: *ἀνακωκύω, γυναιμανής, κελαδέω, κωκύω, νεολαία, νυμφαγωγός, προσμύσσομαι, ὑποδηλώω, ὑποχθόνιος* and *χρυσήλατος*. We could add to this list a few terms that Schmid does not mention but which seem limited to poetry: *ἄπυστος, ἄσις, γαμήλιος, δημογέρων, εἰσαΐσσω, ἐρέσσω, λαθικηδής, πυρφορέω, ὑπερυθρίαω* and *ὑποστένω*. It must also be said that the simple verbs *κωκύω* and *στένω* appear in papyri.¹⁸ In total therefore there are 20 poetic loan words.

The Atticist author with whom Chariton most coincides in the use of poeticisms is Lucian. Of his possible contemporaries, Plutarch is the one who presents most poeticisms; however, the number of poeticisms that do not appear in any of the five authors is even greater.

6. Ionisms

The presence of Ionisms is important in Chariton.¹⁹ Their origin is varied: ancient poeticisms (*διασιωπάω, συμπενθέω*), Ionic prose (*ἐκκομιδή, ἐποφθαλμίζω*), *Corpus Hippocraticum* (*ἀποκαρτερέω, παραμίσγω*), etc. They constitute a total of 43 traditional literary terms, which do not appear in papyri: *ἄβρός, ἀμχανέω, ἀναπέτομαι, ἀνταμοιβή, ἀντίπρωρος, ἄπνους, ἀποκαρτερέω, ἀποκλαίω, ἀπολάμπω, διασιωπάω, δονέω, δυσδιάθετος, ἐγκελεύω, ἐκθνήσκω, ἐκκομιδή, ἔκτρωσις, ἐπαξίως, ἐποφθαλμίζω, ἐράσμιος, θήραμα, κατατρύχω, λείβω, λιποθυμέω, μείρομαι, μελανείμων, νεμεσητός, νησιώτις, οἶα, παγκρατής, παραγυμνός, παραμίσγω, περιπτύσσω, περιφύω, προσαγρυπνέω, προσμείγνυμι, συμπενθέω, τρικυμία, τρύχω, ὑποπέμπω, φιλογύναιος, φρενήρης, χόλος, χρυσοῦφής*. Twenty-six Ionisms are found in the group of terms in which Chariton coincides with two literary authors of his age. Of the 17 extant Ionisms, 5 do not coincide with the five literary authors, nor with the New Testament or papyri: *ἀνταμοιβή, ἔκτρωσις, μελανείμων, νησιώτις, παγκρατής*.²⁰

7. Late terms

Chariton also presents terms which are late, i.e. terms not documented before the third century B.C., or terms used with a late meaning. There are 49 terms, in which we must include those of which there is no evidence before Chariton (no fewer than 14). Those 49 terms are: *ἀδιόδευτος, ἀκυβέρνητος, ἀμάντευτος, ἀναζωγραφέω, ἀνεξικακέω, ἀντιλυπέω, ἀντιμνηστεύω, ἀντισυγκρίνω, ἀποκαρτέρησις, ἀποστεφανώω, ἀφετήριον, βαρυθυμέω, δημοκοπέω, δικανικῶς, δυσσάποσπατος,*

¹⁷ Op. cit. (n. 3), pp. 27–9.

¹⁸ On poeticisms in the *koiné* see Thumb, op. cit. (n. 10), pp. 221–5; on Ionicisms, *ibid.*, pp. 209ff.

¹⁹ See Thumb, op. cit. (n. 10), pp. 225–6.

²⁰ *ἀνταμείβομαι* appears in papyri.

δυσσιώνιστος, ἐναβρύνομαι, ἐπικαταπλέω, ἐπταμηνιαίος, ἐργοστόλος, ἡμίκαυστος, θαυμασμός, ἰδιολογία, κολακευτικῶς, κυφορία, λαμπρειμονέω, μικραίτιος, μοιχικός, νυμφαγωγέω, παρευδοκιμέω, προεπιδημέω, προσεξάπτω, προσερεθίζω, συγκαταφλέγω, συλληστής, συνδεσμέω, συνευχή, τεκνοκτονέω, τυμβωρυχία, ὑλάσσω, ὑπερρίπτω, ὑποβαστάζω, ὑποστίλβω, ὑφορμέω, φιλόκαινος, φιλοκερδία, φιλόκοσμος, φιλόπατρις, ψευδόνειρος. The 14 terms which appear only in Chariton or later authors are: ἀνεξικακέω, ἀντισυγκρίνω, ἀποκατέρησις, ἐργοστόλος, λαμπρειμονέω, προεπιδημέω, συλληστής, συνδεσμέω, συνευχή, τεκνοκτονέω, τυμβωρυχία, ὑλάσσω, ὑποβαστάζω, ψευδόνειρος. They are adjectives and nouns with typical *koiné* formations; the same may be said of the verbs composed of adjective or noun + verb, or the prepositional compounds. ἀνεξικακέω, modelled on the type *μνησικακέω*, is considered *hapax* by Papanikolaou, but appears in authors of the fourth century A.D., whereas the corresponding noun, adjective and adverb appear in Lucian: ἀνεξικακία appears in Plutarch, -κακος in medical texts of first-second century A.D. and in the New Testament. προεπιδημέω and συνευχή are not documented before the fourth century A.D. ἀποκατέρησις appears only in Quintilian.

I have not been able to find evidence of λαμπρειμονέω and ψευδόνειρος. To what extent Chariton tries to give poetic colouring to his language with neologisms or certain rare terms, i.e. uses them with stylistic intention, is something which cannot be established; however, such an impression is produced by terms such as ψευδόνειρος, as in tragedy ψευδόμαντις appears,²¹ later used by Lucian, although we must not forget the appearance of many late compounds formed with ψευδο-.

Among these late terms there are some which coincide with medical texts, such as ἀνεξικακέω, ἀποκατέρησις, ἀποπληξία, ἐπταμηνιαίος and κυφορία: these are probably technical terms which do not necessarily indicate Chariton's knowledge of these documents, but rather which originate from the spoken language.²²

8. Terms common to Chariton, NT and papyri

Finally, there is a group of terms which are common to Chariton, the New Testament and papyri, and which do not appear in the other five literary authors: ἀπασπάζομαι, γραίς, διαπομπή, καθέκαστος, καθημέραν, πανδοχεῖον, παραυτά, πορθμίς, ποσάκις, προενεχυριάζω, προθέσμιος, σαλπιστής, τροφίμη, τυμβωρύχος, ὑποδοχεύς. These are *koiné* terms, naturally, which we must consider as belonging to a more colloquial level of language. There are 15 in all, some with a previous literary tradition, such as ποσάκις, διαπομπή and τροφίμη; others are ancient poeticisms, such as πορθμίς and τυμβωρύχος; and the rest are late formations which belong to literary tradition (ἀπασπάζομαι, προθέσμιος, ὑποδοχεύς) or not (γραίς, καθέκαστος, καθημέραν, προενεχυριάζω).

9. Linguistic style

We have considered a total of 207 terms. Those that may be considered as belonging to the literary tradition are those which correspond to Atticisms, Attic prose and comedy, poeticisms and Ionisms. They are 143 ancient terms, nearly 70% of the words here studied. In contrast, the 49 late terms and the 15 that appear in the New Testament and papyri are recent, and, although some of them are of ancient origin, they must be considered as modern compared to the other 143 terms. Both groups represent different levels of language, and in each of them we could probably discern sublevels.

²¹ A. Ag. 1195; S. O.C. 1097; E. Or. 1667. It is found also in Hdt. 4.69.

²² See Thumb, *ibid.*, pp. 225–6.

In the terms shown, we notice a lexical concern in Chariton and a knowledge of Atticist precepts which the author follows when he wants. Thus, Atticisms are indeed present in Chariton, although in moderate quantity. We must remember that the Atticism of the first century A.D. is more restrained than that of the second century A.D. Papanikolaou's conclusions would have been different if he had compared Chariton not only with *koiné* documents but also with *Atticist* documents.

Chariton uses two linguistic styles: that which corresponds to his time and that which was inherited from literary tradition. It is, then, a mixed language in which various levels of language are combined; yet the *koiné* itself is not homogeneous, as together with vulgarisms it contains technical terms (*Fachprosa*, according to Rydbeck) and other terms belonging to the literary tradition.

But although ancient literary words predominate in this group of less usual terms, some two-thirds of his vocabulary, as has already been said, is common to the New Testament and papyri, and some 77% appears in at least three of the five literary authors.

What should this predominant level be called? *Standard Late Greek? Zwischenschichtprosa?*²³ A hybrid form of both? Whatever the case may be, it is the prose written by literary authors, with evident rhetorical concern, who represent the historical period in which we must place Chariton.

Lasserre reported the contradictory use, among authors of the same period, of rhetorical procedures on the one hand, and vocabulary on the other: the latter still has not been subjected to rigorous precepts.²⁴ The same divergence is noticeable in Chariton.

10. *Chronology*

Based on these findings, we surely also have to question the chronology suggested by Papanikolaou. Mere terminological coincidence with another author does not necessarily indicate chronological simultaneity: Chariton coincides more with Plutarch than with Dio of Prusa, and both are contemporaries. It is also a question of levels of language. But the fact that he coincides more with Plutarch, Flavius Josephus and Philo than with the other two authors studied brings him, I think, not only nearer to their level of language but also to their time, the first century A.D. And in his use of late terms Chariton seems to be nearer the second century A.D. For this reason, I tend towards the last years of the first century A.D. or the beginning of the second.²⁵ Chariton wanted to honour his city and protecting goddess with his novel, and in my opinion he did so with dignity, as befits a *παιδευμένος*.

University of Murcia

CONSUELO RUIZ-MONTERO

²³ See M. J. Higgins, 'The Renaissance of the First Century and the Origin of Standard Late Greek', *Traditio* 3 (1945), 49–100; L. Rydbeck, *Fachprosa, vermeintliche Volkssprache und Neues Testament* (Uppsala, 1967). Unfortunately, and in spite of its title, the recent work by V. Bubenik, *Hellenistic and Roman Greece as a Socio-Linguistic Area* (Amsterdam–Philadelphia, 1989), does not help us in this matter.

²⁴ Lasserre, art. cit., pp. 147, 158; Thumb pointed out the close ties of Flavius Josephus with the *koiné* (op. cit. (n. 10), p. 212), following the study of W. Schmidt, *De Flavii Josephi elocutione* (Leipzig, 1894).

²⁵ I have drawn the same conclusion by comparing the novel of Chariton with its social and cultural environment: see my 'Caritón de Alfródias y el mundo real', in *Piccolo mondo antico*, ed. P. Liviabella Furiani and A. M. Scarella (Naples, 1989), pp. 107–49. My attention has been drawn to the fact that Marie-France Baslez proposed a Hadrianic date for Chariton at the Colloque in Paris (December 1987); this is possible, but cannot yet be considered as proved.