Atticism and Koine in Greek Prose Texts by Jewish Authors

Atticism and Koine in Greek Prose Texts by Jewish Authors:

Linguistic and Stylistic Studies

By

Jordi Redondo

Atticism and Koine in Greek Prose Texts by Jewish Authors:
Linguistic and Stylistic Studies

By Jordi Redondo

This book first published 2026

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD

Χριστιανοὶ γὰρ οὔτε γῇ οὔτε φωνῇ οὔτε ἔθεσι
διακεκριμένοι τῶν λοιπῶν εἰσὶ ἀνθρώπων.
οὔτε γάρ που πόλεις ἰδίας κατοικοῦσιν
οὔτε διαλέκτῳ τινὶ παρηλλαγμένη χρῶνται
οὔτε βίον παράσημον ἀσκοῦσιν
The Christians are not distinguishable
from the rest of people neither by land, tongue and habits.
They do not live somewhere, in their own towns, nor use a
differentiated language
nor use to carry out a noteworthy life (*Epistle to Diognetus* V 1-2).

In writing this book on the language and the style of the Biblical Greek the author intended merely to show in an orderly way his reading notes on these prose texts sharing two common features: their chronology, the period covering the last centuries BCE and the first century CE, and their geographical origin, the ancient Roman province of Judaea[1] and the close territories where the Jewish people settled, mostly Egypt. In other words, their authors share a common ethnic origin: they were Jewish writers who shared their ancestral culture, their national, patrimonial religious and cultural language, Hebrew,[2] their daily used language for social communication, Aramaic, as well as the circumstances that shape society and life.

Beyond the close chronology and the social and cultural community of the authors of this corpus, the papers gathered here have in common a second relevant feature, as they share the same methodological pattern, in which philological accuracy and linguistic analysis determine all the argumentation. That is to say, our concern as researchers is always limited to the linguistic and stylistic analysis of these texts. Any other comment -

---

[1] Actually this administrative territory provided with artificial boundaries by the colonial power, in this case the Roman Empire, does not coincide with the Hebrew homeland.

[2] It seems acceptable as a highly presumed fact that some of the Neotestamentarian authors were neither fluent nor strong in Hebrew, as their mother tongue was only Aramaic. However, even if they were no trained to acquire an in-depth knowledge of Hebrew, the influence of this written tradition was beyond any doubt a major feature of their literary culture.

historical, religious, and so on - has been excluded. Sporadically we will draw on the modern translations as a secondary way to better understand which kind of interpretations a syntactic or semantic problem has suggested.

The title of this collection of papers explains itself which contents are to be found here. The main title *Atticism and Koine. Greek prose texts by Jewish authors,* includes two quite well known concepts, Atticism and Koine, besides a third that is not so well understood as it seems. The subtitle *Linguistic and stylistic studies on Biblical Greek and Josephus* makes clear that the comments deal with the language and the style, in principle separately, at the expense of any other kind of analysis –historical, philosophical, theological, and whatsoever. However, it is necessary to add a twofold precision on our corpus: on the one hand, Biblical Greek does not mean that we were in point to develop an exhaustive research on the whole collections of the *Septuagint* and the *New Testament*; on the other, and for the same reason, our study of Josephus will focus only on the *Jewish War*.

Our familiarity with these texts begins with our readings on the New Testament as a way to approach to the Greek Koine. On March 16th 1981 is recorded our purchase of the edition by Josep M. Bover,[3] since we took it as preferable to that of Nestle and Aland, which was and is the most commonly used by the scholars. The main reason was that the apparatus criticus was much more extensive and therefore more useful. At that time we were engaged in a master thesis presented on October 27th. 1982 on the language of the orator Antiphon, that is to say, the origin of the Greek Koine. This was also the subject of a doctoral thesis presented on November 30th. 1985. All these degrees in Classical Philology were obtained at the Universidad de Salamanca under the direction of a brilliant and liberal researcher and excellent professor, Antonio López Eire. His example led us to adopt a working methodology consisting in a careful reading of our sources always with the help of a linguistic analysis. His 1981 course on the language of Thucydides as a direct precedent of the Koine was a wonderful introduction to the history of the Greek language, where linguistic change had at every moment the support of the evidence rather than that of a theoretical construction.

As the years went by, the presence of the Koine in different authors and literary genres has prompted us to deal with the lexis of the Hellenistic poets Apollonius Rhodius, Callimachus and Aratus, and the historians of the Imperial Age Josephus, Galen and Plutarch. Other papers were devoted to the Neotestamentarian language. These contributions have been published between 1989 and 2018. An important research has been done by our

---

[3] Josep M. Bover, *Novi Testamenti Biblia Graeca et Latina*, Madrid, CSIC, 1968[5]. Its first edition appeared in 1942.

fellows Salvador Santafé and Juanjo Pomer, authors of doctoral theses on the language of the novelists Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus.[4] A cardinal object of both was the elucidation of the mixing of Koine and Atticism in the most developed examples of the genre. Regarding the Biblical Greek, in this case Neotestamentarian Greek, this book includes our 1989 paper written the year before on occasion of a conference on Christian Latin,[5] immediately followed by our 2023 remake; after thirty-five years of study our conclusions remain the same, while the weight, variety and deep of our arguments have grown substantially.

Our quest to find out what the Greek Koine was, has its offspring in the first chapter of this book. It also constitutes an introductory state of affairs to one of the main problems of our corpus: the coincidence of double, contradictory linguistic solutions that put in front of our eyes the complex structure of texts that reflect social and ethnical diversity, as well as the opposition between different literary traditions. The conflict between Atticism and Koine continues indeed the conflict between popular Attic - and popular language in general, be it spoken in Sicily, Ionia, Rhodes or the Thracian Chersonese - and the literary language of whatever prose genre. The conflict between the Greek Koine and the languages with whom it was in contact, in this case Aramaic and to a certain extent Hebrew, must be understood in juxtaposition to the former one between a literary and a non-literary variety.

In the same way as the Biblical Greek is a part of the Greek Koine and it must be explained in parallel with the evolution of the language, the Biblical corpus of texts is also part of the Greek literature and is open to the influence of its tradition. Our research has focused on this perspective as well, inasmuch as this reality has frequently been overlooked.

The inclusion of Josephus - we are not prone to call him Flauius, no matter for what reason we do so- among the authors of the Biblical texts could be surprising at first sight.[6] If this is your feeling in opening this book,

---

[4] Salvador Santafé Soler, *Aproximación lingüística a la obra de Aquiles Tacio*, Universitat de València 2005; Juan José Pomer Monferrer, *Aticisme i koiné als llibres I-III de les Etiòpiques d'Heliodor*, Universitat de València 2015.

[5] The purpose of the organisation that called for interventions in this conference was exactly to give an answer to the new trends of the Catholic Church, since their main aim was to restore Latin as the language of every act of worship. Now as then it seems to us like as an example of poetic justice that we showed there how much the Latin *Vulgate* was unfaithful to Latin and indebted, on the other hand, to the Greek language.

[6] The same option can be found in Gregory E. Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition, Josephos, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography*, Leiden 1992. The

you have just found an answer to your doubts: the language, and to a lesser extent, the style of Josephus fits perfectly with those of the Biblical authors,[7] as the chapter to the *Jewish War* tries to show by means of secure data. Of course huge attention has been paid to the interference of the Semitic languages of the Jewish tradition, Hebrew and Aramaic as well, with the Greek language turned into the overwhelming international *Verkehrsprache* of the Eastern Roman Empire and beyond.[8] Moreover, the comparison of the Biblical Greek corpus, especially that of the Neotestamentarian texts, with the *Jewish War* shows in a solid way that there is a common process of linguistic change that implies our authors beyond their particular ideological, viz. religious, choices, trends and goals.

Our notes on the *Jewish War* have been gathered over approximately thirty years without the help of the electronic resources that are nowadays the perfect helper of the attention, the accuracy and, last and probably not least, the knowledge of the researcher. Beyond any doubt some of our data are not as exact as the computer-generated lists. We apologize for this lack of exactness. More than fifty years ago, Dover set some limits to a rather mechanical research based on the computer resources.[9] Their help should not be interpreted as a divine or magical panacea.

Anyway, a definitive study must take into account the textual variants that should have had its reflection in our modern editions. Moreover, a complete study should comprehend the whole of the Josephan production, which is not the case of our present contribution. Otherwise said, this book represents a step further in our reading of such an important author, but a more solid research, which requires more time and effort, is to be done already.

The quotation that heads this introductory chapter belongs to a not very known short work, the *Epistle to Diognetus*, an early apologetic text in which the Christian believers are defended against the accusations towards

---

difference lies in the scope of our research, since the language remains always at the centre of the argumentation and no role is given to any extralinguistic explanation.

[7] Traditionally attention has been never paid to the genre of these authors, always thought of as men. There should be at least the critical *caueat* not to exclude that also women could have taken a role in the composition of the early Christian literature.

[8] Gilbert Dagron, "Aux origines de la civilisation byzantine: langue de culture et langue d'Etat", *RH 249*, 1969, 23-56.

[9] Kenneth James Dover, *Lysias and the 'Corpus Lysiacum'*, Berkeley & Los Angeles 2018 (= 1968), p. 101: *To recall the analogy of the scissors and the mower, I would certainly cut grass with scissors if I were interested in the ecology of a grass lawn and not only in the aesthetic satisfaction of contemplating a neat green patch.*

them and they are also contrasted with the Jews, who are instead vilified.[10]
Yet our point lays on the topic that nothing features the Christian
community, neither where and how they live, nor how they dress and how
they eat and how they speak. And this is exactly the argument used by the
modern scholars against the idea that there were two special linguistic
varieties featuring on the one hand the *Septuagint*, the so-called Jewish
Greek, the *New Testament*, the Christian Greek, on the other.[11] The aim of
the present contribution is not related to the answer to this problem, but it is
to the general need of an accurate review on the linguistic traits of the
Biblical Greek. For so doing, our methodology requires that every one of
them must be contrasted with the presence, function and frequency in which
they are found in other varieties of the Greek language.

   Just some last remarks must be added before closing this short
introductory chapter: our research has been done on the Budé edition by

---

[10] It is not to be dismissed a curious parallelism between the Greek Koine and the
Jewish nation, since both of them have been -and are, unfortunately, even in our
contemporary societies- despised because of the hate spewed by horrible
supremacist views: the Greek Koine as the result of an alleged perversion of the
Greek language by the action of an Eastern culture that had bastardised and debased
it; and, much more worst, the Hebrew nation as an ethnic group destined to inanity.
[11] Some old and new references will exemplify this scholarly trend, cf. Albert
Thumb, *Die griechische Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus. Beiträge zur
Geschichte und Beurteilung der Κοινή*, Strassburg 1901, pp. 174-176; Gregory H.R.
Horsley, "The fiction of Jewish Greek", *in* Gregory H.R. Horsley (ed.), *New
documents illustrating early Christianity, 5: linguistic essays*, Sydney 1989, 5-40,
and "Christian Greek", *in* Georgios K. Giannakis (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Ancient
Greek Language and Linguistics I*, Leiden Boston 2014, 384-387, p. 386; Coulter
H. George, "Jewish and Christian Greek", *in* Egbert J. Bakker (ed.), *A Companion
to the Ancient Greek Language*, Oxford 2010, 267-280, p. 279: *The language of the
Septuagint and the New Testament does not represent a special dialect of Jewish-
Christian Greek altogether cut off from the regular development of Koine, nor is it
completely free from Semitic influence. Instead, as one would expect of writings
produced in Hellenistic Alexandria and Roman Palestine, it reflects both the
broader evolution of the Greek language as a whole and the more specific influence
of the Semitic milieu in which it arose*; Dorota Hartman, "Jewish Greek", *in* Georgios
K. Giannakis (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics II*,
Leiden & Boston 2014, 1246-1248, p. 1248: *In Josephus as well as in all the other
Judeo-Hellenist writers there is not the slightest hint of a special variety of Greek.
This is also true of texts from papyri. (…) This epigraphic Greek is usually poorly
written and is full of spelling mistakes. It does not contain features that could attest
to the existence of an exclusively 'Judaic' Greek, which only emerges in the early
Byzantine period.*

Pelletier,[12] although for the remaining sixth and seventh books, that the Jesuit researcher could not publish, the supporting text was the old one edited by Niese.[13] This does not mean that we agree with this editing tradition, since many times we will pay attention to the lessons given by (part of) the manuscripts, even if Pelletier -and very often Niese- neglected in the critical apparatus any kind of reference to these linguistic solutions. This means that a strong trend in the manuscript tradition was that of emendating the text according with a preestablished theory on Atticism and Koine: while the Atticist solutions could be accepted, those originated in the Greek Koine seemed out of place in a literary work, where they had to be explained as a result of a corrupted transmission.

As this book collects the fruits of a harvest extended all along the last thirty-five years, it includes four papers on the matter available in other publications, and initially written in Catalan, Galician -that is to say, Portuguese- and Spanish.[14] For different reasons the author is indebted with our colleagues Francisco Javier Ledo Lemos (Universidade de Vigo), Adelina Millet i Albà (Universitat de Barcelona) and Andrea Sánchez i

---

[12] André Pelletier (ed.), *Flavius Josèphe. Guerre des Juifs I-III*, Paris 1975-1982.

[13] Benedikt Niese (ed.), *Flavius* Josephus*. Flavii Iosephi opera*, Berlin 1895. Attention has been also paid to the helpful Catalan edition by Joan-Andreu Martí Gebellí & Joan Ferrer i Costa, *Flavi Josep. La Guerra Jueva I-III*, Barcelona: Alpha, 2011-2020.

[14] These four chapters available in other publications are "On the Koinisms in the Letter of Aristeas: the case of ὡς ἄν", now in press in a volume dedicated to Jaume Pòrtulas; "An approach to the presence of Hellenisms in the Vulgate" (= "Algunos helenismos en la *Vulgata* del Nuevo Testamento", *Helmantica 40*, 1989, 413-418); "On a Hellenic-Hebrew inscription" (= "Sobre una inscripció helˑleno-hebrea", *Sine fine sodales. Estudis d'epigrafia llatina i tradició clàssica i humanisme en memòria de Xavier Gómez i Font. SPhV 13*, 2011, 223-230); and "Hellenistic poetry in the synoptic gospels?" (= "Bión nos evanxeos sinópticos?", *in* H. Cortés Gabaudan, F.J. Ledo Lemos & F. Romo Feito (edd.), *Postremum Munus. Studia in Honorem Celsi Rodríguez Fernández*, Vigo, Universidade de Vigo, 2023, 199-204). Other publications on the matter were originally written in English or French, viz. "The Greek literary language of the Hebrew historian Josephus", *H 128*, 2000, 420-434; "Une autre fable pour l'*Espill*: L'avare qui cache son or", *Reinardus 26*, 2014, 161-173; "Changes in the system of the discourse markers in New Testament Greek", *Rivista Biblica 64*, 2016, 209-224; and "Modal Substitution in Koine Greek: the Gospels of Mark and Luke", *SCI 37*, 2018, 183-194. For different reasons we do not offer here an English translation of the paper entitled "Koinismos, aticismos y semitismos en la lengua del Evangelio de Lucas", *in* I.M. Gallarte & J. Peláez (edd.), *In mari via tua. Philological Studies in Honour of Antonio Piñero*, Córdoba 2016, 217-227.

Bernet (Universitat de València), as in different moments they had to do with the drafting of the text. A special expression of gratitude must be addressed to Joan Ferrer i Costa (Universitat de Girona) and Eulàlia Vernet i Pons (Universitat de Barcelona). They helped in casting light to the darkness in which our research did not make a satisfactory progress. Especially Eulàlia Vernet provided a decisive support in the analysis of aspects of the Hebrew and Aramaic grammar that were out of our reach. Any mistaken interpretation is, of course, solely our responsibility. For her complete revision of the English text thanks are due to V. R. Solovyeva.

Works Cited

Bover, Josep M. 1942[1], 1968[5]. Novi Testamenti Biblia Graeca et Latina. Madrid: CSIC.

Dagron, Gilbert. "Aux origines de la civilisation byzantine: langue de culture et langue d'Etat", RH 249 (1969): 23-56.

Dover, Kenneth James. 1968[1], 2018 reimpr. Lysias and the 'Corpus Lysiacum', Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press.

George, Coulter H. "Jewish and Christian Greek". In A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language, edited by Egbert J. Bakker, 267-280. Oxford and Malden: Wiley, 2010.

Hartman, Dorota. "Jewish Greek". In Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics II, edited by Georgios K. Giannakis, 1246-1248. Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2014.

Horsley, Gregory H.R. "Christian Greek". In Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics II, edited by Georgios K. Giannakis, 384-387. Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2014.

Horsley, Gregory H.R. "The fiction of Jewish Greek". In New documents illustrating early Christianity, 5: linguistic essays, edited by Gregory H.R. Horsley, 5-40. Sydney: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1989.

Niese, Benedikt. 1887-1895. Flavii Iosephi opera, Berlin: Weidmann.

Pelletier, André. 1975-1982. Flavius Josèphe. Guerre des Juifs I-III, Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Pomer Monferrer, Juan José. 2015. Aticisme i koiné als llibres I-III de les Etiòpiques d'Heliodor, Ph. Diss., Universitat de València.

Santafé Soler, Salvador. 2005. Aproximación lingüística a la obra de Aquiles Tacio, Ph. Diss., Universitat de València.

Sterling, Gregory E. 1992. Historiography and Self-Definition, Josephos, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography, Leiden: Brill.

Thumb, Albert. 1901. Die griechische Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus. Beiträge zur Geschichte und Beurteilung der Κοινή. Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner.

DOUBLE STANDARD MODELS: CLASSICAL ATTIC AND GREEK KOINE

1. Introductory

The Greek Koine is often described as a double system in which a high and a low level coexisted, literary and non-literary. The influence of Atticism was exerted only at the high level. In fact this model was not new. Several centuries earlier, in Vth. century Athens, the oppositions established between Old Attic and New Attic, ἀρχαία Ἀτθις and νέα Ἀτθίς, on the one hand, and spoken Attic, on the other, displayed a similar tension about the building of a standard language. This paper will show with different examples the main trends of the linguistic changes targeted by two confronting ways of understanding how a standard variety had to be created.

2. The Linguistic Quarrel in Classical Athens

There was not an only Greek variety used in Classical Athens, but several alternative models. Two of them were dominant for half a century or more, the so-called ἀρχαία Ἀτθίς, a literary dialect used by several highly influential writers in the last quarter of the fifth century BCE;[1] and the νέα Ἀτθίς, used in the first quarter of the fourth century by Lysias and Isaeus and later by other such prosewriters such as Demosthenes and Isocrates. Long time ago, in our 1985 doctoral dissertation on the origin of the Greek Koine after a study of the literary language of the Attic orator Antiphon,[2]

---

[1] All of them were Athenian-born prosewriters, namely the orators Antiphon and Andocides, the unknown author of the *Constitution of the Athenians*, and the historian Thucydides.

[2] In short, we should remind of our position on the question of the identity of the so-called 'orator' and the so-called 'sophist'. The study of both the language and the style show that there are no consistent differences between both corpora, given that the small changes adopted by the author in chosing this or that variant may be due either to the literary tradition of the genre or to the extant transmission of the non-rhetorical Antiphontean works. This position has been stated in some publications, cf. Jordi Redondo, "Sobre el carácter unitario de la obra de Antifonte el orador", *Studia Zamorensia 11*, 1990, 221-226; "Antifont dins el gènere de l'oratòria", *in*

we tried to explain the relationship between ἀρχαία Ἀτθίς and νέα Ἀτθίς in a similar way as we consider high and low Koine, that is to say, literary and non-literary Koine. In our opinion most of the sociolinguistic situations raised up in the Imperial Age were clearly anticipated in the Classical Age. Actually, in the later quarter of the Vth. century BCE, the Attic citizens were offered two different high-prestige languages:

We have in front of us a double linguistic model: on the one hand, the 'correct Attic' spoken by the urban middle classes, as a result of a concurrence between the conservative features of the standard language and the innovative trends of the popular language; on the other, we find a written language regularized by means of a process in which Antiphon took an active part, as many Attic and/or Ionian forms were discarded. This language originates in the intellectual Athenian groups, which are neither properly Attic, nor Ionian.[3]

There was, therefore, a high-prestige language accepted and effectively used by the urban middle classes and created within the Attic-speaking community, and another one which was only a *Schriftsprache*, used for literary purposes by the most qualified professionals and created under a strong influence of the Ionic dialect. The second one, the ἀρχαία Ἀτθίς, was never used in ordinary conversation. It was, however, absolutely relevant in the birth of the Greek Koine:

It is therefore possible to define the ἀρχαία Ἀτθίς as a socially prestigious system as well as a linguistic model for the Attic community,

---

Lambert Ferreres (ed.), *Actes del IX Simposi Català d'Estudis Clàssics I*, Barcelona 1991, 703-707; "Retórica y política en los discursos de Antifonte", *in* Antonio López Eire (ed.), *Retórica, Ideología y Política en la Grecia antigua*, Salamanca 1998, 161-165; "La unitat del corpus", *Antifont de Ramnunt. Discursos I*, Barcelona 2003, 24-29; "Modernidad, sofística y talento creativo en la obra de Antifonte de Ramnunte", *in* Francisco Cortés Gabaudan and Julián Víctor Méndez Dosuna (edd.), *Dic mihi, Musa, uirum. Homenaje a Antonio López Eire*, Salamanca 2010, 569-576.
[3] Jordi Redondo, *Estudio lingüístico de los discursos de Antifonte*, thesis abstract, Salamanca 1986, p. 34: *Tenemos, por tanto, un doble patrón lingüístico: por una parte, el 'buen ático' hablado por las clases medias urbanas, fruto de una compromiso entre los registros conservadores de la lengua oficial y los innovadores de la lengua popular. Por otra, nos encontramos con una lengua regularizada por un proceso en el que Antifonte toma parte activa, y que consiste en la depuración de una serie de formas lingüísticas coexistentes en ático y en jonio, o bien exclusivas de uno de estos dialectos. Dicha lengua se origina en los grupos intelectuales de Atenas, no propiamente áticos ni tampoco jonios.*

which replaced Ionic in the role of high-prestige language and was afterwards replaced by the Greek Koine. (...) After this analysis of the relationship between the main Attic registers –the Umgangssprache and the ἀρχαία Ἀτθίς- we can now try to define the origin of the Greek Koine: it was the standard Attic language that replaced Ionian in its normative role; both were opposed to more colloquial and local models, the ἀρχαία Ἀτθίς to the Attic Umgangssprache (...), the Greek Koine to the νέα Ἀτθίς. Yet the Greek Koine has a noteworthy difference in front of the ἀρχαία Ἀτθίς: while this one is opposed to the νέα Ἀτθίς, the Greek Koine is not opposed to the Umgangssprache. Contrariwise, the Greek Koine embodies not only the language used by Antiphon in his discourses, that is to say, a literary, especialized and cultured language, but also the colloquial Attic that the speakers used in their ordinary conversations.[4]

(...) The Greek Koine is the result of the levelling of the double linguistic models already alluded to, the ἀρχαία Ἀτθίς and the Attic Umgangssprache. It overcomes the extant diglossy between both registers, which are at the very origin of the literary and the non-literary Koine. The difference between the states of the ἀρχαία Ἀτθίς and the spoken Attic, on the one hand, and the Greek Koine and the νέα Ἀτθίς and the other Greek dialects, on the other, can be easily explained because of the opposite trend of their corresponding relationships. The Greek Koine is a well-balanced and productive standard language, able to be used for whatever purpose. The ἀρχαία Ἀτθίς, instead (...) does not offer any chance to be used in ordinary conversation.[5]

---

[4] Jordi Redondo, *Estudio...*, pp. 35-36: *Así pues, es posible definir a la ἀρχαία Ἀτθίς como un sistema socialmente prestigiado y además como un modelo lingüístico para la comunidad ática, que reemplazó en este papel al jonio y fue a su vez reemplazado por la koiné. (...) Desde este análisis de la relación entre los dos principales niveles de la lengua del Ática podemos ya situar el origen de la koiné: se trataría de la lengua estándar ática que reemplazó a la ἀρχαία Ἀτθίς en su papel normativizador; ambas estaban opuestas a modelos más conversacionales y localistas, la ἀρχαία Ἀτθίς al ático hablado (...) y la koiné a la νέα Ἀτθίς. Pero la koiné presenta respecto a la ἀρχαία Ἀτθίς una notable diferencia: mientras que ésta se opone a la νέα Ἀτθίς, la koiné no se opone a la Umgangssprache. Antes bien, en la koiné se integran tanto la lengua de los discursos de Antifonte, lengua literaria, especializada y culta, como el ático coloquial que empleaban los hablantes en la conversación ordinaria.*

[5] Jordi Redondo, *Estudio...*, p. 57: *(...) La koiné resulta de la nivelación del doble patrón lingüístico de que antes hablábamos, la ἀρχαία Ἀτθίς y la Umgangssprache ática. Con ella se supera la diglosia existente entre estos dos niveles, que sin embargo están en el origen de la koiné literaria y la no literaria. La diferencia entre las situaciones de la ἀρχαία Ἀτθίς y el ático hablado, por una parte, y la koiné y la νέα Ἀτθίς y demás dialectos griegos, por otra, se explica por el carácter de sus*

As it has just been exposed, in our view the tension between different standards reflects a state of diglossy[6] in the Attic-speaking society. This conflict already at work in the last quarter of the Vth. century BCE. was subsequently inherited by the fourth-century speakers as well as by the literary authors. Actually, the loss of the ἀρχαία Ἀτθίς and the apparition of the νέα Ἀτθίς did not resolve the conflict, since both the Ionic influence and especially the strongest weight of the Attic substandard innovations originated a constant and deep change of the literary language, as a reflect of the evolution of the Attic dialect and the creation of a new standard.[7]

In this paper we will show how the linguistic tensions occurred in fifth-century Athens, at the origin of the Greek Koine, present big parallelisms with those occurred in the Imperial Age, for instance between non-literary Koine and the Atticist movement. Opposite trends resulting in different, contrasting standards were at work, therefore, both in the Classical and in the Imperial Age.[8]

---

relaciones. La koiné es un estándar bien conformado y rentable, capaz de imponerse para todo tipo de usos. En cambio, la ἀρχαία Ἀτθίς (...) no ofrece posibilidad alguna de ser empleada en la conversación ordinaria.

[6] It sounds quite strange the disqualification of the concept 'diglossy' expressed by Stephen Colvin, "The Greek Koine and the logic of a standard language", *in* Alexandra Georgakopoulou & Michael Silk (edd.), *Standard Languages and Language Standards: Greek, Past and Present*, Farnham & Burlington 2009, 33-43, p. 36. From the very beginning of the coinage of this term, attributed to Jean Psichari, "Un pays qui ne veut pas sa langue", *Mercure de France*, 01-10-1928, 63-121 (= *Quelques travaux de Linguistique, de Philologie et de Littérature helléniques,* Paris 1930, 1283-1337), and to William Marçais, "La diglossie arabe", *L'Enseignement public 104*, 1930, 401-409, diglossy has been used with profit and without trouble. The multifaceted situations to which the concept has been applied have their origin in the nuanced perceptions of what is a language and what is a dialect. Actually, the main inconvenient of using the concept 'diglossy' arose from the opposition, established by Charles Albert Ferguson, "Diglossia", *Word 15*, 1959, 325-340, of the labels *high* and *low* assigned in a clear-cut way to the linguistic varieties that configure a diglossic society, cf. Walter Haas, "Comment", *in* Joshua A. Fishman (ed.), *Focus on Diglossia. International Journal of the Sociology of Language 157*, 2002, 109-115; Andrée Tabouret-Keller, "À propos de la notion de diglossie", *Langage et société 4*, 2006, 109-128, since the social value of the involved varieties can even be equalized.

[7] The evolution of the Attic dialect can be also traced according with the innovations admitted by the authors writing in νέα Ἀτθίς, see Jordi Redondo, "El *Panegírico* de Isócrates y la pureza *del* dialecto ático", *Studia Philologica Zamorensia 8*, 1988, 307-311.

[8] Claudia Strobel, "The Lexica of the Second Sophistic: Safeguarding Atticism", *in* A. GEORGAKOPOULOU & M. SILK (edd.), *op. cit.*, 93-107, p. 93: *Atticism was a*

3. Methodological issues on the Greek Koine

An extended approach to the Greek Koine tries to state a very restricted view on its characteristics, inasmuch as it is described as an impoverished, subverted, corrupted language, featured by the weak competence of many of its speakers; according with this theory, since a mass of the speakers were not native Greek, and therefore most of the territories where the Koine settled were perfectly alien to the Greek linguistic tradition, the language displayed should have given place to simple solutions, that could be easily learned and used by the new speakers. Therefore, the way was paved for eliminating many of the phonological, morphological and syntactic features of the Greek language. It must be said, however, that many among the scholars who gave support to this theory were influenced by the idea that most of the Koine-speakers were unable to keep the inherited level of linguistic competence of their forerunners.[9] This phenomenon includes the Greeks themselves, since they should be undermined by their lack of political autonomy, their increasing economical impoverishment and the lower quality of their contemporary artistic and literary production.[10]

---

counter-movement, in reaction to the Koine, which got under way in the late Hellenistic period and was at its height during the Second Sophistic.

[9] Margaret Eleanor Thrall, *Greek Particles of the New Testament*, Leiden 1962, p. 39: *The absence from the κοινή of many of the classical combination of particles may well be a symptom of the more general decline of the Classical Greek civilization.*

[10] Heymann Steinthal, *Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft bei den Griechen und Römern*, Berlin, Dümmler, 1863, p. 432: *Zugleich beginnt in der städtischen Bevölkerung eine Zerrütung und Zersetzung der griechischen Sprache. Solch ein verunreinigtes Attisch war kein organisches Erzeugniss und war einer idealen Gestaltung unfähig*; P. KRETSCHMER, "Sprache", *in* Alfred Gercke & Eduard Norden (edd.), *Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft I*, Leipzig & Berlin 1910, p. 169-172, described the Greek Koine as a variety featured by the rule of the oral language and the blend of different dialects in opposition to the former prestige of pure Attic, cf. p. 172: (...) *Während die Schriftsprache in wesentlichen Attisch ist und bleibt, ist die Volkssprache im Prinzip indifferent gegen dialektische Reinheit und trägt einen ausgesprochenen Mischcharakter*; also Albert Thumb, *Die griechische Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus. Beiträge zur Geschichte und Beurteilung der Κοινή*, Estrassburg 1901, p. 206, assigned the non-literary elements of the Greek Koine to the increasing influence of spoken Attic: *Der attische Untergrund ist jedoch unverkennbar; genauer werden wir als die Grundlage der gesprochenen Κοινή natürlich das gesprochene Attisch betrachten müssen, und um das Verhältnis jener zu diesem zu bestimmen, wird uns das Vulgärattisch, das in den Vaseninschriften vorliegt, gute Dienste leisten.*

This reductionism was inspired by the romantic idea of Classical Greece as a land governed by purity, perfection and balance. The overwhelming influence of the Neogrammarian school facilitated the condemnation of any innovation suspected to be due to the influence of non-Greek cultures, or to the pressure exerted by the popular classes, considered lacking of a qualified linguistic competence, a situation which is at work even in recent times.[11] Evidence of the effort to explain the Greek Koine as a viable solution for communicative purposes within a multicultural milieu, the theory formulated by Frösén, according to which the origin of this variety aligns with the characteristics of the so-called *pidgin* languages.[12]

In our 1985 doctoral thesis we followed the Prague theory issued by Havránek and Mathesius, and spread in Western Europe and America by Garvin, another Czech-born scholar.[13] This was also the methodological basis supported by Bubenik, who made the necessary corrections to adapt this theorical frame to the reality of the Greek Koine.[14] The matter has been also discussed in some further papers.[15]

It is quite misleading to read that generally, not to say universally, the origin of a Koine-language implies levelling and simplification.[16] Moreover, even among the ancient literary authors and scholars the Koinisms were not especially valued.[17]   The clue for understanding the Greek Koine must be

---

[11] Claudia Strobel, *op. cit*., p. 94, n. 4: *In the morphology there was simplification and systematization which ironed out a number of Attic idiosyncrasies.*

[12] Jaakko Frösén, *Prolegomena to a study of the Greek language in the first centuries, A. D.: the problem of Koiné and Atticism*, Helsinki-Helsingfors 1974.

[13] Jordi Redondo, *Estudio lingüístico de los discursos de Antifonte*, doctoral thesis, Salamanca 1985, pp. 548-549.

[14] Vit Bubenik, *op. cit*., pp. 9-10.

[15] Jordi Redondo, "Variantes y estándar dialectal en el Ática clásica I. La lengua cancilleresca y la de las tablillas de execración", *in* Ángel Martínez Fernández *et al.* (edd.), *Agalma. Ofrenda desde la Filología Clásica al Profesor Manuel García Teijeiro*, Valladolid 2014, 245-253; "Variantes y estándar dialectal en el Ática clásica II. La lengua de la comedia aristofánica, el ático antiguo y el ático nuevo", *Revista de Estudios Clásicos 42*, 2015, 189-206.

[16] See on this matter Paul Garvin, "The Standard Language Problem", *in* Paul Garvin (ed.), *On linguistic method: selected papers*, Den Haag, Mouton, 1964, 154-156 (= *Anthropological Linguistics 1*, 1959, 28-31), who describes a Koine as a variety of simplified language; Peter Mühlhäusler, *Pidginization and Simplification of Language*, Canberra, ANU Press, 1974; Peter Trudgill, *Dialects in Contact*, Oxford, OUP, 1986, p. 107.

[17] James Clackson, *Language and society in the Greek and Roman worlds*, Cambridge, CUP, 2015, p. 58: *The general lack of acceptance of the Koine as the 'correct' variant is revealing, as are the efforts to avoid or purge Koine forms from the literary language.*

found in its double-faceted nature, for there exists a literary and a non-literary Koine. However, they are not two varieties mutually excluded, belonging to different registers and unable to be blended.[18] Actually, both varieties can be found in our literary texts.[19] This mixing of linguistic solutions with and without a literary tradition behind of them can be traced back to the Hellenistic Age, as we tried to show in poetic authors like the poets Apollonius Rhodius, Callimachus, and Aratus.[20]

It must be kept in mind that the linguistic prestige was attached to the literary Koine. Beyond this important remark on which Koine can assume this role, it is also interesting to remind, as Bubenik suggests, that Hellenistic Koine should be considered the standard language of Hellenistic Greece.[21]

The subject of our doctoral thesis, as formerly our master thesis,[22] was the linguistic analysis of the discourses of the orator Antiphon, that is to say, literary texts belonging to the genres of judicial and epidictic oratory. Actually judicial oratory and comedy are the literary genres considered

---

[18] Antonio López Eire, "Fundamentos sociolingüísticos del origen de la koiné", *CFC 16*, 1980, 21-53 (= *Estudios de lingüística, dialectología e historia de la lengua griegas*, Salamanca 1985, 401-431), p. 33: *La lengua llamada koiné o 'común' es una lengua que, al mismo tiempo, presenta determinados aspectos en que esta jerga lingüística se aparta del comportamiento normal del dialecto ático para acercarse a los imperantes en dialectos no áticos, especialmente en jónico. Esta lengua en su origen tiene dos niveles, el literario y el no literario, en cada uno de los cuales se observan perfectamente los dos rasgos que acabamos de señalar. Finalmente, estos dos no están aislados ni separados el uno del otro, sino que se mantienen en contacto y son estrictamente comparables y analógicos en su conformación.*

[19] Jordi Redondo, "Koinismos, aticismos y semitismos en la lengua del Evangelio de Lucas", *in* Israel Muñoz Gallarte & Jesús Peláez del Rosal (edd.), *In mari via tua. Philological Studies in Honour of Antonio Piñero*, Córdoba 2016, 217-227; "Koiné y aticismo en el tratado de Galeno *Sobre los procedimientos anatómicos*", *Nova Tellus 35*, 2917, 11-28.

[20] Jordi Redondo, "Non-epic features in the language of Apollonius Rhodius", *in* Annette M. Harder, Remco F. Regtuit & Gerry C. Wakker (edd.), *Apollonius Rhodius*, Louvain 2000, 129-154; "Dialectal Forms in Callimachus", *in* J. REDONDO & A. Sánchez i Bernet, *Archaic, Classical and Hellenistic Greek Poetry. Contributions to the History of the Ancient Greek Language*, Amsterdam, ISBN 978-90-256-1311-2, 241-265; "Notes sobre la llengua dels *Fenòmens* d'Arat", *Archaic, Classical and Hellenistic Greek Poetry*, 267-280.

[21] Vit Bubenik, *Hellenistic and Roman Greece*, p. 10.

[22] Jordi Redondo, *La lengua de las Tetralogías de Antifonte*, master thesis, Salamanca 1982; see also J. REDONDO, "Las *Tetralogías* de Antifonte: un estudio lingüístico sobre la primera prosa ática", *Cuadernos de Investigación Filológica 12-13*, 1986-1987, 133-137.

more able to make possible an analysis of spoken Attic, insofar as they are the closest to a realistic depiction of the Athenian speakers.[23]

4. Phonetics

Our first feature will deal with a very known phenomenon, itacism. The Attic popular texts of the Classical Age show a small set of unequivocal signs of the innovation being accomplished among part of the Attic population. Nevertheless, the modern scholars have always been reluctant in front of such an inconvenient evidence. In such a popular register as the curse tablets Rabehl, for instance, tried to explain the cases of itacism as misleading spellings and even because of an alleged Boeotian influence.[24] Again in 4th century Athens we find the spellings Ἀθινᾶ, Ἄρις, Διμοσθένις written by schoolboys. But the explanation given by Threatte is again quite conservative, since it does not clarify first of all that this a phonologic innovation reflected by the speakers before being corrected according with the current standard rule.[25]

    Our extant examples, however, are large enough not to have recours to these methodologically weak explanations. There are not only anthroponyms like Διοκλῖ, Φερσεφόνι, Φιδίας, Φίμη, instead of the expected spellings Διοκλεῖ, Φερρεφόνει, Φειδίας, Φήμη, but also common terms as ἱμῶν, καπήλιον, and χῖρα, instead of ἡμῶν, καπηλεῖον, and χεῖρα. Moreover, in our opinion other instances are also relevant for our purposes. In a 1909 paper, Wackernagel showed that there were 'attische Vorstufen des Itazismus', as proved by the forms ἱμάτιον, χίλιοι, derived from εἷμα (< *ϝεσμα) and *χεσλιοι, respectively.[26] The case deserves more attention, but

---

[23] Much to our surprise, Stephen Colvin, *op. cit.*, pp. 35, n. 8, and 39-40, points out some disadvantages of the comic genre. Anyway, he also admits that it is in these two genres where the possibilities to find the tracks of spoken Attic are the highest.

[24] Wilhelm Rabehl, *De sermone Defixionum Atticarum*, Berlin 1906, p. 14: *Itacismum putare mihi periculosius videtur, cum pro multitudine testimoniorum illa orthographia rarissima sit.* (...) *Fieri quidem poterat ut homines minus eruditi illi qui plurimi defixionum tabellas scribebant minus accurate ει et ε et ι inter se distinguerent; accedit quod pronuntiatio Boeotica dialecti prius quam ceterae ad ι declinavit.*

[25] Leslie L. Threatte, *op. cit. I*, p. 165: *The best explanation for these spellings is the boys' incomplete mastering of the alphabet. The sounds of η and ι may have been close enough to confuse them in using the letters for them (E, I) or they may not even have not mastered the technique of writing the letter in question.* This explanation seems unsatisfactory.

[26] Jacob Wackernagel, "Attische Vorstufen des Itazismus", *IF 25*, 326–337 [= *Kleine Schriften II*, Göttingen 1953, 1022–33].

it should be included in a general survey on the evolution of the Greek vocalism in all our known dialects. As for Attic again, a short passage from the Aristophanic comedy *Wasps*, performed in 422 BC., will help us to understand which kind of registers were able to take in the innovation. Philocleon is quite angry and nervous because he cannot leave his home to join his fellows at the jury, and he says the following words to the members of the chorus – as old men as he is:

πάντα πέφαρκται κοὐκ ἔστιν ὀπῆς οὐδ᾽ εἰ σέρφῳ διαδῦναι.
ἀλλ᾽ ἄλλο τι δεῖ ζητεῖν ὑμᾶς· ὀπίαν δ᾽ οὐκ ἔστι γενέσθαι.
Everything is sealed fast; not so much as a gnat could get through.
Think of some other plan; there is no possible hole of escape.[27]

The pun of course relays on the phonetic resemblance between the terms ὀπῆς and ὀπίαν, which could have been severely damaged, were ὀπῆς not pronounced [opiˋs]. Therefore, both syllables are nearly identical. That is to say, the substandard pronunciation of the long closed [*e*:] was accepted when language was used for making fun, for a joke.

A second interesting feature is related to the pronunciation of the intervocalic obstruents, which appears to have been fricativized. In non-literary texts, according with Threatte, *the first examples appear in the later fourth century B.C.*[28] However, other testimonies suggest that the fricativization was at work long before. Threatte himself added the following information after a record taken in Macedonia: *The name of the town Τράγιλος is spelled Τράιλος in one of the fifth-century tribute documents, I² 64-115.*[29] Besides this interesting testimony, we have an Attic literary instance from the comic author Plato. The fragment goes like this:

ὁ δ᾽ οὖ γὰρ ἡττίκιζεν, ὦ Μοῖραι φίλαι,
ἀλλ᾽ ὁπότε μὲν χρείη διητώμην λέγειν,
ἔφασκε δητώμην, ὁπότε δ᾽ εἰπεῖν δέοι
ὀλίγον, <ὀλίον> ἔλεγεν.
But he did not speak good Attic, my beloved Moirai,
for when he had to say 'dietomen'
he used to say 'detomen', and when he had to say

---

[27] Ar. *Ve.* 352-353 (transl. E. O'Neill Jr.).
[28] Leslie L. Threatte, *op. cit.*, p. 440. Further on he comments that the spelling was also quite common in Vth. century coin inscriptions.
[29] Leslie L. Threatte, *The Grammar of the Attic Inscriptions I*, p. 441.

'oligon', he said 'olion'.[30]

The lesson δητώμην was restored after a correction suggested by Dindorf, as the codexes HV give the untenable lesson δὴ τῷ μήν. In our opinion the spelling of /d/ was fricativized because of the former iodization of ι.[31] According with Colvin, a possible parallel should be an epigraphical record that gives us the form ὀστρακίδδω.[32] Actually, the same phonetical explanation must be applied to the spelling <ΔΔ> in ὀστρακίδδω and <Δ> in δητώμην, with the important difference that in ὀστρακίδδω the tonicity of the former vowel as well as the Silbengipfel between the syllables give to the fricativization of δ a plus of intensification that makes it closer to an affricate phoneme.[33] Instead, in δητώμην the inicial voiced dental obstruent should be pronounced as both fricativized and palatalized, because of the iodization of ι.

Let us now turn into the spelling ὀλίος. For so doing, we will also deal with a second instance, for the lexicographer Hesychius has given us another example, when he quotes the term ἴννος:

Ἰννός, ὁ πῶλος ὁ ἐξ ἵππου πατρὸς καὶ μητρὸς ἡμιόνου. ἄλλοι δὲ ὄνου. Ἀριστοτέλης δέ φησιν ἰννόν ἡμίονον ἄρσενα, τούτεστιν ὀρέα τ᾽ ἐπὶ θηλείας ἀναβαίνοντα, ἰννὸν δὲ ἐξ ἵππων νοήσαντες, ἄλλοι δὲ ἡμιόνιον ἢ ἱππάριον ἄναυξες, Ἀριστοφάνης δὲ τοὺς ἰννοὺς γίγνεσθαι ἐξ ἵππων, προγόνου δὲ μητρὸς. (...) ἴννους, παῖδας.

Innos, the colt from a horse father and a mule mother. Others say from a donkey mother. Aristotle says that the 'innos' is a male mule, that is to say that a mule makes it with a female, while others says that it is a mule or a small horse unable to grow up, and Aristophanes says that the 'innoses' come from horses, since their ancestor from the mother side is a horse (...) 'innoses', boys (our transl.).[34]

---

[30] Pl. Com. frg. 183 KA VII, p. 506. See also Kenneth James Dover, "Language and Character in Aristophanes", 244-245; Jordi Redondo, "The female sociolect in the Aristophanic comedy and Attic oratory", *in* Jordi Redondo & Andrea Sánchez i Bernet, *Archaic, Classical and Hellenistic Greek Poetry. Contributions to the History of the Ancient Greek Language*, Amsterdam 2015, 218-240, p. 247, n. 59.
[31] The iodization of ι in the preposition –and preverb- διά was an alternative spelling already in the Archaic Age, as proved by the epic adjective ζάθεος and other similar forms.
[32] Stephen Colvin, *op. cit.*, p. 40: *ὀστρακίδδω indicates (...) the likelihood of a social dialect of Attic which shared the δδ (< *dy) reflex with Boeotian in place of standard Attic ζ.*
[33] Compare, for instance, ζυγόν and σῴζω.
[34] Hesych. *Lex. s.v.* ἴννος.

In our opinion these two spellings, ὀλίος and ἵννος, instead of ὀλίγος, and γίννος, show the same fricativization of the voiceless obstruent, which a soft, non-standard pronunciation would have lead till the plane avoidance of any reflex. The innovation is fully consistent with some other non-literary examples.[35]

5. Morphology

Two features will be enough to offer an overview of the important innovations that cast light on the evolution of the Classical Greek language towards the Koine: on the one hand, the cases of heteroclisis that lead substantives of the athematic declension to the thematic;[36] on the other, the loss of the aspectual meaning of the perfect stem.

Heteroclisis, called by the ancient grammarians μεταπλασμός, as a morphological instrument to rebuild a disadvantageous paradigm was not a frequent device in the history of the Ancient Greek language[37] till the Medieval Age.[38] As known, the athematic declension used to be first of all concurrent with, afterwards replaced by, thematic or semithematic forms, cf. ἀνήρ, ἀνδρός > ἄνδρας, ἄνδρα, ῥήτωρ, ῥήτορος > ῥήτορας, ῥήτορα, and semithematic, cf. γυνή, γυναικός > γυναῖκα, -ας. This innovation can be traced back to the Classical Age. The following fragment was written by a comic author of the Vth. cent. BCE, Pherecrates, who won his first prize when Aristophanes was just ten years old:

---

[35] Wilhelm Rabehl, *op. cit*., p. 20, cf. Ὀλιανθίδης, ὀλιαρχία.
[36] See Wilhelm Crönert, *Memoria Graeca Herculanensis: cum titulorum Aegypti papyrorum codicum denique testimoniis comparata*, Leipzig 1903, p. 175, on metaplasms as βλάβη, βλάβης instead of βλάβος, -ους, cf. *P.Oxy*. II 215. In Francis Thomas Gignac, *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods II. Morphology*, Milano 1981, p. 103, these cases of neuters of the third declension in -ος with by-forms of the first declension feminine in -η, like βλάβος/βλάβη, σκεῦος/σκεύη, etc., are treated under word-formation.
[37] An exception is to be found in the epic language, where many sigmatic formations were transferred to the dental paradigms, cf. Hom. *Od*. XI 599 ἱδρώς and *Il*. X 572 ἱδρῶ, but Hes. *Op*. 289 ἱδρῶτα, and Hom. *Il*. V 354 χρόα, IV 137 χροός, VII 207 χροΐ, but Hom. *Od*. 172 and 179 χρῶτα.
[38] Cf. Robert Browning, *Medieval and Modern Greek*, Cambridge UP 1983, pp. 58-59: *A wide ranging rearrangement of noun paradigms took place, in which the distinction between vocalic and consonantal stems, still in full force in late Koine Greek, was surmounted. (...) This new pattern enabled the singular forms of the vast majority of Greek masculine and feminine nouns to be formed in accordance with two simple paradigms.*

ὡς ἄτοπόν ἐστι μητέρ᾽ εἶναι καὶ γυνήν
that/since/how much it is extraordinary that she is mother and wife also.[39]

There is a second example from the same author:

ἀλλ᾽ ὁρῶ τὰς γυνάς
I see the women.[40]

This same formation, even if not at a very large extent, is attested in several papyri dated on the I and II centuries CE.[41]

Verbal morphology was of course fond of innovations. The pluperfect, for instance, as it was extremely well characterized by the reduplication, the augment and the endings, used to lose in our Koine texts the syllabic augment, as it was morphologically superfluous. In the Classical Age, however, even non-literary texts used to follow constantly the standard, so that the augment is not omitted.[42] But in some literary texts the authors try to reflect daily speech, even if the speakers prefer solutions beyond the standard. For instance, a fragment of the comic Menander offers the form ἐστήκεσαν given by our textual tradition.[43] although Kassel & Austin decided to edit the correction εἱστήκεσαν suggested by Blaydes without any tenable argument.[44]

In later times, even such a sophisticated author as Josephus used pluperfects without augment, as shown by some examples taken from the first book of his *Jewish War*, e.g. καταλελοίπεσαν, καταπεφεύγεσαν, πεποιήκει, δεδώρητο, κεκάρωτο, κεκράγεσαν.[45]

Other innovations occurred only in the Imperial Age and were developed in parallel with the development of the Greek Koine. This is the case of the replacement of the subjunctive and optative moods with the

---

[39] Pherecr. frg. 96 KA.
[40] Pherecr. frg. 206 KA.
[41] Among other examples, see SB 5231, dated on 11 CE; *P.Mich*. 241.10, dated on 16 CE; *P.Lond*. 141.3, dated on 88 CE.
[42] Leslie L. Threatte, *op. cit. II*, p. 502: *The syllabic augment is not omitted in such few pluperfect indicative forms as occur in the Classical and Hellenistic periods* etc.
[43] Men. frg. 395.a KA VI.2.
[44] Friedrich H.W. Blaydes, *Adversaria in Comicorum Graecorum Fragmenta I*, Halle 1890, p. 150.
[45] J. *BJ* I I 329 καταλελοίπεσαν, 341 καταπεφεύγεσαν, 470 πεποιήκει, 590 δεδώρητο, 594 κεκάρωτο, 606 κεκράγεσαν. See Jordi Redondo, "The literary language of the Hebrew historian Josephus", *H 128*, 2000, 420-434, p. 427.

indicative. In the Classical Age, however, even non-literary evidence shows that both moods, indicative and subjunctive, were never confused.[46]

6. Syntax

In the field of syntax, we will pay some attention to major changes, first of all to the substitution of different cases –accusative, genitive, and especially dative- with prepositional phrases. As known, dative was the case mainly affected by the syntactic process that led to the reduction of the Indo-European system. It was replaced either with prepositional phrases or with the other cases, accusative and genitive.

The crisis of the case system was already noticed in 4th century authors like Hypereides.[47] An epigraphical record dated on 329/328 BCE will afford interesting data on the matter. In short lines, the old dative coexists with the prepositional construction of εἰς with accusative:

(...) Ἐλευσινιακοὶ λίθοι εἰς τὸν πύργον etc.
Stones from Eleusis for the tower.
σταθμὰ ταῖς θύραις ἐπὶ τὰς ἱερὰς οἰκίας παρὰ Σύρου ἐμπόρου.
Doorposts for the doors at the sacred house, bought from the seller Syros.[48]

As a matter of fact, however, instances of this complex phenomenon can be traced back to much earlier. This is a passage taken from the orator Lysias:

ἔτι τοίνυν καὶ ἰδία τισὶ τῶν πολιτῶν ἀποροῦσι συνεξέδωκε θυγατέρας καὶ ἀδελφάς, τοὺς δ᾽ ἐλύσατο ἐκ τῶν πολεμίων, τοῖς δ᾽ εἰς ταφὴν παρεῖχεν ἀργύριον.

---

[46] Leslie L. Threatte, *op. cit. II*, p. 465: *unambiguous indicative forms are never used for the subjunctive.*
[47] Ulrich Pohle, *Die Sprache des Redners Hypereides in ihren Beziehungen zur Koine*, Leipzig, Otto Harrasowitz, 1928, p. 94: *Die verstehenden Beispiele lassen deutlich erkennen, daß in der Umgansprache bereits ein Schwanken in der Vertretung der Kasus eingetreten ist. Einzelne gebräuchliche Verba übertragen ihre Konstruktion auf andere, die eine ähnliche Bedeutung haben. Der Dativ verliert dabei am meisten; er wird nicht nur durch den Akkusativ, sondern noch mehr durch Präpositionen der Richtung mit dem Akkusativ verdrängt. In der Koine wird diese Bewegung immer stärker und führt schliesslich zum Austerben des Dativs im Neugriechischen.*
[48] *IG* II² 1672, 52 and 68.

In addition, he also joined privately in portioning daughters and sisters of certain needy citizens: there were men whom he ransomed from the enemy, and others for whose funerals he provided money (transl. W.R.M. Lamb).[49]

The Greek Koine made an extended use of this replacement. This is a quotation from a magical papyrus:

παράθες εἰς τὴν θυσίαν ξύλα κυπαρίσσινα ἢ ὀποβαλσάμινα
(...) *Put aside for the sacrifice cypress wood or balsam wood*.[50]

Other prepositional phrases as substitutes for the dative case were also available from the Vth. century BC. This is an example from the *Tetralogies* written by the orator Antiphon:

δοκεῖ δέ μοι περὶ τὸν ἄρξαντα τῆς πληγῆς τὸ ἀδίκημα εἶναι.
To my mind, it is with the aggressor that the blame for the deed rests (transl. K.J. Maidment).[51]

Besides εἰς and the less common περί, one of the most frequent prepositions substituting the dative case, all of which constructed with the accusative, was πρὸς. The following sentences show how Antiphon used alternatively the dative case and πρὸς with the accusative:

αἰσθομένη δ᾽ ὅτι ἀδικεῖσθαι ἔμελλεν ὑπὸ τοῦ Φιλόνεω, μεταπέμπεται, καὶ ἐπειδὴ ἦλθεν, ἔλεξεν αὐτῇ ὅτι καὶ αὐτὴ ἀδικοῖτο ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ ἡμετέρου.
And on hearing of the wrong intended by Philoneos, she sends for her, informing her on her arrival that she herself was also being wronged by our father (transl. K.J. Maidment).[52]

ταῦτα μὲν ὑμῖν λέγω, ὡς αὐτῷ μοι πρόφασιν οὐδεμίαν εἶχε τἀποκτεῖναι τὸν ἄνδρα.
I assure you that I personally can have had no motive for murdering Herodes (transl. K.J. Maidment).[53]

---

[49] Lys. XIX 59.
[50] *PGM* XIII 364.
[51] Antipho IV δ 2.
[52] Antipho I 19.
[53] Antipho V 60.

(...) καὶ αὐτὸς ἐγὼ καὶ οἱ μάρτυρες ἅπαντες φανεροί ἐσμεν λέγοντες ἅπερ νυνὶ πρὸς ὑμᾶς (...)

And both I and all my witnesses are well known to have maintained from the very first day what we are repeating to you now (transl. K.J. Maidment).[54]

There is no difference in the Greek Koine, where the double syntactic pattern is used alternatively by the authors, so that in the following passage John can prefer the more literary solution and give room to the old dative:

εἶπον οὖν αὐτῷ etc.
So they told him etc.[55]

Luke, however, in spite of his aim of displaying a rather sophisticated language, is quite often close to the more colloquial language, and here he prefers the prepositional phrase:

εἶπεν δὲ Μαριὰμ πρὸς τὸν ἄγγελον 'πῶς ἔσται τοῦτο, ἐπεὶ ἄνδρα οὐ γινώσκω;'
Mary said to the angel, 'But how can this come about, since I have no knowledge of man?'[56]

It was not so frequent the opposite innovation, when the dative replaced another case. This is what happens when the expected regime of accusative turns into a dative:

ἐν οἷς ἐγώ, ὦ ἄνδρες, τῆς μὲν τύχης ᾗ ἐχρησάμην δικαίως ἂν ὑπὸ πάντων ἐλεηθείην, τῶν δὲ γενομένων ἕνεκα εἰκότως ἂν ἀνὴρ ἄριστος δοκοίην εἶναι, ὅστις εἰσηγησαμένῳ μὲν Εὐφιλήτῳ πίστιν τῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἀπιστοτάτην ἠναντιώθην καὶ ἀντεῖπον καὶ ἐλοιδόρησα ἐκείνῳ ὧν ἦν ἄξιος, ἁμαρτόντων δ᾽ ἐκείνων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν αὐτοῖς συνέκρυψα, καὶ μηνύσαντος κατ᾽ αὐτῶν Τεύκρου οἱ μὲν αὐτῶν ἀπέθανον οἱ δ᾽ ἔφυγον, πρὶν ἡμᾶς ὑπὸ Διοκλείδου δεθῆναι καὶ μέλλειν ἀπολεῖσθαι.

Not only do the circumstances in which I here found myself entitle me to the sympathy of all, gentlemen, but my conduct can leave you in no doubt about my integrity. When Euphiletus suggested that we pledge ourselves to what was the worst possible treachery, I opposed him, I attacked him, I heaped on him the scorn which he deserved. Yet once his companions had committed the crime, I kept their secret; it was Teucrus who lodged the

---

[54] Antipho VI 29.
[55] *Ev. Io*. VI 30.
[56] *Lc*. I 34.

information which led to their death or exile, before we had been thrown into prison by Diocleides or were threatened with death (transl. K.J. Maidment).[57]

The usual Attic construction is attested, for instance, by Hypereides:

ἀλλὰ τοὺς νεωτέρους ἐπὶ βοήθειαν καλεῖς, οὓς ὕβριζες καὶ ἐλοιδοροῦ ἀκρατοκώθωνας ἀποκαλῶν;[58]
But you call upon the younger men, though you used to abuse and insult them with the name of wine-swillers (transl. J.O. Burtt).[59]

The Greek Koine also used the dative case, although it could be also replaced with a prepositional phrase. See for example the following passage:

καὶ ἐλοιδορεῖτο ὁ λαὸς πρὸς Μωϋσῆν λέγοντες Δὸς ἡμῖν ὕδωρ, ἵνα πίωμεν. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Μωυσῆς Τί λοιδορεῖσθέ μοι, καὶ τί πειράζετε Κύριον;
And the people reviled Moses, saying, Give us water, that we may drink; and Moses said to them, Why do ye revile me, and why tempt ye the Lord?[60]

A second sample of sentences will show the changes attained in the pronominal system. See, for example, the use of the third person reflexive pronoun referring to the second or even first person. Our first text comes from the orator Antiphon:

δεῖ δέ με καὶ ὑπὲρ Λυκίνου ἀπολογήσασθαι, ἀλλ᾽οὐχ ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ μόνον, ὡς οὐδὲ ἐκεῖνον εἰκότως αἰτιῶνται.
But I must apparently clear Lycinus as well as myself by showing the absurdity of the charge in his case also (transl. K.J. Maidment).[61]

This first-person value of the reflexive pronoun of the third person of course shocked some scholars. Cucuel even suggested that the whole phrase should be athetized, following van Herwerden.[62]

---

[57] And. I 67.
[58] Hyper. *Dem*. frg. 5a.
[59] Hyp. 5a.
[60] *Ex*. XVII 2, 2.
[61] Antipho V 60.
[62] Charles Cucuel, *Essai sur la langue et le style de l'orateur Antiphon*, Paris 1886, p. 66: (...) *Je verrais plutôt dans ces cinq mots une annotation marginale ou interlinéaire de α, introduite dans le texte par les copistes de A et de N.*