

First International Conference of Karamanlidika Studies

Πιριντζί Ουλουσλαραρασή Καραμανλίδικα Αραστηρμαλαρή Κογγρεσί

Πρώτο Διεθνές Συνέδριο Καραμανλίδικων Σπουδών



Nicosia / Λευκωσία / Lefkoşa

11-13 September 2008

Axiothea - Cultural Centre of the University of Cyprus

ABSTRACTS

The Ambivalence of Turkish in a Greek-speaking Community of Central Anatolia

Christos Hadziiossif

Institute of Mediterranean Studies, University of Crete, Rethymnon

Synasos, a small town of mixed Christian and Muslim population in central Anatolia, has entered history books as a Greek-speaking community. Indeed, the local Greek vernacular was very much alive until the exchange of populations between Greece and Turkey in 1924. Moreover, local schools provided both the girls and the boys of the Christian community with a good education in ‘high Greek’. From the mid-19th century onwards, the Christian notables of Synasos boasted about the purity of the Greek dialect spoken in their community and compared it favourably with the Turkish-speaking communities in neighbouring towns and villages. However, there is evidence that prior to this period the linguistic divide between Greek and Turkish was much less clear in Synasos. The first part of the paper deals with the evidence of the complex linguistic reality in Synasos and in the neighbouring Greek-speaking communities. The second part elaborates on the ambiguous attitude of the Christians of Synasos towards Turkish. Even during the period in which the dominance of Greek language was uncontested, local Christians held in high esteem the few members of their community who mastered the formulas of official Ottoman Turkish. At the same time, they despised the use of vernacular Turkish. The paper argues that this contradiction has less to do with a spillover of the nationalist ideology of the Greek State into central Anatolia and more with attitudes dictated by the ideological climate prevailing among the Rums in the capital of the Ottoman Empire.

**«Έξενόφωνοι Νεβσεχιρλήδες ... ελληνόψυχοι Νεαπολίτες»:
η επίμονη, αλλά και αβέβαιη προώθηση της ελληνικής γλώσσας στο τουρκόφωνο
περιβάλλον του Νέβσεχίρ»**

Irini Renieri

Institute for Mediterranean Studies/ Rethymno

Τα τελευταία χρόνια της δεκαετίας του 1880, σε αρκετές τουρκόφωνες κοινότητες της Μικράς Ασίας παρατηρούνται στο εσωτερικό τους έντονες ιδεολογικές διαφορές, που σε ορισμένες περιπτώσεις άγγιζαν ακόμη και τα όρια της κρίσης. Καθώς το μείζον ζήτημα που καλούνταν να αντιμετωπίσουν ήταν ο ρόλος τους μέσα στο πολιτικό και οικονομικό περιβάλλον, θέματα όπως ο προσανατολισμός της εκπαίδευσης, η στάση τους γύρω από το θέμα της τουρκοφωνίας και η διαχείρισής της, ανάγονται σε κεντρικά.

Στην παρουσίασή μου, θα ασχοληθώ με τις αντίστοιχες αντιπαραθέσεις που σημειώνονται στην ορθόδοξη κοινότητα του Νέβσεχίρ, στην κρίσιμη αυτή περίοδο. Η συγκεκριμένη κοινότητα, με την επαρκή διοικητική της οργάνωση, διατήρησε μεγάλο σώμα αρχειακού υλικού στο οποίο μπορεί να κανείς να αναζητήσει τα ίχνη τέτοιων κοινωνικών συγκρούσεων. Η ίδρυση και η λειτουργία φιλεκπαιδευτικών λεσχών, τα προβλήματα εφαρμογής των προγραμματικών τους στοχεύσεων, οι αντιπαραθέσεις για τον έλεγχο του εκπαιδευτικού προσωπικού, του περιεχομένου της εκπαίδευσης αλλά και της οικονομικής της διαχείρισης, θα αποτελέσουν τους βασικούς άξονες της παρουσίασής μου. Ιδιαίτερο βάρος θα δοθεί στο ρόλο της φιλεκπαιδευτικής λέσχης «Βασιλείας» για την προώθηση της ελληνοφωνίας στο Νέβσεχίρ καθώς και στις σχέσεις συνεργασίας ή και αντιπαλότητας που αναπτύσσονται ανάμεσα στη λέσχη και σε άλλους φορείς εξουσίας μέσα στην κοινότητα.

**Villages, Churches and Silver Liturgical Equipment:
The case of Karamanli patronage in the 18th-19th c.**

Anna Ballian

Benaki Museum of Islamic Art, Athens

A large part of the ecclesiastical silverware and other religious objects brought by refugees to Greece after the population exchanges in 1925 came from central Asia Minor and the greater Caesarea region. The inscribed objects usually have inscriptions in Karamanli and insofar as their origin is known, come from three regions: the area of Caesarea, of Niğde and the town of Ankara. Of course, isolated objects have also been preserved from other nearby areas, such as a chalice from Pharasa, another from Yozgat or a cross from Sinasos. There is even a series of objects from the communities of Safranbolu, Kastamonu, Adana and Tarsus. Although in principle this geographical distribution may be considered random, in essence the areas of Caesarea, Niğde and Ankara, from where most of the objects of known provenance come, were significant administrative and economic centres, a fact reflected in the prosperity of their Christian communities. Discussed in this paper are Karamanli-inscribed dedications originating from churches in villages such as Talas, Androniki, Kermira, Vekse, Skopi, Zincidere, Taxiarchis. The mechanism of donation reveals the social and economic background of Karamanli patronage and underlines the importance of Turkish-speaking communities, as opposed to the Greek-speaking enclaves, in the resurgence of the region, from the mid-18th century until about the mid-19th century. The seeds of this resurgence had, of course, been sown earlier. It was during the period of the Grand Vizier Mustafa Köprülü Pasha (1689-1691), who instituted reforms favourable to Christians, and in particular after the Treaty of Carlowitz (1699) that the laws prohibiting the rebuilding of churches started falling into disuse. The consequences were immediate; the metropolitan church of St Nicholas in Caesarea was rebuilt during the last decade of the century while at least twelve other churches and monasteries are known to have been repaired during the period 1717-1729, e.g. at Talas, Androniki, Kermira, Vekse, Skopi, Zincidere, Taxiarchis, Incesu, Prokopi (Ürgüp) and Sinasos. This building activity coincides chronologically with the earliest known silver votive offerings and the first printed editions of Karamanli texts.

Greek perceptions of the Turkish-speaking Cappadocians: the Greek diplomatic sources

Sia Anagnostopoulou
Panteion University / Athens

During my presentation, I will try to observe the ways that the Greek diplomatic authorities consider, estimate and describe the Rums of the greater region of Cappadocia. The Greek diplomatic authorities appear in this specific area with a significant delay, in relation to areas of the Asia Minor coast. Antonopoulos, the Consul of Greece in Smyrna, travels for the first time around the area in 1901 and then sends his first diplomatic report to Athens. The first Greek Consulate in Konya was established just in 1908, in order to serve the Cappadocian, Frygian and Lykaonian areas of the Konya prefecture. A few years later, the first Consul sends a detailed report describing the situation of the Rum communities of the Konya prefecture, in the way that he understands this specific situation. Another detailed report, dated 1916, is considered as an excellent source of information. It describes in many and multiple levels the Greek diplomat's astonishment, when he meets "this strange Greek population".

My presentation is mainly based on this second diplomatic report of 1916. The terminology used by the Greek Consul in order to describe this "unknown" population will be the first object of my presentation. Further on, my second object will be the description of the deep contempt and depreciation that this Greek – coming from the national centre – feels for a population whose characteristics are difficult to understand. Finally, what is the element that shocks the Greek diplomat the most? Is it the incomplete or the hardly recognizable Greekness of the Karamanli – and not only – population of the area? Or is it the "East", an "East" that also shocks the intellectual Ottomans and Turks of Istanbul, in the same period?

Reading the Identity of ‘Karamanli’ through the pages of *Anatoli*

Stefo & Foti Benlisoy

Istanbul Technical University & Boğaziçi University / Istanbul

Anatoli is one of the oldest and most long-lived newspapers of the Ottoman Empire. Publication began in the 1840s and it continued in existence until more or less the end of the Empire. Even so, it has been rather neglected as a source in the Ottoman historiography. Undoubtedly this neglect has to do with its ‘hybrid’ character, manifested in its usage of Turkish in Greek characters, which forms a practical and a mental barrier to the modern historian, who unconsciously assumes fixed and given national, religious and cultural identities. In recent decades, however, these ‘essentialist’ understandings are increasingly being replaced by a contextual and relational understanding of identity formation, and both *Anatoli* and the Turcophone Anatolian Orthodox Christians to whom it was addressed have started to gather the attention they deserve in the Ottoman historiography. The paper focuses on how *Anatoli* tried to represent and construct the identity of the Turkish-speaking Orthodox Christians of Anatolia/Asia Minor, in regard to the wider Ottoman Greek Orthodox community and Ottoman society. It is based on study of the collection of the newspaper in the Oriental Institute of Istanbul, which includes issues spanning the period 1888-1892.

The paper seeks to explain how *Anatoli*, through its pages, tried to form a sort of ‘reform programme’ for its readers and their compatriots. This programme encompassed a wide range of issues, from the economic opportunities that the stabilization of the Hamidian regime and the expansion of the global economy offered to Anatolians, to the desired cultural transformation of the Anatolian Orthodox Christians through better education and dissemination of the values of the centre of the Ottoman Greek Orthodox community. The paper tries to demonstrate how *Anatoli* played a crucial role in the formation of a specific Anatolian Orthodox Christian identity and how, as a newspaper, in certain situations it acted as the representative of the Anatolian Orthodox. The paper aims to shed light on the complex processes of ethno-religious and cultural identity formation.

The newspaper *ANATOLI*: The peak of the Karamanlı Press

Şehnaz Şişmanoğlu Şimşek

Sabancı University, Istanbul

This paper gives the content analysis of the long-lived Turcophone newspaper *Anatoli*, the most influential newspaper in the Karamanli Press. Publication of *Anatoli* was started in İstanbul, in the 1860s, by Evangelinos Misailidis, and continued until 1923. The paper refers to the series of copies of *Anatoli* from 1888 to 1893, which are to be found in the Orient-Institut in İstanbul.

Anatoli covers a broad spectrum of contents, as it is evident even its subtitle: ‘Anatoli: Siyasiye, Fenniye, Tuccariye ve havadis-i mutenevviyadan bahis gazeta’. It includes politics, science, commerce and various kinds of news. *Anatoli* prints news from the Ottoman Empire and from abroad, as well as news from those parts of Anatolia where a Turcophone Rum population used to exist. There is also information on commercial issues, such as ‘bir haftalık tuccariye cedveli’ (*weekly trade registers*), prices of imports and exports, as well on practical matters, such as railway timetables, advertisements, notices on newly-published books. *Anatoli* is also important for the Karamanli reading public in terms of education. There is a permanent column in which some popular literary novels, mostly translated from French authors, are serialized. There are also essays on assorted topics, including religion, history, geography and art. Thus, the content analysis of *Anatoli* reveals important details about the social and political life of the Turkish-speaking Rum community at the end of the 19th century, which may be considered as the eve of immense political and social changes in the Empire.

From Cilicia to Cyprus: Turcophone Orthodox Pilgrims

Michalis N. Michael

University of Cyprus

The presence of Turcophone Orthodox Christians originating from the area of Cilicia in Cyprus during the Ottoman period of the island's history (1571-1878) remains largely unknown, not only in Cypriot but also in foreign historiography. This is due surely to the lack of sources which could verify the permanent residence of Turcophone Orthodox in the island. Only a few written references to their temporary presence in Cyprus have been found. This lack of sources raises the first major question: Were there any Turcophone Orthodox in Cyprus during the Ottoman period? If the answer is yes, in what context were they here? As Turcophone Orthodox who emigrated permanently to Cyprus, or as pilgrims who stopped briefly on the island as visitors, while *en route* from Asia Minor to the Holy Land? All our textual evidence relates to pilgrim travellers to or from the Holy Land, for who Cyprus was not unknown from a religious as well as a commercial point of view.

On a religious level, Cyprus and its important Orthodox pilgrimages became known to the Turcophone Orthodox through various channels. One channel was the merchants, who travelled and brought back to their home cities on the south coast of Asia Minor, mainly Allayia, Antalya and Mersin, their impressions of the island and information about its important monasteries, such as Kykkos. A second channel was the dependencies (*metochia*) of the Kykkos monastery in Asia Minor, especially the *metochi* in Antalya, with monks sent from the monastery in Cyprus, who stayed in the area for years.

According to information given by emigrants from Asia Minor, during the Ottoman period, Turcophone Orthodox pilgrims from Cilicia travelled in caravans, beginning their journey from Niğde, passing through Tarsus and reaching Mersina, where they boarded small ships bound for the final destination, the Holy Land. During the voyage, the ship docked in the port of Larnaca for some days and the travellers took the opportunity to visit important Orthodox pilgrimages on the Cyprus. The most popular pilgrimage for the Turcophone Orthodox of Asia Minor was Kykkos, with the icon of the Virgin. Thanks to the monastery's wealth, the monks were able to offer them hospitality for days, which was another strong motive for the Orthodox pilgrims to pass from Cyprus.

Although this collection of sources relating to the passage through Cyprus of Turcophone Orthodox during and after the Ottoman period yields no evidence of permanent immigration, it shows clearly the religious character of their visit and that they were well-informed about the island. Many years after the end of the Ottoman period, during the third decade of the 20th century, Cyprus once again became a destination for them. But by this time everything was changing around them. Cyprus was no longer an Ottoman territory but a British colony, the Ottoman Empire was dying and, most importantly, their primary identity was not religious anymore but national. Their Turcophone Orthodox identity was overshadowed by their Greek national identity. Their religious and language identity was gradually forgotten, until historical research brought to light the publications in Karamanlidika and endeavours to write about their existence and their history.

Venetian sources and significations of ‘Caramania’

Giampiero Bellingeri

University Ca' Foscari / Venice

It is well-known that the Venetian attempts to establish alliances in the East with the rival powers of the Ottomans gave birth to diplomatic relations, and, at the same time, to travel accounts and embassies. The reports of the political and commercial missions and itineraries in Anatolia and Persia during the second half of the 15th century are published in the Lagoon and spread out in Europe (e.g. the monumental “anthology” by G.B. Ramusio, *Navigazioni et viaggi*). Among the most famous contributions of this kind of writings, we remind the *Travels in Persia* by I. Barbaro (also translated and published in English by Lord Stanley of Alderley, 1873), and the booklet by G.M. Angiolello or G.M. Vicentino (1451-1525), dedicated to the life and gestures of Uzun Hasan (d. 1478). In those pages there are numerous excerpts about the geography of ‘Caramania’ and the ‘Caramanini’, potential allies to the Venetians. It is a potentiality forwarded by the *Aq-qoyunlus* and the Safavids, with a movement towards East, in Persia, of the anti-Ottoman role already played by Uzun Hasan. Besides the political considerations, these Venetian authors and agents pay some attention to the human aspects of that region, populated by the Turcomans and by the Christian turcophone communities who produced that particular literature conventionally called “Karamanlidika”. Brief and interesting data about “Karamanlidika” can be found in the *Historia Turchesca 1300-1514*, written by various authors, among them also G.M. Angiolello, and published by I. Ursu, Bucarest 1910, who relied on the Venetian manuscripts in Paris.

In our contribution, we will recall some passages taken from the *Historia Turchesca*, but with quotations from two other manuscript copies of the same work, kept in the Biblioteca Correr in Venice. It is a very complex and polyphonic text, in which the direct observations of G.M. Angiolello are important being a vivid and effective description of the multicultural landscape around Konya and the religious atmosphere in the area.

Unexploited sources on Serafeim Pissidios

Ioannis Theocharidis

University of Cyprus / Nicosia

Centre d'Etudes d'Asie Mineure et karamanlidika.
Contribution à la compilation et à la bibliographie d'une littérature de
signification multiple

Stavros Anestidis
Centre d'Etudes d'Asie Mineure

Le soin du Centre d'Etudes d'Asie Mineure pour la littérature *karamanli* s'est manifesté dans les années 1950 lorsque les érudits éclairés Eugène Dalleggio et Sévérien Salaville publient le premier volume bibliographique (*Karamanlidika. Bibliographie analytique d'ouvrages en langue turque imprimés en caractères grecs*, vol. I: 1584-1850, Athènes 1958) qui enregistre dès leur début (1584) les ouvrages publiés par les Orthodoxes turcophones. Le travail des pionniers Dalleggio et Salaville a été mené d'une façon très méthodique et substantive par la turcologue et collaboratrice du Centre d'Etudes d'Asie Mineure Evangelia Balta, qui compléta les trois volumes (Vol. II: 1851-1865, Athènes 1966, Vol. III: 1866-1900, Athènes 1974) en six (*Karamanlidika. Additions (1584-1900). Bibliographie Analytique*, Athènes 1987, *Karamanlidika. XXe siècle. Bibliographie Analytique*, Athènes 1987, *Karamanlidika. Nouvelles Additions et Compléments*, Vol. I, Athènes 1997), parus tous dans les séries du Centre d'Etudes d'Asie Mineure. Les recherches d'Evangelia Balta ont mis aussi en évidence les éditions relatives du 20^{ème} siècle. La collection d'ouvrages en *karamanli* que le Centre d'Etudes d'Asie Mineure possède constitue une des plus importantes collections de cette littérature (320 titres) surtout grâce à la donation d'Iordanis Pamboukis, fin connaisseur de cet objet. Il faut aussi indiquer que la traduction d'un livre *karamanli* en langue grecque a été réalisée pour la première fois en 2002 grâce à l'initiative du Centre d'Etudes d'Asie Mineure (voir Ιωάννης Η. Κάλφογλους, *Μικρά Ασία Κητασηνήν Ταριχίε Δζαγραφιασή*, Δερισααδετδέ, Αδελφοί Μισαηλίδαι Ματπασσηνδά ταπ οληνημήσδηρ, 1899 = Ιωάννης Η. Κάλφογλους, *Ιστορική Γεωγραφία της Μικρασιατικής Χερσονήσου*, introduction, traduction et commentaires: Stavros Anestidis, préface: Ioanna Petropoulou, Athènes, Centre d'Etudes d'Asie Mineure, 2002).

Is *Karamanlı* literature part of a ‘Christian Turkish literature’?

Johann Strauss

University Marc Bloch / Strasbourg

The concept of a ‘Christian Arab Literature’ is well established. This vast production has been described in Georg Graf's *Geschichte der christlich-arabischen Literatur*. In the Turkish case we also had until recently a considerable non-Muslim population, consisting mainly of Greek Orthodox and Armenians, whose ethnic language was Turkish. Like the Christian Arabs, they produced many works in a language that was basically identical to that of their Muslim countrymen. Far from being exclusively religious, this literary output is diverse and remarkable in many respects. Significantly, two Turkish novels that have been considered as the “first” (Misailidis's *Temaşa-i dünya* and Vartan Pasha's *Akabi Hikayesi*) were printed in Greek and Armenian script respectively.

This ‘Christian Turkish’ literature, hardly ever dealt with in histories of Turkish literature, raises a number of questions: Did *Karamanlı* and Armeno-Turkish writing really remain outside the mainstream of Turkish literature? Which were the obstacles (linguistic? religious? psychological?) preventing the use of a common alphabet? To what extent was the Turkish of the Muslims a model for *Karamanlıs* and Armeno-Turkish writers? What did ‘Turkishness’ or ‘Ottomanism’ mean for *Karamanlıs* and Turkophone Armenians (cf. the exceptional case of Teodor Kasap)? Not all of these questions can be answered in a satisfactory way. Nonetheless, some of them may challenge the traditional perception of literature and literary activity in the Ottoman Empire.

**From *Polypathis* to *Temaşa-i Dünya*,
from the safe port of translation to the open sea of creation**

Anthi Karra
Council of European Union

In 1839, when Grigorios Palaiologos published his picaresque novel «*O Polypathis*», the Turkish-speaking Christian and Ottoman subject, Evangelinos Misailidis, was a 19-year-old student in the Philology Department of the newly-founded University of Athens. It is, therefore, reasonable to assume that Misailidis was among the first to read the book, with all the enthusiasm of youth and the anticipation of what life held for him. In 1872, when Misailidis published his own version of the novel, under the title «*Temaşa-i Dünya ve Cefakâr-u Cefakeş*», in his own editing house in Istanbul, he was a 52-year-old accomplished journalist, editor and translator.

Evangelinos Misailidis does not merely appropriate the original text, through a free translation and extensive additions, in order to maximize its instructive character, he focuses as a writer on his own particular public, the Turkish-speaking, more or less literate, Rums of Anatolia, and adapts it to their interests and sensitivities, their language and the world-view it articulates. This text, doomed to be banned from the corpus of national literatures, be they Turkish or Greek, moves away from Palaiologos's orientalist conception of the world, unfolding in front of the eyes of the modern Greek or Turkish reader the *Theatre of the World* (*Temaşa-i Dünya*) of the Turkish-speaking Rums of Anatolia and questioning his knowledge of it.

Thoughts on the Turkish verses in Phanariote anthologies (1750-1821)

Julia Chatzipanagioti-Sangmeister & Matthias Kappler

University of Cyprus / Nicosia

The so-called ‘Phanariot anthologies’ of the period between 1750-1821, are of two different kinds and origins: a) manuscripts (μισμαγές / μετζμουάδες < ott. *mecmû'a*) created in the Phanariot milieu in Istanbul and the Danubian principalities, containing mainly songs and poems but also receipts and personal annotations of the writers, b) printed books with literary texts, poems and songs, printed in Vienna (e.g. *Σχολεῖον των Ντελικάτων Εραστών* [1790], *Ερωτος Αποτελέσματα* [1792] etc.). After 1821 most anthologies are printed in the Ottoman Empire, mainly in Istanbul (e.g. *Εντέρπη* [1830], *Πανδώρα* [1846] etc.).

Apart from texts in Greek, almost all the anthologies contain Turkish material in Greek transcription, not necessarily because of a Turcophone authorship, but rather as a sign of a widespread cultural syncretism and ‘multiculturalism’ of the Phanariots and their Ottoman Greek cultural context. Little has been done in order to establish how and why the Turkish texts are inserted into the main Greek body. This is mainly due to ideological concepts which seek to overstress the Phanariots’ social and cultural role as related to a ‘Hellenic’ culture, neglecting the fact that the Turkish texts of the anthologies are part of the Ottoman Turkish musical and poetical tradition.

In our paper we take as an example for the older manuscript tradition the ms. 725 in the Gennadios Library, Athens, composed between 1769 and 1795, and containing receipts, medical prescriptions, songs, and other texts in both languages. After a brief description of the codex, we attempt to examine the Turkish part of the manuscript, its position in and relation to the main Greek body. In this way, we hope to contribute to an analysis of the use of Turkish and the reception of Ottoman songs in the Rum community of Istanbul in the eighteenth century, to shed light on the societal and cultural context of the anonymous writer(s), and to explore the degree to which this production is detached from or related to the ‘Karamanlidika’ tradition of Asia Minor origin.

**Türk Halk Hikâyelerinin Kar
manlıca Baskıları Üzerine
Karşılaştırmal Bibliyografik Notlar**

M. Sabri Koz

Yapı ve Kredi Yayınları / İstanbul

19. yüzyılın ikinci yarısından itibaren Arap harfli Türk alfabesiyle basılmaya başlayan halk hikâyeleri, önce Ermeni harfleriyle Türkçe, sonra da Karamanlıca olarak basılmaya başladı. Anadolu'nun, Türkçe'yi günlük dil olarak kullanan Ermeni ve Karamanlı yerli Hristiyan toplumları kendi alfabeleriyle Türkçe yazdılar, kitaplar ve süreli yayınlar çıkardılar.

Hangi etnik kökenden olursa olsun, hangi dili konuşup hangi yazıyı kullanırsa kullansın Anadolu insanının severek okuduğu Köroğlu, Âşık Garib, Şah İsmail gibi Türkçe halk hikâyelerinin Ermeni harfli ve Karamanlıca baskıları birçok bakımdan karşılaştırılabilir. Biz bu bildiride halk hikâyelerinin Türkçe, Ermeni harfli Türkçe ve Karamanlıca baskıları üzerinde duracak, bunları kronolojik bir sıra ile karşılaştıracamız. Türkçe, Ermeni harfli Türkçe ve Karamanlıca kitaplar üzerinde çalışmış bilim insanlarının emeklerini saygı ile anarak hazırlayacağımız bu bildiri, Anadolu insanının ortak paydalarını aramada küçük bir katkı olursa ne mutlu bana!

Transcription Problems of Karamanlidika texts

Eftychios Gavriel

University of Cyprus / Nicosia

The 752 titles of Karamanlidika editions (Balta 1997-8: 131) which are published within a time period of 218 years (1718-1935) and the great number of manuscripts and documents, referring mostly to the relations between the Orthodox Church Authorities and the Turcophone flock, (Stathis 1984-5: 104) constitute an enormous corpus of texts in Ottoman language written with the Greek alphabet, which, together with other texts written in a non-Arabic script, can form an important source for the research on Ottoman language (Hazai 1990: 68). Although the Greek alphabet can indicate many of the vowels not graphematically expressed with the Arabic script and the word accent, its usage demonstrates some shortcomings in representing all the phonemes of the Ottoman language. One of the major problems faced, is the question of the existence or not of a Karamanlidika orthography (Kappler 2003: 336-339).

In one of his essays dealing with the Turkish culture and its history, Şinasi Tekin refers to the alphabets used by the Turks, underlining the importance of the conditions, the place and the time these alphabets were used (Tekin 2000: 85). Karamanlides, their language and the texts they had produced are also, indisputably, a part of Ottoman culture, and while examining the Karamanlidika texts in the framework of the Ottoman language history, the same importance should be assigned to these factors. Since the place and the time Karamanlidika was used, is sufficiently known, emphasis shall be given to the conditions that had created the need for the use of this writing system. Based namely on these conditions and the need created by them, in this presentation, we will try to study the transcription problems faced while dealing with Karamanlidika texts, making use of evidence provided both from printed and manuscript material.

References:

Balta E., “Périodisation et typologie de la production des livres Karamanlis”, *Δελτίο Κέντρου Μικρασιατικών Σπουδών* 12 (1997-8) 129-153.

- Hazai G., “Die Denkmäler des osmanisch-Türkeitürkischen in nicht-arabischen Schriften”, G. Hazai (ed.), *Handbuch der türkischen Sprachwissenschaft*, Wiesbaden 1990, pp. 63-73.
- Kappler M., “A proposito di ‘ortografia caramanlidica’ ”, U. Marazzi (ed.), *Turcica et Islamica - Studi in memoria di Aldo Gallotta*, Napoli 2003, pp. 309-339.
- Stathis P. (Στάθης), “Δύο εγκύκλια πατριαρχικά γράμματα στα Καραμανλίδικα”, *Δελτίο Κέντρου Μικρασιατικών Σπουδών* 5 (1984-5) 103-132.
- Tekin Ş., “Türklerin kullandıkları alfabeler hakkında eski dilin rüzgariyle bir kaç söz”, Şinasi Tekin, *Ştikakçının Köşesi, Türk Dilinde Kelimelerin ve Eklerin Hayatı Üzerine Denemeler*, İstanbul 2001, pp. 85-90.

An 18th Century Karamanlidic Codex from Soumela Monastery in Trabzon.

Bernt Brendemoen

University of Oslo

In his survey of Pontic manuscripts in the Museum at Ankara Fortress (*Archeion Pontou* 11: 193-248) of 1939, Nikos A. Bees mentions a 211-page codex written in Turkish with Greek letters. Bees quotes A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus and E. Th. Kyriakides, *History of the Sumela Monastery* (1912), where it is claimed that the codex was written in 1782 by a monk originating from Imera, which is close to Trabzon. I managed to get a microfilm of the codex. However, the language bears no traces of Black Sea dialect; the dialect in which it is written is rather Western Anatolian. Nevertheless, the codex is not at all uninteresting from a linguistic point of view. The orthography is very inconsistent; the initial voiced stops being partly marked with π , τ , and κ respectively, sometimes with the combinations $\mu\pi$, $\nu\tau$, and $\gamma\kappa$. However, a study of the codex is particularly rewarding in the field of syntax. In my paper I shall concentrate on syntactical constructions which on the one hand may reflect popular Turkish language, or on the other hand may be calques on constructions in Greek.

Some syntactic issues in Karamanlidika texts

Ceyda Arslan Kechriotis

Boğaziçi University / Istanbul

The aim of the paper is to address texts in Karamanlidika from a linguistic point of view. To this aim, six original Karamanlidika publications dating between 1860 and 1900 (available at Boğaziçi University Library) will be used as samples. I will try to provide only a syntactic analysis of Karamanlidika without going into the phonological, morphological and/or lexical aspects. Such a discussion will hopefully shed light to issues pertaining to the questions of whether Karamanlidika is a language on its own, whether it is a variant/dialect of (Ottoman) Turkish, and whether it shows structural similarities to Greek. However, the outcome of such an analysis can only be tentative since in order to present a thorough analysis of Karamanlidika, knowledge of the Ottoman Turkish of the time, a historical linguistic point of view and a comparative linguistic point of view are necessary.

- Eckmann, Janos. (1950). "Anadolu Karamanlı Ağızlarına ait Araştırmalar". *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi*, cilt VIII, sayı 1-2, Mart-Haziran 1950, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 165-200.
- Kappler, Matthias. (2006). "Toward a linguistic approach to 'Karamanlı' texts". S. Yağcıoğlu et al (eds.), *Advances in Turkish Linguistics: Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, İzmir, 11-13 August 2004*, İzmir: Dokuz Eylül Yayıncılık, 655-667.
- Nuhbalaoğlu, Derya. (2007). Karamanlıca bir eser: *Temaşa-i Dünya ve Cefakar ü Cafakeş*. ms. Boğaziçi University, Istanbul.
- Tekin, Talat. (1984). "Grek Alfabetiyle Türkçe". *Tarih ve Toplum* 3, 180-183.

**Religious Vocabulary in Karamanlidika Texts:
The case of the *Cebel-i Sinanin Medhnamesi* (1784).**

Xaviert Luffin
University Libre (Brussels)

This paper analyses, through one specific Greek text and its translation into Karamanlidika (Perigraphe Hiera Orous Sina – Cebel-i Sinanin Medhnamesi, 1784), the way in which early translators from Greek to Karamanlidika dealt with religious terminology. In this book, the translator – or translators – could choose between various techniques in order to render religious terminology as well as place names or personal names: keeping the Greek word, adopting the Turkish-Islamic equivalent, or creating a new specific term.

Actually, all three techniques are used, sometimes for the same word or expression in various parts of the text. This raises various questions: Is this book the work of one or more translators? Did some elements help the translator in his choice, or was it made at random? Did he prefer one of the techniques in some specific fields (personal names, for instance)? To what extent were his choices systematic? When he adopted the Greek words, to what extent was the text understood by the readers? And when he adopted the Turkish words, to what extent did he introduce ambiguous Islamic terminology into a Christian text? Finally, this translation will be compared with later Karamanlidika translations of religious texts.



University of Cyprus, Nicosia



With the support of :

Holy Monastery of Kykkos
Cyprus Airways
Lithotechnic- Printers

Conference Organization:

Matthias Kappler, University of Cyprus / Nicosia (mkappler@ucy.ac.cy)

Evangelia Balta, National Hellenic Research Foundation / Athens (evalalta@eie.gr)

Graphics:

Vasso Antoniou