

Refined Attic Greek: Hallmark of the Emerging Phanariot Nobility

Jacques Bouchard

Centre d'études néo-helléniques, Université de Montréal

jacques.bouchard@umontreal.ca

Abstract: In the 17th century, in the field of language and culture, Romanian boyars and intellectuals gradually replaced Slavonic by Greek. Spoken modern Greek became a vernacular language in the Danubian principalities. To dissociate themselves from the local society, the emerging Phanariot élite used refined Attic Greek as a symbol of their ascendancy and prestige.

Introduction

The historical period proposed here is quite exact: it begins in 1641, the date of birth of Alexander Mavrocordatos the Exaporit and continues until 1730, death year of his son Nicholas then prince of Wallachia; it marks also the end of the "Tulip Era", when Sultan Ahmet III was deposed.

I will focus my presentation on the first members of the Mavrocordatos family, particularly on prince Nicholas who reigned from 1709 to 1730, a period that I have described in other papers as that of "Reasoned Absolutism", a prelude to the Enlightened Despotism.

I intend to examine the linguistic levels used during that period that preceded the rise of the Phanariot caste, by the élite, princes, scholars and clergymen. Indeed, C.Th. Dimaras exposed the subject with acuity and pertinence in his foreword to my edition of the *Leisures of Philotheos*, more than twenty-five years ago.

Ancient vs Modern Greek

Firstly, we can empirically recognize at a glance what texts were written in ancient Greek: they have no particles $\theta\alpha$, no conjunctions $\nu\alpha$ or $\alpha\varsigma$, no prepositions $\mu\epsilon$ or $\sigma\epsilon$, and do not use the negative $\delta\epsilon\nu$. Of course even if the vocabulary and morphology are ancient, some texts belong to the *Kunstprosa*, while others are simply written in "tyronic Greek". Among the other documents one can distinguish texts in vernacular Greek ($\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\alpha\pi\lambda\acute{\eta}\nu$ $\gamma\lambda\acute{\omega}\sigma\sigma\alpha\nu$), and those composed in elevated style, like the documents redacted by ecclesiastical authorities.

A second remark concerns the type of

document: letters, essays, sermons, literary fiction, philosophical treatises, scientific memoirs, poetry must all be written in a language appropriate to the addressee: a sermon pronounced before poorly-educated congregation cannot be composed in a learned language. On the other hand, an erudite person can address a letter or an essay in ancient Greek to a scholar since he knows that it is easier to understand ancient Greek reading rather than listening.

Texts to be analyzed are found in the collection *Hurmuzaki*, the *Βασική Βιβλιοθήκη*, Legrand's editions, the *Bibliografia românească veche* (BRV) by Bianu and Hodoş, and some works of authors like Mavrocordatos, Cantemir, Notaras, Voulgaris, etc.

Of course, the Greek language existed from Antiquity on the site of Byzantium, but its presence was also attested during Antiquity on the Black Sea littoral, nowadays Dobrogea. Closer to the period under study, the Greek language was found in both principalities from the 14th century onwards, in spite of the fact that the Orthodox Church had even then imposed the slavonic language in the liturgy and civil administration¹.

Vernacular Greek

During the 17th and 18th centuries most texts with ecclesial or pastoral content destined to edify believers were composed in a mixed language, where a syntax with a dusting of ancient Greek imitates vernacular Greek in order to be understood by the audience. The best examples are the sermons of preachers and hagiographers, like Frangiskos Skoufos

(1644-1697), who published the "Panegyric discourse on the Baptist's birth" in Venice in 1670, or Ilias Miniatis (1669-1714); subsequent preachers, like Cosmas Aitolos (1714-1779) and Nikiforos Theotokis (1731-1800) would do the same. They were aware that, to convince their flock, they had to use an understandable language. In his *Art of Rhetoric* published in Venice in 1681, Skoufos described his aim as follows: «να ωφελήσω το Γένος μου... αποφάσισα, ω Αναγνώστα μου φιλόανθρωπε, να συνθέσω το Βιβλίον τούτο, και δια να γενή κοινή εις όλους απλώς η ωφέλεια, ηθέλησα να ομιλήσω και με κοινήν γλώσσαν, επιθυμώντας να το δεχθούν όχιμόνον οι αγκάλες των σοφών και εναρέτων, αμή και εκείνες των απλουστέρων ανθρώπων»². [To be useful to my Nation... I decided, o benevolent Reader, to compose this book, and with the purpose to be useful to all men, I wanted to speak the common tongue, wishing to be accepted not only by scholars, but also by the most simple men].

Vernacular Greek in the Romanian countries

In the domain of sciences and learning, popularisers adopted a simple language; so did Chrysanthos Notaras in his learned work *Introduction to Geography and the Sphere*, printed in Paris in 1716, and reprinted in Venice in 1718. He exposed, in vernacular language, the heliocentric theories of Copernic, Kepler, Galileo and Descartes, even if in the end he preferred to follow the opinion of the Church concerning the geocentric system. Chrysanthos had also written an essay on excommunication in simple language at the request of Voivode Constantine Brâncoveanu, himself under threat of excommunication³.

If we examine the bulk of letters written by Moldavian and Wallachian nobles and published by Émile Legrand and the editors of the *Hurmuzaki* collection, we notice that most of them knew Greek well and used to write it correctly. Among the authors of Greek letters there are the Voivode Vasile Lupu and his daughter Ruxandra, the stolnic Constantine and the spatharius Mihail Cantacuzino, the Brâncoveanu family, Constantine, Ștefan and Radu, the princes Mihai Racoviță, Antioh

Cantemir, Gheorghe Crețulescu, the boyars Nicolae and Ioan Ruset, Grigore Filipescu, Radu Dudescu, Dumitrachi Hirosculaiu and many other letter writers from the Romanian principalities. All of them, without exception, wrote vernacular Greek with or without a touch of ancient Greek, under the influence of the Patriarchate⁴.

We can conclude that knowledge of Modern Greek existed among the political and ecclesial élite, in civil society and the world of commerce. The influence of Greek culture was further encouraged by the establishment of two princely academies, one in Bucharest founded in 1689 by Șerban Cantacuzino, and the other in Jassy by Antioh Cantemir in 1707⁵. These institutions attracted Greek professors from many parts of the Ottoman Empire and encouraged an interest in Greek letters. In 1691 Constantine Brâncoveanu subsidized the edition published in Bucharest (έν τῇ περιφήμῳ πόλει Μπουκουρέστη) of *The Sixty six admonitory chapters* by Basil the Macedon, translated "εις την απλήν των ρωμαίων γλώσσαν" by Chrysanthos Notaras⁶. The Georgian scholar Antim, the Patriarch of Jerusalem Dositheos, his nephew Chrysanthos Notaras and Jeremy Cacavelas helped make of Jassy and Bucharest, and even Târgoviște and Snagov, centers of Greek book diffusion. When the Moldavian Dimitrie Cantemir published his *Divanul* in Jassy in 1698, he juxtaposed with it the Modern Greek translation of his tutor Jeremy Cacavelas. On the other hand, Antim printed Plutarch's *Parallel Lives* in Bucharest in 1704, translated into Modern Greek and Romanian by Constantine, prince Constantine Brâncoveanu's son. In 1713, the same Antim printed *Philosophical Maxims*⁷, in Târgoviște, translated from Italian to modern Greek. In 1715, Antim printed *Νουθεσίαι Χριστιανοπολιτικάί* (Christian Political Admonitions) in Bucharest with a dedication to Voivode Ștefan Cantacuzino as follows: "Ιεζύρωντας (ευσεβέστατε και φιλόχριστε Αυθέντα) την θερμοτάτην αγάπην, και τον ένθεον πόθον, οπου έχει η υμετέρα Υψηλότης εις το να κυβερνήση αμέμπτως και θεάρεστα το Υπήκοον [...] εσύναξα από τα Γνωμικά των παλαιών σοφών Διδασκάλων τα πλέον εξαίρετα και αρμοδιότερα..."⁸. [Most pious and Christian

Prince, knowing your very fervent love and the divine desire of Your Excellency to govern your People impeccably and according to God [...] I have collected from the aphorisms of the ancient Masters' the most exquisite and pertinent ones.]

The Phanariots in the Danubian Principalities

Further historical events are well known: since Sultan Ahmet III had lost confidence in Prince Mihai Racovița, on November 6th 1709 he appointed Nicholas Mavrocordatos to the throne of Moldavia. The Phanariot kept his throne until November 27th 1710. After the short reign of Dimitrie Cantemir, Nicholas recovered his principality on September 26th 1712. In the meanwhile, Nicholas learnt Romanian well enough to read Romanian chronicles⁹. Without losing time, he supported the Romanian edition of a *Synopsis* in Jassy in 1714, an edition decorated with the coat of arms of Moldavia¹⁰. One year later, a *Liturghie* [Liturgy] was printed under the Voivode Nicholas' high patronage, in Slavonic with explanations and prayers in Romanian¹¹, and in September, he published in Greek John Damascene's *Profession of faith*¹². We see very clearly in this last example that the propagation of religious books served both the voivode's political propaganda and personal glorification: one can even decipher flanking the emblem of Moldavia the acronyms Ε Θ Ι Ν Α Β Α Η Π Μ: "By God's grace John Nicholas, son of Alexander, Voivode, Prince, Sovereign of all Moldavia". The Romanian slavist Emil Vîrtosu has demonstrated that the enigmatic "ΙΩ" before Romanian princes' names is a cryptograph that comes from Ιωάννης: a name whose Hebraic etymology means "Dei gratia - by the grace of God"¹³.

Refined Attic Greek

1. Alexander Mavrocordatos the Exaporit

On December 25th 1715, Nicholas was appointed Voivode of Wallachia; he arrived in Bucharest on January 30th 1716. Immediately after his enthronement, Nicholas, in an act of exemplary filial devotion, hastened

to edit a *Holy History* written in koinè by his father Alexander the Exaporit. With its magnificent quality and the precision of its typography the volume is indeed imposing. The book was published in August in Bucharest at Voivode Nicholas' expense and was offered gracefully to the public for its spiritual edification. The double intention of self-promotion and propaganda is obvious as can be seen in the emblem especially executed for Nicholas: it unifies for the first time the arms of Moldavia and of Wallachia side by side, the aurochs head and the crow holding a Latin cross in his beak both coats of arms surmounted by one princely crown. In order to personalize his design, the engraver had inscribed the initials Ι Ν Α Β, meaning Ιω Νικόλαος Αλεξάνδρου Βοεβόδας. Nicholas' arms are followed by a twelve-verse poem composed by the Postelnic Ioannis that describes the coat of arms. The next three pages consist of a pious homage to the Virgin Mary and a profession of faith in the Holy Trinity. Nicholas also offers fulsome praise of his father: "Σοῦ δὲ πατέρων Φιλοστοργότατε, Ἡρώων εὐκλεέστατε, τῶν ἐν λόγοις, καὶ σοφία θαυμαζομένων Σοφώτατε, πῶς ἂν ἐπιλήσιμον γένοιμι τοῦ φῦντος;"¹⁴ [O you, the most affectionate father, the most glorious Hero, the Wisest among admired men for their speech and wisdom, how could I forget my genitor?] Next comes an epigram composed by Hierotheos Metropolitan of Drystra, who lauded Alexander and his sons' merits. Finally, Iacovos of Argos, former tutor of Nicholas, extols the merits of Alexander and his family, a ceremonial speech enhanced with metaphors and classical clichés that praise Prince Nicholas' virtues and administrative aptitudes.

Alexander Mavrocordatos' volume comprises five chapters and a table of contents; composed in refined Attic Greek, it has an austere and elevated style about which we could quote Dionysius of Halicarnassus' expression: "τὸ ἀξίωμα καὶ ἡ σεμνότης τῶν ὀνομάτων εὐμορφον πεποίηκε τὴν φράσιν"¹⁵. [The dignity and grandeur of the words has given the style its pleasing form.] A solid knowledge of Attic Greek is necessary to read this Biblical History, even if the content is well known. It constitutes an example *par excellence* of what

Dionysius calls an "αὐστηρά ἄρμονία"¹⁶ [austere harmony]. But the intention is without doubt to construct for the autochthonous noble families' reputation a monument to the grandeur and majesty to the prince who had inherited his prestige from his father, the founder of the dynasty, and close counsellor to the Sultan, and from the capital with its aura of imperial and ecumenical power, namely Constantinople, "τῶν πόλεων ἡ Βασιλῆς, ἡ τῆς οἰκουμένης μητρόπολις"¹⁷ [the queen of the cities, the metropolis of the world], and from the Phanar, the beacon that illuminates the world.

2. Voivode Nicholas Mavrocordatos

On November 14th of the same year 1716, Nicholas was abducted by the Austrians who had invaded Bucharest with the complicity of some boyars, and perhaps with Metropolitan Antim's assent. During his detention in Transylvania, Nicholas composed a *Treatise on Duties*, and a novel, the *Leisures of Philotheos*, two major works written in refined Attic Greek, known in French as "grec littéral". Nicholas recovered his throne in Bucharest after the signature of the Treaty of Passarowitz on July 10-21, 1718.

The 12th article of the treaty concerned the liberation of Nicholas. Sultan Ahmet III reconfirmed Nicholas on the throne of Wallachia on March 2nd 1719. The Voivode entered Bucharest on April 26th with great pomp and ceremony¹⁸ where he resumed the publishing activities that had been interrupted by his abduction three years earlier. This time he was to assert his personal authority over the Wallachian nobility, and on religious and civil society by displaying the splendour of "noblesse oblige". Though Modern Greek, both vernacular and learned, was daily used in court and in the city, Nicholas would display his intellectual superiority as a Phanariot born in the capital of Hellenism, by publishing volumes written in "grec littéral", a form of purist and elegant ancient Greek. In December 1719 he brought out his *Treaty on Duties*. The book is illustrated with the Voivode Nicholas' coat of arms, finely worked, where one can see the emblems of both principalities, unified under only one crown and flanked by the

acronyms even more explicit than in the *Holy History* edition of 1716: ΙΩ ΝΙ ΑΛ ΒΟ. Here the Voivode's armorial shield brings together the scepter and the sword under the crown, flanked by two trumpets of fame blown by two cherubs.

The main text of the *Treaty on Duties* is preceded by seven eulogies, poems or letters that vaunt the prince's merits composed by George Trapezountios, the Metropolitan of Drystra Hierotheos Komminos and by Dimitrios Georgoulis Notaras. Concerning these flatterers the Amsterdam erudite Jean Le Clerc made, in his *Bibliothèque Ancienne et Moderne* (BAM), the following comment: "Quoi que ces Messieurs entendent le Grec littéral, comme on parle dans le Levant, il s'en faut bien, qu'ils aprochent des Anciens, dans leurs vers. La Prose du Livre du Vaivode est d'un stile, beaucoup meilleur, que le leur"¹⁹. Much as Alexander the Exaporit's prose is stamped with an austere coldness and magnificence, so his son Nicholas' style stands out by virtue of its limpidity, sobriety, facility and elegance. The author of a commentary published in the learned review *Acta Eruditorum* of Leipzig in 1720 summarized the general opinion saying that: «Oratio hic est elegans, pura, perspicua, ingenua, non ad servilem imitationem composita, non Atticismos aut alia obsoleta temere affectans, non dialectos diversas imperite miscens, non calamistrata, nec sophisticos tumore inflata»²⁰. [The text in question is elegant, pure, clear, frank, not composed with servile imitation, without affecting here and there Atticisms or archaisms, without mixing awkwardly different dialects, not fussy, not inflated with sophistries].

The volume contains 19 chapters and constitutes a masterpiece of refined Attic Greek, or "grec littéral", as it was called in French. It helped to consolidate Voivode Nicholas' reputation as a wise philosopher-prince, and even as an exemplary Christian, but also as an author who could handle the koinè, a language with a high coefficient of refinement, with elegance and facility. Nicholas combines, with virtuosity, appropriateness - το πρέπον - and elegance - ἡ γλαφυρὰ σύνθεσις - according to the literary critic Dionysius of Halicarnassus²¹.

As a code of deontology the work drew the attention of the scholarly public in Europe thanks to its publication by Thomas Fritsch in Leipzig in 1722, accompanied by Ștefan Bergler's Latin translation. This edition featured a renewed presentation: in addition to its refined and artistic typography, it presented an exquisite portrait of Voivode Nicholas, executed in 1721 by the engraver of the Prussian court, Johann G. Wolfgang²². Henceforth, in addition to the coat of arms, the Republic of Letters could now attach a countenance to his name and appreciate this fundamental text of neo-hellenic moral philosophy thanks to Bergler's Latin translation. The Leipzig edition of 1722 had such a great success that it was re-issued in London and Amsterdam in 1724 by Samuel Palmer and Gysbert Dommer. Unfortunately the portrait of Nicholas by Wolfgang was clumsily reversed by Joh. Georg. Schniebes²³.

The reputation of the prince-author now extended both to Europe and in the Romanian principalities, in spite of the fact that his other works, also composed in koinè took a much longer time to be published, as did his novel *The Leisures of Philotheos* (1800). But the reputation of the emerging Phanariot nobility was firmly established as it asserted itself in «un langage prestigieux: c'était la langue de Platon, de Thucydide, d'Isocrate», as Constantin Dimaras put it²⁴.

Two examples will be sufficient to demonstrate the evocative power and elegance of Nicholas Mavrocordatos' style. First, here is a lapidary nominal period extracted from the chapter XIII of his *Treatise on Duties*: «Δικαιοσύνης δὲ οὐ μόνον τὸ μὴ ἀδικεῖν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ μὴ ἀδικεῖσθαι»²⁵. Translation cannot easily render the density of the apophthegm: "Justice is not only not to commit injustice, but also to avoid being a victim of it". This sentence illustrates very well Demetrios' definition of the apophthegm in his *Περὶ Ἑρμηνείας* [On Style]: «ἔστι γὰρ καὶ ἀποφθεγματικὸν ἢ βραχύτης καὶ γνωμολογικόν, καὶ σοφώτερον τὸ ἐν ὀλίγῳ πολλὴν διάνοιαν ἠθοῦσθαι»²⁶ [For brevity characterizes proverbs and maxims; and a compression of a lot of meaning into a small space shows more skill]. Finally, let us quote

a short extract from the chapter XI, “Περὶ ἀνδρείας”: it corresponds to Demetrios' definition of the period: “ἔστι γὰρ ἡ περίοδος σύστημα ἐκ κῶλων ἢ κομμάτων εὐκαταστροφῶς πρὸς τὴν διάνοιαν τὴν ὑποκειμένην ἀπρητισμένον”²⁷ [The period is a combination of clauses and phrases arranged to conclude the underlying thought with a well-turned ending.]; it is a masterpiece of rythmical balance, formed by a varied construction of κῶλα (clauses) and of two cascades of homeoteleutons²⁸: «Ἔστι δὲ ἀληθῆς ἀνδρεία ἢ πάντοτε πραγματευομένη τὰ Θεῷ ἀρέσκοντα, τὰ εἰς δόξαν αὐτοῦ τείνοντα, τὰ κοινῇ συνοῖσοντα. Οἱ δὲ τὰς ἰδίας ὠφελείας μαστεύοντες, καὶ δι' αὐτὰς κινδυνεύοντες, τῶν δὲ ὄντως καλῶν ὀλιγῶρως ἔχοντες, ὧνιοί τινές εἰσι, καὶ βάνασοι, τυφλώττοντες περὶ τὴν κρίσιν τοῦ ἀληθῶς καὶ ὄντως καλοῦ»²⁹. Jean Le Clerc translates as follows: «La véritable force de l'esprit est celle, qui s'attache aux choses, qui plaisent à Dieu, qui tendent à sa gloire, qui sont utiles au Public. Mais ceux qui recherchent leurs avantages particuliers, sont des âmes vénales, viles & aveugles, lors qu'il s'agit de juger de ce qui est réellement & véritablement bon»³⁰. Le Clerc concludes: «Il faut avouer qu'il [le Vaivode] avoit bien du génie & de la connoissance de la Langue Greque»³¹.

Conclusion

By way of conclusion, we note that no other contemporary author could equal Alexander and Nicholas Mavrocordatos' quality of style. Not only did they promote the "grec littéral"—refined Attic Greek—to the rank of the "hallmark of the emerging Phanariot nobility", but they also achieved a superior harmony of sonorities, images and metaphors, that reduced vernacular and ecclesiastical Greek to the level of common idioms.

Indeed, the Church used a simple language in order to be accessible to its congregations, or else the traditional idiom of the patriarchal chancellery, like the one in which Dositheos, patriarch of Jerusalem, composed the history of his patriarchate in 1247 pages, *Ἱστορία περὶ τῶν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις Πατριαρχευσάντων*, printed in Bucharest by his nephew Chrysanthos Notaras

in 1715³². A few decades later, when some ecclesiastics began archaizing, they did it so to excess, tastelessly, without any relation with Mavrocordatos' elegant koinè. For example, the famous Eugen Voulgaris composed his manual of logic *Η Λογική εκ Παλαιών τε και Νεωτέρων* in a language so archaic that the professor of logic Iosipos Moisioudax judged it incomprehensible³³. In his leisure time the same Voulgaris translated Virgil's *Eneid* into Homeric verses much more abstruse than the original³⁴.

Once the Phanariot nobility's supremacy was recognized by the autochthonous nobility, prince Nicholas' successors did not deem it necessary to retain the same loftiness of style. Voivode Constantin Mavrocordatos, Nicholas' son, favoured instead the use of Romanian and vernacular Greek. Later, in 1780, strictly speaking at the beginning of the Greek and Romanian Enlightenment, Prince Alexander Hyspilotis published his legal code *Συνταγματίον Νομικόν / Pravilniceasca condică*, in Romanian and vernacular Greek³⁵.

Finally, Nicholas, just like Dimitrie Cantemir, relied upon Latin to promote their written works among the savants of the Republic of Letters. Cantemir wrote his *Description of Moldavia* and his *History of the Ottoman Empire* in Latin: but, one is forced to recognize that Cantemir, in his haste to inform the reading public of the day, did not care to be as much a stylist in Latin, as Nicholas was in koinè. Certainly, Nicholas had at his disposal a language whose vocabulary and syntax had been refined by centuries, whereas Cantemir devised up a rough style, a language "rău scrisă"³⁶ both in Latin and in Moldavian.

Alexander the Exaporit and his son Nicholas enjoyed a posthumous glory as writers: their other works were published and widely diffused during the 18th and 19th centuries. After a period of latency corresponding to the decline of classical studies on a world-wide scale, we now notice a real revival of interest in Phanariot philology. But some quite significant texts are still waiting for translators and commentators if they are to take once again the place they deserve in the history of the Republic of Letters in the Early Enlightenment.

I would like to conclude with a symbolic comparison, that between two coats of arms:

First, one can see in a double-headed eagle, the arms of Ștefan Cantacuzino, hospodar of Hongro- Wallachia in 1714-1716. Thus the prince intends to claim his Byzantine heritage, pretending to belong to an imperial family settled in the Romanian countries. His armorial shield was published in the *Christian political Admonitions*, Bucharest 1715, by Antim, the metropolitan of Bucharest. It is followed by ten traditional political verses, written in vernacular Greek, with rhymes.

Io Ștefan Cantacuzino Voevod
Domn Oblăduitoriu Țării Rumânești



Σημεία τετρατάλαμπερ, πεδύχμι εις τὴν ποδὶλα
Κορυθα, Σταυροί, ζ' Α' εἶδον, Μίαν εἰ δειχθῶμι ὄλα,
ΣΤΕΦΑΝΕ Κωνσταντινῆ, ἔδρα τῶν ἠγμένων
Τιμὴ ζ' μέγα κλί' ἤμα τῶν σὸν λαμπρῶν Πρωτόν.
Ὁ' Α' εἶδος τοῦ Γένους, σὴ δειχθῶμι τὴν ὀργάνην,
καὶ τὴν ρωμαϊκὴν ἑξοχὸν, πεδ' εἶγαν βασιλείαν,
Ὁ' Κόρυξ Σὴ δηλοποιεῖ Λε' Ἐστίλιν τῆς βλαχίας,
καὶ κλιβερνῆτιν ἄρβρον λαοῦ καὶ Πολιτείας,
καὶ ὁ Σταυρὸς ὁ πάντιμος Σὴ μαρτυρεῖ ἁθροσάτιν,
τῆς ὀκκλησίας τοῦ Χριστοῦ, τῆς ὀσιβείας δ' αἰτίων.

The second blazon represents the coat of arms of Nicholas Mavrocordatos, published in his father's *Holy History*, Bucharest 1716. Under the united arms of the two principalities, the description of Nicholas' shield, composed in archaic Greek, marks the difference with the preceding hospodars: ancient Greek is thence the hallmark of this emerging dynasty.



Notes:

- ¹Stelian Brezeanu *et al.*, *Relațiile româno-elene*, Bucharest, Omonia, 2003. Cf. Paula Scalcau, *Hellenism in Romania*, Bucharest, Omonia, 2007.
- ²Βασική Βιβλιοθήκη, 8, p. 50.
- ³Παναγιώτης Δ. Μιχαηλάρης, *Η πραγματεία του Χρύσανθου Ιεροσολύμων "Περί Αφορισμού"*, Athens, Poreia, 2002.
- ⁴Émile Legrand, *Ελληνικόν Επιστολάριον - Épistolaire grec*, Paris, Maisonneuve, 1888, passim. Cf. Athanasios E. Karathanassis, *Οι Έλληνες λόγιοι στη Βλαχία (1670-1714)*, Thessaloniki, Ed. Bros. Kyriakidis, 2000.
- ⁵Ariadna Camariano-Cioran, *Les académies princières de Bucarest et de Jassy et leurs professeurs*, Thessaloniki, Institute for Balkan Studies, 1974.
- ⁶BRV, 1, p. 324-325. Legrand, *Bibliographie 17e*, 3, p. 5.
- ⁷Dan Râpă-Buicliu, BRV, Add. I, Galați, 2000, p. 226. Al. Dușu, *Coordonate ale culturii românești în sec. XVIII*, Buc., 1966, p. 47-49.
- ⁸BRV, 1, p. 499.
- ⁹É. Legrand, *Épistolaire*, *op.cit.*, p. 84.
- ¹⁰BRV, 1, p. 494. Cf. Ana Andreescu, *Cartea românească în veacul al XVIII-lea*, Bucharest, Editura Vremea XXI, 2004, p. 43.
- ¹¹BRV, 1, p. 497-498.
- ¹²*Ibid.*, p. 501.
- ¹³Emil Vîrtosu, *Titulatura domnilor și asocierea la domnie în Țara Românească și Moldova (pînă în secolul al XVI-lea)*, Bucharest, Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Romîne, 1960, p. 84-86.
- ¹⁴A. Μαυροκορδάτος, *Ιστορία Ιερά*, Bucharest, 1716, p. (4).
- ¹⁵*Περί συνθέσεως ονομάτων*, VI, 3, 16. Translation by Stephen Usher, in Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *The Critical Essays in Two Volumes II*, Cambridge Mass., Harvard University Press, 1985, p. 33.
- ¹⁶*Ibid.*, VI, 22, 1.
- ¹⁷A. Μαυροκορδάτος, *Ιστορία Ιερά*, Bucharest, 1716, p. 11.
- ¹⁸Mihai Țîpău, *Domnii fanarioți în Țările Române (1711-1821)*, Bucharest, Omonia, 2008, p. 133.
- ¹⁹BAM, Amsterdam, tome XIV, 1720, p. 116. Cf. BAM, tome XIV, 1720, p. 114-131. And, *ibid.*, tome XV, 1721, p. 84-95.
- ²⁰*Acta Eruditorum*, Leipzig, 1720, p. 38.
- ²¹*Περί συνθέσεως ονομάτων*, VI, 20, 1 et VI, 23, 1.
- ²²Dan Râpă-Buicliu, *Bibliografia românească veche, Additamenta, 1536-1830*, Galați, Editura Alma, 2000, p. 232.
- ²³*Ibid.*, p. 234.
- ²⁴C. Th. Dimaras, Avant-propos, in Nicolas Mavrocordatos, *Les Loisirs de Philothée*, texte établi, traduit et commenté par Jacques Bouchard, Athènes-Montréal, Association pour l'étude des Lumières en Grèce - Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal, 1989, p. 9.
- ²⁵*Περί Καθηκόντων Βίβλος*, Leipzig, Thomas Fritsch, 1722, p. 89. L. Kamperidis translates: "La justice consiste non seulement à ne pas commettre l'injustice, mais aussi à ne pas la subir", Nicolas Mavrocordatos, *Traité des Devoirs*, Athens, Fondation culturelle de la Banque Nationale de Grèce, 2014, p. 115. Cf. Plato, *Gorgias*, 474b-c.
- ²⁶*Περί Ερμηνείας*, 9.
- ²⁷*Ibid.*, 10.
- ²⁸Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 3, 9. 1410b1.
- ²⁹*Περί Καθηκόντων Βίβλος*, *op.cit.*, p. 46.
- ³⁰BAM, 1720, p. 125.
- ³¹*Ibid.*, p. 126.
- ³²Μαγδαληνή Παρχαρίδου, Η γλώσσα του Οικουμενικού Πατριαρχείου, in *Ιστορία της Ελληνικής γλώσσας*, Αθήνα, Ελληνικό Λογοτεχνικό και Ιστορικό Αρχείο, 2000, σ. 208-209.
- ³³Ι. Μοισιόδαξ, *Απολογία*, επιμ. Άλκης Αγγέλου, Αθήνα, Ερμής, 1976, p. 3.
- ³⁴Μανόλης Α. Τριανταφυλλίδης, *Νεοελληνική Γραμματική, Ιστορική εισαγωγή*, Αθήνα, 1938, p. 322.
- ³⁵*Suntagmavtion Nomikovn Alexavndrou Iwavnnonu Uyhlavnth Boebovda hgemovno~ pavsh~ Ouggroblaciva~ 1780*, ekdidovmenon metæeisagwghv~ kai istorikhv~anaskophvsew~ tw n en utwv qesmwv n ed. Panagiotes I. Zepos, Athens, Académie d'Athènes, 1936. Cf. *Pravilniceasca condica', 1780*, ediție critica` Andrei Ra`dulescu, Bucharest, Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Romîne, 1957.
- ³⁶N. Iorga, *Istoria literaturii românești în sec. al XVIII-lea*, p. 275. Cf. Virgil Căndea, "Stilul", in Dimitrie Cantemir, *Divanul*, ed. Virgil Căndea, Bucharest, Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, p. 59-64.