The Etymology of Cypriot Greek /'ent[Integral]e/*
Vayos J Liapis
Glotta; Zeitschrift für Griechische und Lateinische Sprache...; 2007; 83, Humanities Module
pg. 113

The Etymology of Cypriot Greek /'entʃe/*

By VAYOS J. LIAPIS, Montreal

Abstract: /'entʃe/, one of the two negative particles used in Cypriot Greek today, is of obscure origin; etymologies proposed so far do not hold water. It seems that /'entʃe/ should be analysed as a compound word, consisting pleonastically of two negatives, namely /'en/, commonly used in Cyprus, and /'ki/, with attestations only in Pontus. This is confirmed by the fact that both Cypriot /'entʃe/ and Pontic /'ki/ generate parallel syntactic structures, in which pronominal objects follow the verb; whereas with Cypriot /'en/ it is the verb that follows the pronominal object (as with Standard Modern Greek negative δεv). There are good parallels both for the pleonastic combination of synonymous morphemes and for the transference of isolated morphemes into Cypriot Greek from neighbouring linguistic communities. As for the entry of /'ki/ from far-off Pontus into the Cypriot isogloss, it may date back to the 14th-16th centuries, when contacts between Cyprus and Anatolia seem to have become possible after a long period of isolation. A particularly favourable period for the introduction of Anatolian linguistic material into Cyprus was the period after 1571 or 1572, when the Ottoman authorities ordered Anatolian populations, including Christians, to be transferred to the island.

Modern Cypriot Greek has two negative particles, namely (1) ['en], with a rarer allomorph ['ðen], cf. Standard Modern Greek (SMG) δεv; and (2) ['entʃe], with a voiced allomorph ['endʒe]. Both of them have sandhi realizations ['entʃ] or ['endʒ] before vowels. There appears to be no semantic differentiation between /'en/ and /'entʃe/, although they do generate differing *syntactic structures* when pronominal objects are present. Thus, /'en/ causes the pronominal object to precede the verb, as in

---

$$['en^A \ to^B \ 'ekama^C]$$
$$^A not \quad ^B it \quad ^C I \ did$$
"I didn't do it" (cf. SMG δεν το έκαμα).

By contrast, with /'entʃe/, it is the verb that precedes the pronominal object, e.g.

$$['entʃ^A \ 'ekam_ιa^B \ to^C]$$
$$^A not \quad ^B I \ did \quad ^C it$$
"I didn't do it."[1]

The etymology of /'entʃe/ is obscure. Native speakers, who generally spell έντζ(ι)αι, assume that the word derives from a fusion of the common negative /'en/ and of the common connective conjunction /'tʃe/ "and"; the latter corresponds to SMG και, hence the common spelling έντζ(ι)αι. Faced with the obvious objection that, in Greek, a connective ('*tʃe*, "and") cannot be combined with a negative ('*en*, "not") in order to produce another negative ('*entʃe*, "not"), some native speakers will maintain that /'tʃe/, "and", provides a connection with preceding utterances, or that it is elliptic for such phrases as the following:

$$/'tʃe^A \ (la'lo^B \ suʃ^C \ 'ot^D) \ 'en^E \ to^F \ 'ekama^G/$$
$$^A and \quad ^B I \ am \ telling \quad ^C to \ you \ ^D that \quad ^E not \quad ^F it \quad ^G I \ did$$
"and (*I'm telling you that*) I didn't do it."[2]

This however is untenable. To begin with, in such cases Greek syntactic norms require that connectives such as /'tʃe/ precede negatives such as /'en/ rather than follow them. Moreover, it will be noted that, in the example given above, the pronominal object (/to/) comes *before* the verb (/'ekama/), because as noted already /'en/ generates syntactic structures in which the verb is *preceded*

---

[1] This is also pointed out by Menardos (1931= 2001:150).
[2] Such popular notions have found their way into Cypriot glossaries too. Cf. e.g. Loukas (1979: 147): "ὁ *καὶ* περιττεύει, ἂν δὲν εἶναι φρ[άσις] τυπικὴ ἐκ συγκοπῆς προηγουμένων *καὶ* ἐκ μεταθέσεως τῶν *καὶ δέν*". So also, apparently, Erotokritos (1989: 22), who explicates /'entʃe/, impossibly, as δὲν καὶ εἶναι. Loukas, inconsequentially, also entertains the impossible notion that /tʃe/ < Ital. *ce*.

by the pronominal object. Thus, ['tʃe 'en to 'ekama], "I didn't do
it" (or rather ['tʃen to 'ekama], by synecphonesis) is the sole
syntactic structure permissible with /'tʃe 'en/. Nonetheless, this
type of construction is impossible with /'entʃe/: the only syn-
tactic structure allowed here is the one in which the pronominal
object *follows* the verb; thus, ['entʃ 'ekam₁a to].

Cypriot etymological dictionaries or similar reference works
are of no help either. They either insist on the derivation from
(δ)εν + και (e.g. Kontosopoulos [1994:24]) or otherwise offer
fantastic etymologies. In one instance, we hear that ['endʒe]
derives from ancient Greek οὐδέν γε (thus Giankoulles [2002:
s.v. ἐντζε, p. 100]). This of course cannot not hold water,
because γε would give voiced palatalised velar fricative [ʝe], not
alveolar affricate [tʃe] or [dʒe], in Cypriot Greek[3] – and it would
be simply unimaginable that Cypriot Greek has preserved the
ancient Greek pronunciation of γε as palatalised velar stop [ʝe]
in this unique case. Alternative etymologies offered by other
Cypriot dictionaries are worse still. Thus, from a postulated
*/'udʒe/ – spelled *οὔτζε, and supposedly derived from the
sandhi fusion of ancient Greek negative οὐκ with following
syllabic verbal augment ε-, although this would have rather
yielded */'utʃe/ – one etymologist derives an equally hypothe-
tical */'edʒe/ (*ἔτζε) by an unparalleled recessive assimilation
(*οὔτζε > *ἔτζε), finally to arrive at ['endʒe], ἔντζε, where
nasalisation is explained as resulting from the influence of the
common negative /'en/ (thus Hatziioannou [1996:s.v. ἔντζε, p.
64]).

Patently, all etymologies proposed thus far cannot stand, and
a fresh approach is required. To begin with, there can be no
doubt that ['entʃe] presupposes *['ence], given the general ten-
dency of modern Cypriot Greek to express palatal stops (such as

---

[3] Cf. the modern Greek dialect of Apulia, where οὐδέν γε has produced
several palatal plosive, or fricative, variants preserving traces of ancient [ʝe]
but *never* an alveolar affricate [d'endʒe] or ["d'endʒe]; cf. Andriotis (1974:
s.v. οὐδέν, no. 4535, p. 421); cf. *ibid.* s.v. γε (no. 1642, p. 193). Andriotis re-
ports these variants as dévgε (<οὐδέν + γε), déggε, déγε, vdéggε, vdévgε etc.

[c]) as alveolar affricates before front vowels (thus, [c] > [tʃ]).[4] In this case, [dʒ] in the allophone ['endʒe], can be but a voiced allophone of [tʃ], because of the preceding nasal [n].[5]

Nor is there any doubt that ['entʃe] < *['ence] is a compound word with negative ['en] as its first component. It is the second component, namely ['tʃe] < *['ce], that is problematic. The fact that its etymology is no longer understood by native speakers suggests probably an archaic origin that has now been forgotten. It may nonetheless be significant that native speakers unanimously remark that /'entʃe/ is more "emphatic" than simple /'en/. Taking account of this, Simos Menardos proposed as early as 1931 a convincing etymology, which was subsequently forgotten. It is Menardos' suggestion (presented succinctly in a single-page article) which I wish here to revive and to expand on.[6] According to this, /'entʃe/ derives from a pleonastic combination of two negative particles, namely ['en] and ['tʃe], the latter of which is (in accordance with Cypriot phonetic norms) an alveolar affricate allophone of the negative particle /'ke/, "not". This /'ke/, now, is a variant of /'ki/, an abbreviated form of /u'ki/ (it-self is a relic of Ionic οὐκί, or even perhaps a fusion of οὐκ and οὐχί). Both /'ke/ and /'ki/ are widely attested in Pontic Greek.[7] Remarkably, Pontic negatives /'ki/ and /'ke/ are sometimes also

---

[4] Cf. Newton (1972:23, 24-26), who rightly notes that this is not a universal phenomenon in Cypriot Greek, cf. e.g. [eðul'efcete], rather than [eðul'eftʃete]; cf. also Menardos (1969:7-9). Newton is also right to postulate three contrasting phonemes in modern Cypriot Greek, namely [k] (voiceless velar stop), [c] (palatal stop), and [tʃ] (alveolar affricate). I have adapted Newton's symbols (k, ḳ, and č, respectively) to IPA standards.

[5] Cf. Newton (1972:27). For voiceless stops voiced by the preceding nasal in SMG cf. also Mirambel (1949:32); Mackridge (1985:23); for a detailed treatment see Tarabout (1984:445-452).

[6] Menardos (1931 = 1969:150). I had come up with the same etymology independently of Menardos.

[7] Andriotis (1974:s.v. οὐκί, no. 4539, p. 422) reports that 'κί, 'κέ, 'κ but also the unscathed forms οὐκί, οὐκέ are attested in a great number of Pontic regions; cf. also Papadopoulos (1958:II, s.v. οὐ, p. 123). Notable is also a number of *alveolar affricate* Pontic variants ([utʃ'i], [utʃ'e], [tʃ'e], [tʃ] etc.), which of course correspond more closely to Cypriot Greek /'entʃe/. According to Menardos' plausible hypothesis, ['ke] could be a later sandhi development originating in such syntagmata as (οὐ)κ ἔγραψα etc.

combined, pleonastically, with other negatives, such as /ti'ðen/ "nothing" or /'ðen/ and /'mi(n)/ "not". Consider the following examples:

1.

[ti'ðen^A c (='cɪ)^B 'efaɣa^C]
^A nothing   ^B not   ^C I ate
"I ate nothing"

2.

['kara^A c^B a'ika^C 'ðen^D c (='cɪ)^E 'etane^F sin^G tur'cian^H]
^A cars   ^B and   ^C suchlike   ^D not ^E not ^F were   ^G in   ^H Turkey
"Cars and suchlike, there were none in Turkey"

3.

[na^A 'mi^B c (='cɪ)^C 'etrexa^D e'ci^E ti'ðen^F 'ci^G θa^H e'jindune^I]
^A if ^B not ^C not ^D I had run ^E there ^F nothing ^G not ^H would ^I have happened
"If I hadn't run there, nothing would have happened"[8]

This pleonastic combination of two negatives is exactly parallel to that of Cypriot /'entʃe/ (< /'en/+/'tʃe/), and would nicely account for the "emphatic" function attributed to /'entʃe/.[9] After all, Cypriot Greek itself does not lack such pleonastic combinations of particles: cf. the comparative [z'jon] (σγοιόν, "like", "as if"), which derives from ὡς οἷον, ['os 'ion].

As a parenthesis, we may offer a slight alternative (not necessarily a preferable one) to Menardos' derivation of /'entʃe/ from Pontic /'ke/. In view of the fact that /'ki/ is a more ancient (and, it would appear, a somewhat more frequent) variant than /'ke/, it is possible to postulate a derivation of /'entʃe/ from a combination of /'en/ and /'ki/ – i.e. */enki/, or */'entʃi/ according to the phonetic norm in Cypriot Greek –, whence ['entʃe] would be produced with recessive assimilation of [i] to the preceding [e]. For a comparable assimilation of [i] to [e], albeit a progressive

---

[8] The first two examples are taken from Drettas (1997:401-402); the third, from Papadopoulos (as in n. 7).

[9] As a parallel to the double negative Menardos (1931 = 1969:150) adduces e.g. French *je ne dis pas*.

one, cf. Turkish *menevi$, "guilloche" or "moiré fabric", which has yielded in Cypriot Greek [mene'vi∫in] but also [mene've∫in]. Cf. also Turk. *minder*, "cushion" or "mat", which in Cypriot Greek (and in SMG) is realized as /men'deri/.[10]

The hypothesis that Cypriot Greek /'ent∫e/ is a fusion of Cypriot Greek /'en/ and Pontic /'ki/ (or /'ke/ according to Menardos) may receive further support from syntactic considerations. Pontic /'ki/-sentences generate structures in which the pronominal object, as a rule, comes *after* the verb, e.g.

[pso'min[A] o'loeron[B] e'ðecen[C] ats[D] 'ci[E] 'perna[F] to[G]]
[A] bread   [B] whole   [C] she gave   [D] to them   [E] not   [F] they took   [G] it
"She gave them a whole (loaf of) bread, (but) they didn't take it."[11]

As we have already seen, Cypriot Greek /'ent∫e/ likewise causes the pronominal object to follow the verb, whereas in /'en/-negative clauses, the pronominal object precedes the verb; contrast again ['en to 'ekama], "I didn't do it", with ['ent∫ 'ekam₁ato], "I didn't do it."

How should a feature that is seemingly exclusive to Pontus have found its way into Cypriot Greek? To begin with, transference of isolated morphemes into Cypriot Greek from neighbouring linguistic communities (even non-Greek ones) is far from unparalleled. Let two examples suffice:

(1) The Turkish morpheme *-cı* (allomorphs: *-ci, -cu, -cü*, etc.), which denotes professional capacity, has been adopted by Cypriot Greek, as well as SMG: cf. e.g. Turk. *demir-ci*, "blacksmith", *boya-cı*, "painter"; SMG μπογιατζής, "painter", Cypriot Greek [taksi-'dʒis], "taxi driver."

---

[10] It should be further pointed out that, as both S. Menardos and M. Triantafyllides have shown, in a number of foreign loan words (esp. medieval ones), mainland and Cypriot Greek turn ι into ε: cf. /pez'unin/ < Fr. *pigeon*, and for the reverse movement, [tsimiɲ'a] < Fr. *cheminée*. See Triantafyllides (1909:§6, cf. §14) = Triantafyllides (1963:334, cf. 348-349); Menardos (1969:153-154). This implies an instability in the vocalism of such loan-words, instability which may or may not have played an additional rôle in the transformation of */'ent∫i/ into /'ent∫e/, given the non-Cypriot provenance of /'ke/ or /'ki/.
[11] The example (modified) is quoted from Drettas (1997:538).

(2) The Turkish morpheme *miş* (allomorph *ymiş*) designates the "inferential" tense, which denotes an unconfirmed report, or an inference.[12] Cf. e.g. *gel-miş-im* "I am said to be coming." Cypriot Greek has appropriated Turkish *miş / ymiş*, and has assigned it a new grammatical function by turning it into the adverb /i'miʃ/, meaning "supposedly", "professedly."

The main difficulty of my argument would appear to be a geographical one: according to the data assembled by Andriotis, /'ki/ seems to be limited to the Pontic regions along the northern coast of modern-day Turkey, by the Black Sea, and to a few regions in Thrace.[13] It does not, in principle, seem plausible that an isolated morpheme such as Pontic /'ke/ or /'ki/ should have found their way from those remote areas into the Cypriot Greek isogloss to produce /'entʃe/. One may consider several ways about this difficulty, but certainty is impossible. Menardos, for instance, toyed with the idea that the origins of /'entʃe/ date back to 691, during Justinian II Rhinotmetus' first reign, when many Cypriots were forced to resettle in the region of Cyzicus at the Hellespont, as part of a larger policy of mass migrations (possibly "in order to rehabilitate the country which had been terribly devastated by the Arabs");[14] the new settlement was named New Justinianopolis.[15] However, those Cypriots were

---

[12] See further Lewis (1975:101, §10). Cf. the use of the *conditionnel* in French, or the German *Konjunktiv I*, to report utterances that are unverified, open to question.

[13] Cf. again Andriotis (as in n. 7), who records attestations of (variants of) /k'i/ from Thrace (Skopos), Cappadocia (Anakou, Pharasa), and Pontus (Amisos, Haldia, Inepolis, Kerasounda, Kotyora, Oinoe, Ophis, Sanda, Sinopi, Sourmaina, Trapezounda).

[14] Thus Charanis (1961:151 = 1972:no.III, 151). On Justinian's resettlement of Cyzicus with Cypriots in the context of the Byzantine state's policy of population transfer see Jenkins in Jenkins *et all.* (1962: 181 (*ad* 47/3-5)); Charanis (1961:143 = 1972:no.III, 143).

[15] Menardos (1931 = 1969:150). Cf. Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, *De administrando imperio*, ch. 47 (Moravcsik & Jenkins [1949:224-5]); Michael Syrus, *Chronicle* XI.15 (Chabot [1901:469]). Theophanes the Confessor (*Chronogr.* 558-9, De Boor [1883:365]) says that many of these Cypriots drowned or succumbed to diseases while being transferred away from the island; the rest of them were brought back to Cyprus (πλῆθος δὲ Κυπρίων περώντων κατεποντίσθη, καὶ ἀπὸ ἀρρωστίας ὤλοντο· καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ ἐστράφησαν

relocated back to Cyprus as early as 698, surely too short a
period for their dialect to have been influenced by Pontic
Greek.[16]

We must rather look for periods of contact between Cyprus
and Anatolia, which could have opened passageways for the
transference of linguistic material. Such passageways, if any,
cannot have been active later than the late nineteenth century;
for the detailed demographic data that we possess (thanks to the
meticulousness of the British colonial authorities) for the period
1881-1931 show an extremely high percentage (between 97,90%
and 98,94%) of native-born inhabitants of Cyprus, which is of
course incompatible with significant migrations from Pontus or
Anatolia (or anywhere else, for that matter) in that period.[17] By
contrast, there is evidence for contacts between the two areas in
the period from the 14th to the 16th century. After the fall of
Constantinople in 1453, for instance, Helena Palaiologina of-
fered *inter alia* large pieces of land to Hellespont Greeks

εἰς Κύπρον). However, Baronius (1742:114 XII, A.D. 690) rightly points out
that some of those Cypriots must have reached Cyzicus, for the 39th Canon
of the Sixth Synod addresses, precisely, the ecclesiastical status of those
immigrants (cf. also Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, *l.c.*).

[16] Thus Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, *l.c.* (n. 15): "seven years after"
the Cypriots' resettlement in Cyzicus, Justinian II had them carried over back
to Cyprus, together with those Cypriots that were in Syria. Treadgold
(1997:938 n. 19) argues that it was Justinian's overthrower and successor
Leontius (Emperor Leo, 695-698), rather than Tiberius III Apsimar (698-
705), who effected the Cypriots' resettlement on Cyprus; *contra* Jenkins in
Jenkins *et all.* 1962: 181 (*ad* 47/15).

[17] In 1881, the proportion of native-born inhabitans of Cyprus was
98,65%; it changed insignificantly in the decades 1881-1891 (98.13%) and
1891-1901 (98,94%). See Mavrogordato (1902:14, 65 with Table VIII). Cf.
Mavrogordato's comment, (1902:§73): "There has been a very slight varia-
tion in the proportion of persons born in Cyprus during the past two decades,
and the above table shews that only 1.06 of the population at the last Census
were strangers to Cyprus, of whom nearly three fourths are born in Europe";
in other words, there is no migration from Anatolia to speak of. The 1911
census returned a 98,97% of native-born Cypriots (see Mavrogordato
[1912:15]), while in the 1921 Census the percentage remained largely the
same, at 98,28% (cf. Hart-Davis [1922:14]). Finally, the 1931 Census
returned a 97,90% of native-born Cypriots: see Hart-Davis (1932:19). By that
date, /'entʃe/ is firmly established in the literary sources.

seeking refuge on Cyprus.[18] This must have surely brought about an influx of Pontic linguistic material into Cyprus. It is just as possible, however, that such influx was the result of a longer and more complicated process. We know, for example, that in 1375 the Kingdom of Lesser Armenia in Cilicia fell to the Mameluks, and was subsequently invaded by the Ottoman Turks (1405), who managed to establish their authority over the entire region by the sixteenth century; this must have facilitated contacts between Cyprus and the Seleucia region at its north, as well as the rest of the Karaman area.[19] Indeed, in 1571 or 1572, the newly established Ottoman authorities ordered Anatolian populations – Christians, as well as Muslims – to be transferred over to Cyprus, in an attempt to remedy the massive population decline and the devastation of lands caused by the preceding war.[20] All in all, such contacts between Cyprus and Asia Minor as may be gleaned for the period between the 14th and the 16th centuries must surely account, to a considerable extent, for the affinities between Greek dialects of Asia Minor and Cyprus, described among others by M. Triantafyllides, who classified

---

[18] See Leóntios Machairás, Ἐξήγησις τῆς γλυκείας χώρας Κύπρου §711 (Dawkins [1932: 682]). This piece of information survives in only one manuscript, the Oxon. Bodl. Selden Supra 14 (O), 330ʳ; see Pieris & Nikolaou-Konnari (2003:461).

[19] Tsopanakis (1983:II. XLIX) postulates a mass migration of Attaleiotes into Cyprus in 1373, when King Pierre II de Lusignan of Cyprus ceded the castle of Attaleia to the Turks (Leóntios Machairás, Ἐξήγησις τῆς γλυκείας χώρας Κύπρου, §367-8 = Dawkins [1932: 344-6]); Attaleia had been captured and annexed by king Pierre I de Lusignan in 1361 (see Leóntios Machairás §121 = Dawkins [1932: 106], and cf. Papadopoullos [1980:306]). Such a mass migration, if historically verifiable, might indeed have presented yet another potential occasion for the transfer of linguistic material from Asia Minor into Cyprus (although Attaleia is decidedly too far from Pontus). But no such massive resettlement of population can be documented: Machairás (§367-8) makes it clear that it was only the king's Christian garrison that was transferred to Cyprus.

[20] See Papadopoullos (1965:19-27), who shows that the deportation order also affected Christian populations that were likely Greek-speaking. Indeed, in a Sultanic *firman* addressed to the Qadi of Ak-Dag (a certain Husein Çavuş) and dated 8 August 1573, these populations are designated as "Greek rayas": see Papadopoullos (1965:25).

Cypriot Greek as an intermediary idiom between those of Asia Minor and the Dodecanese.[21]

If the entry of /'ki/ into Cypriot Greek goes as far back as the 14th-16th centuries, it may at first sight appear odd that /'entʃe/ does not seem to occur in Cypriot Greek written sources before the first quarter of the twentieth century. For it is absent from a random sample of fifteenth-century administrative documents that I was able to check,[22] as well as from the fifteenth-century *Chronicle* by Leóntios Machairás,[23] and from the sixteenth-century love poems known as Ρίμες αγάπης.[24] Nor does it feature in what Cypriot Greek folk songs I have seen, or in the collection of Cypriot Greek folk tales that Sakellarios collected (presumably from autopsy) and published in 1891. In all of these texts, the only negative particles are [ð'en] or ['en] (or /m'i/ in volitive clauses). By contrast, /'entʃe/ is a regular feature e.g. of D. Lipértis's dialect poems published in the 1920s and '30s, and (to a lesser extent) of V. Michaïlídis's poems published between the 1880s and the early 1910s. Nonetheless, a crucial factor should be taken into account here: authors (especially earlier ones) as well as collectors of folk material tend to play down strongly dialectal or colloquial elements, such as /'entʃe/ when SMG equivalents are available – as is the case with Cypriot Greek /'en/, which is closer to SMG δεν than /'entʃe/. This tendency, observable already in such early texts as Machairás's *Chronicle*, is principally due to a programmatic intent to stress Cyprus's Hellenic identity. Thus, Machairás for instance complains that the common Greek tongue of his day (ρωμαῖκα καθολικά), which Greek Cypriots used to master before the Frankish occupation, had been contaminated by Frankish admix-

---

[21] See Triantafyllides (1938:269-270). Linguistic evidence for such exchanges between Cyprus and Asia Minor is provided by Tsopanakis (1983:II.XLVII-L); Tsopanakis (1986:1-2).

[22] Such as the fifteenth-century peace treaties, petitions, and edicts published by Sakellarios (1891:II.1-6).

[23] Cf. Dawkins (1932); "diplomatic" edition of the surviving manuscripts (a valuable source of linguistic peculiarities): Pieris and Nikolaou-Konnari (2003).

[24] See Siapkaras-Pitsillidès (1975); Siapkara-Pitsillidou (1976).

tures during the Lusignan regime.[25] Some four centuries later, Vasílis Michaïlídes, despite producing a significant number of purely dialect poems, would nonetheless on a number of occasions ape the *katharévousa* of the Greek romantics. Even Dimítris Lipértis, who wrote perhaps the most unadulterated, self-conscious Cypriot poetry (and does regularly use /ˈentʃe/), succumbed to the Hellenocentric fashion of his day by penning a limited number of poems in SMG or in a mild *katharévousa*. At any rate, conclusive evidence for the entrance of /ˈentʃe/ into Cypriot Greek cannot be obtained so long as we lack concordances and serious specialized lexica for Cypriot Greek – and so long as one has no access to searchable databases of medieval and modern Cypriot texts.

To conclude: we have argued that Cypriot /ˈentʃe/ is a pleonastic combination of two negative particles, namely /ˈen/ and /tʃˈe/, the latter of which derives from /kˈi/ (or /kˈe/), which is otherwise attested only in Pontus. Pleonastic combination of particles and importation of isolated morphemes from foreign linguistic communities are amply attested for Cypriot Greek. As for the date and the manner of the entrance of /kˈi/ into the Cypriot isogloss, they are a matter of conjecture, although it is possible that this took place in the 14th-16th centuries via the Karaman area that functioned as a passageway between Cyprus

---

[25] L. Machairás, Ἐξήγησις τῆς γλυκείας χώρας Κύπρου, §158 (= Dawkins [1932:142]): ...ὡς που καὶ 'πῆραν τὸν τόπον οἱ Λαζανιάδες, καὶ ἀπὸ τότες ἀρκέψα νὰ μαθάνουν φράγκικα, καὶ 'βαρβαρίσαν τὰ ρωμαῖκα, ὡς γοιὸν καὶ σήμερον, καὶ γράφομεν φράγκικα καὶ ρωμαῖκα, ὅτι εἰς τὸν κόσμον δὲν ἠξεύρουν εἶντα συντυχχάνομεν: "until the Lusignan took hold of this land, and since that time they [sc. Cypriot Greeks] started learning Frankish, and barbarized their Greek tongue, just like today, when we write Frankish and Greek [i.e., a mixed Frankish-Greek language, cf. the O version: ἐσμίχτην ἡ συντυχία, βάρβαρη ρωμαίκη καὶ λατινική], in such a way that no one in the world can say what our language is." (transl. Dawkins, adapted). I reproduce Dawkins' (1932) edition of the V version; for the variants in the other two versions (O, R) see Pieris & Nikolaou-Konnari (2003:148).

and Anatolia, or as a result of refugees from the Hellespont settling on Cyprus after the fall of Constantinople, or of mass resettlement of Anatolian populations to Cyprus by the Ottoman authorities. Still, no certain conclusion may be reached until we have either reliable tools for the study of modern Cypriot, or a sizeable corpus of modern Cypriot texts available in electronic format.

Notes

Bibliography

Andriotis, N. (1974): *Lexikon der Archaismen in neugriechischen Dialekten* (Schr. d. Balkankomission Ling. Abt. XXII). Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Baronius, C. (1742): *Annales ecclesiastici auctore Caesare Baronio Sorano ... una cum critica historico-chronologica P. Antonii Pagii,* vol. XII. Lucae: Typis Leonardi Venturini.

Chabot, J.-B. (1901): *Chronique de Michel le Syrien, Patriarque jacobite d'Antioche (1166-1199). Éditée pour la première fois et traduite en français par –,* vol. II. Paris: Ernest Leroux.

Charanis, P. (1961): "The Transfer of Population as a Policy in the Byzantine Empire", *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 3: 140-54.

- (1971): *Studies on the Demography of the Byzantine Empire: Collected Studies.* London: Variorum Reprints.

Dawkins, R. M. (1932): *Leontios Makhairas, Recital Concerning the Sweet Land of Cyprus Entitled "Chronicle", Edited with a Translation and Notes by* –, vol. I. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

De Boor, C. (1883): *Theophanis Chronographia*, vol. I. Leipzig: Teubner.

Drettas, G. (1997): *Aspects pontiques*. Paris: Association de recherches pluri-disciplinaires.

Erotokritos, I. (1989): Ὑλικὰ διὰ τὴν σύνταξινἱστορικοῦ λεξικοῦ τῆς κυπριακῆς διαλέκτου, μέρος Γ΄: Γλωσσάριον Ἰωάννου Ἐρωτοκρίτου, ἔκδοση Θεοφανῶς Δ. Κυπρῆ, Nicosia: Kentron Epistimonikon Erevnon Kyprou.

Giankoulles, K. G. (2002): Θησαυρὸς κυπριακῆς διαλέκτου. Nicosia: S. Leivadiote.

Hart-Davis, C. H. (1922): *Cyprus: Report and General Abstracts of the Census of 1921*. London: Waterlow & Sons.

- (1932): *Cyprus: Report and General Abstracts of the Census of 1931*. Nicosia: F.S. Passingham.

Hatziioannou, K. (K. Χατζηιωάννου) (1996): Ἐτυμολογικὸ λεξικὸ τῆς ὁμιλουμένης κυπριακῆς διαλέκτου. Nicosia: Tamassos.

Jenkins, R. J. H. *et all.* (1962): *Constantine Porphyrogenitus De Administrando Imperio, volume II: Commentary, by F. Dvornik, R. J. H. Jenkins, B. Lewis, G. Moravcsik, D. Obolensky, S. Runciman, edited by* –. London: The Athlone Press.

Kontosopoulos, N. G. (N. Κοντοσόπουλος) ([2]1994): Διάλεκτοι καὶ ἰδιώματα τῆς Νέας Ἑλληνικῆς. Athens.

Lewis, G. L. ([2]1975): *Turkish Grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Loukas, G. (1979): Ὑλικὰ διὰ τὴν σύνταξιν ἱστορικοῦ λεξικοῦ τῆς κυπριακῆς διαλέκτου, μέρος Α΄: Γλωσσάριον Γεωργίου Λουκᾶ, ἐκδιδόμενον ὑπὸ Θεοφανοῦς Δ. Κυπρῆ, Nicosia: Kentron Epistimonikon Erevnon Kyprou.

Mackridge, P. (1985): *The Modern Greek Language: A Descriptive Analysis of Standard Modern Greek*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mavrogordato, A. (1902): *Cyprus: Report and General Abstracts of the Census of 1901*. Nicosia: The Government Printing Office.

- (1912): *Cyprus: Report and General Abstracts of the Census of 1911*. London: Waterlow & Sons.

Menardos, S. (Σ. Μενάρδος) (1931): «Περὶ τοῦ κυπριακοῦ ἔντζε», Πρακτικὰ τῆς Ἀκαδημίας Ἀθηνῶν 6: 476.

- (1969): Γλωσσικαὶ μελέται [Δημοσιεύματα τοῦ Κέντρου Ἐπιστημονικῶν Ἐρευνῶν]. Nicosia: Kentro Epistimonikon Erevnon (repr. 2001).

Mirambel, A. (1949): *Grammaire du grec moderne*. Paris: Klincksieck.

Moravcsik, G. (ed.) & R. J. H. Jenkins (transl.) (1949): *Constantine Porphyrogenitus De administrando imperio*. Budapest: Pázmány Péter Tudományegyetemi Görög Filológiai Intézet.

Newton, B. (1972): *Cypriot Greek: Its Phonology and Inflections*. The Hague/Paris: Mouton.

Papadopoulos, A. A. (Α. Α. Παπαδόπουλος) (1958): *Ἱστορικὸν λεξικὸν τῆς ποντικῆς διαλέκτου*. Athens: Myrtides.

Papadopoullos, Th. (Θ. Παπαδόπουλλος) (1965): *Social and Historical Data on Population (1570-1881)*. Nicosia: Cyprus Research Centre.

- (1980): «Τὸ μεσαιωνικὸ βασίλειο τῆς Κύπρου 1192-1489», *Ἱστορία τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ Ἔθνους*, 301-316, Athens: Ekdotiki Athinon.

Pieris, M./Nikolaou-Konnari, A. (Μ. Πιερής/Α. Νικολάου-Κονναρή) (2003): *Λεοντίου Μαχαιρά Χρονικό της Κύπρου: παράλληλη διπλωματική έκδοση των χειρογράφων*. Nicosia: Kentro Epistimonikon Erevnon.

Sakellarios, A. A. (Α. Α. Σακελλάριος (1891): *Τὰ Κυπριακά, ἤτοι γεωγραφία, ἱστορία καὶ γλῶσσα τῆς νήσου Κύπρου ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρχαιοτάτων χρόνων μέχρι σήμερον*. Athens: P.D. Sakellarios.

Siapkaras-Pitsillidès, Th. (1975): *Le Pétrarquisme en Chypre. Poèmes d'amour en dialecte chypriote d'après un manuscrit du XVIe siècle*. Paris/Athens: Les Belles Lettres.

Siapkara-Pitsillidou, Th. (Θ. Σιαπκαρᾶ-Πιτσιλλίδου) (1976): *Ὁ Πετραρχισμὸς στὴν Κύπρο. Ρίμες ἀγάπης ἀπὸ χειρόγραφο τοῦ 16ου αἰῶνα μὲ μεταφορὰ στὴν κοινή μας γλῶσσα*. Athens.

Tarabout, Y. (1984): "Le traitement de l'association nasale + occlusive en Grec moderne", in: *Αφιέρωμα στον Καθηγητή Σταμάτη Καρατζά*, edited by various editors, Athens: Elliniko Logotechniko kai Istoriko Archeio.

Treadgold, W. (1997): *A History of the Byzantine State and Society*. Stanford, CA.

Triantafyllides, M. (Μ. Τριανταφυλλίδης) (1909): *Die Lehnwörter der Mittel-griechischen Vulgärliteratur*. Diss., Marburg.

- (1938): *Νεοελληνικὴ γραμματική, πρῶτος τόμος: ἱστορικὴ εἰσαγωγή*. Athens.

- (1963): *Ἄπαντα Μανόλη Τριανταφυλλίδη*, vol 1. Thessaloniki: Institouto Neoellinikon Spoudon.

Tsopanakis, A. G. (Α. Γ. Τσοπανάκης) (1983): *Συμβολὲς στὴν ἱστορία τῆς ἑλληνικῆς γλώσσας*. Thessaloniki.

- (1986): «Μικρασιατικὲς φωνητικὲς ἐπιδράσεις στὰ γειτονικά νησιωτικά ἰδιώματα», in *Studies in Greek Linguistics: Proceedings of the 7th Annual Meeting of the Department of Linguistics ... University of Thessaloniki*, edited by various editors. Thessaloniki: Adelfoi Kyriakidi.