

HISTORICAL GREEK GRAMMAR

INTRODUCTION.

01. IN all countries and at all times it has been observed that natural, local, social, and other manifold influences lead invariably to varieties of racial type, character, and language. This phenomenon manifested itself also in ancient Greece: her populations exhibited many well-defined differences in every respect. The Greeks themselves were struck by this fact, and sought to account for it by attributing their dissimilarities of race, character, and speech to a dissimilarity of origin. Accordingly they invented a mythological genealogy calculated to satisfy the popular mind. Three legendary heroes, they assumed, Aeolos and Doros, sons, and Ion, grandson, of Hellen, were the progenitors of all Greeks. Aeolos gave birth to a distinct race of Greeks, named after him Aeolians, Doros to another called Dorians, and Ion to that of the Ionians. Each race was naturally made to speak a distinct dialect: the Aeolians Aeolic, the Dorians Doric, and the Ionians Ionic. Some time after, the Ionic branched off, so they believed, and gave rise to a new dialect called Attic.

02. These beliefs, once settled in the popular mind, passed into history, and assumed the sanctity of a religious canon through all antiquity. They were accepted as a matter of unquestionable authenticity, and every particular phenomenon was adapted to this national legend. It is only since the beginning of the present century that philological and historical criticism has called these traditions in question, and eventually compelled classical students to give up the old theory so notoriously refuted by modern science. Indeed, when we found our researches on the critical examination of direct evidences (chiefly inscriptions) and other allied fields, we are forced to the con-

clusion that the Greek language once formed not four (Aeolic, Doric, Ionic and Attic), but numerous dialects varying more or less considerably from one another. In point of fact, in prehistoric times and several centuries thereafter, each Greek region and community had a dialect of its own. At the same time these various dialects, when compared to one another, exhibit some common features which enable philologists to group them under two leading heads, the Non-Ionic and the Ionic. The chief criterion for this grouping is afforded by the observation that the Non-Ionic head, on the whole, shows 'long' α where the Ionic exhibits μ (though cp. 29; also App. ii. 6 & 14). Thus the assumed prototype Indo-European word, **sistami* 'I place,' sounded *ισταμ* among the Non-Ionic dialects, and *ιστημ* in the Ionic group.

03. The two groups of dialects referred to, as well as their varieties or subdivisions, may be roughly illustrated by the following classification.

A. NON-IONIC or α -dialects.

I. *Doric*: (1) Laconia; (2) Heraclia and Taras; (3) Messenia; (4) Argolis and Aegina; (5) Corinth and Corcyra; (6) Megaris and Byzantium; (7) Crete; (8) Melos; (9) Rhodes; (10) Achaia; (11) Doric isles of the archipelago (Anaphe, Astypalaea, Tenos, Cos, Calymna, etc.).

II. Achaëic Dialects:

A. Northern Greece: (1) Epiros; (2) Locris^[1]; (3) Phokis^[1]; (4) Aetolia^[1]; (5) Acarnania^[1]; (6) Phthiotis.

B. (*Aeolic*) (1) Northern Thessaly^[1]; (2) Elis^[1]; (3) Arcadia^[1] and Cyprus^[1]; (4) Pamphylia; (5) Lesbos (*Aeolic*); (6) Boeotia.

B. IONIC or μ -dialects.

I. *Ionic*: (1) Decapolis; (2) Cyclades; (3) Euboea.

II. ATTIC:

1. CLASSICAL PERIOD (500-300 B.C.).

2. POST-CLASSICAL PERIOD:

- (a) Hellenistic or Alexandrian Period (300-150 B.C.).
- (b) Greco-Roman Period (150 B.C.-300 A.D.).
- (c) Transitional Period (300-600 A.D.).

3. NEOHELLENIC PERIOD (600-1900 A.D.).

- (a) Byzantine or First Neohellenic period (600-1000 A.D.).
- (b) Mediaeval or Second Neohellenic period (1000-1450 A.D.).
- (c) Modern or Third Neohellenic period (1450-1800 A.D.).
- (d) Present or Fourth Neohellenic period (1800-1900 A.D.).

[1] Popular dialects of which we possess no representative literature, except inscriptions.

04. Whatever may have been originally the actual number of Greek dialects, it lies in the nature of language that local, political, social, and cultural factors should favour this or that dialect, and give it ascendancy over the rest, so as to eventually supersede them. In the case of Greek, it was at the outset—so far back at least as history can trace—the Ionic group which rose to pre-eminence and became the received language of early composition (Homer, cyclic poetry, Hesiod—then Herodotos, Hippocrates, etc.). On the other hand, the Dorian conquest ('Return of the Heraclids' ±1000 B.C.) could not fail to lead, in progress of time, to the rise of a powerful rival in the spread of the Doric dialects. However, with the close of the VIth B.C., the dialect of Athens, the so-called Attic—one of the Ionic group—prevailed over all other sister-dialects, and eventually absorbed them⁽¹⁾. It was the Attic, because Athens, particularly after the Persian wars, rose to absolute dominion over all the other Greek communities, and finally became the metropolis of all Greek races. Once having gained the hegemony, she leads in every line: science, art, literature, trade, manufacture, fashion, wealth, and all other political, military, social, and educational institutions are started and developed in Athens, and from Athens spread in all directions through the ancient world. The entire nation, in and out of Greece proper, streams, for purposes of business, knowledge, pleasure, etc., to the national metropolis. Younger people, also, eager for education, repair to Athens, as the universal or Panhellenic seminary of culture. Hence Pericles himself could well say of her: *ἐπισέρχεται δὲ διὰ μέγεθος τῆς πόλεως ἐκ πάσης γῆς τὰ πάντα.* (Th. 2, 38.)

05. It is during this period of supremacy of Athens (500-300) that the Athenian or Attic dialect attained its highest stage of development. It is amply reflected in the contemporary works of Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Aristophanes; the historians Thucydides and Xenophon; the philosophers Plato and Aristotle; the orators Demosthenes, Aeschines, Isocrates, Lysias, etc., then in numerous inscriptions of the time. The language of this period is also styled the *classical* or *Attic Greek par excellence*. But, speaking of Attic Greek, we must not infer that all Athenians and Atticized Greeks wrote and spoke the classical Attic portrayed in the aforesaid literature, for this

(1) This is evidently the meaning of [Xenophon] when he says in 'Αθην. Πολιτ. 2, 3, 8 *οἱ μὲν Ἕλληες ἰδίᾳ μᾶλλον καὶ φωνῇ καὶ διαίτῃ καὶ σχήματι χρῶνται, Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ κεκραμένη ἐξ ἀπάντων τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ βαρβάρων.* The first to retreat was Aeolic (hence later Greeks attributed to this dialect the then extinct *διχαιμα* f), next Ionic, and last Doric. None of these dialects has left any traces in present Greek except Doric which still lingers in Tsacanic, then in a few solitary words elsewhere, as ἡ Μίλατο (Crete) for ancient Μιλαιος.

Attic is essentially what it still remains in modern Greek composition: a merely historical *abstraction*, that is an *artistic language* which nobody spoke but still everybody understood (05^b ff. 020 [2] & 20). Nor must we imply that, because the above writers have been styled classics by posterity, they were both the creators and finishers of Greek literature. They rather were the continuators and perfecters of a work relegated to them as a national inheritance. Their own productions, therefore, are both in matter and form emulous though free imitations of ancestral models^[1]—lost to us—and as such reflect the genius, subject, practice, language, and technical treatment of preceding ages (29 ff. App. ii. 9 ff.) under the unavoidable influence of their own time. Accordingly what is generally styled the classical or Attic period marks not the start of a new era; it rather forms the crowning age of a glorious history, an age subsequently raised to ideal by its excellence over all posterity. The literary masterpieces of this period then do not represent the language as actually spoken at the time; they simply reflect the traditional or received style artistically tempered and adapted to the exigencies of the age^[1]. For in ordinary intercourse both the educated classes and uneducated multitudes could not rise above the simple colloquial or popular speech, in many cases degenerating into a vernacular or even rustic idiom. The co-existence at all times of an artistic or literary style, and a colloquial or popular speech (to pass over the rustic idiom) with an intermediate conventional language, is a fact indisputably established by the force of logic, by historical investigation, and by modern analogies, as well as by daily experience.

05^b. 'In Greek, more than in most other old languages, there was a difference between the artless or popular language and the literary, especially the poetical language (written and artificial dialects); a difference which, in view of our insufficient knowledge of the artless popular speech, we can only conjecture but not clearly define. For even the oldest Greek extant, the Homeric poetry, was an artificial dialect which exhibits forms of various times and widely different idioms commixed, and so can by no means have been the language of ordinary intercourse. This language then has influenced, in a more or less degree, the entire poetry of subsequent times. The mixture of the dialects having become, through the Homeric standard, a so-to-say constituent element of the poetical diction, appears to have been carried to greatest lengths in lyric poetry. Among the older prose writers, Herodotos and the oldest Attics show the

[1] Hence the frequent sharp discrimination in Attic grammar between 'poetical' (als. 'epic') and 'prose' Greek.—This also explains why Hesiod and Pindar, though Boeotians, have not written in their native dialect. Again, Alceos, Sappho, and the tragedians, though employing on the whole the received language of their country, frequently borrow Homeric forms, and the choric parts of the Attic plays are conventionally in Doric.

clearest difference from the colloquial language, though that difference cannot [?] have been very considerable. Towards the close of the Vth B.C. a Panhellenic literary language, founded on the Attic dialect, came into existence, which gradually lost touch with the popular language.—KBRUGMANN, *Gr. Gram.* p. 21; so too p. 76 footnote.

06. But apart from these facts and considerations, it is within daily observation that no writer whatever uses the same diction both in writing and speaking. On the contrary, every penman makes it a special point to clothe his thoughts in a more or less elegant expression, and we all acknowledge that a literary composition is likely to meet with more favour on the part of its readers if it rises above daily common talk (020). Accordingly the classical writings of the Greeks, which excel in elegance of style and diction, are of necessity artistic and artificial productions different from the common and popular, as well as from the plebeian or rustic speech.

07. Facts, then, analogy, and modern experience, force us to the recognition, at all periods of Greek history, of a literary style, and a colloquial speech in the Attic or national language of Greece. It now remains to say a word on the literary productions extant of these two forms of language. In the case of the literary style the material at hand is very rich and surpassing; in fact, the whole Greek literature, the glory of ancient Greece, is composed almost exclusively in the literary diction. With regard to the colloquial or popular speech, it is hardly represented in the written monuments extant (cp. 020). This is a regrettable vacuum, but its occurrence is not surprising. For all colloquial compositions of the time, being of temporary and private character (private correspondence, notes, etc.), were committed to skins, leaves, wax-boards or tablets (*ceræ*, *πυξία*, *δελτία*), and papyri, which, being single copies, have all perished in the humid soil of Greece. But even if the material were of lasting substance, we must remember that every scribe, the moment he tries to commit his thoughts to writing, instinctively shapes them in a more or less artistic form, and thus unconsciously rises to the conventional or literary style (05. 019). In these circumstances the colloquial or popular language, especially that of the classical period, has left, and could leave, no representative specimens to distant posterity.

HELLENISTIC PERIOD (300-150 B.C.).

Greek becoming an International Language.

08. With the close of the IVth B.C. a new era opens in the history of the Greek language. With the final subjection of Greece to the Macedonian rule her glorious days closed for ever. At the same time, the rapid and vast conquests of Alexander the Great in Asia and Egypt threw the East open to the Greek populations. Multitudes of them soon made their

way into the various territories of Asia, Egypt, North Africa, Southern Europe, Spain, France, the Euxine, in short, along the coasts of the Mediterranean and Black seas, in many cases penetrating into the far interior. The Greek language then, already Atticized, gradually conquered the whole ancient world, and became the medium of international communication. At the same time, the rapid expansion of the Hellenic race over alien regions naturally led to novel conditions: new Greek communities sprang up in Asia Minor (Smyrna, Rhodes, Antioch, Pergamon) and Alexandria, which soon competed with the metropolis for supremacy. The balance of culture and learning eventually shifted to the East, Alexandria becoming the principal centre of classical education and learning (hence this period is often termed the *Alexandrian period*).

09. The conditions created by such political and social changes are naturally reflected in the contemporary literature and language: the Greek populations which had settled abroad among alien races (such as Syrians, Persians, Egyptians, Ethiopians) as soldiers, colonists, tradesmen, and the like, formed only a minority among the natives. They had to accommodate themselves to altered conditions: novel (oriental) life, new avocations, new climate, foreign culture. Such changes in life, coupled with the absence of a national centre and a uniform or systematic education, called into existence a sort of colonial or *Levantine* Greek which soon began to tell on the language of the already declining metropolis in Greece proper, inasmuch as the colonial and foreign spirit asserted itself against the ancestral or classical culture. In this way a Panhellenic Greek sprang up which, while always preserving all its main features of Attic grammar and vocabulary, adopted many colonial and foreign elements and moreover began to proceed in a more analytical spirit and on a simplified grammar. This modified or cosmopolitan Greek is generally designated as the non-Attic or *Common* Greek (Κοινή or Ἑλληνικὴ διάλεκτος), that is, the generally received Greek (Panhellenic). It is this Panhellenic or *new Attic* that marks an already advanced stage in the direction of *Modern Greek*.

GRECO-ROMAN PERIOD (B.C. 150-300 A.D.).

010. From this time onward the Greek language departs farther from classical Attic under more and more varying conditions. In the first place, while the cultural and social competition between the new Greek commonwealths in the East and the ancient metropolis (Athens) of all Greeks was still in process, a foreign unwelcome master interposed: the Romans came upon the stage and put an end to the political independence of all Greek communities, both abroad and at home. However,

we must not imply here that Greek made room for Latin; for the Romans, instead of Romanizing their Greek subjects, were Hellenized by them—a fact deplored by the Romans themselves.

Hor. Ep. 2, 1, 156: *Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit et artes Intulit agresti Latio*.—Ovid Fast. 3, 101 sq.: *nondum tradiderat viclas victoribus artes Graecia*.—Liv. 34, 4: *iam in Graeciam Asiamque transcendimus omnibus libidinum illecebris repletas, et regias etiam attractamus gazas; eo plus horreo ne illae magis res nos ceperint quam nos illas*. Cic. Arch. 23 *quod Graeca leguntur in omnibus fere regionibus, Latina suis finibus, exiguis sane, continentur*.—and ἀπολοῦσι Ῥωμαῖοι τὰ πράγματα γραμμάτων Ἑλληνικῶν ἀναπληθέντες, said Cato the elder (Plut. Cato Maj. 23, 3)^[1].

011. On the other hand, it is equally true that the Roman administration, notwithstanding its surrendering to Greek culture and education, did not fail to influence the Greek language: a large number of words referring to Roman associations and novelties, especially official (administrative, military, and judicial) terms, social grades, titles and dates were adopted in a more or less Hellenized form. At the same time the Roman rule, essentially military as it was, reduced intellectual life and culture to a lower ebb, and thus on the one hand brought into disuse and oblivion a considerable portion of the Greek vocabulary, and on the other left freer play and scope to the colloquial or popular speech. Now as the language developed under such conditions and influences compared unfavourably with the Attic of the glorious olden times of Athenian hegemony, many scholars now, and after them the great majority of their successors, acting in a tacit conspiracy, endeavoured to check the further progress of this 'Common' (i. e. unclassical Attic) Greek and revive the ancient pure Attic, a circumstance which gave them the nickname of *Atticists*, i. e. 'purists.' Not originality, but *imitation* and *form*: *Κεῖται; οὐ κεῖται*;—was now the motto of all scribes^[2], and their general conspiracy systematically excluded from the literary compositions all the new elements daily cropping up, and thus prevented them from reaching posterity^[3]. The effort and example of these purists, too, though criticized at first, gradually became a sort of moral dictatorship, and so has been tacitly if not zealously obeyed by all subsequent scribes down to the present time.

[1] Cp. also Senec. Consol. ad Helv. 6, 8; Juven. 6, 184; 15, 110; Quintil. i. 1, 12; Sueton. Claud. 42; Aristid. i. 394, 10; Acts 21, 37; Jos. B. J. 5, 5, 2; Epict. Frg. 53.

[2] Thus Aristides (Rhet. 2, 6) prides himself on being able to state that he has used not a word which is not sanctioned by classical writers: *περὶ δὲ ἑρμηνείας τοσούτων ἂν εἴποιμι, μήτε ὀνόματι μήτε ῥήματι χρῆσθαι ἄλλοις πλὴν τοῖς ἐκ τῶν βιβλίων*.—See also FBlass Pron. 10 f.

[3] The actual state of public education at this period may be gauged by such documentary specimens as: (Gr. Urk. Berlin 13³ [July 22, 289 A.D.], 22-23) ἀ]ρηγῆλιος ἀμμωνίς ἀπο χωρίας νεθεῖτων ἀξιωθεῖς υπαῖρατων γραμματα μετ εἰδωτων εγγραφα υπαῖρ ατων (for Αὐρήλιος Ἄμμωνίς ἀπὸ χωρίας Νεθετῶν ἀξιωθεῖς ὑπ' αὐτῶν γράμματα μετ εἰδῶτων ἔγγραφα ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν), where the formal and standing phraseology of the signature by procuration would have led us to expect a more correct spelling even among the uneducated masses.

012. But despite this purist conspiracy of all post-classical scribes, which is amply illustrated in the Atticistic productions of the time, the unlearned inscriptions and papyri, especially those of a private character, show an essentially different complexion, which reflects, though dimly, the popular or colloquial language, and at the same time signalizes, as stated above (09), a distinctly advanced stage of modern Greek.

013. Generally speaking, in the literary productions of this period we can distinguish four different strata of the language: (1) The *Atticists*, who adhere rigidly to classical Attic, copying both its vocabulary and grammar (Dionysios of Halicarnassos, Dion Chrysostomos, Lucian, Aristides, Pausanias, Aelian, Himerios, Themistios, Libanios, Phrynichos, Moeris, etc.). (2) The *common* or *conventional* school consisting of writers who in their compositions follow the received or Panhellenic language, that is Attic with many concessions to the spirit of the times (Polybios [but cp. 1771, b], Diodoros, Plutarch, etc., also Josephos and Philon). (3) The *Levantine* group, represented by Asiatic Greeks and those Hellenized foreigners who in their compositions adopted the Greek language (many contemporary inscriptions and papyri, then the New Testament, less the Septuagint which is Rabbinic Greek). This Levantine group is sometimes wrongly termed the *Hellenistic*.—From these three schools which represent the *written* language, we must distinguish as (4): The *colloquial* or *popular speech*, which is discernible in the analytical spirit and modernized diction of the Common and Levantine Schools, and particularly in many of the contemporary inscriptions, and papyri. The last-named source, especially that of the papyri, is now being daily multiplied by discoveries in Egypt, where the dryness of the climate and the solidity of the temples and tombs afforded to MSS and other documents an everlasting shelter.

TRANSITIONAL PERIOD (300-600 A.D.).

a. *Christianization of the Greek language: Greek body, Christian soul, Modern Attire.*

014. In this transition stage of the Greek language, another agency, mightier than any previous one, manifested itself and remodelled its character: the conversion of the Greek race to Christianity. It was Christianity, indeed, which had the most revolutionary effects on the Greek history and culture. Christianity originated in Asia Minor, which was ruled by Rome but spoke Greek. It came not from abroad as a foreign invader and conqueror, but sprang up in the midst

of the masses as a friend and saviour. Once set in the hearts of the people, it became part of their race, part of their nature, and turned them not to subjects but to zealous agents. The classical or Hellenic spirit now makes room for new ideas and doctrines, new education and life. In their religious ardour and enthusiasm, the Greek multitudes abjure their ancestral beliefs, their history and literature, and therewith that part of their vocabulary which was associated with unchristian principles. The Greek temples are zealously transformed into Christian churches or deserted as haunted spots; the traditional customs and beliefs are abandoned and disowned; the reading of pagan authors, that is, of Greek literature altogether, is religiously shunned^[1]; Hellenic colleges are abolished as pagan institutions; in short, the old Hellenism is Christianized in a modern spirit, and thus undergoes a process of transubstantiation.

015. The work of Christianity in the transformation of the Greek language received an additional impulse from another momentous factor: with the division of the Roman Empire into Eastern and Western, the seat of Greek culture and learning removed from Alexandria and Athens to ancient Byzantium, now rebuilt by Constantine the Great, and named New Rome (later Constantinople). Constantine himself having adopted the Christian faith (first Christian Emperor) raised it to a State Church and made New Rome a metropolis of the Eastern Empire, which was now composed chiefly of Christianized Greeks (cp. 025). The new capital was situated in the midst of many heterogeneous races and alien influences; the administration and court ceremonial were entirely novel; the spirit of the times was mainly religious and martial. All these influences affected daily life and imprinted on the language a peculiar and, as it were, composite stamp which is conventionally termed the *Byzantine style*.

016. To sum up, partly the Roman sway,—whether it proceeded directly from Rome proper as in the first centuries (145 B.C.—330 A.D.), or from New Rome, her Hellenized successor and rival in the East (025)—but chiefly the rapid transition from Greek culture to the ascetic fervour of Christianity, had the most consequential and permanent effects on the Greek language. Thousands of words and terms associated with science, literature, history, mythology (now called idolatry), philosophy, and all such vocabulary as was associated with God-forsaken paganism, passed into oblivion^[1]. Even the name of ‘Hellen,’ the

[1] Clementina 4, 12 ἐγὼ τὴν πᾶσαν Ἑλλάδα κακοῦ δαίμονος χαλεπωτάτην ὑπόθεσιν εἶναι νομίζω. Const. Apost. 1, 6 τί γάρ σοι καὶ λείπει ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἢ ἐπ’ ἐκεῖνα τὰ ἐθνομυθὰ ὀρμήσης;

traditional and hereditary designation for a Greek, being now associated with heathen reminiscences, was repudiated, and the appellation 'Romaïos' (Ῥωμαῖος), that is, citizen of the Christian metropolis, New Rome, or 'Rome *par excellence*,' was universally adopted instead. In this way the formerly copious stock and vocabulary of the Greek language was now considerably reduced and modified in a Christian and modern spirit.

b. The Church saving Literary Greek from Extinction.

017. Here, however, misunderstanding must be guarded against. It is true that Christianity while ousting paganism obliterated Hellenic culture and with it remodelled the Greek language. But on the other hand a reaction followed: once Christianized, the Greek language found a mighty support and shelter in the Christian Church. Not that the latter was in actual sympathy with the Hellenic language as such, but for other practical reasons. Apart from the very momentous fact that the Old Testament had been translated from the Hebrew into the conventional or Atticizing Greek (013), the then international or cosmopolitan language, the very founder of Christianity (presumably) and His Apostles (certainly) had preached and written in Greek; the New Testament, the foundation and fountain-head of the Christian faith, had been promulgated in Greek; the early ecclesiastical writers and Church Fathers had devoutly imitated the Biblical diction; in short, the Christian Church had been founded upon the conventional and universal Greek of the time. In these conditions it was a foregone conclusion—nay, it was almost pre-ordained—that all subsequent religious compositions should be guided by the sacred language of the Church, whose diction and grammar, having once received a canonical sanction, continued as a fixed standard, appropriate to the lofty and earnest subject, to influence in every way Christian posterity.

018. It might be reasonably objected here, that secular writers of the Christian era, whose number is considerable, though Christians themselves, were not, by any means, compelled by religious considerations to frame their compositions after Biblical or patristic Greek. This is true, but, as already explained (010ff.), for pagan or secular compositions, the old classical Attic diction, sanctioned as it had been through all previous ages, still stood as the only model and standard for all composition. Thus it came to pass that all literary compositions produced since the Christianization of the Greek race, if religious in their character, were adapted to ecclesiastical Greek; if secular in their tenour, were moulded on the classical language. As a matter of course, either form goes back to the same original, classical Attic (019).

NEOHELLENIC PERIOD (600-1900 A.D.).

a. *Byzantine Period* (600-1000 A.D.).

019. With its Christianization, the Greek language had entered on the path of distinct modernization. We have already seen that, since the Roman dominion, ancient culture had made room for Christian worship, and education for ascetic renunciation. This state of things naturally led to general ignorance and darkness, a circumstance which greatly loosened the mutual touch previously existing between the literary style and the colloquial or popular speech, and thus left an unhampered course to the latter. It might have even led to a complete disconnection and separation between the two forms, had not the literary language already permeated the popular idiom. For it will be remembered that, just as classical Attic had served as a model for all pre-Christian antiquity, so ecclesiastical Attic succeeded and continued as a fixed and sacred standard for all post-Christian literature. As a matter of fact, ecclesiastical Attic was now the diction of every reading book; ecclesiastical Attic was the language of the ritual daily read and heard in the Greek Church; ecclesiastical Attic was the diction of all school-books, the entire course of education being religious in its spirit and bearing. Likewise the official language of the Emperor and his court, that of the vast administration, of the law courts and the numberless clergy, was essentially ecclesiastical or modernized Attic. Even the language of the uneducated masses was crammed and infused with an immense amount of phraseology recognizable as ecclesiastical expressions, official terms and standing phrases. In short, all compositions as well as polite language were moulded after the same pattern: the ecclesiastical or modernized Attic. It is true that, in his daily life and intercourse, every Greek was at liberty to speak the colloquial language or even his own dialect; but as soon as he proceeded to commit his thoughts to paper, he was compelled to follow some grammar (07). Now there was but one grammar: the Attic. It was Attic grammar that every penman, whether highly or poorly educated, had learned. Attic grammar then naturally suggested the traditional orthography and vocabulary associated with it (25^e). It must be also borne in mind that education was limited almost to the clergy—the great majority of penmen since Christian times—who read chiefly, if not exclusively, the Bible and so knew it by heart. These monks and priests, then, whether they treated religious subjects or secular matters, gave them a scriptural colour. They made it a pious duty to copy or imitate the sacred language of the Church. From whatever quarter then we may start we always gravitate towards the same central fountain—the Attic grammar and stock (018). Thus

there was at all stages of the Greek language, since classical antiquity, a general conspiracy of agencies in favour of the Attic dialect, which caused nearly the whole Greek literature, whether pre-Christian or post-Christian, to be clad in a more or less artificial Attic attire varying only with the degree of the individual education of each scribe.

020. Under these conditions it is not surprising if the colloquial speech is hardly represented in literature in its genuine form. It never obtained recognition or favour among the educated set of writers (ο5 ff., 25 ff.). On the contrary there has been at all times a general prejudice against it, and the writers and scribes of the time made it a special point of honour and pride to make the least possible concessions to the popular vocabulary and grammar. It is true that the spirit of the popular language breathes through all post-Christian compositions, still in every case it is very carefully disguised under the veil of classicalism. It is only now and then that we light upon a purely popular expression which has forced its way into the text owing to its untranslatable nature, but even then it is branded as 'common,' that is, exceptionable or vulgar, and the author intimates to us his reluctance and aversion to such 'vulgarisms.' A curious specimen of such Greek, exhibiting the literary style mixed with colloquialisms, may be adduced here as an illustration. It is a satire against the Byzantine Emperor Maurice, in the year 600 A.D. (Theoph. 283, 19-23.)

Εὔρηκε τὴν δαμαλίδα ἀπαλὴν (καὶ τρυφερὰν)
καὶ ὡς τὸ καινὸν ἀλεκτόριον ταύτῃ (ἐ)πεπῆδησεν ^[1],
καὶ ἐποίησε παιδία ὡς τὰ ξυλοκούκκουδα,
καὶ οὐδεὶς τολμᾷ λαλῆσαι, ἀλλ' ὅλους ἐφίμωσεν.

Ἄγιέ μου ἄγιε, φοβερὸ καὶ δυνατὸ,
δὸς αὐτῷ κατὰ κρανίου ἵνα μὴ περαιρήται,
κάγώ σοι τὸν βούν τὸν μέγαν προσαγάγω εἰς εὐχὴν.

021. This specimen of mixed Greek, which represents two languages blended into one common stock, or rather one language embodying, like a composite picture, the features of two languages ^[2], is very characteristic. Taken in connexion

[1] The reading of the text is ταύτῃ πεπῆδηκεν, both against the metre and the construction of the word. The form ἐπεπῆδησεν (ἐπιπῆδῶ) is required both by the dative ταύτῃ and the sense. Cp. Arist. H. A. 5, 2, 4. Plut. ii, 512 D. Achem. 35, 15.

[2] Similar characteristics are discernible in almost all literary productions dating since the VIth of our era. Whether they are based upon the classical dictionary and grammar, or upon the popular speech, they do not mirror the actual state of the language. In the former case, which embraces well-nigh all literature down to the XIth and the greater part produced since, the language, looked at from the standpoint of grammar and vocabulary, is essentially Attic, while in its spirit and character it reflects the popular or colloquial speech; virtually it may be literally paraphrased into modern Greek. On the other hand, all compositions which profess to be founded on the popular language are infused with a literary vocabulary and phraseology so considerable that they are anything but exponents of the actual speech. In

with the Alchemistic texts and some more serious or pretentious writings of the time, like those of a Callinicos (450 A.D.), the two Vitae Epiphanii, Malalas (560 A.D.), Leontios of Neapolis in Cypros (620), Joannes Moschos (620), the Chronicon paschale (630), Theophanes (810), Constantinos Porphyrogenetos (950), Theophanes continuatus (960), and others, leave no doubt that the popular language at this time had very closely approached that of the present day. This was also to be expected not only from the general character of the preceding or transitional literature, but even from that of the New Testament and such of its sequels as the Didachê and the Testamenta XII Patriarcharum.

022. It has been argued that the political history of the Greek race during the Middle Ages had sweeping effects on the Greek language, and that the Slav invasions since the VIIth gave the finishing stroke to ancient Greek. This part of Greek history, it is alleged, records the sad fact that Slavs⁽¹⁾, Franks, Venetians, and Turks succeeded one another in the formerly classical soil of Greece, and have swept away all features of Greek culture and language left behind by the Roman sway. Each foreign race, it is assumed, naturally imparted the stamp of its régime to the language of its Greek bondsmen, so that the final product of this successive or periodical havoc was the submerging and extinction of the original language. In other words, all the above heterogeneous elements were blended together and produced a bizarre idiom, the 'Romaic' or modern Greek. This line of reasoning, however, so fair in its semblance, does not stand the test of critical research. It is founded upon a superficial comparison of modern Greek glossary with ancient Greek lexicon, that is upon a parallel of the vocabulary of present popular speech with the artificial diction of classical literature (05 f. 032), and not, as it should be, upon a comparison of present Greek grammar with ancient Greek grammar, the true test in the critical or scientific study of language. Now such a comparison will easily show that present (popular) Greek preserves almost faithfully the phonology, in all its essentials the morphology or accidence, and to a considerable extent the syntax of ancient Greek (031): three unmistakable criteria of its being a lineal descendant and direct representative of ancient Greek. Were it a new, that is a distinct or separate language, formed, as erroneously believed, during the above stormy times, it would inevitably represent the result or conglomerate of all their heterogeneous influences; it would be an essentially Franco-Slavonic idiom, as English is Anglo-Saxon, and thus preserve only such Greek (chiefly lexical) elements as English does preserve Celtic relics. But the results before us tell a very different story. They plainly show that, in its character and

fact, it may be safely contended that, with the exception of the popular songs and the epic story Erotocritos of the Cretan poet Cornaros, no literary production worthy of note, whether ancient or modern, reflects the colloquial language of the time in its pure and genuine form.

(1) In passing by the invasions previous to this time, of the Goths (306-7), Bulgarians (540), and Slavs (811), I neither ignore nor dispute these historical facts, but the presence of the above races in Greek territory was too transient; in point of fact, these incidents mark mere predatory incursions which could not leave lasting or perceptible traces on the Greek language. This is also proved by the fact, that there is not a single Slav word in modern Greek, which can be traced back to the presence of Slavs in Greece (1040, c, c & [2]).

structure, present Greek is still genuine Greek, and, in all its essentials, can be traced back to ancient times. The phenomenon too, though very remarkable, finds its explanation in the natural law that the language of the more civilized race remains supreme, whether that race be the conqueror or the conquered⁽¹⁾. Now the culture of all foreign rulers of Greece—Romans, Goths, Slavs, Franks, Venetians, Turks—was certainly inferior to that of their contemporaneous Greeks, especially in reference to language. For, to begin with the Romans, they were a nation of great racial strength and military genius, but of avowedly inferior culture, as compared with their Greek subjects. Accordingly they received more from, than they imparted to, the Greek language, since it was already far richer and more cultivated than theirs (010.025). They imposed on it only such a vocabulary as was peculiar to their superiority, or new to the Greeks; that is to say, a vocabulary expressive, as we have seen, of Roman associations and novelties, especially official and administrative terms or titles (011.023).

023. The Roman dominion was succeeded by the Byzantine Empire, which was an essentially Greek régime. For even the emperors themselves, though originally Roman, soon adopted not only the Christian faith in its original Greek form, but also the Greek language and nationality (015); nay, they identified themselves so much with the Greek race and cause, that they even disclaimed all connexion with old Rome, and carried on against her a constant religious war. Now what were the characteristic features of this Byzantine period apart from its devotional spirit (019)? Religious strifes and military struggles. The religious hatred which ensued between the Roman or Latin and Greek Churches (and remains alive to the present time) has kept the Greek and Latin races, through all times, apart from each other, or rather, in constant antagonism, so that neither (old) Rome nor her Romanic descendants (Franks and Venetians) succeeded in converting Greece to their faith, or in influencing her language in any perceptible degree. As to the Latinisms—military, judicial, and administrative terms originally adopted from the Romans—so far as they had not been Grecized, they were naturally displaced by a corresponding Byzantine—that is, Greek—vocabulary, Greek being the language, not only of the people and the administration, but of the emperors themselves, who frequently even aspired to eminence in Greek literature (015.028).

b. *Mediaeval Period* (1000-1450 A.D.).

024. With the opening of the next or Mediaeval period, we are faced all at once by all those changes which had been effected since Christian times by a long and gradual but hitherto latent process: here we witness the complete modernization of the language. A whole series of compositions, especially metrical, are written in undisguised 'modern Greek.' This is the more significant as the earliest of these specimens (Spaneas, Theodoros Prodromos, Michael Glykás, etc.) were composed by 'learned' scribes or champions of ancient Greek, and at a time noted as the period of zealous reaction in the spirit of classicalism (028). The language of these productions

⁽¹⁾ A striking illustration of this law is afforded by Roman history. From the Ist a.c. to the IVth a.d. Rome was the mistress of Gaul and Spain on the one hand and of Greece on the other, yet with very different results. For while she succeeded in completely Romanizing the Gauls and Spaniards, in Greece she was Hellenized by her subjects (010).

then marks not the beginning, as commonly believed, but the completion of the process which since classical antiquity had been leading to 'modern Greek.'

025. The Greek terms of administration, titles, and military grades, introduced by the Byzantine régime, had a peculiar history. In the capital (Constantinople), and those eastern provinces which escaped all foreign dominion during the Middle Ages, they remained in full force and continuous use as late as the XIVth, when the Turks came upon the stage. In Greece proper, however, the Byzantine terms were expatriated, and replaced by a new vocabulary of the feudal régime of the Franks, chiefly bearing on chivalry and gallantry. Still, these extraneous and alien novelties, which had nothing to do with common life and thought, never struck root in the character of the Greek people, so that, through popular unconcern and time, they soon passed into oblivion. Similar considerations apply to the succeeding dominion of the Venetians, whose Romanish institutions, like those of their predecessors, never became popular in Greek provinces. They also substituted their own (Italian) terminology—military, administrative, nautical, commercial—for those of the Franks; but dissimilarity of race, and religious antagonism between Rome and Constantinople, or between the Roman and Greek Churches, kept the two races apart, or rather in antagonism, and prevented a free intercourse and influence of real consequence (023). A striking illustration of the failure which attended the efforts of Venice—the most civilized and mighty of all foreign rulers in Greece—to assimilate her Greek subjects, may be found in the present state of Crete. That island remained under the Venetian dominion, and formed a dependency of admirable organization—it was called the Kingdom of Crete (Regno di Candia)—for an unbroken series of more than 450 years (1210-1669)^[1], yet with all that, hardly any native Cretan Romanist is to be found on the island, and the Cretan vocabulary of to-day does not preserve fifty words which can be traced directly back to the Venetian domination^[2].

c. Modern Period (1450-1800 A.D.).

026. The subjugation of the Greeks to the Turkish rule had a peculiar effect on the Greek language. The Turks had no affinity with either their predecessors (the Byzantines at Constantinople or the Venetians in Greece) nor with their Greek subjects, but were totally alien in race, religion, and culture. Their policy also was directed, not to assimilate their bondsmen (for which they neither cared nor had capacity), but mainly to keep down their Christian subjects, and extort from them the greatest possible material benefit. The Greek Church was even respected, for fear lest her numerous and powerful flock might be pushed into the arms of the Western Christian powers, the formidable foes of the Turk. Hence the Sultans not only spared, but also recognized, the Patriarch of Constantinople as the 'spiritual head' of all Christians in his dominions, so that the Greek Church exercised a sort of national authority and power.

027. The appearance and establishment of Turkish rule in Europe—much as it may have proved obnoxious to civilization and the Christian

[1] In Greece proper the Venetian dominion lasted only half as long.

[2] This is the more striking when we remember that Crete has not since changed masters more than once, for it has passed from the Venetians directly to the Turks, her present rulers, who cannot claim a civilization superior to that of their predecessors.

cause—looked at from a Greek point of view, appears less fatal than any other foreign régime might have proved, since, notwithstanding its barbarous character, it has proved less injurious to the cause of the Greek Church and language. For, having an aversion to all European civilization and religion, the Sultans fenced their empire against all access from Europe, and thus barred out all Western influence on their subjects. This policy, though obstructing the progress of the Greeks in proportion to the Western Europeans, had a beneficial effect on their language, inasmuch as it guarded it against Western (Romanic) influence. Again, the open contrast and hostility between the Christian faith of the Greeks and the Mohammedan religion, kept aloof the Christians who looked for comfort and salvation in their Church. Be it further remembered that the Greeks of the time, degenerate though they were, still preserved a degree of culture and education superior to that of their Mohammedan masters. In point of fact, they had hardly anything to learn from them, save some novel administrative terms and a small vocabulary referring to oriental dresses, meals, and other Asiatic novelties. The grammar and main stock of the Greek language was not materially affected, since the Greeks, having been left to themselves, continued to pursue their ancestral vocations as agriculturists, tradesmen, artisans, shepherds, priests, or monks, and employed the very same implements and means as they had inherited from time immemorial. At the same time it was inevitable that this stationary condition, which barred out the influx of foreign elements into the Greek language, led to another serious evil: a gross ignorance ensued, and the remains of education, science, and knowledge, which had been preserved from the previous times, now came to an end. All the terms then representative of such cultural notions were forgotten, so that the *vocabulary* sustained a further depletion and change. On the whole, however, in grammar and spirit, the language remained purely Greek; and in lexicon, essentially Greek, for the reasons given above (023).

028. Under these conditions, the Greek of to-day, as spoken by the people (not the *abstract*—scholarly and journalistic—Greek, which is ancient Attic modernized), is a direct survival and development of classical Attic, impoverished and simplified in a modern spirit, and under the unavoidable influence of various agencies, mostly internal and peculiar to Greek history. These may be briefly summed up here. Classical Attic, having once attained its fullest development, furnished post-classical antiquity and posterity with a surpassing and inexhaustible literature, extending into almost every line of thought and action. This advantage secured for it an absolute supremacy and authority in the ancient world: it made it first a standard or national, then an international—though always an *abstract*—language (05). When the period of Greek sway had gone, instead of vanishing with the glory of its native soil, it met with exceptionally favourable chances: no superior or even equal culture followed in Greek lands to supersede and extinguish it; all races which occupied its classical territory, however strong and mighty in military genius, proved inferior in culture. Hence the Greek language has successfully resisted all foreign predominance. Looked at also from the internal point of view, it withstood, more successfully than any other language, the mighty stream towards rapid change and modernization. This singular phenomenon is due to various factors peculiar not only to the nature of the Greek language (cp. 32 ff. 81. App. i. 9), but also to the Greek history.

To begin with, the Atticists (B.C. 200-100 A.D.) were the first to raise the standard of classicism, and their efforts did not fail to further the cause of the language, by influencing all subsequent writers. Second in order, but foremost in importance, is the mighty support which it received from the Greek Church. Whatever may have been the motives which actuated her, it is indisputable that her shield proved a veritable palladium for the language. Another impulse which also furthered considerably the cause of the language is to be found in the revival of classicism at the imperial court of the then metropolis (Constantinople), during the reign of the Comneni (1050-1200) and Palaeologoi (1260-1450). The literary taste and ambition of these emperors, and their zealous and commanding efforts to enforce, through the administration, ancient Greek upon common life, did not fail to refresh and enliven the language. The fourth and last agency need not be emphasized: I refer to the regeneration of Greece, which has naturally led to the revival of the language. In point of fact, the national zeal displayed by the present Greeks during the last seventy years, though not always in the right direction, has already made up for well-nigh all lexical losses sustained by the ancient vocabulary during the last twenty centuries^[1].

028^b. It results from the foregoing sketch that the history of ancient Greek literature is not the history of the ancient Greek language, and likewise, the history of modern Greek literature is by no means the history of the modern Greek language. Ancient Greek *literature*—an artistic product of psychological action and mental reflexion—begins for us with Homer and closes conventionally with the end of paganism, its subsequent continuation being a merely artificial and scholastic reproduction of ancient models. In the same way the ancient Greek language begins with the origin of the Greek race and closes virtually with the present day, or, so far as it differs from present speech, with the end of paganism. This inter-relation of literature and language is more pronounced in the case of modern Greek. For the history of *modern Greek literature*—i.e. of those compositions which reflect popular speech—opens as late as the twelfth century A.D., whilst the history of the *modern Greek language* is virtually as old as the history of ancient Greek, or, considered in its distinctly modern form, goes at least as far back as the origin of Christianity.

029. In its present stage, that is not in its abstract or literary form, but as *actually spoken by the uneducated masses* during the last hundred years, modern Greek consists of a great number of dialects and idioms which are distinguished from one another principally by lexical varieties. At the same time their phonology is not quite identical throughout, but varies more or less according as a locality lies further south or north. A line drawn along the 38th degree of northern latitude would (according to GHatzidakis 342) divide all dialects into two general groups: the *northern*, which would comprise Continental Greece, Euboea, Epirus, Thessaly, Macedonia, Thrace, Pontos, and the northern Sporades (Asia Minor); and the *southern*, which would consist of the Peloponnese (Achaia excepted), Megara, Aegina, the Cyclades (except Tenos, partly also Andros), Crete, Chios, Cyprus,

[1] It may be computed that more than 40,000 new words have been coined within the last 100 years either to supplement the reduced stock, or to replace the foreign element. As a matter of course, a very great number of these new formations were never naturalized, but after a short life passed into oblivion.

Rhodes, up to the southern Sporades (Asia Minor), then Southern Italy, especially Otranto and Bova (Byzantine settlements of the VIIIth-Xth), which last, having been cut off from all other Greek dialects since the XIth, in some respects preserve the pre-mediaeval morphology and vocabulary of modern Greek.

030. The fundamental difference between the two groups lies in the higher or lower stress of accent, inasmuch as the more north we proceed, the stronger the stress becomes, at the expense of unaccented syllables, and conversely the more south we return the less the difference becomes between accented and unaccented syllables. Accordingly in southern speech all syllables, whether stressed or unstressed, are well defined and almost isochronous (half long), whereas in the northern dialects the effect of the strong expiratory or dynamic accent has been to lessen the stability of the unaccented parts of the word, whether following (post-tonic) or preceding (pre-tonic), that is to reduce unaccented vowels to a minimum, often even to nil. The chief vowel sounds affected by this northern phonetic principle are *i*, *u*, *e*, *o*, in that southern unaccented *e* and *o* are reduced to short *i* and *u* respectively, and southern *i* and *u* frequently swallowed altogether^[1]. The natural consequence of this phonetic tendency is that, while southern speech, like ancient Greek, is averse to consonantal accumulations (123), and in case of need even develops interconsonantal vowel sounds, dropping also any final consonants except *σ* and *ν*;—the northern dialects generally, but especially those of Macedonia (e.g. Velvendos) show a decided fondness for consonantal sounds, whether initial, medial, or final, and drop weak vowels (146 ff.). Thus southern *ἔρημος* 'deserted' in northern speech changes to *ἔρ'μους* or *ἔρ'μους*, *δουλεύω* 'work' to *τρ δ'λεω* or *δ'λεύου*, *σκυλί* 'dog' to *σκ'λι* or *σκ'λί*, *νερό* 'water' to *νιρό*, *παιδί* to *π'δί*, *κουνούπι* 'gnat' to *κ'νούπ'*, *θυμός* 'wrath' to *θ'μός*, *λιβάδι* 'meadow' to *λ'βάδ'*, *κοιμούμι* 'sleep' to *κ'μούμ'*, *σηκώνω* 'lift' to *σ'κώνου*, *πουλώ* 'sell' to *π'λῶ*, *κεφάλι* 'head' to *κ'φάλ'*, *ποτάμι* 'river' to *π'ουτάμ'*, *κάνετε* 'you do' to *κάνιτε*, *ἐγὼ* 'I' to *ιγῶ*, *ἐμεῖς* 'we' to *ιμεῖς*, *με* 'me' to *μί*, *μὴ* 'don't' to *μέ*, *βουβός* 'dumb' to *(β'βός) 'βός*, *στουπί* 'flax' to *(στ'πί) σ'πί*.—In other words, the reduction to a minimum or disappearance of unaccented *i*, *u*, and the change of unaccented *e* *o* to *i*, *u*, have altogether transformed the language, the ancient rich sonantism (124) having made room for a new and odd sonantism, and the ancient poor consonantism (123 f. 169) for a strange succession of consonants, whereas the declension and conjugation, so richly developed in ancient times, now appears strangely reduced and almost irrecognizable. Thus northern (Macedonian) speech changes southern *ὁ λόγος* to *οὐ λόγους*, *τοῦ λόγου* to *τ' λόγ'*, *τοῖς λόγους* to *τ'ς λόγ'ς*, *ὁ κλέφτης* 'thief' to *οὐ κλέφτ'ς*,—*θελῶ* 'will' to *θέλου*, *πουλούμεν* 'we sell' & *ἐπουλούμεν* to *π'λούμ'*, *πηδάτε* 'you jump' & *ἐπηδάτε* to *π'δάρ'*, *ἐλέγετε* to *λέγιτ'*, *ἐγύρισε* to *γύρ'σ'*, *θὰ πουλήσετε* 'you will sell' to *θὰ π'λήσ'τ'*, *θὰ πουλήσουν* 'they will sell' to *θὰ π'λήσ'ν*.—*Τ'ν ἄλλ' τ' μέρα κάθονταν ἢ γ'ναῖκα τ' μὴ τοῦ κέν'μα'ς τοῦ κατέφλ'ου μὴ ἄλλ'ς γ'τόν'σ'ς κ' κ'ντοῦσ'ν*, for southern

[1] As a matter of course, these phonetic peculiarities of northern speech are modern and have nothing in common with the reputed ancient 'quantity,' otherwise the process would have affected the entire Greek phonology and led to the disappearance of all the formerly 'short' vowels. In all likelihood, the phenomenon is traceable to foreign influence, the more so as Albanian phonology shows striking analogies (cp. G Meyer in G Gröber's Grundriss, i. 812 f.).

τὴν ἄλλην (τὴν) ἡμέρα ἐκάθετο ἡ γυναῖκα του μὲ τὸ κέντημα 'ς τὸ κατώφλιο μὲ ἄλλες γειτόνισσες κ' ἐκέντα.

031. We see then that, from a phonological point of view, the northern and southern groups, especially towards their extreme boundaries (e. g. Velvendos in Macedonia—Crete), exhibit a very marked difference of sonantism (124). It is further evident that the geographical position of the several localities, their isolation or their vicinity to foreign races, their political and internal history, have, to a greater or less extent, conduced to shape the idioms at present spoken in the various Greek communities. That these various dialects have not the same historical value needs no special comment. Thus while northern speech has been influenced by alien (Albanian, etc.) phonology, the dialects of Pontos and South Italy bear unmistakable traits of Turkish and Italo-Venetian influence. Now as phonology in every language is intimately connected with morphology, it inevitably follows that the grammar of the above specified (northern, Pontic and Italian) dialects has been, within Neohellenic times, considerably affected by extraneous influences. At the same time, a careful examination of the southern group will show that, for various reasons, these dialects have withstood foreign influence with far greater success than the northern, and so preserved the ancient phonology, substantially also morphology and syntax (022), with such (chiefly morphological and syntactical) changes and vicissitudes only as would be inevitable from the nature of the case and the culture or spirit of the time. It is for these reasons that students of the post-classical and subsequent history of Greek, in looking for information in the present stage of modern Greek, should direct their attention not so much to the northern as to the *southern* group of Neohellenic dialects.

[032. As an appendix to this introduction, it may be well to remind young students of a fundamental error often committed by investigators of modern Greek. These Neo-grecists are apt to rashly draw an unqualified parallel between *classical Greek*, in its artistic as well as artificial form, taught through the Attic grammar (05-06), and *present popular speech*, especially northern. And the evil is aggravated by the practice of representing present popular speech in its *phonetic* spelling, while retaining *etymological* or *historical orthography* for ancient Greek (25°). The natural consequence of this comparison is the creation of such a wide chasm between classical and modern Greek as to render the former almost irrecognizable in the latter. This method, however, is utterly misplaced and misleading. A phonetic parallelism between the ancient Greek of the texts and the popular speech of to-day would be justified only under the three following assumptions: that the pronunciation of classical Greek (V-IVth B.C.) had been incontrovertibly the Erasmian; that the ancient Hellens wrote and spoke the same language, that is they used the same vocabulary and grammar whether they wrote or spoke; and above all that they followed the principle of phonetic spelling. Now as these premises can never be established, to contend that classical θεός (allegedly τηός) has degenerated to θίός, παλαιός (παλαῖός) to παλίός, δίκαιος (δίκαῖος) to δικίος or δίκος, ἡ γλυκεία and τὰ γλυκεία to ζλυκίά, καὶ ἄν το κί ἄν, ὁποῖος (ἠοποῖος) to ὄπχιος or ὄπχος, μία το μιιά, ἀλλοίως to ἀλιώς, etc. is not only to disregard ancient phonology—that is the characteristic phenomenon of synaloephe (synizesis, contraction, crasis, elision, etc.), so common even in classical *compositions*,—but to ignore the very physiology and actual structure of language. No doubt

modern popular Greek is *the* form to be considered in an historical and critical study of the Greek language, but to apply historical orthography to the ancient period and phonetic spelling to the modern, introducing even novel and alien symbols into ordinary texts, is to forget the elementary fact that such a parallelism would distort any language, whether we should compare two different ages of it or the written and spoken forms of the same period. Take as instances the following specimens of *modern* French, German, and English, as given phonetically by HSweet (Primer of Phonetics, pp. 92, 100, and 81 f.).

French.

parle vu frañsə? əŋ pə. ʒaŋ se ʒyst ase pur mə fæər koŋ-
praɑndrh. il lə parl kuramaŋ. il ekri l frañsə kəm sa pɔpɔrh laaŋg.
kæl œər æt il? il ə trwɛz œər e dmi. save vu si ʃit œər oŋ deʒə
sɔne? vule vuz ataɑndr əŋ eŋstaŋ?

Parlez-vous français? Un peu. J'en sais juste assez pour me faire com-
prendre. Il le parle couramment. Il écrit le français comme sa propre langue.
Quelle heure est-il? Il est trois heures et demie. Savez-vous si huit heures ont
déjà sonné? Voulez-vous attendre un instant?

German.

:oo 'zeestu, 'folər 'moontʃain! -tsum ;letstn :maəl -auf :mainə
'pain, :deen :iç :zoo 'mançə 'mitərnaxt -an :diizm 'pult her'ɑŋgə:vaxt!
'dann :ybyər 'byyçərn -unt pə'piir, :tryyp'zeeljər 'froynt! er'ʃiinst :duu
'miir. 'ax, 'kœnt -iç :dox -auf ;bergəshəən -in :dainəm 'liibn 'liçtə
'geen, -um 'bergəshəələ -mit 'gaistərn ;veebm, -auf ;viizn -in :dainəm
'demər 'veebn, -fon 'aləm ;vianskvalm ent'laadn -in 'dainəm 'tau
gə'zunt -miç 'baadn.

O sähtst du, voller Mondenschein! zum letztenmal auf meine Pein, den ich
so manche Mitternacht an diesem Pult herangewacht! dann über Büchern und
Papier, trübsel'ger Freund! erschiest du mir. Ach! könnt' ich doch auf
Bergeshöh'n in deinem lieben Lichte gehn, um Bergeshöhle mit Geistern schwe-
ben, auf Wiesen in deinem Dämmer weben, von allem Wissensqualm entladen,
in deinem Thau gesund mich baden!

English.

:pijpl 'juws -tə :piŋk -çi 'əp -wɛz -ə :kaɪnd -əv 'flæt 'keik', -wiʃ -ðə
'siç -ɔl 'raund -it'; -bət -wij 'nou 'nau -ʒət -its 'ri:li ;raund', :laik -ə
'bɔl—'not 'kwaɪt :raund', -bət -ə :litl 'flætnd', :laik -ən 'ɔrɪŋz'.

People used to think the earth was a kind of flat cake, with the sea all round
it; but we know now that it is really round, like a ball—not quite round, but
a little flattened, like an orange.

-ən 'iŋglɪsmən -wɛz 'wɛns 'trævliŋ -in 'tʃainə' -huw 'kudnt :spi:k
'tʃaini:z'. 'wɛn 'dei' -hiç -wɛz 'dainiŋ -ət :səm 'içtiŋ:haus', -ən -ðə
'weɪtə 'brɔt -im -ə 'miçt 'pai'. -ɛz -ij -wɛz 'veri 'hɛŋgri', -biç 'et -it
'ɛp', -ən 'pɔt -it 'veri 'gud', -bət -ij 'kudnt :meik 'aut :whɔt -it -wɛz
'meɪd -ov'. -sou :wen -ʒə :weɪtə :keɪm -tə :kliər 'əwei', -hiç 'pointid
'ət -ði 'emti 'paɪdiʃ', -ən 'kwækt -laik -ə 'dak'. -ðə 'weɪtər -ət 'wɛns
'ju:k -iz 'hed', -ən 'baekt -laik -ə 'dog'. -ən 'sou -çi :iŋglɪsmən 'njuw
-içd -biçn 'dainiŋ -on 'dogzflɛʃ.

033. It is therefore absolutely unscholarly, or arbitrary and mis-
leading, to contrast modern Greek (especially northern) in its phonetic
spelling, with ancient Greek (especially artistic) in its historical
orthography before we have gained a full insight into the actual
phonology and grammatical structure of classical and subsequent
'ancient' Greek. To contribute something in that direction is one
of the primary objects of the present work.]