
Encyclopedia of Turkic Languages and Linguistics Online

Karamanli

(6,262 words)

1. Definition and History of the Term

The terms 'Karamanli texts' and 'Karamanli literature', often called 'Karamanlidika' (*Καραμανλίδικα*), conventionally refer to Turkish texts written in Greek characters, produced by and for the Turkish-speaking Christian communities living mainly in Inner Asia Minor and in the cities of Izmir and Istanbul until the population exchange in 1924. The texts were initially written for religious purposes, i.e., in order to provide the flock with liturgical and other religious-related material in their mother tongue. The first printed book of this kind was published in 1718. Later, texts on non-religious topics, such as literature, history, music, and geography, were also produced. From the beginning of the 18th c. to the first quarter of the 20th c. about 750 printed titles are known to have been published, while there was also an extensive manuscript production. From a linguistic point of view, Karamanli texts are written in various Ottoman Turkish varieties.

'Karamanli' (*Karamanli*, *Καραμανλήδες*) is a conventional term used to describe the Turkish-speaking, mostly Orthodox Christian population living in the Ottoman empire until the population exchange in 1924. They lived mainly in Inner Asia Minor, greater Cappadocia, Western Anatolia, areas of Kula, Burdur, and İsparta, in some coastal areas of the Black Sea, and around Antalya, as well as in the cities of Izmir and Istanbul.

Table of Contents

- [1. Definition and History of the Term](#)
 - [2. The Sources of Karamanli Literature and their Linguistic Relevance](#)
 - [3. Linguistic Studies on Karamanli](#)
 - [4. The Karamanli Writing Systems](#)
 - [5. The Dialectal Dimension](#)
 - [6. Other Sociolinguistic Aspects](#)
- [Bibliography.](#)

'Karamanlidika', after the homonymous bibliographical work begun by Salaville & Dalleggio (1958, 1966, 1974), refers to Turkish texts written in Greek characters, produced by and for the Turkish-speaking Christian communities, primarily for religious purposes, i.e., in order to provide the flock with liturgical and other religious-related material in their mother tongue. This subsequently evolved into an extensive range of literature including many non-religious topics.

From a linguistic point of view, Karamanli is not a specific or homogeneous variety of Turkish. Karamanlidika texts are highly complex in their diatopic and diastratic variation, being written in various Anatolian or sometimes Rumelian dialects, as well as in urban varieties with various forms of standard influence, and even in high-style standard Ottoman. It is therefore preferable to adopt Balta's (1987a: xvi) definition of a Karamanli book, referring to printed productions, but valid also for non-printed texts, as "any printing containing a Turkish text in Greek characters". In other words, Karamanli texts refer to a merely graphic phenomenon typical of the so-called 'syncretistic' writing; the adoption of a writing system divergent from the main one used for a specific language, due to religious or ideological association of a minority with the language of the adopted writing system. The specific linguistic variety or varieties have to be explored in every single case (Kappler 2006).

Orthodox Christian speakers of various Turkish dialects in Asia Minor have been known from European texts since the 15th c. The first attestations, though without mentioning the term 'Karamanli' explicitly, seem to be in a document prepared for the Council of Basel (1431-1438) (Clogg 1999: 118) and in the accounts of the Venetian traveler Giovan Maria Angiolello in 1474 (Bellingeri 2010: 82-83). The first use of the term occurs in the diary written by Hans Dernschwam, who visited Istanbul in 1553-1555 and reports on the presence of "Caramani" and "Caramanier" in the neighborhood of Yedikule (Eckmann 1964: 820). The use of this term is derived from the region of Karaman in Asia Minor, partly overlapping with the homeland of Turkish-speaking Christians in Cappadocia, and also from the fact that the term "Caramani" was, at that time, still widely used in European, especially Italian sources, because of its association with the former principality (*beylik*) of the Karamanids (*Karamanoğulları*), who dominated the area until the supremacy of the Ottomans in the late 15th c. However, they never called themselves 'Karamanli', but rather 'Anatolian (Orthodox) Christians' (*Ανατόλ [Ορθόδοξος] Χριστιανλαρή, Anadol [Ortodoksos] Hristiyanları*), 'Anatolian Christians, who do not know Greek' (*Γιουνανί λισανί | Ρουμί λισανηνή πίλμεγιεν Αναδολουδακί Χριστιανλέρ, Yunani lisanı/Rumi lisanını bilmeyen Anadoludaki Hristiyanler*), or just 'Anatolians' (*Ανατολλουλάρ, Anadollular*), in addition to using other terms (Eckmann 1964: 820). In the 19th c. and 20th c. the term was adopted also to describe their language. As a consequence, even until recently, terms such as 'Karamanli language' or 'Karamanli dialect' could be encountered. This inappropriate use of the term, already challenged by Anhegger (1979-1980: 166-168) can be primarily traced back to the dialectological classification criteria by Kúnos, where 'Karamanisch' was the overall term for the "south-eastern Anatolian dialects between Mersin and Konya" (Kowalski 1934: 996). An

important role in the transmission of the misleading interpretation of Karamanli as a homogeneous language or dialect was played by the well-known basic study by János Eckmann on the "Karamanli dialects" (1950a), as well as subsequent studies. For a discussion of the development of the term in relation to language see Kappler (2016).

Karamanli is also used conventionally for Turkish texts in Cyrillic script produced mainly in Bulgaria in the second half of the 19th c. (Kappler 2011). The use of the term for this kind of text was introduced by Dmitriev (1928-1930) and is problematic in terms of its linguistic differentiation from texts in the Gagauz variety of the same period, and because the Gagauz themselves used books written in the Greek alphabet until the late 19th c. (Balta & Trandafilova-Louka 2013: 50).

2. The Sources of Karamanli Literature and their Linguistic Relevance

2.1. Overview

Although Karamanli texts are mainly known of and studied from printed books, they are found in both printed and manuscript forms. The preponderance of the printed medium in Karamanli studies can be explained by the extensive printed production itself: according to the *Karamanlidika* bibliography we can assume there were about 750 titles dating from the beginning of the 18th c. to the first quarter of the 20th c., though this also includes grammar books and dictionaries with Turkish word material written in Greek characters. The notoriety of the printed material, however, is additionally due to the nearly complete and thorough bibliographic description of the printed media in the three-volume bibliography by Salaville & Dalleggio (1958, 1966, 1974), which includes the printed Karamanli book production until the end of the 19th c., continued by Evangelia Balta with one volume for the 20th c. (Balta 1987a), and two volumes of additions (Balta 1987b, 1997). A new edition of the first volume with some additions has been published (Salaville et al. 2018). Manuscript texts must have already existed in the 15th c., but consistent manuscript material is available only from the 18th c. onwards, primarily in the archive of the Center of Asia Minor Studies in Athens (Anestidis 2010: 149, with further bibliography).

The first text recorded in the *Karamanlidika* bibliography is a Turkish translation of the Christian profession of faith, commissioned by Sultan Mehmet II the Conqueror to the Patriarch Gennadios Scholarios in 1480. The transcription of this text, in Greek characters, is included in the volume *Turco-Graecia*, written by the German humanist and philologist Martinus Crusius, alias Martin Krauß, from Tübingen, and printed in Basel in 1584 (Salaville & Dalleggio 1958: number 1; Halasi-Kun 1987-1992).

The first century of Karamanli book production (1718-1811) consists of religious books printed almost exclusively in the Venetian printing-houses specializing in the printing of Greek books, such as Bortoli and Glykis; other printing locations include Amsterdam, Leipzig, Bucharest, and

Istanbul. However, most books of the 19th c. and early 20th c., were printed in Istanbul, with a group of books, especially in the late 1830s and early 1840s, printed in Athens, as well as re- editions printed again by the Venetian typographers. The subject matters partly shifted to the wordly themes of history, geography, literature, and music, though the religious publications continued to be the main focus of production. Whereas the language of many books produced during the 18th c., being closer to the Asia Minor tradition, reveals numerous elements from Anatolian Turkish dialects, the language in the following century and a half is dominated by more standardized Ottoman Turkish varieties, with more or less learned Arabic and Persian influence. Due to the coercive population exchange between Turkey and Greece in the aftermath of the Treaty of Lausanne in 1923, when Anatolian Turkophone Christians, together with most of the other former Ottoman Christian subjects, had to migrate to Greece, Karamanli book production slowly ceased to exist. The Turkish-speaking Christians were steadily assimilated linguistically into their new Greek-speaking environment. Nevertheless, there was still a considerable Karamanli text production after 1924 in Greece, such as newspapers for the refugees, or epical poems on the exodus. The last item listed in the Karamanlidika bibliography is a prayer book from Paphos (1935), although a copy of the text has not yet been found. Another genre of Karamanli sources is the periodical press, which flourished especially around the turn of the 20th c. (Balta 2005). The first newspaper *Ανατολή*, founded in 1840 by Evangelinos Misailidis and appearing, albeit with interruption, until 1922, holds an important place within the Karamanli press (Şişmanoğlu Şimşek 2010: 111-113).

The majority of Karamanli books are translations or adaptations, mostly from Greek. This offers a wide range of possibilities for linguistic investigation in the field of contact linguistics. Another notable linguistic aspect is the presence of dialectal forms, especially in the early works, which makes the books an important source for the study of Turkish, especially Anatolian, but also, in the case of those written in Cyrillic script, Rumelian, i.e., Balkan Turkish dialects. In a certain sense, they can be included into the so-called 'transcriptional texts', i.e., Turkish texts in non-Arabic and usually Latin characters, providing an insight into phonological features not always detectable in texts written in the Arabic script.

2.2. Religious Texts

The bulk of Karamanli books contain religious texts: prayer books, lives of saints, liturgical books, psalms, texts referring to the Christian calendar and to the Holy Places, and, starting in the 19th c., bible translations. The first book is the 'Anthology of the Christian faith', *Gülzar-ı İman-ı Mesihî* (*Απάνθισμα της Χριστιανικής Πίστεως, Κιουλζάρι Ιμάνι Μεσιχί*), printed in 1718, probably in Istanbul (Salaville & Dalleggio 1958: number 2). The book was written, according to the prologue, for the Christian community of Asia Minor and seems to have had a relatively swift

and geographically wide distribution, even outside Asia Minor. An example is its use for a Turkish grammar compiled by a Greek teacher from the Peloponnese as early as 1730 (Kappler 2014).

The first translation of the New Testament was published in 1826, *Rabb-ı İsa el-Mesihin Ahd-i Cedidi[nin]...* (*Ράππι Ιισά ελ Μεσιχίν άχδιτζεδιδι [νίν]...*) (Salaville & Dalleggio 1958: number 64), and was commissioned by the British Bible Society, which played a pioneering role in the production of religious Karamanli books and of Turkish Christian bible texts in general. The first Orthodox translation of the New Testament was printed 40 years later. Moreover, the protestant publications introduced the systematic use of diacritic points for the further differentiation of Turkish phonemes, thus facilitating their linguistic investigation.

An exceptional case of religious poetry has been studied recently (Kappler 2018).

2.3. Literary, Geographic, and Historical Texts

In the 19th c., the production of non-religious texts gained significance. The literary texts are mostly:

- 1 translations from European languages, mainly French and English, such as the first Turkish translation of 'Robinson Crusoe' (*Ροπινσών Κρούσοϋ χικιαγεσί*, 1853) (Balta 1987a: number 33);
- 2 transcriptions from Ottoman texts, such as the novels by Ahmed Midhat, or popular literature. e.g., *Nasreddin Hoca*, *Aşık Garip*;
- 3 adaptations/translations from Greek works, first of all *Tamaşa-i Dünya* (1871) by Evangelinos Misailidis (Salaville & Dalleggio 1974: number 175), which for many years was considered the first Turkish novel, until it was found that it is a very free translation from the Greek novel *Πολυπαθής* (1839) by Grigorios Palaiologos (Karra 2010).

The Karamanli literary productions should also be seen in a wider context of other Christian literatures of the Ottoman empire, first of all in Arabic and Armenian (Strauss 2010). Geographic and historical texts are more scarce, however there are some important books, such as an Ottoman history *Tarih-i Osmani* (*Ταρίχι Οσμανί*) (1874) (Salaville & Dalleggio 1974: number 187), and a geography of Asia Minor (*Μικρά Ασία*) (1899) (Balta 1987a: number 103). Most of the books containing non-religious subject matters were printed in the Istanbul-based printing-house Anatoli, directed by Evangelinos Misailidis and his sons, who, just like the books produced by the British Bible Society, contributed to the further differentiation of the Karamanli writing systems (section 3).

2.4. Musical Books

An important part of Karamanli texts is constituted by often bilingual, Greek-Turkish, musical anthologies, with or without Byzantine musical notes. Turkish song texts in Greek characters are known from the 16th c., and became extremely popular under the name of μισμαγιές ← Ottoman *mecmu'a* 'collection' in the 18th c. (Chatzipanagioti-Sangmeister & Kappler 2010), forming part of the so-called 'Phanariote verse' literature. These manuscripts containing mainly Greek, and only occasionally also Turkish poems and songs, have been in circulation among Grecophone and Turkophone Christians alike. The printed production of the anthologies begins in 1830 with the bilingual *Ευτέρπη* (Istanbul), and thus precedes the printing of Ottoman *güfte mecmuaları* 'musical text collections' in Arabic script. The first of them was the *Mecmu'a* by Hâşim Bey, published in 1853. From a linguistic point of view, the Karamanli musical texts, due to their wide geographic and diachronic distribution, are useful for the analysis of phonetic variants, and the historical development in the morphonology of both free and bound morphemes (Kappler 2002), but they are less suitable for research on specific Turkish dialectal varieties.

2.5. Language Books: Grammars, Textbooks and Dictionaries

Grammars, dictionaries and other linguistic material were included in the Karamanlidika bibliography by Salaville & Dalleggio and Balta because of their graphic relevance containing Turkish text in Greek characters. Strictly speaking, this kind of literature is not 'Karamanli' in the sense of Turkish-speakers, since the greater parts of language textbooks, grammars and dictionaries are addressed to Greek-speaking learners of Turkish as a foreign language (Kappler 2007). On this account, language teaching material is considered here only if relevant to its Karamanli texts. The first of these grammars, the *Γραμματική Γραικικο-τουρκική* 'Greek-Turkish grammar' was printed in 1812 in Vienna, and written by Dimitrios Alexandridis (Kappler 2021). This book is important due to its introduction of a more systematic use of graphic representation in the context of Karamanli writing (section 4). The first dictionary, compiled by Zacharias Agioreitis, was printed for the first time in Venice in 1805, and reprinted in 1812, the same year when Alexandridis published a 'provisory lexicon of the Greek and Turkish languages' (*Λεξικόν πρόχειρον της γραικικής και τουρκικής διαλέκτου*) in Vienna. Only 50 years after, in 1860, a dictionary larger in size, the widely used *Λεξικόν Ελληνο-Τουρκικόν* 'Greek-Turkish lexicon', written by A. Fardys and K. Fotiadis, came out of the Istanbul printing-house 'Anatoli'.

3. Linguistic Studies on Karamanli

It is a matter of fact that research on Karamanli issues is undertaken predominantly in the context of studies of history, while linguistic investigation has not yet been as detailed. Although language studies were undertaken by János Eckmann at the beginning of the 1950s, i.e., even before the edition of the first volume of the *Karamanlidika* bibliography, scientific publications

in linguistic topics remained an exception until the beginning of the 21st c. It has, though, to be said that the revival of Karamanli studies in the 2000s concerns not only works on language, but on Karamanlidika in general. For an overview see Balta (2010: 11-22). Since then, three international conferences on Karamanli studies have been held (Nicosia 2008, Istanbul 2010, Uçhisar in Cappadocia 2013) and interest in various aspects of the subject has considerably increased.

Apart from the aforementioned studies by Nikolaj Dmitriev (1928-1930) on Turkish texts in the Cyrillic alphabet termed by the scholar as 'Karamanli' (Kappler 2006), the very first specifically linguistic study was an article by Jean Deny (1941), dealing with a converb form in a Turkish text written in Greek characters. An extensive article (Eckmann 1950a) about phonetics in a vast selection of printed Karamanli books opens a series of other contributions by the same author to different aspects of Karamanli linguistics, which were published in 1951 and 1958 (Kappler 2006), namely on the writing system (1950b), and, again, on converb constructions to be found in Karamanli texts and going back to various dialectal origins. In the following 40 years, apart from an article by Mefküre Mollova (1979-1980), dealing essentially with the Anatolian dialectal background of the 'Karamanli' texts discussed by Eckmann, very little has been published on language aspects of Turkish texts in Greek script. Among them are Robert Anhegger's important contributions (1979-1980, 1983) containing valuable sociolinguistic material, and Andreas Tietze's (1987) study tackling specific features in the lexicon and word formation in Karamanli books. More recent studies deal with questions of writing and graphemes (Kappler 2003; Gavriel 2010a; Irakleous 2013), which is, as a matter of course, a prominent topic in the linguistic investigation of Karamanli texts (section 4), and with syntax (Arslan-Kechriotis 2009). The edition and transcription of printed and manuscript material with linguistic analysis is of great importance, and has to be intensified in future research. So far we have edited material on song texts and printed musical anthologies (Gallotta 1988; Kappler 2002), on an extensive 18th-c. manuscript (Gavriel 2010b), and on a codex from the Black Sea, though with features from Western and Central Anatolian dialects (Brendemoen 2010).

4. The Karamanli Writing Systems

Karamanli texts are the product of a primarily graphic process in the syncretistic writing of a language, motivated by religion, culture and/or ideology (section 1). The most obvious linguistic approach to these kinds of texts is therefore the analysis of the writing system(s) adopted in such a process.

The principal research questions concerning syncretistic writing, which have been addressed in Karamanli studies, can be summarized as follows:

- 1 The question of the graphic representation of those Turkish phonemes that do not appear in the Greek phonological system, e.g., the Turkish vowel phonemes /ö/, /ü/, /i/, or

consonant phonemes such as /š/, /j/, /č/.

- 2 The question if, and when, a standardizing orthographic tradition took place.
- 3 The role of morphophonemic, "etymological" or "historicizing", orthography due to influence from the two contact systems (Greek and Arabic alphabets).

From the beginning of graphematical research on Karamanlidika, the first of these issues has been the focus of researchers, and also in the following text editions (Gallotta 1988; Kappler 2002) it was the starting point of the analysis, evolving into further investigation of other linguistic levels, such as phonetics, phonology, morphology, and syntax. Eckmann (1950b) in his pioneering study of Karamanli writing systems had distinguished the emergence of standardizing traditions, i.e., the first prints, the missionaries' books, the 'Athenian' system, touching on the second issue mentioned above. Irakleous (2013) is primarily interested in the description of standardizing efforts in different editions of the same book, but also goes into the discussion of morpho-phonological issues and morphophonemic orthography, whereas Gavriel (2010a) has a more sociolinguistic approach in order to explore the relationship between the social function of the books and the way they are graphically fixed. Kappler (2003) proposes a categorization of the texts into groups, according to their typographical origin and respective printing tradition, in order to describe the development of the Karamanli writing systems. In this sense, the most striking graphic features of the 32 printed books, analyzed in the study, can be attributed to the following three main groups:

- 1 Books printed in Venice, mostly in the printing house of Nikolaos Glykis, and most of them compiled by Serapheim "Antalyalı", one of the most prolific translators and compiler of Karamanli books of the 18th c. (Stathi 2004; Irakleous 2013: 63-64; Irakleous 2020). The books belonging to this group appeared therefore during the initial period of the Karamanlidika book production;
- 2 Books commissioned by the British Bible Society, active from 1826 onwards in the publication of religious protestant texts to be distributed among the Turkophone population of Anatolia;
- 3 Books written and translated by Evangelinos Misailidis or printed in his printing house, *Anatoli* (Anhegger 1979-1980: 185-187).

Each of these groups displays specific graphic features with regards to the representation of Turkish phonemes.

The first group makes extensive use of digraphs, either existing in Greek orthography, e.g., <μπ> for initial /b/, or newly invented, e.g., <σσ> for /š/. However, pairs like /o/ : /ö/, /b/ : /p/ etc., are usually not yet differentiated in this group, using, in the above examples, <ο> and <π> for solely adopted graphemes. The double dotted sigma <σ̈> for /š/ appears, in printed form, for the first time in 1784, but it is still an exception in this group. However, it is important to recall that double diacritic dots on different graphemes, such as <σ̈>, <ζ̈>, <τ̈ζ̈>, <τ̈>, <π̈> can also be detected in the contemporary Karamanlidika manuscript tradition during the second half of the 18th c. (Gavriel 2010b: 184). The links between the previous manuscript writing practices and the implementation in printed works has still not been very well investigated due to a lack of studies of manuscripts.

The second group contributes to a certain systematization in the simple dotting of both vowels and consonants, and corresponds to what has been named the 'Athenian system' by Deny (1941: 122) and Eckmann (1950b: 30), after a series of bible translations published by the British Bible Society in Athens.

The first Protestant Bible translation in 1826 was produced in the De Castro printing house in Istanbul, and presents a mixed system with double and single dotted characters, as well as digraphs, like other publications from the same printing house, e.g., the aforementioned musical anthology *Εὐτέρη* printed in 1830. The use of diacritic dots was then improved after 1830 by the British Bible Society, under the guidance of Christos Nikolaidis and H. D. Leeves (Irakleous 2013: 64-65, 69-70), in order to become generalized throughout the entire 19th c. The most frequently used dotted grapheme in the 19th c. was <π̈> for /b/, followed by <σ̈> for /š/. However, the first book to introduce systematically dotted characters was not a book printed by the Bible Society, but a Greek-Turkish grammar (see below).

The 'Athenian system' developed further with slight differences in the second half of the 19th c., occurring first of all in the books of the third group, printed in Misailidis' printing-house, Anatoli, in Istanbul, and therefore it might be called the 'Misailidis system'. This is actually a variant of the 'Athenian system', the main difference being the gradual preference to use undotted <δ> and <δζ> for Turkish /d/ and /j/ instead of <τ̈> and <τ̈ζ̈>, respectively, probably for the sake of saving diacritic dots in typography.

The two systems, 'Misailidis' and 'Athenian', differing actually only slightly from each other, or a mixture of both, continued to be used until the beginning of the 20th c. by most of the editors. However, speaking about 'standardization' in Karamanli writing is problematic, since some texts are characterized by a return to the original, i.e., 18th-c. orthography, where phonematic opposition was not usually graphically represented. This occurs particularly in publications

with practical and/or non-religious functions: poetry or song anthologies, brochures and small newspaper leaves, e.g., in the 20th c. for the use of the Turcophones in Greece after the population exchange in 1924, e.g., Balta (1997: number 104, 105, 107, 108).

Another group of books constitutes a valuable source for the study of Karamanli writing, namely grammars and other language teaching material containing Karamanli text material (section 2.5). The first printed grammar of Turkish for Greek-speaking learners, D.

Alexandridis' *Γραμματική Γραικικο-τουρκική* (Vienna, 1812), assigns the grapheme <η> to the phoneme /i/, and <ι> to /i/, being thus the first attempt of systematical differentiation of the two phonemes. Almost all the books that appeared during the 19th c. adopt this system. This includes also 1894, Chloros' Turkish grammar, first edition 1887, which can be considered as the most widely used Greek-Ottoman grammar throughout the 19th c. Alexandridis was also the first to introduce a systematic use of diacritic dots for the notation of /š/, /ö/, /ü/.

According to the cultural context of every single work, the influence from the two contact writing systems, Greek and Arabic, can vary. An example for Greek graphic influence can be found in the bilingual musical anthology *Πανδώρα* (1846²: 42) with the writing ἤσμύρ for *İzmir*, reproducing the spiritus asper of the Greek article ἡ, the maintenance of <υ> for /i/, and of the cluster <σμη> for /zm/ (Kappler 2002: 89-90). The influence of the writing conventions known from Ottoman texts in Arabic script, historizing orthography, is perceptible throughout the 19th c., already in the publications of the Bible Society in the late 1820s onwards, and increasing in the second half of the century, when many editors, often Istanbulite intellectuals, make use of a more complex language in the tradition of high-style Ottoman literature, e.g., in the use of the ablative and locative suffixes {+dAn} and {+dA} (Kappler 2003: 331-332; Irakleous 2013: 83), or the writing of closed /e/ as <ι>, according to Ottoman use (Irakleous 2013: 86). This can lead to exceptional cases, such as P. A. Deirmencoğlu's proposal, in 1886, to invent a 'Karamanli' grapheme for every Arabic letter (Kappler 2003: 333-334). In other publications we find similar attempts to reproduce graphically 'ayn and hamza, the Persian *izafet*, or the assimilation of the Arabic definite article (Kappler 2003: 335; Irakleous 2013: 86-87).

5. The Dialectal Dimension

It can be assumed that the Turcophone Christian population of Asia Minor spoke the Turkish dialect of their environment, with a certain influence from Greek, particularly in the religious lexicon. In particular, early Karamanli books and those produced from and for Anatolian Christians therefore contain precious dialect material from the 18th c. to the early 20th c., while others make use of a rather standardized form of Ottoman without dialectal elements. Unfortunately, this aspect has not yet been sufficiently considered, neither in Karamanli studies, nor in Turcological dialectology. Sporadic information can be found only in Kappler (2002) and Brendemoen (2010, 2016), whereas the rich material contained in Eckmann (1950a) must be cross-checked with the data that in the meantime have become available through numerous

studies on Turkish dialects. There are many examples of various forms occurring in Western and Central Anatolian dialects, such as *en-* 'to go down' vs. standard Turkish *in-*; *gözel* 'beautiful' vs. standard Turkish *güzel*; *Bax!* 'Look!' vs. standard Turkish *Bak!*, as well as in morphology, displaying archaisms, such as the old optative 1st person singular forms *Ver-em* 'Let me give' or *Ed-em* 'Let me do', vs. standard Turkish *Ver-eyim* and *Ed-eyim* (Brendemoen 2010: 274-275; Kappler 2002: 109, 114, 181-182). A striking feature is the presence of the velar nasal phoneme /ŋ/ in stems, e.g., *aŋna-* 'to understand' vs. standard Turkish *anla-*, or *soŋ* 'end' vs. standard Turkish *son*, affixes, and inflected personal pronouns, the dative forms of the 1st and 2nd person *baŋa* 'to me' and *saŋa* 'to you' vs. standard Turkish *bana*, *sana* (Kappler 2002: 180-181). The most remarkable phonetic and phonological influence can be assumed in the field of Central Anatolian, Cappadocian, Turkish dialects, including phenomena such as the assimilation *ml* > *mn* and *nl* > *(n)n*, e.g., *cümne* <τζούμνε> 'all' vs. standard Turkish *cümle*; *olannar* <ὀλαννὰρ> 'they being' vs. standard Turkish *olanlar*; metathesis, e.g., *garyete* <καργετέ> 'to the effort' vs. standard Turkish *gayrete*; epenthesis, e.g., *uykudan* <ούγιουκουτάν> 'from sleep' vs. standard Turkish *uykudan*; prothesis *irica* <ίριτζά> 'request' vs. standard Turkish *rica*. Variants for standard Turkish {+(y)lA} 'with' are {+(y)lAn}, e.g., *masraflarıyan* <μασραφλαρήγιαν> 'with the expenses' and *-(y)lAn*, e.g., *zahmetinan* <ζαχμέθιναν> 'with labor', 'laboriously'; {+(y)lAn}, e.g., *aklyulan* <άκλίγιλαν> 'with reason', *eliyilen* <έλίγιλεν> 'by hand'; and {+(y)lA}, e.g., *gönüllüiyüle* <κονουλλούγoule> 'with one's heart', 'of one's own accord'. All examples are from the 1815 book, *Που Αλτηνολούκ*, by Papa Georgios from Nevşehir (Salaville & Dalleggio 1958: number 50].

6. Other Sociolinguistic Aspects

As Gavriel (2010a: 260-261) points out, the essential functional criterion in the choice of a written form for Karamanli literature, predominantly aimed at practical use, is the linguistic stance of the author and of his target readers. In other words, the classical principle of sociolinguistics, developed by Fishman for the spoken language, plays an equally prominent role if we want to describe Karamanli writing: who writes for whom and why? In this context, it is particularly interesting to follow the discussion about language between editors and readers in the Karamanli newspaper *Ανατολή* in 1890 (Şişmanoğlu Şimşek 2010; Kappler 2013). In a period in which Ottoman Turkish intellectuals, such as Namık Kemal, Ahmed Midhat, and Ziya Paşa were already encouraging a 'moderate language reform' that would simplify the Ottoman language open to all kinds of borrowing from Persian and Arabic, the usual mission of most Karamanli editors, first of all Evangelinos Misailidis, was to communicate with the readers in a possibly simple language. However, there were also other opinions. As Şişmanoğlu Şimşek (2010: 114-115) has shown, under Misailidis' successor, Nikolaos Soullidis, the language of the newspaper *Ανατολή* was again "enriched" with more Arabo-Persian lexical and syntactical structures. This view is actually very close to the language beliefs of Grecophone Ottoman Greeks in the framework of Helleno-Ottomanism (Kappler 2013), but is in contrast to the

previous Karamanlidika tradition of linguistic simplification. In this sense, Karamanli books can contribute a great deal to the study of the history of Ottoman Turkish language beliefs and attitudes.

In the second half of the 19th c., the so-called "re-hellenization" of the Karamanlides by the Ecumenical Patriarchate took place (Anagnostopoulou 2010). The Greek kingdom and its foreign policy, by the establishment of schools with teachers educated in Greece (Clogg 1999: 129), as well as the 'brotherhoods' in Anatolia, again because of their contribution to the organization of Greek-speaking school education (Renieri 2010), played an important role in this process. However, the spoken language among Anatolian Turkophone Christians for the sake of internal communication essentially remained Turkish (Clogg 1999: 130-131; Renieri 2010: 42). From a linguistic point of view, the didactic textbooks, grammars, and phrase books, addressed to the Turkophone population, being a part of the Karamanli bibliography (section 2.5), remain a significant field for analysis. One of the main sources is Ilias Emmanouilidis' *Usul-i cedid yani ellinika lisanını yazmak anlamak ve söylemek için usul* <Νέα Μέθοδος Ουσούλι Δζεδίδ Γιάνι ελληνικά λισαννή γιαζμακ ανλαμάκ βε σοίλεμέκ ιτζούν ουσούλ> 'New method, the method to write, understand and speak the Greek language', which was printed in Istanbul in 1885 (Salaville & Dalleggio 1974: number 229).

As Evangelia Balta (2010: 17) points out, the important issue of the sociolinguistic status of the language used in Karamanli books as opposed to the language of the rich Armeno-Turkish Christian literature has yet to be studied. Turkish texts in syncretistic writing should be compared to the same texts in other alphabets, as well as to texts in Arabic script, if available. See Kappler (2011: 54-57) for a short comparison of a text written in the Greek and Cyrillic alphabets. Together with the necessary dialectological approach (section 5), this would lead to a clearer understanding of the complex language structure in Karamanli books, and to its place within Ottoman Turkish varieties in general.

Matthias Kappler

Bibliography

Anagnostopoulou, Sia 2010. Greek diplomatic authorities in Anatolia. In Balta & Kappler 2010: 63-78.

Anestidis, Stavros Th. 2010. The Centre for Asia Minor Studies and books printed in Karamanli: a contribution to the compilation and the bibliography of a significant literature. In Balta & Kappler 2010: 147-152.

Anhegger, Robert 1979-1980. Hurufumuz Yunanca. Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der Karamanisch-Türkischen Literatur [A contribution to the knowledge of the Karaman-Turkish literature]. *Anatolica* 7: 157-202.

Anhegger, Robert 1983. Nachtrag zu Hurufumuz Yunanca [Supplement to "Hurufumuz Yunanca"]. *Anatolica* 10: 149-164.

Arslan-Kechriotis, Z. Ceyda 2009. Some Syntactic issues in Karamanlidika texts. *Turkic Languages* 13: 172-187.

Balta, Evangelia 1987a. *Karamanlidika - XXe siècle*. Bibliographie analytique [Karamanlidika - 20th century. Analytical bibliography]. Athènes: Centre d'études d'Asie mineure.

Balta, Evangelia 1987b. *Karamanlidika. Additions (1584-1900)*. Bibliographie Analytique [Karamanlidika - Additions (1584-1900). Analytical bibliography]. Athènes: Centre d'études d'Asie mineure.

Balta, Evangelia 1997. *Karamanlidika - Nouvelles additions et compléments I* [Karamanlidika - New additions and supplements]. Athènes: Centre d'études d'Asie mineure.

Balta, Evangelia 2005. Karamanli Press Smyrna 1845-Athens 1926. In Belli, Oktay et al. eds. *Izzet Gündoğdu Kayaoğlu Hatıra Kitabı Makaleler*. İstanbul: Taç Vakfı Yayınları. 27-33.

Balta, Evangelia 2010. Cries and whispers in Karamanlidika books before the doom of silence. In Balta & Kappler 2010: 11-22.

Balta, Evangelia & Kappler, Matthias eds. 2010. Cries and whispers in Karamanlidika books. In *Proceedings of the First International Conference on Karamanlidika Studies (Nicosia 11th-3th September 2008)*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Balta, Evangelia & Trandafilova-Louka, Oxana E. 2013. Books in Turkish written in various alphabets for the Gagauz (19th-early 20th century). In Balta, Evangelia *Miscellaneous studies on the Karamanlidika literary tradition*. İstanbul: İsis. 41-69.

Bellingieri, Giampiero 2010. Some Venetian sources on cultural landscapes of "Caramania". In Balta & Kappler 2010: 79-91.

Brendemoen, Bernt 2010. An eighteenth-century Karamanlidika codex from Sumela Monastery in Trabzon. In Balta & Kappler 2010: 267-280.

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

Chatzipanagioti-Sangmeister, Ilia & Kappler, Matthias 2010. Thoughts on the Turkish verses in Phanariot poetry collections (1750-1821). In Balta & Kappler 2010: 219-240.

Clogg, Richard 1999. A millet within a millet: the Karamanlides. In Gondicas, Dimitri & Issawi, Charles eds. *Ottoman Greeks in the Age of Nationalism: Politics, Economy and Society in the Nineteenth Century*. Princeton: Darwin Press. 115-142.

Deny, Jean 1941. Le géronitif en -(y)*işin* d'après les écrits du moine Ioanni Hierothéos en turc des grecs-orthodoxes turcophones d'Anatolie [The converb in -(y)*işin* according to the writings of the monk Ioanni Hierotheos in the language of the Turkish-speaking Greek Orthodox population in Anatolia]. *Körösi Csoma-Archivum* 3: 119-128.

Dmitriev, Nikolaj K. 1928-1930. Materialy po osmanskoj dialektologii. Fonetika "karamlickogo" jazyka [Materials on Ottoman dialectology. The phonetics of the "karamanli" language]. *Zapiski Kollegii Vostokovedov* 3, 2 (1928): 417-458; 4 (1930): 107-158.

Eckmann, János 1950a. Anadolu Karamanlı ağızlarına ait araştırmalar [Studies on the Anatolian Karamanli dialects]. *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi* 8/1-2: 165-200.

Eckmann, János 1950b. Yunan harfli Karamanlı imlası hakkında [On the Karamanli orthography in Greek characters]. In Eren, Hasan & Halasi-Kun, Tibor eds. *Türk Dili ve Tarihi Hakkında Araştırmalar* 1. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu. 27-31.

Eckmann, János 1964. Die karamanische Literatur [The Karamanian literature]. In Bazin, Louis et al. eds. *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta* 2. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner. 819-835.

Gallotta, Aldo 1988. Due testi turchi in caratteri greci [Two Turkish texts in Greek characters]. In Bellingieri, Giampiero & Vercellin, Giorgio eds. *Studi eurasiatici in onore di M. Grignaschi*. Venezia: Libreria Universitaria Editrice. 161-171.

Gavriel, Eftychios 2010a. Transcription Problems of Karamanlidika Texts. In Balta & Kappler 2010: 255-265.

Gavriel, Eftychios 2010b. Η Τουρκική με το Ελληνικό αλφάβητο σε χειρόγραφο του 18ου αιώνα [Turkish with Greek alphabet in a 18th-century manuscript]. Doctoral dissertation University of Cyprus.

Halasi-Kun, Tibor 1987-1992. Gennadios' Turkish Confession of Faith. *Archivum Ottomanicum* 12: 5-103.

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

Irakleous, Stelios 2020. *El edna kulunuz Atalialu Serapheim: A study of eighteenth-century Karamanlidika*. Doctoral dissertation University of Leiden.

Kappler, Matthias 2002. *Türkischsprachige Liebeslyrik in Griechisch-Osmanischen Liedanthologien des 19. Jahrhunderts* [Turkish love poetry in Greek Ottoman song anthologies of the 19th century]. Berlin: Klaus Schwarz.

Kappler, Matthias 2003. Note a proposito di 'ortografia caramanlidica' [Notes on 'Karamanli orthography']. In Marazzi, Ugo ed. *Turcica et Islamica - Studi in memoria di Aldo Gallotta*. Napoli: Università degli Studi di Napoli "L'Orientale". 309-339.

Kappler, Matthias 2006. Toward a linguistic approach to 'Karamanli' texts. In Yağcıoğlu, Semiramis et al. eds. *Advances in Turkish Linguistics - Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Turkish Linguistics (11-13 August, 2004)*. İzmir: Dokuz Eylül Yayınları. 655-667.

Kappler, Matthias 2007. Konflikt und Ideologie in den griechischen Grammatiken des Osmanischen im 19. Jahrhundert [Conflict and ideology in the Greek grammars of Ottoman in the 19th century]. In Boeschoten, Hendrik & Stein, Heidi eds. *Einheit und Vielfalt in der türkischen Welt - Materialien der 5. Deutschen Turkologenkonferenz*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 80-93.

Kappler, Matthias 2011. Printed Balkan Turkish texts in the Cyrillic alphabet from the middle of the nineteenth century (1841-1875): a typological and graphematic approach. In Balta, Evangelia & Ölmez, Mehmet eds. *Between Religion and Language*. İstanbul: İsis. 43-69.

Kappler, Matthias 2013. Maintenance and renovation in the attitudes of Ottoman Greek intellectuals towards Ottoman Turkish. In Karyolemou, Marilena & Pavlou, Pavlos eds. *Language Policy and Planning in the Mediterranean World*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars. 72-85.

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

Kappler, Matthias 2016. Transcription text, regraphization, variety? Reflections on Karamanlidika. In Csató, Éva et al. eds. *Spoken Ottoman in Mediator Texts*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 119-127.

Kappler, Matthias 2018. The Karamanli *Divan* by the 'Aşık Talib and Ottoman Lyric Poetry: a Preliminary Approach. In Balta, Evangelia ed. *Karamanlidika Legacies*. İstanbul: İsis. 142-166.

Kappler, Matthias 2021. The first printed grammar of Turkish in Greek and European *Ars grammatica*. In Balta, Evangelia ed. *Following the traces of Turkish-speaking Christians of Anatolia*. Harvard: Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations. 41-67.

Karra, Anthi 2010. From Polypathis to Temaşa-i Dünya, from the safe port of translation to the open sea of creation. In Balta & Kappler 2010: 201-218.

Kowalski, Tadeusz 1934. Osmanisch-Türkische Dialekte [Ottoman Turkish dialects]. *Enzyklopädie des Islam* 4. Leiden: Brill. 991-1011.

Mollova, Mefküre 1979-1980. Sur le terme "Karaman" et les recherches sur les Karamans de J. Eckmann [On the term "Karaman" and J. Eckmann's research into Karamanlis]. *Güneydoğu Avrupa Araştırmaları Dergisi* 8-9: 201-257.

Renieri, Irini 2010. 'Xenophone Nevşehirliis ... Greek-Souled Neapolitans': The persistent yet hesitant dissemination of the Greek language in 1870s Nevşehir. In Balta & Kappler 2010: 31-44.

Salaville, Séverien & Dalleggio, Eugène 1958, 1966, 1974. *Karamanlidika. Bibliographie analytique d'ouvrages en langue turque imprimés en caractères grecs, I (1584-1850), II (1851-1865), III (1866-1900)* [Karamanlidika. Analytical bibliography of works in Turkish printed in Greek characters, 1, 2, 3]. Athènes: Centre d'études d'Asie mineure.

Salaville, Séverien (†), Dalleggio, Eugène (†) & Balta, Evangelia 2018. *Karamanlıca. Kitaplar Yunan Harflerle Türkçe Eserlerin Çözümlemeli Bibliyografyası - Karamanlidika. Bibliographie analytique d'ouvrages en langue turque imprimés en caractères grecs. 1: (1718-1839)* [Karamanlidika. Analytical bibliography of works in Turkish printed in Greek characters, 1: (1718-1839)]. Istanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları

Şişmanoğlu Şimşek, Şehnaz 2010. The Anatoli Newspaper and the heyday of the Karamanli press. In Balta & Kappler 2010: 109-123.

Stathi, Pinelopi 2004. Τα τουρκογραικικά βιβλία και ο Σεραφείμ Ατταλειάτης [The Turco-Greek books and Serafeim Attaleiatis]. In Sklavenitis, Triantafylos ed. *To entypo elliniko vivlio 15.-19. aionas* [The Printed Greek Book 15th-19th c. - Acts of the International Congress 16th-20th May 2001, Delfi]. Athens: Kotinos. 329-339.

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

Tietze, Andreas 1987. Die Erfassung des türkischen Wortschatzes und ein türkischer Roman von 1871-1872 [The recording of Turkish vocabulary and a Turkish novel from 1871-1872]. In Bacqué-Grammont, Jean-Louis et al. eds. *Türkische Miscellen - Robert Anhegger Festschrift*. İstanbul: Divit

Cite this page

Kappler, Matthias, "Karamanli", in: *Encyclopedia of Turkic Languages and Linguistics Online*, General Editor: Lars Johanson. Consulted online on 30 May 2023 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2667-3029_ETLO_SIM_032110>
First published online: 2023