

The Atticists' choice of words and of morphology (e.g. the dual and the optative) have been studied in detail (Schmid [1887-1897]). Also, the evidence for the changes in the pronunciation of Greek from the Classical period through the Second Sophistic and height of Atticism (the second and third centuries CE) until late antiquity has been collected (e.g. Mayser-Schmoll [1970], Gignac [1976], and Threatte [1980]). However, the question of how the Atticists of this period actually delivered their declamations and diatribes has remained largely a matter of assumption. It is often asserted that an educated pronunciation, probably resembling Attic, coexisted with the Hellenistic Koine pronunciation (see Horrocks [1997: 43-44]) and that later the Sophists attempted an Attic pronunciation (e.g. Swain [1996: 31] and Bowie [2004: 65-67]). However, when the conservative *speech* of the Sophists is discussed, the treatment quickly turns back to morphology and word choice. These assumptions about pronunciation remain in need of confirmation and elaboration.

There are surprisingly few testimonia in this period about regional variation in spoken Greek (see Millar [1968: 126-127] and Bowie [2004: 65-83]). Most of the texts are open to different interpretations because references to barbarism in speech may refer to usage rather than to pronunciation (see Lucian, *The False Critic* 1 and Swain [1996: 299 n. 5]).

Nevertheless, it seems unlikely that speakers who were very particular about using only approved words (see e.g. Phrynichus and ps.-Aristides, *Ars Rhetorica* 2.10), about prose rhythm (see Philostratus, *VS* 513 and 586), and about every other aspect of their self-presentation and performance (e.g. Lucian, *The Dream* 11 and 13) would be content to sound like the masses from whom they otherwise sought to distinguish themselves. We should also remember that a prescriptive grammatical tradition, which included a treatment of phonology, was being codified in this period.

When we consider that some of the most famous sophists of this period were not native speakers of Greek from Greece, but came from Cappadocia (Pausanias), Gaul (Favorinus), Rome (Aelian), Syria (Lucian), and from throughout Asia Minor, the question of pronunciation becomes more acute. Variation in pronunciation would be expected over such a widespread area, in which a range of other languages were spoken alongside Greek. If one wanted to seem Greek and cultured, how did one have to sound? Was it enough to sound 'Greek' (rather than, say, Syrian) or did one have to sound 'Attic'?

This paper will review some of the literary testimonia (principally from Josephus, Lucian, Philostratus and Strabo) and some of the evidence from the grammatical tradition (especially Phrynichus). It will build on Teodorsson [1974: 273-281 and 1978: 111-113] and on Threatte [1982] to show that there was a distinctive, conservative pronunciation in Attica even in the second and third centuries CE and then it will demonstrate that the Sophists prized and imitated that pronunciation.