

# The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



---

## The True Meaning of the Κοινή

A. N. Jankaris

The Classical Review / Volume 17 / Issue 02 / March 1903, pp 93 - 96

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00207506, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00207506](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00207506)

### How to cite this article:

A. N. Jankaris (1903). The True Meaning of the Κοινή. The Classical Review, 17, pp 93-96  
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00207506

**Request Permissions :** [Click here](#)

# The Classical Review

MARCH 1903.

## THE TRUE MEANING OF THE *Koinḗ*.

It has recently become the fashion among classical students to designate the colloquial Greek of post-classical and Graeco-Roman antiquity by the term *κοινή* and brand or conceive it as *vulgar Greek*: 'lingua corruptissima,' 'corrupta graecitas,' 'lingua franca,' 'Jargon,' and the like. True, within the last few years, a reaction has set in as regards the character of this much despised form of Greek, but the doubtful designation by the strange term *κοινή* is still in vogue, having even attained almost universal acceptance especially through the publications of Hatzidakis, Thumb, Dieterich, Schweitzer, and Kretschmer, who speak rather loosely of a *Koine* and even a *Koinisierung* assuming these notions to be well defined and familiar to all. As nearly all other classical students follow the fashion, and as I have myself fallen into the mistake by copying the term *κοινή* in my *Historical Greek Grammar* (p. 6), I feel bound to confess and rectify my error and at the same time explain for the benefit of other fellow-sinners that a critical examination of the question has convinced me that a *κοινή* language, as now styled and described, never had a concrete real existence or place in Greek written composition.

Classical scholars are well aware that, when speaking of their language, the Greeks never considered the vernacular or colloquial speech of their time. Unlike modern philologists and grammarians who lay down the rules and principles of language in 'speaking and writing,' the ancients ignored the spoken language with its winged

or passing words, and had regard exclusively to the *written* language, especially to that received or artistic form of language which had attained permanent and honourable place in literature. When national Greek history and literature had entered the period of decline, the then Greeks looked back to the glorious ancestral times, and with a sad pride referred to the language of their great ancestors with the reverential terms *παλαιά*, *ἀρχαία*, *δόκιμος*, *ἔνδοξος*, and the like, thus contradistinguishing it from their own (written) language, now styled *μεταγενεστέρα*, which suffered from such new accretions and elements as appeared *ἀδόκιμα*, *νόθα*, *ἐκφυλα*, *ἀμαθῆ*, *ιδιωτικά*, *βάρβαρα*, *σόλουκα*, and the like. On the whole, however, the Greeks at all times regarded their (written) language as an unbroken and homogeneous inheritance, and when they distinguished in it a *παλαιά* or *ἀρχαία* (classical) and a *μεταγενεστέρα* (post-classical), that distinction referred mainly to time and only indirectly to the character of the language.<sup>1</sup>

Ignoring, then, systematically the spoken

<sup>1</sup> It is only casually and indirectly that we meet in ancient writings with an allusion to the vernacular speech of the time by such a designation as *ιδιωτικὴ λέξις*, (*κοινῇ*) *συνήθεια*, or *χυδαία λαλιά*, etc.—In modern Greek this colloquial or illiterate form of speech is generally called *γλῶσσα ἄτλῃ* or *λαλουμένη* or *ὀμιλουμένη*. The alternative designation as *καθομιλουμένη* (adopted by Prof. Kretschmer and applied to the speech of the Hellenistic period) is a recent coinage of fastidious Greek scribes who overlook that *καθομιλῶ* in the sense of 'I speak' is neither modern nor ancient Greek. Those who are not pleased with the term *ὀμιλουμένη* should at least adopt the form *καθωμιλημένη*.

or vernacular language of all times, the ancient Greeks knew and considered but one language, that which appeared in national literature. In this generally received language, however, and for literary purposes, they drew and emphasized a great distinction: the distinction between *dialectal* and *non-dialectal* Greek. With them DIALECTAL Greek was that particular vocabulary and diction which appeared as peculiar to one or more of the dialects (Aeolic, Doric, Ionic, Attic, also poetic), whereas by NON-DIALECTAL Greek they understood that wider part of the language which was 'common to all Greek dialects.' This common good, this universal or panhellenic Greek, they designated by the appropriate term *κοινή διάλεκτος*, the language common to all Greeks, and regarded it as the basis and norm (*μήτηρ ἢ κοινή* sc. *διάλεκτος*, Schol. in Dion. Thr. 469, 6, ed. A. Hilgard, 1901), by which all writers had to abide. The best type of this *κοινή διάλεκτος* they found in the Attic orators, and Dionysios of Halicarnasos singles out Isocrates as the best representative of this standard or *κοινή διάλεκτος*.

1. KOINH DIALEKTOS (not *κοινή* without *διάλεκτος*): the *καθαρεύουσα*: the literary standard language as illustrated in the Attic orators, i.e. pure and free from all dialectal (and poetical) elements: Dion. Hal. de Isocr. § 2: 'Ἡ δὲ λέξις (i.e. style) ἢ κέχρηται (Ἰσοκράτης) τοιοῦτόν τινα χαρακτηριστὴρα ἔχει καθαρὰ μὲν ἐστὶν οὐχ ἥττον τῆς Λυσίου καὶ οὐδὲν εἰκὴ τιθεῖσα, τὴν τε διάλεκτον ἀκριβοῦσα ἐν τοῖς πάντι τὴν κοινήν καὶ συνηθεστάτην. καὶ γὰρ αὕτη πέφυγεν ἀπηρχαιωμένων καὶ σημειωδῶν ὀνομάτων τὴν ἀπειροκαλίαν καὶ κέκραται συμμέτρως, τό τε σαφὲς ἐκείνη παραπλήσιον ἔχει καὶ τὸ ἐναργές, ἡθικὴ τέ ἐστὶν καὶ πιθανή. Cp. also Id. de Lys. § 2 κατὰ τοῦτο μὲν δὴ τὸ μέρος, ὅπερ ἐστὶν πρῶτον καὶ κυριώτερον ἐν λόγοις, λέγω δὲ τὸ καθαρεύειν τὴν διάλεκτον, οὐθεὶς τῶν μεταγενεστέρων αὐτὸν (i.e. τὸν Λυσίαν) ὑπερβάλετο· ἀλλ' οὐδὲ μιμήσασθαι πολλοὶ δύναμιν ἔσχον, ὅτι μὴ μόνος Ἰσοκράτης. καθαρώτατος δὴ τῶν ἄλλων μετὰ γε Λυσίαν ἐν τοῖς ὀνόμασιν οὗτος ἐμοί γε δοκεῖ γενέσθαι ὁ ἀνὴρ. id. § 3 τίς δὲ ἐστὶν (ἢ ἀρετὴ) αὕτη; ἢ διὰ τῶν κυρίων τε καὶ κοινῶν καὶ ἐν μέσῳ κειμένων ὀνομάτων ἐκφέρουσα τὰ νοούμενα. id. de Isocr. § 13 τοῖς κυρίοις καὶ συνηθεσὶ καὶ κοινοῖς ὀνόμασιν ἀμφοτέροι (Ἰσοκράτης καὶ Λυσίας) κέχρηται.

Clem. Al. Strom. i, 146 (38) φασὶ δὲ οἱ Ἕλληες διαλέκτους εἶναι τὰς παρὰ σφίσι πέντε, Ἀτθίδα Ἰάδα Δωρίδα Αἰολίδα, καὶ

πέμπτην τὴν κοινήν.—Schol. in Dion. Thr. 14, 14 *διάλεκτοι δὲ εἰσι πέντε Ἀτθίς Δωρίς Αἰολίς Ἰὰς καὶ κοινή. καὶ Ἀτθίς ἢ τῶν Ἀθηναίων, Δωρίς ἢ τῶν Δωριέων, Αἰολίς ἢ τῶν Αἰολέων, Ἰὰς ἢ τῶν Ἰώνων, κοινή ἢ πάντες (the writers) χρῶνται.* So too 100, 38. 155, 33. 302, 2. 309, 28: πόσαι διάλεκτοι; πέντε, Ἰὰς ἤγουν ἢ τῶν Ἰώνων . . . καὶ κοινή ἢ τινὶ πάντες χρῶμεθα (which all of us writers use). So further 567, 38. 411, 3. 431, 3. 463, 24: τὴν δὲ κοινήν (διάλεκτον) ἀπὸ τῶν τεσσάρων λέγουσι πεποιήσθαι, κακῶς. καὶ γὰρ Ὅμηρος τέτταρσι χρῆται, καὶ οὐ παρὰ τοῦτο κοινή ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ ἢ διάλεκτος. 469, 1 ff. *περὶ κοινῆς (διαλέκτου).* τινὲς φασιν ὅτι οὐκ ὀφείλει κοινή καλεῖσθαι ἀλλὰ μικτὴ, ἐπερ ἢ κοινή ἀπὸ τεσσάρων συνέστηκεν. οὐ γὰρ τὴν διὰ τεσσάρων φαρμάκων ἔμπλαστον κοινήν καλοῦμεν ἀλλὰ μικτήν.<sup>1</sup> καὶ καλῶς ἔλεγον ταῦτα πρὸς τοὺς λέγοντας τὴν κοινήν συνίστασθαι ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων, καὶ πρὸς τούτοις ὅτι μήτηρ ἢ κοινή. εἰ γὰρ τις εἴποι ὅτι Δωριστὶ, φάμεν ὅτι τὸ κοινὸν αὐτοῦ ἢ Αἰολιστὶ ὁμοίως, ἢ Ἰαστὶ ἢ Ἀττικιστὶ. καὶ τὴν μὲν ἡμέραν <ἡμέραν> οἱ κοινοὶ λέγουσιν, οἱ Ἀττικοὶ ἔως, οἱ Ἴωνες ἡώς, οἱ Δωριεῖς ἄως, οἱ Αἰολεῖς αὔως· καὶ μελισσῶν μελισσῶν μελισσῶν. 563, 20 τούτων δὲ (τῶν ἐπιρρημάτων) τὰ μὲν ἐστὶ ποιητικά, τὰ δὲ τῆς κοινῆς διαλέκτου. Gregorios of Corinth 11 (ed. Schaefer) *κοινή δὲ ἢ πάντες χρῶμεθα...ἤγουν ἢ ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων συνεστῶσα*—Etb. M. (ed. Gaisford) 21, 7 *ιστέον δὲ ὅτι κατὰ τὴν κοινήν διάλεκτον τὰ ἀπαθῆ οὐ λέγεται, οἷον τὸ πατέρος καὶ μητέρος καὶ ἀνέρος, ἀλλὰ τὰ πεπονθότα, οἷον τὸ πατρός. 760, 20 καὶ τῷ μὲν πρώτῳ (προσώπῳ) τύψαι χρῶνται οἱ Αἰολεῖς, τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς προσώποις (τύψαι τὴν τύψαι) ἢ κοινή συνήθεια καὶ διάλεκτος. ὡσαύτως καὶ τῷ τρίτῳ τῶν πληθυντικῶν.*—327, 30:

<sup>1</sup> Johannes Philoponos (in ed. Aldus Manutius' Thesaurus of 1496, fol. 286 f.,) οἱ μὴ βουλόμενοι τὴν κοινήν καταριθμεῖν διάλεκτον ταῖς προειρημέναις τέσσαρσιν, αἰτιώμενοι τούτῳ τῷ τρόπῳ· οὐδὲν γάρ, φασίν, ἔχει ἴδιον, ἀλλ' ὥσπερ τετραφάρμακος δύναμις ἐκ τεσσάρων συνεστῶσα τετραφάρμακον λέγεται, οὐδὲν ἴδιον ἔχουσα, οὕτως καὶ ἡ κοινή διάλεκτος, ἐκ τεσσάρων συναρμοσθεῖσα, οὐκ ὀφείλει συναριθμεῖσθαι ταύταις. τῶν δὲ τὴν κοινήν διάλεκτον εἰσσηγασμένων οἱ μὲν λέγουσιν ὅτι πάσαις συμβέβληται ταῖς διαλέκτοις τοῖς ὁμοφώνοις, οἷον φίλος νῦν καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα· οἱ δὲ ὅτι νῦν [οὐκ!] ἐστὶν ἔχουσα τύπον, ἀλλ' ἐκ διαφόρων λέξεων συνηθροισμένη, μεταπτώσεις δὲ αὐτῆς οὐχ εὐρίσκονται...διάλεκτοι δὲ εἰσι, εἰ καὶ τὴν κοινήν τις καταριθμεῖ, πέντε· Ἰὰς Ἀτθίς Δωρίς Αἰολίς κοινή· ἢ γὰρ πέμπτη ἴδιον οὐκ ἔχουσα χαρακτηριστὴρα κοινήν ὀνομάσθη ἦτοι ὅτι τοῖς κοινοῖς τῶν πασῶν χαρακτηριστὴρι χρῆται καὶ ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων κατέστηκεν ἢ ὅτι κοινῶς αὕτη πάντες χρῶνται, ἢ διότι ἐκ ταύτης ἀρχονται, ὡς ταύτης οὐσης πάσαι.

ἐλεῶ· κατὰ μὲν τοὺς Ἀττικοὺς πρώτης συζυγίας τῶν περισπωμένων [ἰ.ε. -έω], ἐλεείς· ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν ἐλεεί καὶ δανείζει ὁ δίκαιος'. κατὰ δὲ τὴν κοινὴν [ἴ] δευτέρας [ἰ.ε. -άω]· καὶ γίγνεται παρὰ τὸ ἔλεος, τοῦτο δὲ παρὰ τὸ λῶ, τὸ θέλω.

2. ΟΙ ΚΟΙΝΟΙ: the καθαρεύοντες prose writers, those who write in the κοινὴ διάλεκτος: see above under 1. Schol. in Dion. Thr. 469, 1 ff. (also quoted above under 1).—Et. M. 405, 23 οἱ Ἀττικοὶ χθές, οἱ δὲ κοινοὶ ἐχθές. 692, 13 ὅπερ (πρῶτ) οἱ μὲν ποιηταὶ βαρύνουσιν, οἶον· πρῶτ' δ' ὑπηγοῖσι σὺν τεύχεσιν, οἱ δὲ κοινοὶ καὶ Ἀττικοὶ καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι δέξονται.

3. ΚΟΙΝΟΣ: common to all dialects represented in literature, commonly shared by all classical prose writers; hence non-dialectal, panhellenic, national, classical. Apoll. D. de Pron. 4, 19 (263A) τὸ μὲν ὄνυμα οὐ κοινόν, τὸ δὲ ὄνομα. Schol. in Dion. Thr. 93, 11 εἰσὶ δὲ αἱ προθέσεις ἅσαι ὀκτωκαίδεκα, προστιθέναι δεῖ καὶ ἐνταῦθα 'κατὰ τὸ κοινὸν ἔθος', ἢ ἢ οὕτως. τοῦτο δὲ εἶπον ἐπεὶ παρὰ τῷ ποιητῇ εὐρίσκομεν τὴν παρὰ καταὶ ὑπεῖρ ἐνί· δεῖ οὖν ἀναγκαίως προστιθέναι κατὰ τὸ κοινὸν ἔθος'. 155, 33 ἢ οὐκὶ λέξις Ἰωνικὴ ἐστίν, οὐ κοινή... πᾶσαι αἱ προθέσεις μονοσυλλαβῶς λεγόμεναι... Ἰωνικαὶ εἰσὶ, κοιναὶ δὲ γεγόνασι ταῖς προσθήκαις τῶν φωνηέντων. οἱ γὰρ Ἰῶνες πάρθεσαν καὶ κάτθεσαν καὶ ἄνθεσαν λέγουσιν, ἡμεῖς δὲ παρέθεσαν καὶ κατέθεσαν καὶ ἀνέθεσαν. 188, 31 τὸ φυράσω καὶ τὸ περάσω καὶ τὸ δράσω οὐ Δωρικὰ ὄντα ἀλλὰ κοινὰ μακρῷ τῷ ᾧ κέχρηται. 279, 10 τὸ εἶθε κοινόν, τὸ δὲ αἶθε Δωρίον. 366, 32 λέγει τοῖνον ὁ τεχνικός χαρακτήρας καὶ τύπους τῶν πατρωνυμικῶν τρεῖς· κοινὸν μὲν πάσης διαλέκτου τὸν εἰς -δης, οἶον Πηλεΐδης, Ἰωνικὸν δὲ τὸν εἰς -ων, οἶον Ἀτρείων, καὶ τρίτον τῶν Αἰολέων τὸν εἰς -άδιος, κτλ. So also 368, 13. 432, 22 εἰσὶ δὲ τὸν ἀριθμὸν οἱ διαzeugτικοὶ (σύνδεσμοι) τρεῖς, ἦ, ἦτοι, ἦέ. εἰσὶ δὲ τούτων τῶν διαzeugτικῶν οἱ μὲν ποιητικοί, οἱ δὲ πεζοί, οἱ δὲ κοινοί (common to both as ἦ, ἦτοι). So also 288, 1—Et. M. 272, 12 οὐδέποτε, τὰ εἰς -κω ῥήματα κοινὰ ὄντα διφθόγγῳ τῇ διὰ τοῦ ἰ παραλήγεται· ὅθεν ἐπιμεμπτος Ἀρίσταρχος τὸ αἶκε σε τῷ εἰσκοντες', διὰ τῆς εἰ διφθόγγου γράφων, δέον διὰ τοῦ ἰ, πρόσκειται κοινὰ διὰ τὰ Αἰολικά. οἱ γὰρ Αἰολεῖς θναίσκω καὶ μμναίσκω διὰ τῆς αἰ διφθόγγου λέγουσιν.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Compare also Moiris the Atticist who, writing in the interest of the purely Attic dialect, contradistinguishes from it as κοινὸν or panhellenic the stock common to all the dialects, including Attic, and as Ἑλληνικὸν or Hellenic the stock common to all the dialects except Attic. ἀνακῶς Ἀττικοί, ὡς Πλάτων ὁ κωμικός· 'καὶ τὰς θύρας ἀνακῶς

4. ΚΟΙΝΟΣ:<sup>2</sup> like κατὰ τὸ κοινὸν ἔθος, as generally received, as used in the κοινὴ διάλεκτος, Moiris: συμφώνως Ἀττικοί, συμφώνως Ἑλληνες καὶ κοινῶς. Schol. in Dion. Thr. 112, 12 ἐκ τούτου αὐτὸς καὶ βαυρός, ὅπερ κοινῶς μὲν δέξνεται, Ἀττικῶς δὲ βαρύνεται. 541, 13 τῶν διὰ τοῦ -εας τινὰ συναίρεται Δωρικῶς, Ἑρμέας Ἑρμᾶς, Βορέας Βορᾶς, κοινῶς δὲ Ἀπελλῆς.—So also ΚΟΙΝΟΤΕΡΩΣ (in a more general way) Schol. in Dion. Thr. 151, 23, ἢ γὰρ δεκάς δεχᾶς ἂν κοινότερως ῥηθῇ ὅτι τοὺς πρὸ αὐτῆς ῥηθέντας ἀριθμοὺς μεθ' ἑαυτὴν λεγομένους δέχεται καὶ συναλείται αὐτοῖς. ib. 34 οὕτω τὸν δέκα δέχα εἶποις κοινότερως ὡς δεκτικὸν τῶν ἄλλων.

5. ΚΟΙΝΟΛΕΚΤΕΙΣΘΑΙ: to be common to some or all dialects, to be used in pure classical non-dialectal prose: Apoll. D. de Pron. 92, 20 (378 B) αἱ πληθυντικαὶ (ἀντωνυμῖαι) κοινολεκτοῦνται κατ' εὐθείαν πρὸς τε Ἰῶνων καὶ Ἀττικῶν· ἡμεῖς ὑμεῖς σφέες. Id. de Adv. 169, 20 (580, 30) τὰ εἰς -ως λήγοντα ἐπιρρήματα κοινολεκτούμενα δυσὶ τόνοις ὑποπίπτει· ἢ γὰρ βαρύνεται, ὡς κούφως φαῖναις μετρίως, ἢ περισπᾶται, ὡς σεμνῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς. Et. M. 189, 39 τὰ εἰς -εως λήγοντα ἀρσενικά, εἴτε μονοσύλλαβα εἴτε ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβάς, ἅπαντα δέξνεται, δηλονότι κοινολεκτούμενα, βασιλεὺς Ἀχιλλεὺς Πηλεὺς κτλ. πρόσκειται κοινολεκτούμενα, οἱ γὰρ Αἰολεῖς βαρυτόνως λέγουσιν· Ἀχιλλεὺς Πηλεὺς. 304, 51 τὰ εἰς -εις ὀνόματα μὴ κοινολεκτούμενα ἔχοντα οὐδετέρου παρασχηματισμὸν ἀποστρέφεται τὴν ὀξείαν

ἔχειν· ἀσφαλῶς ἢ φυλακτικῶς κοινόν. ἀτεχνῶς Ἀττικοί, ἀπλῶς κοινοί. βιβλία διὰ τοῦ ἰ, ὡς Πλάτων, Ἀττικοί· βυβλία, ὡς Δημοσθένης, κοινόν. γλαμῶσα Ἀττικοί, λημῶσα κοινόν ἀμφοτέρω. γόης Ἀττικοί, κόλαξ Ἑλληνικὸν καὶ κοινόν. δευστοποῖοι Ἀττικοί, βαφεῖς κοινόν. διήρης Ἀττικοί, ὑπερφον κοινόν. ἐξίλλειν Ἀττικοί, ἐξείργειν Ἑλληνες, ἐκβάλλειν κοινόν (common to all). εἰ γὰρ Ἀττικοί, εἶθε γὰρ κοινόν. ἡρεσέ με Ἀττικοί, ἡρεσέ μοι κοινόν. ἦττω Ἀττικοί, ἦσσονα κοινόν. Ἰτρια (πλάσματα λεπτὰ σπασμῶν πεπρασμένα) λάγανα κοινόν. ἴσασιν Ἀττικοί, οἶδασι κοινόν <Ἀττικοί>, κάθησο Ἀττικοί, κάθου κοινόν. λέμμα ἀντὶ τοῦ λέπισμα Ἑλληνες, λέπος κοινόν. μαχαιρίδες (αἱ μάχαιραι τῶν κουρέων) Ἀττικοί, μάχαιραι κοινόν. νεάτον Ἀττικοί, ἔσχατον κοινόν. οἶε Ἀττικοί, φέρε Ἑλληνικὸν καὶ κοινόν. ποῖ Ἀττικοί, ποῦ κοινόν. ῥιγῶν Ἀττικοί, ῥιγοῦν κοινόν, ῥιγοῖν Ἑλληνες. σκιάς Ἀττικοί, ἀναδεδράς κοινόν. σπάδων κοινόν, εὐνοῦχος Ἑλληνες. σμικρὸν Ἀττικοί, μικρὸν κοινόν. φειδωλοὶ Ἀττικοί, σκνιφοί [σκνιποὶ?] κοινόν. ὦδε κοινόν Ἰῶνων Ἀττικῶν, οὕτως Ἑλληνες.

<sup>2</sup> Compare Sext. 608, 17 γραμματικὴ τοῖνον λέγεται κατὰ δμωνυμῖαν κοινῶς τε καὶ ἰδίως. καὶ κοινῶς μὲν ἢ τῶν ὀπωινθηποτοῖν γραμμάτων εἰδησις, ἐὰν Ἑλληνικῶν ἐὰν τε βαρβαρικῶν, ἣν συνήθως γραμματιστικὴν καλοῦμεν, ἰδιαίτερον δὲ ἢ ἐντελὲς καὶ τοῖς περὶ Κράτῃ τὸν Μαλλώτην Ἀριστοφάνην τε καὶ Ἀρίσταρχον ἐκπονηθεῖσα.

τάσιν, ὀνόματα δὲ εἶπεν (sc. ὁ τεχνικός) τὰς μετοχάς, οἷον τυφθεῖς κοινολεκτούμενα δὲ εἶπε διὰ τὸ εὐγενὲς καὶ εὐσεβές· οἱ γὰρ Βουωτοὶ διὰ τῆς εἰς διφθόγγου γράφουσιν. 737, 25 τὰ εἰς -ζω λήγοντα ῥήματα κοινολεκτούμενα οὐδέποτε ἔχει τὸ α ἐν τῇ παραληγούσῃ μακρὸν φύσει...πρόκειται κοινολεκτούμενα, ἐπειδὴ τὸ πλήσσω πλάζω λέγουσιν οἱ Δωριεῖς, καὶ ἔστι τὸ α φύσει μακρόν.

But there is no need of accumulating further proofs of what is already too manifest. Wherever the ancients refer to the κοινὴ διάλεκτος they *always* mean that national literary Greek which is free from all dialectal and even poetical admixture, a form of style best represented in the orators. It is in this sense also that the older of modern philologists and grammarians understood the term κοινὴ διάλεκτος. Thus in his famous Phalaris (ed. W. Wagner 402 f.) Bentley says: 'The general manner of speech call'd κοινὴ διάλεκτος, *The Common Dialect*, which the writers [before and] after Alexander's time commonly used, was never at any time or in any place the popular idiom; but perfectly a language of the

learned.' Still more explicit and marvelously correct is the definition given to the κοινὴ διάλεκτος by the great philologist and sound grammarian Fr. Thiersch, when he says in his *Greek Grammar* (ed. of 1830, Engl. by D. K. Sandford) p. xvii: 'In the universal language to which the Attic dialect was raised, a distinction was however drawn between some forms peculiar to Attica and others in general usage. Hence the opposition of one part as Attic (Ἀττικόν) to the other as Common (κοινόν). *The universal language—or common dialect—is assumed as the basis of Greek grammars*'. Then p. xix 'The selection of that which is common to the Attic and the other dialects constitutes the *Common dialect*.'

How we modern students have come to lose sight of all tradition and thus misapply the term κοινὴ (διάλεκτος) to post-classical demotic or vernacular speech, a form of language systematically ignored by the ancients, is a phenomenon hardly creditable to the exact and critical scholarship of our times.

A. N. JANNARIS.

#### ON THE ORIGINAL CONCLUSION OF THE 'Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ Μενελάου Μονομαχία.

PERHAPS no episode in the Iliad suffers from a more 'lame and impotent conclusion' than the duel between Menelaos and Paris. Paris challenges Menelaos to single combat: an agreement is made that the victor shall have Helen and all the goods that came with her to Troy, and the agreement is ratified by a sacrifice: they fight; and when Paris is on the point of being worsted he is rescued by Aphrodité and taken off by supernatural means to Helen's chamber, while Menelaos is left wandering on the field in search of his antagonist. Agamemnon comes forward to claim the reward of the victory on his brother's behalf, the Achaeans assent to the claim, and—no more is heard of the matter so far as the persons chiefly interested are concerned. The way in which the whole episode is apparently forgotten, but for a few stray references to the subsequent treachery of Pandaros, is one of the most striking facts in the Iliad.

Robert (Studien zur Ilias) treats the difficulty in drastic fashion. He regards the duel-episode as an *Einzellied*, ending

with the scene in Helen's chamber (Il. iii, 447): the remaining lines of the book are an attempt, (a clumsy attempt, one must admit) to fit the episode into the framework of the Iliad: Menelaos (according to Robert) was only a secondary figure; the whole interest centres in Paris: 'Was aus Menelaos wird, fragt der Hörer nicht und soll er nicht fragen' (*op. cit.* p. 208). Surely there is some other way out of the difficulty than this.

Let us see what the points are that call for explanation. (1) What reply have the Trojans to give to Agamemnon's demand for the restitution of Helen in accordance with the oaths? There seems to be no consciousness in their minds when, after the scene in Olympus with which Book 4 opens, we are transported by the poet to the Trojan host, that any reply is called for. (2) What attitude towards Pandaros do the Trojans assume considering that (according to iii, 453) they would gladly have seen Paris killed and, presumably, the war ended? We must find some answer to these questions if we are not to assume some