13

Aspects of Bilingualism in the History of the Greek Language

MARK JANSE

1. Language Contact in Antiquity

When speakers of different languages meet there is language contact. If the contact is regular or prolonged, it will automatically produce a certain degree of bilingualism if the speakers of the different languages are to communicate with each other. Language is essential to communication, as God realized when the people of the whole world started building the tower of Babel (Gen. 11: 6):[1]

(1) הֵן עַם אֶחָד וְשָׂפָה אַחַת לְכֻלָּם וְזֶה הַחִלָּם לַעֲשׂוֹת וְעַתָּה לֹא־יִבָּצֵר מֵהֶם כֹּל אֲשֶׁר יְזָמוּ לַעֲשׂוֹת.

ἰδοὺ γένος ἓν καὶ χεῖλος ἓν πάντων, καὶ τοῦτο ἤρξαντο ποιῆσαι, καὶ νῦν οὐκ ἐκλείψει ἐξ αὐτῶν πάντα, ὅσα ἂν ἐπιθῶνται ποιεῖν.

הֵן	עַם	אֶחָד	וְשָׂפָה	אַחַת	לְכֻלָּם	וְזֶה
hēn	*ʿam*	*ʾeḥād*	*wĕ-śāpâ*	*ʾaḥat*	*lĕ-kullām*	*wĕ-zeh*
ἰδοὺ	*γένος*	*ἓν*	*καὶ χεῖλος*	*ἓν*	*πάντων*	*καὶ τοῦτο*

הַחִלָּם	לַעֲשׂוֹת	וְעַתָּה	לֹא־יִבָּצֵר	מֵהֶם	כֹּל
haḥillām	*la-ʿăśôt*	*wĕ-ʿattâ*	*lô-yibbāṣēr*	*mē-hem*	*kōl*
ἤρξαντο	*ποιῆσαι*	*καὶ νῦν*	*οὐκ ἐκλείψει*	*ἐξ αὐτῶν*	*πάντα*

אֲשֶׁר	יְזָמוּ	לַעֲשׂוֹת
ʾăšer	*yāzĕmû*	*la-ʿăśôt*
ὅσα	*ἂν ἐπιθῶνται*	*ποιεῖν*

There you have one people with one language for all, and they have

I would like to thank Jim Adams, Marc De Groote, Kristoffel Demoen, Brian Joseph, Danny Praet, Erik Seldeslachts, Simon Swain, and Johan Vandewalle for comments, information, and assistance of various sorts.

[1] Hebrew text is transliterated in accordance with the American SBL (Society of Biblical Literature) standard.

begun to do this, so now nothing will be impossible for them of all they plan to do.

In this monogenetic view of language the whole world was originally monolingual (Gen. 11: 1):

(2) **וַיְהִי כָל־הָאָרֶץ שָׂפָה אֶחָת.**

καὶ ἦν πᾶσα ἡ γῆ χεῖλος ἕν.

וַיְהִי	**צָל־הָאָרֶץ**	**שָׂפָה**	**אֶחָת**
wa-yĕhî	*kol-hā-'āreṣ*	*śāpâ*	*'eḥāt*
καὶ ἦν	*πᾶσα ἡ γῆ*	*χεῖλος*	*ἕν*

And the whole world had one language.

Whether or not *homo sapiens* once spoke one and the same language (sometimes referred to as 'Proto-World' or 'Mother Tongue') is a question that need not detain us here. The fact is that most societies are multilingual: 'Nicht die Einsprachigkeit, sondern die Mehrsprachigkeit stellt den Normalfall dar, Einsprachigkeit ist eine kulturbedingte Grenzfall von Mehrsprachigkeit und Zweisprachigkeit eine Spielart der letzteren' (Lüdi 1996*a*: 234). Already in antiquity language contact was an acknowledged fact. The earliest reference comes from Odysseus, who tells Penelope about the 'mixed languages' of Crete (*Od*. 19. 175 ff.):[2]

(3) *ἄλλη δ' ἄλλων γλῶσσα μεμιγμένη· ἐν μὲν Ἀχαιοί,*
ἐν δ' Ἐτεόκρητες μεγαλήτορες, ἐν δὲ Κύδωνες,
Δωριέες τε τριχάϊκες δῖοί τε Πελασγοί.

Every language is mixed with others; there live Achaeans,
there great-hearted native Cretans, there Cydonians,
and Dorians dwelling in threefold location, and noble Pelasgians.

In the so-called 'Old Oligarch' it is claimed that even the Athenians spoke a mixed language ([Xen.] *Ath*. 2. 8):

(4) *φωνὴν πᾶσαν ἀκούοντες ἐξελέξαντο τοῦτο μὲν ἐκ τῆς, τοῦτο δὲ ἐκ τῆς· καὶ οἱ μὲν Ἕλληνες ἰδίᾳ μᾶλλον καὶ φωνῇ καὶ διαίτῃ καὶ σχήματι χρῶνται, Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ κεκραμένῃ ἐξ ἁπάντων τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ βαρβάρων.*

Hearing every kind of language, they have taken something from each; the Greeks individually rather use their own language, way of life, and type of dress, but the Athenians use a mixture from all the Greeks and non-Greeks.

[2] On the historical importance of this passage (including the identification of the peoples mentioned and the etymology of *τριχάϊκες*) cf. Russo (1992) 83–4.

But what are we to make of such *γλῶσσαι μεμιγμέναι* and *φωναὶ κεκραμέναι*? In a sense all human languages are mixed, since borrowing is 'part of their cultural history' (Hoffer 1996–7: 546).[3] The above quotations show that the ancient Greeks were quite aware of this. Socrates, for instance, when questioned by Hermogenes about the etymology of words of obscure origin like *πῦρ*, remarks (Plato *Cra*. 409 E):

(5) *πολλὰ οἱ Ἕλληνες ὀνόματα ἄλλως τε καὶ οἱ ὑπὸ τοῖς βαρβάροις οἰκοῦντες παρὰ τῶν βαρβάρων εἰλήφασιν.*

The Greeks, especially those living among the barbarians, have taken many words from the barbarians.

Borrowing presupposes at least a minimum degree of bilingualism, a concept well known to the Greeks, as can be gathered from Galen's use of the terms *δίγλωττος* 'bilingual' and *πολύγλωττος* 'multilingual' (viii. 585). Plutarch uses *δίγλωττος* in the sense of *ἑρμηνεύς* 'interpreter, dragoman' (*Them*. 6). The Greek 'unwillingness to learn other languages' (Thomas 1996: 240) being almost proverbial, bilingual interpreters were indispensable whenever Greeks came into contact with non-Greeks.[4] The fact that speakers of foreign languages were almost without exception categorized as *βάρβαροι* by the Greeks testifies to their assurance of cultural superiority.[5] Unfortunately, the Greeks had very little to say about other languages, apart from calling them *φωναὶ βάρβαροι* or *γλῶσσαι βάρβαροι*.[6]

βάρβαρος and its derivatives were not only used to refer to speakers of foreign languages, but also to foreigners speaking bad Greek. *βαρβαρόφωνος* is a case in point. The term is applied to the Persians by Herodotus (8. 20; 9. 43) and to the Carians by Homer (*Il*. 2. 867). Strabo, commenting on Homer, insists that *βαρβαρόφωνος* and its derivative *βαρβαροφωνέω* originally meant 'speaking bad Greek' (14. 2. 28):

(6) *καὶ γὰρ τοῦτο ἐπὶ τῶν κακῶς ἑλληνιζόντων εἰώθαμεν λέγειν, οὐκ ἐπὶ τῶν*

[3] Cf. Heath (1994) 393.

[4] Cf. Hdt. 2. 125, 154; Xen. *An*. 1. 2. 17; 5. 4. 4.

[5] Strabo (14. 2. 28) already noted that *βάρβαρος* is an onomatope meaning 'babbling, gibbering, jabbering'. The word is related to Sanskrit *barbara-*, which has the same meaning (Mayrhofer 1986– : ii. 217–18; cf. Frisk 1954–73: 219–20; Chantraine 1968–80: 164–5). A modern parallel comes from Asturia: the local dialect is considered to be a separate language by the Academia de la Llingua Asturiana, but the Spaniards call it *bable*.

[6] *φωναὶ βάρβαροι*: cf. Aesch. *Ag*. 1051; Plato *Prot*. 341 C; *γλῶσσαι βάρβαροι*: cf. Soph. *Aj*. 1263; Hdt. 2. 57; Strabo 14. 2. 28.

καριστὶ λαλούντων· οὕτως οὖν καὶ τὸ βαρβαροφωνεῖν καὶ τοὺς βαρβαροφώνους δεκτέον τοὺς κακῶς ἑλληνίζοντας.

For we are accustomed to say this of those who speak bad Greek, not those who speak Carian. So, therefore, the terms 'speak barbarously' and 'speaking barbarously' have to be interpreted as referring to those who speak bad Greek.

Strabo also notes that *βάρβαρος* and its derivatives bear a negative connotation, being used originally *κατὰ τὸ λοίδορον* or *λοιδόρως* 'abusively' (ibid.). When referring to speakers of a foreign language, Strabo uses the term *ἑτερόφωνος* (8. 1. 2; 12. 1. 1), which is obviously more neutral in its connotation. Other terms for 'speaking a foreign language' can be found in the Septuagint. The first of these, *ἀλλόγλωσσος*, comes from the apocryphal Book of Baruch, where it is used to refer to the Babylonians. The context is worth quoting in full, because it breathes the idea of *βάρβαρος* without actually using the term (Bar. 4: 15):

(7) *ἐπήγαγεν γὰρ ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἔθνος μακρόθεν, ἔθνος ἀναιδὲς καὶ ἀλλόγλωσσον, οἳ οὐκ ᾐσχύνθησαν πρεσβύτην οὐδὲ παιδίον ἠλέησαν.*

For he set on to them a far-off people, a shameless people speaking a foreign language, who did not respect old people nor have mercy on children.

The term *ἀλλόγλωσσος* is also used in the Book of Ezekiel, together with a remarkable number of other qualifying adjectives expressing the same idea (Ezek. 3: 5–6):

(8) **לֹא אֶל־עַם עִמְקֵי שָׂפָה וְכִבְדֵי לָשׁוֹן אַתָּה שָׁלוּחַ אֶל־בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל.**
לֹא אֶל־עַמִּים רַבִּים עִמְקֵי שָׂפָה וְכִבְדֵי לָשׁוֹן אֲשֶׁר לֹא־תִשְׁמַע דִּבְרֵיהֶם.

οὐ πρὸς λαὸν βαθύχειλον καὶ βαρύγλωσσον σὺ ἐξαποστέλλῃ πρὸς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ οὐδὲ πρὸς λαοὺς πολλοὺς ἀλλοφώνους ἢ ἀλλογλώσσους ὧν οὐκ ἀκούσῃ τοὺς λόγους αὐτῶν.

לֹא	**אֶל־עַם**	**עִמְקֵי שָׂפָה**	**וְכִבְדֵי לָשׁוֹן**	**אַתָּה**	**שָׁלוּחַ**
lô	*'el-'am*	*'imĕqê śâpâ*	*wĕ-kibĕdê lāšôn*	*'attâ*	*šālûaḥ*
οὐ	πρὸς λαὸν	βαθύχειλον	καὶ βαρύγλωσσον	σὺ	ἐξαποστέλλῃ

אֶל־בֵּית	**יִשְׂרָאֵל**
'el-bêt	*yiśrā'ēl*
πρὸς τὸν οἶκον	τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ

לֹא	**אֶל־עַמִּים**	**רַבִּים**	**עִמְקֵי שָׂפָה**	**וְכִבְדֵי לָשׁוֹן**	**אֲשֶׁר**
lô	*'el-'ammîm*	*rabbîm*	*'imĕqê śâpâ*	*wĕ-kibbĕdê lāšôn*	*'ăšer*
οὐδὲ	πρὸς λαοὺς	πολλοὺς	ἀλλοφώνους	ἢ ἀλλογλώσσους	ὧν

לֹא־תִשְׁמַע	דִּבְרֵיהֶם
lô-tišmaʿ	*dibrêhem*
οὐκ ἀκούσῃ	*τοὺς λόγους αὐτῶν*

> Not to a people of obscure speech and obscure language are you being sent, but to the house of Israel, not to many peoples of foreign speech or foreign language nor to those who are difficult in their language, whose words you cannot understand.

It is interesting to take a look at how the original Hebrew expressions are rendered. In fact the Hebrew text has only two such expressions: כִּבְדֵי לָשׁוֹן *kibědê lāšôn* and עִמְקֵי שָׂפָה *ʿiměqê śâpâ*. כִּבְדֵי לָשׁוֹן *kibědê lāšôn*, literally 'heavy of tongue', is at first translated as *βαρύγλωσσος*, which is a calque on the Hebrew phrase. In the second instance, it is translated as *ἀλλόγλωσσος*. The same translation technique underlies *ἀλλόφωνος*, which translates עִמְקֵי שָׂפָה *ʿiměqê śâpâ*, literally 'deep of lip', i.e. *βαθύχειλος*.[7] Codex Vaticanus (B) reads *βαθύγλωσσος*, which would be calqued on עִמְקֵי לָשׁוֹן *ʿiměqê lāšôn*, literally 'deep of tongue', obviously a conflation of the two Hebrew phrases. The use of both *ἀλλόγλωσσος* and *ἀλλόφωνος* is remarkably free, comparable to Aquila's use of *ἑτερόγλωσσος* to translate נִלְעַג לָשׁוֹן *nilʿag lāšôn* '*βαρύφωνος*' (Isa. 33: 19) and לֹעֵז *lōʿēz* '*βάρβαρος*' (Ps. 113 (114): 1). Both נִלְעַג *nilʿag* and לֹעֵז *lōʿēz* are participles, of the verbs לָעַג *lāʿag* and לָעַז *lāʿaz* respectively. Both mean 'barbarisch sprechen' (Gesenius and Buhl 1915: 388 s.v.).[8] In fact לָעַג *lāʿag* and לָעַז *lāʿaz* are both onomatopes, probably imitating the sound of stuttering (as in Jewish Aramaic לַגְלַג *laglag* 'stutter'). The similarity to *βαρβαρίζω* is obvious, so instead of *ἑτερόγλωσσος* Aquila might just as well have chosen *βαρβαρόφωνος* in the sense of 'speaking a foreign language'.

The concept of *βαρβαροφωνία* in the sense of 'foreigner talk' (i.e. 'speaking bad Greek') is well known from Greek literature, but the available evidence has to be treated with all due reserve. For instance, the Scythian archer-police-slave from Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazusae* speaks a kind of literary foreigner talk, the main function of which is to 'characterize foreignness' (Clyne 1994:

[7] In Indo-European languages the concept of 'language' is most commonly expressed by words for the tongue, only rarely by words for the lips (Buck 1949: 1260). The use of *χείλος* and its derivatives is restricted to the Septuagint and quotations from the Septuagint in the New Testament. In each case *χείλος* translates שָׂפָה *śâpâ* 'lip', as in the passages quoted in (1), (2), and (8).

[8] Interestingly, לעז *laʿaz* means 'foreign (non-Hebrew) language' in Modern Hebrew (Baltsan 1992: 215 s.v.).

1274). It is used, in Strabo's words, *κατὰ τὸ λοίδορον*.[9] There are, however, innumerable texts exhibiting 'foreigner Greek' which were never so intended: semi- or even subliterate letters on papyrus, public inscriptions, and even texts with literary pretensions.

Contemporary linguists have made every effort to understand the functioning of language contact and multilingualism, both psycho- and sociolinguistically (cf. Goebl *et al*. 1996–7 for an overview with extensive bibliographies). Traditionally, historical linguists have always been in the vanguard: 'Language contact, together with social, political, and economic factors, has been a popular means of explaining grammatical change throughout history' (Harris and Campbell 1995: 32). The idea of foreign influence as an explanatory device has at times been abused, especially in the case of so-called 'substrate theories' like the 'Pelasgian' hypothesis of Van Windekens (1960), but contemporary historical linguists have re-established language contact as a fundamental and bona fide factor in linguistic change.[10]

One of the major problems facing the historical linguist is the limitedness of the data, which is perforce written. Writing takes more time and more reflection than speaking. More importantly, many ancient text types are subject to specific stylistic conventions which hamper the application of modern theories, which are generally based on spoken language use in a particular sociolinguistic setting of which all the relevant details are or can be known. Ancient texts are often deprived of such contextual and situational information. In other words, it is often very difficult if at all possible to relate the *βαρβαροφωνία* of an ancient text to its actual sociolinguistic setting.

For this reason I have decided to contrast two historical Greek varieties from the perspective of language contact, one ancient and one modern. The two varieties are complete opposites in almost every respect. The ancient one is the Septuagint, the collection of Jewish writings mainly translated from the Hebrew (and in some cases Aramaic) Scriptures, which also includes some original Greek pieces. The modern variety is the Cappadocian Greek dialect which

[9] This is not to say, of course, that 'foreigner talk' in Greek literature could not be genuine. Compare, for instance, Innocente (1998) on the *βαρβαροφωνία* of the Phrygian in Timotheus' *Persae*, who is characterized as *Ἑλλάδ' ἐμπλέκων Ἀσιάδι φωνᾷ* 'entwining the Greek with the Asiatic language' (158–9).

[10] Thomason and Kaufman (1988) 35 ff.; Hock (1991) 380 ff.; Harris and Campbell (1995) 120 ff.; Hock and Joseph (1996) 367 ff.; Trask (1996) 308 ff.; Crowley (1997) 255 ff.; Lass (1997) 184 ff.; Campbell (1998) 57 ff., 299 ff.; Sihler (2000) 176 ff.

used to be spoken in central Asia Minor until the population exchange between Greece and Turkey following the Treaty of Lausanne in 1923. In the next sections a brief description of both varieties will be presented.

2. The Septuagint

According to the letter of Aristeas to Philocrates, Ptolemy II Philadelphus commissioned a translation of the Jewish 'Law' (Hebrew תּוֹרָה *tôrâ*) to be included in the royal library on the initiative of Demetrius of Phaleron, who justified his request as follows (Aristeas 30):[11]

(9) *τοῦ νόμου τῶν Ἰουδαίων βιβλία σὺν ἑτέροις ὀλίγοις τισὶν ἀπολείπει· τυγχάνει γὰρ ἑβραϊκοῖς γράμμασι καὶ φωνῇ λεγόμενα, ἀμελέστερον δὲ καὶ οὐκ ὡς ὑπάρχει σεσήμανται, καθὼς ὑπὸ τῶν εἰδότων προσαναφέρεται.*

The books of the Law of the Jews together with some few others are absent from the library; they are written in Hebrew characters and language and have been carelessly interpreted, and do not represent the original according to those who know.

The use of *λέγω* is somewhat odd in this context, as one would have expected *γεγραμμένα* instead of *λεγόμενα* (Aristeas 3).[12] The same verb is used in Ptolemy's letter to Eleazar, the high priest of Jerusalem (Aristeas 38):

(10) *προῃρήμεθα τὸν νόμον ὑμῶν μεθερμηνευθῆναι γράμμασιν ἑλληνικοῖς ἐκ τῶν παρὰ ὑμῶν λεγομένων ἑβραϊκῶν γραμμάτων.*

We have determined that your Law be translated in the Greek language from the Hebrew language which is used by you.

What are we to make of this? The Law was written in Hebrew, but this was not the kind of Hebrew the Jewish scholars would have spoken. Biblical Hebrew was a 'compromise literary language' (Sáenz-Badillos 1993: 112), which was never actually spoken. It is now generally agreed that in the Second Temple period, i.e. after the return from the Babylonian exile (538 BC) until the destruction of the Temple by the Romans (AD 70), a very different kind of

[11] A very similar version of the story is given by Josephus (*AJ* 12. 2. 1 ff.).

[12] Cf. Luke 23: 38 (א*,c A C³ D W Θ (Ψ) 0250 $f^{1,(13)}$ (33) 𝔐), but compare *γράμμασι λέγον τάδε* (Thuc. 6. 54. 7), which is said of an inscription.

Hebrew was used in Jerusalem and Judaea. When Alexander gained control over the Near East following the battle near Issus (333 BC), this variety of Hebrew became the language of instruction of the Pharisees and the rabbis, from which it took its name, viz. Rabbinic Hebrew.[13] This fits in rather well with the following remark by Demetrius (Aristeas 11):

(11) *ἑρμηνείας προσδεῖται· χαρακτῆρσι γὰρ ἰδίοις κατὰ τὴν Ἰουδαίαν χρῶνται, καθάπερ Αἰγύπτιοι τῇ τῶν γραμμάτων θέσει, καθὸ καὶ φωνὴν ἰδίαν ἔχουσιν. ὑπολαμβάνονται συριακῇ χρῆσθαι· τὸ δ' οὐκ ἔστιν, ἀλλ' ἕτερος τρόπος.*

It needs to be translated, for in the country of the Jews they use a peculiar alphabet, just as the Egyptians have a special form of letters, and speak a peculiar language. They are supposed to use Syriac, but this is not the case, it is quite different.

'Syriac' is not to be confused with the Edessan dialect of Aramaic of the same name which became the literary language of the Christian Church in the Near East.[14] Geographical names and their derivatives were often confused in antiquity.[15] *Συριακή* is here used in the sense of 'Aramaic' (Sáenz-Badillos 1993: 2 n. 6), which became the language of the Galilean and Samaritan Jews and the Near Eastern lingua franca in the Second Temple period.[16] Apparently, Demetrius knew that Aramaic was the most widely used language among the Palestinian Jews, but was unfamiliar with biblical and Rabbinic Hebrew, even though he realized that both were related to one another and at the same time 'quite different' from Aramaic.

The story of Aristeas goes on to say that the Law was translated in seventy-two days by seventy-two Jewish scholars from Jerusalem (Aristeas 50, 307). The translators worked independently, but afterwards their translations were compared (Aristeas 302):

(12) *οἱ δὲ ἐπετέλουν ἕκαστα σύμφωνα ποιοῦντες πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς ταῖς ἀντιβολαῖς· τὸ δὲ ἐκ τῆς συμφωνίας γινόμενον πρεπόντως ἀναγραφῆς οὕτως ἐτύγχανε παρὰ τοῦ Δημητρίου.*

[13] Cf. Sáenz-Badillos (1993) 112–13, 161 ff.; Elwolde (1994) 1536.

[14] Cf. Beyer (1994) 46; Brock (1994*a*) 541.

[15] A telling example is the use of *ἑβραΐς διάλεκτος* in the sense of 'Aramaic language' (Acts 21: 40; 22: 2; 26: 14).

[16] Cf. Sáenz-Badillos (1993) 167 ff., esp. 170–1; Sokoloff (1994) 1815. The importance of Aramaic as a lingua franca is borne out by the Aramaic parts of the Bible. Aramaic is the language used by the astrologers to address the Babylonian king Nebuchadnezzar (Dan. 2: 4 ff.), and correspondence with the Persian king Artaxerxes is maintained in Aramaic as well. The Hebrew term for Aramaic is **אֲרָמִית** *'ărāmît*, which is translated as *συριστί* in the LXX.

> And they set to work, comparing their several results and making them agree, and whatever they agreed upon was suitably copied out under the direction of Demetrius.

In most ancient Greek manuscripts the translation is described as the version *κατὰ τοὺς ἑβδομήκοντα* 'according to the Seventy' (Swete 1914²: 10), whence it has come to be known as *Septuaginta* (LXX). The historicity of the letter of Aristeas is seriously questioned, even though it may have a historical basis.[17] Thackeray, for instance, takes the view that 'the Aristeas story may so far be credited that the Law or the greater part of it was translated *en bloc*, as a single undertaking in the third century B.C.' (1909: 13).[18] Since the Law comprises the first five *τεύχη* 'books' (Aristeas 310) of the Hebrew Scriptures, Origen (*c.*AD 184–255) called this part of the LXX *πεντάτευχος* 'Pentateuch' (PG 14. 44).

The *raison d'être* of the LXX may well exceed Ptolemy's (and Demetrius') bibliophily. According to Josephus, Alexander the Great assigned a place to Jewish colonists in the newly founded Alexandria (332 BC), even admitting them to full citizenship (cf. Aristeas 36–7).[19] This was the beginning of the *διασπορὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων* or 'Greek dispersion' (John 7: 35). The term *Ἕλλην* is used here in the sense of *Ἑλληνιστής* 'Greek-speaking Jew' (Acts 6: 1), for which it is sometimes substituted.[20] As a matter of fact, although the *Ἑλληνισταί* retained their religion and their loyalty to national institutions, they must have shifted to Greek fairly soon after their settlement. As Swete puts it: 'In Alexandria a knowledge of Greek was not a mere luxury but a necessity of common life. If it was not required by the State as a condition of citizenship, yet self-interest compelled the inhabitants of a Greek capital to acquire the language of the markets and the Court' (1914: 9). Swete estimates that 'a generation or two may have sufficed to accustom the Alexandrian Jews to the use of the Greek tongue' (ibid.). In fact it may have taken them even less.[21] Contemporary research has shown that one generation suffices to shift from one language to another: 'Die Herkunftssprache ist häufig weder die am besten beherrschte noch die am meisten verwendete Sprache der Angehörigen von G2 [Generation 2]' (Lüdi 1996*b*: 323). There was then an obvious need

[17] Cf. Swete (1914) 15 ff.
[18] *Pace* Swete (1914) 290.
[19] Jos. *AJ* 19. 5. 2; *Ap.* 2. 4; *BJ* 2. 18. 7.
[20] Acts 9: 29 A 424 *pc*; 11: 20 𝔓⁷⁴ ℵ² A D*.
[21] Cf. Thackeray (1909) 28.

for a translation of the Scriptures for all the *Ἑλληνισταί* who could not read the original Hebrew.[22]

The letter of Aristeas suggests that the translation of the Pentateuch was carried out very carefully, since the seventy-two versions were all compared and harmonized. The result was not necessarily well received in antiquity.[23] Isidorus of Pelusium (d. *c.*AD 435) uses the terms *βαρβαρόφωνος* and *βαρβαρίζω*, both clearly in the sense of 'speaking bad Greek', to describe what pagan purists thought of the language of the Greek Scriptures (PG 78. 1080–1). Theodoret (*c.*AD 393–466) says that even Jewish names were 'ridiculed' as being *βάρβαρος* (PG 83. 945). His use of the verb *κωμῳδέω* shows that *βάρβαρος* was definitely intended *κατὰ τὸ λοίδορον*. The Church Fathers, however, tried to make a virtue of necessity. Basil of Caesarea (*c.*AD 330–79), for instance, concedes that the prophets conversed *ἐκ τῆς βαρβάρου φωνῆς* (PG 32. 1084). That he used *βάρβαρος* in the sense of 'bad Greek' is shown by what follows: *τὰ παρ' ἐκείνων φθεγγόμεθα, νοῦν μὲν ἀληθῆ, λέξιν δὲ ἀμαθῆ* 'we preach their words, true in spirit, but poor in style' (ibid.). The message is clear: it is the *νοῦς* that counts, not the *λέξις*. Isidorus has the following explanation to offer (PG 78. 1124–5):

(13) *διὸ καὶ τὴν θείαν αἰτιῶνται γραφὴν μὴ τῷ περιττῷ καὶ κεκαλλωπισμένῳ χρωμένην λόγῳ, ἀλλὰ τῷ ταπεινῷ καὶ πεζῷ . . . δι' ὃ καὶ ἡ γραφὴ τὴν ἀλήθειαν πεζῷ λόγῳ ἡρμήνευσεν, ἵνα καὶ ἰδιῶται καὶ σοφοὶ καὶ παῖδες καὶ γυναῖκες μάθοιεν.*

For this reason they blame the Holy Scripture for not making use of elaborate and ornamental language, but instead employing a lowly and pedestrian style . . . so for this reason the Scripture expounds the truth in ordinary language, so that ordinary as well as wise men as well as children as well as women might understand.

The same line of reasoning can be found in Theodoret (PG 83. 1008–9), who elsewhere speaks of *βαρβαρόφωνοι ἄνθρωποι τὴν ἑλληνικὴν εὐγλωττίαν νενικηκότες* 'men speaking bad Greek who have

[22] Cf. Thackeray (1909) 28; Swete (1914) 8–9; Tabachowitz (1956) 7; Sevenster (1968) 84; Olofsson (1990) 33. This is also suggested by Ptolemy's justification of the translation in his letter to Eleazar: *βουλομένων δ' ἡμῶν καὶ τούτοις χαρίζεσθαι καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην Ἰουδαίοις καὶ τοῖς μετέπειτα* 'since I am anxious to show my gratitude to these men [sc. the Alexandrian Jews] and to the Jews throughout the world and to the generations yet to come' (Aristeas 38).

[23] Discussions over the quality of Biblical Greek focused especially on the language of the New Testament (Norden 1909: 512 ff.; Vergote 1938: 1321 ff.; Voelz 1984: 895 ff.)

overcome the Greek eloquence' (PG 83. 946). That *βαρβαρόφωνος* is here used in the sense of 'speaking bad Greek' follows from his use in the same sentence of the term *σολοικισμός* 'solecism', which is essentialy synonymous with *βαρβαρισμός*.[24] However, it soon became evident that the *βαρβαροφωνία* of the Greek Scriptures was related to the *ἀλλοφωνία*, specifically the *διγλωσσία*, of its authors. Jerome (*c.*AD 345–419), for instance, emphasizes the fact that the Apostle Paul was *Hebraeus ex Hebraeis et qui esset in uernaculo sermone doctissimus*, 'a Hebrew from among the Hebrews and who was also very learned in the colloquial [sc. Greek] language' (PL 26. 455).

This is not the place to discuss the ensuing controversy between the so-called 'Hebraists', who thought the Greek Scriptures were riddled with Hebraisms (or, generally, Semitisms), and the 'purists', who thought they approached the ideal of Classical Attic.[25] Suffice it to say that since Deissmann's *Bibelstudien* (1895–7) the language of the Greek Scriptures is generally considered to be representative of the *κοινή*, i.e. of the Egyptian *κοινή* in the case of the LXX, specifically the Pentateuch (Swete 1914: 20), and of the Syro-Palestinian *κοινή* in the case of the New Testament.[26] It should be noted that in each case we are talking about written, not spoken, language, even though the use of expressions such as *πεζὸς λόγος* and *uernaculus sermo* suggest, that already in antiquity it was felt to be closer to the colloquial than to the literary *κοινή* of the time.

The language of the Pentateuch is, perhaps somewhat surprisingly, qualified as 'good *κοινή* Greek' by Thackeray (1909: 13). He concedes that 'the LXX, being a translation, has naturally a Semitic colouring' (1909: 16). A similar statement is made by Moulton: 'The LXX was in "translation Greek", its syntax determined perpetually by that of the original Hebrew' (1908: 2). But what exactly is translation Greek? Josephus wrote an Aramaic version of his *Jewish War* before translating it into Greek,[27] but no one has ever accused him of perpetrating translation Greek.[28] In fact, in

[24] Phld. *Rh.* 1. 159 (cf. Plut. *Mor.* 731–2; Luc. *Vit. Auct.* 23). It is worthy of note, however, that Apollonius Dyscolus explicitly distinguishes *βαρβαρισμός* 'incorrectness in the use of words' from *σολοικισμός* 'incorrectness in the construction of sentences' (*Synt.* 198. 8).

[25] Cf. Vergote (1938) 1323–3; Voelz (1984) 897 ff.

[26] The fact that the language of the Alexandrian Pentateuch has been identified as belonging to the Egyptian and not to the Syro-Palestinian *κοινή* disproves the account given in the letter of Aristeas, viz. that the translation was carried out by Palestinian Jews from Jerusalem (Swete 1914: 20).

[27] Jos. *BJ* 1. 3; *Ap.* 1. 50.

[28] Cf. Moulton and Turner (1963) 8.

rendering Old Testament narratives in his *Jewish Antiquities*, Josephus has actually 'rewritten each passage, has not only modified the vocabulary, but revolutionised the style' (Swete 1914: 299). Rife defines translation Greek as 'the mechanical rendering of each single word in the order in which it occurs in the original' (1933: 245). In modern translation studies this technique is termed 'word-for-word translation' (Delisle, Lee-Jahnke, and Cormier 1999: 200). In the LXX it sometimes produces what Thackeray calls 'literal or unintelligent versions' (1909: 13). Even though Thackeray qualifies the Pentateuch not as 'literal' but rather as 'good *κοινή* Greek', it is still unmistakably a word-for-word translation.

In fact, the LXX has become the classic example of this translation technique, which may be typical of religious translations in general.[29] The fact that the Hebrew Scriptures should have been allowed to be translated in the first place is not at all unremarkable, particularly in the case of the Pentateuch. For one thing, any translation risks distorting the original text, as the grandson of Ben Sira realized when he undertook the Greek translation of his grandfather's book Qoheleth (*Sir. Prol.* 20 ff.):

(14) *οὐ γὰρ ἰσοδυναμεῖ αὐτὰ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἑβραϊστὶ λεγόμενα καὶ ὅταν μεταχθῇ εἰς ἑτέραν γλῶσσαν· οὐ μόνον δὲ ταῦτα, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ νόμος καὶ αἱ προφητεῖαι καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν βιβλίων οὐ μικρὰν ἔχει τὴν διαφορὰν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς λεγόμενα.*

> For that which is said in Hebrew in the original is not the same when it is converted into another language; and not just with this book, but also with the Law itself and the Prophets and the other books does it make no small difference when they are read in the original.

For another, the Jewish Law was sacrosanct. According to tradition, the Law that was given to Moses on Sinai by God consisted of the Oral Law and the Written Law (Exod. 21. 1 ff.). The latter was written on two stone tablets, the so-called *πλάκες τοῦ μαρτυρίου* 'tablets of the testimony' (לֻחֹת הָעֵדֻת *lūḥōt hā'ēdūt* Exod. 31: 18) or *πλάκες τῆς διαθήκης* 'tablets of the covenant' (לוּחֹת הַבְּרִית *lûḥōt habbĕrît*, Deut. 9: 9). The tablets were said to be written by God himself (Exod. 32: 16):[30]

(15) וְהַלֻּחֹת מַעֲשֵׂה אֱלֹהִים הֵמָּה וְהַמִּכְתָּב מִכְתַּב אֱלֹהִים הוּא חָרוּת עַל־הַלֻּחֹת.

[29] Cf. Neubert (1996–7) 915.

[30] When Ptolemy asks Demetrius why no one had ever undertaken a translation of the Hebrew Scriptures, Demetrius replies: *διὰ τὸ σεμνὴν εἶναι τὴν νομοθεσίαν καὶ διὰ θεοῦ γεγονέναι* 'because the Law is sacred and of divine origin' (Aristeas 313).

καὶ αἱ πλάκες ἔργον θεοῦ ἦσαν, καὶ ἡ γραφὴ γραφὴ θεοῦ ἐστιν κεκολαμμένη ἐν ταῖς πλαξίν.

וְהַלֻּחֹת	מַעֲשֵׂה	אֱלֹהִים	הֵמָּה	וְהַמִּכְתָּב	מִכְתָּב
wĕ-hal-lūḥōt	*ma'ăśê*	*'ĕlōhîm*	*hēmmâ*	*wĕ-ham-miktāb*	*miktāb*
καὶ αἱ πλάκες	*ἔργον*	*θεοῦ*	*ἦσαν*	*καὶ ἡ γραφὴ*	*γραφὴ*

אֱלֹהִים	הוּא	חָרוּת	עַל־הַלֻּחֹת
'ĕlōhîm	*hû*	*ḥārût*	*'al-hal-lūḥōt*
θεοῦ	*ἐστιν*	*κεκολλαμένη*	*ἐν ταῖς πλάξιν*

And the tablets were the work of God, and the writing was the writing of God, engraved on the tablets.

Surely, if the Law was written in God's own words, it should not be translated as a matter of principle.[31] This explains why Eleazar thought Ptolemy's request was *παρὰ φύσιν* 'against the regular order of nature' (Aristeas 44). He nevertheless consented and even wished Ptolemy good luck: *γένηταί σοι συμφερόντως καὶ μετὰ ἀσφαλείας ἡ τοῦ ἁγίου νόμου μεταγραφή* 'may the translation of the Holy Law prove advantageous to you and successful' (Aristeas 45). And succesful it was. After the translation was completed, Demetrius read it to the Jewish community, who thought it was *ὅσιος* 'hallowed, sanctioned by God' (Aristeas 310). Philo Judaeus (first century AD), a leading and highly influential exegete and expositor of the Pentateuch, relied altogether on the LXX, which he claimed had been divinely inspired (*Moys.* 2. 37).[32] Major evidence of the sacred status of the LXX comes from the New Testament: 'alle neutestamentliche Schriften [gehen] mit ihren Schriftzitaten von der Septuaginta . . . und nicht vom hebräischen Urtext [aus]' (Aland and Aland 1982: 61). An idea of the extent of these quotations can be gathered by looking at the list of *loci citati vel allegati ex Vetere Testamento* in recent editions of Nestle, Nestle, and Aland's *Novum Testamentum Graece* (appendix IV). It stands to reason to assume that the synagogue called *Λιβερτίνων* 'of the Freedmen' (Acts 6: 9), which included Alexandrian Jews, used the LXX, as did the *Ἑλληνισταί* to whom the New Testament epistles were addressed.[33] Finally,

[31] Even today, Jewish boys are called up to the reading of the Law in Biblical Hebrew at their bar mitzvah. Another parallel comes from Islam, where the Koran is still read in Classical Arabic, even in countries where Arabic is not spoken.

[32] Tabachowitz is of the opinion that Philo's exposition of the Pentateuch shows 'dass er jedem Worte der griechischen Übersetzung religiösen Wert beimisst' (1956: 9; cf. Swete 1914: 29).

[33] Cf. Swete (1914) 29.

it is worthy of note that copies of the LXX were found at Qumran.[34]

According to the story of Aristeas, the translation was done *καλῶς καὶ ὁσίως . . . καὶ κατὰ πᾶν ἀκριβῶς* 'excellently and sacredly . . . and in every respect accurately' (Aristeas 310), as opposed to previous attempts, which were considered *ἀμελέστερον* 'less careful' (Aristeas 30) and *ἐπισφαλέστερον* 'rather dubious' (Aristeas 314). For a translation of the Scriptures to be *ὅσιος*, it would have to be as literal as possible, in accordance with the *ἰσοδυναμία* principle referred to in the prologue to *Siracides* quoted above (14). In other words, it would have to be a strongly source-oriented translation. One requirement would be that it be a mechanical or word-for-word translation as defined above, which would be in accordance with God's instruction to Moses not to change anything in the wording of the Law (Deut. 4: 2):

(16) **לֹא תֹסִפוּ עַל־הַדָּבָר אֲשֶׁר אָנֹכִי מְצַוֶּה אֶתְכֶם וְלֹא תִגְרְעוּ מִמֶּנּוּ.**

οὐ προσθήσετε πρὸς τὸ ῥῆμα, ὃ ἐγὼ ἐντέλλομαι ὑμῖν, καὶ οὐκ ἀφελεῖτε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.

לֹא	**תֹסִפוּ**	**עַל־הַדָּבָר**	**אֲשֶׁר**	**אָנֹכִי**	**מְצַוֶּה**
lô	*tōsipû*	*'al-had-dābār*	*'ăšer*	*'ānōkî*	*mĕṣawwêh*
οὐ	*προσθήσετε*	*πρὸς τὸ ῥῆμα*	*ὃ*	*ἐγὼ*	*ἐντέλλομαι*

אֶתְכֶם	**וְלֹא**	**תִגְרְעוּ**	**מִמֶּנּוּ**
'etĕ-kem	*wĕ-lô*	*tigrĕ'û*	*mimmen-nû*
ὑμῖν	*καὶ οὐκ*	*ἀφελεῖτε*	*ἀπ' αὐτοῦ*

You shall not add to the word which I command you, and you shall not subtract from it.

After the translation of the Pentateuch was read to the Jewish community and judged 'excellent and sacred . . . and in every respect accurate', it was decided that it should remain *οὕτως ἔχοντα* 'as it was' (Aristeas 310). In similar words the Alexandrian Jews asked Demetrius to pronounce a curse (Aristeas 311):

(17) *εἴ τις διασκευάσει προστιθεὶς ἢ μεταφέρων τι τὸ σύνολον τῶν γεγραμμένων ἢ ποιοῦμενος ἀφαίρεσιν.*

If anyone should make any alteration either by adding anything or transposing in any way any of the words which had been written or making any omission.

[34] Cf. Moulton and Turner (1963) 8.

The use of *μεταφέρω* suggests a word-for-word translation, which was adhered to as strictly as possible, as is shown by the superposition of the Hebrew and Greek versions in the passages quoted so far. Rife sums up 'some of the commonest fixities of Semitic word-order' (1933: 247): articles are never separated from their noun; adjectives, demonstratives, and genitives always follow their noun; direct, personal, pronominal objects always follow their governing verb. Rife also states that 'the usual Hebrew prose order is VSO' (1933: 250) and concludes that 'All the LXX books with Massoretic texts showed their character plainly by this test' (1933: 251). A quick glance at the passages quoted so far shows that VSO is regular if S and O are nominal, not if they are pronominal. It is only in this sense that VSO is, typologically, the basic Biblical Hebrew word order.[35]

Another requirement for a literal translation would be that it be 'calqued'. 'Calqued translation' is a technique whereby 'the translator transfers the elements of the source text to the target text in such a way as to reproduce their semantic, etymological, and temporal aspects' (Delisle, Lee-Jahnke, and Cormier 1999: 123). The last passage quoted (16) offers two instances of 'calqued translation', viz. *προστίθημι πρός* (יָסַף עַל *yāsap ʿal*) and *ἀφαιρέομαι ἀπό* (גָּרַע מִן *gāraʿ min*) used absolutely in a negative context.[36] An even more extreme case of calqued translation can be found in the first passage quoted (1), which is quite unidiomatic according to Classical Attic standards. Thackeray notes that 'there are well-marked limits to the literalism of the Pentateuch translators', but observes 'a growing reverence for the letter of the Hebrew' in the later books (1909: 30).

This is not the place to discuss every aspect of the translation technique of the LXX, for which the reader is referred to Brock, Frisch, and Jellicoe (1973), Tov (1982), Olofsson (1990), and Dogniez (1995). Three illustrative case studies will be discussed in Section 4.

[35] Cf. Gesenius and Kautzsch (1909) 477; Hetzron (1987) 702; Joüon and Muraoka (1996) 579–80. In this context it may be noted that the position of adjectives, demonstratives and genitives *vis-à-vis* the noun is a typological correlate of VSO word order (Greenberg 1963*b*: 85–6; Comrie 1989: 95 ff.).

[36] Cf. Helbing (1928) 43–4, 300–1.

3. Cappadocian

Cappadocian is a Modern Greek dialect cluster which was spoken in central Asia Minor until the population exchange between Greece and Turkey following the Treaty of Lausanne in 1923. Strabo, a native of Asia Minor, defines the geographical situation of Cappadocia as follows (12. 1. 1):

(18) *οἱ δ' οὖν ὁμόγλωττοι μάλιστά εἰσιν οἱ ἀφοριζόμενοι πρὸς τὸν νότον μὲν τῷ Κιλικίῳ λεγομένῳ Ταύρῳ, πρὸς ἕω δὲ τῇ Ἀρμενίᾳ καὶ τῇ Κολχίδι καὶ τοῖς μεταξὺ ἑτερογλώττοις ἔθνεσι, πρὸς ἄρκτον δὲ τῷ Εὐξείνῳ μέχρι τῶν ἐκβολῶν τοῦ Ἅλυος, πρὸς δύσιν δὲ τῷ τε τῶν Παφλαγόνων ἔθνει καὶ Γαλατῶν τῶν τὴν Φρυγίαν ἐποικησάντων μέχρι Λυκαόνων καὶ Κιλίκων τῶν τῆν τραχεῖαν Κιλικίαν νεμομένων.*

And the inhabitants who speak the same language are, generally speaking, those who are bounded on the south by the so-called Cilician Taurus, and on the east by Armenia and Colchis and by the intervening peoples who speak different languages, and on the north by the Euxine as far as the outlets of the Halys, and on the west both by the tribe of the Paphlagonians and by those Galatians who settled in Phrygia and extended as far as the Lycaonians and those Cilicians who occupy Cilicia Tracheia.

The term *ἑτερόγλωττος* suggests that Cappadocia was a multilingual region, which indeed it was. In the nineteenth century BC Assyrian traders founded colonies in Cappadocia, on which indigenous rulers from Kültepe and other principalities imposed levies.[37] However, the Assyrians were not the only ones to leave linguistic traces. The so-called 'Cappadocian tablets', Assyrian business letters from an archive excavated at Kaniš near Kültepe, contain many names which shed new light on the ethnic relations in Cappadocia in the middle Bronze Age (*c.*2000–1700 BC).[38] Among the non-Assyrian names we find indigenous Hatti and Hurrians as well as Luwians and Hittites.[39] The latter dominated Cappadocia from their capital Hattuša (Bogazköy) in the late Bronze Age (*c.*1700–1200 BC).[40] After the fall of the Hittite empire (*c.*1000 BC), Cappadocia was invaded by Phrygians, Cimmerians, and Persians in turn.[41]

[37] Cf. Goetze (1957) 67 ff.; Orlin (1970) 73 ff.
[38] Cf. Goetze (1957) 68–9; Orlin (1970) 184 ff.; Tischler (1995) 395 ff.
[39] Cf. Goetze (1957) 45 ff.; Tischler (1995) 362; Alp (1997) 38 ff.
[40] Cf. Goetze (1957) 82 ff.
[41] Cf. Goetze (1957) 200 ff.

After the Persian conquest, Cappadocia was divided into two satrapies, which became kingdoms under the Seleucids:[42] the northern kingdom was named *Καππαδοκία πρὸς τῷ Πόντῳ* 'Cappadocia Pontica' or simply *Πόντος* 'Pontus', whereas the southern kingdom was named *Καππαδοκία πρὸς τῷ Ταύρῳ* 'Cappadocia near Taurus', *ἡ μεγάλη Καππαδοκία* 'Magna Cappadocia', or simply *Καππαδοκία* (Strabo 12. 1. 4), after the name of the former eighth Persian satrapy, *Katpatuka*, the etymology of which is unknown.[43] The ancestral name of the Cappadocian kings was Ariarathes, an Iranian name.[44] It originated with the Persian satrap Ariarathes I, who refused to submit to Alexander the Great and was killed by Perdiccas (*c.*322 BC). The first king of Cappadocia was Ariarathes III (*c.*255–220), who married Stratonice, daughter of Antiochus II (Strabo 12. 1. 2). The Cappadocian kings were all philhellenes, as can be gathered from their adoption of Greek surnames, e.g. Ariarathes IV Eusebes (*c.*220–163), who married Antiochis, daughter of Antiochus III, and fought for Antiochus against Rome in the battle of Magnesia (190 BC). His son Ariarathes V Eusebes Philopator (*c.*163–130) was undoubtedly the most Hellenized of his family. In the words of the great Mommsen: 'Durch ihn drang [die hellenische Bildung] ein in das bis dahin fast *barbarische* Kappadokien' (1874: ii. 55—emphasis added).

It stands to reason to assume that the Hellenization of the indigenous population of Cappadocia was accelerated by the philhellenism of their kings,[45] and reinforced by the Roman annexation (AD 17), of which Strabo says (12. 4. 6):

(19) *ἐφ' ὧν ἤδη καὶ τὰς διαλέκτους καὶ τὰ ὀνόματα ἀποβεβλήκασιν οἱ πλεῖστοι.*

Under their reign most of the peoples had already lost both their languages and their names.

Although Strabo is referring to Bithynia, his remark would have applied to all of Asia Minor, as emerges from Jerome's observation *sermone graeco, quo omnis oriens loquitur* 'the Greek language, which the entire East speaks' (PL 26. 382). Thumb has this to say on the matter: 'Von allen nichtgriechischen Ländern ist am gründlichsten

[42] Cf. Frye (1984) 87 ff.; Weiskopf (1989–90) 780 ff.

[43] Cf. Bartholomae (1904) 434. Tischler (1977: 72) argues for an Anatolian (Hittite) origin of the name. For discussion of the ancient sources cf. Franck (1966) 5 ff.; Schmitt (1976–80) 399–400.

[44] Cf. Robert (1963) 519; Weiskopf (1989–90) 782 ff.

[45] Cf. Weiskopf (1989–90) 784.

Kleinasien hellenisiert worden . . . Die ungeheure Masse griechischer Inschriften, die auf dem ganzen Gebiet sich finden . . . zeigt, dass Kleinasien mindestens in der römischen Kaiserzeit ein ganz griechisches Land mit griechischer Cultur gewesen ist' (1901: 102–3).[46] However, Thumb's observation needs some qualification: the Hellenization of Asia Minor proceeded at a slower rate in the rural areas than in the cities, which were formed after the Greek model.[47] The slower rate of the Hellenization of rural Asia Minor is reflected in the maintenance of a number of indigenous languages in the first centuries AD. A number of these are referred to in the story of the glossolalia of the Apostles, who began to 'speak in tongues', so everyone could hear them in their own language (Acts 2. 8 ff.):

(20) *πῶς ἡμεῖς ἀκούομεν ἕκαστος τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ ἡμῶν ἐν ᾗ ἐγεννήθημεν . . . Πάρθοι καὶ Μῆδοι καὶ Ἐλαμῖται καὶ οἱ κατοικοῦντες τὴν Μεσοποταμίαν, Ἰουδαίαν τε καὶ Καππαδοκίαν, Πόντον καὶ τὴν Ἀσίαν, Φρυγίαν τε καὶ Παμφυλίαν, Αἴγυπτον καὶ τὰ μέρη τῆς Λιβύης τῆς κατὰ Κυρήνην, καὶ οἱ ἐπιδημοῦντες Ῥωμαῖοι, Ἰουδαῖοί τε καὶ προσήλυτοι, Κρῆτες καὶ Ἄραβες, ἀκούομεν λαλούντων αὐτῶν ταῖς ἡμετέραις γλώσσαις τὰ μεγαλεῖα τοῦ θεοῦ.*

How is that each of us hears them in his own native language? Parthians, Medes, and Elamites, and those who live in Mesopotamia, Judaea, and Cappadocia, Pontus and Asia, Phrygia and Pamphylia, Egypt and the parts of Libya near Cyrene, and Romans staying here, Jews and proselytes, Cretans and Arabs—we hear them declaring the miracles of God in our own tongues.

What is interesting about the *ἔθνη* 'nations' (Acts 2: 5) mentioned here is that most of them are known to be bilingual in the first century AD, speaking either Greek or Aramaic as a second language (as opposed to their 'own *native* language'). Would Persian, Mesopotamian, Judaean, and even Arabian (Nabataean?) Jews not be able to understand Galilean Jews speaking Aramaic?[48] And what of the 'native languages' of the Jews from Cyrene and Egypt and those from 'Asia'?[49] Would they not have spoken Greek? According to Clearchus of Soli (fourth–third centuries BC), a pupil of Aristotle, the latter said of Hyperochides, an Asia Minor Jew: *Ἑλληνικὸς ἦν οὐ τῇ διαλέκτῳ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῇ ψυχῇ* 'he was a Greek, not only in his language, but in his spirit as well' (Clearch. fr. 6).[50] Would

[46] Cf. Holl (1908) 240; Vryonis (1971) 42; Bubeník (1989) 277.
[47] Cf. Jones (1940) 40 ff., 289 ff.; Vryonis (1971) 44–5; Brixhe (1987*a*) 11.
[48] Cf. Schmitt (1980) 196 ff.
[49] Cf. Neumann (1980) 172; Lüddeckens (1980) 247; Rössler (1980) 273.
[50] Quoted by Josephus (*Ap.* 1. 22; cf. Euseb. *PE* 9. 5).

the Greek spoken in these regions have been very different from the Greek spoken in Palestine? Not to mention the Greek of the Cretans and Pamphylians, who may have spoken a distinct variety of Greek, but Greek nevertheless.[51]

And what about the other *ἔθνη* from Asia Minor: the Phrygians, Pontians, and Cappadocians? The Neo-Phrygian corpus from the first centuries AD comprises barely 114 inscriptions, 63 of which are bilingual (Brixhe 1999*b*: 292), which indicates that Phrygian was a language that was still in use, but under heavy Greek pressure.[52] There is evidence, however, that Phrygian continued to be spoken until the fifth century. According to Socrates Scholasticus (fifth century AD), there was a Gothic bishop by the name of Selinas who lived in Asia Minor in the fifth century (PG 67. 648):

(21) *Γότθος μὲν ἦν ἐκ πατρός, Φρὺξ δὲ κατὰ μητέρα, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἀμφοτέραις ταῖς διαλέκτοις ἑτοίμως κατὰ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἐδίδασκε.*

He was Gothic from his father, but Phrygian through his mother, and because of this he taught readily in both languages in church.

From the expression *ἀμφοτέραις ταῖς διαλέκτοις* it might be deduced that Selinas was bilingual. In fact, he may even have been trilingual. Sozomen (fifth century AD), apparently relying on Socrates,[53] omits the reference to Selinas' Phrygian mother, but instead mentions his ability to preach in both Gothic and Greek (PG 67. 1468):

(22) *οὐ μόνον κατὰ τὴν πάτριον αὐτῶν φωνήν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν Ἑλλήνων.*

Not only in their native language, but also in that of the Greeks.

Vryonis (1971: 46–7), however, takes the view that *Φρύξ* in (21) is a geographical reference indicating that Selinas' mother was from the district of Phrygia, where the Goths had settled in the fourth century.[54] According to Vryonis, Selinas' ability to speak Greek indicates that the Phrygians had been 'Hellenized in their speech' (1971: 47). His conclusion is based on the fact that Phrygia was in later times called *Γοτθογραικία*, not *Γοτθοφρυγία*, just as Galatia was called *Γαλλογραικία* because 'at an earlier period the Celts had been similarly Hellenized' (ibid.). However, the name *Γαλλογραικία* (Strabo 12. 5. 1) was given to Galatia because *Γαλατία* could be used

[51] Cf. Bubeník (1989) 172, 230, 240.

[52] Cf. Thumb (1901) 103; Dawkins (1916) 2; Vryonis (1971) 47–8; Neumann (1980) 174 ff.; Bubeník (1989) 277.

[53] Cf. Holl (1908) 248; Vryonis (1971) 47.

[54] Cf. Holl (1908) 249.

to refer to Gallia as well as Galatia.[55] It is quite conceivable that *Γοτθογραικία* was used to distinguish the country of the Ostrogoths from that of the Visigoths. Whatever one chooses to make of all this, it is in any case indisputable that as late as the fifth century AD Gothic was still spoken in Asia Minor, as was Galatian according to Jerome (PL 26. 382).[56]

The story of Selinas and the Neo-Phrygian corpus show that the Hellenization of the indigenous and exogenous peoples provoked widespread bilingualism and eventually language death in Asia Minor. Another example comes from a language which has already been mentioned, viz. Carian, an Anatolian language related to Hittite.[57] It will be recalled that Strabo uses the term *βαρβαρόφωνος* to refer to the 'bad Greek' of the Carians. He even considers Carian to be a mixed language: *πλεῖστα ἑλληνικὰ ὀνόματα ἔχει καταμεμιγμένα* 'it has very many Greek words mixed up with it' (14. 2. 28). The reason why the Greek of the Carians was considered bad was that it was infested with Carian: *τὸ βαρβαρόφωνον ἐπ' ἐκείνων πυκνὸν ἦν* 'the 'barbarous element' in their language [sc. Greek] was strong' (ibid.). The verb *καρίζω* is therefore to be taken in the sense of 'speak Greek like a Carian' according to Strabo, just as *σολοικίζω* means 'speak Greek like a Solian' (ibid.). All this indicates widespread bilingualism among the Carians, an image which is confirmed by Thucydides' *Κὰρ δίγλωττος* 'bilingual Carian' (8. 85).

The fact that with the exception of Neo-Phrygian most languages have left very meagre, if any, remains at all testifies to the cultural superiority of the Greek language and civilization. The Galatian tribes and their leaders described by Strabo (12. 5. 1 ff.), for instance, all carry Celtic names, but the garrison of the Trocmi called *Ταούιον* 'Tavium' had a colossal bronze statue of Zeus (12. 5. 2).[58] And when Paul healed a lame man in Lystra, the people starting talking *λυκαονιστί* 'Lycaonian', but they called Paul Hermes and Barnabas Zeus, whose temple was just outside the city (Acts 14:

[55] Cf. Bauer, Aland, and Alan (1988) 301. In the second epistle to Timothy, *Γαλλία* is found as a variant reading for *Γαλατία* in a number of manuscripts (4: 10 ℵ C 81. 104. 326 *pc* vg$^{st.ww}$ sa bo^{pt}; Eus Epiph).

[56] Cf. Holl (1908) 248–9; Weisgerber (1931) 151 ff.; Jones (1940) 290; Mitchell (1993) 50–1.

[57] Cf. Neumann (1980) 172.

[58] The emporium of Pessinus, on the other hand, had a temple of the indigenous mother goddess Cybele, called *Agdistis* by the Galatians (Strabo 12. 5. 2).

11 ff.). Lycaonian is another indigenous language to have survived until the sixth century AD.[59]

The only indigenous language not discussed so far is the native language of Cappadocia mentioned in the passages quoted in (18) and (20). Cappadocian Jews are mentioned in Peter's first epistle, which is addressed to the *ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις διασπορᾶς Πόντου, Γαλατίας, Καππαδοκίας, Ἀσίας καὶ Βιθυνίας* 'elected strangers of the dispersion of Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia' (1 Pet. 1: 1). The fact that the letter was written in Greek again testifies to the widespread bilingualism in Asia Minor. The use of *παρεπίδημος* '(für kurze Zeit) an einem fremden Ort weilend, sich als Fremdling aufhaltend' (Bauer, Aland, and Aland 1988: 1264) is inconsistent with the use of *κατοικέω* in the passage quoted in (20), where it was suggested that the Cappadocian Jews spoke their 'native language'. Unfortunately, we have no idea what the indigenous language of Cappadocia might have been like. That it must have been a foreign language from the Greek point of view can be inferred from some remarks made by the Cappadocian Church Fathers. Gregory of Nyssa (*c.*AD 330–95) has the following to say (PG 45. 1045):

(23) *ἡμεῖς οὐρανὸν τοῦτο λέγομεν, σαμαΐμ ὁ Ἑβραῖος, ὁ Ῥωμαῖος κελοὺμ, καὶ ἄλλως ὁ Σύρος, ὁ Μῆδος, ὁ Καππαδόκης, ὁ Μαυρούσιος, ὁ Σκύθης, ὁ Θρᾷξ, ὁ Αἰγύπτιος.*

We call it heaven, *šamayim* the Hebrew, the Roman *caelum*, and still otherwise the Syrian, the Mede, the Cappadocian, the Moor, the Scythian, the Thracian, the Egyptian.

This statement seems to suggest that Cappadocian was both a living language in the fourth century and distinct from Greek. Intriguing confirmation seems to come from Basil of Caesarea. While discussing two different wordings of the Doxology, Basil notes that some say *σὺν Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι Θεοῦ* 'with God's Holy Spirit' (PG 32. 204), others *καὶ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα Θεοῦ* 'and God's Holy Spirit' (PG 32. 205). He goes on to say that the use of *καί* instead of *σύν* would be natural in languages other than Greek and refers to 'a certain Mesopotamian' (PG 32. 208):

(24) *ὡς δὲ ἐγώ τινος τῶν Μεσοποταμίας ἤκουσα, ἀνδρὸς καὶ τῆς γλώσσης ἐμπείρως ἔχοντος, καὶ ἀδιαστρόφου τὴν γνώμην, οὐδὲ δυνατὸν ἑτέρως εἰπεῖν*

[59] Cf. Holl (1908) 243; Jones (1940) 289; *pace* Vryonis (1971) 46 n. 231.

τῇ ἐγχωρίῳ φωνῇ, κἂν ἐθέλωσιν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς καὶ συλλαβῆς, μᾶλλον δὲ τῶν ἰσοδυναμουσῶν αὐτῇ φωνῶν, κατά τι ἴδίωμα πάτριον, ἀνάγκον αὐτοῖς εἶναι τὴν δοξολογίαν προφέρειν.

I have heard from a certain Mesopotamian, a man at once well skilled in the language and of unperverted opinion, that by the usage of his country it is impossible, even if they wanted it, to express themselves in any other way, and that they are compelled by the idiom of their native language to offer the Doxology by the syllable 'and' or, I should more accurately say, by their equivalent expressions.

The digression is concluded with the following statement (ibid.):

(25) *καὶ Καππαδόκαι δὲ οὕτω λέγομεν ἐγχωρίως.*

We Cappadocians, too, speak like that in our native language.

According to the apparatus criticus of Migne's edition, two scholiasts observe that by *τινος τῶν Μεσοποταμίας* Basil is referring to Ephraem Syrus (*c.*AD 307–73). Ephraem was indeed born at Nisibis in Mesopotamia, a city with a mixed population of Aramaeans, Arabs, Greeks, and Persians. After Jovian's surrender of the city to the Persians (AD 363), he was forced to move to Edessa, the cradle of the Syriac dialect of Aramaic, as already remarked apropos of (11), whence his surname *Σύρος* 'the Syrian'. As has already been observed, geographical names and their derivatives were often confused in antiquity. Herodotus uses the name *Σύροι* (*Σύριοι*) to refer to Assyrians (7. 63) as well as Syrians (2. 30, 104, 159; 3. 5). To complicate matters even more, the same name is used to refer to the Cappadocians. In fact, he says that the Cappadocians are called *Σύριοι* by the Greeks, but *Καππαδόκαι* by the Persians (1. 72; 7. 72), and hence he refers to them as *Σύροι Καππαδόκαι* 'Cappadocian Syrians' (1. 72).[60] Strabo, commenting on Herodotus, says *Σύριους λέγοντα τοὺς Καππαδόκας* 'by Syrians he means the Cappadocians' (12. 3. 9).[61] Strabo's explanation may not be sufficient, but is nevertheless interesting (ibid.):

(26) *καὶ γὰρ ἔτι καὶ νῦν Λευκόσυροι καλοῦνται, Σύρων καὶ τῶν ἔξω τοῦ Ταύρου λεγομένων· κατὰ δὲ τὴν πρὸς τοὺς ἐντὸς τοῦ Ταύρου σύγκρισιν, ἐκείνων*

[60] Cf. Hdt. 2. 104; 3. 90; 5. 49.

[61] This may also explain why Eusebius of Caesarea (*c.*AD 260–339) reads *Συρίαν τε καὶ Καππαδοκίαν* instead of *Ἰουδαίαν τε καὶ Καππαδοκίαν* in the passage quoted in (20). Also worthy of note is the fact that Tertullian (*c.*AD 160–240) and Augustine (AD 354–430) read *Armeniam quoque et Cappadociam* instead of *Iudaeam quoque et Cappadociam* ad loc.

ἐπικεκαυμένων τὴν χρόαν, τούτων δὲ μή, τοιαύτην τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν γενέσθαι συνέβη.

And in fact they are still today called 'White Syrians', while those outside the Taurus are called 'Syrians'; because those outside the Taurus, as compared with those this side of the Taurus, have a tanned complexion, while those this side do not, this appellation came into being.

What are we to make of all this? The fact that Assyrians and Syrians are confused is not surprising. The Aramaeans made their first historical appearance in the twelfth century BC in the Harran area 'outside the Taurus', and from there they spread over Mesopotamia and Syria.[62] Aramaic became the lingua franca in the late Assyrian and Persian periods, as evidenced by the numerous inscriptions found in Asia Minor, Egypt, and India, where it was never native.[63] Given the connection between Cappadocian and Syriac, as suggested by Basil in (24) and (25), could it be that the former was related to the latter and, in other words, an Aramaic dialect? This is not very likely in view of the fact that none of the Cappadocian Church Fathers seem to be familiar with the Aramaic תַּרְגּוּמִים *targûmîm* 'interpretations' of the Hebrew Scriptures or with Aramaic in general. Quotation (23), for instance, seems to suggest that Gregory of Nyssa did not know that the Hebrew word for 'heaven', שָׁמַיִם *šâmayim*, was very similar to its Aramaic equivalent שְׁמַיָּא *šĕmayyâ*. And there are no traces of Aramaisms in the Greek inscriptions from Cappadocia or in the modern Cappadocian Greek dialect.[64]

Could it have been an Indo-European language? This is not unlikely in view of the fact that Cappadocia used to be Hittite territory in the late Bronze Age and in view of the proximity of many other Anatolian languages, such as Lycian, Pisidian, and Sidetic.[65] More importantly, the Hittites conquered and dominated Syria after the establishment of the authority of Hattuša, whence the חִתִּים *ḥittîm* 'Hittites' are frequently mentioned among the pre-exilic Canaanite peoples in the Law.[66] In Akkadian sources, *māt Ḫatti* 'land of the Hittites' is used to refer to either Cappadocia (Old and

[62] Kutscher (1977 [1971]) 347 ff.; Kaufman (1974) 7 ff., 22–3; Beyer (1984) 23 ff.; (1994) 13 ff.

[63] Kutscher (1977 [1971]) 361 ff.; Sokoloff (1994) 1815; cf. Neumann (1980) 172.

[64] (Neumann (1980); 182; Dawkins (1916) 193 ff.

[65] Cf. Neumann (1980) 172.

[66] Cf. Gen. 15: 20; Exod. 3: 8, 17; 13: 5; 23: 3 ff., 23, 28; 25: 9, 10; 26: 34; 33: 2;

Middle Babylonian) or Syria (Neo-Babylonian).[67] It should come as no surprise, then, that *Σύριοι* could be used for both Aramaean and and Hittite (Cappadocian) Syrians. This would also explain Strabo's distinction between *Σύροι* and *Λευκόσυροι* quoted above. However, to equate Cappadocian with Hittite (or another Anatolian language) would be nothing more than a speculative guess.

Finally, there is Jerome's explanation of the Biblical מֶשֶׁךְ *mešek*, LXX *Μόσοχ*, son of Japheth (Gen. 10: 2), eponym of the so-called 'Japhetic' languages (Gen. 10: 5), including Iranian, Greek, and Latin:[68] *Mosoch Cappadoces, unde et urbs usque hodie apud eos Mazaca dicitur* 'the "Mosoch" are the Cappadocians, whence there is a city which is still today called Mazaca' (CCSL 72. 14 Lagarde). Now *Μάζακα* is an Iranian name derived from **maz-* 'great',[69] which was given to the city later called *Καισάρεια*. It was created by the Cappadocian kings to be their capital and called *Εὐσέβεια* by Ariarathes V Eusebes Philopator (Strabo 12. 2. 7). The name was changed to Caesarea by the last Cappadocian king, Archelaus, after whose death (AD 17) it became the capital of the procuratorial province of Cappadocia.[70] Given the philhellenism of the Cappadocian kings, it seems unlikely that Cappadocian would have been an Iranian language. In fact, Aramaic became the lingua franca in Asia Minor following the victory of Cyrus over Croesus (546 BC), as evidenced not only by official but also by private inscriptions.[71] The only thing we do in fact know about Cappadocian is that Strabo says it was related to 'Cataonian' (12. 1. 2), yet another mysterious language.

We know, however, that the Cappadocians were considered *βαρβαρόφωνοι* in antiquity. Judging from the following distich attributed to Lucian (second century AD), it would appear that Cappadocian *βαρβαροφωνία* was proverbial (*AP* 11. 436):

(27) *θᾶττον ἔην λευκοὺς κόρακας πτηνάς τε χελώνας*
εὑρεῖν ἢ δόκιμον ῥήτορα Καππαδόκην.

34: 11; Num. 13: 29; Deut. 7: 1; 20: 7. In fact, the חִתִּים *ḥittîm* are also called בְּנוֹת חֵת *bĕnôt ḥēt* 'sons of Heth' (Gen. 23: 3), and as such they are the (grand)children of Canaan (Gen. 10: 15), and the (great) grandchildren of Ham (Gen. 10: 6), eponym of the Hamitic languages (Gen. 10: 20).

[67] Cf. Gesenius and Buhl (1915) 268.
[68] Sawyer (1994) 295.
[69] Zgusta (1984) 356–7; cf. Bartholomae (1904) 1156.
[70] Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 2. 42. 2 ff.; Cass. Dio 57. 17.
[71] Cf. Neumann (1980) 172; Frye (1984) 88; Lemaire and Lozachmeur (1996) 91 ff.

It was easier to find white ravens or winged turtles than a decent Cappadocian orator

Flavius Philostratus (second–third centuries AD) is even more explicit in his description of the Cappadocian accent of Pausanias of Caesarea (second century AD), a student of Herodes Atticus (*VS* 2. 13):

(28) *ἀπήγγειλε παχείᾳ τῇ γλώττῃ καὶ ὡς Καππαδόκαις ξύνηθες, ξυγκρούων μὲν τὰ ξύμφωνα τῶν στοιχείων, συστέλλων δὲ τὰ μηκυνόμενα καὶ μηκύνων τὰ βραχέα.*

He delivered his declamations with a heavy accent, as is the way with Cappadocians, making his consonants collide, shortening the long syllables, and lengthening the short ones.

Allusion to the distinctive accent of the Cappadocians is also made by Gregory of Nazianzus (AD 329–89) in his speech to the conceited clergy of Constantinople (PG 36. 24):

(29) *ἀπαιδευσίαν δὲ οὐκ ἐγκαλέσεις ἢ ὅτι τραχύ σοι δοκῶ καὶ ἄγροικον φθέγγεσθαι;*

Will you reproach me for want of education because I seem to speak in a harsh and peasant fashion?

That the Cappadocian accent was indeed notorious also emerges from Philostratus' description of Apollonius of Tyana (first century AD), who apparently was able to speak Greek without any accent (*VA* 1. 7):

(30) *ἡ γλῶττα Ἀττικῶς εἶχεν, οὐδ' ἀπήχθη τὴν φωνὴν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἔθνους.*

His tongue affected Attic, nor was his accent corrupted by his race.'

From both accounts it can be inferred that the most conspicuous feature of Cappadocian Greek was its accent, owing to transfer of phonetic and phonological features from the indigenous Cappadocian substrate. Phonetic and phonological interference from the indigenous languages is in fact amply attested in Asia Minor Greek.[72] Evidence of grammatical and lexical interference seems to be lacking altogether.[73]

When exactly the indigenous languages of Asia Minor died we do not know. Vryonis takes the view that 'by the sixth century

[72] Cf. Thumb (1901) 133 ff.; Bubeník (1989) 276 ff.

[73] Cf. Neumann (1980) 180–1.

the Greek language had triumphed over the various indigenous tongues of western and central Anatolia (to the regions of Cappadocia)' (1971: 48). Some think that Phrygian may have survived until the Arab invasions in the seventh century or even the Seljuk invasions in the eleventh.[74] However, in the easternmost parts of Asia Minor a number of non-indigenous languages coexisted with Greek. The most important of these were Armenian, Syriac, Kurdish, Georgian, and Arabic, the latter gaining a stronger foothold during the Arab invasions from the seventh to the ningth century.[75] The only language to have left some traces in Cappadocian Greek is Armenian.[76]

The Seljuk invasions from the eleventh century onwards, on the other hand, were to have a dramatic impact on both the use and the form of Cappadocian Greek (henceforth: Cappadocian). Even before the Byzantine defeat at Manzikert (1071) the Seljuks had raided important parts of Cappadocia, including Caesarea, which was plundered, burnt, and destroyed.[77] Cappadocia was thus cut off from the rest of the Greek-speaking world long before the fall of Constantinople (1453), which put an end to the Byzantine Empire. Turkish being the language of the conquerers, it assumed the role played by Greek for centuries and centuries. Already in the fifteenth century there is evidence of language shift, even in church, as is shown by the following document from 1437:[78]

(31) notandum est, quod in multis partibus Turcie reperiuntur clerici, episcopi et arciepiscopi, qui portant uestimenta infidelium et locuntur linguam ipsorum et nihil aliud sciunt in Greco proferre nisi missam cantare et euangelium et epistolas. alias autem orationes dicunt in lingua Turcorum.

It should be noted that in many parts of Turkey clerics, bishops, and archbishops are found who wear the clothes of the infidels and speak their language, and are unable to express anything in Greek apart from singing the Mass and quoting the Gospel and Epistles. Other speeches, however, they deliver in the language of the Turks.

Put differently, Greek had already disappeared in some parts of Asia Minor in the fifteenth century. Around 1910, when Dawkins conducted his fieldwork, Cappadocian was threatened with complete extinction: 'Turkish . . ., as the language of the rulers and of

[74] (Brixhe (1987*a*) 11; Thumb (1901) 103.
[75] Cf. Vryonis (1971) 48.
[76] Cf. Dawkins (1916) 196–7.
[77] Cf. Vryonis (1971) 95.
[78] Quoted by Dawkins (1916) 1 n. 1.

an increasing proportion of the population, threatens to crush it altogether' (1916: 1). In those parts where it did survive, it developed 'under the strongest influence of the surrounding Turkish' (ibid.). Dawkins' description of Fertek (*Βαρτάκαινα Vartákena* in the local dialect) illustrates this state of affairs quite vividly (1916: 14 ff.). The population of the village was estimated at about 2,700 Greek-speaking Christians and 300 Turkish-speaking Muslims by 1900. Hardly ten years later, the ratio was 1,100 to 2,000 and another ten years later 430 to 2,500. A detailed and illuminating account of the sociolinguistic situation is given by Dawkins (1916: 14–15):

(32) The men . . . amongst themselves generally talk Turkish, although they as a rule know common Greek. They also understand the local dialect, although they do not talk it very freely. The use of the dialect is thus almost confined to the women and children, and as Turkish women often come to the Greek houses to help in house-work, the women also are apt to acquire the habit of talking Turkish amongst themselves as well as to their husbands, which materially helps the decline of the dialect. Fertek in fact will, I believe, become entirely Turkophone, unless its schools save a small remnant to talk the common Greek.

Fertek is thus the perfect illustration of 'diglossic bilingualism' (Blanc 1994: 355), with three varieties being used by different people on different occasions and for different purposes. In villages with full 'societal bilingualism' (Blanc 1994: 354), where Turkish could be used by all the inhabitants on any occasion, Cappadocian was even more endangered. Such is the case of Ulagaç, where Dawkins 'even heard women talking Turkish to their children, a sure sign of the approaching extinction of the Greek dialect' (1916: 18).[79] As a result Turkish interference in Cappadocian was so pervasive, especially in the fully bilingual villages, that Dawkins concluded that 'the Turkish has replaced the Greek spirit; the body has remained Greek, but the soul has become Turkish' (1916: 198).

[79] The full bilingualism of the Cappadocians is evidenced most elqoquently by their response (in Turkish) to the arrival of the Greek troops in Asia Minor: *τζενδέμ ολσούν, γκελέμεζλερ*, i.e. *cendem olsun, gelemezler* 'Let them go to hell, they cannot come!' (Iosiphidis 1983 [1962]: 62). The peaceful coexistence between the Cappadocians and the Turks can be illustrated by the following poignant testimony of one of the Cappadocian refugees after the population exchange between Greece and Turkey following the Treaty of Lausanne (1923): *κλάψανε οι Τούρκοι, οι δικοί μας οι Τούρκοι* 'They wept, the Turks, *our* Turks' (Papagrigoriadis 1983 [1956]: 75). Another refugee had this to say: *πως να πούμε "ο Τούρκος είναι κακός";* 'How can we say "Turks are bad"?' (Zachariadi 1983 [1955]: 50).

The impact of Turkish on Cappadocian will become clear in the next section.

4. Three Case Studies

In the following case studies the Greek varieties of the LXX and Cappadocian will be contrasted to illustrate the differences between two opposites. The LXX is both a word-for-word and a calqued translation of a sacred text written in a foreign (dead) language into the newly acquired language of the translators. The aim of the translators was not to re-create freely the content of the Hebrew Scriptures, but to reproduce both content and form as faithfully as possible so as not to go against God's commandment quoted in (15). The language of the LXX cannot therefore be assessed exclusively in linguistic terms, since it reflects a conscious translation technique characteristic of religious translation in general. The language of the LXX is, in other words, a hybrid in the sense that it does not and indeed cannot reflect the spoken or even written *κοινή* of its time in every respect, even though it makes use of its lexical and grammatical resources. In order to do this, the translators deliberately stretched their linguistic resources to produce a 'mimetic' text. A distinctive feature of such a translation technique is 'extension', a technical term defined by Harris and Campbell as 'change in the surface manifestation of a pattern that does not involve immediate or intrinsic modification of underlying structure' (1995: 97). Moulton, referring to the same phenomenon without actually using the term, put it this way: 'the ordinary Greek speech or writing of men whose native language was Semitic . . . brought into prominence locutions, correct enough as Greek, but which would have remained in comparatively rare use but for the accident of their answering to Hebrew or Aramaic phrases' (1908: 11). Thackeray speaks of the 'over-working' and 'accumulation of a number of just tolerable Greek phrases, which nearly correspond to what is normal and idiomatic in Hebrew' (1909: 29).

In Cappadocian, on the other hand, interference is not conscious, but the result of language maintenance under strong cultural pressure and long-term bilingualism.[80] Interference has here taken the form of 'heavy borrowing', a technical term introduced by Thoma-

[80] Cf. Thomason and Kaufman (1988) 93–4, 215–16.

son and Kaufman, which includes 'much lexical borrowing' and 'heavy structural borrowing, especially in phonology and syntax' (1988: 50).[81] Unlike the LXX, Cappadocian was a spoken language, not a language written for a special purpose. The result is nevertheless something of a hybrid. In the words of Kontosopoulos: *όποιος ακούει . . . την καππαδοκική διάλεκτο, δεν ξέρει αν έχει να κάνει με τουρκικά σε ελληνικό στόμα ή με ελληνικά σε στόμα τούρκικο* 'whoever hears . . . the Cappadocian dialect does not know whether he has to do with Turkish spoken by a Greek or with Greek spoken by a Turk' (Kontosopoulos 1994: 7).

Cappadocian is indeed a hybrid in that it is a truly mixed language. This does not imply that the Cappadocian (oral) texts recorded by Dawkins exhibit 'code-switching', defined by Heller and Pfaff as 'the use of more than one linguistic variety, by a single speaker in the course of a single conversation' (1996: 594). Inevitably, code-switching must have occurred in everyday conversation in Cappadocia, e.g. between men and women or women and children in villages with diglossic bilingualism like Fertek or Ulagaç discussed above. Yet Cappadocian itself retained enough Greek to count as a Greek dialect and it was felt as such by its speakers. A Cappadocian who encountered Cretan Muslims noted that they spoke the 'same' language as he: *μιλούσαν ελληνικά, καλά ελληνικά, κι εμείς μιλούσαμε ελληνικά, αλλά δεν τους καταλαβαίναμε* 'they spoke Greek, good Greek, and we spoke Greek as well, but we did not understand them' (Chinitsidis 1983 [1959]: 25).[82] Both Cappadocians and Cretans may have thought of each other as *βαρβαρόφωνοι*, speakers of 'bad' Greek, but Greek nevertheless.[83] Code-switching is not the appropriate term here, because the Cappadocians did not use Turkish and Greek alternately. They borrowed heavily from Turkish, but the Turkish borrowings were fully integrated with

[81] Cf. Thomason and Kaufman (1988) 75–6.

[82] Neither ethnicity nor religion had anything to do with language, as appears from the following testimony from a Turkish-speaking refugee from Kitsagaç: *Θυμάμαι που ήρθαν οι Τούρκοι πρόσφυγες. Ελληνικά μιλούσανε και δεν τους καταλαβαίναμε. Λέγανε οι παλιοί Τούρκοι "Τούρκοι φεύγουν κι Έλληνες έρχονται"* 'I remember the Turkish refugees coming. Greek they spoke and we did not understand them. The old Turks said: "The Turks are going and the Greeks are coming"' (Kekili 1983 [1953]: 224). The 'Turkish refugees' must have been Greek-speaking Muslims (Cretans, for instance).

[83] The use of *καλά* in the testimony of Chintzidis is interesting: the Cretans spoke 'good' Greek, but he could not understand them anyway!

their Greek. A more appropriate term would be 'code-mixing',[84] especially in the case of the most heavily influenced subdialects such as that of Ulagaç (Dawkins 1916: 209), which in the words of Thomason and Kaufman would be 'over the border of nongenetic development' (1988: 94).[85]

The difference between Hebrew interference in the LXX and Turkish interference in Cappadocian will become obvious in the following case studies. They are intended to be illustrative of the difference between conscious interference in religious translation and unconscious interference in language maintenance under strong cultural pressure and long-term bilingualism. It should once again be noted, however, that whereas the two types may be contrasted as being complete opposites, they cannot be properly compared.

4.1. *Relatives*

Hebrew relative clauses (RCs) resemble their Greek counterparts typologically in that both languages make use of a relative marker and a finite clause. Unlike the Greek relative pronoun, however, the Hebrew relative marker אֲשֶׁר *'ăšer* is indeclinable and as such comparable to Modern Greek *που*.[86] Since אֲשֶׁר *'ăšer* cannot express any syntactic function or relation, the latter is often expressed by a so-called 'resumptive' pronoun in the RC.[87] In Greek there is, strictly speaking, no need for such a resumptive pronoun, the syntactic function of the latter being expressed by the relative pronoun. Where it does occur it is generally called, for obvious reasons, 'pleonastic'.[88] Bakker, who has written a monograph-length study on the subject, calls it *pronomen abundans*, defined as 'a personal or demonstrative pronoun which repeats the relative pronoun in a single-limbed relative clause' (1974: 9). Bakker (1974: 11 ff.) has collected a few scattered examples in Ancient Greek, but according to Thackeray 'The pleonastic . . . pronoun appended to a relative pronoun or a relative adverb . . . is found in all parts of the LXX and

[84] Cf. Bechert and Wildgen (1991) 65; Hock and Joseph (1996) 381.

[85] It may be noted that McCormick, who juxtaposes both terms in the title of his article (1994), does not distinguish between code-switching and code-mixing.

[86] Cf. Gesenius and Kautzsch (1909) 465 ff.; Waltke and O'Connor (1990) 330 ff.; Joüon and Muraoka (1996) 118–19, 536–7.

[87] Cf. Waltke and O'Connor (1990) 333–4; Joüon and Muraoka (1996) 594 ff.

[88] Cf. Thackeray (1909) 46; Swete (1914) 307–8.

undoubtedly owes its *frequency* to the Hebrew original' (1909: 46).[89] Examples (8) and (33) illustrate the phenomenon (Gen. 28: 13):

(33) הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר אַתָּה שֹׁכֵב עָלֶיהָ לְךָ אֶתְּנֶנָּה.

ἡ γῆ, ἐφ' ἧς σὺ καθεύδεις ἐπ' αὐτῆς, σοὶ δώσω αὐτήν.

הָאָרֶץ	אֲשֶׁר	אַתָּה	שֹׁכֵב	עָלֶיהָ	לְךָ
hā-'āreṣ	*'ăšer*	*'attâ*	*šōkēb*	*ʿālê-hā*	*lĕ-kā*
ἡ γῆ	*ἐφ' ἧς*	*σὺ*	*καθεύδεις*	*ἐπ' αὐτῆς*	*σοὶ*

אֶתְּנֶנָּה
'ettĕnen-nâ
δώσω αὐτήν

The land on which you are lying I will give (it) to you.

It is clear why (*ἐπ'*) *αὐτῆς*, which simply copies the syntactic function of (*ἐφ'*) *ἧς*, is considered pleonastic, unlike עָלֶיהָ *ʿālê-hā*, which is, in the words of Bakker, 'not redundant, but necessary' (1974: 36). This example is again a clear illustration of the translation technique of the LXX, which is at once word-for-word and calqued. The same applies to the following (Lev. 15: 26):

(34) כָּל־הַמִּשְׁכָּב אֲשֶׁר־תִּשְׁכַּב עָלָיו . . . וְכָל־הַכְּלִי אֲשֶׁר תֵּשֵׁב עָלָיו.

πᾶσαν κοίτην, ἐφ' ἣν ἂν κοιμηθῇ ἐπ' αὐτῆς . . . καὶ πᾶν σκεῦος, ἐφ' ὃ ἂν καθίσῃ ἐπ' αὐτό.

כָּל־	הַמִּשְׁכָּב	אֲשֶׁר־	תִּשְׁכַּב	עָלָיו . . .	וְכָל־
kol-	*ham-miškāb*	*'ăšer-*	*tiškab*	*ʿālāw . . .*	*wĕ-kol-*
πᾶσαν	*κοίτην*	*ἐφ' ἣν*	*ἂν κοιμηθῇ*	*ἐπ' αὐτῆς . . .*	*καὶ πᾶν*

הַכְּלִי	אֲשֶׁר	תֵּשֵׁב	עָלָיו
hak-kĕlî	*'ăšer*	*tēšēb*	*ʿālāw*
σκεῦος	*ἐφ' ὃ*	*ἂν καθίσῃ*	*ἐπ' αὐτό*

Any bed she lies on (it) . . . and any thing she sits on (it).

In the next example (Lev. 11: 32) the indeclinable אֲשֶׁר *'ăšer* is even rendered by *ὅ*, a 'fossilized neutral form . . . absolutely unique . . . in Greek' (Bakker 1974: 34):

(35) כָּל־כְּלִי אֲשֶׁר־יֵעָשֶׂה מְלָאכָה בָּהֶם בַּמַּיִם יוּבָא.

πᾶν σκεῦος, ὃ ἐὰν ποιηθῇ ἔργον ἐν αὐτῷ, εἰς ὕδωρ βαφήσεται.

כָּל־	כְּלִי	אֲשֶׁר־	יֵעָשֶׂה	מְלָאכָה	בָּהֶם
kol-	*kĕlî*	*'ăšer-*	*yēʿāśêh*	*mĕlâkâ*	*bā-hem*
πᾶν	*σκεῦος*	*ὃ*	*ἐὰν ποιηθῇ*	*ἔργον*	*ἐν αὐτῷ*

[89] Cf. Bakker (1974) 33–4; Soisalon-Soininen (1987*b* [1977]) 60.

בַּמַּיִם	יוּבָא
bam-mayim	*yûbâ*
εἰς ὕδωρ	*βαφήσεται*

Every thing, whatever use there is in it, shall be put in water.

The phenomenon is not restricted to translation Greek, but attested in 'original Greek' (Thackeray 1909: 46) as well (2 Macc. 12: 27):

(36) *ἐπεστράτευσεν καὶ ἐπὶ Ἐφρὼν πόλιν ὀχυράν, ἐν ᾗ κατῴκει πάμφυλα ἐν αὐτῇ πλήθη.*

He also marched upon Efron, a strong city, where many nations lived (in it).

In the Greek New Testament the pleonastic pronoun can also be found. Turner calls it a 'Semitism', but notes that 'non-Biblical Greek, and indeed many languages reveal the same phenomenon' (Moulton and Turner 1963: 325).[90] A particularly telling example is the following (Matt. 10: 11D)

(37) *ἡ πόλις εἰς ἣν εἰσέλθητε εἰς αὐτήν, ἐξετάσατε τίς ἐν αὐτῇ ἄξιός ἐστιν.*

Whatever city (in which) you enter (in it), find out who is worthy in it.

Since the phenomenon is not restricted to Biblical Greek, Bakker takes the view that the use of the pleonastic pronoun is not a Semitism *per se* (1974: 33 ff.). He concludes that the presence or absence of a pleonastic pronoun is related to the type of RC. In linguistic typology it is customary to distinguish between 'restrictive' and 'non-restrictive' RCs (Comrie 1989: 138 ff.).[91] The difference is defined as follows by Comrie: 'the restrictive relative clause uses presupposed information to identify the referent of a noun phrase, while the non-restrictive relative is a way of presenting new information on the basis of the assumption that the referent can already be identified' (1989: 139). He adds that 'in typological terms . . . this distinction seems to be almost completely irrelevant' (ibid.). It is generally assumed that the distinction has no relevance for Greek either: 'Il n'existe pas en grec de signe de subordination qui permette de distinguer *formellement* . . . les propositions circonstantielles [i.e. non-restrictive RCs] des propositions déterminatives [i.e. restrictive RCs]' (Humbert 1960: 239).

[90] Cf. Blass and Debrunner (1979) 246.

[91] Cf. Touratier (1980) 241 ff.; Lehmann (1984) 261 ff.

Bakker, however, who uses the terms 'essential' and 'non-essential', found that in non-Biblical Greek the pleonastic pronoun occurs exclusively in non-restrictive RCs (1974: 13, 29). Its occurrence in (35) and (36) would be in accordance with his rule. The use of a pleonastic pronoun in restrictive RCs as in (33), (34), and (37), on the other hand, would bend the rule: 'when a relat[ive] clause in which occurs a *pronomen abundans* is essential (restrictive), it does not follow the rules of the Greek language and must be considered as non-Greek, and therefore as a Semitism' (1974: 36).[92] Elsewhere he contends that 'the phenomenon breaks through its limits [sc. of the Greek language], or rather it *stretches* them extremely far' (1974: 35—emphasis added). Bakker's use of the word 'stretch' suggests that what we have here is in fact an example of extension of a syntactic rule: the use of the pleonastic pronoun is no longer restricted to non-restrictive RCs, but is extended to restrictive RCs on the analogy of the Hebrew usage. According to Soisalon-Soininen it is 'the natural result of the literal translation of the Hebrew text' (1987*b* [1977]: 60).

Turkish RCs do not resemble their Greek counterparts at all typologically. As already remarked, the Modern Greek language does not use a relative pronoun, but an indeclinable relative marker *που*, comparable to Hebrew אֲשֶׁר *'ăšer*. But apart from that the Modern Greek RC has remained a finite clause as in Ancient Greek. The Turkish RC, on the other hand, is of a completely different type in that it does not resort to a finite verb but to a participle.[93] For this reason Lehmann prefers to speak of a 'Relativpartizip' or 'relative participle' (1984: 49, 52 ff.).[94] Another typological difference between Greek and Turkish RCs has to do with word order. Turkish is a canonical SOV language.[95] A typological corollary of this basic word order is that the modifier always precedes the modified. This means that, for instance, nominal modifiers such as demonstratives, adjectives, and RCs precede the noun, as in the following examples:[96]

[92] Cf. Bakker (1974) 39.

[93] Cf. Lewis (1967) 163 ff., 260 ff.; Kornfilt (1997) 57 ff.

[94] *Pace* Lewis (1967) 163 n. 1.

[95] Cf. Lewis (1967) 240; Kornfilt (1987) 636; (1997) 91.

[96] The following abbreviations are used: ACC = accusative, AOR = aorist, CAUS = causative, DEM = demonstrative, GEN = genitive, IPF = imperfect, NEG = negative, NOM = nominative, PART = participle, PL = plural, PRES = present, PRT = particle, REL = relative

(38a) *bu* *küçük* *kız*
this little girl
This little girl.

(38b) *bu* *küçük* *ol-an* *kız*
This little be-PART girl
This girl who is little.

In the Modern Greek equivalents of (38a–b) the nominal modifiers either precede or follow the noun,[97] except for the RC, which always follows:[98]

(39a) *αὐτό* *το=μικρό* *το=κορίτσι*
this the=little the=girl
This little girl.

(39b) *αυτό* *το=κορίτσι* *το=μικρό*
this the=girl the=little
This *little* girl.

(39c) *αυτό* *το=κορίτσι* *που=είναι* *μικρό*
this the=girl REL=be-$_{3sg}$ little
This girl who is little.

In both Turkish and Greek grammars RCs are sometimes called 'adjective clauses', because a RC modifies a noun in much the same way as an adjective does, in that it restricts the semantic domain covered by the noun.[99] The parallelism is borne out formally in the Turkish examples (38a–b) especially. As Lewis puts it, Turkish RCs actually 'function as adjectives' (1967: 158).

In (38b) the antecedent *kız* is also the subject of the RC. If such is not the case, Turkish resorts to another type of participle, called 'personal participle' by Lewis (1967: 163), which is formed by adding a pronominal suffix to the participles in *-dik* (Kornfilt 1987:

marker, $_{sg}$ =singular. The double hyphen (=) marks the attachment of clitics, a simple hyphen (-) the attachment of affixes. It should be noted that the interpretation of Modern Greek *pu* as a (pro)clitic is not generally accepted (for discussion see Joseph and Philippaki-Warburton 1987: 216). The Turkish translations are provided by my near-native speaker informant Johan Vandewalle.

[97] Cf. Holton, Mackridge, and Philippaki-Warburton (1997) 341.

[98] Cf. Joseph and Philippaki-Warburton (1987) 24; Holton, Mackridge, and Philippaki-Warburton (1997) 440.

[99] Cf. Joseph and Philippaki-Warburton (1987) 23; Holton, Mackridge, and Philippaki-Warburton (1997) 440; Kornfilt (1997) 57; Janse (1999*b*) 453.

630; 1997: 57).[100] Compare, for instance, the following Modern Greek example with its Turkish translation (40b):

(40a) *βρήκε* *το=κορίτσι* *που=γύρευε*
find-AOR-3sg this=girl REL=look for-IPF-3sg

(40b) *ara-dıg-ı* *kız-ı* *bul-du*
look for-PART-3sg girl-ACC find-PAST-3sg
He found the girl he was looking for.

Literally, (40b) translates as 'he found the girl of his looking for'. The differences between the Greek RC and its Turkish counterpart are obvious. Not only does Turkish use a participle instead of a finite verb, but in terms of linear word order the two utterances are each other's mirror image: VO/OV (and N-RC/RC-N).

Cappadocian RCs are like Greek RCs in that they have retained the finite verb construction with a relative marker. The usual relative marker in Cappadocian is the indeclinable *tó*, plural *tá*.[101] At Faraşa (*Βαρασός Varašós* in the local dialect), it is the indeclinable *tú*.[102] The loss of gender distinctions is due to Turkish influence,[103] since Turkish has no grammatical gender.[104] The loss of case distinctions is a corollary of this, as Dawkins points out in connection with the article: 'Where, with the breakdown of the distinction between these two classes, all nouns tend to become neuter in form . . . [t]here is no distinction of case or gender: the only forms used being *to* (*do*) for the singular and *ta* (*da*) for the plural' (1916: 87).

The Cappadocian relative maker is formally identical with the article. It is important to realize that the use of this so-called 'postpositive' article goes back to ancient times.[105] It was, in fact, very common in the Ionic dialect,[106] notably in Homer and Herodotus, which may be the reason why it spread over Asia Minor.[107] The article is in origin a demonstrative and it is this originally demonstrative function which explains its use as a relative marker, e.g. in

[100] It should be noted that intervocalic *k* regularly becomes *g* (Lewis 1967: 5), and that the rules of vowel harmony apply as well (Lewis 1967: 17–18).

[101] Cf. Dawkins (1916) 127; Mavrochalividiw and Kesisoglou (1960) 90.

[102] Cf. Dawkins (1916) 176' Anastasiadis (1976) 168.

[103] Cf. Dawkins (1916) 203; Thomason and Kaufman (1988) 219–20.

[104] Cf. Lewis (1967) 25; Kornfilt (1997) 270, 291.

[105] Cf. Jannaris (1897) 166; Monteil (1963) 21 ff.; 67ff. The term *ὑποτακτικὸν ἄρθρον* 'postpositive article' is Alexandrian (Ap. Dysc. *Synt*. 9. 3, 68. 4–5, 116. 9 ff., 189. 11, etc.).

[106] Cf. Jannaris (1897) 353; Monteil (1963) 80 ff.

[107] Cf. Anastasiadis (1976) 169–70.

Homer.[108] It should be noted, however, that the postpositive article is sporadically attested in Classical and post-Classical Greek,[109] especially in unofficial inscriptions and papyri.[110]

Cappadocian and Greek RCs differ, however, in their position *vis-à-vis* the noun. Whereas Greek RCs always follow the noun, Cappadocian RCs normally precede. The Cappadocian equivalent of (40a) illustrates the point (Dawkins 1916: 526):

(40b) *ara-dıg-ı* *kız-ı* *bul-du*
look-for-PART-3sg girl-ACC find-PAST-3sg

(40c) *ívre* *tú=írepse* *to=korítsi*
find-AOR-3sg REL=look for-AOR-3sg the=girl

He found the girl he was looking for.

Prepositive RCs are a clear sign of Turkish interference.[111] There is, however, a crucial difference between the Cappadocian utterance (40c) and its Turkish equivalent (40b). The initial position of *ívre* in (40c) differs markedly from the final position of *buldu* in (40b). This means that Cappadocian word order is calqued on the Turkish only as far as the order of the RC and its antecedent is concerned, i.e. on the level of the noun phrase.[112] Perhaps even more interesting is the fact that, contrary to the claim made by Thomason and Kaufman (1988: 222), Cappadocian RCs are characterized by verb-second (V2) positioning, which is a pan-Greek phenomenon in subordinate clauses generally.[113]

Before concluding this section, I would like to return briefly to the hypothesis that RCs are in fact adjective clauses. It has been pointed out that in Modern Greek RCs differ from adjectives in that in terms of linear word order the former are obligatorily postpositive, as in (39c), but the latter normally prepositive, as in (39a). In Cappadocian the isomorphism between RCs and adjectives is almost complete.[114] Compare, for instance, the following pairs. The first one comprises an adjective (Dawkins 1916: 392):

[108] Cf. Chantraine (1958) 277; Monteil (1963) 21 ff.
[109] Cf. Schwyzer (1950) 610; Anastasiadis (1976) 170.
[110] Cf. Bakker (1974) 95–6.
[111] Cf. Dawkins (1916) 201–11; Andriotis (1948) 48–9; Kesisoglou (1951) 51–2; Mavrochalividis and Kesisoglou (1960) 90; Anastasiadis (1976) 176.
[112] Cf. Janse (1999*b*) 457.
[113] Cf. Thumb (1910) 192; Joseph and Philippaki-Warburton (1987) 20; Holton, Mackridge, and Philippaki-Warburton (1997) 439.
[114] Cf. Janse (1999*b*) 458.

(41a) *etó* *to=mikró* *to=korítsi*
this the=little the=girl

(41b) *bu* *küçük* *kız*
this little girl
This little girl.

The second one comprises a RC (Dawkins 1916: 306):

(42a) *etó* *tó=érxete* *to=pedí*
this REL=come-PRES-3sg the=child
This child which is coming.

From the Turkish point of view, Cappadocian RCs behave exactly like adjectives, including their position *vis-à-vis* other prenominal modifiers such as demonstratives.[115] The isomorphism between (41a) and (42a) is so striking as to raise the question why Cappadocian should have retained the erstwhile 'postpositive' article as a relative marker. The first thing to note is that the accent on the relative marker *tó* is purely 'orthographic', possibly to distinguish it from the 'true' article *to*. The second thing to note is that the relative marker is no longer 'postpositive' *vis-à-vis* the noun, but rather 'prepositive', just like the 'true' article. There is reason to believe that both were actually identical, not just in form but in function as well.[116] Already in Ancient Greek the 'true' article *τό* was used as a nominalizer.[117] A telling example can be found in the New Testament, when Jesus tells a rich young man what the commandments are (Matt. 19: 18–19):

(43) *τὸ οὐ φονεύσεις, οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ κλέψεις, οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις, τίμα τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα, καὶ ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν.*
(The) you shall not murder, you shall not commit adultery, you shall not steal, you shall not give false testimony, honour your father and your mother, and love your neighbour as yourself.

Even in Modern Greek 'the neuter forms of the definite article may be used to substantivize any part of speech (and even whole phrases and clauses) in a variety of ways' (Holton, Mackridge, and Philippaki-Warburton 1997: 280).[118] From this perspective it is revealing that Comrie should call the suffix *-dik* in personal participles like

[115] Cf. Kornfilt (1997) 109.
[116] Cf. Janse (1999*b*) 460.
[117] Cf. Kühner and Gerth (1898) i. 596–7.
[118] Cf. Joseph and Philippaki-Warburton (1987) 50, 218.

ara-dik (40b) a 'nominalizing suffix' (1989: 142). Could it be that the former 'postpositive' article developed into a nominalizer in Cappadocian to render the Turkish RC as faithfully as possible?[119] As a matter of fact, Cappadocian lacks an active participle which could be used to render the Turkish relative participle in *-en*.[120]

The conclusion to be drawn from all this is that in terms of syntactic structure, the Cappadocian RCs are still Greek, whereas in terms of linear word order they have become Turkish, the proviso being that the overall word order within the sentence has remained Greek as well.[121] I conclude with two final examples to show just how 'heavy' (in the sense of Thomason and Kaufman 1988: 50, 75–6) Turkish interference in Cappadocian could get.[122] The first one comes from Telmisos (*Ντελμεσό Delmesó* in the local dialect). When Dawkins visited the village in 1910, he found the local dialect 'relatively free from the influence of Turkish' (1916: 13). So much so, in fact, that he considered it 'the best representative of what Cappadocian Greek must have been before it was . . . Turkised' (ibid.). Turkish interference is nevertheless as 'heavy' as can be, as in the following example (Dawkins 1916: 314):

(44a)	*eší*	*tó=ívres*	*to=koríč*	*etá*	*dé=ne?*	
	you	REL=find-AOR-2sg	the=girl	that	not=be=3sg	
(44b)	*sen-in*	*bul-dug-un*	*kız*	*o*	*degil=mi?*	
	you-GEN	find-PART-2sg	girl	that	not be=PRT	
	The girl you have found, is that not her?					

The Turkish RC (44b) literally translates as 'the girl of your finding'. The Cappadocian RC (44a) is completely calqued on the Turkish, resulting in something which looks like an extracted pronoun, *eší*, the case of which can only be explained from the Greek point of view. As the Cappadocian RC is a finite clause, its subject has to be in the nominative, not the genitive, which is the case of its Turkish counterpart. If (44a) were a translation of (44b), it would have to be called at once word-for-word and calqued, as in the translation Greek of (33) to (35).

I conclude with an almost identical example from a text from Faraşa (Dawkins 1916: 500), where the local dialect was 'still the habitual language of every-day life' around 1910, even though all

[119] Cf. Janse (1999*b*) 460.
[120] Cf. Dawkins (1916) 147, 192.
[121] Cf. Janse (1999*b*) 457.
[122] Cf. Janse (1999*b*) 460.

the men and most of the women knew 'more or less Turkish' according to Dawkins (1916: 34):

(45a) *gó* *tú=pítaksa* *to=palikári* *pú* *píje?*
I REL=send-AOR-1sg the=youngster where go-AOR-3sg

(45b) *ben-im* *gönder-dig-im* *delikanlı* *nereye* *git-ti?*
I-GEN send-PART-1sg youngster where go-PAST-3sg

The young man I sent, where did he go?

4.2. *Causatives*

Kühne opens his monograph on the Greek causative with the statement: 'Das griechische gehört nicht in die reihe der sprachen, welche für den causativen begriff eine feststehende form entwickelt haben' (1882: 1). Indeed, of the Indo-European iterative-causative in **-éye/o-* with *o*-grade of the root (Szemerényi 1996: 295 ff.) only a few scattered remains have been preserved in Greek. Compare, for instance, *φέβομαι* 'flee' with *φοβέω* 'cause to flee, put to flight', *φοβέομαι* 'be put to flight'.[123]

The Hebrew verb system, on the other hand, comprises two separate categories with causative meaning, traditionally called **פִּעֵל** *pīʿēl* 'piel' and **הִפְעִיל** *hipʿîl* 'hifil', derived by ablaut and, in the case of the hifil, by prefixation from the base, traditionally called **קַל** *qal* 'qal'.[124] The hifil is usually considered the causative proper, whereas the piel has a variety of meanings, one of which is traditionally called 'factitive'. The difference between hifil and piel is generally related to dynamic vs. stative verbs, but in actual practice the distinction is often blurred.[125] Muraoka notes, for instance, that piel and hifil of **חָיָה** *ḥāyâ* 'live' are 'often interchangeable' in the sense of 'let live' or 'bring (back) to life' (Joüon and Muraoka 1996: 156).[126]

Typologically, causatives can be distinguished into three types, viz. morphological, analytic, and lexical.[127] The Hebrew piel and hifil are morphological causatives, as can be gathered from the proportionality between, for example, **מוּת** *mût* 'die' and the corresponding hifil **הֵמִית** *hēmît* 'cause to die=kill'. English has to resort to analytic constructions to express causative meaning, as in the gloss 'cause to die'. Lexical causatives are of the type 'kill=cause to

[123] Cf. Schwyzer (1939) 717; Chantraine (1968–80) 1183; Janse (1999*a*) 137–8.
[124] Cf. Gesenius and Kautzsch (1909) 147 ff., 151 ff.; Joüon and Muraoka (1996) 151 ff., 160 ff.
[125] Cf. Janse (1999*a*) 134.
[126] Cf. Gesenius and Buhl (1915) 226.
[127] Cf. Comrie (1989) 167.

die', the classic example in contemporary linguistics.[128] Since every language has lexical causatives, this distinction does not seem very relevant in typological terms.[129]

As has already been remarked, Ancient Greek did not have a separate category for morphological causatives. Apart from the lexical type, however, it could also resort to analytic causatives, as in the following example (Mark 7: 37):[130]

(45) *καὶ τοὺς κωφοὺς ποιεῖ ἀκούειν καὶ τοῦς ἀλάλους λαλεῖν.*

He even makes the deaf hear and the mute speak.

To some extent, however, causative meanings could be expressed by morphological means in Greek as well. A case in point is the difference between the intransitive or 'anti-causative' (Comrie 1989: 168) middle voice and the transitive or causative active voice of verbs like *ἵσταμαι* 'stand' vs. *ἵστημι* 'make stand'.[131] The same proportionality recurs in the aorist, e.g. intransitive (anti-causative) *ἔστην* 'stood' vs. transitive (causative) *ἔστησα* 'made stand'.[132]

There are, however, a number of derived verbs which seem to take on causative meaning occasionally.[133] Among the ones singled out by Kühne because they are used causatively 'mit einer besonderen vorliebe' (1882: 14) are verbs in *-όω* and *-ίζω*. The former have always been extremely productive, not least in the Hellenistic age.[134] Most of them are denominatives with factitive meaning equivalent to the Hebrew piel.[135] Equally productive are verbs in *-ίζω*.[136] Both types must have been in competition, as can be gathered from the coexistence of such pairs as *ὁρκίζω* vs. *ὁρκόω* 'make swear', *φορτίζω* vs. *φορτόω* 'make carry', etc.[137]

Finally, it should be mentioned that it was always possible in Greek to make an intransitive (anti-causative) verb transitive (causative) by simply adding a direct object to it.[138] A well-known example is the following, which has a 'postpositive' article as well (Hdt. 1. 206):

[128] Cf. Newmeyer (1986) 91 ff. [129] Cf. Janse (1990*a*) 93.
[130] Cf. Janse (1999*a*) 141. [131] Cf. Schwyzer (1950) 233–4.
[132] Cf. Kühne (1882) 19 ff.; Schwyzer (1939) 754 ff.; (1950) 71.
[133] Cf. Kühne (1882) 6 ff.
[134] Cf. Moulton and Howard (1929) 393 ff.; Mayser (1936) 141–2, and compare Debrunner (1917) 99 ff. [135] Cf. Janse (1999*a*) 140.
[136] Cf. Moulton and Howard (1929) 406 ff.; Mayser (1936) 145 ff.; and compare Debrunner (1917) 116, 127 ff. [137] Cf. Janse (1999*a*) 140–1.
[138] Cf. Kühne (1882) 3 ff.; Schwyzer (1950) 71 ff.

(47) *παῦσαι σπεύδων τὰ σπεύδεις.*

Stop hurrying on what you are hurrying on.

Now what happens when a Hebrew piel or hifil is translated into Greek? The translation technique of the LXX demands a translation which is both word-for-word and calqued, whence a preference for morphological causatives.[139] In some cases the translators used 'alternative techniques' (Tov 1999 [1982]: 195), as in the following example, where **הַקְטִין** *haqṭîn*, hifil of **קָטַן** *qāṭan* 'be small', is translated as *ποιέω μικρόν*, an analytical causative (instead of *μικρύνω*, 1 Chron. 17: 17), whereas **הַגְדִיל** *hagdîl*, hifil of **גָּדַל** *gādal* 'be great', is rendered by *μεγαλύνω*, a morphological causative (Amos 8: 5):

(48) **לְהַקְטִין אֵיפָה וּלְהַגְדִיל שֶׁקֶל.**

τοῦ ποιῆσαι μικρὸν μέτρον καὶ τοῦ μεγαλῦναι στάθμια.

לְהַקְטִין	**אֵיפָה**	**וּלְהַגְדִיל**	**שֶׁקֶל**
lĕ-haqṭîn	*'êpâ*	*û-lĕ-hagdîl*	*šeqel*
τοῦ ποιῆσαι μικρὸν	*μέτρον*	*καὶ τοῦ μεγαλῦναι*	*στάθμια*

To skimp the measure and boost the prices.

The alternative techniques employed to translate **הֵיטִיב** *hêṭîb*, hifil of **יָטַב** *yāṭab* 'be good', are quite remarkable: *ἀγαθόω* (1 Kgs. 25: 31) vs. *ἀγαθύνω* (1 Kgs. 2: 32); *ἀγαθύνω* (Judg. 17: 13B) vs. *ἀγαθοποιέω* (Judg. 17: 13A); *ἀγαθοποιέω* vs. *εὖ ποιέω* (both Num. 10: 32).

The morphological proportionality between qal and hifil is faithfully rendered in the case of *ἵσταμαι* and *ἵστημι* only. In the following pair *ἵσταμαι* translates **עָמַד** ; *ʿāmad* 'stand' (Num. 2: .21), *ἵστημι* its hifil **הֶעֱמִיד** *heʿĕmîd* 'make stand' (Num. 27: 19):

(49a) **וְהַעֲמַדְתָּ אֹתוֹ לִפְנֵי אֶלְעָזָר הַכֹּהֵן.**

καὶ στήσεις αὐτὸν ἔναντι Ἐλεάζαρ τοῦ ἱερέως.

וְהַעֲמַדְתָּ	**אֹתוֹ**	**לִפְנֵי**	**אֶלְעָזָר**	**הַכֹּהֵן**
wĕ-haʿămadtā	*'ōtô*	*li-pnê*	*'lʿāzār*	*hak-kōhēn*
καὶ στήσεις	*αὐτὸν*	*ἔναντι*	*Ἐλεάζαρ*	*τοῦ ἱερέως*

And you will make him stand before Eleazar the priest.

(49b) **וְלִפְנֵי אֶלְעָזָר הַכֹּהֵן יַעֲמֹד.**

καὶ ἔναντι Ἐλεάζαρ τοῦ ἱερέως στήσεται.

וְלִפְנֵי	**אֶלְעָזָר**	**הַכֹּהֵן**	**יַעֲמֹד**
wĕ-li-pnê	*'elʿāzār*	*hak-kōhēn*	*yaʿămōd*
καὶ ἔναντι	*Ἐλεάζαρ*	*τοῦ ἱερέως*	*στήσεται*

[139] Cf. Janse (1999*a*) 142.

And before Eleazar the priest he will stand.

Of the morphological causatives, those in *-ίζω* are by far the most popular in the LXX.[140] A particularly telling example is the frequency of *ὁρκίζω* vs. *ὁρκόω*, both used to translate **הִשְׁבִּיעַ** *hišbîă*ʿ, hifil of **שָׁבַע** *šāba*ʿ 'swear'. Whereas *ὁρκίζω* is used 22 times in the LXX, *ὁρκόω* occurs only once as a variant of the former (2 Kgs. 11: 4):

(50) **וַיְשָׁבַע אֹתָם.**

καὶ ὤρκισεν αὐτούς.
ὤρκωσεν B

וַיְשָׁבַע	**אֹתָם**
*way-yišba*ʿ	*ʾōtām*
καὶ ὤρκισεν	*αὐτούς*

And he made them swear.

The question is whether *ὁρκίζω* and *ὁρκόω* were felt to be morphological rather than lexical causatives. In the following example (1 Kgs. 1: 29), another form of **שָׁבַע** *šāba*ʿ 'swear' is used to express the 'anti-causative' meaning, viz. **נִשְׁבַּע** *nišba*ʿ, the so-called **נִפְעַל** *nipʿal* 'nifal', the meaning of which is akin to the Greek middle voice.[141] Whereas there is an obvious proportionality between **הִשְׁבִּיעַ** *hišbîă*ʿ 'make swear', **נִשְׁבַּע** *nišba*ʿ 'swear for oneself', and **שָׁבַע** *šāba*ʿ 'swear', there is no morphological relation between *ὁρκίζω*/*ὁρκόω* in (50) and *ὄμνυμι*, which is used to translate the Hebrew nifal in (51):

(51) **וַיִּשָּׁבַע הַמֶּלֶךְ.**

καὶ ὤμοσεν ὁ βασιλεύς.

וַיִּשָּׁבַע	**הַמֶּלֶךְ**
*way-yiššāba*ʿ	*ham-melek*
καὶ ὤμοσεν	*ὁ βασιλεύς*

And the king swore.

The same applies, *mutatis mutandis*, to *βαίνω* 'go' and *βιβάζω* 'make go'. Although both are historically related, there is no productive word-formation pattern by which to derive the former from the latter in the Hellenistic age. It would seem better, then, to consider *βιβάζω* as a lexical or rather lexicalized causative.[142] *βαίνω* and

[140] Cf. Tov (1999*b* [1982]: 198–9; Janse (1999*a*) 142–3; and compare Helbing (1907) 117 ff.

[141] Cf. Gesenius and Kautzsch (1909) 144; Joüon and Muraoka (1996) 151.

[142] Cf. Janse (1999*a*) 144.

its compounds are nevertheless used systematically to translate the qal as in (52a) (Gen. 13: 1), *βιβάζω* and its compounds to translate the hifil as in (52b) (Exod. 17: 3):

(52a) **וַיַּעַל אַבְרָם מִמִּצְרַיִם.**

ἀνέβη δὲ Ἀβρὰμ ἐξ Αἰγύπτου.

וַיַּעַל	**אַבְרָם**	**מִמִּצְרַיִם**
way-yaʿal	*ʾabrām*	*mim-miṣrayim*
ἀνέβη δὲ	*Ἀβρὰμ*	*ἐξ Αἰγύπτου*

And Abraham went out of Egypt.

(52b) **לָמָּה זֶּה הֶעֱלִיתָנוּ מִמִּצְרַיִם.**

ἵνα τί τοῦτο ἀνεβίβασας ἡμᾶς ἐξ Αἰγύπτου;

לָמָּה	**זֶּה**	**הֶעֱלִיתָנוּ**	**מִמִּצְרַיִם**
lām-mâ	*zêh*	*heʿĕlîtā-nû*	*mim-miṣrayim*
ἵνα τί	*τοῦτο*	*ἀνεβίβασας ἡμᾶς*	*ἐξ Αἰγύπτου*

Why did you make us go out of Egypt?

In the same way *καταβαίνω* translates **יָרַד** *yārad* 'go down', *καταβιβάζω* its hifil **הוֹרִיד** *hôrîd* 'make go down' (Ezek. 31: 15–16), and *διαβαίνω* **עָבַר** *ʿābar* 'cross over', *διαβιβάζω* its hifil **הֶעֱבִיר** *heʿĕbîr* 'make cross over' (2 Kgs. 19: 40–1).

In some cases the same verb is used to translate both qal and hifil. In the following pair *ἀποστρέφω* is used both intransitively to translate **שׁוּב** *šûb* 'return' (Gen. 18: 33) and transitively to translate its hifil **הֵשִׁיב** *hēšîb* 'make return' (Gen. 28: 15):

(53a) **וְאַבְרָהָם שָׁב לִמְקֹמוֹ.**

καὶ Ἀβραάμ ἀπέστρεψεν εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτοῦ.

וְאַבְרָהָם	**שָׁב**	**לִמְקֹמוֹ**
wĕ-ʾabrāhām	*šab*	*li-mqōm-ô*
καὶ Ἀβραάμ	*ἀπέστρεψεν*	*εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτοῦ*

And Abraham returned to his place.

(53b) **וַהֲשִׁבֹתִיךְ אֶל־הָאֲדָמָה הַזֹּאת.**

καὶ ἀποστρέψω σε εἰς τὴν γῆν ταύτην.

וַהֲשִׁבֹתִיךְ	**אֶל־הָאֲדָמָה**	**הַזֹּאת**
wa-hăšibōtî-kā	*ʾel-hā-ʾădāmâ*	*haz-zôt*
καὶ ἀποστρέψω σε	*εἰς τὴν γῆν*	*ταύτην*

And I will let you return to this land.

Conversely, *βασιλεύω* is used both intransitively to translate מָלַךְ *mālak* 'be king' and transitively to translate its hifil הִמְלִיךְ *himlîk* 'make king', as in the following example (1 Kgs. 15: 35):[143]

(54) הִמְלִיךְ אֶת־שָׁאוּל עַל־יִשְׂרָאֵל.

ἐβασίλευσεν τὸν Σαοὺλ ἐπὶ Ἰσραήλ.

הִמְלִיךְ	אֶת־שָׁאוּל	עַל־יִשְׂרָאֵל
himlîk	*'et-šā'ûl*	*'al-yiśrā'ēl*
ἐβασίλευσεν	*τὸν Σαοὺλ*	*ἐπὶ Ἰσραήλ*

He had made Saul king over Israel.

Finally, analytic causatives were used as well,[144] although this translation technique was against God's instruction to Moses quoted in (16), hence against the word-for-word principle. The following example illustrates both the analytic causative and the use of a pleonastic pronoun in the RC (Judg. 16: 26A):

(55) וְהַמִישֵׁנִי אֶת־הָעַמֻּדִים אֲשֶׁר הַבַּיִת נָכוֹן עֲלֵיהֶם.

καὶ ποίησον ψηλαφῆσαί με ἐπὶ τοὺς στύλους ἐφ' ὧν ὁ οἶκος ἐπεστήρικται ἐπ' αὐτῶν.

וְהַמִישֵׁנִי		אֶת־הָעַמֻּדִים	אֲשֶׁר	הַבַּיִת
wĕ-hêmîšē-nî		*'et-hā-'ammūdîm*	*'ăšer*	*hab-bayit*
καὶ ποίησον ψηλαφῆσαί με		*ἐπὶ τοὺς στύλους*	*ἐφ' ὧν*	*ὁ οἶκος*
נָכוֹן	עֲלֵיהֶם			
nākôn	*'ălê-hem*			
ἐπεστήρικται	*ἐπ' αὐτῶν*			

And make me feel the pillars by which the temple is supported.

Turkish resembles Hebrew in that its verb system allows for the productive formation of morphological causatives. The most productive suffix to derive causative stems from the base is *-dir*.[145] Modern Greek, on the other hand, does not have morphological causatives.[146] It can express causativity either by adding a direct object to an intransitive (anti-causative) verb or by using an analytic causative with *κάνω* 'do'.[147] In Cappadocian both strategies are attested, as in the following pair from Silata (Dawkins 1916:

[143] Cf. Tov (1999*b* [1982]) 199–200.
[144] Cf. Tov (1999*b* [1982]) 200–1; Janse (1999*a*) 145–6.
[145] Cf. Lewis (1967) 144; Kornfilt (1997) 331 ff.
[146] Cf. Joseph and Philippaki-Warburton (1987) 170.
[147] Cf. Joseph and Philippaki-Warburton (1987) 171.

452), where the Ancient Greek verb *ποιέω* is used, which has been preserved in the aorist only:[148]

(56a) *pjós=se* *píken* *na=jelášis?*
who=you make-AOR-3sg PRT=laugh-AOR-2sg

Who made you laugh?

(56b) *éna=maimún=me* *jélasen*
ART=monkey=me laugh-AOR-3sg

A monkey made me laugh.

Much more common, however, is the borrowing of Turkish causative stems. Borrowing of verb stems is highly unusual, as Dawkins correctly observes: 'verbs are borrowed much less easily than other parts of speech, and only appear in any number when the vocabularies of two languages have reached a high degree of fusion' (1916: 197).[149] He adds that in certain subdialects these Turkish loans 'have entirely superseded the corresponding Greek verbs' (1916: 198).

Turkish verbs are fully integrated in the Cappadocian verb system and acquire the normal set of inflectional and derivational possibilities. However, it is not easy to decide how these verbs are actually transferred from Turkish into Cappadocian. According to Dawkins, they are formed 'by adding (1) *-dó*, *-dás*, *-dá*, etc., or (2) *-dízo* to the Turkish verb stem' (1916: 129).[150] For instance, the Turkish verb *ara-mak* 'seek' appears in Cappadocian as either *aradó* or *aradízo*.[151] The origin of the *-d-* in the various suffixes is best explained on the basis of the Turkish definite or *di*-past.[152] The past tense of *ara-mak* is *ara-dı* (with vowel harmony). *Ara-dı* is the unmarked third person singular, which was reanalysed as a stem, in accordance with Watkins' Law,[153] and borrowed as a perfective or aorist stem in Cappadocian, the unmarked and hence the basic stem of the Greek verb generally.[154] The resulting form was 1sg *arádisa* > *arátsa*, subjunctive *aradíso*, which could be interpreted as

[148] Cf. Dawkins (1916) 636 s.v. *ποιέω*.
[149] Cf. Anastasiadis (1975) 166; Thomason and Kaufman (1988) 216.
[150] Cf. Anastasiadis (1980*a*) 325. [151] Cf. Dawkins (1916) 664 s.v. *aramaq*.
[152] Cf. Miklosich (1890) 8, *pace* Dawkins (1916) 42 n. 1. For the Turkish formation see Lewis (1967) 127; Kornfilt (1997) 337–8.
[153] Cf. Watkins (1962) 90 ff., 93–6; (1969) 18; Joseph (1980) 182; Collinge (1985) 239–40; Koch (1994) 31 ff. [154] Cf. Mackridge (1985) 106.

being derived from either *aradó* < *aradáo* or *aradízo*.[155] The process can be represented as follows:

(57) *ara-dı* → arádisa > *arátsa*, subj. *aradíso*
→ *aradáo* > *aradó*/*aradízo*

The interpretation of *arátsa*/*aradíso* as being derived from a present *aradízo* should not come as a surprise, as the *-ízo* suffix has always been extremely productive, as noted above, and it remained so throughout the Middle Ages until the present day.[156] Verbs in *-ó* < *-áo* constitute, of course, a very important category in the Modern Greek verb system generally,[157] so the alternative interpretation of *arátsa*/*aradíso* as being derived from a present *aradó* < *aradáo* is quite natural as well.

Interestingly, Turkish causative stems in *-dır* are borrowed in Cappadocian as well. The following example from Ulagaç is derived from the past tense of *öl-mek* 'die' (Dawkins 1916: 666 s.v. *ölmek*):[158]

(58a) *öl-dü* → öldíso → *öldízo* 'die'

(58b) *öl-dür-dü* → *öldürdíso* → *öldürdízo* 'cause to die = kill'

The formation of causatives is as productive in Cappadocian as it is in Turkish, as can be inferred from even the briefest inspection of the available glossaries.[159] The following is a selection taken from Anastasiadis (1980*a*: 325):

(59) *bulan-dı* → *pulandízo* 'become turbid, muddy'
bulan-dır-dı → *pulandurdízo* 'make turbid, muddy'

(60) *dolan-dı* → *tolandízo* 'go round'
dolan-dır-dı → *tolandurdízo* 'make go round'

(61) *usan-dı* → *osandízo* 'be/get tired, fed up'
usan-dır-dı → *osandurdízo* 'annoy, bother'

[155] Cf. Dawkins (1916) 135–6.

[156] Cf. Browning (1983) 65, 84, 96, for Medieval Greek, and Mackridge (1985) 323, for Modern Greek.

[157] Cf. Mackridge (1985) 163 ff.; Joseph and Philippaki-Warburton (1987) 192 ff.; Holton, Mackridge, and Philippaki-Warburton (1997) 127 ff.

[158] The forms are given in the following order: Turkish past tense → Cappadocian aorist subjunctive → Cappadocian present indicative. The Cappadocian verbs quoted are all in *-ízo*, but variants in *-ó* < *-áo* are generally attested as well (Dawkins 1916: 129; Anastasiadis 1980*a*: 325).

[159] Cf. Dawkins (1916) 664 ff.; Kesisoglou (1951) 109 ff.; Mavrochalividis and Kesisoglou (1960) 130 ff.; Fosteris and Kesisoglou (1960) 17 ff.; Anastasiadis (1980*b*) 99–100.

Now the question may be asked whether the Turkish causatives were indeed transferred as such into Cappadocian, as suggested by the arrows in the examples just quoted. Alternatively, they could be genuinely Cappadocian formations. In that case, the causative suffix *-dır-* would have been abstracted from the causative stems and become a productive suffix in Cappadocian as well. It is very difficult to decide how the transfer must have taken place for want of native speakers, but the possibility is a real one. All depends on the degree of bilingualism of the Cappadocians in the different villages and on their fluency in Turkish. That the possibility cannot be ruled out beforehand is proven by the fact that some Turkish suffixes are used to derive genuinely Greek words. Dawkins has recorded the following example at Fertek (1916: 130):

(62) *astenár-lan-s-e*
ill-PASS-AOR-3sg

He became ill.

The suffix *-lan-* (usually *-len-*) is used to derive reflexive and passive verbs or, in the words of Dawkins, 'to make an intransitive verb . . . from an adjective' (1916: 130),[160] in this case *astenár* = *ασθενής* 'ill'. Another example is the following from Malakopi, which is derived from *xulí* = *χολή* 'anger, wrath' (ibid.):

(63) *xul-lán-s-in*
angry-PASS-AOR-3sg

He became angry.

Finally, I mention another Greek word from Ulagaç derived by means of a Turkish suffix, in this particular case another causative suffix *-t-*:[161]

(64) *psofá-t-s-an=to*
kill-CAUS-AOR-3pl=him

They killed him.

The Cappadocian verb is *psofó* (< *psofáo*), which, according to Dawkins, is used in Modern Greek 'only of animals; in Capp[adocian] and Ph[arasiotic] also of men, especially of Turks' (1916: 663 s.v. *ψοφῶ*).[162] The use of the *-t-*suffix instead of *-dır* is regular

[160] Cf. Lewis (1967) 228.
[161] Cf. Dawkins (1916) 130; Lewis (1967) 145.
[162] *ψοφώ* is indeed used in the testimony of Serafimidou, a Cappadocian refugee

from a Turkish point of view, as the former is used 'with polysyllabic stems ending in a vowel' (Lewis 1967: 145).

It is difficult, if at all possible, to decide whether these formations have ever been productive in Cappadocian. Examples (62) to (64) are the only ones Dawkins recorded, and he explicitly uses the word 'occasionally' (1916: 130). If, on the other hand, such formations were not productive, they nevertheless violate the so-called Free Morpheme Constraint. This constraint basically states that code-switching cannot take place within words and that, in other words, affixes of one language cannot be attached to lexical stems of another.[163] As has already been remarked, the concept of code-switching does not apply to Cappadocian as it emerges from the texts recorded by Dawkins. What we have here can best be described as code-mixing.[164]

4.3. *Clitics*

Hebrew has relatively few clitics as compared to Greek. There are a few proclitics, which are usually, though not always, connected orthographically with the following word by means of a diacritic sign called מַקֵּף *maqqēp* 'linking, linker'.[165] Examples include the negative marker לֹא־ *lô-* 'not', the relative marker אֲשֶׁר־ *'ăšer*, the object marker אֵת־ *'et-*, prepositions like אֶל־ *'el-* 'towards' and עַל־ *'al-* 'on', and other monosyllables like כָּל־ *kol-* 'all'.[166] Hebrew does not have enclitics. Instead of enclitic pronouns (EPs), as in Greek, Hebrew uses pronominal suffixes if no special emphasis is needed.[167] It should come as no surprise that in the LXX EPs are normally postpositive *vis-à-vis* the noun or verb by which they are governed, as Wifstrand observes: 'die Septuaginta [haben] in manchen Büchern nur unmittelbare Nachstellung des Pronomens . . ., weil

from Zindzidere: *Μας έφεραν πρόσφυγες Τούρκους. Ήσαν αδύνατοι και ψειριασμένοι . . . Δεν έζησαν εκείνοι πιά. Όλοι πέθαναν. Ψόφησαν* 'They brought us Turkish refugees. They were weak and injured . . . They were barely alive. They all died. They pegged out' (1983 [1954]: 68)

[163] Cf. Wilkins (1996) 113.

[164] Cf. Bechert and Wildgen (1991) 65; Hock and Joseph (1996) 381.

[165] Cf. Gesenius and Kautzsch (1909) 66; Joüon and Muraoka (1996) 58.

[166] A well-known example including three consecutive proclitics is the following: אֵת־כָּל־אֲשֶׁר־לוֹ *'Et-kol-'ăšer-lô* 'everything which [was] his' (Gen. 25: 5). The LXX has *πάντα τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῦ*.

[167] Cf. Gesenius and Kautzsch (1909) 162 ff., 265 ff., 532 ff.; Joüon and Muraoka (1996) 170 ff., 285 ff., 660–1, 686–7.

die Übersetzung sich so am besten an das Original anschliessen kann, wo die betreffende Pronominalbegriffe nicht durch besondere Wörter ausgedrückt werden, sondern durch Suffixe, die an die Substantiv- oder Verbform angehängt werden' (1949–50: 44).[168] Since these pronominal suffixes are repeated on consecutive verbs or nouns in Hebrew, the EPs in the LXX are characterized by what Swete calls 'wearisome iteration' (1914: 307). The phenomenon is evidenced by the following example (Gen. 48: 4), which also contains two causatives, viz. מַפְרִיהַ *maprîha*, hifil participle of פָּרָה *pārah* 'be fertile', and הִרְבִּיהַ *hirbîha*, hifil of רָבָה *rābah* 'be plentiful':

(65) **מַפְרְךָ וְהִרְבִּיתִךָ וּנְתַתִּיךָ לִקְהַל עַמִּים.**

αὐξανῶ σε καὶ πληθυνῶ σε καὶ ποιήσω σε εἰς συναγωγὰς ἐθνῶν.

מַפְרְךָ	**וְהִרְבִּיתִךָ**	**וּנְתַתִּיךָ**	**לִקְהַל**
maprĕ-kā	*wĕ-hirbîtī-kā*	*û-nĕtattî-kā*	*li-qhal*
αὐξανῶ σε	*καὶ πληθυνῶ σε*	*καὶ ποιήσω σε*	*εἰς συναγωγὰς*

עַמִּים
ʿammîm
ἐθνῶν

I will make you fertile and make you plentiful and make you a community of peoples.

The books with almost exclusively postpositive EPs referred to by Wifstrand (1949–50: 44–5) are identical to the 'later books' identified by Thackeray as exhibiting a 'growing reverence for the letter of the Hebrew' (1909: 30). In the Pentateuch, however, the ratio between post- and prepositive EPs is different, especially in the book of Genesis, where it is estimated at 850 to 65 by Wifstrand (1949–50: 50). In the New Testament postpositive EPs are in the majority as well,[169] but the same ratio obtains in non-Biblical Greek, especially in 'vernacular' as opposed to 'literary Greek' (Wifstrand 1949: 178 ff.).[170] Moulton explains the 'wearisome iteration' of EPs as being characteristic of the 'vernacular' and 'colloquial style' as well (1908: 85).[171]

If postposition had become the unmarked order for EPs in the *κοινή* generally, it will be difficult to describe the phenomenon in the LXX as translation Greek. It is rather a matter of 'over-working'

[168] Cf. Rife (1933) 247; Wifstrand (1949) 182.
[169] Cf. Janse (1993*b*) 87 ff.; (1995) 102 ff., 171 ff.
[170] Cf. Rife (1933) 247.
[171] Cf. Moulton and Howard (1929) 431; Moulton and Turner (1963) 38; Blass and Debrunner (1979) 229.

and 'accumulation', in the words of Thackeray (1909: 29). Put differently, postposition of EPs was 'brought into prominence' (Moulton 1908: 11) because it corresponded with suffixation in Hebrew. The question is, however, why the LXX should have prepositive EPs at all. It is well known that in Ancient Greek EPs were more often prepositive than not. In fact, there was a tendency for EPs (and other enclitics) to come second in the sentence or clause, a phenomenon known as Wackernagel's Law (Wackernagel 1892: 335 ff.).[172] The exact interpretation of Wackernagel's Law need not detain us here. Suffice it to say that preposition of EPs is generally triggered by the presence of a word at the start of the sentence or clause that is 'heavily accented' (Wifstrand 1949: 178).[173] A case in point is the following example (Isa. 43: 4), where the EP is attracted to the 'heavily accented' subject pronoun:

(66) **אֲנִי אֲהַבְתִּיךָ.**

ἐγώ σε ἠγάπησα.

אֲנִי	**אֲהַבְתִּיךָ**
'ănî	*'ăhabtî-kā*
ἐγώ	*σε ἠγάπησα*

I have loved you.

Interestingly, the same passage is quoted with the reverse order in the Apocalypse (Rev. 3: 9). The same variation also occurs in the following pair, where the EPs are attracted to the 'heavily accented' negative markers *οὐ μή* and *οὔτε μή* in (67a) (Deut. 31: 6), but not to the proclitic negative marker *οὐ* (and hence probably neither to *οὔτε μή*)[174] in (67b) (Deut. 31: 8):

(67a) **לֹא יַרְפְּךָ וְלֹא יַעַזְבֶךָּ.**

οὐ μή σε ἀνῇ οὔτε μή σε ἐγκαταλίπῃ.

לֹא	**יַרְפְּךָ**	**וְלֹא**	**יַעַזְבֶךָּ**
lô	*yarpĕ-kā*	*wĕ-lô*	*yaʿăzĕbek-kā*
οὐ μή	*σε ἀνῇ*	*οὔτε μή*	*σε ἐγκαταλίπῃ*

He will never (ever) leave you nor (ever) forsake you.

(67b) **לֹא יַרְפְּךָ וְלֹא יַעַזְבֶךָּ.**

[172] Cf. Collinge (1985) 217 ff.

[173] Cf. Janse (1990*b*) 2648; (1993*a*) 21; (1993*b*) 94 ff.; (1995) 113 ff.

[174] It may be noted that **וְלֹא** *wĕ-lô* should have been translated as *καὶ οὐκ*, as in (16), instead of *οὔτε* (*μή*) in (67b), **וְ** *wĕ-* being a prefix and **לֹא** *lô* a proclitic.

οὐ ἀνῇ σε οὔτε μὴ ἐγκαταλίπῃ σε.

לֹא	יַרְפְּךָ	וְלֹא	יַעַזְבֶךָּ
lô	*yarpĕ-kā*	*wĕ-lô*	*yaʿăzĕbek-kā*
οὐ	*ἀνῇ σε*	*οὔτε μὴ*	*ἐγκαταλίπῃ σε*

He will never leave you nor (ever) forsake you.

The following example (Deut. 30: 5) is even more interesting, because it illustrates all that has been discussed so far: post- and prepositive EPs, pleonastic pronouns, and causatives. Since the LXX translators used analytic causatives to render the Hebrew hifil in two cases (הֵיטִיב *hêṭîb*, hifil of טוֹב *ṭôb* 'be good', and הִרְבִּיהַ *hirbîha*, hifil of רָבָה *rābah* 'be plentiful'), they were able to separate the causative and lexical meanings and to emphasize the latter, which resulted in the attraction of the EPs:[175]

(68) וֶהֱבִיאֲךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֶל־הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר־יָרְשׁוּ אֲבֹתֶיךָ וְיָרַשְׁתָּהּ וְהֵיטִבְךָ וְהִרְבְּךָ מֵאֲבֹתֶיךָ.

καὶ εἰσάξει σε κύριος ὁ θεός σου εἰς τὴν γῆν ἣν ἐκληρονόμησαν οἱ πατέρες σου καὶ κληρονομήσεις αὐτήν καὶ εὖ σε ποιήσει καὶ πλεοναστόν σε ποιήσει ὑπὲρ τοὺς πατέρας σου.

וֶהֱבִיאֲךָ	יְהוָה	אֱלֹהֶיךָ	אֶל־הָאָרֶץ
we-hĕbî'ă-kā	*YHWH*	*'ĕlōhê-kā*	*'el-hā-'āreṣ*
καὶ εἰσάξει σε	*κύριος*	*ὁ θεός σου*	*εἰς τὴν γῆν*

אֲשֶׁר־יָרְשׁוּ	אֲבֹתֶיךָ	וְיָרַשְׁתָּהּ
'ăšer-yārĕšû	*'ăbōtê-kā*	*wî-rištā-h*
ἣν ἐκληρονόμησαν	*οἱ πατέρες σου*	*καὶ κληρονομήσεις αὐτήν*

וְהֵיטִבְךָ	וְהִרְבְּךָ	מֵאֲבֹתֶיךָ
wĕ-hêṭîbĕ-kā	*wĕ-hirbĕ-kā*	*mē-'ăbōtê-kā*
καὶ εὖ σε ποιήσει	*καὶ πλεοναστόν σε ποιήσει*	*ὑπὲρ τοὺς πατέρας σου*

And the Lord your God will bring you into the land which your fathers occupied, and you will occupy it, and he will do you good and make you more numerous.

Finally, it should be mentioned that relative pronouns regularly attract EPs into second position as well.[176] Given the originally demonstrative function of relative pronouns, it is easy to see why they should be reckoned among the 'heavily accented' words. Compare, for instance, the following example (Isa. 8: 18):

[175] Note also the alternative techniques to render הִרְבִּיהַ *hirbîha* 'make plentiful': *πληθύνω* in (65) vs. *πλεοναστὸν ποιέω* in (68).

[176] Cf. Wifstrand (1949–50) 69; Janse (1995) 197 ff.

(69) הִנֵּה אָנֹכִי וְהַיְלָדִים אֲשֶׁר נָתַן־לִי יְהוָה.

ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ καὶ τὰ παιδία ἅ μοι ἔδωκεν ὁ θεός.

הִנֵּה	אָנֹכִי	וְהַיְלָדִים	אֲשֶׁר	נָתַן־לִי	יְהוָה
hinnê	*ʾănōkî*	*wĕ-ha-yĕlādîm*	*ʾăšer*	*nātan-lî*	*YHWH*
ἰδοὺ	ἐγὼ	καὶ τὰ παιδία	ἅ	μοι ἔδωκεν	ὁ θεός

Here am I and the children the Lord has given me.

The conclusion to be drawn from all this is that whereas the word-for-word principle was adhered to as strictly as possible, the LXX translators nevertheless deviated from the rule to produce idiomatic Greek on occasion. As Wifstrand puts it: 'Offenbar war in solchen Fällen der griechische Sprachgebrauch so fest, dass einige von den Übersetzern der jüdischen Bibelbücher dadurch bisweilen zu einer kleinen Abweichung von der im allgemeinen befolgten Wortstellung gezwungen wurden' (1949–50: 69–70). This makes it very improbable that the LXX translators were native speakers of Hebrew or Aramaic, as the letter of Aristeas suggests (see (10) and (11) above). In fact, if they were able to deal with such subtleties as Wackernagel's Law, we must assume that they were native speakers of the Egyptian *κοινή*, specifically in the case of the Pentateuch.[177]

Turkish, like Hebrew, has relatively few clitics as compared to Greek, and no clitic pronouns or pronominal suffixes.[178] If there is no need to emphasize the pronoun, it is generally omitted altogether.[179] If a pronoun is used, it is always prepositive *vis-à-vis* the verb by which it is governed, Turkish being a canonical SOV language.[180]

Cappadocian, on the other hand, has retained the Ancient Greek EPs, which are generally postpositive *vis-à-vis* the verb.[181] Compare, for instance, the following example from Telmisos (70a) (Dawkins 1916: 324 ff.) with its Modern Greek equivalent (70b), which also confirms Moulton's observation that the 'wearisome iteration' of EPs is a feature of 'vernacular' and 'colloquial' language generally (1908: 85):

[177] Cf. Swete (1914) 20.

[178] Cf. Lewis (1967) 23–4; Kornfilt (1997) 286, 435.

[179] Cf. Lewis (1967) 68; Kornfilt (1997) 281 ff.

[180] Cf. Lewis (1967) 240; Kornfilt (1987) 636; (1997) 91.

[181] Cf. Thumb (1910) 82 n. 1; Dawkins (1916) 120; Andriotis (1948) 48; Kesisoglou (1951) 50–1; Mavrochalividis and Kesisoglou (1960) 89; Mirambel (1963) 98; Anastasiadis (1976) 140; Janse (1994*a*) 435f.; (1998*a*) 260; (1998*c*) 525.

(70a) *ksévalen=čin* *ke=píren=čin*
take out-AOR-3sg=her and=take-AOR-3sg=her
(70b) *την έβγαλε* *και την πήρε*
her=take out-AOR-3sg and=her=take-AOR-3sg

(70a) *ke=lúsen=čin* *ke=éplinen=čin*
and=bathe-AOR-3sg=her and=wash-AOR-3sg=her
(70b) *και τη λούσε* *και την έπλυνε*
and=her=bathe-AOR-3sg and=her=wash-AOR-3sg

(70a) *ke=píken=čin* *pál* *néka=t*
and=make-AOR-3sg=her again wife=his
(70b) *και την έκαμε* *πάλι* *τη γυναίκα του*
and=her=make-AOR-3sg again ART=wife=his

He took her out and took her and bathed her and washed her and made her again his wife.

The Cappadocian situation has thus remained essentially the same as in the Hellenistic age, where postpositive EPs were in the majority as well, at least in colloquial texts. In fact, postpositive EPs are attested only in the Eastern dialects of Modern Greek, which seems to suggest that it was a distinctive feature of the Eastern (Asia Minor, Syro-Palestinian, and Egyptian) *κοινή*.[182] Interestingly, however, Cappadocian has generalized Wackernagel's Law in a number of syntactic contexts where prepositive EPs are obligatory.[183] One such context involves initial interrogatives as in (56a), but (56b) shows that any 'heavily accented' word or phrase could occasionally attract EPs in second position. The following example from Ulagaç (Dawkins 1916: 356) combines an obligatorily prepositive EP in the presence of an interrogative pronoun (71a) with an optionally prepositive EP in the presence of a 'heavily accented' subject pronoun (71b):

(71a) *ta=šamdánja* *tís=ta* *álakse*
the=candlesticks who=them change-AOR-3sg

Who changed the candlesticks?

(71b) *ογό=ta* *álaksa*
I=them change-AOR-1sg

I changed them.

The regular postposition of the EPs *vis-à-vis* the verb has led to

[182] Cf. Janse (1993*b*) 119; (1998*a*) 264; and compare Thumb (1914) 199; Dawkins (1916) 214; Contossopoulos (1983–4) 152.
[183] Cf. Janse (1994*a*) 436 ff.; (1998*a*) 261 ff.

their partial grammaticalization in Cappadocian. Several pieces of evidence can be adduced to show that the Cappadocian EPs were on their way to becoming pronominal suffixes. The first of these has to do with the breaching of the 'rule of limitation' (Janse 1995–6: 155–6): in the case of *ksévalen=čin* and *éplinen=čin* in (70a), the enclitic accent is omitted from the verb, suggesting that *čin* was no longer felt to be a clitic. Interestingly, both types appear to be interchangeable, as in the following pair from the same text from Farasa (Dawkins 1916: 558):

(72a) *ésirén=ta*

(72b) *ésiren-ta*
shoot-AOR-3SG=it

He shot it.

Elsewhere I have ventured to call this phenomenon 'agglutination' (1998c: 530) to distinguish it from true affixation or 'fusion' (1998c: 535).[184] Sometimes the lack of an enclitic accent in cases like (72b) caused the erstwhile EP to be reinterpreted as a true suffix in that the rule of limitation was unconsciously applied. The following example, which was taken from the same text as (72a–b), illustrates the phenomenon (Dawkins 1916: 558):

(72c) *esíre=me*
shoot-AOR-3SG=me

He shot me.

Fusion of erstwhile EPs is not a case of extension but rather of 'reanalysis', a technical term defined by Harris and Campbell as a 'mechanism which changes the underlying structure of a syntactic pattern and which does not involve any immediate or intrinsic modification of its surface manifestation' (1995: 50). In the case of (72c), the order of the erstwhile EP *vis-à-vis* the noun has remained the same, but the former is now treated as a pronominal suffix rather than an EP. Reanalysis is also responsible for the (regular) deletion of unaccented initial *e-* in *píren=čin* and *píken=čin* in (70a).[185] The process can be represented as follows:

(73a) *épiren=čin→epíren-čin→píren-čin*

[184] Cf. Haspelmath (1994) 1.
[185] Cf. Janse (1998*c*) 537, and compare Dawkins (1916) 138.

(73b) *épiken=čin→epíken-čin→píken-čin*

The final piece of evidence of the grammaticalization of the erstwhile EPs comes from the use of *ta*, formally a third person plural EP, as the unmarked object agreement marker for the third person singular and plural.[186] The *ta* in (72a–b), for instance, has a singular referent. The use of doubled EPs as object agreement markers is obligatory in Cappadocian, as in the following examples from Silli (74a) (Dawkins 1916: 286) and Telmisos (75a) (Dawkins 1916: 314):

(74a) *eγó séna filáttu=se*
I you guard-PRES-1SG=you

I will guard you.

(75a) *eγó séna dilévo=se*
I you feed-PRES-1SG=you

I will feed you.

The word order of both utterances is SOV, which is the basic word order in Turkish.[187] Compare, for instance, the Turkish translations of (74a) and (75a):

(74b) *ben seni kor-uyorum*
I you guard-PRES-1SG

I will guard you.

(75b) *ben seni ye-dir-iyorum*
I you eat-CAUS-PRES-1SG

I will feed you.

It would seem, then, that the word order of the Cappadocian examples (74a) and (75a) is calqued on the Turkish. What sets Cappadocian apart, however, is the use of doubled EPs as object agreement markers. The same phenomenon occurs in the closely related Pontic dialect (Drettas 1997: 251):

(76a) *eγó avút to=koríts aγapó-ato*
I that the=girl love-PRES-1SG=her

(76b) *ben o kızı siv-iyorum*
I that girl love-PRES-1SG

I love that girl.

[186] Cf. Janse (1998*c*) 539, and compare Dawkins (1916) 172.
[187] Cf. Lewis (1967) 240; Kornfilt (1987) 636; (1997) 91.

It will be recalled that Cappadocia ('Magna Cappadocia') and Pontus ('Cappadocia Pontica') used to be one before the Persian conquest. In fact the similarities between Cappadocian and Pontic are such that Dawkins concluded that 'they must be regarded as having at one time formed a continuous linguistic area' (1916: 205). In Pontic, however, the erstwhile EPs have developed into full-fledged pronominal suffixes functioning as object agreement markers.[188] Whereas the Cappadocian EPs are prepositive *vis-à-vis* the verb in a number of syntactic contexts, Pontic must have generalized postposition at one point before reanalysing the EPs as pronominal suffixes.

Remarkably, the Turkish Black Sea dialects have in their turn been heavily influenced by Pontic.[189] Whereas Turkish normally omits the pronoun if it can be inferred from the context or situation,[190] the Black Sea dialects not only use non-emphatic pronouns on the analogy of the Greek EPs, but they are usually postpositive *vis-à-vis* the verb on the analogy of the Pontic pattern as well, as in the following example from Çaykara (Brendemoen 1993: 55):[191]

(77) *yap-ti-ler=oni* *burda* *eski-ler* *yap-ti=oni*
make-PAST-PL=it here old-PL make-past=it
iki *uç* *kişi* *yap-ti=oni*
two three person make-PAST=it

They have made it [sc. the mosque] here, the ancients have made it, two–three people have made it.

It is generally assumed that Turkish did not spread among the Pontians until the seventeenth century, although Turkish tribes started penetrating Pontus from the middle of the thirteenth.[192] One possible explanation for Pontic interference in Black Sea Turkish is that, being numerically inferior, it was the Turks who became bilingual, not the Pontians.[193] However one may wish to explain the interference in these Turkish dialects, it will be clear that one

[188] Cf. Drettas (1997) 393.

[189] Cf. Brendemoen (1998) 27 ff.; (1999) 365 ff.

[190] Cf. Lewis (1967) 68; Brendemoen (1993) 51; Kornfilt (1997) 281 ff.

[191] Among other interference features in the Turkish Black Sea dialects the backing of /ü/ > /u/ and the fronting of /i/ > /i/ are worthy of note (Brendemoen 1999: 369), e.g. *üç* > *uç* and *yaptı* > *yapti* in (77).

[192] Cf. Brendemoen (1999) 365–6.

[193] Cf. Brendemoen (1999) 366.

cannot simply assume that 'it is the social context, not the structure of the language involved, that determines the direction and the degree of interference' and that 'Turkish influenced Greek in Asia Minor because it was the Greeks who were under cultural pressure and (therefore) the Greeks who became bilingual' (Thomason and Kaufman 1988: 19).

Most if not all of the Greek-speaking Cappadocians were indeed bilingual,[194] so there may have been no need for the Cappadocian Turks to learn Greek. But the social and cultural relations were not always as straightforward as Thomason and Kaufman assume, as the following testimony of a Cappadocian refugee from Mutalaski shows (Devletoglou 1983 [1955]: 99):

(78) *Με τους Τούρκους της πατρίδας μας περνούσαμε καλά. Ήσαν φτωχοί και τους παίρναμε στις δουλειές μας. Τους πληρώναμε για ό,τι μας έκαναν. Ήμασταν κύριοι κι ήσαν δούλοι. Και οι Έλληνες και οι Αρμεναίοι ήσαν πλούσιοι. Οι Τούρκοι έτρωγαν από μας. Κυρίους μας έλεγαν.*

With the Turks of our country we got on very well. They were poor and we took them into our employment. We paid them for what they did for us. We were masters and they were servants. And the Greeks and the Armenians were rich. The Turks ate from us. Masters they called us.

5. Conclusion

Although the concept of *βαρβαροφωνία* 'speaking bad Greek' has been applied to the translation Greek of the LXX and could have been applied to the Greek of the Cappadocians, the two varieties are complete opposites. Hebrew interference in the LXX is due to a translation technique, typical of religious translations, which is at once calqued and word-for-word to produce a mimetic text. As a result, interference is almost limited to lexical and syntactic extension. Although syntactic extension has been the focus of the three case studies, lexical extension has been exemplified as well, e.g. the use of *χείλος* instead of *γλῶσσα* in the sense of 'language' as a calqued translation of שְׂפָה *śāpâ* 'lip' in (1) and (2). Syntactic extension in the LXX stems from the word-for-word principle, which was connected with God's commandment quoted in (16). Interference in the linear word order or in the omission or insertion of words which

[194] Cf. Dawkins (1916) 10 ff.

would be unidiomatic in Greek is not determined by unconscious mental processes associated with bilingualism, but dictated by a conscious translation technique. If the language of the LXX can indeed be qualified as 'good *κοινή* Greek' (Thackeray 1909: 13) because of its drawing from the lexical and grammatical resources of the Egyptian *κοινή*, especially in the case of the Pentateuch (Swete 1914: 20), this is not tantamount to saying that it can be considered representative of the spoken or even written language of its time in every respect.

Deviations from the Hebrew word order, however, could in principle be interpreted as unconscious interference from the target language. A typical example is the preposition of EPs where the Hebrew *Vorlage* has suffixes. But even in such cases extreme caution is warranted, since many alleged Semitisms have turned out to be 'good *κοινή* Greek' after all, as research since Deissman (1895; 1897) has shown. It may be useful to stress the importance of a historical perspective at this point. The grammaticalization of postposed EPs in Cappadocian and Pontic, for instance, proves that postposition must have been the unmarked order once, which in turn sheds new light on the LXX usage.

Judging by the words of Kontosopoulos, the *βαρβαροφωνία* of the Cappadocian Greeks could almost be interpreted as 'speaking a foreign language': *όποιος ακούει . . . την καππαδοκική διάλεκτο, δεν ξέρει αν έχει να κάνει με τουρκικά σε ελληνικό στόμα ή με ελληνικά σε στόμα τούρκικο* 'whoever hears . . . the Cappadocian dialect does not know whether he has to do with Turkish spoken by a Greek or with Greek spoken by a Turk' (Kontosopoulos 1994: 7). Language maintenance under strong cultural pressure and long-term bilingualism has resulted in unconscious 'heavy' interference on every level, producing a *γλῶσσα μεμιγμένη* in the literal sense of a 'mixed language'. The technical term to be applied to the Cappadocian case is code-mixing, since the Greek and Turkish 'codes' are really mixed to produce a unique contact language 'over the border of nongenetic development' (Thomason-Kaufman 1988: 94).

The contrast between the translation Greek of the LXX and the mixed language of the Cappadocians could not be better expressed than by juxtaposing two earlier quotations. The first of these applies to the Jew who shifted his language: *Ἕλληνικὸς ἦν οὐ τῇ διαλέκτῳ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῇ ψυχῇ* 'he was a Greek, not only in his language, but

in his spirit as well' (Clearch. fr. 6),[195] the second to the Cappadocian who maintained his language: *το σώμα έμεινε ελληνικό, μα η ψυχή τουρκική* 'the body has remained Greek, but the soul has become Turkish' (Anastasiadis 1975: 159).[196]

[195] Quoted by Jos. *Ap.* 1. 22 (cf. Euseb. *PE* 9. 5).
[196] After Dawkins (1916) 198.