Werk

Titel: Early European grammars of Ottoman Turkish in Greek translation: A Greek version ...

Autor: Kappler , Matthias

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 2001

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0005|LOG_0016

Early European grammars of Ottoman Turkish in Greek translation: A Greek version of Du Ryer's "Rudimenta Grammatices Linguae Turcicae" (1630)

Matthias Kappler

Kappler, Matthias 2001. Early European grammars of Ottoman Turkish in Greek translation: A Greek version of Du Ryer's "Rudimenta Grammatices Linguae Turcicae" (1630). *Turkic Languages* 5, 120-137.

The Athos manuscript 1299 contains two grammar sketches, both of them adaptations of European grammars of Turkish and earliest examples of Ottoman grammar activity in Modern Greek. After the edition of the first manuscript (a 1664 translation of Molino's "Rudimenti del parlar turchesco"), the present article is dedicated to the presentation of the second, unfortunately undated, example, a partial adaptation of Du Ryer's "Rudimenta" (Paris 1630). The manuscript is precious not only because it completes Du Ryer's grammar from a phonetic point of view, providing the Turkish data in Greek characters while the Latin original uses Arabic letters, but also because it provides interesting insight into the reception of grammar description in the still nearly unstudied field of Greco-Turkish linguistic tradition.

Matthias Kappler, University of Cyprus, Department of Turkish Studies, P.O. Box 20537, CY-1678 Nicosia, Cyprus. E-mail: mkappler@ucy.ac.cy

The most recent research in the Greek reception of 17th century Turkish grammars printed in Europe can be summarized in the following manner:

1. Two manuscripts of Turkish grammars written in Modern Greek are conserved in the Athos monastery of Megisti Lavra. One of them, entitled Σύντομοι κανόνες τῆς τῶν Τούρκων διαλέκτου and published in a recent contribution (Kappler 1999), appears to be the first dated (1664) translation of a Turkish grammar in Greek, namely of the *Rudimenti del parlar turchesco* by Giovanni Molino (printed in Rome in 1641 as an appendix to the second edition of Molino's *Dizionario della Lingua Italiana Turchesca*; cf. Adamović 1974).

2. Molino's grammar has further been copied (a) 1668 in an incomplete Hungarian version (not translation, the newer text being Italian as in the original, but the Turkish words and paradigms being transcribed according to Hungarian orthography), part of the well-known Illésházy manuscript (see Németh 1970; cf. Mollova 1997: 49, 54, apparently unaware that she is dealing with an adaptation and not an

original work) and (b) 1677 in another Italian printed work, the *Rudimenti gram-maticali per ben tradurre l'idioma Toscano in Turchesco*, part of the *Vocabolario toscano e turchesco* by Antonio Mascis (Drimba 1992).

A comparison of these copies with the Greek translation shows that the latter introduces a new element: while the Turkish data are regularly transcribed in Greek letters within the text of the grammar, there is an appendix (f. 153r-158v) containing a list of all quoted Ottoman words in Arabic script. While the Hungarian compiler has faithfully provided us with the pronunciation of his own Balkan Turkish dialect, the Greek translator seems to have had a more profound knowledge of literary Ottoman. Beyond the mentioned appendix with the forms in Arabic script in the Greek version, none of the adapters / translators adds passages or remarks of their own.

3. The Greek translation of Molino's grammar is all the more valuable since its author, date and place of compilation are known. It bears, indeed, a bilingual (Greek and Arabic) colophon which indicates a certain Papa Damaskinos, a monk perhaps of Syrian origin, the year 1074 Hidjra-1664 A.D., and Athens as the place of compilation (Kappler 1999: 273). Thus, the manuscript can be ascribed to the Athenian milieu of Theodore Korydaleus' new-Aristotelian school, founded in 1646, and where Damaskinos (whom we identify as the Ieromonachos Damaskinos of the Greek sources) was a renowned teacher.

The second manuscript kept in the Lavra monastery forms the subject of the present contribution.

The manuscript constitutes an anonymous undated compilation entitled Γραμ-ματική τουρκική, κανόνες ("Turkish grammar, rules"), and has been conserved together with Damaskinos' Σύντομοι κανόνες in the same fascicle no. 1299 of the Athos Greek manuscripts, of which it forms leaves 160r-165v. It is written in quite a homogeneous hand, each paragraph being marked with a majuscule. The handwriting is very different from Damaskinos', and we do not know whether the compilation has any historical connection to the Athenian environment of that period (recall that the Σύντομοι κανόνες are dated 1664), although we suppose that the translation dates back to the second or last third of the 17th century, perhaps even being the earliest example of Greco-Ottoman grammatical activity. A detailed examination of the paper and the handwriting could lead to more validated findings, but unfortunately we only had the chance to see the manuscript on microfilm (which can be viewed in the Patriarchal Institute for Patristic Studies in Thessaloniki*).

As in the case of the twin manuscript (and of Illésházy, too), the unknown author does not mention the original source which he translated / adapted; at first sight it might appear to be an original text. At a closer glance, however, it turns out to be a partial translation of the *Rudimenta grammatices linguae turcicae* written by André Du Ryer (which, in spite of the name, has no immediate relationship with Molino's

Rudimenti mentioned above), printed in Paris in 1630, and followed by a second edition in 1633.

André Du Ryer-Malezair was a French consul in Egypt until 1629 (see Kalus 1992: 83 and frontispiece of *Rudimenta* : "... Andreae Du Ryer Marciniacensi Pro Christianissimo Rege et eius Nationibus in Aegypto Exconsule"). His grammar was printed by Antoine Vitray and represents the first printed Turkish grammar in France (apart from the very first sketch of a description of Turkish, the *Instruction des mots de la langue turquesque les plus communs*, Paris 1575, by Guillaume Postel, see Kalus 1992: 82), though not in Europe, which is Hieronymus Megiser's *Institutionum linguae turcicae libri IV* (Lipsia 1612). The aim of the publication appears to be to provide missionaries in the East with the necessary linguistic knowledge, as apparent in the "privilège du Roi" in the second edition (p. [VII]): "à la charge qu'ils imprimeroient les Nouveaux Testaments, les Catechismes et les Grammaires des Langues Orientales: et en donneroient gratuitement certain nombre, qui sera envoyé aux Missionaires d'Orient, pour les distribuer à ceux qu'ils désireroient instruire en la verité de nostre Religion".

Unlike the other 17th century European grammarians, Du Ryer chooses to give his Turkish examples and paradigms in Arabic script, though wholly vocalized and therefore informative at least concerning the labial vocalism. The grammar is nonetheless judged "of lesser value" by some scholars (see the observations in Kenessey 1974: 122, which regard some passages of Du Ryer's grammar copied by F. M. Maggio in his *Syntagmaton linguarum orientalium* [Rome 1643]). Turning back to our case, the Greek adapter, except for a few cases concerning single characters or suffixes, transcribes the Turkish text into the Greek alphabet, probably according to his own speech, which makes the translation a valuable completion to the original.

As pointed out above, the Greek manuscript (henceforward called GRAMMATIKI) is not a complete translation of Du Ryer's work (henceforward RUDIMENTA; for the present contribution a copy of the second edition [1633], conserved at St. Mark's Library in Venice, was consulted). The following overview of the contents may serve to illustrate this:

RUDIMENTA	p.	GRAMMATIKI	f.
Turcicum Alphabetum	2	----	
Caput Primum (De Pronunciatione Litterarum, earumque Figuris)	8	----	
Caput II (De Vocalibus)	9	----	
Caput III (De Nomine eiusque accidentibus)	11	Εἰς τά ὀνόματα...	160r
Caput IV (De Pronomine)	20	Αἱ πρωτότυπαι ἀντωνυμίαι...	161r
Caput V (De Verbo et Formatione Modorum, Temporum ac Personarum)	29	Περί ρήματος	162r
Caput VI (Coniugatio verbi)	35	Συζυγία τῶν ρημάτων	163r
Caput VII	46	Περί τοῦ σχηματισμοῦ τῶν	164v

(De Formatione Passivorum)		παθητικῶν	
Caput VIII (De variis verborum classibus)	47	Περί τῶν πολλῶν ἐγκλίσεων τῶν διαφόρων ρημάτων	165r
Caput IX (De Verbis negativis)	51	Περί τῶν ἀρνητικων ρημάτων	165v
Caput X (De Coniugatione verbi substantivi *sum*)	60	----	
Caput XI (De verbo substantivo Negationis)	68	----	
Caput XII (De Syntaxi Linguae Turcicae)	78	----	
Caput XIII (De Particulis Orationis)	83	----	
De Numerorum	89	----	
Exercitatio Lectionis Linguae Turcicae	94	----	

Thus, GRAMMATIKI ends at RUDIMENTA's p. 55, after the paradigm "Futurum Indicativi *Non amabo*". Whether it remained uncompleted or whether the other leaves have been lost cannot be told for certain. Therefore, the conjugation paradigms of chapter X and XI and Du Ryer's observations about syntax (more properly a chapter about morphosyntax, such as verb government, genitival constructions / izafet groups and, in chapter XIII, about postpositions [p. 84: "Praepositiones postponuntur Nomini aut Verbo cum quo iunguntur"]) remain outside the range of our Greek adaptation.

Within the single sections of the grammar, the Greek translator decided not to take over the whole original text. Thus, for instance, the tables in RUDIMENTA (chapter III, IV, VI, IX) with complete paradigms in all cases / persons are not quoted in GRAMMATIKI, where we find only some selected examples for each paradigm. Also a lot of other examples are omitted in GRAMMATIKI; generally speaking, we find for every discussed occurrence just one or two examples, whereas RUDIMENTA might present more Turkish material, as if the Greek translator aimed to supply just an abridged version of the original text.

In a few instances, examples in GRAMMATIKI differ from those to be found in RUDIMENTA. This is the case when the noun derivational suffix {lI} is discussed (RUDIMENTA 15, GRAMMATIKI 160v). In the Latin original we find the words *odun* 'lignum' – *odunlu* 'ligneus', *gök* 'coelum' – *göklü* 'coelestis', *zînet* 'ornamentum' – *zînetlü* 'ornatus', *taš* 'saxum' – *tašlu* 'saxeus'; the Greek version adopts only the first two examples, but one of them with a different suffix (ὀντοῦν 'ξύλον' – ὀντουν- λοῦκ 'ξύλινον', γγιόκ 'οὐρανός' – γγιοκλοῦ 'τό οὐράνιον') adding the example σοῦ 'τό νερόν' – σουλί 'τό νερουλόν'. The interesting feature of the present case is that Du Ryer's examples *odunlu* and *göklü* are not attested in Ottoman sources (*göklü* can be considered a phantom word which also entered Molino's grammar and its versions; see Adamović 1974: 43, 61; Németh 1970: 44; Kappler 1999: 288); in fact, the Greek translator changes *odunlu* into the more familiar *odunluk* (although the suffix {lIk} is discussed elsewhere); he adopts **göklü*, but adds *suli* (> *sulu*), not necessarily a new addition, since the example might appear in the first edition of

Du Ryer's grammar, which was not available to us. But if we compare GRAMMATIKI with the other Greek Athos manuscript (henceforward KANONES) and with Molino's grammar, we find the same example σοῦ 'τὸ ὕδωρ' – σουλοὺ 'τὸ ὑδατῶδες' (KANONES 144r) and sù 'acqua' – suli 'acquato' (cf. Adamović 1974: 61; also in Illésházy, see Németh 1970: 44) respectively. The example shows that, even when GRAMMATIKI presents different lexemes from those found in RUDIMENTA, they still belong within the same tradition of the European (and thus Latin / Ancient Greek) linguistic system (the most typical evidence of this being, obviously, the lexeme used in all verbal paradigms, which must and cannot be anything other than sev- 'amare'). It has to be stated at this point that, generally speaking, all grammars from the 17th century since Megiser's (1612) have more or less the same formal structure and are very similar as far as paradigms, examples and terminology are concerned, due to the (sometimes explicitly stated, sometimes not even mentioned) reliance of the later grammars on the previous ones. The further question of how the model of the Latin / Greek system determined the description of Ottoman Turkish in these early grammars is certainly a topic worthy of thorough investigation in a more theoretical context (cf. the study of the application of the Arabic linguistic model to the description of Turkic in Ermers 1999).

The aim of the following paragraphs is to present the most striking features of the Modern Greek translation compared with its Latin original in the fields of graphematics, phonetics and morphonology.

Graphematics

The phonetic notation is not unusual for 17th and 18th century Turkish texts in Greek script. Thus, no auxiliary signs or diacritic points are used, and some phonemes, such as /b/ or /g/, are transcribed by compound graphemes, according to the corresponding signs used in the orthography of Modern Greek. Such cases are:

/b/   <μπ>.
/g/   <γγ>; palatal g' is noted by <γγι>, as in f. 160r γγιουζέλ güzel.
/d/   <ντ> and <νδ>, fluctuating (e.g. f. 165r σεβντουρμέκ sevdurmek – σεβνδουροῦμ sevdurum); rarely <δ> (e.g. f. 164r σεβδοῦκ sevduk); to make clear the difference between /d/ and /t/, the latter is once noted by <ττ> (f. 162v ἀτζιττεί açtı versus ἀτζινδεί açdı), but in one case it seems to mean exactly the opposite, namely <ττ> for /d/: γγεττήσσ gediş (164v).

Compound graphemes for phonemes not existing in the phonematic system of standard Greek are:

/č/   <τζι> (e.g. f. 165r ἰτζιμέκ içmek, 162v ἀτζιμάκ açmak, 160v ἐκμεκτζί ekmekçi).
/j/   <γγ> (e.g. f. 164r σεβεγγέκ sevecek, 164v σεβιγγῆ sevici), <ντζ(ι)> (e.g. 160v εὐντζίκ evcik).
/ş/   <σσ>.

/ŋ/   <γγ>; rarely (at the beginning of the manuscript, ff. 160-161) <νγ>.

No distinction is made between /o/ – /ö/ and /u/ – /ü/, both noted as <o> and <ου> respectively.

It would be incorrect to suppose that the Greek translator distinguishes between /i/ and /ı/, both transcribed with either <ι> or <η> (or <ει>, see below; also <υ> in the last syllable of the possessive suffix of the 3rd person singular), though one could assume an attempt to express palatal-velar variation in cases such as ἀλλαχλήκ *Allahlık* – ἐρλίκ *erlik* (160v). Moreover, there is one instance (ἀλενμάκ *alınmak*, 165v) of rendering /ı/ as a semi-closed vowel (here graphically <ε>), as can be found frequently in European Turkish texts in Latin script (see Stein 1979: 60). It should be noted, however, that the corresponding example in Arabic script, as Du Ryer entered it into his RUDIMENTA (p. 51), has *alenmaq* with the same vocalization (*fetha* over *lâm*). Interestingly enough, there is also an instance of the same notation in palatal surroundings: RUDIMENTA 50 *sevenmeq* (sic; Du Ryer always writes infinitives with *qaf*, even after palatal syllables) – GRAMMATIKI 165r σεβενμέκ.

There are two occurrences for <ει>, once in the word *kim* (κειμλέρ, χέρ κείμ, χερκειμείγγ, f. 162r, but also κίμ in the same paragraph), and once in the past tense marker {DI} (ἀτζιττεί *açtı* and ἀτζινδεί *açdı*, f. 162v). It is interesting that *kim* appears always as <κειμ> in the twin manuscript, too (KANONES 145r, see Kappler 1999: 277-278), although no explanation for this use can be provided for the time being. The case of the {DI}-suffix, however, can be explained by the Greek infinitive aorist form in -ει, used for the formation of the past perfect in Modern Greek. This phenomenon is quite frequent in "Karamanlı" prints of the 18th century, namely those edited by Serafeim (see Kappler forthcoming: footnote 38).

A systematical comparison of the transcription with RUDIMENTA cannot be drawn because of the Arabic writing in the latter. However, some of the graphical choices made in GRAMMATIKI correspond to the European tradition, such as the use of <γγ> for /j/, influenced by the Italian orthography. Strangely enough, GRAMMATIKI adopts Greek graphical patterns, just where RUDIMENTA uses, in one of its few entries in Latin script, <g>, i.e. *gic* (for the diminutive suffix, RUDIMENTA 17) – ντζίκ (GRAMMATIKI 160v), whereas in most of the other cases we find <γγ>, as pointed out above.

Compared with the notation in the twin manuscript KANONES, we can state that GRAMMATIKI is a little more precise: only two variants for /ŋ/, compared to four in KANONES (Kappler 1999: 289); a strict distinction between /s/ and /ş/, no use of <τ> for /d/ (except once ζείτουντέν – *zeydunden* [160v], but then again ζείντουνοῦνγ ἀτύ – *zeidunuŋ atı* [161v]), although there are other fluctuations concerning /d/ (see above). On the other hand, both grammars share general features such as the use of compound graphemes (<μπ>, <ντ>, <γγ>) and the parallel application of <γγ> and <τζ(ι)> for /j/. A shortcoming of both grammars is consequently the threefold use of <γγ>, which can be read as /g/, /j/ or /ŋ/.

Accents are regularly set, as stress markers in polysyllabic words, but also in monosyllabic entries, according to the Greek orthography of the time. Usually we find acute and grave markers (not always discernible in handwriting, therefore our examples are always given with acute markers); only in last syllables containing the vowel /u/ do we have circumflex (<oῦ>), with but a few exceptions. Like in KANONES, there are occurrences of primary and secondary stress, such as σεβμίσσιν-δοῦμ – *sevmişidùm* (f. 163v). As has been pointed out for the Turkish grammar of Thomas Vaughan (published in 1709, see Gilson 1987: 21, 29), accents (as stress markers, or, in the case of monosyllabic words, perhaps length markers) can be found in European grammars, too. An influence of Greek prototypes has been supposed (Gilson 1987: 23) although no evidence was provided. It should, however, be kept in mind that the setting of stress markers can easily be derived from the Italian tradition, too (cf. the extended accent system in Argenti's *Regola del parlare turco* [1533], see Bombaci 1938: 65-66). Moreover, whether the Oriental Greek manuscripts (since no printed books are known for that time) were spread about Europe and whether they came into Western hands is hard to say, but, as far as our Greek grammars are concerned, rather improbable (the only Greco-Turkish text known for certain in European circles is Gennadios' confession of faith, published in Tübingen by Martinus Crusius in 1584). Be that as it may, the fact remains that these two early texts, at least theoretically, might have served as sources for the compilation of other grammars.

Phonetics and morphonology

Due to the scarce lexical material contained in our grammar, a comprehensive analysis of phonetic changes cannot be carried out. Presumable phonetic phenomena can often be interpreted as graphical, too. Thus, σεβισσιλέρ *sevişiler* (GRAMMATIKI 165r) versus *sevişirler* (RUDIMENTA 50) can be interpreted as loss of *r*, very frequent in Istanbul pronunciation (see Bergsträsser 1918: 251), but also in Rumelian and Anatolian dialects (see Caferoğlu 1959: 249), although it could simply reflect a graphical error. A change *ö > ü* can be assumed in the entry οὐκουνμέκ *üyünmek* (GRAMMATIKI 165r; the Arabic script in RUDIMENTA does not allow an unequivocal reading). In another case, RUDIMENTA 16 *etmek* 'panis' corresponds to GRAMMATIKI 160v ἐκμέκ 'ψωμί', the latter thus choosing a more colloquial form (cf. Redhouse 1890: 23 "*etmek*, vulg. *ekmek*"), a tendency in GRAMMATIKI of which we will see more evidence below.

Much more material is provided in the field of morphonology, thanks to the relatively wide range of grammatical patterns and suffix variation.

/ŋ/

Concerning the phoneme /ŋ/, a very interesting point emerges from the second paragraph of GRAMMATIKI (f. 160r): in one of the rare cases that the paradigms in the Greek text differ from those in the Latin original, we read genitive forms in *-n* (μπεηνούν, μπεηλερούν – *beynun, beylerun*), while RUDIMENTA 13 (where *adem* is

chosen as an example) reports *ademuŋ, ademleruŋ*. From the following paragraph onwards, GRAMMATIKI adopts /ŋ/ in all genitive forms, according to Du Ryer's grammar (cf. RUDIMENTA 15 *beynuŋ*, GRAMMATIKI 160r μπεηνούνγ; but there is still one instance of /n/ in the sentence ζείτουνοῦν σεβδικτένσογγρα (sic) – *zeidunun sevdikten soŋra* [164r], versus RUDIMENTA 44 *zeydunuŋ sevdiginden şoŋra*). A conclusion which could be drawn is that the Greek translator already used in his speech, or knew from the speech familiar to him, the more progressive /n/ instead of older /ŋ/, but he applies such variants only in cases where the original text is not followed as faithfully as usual.

{lAr}

Palatal-velar assimilation is particularly interesting when we have the chance to compare a text in Arabic script with a complementary one in Greek (or Latin) script. In our text, the plural marker {lAr}, written throughout <lr> with *fetha*-vocalization in RUDIMENTA, shows up as <λερ> – *ler* after velar stems in the Greek version: ἀνλέρ – *anler*, μπουνλέρ – *bunler* (161r), κουλλεροῦμ, κουλλεριμούζ – *kullerum, kullerimuz* (161r), ἀτλεριγγίζ – *atleriŋiz*, ἀτλερί – *atleri* (161v), ἀτλέρ – *atler*, ἀτλεροῦμ – *atlerum*, ἀτλερουμοῦγγ – *atlerumuŋ*, ἀτλερουμέ – *atlerume*, ἀτλερουμί – *atlerumi*, ἀτλερουμντέν – *atlerumden* (162r). Unfortunately, we have no entries with verbal forms (Rumelian and Eastern Black Sea dialects as well as "transcription texts" show nominal plural forms harmonized, while verbal forms appear only in palatal variants; see Johanson 1981). Our data with palatalized plural markers correspond to most of the other grammars and word lists of the 16th and 17th centuries (Molino, see Adamović 1974: 42-43; Lubenau, see Adamović 1977: 27; Vaughan, see Gilson 1987: 83-84), as well as to texts in Greek writing (Gennadios' confession, see Halasi-Kun 1992: 56-60; "Karamanlı" texts, see Eckmann 1950: 182) and are certainly not due to dialectal variation, but rather to the tradition of learned pronunciation, a well-known effect of the usual palatalization of palatal-velar suffixes in loanwords.

{DAn}, {(y)A}

Very few occurrences of the ablative and dative markers impede a thorough discussion of these suffixes. It is, however, noteworthy that {DAn} appears, unlike the plural marker, in both velar and palatal variants: μπαλντάν – *baldan*, ζείτουντέν – *zeydunden* (160v), ἀτουμντέν – *atumden*, ἀτλερουμντέν – *atlerumden* (162r), ἀντέν – *anden* (161r). There is but one occurrence of {(y)A} after velar stem: μπαμ-παγέ – *babaye* (160r). This coincides with some data available from 15th to 17th century texts (cf. Hazai 1973: 383, Halasi-Kun 1992: 52).

Labial harmony in possessive markers
1st person:
   The author of the original grammar (i.e., Du Ryer) is aware of the difference between illabial and labial forms, although he does not explain where the respective

form has to be used: "sonatque in Singulari ut *em* aut *um*, et in Plurali ut *miz* vel *muz*" (RUDIMENTA 21; cf. GRAMMATIKI 161r: "κάμνει ὡσάν ἔμ ἤ οὖμ εἰς τό ἐνικόν, καί ὡσάν μίζ ἤ μοῦζ εἰς τό πληθυντικόν" – 'It makes *em* or *um* in the singular, and *miz* or *muz* in the plural').

In the corresponding examples of GRAMMATIKI, fluctuation can be observed between labial and illabial forms after illabial stems: εὐίμ – *evim* (161r), ἀτοῦμ – *atum* (161v); after plural suffix always labial: εὐλερούμ – *evlerum*, κουλλερούμ – *kullerum* (161r), ἀτλερούμ – *atlerum* (162r). Declined forms with vowel elision: εὐμοῦγγ – *evmuŋ*, εὐμέ – *evme*, εὐμί – *evmi* (161v), ἀτμέ – *atme*, ἀτμί – *atmi* (162r), but: ἀτουμούγγ – *atumuŋ* (161v; RUDIMENTA 24 *atmuŋ*). Vowel elision as well in one plural form: εὐμέζ – *evmez* (161r; RUDIMENTA 20 *evmiz*); the others are labial forms: κουλουμούζ – *kulumuz*, εὐλερουμούζ – *evlerumuz* (161r; RUDIMENTA 20 *evlermiz*); interesting is one diachronically intermediate form: κουλλεριμούζ – *kullerimuz* (161r; RUDIMENTA 21 *qullermuz*).

2nd person:
Du Ryer only explains the labial variant, and so does the Greek translator; the following vocalized forms in the Greek version, however, show both illabial and labial suffixes: "Secundae personae Possessivum formatur addita fini eius littera *kef agemi*, ..., et sonat ut *ung*" (Rudimenta 21; cf. GRAMMATIKI 161r-v: "Τοῦ δευτέρου προσώπου τό κτητικόν γίνεται μέ τό η [in Arabic script] ἀτζεμί καλούμενον, εἰς τό τέλος, καί μιλεῖ ὡσάν οὖνγ" – "The possessive of the second person is formed by the *ŋ acemi* at the end, and is pronounced as *uŋ*"). The subsequent forms in GRAMMATIKI 161v are: εὐίγ – *eviŋ*, ἀτοῦνγ – *atuŋ*. As corresponding plural forms the following are given: εὐεγγίζ – *eveŋiz*, εὐλεριγγίζ – *evleriŋiz*, ἀτιγγίζ – *atiŋiz*, ἀτλεριγγίζ – *atleriŋiz* (161v).

3rd person:
No peculiarity can be noted, except the curious notation *-ύ* in the Greek version (εὐύ – *evi*, ἀτύ – *ati*; 161v). The forms after stems ending in vowels show the "regular" notation *-σί* (χαζνεσί – *haznesi*, μπαμπασί – *babası*, ταγγρησί – *taŋrısı*; 161v).

Labial harmony in personal markers

Personal suffixes attached to verbs are introduced in RUDIMENTA's chapter V ("De Verbo...", p. 29); for the aorist both labial and illabial forms are considered to be added to all stems: "Itaque modi Indicativi tempus praesens ab Infinitivo effluit, relicta syllaba *meq* et assumpta syllaba *rem* aut *rum* ut *sevmeq* id est 'amare', *severem* 'amo', vel *severum*, quod idem est." (p. 30; cf. GRAMMATIKI 162v: "Τοιουτοτρόπως ὁ χρόνος ὁ ἐνεστώς τοῦ ὁριστικοῦ γίνεται ἀπό τό ἀπαρέμφατον, ἀφίνοντας μέκ καί προσθέτοντας ρέμ ἤ ροῦμ, ὡσάν σεβμέκ, νά ἀγαπήση, σεβέρεμ ἤ σεβέρουμ, ἀγαπώ." – "In the same way, the present tense indicative is made from the infinitive, leaving aside *mek* and adding *rem* or *rum*, such as *sevmek* 'to love', *severem* or *severum* 'I love'"). The vocalization in GRAMMATIKI is always labial in the following few occurrences, partially influenced

by preceding suffixes: σεβέρουμ – *severum* (163r), σεβιλούρουμ – *sevilurum* (164v), σεβνδουρούμ – *sevdurum* (165r). Whether the actual form has to be considered velar or palatal (*severüm, sevilürüm, sevdürüm*) cannot be told for certain. The other personal markers in the paradigm are illabial (σεβερίζ – *severiz*, σεβέρσιζ / σεβέρσιγζ – *seversiz / seversiŋ(i)z* (163v), but there are no entries with labial stem. The data correspond to the Latin original, being the paradigm for the aorist ("Indicativi Praesens") in RUDIMENTA (p. 35): *severum, seversen, sever, severiz, seversiz, severler*. Cf. also Meninski's Grammatica Turcica (Vienna 1680), p. 72 ("*sewerim*, vel *sewerem*, vel communiter *sewerüm*"), apparently relying on Megiser (1612; see Stein 1993: 178).

{DI}

The *di*-past marker is always labial in the first person, and illabial in the third person. These are the examples after illabial syllables: σεβέρντουμ (162v), σεβέρνδουμ (163v) – *severdum* (or: *severdüm*; the palatal reading could also be supposed for all the following forms); σεβέρντουκ – *severduk* (162v); σεβμέζ[δ]ουμ, σεβμεζδούκ – *sevmezdum, sevmezduk* (165v); σεβντοῦμ (162v), σεβνδοῦμ, σεβνδούκ (163v) – *sevdum, sevduk*; σεβηλντοῦμ – *sevildum* (164v); σέβμενδουμ, σέβμενδουκ – *sevmedum, sevmeduk* (165v); σεβμίσσ ὀλάηνδοῦμ – *sevmiş olaydum* (164v), σεβμίσσινδοῦμ (163r), σεβμίσσινδοῦμ (163v) – *sevmiş idum*, σεβμίσσινδούκ – *sevmiş iduk*; σεβέηνδουμ, σεβέηνδουκ – *seveydum, seveyduk* (164r); σεβσέηνδουμ, σεβσέηνδουκ – *sevseydum, sevseyduk* (164r). Third person: σεβμίσσ ὀλάηνδι – *sevmiş olaydı* (164v), αντζιττεί – *açtı* (162v). No data are given for other persons. The paradigm of the "Praeteritum Perfectum" in RUDIMENTA (p. 37) is: *sevdum, sevdiŋ, sevdi, sevduk, sevdiŋz, sevdiler*, i.e. like GRAMMATIKI with labial forms only in the first persons. The same data emerge from other 17th century grammars (see e.g. Meninski's *Grammatica Turcica* Vienna 1680, pp. 73, 74, 75, 77).

{DIK}

The *di*-past first person plural form is further on confused with the *dik*-participle: σεβδοῦκ, ἀγαπήσαμεν ἢ πρᾶγμα ἀγαπημένον ἢ καί φιλία ("*sevduk*, 'we loved', or 'beloved thing' or 'love'"; 164r). The confusion results from a modification of the Greek translator, whose knowledge of Turkish seems to overlap that of Latin: in fact, RUDIMENTA 43 notes "*sevduk*, 'amavisse' aut 'res amata', et 'amicitia'", and in the following examples quotes the suffix only in the illabial form (*sevdikden şoŋra* [p. 43], *sevdikden evvel* [44], *zeydunuŋ sevdiginden şoŋra* [44]), while GRAMMATIKI fluctuates between the two variations: σευδουκτένσογγρα, σευδουκτέν ἐβέλ, ζείντουνοῦν σεβδικτέν σογγρα – *sevdukten soŋra, sevdukten evel, zeidunun sevdikten soŋra* (164r). The labialization is therefore to be considered an effect of the supposed analogy with the *di*-past form.

Morphology

1. Finite forms

As pointed out above, the full verbal paradigms in the Latin original have been abridged in the Greek version. Usually, only the first person (singular and plural) are noted in GRAMMATIKI. The paradigm is the verb *sev-* 'amare', as prescribes the Greek-Latin grammar tradition. The individual forms and the respective denomination of tense / mood in GRAMMATIKI (Chapter Συζυγία τῶν ρημάτων, ff. 163r-164r) with the corresponding Latin terminology in RUDIMENTA (Chapter VI "Coniugatio verbi", pp. 36-46) are as follows:

aorist
Terms: GRAMMATIKI – RUDIMENTA: ὁριστικός ἐνεστώς (f. 163r) –
Indicativi Praesens (p. 35)
Text: μπέν σεβέρουμ ἐγώ ἀγαπώ. μπίζ σεβερίζ ἡμεῖς ἀγαποῦμεν. Παραγγέλω σου ὅτι να μήν τελειώσῃς. Τό δεύτερον πρόσωπον τοῦ πληθυντικοῦ μονάχα μέ σίζ ἀλλά καί μέ σουγγοῦζ ἤ σίζ, μέ τό ὀτροῦ ἤ μέ τό ἐστρέ, καί νά εἰπῇ σεβέρσιγζ ἤ σεβέρσιζ ἐσεῖς ἀγαπᾶτε.
Transcription and translation: "ben sevérum *I love*. biz severíz *we love*. I order you not to stop. The second person plural [not] only with siz but also with suŋúz or siz, with *ötrü* [Arabic vowel sign for labial vowels] or with *esre* [vowel sign for *i* and *ı*], and so to say sevérsiŋz or sevérsiz *you love*."
Forms mentioned: severum, severiz, seversiŋz, seversiz.
RUDIMENTA: severum, seversen, sever, severiz, seversiz, severler.

aorist + -*DI* (imperfect)
παρατατικός (163v) – Praeteritum Imperfectum (36)
ἀγάπουνα, σεβέρνδουμ, εἰς τό πλ. σεβέρντουκ ἤ σεβερλέρντουκ, ἡμεῖς ἀγαπούσαμεν.
"*I loved*, sevérdum, in the plural sevérduk or severlérduk, *we loved*."
severdum, severduk, *severlerduk.

The latter phantom form is present in Molino's grammar and KANONES, too; see Adamović 1974: 48, Kappler 1999: 278. The forms in RUDIMENTA: "severdum, severdiŋ, severdi, severduk et severlerduk, severdiŋiz et severlerdiŋiz, severdiler, severlermiş [sic], severlerdi".

-*DI*-past (*di*-perfect)
παρακείμενος (163v) – Praeteritum Perfectum (37)
σεβνδοῦμ, ἠγάπηκα. Εἰς τό πληθυντικόν σεβνδούκ, ἠγαπήκαμεν.
"sevdúm, *I've loved*. In the plural sevdúk, *we've loved*".
sevdum, sevduk.

For the forms in RUDIMENTA see the paragraph above about the suffix {DI}.

-miş + idi (pluperfect)

ὑπερσυντέλικος (163v) – Praeteritum Plusquam perfectum (38)

σεβμίσσινδοῦμ, ἐγώ εἶχα ἀγαπήσει, εἰς τό πληθυντικόν σεβμίσσινδούκ, εἴχαμε ἀγαπήσει.

"sevmíş idùm, *I had loved*, in the plural sevmíş idùk, *we had loved*".

sevmiş idum, sevmiş iduk.

RUDIMENTA: sevmiş idum, sevmiş idiŋ, sevmiş idi, sevmiş iduk, sevmiş idiŋiz, sevmiş idiler.

It is remarkable that the twin manuscript KANONES calls this tense "aorist" (ἀόριστος), although Molino's original shows the traditional term "Preterito plusquam perfetto" (see Kappler 1999: 286).

volitive and aorist = "future"

μέλλων τοῦ ὀριστικοῦ (163v) – Futurum Indicativi (38-39)

σεβμεγίμ [recte: σεβεγίμ], ἐγώ θέλω ἀγαπήσει. Εἰς τό πληθυντικόν σεβέριζ, θέλωμεν ἀγαπήσει.

"sevmeyím [recte: seveyím], *I shall love*. In the plural sevériz, *we shall love*".

seveyim, severiz.

RUDIMENTA also has the volitive in the first person singular, and the aorist in all remaining persons: seveyim, seversin, sever, severiz, severseŋuz, severler. The mixed paradigm in the "future" can be found in the other related grammars, too; for Molino see Adamović 1974: 49, for KANONES see Kappler 1999: 279, 287; in RUDIMENTA the second person plural is vocalized *severseŋuz*, which seems to be a conditional form; it is interesting that Molino uses an analogous form: *severseŋiz* (Adamović 1974: 49), a possible indication that Molino consulted Du Ryer's grammar.

imperative

προστακτικόν (163v) – Imperativus modus (39)

σεβσέν, ἀγάπησον σύ, εἰς τό πλ. σεβρούμ [recte: σεβλούμ?] μπίζ, ἀς ἀγαπήσωμεν ἡμεῖς. Κάποιαις βολλαῖς βάλουν γήλ, ὡσάν σεύγηλ, ἀγάπα σύ, τοῦτ πιάσε, τοῦτγήλ πιάσε σύ.

"sev sén, *love thou!*, in the plural sevrúm [recte: sevlum ~ sevelum?] biz, *let's love*. Sometimes they put gil, such as sévgil, *love thou!*, tut *take!*, tútgìl, *take thou!*".

sev, sevelum (probably, since RUDIMENTA has *sevelum*), sevgil, tutgil.

The second person plural is lacking, as well as the third person; RUDIMENTA lists the full paradigm: sev sen, sevsün ol, sevelum [volitive], seveŋ siz, anler sevsünler.

optative and volitive = "imperative future"

μέλλων τοῦ προστακτικοῦ (163v) – Futurum Imperativi (40)

σεβέ σέν, ἀγάπησε, εἰς τό πληθυντικόν, σεβελοῦμ, ἀς ἀγαπήσωμεν.

"sevé sen, *love!*, in the plural sevelúm, *let's love*".
sevesen, sevelum.

Sevesen / seve sen is to be found in Molino and KANONES, too (Adamović 1974: 50, Kappler 1999: 279, 286), and can be read as an optative form *sevesin*, while Adamović ibidem interprets the form as "*sev* + exclamation *e!*" (and, in the case of *oquya sen* as "*oqu* + exclamation *ya!*"). The optative reading is certainly preferable, since RUDIMENTA (as well as Molino / KANONES) lists optative forms in all second and third persons; cf. RUDIMENTA: sevesen, ol seve, sevelum, sevesiz, seveler; Molino: seveh sen, ol seveh, sevehlum, sevehsijz, sevehler, the *-h-* being evidently graphical, quoted in KANONES with σεβέχσὲν. It is interesting again how the apparently unrelated grammars show the same forms, due to the same tradition. Likewise, the adaptation of an irrelevant mood (imperative future) for the description of Turkish may serve as an example of the rigid application of the Latin grammatical tradition.

> optative
> εὐκτικός (163v) – Optativus (40-41)
> Εἰς τό εὐκτικόν λέγεται ὀμπροστά μπολάηκι ἄμποτε... σεβέμ, νά ἤθελα ἀγαπήσῃ, εἰς τό πλ. σεβέηζ νά ἠθέλαμεν ἀγαπήσῃ.
> "In the optative they put 'boláiki' before it, *may it be that*, sevém, [*may it be that*] *I loved*, in the plural sevéiz, [*may it be that*] *we loved*".
> (bolaiki) sevem, seveiz.

Bolaiki and similar forms (< bola[y] ki) are usually mentioned in European grammars to mark the "optative": for Molino see Adamović (1974: 51) (bulaiki), for Vaughan see Gilson (1987: 118) (bulaiky), for the grammar of Giovanni Agop (*Rudimento della lingua turchesca*, Venezia 1685; brief presentation in Drimba 1997) see p. 17 in the copy at St. Mark's Library ("optativo presente: bulaki olam ..."), for Meninski's *Grammatica Turcica* (Vienna 1680) see on p. 75 ("Optativo autem praeponi solent particulae *ki* ut, ..., *bulajki, bolajki* utinam ..."). Unlike GRAMMATIKI, the Greek translator of KANONES quotes Molino's *u*-form (μπουλάικη, KANONES 146v, 151r, see Kappler 1999: 279, 285). The full paradigm in RUDIMENTA: sevem, sevesin, seve, seveyiz, sevesiz, seveler.

> optative + *idi*
> παρακείμενος τοῦ εὐκτικοῦ (163v-164r) – Praeteritum Perfectum Optativi (41)
> σεβέηνδουμ, μακάρι νά εἶχα ἀγαπήσῃ, εἰς τό πληθυντικόν, σεβέηνδουκ, μακάρι ἠθέλαμεν ἀγαπήσῃ.
> "sevéydum, *would that I had loved*, in the plural sevéyduk, *would that we had loved*".
> seveydum, seveyduk.
> RUDIMENTA: seveydum, seveydiŋ, seveydi, seveyduk, seveydiŋiz, seveydiler.
> conditional and optative = "subjunctive"

ὑποτακτική (164r) – Subiunctivus (41-42)
Εἰς τήν ἔγκλισιν τήν ὑποτακτικήν βάλεται ὀμπροστά ἔγγερ δηλονότι ἀνίσως. σεβσέμ, ἀγαπήσω ἤτοι ἀνίσως ἀγαπήσει. Εἰς τόν πληθυντικόν, ἔγερ σεβέηζ, ἀνίσως καί ἀγαπήσωμεν.
"In the subjunctive mood they put 'éger' before it, which means *if*, sevsém, *I loved*, i.e. *if I loved*. In the plural éger sevéiz, *if we loved*".
sevsem, seveiz.

The plural form is again an optative, as well as in RUDIMENTA: sevsem, severseŋ et sevseŋ, severse et sevse, seveyiz, sevseŋiz, severlerse. The promiscuous use of optative and conditional ("subjunctive") corresponds to the theoretical explanation in RUDIMENTA 43: "Notabis tamen apud Turcas Optativum et Subiunctivum saepe usurpari in eadem significatione indifferenter ac promiscue"; in the Greek version (GRAMMATIKI 164r): "Πλήν ἤξευρε ἀκόμη ὅτι πολλάκις δουλεύονται ἀπό τό εὐκτικόν διά ὑποτακτικόν, καί ἀπό ὑποτακτικόν διά τό εὐκτικόν" (translation of the Latin version:) "Also take notice of the fact that the Turks often use optative and subjunctive in the same meaning indifferently and promiscuously".

conditional + *idi*
παρακείμενον [τῆς ὑποτακτικῆς] (164r) – Praeteritum perfectum Subiunctivi (42)
Εἰς τό παρακείμενον σεβσέηνδουμ, ἄν εἶχα ἀγαπήσῃ, εἰς τό πληθυντικόν σεβσέηνδουκ, ἄν εἴχαμε ἀγαπήσῃ.
"In the perfect tense sevséydum, *if I had loved*, in the plural sevséyduk, *if we had loved*".
sevseydum, sevseyduk.
RUDIMENTA: sevseydum, sevseydiŋ, sevseydi, sevseyduk, sevseydiŋiz, sevseydiler.

2. Non-finite forms

The infinitive is given as σεβμέκ (164r); RUDIMENTA 43: sevmeq), together with the dik-participle σεβδοῦκ (RUDIMENTA: sevduk); cf. the paragraph above about {DIK}. The other forms are:

Converbs
As converbs (γερούντια – 164r, RUDIMENTA 44: Gerundia) the following are considered:
σεβμεγέ, εἰς τό νά ἀγαπήσῃ – sevmeyé, *to love* (RUDIMENTA: *sevmege* 'Amandi')
σεβέρκεν ἤ σεβερέκ, ἀγαποῦνται δύο – sevérken or severék, *two love each other* (?) (RUDIMENTA: *severken* et *severek*, 'amando')
σεβμέκ ἰτζιοῦν, διά νά ἀγαπήσῃ – sevmék içün, *in order to love* (RUDIMENTA: *sevmeq içün*, 'amandum').

Apparently, the Greek translator was not able to discern *amandi, amando, amandum*, putting thus an erroneous interpretation to the (modal) converbs *severken* and *severek*, whose meanings he obviously did not know.

> Participles
> Classified as participles (μετοχαί – 164r-164v, RUDIMENTA 44-45: Participia) the following are listed:
> σεβέν, ἐκεῖνος ὁποῦ ἀγαπᾶ καί ἠγάπα. ('sevén, *he who loves and loved*'). – RUDIMENTA: *seven* 'amans'.
> σεβεγγέκ, καί σεβισέρ, ὁποῦ ἔχει νά ἀγαπήσει ἤ θέλει ἀγαπήσει. ('sevecék and sevisér, *he who has to love or will love*'). – RUDIMENTA: *seveceq* et *seviser* 'amaturus'.
> σεβμελοῦ, ὁποῦ θέλει ἀγαπηθεῖ γλύγορα. ('sevmelü, *he who will be loved immediately*'). – RUDIMENTA: *sevmelü* 'amaturus iam'.
> σεβιγγῆ, ὁ ἀγαπητικός. ('sevicí, *the lover / beloved*'). – RUDIMENTA: *sevci* (sic) 'amator'.
> σεβμίσσ, ὁ ἀγαπημένος ('sevmiş, *the beloved*'), – RUDIMENTA: *sevmiş* 'amatus'.

Here, the Greek adaptor displays a sensitivity to the tense independence of the *-(y)An*-participle and of both future participles. Interesting, from the historical point of view, is the presence of the old future participle *-(y)IsAr*, not considered by most of the other 17th century grammarians (except Meninski who notes on p. 74 of his *Grammatica Turcica*, Vienna 1680, after having listed the *-(A)r* and *-(y)AcAK*-forms: "Vel per alterum, quantumvis rarius, Participii Futurum, sic *sewiserum*, vel *sewiserem, amabo, amaturus sum*"). Du Ryer is also aware of the different modal / aspectual values of the *-(y)AcAK*-participle (such as *okuyacak bir kitap*), and tries to explain this by means of voice coincidence: "Observabis hîc Participium *seveceq* habere promiscue Activam aut Passivam significationem, ac significare amaturus et amandus, sicut *göreceq* visurus et vivendus." (RUDIMENTA 45). The Greek translator commits one more confusion (or simply an error in copying), taking the *miş*-form for the *ecek*-form: "Πρέπει νά προσέχει τίς, ὅτι ἡ μετοχή δουλεύει διά τήν ἐνεργητικήν καί τήν παθητικήν, ἤγουν ἐκεῖνος ὁποῦ ἔχει νά ἀγαπήσῃ ἤ νά ἀγαπηθῇ σεβμίσσ. γγιορεγγέκ, ὁποῦ ἔχει νά ἰδῇ, ἤ καί νά ἰδοῦσιν." ("It must be paid attention to the fact that the participle functions as both active and passive, i.e. *he who has to love* or *to be loved:* sevmiş; görecék, *he who has to see*, or *to be seen*.").

> Verbal nouns
> Du Ryer introduces two verbal nouns: *-(y)Iş* and *-mA* (the latter only in the plural form *-mAlAr*):
> RUDIMENTA 45: "Utuntur etiam vocabulis *sevmeler* et *seviş*, quae exprimunt per hoc nomen *amicitia*, ut etiam *gidiş geliş* et *gitmeler gelmeler* quod Gallice *allée* ac *venue* dici potest, sed hoc rarissime."

The Greek adaptor again has some difficulties in translating and copies a paradigm erroneously:

GRAMMATIKI 164v: "Δουλεύονται ἀκόμη καί ἀπό τό σεβμίσσ, ἤ σεβμισλέρ, καί σεβμελέρ, πῶς ἐξηγοῦνται ἀκόμα διά τό ὄνομα τῆς φιλίας. Καθώς ἀκόμα, γγελήσσ, γγεττήσσ καί γγελμελέρ, γγιτμελέρ, ὅπου θέλει νά εἰπῇ πηγενάμενος καί ἐρχόμενος, ἀλλά ὀλίγαις φοραῖς." ("They still are made from sevmíş, or sevmişlér and sevmelér, which may be explained by the noun *friendship*, as well as gelíş gedíş and gelmelér gitmelér, which means *going* and *coming*, but only a few times.").

3. Voice

Du Ryer's presentation of the four voices passive ("de formatione passivorum", p. 46), causative ("verbum, cuius actio transeat in alium", p. 48), reciprocal ("verba cooperantis actionis, quae reciprocantia licebit appellare", p. 49), and reflexive ("verba intranseuntis significationis", p. 50; adding that this form can also have passive meaning: "Tamen advertas velim, hunc loquendi modum usurpari saepe etiam in Passiva significatione", p. 51), is faithfully adapted in the Greek version (164v-165v). The following suffixes and paradigms are given:

-(I)l: σεβηλμέκ, σεβιλούρουμ, σεβηλντοῦμ, σεβηλούρνδουμ, σεβηλεγίμ (sevilmék, sevilúrum, sevildúm, sevilúrdum, sevileyím)

-Dlr: σεβντουρμέκ, σεβνδουροῦμ (sevdurmék, sevdurúm [haplology for *sevdururum*)

-(I)r: μπισσιρμέκ (bişirmék)

-(I)ş: σεβισσμέκ, σεβισσίριζ, σεβισσιλέρ (sevişmék, sevişíriz, sevişilér [for sevişirler, see above])

-(I)n: σεβενμέκ, οὐκουνμέκ, ἀλενμάκ (sevinmék, üyünmék, alınmák [for <e> ~ i, ı and ö > ü see above]

Meninski's grammar (1680, pp. 59-60) adopts and extends Du Ryer's terminology, and, interestingly enough, carries over the same example in the reflexive-passive (ögˈmekⁱ – ögˈünmekⁱ, p. 59). The Greek translator does not make any significant modification, apart from omitting an example, i.e. the causative form of *içmek* (GRAMMATIKI 165r ἰτζιμέκ [skipping *içirmeq-bişmek*] νά ψήσῃ, μπισσιρμέκ, νά κάμει νά ψήσῃ; cf. RUDIMENTA 49: *içirmeq* 'bibere facere').

Conclusions

The discussed manuscript GRAMMATIKI is remarkable mainly because of the following facts:

1. It belongs to a group of Greek manuscripts (two of them preserved until now) of the 17th century, probably written in Greece, which represent the very first examples of Greco-Turkish grammar activity.

2. It provides a, yet unfinished, completion to Du Ryer's RUDIMENTA in the form of transcribed Turkish data.

3. Unlike its twin manuscript KANONES, it bears a more popular linguistic shape in the Greek part. Verb and noun paradigms are more often in vernacular, while KANONES prefers Ancient Greek or archaizing forms. Though an extensive analysis of the Greek part could not be carried out in this context, the vulgarizing tendency is true for the explanatory part as well as for some of the translated examples (such as the translation for *ekmek* 'bread' and *su* 'water': KANONES 144r [Kappler 1999: 276] 'ὁ ἄρτος', 'τὸ ὕδωρ', GRAMMATIKI 160v 'ψωμί', 'τό νερόν'; moreover the dative forms in KANONES are always translated with the Ancient Greek dative, while GRAMMATIKI prefers sometimes, though not consistently, the modern forms with the preposition εἰς + accusative [e.g. 160r: μπεγέ, εἰς τόν ἀφέντην; but ibidem, not accidentally in a more stereotyped context: μπαμπαγέ, τῷ πατρί]). In the specific case of the Greek *diglossia*, such linguistic shapes of the 'source language' should be duly considered, not least because such observations can be helpful in determining different intentions or different target groups. In this case, it could be supposed that our GRAMMATIKI is addressed to a broader public than KANONES (if ever it was addressed to anyone and not merely intended for private purposes), or simply has a more practical aim in providing the reader with elements of Turkish. The choice of Du Ryer's RUDIMENTA, whose practical intentions are quite explicit, as a model should not be considered a coincidence.

References

Adamović, Milan 1974. Giovanni Molino und seine türkische Grammatik. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 24/1-4, 37-67.

Adamović, Milan 1977. *Das osmanisch-türkische Sprachgut bei R. Lubenau*. München: Trofenik.

Bergsträsser, G. 1918. Zur Phonetik des Türkischen nach gebildeter Konstantinopler Aussprache. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 72, 233-262.

Bombaci, Alessio 1938. *La 'Regola del parlare turco' di Filippo Argenti. Materiale per la conoscenza del turco parlato nella prima metà del XVI sec*. Napoli: R. Istituto Superiore Orientale.

Caferoğlu, Ahmet 1959. Die anatolischen und rumelischen Dialekte. In: Deny, Jean & Grønbech, Kaare & Scheel, Helmuth & Togan, Zeki Velidi (eds.) *Philologiae turcicae fundamenta* 1. Aquis Mattiacis: Steiner. 239-260.

Drimba, Vladimir 1992. La grammaire turque d'Antonio Mascis (1677). *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 82, 109-120.

Drimba, Vladimir 1997. La grammaire turque de Giovanni Agop (1685). In: Kellner-Heinkele, Barbara & Zieme, Peter (eds.) *Studia Ottomanica. Festgabe für György Hazai zum 65. Geburtstag*. (Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica 47.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 39-46.

Eckmann, János 1950. Anadolu Karamanlı ağızlarına ait araştırmalar. *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi* 8/1-2, 165-200.

Ermers, Robert 1999. *Arabic grammars of Turkic*. Leiden: Brill.

Gilson, Erika H. 1987. *The Turkish grammar of Thomas Vaughan. Ottoman-Turkish at the end of the XVIIth century according to an English 'Transkriptionstext'*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Halasi-Kun, Tibor 1992. Gennadios' Turkish confession of faith. *Archivum Ottomanicum* 12 (1987-1992), 5-103.

Hazai, György 1973. *Das Osmanisch-Türkische im XVII. Jahrhundert. Untersuchungen an den Transkriptionstexten von Jakab Nagy de Harsány.* Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Johanson, Lars 1981. *Pluralsuffixformen im Südwesttürkischen.* Mainz, Wiesbaden: Steiner.

Kalus, Marielle 1992. Les premières grammaires turques en France et leur édition (XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles). In: Bacqué Grammont, J.-L. & Dor, R. (eds.) *Mélanges offerts à Louis Bazin* (Varia Turcica XIX.) Paris: L'Harmattan. 83-86.

Kappler, Matthias 1999. Eine griechische Übersetzung (1664) von Giovanni Molino's 'Brevi rudimenti del parlar turchesco'. *Archivum Ottomanicum* 17, 271-295.

Kappler, Matthias forthcoming. Note a proposito di 'ortografia caramanlidica'. In: U. Marazzi (ed.) *Studi in memoria di Aldo Gallotta.* Napoli.

Kenessey, Mary 1974. A Turkish grammar from the 17th century. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 28/1, 119-125.

Mollova, Mefküre 1997. Die Bedeutung der Handschrift Illésházy. *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 33/1, 38-75.

Németh, Julius 1970. *Die türkische Sprache in Ungarn im siebzehnten Jahrhundert.* Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Redhouse, James W. 1890. *A Turkish and English lexicon.* Constantinople.

Stein, Heidi 1979. Zur Frage der Lautbezeichnung in einem türkischen Transkriptionstext. *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 40/2, 51-64.

Stein, Heidi 1993. Megisers türkische Grammatik als Quelle zur türkischen Sprachgeschichte. In: Laut, J. P. & Röhrborn, K. (eds.), *II. Deutsche Turkologen-Konferenz – Sprach- und Kulturkontakte der türkischen Völker.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 173-180.