Werk

Titel: Karamanlidic literature and its value as a source for spoken Turkish in the 18th ...

Autor: Brendemoen, Bernt

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 2016

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0020|LOG_0009

Kontakt/Contact

Digizeitschriften e.V.
SUB Göttingen
Platz der Göttinger Sieben 1
37073 Göttingen

info@digizeitschriften.de

Karamanlidic literature and its value as a source for spoken Turkish in the 18th and 19th centuries

Bernt Brendemoen

Brendemoen, Bernt 2016. Karamanlidic literature and its value as a source for spoken Turkish in the 18th and 19th centuries. *Turkic Languages* 20, 5–25.

Karamanlı literature consists almost exclusively of translations, mostly from Greek and French, but a minor part is transliterations (or rather adaptations) of Ottoman literature. Because the bulk of its readers, who constituted a rather marginal group in Ottoman society, most probably were not very familiar with Ottoman literary traditions, Karamanlı literature has no aspirations of being erudite and elegant in the same way as contemporary Ottoman literature, but is written with the functional aim of reaching as many Turcophone Greek Orthodox Christians as possible. Accordingly, Karamanlı texts are closer to spoken Turkish than most contemporary Ottoman texts, but the question is to what extent the language is influenced by Greek, which most of the authors must have known alongside Turkish. The article concentrates on two texts, the *Ḥāğetnāme* by Seraphim, Metropolitan of Ankara (1756), and Evangelinos Misailidis' novel *Temāšā-yı Dünyā* (1872), and gives a short synopsis of their contents. It also discusses the linguistic characteristics of these texts, the first of which shows some Central Anatolian dialect features, while the second one most probably is closer to Istanbul vernacular. Examples of possible Greek syntactic elements are taken up and discussed.

Bernt Brendemoen, Oslo University, Blindern P.b. 1030, NO-0315 Oslo, Norway. E-Mail: bernt.brendemoen@ikos.uio.no

The term Karamanlidic literature, which is used in this article, immediately asks for a definition. The adjective Karamanlidic or Karamanlı had negative connotations in the ears of the Ottoman group designated by this term, conveying a sense of 'uncouth, roguish, provincial'. Here it is used to designate 'Turcophone Greek-Orthodox', and by "literature" is meant what in German is called *Schrifttum*, which includes e.g. translations and periodicals. All Karamanlı texts are written in Turkish with Greek letters. I will not go into questions such as the ethnic background of the Karamanlıs nor give a detailed survey of their literature; this latter task was begun by Séverien Salaville and Eugène Dalleggio, who between 1958 and 1974 published a bibliography of *Karamanlidika* in three volumes. This was extended by three more volumes between 1987 and 1997 by Evangelia Balta, the foremost scholar of Karamanlidic studies,. Altogether 752 titles are currently known, including period-

icals, titles of newspapers, brochures etc.[1] What I intend to do here is to first give a short characterization of the genres of Karamanlidic literature, then concentrate on two of the major works, and finally comment on some aspects of the language used in this literature.

The emergence of Karamanlı literature is closely related to the emergence of the art of printing, and the first known Karamanlidic text is a Turkish translation (in Greek script) of the Christian confession of faith as written by Gennadios Scholarios, the first Greek Orthodox patriarch in Istanbul after the Turkish conquest. The existence of Karamanlı manuscripts from the 17th and 18th centuries is briefly mentioned by Moravcsik and Heffening (Eckmann 1964: 822), but they have remained unpublished up to now. That they exist in great numbers "in public and private archives in Turkey, Greece, Bulgaria, Italy and elsewhere" is verified by Kappler (2006: 663), who also mentions that the late Penelopi Stathi was striving to compile a bibliography of them. The Karamanlidic version of the Christian confession of faith was printed in Basel by Martin Crusius in 1584. However, more than a century passed before the first Karamanlı book for use by the Orthodox community in Anatolia was published in 1718. Most of the books until the beginning of the 19th century were printed abroad, mostly in Venice.

Before 1830, almost all the books printed dealt with religious subjects, aiming at strengthening the faith of the Orthodox flock in Istanbul and Anatolia. They were biblical texts, catechisms, descriptions of the lives of saints, psalms, etc., but also spiritually edifying books published by priests and bishops, all of them translated from Greek. Before 1800, only one non-religious title, a pamphlet containing proverbs, had been published. Although non-religious literature such as popular romances was printed in Venice in Greek for the use of Greek-speaking readers, no Karamanlı versions were made because—as stated e.g. by Nikodemos Hagioritis, an author of spiritual Karamanlı books—they would hurt the souls of the Christians and lead the flock astray (Balta 1999: 7). The Karamanlıs were probably regarded as a "borderline case" in Orthodoxy because their language was the language of the Muslims.

Seraphim of Pisidia

One of the most prolific writers of Karamanlı literature in the 18th century—most of which was based on Greek originals—was Seraphim (Serapheim) of Antalya, also called Seraphim of Pisidia.[2] He studied at the famous monastery of Kykkos in Cyprus. However, in Ankara he was involved in a scandal so serious that he was

1 For a detailed definition of what kind of texts should be classified as Karamanlı see Balta (1999: 3).

2 Isparta is mentioned as his birth-place by Eckmann (1964: 823), but this is not at all mentioned by Theocharides (2010: 125).

dismissed from the holy order in 1753.[3] Nevertheless he was pardoned and became an archimandrite, and later (1774) Metropolitan of Ankara, a position he held until 1779. One of Seraphim's most widely spread works was his *Hacetname Kitabı* (*Ḥāğetnāme Kitābı* 'The Book of Necessity', i.e. 'The indispensable book'), with the following subtitle: [4] *Sultan Validullah Panagia Mevludullahın Niazimet Paraklisileri* 'The supplications to the Queen, the Mother of God, the Virgin', *ve yirmidört selamlamaları* 'and twenty-four greetings to her' *ve Amartolon Soteriada beyan olan hekmetnameleri* 'and accounts of her miracles told in *The salvation of the sinners*' *ve Exapsalmos* 'The Six Psalms', *ve Apodeipnon* 'and Prayer said after dinner' *ve dahi iktizalı şeyler burada mevcuttur, onlarki her Hristiana lazım ve iktizadır sabah akşam okuya* 'and other necessary things that every Christian must read morning and evening are also found here'. *Şimdi ilk evvel tefsir olunup basmaya verildi, bu zikr olunanın harç masrafiylan Yavan Romca dilinden Türk lisanına, ziyade emek zahmetilen Atallialu Serafeim Hiermonahostan* 'Now it has for the first time been explained and printed at the expense of the person mentioned [below], [and translated] from regular Greek language into the Turkish language, with great effort, by the monk and priest Serapheim from Antalya'. *Hristianların kifayetligi için ayanları izniylen Venedikte basıldı Bortoli Antoniostan* 'It was printed in Venice by Antonio Bortoli by permission of the senators for the satisfaction of the Christians' (1756). *Cümleniz Hristosun izine yürüyün* 'Go all of you in the path of Christ'.[5] One of the most interesting parts of this book, which totals 212 pages and was reprinted four times, is what Seraphim calls the *yirmidört selamlamalar* 'twenty-four greetings' to the Virgin. This is the *Akathistos* hymn, the 'Non-sitting hymn', a long hymn to the honour of the Virgin Mary from the 6th century. In Turkish, it has *Selam, güveyisiz gelin* 'Rejoice, Bride without a Bridegroom' as one of its refrains. Every verse begins with a different letter, running through the whole Greek alphabet in alphabetical order; that is why it has twenty-four verses. This principle has in fact been transferred to the Turkish translation. (In

3 ibid. Due to his short temper, he is said to have killed a deacon during the Mass by hitting him with a heavy gospel; see Irakleous (2013: 63). In fact in 1755, he seems to have been involved in yet another scandal, this time in Venice where, fearing for his life, he took refuge in the English embassy. From there he wrote a letter to his teacher Ephraim, reproduced in English translation by Teocharides (2010: 131–143).

4 I prefer to use the modern Turkish alphabet to transliterate Karamanlidic Turkish when the phonological features are not to be emphasized, because the Turkish and the Greek alphabets share some important shortcomings regarding accuracy, e.g. when it comes to showing features such as vowel length, velar vs. palatal stops, etc. (The use of Turcological or Ottoman transcription would require making a large number of conjectures; see further footnote 8).

5 The entire book is found at http://anemi.lib.uoc.gr/metadata/0/f/c/metadata-155-0000117.tkl. I am most grateful to Dr. Evangelia Balta for giving me this information. See also Salaville & Dalleggio (1958: 26–29).

the verses starting with letters not used in Turkish (Θ, Ξ, and Ψ), Greek words are used instead.)

At least from a linguistic point of view, the most interesting part of the book is the *Hekmetnameler*, accounts of miracles performed by the Virgin (pp. 9–84). Most of these stories must have been translated from Greek. According to the title above, they were taken from *Amartolon Soteria* 'The Salvation of Sinners', a book written by the Cretan monk Agapios Landos and printed in 1641 (cf. Amart. Sot. 2008 in the bibliography). Although this is true for true for most of the stories, Salaville and Dalleggio claim (1958: 27) that only short parts ("*extraits*") were taken from there, *vide infra*. I published one of these thirty-one stories in 2010. At that time I had found a handwritten Karamanlidic codex in the Millî Kütüphane in Ankara[6] containing, among other things, the Akathistos Hymn and several stories about the miracles of the Virgin. The codex bears the date 1782, but it now seems that at least parts of it are copies of Seraphim's *Ḥāğetnāme*, although the sequence of the elements differs. (A project in which the two texts will be closely compared is currently going on. The printed book must have been dictated to a scribe since there are minor differences as to spelling etc., some of which may also reflect dialect differences.)

The *ḥikmet* I have published (which bears the number 17 in the printed *Ḥāğetnāme*, page 53; in the codex it is found on fol. 43r–44r), tells about a priest in Paris who more than everything in the world wishes to see the Virgin Mary, and prays for this every day. Finally an angel comes to him and tells him that his prayers have been heard, and that the Virgin will appear to him at prayer time next Sunday. However, the angel warns him that her beauty is so extreme that he will become blind after seeing her. The priest agrees, but after the angel has left, he starts worrying about what he will do after he has become blind. Hence, when the Virgin appears to him, he closes one eye. The eye he had kept open becomes blind, but not the other one. Now he starts cursing his lack of faith and reproaches himself for not having enjoyed the revelation completely with both eyes, even if he would have become completely blind. So he prays to God again and promises that he will look at her with both eyes if he gets another chance. The angel comes again and tells him that he will get another chance because his love for the Virgin is so strong. When the priest says that he agrees not only to losing his sight if he gets the opportunity to see her, but also every limb of his body, the angel answers that his faith is so strong that not only will he retain the sight in his seeing eye, but he also will regain the sight in his blind eye, which then happens.

The original version of this *ḥikmet* is found on page 146 of *Miracoli di nostra donna*, which was compiled by the Catholic monk Silvano Razzi (1527–1611) and published in Florence in 1576.[7] This—alongside other *miracoli*—must have been

6 Classified as 06–Mil–Yz_Latince_34 [sic!].

7 The book is reproduced on: https://books.google.com.tr/books/about/ Miracoli_Di_ Nostra_Donna_Raccolti_Nuovam.html?id=OClSAAAAcAAJ&redir_esc=y

translated into Greek by Agapios Landos (it is found in Amart. Sot. 2008, pp. 396–398). The Greek translation is relatively free in comparison with the Italian original, but Seraphim's Turkish version is quite close to the Greek one.

Some of the *ḥikmet*s of the Virgin deal with Jews. The following is a transcription of one of the shortest ones (no. 18, found on p. 55 in the printed version and in fol. 44r–45r in the codex. Some of the linguistic aspects of this text will be taken up further down).

> Onsekizinci hekmet.[8] Yahudi ušaγïnïn koinonia[9] alïp, ateše kodular, ve yanmadïγïnïn bea:nindedir.
>
> Anadol semtinde, bir yahudinin, yedi yašïnda bir evladï varïdï. Ve bu oγlan bir gün, χristian čoǰuklariyilan[10] beraber oldu ve ekklisaye gitmeyilen χristos efendinin kanïndan ve teninden koinonia aldï, öteki ušaklarïn ettiyi gibi, ve papaz χristian čoǰuγu zan eylemeyilen koinonia verdi buna. Ve antidoroγï[11] yedikten geri evlerine gitti, ve atalarïna nakl eyledi. Ve bunun babasï övkelendi, χristos efendinin düsmanï gibi,[12] ve intikam almaya istemeyilen, čoǰuγun tuttuγu išten[13] (niǰeki kendi ǰahilliyi ile zan ederidi) birden čoǰuγu kaptï aldï sučsuz günahsïzïkan, ve bir yanmïš külχana[14] braktï, daχi ziyade odun braktï, tezie[15] kül olsun. Lakin baγdat tarafïnda üč čoǰuklarï külχandan koruyan rabbi, bu mubarek čoǰuγu da esirgedi, ve atešin alavlanmasïndan ve kuvetinden helak olmadï. Lakin bir serin yerde durmuš gibi dururdu. Bunu čoǰuγun anasï duyudukta feryat etti seirtti, zan ettiki atešte külünü bulsun čoǰuγun. Ve daχi saire χristianlar gitmeyilen, baktïlar čoǰuγu atešin ortasïnda durduγunu saγ ve diri, ve ne geyimi ve ne bir kïlï ziana oγradï. Imdi taǰip kalïp šašmaγïlan tašra čïkardïklarïnda atešten, ǰümlesi avaz ettiler, gerektir ki babasïnï atešin ičine atsïnlar, ettiyine göre bulsun. Imdi baγladïlar bunu, ve külχana attïlar, ve olsa-

8 I have here tried to give a phonemic transcription using the Turcological transcription system, but because of the inadequacy of the Greek script there are certain features I have not indicated because the texts give no clues, i.e., vowel length, possible distinctions between different front or half-front unrounded low vowels, or between palatal/velar stop. However, since the texts represent a Central Anatolian dialect, there is no reason to believe that these features were different in the 18th century from what they are today.

9 Κοινωνία 'communion'.

10 The spelling τζοτζουκλαρίγιλαν indicates that the possessive suffix has a front and not a back vowel; otherwise the reading would have to be *-ïγïlan*, which would be etymologically incorrect.

11 The *antidoron* (Greek: Ἀντίδωρον) is ordinary leavened bread which is blessed but not consecrated and distributed in Eastern Orthodox churches after the service. The final *-n* is lost in Modern Greek, but the *γ* is still puzzling.

12 *Gibi* corresponds here to Modern Turkish *olarak*.

13 Probably "because of the thing the child had done".

14 'Stokehole, furnace'.

15 See *tiziye* 'tezce, çabucak, heman', *Tarama Sözlüğü* 3810.

hat kül oldu bečere.[16] Ve čoǰuk sïval[17] olundu ve ǰevap etti, dedi ekmeyi yediyim ekklisade olan karï kuǰaγïnda maksïmï[18] tutan, yanïmda dururudu ve aspabiyilan beni örteridi ve ateš bana asla dokanmazïdï. Oldem aŋnadïlar, panagia idi aziz koinonian baχšïšïndan koruduγunu. Imdi bušekil yahutti avreti hak imanï aŋnamaγïlan čoǰuγulan beraber vaptis oldu. Ve daχi saire čok yahudiler iman getirdiler bu sebep ičin rabbi yesus χristos efendimize. Onaki hamd ve ziynet gerektir. Amin.

18th Miracle. About the Jewish boy whom they threw into the fire after he had taken communion, but who did not burn.

In the land of Anatolia, a Jew had a seven-year-old child. One day this boy was together with some Christian children. When he went to the church, he took communion, a part of the blood and flesh of Christ, like the other boys did, and since the priest thought he was a Christian child, he gave him communion. And after having taken the *antidoron*, he went back home and told his parents [what he had done]. His father, being an enemy of Christ, became angry and, wanting to take revenge for what the child had done (although he had done it out of ignorance), suddenly grasped the boy, although he had not sinned, and put him in a burning furnace [of a bath], and put more wood [on the fire], so that he would burn rapidly. But the Lord, who had rescued the three children from a furnace in Bagdad, protected this blessed child, too, and he was not destroyed by the flames and the force of the fire, but remained as if he had been standing in a cool place. When the mother of the child heard this, she cried out and ran, believing she would find the ashes of the boy in the fire. And when the other Christians went there, they saw that the boy was standing safe and sound in the middle of the fire, and that neither his dress nor a single hair had been hurt. When they, astonished and amazed, had taken him out of the fire, they all shouted that his father must be thrown into the fire so that he

16 Probably *bīčāre* 'poor, wretched' (the Greek texts has ἄθλιος 'miserable, vile') although at least today, *biçare* conveys a certain pity or compassion which is not intended by the narrator.

17 = *sı'āl* 'question'.

18 It is obvious from several other of the *ḥikmet*s (e.g. nr. 14, pp. 48–49 "Irmaktan kurtulan maksïmïn beanindedir") that *maksïm* means 'baby, infant'. See the following passage from that *ḥikmet*: "Čoǰuγa sïval eyleyen herkes, nasïl kurtuldγunu nakl ederidi evhali ačïk, firate frate anlatïrïdï her birine, ol ki saire türlü, ǰevaplarï tetik ve peltek söyleridi saire maksïmlar gibi". 'Everyone who asked the boy, to all of them he explained how he had been rescued, what had happened, in a very clear and fluent way (?), although he was giving other answers (about other matters) stuttering and lisping like other infants.' (Here, *evhal* must be the same as *ahvāl* in the standard language.) The word *maksïm* is a dialect form of *masum* 'innocent' (with vowel harmony and *'ayn* being realized as velar stop); see Eckmann (1950: 185), who, however, with the support of written texts, gives the form as *maksim*. This word is frequently found (in the meaning 'infant') also in the Balkan dialect of Vidin; see Németh (1965: 167) and *passim*. I am indebted to Dr. Edith Ambros for clarifying this and other details in connection with this text and my article in general.

> could get what he deserved. They tied him up and threw him into the furnace, and he turned into ashes at once. The child was questioned and he answered, saying: "The lady who was in the church where I ate the bread and who was holding the infant on her lap, was standing beside me and was covering me with her clothing, and the fire did not hurt me at all." At that moment they understood that it was the Virgin Mary who had protected him because of the gift[19] of the holy communion. In this way the Jewish woman understood the true religion, and was baptized together with her child. And because of this, many other Jews also began to believe in our Lord Jesus Christ. One must praise and adorn him. Amen.'

The time after 1830

The Greek Orthodox Church continued to publish religious literature, but after 1820 they got a dangerous competitor, the (largely Lutheran) Bible Society. Lutheran missionaries (especially Americans) were active not only in Istanbul, but also in large parts of Anatolia, throughout the 19th century. They had more success converting Armenians, but by the middle of the century, the Bible Society had published 32 Karamanlı titles, and, eager to refute the Lutheran ideas, the Orthodox church had published 24 (Balta 1999: 9). At the same time, non-religious books started to appear too, for example in the fields of medicine and history. The first translations of novels, such as *Robinson Crusoe*, began appearing after the middle of the century, but it was only at the very end of the century that French novels were printed in Karamanlidic translations.

The establishment of Greece as an independent state led to a revival of interest in classical Greek culture, which alongside Orthodoxy became the cornerstone of the modern Greek identity. This revival also reached Greek city-dwellers in Turkey—after all, Istanbul continued to be the centre of Greek culture all the way up to World War I. Only 750,000 of the two million Greeks in the Ottoman Empire were living in the newly founded Greek kingdom, which started a Hellenization process among the Ottoman Greeks where the teaching of Greek language and the strengthening of Greek identity were central. The incorporation of the Ottoman Greeks (and also the Ottoman soil on which they lived) into Greece is the Greek irredentist ideal, which in history is called *megali idea*. In this ideological framework, the Turkish-speaking Karamanlıs constituted a foreign element, and the Hellenization trend among Orthodox groups in Turkey was therefore directed especially toward them. As a result, many of them learned Greek and married Ottoman Greeks who had Greek as their mother tongue, and the Karamanlı identity eventually began to melt away. The literary activities in the 19th century, however, and especially the publication of numerous newspapers which had subscribers all over Anatolia, show that the number of Greek Orthodox Ottomans who preferred to read Turkish over Greek was

19 Should perhaps rather be translated 'grace'. *baχšïš* is obviously a translation of Greek χάρις; see Amart. Sot. 2008: 399.

quite high. In particular, the numerous editions of popular epics such as *Köroğlu*, *Şah İsmail*, and *Aşık Garip* show that the literary taste of the Karamanlı public was different from that of the Greek-speaking Ottomans. The best-known of the newspapers, *Anatoli*, was published by Evangelinos Misailidis (*vide infra*) and subsequently by his son, from 1840 to 1923. Şimşek, who has made a valuable study of this newspaper, reproduces (2010: 113) a statement by Nikolaos Soulidis, Misailidis' successor as the director of the newspaper, from 1890. In it he gives a clue about the number of actual and potential readers: "We have only 500 subscribers, and this is not enough for the Rums of Anatolia. The number of our subscribers should be at least 1000 since the number of Rums in Anatolia who are able to read this newspaper is more than 500 thousand."

In connection with the fact that the bulk of Karamanlı literature consists of translations, it should be kept in mind that originality, which is a prerequisite for any kind of literature aiming to being taken seriously today, did not play the same role in Ottoman tradition. Writing *naẓīre*s based on the works of earlier poets was a quite acceptable trend in Ottoman poetry; why should the same custom not also be applied to fictional prose when it was being introduced in the Ottoman realm in the second part of the 19th century? The first Turkish novels in Ottoman script were all adaptations of European novels, and in cases where the Ottoman version did not pretend to be original, but appeared with the original title mentioned, modern principles of translation were not applied at all; "translations" were only adaptations, usually drastically abridged. Paragraphs or chapters thought to be politically sensitive or morally unsuitable would be omitted, but there could be even more diffuse motivations. However, in some cases the original novels were expanded to such an extent that the original seems to have only served as an inspiring framework. Karamanlı literature constituted no exception to this trend; in an extremely interesting article, Şimşek (2011) has shown how Aḥmed Midḥat's historical novel *Yeŋičeriler* (1871) was altered extensively by its "translator", the writer and journalist Ioannis Gavriilidis, who not only transliterated the novel into Greek letters, but transformed it considerably. The Karamanlı version was serialized in *Anatoli* in 1890 and 1891. By the end of the 19th century around twenty novels had appeared in Karamanlidic translation, most of them translated from French. The reason why a novel by Aḥmed Midḥat would appear in a Karamanlidic version—apart from the popularity of this prolific writer— was probably that his Turkish was much less complicated than the regular Ottoman prose of the period (although Gavriilidis writes in the foreword that it has been challenging for him to "narrate" the story "because of the rhetoric of Aḥmed Midḥat, which is full of words Anatolians would hardly be familiar with" (Şimşek 2011: 264).) It is quite interesting that Gavriilidis also states that one of the reasons why he has chosen this book to "translate" is that both the names of the protagonists and the story itself are *millī*, i.e., take place "in our own country", and that he believes "it is better for someone to get interested in things he is acquainted with rather than things unknown to him" (Şimşek 2011: 254).

Evangelinos Misailidis' *Temāšā-yı Dünyā*

Here I shall deal at length with Evangelinos Misailidis' huge novel, totalling 1056 pages, *Temāšā-yı Dünyā*, with the subtitle *Ǧefākār u Ǧefākeš* 'The Theatre of the World—the Tormentors and the Tormented', published in four volumes in Istanbul in 1871–1872.[20] One of the reasons why this novel has not received more attention than it has, could be that a modern edition in Latin script did not appear until 1986 (prepared by Robert Anhegger and Vedat Günyol and with the title *Seyreyle Dünyayı* 'View the World'; new edition in 1988).[21] Therefore Eckmann, whose bibliography of Karamanlidic literature (1964) alongside the one by Salaville and Dalleggio is one of the standard works on the subject, does not even mention the title. Another reason why it has remained in obscurity could be uncertainty about whether the novel is an original work or a translation. As shown by Stathi in 1995, however, and further developed by Karra (2010), the novel is based on the novel *O Polypathis* 'The Man who Suffered a Lot' by Grigorios Palaiologos. This had appeared in Athens in 1839, but never gained popularity.[22] Hence, Misailidis does not mention Palaiologos at all, but pretends that the novel is an original written by himself. In fact, modern Greek literature in Turkish translation was not very popular among the Turcophone readers; in the same way, Modern Greek novels in their original language were not commonly read by Greek-speaking Ottomans: As a result of the endeavours to Hellenize the Ottoman Greeks, the Greek-speaking Ottomans were more interested in Classical Greek literature than modern literature (Strauss 2010: 180). One reason why *O Polypathis* did not become popular even in Greece could be that it was written in a high-style *katharevousa* and probably addressed Greeks of a certain standing. However, when Misailidis reworked the plot to serve as a framework for his own novel, his target group was Orthodox Turkish speakers in general, both city-dwellers and people in the countryside. The style is as different from the Greek "original" as possible, being quite oral and a bit reminiscent of the style of the *meddaḥ*s. The fact that it represents a challenge to the modern reader is due to all the words of Arabic and Persian origin. However, these were probably in use in use even in the popular language of the author, which has absolutely nothing about it of the artificial air we often meet in 19th century Ottoman prose.

20 Balta (1999: 13) claims that this novel was first published in serial form in Misailidis' newspaper *Anatoli*, but she does not state when. It is true that most of the novels translated by the very prolific Misailidis were first published in this way, but it is a bit unlikely that Misailidis, who was very concerned with strengthening the morals of his readers and their families, would not see that this novel was not very suitable in this respect, even if almost every chapter contains some words of moral indignation from the protagonist over the vices and debauchery he witnesses.

21 This is the edition I refer to in this article, hence the citations in modern Turkish orthography.

22 For possible models of Palaiologos' novel and a reading of *Temāšā-yı Dünyā* as a picaresque novel; see Şimşek (2012).

Nevertheless, the language of Misailidis contains more Arabic and Persian lexical elements than for example the language used by the contemporary Aḥmed Midḥat. As mentioned by Strauss (2003: 39), *Temāšā-yı Dünyā* is one of the oldest Ottoman novels, the oldest being Vartan Paşa's *Akabi Hikâyesi* 'The Story of Akabi' written in Armenian script, which appeared in 1851, and which seems to be a more original work than *Temāšā-yı Dünyā*. (However, if one defines "Ottoman novel" as a novel written in Ottoman script and thus accessible to the majority of readers in the Empire, the first one would be Šemseddīn Sāmī's *Ta'aššuḳ-i Ṭal'at ve Fitnat* 'The Enamoration of *Ṭal'at* and *Fitnat*'.)[23] Still it should be pointed out that the influence exerted by the "minority novels", especially *Temāšā-yı Dünyā*, on Ottoman literature, is quite minimal. While quite a number of Turkish novels, especially by Aḥmed Midḥat, appeared in Armenian and Greek script (possibly, as mentioned above, because his language and style was uncomplicated and easy to understand by people who—unlike the intellectual Turks—did not have any formal education in Ottoman), the opposite was not the case, and *Temāšā-yı Dünyā* seems to have remained largely unnoticed by the Muslim Turkish public. (Strauss 2003: 53; Aydın [s.a.], however, believes that it influenced Aḥmed Midḥat's *Leṭā'if-i Rivāyāt* 'Entertaining Stories'.)

The narrator of this picaresque novel is at the same time its hero, the lawyer Aleko Favini. The subject is his life from his birth until his old age, when he finally (on the very last pages) is united with the woman he has loved for many years (he is then 65 years old; she is 40), and the strange, sad and funny experiences he is exposed to along the way. Aleko is the son of a Greek mother from whose womb he is rescued at the moment she is killed by his jealous Roman Catholic father (the chief interpreter at the French embassy in Istanbul) who believes she has been unfaithful. He is brought up by his maternal grandfather, a lawyer, but becomes a spoiled child who, despite not being interested in school, always complains about his teachers. When he gets interested in girls, he is always turned down and disappointed, but his womanizer nature drives him on. It is only when he sees the two girls Fazilet (Virtue) and Sefahat (Debauchery) in a dream (p. 62) that he understands that he has to turn his life around and acquire a profession, becoming a lawyer like his grandfather. From this point onwards the novel consists of events, episodes and disasters caused by Favini's profession, his weakness for the opposite sex, and his curiosity. To help people who are suffering, he becomes a sufferer himself. To today's reader, the book opens a door on to an Istanbul quite different from the Istanbul we usually meet in Ottoman sources, i.e. the capital of the Greek Orthodox world. The descriptions are always very down to earth, probably more so than would be possible in Ottoman novels of the same period. The following is one example of numerous episodes describing cunning ways of cheating strangers out of money. One evening Favini is taking a walk in Bağlarbaşı on the Asian side, when he notices that an old woman (*kocakarı*) is following him (pp. 96–98). Suddenly the

23 For an interesting survey; see Gökalp (1999).

woman embraces him and says: "Are you not Yorgaki? I have been following you for two hours; why did you leave us for so long?" The woman claims that he married her daughter Aspasia, but then went to Egypt, and that they have been waiting for him for a whole year. When Favini is about to point out that there must be a mistake, he realizes that the woman has mistaken him for her son-in-law, and decides to take advantage of the situation, despite being afraid that his "wife" will know he is not her husband when she sees him. When he arrives at her house, the "wife" comes down the stairs with the words *Vay benim bir yıllık hasretim Efendim, hoş geldin, sefa geldin, kademler getirdin, buyurun yukarı* 'Ah my Master for whom I longed for a whole year! Welcome! Welcome! You are bringing good luck! Pray come upstairs!' and gives him one kiss for every step on the stairs. Observing that 'the woman was young and fresh and plump like a Tekirdag watermelon' (*...karı da torlak ve Tekirdağ karpuzu gibi tombarlak bir şey idi*), Favini decides to stay overnight and to run away in the morning.

At this point the woman picks up a baby from the cradle and presents him to Favini as their son Dimitraki. When the neighbours come and want to celebrate the return of the husband, the "wife" and "mother in law" say—to Favini's relief—that he is too tired and has to rest. And as Favini later finds out, a year earlier one Yorgaki from Niğde, who already had a wife in his village, had actually married a woman in Üsküdar named Aspasia, but had disappeared after three months.

After his meal, Aspasia brings Favini his nightshirt and undresses him. While caressing him and 'chatting about this and that' (*dereden tepeden yarenlik ederken*), somebody knocks on the door. When they open it, a young man says that Vasilaki is expecting them immediately. Favini tries to find excuses for not going, but Aspasia points out that Vasilaki is their benefactor, their *veli-i nimet*, and that they could not have managed without him during Yorgaki's absence. Accordingly, he must go to show his gratitude. So, wearing his nightshirt and a fur, and carrying the little Dimitraki, he steps outside the door. At the same moment the door slams shut behind him, and the light is turned off. Robbed of the money he had in his clothes and with a baby in his arms he finds his way down to the quay, where he hires a boat to take him to Tophane, but cheats the boatman, telling him to wait for him. Because of his own stupidity and shame, of course, he does not go to the police. Later he finds out that the baby was a foundling that Aspasia must have wanted to get rid off. Aspasia and her mother turn up again in volume 2 (p. 200 onwards), when the mother is asked by the *çorbacılar* 'Janissary captains' in Üsküdar what happened to the child, and she claims that the Jews must have taken it to use its blood to make their unleavened bread for Passover, an idea that is condemned by Favini (or rather by Misailidis, or perhaps by Palaiologos) as nonsense. Aspasia and her mother also appear in other connections later in the novel.

Favini's profession, as well as his curiosity and sexual appetite, bring him in contact with all kinds of people, and the number of stories this enables the author to include is enormous.

Misailidis uses every opportunity to moralize, to denounce what he describes as sin and debauchery, and to express his wish that God will not lead his readers astray. For example, describing the Carnival in Istanbul, he says (p. 128:) "I wish there were not such a thing, because the debauchery, the wild conduct and immoral behaviour seen during these weeks never occur at other times. It would be very good if the rulers could dispose of these circumstances because they ruin the habits and moral of people, but this is said to be a product of civilization. "*Vay gidi medeniyet vay!* 'What kind of a civilization is this!'" He then states somewhat wryly that he now will leave these considerations about the carnival aside and go on to describing it, which he does in great detail indeed. The carnival ends with a visit to a brothel in Beyoğlu, which is followed by a long chapter (pp. 137–194) on prostitutes, including detailed stories about some of them, starting with a discourse about how immoral prostitution is. The stories are not obscene in any way; in most of them the women are depicted as victims of bad fortune or of cruel men. In the story of the sadist Zöhre Hanım, however, (p. 305), Misailidis excels in realistic descriptions of the wickedness of this slightly deranged Muslim woman who, after having thrown the men she has charmed into a dungeon, robs them, and if they are Christian has them strangled, but if they are Muslim, contents herself with leaving them in a distant place.

Misailidis' novel was published thirty years after Palaiologos' original, which, as mentioned by Karra, may be read as an allegory of the establishment of the modern Greek state. By setting his plot later in time, Misailidis allows his protagonist to live many years into the Tanzimat period in Turkey, and lets him praise the Tanzimat warmly (e.g. p. 267 and 504). However, even if the main events told in *Temāšā-yı Dünyā* are depicted as consecutive, there is no consistency as to when in history they take place. Thus, after having praised the Tanzimat (on p. 504), he is suddenly back at the Janissary revolt of 1807 (on p. 509), obviously following Palaiologos' chronology. This does not disturb the reader, however, who quickly gets used to taking everything with a pinch of salt. In addition, the linearity of the events is constantly broken by a complicated network of references forwards and backwards in the book. Characters the reader believes left the story several chapters earlier, can suddenly appear again. For example, after Favini has become a Muslim (in order to escape from a difficult situation he gets into by insulting a lady, p. 501), he flees to Naples, where he feels an urge to find a priest to confess his sins and get absolution. He finds a hermit in a narrow cave in a mountain outside town, and when he begins to tell his story, the hermit is revealed to be his own father, who had repented the injustice he had done to his wife to such an extent that he gave up his mundane life and went out into the wilderness. Whereupon his father of course dies (p. 511).

In describing Favini's various travels in Europe, Misailidis gives extensive information about European life and habits, but unlike some Ottoman writers, he is in no way dazzled by what he sees, and displays a sincere trust in the Ottoman state after the Tanzimat. It is obvious that the future of the Anatolian Greeks was of great concern to him, and that he was genuinely proud of belonging to that community.

Even if, willingly or not, he creates the impression that the Greeks are the superior *millet* in the Ottoman empire, he displays no contempt towards the others; in particular the Muslims are usually described as honest and hard-working people. However, the reader cannot avoid feeling that there must have been an immense distrust between the different *millet*s. Even if Misailidis displays deep knowledge about the Armenians, Jews, and Muslims and their habits and religions, one is struck by the fact that the plot is almost exclusively set in a Greek environment, and that all the main figures are Greek, testifying to the degree of separation between the *millet*s, not only in Istanbul and in the West coast, but also in Anatolia. Maybe the reason why no edition has ever been printed in Ottoman is that Ottoman Turkish readers would not feel familiar with the Greek setting, apart from the fact that the frivolity of many of the women depicted could be found offensive, despite the empathy displayed by the author.

Songs and poetry

From the 18th century onwards, a rich literature of Turkish love poetry in Greek letters has been preserved. Most of this poetry has been written to be sung, and represents partly a Phenariot tradition of church music, aiming to create equivalents to European romances and love-songs, and parly the Ottoman tradition of *ši'r meğmū'aları* 'poetry collections', originally notebooks where the owner would add the text of a new poem or song he heard, often also with an indication of the rhythm or *maḳam*. From the beginning of the 19th century, such collections of songs (mostly *šarḳīlar*) were printed. The language of the poems or songs would be partly Turkish partly Greek, and the target group would comprise Greek-speaking and Turkish-speaking Christians interested in Turkish music and poetry. Parallel to these anthologies in Greek letters, there was of course a rich literature of Turkish songs written in Ottoman script aiming at Turkish readers, but the first printed anthology in Ottoman script appeared as late as 22 years after the first one in Greek letters. This subject has been studied thoroughly by Kappler (2003), who with great erudition takes linguistic, musicological, metrical, historical and literary aspects into account, and has also published a great part of the songs.

The linguistic value of Karamanlı texts

The Greek alphabet is poorly suited to represent the sounds of Turkish, as Greek has no unequivocal way of rendering *ö*, *ü*, *ï*, *š*, and basically not *č* or *ǰ* either, and because voiced stop consonants occur in Greek only in combination with nasals. Therefore, in the oldest texts, *o* may represent both *o* and *ö*; *ου* may represent both *u* and *ü*; and *ι* and *η* may stand for both *i* and *ï*. Likewise, *b* may be written *μπ*, but is more often written *π*, which is also read as *p*; *d* may be written *ντ*, but is more often written *τ*, which is also read as *t*; and *g* may be written *γκ*, but is more often written *κ*, which also represents *k*. The letter *γ* has many functions; it may correspond to the modern Turkish letter *ğ* and be a voiced velar stop or a voiced postvelar fricative in

contact with back vowels and *y* in contact with front vowels, etc. The development of the Karamanlı alphabet has been thoroughly studied by Kappler (2003). As early as 1764, the monk Meletios Fenerli lay down some principles for writing Turkish with Greek letters in his introduction to an edition of *Psalms of the Prophet and King David*; the problem is that these principles were not followed consistently (Gavriel 2010: 255). In his 2010 study, Gavriel compares three editions of the Psalterion, from 1764, 1810, and 1827. Psalteria from 1764, 1782, 1841 and 1895 served as material for another study, by Irakleous (2013), who finds important orthographic differences between them. A system of diacritics was developed by the Protestant missionaries in order to make the orthography less ambiguous, and in principle it became almost as phonemic as the modern Turkish Latin alphabet, although the letter γ still had a lot of functions. The first edition of the New Testament using this orthography was printed in 1826, and a new version of the Psalterion was published in 1827 (Anhegger 1979–1980: 172). The use of this new orthography was also full of inconsistencies, at least in its earliest years; see also Kappler (2003). Irakleous (2013: 66–75) presents a detailed study of the development of the orthographic rules.

There certainly is a Karamanlı literature (in the meaning *Schrifttum*, as mentioned above), but the existence of a Karamanlı language is a myth. As pointed out by Kappler (2006), Eckmann, who devoted an enormous amount of work to establishing phonological characteristics of the "Karamanlı dialects" (1950) based on 21 printed books, was unable to find common features for larger parts of his material. Nevertheless, his study is a valuable documentation of the dialectal variation in Anatolia. From a turcological point of view the Karamanlidic texts have a linguistic value as "transcription texts", not only in the usual sense of this rather awkward designation—texts that have the potential to reflect the actual pronunciation of the language because they are written with an alphabet that better renders the phonemes of Turkish than the Ottoman alphabet, with its conservative orthography, does—but also because they reflect spoken varieties of Turkish better than Ottoman texts do. This is because they are relatively free from the Ottoman literary tradition with its stylistic pretentiousness; their aim is to be understood by people without any Ottoman literary background. And obviously most of the texts were also written by people outside this literary tradition, even if they may have had a fair ability to read and write Ottoman Turkish.

As with most other transcription texts, the question arises whether the author was influenced by the principles of Ottoman orthography. In the case of Misailidis, forms such as *olmakdan*, *geçdim*, *yakalayub*, and *bulınub* cannot have any other explanation (Anhegger 1979–80: 168, and the survey by Irakleous 2013: 83–85). However, when it comes to features such as Seraphim's rendering of the original velar nasal by *ŋ* (γγ or γν) in stems, e.g. *aŋnadïlar* in the *ḥikmet* I reproduced above, I think we can be quite sure that it represents a velar nasal (and is a dialectal charac-

teristic alongside the other Central Anatolian features in that text).[24] But when forms such as *biŋ*, *geŋiş*, and *diŋle* are found in the Psalterion of 1841 (Irakleous 2013: 85), they more probably reflect the Ottoman spelling, since the missionaries editing that text are not likely to have used dialectal elements.

There can be no doubt that the texts written by Seraphim reflect a Central Anatolian dialect typical of the 18th century. As can be expected, vowel harmony is approximately on the same level as today; velar nasal is partly preserved (in suffixes it occurs in the 2nd person possessive suffix but not in the genitive); syllable final velar stop quite often becomes a fricative, etc. (Brendemoen 2010: 274–275). However, it is mostly in the field of syntax that the Karamanlı texts show features that demand special explanation.

In the above *ḥikmet* by Seraphim, we see unequivocal examples of the use of the past aorist where we would expect the imperfect: *ekklisade olan karï [...] yanïmda dururudu ve aspabiyilan beni örteridi ve ateš bana asla dokanmazïdï*. 'The woman who was in the church was standing beside me and she was covering me with her clothes, and the fire did not hurt me', where Modern Turkish would have *duruyordu*, *örtüyordu*, and *dokunmuyordu*. This feature is found also in other texts by Seraphim (Brendemoen 2010: 275). Since the Greek verbal system has the same possibilities to express the difference between perfective and imperfective (progressive) aspect as Turkish has, this feature cannot have been copied from the original Greek texts, but must reflect an extraordinarily late development of the Turkish imperfect tense in this dialect.[25] (Even if the first examples of *-yur* occur in the late part of the 15th century in texts from Istanbul, the past form must have developed later. Accordingly, in especially archaic dialects such as some of the Trabzon dialects, the imperfect past is still used less frequently than in Standard Turkish; see Brendemoen 2002, 1: 256).

In the field of syntax, Karamanlı texts, including those from the 19th century, are especially interesting because of their use of gerund constructions not found in modern standard Turkish, and that also are relatively rarely found in contemporary Ottoman texts. For the older texts, these constructions may be representative of specific dialects; for the newer ones such as *Temāšā-yı Dünyā*, they may have been characteristic of the vernacular of mid 19th-century Istanbul. Karahan has shown (1994) that a rich register of gerundial possibilities is found in Anatolian dialects. However, because to the best of our knowledge the diffusion of some of these suffixes is limited and idiosyncratic uses are very common, it is obvious that the need to create new gerundial expressions is an ongoing process.

24 An example is the kind of vowel harmony found in *ma'ṣum* > *maksïm* and *su'āl* > *sïval*, where the labializing consonants do not have any effect on the vowels, as in dialect forms such as *yaγmır* 'rain' and *çamır* 'mud', characteristic of the northern parts of Central Anatolia.

25 The orginal of the last-mentioned example has imperfect forms indeed: ἔστεκε 'was standing', ἐσκέπαζε 'was covering', ἔγγιζεν 'was hurting' (Amart. Sot. 399).

Thus, the "specifically Karamanlı" use of a gerundial suffix *-(y)išin* was described by Deny (1941b), and Eckmann in an article from 1958 mentions five suffixes he thinks are characteristic of Karamanlı texts (without, of course, claiming that they are exclusively found in such texts), i.e.:

1. *-dıkla(y)ın/-dikle(y)in*, e.g. *Hırsız kapuya bastıkları kımıldanmas oldular* 'Als die Räuber gegen de Pforte drückten, wurden sie gelähmt'.
2. *-dığı birle/birlen/birinen*, e.g. *Ayosu gördüğü birle vardı, yanına oturdu* 'Als er den Heiligen erblickte, ging er hin und setzte sich neben ihn'.
3. *-r ikenden*, e.g. *Sultan gider ikenden dova eder idi* 'Die Kaiserin betete, während sie ging'.
4. *-maynan/-meynen, -maylan/-meylen* etc., e.g. *Papaz gelmemeyle lituryasıs kaldılar* 'Da kein Priester kam, blieben sie ohne Gottesdienst'.
5. *-masına/-mesine*, expressing purpose, e.g. *Döndüm geriye büyüğünü almasına* 'Ich kehrte zurück, um den grösseren (Sohn) zu nehmen'.

In my opinion, the last-mentioned form is no real gerund. As for 1 and 4, they are found in regular Ottoman texts, too; see Brendemoen 2014b, where quite a number of examples of {-mAylAn} from Evliya Çelebi are mentioned.

In a very interesting article, Arslan-Kechriotis (2009) discusses syntactic features in Karamanlı texts which are not commonly found in the standard language today. She assembled her material by going though samples from six printed books from the end of the 19th century. The only one of the converbial constructions mentioned above that she also comments on is the one which is not really a converb, but an infinitive. She notices that it is used in one of the works she has gone through, though much more frequently with a possessive suffix than is the case in modern Turkish. In the following example (p. 177) the meaning is finite in the same way as Eckmann's: *... benim yüzümden ve gözlerimden öpmesine sarıldı...*, which probably should be translated 'He embraced [me] in order to kiss me on my face and eyes...'. However, non-final examples are also found. Arslan-Kechriotis has also noticed the frequent use of a gerund in {-DIkDA}, but this is also found in regular Ottoman texts (Deny 1941a: 925) and in Anatolian dialects (Karahan 1994: 224). One quite unusual gerundial construction is the use of *ise* not in a conditional, but a temporal sense. In some examples of this from Arslan-Kechriotis' material, the subject gets the suffix {-DIr}, for instance: *Kızdır ....gelip ....Mandolinaya ... çekidüzen vermeye başladı ise, Fransız delikanlı ... dimeye başladı...* 'When the girl came ... and started to tune up the mandolin ..., the French young man started to say...'. In *Temāšā-yı Dünyā*, too, we find examples of the temporal use of *ise*, but not usually combined with {-DIr}, e.g. *Bir de yanına varıp, efkârına muvafık (dertlerine uygun) yarenliğe başladım ise, kuzu gibi uslanıp, kitabı açtı...* (p. 82) 'And when I went up to him and started a friendly conversation that suited his worried mind, he became meek as a lamb and opened the book...'. One example with {-DIr} is: *Benidir gördü ise*, meaning *beni görünce* 'When he/she saw me', cited in the afterword to *Temāšā-yı Dünyā*

(p. 647). The use of conditional sentences for temporal ones is not strange *per se*, as the opposite is quite frequent,[26] but the use of {-DIr} is inexplicable. Apart from this last point, most of the above features mentioned by Arslan-Kechriotis are typical of 19th century (and older) Ottoman and/or popular language, as are also the less frequent use of the genitive than in the Turkish of today (p. 185), *dedi* constructions without *ki*, (pp. 180–182) and the frequent use of the infinitive {-mAklIk} (pp. 176–177). As for the last-mentioned feature, we see in the examples cited that wherever this infinitive has a possessive suffix, the suffix is the first person, most probably to avoid the form *-mAm*, which would be homonymous with the negated aorist 1st person form. This is a rule in the language of Aḥmed Midḥat; see Brendemoen (2014a). Likewise, the sentence-final position of the infinitive governed by *başlamak* is very old in Ottoman Turkish, and is still almost a rule in certain dialects (Brendemoen 2013). However, some of the features mentioned by Arslan-Kechriotis, such as the use of the plural ending after numerals, and the tendency to use plural verbal agreement even when the subject is inanimate, may no doubt have been influenced by Greek.[27] Another feature not mentioned by her is the rather infrequently occurring examples of expressing the acting person in passive constructions without any postposition such as *tarafından*, but only with the ablative, as in the following example from *Temāšā-yı Dünyā* (p. 220): ... *en zengin bir kaç âdemlerin kızları nâbedid (kayıp) oldular ve tuhafı bundadır ki, bu zayi olanların haneleri de haftasına hırsızlardan soyuldu* 'The daughters of some of the richest men disappeared, and the strange thing is that the homes of those who disappeared were also burgled by thieves after one week'. Here the use of the ablative *hırsızlardan* could be thought to reflect the parallel Greek construction, where the preposition από would be used. The same feature is also found in the subtitle of the *Ḥāğetnāme* reproduced above: *Şimdi ilk evvel tefsir olunup basmaya verildi ... Atallialu Serafeim Hiermonahostan* 'Now for the first time it has been explained and printed ... by the monk and priest Serapheim from Antalya'.[28]

When it comes to the order of the sentence constituents, however, most of the texts represent a very oral language, especially the *Ḥāğetnāme*; see Brendemoen (2010: 275–277). Here are some examples from our *ḥikmet*: *ǰümlesi avaz ettiler, gerektir ki babasïnï atešin ičine atsïnlar* 'All of them shouted that his father must be thrown into the fire'. The use of the imperative instead of an infinitive construction after *gerek(t)ir* is known to be a characteristic of the Balkan dialects today, where it

26 I.e. questions expressing conditional of the form *Kayınpederi rakıyı devirdi mi gözü dönerdi* 'As soon as her father-in-law had drunk the rakı, he would become completely crazy'.

27 The plural suffix is found after numerals in older Ottoman as well, even outside the case of "well-known groups" such as *Oniki Adalar* 'The Dodecanese'.

28 Also in the next sentence: *Hristianların kifayetligi için ayanları izniylen Venedikte basıldı Bortoli Antoniostan* 'It was printed in Venice by Antonio Bortoli by permission of the senators for the satisfaction of the Christians'.

probably is a product of copying from Greek and/or Bulgarian, but it is also found in Azeri, and may have been much more widely used in oral language earlier. Ultimately the construction may be a product of copying from Indo-European languages, but it is also quite acceptable in informal Standard Turkish today. The use of the construction in this particular text could also be explained as a direct calque on the Greek original, so that the Turkish imperative *atsïnlar* would be a rendering of the Greek construction with να + subjunctive.[29] The use of the imperative in the example *zan ettiki atešte külünü bulsun čoǰuγun* 'She thought she would find the ashes of the child in the fire' is more difficult to explain since there is no desire involved. However, it is not impossible that the feature should be explained as a more or less automatic rendering of Greek να + subjunctive constructions by Turkish imperative or optative in both this and the previous sentence.[30] Finally, let us examine the sentence *ekmeyi yediyim ekklisade olan karï kuǰaγïnda maksïmï tutan, yanïmda dururudu* 'The lady, who was in the church where I ate the bread and who was holding the infant on her lap, was standing beside me', which is quite a complex sentence. The position of the participle construction *kuǰaγïnda maksïmï tutan* after and rather than before the noun it describes is very unusual, and must be a calque of the Greek original.[31] At the same time, although awkward, the sentence is fully comprehensible. The oral character of the text would of course be emphasized when it was read aloud, for which purpose it most certainly was meant. However, considering the fact that spoken language is less complex than the written one, it is not probable that constructions of this kind were typical of the spoken Turkish of the Karamanlıs.

Conclusion

Karamanlı texts, especially the older ones such as the *Ḥāǧetnāme*, are valuable historical sources for oral language and the dialect of their writers. Some texts from the 19th century, such as *Temāšā-yı Dünyā*, also reflect the spoken Ottoman language in a unique way. The extent to which the language was influenced by Greek constructions remains to be investigated further. Syntactically, e.g. the language of the *Ḥāǧetnāme* does show elements copied from Greek, but in general the constructions are genuinely Turkish. Comparison of 19th century Karamanlı

29 The sentence in Greek is: *ἐβόησαν ἅπαντες, ὅτι ἔπρεπε νὰ ρίψουσιν εἰς τὴν κάμινον τὸν πατέρα του* (Amart. Sot. 2008: 399).

30 The original has: … *ἡ Μήτηρ αὐτοῦ ἔδραμε μετὰ ὀδυρμῶν, νομίζουσανὰ τὸ εὗρη στάκτην γενόμενον* (ibid.).

31 In the Greek original, too, there are two relative clases describing 'the lady', and one relative sentence describing 'the church'. All these relative clauses have finite verbs as predicates. The rule that Seraphim not has obeyed, however, is that corresponding Turkish participle constructions always should precede their head. The Greek sentence is.: *Ἡ γυνὴ ἐκεῖνη, ἥτις εἶναι εἰς τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν, ὅπου ἔφαγα τὸ ψωμί, καὶ κρατεῖ τὸ βρέφος εἰς τὴν ἀγκάλην της, ἔστεκε πλησίον μου, καὶ ἐσκέπαζέ με μὲ τὸ ἐπανοφόρι της*... (ibid.).

editions of Turkish folk-tales such as *Köroğlu*, *Şah İsmail*, and *Aşık Garip* with regular Turkish editions could also be interesting. From a historical and cultural point of view, Karamanlı literature has special value because it opens a door on to a fascinating cosmos that has completely disappeared today.

Bibliography

Amart. Sot. 2008. *Ἁμαρτωλῶν Σωτηρία, σύντεθεν εἰς κοινὴν τῶν Γραικῶν διάλεκτον παρὰ Αγαπίου μονάχου τοῦ Κρῆτος*. Ed. Ioannes Vranos. Thessaloniki: Ekdoseis Vas. Rigopoulou.

Anhegger, Robert 1979–1980. Hurufumuz Yunanca. Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der Karamanisch-Türkischen Literatur. *Anatolica* 7, 158–202.

Arslan-Kechriotis, Ceyda 2009. Some syntactic issues in Karamanlidika texts. *Turkic Languages* 13: 2, 172–187.

Aydın, Feyza Betül (no date). *Karamanlı bir Rum'un, Evangelinos'un gözünden Tanzimat sonrası Osmanlı'da Müslim-Gayrimüslim ilişkisi*. Found on http://www.academia.edu/3104347/Karamanlı_Bir_Rum_un_Evangelinos_un_Gözünden_Tanzimat_Sonrası_Osmanlı_da_Müslim-Gayrimüslim_İlişkisi.

Balta, Evangelia 1987a. *Karamanlidika. Additions (1584–1900). Bibliographie analytique.* Athènes: Centre d'Études d'Asie Mineure.

Balta, Evangelia 1987b. *Karamanlidika. XXe siècle. Bibliographie analytique.* Athènes: Centre d'Études d'Asie Mineure.

Balta, Evangelia 1997. *Karamanlidika. Nouvelles additions et compléments.* Athènes: Centre d'Études d'Asie Mineure.

Balta, Evangelia 1999. Périodisation et typologie de la production des livres karamanli. *Revue des mondes musulmans de la Méditerranée* (En ligne), 87–88. Septembre 1999. http//remmmrevues.org/306. Consulted 3 March, 2015.

Balta, Evangelia & Kappler, Matthias (eds.) 2010. *Cries and whispers in Karamanlidika books. Proceedings of the First International Conference on Karamanidika Studies* (Nicosia, 11–13 September 2008). (Turcologica 83.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Brendemoen, Bernt 2002. *The Turkish dialects of Trabzon* 1–2. (Turcologica 50.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Brendemoen, Bernt 2010. An eighteenth-century Karamanlidika codex from Soumela monastery in Trabzon. In: Balta & Kappler (eds.) 2010: 267–280.

Brendemoen, Bernt 2013. The infinitive in *-me/-ma* in the Balkan dialects. *Turkic Languages* 17, 31–37.

Brendemoen, Bernt 2014a. The late Ottoman use of the infinitives in *-mA* and *-mAklIk*. *Dilbilim Araştırmaları Dergisi* 2014: 2, 25–35.

Brendemoen, Bernt 2014b. Some remarks on the infinitive in *-mA* in 17th century Ottoman Turkish. In: *Turcology and linguistics. Éva Ágnes Csató Festschrift*. Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Yayınları. 103–113.

Deny, Jean 1941a. *Türk dili grameri (Osmanlı lehçesi)*. Çeviren: Ali Ülvi Elöve. İstanbul: Maarif Matbaası.

Deny, Jean 1941b. Le gérondif en *-(y)išin*, d'après les écrits du moine Ioanni Hierothéos, en turc des Grecs-orthodoxes turcophones d'Anatolie. *Körösi Csoma Archivum* 3, 119–128.

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

Eckmann, János 1958. Einige gerundiale Konstruktionen im Karamanischen. In: Eckmann, János & Levend, Agâh Sırrı & Mansuroğlu, Mecdut (eds.) *Jean Deny armağanı.* Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.

Eckmann, János 1964. Die karamanische Literatur. In: Bazin, Louis et al. (eds.) *Philologiae turcicae fundamenta* 2. Aquis Matthiacis: Franz Steiner. 819–835.

Gavriel, Eftychios 2010. Transcription problems of Karamanlidika texts. In: Balta & Kappler (eds.) 2010: 255–265.

Gökalp, G. Gonca 1999. Osmanlı-Türk romanının başlangıcında beş eser. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi Osmanlı'nın 700. Yılı Özel Sayısı*, 185–202.

Irakleous, Stelios 2013. On the development of Karamanlidika writing systems based on sources of the period 1764–1895. *Mediterranean Language Review* 20, 57–95.

Kappler, Matthias 2003. Note a proposito di 'ortografia caramanlidica'. In: Marazzi, Ugo (ed.) *Turcica et Islamica. Studi in memoria di Aldo Galotta.* Napoli: Università degli Studi di Napoli 'L' Orientale'. 309–339.

Kappler, Matthias 2006. Toward a linguistic approach to "Karamanlı" texts. In: Yağcıoğlu, Semiramis & Değer, Ayşen Cem (eds.) *Advances in Turkish linguistics. Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Turkish Linguistics 11-13 August, 2004.* İzmir: Dokuz Eylül University. 655–667.

Karahan, Leyla 1994. Anadolu ağızlarında kullanılan bazı zarf-fiil ekleri. *Türk Kültürü* 32, 205–236.

Karra, Anthi 2010 From *Polypathis* to *Temaşa-i Dünya*, from the Safe Port of translation to the open sea of creation. In: Balta & Kappler (eds.) 2010: 201–218.

Misailidis, Evangelinos 1988[2]. *Seyreyle dünyayı (Temaşa-i dünya ve cefakâr u cefakeş).* Hazırlayanlar: Robert Anhegger ve Vedat Günyol. Istanbul: Cem.

Németh, Julius 1965. *Die Türken von Vidin. Sprache, Folklore, Religion.* Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Salaville, Sévérien & Dalleggio, Eugène 1958. *Karamanlidika. Bibliographie analytique d'ouvrages en langue turque imprimés en caractères grecs* 1. (1584–1850). Athènes: Centre d'Études d'Asie Mineure.

Salaville, Sévérien & Dalleggio, Eugène 1966. *Karamanlidika. Bibliographie analytique d'ouvrages en langue turque imprimés en caractères grecs* 2. (1851–1865). Athènes: Institut Français.

Salaville, Sévérien & Dalleggio, Eugène 1974. *Karamanlidika. Bibliographie analytique d'ouvrages en langue turque imprimés en caractères grecs* 3. (1866–1900). Athènes: Filologikos Syllogos « Parnassos ».

Şimşek, Şehnaz Şişmanoğlu 2010. The *Anatoli* newspaper and the heyday of the Karamanli Press. In: Balta & Kappler (eds.) 2010: 109–124.

Şimşek, Şehnaz Şişmanoğlu 2011. The *Yeniçeriler* of Ioannis Gavrilidis. A palimpsest in Karamanlidika. In: Balta, Evangelia & Ölmez, Mehmet (eds.) *Between religion and language*. Istanbul: Eren. 245–275.

Şimşek, Şehnaz Şişmanoğlu 2012. İspanya'dan İstanbul'a. Karamanlı Pikaro Favini. In: Mutlu, Betül & Turan, Metin (eds.) *Türk ve dünya edebiyatında etkileşimler. Sempozyum bildirileri.* Ankara: UEM. 127–153. Found on: http://w3.beun.edu.tr/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/yayinlar/Turk_%20ve%20Dunya_%20Edebiyatlari_%20Arasinda_%20Etkilesimler.pdf

Strauss, Johann 2003. Who read what in the Ottoman Empire (19th–20th centuries). *Middle Eastern Literatures* 6: 1, 39–76.

Strauss, Johann 2010. Is Karamanli literature part of a "Christian Turkish (Turco-Christian literature"? In: Balta & Kappler (eds.) 2010: 153–200.

*Tarama Sözlüğü*1988–1972. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.

Theocharides, Ioannis 2010. Unexpected sources on Serapheim Pissidios. In: Balta & Kappler (eds.) 2010: 125–134.