

Language Policy and Planning
in the Mediterranean World

Edited by

Marilena Karyolemou and Pavlos Pavlou

CAMBRIDGE
SCHOLARS

P U B L I S H I N G

Language Policy and Planning in the Mediterranean World,
Edited by Marilena Karyolemou and Pavlos Pavlou

This book first published 2013

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2013 by Marilena Karyolemou and Pavlos Pavlou and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-4234-6, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-4234-1

In memoriam

This volume is dedicated to the memory
of my friend and colleague Pavlos Pavlou
who this project was initially conceived with



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
<i>Language Policy and Language Planning in the Mediterranean</i> Marilena Karyolemou	

Part I

Chapter One	12
<i>The Mediterranean as Sociolinguistic Ecosystem</i> Bernard Spolsky	

Chapter Two	23
<i>Le poids des langues en Méditerranée</i> Louis-Jean Calvet	

Chapter Three	41
<i>International Law and its Relevance to Language Policy and the Protection of Linguistic Diversity</i> Fernand de Varennes	

Chapter Four	54
<i>Les droits linguistiques et les étapes précoces de modernisation des langues balkaniques</i> Angel G. Angelov	

Chapter Five	72
<i>Maintenance and Renovation in the Attitudes of Ottoman Greek Intellectuals towards Ottoman Turkish</i> Matthias Kappler	

Part II

Chapter Six	88
<i>La parité linguistique masculin/féminin: une exigence démocratique</i> Edwige Khaznadar	

Chapter Seven.....	103
<i>La féminisation des noms de métier et des titres dans trois langues romanes (français, italien, espagnol): convergences et divergences</i>	
Elmar Schafroth	
Chapter Eight.....	122
<i>Normes systémiques et imaginaire linguistique: étude de cas dans la presse chypriote</i>	
Fabienne Baider and Marilena Karyolemou	
Part III	
Chapter Nine.....	144
<i>Which Languages for Which Schools? Issues in Language Policy in Bilingual Malta</i>	
Lydia Sciriha	
Chapter Ten	160
<i>Contextualising English Language Policy in Greek Universities: ESP, EAP or EGP</i>	
Androniki Gakoudi, Eleni Griva and Foteini Karanikola	
Chapter Eleven	178
<i>Involving Youth in Planning the Renewal of a Lesser Used Language</i>	
Brian Bielenberg	
Part IV	
Chapter Twelve	194
<i>Micro and Macro in Language Policy and Planning: Some Definitions and Paradigms from the Cypriot Context</i>	
Popi Theophanous	
Chapter Thirteen.....	210
<i>Public and Commercial Signs in Cyprus: Should Language Policy Foster an Identity?</i>	
Dimitra Karoulla-Vrikki	

Chapter Fourteen	225
<i>A Language at Stake: Identity Issues and Political Actions among the Maronite Community in Cyprus</i> Maria Koumarianou	
Editors and Contributors.....	240
Index.....	252

CHAPTER FIVE

MAINTENANCE AND RENOVATION IN THE ATTITUDES OF OTTOMAN GREEK INTELLECTUALS TOWARDS OTTOMAN TURKISH

MATTHIAS KAPPLER

1. Premises

Renovation as an action within corpus planning, a term introduced by Cooper (1989: 154), involves “an effort to change an already developed code, whether in the name of efficiency, aesthetics, or national or political ideology”. Cooper coined the term to refer to the Turkish language reforms that began in the 1920s, as well as other renovation movements. However, the term did not catch on, and was not used on a large scale by subsequent scholars. Renovation as an act of language policy also implies its counterpart, maintenance, motivated by a social or political attitude established as language ideology and language beliefs. The motivation for renovation, as described by Cooper (efficiency, aesthetics, ideology), will be used in the present paper as the premise for an analysis of language beliefs—resulting in true language management—roughly half a century before the actual reform movement in Kemalist Turkey, and, specifically in the attitude of Ottoman Greeks (Rums) in Istanbul and Asia Minor.

2. Aesthetics

2.1 *Elsine-i şelâse* – The Three Languages

The Turkish Language Reform has been cited in language policy and language planning (LPLP) literature as one of the most “dramatic” and “radical” examples of language planning in the framework of modernization.

This view often neglects or disregards the fact that the language discussion on the status of Ottoman Turkish, on the alphabet and on language renovation within the Ottoman society preceded the actual reforms that took place during the 1920s and 30s. However, most researchers dealing extensively with the Turkish reform—for example Heyd (1954: 9-18), Gallagher (1971), Lewis (1999: 5-26)—underline the importance of the development of a “moderate language reform” by Ottoman intellectuals like Ziya Paşa or Namık Kemal. These intellectuals stressed the need for linguistic simplification, including the substitution of the Arabo-Persian lexicon with “genuine” Turkic words, and the reform of the Arabic graphic system. Yet it must be emphasized that, at that time, these efforts were not supported by a nationalist ideology. Standard Ottoman Turkish was considered an odd system of symbols that concerned a linguistic elite and hindered political westernization and democratization. Traditionally, Ottoman is seen, both from an ideological and from an aesthetic point of view, as a compound of three languages (in Ottoman *elsine-i şelâse*), Arabic, Persian and Turkish, where every language has its own prestige and status: Arabic as a religious symbol, Persian as the literary language of the Turkic states for many centuries, Turkish—which was formerly considered of inferior status—as an emerging means for ideological self-expression. Namık Kemal (1840-1888) is one of the first Ottoman intellectuals who questioned the ideological axiom of the “three languages,” and more generally argued against borrowing from foreign languages, which he considered a sign of “domination” (cited in Lewis 1999: 13). It is interesting to note that he rhetorically uses the Christian term *eqânîm-i şelâse* (trinity) when, in 1866, he criticizes the growing divergence between the spoken and written varieties of Ottoman:

Türkçenin eczâ-yı terkibi olan üç lisân ki, telâffuzda olduçça ittihâd bulmuşken tahrîrde hâlâ hey'et-i aşliyyelerini muhafaza ediyor. Eqânîm-i şelâse gibi sözde gûya müttehid ve haqiqatte zidd-ı kâmindir.

While the three languages of which Turkish is compounded have attained a certain unity in speech, they still preserve their original form in writing. Like the three persons of the Trinity, they are said to be united, but are in fact the reverse of integrated. (*Taşvîr-i Efkâr* 416 [1866]; Lewis 1999: 13)

Thus, the ideological discussion about language actually begins in the 1860s; this could be considered the first period of Turkish language reform. The first efforts to find a new name for the standardized variety of Ottoman Turkish, without—or without yet—effectively changing linguistic structure, must be analyzed from the perspective of status planning.

2.2 Ottoman Grammar Books in Turkish and Greek

The effort to name the standardized variety can be seen in the titles of Ottoman Turkish grammars published in the second half of the nineteenth century. The most widely used grammar book was written by Ahmed Cevdet Paşa, *Rules of Ottoman* (*Qavâ'id-i 'Osmaniyye*, first edition under *Medhal-Qavâ'id* in 1268/1851) and included all three languages treated in different parts of the grammar. After 1871 the section concerning Turkish was published several times separately under the title *Rules of Turkish* (*Qavâ'id-i Türkiyye*), while the integral Ottoman version continued also to be published (sixteen times until 1906; see Karabacak 1989). The first grammar to bear the word *Turkish* was the *Science of Turkish grammar* (*İlm-i Şarf-ı Türki*, 1293/1874) by Süleyman Paşa (cf. Lewis 1999: 16); it also contains a description of the Arabo-Persian elements of Ottoman. Until the end of the century, nineteen grammars specified *Ottoman* in their title, while six grammars (one published in 1885, two in 1890, 1892, 1893, and 1897) used the word *Turkish*. On the other hand, all the grammars that appeared at the beginning of the twentieth century, between 1906 and 1911, i.e. shortly before and after the revolution of the Young Turks, had only the term *Turkish* in their title.

The middle of the nineteenth century, with the publication of Adosidis' grammar in 1850,¹ is the starting point of the production of printed² Ottoman grammars written in Greek. Throughout the century twelve grammar books and a large number of manuals, dialogue books, syllabaries and other language material were published in Istanbul and Izmir for the use of the Greeks in the Ottoman Empire who wanted to, or had to, learn Turkish. The linguistic variety named in the title of these books is always *Ottoman*. The books either include a separate discussion of the "three languages" in different chapters, or integrate the description of the Arabo-Persian elements into the main part of the text. It is interesting to note that the most widely used Greek Ottoman grammar, the famous *Γραμματική της Οθωμανικής Γλώσσης* [*Grammar of the Ottoman language*] by Ioannis Chlorós, was renamed in its fifth edition in 1911, *Γραμματική της Τουρκικής Γλώσσης* [*Grammar of the Turkish language*]. The date is by no means a coincidence, since it overlaps with the foundation of the literary group and journal *Genç Kalemler* in Salonica in April 1911 and, generally speaking, reflects the change of attitude and ideology after the Young Turk revolution in 1908.

It has been stated that Turkish writers at that time—and since the end of the nineteenth century—to a great degree avoided Persian constructions and considered their language to be Turkish, not Ottoman (Lewis 1999: 21). Although the attitudes towards language have been exhaustively investigated

in the major works on the Turkish language reform, the language beliefs of the Ottoman minorities (mainly Greeks, Armenians, and Jews) on the subject have not yet been studied. As far as the attitude of Ottoman Greeks in particular (Armenians and Jews probably present a rather different image), we find a valuable source in the prologues of the above-mentioned Turkish grammars written by Ottoman Greeks for Greek speaking learners during the nineteenth century.³ In the second part of the paper, I will try to describe the discussion on language among the Turcophone Greek Orthodox population, conventionally called Karamanli.

2.3 Ottoman Greek Grammars and Dictionaries

First of all, our sources clearly indicate that the Ottoman Greeks involved in language acquisition planning (school teachers, grammarians, state employees in the Ottoman Ministry of Education, curriculum planners) did not question the principle of the threefold nature of Ottoman, the "three languages" (*elsine-i selâse*), according to the Ottoman Turkish ideology. This point of view is expressed in some cases in a rather literary way:

1. 'Η ὀθωμανικὴ γλῶσσα, φύσει σοβαρὰ καὶ μεγαλοπρεπὴς, προσλαβοῦσα ἕκ μὲν τῆς περσικῆς τὸ γλαφυρὸν καὶ ἑναρμόνιον, ἕκ δὲ τῆς ἀραβικῆς τὸ ὕψος καὶ ποικιλοφραδῆς κατέστη ἐξαιρετος, δυναμένη ἐναβρύνεσθαι μεταξύ τῶν πλουσιωτέρων τε καὶ ὠραιωτέρων γλωσσῶν τῆς οἰκουμένης. (Adosidis 1850: viii)

The Ottoman language, serious and majestic by nature, has received from Persian the elegance and the harmony, and from Arabic the elevation and richness of expression, and has thus reached an exceptional variety, and can boast to be among the richest and most beautiful languages of the world.

2. 'Η ὀθωμανικὴ γλῶσσα συγκειμένη ἐκ τῆς Ἀραβικῆς, Περσικῆς καὶ Ταταρικῆς γλώσσης, συγκεντρώνει ἐν ἑαυτῇ πᾶσας τὰς ὠραιότητας τῶν τριῶν τούτων γλωσσῶν: ὡς καλὴ μέλισσα ἐσύναξε τὸ λεπτὸν ἐκεῖνο μέρος ἀπὸ τὰ περικαλλῆ ἄνθη καὶ ἐπλούτισε καὶ ἐστόλισεν ἑαυτὴν, ἢ μάλλον εἰπεῖν παρήγαγε τὸ γλυκύτατον μέλι τῶν Ἀνατολικῶν γλωσσῶν. 'Η δὲ σαφήνεια αὐτῆς, ἢ γλαφυρότης, ἢ ἄρμονία καὶ καλλιπέπεια αὐτῆς εἶναι μεγίστη καὶ ὁσημέραι προβαίνει εἰς ἐνείλειαν. (Fardys & Fotiadis 1860: 16-17)

The Ottoman language, composed of Arabic, Persian and Tatar, comprises in herself all the beauties of these three languages: like a good bee she gathered the finest part of the most beautiful flowers enriching and

embellishing herself, or, in other words, she produced the sweetest honey of the Oriental languages. Her clarity, elegance, harmony and beauty are exceptional and move towards perfection day by day.

3. [...] ἀπὸ πολλοῦ, χάρις εἰς τὰ σοφὰ πονήματα φιλοπόνων καὶ εὐπαιδευτῶν ὁμογενῶν τουρκιστῶν, ἐντρυφώμεν εἰς τὰ ἄνθη τῆς ὀθωμανικῆς γλώσσης τὰ ἀποπνέοντα τὸ ἄρωμα τῆς Ἀραβικῆς καὶ ραντιζόμενα ὑπὸ τῆς δρόσου τῆς Περσικῆς. (Miliopoulos 1875: 1)

[...] for a long while, thanks to the erudite works of industrious and learned Turkologists of our community, we have enjoyed the flowers of the Ottoman language which emanate the perfume of Arabic and are sprinkled with the dew of Persian.

At the end of the century, Apostolis Fotiadis, a member of an important family of turcologists (his father, Konstantinos Fotiadis, was the co-author of *The Greek Turkish lexicon*, published in 1860), still referred to the *elsine-i selâse* as an untouchable principle; but he already notes how difficult the Ottoman language is due to its Arabic and Persian elements, which later was to become one of the main arguments—the sake of efficiency—used by the language reformers:

4. Ὁ μακαρίτης πατήρ μου ἀπὸ τῆς τρυφερᾶς μου ἡλικίας μοὶ ἐνέπνευσεν εὐκρινῆ ἀγάπην καὶ ἄπειρον σεβασμὸν πρὸς τὴν ἐπίσημον τῶν ὀθωμανῶν γλώσσαν, τὴν γοητευτικὴν καὶ σεμνὴν ταύτην δεσποίναν τῆς Ἀνατολῆς. [...] Ὅσακις ἐξήτουν να συνδιαλεχθῶ μετὰ τῆς ὀραίας ταύτης δεσποίνης, αἱ δύο σοβαρὰ σύντροφοι αὐτῆς, ἄραβ καὶ περσίς, λαμβάνουσαι ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πλεῖστον τὸν λόγον, καθίσταν ἀδύνατον τὴν ἀντίληψιν τῶν λεγομένων τῆς. [...] Μετὰ πολλοὺς κόπους καὶ μοχθοὺς κατώρθωσα μὲν νὰ ἐννοῶ κάπως τοὺς λόγους τῶν δύο ἐπιβλητικῶν καὶ ἀχωρίστων συντρόφων τῆς, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάλιν ἡ πλήρης συνεννόησις δὲν θὰ ἐπιτυχάνετο, ἂν μὴ ἡ σεβασμία μήτηρ τῆς ἀγνῆς δεσποίνης, ἡ ἀρχαία τουρκικὴ γλώσσα, ἐπῆρχετο καὶ μοὶ ὑπεδύκνυε τὸ ἀρχικὸν ἰδίωμα τῆς χαριτοβρύτου θυγατρὸς τῆς. (Fotiadis 1897: i)

My late father inspired in me from my tender childhood years the love and utmost respect for the official language of the Ottomans, that gracious and modest maiden of the Orient. [...] Every time I tried to converse with that beautiful maiden, her two grave companions, Arab and Perse, took up the major part of the speech and made comprehension of what she said impossible. After much effort and labour, I managed to understand to a certain extent the speech of her two imperious and inseparable companions, but in spite of that perfect intelligence would not have been achieved if the respected mother of the pure maid, the ancient Turkish

language, had not appeared and shown to me the original idiom of her graceful daughter.

It is not clear what Fotiadis means by “ancient Turkish,” but we have to remember that the Orhon inscriptions (the oldest Turkic written source, dating to the seventh century AD) had already been discovered by Russian Turcologists in Mongolia eight years earlier, and Fotiadis likely is alluding to that. What is new in Fotiadis’ attitude is the status of the Turkic element, which he characterized as “respectable,” “pure” and “graceful.” This is a huge progress, which eventually led to the rejection of Arabo-Persian elements and the reshaping of the status of Turkish in relation to the Turkic origins of Ottoman Turkish. As a comparison, former Ottoman Greek grammarians characterized the Turkic part (often called “Tatar”) as “poor” or “rude”:

5. Ἡ Τουρκικὴ διάλεκτος εἶναι πτωχοτάτη, δι’ ὃ καὶ δανεῖζεται ἀπὸ τὴν Ἀραβικὴν καὶ Περσικὴν ὄχι μόνον ὅσα δὲν ἔχει, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλὰ, τὰ ὅποια ἔχει, πρὸς καλλωπισμὸν τῆς γλώσσης. (Alexandridis 1812: 117)

The Turkish dialect is very poor, and that’s why it borrows from Arabic and Persian not only what it does not have, but also many [words] that it does have, to embellish the language.

6. [...] ἡ ὀθωμανικὴ γλώσσα δὲν ἔπαυσε νὰ προάγῃται καὶ ἀκμάζῃ, καὶ ἀπὸ τραχυφθόγγου καὶ πενιχρᾶς ταταρικῆς διαλέκτου κατέστη γλαφυρὰ καὶ γλυκεία, προσεκτήσατο δὲ μεγαλοπρέπειαν, πομπῶδες ὕφος, πλοῦτον καὶ χάριν, διότι εἰς τὴν μόρφωσιν καὶ ἀνάπτυξιν αὐτῆς μεγάλως συνετέλεσαν αἱ τότε καὶ νῦν ἀκμάζουσαι γλώσσαι περσικὴ καὶ ἀραβικὴ. (Konstantinidis 1874: xiv)

(...) the Ottoman language has continued to progress and prosper, and from a raw-sounding and miserable Tatar dialect it has achieved elegance and sweetness, and has reached magnificence, solemn style, richness and grace, since the Arabic and Persian languages, flourishing at that time and today, have contributed much to its formation and development.

3. Ideology

This traditional aesthetic evaluation of Ottoman finds fertile ground both in the phenomenon of “Ottomanism” (*osmanlılık*), characteristic of the second half of the nineteenth century, and, as regards the Rum millet, in the ideology of Helleno-Ottomanism which sought to legitimate the political power of the Sultan—along with the “national” power of the Orthodox Patriarch—as unchallengeable (see Anagnostopoulou & Kappler

2005-2006). In this ideological framework, the belief in an Ottoman language that belonged to all the subjects of the empire, be they Turcophone or not, was highly symbolic. In the prologue of the first Greek-Ottoman grammar printed in Istanbul (Adosidis 1850: 7), we read:

7. [...] ἐὰν μὲν ἡ σπουδὴ τοῦ ἀρχαίου Ἑλληνος λόγου μας εἶναι ἀπαραίτητος διὰ τὸ νὰ καλλύνωμεν τὴν λαλομένην ἡμῶν γλῶσσαν καὶ νὰ φιλοσοφῶμεν εἰς τὰ προγονικὰ ἡμῶν συγγράμματα, οὐχ ἦττον μὰς εἶναι ἀναγκαῖα καὶ ἡ γνώσις τῆς ὀθωμανικῆς γλώσσης ὡς χρησιμεύουσα εἰς τὸ νὰ προσουκειώσῃ ἡμᾶς καὶ συσφίξῃ, οὕτως εἰπεῖν, μετὰ πολυαριθμῶν διαφοροθρήσκων λαῶν, συγκροτούντων τὴν μεγάλην ὀθωμανικὴν οἰκογένειαν, ὡς καθιστῶσα ἡμᾶς ἰκανοὺς νὰ ὑπερασπιζώμεν τὰ δίκαια ἡμῶν ἐπὶ δικαστηρίου καὶ νὰ διατρέχωμεν εὐρὺ ἐμπορικόν, πρόσθετες καὶ πολιτικόν, στάδιον ἐπὶ Ἐπικρατείας ἐκτεινομένης ἀπὸ τοῦς αἰγιαλοῦς τοῦ περσικοῦ κόλπου μέχρι τῶν ἐσχατιῶν τῆς ἰονικῆς θαλάσσης, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦς καταβράκτας τοῦ Νείλου πέραν τῶν ὄχθων τοῦ Δουναβέως, καὶ ὡς συντελοῦσα, τέλος, εἰς τὸ νὰ συνάψῃ καὶ διατηρήσῃ ἄρχοντας καὶ ἀρχομένους εἰς ἀγαπητικὴν διάθεσιν. (Adosidis 1850: vii)

(...) although studying the Ancient Greek literature is indispensable for us in order to improve our spoken language and to philosophize on the scripts of our ancestors, the knowledge of the Ottoman language is not less necessary to us, because it serves to familiarize ourselves and, so to say, to tie up with the numerous peoples of different religions that constitute the large Ottoman family, and because it allows us to defend our rights in court and to spread over a wide commercial, and also political, radius in a territory which extends from the coasts of the Persian Gulf until the extremes of the Ionian Sea, and from the waterfalls of the Nile to the shores of the Danube, and, finally, because it [the Ottoman language] contributes to keeping dominators and dominated united in mutual love.

The metaphor of the family in the Ottomanistic view can here be compared to the rhetorical device (Fotiadis, see above extract 4) used for the “three languages” in which the Ottoman language is described in terms of family relationships.

But Ottomanism, aesthetics and efficiency are not the only arguments: Adosidis also mentions the practical reasons for learning Ottoman, an important issue which perhaps seems obvious at first blush, but actually was the leading motivation in nineteenth-century Greek Ottoman grammar production.

4. Karamanli: Efficiency and Education

Another interesting source of information, albeit with a different perspective, comes from that part of the *millet-i Rum*, the Orthodox Christian community, who are not Hellenophones or, at least, do not have Greek but Turkish as their mother tongue, the so-called *Karamanli*, or *Karamanlides*. At the end of the nineteenth century, Karamanli had already spread throughout the entire Ottoman Empire, leaving behind their motherlands situated in Inner Anatolia and settling along the coastal areas of the peninsula, and, particularly, in the capital Istanbul. It is in these urban settings that was published the most long-lived Karamanli newspaper, *Anatoli*, the first newspaper in Turkish written in the Greek alphabet at the intention of the Turcophone Christians all over the empire.⁴ For this speech community, the “language question” has a completely different dimension, bearing aspects of status and corpus planning not from the point of view of language acquisition, but from the very base of language practice inside and outside the religious borders of the *millet*. However, the same attitude of “maintenance,” or language conservatism, observed in the Hellenophone Ottoman Greeks, can be found in the Turcophone Orthodox circles, too. From a discussion on the language issue between the editors and the readers of the newspaper *Anatoli* in 1890, it becomes evident that the views expressed by the director N. T. Soullidis, a native speaker of Turkish, concur with the language beliefs of the Ottoman Greek curriculum planners and grammarians:⁵

8. Πῆρ γαζετὲ λισανηνὴν νὰς πείνινδὲ κουλλανηλὰν λισὰν δερεδζεσινὲ ἰνδριλιμεσίδε δζαῖζ ὀλαμάζ. Πῆλ ἄικς τεδζριδζὲν [tedricen] λισανὴν δούζελεδλῶνπ, νὰς πείνινδὲ νὰκς βὲ γιανλῆς πῆρ σουρετδὲ σῶιλενὲν σὸς βὲ τααπιρατὴν τασχιχὶ γαζετανὴν δζῶυμλεῖ βαζαῖφινδένδῆρ. (*Anatoli*, 8 May 1890, no. 4184)

It is not acceptable that the language of a newspaper be lowered down to the level of the language as used by common people. On the contrary, it is one of the general duties of the newspaper to correct gradually and to adjust the form and expression of the language that is spoken deficiently and faultily by common people.

This view is shared also by some readers, as can be seen from the letter of a certain Chrysanthos Efendi:

9. Χερσὲχριλεμὲ. Τεαμίμ ἰλμ-οὐ-μεαριφὲ, τεεμίνι ἄδλ-οὐ-χακαῖκ τεβσιῖ χηρὲφ βὲ σαναῖγὲ, τεδεββούνι ἀκβὰμ βὲ καπαῖλε, βελχάσηλ πένι πῆσερῖν φητρετὲν μούτεχαλλῖκ ὀλδηγὴ χασαῖσι μούμεγιέζζε βὲ μουφεχχεφρεσινὴν τενβῖρὶ βὲ ἀμαλινὴν τεβχιδὶ ἰλὲ σααδέτι δούνγεβιγὲ βὲ οὐχριβεγεσινὴν

ἰκτισάπ-οὐ-ἰστιχσαλινέ, ἀλέμι ματ்பουατήν βασιταϊγεκάνε ὀλδηγηνή κίμεσενέ ἰνκίάρ ἰδεμέζ. [...] Ἄλελ χουσσούς ἀδζιζλερινίν βέ πένιμ ἰλέ περαπέρ δικέρ πιλ-δζύμλε βατανδασλαρημὴν σού γαζεταγι μουταλααδάν μακσαδὴ ἄλελ-οὐμούμ ἐβράκη χαβαδισίν μουταλαασή κιπὶ μουνχασηρέν ἀχβάλι ἀλέμ χακκηνδὰ μααλουμάτη μούδζμελέ ἰστιχσαλι ὀλμαγιουπ, πῆρδε ἰσλάχη λισάνδρη. Λισάνη μαδερζαδεμιζ ὀλάν Ὀσμανληδζανήν Ἀνατοληνήν χέρ κητασηνδὰ πασκά πασκά τάρζ-οὐ-σίβεδὲ ἰστιμάλ ἰδιλόυρ ἰκέν, χιτζ πῆρσινίν μουσαχχάχ βεγια χιτζ ὀλμάζσε πῆρ δερεδζεγέ καδάρ ἀσληνά μακρουόν σουρετδὲ κουλλανηλμαδηγή χέρ ἂν μεσμοῦί ἐσέφ μεσμούλ ὀλμακδάδηρ. Ὀνον ἰτζίν χεμσέχριλεριμ Ἀνατολληλάρδζα σού γαζετανήν μούταλαασή ἐσασέν ἰσλάχ βέ τεβχιδι λισανὰ χηδμέτ ἰδεδζεγινδέν, βέ λισάνη φεσαχέτ πεγιάνη Ὀσμανιν ἰσέ, μούρεκκεπάτη μούχτελιφεσι σεπεπὶ ἰλέ ζάτεν βασή βέ ἔμσαλι ἀρασηνδὰ ρεφι ὀλδουκεδάν μααδὲ σού ἄσηρ χαζρέτι Σεχινσάχιδὲ μαγιούτι δζιχάν βέ ζιῖνέτ εφζάι λισάν ὀλαδζάκ δερεδζελερδὲ τεκεμμούλ εἴλεμιζ βέ κίουνδέν κίουνέ τεφεγιούζ ἰμεκδὲ πουλουνμούζ ὀλμασηνά μεπνὶ ἰσπου γαζετανήν δαχὶ ὀ γιολὰ δόκούλμεσι ταπὶ ἰδί. (*Anatoli*, 28 April 1890, no. 4180)

To our compatriots. Nobody can deny that the world of the press is the sole means of ensuring science and knowledge, justice and rights, of enlarging trade and industry, of registering peoples and tribes, in short of illuminating the distinguished qualities acquired naturally by mankind, and of uniting their aspirations in order to obtain happiness in the present and the future world. (...) Specifically, as for all my other compatriots, so for myself, the aim of reading this newspaper is not exclusively to get informed generally on events and to acquire concise knowledge about international affairs, but also to improve language. Since our mother tongue, Ottoman, is spoken in every part of Anatolia in different ways and with different accents, it is regrettable to hear constantly that nobody uses [the language] correctly or at least in a way as close as possible to the original. Therefore, since the reading of this newspaper helps my compatriots all over Anatolia basically to improve and unify their language, and apart from being elevated because of the various compounds of pure and eloquent Ottoman expression through extensive examples, it was natural that this newspaper also took that route since it is perfecting this era of instruction protected by the Sultan to degrees which reach the prosperity of the world and the increasing adornment of language.

In spite of this policy towards language use adopted by the editors of *Anatoli*, and implemented at least by some of its readers, there are, though admittedly very rarely, voices of protest. An anonymous reader, with the initials A. N. from Eskişehir, writes:

10. Ἐσκισέχρη, 19 Μαΐου 1890. ANATOLIA ματπασαινδὰ Ν. Θ. Σουλλιδῆς δζεναπλερινέ. Μαλούμι ἀλιντζδῆρικι, ραχμετλι Εὐαγγελινός Μισαηλίδης ζεμανηνδὰ Ἀρεπὶ βέ Φαρσί λογάτ βέ ἰπαρελέρ γιαζηλήγιωρ

ἰδί. Σόνρα τεσέκκι ὀληνδὴ κι, ἐκσεριγιέτ Τούρκτζε πῆρδζινδέν, ἀνλάμαγιωρλαρ δεγιού. Ὁ ζεμάν κενδισὶ ἰλάν ἰτδὶ βέ ἀτζήκ Τούρκτζε γιαζμαγια πασλαδὴ. Σιμιδὶ σιζλέρ πασλαδηνήζ. Κιούζέλ, ἔμμα ἀνλαγιάν βάρ ἰσέ, ὄνα ἐγίδιρ, ἀνλαμαγιανὰ χιτζ μακαμηνδάδηρ. Τζουνκούδ Γαζέτα ὀκουμακδάν μακσαδ νέδιρ, γιαζηληδηγηνή ἀνλαμάκδηρ. Ἀνλαμάζ ἰσέ λουζουμι γιόκδηρ ζάν ἰδέριμ. Ἀνήν ἰτζόν κελεδζέκ 1891 σενεσινέ καδάρ πεδελινὶ βηρδζιμιζδέν χακκημηζ βάρδηρ, ἰστέρ ἰστεμέζ ἀλαδζάγηζ. Εγέρκι πού λισάν ἰλέ δεβὰμ ἐδέρσενιζ, πιζλερὶ αβφ ἰδερέκ μούστερι δεφτερινδέν καϊδημηζή σιλινιζ. [...] Χιτζ μαμαφιχ σιμιδιδέν ἰχπαρέ λουζουμ κόρούλουσδούρ. Πακὶ ἀφιγετδὲ ὀλασηνήζ. Α. Ν. (*Anatoli*, 26 May 1890, no. 4191)

Eskişehir, 19 May 1890. To the Esteemed N. Th. Sullidis at the Anatoli printing-house. As you know, at the time of the late Evangelinos Misailidis [many] Arabic and Persian words and expressions were written. Afterwards there were complaints that since the majority knows Turkish, they do not understand. Then he made a declaration and began to write in clear Turkish. Now you have begun [to write]. This is all very well, but if someone understands, good for him, but for him who does not understand there is no way. Because what is the aim of reading a newspaper? It is to understand what is written. If one does not understand, I think it is needless. Therefore, since we paid the subscription until the forthcoming year 1891, we have the right, willingly or not, to take it [back]. If you go on with this language, forgive us and cancel our subscription from the customer's register. (...) However, I felt the need to warn you as from now. Be always in good health A. N.

Soullidis' answer is interesting, not only because of its harsh, educational tone and concealed irony, but also because in his response he uses and defends Arabic and Persian lexical loans and grammatical structures—although his reply is still less pompous and more close to spoken language than that of Chrysanthos Efendi (see extract 9 above):

11. Πού ζάτη μουουτεπερεγιέ ἰχτάρ εἴλεδιγι ἰτζόν σαχιχέν βέ κερτζεκδέν ὀλαράκ, τεσέκκιούρ ἰδέρ ἰσέκδε, Γαζεταμηζήν σιβεὶ λισανὴ κενδισινίν μεκτουπινδὲ κουλλανδηγηή λισανδάν φαρκὴ γιόκ γιαχδδ πέκ ἄζ φαρκὴ βάρδηρ. Γεκανέ μακσαδημηζ βέ ἀρζουμούζ Τουρκτζεδέν πασκά λισανὰ ἄσινὰ ὀλμαγιαν σεβκιλι χεμσέχριλεριμιζέ χηζμέτ ἰμεκ ἰδούγινδέν, μούκκιν ὀλδηγηή μερτεπεδὲ ἀτζήκ λισανδὰ γιαζμαγια δηκκὰτ ἰδιγιουρζ. Μαμαφιχ (πού τααπίρι ἀρεπὶγι Α. Ν. Ἐφένδι δαχὶ κουλλανδηγηνδάν πῆζδε ἰστιμάλ ἰδιγιουρζ) γιόκσα πουνούν ἰλέ περαπέρ τααπῆρινὶ κουλλαναδζάκ ἰδὶκ) ρεσμί βέ ἀτζήκ Τουρκτζεγιέ τερδζεμεσι μούκκιν ὀλμαγιαν πάζη λογάτ βέ τααπῆράτ βάρ ὄνλαρην κουλλανηλμαση ζαρουρὶδιρ. Πουνδάν πασκά γιαβὰζ γιαβὰζ πάζη ἀρεπὶ βέ φαρσί λογάτ βέ τααπῆράτ ὀγρενιλιμζ ὀλσὰ ζαραρδάν ζγιαδὲ φαϊδεσι ὀλαπιλιρ ζάν ἰδέριζ. [...] Μεσελὰ Α. Ν. ἔφενδινίν μεκτουπινὶ μισὰλ τουταλήμ Ἀνατολημηζδὰ ἐκσεριγιέ (τζοκλήκ),

μακσὰδ (μερὰμ), μαμαφιχ (πουνονὺν ἰλὲ περαπὲρ) κῑτὶ λογάτ βὲ τααπίρὰτ πῑλινμὲζ ἰκὲν, Γαζέτα ὀκουγιά ὀκουγιά βὲ μουσαχχὰχ λισὰν σὸῖλεγενλερι ἰσὶδὲ δινλεγιὲ πὲκ τζὀκ λογάτ βὲ τααπίρὰτ ὀρενιλιδὶ βὲ κουλλανήγορουζ βὲ γαβὰς γαβὰς πῑρ ἔδιπ (ὀκουμῆς, κατῑπ, λισανὰ ἀσῑνὰ ἔφένδι) καδὰρ δεγλ ἰσὲ, ὄνα γιακῑν τεκελλὸμ ἰδιλεπῑλινίγορ πουνδὰν πὸῖλὲ δαχὰ ζγιαδὲ σὲιλὲρ ὀρενιλεδζεγῑ κῑὸν κῑτὶ ἀσικιάρδρη. (*Anatoli*, 26 May 1890, no. 4191)

We sincerely and really thank the esteemed person for his suggestion, but there is no difference or very little difference between the language of our newspaper and the language that he used in his own letter. Since our only aim and wish is to serve our dear compatriots who do not know any language other than Turkish, we make sure and write in a language which is as clear as possible. However (as this Arabic term [*mamafiḥ*] has been employed also by A. N. Efendi, we use it too; otherwise we would have used the term *bunun ile beraber*), there are some words and terms which cannot be translated into formal and clear Turkish; their usage is obligatory. Apart from this, we think that it is more useful than harmful if gradually some Arabic and Persian words and terms are learnt. Let us quote A. N. Efendi's letter as an example: although words and terms such as *ekseriye* (majority), *maksad* (aim), *mamafiḥ* (however) are unknown in our [homeland] Anatolia, they have been learnt and are used through constantly reading a newspaper and hearing how they are said in the correct language, and can gradually be pronounced, if not in the manner of a literary man (i.e., of learned people, scribes, language experts), then at least close to that. It is as clear as day that more such things like this can be learnt.

The view of the director of the most widely read Turkish newspaper for Orthodox Christians in the Ottoman Empire, together with that of the Greek curriculum planners and grammarians, might be representative of the conservative language ideology of Ottoman Greeks in general. Interestingly, the attitude expressed by Greeks stands in striking opposition to the views of the most influential Turkish Ottoman journalists of the same time, who are striving for a simplification and a renovation of the language, and in this sense prepare the ground for the Kemalist language reforms in the twentieth century. Important examples are Namık Kemal, already quoted above, editor and founder of several Ottoman newspapers; Ahmed Midhat, the most prolific writer of the Tanzimat period; and Şemseddin Sami, who compiled the first comprehensive Turkish dictionary (*Qâmûs-i Türkî*).

This wide gap between Greek (be they Hellenophone or Turcophone) and Turkish Ottomans may be explained either by historical and political arguments related to the ideology of Helleno-Ottomanism, or by

sociological constraints, since the Greeks, being a minority within the leading intellectual elite, would tend toward greater conservatism than the Muslims, who constitute the majority. Unlike many of their Muslim fellow citizens, the Greek elite and the head of the Greek community, the Ecumenical Patriarch (in Ottoman *milletbaşı*), were closely linked to Ottoman power, and quite naturally defended its language.

5. Conclusion

In view of the above findings, future research should concentrate on the overlapping and contacts between the Turkish and Greek Ottomans, asking questions such as: Was there a dialogue between Greek and Turkish Ottomans on the issue of language reform? Was there a Greek contribution to the renovation efforts in the early stages of the Turkish language reform? Future research should also include other minorities, such as the Armenians, among whom the number of Turcophones was much more important than among Greeks and who, as it is well-known, played an important role in the main period of the Kemalist language reforms; or the Jews, among whom there was also a growing percentage of Turkish speakers. Whatever results further research may yield, the resistance of Greek intellectuals to Turkish language renovation may well be an important indication of a wider societal phenomenon which has not yet been investigated in terms of language and might well shed light on one of the most striking examples of language management worldwide.

Notes

¹ Actually the first printed Ottoman Greek grammar, that of Alexandridis (1812), is exempted because it was published in Vienna.

² The first hand written Ottoman grammars in Greek date to the seventeenth century, but are only adaptations/translations of European grammars (see Kappler 1999, 2001). The first Ottoman Greek grammar, which is not an adaptation, is known to be written in the eighteenth century by Kanellos Spanos (see Siakotis 2006).

³ For a first attempt to consider these attitudes see Kappler 2007.

⁴ *Anatoli* was founded by Evangelinos Misailidis in the 1840s in Izmir. After 1859 the newspaper was published in Istanbul. Although its founder died in 1890, the newspaper circulated until probably 1923; cf. Şişmanoğlu 2010: 111-112; Balta 2005.

⁵ The following quotations were initially published in part by Şişmanoğlu (2010) in Latin transcription. For the purposes of the present contribution, the passages were checked and completed according to sources. They are quoted here in their original polytonic Greek script.

Bibliography

- Adosidis, K. 1850. *Elements of Ottoman grammar* [in Greek: *Στοιχεία της Οθωμανικής γραμματικής*]. Istanbul: Aftokratorikon Typografeion.
- Alexandridis, D. 1812. *Greek-Turkish grammar* [in Greek: *Γραμματική γραικικο-τουρκική*]. Vienna.
- Anagnostopoulou, S., and M. Kappler. 2005-2006. “Ζήτω ζήτω ο Σουλτάνος / Bin yaşa Padişahimiz: the *Millet-i Rum* singing the praises of the Sultan in the framework of Helleno-Ottomanism.” *Archivum Ottomanicum* 23. *Mélanges en l'honneur d'Elizabeth A. Zachariadou*: 47-78.
- Balta, E. 2005. “Karamanli Press Smyrna 1845 – Athens 1926.” In *Izzet Gündoğ Kayaoğlu Hatıra Kitabı Makaleler*, edited by O. Belli, Y. Dağlı, and M. S. Genim, 27-33. Istanbul: Türkiye Anıt Çevre Turizm Değerlerini Koruma Vakfı.
- Cooper, R. 1989. *Language planning and social change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fardys, A.Th., and K. Fotiadis. 1860. *Greek-Turkish lexicon* [in Greek: *Λεξικόν Ελληνο-Τουρκικόν*]. Istanbul: Anatoli.
- Fotiadis, A. 1897. *Complete grammar of the Ottoman language* [in Greek: *Πλήρης Γραμματική της Οθωμανικής Γλώσσης*]. Istanbul.
- Gallagher, Ch. 1971. “Language reform and social modernization in Turkey.” In *Can language be planned? – Sociolinguistic theory and practice for developing nations*, edited by J. Rubin, and B. Jernudd, 159-178. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.
- Heyd, U. 1954. *Language reform in modern Turkey*. Jerusalem: Israel Oriental Society.
- Kappler, M. 1999. “Eine griechische Übersetzung (1664) von Giovanni Molinos ‘Brevi rudimenti del parlar turchesco.’” *Archivum Ottomanicum* 17: 276-295.
- . 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(1): 120-137.
- . 2007. “Konflikt und Ideologie in den griechischen Grammatiken des Osmanischen im 19 Jahrhundert.” In *Einheit und Vielfalt in der türkischen Welt – Materialien der 5. Deutschen Turkologenkonferenz, Universität Mainz*, edited by H. Boeschoten, and H. Stein, 80-93. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Karabacak, E. 1989. “Ahmet Cevdet Paşa’nın Dilbigisi Kitapları Üzerine bir İnceleme.” *Türklük Araştırmaları Dergisi* 5: 261-270.

- Konstantinidis, A. 1874. *Ottoman grammar* [in Turkish and Greek: *Şarf-ı ‘Osmanî – Οθωμανική γραμματική*]. Istanbul: Typois Boutyra kai S/as.
- Lewis, G. 1999. *The Turkish language reform. A catastrophic success*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Miliopoulos, I. P. 1875. *Turkish-Greek and Greek-Turkish dialogues* [in Greek: *Διάλογοι τουρκο-ελληνικοί και ελληνο-τουρκικοί*]. Istanbul: Kopanaris.
- Siakotis, V. A. 2006. “The teacher Kanellos Spanos (ca. 1700-1756) and his work *Γραμματική της τουρκικής γλώσσης* (1730).” [in Greek] *Journal of Oriental and African Studies* 15: 251-292.
- Şişmanoğlu, Ş. 2010. “The *Anatoli* newspaper and the Heyday of the Karamanli press.” In *Cries and whispers in Karamanlidika books*, edited by E. Balta, and M. Kappler, 109-123. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.