
Encyclopedia of Turkic Languages and Linguistics Online

History of Teaching of Turkish in Europe

(6,593 words)

1. Historical Outline

The learning and teaching of Ottoman Turkish in Europe from the first quarter of the 16th c. until the 19th c. went through various stages. The main target learners of the teaching material produced in the first few centuries were merchants and diplomats, and later missionaries. The significant production of dictionaries, grammars and phrase books, both printed and manuscript, occurred in the 17th c. and 18th c., whereas the 19th c. was characterized by a more practical approach to language teaching. Several European states, beginning with Venice and France, instituted a system called 'language youth' in order to teach young dragomans-to-be in Constantinople. The most current languages in which Turkish grammars were written until the beginning of the 20th c. are Latin, Italian, German, French, and English.

The beginning of the learning and teaching of Ottoman Turkish as a foreign language in Europe can be approximately dated to the first quarter of the 16th c. with the compilation of the first Turkish-Italian word lists and grammar sketches in Italy. These initial productions were motivated by the practical needs of merchants and missionaries, and contained mainly dialogues and small glossaries, but also some grammatical rules. However, the interest in learning Turkish was limited. Merchants and diplomats used the services of interpreters, or thought that knowledge of European languages and Greek was sufficient (Gallotta 1996: 537). The production of grammars and dictionaries increased in the 17th c. and 18th c., spreading to other countries and metalanguages, especially Latin, French, German, and English. The reason

Table of Contents

- [1. Historical Outline](#)
 - [2. The First Sources for the Teaching of Turkish in the 16th Century.](#)
 - [3. The Venetian and French Institution of the 'Language Youth': The First Schools for the Teaching of Turkish](#)
 - [4. Teaching Material Produced in the 17th Century and 18th Century.](#)
 - [5. The 19th Century.](#)
- [Bibliography.](#)

for this development lies in the tight diplomatic relations between the 'West' (Venice and other Italian cities, Austria, France) and the Ottoman empire. This led to the need of qualified 'dragomans', translators, and interpreters, and of teaching material for this purpose, in order not to depend on the dragomans of the Porte, or on occasional interpreters, often recruited from the Ottoman Greek and Armenian communities. The foundation of two significant institutions which educated and trained young men for that important duty, the Venetian *giovani di lingua* as of 1551, and the *jeunes de langues* of the French, instituted in 1669, must be seen in this context (see section 3. below). An important input for the learning of Turkish in the 17th c. was also the new missionary policy of the Catholic church with the institution of the congregation *De propaganda fide* in 1622. In the 18th c. and 19th c., the non-Muslim communities of the Ottoman empire, especially Greeks, Armenians, and Levantines, continued to be active linguistic mediators through the publication of grammars and other teaching material. Due to the westernization process of the Ottoman empire in the Tanzimat period and afterwards, the subsequent learning of European languages by the Ottomans, and, eventually, the decline of the Empire, the need of didactic material for diplomatic purposes decreased. At the same time, however, Orientalism, new findings in linguistics, and a general interest in language learning with a less theoretical approach entailed the large production of manuals, practical grammars, and phrase books during the 19th c. The scale of publication was also to satisfy the needs of the newly established Turkish courses in many European universities, especially in the centers of Oriental studies, such as Leiden, Leipzig, Vienna, Paris, and Naples. However, these courses were often subordinated to a wider context of 'Orientalistic', mostly Arabic studies.

The Turkish word material contained in the 16th-c., 17th-c., and 18th-c. grammars and glossaries written in Latin characters is an important source for the study of Turkish phonetics and phonology, and thus it falls under the category of the transcriptional texts, written in non-Arabic alphabets, which, in many cases, express more clearly the vowel structure of a word than the predominantly consonantic Arabic script.

2. The First Sources for the Teaching of Turkish in the 16th Century

We can find evidence for the study of Turkic varieties in several Byzantine and medieval sources prior to the 15th c. (Balivet 1997: 67-73). For Kipchak varieties the most important source is the *Codex cumanicus*, 12th c.-13th c. A copy conserved at the St Mark's Library in Venice dates from 1330. However, the first European work known to us, which can be truly considered as teaching material for learners of Oghuz Ottoman Turkish, is the undated word list *Opera Nova de M. Pietro Lupis Valentiano la qual insegna a parlare turchesco*. According to Yağmur (2015: 245) the probable print date was between 1520 and 1527. The author Pietro Lupis (Pedro López) from Valencia was a Spanish Jew who migrated to Italy after the expulsion of the Jews from Spain. The Munich copy, available for online reading on the website of the [Bavarian State Library](#), which Yağmur used for his study, consists of an Italian-Turkish word list with 237 entries on eight pages.

It corresponds to a booklet studied by Adamović (1975), conserved at the British Museum, which he presented as an 'anonymous Venetian' work, assuming 1525-1530 as its printing date. The phonetic shape of some words in the Munich copy is slightly different.

Only a few years later, in 1533, Filippo Argenti compiled the *Regola del Parlare Turco* (Bombaci 1938; Adamović 2001; Rocchi 2007). The text, which remained unprinted, contains a glossary and some observations on grammar, and is thus the first, though rudimentary, description of this kind in a European language.

In 1544 in Antwerp, the Dalmatian Bartholomaeus Georgievits published a short work, *De Turcorum ritu et ceremoniis*, of which the fourth chapter is an extensive word list and some dialogue phrases are provided, and of which a small chapter on grammar with a description of the plural suffix is given (Heffening 1942; Yerasimos 1997: 56-60).

One of the most remarkable figures of the 16th c. was the eclectic French erudite Guillaume Postel (b. 1510-d. 1581), who in 1575 published the voluminous *Histoires orientales et principalement des Turkes ou Turchikes et Schitiques ou Tartaresques*, re-edited by Jacques Rollet (Istanbul, 1999) with an important linguistic section, titled *Instruction des mots de la langue turquesque les plus communs*. Postel's work does not only provide a basic Turkish-French-Latin glossary, but also a grammar introduction with rules about suffixes, noun inflection and verbal tenses (Balivet 1997: 73-77).

Some minor word lists in 16th-c. European travel accounts are mentioned in Yerasimos (1997), while two manuscript Italian-Turkish dictionaries from the 16th c. are reported from the National Library of Paris (Berthier 1992).

3. The Venetian and French Institution of the 'Language Youth': The First Schools for the Teaching of Turkish

Politically and commercially motivated considerations led, in February 1551, to the decision of the Venetian Senate to establish a school for interpreters, *dragomanni* 'dragomans' of Oriental languages at the 'casa bailaggia', the residence of the Venetian *bailo* 'ambassador' in Istanbul, in the quarter of Pera, today Beyoğlu. At the end of the same year, the first *giovani di lingua* 'language youth' were sent to the Ottoman capital. The innovative initiative was destined to fail and then rise again intermittently many times during the following two centuries, due to practical, economic, and methodological problems (Lucchetta 1989; Bellingeri 1991; Palumbo Fossati Casa 1997; Rothman 2013). After a languishing decline during the war of Candia (1645-1669), the school was booming again thanks to the efforts of the *bailo* Giovanni Battista Donà, author of the famous *Letteratura de' Turchi* (1687), one of the most important accounts of Ottoman culture and literature in the 17th c. (see section 4.1. below). Donà, being conscious of the need to provide propaedeutic knowledge before the departure of the students to Istanbul, was the first *bailo* to suggest the establishment of a school in Venice, and in 1699 the Senate

decided to open an institute in Padua, but without long-lasting success. The school in Istanbul faced many problems again in the 18th c. The difficulty of recruiting young Venetians, the low motivation of many pupils, economic questions, the scarcity of teachers and dragomans, and the continuous debate on the best way of teaching, whether by a Muslim *hoĵa*, 'cozza' in the Venetian sources, or by a plurilingual eastern or western Christian, hindered the constant functioning of the school and, eventually, led to three other rather unsuccessful or short-lived attempts in the 18th c. to open a school in Venice. The last was in 1786, when the school in Pera was finally closed, and thus only a few years before the end of the republic (Lucchetta 1985).

Some of the *giovani di lingua* also produced teaching material, such as Antonio Benetti, pupil under the *bailo* Donà, who, together with other 'language youths' of his generation, published a collection of Turkish proverbs (*Raccolta ... d'adaggi turcheschi trasportati dal proprio idioma nell'italiano e latino dalli giovani di lingua* 1688). We may assume that some students kept personal notebooks with grammatical and other linguistic observations which remained unprinted, but only one of these manuscripts has been found so far, namely the *Memoria locale di Precetti Grammaticali Turchi* 'Local memory of Turkish grammatical rules', dated 1711, which follows Meninski's *Grammatica Turcica* (Vienna, 1680; cf. section 4.2. below), and was written by the *giovane di lingua* Pietr'Antonio Rizzi (Kappler 2014a).

In 1669, Jean-Baptiste Colbert decided to establish a French version of the Venetian model, also taking its name: *École des jeunes de langues*, sometimes also *enfants de langues*. At the beginning, the teaching was implemented at the monastery of the Capuchin brethren in Istanbul, but soon, in 1700, probably learning from the negative experience of the Venetian model, a school was established at the Jesuit College, after becoming the Lycée Louis-le-Grand in Paris, while the school in Istanbul was not closed, and the pupils were supposed to pass parts of their studies in both cities. A difference with the Venetian model is the fact that the teaching was always done by Catholic clergymen and the pupils were recruited among French families exclusively, underlining the role of the French king as protector of the Christians (Mantran in Hitzel 1997: 107). In 1795, Year III of the Revolution, the *École Spéciale des Langues Orientales*, the direct predecessor of today's *Institut national des langues et civilisations orientales* (INALCO), was founded as a small department within the Louis-le-Grand. This was the framework in which the institution of the *enfants de langues* continued to exist until the beginning of the 19th c.

With reference to the linguistic sources, like the Venetian *giovani di lingua*, the French 'language youth', too, produced personal notebooks, such as the *Livre de Phrases Turques et Françaises, composées par J.B. Couet, enfant de langues à Constantinople, en 1712* (Berthier 1997: 295; 2010), which contains lexical material, phrases and dialogues on different subjects, as well as songs. Other productions achieved by the *jeunes de langues* in the 17th c. and 18th c. include an

impressive number of translations of Ottoman texts, first of all historical accounts, which are today conserved in the manuscript collection of the National Library of France (Berthier 1997), as well as grammars and dictionaries (see section 4.3.).

After Venice and France, other European states also established schools for the teaching of Oriental languages during the 18th c., according to the system of the Venetian and French 'language youth', namely Naples, Russia, Poland (Majda 1997), and Austria with the 'Sprachknaben-Institut' (Petritsch 1987: 30). Although for political and diplomatic reasons, Turkish was the main language taught in all these schools, other 'Oriental' languages (first of all Arabic and Persian) always formed part of the curricula.

4. Teaching Material Produced in the 17th Century and 18th Century

4.1. Italy

In the 17th c., the production of grammars, such as Pietro Ferraguto's *Grammatica Turchesca* (Naples, 1611; Bombaci 1940; edited by Rocchi 2012), Pietro Della Valle's *Grammatica Turca* (1620; Rossi 1935), and Giovambattista Montalbano's *Turcicae linguae per terminos latinus educta Syntaxis in usum eorum qui in Turciam missiones subeunt* (Naples, ca 1630; Gallotta 1981; Gallotta 1996: 537-540; edited by Rocchi 2014) intensified. None of these works were printed.

The best-known and most widely used Italian dictionary in this century is the *Dittionario della Lingua Italiana-Turchesca*, with a grammatical appendix called *Brevi rudimenti del parlar turchesco*, which was printed in Rome in 1641 (Adamović 1974). The *Dittionario* was written by an Armenian from Ankara, Yovhannes Ankiwrac'i, better known under his Italian name Giovanni Molino (Święcicka 2000, also for the printing datation questions). The importance of Molino's work can be assumed by the fact that two further 17th-c. publications, explicitly refer to Molino (Maggio) or even copy him almost literally (Mascis). They are F. M. Maggio's *Syntagmaton linguarum orientalium... liber secundus... turcicae linguae institutiones* (Rome, 1643; see Kenessey 1978), the only printed grammar of this period produced in Italy which is not written in the vernacular Italian but in Latin, and Antonio Mascis's *Vocabolario toscano e turchesco*, together with the grammar appendix *Rudimenti gramaticali per ben tradurre l'idioma Toscano in Turchesco* (Florence, 1677; see Drimba 1992; Yağmur 2019). A part of Molino's work has furthermore been adapted into a Hungarian compilation from 1668 and integrated into the *Dictionarium turcico-latinum* of the so-called Illésházy manuscript (Németh 1970), whereas a short version of Molino's grammar appendix was translated into Greek in 1664 by a monk called Damaskinos from Athens (Kappler 1999). Besides Molino's work, another Italian-Turkish dictionary was printed in the 17th c., namely Bernardo da Parigi's *Vocabolario Italiano-Turchesco* in three volumes (Rome 1665). One of the most extensive Ottoman-Turkish dictionaries ever written, comprising sixteen thousand entries, was compiled by the Tuscan monk Arcangelo Carradori. The manuscript is dated 1650 and has been edited by Rocchi (2011).

Returning to grammars, there was only one 17th-c. work in Italy after 1640 which was not directly influenced by Molino's grammar, in spite of a similar title, namely the *Rudimento della lingua turchesca* by the Venetian Armenian Giovanni Agop, printed in Venice in 1685 (Drimba 1997). The author refers in his prologue to the "close fall of the Ottoman empire", concluding that the fact that "a good part of that Turkish world will have the fortune to come under the dominion of this glorious Republic" will require good knowledge of Turkish, as well as knowledge of Italian for the Ottomans: "Se vicina è la caduta dell'Impero Ottomano, come pare, [...], devesi sperare che buona parte di quel mondo Turchesco habbia fortuna a venire sotto il Dominio di questa gloriosa Republica, e all'hora sarà ben, molto utile, forse necessaria la cognizion delle Lingue, così a noi della Turchesca, come a loro dell'Italiana".

The *bailo* Giovanni Battista Donà, who was a prominent figure for the development of the institution of the 'language youth' (see section 3.), published in 1687 his *Letteratura de' Turchi*. Though not a grammar, it provides knowledge not only about Ottoman poetry and culture, but also about language. It can therefore be considered an important tool for language learners of that time. Donà's most interesting observations concern the sociolinguistic status of Turkish against Persian and Arabic, comparing the role of Persian as a high-prestige variety to that of Tuscan: "the Turkish language is like the provincial language in Italy, which everyone speaks with the forms, the pronunciation and the accent of the countryside. But it is decorated by Persian, the same as we do with Tuscan" (see Bellingeri 2016: 178-179).

At the end of the following century, another Armenian, Cosimo Comidas de Carbognano, compiled his *Primi Principi della Grammatica Turca*, which was printed in Rome in 1794. Other basic grammatical and lexicographical works written during the 18th c. in Italy are L. Antonelli's *Primi principi della grammatica turca* (Rome, 1724), and Bernardino Pianzola's plurilingual, Italian-Greek-Turkish *Dizionario, gramatiche e dialoghi per apprendere le lingue italiana, greca volgare e turca e varie scienze* (Padova, 1789), edited by Rocchi (2009).

4.2. Germany and Austria

Almost 30 years before Molino's dictionary and grammar appeared in Rome, the *Institutionum Linguae Turcicae libri IV* was printed in Leipzig (1612). Its author, Hieronymus Megiser, in an attempt to describe "the language of the enemies" (Stein 1987: 42), and to "give grammar rules to that Barbarian language" (Petritsch 1987: 26), provides a complete description of Turkish in the first two books of the work (*Isagoges grammaticae Turcicae*), applying rigorously the patterns of the Latin-Greek grammar tradition, followed by other linguistic observations as well as the Latin-Turkish and Turkish-Latin *Dictionarium* in the fourth book, comprising 2,500 words. Although the grammar section in Postel's *Instruction* (see section 2.) is, strictly speaking, the first printed Turkish grammar sketch in Europe, Megiser's grammar, due to its much larger coverage and accuracy, is considered the first comprehensive dictionary and grammar of Turkish printed in Europe.

During the 17th c. and 18th c., Leipzig University continued to be a center of Oriental studies. Several professors gave lessons in Turkish, often in the framework of Arabic studies. One of these teachers was Johann David Schieferdecker, who, in 1695 published a minor grammar (*Nucleus institutionum arabicarum enucleatus, variis linguae ornamentis atque praeceptis dialecti Turcicae illustratus*, Leipzig), a synthesis of Meninski's grammar. The same can be said for the *Grammatica Turcica ... aliquot colloquiis et sententiis Turcarum aucta* (Leipzig, 1729), written by the Arabist Johann Christian Clodius, while the dictionary *Compendiosum lexicon latino-turcico-germanicum* (Leipzig, 1730) by the same author, still committed to Meninski's work, contains numerous changes and additions (Stein 1987: 44).

Meanwhile, in Vienna, the other important German-speaking center of Oriental studies, the most influential work in Turkish grammar and lexicography had been published: the monumental *Thesaurus linguarum orientalium*, a Turkish-Arabic-Persian-Latin dictionary, and the grammar *Linguarum orientalium turcicae, arabicae, persicae institutiones seu grammatica turcica* (both Vienna, 1680), written by the *Kaiserliche Hofdolmetscher* 'Imperial interpreter of the Court', Franz von Mesgnien Meninski (b. 1623-d. 1698). His Turkish grammar remained one of the most important reference works in the following centuries, and the dictionary is an extensive word list of around nine thousand entries, which was used by 'language youth', dragomans, and Turcologists alike. A second enlarged edition of the *Thesaurus* was printed as *Lexicon Arabico-Persico-Turcicum* (1780-1802) in Vienna. The grammar part with dialogues, texts, and analyses was reedited separately in 1756 (Stachowski 2000: xxviii). The Vienna 1680 edition has been reprinted in *Türk Dilleri Araştırma Dergisi* 30 (Istanbul, 2000).

Many grammars during the 18th c. and 19th c. relied more or less explicitly on Meninski's *Grammatica*. The most important were Jean Baptiste Holdermann's *Grammaire turque ou méthode courte & facile pour apprendre la langue turque* (Constantinople, 1730), a product of the first official Ottoman printing-house founded by Ibrahim Müteferrika (section 4.3), Carbognano's aforementioned (section 4.1) *Primi Principi della Grammatica Turca* (Rome, 1794), the first printed Turkish grammar in Greek by Dimitrios Alexandridis *Γραμματική Γραικικο-τουρκική* 'Greek-Turkish grammar' (Vienna, 1812), Artin Hindoglu's *Theoretisch-praktische türkische Sprachlehre* (Vienna, 1829), and a French translation, *Grammaire théorique et pratique de la langue turke* (Paris, 1834).

The Venetian *giovani di lingua*, and probably most of the other 'language youth' of different nations learning Turkish during the 18th c., used Meninski's grammar, such as the *giovane di lingua* Pietr'Antonio Rizzi at the beginning of the 18th c. (see section 3.). Moreover, Meninski's dictionary and grammar were the model of the 18th-c. Greek-Turkish grammar production (Kappler 2014b).

One of Meninski's pupils, the Italian Giovanbattista (Johann Baptist) Podestà published a *Cursus grammaticalis linguarum orientalium* [...], *Tomus III: Lingua turcica* (Vienna, 1703), but it is reported that Meninski was in continuous conflict with his student Podestà, as well as with other interpreters of Oriental languages in Vienna (Petritsch 1987: 29). With the foundation of the 'Kaiserlich-königliche Akademie der Orientalischen Sprachen' in 1754, the institution of the *Sprachknaben* 'language youth' was introduced in Vienna, and led to the establishment of Turkish studies in Austria.

4.3. France

With the exception of Postel's aforementioned attempt, the first Turkish grammar printed in France was the *Rudimenta grammatices linguae turcicae*, published in Paris in 1630, i.e., between Megiser's and Molino's works. Its author, the French consul in Egypt, André Du Ryer-Malezair, was also the first French translator of the Qur'an, as well as the author of a *Dictionarium turcico-latinum* which has never been printed (Berthier 1992: 80). Du Ryer supposedly did not know of Megiser's grammar, since he writes in the preface that his grammar is the first in a European language. Unlike the other 16th-c. and 17th-c. grammars produced in Europe, the *Rudimenta* is not a transcription text, i.e., the Turkish words are printed in fully vocalized Arabic script with characters that had been engraved in Rome and previously used for the first printed bilingual Turkish-French text (Kalus 1992: 83-84). Du Ryer's grammar had enormous success with a second edition printed immediately in 1633. Initially written for the "missionaries of the Orient", it was widely used by the *jeunes de langues*, for whom a translation into French was under discussion during the 18th c. (Kalus 1992: 84). An abridged version of the grammar was translated into Greek, probably in the second or last third of the 17th c. (Kappler 2001), which is another sign of its popularity.

The *Grammaire turque ou méthode courte & facile pour apprendre la langue turque* (Constantinople, 1730), attributed to the Jesuit father Jean Baptiste Holdermann, or written under his guidance, was one of the first books printed in the Ottoman state printing house. Following Meninski's model in structure and paradigms, though with numerous differences, it represents a more learner-friendly version of the famous Latin work; cf. Menz 2002 for a comparison of the two grammars. Another French grammar, Pierre-François Viguier's *Élemens de la langue turque* (Constantinople, 1790), radically different from Meninski's model, was also produced in Istanbul, but printed in the French ambassador's private printing house of the Palais de France at the end of the century. Viguier was a missionary employed in Istanbul for the *Congrégation de la Mission pour le Levant*. His grammar is committed, like every European grammar of Turkish, to the classical Greek-Latin grammar system; however at some points it implicitly relates to the 17th-c. French grammar tradition of the *Grammaire générale et raisonnée* by Antoine Arnauld and Claude Lancelot (1660) (Kappler 2016: 217). The Turkish material in

Viguiet's work is provided in Latin characters, in order to "facilitate the reader", but it was apparently less used by the *jeunes de langues* than Du Ryer and Holdermann's grammars (Kalus 1992: 85-86).

As in Italian, there is a considerable amount of French manuscript material, most of it used for the teaching of Turkish in the *École des jeunes de langues*. Several French-Turkish, Latin-Turkish, and plurilingual, partly very voluminous dictionaries, as well as Turkish grammars were compiled during the 17th c. and 18th c., and are conserved at the National Library of Paris (Berthier 1992: 79-82).

4.4. England

The 17th c. and 18th c. produced two grammars printed in England, both of them original works, but very different from each other: Gulielmo (William) Seaman's *Grammatica linguae turcicae, in quinque partes distributa* (Oxford 1670; see Lewis 1988: 83-84), and Thomas Vaughan's *A Grammar of the Turkish language* (London 1709; see Gilson 1987; Lewis 1988: 86-90). The main differences between the two works consist in the use of different metalanguages, Latin vs. English, as well as in the representation of the Turkish language material: Seaman employs Arabic characters, whereas Vaughan's grammar is a transcription text with the use of the Latin alphabet for Turkish words. Vaughan's 18-page long preface is an interesting source for the grammar teaching debate of that time. He defends the simplicity in explanation and the use of the vernacular, referring also to Meninski's and Seaman's grammars, which he recognizes as models: "And though it's acknowledg'd to fall short to the Perfection of Meninsky's in Latin, I think I may venture to say, it's an Improvement of Mr. Seaman's, which gave this its Form, and well-nigh all its Substance too". However, he clearly rejects the use of Latin: "I therefore first observe, that 'tis an Error in Practice to confound the Learning of an Art, with the Learning of a Language: And I take the Art of Grammar to be such, that no Nation need have Recourse to Latin, or any foreign Language to attain it". At some points, he gets into open polemics with Seaman about terminological and methodological issues (Kappler 2016: 216).

4.5. Other Languages

A special place in Turkish grammarianism is occupied by the prolific writer and musician Wojciech Bobowski, a native from Lvów of Polish descent, who was captured by Tatars in his youth and sold as a slave in Istanbul, where he stayed for about 20 years (Neudecker 1996: 170-171). He is also known by his Latin name, Albertus Bobovius, and as Ali Ufki in Ottoman, the latter especially in his work as a musician and composer. Among many other works, he compiled a grammar in Latin, *Grammatica turcico-latina*, dated 1666, in 96 folios, which is conserved at the Bodleian Library in Oxford. The Turkish language material in this manuscript is given in fully vocalized Arabic script (Neudecker 1996: 177-186).

A few years later, in 1672, another cosmopolitan figure, the Hungarian diplomat Jakab de Harsány, compiled a collection of Turkish-Latin dialogues for use by travelers, the *Colloquia familiaria turcico-latina*, one of the most important middle-Ottoman transcription texts, edited by György Hazai (1973). The rich Hungarian tradition of Turkish grammars properly developed much later, in the second half of the 19th c. See the list in Dilaçar (1953: 609).

5. The 19th Century

The motivation for the learning and teaching of Turkish, as well as other non-European languages, underwent a change during the 19th c. The reason for the compilation of grammars and other didactic material was no longer prevalently religious mission, commerce, and diplomacy, but more and more an interest in foreign languages and cultures, scientific curiosity, and orientalism. This was due to the general development of Indo-European linguistics, especially in the second half of the century, to romantic ideas concerning the Orient, and to an improvement in language teaching methodologies.

For these reasons, the grammars have a more practical approach and more and more language manuals and phrase books appear. If the importance of Latin as a metalanguage was already diminishing in the second half of the previous century, it has now completely fallen into desuetude, with only a few exceptions, such as R. P. M. Vergeiner's *Institutio ad studium linguae turcicae* (Jerusalem, 1872). Typical examples for 19th-c. handbooks are *Le Drogman Turc donnant les mots et les phrases les plus nécessaires pour la conversation* (Paris, 1854), written by the Polish orientalist Alexandre Chodzko, or *Abrégé de la grammaire turque, contenant outre les principes de cette langue, des idiotismes, des discours familiers, et un petit vocabulaire en français, turc et hongrois*, by Jean Charles de Besse (Pest, 1829; see Majda 1985).

Some authors published practical didactic material beyond grammars, such as the Austrian Armenian Artin Hindoglu, whose Meninskian grammar had been translated into French (section 4.2.), and who compiled the *Mecmu'a-i Lugat oder Sammlung der zum Sprechen nöthigsten Wörter und Redensarten der türkischen, neugriechischen und deutschen Sprache* (Vienna, 1840), a "Reise- und Taschendolmetscher für Handelsmänner", a phrase book for the use of travelers and businessmen. Grammars were often explicitly written for use in schools, such as Amédée Jaubert's *Elémens de la grammaire turke* (Paris, 1823), with a second edition in 1833, which bears the addition *à l'usage des élèves de l'école royale et spéciale des langues orientales vivantes*, i.e., for the use of the official School for Oriental Languages, established in 1795 (section 3.). Another example for this category is a grammar designed for the use in the Italian schools in Turkey, Angelo Scanziani's *Grammatica turca teorico-pratica... ad uso degli italiani e delle scuole italiane in Turchia* (Istanbul, 1890).

Not every 19th-c. work can be considered as particularly accurate. Thus, Lewis (1988: 90-95) reports many mistakes in Arthur Lumley Davids' *A Grammar of the Turkish Language* (London, 1832), which was translated into French three years later by the author's mother, *Grammaire turke, précédée d'un discours préliminaire sur la langue et la littérature des nations orientales avec vocabulaire...traduits de l'anglais par Sarah Davids* (London, 1836). The same goes for another English grammar, Captain C. F. Mackenzie's *Turkish Manual* (London, 1879), a typical example of the practical approach to grammar teaching in the 19th c. The most prominent Englishman in this field was undoubtedly Sir James W. Redhouse (b. 1811-d. 1892). After an academic grammar in French, *Grammaire raisonnée de la langue Ottomane* (Paris, 1841), he published some practical handbooks and language guides, as well as *A simplified grammar of the Ottoman-Turkish* (London, 1884). His main work however was his famous Ottoman-English dictionary, *A Turkish and English Lexicon* (Constantinople, 1890), an indispensable tool for Ottomanists still today, and the base for a number of Turkish-English dictionaries throughout the 20th c.

The first printed Turkish grammar in Ottoman fell also into the 19th c., namely the *Qavâ'id-i 'Osmâniyye* by Ahmed Cevdet Paşa and Fu'âd Efendi (Istanbul, 1851). This work was translated a few years later into German by H. Kellgren, *Grammatik der osmanischen Sprache... Deutsch bearbeitet von H. Kellgren* (Helsingfors, 1855). Another practical handbook/grammar widely used by German-speaking users at the end of the 19th c. was Adolf Wahrmund's *Praktisches Handbuch der osmanisch-türkischen Sprache* (Giessen, 1869), with a second enlarged edition in 1898. It appears particularly obvious that in Germany and Austria the preference for practical language handbooks is a typical trend in the 19th c. The production in German, especially in the second half of the century, and the beginning of the 20th c., concerns not only grammars, but numerous chrestomathies, *Sprachführer* and other phraseological material for the practical use of travelers, such as M. Wickerhauser's *Wegweiser zum Verständnis der türkischen Sprache - Eine deutsch-türkische Chrestomathie* (Vienna, 1853), L. Fink's *Türkischer Dragoman: Grammatik, Phrasensammlung und Wörterbuch* (Leipzig, 1872), or the *Türkische Grammatik mit Paradigmen, Literatur, Chrestomathie und Glossar* by A. Müller and H. Giese (Berlin, 1889). The new genre of 'Konversationsgrammatik', very much in vogue in the German lands in that period, produced several books, e.g., H. Jehlitschka's *Türkische Konversation-Grammatik* (Heidelberg, 1895).

Eventually, the last grammar which can be considered as pertaining to the 'long 19th c.', although it was printed in 1921, i.e., shortly before the Kemalist language reforms, is Jean Deny's *Grammaire de la langue turque (dialecte osmanli)* (Paris, 1921), which is still being used by learners of Ottoman and scholars of Ottoman and Turkish studies. Deny's grammar constitutes an innovation especially in the treatment of vowel assimilation, benefitting from the latest achievements in phonology.

Matthias Kappler

Bibliography

- Adamović, Milan 1974. Giovanni Molino und seine türkische Grammatik [Giovanni Molino and his Turkish grammar]. *Acta Linguistica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 24: 37-67.
- Adamović, Milan 1975. Ein italienisch-türkisches Sprachbuch aus den Jahren 1525-1530 [An Italian-Turkish vocabulary (1525-1530)]. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 67: 217-247.
- Adamović, Milan 2001. *Das Türkische des 16. Jahrhunderts: Nach Aufzeichnungen des Florentiners Filippo Argenti (1533)* [Turkish in the 16th Century: According to Notations by the Florentine Filippo Argenti (1533)]. Göttingen: Pontus.
- Bacqué-Grammont, Jean-Louis & Dor, Rémy eds. 1992. *Mélanges offerts à Louis Bazin* [Miscellanea Offered to Louis Bazin]. Paris: Editions L'Harmattan.
- Balivet, Michel 1997. Avant les jeunes de langues: Coup d'œil sur l'apprentissage des langues turques en monde chrétien, de Byzance à Guillaume Postel (VI^e-XVI^e siècles) [Before the language youth: A look at the learning of Turkic languages in the Christian world, from Byzantium to Guillaume Postel (6th-16th centuries)]. In Hitzel 1997: 67-77.
- Bellingeri, Giampiero 1991. Venezia e il turco: Dalla cancelleria ducale a Ca' Foscari [Venice and Turkish: From the Ducal Chancellery to Ca' Foscari]. In Perosa, Sergio et al. eds. *Venezia e le lingue e letterature straniere*. Rome: Bulzoni. 55-69.
- Bellingeri, Giampiero 2016. *Motivi persiani, e azeri: Persia, Safavidi e Ottomani nell'intreccio politico e narrativo di Venezia (secoli XV-XVIII)* [Persian and Azerbaijani motives: Persia, Safavids, and Ottomans in the political and narrative entanglements of Venice (15th-18th centuries)]. Rome: Istituto per l'Oriente C. A. Nallino.
- Berthier, Annie 1992. À l'origine de l'étude de la langue turque en France: Liste des grammaires et dictionnaires manuscrits du fonds turc de la Bibliothèque nationale de Paris [The origins of studying Turkish in France: List of manuscript grammars and dictionaries in the Turkish inventory of the National Library of Paris]. In Bacqué-Grammont & Dor 1992: 77-82.
- Berthier, Annie 1997. Turquerie ou turcologie? L'effort de traduction des langues au xvii^e siècle, d'après la collection de manuscrit conservée à la Bibliothèque nationale de Paris [Turquerie or Turcology? The translation efforts of languages in the 17th century according to the manuscript collection conserved at the National Library of Paris]. In Hitzel 1997: 283-317.

Berthier, Annie 2010. Le Livre de Phrases Turques et Françaises de Jean-Baptiste Couët: un témoignage de la vie étudiante à Constantinople au début du 18^e siècle [The Livre de Phrases Turques et Françaises by Jean-Baptiste Couët: A witness of students' life in Constantinople]. *Eurasian Studies* 8: 27-32.

Bombaci, Alessio 1938. *La 'Regola del parlare turco' di Filippo Argenti: Materiale per la conoscenza del turco parlato nella prima metà del XVI sec.* [The 'Regola del parlare turco' by Filippo Argenti: Material for the knowledge of spoken Turkish in the first half of the 16th century]. Naples: R. Istituto superiore orientale.

Bombaci, Alessio 1940. Padre Piero Ferraguto e la sua Grammatica turca (1611) [Padre Piero Ferraguto and his Grammatica turca (1611)]. *Annali dell'Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli* 1: 205-236.

Dilaçar, Agop 1953. Türkiye Türkçesi gramerlerinden seçme eserler [Selected works of Turkish grammars]. *Türk Dili* 21, 2: 603-610.

Drimba, Vladimir 1992. La grammaire turque d'Antonio Mascis (1677) [The Turkish grammar by Antonio Mascis (1677)]. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 82: 109-120.

Drimba, Vladimir 1997. La grammaire turque de Giovanni Agop (1685) [The Turkish grammar by Giovanni Agop (1685)]. In Kellner-Heinkele, Barbara & Zieme, Peter eds. *Studia Ottomanica: Festgabe für György Hazai*. Wiesbaden. 39-46.

Gallotta, Aldo 1981. La Grammatica turca di Giovambattista Montalbano (XVII secolo) [The Turkish grammar by Giovambattista Montalbano (17th century)]. *Atti del Simposio di ricerche e di studi per uno sviluppo scientifico dei rapporti italo-turchi* (Ankara-Istanbul 9-14 ottobre 1980). Milano: A. Giuffrè. 177-190.

Gallotta, Aldo 1996. Gli studi di lingua turca in Europa in epoca rinascimentale [Turkish studies in Europe during the Renaissance]. In Mirko Tavoni ed. *Italia ed Europa nella linguistica del Rinascimento*. Modena: F.C. Panini. 535-549.

Gilson, Erika Hitzigrath 1987. *The Turkish Grammar of Thomas Vaughan: Ottoman Turkish at the End of the XVIIth Century According to an English "Transkriptionstext"*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Hazai, György 1973. *Das Osmanisch-Türkische im XVII. Jahrhundert: Untersuchungen an den Transkriptionstexten von Jakab Nagy de Harsány* [Ottoman Turkish in the 17th century: Research into the transcriptional texts by Jakab Nagy de Harsány]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Heffening, Wilhelm 1942. *Die türkischen Transkriptionstexte des Bartholomaeus Georgievits aus den Jahren 1544-1548* [The Turkish transcriptional texts by Bartholomaeus Georgievits (1544-1548)]. Leipzig: Brockhaus.

Hitzel, Frédéric ed. 1997. *Istanbul et les langues orientales* [Istanbul and the Oriental languages]. Paris: Editions L'Harmattan.

Kalus, Marielle 1992. Les premières grammaires turques en France et leur édition (XVII^e et XVIII^e siècles) [The first Turkish grammars in France and their edition (17th-18th centuries)]. In Bacqué-Grammont & Dor 1992: 83-86.

Kappler, Matthias 1999. Eine griechische Übersetzung (1664) von Giovanni Molinos 'Brevi rudimenti del parlar turchesco' [A Greek translation (1664) of Giovanni Molino's 'Brevi rudimenti del parlar turchesco']. *Archivum Ottomanicum* 17: 276-295.

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

Kappler, Matthias 2014a. An unedited sketch of Turkish grammar (1711) by the Venetian *giovane di lingua* Pietr'Antonio Rizzi. *Turkic Languages* 18: 104-127.

Kappler, Matthias 2014b. The place of the *Grammatiki tis Tourkikis Glossis* (1730) by Kanellos Spanós in Ottoman Greek grammarianism and its importance for Karamanlidika studies. In Balta, Evangelia ed. *Cultural Encounters in the Turkish-Speaking Communities of the Late Ottoman Empire*. Istanbul: Isis Press. 105-117.

Kappler, Matthias 2016. Wenn das Wörtlein *und* nicht wär': Die unglückliche Geschichte eines Bindeworts in historischen Sprachbeschreibungen des Osmanisch-Türkischen [The unhappy history of a conjunction in historical language descriptions of Ottoman Turkish]. In Hauenschild, Ingeborg et al. eds. *Eine hundertblättrige Tulpe - Bir şad barg lāla: Festgabe für Claus Schönig*. Berlin. 204-223.

Kenessey, Mary 1978. A Turkish Grammar from the 17th Century. *Acta Orientalia Hungarica* 28: 119-125.

Kreiser, Klaus ed. 1987. *Germano-Turcica: Zur Geschichte des Türkisch-Lernens in den deutschsprachigen Ländern* [On the History of Learning Turkish in the German-speaking Lands]. Bamberg: Universitätsbibliothek.

Lewis, Geoffrey 1988. English writers on the Turkish language. *Osmanlı Araştırmaları* 7-8: 83-96.

Lucchetta, Francesca 1985. L'ultimo progetto di una scuola orientalistica a Venezia nel Settecento [The last project of an school of Oriental languages in Venice in the 18th century]. *Quaderni di Studi Arabi* 3: 1-43.

Lucchetta, Francesca 1989. La scuola dei "giovani di lingua" veneti nei secoli xvi-xvii [The school of the Venetian "language youth" in the 16th-17th centuries]. *Quaderni di Studi Arabi* 7: 19-40.

Majda, Tadeusz 1985. The handbook "Le drogman turc" by A. Chodzko and his importance as a linguistic source. 5. *Milletlerarası Türkoloji Kongresi. Tebliğler: 1. Türk Dili* 1. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi. 187-191.

Majda, Tadeusz 1997. L'école polonaise des langues orientales à Istanbul au xviii^e siècle [The Polish school of Oriental languages in Istanbul in the 18th century]. In Hitzel 1997: 123-128.

Menz, Astrid 2002. Eine türkische Grammatik aus dem Jahre 1730 [A Turkish grammar from 1730]. In Demir, Nurettin & Turan, Fikret eds. *Scholarly Depth and Accuracy: A Festschrift to Lars Johanson*. Ankara: Grafiker. 295-306.

Németh, Julius 1970. *Die türkische Sprache in Ungarn im siebzehnten Jahrhundert* [The Turkish Language in Hungary in the 17th Century]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Neudecker, Hannah 1996. Wojciech Bobowski and his Turkish grammar (1666). *Dutch Studies published by NELL* 2: 169-192.

Palumbo Fossati Casa, Isabella 1997. L'école vénitienne des 'giovani di lingua' [The Venetian school of the 'giovani di lingua.']. In Hitzel 1997: 109-122.

Petritsch, Ernst D. 1987. Die Wiener Turkologie vom 16. bis zum 18. Jahrhundert [Turcology in Vienna from the 16th to the 18th century]. In Kreiser 1987: 25-31.

Rocchi, Luciano 2007. *Ricerche sulla lingua osmanli del XVI secolo: Il corpus lessicale turco del manoscritto fiorentino di Filippo Argenti (1533)* [Research into the Ottoman language of the 16th century: The lexical corpus of the Florence manuscript by Filippo Argenti (1533)]. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Rocchi, Luciano 2009. *Il lessico turco nell'opera di Bernardino Pianzola: Materiali per la conoscenza del turco parlato di fine Settecento* [The Turkish lexicon in the work by Bernardino Pianzola: Material for the knowledge of spoken Turkish at the end of the 18th century]. Trieste: Edizioni Università di Trieste.

Rocchi, Luciano 2011. *Il dizionario turco-ottomano di Arcangelo Carradori (1650)* [The Ottoman Turkish dictionary by Arcangelo Carradori (1650)]. Trieste: Edizioni Università di Trieste.

Rocchi, Luciano 2012. *Il "Dittionario della Lingua Turchesca" di Pietro Ferraguto (1611)* [The "Dittionario della Lingua Turchesca" by Pietro Ferraguto (1611)]. Trieste: Edizioni Università di Trieste.

Rocchi, Luciano 2014. *I Repertori Lessicali Turco-Ottomani di Giovan Battista Montalbano (1630 ca.)* [The Ottoman Turkish word lists by Giovan Battista Montalbano (ca. 1630)]. Trieste: Edizioni Università di Trieste .

Rossi, Ettore 1935. Importanza dell'inedita grammatica turca di Pietro Della Valle [The importance of the unedited Turkish grammar by Pietro Della Valle]. *Atti del 19. Congresso internazionale degli Orientalisti*. Rome. 202-209.

Rothman, E. Natalie 2013. Dragomans and 'Turkish Literature': The making of a field of inquiry. *Oriente Moderno* 93: 390-421.

Stachowski, Stanisław 2000. François à Mesgnien Meninski und sein Thesaurus Linguarum Orientalium [François à Mesgnien Meninski and his Thesaurus Linguarum Orientalium]. In Francisci a Mesgnien Meninski, *Thesaurus Linguarum Orientalium Turcicae-Arabicae-Persicae*, Nachdruck der Ausgabe Vienna MDCLXXX, I. İstanbul: Simurg. xxiii-xxxiv.

Stein, Heidi 1987. Zur Geschichte türkischer Studien in Leipzig (von 1612 bis ins 20. Jahrhundert) [On the history of Turkish studies in Leipzig (from 1612 to the 20th century)]. In Kreiser 1987: 41-47.

Święcicka, Elżbieta 2000. Interpreter Yowhannes Ankiwraç'i, also called Giovanni Molino. *Folia Orientalia* 36: 329-342.

Yağmur, Ömer 2015. Pietro Lupis Valentiano'nun İtalyanca-Türkçe çeviri yazılı sözlüğünde ses olayları (1520-1527) [Phonetic changes in Pietro Valentiano's Italian-Turkish transcriptional dictionary]. *Fatih Sultan Mehmet İlmî Araştırmalar* 6: 243-278.

Yağmur, Ömer 2019. Antonio Mascis, *Vocabolario Toscano e Turchesco (1677)*' ve Giovanni Molino, *Dittionario della Lingua Italiana, Turchesca (1641)*' ya göre 17. yüzyılda yaşayan Türkçenin söz varlığı [The Vocabulary of 17th century spoken Turkish according to Antonio Mascis' *Vocabolario Toscano e Turchesco (1677)* and Giovanni Molino's *Dittionario Della Lingua Italiana, Turchesca (1641)*]. Ankara: Kesit Yayınları.

Yerasimos, Stéphane 1997. Les voyageurs et la connaissance de la langue turque en Europe [The travellers and the knowledge of Turkish in Europe]. In Hitzel 1997: 49-65.

Cite this page

