The Lord's Prayer in Six Greek Dialects. A Curious Variation on a Renaissance Linguistic Topic

Roberto Peressin

University of Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński, Warsaw

Abstract

The renewal of interest in the Greek dialects during the Renaissance produced a number of works on the subject mostly based on the late-ancient and medieval dialectological tractates. In this context is to be placed the school-book supplemented with versions of the *Lord's Prayer* in the "six" Greek dialects written by Mikołaj Żórawski (Nicolaus Zoravius) and printed in Cracow in 1632. After briefly discussing the concept of dialect and the trend of polyglot "*Pater Noster* catalogues", which originated in the 16th century and marked the beginning of a different approach to linguistic diversity, I will focus my attention on the analysis of the six versions, trying to shed light on the knowledge and the division of standard Greek dialects (Attic, Ionic, Doric, Aeolic and *koiné*), and the position of demotic in the 17th century. In the end I will give some final remarks on the methods and sources used by the author in composing this curious text under analysis.

Keywords: Żórawski, Zoravius, Greek dialects, Pater Noster, Lord's Prayer, Cracow Academy

Abstrakt

Szerokie zainteresowanie greckimi dialektami podczas Renesansu zaowocowało wieloma dziełami w tej dziedzinie, głównie bazującymi na późno-starożytnych i średniowiecznych traktatach dialektologicznych. W kontekst ten wpisuje się podręcznik szkolny, napisany przez Mikołaja Żórawskiego i wydrukowany w Krakowie w 1632 roku, zawierający m.in. sześć wersji Modlitwy Pańskiej w dialektach greckich. W niniejszym artykule po krótkim wstępie przedstawiającym pojęcie dialektu i sposoby sporządzania wielojęzycznych katalogów „Pater Noster" z XVI wieku, skoncentruję się na analizie sześciu wersji modlitwy. Spróbuję omówić ówczesną wiedzę o klasycznych dialektach greckich (attyckim, jońskim, doryckim, eolskim i koiné), ich podziałach, i miejscu demotyku w XVII wieku. Ostatnie uwagi będą poświęcone metodologii i źródłom użytym przez autora w kompozycji tego osobliwego tekstu.

Słowa kluczowe: Żórawski, Zoravius, dialekty greckie, Pater Noster, Modlitwa Pańska, Akademia Krakowska

In this article I wish to offer a small contribution to the renewal of interest in the Ancient Greek dialectology which took place in the Renaissance, by presenting an uncommon 'exercise-book' of Greek printed in Cracow in 1632. The book, intended as a learning aid for the students of the Nowodworski College in Cracow,[1] contains a Greek translation of Cicero's oration *Pro Archia poeta* followed by six versions of the *Lord's Prayer* in the Greek dialects. After focusing on the trend of polyglot *Pater Noster* that originated in the

---

[1] Μάρκου Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος, ὁ ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἀρχίου Ποιητοῦ ΛΟΓΟΣ, ἐκ τῶν Ῥωμαίων γλώττης, εἰς τὴν ἑλληνικὴν παρὰ τοῦ Νικολάου Ζοραβίου, ἐπί τῆς τοῦ Κράκου πολεως τῇ Ἀκαδημίᾳ, τῆς Φιλοσοφὶας διδασκάλου καὶ καθηγητοῦ, μεταφρασθείς. Ἔτει ἀπὸ τῆς θεογονίας, χιλιοςῷ ἑξακοσιοςῷ τριακοςῷ δευτέρῳ. M. T. Ciceronis pro Archia poeta oratio ex latino sermone in graecum a Magistro Nicolao Zorawski, in Acad[emia] Crac[oviensi] Philosophiae Doctore et Professore, translata. Anno a Nativitate Dei MDCXXXII, παρὰ τῷ Φραγκίσκῳ Καισαρίῳ. The book was issued *in octavo* and the only surviving copy so far is now available at the Library of the Polish Academy of Sciences in Gdańsk, under the shelfmark Cc 11872³ adl. 5. For more information about the author, the recent finding of the book in Gdańsk, and how it was for long time considered lost (Czerniatowicz 1991, 186), see Peressin (2016, 82–91). Analysis of the text is the principal subject of my PhD project.

16th century and marked the beginning of a different approach to linguistic diversity, my analysis of the six versions will attempt to shed light on the knowledge of the standard Greek dialects (Attic, Ionic, Doric, Aeolic and *koiné*), their division, and the consideration of demotic among them in the 17th century. Some last remarks will be given on the methodology and sources that may have been used by the author in composing this text.

Traces of an early reflection over linguistic alterity can be seen in Homer's *Iliad*, where non-Greeks are defined as βαρβαρόφωνοι, "those who stammer" or "those who speak a foreign language" (2, 867, 1924). A more linguistic approach to the fragmentation and differentiation of Greek language is shown later by the Stoics, but most importantly from the 3rd century BC by the Alexandrine philologists, who explained and analyzed the Classical texts, writing commentaries and compiling grammatical treatises[2]. Some of them were dedicated to specific grammatical subjects as well as Greek dialects; these Hellenistic compendia were copied and abridged all through the Byzantine era, but since *koiné* Greek, the 'supra-regional' idiom that from the 4th century BC began to spread in the whole Mediterranean area, performed a levelling action on the Greek language in use, dialectal forms became more and more unintelligible to the copyists.

What has survived to our times of this production, also due to the lack of interest for the obscure nature of such works, are shortened versions of the Alexandrine philological treatises. Grammarians Apollonius Dyscolus and his son Herodianus (2nd century AD) are considered as the organisers of the topic who formalized the partition of dialects by composing specific works on Attic, Ionic, Doric, and Aeolic, whilst John Philoponus (6th century AD), the unidentified Grammaticus Meermannianus, the Grammaticus Leidensis (once attributed to Philoponus), and Gregory of Corinth (Gregorius Pardus, 11th-12th century AD) belong to the second generation of epitomizers (Bolognesi 1953, 97–120).

Although such books were still available in the Byzantine Empire, it is yet to be remembered that in the Western world Greek was still almost completely unknown until the end of the 14th century, that is, until a group of scholars from Constantinople made their way to Italy and began their career as teachers of Greek Literature. Prior to those erudites, among the mists of "Graeca non leguntur" almost the sole voice of Roger Bacon could be heard in Europe (Botley 2010, 32).

It is generally believed that the first work on the subject of Greek dialectology to be published in the West was the excerpt by Pseudo-Plutarch *De dialectis quae apud*

---

[2] On the first reflections on Greek dialectology, see e.g. Calabrese (1967, 159–161).

Homerum, as part of the *De vita Homeri* contained in Homer's editio princeps printed in Florence in 1488. The belief needs to be revised, since – as demonstrated by R. Van Rooy – the Humanist Johannes Reuchlin himself informs us that he composed his treatise on the various dialects of the Greek language (*De quattuor linguae Graecae differentiis libellus*) during a winter's night between 1477 and 1478 (Van Rooy 2015, 505).[3] Further sources ensuring the transmission of knowledge on Greek dialectology from the 15th century in the West are to be found in the late-ancient and medieval treatises by John Philoponos, Manuel Moschopulos (14th century), and Gregory of Corinth (Bolognesi 1953, 100–104), which were entitled Περὶ διαλέκτων (*On dialects*) and reelaborated – as indicated above – the works of former grammarians Tryphon (1st century AD), Apollonius Dyscolus, and Herodianus. Gregory's treatise was included in Aldus Manutius' popular collection *Thesaurus Cornucopiae et Hortus Adonidis* published in 1496 (republished in 1512 with a Latin translation).[4] Pardus' epitome can be described as by far the most complete one among compilations on the Greek dialects (Hainsworth 1967, 62–76).

Such compendia generally showed a recurring structure (Hainsworth 1967, 63). After a short introduction concerning the geo-ethnographical elements of a dialect and the authors who made use of it, some linguistic features followed, exemplified by citations. From the 16th century on, adhering to the tradition imported by Byzantine scholars, Western Humanists began to write their own tractates and Greek grammars, in which a section describing the characteristics of each of the four (or five with *koiné*) dialects was occasionally added. It is for instance the case of the successful Greek grammar by Nicolaus Clenardus (Nicolas Clénard) (Clenardus 1530),[5] which was reprinted in 1554 and enhanced with Petrus Antesignanus' commentary on the dialects, or Erasmus Schmidt's *Tractatus de dialectis* (Schmidt 1604).

---

[3] Probably a translation of an original Greek work.

[4] Gregory's treatise Περὶ διαλέκτων – first published in 1493 (Botley 2010, 121) – was also accessible along with other dialectological works in Henricus Stephanus's *Appendix Libellorum ad Thesaurum Graecae Linguae pertinentium*, 5th volume of the *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae* (Stephanus 1572, 5th vol. 15–32).

[5] Clenardus' grammar was one of the official school-books of Greek adopted at the Cracow Academy for the years 1548, 1555, 1556 (Wisłocki 1886).

To name a few more authors of Greek grammars including notes on dialects: Urbanus Bolzanius (1442–1524), Hadrianus Amerotius (1490–1560), Otto Gualperius (1546–1624), Erasmus Schmidt (1570–1637) (Van Rooy 2015, 519–520; Botley 2010, 36–52).

It should be noticed that, although we speak of "dialects" while referring to the diverse speeches of Ancient Greece with their specific characteristics and fitting precise literary contexts, the word διάλεκτος was used in this sense neither in the works of the Stoics, nor in Plato or Aristotle. It only defined speech, manner of speaking, whereas the generic terms γλῶττα (γλῶσσα) or φωνή was used to indicate the idiom of a certain region. The Peripatetic Dicaearchus and later Alexandrine philologists introduced a new meaning for "dialect" (Calabrese 1967, 160), that is, a speech deviating from the standard language. In the Roman world, Quintilian names them "sermonis differentiae" (11.2) but does not use the word "dialectos" (or "dialectus"). Furthermore, the first Humanists tended to translate the Greek word διάλεκτος by "lingua", "sermo", avoiding – in line with the Ciceronian precepts – transcribing the term as "dialectus". Later, from the 16th century, the loanword eventually came into use by means of vocabularies and lexica, such as Ambrogio Calepino's *Dictionarium* (1502) (Alinei 1984, 147–173; Trovato 1984, 205–236; Regis 2012, 3–16; Van Rooy 2014, 521).

As regards the number of dialects, grammatical tradition initially conveyed the division into three, i.e. Doric, Ionic, Aeolic, to which Attic was added as a fourth, probably due to its prestige (Hainsworth 1967, 67). According to Clemens of Alexandria (*Strom*. 1.142.4, 1960; Hainsworth 1967, 67),[6] also *koiné* later joined the traditional division as the fifth dialect. Roman historian Valerius Maximus lists "quinque genera" of Greek (8.7), as well as Quintilian, who writes about "quinque sermonis differentiae" (11.2, 2002). Such a division survived intact during the Middle Ages up to the Renaissance, since 15th century sources depended on Byzantine treatises.

A sort of new division of the Greek dialects appears in the 17th century *curiosum* that is intended to be the main topic of this paper. As mentioned earlier, the book includes Cicero's *Pro Archia poeta*[7] in Greek. The speech was translated by Nicolaus Zoravius (Mikołaj Żórawski) from Lublin (1595–1665), a teacher of Greek at the Cracow Academy, doubtlessly better known as the court physician and astrologer of the Polish-Swedish House of Vasa. My interest, however, is focused here on the final section of the book presenting the *Lord's Prayer* (*Oratio Dominica*) in six Greek dialects that Zoravius appended to the Greek version of the speech.

---

[6] Greek authors and works are cited according to the abbreviations in *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (Hornblower-Spawforth 2012).

[7] See footnote 1.

The work is of interest for several reasons. Firstly, it offers a testimony to the enthusiasm for the study and teaching of Greek in 17th century Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth; secondly, it provides some interesting new perspectives and confirms the old ones regarding the Humanistic reflection on Greek dialectology; lastly, we could look at this "linguistic" attempt composed in a borderland area of Europe as a part of the wider contemporary cultural tendencies, i.e. the discourse on the diversity and systematization of the world languages that arose in the 16th century.

Greek Literature was a semi-regular subject at the Cracow Academy from 1500. During the 16th century brilliant and erudite scholars of various provenience produced worthy translations (into Latin and Polish) and wrote occasional verses.[8] Yet, the end of this and the following century brought a weakening of the Kingdom's borders. New wars with Russia and Sweden caused a general decay of the cultural life, and this state of affairs soon influenced also the Academy. The teaching of Greek was more and more difficult because of the lack of competent teachers, but despite these adversities in 1612 the first chair of Greek Literature was inaugurated in Cracow (Barycz 1935, 545; Peressin 2016, passim).

Zoravius received a traditional education at the Cracow Academy, where he pursued his Bachelor of Arts and subsequently the Master of Arts degree. Later, he was able to study in Padua, receiving his Master of Medicine in 1632.[9] Unfortunately, not much has remained of his works. Apart from the Greek version of *Pro Archia*, only some calendars and a short eulogy are left (Peressin 2016, 82–85).

Let us now attempt to present this "exercise" in its adequate context. Humanistic translations from Greek into Latin were of crucial relevance from the 15th century on when Greek manuscripts – most of them containing works hitherto unknown – began to reach the Western world and their contents were thus made comprehensible to non-Greek readers in translation. Certainly, translations in the opposite direction, that is from Latin into Greek, were much less popular and circulated mainly among Byzantine scholars who learned Latin by translating the text of Roman philosophers and theologians for diplomatic and cultural purposes.[10] Thus, it can be easily inferred that in 17th century Central-Eastern Europe such a translation had no other than educational aims. In fact,

---

[8] On the topic see Czerniatowicz 1965.

[9] The teacher is lavishly praised as well versed in Latin, Greek and Hebrew by Polish historian Szymon Starowolski in his *Laudatio Almae Academiae Cracoviensis*, Cracoviae 1639, p. 36.

[10] Also Western students took advantage of these Greek translations (Botley 2010, 76–77).

Zoravius remarks in the foreword to the oration that his students at the Nowodworski College had problems reading Greek, therefore, he hopes that this new "instrument" will meet their needs. Moreover, to stimulate their curiosity, the book is equipped with the above-mentioned supplement of the *Our Father* in six Greek dialects.

It makes one wonder what the reason was why Zoravius chose to give this prayer as a model-text exemplifying the richness of the Hellenic language. The question could be explained by the fact that *Pater Noster* is the common ground of all Christians, the universal prayer Jesus himself taught his disciples. In addition, it does not contain references to dogmatic subjects likely to cause confessional issues, like e.g. Christ's atonement (see e.g. Easton 1893, 427; Jeremias 1964, v-vi). The text is recorded in two passages of the New Testament (a longer version in Matthew 6, 9–13, a shorter one in Luke 11, 2–4) and in Matthew's wording – the one used by Zoravius – it is composed of an invocation and seven petitions. The final phrase (Hammerling 2010, 21, 40–41) "ὅτι σοῦ ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία καὶ ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας· ἀμήν, for thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen"[11] can be found in some manuscripts of Matthew's Gospel (the so-called *Didaché* doxology) and it is often included during the recitation by Protestants, whilst it is mostly omitted by Roman Catholics (Hammerling 2010, 41).[12] We should add that Greek prayers and in general Scriptures were frequently appended to Greek grammars as a teaching tool, mainly because texts such as the *Lord's Prayer*, the *Hail Mary* and the *Creed* were familiar to students (or at least available in Latin translation), who could thus easily compare Greek grammatical structures and vocabulary with the Latin ones (Botley 2010, 75–76).

If these reasons may partially justify the choice for this text (see also footnote 13), it is nevertheless doubtless that at that time the *Pater Noster* already belonged to a well-defined literary trend. The Swiss Humanist Conrad Gesner from Zurich is commonly said to have conceived the first work describing and celebrating the diversity of languages. His *Mithridates…,* published in 1555 inaugurated indeed a sort of genre (Trabant 1998, 95–111). Such "Sprachinventar" aimed at showing the variety among languages (Old and Modern) from around the known world by outlining their features; in order to do that, they often presented basic specimen texts illustrating the languages, most often the *Lord's Prayer*. But, if Gesner is undeniably the best known organizer of the languages of the Early Modern Era by publishing the popular *Mithridates*, he was, however, not the

---

[11] English translation is from *The Holy Bible* 1910.

[12] In the wording included in Zoravius 1632, the doxology is missing.

first one to exploit this trend. J. Ch. Adelung and J. S. Vater (Adelung-Vater 1806–1817, 643–676) detail a long list of *Vaterunser-Polyglotten* dating back to 1427 and all the way up to 1805. One of them in particular, printed in Frankfurt in 1593 by Hieronymus Megiserus (Jerome Megiser), *Specimen quinquaginta diversarum atque inter se differentium linguarum et dialectorum,*[13] shows in some respects close similarities with Zoravius' work. Megiserus reports in his inventory fifty versions of the *Lord's Prayer*, including three in Greek: the first one in Greek *communiter*, i.e. *koiné*; the second one composed by diverse literary dialects; and a third one "Graeca lingua vulgari", that is demotic. The latter text is identically reproduced in Zoravius 1632*,* and I could still trace it in B. Motte's 1736 edition of his *Pater Noster* catalogue (Motte 1736, 6).[14]

Further possible evidence of the Polish translator's conscious involvement in this cultural tendency can be found in the foreword, where, praising his protector by arguing that noblemen are gifted by nature with innate virtues, he lists some eminent *exempla* (Zoravius 1632, 8–9): the Kings of France (known for thaumaturgy), Julius Caesar

---

[13] The first edition of the book contains 40 texts (Megiserus 1592). On pages 2r-2v is found the *Encomium orationis dominicae*, a foreword in the form of a dedication to the typographer (Megiserus' father-in-law). In these verses significantly recalling the Pentecostal *glossolalía*, the German philologist gives his reasons for the choice of the *Lord's Prayer:* "Mortales quondam docuit quam Christus Iesus / Nil prece terrarum sanctius orbis habet. / Hac nihil utilius, nihil hac preciosius una. / Omnia in hac, mira sub brevitate, latent. / Hanc cape, linguarum vario discrimine cultam, / care socer, veri patris amande loco. / Est operis Deus Interpres, Patronus et Auctor. / Quidnam igitur lectu dignius esse queat? / Patronus Pater huic, est illi nempe dicatum. / Ipseque fecit idem Filius Auctor opus. / Spiritus id linguis Interpres pluribus ornat. / (Linguae etenim Flatus munera rara Sacri). / Ceu quondam imparibus Chelys efficit aurea chordis, / Unanimi dulcem dissidio Harmoniam, / Haud secus haec variae concors discordia linguae / Concentu suavi huc, unde profecta, redit [*Jesus once taught mortals how nothing on this earth is more saint than prayer. / Nothing more useful, nothing more precious than this prayer alone. / All is in it concealed, under its wonderful brevity. / Accept this (*prayer*), adorned by the diversity of tongues, dear father-in-law, who deserve to be loved as a true father. / God is Interpreter of the work, Patron and Author. / What then could be more worthy reading? / The Father is as a Patron to it, and to Him this is dedicated. / And the Son himself as an author made the same work. / The Spirit, as Interpreter, embellishes it with many tongues. / (For tongues are rare gifts of the Holy Spirit). / Like sometimes with unequal strings the golden lyre produces / a sweet Harmony by a unanimous dissonance, / even so this agreeing disagreement of a different tongue / returns here, whence it departed, with a harmonious blending of sounds*]" (Translation mine).

[14] Motte's *Lord's Prayer* catalogue was first published in London in 1700, then reprinted in Augsburg in 1705. I examined a later 1736 edition.

(known for mnemonic abilities), and Mithridates, after whom Gesner entitled his catalogue. The Philhellenic king of Pontus was indeed known in the Antiquity[15] not only for being the last great enemy of Rome and for inventing a universal antidote to poisons, but also for speaking the languages of all the twenty-two countries he ruled (Gesner 1555, 2r). Mithridates' polyglot figure attracted particular attention in the Renaissance, and in Gesner's Protestant vision he represented also a sort of pluralist alternative to the linguistic and religious centralisation of the Roman Catholic Church (Colombat-Peters 2009, 23).

Having briefly defined the background of the work, I will now present the texts of the Greek *Lord's Prayer* as they appear in the printed book, without any attempts at edition. Therefore, I decided to report the texts with anomalies and inaccuracies (irregular accentuation and diacritics, spelling "mistakes"), leaving to the reader the judgment whether they might have originated from the author's negligence or from his conjectures based on comparison with the notions he possessed about Greek dialects. I will give explanation for some of the linguistic features which also occur in Gregory of Corinth's tractate (Schaefer 1811, 9–624)[16] – demonstrating the author's acquaintance and usage of this or similar works – or may be clarified in the light of the text-sources available to the author. I accord preference, among similar tractates, to Gregory of Corinth's *Περὶ διαλέκτων* as it shows more comprehensiveness and because it was the main source of 15th and 16th century grammatical and lexicographic compilations on the Greek dialects. When possible, I will give reasons for the principles of modern linguistic research.[17] It should be pointed out that, if we can state that the demotic version is not by Zoravius, as we saw above, there is no evidence to suggest that the four others were not penned by him.

---

[15] Cf. Plin., *HN*, 7.88; Gell., *NA,* 17.17.

[16] For citations from this source I will give the chapters referring to the dialects sections (intro., ion., att., dor., aeol.) followed by the numbers of paragraphs. It stands to reason that in my comments I will refer to the five dialects of the literary tradition, avoiding the modern partitions (e.g. into West Greek dialects and East Greek dialects) that were unknown to a 16th-17th century Humanist.

[17] Symbol º marks forms that are not attested in the TLG, that is fictitious, originally created by the author or printed incorrectly. In square brackets [], for the sake of comparison, I will put the original forms as they appear in the *koiné* text of the Gospel (Nestle-Aland 1993, 13).

ΕΥΧΗ ΚΥΡΙΑΚΗ. ORATIO DOMINICA (Zoravius 1632, 61–63)

Κοινῶς. Communiter.

Πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ἁγιασθήτω τὸ
ὄνομά σου, ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου, γενηθήτω
τὸ θελημά σου, ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς; τὸν
ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον, καὶ ἄφες
ἡμῖν τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν, ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς, ἀφίεμεν
τοῖς ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν. καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκης ἡμᾶς εἰς
πειρασμόν. ἀλλὰ ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς, ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ.
Ἀμήν[18].

Ἀττικῶς. Attice.[19]

Πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὅγε ἐν τῶν οὐρανῶν, ἁγιασθήτω
τοὔνομά σεθεν, ἐλθετω ἥγε βασιλήα σεθεν,
γενηθήτω τόγε θέρημά σεοθεν, ὡς ἐν οὐρανοῦ καὶ
ἐπὶ τῆσγε γῆς. τόγε ἄρτον ἡμῶν τόγε ἐπιού-
σιον, δὸς ἡμῖν τήμερον, καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τάγε ὀφεω- 5
ρήματα ἡμῶν, ὡς καὶ ἥμης, ἀφίεμεν τοῖσι ὀφειλέ-
τασι ἡμῶν, καὶ μὴ ἐσενέγκης ἡμᾶς ἐς πησασμόν.
ἀλλὰ σῦσαι ἡμᾶς, ἀπὸ τοῦγε πονησοῦ. Ἀμήν.

---

[18] "Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name. / Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven. / Give us this day our daily bread. / And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors. / And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. Amen". English translation is from *The Holy Bible,* King James' Version.

[19] It is useful to observe that Gregory of Corinth (in line with the grammatical tradition) lists the following Atticist writers: Aristophanes, Eurypides, Thucydides, att. 1–3; Ionic writers: Herodotus, Homer, Hippocrates (ion. 1–7); Theocritus' work in the compendia often represents the Doric dialect, (cf. dor. *passim*)*,* although Grammaticus Leidensis lists also Alcman, Stesichorus, Ibycus, Epicharmus and Bacchylides (Schaefer 1811, 635). Gregory's silence on the Aeolic writers is compensated by Grammaticus Leidensis, who lists Alcaeus and Sappho (Schaefer 1811, 639).

l. 1 ὅγε [= ὅ γε]: this form recalls the pronoun ἔγω-γε "I at least" strengthened by particle γε (more frequent in Attic and labelled as such by Stephanus 1572 s.v.); see also ἥγε, τόγε, τῆσγε, τόνγε, τάγε, τοῦγε.

l. 1 ἐν τῶν οὐρανῶν: shows analogy with elliptic expressions like e.g. εἰς Ἅιδου (μυχόν, οἶκον) Ar. *Ran.* 49; ἐν Διονύσου (ἱερῷ) Dem. 5.7[20] (here could be seen the ellipse of βασιλεία "kingdom"). Gregory reports this as an Atticists' feature in att. 12, although it is also frequent in Homer (cf. e.g. *Il.* 5.395; 22.389; *Od.* 11.164); see also l. 3 ἐν οὐρανοῦ.

l. 2 τοὔνομα [τὸ ὄνομα]: this type of crasis is widely attested in many dialects, yet the fact that it is found in att. 53 could explain why it appears in this version (see also Stephanus 1572 s.v. ὄνομα).

l. 2 βασιλήαº [= βασιλεία]: perhaps this writing is based on the comparison with Old Attic forms such as κλῄς instead of κλείς "key" (see e.g. Eur. *Med.* 212; Soph. *OC* 1053; Aesch. *Eum.*, 827), cf. att. 43, where change ει > η is implied. See also l. 6 ἡμηςº, l. 7 πησασμόνº.

l. 2 τήμερον: adverb σήμερον is commonly attested as an Attic form by initial τ-. Cf. att. 5.

l. 2 σεθενº [= σέθεν, σου]: genitive of pronoun σύ with suffix of place -θεν often appears in poetry (Homer, tragedy and the Aeolic poets, Schwyzer-Debrunner 1950, 552); Stephanus 1572, s.v. σύ describes it as an Attic form.

l. 3 σεοθενº [= σου]: such a form is attested in Stephanus 1572, s.v. σύ as a 'variant' of the previous σεθενº; σέο alone is e.g. in *Il.* 1.396.

l. 3 θέρημαº [= θέλημα]: here can be observed a shift from λ to ρ, as Gregory indicates by means of the example κεφαλαλγία > κεφαλαργία "headache", att. 85.

l. 7 πησασμόνº [= πειρασμόν]: for ρ > σ see Greg. att. 82, where is given the example θαρραλέον > θαρσαλέον "confidence". Grammarians considered it an Attic feature, as it is often found in tragedy and other Attic writers, cf. Thuc. 2.51[21].

l. 8 σῦσαιº [= ῥῦσαι] ... πονησοῦº [= πονηροῦ]: for σ instead of ρ see l. 7.

<div align="center">Ἰωνικῶς. Ionice.</div>

Πέτερ ἡμέων ὁ ἐν τοῖσι εὐρανοῖσι, ἁγιάζεσθαι
τὸ οὔνομά σευ, ἐλθέμεναι ἡ βαβιλη<ί>α σευ,

---

[20] Cf. also Isocr. 10.20; Diog. Laert. 4.50; Plat. *Leg.* 905b. Such expressions are commonly defined as elliptic, although they were originally intended as genitives with locative or allative meaning, Schwyzer-Debrunner (1950, 395).

[21] It is yet now considered to be an Ionic element (Buck 1928, 64).

γένεσθαι τὸ τελημά σεο, ἐν εὐρανῶι ὡς καὶ ἐπὶ
τῆς γῆς. τοῖν ἤρτον ἡμέων τοῖν ἀπίευσιον δοὺς ἦμιν
σήμειρον, καὶ ἄπες ἦμιν τὰ οὐπηϊλήματα ἡμέων ὡς 5
καὶ ἡμέες, ἀπίεμεν τοῖσι οὐπηϊλέτησι ἡμείων, καὶ
μὴ ἠϊσενέγκης ἡμέας εἰς πηϊρασμόν. ἀλλὰ ῥυέμε-
ναι ἡμέας, ἀπὸ τοῖο πουνηροῖο. Ἡμήν.

l. 1 πέτερ⁰ [= πάτερ]: although a misprint may not be ruled out, a likely explanation for the vocative πέτερ could be the inspiration of Greg. ion. 15, illustrating the metaphonetic shift α > ε that occurs e.g. in ὁρέω for ὁράω "to see" (cf. Hdt. 1.111).

l. 1 τοῖσι εὐρανοῖσι⁰ [= τοῖς οὐρανοῖς]: as is known, to the Ionic dialect is attributed the adding of -ι to dative plural ending -οῖσ-ι, see Greg. ion. 2. Diphthong ευ instead of ου seems to be justified by the observation of Homeric Ionic genitives γένευς (Att. γένους) "kin" (cf. *Od.* 15.533) or θέρευς (Att. θέρους) "summer" (cf. *Od.* 7.118) (Chantraine 1958, 58), or Ionic forms like σευ (Att. σου), ποιεύμενος (Att. ποιούμενος).

l. 2 σευ [= σου]: Ionic enclitic form of the gen. sing. of pronoun σύ (cf. *Il.* 5.811, Hdt. 3.36); see at l. 3 the variant σεο [= σου], cf. *Il.* 1.396.

l. 4 ἤρτον⁰ [= ἄρτον]: possibly an attempt to recreate the Ionic vowel shift ᾱ > η (Buck 1928, 19; ion. 10; ion. 52) could be observed here, cf. νηός (for νᾱός) "temple", ἡμέρη (for ἡμέρᾱ) "day".

l. 1, 5 ἡμέων: the genitive plur. of pronoun ἐγώ is used by Herodotus, cf. 1.112. At l. 6 we encounter the Homeric variant ἡμείων, cf. *Od.* 24.170.

l. 1, 2, 3, 7 ἀγιάζεσθαι, ἐλθέμεναι, γενέσθαι, ῥυέμεναι⁰, ἀπίεμεν⁰: the four infinitives stand instead of the 2nd person of imperative: this feature is more common in poetry and Greg. ion. 32 reports it as Ionic.[22] Besides, the author unsurprisingly ignores that infinitive with ending -μεν(αι) belongs to Aeolic (Chantraine 1958, 485): in Homer, who was accounted as an Ionic[23] writer, this is indeed a recurring feature (cf. e.g. *Il.* 4.351, 22.265; *Od.* 1. 370, 2.207) and therefore such a form was "mistaken" for Ionic. The feature does

---

[22] This grammatical feature appears in the Ionic section of Gregory's treatise, although infinitive as imperative is witnessed in a number of authors up to the *koiné* period, see e.g. Ionic Hdt. 1.32 (with negative adverb); Hippocr. 1.151; but also Ar., *Ach.* 1001; Thuc. 5.9; Plat. *Crat.* 426b (Schwyzer-Debrunner 1950, 380; Kühner 1904, 20–21).

[23] See e.g. ion. 4, 6 and Grammaticus Leidensis ion. 9 (Schaefer 1811, 629). However, Homeric language was also considered to be a mixture of all dialects, cf. e.g. D.Chr. 11.23, 12.66.

not appear in the Aeolic section of Gregory's *Περὶ διαλέκτων,* and that explains also the absence of such infinitives from the Aeolic version (see *infra*).

l. 2 βαβιληῖᾰ° [pro βασιληῖα?= βασιλεία]: Greg. ion. 3 ascribes the shift ε(ι) > η(ι) to Ionic, noticing two forms of the epic patronymic Πηλεΐδης and Πηληϊάδης "son of Peleus", both actually used in Homer (cf. e.g. *Il.* 1.1; 1.277). The same shift can be seen in the epic-Ionic ληῖς and ληΐη for λεία "prey", often explained as a metrical shortening (Chantraine 1958, 106–107).[24] Cf. the same at l. 5 οὐπηϊλήματα°, l. 6 οὐπηϊλέτηϊσι°, l. 7 ἠϊσενέγκῃς°, πηϊρασμόν°.

l. 3 τέλημα° [= θέλημα]: psilosis – that is deaspiration of vowels and consonants – as well as the interchange of aspirates and surds (here reproduced by the change of τ for θ), is defined by Gregory as an Ionic trait, cf. ion. 18 and ion. 28, where as an example the grammarian gives the Ionic βάθρακος for βάτραχος "frog".

l. 5 σήμειρον° [= σήμερον]: addition of -ι to vowel ε- is documented by Greg. ion. 8; cf. epic form ξεῖνος (for ξένος),[25] which probably suggested this form.

l. 6 ἡμέες [= ἡμεῖς]: this Ionic pronominal form is rarely attested and not thoroughly clear.[26]

l. 6 τοῖσι οὐπηϊλέτηϊσι° [= τοῖς ὀφειλέταις]: the ending of fem. dat. plur. -ῃσι is in ion. 5.

l. 7 ἡμέας [= ἡμᾶς]: Ionic form of the acc. plur. of pronoun ἐγώ (cf. Hdt. 3.72.1).

l. 5, 6 ἄπες°, ἀπίεμεν:[27] the forms show psilosis, see l. 3.

l. 8 τοῖο πουνηροῖο° [= τοῦ πονηροῦ]: the ending -οιο of genitive singular of *o*-stems is typically Homeric (Schwyzer-Debrunner 1950, 555), and therefore described as Ionic in ion. 22.

---

[24] For ει as the earlier stage of ηι, see Buck (1928, 33).

[25] Vowel lengthening ε > ει is caused by loss of postconsonantal ϝ (*ξένϝος) (Buck 1928, 46).

[26] Stephanus 1572, s.v. ἐγώ defines ἡμέες "we" as Ionic. The form appears as *falsa lectio* in Hdt. 2.6 in the editio princeps by Manutius (1502), but it is rejected by modern editors. It is however attested in some Ionic writers, cf. e.g. Diog. Laert. 1.44.3, 2.4.5 and recorded as Ionic in *scholia* to the *Iliad* 8.352: Νῶϊ. Ἡμεῖς. Κοινὴ ἡ διάλεκτος. Δωριεῖς δέ φασιν, ἄμμες. Αἰολεῖς, ἄμμε. Ἀττικοὶ δὲ, νῶϊ. Ἴωνες, ἡμέες (Erbse 1969–1988) [Νῶϊ: that is ἡμεῖς in *koiné*. The Dorians say ἄμμες. The Aeolians, ἄμμε. The Attic people, νῶϊ. The Ionians, ἡμέες].

[27] The form ἀπίεμεν is attested only as 1st pers. plur. of pres. indic. from ἀφίημι, cf. Hdt., 2.17.

Δωρικῶς. Dorice.

Ἀπφὺ ἀμέων ὢν τοῖσιν ὠρανοῖσιν, ἁγιασθήτον
τὸ ὄινοιμά τευ, ἐνθέτον ἁ βασιλέα του,
γεννατάτον τὸ σέλαμά σευ, τὼς ποτὰν ἐν ὠρα-
νῶ καὶ ἐπὶ τᾶς γᾶς, τὸν ἄτρον ἀμέων τὸν ἐπιώ-
σιον δοὶς ἀμῖν σάμερον, καὶ ἄπες ἀμῖν, τὰ οἰπε- 5
λάματα ἀμῶν, τὼς καὶ ἄμες, ἀπίεμες τᾶσι οἰ-
φελέταισιν ἀμῶν, καὶ μὰ ἐσενέγκης ἄμμε ἐς περα-
σμόν. ἀλλὰ ῥῦσαι ἄμαῖς, ἀπὸ τῶ ποιναρῶ.
Ἀμάν.

l. 1 ἀπφύ: Doric ἀπφύς for "father" is attested in Theocritus (15.13) and it is recorded in Greg. dor. 132.

l. 2 τευ [= σου]: Doric enclitic gen. of pronoun σύ (cf. Theoc. 5.42).

l. 2 τουᵒ [= σου]: gen. of pronoun σύ was perhaps derived from σου on the basis of the change σ > τ as in dor. 43 σύ > τύ "thou".[28]

l. 1 ἀμέων: Doric form of genitive plural of pronoun ἐγώ, cf. Theoc. 8.25.

l. 1 ὠρανοῖσιν [= οὐρανοῖς]: although ὠρανός is explained by ancient grammarians as Aeolic,[29] -ω for -ου appears in Doric gen. sing. of the o-stem (cf. Theoc. χιμάρω 1.6, τῶ 1.20 and Greg. dor. 8), see also l. 8. The epic-Ionic endings -οῖσιν in this version are not clear, possibly depending on some epic features present in Theocritus.[30]

l. 1 ὢν [= ὁ ἐν]: contractions of articles and prepositions (crasis) are described by Greg. dor. 7 and dor. 12.

l. 2 ὄινοιμαᵒ [= ὄνομα]: Dorians often add ι to o, as asserts Greg. dor. 32 quoting the example πνοιή < πνοή "blast".

l. 2 ἁ [= ἡ]: Doric fem. sing. article ἁ, see e.g. Theoc. 15.63; cf. l. 3 for vocalism.

l. 3 σέλαμαᵒ [= θέλημα]: assibilation of dental θ > σ is noticed by grammarians, cf. Greg. dor. 115; the word shows also the typical Doric vocalism with retention of ᾱ instead of Ionic-Attic η, see also l. 4 τᾶς γᾶς, l. 5 σάμερον.

---

[28] That is lack of assibilation in Doric τύ= Ion.-Att. σύ (Buck 1928, 54).

[29] See e.g. Hdn., *de prosodia catholica*, 3.1.

[30] The idylls 12, 22, 25 show closeness to the Homeric language (Gow 1950, lxxii-lxxx).

l. 5 σάμερον [= σήμερον]: cf. Pind. *Ol*. 6.28.[31]

l. 5 ἀμῖν [pro ἀμίν]: Doric form of dat. plur. of pronoun ἐγώ, cf. Theocr. 5.25.

l. 8 τῶ ποιναρῶ° [= τοῦ πονηροῦ]: for -οι- see l. 2 ὄινομα°, for -α- see l. 5 σάμερον.

l. 2 ἐνθέτον° [= ἐλθέτω]: consonant shift λ > ν is documented in Doric, see ἦνθον for ἦλθον dor. 11, cf. e.g. Theocr. 1.80, 1.95; obscure is the dual (?) ending -τον of the three imperatives ἀγιασθήτον°, ἐνθέτον°, γεννατάτον°.

l. 6 ἀπίεμες° [= ἀφίεμεν]: the primary ending of 1st pers. plur. -μες is Doric (Buck 1928, 104, 141), whereas Ion.-Att. uses -μεν, cf. dor. 2; psilosis is reported in dor. 151.

Αἰολικῶς. Aeolice.

Πήτερ ἀμμέων, ὁ ἐν τοῖσι ὠρανοῖσι, ἀζιασθή-
τω τὸ ὄνυμά σευ, ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλοία σευ,
γενηθήτω τὸ φέληπά σευ, ὡς ἐν ὠράνω κὰ ἐπὶ
τῆς γῆς, τὸν ἄρτον ἀμμέων τὸν ἐμιούσιον δὸς ἄμμιν
σήμερον, κὰ ἄφες ἄμμιν, τὰ ὑφοιλήματα ἀμ- 5
μέων, ὡς κὰ ἄμμες, ἀφίεμεν τοῖς ὑφοιλέταις
ἀμμέων, καὶ μὴ ὀισενέγκης ἄμμε ὀις μοιρασμόν.
Ϝαλλὰ ῥῦται ἄμμε ἀμὸ τοῦ μονηροῦ. Ἠμήν.

l. 1 ἀμμέων [= ἡμῶν]: Aeolic gen. plur. of pronoun ἐγώ, cf. Stephanus 1572, s.v. ἐγώ; Sapph. 147 (Campbell 1990).

l. 2 ὄνυμα [= ὄνομα]: the word is defined as Aeolic in Byzantine lexica (Etym. Mag. 696.3; Etym. Gud. π 450.3) and in Greg. aeol. 9, where is described the raising o > υ[32]. See the same in ὑφοιλήματα° [= ὀφειλήματα] and ὑφοιλέταις° [= ὀφειλέταις].

l. 2 σευ [= σου]: the gen. sing. form of pronoun σύ is actually epic-Ionic (Hdt. 3.36; 7.49; *Il*. 5.811); Aeolic interpretation is found in Stephanus 1572 s.v. σύ.

l. 3 ἐν ὠράνω [= ἐν οὐρανῷ]: diphthong ου is replaced by ω, see Greg. aeol. 8. Lack of iota subscript in Aeolic dative sing. is described in aeol. 30, while accent on the penultimate syllable reveals an attempt to recreate Aeolic barytonesis, cf. Sappho ὤρανος 1.11 (Campbell 1990); aeol. 48.

---

[31] Although Gregory states that Pindar used *koiné* (Schaefer 1811, 12).

[32] It is nonetheless a form common to many dialects (Buck 1928, 25).

l. 2 ἡ βασιλοίαº [= βασιλεία]: the word was probably created on the basis of the shift ει > οι as in ὄνοιρος (Ion-Att. ὄνειρος) "dream", ἐπείγω (Ion.-Att. ἐποίγω) "to press", see aeol. 28; see the same in οἰσενέγκηςº; article ἡ shows typical Aeolic psilosis as in pronouns ἀμμέων, ἄμμες.

l. 3 φέληπαº [= θέλημα]: φ instead of θ is evidently influenced by forms like Aeol. φήρ for θήρ "beast"[33], aeol. 41; similarly μ is replaced by π as in Sappho ὄππατα 2.11 (Campbell 1990) for ὄμματα "eyes"; cf. aeol. 5.

l. 5 κάº [= καί]: the form may have been coined by observing Aeolic drop of iota in diphthong αι, as in ἀρχάος for ἀρχαῖος "ancient", cf. aeol. 19 and aeol. 33.

l. 4 ἄμμιιν [pro ἄμμιν], l. 5 ἄμμιν: dative sing. of ἐγώ, cf. Sapph. 21.12 (Campbell 1990); aeol. 59.

l. 7–8 μοιρασμόνº ... ἀμόº ... μονηροῦº [= πειρασμόν ... ἀπό ... πονηροῦ]: except for the shift ει > οι in μοιρασμόν, the three words remain unclear, as they show exactly the opposite of consonant change μ > π seen above in φέληπα.

l. 8 ἄμμε [= ἡμᾶς]: Aeol. acc. plur. of ἐγώ, cf. Alc. 70.8 (Campbell 1990); aeol. 59.

l. 8 Ϝαλλάº [= ἀλλά]: digamma is not originary, but its presence proves that this letter was known to the author to be a distinctive mark of Aeolic (see *infra*).

l. 8 ῥῦται [= ῥῦσαι]: psilotic form, see ἡ at l. 2; shift σ > τ seems to depend on aeol. 43 (τύ instead of σύ).

Τῇ διαλέκτῳ, ᾗ τὸ πλεῖθος ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ Κωνσταντίνου πόλεως χρῶνται.
Dialecto, ea qua vulgus Constantinopoli utitur.[34]

Πατερ ημας, οποιος ισε εης τως ουρανους, α-
γιασθιτο το ονομα σου, να ερτη βασιλεια
σου, το θελιμα σου. να γινεται, ιτζου εν τη γη,
ως εις τον ουρανον, το ψωμι ημας δοσε ημας
σιμερον, και συχορασε ημας τα κριματα ημων, 5

---

[33] See e.g. Hesychius: Φῆρες· οἱ Κένταυροι, Αἰολικῶς φηρία· θηρία. Αἰολεῖς [Φῆρες, i.e. the Centaurs in Aeolic; φηρία, that is θηρία as the Aeolians say], Schmidt (1863, 1519); cf. Buck (1958, 58).

[34] "In the dialect used by the masses in Constantinople". This preamble is by Zoravius, while the text Πατερ ... Αμην – as above mentioned – is presumably taken from Megiserus 1593, 4ʳ. Since diacritics are missing in both texts, I will provide the correct transcription of the commented words by adopting the polytonic system to the demotic language.

ιτζου και εμης, σιχορασομεν εκεινους οπου μας αδι-

κουν, και μεν περνης ημας εις το πειρασμο. αλ-

λα σοσον ημας, απο το κακο. Αμην.

The last version shows features of a demotic language spoken in the Ottoman Empire. We observe:

a. a large number of spelling mistakes, mostly due do itacistic pronounciation[35]: πλεῖθος (πλῆθος "multitude": η and ει were confused, as they sounded [i]); l. 1 ισε (demotic εἶσαι, 2nd pers. sing. of εἶμαι "to be"); l. 1 ενς (εἰς, but correct at l. 4); αγιασθιτο l. 1–2 (ἀγιασθήτω, η [ι]); l. 3 θελιμα (θέλημα); l. 5 σιμερον (σήμε-ρον); l. 6 εμης (ἐμείς, 1st pers. plur. pron. ἐγώ); l. 6 σιχορασομεν (συχωράσομεν / συχωρήσαμεν, 1st pers. plur. pres. / aor. ind., see *infra*);

b. some inaccuracies concern vowel quantity, as post-classical Greek lost the quantitative distinction between short and long vowels ο/ω (Browning 1983, 26): συχορασε (συ(γ)χώρησε, 2nd pers. sing. aor. imper. from συ(γ)χωρώ < συγ-χωρέω "to forgive"); σιχορασομεν (συχωρήσαμεν, aor. ind. ?)[36]; l. 4 δοσε (δῶσε, 2nd pers. imper. aor. from δίνω "to give" with -ε for analogy to ω-stem verbs); l. 8 σοσον (σῶσον, 2nd pers. imper. aor. from σώζω "to save")[37]; finally μεν (negative adverb μή(ν)) shows confusion between ε and η;

c. l. 1, 4 the use of acc. plur. of pers. pronoun ημας (ἡμᾶς) as genitive with the function of possessive (Browning 1983, 227, 280), cf. mod. Gr. μας;

d. l. 2, 3 να (νά) (aphaeresis for ἵνα) with subjunctives ερτη (ἔρθη, 3rd pers. sing. subjunctive ἔρθω from ἔρχομαι "to come") and γινεται (γίνεται)[38] has optative function (Holton-Mackridge-Philippaki 2012, 268), whereas in the *koiné* version

---

[35] Starting from the Hellenistic age, η, ι, ει, and subsequently in the medieval period υ and οι, tended to coincide phonologically [i]. That led to the vowel system of the Modern Greek, cf. Browning 1983, 25–26, 56–57.

[36] It should be a pres. indic., cf. *koiné* ἀφίεμεν. The forms συχορασε and σιχορασομεν seem to show the confusion of paradigms between contract verbs in -αω and verbs ending in -άζω, see Horrocks (2010, 238).

[37] The two forms δοσε (δῶσε, demotic aorist imper.) and σοσον (σῶσον, classic aorist im-per.) illustrate the coexistence in the text of both ancient and modern elements.

[38] From late antiquity the regular endings of the present subjunctive converged into those of the present indicative, see Horrocks (2010, 246).

we have imperative; subjunctive is again used to express a milder negative command (jussive) in l. 7 μεν περνης (μὴν πέρνης) "do not lead us";

e. the vernacular adverb ιτζου (itacistic form for ἤτζου, from (ε)ἴτις < ἔτης "so, thus", cf. med. Gr. ἔτζη Du Cange 1688, 440) "thus" is Cypriot (Horrocks 2010, 226);

f. semantic development of some lexemes: the classic relative-indefinite-interrogative pronoun ὁποῖος "of what sort? / of such a sort as" and adverb ὅπου "where" start to be used as relative pronouns in the Byzantine period (l. 5, 6) (Horrocks 2010, 225); l. 5, 6 συ(γ)χωρέω, originally "to consent to, to concede", in this text it means "to forgive"; l. 5 τα κριματα (τὰ κρίματα) for τὰ ὀφείληματα "debts" shows the meaning change of κρίμα from classical "decision, judgment" to biblical "punishment, conviction" (cf. Deut. 21,22; Mc 12,40); l. 7 μεν περνης (μὴν πέρνης), where περνῶ – from περάω with nasal infix -ν- (Horrocks 2010, 236) "I pass" acquires the new transitive meaning of "I make pass, I lead";

g. the lexeme ψωμι (ψωμί) "bread" shows the loss of -o- and -ν from an originary form ψωμίον "morsel (of bread)"; in the common speech the word ψωμίον, a diminutive[39] from ψωμός, substituted the learned ἄρτος;

h. we notice the use of two accusatives in place of datives: εκεινους (ἐκείνους) for ἐκείνοις and δοσε ημας (δῶσε ἡμᾶς) for (δῶσε) ἡμῖν; as well as in place of genitive in απο το κακο (ἀπὸ τὸ κακό);[40]

i. the absence of the adjective ἐπιούσιον[41] in the version highlights that the translator might have had difficulties in understanding and rendering the true meaning of this word, only attested in the Gospel.

In the light of these linguistic data, it is useful to recapitulate the principal points of this paper. Starting from the division of the Greek dialects, the number of six proposed by Zoravius taking into account also the demotic Greek, shows a new perception of the "Graeca lingua vulgaris", which seems – from Megiserus on – to be equated to the five

---

[39] On the productiveness of neuter diminutive suffix -ίον in the Roman period, see Horrocks (2010, 117, 220).

[40] On the decline of the dative in favour of the accusative, see Horrocks (2010, 124–26, 216).

[41] Around the uncertain meaning of the word ἐπιούσιον ("daily", "supersubstantial" referred to ἄρτον "bread") philological discussions arose very early among the Fathers, see e.g. Ayo (1992, 59–65).

canonic dialects. On the other hand, the addition of a demotic version which was not composed by Zoravius himself, reveals the author's intention to provide a complete overview of the Hellenic speeches accordingly to the *Pater Noster* catalogues trend, rather than a plausible purpose of teaching also the sixth variety of Greek spoken in Constantinople.

As regards the resources for the dialectological features of the five speeches, I believe Zoravius took advantage of instruments available in the 17th century, like the *Thesaurus Cornucopiae* and Stephanus' *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae* (e.g. lemmas ἐγώ and σύ provide the pronominal forms for each dialect encountered in this text) with the *Appendix* (containing grammatical treatises), and Greek grammars equipped with a section on dialects, as evidence shows in the numerous correspondences between Gregory's linguistic description of the single dialects and Zoravius' four versions. It is also clear that he made direct or indirect use of other resources like Byzantine lexica or editions of classics.

At this point it is worth making a few remarks on the author's methodology. Zoravius makes use of lexica and dialectological compendia, extracting from them some linguistic forms and observations for every dialect as if they were rules; what he then does consists in a rarely systematic employment of these rules on the *Lord's Prayer* text (e.g. probably on ὄνοιρος he forms βασιλοία°, and after observing ξεῖνος he creates σήμειρον°). Moreover, Gregory's and other grammarians' works contain repetitions and inconsistencies which made this sort of translation process into the four dialects even more complicated. To some extent this could clarify discrepancies noticed in the four texts: some typical features of one dialect happen to be absent or scarce in the proper version (e.g. psilosis is slightly represented in Aeolic); while some facts remain unclear (e.g. the dual, π for μ in Aeolic).

The presence of digamma in the form ϝαλλά° offers the opportunity for an interesting remark. Although this letter has always been a distinctive trait of the Aeolic dialect, as Greek and Latin grammarians confirm,[42] I could find no mention of the fact in the dialectological treatises I examined.[43] In addition, 16th century editions of representative Aeolic poets Alcaeus and Sappho lacked digamma, as in the Middle Ages the sound was lost and the letter was thus misunderstood by copyists, who wrote Γ, Ε or Τ in place of the unfamiliar F (Thumb 1909, 258; Allen 1968, 48). Nevertheless, Zoravius could

---

[42] For a list of Greek and Latin grammarians who wrote on the Aeolic digamma, see Meister (1882, 103–104).

[43] Gregory only mentions the addition of β- in βρόδον for ῥόδον "rose", aeol. 1. The group βρ- shows the preservation of original digamma (ϝρ-), see Browning (1983, 48).

be acquainted with the graphic and phonetic values hereof by relying on grammarians, whose precepts report that: 1) digamma appears in the Aeolic speech; 2) it is placed at the beginning of a word or in the middle; 3) it always precedes a vowel; 4) it is compared to Latin V as in ϝ*otum,* ϝ*irgo* for *uotum, uirgo*.[44] As it is well known, digamma was restored in the 18th century by Richard Bentley who postulated its presence to explain absence of elision in Homer (Allen 1968, 46).

Although on the one hand this small "Vaterunser" catalogue undoubtedly shows some unique characteristics, on the other hand it utterly fits the "Mithridatic" Zeitgeist in which it was produced, testifying to the circulation of the contemporary linguistic trends in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. However, for a more accurate overview of the topic, it would be of interest to investigate other similar attempts to 'recreate' the Greek dialects as a school-exercise on the basis of the Byzantine treatises, and to study the methodologies and the sources used for this purpose. Contemporary cases showing this direction can be seen e.g. in Megiserus' polyglot catalogue, containing a version composed of a mixture of Greek dialects (see *supra*), but what was presented in this article is, in my opinion, something different. A further examination of the prayer texts might also bring new light on some linguistic facts I may have overlooked in my commentary.

One last reflection goes to the spurious demotic version. The analysis I conducted on the text confirms some interesting linguistic aspects concerning the development of the Greek language in the post-Byzantine period, like the confusion between paradigms -άω and -άζω, the semantic shift of some lexemes, and the coexistence of classic and modern elements. Nonetheless, a more in-depth study is needed to identify the origin of this text (a Cypriot trait has been brought to light) which was printed from the 16th at least up to the 18th century in the *Lord's Prayer* catalogues as a representative specimen of the contemporary Greek speech.

Works cited

Adelung, Johann Ch., and Vater, Johann S. 1806–1817. *Mithridates oder allgemeine Sprachenkunde mit dem Vater Unser als Sprachprobe in bey nahe fünf hundert Sprachen und Mundarten,* 4 Teile. Berlin: Vossischen Buchhandlung.

---

[44] See e.g. Prisc., *Inst*. 1.6; 1.12; 1.20; 1.21–23; 2.48; 6.69.

Alinei, Mario. 1984. "Dialetto: un concetto rinascimentale fiorentino. Storia e analisi". *Quaderni di Semantica* 2:147–173.

Allen, William S. 1968. *Vox Graeca*. Cambridge: University Press.

Ayo, Nicholas. 2002. *The Lord's Prayer: A Survey Theological and Literary*. Philadelphia: Rowman & Littlefield.

Barycz, Henryk. 1935. *Historia Uniwersytetu Jagellońskiego w Epoce Humanizmu*. Kraków: Drukarnia Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.

Bolognesi, Giancarlo. 1953. "Sul *Περὶ διαλέκτων* di Gregorio di Corinto". *Aevum* 27:97–120.

Botley, Paul. 2010. *Learning Greek in Western Europe, 1396–1529. Grammars, Lexica and Classroom Texts*. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society.

Browning, Robert. 1983. *Medieval and Modern Greek*. Cambridge: University Press.

Buck, Carl D. 1928. *Introduction to the Study of Greek Dialects. Grammar, Selected Inscriptions, Glossary*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Calabrese, Rita. 1967. "I grammatici antichi e i dialetti greci". *Atene e Roma* 12:159–165.

Campbell, David A., ed. 1990. *Greek Lyric I. Sappho and Alcaeus*. Cambridge MA.: Harvard University Press.

Chantraine, Pierre. 1958. *Grammaire homérique. I tome*. Paris: Klincksieck.

Clement of Alexandria. 1960. *Stromata*, *bks. 1–6*. Edited by O. Stählin and L. Früchtel. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Clenardus, Nicolaus. 1530. *Institutiones in Linguam Graecam*. Leuven.

Czerniatowicz, Janina. 1965. *Z dziejów grecystyki w Polsce w okresie Odrodzenia*. Wrocław: Zakł. Nar. Im. Ossolińskich.

Czerniatowicz, Janina. 1991. *Opusculum poësis Polono-Graecae saeculorum XVI-XVII (1531–1648)*. Wrocław: Zakł. Nar. Im. Ossolińskich.

Du Cange, Charles. 1688. *Glossarium ad scriptores mediae et infimae Graecitatis*. Lyon.

Easton, Matthew G. 1893. *Illustrated Bible Dictionary*. New York: Harper and Broethers.

Erbse, Hartmut. 1969–1988. *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem*. Vol. 2. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Gesner, Conrad. 1555. *Mithridates. De differentiis linguarum tum veterum tum quae hodie apud diversas nationes in toto orbe terrarum in usu sunt, Conradi Gesneri Tigurini observationes*. Tiguri: Froschoverus.

Gesner, Conrad. 2009. *Mithridate. Mithridates*. Edited by Bernard Colombat and Manfred Peters. Genève: Droz.

Gow, Andrew S.F. 1950. *Theocritus*. Cambridge: University Press.

Hainsworth, John B. 1967. *"*Greek views on Greek dialectology*". Transactions of the Philological Society* 66:62–76.

Hammerling, Robert. 2010. *The Lord's Prayer in the Early Church.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Herodianus. 1867. *De prosodia catholica.* In *Grammatici Graeci*, edited by A. Lentz. Leipzig: Teubner.

Holton, David, Mackridge, Peter and Irene Philippaki-Warburton. 2012. *Greek: A comprehensive Grammar.* London: Routledge.

Homer. 1924–1925. *Iliad.* 2 vols. Translated by A.T. Murray. Cambridge, MA., London: Loeb.

Homer. 1919. *Odyssey.* 2 vols. Translated by A.T. Murray, Cambridge, MA., London: Loeb.

Horrocks, Geoffrey. 2010. *Greek: A History of the Language and Its Speakers.* Cichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Jeremias, Joachim. 1964. *The Lord's Prayer*, Philadelphia: Fortress.

Kühner, Rafael. 1904. *Ausfürliche Grammatik der Griechischen Sprache*, vol. 1. Hannover: Hahnsche.

Megiserus, Hieronymus. 1592. *Specimen quadraginta diversarum atque inter se differentium linguarum et dialectorum, videlicet Oratio Dominica totidem linguis expressa.* Francoforti: ex Typographeo Ioannis Spiessii.

Megiserus, Hieronymus. 1593. *Specimen quinquaginta diversarum atque inter se differentium linguarum et dialectorum, videlicet Oratio Dominica totidem linguis expressa.* Francoforti: apud I. Bratheringium.

Meister, Richard. 1882. *Die griechische Dialekte auf Grundlage von Ahrens' Werk "De Graecae linguae dialectis"* vol. 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Motte, Benjamin. 1736. *Oratio Dominica πολύγλωττος, πολύμορφος, nimirum plus centum linguis, versionibus aut characteribus reddita et expressa.* Londini: Dan. Brown.

Nestle, Eberhart and Kurt Aland. 1993. *Novum Testamentum Graece.* Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgeschaft.

Peressin, Roberto. 2016. "Cycerońska mowa *Pro Archia poeta* po grecku: kilka uwag o nauce greki w Akademii Krakowskiej w XVII w". In *Studia Classica et Neolatina XV. Pars II,* edited by Zofia Głombiowska, 82–91. Gdańsk: Uniwesytet Gdański

Quintilian. 2002. *The Orator's Education*, Volume I: Books 11–12. Edited and translated by Donald A. Russell. Cambridge MA.: Harvard University Press.

Regis, Riccardo. 2012. "Note su *koiné*". *Romanische Forschungen* 124:3–16.

Schaefer, Gottfried H. 1811. *Gregorii Corinthii et aliorum grammaticorum libri de dialectis linguae Graecae, quibus additur nunc primum editis Manuelis Moschopuli libellus de vocum passionibus*. Lipsiae: A.G. Weigel.

Schmidt, Erasmus. 1604. *Tractatus de dialectis Graecorum principalibus, quae sunt in parte λέξεως*. Wittemberg: Laurentius Seuberlich.

Schmidt, Moritz, ed. 1863. *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*. Jena: Hermann Duft.

Schwyzer, Eduard and Albert Debrunner. 1950. *Griechische Grammatik*. Vol. 1. München: C.H. Beck.

Starovolscius, Simon. 1639. *Laudatio Almae Academiae Cracoviensis*. Cracoviae (Cracow).

Stephanus, Henricus. 1572. *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae*. 4 vols. Genevae: Henricus Stephanus.

Sturzius, Fridericus, ed. 1818. *Etymologicum Graecae Linguae Gudianum*. Lipsiae: A.G Weigel.

Sylburgius, Fridericus, ed. 1816. *Etymologicum Magnum*. Lipsiae: A.G Weigel.

The Holy Bible. King James' Version. 1911. Oxford: University Press.

Thumb, Albert. 1909. *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte*. Heidelberg: Carl Vinter's Universitätsbuchhandlung.

Trabant, Jürgen. 1999. "Mithridates: de Gesner jusqu'à Adelung et Vater". *Cahiers Ferdinand de Saussure* 51:95–111.

Trovato, Paolo. 1984. "'Dialetto' e sinonimi ('idioma', 'proprietà', 'lingua') nella terminologia linguistica quattro- e cinquecentesca (con un'appendice sulla tradizione a stampa dei trattatelli dialettologici bizantini)". *Rivista di letteratura italiana* 2:205–236.

Valerius Maximus. 1888. *Factorum et Dictorum Memorabilium Libri Novem*. Edited by Karl Friedrich Kempf. Leipzig: Teubner.

Van Rooy, Raf. 2014. "A first stumbling step toward Ancient Greek dialectology in Western Europe. An edition and brief discussion of Johann Reuchlin's *De quattuor Graecae linguae differentiis libellus* (1477/1478)". *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance. Travaux et Documents* 76:501–526.

Wisłocki, Władysław, ed. 1886. *Liber Diligentiarum Facultatis Artisticae Universitatis Cracoviensis. Pars Prima*. 1886. Cracoviae: Kluczycki.

Zoravius, Nicolaus. 1632. Μάρκου Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος, ὁ ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἀρχίου Ποιητοῦ ΛΟΓΟΣ, ἐκ τῶν Ῥωμαίων γλώττης, εἰς τὴν ἑλληνικὴν παρὰ τοῦ Νικολάου Ζοραβίου, ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ Κράκου πολεως τῇ Ακαδημίᾳ, τῆς Φιλοσοφίας διδασκάλου καὶ καθηγητοῦ,

μεταφρασθείς. Ἔτει ἀπὸ τῆς θεογονίας, χιλιοςῷ ἑξακοσιοςῷ τριακοςῷ δευτέρῳ. M. T. Ciceronis pro Archia poeta oratio ex latino sermone in graecum a Magistro Nicolao Zorawski, in Acad[emia] Crac[oviensi] Philosophiae Doctore et Professore, translata. Anno a Nativitate Dei 1632, παρὰ τῷ Φραγκίσκῳ Καισαρίῳ. Cracow: F. Cezary.