T 129

Sociocultural Aspects of Greek-Turkish Language Contact(s)

Harrassowitz

9 783447 124133

www.harrassowitz-verlag.de

TURCOLOGICA 129

Sociocultural Aspects of Greek-Turkish Language Contact(s)

Edited by
Konstantinos Sampanis, Matthias Kappler
and Eleni Karantzola

Harrassowitz Verlag

TURCOLOGICA

Herausgegeben von Lars Johanson

Band 129

2025
Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

Sociocultural Aspects of Greek-Turkish Language Contact(s)

Edited by
Konstantinos Sampanis, Matthias Kappler
and Eleni Karantzola

With the editorial assistance of Dilara Kaplan

2025
Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

Cover illustration: The inscription on the entrance of the former Greek-Orthodox church of Saint Helen (now Aya Elenia Müzesi) in Sille.

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über https://dnb.de abrufbar.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data is available on the internet at https://dnb.de

For further information about our publishing program consult our website https://www.harrassowitz-verlag.de

Printed on permanent/durable paper.
Printing and binding: docupoint, Magdeburg
Printed in Germany

ISSN 0177-4743 eISSN 2748-0941
ISBN 978-3-447-12413-3 eISBN 978-3-447-39705-6

Matthias Kappler

Cultural Contacts through Ottoman Greek Grammarianism

1 Grammar and culture

The claim that grammar has a strong impact on society, arts, and culture (and vice versa sociocultural structures on grammar writing) is not new. Since Aristotle, grammar has been associated, and treated together, with poetics; it was considered as an "art", called τέχνη γραμματική by the Alexandrian Dionysius Thrax in the second century AD, and subsequently, though in a different sense, as *ars grammatica* by late Roman and early Medieval grammarians, such as Donatus, being a part of the *septem artes liberales*. Thrax characterized grammar as the "practical knowledge of the general usage of poets and prose writers" (Robins 1967: 31). This descriptive (or rather exegetic) principle evolved into a normative assertion, where the language usage of a restricted elite was put as a norm, culminating in the Medieval concept of *auctoritas*, the "authority" of grammatical knowledge, and thus of religious (Augustinus) and political (Alcuin) power in the early Christian and Carolingian eras.[1] The connection to religion is another cultural aspect of grammars: In the six "core traditions" of language description (Ancient Egyptian, Akkadian, Chinese, Sanskrit, Greek, and Arabic) grammar often intersected with and was motivated by religious exegesis, in order to understand and comment the Holy Scriptures, e.g. the Vedic texts in the Sanskrit tradition or the Qur'ān in Arabic grammar writing (Versteegh 2006: 2792). Not to speak about the multiple relations between grammar and philosophy throughout the history of language description, for example grammar related to logic, from Aristotle to the speculative grammar in the thirteenth century (Stockhammer 2014: 102–112), to name only two of the prominent streams. Hence, it is not an overstatement to assert that grammar writing primarily constitutes a cultural act. A further significant aspect which links grammar to society and culture is ideology, since – in all cultures and periods – the stances and attitudes towards the described language (and the metalanguage) serve as crucial ideological premises for the writing of a grammar.

This latter issue has been explored for the (Ottoman) Turkish-Greek grammar literature in several studies (e.g. Kappler 2007, 2013). Underlying ideological constraints become frequently manifest in the prologues of many grammars of the Ottoman Greek production in the nineteenth century, as well as in other instances of grammatical writing, such as Italian grammars of Turkish in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In their prefaces, authors typically expound on the rationale behind their works, a stereotype observed across various

1 See Stockhammer's (2014: 258) compelling portrayal of how the act of writing grammar embodies an exercise of power.

kinds of manuscripts and books throughout history. In the case of grammar writing on Ottoman Turkish, common motivations include aesthetical considerations (portraying Ottoman as the universally "richest and most beautiful" language, see below chapter 5), political factors (positioning the Ottoman state as a protector of diverse peoples and minorities), or practical reasons (promoting the diffusion of the Ottoman language, e.g. through commerce, and historically through religious missionarism). In this way, grammar books, and especially their prologues, serve as invaluable historical sources unveiling sociocultural structures of the time they were written. While it may seem trivial that prefaces hold significant cultural and ideological relevance for any kind of books, the significance extends further in the case of grammar books. The structural aspect of language description and the research into the models of a grammar beyond the analysis of the prologues can offer compelling evidence of the intercultural background of authors and their respective traditions (Kappler 2007, 2021). The concept of "tradition" emerges as particularly crucial in a field where grammar evolves to elucidate language usage in culturally relevant texts, whether poetic, religious, or both. However, the question of tradition, and models, has not yet been entirely solved for Greek-Turkish grammar writing; so far it seems that the two strands, – the Greco-Latin and the Arabic traditions –, are often intertwined in a complex and multi-layered texture of different threads. Interestingly, the Arabic elements are subtly veiled under the guise of the Greek tradition, they are seldom overtly referenced and necessitate careful structural-linguistic analysis for unraveling.

2 Overt and non-overt models

As a rule, the base of the Ottoman Greek grammars in the nineteenth century is the Greco-Latin descriptive system. This fact is explicitly articulated by authors only on rare occasions, such as in Fotiadis (1897: vii) who writes:

> Composing the main grammar I endeavoured not only to ensure clarity, precision, and conciseness, following the method of the Greek grammars we, young and old, are used to, but above all, I drew my attention to achieve that [the grammar] may become really complete.[2]

Usually, the Greco-Latin background is tacitly assumed, and becomes evident when the texts are analyzed comparatively with the implied sources, which often include significant European grammars of Turkish, widely known at that time (albeit rarely referenced by the authors), namely Meninski (1680) and Viguier (1790) for the first half of the nineteenth century, and Redhouse (1846) for the second half, but also other works. As an example, the first printed Greek-Turkish grammar, Dimitrios Alexandridis's *Γραμματική γραικικο-τουρκική* (1812), primarily draws from Franciscus Mesgnien Meninski's *Grammatica*

2 «Ἐν τῇ συντάξει τῆς κυρίως γραμματικῆς οὐ μόνον ἐπεδίωξα τὴν σαφήνειαν, τὴν ἀκρίβειαν καὶ τὸ σύντομο, καὶ ἠκολούθησα τὴν μέθοδον τῶν ἑλληνικῶν γραμματικῶν, εἰς ἣν εἴμεθα συνειθισμένοι γέροντές τε καὶ νέοι, ἀλλὰ πρὸ πάντων ἐπέστησα τὴν προσοχὴν μου εἰς τὸ νὰ καταστῇ αὐτὴ πράγματι πλήρης». In spite of this "Western" approach, he opens his grammar with the usual Muslim formula *Bismillah* (in Arabic and Greek translation; Fotiadis 1897: 20).

turcica, printed in 1680 in Vienna (where Alexandridis's grammar was also published), and François Viguier's *Elemens de la langue turque* (Constantinople 1790) – although none of these sources are mentioned by Alexandridis (Kappler 2021). In the middle of the century, Konstantinos Adosidis's *Στοιχεία της οθωμανικής γραμματικής* (1850) not only aligns, for the most part, with James Redhouse's *Grammaire raisonnée de la langue ottomane* (1846), but also appears to be a direct translation of it in certain sections. Just as most of the other grammarians of his time, Adosidis does not bother about explicitly acknowledging his sources; sporadically he adds generic reference without specifying particular models. At the end of the century, another Ottoman Greek grammarian, the aforementioned Apostolos Fotiadis, who was evidently familiar with Adosidis's grammar, affirms that the latter's model was Redhouse (Fotiadis 1897: iii), a work which was apparently used by himself, too. While Fotiadis cites Alexandridis's work explicitly, he also acknowledges "all the existing noteworthy grammars of Ottoman written in Greek, French, and Ottoman" («πάσας τὰς ὑπαρχούσας ἀξίας λόγου ὀθωμανικὰς γραμματικὰς: ἑλληνιστί, γαλλιστί καὶ ὀθωμανιστὶ γεγραμμένας», Fotiadis 1897: viii), without specifying which books he used, whereas he does name his sources for Persian and Arabic.[3]

Due to the lack of reliable source references, the content of the grammars necessitates a comparative analysis to unveil intertextual relations, both within the Ottoman Greek grammar production and with other models – a task not always straightforward. First of all, it is natural that Ottoman Greek grammarians rely on themselves, i.e. that they copy from each other – as evident in Fotiadis's above-quoted overtly declared reference to Alexandridis and Adosidis. However, such relations are often not overtly declared, as in Adosidis's treatment of determination by adding possessive suffixes to numerals (e.g. *ὁ εἷς* 'the one' > *biri* / *birisi*) exactly as Alexandridis does: Alexandridis (1812: 23) compares the phenomenon to the use of the Greek article (being the article a "gap" category, see Kappler 2021: 55): "The cardinal numerals take at the end the possessive pronominal suffix of the third person, as we express this by the article".[4] For the ordinal numbers is said the same: "When we express the ordinalia with article leaving out the substantive, then they take at the end, like the cardinal numbers, the possessive pronominal suffix […]" (Alexandridis 1812: 24).[5] Adosidis (1850: 50) uses almost literally the same sentence about determination in cardinal numbers.[6] Given that Meninski (Alexandridis's main model) does not address the topic in

3 For Persian he refers to the grammar by Alexandre Chodzko (*Grammaire persane, ou Principes de l'iranien moderne*, Paris 1852, according to Fotiadis: 1851) and for Arabic to the French translation (*Grammaire arabe*, Paris 1881; translated by Uriceohea) of P.C. Caspari's *Grammatica arabica,* and the widely known *Grammaire arabe à l'usage des élèves de l'École Spéciale des Langues Orientales Vivantes* (Paris, 1810) by A. J. Silvestre de Sacy, but he also claims to have used Arabic grammars written in Arabic and Ottoman (Fotiadis 1897: viii-ix).

4 «Τὰ ἀπολελυμένα ἀριθμητικὰ προσλαμβάνουσιν ἐν τέλει τὴν κτητικὴν ἀντωνυμικὴν κατάληξιν τοῦ γ' προσώπου, ὅτε ἡμεῖς ἐκφράζομεν αὐτά δι' ἄρθρου».

5 «[...] ὅταν ἡμεῖς ἐκφράζομεν τὰ τακτικὰ ἐνάρθρως, καὶ τὸ οὐσιαστικὸν ἐννοεῖται, τότε προσλαμβάνουσιν ἐν τέλει, ὡς καὶ τὰ ἀπολελυμένα, τὴν κτητικὴν ἀντωνυμικὴν κατάληξιν».

6 «[...] ὅταν ἡμεῖς ἐκφράζωμεν τὰ ἀριθμητικὰ ἐνάρθρως, προσυπεννοουμένου τοῦ οὐσιαστικοῦ, τότε οἱ ὀθωμανοὶ προσαρτῶσιν ἐν τέλει τῶν ἀριθμητικῶν τὴν ἑνικὴν τριτοπρόσωπον καταληκτικὴν κτητικὴν ἀντωνυμίαν».

this way,[7] and Viguier – while comparing the construction to the (French) article – uses a different formulation ("Cet Affixe, ou ce Pronom turc, équivaut fréquemment dans la langue Françoise à nos Articles *le, la, les*"; Viguier 1790: 86), we can be quite sure that this constitutes a case of "intra-Ottoman Greek" intertextuality. Adosidis's unspoken reference to Alexandridis can be seen in various other instances, e.g. in the description of "vowel harmony", a chapter that Alexandridis did not copy from Meninski (see Kappler 2021: 51–52). Subsequently, if Alexandridis was one of Adosidis's models, the latter is the main model for the grammars in the second half of the century. A typical example is Konstantinidis Paşa's *Οθωμανική γραμματική* (1874) who adopts artificially created (yet not inexistent) forms from Adosidis, e.g. tense-marked infinitives (according to the model of Ancient Greek, and Latin). These "tenses" are supposed to be expressed by the aid of the respective participles and the verb *olmaq* resulting in forms such as *aramış olmaq* and *arayacaq olmaq*, specifying that these are "used only with the postposition *ile*". The formulation and terminology (ἔγκλισις ἀπαρέμφατος 'inflection of infinitives') is nearly identical in both Adosidis (1850: 126) and Konstantinidis (1874: 56). Similar examples where Konstantinidis clearly relies on Adosidis (without references, of course) concern the description of aspect differences in the present tense (Adosidis 1850: 105, Konstantinidis 1874: 46), the order of description and terms in the chapter on converbs (called "indeclinable participles"; Adosidis 1850: 138–139, Konstantinidis 1874: 57–59) and "adverbs" (Adosidis 1850: 206, Konstantinidis 1874: 159), in the latter case again copied from Alexandridis (1812: 76).

While these observations may seem overly specific and somewhat obvious (given the prevalent practice of copying without source attribution in the nineteenth century), the issue of cultural interrelation and intertextuality acquires major importance when considering relations with the Arabic grammar model. Explicit references to the Islamic tradition are exceedingly rare, actually to be found only sporadically in generic statements, such as Adosidis's mention of "Ottoman grammarians and lexicographers" («Ὀθωμανοί γραμματικοὶ καὶ λεξικογράφοι»; Adosidis 1850: 5), or Fotiadis's reference to "Arabian / Ottoman grammarians" when talking about word classes (as detailed in the subsequent chapter below).

The only grammar that pays special attention to Ottoman Turkish sources, is Ḫāfiẓ Reʿī's *Γραμματική οθωμανική* (1875) (which is actually a translation; see below chapter 4). It meticulously elucidates the viewpoint of the "Ottomans" through systematic annotations in the form of footnotes. An example (amongst many others) is the additional insights appended to the description of the copular verb, commonly referred to by Ottoman Greek grammarians – also by Ḫāfiẓ Reʿī – as "συνδετικό ρήμα". In one such footnote it is remarked: "The Ottomans consider this as a suffixed relative pronoun – *żamīr-i nisbī*" (Ḫāfiẓ Reʿī 1875: 66)[8].

7 The only comment on this matter is found in his declaration regarding the irregular doubling of the 3 singular possessive suffix, exemplified by *birisi*, which he renders as 'unus eorum' (Meninski 1680: 58). Nonetheless, he could not explain the construction with a "lacking article" anyway, given that his metalanguage, Latin, is a zero-article language too (even though in instances such as these, as seen in his chapter about the Arabic article [p. 21], Meninski typically resorts to other example languages like German, Italian, or Hungarian).

8 «Οἱ Ὀθωμανοὶ θεωροῦσιν αὐτὸ ὡς καταληκτικὴν σχετικὴν ἀντωνυμία – ζαμίρ-ι νισπί.»

Apart from these isolated cases, the (subtle) impact of Ottoman grammarianism according to the Arabic grammar tradition has to be unraveled by a meticulous linguistic and comparative analysis.

3 Two traditions intertwined: Greco-Latin and Arabic

Grammatical works written in Ottoman Turkish predominantly draw from the Arabic grammar model, which underwent its formative phase between the eighth and the close of the tenth centuries (Owens 1988: 8–9). As Versteegh (2006) has noted, and as mentioned above, Arabic grammar theory stands as one of the six grammatological core traditions of the world, from which the "dependent" traditions (as Versteegh calls them) – in our case Persian and Ottoman – derive. Arabic linguistic theory was therefore adapted to all descriptions of Turkic languages from the fourteenth century onwards (see Ermers 1999), including the first Ottoman Turkish grammar in manuscript form, the *Müyessiretü 'l-'ulūm* from the sixteenth century (edited by Karabacak 2002). If we presume that Ottoman Greeks were acquainted with and utilized the salient works of Ottoman grammarians, as sporadic references such as those made by Adosidis and Fotiadis imply, and even if we take for granted that Ottoman Greeks (excludig native Turkish speakers, such as Turkophone Orthodox *Karamanlides*) in the eighteenth century learned Turkish, from the grammatical point of view, from a Muslim *Hoca*[9], we will still need textual evidence to corroborate this hypothesis, and must detect the traces of the authors' training in Arabic linguistic theory. Firstly, nearly all the grammars of the nineteenth century, in addition to the Greek grammatical terminology, incorporate Arabic terms, usually provided in brackets after the Greco-Latin terms (e.g. Fotiadis 1897) albeit to varying degrees of systematicity, and with Ḥāfiẓ Ref'ī being the most systematic, as pointed out above). Secondly, they conspicuously align with the political discourse of "Ottomanism", not only in their prologues (Kappler 2007, 2013), but also in the structuring of chapters: The depiction of Ottoman, considered in the official ideological rhetoric as a language composed by three languages, i.e. Arabic, Persian, and Turkish, encapsulated under the lexically Arabic but syntactically Persian expression *elsine-i s̲elās̲e* ('The Three Languages'), is often partitioned into three parts, sometimes by integrating the three languages on the various thematic chapters (as already Meninski did), or, later on, by presenting three different grammars in one. More than this, following the political discourse of nineteenth-century Ottomanism the grammars tend to separate the "three languages" more distinctly as the century progresses. For instance, Ioannis Chloros's *Γραμματική της Οθωμανικής Γλώσσης,* undergoes noticeable changes between its initial editions (1887, 1890) where each of the three languages are discussed thematically together in each chapter, and the third edition (1894) illustrating a stricter division into three grammar parts ("Books"), Turkish, Persian and Arabic.[10]

9 Cf. Marc-Philippe Zallony's remarks on this issue (Zallony 1824: 196); the passage is quoted also in Kappler 1995: 350. See for more information Shafir 2021: 197.

10 The same as the fourth edition (1911), which, by the way, bears the title *Γραμματική της Τουρκικής Γλώσσης* ('Grammar of the Turkish Language', diverging from its previous designation as 'Grammar of

Another aspect that warrants attention (Kappler 2021: 53–54) is the categorization of "word classes" (the Greek-Alexandrian term introduced by Dionysius Thrax is μέρη του λόγου 'parts of the speech'): The Greco-Latin system employs an eight-word class system (noun, verb, article, pronoun, participle, adverb, preposition, conjunction), whereas the Arabic theory utilizes three classes (noun, verb, particle / *ism, fiʿl, ḥarf/ḥurūf*). Nineteenth-century Ottoman Greek grammar books blend these systems implicitly adhering to the Greco-Latin system, but incorporating elements of the Arabic system in an original way. At the end of the century, Fotiadis (1897: 39) adopts an intriguing approach: In a dedicated chapter on the word classes, he echoes his advocacy for the principle of the *elsine-i selāse*, and notes that "according to the Arab grammarians" («κατὰ τοὺς ἄραβας γραμματικούς») there are three word classes (μέρη τοῦ λόγου / *iczā-yi kelām*):[11] noun, verb and particle (ὄνομα, ῥῆμα, μόριον / *ism, fiʿl, ḥarf*). To approximate previous grammarians (such as Alexandridis) and to accommodate the Greco-Latin word classes with more or less variation, he expands the "noun" class, subdividing it into substantive, adjective and pronoun (οὐσιαστικόν, ἐπίθετον, ἀντωνυμία / *mevṣūf, ṣıfat, żamīr* or *kināye*), adding the participle (μετοχή / *ferʿ-i fiʿl*) to the "verb" class, and the prepositions, the adverb, the conjunction and the interjection (προθέσεις / *ḥarf-i cer* or *edāt*, ἐπίρρημα / *edāt-i ẓarf*, σύνδεσμος / *edāt-i rabṭ*, ἐπιφώνημα / *ḥarf-i nidā*) to the "particle" class, happily ending up in the eight-word class system of the Greek tradition. In essence, he enriches an Arabic-origin "skeleton" with Greek terminology.[12]

However, the most convincing linguistic evidence supporting the assertion that Ottoman Greeks were trained in the Arabic grammar tradition lies in the methodology of language description, e.g. on the morpho-phonological level. Arabic theory primarily revolves around consonants, the *ḥurūf* (also used for *plene* written long vowels), while short vowels, gemination, and lack of a vowel are indicated (in case the text is vocalized) by diacritic marks (*taškīl*). Of these diacritics, those denoting short vowels, called *ḥarakāt* (cf. Owens 1988: 94–95), *ḥareke* in Ottoman, meaning "movement", are the most significant, while the absence of vowel is marked by a diacritic called *sukūn*, meaning "silence". When it comes to morphological issues, e.g. affixation, the Arabic tradition applies a complex system, based on graphical criteria (consonants with one of the three vowel signs or the "silenced" sign, indicating the vocalization and the affixation). While most of the European grammarians like Meninski usually describe "declension" or "conjugation" in the way the topic is presented in the Greco-Latin tradition (i.e. roots/stems and suffixes, declension classes etc.), Ottoman Greek grammarians often translate the Arabic terminology throughout the whole description of the various phenomena. An example for this proceeding (shown in Kappler 2007: 90–91) illustrates the use of "moved" and "silenced" "letters" (κινητόν / ἠρεμοῦν γράμμα) in the description of the reciprocal suffix; I am going to add some more instances here.

---

the Ottoman language'), a shift that aligns with the era's political transformations (escalating nationalism, Young Turks).

11 The term *iczā-yi* (or *eczā-yi*) *kelām* is borrowed from Cevdet Paşa's grammar (see following footnote), and is actually a translation of the Greek Alexandrian term ('parts of speech').

12 Interestingly, Ottoman Turkish grammarians of the nineteenth century demonstrate a notable inclination towards revising the traditional Arabic tripartite division, instead opting for a classification of five classes, probably under European influence. For instance, the renowned Ottoman Turkish grammarian Cevdet Paşa in his widely used work *Qavāʿid-i ʿOsmāniyye* by (1885-86 [1304], p. 13) delineates five word classes, augmenting the Arabic system with the inclusion of the adjective (*ṣıfat*) and the pronoun (*żamīr*).

Adosidis (1850) consistently adopts the Arabic *ḥareke*-system with a graphical-centered approach, as seen in the description of the copula verb (Adosidis 1850: 107). Most other grammars (excluding Alexandridis) also use the graphical explication for numerous morphological formation and inflection patterns, making the illustration of the examples occasionally complex. An example in morphology is the application of the concept of "root" for the 2S imperative: In the European structural approach root is defined as "the minimal form of a word, not including any suffixes, whether derivational or inflectional" (Göksel & Kerslake 2005: 558), and the imperative 2S as "root/stem + zero-morpheme", as opposed to the graphical-centered approach of the Arabic tradition where a complicated system of consonants and *ḥareke* needs long comments on topics which, from the modern point of view, are "obvious". An example is Konstantinidis Paşa (1874: 44):

> If the last letter of the root is a consonant having *ḥareke üstün*, a *he* is added after that letter for the second person singular of the imperative. E.g. *işlemek* 'to work', *işle* 'work!'. The last letter of the root is usually still […]; but sometimes it is moved, and so if it has *üstün*, after the moved [letter] sometimes a *plene* ["shown"] *elif* is written, if it has *esre*, after the moved [letter] always a *plene ye* is put, and if it has *ötürü*, after the moved [letter] always a *plene vav* is written (*üstün*, *esre* and *ötürü* being the names of the diacritic signs [*ḥareke*] for a/e, ı/i, and o/u/ö/ü respectively, whereas *he/ye/vav* are *plene* written letters [*ḥurūf*]).[13]

So, a root (in reality mixed up here with the term "stem") ending in a consonant is referred to as "silenced", and one ending in a vowel is termed "moved", according to the Arabic system, instead of stating that the 2S imperative is formed by the verbal root (or stem), which would be the Greco-Latin approach.

Chloros (1887), one of the most widely used grammars in the second half of the nineteenth and the early twentieth centuries, similarly uses graphical explanation, such as for the formation of the verbal noun mA, which he derives from the "infinitive" mAk, according to the Greco-Latin tradition, but using in his explanation the graphical Arabic approach where one of the *ḥurūf* (*qaf*) is substituted by another one (*he*) (Chloros 1887: 85).

From a cultural perspective, I would describe these approaches as "syncretistic" (syncretism occurs when elements from two different and formerly independent entities merge to form a new entity; Colpe 1997: 42–43), a term that enables us to show how much the actors of this new way of description are in a mediator position, as Ottoman Greeks actually were. But who were those actors?

13 «Ἐὰν τὸ τελευταῖον ῥιζικὸν ᾖναι σύμφωνον, ἔχον χαρεκὲ οὐστοὺν, κατόπιν τοῦ γράμματος τούτου τίθεται ἓν ه εἰς τὸ δεύτερον ἑνικὸν πρόσωπον τῆς προστακτικῆς. Π.χ. أيشلمك ἰσ́λε-μὲκ = ἐργάζεσθαι, أيشله ἰσ́λὲ = ἐργάζου. Τὸ τελευταῖον γράμμα τῆς ῥίζης εἶναι ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πλεῖστον ἠρεμοῦν [...], ἐνίοτε ὅμως εἶναι κινητὸν καὶ τότε ἐὰν μὲν ἔχη οὐστοὺν, γράφεται ἐνίοτε κατόπιν τοῦ κινητοῦ ἓν ا ἐλὶφ δεικτικὸν, ἐὰν δὲ ἔχη ἐσρὲ, κατόπιν τοῦ κινητοῦ τίθεται πάντοτε ἓν ي γε δεικτικὸν, καὶ ἐὰν ἔχη ἰοτουροὺ, κατόπιν τοῦ κινητοῦ γράφεται πάντοτε ἓν و βὰβ δεικτικὸν».

4 The actors

The linguistic and cultural intermediary role of Ottoman Greeks traces back to the institution of the Translator of the Imperial Divan (*Dīvān-ı Hümāyūn Tercümanı*), widely known as "Grand Dragoman", in the second half of the seventeenth century (the first Μέγας Διερμηνέας της Πόρτας, Panagiotis Nikousios, was appointed in 1661), and the office of the Dragoman of the Fleet (*Tersane Tercümanı*), both positions reserved to Greek or Hellenized families from Constantinople subsequently advancing to the well-known "Phanariot aristocracy", especially after 1711, when these families began to be appointed by the central Ottoman power to govern the Danubian and Moldavian Principalities.[14] As has been shown, the ascent of the Phanariots is intrinsically linked to their proficiency in high-style Ottoman Turkish, acquired and transmitted by a narrow network with the Ottoman Muslim bureaucratic corps (see Shafir 2021). According to a phrasing by Nir Shafir (2021: 214), "[l]ike so many members of the Ottoman bureaucracy, language was the only way they [= the Phanariots] could seize and hold onto power". The Phanariots held their political stake under the service of the Ottoman government, keeping a laical role but maintaining, at the same time, a close relationship with the Ecumenical Patriarchate in the Phanar, until the Greek revolution in the 1820s. However, Ottoman Greeks continued to play a significant role in the Ottoman intellectual and economical scene of the nineteenth century. The Ottoman (especially Istanbul) Greeks gained economic and cultural importance after the *Tanẓīmāt* (the period of Ottoman reforms) and the imperial edict *Ḫaṭṭ-ı Hümāyūn* (1865), when equal civic rights were granted to the minorities. The *millet* split into two factions, an ethnocentric "Greek" class and the traditional upper class of the "Neo-Phanariots" around the ideology of Helleno-Ottomanism (Kamouzis 2013). The authors of the nineteenth-century Ottoman Greek grammars principally belonged to the traditional circles, which became politically marginalized as nationalism gained momentum towards the century's end. Some were teachers in the Greek and foreign schools of Istanbul,[15] while others rose to Ottoman state officers (with the exception of Alexandridis, who had a true "Phanariot profile", but was active outside the Ottoman Empire; see below). One of the principal reasons the Ottoman Greeks (Rums) occupied political, administrative and diplomatic key positions lies certainly in their linguistic skills, being proficient in both the "Oriental" languages (Turkish, but also Arabic and Persian), and the European ones (primarily French). However, Greek-Turkish bilingualism in the ninetheenth century was prevalent only among the Ottoman Greek elite, but not (anymore) generally in the Greek society residing in the Empire (cf. Kappler 2023: 77–80), prompting the promotion of Turkish by the production of language material of

14 See Stamatiadis 1865 for the biographies of the Grand Dragomans, and the "classical" studies by Argyropoulos 1953, Orhonlu 1975, Vranoussis 1977, Tüncel 1977. For a comprehensive and insightful examination of Phanariots as linguistic mediators refer to Strauss 1995. For an analysis of Phanariots within the broader context of "Ottoman culture" during the initial two centuries of Phanariot rule consult Sariyannis 2011 and Philliou 2009.

15 Examples of language instructors among the authors of the grammars examined in this study include Ioannis Chloros, who served as a teacher at the "Patriarchal Great School of the Nation [in the sense of *millet*]" (Μεγάλη του Γένους Σχολής) located at the Phanar. Notably, Chloros held also the position of director of the Patriarchal Ottoman Office (Πατριαρχικό Οθωμανικό Γραφείο), as indicated on the title page of his grammar. Additionally, Ḫāfiẓ Refʿī and the translators associated with his grammar also fit within this category, as elaborated further below.

various genres (grammars, dictionaries, alphabet books, chrestomathies, dialogue books).[16] Additionally, Turkish was steadily introduced into the Greek schools of larger cities, culminating in the introduction of compulsory classes after 1894 (Alexandris 1983: 46). However, this development was not without challenges: Dimitrios Christidis, in his work on Ottoman Greek schools of the nineteenth century in Istanbul, lamented that Turkish was not sufficiently taught in the Greek schools, first of all due to the lack of qualified staff, and, secondly, because of the perceived "difficulty of Turkish", which, according to him, "takes more than two years to learn" (Christidis 1865: 44).

However, the main impetus for the promotion of Turkish among Ottoman Greeks in the second half of the nineteenth century was the loss of the Rums' political and administrative key positions to more proficient multilingual Armenians (Issawi 1999: 3–4), and to a raising class of polyglot Muslims after the creation of the Ottoman *Terceme Odası* ('Chamber of translation'), founded in 1832 for the training of (mainly Muslim) Ottomans in foreign languages, primarily French (Strauss 1995: 210–211). Nevertheless, Ottoman Greeks also entered the *Terceme Odası*, and two of our grammarians emerged from this school: Konstantinos Adosidis and Alexandros Konstantinidis.

Konstantinos Adosidis (1817–1897) originated from Cappadocia, though we do not know if he was part of the Turkophone language community. Along with journalistic activities, he spent his life with various diplomatic assignments and missions, official positions in ministries and public offices, and was briefly (1877–1878) the governor of Crete (Strauss 1995: 224). He was a member of the *Terceme Odası* (as noted on the title page of his grammar). As has been mentioned above, his grammar (Adosidis 1850) relies on Alexandridis and, mainly, Redhouse, but presents some original approaches which, again, were adopted by later authors.

One of those who extensively used Adosidis, was Alexandros Konstantinidis Paşa (d. 1890), undoubtedly one of the main figures among our nineteenth-century grammarians. His *Οθωμανική γραμματική* (1874) has been mentioned several times above. Being a typical Ottoman official, he held several minor administrative positions and was appointed *paşa* by the Ottoman government (see Strauss 1995: 227–230 for more detailed information on Konstantinidis). In addition to the various versions of his Ottoman grammar and preliminary publications in form of short grammar sketches and language manuals (and a Greek grammar for Turkish learners, *Uṣūl-i Lisân-i Rūmī* [1892]), he authored a "History of Ancient Greece from 2200 to 146 B.C." (*Ta'rīẖ-i Yunānistān-ı qadīm qable 'l-milād min 2200 ilā 146*), written in Ottoman Turkish and published in 1869, and an Ottoman chrestomathy (*Müntaḫabāt-i āṯār-ı 'oṯmaniyye / Οθωμανική Χρηστομάθεια*, Istanbul 1871), with an interesting preface where he laments:

> [...] we are completely ignorant not only of their [i.e. the Ottoman Turks'] language, but also of their manners and customs, and, in addition, of their history. We are able to talk about the Chinese and other remote peoples, but we are compelled to keep

16 The phenomenon of Turkish-Greek bilingualism during the eighteenth century finds its expression in numerous literary works authored by members of Phanariot families. This topic has been thoroughly examined by the late Peter Mackridge (2020, 2021), as well as by Johann Strauss (2013). For further exploration of Greek-Turkish bilingualism during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in Istanbul, one may also refer to the research conducted by Kappler in 2023.

> silent whenever that people is concerned with whom we live together and by whose laws we are governed. Isn't this sad, or rather, doesn't it put us to shame? (p. 9; cited from Strauss 1995: 229–230)

A little different is the case of Dimitrios Alexandridis, whose *Γραμματική γραικικο-τουρκική* (Vienna 1812) was, as mentioned earlier, the first printed Ottoman Greek grammar (see Kappler 2021). He was born around 1785 in Tyrnavos/Thessaly, but by the age of twenty he was already in Vienna, where he initially studied philology, and later medicine, and where he died in 1851 (Tabaki 1984: 323–325). In 1807 he published a translation from Arabic of Abū 'l-Fidā's "Geography" in an Arabic-Greek bilingual edition (see Tabaki 1993). His dedication to Oriental languages and his wide-ranging interests in history, geography, politics, and linguistic studies are evident in substantial portions of his journal *Ελληνικός Τηλέγραφος* (Vienna), which, according to Tabaki (1984: 329), "introduced constitutive elements of a scientific orientalism". He was an orientalist, intellectual, journalist and "iatrophilosophos", making him one of the most multifaceted personalities among the authors of nineteenth-century grammar books.

An exceptional mediator place is occupied by a grammar book originally written not in Greek, but translated from French: Ḫāfiẓ Ref'ī's *Γραμματική οθωμανική* translated by Alexandros Naoum. As indicated on the title page of the 1876 edition of his grammar, Ḫāfiẓ Ref'ī was a teacher "of Arabo-Turkish" at the Imperial Lycée in Gülhane, and, according to the slightly expanded second edition (1887), of "Arabic" at the Galatasaray Lyceum.[17] In addition to his grammar, he published a commented edition of some Aesop tales in Arabic and Turkish in 1874 (*Edebiyāt ve ḥikāyāt-ı ġarībe-yi Türkiyye ve 'Arabiyye*; Strauss 2003: 49), and an Ottoman *alphabetarium* (*Elifbā-yi Cedīd-i 'Os̲mānī*; only preserved in a third edition printed in 1881–82; see Özege 1980: n. 4769). The intriguing aspect of Ḫāfiẓ Ref'ī's case is the fact that a grammar written by an Ottoman Muslim, albeit based on the Greco-Latin tradition, with specific reference to the Ottoman Arabic tradition (as discussed earlier), was made accessible to Greek readership through translation.

As observed in the previous sections, the cultural versatility of the individuals involved in this process is evident in how the grammarians describe language in their works, and how these works are structured. Let's return now to the analysis of the sources to provide further instances that demonstrate how cultural mediation intersects with a syncretistic approach to writing grammars.

17 The second edition of Ḫāfiẓ Ref'ī's grammar was edited "with the help of Dimitrios Makridis" who was a teacher of French at the Galatasaray Lycée (Full title: *Ὀθωμανική Γραμματική ὑπό Χαφούζ Ρεφή Ἐφφένδη, Καθηγητοῦ τῆς Ἀραβικῆς ἐν τῷ Αὐτοκρατορικῷ Λυκείῳ τοῦ Γαλατά-Σεραγίου, τῇ βοηθεία Δημητρίου Κ. Μακρίδη Βέη, Καθηγητοῦ τῆς Γαλλικῆς ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ Λυκείῳ ... Ἔκδοσις δευτέρα, Ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει, Τύποις Βουτυρᾶ καί Σ/ας 1887*). The full title of the 1876 edition is: *Γραμματική ὀθωμανική ὑπό Χαφούζ Ρεφή, Καθηγητοῦ τῆς Ἀραβο-Τουρκικῆς ἐν τῷ Αὐτοκρατορικῷ Λυκείῳ τοῦ Γκιούλ-Χανέ. Μεταφρασθεῖσα δε καί ἐπί τό ἑλληνικώτερον διασκευασθεῖσα ὑπό Ἀλεξάνδρου Ναούμ*.

5 The cultural dimension of lexicon

Beyond the issues of tradition and methodology in language description, as noted earlier, a further linguistic aspect shedding light on the cultural relevance of Ottoman Greek grammars is the lexical level, or, more specifically, the approach to borrowed lexicon and language mixing. The concern of European grammarians with "foreign" words is as old as grammar itself: The famous term *barbarismós* for any non-Greek linguistic element is already present in Aristotle's *Poetica*, in an epoch when linguistic reflections in European grammar writing were exclusively about Greek, and purity was not just a claim of language policies but was considered the only possible (idealized) state of language. In Latin language philosophy the issue took on a triple relation and *barbarus* became something neither Greek nor Latin (Stockhammer 2014: 312), while in the late Antiquity Isidore of Seville (560–636) relates the advancing phenomenon of language mixing to the expansion of the Empire comparing it to the irruption of "customs and humans into the Roman community" ("Mixta, quae post imperium latius promotum simul cum moribus et hominibus in Romanam civitatem inrupit, [...]"), showing an awareness that language mixing is an unavoidable part of language evolution, even though the puristic ideal of Latin will be maintained (Stockhammer 2014: 316–317). Normative grammar typically teaches a "pure" form of the language, remaining silent about influences from other languages (and about non-standard varieties). In Ottoman Greek grammarianism the approach to "foreign" words is diametrically opposite, linked to the aforementioned ideology of the *elsine-i s̲elās̲e*, the "three languages" of Ottoman. This approach takes on an aesthetical dimension where everything which is mixed is considered "beautiful". This aspect has been abundantly exposed in some previous studies (Kappler 2007, 2013) and requires no repetition; nevertheless we cite here one of the numerous witnesses, namely the introductory sentences from the prologue to Ioannis Chloros's grammar (1887: 1):

> Turkish as official language of the Ottoman state is called Ottoman language. Besides the Turkish words forming its base, it includes a lot of Arabo-Persian [words], such as nouns, adjectives, pronouns, verbal nouns, prepositions and adverbs. Through them, enriched and embellished, it can compete in elegance and grace with the European languages.[18]

As mentioned in the second chapter above, all the authors endeavor to account for the coexistence of the three languages involved through a language description structured by a more or less strict separation of the three grammars. Consideration of the composed nature of Ottoman occasionally assumes a practical dimension, for example when Chloros offers a method to assist learners in distinguishing, in some cases, the origin of a word with the help of the etymological analysis of graphemes. In the chapter titled "Linguistic division of the letters" (Γλωσσικὴ διαίρεση τῶν γραμμάτων, Chloros 1887: 6) – a remarkable terminology in itself! – he categorizes selected gaphemes into four "Persian letters" (<p>, <č>, <ž>, <g>),

18 «Ὀθωμανικὴ γλῶσσα καλεῖται ἡ Τουρκικὴ ὡς γλῶσσα ἐπίσημος τοῦ Ὀθωμανικοῦ κράτους, περιλαμβάνει δε ἐκτὸς τῶν τουρκικῶν λέξεων, αἵτινες ἀποτελοῦσι τὴν βάσιν αὐτῆς, πλῆθος ἀραβοπερσικῶν, οἷον οὐσιαστικῶν, ἐπιθέτων, ἀντωνυμιῶν, ῥηματικῶν ὀνομάτων, προθέσεων καὶ ἐπιρρημάτων. Δι' αὐτῶν πλουτισθεῖσα ἅμα καὶ καλλωπισθεῖσα ἀμιλλᾶται κατὰ γλαφυρότητα καὶ χάριν πρὸς τὰς εὐρωπαϊκάς.» With similar wording in the 1894 edition (p. 5), but without reference to the "European languages".

absent in any words of Arabic origin, and eight "Arabic letters" (<s>, <ḥ>, <ṣ>, <ż>, <ṭ>, <ẓ>, <ʻ>, <q>) which do not appear in purely Persian words, supplemented by the "ṣaġır nūn" (<ŋ>), the sole "Turkish" letter of the alphabet. In this way, the grammars raise awareness for the perception of Ottoman as a "mixed language".

Interestingly, certain books discuss the contact between Turkish and Greek (which, in the perspective of that time, was supposed to have the character of a "pure" language), and enumerate a variety of Greek Turkisms. Once again, the objective is practical – to aid learners in acquainting themselves with new vocabulary and developing lexical acquisition strategies.

One example is a language guide – not a grammar but a bilingual phrase book –, Ioannis Miliopoulos's *Διάλογοι τουρκο-ελληνικοί και ελληνο-τουρκικοί / Mükālimāt-i türkiyye-i rūmiyye ve rūmiyye-i türkiyye* ('Turkish-Greek and Greek-Turkish dialogues'; Istanbul 1875). Pages 69–91 feature a word list titled "Τουρκικαὶ λέξεις ἐν τῇ καθομιλουμένῃ Ἑλληνικῇ – Lisān-i cedīd-i rūmiyyeniŋ zemân-i ḥāżırda müsta'mil elfāẓ-ı türkiyyeyi müş'ir-i iḫṭārāt" ('Turkish Words in Everyday Greek – Rememberable Turkish Expressions Currently in Use in Modern Greek'). The book caters to both Greek and Turkish speakers, presenting all words and sentences along with their original writing in transcription: Arabic script for Greek and Greek script for Turkish, rendering the book an "Aljamiado" and a "Karamanli" monument simultaneously. The extensive glossary – deserving of independent study – comprises 475 Greek Turkisms alongside their "genuine" Greek equivalents, with some examples being:

Table 1: Selection of Turkisms in Miliopoulos 1875

Greek Turkism	**Turkish etymon**	**Translation**	**Greek equivalent**	**Page**
ἄλικος	al	red	ὕσγινος	69
ἀληϑβερίϑι	alışveriş	business, trade	ληψοδοσία	69
ενταρί	entari	a kind of dress	χειριδωτός	70
καλδιρήμι	kaldırım	sidewalk	λιθόστρωτον	75
κεπαπτσῆς	kebapçı	cook/seller of *kebab*	ὀπτανεύς	76
μπουδαλᾶς	budala	foolish	εὐήθης	82
σαρήκι	sarık	turban	κύδαρις	84
τσακάλι	çakal	jackal	θῶς	86
τσακμάκι	çakmak	pocket lighter	πυρεῖον	86

The list is remarkable not only for its documentation of the rich Greek repertoire of Turkish borrowings at that time, but also for its evident ability to uncover Greek words through often archaizing forms, likely with limited use in everyday Greek. This suggests that the aim was not solely to provide lively expressions of colloquial language, as the title implies, but also to acquaint Turkish-speaking learners with an alternative "pure" Greek lexeme, even if the words are predominantly uncommon. What is more, it is plausible that another intention was to promote linguistic purism among Greek-speaking users.

Howsoever, to utilization of contact-induced vocabulary is not a novel concept in Greek-Turkish language learning. Artin Hindoglu, an Armenian from Kütahya, professor of Turkish and Armenian in Vienna, and "k.k.n.ö. Landrechts-Dolmetscher", i.e. 'Imperial-royal interpreter of Lower Austria', author of the renowned *Dictionnaire Abrégé Français-Turc* (Vienna 1831), mentions in the preface of his trilingual (Turkish-Greek-German) *Mecmū'a-i Luġāt* (Vienna 1840):

> Der Leser wird in der neugriechischen Sprache viele türkische, und in der Letzteren viele griechische Wörter finden, welche bereits nationalisiert worden sind. [...] Nach der Eroberung Konstantinopels durch Sultan Mehemed II. lebte der Grieche mit den Türken oder Osmanen gemeinschaftlich, und nahm viele Kunst- und technische Ausdrücke aus der türkischen Sprache in die seine auf, wovon die meisten in meinem Büchlein vorkommen, und welche er nur mit Beziehung des Tones oder eines Endlautes veränderte. (Hindoglu 1840: iv–vi)[19]

By "nationalization" of foreign words, referring to the phonetic and morphological adaptation of borrowed elements, language enriches its lexicon, thus serving as an intercultural strategy in language teaching – indeed an intriguing approach which underscores the cultural relevance of grammar writing.

6 Toward a reinterpretation of grammar books

The political, economical and social changes in the framework of modernization during the Ottoman eighteenth and nineteenth centuries undoubtedly reshaped the status of Ottoman Greek elites and other non-Muslim communities. Revisionist studies have shifted focus from the traditional perception of insulated religious minorities according to the *millet* system toward analyzing open communities with active roles in Ottoman society, placing "Ottomanization" and "Ottomanness" at the core of new identity structures (see, for example, the introduction to Anastasopoulos 2005). In this process, language has played a pivotal role. In the given context, beyond the identity-shaping function of Greek itself (including for non-Greek Orthodox elites; see, for example, Wasiucionek 2017–2018 on the Danubian Principalities), the attitudes of Ottoman Greeks toward the Turkish language emerge as a crucial factor. Grammar books, or other language learning materials, present a promising yet overlooked source for understanding Ottoman Greek mentality.

One of the central questions in this debate revolves around multilingualism and the knowledge of Turkish in the Ottoman Greek population (or Hellenized communities in the peripheries). A preliminary answer lies in the sheer quantity of language publications during the nineteenth century, indicating a necessity to learn Turkish and, conversely, a lack of Turkish knowledge among Ottoman Greeks (in contrast to other non-Muslim communities,

19 'The reader will find in the Modern Greek language many Turkish, and in the latter many Greek words, which already have been nationalized. [...] Following the conquest of Constantinople by Sultan Mehmed II., Greeks coexisted alongside Turks or Ottomans, and have adopted many Turkish words related to art and technology; most of them are cataloged in my booklet and have undergone alterations [in pronunciation and morphology] only through accentuation or affixation'.

such as Armenians or Jews) at that time. It is essential here to distinguish between colloquial Turkish, acquired to some extent by all non-Muslim communities in a natural way through daily interactions with their Turkish-speaking fellow-citizens, and the formal written variety of Ottoman used in public bureaucracy and the arts (Shafir 2021: 182; cf. Strauss 2013: 268–269). Mastery of the latter propelled the Phanariots to power in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries,[20] while its decline in the nineteenth century contributed to their loss of dominance to other (Armenian, Muslim) elites. Grammar books attest to traditional post-Phanariot circles' efforts to regain power through language, the same factor that had marked their predecessors' ascent.

Furthermore, grammars provide evidence of the Ottoman Greeks' intercultural mediation role through syncretistic language description, incorporating various strands of grammar tradition (Arabic and Greco-Latin), and addressing sociolinguistically relevant issues, such as borrowed lexicon. From this perspective, grammar books, or even any language teaching and learning materials in general, serve as sources of historical and cultural significance, not only in declaratory and introductory sections like prefaces, but also in their structural components, particularly in how language is described and contextualized.

References

1. Grammar sources

Adosidis, Konstantinos. 1850. *Στοιχεία της οθωμανικής γραμματικής.* Istanbul: Aftokratoriko Typografeio.

Alexandridis, Dimitrios. 1812. *Γραμματικὴ γραικικο-τουρκική.* Vienna: Typografia Ioan. Barth. Tzvekiou.

Chloros, Ioannis. 1887. *Γραμματική της Οθωμανικής Γλώσσης*. Istanbul: Patriarchikou Typografeio.

Fotiadis, Apostolos. 1897. *Πλήρης Γραμματική της οθωμανικής γλώσσης.* Istanbul: Typois Aristovoulou.

Ḫāfiẓ Refʿī. 1875. *Γραμματική οθωμανική υπό Χαφούζ Ρεφή, Καθηγητού της Αραβο-Τουρκικής εν τω Αυτοκρατορικώ Λυκείω του Γκιούλ-Χανέ. Μεταφρασθείσα δε και επί το ελληνικώτερον διασκευασθείσα υπό Αλεξάνδρου Ναούμ.* Istanbul: Typois Voutyra.

Hindoglu, Artin. 1840. *Mecmūʿa-i Luġāt oder Sammlung der zum Sprechen nöthigsten Wörter und Redensarten der türkischen, neugriechischen und deutschen Sprache.* Vienna: Fr. Beck's Universitäts-Buchhandlung.

Konstantinidis, Alexandros (Paşa). 1874. *Ṣarf-i ʿOs̲mānī – Οθωμανική γραμματική.* Istanbul: Typois Voutyra.

Meninski, Franciscus à Mesgnien. 1680. *Linguarum Orientalium Turcicae, Arabicae, Persicae Institutiones seu Grammatica Turcica.* Vienna.

Miliopoulos, Ioannis P. (Yanqo Miloġlu). 1875. *Διάλογοι τουρκο-ελληνικοί και ελληνο-τουρκικοί / Mükālimāt-i türkiyye-i rūmiyye ve rūmiyye-i türkiyye.* Istanbul: Typois Voutyra.

Redhouse, James W. 1846. *Grammaire raisonnée de la langue ottomane.* Paris: Gide et Cie.

20 In Nir Shafir's words: "They [the Phanariots] were active members of a Muslim government but also inescapably Christian. Greek was the language that bound them together and defined their intellectual ambitions, but it was ultimately the Turkish language that allowed them to succeed within the empire" (Shafir 2021: 213).

Viguier, Pierre-François. 1790. *Elemens de la langue turque.* Constantinople: Imprimerie du Palais de France.

2. Secondary sources

Alexandris, Alexis. 1983. *The Greek Minority of Istanbul and Greek-Turkish relations 1918-1974.* Athens: Center for Asia Minor Studies.

Anastasopoulos, Antonis (ed.). 2005. *Provincial Elites in the Ottoman Empire.* Rethymno: Crete University Press.

Argyropoulos, Pericles. 1953. Les Grecs au service de l'Empire Ottoman. *L'Hellénisme contemporain* 7: 151–177.

Christidis, Dimitrios. 1865. *Τα Σχολεία της Κωνσταντινουπόλεως* [The schools of Istanbul]. Istanbul: Antonios Koromilas.

Colpe, Carsten. 1997. The Phenomenon of Syncretism and the Impact of Islam. In K. Kehl-Bodrogi, B. Kellner-Heinkele & A. Otter-Beaujean (eds.). *Syncretistic Religious Communities in the Near East.* Leiden: Brill, 35–48.

Ermers, Robert. 1999. *Arabic grammars of Turkic.* Leiden: Brill.

Göksel, Aslı & Kerslake, Celia. 2005. *Turkish – A comprehensive grammar.* London and New York: Routledge.

Issawi, Charles 1999. Introduction. In Dimitri Gondicas & Charles Issawi (eds.). *Ottoman Greeks in the Age of Nationalism: Politics, Economy, and Society in the Nineteenth Century.* Princeton: The Darwin Press, 1–16.

Kamouzis, Dimitris. 2013. Elites and the formation of national identity: the case of the Greek Orthodox millet (mid-nineteenth century to 1922). In Benjamin C. Fortna, Stefanos Katsikas, Dimitris Kamouzis & Paraskevas Konortas (eds.). *State-Nationalisms in the Ottoman Empire, Greece and Turkey. Orthodox and Muslims, 1830–1945.* New York: Routledge, 13–46.

Kappler, Matthias. 1995. Über die Beziehung der griechischen Bevölkerung Konstantinopels zur osmanischen Kultur im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert. *Θησαυρίσματα* 25: 349–361.

—. 2007. Konflikt und Ideologie in den griechischen Grammatiken des Osmanischen im 19. Jahrhundert. In Hendrik Boeschoten & Heidi Stein (eds.). *Einheit und Vielfalt in der türkischen Welt – Materialien der 5. Deutschen Turkologenkonferenz, Universität Mainz.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 80–93.

—. 2013. Maintenance and Renovation in the Attitudes of Ottoman Greek Intellectuals Towards Ottoman Turkish. In Marilena Karyolemou & Pavlos Pavlou (eds.). *Language Policy and Planning in the Mediterranean World.* Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 72–85.

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

—. 2023. Intercultural aspects of Phanariot and post-Phanariot Greek-Turkish bilingualism. *Κονδυλοφόρος* 21 [Μνήμη Peter Mackridge]: 74–92.

Karabacak, Esra (ed.). 2002. *Bergamalı Kadrî, Müyessiretü'l-Ulûm.* Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.

Mackridge, Peter. 2020. Enlightenment and entertainment: the intolerable lightness of Phanariot literature, 1750–1800. *Revue des Études Sud-Est Européennes* 58/1–4: 119–138.

—. 2021. Borrowing and code switching in Phanariot Greek. *Mediterranean Language Review* 28: 1–20.

Orhonlu, Cengiz. 1975. *Osmanlı Devletinde "Tercümanlık"*. Ankara.

Owens, Jonathan. 1988. *The foundations of grammar – an introduction to medieval Arabic grammatical theory.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Özege, Seyfettin. 1980. *Eski Harflerle Basılmış Türkçe Eserler Kataloğu*. İstanbul: Nihal Kitabevi.

Philliou, Christine. 2009. Communities on the Verge: Unraveling the Phanariot Ascendancy in Ottoman Governance. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 51/1: 151–181.

Robins, Robert Henry. 1967. *A short history of linguistics.* London: Longman.

Sariyannis, Marinos. 2011. Οι Φαναριώτες και η οθωμανική παράδοση: Επιδράσεις και στεγανά, 17ος-18ος αιώνες [Phanariots and Ottoman tradition: influences and barriers, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries]. In Giorgos Salakidis (ed.). *Τουρκολογικά. Τιμητικός τόμος για τον Αναστάσιο Κ. Ιορδάνογλου [Turcologica. A Festschrift in honor of Anastasios K. Iordanoglou].* Thessaloniki: Ant. Stamoulis, 305–322.

Shafir, Nir. 2021. Phanariot Tongues: The Mavrocordatos Family and the Power of the Turkish Language in the Eighteenth-Century Ottoman Empire. *Oriente Moderno* 101: 181–220.

Stamatiadis, Epaminondas. 1865. *Βιογραφίαι τῶν Ἑλλήνων Μεγάλων Διερμηνέων τοῦ Ὀθωμανικοῦ Κράτους [Biographies of the Greek Grand Dragomans of the Ottoman State].* Athinai. [Reprint Thessaloniki 1973].

Stockhammer, Robert. 2014. *Grammatik. Wissen und Macht in der Geschichte einer sprachlichen Institution.* Berlin: Suhrkamp.

Strauss, Johann. 1995. The Millets and the Ottoman Language: The Contribution of Ottoman Greeks to Ottoman Letters (19th–20th Centuries). *Die Welt des Islams*, New Series, 35/2: 189–249.

—. 2003. Who Read What in the Ottoman Empire (19th–20th centuries)? *Arabic and Middle Eastern Literatures* 6/1: 39–76.

—. 2013. The New Status of Turkish in the Phanariot Era. Notes on the Turkish elements in Phanariot prose and poetry writing. In Ilia Chatzipanagioti-Sangmeister, Chariton Karanasios; Matthias Kappler & Charalambos Chotzakoglou (eds.). *Φαναριώτικα και αστικά στιχουργήματα στην εποχή του νεοελληνικού Διαφωτισμού.* Athina: Akadimia Athinon, 263–286.

Tabaki, Anna. 1984. Un aspect des lumières néohelléniques: l'approche scientifique de l'Orient. Le cas de Dimitrios Alexandridis. *Ελληνικά* 35: 316–337.

—. 1993. L'édition arabe-grecque de la *Géographie* d'Aboulféda par Dimitrios Alexandridis (1807) et sa 'fortune' au début du XIXe siècle. *Graeco-Arabica* 5: 251–258.

Tüncel, Bedreddin. 1977. L'âge des Drogmans. In *Istanbul à la jonction des cultures balkaniques, méditerranéennes, slaves et orientales aux XVIe–XIXe siècles.* Bucarest: A.I.E.S.E.E., 361–370.

Versteegh, Kees. 2006. The study of non-Western linguistic traditions. In Sylvain Auroux (ed.). *History of the Language Sciences – Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaften – Histoire des sciences du langage. An International Handbook on the Evolution of the Study of Language from the Beginnings to the Present. Volume 3 – 3. Teilband* (HSK 18.3). Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2791–2802.

Vranoussis, Leandros. 1977. Les Grecs de Constantinople et la vie intellectuelle à l'âge des Drogmans. In *Istanbul à la jonction des cultures balkaniques, méditerranéennes, slaves et orientales aux XVIe–XIXe siècles.* Bucarest: A.I.E.S.E.E., 133–142.

Wasiucionek, Michal. 2017–2018. Greek as Ottoman? Language, identity and mediation of Ottoman culture in the early modern period. *Cromohs (Cyber Review of Modern Historiography)* 21: 70–89.

Zallony, Marc-Philippe. 1824. *Essai sur les Fanariotes.* Marseille: Imprimerie d'Antoine Ricard.