FACHLITERATUR
EDITION ROMIOSINI
ΕΠΙΣΤΗΜΗ

ICGL12

12th INTERNATIONAL CONFERENC
ON GREEK LINGUISTICS
16 – 19 SEPTEMBER 2015
FREIE UNIVERSITÄT BERLIN, CEMOG

Proceedings of the ICGL12

vol. 1

The International Conference on Greek Linguistics is a biennial meeting on the study and analysis of Greek (Ancient, Medieval and Modern), placing particular emphasis on the later stages of the language.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE ICGL12
ΠΡΑΚΤΙΚΑ ΤΟΥ ICGL12

Thanasis Georgakopoulos, Theodossia-Soula Pavlidou, Miltos Pechlivanos, Artemis Alexiadou, Jannis Androutsopoulos, Alexis Kalokairinos, Stavros Skopeteas, Katerina Stathi (Eds.)

PROCEEDINGS OF THE 12TH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON GREEK LINGUISTICS

ΠΡΑΚΤΙΚΑ ΤΟΥ 12ΟΥ ΣΥΝΕΔΡΙΟΥ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗΣ ΓΛΩΣΣΟΛΟΓΙΑΣ

VOL. 1

EDITION ROMIOSINI

Vertrieb und Gesamtherstellung: Epubli (www.epubli.de)
Satz und Layout: Rea Papamichail / Center für Digitale Systeme, Freie Universität Berlin
Gesetzt aus Minion Pro
Umschlaggestaltung: Thanasis Georgiou, Yorgos Konstantinou
Umschlagillustration: Yorgos Konstantinou

ISBN 978-3-946142-34-8
Printed in Germany

Online-Bibliothek der Edition Romiosini:
www.edition-romiosini.de

Στη μνήμη του Gaberell Drachman (†10.9.2014)
και της Αγγελικής Μαλικούτη-Drachman (†4.5.2015)
για την τεράστια προσφορά τους στην ελληνική γλωσσολογία
και την αγάπη τους για την ελληνική γλώσσα

ΣΗΜΕΙΩΜΑ ΕΚΔΟΤΩΝ

Το 12ο Διεθνές Συνέδριο Ελληνικής Γλωσσολογίας (International Conference on Greek Linguistics/ICGL12) πραγματοποιήθηκε στο Κέντρο Νέου Ελληνισμού του Ελεύθερου Πανεπιστημίου του Βερολίνου (Centrum Modernes Griechenland, Freie Universität Berlin) στις 16-19 Σεπτεμβρίου 2015 με τη συμμετοχή περίπου τετρακοσίων συνέδρων απ᾽ όλον τον κόσμο.

Την Επιστημονική Επιτροπή του ICGL12 στελέχωσαν οι Θανάσης Γεωργακόπουλος, Θεοδοσία-Σούλα Παυλίδου, Μίλτος Πεχλιβάνος, Άρτεμις Αλεξιάδου, Δώρα Αλεξοπούλου, Γιάννης Ανδρουτσόπουλος, Αμαλία Αρβανίτη, Σταύρος Ασημακόπουλος, Αλεξάνδρα Γεωργακοπούλου, Κλεάνθης Γκρώμαν, Σαβίνα Ιατρίδου, Mark Janse, Brian Joseph, Αλέξης Καλοκαιρινός, Ναπολέων Κάτσος, Ευαγγελία Κορδώνη, Αμαλία Μόζερ, Ελένη Μπουτουλούση, Κική Νικηφορίδου, Αγγελική Ράλλη, Άννα Ρούσσου, Αθηνά Σιούπη, Σταύρος Σκοπετέας, Κατερίνα Στάθη, Μελίτα Σταύρου, Αρχόντω Τερζή, Νίνα Τοπιντζή, Ιάνθη Τσιμπλή και Σταυρούλα Τσιπλάκου.

Την Οργανωτική Επιτροπή του ICGL12 στελέχωσαν οι Θανάσης Γεωργακόπουλος, Αλέξης Καλοκαιρινός, Κώστας Κοσμάς, Θεοδοσία-Σούλα Παυλίδου και Μίλτος Πεχλιβάνος.

Οι δύο τόμοι των πρακτικών του συνεδρίου είναι προϊόν της εργασίας της Εκδοτικής Επιτροπής στην οποία συμμετείχαν οι Θανάσης Γεωργακόπουλος, Θεοδοσία-Σούλα Παυλίδου, Μίλτος Πεχλιβάνος, Άρτεμις Αλεξιάδου, Γιάννης Ανδρουτσόπουλος, Αλέξης Καλοκαιρινός, Σταύρος Σκοπετέας και Κατερίνα Στάθη.

Παρότι στο συνέδριο οι ανακοινώσεις είχαν ταξινομηθεί σύμφωνα με θεματικούς άξονες, τα κείμενα των ανακοινώσεων παρατίθενται σε αλφαβητική σειρά, σύμφωνα με το λατινικό αλφάβητο· εξαίρεση αποτελούν οι εναρκτήριες ομιλίες, οι οποίες βρίσκονται στην αρχή του πρώτου τόμου.

Η Οργανωτική Επιτροπή του ICGL12

ΠΕΡΙΕΧΟΜΕΝΑ

SOME LITERARY REPRESENTATIONS OF SPOKEN GREEK BEFORE NATIONALISM(1750-1801)

Peter Mackridge
St Cross College, Oxford
peter.mackridge@stx.ox.ac.uk

Περίληψη

Ορισμένα λογοτεχνικά κείμενα που γράφτηκαν στην περίοδο 1750-1800 στις περιοχές όπου ο ελληνικός πολιτισμός κυριαρχούνταν από τους Φαναριώτες (ιδίως στην Κωνσταντινούπολη και στο Βουκουρέστι) παρέχουν πολύτιμο υλικό για τη μελέτη της ιστορικής εξέλιξης της ελληνικής γλώσσας. Ιδίως οι συγγραφείς και οι μεταφραστές κωμωδιών και άλλων δραματικών κειμένων φρόντιζαν να αναπαραστήσουν τον καθημερινό λόγο ομιλητών που ανήκαν σε διάφορες κοινωνικές κατηγορίες. Στην παρούσα μελέτη επιχειρούνται ορισμένες γενικές παρατηρήσεις σχετικά με τις κυρίαρχες ελληνικές ποικιλίες που ομιλούνταν στα φαναριώτικα πολιτισμικά περιβάλλοντα και αναλύονται ορισμένα λεξικολογικά και γραμματικά φαινόμενα που εμφανίζονται στα σχετικά κείμενα.

Keywords: Constantinople; Phanariots; 18th-century Greek literature; 18th-century Greek language; Greek and Turkish in contact

1. Introduction

Since 2012 I have been doing some time-travelling in the Greek language. I have been visiting a little-studied region of Greek, namely the language of literary texts produced in the late eighteenth century in the area dominated by a powerful group of Greek-speaking Orthodox Christians in Constantinople known as the Phanariots. On these journeys, I have often been reminded of my geographical travels in the 1980s to study

another under-researched region of Greek, namely the Pontic dialect spoken by Greek-speaking Muslims in north-east Turkey. Not the least of the similarities between these two kinds of travel is that both of them have involved the study of linguistic phenomena that are due to contact between Greek and Turkish. In this paper I will provide a brief account of the kind of material I have collected in my recent time-travelling fieldwork and will argue that certain types of literary text may provide *prima facie* evidence of spoken usage in a particular speech community. Then I shall present some provisional results of my ongoing research. I will present two types of result: first, the insights my fieldwork has given me into the general state of the Greek language in the particular time and place I have visited, and finally some examples of various linguistic phenomena that are exemplified in the data I have brought back with me. Although the particular focus of my research is lexis and semantics, in the present paper I shall cast my net wider.

The last fifty years or so of the eighteenth century form part of the lexicographically missing years between the end point of Kriaras' (1968-) dictionary of medieval and early modern Greek (namely 1669) and the Greek dictionaries produced in the first third of the nineteenth century.[1] Because of the political and cultural ascendancy of the Phanariots within the Ottoman empire, it is a period when written vernacular Greek was exposed to more intense Turkish influence than ever before or since, and this is one of the aspects of the period that I find particularly interesting.[2]

It seems to me to be important to study Greek as it was spoken and written immediately before the rise of nationalism and before the onset of the first intense phase of the language controversy. The history of the language of the unlettered rural Greek folk has already been intensively studied; what I find interesting now is to study the history of the speech of educated urban people, ranging from simple everyday utterances to highly complex sentences. For one thing, given that the Greek state, from its foundation in the 1820s until 1974, was characterized by diglossia and by continuous controversies over which variety of Greek was the most appropriate for written purposes, we might ask: to what extent was purism operating in everyday speech before the rise

1 Not only the lexicon but also the grammar of eighteenth-century vernacular Greek is under-studied: the forthcoming *Cambridge Grammar of Medieval and Early Modern Greek* will stop at 1700. Concerning the term "early modern Greek", Kaplanis (2009: 350) proposes that literary texts written in vernacular Greek from 1100 to at least 1830 "can be safely described as early modern Greek".

2 It is only recently that this language has been readily available for study thanks to the first editions of literary texts such as Goldoni 1988, Spathis 1995, Kallinikos 2004, *Afxentianos* 2010 and Rigas 2011, and the digitization of the dictionaries of Ventotis 1804 (Greek-French), Dehèque 1825 (Greek-French) and Vyzantios 1835 (Modern Greek-Ancient Greek-French), as well as many literary and non-literary texts, some of which are electronically searchable.

of nationalism, and what were its motives? In addition, studying the Greek language during this period in comparison with later periods helps us understand the kinds of human agency involved in linguistic innovation and linguistic change[3] – especially those changes that spread from written to spoken usage.

I want to emphasize that I am not talking about the state of the Greek language as a whole in a particular chronological period, but about some of the varieties of Greek that are attested from that period, namely the varieties that were used in Phanariot circles.

Why focus on texts from the Phanariot cultural area? Members of the Phanariot families (whose centres of political power and cultural diffusion were Constantinople, Bucharest and Iaşi [Jassy], the last two in present-day Romania), were appointed to high positions in the Ottoman administration, including those of Grand Dragoman of the Porte, Dragoman of the Fleet, and the hospodars (princes) of Wallachia and Moldavia. For this reason they became the most politically powerful and culturally prestigious group of Orthodox Christians in the Ottoman empire. Constantinople was the Βασιλεύουσα (imperial capital), the seat of the Sultan and therefore the administrative capital of the Ottoman empire, as well as being the seat of the Ecumenical Patriarch and therefore the spiritual capital of the Greek Orthodox world. Constantinople was a melting-pot that gathered together people from all over the Greek Orthodox world; and people and cultural features of this world spread well beyond the confines of the area in which the Phanariots wielded political power, to cultural centres in Ottoman Greece such as Yannina, to diaspora communities in cities such as Vienna,[4] and later to Athens even before it became the capital of the Greek state in 1834.[5]

3 Cf. Andersen's distinction mentioned by Janda and Joseph (2003). According to Milroy, innovation may be made by an individual speaker, whereas change refers to a community's increasing adoption of an innovation (Janda and Joseph 2003: 78-79).

4 For instance, the German philologist Friedrich David Gräter reported being taught Phanariot songs in Halle in 1786-87 by a fellow-student named Efstathios Athanasios from Tyrnavos in Thessaly (Chatzipanagioti-Sangmeister 2001: 149-51).

5 The first book ever to be printed in Athens was *Λυρικά*, a popular collection of poems by the Phanariot poet Athanasios Christopoulos, which had already been printed in Venice, Vienna and Corfu. The Athens edition was printed in 1825, while the Greek Revolution was still raging. The author of the first dictionary of Modern Greek to be published in the Greek state (Vyzantios 1835) was from Constantinople, and the language presented in the dictionary is likely to have been influenced by Constantinopolitan usage.

2. The texts

Focusing on a selection of Greek literary texts from the late eighteenth century, I will argue that they provide effective evidence for the spoken language of their time and place. The following texts are at the centre of my research material:

- Two original satirical comedies written in the Phanariot cultural area:

(1) *Ο Αλεξανδροβόδας ο ασυνείδητος* ('Prince [*voyvoda* or *hospodar*] Alexander the unscrupulous') written by G. N. Soutsos (probably in Constantinople) around 1785: the target of the satire is Alexandros Mavrokordatos, prince of Moldavia 1785-86 (Soutsos 1995).

(2) *Το σαγανάκι της τρέλας* ('The tempest of madness'; < T *sağanak* 'cloudburst, downpour') probably written in Bucharest by Rigas Velestinlis around 1790 and targeted against Nikolaos Mavrogenis, prince of Wallachia 1786-89 (Rigas 2011).

- Two sets of translated dramas:

(1) Ten comedies by the Venetian Carlo Goldoni translated from Italian by one or more anonymous individuals in the Phanariot area (Goldoni 1988).

(2) Three dramas and one comedy by August von Kotzebue translated from German in Vienna by Konstantinos Kokkinakis and published in the same city in 1801 (Kokkinakis 2008).

The authors or translators of all of these texts attempt to represent contemporary spoken Greek, and all of these texts are in prose.[6] The fact that most of them remained unpublished until a century or two later suggests that their authors were probably not in a position to read each other's texts: each text was written independently of the others, so

6 The Goldoni translator seems to sum up his intentions regarding the language of his translation in the following speech in which a nobleman issues instructions to his new secretary who has brought his master some letters to sign: "Γράφε μιξοβάρβαρα και χωρίς ελληνισμόν. […] Αυτούς τους ιδιωτισμούς, άρχον Γραμματικέ, μην τους μεταχειρίζεσαι εις το εξής" ('Write μιξοβάρβαρα, without ελληνισμός [archaism]. In future, do not use such idioms, master secretary': Goldoni 1988: 146). Kriaras (1968-) defines *μιξοβάρβαρα* as "language mixed with barbarisms, mixed and uncultivated language". Cf. Goldoni's original: "Oibò, queste parole affettate non voglio che si usino. Scrivete in buon italiano, senza cercar lo stile cruschevole". The phrase "in buon italiano" means 'in plain language, free from pedantic literary archaisms' (thanks to Arturo Tosi); similarly, in Molière (1988: 65) the analogous phrase "en bon français" is rendered as "με απλά ρωμαίικα" ('in simple Romaic [Modern Greek]'); conversely, "lo stile cruschevole" suggests the stiff, pedantic style of Italian promoted by the Accademia della Crusca. We can compare the interesting (and perhaps counter-intuitive) distinction made by an earlier Alexandros Mavrokordatos (1636-1709) between "Hellenic", which is used for playful display, and the "vulgar dialect", which is used for serious communication (Livadas 1879: 146 ff., quoted in Mango 1973: 52).

that linguistic features that are common to all or most them are likely to indicate widespread phenomena rather than features that were confined to a small literary clique.

According to Janda and Joseph (2003: 37), in order to study the history of a language

> we wish to gain a maximum of information from a maximum of potential sources: different times and different places – and […] also different regional and social dialects, different contexts, different styles, different topics, and so on and so forth.

I should make it clear that I am not confining my research to literature; I am also studying historical chronicles, newspapers and commercial correspondence. However, I am focusing on the region of the Greek-speaking world under Ottoman/Phanariot control to the exclusion of the Venetian/Heptanesian region (though the two communities shared a considerable proportion of their linguistic norms in common).

3. Literary texts that provide effective evidence of spoken usage

In the same text Janda and Joseph (2003: 16) write that

> we do well to remind ourselves of the apparently ubiquitous bias favoring the creation and preservation of religious, legal, commercial, and literary texts over written representations of informal speech. Now, it is in the very nature of holy scriptures, stabilizing laws, binding contracts, and monumental epics to promote the iconic equating of fixation in writing with fixity of language, and of intended invariance over time with imposed linguistic invariance […]. [T]he texts which most often tend to be written and preserved are those which least reflect everyday speech.

Note the questionable implication that literary texts, by definition, exclude the representation of informal speech. However, the last phrase of this passage is glossed by a footnote with which I heartily agree:

> Historical linguists sometimes are in the fortunate position of having access to earlier texts which are deliberately crafted so as to approximate colloquial usage or the like, such as plays or other works of fiction containing vivid dialogue. Still, since these works are constructed and so may contain stereotyped linguistic features or atypical frequencies (even if these exaggerations have some basis in reality), they must be used judiciously; they certainly cannot be uncritically taken at face value (Janda and Joseph 2003: 144, note 29).

I contend that the literary texts I am using for my study are likely to contain a high proportion of linguistic material belonging to informal speech; but I try to use them judiciously.

Linguists understandably want to use data that are as natural as possible. For this reason they prefer to study non-literary texts such as legal documents and private letters. The historical linguist Io Manolessou (2014: 30) has recently laid down two criteria for the reliability of texts for the purposes of historical linguistic research:

> In order to identify the origin and track the spread of changes, preference is given to texts that are a) localizable in space and time, i.e. dated and of known geographical provenance and b) statistically representative, i.e. constituting a sample that contains different ages, social classes and genders. The first requirement is the main cause of preference for non-literary over literary texts: it is usually texts like legal documents or private letters that mention time and place of composition, and not literary creations, which have come down to us through copying by anonymous successive editors.

As it happens, some of the literary texts I am studying are precisely localizable in space and time, and the manuscripts that contain them were either written by the authors themselves or date from very close to the time when the texts were originally composed.

Having worked at the interface between literary and linguistic studies for almost fifty years, I am convinced that the literature of the past can be a rich source of knowledge and understanding concerning the language that was spoken in the time and place in which the text was written. As the young Belgian Hellenist Jorie Soltic (2015: 159) has recently put it, in literary texts "the extralinguistic context is, as it were, 'absorbed' in the textual one. The embedding of the context in the text is indeed a great – yet often forgotten – advantage of literature when doing pragmatically oriented research."

Since one of the chief characteristics of linguistic competence is creativity, it seems to me to be appropriate to use literary texts as evidence of linguistic usage, since the writing of literature is one of the most creative activities that involve the use of language: it tests the limits of the kinds of utterances that can be generated and the kinds of utterances that can be comprehended.

It may seem strange to be basing conclusions about language partly on texts that are translated from other languages. However, these particular translators adapt the foreign texts to Greek situations, so that the characters of Goldoni's comedies, for instance, wear Ottoman dress, eat Ottoman food and display Greek-Ottoman social attitudes, such as attitudes to marriage.[7] Just as we can learn a lot about a language and its history by comparing two different stages of the same language, we can learn much from comparing two different languages (especially at the same period) – hence the importance of studying translations: texts that have been translated or adapted from texts written in other languages may provide further evidence for the "limits of the sayable" in the target language as well as evidence for what the translators believe to be the equivalent word or phrase in the target language for a word or phrase in the source language. Besides, literary translation is a particularly informative special case of language contact: whereas the translation of legal and administrative documents entails a lot of literal transfers of usage from the source language in an attempt to convey the precise meaning of the original, literary translators (especially in the period under study) tend to take significant liberties with the original in order to produce a text that conforms to the norms of the target language and the target culture.

I now turn to Manolessou's second point, regarding the importance of using a sample that includes different ages, social classes and genders. Dramas (especially comedies) written in prose are particularly valuable for their representation of spoken language.[8] Certain types of non-literary texts, such as newspapers, legal documents and commercial correspondence, are confined to a single register and make repeated use of stock formulas. By contrast, comedies in dramatic form provide *prima facie* evidence of the use of different linguistic registers. Especially in comedies, vocabulary and grammar are displayed in action and reaction; utterances are performed in a social context, in every-

7 For the last of these aspects see Glytzouris (2015).

8 By contrast, the Heptanesian comedies of Savogias Rousmelis and Dimitrios Gouzelis, as well as the non-dramatic satires of Dionysios Solomos and Antonios Matesis, are all in verse.

day verbal and non-verbal interactions among various specific types of speaker.[9] In the texts I am studying, the speakers occupy various positions in society. Their speech displays a range of sociolinguistic phenomena, for instance the kinds of utterances that were thought to be appropriate and inappropriate in specific social situations, including degrees of formality and levels of politeness. Because of these factors, these comic dramatic texts display a variety of different levels of language use that were available at the time, from pompous formal speech to vulgar slang. We see the way masters (whether aristocrats or bourgeois) interact with other masters, servants with servants, masters with servants, parents with sons and daughters, husbands with wives, and lovers with each other – and even the way adults talk to babies (at least one character says αγκού (Goldoni 1988: 484), just as people did in Greece when I was living there in the 1960s and 70s).[10]

The plays contain instances of all or most categories of speech act, including greetings and leave-takings, categorical and tentative statements, affirmations and denials, questions, commands, requests, expressions of advice, promises, apologies, congratulations, exclamations, and attempts to persuade or frighten – each one placed within a specific context of social interaction in real time, and most of them eliciting a plausible linguistic response – and/or sometimes a physical response, especially in slapstick comedy. In addition, characters are sometimes depicted talking to themselves; these interior monologues, used by authors attempting to represent the immediacy and incomplete nature of fleeting thoughts, include interesting fragments of raw linguistic material, seemingly captured before they have formed themselves into grammatical utterances.

I grant that the speakers in these texts are fictional characters rather than real people who existed in the past; but do we have any such evidence of the ways in which living people interacted linguistically at the time?

These texts provide snapshots of the state of the Greek language in a particular cultural area immediately before the onset of systematic purism and of vituperative arguments about the language. The composite picture they provide is admittedly somewhat blurred: they provide little reliable information about phonology, and they reveal almost

9 Cf. "Verbal interaction is the fundamental reality of language"; "It could be said that all verbal communication, all verbal interaction takes place in the form of an exchange of utterances, that is, in the form of a dialogue" (Mikhail Bakhtin, quoted in Todorov 1984: 44).

10 Αγκού, which is hardly used today except in jest, has an entry in *Istorikon lexikon* (1933-) but not in any of the recent big Greek dictionaries (Babiniotis, Triantafyllidis and the *Χρηστικό λεξικό* of the Academy of Athens). The Turkish word *agu* appears in Redhouse (1968), though nowadays, as in Greece, it seems to be used only for comic purposes. I don't know that anyone has written about the way Greeks talk to babies apart from Drachman (1973).

nothing about phonetics. As one might expect, they provide a great deal of information about vocabulary and semantics, but little about morphology that is not already well known. There is also a lot of syntactic information that I have not yet begun to examine.

The texts I am studying make little use of features from specific regional dialects (apart from Phanariot features, that is). Moreover, speech that does not conform to the authors' norms is not usually presented with a specifically satirical purpose, as it is in later comedies promoting a particular language ideology, such as I. R. Neroulos' *Korakistika* (1811) and D. K. Vyzantios' *Vavylonia* (1836). Some servants are presented as using a kind of generic island speech that is not geographically specific; it contains a mixture of features that are typical of the Aegean islands and Crete, such as the verb κατέχω 'I know', the interrogative pronoun ίντα 'what' and the third-person verb ending –ουσι, with features of Heptanesian speech such as the oath "μα τον άγιο" ('by the saint') and a large number of words and phrases from Italian. The association of servants with islands probably reflects the social reality of Greek life in Constantinople;[11] however, I am not treating the non-Phanariot speech of certain servant-characters as reliable linguistic evidence.[12]

4. General observations on the state of the language

In this section I will make some general observations on the state of the Greek language in the Phanariot cultural area immediately before the rise of nationalism, focusing in particular on the increased number and the enhanced status of Turkish features in the language of the Phanariots.

Constantinople, Bucharest and Iaşi were the chief centres of Greek political and cultural power at that time. During the eighteenth century and until the early nineteenth, Bucharest was the capital of the Phanariot-governed principality of Wallachia and home to the princely academy, the most prestigious and influential of all Greek schools at the time (and the most important educational establishment in south-east Europe), while Iaşi was the capital of the Phanariot-governed principality of Moldavia. By com-

11 Gentilini does not mention the fact that some of the servants are supposed to be speaking in dialect: see the long quote from *La buona moglie* in Gentilini (1984: 327-31).

12 Note the phrase "δεν είναι καμία ταουσάνα ή δουλεύτρα" ('she's not some islander or maidservant': Goldoni 1988: 465). In Athens too, in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, households employed maidservants from the Greek islands until they were superseded by immigrants from certain more distant islands.

parison with these places, the Peloponnese, which has traditionally been assumed to be the region where Common Modern Greek developed, was insignificant in terms of its educational activity at that time. Thus the Greek language of Constantinople, Bucharest and Iaşi, far from being of peripheral interest to the historian of the Greek language, should be central.

The Ottomanist Johann Strauss has recently talked of "the new status of Turkish in the Phanariot era".[13] It seems clear that in the Phanariot period Ottoman Turkish took on the status of an administrative language and a language of culture for certain politically and culturally influential groups of Greek-speaking Orthodox Christians, not because the study of Turkish was imposed by the Ottoman authorities on their subjects in general (it wasn't) but because learning Turkish served the interests of these particular groups, in terms of material gain and social and political status. Another Ottomanist, Matthias Kappler (1996: 87), has talked of the phenomenon of "Ottomanization without Islamicization" of non-Muslim groups in cosmopolitan Ottoman cities.[14] The great influx of Turkish features into Greek in the Phanariot period took place not so much among those native Greek-speakers who were comparatively powerless and overwhelmingly dominated by Turkish overlords, as among those who lived on a more equal level with their Turkish colleagues.

It is significant that it was the knowledge of languages that enabled the Phanariots and the members of their circles to be successful in their careers, and in many cases to become rich and powerful. Writers such as Konstantinos (later Kaisarios) Dapontes (from the island of Skopelos), Rigas Velestinlis (from Thessaly) and the Constantinopolitan Iakovakis Rizos Neroulos, all of whom had worked as secretaries at the princely courts of Wallachia and Moldavia, had to know Turkish (both colloquial Turkish and formal Ottoman) as well as either French or Italian and had to master a huge vocabulary relating, for instance, to the titles of the various Ottoman and Romanian officials and the elaborate dress codes that applied to each of them (what Strauss 2013: 270, 266 calls "administrative Turkisms" and "diplomatic jargon"). Most of these words were from

13 Strauss (2013) has studied the presence of Turkish loanwords in Greek in Phanariot poetry, but not in dramatic texts. See also Chatzipanagioti-Sangmeister and Kappler (2010).

14 Greek-speaking characters in these texts sometimes use specifically Muslim terms and phrases without their religious meaning; for instance, in the *Saganaki*, Mavrogenis expresses his gratitude for a gift by saying "Αλλά μπερεκιάτ βερσίν" (T[urkish] *Allah bereket versin* 'may God grant abundance': Rigas 2011: 94), and Feraris exclaims "Αλλάχ ιτσιούν" (T *Allah için* 'for God's sake': Rigas 2011: 106). In a more recent publication Kappler (2013: 97) points out that there is a reference to the Islamic call to prayer in a love song included in *Erotos apotelesmata* (1792: 27).

either Turkish or Romanian, while many of those from Romanian had already been borrowed from Slavonic languages or Hungarian. Rigas' career was probably facilitated by the fact that he either spoke Vlach/Aromanian or at least knew some of the language before moving to the Romanian-speaking regions. Dapontes worked as British consul in Bucharest as well as second secretary to the prince of Wallachia (Paizi-Apostolopoulou 2003: 91), so he must have been highly competent in either Italian or French. He also acquired enough Ottoman Turkish to produce a Greek translation of an Ottoman ambassador's account of his embassy to the court of France.[15] Neroulos was proud of his knowledge of Turkish; he knew some Persian and Arabic and was well versed in Ottoman chancery style; he was also well acquainted with Ottoman poetry (Strauss 2013: 269-70, 275). The same goes for the great Enlightenment intellectual Dimitrios Katartzis. Phanariots who served as Grand Dragoman of the Porte even translated a number of non-literary works from French into Ottoman Turkish at the behest of the Sultan.[16]

Some of the Turkish and Romanian terms used in Phanariot circles came to be used in Greek outside the strictly Ottoman/Phanariot cultural area. Take Konstantinos Kokkinakis, who was born in Chios and lived in Vienna: in his translations of Kotzebue's dramas, whose action takes place in Germany, Kokkinakis frequently uses linguistic features that are characteristic of Constantinopolitan Greek, such as the adverb κομμάτι 'a bit', the accusative case for the indirect object, and certain forms of the verb βλέπω 'I see': the imperative διες/διέτε and the perfective non-past να διω etc.[17] Kokkinakis even uses words of Romanian origin, such as κοκόνα '[my] lady'[18] (< Rom. *cocon* (masc.) and *cocoană* (fem.)) and κοκονίτσα 'Miss' ("Mamsel" in the German text), βατάχος 'steward, majordomo'[19] (cf. Rom. *vătaf*, Bulg. *vătah*), καμαράσης 'counsellor' (< Rom. *cămăraş*) and even μάσα 'table' (< Rom. *masă*). Kokkinakis' translations also include a character bearing the name Saftica, a Romanian diminutive of Elizabeth. It is true that Kokkinakis had studied in Constantinople and Bucharest before settling in Vienna, but my point is that the Phanariots formed such a powerful and presti-

15 Yirmisekiz Çelebi Mehmet, *Fransa Serafetnamesi* (1721): see Strauss (2013: 265).

16 E.g. Konstantinos Ypsilantis' Ottoman Turkish translation of Vauban's *Oeuvres militaires* and Iakovakis Argyropoulos' translation of Castéra's *Histoire de Catherine II* (Cairo 1828 and 1830): see Kappler 2002: 43-4, where the date of publication of the Castéra translation appears as 1892 as a result of a typographical error.

17 The form διες 'look!' is also used in Rigas (1790). In the *Saganaki*, (the fictional) Mavrogenis uses the form "να διούμε!" ('let's see!': Rigas 2011: 80), which indicates that he is influenced by Constantinople speech despite not being from Constantinople.

18 Still used today by Istanbul Greeks (Zachariadis 2014).

19 E.g. Kokkinakis (2008: 299). Also used in the Goldoni translations as the equivalent of *maestro di casa* and *fattor*.

gious group in the Ottoman empire that their language was similarly prestigious. The language used by Kokkinakis in his translations of Kotzebue illustrates the spread of Phanariot cultural influence outside the Phanariot cultural area.

There developed in Constantinople an Ottoman Greek culture (analogous to the Veneto-Cretan culture in Crete from the thirteenth to the seventeenth centuries) consisting of an amalgam of various features of language, music, architecture, clothing and cuisine. People writing in Greek at the time used not only vocabulary borrowed from Turkish, but metaphors and expressions too: even when the characters are not using Turkish words, they often use phrases that are translated word for word from Turkish. I sometimes find that in order to understand such expressions I have to translate them word for word into Turkish and then look them up in a Turkish dictionary.

The authors of the Saganaki and the Goldoni translations must have known a good deal of Turkish, and whoever their intended audience might have been, they too would have had to know quite a lot of Turkish in order to understand the jokes. The use of Turkish loans in Greek texts of the eighteenth century provides important evidence of the consequences of contact between native speakers of different languages. Some of the characters in these comedies switch or mix codes between Greek and Turkish, both between sentences and within sentences, not only using official Ottoman expressions but uttering whole sentences in Turkish.[20] Sometimes it is difficult to distinguish code-mixing from the use of loanwords, especially when it comes to uninflected words such as adverbs. Such phenomena challenge us to try to discover the motivation for their use, by both the authors and their characters: is it for reasons of politeness, prestige, pretentiousness, humour, or simply fashion? Metaphors taken from various aspects of the Ottoman administration such as the legal system are frequently used (see, e.g., *Erotos apotelesmata* 1792: 83). Whereas we may have assumed that Turkish loanwords have entered Greek at a popular level, here we see highly educated Greeks using not only Turkish words that belong to colloquial registers but also Ottoman literary and technical terms belonging to learned and socially prestigious registers, and even words

20 Some of this occurs within sentences (code-mixing) and sometimes between sentences (code-switching): see Thomason (2003: 695). But how do we distinguish between code-switching and the use of loanwords? Generally in Greek, loanwords have to be adapted to Greek morphological patterns. But what's happening when a character responds to a statement made to him in Greek by using the single-word Turkish sentence *Gerçeksin*? (spelled *Γερτσέκσιν*; 'really?, is that so? (lit., 'are you real?')': Goldoni 401)? To complicate things even further, Emine Gürsoy-Naskali has pointed out to me that the normal Turkish form would be *gerçekmisin*? with an interrogative affix; according to her, the absence of the interrogative affix is a characteristic of "minority" speech in the Ottoman empire.

and phrases that are specifically associated with Islam.[21] But we also find everyday terms of endearment such as τζάνουμ ('my dear fellow', < T *canım*, literally 'my soul', used not only in the Goldoni translations but also by Kokkinakis) and τζιέρι μου (literally 'my liver', cf. T *ciğerim*, of which a more normal Greek equivalent might be σπλάχνο μου).

Literary scholars have often seen the Turkish loanwords and phrases used in Greek texts of the time as signs of "contamination" (Gentilini 1976: 30; 1997: 481): the Italian Hellenist Anna Gentilini (1984: 325), for instance, has talked disparagingly about "questa lingua ibrida e infarcita di prestiti linguistici".[22] However, these features are the almost inevitable consequence of language contact in a society where the most educated people were functionally bilingual or multilingual. Similarly, the Greek language controversy has sometimes led scholars to classify the language of these texts in terms of an anachronistic dichotomy between demotic and *katharevousa*. Thus Gentilini (1976: 30) states that the Goldoni translations are written in a "mixed" language, in which the demotic is "contaminated" by *katharevousa* features. Yet this is not really a "mixed language": it is just that these authors, unlike the Cretan Renaissance poets and unlike Katartzis, did not attempt a faithful representation of the phonology and morphology of the spoken language in their writings. The writers I am studying usually write the more archaic features *διά* 'for', *εις* 'to' and the nominal endings *-ν*, *-ις*, etc., instead of the more colloquial equivalents *για*, *σε*, -Ø and *–ι* [= modern *–η*]. Indeed, it is quite probable that educated people used to spruce up their language in this way when they were trying to speak politely; on the other hand, it might have been a convention that they *wrote* these learned forms but *pronounced* them in the colloquial manner.

The language used in the Goldoni translations is not "exceptional" or "unusual" within its geographical and cultural context; it only seems exceptional or unusual to Greek-speakers today.[23] Gentilini claims the Goldoni translations contain two hundred loanwords from Turkish that are not found elsewhere in any Greek text or dictionary of the last two hundred years, although she concedes that, in his *Δακικαί εφημερίδες*,

21 A distinction should perhaps be made between words of Turkish origin used in the same meaning as in Turkish, and others used in specifically Greek or Balkan meanings, and even possibly pseudo-Turkish loans such as *αριφτές* 'clever, skilful' and *αριφτελίκι* 'cleverness, skill'. For Balkan Turkisms see also Kappler (2000).

22 Cf. Thomason's (2003) use of the term "interference", which – quite apart from its pejorative connotations – is perhaps more appropriate for denoting contact-induced grammatical change or the influence of the mother tongue on people speaking a second language rather than the use of loanwords and code-switching.

23 A number of the words cited by Gentilini (1984: 331-32) as being unique to the Goldoni translations are found in other texts of the period.

Dapontes also uses a similar "Greek stuffed with Turkisms" (Gentilini 1997: 487, 486). Yet the *Saganaki*, *Alexandrovodas*, the so-called *Mismagies* (the manuscript anthologies of Phanariot songs) and other literary texts use a large number of words that (according to Gentilini 1984: 331-2) are unique to the Goldoni translations. As two more recent scholars have written, "Mixing up languages, first of all Greek and Turkish, in playful songs [in comedies too, I would add: PM] seems to have been a very popular tradition in Ottoman Greek society" (Chatzipanagioti-Sangmeister and Kappler 2010: 224-5).

5. Lexical, grammatical and sociolinguistic phenomena

In this section I will present some examples from a range of lexical, grammatical and sociolinguistic phenomena that occur in my chosen texts. Most of the interesting linguistic phenomena concern lexical and sociolinguistic features rather than phonology and morphology (which, as I have suggested, is often slightly archaized) and syntax.

5.1. Lexis and semantics

A number of commonly used native words have changed their meaning since that time, e.g.

- αποβάλλω 'reject' (Standard Modern Greek [SMG] απορρίπτω)
- πρόβλημα 'proposal, suggestion' (SMG πρόταση)
- ζήτημα 'demand' (SMG αίτημα)
- θεωρία (denoting both the appearance of something and the act of looking at it: thus άξια θεωρίας 'worth seeing' (Dapontes 1995: 150) = SMG αξιοθέατα)
- the singular of the adjective μερικός 'a certain amount of' (e.g. διά/από μερικόν καιρόν 'for some time', μερικόν στράτευμα 'some troops': Dapontès 1880: ξγ)
- the verb ακολουθεί 'it occurs, happens' (SMG συμβαίνει).

Also, unlike in SMG, τελείως (more often than not) and καμιά φορά (frequently) were used in negative rather than positive sentences (δεν με αρέσει τελείως 'I don't like it at all'), while ποσώς was obligatorily accompanied by a negative particle (δεν με αρέσει ποσώς, same meaning: Goldoni 1988: 428), whereas today it is often used in a negative

sense without a negative particle, e.g. "Ποσώς με ενδιαφέρουν τα τελεσίγραφα του ΔΝΤ [Διεθνούς Νομισματικού Ταμείου]" ('The IMF's ultimatums don't interest me one bit').

Loanwords. As we have already seen, the majority of the loanwords used in the texts under review are from Turkish and (less so) Italian, while some are from Romanian. Given that most members of the Phanariot circles had some competence in French, it is perhaps surprising that very few words of unambiguous French origin are found in these texts.[24] Here is an instance of several loanwords within a single sentence:

> "Οι χαβαδιτζήδες δεν απολείπουν, και μήπως αμέσως γετιστιρδίζουν εις τον θειόν μου και ύστερον φανώ άψηφος εις λόγου του· και με ακολουθεί μεγάλο κεδέρι εις τα ιντερέσσα μου."[25] ('There's no shortage of bearers of good tidings, and maybe they'll immediately convey the news [of my engagement] to my uncle, and then I'll appear to be disrespectful towards him; and that would do great harm to my [financial] interests': Goldoni 1988: 200).

Note the following words:

- χαβαδιτζής (< T *havadisçi* 'one who gathers or brings good news' < *havadis* 'good news').
- γετιστιρδίζω, v.t. (< T *yetiştirmek* 'convey [news]', causative of *yetişmek* 'arrive, reach'): causative verbs such as this (with the affix *–tir-/-dir-*) are among the Turkish features that Greek writers and speakers of this period seem to have found particularly useful; other examples include καζανδιρδίζω 'cause to gain or profit' (< T *kazandırmak*), σοϊλεδιρδίζω 'cause to speak' (< T *söyletirmek*),[26] αρτιρδίζω '[cause to] increase' (< T *artırmak*).[27] Some of these verbs are still used today in Istanbul Greek, but I can't think of any example of this kind of verb that is used in SMG.
- κεδέρι 'harm, damage' (< T *keder* 'care, grief, affliction').
- ιντερέσσο (< It. *interesse*, = SMG συμφέρον).

24 The only indubitably French loanword that I have found in Phanariot texts of the second half of the eighteenth century is the indeclinable feminine noun τρες 'gold braid' (< F *tresse*). This is found in Kallinikos (2004: 185), Momarz (1766: 35, 114, 117) and Sofianos (2011: 147). The indeclinable nature of this loanword word in Greek – a rare phenomenon at that time – prefigures the large number of indeclinable nouns from French and English in today's language.

25 As often in these texts, Greek δ in words of Turkish origin represents the pronunciation [d].

26 Both of these are used in Goldoni and *Saganaki*.

27 Goldoni; still used today in Istanbul.

Considering that this passage is found in a translation from Italian, it is remarkable that it contains far more loans from Turkish than from Italian; this is the case with the totality of the Goldoni translations done by this author.

The Greek of this period is characterized by a high degree of synonymy.[28] Doublets of Greek and foreign origin used in the Goldoni translations include the following: απελπισία and δισπερατσιόνε 'despair', περιέργεια and κουριοζιτά 'curiosity', δυστυχισμένος and ζάβαλης 'unhappy', περιπαίζω and ζεφκλενδίζω 'make fun of'. Examples of triple synonyms include εύγε (Ancient Greek), άφεριμ (< T *aferim*) and μπράβο (< It. *bravo*) 'well done!' In some cases we find an even larger repertoire of synonyms being used: μεταδοτικός, μεγαλόδωρος, μεγαλόψυχος, πλουσιόδωρος, γαλαντόμος (< Venetian *galantomo*), τζουμέρτης (< T *cömert*) 'generous'.[29] We do not find such an array of synonyms in the Italian original.

In some cases there is a clear stylistic differentiation between synonyms, e.g. ογλήγορα (neutral) 'quickly' and τσαπούκικα (slang in Greek, but < unmarked T *çabuk* 'fast') 'sharpish, double-quick, chop-chop, at the double', and φλυαρώ (high register) and τσαμπουνώ/τσαμπουνίζω (low register) 'talk garrulous nonsense, blather' (both are still used today).[30]

5.2. Idiomatic phrases calqued on Turkish (see also Spathis 1995: 395)

It is well known that the Balkan languages share a large number of idioms that are calqued from one language to another. I will mention here two types of phrasal calques that are used in these texts.

There are a number of transitive verb phrases consisting of the verb 'to do, make' followed by a direct object in the form of a noun. Such verb phrases, in which the verb has two direct objects, are copied from Turkish. Two of the few that survive today are κάνω ζάπτι 'I arrest, catch' (<T *zapt etmek*) and κάνω χάζι 'I like' (<T *hazzetmek*) – though not with the same meaning in SMG – while among the many more that have not survived are κάνω ιλζάμι 'I convince' < T *ilzam etmek* and κάμνω πεϊδάχι 'I procure, acquire' < T *peydah etmek*.

28 This situation runs contrary to Schendl's (2001: 33) claim that "there seems to be a tendency for languages (or rather their speakers) to avoid synonymous words for reasons of economy".

29 Also τζενερόζος (< It. *generoso*) in the speech of a servant. This last set of examples is taken from Daniel (1928: 10).

30 The first pair in Goldoni (1988), the second in Kokkinakis (2008).

Among the wealth of miscellaneous idioms that are probably calqued on Turkish, I will confine myself to a few examples that involve parts of the human body. A very widely used expression in texts of the time is δεν με δίδει χέρι 'it is not in my interest' (cf. T *el vermez* 'it is not worth it');[31] a pair of expressions comprises βγαίνει στο κεφάλι 'it is accomplished' (cf. T *başa çıkmak*) and its causative counterpart βγάζω στο κεφάλι 'accomplish' (cf. T *başa çıkarmak*);[32] and, lastly, "τι συμβεβηκός μεγάλο και ανέλπιστο οπού ήλθε εις το κεφάλι μου" ('what a great and unexpected accident has befallen me'; cf. T *başa gelmek*: Goldoni 1988: 201).[33]

5.3. Grammar

Phonology and orthography

Certain sounds are represented unsystematically in the texts, e.g. [nd] is written as αφέντης, αφένδης, αφέδης.[34]

For [b] [d] [ʃ] [ʤ] some writers use the diacritics that had been developed for use in *karamanlidika* earlier in the eighteenth century (p̈, ḋ, s̈,[35] ṫẓ), but most make do with the unadorned Greek alphabet: thus [kurdízo] is variously represented as κουρδίζω, κουρντίζω and κουρτίζω.[36]

31 I also found this in an internet forum: "δεν με διευκολύνει, δεν μου «δίνει χέρι»'.

32 Both are also used by Rigas Velestinlis and Yannis Vilaras; the latter also in Molière (1988: 65) and in Georgios Vizyenos' story "Το μόνον της ζωής του ταξείδιον" but apparently not in SMG.

33 See also Rigas 1790: 18; cf. Zachariadis 2014, s.v. ντουρ μπακαλούμ: "ποιος ξέρει τι θα 'ρθει ακόμα στο κεφάλι μας;"

34 All these are found in Goldoni. This might seem to suggest that in that sociolect [d] was pronounced without prenasalization. However, the Constantinopolitan Katartzis, in his discussion of combinations of letters such as <ντ>, states explicitly that Αντώνις 'Anthony' is pronounced Αν-ντων-ις [andónis] (Katartzis 1970: 241), and prenasalization is still a feature of Constantinople speech today (Zachariadis 2014: 23). Another explanation for αφέδης is that it is meant to be spoken by characters from certain parts of the Greek-speaking world other than Constantinople; it is striking that a Cephallonian character in *Αυξεντιανός* (2011) repeatedly addresses others as αφέδη.

35 For [ʃ] the sigma is in fact surmounted by three dots in a triangular pattern, but I am unable to reproduce this here. Christodoulos Christodoulou informs me that this use of three dots follows Arabic practice, *šīn* [ʃ] being distinguished from *sīn* [s] in the same way in Arabic script.

36 Despite this use of sigma with a diacritic, Christos Tzitzilis (personal communication) claims that speakers of Constantinople Greek pronounced Turkish <ş> [ʃ] as [s], adducing as evidence the fact that Katartzis, in his sketch for a grammar of spoken Greek dating from the 1780s, explicitly omits what he calls the "σιελώδες σίμα [sic]" ('salivary/slobbery sigma') from his list of Modern Greek sounds on the grounds that it is not generally used in Modern Greek but is confined to certain parts of Roumeli (Katartzis 1970: 218). However, it is not clear what Katartzis understands by the term "Roumeli"; and he does not say explicitly that this sound is *not* used in words of Turkish origin. Besides, spellings such as σιαστίζω (< T *şaşmak*) and τζιάμπα (< T *caba*; both in Kokkinakis 2008) suggest that Turkish palato-alveolar sounds such as [ʃ] and [ʤ] may have been pronounced in loanwords in Greek.

Spellings such as μπελιάς (Soutsos 1995: 134) indicate the Turkish palatal pronunciation of /l/ in this particular vocabulary item, as opposed to the "dark l" normally used before mid and back vowels in Turkish and in Constantinopolitan Greek, both then and now.

Morphophonology

If we adopt a synchronic approach to historical linguistics, we can look not only at how the present-day language developed, but at features that appeared and then disappeared again. A curious phenomenon found in these texts is affrication in the vocative singular and nominative plural of certain words borrowed from Romanian, where morphophonological features have been borrowed along with the vocabulary item. E.g. ποστέλνικος 'chamberlain', voc. sg. ποστέλνιτσε, nom. pl. ποστέλνιτσοι:[37] this phenomenon is due to the affrication of /k/ before /i/ and /e/ in the voc. sg. and nom. pl. of the corresponding words in Romanian: *postelnic* [postélnik], voc. sg. *postelnice* [postélniʧe], nom. pl. *postelnici* [postélniʧ]. This is a rare instance of the morphophonological influence of another language on Greek before very recent times (cf. modern plurals such as φιλμς 'films' today, influenced by English). However. these phenomena applied only to a limited number of loanwords and were not generalized elsewhere. Perhaps they were originally instances of interference observed in the Greek spoken by native speakers of Romanian rather than direct borrowings from Romanian by native Greek-speakers into their own language.

Conversely Italian [ʧ] and [ʤ] are sometimes rendered as [c] and [ɟ] respectively, e.g.

- κολέγκιο (< It. *collegio*: Goldoni 1988: 132),[38] to which we can add from other sources
- γκενεράλης (< It. *generale*), μπογκιόρνο (< It. *buongiorno*: Dimitrios Gouzelis, Zakynthos, late eighteenth century), and also
- Παρίγγι in Savogias Rousmelis (also Zakynthos, mid-eighteenth century).

37 Other instances include παχάρνιτσε (*pacarnic*: title of another office-holder; Soutsos 1995: 7 and Rigas 2011: 64), βορνιτσέσα (fem. of *vornic* [another title]: Soutsos 1995: 28), βατάσσε (voc. of βατάχος: Goldoni 1988: 127; already noted by Daniel 1928: 17; however, Kokkinakis [2008: 380] uses the voc. sg. βατάχε); cf. the derivatives γραμματιτσία ('secretariat': Dapontes 1995: 22; cf. Rom. *grămăticie*), παχαρνιτσία (the office of the *paharnic*: Dapontès 1880: λγ; cf. Rom. *păhărnicie*) and ποστελνιτσέλος ('official subordinate to a *postelnic*', < Rom. *postelnicel*: Rigas 2011: 238).

38 Also πακιάρω (Goldoni 1988: 54, 61, 395), probably < It. *impacciare* 'to bother'.

These seem to be spelling loans resulting from transcribing the Italian letters <c> and <g> as <κ> and <γκ> (or <γγ>) respectively.

As with lexis, these texts display considerable inconsistency in morphology and phonology (see Gentilini 1976: 32-33). Nevertheless, they make fairly systematic use of some typically Northern Greek morphological and syntactical features, particularly the following:

- the use of –α rather than –ε in the expanded accusative singular forms of certain pronouns: αυτόνα 'him', εκείνηνα 'her', διες τονα/τηνα 'look at him/her', ποιόνα/ποιάνα 'whom.'[39]
- endoclisis or clitic infixation, i.e. the placing of a first-person singular clitic object pronoun between the stem and the plural ending of imperative forms: πέ(σ)μετέ το 'tell me', κρύψεμέτε 'hide me' (Goldoni 1988: 523), δώσεμέτε το 'give it to me', δώσμετε (*Erotos apotelesmata* 1792: 163); also a single example of an analogical non-imperative form: θέλεμέτε μάθει πως σας ηξεύρω 'you'll find out that I know you' (Goldoni 1988: 464).[40]
- the use of the accusative for the indirect object (με το είπες 'you told me it'), but
- the use of [tis] (conventionally spelled της) for the masculine as well as the feminine sg. indirect object: της το δίνει 'he gives it to him' (Goldoni 1988: 473), της το δίνουν 'they give it to him' (Soutsos 1995: 16); in fact this construction is not confined to northern Greek dialects but has – or once had – a wide geographical distribution.[41]

In *verb morphology* the texts of this period use modernized imperfective forms of Ancient Greek verbs in –μι where SMG uses forms that are closer to the ancient ones:

39 For the last two see Goldoni (1988: 471, 472).

40 Cf. Joseph 1989 (quoting Tzartzanos 1909 and Thavoris 1977) and Ralli 2006. While Ralli confines this phenomenon to monosyllabic imperative forms, two of my examples are based pn the disyllabic forms κρύψε and δώσε.

41 Other examples are found in *Alexandrovodas* and *Saganaki* as well as Goldoni. Sometimes these texts also use the Italian-style third-person feminine singular pronoun of politeness (της το είπα 'I told your worship'). The Italian editors of the Goldoni texts have been confused by the two uses, to the extent that they have interpreted every use of της referring to a male as an expression of politeness, even when the character referred to is a servant (e.g. Goldoni 1988: 236; contrast Gentilini 1976: 32). The example I quote in the main text cannot possibly be the feminine of politeness, since it appears in a stage direction. For the use of this construction in Medieval Greek see the pioneering article by Lendari and Manolessou (2003) and also Lendari (2007: 119-21).

- αποδείχνω 'I prove' (widespread; also used by Korais and in the Vienna newspaper *Εφημερίς* [1790s]) < AG ἀποδείκνυμι (contrast SMG αποδεικνύω).
- κατασταίνω and καταστήνω 'I render' < AG καθίστημι (contrast SMG καθιστώ).[42]

The *past perfect* of the type με είχες πει is found (even with the word order είχε της το ειπεί: Goldoni 1988: 525), but I have found no instance of the modern present perfect of the έχω πει type.

Future tenses are regularly formed either with personal θέλω + non-finite verb (θέλω σε δώσει 'I will give you'), or less with frequently impersonal θέλει + finite verb (θέλει σε δώσω 'ditto'), and occasionally with both verbs in finite forms (δεν θέλουν σε ιδούν 'they won't see you'),[43] or else θενα + finite verb (θενα είναι 'it will be': Goldoni 1988: 428);[44] I have found very few instances of the future formed with the modern particle θα.[45]

Voice and transitivity

Here are three instances where a passive verb form used in the eighteenth century has since been replaced by an active form in the same meaning:

- the transitive deponent verb επιχειρίζομαι 'I undertake' (SMG επιχειρώ),
- the transitive deponent verb συγχαίρομαι 'I congratulate' (SMG συγχαίρω, which however still uses passive forms in the perfective: συγχάρηκα, συγχαρώ), and
- the passive verb θυμώνομαι 'I get angry' (passive of transitive verb θυμώνω 'I anger', which is now employed in both transitive and intransitive uses).

Syntax

In texts of this period the use of αρχίζω with the perfective is extraordinarily frequent (e.g. άρχισε να τραγωδήσει 'he began to sing': *Erotos apotelesmata* 1792: 20).[46] It remains to be investigated what rule lies behind the choice of aspect after αρχίζω, and how, when and where the present absolute rule (αρχίζω + imperfective) developed.

42 Kriaras (1968-) has κατασταίνω, but not καταστήνω.

43 In epistemic use with past reference, non-finite θέλει (rather than θέλω + non-finite form) is used (θέλει άλλαξα 'I must have changed', Goldoni 1988: 363).

44 Also occasionally θανα, and even once θαν (θαν πάρει 'he will take').

45 In the 540-page edition of the Goldoni translations I have only found two instances: one (θα προξενήσει 'it will cause': Goldoni 1988: 211) in a speech addressed by the miserly Ottavio to his money and the other (θα φα 'he will eat': Goldoni 1988: 62) uttered by a servant whose speech is characterized by certain Ionian Island features.

46 This construction is also very frequently found in texts from the Ionian Islands, from this period and later.

A striking example of syntactic code-mixing within a complex noun phrase is the following mixture of Greek, Turkish and Persian syntax in a fictional speech by Prince Nikolaos Mavrogenis:

οι χαΐνηδες δίνι	δοβλέτι	αλιγενήν
the traitors religion-and	state-PART	lofty-POSS

'the traitors of religion and the lofty [Ottoman] state' (Rigas 2011: 64).

(Note the dot over the two deltas to indicate the sound [d].) The noun phrase οι χαΐνηδες is Greek (χαΐνης < T *hain* < Arabic), the phrase *din ü devlet-i aliyye* is Persian (the [originally Arabic] noun *devlet* is linked to the [originally Arabic feminine] adjective *aliyye* by the Persian *izafet* particle *–i*), while the final *–nin* is the Turkish possessive suffix even though in all other respects the syntax of the whole phrase is totally un-Turkish.[47] I believe the author of this text (who was probably Rigas Velestinlis) knew exactly what he was doing, and that he was doing it for comic purposes.

5.4. Register, purism and slang

Regarding politeness phenomena, one could in future study

- forms of address, such as the uses of the singular and plural of the second person when addressing a single individual, and the use of various forms of address such as η Ευγενεία σας and η Αφεντιά σου;
- the use of Δούλος σας 'your servant' as an expression of leavetaking ('I take my leave of you'), with which we can compare both It. *schiavo* and T *kulunuz*; and
- hypercorrections in the service of politeness (and obsequiousness), e.g. ορίσθε and καθίσθε for ορίστε (various meanings, including 'kindly come this way') and καθίστε 'sit down' (frequently in Goldoni, but also in *Afxentianos* 2010: 329), and εγνωρίζω for γνωρίζω 'I know' (e.g. obsequious servant to master in Kokkinakis 322; otherwise γνωρίζω throughout the same text).[48]

47 Thanks to Matthias Kappler for explaining the complex structure of this phrase to me.

48 It may be that these hypercorrections are not always deliberate on the author's or copyist's part; we find -σθε for -στε in the writings of the 16th-century Corfiot notary Dimitrios Farmakis and later in Solomos, while εγνωρίζω is frequently found (see Kriaras 1968-, s.v. γνωρίζω).

The authors of these texts display a sophisticated sociolinguistic awareness of the lexical and morphological aspects of the various linguistic registers used by members of different classes, as well as the various registers used by the same individuals in different circumstances. Some efforts towards a degree of linguistic purism (especially in morphology) can be seen in the speech of higher-class characters when they are trying to be serious and impressive. The purpose of this purism is not so much in order to make their speech more like *Ancient* Greek, but in order to sound more *refined* than their servants: the motivation for such morphological archaism in the speech of higher-class characters is based on considerations of class (social divisions within the Orthodox Christian community, involving a sense of superiority vis-à-vis other social classes) rather than nationalism and national identity (social homogeneity within a nation that is felt to be superior to other nations), as was the prime motivation of Greek purism in the age of nationalism.[49]

Finally, one of the most interest aspects of some of these texts is the use of slang in the speech of some of the characters. Characters in *Alexandrovodas* use slang to avoid being understood in case they are overheard by Turks, e.g.: "Οι μπάτσοι γρόμπους θέλουν" ('The Turks want dosh'). Nowadays μπάτσοι refers to the police, while γρόμπος (lit. 'lump') is still used in some dialects to mean a secret hoard of cash.[50] Slang is also sometimes used for reasons other than secrecy: for instance, one character in the same play says to another: "Οι πούστηδες σαν καρτιάσουν γίνονται ιμπνέδες" ('When they get past their prime, *puşt*s become *ibné*s': Soutsos 1995: 101-2; Redhouse (1968) renders both of these nouns as 'catamite'.)[51] The verb καρτιάζω is an internal Greek development, from the adjective κάρτης (< T *kart* 'tough, hard, not fresh or tender; (colloq.) past its prime').[52] It is indicative of the author's satirical thrust that these vulgar expressions are spoken by members of a princely court rather than by members of the working class.[53]

49 A rare exception occurs in *Afxentianos* (2010: 386-87), where a learned bishop responds to a priest who has failed to understand his high-flown Greek: "Don't you know that we are Hellenes and the children of Hellenes? Do you think Christianity rejects γένος [racial descent]? Besides, by recovering their ancestral language […], the learned rejoice in attaining their own language […]".

50 In Samos and parts of Crete (e.g. Kisamos), according to *Istorikon lexikon* (1933-).

51 Still today in colloquial Greek, a μπινές seems to be considered in some way inferior to a πούστης.

52 The verb καρτιάζω is still used in Constantinople Greek today according to Zachariadis (2014), who defines it as "Χάνω τη νεότητά μου, τη φρεσκάδα μου" ('I lose my youth, my freshness') and quotes the following sentence: "είχα χρόνια να τη δω και ξαφνιάστηκα, κάρτιασε κι αυτή σαν και μένα" ('I hadn't seen her for years, and I was surprised; she's lost her freshness, just like me'). According to the same authority the form ιμπνές (SMG μπινές) is also still in use in Constantinople Greek.

53 See also the footnotes in which the author glosses certain Turkish loanwords (Soutsos 1995: 101-3).

6. Conclusions

Questions we might ask – to which I haven't attempted to provide answers in this paper – might include the following:

- To what extent do the Constantinopolitan features in these texts result from the fact that Constantinopolitan is part of a wider dialect area, which Christos Tzitzilis calls "Thraco-Bithynian"?[54]
- Are we dealing only with a localized dialect or sociolect, or is there evidence that the linguistic features noted here had a wider distribution?
- What can the language of these texts tells us about attempts to form a "common language", and in what ways might this common language have differed from today's?
- To what extent has Standard Modern Greek drawn from Constantinople Greek?

I acknowledge that some of the developments I have mentioned are dead ends and some are confined to a particular cultural environment in a particular region. But without sorting out the dead ends and the byways from the arterial thoroughfares we will not be in a position to assess the contribution of Constantinopolitan/Phanariot Greek to later developments in the Greek language as a whole.

References

Afxentianos. 2010. *Afxentianos Metanoimenos [1752]*, edited by Iosif Vivilakis. Athens: Akadimia Athinon.

Chatzipanagioti-Sangmeister, Ilia. 2001. "To 'Scholeion ton Ntelikaton Eraston' kai to 'Erotos Apotelesmata': Nea Stoicheia gia ta Stichourgimata tous". *Eranistis* 23:143–165.

Chatzipanagioti-Sangmeister, Ilia, and Matthias Kappler. 2010. "Thoughts on the Turkish Verses in Phanariot Poetry Collections (1750–1821)." In

54 Tzitzilis forthcoming. For the time being, see Tsolaki (2008: 53-56) for a summary of the morphological characteristics of Thraco-Bithynian group.

Cries and Whispers in Karamanlidika Books. Proceedings of the First International Conference on Karamanlidika Studies (Nicosia 11th-13th September 2008), edited by Evangelia Balta and Matthias Kappler, 219–240. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz [Turcologica 83].

Chatzipanagioti-Sangmeister, Ilia et al., eds. 2013. *Fanariotika kai Astika Stichourgimata stin Epochi tou Neoellinikou Diafotismou*. Athens: Akadimia Athinon.

Daniel, Valérie. 1928. *Une Traduction Inédite en Grec Moderne de Goldoni. La Question du Prodigo*. Paris: Hachette.

Dapontès, Constantin. 1880. *Dakikai Efimerides/Éphémerides daces ou Chronique de la Guerre de Quatre ans (1736-1739)*, edited by Émile Legrand, vol. 1. Paris: Ernest Leroux.

Dapontes, Kaisarios. 1995. *Kipos Chariton*, edited by G. P. Savvidis. Athens: Ermis.

Dehèque, F. D. 1825. *Dictionnaire Grec Moderne Français*. Paris: Jules Duplessis.

Drachman, Gabriell. 1973. "Baby Talk in Greek." *Ohio State University Working Papers in Linguistics* 15:174–189.

Erotos Apotelesmata. 1792. Vienna: Georgios Ventotis.

Gentilini, Anna. 1976. *Una Traduzione Neogreca Inedita:* La Moglie Saggia *di C. Goldoni*. Padua: Università di Padova.

Gentilini, Anna. 1984. "Il ms. Greco Brux. 14612: Note per l'Edizione", *Museum Patavinum*, anno 2, n. 2:325–334.

Gentilini, Anna. 1997. "Turchismi in un Testo di Greco Periferico fra Settecento e Ottocento", in *Atti del Secondo Incontro Internazionale di Linguistica Greca*, edited by Emanuele Banfi, 479–512. Trento: Dipartimento di scienze filologiche e storiche.

Glytzouris, Antonis. 2015. "Panourges Chires sto Perithorio tou Neoellinikou Diafotismou." In *Logos kai Chronos sti Neoelliniki Grammateia (18os-19os Aionas): Praktika Synedriou pros Timin tou Alexi Politi*, edited by Stefanos Kaklamanis, Alexis Kalokairinos and Dimitris Polychronakis, 143–56. Heraklion: Panepistimiakes Ekdoseis Kritis.

Goldoni. 1988. Anna Gentilini, Lidia Martini, and Cristina Stevanoni, eds., *Dieci Commedie di Goldoni Tradotte in Neogreco (Ms. Bruxelles Bibl. royale 14612)*. Padua: La Garangola.

Istorikon Lexikon tis Neas Ellinikis Glossis. 1933-. Athens: Akadimia Athinon.

Janda, Richard D., and Brian D. Joseph. 2003. "Introduction." In *The Handbook of Historical Linguistics*, 1–180. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Joseph, Brian D. 1989. "I Ermineia Merikon Vorion Tipon tis Prostaktikis Symfona me ti Simerini Morfologiki Theoria." *Elliniki Dialektologia*

1:21–26.
Kallinikos III. 2004. *Ta kata kai meta tin Exorian Episymvanta*, edited by Agamemnon Tselikas. Athens: Morfotiko Idryma Ethnikis Trapezis.
Kaplanis, Tassos. 2009. "'Modern Greek' in 'Byzantium'? The Notion of 'Early Modern' in Greek Studies." In *Greek Research in Australia: Proceedings of the Biennial International Conference of Greek Studies, Flinders University June 2007*, edited by Elizabeth Close et al., 343–356. Adelaide: Flinders University.
Kappler, Matthias. 1993. *Turcismi Nell' "Alipasiadha" di Chatzi Sechretis: un Poema Epico Neogreco del Primo Ottocento e le sue Parole Ottomane*. Turin: S. Zamorani.
Kappler, Matthias. 1996. "Fra Religione e Lingua/grafia nei Balcani: i Musulmani Grecofoni (XVIII-XIX sec.) e un Dizionario Rimato Ottomano-greco di Creta.'' *Oriente Moderno* n.s. 15, 76 (3):79–112.
Kappler, Matthias. 2000. "Verso un Nuovo Thesaurus dei Turcismi Balcanici: la Dimensione Dialettale e Materiale sui Turcismi Greco-epiroti dei secoli XVIII-XIX." In *Processi di Convergenza e Differenziazione Nelle Lingue dell'Europa Medievale e Moderna*, edited by F. Fusco, V. Orioles, A. Parmeggiani, 157–194. Udine: Forum Editrice.
Kappler, Matthias. 2002. *Turkish Language Contacts in South-East Europe*. Istanbul: Isis Press.
Kappler, Matthias. 2013. "Two Cities of Beloveds, One Garden of Love: the Case of *Erotos Apotelesmata*". In *Fanariotika kai Astika Stichourgimata stin Epochi tou Neoellinikou Diafotismou*, edited by Chatzipanagioti-Sangmeister et al., 89–105. Athens: Akadimia Athinon.
Katartzis, Dimitris. 1970. *Ta Evriskomena*, edited by Konstantinos Th. Dimaras. Athens: Ermis.
Kokkinakis, Konstantinos. 2008. *Theatrikes Metafraseis tou August von Kotzebue: Ekousios Thysia, Misanthropia kai Metanoia, Ptocheia kai Andreia, Oi Korsai (Vienni 1801)*, edited by Walter Puchner. Athens: Idryma Kosta kai Elenis Ourani.
Kriaras, Emmanouil. 1968-. *Lexiko tis Mesaionikis Ellinikis Dimodous Grammateias, 1100-1669*. Thessaloniki: Ypourgeio Ethnikis Paideias kai Thriskevmaton and Kentro Ellinikis Glossas.
Lendari, Tina. 2007. *Afigisis Livistrou kai Rodamnis (Livistros and Rodamne): The Vatican Version*. Athens: Morfotiko Idryma Ethnikis Trapezis.
Lendari, Tina, and Io Manolessou. 2003. "I Ekfora tou Emmesou Antikimenou sti Mesaioniki Elliniki: Ekdotika kai Glossologika Provlimata."