III.—*Phases of the Living Greek Language.* By Emeritus Professor BLACKIE.

(Read 3rd March 1890.)

GENERAL SCHEME OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
1. Historical Glance at the Conditions of Change in the Greek Language. Specimen of the Current Greek of the Newspapers, . . .	45	to its legitimate Position as dominating the corrupted types of Local Idioms by KORAES. Regeneration of the Current Greek since 1822, . . .	51-52
2. How the Current Notion of Greek being in a state of Barbarous Corruption arose, and Confusion of two Strata of Greek—the Literary and the Popular. Specimen of the Vulgar Greek of the Peasantry, . . .	46-47	5. Principle of wise Compromise between the Literary and the Vulgar Greek in the Formation of the present universally accepted type of the Neo-Hellenic Standard, as distinguished from the Romaic Dialect, . . .	52-53
3. Philological Classification of the Differentiating Features of the Vulgar or Popular Greek, . . .	48-51	6. Scheme of Reform for the Teaching of Greek as a Living Language, with an indication of the advantages to flow from such a Reform, . . .	53-55
4. Restoration of the Greek of Literary Currency			

I will commence by stating that three reasons have moved me to bring this subject before the Society—(1) Because I found everywhere loose and even altogether false ideas possessing the public mind on the subject; (2) because I much fear that we, the academical teachers of the Greek language, are chiefly to blame for the currency of these false ideas; and (3) because, if Greek is a living and uncorrupted language, and dominating large districts of Europe and the Mediterranean, as influentially as French on the banks of the Seine and German on the Rhine, it follows that a radical reform must take place in our received methods of teaching this noble and most useful language. Now that the current language of the Greeks in Athens and elsewhere is not, in any sense, a new or a corrupt language, as Italian is a melodious and French a glittering corruption of Latin, may be gathered even *a priori*; for languages are slow to die, and the time that elapsed from the taking of Constantinople by the Turks in 1453 and the establishment of the Venetian power in the Morea in 1204, to the resurrection of Greek political life in 1822, was not long enough to cause such a fusion of contrary elements as produced the English language from the permanent occupation of the British Isles by the Normans. Nay rather, so far from being a fusion, there was a strong repulsion between the Mahommedan conquerors and their Christian subjects; while the jealousy between the Greek and the Latin Churches acted as a strong force to prevent any transforming power that might have been exercised on Greek by a sporadic contagion from the Italian; and the results in the present state of the language are just what were to be expected from such historical antecedents. Local varieties of careless or corrupt Greek of course may be found among the peasantry, just as we have one type of English in Yorkshire, another in Dorsetshire, another in Lancashire, and a fourth in Scotland; for Scotch is in no sense of the word a separate language from English, as Gaelic is from

Welsh, but only the lyrical and musical dialect of the English tongue, as Doric was of the Attic Greek. The few blots and blotches that the popular Greek had contracted through long centuries were prevented from impressing any permanent stamp on the current language, partly from the uninterrupted action of the Greek Church and partly from the continuous literary traditions of Byzantium among the educated Greeks in Venice, Cephalonia, Mount Athos, and elsewhere; and the consequence was that so soon as the oppressive yoke of the Turks had been fairly thrown off by the happy conclusion of the revolt of 1822, any Turkish and Italian corrupting elements that had partially defaced the popular dialect were thrown off as the scales of a skin disease, and left not a mark on the fair body of the tongue. As a proof of this, I lay before you a short paragraph, the first that comes to my hand, from a recent Greek newspaper, the *Ἐφημερίς*, published at Athens, October 15, 1889, in which an account is given of the marriage of the Prince Royal of Greece to a daughter of a royal European house.

Μόλις παρήλθον εἴκοσι χρόνοι ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας καθ' ἣν ἐγεννᾶτο τὸ πρῶτον ἑλληνικὸν βασιλόπουλον, ὡς οὐρανόπεμπτον χάρισμα, ὡς ῥοδόχρυσος αὐγὴ πανελληνίων ἐλπίδων, σκεδάζουσα τὰ σκοτὴ τῆς νυκτός. Εἰς τὸ βασιλόπουλον ἐχαρίσθη τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ τελευταίου Ἑλλήνος αὐτοκράτορος, εἰς τοῦ ὁποίου τὴν ἐκφώνησιν συγκλονεῖται καὶ λαχταρεῖ καὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ὁ ἔσχατος. Καὶ ὁ νέος Κωνσταντῖνος ἤρξε καὶ ἐμεγαλύνετο εἰς ἀρρενωπὸν νεανίαν, καὶ συνώδευον αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ βίῳ ἀπὸ τοῦτον εἰς ἐκείον τὸν σταθμὸν αἱ εὐχαί, οἱ πόθοι, ἡ ἀγάπη πάντων ἡμῶν. Καὶ μυστικὴ αἴγλη τὸν περιέβαλλε καὶ ἄνωθεν αὐτοῦ ἐπλανᾶτο καὶ τὸν ἐσκίαζε διὰ χρυσῶν πτερύγων τὸ φωτοβόλον πνεῦμα τοῦ μέλλοντος.

Anybody that can read POLYBIUS or DIODORUS, PLUTARCH or CHRYSOSTOM, without a dictionary, will understand this at a glance; for the deviations that occur in it from the strict classical form are so few and so slight as not to throw any hindrance in the way of a scholar of common intelligence.* The so-called corruption of the Greek language is therefore, if understood of the current language of the day in newspapers, an imagination, consisting, as it does, in only a few superficial changes, such as any language in the process of centuries naturally undergoes. How this imagination arose can be easily explained; first from the systematic divorce between the academical teaching of Greek and the speech of the Greek people, caused by the hybrid and arbitrary pronunciation of the language that followed upon the sceptical solution of sceptical doubts raised early in the sixteenth century by a notable work of ERASMUS, the effect of which was to make the university man look upon the speech of the living Greeks as barbarous, while the grand barbarism lay with himself; and again, from the superficial notice of the current Greek taken by the academical men, leading them to confound the lowest specimens of vulgar Greek in the popular ballad with the current language of the Church and of educated men from the taking of Constantinople downwards. From this point of view, no doubt,

* These are—(1) *χρόνοι* for *ἔτη*, but used also sometimes in later Greek. (2) *βασιλόπουλος* for prince, where *πύλος* is a common termination of Greek proper names, corresponding to *son* in English and *Mac* in Gaelic. The etymology from *πύλος*, Lat. *pullus*, Eng. *foal*, is obvious. (3) *ὁ ὁπίστος* for *ὁ*, probably introduced from the Italian *il quale*. (4) *λαχταρεῖ*, a new formation from *λακτίζω*, signifying the kicking or beating of the heart against the ribs in cases of vehement desire. (5) *εἰς* with the accusative, used for *ἐν* with the dative (see below).

modern Greek might be called a corruption, or at least a deviation from the recognised type of correct expression, just as the Milanese dialect of the Italian is a deviation from the Florentine standard, and the low German of the common people, in the lower region of the Rhine and the Weser, may be called a corruption of or a vulgar deviation from the high German type made classical by MARTIN LUTHER; but even in the lowest of these low forms of the vulgar speech of the people, the inherent vitality of the continuous literary tradition manifests itself so strongly, that of corruption in the strict sense, that is, impurity from the infusion of foreign blood, the traces are remarkably few, and the changes on the face of the type, though sufficiently marked, are very far from constituting what can with any philological propriety be called a new language. As a specimen of what this uncultivated form of the vulgar street ballad mostly was, we cannot do better than insert here one of the oldest of the historical ballads found in Passow* and other collections, viz., a few lines on the taking of Constantinople by the Turks, a ballad contemporaneous, no doubt, with the achievement of that bloody inroad of oriental barbarism into the intellectual civilisation of the west:—

Πῆραν τὴν πόλιν, πῆράν την! πῆραν τὴν Σαλονίκην!
 Πῆραν καὶ τὴν ἁγίαν Σοφίαν, τὸ μέγα μοναστήρι,
 Π' εἶχε τριακόσια σήμαντρα κ' ἐξήντα δυὸ καμπάναις.
 Κάθε καμπάνα καὶ παππᾶς, κάθε παππᾶς καὶ διάκος.
 Σιμὰ νὰ 'βγοῦν τὰ ἅγια, κ' ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῦ κόσμου,
 Φωνὴ τοὺς ἦρθ' ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, ἀγγέλων ἀπ' τὸ στόμα.
 'Αφῆτ' αὐτὴν τὴν ψαλμωδιάν! νὰ χαμηλώσουν τ' ἅγια!
 Καὶ στείλτε λόγον ἔς τὴν Φραγκιὰν, νὰ ἔρθουν, νὰ τὰ πιάσουν,
 Νὰ πάρουν τὸν χρυσὸν σταυρὸν καὶ τ' ἅγιον εὐαγγέλιον,
 Καὶ τὴν ἁγίαν τράπεζαν, νὰ μὴ τὴν ἀμολύνουν.
 "Σὰν τ' ἄκουσεν ἡ Δέσποινα, δακρύζουν ἡ εἰκόνες.
 Σώπα, κυρία Δέσποινα! μὴ κλαίης, μὴ δακρύζης!
 Πάλε μὲ χρόνους, μὲ καιροὺς πάλε δικά σου εἶναι."

They have taken the city, they have taken it, they have taken Thessalonica,
 They have taken the holy Sophia, the big cathedral,
 Which had three hundred hand bells, and sixty-two great bells,
 With a priest for every great bell, and for every priest a deacon.
 As soon as the holy host went out, and the king of the world,
 A voice came from Heaven, from the mouth of angels,
 Leave off your psalmody, and set down the host,
 And send word to the land of the Franks to come and take it,
 And to take the golden cross, and the holy gospel,
 And also the holy table that it may not be polluted.
 This, when our Lady heard, her images begin to weep;
 Be still, revered lady, wail not, weep not,
 For again, with the years and the seasons, St Sophia will be thine.

* *τραγουδία Παμάικα*, edidit ARNOLDUS PASSOW, Leipzig, 1860.

Now in this passage

For <i>πῆραν</i>	write <i>ἔπηραν</i> .	For <i>χαμηλώσουν</i>	write <i>χαμαιώσι</i> .
„ <i>τὴν</i>	„ <i>αὐτὴν</i> .	„ <i>στείλε</i>	„ <i>στείλατε</i> .
„ <i>μοναστήρι</i>	„ <i>μοναστήριον</i> .	„ <i>ἐρθουν</i>	„ <i>ἐλθωσι</i> .
„ <i>καμπάναις</i>	„ <i>κώδωνας</i> .	„ <i>πιάσουν</i>	„ <i>πιέξωσι</i> .
„ <i>παππᾶς</i>	„ <i>ιερεὺς</i> .	„ <i>πάρονν</i>	„ <i>ἐπάρωσι</i> .
„ <i>κάθε</i>	„ <i>ἐκαστος</i> .	„ <i>ἀμυλύνουν</i>	„ <i>ἀμυλύνωσι</i> .
„ <i>διάκος</i>	„ <i>διάκονος</i> .	„ <i>σὰν</i>	„ <i>ὥς αν</i> .
„ <i>σιμὰ</i>	„ <i>ὥς</i> .	„ <i>ἄκουσεν</i>	„ <i>ἤκουσεν</i> .
„ <i>νά</i>	„ <i>ἵνα</i> .	„ <i>δακρύζουν</i>	„ <i>δακρύνουσι</i> .
„ <i>βγοῦν</i>	„ <i>ἐκβαίνουσι</i> .	„ <i>ῆ</i>	„ <i>αἶ</i> .
„ <i>βασιλεᾶς</i>	„ <i>βασιλεὺς</i> .	„ <i>σωπα</i>	„ <i>σιώπα</i> .
„ <i>τοῦς</i>	„ <i>αὐτοῖς</i> .	„ <i>πάλε</i>	„ <i>πάλιν</i> .
„ <i>ἦρθ</i>	„ <i>ἦλθε</i> .	„ <i>μὲ</i>	„ <i>μετὰ</i> .
„ <i>τὸ στόμα</i>	„ <i>του στόματος</i> .	„ <i>δικὰ</i>	„ <i>ἰδικὰ</i> .
„ <i>ἀφῆτ</i>	„ <i>ἀφίετε</i> .	„ <i>ἔναι</i>	„ <i>ἔστι</i> .

Now here we have thirty corruptions for only fourteen lines; but some of them are mere repetitions, and others are so slight as to be easily guessed; not, certainly, amounting to a new language in the sense that Spanish or Portuguese are new languages from Latin, and Dutch a distinct species from German. Let us now classify, under distinct heads, the deviations from the literary type which this and similar productions of the unlettered Muse sporadically present.

1. The loss of the infinitive mood, for which *νά* for *ἵνα* with the subjunctive is the regular substitute, as if we should say in English “I beg that you accept,” for “I beg you to accept.”

2. The loss of the *optative mood*—logically to be lamented, but practically of no consequence—“I said so that you may not misunderstand me,” being as intelligible as “that you might not.” In Greek this loss was facilitated partly by the multiform luxuriance of the verb, partly by the identity in pronunciation of *οι* and *η*, both being the English *ee*, which appears regularly in the New Testament (see John iii. 25).

3. The disappearance of the *dative case* is much more serious; no doubt the accusative is the case in most frequent use, and which strikes the ear more forcibly; our language, which is a history of losses, has done the same, “him” standing for the German *ihm* and *ihn*; but the Greeks have done worse; along with the dative case they have lost the preposition *ἐν*, with which it is naturally joined, and so for “in these circumstances,” they say, *ἐν τὰς περιστάσεις ταύτας*, as in Scotch we say, “this man has muckle room in his head, but there’s na muckle intil’t.”

4. Another equally, perhaps more serious loss, as more foreign from the genius of the classic idiom, is the resolution of the tenses expressed in English by “have” and “had,” “will” and “should,” into auxiliary verbs exactly as in modern languages—*ἔιχα* being used for a pluperfect, and *θα* for “will” and “would.”

5. The sparing of trouble in the memorising of various forms leads to the abolition of irregular forms, and massing them all under a common type ; so in verbs, *δίδν* for *δίδωμι*, *θέτω* for *τίθημι*. The irregular present *ἵστημι* was discarded and a new regular verb, common in the New Testament, was formed from the perfect *ἕστηκα*, viz., *στέκω* or *στήκω*. In the same way *πατέρας* takes the place of *πατήρ*, from the acc. *πατέρα*, following the analogy of final *ας* in masculines of the first declension, and similarly *βασιλεῆς* for *βασιλεύς*, perhaps not innovations but remnants of the old *Doric*, in which *α* was the favourite vowel.

6. *Pronouns* and *particles*, as not being very self-assertive in their nature, and liable to be flung in as adjuncts or enclitics to more prominent words, in Greek, as in all languages, are particularly liable to curtailment or careless treatment of some kind : so *μᾶς* for *ἡμᾶς*, *σεῖς* for *ὑμᾶς*, *τοῦ* and *τὸν* for *αὐτοῦ* and *αὐτὸν*, *νὰ* for *ἵνα*, *που* and *πω* for *ὅπου*, and for “who,” *πῶς*, for “that,” conjunction, *δὲν* for *οὐδὲν* ; *ᾶς* with subjunctive for *ἄφες*, like English “let,” *ἄφες ἴδωμεν*, “let us see” (Matthew xxvii. 49). In this instance, as in the use of *ἵνα* with the subjunctive, we see the modern Greek is simply a natural development of the Greek of the New Testament. See for *ἵνα*, Matthew v. 29 ; vii. 4, 12.

7. In nouns and verbs, and compound words, *ἀφαίρεσις*, or the cutting off the initial syllable, is very common : thus, *πωρικὰ* for *ὀπωρικά*, for *ὀπώρα*, “fruits in their season ;” *πίσω* for *ὀπισω*, *γραμμένος* for *γεγράμμενος*, as in English “given,” for the Teutonic *gegeben* ; in a great number of compounds of *ἐξ*—*ξύρω* for *ἐξεύρω*, *ξάκουστος* for *ἐξάκουστος*, *ξεσκεπάζω*, for *ἐξεσκεπάζω*—*νομάτος*—*ὀνομάτος*—*ὀνομαστος*, “a person.”

Nor is *apocope* less common not only of syllables but of single letters, as *παιδὶ* for *παιδίον*, *ὀλίγο* for *ὀλίγον*, *γραφοῦμε* for *γράφουμεν*, as the 1st person plural of verbs.

8. Not unfrequently both *aphæresis* and *apocope* take place, until the word is scarce recognisable. This is specially observable in *diminutives*, of which Greek, like *Italian*, is very fond, thus—

ὄμμα	ὀμμάτιον	ὀμμάτι	μάτι
ὄφης	ὀφίδιον	ὀφίδι	φίδι
ὄξύ	ὀξύδιον	ὀξύδι	ξύδι
φύκος	φυκίδιον	φυσακίδιον	φυκασίδι

9. Notwithstanding the *gracilitas*, or graceful tenuity of Greek, as *QUINTILIAN* calls it, the modern Greeks show a peculiar favour for the broad soft sound of *ου* = *ὄ* in *boom*. Thus they have not only *γραφουν* (Lat. *scribunt*) for *γραφουσι*, a remnant of the *Doric*, but *ἐπατουσα* for *ἐπάτησα* as past tense of *πατέω*. A marked *Dorism* also we have in *ἐλαβαν* for *ἐλαβον*, *εἶχα* for *εἶχον*, and other such *aorists* regularly. So also *πιάζω* and *πιάνω*, unquestionably *Doric*, Acts iii. 7 and elsewhere for *πιέζω*. Contrasted with this *Dorism* the *ρην* for *ραν* as the accusative of adjectives in *ρός*, frequent in modern Greek, is distinctly *Ionic*, and a venerable relic of the phraseology of the *Iliad* (xxiii. 48).

10. Of course *syncope* also comes into play, alone or along with *aphæresis*, as *κόρφη* for *κορυφή* ; from *ὑπάγετε* (John iv. 16), *πάγετε*, *πᾶτε*. Sometimes the lost consonant is

supplied by assimilation to the preserved one, as for *κυπτάζω* = *κυττάζω*, *ἀφειντης* for *αὐθέντης*, our Effendi.

11. The insertion of a consonant between two vowels, a sort of euphony, as *ἄγουρος* for *ἄωρος*, *αὐγόν* for *ῶον*, likely a remnant of the old form, as *egg* is doubtless older than the Saxon *ei* or *ey*; *κλαίγω* for *κλαίω*.

12. Simple carelessness, as *ἀγροικέω* for *ἀκροάμαι*, *ἐψές* for *ἐχθές*; or interchange of cognate letters, *ἀδερφός* for *ἀδελφός*, *ἦρθε* for *ἦλθε*, *βύζω* from *μύζω*, *γλίγωρα* for *γρήγορα*.

13. Traces of the contagious action of foreign tongues, especially on a people dragging out its existence through centuries in a subordinate and servile position, no doubt exist, *Italian*, of course, mainly, and *Turkish*, but remarkably few even in the most vulgar type of the *Kleptic* or Brigand ballads. The following are examples:—

Turkish.

<i>Μπαρούτι</i> , gunpowder.	<i>ντεβλέτι</i> , empire, government.	<i>ταμπούρι</i> , agger.
<i>τουφήκι</i> , gun.	<i>μουρτάτης</i> , a recreant infidel.	

Italian.

<i>καπιτάν</i> , captain.	<i>ταμβούρος</i> , tabor.	<i>βιγλίζω</i> , vigilare.
<i>σέλλα</i> , saddle.	<i>λεβέντα</i> , volentieri.	<i>σταμπαρία</i> , printing-office.
<i>ἀβουκάτος</i> , avvocato.	<i>βέργα</i> , verga.	

Latin.

<i>σουβλα</i> , subula.	<i>σπήτι</i> , hospitium.	<i>κέλλιον</i> , cella.
<i>Ρήγας</i> , Rex, Regis.	<i>πανάριον</i> = <i>αρτοφόριον</i> .	<i>ἀκούμβω</i> , accumbere,

with a family of merely official names occurring in the Byzantine writers, and collected in the well-known work of *Codinus de officiis*.

Albanian, a slight sprinkling in Passow's glossary; but the influence of such an unlettered people on the Greeks must necessarily have been small.

All these characteristic deviations from the recognised classical type of Attic Greek may justly fall under the categories either of losses, as when a branch or two are lopped off from an old tree, or of taint, as when neglect of the forester or inclemency of the weather has allowed some unseemly scurf to spread itself in patches over the whiteness of the bark; but there is a large class of changes which can in no sense be called corruptions, being, in fact, neither more or less than that natural expansion and enrichment which belongs essentially to every living growth, and to which the Greek language in these latter ages is as much entitled as it was in the days of PERICLES and DEMOSTHENES. Enrichments of this description, sometimes pure luxuries, sometimes necessary formations for the expression of new ideas, are found *passim* in all varieties of living

Greek, the literary as well as the popular; and among these is specially to be observed a partiality for the terminations *ίζω* and *όνω* in verbs, as *ζαλίζω* from *ζάλη*, *πληγόνω* from *πλήγη*, *παθαίνω* from *πάθος*, *σηκόνω* from *σῆκος*, and many more. Under the category of expansion falls also the application of old words to new circumstances, or attaching to them new meanings, as a mere sport of the fancy, or simply from the delight in change, as *τὸ βράδυ*, "the evening," for *ἔσπερος*, *δρόμος* for *ὁδός*, *κάμνω* for *πράττω*, and such like.

All this looks a very formidable array of losses and disfigurements, which may seem to justify the academical treatment of Greek as practically a dead language, and recall to the mind of the scholar the *glossarium græco-barbarum* of the learned Dutchman MEURSIUS, in which 1040 foreign words are paraded with due pomp of quotation in a stout octavo of 650 pages. But we have only to recall the statement made above in our introductory paragraph to show the utter falsehood of such a hasty impression. The corrupt dialect, whose peculiarities we have been enumerating, as a medium of communication amongst educated Greeks, exists no longer; it is universally condemned as a false coin, and has no currency. The first step to this condemnation was made a century ago, by the famous ADAMANTIOS KORAES, at that time resident in Paris, from whom the prolusive blast of patriotic inspiration proceeded, that through the noble martyrdom of RHIGAS PHERÆAS, and the patriarch GREGORY V., culminated in the political liberation of Greece by the revolt of 1822. But even before that period there were degrees of corruption, separate platforms, so to speak, of vulgar Greek, which no intelligent man could mistake for the current Greek of educated men. Of these platforms the Cretan dialect was the lowest, the dialect used by a Cretan Greek resident in Venice, CORNARO by name, who, in the year 1756, gave to the world a love romance or novel in verse called *Erotocritus*, which achieved an immense popularity, and has run through many editions. As a specimen of the current style of colloquial Greek, on a platform considerably above this, we may take the Greek translation of the *Arabian Nights*, published at Venice in the year 1792; but all this since the resurrection of Greece to political independence in 1822 is past; and no man would dream now of translating any modern work into the Greek of the *Arabian Nights*. As a proof of this, any one who pleases may consult the work named below, a translation from the travels of a lady well known in Cambridge for her expert use of Greek and other living languages.* How was this? Plainly enough from the superficial nature of the disease with which the noble language of the Christian religion and literature had been tainted, and from the instinctive ease with which the strong impulse of regenerate nationality was enabled to throw it off. The instantaneous effect of the successful rising of 1822 was to give a pulsing reality and a pervading force to the linguistic reformation preached by KORAES. The corruptions that had hitherto defaced the classical tongue were felt as stamps of a hateful tyranny, and badges of an unworthy slavery; and so with one consent the educated mind of liberated Greece arose to the grand conception of restoring their language of literary and political intercommunion to a type not unworthy of shaking hands with

* *Αγγλῆς Σμυθὶ*: *Βλέμματα ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ βίου καὶ τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς τοπογραφίας*, ἐκ τοῦ Ἀγγλικοῦ, Leipzig, 1885.

the best models of classical antiquity. Nor was this by any means difficult to do; for, as we have already stated, alongside of the vulgar there had always been practised, from the last of the Byzantine historians, a literary Greek, only in the very slightest degree, or scarcely at all, infected with the vulgarities of the unlettered speech.* The success of this movement was certain; but, as in all changes of great social forces, there were adverse elements at work which required to be considered. Influential as the traditions of the literary platform were, it could not be denied that the inspiration which had nerved the national arm for victory, had come from the mass of the common people as much as from the exertions of the cultivated few; the praises of the popular heroes of the war had been sung in the language of the popular ballads, commonly known as Romaic, and had a most righteous claim not to be ignored in the linguistic presentation of the restored nationality. Besides, it could not be the object of patriotic men of culture to separate themselves, by a rigidly drawn line, from the language of the common people, whom it was their mission to elevate and to improve; so the advocates of the contending types came to a philological compromise, pretty much in the same fashion that political compromises are managed between the reforming and the conservative forces in our parliamentary debates. The result of this compromise is what we see daily in the Greek organs of public opinion, and in other works which issue from the press, of a people who at no period proved themselves destitute of that intellectual acuteness and that literary dexterity which was the boast of their forefathers; and the principles on which this successful compromise was made, say as much for the good sense and practical judgment of the leaders of literary opinion as its original conception did for their patriotism. These principles are four—(1) the absolute exclusion of all foreign words as unnecessary and unseemly in a language which has, through so many centuries, retained the luxuriant vitality of its native growth; (2) a free exercise of the formative power of the language when new words have to be introduced for new facts and new ideas; (3) such a moderate restoration of classical forms as slides easily and without any felt exertion into the popular ear; (4) such a sparing adoption of the peculiarities of the vulgar Greek as leaves the style of modern literary prose much more near to the style of ancient classical prose than the style of ÆSCHYLUS is to that of HOMER, or the style of Lord BYRON to that of GEOFFREY CHAUCER. And, in fact, the current style now used by the Greeks in their literary productions, their mercantile correspondence, and their political debates, is differentiated from the Greek of POLYBIUS and DIODORUS by a few characteristic turns, which any intelligent school-boy may master in ten minutes. This, however, does not imply that the language of the peasants is to be allowed to fall into total disuse; on the contrary, we agree with the principles and the practice of an accomplished Coreyean gentleman, who has translated not only SHAKESPEARE'S plays but the *Odyssey* of his own HOMER into a style of expression more or less approximating to the vulgar dialect,† viz., that the language

* See as a striking proof of this the *Νεο-ἑλληνική Φιλολογία* from 1453 to 1821, by SATHA, Athens, 1868; or let any one take up PHRANZES, the historian of the last age of Byzantine Hellenism, and judge for himself.

† *Ὁμήρου Ὀδύσσεια*, by JACOBUS POLYTLAS, Athens, 1875. *Ἡ τρικυμία του Σεικοππρι*, Coreyra, 1855. *Ἀμλετ*, Athens, 1889.

of popular song should go hand in hand with the language of literary culture, just as Doric dialect in ancient times did with the Attic norm, and as Scotch does at the present moment, in the lyrical domain, with the English of literary prose ; while, at the same time, there can be no greater mistake in the mouth of a philologist than to denounce the one as a hateful barbarism and to disown the other as a pedantic affectation. They are both living forms of a living language, the noblest of all living languages, and a language which has preserved its vital continuity through a period of more than three thousand years, and as such ought to be dealt with by all intelligent persons in such a living fashion, as the principles of linguistic science and the utilities of international intercourse enjoin.

Remains only now to indicate the process of practical reform which our teaching of Greek in this country must go through in order to grow from this lusty root into living fruit ; and here the well-known aphorism of the wisest British thinker sets before us, with his usual pregnant conciseness, at once our starting point and our goal. "Speaking," says he, "makes a ready man, reading makes a full man, writing an exact man"—all the three necessary to make an accomplished scholar, but each in its own place. The acquisition of any language is always, like dancing or fencing, a living dexterity of art in the first place, and only in a secondary way an application of bookish rules. People must have their nails before they pare them. In honestly endeavouring to realise this teaching of languages according to nature, we must set a machinery agoing, somewhat in the following style :—

1. Let the universities declare that they will tolerate no longer the figmentary and hybrid pronunciation of Greek generally practised in this country, and that after five years they will expect all entrants to the Greek classes to come to college with their ears well exercised to understand any sequence of intelligible sentences on common matters, whether in the style of XENOPHON or of TRICOUPI, according to the laws of Hellenic orthoepy handed down to the present day from the Alexandrian grammarians and through the continuous living traditions of the Greek people.

2. That to every professorship of Greek in a Scottish university, and tutorship in an English college, there shall be attached a practical class or classes, containing not more than twenty-five students, to be superintended by a *native Greek*, and exercised by him in the conversational use of the Greek language, and to be *instructed* in the literary, political, and ecclesiastical history of Greece from the taking of Constantinople to the present time.

3. That all university libraries, reading-rooms, and students' unions shall be supplied regularly with some Greek newspaper and literary periodical, to give them a living sense of the *continuity* of Greek as a medium of expression for the political events and the social interests of the hour.

4. That all patriotic patrons of learning, specially the pious donors of bursaries and exhibitions for students in the university, shall be invited to present £100 or £150 a year to such hopeful young scholars as may be desirous to gain a living knowledge of the

Greek tongue by residence in the country, and attendance on historical and philological classes in the University of Athens, on condition that after six months they shall return home and report progress to the Neo-Hellenic coadjutor of the Greek class in the university to which they belong.

The objections that may be made to such a reform in our method of teaching Greek, so far as they are not founded on mere stolid conservatism, I have answered elsewhere, and need not repeat here.* Suffice it to say that, while it is obvious to object to certain points in the orthoepy of the living Greeks, on the ground that they have departed from the ascertained classical norm, it is, on the other hand, impossible to restore for practical purposes a consistent orthoepic scheme that shall apply to all literary Greek from PHERECYDES to CHRYSOSTOM. All living languages, by the very fact of their being alive, undergo changes, proceeding gradually but surely to the development of certain favourite tendencies in pronunciation; and these changes must be accepted by those who study the Greek language, just as the antepenultimate accent of a host of words in English is now accepted in place of the *oxytone* accent which regulated these words in CHAUCER'S verse; and there can be no harm in scholars reading individual authors, say SOPHOCLES or HOMER, in such orthoepic fashion as can be proved to have ruled the language in the days of these authors; but for general purposes the catholic tradition of the language must be accepted wholesale, as indeed it was by the great scholars of the fifteenth century, before ERASMUS, in his haste to point out a few faults in a fair structure, left a chaos for a few blind masons to heap up into a motley architecture at their will. No doubt there is always a difficulty in getting people to change their bad habits in language, as in everything else; but this difficulty, rooted principally in ignorance or prejudice, in laziness or in conceit, is not one which should appear so formidable to academical, as it so often does to political rulers. Besides the advantages which will flow from a radical reform in this matter, are such as will amply compensate for any trouble that a change of scholastic habits may occasion; for not only will a living familiarity with the length and breadth of the Greek tongue be in this fashion acquired by the few who aspire to professional scholarship in a fourth part of the time now spent in the acquisition of the same language treated as a dead language, but hundreds of individuals desirous of the best culture, for one that now can achieve such a result, will be able to shake hands with PLATO, and to hold parley with ARISTOTLE, as intimately as they can do now with CUDWORTH, or HEGEL, or IMMANUEL KANT. The teaching of Greek will cease to be to scholastic, and become popular at a bound. Nor are we to keep out of view the immense social advantage to British tourists in this age of cheap and speedy intercourse, of being able to strengthen the bonds of social communion with such an intelligent people as the Greeks. As little should we make small account of the mighty lever which a friendly familiarity with living Greek will put into the hands of our statesmen to cultivate political relations with a people who command the coasts of the Archipelago and the Levant, and whose

* *On Greek Pronunciation: Accent and Quantity*, Edinburgh, 1852; and *Essays on Subjects of Moral and Social Interest*, Edinburgh, 1890, Appendix.

geographical position points them out as the most effective barriers in South-Eastern Europe and Western Asia against Russian ambition on the one hand and Turkish barbarism on the other. We islanders have sometimes, not altogether unworthily, been accused of a certain insular ignorance in foreign matters, and a certain want of easy and kindly sympathy with foreign peoples. The sooner we get rid of this offence the better. A familiar acquaintance with the accents of strange tongues is the surest key to the affections of strange hearts ; and to an imperial power like Great Britain this must always be no secondary consideration. The ruler who would be lightly obeyed must know to be largely loved.