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The history and etymology of Cappadocian fšáx ‘child’, Pharasiot fšáxi ‘boy’

Abstract

Cappadocian fšáx ‘child’, Pharasiot fšáxi ‘boy’ are traditionally derived from Turkish ušak, assuming a hitherto unexplained fricativization of [u] to [f] and of word-final [k] to [x] after the borrowing process. The latter cannot be attributed to Cappadocian or Pharasiot, however, as it is a common feature of Anatolian Turkish. In order to understand the former sound change, we have to assume an isolated case of high vowel fricativization in the articulated plural ta ušáxja > ta fšáxja → sg. to fšáx(i) by metanalysis, comparable to the generally acknowledged case of ta otjá > ta utjá > ta ftjá → sg. to ftí ‘the ear’. We argue that fšáx(i) is an archaism in light of the parallel use of ušak > ušák reported in 19th-century sources and the preservation of word-final [x] even in dialects which seem to have borrowed words ending in [k] from Standard instead of Anatolian Turkish. The irregular inflection of fšáx(i) suggests that it was borrowed as an adjective from Old Anatolian Turkish before it was substantivized in Ottoman Turkish, perhaps even from Old Turkish uvšak ‘little’: ta ufšáxa ta peđjá ‘the little children’ > ta fšáxa ‘the little ones’ by apheresis.

1. Introduction

In his classic study on glottochronology, Morris Swadesh observed: “Though words are readily borrowed, it has long been known that borrowings take place primarily in the ‘cultural’ part of the vocabulary and that the ‘intimate’ vocabulary resists change” (1952: 455). Matras confirms “the greater stability of concepts pertaining to the immediate surroundings”, i.e. “the nearest human environment”, which he terms “the ‘proximity’ constraint” (2009: 169). Quite naturally, then, kinship terms tend to be representative of the private, intimate domain. In a recent handbook of loanwords in the languages of the world (Haspelmath & Tadmor 2009), it was concluded that kinship terms belong to the semantic fields “least amenable to borrowing” (Tadmor 2009: 65), having a borrowing rate of just 15% (p. 64). Matras suggests that the borrowing rate is likely to drop even further in the case of close as opposed to remote kin (2009: 161), particularly EGO & siblings, their children and their parents (pp. 169-171).1 Swadesh included ‘child’ defined as “young person rather than as relationship term” in the original version of his list (1952: 456) and calculated its “item persistence” at 50% in a later publication (1955: 132).

In their forthcoming handbook of the Balkan languages, the classic example of a linguistic area or Sprachbund, Friedman and Joseph note that, despite their universally recognized resistance to borrowing, kinship terms have been borrowed extensively in the Balkans, involving close as well as more distant kin (2020: §4.3.1). They conclude that “the sort of contact needed for the acceptance of borrowed kinship terms into wide usage would thus be intense and sprachbund-conducive and thus associated with ERIC loans” (ibid.). ERIC loans are “Essentially Rooted In Conversation” and defined as “loans that depend crucially on speaker-to-speaker interaction of an on-going and sustained kind, the sort of contact that can be characterized as intense and at the same time intimate, as

1 On the basics of kinship and its relations see Dousset (2011; 2012) and Bamford (2019).
opposed to occasional and casual” (Friedman & Joseph 2020: §4.3). 2 ERIC loans crucially reflect interactions “of a playful, friendly, bantering nature, with good will among the participants in conversational exchanges” (ibid.). As such they are considered “sprachbund-consistent” as well as “sprachbund-conducive” (ibid.). It is precisely in such a sociolinguistic context that kinship terms can be borrowed more extensively than elsewhere and it is surely no surprise that they are considered a prime example of ERIC loans by Friedman and Joseph (2020: §4.3.1).

Cappadocian Greek3 has borrowed numerous kinship terms from (Anatolian) Turkish (Janse 2019a: §11.2.1; cf. Janse, Papanikolau & Vandewalle 2015), e.g. abla ‘elder sister’ > ablâ (Ulağaç); paşa / başa ‘elder brother’ > paşâ (Aravan) / pašâs (Sinasos) / bašâ (Fertek) / bašâs (Floïta, Malakopi, Axo, Misti); kardaş / gardaş ‘brother’ > kardâs (Silata) / gardâs (Ulağaç) / yardâs (Axo, Misti, Aravan);4 dayî / deyi ‘maternal uncle’ > taği (Malakopi) / tajis (Sinasos) / daî (Misti) / daïs (Anaku, Sinasos) / deï (Axo), dei (Aravan, Ulağaç); hala ‘paternal aunt’ > xalâ (Anaku, Misti).5 These qualify as ERIC loans par excellence and, indeed, it has been suggested that many of them were originally borrowed as terms of address (Janse, Papanikolau & Vandewalle 2015).6 Particularly instructive in this respect is the vocative accentuation of (do) pása in the post-exchange speech of refugees from Ulağaç, which is glossed as ‘form of address (προσφώνηση) for the father or for elder males by younger males’ (Kesisoglou 1951: 105); similarly (do) xâla, glossed as ‘aunt’ (θέα) (p. 107). For reasons of space, the question whether Cappadocia can be considered a linguistic area will not detain us here.7 Suffice it to say that the sociolinguistic conditions stipulated by Friedman and Joseph would fit the Cappadocian context very well.8

Within its kinship system, Cappadocian has borrowed several words to refer to children (Janse & Vandewalle 2018): (Anatolian) Turkish evlat > evlât (Axo, Ulağaç) / evlêt (Misti) / evlâs (Aravan); taze / teze ‘new’ > teze ‘young(ster)’ (Aravan) / tezê ‘baby’ (Misti); javrú ‘young (of an animal); child’ > javrû (Delmeso, Silata, Anaku, Axo, Misti, Aravan), usually used as an affectionate form of address when referring to children: javrû-m ‘my child’ (Anaku, Misti) or, with vocative accentuation, jávrû-m (Axo, Aravan, Ulağaç). In addition to these, Cappadocian has inherited the Greek word παύω, which occurs in a variety of forms in the various dialects according to the treatment of the voiced fricative [ð]: peði (North Cappadocian), pedi (Fertek), peði (Axo, Misti, Ulağaç, Ağaç).

2 The term ‘ERIC loan’ was first introduced in Friedman & Joseph (2014: 15).
4 On the voicing / fricativization of word-initial [k] see Janse (2019a: §6.2.2.3; 2019b: XXX).
5 Dawkins (1916) and Janse (2019a) are the general references for Cappadocian; references for individual dialects: Anaku (Kostakis 1963; Costakis 1964), Aravan (Phosteris & Kesisoglou 1960), Axo (Mavrochalyvidis & Kesisoglou 1960; Mavrochalyvidis 1990), Fertek (Krinopoulos 1889), Malakopi (Karphopoulos 2008), Misti (Kostakis 1977, 1990; Kozmisoglou 2006; Kotsanidis 2006; Phates 2012), Sinasos (Archelaos 1899), Ulağaç (Kesisoglou 1951).
6 Note that postalveolar [s] occasionally changes to alveolar [s] in the post-exchange speech of refugees from Ulağaç (Kesisoglou 1951: 98).
7 On Ancient Anatolia as a linguistic area see Watkins (2001); on East Anatolia as a linguistic area (excluding Asia Minor Greek) see Haig (2014).
8 Numerous testimonies collected in the gripping collection The Exodus (Mourelos 1982) testify to the warm and friendly relationships between Greeks and Turks in Cappadocia at the time of the population exchange. The Convention Concerning the Exchange of Greek and Turkish Populations was signed at Lausanne on 30 January 1923, but executed in 1924 as far as Cappadocia was concerned (Mourelos 1982: 4).
Semendere), peri (Aravan, Ghurzono). As in Medieval (Kriaras 1968-) and Modern Greek (Triantafyllidis 1998; Babiniotis 2002), Cappadocian peðí and its variants can be used in a wider sense to refer to children in general and in a narrower sense to refer to male children. The former sense predominates in the plural, the latter in the singular. Dawkins translates the word uncompromisingly as ‘boy’ (1916: 630), Archelaos as ‘male child’ (βρέφος παιδίον, 1899: 258), Karhopoulos as ‘boy’ (ἀγόρι) and ‘son’ (υἱός) (2008: 123), Phosteris & Kesisoglou as ‘child’ (παιδί) and ‘boy’ (ἀγόρι) (1960: 36), the other Cappadocian glossaries simply as ‘child’ (παιδί, but with the ambiguity inherent in the word). A typical example from an equally typical beginning of a folktale from Axo is the following: içtan djó bedjá, tóna pejí ce tálo koríš ‘there were two children, (the) one a boy and the other a girl’ (Mavrochalyvidis & Kesisoglou 1960: 186).9

There is another word for ‘child’, which is used all over Cappadocia and the etymology of which is the topic of this paper: fsáx(i). Its meaning is almost identical with that of peðí vel sim. Dawkins translates it simply as ‘boy’ (1916: 658), but the other glossaries generally have ‘child’ (παιδί, again with the already mentioned ambiguity, although there is no unambiguous evidence for the narrower sense ‘boy’). In a folktale from Delmeso, a princess is about to give birth to two children repeatedly referred to as fsáxa, but her two sisters envy her because of her marriage to a prince and bribe the midwife to replace the children with pups alternatively referred to as šcüljú javrúðja and šcüljú kulákja, both meaning ‘dog’s pups’ (Dawkins 1916: 316).10 The abandoned children are adopted by a man: ce sa fsáx-a te lèç: peðjá-m ‘and to his children he says: my children’ (p. 318), from which it can already be deduced that peðjá may be used as a form of address in contrast with fsáxa. The two children are later identified as a boy (peðí) and a girl (koríš) (ibid.). In this particular folktale, the newborn children are once described as ta mikrά ta fsáxa ‘the little children’ (p. 316), but even when they have grown up to be tall, they are still called fsáxa (ibid.). In several glossaries, however, the translation ‘child’ (παιδί) is further specified as ‘little child’ (παιδάκι, Karhopoulos 2008: 143; μικρό παιδí, Kotsanidis 2006: 160 s.v. παιδí), ‘newborn child’ (βρέφος, Krinopoulos 1889: 66), ‘newborn’ (βρέφος) or ‘infant child’ (νηπίον παιδίον, Archelaos 1899: 277), ‘baby’ (μωρό, Mavrochalyvidis & Kesisoglou 1960: 142; Koimisoglou 2006: 219; Phates 2012: 168). Another, less typical but more hilarious, example comes from Aravan: něka pómne so fsáx ... en sonundá něka jěnse āmma ně peri ēpe né koríš, manaxó ēpe ena cötšékos ‘the woman was expecting a baby (fsáx) ... at long last the woman gave birth, but she produced neither a boy (peri) nor a girl (koríš), but she produced a camel calf (cötšékos)’ (Phosteris & Kesisoglou 1960: 98).

In contemporary Mišótika, a distinction is sometimes made between fsáx as a ‘child before coming of age’ (πριν την ενηλικίωση) and klást as a ‘child after coming of age’ (μετά την ενηλικίωση, Kotsanidis 2006: 12 s.v. αγόρι), in a biological rather than a legal sense, but in pre-exchange Misti the distinction seems to have been between fsáx as a ‘preschool’ and klást as a ‘school child’. Compare the phrase ta skóljas klástsa ‘the school children’ in Kostakis’ chapter on education, where the pupils are invariably referred to as klástsa (1977: 171-181, phrase on p. 173). The same Kostakis, however, insists that ‘children’ are generally (γενικά) called fsáxa or klástsa (p. 322), and the stock phrase when someone was lying in their deathbed was either vrejšetet ta fsáxa or vrejšetet ta klástsa ‘call

---

9 The morphonological variation in the inflection of pejí, gen. bedjú, pl. bedjá is peculiar to Axo (Mavrochalyvidis & Kesisoglou 1960: 48; Mavrochalyvidis 1990: 636).
10 Gen. šcüljú < šciljú, nom. šcill < Greek οκυλί ‘dog’, is very remarkable for its palatal harmony (Janse 2019a: §6.2.1.4.1).
the children’, although the latter is used as the heading of the section (p. 233). In any case, kláš is never used to refer to a newborn or little child, whereas fsáxi and ævléti are used interchangeably in certain expressions, although the latter is much rarer than the former, e.g. pósa fsáxa é(x)is? = pósa ævlétiá é(x)is? ‘how many children do you have?’ (Kotsanidis 2006: 160 s.v. παιδί).

The origin of the word kláš is clear: κοιλάκι ‘pup’ > Cappadocian kulák > klák (Silata, Axo), kláš (Misti), but the etymology is not. It is generally derived from σκολάκι ‘little dog, pup’ > *συλάκι > κοιλάκι (Krinopoulos 1889: 52, quoted by Dawkins 1916: 612 and accepted in the other glossaries), but the cluster [sk] is generally preserved instead of being reduced, most notably in the common word for dog σκολι > Cappadocian σκίλι. The parallel use of the above quoted phrases σκύλιον ἀπορρίπτων and σκύλιον κυλάκι indicates that the borrowed and the inherited words are synonymous.11 In the remainder of this paper we will investigate the history and etymology of fsáx which, apart from Cappadocian, is attested only in the related Asia Minor Greek variety Pharasiot (located in the far southeast of Cappadocia, see figure 1), where it occurs as fsáxi, diminutive *fsax-ókko > fsókko (Dawkins 1916: 658; Anastasiadis 1980: 80; cf. Andriotis 1948: 78). The meaning of Pharasiot fsáxi is identical with Cappadocian pedí with the ambiguity inherent in the word mentioned above. Dawkins glosses it as ‘boy’ (1916: 658), Andriotis as παιδί (1948: 78), Anastasiadis as παιλκάρι ‘lad’ (1980: 80). The word pedí itself is “not used at Ph[arasa]” (Dawkins 1916: 630). Whereas Cappadocian uses pedí versus korít(s) to distinguish between boys and girls, Pharasiot uses the diminutives fsókko versus *kortis-okko > kordókko (Dawkins 1916: 612, for examples see 478, 484; cf. Andriotis 1948: 23, 42).12

2. The received etymology of fsáx(i)

The most fanciful etymology for fsáx(i) is put forward by Krinopoulos: “perhaps from βοζαστάκιον, βοζαστάκ, βοζαστάχ” (1889: 66). None of these words is actually attested, as far as we know, and Archelaos perceptively concludes that “Krinopoulos’ βοζαστάχ is rashly derived (βεβιασμένον) from βουζάνω, i.e. ‘suckle’ (1899: 277). Archelaos notes that “some compare Turkish uşak (οὐσάκ) from which, however, it does not seem to be derived, since that word is being used as well, and in any case, as a known word, uşak would not be changed to fsáx” (ibid.). Dawkins has the following to say: “Perhaps from Turk[ish] uşaq, osça, boy, although the parallel use of this word, pointed out by Arch[elaos], is against this” (1916: 658).

Ignoring the parallel use of fsáx(i) and uşak, Andriotis squarely derives Pharasiot fsáxi from uşak by assuming two changes. The first of these involves the fricativization of word-final [k] to [x] (1948: 75), i.e. uşak > *ušax, which is integrated in the inflectional class of the inherited neuter nouns in -i by means of the ‘integrator’ -i (for the term see Ralli et al. 2015; Ralli 2016; Janse 2019b: XXX): *ušaxi with velar [x] instead of palatal

---

11 Note, however, that as a term of address javrú is affectionate, kulák reproachful, as in a phrase from Ghrzono: Türk kulák, σκύλιον kulák ‘a Turk’s young [is] a dog’s young’ (Dawkins 1916: 612). In his ethnographic study of Anaku, Kostakis specifies that javrú has ‘affectionate meaning’ (θεσποικής σημασία, 1963: 153 fn. 1); kulák is only once used to address a boy who had farted in church after having been warned by his grandmother not to fart in the street: kulák, sin ekklisía mi ertis, klánis! ‘you cur, don’t come into the church [because] you’re farting!’ (p. 131).

12 Note that fsáxi is never used to refer to a baby, for which Arabic maʾṣūm (مَعْصُومٌ) ‘innocent’ → Turkish maʾsum, Anatolian Turkish mahsum (Derleme Sözlüğü, vol. IX s.v.) → Pharasiot máxt(s)imi is used (Dawkins 1916: 686; Andriotis 1948: 77; Anastasiadis 1980: 66).
[c], hence transcribed as φόσαξις by Andriotis (p. 76). The second one involves the sporadic change (κάποτε τρέπεται, p. 19) of word-initial [u] to [v] before a voiced consonant and to [f] before an unvoiced consonant. Andriotis quotes just two examples of this change: uşak > fšáxı and uráði > vráði (ibid.), the latter a diminutive of oύρα ‘tail’ > oʊράðι(v), securely attested in Medieval Greek (Kriaras 1968:-). Andriotis’ etymology of Cappadocian fšáxı and Pharsiatı fšáxı is accepted by his pupil Kesisoglou (1951: 10, 107; cf. Mavrochalyvidis & Kesisoglou 1960: 142; Phosteris & Kesisoglou 1960: 57) and repeated without further discussion by others (Kostakis 1963: 457, 1977: 154; Anastasiadis 1980: 80; Koisimosoglou 2006: 219; Kotsanidis 2006: 160 s.v. παλάτι; Rizos 2007: 154 fn. 148, Karphopoulou 2008: 143).

The first thing to note is the fact that both Dawkins and Andriotis seem to assume that the source of fšáxı is uşak (owski), i.e. the non-dialectal form of the word in Ottoman Turkish. Dawkins observes that “the Turkish q (gaf, ʄ) medially and initially, except for an occasional confusion with γ […], keeps it Turkish sound, a hard back k; finally almost everywhere becomes ʄ’, except at Ulağac and “to a less extent” also in Northwest Cappadocian (1916: 86). Andriotis notes “the regular change” (κανονικὴ ἀλλοίωση, 1948: 75) of word-initial [k] to [g] and of medial and word-final [k] to [x] (p. 76). For example, Ottoman Turkish konak (φονική ‘palace, mansion’ appears as konak at Floita (Dawkins 1916: 424) and at Ulağac (pp. 348, 354-8, twelve times). Kesisoglou notes the regular voicing of word-initial [k] to [g] in the post-exchange speech of refugees from Ulağac (1951: 97-8): gonak (pp. 9, 14, 31, 102). The ‘occasional confusion with γ’ in word-initial position seems to have become the rule in the post-exchange speech of refugees from Aravan (Fosteris & Kesisoglou 1960: 47f.), Axo (Mavrochalyvidis & Kesisoglou 1960: 130) and Misti, where konak appears as gonox (Kostakis 1977: 59; Kotsanidis 2005: 161 s.v. παλάτι; Koisimosoglou 2006: 208). Dawkins records Pharsiatı konáxi (1916: 683), but Andriotis has gonáxi (1948: 76).

Now it is well-known that the voicing of word-initial [k] to [g] and the fricativization of medial and word-final [k] to [x] is a characteristic feature of Anatolian Turkish dialects (Kowalski 1934: 1001; Caferoğlu 1959: 251; Lewis 2000: 4; Brendemoen 1998: 237f.). For instance, Ottomsn Türkish konak appears as gonah in Niğde Province (Derleme Sözlüğü, vol. VI s.v. gonah II), uşak as uşah in Kırşehir Province (Derleme Sözlüğü, vol. XI s.v. uşah; cf. Günser 2000: 279, XXVII/21: uşahlarımı) and çocuk, another word for ‘child’, as çocuh in Nevşehir Province (Korkmaz 1994: 182, 65/2-4: çocuh bis). This last word is not borrowed in Cappadocian, but within Pharsiatı it is attested at tšodžúki at Avşar and Kiska (Dawkins 1916: 672). Given the fact that fšáxı is found “everywhere in Cappadocia” (Dawkins 1916: 658), we have to assume that if uşak is the Turkish source of the word, it would have to be in its Anatolian form uşah. We then need to understand how uşah changed to fšáxı, i.e. how word-initial [u] changed to [f].

As mentioned above, Andriotis assumes a sporadic but otherwise unexplained change of word-initial [u] to [v] in uráði > vráði and to [f] in uşak > fšáxı (1948: 19). Now the fricativization of [u] to [v] before voiced and to [f] before unvoiced consonants is of course extremely well documented in the history of Greek in the case of the diphthongs [au], [eu] and [iu] (for the early history of the change see Horrocks 2010: 163ff.). Crucially, therefore, we would need a (mor)phonological environment in which the vowels [a], [e] or [i] are involved to allow for this particular change. As a matter of fact, Andriotis provides three examples in which the vowel sequence [ao] changes to [au] and then to [av] before voiced consonants in Pharsiatı: άωρος > άωρος > αβρος ‘unripe’,...
\[ \text{áλογο} > \text{άγο} > \text{άγου} > \text{άβ} 'horse', \text{άλλο} > \text{άο} > \text{άου} > \text{άβ} 'other' (1948: 19). The last two involve the deletion of intervocalic [l], which is a characteristic feature of Pharasiot. Both Dawkins (1916: 154f.) and Andriotis (1948: 30) describe it in great detail, but fail to provide a phonetic explanation for the phenomenon. It is actually a well-known sound change attested in Romance, Germanic and Slavic languages involving L-velarization before back vowels followed by L-vocalization and / or L-deletion. Recasens (2012) shows how several prominent articulatory and / or acoustic cues may be responsible for L-velarization, L-vocalization and L-deletion in Romance. It may be accordingly explained as involving the velarization of [l] to [l]-velarization, L-vocalization and L-deletion in Romance. It may be accordingly explained as involving the velarization of [l] to [l] before back vowels, followed by the vocalization of [l] to [w], which is subsequently deleted: \[ \text{άλογο} > \text{άλογο} > \text{ά(ν)ωγο} > \text{άω} > \text{άνγο} 'horse'. \] The vocalization of [l] to [w] is still apparent in cases where [l] was preceded by a velar consonant, e.g. \[ γλώσσα > γλώσα > γώσα 'tongue' (Dawkins 1916: 158; Andriotis 1948: 30). \]

Anastasiadis, a native speaker of Pharasiot, lists another example unrecorded by Dawkins and Andriotis: \[ \text{άβ} \text{πος} < \text{άλωπος} 'fox' (2003: 55), which may be reconstructed as \[ \text{αλόπος} > \text{αιλόπος} > \text{απός} > \text{αιφός} \] (for \text{αβ} \text{πός}). Dawkins quotes \text{αφός} from Avşar, but \text{αφός} from Pharsa (1916: 583; cf. Andriotis 1948: 86, 1974: 88). He notes that if the loss of intervocalic [l] results in a sequence of two different vowels, “they are generally kept apart [b]ut sometimes the vowels coalesce” (1916: 156). Avşar \text{αφός} is an example of the former, Pharsa \text{αφός} of the latter. A common hiatus resolution strategy is the insertion of a voiced fricative, either [ɣ] or [v]. Dawkins quotes a telling example: “\[ δέβος (διάβολος) devil, gen. δέβοοου (odd accent) or δέβοου or δέβογου \]” (ibid.; cf. Karolidis 1885: 158; Lagarde 1886: 49). He also mentions the coexistence of \[ γ \text{γου} \] and \[ β \text{βου} \] as variants of \[ θ < \text{άλλο} 'other', \] listed under “\[ λ is changed to γ \]” and “\[ λ is changed to β \]” respectively (p. 158), but correctly explained previously: “the forms of \[ άλλος \] in use, \[ άγου, \] \[ άβου, \] \[ άου, \] suggest that the \[ γ \] and \[ β \] are later fillings of the hiatus, as they certainly are in the ending of the -\[ άο \] verbs, which appears generally as -\[ άγο, \] but sometimes as \[ -άβο \] as well as -\[ άω \]” (p. 155).

It is therefore likely that the raising of unstressed [o] to [u] in these examples is due to the vocalization of intervocalic [l] to [w] via [l] before its ultimate deletion: \[ áló > álo > \text{ά(ν)ωγο} > \text{άω} \]. This is confirmed by cases like \[ πολλά > πουά \] (Dawkins 1916: 157; Andriotis 1948: 19), which may be reconstructed as \[ \text{πολά} > \text{πολά} > \text{πο(ν)ώ} > \text{πουά} \]. These are the only instances where unstressed [o] is raised to [u] in Pharsa according to Dawkins: “At Pharsa these changes do not occur, except that it is difficult to explain \[ άβου for άλλου otherwise” (1916: 149). The only apparent exception is the above mentioned \[ όφος > άφος > \text{άβρος} \], quoted by Andriotis (1948: 19), but not recorded by Anastasiadis (2003) nor, quite surprisingly, by Andriotis in his lexicon of archaisms in the Modern Greek dialects, who instead lists \[ όφος \], attested in several Modern Greek dialects including Cappadocian (Silata) and Pontic (Ophis) (1974: 170).\footnote{In this particular case, the change of [o] to [u] is unexpected, Ancient Greek {ο} being normally preserved in Pharsa (Andriotis 1948: 10 and 18 for exceptions; cf. Dawkins 1916: 149). Andriotis quotes evidence from Rhodian to further illustrate the change of [ao] to [au] and of [au] to [av]: \[ άγουρία > άουρία > άβρια 'sour grape’, \] \[ μάσολο > μάσολο > μάβλο 'cheek', \] \[ σάγουνο > σάρουνο > σάβγο \] (1948: 19; cf. Tsopanakis 1940: 54).}

In all these cases unstressed [u] changes to [v] when preceded by (stressed or unstressed) [a] and followed by a voiced consonant, just as the older diphthong [au] changed to [av] in this particular context. The phenomenon is called ‘friction’ by Horrocks (2010: 165ff.) and, with reference to Sino-Tibetan and Grassfield Bantu languages, ‘high vowel fricativization’ by Faytak (2014), whose ‘report’ is probably the most detailed phonetic-phonological study published in recent years. But how are we to imagine high vowel fricativization in the case of θrάδi and θsάξ[i]? The only plausible explanation would be to invoke the definite article, more specifically the neuter plural article ta, which would provide the preceding [a] necessary for the fricativization of the [u]. As a matter of fact, there are two well-known examples of metanalysis involving the prefixation of the definite article which have made the inherited words almost unrecognizable in their modern shape. The first one is Ancient Greek φόν ‘egg’, articulated pl. τὰ φάδα > Post-classical Greek τα οά (monophthongization) > τα ογά (hiatus resolution) > τα υγά (mid vowel raising) > τα νγά (high vowel fricativization) > τα υγά (metanalysis) > τα αγά → sg. το αγό (Andriotis 1983: 2; cf. Triantafyllidis 1998; Babiniotis 2002, 2011). The second example is Ancient Greek ορίν ‘ear’, articulated pl. τὰ ορία > Post-classical Greek τα οτία > τα υτία (mid vowel raising) > τα ριά (high vowel fricativization) > τα ριά (metanalysis) > τα ριά → sg. το ριά (Andriotis 1983: 45; cf. Triantafyllidis 1998; Babiniotis 2002, 2011).

To explain θράδι this way, one would have to presuppose a metanalysis from the articulated pl. τα θράδια > τα θράδια → sg. το θράδι. Whereas it is easy to see how the frequent use of the articulated plurals τα ρά ‘the eggs’ and τα οτί ‘the ears’ led to the metanalyzed singulars αγά and ριά, it is rather difficult to envisage a world in which it should be more common to refer to a plurality of tails rather than to indivual tails. This appears from the various shapes of the word which is preserved as an archaism in several Modern Greek dialects, e.g. Pontic θράδ(ιν), ωδάρ(ιν), ράδι and, significantly θυράδι (Papadopoulos 1958-61 s.v. ούραδιν). The last variant is particularly instructive as it is metanalyzed from το θράδιν > τ’ θράδιν > το θράδιν, pl. τα θράδια. It is also recorded at Sinasos by Archelaos (1899: 271 s.v. τουράδι; cf. Takadopoulos 1982: 190; Rizos 2007: 215). Another diminutive variant is τράτσα, listed by Karolidis for Misti and other Cappadocian varieties (1885: 216), or τράδζα, listed by Archelaos for ‘Bagdaonian’ (1899: 271), which refers to Cappadocian minus Sinasos (Dawkins 1916: 10). According to Dawkins, τράτσα “seems to be for τ(ου)ράδ(ι)τσα” (1916: 630), i.e. τ’ θράδετσα > τράθετσα > τράτσα or τράδζα (with regular syncope of unstressed [u] and [i], cf. Dawkins 1916: 62; Janse 2019a: §§6.2.1.1). In contemporary Mišótika, τράδζα is simplified to τράζα (Kostakis 1977: 271, 457; Kotsanidis 2006: 158 s.v. ούρα; Phates 2012: 167).

The case of Pharasiot θράδι thus becomes be crucial, as it appears to be the only evidence for the putative fricativation of unstressed [u] to [v] before a voiced consonant, to wit the rhotic liquid [r]. In this respect, it is noteworthy that several 19th-century sources record θραδί instead of θράδι for Pharasiot (Karolidis 1885: 144; Lagarde 1886: 44; Archealos 1899: 271), suggesting that the latter is a syncopated form of the former. This further complicates an analysis in terms of high vowel fricativation, especially since

---

14 Cappadocian ούρα (Dawkins 1916: 663 s.v. φόν) is the result of a similar metanalysis, whereas Pharasiot θού is more likely the result of hiatus resolution: το φόν > τ(ου) ού > τ’ ού > το νό, pl. τα νά (Andriotis 1948: 55).

there are no other examples of a change from unstressed [u] to [v] before [r] in Pharasiot (nor in any other Greek variety we are aware of).

3. The history and etymology of $fšáx$

This brings us back to the putative fricativization of [u] to [f] in $ušah > fšáxi(i)$. In this particular case, it is not very difficult to imagine a world in which references to a plurality of children would be as frequent as references to individual children. Compare, for instance, the beginning of a folktales from Ulaşçaç: $ándra néka ėjiškan dójoka $fšáya$. da $fšéa-t épan ci ‘A man [and] a woman had twelve children. The children said’ (Dawkins 1916: 346). Here we have the necessary context for the putative high vowel fricativization: articulated nom.-acc. pl. $*ta ušáxi-a > ta $fšájja > ta $fšáija > ta $fšéja > ta $fšéa$, the raising of [a] to [e] before [i] or [j] in $fšéija$ being optional (Dawkins 1916: 65; cf. Kesisoglou 1951: 9). The numeral dójoka ‘twelve’ provides another context in which [u] is preceded by [a], as would other numerals like tría ‘three’, tésera ‘four’, efúa ‘seven’, enjá ‘nine’, éndeka ‘eleven’ and, indeed, polá ‘many’. Even singular $ena fšáx$ could be derived from $*ena ušáx ‘a, one child’.

In the case of Pharasiot this would result in the following scenario: $ušah → *ušáxi$, articulated pl. $*ta ušáxia > ta $fšáxe → sg. to $fšáxi$, gen. tu $fšáxu$. As noted above, the integrator -$i$ is used to integrate the loan noun in the inflectional class of the neuter nouns. It was originally a diminutive suffix, which was very productive in Post-classical Greek (Horrocks 2010: 175), but became “semantically neuter” in Medieval Greek (p. 262). It is the regular integrator of Turkish loan nouns ending in a consonant, especially of “Turkish names of things” (sic), as Dawkins notes with reference to Pharasiot (1916: 164), but more accurately of “Turkish substantives […] the meaning of which does not involve the idea of personality” with reference to Cappadocian (p. 90). Inherited diminutives like παύκον > Cappadocian $pebó vel sim.$ naturally belong here and so it seems to make sense that Turkish $ušah$ should be integrated in this inflectional class.

Due to the regular apocope of final unstressed [i] in Cappadocian (Dawkins 1916: 62; Janse 2019: §6.2.1.1), the integrator -$i$ does not appear in the nom.-acc. sg. of loan nouns such as $fšáx$, but it reappears in the nom.-acc. pl. $fšáx-ja > $fšája > $fšáija > $fšéja and in the gen. sg.-pl. $fšáxi-u > $fšáxi-jú > $fšájju > $fšejú. Quite surprisingly, however, the endings gen. -$iu$, pl. -$ja$ are only attested in three Cappadocian dialects: $fšája-$fšájja$ are found at Ghurzono (Dawkins 1916: 338), $fšája-$fšájju-$fšájú$ and $fšejú$ at Ulaşçaç (Dawkins 1916: 65, 658, passim; Kesisoglou 1951: 32, passim) and $fšéja$ and $fšejú$ at Aravan (Dawkins 1916: 330; Phosteris & Kesisoglou 1960: 148). Instead of $fšáxa$ we find $fšáxa$ at Anaku (Kostakis 1964: 84), Malakopi (Karphopoulos 2008: 143), Sinasos (Archelaos 1899: 141) and Silata, where $fšáya$ is recorded as an alternative to $fšáxy$ by Dawkins (1916: 448, 658). At Floïta (Dawkins 1916: 412, 426), Delmeso (1916: 314, 318ff.), Akso (Mavrochalyvidis & Kesisoglou 1960: 218) and Misti (Kostakis 1977: 154) $fšaxú$ is attested in addition to $fšáxa$. These forms resemble $fšaxú$ at Pharas and $fšáxa$ at Avşar (Dawkins 1916: 574), where the endings -$u$ and -$a$ are regular for the inflectional class to which $fšáxi$ belongs (Dawkins 1916: 152; Andriotis 1948: 36). In Cappadocian, $fšáx$ is $*fša(x)ókko > fšókko$ in Pharasiot (Dawkins 1916: 658; Andriotis 1948: 42; Anastasiadis 1980: 80).

---

16 For the change (‘synizesis’) of [iu] to [e] in Pharasiot see Dawkins (1916: 152), Andriotis (1948: 17f.); the change of [iu] to [u] is explained as ‘synizesis’ by the former (1916: 152), as ‘apocope’ by the latter (1948: 23).

17 The diminutive of $fšáx$ is $*fša(x)ókko > fšókko$ in Pharasiot (Dawkins 1916: 658; Andriotis 1948: 42; Anastasiadis 1980: 80).
on the other hand, one would expect the endings -jú and -ja, i.e. fšaxjú and fšaxja and later developments of these forms. Compare, for instance, Anatolian Turkish konax > konaxja at Fertek and Floïta (Dawkins 1916: 328,418) and γonax, γonaxji at Akso (Mavrochalyvidis & Kesisoglou 1960: 196), γonaxjú and γonaxja at Misti (Janse 2019b). Being isolated forms, it looks as if fšax and fšaxa are archaisms and fšaxja analogical innovations.

As already noted above, the fricativization of word-final [k] to [x] is a characteristic feature of Anatolian Turkish, which is normally not found at Ulağaç, where Ottoman Turkish konak (قُنَاك) is borrowed as konak, gen. konakjú, pl. konakjja (Dawkins 1916: 348) or, in the speech of refugees from Ulağaç, gonak, gen. gonakjú, pl. gonakjja (Kesisoglou 1951: 9, 31). Likewise, kabak ‘pumpkin’ > gabak, kaymak ‘cream’ > gaimak, kapak ‘lid’ > gapak, listed by Kesisoglou to illustrate the regular voicing of word-initial [k] to [g] before back vowels (1951: 97). He also mentions the fricativization of [k] to [x], which is introduced as follows: “In Turkish mouths maybe also the following changes took place” (Σὲ τουρκικά στόματα έγιναν ἵως καὶ οἱ πῖο κάτω ἄλλοισσας, p. 98). The only example of word-final [k] quoted there is uşak > fšak (ibid.), but there is one other listed in the glossary: merak ‘anxiety’ > merax (p. 104). This is remarkable, as merax is attested at Malakopi (Karphopoulos 2008: 119), where word-final [k] is also regularly preserved in Turkish loan nouns (Dawkins 1916: 86). It is difficult to decide whether the isolated fšax and merax are archaisms rather than innovations at Ulağaç or the other way around. The fact that fšax is used instead of the expected fšak at Malakopi as well is at Silata and Floïta, two other dialects where word-final [k] is preserved, albeit “to a less degree” in the case of the former and “probably also to some extent” in the case of the latter (Dawkins 1916: 86), suggests that it is more likely to be a pan-Cappadocian archaism. This would explain the parallel use of uşak > ušak, noted by Archelaos, whose astute observations is repeated here: “as a known word, uşak would not be changed to fšax” (1899: 277).

Dawkins seems to agree with Archelaos and tentatively explains fšax as “a singular formed from the Turk[ish] plural ev-ušaq-lar, ‘the household’, ‘the boys of the house’” (1916: 658). A derivation by metanalysis from an indefinite ızafet construction (Lewis 2000: 41) such as ev uşak-lar-i is not very likely in light of the existence of such forms in Cappadocian (for discussion see Janse 2019b: XXX fn. 39), e.g. Turkish hamam sahabi ‘bathowner’ > Ulağaç do xamamjú do sábïs (Dawkins 1916: 376), Turkish oda sahibi ‘room owner’ > Akso odá sáabïs (p. 402). We would have to assume that singular ev uşaq-i would have been borrowed as *evušaqyi > *efšaqyi (syncope) > *efšaqyi (integration) > *efšaq (apocope and final devoicing) > fšaq (apheresis). Apheresis of initial unstressed [e] is rare in Cappadocian (Kesisoglou 1951: 14; Mavrochalyvidis & Kesisoglou 1960: 10; Kostakis 1990: 177) as in Pharasiot (Andriotis 1948: 22), though attested in a few words, e.g. τὸ ἐγγόνι ‘grandchild’ > τὸ (ŋ)gón, τὸ ἐρίφι ‘kid’ > τὸ rif, but Turkish ev-lat > to ev-lat vel sim. (cf. supra). Phonologically, then, Dawkins etymology is certainly imagineable, but semantically it does not make sense, given the fact that ev uşaqi is used

---

18 Kotsanidis records merax (2006: 138) instead of the expected merax, listed by Koimisoglou (2006: 211); compare merax at Akso (Mavrochalyvidis 1990: 632). It is likely that merax is sometimes replaced by merak in contemporary Mišötika under the influence of Modern Greek meráki. The Pharasiot equivalent is meráxi (Andriotis 1948: 76).

19 Archelaos obviously quotes the Ottoman Turkish form uşak (üş-), which would correspond with uşah in the local Anatolian Turkish (Derleme Sözlüğü, vol. XI s.v. uşah; cf. Günşen 2000: 279, XXVII/21: uşahlarmın).
to refer to a male servant, i.e. a ‘boy’ in a specialized sense, not to a ‘boy’ in its primary sense of ‘male child’, let alone to a ‘little boy’ or even a ‘little child, baby’ without regard to sex.

We believe that the parallel use of ušâk and fšâx observed by Archelaos together with the phonological and inflectional peculiarities of the latter indicate that fšâx(t) is indeed an archaism. This does not preclude the possibility that fšâx derives from to ušâx < Anatolian Turkish uṣaḥ, along the lines sketched above, although word-initial high vowel fricativization is not particularly well documented in either Cappadocian or Pharasiot, the only trustworthy witness being precisely fšâx(t).20 Elsewhere, we have tentatively suggested a slightly different etymology and, indeed, chronology, which would better explain its phonological peculiarities and also accounts for its deviant inflection (Janse & Vandewalle 2018: 87; cf. Janse 2019a: §11.2.1). Turkish uṣak, Anatolian Turkish uṣâ is derived from Old Turkish uṣak ‘small’ (Nadeljaev et al. 1969: 619 s.v. uvṣaq; Clauson 1973: 16 s.v. uṣa:k). Clauson notes that uṣak is “very rare in its original form and soon replaced by uṣak” (ibid.; cf. Nadeljaev et al. 1969: 617). As there is no trace of the word in documents written in Old Anatolian Turkish, a direct derivation of Cappadocian fšâx / Pharasiot fšâx from uṣak cannot be proven, but neither can it be excluded altogether, as it would offer an alternative explanation of the initial [f] in both words: uṣak > Anatolian Turkish uṣâ > uṣâ > articulated to uṣâ > to fšâx (apheresis). The development would be comparable to to urâði > to ráði, attested in several Pontic and Dodecanese dialects, and also to Chian to urjâði > to rjâði > t’ orjâði by metanalysis (Andriotis 1974: 422).

It should be noted, however, that uṣak / uṣak is an adjective, so we must assume that it was borrowed as such in Cappadocian and Pharasiot. This explains the irregular inflection of the word in the North and Central Cappadocian dialects. The 11th-century Qarakhanid scholar Maḥmūd al-Kāšġarī, who does not record uṣak, writes: “Things that are small (ṣiyâr) are called uṣaq nân. Hence babies (ṣibyân) are called uṣaq oylân” (1982: 108), i.e. ‘little boy’ (malen ‘kij mal’čik, Nadeljaev et al. 1969: 617). Kāšģarī adds: “This word is not used for the singular but only for the plural” (ibid.), so the latter example should actually have been u(v)ṣak oğlanlar ‘little boys’. Translated into Cappadocian this would have been *u(f)šâx peðjâ, with obligatory marking of the plural in the adjective, articulated *ta fšâxu ta peðjâ, with adjectival instead of nominal inflection of fšâx, by analogy with ta mikrâ ta peðjâ ‘the little boys’.21 The gen. sg. would be *tu fšâxu tu peðjâ, a construction which had become rare in early 20th-century Cappadocian but still attested at Potamia, e.g. tu kalî tu nékas ‘of the good wife’ (Dawkins 1916: 115).

We believe that this scenario is the only plausible explanation for the adjectival inflection of fšâx, which is another indication that it is indeed an archaic loan noun. Due to the regular apocope of final unstressed [u] in Cappadocian, gen. fšâxu ended up being syncretic with nom. fšâx, which resulted in two different ‘repair strategies’ (Janse 2019b): the North and Central Cappadocian dialects copied the ending of the gen. pl. -ín > -ú in the singular: fšâxu > fšâx > fšaxû, whereas the South Cappadocian dialects adopted the so-called ‘agglutinative inflection’ (Janse 2019b) which would become the regular inflection of Turkish loan adjectives ending in a consonant, e.g. zengin ‘rich’ > zengin,

20 As pointed out above, vrâdî < varâdî is a doubtful case.
21 The doubling of the article is obligatory in the case of inherited neuter nouns like peði (Janse 2019a: §8.1.2.1). The phenomenon is often called ‘determiner spreading’ or ‘polydefiniteness’ (Lekakou & Karatsareas 2016).
pl. *zenginja (Dawkins 1916: 115). As this was also the regular inflection of substantivized adjectives (*ibid.*), *fšax* was integrated in the inflectional class of the inherited neuter nouns in -ī in South Cappadocian as well as in Pharasiot: *fšax(i)*, gen. *fšax-ū > *fšaxjú > *fšaxjū > *fšejū, pl. *fšaxi-ja > *fšaxja > *fšajja > *fšēja. In North and Central Cappadocian, however, *fšax* preserved its archaic adjectival inflection: gen. *fšaxū*, nom. *fšaxa*. The substantivization of *fšax(i)* in Cappadocian and Pharasiot runs parallel with the substantivization of *uşak* which meant both ‘small’ (without connotation of plurality) and ‘small boy’ in Ottoman Turkish from the 14th century onwards (Clauson 1972: 16).

4. Conclusion

In this paper we reassessed the etymology of Cappadocian *fšax* ‘child’ and Pharasiot *fšax(i)* ‘boy’. We argued that Anatolian Turkish *uşah* was the source of the borrowing instead of Ottoman Turkish *uşak* (أوشاق), as hitherto assumed. We also investigated the alleged change of word-initial [u] to [f] before unvoiced consonants and concluded that the change from *uşah* to *fšax(i)* could be explained as an isolated case of word-initial high vowel fricativization in the articulated plural *ta ušaxa > ta fšaxa*, comparable to *ta otjá ‘the ears’ > ta utjá (mid-vowel raising) > *ta fšjá (high vowel fricativization) > *t’ aftjá (metanalysis), sg. *ta afli in Modern Greek. We compared the alleged change of word-initial [u] to [v] in *vrádi ‘tail’ to *vrđi in Pharasiot with the comparable change of *ta øjá ‘the eggs’ > *ta øjá > *ta øjá > *t’ avjá, sg. *ta avjó in Modern Greek, but concluded that Pharasiot *vrđi* must be considered a syncopated variant of an older variant *vrađi*. We also concluded that it was difficult to imagine an articulated plural context in the case of *v(a)rđi in light of the many dialect forms based on the articulated singular *to urđi > Pontic and Dodecanese *to rđi, Chian *t’ orjđi and again Pontic *turdoin. We further argued that *fšax(i) has to be considered an archaism in light of the parallel use of *uşak > ušák reported in 19th-century sources. The fact that *fšax* instead of *fšák is securely attested in Cappadocian dialects where word-final [k] does not change to [x] in Turkish loan nouns is another argument in favour of the archaism of *fšax*. Finally, we argued that the irregular inflection of *fšax* in North and Central Cappadocian – gen. *fšaxi* instead of *fšajxjū, pl. *fšaxja instead of *fšaxja – is another sign of the archaic character of the word which was probably borrowed as an adjective from Old Anatolian Turkish before it became substantivized in Ottoman Turkish. Finally, we suggested an alternative etymology for *fšax(i)* from *uşjak*, an adjective attested in Old Turkic, although unattested in Old Anatolian Turkish: *ta ufšaxa ta peđjá ‘the little children’ > *ta fšaxa ‘the little ones’ by apheresis. We believe that our little exercise in historical linguistics offers a better explanation of the etymology of *fšax(i)* and a more secure establishment of the chronology of its borrowing from Old Anatolian Turkish.
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FIGURE 1: Geographical Distribution of the Cappadocian and Pharasiot dialects

TABLE 1: Classification of the Cappadocian dialects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North Cappadocian</th>
<th>Central Cappadocian</th>
<th>South Cappadocian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NORTHWEST</td>
<td></td>
<td>SOUTHWEST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Silata</td>
<td>• Axo</td>
<td>• Aravan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Anaku</td>
<td>• Misti</td>
<td>• Ghurzono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Floïta</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Fertek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Malakopi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHEAST</td>
<td></td>
<td>SOUTHEAST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sinasos</td>
<td>• Ulağaç</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Potamia</td>
<td>• Semendere</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Delmeso</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Abstract

Cappadocian ǧšáx ‘child’ and Pharasiot ǧšáxi ‘boy’ are traditionally derived from Turkish uşak, assuming a hitherto unexplained fricativization of [u] to [f] and of word-final [k] to [x] after the borrowing process. The latter cannot be attributed to Cappadocian or Pharasiot, however, as it is a common feature of Anatolian Turkish. In order to understand the former sound change, we have to assume an isolated case of high vowel fricativization in the articulated plural ta ušáxja > ta ǧšáxja → sg. to ǧšáx(i) by metanalysis, comparable to the generally acknowledged case of ta otjá > ta utjá > ta ftjá → sg. to fi ‘the ear’. We argue that ǧšáx(i) is an archaism in light of the parallel use of ušak → ušák reported in 19th-century sources and the preservation of word-final [x] even in dialects which seem to have borrowed words ending in [k] from Standard instead of Anatolian Turkish. The irregular inflection of Cappadocian ǧšáx suggests that it was borrowed as an adjective from Old Anatolian Turkish before it was substantivized in Ottoman Turkish, perhaps even from Old Turkish uṷšak ‘little’: ta uǰšáxa ta peǰjá ‘the little children’ > ta ǧšáxa ‘the little ones’ by apheresis.

1. Introduction

Cappadocian,¹ a variety of East Asia Minor Greek (figure 1),² has borrowed numerous kinship terms from Anatolian Turkish (Janse 2020b: §11.2.1), e.g. abla ‘elder sister’ → ablá (Ulağaç); paša/baša ‘elder brother’ → pašá (Aravan), pašás (Sinados), bašá

¹ The main research for this article was done when the first author was a Fellow of Harvard’s Center for Hellenic Studies during the Fall Semester of 2013 and a Visiting Fellow of All Souls College (Oxford) during Michaelmas term 2014. He would like to thank the Warden and Fellows of ASC for the honour of electing him a second time to a visiting fellowship in 2014 and the Director and Senior Fellows of the CHS for electing him a Fellow in 2013 and appointing him an Associate in 2019. We would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their useful comments.

There is another word for ‘child’, used all over Cappadocia, the etymology of which is the topic of this paper: fšáx(i) with a variety of plural forms according to the dialects. Its meaning is almost identical with that of peóí. Dawkins translates it simply as ‘boy’ (D658), but the other glossaries generally have ‘child’ (παιδί, again with the already mentioned ambiguity, although there is no unambiguous evidence for the narrower sense ‘boy’). In a folktale from Delmeso, a princess is about to give birth to two children repeatedly referred to as fšáxa, but her two sisters envy her because of her marriage to a prince and bribe the midwife to replace the children with pups alternatively referred to as šcüljú (D316). The abandoned children are adopted by a man: ce sa fšáxa-t ce léç: pežjá-m ‘and to his children he says: my children’ (D318), from which it can already be deduced that pežjá may be used as a form of address in contrast with fšáxa. The two children are later identified as a boy (pežjá) and a girl (koriš) (ibid.). In this particular folktale, the newborn children are once described as ta mikrá ta fšáxa ‘the little children’ (D316), but even when they have grown up, they are still called fšáxa (ibid.). In several glossaries, however, the translation ‘child’...
is further specified as ‘little child’ (παιδάκι, Karphopoulos 2008: 143; μικρό παιδί, Kotsanidis 2006: 160 s.v. παιδί), ‘newborn child’ (βρέφος, Krinopoulos 1889: 66), ‘newborn’ (βρεφός) or ‘infant child’ (νήφων παιδίον, Archelaos 1889: 277), ‘baby’ (μωρό, Mavrochalyvidis & Kesisoglou 1960: 142; Koimisoglou 2006: 219; Phates 2012: 168). Another, less typical but more hilarious, example comes from Aravan: néka pómine so fšax ... en sonundá néka jénsé, ámma né peri épce né koríš, manaxó épce ena cötšékos ‘the woman was expecting a baby (fšax) ... at long last the woman gave birth, but she produced neither a boy (peri) nor a girl (koríš), but she produced a baby camel (cötšékos)’ (Phosteris & Kesisoglou 1960: 98).

In contemporary Mišótika, a distinction is sometimes made between fšax as a ‘child before coming of age’ (πριν την ενηλικίωση) and kláts as a ‘child after coming of age’ (μετά την ενηλικίωση, Kotsanidis 2006: 12 s.v. αγόρι), in a biological rather than a legal sense, but in pre-exchange Misti the distinction seems to have been between fšax as a ‘preschool child’ and kláts as a ‘school child’. Compare the phrase ta skóljas klátsa ‘the school children’ in Kostakis’ chapter on education, where the pupils are invariably appearing in various Turkish dialects today as guduk / gđuk etc. with the meaning ‘whelp, puppy’

The origin of the word kláts is clear enough: *κουλάκι ‘pup’ > Cappadocian kulák > klák (Silata, Axo) > kláts (Misti), but the etymology is obscure. In Krinopoulos (1889: 52) derives it from σκυλάκι, the Late Medieval and Modern Greek form of Ancient Greek σκύλαξ, a diminutive of σκύλος. In other Cappadocian glossaries, however, the word kuluk > klak is listed under the heading «Λέξεις ανετυμολόγητες». Dawkins quotes Krinopoulos’ etymology, but notes that “the usual word for puppy is κουλούκι” (D612). This is a curious observation, as kulukí is attested in Livisiot (Andriotis 1961: 93) and Pontic (Papadopoulos 1958-61: vol. 1, 481), but not in any of the Cappadocian dialects nor, for that matter, in Pharasiot.

Papadopoulos derives it from Anatolian Turkish kuluk ‘puppy’ (ibid.; cf. DS s.v.). The etymology of this word is problematical, as there is no obvious Turkish source for it. Interestingly, however, κουλούκι(ν) is attested in Late

---

7 We would like to thank one of the reviewers for encouraging us to elaborate on the etymology of Cappadocian kuluk. One of the reviewers’ question whether Pharasiot kuladžókko, recorded by Dawkins in a folktale and translated as “little snake” (D506), belongs here is unclear. *κουλάκι would change to *kulati > *kuladi in Pharasiot (D154; A27-9), the diminutive form of which would be kuladžókko, with the Pharasiot diminutive suffix -okko [ok:o] (A41-2). The word is used several times in a folktale recorded by Dawkins and translated as ‘little snake’ (D508-8), but he analyzes the word as having a mysterious Turkish diminutive suffix joy [sic] (D612), perhaps by confusion with the regular diminutive suffix -ck (Lewis 2000: 54). From a derivational perspective kuladžókko makes perfect sense, cf. köpîç > Pharasiot koritsi > koridi, diminutive koridskko (D612; A23); cf. Cappadocian koritsi, diminutive koritsîpipo (Axo; Mavrochalyvidis & Kesisoglou 1960: 46).
8 For Medieval Greek see LBG & LME ss.v.
10 It may be noted that Dawkins’ glossary does not have a separate entry for κουλούκι.
11 One of our reviewers suggests two sources: (1) Anatolian Turkish küçük / gëdük ‘small, whelp’, appearing in various Turkish dialects today as guduk / gđuk etc. with the meaning ‘whelp, puppy’
Medieval Greek and is etymologically also derived from σκωλάκιον by Kriaras (LME) as well as Trapp (LBG). The backing of [i] to [u] between velar and liquid consonants is well attested in Late Medieval Greek (Manolessou in Holton et al. 2019: vol. 1, 76-8) and sporadically in Cappadocian (Kesisoglou 1951: 8; Mavrochalyvidis & Kesisoglou 1960: 4; Costakis 1963: 25), but the details of the remaining sound changes remain unexplained and can at best be reconstructed as follows: σκωλάκι > *(σ)κουλάκι (backing) > *(σ)κουλούκι (progressive assimilation). If this chronology is correct, it suggests that Cappadocian kulak is older than Late Medieval κουλούκι (v), the earliest attestations of which are, quite interestingly, from the Late Byzantine epic Digenis Akritis,12 whose origins are to be sought in East Asia Minor if not in Cappadocia itself. As κουλούκιον is also found in the work of the eleventh-century Constantinopolitan savant Michael Psellus (PselMB V 568.21),14 it is unlikely that the word was borrowed from Anatolian Turkish into Late Medieval Greek but rather the other way around. The apheresis of the initial [s] remains problematic, as there are no other examples of a cluster reduction [sk] > [k], as is most eloquently illustrated by the common word for ‘dog’: σκολί > scili (Malakopi, Silata) > scili in the other dialects (D644). The parallel existence of words for ‘dog’ with and without backing of [i] to [u] and with or without initial [s], although not entirely impossible, seems to invalidate the proposed etymologies of κουλάκι and κουλούκι, especially since both can be combined in a single phrase, e.g. sciljú klák ‘dog pup’, used as an insult at Malakopi (Karphopoulos 2008: 111). The parallel use of the above quoted phrases sciljú javrúdja and sciljú kulákja from Delmeso indicates that the borrowed word javrú and the inherited (?) word kulák are synonymous.15

In the remainder of this paper we will investigate the history and etymology of fsixo which, apart from Cappadocian, is attested only in Pharasiot (located in the far southeast of Cappadocia, see map 1), where it occurs as fsixi, diminutive *fšax-ókko > fsókko (D658; A78; Anastasiadis 1980: 80). The meaning of Pharasiot fsixo is identical with Cappadocian pedi with the ambiguity inherent in the word mentioned above. Dawkins glosses it as ‘boy’ (D658), Andriotis as παιδί (A78), Anastasiadis as παλικάρι ‘lad’ (1980: 80). The word pedi itself is “not used at Ph[arasa]” (D630). Whereas Cappadocian uses pedi versus koriti to distinguish between boys and girls, Pharasiot uses the diminutives fsókko versus *korits-ókko > kordzókko (D612, for examples see D478, D484; cf. A23, A42).16

12 D4 757 & 766 (Escorial), where the κουλούκια are bear cubs.
13 For more detail see Jeffrey (1998) and Janse (2020c).
14 The reference is taken from LBG s.v. κουλούκιον.
15 Note, however, that as a term of address ma’sum is affectionate, kulak reproachable, as in a saying from Ghurzono: Türk kulak, sciljú kulak ‘a Turk’s young [is] a dog’s young’ (D612); similarly at Malakopi: ñjavól kulak ‘Devil’s breed’ (Karphopoulos 2008: 111). In his ethnographic study of Anaku, Kostakis specifies that javrú has ‘affectionate meaning’ (θετουμένα σημασία, 1963: 153 fn. 1); kulak is only once used to address a boy who had farted in church after having been warned by his grandmother not to fart in the street: kulák, sin eklišá mín ertis, klánis! ‘you cur, you shouldn’t go to church, [as] you’re farting!’ (p. 131).
16 Note that fsixo is never used to refer to a baby, for which Arabic ma’sum (مُصْلُومُ ‘innocent’) → Ottoman Turkish ma’süm, Anatolian Turkish mahsum (DS vol. IX s.v.) → Pharasiot máx(t)isúmi is used (D686; A77; Anastasiadis 1980: 66).
2. The received etymology of $fšáx(i)$

The most fanciful etymology for $fšáx(i)$ is put forward by Krinopoulos: “perhaps from βυζαστάκιον, βυζαστάχ, βυζαστάχ’” (1889: 66). None of these words are actually attested, as far as we know, and Archelaoi perceptively concludes that “Krinopoulos’ βυζαστάχιον is rashly derived (βεβιασμένον) from βυζάνω”, i.e. ‘suckle’ (1899: 277). Archelaoi notes that “some compare Turkish ušak (οὔσακ) from which, however, it does not seem to be derived, since that word is being used as well, and in any case, as a known word, ušak would not be changed to $fšáx$” (ibid.). This is a very important observation, as the parallel use of two etymologically identical words is unlikely, as in the case of $scéli > šcéli$ and $kulák > klák$, discussed in the introduction. Dawkins has the following to say: “Perhaps from Turk[ish] ušaq, ἀρσάκ, boy, although the parallel use of this word, pointed out by Arkh[elaos], is against this” (D658).

Ignoring the parallel use of $fšáx(i)$ and ušak, Andriotis squarely derives Pharasiot $fšáxi$ from ušak by assuming two changes. The first of these involves the fricativization of word-final [k] to [x] (A75), i.e. $ušak > *ušax$, which is integrated in the inflectional class of the inherited neuter nouns in -i by means of the integrator -i:17 $*ušax-i$ with velar [x] instead of palatal [ç], hence transcribed as φόσάχι by Andriotis (A76). The second one involves the sporadic change (κάποτε τρέπεται, A19) of word-initial [u] to [v] before a voiced and to [f] before an unvoiced consonant. Andriotis quotes just two examples of this change: $ušax > fšáxi$ and $uráði > vráði$ (A19), the latter a diminutive of ὄουρά ‘tail’ > ὀὐράδιον(v), itself secure attested in Medieval Greek (LME & LBG). Andriotis’ etymology of Cappadocian $fšáx$ and Pharasiot $fšáxi$ is accepted by his pupil Kesisoglou (1951: 10, 107),18 and repeated without further discussion by others.19

The first thing to note is the fact that both Dawkins and Andriotis assume that the source of $fšáx$ is ušak, that is to say the non-dialectal form of the word in Ottoman and Turkey Turkish. Dawkins observes that “the Turkish q (qaf, _QUOT_3;) medially and initially, except for an occasional confusion with γ […]’, keeps it Turkish sound, a hard back k; finally it almost everywhere becomes χ’, except at Ulağaç and ‘to a less extent also in Northwest Cappadocian (D86). For example, Ottoman Turkish qonaq (قنواع) ‘palace, mansion’ appears as konak at Floïta (D424) and at Ulağaç (D348, 354-8, twelve times). Kesisoglou notes the regular voicing of word-initial [k] to [g] in the post-exchange speech of refugees from Ulağaç (1951: 97-8): gonâk (pp. 9, 14, 31, 102). The “occasional confusion with γ’ in word-initial position seems to have become the rule in the post-exchange speech of refugees from Aravan, Axo and Misti, where konak appears as $γonaáx$.20 Similarly, Dawkins records Pharasiot konáxi (D683), whereas Andriotis has $γonaáxi$ (A76).

It is commonly known that the fricativization of syllable- and word-final [k] to [x] following back vowels is a characteristic feature of Anatolian Turkish.21 Old Turkic syllable- and word-final [k] very frequently appears as [x] in Old Anatolian Turkish, e.g. Old Turkic $yŏk > Old Anatolian Turkish $yoh ‘there is not’ (Timurtas 1976: 342, §37). In the written standard of Ottoman and Turkey Turkish, [k] has been restored (Ergin 1997:

---

89), but [x] is well attested in these positions in Central and East Anatolian Turkish [x]. For instance, Standard Turkish konak appears as gonah in Niğde Province (DS, vol. VI s.v. gonah), uşak as uşah in Kırşehir Province (DS, vol. XI s.v. uşah),22 and çocuk, another word for ‘child’, as çocuğ in Nevşehir Province (Korkmak 1994: 182, 65/2-4: çocuğ bis). Given the fact that fšáx is found “everywhere in Cappadocia” (D658), we have to assume that if uşak is the Turkish source of the word, it would have to be in its Old c.q. Central and East Anatolian form uşah.23 We then need to understand how uşah changed to fšáx, i.e. how word-initial [u] changed to [f].

As mentioned above, Andriotis assumes a sporadic but otherwise unexplained change of word-initial [u] to [v] in uráði > vráđi and to [f] in uşak > fšáx (A19). Now the fricativization of [u] to [v] before voiced and to [f] before unvoiced consonants is of course extremely well documented in the history of Greek in the case of the diphthongs [au], [eu] and [iu].24 Crucially, therefore, we would need a (mor)phonological environment in which the vowels [a], [e] or [i] are involved to allow for this particular change. As a matter of fact, Andriotis provides three examples in which the vowel sequence [ao] changes to [au] and then to [av] before voiced consonants in Pharsaiot: ἀωρός ‘unripe’ > αὐρός > ἀναρός (A19), ἀλλο ‘other’ > ἀο > ἀυ > ἀν (A19), , ἀλόγο ‘horse’ > ἀόγο > ἀογο > ἀνγο (A31). The last two involve the deletion of intervocalic [l], which is a characteristic feature of Pharsaiot. Both Dawkins (D154ff.) and Andriotis (A30) describe it in great detail, but fail to provide a phonetic explanation for the phenomenon. It is actually a well-known sound change attested in Romance, Germanic and Slavic palatapalata involving L-velarization before back vowels followed by L-vocalization and / or L-deletion. Recasens (2012) shows how several prominent articulatory and / or acoustic cues may be responsible for L-velarization, L-vocalization and L-deletion in Romance. It may be accordingly explained as involving the velarization of [l] to [w], which is subsequently deleted: álugo > álugo > áwugo > áleo > áuo > áνγο. The vocalization of [l] to [w] is still apparent in cases where [l] is preceded by a velar consonant, e.g. γλῶσσα > γλώσα > γνώσα ‘tongue’ (D158; A30).25

Anastasiadis, a native speaker of Pharsaiot, lists another example unrecorded by Dawkins and Andriotis: állóptος ‘fox’ > αβ’πός [sic] (2003: 55), which may be reconstructed as alopó > alopó > awopó > aopó > awopó > afpós (for αβ’πός). Dawkins quotes aopó from Avşar, but apó from Pharsa (D583; cf. A86, Andriotis 1974: 88).26 He notes that if the loss of intervocalic [l] results in a sequence of two different vowels, “they are generally kept apart [b]ut sometimes the vowels coalesce”

23 As one of our reviewers rightly observes, neither Dawkins nor Andriotis could have deduced this from their sources, which were written in the standard variety of their time.
24 For the early history of the change see Horrocks (2010: 163ff.).
25 One of our reviewers points out that there is at least one putative example in Pharsaiot of L-deletion before a front vowel: κάλυφος ‘shell’ > tšéfos (A56). Andriotis assumes the following changes: célífos > tsélífos (palatalization) > tšéfos (L-deletion) > béfos, with contraction of [ei] to [e] as in γείς ‘you have’ > éis > éis > és (A18). The latter form is explained by Dawkins as the result of “contraction after dissimilatory dropping of the first syllable” (D178). Instead of tšéfos one would have expected tšélífos [tʃelífos], as in mélísa ‘bee’ > mélsa / *mésa (226).
Avşar aopós is an example of the former, Pharasa após of the latter. A common hiatus resolution strategy is the insertion of a voiced fricative, either [ɣ] or [v]. Dawkins quotes a telling example: “διέβος (διάβολος) devil, gen. διάβον (odd accent) or διάβος or διάβης” (ibid.). 27 He also mentions the coexistence of ἄγου and ἄνου as variants of ἄου ‘other’ (cf. supra), listed under “λ is changed to γ” and “λ is changed to β” respectively (D158), but correctly explained previously: “the forms of ἀλλος in use, ἄγου, ἄβου, ἄου, suggest that the γ and β are later fillings of the hiatus, as they certainly are in the ending of the -αω verbs, which appears generally as -άγο, but sometimes as -άβο as well as -άω” (D155).

It is therefore likely that the raising of unstressed [o] to [u] in these examples is due to the vocalization of intervocalic [l] to [w] via [I] before its ultimate deletion: ἀλο > ἀλο > ἀω > ἀο > ἀυ. This is confirmed by cases like πολλά ‘many’ > puá (D157; A19), which may be reconstructed as polá > polá > powá > puá. These are the only instances where unstressed [o] is raised to [u] in Pharasiot according to Dawkins: “At Pharasa these changes do not occur, except that it is difficult to explain ἀβου for ἢλου otherwise” (D149). The only apparent exception is the above mentioned ἀορος > auros > avros, quoted by Andriotis (A19), but not recorded by Anastasiadis (2003) nor, quite surprisingly, by Andriotis in his lexicon of archaisms in the Modern Greek dialects, who instead lists ἀγορος, attested in several Modern Greek dialects including Cappadocian (Silata) and Pontic (Ophis) (1974: 170). 28 In this particular case, the change of [o] to [u] is unexpected, Ancient Greek {o} being normally preserved in Pharasiot. 29 Andriotis quotes evidence from Rhodian to further illustrate the change of [ao] to [au] and of [au] to [av]: Medieval Greek ἀγορίδα ‘sour grape’ > auría > avría, Latin magulum ‘cheek’ → Medieval Greek μάγουλο (LBG & LME) > máulo > mávlo, Ancient Greek σάγον ‘jaw’ > Medieval Greek σάγονο (LME s.v. κατωσάγονο ‘chin’) > σάνο < sávno (A19; cf. Tsopanakis 1940: 54).

In all these cases unstressed [u] changes to [v] when preceded by (stressed or unstressed) [a] and followed by a voiced consonant, just as the older diphthong [au] changed to [av] in this particular context. The phenomenon is called ‘frication’ by Horrocks (2010: 165ff.) and, with reference to Sino-Tibetan and Grassfield Bantu languages, ‘high vowel fricativization’ by Faytak (2014), whose ‘report’ is probably the most detailed phonetic-phonological study published in recent years. 30 But how are we to imagine high vowel fricativization in the case of vráði and fsáxi(i)? The only plausible explanation would be to invoke the definite article, more specifically the neuter plural article ta, which would provide the preceding [a] necessary for the fricativization of the following [u]. As a matter of fact, there are two well-known examples of metanalysis involving the prefixation of the definite article which have made the inherited words almost unrecognizable in their modern shape. The first one is Ancient Greek ὣν ‘egg’, articulated plural τὸ ὄν > Post-classical Greek ta oá (monophthongization) > ta oá (hiatus resolution) > ta urá (mid vowel raising) > ta νά (high vowel fricativization) > t’aván (metanalysis) > ta aván → sg. to aván (Andriotis 1983: 2; cf. Triantafyllidis 1998;

29 For exceptions see A16 & A18; cf. D149.
30 One of our reviewers correctly observes that Faytak’s analysis is not necessarily supported by the Cappadocian and Pharasiot data presented in this paper, but the term ‘high vowel fricativization’ is his and at least some of the examples quoted suggest the kind of chain shift discussed by Faytak, i.e. raising of unstressed [o] to [u] and subsequent fricativization of [u] to [v].
The second example is Ancient Greek οὐτίον ‘ear’, articulated pl. τὰ οὕτια > Post-classical Greek τὰ οὕτα > τὰ οὐτά (mid vowel raising) > τὰ ψάχα (high vowel fricativization) > τὰ αἰφία (metanalysis) > τὰ αἰφία > sg. to αἰφί (Andriotis 1983: 45; cf. Triantafyllidis 1998; Babiniotis 2002, 2011).

To explain vrάði this way, one would have to presuppose a metanalysis from the articulated pl. τὰ ράδια > τὰ ράδια → sg. το ράδι. Whereas it is easy to see how the frequent use of the articulated plurals τὰ οὐά ‘the eggs’ and τὰ οὐά ‘the ears’ led to the metanalyzed singulars αὐγό and αφί, it is rather difficult to envisage a world in which it should be more common to refer to a plurality of tails rather than to individual tails. This appears from the various shapes of the word, which is preserved as an archaism in several Modern Greek dialects, e.g. Pontic urάð(in), ωοάρ(in), ράδι and, significantly τúράδιn (Papadopoulos 1958-61 s.v. ωοῦράν). The last variant is particularly instructive as it is metanalyzed from to τράδιn > τ’ τράδιn → το τράδι, pl. τα τράδια. It is also recorded at Sinasos by Archelaos (1899: 271 s.v. τουράδιν; cf. Takadopoulos 1982: 190; Rizos 2007: 215). Another diminutive variant is τράτσα, listed by Karolidis for Misti and other Cappadocian varieties (1885: 216), or τράδεα, listed by Archelaos for ‘Bagdaonian’ (1899: 271), which refers to Cappadocian minus Sinasos (D10). According to Dawkins, τράτσα “seems to be for τ(ο)υοάδ(ι)σα (D630), i.e. τ’ ραύατσα > τράδεα > τράδεα or τράδεα (with regular syncope of unstressed [u] and [i]).” In contemporary Miśótiika, τράδα is simplified to τράζα.

The case of Pharasiot vrάδi thus becomes crucial, as it appears to be the only evidence for the putative fricativization of unstressed [u] to [v] before a voiced consonant, to wit the rhotic liquid [r]. In this respect, it is noteworthy that several 19th-century sources record vorάδi instead of vrάδi for Pharasiot, suggesting that the latter is a syncopated form of the former. This further complicates an analysis in terms of high vowel fricativation, especially since there are no other examples of a change from unstressed [u] to [v] before [r] in Pharasiot (nor in any other Greek variety we are aware of).

3. The history and etymology of ψάχ

This brings us back to the putative fricativization of [u] to [f] in ωάχ > ψάχ(i). In this particular case, it is not very difficult to imagine a world in which references to a plurality of children would be as frequent as references to individual children. Compare, for instance, the beginning of a folktale from Ulağaç: ἀνδρὰ νέκα ἕιςκαν δόξικα ψάχ(α) [ce] da ψέα-t éπαν εἰ ‘A man [and] a woman had twelve children [and] the children said’ (D346). Here we have the necessary context for the putative high vowel fricativization: articulated nom.-acc. pl. *τα ψάξα-ta > τα ψάξα > τα ψάξα > τα ψάξα > τα ψάξα, the raising of [a] to [e] before [i] or [j] in ψέ(ε)α being optional.36

---

31 Cappadocian οὐρά (D663 s.v. υοῦρα) is the result of a similar metanalysis, whereas Pharasiot υό is more likely the result of hiatus resolution: τὸ υόν > τ(ο) υό > τ’ υόν → το υό, pl. τα υά (A55).
33 Cf. Dawkins (D62), Jansse (2020b: §6.2.1.1).
36 Cf. Dawkins (D65), Kesisoglu (1951: 9).
In the case of Pharasiot this would result in the following scenario: *uṣāh* → *uṣáxi*, articulated plural *ta uṣáxja > ta fšáxe → sg. to fšáxi*, gen. *tu fšáxu*. As noted above, the integrator -i is used to integrate the loan noun in the inflectional class of the neuter nouns. It was originally a diminutive suffix, which was very productive in Post-classical Greek (Horrocks 2010: 175), but became “semantically neuter” in Medieval Greek (2010: 262). It is the regular integrator of Turkish loan nouns ending in a consonant, especially of “Turkish names of things” (sic), as Dawkins notes with reference to Pharasiot (D164), but more accurately of “Turkish substantives […] the meaning of which does not involve the idea of personality” with reference to Cappadocian (D90). Inherited diminutives like *παιδίον* > Cappadocian *pedi vel sim.* naturally belong here and so it seems to make sense that Turkish *uṣah* should be integrated in this inflectional class.

Due to the regular apocope of final unstressed [i] in Cappadocian, the integrator -i does not appear in the nom.-acc. sg. of loan nouns such as *fšáx*, but it reappears in the nom.-acc. pl. *fšáxi-ja > fšáxja > fšájja > fšėjja* and in the gen. sg.-pl. *fšáxi-u > fšaxjú > fšajjú > fšėjű*. Quite surprisingly, however, the endings -jū, -ja are only attested in three Cappadocian dialects: *fšája / fšėja / fšėa* and *fšajjū / fšajjū / fšėjű* at Ulağac (D65, D658, passim; Kesisoglou 1951: 32, passim) and *fšėja and fšėjű* at Aravan (D330; Phosteris & Kesisoglou 1960: 148). Instead of *fšáxja* we find *fšáxa* at Anaku (Kostakis 1964: 84), Malakopi (Karphopoulos 2008: 143), Sinasos (Archelaos 1899: 141) and Silata, where *fšája* is recorded as an alternative to *fšáxa* by Dawkins (D448, D658). At Floīta (D412, D426), Dalmes (D314, D318ff.), Axo (Mavrochalyvidis & Kesisoglou 1960: 218) and Misti (Kostakis 1977: 154) *fšaxū* is attested in addition to *fšáxa*. These forms resemble *fšāx* at Pharasa and *fšāx* at Avşar (D574), where the endings -ū and -a are regular for the inflectional class to which *fšāx* belongs (D152, A36). In Cappadocian, on the other hand, one would expect the endings -jū and -ja, i.e. *fšaxjū* and *fšāxjā* and later developments of these forms. Compare, for instance, Anatolian Turkish *konah > konāx, konāxja* at Fertek (D328) and Floīta (D418) and *γonāx, γonaxjū* at Axo (Mavrochalyvidis & Kesisoglou 1960: 196), *gonaxjū* and *gonāxja* at Misti (Janse 2019: 91). Being isolated forms, it looks as if *fšaxū* and *fšāx* are archaïsms and *fšaxjū* and *fšāxjā* analogical innovations.

As already noted above, the fricativization of word-final [k] to [x] is a characteristic feature of Anatolian Turkish, which is normally not found at Ulağac, where Standard Turkish *konak* is borrowed as *konάx, gen. konāxjū, pl. konāxjā* (D348) or, in the post-exchange speech of refugees from Ulağac, *gonak, gen. gonakjū, pl. gonakjā* (Kesisoglou 1951: 9, 31). Likewise, *kabak ‘pumpkin’ > gabak, kaymak ‘cream’ > gaimak, kapak ‘lid’ > gapak*, listed by Kesisoglou to illustrate the regular voicing of word-initial [k] to [g] before back vowels (1951: 97). He also mentions the fricativization of [k] to [x], which is introduced as follows: “In Turkish mouths the following changes probably also took place” (1951: 98). The only example of word-final [k] quoted there is *uṣak > fšāx (ibid.),* but there is one other listed in the glossary: *merak ‘anxiety’ > merăx* (p. 104). This is remarkable, as *merak* is attested at Malakopi (Karphopoulos 2008: 119), where word-final [k] is also regularly preserved in Turkish loan nouns (D86). It is difficult to decide

---

37 For the change (‘synizesis’) of [ia] to [e] in Pharasiot see Dawkins (D152), Andriotis (A17f.); the change of [i] to [u] is explained as ‘synizesis’ by the former (D152), as ‘apocope’ by the latter (A23).
38 The diminutive of *fšax* is *fšaxjokko > fšókko* in Pharasiot (D658; A42; Anastasiadis 1980: 80).
39 Cf. Dawkins (D62), Janse (2020b: §6.2.1.1)
40 Kotsanidis records *merăk* (2006: 138) instead of the expected *merāx*, listed by Koimisoglou (2006: 211); compare *merăx* at Axo (Mavrochalyvidis 1990: 632). It is likely that *merăx* is sometimes replaced by *merăk*.
whether the isolated fšāx and merāx are archaisms rather than innovations at Ulağac or
the other way around. The fact that fšāx is used instead of the expected *fšāk at Malakopi
as well as at Silata and Floïta, two other dialects where word-final [k] is preserved, albeit
“to a less degree” in the case of the former and “probably also to some extent” in the case
of the latter (D86), suggests that it is more likely to be a pan-Cappadocian archaism. This
would explain the parallel use of uşak > uşāk, noted by Archelaos, whose astute
observation is repeated here: “as a known word, uşak would not be changed to fšāx”
(1899: 277).

Dawkins seems to agree with Archelaos and tentatively explains fšāx as “a singular
formed from the Turk[ish] plural ev-uşaq-larǝ, ‘the household’, ‘the boys of the house’”
(D658). A derivation by metanalysis from an indefinite izafet construction (Lewis 2000:
41) such as ev uşak-lar-i is not very likely in light of the existence of such forms in
Cappadocian,41 e.g. Turkish hamam sahibi ‘bathowner’ > Ulağac do xamamjü do sâbîsî
(D376), Turkish oda sahibi ‘room owner’ > Axo odá sâabîs (D402). We would have to
assume that singular ev uşāq-i would have been borrowed as *evušāyî > *efšāyî (syncope)
> *efšāyî (integration) > *fšāx (apocope and final devoicing) > fšāx (apheresis).
Apheresis of initial unstressed [e] is rare in Cappadocian,42 as in Pharsial (A22), though
attested in a few words, e.g. τὸ ἐρίφι ‘grandchild’ > to (ŋ)gón, τὸ ἐρίφι ‘kid’ > to ríf, but
Turkish evlat > to evlát vel sim. (cf. supra). Phonologically, then, Dawkins’ etymology is
certainly imaginable, but semantically it does not really make sense, given the fact that
ev uşaq-i is used to refer to a male servant, i.e. a ‘boy’ in a specialized sense, not to a ‘boy’
in its primary sense of ‘male child’, let alone to a ‘little boy’ or even a ‘little child, baby’
without regard to sex.

We believe that the parallell use of uşāk and fšāx observed by Archelaos together
with the phonological and inflectional peculiarities of the latter indicate that fšāx(i) is
indeed an archaism. This does not preclude the possibility that fšāx derives from to uşāx<br>
< Anatolian Turkish uşâh, along the lines sketched above, although word-initial high
vowel fricativization is not particularly well documented in either Cappadocian or
Pharsiol, the only trustworthy witness being precisely fšāx(i).43 Elsewhere, we have
tentatively suggested a slightly different etymology and, indeed, chronology, which
would better explain its phonological peculiarities and also accounts for its deviant
inflection.44 Turkish uşak, Anatolian Turkish uşâh is derived from Old Turkish uvsak
‘s’small’;45 Clauson notes that uvsak is “very rare in its original form and soon replaced by
uşak” (1973: 16). As there is no trace of the word in documents written in Old Anatolian
Turkish, a direct derivation of Cappadocian fšāx / Pharsiol fšâx from uvsak cannot be
proved, but neither can it be excluded altogether, as it would offer an alternative
explanation of the initial [f] in both words: uvsak > Anatolian Turkish uşâh > ufšâx >
articulated to ufšâx > to fsâx (apheresis). The development would be comparable to to
urâði > to ruð(â)î, attested in several Pontic and Dodecanese dialects, and also to Chian to
urjâði > to rjâði > t’ orjâði by metanalysis (Andriotis 1974: 422).

41 For discussion see Janse (2019: 93-4 fn. 39).
43 As pointed out above, vrâði < varâði is a doubtful case.
It should be noted, however, that *ušak / ušak is an adjective and it was clearly borrowed as such in Cappadocian.\textsuperscript{46} This explains the irregular inflection of the word in the North and Central Cappadocian dialects. The 11\textsuperscript{th}-century Qarakhânid scholar Mahmûd al-Kâšgârî, who does not record *ušak, writes: “Things that are small (ṣiyâr) are called ušaq nân. Hence babies (ṣibyân) are called ušaq oylân” (1982: 108), i.e. ‘little boys’ (Nadîljaev et al. 1969: 617). Kâšgârî adds: “This word is not used for the singular but only for the plural” (ibid.). Translated into Cappadocian this would have been *u(f)šáxa peðjâ, with obligatory marking of the plural, articulated ta ûšaxa ta peðjâ, with adjectival instead of nominal inflection of ûšax, by analogy with ta mikrâ ta peðjâ ‘the little boys’.\textsuperscript{47} The genitive singular would be *tu ûšaxu tu peðjû, a construction which had become rare in early 20\textsuperscript{th}-century Cappadocian but is still attested at Potamia, e.g. tu kalû tu nêkas ‘of the good wife’ (D115).

We believe that this scenario is the only plausible explanation for the adjectival inflection of ûšax, which is another indication that it is indeed an archaic loan word. Due to the regular apocope of final unstressed [u] in Cappadocian, gen. ûšaxu ended up being syncratic with nom. ûšax, which resulted in two different ‘repair strategies’ (Janse 2019: 97-8): the North and Central Cappadocian dialects copied the ending of the gen. pl. -în > -û in the singular: ûšaxu > ûšax > ûšaxû, whereas the South Cappadocian dialects adopted the so-called ‘agglutinative inflection’,\textsuperscript{48} which would become the regular inflection of Turkish loan adjectives ending in a consonant, e.g. zengin ‘rich’ → zengûn, pl. zengûnja (D115). As this was also the regular inflection of substantivized adjectives (D115), ûšax was integrated in the inflectional class of the inherited neuter nouns in -î in South Cappadocian as well as in Pharasiot: ûšax(i), gen. ûšaxî-u > ûšaxjû > ûšaxjû > ûšajû, pl. ûšajî-i > ûšaxjîa > ûšaxjîa > ûšajîa. In North and Central Cappadocian, however, ûšax preserved its archaic adjectival inflection: gen. ûšaxû, nom. ûšaxa. The substantivization of ûšax(i) in Cappadocian and Pharasiot runs parallel with the substantivization of ušak which meant both ‘small’ (without connotation of plurality) and ‘small boy’ in Ottoman Turkish from the 14\textsuperscript{th} century onwards (Clauson 1972: 16).

4. Conclusion

In this paper we reassessed the etymology of Cappadocian ûšax ‘child’ and Pharasiot ûšaxî ‘boy’. We argued that Anatolian Turkish ušâh was the source of the borrowing instead of Standard Turkish ušak, as hitherto assumed. We also investigated the alledged change of word-initial [u] to [f] before unvoiced consonants and concluded that the change from ušâh to ûšax(i) could be explained as an isolated case of word-initial high vowel fricativization in the articulated plural *tu ušaxa > ta ûšaxa, comparable to ta oṭjâ ‘the ears’ > ta uṭjâ (mid-vowel raising) > ta fʃjâ (high vowel fricativization) > t’ aʃfjâ (metanalysis), sg. to aʃfî in Modern Greek. We compared the alledged change of word-initial [u] to [v] in urâdî ‘tail’ to vrâdî in Pharasiot with the comparable change of ta oʃâ

\textsuperscript{46} We are aware of the controversy about the lack of categorial distinction between nouns and adjectives in Turkish, e.g. Grönbech (1936: 3), Godel (1945: 45), Başkakov (1958: 60), Erdal (1991: 132 fn. 187), Braun & Haig (2000), but see Bağrıaçık (2018) for syntactic arguments in favour of a lexical distinction between the two.

\textsuperscript{47} The doubling of the article is obligatory in the case of inherited neuter nouns like pêdî (Janse 2020b: §8.1.2.1). The phenomenon is often called ‘determiner spreading’ or ‘polydefiniteness’ (Lekakou & Karatsareas 2016).

'the eggs’ > ta ἡπά > ta νῆδα > τ’ ἡπά, sg. to ἡπῷ in Modern Greek, but concluded that Pharasiot ῥάδι must be considered a syncopated variant of an older variant ῥαδί. We also concluded that it was difficult to imagine an articulated plural context in the case of ν(α)ράδι in light of the many dialect forms based on the articulated singular to ῥάδι > Pontic and Dodecanese τά ῥάδι, Chian τ’ ῥάδι and again Pontic τά ῥάδιν. We further argued that ἕσαξ(ι) has to be considered an archaism in light of the parallel use of ὦσάκ reported in 19th-century sources. The fact that ἕσαξ instead of *ἐσάκ is securely attested in Cappadocian dialects where word-final [k] does not change to [x] in Turkish loan nouns is another argument in favour of the archaism of ἕσαξ. Finally, we argued that the irregular inflection of ἕσαξ in North and Central Cappadocian – gen. ἕσαξυ instead of ἕσαξύ, pl. ἕσαξα instead of ἕσαξα – is another sign of the archaic character of the word which was probably borrowed as an adjective from Old Anatolian Turkish before it became substantivized in Ottoman Turkish. Finally, we suggested an alternative etymology for ἕσαξ(ι) from ὦνσάκ, an adjective attested in Old Turkic, although unattested in Old Anatolian: ὀσάκ ὦσάκα ἕσαξα ta ὀσάκα ta ὄσάκα ‘the little children’ > ta ἕσαξα ‘the little ones’ by apheresis. We believe that our little exercise in historical linguistics offers a better explanation of the etymology of ἕσαξ(ι) and a more secure establishment of the chronology of its borrowing from Old Anatolian Turkish.
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TABLE 1: Classification of the Cappadocian dialects

North Cappadocian

Northwest
- Silata
- Anaku
- Floïta
- Malakopi

Northeast
- Sinasos
- Potamia
- Delmeso

Central Cappadocian
- Axo
- Misti

South Cappadocian

Southwest
- Aravan
- Ghurzono
- Fertek

Southeast
- Ulağaç
- Semendere

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