
On the Value of Modern Greek for the Study of Ancient Greek

Author(s): Albert Thumb

Source: *The Classical Quarterly*, Vol. 8, No. 3 (Jul., 1914), pp. 181-205

Published by: Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Classical Association

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/635575>

Accessed: 27-10-2018 13:07 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



Cambridge University Press, The Classical Association are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Classical Quarterly*

ON THE VALUE OF MODERN GREEK FOR THE STUDY OF ANCIENT GREEK.¹

THE study of Hellenistic Greek, or of the *κοινή*, which has flourished increasingly since the beginning of the present century, has brought Modern Greek more and more within the view of classical philologists. As I have insisted on utilizing Modern Greek for Hellenistic philology for about twenty years, I may claim some credit if a knowledge of Modern Greek is now admitted to be indispensable to Hellenistic studies; but philologists only reluctantly acknowledge this new demand, and hesitate to acquire as full an acquaintance with Modern Greek as the study of the *κοινή* demands.

Thus, for instance, the linguist Paul Kretschmer² emphasizes the value of Modern Greek to students as an important source of linguistic information, but Professor Gercke, one of the editors of the work in which Kretschmer's article appears, states in the same volume that although Modern Greek has been useful in elucidating many problems of vulgar or Hellenistic Greek, it remains outside the interests of most classical students. Hence young students will unfortunately be inclined to conclude that they need not burden themselves with this new study, even if good opportunities should come in their way.

I think I may claim to have proved by my own scientific work how much a good knowledge of Modern Greek contributes towards a right perception of the character of Hellenistic Greek, and I therefore venture to discuss the methodical value of Modern Greek philology to-day, and to illustrate its fruits by some concrete examples. The theme of my lecture will give me occasion not only to review the latest results of investigation, but also to trace the lines of future inquiry. I shall restrict myself to the linguistic side of the subject, whereas Dr. Menardos,³ the Reader of Modern Greek in the University of Oxford, and the Dutch Neogrecist, Hesseling,⁴ have extended their investigations to folklore and literature, treating the language itself but lightly.

But before entering upon the discussion of my special subject, I should wish to say a few words as to the interest which the study of three thousand years of continuous linguistic development has for those who concern themselves with the science of language in general. Only the Indian and Chinese

¹ A lecture delivered before the Victoria University of Manchester, October 13, 1913.

² Gercke und Norden, *Einleitung in die klass. Altertumswissenschaft*, I² (1912), p. 474.

³ *On the Value of Byzantine and Modern Greek in*

Hellenic Study, Oxford, 1909.

⁴ *Det Beteikenis van het Nieuw Grieks voor de Geschiedenis der Griekse Taal en der Griekse Letterkunde*, Leiden, 1907.

languages have a documentary history extending over so long a period. "The great gain from the study of contemporary Greek is the perception of the whole as a continuous and living language," says Menardos concisely.¹ As in the development of human speech, transformation or change alone is constant—*πάντα ῥεῖ*, says Heraclitus of Ephesus—it is of the highest importance for the knowledge of the laws of linguistic development that we should be able to observe the transformation of a language for as long a time as possible. For instance, the decay of the verbs in *-μι* takes place before our eyes; we see it begin with Homeric forms such as *δεικνύουσι*, continue through Hellenistic *ιστῶ*, *τιθῶ*, *κάθομαι*, until Modern Greek is reached, in which *εἶμαι* alone remains from the rich Indo-European formation. In Latin the same process was completed before the beginning of written records. 'Itacism,' from its beginning with the transition of *ei* into *ē* in the ancient Corinthian dialect (6th century) to its completion with the transition of *η* and *υ* to *i*, lies entirely within the textual tradition of Greek. The process was at work for about 1,500 years, *i.e.*, from 600 B.C. to A.D. 900, as regards common Greek; but even to-day it is not entirely complete, for *η* and *υ* have still in some dialects their old values as *e* and *u*.

There are philologists who are accustomed to characterize all modifications of classical Greek as due to the decline or deterioration of the language. How wrong such an opinion is appears from the fact that some tendencies of classical Greek have only attained adequate expression in the modern language. So, for example, the old dualism expressed in the two forms *ἔγραφον ἔγραψα* only reaches completeness in the modern differentiation of the future into the two forms *θα γράφω* and *θα γράψω*. Modern Greek, accordingly, shows that the distinction between imperfective and perfective action, far from vanishing in post-classic times, has remained sufficiently vigorous to create new forms supplementary to those of classical Greek.

If the development of a language can be traced through three thousand years, we may expect to find that in the succession of phenomena certain processes are at times repeated, and observations of this kind are of special importance for the study of the laws of linguistic development. We know, for instance, that in prehistoric Greek, long before the time of our textual tradition, the palatalization of *q^hi*, *q^he*, has led through *çi*, *çe* to *τι*, *τε* (*e.g.*, in *τίς*, *τέ*, *πέντε*), and that this process repeated itself at the end of the classical period, spreading over a great part of the Modern Greek dominion to an extent which cannot at present be exactly delimited. In Crete and other islands, in the Peloponnesus and elsewhere, *ki*, *ke* has become *çi*, *çe*, *tsi*, *tse*, and the like, exactly as in the Romance languages.² But whereas in the Romance languages this sound-change is almost universal, it is restricted in Modern Greek to particular dialects; and I mention it because just in the same way the prehistoric change did not establish itself in all dialects; for instance, the

¹ *The Value*, etc., p. 19.

Vernacular (Edinburgh, 1911), § 17.

² A. Thumb, *Handbook of the Modern Greek*

Aeolic group has *πέσσυρες* for *τέσσαρες*. Further, the assibilation of *τι* to *σι* (*δίδωσι, τίθησι*) is a characteristic of the ancient eastern and central dialects; and the same change is found again in Modern Greek as a characteristic of the speech of Crete and some other islands of the Aegean, in which places words like *μάτια, στρατιώτης* have become *μάθια, στραθιώτης*. In inflexion also we find examples of the repetition of the same process of change after an interval of time. Thus the ancient passive aorist *ἐδόθην*, according to the probable hypothesis of J. Wackernagel, had its origin in the 2 s. *ἐδόθης* (= old Indian *adithās*)—that is to say, this single form has developed into a complete tense formed on the analogy of *ἐβάλλην, -ης, -η*, etc. In the same way the Modern Greek imperfect *ἐφιλοῦσα, -ες, -ε*, etc., has its origin in 3rd pl. *ἐφιλοῦσαν*, which is found in the Hellenistic period. Let me give one more example of a less obvious character. In the ancient Cretan dialect there occur nominatives such as *ἄμην* for *ἄμές, τινέν* for *τινές*; and Johannes Schmidt has shown that these forms are occasioned by the 1 pl. ending which appears in *φέρομεν*.¹ Now the modern dialect of Aravanion in Cappadocia furnishes the form *ἐσεῖτ* for *ἐσεῖς*, 'you,' which is clearly occasioned in the same way—i.e., by the analogy of the 2 pl. *λέτ* (= *λέγετε*) and similar forms.² Such examples can be multiplied to any extent.

A detailed comparison of the development of Greek with that of Latin and Old and Modern Indian would be calculated to enlarge greatly our knowledge of the general character and causes of linguistic development. No adequate inquiry of this kind has yet been made. For instance, what has been said about the parallel development of Greek and Latin is far from sufficient.³ Such a comparative history of Greek and Latin and of Greek and Indian and German would be of value to the whole Science of Language, for it shows over long periods the general conditions and effects of linguistic development. Even a superficial comparison brings out the difference of rate of linguistic transformation in different languages. The rate of transformation seems to be much slower for Greek than, for instance, for the Romance and Germanic groups.

The sound changes of Modern Greek, though greater than those in Italian, are less pronounced than those of French and English, especially where unaccented syllables and terminations are concerned. In accordance the Romance languages have lost all, English nearly all, the case-forms: whereas Modern Greek has kept all the old cases (except the dative) and the different types of declension. Compare, for instance, the Modern Greek *φίλος, φίλου, φίλο(ν), φίλοι, φίλω(ν), φίλους* (as in Classical Greek), and the Italian *amico*, (plural) *amici* against the Latin *amicus, amici, amicium*, etc.; or the English *day*

¹ See Brugmann-Thumb, *Gr. Gramm.*, p. 273.

² See Hatzidakis, *Ἀθηνᾶ*, xxiv, 342.

³ Körting's book, *Neugriechisch und Romanisch* (Berlin, 1896), is unmethodical, and therefore a failure. K. Dieterich in *KZ.* xxxvii. 407 sqq., xxxix. 87 sqq., Immisch in his *Sprach- und Stilge-*

schichtliche Parallelen zw. Griech. u. Lat., N. Jahrbücher f. d. klass. Altertum. xxix. 27 sqq., and Pfister in *Vulgärlatein und Vulgärgriechisch*, Rhein. Mus. lxvii. 195 sqq., make some suggestive remarks.

(plural) *days* against the Gothic *dags, dagis, daga, dag, dagōs, dagē, dagam, dagans*.

We must not, however, underestimate the distance between Ancient and Modern Greek, as Professor Hatzidakis has lately done.¹ The modern Cappadocian dialect, for instance, has developed in such an original manner that it differs from common Greek more than French differs from Italian or Italian from Latin. We may put it generally, and say that the energy of dialectic differentiation in Greek is not less than that seen in the Romance languages; for between the dialects of the Peloponnesus, Macedonia, Cyprus and Cappadocia, there is a distance not surpassed by that which separates Italian, Spanish, French and Roumanian. Indeed, the difference between the Tsaconian dialect, the descendant of the old Laconian, and all the other dialects, cannot be equalled by any differences among the Romance languages as I know them. Nevertheless, the centrifugal forces in Modern Greek must be accounted weaker than those in the Romance, Germanic and Slavonic languages. These latter have produced more than a single literary form; while Greek, from the Hellenistic period down, and even before this, has always possessed the same centripetal or unitary tendencies. It never occurred to the modern Greeks to create distinct literary dialects—one for the Greek kingdom itself, another for Cyprus, another for Pontus or Cappadocia.

For all problems concerning the highest and ultimate principles of linguistic science, we must utilize the comparison of different languages; and the longer a language-history the greater our gain from it. The philologist, therefore, who takes an interest in the universal science of language, must not neglect Modern Greek, which has a documentary history of nearly 3,000 years, and one differing widely from that of the other European languages.

We have already touched upon the subject of literary dialects. In Greece throughout the whole of its history this has shown unique features. We see to-day in Greece the struggle for a new form of literary speech. This 'battle of language' has a universal interest, for it teaches us what processes accompany, and what conditions influence the rise of a new literary dialect. A young and energetic party, which grows from day to day, has for about fifteen years been struggling against the traditional literary speech, the *καθαρεύουσα*, which artificially preserves ancient Greek forms and words. These reformers aim at creating a new language of literature, which shall agree with the living popular language and draw its power from it. They desire what we have long possessed, a natural and national speech, free from the chains of the past, however glorious, like French and Italian, which have liberated themselves from bondage to Latin, or English and German, which have won the place

¹ Περὶ τῆς ἐνότητος τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς γλώσσης, Ἐπετηρὶς τοῦ Ἑθνικοῦ Πανεπιστημίου 1909. 47 sqq. Professor Hatzidakis, relying on his list of words, says that half the words of the Homeric vocabulary survive in Attic, and a third of these in Modern Greek (6480 : 3485 : 1165); of the 4,900

words of the New Testament, 2,280 are still used ἐν τῇ κοινῇ λαλίᾳ. These statistics are open to the objection of including words owing their vogue to literary influence, and before admitting their validity we should apply the same test to the relations of Latin and Italian.

once held by Latin, as the language of monks and scholars. For us in 'Europe' this struggle for a really modern language belongs to the past. In Greece we see before our eyes how progress struggles with tradition, and how the national spirit is roused by an endeavour to introduce vernacular forms and words like *πατέρας* for *πατήρ*, *νερό* for *ὕδωρ*, *σπίτι* for *οἰκία*, or to banish the dative from the written language. The study of this process teaches us not only how a new literary form of speech arises, but also what psychological factors, national or individual, prevent or promote such a process. It enables us to realize what difficulties the great Dante had to face in elevating the *lingua uolgaris* to the literary rank of Latin, and why the language of the great reformer Luther was so long in winning its victory over German dialects of North and South. And we see from the Greek parallel that such literary innovations came not only through academic discussion, but also through passionate strife. The present opportunity of observing the struggle for a new literary dialect illustrates in many details similar conflicts in the past, not everywhere perhaps so passionate as in modern Greece, where this literary question has incited men to political revolution, and even resulted in bloodshed.

The new literary idiom is based on colloquial Greek, but forms also a higher unity, above the dialects. Greece had already solved this problem when Hellenistic Greek developed out of Attic, and united the whole of Hellenism in a common spoken and written language which finally superseded the old dialects. The study of this process, the rise of the so-called *κοινή*, receives useful suggestions from the history of Modern Greek. So I come to my special theme to which I wish to call your attention, and proceed to inquire what is the value of Modern Greek philology for the study of Ancient Greek. Modern Greek research proceeded upon wrong lines until thirty years ago,¹ and in consequence its importance for Ancient Greek was first sought in a wrong direction. It was believed that Modern Greek was a descendant of Aeolo-Doric dialects, and even that certain Modern Greek sounds and inflexions must be derived from prehistoric Greek types. Thus, for instance, every *a* where Attic had *η* was thought to be Doric, the nom. and acc. plural *τιμές* = *τιμαί(-ας)* was identified with Aeolic *τιμαῖς* = *τιμάς*, the old digamma was everywhere recognized where Modern Greek *β* or *γ* or another consonant did not clearly correspond with identical sounds in the ancient language. In (dialectic) forms like *ἀγαπάεις* for *ἀγαπᾷς* the original uncontracted form was seen; and in cases such as *ἐρώταγα* = ancient *ἐρώτων* the genuine Indo-European type was believed to survive. A scientific fantasy which was guided by no method regarded Modern Greek and its dialects as a help in recognizing unknown dialectic forms of old Greek, and even forms from prehistoric and pre-Hellenic times. Scholars affected by this *Archäomanie*, as it has been called, never examined or explained the absurd historical premisses on which those grammatical derivations and

¹ See Thumb, *Die neugriech. Sprache*, Freiburg i. B., 1892.

speculations rested. European and Greek philologists revelled in the great antiquity of Modern Greek; and when the truth about its origin had already been stated, a Greek¹ still praised its Homeric character. Even to-day there are occasionally Greeks who surpass their predecessors, if possible, and make the most absurd assertions as to the archaic character of their mother tongue; but they are amateurs, of no scientific importance, who are no longer taken seriously. For we have long known that Modern Greek with its dialects descended from the *κοινή* or Hellenistic common speech. This statement has changed the point of view from which the relation between Ancient and Modern Greek must be considered.

In the first place, the present-day view of Modern Greek has a negative side; our knowledge of the ancient dialects cannot be enlarged by the study of the modern tongue, at any rate not on the basis of clear and undisputed facts. The traces of ancient dialectic elements are too unimportant, and their recognition in Modern Greek depends too much upon the ancient traditional dialectology for us to draw any certain information from studies of this kind in the modern language. It is possible enough that a digamma should live on in the β of a rare dialectic word or place-name, but, apart from Tsaconian, only the place-name *Βούτυλο* (a village in Maina) eludes critical examination;² for *βολκός* 'kiddle' (Western Peloponnesus) recently supposed to come from an ancient **Φολκός*,³ has its digamma disproved by the fact that *όλκός* and *έλω* in antiquity show no trace of it. On the other hand, an old digamma cannot be proved by the M.Gr. word because a β in other words also appears spontaneously before an initial *ο*.⁴

It is therefore not worth our while to look in Modern Greek for traces of ancient dialect phenomena. The search would be a failure, and sheer waste of energy, for the direct way to the sources is shorter and surer. There is only one exception. The Tsaconian, spoken in the Parnon mountains, is the only descendant of an ancient dialect, and we may characterize it as a mixture of old Laconian and Hellenistic elements.⁵ In this single case we can reconstitute an ancient dialect, starting from a modern one; and with the additional help afforded by tradition we can delineate the features of the later Laconian. As I remarked years ago,⁶ it would be worth while to apply Tsaconian to the examination of the text and language of the Laconian psephism in Boethius, *De Institutione Musica*, I., 1, a forgery by a grammarian of the Imperial age. Professor von Wilamowitz, through neglecting the help of Modern Greek, has failed to advance the linguistic interpretation and reconstruction of this text.⁷ Further, Tsaconian gives us some knowledge of old Laconian characteristics

¹ Κοντόπουλος, 'Αθνασία τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς γλώσσης, ἡ ἀνέφεσις τῆς Ὀμηρικῆς γλώσσης ἐν ταῖς δημόδεσι διαλέκτοις, Athens, 1884 (2nd edition!).

² See most recently Hatzidakis' *Μεσαιωνικά καὶ νέα Ἑλληνικά* II. (1907) 316 sqq.

³ See Σκιάς in the 'Ἐπετηρίς τοῦ Πανεπιστημίου, 1911, 217 sqq. (K. Dieterich, *Byz. Zeitschr.* xxi.

286, also expressed doubts.)

⁴ See Hatzidakis *l.c.*

⁵ See Thumb, *Handbuch der griech. Dialekte* (Heidelberg, 1909), 90 sqq.

⁶ *Hellenismus*, pp. 36 sq.; most recently *Indog. Forsch.* xxxiii. 298.

⁷ *Timotheos, Die Perser* (Leipzig, 1903), 69 sq.

preserved in the later Laconian; thus Professor Hatzidakis has shown¹ that it not only proves an old pronunciation of *υ* as *u*, and so confirms the ancient tradition, but also proves that under certain conditions Laconian made *υ* into *iu*—a fact previously known only for the Boeotian dialect, and quite new for Laconian.

But that which we may glean from Tsaconian is quite trifling in comparison with the rich harvest of information that Modern Greek yields concerning Hellenistic. The modern language enables us, first, to deduce the spoken *κοινή* independently of the ancient sources, and so to fill up the gaps in our textual tradition. Then it renders possible a critical examination of this textual tradition. And so by the combination of these processes we can form an accurate conception of that important period of Greek.

Beginning with the first point, we may observe that our scientific research has the same task and the same method as the study of Vulgar Latin by the aid of Romance philology. Since we may assume that Modern Greek dialects began to differentiate markedly between A.D. 500 and 1000, it follows that the deduced common basis of Modern Greek and its dialects represents Greek as spoken about the end of antiquity. Let us see now in a rapid review how Later Greek appeared about A.D. 500, if we reconstruct it with the help of Modern Greek alone, renouncing the aid of textual tradition.

1. The *vocalism* had already reached the stage known as 'Itacism,' found in the language of to-day: *ει* and *η* had become *i* everywhere, and so had *η* almost everywhere; *οι* and *υ* were pronounced alike, partly as *i* and partly as *ü*; *αι* had the same sound as *ε*, and *ευ*, *αυ* were either *ev*, *av*, or *ef*, *af*. Vowel quantities were levelled: all accented syllables, whatever the original quantity of their vowel, became uniformly half-long, while all unaccented syllables were short. The tone difference between acute and circumflex had disappeared, the two accents denoting essentially stress, not pitch.²

That the state of vocalism presupposed by Modern Greek really belongs to the close of antiquity is proved by the Northern Greek dialects of to-day. Here every unaccented *i* and *u* has been reduced or has disappeared, every unaccented *e* and *o* has become *i* and *u*. In these changes the ancient *ι*, *η*, *υ*, *ει* and *οι* are alike treated as *i*, *ε* and *αι* as *e*, *ο* and *ω* as *o*. The Northern Greek changes of vocalism imply that Itacism had become complete. And since we may assume that these developments in Northern Greek started between A.D. 500 and 1000,³ the stage of Itacism must have been fully reached about the end of antiquity.

2. The *consonantism* too has the same aspect as that of Modern Greek. The old *φ*, *χ*, *θ* have become *f*, *ch*, *p* (except that *σθ* is *στ*, *χθ* is *χτ*, and *φθ* is

¹ Kuhn's *Zeitschrift*, xxxiv. 81 sqq.

² For a certain musical element in Modern Greek accent, see H. Pernot, *Phonétique des parlers de Chio*, 50 sqq.; also Brugmann-Thumb, *Gr. Gramm.*, 176 sq.

³ See *Hellenismus*, p. 165, *Prinzipienfragen, der Koiné-Forschung, Neue Jahrbücher f. d. kl. Alt.*, 1906, pp. 258 sq. Kretschmer, however (*Der heutige lesbische Dialekt*, pp. 5 sq.), is not certain as to the antiquity of the Northern Greek phenomena.

φτ), and β, γ, δ are υ, ζ, δ̄, except in the combinations μβ, γγ, νδ, where the mediae remain unchanged. The tenues as a rule suffered no change, but they were softened after a nasal (as in ἔμπορος, ἔντερα, ἀνάγκη), and became fricatives before τ (κλέπτῃς becoming κλέφτῃς, δκτώ ὀχτώ, etc.); the nasals disappeared before φ, χ, σ, as νύφη, Κωσταντίνος; ζ and σ before a voiced consonant were sounded ζ, as in κόσμος.

3. In the inflexion of the nouns may be noted the loss of the dative, and such paradigms as γλῶσσ-α, -ας, -αν, -ες, -ῶν, -ας, or -ες; ἐλπιδ-α, -ας, -αν, -ες, -ων, -ας, or -ες; πόλι, πόλεις, πόλιν; ναύτ-ης, -η, -ην, -ες, -ῶν, -ες, or -ας; πατέρ-ας, α, αν, -ες, ων, -ες, or -ας; ψωμ-ᾶς, ᾶς, -ᾶ, ᾶδες; ἀλεπ-οῦ, -οῦς, -οῦδες. The pronouns ἐμέ and ἐσέ had become ἐμέν(α) and ἐσέν(α), ἡμεῖς and ὑμᾶς had been replaced by σεῖς and σᾶς, οὗτος by τοῦτος, and ὅδε had disappeared.

4. In verb-inflexion it is characteristic that the present active participle became indeclinable, the infinitive was limited (the substantival use must have retained its position unimpaired), reduplication was lost, and so were the middle aorist, the optative, and the perfect passive. The -μι verbs were transformed into verbs in -ω, except εἰμί, which was however conjugated as a middle (εἶμαι, εἶσαι (ἔνι), εἶμεθα, εἶσθε (ἔνι), with imperfect ἤμην, etc.). Subjunctive and indicative flexion coincided, as did that of imperfect, perfect, and aorist (ἔγραφα, ἦλθα, ἔγραψα, εὔρηκα), the perfect tense receiving the syntactical force of the aorist.¹

It is however remarkable that ἔδωκαν and ἔδοσαν, ἔθηκαν and ἔθεσαν lived on together. The difference between active and middle persisted, though middle and passive forms were levelled, and the subtleties of the ancient middle were lost. The total list of *media tantum* verbs was not reduced, for such losses as παραιτῶ for -οῦμαι, 'resign,' were compensated by innovations like χαίρομαι.

Such is the picture, in a few broad lines, of Hellenistic as presented to us by the comparative study of Modern Greek and its dialects. It is a hypothetical reconstruction, and we ought, if we had no other evidence, to place the asterisk before these assumed earlier forms, and write τῆς *γλῶσσας, οἱ *ναῦτες (*náftes), *εἶμαι (*íme), *ἔνι, *ἔγραφα, *ἦλθα. The comparative method however permits us to regard them as really existing: it is only on their relative age that we might entertain doubts, had we not direct textual evidence, so as to feel hesitation in ascribing them to the end of antiquity. But now the textual tradition, presented most conspicuously in the papyri and inscriptions, affords us immediate evidence that the deduced forms really existed in the Hellenistic age. Thus Itacism in its first stages can be distinctly observed from the third century B.C.; the Hellenistic change of θ to ϐ is proved for the second century A.D.; the accusative πατρίδαν and such forms as ἦλθα, ἔγραφα have been attested from the beginning of our era; ἔχουσες=ἔχουσαι from the first century A.D.; the genitive τοῦ ἀπηλιώτη from

¹ This statement is made on the assumption perfect.
that the modern κ aorist continues the old

the second century; ἦμην, 'I was,' from the third century B.C.; εἶμαι, 'I am,' from the fourth A.D. And if we consider that the Hellenistic texts do not reflect the real condition of the spoken language—on this see below—we may assert with confidence that the κοινή as deduced from Modern Greek was spoken at latest about the fifth century A.D. Indeed, we might safely go further, and claim that it shows us the condition of vernacular Greek as far back as the third: the speech of the common people had by the middle of the Imperial epoch a very Modern Greek appearance.

This result, gained by a comparison of Modern and Hellenistic Greek, is a starting-point for further research, for it entitles us to supplement our deficient knowledge of the κοινή from living speech. How we may do this I may illustrate by one or two examples. Years ago I concluded¹ from modern forms such as ἀλεκάτη, κρεβάτι (for ἡλεκάτη, κραββάτιον) that in the κοινή unaccented ρα, λα changed into ρε, λε; and these forms have since been discovered in Hellenistic texts. In the same way I attribute Modern Greek θωρῶ, χρωστῶ, σωπῶ (for θεωρῶ, χρεωστῶ, σιωπῶ) to the κοινή, although they are not yet attested by any text. The Modern Greek ἐφέτος, 'this year,' and ἀφουκράζομαι, 'I listen,' are proof for ἔτος and ἀκροάομαι with *spiritus asper*—the first form being attested, the latter presumed. Μολίβι, 'lead,' takes us back to an ancient μόλιβος, which can be supported by written tradition.² 'Αρκούδα, 'she-bear,' proves an ancient ἄρκος beside ἄρκτος, and this form duly appears. Modern Greek ἀκολουθῶ = ἀκολουθῶ, σκόρδο = σκόροδον, πέρσι = πέρυσι, περιβόλι = περιβόλιον are the product of a phonetic law by which one of two vowels flanking ρ or λ falls out; and P. Kretschmer has recognized this in Hellenistic phonology from the occurrence of such words as σκόρδον, Μελίνη, φερνίκη.³

If Modern Greek provides us with new facts in Hellenistic, it serves further to establish forms for which there is no certain textual tradition. In Hellenistic texts we frequently find forms unknown to the classical language, which astonish a student who comes fresh from the schoolmaster's Greek to the study of papyri and inscriptions. Philologists in consequence emended Hellenistic texts without scruple, according to the pattern of classical grammar. One day Polybius was treated in this manner by Dutch scholars; another day it was inscriptions or papyri; even the Byzantine authors have been 'corrected' by the philologists of Bonn in accordance with the same Attic prescriptions. For these philologists thought they understood Greek better than the Greek authors themselves. But one who knows Modern Greek looks at such forms as ἄλλες = ἄλλας, ἐμέν = ἐμέ, γέγοναν = γεγόνασι, εἶδα = εἶδον with different eyes: he sees therein the earliest monuments of the developments that issued in the Greek of to-day, and collects them as valuable testimonies which he tries to explain, but refuses to correct like a schoolmaster with a pupil's exercise. There are, no doubt, in papyri and inscriptions many

¹ *Indog. Forsch.*, ii. 85.

Thumb, *Gr. Gramm.*, pp. 156, 160.

² Hatzidakis, *Glotta*, iii. 70 sqq.; Brugmann.

³ Brugmann-Thumb, *l.c.*, p. 80.

wrong spellings and grammatical blunders made by uneducated men. Not all that is written may be admitted as evidence of living speech. The occurrence of individual mistakes and momentary slips of the tongue must be acknowledged, and has of course its interest for the psychology of speech; but it is unconnected with the actual history of Greek.¹ We must therefore first inquire whether such curious forms are individual or not. As a rule, the repeated occurrence of strange forms proves their linguistic value. If, however, they are isolated, we must seek some criterion to determine whether they really belong to living speech. Here Modern Greek can help us, and it may prevent us from rejecting an isolated textual form. For that which actually lies in the direction of Modern Greek development cannot be a mere slip of the pen or an individual blunder: it must be evidence of the linguistic condition of its age. Thus, for instance, the nominative ἡ γῆς for γῆ, or the adjective ἄσκεπος for ἄσκεπτος—both of which are found in Graeco-Latin glossaries—are confirmed by Modern Greek ἡ γῆς, and formations like ἀνέγγιγος for ἀνέγγικτος. It is wrong, therefore, to conjecture ἄσσοπος for ἄσκεπος.² A gloss βυζιν is silently read βυζίν by a Neogrecist (not βίζιον, as the editor has it), because he knows Modern Greek βυζί(ν), 'nipple.' The aorist subjunctive ἔρχω³ for ἔλθω reminds us of the Modern Greek aorist ἦρχα.

Philologists who are shocked by such 'barbarisms,' and neglect them as simple blunders, have the old instinct surviving that only the classical and literary languages are really worth studying. They cannot appreciate Hellenistic Greek as a living development; and Modern Greek moves their contempt, 'because it has ἀπό with the accusative!'

Of course it is not always easy to form a decisive judgment as to the linguistic value of dubious forms. Hence the need of a close acquaintance with the modern tongue, if we would estimate correctly the relations between the ancient and the modern. External resemblance or identity between a papyrus form and one found in Modern Greek does not necessarily imply a true historical connexion. The numerical τέσσερις on a Hellenistic inscription⁴ will not be taken as prototype of Modern Greek τέσσερεις; for the former is occasioned by the confusion of *i* and *e*, characteristic of the κοινή of Asia Minor, whereas the modern form is produced by the analogy of τρεῖς. Again, at first sight the isolated and strange future εἰπόσει, unearthed by Radermacher,⁵ might be supposed to have a relation to the Modern Greek εἰπώθηκα and εἰπωμένος. But a future like εἰπόσει having no analogy in the modern language, we must regard it probably as an individual aberration, starting from the Hellenistic 3rd plural εἶποσαν, according to the analogy of ἐδούλωσαν : δουλώσει, and the like. General rules cannot be laid down for instances such as these; every case must be determined by special examination.

¹ Nachmanson, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der altgriech. Volkssprache* (Uppsala, 1910), has not paid sufficient attention to this point of view.

² See *Prinzipienfragen*, p. 249, where further examples of the same kind are given.

³ *Papyri Iandanae* (Leipzig, 1912), No. 22—between A.D. 619 and 629.

⁴ *Journal of Hell. Studies*, xxii. 358, No. 119.

⁵ *Neutestamentliche Grammatik* (Tübingen, 1911), p. 82.

But what is to be done if strange innovations in Hellenistic are at once well attested by textual tradition, and lacking in support from Modern Greek, either directly or by some indirect precedent? The answer to this question will appear later, when we try to describe the general character of Hellenistic in the light of the modern language.

As Modern Greek affords us the means of enriching our knowledge of Hellenistic speech, we shall not be surprised to find it help us in understanding and interpreting Hellenistic texts. Above all it throws light on the meaning of single words. Thus Hellenistic lexicography gains by the study of Modern Greek. Exactly as we use the latter in reconstructing Hellenistic phonology and accidence, we may ask whether the meaning of certain modern words may not be applied to their ancient prototypes.

I will first give some characteristic examples from Greek scholars of the present day. In Euripides *Cyclops* (v. 694) we find *κακῶς* in a context which excludes the usual sense of the word. The Dutch philologist Cobet has therefore conjectured *ἄλλως* 'in vain.' The Greek Pallis¹ reminds us of Modern Greek *τοῦ κάκου* 'in vain,' and the difficulty disappears if we give this meaning to *κακῶς* in the passage of Euripides. Pallis, who has translated the New Testament into vernacular Greek, has also explained Mark vii. 19, by interpreting the word *βρώματα* not as 'food,' 'meat,' but as 'stench,' 'impurity,' with the Modern Greek meaning.² Again, he has translated *ἡμέρα εὐκαιρος* in Mark VI. 21, not as 'convenient day,' but as 'an empty day,' 'a holiday,' according to the Modern Greek meaning of *εὐκαιρος*.³ Thus a layman, whose mother tongue is Modern Greek, has been able, without scientific study, to enlighten philologists and theologians; for in the really good dictionary of the New Testament by Zorell⁴ both interpretations are accepted, although Pallis' name is not mentioned. If even a superficial knowledge of Modern Greek, without scientific research, promises such advantages, a thorough inquiry into the language will be still more profitable. A short paper by the Greek Kujeas⁵ furnishes a good illustration. In the *Characters* of Theophrastus a children's game is described, and the expression *ἄσκος πέλεκυς* is used in connexion with the alternate lifting up and setting down of children. The expression has puzzled philologists, but Kujeas has found the solution of the riddle in a saying of his Peloponnesian home (Aviá in Laconia). Those words accompany the action of lifting and setting down, and mean 'light like a leather bottle' (which floats) and 'heavy like an axe' (which sinks in water).

The student of Hellenistic texts must not be influenced by his classical Greek—he had better bend his eyes forward to the modern language or, at least, he must remain unprejudiced. Thus did Wellhausen in one of his

¹ In *Class. Rev.*, xix. (1905), 36; Rouse (*ibid.*) gives another instance of Modern Greek as a help for Ancient Greek.

² Pallis, *A Few Notes on the Gospels* (Liverpool,

1913), p. 14.

³ *L.c.*, p. 11.

⁴ *Novi Testamenti Lexicon Graecum*, Paris, 1911.

⁵ *Hermes*, XLI., 478 sqq.

illuminating commentaries on the Gospels, translating Matthew XIV. 15, ἡ ὥρα παρήλθεν by 'the time is advanced,' or proposing for the verb παράγειν the meaning 'to go on.' The excellent orientalist was guided only by his natural feeling, for he did not know that the presupposed meaning of παρά is directly confirmed by Modern Greek expressions like παραπάνω, 'higher up,' παρακάτω, 'further down,' παραμέσα, 'more inside.' Again, if we observe, e.g., that the modern meaning of καιρός, 'time,' or χρόνος, 'year,' is already attested in papyri,¹ we are entitled to project the Modern Greek meaning of words into the period of the κοινή, even when Hellenistic texts do not oblige us to do so. The verb τραγουδῶ, for example, must have had the modern meaning 'I sing,' at the end of the classical period, although this sense is not attested by ancient texts; that the noun τραγωδός had, in fact, the meaning 'singer,' is proved by a Greek loan-word in Syrian, which has this sense.² Modern Greek νηρόν, 'water,' must also have existed in antiquity; it is the contracted form of νεαρόν, and the meaning 'fresh water' is attested by a late-Greek schoolbook. For these reasons I see no difficulty in assuming that the meaning of ὁ ῥιζικός (sc. λίθος), 'reef' (from ῥίζα 'root'), which is adopted by Joh. Schmidt in an interesting paper on Modern Greek τὸ ριζικό (= Italian *risico*)³ belonged to the Hellenistic epoch, although at present no direct proof exists.

Some groups of words may be mentioned in which Modern Greek can provide direct and decisive evidence towards determining the ancient meaning. The names of plants and animals are particularly suitable for investigation, because the modern vocabulary has been carefully examined in special treatises, and rendered available for research.⁴

A few examples, taken at random, may show how the meaning of ancient names of plants, where it is doubtful, can be elucidated by an appeal to Modern Greek.⁵ Ancient Greek ἀγλαοφῶτις, 'a certain plant,' according to the Greek dictionaries, is the Modern Greek ἀγλαοφώτης, *Paeonia officinalis*; Ancient Greek ἄρακος, 'a kind of lentil' is Modern Greek ἀρακάς, *Pisum sativum* or *Lathyrus sativus*, or *Vicia dasycarpa*; ἐχινόπους, 'a prickly plant,' is Modern Greek ἀχινόποδας, *Genista acanthoclada*; Ancient Greek βρυώνη or βρυωνία, 'a creeper or climbing plant,' is modern βρυωνιές, *Smilax aspera*; κόνυζα, 'a plant of strong smell,' is modern ἀκόνυζα, *Inula graueolens*; λαψάνη, 'an eatable herb,' is λα(μ)ψάνα, *Sinapis arvensis* or *putescens*; περδίκιον, 'a plant' (!) is modern περδικάκι, *Parietaria*; φυλίκη, 'a species of Rhamnus,' is modern φυλίκι, *Phyllirea media* or *Rhamnus alaternus*. These examples suffice to prove the value of further investigation. But I do not know any enquiry into

¹ See K. Dieterich, *Rhein. Mus.*, LIX., 234 sq.

² See Krumbacher, *Byz. Zschr.*, xi. 523.

³ *Miscellanea linguistica in onore di G. Ascoli* (Torino, 1901).

⁴ Cf. Heldreich, *Τὰ δημῶδη ὀνόματα τῶν φυτῶν ἐκδιδ. ὑπὸ Σπ. Μηλαράκη*, Athens, 1910. A list of plant-names is also given by Wilski in Hiller v. Gärtringen, *Thera*, iv., pp. 119-130. Lundström,

Botaniska Lexika från medeltiden, Minneskrift Göteborg, 1910, pp. 42 sqq. Krumbacher, *Das neugriech. Fischbuch*, Sitz.-Ber. d. Bayer. Akad., 1903, pp. 345 sqq. (Compare also G. Schmidt, *Vremennik*, x. 603 sqq.)

⁵ I give the Modern Greek names and their botanical denotation from Heldreich, *op. cit.*

Ancient Greek plant-names in which Modern Greek is utilized;¹ only it may be pointed out that Victor Hehn, in his standard work on cultivated plants and domestic animals, does not quite neglect the Modern Greek plant-names.

With regard to the names of animals, the conditions are similar. Medieval Greek works, such as the *Book of Fishes*, edited by K. Krumbacher, give us links in the connexion between ancient and modern names, and Krumbacher's treatise illustrates further how the interpretation of Ancient Greek words is assisted by the evidence of the modern language. It does not surprise us, however, when we find Professor O. Keller, in his book on the animals of the ancient world,² overlooking Modern Greek and Krumbacher's observations. Many a classical scholar would leave a name uninterpreted rather than look for help in the most promising quarter. One example will suffice; I give it in Krumbacher's words.³ 'The *συναγρίς* (an ancient name of a fish), which enjoys an unnecessary anonymity in our dictionaries, can almost certainly be identified. It is the *dentex vulgaris* or "Zahnfisch" (French "denté").'

Philologists who neglect Modern Greek on these points cannot plead scarcity of relevant literature, for there are several useful works in existence.⁴ But they might express doubt as to whether the words we have cited have actually preserved their ancient meaning to the present time. Of course, changes of meaning might occur, just as, for instance, the Indo-European name of the beech, **bhāgos*, Old German *buocha*, Greek *φηγός*, became the name of a species of oak in a prehistoric epoch of the Greek language. But the burden of proof lies on those who doubt the identity of ancient and modern meaning. If a Greek word has the same meaning in all the modern dialects, this meaning must hold for Hellenistic Greek, exactly as we attribute to the *κοινή* Modern Greek sounds and inflexions under the same circumstances.

Unfortunately we do not yet possess the great Modern Greek Thesaurus, to give us information about the areas over which the use of the rarer words extends. Still, the lexicographic material, which is already known and easily accessible, will serve at least for a beginning, as the examples and investigations given above have shown.

But does Modern Greek afford us any possibility of adding to the ancient vocabulary quite new words, which are not attested at all in antiquity? Theoretically, the question must be answered in the affirmative, yet the solution of the problem is not so simple. For only if a word is found in dialects which are very distant from each other, for instance, in the Peloponnese or Crete and Cyprus, in Thrace and Asia Minor, are we authorized to attribute the word to the Hellenistic stock, according to the same method

¹ A few interesting equivalences are pointed out by Kalitsunakis, *Mitteil. d. Seminars für orient. spr.* XIII. (1910), 96 sqq.

² *Die antike Tierwelt*, Leipzig, 1909, 1913. The same holds good of Robert, *Les noms des oiseaux*, Neuchâtel, 1911.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 368.

⁴ See, besides the literature quoted above, p. 192, note 4, Krumbacher's edition of the *Book of Fishes*. Add Stefani, Forsyth (Major), W. Barbey, *Karpathos, Étude géologique*, Lausanne, 1895.

which permits us to infer an Indo-European word **g^hōus* 'ox,' from Old Indian *gāus*, Greek *βοῦς*, Old High German *kuo*. When we have the Modern Greek Thesaurus, it will be easy to find out the words which Modern Greek adds to the ancient vocabulary; at present such an inquiry is very toilsome, as we are obliged to collect our material from a great many dialect glossaries and monographs. But let us make an attempt with the scanty material which has been recently published as a specimen in an official paper of the Greek Committee for the new Thesaurus.¹ There nine words are treated; four of them, which I give in the ancient form—viz., **ἡλιόπυρος*, **θαρρετός*, **λαβόω*, **παραθαλαμίδιον*, are missing in our Greek dictionaries. A priori, these four words could equally belong to Ancient Greek. But as the descendants of *παραθαλαμίδιον* (*βαρθαλαμίδι*, *βαρταλαμίδι*) are found only in Crete, in the Aegean Sea, and Macedonia, it is dubious whether the word existed in antiquity, although its phonetical character would allow us to conclude that it did. With regard to the others, however, I do not hesitate to attribute them to the *κοινή*. For *ἡλιόπυρος* (-ον) 'warmth of sun,' 'sunny place,' does occur in Asia Minor, on the islands from Cyprus and Rhodes to Lesbos, in Euboea, in Epirus and the Peloponnese. *Θαρρετός*, 'light-hearted,' is found in Thrace, Bithynia, Macedonia, Peloponnesus, and Zacynthus, and in the Tsaconian dialect, and it is moreover attested by medieval texts. Finally, **λαβόω* (Modern Greek *λαβώνω*) is in common use. Also the form of these words harmonizes with the character of Hellenistic Greek, and therefore I should not be surprised to find them one day in a papyrus, as on the other hand many a papyrus word, which is an *addendum lexicis*, or many a Greek loan-word from Latin, Hebrew, or Armenian (also lacking in the Greek dictionaries) is confirmed by Modern Greek.² Sometimes internal (etymological) reasons lead us to assume that a modern word might be old; thus I myself³ have concluded from Modern Greek *σύμπλιος*, 'neighbour,' and *σύμπλια*, 'near,' although the form has only been found hitherto on some islands (Andros, Naxos, Syra, Melos, Carpathos), that there existed an Ancient Greek word **σύμπληγος*, 'knocking together,' 'confining,' which is, moreover, the basis of ancient *συμπληγᾶς* (*Συμπληγάδες νήσοι*).⁴ And Hatzidakis has declared Modern Greek *γρίπος* to be old, on the authority of the Theocritean *γριπεύς*⁵—without knowing that *γρίπος* is well attested in antiquity.⁶

Finally, there is a whole group of modern words, which, for external historical reasons, must be attributed to the ancient vocabulary—viz., the

¹ *Ἐπιτροπή τοῦ λεξικοῦ τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς γλώσσης. Ἀνακοίνωσις πρώτη*. Athens, 1912. Compare, too, the lecture of Hatzidakis given before the Congress of Orientalists (Athens, 1912), 'Ἀθηνᾶ xxiv. 373 sqq., and the short but instructive article of Παπαγεωργίου, *Περὶ τῶν σημασιῶν τοῦ ῥήματος ἀρμενίζω*, 'Ἀθηνᾶ. xxiv. 459 sqq.; where the ancient *ἀρμενον* and *ἀρμενίζω* are elucidated by Modern Greek.

² See the bibliography, Thumb, *Arch. f.*

Papyrusforsch., ii. 406 sqq.

³ *Indog. Forsch.*, xiv. 349 sqq.

⁴ The derivation from *συμπλήσιος*, *συμπλησιάζω*, which is tentatively suggested by K. Dieterich, *Byz. Zschr.*, x. 595, and resolutely accepted by M. Vasmer, *ib.* xvi. 552 sq., seems to me hardly substantiated.

⁵ See 'Ἀθηνᾶ, xiv. 523.

⁶ See *Μέγα Λεξικόν* (Athen 1901-1906) s.v., and Lambertz, *Glotta*, v. 136.

Latin loan-words which survive in Modern Greek. They must have come into Greek in the Latin epoch—i.e., before the formation of the Romance languages, at the latest at the end of antiquity.¹ Our dictionaries know nothing about words such as *βίσεξτος, *bisextus*, 'leap year'; γούνα, *gynna*, 'fur'; κάστρον, *castrum*, 'castle'; κιστέρνα, *cisterna*; *κομμέρκι(ο)ν, *commercium*, 'customs duty'; λούρον, *lorum*, 'strap'; μαντίλι(ο)ν, *mantile*, 'handkerchief'; ρόγα, **roga*, 'pay'; *σαγίττα, *sagitta*, 'arrow'; σκουτέλλα, *scutella*, 'plate'; ὀσπίτι(ο)ν, *hospitium*, 'house'; τούμπα, *tumba*, 'hill'; φασκιά, *fascia*, 'tie'; *ὀψίκιον, *obsequium*, 'wedding or funeral train'; and although the papyri and inscriptions afford a store of information on Latin loan-words in Hellenistic Greek,² yet the number of such words is augmented when Modern Greek is drawn on. The words that have been found hitherto in Hellenistic documents prove that Latin words in Modern Greek represent an old Hellenistic inheritance. Similar evidence of antiquity can be found in other directions: for instance, I may call attention to the fact that we are justified in claiming ψίκι or Byzantine ὀψίκιον as an old element in Greek on the ground that it occurs as a loan-word in the New Hebrew literature of Midraš (in the form *apšikîn*).

We have shown by a few details in grammar and lexicography in what manner our knowledge of Hellenistic Greek can be revised, confirmed, and extended by the help of Modern Greek study. Modern Greek is at least as important in enabling us to form correct views upon the ancient κοινή as a whole, and as a link in the long history of the Greek language, whether literary or spoken. Our reconstruction of the κοινή, which has led us from Modern Greek to the latest period of antiquity, results in a language which is very similar to Modern Greek. But the distance between the written texts, even those of the most vulgar character, and the spoken language we can reconstruct is very considerable. Although the speech of literary tradition is much influenced by the living language of the Hellenistic epoch, yet it is not replaced by it in any written document of Hellenism. For the written language shows throughout a mixed character. The proportion of the constituent elements drawn from the traditional and the living speech varies; but even the most vulgar papyri stand at a certain distance from the vernacular language of their times. Without the knowledge of Modern Greek this fact would not appear so clearly. Hence arises a problem of textual criticism which has great importance for some Hellenistic authors, who, in opposition to the Atticising literature, avail themselves of a more popular language. Are all the vulgar (or Modern Greek) forms which occur in the manuscripts in reality elements of the original work? Uneducated copyists might spontaneously and involuntarily have inserted such forms into the manuscripts; conversely, educated copyists might have removed vulgar

¹ Cf. particularly G. Meyer, *Neugriech. Studien*, iii. (Wien, 1896).

² Cf. from the most recent literature, especially Hahn, *Rom und Romanismus im griech.-römischen Osten*, Leipzig, 1906; (thereon see Thumb, *Indog.*

Forsch. Anz., xxii. 39 sqq.); *Der Sprachenkampf im röm. Reich*, *Philologus*, Suppl. x. (1907); Wessely, *Die latein. Elemente in der Gräzität der ägypt. Papyrusurkunden*, *Wiener Studien*, xxiv. (1902) 99 sqq., xxv. 40 sqq.

forms, on account of Atticising tendencies, which have dominated Greek literature from the beginning of our new era till to-day. If therefore (for example) the manuscripts of the Christian Apocrypha show more or less the occurrence of vulgar forms, we may suppose that the textual tradition has been infected and adulterated so as to bring it into harmony either with the classical or the vernacular language. It is not possible to reach a decision by general rules, but only by an exact examination of each literary work and of its textual tradition;¹ and here (a danger to be avoided) the knowledge of Modern Greek might be used in a mistaken direction: a form in the manuscripts might remain unaltered just because it is modern.

Modern Greek in the first place helps us to recognize the condition of the spoken language, which lies at the back of the written language. For it follows from the very existence and the character of Modern Greek that the *κοινή* was a spoken language, used by all Greeks. Here we touch the highest problems, which concern the general character of the *κοινή*.

Modern Greek, together with its dialects, has arisen from the *κοινή* as a unity, and this fact presupposes the disappearance of the ancient dialects. It is the same process which took place in Vulgar Latin and in Armenian (not in the Germanic languages); Latin put an end to the old Italic dialects (Oscan, Umbrian, etc.), and thus became the mother of the Romance languages. Literary Armenian, used as the common language of life, also caused the contemporary dialects to disappear, and became the starting-point of modern dialectical differentiation. So the Modern Greek dialects—those, for example, of Megara, Crete, Naxos, and Cyprus—as we said before, are not descendants of ancient Doric, Ionic, or Cyprian, but descendants of that *κοινή* which in antiquity was spoken in the several districts. The ancient dialects, therefore, must have disappeared in the course of the Imperial period.

Indeed, the ancient inscriptions present the counterpart of this. We observe how the dialects decreased more and more from the third century B.C. on, until they were everywhere displaced by the *κοινή* about the third century A.D. Some scholars have attempted to prove that this process, which is observed in the inscriptions, reflects only the usage of the official language, but is no illustration of the condition of the spoken language.² This may be true in part. But on the whole the inscriptions certainly reflect the natural process, which ended with the disappearance of the old dialects; for Modern Greek imperatively demands this theory; and it seems to me sophistical to dispute the connexion between the evidence of the inscriptions and the evidence deduced from Modern Greek.³ Thus the first epoch of the *κοινή* may be defined as a transition state between the classical epoch, where the dialects existed independently beside each other, and that basis of Modern

¹ Cf. *Hellenismus*, pp. 12, 186 sq.

des Hellenismus. Wien, 1907.

² Cf., for instance, Wahrmann, *Prolegomena zu einer Geschichte der griech. Dialekte im Zeitalter*

³ Cf. *Hellenismus*, pp. 28 sqq.

Greek, where the old dialects had been quite absorbed by a unitary and common speech. Nevertheless, it would be incorrect to define the *κοινή* as *only* a transition state: it has also an independent character, compared with Attic Greek, from which it originated in its essentials, as well as with the language which must be assumed as the basis of Modern Greek. This is well illustrated by the fact that certain Hellenistic formations are missing in the modern language. Forms such as *οὐθείς* for *οὐδέίς*, *κατήγῳρ* for *κατήγορος* and *βάθραξ* for *βάτραχος*, *συγγενεῦσι* for *συγγενέσι* and *γονεῖσι* for *γονεῦσι*, *μειζότερος* for *μείζων* and *βέλτατος* for *βέλτιστος*, *ἦτω* for *ἔστω*, *ποιή* and *δῶ* for *ποιόη* and *δοίη*, *δῶναι* for *δοῦναι* are neither Attic nor predecessors of Modern Greek types. They are peculiar characteristics of the *κοινή*, showing a disposition to a new development, just like all the other innovations of the *κοινή*, only that they remained confined to the Hellenistic epoch and vanished again, partly because the grammatical categories to which they belonged (dative, optative, infinitive) have been lost. We may call them forms of transition, as belonging to Greek only for a time. We must lay stress upon these formations in order to obtain a clear conception of the notion *κοινή*; innumerable are the lexical innovations, which have become obsolete again in the modern speech. A rapid comparison of the Hellenistic and the modern dictionary suffices to show this.

As we have said, the modern dialects have nothing to do with the ancient dialects.

Modern Greek is divided into numerous dialects. Disregarding Tsaconian, we recognize to-day the following main groups: (1) Pontus and Cappadocia; (2) Cyprus and the south-eastern islands (Rhodes, etc.); (3) Crete and the Aegean Sea; (4) the northern islands (Lesbos, etc.); (5) Thrace and Macedonia (perhaps with Thessaly); (6) Euboea, Attica, Megara (perhaps with the Peloponnesus); (7) Epirus and the Ionian islands (whose peculiar features have been insufficiently investigated); (8) the Greek dialects of Southern Italy. The greatest difference is that between the dialects of Pontus and Cappadocia on the one side, and all the rest on the other. The northern dialects (numbers 4 and 5, less distinctly numbers 1 and 7) differ from the southern by a number of vowel changes, involving the disappearance or reduction of every unaccented *i* or *u*, and the change of unaccented *e* and *o* into *i*, *u*.

The grouping of the modern has no relation to that of the ancient dialects. The former must accordingly have developed from a new basis, which can only be the *κοινή*. The question now arises, to what extent do the modern dialects, at least in their embryo forms, pre-exist in the *κοινή*? Had Hellenistic Greek dialectic variations which can be regarded as forerunners of the new dialect differentiation? The ancient texts give us practically no information. Hitherto we have not got beyond a few insignificant details, and some very general reflections. Probably an exact and minute examination of the Hellenistic sources will some day permit us to advance, especially, I believe, on the lexical side. But we have already seen that here also we cannot do

without the help of Modern Greek. As things are, the problem of Hellenistic dialects cannot be solved except by utilizing the modern language, or at least working in close connexion with it. Before examining this, however, it is important to define our task exactly and to put our question into the right form.

When in its first epoch Hellenistic Greek began to eliminate the dialects, the *κοινή* naturally varied as spoken in Doric, Aeolic, or Ionic territory according to the various admixture of old dialectic ingredients. But these elements decreased continually, and the traces of the old dialects which have been locally preserved till the present day¹ are so trifling as to have had no influence in differentiating the modern dialects; for those traces—themselves equally insignificant—which are common to the *κοινή* as a whole, do not concern our present problem. Moreover, Egypt and Asia Minor, a large part of Hellenistic territory, do not belong to the domain of the ancient dialects. And finally, if we speak of dialectic varieties of the *κοινή*, we refer especially to such local differences as have developed from the new-born unity of speech. Taking into account these points of view, we must formulate our two questions, as we did above, guided by Modern Greek. We may now put the one question somewhat more exactly thus: In the Imperial age did dialect marks exist which may be regarded as germs of the modern dialects? The answer to this question depends again upon another: What are the oldest dialectic phenomena of Modern Greek? Do they belong to the Hellenistic epoch? We have already touched on the conditions under which Modern Greek phenomena of a local or dialectic character can be attributed to the *κοινή*. The problem has received but little attention.²

That Modern Greek forms of local currency can be derived from analogous forms of the *κοινή*, follows immediately from their occurrence in Hellenistic texts; and when we combine these forms of Ancient and Modern Greek, we deduce a number of facts which must be interpreted as signs of dialectic variation in the *κοινή*. Compare, for example, the following features:

1. *Phonology*.—In Pontic the vowel η is preserved as ϵ ($\pi\epsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\delta\iota = \pi\eta\gamma\acute{\alpha}\delta\iota\omicron\upsilon$), whereas it has become i everywhere else. The change of η to i is well known from Hellenistic texts. If, now, the pronunciation of η as ϵ still exists in a modern dialect, we must infer that in antiquity there were two provinces of the *κοινή*, one with $\eta = i$ and another with $\eta = \epsilon$. The development of γ in Modern Greek $\delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\omega$ for $\delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\omega$ is dialectal, but it is old, as the form $\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\gamma\iota\lambda\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\upsilon$ for $\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\iota\lambda\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\upsilon$ in a Hellenistic inscription of Amorgos clearly shows: and it is remarkable that the modern dialect of Amorgos belongs to the group of which this intrusive γ is characteristic. In antiquity, therefore, there were two distinct provinces, one with $\delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\omega$ and one with $\delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\gamma\omega$. *Geminata*, or double consonants are, as a rule, simplified in modern speech, and this change was already taking place in the Hellenistic age. But *geminata* have

¹ See *Hellenismus*, pp. 53 sqq.

² K. Dieterich treated it with some minuteness in *Kuhn's Zeitschrift*, xxxix. 81 sqq. He gives

some useful hints, but his methods are too constructive, and his results often leave us sceptical.

been preserved to the present day in the south-western islands. In the *κοινή* therefore there were districts which simplified double consonants, and districts which preserved them.

2. *Inflection*.—The coincidence of nominative and accusative singular is peculiar to Pontic (e.g., *ὁ ἀδελφόν*). It is witnessed by a *tabella defixionis* from Cyprus.¹ The phenomenon is accordingly ancient, but dialectic, for most of the modern dialects continue to distinguish *ὁ ἀδελφός*, *τὸν ἀδελφόν*. The 3rd plural *φέρουν* already appears in the Imperial epoch, but the type *φέρουσι* is also preserved to-day in the Aegean, in Cyprus, and elsewhere. There were consequently in Hellenistic times districts with *-ουν* and districts with *-ουσι*.

We may then state the case generally thus: If we can establish the existence in antiquity of some local innovation in Modern Greek, and if side by side with this novelty the old form survives in another district, we may recognize in these differences the beginning of a dialectic differentiation in the *κοινή*. In this way we recognize also districts preserving final *-ν*, and others where it was lost; a (small?) area showing palatalization of *κ* beside the usual *κ*; a district with *ἀδερφός* and one with *ἀδελφός*; districts with the several endings *ἐλαβαν* and *ἐλάβασι*, and the now extinct *ἐλάβοσαν*, or again with *ἐφίλουν* and *ἐφιλοῦσαν*, or the imperatives *γράψον* and *γράψε*. When in this way local varieties of the *κοινή* have been indicated, I believe that a closer examination of Hellenistic Greek along such lines will be more successful than parallel researches in vulgar Latin. Thus some years ago I succeeded in discovering a real dialect in the *tabellae defixionum* from Cyprus, and I formulated a relation between this and the modern dialects of the south-east.² Guided by such facts, we may suppose that certain marks of modern dialects were already local features of Hellenistic Greek, even if they are not directly attested from antiquity. But we cannot give a general rule as to the circumstances under which a modern dialecticism must be regarded as old. Normally, however, I venture to say, modern dialecticisms which are proper to a group of discontinuous modern dialects, can be derived with some probability from local varieties of Hellenistic Greek, unless spontaneous development in different regions may be expected. Thus, for instance, features common to the dialect group of Athens, Aegina, and Megara, which for several centuries was cut off from the other dialects by the Albanians, and common also to the dialect of the Maniates, as agreements between Epirus, Peloponnesus, and Southern Italy, may be considered as local elements of Hellenistic Greek. For this reason I believe that the *κ* aorist, which appears in Aegina, Athens, Kyme (in Euboea), Epirus, and Maina, must be connected with the Hellenistic *perfectum historicum*. Further, it seems to me legitimate to deduce from agreements between Pontic, Cappadocian, and Cyprian characteristics of an ancient 'Eastern' *κοινή*, because these dialects have been separated from each other through five centuries, by Seljuks and Turks, and because on account of this isolation the

¹ See *Principienfragen*, p. 258.

² *Ibid.*, p. 257.

Pontic and Cappadocian dialects have preserved their archaic character.¹ To the establishment of an Eastern *κοινή*² I attach particular importance for our views of Hellenistic Greek. For the linguistic diversity of the Greek mother country and Hellenized territories outside leads us by *a priori* reasoning on to some other problems, and in the first place to the question whether the old dialects in Hellas, or the speech of the Hellenized population in Asia Minor, influenced to any significant extent the development of Hellenistic and Modern Greek. For the purpose of these problems, Hellenistic must be divided into three main areas, the Greek mother country, Asia Minor (with Syria), and Egypt. But as Egypt and Syria have been lost again to Hellenism by the Arab conquest, only the linguistic contrast of Asia Minor and continental Greece concerns us for the purposes of our inquiry, which is based on Modern Greek. A comparative grammar of the dialects of Asia Minor would be indispensable for the problem we have touched upon. Hitherto we have only some preparatory monographs, such as the excellent sketch of the Cappadocian dialects which we owe to the English archaeologist Dawkins.³

What we have so far learnt from Hellenistic sources about the *κοινή* in Asia Minor is but scanty. Some phonetic influences of the indigenous population can be distinctly recognized—viz., the confusion of *tenuēs*, *mediae*, and *aspirates*, and that of the vowels *e* and *i*. But these very features (which are also found in Egypt) have remained barbarisms of the lower classes, and do not survive in Modern Greek. Other features, which are also probably due to the influence of the indigenous population of Asia Minor—viz., the change of *υ* into *ι*⁴ and the levelling of vocalic quantity (which had begun in Asia and in Egypt⁵)—have become common in Modern Greek. Asia Minor initiated these innovations, and since their development required time, the *κοινή* of Asia Minor (and of Egypt) must have differed for a period from that of continental Europe in these features, which slowly spread over the whole of Hellenism. If now Asia Minor was the birthplace of some common innovations, it follows of course that other innovations, arising in that country, might have failed to make their way through the whole domain of Hellenism. Perhaps the spontaneous nasalization of consonants, as in *σάμβαρον* for *σάββαρον*, comes under this category. The last word has not yet been spoken about this phenomenon,⁶ which appears both in the *κοινή* and in Modern Greek, but cannot yet be brought under a precise phonetic law. We need a more complete knowledge of the field of this nasalization. I therefore express myself with reserve. Examining in Buturas' collection of material the instances of a spontaneous and purely phonetic nasalizing, in their local distribution, I found that the majority of dialectic (not common) examples

¹ The archaic character of these dialects of Asia Minor has been emphasized by K. Dieterich, see *Kuhn's Zeitschrift*, xxxix., pp. 86 sqq.

² Cf. also K. Dieterich, *l.c.*, p. 87.

³ *Modern Greek in Asia Minor*, in *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, xxx. (1910), pp. 109-132, 267-291.

⁴ Except the cases I have dealt with in *Hellenismus*, pp. 194 sq. (*υ* to *ι*).

⁵ See *Hellenismus*, pp. 143 sq.

⁶ Not even by Buturas (*Glotta*, v. 170 sqq.), who treats it rather unmethodically.

belong to Eastern Greek (Asia Minor and Cyprus, Cos, Carpathus, Rhodes and Lesbos), and that they become less and less frequent as we go west.¹ It seems as if the process had started in Hellenistic Asia (and in Egypt), and extended in such a manner that single words with nasalized consonants ultimately found their way into western Hellenism. If my theory is correct, the *κοινή* of Asia Minor was accordingly distinguished from that of Greece also by the nasalization of consonants. Moreover, the innovation seems to be affected by the influence of the phonetic system of the Hellenized indigenous population,² whereas other traces of such an influence have been either lost again or become common to the whole language, as has been observed above.

But the *κοινή* of Asia Minor was not only exposed to the influence of indigenous language: it lay within the sphere of the Ionic Greek. It is remarkable that Ionic traces have been preserved in the modern dialects of Pontus³ in a more characteristic manner than can be predicated of other old dialectic traces surviving in the new. In keeping with this archaic character of Pontic is the existence in Pontic and Cappadocian of two other archaic survivals, which have some importance also for the delineation of New Testament Greek.⁴ Firstly, these dialects only have preserved the ancient possessive adjective *ἐμός, σός*, while in all other dialects those forms are supplanted by the enclitic genitives *μου, σου*, etc. Secondly, the infinitive, which in the New Testament had begun to be displaced by the construction with *ἵνα*, has shown itself capable of resistance in Pontic, where it is still used to-day after several classes of verbs, as, for instance, verbs of motion. It is worth remarking that the infinitive of purpose, which appears distinctly in the New Testament, seems to be of Ionic origin: at any rate, it is but rare in Attic Greek.⁵ Thus we see how Ionic influence worked through the *κοινή* upon the configuration of the modern dialects of Pontus. Since the disappearance of the pronouns *ἐμός*, etc., and the supersession of the infinitive by *ἵνα* can be seen already in the Hellenistic age, it follows again that in antiquity there were two dialect-areas, one more extensive, in which the pronouns *μου, σου*, etc., and the *ἵνα* construction progressively superseded *ἐμός* etc. and the infinitive, and a smaller one where these processes were brought to a stop. To this latter area belongs the Greek of the New Testament: it has the infinitive instead of *ἵνα* after the very classes of verbs which now in Pontic demand the infinitive, and in the Gospel of John *ἐμός* is used far more frequently than in the other New Testament writers. We can therefore draw the conclusion that New Testament Greek is a local variety of Hellenistic, written by men who spoke the Eastern *κοινή*.

The facts we have adduced are not the only marks of a local colour in

¹ I have disregarded Tsaconian. Nasalization is more frequent in Epirus than elsewhere in the west.

² As I observed years ago in *Hellenismus*, pp. 133 sqq.

³ See *Hellenismus*, pp. 87 sq.

⁴ Cf. *Prinzipienfragen*, p. 259 (with bibliography), and Moulton, *Prolegomena*, pp. 40 sq.

⁵ See Brugmann-Thumb, *Griech. Gramm.*, § 580 (pp. 593 sq.).

this Eastern *κοινή*. A typically local character is perhaps to be discerned in the confusion of case-usage which seems to be more frequent in the vulgar inscriptions of Asia Minor than in continental Greece. If exact research in Hellenistic inscriptions should confirm this assertion,¹ it might be connected with the larger simplification and confusion of cases characteristic of the modern Pontic and Cappadocian dialects.

To illustrate the local character of Biblical Greek, I may mention further some less important points. The New Testament word *ῥαλος* agrees with Modern Greek; but ancient authorities give *ῥελος* as Hellenistic. Verbal forms such as *ἐκχύννω*, with double *νν*, live on in Cyprus (*ζώννω*, etc.), whereas the type with one *ν* is modern common Greek. The form *ἀποστείλω* in Acts vii. 34, which is declared to be 'quite insupportable' as a hortative subjunctive, may be compared with the Pontic pres. indic. *στέλω*. Also the New Testament use of *ἔτι* before oratio recta² may be cited, since this became a rule in the Syrian historian Malalas³ and in the Cappadocian dialect⁴—that is, in Eastern *κοινή*.

Finally, I have pointed out elsewhere⁵ that the vocabulary of New Testament Greek seems to have had some peculiarities indicating a relation to the Eastern *κοινή*, the suggestion coming to me again from Modern Greek.

If the study of Modern Greek opens such a wide horizon of new problems in the ancient language, its value is thereby sufficiently established. We have seen how Modern Greek, if combined with the study of Hellenistic texts, gives us valuable information about the special character of an Eastern *κοινή*; and this result again authorizes us to avail ourselves of the modern dialects for completing the delineation of the Eastern *κοινή*, even if ancient sources be silent. So for instance I do not hesitate to attribute to the ancient Eastern *κοινή* as characteristic the change of *σφ* to *σπ* (*σπίγγω* = *σφίγγω*), which is found in the modern dialects of Cyprus, Pontus, and Icarus, or the form *γλέπω* for *βλέπω*, which occurs in Cyprus, Cappadocia, and Chios. Guided by Modern Greek, we have found that Hellenistic Greek must have become locally differentiated, and we can adduce facts to prove that this differentiation was partly due to the influence of a foreign Hellenised population. As the same factors have been at work in the differentiation of Vulgar Latin in Italy, Gaul, and Spain—the Celtic language, for example, has influenced the Vulgar Latin in Gaul⁶—it cannot surprise us to find that the indigenous languages of Asia Minor have influenced the development of Greek. Nevertheless, I must maintain emphatically that foreign influences play but a small part in comparison with the great number of innovations which have altered the

¹ We must take into account in this connexion the fact that in Asia Minor and Egypt there is a relatively greater number of vulgar texts; and of course these inscriptions must only be compared with similar texts from European Greece.

² Blass, *Grammar of N. T. Greek* (E. T.), p. 286.

³ K. Wolf *Studien zur Sprache des Malalas*, 2 (1912), p. 73.

⁴ See Dawkins, *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, xxx. 128.

⁵ *Byzant. Zeitschrift*, xxii., pp. 484 sqq.

⁶ See *Hellenismus*, p. 150, and Meyer-Lübke, *Einführung in das Studium der roman. Sprachwiss.* 3 (1909), 207 sqq.

character of Classical Greek. For in their general characteristics Hellenistic and Modern Greek are a natural development of Attic Greek, and Modern Greek is not, as has been said, the continuation of a Hellenistic jargon—*i.e.*, of a speech which might be compared with Creolian Spanish, Pigeon-English, or the Greek of the so-called Levantines. Indeed, such forms of speech did exist in antiquity—I have pointed out a mixed Graeco-Latin jargon of this kind in North Africa¹—but they were without significance either for the development of Greek or for the literary productions in the Semitic and Egyptian provinces of Hellenism. The most prominent literary monument of the Graeco-Semitic *milieu*, the New Testament, does not at all show the character of Jewish Greek or *Grec hébraïsant* or any other similar terms by which it has been characterized.

At this point we touch upon a problem which has during recent years greatly occupied students of the Bible and Hellenistic Greek—the question of Hebraisms or, better, Semitisms in New Testament Greek. There was a time when every phenomenon of Biblical Greek which, from a classical point of view, was felt to be strange, was regarded as the effect of Hebrew or Semitic thought. If this opinion has been given up to-day, it is due to the work of a few scholars, and I am glad to say that in England my dear friend, Professor Moulton, has contributed in an excellent manner to the victory of the new ideas. Since papyri have been seriously studied, New Testament Greek has been drawn out of its linguistic isolation and brought into close relation to Hellenistic Greek. In the course of this lecture we have seen how New Testament Greek can be illuminated by Modern Greek for the very reason that it is a branch and document of Hellenistic speech. The celebrated question of Hebraisms must, therefore, be considered from the same point of view. One who, like myself, examines this question from the Modern Greek point of view does not at all understand how, for instance, the simple paratactic connexion of sentences; the frequent occurrence of *καί*, ‘and’; the distributive use of *δύο δύο*, ‘every two’; the meaning of *νύμφη*, ‘daughter-in-law’; and many other idioms in the New Testament² could have been occasioned by the influence of Hebrew or Aramaic. Can we really suppose that similar things in Modern Greek have been borrowed from Semitic? Are we to believe, for instance, that Modern Greek (*ὁ*)*ποῦ*, ‘who, which,’ is due to the influence of Hebrew because Hebrew uses *’ašer* in a similar way, or that the Modern Greek idiom *δὲν ἦρθε ψυχή*, ‘nobody has come,’³ is an imitation of Hebrew because *ψυχή* bears the meaning of Hebrew *nef’esh*, ‘soul’? That some expressions could find their way from a book like the Bible into the vernacular language, and even into the dialects,⁴ is not inconsistent with our view. In the grammatical development of Greek, however, such an

¹ *Indog. Forsch.*, Anzeiger, xviii, 43.

³ Psichari, *l.c.*, p. 183.

² Cf., besides *Hellenismus*, especially Psichari, *Essai sur le grec de la Septante*, *Rev. des Ét. juives*, 1908, pp. 161 sqq.

⁴ For examples see Π. Λωρεντζάτος, *’Αθηνά*, xvi., pp. 212 sqq.

influence is out of the question. Therefore, if a New Testament Greek idiom has a parallel in Modern Greek, we must regard it as a spontaneous product of the Greek spirit, and not as the effect of foreign influence. The fact that Hebrew sometimes coincides with Greek in this or that respect is no proof of the theory of Semitic influence on the development of Biblical or Hellenistic Greek. For different languages in their development not infrequently arrive at the same result independently of one another, and I do not think it necessary to give examples of this. 'Un peu de philologie et beaucoup de grec moderne mettent dans la juste voie,' as Jean Psichari, the French Neogrecist,¹ rightly says with regard to the question of Hebraisms.

Let me conclude my lecture with the following remarks on New Testament Greek. If Modern Greek had no other value than to help Biblical philology in the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures, this alone would be of no small importance. The New Testament is a first-class document of Hellenistic Greek, and all the advantage which we derive from Modern Greek for the study of the *κωινή* is of benefit to the study of Biblical Greek. Thus our methodical results lead us to the convincing conclusion that every student who occupies himself with Hellenistic or Biblical Greek must become acquainted with Modern Greek—the more the better. In my scientific work I considered it my principal task to utilize the study of Modern Greek for research into Hellenistic Greek, and in the new edition of my book on the *Sprache des Hellenismus*, which I am at present preparing, I hope to utilize it still more; for, since the publication of my book, the study not only of the *κωινή*, but also of Modern Greek, has made progress. Of course, he who wishes to bring each into a correct relation to the other must have more than a merely superficial knowledge of Ancient and Modern Greek. Dangers also exist for him who would without criticism combine all linguistic facts which bear some resemblance to one another. There are instances where the resemblance between Hellenistic and Modern Greek is accidental, or at least open to different interpretations. The problems are sometimes so complicated that even one who has a good and critical knowledge of the facts cannot, for the present at least, offer a satisfactory solution.

There is still need of much hard work in Ancient and Modern Greek before we can elucidate all the problems of Hellenistic Greek, the solution of which will depend upon a utilization of Modern Greek. And when we have succeeded in this work, I am afraid new problems will arise; for to the branch of philology in which we are working by new methods, and with a material that grows from day to day, Goethe's words, 'Da muss sich manches Rätsel lösen, doch manches Rätsel knüpft sich auch,' are truly applicable.

I have confined myself to the history of language. Of course, the value of Modern Greek is not confined to this. Other philological problems have been indicated by scholars such as Hesselung and Menardos, whom I named at the

¹ *Grec de la Septante*, p. 192.

beginning of my lecture. The so-called folklore of antiquity has, above all, much to gain from Modern Greek philology. Cosmological and mythological ideas, customs, and superstitions of the Modern Greek people, all have their roots in antiquity. Thus modern folklore enables us, like modern language, to understand and to complete ancient traditions; and I think the advantage will here, perhaps, be yet greater than in the study of the language, because the sources of ancient folklore are not so abundant as those of the vernacular language. But few philologists make use of this source of knowledge. Linguistic inquiry will be a guide in these studies; for the methods and problems of both are very similar. Just as the different sides of human culture are closely connected and phenomena in one sphere of culture have their parallels in the others, so do the different branches of philology or *Kulturwissenschaft* help one another, each branch co-operating with the others in the interests of the whole, the study of the human mind and human culture. Hence the history of language is, rightly understood, a piece of the history of culture.

ALBERT THUMB.

UNIVERSITY OF STRASSEBURG.

A FALSE QUOTATION FROM PLAVTVS.

MAYOR on Juv. xvi. 23 cites Plaut. *Cist.* iv. 12. 2 *mulo inscitior*. He is followed by Friedländer *ad loc.* Ellis, in the first edition of his commentary on Catullus, refrains from citing the passage to illustrate lxxxiii. 3 *mule nihil sentis*, but gives it in his second edition on the authority of Scioppius. The phrase is a false quotation and will not be found in any modern text of the *Cistellaria*. Its origin is explained by Taubmann's note, in Gruter's *Plautus*, 1621, on *Cist.* iv. 2. 12 (iv. 2. 10 in modern texts) *Non sum scitior*: 'At Janus Guilielmus "Verum" inquit "est, aut ueri saltim non dissimile, scripsisse Plautum, *Sed nonne ecaster ego sum mulo inscitior?* quod adagionem urbanum et politissimo poeta dignum redolet. Nam ita et multos παροιμιωδῶς, nominabant stupidos et hebetes, καὶ ἀναισθήτους. Catullus: *Mule nihil sentis*. Et hoc, credo, hausit e Brixiana editione in qua est, *Sed nonne ecaster ego sum multo inscitior.*"'

F. W. HALL.