

ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗ ΓΛΩΣΣΑ GREEK LANGUAGE
ΣΥΓΧΡΟΝΙΑ ΚΑΙ ΔΙΑΧΡΟΝΙΑ SYNCHRONY AND DIACHRONY

2

Γλωσσικές επαφές Language Contact
στα Βαλκάνια in the Balkans
και στη Μικρά Ασία and Asia Minor

1ος τόμος 1st volume

Επιμέλεια Editors
Χρ. Τζιτζιλής Chr. Tzitzilis
Γ. Παπαναστασίου G. Papanastassiou

ΑΡΙΣΤΟΤΕΛΕΙΟ ΠΑΝΕΠΙΣΤΗΜΙΟ ΘΕΣΣΑΛΟΝΙΚΗΣ
ΙΝΣΤΙΤΟΥΤΟ ΝΕΟΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ
[ΙΔΡΥΜΑ ΜΑΝΟΛΗ ΤΡΙΑΝΤΑΦΥΛΛΙΔΗ]

Ινστιτούτο Νεοελληνικών Σπουδών
(Ίδρυμα Μανόλη Τριανταφυλλίδη)
Αριστοτέλειο Πανεπιστήμιο Θεσσαλονίκης
541 24 Θεσσαλονίκη
<http://ins.web.auth.gr>
e-Shop: <http://www.eshop.ins-auth.gr>
e-mail: ins@phil.auth.gr

© 2019 Ινστιτούτο Νεοελληνικών Σπουδών

ISBN 978-960-231-194-3

Φιλολογική επιμέλεια
Κική Τσαλακανίδου

Στοιχειοθετήθηκε
από την Αθανασία Κοπανά
στο Ινστιτούτο Νεοελληνικών Σπουδών

Τυπώθηκε στη Θεσσαλονίκη
από την Τσιαρτσιάνης Αθ. & Σία Ο.Ε.

Institute of Modern Greek Studies
(Manolis Triandaphyllidis Foundation)
Aristotle University of Thessaloniki
GR-541 24 Thessaloniki
<http://ins.web.auth.gr>
e-Shop: <http://www.eshop.ins-auth.gr>
e-mail: ins@phil.auth.gr

© 2019 Institute of Modern Greek Studies

ISBN 978-960-231-194-3

Proofread and edited
by Kiki Tsalakanidou

Desktop publishing
by Athanasia Kopana
at the Institute of Modern Greek Studies

Printed in Thessaloniki
by Tsiartsianis Ath. & Co G.P.

Περιεχόμενα | Contents

<i>Πρόλογος</i>	9
<i>Preface</i>	29
Balkansprachbund reviewed: On the background of contact linguistics KLAUS STEINKE	47
Semantic borrowing in the creation of Slavic Christian terminology: The case of OCS <i>věra</i> : Gk. <i>πίστις</i> JASMINA GRKOVIĆ-MAJOR	61
Greek 'nasal + stop' clusters and the Greek-Macedonian convergence IRENA SAWICKA	73
Grammaticalized non-quantifying constructions in Greek, BCMS, and Albanian COSTAS CANAKIS	81
Some affine subordination patterns in the synchrony and diachrony of Greek, Albanian and other Balkan languages IOANNIS FYKIAS & CHRISTINA KATSIKADELI	97
Forms of the future on the periphery of the Balkan Sprachbund JERNEJA KAVČIČ	113
Σχετικά με την κατηγορία της evidentiality στην ελληνική και τη βουλγαρική γλώσσα DESLAVA YORDANOVA-PETROVA	125
The relation between subjunctives and infinitives of the old and new Gheg varieties of Albanian INA ARAPI	139
Τα νεοελληνικά ιδιώματα της Ν. Αλβανίας υπό το φως της βαλκανικής γλωσσολογίας ΔΩΡΗΣ Κ. ΚΥΡΙΑΖΗΣ	156
The Arvanite place names of Achaia as fossils of language contact: Morphophonological evidence ASIMAKIS FLIATOURAS	176
Syntactic borrowability in a Sprachbund setting: Object clitics and definite articles in the West Thracian Greek (Evros) dialect NIKOLAOS LAVIDAS	189
On some contact-induced changes in Pomak and the role of Greek EVANGELIA THOMADAKI & CHRISTINA MARKOU	209

Diglossia features and bilingualism in the Turkish-speaking community of Western Thrace MARIA PETROU	222
Όψεις του ιταλικού/βενετικού δανεισμού στη νέα ελληνική ΓΕΩΡΓΙΑ ΚΑΤΣΟΥΔΑ & ΜΑΓΔΑΛΗΝΗ ΚΩΝΣΤΑΝΤΙΝΙΔΟΥ	233
The Eastern Black Sea dialects of Turkey from the point of view of language contact BERNT BRENDAMOEN	248
Loan verb adaptation in Pontic Greek spoken in Georgia SVETLANA BERIKASHVILI	262
Το φωνηεντικό σύστημα των ποντιακών: συγχρονική σύγκριση ανάμεσα σε δύο ποντιακές κοινότητες στον ελλαδικό χώρο ΔΗΜΗΤΡΗΣ ΠΑΠΑΖΑΧΑΡΙΟΥ	279
Archaisms and lexical borrowing: Greek archaisms in Turkish dialects ELENI PAPADAMOU & GEORGE PAPANASTASSIOU	294
Accounting for morphological complexity vs. simplification in situations of language contact: Evidence from Cappadocian Greek DIMITRA MELISSAROPOULOU	321
Γλωσσική επαφή και γλωσσικός θάνατος: κριτική εξέταση με εμπειρικά δεδομένα από τα αρβανίτικα, τα τσακωνικά και τα καππαδοκικά ΝΙΚΟΣ ΛΙΟΣΗΣ	337
Language contact in spoken Ottoman: Observations on graphic syncretism in a Karamanli book (1718) MATTHIAS KAPPLER	353
Επαφή των καππαδοκικών διαλέκτων με την τουρκική: τα πεδία της εκπαίδευσης και της θρησκείας ΑΝΑΤΟΛΗ ΘΕΟΔΩΡΙΔΗ & ΕΛΕΝΗ ΚΑΡΑΝΤΖΟΛΑ	372
On dependent clauses in Rhodian Turkish HASAN KAILI	391
Η πραγματολογία της γλωσσικής επαφής: το χιούμορ σε δίγλωσσες συνομιλίες ΜΑΡΙΑΝΘΗ ΓΕΩΡΓΑΛΙΔΟΥ & ΧΑΣΑΝ ΚΑΪΛΗ	408
Elias Riggs: An American missionary and linguist in Smyrna HELMUT W. SCHALLER	421

Διδάσκοντας την ελληνική ως δεύτερη ή ξένη γλώσσα στη Μικρασία του 19ου και του 20ού αιώνα ΛΕΛΙΑ ΠΑΝΤΕΛΟΓΛΟΥ	428
Ευρετήριο Index	441

Language contact in spoken Ottoman:
Observations on graphic syncretism
in a Karamanli book (1718)

MATTHIAS KAPPLER

1. Theoretical framework

Research concerning language contacts in spoken Ottoman varieties is rare. High Ottoman, with its enormous share of Persian and ultimately Arabic lexical elements, and its partially Indo-European syntactic structure thanks to the influence of Persian, is certainly a contact language *par excellence*, but it does not present the appropriate sources for an analysis of colloquial speech, since it does not represent a spoken linguistic variety at all. However, spoken Ottoman has never been ousted by literary Ottoman; on the other hand, “one spoken Ottoman” does not exist, but rather a multitude of sociolects, dialects, ethnolects, and religiolects (for this term see below), featuring a situation which is much more complex than simply “diglossic” (cf. Johanson 1989).

During a project within the framework of linguistic ecology, the use of the so-called *transcription texts* was suggested to examine spoken urban varieties in 17th century Istanbul (Csató et al. 2016). Transcription texts are Ottoman Turkish texts in non-Arabic alphabets; the traditional use of the term was confined to texts in Latin characters, first of all from the 17th and 18th centuries, i.e. the Middle Ottoman period, but it was extended to any non-Arabic written text, such as Turkish in the Greek, Armenian, Hebrew, Syrian or Georgian alphabets (Hazai 1990). Most of these texts reflect spoken varieties of Ottoman, because the motivation of their composition was purely practical: transcription of dialogues for travelers or missionaries; grammars and dictionaries; religious material for practical use in church liturgy and at home; letters and songs etc. Moreover, some phonetic features of the language can be detected better than from the consonantal Arabic script. However, it must be said that there are also many sources in Arabic characters reflecting spoken Ottoman, even some poetical genres, excluding the largest part of the high-style Ottoman *gazel* and *qaşıde*-poetry, but including, for instance, erotic poems in the *şehr-engîz* or *meşnevî* tradition.

Approaches, such as the aforementioned project on linguistic ecology, that aim to individuate and analyze the various codes of a multicultural environment like Istanbul, inevitably deal with language contact. Choosing the example of Turkish texts written in the Greek alphabet by and for the Turkophone Christian population both in Asia Minor and the Balkans (the so-called Karamanlidika, or Karamanli texts), I intend to combine the ecological factor with two other theoretical

approaches. One of them is Hary & Wein's (2013) application of Jewish-defined languages to Christian and Muslim contexts. Hary & Wein assume that Jewish varieties in different languages (such as Judeo-Arabic, Judeo-Italian, or Jewish English), named by these researchers as "religiolects", show special religion-defined features, namely, among others: (a) the use of the Hebrew alphabet, deriving from the high prestige of the language in which the holy scriptures are written; (b) many lexical copies from Hebrew; (c) sometimes the development of distinct, "unintelligible" spoken forms, as well as migrated or displaced dialectisms, and archaisms (Hary & Wein 2013, 90–93). It is true that Ottoman religiolects do not show some of the above mentioned characteristics typical of Jewish religiolects, such as the development of their own linguistic varieties, and in some cases Karamanli texts, in contrast to most other texts in non-Arabic scripts, do not reflect spoken language at all, but simply transcribe High Ottoman written literary varieties. Nevertheless, most Karamanli sources display many features which make these texts clearly religion-defined; first of all, the use of the alphabet and of lexical copies from the liturgical language, Greek. A further criterion for its definition as a religiolect could probably be the presence of displaced dialectisms, because of the migration of large groups of the Turkophone Christian population from Inner Anatolia and the Balkans to Istanbul during the 19th century, although it is not clear if the relevant dialectal forms have migrated only in written form or if they were also present in a kind of spoken Ottoman-Christian koine. A clear advantage of Karamanli texts, and another common feature with Jewish religiolects, again in contrast to other transcription texts, especially in the Latin script, is that the authors of the text were almost without exception native speakers of Turkish.

The other approach that I consider to be helpful here is borrowed from religious studies, and concerns the concept of syncretism. Syncretistic structures develop because of the interaction and, eventually, the confluence of entities or systems that were originally independent from each other, creating a new system which, in its final stage, we might call *symbiosis* (Colpe 1997, 42–43). The Karamanli religiolect, as I now tentatively call it here, is a clear case of syncretistic writing, with the confluence of various writing and language systems, and the subsequent symbiotic creation of a new, though very composite writing and cultural system. This system is, as a matter of course, particularly exposed to contact, since it is the result of contact.

Concluding and summarizing the theoretical part of this contribution, we might say that the intent to analyze spoken Ottoman varieties within the framework of their geocultural, multilingual and multireligious environment leads to the individuation of sources which present syncretistic features, in order to permit insight into contact phenomena in relation with the surrounding codes and systems. Among texts composed in religion-defined varieties, so-called religiolects, the Karamanli texts (except for a small number of them featuring a High Ottoman variety) seem particularly appropriate for this, because, as opposed to many transcription texts in Latin characters, the authors were native speakers of Turkish; moreover, a large portion of these texts are translations from religious works in the prestige language

Greek, which makes contact analysis particularly suitable. The target language of these translations, Turkish, not being the prestige-language in question, is thus free from orthographic or stylistic constraints (again excluding texts that imitate a High Ottoman literary variety), and may serve as a valuable reflection of a spoken contact code.

2. Methodology and source of the data

2.1 Language contacts and Karamanlidika

Research into contact-induced phenomena in transcription texts is still in its infancy; a very interesting case has been presented recently by Heidi Stein (2016), who analyzed syntactic copies in a 17th-century Italian grammar of Turkish, which are also present in Modern Turkic varieties under heavy contact influence, such as Gagauz or Cypriot Turkish. In the case of Karamanlidika, contact-relevant research has been concentrated on comparative graphic analysis (Kappler 2003, 328–35; Irakleous 2013, 81–88); less has been done on issues concerning other linguistic levels (but cf. Arslan-Kechriotis 2009 for a syntactic analysis).¹ In a very interesting recent article, Brendemoen (2016) also argues for the use of Karamanli texts as sources for spoken Ottoman and for the analysis of phenomena resulting from contact with Greek, providing syntactic examples as well. The opportunity offered by Karamanlidika (and perhaps by other Ottoman religiolects) lies also in their geographical distribution: initially a phenomenon of Inner Anatolia, Karamanli syncretistic writing spread over the West of Asia Minor to Istanbul and from there to South-Eastern Europe. The Turkophone Christian populations of the Balkans used books written in Greek characters throughout the 18th and until the late 19th century (Balta et al. 2013, 49–51); after that an intense production of books in the Cyrillic alphabet began, but probably on the model of the former Karamanli tradition (Kappler 2011). For this reason, the analysis of language contact phenomena in Karamanli texts concerns not only Asia Minor, but can be extended to South-Eastern Europe as well. Moreover, most of the texts in the 19th century were produced in the melting-pot Istanbul, i.e. in an environment where different codes and dialects were already converging. For the same reason, some of the aforementioned "displaced dialectisms" which can be detected in Karamanli texts come from both areas, Anatolia and the Balkans. With the same methodological approach, we can extend our research to other graphically syncretistic varieties in South-Eastern Europe, even outside the Turkic realm, such as Bosnian, or Muslim-defined (Aljamiado) Greek in Crete and Epirus.

¹ On some aspects of linguistic research on Karamanlidika see Kappler (2006; 2016).

2.2 The source: The first printed Karamanli book

I will not go so far this time, within the limited framework of the present contribution. I only want to show one text example on which we can tentatively conduct the proposed analysis, since it fulfils all the criteria I have mentioned before: religiolect and syncretistic writing, reflection of spoken Ottoman written by a (probably) native speaker, or at least with intermediation of a native speaker, and geographical distribution from Asia Minor to South-Eastern Europe. Moreover, the text I am going to present contains both the text in the prestige- and source-language Greek, and the Turkish translation, thus facilitating the comparative analysis. I am talking about the first ever printed Karamanli book, *Απάνθισμα της Χριστιανικής Πίστεως / Κιουλζάρι Ιμάνι Μεσιχί* (*Gülzar-i İman-i Mesihî*), printed in 1718, probably in Istanbul (cf. Salaville & Dalleggio 1958, 3–10). A second edition of the book appeared in 1743 in Amsterdam (cf. Salaville & Dalleggio 1958, 11–12), exhibiting, according to Salaville & Dalleggio (1958, 11), a slightly different, more progressive morpho-phonology, and a third one was printed in 1803 by the Patriarchal printing-house in the Phanar (Salaville & Dalleggio 1958, 114–16). Finally, a fourth edition was produced by the famous Karamanli author, editor and translator Evangelinos Misailidis in 1883 in Istanbul, including the original prologue (Salaville & Dalleggio 1974, nr. 214).

The Greek text was (re?)translated or edited (Salaville & Dalleggio 1958, 9) by Neophytos, Metropolitan of Nafpaktos and Arta, Exarch of Aitolia (1656–1740), as we learn from the first edition (*Απάνθισμα* 1st ed., 1/2).² We actually do not know if Neophytos himself was the translator or if he edited the book together with an anonymous native speaker of Turkish. The second and third editions, however, do not mention the original translator or editor, whose name is systematically removed. In the third edition the book is presented as a work by a person with the initials “B.I.” (*Απάνθισμα* 3rd ed., 5). Interestingly enough, the bio-geographical context of this edition is transposed from South-Eastern Europe (Aitolia and Epirus) to Asia Minor, since “B.I.” adds a dedication to Kyrril, Exarchos of Lykaonia, and “Saint of Ikonion” (Konya; *Απάνθισμα* 3rd ed., 3). The *target*, however, remains Anatolia: Neophytos, in the first edition, presents his book as a didactic tool not only for religious notions, but also for the Greek language, which “in Asia has been totally lost” (*Απάνθισμα* 1st ed., I/II: “εις δὲ τὴν ἀσίαν καθόλου ἐχάθη / ἀνατολὶ ταραφιντὰ ἰσα κιουλλιγετὲν ζαγὶ ὁλτὶ [*anatoli tarafında isa külliyyeten zayi oldı*]”). He continues: “That’s why the Christians living in Asia have come to such a barbarity that they have lost not only the sciences, but also their true and inherited language, and acquired instead the Turkish language, which they write and read with Greek letters”.³ Nevertheless, the impact of the book was not limited to Asia Minor: we

² As the book is bilingual exhibiting a page per page alternation (each page in Greek alternates with a page in Turkish), all references to the text are given by two page numbers separated by a slash, where the first number refers to the Greek, and the second one to the Turkish text.

³ Our translation follows the Greek text, the Turkish one being almost identical: “Καὶ διὰ

know that it was used already in 1730, i.e. only twelve years after the first edition, for linguistic exercise in a Turkish grammar compiled by a Greek teacher from the Peloponnese (Kappler 2014), practically reversing the objective of the target language to be learned: from Greek to Turkish.

2.3 Contents

The book contains the principles of Christian faith, organized in three parts: the first one (pp. 1–90), with 12 subsections concerning everything a Christian must know “for his salvation”, with the Greek text of unknown authorship, perhaps by Neophytos himself. The second part (pp. 91–122) consists of the 20 chapters of the Confession of Faith by the first Patriarch of Istanbul after the Ottoman conquest, Gennadios Scholarios. This text is well-known from Martin Crusius’ first publication in 1584, though this is a different version from that provided by Crusius (Salaville & Dalleggio 1958, 7). The third part (pp. 123–150) contains in 15 chapters the solar and lunar cycles and the methods for calculating the Orthodox festivities.

The second edition faithfully follows the first one, but it contains a series of appendices, such as a menology (*μηνολόγιον*), composed by Christophoros Patrikios and Anthypatos the Mytilenian (*Απάνθισμα* 3rd ed., 128–43), and – very important though up to now completely neglected in Turkish transcription text studies – an extensive Greek-Turkish vocabulary (“Ιουνανὶ Λογετλερὴν τερτζουπεσίτηρ [recte *Yunani Logetlerin tercümesidir*]”; *Απάνθισμα* 3rd ed., 143–77), subdivided into nouns and verbs and containing roughly 2,500 entries; moreover a bilingual conversation part on ecclesiastical themes, including two dialogues in a lively colloquial language, extremely interesting for the knowledge of both spoken Greek and Turkish at the end of the 18th century (*Απάνθισμα* 3rd ed., 177–92). In both editions, all the text is rigorously bilingual, with interchanging pages: one page Greek, one page Turkish, except for the dialogues, which are organized in columns.

As can be easily inferred from what has been said until now, a complete comparative analysis of the Greek and Turkish texts of the whole book would be well worth the trouble. For the limited framework of the present contribution, only the first 26 pages of the first edition of our source (*Απάνθισμα* 1st ed.) have been analyzed

τοῦτο οἱ χριστιανοὶ οἱ ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἀσίᾳ οἰκούντων εἰς τοσαύτην βαρβαρότητα ἦλθον, ὅπου οὐ μόνον τὰς ἐπιστήμας, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν γνησίαν καὶ πατροπαράδοτον αὐτῶν γλῶσσαν ἀπώλεσαν, καὶ ἀντὶ ταύτης τὴν τουρκικὴν γλῶσσαν ἀπόκτησαν, τὴν ὁποίαν μὲ ῥωμαϊκὰ γράμματα γράφοντες, ἀναγινώσκουσι / ἀνοῦν ἰτζοῦν ἀνατολὶ ταραφιντὰ σακὶν ὅλᾶν χριστιανλάρ ὄλκαταρ οὐτζμεττὲ κελτὶ, κὶ ἰλιμλερὶ γιαλινιζ τεγιουῖλ, λάκιν κεντὶ λισανλερινὶ ταχὶ ἰζαὰτ ἐττὶ, βὲ ἀνοῦν γεριντὲ τοῦρκ λισανινὶ ταχσιῖλ ἐγλετὶ, βὲ ἀνὶ ροῦμ χαρφαρι ἰλε γιαζοῦπ, ὁκοῦρ [*anun içün anatoli tarafında sakın olan hristianlar olkadar ucmette geldi ki ilimleri yalnız deyül, lakin kendi lisanlerini dahi izaat etti, ve anun yerinde türk lisanini tahsil eyledi, ve anı rum harfları ile yazup okur*]” (*Απάνθισμα* 1st ed., I/II). The term *ucmet* (strangely in locative case instead of the usual dative, but it could be a typographical mistake) for *βαρβαρότητα* is particularly interesting, since Ar. *‘ujma* denoted the incorrect (‘obscure’) pronunciation of Arabic by foreigners (cf. Ayoub 2006, 85); the term *acemi*, from the same root, passed into Ottoman with the meaning ‘inexperienced; Persian’.

concerning the contact-induced phenomena they contain. In this case the model code would be Greek, whereas the basic code is Turkish (following Johanson 2006).

3. Analysis of contact-induced phenomena in *Απάνθισμα της Χριστιανικής Πίστεως / Gülzar-i İman-i Mesîhi* (1st ed.)

3.1 Global copies – religious terms

It can be expected from a Christian text translated from Greek that most of the religious terms may be copied from Greek. There are in fact some such instances, which fall into two categories:

(a) Terms without an available synonym, such as titles (in the Turkish texts the original Greek titles and names are shown in italics):

[1]

Συντεθὲν παρὰ τοῦ πανιερωτάτου, καὶ λογιωτάτου μητροπολίτου ναυπάκτου καὶ ἄρτης, ὑπερτίμου καὶ ἐξάρχου πάσης αἰτωλίας κυρίου κύρ Νεοφύτου
Κὶ ναύπακτος βὲ ναρτανοῦν πανιερώτατος βὲ λογιώτατος μητροπολίτ πουτοῦν αἰτωλιανοῦν ὑπέρτιμος, βὲ ἐξαρχοῖ κύριος κύρ Νεοφυτος τὰν τεελίφ ὀλουντί
[Κὶ ναύπακτος ve [v]αρτα'νυν πανιερώτατος ve λογιώτατος μητροπολίτ bütün αἰτωλία'νυν ὑπέρτιμος, ve ἐξαρχοῖ'ι κύριος κύρ Νεοφυτος'tan teelif olundi]
'Composed by the very holy and learned, and honored Metropolitan of Nafpaktos and Arta, Exarch of all Aitolia, Kyrios Kyr Neophytos'

(*Απάνθισμα* 1st ed., 1/2)

Worth mentioning in the present example is the morphological transmission from model code to basic (target) code in terms of adaptation to the target grammar according to its syntactic constraints (*αἰτωλίας* → *αἰτωλιανοῦν*, *ἐξάρχου* → *ἐξαρχοῖ*), including the transfer from the oblique case, here genitive, to the unmarked case (nominative) (*λογιωτάτου* → *λογιώτατος* etc.).

In this category we also have Christian terms where a correspondence in Islam does exist, but the Islamic term is not used:

[2]

Ἡ πίστις περιέχεται εἰς τὸ πιστεύω
Ἰμὰν πιστεύωτε μεβτζούττουρ
[İman πιστεύωde mevcuttur]
'Faith is contained in the Creed'

(*Απάνθισμα* 1st ed., 3/4)

Although we have morphological adaptation here as well, the locative suffix *-DA* is realized by the phonologically irregular form *-de*.⁴

(b) Terms with an available synonym, but where the choice of the Greek word

⁴ The irregular stress might indicate, at first sight, a confusion with the enclitic *da*, but the stress is systematically on the same syllable in all the occurrences (cf., for instance, example [11] below), and it is more probable that the translator did not want to alter the graphic shape of the

marks the Christian and specifically Greek-Orthodox context, e.g. the phonetically and morphologically fully adapted word *stavroz* of Greek origin, which is preferred instead of the also available *hac* 'cross' (< Armenian):

[3]

τὰ τέσσαρα μέρη τοῦ σταυροῦ
σταυροζοῦν τόρτ κιοσεσί
[stavrozun dört köşesi]
'the four angles of the cross'

(*Απάνθισμα* 1st ed., 1/2)

However, it is interesting to note that most of the religious terms are Islamic, transposed to the Christian context, such as *Allah* 'God', *iman* 'faith' (cf. example [2]), *cennet* 'paradise', *mukaddes ruh* 'holy spirit', and other terms that never appear in their Greek form. In some instances, we have precise philosophical and theological copying from Islamic terms, e.g. *cevher* in the sense of 'essence' for Greek *ουσία*,⁵ and *illlahiyet* for *θεότητα*⁶ (*Απάνθισμα* 1st ed., 5/6).

In an especially interesting case, a religious term, *kible* 'the place or object towards which the Muslim turns in worship of God, the direction of Mekka' (Redhouse 1890, 1433), is used in a non-religious context, namely in the sense of 'South' (where the religiously neutral *cenub*, apart from Turkish *güney*, would also be available):

[4]

Τὰ τέσσαρα μέρη τοῦ κόσμου, ὅπου εἶναι ἀνατολὴ, δύσις, ἄρκτος, καὶ μεσημβρία
Τουνγιανοῦν τόρτ κιοσεσί ἰλε, κὶ μεσρὶκ, μαγρίπ, κιπλέ, σιμάλτουρ
[Dünyanın dört köşesi ile, ki meşrik, mayrip, kible, şimaldur]
'The four angles of the world, which are East, West, South, and North'

(*Απάνθισμα* 1st ed., 3/4)

Another interesting instance for the transposition of Islamic terms to the Christian sphere is the use of the word *rafazılar* for 'heretics', the *rafıza* being a specific Islamic (Shiite) sect (see the context in example [7]).⁸

Luffin (2010) in his analysis of the religious vocabulary in another Karamanli book, dated 1784, finds out that, although many Greek words are maintained, there is a wide use of Islamic terminology; actually "Greek terms are more technical and liturgical than conceptual" (Luffin 2010, 286). He explains the extensive use of Islamic terms with the fact that these words were acceptable because of the common

original Greek word, including the stress. This would be an interesting hint to the 'sacrality' of language and script in syncretistic writing.

⁵ Redhouse (1890, 691) gives for *cevher*, beyond the general use of the word as 'jewels, [...] a gem [...]'; the philosophical meanings 'a substance, an essence, as opposed to an accident'; cf. Strauss (2014, 188).

⁶ Redhouse (1890, 181): 'the quality of deity, godhead'.

⁷ With 'South' and 'North' in reversed order in the Turkish translation.

⁸ For the history of the term *rafazı* in Karamanli literature see extensively Strauss (2014, 194–196), who considers the term as one of the most "striking" ones.

ground of the two religions, but, first of all, because of the practical need of all Karamanli texts, which had to be easily understood by the readers/listeners. The particular case of 'God', where the Greek word is never used, is known also from other Karamanli sources – cf. the 18th century manuscript studied by Gavriel (2010, 345) – and confirms the findings in our text. In his seminal study on religious terminology in Karamanli texts, Strauss (2014) shows that the reasons for the use of Arabic terms has to be searched in the tradition of the Islamized lexicon in Ottoman Turkish itself and suggests that Karamanli authors may have been familiar with Christian Arabic texts.

3.2 Combinational copies

Beyond the borrowing of lexicon, the so-called "selective copies" (Johanson 2006, 5), especially the combinational ones at the syntactic level (Johanson 2006, 16–20), are of great interest. The Turkish text of our source presents relatively few participle and converb constructions (except *mayle*, which is frequently used),⁹ most of the object and relative clauses are translated by the means of Persian conjunctions. Although this is not astonishing *per se*, since such constructions are very common in Ottoman texts (see below), there are some examples where the Turkish translation, compared to the Greek source text, presents peculiarities.

3.2.1 Relative clauses

The Persian *ki* as a conjunction to introduce a relative clause was widely used in Ottoman texts, including Karamanli books.¹⁰ Jean Deny's (1921, 850–52) grammar dedicates a section to the *ki*-relative clauses, but at the end of the chapter, Deny (1921, 852) remarks that frequent use of *ki* in relative clauses has to be considered as a "foreign" influence: "L'usage trop fréquent des propositions subordonnées commençant par *ki* décecle souvent la nationalité étrangère du sujet parlant."

Our text displays many relative clauses introduced by *ki*, such as:

- [5]
ἐκεῖνος ὅπου πρῶτα ἦτον μόνον Θεός
'that, who at first only was God'
ποῦ ἀλλὰχ κι ἐββελτὲ φάκατ ἀλλὰχ ἰτι
[bu allah ki envelde fakat allah idi]
'this God, who at first only was God'

(*Απάνθισμα* 1st ed., 7/8)

⁹ This converb, often in the forms *mAynAn*/*mAylAn*, and with different semantic contents, seems to be one of the most frequently encountered converbs in Karamanli texts (cf. Eckmann 1958, 80–82). However, this form can be often found in "regular Ottoman texts" too (Brendemoen 2016, 20).

¹⁰ Relative clauses introduced by *ki* in other Karamanli texts have been noted by Arslan-Kechriotis (2009, 180).

Quite typically, relative clauses are transformed into main clauses by resuming the heads in order to avoid cleft or other untypical constructions, resulting in a repetition of the word in the Turkish translation (this can be already observed in example [5]). This proceeding is very frequent; we will provide just one example (another case can be seen in example [18c] below):

- [6]
[ἓνα πράγμα...], τὸ ὁποῖον δὲν εἶχε ποτὲ ἀρχήν¹¹
'[a thing...], which never had a beginning'
βὲ ποῦ σεγιοῦν ἐββελὶ ἄσλα γιόκ ἰτι
[ve bu şeyün envveli asla yok idi]
'and this thing never had a beginning'

(*Απάνθισμα* 1st ed., 3/4)

In quite a few instances the relative clause is omitted, being paraphrased by other constructions, e.g. the causal conjunction *zira*, thus resuming the head of the Greek relative clause:

- [7] (talking about the two mysteries (*μυστήρια/esrar*) of faith)
τὰ ὅποια ξεχωρίζουσιν ἡμᾶς τοὺς χριστιανοὺς ἀπὸ ἀσεβεῖς, ἐβραῖους, καὶ τινὰς αἰρετικῶν
'which distinguish us, the Christians, from atheists, Jews, and some heretics'
ζῆρα ποῦ ἰκὶ ἐσράρ πῖζ χριστιανλαρῇ μουλχιτλερτὲν, βὲ γιαχουτιλερτὲν, βὲ πάζι ραφαζιλαρ-
τὰν ἀγιροῦρ
[zira bu iki esrar biz hristianları mülhidlerden, ve yahudilerden, ve bazı rafazılardan ayırur]
'because these two mysteries distinguish us, the Christians, from atheists, and Jews, and some heretics'

(*Απάνθισμα* 1st ed., 3/4)

The general trend of the translator to avoid or simplify relative clauses must be certainly seen in the general perspective of the didactic function of the texts, which had to be simple and easily understood by the target readership.

3.2.2 Object clauses

The most typical construction for object clauses is not the infinite left-branching 'Turkic' one, i.e. by using a verbal noun as direct or indirect object (cf. Göksel & Kerslake 2005, 358–69), but a subordinating strategy with the Persian conjunction *ki* plus a right-branching clause containing a finite verb:

- [8]
Ἡξεύρετε λοιπὸν, ὅτι δύο εἶναι τὰ μεγαλύτερα μυστήρια τῆς πίστεώς μας
Ἰμτι πιλμῖς ὀλάσινιζ κι ἱμανιμουζοῦν ἔν πουγιοῦκ ἐσραρὶ ἰκίτουρ
[İmdi bilmiş olasınız ki imanımızun en büyük esrarı ikidür]
'Thus know that two are the greatest mysteries of our faith'

(*Απάνθισμα* 1st ed., 3/4)

The following example contains an object clause and a (right-branching) rela-

¹¹ For the whole sentence see example [9].

tive clause (in Greek an adverbial complement), both introduced by *ki*, and then another relative clause transformed into a main clause in Turkish (see example [6]). By this procedure, the translator managed to obtain exactly the same constituent order in his Turkish translation:

[9]
πρέπει νὰ ἡξεύρωμεν, ὅτι ἡ ἐνότης τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι ἓνα πρᾶγμα ἔξω ἀπὸ ὅλα τὰ πράγματα τοῦ κόσμου, τὸ ὁποῖον δὲν εἶχε ποτὲ ἀρχὴν
'we have to know that the unity of God is one thing outside all the things of the world, which never had a beginning'
πιλέκ κερέγιζ κι ἀλλαχοῦν πιρλιγι πῖρ σέγτουρ κι τουνγιανοῦν πουτοῦν σεγλεριντέν τασράτουρ, βὲ ποῦ σεγιούν ἐββελὶ ἄσλα γιόκ ιτι
[bilmek gereyiz ki allahun birliyi bir şeydür ki dünyanın bütün şeylerinden taşradur, ve bu şeyün evveli asla yok idi]
'We must know that the unity of God is one thing, which is outside all the things of the world, and this thing never had a beginning'

(*Απάνθισμα* 1st ed., 3/4)

An interesting case is the following example, where a converb is embedded into the finite object clause. The use of the converb (*olmayle* < 'to be') is motivated by the presence of a Greek gerund (*ὄντας* < 'to be') in the source text. Note also the addition of extra lexemes (*elem*, *dert*, *illet*) for the meaning 'suffering', in order to underline the semantics of the Greek verb *πάσχω* 'to suffer', but also in the stylistic tradition of the Ottoman *hendiadyoin*, where synonymous elements are linked by the connector 'and' (*ve* > *-u/-ü*):

[10]
Πρέπει νὰ ἡξεύρωμεν καὶ τοῦτο, ὅτι ὁ δεσπότης χριστός ὄντας θεὸς καὶ ἄνθρωπος, ἡ θεϊκὴ αὐτοῦ φύσις δὲν ἔπαθε καθόλου, ἀλλὰ ἡ ἀνθρωπίνη φύσις αὐτοῦ μόνον ἔπαθε
'We also have to know this: that, the Lord Christ being God and human, his divine nature did not suffer at all, but only his human nature suffered'
Πουνὶ πιλέκ κερέγιζ, κι Χριστός ἐφεντιμουζοῦν ἀλλαχλοῦ, βὲ ἰσανλοῦ ταπιατὶ ὀλμάγλε, ἀλλαχλοῦτεγιούλ, λάκιν γιαλινιζ ἰσανλοῦ ταπιατὶ ἐλέμ, βὲ τέρτ, βὲ ἰλλέτ τζεκτι
[Bunı bilmek gereyiz ki Hristos efendimizin allahlu ve insanlu tabiatı olmayle, allahlu deyül, lakin yalnız insanlu tabiatı elem, ve dert, ve illet çekti]
'We have to know this: that, Christ our Lord being God and human, not his divine [nature], but only his human nature suffered'

(*Απάνθισμα* 1st ed., 7/8)

3.2.3 Comparative clauses with *nice ki*, with and without converbs

The Greek comparative conjunction *καθώς* 'as' finds its exact correspondence in the Ottoman (< Persian) connective *nice ki*, following the syntactical pattern of the model code, but comprising a modality shift. The use of the conditional suffix *sA* + *gerek* 'need' is frequent in spoken Turkish in the expression *olsa gerek* 'must be', but mostly in the 3rd person and only as a probability statement (Göksel & Kerslake 2005, 299), whereas necessity semantics in other persons, and, above all, with dou-

ble personal marking, both on the verb and on *gerek*, seem to be less frequent. Information about this construction in Ottoman is not available (cf. example [10] *bilmek gereyiz*, with infinitive):

[11]
καθὼς θέλομεν εἰπεῖ εἰς τὸ πιστεύω
'as we will say in the creed'
νίτζε κι πιστεύωτε τεσὰκ κερέγιζ
[nice ki pistevode desak gereyiz]
'as we should say in the creed'

(*Απάνθισμα* 1st ed., 7/8)

Arslan-Kechriotis (2009, 183–84) detected a similar structure with *nice ki... ise* in temporal clauses in another Karamanli book, though without the necessative modality, and only on one and the same verb (*işit* 'to hear'). An interesting use of the conditional, though different from here, where the enclitic *ise* is linked with *dIr* and expresses a temporal converb, has also been observed in Karamanlidika by Arslan-Kechriotis (2009, 179), and by Brendemoen (2016, 20–21).

The following is an example where the comparative clause contains an embedded converb clause (< in Greek a temporal clause):

[12]
καὶ καθὼς τὸ φῶς τοῦ ἡλίου ὅταν εἶναι εἰς ἓνα δένδρον, καὶ ἐκεῖνο τὸ δένδ[ρ]ον τινὰς ἤθελε τὸ κόψει μὲ τζικοῦρι, τὸ φῶς τοῦ ἡλίου δὲν ἤθελε πάσχει, ἀλλὰ μόνον τὸ δένδρον
'and as the sunlight, when it shines on a tree, and someone wanted to cut that tree with an axe, the sunlight will not suffer, but only the tree'
βὲ νίτζε κι κιουνεσοῦν ἀγτινλιγι πῖρ ἀγάτζ οὔζεριντέ ὀλτουκτέ, βὲ ὀλ ἀγάτζ πιρσιὶ παλτάιλε κεσσὰ, κιουνεσοῦν ἀγτινλιγι πῖρ ἰλέτ τζεκμέζ, λάκιν γιαλινιζ ἀγάτζ
[ve nice ki güneşün aydınlığı bir ağaç üzerinde oldukde, ve ol ağacı birisi baltayle kessa, güneşün aydınlığı bir ilet çekmez, lakin yalnız ağaç]
'and as the sunlight, when it shines on a tree, and if someone cuts that tree with an axe, the sunlight will not suffer, but only the tree will'

(*Απάνθισμα* 1st ed., 7/8)

The step from the previous example towards a construction of the comparative clause with an adverbial clause, and not with a finite verb, as in Greek, becomes comprehensible in the following example. Furthermore, this construction contains the aforementioned converb *mayle*:

[13]
καὶ καθὼς ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἔχει τρία πράγματα, ἡγουν νοῦν, λόγον καὶ πνεῦμα, ὅμως δὲν εἶναι τρεῖς ἄνθρωποι ἀλλὰ ἓνας
βὲ νίτζε κι ἰσανοῦν οὔτζ σεγλερι γιάνι ἀκλι, σοζι, βὲ ρουχι ὀλμάγλε, οὔτζ ἰσαν τεγιούλτουρ, λάκιν πῖρτουρ
[ve nice ki insanun üç şeyleri yani aklı, sözi, ve ruhi olmayle, üç insan deyüldür, lakin birdür]
'and as the human has three things, i.e. reason, speech, and soul, they are not three humans, but one'

(*Απάνθισμα* 1st ed., 5/6)

3.2.4 Plural marking after numerals

As can be seen in example [13], we come across plural marking after numerals, whereas, in Turkish, plural after quantifiers is usually not marked (Göksel & Kerslake 2005, 148). The example above displays *üç şeyleri* (instead of *üç şey*), but also the regular *üç insan*. In fact, the phenomenon is systematic only with the noun *şey*:

[14]
[Greek text lacking]
βὲ ποῦ τόρτ σεγλέρ
[ve dört şeyler]
'and four things'

(Απάνθισμα 1st ed., 1/2)

[15]
μὲ τὰ τέσσαρα ἀξιомνημόνευτα ἔσχατα
'with the four things to be remembered'
χατίρμουζὲ κετουρμὲκ λαζιμ ὅλὰν ὅλ τόρτ ἀχίρ σεγλέρλε
[hatırımüze getürmek lazım olan ol dört ahir şeylerle]
'with those four last things we have to call to mind'

(Απάνθισμα 1st ed., 3/4)

It also occurs, however, sporadically with other (inanimate) nouns:

[16]
καὶ περιέχει δώδεκα μέρη
βὲ ἀνοῦν ὄν ἰκὶ κιταλερὶ βάρτουρ
[ve anun on iki kıtaleri vardur]
'and it contains twelve parts'

(Απάνθισμα 1st ed., 9/10)

Arslan-Kechriotis (2009, 176) observes similar structures with plural-marked nouns after quantifiers in other Karamanli texts. As Brendemoen (2016, 21) points out, this phenomenon is certainly to be ascribed to influence from Greek.

3.2.5 Word order

A typical phenomenon in Turkic contact languages, where the dominating code is Indo-European, is the changed word order (cf. Johanson 2006, 17). The neutral (unmarked) SOV order undergoes alteration (in principle possible in Turkish, but with pragmatic markedness, e.g. focus) according to the syntax of the model code. Nevertheless, unmarked word order changes in our text are relatively rare; here is one of the examples that can be cited, where the striking feature, apart from the word order, is also the reproduction of the Greek substantivized numeral (in Turkish, a head noun, e.g. *esrar* 'mystery', would be regularly required, or else the adjective would occur with a possessive suffix, which is lacking here):

[17]
ἄς ἔλθωμεν τῶρα καὶ εἰς τὸ δεῦτερον.
κελελοῦμ σίμιτι ἰκιντζιγέ.
[gelelüm şimdi ikinciye.]
'let's come now to the second [mystery].'

(Απάνθισμα 1st ed., 5/6)

3.3 Frequential copies

As an example for frequential copies we may refer to the extensive use of the coordinative conjunction *ve* 'and' to link a series of sentences, which is not very frequent in Turkish, where coordination is more often expressed by converbs, juxtaposition, or other means, especially the enclitic *da* (see Göksel & Kerslake 2005, 438–61; Kerslake 1996). The massive use of sentence-initial *ve* is, however, well-known from Ottoman texts, again under the influence of the prestige languages Persian and Arabic. The following is an example where the reproduction of the Greek connective *καί* is particularly visible (the example is provided without transcription and translation):

[18]
(a) καὶ ἐκεῖ ἤρρεν ὅλους τοὺς ἀγίους πατέρας, καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς ψυχὰς τῶν δικαίων,
(b) καὶ τὴν τρίτην ἡμέραν, ἤγουν τὰ σύναυγα τῆς Κυριακῆς ἔνωσε πάλιν τὴν ψυχὴν μὲ τὸ κορμί,
(c) ἀπὸ τὸ ὁποῖον δὲν ἐχώρισε ποτὲ τὴν θεότητά του,
(d) καὶ ἔτζι ἀνέστη ἔνδοξος,
(e) καὶ νικητῆς τοῦ ἄδου, καὶ τοῦ θανάτου,
(f) συναναστένοντας ἀκόμι καὶ τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν δικαίων [...]
(g) καὶ δίδοντας εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐλπίδας βεβαίας, ὅτι καὶ ἡμεῖς θέλομεν ἀναστηθῆ μετὰ θάνατον μὲ τὴν ἄμετρον αὐτοῦ δύναμιν.
(a) βὲ ἀντὲ τζοῦμλε μουπαρέκ πετερλερὶ, βὲ ἀτὶλ τζανλαρὶ πουλτὶ,
(b) βὲ οὐτζιντζὶ κιουντὲ, γιάνι παζάρ κιουνινούν πέκ σαπαχιντὲ τζανὶ ἰλε τενινὶ πὶρ ἐγλετὶ,
(c) βὲ κεντὶ ἀλλαχλιγινὶ ὅλ τεντὲν ἄσλα ἀγίρματι,¹²
(d) βὲ ποῦ βὲτζχ οὐζρὲ ἰφτιχάρ, βὲ ἰζέτλε τιριλτὶ,
(e) βὲ ταμουγὲ βὲ οὐλουμὲ γαλίπ ὅλτὶ,
(f) βὲ ἀτιλεροῦν τζανλαρινὶ τιριλττὶ.
(g) βὲ πιζὲ σουπχεσιζ οὐμίτ βιρτὶ κὶ οὐλουμτὲν σονρα πουνουὶν νιχαγετσιζ κουββετὶ ἰλε τιριλατζάγιζ.

(Απάνθισμα 1st ed., 17/18)

¹² Note the omission of the Greek relative clause by resuming the head (τὸ κορμί > *ol tenden*). See for this point Section 2.2.1. Furthermore, in this case the conjunction 'and' is an addition in the Turkish text, as also in (f).

4. Conclusions

The phenomena found in the 1st edition of *Απάνθισμα* and described above occur in various contact-induced Turkic varieties of the area today, namely Gagauz, Rumelian or Balkan Turkish, Rhodian Turkish and Cypriot Turkish, as well as in the Turkish varieties spoken in Central Europe.¹³ Moreover, right-branching relative and object clauses with connectives and finite verbs are typical structures in several periods during the history of Ottoman,¹⁴ which itself can be considered a language under heavy contact influence. For this reason, the interpretation of these doubtless contact-induced phenomena is not always unambiguous, as some of them could be interpreted as influence from Greek, others from Ottoman, i.e. ultimately from Persian, without being able to tell which is which. However, the opportunity presented by this text to compare directly the source code Greek and the target language Turkish by juxtaposition of the translated texts, does show a clear reference to the model code. Moreover, perhaps the most important conclusion, and, at the same time, prospective for the future, is the insight that these kinds of texts are highly suitable for diachronic language contact research on spoken Ottoman. For older stages of languages, here Ottoman Turkish, sources for spoken varieties are rather rare. Language systems with features that we can call, as I do, *syncretistic*, offer the opportunity to analyze language contact phenomena back in time; not all of them reflect the spoken language, but many of them do. Religiolects of the past are syncretistic linguistic systems with high information content about spoken language, and they are contact-induced by definition. Karamanlidika is only an example; another copious corpus could be the extensive Turkish texts in Armenian script. We can also imagine that several South-Eastern European religiolects contain equally valuable data, for example the spoken variety of Cretan Muslims, which may offer interesting insight into the contact of 18th and 19th century Cretan Greek varieties with Turkish, an aspect which, to my knowledge, has not yet been investigated. Albanian and Bosnian Aljamiado texts might also be a rewarding object of study in this field, probably providing results that exceed mere lexical copying. This existing material, therefore, being already well-known as important historical and literary sources, has to be examined in terms of deeper, not only lexical language contact.

¹³ To mention only a few, mainly recent, of the numerous studies which deal with the phenomena from a contact-induced perspective: Friedman (2006, 39–41) and Matras (2006, 52–55) on relative clauses in Macedonian Turkish varieties; Menz (2006) on word order, relative and object clauses in Gagauz; Pfaff (1991, 116) on plural marking after numerals in Turkish varieties of Germany; Rehbein (2001, 323) on continuous sentence-coordination with the connector *ve* as used by Turkish-German bilinguals; Kappler (2008, 205–13) and Gulle (2011, 95–99) on object and relative clauses in Cypriot Turkish; and Kaili, Çeltek & Georgalidou (2012, 115, 117) on (though less frequently occurring) object clauses with *ki* in Rhodian Turkish.

¹⁴ Kerslake (1998, 199) speaks about a decrease of Persian syntactical influence in the Middle Ottoman period (16th to 18th c.).

References

- Απάνθισμα* = *Απάνθισμα της χριστιανικής πίστεως* = Γιάνε Γκιούλζαρι Ιμανί Μεσιχί. 1718, Istanbul (1st ed.); 1743, Amsterdam (2nd ed.); 1803, Istanbul: Patriarchal Printing-house (3rd ed.); 1883, Istanbul: Anatoli printing-house (4th ed.).
- Arsilan-Kechriotis, Z. C. 2009. "Some syntactic issues in Karamanlidika texts", *Turkic Languages* 13, 172–87.
- Ayoub, G. 2006. "Faṣiḥ", in K. Versteegh (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics*. Leiden: Brill, 84–90.
- Balta, E., O. Trandafilova-Louka & D. Stilo. 2013. "Books in Turkish written in various alphabets for the Gagauz (19th – early 20th century)", in E. Balta (ed.), *Miscellaneous Studies on the Karamanlidika Literary Tradition*. Istanbul: Isis Press, 41–69.
- Brendemoen, B. 2016. "Karamanlidic literature and its value as a source for spoken Turkish in the 18th and 19th centuries", *Turkic Languages* 20, 5–25.
- Colpe, C. 1997. "The phenomenon of syncretism and the impact of Islam", in K. Kehl-Bodrogi, B. Kellner-Heinkele & A. Otter-Beaujean (eds), *Syncretistic Religious Communities in the Near East*. Leiden: Brill, 35–48.
- Csató, É., B. Brendemoen, L. Johanson, C. Römer & H. Stein. 2016. "The linguistic landscape in Istanbul in the seventeenth century", in É. Csató, A. Menz & F. Turan (eds), *Spoken Ottoman in Mediator Texts*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1–33.
- Deny, J. 1921. *Grammaire de la langue turque (dialecte osmanlie)*. Paris.
- Eckmann, J. 1958. "Einige gerundiale Konstruktionen im Karamanischen", in J. Eckmann, A. S. Levend & M. Mansuroğlu (eds), *Jean Deny Armağanı*. Ankara: TTK Basimevi, 77–83.
- Friedman, V. A. 2006. "West Rumelian Turkish in Macedonia and adjacent areas", in H. Boeschoten & L. Johanson (eds), *Turkic Languages in Contact*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 27–45.
- Gavriel, E. 2010. *Η τουρκική με το ελληνικό αλφάβητο σε χειρόγραφο του 18ου αιώνα*. Ph.D. diss. University of Cyprus.
- Göksel, A. & C. Kerslake. 2005. *Turkish: A Comprehensive Grammar*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Gulle, V. O. 2011. "Structural borrowings in Cypriot Turkish from Cypriot Greek", *Mediterranean Language Review* 18, 91–113.
- Hary, B. & M. Wein. 2013. "Religiolinguistics: On Jewish-, Christian- and Muslim-defined languages", *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 220, 85–108.
- Hazai, G. 1990. "Die Denkmäler des Osmanisch-Türkisch in nicht-arabischen Schriften", in G. Hazai (ed.), *Handbuch der türkischen Sprachwissenschaft*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 63–73.
- Irakleous, S. 2013. "On the development of Karamanlidika writing systems based on sources of the period 1764–1895", *Mediterranean Language Review* 20, 57–95.
- Johanson, L. 1989. "Substandard und Sprachwandel im Türkischen", in G. Holtus & E. Radtke (eds), *Sprachlicher Substandard II: Standard und Substandard in der Sprachgeschichte und in der Grammatik*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 83–113.
- . 2006. "Turkic language contacts in a typology of code interaction", in H. Boeschoten & L. Johanson (eds), *Turkic Languages in Contact*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 4–26.
- Kaili, H., A. Çeltek & M. Georgalidou 2012. "Complement clauses in the Turkish variety spoken by Greek-Turkish bilingual children on Rhodes, Greece", *Turkic Languages* 16, 106–20.

- Kappler, M. 2003. "Note a proposito di 'ortografia caramanlidica'", in U. Marazzi (ed.), *Turcica et Islamica: Studi in memoria di Aldo Gallotta*. Naples: Università degli Studi di Napoli "L'Orientale", 309–39.
- . 2006. "Toward a linguistic approach to 'Karamanli' texts", in S. Yağcıoğlu & A. C. Değer (eds), *Advances in Turkish Linguistics* Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Turkish Linguistics (Izmir, 11–13 August, 2004). Izmir: Dokuz Eylül Yayınları, 655–67.
- . 2008. "Contact-induced effects in the syntax of Cypriot Turkish", *Turkic Languages* 12, 196–220.
- . 2011. "Printed Balkan Turkish texts in the Cyrillic alphabet from the middle of the nineteenth century (1841–1875): A typological and graphematic approach", in E. Balta & M. Ölmez (eds), *Between Religion and Language*. Istanbul: Eren, 43–69.
- . 2014. "The place of the *Grammatiki tis tourkikis glossis* (1730) by Kanellos Spanos in Ottoman Greek grammarianism and its importance for Karamanlidika studies", in E. Balta (ed.), *Cultural Encounters in the Turkish-speaking Communities of the Late Ottoman Empire*. Istanbul: The Isis Press, 105–17.
- . 2016. "Transcription text, regraphization, variety? The linguistic research history of 'Karamanlidika'", in É. Csató, A. Menz & F. Turan (eds), *Spoken Ottoman in Mediator Texts*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 119–27.
- Kerslake, C. 1996. "The role of connectives in discourse construction in Turkish", in A. Konrot (ed.), *Modern Studies in Turkish* Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Turkish Linguistics (12–14 August 1992). Eskişehir: Anadolu University, 77–104.
- . 1998. "Ottoman Turkish", in L. Johanson & É. A. Csató (eds), *The Turkic Languages*. London & New York: Routledge, 179–202.
- Luffin, X. 2010. "Religious vocabulary in Karamanlidika texts: The case of the *Cebel-i Sinanin Medhnamesi* (1784)", in E. Balta & M. Kappler (eds), *Cries and Whispers in Karamanlidika Books* Proceedings of the First International Conference on Karamanlidika Studies (Nicosia 11th–13th September 2008). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 281–88.
- Matras, Y. 2006. "Layers of convergent syntax in Macedonian Turkish", in H. Boeschoten & L. Johanson (eds), *Turkic Languages in Contact*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 46–62.
- Menz, A. 2006. "On complex sentences in Gagauz", in H. Boeschoten & L. Johanson (eds), *Turkic Languages in Contact*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 139–51.
- Pfaff, C. 1991. "Turkish in contact with German: Language maintenance and language loss among immigrant children in Berlin (West)", *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 80, 97–129.
- Redhouse, J. W. 1890. *A Turkish and English Lexicon*. Istanbul: Boyajian.
- Rehbein, J. 2001. "Turkish in European societies", *Lingua e Stile* 26(2), 317–34.
- Salaville, S. & E. Dalleggio. 1958. *Karamanlidika: Bibliographie analytique d'ouvrages en langue turque imprimés en caractères grecs*, 1st v.: 1584–1850. Athens: Centre d'Études d'Asie Mineure.
- . 1974. *Karamanlidika: Bibliographie analytique d'ouvrages en langue turque imprimés en caractères grecs*, v. III (1866–1900). Athens: Φιλολογικός Σύλλογος "Παρνασσός".
- Stein, H. 2016. "The dialogue between a Turk and a Christian in the *Grammatica turchesca* of Pietro Ferraguto (1611): Syntactical features", in É. Csató, A. Menz & F. Turan (eds), *Spoken Ottoman in Mediator Texts*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 161–71.
- Strauss, J. 2014. "Le lexique technique du christianisme en karamanli: Remarques préliminaires", in E. Balta & M. Ölmez (eds), *Cultural Encounters in the Turkish-Speaking Communities of the Late Ottoman Empire*. Istanbul: The Isis Press, 176–221.

Περίληψη

Γλωσσική επαφή στην προφορική οθωμανική:
παρατηρήσεις σχετικά με τον γραφικό συγκρητισμό
σε ένα караμανλίδικο βιβλίο (1718)

Οι περισσότερες οθωμανικές πηγές σε αραβικό αλφάβητο, γραμμένες σε μια υψηλή ποικιλία, δεν μας προσφέρουν πληροφορίες για την ομιλούμενη γλώσσα της εποχής. Παρόλο που η οθωμανική είναι μια κατεξοχήν 'επαφική' γλώσσα, η δυσκολία αυτή επεκτείνεται και στην έρευνα φαινομένων γλωσσικής επαφής σε επίπεδο προφορικής γλώσσας, και όχι μόνο όσον αφορά τα περσικά και τα αραβικά δάνεια. Εδώ και πολλά χρόνια στην τουρκολογία εξετάζονται και χρησιμοποιούνται πηγές σε μη αραβικές γραφές, τα λεγόμενα *κείμενα σε μεταγραφή* (Transkriptionstexte), σε λατινικό, αρμενικό, ελληνικό, κυριλλικό, εβραϊκό, συριακό ή άλλο αλφάβητο, που παρήχθησαν για πρακτικούς σκοπούς και αντανakλούν έτσι την προφορική γλώσσα. Ορισμένα από αυτά μπορούν να θεωρηθούν *θρησκευόμενα* (religiolects) της οθωμανικής – επέκταση της ορολογίας των Hary & Wein (2013) – δηλαδή, αν όχι ξεχωριστές γλωσσικές ποικιλίες, τουλάχιστον ποικιλίες με συγκεκριμένα χαρακτηριστικά, που ορίζονται από τη θρησκεία των ομιλητών τους (όπως χρήση της 'ιεράς' γραφής, πολλές δάνειες λέξεις από μια γλώσσα κύρους, σχετική διασπορά διαλεκτικών φαινομένων και αρχαϊσμών). Ένας άλλος όρος, εκείνος του *γραφικού συγκρητισμού*, κάνει κατανοητό τον συμβιωτικό χαρακτήρα των κειμένων μέσω της 'συγκρητιστικής' χρήσης μιας γραφής που, υπό τις κυρίαρχες ή επίσημες κοινωνικές, πολιτικές και θρησκευτικές συνθήκες, δεν χρησιμοποιείται κανονικά για μια συγκεκριμένη γλώσσα. Τέτοια κείμενα περιέχουν, εξ ορισμού, επαφικά φαινόμενα και είναι γι' αυτό τον λόγο ιδανικά για την έρευνα γλωσσικών επαφών σε γλώσσες που δεν διαθέτουν προφορικά κείμενα.

Τα λεγόμενα *καράμανλίδικα*, δηλαδή τα τουρκικά κείμενα σε ελληνική γραφή από τον 16ο έως τις αρχές του 20ού αιώνα, πληρούν τις περισσότερες προϋποθέσεις των θεωρητικών μας προσεγγίσεων (κείμενα σε μεταγραφή ως πηγές της προφορικής οθωμανικής, θρησκευόμενα και γραφικός συγκρητισμός). Ως παράδειγμα εφαρμογής μιας τέτοιας προσέγγισης επιλέξαμε το πρώτο τυπωμένο καράμανλίδικο βιβλίο και επιχειρήσαμε να αναλύσουμε μερικά επαφικά στοιχεία στα επίπεδα του λεξιλογίου και της σύνταξης. Πρόκειται για το *Απάνθισμα της Χριστιανικής Πίστεως / Κιουλζάρι Ιμάνι Μεσιχί* (*Gülzar-i İman-i Mesihî*), που τυπώθηκε το 1718, πιθανόν στην Κωνσταντινούπολη, με τρεις άλλες μεταγενέστερες εκδόσεις (1743, 1803 και 1883). Ο συγγραφέας/μεταφραστής είναι ο Νεόφυτος, "μητροπολίτης Ναυπάκτου και Άρτης, έξαρχος πάσης Αιτωλίας" (1656–1740), και το βιβλίο περιέχει τις βάσεις και το Πιστεύω της χριστιανικής πίστης, ένα εορτολόγιο και, στις μεταγενέστερες εκδόσεις, ένα μηνολόγιο και ένα λεξιλόγιο με διαλόγους πάνω σε θρησκευτικά θέματα. Το βιβλίο αποτελεί λοιπόν ένα έργο διδακτικού χαρακτήρα για τη διδασκαλία της χριστιανικής πίστης, αλλά και, όπως γράφει ο πρόλογος, της ελληνικής γλώσσας στους τουρκόφωνους χριστιανούς της Μικράς Ασίας. Γι' αυτό

τον λόγο το βιβλίο είναι δίγλωσσο, με το τουρκικό κείμενο ως μετάφραση του ελληνικού (τα δύο κείμενα εναλλάσσονται ανά σελίδα, μία σελίδα στα ελληνικά και μία στα τουρκικά με ελληνική γραφή). Εξαιτίας αυτών των χαρακτηριστικών, το βιβλίο προσφέρεται για μελέτη σε ζητήματα μετάφρασης και γλωσσικών επαφών.

Η ανάλυσή μας χωρίζεται σε ολικά και επιλεκτικά αντίγραφα (*global/selective copies*, πρβ. Johanson 2006). Στα ολικά αντίγραφα δίνουμε παραδείγματα θρησκευτικής ορολογίας στο τουρκικό κείμενο, π.χ. “Η πίστις περιέχεται εις τὸ πιστεύω / Ἰμὰν πιστεύωτε μεβτζούττουρ”, ή “[...] τὰ τέσσερα μέρη τοῦ σταυροῦ / [...] σταυροζοῦν τὸρτ κιουσεσί”. Το ενδιαφέρον είναι όμως ότι το μεγαλύτερο μέρος της θρησκευτικής ορολογίας αντλείται από την αντίστοιχη ισλαμική: συγκεκριμένα, οι όροι για τον Θεό, την πίστη, το Άγιο Πνεύμα, τον παράδεισο κ.ά. είναι αποκλειστικά αραβο-οθωμανικοί (*Allah, iman, mukaddes ruh, cennet* αντίστοιχα). Αυτή η παρατήρηση επιβεβαιώνει τα αποτελέσματα της προηγούμενης έρευνας σε αυτό τον τομέα.

Στο συντακτικό επίπεδο (*combinational copies*, κατά την ορολογία του Johanson) αναλύθηκαν αναφορικές προτάσεις, π.χ. “ἐκεῖνος ὁποῦ πρῶτα ἦτον μόνον Θεὸς / ποῦ ἀλλὰχ κι ἐββελτὲ φάκατ ἀλλὰχ ἰτι [bu allah ki envvelde fakat allah idi]”, ειδικές προτάσεις, π.χ. “πρέπει νὰ ἡξέυρωμεν, ὅτι ἡ ἐνότης τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι ἓνα πρᾶγμα ἔξω ἀπὸ ὅλα τὰ πράγματα τοῦ κόσμου, τὸ ὁποῖον δὲν εἶχε ποτὲ ἀρχὴν / πιλμέκ κερέγιζ κι ἀλλαχοῦν πιρλιγι πιρ σέγτουρ κι τουνγιανοῦν πουτοῦν σεγλεριντὲν τασράτουρ, βὲ ποῦ σεγιοῦν ἐββελὶ ἄσλα γιόκ ἰτι [bilmek gereyiz ki allahun birliyi bir şeydür ki dünyanun bütün şeylerinden taşradur, ve bu şeyün enveli asla yok idi]”, καθώς και συγκριτικές και επιρρηματικές προτάσεις, π.χ. “καὶ καθὼς τὸ φῶς τοῦ ἡλίου ὅταν εἶναι εἰς ἓνα δένδρον, καὶ ἐκεῖνο τὸ δένδρον τινὰς ἤθελε τὸ κόψει μὲ τζικοῦρι, τὸ φῶς τοῦ ἡλίου δὲν ἤθελε πάσχει, ἀλλὰ μόνον τὸ δένδρον / βὲ νίτζε κι κιουνεσοῦν ἀγτινλιγι πιρ ἀγάτζ οὔζεριντὲ ὀλτουκτὲ, βὲ ὀλ ἀγατζὶ πιρσι παλτάιλε κεσσά, κιουνεσοῦν ἀγτινλιγι πιρ ἰλὲτ τζεκμεζ, λάκιν γιαλινιζ ἀγάτζ τζεκέρ [ve nice ki güneşün aydınlığı bir ağac üzerinde oldukde, ve ol ağacı birisi baltayle kessa, güneşün aydınlığı bir ile çekmez, lakin yalnız ağac çeker]”, οι οποίες ακολουθοῦν το μοντέλο της ελληνικής σύνταξης. Ἐνα ἄλλο παράδειγμα στο συντακτικό επίπεδο εἶναι ἡ – ασυνήθιστη γιὰ τὴν τουρκική – σύνδεση φράσεων με τὸν συνδέσμο *και/ve*. Ἐπίσης, εντοπίστηκαν συντακτικά φαινόμενα ὡς πρὸς τὴ σειρά των λέξεων που οφείλονται σε γλωσσική επαφή, π.χ. “ἄς ἔλθωμεν τῶρα εἰς τὸ δεῦτερον / κελελοῦμ σίμιτι ἰκιντζιγέ [gelelüm şimdi ikinciye]”, καθώς και τὸ μαρκάρισμα του πληθυντικού ὕστερα ἀπὸ ἀριθμητικά, τὸ ὁποῖο, σε τυποποιημένη τουρκική γλώσσα, ἐκτὸς ἀπὸ συγκεκριμένες ἐκφράσεις, δὲν ἐπιτρέπεται, π.χ. “καὶ περιέχει δώδεκα μέρη / βὲ ἀνοῦν ὄν ἰκὶ κιταλερὶ βάρτουρ [ve anun on iki kitaleri vardur]”.

Ὅλα αὐτὰ τὰ φαινόμενα γλωσσικῆς επαφῆς ἀπαντοῦν καὶ σε σύγχρονες τουρκικές ποικιλίες που εξακολουθοῦν νὰ βρίσκονται σε επαφή με μὴ τουρκικές γλώσσες, ὡπως τὰ βαλκανικά τουρκικά (“ρουμελικά”), τὰ γκαγκαούζικα, τὰ τουρκικά τῆς Κύπρου καὶ τῆς Ρόδου καὶ τὰ τουρκικά τῆς Κεντρικῆς Ευρώπης. Στόχος μας εἶναι νὰ δείξουμε ὅτι κείμενα ὡς τὸ *Ἀπάνθισμα* ἀποτελοῦν παραδείγματα πρὸς

ροῦν νὰ συγκριθοῦν με ἄλλες γλωσσικές μορφές καὶ ἐκφράσεις συγκρητικῆς γραφῆς τῆς εποχῆς. Παρόμοια προσέγγιση προσφέρεται ἐπίσης γιὰ ἄλλα κείμενα συγκρητικῆς γραφῆς σε θρησκευόμενα τῆς Οθωμανικῆς Αυτοκρατορίας, ὡπως τουρκικά κείμενα σε αρμενική γραφή, ἢ, ἀκόμα καὶ ἐκτὸς των τουρκόφωνων τῆς περιοχῆς, σε ἄλλες μορφές γραφῆς που καθορίζονται ἀπὸ τὴ θρησκεία, ὡπως τὰ ελληνικά *Aljamiado* των ελληνόφωνων μουσουλμάνων τῆς Κρήτης καὶ τῆς Ηπείρου, ἢ ἰσλαμοσλαβικές ποικιλίες, ὡπως τὰ βοσνιακά τοῦ 18ου καὶ 19ου αἰώνα.