TRANSACTIONS.

I.—*On the Philological Genius and Character of the Neo-Hellenic Dialect of the Greek Language.* By PROFESSOR BLACKIE.

(Read 16th December 1872.)

PROPOSITION I.—All spoken language is a growth, subject, like the creature who uses it, to a constant course of mutation ; it is a living organism, developed according to certain laws, partly inherent, partly superinduced ; and, though it is liable to decay, disintegration, and death, this disintegration, except in special cases of extermination, becomes the soil of a new growth, and this death the cradle of a new life. The historical action of this process of mutation is to produce either new varieties or dialects of one language, or new species of one family of languages.

PROPOSITION II.—Though no living language is capable of an absolute stoppage, and, according to the Heraclitan doctrine of *πάντα ῥεῖ*, must either go on growing or be exterminated, yet there are certain influences at work in the constitution of human society that may retard the process of change to an indefinite period, creating a more or less fixed type, from which deviations are few and far between. These influences are of two kinds, internal and external, or, as we may say, intellectual and political : intellectual, proceeding from the predominant and authoritative force of great creative intellects, such as Homer and Dante ; political, proceeding from the unifying effect of a stable form of government, and a permanent type of social order. In other words, the changes that naturally go on in language, as in everything vital, will be impeded and retarded by the traditions of the past so long as these retain a firm hold on the national habit of thought and expression. And the duration of the type of any ancient language will be in the direct ratio of the force of the controlling influences, internal and external.

PROPOSITION III.—In the case of the Greek language, while the internal conservative influences were peculiarly strong, the external were loose and variable. An absolute political cohesion in the Roman style the Greeks never had. Variety by expansion, and dispersion, and consolidation round a number of special social nuclei, was during their most brilliant period the law of their external growth; but during this period, the influence, first, of an Ionic minstrelsy in Asia Minor, and then of an Attic culture in south-eastern Europe, was so strong that it controlled in a very imperial fashion the separative and particularising forces of independent political centres; and afterwards, when a strong central government was established, and continued for many centuries at Constantinople, this unifying influence, acting with the double power of Church and State, though disturbed at first by the intrusion of a strong Roman vein, combined, with an unexampled weight of intellectual and moral tradition, to retard and impede, or practically to ignore, the changes which, by a process of nature, were naturally going on in the Greek language, in an increasing ratio, from the overthrow of the political and intellectual supremacy of Athens by the Macedonians, to the taking of Constantinople by the Turks, and from that time by natural propagation, though with diminished force, up to the present hour.

PROPOSITION IV.—These retarding forces, however, being in a manner artificial, and acting contrary to the natural law of variation by growth, are necessarily limited in their operation, and can, of course, act only where they are felt; that is to say, in those classes of society which are kept constantly under the moulding and controlling influence of the inherited traditions of the past; or, in common language, in the well-educated classes of the community. The uneducated classes, on the contrary, by whom the controlling power of this traditional culture is not felt, or felt only indirectly and with greatly diminished force, go on, partly breaking down old forms of speech, partly sending forth new shoots, so as to form what becomes a distinctly marked dialect of their own; and in this way the language of a whole people in a state of imperfect and inadequate culture may be propagated in two distinct parallel lines, like an upper and a lower stratum in geology, without coalescing into any common type.

PROPOSITION V.—This bistratified condition of a spoken language is exactly what we find realised in the capital of the Byzantine Empire at the time of the Crusades. For here, while a remarkably strong and unbroken chain of literary and ecclesiastical tradition had preserved, with very trivial alterations, the Catholic dialect of the Greek language, of which Attic is the most finished type, the gradual disintegration of an ill-governed empire had combined with

various influences, topographical, and commercial, and social, and political, to shake the language of the great mass of the illiterate masses loose from all precedent, and to favour the growth of a corrupt and hybrid dialect, which, with the aid of favourable circumstances, might in due season shape itself, like the barbarous Latin of the middle ages, into a new language. Of this we have happily the most distinct and clear evidence in the two short poems of the monk THEODORE PTOCHOPRODROMUS, written in the popular dialect, and addressed to the Emperor MANUEL, who came to the throne in the year 1143. These poems are composed, not only, like the Annals of CONSTANTINE MANASSES, who wrote about the same period, with a total disregard of the old classical rhythmical laws, but with a phraseology, and in a style so corrupt and so hybrid, that, even after the lights thrown on the work by DU CANGE, KORAES, and other scholars, not a few passages still remain obscure, and would be much more so were it not that the Latin, which forms one of the chief corrupting elements, is a language with which the readers of Byzantine Greek are generally familiar.

PROPOSITION VI.—We must not suppose, however, from the fact of THEODORE, or any other stray writer of the Byzantine period, having taken it into his head to write a book or two of verses in the corrupt popular dialect, that this dialect had at that time asserted for itself a place, and received a certain recognition in the world of books. Quite the contrary. In those dreary days, there arose no popular genius to stamp the popular dialect with a certain character of limited classicality; but even had the Byzantines of those times had strength to produce a Burns, the traditional Greek of the court, the Church, and all educated intellects, was too strong to allow a mere lyrical variety, fostered in the hotbed of barbarism and corruption, to claim for itself more than a very little corner in a very large vineyard. The consequence was, that while the lower stratum of the spoken language was ripening from day to day into the well-marked form of a new dialect, or even a new language, it does not appear to have advanced a single step out of its ignored position as a literary organ, from the time of THEODORE down to the taking of Constantinople by the Turks in 1453. Byzantine Greek was classical Greek from beginning to end, with only such insignificant changes as altered circumstances, combined with the law of its original genius, naturally produced.

PROPOSITION VII.—By the fall of the last PALÆOLOGUS, the bond of amity which held the motley provinces of the Byzantine Empire together was broken; one of the two strong external links that connected the degraded present with the glorious past was snapped; and with the ruin of the Greek Empire, if the example of the Western Empire was to be a precedent, the death of the Greek language might naturally be expected to follow. But this result did not follow,

and that principally from the action of THREE VERY POWERFUL FORCES. The system of government introduced by the conquering Turks was not such as to render a fusion of the dominant and subject races possible ; here was the first element of repulsion ; in the domain of religion the repellent force on the side of the vanquished was even stronger ; and if we add to these two influences the fact, that the accumulated intellectual forces of ages were all on the same side, we shall have no difficulty in perceiving how the taking of Byzantium by the Turks could have no such effect on the language of the Greeks, as the Lombard reign in Italy had on that of Rome, or the Norman invasion of England, in a much more decided way, on the speech of the Anglo-Saxons. Nor were matters much different in the south-western division of the Greek Empire, where the Venetians and other Franks had parcelled among themselves, in governments of greater or less permanency, the dismembered inheritance of the Byzantine Cæsars ; for the Greeks hated the Pope, who had on various occasions endeavoured to deprive them of their ecclesiastical liberties, scarcely with less intensity than they did the Turks, who had deprived them of all liberty ; and thus, in Frankish Greece also, the new forces introduced by external conquest were not strong enough to effect the disintegration of the old linguistic inheritance, and the construction of a new language, or even the general recognition of a new dialect.

PROPOSITION VIII.—But in spite of the strong and long-continued action of these retarding forces, nature would have her way ; a process of growth was slowly going on, which could not but issue in the formation either of an entirely new language, or of a well-marked species of an old language ; and under the continued action of the strong conservative force indicated, the latter was the only result possible. The matter was brought to a practical decision, like so many other significant events in modern times, by the invention of printing and the diffusion of books. By means of these powerful engines, the great storehouses of knowledge were no longer confined to the few, but gradually, as by a well-organised system of irrigation, the refreshing waters were brought down from the far hills, and dispersed through the plains ; and an essential part of such a machinery, of course, was the adoption of a language understood by the great mass of the people. If the Greek people were to be raised from the state in which they were kept by their political oppressors, the great preparatory instrument, till an opportunity for physical resistance should present itself, was popular education ; and popular education remained impossible so long as the learned wrote in a dialect artificially fed from reservoirs of dead tradition not beating with the living pulses of the present. Under the influence of this patriotic necessity, books of various kinds, especially theological and ecclesiastic, had been issued from the Greek press in a popular

dialect, somewhat similar to, but not nearly so corrupt as that used by PROCHODROMUS; and books originally written in classical Greek, like the well-known Church History of MELETIUS, Bishop of Athens (ob. 1714), were translated into Romaic or modern Greek, just as we modernise CHAUCER for the benefit of the million. These patriotic exertions for elevating the popular intellect were brought to a distinctly marked and generally recognised climax by the learned ADAMANTINE KORAËS (nat. 1748), a Smyrniote Greek of great learning, philological talent, and ardent patriotism. This distinguished man, living under the inspiring influence of the great French Revolution, showed his countrymen, by precept and example, how it was possible to use the popular dialect according to its own now fully formed type, preserving a well-balanced medium between the classical norm familiar to scholars and the gross barbarisms practised in the most remote districts, and by the rudest portion of the community. This wise and patriotic example, followed generally by a succession of accomplished men, has issued in planting modern Greek, or Neo-Hellenic, as it is now generally called in its perfect form, as one of the recognised types of the great Greek language, on the same platform with the Ionic of HOMER and the Doric of THEOCRITUS.

PROPOSITION IX.—In attempting now to state scientifically the specific characteristic differences between the Neo-Hellenic dialect and what we are accustomed to call ancient Greek in all its extent, two important questions occur on the threshold. *First*, what do we mean by a *dialect of a language*, as distinguished from a new language formed from old materials; and from what sources, as a standard, are we to make our inductions with regard to the real philological character of modern Greek? The first question is one which, in theory, it may be very difficult to answer; but practically we may say, that whenever the old materials of a language are so modified as that only a very few words remain in their original form, and that more accidentally than systematically, and when the obscurity arising from this source is increased by the admixture, in larger or smaller quantity, of foreign materials, in this case, as in the examples of *Spanish* and *Italian*, a new language has been created.* But whenever the changes induced on the old materials are comparatively slight and more sporadic than penetrating and pervading in their character, with only a very spare admixture

* The lines in Italian—

“In mare irato, in subita procella,
Invoco te, nostra benigna stella,”

often quoted (C. LEWIS' "Romanic Languages," 2d edit., p. 246) to prove the nearness of Italian to Latin, are no proof of the rule in that language, but are altogether exceptive, as any one may perceive by taking a stanza of *Ottava rima* either in TASSO or ARIOSTO, and counting how very few words in the eight lines have retained the unaltered form of the Latin from which they are derived.

of foreign materials, in this case we shall have only a *new dialect*—not a new *language*. The second question, as to what we may take as a fair standard of modern Greek, can be answered as a matter of fact only by hitting a judicious medium between the two extremes of gross corruption, and that greater or less approximation to the standard of classical Greek, which the practice of some writers presents. Topographical and political causes conspired to create different shades or grades, or types of modification in the popular Greek dialect, which had more or less of a local character. The Byzantine Greek of THEODORUS, the Albanian Greek of the Epirotic KLEPHTS, and the Cretan Greek of CORNARO, who wrote the romance of Erotocritus, in the first half of the eighteenth century (first edition, Venice, 1737), are in some characteristic points essentially different. These constitute what, according to a botanical analogy, we might call local varieties of a common species; and such varieties, as a rule, present a greater amount of deviation from the normal classical type than the floating mass of modern Greek common to all the existing race. On the other hand, since the time of KORAES, there has commenced a process of purification and restoration which tends to remove from the modern language some of those peculiarities which are its most distinctive characteristics. In judging of the language as a whole, therefore, it is wise to take some work or book of an essentially popular character written for general circulation in the last century, before the appearance of KORAES; and I have used for this purpose a translation of the “Arabian Nights” into modern Greek, published at Venice by the well-known house of GLYCYS, in the year 1792. This choice, however, was dictated purely with a view to the conclusions of philological science; for practical purposes, it is manifest that the best type of the Greek actually now spoken in Greece is contained in the Greek newspapers destined for general circulation. But neither can the philologist, though he refuses to accept local varieties, as part of the general norm of the dialect, overlook them as a fact. They are part either of the disintegration of the old type, or of the growth of the new, of which he is bound to take cognisance in all its stages; the more that the phenomena of linguistic change, which are the most interesting to him, present themselves more strikingly in the more corrupt than in the less corrupt forms of the language.

PROPOSITION X. — In examining the processes of modification through which the Neo-Hellenic language has attained its present type, the most obvious helps are, of course, the dictionaries of mediæval Greek by DU CANGE and MEURSIUS, the learned commentaries of KORAES on Theodorus, the dictionary of Byzantine Greek by SOPHOCLES, the dictionaries of modern Greek by GERASIMUS, BENTOTES, KIND, DE HEQUE, BYZANTIUS, and others, with the grammars from THOMAS downwards to that of SOPHOCLES and MULLACH, which is the most

complete. Besides the grammar, MULLACH has edited the "Batrachomyomachia" of DEMETRIOS ZENUS, from which the student will reap benefit; and with him should be taken the collection of mediæval Greek chronicles and poems by ELLISEN. Great zeal has been shown in the same department of Hellenic study by the French, of which the "Collection de Monuments pour servir à l'Etude de la langue Neo-Hellenique," by Monsieur LE GRAND,* and the Paris association for the same object, of which Monsieur D'ECHTHAL is the moving genius, furnish ample evidence.* English scholars as a rule have paid little attention to the subject. PASHLEY, TOZER, and the late Viscount STRANGFORD, and the late Professor FELTON in America, were the only English names known to me in connection with this branch of scholarship, till the publication last year of the highly original and ingenious work of M. GELDART; in Scotland special praise is due to Dr CLYDE, and after him to DONALDSON.† The late CORNEWALL LEWIS, unfortunately, was altogether ignorant of this branch of Philology; otherwise, as is evident from a note in his Essay on the Romanic Languages (p. 237, second edit.), he was prepared to have made an admirable use of it.

- * (1.) KORAES, *ἁγакта*.
 (2.) SOPHOCLES' Glossary of Byzantine Greek. London, 1860.
 (3.) GERASIMI Thesaurus quatuor Linguarum. Venet. 1723.
 (4.) KIND, Handbuch der Neu-grechischen Sprache. Leipzig, 1841.
 (5.) DE HEQUE. Paris, 1825.
 (6.) *Λεξικόν Ἑλληνικὸν καὶ Γαλλικόν*. By BYZANTIUS. Athens, 1846.
 (7.) *Λεξικόν τριγλωσσον*. By BENTOTES and BLANTE. Venice, 1820.
 (8.) Nova Methodus Linguae Græcæ vulgaris; auctore THOMA. Paris, 1709.
 (9.) Methode pour etudier la langue Grecque moderne, par DAVID. Paris, 1821.
 (10.) Grammatica linguae Græcæ recentioris. Franz, Romæ, 1837.
 (11.) SOPHOCLES' Modern Greek Grammar. Hartford, 1842.
 (12.) Grammatik der Griechischen Vulgar sprache. Mullach. Berlin, 1856.
 (13.) Analekten der Mittel und Neu Griechischen Litteratur, Ellisen. Leipzig, 1855.
 (14.) DEMETRII ZENI; Paraphrasis Batrachomyomachia, Mullachius. Berolini, 1837.
 (15.) Collection de monuments pour servir à l'Etude de la langue Neo-Hellenique, par EMILE LE GRAND. Paris, 1869.
 (16.) Mediæval Greek texts; the Philological Society's extra volume. By W. WAGNER. London, 1870.
 (17.) Association pour l'encouragement des Etudes Grecques en France; ANNUAIRES. Paris, 1868-71.
- † (1.) PASHLEY; Travels in Crete. London, 1837.
 (2.) TOZER; Researches in the Highlands of Turkey. London, 1869.
 (3.) Viscount STRANGFORD on the Cretan Dialect in SPRATT'S travels in Crete. London, 1865.
 See also collected works of Viscount STRANGFORD. London, 1871.
 (4.) CLYDE; Romaic and Modern Greek compared. Edinburgh, 1855.
 (5.) DONALDSON; Modern Greek Grammar. Edinburgh, 1853.
 (6.) GELDART; The Modern Greek Language in its Relation to Ancient Greek. Oxford, 1870.
 (7.) Professor FELTON published a collection of pieces in modern Greek, which was once in my possession, but of which I cannot now recover the title.

PROPOSITION XI.—When scholars talk of a type of language, such as the strange events of long centuries have produced in modern Greece, they are apt to talk of it altogether as a *corruption*, and as the pure result of phonetic decay. But this is only a part, and a small part of the truth. A language is corrupt when it abandons its own natural analogies, or adopts foreign ones, which do not harmonise with its original type, or when it is defaced and disfigured in various ways by sheer ignorance and carelessness. In this sense it is quite correct in Italian, for instance, to say, that *donna* is a corruption of *domina*, *avuto* of *habitum*; and in the same way, in Neo-Hellenic, to say that ἐβγάλλω is a corruption of ἐκβάλλω, and μαθαίνω of μανθάνω; and of such corruptions, no doubt, a large part of Italian, and a certain much less considerable part of modern Greek is composed. But, on the other hand, it is no corruption when, in the progress of time, an old word comes to be used in a modified, or perhaps, altogether different sense; as when κάμνω, in modern Greek, takes the place of ποιῶ, when σηκόω, which in Plutarch signifies to *weigh*, in modern Greek signifies to *raise*, when φθάνω is used generally for ἀφικνέομαι, to arrive, or παιδεύω, for μαστιγώω, as they are not only in modern Greek, but in the New Testament. Such progressions and transmutations of meaning are always going on in all living languages, of which ample illustrations could be produced from English and every spoken language, if it were necessary. As little can it be called a corruption, when new forms blossom out from old roots, so long as these new forms follow the fair analogies of the language. No one, for instance, supposes that the English language is corrupted when we bring into currency such words as *solidarity*, *complicity*, *utilise*, and similar French formations from Latin roots long ago acknowledged in both languages. In the same way, χρήσιμεύω, νοστιμιεύομαι, and other such words, are perfectly legitimate formations, even though it be true that the Attics were not in the habit of affixing the termination εῖω to verbals in μος; for the Athenians at all times had their peculiar local idioms, just as London has its Cockneyisms; and the mere Attic usage could prescribe the law to the common Greek tongue, only so long as Athens remained the political and literary capital of Greece, which it ceased to be exclusively when the centre of intellectual activity was transferred first to Alexandria and then to Byzantium. To write pure Attic Greek, after the Athenian literary dictatorship had ceased, was an affectation of which only pedantry or a false fastidiousness could be guilty. The barbarism to which, in a general way, a certain class of scholars would consign such words, is more justly regarded as an overgrowth of lusty vitality. Such new coined words may not indeed be necessary; the old words might have served all purposes equally well; but they are the natural and legitimate product of the right of a living organism to put forth new shoots according to its type. If it be said that a word is always barbarous till it be stamped by the authority of a great classic of the language,

I answer this may be a very healthy limitation which a writer at a certain period of the adult growth of a language may choose to put on his choice of vocables; but it is to the eye of the philologist an arbitrary procedure of which science can take no account. To him *claritudo*, and *gratitudo*, and *beatitudo* are perfectly good Latin words, whether CICERO happens to use them or not; and in such words what a nice Ciceronian of the Bembo school would brand as a departure from the norm of Latin purity, a philologist may often have cause to recognise a natural extension and fair enrichment of a meagre and inadequate medium of expression. If, therefore, HOMER uses not only γλυκός, but γλυκερός, there is no reason why a scholar should condemn as barbarous varieties of a similar description in the existing Greek tongue; and if the ancients, in their exuberant play of terminational affixes, chose to say ἀληθινός as well as ἀληθής, shall it be forbidden to the modern Greek to say ταχινός as well as ταχύς, and βρωμερός as well as βρωμώδης? So in English one writer may say *kingliness* and another *kinglihood* (TENNYSON), with equal right. But further, even in the case of corruptions properly so-called, that is not a new growth of the language, but a breaking down of the old structure from sheer carelessness, or the intrusion of some extraneous element, there is a great and vital distinction to be made between those corruptions, which, to the eye of a philologist, look like a scar or a patch, and such as easily take their place and fit into the old structure of the language. Thus the word γεμάτο, from γέμω, to be full, is a gross barbarism, for it attaches to a Greek root a Latin participial termination, which is at once recognised as something foreign and incongruous. It is as if, instead of the word *obesity*, we should talk of the *fattosity* of a corpulent person, a combination at once felt to be barbarous, though certainly our English tongue, through its loss of native terminations, has an excuse for incongruities of this kind, which could not be pleaded by the Greek. On the other hand, the modern Greek habit of substituting the diminutive for the simple word, and then cutting off the final or accented syllable, as when παιδίον is used for παῖς, and then παιδί for παιδίον, is an offence against the ancient tradition readily condoned; for by the emphasis of the accent on the accented syllable, the ear is already accustomed to the sound, which becomes final when the short ultimate syllable is dropped. In the same manner, the favourite diminutive termination άκι, appearing in γεροντάκι, κοντάκιον, δενδράκι, and scores of other words, where analogically it is not the diminutive termination pertaining to such roots, passes lightly into the habit of the ear from the analogy of μειράκιον, and other such words, where the ακ is part of the root. Of superficial and false analogies of this kind, both in flexion and in syntax, the structure of all languages gives sufficient instances.

able characteristic that strikes us in the Neo-Hellenic dialect, is the remarkable change and extension that has taken place in the usage of certain words, giving rise to significations either altogether different from classical usage, or deriving from that usage only their late and scarcely apparent germ. Of these I shall here set down some of the more remarkable.

	MODERN.	ANCIENT.
σηκόω,	to raise,	weigh, balance.
βαστάζω,	to refrain, restrain,	carry.
καμαρώνω (όω),	to give one's self airs, to admire,	vault or arch.
τάσσω,	to promise,	arrange.
συντρέχω,	to assist,	run together.
ιδίωμα,	manners,	a peculiarity.
λαλῶ,	sing,	prate.
χώνω,	conceal,	heap up.
σώνω (σώζω),	suffice,	save.
κύριος,	a father,	a master.
κομβόω,	deceive,	to bind up, gird.
χωνεύω,	digest,	cast metal.
ψοφάω,	to die (of an animal),	to make a slight noise.
βραδύ,	the evening,	slow.
πρόξενος,	a match-maker,	patronus (in politics).
πλακόω,	oppress, overwhelm,	lay with flat plates.
έξωτική,	a fairy,	extraneous, foreign.
ἀψυχῶ,	to spare life,	to die.
μετεώρισμα,	an amusing tale,	floating in the air.
βασιλεύω,	to set (of the sun),	reign.
ποδαπός,	a person of no account,	from whence.
χάνω,	lose,	gape.
ἀγγή,	morning,	brightness.
βάνω (βαίνω),	place, set,	go.
φθάνω,	to arrive,	to get before.
ἄνοιξις,	the spring,	opening.
πλάτη,	shoulder,	flat part of an oar.
ὑποκείμενον,	a person,	a subject.
ἀράσσω,	to land,	to crash.
σκιάζομαι,	to be afraid,	to shade one's self.
ἀδειάζω,	to fire a gun,	to give an amnesty.
πνευματικό,	a clergyman,	windy.
ταχύ,	the morning,	swift.

	MODERN.	ANCIENT.
γεῦμα,	dinner,	taste, smack.
τὰ σωστά,	sense, wits,	things saved.
συμπάθεια,	pardon,	sympathy.
σκοτίζω,	stun, astonish,	darken.

PROPOSITION XIII.—But these changes of meaning and application in old words, however strange, and however important to be noticed as presenting a practical difficulty to a student passing from the classical to the modern dialect, are only what must take place in any language, which for the space of more than a thousand years has been allowed to float freely on the surface of the popular mind without any central authoritative control. More characteristic of the peculiar genius of the Greek tongue, is the luxuriant growth of new terminations to old roots, especially verbal, which the living dialect presents. This habit of luxuriating in a variety of verbal forms differing nothing in signification, but displaying only, to adopt a botanical phrase, a greater breadth of terminal blossom, was characteristic of Hellenic speech from the earliest times. Thus, from the adjective ὁμαλος we have the three equivalent forms ὁμαλίζω, ὁμαλύνω, and ὁμαλόω, for which our meagre English is only too happy to find that it possesses the single *equalise*; and in the same way, from the root σεβ, we have the verbal forms σέβομαι, σεβάζομαι, σεβίζω, and later σεβασμιάζω (in ZONARAS), all perfectly identical in signification. And though, no doubt, it may seem that άζω, as in ἐλκυστάζω, and ύζω as in ἐρπύζω, had originally a frequentative meaning, yet this distinctive feature was lost in the growth of the language; and between στένω and στενάζω there is only a difference of sound, as, in Latin, between *claritas* and *claritudo*. Following out this instinct of rich terminational ramification and efflorescence, the current Greek vocabulary presents such varieties as the following :—

MODERN.	ANCIENT.
ἀρχίζω and ἀρχινίζω,	ἀρχομαι.
δακρύζω,	δακρύω.
πασχίζω,	πάσχω.
φοβερίζω,	φοβέω.
τρομίζω,	τρομέω.
ξυραφίζω,	ξύρω.
ἀραχινιάζω,	ἀραχινιώω.
λαβόω, to catch, hit, wound,	λαμβάνω.
λογιάζω,	λογίζομαι.
μελανιάζω,	μελανίζομαι.
σκοτεινιάζω,	σκοτίζομαι.
χορταίνω,	χορτάζω.

All these are legitimate formations, being either parallel forms from the original root, or secondary verbs from the substantive of a primary verb, or the adjective connected with the substantive. Not unfrequently this luxuriance of terminational blossom shoots out into pregnant new formations, which have no parallel in the classical tongue, as in

πλαγιάζω,	to fling one's self down across the mattress and sleep.
ξεκαρδίζομαι,	my heart leaps out of my body, as with violent joy.
ἀρκούδίζω,	to go on all fours like a bear, as children do.

A similar lustihood of terminational vitality—a point where our English tongue is so remarkably feeble—displays itself in the terminations of adjectives and substantives, some of which are authorised by ancient analogy, as in *βρωμερός*, for *δυσώδης*, and others are a separate creation of the modern linguistic instinct, as in *φρονιμάδα*, *νοστιμάδα*, and the whole family of abstract nouns in *άδα*.

PROPOSITION XIV.—But it is not only in terminational variety that the ample vitality of the living Greek tongue asserts itself. As in the ancient, so in the modern dialect, the tendency to a florid growth of ever new compound words is irresistible. It is in the domain of the verbs again where this tendency exhibits itself most strongly. Here, of course, the compounding elements are often prepositions; but other elements are not excluded; and not a few very expressive compounds are formed from elements of which, for this purpose, the ancients made little or no use. Let the following serve as examples:—

ἀνακατόνω (όω),	to turn upside down.
στρεφογυρίζω,	to turn round and round.
ἀποκαμαρόνω,	to contemplate with admiration.
ξανθογυρομάλλος,	having red and curly hair.
πολυσκουριάζω,	to cover with rust.
χειλημονκτρίζω,	to neigh.
ἐκκοκκινίζω,	to turn pale, <i>lit.</i> , to go out of the red.
καλοκυττάζω,	to look favourably on.
γλυκυφιλῶ,	to give sweet kisses.
γλυκυχαράζω,	to break sweetly, as of the dawn.
γλυκυκυττάζω,	to look sweetly on.
κακοκαρδίζω,	to displease.
κακοκυττάζω,	to look with an envious eye on.
κακοφαίνεται,	it displeases me.
ἀστροπελεκίζω,	to lighten, <i>lit.</i> , to send down meteor-axes.
χαμογέλασμα,	a slight smile.

χαροκόπος,	a bon vivant, a man of pleasure, a voluptuary.
μοσχομυρίζομαι,	} to be fragrant, odorous.
μοσχοβολῶ,	
κλωθογυρίζω,	to spin round and round and lose one's way.
ὀφθαλμοφανῶς,	for <i>ἐναργῶς</i> , <i>i.e.</i> , clearly, distinctly, bodily.
ἀναποδιάζω,	to do a thing perversely, awkwardly.
ψυχοπαίδιον,	an adopted son, son of my soul.
ψυχοπονέω,	to sympathise.
μονοπάτιον,	a footpath.
παλαιογυρνομήτης,	a swine-snouted old sot.
κοσμογυριστής,	a world-perambulator, said of the sun.
ἀναποδογυρίζω,	to turn upside down.
συμποσώω,	to amount to.
βρεφουργῶ,	to make incarnate.
σπαταλοκρομάδης,	an onion-gourmand.
βομβοκτυπίζω,	to din the ears, <i>obtundo</i> .
μοσχοκάρνουν,	nutmeg.
ἐποφθαλμιῶ,	to cast an envious eye on.
ἐκμυστηριάζομαι,	to reveal.
κρασοπατέρας	a wine-bibber.

These examples, and a host of others that might be adduced, show how absurd it is to class under the head of corruption those changes in a long-lived language, which indicate a buoyant juvenescence rather than a withered decrepitude of expression. Let us now turn our attention to those changes in the form of the language, which fall distinctly under the category of LOSS or ABATEMENT, though by no means necessarily under that of DEFACEMENT and DISFIGUREMENT.

PROPOSITION XV.—As language, in long ages of neglect and semi-barbarism, is used by the masses principally for purposes of convenience, it is plain that considerations of an æsthetical nature, such as influence men of genius and high culture in their use of language, will be subordinated ; and the purely scientific considerations, on which the philologist puts a high value, will not influence the popular mind at all. Carelessness, convenience, custom, and sometimes mere freak, fashion, and the itch of novelty, will produce important changes in the structure of a language which a delicate sense of harmony, and a scientific perception of organic completeness, would alike repudiate. Among the phenomena of this kind which continually tend to break down the classical form of words, those known to grammarians under the heads of *aphæresis*, *apocope*, and *syncope*, are the most frequent. But, not to encumber a plain

subject with learned phraseology, we shall say simply, that all cultivated languages, when used merely for convenience, without the continued check of a higher aim, are liable to have their vocabulary changed by a process of CURTAILMENT, which makes a part of the word serve for the whole. Thus in America, from the rattling haste in which the people delight, "an acute man" is called "a 'cute man;" from the same careless instinct, the ignorant English peasant, or the sharp London street boy, talks of the "varsity" instead of the "university;" and the familiar words, *bus* and *cab*, are only the tail and head respectively of two polysyllabic words, borrowed the one from the Latin, the other from the French. That this is a corruption, not of a very elegant kind, no person will deny; for even when the original form of the word may have died out from the popular memory, it requires only a little bookish culture to make one feel that a segment has been cut from the full sound of the thing, the absence of which makes itself felt. Curtailments of this kind are obvious everywhere in French and Italian, and in not a few German words also derived from Latin and Greek, as in *probst* for *propositus*, *pfingst* for *πεντηκοστή*, and such like. Now, it is manifest that these corruptions may be made in various ways. Sometimes only a weak initial or final letter or short syllable may be dropt, which leaves the word not much the worse; sometimes a half, and that not the most important half, may be left, after the amputation, and in such a fashion it may be, that only a scientific eye can recognise its original identity. One of the commonest forms of curtailment in Greek is that of an initial short vowel, of which the following list contains some of the most common:—

λίγος,	for	ὀλίγος.	μπορῶ,	for	ἐμπορῶ.
μαλιά,	,,	ἄμιλλα.	τέρι,	,,	ἐτάϊρος.
μιλῶ,	,,	ὀμιλῶ.	πωρικά,	,,	ὀπωρικά.
πές,	,,	εἰπές (εἰπέ).	βρίσκω,	,,	εὐρίσκω.
νός,	,,	ένός.	βλόγια,	,,	εὐλόγια.
ψηλός,	,,	ὑψηλός.*	λημέρι,	,,	ὀλημέρι.
μέρα,	,,	ἡμέρα.	βαγγέλιον,	,,	εὐαγγέλιον.
μερόνω,	,,	ἡμερόω.	πεθυμιά,	,,	ἐπιθυμία.
διόμα,	,,	ἰδίωμα.	γούμενος,	,,	ἡγούμενος.
πανδρεύομαι,	,,	ὑπανδρεύομαι.	σφαλίζω,	,,	ἀσφαλίζω.
σκύπτω,	,,	εἰσκύπτω.	παντυχαίνω,	,,	ἀπαντυχαίνω.
γιαλος,	,,	αἰγιαλός.	φετεινός,	,,	ἐφέτεινος.
ῥέγομαι,	,,	ὀρέγομαι.	ματώνω,	,,	αἱματόω.
σάζω,	,,	ἰσάζω.	ῥημοκλήσι,	,,	ἔρημα ἐκκλησία.
σώθικα,	,,	ἐσώθικα, i.e., ἐντόσθια.	πετραχήλι,	,,	ἐπιτραχήλιον.
μβαίνω,	,,	ἐμβαίνω.	γεία,	,,	ὑγεία.

* The highest peak of Mount Ida in Crete is now called *Psiloriti*, or High-mount.

πίσω	for	ὀπίσω.	λάμνω	for	ἐλαύνω.
μᾶς	,,	ἡμᾶς.	γλυτόνω	,,	ἐκλυτόω = ἐκλύω from λυτός.

In these cases of initial curtailment it will be seen that the vowel which falls off, as in the case of the American “’cute,” is generally a very feeble one, such as in rapid pronunciation is little missed. Sometimes, however, it is a diphthong, though never an accented one, as in *ματώ* for *αἵματώ*, *δὲν* for *οὐδὲν*, *γιαλός* for *αἰγιαλός*, and some others. It may even be a whole syllable, like the Italian *scuro* for *obscurus*, as in *δάσκαλος* for *διδάσκαλος*.*

PROPOSITION XVI.—But the end of the word presents to a hasty speaker even greater facilities than the beginning for a popular amputation, of which tendency the final *m* and *s* of the ancient Roman poets afford familiar examples. And here we find a remarkable analogy pervading old Roman, Italian, and modern Greek. As the Roman dropt his final *m*, producing the Italian *domino*, from the perfect form *dominum*, so the modern Greek regularly drops the final *ν*, which with him corresponds to the Latin *m*, and says *καλό* for *καλόν*; and not only so, but in diminutives he drops regularly the complete last syllable *ου*, so that all diminutives which are paroxytones in classical Greek, come out with a sharp acute accent on the final syllable. Thus *παιδίον* becomes *παιδί*, *κρασίον*, *κρασί*,† just as in Italian *amarit* becomes *amò*, *potestatem*, *podestà*, and so forth. When the original word has the oxytone accent, as in *ποταμός*, *κεφαλή*, the accent of the curtailed diminutive lies on the penult

* The following examples from Italian illustrate the same tendency to initial curtailment in languages set free from the control of strict literary aristocracy:—

bieco	for	obliquum.
scuro	,,	obscurum.
sciocco	,,	exsuccus.
badia	,,	abbadia.
cagionè	,,	occasione.
stivali	,,	æstivale.
ricciò	,,	cirricius.
Lamagna	,,	Alemannia.
rame	,,	æramen.
nemico	,,	inimico.
stimare	,,	æstimare.
state	,,	æstate.
sperto	,,	esperto.
spietato	,,	dispietato.
sbarcare	,,	disbarcare, and other compounds with <i>dis</i> .
romita	,,	eremita.
stra (French <i>très</i>)	,,	extra, as in <i>straordinario</i> , and other compounds.
mentre	,,	dum-interim (Diez).

† The historic steps in the process were *παιδίον*, *παιδίν*, *παιδί*, the intermediate form appearing generally in THEODORUS.

ποτάμι, κεφάλι, and many others. Similarly, a final oxytone in prepositions may fall off, as in ἀπ for ἀπό.

PROPOSITION XVII.—It is manifest that both these kinds of amputation, by head and by tail, may be exercised upon the same word; and then there arises sometimes a new word consisting only of the middle syllable, or two middle syllables of the amputated diminutive, which it requires an exercised eye to detect. Of this double curtailment the following are a few familiar examples:—

shore,	γιάλι,	from	αἰγίαλιον,	αἰγιαλός.
eye,	μάτι,	„	ὀμμάτιον,	ὄμμα.
fish,	ψάρι,	„	ὀψάριον,	ὄψον.
companies,	τέρι,	„	ἑταῖρος,	
oil,	λάδι,	„	ἐλάδιον,	ἐλαιον.
vinegar,	ξίδι,	„	ὀξύδιον,	ὄξύ.
house,	σπίτι,	„	ὀσπίτιον, (Lat.)	hospitium.

A perfect analogy to this system of double amputation occurs in many English words, when their present form is compared with the original German word. Thus, our “*fought*,” is “*foughten*” in old English, and *gefochten* in German.

PROPOSITION XVIII.—As the Greek verb is the part of speech in which the formative instinct of that rich language blossoms out most luxuriantly, we should expect that in this domain the pernicious, or it may be in this case perhaps, the beneficial effects of amputation will best appear. And so in fact it is. For not only have individual verbal affixes and prefixes been lopped off, but whole tenses and moods totally disappear, to supply whose place auxiliary verbs after the fashion of the modern languages are freely used. But as this is a matter that affects largely the syntax of the language, I shall reserve what is to be said on these organic losses for another section. In this place it will be sufficient to say, that of verbal curtailments falling under the heads of aphæresis and apocope, and not affecting the syntax of the language, the three following seem to be the principal:—(1.) The very irregular use and frequent omission of the augment. In this, however, it is superfluous to mention that the moderns follow the example of Homer, and that the loss is mostly as unimportant as that of the reduplicated second aorist of the poet was to the Athenians. (2.) The reduplication before the perfect participle passive is omitted—*γραμμένος* for *γεγραμμένος*. This is a change precisely analogous to that which the German has suffered in passing into English, as in *given* for *gegeben*, and so forth. (3.) The infinitive of the present infinitive active, after cutting off the terminative *ν*, becomes *ει*, as *γράφει* for *γράφειν*, and that of the first aorist passive,

in the same way after cutting of the terminal *ναι*, becomes *ἦ*, as *ἐλευθερωθῆ*, for *ἐλευθερωθῆναι*. This again forms a perfect analogy to the process by which the *ν*, which originally belonged to the full form of the infinitive, as *ἔμμεναι*, *ἔμμεν*, *εἶναι*, and which appears in the German, *loben*, *geben* is dropt in English, so that only the monosyllables *love* and *give* remain.

PROPOSITION XIX.—A very peculiar and characteristic species of initial curtailment is that which takes place when a preposition precedes the definite article, and being absorbed by it, is pronounced as one word. Thus, *εἰς τὴν πόλιν*, *to the city*, by curtailment of the initial diphthong and absorption of the remaining consonant by the following article, become *στην πόλιν*, or *στανπόλιν*, where the Dorism of *α* prevails, whence the vulgar *Stamboul* arising from a misunderstanding of the Franks. In the same way the ancient Cos was supposed to have been metamorphosed into *Stanco* (ἐς τὰν Κω); and in Crete, according to SPRATT,* they have actually *Νήδα* from *εἰς τὰν Ἰδα*. A similar error, arising from the ignorance of the Lowlanders, occurs in the Highlands, where *Loch Nell*, for instance, near Oban, receives its barbarous and unintelligible Saxon designation from the absorption of the definite article *na* by the substantive *eala*, signifying a *swan*, as is the case also with *Loch Ness*, *Moness*, and other such names, occurring not unfrequently in the topography of the Highlands, where the Gaelic *ais*, signifying a waterfall, attaching to itself the *n* of the definite article, presents to the uninstructed the false appearance of an independent word *ness*. In the same way the substantive verb vanishes into the following noun: as *smellum so = is maith leum so, this is good with me, I like*; and *spik orm, for is beag orm, this is little on me, I dislike*. It is remarkable that in German it is not the preposition in such cases, but the article that is absorbed. Thus *zu der* becomes *zur*, *zu dem*, *zum*, *in das*, *in's*, and so forth. In Italian sometimes both the article and the preposition are curtailed, as in *pel* for *per lo*, *nel* for *in illo*.

PROPOSITION XX.—Of *syncope*, or the dropping of consonants in the middle of a word, and of *synizesis*, or the slurring of two consecutive vowels into one syllable, there are not wanting examples in Romaic; but, as they are neither so frequent as the initial and final curtailment, nor occasion the same difficulty to the student, they may be slightly mentioned here. As in HOMER we have *κάββαλε* for *κατέλαβε*, and such like, so in Romaic we have *σνβάζω* for *συμβιβάζω*, *σπίθη* for *σπινθήρ*, *κάνω* for *κάμνω*, *νύφη* for *νύμφη*, *φάιτο* for *φάγετο*, *λάιν* for *λαγέριον*, *πεντήντα* for *πεντήκοντα*, and with a large initial curtailment *σαράντα* for *τεσσαράκοντα*. Two of the most familiar examples of this medial curtailment are those which take place on the verbs *λέγω* and *ὑπάγω*. When I

* Travels in Crete, by Captain SPRATT. London 1865.

was living a lodger in Athens, about twenty years ago, a little girl, the landlord's daughter, as I was going out, used to say to me *ποῦ πᾶτε*. When I heard this first I was considerably puzzled, and began at once to think of *πατέω* and *pattens*; but this scent led me far astray, and on inquiry I found that the mystical dissyllable was only a curtailed form of *ὑπάγετε*, as that word is used in the New Testament (Matthew xvi. 23). The same habit of dropping the medial gamma, I afterwards found, led to the forms *λές*, *λέτε*, *λέν*, familiarly used for *λέγεις*, *λέγετε*, and *λέγουν*; and in like manner *φᾶν* stands for *φάγουν*. (So in CHAUCER *han* for *haben* = *have*.) As to *synizesis*, or the slurring of two vowels into one syllable, which the readers of the Attic plays are quite familiar with, the modern Greek makes a systematic use of this figure in words of the first declension, such as *σοφία*, *φωτία*, *καρδία*, accompanying the slur of the slender vowel with the transference of the accent to the strong final vowel *καρδιά*. Sometimes in such cases the slight vowel is omitted altogether, as *κυρά* for *κυρία*, *lady*, *mother*.

Closely connected with *synizesis* is the practice of *crasis*, so perplexing to the tyro in Sanscrit, and familiar to the ancient Greek in such cases as *άνήρ* for *ὁ άνήρ*, *ᾶνερ* for *ὦ άνερ*, and others. The most common phenomena of this kind in modern Greek, and on which a classical scholar will be apt to stumble, are such forms as—

<i>νᾶσαι</i> ,	for	<i>ἵνα εἶσαι</i> ,
<i>νᾶλθῃ</i> ,	„	<i>ἵνα ἔλθῃ</i> ,
<i>νᾶχει</i> ,	„	<i>ἵνα ἔχει</i> ,
<i>τῶχει</i> ,	„	<i>τὸ ἔχει</i> ,
<i>πῶρχεται</i> ,	„	<i>ὅπου ἔρχεται</i> ,
<i>τῶπα</i> ,	„	<i>τὸ εἶπα</i> ,

and others of a similar description, which occur frequently in the *Erotocritus*.

PROPOSITION XXI.—These remarks taken singly, might naturally lead to the idea that modern Greek is a sort of amputated ancient Greek, as the Saxon half of English is a sort of amputated German—a meagre dialect in which every dissyllable has been cropped down into a monosyllable, and every trisyllable into a dissyllable. But this is by no means the case. Miserable and meagre, in point of vocal swell and syllabic roll, as our truncated Saxon tongue would have been, had it not been reinforced by the strong intrusion of the sonorous element from the classical languages, the tongue of the ancient Hellenes has suffered no such loss as to produce any bald disfigurement of this kind. The explanation of this is obvious. The words of the Greek language are so exuberantly polysyllabic, that the abstraction of a single syllable from each word would leave the great body of the language still distinctly polysyllabic; thus, *πιθυμῶ* falls upon the ear with pretty much the same amplitude

as the full form ἐπιθυμῶ. But further, the fact is that the curtailments of which we have spoken affect only a limited class of words ; and, singularly enough, the largest class to which apocope is applied contains a compensation which leaves the apocopated word as many syllables, or perhaps more than the original word of the classical tongue. This apparent paradox arises out of that substitution of diminutives for the original word, which we have already noted as characteristic of the modern dialect. For the diminutive in Greek, and all the Aryan languages, while it lessens the idea, increases the magnitude of the word, as in βρέφος, βρεφύλλιον, μείραξ, μειράκιον, σάρξ, σαρκάριον, and so forth, from which the consequence follows, that where a diminutive is systematically substituted for the simple word, and afterwards apocopated, the syllabic magnitude of the word is not diminished. Sometimes it may even be increased, as παιδί, παιδίον, παῖς ; ποτάμι, ποτάμιον, ποταμός ; γεροντάκι, γεροντάκιον, γερόντιον γέρων. If to these considerations we add the exuberant, amplificative and expansive tendency of the Greek language, and its delight in the formation of new compounds (p. 12, above), we shall be prepared to believe that the existing Greek language is no wise inferior to its classical prototype in point of syllabic luxuriance, and the student of ARISTOPHANES, whose ear swells with pleasure at the σφραγιδονχαργοκομήτης, and other sesquipedalian luxuries of the jovial Attic comedian, will not be surprised at encountering χαβιαροκατελυτος, σκουμπροπαλαμιδοπαστός, ἐγγραυλοπαστοφάγος, and such like, in his meagre Byzantine follower.

PROPOSITION XXII.—The practice of substituting the *diminutive* regularly for the simple word, which we have just mentioned, deserves further the special remark, that besides being a characteristic of Italian, as in *sorella*, *fratello*, *uccello*, &c., it had its origin in the earliest classical times, as we see in the Latin *oculus*, from the old root ὄκκος (HESYCH), identical with ἀνγή, German *auge*, Sanscrit *akshi*, in *auricula*, Italian *orecchia*, for *auris*, and in the classical Greek *θηρίον*, *πεδίον*, and a few others. In ARISTOPHANES the frequent use of the diminutives must strike every reader ; and we see here, as in most other instances, that what we call modern Greek is merely the natural development and full growth of tendencies deeply rooted in the heart, if not always visible on the surface of the classical tongue.

PROPOSITION XXIII.—The chapter of curtailment on which we have been dilating, so common in the progress of all languages, suggests, as its natural complement and counterpart, the chapter of *addition* or *increment*, whether that addition be real, that is, an appendage posteriorly added to the root, or only a part of the root, by change of circumstance brought to the surface after a long period of concealment, as happens to seeds sometimes by the process of

deep trenching. It is a well-known fact in the classical Greek language, that familiar words sometimes appear in two forms, the one differing from the other only by the addition of an appended letter or syllable,—an appendage which, when it appears in the front of the word, is technically called *prosthetic*, and when at the end *paragogic*. Thus we have $\chi\theta\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$ and $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\theta\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$, $\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma$ and $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma$, $\mu\alpha\upsilon\rho\acute{\omicron}\omega$ and $\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\upsilon\rho\acute{\omicron}\omega$, and not a few others. The same phenomenon appears largely in the comparison of different languages of the same family, as in *dent*, $\delta\delta\omicron\nu\tau$, $\delta\phi\rho\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$ and our *brow*, $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\rho$ (Gaelic, *bruach*), *star*, *tara*, $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\iota\rho\epsilon\alpha$ (HOM.) Now, though in many of these cases it is quite plain that curtailment has taken place, as when *pater* becomes *athar* in Gaelic, and *plenus lan*, it seems pretty certain that in others the taste or fashion of some particular time and place has added a letter to the original root. For this adhibition there may be various causes, demonstrative emphasis perhaps, as in the *celui ci* and *celui la* of the French, or mere euphony, as in the favourite habit of the Italian ear, which leads them to avoid a consonantal ending; thus *sunt* becomes not *son*, but *sono*. To determine the history and significance of these prosthetic and paragogic letters, is in many cases one of the most difficult tasks of scholarship; and on some of these problems the masculine erudition of one of the greatest of German scholars has been not unworthily spent;* but to enter into such discussions here would lead too far from the main purpose of this discourse; so I shall merely set down a few of the more notable of these enlargements of the old Greek form which the existing popular dialect presents, without speculating curiously on their origin. In the first place, we have sometimes, though far from regularly, a vowel appended to the third person plural of the indicative mood, $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omicron\upsilon\nu\epsilon$ for $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omicron\upsilon\nu$, $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\alpha\nu\epsilon$ for $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\alpha\nu$, quite in the Italian fashion. Similarly, among the pronouns we meet frequently with $\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\epsilon$ for $\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu$, just as the Athenians said $\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\sigma\acute{\iota}$ for $\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$, and $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu\omicron\sigma\acute{\iota}$ for $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma$; then for $\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omicron\upsilon$ we have $\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omicron\upsilon\nu\omicron\upsilon$, for $\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\acute{\eta}\varsigma$, $\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\eta\nu\acute{\eta}\varsigma$, and $\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\eta\nu\acute{\eta}\varsigma$ $\tau\acute{\eta}\varsigma$. Among the particles we have $\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ for $\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\acute{\iota}$, and $\tau\acute{\omicron}\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ for $\tau\acute{\omicron}\tau\epsilon$. This final ς appears in the imperative of certain verbs, as in $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$, by apocope $\acute{\iota}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$, following the ancient analogy of $\delta\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ and $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$. The accusative of the pronouns of the first and second persons presents the lengthened forms of $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha$ and $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha$. The demonstrative, on the other hand, is lengthened only in the front, and $\tau\acute{\omicron}\upsilon\tau\omicron$ becomes $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron$. $\tau\acute{\omicron}\iota\omicron\varsigma$ is subject to a reduplication, and becomes $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\tau\omicron\iota\omicron\varsigma$. A prosthetic ι before two initial consonants, of which the first is σ , is familiar to the student of the Romanic languages, and appears in the modern Greek $\acute{\iota}\sigma\kappa\iota\omicron\nu$ for $\sigma\kappa\acute{\iota}\alpha$.† This initial σ itself is added in some words, as in $\sigma\kappa\acute{\omicron}\nu\eta$

* *Pathologia Græci Sermonis*. Lobeck, Königsberg, 1853.

† This prosthetic ι appears regularly in Italian when the previous word ends in a consonant, as *con isdegno* for *con sdegno*. But this is only the occasional form of the word for the sake of euphony; the rule is, that while in Italian the initial e or i in such cases is never added, but regularly rejected, in Provençal, Spanish, and early popular French, it is always prefixed, even where no traces of it are found in Latin. CORNEWALL LEWIS on the "Romanic Languages," 2d edit., p. 107.

for *κόνις*, just as in the classical dialect *μικρὸς* and *σμικρὸς* appear in friendly company. The letter *γ*, which appears sometimes as a prosthetic letter, seems to be a modification of the rough breathing, as in *γυιός* for *ύιός*, *γιεράκι* for *ιεράκιον*, from *ἱεραξ*. But this *γ* has a tendency to show itself, not only in the front of words, but specially in the middle between two vowels, by the figure known to the old grammarians by the name of epenthesis. Thus we have—

σαλένγω,	for	σαλεύω.
γυρεύγω,	„	γυρεύω.
ἄγδουρος,	„	ἄωρος.
καβαλλικεύγω,	„	καβαλλικεύω.
αὔγον,	„	ᾠον.
θηργιό,	„	θηριό = θηρίον.
λάγουτα,	„	λαοῦτα (lute).
πλέγω,	„	πλέω.
ραγίζω,	„	ραίζω.
στέργιος,	„	στέρεος.
βογγάω,	„	βοάω.
ἄγναντεύω,	from	ἐναντίος.

That this epenthetic *γ* is a relic of the famous digamma, which plays such a redoubtable part in the criticism of the Homeric text, is a favourite notion with scholars. That it actually is so in some cases seems probable; scarcely in all, I should think, or in the majority of cases.

One of the most notable epenthetic lengthenings of classical words occurs in the present indicative of certain classes of verbs, by the insertion of *ν*. Thus, in all liquid verbs, for *στέλλω*, *στέλνω*, for *φέρω*, *φέρνω*, *κολνάω* for *κολλάω*, a fashion clearly traceable in the New Testament. There we have *δέρνω* for *δείρω*, *ὀπτάνομαι* for *ὀπτομαι*, *χύνω* for *χέω*, and others. In fact, this peculiarity is as old as HOMER, who has *θύνω* and *δύνω* for *θύω* and *δύω*, and the lengthened form of *ἀγνέω* for *ἄγω*. We need not, therefore, be surprised at its great prevalence in modern Greek. From the Alexandrians downwards, the people have always been in the habit of inserting a *ν* before the final vowel of the large class of verbs in *ώ*; as in the common *σκοτόνω*, to *darken one's day-lights*—to *kill*, *φανερώνω*, *καμαρόνω*, and many others. But this *ν* is found also in other and less marked cases, as in *ἀφίνω* from *ἀφίημι*, *σώνω* for *σώζω*, *βάνω* for *βάζω*, *χαρίνω* for *χαρίζω*, *ψένω* for *ἔψω*, *ψάχνω* for *ψαύω*. This is a peculiarity indeed, to which every one must tune his ear who wishes to read modern Greek with any comfort.*

* Mr GELDART (c. 4) remarks that, “in ancient Greek we may regard *αίνω* as a strengthened form of *έω*, and *άνω*, as a strengthened form of *άω*.” This may be quite true; only in such verbs as *λευκαίνω*, the *ν* is retained throughout all the parts of the verb, whereas in the modern *σκοτόνω*, and such like, it belongs only to the present indicative.

The remarkable paragoge of *κα*, which appears in the vulgar form of the first aorist passive, *ἐγράφηκα* for *ἐγράφην*, appears to have arisen from an illiterate confusion of the terminations of the past forms of the active and passive voice.

PROPOSITION XXIV.—The process of partial disintegration and reconstruction to which modern Greek, like Italian and French, owes its birth, is governed by a law, which seems to belong naturally to all human speech under similar circumstances, what I may call the LAW of SIMPLIFICATION and REGULARISATION. All language, by the natural action of the human mind, is constructed originally on the principle of likeness and analogy; but when, by the mixing of diverse tribes, or from other causes, irregularities and anomalies have once got a place in it, which disregard or contradict its characteristic analogies, the establishment of a classical norm of speech, by a succession of authoritative writers, may stereotype such irregularities as a recognised part of the language for an indefinite period. Thus in English, the irregular plurals—*fragments*, by the way, of an old regularity—*men*, *women*, *oxen*, and a few others, remain fixed; and so in Greek, the aoristic forms in *κα*, *ἔθηκα*, *ἔδωκα*, *ἦκα*, contrary to the general rule of verbal formation. But so soon as the firm control of intellectual authority is weakened, as by the removal of some artificial constraint, the popular ear falls back on the familiar analogy, and abolishes the anomaly; and thus in modern Greek, *ἔθηκα* becomes *ἔθεσα*, *ἔδωκα*, *ἔδωσα*, *ἀνέγγων*, *ἀνέγνωσα* (also in ancient Ionic), and so forth. A familiar example of this tendency is the *seed* for *seen*, *coomed* for *come*, &c., of the common people in England. Similarly we find in Greek *ἐφέρθη* from *φέρω*, *βαλμένος* for *βεβλημένος*, *καλεσμένος* for *κεκλημένος*. To the same category belongs the total abolition of all verbs in *μι*, the relic, as is well known, of the oldest form of the verb in the Aryan languages. Thus, as early as the New Testament epoch, from the general use of *ἔστηκα* as a present, the new regular form *στέκω* had been produced, which is the only form of the old *ἵστημι* now used in the Greek tongue. So for *δίδωμι* we have now *δίδω*, for *τίθημι*, a secondary verb, *θέτω*, formed from the verbal adjective *θετός*, like *ἄστατέω* (1 Cor. iv. 11) from *ἄστατος*, and *στατός*, for *ἀφίημι*, *ἀφίνω*, and for *παρίστημι*, *παρισταίνω* (Rom. xii. 1). So much for the verbs. Among the nouns this tendency displays itself most strikingly, as in Italian, in the habit of taking the objective case of nouns of the third declension, and turning it into a new nominative, to be declined after the fashion of the first or second declension.* Thus,—

ἡ μητέρα,	from	μήτηρ.
ἡ πεδιάδα,	„	πεδιάς.
ἡ ἀγελάδα,	„	ἀγελάς.

* CORNEWALL LEWIS, in his essay on the Romanic Languages (2d edit., 1862, p. 91), while tracing this tendency to prefer the accusative case through all the Romanic languages, says that “ he is unable to

ἡ φλέβα,	from	φλέψ.
ἡ φτέρα,	„	πτερίς.
ἡ φοράδα,	„	φοράς.

And this termination *άδα*, when it had once caught the popular ear, became a favourite norm for the formation of abstract substantives even when there was no objective case of the third declension from which to make the transfer. Thus,—

For λαμπρότης,	λαμπυράδα.
For φρόνησις,	φρονημάδα.
From νόστιμος,	νοστιμάδα.

In the same way with masculines,—

For ἔρως,	ἔρωτας.
„ πατήρ,	πατέρας.
„ ἀήρ,	ἀέρας.
„ βασιλεύς,	βασιλιάς.
„ Rex (<i>Lat.</i>)	Ρήγας.

For, in fact, *ς* in non Attic Greek was the favourite termination of masculine agents, as we see in *Cosmas*, *Ducas*, and other proper names of the Middle Ages. So for the Attic ἀρτοποιός they preferred the shorter form ἀρτάς, for ὠρολογιοποιός, ὠρολογάς, and many others. The prevalence of this termination is specially marked by the systematic use of the form βλέπωντας for βλέπων as the nominative of the participle, and that in both genders. The termination *ος* of the second declension is sometimes used in the same way, as γέρος for γέρων, δράκος for δράκων; of which confusion we have examples also in the classic authors, as ἀλάστορος (HOMER, ÆSCHYL., and SOPH.) for ἀλάστωρ, μάρτυρος for μάρτυρ. To the same category of regularisation belong, of course, the forms καλήτερος, πολλότατος, μεγαλήτερος, μεγαλότατος, for the well-known irregular forms of the classical grammar.

PROPOSITION XXV.—The previous observations relate exclusively to the changes that time has wrought on individual words, apart from their relation to one another. Now, the elements of language which indicate the method of the connection of one word with another, or of one sentence with another, are

suggest any very satisfactory explanation” of the phenomenon. The explanation seems simply to be that, in the case of most nouns, which are not agents, we think of them regularly as *objects* of our thoughts and feelings, that is, grammatically, we generally use the objective case; and even in the case of agents, we feel more strongly, and have to express more frequently, our action on them than their action on us, as, *I like HIM, I hate HIM, I tell HIM, I order HIM, I forbid HIM, &c.*

chiefly the cases of nouns, the tenses and moods of verbs and prepositions and conjunctions. Every change, indeed, made on a verb by diminution or increase, does not mark a change in the law of the dependence of words on each other, or of sentences on sentences; but for the sake of a complete view (in addition to what was said above), it will be convenient to note the principal changes made on the verb in this place. Now, every one who bears in mind the prodigal luxuriance of form in the Greek verb, will be prepared to find that the change here falls almost exclusively under the category of loss. Thus the common third person plural of the present indicative in *οὐν*, sometimes *οὐνε*, is a manifest curtailment of the old Doric *οντι*, Latin *unt*. This *οὐν* of the indicative is then transferred to the subjunctive, and we have *πράξουν* for *πράξωσι*, and similar forms. The next thing that strikes us is the total disappearance of that double form of the aorist, which gives so much annoyance to young students of the classical tongue. The first aorist with the *α* as its final syllable has gained a decided victory over the *ο* form in the active voice; and in the passive the aspirated form which appears in *ἐστάλθην*, is preferred to the Attic *ἐστάλην*. Thus, even when the second aorist is retained, because no first aorist existed, it assumes the *α*, which is the characteristic of the first aorist. So *ἔλαβαν* for *ἔλαβον*, a peculiarity already prominent in the septuagint. But the two most striking amputations which the verb has suffered, and which most prominently affect the syntax, are those of the optative and the infinitive mood, both changes for which the way was fully prepared in ancient times, as the student of the New Testament must be aware. The loss of the *optative* as the natural and symmetric form, of the conjunctive after a past tense in the leading clause, is no doubt in an æsthetical point of view to be lamented; its effect in modern Greek is the same as if in English we should say, "*I GAVE you this property, that you MAY enjoy yourself on it*"; practically, however, it occasions no ambiguity, and accordingly we find that in the language of the New Testament the place of the optative in such dependent clauses is almost always taken by the subjunctive; and not in the New Testament only, but frequently in Plutarch, and not seldom even in Thucydides. It may be said, therefore, with perfect truth that the dropping of the optative is in the end an improvement, rather than a corruption of the language; as it is better that a person should be dead altogether, than that being alive, his occasional presence should serve only to remind us with the more acute pain of his habitual absence. But the loss of the *infinitive mood* is something to which the thorough-bred classical scholar will feel it much more difficult to reconcile his ear. If there is one thing more than another that distinguishes the flexible grace of Greek syntax from the somewhat formal dignity of the Roman, it is the frequent use of the infinitive mood. And one cannot but express a wonder at first blush, that a form of expression so con-

venient and so flexible as the infinitive certainly is, should have given place to the lumbering form of a conjunction with the subjunctive or indicative mood. But so it is; for even the Greeks in their best days said *οἶδα ὥς* or *ὅτι*, instead of the less circuitous infinitive or participle; and the Romans who, for a special class of cases well-known to schoolboys, had prescribed the accusative before the infinitive as the only form, before the time of St Augustine began pretty generally to say, *Scio quod Petrus est vir doctus*, or even *quia*, which is the mother of the French *que* and the Italian *che*. Whence the habit now so characteristic of modern Greek took its rise of using *να* (for *ἵνα*), with the subjunctive instead of the old infinitive, it seems useless to inquire. I have sometimes thought it might be by a contagion caught from the Roman syntax; but the relation of the two languages was of such a kind as to create a current of contagion from Greek upon Latin syntax (as indeed we see in Tacitus), rather than the reverse. I shall say, therefore, it was only a change of fashion; certain it is that the partiality for *ἵνα* with the subjunctive mood, appears already largely developed in the New Testament in cases where a classical ear feels the want of the familiar infinitive. But custom, which exercises a despotic authority in such matters, soon reconciles us to the change; which indeed, when considered apart from the habit of the ear, is anything but an important one, and quite in harmony with the commonest grammatical phenomena, both in ancient and modern languages. When I say in English, for instance, *It is too bad that you should do so and so*, I am merely using the modern Greek syntax of *δεινὸν νὰ τὰ τοιαῦτα κάμῃς* for the classical *δεινὸν τὸ τὰ τοιαῦτα σέγε πράττειν*; and the apparently more awkward syntax, *διὰ τὸ να πραχθῶσι τὰντα*, for *πραχθῆναι ταῦτα*, is again only the English *on account of the fact that*, and the Latin *propterea quod*. There is only one other amputation in the Greek classical verb which must be mentioned, for it is certainly the most grievous of all; I mean the loss of the future and the pluperfect, with the substitution therefor of the auxiliary verbs, *θέλω* or *θά*, and *ἔχω*. Now, it is no doubt true that the particle *ἄν*, so familiar in the classical dialect, and *κε* in HOMER, could have been nothing in their origin but auxiliary verbs; and so *θα* may plead a classical precedent. True also it is that the verb *ἔχω* is not unfrequently in the tragic writers joined with the past participle in a way that has some analogy to the function of an auxiliary verb; but it is in reality very different; and as there is nothing in modern Greek that so offends the polite ear of the elegant scholar as the presence of these auxiliary verbs, it is matter of congratulation that the best modern writers know so rarely and so dexterously to use them, that the offence is practically reduced to a minimum, and with some writers appears to cease altogether. There is another characteristic of Neo-Hellenic prose closely allied to such essentially modern syntactic combinations; I mean the use of such modern turns of speech as *βάλλω εἰς πρᾶξιν*, *to put into execu-*

tion—*χάνω τὴν στράταν*, to lose the way—*κάμνω πανία*, to make sail, &c. ; and in respect of these also, it is comfortable to remark, that even in the lowest phase of the language they are much fewer than might have been expected, and in the more cultivated forms are becoming fewer and less prominent every day.

Another severe syntactic loss which the modern dialect has suffered, is the disappearance of the *dative case*, and the confounding of that case, not only with the accusative, as in our English pronoun *him*, but with the genitive. The loss of the cases, as is well known, takes place naturally from the relations originally expressed by the terminational affixes having become obscured to the popular ear ; a process which was sometimes precipitated by a confusion in the pronunciation of cognate diphthongs, as when *τοῦ* was pronounced *τῷ*, or the contrary. This loss is repaired, in the first place, by the use of *prepositions* along with case-affixes, in which conjunction they are in fact tautological, as in the Homeric phrase *ἐξ ἐμέθεν*. Afterwards, when the removal of all authoritative control, and the weakening of precedent, have allowed the affixes to be dropt or confounded, the prepositions take their place as the alone significant element, and attach themselves prominently or exclusively to the accusative as the dominant case. Thus, in modern Greek, *ἀπό* takes the accusative, and *εἰς*, usurping the function of *ἐν*, is joined with the same case, whether its signification be *in* or *into*. This is the case in Scotch also, as we say “*a head wi’ a muckle lot in till’t*,” i.e., *in it* ; and both in Latin and in German there is only one form for *εἰς* and *ἐν*.

In reference to the connection of clauses, there are only two observations more to be made : one, that the relative *ὅς* is in the modern dialect frequently replaced by *ὁ ὅποιος* (the Italian, *il quale*), or simply by the indeclinable *ὅπου*, somewhat as in English we say, *whereof* and *wherefrom*, instead of *of which* and *from which*. In German the adverb *so* is used in the same way ; and among ourselves, with the uneducated, *as* often serves the same purpose. The other point is the confounding of *ὥς ἄν* or *σάν* with *ὥς* ; and combined with this the formation of some new conjunctions, of which the most common are,—

<i>ἀγκαλά,</i>	though.
<i>ἀμή,</i>	but.
<i>ὥς τόσον,</i>	meanwhile.
<i>εἰς τόσον ὅπου,</i>	the while—while that.
<i>μὲ ὅλον τοῦτο,</i>	nevertheless.

Some new prepositions and adverbs, or old forms curtailed, may also here be noticed, as,—

<i>συμμά,</i>	near.
<i>μέ,</i>	with.

μαζί,	with
μέσα,	in, into, within.
δλόγυρα,	for περί.
δίχως,	for χωρίς, άνευ.
τὰ ισῖα (<i>soeben</i> , German),	for αντίκα.

This phenomenon appears also in the Romanic dialects,* and seems to belong naturally to a language in a case of nascent or complete disintegration.

PROPOSITION XXVI.—Not the least important element in the new phasis of an old language is that which either does not appear at all, or is only partially represented in the Dictionary—viz. : the *pronunciation*. This is a matter with regard to which, from the Reformation downwards, very fierce battles have been fought between the living Greeks and the great majority of classical scholars ; but after three centuries of ink shed, and now that in the great German school an accurate philology has been added to a large philosophy, we feel warranted in asserting that the great salient points of the question have been planted before the thinking scholar in their right aspect. No person who has examined the subject will now deny that, while correct Greek speakers pronounced their prose orations both according to accent and quantity, in prose the accent was the dominant element, while quantity prescribed the law to poetry.† Then as to the sounds of the individual vowels and diphthongs, while on the one hand no sensible person will suppose or attempt to prove that the present vocalisation of the Greek tongue has remained in all respects unchanged from HOMER downwards, on the other hand, such a person will regard it as no less certain that the comparative tenuity, the so-called *itacism* of the modern dialect, is a peculiarity of very ancient date in the language, being in fact clearly noted by QUINCTILIAN in the marked contrast which he draws between the *strong* Roman language and the *slender* Hellenic.‡ As little will any well-informed scholar in these days be bold enough to assume the advocacy of that altogether arbitrary pronunciation of Greek which has obtained currency in this country—a pronunciation which both corrupts vocalisation by the insular anomalies of John Bull, and travesties intonation at almost every step by the arbitrary substitution of the Latin for the Greek accent. On this basis, and emancipated formally from the evil habit of our English school utterance, the position of the modern Greek with regard to *accent, quantity, and vocalisation*, may be simply stated thus. The accent, with a very few exceptions, has asserted its supre-

* See CORNEWALL LEWIS, ch. v., for an analysis of the French, Italian, and Provençal prepositions, adverbs, and conjunctions.

† For the detailed proof and illustration of this, I must refer to my paper on the *Power and Place of Accent in Language*, Transactions of Royal Society, Edinburgh, March 1871.

‡ *Non possumus esse tam GRACILES? Simus FORTIORES.*—INSTITUT. ORAT. xii. 10.

macy on those very syllables of the word where its emphasis was marked by the grammarian, ARISTOPHANES of Byzantium, in the early days of the Ptolemies; and the circumstance that, wherever a word is curtailed by dropping an initial, or final syllable, or both, the accented syllable always remains, as containing, to use DIOMEDE'S phrase, "the soul of the word;"* this circumstance of itself were sufficient proof, though all others were wanting, that emphasis or stress, in the modern sense, and not mere elevation, as some English scholars hastily assume, was the essential element in that affection of articulate speech which the Greeks called *τόνος* (*stress* or *strain*, from *τείνω*). When we reflect what extensive changes in English accentuation have taken place with us since the time of CHAUCER, we shall consider this persistency of the same element in the Greek, during a period of more than two thousand years, a phenomenon not a little remarkable, and we shall rejoice to think that the great Byzantine grammarian, if not in the general practice of English scholars, certainly in the living tradition of his people, and in the practice of the national Church, has received the reward which he deserved. But the accent, like other strong forces, having lost the salutary control of a hereditary school of music, has not only maintained its position, but invaded the domain of quantity; so that with the modern Greek the word *ἀνθρωπος*, for instance, is pronounced not like the English word *lándhólder*, as it was by DEMOSTHENES, but like the English word *abbacy*, or *atrophy*, that is, with the middle syllable curtailed of its natural volume of sound. The fact of the matter is, that there is in all language a popular tendency to cheat the unaccented syllable of its full quantity, especially when it comes immediately after an accented syllable; and to this tendency Latin yielded at an early period (as we see from the short final *o*, in Martial) and Greek probably about the same time. Along with this abuse, there crept in also in Greek that other one of, in many cases, dwelling upon the accented syllable in such a manner as to change its natural quantity from short to long; just as the Scotch, who as a rule speak slower than the English, draw out the accented syllable in many words, such as *májesty*, *nátionál*, which the English pronounce short. The consequence of this excessive emphasis of the accent is, that in their rhymed poetry, the Greeks find no offence in echoing *αἰνᾶ* by *ἐνα*, *μένος* by *μῆνος*, and so forth; which is just the same as if we were to abolish the difference between *hare* and *her*, *mane* and *men*, *pope* and *pop*. Then again as to the vowel sounds. In the face of the distinct gamut of the vowels given by DIONYSIUS of Halicarnassus (*De Structurâ Orationis*, xiv.), it is impossible to maintain that the itacism now universally prevalent was considered correct speaking (though it might perhaps have been the vulgar fashion) in the days of Augustus Cæsar. We must say, therefore, that the present fashion of pronouncing *η* like *ee* is a corruption and an enfeeblement of the classic speech, in so far as it

* *Accentus est anima vocis*.—DIOMEDE. "Pulsch. Gr. Lat. Auct.," p. 425.

substitutes a weak and feminine for a strong and masculine sound. The like verdict must be pronounced on the itacising of the delicate sound of *υ*, which was equivalent to the German *ü* in *Brüder*, and the Scotch *ui* in *bluid*, *guid*—a vulgarising of a fine sound to which the descent, when corruption once sets in, is very prone; as we find even now in Saxony, where *Brüder* is commonly pronounced *breeder*, and in Aberdeen, where the south country *guid* is squeezed out into *gweed*.

PROPOSITION XXVII.—It is another question altogether, how far the euphony of the Greek language, considered as an æsthetical product, has been affected by these corruptions. Latin was corrupted in a similar fashion, and came out of the process, not only not less, but, as some think, considerably more euphonic, in the shape of Italian and Spanish. The mere change from quantitative to accented poetry implies no absolute cacophony; it is merely the introduction of a new rhythmical law, and the transference of the musical weight of a word in verse from one syllable to another. This the beautiful hymnology of the Latin Church sufficiently attests; and no man of taste, who knows how to read these compositions, will speak less favourably of the unrhymed accented chants of the Byzantine Church, except, of course, in so far as he may feel the want of the pleasant recurrent sweetness of rhyme.

χαῖρε ἀστήρ, ἐμφαίνων τὸν ἥλιον.
 χαῖρε γαστήρ ἐνθέου σαρκώσεως·
 χαῖρε, δι' ἧς νεουργεῖται ἡ κτίσις
 χαῖρε δι' ἧς βρεφουργεῖται ὁ κτίστης
 χαῖρε, νύμφη ἀνύμφευτε.*

Then, as to the effect of the excessive frequency of the feeble sound of *ι*, expressed by the term itacism, we must bear in mind that, though the modern pronunciation applied absolutely to certain picked lines of the ancient classics might produce a very petty vocal effect, it does not at all follow that the same result will be produced when the modern language is used by those who know how to handle it. Such a sequence of weak identical sounds, for instance, as occurs when the law of itacism is applied to a word like *πληθυνθείη*, does not exist in the Neo-Hellenic verb; for the optative is obsolete. But further; it seems to be quite certain, that if certain lines in classical Greek have their music marred by the application of the modern itacism, the harmony of the whole language is destroyed by the barbarous English pronunciation of the diphthong *ου*, in which the rude canine *ow* is substituted for the soft and velvety *oo*. And with regard to this beautiful *ου*, which the English so pervert, it is a noticeable fact, that not only is it one of the most prominent sounds

* SERGII, ὕμνος ἀκάθιστος τῆς Θεοτόκου. Anthol. Græca Carminum Christianorum. *Christ et Par-nikas*. Lips. 1871, p. 140.

in classical Greek, but it has extended its sphere in the modern dialect so as to produce some new and sonorous terminations. How beautiful, for instance, are the diminutives in οὔλα, as—

ράχοῦλα,	for	ράχη.
μανοῦλα,	„	μάνη.
αὐγοῦλα,	„	αὐγή.
φωνοῦλα,	„	φωνή.
περδικοῦλα,	„	περδίκιον.
παλαιὰ κλησοῦλα,	„	παλαιὰ ἐκκλησία.
καρδοῦλα,	„	καρδία.
λαλοῦλα,	„	λάλημα.
βρυσοῦλα,	„	βρύσις.

No man with an ear will deny that in these cases,—and they are abundant enough to give a marked character to the modern dialect,—the classical type of the word has been corrupted into a decided improvement. A similar euphony strikes the ear in the words with the less common termination οὔδα, as in ἀρκοῦδα and καλιακοῦδα. The same favourite diphthong appears in βροντοῦνε for βροντῶσι, in ζοῦνε for ζῶσι, and others of the same kind, which may be picked out of the Klephtic ballads. The ranks of the same favourite diphthong are further swelled by desertions from the ancient υ, as in

φουσκόνω,	from	φύσκοω.
κουδούνιον,	„	κώδων.
βρονχίζω,	„	βρύχω.
σκούζω,	„	σκύζω.
σκούβαλον,	„	σκύβαλον,

and others.

Nor is the sonorous sound of α, according to DIONYSIUS the most musical of the vowels, but which the English in many cases degrade into the feeble rank of η (Scotch), less prominent in the modern than in the ancient dialect. On the contrary, many beautiful new substantive forms are used with a marked preference to which this rich vowel gives the key-note, as in

σημάδι,	for	σημεῖον.
σκοτάδι,	„	σκότος.
ποτάμι,	„	ποταμός.
εὐμορφάδα,	„	εὐμορφία.
νοστιμάδα,	„	νοστιμότης.
φρονημάδα,	„	φρόνημα.

With the troop of favourite diminutives in άρι and άκι.

And I must say, generally, that in reading through the *Erotocritus*, I was more struck by the predominance of these two rich musical sounds of *a* and *ou*, than by any offensive accumulation of itacised syllables; and both in that poem and in the Klephtic ballads, my ear not seldom rested on lines of a full and masculine melody, not inferior to the best in HOMER. Thus we read—

‘Ολημεροῦλα πολεμᾷ τὸ βράδυ καραοῦλι.

“*All day we fight, and all the night we waste in sleepless watches.*”

And

Σκοπώνει τοὺς Ἀγαρηνοὺς, πεζοῦρα καὶ καβάλο.

“*He mows them down, the Agarenes, both foot and horse he mows them.*”

And, again,

Πολλὴ μαυρίλλα ἔρχεται, μαυρὴ σὰν καλιακούδι.

“*A blackness sweeps across the plain, black as a troop of ravens.*”*

And what can be more vigorous and powerful, so far as sound is concerned, than the following lines from the *Erotocritus*, describing the impatient steeds at a battle, eager to start at the first blast of the trumpet?

Κτυποῦν τὰ πόδια τοὺς στὴν γῆν, τὴν σκόνῃ ἀνασηκόνουν,

Τὸ τρέξιμον ἀναζητοῦν, ἀφρίζουν, καὶ δριμώνουν.

Ἡ γλώσσα μὲ τὸ στόμα τοὺς παίζει τὸ χαλινάρι,

Τῶνα καὶ τ’ ἄλλο ἀγριεύετο, σὰν κάνει τὸ λιοντάρι.

Τὰρθούνια τοὺς καπνίζουνσι, συχνὰ τ’ ἀφτιά σαλεύουν,

Καὶ νὰ κινήσουν βιάζονται, νὰ τρέξουσι γυρεύουν.

Or, again, take the beautiful little *χελιδόνισμα*, or swallow song to welcome the spring, from KIND’s collection—

‘Ο Ἀπρίλης ὁ γλυκὺς ἔφθασε, δὲν ἔναι μακρὰ.

Τὰ πουλάκια κέλαδουν, τὰ δενδράκια φυλλανθοῦν,

Τὰ ὀρνίθια νὰ γεννοῦν ἄρχισαν καὶ νὰ κλωσσοῦν,

Τὰ κοπάδια ἀρχиноῦν ν’ ἀναβαίνουν ἔς τὰ βουνὰ,

Τὰ καϊζίκια νὰ πηδοῦν καὶ νὰ τρώγουν τὰ κλαδιά.

So that, upon a broad practical estimate of the whole, I scarcely think any impartial person, who has taken the trouble to train his ear to the euphony of language (which I am sorry to see even great scholars don’t always do), will pass any other verdict than this, that the old language of HOMER, and PLATO, and DEMOSTHENES, whatever amputations and transmutations it may have suffered in the course of centuries, remains still among the organs of human expression one of the most vigorous and the most harmonious; as a magnificent

* PASSOW: *Popularia Carmania Græcorum*, ix. 2, lxxxii. 12, xcvi. 6.

† KIND: *Neugrichische Anthologie*, p. 72. Leipzig. 1847.

tree with full luxuriant leafage may bear much lopping, and still remain very beautiful.

PROPOSITION XXVIII.—In connection with the orthoepy of the existing Greek language, one or two other points deserve mention. The first is that the present race, while allowing the *spiritus asper* to drop, have shown no tendency to narrow the sphere of that consonantal *aspiration* so favoured by their ancestors, but have rather increased it. For not only do ϕ , χ , ψ , and θ remain with their full aspirated force in the words which originally had them, but many words which had a slender consonant in classical usage, now regularly receive an aspirate. This specially happens where two slender consonants come together, in which case, in the modern practice, the former is always aspirated ; thus,

For κλέπτῃς,	they say	κλέφτῃς.
βλάπτω,	„	βλάφτω.
πίπτω,	„	πέφτω.
δείκνυμι,	„	δείχνω,
πτωχός,	„	φτωχός.
πτέρυγες,	„	φτέρουγες.
ρίπτω,	„	ρίχνω.
ράπτω,	„	ράφτω.
ᾶπτομαι,	„	ᾶφτω.
πταίω,	„	φταίω.

And many more. The same tendency to aspiration—closely connected with the sibilation so common in classical Greek—has led to the lisping of every δ , and the softening of β into our English *v*, which often produces a very pleasant effect, as when *voólomæ*, the Romaic pronunciation of *βούλομαι* is compared with the rude and canine English *bowlomai*. And if the modern Greek has shown no objection to the classical aspirates, as little has he felt inclined to soften down the masculine ξ — $\kappa\varsigma$ —after the fashion of the Italians, into a double sibilant. Besides retaining the ancient ξ in all cases where it existed, he has new created a large class of compound verbs with $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$ or $\acute{\epsilon}\xi$, of which the characteristic is, that the initial vowel is omitted or transposed, so that $\epsilon\kappa$ becomes $\xi\epsilon$, and the word appears commencing with the double consonant. Of this class the following are characteristic examples :—

ξαγαπῶ,	to cease loving—grow cool.
ξακουστοσύνη,	celebrity.
ξαστερία,	clear starry brightness.
ξαφεγγαρία,	moonlessness.
ξεβάπτω,	to take out the colour.

ξεβουλλώνω,	to unseal.
ξεδοντίζω,	to draw teeth.
ξεκαρδίζω,	to dishearten.
ξεκαρφώνω,	to take out nails.
ξεμανθάνω,	to unlearn.
ξεμναλίζω,	to put one's brain out of shape—madden.
ξεσπαθώνω,	to draw the sword.
ξετραχηλίζω,	to break one's neck.
ξεψυχέω,	give up the ghost.
ξημερώνει,	the day breaks.

PROPOSITION XXIX.—In the above analysis I have made no allusion to one element of corruption, which from the analogy of Italian one might expect to find in the modern Greek dialect. I mean the element of *adulteration* from foreign sources. In the purest modern languages, as in German, for instance, this adulteration is considerable, and, except on a principle of pedantic purism, to which utility and good taste are equally opposed, could not be dispensed with. But it is different with Greek. For not only do all nations borrow their scientific terminology from the language of ARISTOTLE and HIPPOCRATES, while the language of these great master-builders of early science borrows from no one, but the foreign elements which at different periods got into use as part of the current Hellenic, did so only by way of external attachment, so to speak, not by way of inoculation; they did not infuse themselves into the blood, or, to use a legal simile, they were not fixtures. And thus it came to pass, that with the change of masters one adopted element was readily thrown off, and another as readily assumed, and as loosely retained. The colloquial style of the Byzantine Greeks thus became superficially Latinised, or spotted rather with Latinisms; that of the Frankish chroniclers included a sprinkling of French words; that of the Cretans flirted with Italian; while that of the Acarnanian, Thessalian, and Epirotic Klephts was forced, for the sake of convenience, to tolerate a certain admixture of the Turkish element, which their most deeply rooted principles and their most powerful associations would have led them to disdain. But the number of these foreign words was at no time considerable; and as one immediate result of the grand national resurrection in 1821, the unseemly crusts and blotches of this foreign element instantly fell off like the scurf of a cutaneous disease, and the pure Hellenic came out of the caldron of a barbarous broth as clean and bright, and pure from all stain, as the god-like Ulysses out of his bath. In the current Greek newspapers which present the language in its ultimate type, not one of those Latin, Italian, Albanian, and Turkish words is to be found, which raise a not unfrequent stumblingblock in the way of the student of mediæval and Venetian

Greek; much less do those hybrid compounds occur which bristle in THEODORUS, made by the addition of the Latin terminations *άτωρ*, and *άτος*, and *άριος*, to a Greek root.* At the present time, a little girl in the street, if you ask for a flower by the Albanian word *λουλούδι*, may surprise you by saying that you must say *άνθος*; and if you wish a boat to shoot across from the Piræus to Ægina, you must ask in Thucydidean phrase for a *λέμβος*, and not for a *barchetta*.

PROPOSITION XXX.—With regard to the materials of which the modern dialect consists, as well as the physiognomy which it presents, a question has been raised, in how far it represents any of the ancient dialects—Doric, Ionic, or Æolic; for Attic it certainly is not. Now, it seems quite plain that, looking at the conditions of the case, nothing would have been more strange than that some considerable traces of these non-Attic varieties of Greek speech should not have presented themselves in the modern new formation. For Attic, we ought to remember, was a dialect originally confined to a comparatively small portion of the Greek-speaking population; and the breadth of space which it afterwards occupied was a purely literary phenomenon, leaving untouched the great popular substratum of a distinctly diverse feature, spread out in large reaches of country from Tænarus to Trebizond. Byzantium specially, the centre of non Attic Hellenism in later days, was a Doric colony; in Africa, neither Alexandria nor Cyrene could lay any claim to a native Atticism; and on the sunny shores of Asia Minor, as well as the bright isles of the Ægean, Doric, Æolic, or Ionic varieties of Greek speech were everywhere at home.† Now, in what proportions these local peculiarities might mix themselves up in a new dialect to be formed after the long and disturbed action of centuries, so as to serve for a common medium of understanding, no man could dare to prophesy; but that the traces of their existence should appear in some shape and to some extent, seemed certain. And so, in fact, it has proved. Putting out of view the local dialect of the Tzacones‡ in Eastern Laconia, as something isolated and

* Of this barbarism, the name of an illustrious Fanariot family, MAUROCORDATO—*black-hearted*, is a familiar example.

† How much of the peculiarities of the Alexandrian Greek has passed, either directly, or through the influence of the Church and the Alexandrian translation of the Old Testament, into modern Greek, the student of the Septuagint will readily convince himself. It is notable also, that not a few of the rare words used in the Septuagint, though unknown to Attic Greek, are found in POLYBIUS, HERODOTUS, and DIODORUS, as SCHLEUSNER, and other Biblical lexicographers, have been careful to note. The Biblical Greek which issued from Alexandria is, in fact, a sort of half-way house between Attic Greek and Romaic; and in this view it is certain that a familiarity with the living dialect of Greece would be of more value to our young theologians than many of the branches of philology which at present occupy their attention.

‡ On the peculiarities of the dialect of the Tzacones, which MULLACH identifies with the *Caucones* of the ancient topographers, see MULLACH, "Grammar," p. 94, and "Das Tzakonische von Prof. MORIZ SCHMIDT in Studien zur Griechischen und Lateinischen Grammatik, herausgegeben von GEORG CURTIUS," vol. iii. p. 347.

deserving special consideration, the general dialect of the modern Greek, from the Byzantine lingo of PTOCHOPRODROMUS, to the Cretan of CORNARO, and the Epirotic of the Klephtic ballads, certainly does present certain features of an Æolo-Doric physiognomy. Of this the dominance of the broad vowel *α*, not only in the nominative of all masculine agents, as above mentioned (p. 23), but in a large class of verbs, as in *ζητᾶ* for *ζητεῖ*, *μετρᾶ* for *μετρεῖ*, *φοβᾶται* for *φοβεῖται*, is in itself sufficient evidence. But besides this, we have the well-known Doric peculiarity of forming all verbs whose future is in *ξ* from a present in *ζ* instead of a double *σ*, according to the Attic usage; thus, instead of *τάσσω* we have *τάζω*;* and in this way has been formed a large class of modern verbs, as, *φωνάζω*, *φωνάξω*, *φοβερίζω*, *φοβερίξω*, *τρομάζω*, *τρομάξω*. Of Æolism, the accusative plural of the first declension in *αι* instead of *ᾱ*, as *Μούσαις* for *Μούσας*, is a familiar example. On the other hand, it is not to be denied that there are some traces of Ionic also in modern Greek, as in the conversion of *ο* or *ω* into *ου*, and the use of the slender *η* for the broad *α* in certain adjectives in *ρος*; but I have not been able to confirm from my observation the strong remark of the late Viscount STRANGFORD on this point—one of the best authorities no doubt—to the effect that, “it would be easy to show two Ionisms for one Æolism or Dorism in modern Greek.†

A kindred point to this dialectic physiognomy of the modern tongue is brought out by the occurrence in it of certain words, or forms of words, which anciently were confined to poetic usage, but have now passed into general circulation. The following is a short list of this type which I have collected:—

<i>σιγαλός</i> ,	(PINDAR).
<i>βροχή</i> ,	for <i>ὑετός</i> .
<i>ὀμμάτια</i> ,	<i>ὄμματα</i> , HOMER, for <i>ὀφθαλμός</i> .
<i>τρικυμία</i> ,	storm at sea, for <i>λαῖλαψ</i> .
<i>νόστιμος</i> ,	for <i>τερπνός</i> .
<i>κτυπάω</i> ,	<i>έω</i> , HOM., for <i>τύπτω</i> .
<i>κτίριον</i> ,	<i>κτέαρ</i> , HOM., for <i>κτῆμα</i> .
<i>ἄρμενα</i> ,	tackling, riggling, for <i>ὄπλα</i> .
<i>λιβάδιον</i> ,	from <i>λιβάς</i> , for <i>λειμών</i> .
<i>δροσερός</i> ,	for <i>ἡδύς</i> .
<i>τάχινός</i> ,	(CALLIM), for <i>ταχύς</i> .
<i>αἶθουσα</i> ,	a hall.

The transference of such words from poetical into common usage is not a phenomenon that need excite any surprise. The popularity of a great

* AHRENS, *De Dialecto Dorica*.

† “On Cretan and Modern Greek,” in the Appendix to Captain SPRATT’S “Travels in Crete,” vol. i.

national poet, or the affectation of some fashionable writer, may readily achieve this ; but we must bear in mind also, that what we would justly mark as poetic in an Attic writer may, in some of the widely scattered provinces occupied by the Greek race, have been a word which was generally current in the mouth of the people. That HOMER himself, as being a popular minstrel, addressed the inhabitants of the eastern shores of the Ægean, to which country he belonged, not in a peculiarly and distinctly marked so-called poetical style, but, like our own BURNS, in a style familiar to the common people, we cannot for a moment doubt ; and in this view any Homeric element in the existing Romaic may have come down by direct descent from the pre-Homeric popular dialect, not by degradation from the peculiar poetic and epic style used by literary Greece.

PROPOSITION XXXI. In conclusion, it seems not improper, in the case of a famous language of such remarkable longevity, to cast an eye into the future, and calculate the chances of its permanence. And in this divination past experience certainly entitles us to say with confidence, that a language which has survived so many changes, and resisted such a succession of destructive forces, will maintain its vitality unimpaired, so long as the moral motive power of the world is mainly Christian, and the science of the world is proud to root itself in Greek traditions. For whether the present little Greek kingdom shall have strength enough to grow into an independent political integer, or whether, which seems its more probable destiny, it shall at no distant day be attached to the great Russian Empire in the manner of an outlying principality, as Cymric Wales was attached to Saxon England, it does not appear that it will have to contend with any disintegrating or exterminating force in any way so strong as those which it successfully resisted when under Turkish and Venetian supremacy. The conservative force of the Welsh language in the south-western corner of our insular triangle, is a fact of such potency, as to have been deemed worthy of special notice and wise concession by our administrative council in London ;* but if Cymric, which is no doubt as old a language as Greek, with its scanty stores of literary tradition, still flourishes in a green old age, the extinction of Greek, with its immense momentum of intellectual and moral force, not less intense in kind than extensive in operation, is not a thing to be looked for within any assignable period. If the Greek kingdom should unfortunately not be able to maintain its position against the

* In the winter of 1872 a representation was made to the British Government on the evils arising from the appointment to judicial situations in Wales of barristers unacquainted with the language of the natives ; and the Government pledged themselves to have respect to the representation in future, in so far as it might be possible to do so with a due regard to the legal knowledge of the persons appointed, *i.e.*, that a Welsh-speaking barrister should in future be preferred, if his abilities and learning were equal.

combination of internal faction and external aggression, which may at any moment break it up, there is nothing in the antecedents of any of the great powers into whose hands a dismembered Greece might fall, to warrant the apprehension that they would employ any severe measures for the purpose of stamping out the national language. Russia certainly, which in religion is full sister to Greece, would have neither desire nor interest to look upon the language of Athens with the same jealousy that she looks on that of Warsaw. Under Russia the Greeks might readily become the founders of an enlightened Broad Church party in that country, just as under the Turks they became first the necessary interpreters, and then the wise governors of great and important provinces. As for the form in which it seems most desirable that this noble language should be transmitted to distant ages, it seems necessary, on the one hand, to warn against any forced and affected recurrence to the classical type, and on the other to invite literary men to the culture of the popular dialect as the fittest for a certain style of lyrical and essentially popular poetry. As in Scotland the language of popular song runs in its own channel, apart from the English, used as a general literary medium, so the Greek of CORAËS and the newspapers might still continue to occupy a middle place between the Greek of classic tradition and the Greek of the popular ballads. Variety was one of the distinguishing features of the Greek family of languages from the beginning, and it may well remain so to the end. Whether or not the course of affairs shall ever be so ordered by Divine Providence, as that, according to the pious aspirations of Monsieur D'EICHTHAL, and other eminent French Hellenists, it may at no distant period be prepared to take the place of Latin as a catholic medium of correspondence between cultivated men of all countries, it seems in vain to speculate; but, in the form that it has now assumed, and in all likelihood will maintain for centuries, there is no reason why it should not be much more extensively studied by all classes than at any previous period. When our classical scholars shall have become ashamed of their false methods and narrow prejudices, and when a succession of intelligent travellers shall have been practically convinced that it is as easy to learn Greek in Athens, as to learn German in Berlin, or French in Paris, the sons or grandsons of Monsieur D'EICHTHAL and his French associates may behold with joy the probable advent of that kingdom of Pan-Hellenic brotherhood of which it is now only permitted to dream.