Mark Janse

9 Back to the future: Akritic light on diachronic variation in Cappadocian (East Asia Minor Greek)

Abstract: Cappadocian is an East Asia Minor Greek variety most closely related to Pharsiot and Pontic. Having been cut off from the rest of the Greek-speaking world after the defeat of the Byzantine army by the Seljuk Turks in the battle at Manzikert (1071), Cappadocian was increasingly Turkicized, but the Greek component preserved its essentially Late Medieval Greek character. Unfortunately, our evidence for the historical development of Cappadocian is very scanty, consisting as it does of a few dozen inscriptions from the famous “rock-cut” churches of Cappadocia and the Greek poems written in Arabic script by the thirteenth-century Persian poet-scholar Rūmī and his son Sultan Walad. In this chapter I analyze new and hitherto unexplored evidence for diachronic variation in Cappadocian: Medieval Akritic songs orally transmitted through the ages in Cappadocia. The language of these songs, composed in the traditional Byzantine decapentasyllable or political verse, is a mixture of Late Medieval / Early Modern Greek and nineteenth-century Cappadocian, linguistically reminiscent of the Ancient Greek epic, which also combined archaic and innovative features in a set metrical framework. Apart from loanwords and grammatical patterns borrowed from Turkish, the so-called “Byzantine residue” of Cappadocian offers a unique glimpse of language variation and change in Late Medieval / Early Modern Greek.

1 Introduction: diachronic variation in Cappadocian

Cappadocian is perhaps the most famous representative of what is commonly referred to as “Asia Minor Greek”, ever since it was presented as a prime example of heavy borrowing in Thomason and Kaufman’s groundbreaking study of language contact (1988: 215–222).¹ Their use of the term was inspired by the

¹ Research for this chapter was done within the framework of a collaborative research project funded by the HERA network entitled ‘Multilingualism and Minority Languages in Ancient Europe’ (HERA.15.029). Embryonic versions of section 2 were presented at the U4 Winter School in Istanbul (2012), at the Seeger Center for Hellenic Studies of Princeton University (2017), at the Netherlands Institute at Athens (2019) and, obviously, at our ‘Varieties’ conference. I thank the

title of Dawkins' *Modern Greek in Asia Minor*, who explicitly restricted it to the dialects “native to Asia Minor” (D5), especially the dialects of Cappadocia, Phrasia and Pontus, which “must be regarded as having at one time formed a continuous linguistic area” (D205), referred to as “the medieval Greek dialect of eastern Asia Minor” (D213). It is therefore better to call this dialectal subgroup “East Asia Minor Greek” (Janse 2008: 190) and to use the term “Asia Minor Greek” exclusively as a geographic designation to include all the “varieties of Greek spoken in the Asia Minor peninsula” from the Middle Ages until the early twentieth century.² East Asia Minor Greek is a medieval descendant of the Asia Minor or Anatolian Koine.³ Its subgrouping is a matter of controversy, the details of which need not detain us here.⁴ The “accepted genealogical classification” (Karatsareas 2011: 50), based on Janse (2008: 191), is given in Figure 1 (where the dotted lines indicate contact zones). The subgrouping of the Cappadocian dialects is displayed in Table 1 (based on Janse 2008: 191).⁵

various audiences for insightful thoughts and comments, particularly Emmanuel Bourbouhakis and Brian D. Joseph. Special thanks are due to Marjolijne Janssen for her expert comments on an earlier version of this chapter, to Wolfgang de Melo and Federica Lazzerini for providing me with a digital photocopy of Levidis (1892), and to Nick ‘Opoudjis’ Nicholas for sending me a copy of Dedes (1993).

Abbreviations used in this chapter: AncGr = Ancient Greek, Cappa = Cappadocian, CC = Central Cappadocian, EMedGr = Early Medieval Greek, EModGr = Early Modern Greek, Lat. = Latin, LMedGr = Late Medieval Greek, MedGr = Medieval Greek, ModGr = Modern Greek, NEC = Northeast Cappadocian, NWC = Northwest Cappadocian, PcGr = Post-classical Greek, SEC = Southeast Cappadocian, SWC = Southwest Cappadocian, Tk. = Turkish.

2 Cf. Ralli (2019: 8–12), Manolesou (2019: 20).

3 On the Asia Minor or Anatolian Koine see Bubeník (1989: 237–252; 2014: 285), Brixhe (1987; 2010).

4 The controversy concerns the position of Phrasiot within the Proto-Cappadocian subgroup of East Asia Minor Greek. Dawkins (D206), followed by Andriotis (1948: 10), Anastasiadis (1975: 177; 1976: 16; 1995: 111–119), Janse (e.g. 2008: 190–191; 2020: §4) groups Phrasiot with Pontic; Kontosopoulos (1994: 10), followed by Janse in earlier publications (e.g. 1998b: 523), groups Phrasiot with Cappadocian; Karatsareas (2011: 53; 2013: 207–208) considers Phrasiot to be a subbranch separate from Cappadocian-Pontic. Instead of East Asia Minor Greek, Manolesou uses the term “Inner Asia Minor Greek” (2019: 20, 29), which is confusing, as it was used by Kontosopoulos to refer to Cappadocian-Phrasiot as a subbranch separate from Pontic (1994: 10; cf. Janse 1998b: 523).

5 The division between North, Central and South Cappadocian is due to Dawkins (D211), who also presents arguments to group Delmeso, geographically southwest, with Sinasos and Potamia, geographically northeast (D10 & D211). The consequential grouping of Silata, Anaku, Floita and Malakopi is confirmed by Costakis (1964: 9). Dawkins considers Ulağaç and Semendere as a separate group within South Cappadocian (D18; cf. Kesisoglou 1951: 2–3), and also notes the intimate connection between Aravan and Ghurzono (D18; cf. Phosteris & Kesisoglou 1960: τ’).

Figure 1: The accepted genealogical classification of the East Asia Minor Greek dialects.

Map 1: Geographical distribution of Cappadocian and Pharasiot.

Our information about the historical development of Cappadocian is largely indirect. An interesting discussion of the evidence provided by loanwords is given by Dawkins (D193-197). Noting the “rarity of Italian words in the vocabulary”, he concludes that Cappadocian was separated, culturally as well as geographically,

Table 1: Subgrouping of the Cappadocian dialects.

NORTH CAPPADOCIAN		
NORTHWEST CAPPADOCIAN		NORTHEAST CAPPADOCIAN
– Floīta		– Sinasos
– Silata		– Potamia
– Anaku		
– Malakopi		– Delmeso
CENTRAL CAPPADOCIAN		
– Axo		
– Misti		
SOUTH CAPPADOCIAN		
SOUTHWEST CAPPADOCIAN		SOUTHEAST CAPPADOCIAN
– Aravan		– Ulağaç
– Ghurzono		– Semendere
– Fertek		

from “the rest of Greek” during the long period of Italian domination, beginning with the Fourth Crusade (1202–1204) (D193).⁶ The abundance of Latin loanwords, on the other hand, indicates that Cappadocian was “in full connexion with the rest of the Greek world in the early Byzantine period” and that “the separation came later, and before the appearance of the Italian words” and was “due to the arrival of the Turks in Asia Minor, where the Seljuks were fully settled by the latter part of the eleventh century” (D195), following the defeat of the Byzantine army at the battle of Manzikert (1071).⁷

The Turkicization of Cappadocian extended over a long period from the twelfth century until the exchange of populations between Greece and Turkey in 1923–1924. Writing in 1915, Dawkins has this to say about the extent of “the Turkish element” in Cappadocian: “as the language of dominant race, its influence is steadily increasing, even to the point of crowding the dialect out of existence altogether” (D197). The Turkicization of Cappadocian was such that Thomason

⁶ When Dawkins conducted his fieldwork (1909–1911), he noted an increase in Italian loanwords, “not in itself, but as part of the growing influence of the common Greek at such villages as Sinasos and Potamia” (D197).

⁷ The literature on the Turkish conquest of Asia Minor and its political and military consequences is abundant, but Vryonis’ account remains a classic statement (1971: 69–142).

and Kaufman present it as their first case study, labelling it “an excellent example of heavy borrowing” (1988: 215), category 5 (the highest) in their borrowing scale (1988: 74–76).⁸ They make the very interesting observation that most dialects “clearly retain enough inherited Greek material to count as Greek dialects in the full genetic sense,” but “a few dialects may be close to or even over the border of nongenetic development” (1988: 93–94), an idea developed in more detail in Janse (2007).⁹ Especially the Southeast Cappadocian dialects of Ulağaç and Semendere are typologically closer to Turkish than to Greek, having vowel harmony, agglutinative morphology and SOV-type word order.¹⁰

Extremely interesting as these Turkish features may be, much more relevant for the purpose of the present volume is what Vryonis calls the “Byzantine residue” (1971: 444–497) of Cappadocian, which Kitromilides considers “a form of idiomatic Medieval Greek” (1990: 5). This is immediately apparent from the great number of MedGr words in the Cappadocian lexicon (Janse 2020: §11), but also from the great number of grammatical archaisms, e.g. the retention of the so-called ‘postpositive article’ as relative pronoun,¹¹ the retention of the AncGr possessive adjectives ἐμός, σός, ἡμέτερος, ὑμέτερος in a variety of forms,¹² the retention of the AncGr interrogative pronoun τίς,¹³ the retention of the aorist passive in -ην instead of -ηκα,¹⁴ the retention of the PcGr / MedGr order of clitic pronouns,¹⁵ the retention of να with the subjunctive to express a simple

8 Cappadocian is also assigned a prominent position in Winford (2005: 402–409).

9 Elsewhere, I have compared the Cappadocian language-dialect continuum with a creole continuum (Janse 2009: 38).

10 For a general survey see Dawkins (D197–203), Janse (2009).

11 Cf. Dawkins (D127), Janse (1999; 2020: §8.2.5.2). In LMedGr, the relative pronoun τόν, τήν, τό is “very frequent in lower-register texts” and has been called “the commonest form of the relative pronoun” (CGMG 2.1098).

12 Cf. Dawkins (D122–124), Janse (2020: §7.4.2). These had become “residual forms” in LMedGr, as they “disappeared from spoken use in the first millennium” (CGMG 2.914).

13 Cf. Dawkins (D126), Janse (2020: §7.4.7). In LMedGr and EModGr the ModGr interrogative pronoun ποῖος > ποιός “is fully synonymous with τίς, but is employed much more frequently” (CGMG 2.1004 & 2.1010).

14 The actual endings are often active instead of passive, frequently a mixture of both, e.g. Delmeso (ἐ)λύθα, -θης, -θην, -θαμ', -θετε, -θαν (D145). The disappearance of the old endings in LMedGr was a “gradual process” (CGMG 3.1630).

15 Cf. Janse (1993; 1994; 1998a; 2020: §8.2.3.1); for MedGr see Horrocks (1990), Mackridge (1993b; 2000), CGMG (4.2026–2037).

future.¹⁶ Most of these archaisms are also attested in Pharasiot and Pontic and can safely be regarded as features of the East Asia Minor variety of MedGr.

Unfortunately, the written evidence for the diachronic development of Cappadocian is very scanty. Manolessou (2019: 29–34) provides a useful summary of the little we have: inscriptions from the Cappadocian rock-cut churches (9th–11th c.) and the Greek poems written in Arabic script by the Persian philosopher Rūmī and his son Sultan Walad (13th–14th c.), which have been identified as representing Cappadocian as spoken in the LMedGr period on the basis of a number of distinctive features,¹⁷ e.g. the postalveolarization before [i] of [s] and [z] to [ʃ] and [ʒ] respectively,¹⁸ the replacement of the dative by the accusative,¹⁹ and many distinctive lexical items such as γιορών [jorón] or γιόρος [jōros] ‘old man’.²⁰

Unfortunately, there is no other direct evidence for either. In the case of Cappadocian, we have to wait until the nineteenth century before we get the first reports about the villages and their dialects, usefully summarized by Dawkins (D11–12). Among these is a manuscript by Anastasios Levidis (1892), a schoolmaster from Zincidere near Kayseri (Caesarea), containing “a valuable collection of folk-songs”, the publication of which he considered “greatly to be desired” (D32). Dawkins later acquired the manuscript from the author’s heir and from it published a Byzantine carol in honour of St. Basil (1946) and four folk songs from Cappadocia (1934).²¹ The manuscript is now part of the “Papers of Richard Dawkins” collection of the Bodleian Library at Oxford, on loan from Exeter College, of which Dawkins was a fellow.²² In the next section, I discuss the importance of these folk songs for the history of Cappadocian and analyze one of them in detail in comparison with another version of the same song recorded by Pavlos Karolidis and published by Lagarde (1886: 17–18).

¹⁶ Cf. Dawkins (D626), Janse (2020: §7.6.1.5). “Futurative” (ἴνα + subj. was used throughout the EMedGr and LMedGr periods, but “with decreasing frequency” in the EModGr period (CGMG 3.1768).

¹⁷ Cf. Theodoridis (2004: 433), Kappler (2010: 385), Manolessou (2019: 32).

¹⁸ Cf. Dawkins (D71), Janse (2020: §6.2.2.5.3).

¹⁹ Cf. Janse (2020: §8.2.1).

²⁰ Dedes reads γιόρον (1993: 17), Theodoridis γιορών (2005: 437) for يورون *ywrwn* in Sultan Walad’s *ġazal* 83.2b. Both forms are distinctively Cappadocian (D592 s.v. γέρος) ~ LMedGr γέρος (LME) < AncGr γέρων (LSJ).

²¹ The first of the four folksongs from Cappadocia is actually a Pontic song recorded at Karipler, a Pontic colony in the Akdağ (‘White Mountain’), south of Tokat (Dawkins 1934: 113).

²² The Rector and Fellows of Exeter College have kindly granted me written permission in 2007 to publish, in whole or in part, the Levidis manuscript. For this reason I obtained a digital photocopy of the manuscript in 2017.

2 Akritic songs from Cappadocia: Variation and change

The four folk songs (δημοτικά τραγούδια)²³ published by Dawkins (1934) belong to the category of the so-called ‘akritic songs’ (ακριτικά τραγούδια):²⁴ heroic poems traditionally sung in ‘political verse’ (πολιτικός στίχος).²⁵ The name obviously suggests a relationship with the Late Byzantine epic-romance *Διγενής Ἀκρίτης* (Jeffreys 1998).²⁶ The hero’s name is Basil (Βασίλειος), whose epithet *διγενής* means ‘double-born’ or ‘of double descent’: his father was an Arab emir who abducted the daughter of the governor of the Byzantine Theme of Cappadocia. His second epithet *ακρίτης* means ‘frontiersman’, not necessarily in a military sense, but more commonly to designate “inhabitants at the extremities of imperial territory” (Cappel 1991: 47). Basil’s Cappadocian ancestry is often referred to:²⁷ ὁ θαυμαστός Καππάδοκας ‘the marvellous Cappadocian’ (*Dig.* E1092), τὸν Διγενῆ Καππάδοκα ‘the Double-Blooded Cappadocian’ (*Dig.* G3.106), τῶν Καππαδόκων ὁ τερπνὸς καὶ πανευθαλὴς ἔρνος ‘the Cappadocian’s delightful and all-flourishing offspring’ (*Dig.* G7.2).²⁸

It comes as no surprise, then, that akritic songs have always been very popular in Cappadocia,²⁹ where they continued to be sung until the population exchange in the 1920s. In the Pontic song from Karipler the hero’s name is Ἀκρίτας (Dawkins 1934: 113), in the Cappadocian song from Potamia Ἀκρίτης (1934: 117), in other songs it is Διγενής or a related or even entirely unrelated form (Jeffreys 1991: 48), but the two are rarely found in combination (Jeffreys 1998: xv). What exactly counts as an akritic song or whether there even exists a separate such category is again a matter of much dispute.³⁰ Several themes have been identified as being truly ‘akritic’ (Jeffreys 1991: 48): the abduction of the bride,³¹ the building of the castle, the wrestling with Charos (Charon) and

²³ Levidis uses the term *δημῶδη ᾠσματα* (1892: ch. Δ´ - the manuscript is unpaginated).

²⁴ The best-known collections of akritic songs are Politis (1909) and Lüdeke (1994).

²⁵ On the metrical structure of the decapentasyllable or political verse see Mackridge (1990), Lauxtermann (1999; 2019: 265–384), Jeffreys (2019).

²⁶ The nature of the relationship has been the subject of much research and controversy which will not concern us here; see, for instance, Jeffreys (1991), Mackridge (1993a), Saunier (1993).

²⁷ The epithet was included in the subtitle of Ioannidis’ edition of the now lost *Trebizond* (T) version (1887; cf. Jeffreys 1998: xxi–xxii).

²⁸ References are to the Escorial (E) and Grottaferrata (G) versions as edited by Jeffreys (1998).

²⁹ As well as in Pontus, Cyprus and Crete (Jeffreys 1998: xv).

³⁰ See especially Saunier (1993).

³¹ On this particular theme see Mackridge (1993a).

the ultimate death of the protagonist.³² The last three themes are represented in the Pontic song from Karipler (Dawkins 1934: 113) and in the Cappadocian song from Potamia (1934: 117). The second Cappadocian song is very different, as Dawkins, an acknowledged expert in Greek folklore, acknowledges (1934: 119). Dawkins informs us that the hero is called ‘George’ (1934: 113), although his name does not appear in the song itself, but can only be gathered from the title provided by Levidis: Γεωργός καὶ Χάρων (Figure 2).³³

Figure 2: Γεωργός καὶ Χάρων, ll. 1–6 (Levidis 1892: ch. Δ', ιβ').

As Marjolijne Janssen astutely notes in her precious comments on a previous version of this paper, γεωργός [joryós] is a noun and not identical with the proper name derived from it, Γεώργιος [jórjos] > ModGr Γεώργος / Γιώργος [jórjos]. The meaning of the noun ‘farmer’ goes very well with the hero’s agricultural activities described in the songs. As Dawkins observes: “in several of the Akritic songs the hero appears guiding his plough” (1934: 119). What is especially noteworthy is the fact that the noun lacks the definite article, which seems to suggest that it is a proper name after all, but the omission of the definite article with inherited masculine nouns in the nominative is a Cappadocian feature (cf. *infra*). This is not the place nor is it, indeed, my expertise to discuss the contents of this particular song from a comparative folkloristic perspective, either in comparison with other akritic songs in or with ModGr folk songs in general, for which the interested reader is referred to the brief but informative discussion by Dawkins (1934: 119). Instead, I

³² Saunier accepts “seven or eight important themes” as “truly [. . .] akritic” (1993: 148), but Politis (1909) and Lüdeke (1994) identify many more.

³³ Cf. Levidis (1892: ch. Δ', ιβ'), repeated in his παρατηρήσεις (ch. Ζ', ιβ').

will focus on the dialectological features of the song from a diachronic variationist perspective.

2.1 Critical edition

In his ‘remarks’ (παρρηγήσεις) on Γεωργός και Χάρων, Levidis notes that it was “sung in Ferteke and the neighbouring villages” (1892: ch. Ζ’, ιβ’).³⁴ Dawkins remarks that “the language in fact bears traces [. . .] of the dialects of Delmeso, Aravan, and Ghurzono, all villages only a very short distance from Ferteke” (Dawkins 1934: 119; cf. Map 1), and concludes: “Though this song was taken down at Ferteke, I think the informant must have come from one of these adjacent villages” (1934: 120). He admits that the song “is of a type I have not seen elsewhere” (1934: 119). This is very remarkable as a longer but otherwise very similar version was published by Lagarde (1886: 17–18), whose publication was known to Dawkins and described by him (D31). The song is part of a collection of songs and other texts from Cappadocia collected by Pavlos Karolidis, the author of a questionable comparative study of the Pharasiot vocabulary (Karolidis 1885). The collection was published by Lagarde with the following caveat: “Mir fällt nicht ein, die im folgende abgedruckten Texte für ‘herausgegeben’ anzusehen” (1886: 6).³⁵ Dawkins discusses Karolidis’ work rather critically (D30) and Lagarde’s very favourably (D31).³⁶ It is therefore all the more surprising that he should have missed this particular version of the song published in his article, which was recorded at Delmeso and called Χάρως και ὁ ἄωρος ἀποθανὼν νέος ‘Charon and the young man who died untimely’ (1886: 17).³⁷ In what follows I present a critical edition of Levidis’ transcription from the original manuscript (Figure 2) with reference to Karolidis’ version as published by Lagarde, together with a thorough revision of

34 “Τὸ ιβ’ ἄσμα « Γεωργός και Χάρων » ἄδεται ἐν Φερτακαίνοις και τοῖς περιχώροις” (1892: ch. Ζ’, ιβ’). On the name of the village see Dawkins’ remark: “Ferték, Grecised as Φερτέκι, is the Turkish name of the village; in the dialect it is called τὰ Βαρτάκαινα, and in literary Greek τὰ Φερτάκαινα” (D14).

35 In his introduction to the glossary, Lagarde remarks: “Denn da Herr Karolides selbst an mehr als einer Stelle zugibt, daß er seine Lieder nicht verstehe, ich aber in einer noch weit schlimmeren Lage bin, als er, ist es das Klugste, die Leser sich auf eigene Gefahr in diese Wildnis hineinwagen zu lassen” (1886: 41).

36 Lagarde’s alphabetical arrangement (1886: 41–68) of Karolidis’ γλωσσάριον συγκριτικόν (1885: 129–221) was judged “so much more convenient” than the latter’s “chaotic” glossary that Dawkins refers only to Lagarde’s work (D31).

37 Henceforth referred to as K10, following the numbering in the manuscript, ~ L12 = Levidis (1892: ch. Ζ’, ιβ’).

Dawkins' translation (1934: 120–121).³⁸ The song is composed in the traditional de-capentasyllable or political verse, with an obligatory caesura after the eighth syllable.

- (1) ένα παιδί και τῷ παιδί | με τα πολλά χαϊβάνια,³⁹
 éna peḗi ce tῷ peḗi | me ta polá xaiḗḗna
 a boy and what a boy, with his many cattle
- (2) και μάννα του το θήλαινε | με τ' αρνιакό το γάλα.⁴⁰
 i mána tu to thílene | me t arḗnakó to gála
 his mother used to suckle him with lamb's milk
- (3) Χάρος τό ειδε και ζήλεψε | 'ποτ' έλαμνε ζευγάρι.⁴¹
 xáros tóide ce zílepse | pot élamne zevgári
 Charon saw him and desired him, as he was ploughing
- (4) κοβαλατίζ' και πιάνει το | σου κάματου τῶην άκρη.⁴²
 kovalatíʒ' ce pḗani to | su kámatu t tῷn ákri
 he chases him and grabs him at the end of his field
- (5) Χάρε, σάλτα μ' ας τα μαλλιά | και πιάσε μ' ας τα χέρια,⁴³
 xáre sálta m as ta malía | ce pḗase m as ta chérja
 Charon, let go of my hair and take me by the hands

38 Levidis' transcription contains very few capital letters, not even initials of proper names like Χάρων, as opposed to Dawkins', where every line starts with a capital. Interestingly, Levidis indicates synizesis of [i] > [j] by means of a horizontal line below ι + following vowel, e.g. χέρια (Figure 2, l. 1), transcribed here as χέρια, as elsewhere in this chapter. I have applied the 'monotonic' system of accentuation (cf. Horrocks 2010: xx) in my transcription, omitting breathings and replacing circumflex and grave with acute accents (cf. D40). I have added diacritics to distinguish postalveolar ḡ [ʃ] and ḗ [ʒ] from their alveolar counterparts, as well as Roman characters to represent the voiced plosives [b, d, g], following Dawkins (D39). Note that Lagarde writes Karolidis' "punktierter, ḡ bedeutende, σ der Vorlage" as σσ (1886: 17).

39 = K[arolidis] 10.1 | χαϊβάνια MJ : χαβάνια L[evidis] *ut vid.*, χαβάνια D[awkins] ~ ζουμπούλια K[arolidis].

40 = K10.2 | καί μάννα L *ut vid.* : καί μάνα K, ή μάννα D | θήλαινε *sive* θήλευε *sic pro* τίλευε? L : θήλευε D : τίλευε K | άρνιакό L D : άρνικό K.

41 = K10.3 | τῶειδε L, τῶ εἶδε D K | ζήλεψε L D : ζήλευσε K | έλαμνε L D : ἦλαυνε K.

42 = K10.4 | κοβαλατίζ' και πιάνει το L D : τὸ κώλησε και τὸ 'πίασε K | σου MJ : σου K : σ' τοῦ L | τῶην άκρη MJ : την άκρη L D : τὴν άκραν K.

43 = K10.5-6 | Χάρε L D : Χάρε μου K | σάλτα L D : ἄφες K | τὰ μαλλιά L, τὰ μαλλιά D : ἄ [*sic pro* τὰ] καλλία K | πιάσε L D : πιάς K | τὰ χέρια L D : τὸ χέρι K.

- (6) και δείξε με τὴν τέντα σου, | και μοναχό μ' αὖ ἀγω.⁴⁴
 ce ðíkse me tʃin denda su | ce monaxó m af ágo
 and show me your tent, and let me go by myself
- (7) ἐσάλτ'σεν τον ας τα μαλλιά, | και πῖάν' τον ας το χέρι,⁴⁵
 esáltsen don as ta malá | ce pʃán don as to zéri
 he let go of his hair, and takes him by the hand
- (8) δείχνει σ' ἐτό τὴν τέντα του, | και μοναχό τ' πηγαίνει.⁴⁶
 ðíçni s etó tʃin dénda tu | ce monaxó t pijéni
 he shows him his tent, and he goes there by himself
- (9) και δίνει και σα χέρια του, | τ' ἀμάθετα τα βόλδια,⁴⁷
 ce ðini ce sa zérja tu | t amátheta ta nóidja
 and he gives into his hands the untamed oxen
- (10) και δίνει και ὅη ράχη του | τ' ἀτέλειωτο <το> σπόρο.⁴⁸
 ce ðini ce ʃi ráçi tu | t atélotο to spóro
 and he puts on his back the endless seed
- (11) ἐνι τ' αλέτρι του χρυσό, | ζυγός του σαν ἀσήμι,⁴⁹
 éni t alétri tu xrisó | zīgós tu san asjimi
 his plough is golden, his yoke as silver
- (12) εἵνται και τα ζευλίτσα του | παλληκαριού βραχιόνια.⁵⁰
 ínðe ce ta zevlítʃa tu | palikarjý vracjóna
 His [yoke's] collars are the arms of a brave young man
- (13) λάμνει και παίνει κ' ἔρχεται, | σο γύρισμά του κλαίγει.⁵¹
 lámni ce péni c ércete | s to jirizmá tu kléji
 he is ploughing and going to and fro, at his turn he is crying

44 = K10.6 | τὴν τέντα MJ : την τέντα L : τὴν τέντα D : τὰ δένδρα K | μοναχό μ' L D : μόνος K.

45 = K10.7 | ἐσάλτσεν L D : ἀφῆκεν K | μαλλιά L D : καλλιά K | καὶ πῖάν' L D : κ' ἐπίασεν K.

46 *om.* K | ἐτό L : ἀτό D | τὴν MJ : τη L D.

47 = K10.8 | καὶ δίνει καὶ L D : δώκε K | ἀμαθέτα L D : ἀμάθητα K | βόλδια L, βοῖδια [sic] D, βωῖδια K.

48 = K10.9 | καὶ L D : *om.* K | σὴ L D : 'στὴ K | τ' ἀτελείωτο σπόρο L, τὸ *suppl.* D : τ' ἀτελείωτο τὸ σπόρο K.

49 = K10.10 | χρυσό L D : χρουσό K | σὰν ἀσήμι L D : ἄς ἀσσημι K.

50 = K10.11 | εἵνται K : ἦνται L D | τα ζευλίτσα MJ : τὰ ζευλίτσα K : ἡ ζευλίτσα L : ἡ ζευγλίτσα D | βραχιόνια L D : βραχιόλια K.

51 = K10.12 | παίνει L D : πγαίνει K | καὶ 'ρχεται L D : κ' ἔρχεται K | σο γύρισμά του MJ : σ' τὸ γύρισμά του L D : κ' εἰς τὸ γύρισμα K | κλαίγει L : κλαίει D K.

- (14) Χάρε, βρυχάται μάννα μου, | στριγγά με αδελφή μου.⁵²
 xáre vrixate mána mu | stringá me adelḗfi mu
 Charon, my mother is crying, my sister is calling me
- (15) μάννα σου ας μή βρυχησκέι, | κι αδελφή σ' μή στριγγήσει.⁵³
 mána su az mí vrixíscēi | c adelḗfi s mí stringíḡi
 your mother should not cry and your sister should not call
- (16) Χάρε, σάλτα μ' ας παραμώ, | ας μείνω κι αύρι' ας έρθω.⁵⁴
 xáre sálta m as paramó | az míno ci ávri' as éρθω
 Charon, let me go back, let me stay [with them] and let me come tomorrow
- (17) εδά 'μεναν Σαράκενοι, | εδά 'μεναν κι οι Τούρκοι,⁵⁵
 edá menan saráceni | edá menan c i túrci
 here Saracens have stayed, here the Turks have stayed as well
- (18) εδά μικροί μεγάλωσαν, | μεγάλ' ήφεραν γένεια.⁵⁶
 edá mikrí meḡálosan | meḡál iferan jéna
 here little ones have grown up, grown-ups have worn beards
- (19) κάτσε κι έσύ, κοντόχρονε, | με τους πολυχρονάτους.⁵⁷
 kátse c eḡi kondóchrone | me tus polixronátus
 sit down, you who is short-lived, with those who are long-lived
- (20) νά σε είδα σε, Χάρε μου, | σ' ενα πλατύ λιβάδι,⁵⁸
 ná se ída se xáre mu | s ena platý livádi
 I wish I had seen you, my Charon, on a wide meadow
- (21) ο μαύρος σου να βόσκεται, | κι εσύ ν' αποκοιμάσαι,⁵⁹
 o mávros su na vóscete | c eḡi n apocimáse
 your black [charger] grazing and you asleep

52 = K10.13 | μάννα L D : μάνα K | με L D : ή K.

53 *om.* K | βρυχήσκει MJ | βρυχήσκη [sic] L, βρυχίσκη [sic] D | κι αδελφή L, κι αδελφή D | στριγγήση L D.

54 = K10.34 [sic] | Χάρε L D : Χάρε μου K | σάλτα μ' L D : άφες με K | παραμώ MJ : παρεμώ K : πορέμαι L D | κι αύρι' L, κι αύρι' D : και αύριο K.

55 = K10.17 | εδά L D : έδω K bis | 'μέναν L D : μείναν K bis | Σαράκενοι L D : Σαράκηνοι K : Σαρακηνοί Lagarde *ad loc.* | κ' L D : *om.* K.

56 = K 10.35 [sic] | εδά L D : έδω K | μεγάλ' ήφεραν MJ : μεγάλοι 'φέραν L (D) : και μεγάλοι έφεραν γένεια K.

57 = K 10.36 | κάτσε και σύ L D : κάθου και σύ K | κοντόχρονε L D : κοτόχρονε K | πολυχρονάτους L D : πολλούς χρονάτους K.

58 = K10.21 | είδα σε L D : ιδώ K | μου L K : μοι D | πλατύ L K : πλατύ K.

59 = K 10.22 | ό μαύρος L K : τó μαύρο K | βόσκεται L D : βόσκηται K | κ' έσύ L D : και σύ K.

- (22) να ἦρθα ἀγάλια ἀγάλια, | να ἦρθ' ἐνέδια ἐνέδια,⁶⁰
 na írtha agál agála | na írth enéf enéfa
 that I had come up very gently, that I had come up very quietly
- (23) να παίρνισκα Χάρ' τα κλειδιά, | παράδεισ' τ' αναχτήρια,⁶¹
 na pérnifka xár ta kliðjá | paráðis t anaxtírja
 that I would take Charon's keys, the keys of paradise
- (24) ν' ἀνοίξα τον παράδεισο, | ν' ἰδῶ μέσα τί εἶναι.⁶²
 n ániza tom paráðiso | n idó méssa tí ine
 that I would open paradise, to see inside what is in it
- (25) ὃη μέση κείται μάννα μου, | ὃην ἀκρη ἀδελφή μου,⁶³
 ði méfi cíte mána mu | ðin ákri aðelfi mu
 in the middle sits my mother, at the end my sister
- (26) ἀντίζις ἀκρῆς ἀκρούτσικα | κάθετα και γονιός μου.⁶⁴
 antzís ákris akrútjika | káthete ce yonóz mu
 at the opposite end, at the very end, there sits my father as well

2.2 Linguistic analysis

The language of Γεωργὸς καὶ Χάρων is a fascinating admixture of LMedGr / EModGr and Cappadocian Greek, reminiscent of the *Kunstsprache* of the AncGr epic tradition.⁶⁵ The matrix language of Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey* is an archaic form of Eastern Ionic, interspersed with Aeolic elements and a number of archaisms not readily identifiable with any of the historical Greek dialects (Horrocks 2010: 44). The matrix language of this particular Akritic song is nineteenth-century Cappadocian interspersed with archaisms going back at least to the LMedGr Period.⁶⁶ Unfortunately, it is not always, if at all, possible to decide whether a particular archaism belongs to an earlier stage of Cappadocian, say,

60 = K10.23 | ἦρθα L D : ἦλθα K | ἀγάλια ἀγάλια L D : ἀγάλια ἀγάληνα K | ἦρθ' L D : ἦλθα K | ἐνέδια ἐνέδια L D : νέσσαττε K sic pro <ἀ>νέσια?

61 = K10.24 | παίρνισκα L D : ἐπῆρα K | Χάρ', τὰ κλειδιά L D : τοῦ Χάρου τὰ κλειδιά K | παράδεισ' τ' ἀναχτήρια L D : τοῦ παραδείσου τάνοιχτήρια K.

62 = K10.25 | ν' ἀνοίξα L D : νὰ ἦνοιξα K | παράδεισο L D : παράδεισον K | ν' ἰδῶ L D : καὶ νὰ εἶδα K | μέσα L D : σὴ μέση του K | τίς L D : ποῖοι K | εἶνε L, εἶναι D : εἴνται K.

63 = K10.26 | κείται MJ : κεῖτ' ἢ L D : κάθετα K | σὴν ἀκρη MJ : σὴν ἄκρ' ἢ L D : σὴν ἄκρα ἢ K.

64 = K 10.27 | ἀντίζις ἀκρῆς ἀκρούτσικα L D : καὶ ἀνακρούτσικα K | και γονιός MJ : ὁ γονιός L D : τάγονιός sic pro καὶ γονιός? K.

65 More Akritic songs from Cappadocia are analyzed in Janse (forthcoming).

66 That is roughly the period covered by LME and CGMG.

‘Early Modern’ or ‘Late Medieval’, if we can borrow these terms from the history of Greek. In many cases, for instance, we can ascertain that a specific feature was absent from nineteenth-century Cappadocian and attested in LMedGr or EModGr, but these facts do not allow us to conclude that it must have been a feature of Late Medieval Cappadocian as well. In the case of γιορών or γιόρος discussed in section 1, we can in all likelihood conclude that they must be thirteenth-century Cappadocian variants of γέπων or γέπος, as both variants are attested in the modern dialects.⁶⁷ In the case of the other variants, γέπος and γέπων, also attested in the modern dialects as well as in varieties of LMedGr,⁶⁸ we cannot draw any conclusions as to whether it was already used as a variant in Late Medieval Cappadocian or whether it emerged at a later stage due to contact with other varieties of Greek as a result of the “constant population movements” during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (Manolessou 2019: 30) or the “close contact with Constantinople” in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (D194).

Especially in the case of the Akritic songs, which have been transmitted orally for very many centuries all over Asia Minor and the adjacent islands, there are theoretically many possible pathways by way of which particular linguistic features may have found their way back into Cappadocia, judging from the traditional formulaic phraseology attested in different versions in widely separated dialects. In addition, archaisms may have been retained for metrical reasons, just as in the AncGr epic tradition Aeolic words and inflections are used alongside their Ionic counterparts if the position in the verse requires a metrical alternative. Such considerations do not explain, however, the variation between ἐνι [éni] (11a) and εἶναι [íne] (24b), two metrically equivalent disyllabic penultimate words, in Levidis’ version. The former is the inherited form which was still the most common form at the beginning of the LMedGr period, the latter one of several innovations often found side by side with ἔνι, including εἶν(αι) and ἔν(αι), often spelled εἶν(ε) and ἔν(ε) respectively (CGMG 3.1710–1727). Inherited ἐνι has survived in Pharasiot, Pontic, Cypriot and other ModGr dialects (Andriotis 1974: 239). At Pharasa ἐνι is used alongside εἶνι [íni], εἶναι [íne] and the Pharasiot innovation εἶνου [ínu] (Kostakis 1968: 77), which dramatically illustrates the possible extent of such variation.

In Cappadocian, on the other hand, ἐνι is not attested in any of the nineteenth-century dialects, except in Akritic and other traditional songs. Instead,

⁶⁷ γιόρος [jóros] Aravan (D592; PK23) < MedGr γέπος (LME); γιορών [jorón] Floïta, Malakopi (D592), Axo (MK99), Misti (Phates 2012: 157) < AncGr γέπων (LSJ).

⁶⁸ γέπος [jéros] Delmeso & Fertek (D592) < MedGr γέπος (LME); γέπων Axo (D592) < AncGr γέπων (LSJ).

the apocopated form *έν'* [én] is found in the majority of the dialects, including those of southwestern Cappadocia, where this particular rendition of the song is to be situated: Delmeso (D148), Fertek (Krinopoulos 1889: 38–39) and Aravan, where *είν'* [ín] is occasionally attested as a variant (PK152). As far as we know, the other dialects all have *έν'*,⁶⁹ with the exception of Malakopi and Misti, where *είν'* is found.⁷⁰ These are the strong forms of the verb, which have a corresponding weak (clitic) form *'ναι* [ne], or *'νι* [ni] at Malakopi and Misti, where unstressed [e] is raised to [i].⁷¹

This seems to suggest that in Cappadocian *έν'* is the apocopated form of *έναι*, one of the innovations of the LMedGr period, but the former is already attested in EMedGr as the apocopated variant of *ένι*, so the historical evolution of the forms in MedGr has to be reconstructed as *ένι* > *έν'* > *έναι* > *ένιαι* (CGMG 3.1720).⁷² The variant *είν'* at Aravan seems to be the apocopated form of *είναι* [íne], at Malakopi and Misti of *είνι* [íni]. These full forms are only found with any frequency in the folktales recorded by Dawkins at Floīta and Silata, as well as at Anaku,⁷³ which suggests that it may have been a feature of Northwest Cappadocian, although it cannot be excluded that such full forms are non-dialectal. This is certainly the case of *είνι* [íni] in present-day Mišótika, e.g. *τί είνι*; [tʰí íni?], reported by Phates (2012: 37) as opposed to *τί είν'*; [tí ín?] 'what is it?' in Dawkins' only folktale from Misti (D388).⁷⁴ The former is the Mišótika equivalent of ModGr *είναι*, from which it is most likely borrowed, but normally the apocopated full forms are used, e.g. *τί έν'*; [tí én?] Potamia (D458), *Ulağaç* (Kesisoglou 1951: 150), *τσί έν'*; [tʃí én?] Aravan (PK67 & 122). If this interpretation is correct, the use of *τσί είναι*; [tʃí íne?] in our song (L12.24b) is probably an archaism in disguise.⁷⁵ It may be noted that the weak (clitic) and not the strong forms of the verb are used after *τίς* [tís?] 'who?', e.g. *τίς 'ναι* (i)tó; [tíz ne (i)tó?] 'who is this?' *Ulağaç* (D348 bis), *τσίς 'σαι εσύ*; [tʃís se eʃí?] 'who are you?' Aravan (PK74), *τίς 'νι*; [tʰíz ni?] 'who is it?' Mišótika (own fieldnotes).

The case of *είνται* [índe] (L12.12a) is different, as this form is not attested in LMedGr or EModGr (CGMG 3.1710). It is a typically Cappadocian 'agglutinative'

69 *Αξο έν'* (MK58), *Ανακού έν'* (Costakis 1964: 48), *Ulağaç έν'* (Kesisoglou 1951: 37).

70 Cf. Karphopoulos (2008: 96), Phates (2012: 37).

71 Cf. Dawkins (D64), Janse (2020: §6.2.1.3).

72 I owe this observation to Marjolijne Janssen (personal communication).

73 Cf. Dawkins (D410–452), Costakis (1964: 48).

74 Cf. Phates (2012: 37), who also quotes *τί είν' ντρου λές*; [tʰí ín du les?] 'what is it that you are saying?' (ibid.). Voiceless plosives are often aspirated (Janse 2020: §6.1.2), as already noted by Thumb (1910: 297), but Dawkins admits to "have no record of this" (D70).

75 The disguise being the pronunciation of *τί* [tʰí] as *τσί* [tʃí], cf. *infra*.

formation (Janse 2009b: 98–103), which is best illustrated with the inflections from Fertek (D148) and Axo (MK58):

1sg	(έν)μαι	(έν)me	(είν)μαι	(ίν)me
2sg	(έν)μαι	(έν)se	(είν)μαι	(ίν)se
3sg	(έν)αι	(έν)e	(έν)αι	(έν)e
1pl	(έν)μεστε	(έν)meste	(είν)μεστε	(ίν)meste
2pl	(έν)στε	(έν)ste	(είν)στε	(ίν)ste
3pl	(έν)δαι	(έν)de	(είν)δαι	(ίν)de
	Fertek		Axo	

The full forms are ένμαι ~ είνμαι etc., the enclitic forms 'μαι etc., e.g. αστενάρ' 'μαι [astenár me] 'I'm sick' Fertek (Krinopoulos 1889: 39), Aravan (D148).⁷⁶ The entire paradigm was restructured on the basis of the 3sg:⁷⁷ έν' at Fertek, είν' at Axo, except that είν' was apparently no longer used there in the early twentieth century.⁷⁸ In the other dialects, the [n] of έν' ~ είν' has been assimilated or absorbed in the endings, but the innovative 3pl είνται is a silent witness of the process. It is attested everywhere, including at Delmeso. It is all the more remarkable that the version of the Akritic song recorded by Krinopoulos has είνται in a slightly different version of line 12 of Levidis', but two occurrences of ένται in a spurious line which is absent from the latter (K10.31). The variant ένδαι is not mentioned by Dawkins, who gives the full paradigm of the verb for Delmeso (D148), nor is it attested in the folktales recorded by him, as opposed to είνδαι which occurs five times (D304–320). Again we cannot exclude that ένδαι was used alongside είνδαι at Delmeso, as it would fit the agglutinative inflection even better than είνται in light of the 3sg έν(αι), but neither form occurs in any variety of LMedGr or EModGr, so both are clearly Cappadocian.

We are very fortunate to have Karolidis' alternative version of the same song, if only because it confirms that Levidis' version is in fact from Delmeso and not from Aravan or Ghurzono. As a matter of fact, Karolidis notes in his manuscript that this particular song was sung or dictated to him by more than

⁷⁶ It is noteworthy that Krinopoulos writes αστενάρμαι 'άσθενῶ' as a single (phonological) word, whereas Dawkins hyphenates: αστενάρ-μαι, i.e. as a clitic group.

⁷⁷ The restructuring of verbal paradigms on the basis of the 3SG, reanalyzed as having a zero ending, is attested cross-linguistically and known as Watkins' Law (Janse 2009b); see Joseph (1980) for ModGr evidence of Watkins' Law.

⁷⁸ There is no trace of είν' in the folktales recorded by Dawkins (D388–402) and Mavrochalyvidis & Kesisoglou (MK186–220).

one informant from Delmeso.⁷⁹ There are only two lines in Levidis' version that do not occur in Karolidis', but the remaining 23 lines are almost without exception different and provide us with a fascinating view of variation and change in the oral transmission of traditional songs in Cappadocia.

Let me start with the Cappadocian features that identify the song as originating from Delmeso. I recall that Dawkins concluded that the singer could not have come from Fertek but from one of the adjacent villages, as some of the linguistic features of the song are only found in the dialects of Delmeso, Aravan and Ghurzono (1934: 120). The main evidence for this is the postalveolarization of the voiceless alveolar plosive [t] to the voiceless postalveolar affricate [tʃ] before [i] in these dialects as in τί [tí] > τσί [tʃí] (L12.1a), written τζι in Karolidis' version (K10.1a), την [tin] > τσιν [tʃin] (L12.6a & 8a, om. K), πλατύ [platí] (K10.21b) > πλατσύ [platʃí] (L12.20b). Similarly, [d] is postalveolarized to [dʒ] before [i] in αντίς [andís] 'opposite' > αντζίς [andʒís] (L12.26a, written αντσίς).⁸⁰

A special case is the idiomatic phrase ας άγω 'let me go' (L12.6b = L10.6b), which should be read as ας άγω [af áɣo], with postalveolarization of [s] to [ʃ]. It is generally considered to be a variant of the aorist subjunctive 1sg of the verb παίνω [péno] (L12.13a), the Cappadocian variant of πηγαίνω [pijéno] (cf. *infra*), which is used alongside παίνω in Levidis' version of the song (L12.8b). Dawkins enumerates the various forms of the aorist subjunctive, some of which are contracted after the loss of the intervocalic fricatives [ɣ] or [j] (D137): 1sg πά(γ)ω [pá(ɣ)o] > πώ [pó], 2sg πά(γ)εις [pá(j)is] > πάς [pás], 3sg πά(γ)ει [pá(j)i] > πάει [páj], 1pl πά(γ)ωμ(ε) [pá(ɣ)om(e)] > πάμ' [pám], 2pl πάτ(ε) [pát(e)], 3pl πάν(ε) [pán(e)]. At Ghurzono (D634) and Aravan (PK185-186) the aorist subjunctive of παίνω is from υπάγω, which is of course the etymon of παίνω < πηγαίνω:⁸¹ 1sg υπά(γ)ω [ipá(ɣ)o], 2sg υπά(γ)εις [ipá(j)is] > υπάς [ipás], 3sg υπά(γ)ει [ipá(j)i] > υπάει [ipáj], 1pl υπά(γ)ωμ(ε) [ipá(ɣ)om(e)] > υπάμ' [ipám], 2pl υπάτ(ε) [ipát(e)], 3pl υπάν(ε) [ipán(e)].

For what is called "speaker-inclusive 'exhortation'" in the first person and "speaker-exclusive 'encouragement'" in the third person (CGMG 4.1878), the particle ας < άφες is used with, in the words of Dawkins, "a subjunctive without π, formed on the analogy of the imperative άμε, άμέτ(ε), which naturally serve

⁷⁹ This can be deduced from the fact that l. 27 of Karolidis' version of the song was put between square brackets "διότι εις μόνον τών άσάντων ή ύπαγορευσάντων άπήγγειλε τόν σίχον έκεινον" 'because only one of the informants who sang or dictated the song recited this particular verse' (Lagarde 1886: 17).

⁸⁰ For this phonological change see Dawkins (D74), Janse (2020: §6.2.2.5.2), cf. αντίς [andís] Sinasos (Archelaos 1899: 223) < MedGr αντίς (LME).

⁸¹ Cf. Andriotis (1974: 568; 1995: 279), CGMG 3.1391–1392, LME s.v. υπαγαίνω.

for the 2nd persons” (D137). He reports for Delmeso (D137): 1sg αῖ άω [af áo], attested once in the folktales (D308) alongside αῖ άγω [af áyo] (D310 & 322), 3sg αῖ άει [af áj], 1pl αῖ άμ' [af ám], 3pl αῖ άν' [afân]. Dawkins recorded 1pl αῖ άμ' [af ám] also at Ferteke (D137) and quotes Alektoridis' paradigm from the same village (1883: 501): 1sg αῖ άγω [af áyo], 3sg αῖ άει [af áj], 1pl αῖ άμ(ε) [af ám(e)], 3pl αῖ άν(ε) [af ân(e)].⁸² The folktales recorded by Phosteris and Kesiosoglou provide examples from Aravan: 1sg αῖ άγω [af áyo] (PK118), 3sg αῖ άει [af áj] (PK122), 1pl αῖ άμ' [af ám] (PK98). Like Dawkins (D634), Phosteris and Kesiosoglou refer to υπάγω and 'άγω under παίνω (PK171), suggesting that both are suppletive.

Dawkins was certainly on the right track when he claimed that the verbal forms “without π” were formed on the analogy of the imperative 2sg άμε [áme], 2pl αμέτ(ε) [amét(e)], which are used in all the dialects (D634). Krinopoulos, a native from Ferteke who calls himself a ‘philology student’,⁸³ quotes the same forms as Alektoridis, but explains 1pl αῖ άμε [afáme] from αῖ άγομεν (1889: 58), thus deriving the entire paradigm from AncGr άγω. Presumably άγομεν is a (not quite philological) typo for άγωμεν ‘let us go’ (e.g. *Ev.Marc.* 1.38): “the subjunctive form had undergone a remarkable semantic change from transitive ‘bring, carry’ to intransitive ‘go’ in the Hellenistic period, with multiple examples in the New Testament [. . .] probably with influence from άγε (see LSJ) and υπάγω” (*CGMG* 3.1369). In LMedG άγωμε(ν) (sometimes spelled άγομε(ν)) “came to be interpreted as a 2nd sg. imperative” and a “syncopated form άμε occurs from the 14th century onwards” (*ibid.*). It would seem, then, that the dialects of southwestern Cappadocian have preserved the “hortatory subjunctive” (*CGCG* 439) with the PcGr intransitive meaning of άγω ‘go’ in these grammaticalized phrases, including PcGr 1pl άγωμεν > (αῖ) άμ(ε) alongside the reanalyzed LMedGr aorist imperative 2sg άγωμε(ν) > άμε, 2pl αμέτ(ε). The idiosyncratic postalveolarization of [s] to [ʃ] may be due to conflation of the suppletive subjunctive αῖ υπάγω [as ipáyo] > αῖ υπάγω [af ipáyo], where [i] is responsible for the postalveolarization of [s].⁸⁴ Finally, it may be noted that the other Cappadocian dialects use the regular subjunctive of παίνω: e.g. αῖ πάγω [as páyo] at Potamia (Levidis 1892: ch. Δ', δ'; cf. Dawkins 1934: 25), Ghurzono (D340), Axo (MK186) and αῖ πάμ' [as pám] at Ulağaç (Kesiosoglou 1951: 142), where Dawkins also recorded αῖ άμ' [afám] (D137).

⁸² We have to assume that Alektoridis spelling ᾱς stands for αῖ [af], as he did not distinguish alveolar [s] from postalveolar [ʃ], both being written as σ, as in most Greek publications. Dawkins' mention of 1pl αῖ άμ' [afám] at Ferteke (D137) confirms this assumption.

⁸³ The title page mentions the author as Σωκράτους Κρινουπούλου, φοιτητοῦ τῆς φιλολογίας.

⁸⁴ Cf. fn. 18.

Returning to the postalveolarization of [t] and [d] to [tʃ] and [dʒ]: these sound changes suffice in and by themselves to exclude Ferteke as the place of origin of the singer of Levidis' song. Dawkins says they appear "a little" at Ferteke, quoting τός [tʃis] "by the side of" τίς [tʃis], but mainly in the clusters τ [tʃ] > τζ [tʃ] and δ [dʒ] > τζ [dʒ] (D74). Krinopoulos would surely have mentioned the sound change in the section entitled Παθολογία τῶν συμφώνων 'Pathology of the consonants' (1889: 35) and there is no trace of it in the glossary (1889: 64–65),⁸⁵ but he does quote σα σπίτια [sa spítʃa] 'to the houses' instead of σα σπίτσα [sa spítʃa] (1889: 39). Alektoridis' glossary does not contain a single word betraying the sound change either (1883: 504–505), but he does quote τίς, τίνος and τίνα and not τός, τόνος and τόνα as the interrogative pronouns (1883: 488). In the only folktale from Ferteke recorded by Dawkins (D328–330) there is no trace of τός, but instead two occurrences of τί⁸⁶ one occurrence of σπίτι τ' [spíti t] 'his house' and eleven of σπίτια [spítʃa] 'houses' instead of *σπίτσα τ' [spítʃi t] and *σπίτσα [spítʃa]. On the other hand, τζό [dʒó] instead of *δίο [djó] < δύο [díō] 'two' is attested once and listed as such in the glossary (D597). The folktale from Ferteke recorded by Thumb (1910: 297–298) contains no traces of postalveolarization: σαχάτι μ' [saxátʰi m] 'my hour' ~ *σαχάτσι μ' [saxátʃi m],⁸⁷ ἀνδον με καντίεις [ándon me kandíis] 'if you believe me' ~ *καντζίεις [kandzíis].⁸⁸

Dawkins mentions only one feature that distinguishes the dialect of Delmeso from those of Aravan and Ghurzono: the change of ὅτι [ʃti] > ὅκι [ʃci] in ας μή βρυχηστέι [az mí vriçíʃti] 'she should not cry' > βρυχησκέι [vriçiscí] (L12.15a, om. K), LMedGr βρυχησθεί.⁸⁹ This feature would in itself have sufficed to conclude that the singer must from Delmeso, but Dawkins nevertheless refrains from excluding Aravan and Ghurzono. There are, however, a number of features which clearly exclude the latter possibility. The inherited dental fricatives unvoiced [θ] and voiced [ð] are preserved only in Northwest and Northeast Cappadocian as well as at Delmeso, which belongs to the latter subgroup (Table 1). In all the other Cappadocian dialects, including Aravan and Ghurzono as well as Ferteke, the dental fricatives have been

⁸⁵ And so we find τί κανά φέρετε [tí cená férete] 'what news are you bringing?' (Krinopoulos 1889: 21).

⁸⁶ The aspiration of initial [t] > [tʰ] is secured by Thumb (1910: 297).

⁸⁷ Compare σαάτῳ [saátʃ] > σαάῳ [saáʃ] at Aravan (PK7).

⁸⁸ κανδίζω [kandízo] 'believe' Ferteke (Thumb 1910: 321), καντίζου [kandízu] Malakopi (Karpophopoulos 2008: 114). The present subjunctive 2sg καντίεις [kandíis] is from καντίζεις [kandízis] by dissimilation (D84, 131).

⁸⁹ βρυχοῦμαι [vriçúme], aorist passive βρυ(χ)ήσῃτα [vri(ç)íʃta] 'cry, shout' (Levidis Λεξ. ζ') < MedGr βρυχοῦμαι (LME).

replaced by various phonetically related sounds, depending (among other things) on the position of the original sound in the word, due to interference from Turkish, which lacks dental fricatives.⁹⁰

Initial [ð] becomes [d] at Aravan and Ghurzono (as well as at FerteK):⁹¹ δείξε [ðíkse] (L12.6a = K10.6a) ~ δείkse [díkse], δείχνει [ðíçni] (L12.8a, *om.* K) ~ δείχνει [díçni],⁹² δίνει [ðíni] (L12. 9a, *om.* K & L12.10a = K10.9a) ~ δίνει [díni].⁹³ Medial [ð] becomes usually [r], occasionally [d] (as at FerteK): είδε [íðe] (L12.3a = 10.3a) ~ είρε [íre], βόιδ' [vóið], pl. βόιδα [vóiða] (L12. 9b = K10.8b) ~ βόρ' [vór], βόρτα [vórta],⁹⁴ παιδί [peði] (L12.1a = K10.1a) ~ παρί [perí],⁹⁵ εδά [eða] (L12.17 = K10.17) ~ ερά [erá],⁹⁶ λιβάδ(i) [liváð(i)] (L12.20b = K10.21b) ~ λιβάρ' [livár],⁹⁷ κλειδί [kliði] (L12.23a = K10.24a) ~ κλειρί,⁹⁸ but αδελφή [aðelfi] (L12.14b, 25b = K10.13b, 26b) ~ αδελφή [aðelfi] at Aravan, Ghurzono and FerteK.⁹⁹ The Christian term παράδεισος [paráðisos] 'Paradise' (L12.24a = K10.25a) is attested in several Cappadocian dialects, but not at Aravan or Ghurzono, where it would probably have been παράγισος [parájisos], as at Axo,¹⁰⁰ instead of *παράρεισος [paráreisos], due to dissimilation.¹⁰¹

90 On the outcomes of the phonological substitutions in the various dialects see Dawkins (D74-80), Janse (2020: §6.2.2.6).

91 For Aravan and Ghurzono see Dawkins (D75-76), for Aravan in particular Mavrochalyvidis & Kesiosoglou (MK5), for FerteK Dawkins (D75) and Krinopoulos, who notes that δ "προφέρεται πάντοτε ως τὸ γαλλικὸν d" (1889: 45).

92 δείχνω [ðíçno] 'show' NEC-NWC, δείχνω [díçno] Aravan (D595; PK5) < MedGr δείχνω (LBG & LME).

93 δίνω [ðíno] 'give' NEC-NWC, δίνω [díno] SEC & SWC (D596) < MedGr δίνω (LBG & LME).

94 βόιδ' [vóið] pl. βόιδια [vóiða] 'ox' Delmeso, βόιτ' [vóit], pl. βόγια [vója] FerteK (D590) < MedGr βόιδι(v) (LME); βόρ' [vór], pl. βόρτα [vórta] Aravan, Ghurzono (D590; PK21) < MedGr βόδι(v) (LME).

95 παιδί [peði] 'boy' NEC-NWC, παιδί [pedí] FerteK, παρί [perí] Aravan, Ghurzono, παι(γ)ί [pe(j)i] CC (D630) < MedGr παιδί(v) 'child; boy' (LME).

96 εδά [eða] 'here' NEC-NWC (D597), Anaku (Costakis 1964: 59), εδά [edá] FerteK (Krinopoulos 1889: 39), ερά [erá] Aravan (MK25), εγά [ejá] Axo (MK77) < MedGr εδά (LME).

97 *λιβάδ' [liváð] NEC-NWC, λιβάρ' [livár] 'meadow' Aravan (PK32) < MedGr λιβάδι(v) (LME).

98 κλειδί [kliði] 'key' NEC-NWC, κλει(γ)ί [kli(j)i] Axo (D609; MK104), κλειρί [klirí] 'key' Aravan (PK29) < MedGr κλειδί(v) (LME).

99 αδελφή [aðelfi] 'sister' NEC-NWC, αδελφή [aðelfi] Aravan, Ghurzono, FerteK, αελφή [aelfi] Axo (D581), αίλφη [ailfi] Misti (Kotsanidis 2005: 15) < AncGr ἀδελφή (LSJ).

100 Compare the saying at Axo: παραγείσ' πουλί [parájis pulí] 'bird of Paradise' (MK114 s.v. ουράνῳ), of the soul of a dead child who flies to heaven.

101 This is Dawkins' explanation for similar exceptions at Aravan (D75); compare MedGr Τετράδι [tetráði] 'Wednesday' > Τετράρ' [tetrár] Ghurzono (D76), Aravan (PK42) ~ Τετράχ' [tetráç] Aravan (D75).

Initial [θ] becomes [x] or [ç] at Aravan and Ghurzono (and [t] at Ferteke),¹⁰² but the verb θηλαίνω [θiléno] ‘suckle’ (L12.2a) is not attested in any of the Cappadocian dialects, which use βυζάνω [vizáno] instead (cf. *infra*). Medial [θ] becomes usually [r], sometimes [x] or [ç], occasionally [t] (as at Ferteke): κάθομαι [káθome] (L12.26b = K10.27b) ~ κάrouμαι [károume],¹⁰³ but έρθω [érθo] (L12.16b = K10.34b) ~ έρτω, ήρθα [írθa] (L12.22a–b) ~ ήλθα [ílθa] (K10.23a–b) ~ ήρτα [írta].¹⁰⁴ The adjective αμάθετο [amáθeto] ‘unlearned: untamed’ (L12.9b) is not attested in any of the dialects, but Levidis’ variant must be Cappadocian, given the pronunciation of η as [e] instead of [i], the latter represented in Karolidis’ variant αμάθητο [amáθito] (K10.8b).¹⁰⁵ At Aravan the form of the adjective would be αμάρετο [amáreto], cf. μαραινίσκω [marenísko] ~ μαθαίνω [maθéno].¹⁰⁶

The other Cappadocian features of the song are non-distinctive and thus non-criterial for the identification of the matrix language of the song, e.g. the preposition ας ‘from’ (L12.5-7, 15–16 = K10.5-6, 10.34),¹⁰⁷ the personal pronoun ετό (L12.8a, *om.* K),¹⁰⁸ the progressive assimilation of [i] to [a] in ανοιχτήρια [aniçtírja] (K10.24b) > αναχτήρια [anaxtírja] (L12.23b),¹⁰⁹ the regressive assimilation of [a] to

102 For Aravan and Ghurzono see Dawkins (D75-76), for Aravan in particular Mavrochalyvidis & Kesisoglou (1960: 5–6), for Ferteke Dawkins (D75) and Krinopoulos, who notes that θ “προφέρεται ως τ πάντοτε” (1889: 48).

103 κάθομαι [káθome] ‘sit’ NEC-NWC, κά(χ)ουμαι [ká(x)ume] Axo (MK261), κάχουμι [káxumi] Misti, Semendere (D605) < LMedGr κάθο(υ)μαι (*LME*).

104 On the variation between ήρτα and ήλτα cf. *infra*.

105 The “retention of ‘Ionic’ [e]” (*CGMG* 1.26-28) is usually considered to be an archaism of Cappadocian and especially Pontic (D67), but Horrocks considers it to be a case of vowel weakening, particularly in post-tonic syllables (2010: 400).

106 μαθαίνω [maθéno] ‘teach’ NEC-NWC (D621), μαραινίσκω [marenísko] Aravan (PK33) < MedGr μα(ν)θαίνω (*LME*).

107 “Used all over Cappadocia” (D586) as well as in Pontic; derived from άξ < έξ by Papadopoulos (1958–61: vol. 1, 148; cf. Andriotis 1974: 241 s.v. έξ).

108 Written as, or perhaps unwittingly corrected to, ατό by Dawkins (1934: 120), although ετό and ετά are the usual Cappadocian forms (D120). Just as ατό(ς) is derived from αὐτός, ετό(ς) is probably derived from εὐτός, a variant of αὐτός, rare in LMedGr and EModGr (*CGMG* 941), but well attested in Modern Greek dialects of the Ionian and Aegean Seas (Thumb 1910: 80).

109 Dawkins notes that Cappadocian αναχτήρ “comes straight from άνοικτήριον, and not from it by way of Turk. *anahtar*” (D584). The Pontic forms ανοιχτάρι [aniçtári] and ανοιχτέριν [aniçtérin] (Papadopoulos 1958–61: vol. 1, 72) show that the Medieval Greek variants άνοιχτάρι(ν) (*LME*) and άνοικτήρι(ν) (*LBG*) may have coexisted in East Asia Minor as well. The former was borrowed in Turkish as *anahtar*, dialectal *anahtar*, the latter as dialectal *anehtar*, *enetter* (Symeonidis 1976: 94), which exhibit regressive instead of progressive assimilations.

[e] in ανέσια [anéʃa]¹¹⁰ > ενέσια [enéʃa] (L12.22b).¹¹¹ The dissimilatory consonant reduction in the collocation of the preposition εις ‘to’ with the accusative definite article in στα > σα (L12.9a = K10.8a) and στου > σου (K10.4b) ~ σ’ του (L12.4b) is also attested in the phrase εις σὴ ἔστιά μου in Sultan Walad’s *ġazal* 83.2a, if Dedes’ reading of مو استيا اسي *sy ‘sty’ mw* is correct (1993: 17). The evolution of στη in Karolidis’ version (K10.9a) to ση = ὄη [ʃi] in Levidis’ (L12.10a) is again a distinctive feature of the dialect of Delmeso, as the feminine article is not preserved in the Southwest Cappadocian dialects of Fertek, Aravan and Ghurzono (D87-89). It is noteworthy that Karolidis writes ση(v) = ὄη(v) [ʃi(n)] elsewhere in his transcription of the song (K10.26a–b = L12.25a–b).

A distinctively Cappadocian feature is the formation of the imperfect of barytone verbs with a dedicated suffix attached to the present stem. The phonological shape of the suffix is -ῖκ- [ɪk] in most dialects and so also at Delmeso.¹¹² The only example comes from Levidis’ version: παίρνῖκα [pérniʃka] (L12.23a), the imperfect indicative of παίρω.¹¹³ The imperfects without the suffix are not necessarily archaisms. Presents ending in -ζω, -αίνω, -ώνω, -εύω and -ῖκω are inflected as in MedGr and ModGr, e.g. ἀνοίξα [anízɔ] (L12.24a),¹¹⁴ ἔλαμνε [élamne] (L12. 3b) as opposed to ἤλαυνε [ílavne] (K10.3),¹¹⁵ which is definitely an archaism, and possibly θήλαινε [θílene] (L12.2a), although the verb is probably not Cappadocian (cf. *supra*). By contrast, the imperfect (ἐ)μεναν [(é)menan] (L12.17a–b) is definitely non-Cappadocian, as the verb μένω is not preserved in any of the dialects, only variants of the LMedGr prefixed verb ἀπομεινίσκω > ἀπομνίσκω¹¹⁶ > Cappadocian

110 Perhaps recoverable from Karolidis’ reading ἤλθα (ἀ)νέσσατζε (K10.23b).

111 ενέσια [enéʃa] ‘quietly’ (hapax) < MedGr ανέσια « ἡσυχᾶ, ἡρεμα » < ανέσι « ἀνάπαυση, ησυχία » (*LME*), cf. Dawkins’ remark: “In all the villages an *i* tends to change *a* of the preceding syllable to *e* or less often to *aī*” (D65). For the reduplication cf. φιλεῖ, φιλεῖ με γαληνά, | κρατεῖ με ανέσι ανέσι ‘he kisses me gently, he holds me tenderly’ (*Erotop.* 401). Note that γαληνά ‘gently’ is usually taken to be the etymon of LMedGr ἀγάλια [aǵála] ‘gently’ (Andriotis 1974: 192; 1995: 3; cf. *LME* s.v.), which is attested as such in Cappadocian (D580). It is therefore noteworthy that Levidis’ ἀγάλια ἀγάλια [aǵál aǵála] (L12.22a) should appear as ἀγάλια ἀγάληνα [aǵál aǵáline] in Karolidis’ version (K10.23a).

112 For details on the variants of the suffix and the morphological restrictions on its use see Dawkins (D132–135), Janse (2020: §7.6.1.2).

113 παίρω [péro] ‘take’ Cappa (D630), rarely παίρνω [pérno] Aravan (PK66) < MedGr (ἐ)παίρνω (*LME*) < AncGr ἐπαίρω (*LSJ*).

114 ἀνοίζω [anízɔ] ‘open’ Cappa (D584), rarely ἀνοί(γ)ω [aní(γ)ɔ] Anaku (Costakis 1964: 30) ~ MedGr ἀνοίγω.

115 λάμνω [lámno] ‘plough’ Cappa (D618), semantically narrowed from λάμνω ζευγάρι ‘drive a yoke’ < MedGr (ἐ)λάμνω < (ἐ)λαύνω (*LME*).

116 Dawkins derives the Cappadocian forms erroneously from απομένω (D585). On the productivity of the suffix -ῖκ- to form new imperfective stems of nasal-stem verbs based on their

πομ(ν)ίσκω [pom(n)ísko], aor. πόμ(ν)α [póm(n)a], which at Delmeso takes the form *πλομ(ν)ίσκω [plom(n)ísko], aor. πλόμα [plóma] (D585). Consequently, the aorist (έ)μειναν [(έ)minan] in Levidis' version (L12.17a–b) must be an archaism as well.

More challenging is the interpretation of Karolidis' επήρα [epíra] (K10.24a) versus Levidis' παίρνισκα [pérniška] (L12.23a). The aorist indicative of παίρω is πήρα "everywhere except at Ulağaz, where έπήρα, έπηρε and έπερα are used", as Dawkins notes, adding "έπήρα also at Delmeso" (D631). It is of course impossible to decide whether Karolidis' variant επήρα is here the Delmeso or the LMedGr form of the aorist indicative, as both are identical.¹¹⁷ The same applies, *mutatis mutandis*, to the variation between ήρθα [írtha] (L12.22a–b) and ήλθα [íltha] (K10.23a–b). Although the latter is historically an archaism and the former an innovation (CGMG 1.214–215), both forms are attested in LMedGr, EModGr and even Standard ModGr. The Cappadocian form is ήρτα [írta], with a voiceless alveolar stop instead of a dental fricative, which is found "everywhere, except ήλτα at Ax[o] and probably elsewhere by the side of ήρτα" (D599), but there is no trace of the former in the Cappadocian folktales recorded by Dawkins, including those from Delmeso (D304–328) and Axo (D388–404).¹¹⁸ The voiceless dental fricative [θ] is preserved at Delmeso, so it is difficult to make sense of Levidis' ήρθα, that is whether it was actually pronounced as [θ] or as [t], and even more of Karolidis' ήλθα.

This uncertainty applies to many other forms as well such as εδά [eḋá] in Levidis' version (L12.17–18a) as opposed to εḋώ [eḋó] in Karolidis' (K10.17, 35a). Both are variants of the locative adverb 'here' in LMedGr, and both are attested, probably side by side, in Cappadocian (D597). The voiced dental fricative [ð] is of course only preserved in Northwest and Northeast Cappadocian, including Delmeso (cf. *supra*), and the fact that Karolidis has εḋώ seems to suggest that both forms were used interchangeably at Delmeso as well, although Dawkins' folktales from the village (D304–328) contain only εḋά (three times) and another variant, εḋού [eḋú] (eleven times).

Other variants are perhaps more easily explained as archaisms preserved in the oral tradition, assuming, of course, that Karolidis' and Levidis' transcriptions are accurate. Compare, for instance, the phrase στη ράχι του [sti ráçi tu] in Karolidis' version (K10.9a) with στη ράχη του in Levidis' (L12.10a). As explained

non-sigmatic perfective stems in LMedGr see CGMG (3.1295–1298), where μείνισκω as well as the syncopated form μνίσκω are quoted (1296).

117 The variants πήρεν (22x) and επήρεν (4x) are used side by side in Dawkins' folktales from Delmeso (D304–328)

118 Nor, for that matter, in the folktales from Axo recorded by Mavrochalyvidis and Kesisoglou: the index of forms contains only delateralized forms (1960: 256–257).

above, the collocation στη(ν) became ὄη(ν) via στὴν(ν) at Delmeso, so στη is definitely an archaism.¹¹⁹ The noun ράχη ‘back’ was preserved as a feminine noun at Sinasos as well as at Anaku, where it appears as ρέση [réʃi] with regressive assimilation of [a] > [e] and postalveolarization of [ç] > [ʃ]. In the Southwest Cappadocian dialects it became a neuter noun: ρέχ’ [réç] at Aravan and, with a prosthetic [d] which is difficult to explain, δρέχ’ [dréc] > δρέῶ’ [dréʃ] at Ferteke.¹²⁰ It is now clear that Karolidis’ version of the phrase στη ράχι του is archaic, whereas Levidis’ version ὄη ράχη του is innovative, but it cannot be decided whether ράχη was preserved as such at Delmeso, as one might have expected ρέχ(η) [réç(i)] with [e] instead of [a] as at Aravan and Ferteke, because the regressive assimilation of [a] > [e] is well attested at Delmeso as well (D65).¹²¹

The phrase contains another archaism: the retention of unstressed final [u] in του. As is well-known, unstressed [u] is regularly apocopated in final position in Cappadocian (D62; Janse 2020: §6.2.1.1), but the song contains quite a few examples of non-apocopated forms of the possessive pronouns: μου (L12.14a-b, 20a, 25a-b, 26b = K10.13a-b, 21a, 26a-b, 27b), σου (L12.6a, 15a, 21a = K10.6a, 22a), του (L12.2a, 8a-13b = K10.2a, 8a-11b). Interestingly, however, there are also examples of apocopated forms: μάννα σου [mána su] ~ ἀδελφή σ’ [aðelfi s] (L12.15a-b), μοναχό τ’ [monaxó t] (L12.8) ~ μοναχό μ’ [monaxó m] (L12.6b), but the latter can be explained as elision to avoid hiatus. The last two examples are interesting for another reason, as they illustrate another characteristic feature of Cappadocian: the use of neuter forms in adjectival agreement,¹²² in these cases μοναχό τ’ [monaxó t] ~ μοναχός του [monaxós tu] and μοναχό μ’ [monaxó m] ~ μοναχός μου [monaxós mu].

Another non-apocopated form is κάματος [kámatu] (L12.4b = K10.4b), the meaning of which is ‘trouble, fatigue’ in all the Cappadocian dialects, just as it has always been in the entire history of the Greek language, but both Levidis and Karolidis gloss it here as ‘field’, which would be a hapax as far as its meaning is

119 It would have been pronounced [ʃci] at Delmeso, cf. βρυχήῃται [vriçiʃti] > βρυχήῃκει [vriçiʃci] (L12.15a).

120 ράχη [ráçi] f. ‘back’ Sinasos (Archelaos 1889: 264), ρέση [réʃi] Anaku (Costakis 1964: 23), ρέχ’ [réç] n. Aravan (PK39), δρέχ(η) [dréc(i)] Ferteke (Alektoridis 1883: 494) > δρέῶ’ [dréʃ] Ferteke (Krinopoulos 1889: 46) < MedGr ράχη (LME) < ῥάχης (LBG). Krinopoulos explains the successive changes in the Ferteke forms as follows: τὸ ράχι > τ’ράχι > δρέχι > δρέῃ > δρέῶ’ (1889: 46). Forms with prosthetic [t] or [d] are attested in other Cappadocian dialects and in Pharsiot (D641).

121 Examples include λιθάρ’ [liθár] ‘stone’ > λιθέρ’ [liθér] Delmeso > χτέρ’ [çtér] Ferteke > τερ’ [térr] Aravan (D620) < MedGr λιθάρι(ν) (LME); Tk. *yular*, dialectal *yilar* (DS) > γιλάρ’ [jilár] Ulağaç > ιλάρ’ [ilár] Aravan > ‘λέρ’ [lér] Delmeso ‘halter’ (D688).

122 Cf. Dawkins (D115-116), Janse (2020: §8.1.2.1).

concerned.¹²³ Note that κάματος is a proparoxytone noun and that the stress remains on the antepenultimate in the genitive κάματος in both Levidis' and Karolidis' version. The same applies to παράδεισ' [parádis] in Levidis' version (L12.23b) ~ παράδεισου [parádisu] in Karolidis' (K10.24b). The same variation is attested in LMedGr (CGMG 2.288-289) and also in Cappadocian, notably at Delmeso, e.g. άνθρωπος [áthropos], gen. αθρώπ' [aθróp] 'man' ~ δάσκαλος [ðáskalos], gen. δάσκαλ' [ðáskal] 'teacher' (D95).

Another reading in need of correction is Dawkins' rendering of Levidis' να παίρνισκα, Χάρ' τα κλειδιά [na pérnɪʃka xár ta kliðjá] (L12.23a) as να παίρνισκα, Χάρ', τα κλειδιά, apparently interpreting Χάρ' as an apocopated form of the vocative Χάρε (L12.5a, 14a, 16a = K10.5a, 13a, 34a), suggested by the comma punctuation before Χάρ' in Levidis' transcription, but the comma added by Dawkins immediately after Χάρ' does not appear in the manuscript. It is therefore clear that Χάρ' is here the apocopated version of the genitive Χάρου, as appears from a comparison with Karolidis' version: να επήρα του Χάρου τα κλειδιά [na epíra tu xáru ta kliðjá] (K10.24a). Levidis' is clearly innovative, as shown by the absence of the definite article, which "is not used at all in the genitive" (D87). Compare also the second colon in both versions, where the phrase from the first colon is paraphrased as του παραδείσου τ' ανοιχτήρια [tu paraðísu t anixtírja] in Karolidis' version (K10.24b), but παραδείσ' τ' αναχτήρια [paraðís t anaxtírja] in Levidis' (L12.23b).¹²⁴

The attentive reader will have noticed that Karolidis' version of this particular line is unmetrical, as in fact many of his lines are. The only way to turn the first colon into an octosyllable and the second one into a heptasyllable is to apocopate unstressed [u] in the genitive endings of του Χάρου > τ' Χάρ' [t xár] and του παραδείσου > τ' παραδείσ' [t paraðís].¹²⁵ In other cases, however, the apocopated and non-apocopated forms are simply variants which can be used

¹²³ Although both Levidis and Karolidis have κάματος, it is tempting to read κομμάτου [komátu] 'of the field' or κομμάτου τ' [komátu t] 'of his field' instead, κόμμα being the usual word for 'field' in Cappadocian (D611). By simply adding the possessive pronoun του in its apocopated form τ' the retention of final [u] in κάματος τ' ~ κομμάτου τ' would be normal in Cappadocian (D62).

¹²⁴ As Dawkins rightly notes: "The pagan view of death presented by the Modern Greek Charon songs is well known: here we have at least an attempt at a reconciliation with something more approaching Christian orthodoxy. The idea of Charon holding the keys of Paradise brings him close to St. Peter" (1934: 119). In a footnote he adds: "The usual approximation is that of Charon to St. Michael, who is in Greek iconography and tradition the angel who carries away the soul" (ibid.). For the phrase compare παραδείσου θυρών ανοικτήριον (TrypCant 32 ζ' 9).

¹²⁵ At Axo apocopated του > τ' is in fact still regularly used as the genitive form of the definite article (MK81). It is very likely that the omission of the genitive article in the other

if the position in the verse requires a metrical alternative. Compare, for instance, *και μοναχό μ' αζ άγω* [ce monaxó m af ágo] (L12.6b) ~ *και μοναχό τ' πηγαίνει* [ce monaxó t pijéni] (L12.8b). The latter example is also interesting for another reason, as the final unstressed [i] in *πηγαίνει* is not apocopated *metri causa*.¹²⁶ It is worthy of note, however, that the verb *πηγαίνω* [pijéno] is not attested as such in any of the Cappadocian dialects, where instead *παίνω* [péno] is the only attested form, cf. *παίνει* [péni] (L12.13a) but note *παίνι* [pjéni] in Karolidis' version (K10. 12a) which, if not a typo, may reflect a syncopated form *πηγαίνει* > *π'γαίνει*.¹²⁷ Obviously, an apocopated form of either variant would not fit the metre.

Another example of this variation *metri causa* is *κοβαλατίζ' και πάνει το* [kovalatíz ce pčáni to] (L12.4a) ~ *και πían' τον ας το χέρι* [ce pčán ton as to céri] (L12.7b), where unstressed [i] is preserved in *πάνει* (as well as in *χέρι*), but apocopated in *κοβαλατίζ'* and *πían'*. It is worthy of note that the word order of Karolidis' version of the former half-verse is neither Medieval Greek nor Cappadocian Greek, as far as the preverbal position of the clitic pronouns is concerned.¹²⁸ *το κόλησε και το 'πίασε* [to kólise ce to píase] 'he chased him and grabbed him' (K10.4a), the latter part of which should probably be read *και τό 'πιασε* [ce tó pčase].¹²⁹ The second colon, on the other hand, has the expected word order: *κι επίασεν*

Cappadocian dialects is the result of cluster reduction, as apocopated τ' followed by an initial consonant in the noun yielded many clusters not normally found at the beginning of a word (Janse 2020: §6.2.2.9.1), e.g. τ' ναίκας [t nékas] 'of the woman', τ' μέρας [t méras] 'of the day'.

126 Other non-apocopated forms: *ζευγάρι* [zevgári] (L12.3b), *δείχνει* [dichni] (L12.8a), *δίνει* [dini] (L12.9a & 10b), *αθήμι* [afimi] (L12.11b), *κλαίγει* [kléji] (L12.13b) *στριγγήσει* [stringífi] (L12.15b), *Τούρκοι* [túrci] (L12.17b), *μεγάλοι* [megáli] (L12.18b); *αλέτρι* [alétrí] (L12.11) is normally not apocopated (Archelaos 1889: 221), but the usual form, also at Delmeso, is *αλέτιρ* [alétir] (D583).

127 Dawkins notes that *πα(γ)αίνω* [pa(γ)éno] is also found at Potamia, but "possibly not dialectic" (D634), because the "dialect has been a good deal influenced by the common Greek" (D29). In the folktales from Potamia I find *παγαίν'* [pajén] and *παγαίνεις* [pajénis] (D458 *ter*) as well as *παγαίνισκαν* [pajéniskán] (D464), but also *παγαίν'* [pajén] at Silata (D442 *ter*), where the "dialect is in common use" (D26). *Πα(γ)αίνω* is also attested at Sinasos (Archelaos 1889: 28), where "the old dialect largely gives way to the common Greek" (D27), as well as in Silliot and Pharasiot (D634), in the latter as a variant of *παίνω* (D634), which is clearly a contracted form of *πααίνω* [paéno].

128 For the position of clitic pronouns in Late Medieval and Early Modern Greek see Horrocks (1990), Mackridge (1993b; 2000), *CGMG* (4.2026–2037); for Cappadocian see Janse (1993; 1994; 1998a; 2020: §8.2.3.1).

129 Another Cappadocian song from Levidis' collection (1892: ch. Δ', δ'), published by Dawkins (1934: 117) is riddled with preverbal clitic pronouns in contexts where postverbal position would be expected in Medieval Greek as well as in Cappadocian.

τον ας το χέρι [c epíasen ton as to çeri] ‘and he took him by the hand’ (K10.7b), but the verb phrase should probably be read και πιάσεν τον [ce pçásen ton].¹³⁰

There are other examples of archaisms used for metrical reasons. As is well known, the definite article is not used in the nominative with inherited masculine and feminine nouns denoting animates in most of the dialects with the notable exception of Southeast Cappadocian.¹³¹ Examples include Χάρος (L12.5a = K10.3a), μάννα μου (L12.14a = K10.13a), μάννα σου (L12.15a), αδελφή σ’ (L12.15b). An exception is ζυγός του [ziγós tu], an inherited masculine but inanimate noun, but here the omission of the article can be explained as an extension of the rule by analogy with other masculine nouns.

Sometimes Levidis’ and Karolidis’ versions deviate from each other: στριγγά με αδελφή μου [stringá me aðelfi mu] (L12.14b) ~ στριγγά η αδελφή μου [stringá i aðelfi mu] (K10.13b). In other cases, a textual emendation seems possible: ση μέση κείτ’ η μάννα μου [ʃi méʃi cít i mána mu] (L12.25a) > ση μέση κείται μάννα μου [ʃi méʃi cíte mána mu] ~ ση μέση κάθεται μάννα μου [ʃi méʃi káthete mána mu] (K10.26a); σην άκρ’ η αδελφή μου [ʃin ákr i aðelfi mu] (L12.25b) > σην άκρη αδελφή μου [ʃin ákri aðelfi mu] ~ σην άκρα η αδελφή μου [ʃin ákra i aðelfi mu] (L12.25b) > σην άκρη αδελφή μου [ʃin ákri aðelfi mu]; εδά ’μεναν κ’ οι Τούρκοι [eðá menan c i túrci] (L12. 17b) > εδά ’μεναν και Τούρκοι [eðá menan ce túrci] ~ κ’ εδώ μείναν οι Τούρκοι [c eðó mínan i túrci] (K10.17b); κάθεται κ’ ο γονιός μου [káthete c o γοηόζ mu] (L12.26b) > κάθεται και γονιός μου [káthete ce γοηόζ mu] ~ κάθεται καγονιός μου [káthete caγοηόζ mu] (K10.27b) > κάθεται και γονιός μου [káthete ce γοηόζ mu].

A special case is ο μαύρος σου [o mávros su] in Levidis’ version (L12.21a), which corresponds with το μαύρο σου [to mávro su] in Karolidis’ (K10.22a). The phrase is formulaic and found many times in the Διγενής Άκριτης.¹³² As a substantivized adjective it refers to a certain race of black horses, especially ‘war horses’ (LME s.v. μαύρος).¹³³ Levidis’ ο μαύρος σου is therefore an echo of this formulaic usage, because the archaic masculine word ἵππος ‘horse’ underlying the phrase was unknown in nineteenth-century Cappadocia, where the word άλογο [álogo] was used, as in the rest of the Greek-speaking world. It should be noted, however,

130 For the accentuation see Dawkins (D138 & 634 s.v. πιάνω), Janse (1998b: 535–537). Karolidis’ version τὸ ’πιάσεν [to píase] cannot be read (or sung) with synizesis, as the metre requires an antepenultimate before the caesura (cf. *CGMG* 2.249–252).

131 On the use of the definite article in the nominative see Dawkins (D87), Janse (2004: 12–14; 2019: 100–102; 2020: §7.1.1), Karatsareas (2013: 211–221).

132 E.g. ἤτον δάος ὁ μαῦρός του | τὸ φέγγος ὡς ἡμέρα ‘his black horse was swift, the moonlight like day’ (Dig. G4.407) ~ ἤτον λαμπρός ὁ μαῦρός του | καὶ ἔφεγγεν τὸ φεγγάρι ‘his black horse was gleaming, the moon shining bright’ (Dig. E844).

133 ἀπόστρωσε τὸν γρίβαν μου | καὶ στρώσέ μου τὸν μαῦρον ‘unsaddle my grey horse, and saddle for me the black’ (Dig. G4.376 = E798)

that ἄλογο is not the noun underlying Karolidis' το μᾶρο σου, but rather the obscure word ἔθιο in the phrase μᾶρο ἔθιο, which should probably be written μᾶρο ἔτιο [mávro étço] (K10.14a), glossed as « ἵππος » in a footnote (Lagarde 1886: 17f) and in the glossary (Karolidis 1885: 81, 161). Lagarde correctly derives the word from Ottoman Turkish ات [at] (1886: 50), which was borrowed in Medieval Greek as ἄτι [átì] (LME), but in the song it appears with [e] instead of [a] due to the regressive assimilation so well attested at Delmeso (cf. supra). It is not attested at all in any of the Cappadocian dialects, but the phonological shape of the diminutive suffix -ιο instead of -ι at the end of the word gives it a particularly archaic outlook, as ἄτιο(v) or even ἄτι(v) is unattested in LMedGr.¹³⁴

Another Cappadocian feature is also related to the use of the definite article: the multiple occurrence of the article in contexts of attributive adjectival modification, a phenomenon called 'determiner spreading' (Lekakou & Karatsareas 2016).¹³⁵ It is of course a phenomenon well-known from AncGr, where the article is obligatorily repeated when the adjective is used attributively in postnominal position (CGCG 331). It is very common as well in LMedGr, where the attributive adjective may also appear in prenominal position, an innovation called "reverse determiner spreading" in CGMG (4.1973). Whereas in LMedGr and EModGr the position of the adjective vis-à-vis the noun was thus "amenable to the rules of focalization" (*ibid.*), adjectives and other noun modifiers are obligatorily placed in prenominal position in Cappadocian, a word order pattern borrowed from Turkish.¹³⁶

Levidis' version of our song contains one example of determiner spreading: τ' ἀμάθετα τα βόιδια [t amátheta ta nóidja] (L12.9b ≈ K10.8b). The second colon of the following line reads τ' ατελείωτο σπόρο [t atelíoto spóro] (L12.10b), without determiner spreading, which prompted Dawkins to note: "probably a better reading would be τ' ἀτελείωτο τὸ σπόρο, with the double article" (1934: 120).¹³⁷ The reading in Levidis' manuscript actually lacks the second article, which is probably due to haplography of the syllable [to]. Fortunately, we have Karolidis' version of the same colon, which indeed reads τ' ἀτέλειωτο το σπόρο [t atélotō to spóro] (K10.9b), with the double article and with the necessary synizesis

¹³⁴ Kriaras only gives one reference (*Ptochol.* B 155), whereas the TLG yields eighteen results, four from the *Historia Alexandri Magni* and fourteen from Caesarius Dapontes, including the phrase ἄτι μαῦρον 'black horse' (5.8.2).

¹³⁵ Cf. Dawkins (D116), Janse (2020: §8.1.2.1), Lekakou & Karatsareas (2016).

¹³⁶ Cf. Dawkins (D200–202), Janse (2009a: ; 44–49; 2006; 2020: §8.2.3).

¹³⁷ On the difference between Levidis' ἀτέλειωτο and Karolidis' ἀτελείωτο see the remarks on synizesis, stress shift and accent notation in CGMG 2.249–252.

ατελείωτο [atelióto] > ατέλειωτο [atélioto]. The second colon of the first line of the song seems to lack the double article as well: τα πολλά χαϊβάνια [ta polá xanána] (L12.1b ≈ K10.1b). In this particular case, the adjective is a quantifier and behaves like a numeral in this respect, as in the following examples from Delmeso: τα δυό φῶχα [ta ðjó fǽxa] ‘the two children’ (D318 *bis*), τα τρία γκιϋζέλια [ta tría jyzéla] ‘the three fair ones’ (D304–326 *passim*).

The lexical variation in the two versions of the song is very interesting, as has already been shown on several occasions. Already in the second line of the song we are in for a surprise: Levidis reads θήλενε [θilene] (L12.2a) according to Dawkins (1934: 119). If Dawkins’ reading is correct, the verb should be read as θήλαινε, a hapax by any standard, as it is not attested in Cappadocian nor in in any other variety of MedGr or ModGr, where the AncGr form θηλάζω is still used. It would be an example of the well-known variation between present stems in -άζω and -αίνω ~ -άνω, which can be appropriately exemplified with the Cappadocian word for ‘suckle’ βυζάνω [vizáno], which is identical with the first of two variants in MedGr βυζάνω (*LME*) ~ βυζάζω (*LBG*), the former corresponding with βυζαίνω in ModGr.¹³⁸ Karolidis, however, reads τίλευε [tíleve] (K10.2a), glossed as « τρέφω » (Lagarde 1886: 17d) and identified in his glossary as uniquely Cappadocian (Karolidis 1885: 217 = Lagarde 1886: 64).¹³⁹ The etymology of the verb is unknown,¹⁴⁰ but Dawkins recorded it at Delmeso, Aravan and Ghurzono, albeit with a voiced instead of an unvoiced initial alveolar plosive: διλεύω [dilévo] (D654). I tend to believe that Levidis actually wrote θήλενε [t^híleve],¹⁴¹ with θ to mark an aspirated voiceless alveolar plosive [t^h].¹⁴²

An obvious crux is Levidis’ reading πορέμαι [porémei] (L12.16a), which Dawkins considers “unmetrical”, because he believes it stands for πορεύομαι, in Levidis’ glossary of Zila and Sinasos glossed as « προσπορίζομαι » (Λεξ. Δ’ s.v.) and translated by Dawkins as ‘go forward’ (1934: 118). This is really not appropriate, as is immediately apparent from the following context: our hero wants to go not forward but

138 On the variation between present stems in -άνω and -αίνω see *CGMG* (3.1294–1295). Compare πα(γ)άζω [pa(γ)ázo], a variant of πα(γ)αίνω [pa(j)éno] in Pharasiot (Andriotis 1948: 70), which is also attested at Ulagaç (Kesisoglou 1951: 85).

139 As opposed to Pharasiot, where the verb is ζουλεύω [zulévo], cf. Dawkins (D601), Andriotis (1948: 63).

140 Mavrochalyvidis & Kesisoglou (MK 147) and Phosteris & Kesisoglou (PK 60) list it in the section Λέξεις ανετυμολόγητες.

141 Both θήλενε (Dawkins’ reading) and θήλευε (my alternative reading) are (neo)paleographically possible. Marjolijne Janssen confirms my alternative reading (personal communication).

142 Compare Karolidis’ writing of έθλο [ét^hco?] with θ instead of τ, as opposed to Medieval Greek ἄτι (*supra*).

rather back, as he explicitly states that he wants to stay and come (= go) tomorrow (L12.16b). Archelaos glosses πορεύομαι for Sinasos as « ζῶ, ἔχω τι ὥς πόρον ζωῆς » (1899: 262) and likewise Karphopoulos for Malakopi (2008: 126) and Mavrochalyvidis & Kesisoglou for Axo (MK117). Obviously, then, Levidis' reading πορέμαι cannot be a corruption of πορεύομαι, as the idiosyncratic Cappadocian meaning of the verb does not fit the context. Moreover, we need an aorist subjunctive, not a present indicative, as is clear from *ας μείνω* and *ας έρθω* in the second colon. Karolidis' reading παρεμῶ (K10.34) offers the solution to the crux, although the corresponding line appears at the end of the song. The verb we are looking for is παραμαίνω, analyzed by Dawkins as "a compound of παρά and μαίνω (*i.e.* ε)μβαίνω)" and glossed as 'go away' (D632). The translation is not entirely accurate, as the verb is well attested and glossed as « ἀπέρχομαι εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν » by Karphopoulos (2008: 124) and « πηγαίνω σπίτι » by Mavrochalyvidis & Kesisoglou (MK115). The aorist indicative is παρέμα, subj. παραμῶ (*ibid.*). Karolidis' reading παρεμῶ, if correct, seems to represent an earlier form with both prefixes still visible: παρ-εμ-(π)ῶ.

Because of the formulaic nature of the Akritic songs, it is very interesting to take a closer look at the substitution of newer forms for older ones in both versions. In this respect, the use of Turkish loanwords is very interesting, as it is very unlikely that they were already in place when the songs started being transmitted. The case of χαϊβάνια [xaiváɲa] 'cattle' (L12.1b) ~ ζουμπούλια [zumbúɻa] 'hyacinths' (K10.1b) is therefore not particularly revealing, as both are of Turkish origin.¹⁴³ More interesting is the use of the loanverb κοβαλατίζω [kovalatizo] 'run after, chase' in Levidis' version (L12.4a) vis-à-vis Karolidis' use of κολῶ [koló] 'drive' (K10. 4a), a verb used all over Cappadocia but with unknown etymology.¹⁴⁴ Given the spread of the distinctively Cappadocian word κολῶ, it is surprising that it should have been replaced by a Turkish loanverb.

Very intriguing as well is the use of the loanverb σαλτώ [saltó] 'let go' in Levidis' version: σάλτα [sálta] (L12.5a), εσάλτ'σεν [esáltsen] (L12.7a) versus Karolidis' use of αφήνω [afino]: άφες [áfes] (K10.5a), αφήκεν [aficen] (K10.7a). Both verbs are used in Dawkins' folktales from Delmeso: the former appears as σαλδώ [saldó], with a voiced instead of an unvoiced alveolar plosive and

¹⁴³ χαϊβάν [xaiván] 'animal', pl. χαϊβάνια [xaiváɲa] 'cattle' (D673) < Tk. *hayvan*; ζουμπουλ' [zumbul], perhaps to be read as ζυμπύλ' [zymbýl] 'hyacinth' Cappa (Lagarde 1886: 17c) < Tk. *sümbül*, Central Anatolian Tk. *zümbül* (DS).

¹⁴⁴ κολῶ [koló] 'drive' Cappa (D611), etymology unknown, but see Karolidis (1885: 176) and Archelaos (1889: 245) for the spread of the verb and fanciful etymologies.

always in the sense of ‘send’.¹⁴⁵ The aorist indicative is syncopated, as in Levidis’ version, but with further cluster reduction: εσάλδησεν [esáldisen] > εσάλτ’σεν [esáltsen] > εσάλσεν [esálsen] or, without the augment, σάλσεν [sálsen] (both in the same text right after each other, D324). The present imperative σάλτα is apparently used as the equivalent of the aorist imperative άφες, but the reason is not metrical, but aspectual. That is to say, Cappadocian does not have an aspectual opposition between perfective and imperfective imperatives, barytone verbs having only perfective, oxytones only imperfective imperatives.¹⁴⁶

The case of σαλτώ [saltó] ~ σαλδώ [saldó] is interesting for other reasons as well, because the other Turkish loanverb is not an oxytone, but a barytone: κοβαλατίζω [kovalatízo] (L12.4a).¹⁴⁷ The borrowing of Turkish loanverbs takes place in the aorist, the perfective aspect being unmarked as opposed to the imperfective aspect. The basis for the borrowing process is the equivalent of the Greek aorist: the Turkish perfective or *dI*-past (Lewis 2000: 128). The basis for the borrowing is the 3sg of perfective past in accordance with Watkins’ Law (Janse 2009b: 100–1003).¹⁴⁸ *sal-di-Ø* [saldíu] ‘send-PFV-3sg’ → aorist indicative 3sg (ε)-σάλ+δι-σ-εν [(e)sáldiwsen] > (ε)-σάλτ’σεν [(e)sáltsen] > (ε)-σάλσεν [(e)sálsen] (cf. supra), subj. 3sg σαλνδιῶ(ει) [saldíuʃ(i)] or, without vowel harmony, σαλδιῶ(ει) [saldíʃ(i)]. From the unmarked aorist two present stems can be formed, either oxytone σαλδώ [saldó] or barytone σαλδιῶ [saldíuʒo] or, without vowel harmony, σαλδιζω [saldízo]. According to Dawkins (D677), the oxytone variant is the only one attested in Cappadocian, including Delmeso and Aravan.¹⁴⁹ Phosteris and Kesisoglou, on the other hand, list σαλδιῶ [saldíuʒo] and σαλδώ [saldó] as variants for Aravan (PK55).¹⁵⁰ The reality is probably that the oxytone and

145 The verbal root *sal-* means ‘let go’ and in Anatolian Turkish also ‘send’ (DS); see also Dawkins (D677).

146 Cf. D139), Janse (2020: §7.6.1.6).

147 Dawkins translates κοβαλατίζω incorrectly as ‘strikes’ (1934: 120), which is odd, as the verb is correctly translated as ‘run after, chase’ in his glossary (D682) < Tk. *kovala-*.

148 On the details of the borrowing process see Dawkins (D42¹, 129), Janse (2001: 477–478; 2009b: 100–103; 2020: §7.6.1.3, 9.4.2, 11.2.10).

149 Dawkins’ folktales from Delmeso provide the present indicatives 3pl σαλδούν [saldún] (D320) and σαλδά [saldá] (D326), those from Aravan the present imperative 2sg σάλδα [sálda] (D336).

150 Their folktales, however, only contain examples of the oxytone variant: σάλδιναν [sáldinan] (PK114 bis).

barytone variants were often conflated, as the latter are found very frequently at Delmeso and elsewhere.¹⁵¹

As a matter of fact, oxytones and barytones in *-ίζω* were often conflated in MedGr as well. *CGMG* devotes a special section to this particular type of transfer and quotes numerous examples of barytone to oxytone and vice versa (3.1307–1311). They rightly emphasize that the availability of both oxytone and barytone forms of the same verbs is very convenient for poets composing political verse, because it allowed them to use oxytone or proparoxytone forms before the caesura, but paroxytone forms at verse end (1307). The oxytone *στριγγώ* [stringó] (L12. 14b = K10.13b), attested in Cappadocia at Aravan (but only with reference to birds),¹⁵² has a barytone variant *στριγγίζω* [stringízo] in MedGr. The fifteenth-century poet Leonardus Dellaportas uses present indicative 1sg *στριγγίζω* at verse end (1.796), but 2sg *στριγγῆς* before the caesura (2.79). The barytone variant *κοβαλατίξ* [kovalatíz] in Levidis' version (L12.4a) is of course metrically equivalent with its oxytone counterpart *κοβαλατά* [kovalatá] / *κοβαλαδά* [kovaladá], the latter being attested at Malakopi (Karpophopoulos 2008: 115), the former at Anakou (Kostakis 1963: 75).

Returning to Karolidis' use of *αρήνω* [afino] instead of Levidis' *σαλδῶ* [saldó], it is clear that both *άφες* (K10.5a) and *αρήκεν* (K10.7a) are archaic forms. The ancient aorist imperative *άφες* continued to be used in LMedGr and EModGr alongside the innovative sigmatic form *άφησε*, often apocopated before clitic pronouns (*CGMG* 3.1661–1662). The ancient aorist indicative *άφηκα* continued to be used as well alongside two innovative forms: *άφηκα* (*CGMG* 3.1341) and *άφησα* (*CGMG* 3.1312³⁶). The archaic forms in *-κ-* have been preserved in the Cappadocian aorist indicative: *αρήκα* [afika] in Central, Northwest and Northeast Cappadocian, *άφηκα* [áfika] in Southeast and Southwest Cappadocian, often syncopated to *άφ'κα* [áfka], notably at Delmeso, which differs from the other Northeast Cappadocian dialects with respect to the stress.¹⁵³ The aorist imperative, on the other hand, has the sigmatic form: *άφησε*, but *άφησ'* before clitic pronouns.¹⁵⁴ It is therefore not clear whether Karolidis correctly transcribed the aorist imperative as *άφες* or should have written *άφησ'* instead.

¹⁵¹ E.g. pres. ind. 1sg *απαδιζώ* [aradízo] 'I am looking for' (D306, 308), 2sg *απαδιεις* [aradúis] (D308), 3sg *απαδιῶ* [aradúf] (D306 bis, 308, 328).

¹⁵² E.g. το *κοκονίος στριγγά* [to kokonós stringá] 'the cock is crowing' (MK41).

¹⁵³ Cf. Dawkins (D587), Janse (2020: §7.6.3). It may be noted that the Southwest Cappadocian dialects of Aravan and Ghurzono have metathesized forms: pres. ind. *βαήνω* [váino] ~ *βαήκνω* [vaikno], aor. ind. *βάφ'κα* [váfka] ~ *βάκα* [váka] (PK21).

¹⁵⁴ So still in present-day Mišótika (own fieldnotes) as well as at Axo (MK99, 169). At Aravan the metathesized form is *βάησ'* το [váis to] (D139) or *βάηθ'* το [váif to] (PK104).

It is important to realize, however, that these lines belong to the oldest stratum of the song, as they appear in many other versions about the death of Digenis. Apart from the substitution of σάλτα with ἄφες and of χέρι with χέρα, line 5 in Levidis' version corresponds with 5b-6a in Karolidis', which is in turn identical with line 25 in a song from Potamia recorded by Levidis (1892: ch. Δ', δ') and published by Dawkins (1934: 117), with line 22 in a song from Sinasos recorded by Karolidis (Lagarde 1886: 26),¹⁵⁵ and with line 21 in another song from Sinasos recorded by Archelaos (1899: 160).¹⁵⁶ Likewise, lines 6–7 in Levidis' version appear in more or less the same form in the songs just quoted and in many others from other parts of Asia Minor and the adjacent islands. It is therefore not surprising that archaic forms should appear alongside less archaic and innovative forms and a study of formulaic variation in the Akritic songs is therefore a desideratum.

An important methodological caveat is in place, however. What we have at our disposal are transcriptions of songs and it is clear from Levidis' and Karolidis' versions that these transcriptions are not always reliable. Levidis' πορέμει [poréme] (L12.16a) ~ Karolidis' παρεμώ [paremó] for παραμώ [paramó] (K10.34a) is a good example, already discussed above. Lagarde's warning that his publication of Karolidis' texts should not be considered definitive (1886: 6) is easily exemplified with a host of ghost readings. Some of these can easily be interpreted as misreadings, e.g. καλλιὰ [kalá] for μαλλιὰ [malá] (K10.5a & 7a), others are plain mistakes, e.g. νέσσατζε [néʃadze] for ενέσια [enéʃa] (K10.23). And even if the transcriptions we have are accurate, we have to take into account the possibility that the singer may have made mistakes, which is of course very likely in an oral setting, as we know very well from the AncGr epic tradition. One possible candidate is the enigmatic phrase αντζις ακρής ακρούτδικα [andzís akrís akrútʃika] (L12.25a) which, although perfectly interpretable, sounds like a distant echo of a formulaic colon found in several Pontic songs in Politis (1909): ακούσ' ακούσ' Ακρίτα μου [akús akús akríta mu] 'listen, listen, my Akritas'.¹⁵⁷ A similar echo can be found in the first line of another song from Delmeso recorded by Karolidis (Lagarde 1886: 18): ένα πουλί και τσί πουλί [éna pulí ce tʃi pulí] 'a bird and what a bird' (K11.1a). In this case, one wonders who came first: the boy or the bird?

¹⁵⁵ = Politis (1909: 248, #37) = Lüdeke (1994: 174–175, #24).

¹⁵⁶ = Politis (1909: 247, #36) = Lüdeke (1994: 175–176, #25).

¹⁵⁷ E.g. #23.35, #24.10, #25.1; also in Levidis' song from Karipler (Dawkins 1934: 113, l. 9).

3 Conclusion

In this chapter I have presented a linguistic analysis of two orally transmitted Akritic songs as evidence for diachronic variation in Cappadocian. Although Akritic songs have been studied intensively from a comparative folkloristic and literary perspective, they have not yet been sufficiently explored and exploited linguistically, leaving aside the rather cursory remarks in Dawkins (1934). I hope to have shown that a comparative linguistic analysis of such songs sheds new light on linguistic variation, not just in Cappadocian but also in LMedGr and EModGr. The reason is that the Greek layer of Cappadocian is essentially LMedGr, with archaisms going back as far as the Asia Minor or Anatolian Koine. Many of the archaisms identified and studied in this chapter shed light on diachronic and diatopic variation in these older stages of the Greek language such as the retention of the AncGr ‘postpositive article’ as relative pronoun, the AncGr interrogative pronouns τίς, the possessive adjectives ἐμός, σός, ἡμέτερος, ὑμέτερος, the aorist passive in -ην instead of -ηκα, the PcGr / MedGr order of clitic pronouns, the use of *να* with the subjunctive to express the simple future etc.

The use of the traditional LMedGr decapentasyllable or political verse imposes metrical constraints on the use of certain forms and encourage the use of alternative forms. The centuries-long transmission of the Akritic songs have resulted in a unique admixture of archaic and innovative forms, comparable to the *Kunstsprache* of the AncGr epic tradition. Thus we find the older *πηγαίνει* [pijéni] (L12.8b) alongside the newer *παίνει* [péni] (L12.13a) and the syncopated intermediate *π'γαίνει* [pçéni] (K10.12a); remnants of the older hortative subjunctive 1sg ἄγω ‘let me go’ > αἶγω [af ágo], 1pl ἄγωμε(ν) ‘let us go’ > ἄμε > αἶ ἄμ’ [af ám] alongside the reanalyzed LMedGr imperative 2sg ἄγωμε(ν) ‘go!’ > ἄμε > ἄμε [áme], 2pl ἀμέτ(ε) [amét(e)]; variation in the use of the nominative of the definite article with inherited masculine and feminine nouns denoting animates; lexical variation, with many lexical archaisms not found in other ModGr dialects etc.

I have not systematically reviewed every variant between Levidis’ and Karolidis’ version of the Akritic song, which would have resulted in a monograph-length chapter. This is just one suggestion for future research, which will include a comparative analysis of two more Akritic songs from Cappadocia (Janse forthcoming) and the critical and comparative edition of other traditional songs from the unpublished manuscript of Levidis (1892) and the published but unedited manuscript of Karolidis (Lagarde 1886: 15–40). One of my personal desiderata is the systematic study of the formulae in these traditional songs, which again reveal an unparalleled variation between the various versions.

References

- D* = Dawkins (1916) + page number(s).
DS = *Türkiye’de Halk Ağzından Derleme Sözlüğü* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1963–82).
 Λεξ. = Levidis (1892: Λεξιλόγιον Α΄-Θ΄).
 MK = Mavrochalividis & Kesisoglou (1960) + page number(s).
 PK = Phosteris & Kesisoglou (1960) + page number(s).
- Alektoridis, Anastasios S. 1883. Λεξιλόγιον τοῦ ἐν Φερτακαίνοις τῆς Καππαδοκίας γλωσσικοῦ ἰδιώματος. *Δελτίον τῆς Ἱστορικῆς καὶ Ἐθνολογικῆς Ἑταιρείας τῆς Ἑλλάδος* 1, 480–508.
- Anastasiadis, Vasilios K. 1975. Ἱστορία καὶ γλῶσσα τῆς Καππαδοκίας καὶ τὸ ἰδίωμα τῶν Φαράσων. *Μικρασιατικά Χρονικά* 16, 150–184.
- Anastasiadis, Vasilios K. 1976. *Ἡ σύνταξη στὸ Φαρασιώτικο ἰδίωμα τῆς Καππαδοκίας σὲ σύγκριση πρὸς τὰ ὑπόλοιπα ἰδιώματα τῆς Μικρᾶς Ασίας, καθὼς καὶ πρὸς τὴν Ἀρχαία, τὴ Μεσαιωνικὴ καὶ τὴ Νέα Ἑλληνικὴ γλῶσσα*. PhD dissertation, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki.
- Andriotis, Nikolaos. 1948. *Τὸ γλωσσικὸ ἰδίωμα τῶν Φαράσων*. Athens: Ἰκαρος.
- Andriotis, Nikolaos. 1974. *Lexikon der Archaismen in der neugriechischen Dialekten*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Andriotis, Nikolaos. 1995. *Ἑτυμολογικὸ λεξικὸ τῆς κοινῆς Ἑλληνικῆς*. 3rd ed. Thessaloniki: Ἰνστιτοῦτο Νεοελληνικῶν Σπουδῶν (Ἰδρυμα Μανόλη Τριανταφυλλίδη).
- Archelaos, Ioannis Sarantidis. 1899. *Ἡ Σινασός: ἥτοι θέσις, ἱστορία, ἠθικὴ καὶ διανοητικὴ κατάστασις, ἥθη, ἔθιμα καὶ γλῶσσα τῆς ἐν Καππαδοκίᾳ κωμοπόλεως Σινασοῦ, ἐν ἐπιμέτρῳ δὲ καὶ σύντομος περιγραφὴ τῶν ἐν ταῖς ἐπαρχίαις Καισάρειας καὶ Ἰκονίου Ἑλληνικῶν Κοινοτήτων, ὡς καὶ τῶν ἐν αὐταῖς σωζομένων ἑλληνικῶν διαλέκτων ἐν σχέσει πρὸς τὴν ἐν Σινασῷ λαλουμένην*. Athens: Ἰωάννης Νικολαΐδης.
- Burgière, Paul & Robert Mantran. 1952. Quelques vers grecs du XIII^e siècle. *Byzantion* 22, 63–79.
- Brixhe, Claude. 1987. *Essai sur le grec anatolien au début de notre ère*. Nancy: Presses Universitaires de Nancy.
- Brixhe, Claude. 2010. Linguistic diversity in Asia Minor during the Empire: Koine and non-Greek languages. In Egbert Bakker (ed.), *A companion to the Ancient Greek language*, 228–252. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Bubeník, Vít. 1989. *Hellenistic and Roman Greece as a sociolinguistic area*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Bubeník, Vít. 2014. Koine, Origins of. *EAGLL* [online edition].
- Cappel, Andrew J. 1991. Akritai. In Alexander P. Kazhdan (ed.), *The Oxford dictionary of Byzantium*, 47. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Costakis, Athanase P. 1964. *Le parler grec d’Anaku*. Athens: Centre d’études d’Asie mineure.
- Dawkins, Richard MacGillivray. 1910. Modern Greek in Asia Minor. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 30.109–132, 267–291.
- Dawkins, Richard MacGillivray. 1916. *Modern Greek in Asia Minor: A study of the dialects of Sílli, Cappadocia and Phárasa with grammar, texts, translations and glossary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dawkins, Richard MacGillivray. 1934. Some Modern Greek songs from Cappadocia. *American Journal of Archaeology* 34, 12–122.

- Dawkins, Richard McGillivray. 1946. A Byzantine carol in honour of St. Basil. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 66, 43–47.
- Dedes, Dimitris. 1993. Τὰ ἑλληνικὰ ποιήματα τοῦ Μαυλανᾶ Ρουμῆ καὶ τοῦ γιοῦ του Βαλέντ κατὰ τὸν 13ον αἰῶνα. *Τὰ Ἱστορικά* 18–19, 3–22.
- Horrocks, Geoffrey. 1990. Clitics in Greek: A diachronic review. In Maria Roussou & Stavros Panteli (eds.) *Greek outside Greece II*, 35–52. Athens: Diaspora Books.
- Horrocks, Geoffrey. 2010. *Greek: A history of the language and its speakers*. 2nd ed. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Ioannidis, S. 1870. Ἔπος μεσαιωνικὸν ἐκ τοῦ χειρογράφου Τραπεζοῦντος: Βασίλειος Διγενῆς Ἀκριτῆς ὁ Καππαδόκης. Constantinople: Κεφαλίδης.
- Janse, Mark. 1993. La position des pronoms personnels enclitiques en grec néo-testamentaire à la lumière des dialectes néo-helléniques. In: Claude Brixhe (ed.): *La koiné grecque antique*. I. *Une langue introuvable*, 83–121. Nancy: Presses Universitaires de Nancy, 1993.
- Janse, Mark. 1994. Son of Wackernagel. The distribution of object clitic pronouns in Cappadocian. In Irene Philippaki-Warbuton, Katerina Nicolaidis & Maria Sifianou (eds.): *Themes in Greek linguistics: Papers from the First International Conference on Greek Linguistics, Reading, September 1993*, 435–442. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Janse, Mark. 1998a. Cappadocian clitics and the syntax-morphology interface. In Brian D. Joseph, Geoffrey Horrocks & Irene Philippaki-Warbuton (eds.): *Themes in Greek Linguistics II*, 257–281. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Janse, Mark. 1998b. Grammaticalization and typological change : The clitic cline in inner Asia Minor Greek. In Mark Janse (ed.), *Productivity and creativity: Studies in general and descriptive linguistics in honor of E.M. Uhlenbeck*, 521–547. Berlin Mouton de Gruyter.
- Janse, Mark. 1999. Greek, Turkish, and Cappadocian relatives revis(it)ed. In: Amalia Mozer (ed.): *Greek linguistics '97: Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Greek Linguistics*, 453–462. Athens: Ellinika Grammata.
- Janse, Mark. 2001. Morphological borrowing in Asia Minor Greek. In Yoryia Aggouraki et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Greek Linguistics (Nicosia, 17–19 September 1999)*, 473–479. Thessaloniki: University Studio Press.
- Janse, Mark. 2002. Aspects of Bilingualism in the History of the Greek Language. In J.N. Adams, Mark Janse & Simon Swain (eds.), *Bilingualism in ancient society: Language contact and the written text*, 332–390. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Janse, Mark. 2004. Animacy, definiteness and case in Cappadocian and other Asia Minor Greek dialects. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 5. 3–26.
- Janse, Mark. 2006. Object position in Cappadocian and other Asia Minor Greek dialects. In Mark Janse, Brian D. Joseph & Angela Ralli (eds.), *Proceedings of the Second International Conference of Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory*, 115–129. Patras: University of Patras.
- Janse, Mark. 2007. The Cappadocian language / dialect continuum. *Abstracts of the 4th International Conference on Language Variation in Europe (ICLaVE 2007)*, 17–19 June 2007, Nicosia, Cyprus, 22. Nicosia: University of Cyprus.
- Janse, Mark. 2008. Clitic doubling from Ancient to Asia Minor Greek. In Dalina Kallulli & Liliane Tasmowski (eds.), *Clitic doubling in the Balkan languages*, 165–202. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Janse, Mark. 2009a. Greek-Turkish language contact in Asia Minor. *Études Helléniques / Hellenic Studies* 17, 37–54.

- Janse, Mark. 2009b. Watkins' law and the development of agglutinative inflections in Asia Minor Greek. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 5, 3–26.
- Janse, Mark. 2019. Agglutinative noun inflection in Cappadocian. In Angela Ralli (ed.), *The morphology of Asia Minor Greek: Selected topics*, 66–115. Leiden: Brill.
- Janse, Mark. 2020. Η Καππαδοκική διάλεκτος. In Chr. Tzitzilis (ed.), *Νεοελληνικές διάλεκτοι. Thessaloniki: Ίνστιτούτο Νεοελληνικών Σπουδών (Ίδρυμα Μανόλη Τριανταφυλλίδη)*, in press.
- Janse, Mark. Forthcoming. Ακρίτης κάστρον έχτισε: Variation and change in Akritic songs from Cappadocia. In preparation.
- Janse, Mark & Johan Vandewalle. 2020. The history and etymology of Cappadocian *ῥῥάχ* 'child', Pharasiot *ῥῥάχι* 'boy'. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 118, forthcoming.
- Jeffreys, Elizabeth M. 1991. Akritic songs. *ODB* 48.
- Jeffreys, Elizabeth M. 1998. *Digenis Akritis: The Grottaferrata and Escorial versions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jeffreys, Michael. 2019. From hexameters to fifteen-syllable verse. In Wolfram Hörandner, Andreas Rhoby & Nikos Zaglas (eds.), *A companion to Byzantine poetry*, 66–91. Leiden: Brill.
- Jerphanion, Guillaume de. 1925–1942. *Une nouvelle province de l'art byzantin: Les églises rupestres de Cappadoce*. Paris: Geuthner.
- Joseph, Brian D. 1980. Watkins' law and the Modern Greek preterite. *Sprache* 26, 179–184.
- Kappler, Matthias. 2010. Die griechischen Verse aus dem *İbtidâ-nâme* von Sultân Veled. In Matthias Kappler, Mark Kirchner & Peter Zieme (eds.), *Trans-Turkic studies: Festschrift in honour of Marcel Erdal*, 379–397. Istanbul: Mehmet Ölmez Yayınları.
- Karatsareas, Petros. 2011. *A study of Cappadocian Greek nominal morphology from a diachronic and dialectological perspective*. PhD dissertation, University of Cambridge.
- Karatsareas, Petros. 2013. Understanding diachronic change in Cappadocian Greek: The dialectological perspective. *Journal of Historical Linguistics* 3, 192–229.
- Karolidis, Pavlos. 1885. *Γλωσσάριον συγκριτικὸν Ἑλληνοκαππαδοκικῶν λέξεων ἥτοι ἡ ἐν Καππαδοκίᾳ λαλουμένη Ἑλληνικὴ διάλεκτος καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ σωζόμενα ἔχνη τῆς ἀρχαίας Καππαδοκικῆς γλώσσας*. Smyrna: Ὁ Τύπος.
- Karphopoulos, P. 2008. Γραμματικά; λεξιλόγιον. In Eleni G. Tzioutzia (ed.), *Μαλακοπή Καππαδοκίας: Μέσα από πηγές, έγγραφα καὶ μαρτυρίες*. Thessaloniki: ILP Productions
- Kesisoglou, Ioannis I. 1951. *Τὸ γλωσσικὸ ἰδίωμα τοῦ Οὐλαγάτς*. Athens: Institut français d'Athènes.
- Kitromilides, Paschalis M. 1990. Irredentism in Asia Minor and Cyprus. *Middle Eastern Studies* 26, 3–17.
- Kontosopoulos, Nikolaos G. 1994. *Διάλεκτοι καὶ ἰδιώματα τῆς νέας ἑλληνικῆς*. 2nd ed. Athens: Γρηγόρης.
- Kostakis, Athanasios P. 1963. *Ἡ Ἀνακού*. Athens: Κέντρο Μικρασιατικῶν Σπουδῶν.
- Kostakis, Athanasios P. 1968. *Τὸ γλωσσικὸ ἰδίωμα τῆς Σίλλης*. Athens: Κέντρο Μικρασιατικῶν Σπουδῶν.
- Kotsanidis, Lazaros. 2005. *Τὸ γλωσσικὸ ἰδίωμα τοῦ Μιστί Καππαδοκίας*. Kilikis: Γνώμη Κιλκίς-Παιονίας.
- Krinopoulos, Sokratis. 1889. *Τὰ Φερτάκινα: Ὑπὸ ἐθνολογικὴν καὶ φιλολογικὴν ἐποψιν ἐξεταζόμενα*. Athens: Δημ. Φέξης.
- Lagarde, Paul. 1886. *Neugriechisches aus Kleinasien*. Göttingen: Dieterichsche Verlagsbuchhandlung.

- Lauxtermann, Marc D. 1999. *The spring of rhythm: An essay on the political verse and other Byzantine meters*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Lauxtermann, Marc D. 2019. *Byzantine poetry from Pisides to Geometres: Texts and contexts*. Vol. 2. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Lekakou, Marika & Petros Karatsareas. 2016. Marking definiteness multiply: Evidence from two varieties of Greek. In Mark Janse, Brian D. Joseph & Angela Ralli (eds.), *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory, Patras, 25–28 September 2014*, 189–203. Patras: University of Patras.
- Levidis, Anastasios M. 1892. *Πραγματεία περὶ τῆς ἐν Καππαδοκίᾳ λαλουμένης γλώσσης: Μετὰ τῶν δημῶδων ᾠσμάτων, αἰνιγμάτων, παροιμιῶν, ευχῶν, καταρῶν, ὄρκων, κυρίων ονομάτων, μύθων, ᾠσμάτων μεσαιωνικῶν, γραμματικῆς, καὶ γλωσσᾶριων οκτώ, καὶ σημειώσεων*. Unpublished manuscript. Oxford: Bodleian Library [Arch.Z.Dawk.22].
- Lewis, Geoffrey. 2000. *Turkish grammar*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lüdeke, Hedwig. 1994. *Ἑλληνικὰ δημοτικὰ τραγούδια: Τὰ ακριτικά / Neugriechische Volkslieder: Akritenlieder*. Athens: Ἀκαδημία Ἀθηνῶν.
- Mackridge, Peter. 1990. The metrical structure of the oral decapentasyllable. *Byzantine & Modern Greek Studies* 14, 200–212.
- Mackridge, Peter. 1993a. ‘None but the brave deserve the fair’: Abduction, elopement, seduction and marriage in the Escorial *Digenes Akrites* and Modern Greek heroic songs. In Roderick Beaton & David Ricks (ed.), *Digenes Akrites: New approaches to Byzantine heroic poetry*, 150–160. Aldershot: Variorum.
- Mackridge, Peter. 1993b. An editorial problem in Medieval Greek texts: The position of the object clitic pronoun in the Escorial *Digenes Akrites*. In Nikolaos M. Panagiotakis (ed.), *Ἀρχές της νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας: Πρακτικά του δεύτερου διεθνούς συνεδρίου “Neograeca Medii Aevi”*, 325–342. Venice: Istituto Ellenico di Studi Bizantini e Postbizantini di Venezia.
- Mackridge, Peter. 2000. The position of the weak object pronoun in Medieval and Modern Greek. *Jazyk i řečevaja dejatel'nost'* 3. 133–151.
- Manolessou, Io. 2019. The historical background of the Asia Minor dialects. In Angela Ralli (ed.), *The morphology of Asia Minor Greek: Selected topics*, 20–65. Leiden: Brill.
- Mavrochalividis, Giorgios P. 1990. *Ἡ Ἀξὸ Καππαδοκίας*. Athens: Ἑστία Νέας Σμύρνης.
- Mavrochalividis, Giorgios P. & Ioannis I. Kesisoglou. 1960. *Τὸ γλωσσικὸ ἰδίωμα τῆς Ἀξοῦ*. Athens: Institut français d’Athènes.
- Papadopoulos, Anthimos A. 1958–61. *Ἱστορικὸν λεξικὸν τῆς Ποντικῆς διαλέκτου*. Athens: Μυρτίδης.
- Phates, Thomas. 201. *Χιογός α σι χαρίς: Εκμάθηση του Μισιωτικού ιδιώματος (άνευ διδασκάλου)*. Konitsa.
- Phosteris, Dimitrios & Kesisoglou, Ioannis O. 1960. *Λεξιλόγιο τοῦ Ἀραβανί*. Athens: Institut français d’Athènes.
- Politis, Nikolaos G. 1909. Ἀκριτικά ᾄσματα: ὁ θάνατος τοῦ Διγενῆ. *Λαογραφία* 1, 169–275.
- Ralli, Angela. 2016. Strategies and patterns of loan verb integration in Modern Greek varieties. In Angela Ralli (ed.), *Contact morphology in Modern Greek dialects*, 73–108. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Press.
- Ralli, Angela. 2019. Introduction. In Angela Ralli (ed.), *The morphology of Asia Minor Greek: Selected topics*, 1–19. Leiden: Brill.
- Sarantidis Archelaos, Ioannis cf. Archelaos, Ioannis Sarantidis

- Saunier, Guy. 1993. Is there such a thing as an 'akritic song'? Problems in the classification of Modern Greek narrative songs. Roderick Beaton & David Ricks (ed.), *Digenes Akrites: New approaches to Byzantine heroic poetry*, 139–149. Aldershot: Variorum.
- Symeonidis, Charalambos. 1976. *Der Vokalismus der griechischen Lehnwörter im Türkischen*. Thessaloniki: Institute for Balkan Studies.
- Theodoridis, Dimitri. 2004. Versuch einer Neuausgabe von drei griechischen Doppelversen aus dem *Dīwān* von Sulṭān Walad. *Byzantion* 74, 433–451.
- Thomason, Sarah Grey & Terrence Kaufman. 1988. *Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Thumb, Albert. 1910. *Handbuch der neugriechischen Volkssprache*. 2nd ed. Strassburg: Trübner.
- Vryonis, Speros, Jr. 1971. *The decline of medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the process of Islamization from the eleventh through the fifteenth century*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Winford, Donald. 2005. Contact-induced changes: Classification and processes. *Diachronica* 22. 373–427.