

SOME GREEK LITERARY REPRESENTATIONS OF GREEK LIFE AND LANGUAGE IN THE LATE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY¹

Peter Mackridge*

1. Introduction

Nasos Vayenas has identified three literary traditions in the Greek eighteenth century: Phanariot, Aegean and Heptanesian.² In this article I am focusing on the Phanariot cultural area, with some references to the Aegean. Both of these traditions developed within the Ottoman Empire. The Heptanesian tradition, which developed within the Venetian empire, is certainly no less rich, but it has already been studied more than the culture and literary tradition of the Ottoman Greeks, and I believe it is time to redress the balance.

Ever since the eighteenth century the term “Phanariot” has often had derogatory connotations. The appointment of members of certain Orthodox Christian families to important positions in the Ottoman administration from the late seventeenth to the early nineteenth century was not accomplished without a degree of bribery and political machination, and the authority of the Phanariot princes of Wallachia and Moldavia was not exercised without the imposition of taxes on the local populace. Adamantios Korais (1748-1833), the most influential figure of the Greek national enlightenment, was also the most consistent critic of the Phanariots during the period leading up to Greek independence. As a consequence, the Phanariots have often been painted in rather negative colours, while historians of Greek literature have tended to ignore or dismiss that part of the Phanariot literary output which cannot be categorized as being “enlightening” and didactic. Nevertheless, the Phanariot period of Greek history and literature is an important and fascinating one. This was a period that included the peaceful Tulip Period of Ottoman history (1718–1730) and the concomitant regeneration of Istanbul through public building projects. During this period a number of Orthodox Christians within the Ottoman empire (albeit a small elite) came to enjoy unprecedented freedom, wealth, political power and social prestige. With all this came new ways of life associated with leisure, fashion and the pursuit of pleasure.

¹ This article is a revised and expanded version of a seminar paper given at the *École des hautes études en sciences sociales*, Paris, 9 April 2015, as part of the series “*Chrétiens, Romains, Hellènes: Discours identitaires et transferts culturels*”.

* University of Oxford.

² N. Βαγενάς, *Η ειρωνική γλώσσα* (Athens 1994) 160–161.

Membership of this elite cultural group was not confined to members of the small number of Phanariot families such as the Mavrokordatos and the Soutsos, but included the considerably larger number of Orthodox Christians who lived in their entourage, such as the holders of various administrative posts in Istanbul, Bucharest and Jassy. Those who passed, albeit temporarily, through the Phanariot cultural environment, included important literary and historical figures such as Kaisarios Dapontes and Rigas Velestinlis, and clerics such as Evgenios Voulgaris, who served as headmaster of the Patriarchal Academy in Constantinople in 1760–1761, and Kallinikos III (Konstantinos Mavrikios), who briefly served as Patriarch of Constantinople in 1757.³ In some of their writings these men show themselves to have been culturally and linguistically integrated into the Phanariot environment; if by nothing else, their integration is indicated by their ample use of Turkish words and expressions in their writings. The prestige of the powerful members of the Phanariot families was such that members of their entourage liked to imitate their use of language, which included a fondness for displaying their knowledge of Turkish.

The long poem entitled *Vosporomachia* (“The Battle of the Bosphorus”) and the poetry of Patriarch Kallinikos contain many descriptions of the pleasures of life in Constantinople and especially in the villages and countryside bordering both shores of the Bosphorus, with their pleasure gardens, fountains and kiosks where groups of friends could go and eat, drink and converse. The frequency of words denoting leisure and pleasure in the *Vosporomachia* and the writings of Kallinikos is very telling, for instance *χουζούρι* ‘peace of mind, relaxation’ (< T[urkish] *huzur*), *εγλεντζές* ‘entertainment, enjoyment’ (< T *eğlence*), *ζέφκι* ‘fun, enjoyment’ (< T *zevk*), and *σεριάνι*, an expressive word meaning both ‘walking or riding for pleasure’ and ‘sight, spectacle’ (< T *seyran*), in other words ‘sightseeing’. Also frequent in the above texts is the noun *ελευθερία*, which refers not to political liberty but to the freedom from social restrictions that both men and women could enjoy while out in the countryside, far from the censorious eyes of Ottoman officials.

My aim in this article is to discuss some of the aspects of Greek life that are illustrated in specific texts produced in the cultural area of the Orthodox Christian world dominated by the Phanariots. In doing so, I will avoid expressing judgements of literary value. Phanariot literature has been too often dismissed as being of a poor aesthetic standard, but this seems to me to be the result of imposing

³ It was Voulgaris who in 1766 published in Leipzig the first edition of the *Βοσπορομαχία* (*Vosporomachia*), in which Asia and Europe quarrel as to which side of the Bosphorus is the more beautiful. The same volume includes an anonymous verse translation of Voltaire’s philosophical tale *Memnon*. This translation, which is most probably by Voulgaris, sets Voltaire’s tale in an environment reminiscent of the Ottoman. Kallinikos, after his deposition from the patriarchal throne, wrote thousands of verses describing the beauties of Istanbul and its environs. In the first edition the authorship of the *Vosporomachia* is ascribed to the late Caspar Ludwig Momarz, dragoman of the Austrian embassy in Istanbul, but there is strong evidence to suggest that its published form was revised by Kallinikos and perhaps also by Voulgaris. See Kallinikos G’, *Τα κατά και μετά την εξορίαν επισυμβάντα*, ed. Agamemnon Tselikas (Athens 2004), p. 59.

anachronistic criteria (such as intensity of perception and emotion, sincerity, spontaneity, individuality and originality) that are more suitable for the discussion of Romantic literature than for literary products of the eighteenth century. Phanariot literature is often comic, and it was always intended to be pleasurable. At all events, these texts provide valuable insights into the history and society of their time, while the language in which they are written provides unique evidence of everyday speech in the Phanariot world.

2. The texts

All the texts I am focusing on are in the form of dramas and date from the last fifteen years of the eighteenth century. The authors and translators of my chosen texts attempt to represent contemporary spoken Greek, and all of these texts are in prose. They consist of the following two groups:

First, two original satirical comedies aimed at specific historical characters and written in the Phanariot cultural area:

(1) *Ο Αλεξανδροβόδας ο ασυνείδητος* ('Prince [voynoda or hospodar] Alexander the unscrupulous') written by G. N. Soutsos around 1785; the target of the satire is Alexandros Mavrokordatos, prince of Moldavia 1785–1786, who became known as *firarí* (in Greek, φιραρής) 'fugitive, deserter' because he fled to Russia after being dismissed from his post;⁴ and

(2) *Το σαγανάκι της τρέλας* ('The tempest of madness' [σαγανάκι < T *saġanak* 'cloudburst, downpour']) written anonymously around 1790 and targeted at Nikolaos Mavrogenis, prince of Wallachia 1786–1789; the editor of the first edition of this text, Lia Brad Chisacof, argues plausibly, with supporting palaeographical evidence, not only that the sole manuscript of this work was written by Rigas Velestinlis, but that he was its original author.⁵

Secondly, two sets of translated dramas depicting everyday life:

(1) One set translated from Italian: ten comedies by the Venetian Carlo Goldoni (undated, c. 1800), probably translated by a single anonymous individual,⁶ and

(2) one set translated from German: three dramas and one comedy by August von Kotzebue translated by Konstantinos Kokkinakis and published in Vienna in 1801.⁷ Although Kokkinakis was educated in Constantinople and

⁴ The original text was first published as G. N. Soutsos, *Αλεξανδροβόδας ο ασυνείδητος*, ed. Dimitris Spathis (Athens 1995). There is also an English translation: Georgios N. Soutsos, *Alexandrovodas the unscrupulous (1785)*, introduction and translation Anna Stavropoulou (Istanbul 2012).

⁵ Lia Brad Chisacof (ed.), *Ρήγας. Ανέκδοτα κείμενα* (Athens 2011).

⁶ Anna Gentilini *et al.* (ed.), *Dieci commedie di Goldoni tradotte in neogreco. Volume 1. Testi* (Padua 1988). In my page references to this volume I will refer to this edition simply as "Goldoni". The translations must have been made after 1754, the date of first publication of the most recent of Goldoni's plays translated.

⁷ Konstantinos Kokkinakis, *Θεατρικές μεταφράσεις του August von Kotzebue: Εκούσιος Θυσία, Μισανθρωπία και Μετάνοια, Πτωχεία και Ανδρεία, Οι Κόρσαι (Βιέννη 1801)*, ed. Walter Puchner (Athens 2008). In this article I am not taking into account other Greek translations of Goldoni

Bucharest, he was not living in the Phanariot environment when he produced these translations, nor did his intended audience belong chiefly to that environment. Nevertheless, it is instructive to observe the Phanariot influences that colour his language.⁸

3. General remarks

In the past, K. Th. Dimaras and other Greek scholars tended to view Greek texts of this period from the viewpoint of a Hellenocentric national narrative which leads, by way of Enlightenment and national awakening, to the liberation of the Greeks from the Turks and the foundation of a Greek national state. In contrast to this teleological view, I am not searching my chosen texts for signs of Greek national identity, nor for calls to revolution, nor for expressions of a desire for political liberty and independence. Instead, I am treating literary texts (especially comedies) as documents of social history. These particular texts show what happens when the theatre is not used as a schoolroom or a pulpit; when it is used primarily for entertainment rather than for purely didactic or educational purposes.⁹

Apart from Kokkinakis' translations of Kotzebue, none of these plays was published at the time, and none is accompanied by an introduction by the author or translator. For this reason (again, with the exception of Kokkinakis) we don't know what aims their authors or translators had in mind when they were writing them. As far as I know, only one of these dramatic texts was ever performed on stage: an amateur performance of one of Kokkinakis' translations, at Ambelakia in Thessaly in 1803, is perhaps the earliest documented theatrical performance to have taken place in mainland Greece since antiquity.¹⁰ Indeed, apart from Kokkinakis, it is not certain that the authors and translators had ever witnessed the performance of a play. The only theatrical performances that took place in Istanbul or Bucharest during this period were either impromptu performances by travelling players or amateur productions in private houses. With regard to the unfamiliarity of some of these writers with the theatre as a physical space, it is telling that in the stage

produced around the same time (those by Lambanitziotis published in 1791 and 1794 and those by Mitiou Sakellariou – one of the few published Greek women writers of the time – published in 1818), nor the translations of Metastasio – those by Lambanitziotis (1794 and 1796) and Rigas Velestinlis (1797) – nor the various translations of Molière, from the anonymous translations of 1741 published by Anna Tabaki to Kokkinakis' 1815 translation of *Tartuffe* and Oikonomos' 1816 adaptation of *L'Avare*.

⁸ Puchner (*Θεατρικές μεταφράσεις του August von Kotzebue*, p. 21) rightly notes that in 1801 Kokkinakis was not yet a follower of Korais, and that he still followed the linguistic practice of the Greeks of Constantinople.

⁹ However, Goldoni's *Il vero amico* is described by the editor of the Greek translation as “Una commedia [...] più edificante che divertente” (Lidia Martini, *Una traduzione neogreca inedita: Il vero amico di C. Goldoni* (Padua 1976), p. ix).

¹⁰ Puchner, in *Θεατρικές μεταφράσεις του August von Kotzebue*, p. 10, 49–53.

directions in the *Saganaki* and in the translations by Kokkinakis, as well as in Konstantinos Oikonomou's adaptation of Molière's *L'Avare* (1816), the word *θέατρον* is used to refer to the stage rather than to the theatre as a whole.¹¹ The translators tend to translate not from stage to stage, but from page to page; their texts belong to the category that Stesi Athini calls "θεατρικό ανάγνωσμα" ('theatrical reading').¹² Yet, despite the absence of an established theatre, it is clear that these authors and translators felt the need to present the interaction of characters through drama and dialogue. In addition, the characters in the original comedies view the public life of the Phanariots as a *θέατρον*, and a frequently used expression at the time was "το θέατρον του κόσμου".¹³ In such instances the word *θέατρον* is being used in the same sense that St Paul used it, in other words a "spectacle".¹⁴ In his novel *Anastasius* (1819) the English writer Thomas Hope, who claimed to have known Mavrogenis personally, says that his "thirst for posthumous notoriety gave all his actions a sort of theatrical turn".¹⁵ In both of the original satires the word "κωμωδία" is used with ironic self-reference: in the *Saganaki* one of Mavrogenis' advisers warns him that the local Romanian boyars "δεν το έχουν τίποτες να μας κάμουν μίαν κωμωδίαν" ('think nothing of making a comedy out of us')¹⁶, while one character in *Alexandrovodas* describes other characters as "υποκείμενα διά κωμωδία" ('individuals fit for comedy').¹⁷

What images of the pre-Revolutionary Greeks emerge from these texts? What features of contemporary Greek life and culture do the authors or translators of these texts display to us? It may seem strange to be basing some of my conclusions about Greek life on texts that are translated from other languages. However, the translators not only transfer the foreign text into the Greek language; they also

¹¹ See, e.g., Ρήγας. *Ανέκδοτα κείμενα*, p. 76, 96; *Θεατρικές μεταφράσεις του August von Kotzebue*, p. 549, 555, 578, 582, 587; Konstantinos Oikonomos, *Ο Φιλάργγρος του Μολιέρου*, ed. Kostis Skalioras (Athens 1970), p. 47.

¹² Stesi Athini, *Οψεις της νεοελληνικής αφηγηματικής πεζογραφίας 1700–1830* (Athens 2010), p. 222.

¹³ See Ilia Chatzipanagioti -Sangmeister, "Εις το θέατρον του κόσμου: αποτυπώσεις του Μπαρόκ στα φαναριώτικα στιχουργήματα", in eadem (ed.), *Φαναριώτικα και αστικά στιχουργήματα της εποχής του Διαφωτισμού* (Athens 2013), p. 54ff. Cf. Shakespeare, *As you Like it*: "All the world's a stage, / And all the men and women, merely Players".

¹⁴ "Θέατρον ἐγενήθημεν τῷ κόσμῳ" (1 Ep. Cor. 4.9).

¹⁵ Thomas Hope, *Anastasius, or Memoirs of a Greek*, vol. II (Paris 1831 [1st edn London 1819]), p. 34. The way Mavrogenis speaks and acts in the *Saganaki* is remarkably similar to the way he speaks and acts in Hope's novel *Anastasius*. If Hope did not know Mavrogenis personally, he must have known him by repute. The author of *Saganaki* could not have known Hope's novel, which dates from thirty years later, and it is extremely unlikely that Hope would have known the *Saganaki*. It may be, though, that Hope had talked with the author about Mavrogenis, or that they at least had common acquaintances. Hope quotes information given him by Condilli (Kondylis), who appears as a character in the *Saganaki*. For Mavrogenis see also Christine M. Philliou, *Biography of an Empire: Governing Ottomans in an Age of Revolution* (Berkeley 2010), p. 45–47.

¹⁶ Ρήγας. *Ανέκδοτα κείμενα*, p. 102.

¹⁷ *Αλεξανδροβόδας*, p. 26.

carry out other types of transfer into the culture into which they and their intended readers are living. The way in which the translators domesticate the foreign texts into a Greek context is revealing, since it invites us to find out which cultural features of the original texts they thought would be unfamiliar or even incomprehensible to their intended readership or audience.¹⁸

Most of the characters in these plays have an urban cultural orientation. They are not peasants but members of the nobility and the bourgeoisie (πολίτες with a small π, and particularly merchants), together with their servants. The two original satires depict the environment of the Phanariots, who formed a self-styled aristocracy. In *Alexandrovodas*, which was written shortly before the French Revolution, a Phanariot prince is attacked by a member of a rival Phanariot family. The *Saganaki* was written shortly before the dethronement of Louis XVI in 1792 and his execution in 1793 by an anonymous member of the Phanariot circle who attacks a prince who is a non-Phanariot. Both *Alexandrovodas* and Goldoni's comedies often present strong and intelligent female characters, with the difference that in *Alexandrovodas* they are presented as negative and in Goldoni they are viewed as positive. The differences between the presentation of male and female characters would be a sufficient topic for a separate study.

By contrast, most of the translated plays by Goldoni and Kotzebue are set in a bourgeois environment and reflect the bourgeois outlook of their authors.

How does one define one's own identity and that of others? We are told that this is done on the basis of race, ethnicity, religion, language and culture. In these texts, religion and language clearly come into play: they are co-extensive with "us", and they clearly mark the frontier between "us" and "the others". (I will say more about religious references later on.) In language, there is a degree of linguistic purism in the speech of the higher-class characters when they are trying to be serious and impressive: however, this is not so much in order to make their speech more like *Ancient Greek* (as was the case with the "improvement" of the Greek language proposed by Korais and others), but in order to sound more *refined* than their servants: here the motivation for linguistic purism is based on considerations of class (social differentiation) rather than nationalism (synchronic homogeneity coupled with diachronic connections with the "ancient ancestors").¹⁹

¹⁸ For the dichotomy between the translation strategies of domestication and foreignization see Lawrence Venuti, *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation* (London 1995) and *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference* (London and New York 1998), which present foreignization as the ethical duty of the translator.

¹⁹ A rare exception to this outlook is found in another satirical comedy, written in the Phanariot area in 1752: *Αυξεντιανός μετανοημένος*, ed. Iosif Vivilakis (Athens 2010), p. 386–387. When the learned bishop Gennadios speaks in highfalutin language to the uneducated priest Afxentios, the latter responds: "I'll tell the Christians that learned men are Hellenes, so they'll throw you out and they won't want to see you again". (At that time the term "Hellene" normally referred to the pagan ancient Greeks.) The bishop replies: "We don't deny that the learned are Hellenes. I too am a Hellene. [...] Don't you know that we are Hellenes and the children of Hellenes? Do you think

I should note, however, that, unlike the Mavrokordatos presented in *Alexandrovodas*, the Mavrogenis presented in the *Saganaki* almost always uses colloquial and often vulgar language; this difference is indicative of the characterization of Mavrokordatos as a hypocrite who hides his true beliefs under a façade of respectability, and Mavrogenis as someone who always speaks his mind.

It is difficult to discern how the authors of these texts and their characters perceive of race and ethnicity; clearly the Greek characters might think of themselves as being of a different race from Turks; but while some of them use the ethnic term “Ρωμαίοι” (as distinct from “Βλάχοι”, for instance, in the *Saganaki*), they do not present any definition of this term. As for culture, apart from specifically religious culture, there are many common features between “us” (Greeks) and “the others” (Turks) in terms of dress, food, behaviour and attitudes, as we shall see.

4. Group identities in the original plays

The eastern and western Greek traditions that I mentioned at the beginning of this article were not totally distinct. In fact, some of the texts under discussion stand in between Constantinople and Venice, the two countervailing powers that dominated the Greek world for centuries. The Constantinopolitan translator of the ten Goldoni comedies chose to translate plays written by a Venetian, while in the *Saganaki* (and in reality too, according to Thomas Hope) Mavrogenis, the prince of Wallachia appointed by the sultan, proudly claims that he is descended from the aristocratic Venetian Morosini family.²⁰ In fact he sees his own Venetian pedigree as a more genuine kind of nobility than the one claimed by the Phanariots for themselves.

Mavrogenis was born and bred on the Aegean island of Paros. The Aegean islands were no longer under Venetian rule as the Ionian Islands were at that time, but they were still considered to be closely connected with Venice, by kinship, commerce and culture. (Many Aegean islanders – though not the Mavrogenis family – were, and continue to be, adherents of the Catholic rather than the Orthodox faith.) Mavrogenis was the only ruler of one of the Danubian principalities to have risen to that position directly from having been Dragoman of the Fleet without having served as Grand Dragoman of the Porte in between,²¹ and he was the only Greek prince of one of the Danubian principalities who was not by origin a Phanariot.²² Historians have written that Mavrogenis was the most eminent

Christendom rejects γένος [racial descent]? Besides, by recovering their ancestral language [...], the learned rejoice in attaining their own language [...]”. Pace Vivilakis (*op. cit.*, p. 513), the fact that Gennadios is one of the chief targets of the author’s satire suggests that the author does not share his views on this topic. It is also ironic that this self-styled Hellene is bilingual in Greek and Turkish.

²⁰ Πήγας. *Ανέκδοτα κείμενα*, p. 138–140.

²¹ Brad Chisacof, *op. cit.*, p. 11; Nikos V. Sphyroeras, *Οι δραγομάνοι του στόλου* (Athens 1965), p. 128.

²² Sphyroeras, *ibid.*

of the Dragomans of the Fleet; he was certainly the second longest-serving holder of the post. It was precisely because Mavrogenis was an islander, and not a Phanariot, that he was a particularly appropriate choice as Dragoman of the Fleet, whose duties were focused especially on the Aegean region and included acting as governor of the Aegean islands.²³ But what made him an effective Dragoman of the Fleet seems to have made him unsuited to be prince of Wallachia. In the *Saganaki* many of his associates in Bucharest express the view that it is inappropriate for an islander and a seaman to rule one of the Danubian principalities.²⁴ The characters of the *Saganaki* make distinctions between Πολίτης (with a capital Π, i.e. Constantinopolitan), νησιώτης (islander) or ασπροθαλασσίτης (Aegean islander) and Βλάχος (Wallachian).²⁵ Indeed, Constantinopolitans often used a slang word to refer to a Greek islander: ταουσάνης (< Τ *ταύσαν* ‘rabbit; hare’).²⁶

However, in both the Greek satires and the translated plays there is no attempt at a systematic depiction of different regional Greek dialects, as there is in Iakovos Rizos Neroulos’ satire on Korais’ linguistic reforms, *Κορακιστικά* (1813), in Oikonomou’s *Ο φιλάργυρος* (1816) and in D. K. Vyzantios’ satire on the multiplicity of Greek dialects, *Βαβυλωνία* (1836). Nevertheless, in Kokkinakis’ translation of Koyzebue’s *Die Corsen* the Corsican characters use dialect features of the translator’s native Chios. (It is fitting that Corsican and Chiot are both island varieties.)

Phanariots and non-Phanariots

Let us focus more on the distinctions that are made in the plays between Phanariots and non-Phanariots. The Phanariots wore Oriental dress, and they moved easily between Greek and Ottoman culture. For instance, the author of *Alexandrovodas*, Georgios Soutsos, who did not involve himself directly in politics, apparently devoted much of his life to the study of “Turco-Persian music”, and he wrote the words and music of a number of songs.²⁷

²³ Nikolaos Petrou Mavrogenis was not the first Parian to serve as Dragoman of the Fleet: the first was Konstantinos Ventouras (1713–1731), who was likewise decapitated. Two of N. P. Mavrogenis’ uncles had served before him, and he was immediately succeeded by one of his nephews.

²⁴ See Ρήγας, *Ανέκδοτα κείμενα*, p. 238.

²⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 236–237.

²⁶ This term is used by Kallinikos as well as in the *Saganaki*, in the Goldoni translations and in Thomas Hope’s novel. Servants in the Goldoni translations use geographically non-specific island features in their speech (some from the Ionian Islands, others from Crete and the Aegean islands), perhaps because servants employed by Greek families in Constantinople were typically from the islands. This may be an additional explanation for the contempt in which Mavrogenis is held in Phanariot circles in the *Saganaki*.

²⁷ Spathis, in *Αλεξανδροβόδας*, p. 239. The lyrics of some of Soutsos’ songs are included in an 1818 manuscript anthology edited by Anastasia Tsakiridou, “«Μελομένη»: έκδοση χειρόγραφης μισμαγιάς του Νικηφόρου Καντουνιάρη (1818) «Μελομένη»”, dissertation, University of Thessaloniki, 2007 (downloadable from <http://ikee.lib.auth.gr/record/100759>). The texts of Soutsos’ songs (mostly in Greek, but with refrains in Turkish [written in Greek characters]), each of them accompanied by the designation of the Ottoman *usul* (rhythmic pattern) and *makam* (melodic mode)

It is striking how frequently the word Φαναριώτες appears in these two plays. It is used not by the Phanariots themselves, but by those who originate from outside Phanariot circles, including prince Nikolaos Mavrogenis, and by various people associated with prince Alexandros Mavrokordatos. It is remarkable that it is always used in a pejorative sense. This frequency of use indicates how the Phanariots were perceived to be a particular category of people with distinctive features. One character in *Alexandrovodas* talks about “ψωροφαναριώτες” (‘mangy Phanariots’) while an official at Mavrokordatos’ court says proudly: “εγώ ’μαι Αρμένης χαλίσης και κωλοβερέντζιες φαναριώτικες δεν έμαθα” (‘I’m a true Armenian, and I haven’t learnt to bow and scrape like a Phanariot’, i.e. how to make exaggerated displays of humility in front of a supposed social superior).²⁸

In the *Saganaki* Mavrogenis contrasts himself favourably with the Phanariots: “δεν είμαι σαν τους Φαναριώτες εκείνους τους ψεύτες οπού έκαμαν χαράπι το μεμλεκέτι” (‘I’m not like those lying Phanariots who have destroyed the country’: note that he uses two words of Turkish origin, *χαράπι* and *μεμλεκέτι*).²⁹ He dismisses the Phanariots as “ταντούρ τσελεπήδες” (‘tandoor gentlemen’), in other words people who are accustomed to living in luxury and are reluctant to give up their home comforts,³⁰ whereas he describes himself as a “παλικάρι” (‘brave soldier’). Indeed, the real-life Mavrogenis was a brave and competent soldier who commanded an Ottoman army against Austrian and Russian forces: he was the only Greek to serve as a commander-in-chief of Ottoman forces. Mavrogenis also contrasts the Phanariots’ secretiveness and hypocrisy with what he calls “την ελευθερίαν της γλώσσης μου” (‘the freedom of my tongue’).³¹ By contrast, the Phanariots “συντυχαίνουν με το κουμπάσο, και μόλις εβγάνει με το σιμπιδι κανείς λόγον από το στόμα τους” (‘speak with exaggerated circumspection; you can hardly get a word out of their mouths with a pair of tweezers’).³²

It is clear from these references that, even in the eighteenth century, the word “Phanariot” had already become associated with insincerity, intrigue and machination. In *Alexandrovodas*, Soutsos sometimes depicts the prince’s family and his associates talking like common criminals, using code words that were probably taken from thieves’ slang, and some of which are still in use in Greek slang today.

to which it was intended to be sung, are reproduced on p. 66–68, 314–316 and 332–336 of Tsakiridou’s dissertation.

²⁸ *Αλεξανδροβόδας*, p. 69. The form *κωλοβερέντζιες* is presumably a slip of the pen for *κωλορεβερέντζιες* < *κωλος* ‘arse’ + French *révérance* or Italian *riverenza* ‘bow, curtsy’; cf. *κωλοτούμπα* ‘somersault’ with *κωλο-* (often used as a pejorative prefix) as its first component.

²⁹ *Ρήγας. Ανέκδοτα κείμενα*, p. 74.

³⁰ The tandoor was a stove placed under a table to keep people’s feet warm as they sat.

³¹ Cf. the phrase “ελευθερία της γλώττης” in Goldoni, p. 151, corresponding to “scioltezza [di lingua]” (‘fluency of speech’) in the original.

³² *Ρήγας. Ανέκδοτα κείμενα*, p.76. The phrase “με το κουμπάσο” is based on the Italian expression *col compasso*.

A leading scholar of modern Greek theatre, Walter Puchner, has described the *Saganaki* as a “gehässige Machwerk” (‘spiteful concoction’),³³ yet the play is extremely interesting and valuable for the study of Greek, Ottoman and Balkan history and languages. We have access to many depictions of the Phanariots as viewed by both Phanariots and non-Phanariots, but we do not have many views of non-Phanariots by people who were loyal to Phanariot circles, as we do in the *Saganaki*. The author (probably Rigas) was someone who was used to working in the Phanariot environment and who disapproved of the behaviour of a prince who originated from outside this environment: in the list of dramatis personae the author refers explicitly to Mavrogenis as “αρπαστής του θρόνου της Βλαχίας” (‘usurper of the throne of Wallachia’), and Mavrogenis himself says “εις το πείσμα των Φαναριωτών έγινα αυθέντης” (‘I became prince in spite of the Phanariots’),³⁴ which implies that the sultan appointed him on the basis of his personal merits, and not because of the machinations and bribery of the Phanariots, who wanted Alexandros Ypsilantis to become prince of Wallachia.³⁵ Throughout the play Mavrogenis is treated as an outsider. From his first appearance, he is ridiculed for wearing naval dress, speaking nautical jargon, surrounding himself with a bodyguard of sailors, and treating landlocked Bucharest as though it were a ship under his command. The author’s negative attitude towards Mavrogenis indicates how far removed the Phanariots were from the maritime culture of so many of their fellow Greeks. It is also significant that when Mavrogenis first arrives in Wallachia the local people do not realize that he is the prince, while he in turn is unable to distinguish the local noblemen from their servants, because each side is unfamiliar with the dress codes that are customary in the other social environment. Similarly Mavrogenis fails to recognize the signals that indicate the class distinctions that were all-important in Phanariot and Romanian society.

Alexandrovodas and *Saganaki* are unflattering portraits of two princes written by authors who believe these men should not have been appointed to their positions. These princes are determined to grab as much money as possible during their inevitably short reigns. Mavrokordatos, who is depicted in Constantinople just before travelling to Jassy to occupy the throne of Moldavia, owes money to his brother-in-law, and he needs to extract funds from the Moldavians in order to pay back his debts. But he has another problem: he hates his wife, who comes from another Phanariot family, and is besotted with his non-Phanariot mistress, whom he wants to marry.

³³ Walter Puchner, review of Brad Chisacof, *Ρήγας. Ανέκδοτα κείμενα*, in *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 48 (2012), p. 267.

³⁴ *Ρήγας. Ανέκδοτα κείμενα*, p. 80.

³⁵ In reality the Phanariots, led by Petraki Çelebi, head of the imperial mint, had tried to bribe the sultan not to appoint Mavrogenis; nevertheless, the sultan decided to go ahead with the appointment and ordered Petraki Çelebi to be beheaded at Mavrogenis’ investiture ceremony in Constantinople. See also Athanasios Komninos Ypsilantis, *Εκκλησιαστικών και πολιτικών των εις δάδεκα βιβλίων Η΄, Θ΄ και Ι΄ ήτοι Τα μετά την άλωση, 1453–1789* (Constantinople 1870) p. 640–641, 644–645.

Both Mavrokordatos and Mavrogenis are depicted as displaying what today might be termed psychopathic characteristics: a grandiose sense of self-worth, selfish behaviour, poor impulse control, and lack of empathy and remorse. However, there are major differences between the behaviour of the two characters: Mavrokordatos tries to keep his distance from the Ottoman government, while Mavrogenis is a faithful servant of the sultan.

Mavrokordatos describes himself as an admirer of Machiavelli,³⁶ and in one soliloquy he presents an argument for the non-existence of God as a justification for his plan to murder his wife. By contrast, Mavrogenis presents himself as a pious Christian whose actions are inspired by the Holy Spirit. However, at one point, as a loyal servant of the sultan he demands to know “πού είναι αυτοί οι χαϊνηδες δίνοι δοβλέτι αλιγενήν;” (‘where are these traitors to religion and the exalted [Ottoman] state?’), using the Ottoman expression *hain-i din ü devlet-i aliye*.³⁷ Mavrogenis seems to view both Christianity and Islam as equally valid – or perhaps I should say equally useful, since, like Mavrokordatos, he exploits religion as an instrument of power.³⁸ The only priest who appears in either of these two plays is the confessor of Alexandrovodas’ wife, who acts as the prince’s agent in trying to persuade the pious princess to accept her husband’s desire to reject her.³⁹

Alexandrovodas and the *Saganaki* are distorted “mirrors of princes”; they follow the precepts of Machiavelli instead of ruling according to Christian precepts and democratic standards. Their word is law, they rule by arbitrary violence and personal caprice,⁴⁰ and they want to be feared rather than loved; they believe that any leniency on their part will be interpreted by their subjects and by the sultan as a sign of weakness.⁴¹ Whereas “mirrors of princes” normally show the reader how princes *should* behave, the authors of these two comedies show the audience or reader how princes should *not* behave. Greek history and culture of the period have tended to be seen as the prelude to national awakening and the struggle for national independence, but these satires show that these princes, their courts and their subjects, were not living in the Age of Enlightenment. Visitors from Western Europe to the court of Nikolaos Mavrogenis in Bucharest in the late 1780s might have thought they had mistakenly entered the court of Henry VIII in London 250 years earlier.

In terms of the cultural information they provide, the two Phanariot satires contain many details of how the princes and various officials and relatives make their living from taxes, presents, bribes and theft. However, the *Saganaki* also

³⁶ *Αλεξανδροβόδας*, p. 37.

³⁷ *Ρήγας. Ανέκδοτα κείμενα*, p. 64.

³⁸ The author of the *Saganaki* makes no reference to the rumour that Mavrogenis was a convert to Islam.

³⁹ There are no priests in any of the ten comedies by Goldoni translated anonymously into Greek.

⁴⁰ According to Hope’s novel, Mavroyeni’s state was “ruled by caprice rather than cool reason” (*Anastasius*, vol. 2, p. 20).

⁴¹ Cf. *op. cit.*, vol. 2, p. 28.

includes some interesting references to Mavrogenis' tastes in visual art: he commissions paintings for his palace, one of which will depict his patron, the Kapudan Pasha Hasan. For the council room he orders a canvas depicting half a dozen of his predecessors burning in Hell with purses in their hands to show the bribes they have taken. His private cabinet (*καμπινέτο*) in his kiosk contains a framed painting depicting the *Pulad-ı Bahrî* ('Steel of the Sea'), a frigate built for the Ottoman navy on the island of Lemnos around 1780 while Mavrogenis was Dragoman of the Fleet. He also commissions a painter from his native island of Paros to restore the portraits of the founders in Bucharest churches.⁴² Mavrogenis' musical taste is illustrated by the care and attention he bestows on his Ottoman ceremonial band (*mehterhane*), which consists of *zurnas* (shawms), *burus* (trumpets) and *nakares* (kettle-drums).

Mavrogenis refers explicitly to his use of Turkish linguistic features when he asks one of his servants what people think of his use of Turkish words when speaking Greek: "Τι λέγουν άραγε διά [...] το ελφάζι μου [< T *elfaz* 'words'], και περισσότερο οπου ανακατώνω τες τούρκικες λέξεις εις την ομιλίαν μου· απορούν ίσως οι καημένοι πώς ένας ασπροθαλασσίτης έφτασε να μάθει και να κάμει τόσα πράγματα" ('What do they say about [...] my vocabulary, and in particular about the way I mix Turkish words into my speech? Do they perhaps wonder how an Aegean islander has managed to learn to do so many things?'). It seems that, if nothing else, in terms of language Mavrogenis has done his best to become a proper Phanariot.⁴³

Greeks and non-Greeks

As Karl-Heinz Ziegler has written, "In the course of the late seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries, the position of the Ottoman Empire in Europe changed from that of a powerful 'enemy of Christianity' to a partner in the European system."⁴⁴ Ottoman Christians began to be appointed to high posts in the Ottoman administration (the first Christian Grand Dragoman was Panagiotis Nikousios, who served from 1669 onwards) just as the empire was making a series of new treaties with Christian powers. Soon after this, the empire began to suffer a series of defeats at the hands of Christian powers. Nevertheless, while always being conscious that their own individual position was precarious, the Phanariots tended to behave as though they believed that the empire would last indefinitely.

⁴² *Ρήγας. Ανέκδοτα κείμενα*, p. 118, 212, 230.

⁴³ *Op. cit.*, p. 76–78. It seems to have been fashionable in Phanariot circles to scatter Turkish words and phrases in one's texts (e.g. in the popular songs recorded in the manuscript collections known as *μισμαγιές*), and perhaps also in one's speech. Thomas Hope's *Anastasius* observes that among the Phanariots "the Romaic idiom [...] was no longer to be used, except interlarded with such scraps of French, Italian and Turkish, as to render it almost unintelligible to the vulgar auditor" (Hope, *Anastasius*, vol. II, p. 81).

⁴⁴ Karl-Heinz Ziegler, "The peace treaties of the Ottoman Empire with European Christian powers", in Randall Lesaffer (ed.), *Peace Treaties and International Law in European History: From the Late Middle Ages to World War One* (Cambridge 2004), p. 347.

It was the knowledge of foreign languages, coupled with negotiating skills, that enabled the Phanariots to become rich and powerful. They became princes because of their expertise as translators and interpreters: the normal career path was from Grand Dragoman to Hospodar. As both translators and princes they had to negotiate with Ottomans, Russians and Austrians, among others. They had to be functionally bilingual in Greek and Turkish (both colloquial and Ottoman), and they had to be competent in either French or Italian, or both. They probably learned their languages mostly or exclusively from private tutors: Phanariots were expected to acquire their language skills at their own expense, just as they were expected to pay the sultan for the privilege of becoming princes, and to recoup their expenses from the unfortunate inhabitants of Wallachia and Moldavia.

The old Greek nationalist discourse of Turkish occupation and Turkish yoke suggested that the Greeks and Turks had nothing in common. Yet these texts depict the results of cultural interactions between Greeks and Turks, Christians and Muslims, and Turkish influences on Greek culture that were at least due to osmosis, if not the result of deliberate imitation of Turkish culture by Greeks.

In Constantinople there developed a Turco-Greek culture analogous to the Venetian-Greek culture that developed in Crete and the Ionian Islands. This hybrid culture, shared by Muslims, Christians and Jews, consisted of a blend of various features of language, music, architecture, clothing and cuisine. Even though Goldoni is translated from Italian, the Greek translator uses far more words of Turkish than Italian origin, because Turkish was the language most familiar to his intended audience after Greek.⁴⁵ The authors of these texts were bicultural (though the term biculturalism, like bilingualism, suggests the parallel existence of two distinct languages and cultures rather than a mingling of languages and cultures, which was the actual situation); they partook in a cultural and linguistic synthesis. It is telling that the Goldoni translator makes fun of some of the servants by making them speak in a generic island dialect replete with Italianisms: the frequent use of Italian loanwords is cause for amusement, while the frequent use of Turkish features by the upper- and middle-class characters is apparently not.⁴⁶

In *Alexandrovodas* there are no Turkish characters and no explicit references to Turks at all, although they are referred to collectively as *μπάτσοι* (a slang word which today means ‘policemen’). In this coded language “το Βήτα” (i.e. Βασιλεύς) is the sultan, while the expressions “ο επάνω”, “η βούλλα” and “ο καραντζούλος” or “καραντζούλης” all refer to the Grand Vizier: “βούλλα” (literally ‘seal’) because the

⁴⁵ In their editions of the translations they published in separate volumes, Anna Gentilini Grinzato (*Una traduzione neogreca inedita: La moglie saggia di C. Goldoni* (Padua 1976), p. XIX) and Cristina Stevanoni (*Una traduzione neogreca inedita: La locandiera di C. Goldoni* (Padua 1977), p. XXIII) noted that there were three times as many words from Turkish as from Italian.

⁴⁶ It is remarkable that many of the Italianisms which the translator places in the servants’ mouths are not the same words that are used in Goldoni’s original text. However, there are other instances where the translator imports a lot of Goldoni’s Italian into the servants’ Greek for comic effect.

Grand Vizier was the keeper of the imperial seal, whereas “καραντζούλος” is of uncertain origin.⁴⁷ It is no wonder the non-Phanariot characters sometimes fail to understand these references.⁴⁸ Although none of the characters appearing in the original plays are explicitly stated to be Turks or Muslims, some of Mavrogenis’ anonymous minor servants in the *Saganaki* may possibly be Turkish, at least to judge by their more frequent use of Turkish phrases; in addition, Mavrogenis frequently refers to his Albanian guards, who may be Muslims, but they do not have speaking roles.⁴⁹ The chief doorkeeper in *Saganaki*, Matios, is clearly a Christian, but he is possibly intended to be a Turcophone Karamanli. In *Alexandrovodas* there is one Armenian character, Nikodimos, to whom I have already referred.

No ethnic self-designation is specified in *Alexandrovodas*. The “we” in *Saganaki* are called “Ρωμαίοι” (in contradistinction to “Βλάχοι”); unless I am mistaken, none of the characters in either of these satires refer to themselves as “Χριστιανοί” (Christians).⁵⁰ In the *Saganaki*, there is no difference in speech between the “Άρχοντες Ρωμαίοι” (Greek nobles) and the “Άρχοντες Βλάχοι” (Wallachian boyars). It is noticeable that the local boyars use the terms “το έθνος” (‘the nation’, i.e. the Wallachians) and “η πατρίδα μας” (‘our homeland’),⁵¹ while the Greek characters in the *Saganaki* and the *Alexandrovodas* do not.⁵² This is no doubt because the boyars have a sense of participating in the government of their own homeland, whereas the Phanariot princes and the Greek archons are administering territory that is culturally alien to them.

Matthias Kappler has referred to the phenomenon of “Ottomanization without Islamicization” among non-Muslims living in cosmopolitan Ottoman cities.⁵³ However, the characters in the two Phanariot satires use even Turkish words with Islamic connotations in addition to *halal* (χαλάλι) and *haram* (χαράμι), which are used in a non-religious sense all over Balkans.⁵⁴ Not only do they say

⁴⁷ For these expressions, some of which are glossed by the author, see *Αλεξανδροβόδας*, p. 79–80 and 102. Καραντζούλης survives as a Greek surname today. Possibly < T *kara* ‘black’ + T *cul* ‘broadcloth’, i.e. ‘one who wears black broadcloth’. But cf. T *karakoncolos* and Greek *καλικάντζαρος* ‘bogey-man’.

⁴⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 76.

⁴⁹ There is also a passing reference to a Jew and possibly an Arab (*Ρήγας. Ανέκδοτα κείμενα*, p. 142).

⁵⁰ In *Αυξεντιανός μετανοημένος* (p. 385), by contrast, Afxentios asks a Cephallonian whether he is a Φράγκος (i.e. an adherent of Western Christianity). “Not at all, master, I’m a Ρωμαίος,” he replies, whereupon Gennadios confirms this by saying, “Certainly, [...] he’s an Orthodox Christian”. In this context, it is the character’s religious affiliation and not his ethnicity (Greek or non-Greek) that is in question.

⁵¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 74, 90.

⁵² As I have said, Mavrogenis refers to Wallachia by the Turkish-origin term *μεμλεκέτι*, which is the equivalent of the Greek word *πατρίδα*.

⁵³ Matthias Kappler, “Fra religione e lingua/grafia nei Balcani: i musulmani grecofoni (XVIII–XIX sec.) e un dizionario rimato ottomano-greco di Creta”, *Oriente Moderno*, vol. n.s. 15, 76 (3) (1996), p. 87.

⁵⁴ Matthias Kappler, “Verso un nuovo Thesaurus dei turcismi balcanici: la dimensione dialettale e materiale sui turcismi greco-epiroiti dei secoli XVIII–XIX”, in F. Fusco et al. (ed.), *Processi di convergenza e differenziazione nelle lingue dell’Europa medievale e moderna* (Udine 2000), p. 174.

ινσαλλάχ (*inşallah*), for instance,⁵⁵ but they sometimes use terms that are even more specific to Islam.

In the *Saganaki* the author describes the boyars making obeisance to the prince by kneeling down and “bowing their heads three times to the ground, as the Turks do when praying”. In the same scene Mavrogenis tells the boyars he has prayed that all ships return safely to harbour: in the first case the author uses the word *ναμάζι* (< T *namaz*, ritual praying, facing Mecca); in the second, *δοάς* (< T *dua* ‘the “*du’a* of asking”, i.e. supplication to God’).⁵⁶

Attitudes to Europe

One of Mavrogenis’ secretaries is embarrassed by his master’s behaviour because he is conscious that Wallachia has “ευρωπαϊούς γειτόνους” (‘European neighbours’).⁵⁷ Another of the secretaries conceives of an ascending scale of three geographical locations in terms of erudition, with Bucharest at the bottom, Constantinople in the middle and Europe at the top.⁵⁸

There is no suggestion in the *Saganaki* that Mavrogenis is dissatisfied with his position. By contrast, in *Alexandrovodas*, Mavrokordatos has spent some of his youth in Russia during the period when Catherine the Great was encouraging efforts to introduce Enlightenment ideas into her country, and he dreams of going off to live in Europe. Despite his knowledge of French, he has never visited France; according to his system of ideas, however, France and Europe in general are not so much beacons of progress and Enlightenment as places where he believes he can freely indulge his sexual desires. He is an amoral libertine; he is described by one of the characters as an atheist and freemason, and he is depicted as exploiting modern ideas in order to serve his own self-interest.⁵⁹ Kaisarios Dapontes, when dedicating his long poem *Κήπος χαρίτων* to the 14-year old Alexandros Mavrokordatos in 1768, described him as pious and morally upstanding. If the allegations in Soutsos’ satire are true – and some of them clearly are – the young princeling must have turned out badly despite Dapontes’ teachings.⁶⁰

⁵⁵ Ρήγας. *Ανέκδοτα κείμενα*, p. 126; Goldoni, p. 214.

⁵⁶ Ρήγας. *Ανέκδοτα κείμενα*, p. 110. For examples of the use of Islamic terms in the translated plays see section 5 below. In the same scene Mavrogenis quotes from the Bible and offers an idiosyncratic interpretation of one of Christ’s parables: he is the “good and faithful servant” of his king the sultan: cf. Matthew 25.21.

⁵⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 70.

⁵⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 82. 86.

⁵⁹ *Αλεξανδροβόδας*, p. 398, 404, 138.

⁶⁰ In his dedication Dapontes describes the young princeling as “ευσεβής” (‘pious’) and “χρυσοθηθέστατος μάλλον ή χρηστοθηθέστατος” (‘golden-mannered rather than [simply] well-mannered’): Kaisarios Dapontes, *Κήπος χαρίτων*, ed. G.P. Savvidis (Athens 1995), p. 16. By contrast, Athanasios Komninos Ypsilantis, a contemporary of Mavrokordatos, wrote that he was “ανευλαβής εις τα θεία” (‘impious towards the sacred’, *Τα μετά την άλωση*, p. 643; see also Spathis in *Αλεξανδροβόδας*, p. 307, n. 38), that “ως ασελγέστατος έζη βίον αβίωτον με την γυναίκα του” (‘being extremely licentious he lived an insufferable life with his wife’) and that “από την ασέλγειάν του

5. Geographical and cultural relocation in the translated plays

Translators often feel they can convey the message of the source text more effectively if they use references that are familiar to the readership of the target text. Instead of the culture of the source text being transferred wholesale into the target text, some aspects of the target culture is imposed on the source text. This is what Anna Stavrakopoulou has called “geographical and cultural relocation”.⁶¹ The Greek translators of Goldoni and Kotzebue carry out a certain degree of geographical and cultural relocation in their texts, which include a lot of insights into life in Ottoman cities.

When a translated text is “domesticated” or “nativized” to make it more accessible to the target audience, what features of the source text does the translator think will be unfamiliar to the reader of the target text and therefore need to be altered?

The most obvious feature that is adapted to local requirements is the language. The linguistic material that needs to be translated includes not only the vocabulary and grammar used in the dialogues and the stage directions, but also possibly the names of characters and the terminology of titles and offices, as well as metaphorical expressions and proverbs and expressions of politeness (and their opposites). But there are also other references, such as clothing, food and drink, geographical references, means of transport, entertainment, and coinage.

Local technical terms in the Phanariot area of the Greek-speaking world were typically of Turkish origin.⁶² The fact that the Goldoni translator’s Greek is interspersed with Turkish words and phrases suggests he was conversant with Turkish and assumed that his intended audience was equally conversant with it. However, some of the local terms are from Romanian. In his translations of Kotzebue, Kokkinakis carries out fewer of these cultural relocations than the Goldoni translator does. Kokkinakis could be said to belong to both the Aegean and the Phanariot traditions: he was born in Chios, but he studied in Constantinople and Bucharest before settling in Vienna. Since he was living outside the Ottoman and Phanariot area (in Vienna) when he carried out his translations of Kotzebue, his (albeit sporadic) use of technical terms from Turkish and Romanian provides evidence of Phanariot cultural influence beyond the borders of Phanariot political influence.

ευρέθη έγγυος μία νέα δούλη του” (‘as a result of his lewdness a young servant girl of his found herself pregnant’; both quoted by Spathis, *op. cit.*, p. 342).

⁶¹ Anna Stavrakopoulou, ‘Translation as geographical relocation: nineteenth-century Greek adaptations of Molière in the Ottoman Empire’, in S. Bazzaz et al. (eds), *Imperial Geographies in Byzantine and Ottoman Space* (2013) 207–223. The anonymous translator of Goldoni does not seem to have added scenes of his own, containing topical references to controversies taking place in his own cultural environment, as Oikonomos did in his adaptation of *L’Avare*; on the contrary, he often omits or conflates scenes in the interests of brevity.

⁶² For semantic fields of Turkish loans in the Goldoni translations see Anna Gentilini, ‘Turchismi in un testo di Greco periferico fra settecento e ottocento’, in E. Banfi (ed.), *Atti del Secondo Incontro Internazionale di Linguistica Greca* (Trento 1997), p. 504–505.

Here are some examples of words from Romanian (many of Slav origin) used in the Goldoni translations, i.e. in what is supposed to be a non-Romanian context: βούτκα ‘vodka’ (< Rom. *vutcă*; also in Kallinikos and *Alexandrovodas*), μοσία ‘large estate’ (< Rom. *moșie*), πίβνιτσα ‘cellar for storing food and drink’ (< Rom. *pivniță* < Slav *pivnica* < *pivo* ‘beer’), ραδιβάνι ‘large closed carriage’ (< Rom. *rădvan*),⁶³ τσάρα ‘country, countryside’ (< Rom. *țara*: “έξω εις την τσάραν” ‘out in the country’⁶⁴). Even the title of Goldoni’s *La locandiera* is rendered as “Η νοικοκερά του ξενοδοχείου, ήτοι Η γκάζδα” (‘The hotel proprietress, or The *gazda*’ < Rom. *gazdă* ‘hostess, landlady, innkeeper’, of Hungarian origin). The anonymous translator’s use of Romanian loanwords may suggest that he was living (or had spent some time) in the Danubian principalities. However, some of these words are also used by writers who do not appear to have connections with Romanian lands.

As I have said, even Kokkinakis, writing in Vienna, uses words of Romanian origin. He frequently uses κοκόνα ‘[my] lady’ (< Rom. *cocon* (masc.) and *cocoană* (fem.)) and κοκονίτσα ‘Miss’ (“Mamsel” in the German text). The Countess’s maidservant in *Menschenhass und Reue*, who is called Lotte in the original, is given the Romanian name Σαφτίκα (*Săftica*, a diminutive of *Elisaveta*) in the Kokkinakis translation. He also uses two job titles that originated in the Danubian principalities: βατάχος ‘steward, majordomo’ (cf. Rom. *vătaf*, Bulg. *vătah*; also in Goldoni, where it translates *fattor*) and καμαράσης ‘counsellor’ (< Rom. *cămăraș*). He even uses μάσα ‘table’ (< Rom. *masa*; also in Goldoni).

Characters’ names

Most of the characters’ names are not Hellenized in the Goldoni translations, but Kokkinakis gives Greek names to some of the characters, particularly the children, the servants and the comic characters; in fact, in the only one of the four Kotzebue plays that is explicitly labelled as a comedy, all but one of the characters have been given Greek names. In addition, the following names of dogs appear in Kokkinakis’ Kotzebue: Ασλάνης (< T *aslan* ‘lion’), Καραμάνης (< T *karaman* ‘very dark person’), Σουλτάνος (< T *sultan*). It is possible that giving Turkish names to dogs was common practice among the Greeks at the time; but it may possibly have served a humorous purpose, especially given the hadith-based Muslim antipathy towards dogs.⁶⁵

Geographical references

In *La vedova scaltra* (act 2, scene 2) Rosaura asks a Spanish character: “Don Alvaro, come vi piace la nostra Italia? [...] E dell’Italiane, che ne dite?”, while in

⁶³ Also used by Dapontes and in the *Vosporomachia* and *Alexandrovodas*.

⁶⁴ Goldoni, p. 356.

⁶⁵ In the original text, the equivalent names are, in the same order as above, Fidel, Sultan and Caro. Καραμάνης is still used today in Greece as a name for a black dog. “Sultan” appears in both the German and the Greek; but Kokkinakis has changed the order of names, probably for humorous purposes: the Greek text has the character saying “[The] Sultan has bitten plenty of peasant lads on the shins” (Kokkinakis, p. 317).

Greek she asks: “Πώς σας άρεσεν, άρχοντα, η Πόλις; [...] Αμά οι Πολίτισσες πώς σας φαίνονται;” (‘Sir, how do you like Constantinople? [...] And what do you think of Constantinopolitan women?’).⁶⁶ “Πόλις” (the colloquial Greek name for Constantinople) is used in other parts of the Goldoni translations where the original text specifies the names of Italian cities.

At one point the translator successfully renders a pair of punning place names: Castelbuono and Castelvattivo in Goldoni’s *La dama prudente* are rendered as Αργυρόκαστρο (a real place-name, literally meaning ‘Silvertown’) and Βρωμόκαστρο (a fictitious name meaning ‘Filthytown’).⁶⁷

While on the subject of cities, I would add that Kotzebue’s term *Stadtleben* (‘city life’) is rendered by Kokkinakis as “τσιλιμπιδική ζωή” (the life of a *τσιλεπής* [*< T celebi* ‘gentleman’], i.e. civilized or refined living); in the glossary to his edition of the Kokkinakis translations, Puchner renders the Greek phrase as “κοσμική ζωή”.

Food and drink

In Goldoni’s *Il vero amico* there is a discussion about what food to prepare for “capo all’anno” (‘New Year’; in Greek, Αρχιχρονιά): *pane* is translated as “παξιμάδια” (‘rusks’), but whereas the miserly master of the house in Goldoni orders *minestrina* (a kind of thin soup) the translator uses the word “πίτα” (‘pie’), and further down he even adds a reference to “πίτα του Αγίου Βασιλείου” (‘St Basil’s pie’), the traditional Greek cake eaten on New Year’s Eve (nowadays known as *βασιλόπιττα*) where Goldoni does not specify any particular food.⁶⁸

Parts of a capon are listed in *Il padre di famiglia*: besides the leg (*coscia*, ματσούκα), the wing (*ala*, πτερόν) and the rump (*groppa*, καράβι), the translator adds the wishbone (γιαδέστσι [cf. *T yâdes* *< Persian yadast*], Modern Greek γιάντες), probably because in Ottoman and Greek culture a game is played with the wishbone.⁶⁹

Elsewhere in the Goldoni translations the characters eat *κεπάπια* (*< T kebab*), *ντολμάδες* (*< T dolma* ‘stuffed vegetables’), *λουκούμια* (*< T lokum* ‘Turkish delight’) and *γεούρτι* (*< T yoğurt* ‘yoghurt’) and drink *ρακί* (*< T raki* ‘raki, arrack’).⁷⁰ In Kokkinakis’s translation, Kotzebue’s *Kartoffel* (‘potato’) becomes ψωμί ξερόν (‘dry bread’), *Champagner* becomes σκοπελίτικον κρασί (‘Skopelos wine’),⁷¹ *Rheinwein* becomes κουμανταριά (a kind of sweet wine from Cyprus) and *Malaga (Wein)* becomes κυπριώτικο κρασάκι (‘Cypriot wine’: that makes two wines from Cyprus).

⁶⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 441.

⁶⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 358–359.

⁶⁸ Goldoni, p. 203.

⁶⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 94. Strangely the breast is not mentioned in either the Italian or the Greek text.

⁷⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 64. See also Gentilini, “Turchismi”, p. 505. The *Vosporomachia* uses the normal MG form *γιαούρτι* (p. 44).

⁷¹ Skopelos, the birthplace of Dapontes, was a major wine-producing island, as we know from that author’s *Κήπος χαρίτων*.

Clothing and other objects worn about the body

The wigs worn by Goldoni and his male characters are removed by the Greek translator. The characters of the Goldoni translations wear Ottoman (or at least Balkan) dress, including the following:

- δολαμάς ‘kind of jacket, tunic or coat’ (< T *dolama*)
- κοντόσι ‘fur-lined mantle or cloak’ (< Hungarian *köntös* ‘robe, gown’)
- μπινίσι ‘nobleman’s long cloak’ (< T *biniş* (also *Saganaki*))
- σαμουροπατσά ‘cloak of sable fur’ (< T *samur paçası*)
- καλπάκι ‘fur hat’ (< T *kalpak*)
- σαρίκι ‘woman’s headdress’ (< T *sarık* ‘turban’), which is surrounded by a κουλούφι ‘cloth wound round the outside of the cap or fez’ (< T *kılıf*), whereas the same character in Goldoni’s original text wears a *goliè* ‘choker’ (< F *collier*)
- τσαζίρι ‘kind of breeches’ (< T *çakşır*)

In the Goldoni translations a *cappello* becomes φέσι (< T *fez*), and when a character in *Il padre di famiglia* (act 2, scene 11) loses his sword in a gambling den, it becomes a ring in Greek,⁷² most probably because Christians were not normally allowed to wear swords in the Ottoman Empire. In the Greek version of *La locandiera* the marquis offers Mirandolina a kerchief which he describes as being “κουσγουντζουκλίδικον” (i.e. from Kuzguncuk, a settlement on the Asian shore of the Bosphorus chiefly inhabited by non-Muslims),⁷³ whereas in the Goldoni original it is from London.

Even in the Kokkinakis translation of Kotzebue one of the characters uses the term καβάδι[ov] (in use as early as the late Byzantine period), meaning the long, gold-embroidered outer garment worn by Phanariot princes and officials as a symbol of their high civil rank.

Household objects

In *La locandiera*, one of the characters wonders whether a particular object is made of gold or of “*princisbech*”.⁷⁴ The translator shows a sophisticated knowledge of Italian and a sensitivity to cultural differences by rendering *princisbech* as *τομπάκι*. Pinchbeck is an alloy of copper and zinc, mixed in such a proportion that it resembles gold. It was invented in the eighteenth century by Christopher Pinchbeck, a London clockmaker. Turkish *tombak* (derived from the Malay word for ‘copper’) refers either to an alloy of copper and zinc or to a method

⁷² Goldoni, scene AB’, p. 76, 78.

⁷³ Goldoni, p. 249.

⁷⁴ The change from *pinch-* to *princis-* in Italian was probably due to an erroneous association with *prince*’s.

of gold-plating copper utensils. The translator has successfully found a cultural equivalent by replacing a metal that comes from the West (London) with one that originated in the Orient.⁷⁵

Modes of transport

Where Goldoni talks of characters being transported around Venice in sedan chairs, the translator has them riding in a carriage (καρέτα). There are no canals and gondolas in the anonymous Greek translation of Goldoni. Instead the characters travel up and down the μπουγάζι (< T *boğaz* ‘strait, Bosphorus’) in καΐκια (< T *kayık* ‘caïque’), which were normally rowed by several pairs of oarsmen.⁷⁶

Entertainment

Characters in the Goldoni translations talk about composing and singing rhymed couplets known as κοτσάκια,⁷⁷ and they celebrate happy occasions (such as an engagement to be married) with Ottoman musical instruments (*saz*). As for dancing, Kotzebue’s *Cotillion* becomes an “ασπροθαλασσίτικος χορός” (‘Aegean island dance’).

Goldoni often depicts his characters playing cards. This gives the Greek translator the opportunity to inform us about the card games that might have been familiar to him and his intended audience. Thus, for instance, Goldoni’s *bassetta* is replaced by κιορδούμ (cf. Rom. *ghiordum* in same meaning, probably < T *gördüm* ‘I saw’);⁷⁸ *primiera* becomes once όμπρα (< Ital. *ombre* < Spanish *hombre*) and once τριανταμία (literally ‘thirty-one’); while the phrase “κοντούμ κοντούμ κούμαδμ” (perhaps < T *kodum kodum komadım*, lit. ‘I put, I put, I didn’t put’) seems to be a card game that has no equivalent in the original. The card game *picchetto* is once rendered as πικέτο, but on another occasion it is replaced by μάγκαλα ‘mancala (a kind of board game)’ (cf. T *mankala*).

One of the characters in Goldoni’s *La locandiera* (act 2, scene 10) remarks about another: “Questo sarebbe un bel carattere per una delle vostre commedie”. In Greek this becomes “Αληθινά αυτός ο χαρακτήρ του είναι μουνασίπικος διά κομédieν και χαγιαζίλι” (‘Truly that character of his is suitable for commedia and

⁷⁵ In her edition of one of the Goldoni translations, Valérie Daniel (*Une traduction inédite en grec moderne de Goldoni. La question du Prodigio* (Paris 1928), p. 5) claims that pinchbeck had superseded tombac in the world of fashion and that the replacement of *princisbech* with tombac in Greek shows that the translator was behind the times. Since tombac is still produced in Turkey today, it cannot be the case that he was behind the times in the Ottoman context.

⁷⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 14.

⁷⁷ People singing κοτσάκια also make plentiful appearances in the *Vosporomachia* and the writings of Kallinikos.

⁷⁸ Γκιορντούμ is also mentioned by Kallinikos: see glossary to Vasileios F. Tomadakis, *Ανέκδοτα επιγράμματα και άλλα στιχουργήματα του Πατριάρχου Καλλινίκου Γ' (1713–1792) (από το χειρόγραφο (B', 1757) της "Βοσπορομαχίας"* (Athens 1999). Γκιορντούμ is still played in Turkey (Nikos Zachariadis, personal communication, 12 September 2015).

shadow theatre’).⁷⁹ The translator is perfectly aware of the Greek term *κωμωδία* (which he uses to label the title at the beginning of each of the translated plays), but he preserves the Italian term (perhaps with the sense of *commedia dell’arte*) and adds a word based on the Ottoman term for ‘shadow theatre’ (i.e. Karagöz), namely *hayali zil* (lit., ‘imaginary shadow’). In this way he brings together in one phrase the western and eastern traditions, between which the Greeks lived, worked and moved.

Coinage

In the Goldoni translations, sums of money are specified in units familiar to the inhabitants of the Ottoman empire. As in the *Saganaki*, most sums in these translations are expressed in *γρόσια* (*kuruş*, the standard unit of Ottoman currency, known in the West as ‘piastres’). There are many references in both texts to the *πουγγί* (‘purse’, equivalent to T *kese*), a sum of money in the Ottoman empire equivalent to 500 piastres. Where the miserly Ottavio in *Il vero amico* (act 3, scene 1) expresses his love for his *zecchini*, *scudi* and *monete di Portogallo*, his counterpart in the Greek translation lovingly lists his *ζερμακούπια*, *φουνδουκλιά* (both of these were Ottoman gold coins), *φλωριά ματζάρικα* (Hungarian florins) and *ηγεμονικά βενετικά* (‘Venetian ducats’).⁸⁰ Elsewhere *soldo* (a coin of little value) is rendered as *φόλα* (480 folas = 1 *kuruş*).⁸¹

Legal terminology

Kotzebue’s *confiscirt* ‘confiscated’ is rendered by Kokkinakis as “έγιναν μοιρί” ‘they became state property’ (< T *miri*).⁸²

Expressions of politeness and forms of address

When one character in the Goldoni translations asks another for a favour, the second answers “*πας ουστουνέ*” (< T *baş üstüne* ‘with pleasure’, lit., ‘on top of the head’).⁸³ The question of how people address each other (the conventional forms address such as η Αφεντία σας, η Ευγενεία σου, η Λογιότης σου etc., and whether they use the singular or plural when addressing a single person) is too complex to go into here; but I note that in both the Goldoni and the Kotzebue translations masters frequently use the interjection *μπρε* when speaking to or summoning servants. It is significant that in every one of the texts (both original and translated)

⁷⁹ Goldoni, p. 262. The manuscript reads *χαγιαζήλι*. Katartzis uses the form *χγιαζίλι*, which he defines as “τούρκικη κωμωδία” (D. Katartzis, *Τα ευρισκόμενα*, ed. K. Th. Dimaras (Athens 1970), p. 81, 456), while Kallinikos uses the form *χιαζίλι*. *Μονασίτικος* is < T *münassip*.

⁸⁰ Goldoni, p. 211. The rendering ‘ducats’ is due to Daniel, *Une traduction inédite en grec moderne de Goldoni*, p. 4.

⁸¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 185; also used in the *Saganaki*.

⁸² In other Phanariot texts, too, such as the poems and songs included in the volume *Έρωτος αποτελέσματα* (Vienna 1792), some of the legal terminology is of Turkish origin: *ινσάφι* ‘justice, fairness’ (< T *insaf*), *άφι* ‘pardon’ (< T *af*), *δαβατζίσα* ‘plaintiff’ (< T *dāvacı*), rhyming with *δοβατζίσα* ‘suppliant, one who prays’ (< T *duacı*) in a single poem, *op. cit.*, p. 83.

⁸³ Goldoni, p. 178.

that I am focusing on in this article, characters use the friendly (though sometimes condescending or slightly reprimanding) Turkish address *τζάνουμ/τζάνιμ* when talking to each other (< T *canım*, lit., ‘my soul’).

Other social conventions

In the Greek translations of Goldoni a social visit is called *γειτόνευμα* (also in the *Saganaki*, beside *βίζιτα* < Ital. *visita*), and conversation during such a visit is called *σοχπέτι* (< T *sohbet*).⁸⁴ In the Goldoni translations, however, unlike in Muslim society, *σοχπέτι* is not confined to single-sex gatherings, so that it becomes more like an Italian *conversazione*.

In Goldoni’s plays there are frequent disputes about dowries. The translator uses two different Greek words where Goldoni only has *dote*: *προίκα* (the standard Greek term for a dowry) and *τράχωμα* (the cash component of a dowry, apparently peculiar to Constantinople).⁸⁵ He also uses *θώλετρον* (a gift to a bride after the wedding), which has no equivalent in the Italian original.⁸⁶ All three of these terms appear together in a single play, namely the translation of *La locandiera*. By contrast, in Oikonomos’ *Φιλάργυρος* (1816) Harpagon’s repeated “Sans dot!” is always rendered as “Χωρίς προίκα!”

The Greek conventions of the time appear to have prevented the translator of Goldoni from understanding the eighteenth-century Venetian concept of the *bracciere* (otherwise known as *cicisbeo* or *cavalier servente*), an admirer of a married woman who accompanies her frequently in public as well as in private. At one point where Goldoni refers to a woman going through the streets with her *bracciere*, the translator renders this as her servant, whereas at another point, instead of saying she is travelling with her admirer, he says she is travelling in a carriage!⁸⁷

Use of Islamic terminology

In the Greek translation of Goldoni, after one character has delivered a long monologue (longer than in the original), another character says to himself sarcastically: “Μασιαλλάχ, σαν Δημοσθένης ελάλησε” ‘How wonderful, he spoke just like Demosthenes!’ (< T *maşallah* ‘what wonders God has willed’).⁸⁸ There is no equivalent in Goldoni for this comic juxtaposition of Islamic and Classical Greek culture; the Italian text simply says “Ha parlato da Cicerone.”⁸⁹

⁸⁴ For the importance of *sohbet* in Ottoman society see Johann Strauss, “La Conversation”, in François Georgeon et Paul Dumont (ed.), *Vivre dans l’Empire ottoman. Sociabilités et relations intercommunautaires (XVIIIe-XXe siècles)* (Paris 1997), p. 251–318.

⁸⁵ The term *τράχωμα* is also used in one of the poems and songs in *Έρωτος αποτελέσματα*.

⁸⁶ < Byzantine Greek *θεώρετρον* < Ancient Greek *θεώρητρα*. See Daniel, *Une traduction inédite en grec moderne de Goldoni*, p. 11, Stevanoni, *Una traduzione neogreca inedita: La locandiera*, p. XLVI, and Nikolaos Andriotis, *Lexikon der Archaismen in neugriechischen Dialekten* (Vienna 1974), s.v. *θεώρητρα*.

⁸⁷ Goldoni, p. 355, 29.

⁸⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 227.

⁸⁹ Act 3, scene 24 (Carlo Goldoni, *Le commedie*, vol. IV (Florence 1753), p. 237; see Martini, *Una traduzione neogreca inedita: Il vero amico di C. Goldoni*, p. x.

In the Goldoni translation the characters frequently use temporal expressions based on the times of Islamic prayers: “[κινώ] από το σαμπάχ ναμάζι” (‘[I’m setting off] first thing in the morning’, < T *sabah namazi* ‘morning prayer’) and “το κεντί” (‘[in] the middle of the afternoon’, < T *ikindi* ‘time of afternoon prayer’), the latter being still used by Greeks in Istanbul today.⁹⁰

In *Il vero amico*, when a terrified miser asks who has just thrown a stone into his money-box to frighten him, the invisible culprit (one of his servants) answers “Il diavolo”, whereas in the Greek translation he says “Ο διάβολος, ο τζίνης” (< T *cin* ‘jinn’), which pairs the Christian devil with a Muslim demon.⁹¹ This is a typical instance of the frequent phenomenon of linguistic doubling in the Goldoni translations, where a Greek and a non-Greek word are used side by side.

The Goldoni translator does not simply translate words; he imagines how each particular scene would be played out in a Greek-speaking environment; how the characters would act and speak if they were Greek.⁹² Examples of this can be seen in the translator’s use of Greek expressions. A mother complains about her husband’s treatment of her son: “Όλα τα στραβά ψωμιά είναι του Φλωρίνδου μου” (‘all the crooked loaves are due to my Florindo’, in other words poor Florindo gets the blame for everything. This sentence is a variation on the proverbial expression “Όλα τα στραβά ψωμιά η νύφη μας τα πλάθει” (‘all the crooked loaves are kneaded by our daughter-in-law’). It is significant that there is no corresponding proverbial phrase in Goldoni.⁹³ Even Kokkinakis, whose translation stays fairly close to the original German text, often uses local expressions. For instance, he renders Kotzebue’s “er hat sich ein wenig blamirt” (‘he’s made a fool of himself’) as “την έπαθε χιώτικην” (‘he blew it Chios-style’).⁹⁴ And one of the characters in the Kokkinakis translations complains: “όλα τα βιβλία του έπεσαν εις τα χέρια των χαλβατζήδων” (lit. ‘all my books have fallen into the hands of the halva merchants’, in other words their pages have been used for wrapping sweets), referring to the makers or sellers of the familiar Arabic-Ottoman sweet.

6. Conclusion

The original Greek satirical comedies, the *Saganaki* and *Alexandrovodas*, depict a precarious society in which the rule of law is absent and in which the

⁹⁰ Goldoni, p. 180, 274. Similarly, in the *Saganaki*, p. 70, Mavrogenis says “Αλλάχ ισμαρλατικ” (T *Allaha ismarladik*, lit., ‘we have commended [you] to God’, the normal phrase of farewell used in Turkish when one is leaving).

⁹¹ Goldoni, p. 212.

⁹² This aspect of adaptation in the translation of *La vedova scaltra* is the subject of Antonis Glytzouris, “Πανούργες χήρες στο περιθώριο του νεοελληνικού Διαφωτισμού”, in Stefanos Kaklamanis et al. (ed.), *Λόγος και χρόνος στη νεοελληνική γραμματεία (18ος – 19ος αιώνας): Πρακτικά συνεδρίου προς τιμήν του Αλέξη Πολίτη* (Heraklio 2015), p. 143–156.

⁹³ Goldoni, p. 68.

⁹⁴ There is deliberate irony here, since the translator was from Chios.

arbitrary power of the prince and the threat of war are ever-present; it is also a society in which even (or perhaps especially) the prince is in constant danger of being stripped of his rank (as happened to Mavrokordatos for going over to the Russians) and even executed (as happened to Mavrogenis despite his unwavering loyalty to the sultan), and it is often impossible to predict the outcome of one's actions. By contrast, the translations of Goldoni's and Kotzebue's plays depict a well-ordered and largely peaceful society in which members of the dominant aristocratic and bourgeois classes enjoy ample leisure (if not always ample money) and in which virtue is rewarded. The translator of Goldoni must have been a member of an analogous class within the Ottoman Empire, while Kokkinakis was living safely in diaspora Vienna.

It may be that the decision of these two writers to transfer plays by Goldoni and Kotzebue into Greek is an indication of their desire – and possibly their hope – that Greek society would come to resemble the societies depicted in these Venetian and German plays. If so, their domestication or nativization of certain cultural features within the otherwise foreign cultural products that they were translating was perhaps intended not only to enable the audience to understand the situations depicted, but to help the translator as well as the audience to envisage the possibility that their own society might one day become more like the foreign one.

REZUMAT

Există trei tipologii despre care se poate vorbi în cultura și tradiția literară a Greciei secolului al XVIII-lea: fanariotă, egeană și ionică/heptanesiană (a celor șapte insule/a insulelor ionice). Aspecte ale vieții și evenimente din istoria Greciei acelor vremuri apar și în unele texte scrise în aria culturală a creștinismului ortodox aflată sub influența fanariotă. Acest articol își propune o analiză a caracteristicilor limbii, literaturii și culturii fanariote din Grecia secolului al XVIII-lea. În acest sens, sunt discutate următoarele texte: două comedii satirice, *Alexandrovodas / Prințul fără scrupule*, scrisă de G.N. Soutsos în preajma anului 1785 – o satiră la adresa lui Alexandru Mavrocordat, domnul Moldovei –, și *Saganaki / Furtuna nebuniei*, scrisă de un anonim în preajma anului 1790, avându-l în centru pe domnitorul Țării Românești Nicolae Mavrogheni (între anii 1786 și 1789); câteva traduceri (din italiană și din germană) ale unor piese de teatru de Carlo Goldoni și August von Kotzebue. Acestea din urmă pun în contrast lumea fanariotă (guvernată de arbitrar și imprezvizibil) cu o lume organizată și liniștită în care reprezentanții claselor burgheze și aristocrate se bucură de viață și unde virtutea este pusă la mare preț. Traducătorul lui Kotzebue, Konstantinos Kokkinakis, educat la Constantinopol și București, folosește cuvinte românești în textul său, publicat la Viena în 1801. La fel traducătorul anonim al lui Goldoni, semn că și acesta a petrecut timp în Principatele Române.

Cuvinte-cheie: epoca fanariotă, elemente turce în traduceri în greacă, atitudinea față de Europa în literatură, elemente de specific geografic și cultural în traduceri în greacă.