

# ΜΑΝΤΑΤΟΦΟΡΟΣ

Δελτίο Νεοελληνικών Σπουδών



Τεύχος 22 Νοέμβριος 1983

# JOURNAL OF THE HELLENIC DIASPORA

is the *only* quarterly journal of modern Greek studies  
in the English-speaking world.

*Articles published in past issues have included:*

"Problems of Economic History of the Period of Ottoman  
Domination in Greece" by SPYROS I. ASDRACHAS;  
"Greek Education: A Story of Frustrated Reform" by ALEXIS  
DIMARAS;  
"Cavafis and his Translators into English" by KIMON FRIAR;  
"Shepherds, Brigands, and Irregulars in Nineteenth Century  
Greece" by JOHN S. KOLIOPOULOS;  
"The Politics of Hunger: Economic Aid to Greece, 1943-1945"  
by ANGELIKI LAIOU-THOMADAKIS;  
"The Army and Politics in Modern Greece" by NICOS MOUZELIS;  
"Greek Socialism: Walking the Tightrope" by JAMES F. PETRAS;  
"On the Problem of Political Clientelism in Greece in the Nine-  
teenth Century" by CONSTANTINE TSOUICALAS;  
"Anatomy Lesson" an original story by VASILIS VASILIKOS;  
"The Greek State and Economy During the Pangalos Regime,  
1925-1926" by THANOS VEREMIS;  
plus special issues on "Greece: 1940-1950" and  
"Education in Greece Today: A Symposium" guest edited by ANNA  
FRANGOUDAKIS.

## Subscription rates:

- |  |         |
|--|---------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Individual—One year                         | \$15.00 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Individual—One year, foreign (surface mail) | \$20.00 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Individual—One year, foreign (air mail)     | \$25.00 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Institutional—One year                      | \$25.00 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Institutional—One year, foreign             | \$30.00 |

Please remit in U.S. dollars to:

Pella Publishing Company  
337 West 36th Street, New York, NY 10018, U.S.A.

Brian Joseph

## MANTATOΦOPOΣ

Δελτίο

Νεοελληνικών Σπουδών

αρ. 22, Νοέμβριος 1983

Διεύθυνση της σύνταξης:  
"Mantatoforos" (Wim Bakker/Arnold van Gemert),  
Byzantijns-Nieuwgrieks Seminarium,  
Nieuwe Doelenstr. 16,  
1012 CP Amsterdam, Holland.

## ΠΕΡΙΕΧΟΜΕΝΑ

Της σύνταξης	2
Νέα	3
TAMÁS GLASER, Επισκόπηση μεταφράσεων και μετα- φραστών: ΟΥΓΓΑΡΙΑ	5
BRIAN D. JOSEPH, Modern Greek Linguistics from the Balkan Perspective	13
J.N. KAZAZIS, Constructing a Computer-assisted Complete Index to Makriyannis' Memoirs	27
ΜΑΡΙΑ ΜΑΝΤΟΥΒΑΛΟΥ, Ρωμαίος-Ρωμίος και Ρωμο- σύνη	34
JÜRGEN WERNER, Επισκόπηση μεταφράσεων και μετα- φραστών: ΛΑΤΙΚΗ ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΙΑ ΓΕΡΜΑΝΙΑΣ	73
WIM BAKKER/ARNOLD VAN GEMERT, Χρονολογικός πί- νακας των έργων της κρητικής λογοτεχνίας κατά την περίοδο της Βενετοκρατίας	79
Βιβλία που πήραμε	88
Ευρετήριο των τευχών 11 - 22	89

Αυτό το τεύχος το επιμελήθηκαν οι  
Wim Bakker, Kostas Dimadis, Arnold van Gemert,  
Christiane Hermans και Ems Swaan.

του στην Ελλάδα, ίδρυσε ένα περιοδικό - το "Πρίσμα" - με σκοπό τη διάδοση της ξένης λογοτεχνίας. Από το περιεχόμενο των 4 τευχών που εκδόθηκαν γίνεται φανερό ότι πρότυπο ήταν το *Nagyvilág*. Δυστυχώς, μετά το θάνατο του Χατζή η έκδοση του περιοδικού έχει διακοπεί.

Στις δεκαετίες του 60 και του 70 σημειώθηκε άνοδος στη μεταφραστική και εκδοτική δραστηριότητα, πράγμα που οφείλεται τόσο στη βελτίωση των οικονομικών και πολιτιστικών προϋποθέσεων όσο και στο ζωντανό ενδιαφέρον που προκλήθηκε από τα πολιτικά γεγονότα στην Ελλάδα την περίοδο αυτή. Τα τελευταία χρόνια όμως οι οικονομικές δυσκολίες έγιναν αισθητές και σ' αυτόν τον τομέα, όπως δείχνει και η πτώση των "τιράζ". Για παράδειγμα: τα ποιήματα του Καβάφη εκδόθηκαν στα 1975 σε 15000 αντίτυπα, ενώ η εκλογή του Ελύτη στα 1981, δηλ. αμέσως μετά την απονομή του Νόμπελ, αριθμούσε μόνο 1700 αντίτυπα. Το 1973 το έργο "Ο Χριστός ξανασταυρώνεται" είχε εκδοθεί σε 129850 αντίτυπα, που εξαντλήθηκαν σε λίγους μήνες. Το 1981 το ίδιο έργο τυπώθηκε σε 12500 αντίτυπα. Παρά τις δυσκολίες αυτές αυτή τη στιγμή ετοιμάζονται δυο ανθολογίες κυπριακής λογοτεχνίας και ο Kálmán Szabó έχει τελειώσει τη μετάφραση της "Γυναίκας της Ζάκυνθος" του Σολωμού. Πιθανώς θα υπάρξουν κι άλλες πρωτοβουλίες, και έχουμε κάθε λόγο να πιστεύουμε πως η έκδοση νεοελληνικών λογοτεχνικών έργων σε ουγγρική μετάφραση θα συνεχιστεί.

Βουδαπέστη

Famás Glaser

Σημ.: Βλ. και K. Szabo, Η νεοελληνική λογοτεχνία στη σοσιαλιστική Ουγγαρία, *Homonoia* 2(1980), 103-39.

## Modern Greek Linguistics from the Balkan Perspective

### A SURVEY

The Balkans are well-known as an important crossroads area; for centuries numerous peoples have moved in and out of this Southeastern European area, and as a result, speakers of different languages have come in contact with one another. In many cases, this mixing of languages and language communities has led to changes in existing languages in the area, often in terms of the addition of lexical items - cultural items, toponyms, hydronyms and the like - but sometimes in other aspects of the language as well. Katičić 1976 has discussed many aspects of this mixing of languages in the Balkans in ancient times, and somewhat more recently, modern scholars have shown considerable interest in the linguistic picture painted by this area.

In particular, a subfield within the discipline of Linguistics has arisen that is concerned primarily with the study of the interrelations among the languages of the Balkans, especially within the medieval and modern periods. The languages of interest in this regard include Albanian, Modern Greek, Romanian, and the South Slavic languages Bulgarian, Macedonian, and Serbo-Croatian, as well as Turkish. This subfield, known as Balkan Linguistics or Balkanistics examines and attempts to explain the ways in which these various languages have influenced one another over their many centuries of contact. The primary datum that Balkan Linguistics operates with is the observation that these languages show numerous similarities in all levels of linguistic structure - phonological, morphological, syntactic, and lexical, and thus together they constitute what is known as a Sprachbund, "a group of languages in contact, characterized by a development toward typological homogeneity regardless of genetic heterogeneity" (Jeffers and Lehiste 1979: 185). The study of these parallels, their description, and the explanation of their causes, thus, constitute the goals of Balkan Linguistics.

Although the existence of these similarities was recognized at least as early as the 19th century, it was only with the public-

ation in 1930 of Kr. Sandfeld's monumental work, *Linguistique Balkanique - Problèmes et Résultats*, that the field of Balkan Linguistics was effectively created. Sandfeld identified and collected together in one work statements of many of the structural parallels holding among the languages of the area, such as the merger of dative and genitive case functions, the formation of a future tense with a form of the verb for 'want', the appearance of the definite article after the first element of the nominal phrase it is associated with, the general disuse of the infinitive and consequent increase in use of finite subordinate clauses, and the like, as well as numerous other parallels of a lexical nature, such as the formation of the numbers from 11 to 19 as 'DIGIT-on-TEN'. Since that time, much energy has been devoted to the study of these parallels, generally known as Balkanisms, with the result that new Balkanisms have been proposed, such as the merger of dative and locative case functions (Naylor 1981), and others previously identified have been explicated more thoroughly. In fact, the field of Balkan Linguistics has grown so considerably that two new handbooks, Schaller 1975 and Solta 1980, have appeared, a bibliography covering the field and containing some 1500 items (1), Schaller 1977, has been compiled, and at least four journals devoted primarily to Balkanistic concerns, *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie*, *Balkansko Ezikoznanie*, *Les Etudes Balkaniques Tchecoslovaques*, and *Balkanistica*, have been founded and now thrive (2).

Since Balkan Linguistics is concerned with the interrelations among the Balkan languages, it is not surprising that a good part of the progress in this field has been made through the examination of phenomena common to two or more languages in the area and through the study of any interaction that may be evident among these languages. However, the study of linguistic phenomena in the individual languages has also provided an important source of information for the field in general, so that the study of each language mentioned above, in and of itself, is actually of considerable importance to the overall field of Balkan Linguistics.

It is within this context that the role of Modern Greek and of Modern Greek Linguistics can begin to be assessed. Although as noted above, all of the Balkan languages are potential providers of input to Balkan Linguistics, there is a sense in which Greek is an especially important language in this regard. For one thing, Greek is the earliest and most continuously attested Balkan language, with records from ancient times up through the Hellenistic, Byzantine, and Medieval periods, and further up into the Modern era without a break. Greek thus affords the opportunity to see how a Balkan language has evolved under conditions of contact with the other languages since the beginning point before extensive contact is so well documented. Second, Greek for a long time was an important language from a cultural standpoint in many of the non-Greek speaking areas of the Balkans, so that influence from Greek on

these other languages may well have been an significant impetus in the formation of some of the Balkanisms mentioned above. Finally, Greek is a non-Slavic language, so that any parallels between it and the Slavic languages of the Balkans become more significant from a Balkan perspective since they cannot be the result of some innovation harking back to the Common Slavic period when all the Slavic languages were one and the same language, i.e. approximately 800 AD; while the same can certainly be said regarding the other non-Slavic languages of the Balkans, namely Albanian, Romanian, and Turkish, so that this point should not be given undue emphasis, it does mean that a comparison between Greek and Bulgarian, for example, is more interesting from the Balkan standpoint than a comparison between Bulgarian and Serbo-Croatian.

From what has been said so far by way of introduction concerning Balkan Linguistics, it should be clear how Greek and the study of Greek fit into the general Balkan picture. Greek displays a number of the linguistic traits generally considered to be Balkanisms and, what is especially important from the perspective of trying to understand why these phenomena have occurred, Greek did not have these characteristics in its earlier stages, especially in ancient times. A full listing of the Balkan features found in Greek is not necessary here, for these are detailed in the handbooks, especially Schaller (1975: 101-2), and in articles such as the important one by Andriotis and Kourmoulis (1968). Briefly, though, like the other Balkan languages (for the most part), Greek has done away with the verbal category *infinitive* and replaced the earlier infinitive with finite subordinate clauses headed by particles like *na* or *pos*, it has a future tense based on a form of the verb 'want', i.e. *θα* from the earlier *thēlei na*, it has merged genitive and dative "functions" into a single case which continues the Ancient Greek genitive, it forms comparatives analytically by means of the particle *πύθ*, and it makes frequent use of the short pronominal forms to crossindex direct and indirect objects in a clause. Greek, therefore, while not displaying all the characteristics commonly associated with the Balkan languages - the postpositive definite article is missing from Greek and, as Naylor 1980 points out, Greek does not have a mid-to-high central vowel as most of the other languages do - nonetheless displays enough to merit consideration as a member, from a structural standpoint, of the Balkan Sprachbund.

An additional way in which the study of Greek contributes to Balkan Linguistics is through lexicology in its broadest sense, taking in the study of individual lexical items, idioms, phrases, toponyms, hydronyms, etymologies, and the like. For one thing, Greek has contributed numerous loan words to all the Balkan languages - important studies in this area include Andriotis 1952 and Filipova-Bajrova 1968 regarding Greek loans in Bulgarian, Kazazis 1976 and Mihăescu 1966 regarding Greek loans in Romanian, Uhlisch 1968 and 1969 regarding Greek loans in Albanian, and Vasmer 1944

regarding Greek loans in Serbo-Croatian, among others. Also, Greek shows several of the lexical and phraseological parallels found in other Balkan languages, for example *words dlo* 'without doubt', but literally "without (an)other", as also in Bulgarian (*bez drugo*), Albanian (*pa tjetrë*) and Romanian (*fără de alta*), all literally and figuratively like the Greek, or *māzēpse ti glōsa su* 'watch your language!', but literally "collect your tongue", as also in Albanian (*mëlidh gojën*) and Aroumanian (*aduna-ți gura*), again all literally and figuratively like the Greek. (3) In a similar vein, Djamo-Diaconița 1968 has shown numerous parallels in the proverbs in the various Balkan languages, including Greek, e.g. *den kánune óles i mīges méli* as also in Albanian (*s'bënjë mjaltë gjithë mizat*) and Romanian (*nu fac toate muștele miere*), all literally "not all flies make honey" and all used as the expression for "la traditionnelle répulsion pour les paresseux et pour ceux qui se dérobent au travail" (p. 286). Finally, important studies have been done on the question of the Balkan origins for a myriad of place and river names in Greece, especially by Georgacas (e.g. the articles of 1964-1967, among numerous others) and etymologies for several common Balkan terms have often been found in Greek, as by Moutsos 1969/70 with regard to *kopēla* and its counterparts in other Balkan languages.

A final way in which the study of Greek has provided input from the Balkan perspective is with regard to the causes of many of the pan-Balkan features. Greek has been imputed to be the source of some of the Balkanistic features found in the other languages of the area. In fact, Sandfeld himself felt that Greek was the source of the parallels involving the verb 'want' in the future tense formation and the absence of the infinitive from so many of the Balkan languages, though these both have been much disputed since his time and the truth probably is not as clear cut as Sandfeld or his opposition has taken it to be. With regard to the loss of the infinitive, for example, Joseph (1983: Chapter 7) has argued that while the potential for the independent loss of the infinitive seems to have been present in most of the Balkan languages, language contact in some form must have been at least a catalyzing agent in bringing on this development; most likely this was not just the superstratum contact of Greek over other languages, as Sandfeld envisioned it, but instead involved more complex interactions among speakers in an emerging multilingual society, possibly that of Northern Greece in the late Medieval period. As for the future tense formation, Reichenkron 1962 takes issue with the hypothesis that Greek is the source of the 'want' future, objecting to Sandfeld's claims of Greek cultural superiority in the Balkans; moreover, as Šabršula 1972, Demiraj 1972 and many other scholars have pointed out, similar formations occur in the Romance languages (4), so that Balkan Latin may have played some role too. The interrelations of the various future formations in the Balkan languages represent a still poorly-understood area, as noted below and in footnote 8.

Therefore the study of these aspects of the structure, history, and content of Modern Greek sheds important light on the workings of the Balkan Sprachbund as a whole, and to the extent that Greek can be said to have played a role in any way in the spread of these features, the study of Greek contributes to an understanding of how the Balkan Sprachbund came into existence in the first place. However, the relationship between Greek Linguistics and Balkan Linguistics is not one-way, and it is often the case that one can solve problems in Modern Greek Linguistics through a consideration of data from the neighboring languages.

This is especially so with regard to the etymology of particular lexical items, though it is certainly not restricted to this area. By way of illustration, two examples, one concerning an etymology and one concerning a problem in the historical development of the noun in Modern Greek, are discussed below.

The etymology in question is that of the deictic particle *na*, which has generally been held, especially by Greek scholars (e.g. Hatzidakis 1905: II, pp. 100, 400; Andriotis 1967: s.v.) to derive from Ancient Greek *e:nide* 'see there' (composed of the interjection *e:n* 'behold' plus the imperativ form *idé* 'see!') via a re-segmentation to *e:nt-de* which created a free form *e:nt*; with the substitution of the adverbial ending *-a* for *-i* in *e:nt* and the regular loss of unstressed initial vowels, it is claimed, the deictic *na* came into being. While undoubtedly a possible source for *na*, this is certainly a complicated etymology for an apparently simple word; moreover, this etymology does not explain the syntax of the particle *na*. As it turns out, a Balkan etymology can be adduced for *na* which meets these problems. Joseph 1981 argues that Greek *na* is in fact a loan-word from a neighboring Balkan language; an identical particle occurs in South Slavic, as well as in Albanian, Romanian, and Turkish, and demonstrative particles in the South Slavic languages at least, have similar syntax to Greek *na* (see Schaller 1970). What suggests that Slavic is the ultimate source of this word in Greek and not vice-versa, is that this form also occurs in West Slavic, e.g. Polish, and East Slavic, e.g. Ukrainian, areas which do not typically show any evidence of influence from Balkan languages. Thus even if it might have actually entered Greek through a non-Slavic Balkan language like Turkish or Albanian, it seems likely that *na* is actually a Balkan loan-word of Slavic origin in Greek.

Similarly, on the level of morphology, the development of the masculine singular genitives with a zero-ending (*-0*), opposed to nominative singular forms in *-s*, e.g. genitive *tu patéra-0* versus nominative *o patéra-s* 'the father' or *tu kléfti-0* versus *o kléfti-s* 'the robber', is another area in which a Balkan perspective may be useful. The actual historical path by which *patéra* or *kléfti* as genitives were created is somewhat obscure. They are neither the regular phonetic development of an Ancient Greek type - the

patéra type continues the Ancient Greek third declension which had a genitive in *-os* (e.g. *patr-ós* 'of a father') while the *kléfti* type continues the Ancient Greek masculine first declension nouns such as *tamíā:s* 'steward' which had a genitive in *-ou* (e.g. *tamíou*) - nor are they the result of any obvious type of analogical reformation. Various possibilities exist, e.g. for the *kléfti* type one can point to the occurrence of a genitive such as *Atreidḗs*:, from a contraction of *-a:-o*, in Doric and Aeolic, giving a nominative *-a:s* versus genitive *-a:*, analyzable as *-a:-s* / *-a:-Ø*, just like *kléfti-s* / *kléfti-Ø*. However, these ancient dialects generally did not provide much input to the Koine, so that an explanation relying on them is not very satisfying. In a like manner, the second declension nouns do have a nominative in *-s* with a genitive in *-Ø*, e.g. *ánθropo-s* / *ánθropu*, giving a potential model for the genitive forms in question, but the final vowel of the stem changes between the nominative and genitive, unlike the situation with the *kléftis* or *patéras* type, (5) again making this explanation less than satisfactory. (6)

A possible solution to this problem again comes from a consideration of facts from other Balkan languages. As Civ'jan 1965 has noted in her study of the noun in the Balkan languages, Bulgarian and Macedonian show a one-case (or perhaps better, a no-case) noun system, in which one form of the noun serves for all cases, while the other Balkan languages show primarily a two-case system. Civ'jan's model of the formation of the Balkan Sprachbund emphasizes the role that a need for a balance between efficient language production and efficient language processing played in the contact between speakers of several different languages in the Balkans, and for her, Bulgarian and Macedonian come closest in form, with regard to the nominal system at least, to the hypothetical "mediator" language which would have been necessary in such a multilingual context. The fact that many of the Balkan languages have reduced the number of contrasts in their noun declension can be viewed as a direct result of the language contact situation in the Balkans, in Civ'jan's view. Similarly, a continued movement in that direction in many of the languages can be detected. Viewed in this context, the formation of genitives like *patéra* or *kléfti* in Greek becomes more understandable, for they give the masculine nouns a two-case declension - and note that the feminine nouns have a parallel two-case system distributed differently, i.e. nominative and accusative in *-Ø*, e.g. *adelfi-Ø* 'sister' opposed to a genitive in *-s* e.g. *adelfi-s* - whereas otherwise they would have throughout a three-case system, thus constituting an anomaly within the Balkan Sprachbund. Of course, some masculine nouns, i.e. the *o*-stems such as *ánθropos* do have such a three-case declension, but the vast majority of Greek nouns, with the creation of genitives such as *patéra* and *kléfti*, now follow the prevailing Balkan reduced case system.

These examples show the potential for explanatory power that

Balkan Linguistics can offer to Greek linguistics. It is important to emphasize the word "potential" here, for these examples are not to be taken as representing the last word in any sense regarding these problems in Greek linguistics. Etymology is to some extent a matter of taste, so that it is often hard to prove or disprove an etymology conclusively, and much still remains unanswered about the historical development of the Modern Greek masculine genitive singular. Thus, problems may not be completely solved in this way, but the Balkan facts, it seems, should not be ignored in further research into other aspects of Modern Greek linguistics.

Among the desiderata for the future study of Modern Greek in its Balkan context are several areas which have been examined to some degree but not to the full extent that is needed, as well as some relatively new areas which are also deserving of close examination. For one thing, continued lexical studies are needed in order to assess the extent to which the vocabulary of Modern Greek has been influenced by other Balkan languages, to determine the status that these loans have within the Greek lexicon, as Kazazis 1972 and to a lesser extent Joseph 1982 have already begun to do, and at the same time to reevaluate many etymologies for Greek words that have been proposed. As the earlier example of the deictic particle *ná* shows, not all words which appear to be "native" Greek words actually are, and it may well be the case that several of the common affective elements in the Greek lexicon, such as particles, interjections and the like, have their origin in non-Greek Balkan languages; an additional case in point may be the interjection *aidé*, which is usually etymologized as deriving from Ancient Greek *dgeté de*, but in fact is hard to separate from such forms as Turkish *haydi* 'come! be off!', which occurs as *hay de* in 14th century Turkish, just like *aidé*, and is apparently composed of an interjection (*hay* 'hey!', alas!) with a form of the verb 'to say' (*de-mek*); an actual determination, however, awaits further study.

To some extent, examples such as those concerning *na* and *aidé* show another desideratum in Greek Linguistics in its Balkan context, namely the need to move away from linguistic chauvinism; this point has been made also by Andriotis and Kourmoulis (1968: 22) who have noted "la répugnance des linguistes balkaniques à rechercher l'influence des langues limitrophes sur celle de leur propre pays" especially with regard to the source of a particular construction or lexical item in their native language. If what is of interest is the truth - to the extent that it can (ever) be determined - lying behind the history of some word or the spread of some syntagm, then it should not matter whether Greek (or some other language) was the donor language or the borrowing language in a linguistic "transaction".

On a more purely linguistic level, one can note the absence of

significant work on how features such as reportedness, distancing, admirativity, perfectivity, and aspect in general, which have all been shown to enter into extremely complex structuring in the verbal systems of Macedonian, Bulgarian, Albanian, and Turkish (see, e.g. Friedman 1977, 1980, 1981) are realized in the verbal system of Modern Greek. The similarities and differences among these languages in this regard are extremely interesting for the Balkanist, but as yet, only Ancient Greek has been mentioned in this regard, and not Modern Greek. As Friedman (1980: 10) points out, several scholars have noted that Ancient Greek *dra* with the imperfect of 'be' could be used "to express surprise at something which was true in the past but was only accepted or realized by the speaker at the moment of speech ... (a) usage (which) is reminiscent of the Bulgarian admirative"; as yet, though, the existence of a comparable syntagm in Modern Greek has not been thoroughly investigated.

Similarly, the phonological parallels that have been noted for the Balkan languages have generally not been found in Greek; for example, as noted above, Greek lacks the mid-to-high central vowel found in several Balkan languages. While this may be the result of the way in which Greek has developed vis-à-vis the other Balkan languages, it may just as well be the result of a lack of attention to certain aspects of Greek phonology. For instance, Lehiste and Ivič (1980) report that Serbo-Croatian, Albanian, and Romanian seem to show a parallel with respect to a final low-high intonation in yes-no questions; while the findings reported in Waring 1982 would appear to rule Greek out from consideration here, intonation studies of Modern Greek - as Waring himself notes - are still in a nascent state, so that further research here may well prove enlightening from a Balkan standpoint. Instrumental studies of Greek intonation are especially in order, since instrumental analysis of intonation can often reveal facts not readily observable with just the ear, even a trained ear. At the very least, however, the observations concerning the Serbo-Croatian, Albanian, and Romanian question intonation provide an important point of comparison (7) and point of departure for future studies of Modern Greek intonation.

Further research is also needed into the social situation in the early period of contact among the Balkan languages, for without a clear understanding of how the various speech communities related to one another socially, it is hard to determine with any precision how the features usually classified as Balkanisms actually spread from one language to another and how these similar patterns developed in these diverse languages. A case in point here is the question of the absence of the infinitive, where it has been possible to construct a plausible scenario of how the spread of such a feature might have occurred (Joseph 1983), but in the absence of accurate knowledge of the social situation in northern Greece in the period roughly 800 AD to 1400 AD, the scenario

must remain somewhat speculative.

In addition, it would be extremely useful for all putative Balkanisms to be examined in depth with regard to how they are realized, if at all, in Greek. Especially pressing in this regard is the formation of the future tense in Greek. While there are a few works that treat the various formations of the future in Greek, especially Medieval Greek and dialectal Modern Greek, for example Banescu 1915 (difficult to obtain, though) or Blanken 1950, no work yet, it seems, has carefully explored the relation of these various formations to apparent parallel ones in other Balkan languages (8); thus from a Balkan perspective, it is indeed interesting that the Standard Modern Greek future particle *θα* is a reduction of an earlier future marker *thélei na* - as shown especially clearly by the Medieval Greek and dialectal Modern Greek future types *Θε na* + INFLECTED VERB and *Θελα* + INFLECTED VERB, which each apparently represent a different reduction of the same *thélei na* + INFLECTED VERB - and that this source construction is paralleled, for example, by the Macedonian *k'e da* + INFLECTED VERB, where *k'e* is a reduction of the third person singular present of the verb 'want' and *da* is a verbal particle, here optional actually, not unlike Greek *na* in its function, and by Albanian *do të* + INFLECTED VERB, in which *do*, like *Θε* and *k'e*, is a frozen form of the third person singular of 'want' and *të* is a subordinating particle. However the details of the relationship among the expressions of the future in these languages - and indeed among all the Balkan languages - remain to be worked out.

Finally, to close on a matter of importance for research in Balkan Linguistics that touches to some extent on Greek per se but bears more directly on Greece itself, there is a real urgency for the non-Greek Balkan speech communities within Greece to be studied. These include the various Arvanitika, i.e. Albanian-speaking, communities scattered around Greece, the Vlach speakers of north-central Greece whose native Aroumanian language is a dialect of Romanian, the Ladino (or Judeo-Espagnol) speakers of Thessaloniki and environs, the various - and often itinerant - groups of Gypsies whose native language is Romany with admixtures from the languages of the several countries they have historically traveled through, and the Macedonian speakers of the far north of Greece. While Arvanitika, Aroumanian and Macedonian have been in Greece for a long time, some 600 years at least, and are fully "Balkanized", Ladino and Romany are probably of a somewhat more recent date yet they too show some, but not all, of the common Balkan features. Study of these languages in their Greek setting is especially important since all are faced with extinction as pressures from the dominant Greek language begin to prevail in their respective communities. These languages are of interest to the Neo-Hellenist in that they have, within fairly recent times, incorporated numerous Greek linguistic elements. Papahagi 1963, for instance, gives 27 pages (1172-1199) of lexical items in Aroumanian which



are borrowed from Greek; by contrast, there are only 19 pages of words of Latin origin, even though Aroumanian is genetically a Latinate language. Similarly, Haebler 1965 (especially sections 377-380) gives numerous Modern Greek stem-forming elements in Salamis Arvanitika and Tsitsipis 1981 notes that the gerundive in Arvanitika, unlike that of Standard Albanian, is restricted to use as the complement of subject nominals only, just as in Modern Greek. Moreover, these languages offer a unique perspective on Balkan linguistics and on the question of language contact as a source of change and of Balkanisms, for they present living instances of the sort of intense interaction among languages which may well have characterized the Balkans in the crucial period of the formation of the Balkan Sprachbund.

Thus the relationship between Modern Greek and Balkan Linguistics is indeed a vital one. Just as the linguistic study of Modern Greek has much to offer the more general field of Balkan Linguistics, so too can the study of Balkan Linguistics and the languages of the Balkans contribute to the understanding of aspects of Modern Greek Linguistics and the Modern Greek language. The field is still wide open, and investigation of many important topics awaits only the creativity and energy of current and future researchers in this area.

#### Footnotes

1. Some items are repeated under different topic headings and not all pertain to the study of a particular language or linguistic phenomenon in its Balkan context. Other important sources of bibliographical information on Balkan Linguistics in general and on Greek Linguistics from the Balkan perspective are the handbooks themselves listed above, Stankiewicz 1969, Stankiewicz and Naylor 1977/78, and Kazazis 1977/78.
2. I give these four as the leading representatives of their kind, knowing full well that other journals exist which deal indirectly with topics of concern to Balkan Linguistics; my exclusion of these others is not intended in any way as a slight.
3. For more examples, see Sandfeld (1930: 163ff., 205-213), Andriotis and Kourmoulis 1968, Papahagi 1908, and Newton 1962.
4. The Germanic languages as well for that matter show a similar future formation, cf. English futures with *will*.
5. Admittedly, one subclass of Ancient Greek second declension nouns, the contract nouns like *noûs* 'mind' (from *ndos*) had a nominative in *-s* and a genitive in *-ø* (e.g. *noû* from *ndou*) with no change in the final vowel of the stem. However, since that class is so small, it is hard to imagine that it exerted any influence over the noun classes in question here; note, for instance, that

the *noûs* / *noû* subclass had no effect on the stem vowel of the class most like it, namely the regular second declension nouns like *anôropos* / *anôropou*, where the vowel difference has persisted into Modern Greek (*-o-* in the nominative versus *-u-* in the genitive now).

6. Thumb (1964: 47) says the *patêra* type genitive is based on the *klêfti* type, but offers no explanation for the *klêfti* type itself, treating it, incorrectly, merely as a continuation of the *tamia:s* type of Ancient Greek.

7. It is worth noting that Balkan Linguistics can also be enriched by a consideration of the differences holding among Balkan languages, so that even if Greek does not show the same type of question intonation as other Balkan languages, this fact is of significance to the Balkanist.

8. As noted earlier, there are numerous problems associated with the various future formations in the Balkan languages. An additional problem is the existence of futures based on the verb 'have', found in Medieval Greek, northern Albanian (Geg), and Romanian; a Balkan Latin source for this cannot be ruled out, although, as with the 'want' future, much remains to be worked out; see Hamp 1968 and Domi 1968 for some discussion.

#### References

- Andriotis, N. 1952: Ελληνικά στοιχεία της βουλγαρικής γλώσσας, *ΘΕΛΓΘ* 17, σσ. 33-100.
- Andriotis, N. 1967: Ετυμολογικό Λεξικό της Κοινής Νεοελληνικής, Θεσσαλονίκη.
- Andriotis, N. and G. Kourmoulis 1968: *Questions de la linguistique balkanique et l'apport de la langue grecque*, in Georgiev et al., pp. 21-30.
- Bănescu, N. 1915: *Die Entwicklung des griechischen Futurums von der frühbyzantinischen Zeit bis zur Gegenwart*, Bucharest: Königliche Hofbuchdruckerei F. Göbl Söhne.
- Blanken, G. 1950: *La formation du futur en néogrec dialectal*, *AIPHOS* 10, pp. 79-86.
- Civ'jan, T. 1965: *Imja suščestvitel'noe v balkanskix jazykax*, Moscow: Nauka.
- Demiraj, S. 1972: *De l'origine des formes du futur en albanais*, *Cercetari de Lingvistica* XVII, 1, pp. 21-31.
- Djamo-Diaconița, L. 1968: *Contributions à la paremiologie balkanique*, in Georgiev et al., pp. 277-292.



- Domí, M. 1968: *Comments on Hamp 1968*, in Georgiev et al., pp. 670-672.
- Filipova-Bajrova, M. 1968: *Au sujet des emprunts grecs dans la langue bulgare*, in Georgiev et al., pp. 579-585.
- Friedman, V. 1977: *The Grammatical Categories of the Macedonian Indicative*, Columbus, OH: Slavica Publishers.
- Friedman, V. 1980: *The Study of Balkan Admirativity: Its History and Development*, *Balkanistica VI*, pp. 7-30.
- Friedman, V. 1981: *Admirativity and Confirmativity*, *Zeitschr. f. Balkanol. XVII*, pp. 12-28.
- Georgacas, D. 1964-1967: *Place and other names in Greece of various Balkan origins*, *Zeitschr. f. Balkanol. 2*, pp. 38-76 (Part I), 3, pp. 77-100 (Part II), 4, pp. 26-56 (Part III), 5, pp. 167-185 (Part IV).
- Georgiev, V., I. Gălăbov, and J. Zaimov, eds. 1968: *Actes du Premier Congrès international des Etudes Balkaniques et Sud-est Européennes, Vol. VI (Linguistique)*, Sofia: Editions de L'Académie Bulgare des Sciences.
- Haebler, C. 1965: *Grammatik der Albanischen Mundart von Salamis*, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz (Albanische Forschungen 3).
- Hamp, E. 1968: *La langue albanaise et ses voisins*, in Georgiev et al., pp. 663-668.
- Hatzidakis, G. 1905: *Μεσαιωνικά και Νέα Ελληνικά*, Αθήνα.
- Joseph, B. 1981: *On the Synchrony and Diachrony of Modern Greek NA*, *BMGS 7*, pp. 139-154.
- Joseph, B. 1982: Για την ιδιαίτερη θέση του [ts]/[dz] στην ελληνική φωνολογία, to appear in *Studies in Greek Linguistics. Proceedings of the 3rd Annual Meeting of the Dept. of Linguistics, Arist. Univ. of Thessaloniki (1983)*.
- Joseph, B. 1983: *The Synchrony and Diachrony of the Balkan Infinitive: A Study in Areal, General and Historical Linguistics*, Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics, Supplementary Series No. 1).
- Jeffers, R. and I. Lehisté 1979: *Principles and Methods for Historical Linguistics*, Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Katičić, R. 1976: *Ancient Languages of the Balkans. Part One, The Hague: Mouton (Trends in Linguistics, State-of-the-Art Reports 4)*.
- Kazazis, K. 1972: *The Status of Turkisms in the Present-day Balkan Languages*, in H. Birnbaum and S. Vryonis, Jr., eds., *Aspects of the Balkans: Continuity and Change*, The Hague: Mouton, pp. 87-116.
- Kazazis, K. 1976: *The Stylistic Status of Modern Greek Lexical Elements in Rumanian*, *Zeitschr. f. Balkanol. 12*, pp. 42-46.

- Kazazis, K. 1977/78: *Albanian, Modern Greek, and Rumanian Linguistics: 1966-1976*, *Balkanistica IV*, pp. 132-145.
- Lehisté, I. and P. Ivić 1980: *The Intonation of Yes-or-no Questions - A New Balkanism?*, *Balkanistica VI*, pp. 45-53.
- Mihăescu, H. 1966: *Influenta grecească asupra limbii române pînă în secolul al XV-lea*, Bucharest.
- Moutsos, D. 1969/70: *The origin of a balkanism and related problems*, *Zeitschr. f. Balkanol. 7*, pp. 86-102.
- Naylor, K. 1980: *Some Phonological Characteristics of 'Schwa' in Balkan Languages*, *Balkanistica VI*, pp. 54-61.
- Naylor, K. 1981: *The Dative/Locative Opposition in the Balkan Languages*, in H. Aronson and B. Darden, eds., *Studies in Balkan Linguistics to Honor Eric P. Hamp on his Sixtieth Birthday* (Folia Slavica 4, Nos. 2-3), Columbus, OH: Slavica Publishers, pp. 340-345.
- Newton, B. 1962: *Some Modern Greek-Turkish semantic parallels*, *Glotta 40*, pp. 315-320.
- Papahagi, G. 1908: *Parallele Ausdrücke und Redensarten im Rumänischen, Albanischen, Neugriechischen und Bulgarischen*, 14. Jahresbericht des Instituts für rumänische Sprache (Leipzig), pp. 113-170.
- Papahagi, T. 1963: *Dicționarul Dialectului Aromân General și Etimologie*, Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Romine.
- Reichenkron, G. 1962: *Der Typus der Balkansprachen*, *Zeitschr. f. Balkanol. 1*, 91-122.
- Šabršula, J. 1972: *Le futur velle + infinitif: balkanisme ou romanisme*, *Les études balkaniques tchécoslovaques 4*, pp. 51-58.
- Sandfeld, Kr. 1930: *Linguistique balkanique. Problèmes et résultats*, Paris: Librairie ancienne Honoré Champion.
- Schaller, H. 1970: *Die syntaktische Verwendung der Demonstrativpartikeln in den südslavischen Sprachen*, *Zeitschr. f. Balkanol. 7*, pp. 141-149.
- Schaller, H. 1975: *Die Balkansprachen: Eine Einführung in die Balkanphilologie*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Schaller, H. 1977: *Bibliographie zur Balkanphilologie*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Solta, G. 1980: *Einführung in die Balkanlinguistik mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Substrats und des Balkanlateinischen*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Stankiewicz, E. 1969: *Linguistics*, in C. Jelavich, ed., *Language and Area Studies, East Central and South-eastern Europe: A Survey*, Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, pp. 375-410.

- Stankiewicz, E. and K. Naylor 1977/78: *South Slavic Linguistics in the United States: 1966-1976*, Balkanistica IV, pp. 146-169.
- Thumb, A. 1964: *A Handbook of the Modern Greek Language. Grammar, Texts, Glossary*, Chicago: Argonaut, Inc. Publishers.
- Tsitsipis, L. 1981: *Language Change and Language Death in Albanian Speech Communities in Greece: A Sociolinguistic study*, Univ. of Wisconsin-Madison Ph.D. Dissertation.
- Uhlisch, G. 1968: *Zur Problematik der griechischen Lehnwörter im Albanischen*, in Georgiev et al., pp. 795-803.
- Uhlisch, G. 1969: *Die griechischen Lehnwörter im Albanischen. Ein Überblick*, *Altertum* 15, pp. 169-175.
- Vasmer, M. 1944: *Die griechischen Lehnwörter im Serbo-Kroatischen*. *Abhandlungen der Preuss. Akad. der Wissen. Jhg. 1944*, Berlin.
- Waring, H. 1982: *The Investigation of Modern Greek Intonation*, *Ματτατοφ*. 20, σσ. 18-29.

Department of Linguistics,  
204 Cunz Hall  
The Ohio State University  
Columbus, Ohio USA 43210.

Brian D. Joseph

## CONSTRUCTING A COMPUTER-ASSISTED COMPLETE INDEX TO

# Makriyannis' Memoirs

## A Preliminary Report

Among the most urgent, basic *desiderata* of modern Greek philology is an authorized comprehensive dictionary, as well as a number of specialized lexica and/or (even better) full indices to the works of the major authors.

The inherent value of such groundwork on major authors need not be elaborated upon here; it should be stressed however that it is even greater at the present time of rapid transformation of the Greek language, when both the State and public are in search of a linguistic compass. Indeed, no serious research into the rich past of modern Greek is possible in the absence of such philological tools; and without such research, the development of contemporary Greek is in jeopardy.

Prompted by such philological and social considerations, the idea of a complete Index, with the aid of modern technology, to Makriyannis<sup>1</sup> was conceived several years ago, but could only begin to materialize when generous funding became available in the fall of 1979. Since then, a team consisting of a computer expert, a classical scholar with experience in ancient and modern lexicography, and a number of amanuenses set to work in collaboration with a computer company<sup>2</sup>. As of July, 1983, the product of this joint effort was almost ready for the press.

In the description which follows, it is the intention of the present writer to spare you the technical details of this project and limit himself to the philological aspects of it.