THE PONTIC DIALECT OF MODERN GREEK IN ASIA MINOR AND RUSSIA.

By Professor R. M. DAWKINS, M.A.

THE region of Pontos, where until the recent removal and dispersion of the Christian population after the War the Pontic dialect of Greek was spoken, may be taken to be the towns and villages on the south coast of the Black Sea and in the valleys running down to it, all the way from Sinope in the west to beyond Trebizond on the east, almost as far as the Russian frontier. Here to the east of Trebizond are first the valley of Sourmena and then that of Of, in both of which a special and in some ways very archaic dialect of Pontic was spoken. In its most archaic form this dialect still survives among the Moslems of Of, descendants of the Greeks of this region, who under the pressure of the rule of the Dere Beys in the seventeenth century reluctantly changed their religion.[1] This long coastal strip of Greek-speaking places has an important extension inland to the south of Trebizond which runs up the Pyxitis valley with its three great monasteries, Panayia Soumelá, St. John Vazelón, and St. George Peristeróna, to the inland mining district centring round Argyropolis, called by the Turks Gümüsh-khane, a name which equally means the "Silver City". With this must be reckoned too the westward-lying region of Nikopolis and its surrounding villages.[2] From all

---

[1] Since this great dispersal it is only in the Of Valley that Greek is spoken in Asia Minor : there and by a few Moslem refugees from Crete who voluntarily left their homes at the downfall of the Sultan's government in the late nineties of the last century. Some of them went to Adalia, and I found them there in 1929, still talking Greek of the Cretan sort. They had brought their wives with them and children born at Adalia were being brought up, in spite of Turkish protests, to speak the language. See *Byzantion*, viii, p. 259. " We can't give up talking Greek," one of them said to me. Δὲν μποροῦμε νὰ κόψωμε τὰ 'Ελληνικά μας.

[2] The best list of these Greek-speaking places arranged geographically is in 'Η ἐν Πόντῳ 'Ελληνικὴ Φυλή, ἤτοι τὰ Ποντικά, Athens, 1866, by Περικλῆς, Τριανταφυλλίδης, pp. 19–147.

these regions Greeks have in recent years gone to the eastern
Black Sea ports, Batoum and Sokhoum, and from Argyropolis
the Sultans for many years sent out colonies of miners to work
the mines in all their eastern dominions. These colonies,
many of them keeping their Pontic speech and all of them
their ecclesiastical allegiance to the See of Khaldia, reached
as far as the Taurus Mountains and the Euphrates and were
very numerous in the Ak Dagh region.[1]

Apart from these colonies, it is in the regions to the south
of the Black Sea that the dialect has been spoken continuously
and no doubt developed its special features. How long ago
it separated itself from common Greek it is impossible to
say. One piece of evidence we have. Assam Bey, King of
Persia, died in 1478 ; an Italian merchant travelling in Persia
from 1511 to 1520 tells us that he talked with this king's
children in the Greek of Trebizond. This language they had
learned from their mother Despoina, who was a daughter
of the Emperor of Trebizond. The author calls her by the
half-Turkish name Despinacaton, which is Despoina Khatoun,
Lady Despoina. Hatzidakis finds Pontic forms in a document
of 1364.[2] But there can be no doubt that the language is
much older than this. Trebizond was far from the great
centres of Greek life, and this isolation would be favourable
to local linguistic developments. And quite apart from this,
the Turkish irruptions of the thirteenth century cut off these
people very effectually from any close contact with the rest
of the Greek world. All the circumstances were favourable
to the production of a very separate dialect, almost a fresh
language.[3]

The closest connections of Pontic are with the dialects of
Cappadocia, and these again have certain links with the
dialect of Cyprus. From Cappadocia the Pontic area was

[1] For a summary account of these Pontic colonies with references see
Modern Greek in Asia Minor, by R. M. Dawkins, pp. 6–9.

[2] *A Narration of Italian Travels in Persia*, Hakluyt Society, 1873, p. 183,
and Φιλολογικαὶ ᾿Ερευναι, i, p. 284.

[3] For this see a paper in *Byzantion*, vi (1931), *Notes on the Study of the
Modern Greek of Pontos*, especially p. 389. This short paper of mine is
a preliminary to the present one.

separated by a band of Turkish speakers; certainly before
the Turkish conquests the relations between the two were
very much closer than they have ever been since. Beyond
Cappadocia lies the village of Pharasa in the Taurus; the
dialects resemble one another so much that Pharasa may
almost be suspected to have been some very old colony
from a Pontic-speaking region.[1]

So much may be said of Pontic in Asia Minor, its original
home. But the title of this paper implies that some at least
of the Greek now spoken in Southern Russia was brought
over to that country from the southern shores of the Black
Sea; and this we know is in fact the case. In the days of
the Empire of Trebizond there were close connections with
the Tauric Chersonnese, from which corn was largely brought
to Trebizond. The whole district was called Perateia
(Περατεία), the " Land Beyond ", and the emperors styled
themselves " of all Anatolia, Iberia, and Perateia ".[2] This
early connection was strengthened later by the policy of
Russia, which in the eighteenth century made a strong effort
to expand into the southern Balkans; her aim was Con-
stantinople. This policy brought her into close contact with
the Greeks, many of whom came from their homes in the
regions which were then entirely under the rule of the Turks
to take refuge in the lands of the great Orthodox power of
the north; and of these Greek emigrants many came from
the southern shores of the Black Sea. It has in this way
come about that there are in the south of Russia, near the
Sea of Azov, Greeks who speak the same dialect as those
inhabitants of Pontos who have so recently been removed
thence and are now settled in various parts of the Greek
kingdom.

The migrations to Russia did not cease with the eighteenth
century, and we are told something of these later movements

---

[1] A new and fuller study of the Pharasa dialect, still spoken by the
refugees at Moskhato between Athens and the Piræus, is very much needed.
An outline of its grammar is in my *Modern Greek in Asia Minor*.

[2] See the work of Chrysanthos, Metropolitan of Trebizond, Ἡ Ἐκκλησία
Τραπεζοῦντος, pp. 94, 512. This book forms vols. iv and v of the Ἀρχεῖον
Πόντου, Athens, 1936.

in an article in the periodical *Pandora*.[1] In 1812 many Greeks came to Theodosia in the Crimea from Trebizond or Sinope, or at least used these ports as places of embarkation ; in 1853 the number of Greeks at Theodosia is given as more than 16,000. In brief, we have good if not detailed information of large recent migrations from Pontos to Russia.

The bulk of the Greeks of Russia have lived, as far as the West is concerned, a secluded life. The more educated people, much like Greeks elsewhere, have no doubt spoken the common vernacular Greek and written the standard purified language, the *katharévousa*, of Greek official life. The idiom of the people has, however, been always their own dialect, and these dialects the Soviet Government has lately much to the advantage of philologists, been adopting as the official language of education and literature.[2]

The number of Greek speakers in Russia is considerable. I have been in correspondence with Professor Anatol Semenov, of Rostov, and he tells me that there are two linguistic centres : Rostov on Don and Mariupol in the Crimea. At Mariupol there are, he says, 60,000 Greeks, at Rostov there are 100,000 ; these latter all speak the Pontic dialect. In addition there are some 6,000 Greeks who use the ordinary Modern Greek spoken language, and a further 114,000 whom he reckons as Greeks, but who now speak not Greek but Armenian, Tartar, or Turkish ; the location and history of these people I do not know for certain.

Until the year 1926 the Greek schools at Rostov taught the purified, the *katharévousa*, form of the language, exactly as did the schools in Greece itself. Then in 1926 the Soviet Government got to work, and the Greek demotic was introduced ; of these demotic school books I have now in my possession a whole series. But, writing in 1934, Professor Semenov told me that steps were then being taken to go even further and to introduce the Pontic dialect into the

---

[1] *Πανδώρα*, iv (1853).

[2] Of these little books—I give a few titles below—I have now a fairly good collection, due to the kindness first of Professor Anatol Semenov, of Rostov, and later of the Russian authorities there.

schools ; in this dialect I have acquired quite a number of
books of which the earliest is dated 1931. They deal for the
most part with political and social subjects, but I have also
a number of works of fiction, all translations from the Russian.
The demotic school books in my possession are dated as late
as 1934 ; so the proposed transition to the use of Pontic in
education cannot as yet be more than just beginning. Of
the books in Pontic a few notable titles may here be mentioned.
Νεον απϛτανοβκα, νεα προβλιματα τι νικοκιριακυ χτιϛιματος
(*New Circumstances, New Problems of Household Management*),
by I. Stalin.—*Aς ιμες ετιμι* (*Let us be ready*), by M. Gorki.—
Ο κοκκινον ϛτρατον ϛο ϛιμερνον τιν ιμεραν (*The Red Army
at the Present Day*), by P. Ouratsev.—*Αντιθριϛκεφτικον
ενχιριδιον για τι χορετας* (*Anti-religious Handbook for
Peasants*), by M. M. Steinman.—*Τι κομυνιϛτονος τα ιμερας*
(*The Communist's Days*), by I. Gratskoff.—*Τα Φιτανια,
δραμαν ϛε τρια πρακϛις* (*The Intrigues, Play in three Acts*),
by Bolzhanin.—*Ο γιον τι μπολλϛϛεβικυ* (*The Son of the
Bolshevik*), by P. Dorokhov.—Another short story, *To
πετυμενον Νινβιτ* (*The Flying Monster*), by S. Stopnitskiy.
—Two longer novels, *Απϛιματενεν Χαλαρδια* (*Storm of Fire*),
by A. Serafimovitz, and *Τϛεμεντ* (*Cement*), by F. Glatkov.
Of the orthography employed something will be said later.
If anyone wants to see what one of these books is like,
Απϛιματενεν Χαλαρδια has been translated into English as
The Iron Flood and published in London in 1935. With the
contents of this literature of the new orthodoxy I am not
here concerned, but I may quote from the preface to *The
Iron Flood* : *Ο Σεραφιμόβιτζ επερίγραπϛεν τα μεγάλα τα
γεγονότα με μαρκϛιϛτικον προλετάρικον αναλιϛιν.*

Lastly, a man called *Τοπχαρα* has written a grammar of
the dialect, which I have failed to obtain ; it seems to be
out of print. Another Greek, Kanonidis, is said to be preparing
a dictionary ; it cannot come too soon. From the books
I have enumerated and from others in my collection I have
drawn the material used in this paper. I have no oral
acquaintance with this Russian Greek.

As this Greek of Rostov is a variety of Pontic, a discussion

of it is essentially a part of the present paper. But before I go on to it, a few words must be devoted to the dialect of Mariupol. Of this very little indeed was known until the veil was to some extent lifted in a paper in Russian by M. V. Sergievsky : " The Mariupol Greek Dialects : an attempt at a brief description." This appeared in the *Bulletin de l'Académie des Sciences de l'U.R.S.S.,* Classe des sciences sociales, 1934, No. 7 ; I have used a privately made translation from the Russian original.[1] Sergievsky was in Mariupol in the summer of 1933 as a member of a commission for solving the problem of the literary language of the Greeks in the Soviet Union, and his paper is based on the observations he made ; it is not therefore the work of a man who could himself speak the dialect. He also used printed matter published at Mariupol in the dialect, notably Φλογομινιτρες Σπιθες, 1933, which contains work in prose and verse by the local poet, G. Kosto-prav. I possess this and also a poem by the same man called Λεοντι Χοναγπεις, published in 1934, and a 1935 volume, Νεοτιτα, which contains a good deal of his work and that of some other dialect writers, both in prose and verse. Much of Νεοτιτα is, however, written in the common demotic, as are several other books in my possession published recently at Mariupol.

My material is therefore confessedly very far from complete. Still it is sufficient to enable me to make a few observations on this extremely interesting dialect or, to speak more accurately, group of allied dialects.

The Mariupol Greeks are reckoned by Sergievsky as 97,000 odd, but of these only some 82,000 speak Greek ; the rest are now using Crimean Tartar, which they acquired during their stay in the Crimea before they migrated to the shores of the Sea of Azov.[2] From Semenov I have quoted the rather lower figure of 60,000. The writer of the article which I have quoted from *Pandora* gives the number at his time, 1854, as no more than 3,300 ; possibly here he is taking into account

[1] This original is in the British Museum : Press mark Ac. 1125/4.

[2] Evidence for this migration is afforded by the identity of some of the names of the Mariupol villages with places in the Crimea.

only one of the Mariupol villages. The speakers of Greek
now live in fifteen villages in the Donetz region, lands formerly
reckoned in the districts of Mariupol and Stalin. The most
typical dialect is that of Sartana and Chermalyk, and this
with some admixture of common Greek has become the
language of the local press. Another variety of the dialect
is spoken at Maly Yanisol and Chardakly, and a third at
Yalta and Urzuf. The dialects of the other villages may
be classed in one or the other of these three leading types.
The Mariupol Greek is thus, Sergievsky concludes, a complex
of several independent dialects closely related one to another,
but each having its own specific features.

Some light might be thrown on the Mariupol dialects by
looking at the history of the non-Pontic Greeks in Southern
Russia. Of their origin we know a little, though we would
gladly know more. There were ancient Greek colonies on
the northern as well as on the southern shore of the Black
Sea ; these colonies gradually fell before invaders and lost
their independence ; finally they were all absorbed by Tartar
and Turkish conquests. Greek refugees collected in the Tauric
Chersonnese and lived under Greek rulers, until in the year
1474 their last ruler, Isaac, was killed by the Turks.

When at the end of the eighteenth century Greeks, as I have
said, came over from Turkey into Russia in the time of the
Empress Elizabeth, there was a notable revival in these
regions ; Greeks were brought from their scattered places
of refuge and settled in Mariupol, in which district they are
still living and speaking their language.

This Mariupol Greek hardly concerns the present paper,
for the first and most notable point about it is that it is not
a Pontic dialect. There are several very distinctive features,
all of which are found in almost every form of Pontic, and
in the Mariupol Greek every one of these is missing. Of these
we may take the absence of the aorist subjunctive, the
imperative in -ον, the peculiar order of the verb and the
pronominal object, and some curious forms of declension
which I shall notice below : the plurals in -αντοι, and the
genitive in -ονος of the second declension masculine nouns in

-ος. For the negative Pontic never uses the usual Greek δέν, but always κί; in Mariupol Greek both are used, δέν and t'i, where the t' is a dental regularly appearing in some forms of the dialect in place of κ before e and i. As examples of this t' Sergievsky gives kót'nas for κόκκινος, skulét' for σκωλήκι, t'irós for καιρός. Further the dialect lacks the possessives derived from ἐμός, σός, ἡμέτερος, the form ἐσεῖτ and other such variants for ἐσεῖς, the -οῦμαι passive of -ώνω verbs, and the appearance of the ancient η as ε, all of which are marks of Pontic.

There are at the same time curious resemblances : Tartar verbs have the ending -evu, bildraevu " I explain ", Turkish bildirmek, and so on, just as in Pontic, where we get ἀραέβω, " I seek," from aramaq, λακερτεύω, " I speak," etc., while in Cappadocia they all have the same ending as in common Greek, -ντίζω (or -ντῶ) : καζδῶ, " I dig," from qazmaq, ὀτουρδούζω " I sit down," from oturmaq, etc.

But it must in general be concluded that Mariupol Greek is very different from any form of Pontic, just as it differs very widely from any other form of Modern Greek. In particular the endings of the verb are very odd. Just as in Pontic and in the Cappadocian dialects, there is a distinction made in declension between the words for living beings and those for inanimate objects, between what the Greeks call ἔμψυχα and ἄψυχα; but at Mariupol the ἄψυχα become formally neuter, while in Asia they retain the old masculine and feminine endings. As in Pontic too, there is a tendency towards the loss of the feminine endings, and this even in words for living beings, but with a difference : at Mariupol the feminine endings tend to be replaced by the neuter, and we find kaló inéka, " the good woman," and for the plural kalá inékis, while in Pontic we shall see below that the feminine endings merge, very notably in the plural, into the masculine, and we get, e.g. from Sourmena, οἱ καλοὶ γυναῖκ' (for γυναῖκοι) with an accusative τοὶ γυναίκους. In these breakings down of the old system of gender and declension the Pontic and Mariupol dialects have clearly something in common, but the lines along which the development has gone are so very

different that any relation between the two dialects must be regarded as extremely remote. In both cases long isolation has had its effect. Probably too an absence of any higher culture has allowed the language to escape from the restraining influence of the written Greek and the language of the church ; dialect development has proceeded with less hindrance, less brake on its speed, than in more central regions. The question of foreign influence, beyond those obviously to be detected in the vocabulary, is more difficult ; in particular one would like to know the origin of this otherwise quite un-Greek distinction between the declension of animates and inanimates. But further study of Mariupol Greek is needed before these questions can be more than mentioned.

If we seek to place the Mariupol dialect among the other dialects of Modern Greek, we are bound at once to remark that it is so different from any of them as to be unintelligible to any other Greeks. Nevertheless something may be said, and it strikes us at once that it has certain resemblances to the Greek spoken until the recent catastrophe in the large village of Sille, near Konia. In both the article for the masculine and feminine nominative is not used ; in the nominative the article is used only before neuter nouns. There is also a certain similarity about the way in which the possessive genitive is formed : the other substantive, as in all these dialects, is invariably put after it. In both dialects too the numerals for 80 and 90 have been lost and Turkish forms have been borrowed : at Sille *seksénia* and *doksánia*, at Mariupol *seksén* and *doksán*, with *yetmísh* for seventy as well.[1] If this last point has any significance, it suggests some post-Turkish connection between the dialects. When it is observed that this same disuse of the nominative of the article is found in the archaic kind of Pontic spoken at Samsoun and in the Cappadocian dialects, we seem to be faced with a kind of Greek intermediate between the language of Pontos and that of the western part of the Greek world. We shall see later too that all these dialects lie between Pontos and the west in another point : they keep the same order in the arrange-

[1] *Modern Greek in Asia Minor*, p. 49.

ment of the verb and the pronominal object. Lastly, there is, so far as I can see, nothing to combat the idea that the dialect of Mariupol may be at least in part a survival of the Greek of the ancient colonies on the northern shores of the Black Sea.

The Pontic dialect is of great linguistic interest. First, despite the general disappearance of the ancient dialects, certain Ionian elements have been pointed out in it ; the question has been examined by Hatzidakis, who finds, however, that comparatively few of these Ionisms stand careful criticism.[1] Of more general importance is the fact that, without absorbing any obviously external influence except in the way of vocabulary, Pontic has developed from the ancient language into something so different from common modern Greek as almost to deserve the name of another language ; indeed, if it continues its course in Russia for a few more centuries, it can hardly be doubted that it will have to be regarded as just as different from common Greek as one Romance language is from another. Even now it is barely comprehensible at Athens.

Yet even so the position of Pontic is at the end of a long chain of dialects, though it is a last link which has very nearly entirely detached itself. I would illustrate this by looking at the position of the pronominal object in relation to the verb. In the west, both on the Greek mainland and in Italy, the pronoun always precedes the verb : τοῦ τὸ δίνω, " I give it to him," excepting always in the imperative : δός τοῦ το, " give it to him." In the Ægæan Islands in positive principal sentences, and there alone, the object may, but does not very often, follow the verb : τοῦ τὸ δίνω or δίνω τοῦ το. Going further east, we find that at Sille near Konia and in the Cappadocian dialects the object in positive clauses must follow the verb : τὸ δίνω gives way to δίνω το. This is, I think, the condition at Mariupol. At Pharasa in the Taurus mountains the dialect went a little further in the postponement of the object : the object had to follow in all principal clauses, negative as well as positive, e.g. δίτω τα, " I give it," and

$j\grave{o}$ $\delta\acute{\iota}\tau\omega$ τa, " I do not give it," where $\delta\acute{\iota}\tau\omega$ is for $\delta\acute{\iota}\nu\omega$, and $j\acute{o}$, with j as in English, is the negative particle. It is only in subordinate clauses that the object precedes. But the Pharasa dialect is akin to Pontic, and here we have the last link of the chain : the object follows in all clauses, negative as well as positive, subordinate as well as principal, e.g. $\theta\grave{a}$ $\delta\acute{\iota}\nu\omega$ τo, " I will give it," $\pi\rho\acute{\epsilon}\pi$ $\nu\grave{a}$ $\tau\rho\acute{\omega}\gamma\omega$ $\sigma\epsilon$, " I must eat you," as well as $\delta\acute{\iota}\nu\omega$ τo, " I give it," and $\kappa\grave{\iota}$ $\delta\acute{\iota}\nu\omega$ τo, " I do not give it."

Pontic uses the accusative form for the indirect object. But language must be intelligible, and when both the direct and the indirect objects are of the third person, the two accusatives would be awkward. A way round is found by using for the indirect the form $\kappa\acute{\iota}$, which may be $\grave{\epsilon}\kappa\epsilon\hat{\iota}$ or perhaps a remnant of $\grave{\epsilon}\kappa\epsilon\hat{\iota}\nu os$, e.g. $\delta\acute{\iota}\nu\omega$ τo $\kappa\acute{\iota}$, " I give it to him," or " to her " : literally " I give it to that person ", or " over there ".

If space permitted ,it would not be difficult to point out other chains of this sort : the aorist passive and the imperfect active of the contracted verbs would make good examples.

The points in which Pontic differs from ordinary Greek may be classed under four heads : the preservation of features of the language lost elsewhere ; the loss of certain forms generally preserved ; fresh developments in the language itself ; and lastly, the effect upon Pontic of the external influences to which it has been exposed, these being in the main Turkish, Russian, and common Greek.

The third point, the fresh developments off the ordinary Greek lines, is the most interesting, more so to my mind than the preservation of things commonly lost.[1] The most notable of the latter is the use of the infinitive in certain clauses conveying unfulfilled wishes and conditions and after $\pi\rho\acute{\iota}\nu$ meaning " before ". Here are two examples from Kerasund : $\pi\rho\grave{\iota}\nu$ $\acute{o}$ $\pi a\iota\delta\hat{a}s$ $\pi a\gamma\epsilon\hat{\iota}\nu$, " before the boy went away " ; $\kappa a\grave{\iota}$ $\pi\rho o\phi\tau\acute{a}\nu$ $\pi\rho\grave{\iota}\nu$ $\grave{\epsilon}\kappa\epsilon\hat{\iota}\nu$' $\grave{\epsilon}\lambda\acute{a}\nu a\iota$, " and he arrives before they come." These forms of the infinitive have been

[1] Hatzidakis gives a list of archaisms in Pontic in *Byz.-Neugr. Jhrb.*, vii (1930), p. 384 : *Einiges über das Pontische Griechisch*.

very much altered by the working of analogy, but are clearly
to be recognized : as in common Greek too they are used to
form the perfect of the type ἔχω γράψει.[1]   A number of
syntactical peculiarities connected with the sequence of tenses
seem to me to have no direct relation with the ancient
language ; in any case lack of space compels me not to make
more than this allusion to them. An example is the use of
the imperfect instead of the aorist or, in Pontic, the present
subjunctive : e.g. from Sourmena, " I did not wish to drink "
is κ' ἐθέλεσα ν' ἔπινα not νὰ πίνω. The infinitive is
also used : κ' ἐθέλεσα πιίνα. A full account of these
peculiarities of Pontic syntax has been given by Papadopoulos.
He shows that some of them are based upon Turkish models.[2]

In common Modern Greek the old -ον ending of the aorist
imperative has disappeared and in its place the -ε ending
of the present is used. But in Pontos the -ον ending survives
in almost all the verbs, all except the contracta, which, as in
Cappadocia, use an imperative of the old present form, and the
barytone verbs use the aorist in -ον. In the meaning there
can naturally be no distinction.   Examples are : γράψον, pl.
γράψτε or γράψτινε, ἀλέθω, aor. ἔλεσα, imper. ἄλεσον, pl.
ἀλέστε, σπάξον (= σφάξε). It is interesting, but hardly,
I think, historically significant, that the -ον imperative has
been preserved along with the -ε forms in the dialect of the
Terra d'Otranto ; which of the two endings is used depends
upon the position of the accent.[3]

Another archaism is the most conspicuous mark of Pontic :
the negative particle is κί or even, in the Of valley, οὐκ or
οὐκί. Other forms connected with οὐκ are the jó of Pharasa
and the t'i of Mariupol. The word δέν is used, but it means
" nothing ", τίποτε.

[1] This is fully treated by Deffner, " Die Infinitive in den Pontischen
Dialekten und die zusammengesetzten Zeiten des Neugriechischen," in
Monatsberichte d. Berliner Akademie, 1877, pp. 191–230. The examples
were collected in Of ; in the narrative style of folk-tales examples are rare.
See also Papadopoulos in Συμβολὴ εἰς τὴν ἔρευναν τῆς ποντικῆς διαλέκτου
in 'Αθηνᾶ, xxxv (1936), pp. 42–6.

[2] See Papadopoulos, in 'Αθηνᾶ, xxxv, pp, 25 sqq.

[3] G. Morosi, Studi sui dialetti greci della Terra d'Otranto, 1870, p. 138.
In the Bova dialect only the ending -ε is in use.

One form, essential to all other forms of Greek, is lacking in Pontos; this is the aorist subjunctive. In spite of the interest always shown by Greek in the aspects of the verb, this form has disappeared entirely, except in the dialect of Samsoun, which may be regarded as a very ancient form of Pontic. With the preservation of this tense at Samsoun goes the use of the aorist indicative in subordinate clauses in cases where everywhere else in Pontos the imperfect is used. These uses are explained and illustrated by Papadopoulos.[1]

The aorist subjunctive is preserved in the dialect of Pharasa, which may perhaps be regarded as an undeveloped form of Pontic. I have suggested that the dialect of Pharasa, apart from its own newer features, cannot be very far off what Pontic was in some earlier stage.

The simplification of the article may be reckoned among the losses of the dialect. In most parts of Pontos τί is used for the masculine and feminine accusative plural and for all the forms of the genitive. Only at Oinoi and in Sourmena and Of is there a genitive τοῦ, τσί, τοῦ, and an accusative plural τσί or τσού. In the dialect of the upper town of Samsoun there was a strong tendency, if not an absolute rule, to drop the article in the nominative, and even in the genitive, before masculine and feminine nouns denoting living persons. The neuter τό, τά, was kept and used too for inanimate objects even if formally masculine or feminine; but, according to Papadopoulos, before the genitive the disuse of the article was general.[2] I have already noted this disuse of ὀ, ἡ, οἱ at Mariupol, and at Sille and in the Cappadocian dialects. The broken down condition of the article in Cappadocia, where it is generally reduced to τό, τά and no other forms, is described in *Modern Greek in Asia Minor*.

What seems to me the most important fresh development of the Pontic dialect and divergence from ordinary Greek is

---

[1] Of the Upper Samsoun dialect very little has been printed. There is something in two MSS. in the store of the Historical Dictionary at Athens, Nos. 66 and 67. On its syntax see Papadopoulos, in ʼΑθηνᾶ, xxxv, pp. 39, 41.

[2] ʼΑθηνᾶ, xxxv, p. 18.

in the matter of gender and its treatment in declension. In ancient Greek gender is grammatical; names of things are just as much treated as masculines and feminines as are the names and attributes of men and women. The same is true for Modern Greek; in this there has been no change. There is hardly any new principle involved in the great number of newly formed neuters of the second declension— nouns used for males, females, and things alike, such as παιδί for παῖς, κορίτσι for κόρη, πόδι for πούς, χέρι for χείρ, ποτάμι for ποταμός, and any number of names of animals, such as βώδι for βοῦς, φίδι for ὄφις, and so on.

This too is found in Pontic as much as anywhere else. But Pontic has struck out a new line of its own in making a distinction in declension between persons and things, ἔμψυχα and ἄψυχα, as the Greeks call them. By the side of this there is a tendency to suppress feminine endings and to be content with masculine endings for living creatures and neuter endings for things. I have already noted that the Mariupol Greek distinguishes between ἔμψυχα and ἄψυχα, though, as far as I can see at present, with nouns of feminine persons the old feminine endings in disappearing give place not to the masculine but to the neuter.

Let us see what effect this has upon declension. For substantives of persons, ἔμψυχα, the ancient forms are fairly well preserved, and though we have some strange new forms, there is nothing that involves any psychological change of view. But for the names of things, ἄψυχα, the case is very different. The singular is not altered, but the plural is reckoned as neuter; the plural of κόσμος is τὰ κόσμους, and of νύχτα, τὰ νύχτας. In both cases the accusative ending is used for both the nominative and accusative; there is only one ending, just as in the old neuters τὰ μῆλα, τὰ πράγματα, etc. A further point is that the masculine and feminine endings of the adjective are preserved only for the names of living things; for all others, all ἄψυχα, the adjective is in the neuter, and the article is repeated. So we have τ' ἄλλο τὴν ἡμέρα, "next day," instead of τὴν ἄλλην ἡμέρα, or from Rostov τὸ περασμένο ἡ συνεδρίασι, "the past meeting," instead of

ἡ περασμένη συνέδρίασι, while " the good mother " is ἡ
καλέσσα ἡ μάνα. The new feminine ending -εσσα is to be
noted, as well as the repeated article. The feminine article
and the feminine adjective, and these only in the singular,
are the only grammatically feminine forms that have survived,
and, as we have seen, the feminine adjective is used only for
persons, not at all for things. In the plural the process has
gone further and masculine forms are used for female persons ;
where things are concerned the neuter is used. Thus from
Of we have ἡ ἐφτωshέσσα ἡ γυναίκα, " the poor woman,"
but the plural is for the nominative οἱ ἐφτωshοὶ οἱ γυναῖκ',
where γυναῖκ' is for γυναῖκοι, and for the accusative τσ'
ἐφτωχοὺς τσὶ γυναίκους. So too " these women " is ἀτεῖν'
οἱ γυναίκ', where ἀτεῖν' is for ἀτεῖνοι (= αὐτοί), and in
the accusative ἀτεινοὺς τσὶ γυναίκους. Similarly ἄλλ',
ἀουτεῖν' (= τοῦτες), and ἐκεῖν', and with them the accusa-
tives ἄλλους, ἐκείνους, and ἀουτεινούς, are all used for the
feminine as well as for the masculine. The dialect seems
working towards a condition of two sets of endings only,
the old masculine endings for persons of both genders, and
the neuter endings for things, of whatever gender the substan-
tive may be grammatically. In the face of these facts it is
hard to be sure whether the numerous Pontic adjectives in
two terminations m. f. -ος, n. -ον, are a fresh growth or, as
Hatzidakis would have it, ancient survivals ; if they are
the latter, they have survived into a congenial world.[1]

This emphasis on things as opposed to persons, this *he*
and she as opposed to *it* way of using the language, reveals
itself in another way. There is a special possessive for the
3rd person singular of things, answering exactly to the
English " its ". It varies locally ; the usual form is ἀθε,
but ἐθε, ἀχτε, ἀχτες, ἀχτερις, and other forms are also used.
All these enclitic possessives vary locally and are all not
much like common Greek. I quote the forms used at Santa :
for τ' ὀσπίτ, " the house," we have τ' ὀσπίτι μ, ς, " my, thy
house ", 3rd. sg. m. τ' ὀσπίτν ἀτ, f. . . . ν ἀτς, pl. τ' ὀσπίτν
ἐμουν, ἐσουν, " my, your house," and 3rd pl. τ' ὀσπίτν ἀτουν.

---

[1] Φιλολογικαὶ ῎Ερευναι, i, p. 273.

But " its ", used often too for children, has its own form :
ὁ κύρτς ἐθε, ἡ μάνα 'θε, " its father, its mother." I find as
the motto of a Rostov book, Το μεμλεκετ πρεπ να εκσερ
τι ιροαsαθε, " The country ought to know its heroes." The
θ of these forms has been used also to make a neuter genitive
singular of demonstratives and of ἄλλος. Thus at Trebizond
we have for the genitive, of ἄλλος, ἀλλονοῦ, ἀλληνές, and the
neuter ἀλληνθεῖ. So too from ἀκεῖνος we have ἀκεινοῦ,
ἀκεινές, and neuter ἀκεινθεῖ.[1] Besides these forms for
" its " there is a special form for " it ", ἀ instead of ἀτο ;
but this seems to be confined to Of and Sourmena and to
the dialect of Ordou (Kotyora).

This distinction between persons and things, quite strange
to the bulk of Greek, is found in the dialect of Pharasa in
the Taurus, whose kinship to Pontic I have already mentioned ;
it is found in the Cappadocian dialects which are the next
nearest to it both in form and geographically ; and I have
already mentioned it in the dialect of Mariupol. It looks
as if, had not the Turks arrived to break up the geographical
unity of Greek, we should have had an eastern half of the
language tending towards natural gender—*he*, a subordinate
she, and a well-developed *it*, and a western half with the old
idea of grammatical gender quite perfectly preserved. It may
be remarked that Turkish has no gender at all, either gram-
matical or natural, so that there can hardly be here any
question of Turkish influence on the language.

In the use of the definite article some fresh principles are
seen at work. Of its disuse in the masculine and feminine
nominative at Samsoun I have already written ; of its double
use before the adjective and again before the substantive
I have already given examples. This double article is only
used in common Greek under certain conditions : very
generally with personal names, e.g. ὁ καλὸς ὁ Γεώργις.[2]
But the most peculiar usage of the article occurs in connection

---

[1] These forms I take from a MS. by I. Valavanis, belonging to the
Hist. Dict., Athens, No. 298.

[2] I refer to Thumb, *Handb. d. neugr. Volkssprache*, 2nd ed., p. 38, and
to L. Roussel, *Grammaire descriptive du Roméique littéraire*, p. 130.

with the nominative masculine singular of nouns of the second declension. Here, when the definite article appears, the ending is not -ος, but -ον, like the accusative. The old -ος ending of the nominative appears only when the noun is undefined.   Thus we get such a sentence as τὸ ἐμὸν ὁ σκύλον καλὸς σκύλος ἔν, " my dog is a good dog." In the dialect of Oinoi, and possibly elsewhere, this extends to other types of declension, and we find ὁ μαθετήν, ὁ Νικόλαν, ὁ Γιάννεν, ὁ κλέφταν, " the thief," but ἔνας κλέφτας, " a thief," etc.[1]

That this phenomenon, for which I can find no cause, is of some age we may conjecture from two facts.   The first is that there is something very like it in the dialects of Pharasa and of Cappadocia, where the accusative ending is used only when the noun is definite : an example is τὸ λαγὸ ἐσκότωσέν το, " he killed the hare ", but δέκε ἔνα λαγός, " he struck a hare."   Here the nominative ending has spread to the accusative, instead of the other way, but the same principle is involved : the defined has a different ending from the undefined noun.   The second illustrative fact is that the genitive of these -ος nouns is very often not in -ου, but in -ονος.   Thus σκύλος, " dog," will have a defined nominative ὁ σκύλον and a genitive τὶ σκύλονος.   There are besides these -ονος forms plenty of examples of the old genitive ; but everywhere the -ονος forms are to be found, excepting at Oinoi.   A few examples are τσοπάνονος from τσοπάνος, " shepherd," τὶ λύκονος, also λύκ', τ' ἀγγέλονος, τὶ τόπονος, also τὶ τοπί for τοπίου, γέρος, " old man," ὁ γέρον, τὶ γέρονος. All these are from the Santa villages near Argyropolis. I do not find this genitive in adjectives, nor any examples from oxy-tone words. Now such forms can hardly have come into exist-ence, except at a time when the paradigm δαίμων, δαίμονος, was still in current use, a paradigm now entirely dead in the modern spoken language.[2]   In this connection Thumb has adduced ὁ κρατερόν from a Cypriot inscription assigned to

---

[1] From Hist. Dict., Athens, MS. No. 64.

[2] Φιλολογικαὶ Ἔρευναι, i, p. 272.

the third century A.D.[1]   There are no such genitives in
Cappadocia, but we do meet with accusatives in -να. From
Aravan I can quote Τούρκονα, λύκονα, ἄρωπονα (= ἄνθρω-
πον),[2] and at Oinoi many accusatives are said to end in -να : I
find quoted τὴν τιμήνα, τὸν καιρόνα. But at Oinoi the -ονος
genitives are not in use, and it must be admitted that this
-να ending may be from the -να of ἕνα, κανένα, ἀτόνα (=αὐτόν),
etc., which is certainly the origin of the Thracian ending -να,
especially as it is confined to adjectives.[3]

Another set of forms, which also recall the old imparisyl-
labic declension and must therefore be of some antiquity,
are the plurals in -αντ' = -αντοι, -αντους, and for things in
-αντας.   They are modelled, according to Hatzidakis, on
such ancient models as ἀλλᾶς, ἀνδριάς, ἱμάς, πᾶς, and such
participles as ἀναστάς. Starting in this way from the third
declension the endings have now mostly passed to the second,
and we get such forms as ὁ κλέφτες, pl. οἱ κλεφτάντ', acc.
τσὶ κλεφτάντους, ὁ θώπεκας, " the jackal," pl. οἱ θωπεκάντ'
or θωπέκ', acc. τσὶ θωπεκάντους. An example of an ἄψυχον
is ἡ βροχή, pl. τὰ βροχάντας. These are all from Sourmena,
where the genitive plural is lacking and, if a possessive is
needed, an adjectival form is used : thus " the houses of the
thieves " is τὰ κλεφτάντικα τὰ σπίτια. In the Argyropolis
region the genitive plural is found ; in the Santa villages
ὁ παιδᾶς, " the boy," is declined in the plural οἱ παιδάντ',
τὶ παιδάντας, τὶ παιδαντίων. As far as my material goes,
these forms are always limited in number and never supersede
or even equal the common second declension forms οἱ διάκ',
οἱ δεσκάλ', etc.

As for κλεφτάντικα, the substitute for the genitive plural,
the disuse of this case is very general in all Modern Greek ;
its place is taken as a rule by ἀπό with the accusative. But
when the form is out of use in Pontic, its place is taken by
these adjectival formations. From my Sourmena collections I

---

[1] Thumb, " Prinzipienfrage d. Κοινή-Forschung," *Neue Jhrb. f. d. Kl.
Alt.*, xvii (ix), 1906, p. 258.
[2] *Modern Greek in Asia Minor*, p. 103.
[3] Σ. Ψάλτης, Θρᾳκικά, p. 63.

take also ὁ δέσκαλυζο(ν, " the schoolmaster," but τὰ δεσκάλικα τὰ παιδία, " schoolmasters' children " ; instead of γυναίκων we have τὰ γυναίκικα, and in place of the genitive plural of χωρέτες, " peasant," τὰ χωρέτικα. The plural is naturally more useful than the singular τὸ γυναίκικο, etc. For ἄλλος and the demonstratives forms are constructed by the aid of the -ετερο- of the forms from ἡμέτερος. Thus at Oinoi from ἀτός we have τ' ἀτοινέτερα or, if the substantive be singular, τ' ἀτοινέτερο, from ἀβοῦτος (= οὗτος), τ' ἀβουτινέτερα, and from ἐκεῖνος, τ' ἐκεινέτερα. In the same collection I find τὰ γυναικίτικα τὰ μαλλία, " women's hair," and τ' ἀντρίστικον ὁ νοῦς, " the mind of men." [1]

This outline of the peculiarities of Pontic could be carried much further, if space permitted. But I may briefly mention a few points.[2] Accented ι before a vowel keeps the accent and does not pass it forward to the following vowel : e.g. παιδία, and not παιδιά. This is also the case at Pharasa, and less significantly in Italy and in the dialects which fringe the Greek mainland, Mani, Aigina, Megara, etc. In the syllable after the accent ι and ου are dropped ; the same thing is found occasionally at Pharasa. This is hardly to be connected with the vowel weakening and dropping of the North Greek dialects. Ancient η instead of becoming ι is very often, especially in unaccented syllables, sounded as ε. This too occurs at Pharasa. Forms derived from the ancient ἐμός, σός, ἡμέτερος are preserved and used as emphatic possessives ; these are in use also in Cappadocia and at Pharasa. The demonstrative and personal pronouns are peculiar. Notably the second plural " you " is in many places not ἐσεῖς, but ἐσεῖτ. This is used in many of the Cappadocian villages, and in Pontos at Kerasund and Ordou. The τ is probably from the second plural of the verb, just as the ν of ἐσεῖν, which is used for ἐσεῖς at Imera and Santa, villages near Argyropolis, has been brought over from

---

[1] Hist. Dict., Athens, MS. No. 64.

[2] For fuller material see Hatzidakis' paper, Περὶ τῆς Ποντικῆς διαλέκτου, κ. τ. λ., in Φιλολογικαὶ Ἔρευναι, i, pp. 265–291, to which I often refer.

ἐκεῖνοι. In Of ἐσεῖστ is used, and for the first person ἐμεῖστ, forms which derive from the endings of εἶμαι and of the passive verb. The old contracted ending is preserved in the passive of the old -όω contracta, e.g. σηκοῦμαι instead of σηκώνομαι. This is also found at Pharasa and in Cappadocia. The forms of the imperfect active are not formed with -οῦσα; the common endings are in -σκα and -να. The aorist passive has assumed the endings of the aorist active; this change has almost been carried through at Pharasa and in Cappadocia. There is no trace of the common endings in -κα, though these have reached Sille. These scanty notes will show how much more might have been said and the need we have for some sort of systematic grammar of Pontic. Of phonetics I have said hardly anything, and I can do no more than refer my readers to D. E. Oeconomides' book, *Lautlehre des Pontischen*, Leipzig, 1908. What is at present to be known of Pontic must be gathered from this book and from a number of special articles and a few texts; nor has any dictionary or even full vocabulary as yet been published.[1]

Before discussing the vocabulary of Pontic it will be convenient here to consider the position of the Rostov dialect in the whole field of Pontic. This will give an answer to the question from what parts of the Pontic area these people were collected when they sailed across the sea to Russia. The word " Pontic " covers a great many local varieties of

---

[1] For the earlier books (up to 1894) reference may be made to G. Meyer's Bibliography in *Neugr. Studien*, i. For later material I have drawn upon my own 1914 collections made in the Sourmena and Of valleys and at the villages of Imera and Santa in the district of Argyropolis; my folk-tale texts from Sourmena and Of have been published in 'Αρχεῖον Πόντου, iii. For material from Cappadocia and Pharasa and Sille I refer throughout to my *Modern Greek in Asia Minor*. For other books I give references in these notes. The volumes of the 'Αρχεῖον Πόντου, Athens, 1928 onwards, are most valuable. There are also a few scattered papers of value : I note " Analogiebildungen im pontischen Dialekt," by G. N. Hatzidakis, in *Indog. Forsch.*, xxxi, and Γραμματικὰ ἐκ τῆς ποντικῆς διαλέκτου by Δημοσθ. Οἰκονομίδης, in 'Αθηνᾶ, xlv (1933). In 1936 a new periodical, Ποντιακὰ Φύλλα, began. It gives a good deal of dialect.

speech, and the broken character of the southern coasts of the Black Sea, a series of valleys running down from the highlands of the interior, has led inevitably to the formation of a multiplicity of local subdialects. Our problem is in fact to find out the region where the Pontic dialect most closely resembles Rostov Greek.

Here I must make one point clear. The Pontic of Rostov, at least as written, is a fairly unified language, and to this result three causes may have contributed. Either the writers have discriminated between local shades of speech, choosing one rather than another as the literary form ; or the language since the Greeks have been in Russia has unified itself by the elimination of the rarer, less commonly understood forms ; or the migrants came over from one district alone of Pontos and brought with them a more or less uniform vernacular. I think it likely that all three factors have been at work ; but the language, as I shall hope to show in the following pages, agrees so closely with that of one part of the Pontic area that there can be little doubt that this was the original home of at least the majority of the present inhabitants of Rostov. How far the local village peculiarities of their old home are still preserved—for in Pontos each village had its own local forms of speech—could only be learned by a visit to Rostov itself. In this inquiry all our evidence must be gathered from material brought together in Pontos before the dispersal. In their new homes in Greece the people are much mixed ; men from different parts of Pontos are settled together and they must therefore be speaking, so far as they are continuing to speak Pontic at all, a mixed form of the dialect.[1] Hence we are forced to resort to the earlier evidence, of which some has been printed, and some is preserved in MSS. in possession of the Historical Lexicon being compiled at Athens ; from some few districts, Sourmena, Of, and the Khaldia villages, Imera and Santa, I have my own collections made in the year 1914, just on the very eve

[1] Many Pontic Greeks, largely tobacco growers, have been settled in Macedonia, where the climate suits this form of cultivation.

of the War. That more local work in the Pontic linguistic
area was not done before the War is very much to be regretted.
With the dispersal of these people many of the local distinc-
tions have been lost irretrievably, and with them much of
the possibility of tracing the stages of the development of
the language ; for where historical documents are lacking,
as they are for Pontic, their place can to no inconsiderable
degree be filled by the comparison of one contemporary form
of the language with another.

We may begin our survey of the Pontic area from the west.
Of the dialect of Sinope we are bound to say that hardly
anything is known, really only enough to show that it was
a kind of Pontic.[1] But, although we know that Sinope was
one of the ports from which Greeks went over to Russia,
the population there can never have been enough to supply
more than a small element in the language as spoken in
Russia.

Next we come to Samsoun, where the older form of the
dialect was spoken in the Upper Town, Ano Sampsounda.
The Greeks in the town by the sea were immigrants from
the Khaldia district. This old dialect of Samsoun stands
apart from the rest of Pontic in preserving the aorist subjunc-
tive, lost everywhere else. I have mentioned the loss of the
masculine and feminine article in the nominative, τό and τά
alone being in general use : these are two of the numerous
points which separate the Samsoun dialect from the rest of
Pontic and equally from the Rostov dialect.

The next town is Oinoi, which again had a marked dialect.[2]

---

[1] I gained some idea of the dialect of Sinope from an unpublished paper,
copied from a MS. in the possession of the Literary Society of Constantinople,
which I found in a library on Amorgos; see *Byzantion*, vi, p. 391. It was
very inadequate, but I know of no other information on the subject. In
1935 also I met at Paramythiá the Greek bishop, who was from Sinope,
and his old mother could speak enough to make it clear that the old dialect
there was Pontic. There is a little in MS. No. 271 of the Hist. Dict. at
Athens.

[2] My information about the Oinoi dialect is largely drawn from a MS.
grammar and vocabulary in MS. No. 64 of the Hist. Dict. at Athens.

It must certainly be called Pontic ; and yet it lacked several of the most pronounced features of the usual Pontic, and in this it differed just as much from the Rostov Greek as it did from the language of Trebizond and the Argyropolis villages of the diocese of Khaldia, which may be called central Pontic, as the language of the largest Greek-speaking area. In the Oinoi dialect the imperative aorist ended, as generally in Modern Greek, in -ε : we have seen that elsewhere in Pontos the old ending -ον was preserved. The fuller forms of the article, with the genitive τοῦ, ταί, τοῦ, and the special accusative plural forms, in place of the uniformity of the form τί, has already been noticed. Lastly, the declensional types in -ος, genitive -ονος, and the plurals in -αντ', -αντους, -αντας are missing. All these forms are found at Rostov. Oinoi, at least as the dialect was being spoken in recent years, does not fit at all as a place of origin for the Rostov Greeks. I make this qualification " in recent years," because we are told that Greek was lately going back because of the number of Turks, and that education, whilst helping to preserve Greek, was destroying the local dialect. The sailors and traders too were much europeanized.

Of the dialect of Ordou I cannot learn much, but it has features which do not agree with Rostov. The future is formed not with θά, as at Rostov and generally in Pontos, but with ἄ. I note that in Of and Sourmena νά is used. The neuter possessive " its ", used for things, a special peculiarity of Pontic and going with its stress on ἔμψυχα and ἄψυχα, is ἄχτε or ἄχτες, the forms in use at Kerasund, or ἄχτερε, ἄχτερις, and not, as at Rostov and in the rest of Pontos, ἀθε or ἐθε.[1]

Next we come to Kerasund ; here again the dialect has forms which separate it from the Pontic of Russia. The neuter possessive I have just mentioned. The first person plural of the present passive in Pontic ends in -μες, and not in

---

[1] About the Ordou (Kotyora) dialect something is to be learned from the Glossary, now published up to κωφώνω, in 'Αρχεῖον Πόντου, iii and vi, by Euphrosyni Sidiropoulou, and from the Hist. Dict. MS. No. 35.

-μεστε, e.g. ἔρχουμες instead of the usual ἔρχουμεστε.[1] But at Kerasund, and here alone, this ending is used in the active, though not, I think, before an enclitic pronoun, and we get ἔχομες for ἔχομεν, and so on.[2] In the passive the third plural of the imperfect is in -ουνταν : at Rostov the much commoner Pontic forms in -ουσαν are used. Thus at Kerasund we have ἔρχουνταν, " they were coming," but in Rostov ἔρχουσαν. These -ουνταν forms were used also at Oinoi, where, very oddly, the ending had spread to the present. I find as examples the imperfect ἐπλέχκουνταν(ε and the present πλέχκουνταν(ε. The present in -αν is used also at Rostov, e.g. πογιατίσκουνταν, " they are coloured." The article, without the forms τοῦ, ταί, is like that of Rostov, but as a whole the dialect does not fit ; it has too many points of difference.

Of substantial districts we are left with Trebizond and the villages of the Pyxitis valley and of the Argyropolis region, generally referred to as the diocese of Khaldia, and the two valleys east of Trebizond, Sourmena and Of. If we begin with these latter, we perceive that they are not what we are seeking. The negative at Rostov, as generally in Pontos, is κί. In Of, at least occasionally, the older οὐκί is preserved. The future is made with νά and not with θά. The article has the forms τοῦ and ταί, not the single form τί, for the genitives and the accusative plural. There is also, as at Ordou, an enclitic object " it ", used only for inanimate objects, ὰ instead of ἄτο. There are other differences too ; we cannot look in these valleys for a main source, at any rate, for the Rostov Greeks.

We are left with the district of Argyropolis. Here the dialect agrees with the Greek of Rostov in all the points which I have been taking as criteria : the use of ὀ, ἠ, οἰ ; the form τί for the accusative plural and all the genitives of the article ; the plurals in -αντ', etc. ; the -ος declension

---

[1] In Sourmena the ending is -μεστ, in Of -μεστε.

[2] MS. No. 69 in the Hist. Dict. collection by I. Valavanis has a glossary and a rich collection of folk-tales from Kerasund and the surrounding villages. Our other material is no more than scraps.

genitive in -ονος ; the neuter possessive, at Rostov ἀθε, in the
Argyropolis villages ἐθε ; the loss of the aorist subjunctive ;
the imperatives in -ον or -ο ; the future formed with θά ;
the 3rd plural imperfect passive in -σαν.   Since all these
points of the Rostov Greek are found together in that of
Argyropolis and, so far as I know, are all of them in use
together in no other district, there can be little doubt that
at all events the great mass of the Rostov population came
over to Russia from this part of the Pontic world.

This conclusion too is helped by the fact that we are told
that colonists did come from Trebizond to Southern Russia ;
also this district of Khaldia or Argyropolis is by far the
largest Greek-speaking area of Pontos, the only one in fact
from which any very considerable body of people could have
come.

Of the Nikopolis dialect I have said nothing ; it seems to
have been very like the dialect of Argyropolis lying to the
east of it.   An oddity from the village of Ovatchouk is that
the possessive pronoun for the 3rd person masculine singular
was κεν and for the plural κουν.   Thus a published text
has τὸ παιδί κεν, " his son," and ἀντάμα κουν, " with them."
These κ forms are not feminine ; a priest from this same region,
from Shabin Kara Hissar, told me that " his daughter " is
τὸ κορίζν ἀκεν, but " her daugher " τὸ κορίζν ἀτς ; " their
houses " is τὰ σπίτä κουν.[1]   I met this priest at Kavalla.   He
has hellenized his old surname 'Αβτζόγλου to Κυνηγό-
πουλος.

With the Rostov dialect thus placed, the way is clear for
the last part of my remarks on Pontic, some account of the
foreign elements in the dialect, and this in fact amounts to
a consideration of the vocabulary and the loanwords and the
influence upon it of common Greek.   The Russian words and
the borrowings from the Greek *katharévousa* and common

---

[1] The only Nikopolis texts I can find are three tales recorded by I. G.
Valavanis.   They are in MS. No. 69 of the Hist. Dict. collection.   Two
are from the village of Latsasa and one from Ovatchouk.   This is the text
published in the 'Αστὴρ τοῦ Πόντου, i, p. 169.

demotic make their appearance fully only in the language as
spoken at Rostov, and it will be convenient to go to the same
source for the Turkish loanwords, although they came into
the dialect from intercourse with Turkish speakers whilst the
people were still in Asia Minor. In order, however, that these
lists of words may be intelligible, I must first say something
of the orthography employed. The Greek alphabet indeed is
used, but with a newly arranged system of phonetic spelling.

The historical orthography used in Greece to-day is of
course phonetic, but only in the sense that the reader can
have no doubt as to the pronunciation of any word ; the
difficulty is for the writer, because owing to the simplification
of the vowel system the same sounds are written in more
than one way. He cannot be sure whether *af* and *ef* are to
be written av and ϵv, or $a\phi$ and $\epsilon\phi$; *av* and *ev* present a
similar difficulty. There are uncertainties about the sounds *nd*,
mb, *ng* : are they $\nu\tau$ or $\nu\delta$, $\mu\pi$ or $\mu\beta$, $\gamma\kappa$ or $\gamma\gamma$? The distinctions
of accents and of the two breathings are, though meaningless,
still preserved. The Russians clear away all these troubles
by writing the *i*-sound always with ι, rejecting η altogether ;
the *e*-sound is always ϵ, never $a\iota$; ω disappears. The double
letters ξ and ψ are not used. *Nd*, *mb*, *ng* are always $\nu\tau$,
$\mu\pi$, $\nu\kappa$. Breathings are not written at all. As the three
accent marks have to-day all of them the same value, the
acute is sufficient, and even this is written only where it is
felt to be needed ; the foreigner would welcome it rather
more often. The alphabet has had to be supplemented by
$\sigma\sigma$ or, as they print it, ss and $\zeta\zeta$ to express the sounds of *sh* and
zh. The modified *a*, *o*, and *u* of some Pontic dialects, if they
exist, are at all events disregarded in this Russian orthography.
Sigma has only its " final " form. I believe that the Mariupol
Greek follows the same system, no doubt by the direction of
the general commission to regulate these matters.

Such a reform is not quite a new thing. Simplification
of the Greek orthography has been in the air for more than
a century. In 1814 the poet Vilarás dropped the accents and
simplified the writing of the vowels. Then came the freedom

of Greece ; patriotism brought with it an archaizing tendency
in the language, and I find no further movement until 1884,
when Phardýs proposed rather perversely to discard breathings
and accents and so to leave the reader with no guide as to
the accented syllable, but to keep the old spelling which
phonetically serves no purpose at all. Then in 1886 Skylítsis
denounced the breathings. In 1889 Phardýs made another
proposal, by which he retained the useful part of the system
of accents. In 1906 Emilios Evrótas did away with the multiple
spellings of the vowels, in this following Vilarás ; he kept
the old accents. In 1910 Pallis proposed to mark the accented
syllables, but with the acute only ; in 1912 Vlastós suggested
the use of the acute only and has carried out this reform in
his books : I note *H Αργώ καί άλλα ποιήματα* in 1921, and
his very useful *Συνώνυμαι καί Συγγενικά* in 1931. Most
of these reformers drop the iota subscript. Psichari joined
the advocates of change, notably by writing $a\beta$, $a\phi$, $\epsilon\beta$,
$\epsilon\phi$ instead of the old diphthongs av, ϵv. In 1913 Trianta-
phyllidis followed Vlastós, but like the Russians proposed
to write the acute accent only when it is really needed.[1]

For completeness I may mention that Louis Roussel has
chosen to write Greek with the Latin alphabet, systematically
in his *Contes de Mycono*, Léopol, 1929, and in part in his
Grammaire descriptive du Roméique littéraire, Paris, n.d. The
use of Latin characters for the Greek of Southern Italy and
in the devotional books used by the Roman Catholic com-
munities in the Cyclades needs no more than a bare mention.

It is interesting to observe that the Greeks of Pontos,
when they were still at home and before their dispersal,
favoured a phonetic spelling, at least when they were writing
their own Pontic. Except for the recording of folk-songs and
tales very few Greeks have used their own dialect for literary
purposes, when the standard language was at their disposal
—I think only the present-day Cypriots with their school
of local poets, notably Lipertis and Palaisis, and these Greeks

---

[1] For the material in this paragraph I am indebted to *'H 'Ορθογραφία
μας*, by *Μανόλης Τριανταφυλλίδης*, Athens, 1913, p. 8.

of Pontos with their comedies of local life. I have seen plays by George Photiadis ; he uses only the acute accent and cuts out ω and η, using ι for all the *i*-sounds. Comedies of his are *I Προξενία*, 1908 ; *I Δολοφόνος*, 1910 ; of *Τὰ Σκοτάδια* the second edition was printed at Athens in 1924. Yanko Topkhará's comedy *Ματσουκάτκον Χαρά*, 1910, uses much the same system. There were earlier plays in Pontic printed in 1860 and 1876 ; I have not seen them and know nothing of their orthography. It is obviously a relief, when writing a dialect as very far apart from Modern Greek as Pontic is, to shake free from the traditional system of spelling, in which correctness depends on the history of the words, in dialect often so obscure.

The Greeks of Rostov had, therefore, a clear field before them and plenty of examples to follow, and it was not difficult for them, when they began to print their own dialect, to use a thoroughly reformed phonetic spelling, which indeed they had already done in the books in common demotic Greek printed at Rostov by the Soviet. After these remarks on orthography I may pass to the Pontic vocabulary.

The foreign, non-Greek words employed in Pontic are on the whole what one would expect them to be from a consideration of the history of the people. The base of the vocabulary is naturally the Greek of the Byzantine empire, including the Latin element which came to Byzantium when the official language was Latin and not as yet Greek. These words have been many of them collected by Gustav Meyer [1] ; in Pontic we can point to ἄσπρος, βούλα, βρακίν, γούλα, γούνα, κάμπος, καρβών', κάστρο, κερκέλ', κομπώνω, κουκούλ', κουκούμ', κουμούλ', λαμνίν, μάγλον, μαντάτα, μαξελάριν, ὁσπίτι, σουβλίν, στέρνα, στουπίν, στράτα, φάβατον, φοσίν, φούρκα, φουρνίν, φουρτούνα. This list I have compiled from the index to Oeconomides' *Lautlehre des Pontischen* ; it could no doubt be much increased. That such words were in use generally in

---

[1] *Neugr. Studien*, iii.

all the Asia Minor dialects may be seen from a similar list in my *Modern Greek in Asia Minor*.[1]

Modern Greek contains besides these words from Latin an immense number of Italian words which entered the language from the Venetian and Genoese and other Italian traders and rulers in the later Byzantine period. These words are as good as non-existent in Pontic ; the separation from the Western part of the Greek world was by then complete.[2] Greek was never again to be spoken from the Taurus to Italy ; the Greek-speaking area had been split in two as by a wedge by the incoming Turks. The language was lost over a great area of Western Asia Minor, and the eastern fragment, surviving politically only until the fall of the Empire of Trebizond, was henceforward effectually broken off from the main body of Greeks and the currents of Frankish influence which affected them in their homes by the Mediterranean.

Ever since the beginning of these conquests, from the inroads of the Seljuks to the full conquests of the Ottoman Turks, Pontic has been not only under the strongest influence of Turkish, but separated by the Turkish populations from the bulk of the Greek-speaking world and even from their closer neighbours in Cappadocia. The result is a host of Turkish loanwords, which include naturally not only true Turkish words, but numerous Persian and Arabic words which had passed into the Turkish vocabulary. Only in Cappadocia, where Turkish influence was so strong that Greek was in some villages on the point of extinction and was in a condition paralleled only by the Greek of Southern Italy, was the number of loanwords greater than it is in Pontic. I have preferred to exhibit this Turkish influence by lists of words from the Pontic of Rostov rather than from Asia Minor. Lists from both regions would have been much the same ; but the Rostov material is fresher and is also less accessible

---

[1] *Modern Greek in Asia Minor*, p. 195.

[2] Papadopoulos ('Αθηνᾶ, xxxv, p. 17, note 1) gives τζόβενος = *giovane*, and points out that the feminine ending -εσσα is to be reckoned as due to the Genoese. See also Hatzidakis, Φιλολογικαὶ ῎Ερευναι, i, p. 274.

than that from Pontos. Whether any of them are, like the
words from this stock at Mariupol, Tartar words picked up
in Russia and not Turkish words brought over from Pontos,
I have no evidence to decide. But all the probability is
that they come from the Turkish element in the dialect of
Pontos itself.

It is, I think, a fact of observation that the first parts
of speech to be borrowed are substantives, then adverbial
phrases and perhaps pronouns, and lastly verbs. It is not
hard to see the reason of this, and certainly in common
Greek, where Turkish substantives are common enough
Turkish verbs even in the dialects are very rare. Σαστίζω,
" I astonish," δαγιαντίζω, " I endure," and a few others
may be heard ; but in comparison with nouns and adverbial
phrases the examples are very few. The Asia Minor dialects
have gone further and borrowed verbs freely, as may be seen
from the texts in my *Modern Greek in Asia Minor*. The
same has been done by the Pontic dialect, both as spoken
in Asia Minor and at Rostov. I begin the examples of Turkish
words picked from the published Rostov texts with a few
substantives ; the list might very easily have been lengthened.
One point may be noticed : names of things ending in a
consonant become Greek neuters ; but when they end in a
vowel bearing an accent, they are taken over into Greek as
feminines, instead of masculines as in common Greek, e.g. in
Pontic ἡ καβγά, " the quarrel," but in common Greek ὁ
καβγάς. Other examples are : αρκαδαςς, voc., " comrade " ;
το γιαν, " side " ; με ινιατ και επιμονιν, " with obstinacy
('*inad*) and persistence " ; ιςςμαρ, " order " ; τιν κεμεντζε,
" fiddle " ; το μεαμλιακετ, " country " ; το μειταν, " open
place " ; το μεςελ, " story " ; το μιλετ, " nation " ; ι περτε,
" curtain " ; ι πογια, " colour " ; το ςου, " race " ; ι ςςαματα,
" noise " ; τα τιαρτια, " sorrows."

Adverbs and adverbial phrases are abundant. Γιαβάςςα
γιαβάςςα, " gently, gently," Turkish *yavash yavash*, με το ζορ,
" with difficulty," and a few others may be heard com-
monly enough in Greece ; but in this dialect we find many

more examples : γενιτεν, " afresh," though εκνευ (ἐκ νέου) is also used ; γιαχότ, " or " ; γιοκ, " no " ; ει κε ακριβα, " well and dearly " ; καρssι so, " opposite to the " ; τεμεκ, " that is to say " (demek) ; τζιγκι, " because " (chünki) ; τζιπ καλα, " quite well ". Of pronouns I notice only kendi " self " ; κεντι ατος, " himself ", κεντι τεμον πεδιν, " my own boy."

For verbs I can quote the following (I think it safer to give as a rule the person and tense as I have found them in my texts, and not to run the risk of setting down the present indicative) : αραεβω, " I seek " (aramaq) ; ν' αρτυρεφsατα, " for thee to increase them," from αρτυρεβω (artyrmaq) ; εγαζάνεπsα τα, " I gained them " (qazanmaq) ; γιανασséβω, " I approach " (yan, " side," and the verb yanashmaq, " to approach ") ; ιssιτυρέβω, " I make to hear " (from the causal of ishitmek, " to hear ") ; καλατséβω, " I speak," v. Modern Greek in Asia Minor, p. 616 ; κεζινέφκετε, " he wanders " (gezinmek) ; παρτζαλαέβω, " I divide " (parcha, " a morsel ") ; πελτεκιζ, " he stammers " (pelteklemek) ; πογιατίσκυνταν " they are coloured " (passive from boyatmaq, " to colour ", from boya, " colour ") ; να sεβταλανέφκυμε sε, " for us to fall in love with you " (sevdalanmaq, from sevda, " love ") ; ssυφελενεφκυsαν, " they were suspected " (imperfect passive 3rd plural from shubelenmek, " to suspect ") ; ετοπλαεφκυνταν, " they are collected together," and the aorist active ετοπλάεπsαν (from toplamaq).

Among phrases modelled on Turkish idioms we may reckon[1] : Ντο χαλ ερθεν so κιφαλις ; " what has happened to thee ? " from Turkish basha gelmek, " to come to the head," meaning " to happen to a man " ; sον καβγαν εγο δυλιαν κι τερο, " I have nothing to do with the quarrel," literally " in the quarrel I see no work ", where δυλιαν κι τερο (δουλίαν δὲν θεωρῶ) answers to the Turkish ish görmek ; ζοαπ εsι θα δις, " thou wilt (give an) answer," where τζοαπ διγω is the Turkish jevab vermek.

[1] The phrases in this paragraph are all taken from Παγυροτsάκομαν (Breaking the Ice), a translation from the Russian of K. Gorbynov, on pp. 101, 138, 171, 136 in this order.

Nor are phrases lacking in which the Turkish order of words is used instead of the Greek. In Turkish qualifying words always precede the qualified and so we find such a phrase as ἐναν τελεφτέαν ἄγρεν καρδίας ντο παρτζαλαεφ λαλίαν, " a last wild cry which rends thine heart, to rend thine heart," where παρτζαλαεφ is the 3rd singular present of παρτζαλαέβω, the Turkish *parchalamaq*, from *parcha*, " a morsel." There are plenty of examples of both these features, Turkish phrases and Turkish word order, in the Asia Minor dialects, and I have elsewhere collected examples from Sille, from Pharasa, and from the Cappadocian dialects.[1] I have no examples of such full adoptions of the Turkish word order from Pontos, but phrases modelled on Turkish are common enough. Papadopoulos has given a long list of them, beginning with βάλλω ἀπάν' for προσθέτω, formed from *üste qoymaq*.[2]

There are a few Armenian words in Pontic ; in his paper in 'Ἀθηνᾶ, xxxv, Papadopoulos has collected about a dozen.

Greek was brought over from Pontos into Russia about a century and a half ago, and it has not been exposed to the influence of Turkish. I have therefore concluded that this element entered the Rostov dialect when the speakers were still in Pontos. Since they reached their new home, the vocabulary has admitted, as was inevitable, masses of Russian words, some of which we may suppose have ousted Greek words. But the Russian influence has not, at least so far, gone to the lengths of the Turkish. The words borrowed seem confined to substantives ; I have found no adverbs, still less verbs.

Though naturally this Russian influence is much stronger at Rostov than it ever could have been in Asia, still in the

---

[1] *Modern Greek in Asia Minor*, pp. 198–202.

[2] 'Ἀθηνᾶ, xxxv, p. 47. In this paper Papadopoulos demonstrates very clearly the extent of Turkish influence, e.g. in the use of ἄλλο *to* form the comparative like *daha* in Turkish (on p. 20), and in Note 2 on p. 40 he gives the same explanation of such pluperfects as ἐκρύφτεν ἔτον, " he had been hidden," as modelled on the Turkish *saklanmish idi*, as I had given in *Modern Greek in Asia Minor*, pp. 60, 147.

last years before the war Russian words were creeping into use in Pontos. The Russian word for a "steamer", παραχότ', was used rather than the Italian βαπόρ or the *katharévousa* ἀτμόπλοιον, "potatoes" were called by their Russian name καρτόφια, and τζαντζία, the old Byzantine word for "high boots", was giving way to its Russian equivalent, no doubt because of the common Russian use of such boots. Oeconomides, writing in 1907, also gives a few Russian words as new to the dialect and due to increasing communications with the Russian coasts of the Black Sea.[1] He quotes ἡ τρόshκα, "cart"; τὸ παἰτόν', "railway"; τὸ στόλ', "small round table"; τὸ στακάν', "drinking glass." He adds *shαπκά*, "hat"; but this word seems to me more likely to have come directly from the Turks; I have heard it used in Cappadocia. To these Papadopoulos adds μαchῖνα; πέchκος, "stove"; σαμαβάρ'; σπίchκα, "lucifer match"; τοάσκα, "glass for tea"; and the feminine ending -άβα.[2] But in general the Russian element belongs to the dialect as spoken in Russia; any further penetration in Pontos was cut short by the dispersal of the Greeks.

Of the great number of Russian words in the Rostov texts many can be collected which refer to the ordinary objects of life; but these seem to be for the most part things which were hardly to be found in the villages of Pontos, and the words are therefore to be regarded simply as additions to the language. Whether many Greek words have been replaced by Russian equivalents I do not know. This has occurred to a great extent in the Greek dialects of Southern Italy, where Italian words are taking the place of their old Greek equivalents one may say every day. A few of these Russian words are: ι βοτκα; ι γράζζτανι, "citizens"; ι γραζζτανκα, "citizeness"; ι κνιαζ, "princes"; κοζάκος, "cossack"; το κράι, "land"; ι μπογιαρ, "nobles"; μυζζίκος; ι παλάτκα, "tent"; ι πάτsskα, "packet"; ι πλοssάτκα, "square in a town"; ι ποβόζκα, "vehicle"; το πράζνικον,

---

[1] *Lautlehre d. Pontischen*, p. 224.

[2] Ἀθηνᾶ, xxxv, p. 17, note.

" festival " ; ι ϛανκα, " sledge " ; ϛϛαμάνοϛ, " shaman " ;
το υραζζάι, " harvest."

Most of the military and naval words are Russian : τα
βιντόφκαϛ, " rifles " ; ματρόζοϛ, " sailor " ; πόλκια, " regi-
ments " ; ϛϛτίκια, " bayonets." Some have come through
Russian from other languages : τρετνάυτ, " dreadnought,"
and, since the War, τάνκια, " tanks."

The mechanization of the country is responsible for a long
list of words. I quote : ζαβοτ, " factory " ; ινζζινερ,
" engineers " ; τ᾽ ινζζινερυϛϛεμυν (acc. pl.), " our engineers,"
and ινζζινερίον (gen. pl.) ; κλινκερ, " clinkers " ; μαϛϛι-
νίϛτοϛ, " machinist " ; ι μαϛτερϛκάγια, " the workshop " ;
τα πατέντια, " patents " ; ϛλέϛαροϛ, " locksmith " ; ϛπετϛια-
λίϛταϛ (acc. pl.), " specialists " ; ϛϛοϛε " chaussée " ;
ϛτανοκ, " work-bench " ; τόκαροϛ, " turner " ; ϛι τραμβαι
το παρκ, " in the tram park."

There are, of course, many words needed by the new political
and social institutions of Soviet Russia. Some of these are :
κυλακοϛ ; μενϛϛεβικοϛ ; πιατιλέτκα, " five year plan " ; πολϛϛε-
βικοϛ ; πραβλενια, " administration " ; ϛοβετ ; ϛελϛοβετ,
" village soviet."

Many more could be added. A great number of these
newly required political words have come over into Greek
from every language in Europe, but always, no doubt, by
way of Russian. I give a few such words : γρυπα, " group " ;
ετάπια, " stages " (étapes) ; ελεμέντια, με προλεταρικα ελε-
μέντια, " with proletarian elements " ; ιλιυϛτράτϛια, " illus-
tration " ; κλυπ, " club," ϛο κλυπνατυν, " to their club " ;
κολεχτιβιζατϛια, " collectivization " ; τιν κονφιϛκάτϛιαν,
" confiscation " ; ϛε φαρδιν μαϛϛταπ, " in wide measure "
(German masstab) ; μίτιγκ, " meeting " ; μποικοτ, " boy-
cott " ; οπορτυνιζμοϛ, " opportunism," and τι οπορτυνίϛταϛ
(acc. pl.), " opportunists " ; προτεϛτ, " protest " ; πυρζζυάζι-
κοϛ, " bourgeois " ; το ρόλο τι αβανκαρτι, " the rôle of the
advance guard " ; ϛπετϛιαλίϛτοϛ, " specialist " ; ϛτοπ,
" stop " ; τα τεκλαράτϛιαϛ, " declarations " ; υτοπία,
" utopia " ; φακτια, " facts " ; φρόντια, " fronts." But

this list has now perhaps gone far enough ; ισα με το απϲυρτ, as they say, or at least write, at Rostov. All these words are naturally more frequent in political than in purely narrative writing.

It is noticeable that the Greek has either been unable, or has not been allowed, to draw upon its own resources to satisfy these new requirements ; Russian words have been brought over wholesale. It is true that the "Red Army" is called Κόκκινος Στρατός, but it is also Κράϲναγια άρμια, and I find the word ίναϲ κραϲνοαρμέοϲ for a soldier of that army. There is little of that vigour shown by the Greek of Cyprus when at the time of the French feudal kings Greek equivalents for the foreign Frankish law terms were sought for and found. For example, an advocate in the French text of the *Assizes of Jerusalem and Cyprus* is called *avocat*, *procurour*, or *avantparlier*. The Greek uses the French word and writes άβοκάτος or προκουρούρης, and sometimes it merely transliterates with άβὰντ παρλιέρης. But sometimes the writer finds a real translation with πρόλαλος or παραστάτης, and sometimes from his native store can make an exact equivalent to *avantparlier* in ἐμπροπέτης, which has apparently been coined for this purpose from ἐμπρός, "in front, forward," and εἶπα, the aorist of λέγω.[1] Of such proofs of vigour I find none in the Greek of Rostov.

On the Greek side the Pontic of Rostov, at least as written, has adopted a number of words and phrases from the purified language, as well as submitting to some extent to the influence of the common demotic. How far this was the case in Pontos we can hardly know. Though the dialect and common Greek were to some extent separate languages, yet many speakers must have tended to mix them ; but the problem of making Pontic a medium for general culture was never faced, and this admixture from the Greek of the outside world can only be given as indicating the manner in which it is being solved at Rostov. Also it must be remembered that the

[1] See *Philological Soc. Trans.*, 1925–30, p. 302 : a paper on the vocabulary of Makhairas.

Rostov culture was at first carried on in the *katharévousa*,
and then immediately after the revolution in the demotic ;
this full use of the dialect belongs only to recent years.

The influence of the demotic shows itself most plainly in
occasional lapses from the strictness of the dialect into the
forms of common Greek. Notably the adjective before the
names of things grammatically feminine often has the feminine
and not the neuter endings demanded by the strict Pontic
system. And this is especially the case in the genitive ;
I find examples such as ι ιντελιγέντσια τι εργατικις τάκsιs,
where the dialect would require τι εργατικυ τι τακsιs
(= τῆs ἐργατικῆs τάξεωs), and, with the second article
dropped, ι πολιτικι τι soβετικιs εκsυsίαs, with which
compare in the same book το soβετικον ι εκsυsία (= ἡ
σοβετικὴ ἐξουσία) and το παλεον τιν ιντελιγέντsιαν, " the old
intelligentsia." As in the first and second of these examples,
the possessive genitive is sometimes found after the substantive
upon which it depends ; in the Pontic of Asia Minor the
genitive invariably precedes, and this following position is
probably due to the influence of the common Greek. I find
for example so κιφαλ τι Κοζάκονοs, " on the Cossack's head,"
as well as τι Κοζάκονοs τι γύλαν, " the Cossack's throat,"
and το sseρ τι Γλεπ, " Glep's hand," by the side of τι Σsραμ
τ' ομάτια, " Shram's eyes."

Phrases from the purified language, the καθαρεύουσα, are
used quite freely ; indeed it is very difficult to get on without
them, as is admitted even by many of the present-day
demoticists. I have collected a few from my Rostov books.

A few nouns are : τα γεγονότα, ενδιαφερον, τυ παρελθόντος
(genitive), προελεφsιν αθε (προέλευσίν του). Of the very
much more numerous adverbs and adverbial expressions
I have collected the following : αναποφεφχτα, απεναντιας,
απεφθειας, διλαδι, εκδεφτέρυ (ἐκ δευτέρου), εκνέυ (ἐκ νέου ;
for the Turkish γενιτέν see above), εκsετιας (ἐξ αἰτίας),
ενγενι (ἐν γένει), εν προτις, επιδι, επι κεφαλις, επι τέλυς,
επίτιδεs, ἐsτο και αν, εφsινίδιτα (εὐσυνείδητα), λογυ χαριν,
μολαταφτα (μὲ ὅλα ταῦτα), μολονοτι, ολοsδιόλυ (ὅλως δι'

ὅλου), τιυτοτροπος (τοιουτοτρόπως), τιχεος (τυχαίως). These
words also naturally occur most frequently in political and
propaganda writing. In simple narrative they are hardly
used at all; I find none in *To πετυμενον Νιυβιτ* or in *O γιον
τι Μπολσσεβικυ.*

Of the foreign elements in the Mariupol dialect I neither
can say so much, nor need I, as the dialect forms no proper
part of this paper. Sergievsky tells us that it contains a great
number of Tartar words and these he thinks found their way
into the dialect " during the last centuries of the stay of
these Greeks in the Crimea, and most probably after their
settlement on the shores of the Sea of Azov ". The languages
and vocabularies of the Turks and the Tartars are seemingly
so much alike that it is not easy at a first sight to see whether
a loanword in these dialects is from Turkish or from Tartar ;
but the circumstances of the Mariupol Greeks point of course
to Tartar as the source. A good criterion might be found
if these words were examined in bulk. If they are taken
from the Turkish, one would expect among them some of
the Arabic and Persian words with which Ottoman Turkish
so much abounds ; in a Tartar source these would be missing.
So, too, a close examination of the phonetics of Tartar and
Turkish would be helpful. We can be fairly sure too that
the Mariupol dialect contains some large Russian element ;
Sergievsky says as much, but I have not had access to sufficient
texts to make any lists, either of these or of the Tartar words.

Of the future it is never easy to speak. In Greece it seems
most likely that the Pontic dialect will gradually give way
to the general language of Greece ; it will follow, that is to
say, rapidly or slowly the path already entered upon by the
mass of the present-day dialects. In Russia what will happen
will depend upon social and political developments. What
these will be it is hard to foresee, and impossible for one who
has no first-hand knowledge of the social conditions of these
Greek-speaking settlements.

NOTE.—As the above pages were passing through the press,
fresh material for the dialect of Khaldia, the district of

Argyropolis, has been published in vol. vii of the ᾿Αρχεῖον
Πόντου, in the shape of a collection of folk-tales collected by
the late Ioannis Valavanis of Kerasund.   In these texts I
find examples of the enclitic object ἀ, " it," and of the first
plural present active in -μες (τρώγουμες, πίνουμες), so
that these forms are not entirely confined, the first to Of,
Sourmena and Ordou, and the second to the dialect of
Kerasund.   Though there is no record of these forms in the
Greek of Rostov, my argument that this most closely resembles
the Khaldia dialect is not invalidated. I add that I have no
evidence that this active -μες ending appears in either the
imperfect or the aorist : I find no examples of it in these
tenses.