


The Historical Review/La Revue Historique

Vol 20, No 1 (2023)

The Historical Review / La Revue Historique

The *H*istorical Review
La Revue *H*istorique



VOLUME XX (2023)

Section de Recherches Néohelléniques
Institut de Recherches Historiques / FNRS

Section of Neohellenic Research
Institute of Historical Research / NHRF

Tommaso Stanislao Velasti's Battle(s) for the Greek Language

Mara Psalti

doi: [10.12681/hr.40064](https://doi.org/10.12681/hr.40064)

Copyright © 2025



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).

To cite this article:

Psalti, M. (2025). Tommaso Stanislao Velasti's Battle(s) for the Greek Language: The Case of his Frangochiotika. *The Historical Review/La Revue Historique*, 20(1), 209–251. <https://doi.org/10.12681/hr.40064>

TOMMASO STANISLAO VELASTI'S BATTLE(S) FOR THE GREEK LANGUAGE: THE CASE OF HIS FRANGOCHIOTIKA

Mara Psalti

ABSTRACT: This article discusses the Frangochiotic corpus of Tommaso Stanislao Velasti, a prolific Jesuit scholar and writer hailing from the island of Chios (1717–1773), within the broader context of his advocacy for the Greek language, both ancient/classical and vernacular. It examines the linguistic intricacies of his allography, with a focus on two key works: *Anapavsis tis cardhias* (Rome, 1746), a translated manual of spiritual theology, and *Psichofelis loji* (Messina, 1753), an original collection of meditative sermons. The study includes a comprehensive typological analysis of his allographic systems, exploring the correspondences between Latin and Greek scripts, and investigates how his allography reflects the contemporary dialect of Chios. The article posits that Frangochiotika not only mirrors Velasti's overarching aspiration to champion his native Chiot dialect but is also paradoxically incorporated into a pioneering proposal – modeled after Dante and Petrarch – for the standardisation of vernacular Greek.

1. Introduction

Despite the renewed interest in his work by a few Greek and Italian scholars during the late 1980s and throughout the 1990s,¹ Tommaso Stanislao Velasti (Chios, 1717–Palermo, 1773), an extraordinary Greek Jesuit man of letters, poet and translator, remains a familiar stranger of modern Greek literature. This is not surprising. Extant copies of his books are extremely rare and occasionally totally absent from Greek libraries; no access to digital copies of them (except for his linguistic treatises) are available to scholarly readers; most significantly, his books have not yet been reprinted let alone edited. Hence, Velasti emerges as a focal point for future research and editorial practice in the fields of modern Greek, comparative and Jesuit studies.²

A Chiot yet of Genoese origin, a Greek yet a Catholic, a Catholic yet a Jesuit, a Jesuit yet a great admirer of the Byzantine rite, and in a state akin to suppression

¹ For this recent reception of Velasti, see Matteo Mandalà, “Tommaso Stanislao Velasti tra filellenismo partenopeo e ideologia ‘albanista,’” *Studi sull’Oriente Cristiano* 25, no. 2 (2021): 164–67.

² On Velasti's life and work, see mainly Markos Roussos-Milidonis, *Έλληνες Ιησουίτες (1560–1773)* (Athens: Kentro Ekdiloseon-Omilion, 1993), 195–214; Nasos Vayenas, “Θωμάς

by his Jesuit superiors prior to the suppression of his religious order by Pope Clement XIV (“Dominus ac Redemptor,” 1773), Velasti appears to embody multiple identities, encapsulating powerful cultural tensions and self-conflicts amid the enthralling historical and intellectual upheavals of eighteenth-century Europe. Branded as distinctly “other” in all the various contexts he inhabited, Velasti epitomises a representative figure of the century’s contradictions, rendering the study of his life and work a case study. It is not insignificant, moreover, that he actively participated in all the minor and major “battles” of the period up to the third quarter of the eighteenth century: political, religious and linguistic.

Among these battles, the one that should primarily interest scholars of modern Greek studies is Velasti’s battle for language, which took place in two adjacent fields. While still a student of theology at the Roman College (1746–1752), he was vigorously engaged in the question of the pronunciation of classical Greek, part of scholarly agenda since the Renaissance.³ A staunch advocate of the traditional, in the context of his contemporary Grecophone world, iotacistic and non-prosodic pronunciation of classical Greek, virtually identical to modern Greek pronunciation, Velasti initially published an anti-Erasmian booklet on the subject, written in Italian and supplemented with a grammar appendix (1747).⁴

Βελάστης,” in *Η ειρωνική γλώσσα: Κριτικές μελέτες για τη νεοελληνική γραμματεία* (Athens: Stigmi, 1994), 162–71; Matteo Mandalà, “Tommaso Stanislao Velasti e il filellenismo di fine Settecento,” in *Il Risorgimento Greco e l’Italia: Forme e livelli di ricezione durante il XIX secolo*, ed. Francesco Scalora (Palermo: Istituto Siciliano di Studi Bizantini e Neoeellenici “Bruno Lavagnini,” 2022), 115–47, and Mandalà, “Tommaso Stanislao Velasti tra filellenismo,” 167–224. A scholarly undertaking of my PhD dissertation at the University of Thessaloniki, being supervised by Prof. Kostas Yiavis, involves a critical edition of Velasti’s principal work, *Περὶ θυμοῦ* [On anger], a poem of 2,500 verses originally published in Rome in 1747 (Thomas Stanislao Velastis, *Περὶ θυμοῦ: Στίχοι πατρὸς Θεοῦ [sic] Στανισλάου Βελάστου τῆς τοῦ Ἰησοῦ Συντροφίας* [Rome: Typis Antonii de Rubeis, 1747]). My research also extends to a fresh and comprehensive biography of Velasti, focusing particularly on his role as a Jesuit figure within the context of eighteenth-century Italy, and drawing extensively from archival sources.

³ On the question of classical Greek pronunciation, see William Sidney Allen, *Vox Graeca: A Guide to the Pronunciation of Classical Greek*, 3rd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 140–61; Evangelos V. Petrounias, “Ἡ προφορά της αρχαίας ελληνικής στους νεότερους χρόνους,” in *Ιστορία της ελληνικής γλώσσας: Από τις αρχές έως την ύστερη αρχαιότητα*, ed. A.-F. Christidis (Thessaloniki: Centre for the Greek Language, and Institute of Modern Greek Studies, 2001), 947–57; Pascale Hummel, *De lingua Graeca: Histoire de l’histoire de la langue grecque* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2007), 325–36.

⁴ [Tommaso Stanislao Velasti], *Breve trattato del suono delle lettere Greche, delle terminazioni de’ nomi, e de’ verbi, coll’aggiunta di alcune regole della Grammatica, disposte da un religioso della Compagnia di Gesù* (Rome: Antonio de’ Rossi, 1747).

However, it was his exceptionally informed and widely acclaimed Latin treatise under the title *Dissertatio de litterarum græcarum pronuntiatione* (1751) that elevated Velasti to the status of a scholar of European renown and a pivotal figure for subsequent participants in the pronunciation controversy.⁵ While prefatorily acknowledging his perplexity regarding what could be assumed as his defence of the Greeks “to whom Chiots as us, exclusively devoted to the religion, language and customs of the Latins, are as annoying and burdensome to them as foreigners typically are to natives”, his principal argument on the correctness of Greek pronunciation is the universal, quasi-consensual pronunciation of the “sacred language”, namely the liturgical language of the Eastern rite, as it is (and has been) chanted in all churches by Greek-speaking communities in a great geographical span.⁶

Notably, Velasti not only pursued this scholarly interest in linguistics throughout his life but also openly aligned it with political causes. The Italian translation (1772) of his highly influential *Dissertatio*, accessible to a non-Latin-speaking and wider audience beyond academia, was integrated into the editorial programme of the philhellenic circle of Naples.⁷ Dedicated to Empress Catherine II in the aftermath of the Russian victory in the naval battle of Chesma (1770), it underscored the inseparable link between the freedom of the Greek nation and the freedom of its language:

[The most eminent invaders into the sacred language of the Greeks] appointed Cratinus' sheep to the academic chair, aiming to instruct them in their pronunciation – a matter about which the Greeks had never harboured any doubt, nor could they ... The authentic pronunciation [of classical Greek] holds exceptional significance for the Greek language, a wellspring of inexhaustible wealth for the

⁵ Thomas Stanislaus Velastus, *Dissertatio de litterarum græcarum pronuntiatione* (Rome: Typis Angeli Rotilii et Philippi Bacchelli, 1751). For a most recent overview of *Dissertatio*, see Mandalà, “Tommaso Stanislao Velasti tra filellenismo,” 176–80.

⁶ I quote from Velastus, *Dissertatio*, 3. On his “sacred language” argument, see *ibid.*, 17, 25–29, 35, 90, 110.

⁷ Tommaso Velasti, *Dimostrazione Istorico-Grammatica del suono delle lettere Greche* [...]: *Coll'aggiunta d'una Grammatica breve per l'aurea lingua, comune a tutti li Prosatori* [...], *dedicata all'Augustissima Imperatrice di tutte le Russie Catarina II* (Naples: Gennaro Giaccio, 1772). On the political character of *Dimostrazione*, see Constantino Nikas, “I Greci a Napoli nel Settecento,” in *La cultura classica a Napoli nell'Ottocento* (Naples: Pubblicazioni del Dipartimento di Filologia Classica dell'Università degli Studi di Napoli, 1987), 1:465–66; Filippo D'Oria, “Arcadia e filellenismo a Napoli nel Settecento: Tommaso Stanislao Velasti,” *Italoellenica* 2 (1989): 263–65; Mandalà, “Tommaso Stanislao Velasti tra filellenismo,” 205–7.

Republic of Letters ... I have the honour to confer upon Your Imperial Majesty the new title of Liberator, even of the language of the Greeks, from the barbarities of the learned ... It is hoped by the Greeks that from Your Imperial Majesty they shall be freed from the yoke imposed on their letters by the literati.⁸

In the second field of his language battle, Velasti did not become involved as scholar but as a creative writer and translator, utilising as his principal literary language his mother tongue, that is, the dialect of Chios, the only thing for Orthodox and Catholics to share “except for the air and the sun”.⁹ With a strong belief that the language of Chios was most in harmony with “the golden and unadulterated language of the [Orthodox] Church”, he felt the need to preserve it from “the Turkish, Arabic, Mauritanian, Persian, Armenian and Italian influences that surround and besiege it”.¹⁰ His primary objective was to champion the Chiot dialect, which he eventually aspired to elevate to the status of a national (literary) language through “thoughtful adaptations” – a hallmark of his Jesuit identity. Paradoxically, his endeavour was primarily pursued through Frangochiotika, that is, Greek-language texts of a religious thematic written in the Latin script, thus employing an allographic system.¹¹

This article focuses precisely on Velasti’s allography – “the phenomenon of writing a language in the script of another”¹² – intricately linked to his capacity as both a Greek-Italian bilingual and a Catholic author, and influenced by his linguistic interests. Since his allography falls within the category of using a script “of a more or less foreign language endowed with a special status, mostly of a religious nature”, to write “the natural, primary native language of the

⁸ Velasti, *Dimostrazione*, n.p. Throughout this article, all English translations are mine unless otherwise stated.

⁹ Velastus, *Dissertatio*, 4.

¹⁰ See Velastus, *Dissertatio*, 94 and Velasti, *Dimostrazione*, 62, respectively.

¹¹ On Frangochiotika, see the two seminal bibliographical works of Eugène Dalleggio, “Bibliographie analytique d’ouvrages religieux en grec imprimés avec des caractères latins,” *Μικρασιατικά Χρονικά* 9 (1961): 385–499, and F. Markos Foskolos, *Τα “Φραγκοχιώτικα” βιβλία: Ένα κεφάλαιο από την ιστορία της καθολικής ευσέβειας στον ελληνικό χώρο* (Thessaloniki: Apostolic Vicariate of Thessaloniki, 2012). Cf. also Mario Vitti, “A proposito dei Φραγκοχιώτικα,” *Αθηνά* 65 (1961): 239–43. Throughout this article, the terms Frangochiotika/Frangochiotic are used to denote both this specific literature and its script.

¹² On allography, see Johannes den Heijer and Andrea Schmidt, “Scripts Beyond Borders: Allographic Traditions and their Social, Cultural and Philological Aspects. An Analytical Introduction,” in *Scripts Beyond Borders: A Survey of Allographic Traditions in the Euro-Mediterranean World*, ed. Johannes den Heijer, Andrea Schmidt and Tamara Pataridze (Louvain-la-Neuve: Publications de l’Institut Orientaliste de Louvain/Peeters, 2014), 1–63.

community in question”,¹³ the article explores the two primary allographic subsystems Velasti employed, scrutinising how they reflect the Chiot dialect. In this context, the article engages with prior linguistic-orientated literature on Frangochiotika – and more broadly, on Grecophone Latin-script texts such as the manuscripts of literary works of the Cretan Renaissance – with the aim of contributing to a more systematic exploration of the highly intriguing phenomenon of Greek allography in its Latin-script branch.¹⁴

2. General Remarks

Velasti's Frangochiotic corpus includes four prose books: a handbook of practical spiritual theology (*Anapavsis tis cardhias is to aghion thelima tu Theú* [The repose of the heart in the Holy Will of God]),¹⁵ two books of piety (*I imera apò ton christianòn aghiasmeni dhia tis Profevchis ke Meletis* [The day sanctified by the Christian through prayer and meditation] and *Psichofelis loji* [Wholesome sermons]),¹⁶ and a catechism (*Didascalìa christianikì* [Christian doctrine]),¹⁷ varying in degrees

¹³ Ibid., 56.

¹⁴ See mainly Mario Vitti, “Catechismi in ‘francochiotica’ e il codice vaticano greco 1902,” *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 24, no. 3–4 (1958): 257–75; Alkistis Proiou, “Μεταγραφή ελληνικών κειμένων διά λατινικών στοιχείων,” *Παρνασσός* 5, no. 1 (January–March 1963): 55–63; Thomas I. Papadopoulos, ed., *Αγνώστου Χίου ποιητή “Δαβίδ”: Ανέκδοτο διαλογικό στιχούργημα* (Athens: Etaireia Spoudon Neoellinikou Politismou kai Genikis Paideias, 1979), 55–56; Alfred Vincent, ed., *Μάρκου Αντωνίου Φόσκολου “Φορτουνάτος”* (Heraklion: Society of Cretan Historical Studies, 1980), ξδ’–οε’; Wim F. Bakker and Arnold F. van Gemert, eds., *Η θυσία του Αβραάμ* (Heraklion: Crete University Press, 1996), 345–50; Eleni Karantzola, “Γλωσσολογικές μαρτυρίες μη ελληνόγραφων κειμένων (16ος–17ος α.),” *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 25 (2005): 265–76.

¹⁵ Thomas Stanislao Velastis, *Anapavsis tis cardhias is to ajion thelima tu Theú parà tu patros Thomà Stanislau Velasti tis tu Jisú Sindrofias: Dhascalìa malifia Sinathrifmeni ec tu Pateros Alfonfu Rodriquez tis avtis findrofias. Is ofelian mericà ton Chiotòn* (Rome: Ex Typographia Antonii de Rubeis, 1746). I have consulted a copy of the Vatican Library (call no. R.G.Teol.V.842).

¹⁶ [Thomas Stanislao Velastis], *I imera apò ton christianòn aghiasmeni dhia tis Profevchis, ke Meletis: Sinthemeni Apò ena Patera tis Sindrofias tu Iisù, ke aferomeni to Evjenefiato, ke Evlaveftato Theodhoro Vegettio* (Rome: Typis Angeli Rotilii et Philippi Bacchelli, 1751). I have consulted a copy of the Vatican Library (call no. R.G.Teol.VI.383). Thomas Stanislao Velastis, *Psichofelis loji is tes Eortes ke Kiriakes tu chronu sinthemeni parà tu patros Thomà Stanislau Velastu tis tu Jisú Sindrofias: Eximinia proti* (Messina: Francesco Gaipa, 1753). I have consulted a copy of Biblioteca Centrale della Regione siciliana “Alberto Bombace”, Palermo, Italy (call no. ANTIQUA II.822).

¹⁷ [Thomas Stanislao Velastis], *Didascalìa christianikì na lelete apò ta Jesuitomathitopula is ti Chio: Prosevchi tachini ke ale tines Evlavie* (Messina: n.p., 1754). I have consulted a copy of the Bibliothèque Nationale de France (call no. D-32460, N.C.).

of originality and/or adherence to source texts. Published between 1746 to 1754, these works were printed by various presses in Rome and Messina, Italy, during Velasti's studies at the Collegio Romano and tenure at the Jesuit College, respectively, under his personal care and supervision.

As a thorough retranscription of his Frangochiotic corpus into the Greek script has demonstrated, Velasti's method of transcribing vernacular Greek into the Latin alphabet is distinctive and original, reflecting his particular interests in linguistics. Although his Frangochiotika exhibits variability across his works, it consistently maintains strong connections with literary Italian, namely Tuscan, phonology, while also retaining certain conventions inherited from written Latin. As a result, while his Frangochiotika differs from one book to the other, it primarily serves as a phonetic transcription rather than a straightforward transliteration.¹⁸ It is worth noting that Velasti deliberates on his choice to utilise the Latin script in two specific works for which he bears full authorial responsibility: *Anapavsis tis cardhias* (1746) and *Psichofelis loji* (1753). These works exemplify the two main subsystems of his approach to latinography.

3. *Anapavsis tis cardhias* (1746): A Linguistic Monument of the (Literary) Chiot Dialect

3.1. The Authorial Preface: An Innovative Allographic Attempt

In the autumn of 1746, shortly after embarking on his theological studies, Velasti entered the literary scene as a writer-translator with the release of *Anapavsis tis cardhias*, a manual on practical spiritual theology. The book, as indicated by its subtitle ("Instructions mostly compiled from Fr Alonso Rodriguez, SJ"), drew heavily from the eighth treatise ("De la Conformidad con la Voluntad de Dios") of the first part of *Ejercicio de perfección y virtudes cristianas* (Seville 1609; 4th and final ed. 1615) by the Spanish Jesuit Alonso Rodríguez. Velasti adapted this material into the Chiot dialect printed in Frangochiotika. In his preface, Velasti writes in a rather programmatic way:

[E]catapiaftica tuton ton copon dhià na ofelefo olus, ke pedhià, ke meghalus, Pandremenus, Palicaria, Eclifiafticus ke Cofmicùs, fofùs ke aghramatus. Ke dhiati o fcoposmu ine i findopitefmu, mericà i tu Latinicù ritù dhiavto ethelifa na chiotifò is ta loja, na frangghevfo

¹⁸ I do not use here the term "transliteration" as a rendering of the French "métagrammatisme", as defined and discussed by Xavier Luffin, "Le phénomène de métagrammatisme dans le monde musulman: Approche d'une étude comparative," *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 54, no. 2–3 (2001): 339–60.

is ta ghrāmata, veveos pos theli tus arefo tofon perifoteron, ofon ime pleon fpticòs, ke edhicoftus is tin ghlofan. Dhià tuto acomi exedhialifa cathe alin xenin ghlofan is tin edhikinmas, dhià na to dhiavazi cathe aghramatifton pedhì, na to ghricà cathe amathis jineca afcondavta dhichos na jirevi xedhialifmata. Theli jelafufin polà loja is xenus topus; ala as jelafufin osi thelun, legho me ton Ajion Avghuftinon; monon na arefo ekinon, opù thelo. Is tin Orthoghrafian, dhen ecluthifa tin paleàn finithian, alà epaskifa, na evghalo, i na fmixo ekina monon ta ghrāmata, opù xedhializusin ton loghon apatà cathòs ton lemen i Chiotes ... [T]o ghrama tuto ... ine o Protos copos, ala ochi o ifteros tis Epithimias, opù echo, na camo calòn, ton fimpatrioton mu olon.

I took this trouble to benefit everyone, both children and adults, married, young men, monks and laymen, lettered and illiterate. I am addressing my fellow islanders, especially the Roman Catholics, so I preferred to use the dialect of Chios transcribed in the Latin alphabet, being sure that the more I am homelike and familiar to their language, the more they are going to like me. That's why I even translated any other foreign language into our own, so that every illiterate child can read it and every uneducated woman can grasp it without searching for explanations. Some are going to laugh at many words in inappropriate contexts. "Let those who wish laugh at us," ["Let now the strong and the mighty laugh at us"] Saint Augustine would say. It suffices for me to please those I wish. As for spelling, I didn't stick to the old habit. Instead, I tried to remove or blend only those letters that truly express how we speak here in Chios. This book ... is the first effort, but not the last one regarding my wish to do good to all my fellow citizens.¹⁹

As can be observed, the choice of an allographic system is precisely directed by Velasti's missionary aspiration to address a mixed readership (or audience), akin to a pulpit congregation to which he aims to be relatable, taking under serious consideration their receptive abilities. "Given to Latin letters from a young age," males of the Catholic community of Chios might have been acquainted with the Greek alphabet only through their attendance at the classes of humanities and rhetoric at the Jesuit school, reinstated as late as during Velasti's regency (1743–1746);²⁰ on the other hand, literate Catholic women should have been familiar

¹⁹ Velastis, *Anapavsis tis cardhias*, 10–11.

²⁰ I quote from Velastus, *Dissertatio*, 106. Cf. also *ibid.*, 26, 109, and Velasti, *Dimostrazione*, 30–31.

with Latin, considering it was their language of worship.²¹ Therefore, practicality and functionalism emerge as a primary cause for employing allography.²²

More crucial, however, is the emphasis on his innovative approach to the already existing allography. Striving to preserve the authentic pronunciation of the Chiot dialect, Velasti deliberately departs from the conventional transcriptional methods, opting instead to modernise Frangochiotika. This involves the development of a primarily phonetic system, as opposed to the allegedly mere transliteration seen in previous attempts. What Latin-script models might Velasti have sought to avoid? Likely, he considered the widespread writing practices of literate Catholics in Chios, reflected in notarial documents, personal correspondence and diaries. He may also have looked at existing published corpus of Frangochiotika: Diego de Ledesma's *Dottrina Christiana* translated by the Chiot Jesuit Vincenzo Castagnola (1595) and printed both in Greek and in Latin script on facing pages – one or more copies of it could probably have been available at the Casa of the Jesuits in Chora;²³ *Dottrina Christiana Breve* by Roberto Bellarmino translated, as it seems, by Ioannis-Matthaios Karyofyllis (1602, 2nd ed. 1695) and printed in three columns (in Italian, Greek and Frangochiotika);²⁴ and, more importantly, Girolamo

²¹ According to Foskolos, *Τὰ “Φραγκοχιώτικα” βιβλία*, 45n57: “Catholic faithful used to be taught to read Latin texts in their parishes in order to participate in worship, up until recently. However, the teaching of reading Greek texts was not assured during the 18th century.”

²² On this matter, see George A. Kiraz, “A Functional Approach to Garshunography: A Case Study of Syro-X and X-Syriac Writing Systems,” *Intellectual History of the Islamicate World* 7 (2019): 264–71.

²³ For brevity, I give only the Frangochiotic title: [Jacopo Ledesma], *Didascalía christianiki, is tin opian o Didascalos erota, che o mathitis apilogate: Camomeni apo ton patera Iacobon Ledefma theologon tis syntrofias tu lisu, chie girifmeni is to Romaecon dia mesu tu patros Vincentiou tu Castagniola tis omias syntrofias* (Rome: Luigi Zannetti, 1595). A copy has been digitalised by the Jagiellonian Library, Jagiellonian University, Cracow, Poland, available at <https://www.jbc.bj.uj.edu.pl/dlibra/publication/885757/edition/850417/content>, accessed 22 March 2024.

²⁴ For brevity, I give only the Frangochiotic title: [Roberto Bellarmino], *Dhidhascalia Christianiki Syntomos, íghun isè condologhian: Synthefméni (mè horifmòn tù Dhespotimas Papa Clementi Ogdhov) apò tòn timiótaton Patéra Roberton Bellarminon Hieréa tis Syntrofiás tù Ihisu [sic]. Chè tóra Cardinalis tis haghias Ecclesiás, tù Titlu tis haghias Marias in Via. Xanauulepiméni chè apodechoméni apò tin Synaxin tis Rifórmas [...] hi hopía mè horifmon tù aftù Acru Archieréos, chè isè sitima tù edhesimotátu kyríu Gheorghiu Perpinianù Episcópu Tinos che Miconos, emetaghyrifthi, chè estamparifthi isè glóffan Roméchin chinín, pesemeni dhia eghrichifin chè ófelos tù laù echinòn tòn tópon* (Rome: Luigi Zannetti, 1602; reprint: Padua: Stamperia del Seminario, 1695). I have consulted the copy of the Gennadius Library, American School of Classical Studies at Athens (call no. B/T 1000).

Germano's *Vocabolario Italiano et Greco* (1622), which Velasti would quote in his linguistic treatises to support the superiority of the Chiot dialect over the other vernacular Greek regional varieties.²⁵

As a comparative examination has demonstrated, Velasti's transcriptional system is not directly derived from any of the aforementioned works, although some overlapping could not be avoided.²⁶ As attested in the annexed comparative tables, both in terms of transcription of certain "problematic" consonants and consonant clusters (Table 1.1) and more particular features, such as diacritics, consonant voicing and gemination (Table 1.2), the differences between preceding Frangochiotika and Velasti's latinography are significant and extensive. While his criticism of previous allographic attempts may seem somewhat undeserved,²⁷ it is plausible to suggest that Velasti's proposal for Frangochiotika evolved due to the lack of strict regularity (except for Germano), the inadequate or partial representation of actual pronunciation, and, if I may add, the failure of these prior attempts to accommodate his linguistic standards.

3.2. The Allographic Subsystem of *Anapavsis tis cardhias*

While a comprehensive table delineating the correspondences between Velasti's Latin script in *Anapavsis tis cardhias* and the standard Greek script, accompanied

²⁵ Girolamo Germano, *Vocabolario Italiano et Greco, nel quale si contiene come le voci Italiane si dicano in Greco volgare: Con alcune regole generali [...], composto dal P. Girolamo Germano della Compagnia di Giesu* (Rome: Per l'Herede di Bartolomeo Zannetti, 1622) [= Girolamo Germano, *Grammaire et Vocabulaire du grec vulgaire*, ed. Hubert Pernot (Fontenay-sous-Bois (Seine): n.p., 1907)]. On Velasti's references to this work, see Velastus, *Dissertatio*, 95, and Velasti, *Dimostrazione*, 112–13. For a comprehensive presentation of Germano's work, see Vincenzo Rotolo, "To νεοελληνικό Λεξικό του Girolamo Germano," *Επιστημονική Επετηρίς της Φιλοσοφικής Σχολής του Πανεπιστημίου Αθηνών* 30 (1992–1995): 37–51.

²⁶ Of these three works preceding Velasti's Frangochiotika, only *Dhidhascalia Christianiki Syntomos* has been linguistically examined with regard to its allography. See Karantzola, "Γλωσσολογικές μαρτυρίες," 266–70. As indicated in Table 1.1, I have reached some slightly different conclusions. Dalleggio also made some remarks on the distinctive correspondences between the Latin characters used by the "ancient Latin writers", whom Castagnola followed, to denote particular letters of the Greek script, and those used by presumably more modern figures, such as the translator of Bellarmino's catechism. See "Bibliographie analytique," 397–98. Pernot describes Germano's transcriptional system as "highly rudimentary", following a method that is "only partially phonetic" yet appropriate in terms of practicality ("Préface", *Grammaire et Vocabulaire*, 41–42).

²⁷ It should be noted that Germano was fully aware of the difficulties in the representation of the pronunciation through allography (*Vocabolario*, 6). On the matter see also Rotolo, "To νεοελληνικό Λεξικό," 42–43.

by the phonetic values of his specific transcriptions and corresponding examples, is appended to this article (see Table 2),²⁸ I aim to codify the principal characteristics of his initial allographic endeavour:²⁹

1. Use of <i> for all Greek graphemes representing the sound /i/ (<ι, η, υ, ει, οι, υι>). For example, *proimion* (προοίμιον), *tapinosini* (ταπεινοσύνη).
2. Interchangeable, inherited from Latin, use of <u> and <v> to denote <β> or <(α/ε)υ>, and <ou>. For example, *ifterus* (ὑστερους), *uoithian* (βοήθειαν), *uradhi* (βραδύ), *vasana* (βάσανα), *evlaves* (εὐλαβες), *všiafticà* (οὐσιαστικά). In addition, systematic use of <v> to denote [f] in transcriptions of <ευ> and <αυ>. For example, *evcolofalevta* (εὐκολοσάλευτα), *cavchistùn* (καυχιστοῦν).
3. Systematic and consistent distinction between velar and palatal allophones corresponding to the Greek letters <κ> and <γ>:
 - i. Use of <k> (imported into Latin and Italian) before /e, i/ to indicate [c]. For example, *kimata* (κύματα), *keròn* (καιρόν). Use of <c> preceding /a, o, u/ or a consonant to represent [k], according to the Italian spelling practice (cf. *casa, colore, cultura, credo*). For example, *coron* (κόπον), *cardhias* (καρδίας), *curkeli* (κουρκέλι), *acrin* (ἄκρην).
 - ii. Use of the Latin-inherited <j> before /e, i/ to denote [j]. For example, *flojes* (φλόγες), *elejen* (ἔλεγεν), *jin* (γῆν), *odhijiso* (ὀδηγήσω) (see also 4).³⁰ Use of the cluster <gh> before /a, o, u/ or a consonant to denote [γ]. For example, *ghalinin* (γαλήνην), *loghu* (λόγου), *eghlambrotis* (ἐγλαμπρότης).
4. Supplementary and often interchangeable use of <i> and <j> to represent a semi-vowel and/or a palatal allophone [j]. It is plausible to assume an analogy to the old Italian spelling convention for intervocalic <i> (cf. *aiuto/aiuto, gioja/gioia, cuojo/cuoio*). For example, *loja* (λόγια), *jatros* (γιατρός), *Ajosini* (Ἀγιωσύνη), *echorevien* (ἐχώρευγεν), *evieni* (ἐβγαίνει), *Ierus* (Γέρος), *Ielase* (Γελᾶσαι), *Liturian* (Λειτουργίαν), *Iirevse* (Γύρευσε).

²⁸ The preparation of Table 2 (as well as Table 3) is heavily indebted to the “Table of correspondences” of “the letters of the Italian alphabet,” in Vincent, Φόσκολον “Φορτουνάτος,” ξς’–ο’, as well as to the “analysis of the graphematic system of the Marcian manuscript” in Bakker and van Gemert, *Η θυσία του Αβραάμ*, 346–50. For Greek phonology and phonetics, see Antonis Botinis, *Φωνητική της Ελληνικής*, vol. 1, *Βασικές έννοιες φωνητικής και φωνητικά συστήματα* (Athens: Leader Books, 2009).

²⁹ My discussion of sections 3.2 and 3.3 is informed by Jost Gippert, “O en arši anarxos loḡos: Greek Verses in Georgian Disguise,” in Heijer et al., *Scripts Beyond Borders*, 555–601.

³⁰ See [Velasti], *Breve trattato*, n.p.: “La γ, quando la seguita vocale, o dittongo che facci e, o pur i, suona come j consonante. γῆ ji la terra. γέρων jeron vecchio.” See also Velastus, *Dissertatio*, 7, and Velasti, *Dimostrazione*, 1.

5. Systematic use of <g> before /a, o, u/, or a consonant to denote the voiced velar stop [g], and the cluster <gh> before /e, i/ to denote the voiced palatal stop [j] (to be transcribed as <γκ>/<γγ>), according to the Italian spelling practice (cf. *gatto*, *gusto*, *gloria*, *ghetta*, *ghirlanda*); the constant presence of a preceding <n> represents nasalisation.³¹ For example, *sfigondas* (σφίγγοντας), *ngangava* (γκάγκαβα), *punghi* (πουγκί).
6. Systematic employment of <g/gg> before /i, e/, and the cluster <gi> before /a, o, u/ to denote [dz] (to be transcribed as <τζ>), according to the Italian spelling practice (cf. *giglio*, *gelato*, *giambo*, *gioco*, *giustizia*); preceding <n> represents nasalisation ([ndz]/<ντζ>).³² For example, *scangiochiros* (σκαντζόχοιρος), *chalingi* (χαλάντζι), *camochaggidhes* (καμοχατζήδες).
7. Systematic use of <c> before /i, e/ to denote [ts] (to be transcribed as <τσ>), according to the Italian spelling (e.g., *città*, *centro*). For example, *eclocifen* (ἐκλότισεν), *rapucia* (παπούτσια), *cevdhin* (τσευδήν).³³
8. Use of the allographs <s>/<f> for the transcription of <σ>/<-ς>. Only <s> stands for both midword and final Greek sigma. For example, *fapima* (σάπημα), *thalafa* (θάλασσα), *evkeriès* (εὐκαιρίες).

³¹ For Velasti's testimony on the matter, see here 4.1. Cf. [Velasti], *Breve trattato*, n.p, with regard to the Greek <γ>: "Se poi seguita γ, κ ... suona n. ἄγγελος Inviato, ἀναγκάζω necessito dite anangafo, Angghelos." See also Velastus, *Dissertatio*, 7, and Velasti, *Dimostrazione*, 1. Germano, *Vocabolario*, 9 also testified the nasalised pronunciation of <γκ>/<γγ> in his transcriptions. According to Karantzola, "the indistinctive transcription of the clusters <γγ>, <γκ> as <ng, gg>" in *Dhidhascalia Christianiki Syntomos* cannot be regarded as a safe indication for "a nasalised or non-nasalised pronunciation" ("Γλωσσολογικές μαρτυρίες," 268–69).

³² In Germano's *Vocabolario* the presence of <n> in the cluster <ntz> of his transcriptions may either depict nasalised pronunciation or merely indicate the voiced ([dz]) instead of the voiceless ([ts]) pronunciation (e.g., *narantziá*, *dipúntza*, *cantzíli* vs *cótzifas*, *tzachismós*, *paratzícli*). On this matter, cf. Ulrich Moennig, "Από το χειρόγραφο στο εκδιδόμενο κείμενο: Βήματα, προβλήματα, παγίδες," in *Θεωρία και πράξη των εκδόσεων της υστεροβυζαντινής, αναγεννησιακής και μεταβυζαντινής δημόδους γραμματείας*, ed. Hans Eideneier, Ulrich Moennig and Notis Toufexis (Heraklion: Crete University Press, 2001), 201, and David Holton et al., eds., *The Cambridge Grammar of Medieval and Early Modern Greek* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019), 1:120.

³³ As per Karantzola, the "indistinctive employment of <c>" to transcribe the cluster <τζ> in *Dhidhascalia Christianiki Syntomos* "fails to clarify the differentiation between [ts] and [dz] in the Greek language of that era" ("Γλωσσολογικές μαρτυρίες," 269). Nevertheless, the occurrence of <c> in <eci>/<έτζι> (6 entries), as well as in the Italian loanword <officio>, and in the names <Francesco> (to render <Φραγκίσκος>), <Lucia> (/<Λουκία>) and <Cecilia> (/<Καικιλία>) without an accompanying <h>, within the context of an appended Latin hymn, suggests a voiceless pronunciation akin to the respective Italian words.

9. Almost exclusive use of <z> for the transcription of Greek <ζ>. For example, *zoïn* (ζωήν), *Nazianzinòs* (Ναζιανζηνός). There are also rare occurrences of the intervocalic <f> as <ζ>, following the Italian *s intervocalica*. For example, *xedhialifete* (ξεδιαλύζεται).
10. Extensive transcription of <μπ> and <ντ> as <mb> and <nd>, respectively, to indicate nasalisation.³⁴ For example, *ambelaki* (ἀμπελάκι), *emborumen* (ἐμποροῦμεν), *efovundon* (ἐφοβοῦντον), *Afendis* (Ἀφέντης). In foreign names and toponymics, Italian loanwords and in the beginning of words, <μπ> and <ντ> are transcribed merely as and <d>, respectively, indicating their pronunciation as voiced stops ([b], [d]). For example, *Bobadiglias* (Μπομπαντίλιας), *bena* (μπένα), *Bernardos* (Μπερνάρντος), *Lisbonan* (Λισμπόναν). Finally, sometimes, in words with the prefix συν- or learned Greek forms, in Christian terms or names known through Catholicism, and in Italian loanwords <μπ> and <ντ> are transcribed (or transliterated) as <mp> and <nt>, respectively, perhaps in an attempt to encourage their pronunciation as nasalised voiceless stops ([mp], [nt]). For example, *simpatriotòn* (συμπατριωτῶν), *Entimotatis* (Ἐντιμοτάτης), *sintomì* (συντομή) (but always *Sindrofia*), *Bonaventuras* (Μποναβεντούρας), *Penticoftin* (Πεντηκοστήν), *pemptin* (πέμπτην).³⁵
11. No transcription of double consonants, indicating no geminate realisation.³⁶ For example, *Eclifēs* (Ἐκκλησίης), *alofili* (ἀλλόφυλη), *ghrama* (γράμμα), *jinefiēs* (συννεφιές), *tharos* (θάρρος), *thalafa* (θάλασσα).
12. Use of diacritics for accents if needed – mainly final stressed syllables bear a stress mark, as it is the case for *accento grave* in Italian – but no transcription of aspiration having no phonetic value in modern Greek.³⁷

³⁴ For Velasti's testimony regarding <ντ>, see here 4.1. Cf. also Velastus, *Dissertatio*, 7 on <μπ> and <ντ>: "M ... cum π conjunctum faciunt mb ἄμπελος vitis, dic *Ambelos*. T post ν fit d. παντελῶς omnino, dic *Pandelòs*" (likewise, Velasti, *Dimostrazione*, 2). Similarly, Germano, *Vocabolario*, 9. No clear assumptions could be made for the pronunciation of <ντ> as depicted in the transcriptions of *Dhidhascalia Christianiki Syntomos* (Karantzola, "Γλωσσολογικές μαρτυρίες," 268–69).

³⁵ The practice of distinct transcription for <μπ> and <ντ> in loanwords is likewise evident in Germano's *Vocabolario*, as indicated in Table 1.1.

³⁶ See also Velasti's testimony on the matter, here in 4.1. Cf. Velastus, *Dissertatio*, 8: "Geminas consonantes ὁμοειδεῖς ita proferas, ac si essent una tantum." Similarly, Velasti, *Dimostrazione*, 2. As per S.G. Vios, *Χιακά γλωσσικά* (Chios: Panchiaki, 1920), 3, "the simplification [in pronunciation] of geminate consonants" is one of the main features of the Kastron idiom (see below in the main text).

³⁷ Cf. Velastus, *Dissertatio*, 8: "Spiritus ... orthographiae serv[it]." Likewise, Velasti, *Dimostrazione*, 2.

Despite its function as a work of popular literature, *Anapavsis tis cardhias* exhibits a meticulous approach to typesetting. Noteworthy is the comprehensive use of punctuation marks, encompassing even colons and exclamation marks. Word separation is systematic, with enclitics (mostly weak forms of personal and possessive pronouns) being the exception (e.g., *olimas*, *cardhiantu*, *parakinondafme*, *fenetemu*). Elision is depicted by the use of apostrophes (e.g., *m' elaveten*, *t' afotifta*, *n' axaplofi*, *m' efitlen*, *ap' edo*). Moreover, embedded quotations are typographically differentiated by the utilisation of italics, ensuring a clear distinction from the main narrative.

Self-described as “a Catholic admirer of the piety of the Orthodox Church and the pristine beauty and mastery of its language”,³⁸ Velasti consistently opts to draw on passages from the Old and New Testaments rather than from the Vulgate to reinforce his argumentation. These passages are typically presented in footnotes, with their translation into vernacular Greek (the Chiot dialect) being integrated into the narrative. Intriguingly, the original Scripture passages are printed in Greek font. Consequently, in *Anapavsis tis cardhias*, three distinct graphematical systems are employed to represent three languages: Latin script for the sparse excerpts from the Vulgate; Latin script for the Chiot dialect featured in the main text (allography/Frangochiotika); Greek script for the biblical quotations found in the footnotes.

3.3. Depiction of the Chiot Dialect

Undoubtedly, allography constitutes a privileged avenue for gaining valuable insights into the formation of vernacular Greek, particularly in its various dialectal forms.³⁹ In the case of *Anapavsis tis cardhias*, Velasti himself articulates his intention to create a text that feels “homelike” and “familiar” to the readership it targets. This is achieved through his cultural contextualisation of Rodríguez’s original work, which can be described as a process of “Chiotification”: adapting the source text as if it were originally crafted for consumption by the people of Chios. Central to this endeavour is the literary exploitation of the Chiot dialect, infused with a rich and vivid style, often characterised by strong oral qualities. While widely employing similes, imagery and realia drawn from daily routine

³⁸ I quote from Mandalà, “Tommaso Stanislao Velasti e il filellenismo di fine settecento,” 143.

³⁹ On this matter, see Karantzola, “Γλωσσολογικές παρατηρήσεις,” 265–66, 272–73, and Io Manolessou, “Graphematic Evidence for Cretan Phonology from the 16th to the 20th Century,” in *Culture and Society in Crete: From Kornaros to Kazantzakis*, ed. Liana Giannakopoulou and E. Kostas Skordyles (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2017), 156–59 with previous literature. Cf. Luffin, “Le phénomène de métagrammatisme,” 358.

in Chios, Velasti inserts into his text a significant portion of the lexical wealth of the island.⁴⁰

However, what interests us more here is the representation of the grammatical aspects of the Chiot dialect during the mid-eighteenth century, as captured primarily at the phonetic and morphological levels. As Velasti classifies himself among the “urbani”, the inhabitants of Chios Town or Chora, his language must reflect the linguistic condition of the so-called *Kastron* (Castle) idiom.⁴¹ While a comprehensive examination of the language of the work remains a desideratum, here some preliminary observations may be offered.

Regarding phonology:

1. Anaptyxis of /γ/ in the verbal suffix -εύω (and -αύω) (e.g., *dhuleviete*, *edhikevien*, *jirevghondas*, *apojeviese*, *thareviete*, *efalevien*, *alitheviete*, *echorevien*, *etelevgha*, *evafilevien*, *anapaviete*, *cavghunden*).⁴²
2. Abundant presence of the stressed /i/ augment (e.g., *icamen*, *ivalen*, *ichafen*, *ifijen*, *iplexen*, *istilen*, *idhoken*, *ilipsen*, *iniosen*, *iricten*, *isfala*, *icrazes*, *ivojken*).⁴³
3. Extensive appearance of the prefix *àve-* rather than *áva-* in compounds (e.g., *aneghaliasis*, *enejelufan*, *anesicoma*, *anengazi*, *anetrichiafi*, *anestenazi*, *anelighofun*).⁴⁴
4. Occurrences of deletion of intervocalic /γ/ (e.g., *faità*, *perloi*, *lois*, *vairizo*).⁴⁵
5. Abundant presence of final -v in verb endings (see verb morphology).
6. Preference for more vernacular consonant clusters or consonant realisations. For example, /rk/ < /rx/ in the verb *έρχομαι* (*ercomenon*, *ircundan*,

⁴⁰ I transcribe some examples in Greek font and in the form of entry words for clarity: *ξηβορευτής*, *σικλί*, *λιμπάς*, *ἄφκλα*, *λαχιῶς*, *σκαρφιά*, *χρυσοφός*, *τρικάντουνος*, *καλαμίτα*, *μιτριάζω*, *πνιγοβουτώ*, *ξεγκυλώ*, *βοσκαρούδι*, *λιονταρέσσα*, *γυψέλι*, *ξεκουντιά*, *ψήφη*, *σούρφανο*, *καγγραινιάζω*, *σκούληκας*, *μουστρώνω*, *μολυβίτικος*, *πιταγοῦ*, *κούβακας*, *ἀποτσίφνισμα*, *λίσγος*, *στερνιάζω*, *καρκοβέλονας*, *ἐμπυώνω*, *στειράκι*, *σπεσιέρης*, *φαντέσκα*, *ἀνεστάτης*, *μούστρα*, *θομπώνω*, *σφεγγέτια*, *παγιαῦλι*, *βιελούνι*.

⁴¹ See Velastus, *Dissertatio*, 48. On a concise description of the *Kastron* idiom, refer to Vios, *Χιακά γλωσσικά*, 3, and Leonidas O. Pyrgaris, *Το χιακό γλωσσικό ιδίωμα μετά τοπικών διαλεκτικών κειμένων* (Athens: Idyepia, 2021), 76 (for general remarks on the Chiot dialect, see *ibid.*, 37–65 with previous literature).

⁴² Germano, *Vocabolario*, 7, 82, and Holton et al., *Cambridge Grammar*, 1:147–48, 3:1385–86. Cf. N. G. Tsikis, *Γλωσσικά από το Πυργί της Χίου* (Athens: Syllogos Pyrgouson Attikis, 2002), 30.

⁴³ See Holton et al., *Cambridge Grammar*, 3:1403–4. Cf. Tsikis, *Γλωσσικά*, 44.

⁴⁴ Holton et al., *Cambridge Grammar*, 1:68; Vios, *Χιακά γλωσσικά*, 10.

⁴⁵ Holton et al., *Cambridge Grammar*, 1:151–52. Cf. Tsikis, *Γλωσσικά*, 30. Vios, *Χιακά γλωσσικά*, 3 provides a different perspective on the *Kastron* idiom.

irdundon); /st/ < /sθ/, mainly in verbal inflection (see verb morphology); /γ/ < /κ/ in compounds with the prefix ἐκ- (*eghlambrotaton*, *eghlambrotis*, *eghlamberà*); systematic transcription of the cluster <γγ> as <ch>, indicating no nasalisation (e.g., *sicharos*, *sichises*).⁴⁶

Regarding noun and adjective morphology:

1. Presence of the oxytone forms in -ές derived from the masculine nouns in -εύς, -έας: *vafiles*, *vafilè* (gen.), *vafilè* (acc).⁴⁷
2. Systematic preference for oxytone over paroxytone feminine nouns ending in /ia/, namely for forms with synizesis (e.g., *zuliàn*, *arachniàn*, *parighoriès*, *afendiès*, *ftochiàs*, *evkeriès*, *cicuriàn*, *fuvià*, *evcharistiès*).⁴⁸
3. Abundant presence of feminine paroxytone and proparoxytone nouns ending in -ις, even for vernacular words (e.g., *dhiavafis*, *aneghaliāfis*, *paromiofis*, *etimaḡfis*, *apofaḡfis*, *xechaḡfis*, *ghnorifis*, *curaḡfis*, *paracaleḡfis*, *estaḡfis*).⁴⁹
4. Preference for the ending -μάτου rather than the inherited -ματος for the genitive singular of θέλημα, κρίμα and πέρασμα: *thelimatu*, *crimatu*, *peraḡmatu*.⁵⁰
5. Preference for the vernacular (and dialectally marked) alternative neuter forms in /os/ for the neuter /on/ paradigms of the nouns μέσον, μέτρον, ἔργον, δῶρον as *mesos*, *metros*, *erghos*, *dhoros*.⁵¹
6. Occurrences of the dialectally marked forms for the nouns κρέας and γάλα: *criàs* (plur. *criata*) and *ghalas*.⁵²
7. Occurrences of the dialectally marked feminine endings of adjectives in -άρης: *pechnidharià*, *fovitziarià*.⁵³

Regarding verb morphology, I will provide some examples of endings of the active and passive present, imperfect and aorist:

1. -eten (-ετην) for the second-person plural of the active a) present indicative/ subjunctive of barytone verbs (e.g., *echeten*, *kenurioneten*, *xevreten*); b)

⁴⁶ On the phenomena, see Holton et al., *Cambridge Grammar*, 1:159–60, 190–1, 210.

⁴⁷ On the phenomenon, see *ibid.*, 2:401–20. Also, Vios, *Χιακά γλωσσικά*, 36.

⁴⁸ Germano, *Vocabolario*, 17 and Velasti, *Dissertatio*, 95.

⁴⁹ See Holton et al., *Cambridge Grammar*, 2:561n115.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 2:651–52; Germano, *Vocabolario*, 24. Also, Hubert Pernot, *Études de Linguistique Néo-hellénique*, vol. 2, *Morphologie des parlers de Chio* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1946), 58, 114, and Tsikis, *Γλωσσικά*, 34.

⁵¹ On the phenomenon, cf. Holton et al., *Cambridge Grammar*, 2:608, 661–64.

⁵² See Pernot, *Études de Linguistique*, 2:58, 118–19.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 2:143 and Germano, *Vocabolario*, 27.

present imperative of barytone verbs (e.g., *aneghaliazeten*); c) imperfect of barytone and oxytone verbs of both A- and E- stem (e.g., *enghardhioneten*, *exizeten*, *ejelufeten*, *eparakinufeten*); d) aorist indicative/subjunctive of barytone and oxytone verbs (e.g., *idheten*, *epulifeten*, *piftevfeten*, *patheten*); e) aorist imperative of barytone verbs (e.g., *simadepfeten*, *dhiavafeten*, *alaxeten*).⁵⁴

2. *-iten/-aten* (-εῖτεν/ -ῆτεν/ -ᾶτεν) for the second-person plural of the active present indicative/subjunctive of E- and A-stem oxytone verbs, respectively (e.g., *emboriten*, *thariten*, *kivernaten*, *ziteten*).⁵⁵
3. *-ie* (-ειε) for the second-person singular of the active present imperative of E-stem oxytone verbs (e.g., *cratie*, *paracalie*).⁵⁶
4. *-ies*, *-ie* (-ειες, -ειε) for the second- and third-person singular, respectively, of the active imperfect of oxytone verbs (e.g., *embories*, *eporpatien*, *izien*, *etharies*, *eforien*).⁵⁷
5. *-umesten* (-οὔμεστέν) for the first-person plural of the passive present indicative/subjunctive of barytone and oxytone verbs of both stems (e.g., *sterghumesten*, *kimumesten*, *fenumesten*, *ipfilonumesten*, *paraponumesten*).⁵⁸
6. *-usten* (-οὔστεν) for the second-person plural of the passive: a) present indicative/subjunctive of both barytone and oxytone verbs (e.g., *picrenufsten*, *lipufsten*, *fovufsten*); b) present imperative (e.g., *cherufsten*); c) imperfect (e.g., *echerufsten*).⁵⁹
- 7.1. *-onden* (-ονταίν/-ωνταίν) for the third-person plural of the passive present indicative/subjunctive of barytone verbs (e.g., *erchonden*, *cremonden*, *colofirnonden*).⁶⁰
- 7.2. *-unden* for the third-person plural of the passive present indicative/subjunctive of both barytone (to be transcribed as -ουνταίν) and oxytone (to be transcribed as -οῦνταίν) verbs (e.g., *dhinunden*, *xedhializunden*, *aghapunden*, *metrunden*).⁶¹

⁵⁴ Holton et al., *Cambridge Grammar*, 3:1440, 1504, 1538, 1587, 1622, 1649, 1663.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 3:1472.

⁵⁶ Cf. ibid., 3:1655 and Germano, *Vocabolario*, 50.

⁵⁷ According to Vios, *Χιακά γλωσσικά*, 47, these endings are typical of the Kastron idiom.

⁵⁸ Holton et al., *Cambridge Grammar*, 3:1453, 1489–90 and Germano, *Vocabolario*, 60, 64–65.

⁵⁹ Holton et al., *Cambridge Grammar*, 3:1458, 1494, 1564, 1653. As per Vios, *Χιακά γλωσσικά*, 43–44, this ending is typical of the Kastron idiom.

⁶⁰ Holton et al., *Cambridge Grammar*, 3:1458–59.

⁶¹ Ibid., 3:1460, 1495.

8. *-undon* for the third-person singular of the passive imperfect of both barytone (to be transcribed as *-ουντον*) and oxytone (*-οὔντον*) verbs (e.g., *evairizundon*, *epanapavundon*, *eparakinundon*, *eghlicokimundon*).⁶²
9. *-undan* for third-person plural of the passive imperfect of both barytone (to be transcribed as *-ουνταν*) and oxytone (*-οὔνταν*) verbs (e.g., *eparaxenizundan*, *etimazundan*, *epfifundan*, *ekimundan*).
10. *-thin* (*-θην*) for the third-person singular of the passive aorist indicative (e.g., *estathin*, *epilojithin*, *erotithin*).⁶³

3.4. Contemporary Reception of Velasti's Frangochiotika

It is no wonder that this initial attempt of Velasti at Frangochiotika did not go unnoticed. In 1752, in the prestigious Florentine journal *Novelle Letterarie*, the most erudite and highly regarded Giovanni Lami published a review of *Anapavsis tis cardhias*, reserving a distinct place for its language. I quote from Lami's special remarks on the quality and innovation of Velasti's Latin transcription:

The spelling is entirely new. The Roman Catholics of Chios, who have been unique in the world in writing modern Greek with Latin characters, have never had any other master [guide/teacher] in spelling than their own imagination; and often they resorted to those Latin letters corresponding to the Greek alphabet in numerical order, even if they did not properly express that pronunciation. Our author, following the laudable Italian good taste, writes with those letters which precisely express and, in case this is not possible, at least approximate the right pronunciation.⁶⁴

As it has recently turned out, the reviews of Velasti's books published in *Novelle Letterarie* (there followed a second on *Περὶ Ουμοῦ*) must be credited to the concise efforts of the Dominican Cesare Antonino Velasti to promote the literary work of his cousin Tommaso Stanislao.⁶⁵ Hence, we might consider Lami's opinions as reflections of the information he received from Cesare Antonino, a privileged interlocutor of the author himself. This suggests that behind Lami's lines we might infer Velasti's reasonable confidence as an official (albeit without portfolio) teacher of written vernacular Greek language among his

⁶² Ibid., 3:1545, 1556–57. For oxytone verbs, see also Germano, *Vocabolario*, 64–65.

⁶³ Cf. Vios, *Χιακά γλωσσικά*, 28, and Tsikis, *Γλωσσικά*, 43.

⁶⁴ [Giovanni Lami], "Roma [1746]," review of *Anapavsis tis cardhias* by Thomas Stanislao Velastis, *Novelle Letterarie pubblicate in Firenze* 13, no. 4 (28 January 1752): cols. 56–57.

⁶⁵ Mara Psalti, "Giovanni Lami και Θωμάς Στανισλάος Βελάστης: Δύο κριτικά κείμενα," *Rivista di letteratura comparata italiana, bizantina e neoellenica* 7 (2023): 76–84.

fellow countrymen. What's more intriguing: the process of standardisation and rationalisation of Frangochiotika represented for Velasti a primary attempt to play an actively regulatory role in linguistic matters. By refreshing and adjusting the then-in-use Frangochiotika, Velasti presented his compatriots with a model for allographic language.

4. *Psichofelis loji* (1753): *National Language in Allography*

4.1. The Authorial Preface: A Pivotal Moment in the History of Modern Greek

Seven years after the publication of *Anapavsis tis cardhias*, Velasti printed *Psichofelis loji*, in which a more intricate and sophisticated allographic system is employed. The book constitutes a collection of sermons on the feasts of the Virgin Mary and on the religious feasts of the first semester of the year, with an emphasis on Lent, provided as a source for meditation according to Jesuit spirituality. Once again, Frangochiotika is integrated with broader considerations of linguistic policy. With his confidence not easily concealed and having assimilated Lami's acclaim of his transcription method, Velasti opens the collection with a "Prologue to the Reader". This programmatic text of his should be recognised as a watershed in the history of modern Greek, chiefly owing to the author's self-awareness and his pioneering proposal for the necessity of shaping a national language – vernacular Greek or "Romaic" – based on the Chiot dialect:

Os 1300 chronus af'u epesen i Latiniki Glosa anevlastisen apò to xerotis cormo i Italiki dià tis calurjías sofòn anthrópon: Ine ali tosi chroni ke apano af'u epese ke i Evmorfotati Eliniki: piòs de Dantis, i Petrarchis na filisi apanotis tin kinin tutin opù milumen? Pasa fili fchedòn calurgà fimeron to mitricòn idioma calakè varvarojeniton: pos emis ochi to simerinòn romecòn? ke malon to chioticon glikitaton ke strongkiloftomon, to cat' usían elinicoteron op' ola isos t' ala? Egò anangasmenos, os metà tin Vavilonikin echmalosían o Esdras tin Chaldéon glosa me evrecus caractíras, na grapso me Italòn gramata ta romeca lojia, zitò parachorisin, porpatondas anamesa Gramatikin Elínon ke Italòn Orthografían, na mi varvariso plin oson i kinì ton olon noisis zità ke i acoì ipomonevete. Ipomonevonde ta chiotica aftià n' acususin: *aplastos evmorfía*, *af' u*, *alo onoma*, *alà*, *fisis*: lipòn pos me varvarismò na ipò: *fisi*, *ma*, *alon onoma*, *apòs*? Ex enandías i Gramatikì theli *tas iméras*, *tas dinámis*, *i nix*, *imàs*, *ina*, *i zoì avtù*, ta de chiotica aftià nousin alà acuusi calion *i zoitu*, *na*, *emàs*, *i nicta*, *tes dinames*, *tes imeres* catà Eolicòn idioma. *Anggelos* theli i paragoji, *gramma*, *jenna*, *allos*, i de Italiki orthografía opù grafi me to afti orifi *alos*, *jena*, *grama*, *angelos*. Ti dulevi to *h* is to *Eghò*, *dhià*? Is to Italicon

stoma ine to idion *Egò, dià*. O Chiotis, lejis, to proferi os *gama*: as to proferi lipòn ke choris to *h* ke as mu charisi charti melani ke keròn na to grafo. Grafo de *Echo*, *Theòn* calakè i Italòn glosa na leji *Eco*, *Teon* dià na simadevso to *chi*, ke to *thita*. An ichen o Chiotis acomi to *d* ke *g* to Italicòn, ismiga to *gh* ke *dh* na chorifo *delta* ke *gama*. To *s* to Italicòn camni sichnà to *zita*, os edò *arnefe*, *cafa*, *cofa*, *prefa* ofte k'Egò dulevome to *f* dià to *zita pefo*, *vrafi*, *trifo*: dià to *sigma* dulevome to *s*: alà diati canena *s* is tin archìn den proferete apò tus Italùs os *zita* grafo *zoi*, *zitò*, *zestis*: anangkéa in ifos dio i tria gramata kenuria: afino de tavitin tin enian alon opù lavusi tin timin na teliosusi tin Chiotikin Glosan. Tin men varían os i Itali grafo apano is tes liguses tin de oxían is tes paraliguses ke proparaliguses, opotan in proforàs aporía. Is ena logon: ecamamen emìs i Frangochiotes dula ta Latinicà gramata tis romekis glosas? fronimon ine na teriafi os dinete o dulos me ton Afendin, o Afendis me to dulo. Ta moria *me*, *catà*, *apò*, *choris*, *dià* ke ala ta smigo tori me Jenikì tori me Dotiki tori me Etiatikì os orifi i chiotiki acol. Ta tis Grafis ajia loja t' afino os dinome anangkicta. I men stigmès, ipostigmès ke ales diastolès perisevusin is tin Italikìn Orthografían: Egò de grafo tes anangkées monon. Is to telos as noà o amathis kai mi catacrini o sofòs.

About 1,300 years after the fall of the Latin language, Italian sprouted from its dried trunk through the craft of wise men. There have been even more years since the fall of the most beautiful Greek language. Who, then, Dante or Petrarch, shall embrace upon it this vernacular we speak? Almost every nation today cultivates their mother tongue, even if it's born of barbarism. Why not us, the Romaic of our times? The idiom of Chios in particular, most sweet and melodic, perhaps essentially the most Greek than all the others? Forced, like Ezra denoting the Chaldean language in Hebrew characters after the Babylonian captivity, to write the vernacular Greek words with Italian letters, I ask for permission, treading between Greek grammar and Italian spelling, not to barbarise except as much as the common sense demands and the ear tolerates. The Chiot ears tolerate to hear *aplastos evmorfia* [ἄπλαστος εὐμορφία], *af' u* [ἀφοῦ], *alo onoma* [ἄλλο ὄνομα], *alà* [ἀλλά], *fisis* [φύσις]. So, how can I say *fisi* [φύση], *ma* [μά], *alon onoma* [ἄλλον ὄνομα], *apòs* [ἀπὼς], full of barbarism? On the contrary, [Greek] grammar teaches *tas iméras* [τὰς ἡμέρας], *tas dinámis* [τὰς δυνάμεις], *i nix* [ἡ νύξ], *imàs* [ἡμᾶς], *ina* [ἴνα], *i zoi avtù* [ἡ ζωὴ αὐτοῦ]. The Chiots do understand these forms, but instead they prefer to hear *i zoitu* [ἡ ζωὴ του], *na* [νά], *emàs* [ἐμᾶς], *i nicta* [ἡ νύκτα], *tes dinames* [τὲς δύναιες], *tes imeres* [τὲς ἡμέρες] according to the Aeolian dialect. Etymology teaches *Anggelos* [Ἄγγελος], *gramma* [γράμμα], *jenna* [γέννα], *allos* [ἄλλος] as correct forms, but Italian spelling, which writes down only what is pronounced, dictates *alos*, *jena*, *grama*, *angelos*. What does *h* serve in *Eghò* [Εγὼ],

dhià [διά]? For the Italians it is the same as *Egò*, *dià*. The Chiots, you say, pronounce it as *gamma*. So, let them pronounce it without an *h* and let me gain the paper, ink and time to write it. Nevertheless, I spell *Echo* [Ἐχῶ], *Theòn* [Θεόν], even though the Italian pronunciation would be *Eco*, *Teon*, to mark *chi* and *theta*. Had the Chiot dialect had the Italian *d* and *g*, I would add an *h* to *d* and *g* to make *delta* and *gamma* distinct. The Italian *s* is often pronounced as *zeta*, in cases as *arnefe* [tool], *cafa* [house], *cofa* [thing], *prefa* [grip], so I use *f* to denote *zeta*, as in *pefo* [παίζω], *vrafi* [βράζει], *trifo* [τρίζω]. For *sigma* I use *s*. But given that Italians don't pronounce any *s* at the beginning of a word as *zeta*, I spell *zoi* [ζωή], *zitò* [ζητώ], *zestis* [ξέστις]. Perhaps two or three new letters are necessary. But I leave this concern to those who are going to receive the honour of perfecting the Chiot language. I put a grave accent, just like the Italians do, over *ultima*, and an acute accent over *penultima* and *antepenultima* in case of doubtful pronunciation. In a word: haven't we, the Frangochiots, made the Latin letters servants of the vernacular Greek language? It's wise for the servant to match as much as possible with the master, and the master with the servant. I use either genitive, either accusative, either dative after the prepositions *me* [μέ], *catà* [κατά], *apò* [ἀπό], *choris* [χωρίς], *dià* [διά] depending on the way they sound in Chios. As far as I can, I quote the sacred words of Scripture word-for-word. Semicolons, commas and other diacritics abound in Italian script. As far as I am concerned, I use only the necessary ones. In the end, let the ignorant [be able to] understand, and the wise not judge.⁶⁶

The “Prologue” provides valuable insights, addressing three interweaving aspects: the state of the Chiot dialect at the time, Velasti's attitude towards allography and, crucially, his proposed direction for standardising vernacular Greek, and his role in this process. The primary focus actually revolves around the question of language standardisation,⁶⁷ and consequently, the establishment of a national (or official) modern Greek language. Velasti appears to favour the accessible example of standard Italian, which was largely shaped by the Florentine variety of the Tuscan dialect, influenced significantly by the renowned literary works of Dante and Petrarch.⁶⁸ Precisely, not only does he aspire to operate as the instigator, theorist and advocate of a solution to the Greek language question (a Greek Pietro Bembo), but also, owing to his literary prowess, Velasti indirectly

⁶⁶ Velastis, *Psichofelis loji*, 3–4.

⁶⁷ On this matter, see the recent volume by Wendy Ayres-Bennett and John Bellamy, eds., *The Cambridge Handbook of Language Standardization* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021).

⁶⁸ Nicoletta Maraschio and Tina Matarrese, “The Role of Literature in Language Standardization: The Case of Italy,” in *ibid.*, 313–46.

positions himself as the author who will actualise this solution through his work (a Greek Dante or Petrarch). Following the example of these great poets, he selects his mother tongue, the dialect of Chios, as the one to be standardised. Thus, he endeavours to elevate it to the status of a prestige dialect, describing it as “the most Greek”. Reinforcing his argument in such a manner, Velasti indirectly references the work of Girolamo Germano, who had compared Attic Greek with the Chiot dialect.⁶⁹ Thanks to Germano’s *Vocabolario Italiano et Greco*, the Chiot dialect had already had its concise grammar and a dictionary – it was, in a sense, grammatised.⁷⁰ Consequently, Velasti’s work was to be offered as a literary complement to the path towards standardisation. In order to make acceptable the paradoxical presence of allography in this project, Velasti attributes biblical authority to it: likening himself to Ezra the Scribe – one of the most eminent allographers of all times – he practically renders Frangochiotika as a quasi-sacred language.⁷¹ Eventually, he is engaged with the language cause, reappropriating the pejorative term “Frangochiots” as an identity to be proud of.

Regarding the phenomenon of allography in particular, Velasti demonstrates a thorough awareness of the integration of his transcription system into Italian phonology through the Italian, virtually phonetic, spelling, albeit acknowledging certain necessary adjustments, whether historically determined (as in the case of the letters <χ> and <θ>)⁷² or dictated by the economy of typography (as in the case of the letters <γ> and <δ>). Of utmost importance, he thematises the functional/practical aspect that underscores the relationship between the Greek and Italian languages within his allographic system. He acknowledges that despite “the

⁶⁹ See Germano, *Vocabolario*, 10. Cf. Lami, “Roma [1746],” 56. On the way Velasti decontextualised Germano’s remark on the Chiot dialect in order to support his own agenda, see Psalti, “Giovanni Lami–Θωμάς Στανισλάος Βελάστης,” 86n2.

⁷⁰ On the *Vocabolario* as part of the standardisation process of vernacular Greek, see Eleni Kakoulidou-Panou, Eleni Karantzola and Katerina Tiktopoulou, eds., *Δημιώδης πεζός λόγος του 16ου αιώνα* (Athens: Centre for the Greek Language and National Bank of Greece Cultural Foundation, 2023), lxviii92, lxi98. Pernot describes Germano’s work as “first and foremost a Grammar of Chiot Greek” (“Préface”, *Grammaire et vocabulaire*, 22).

⁷¹ On Ezra’s allography Velasti cites from *Bibliotheca Sancta* (1566) by Sixtus of Siena. According to Rabbinic tradition, Ezra allegedly changed the script of the Torah by introducing square characters borrowed from Aramaic. Conversely, according to the Latin Fathers of the Church, he used the Hebrew alphabet for the Aramaic, that is, Chaldean, language. See Edmon L. Gallagher, *Hebrew Scripture in Patristic Biblical Theory: Canon, Language, Text* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 122, 130. On allography as sacred or secret language, cf. Luffin, “Le phénomène de métagrammatisme,” 353–54, 357.

⁷² On this matter, refer also to Germano’s interesting remarks in *Vocabolario*, 6.

repertoire of signs” being Latin, “the system is designed” in vernacular Greek,⁷³ thus adapting to the needs of the latter rather than imposing itself on it. Fully cognisant of the challenges inherent in “the transmission of an alphabet from one language to another”, he suggests the incorporation of a couple of new letters to refine Frangochiotika, addressing “issues of shortages”.⁷⁴ In this manner, both the Latin script and the Italian language are neither “essentialised” nor praised;⁷⁵ on the contrary, employing a servant-and-master metaphor, Velasti appears to believe that it is the Latin alphabet which gains authority from the very fact that it adapts to the needs of vernacular Greek, and particularly the Chiot dialect. Therefore, notions such as “the reference culture” and the “dominant culture”, and their respective relation, are rather destabilised.⁷⁶

Regarding linguistic matters, Velasti confirms in his “Prologue” that feminine paroxytone (and proparoxytone) nouns ending in -ις, derived from or constructed according to ancient Greek third declension, such as φύσις, constituted a structural feature of the Chiot dialect (as we have already observed, these nouns also abound in *Anapavsis tis cardhias*).⁷⁷ According to his testimony, his contemporaries in Chios employed <ταῖς/τῆς> rather than <τὰς> for the accusative plural feminine of the definite article.⁷⁸ Additionally, Velasti certifies the absence of geminate realisation in the Chiot pronunciation – a feature that could be linked to his familiarity with the Kastron idiom, as previously suggested. Finally, while emphasising the absence in the Chiot dialect of phonemes corresponding to the Italian letters <g> and <d>, he confirms the nasalisation of <γκ>/<γγ> and <ντ>, respectively, a phenomenon already graphematically depicted in his transcriptions in *Anapavsis tis cardhias*.⁷⁹

⁷³ See Françoise Briquel Chatonnet, “Un cas d’allographie: Le garshuni,” in *Écriture et communication*, new ed., ed. Dominique Briquel and Françoise Briquel Chatonnet (Paris: Éditions du Comité des travaux historiques et scientifiques, 2015), 68, <https://doi.org/10.4000/books.cths.1403>.

⁷⁴ See Dominique Briquel, “La diffusion de l’alphabet chez les Étrusques: Une fonction qui va au-delà de la notation de la langue,” in *ibid.*, 47.

⁷⁵ This is not the case in allography. As it has aptly been phrased, “what is particularly prestigious in the collective mindset of the communities in question, and what is a prominent marker of their religious identities, is the language in which their sacred texts were written” (Heijer and Schmidt, “Scripts Beyond Borders,” 33). We have already seen how Velasti opted for Greek rather than Latin as sacred (liturgical) language.

⁷⁶ On this matter, refer to Luffin, “Le phénomène de métagrammatisme” 340.

⁷⁷ See here 3.3.

⁷⁸ For different views on the matter, see Germano, *Vocabolario*, 18, and Pernot, *Études de Linguistique*, 2:50.

⁷⁹ See here 3.2.

4.2. The Allographic Subsystem of *Psichofelis loji*

Referring to the appended Table 3 for a comprehensive overview of Velasti's allography in *Psichofelis loji*, I would like to focus on the modification of his Frangochiotika in comparison to *Anapavsis tis cardhias*. The new and revised features are as follows:

1. Use of the cluster <ci> (instead of <tz>) before the vowels /a, o, u/ to denote [ts] according to the Italian spelling conventions (cf. *ciaramella*, *cioccolato*, *ciufolotto*). For example, *ciamada* (τσάμαδα), *cuciomitismena* (κουτσομυτισμένα), *clociusi* (κλοτσοῦσι).
2. Use of plain (i.e., not followed by an <h>) <d> and <g> to render [ð] and [ɣ]. For example, *Despina* (Δέσποινα), *dialogismòs* (διαλογισμός), *liguses* (λήγουσες), *gala* (γάλα).
3. Use of the cluster <ngk> (instead of <ng(g)h>) before /e/ and /i/ to denote the (pre)nasalised voiced palatal stop [ɲj] or [ɲ]. For example, *angelos* (ἄγγελος), *anangki* (ἀνάγκη).⁸⁰
4. Broader, thus systematic, use of the long s <f> as an intervocalic allograph for <z> for the transcription of Greek <ζ>. For example, *amartofimomeni* (ἀμαρτοζυμωμένη), *Trapefa* (Τράπεζα). Almost exclusive use of <s> for <σ, ζ>.
5. Systematic yet not exclusive transcription of voicing of word-initial voiceless stops after a word-final nasal,⁸¹ even in quotes in Koine or learned Greek. For example, *olindu* (ὄλιν του), *tin Detartin* (τὴν Τέταρτην), *apofasin delevi* (ἀπόφασιν τελεύει), *epì ton drachilon don mathitòn* (ἐπὶ τὸν τράχηλον τῶν μαθητῶν), *ean baradosis* (ἐὰν παραδώσης), *ton blisìon* (τὸν πλησίον), *tin braxin* (τὴν πράξιν), *apofasin berì* (ἀπόφασιν περὶ), *gnorisin gke crisin* (γνώρισιν καὶ κρίσιν), *egrapsan gke apedixan* (ἔγραψαν καὶ ἀπέδειξαν), *un don keròn* (οὖν τὸν καιρόν).
6. Broader use of <j> between <v> καὶ <e> (instead of <i>) to denote [j]. For example, *na evjenosin* (νὰ ἐβγαίνωσιν), *ivjen* (ἦβγεν), *vjeni* (βγαίνει).
7. Broader and more systematic use of acute accent in penult.

⁸⁰ Velasti notes in *Dimostrazione*, 1: “Ἄγγελος, Ἄγκυρα: L’Italiano, che voglia co’ caratteri suoi la genuina pronunzia conseguir de’ Greci, convien che scriva: *Angelos*, *Angkira*.”

⁸¹ See Holton et al., *Cambridge Grammar*, 1:203–5. Cf. [Velasti], *Breve trattato*, n.p.: “La π dopo ... ν suona b ... τὸν Παῦλον, ton Bavlou”. For the sonorisation of <π> after the final -ν, see also Velastus, *Dissertatio*, 7, and Velasti, *Dimostrazione*, 2. Germano also attested sonorisation of both <π> and <κ> after final -ν (*Vocabolario*, 9). For transcription of voicing with regard to editorial practices, see Vincent, Φόσκολου “Φορτουνάτος,” οα’–οε’. Vios’s testimony on the matter with regard to the Kastron idiom is slightly different (*Χιακά γλωσσικά*, 3, 6).

In the case of *Psichofelis loji*, as with *Anapavsis tis cardhias*, the allographic text has undergone meticulous proofreading. Authorial footnotes abound, quotations are rendered in italics and all punctuation marks are employed (although the semicolon is less frequent). Words are separated as standard (notably, apostrophes are used to mark elision, e.g., *cat' usían, n' acususin, thel' in, ap' eonos, cath' ešperinin*), except for enclitics (e.g., *somasu, ombrosu, Eleisónme, dioxetus, isacusónmu*).

One noteworthy feature of *Psichofelis loji* deserving particular attention is the unification of the graphematic system employed, namely the exclusive use of the Latin script, in contrast to the practice in *Anapavsis tis cardhias*, which has already been commented upon. Although Velasti, following his customary practice regarding Biblical references, predominantly quotes from the Old and New Testaments, in *Psichofelis loji* these quotations are also transcribed in Frangochiotika. Therefore, he enriches the Frangochiotic corpus with transcriptions of Koine Greek and thus of texts of higher register. This differentiation appears to have arisen due to technical issues during the printing production: it seems that Francesco Gaipa's printing press did not possess a Greek font. As Velasti confesses in a footnote of his, attempting to explain the transcription of <is> in a quotation from a Greek manuscript: "Ine ois me Elinicà gramata ta opia epithimò is ti Mesina" (It is οἷς in Greek characters which I miss in Messina).⁸²

4.3. The Chiot Dialect towards Standardisation (as Official)

Psichofelis loji presents a distinctive stylistic departure from *Anapavsis tis cardhias*. This divergence can be partly attributed to the content of the text, wherein numerous sermons, particularly in the first section of the book, and the dialogues between Velasti's characters Philomathis (the seeker of knowledge) and Alithofilos (the truth lover) delve into doctrinal issues and topics of church history. However, the formal and elaborate style of *Psichofelis loji* – its higher register – is primarily a result of Velasti's deliberate intention to offer it as a model of written language on the path towards standardising vernacular Greek, guided by the Chiot dialect. While Velasti indeed referenced the contemporary linguistic landscape of Chios in the "Prologue" to inform his transcriptional decisions, he significantly tailored the Chiot dialect towards a direction of partial de-dialectalisation, impacting all linguistic levels. Specifically, although he retained a considerable portion of the Chiot lexicon (while introducing learned terminology and constructing

⁸² Velasti, *Psichofelis loji*, 92ne.

numerous compound words),⁸³ he mitigated the dialectally marked features of morphology to a large extent (though not entirely), and to some extent made more conservative phonetic and syntactic choices. An exhaustive or quantified analysis of these adjustments, while undoubtedly valuable, exceeds the scope of this article. Nonetheless, some codified observations could be provided.

Regarding phonology, the following remarks could be made:

1. Decreased presence of anaptyxis of /y/ in the verbal suffix -εύω – only in three occurrences: *ecolakevie* (ἐκολάκευγε), *etelevie* (ἐτέλευγε), *evasilevie* (ἐβασίλευγε).
2. Preference for more learned consonant clusters: systematic transcription of the cluster <γχ> as <nch> (e.g., *sincharon*, *sinchasis*, *sinchenonde*); extensive use of the learned cluster /sθ/ over /st/, primarily in verbal endings (e.g., *damasthi*, *icusthi*, *dialechthi*, *scarfisthusi*).
3. Omission of final /n/ in verbal inflection, specifically in verbal endings of both barytone and oxytone verbs: a) all persons of the plural of the passive present indicative/subjunctive, b) third-person singular and all persons of the plural of the passive imperfect, c) singular of the passive aorist indicative, d) second-person plural of the active present indicative/subjunctive/imperative, active imperfect and active aorist indicative/subjunctive/imperative (see also in verb morphology).
4. Very rare appearance of the preposition ἀνε- in compounds, compared to the use of ἀνά: *anerotà*, *anagnosis*, *anecatonusi*, *anepandita*.

Regarding noun morphology:

1. Parallel presence of the neuter /on/ paradigms alongside the dialectally marked alternative neuter forms in /os/: *mesos* and *meson*, gen. *mesus*; *ergos* and *ergon*, gen. *ergu*; *doros* and *doron*.
2. Preference for the inherited ending -ματος rather than -μάτου for the genitive singular of paroxytone and proparoxytone neuter nouns in -μα: only two occurrences of *plasmatu* in comparison to many occurrences of *plasmatos*, and also *pnevmatos*, *somatos*, *ematos*, *sfalmatos*, *mnimatos*.

⁸³ Vernacular Chiot words (transcribed in Greek as entry words for clarity): e.g., ἀχυλιά, δρογγεύω, στρουφνιστός, ὀτρά, τσιγκελεύω, ἀραφί, μαργώνω, δρώνω (<ιδρώνω>), φαίνω (<ύφαίνω>), ριμάζω (<ώριμάζω>), βαϊρίζομαι, σταλίκι, μαστίχιν, ἀλοή, κόχλακας, μαμουκιάζω, τριπηδῶ, περιπαίχινιδον, ἀργυρένιος, σβουρνιστός, θρουβαλίζω. Learned terms and compounds: e.g., θαλασσοδρομία, ἀνανθρωποδίδακτος, τεταρτημόριον, θεοπολιτικός, προγνώρισις, ἀεροδρομῶ, σμαραγδάστραπτος, πυροχρυσόφωτος, ποντισμοφόρος, περίγειος, ἀπόγειος, λαμπροπυρσεύμορφος, φωτόστρωτος, ταρταροκίνητος, ἀγγελονόητος.

3. Continuation of use of plural forms borrowed from the /os/ paradigm for male paroxytone nouns in /is/ with parisyllabic plural: *stratopedarchi* (nom. plural <στρατοπεδάρχης>), *Patriarchi* (nom. plural <Πατριάρχης>), *exufiarchous* (acc. plural <ἐξουσιάρχης>).⁸⁴
4. Systematic preference for paroxytone over oxytone feminine nouns ending in /ia/, namely for forms without synizesis (e.g., *clepsía*, *afendía*, *metalaxía*, *afiochasía*, *apocotía*).

Velasti's adaptation in the verb morphology is more radical, involving practically the "removal" of dialectally marked endings, especially in the passive voice. What follows are some examples of endings of the passive present and imperfect:

1. *-omestha* (-όμεσθα/-ώμεσθα) and/or *-ometha* (-όμεθα/-ώμεθα) for the first-person plural of the present indicative/subjunctive of barytone verbs (e.g., *cheromestha*, *sevometha*), and *-umestha* (-ούμεσθα) and/or *-umetha* (-ούμεθα) for A- and E-stem oxytone verbs (e.g., *fovumestha*, *diigumestha*, *epicalumetha*). However, Velasti uses the dialectal ending *-uste* (-οὔστε), mainly without a final /n/, for the second-person plural of the present indicative/subjunctive (e.g., *jinuste*, *cremusten*, *dinuste*, *fovuste*).
2. *-onde* (-ονται/-ωνται/-ῶνται) for the third-person plural of the present indicative/subjunctive of barytone verbs and A-stem oxytone verbs (e.g., *scandalifonde*, *epimelevonde*, *sinapandonde*, *kimonde*), and *-unde* (-οὔνται) for E-stem oxytone verbs (e.g., *xercunde*, *psifunde*).
3. *-eto* (-ετο) for the third-person singular of the imperfect of barytone verbs (e.g., *efeneto*, *anepaveto*, *evithifeto*), and *-undo* (-οὔντο) for both A- and E-stem oxytone verbs (e.g., *emetrundo*, *eproskinundo*, *eforundo*, *edigundo*). There is one occurrence of *-ito* (-εῖτο) in *epemelito*.
4. *-ondo* (-οντο) for the third-person plural of the imperfect of barytone verbs (e.g., *etarafoondo*, *egofondo*, *efirnonondo*) and *-undo* (-οὔντο) for both A- and E-stem oxytone verbs (e.g., *eproskinundo*, *osmundo*, *epiundo*).

In terms of syntax, I must recall Velasti's programmatic decision, outlined in the "Prologue", to use, rather indistinctly, the dative case in prepositional phrases, in accordance with the everyday spoken language of his contemporary Chiots. It is reasonable to assume that this "dative" must have derived from the dropping of the final /n/ in noun phrases with the definite article, such as εἰς τὸν ναόν → εἰς τὸ ναὸ → [is to na'o] → εἰς τῷ ναῷ. This hyper-corrective misuse of the dative, therefore, lends the text a scholarly veneer.

⁸⁴ See Holton et al., *Cambridge Grammar*, 2:381, 383.

5. Conclusions

From a contemporary perspective, Velasti stands as a singular figure in modern Greek literary history, being perhaps the sole author to produce such an extensive body of work in two distinct graphematical systems. His Frangochiotic corpus, comprising roughly 154,000 words, stands by his only independently published work in the Greek script, *Περὶ Θυμαοῦ*, composed of 2,500 15-syllable verses.⁸⁵ Published in the mid-eighteenth century, Velasti's linguistic contributions have been rather overlooked, "being placed (or rather lost) in the lexicographical vacuum" between 1669 and 1835,⁸⁶ and falling beyond the scope of the monumental *Cambridge Grammar of Medieval and Early Modern Greek*. Thus, Velasti's *oeuvre* serves as a unique and unparalleled resource for understanding eighteenth-century vernacular Greek, particularly through the dialect of Chios, opening up substantial avenues for more precise conclusions. Moreover, Velasti approaches language not only as a literary tool but also as a subject of scientific inquiry, showcasing a dual sensitivity towards linguistic exploration, coupled with his broader, fundamentally political endeavours. His efforts to elevate the status of the Chiot dialect, both theoretically and practically, resonate strongly in his Frangochiotika. Notably, his pioneering attempt to standardise vernacular Greek, modeled after Dante, predates similar quests of Dionysios Solomos by more than 70 years.

Aristotle University of Thessaloniki

⁸⁵ See here, n. 2.

⁸⁶ Peter Mackridge, "Τα γλωσσάρια στις εκδόσεις των ελληνικών λογοτεχνικών κειμένων του ύστερου 18ου αι.: Απολογισμός και προτάσεις," in *Η εκδοτική των κειμένων της Νεοελληνικής Γραμματείας*, ed. Angeliki Loudi (Thessaloniki: Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, and Institute of Modern Greek Studies, 2016), 55.

PRIMARY SOURCES

Bellarmino, Roberto. *Dottrina Cristiana Breve: Composta per ordine di Nostro Signore Papa Clemente VIII. dal Reuerendo Padre Roberto Bellarmino Sacerdote della Compagnia di Giesù. Adefso Cardinale di Santa Chiesa del Titolo di Santa Maria in Via. Rivista & approvata dalla Congregazione della Riforma [...] La quale d'ordine dell' isteffo Sommo Pontefice, & ad instantia del Revendissimo Monsignor Giorgio Perpiniano Vescovo di Tine & Micone, è stata tradotta, & stampata in lingua Greca Volgare commune per intelligenza & beneficio delli populi di quei paesi.* Διδασκαλία Χριστιανική Σύντομος, ἡγουν εἶσε κοντολογιάν. Συνθεσμένη (μὲ ὀρισμὸν τοῦ Δεσπότη μας Πάπα Κλεμέντη Ὅγδου [sic]) ἀπὸ τὸν τιμωτάτον Πατέρα Ῥωβέρτον Βελλαμῖνον, ἱερέα τῆς Συντροφίας τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. Καὶ τῶρα Καρδινάλις τῆς ἀγίας Ἐκκλησίας, τοῦ Τίτλου τῆς ἀγίας Μαρίας ἰν βία. Ξαναβλεπημένη καὶ ἀποδεχομένη ἀπὸ τὴν Σύναξιν τῆς ριφόρμας [...] ἡ ὅποια μὲ ὀρισμὸν τοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἄκρου Ἀρχιερέως, καὶ εἰσὲ ζήτημα τοῦ αἰδεσιμωτάτου κυρίου Γεωργίου τοῦ Περπινιανοῦ Ἐπισκόπου τίνος [sic] καὶ Μίκονος, ἐμεταγυρίσθη καὶ ἐσταμπαρίσθη εἰσε γλῶσσαν ῥωμαϊκὴν κοινήν, πιεζομένη διὰ ἐγγροίκησιν καὶ ὄφελος τοῦ λαοῦ ἐκεινῶν τῶν τόπων. *Dhidhascalia Christianiki Syntomos, íghun isè condologhian. Synthesménì (mè horismòn tù Dhespotimas Papa Clementi Ogdhov) apò tòn timiótaton Patéra Robertson Bellarminon Hieréa tis Syntrofiás tù Ihsu [sic]. Chè tóra Cardinalis tis haghias Ecclisías, tù Titlu tis haghias Marias in Via. Xanaulepiméni chè apodechoméni apò tin Synaxin tis Rifórmes [...] hi hopía mè horifmon tù aftù Acru Archieréos, chè isè sitima tù edhesimotátu kyriú Gheorghiu Perpinianù Episcópu Tinos che Miconos, emetaghyrifthi, chè estamparifthi isè glóssan Roméchin chinín, pesemeni dhia eghrichifin chè ófelos tù laù echinòn tòn tópon.* Rome: Luigi Zannetti, 1602; reprinted: Padua: Stamperia del Seminario, 1695.

Germano, Girolamo. *Vocabolario Italiano et Greco, nel quale si contiene come le voci Italiane si dicano in Greco volgare: Con alcune regole generali [...], composto dal P. Girolamo Germano della Compagnia di Giesu.* Rome: Per l'Herede di Bartolomeo Zannetti, 1622 [= Germano, Girolamo. *Grammaire et Vocabulaire du grec vulgaire*, edited by Hubert Pernot. Fontenay-sous-Bois (Seine): n.p., 1907].

[Lami, Giovanni.] "Roma [1746]." Review of *Anapavsis tis cardhias* by Thomas Stanislaos Velastis. *Novelle Letterarie pubblicate in Firenze* 13, no. 4 (28 January 1752): cols. 55–57.

Ledesma, Jacopo. *Διδασκαλία Χριστιανική, εἰς τὴν ὁποῖαν ὁ διδάσκαλος [sic] ἐρωτᾷ, καὶ ὁ μαθητὴς ἀπηλογᾷται: Καμωμένη ἀπὸ τὸν πατέρα Ἰάκωβον Λεδέσμα θεολόγον τῆς συντροφίας τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ γυρισμένη εἰς τὸ Ρωμαῖκον διὰ μέσου τοῦ πατρὸς Βιγκεντίου τοῦ Κασταγνιόλα τῆς ὁμοίας συντροφίας. Didascalia christianiki, is tin opian o Didascalos erota, che o mathitis apilogate: Camomeni apo ton patera Iacobon Ledesma theologon tis syntrofias tu Iifu, chie girisfmeni is to Romaecon dia mesu tu patros Vincentiou tu Castagniola tis omias syntrofias. Rome: Luigi Zannetti, 1595.*

Velasti, Tommaso. *Dimostrazione Istorico-Grammatica del suono delle lettere Greche, a' Grechi tutti per lo mondo, che per altro differentissimi materni linguaggi usano, comune, indubitato, perpetuo infin dell'aurea età di Platone, composta in Latino e stampata in Roma nel 1750 [sic], e tradotta in Italiano dallo stesso autore Tommaso Velasti: Coll'aggiunta d'una Grammatica breve per l'aurea lingua, comune a tutti li prosatori, ben diversa da' dialetti e dalla poesia, dedicata all'Augustissima Imperatrice di tutte le Russie Catarina II. Naples: Gennaro Giaccio, 1772.*

[Velasti, Tommaso Stanislao.] *Breve trattato del suono delle lettere Greche, delle terminazioni de' nomi, e de' verbi, coll'aggiunta di alcune regole della Grammatica, disposte da un religioso della Compagnia di Gesù. Rome: Antonio de' Rossi, 1747.*

Velastis, Thomas Stanislao. *Anapavsis tis cardhias is to ajion thelima tu Theú parà tu patros Thomá Stanislau Velasti tis tu Jisú Sindrofias: Dhafcalia malifta Sinathrifmeni ec tu Pateros Alfonfu Rodriquez tis avtis sindrofias. Is ofelian mericà ton Chiotòn. Rome: Ex Typographia Antonii de Rubeis, 1746.*

Velastis, Thomas Stanislao. *Περὶ θυμοῦ: Στίχοι πατρὸς Θομᾶ [sic] Στανισλάου Βελάστου τῆς τοῦ Ἰησοῦ Συντροφίας. Rome: Typis Antonii de Rubeis, 1747.*

[Velastis, Thomas Stanislao.] *I imera apò ton christianòn aghiasmeni dhià tis Profevchìs, ke Meletis: Sinthemeni Apò ena Patera tis Sindrofias tu Iisù, ke afieromeni to Evjenestato, ke Evlaveftato Theodhoro Vegettio. Rome: Typis Angeli Rotilii et Philippi Bacchelli, 1751.*

Velastis, Thomas Stanislao. *Psichofelis loji is tes Eortes ke Kiriakes tu chronu sinthemeni parà tu patros Thomà Stanislau Velastu tis tu Jisù Sindrofias: Eximinia protì. Messina: Francesco Gaipa, 1753.*

[Velastis, Thomas Stanislao.] *Didascalia christianikì na lejete apò ta Jesuitomathitopula is ti Chio: Prosevchì tachini ke ale tines Evlavie. Messina: n.p., 1754.*

Velastus, Thomas Stanislao. *Dissertatio de litterarum græcarum pronuntiatione. Rome: Typis Angeli Rotilii et Philippi Bacchelli, 1751.*

APPENDIX

Table 1.1. Comparative Table on “Problematic” Consonants and Consonant Clusters

Latin script/Frangochiotika <...>						
Greek script <...>	Phonetic value [...]	<i>Dottrina Christiana</i> (1595)	<i>Dottrina Christiana Breve</i> (1602)	<i>Vocabolario Italiano et Greco</i> (1622)	<i>Anapavsis tis kardhias</i> (1746)	<i>Psichofelis loji</i> (1753)
β	v	u (mainly), v	1.1 v/u 1.2 vu/uu	v (in the beginning of a word), u (in the middle of a word)	v/u	v/u
[α/ε/η]v			b			
φ	f	u	1.1 u 1.2 uu	u	v	v
[α/ε/η]v		f (only twice ph)	f (in words of vernacular Greek) ph (for <φ> in the ancient Greek part of the text, and in diachronic Greek words)	f	f	f
		u (f in <affthentis>; once uf <aufthentis>))	f (rarely v/vv)	u	v (rarely f)	v

γ	γ	1.1 gh (+a, o, u) 1.2 g+consonant	g (gh before l so as not to be read as [ʎ])	1.1 gh (+a, o, u, consonant but m) 1.2 g (+m)	g			
	j					gh(i)	j	
								i (in the preposition <γιδ>)
γκ/γγ	ηg ^{/n} g	1.1 gg (mainly), ng 1.2 g 1.3 gchi (once in <fygghiernotis>=<συγκερνότης>)	ng+a/o/u/r/l	ng(g)+a/o/u/r/l (even in the beginning of words)	ng+a/o/u/r/l			
	ηj ^{/n} j					ng+h+e/i	ng(g)+h+e/i	ng+k+i/e
	g							
γκ/γγ	ηκ/ηc	1.1 nc/nch (rarely) 1.2 nk (once in <ifenénkis>=<εϊσενέγκης>)	very rarely as nc or nch (<sincirino>, <sincrisis>, <enchentrizo>)	very rarely as nc or nk for Italian names and for <γκ> in ecclesiastical terms	very rarely as nc for <γκ> in ecclesiastical terms			
	ð	dh (mainly), d	d	dh	d			
	θ	th, rarely plain t	(once dh in <exacludhúmena>)	th	th	th		

ζ	z	z	s/f (once z in <zis>=<ζī<>)	z (very rarely s/f)	almost exclusively z (initially and midwordly/ intervocally), rarely f (midwordly/ intervocally)	f (midwordly/ intervocally)
σ/ς	s	s/f	s/f/ff	s/f	s/f	s (mainly), f (rarely)
	k	c	c	c	c	c
κ	c	k (in <Kyrios>)	k (mainly in <Kyrios> and in the ancient Greek part of the text)	ch(i)	k	k
		1.1 ch(i) 1.2 (very rarely) c	ch(i)			
χ	x	ch	ch	ch	1.1 ch 1.2 often only c in front of t/th (in “ct” ligature)	ch
	ç		chi	ch(i)	ch	
ξ	ks	x	x	cs/cf	x	x
	l			l	l	
λ	λ	l	l	gl (once only in <medaglia>)	gl (only in Italian names)	l
	n	n	n	n	n	n
ν	ν	gn (once in <Castagniola>)	gn (once in <Agnès>)	n	gn (only in Italian names)	gn (once in <Agnèfa>)
	η					

μπ	mb/ ^{mb}	mp	mb	mb (even initially)	mb	mb
	b	X (N/A)	b (in words and names known through Catholicism)	b (in loanwords and words of Italian/Turkish origin)	b (for [b] in foreign names and toponyms, loanwords and initially)	b (for [b] in foreign names and toponyms)
	mp	X (N/A) (see above)	mp (twice in <estamparíthi> and <atalamprynthi>)	mp (in <πέμπτος> and <κοιμωμέσο>)	mp (for [mp] rarely in words with the prefix συν- and in <πέμπτος> Πέμπτη)	mp (in <πέμπτος> Πέμπτη, and verbal adj. of <πέμπω>)
ντ	nd/ nd	nt (mainly), rarely nd (in gerunds and participles)	nd (mainly), d (rarely)	nd (even initially)	nd	nd
	d	X (N/A)		X (N/A)	d (for [d] in Italian names)	d (for [d] in foreign names)
	nt	X (N/A) (see above)	nt (in words with the prefix συν- and for <ντ> in the ancient Greek part of the text)	nt (mainly in loanwords)	nt (rarely in words with the prefix συν-, in names known through Catholicism, in toponyms, in Italian loanwords)	nt (for [nt] in Italian names, in toponyms and in the word <φαντασία> and its derivatives)
τσ	ts	z (twice), tz (once) (all in <ἐτῖ>)	c (in <eci>=<ἐτῖ>, in <officio> and in Catholic saints' names)	tz	1.1 tz+a/o/u 1.2 c+e/i	1.1 ci+a/o/u 1.2 c+e/i zz (in Italian names)
	dz	X (N/A)	X (N/A)	ntz (very rarely gtz and nz, or mere z)	gg+e/i ngi (and only once nggi)	X (N/A) ng+i/e
(ν)τῖ	ndz					

Table 1.2. Comparative Table on Particular Graphematic Features

		<i>Dottrina Christiana</i> (1595)	<i>Dottrina Christiana Breve</i> (1602)	<i>Vocabolario Italiano et Greco</i> (1622)	<i>Anapavsis tis cardhias</i> (1746)	<i>Psichofelis loji</i> (1753)
Diacritics	1. ´ (rough breathing)	rarely; thrice in “hyos”	✓ (as h)	X (once in <me tin hóran>)	X	X
	2.1 ´ (acute accent) 2.1.1 in penult	X	✓	✓	X (very rarely)	✓ (in case of doubtful pronunciation)
	2.1.2 in antepenult	X	✓	✓	X	✓ (rarely)
	2.2 ` (grave accent in ultima)	X	✓	✓	✓	✓ [rarely grave in penult]
Consonant Voicing Transcription		X	X (only twice in <ton górho>=<τὸν κόρρον> and <andíchi>=<ἄν τὸν χη>)	✓	X	✓
Double Consonants Transcription		✓	✓	✓	X (only in the names <Filippon Bavestrelli>, <Joannis Berchmans>, <Joannis Caraffa>)	X

Table 2. The Allographic System of *Anapavis tis cardhias* (1746)

Latin Script <...>	Greek Script <...>	Phonetic value [...]	<i>Anapavis tis cardhias</i>
a	α	a	anapamena (άναπαμένα)
b	μπ	b	Bonaventuras (Μποναβεντούρας), Lisbonan (Λισμπόναν), bena (μπένα), bala (μπάλα)
c			
1.1) c+o/a/u	1.1) κ, κκ	1.1) k	1.1) copon (κόπον), cardhias (καρδίας), curkeli (κουρκέλι)
1.2) c+consonant	1.2) κ, κκ	1.2) k	1.2) acrin (άκριν), Eclifas (Εκκληρίες)
2.1) c+i	2.1) τσ	2.1) ts	2.1) eclocifen (εκλόσισησεν), parpucia (παπούστια), Aciganu (Άτσιγγανου)
2.2) c+e	2.2) τσ	2.2) ts	2.2) cevdhin (τσευδίν)
3.1) c+h	3.1) χ	3.1) x, ç	3.1) taraches (ταραχές), chora (χώρα), lachiòs (λαχιώς)
3.2) c+t (in ligature)	3.2) χ	3.2) x	3.2) ecthrita (έχθρητα), etaractica (επαράχτηκα), dlecthi (δεχθῆ)
3.3) c+h	3.3) γχ	3.3) x, ç	3.3) sicharos (σύγχαρος), sichises (σύγχισες)
d			
1) d+a/i/e/o/u/r	1) ντ	1) d	1) Bernardos (Μπερνάρντος), Ridolfon (Ριντόλφον), Dominicos (Ντομίνικος)
2) d+h	2) δ	2) ð	2) dhromon (δρόμον), dhascalian (δασκαλιάν), dhialoghos (διάλογος)
e	ε, αι	e	erkete (έρκεται)
f			
1.1) f	1.1) φ, rarely [ε/α]v	1.1) f	1.1) Filosofi (Φιλόσοφοι), xivoreftin (ξηβορευτήν)
1.2) f+i+vowel	1.2) φτ-	1.2) fç	1.2) finefiès (συννεφεές), zughrafia (ζουγραφιά)
g			
1.1) g+h+a/o/u/consonant (except for m)	1.1) γ	1.1) γ	1.1) ghalinin (γαλίνην), loghu (λόγου), eghlambrotis (έγλαμπρότης)
1.2) g+m	1.2) γ	1.2) γ	1.2) pragna (πράγμα), paradhigma (παράδειγμα)
2) gg+i/e	2) τζ	2) dz	2) camochaggidhes (καμοχατζήδες)
3.1) g+n (in foreign names)	3.1) νι	3.1) ñ	3.1) Mascaregnas (Μασκαρένιας)
3.2) g+l (in foreign names)	3.2) λι	3.2) λ	3.2) Bobadiglias (Μπουπαντίλιας)
4) g+a/o/u (in foreign names and toponyms)	4) γκ	4) g	4) Caligolas (Καλιγκόλας), Praga (Πράγκα), Granatan (Γκρανάταν)

h (always in clusters, to render phonemes into fricatives) See c(3), d(2), g(1), t(3)			
i			
1.1) i 1.2.1) i (in nominal endings) 1.2.2) i (in nominal endings) 2.1.1) i between v+e 2.1.2) i intervocalically 2.2) i+e+consonant 2.3) i+i (in the beginning of a word) 3) i between g+a/o/u 4) For other uses and phonetic values of <i>, see its appearance after consonants	1.1) ι, η, υ, ει, οι 1.2.1) ιοι 1.2.2) οι 2.1.1) γ (υγε/βγε/βγαυ) 2.1.2) γ 2.2) γε 2.3) γι 3) -	1.1) i 1.2.1) ii, ij 1.2.2) i (de-patalisation?) 2.1.1) j (vje) 2.1.2) j 2.2) je 2.3) ji 3) rendering of <g>/[g] into [dz]	1.1) proimion (προϊμίον), tapinosini (ταπεινοσύνη) 1.2.1) teli (τέλειοι), Aji (Άγιοι) 1.2.2) plusi (πλουῖοι?) 2.1.1) exefevies (ἐξέφευγες), echorevien (ἐχώρευεν), evieni (ἐβγαίνει), evienen (ἐβγανεν), ivien (ἰβγεν), apojeviese (ἀπογεύεσαι), jirevie (γύρευγε) 2.1.2) oieske (όγεσκε), apiloian (ἀπυλογιάν) 2.2) Ierus (Ἰέρους), Ielase (Ἰελάσαι) 2.3) Iirevse (Ἰύρευσε) 3) scangiochiros (σκαντζόχοιρος)

j	1.1) j (in nominal endings)	1.1) ιου	1.1) ii/iʝ	1.1) Macarj (Μακάριοι), aghrj (ἄγριοι)
	1.2) j (in nominal and verbal endings)	1.2) i	1.2) i	1.2) crimatismenj (κριματισμένοι), eleimofinj (ἐλεημοσύνη), pedhevj (παιδεύει)
k	2.1) j+i	2.1) γι	2.1) ji	2.1) jin (γῆν), odhijifo (ὁδηγήσω), Aji (ἄγιοι)
	2.2) j+i	2.2) ι	2.2) i	2.2) jieris (ἱερεῖς)
l	3) j+a	3) γία	3) ja	3) loja (λόγια), jattros (γιατρός), jali (γυαλί), pajavli (παγιαύλι)
	4.1) j+e	4.1) γε	4.1) je	4.1) flojes (φλόγες), elejen (ἐλεγεν), ifijen (ἤφυνεν)
m	4.2) j+e	4.2) ιε	4.2) ie	4.2) jeris (ἱερεῖς)
	4.3) j+e	4.3) γιε	4.3) je	4.3) Jezabel (Πεζαμπέλ < it. Jezabele)
n	5) j+o	5) γιο	5) jo	5) Ajofini (Ἀγιωσύνη)
	6) j+u	6) γιου	6) ju	6) Judhas (Ιουδας < it. Giuda)
o	1.1) k+i/e	1.1) κ	1.1) c	1.1) kimata (κύματα), keron (καρόν)
	1.2) k+ia	1.2) κια	1.2) ca	1.2) arnackia (ἀρνάκια), ctikiafmeni (κτικιασμένοι)
u	1.3) k+ie	1.3) κιε	1.3) ce	1.3) calorizikiēs (καλοριζικιές)
	1.1) l	1.1) λ, λλ	1.1) l	1.1) proskefalon (προσκέφαλον), alofli (ἀλλόφυλη)
u	1.2) l+i+vowel	1.2) λι-	1.2) λ	1.2) plia (πλιά), Aneghaliates (Ἀνεγάλιασες)
	1.1) m	1.1) μ, μμ	1.1) m	1.1) ghrama (γράμμα), mathimeni (μαθημένοι)
v	1.2) m+i+vowel	1.2) μι-	1.2) mɨ	1.2) Amialon (Ἄμιαλον)
	2.1) m+b	2.1) μπ	2.1) mb/ ^m b	2.1) ambelaki (ἀμπελάκι), emborumen (ἐμποροῦμεν), xomblia (ξόμπλια)
w	2.2) m+p	2.2) μπ	2.2) mp	2.2) simpatrioton (συμπατριωτών), Kempis (Κέμπις), pemptis (πέμπτις)

n 1.1) n 1.2) n+i+vowel 2.1) n+d 2.2) n+t 3.1.1) n+g [+a/o/u/r] 3.1.2) n+gg [+a/o/u/r] 3.2.1) n+gh [+i/e] 3.2.2) n+ggh [+i/e] 3.3) n+c/k 4.1) n+gi 4.2) n+gg [+i/e]	1.1) v, vv 1.2) vi- 2.1) vt 2.2) vt 3.1.1) γκ, γγ 3.1.2) γκ 3.2.1) γκ 3.2.2) γγ, γκ 3.3) γκ 4.1) ντζ 4.2) ντζ	1.1) n 1.2) n 2.1) nd/ⁿd 2.2) nt 3.1.1) ng/ⁿg 3.1.2) ng/ⁿg 3.2.1) η/ⁿη 3.2.2) η/ⁿη 3.3) ηκ/ης 4.1) ndz 4.2) ndz	1.1) nerà (νερά), finefiēs (συννεφίες) 1.2) pania (πανιά), arachniēs (αράχνιες) 2.1) archondifá (ἀρχόντισσα), armenizondas (ἀρμενίζοντας), pandotinín (παντοτινήν) 2.2.) sintomi (σύμπτωμ), Entimotatis (Ἐντιμοτάτης), Lavrentios (Λαυρέντιος) 3.1.1) sfingondas (σφιγγόντας), ngangava (γκάγκαβα), dhanganun (δαγκάνουν) 3.1.2) munggrismata (μουνγκρισμάτα) 3.2.1) pungi (πουνγκί) 3.2.2) ingghizen (ἰγγιζέν), strongghilòs (στρογγυλός), anangghéan (ἀναγκαίαν) 3.3) Anketas (Ἀγκέτας), Ankiras (Ἀγκυρας), finclironomos (συνγκληρονόμος) 4.1) scangiochiros (σκαντζόχοιρος), chalangi (χαλάντζι) 4.2) jeronggiàs (γεροντζιάς)
o o, ω		o	ghnorizo (γνωρίζω), idhonēs (ἰδονές)
p 1.1) p 1.2) p+i+vowel 2) p+s/f	1.1) π, ππ 1.2) πι- 2) ψ	1.1) p 1.2) pς 2) ps	1.1) pafchufin (πάσχουσιν), Filipos (Φίλιππος) 1.2) Piòs (Ποιός), capies (κάποιες) 2) pfichin (ψυχήν), psegghadhia (ψεγάδια)
r 1.1) r 1.2.1) r+i+vowel 1.2.2) r+i+vowel	1.1) ρ, ρρ 1.2.1) ρι- 1.2.2) ργι-	1.1) r 1.2.1) ρι 1.2.2) ρι	1.1) ravidhi (ραβδί), tharos (θάρος) 1.2.1) fteriàn (στεριάν), cheriù (χεριού) 1.2.2) kenurion (καινούργιον), Liturian (Λειτουργίαν)
s/f 1.1) s/f 1.2) s/f+i+vowel 2) f (intervocalically)	1.1) σ/ς, σσ 1.2) σι- 2) ζ	1.1) s 1.2) sc 2) z	1.1) íapima (σάπυμα), thalafá (θάλασσα), evkeriēs (εὐκαιρίες) 1.2) forefian (φορεσιάν), nifià (νησιά) 2) xedhialifete (ξεδιαλύεται), loghariafi (λογαριάζη)

t 1.1) t 1.2) t+i+vowel 2) t+z+a/o/u 3.1) t+h 3.2) t+h+i+vowel	1.1) τ, ττ 1.2) τι- 2) τσ 3.1) θ 3.2) θi-	1.1) t 1.2) τς 2) ts 3.1) θ 3.2) θς	1.1) tuto (τούτο), Atlas (Άτλάς) 1.2) fteletian (στελετιάν) 2) tzamburna (τσαμπούρνα), tzugrianifis (τσουγκριανιστής), patzon (πάτσον) 3.1) epithimies (ἐπιθυμίες) 3.2) vathia (βαθιά)
u 1) u 2.1) u 2.2) u+i+vowel	1) ou 2.1) β 2.2) βi-	1) u 2.1) v 2.2) vj	1) Uranon (Οὐρανόν), ifterus (ἴστερος) 2.1) uoithian (βοήθειαν), uradhi (βραδύ) 2.2) sclaiuan (σκελαβιάν)
v 1.1) v 1.2) v+i+vowel 2) v in the beginning of a word 3) v after e/a	1.1) β, ββ, [ε/α]v 1.2) βi- 2) οὐ 3) [ε/α]v	1.1) v 1.2) vj 2) u 3) f	1.1) vasana (βάσανα), enlaves (ἐνλάβες), Avas (Ἀββάς) 1.2) caraviu (καραβιού), vieluni (βιελούνι) 2) vfiaticà (οὐσιαστικά), vranikis (οὐρανικής) 3) encolofalevta (ἐνκόλοσάλεντα), canchistun (κανχιστούν), dhiafendevsun (διαφεντεύσουν), pistsvis (πιστεύσης)
x	ξ	ks	amaxoforon (ἀμαξοφόρον), exotericon (ἐξωτερικόν)
z 1.1) z 1.2) z+i+vowel	1.1) ζ 1.2) ζi-	1.1) z 1.2) zj	1.1) zoin (ζωήν), Nazianzinós (Ναζιανζηνός) 1.2) ziondas (ζιώντας)

Table 3. The Allographic System of *Psichofelis loji* (1753)

Latin Script	Greek script	Phonetic Value	<i>Psichofelis loji</i>
<...>	<...>	[...]	
a	α	a	Análpis (Ανάληψις)
b	μπ	b	Liberios (Λιμπίριος), Blondelos (Μπλοντέλος), Brindisio (Μπριντισίω)
c	1.1) κ, κκ 1.2) κ 2.1) τσ 2.2) τσ 3) χ	1.1) k 1.2) k 2.1) ts 2.2) ts 3) x, ç	1.1) Cosmon (Κόσμιον), Catholiki (Καθολικοί), cucrucà (κουκουκά), Eclisia (Εκκλησία) 1.2) ec (έκ) 2.1) peci (πετσι), cingkelemenos (τσιγκελέμενος), cicirifi (τσιτσιρίζει) 2.2) cevdismata (τσενδίσματα), Aceldama ([του] Ατσελδαμά), cenvdifi (τσενδιίζει) 3) Chaldeon (Χαλδαίων), schedon (σχεδόν), nichia (νύχια)
d	1) δ 2) ντ	1) ð 2) d	1) Despina (Δέσποινα), dio (δύο), dialojismòs (διαλογισμός) 2) Dorè (Ντορέ), Bernardinos (Μπερναντίνος)
e	ε, αι	e	eortì (έορτή), eonion (αίωνιον)
f	1.1) φ 1.2) φι-	1.1) f 1.2) fç	1.1) fimi (φήμη), arofasin (άρόφασιν), epsifusan (έψηφούσαν) 1.2) carfia (καρφιά), sindrofiaso (συντροφιάσω)
g	1) γ 2) γκ 3) νι	1) γ 2) g 3) ñ	1) glosan (γλώσσαν), logon (λόγον), liguses (λήγουσες), gala (γάλα) 2) Gaipa (Γκάπα), Agathes (Αγκάθες), Gonzaga (Γκονζάγκα) 3) Agnefa (Ανιέζα)

1.1) i 1.2) i (in nominal endings) 2.1) i between v+e 2.2) i+e+consonant 2.3) i+a+consonant 2.4) i+i+consonant 3) i between c+a/o/u 4) For other uses and phonetic values of <i>, see its appearance after consonants	1.1) ι, η, υ, ει, οι 1.2) ιοι 2.1) γ (υγε) 2.2) γε- 2.3) γα- 2.4) γι- 3) -	1.1) i 1.2) ii/ iij 2.1) j (vje) 2.2) je 2.3) ja 2.4) ji 3) rendering of <c>/[k] into [ts]	1.1) Andilitrosis (Αντιλήτρωσις), anictà (άνοικτά), keclismenos kipos (κεκλεισμένος κήπος) 1.2) agri (άγριοι), macari (μακάριοι) 2.1) ecolakevie (έκολακευγε), etelevie (έτελευγε), efevrien (έφευγεν), enasilievien (έβασίλευγεν) 2.2) Ieros (Έερος), Iesutitis (Ιεσουτίτης), Ieorjii (Ιεώρηιοι), Proiecton (Προγιέκτον) 2.3) Iansenisti (Πανσενίστιοι), Ianuisji (Πανουήσιοι) 2.4) Iimnòs (Ιιμνός) 3) ciamada (τσάμαδα), cuciomitismena (κουτσομυτισμένα), clociusi (κλωτσοῦσι), Alacios (Άλλάτσος)
j 1) j (in nominal endings) 2) j+i 3) j+a 4.1) j+e 4.2) j+e 5) j+o 6) j+u	1) ιοι 2) γι 3) γία 4.1) γε/γαι 4.2) γιε 5) γιο/ω 6) γιου	1) ii/ iij 2) ji 3) ja 4.1) je 4.2) je 5) jo 6) ju	1) omj (όμοιοι), Epifanj (Επιφάνιοι), Eijptj (Αιγύπτιοι), alotrj (άλλότριοι) 2) kalurjias (καλλουρηγίας), enerjia (ένεργεία), jis (γής) 3) mija (μίγια), ajatrevta (αγιατρεντα), jali (γιαλί) 4.1) vjeni (βγαινει), jerosinin (γεροσύνην), everjesies (εύεργεσίες) 4.2) ijénusi (ύγαινουσι), 5) jomena (γιωμένα), Lojola (Λογιόλα) 6) ejudaisien (έγιουδάσεν)
k 1.1) k+i/e 1.2) k+ia	1.1) κ 1.2) κια	1.1) c 1.2) ca	1.1) Kivernisin (Κυβέρνησιν), Kefalin (Κεφαλήν) 1.2) glikia (γλυκιά), psarakia (ψαράκια)

l					
1.1) l	1.1) λ, λλ	1.1) l	1.1) loja (λόγια), Elínon (Ελληνών)		
1.2) l+i+vowel	1.2) λι-	1.2) λ	1.2) achilià (άχυλιά), aliòs (άλλιώς)		
m					
1.1) m	1.1) μ, μμ	1.1) m	1.1) meleti (μελέτη), Gramatikì (Γραμματική)		
1.2) m+i+vowel	1.2) μι-	1.2) mɲ	1.2) evnostomiasan (έβουβοστομιάσαν), psomià (ψομιά)		
2.1) m+b	2.1) μπ	2.1) mb/ ^{mb}	2.1) grembana (γρέμπανα), ethombose (έθόμποσε), embeni (έμπαινει), ombros (όμπρός)		
2.2) m+p	2.2) μπ	2.2) mp	2.2) Pemptin (Πέμπτην), Theorempitos (Θεόεμπιττος), jinecorempton (γυναικόεμπιττον)		
n					
1.1) n	1.1) ν, νν	1.1) n	1.1) noisis (νόσις), Jenisin (Γέννησιν)		
1.2) n+i+vowel	1.2) νι-	1.2) ɲ	1.2) emoniasasi (έμονοιάσασι), anarniès (άναρνιές)		
2.1) n+d	2.1) ντ	2.1) nd/ nd	2.1) panda (πάντα), chrisokendima (χρυσοκέντημα), sindrofiaso (συντροφιάσω)		
2.2) -n+d-	2.2) -ν τ-	2.2) nd/ nd	2.2) olindu (όλιν του), tin Detartin (τήν Τέταρτην), apofasin delevi (άπόφασιν τελεύει), epì ton drachilon don mathitòn (epì τόν τράχριλον τών μάθητῶν)		
2.3) n+t	2.3) ντ	2.3) nt	2.3) Dantis (Δάντης), Inokentios (Ιννοκέντιος), fantasia (φαντασία), Antuerpian (Άντουερπίαν), Constantinupoleos (Κωνσταντινουπόλεως)		
3) -n+p-	3) -ν π-	3) mb/ ^{mb}	3) ean baradosis (έάν παραδώσης), ton blisiòn (τὸν πλησίον), tin braxin (τήν πράξιν), apofasin berì (άπόφασιν περί)		
4) -n+gk-	4) -ν κ-	4) ɲj/ ^{ɲj}	4) gnorisin gke crisin (γνώρισιν καὶ κρίσιν), egrapsan gke apedixan (έγραψαν καὶ άπέδειξαν), megalin gke varian (μεγάλην καὶ βαρεία)		
5.1) n+g [+a/o/u/r/l]	5.1) γκ, γγ	5.1) ɲg/ ^{ɲg}	5.1) anangasmenos (άναγκασιμένος), Ungarias (Ούγγαρίας), Inglesa (Ιγγλέζα)		
5.2) n+gk [+i/e]	5.2) γκ, γγ	5.2) ɲj/ ^{ɲj}	5.2) angkelos (άγγελος), anangki (άνάγκη), angkisma (άγγισμα)		
5.3) n+c	5.3) γκ	5.3) ɲk	5.3) sincatikía (συνκατοικία), sincironomon (συνκληρονόμων)		
6) n+g+i/e	6) ντζ	6) ndz	6) brunginiticos (μπρουντζινίκος), longimánu (λοντζιμάνου <ital. longimano)		
7) n+ch	7) γχ	7) ɲx	7) sinchenete (σιγχάινεται), asinchoritos (άσυνχώρητος), Melanchthon (Μελάγχθων)		
8) n+v	8) μβ	8) ɲv	8) Sinvulatores (Συμβουλάτορες), Sinveicota (Συμβεβηκότα), sinvasilevon (συμβασιλεύων)		
o	ο, ω	o	acrogoniéos (άκρογωνιάτος)		
p					
1.1) p	1.1) π, ππ	1.1) p	1.1) pnevma (πνεύμα), Filipi (Φίλιπποι)		
1.2) p+i+vowel	1.2) πι-	1.2) pɕ	1.2) Piàs (Πιάς), capia (κάπουα)		
2) p+s	2) ψ	2) ps	2) lampsin (λάμπιν), psoriasis (ψωρίασει), psevdese (ψεύδεσαι)		

r 1.1) r 1.2) r+i+vowel	1.1) ρ, ρρ 1.2) ρi-	1.1) r 1.2) rj	1.1) ricto (ρίκτω), tharos (θάρος) 1.2) varià (βαριά), adriès (αδριές)
s/f 1.1) s, f (rarely) 1.2) s+i+vowel 2) f (intervocally)	1.1) σ/ς, σσ 1.2) σi- 2) ζ	1.1) s 1.2) sç 2) z	1.1) íchedon (σχεδόν), sichnà (συχνά), Cosmonasilisan (Κοσμοβασιλίσσαν), icones (εικόνες) 1.2) tartarolisiasmenus (ταρταρολυσσιασμένους) 2) amartofimomeni (άμαρτοζυμωμένη), Trapefa (Τράπεζα)
t 1.1) t 1.2) t+i+vowel 2.1) t+h 2.2) t+h+i+vowel	1.1) τ, ττ 1.2) τi- 2.1) θ 2.2) θi-	1.1) t 1.2) tç 2.1) θ 2.2) θç	1.1) Topotiritin (Τοποτηρητήν), metaglotismenes (μεταγλωττισμένες) 1.2) chartià (χαρτιά), sfrismatiàn (σφουρηματιάν) 2.1) thimisu (θυμήσου), struthion (στρουθιον) 2.2) mathià (μαθιά), spathiù (σπαθιού)
u 1) u 2) u	1) ου 2) β	1) u 2) v	1) strufnistès (στροφονιστές), acoluthàs (άκολουθάς) 2) Urefos (Βρέφος), iugasi (ήγγασι)
v 1.1) v 1.2) v+i+vowel 2) v initially 3) v after e/a/i	1.1) β, ββ, [ε/α]v 1.2) βi- 2) οὐ 3) [ε/α/η]v	1.1) v 1.2) vj 2) u 3) f	1.1) voscòs (βοσκός), mavrideri (μαυριδερή), Savátu (Σαββάτου) 1.2) moliviù (μολυβιού) 2) Vranù (Ούρανου), Vdepote (Ουδέποτε) 3) evtichian (εὐτυχίαν), pístevso (πιστεύσω), ivxisan (ηῤξησαν), Navplías (Ναυπλίας)
x	ξ	ks	xegdikeosis (ξεγδικαίωση), exo (ἔξω)
z 1.1) z (initially) 1.2) z+i+vowel 2) zz (in Italian names)	1.1) ζ 1.2) ζi- 2) τσ	1.1) z 1.2) zj 2) ts	1.1) zitò (ζητώ), zilías (ηλείας), zondanòn (ζωντανόν) 1.2) ziò (ζῶ), ziondas (ζώντρας) 2) de Pazzis (vrè Πάτσις)

