

21
2023

ΚΟΝΔΥΛΟΦΟΡΟΣ

ΕΤΗΣΙΑ ΕΚΔΟΣΗ ΝΕΟΤΕΡΗΣ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗΣ ΦΙΛΟΛΟΓΙΑΣ



ΜΝΗΜΗ PETER MACKRIDGE

RODERICK BEATON

DAVID HOLTON

ΧΡΗΣΤΟΣ ΚΑΡΒΟΥΝΗΣ

MATTHIAS KARPLER

ΝΑΤΑΛΙΑ ΔΕΛΗΓΙΑΝΝΑΚΗ

ΑΛΕΞΗΣ ΠΟΛΙΤΗΣ

ΜΑΡΙΛΙΖΑ ΜΗΤΣΟΥ

ΓΕΩΡΓΙΑ ΓΚΟΤΣΗ

ΑΓΓΕΛΑ ΚΑΣΤΡΙΝΑΚΗ

ΕΛΕΝΑ ΚΟΥΤΡΙΑΝΟΥ

ΔΗΜΗΤΡΗΣ ΤΖΙΟΒΑΣ

ΣΤΕΣΗ ΑΘΗΝΗ

DAVID RICKS



ΠΑΝΕΠΙΣΤΗΜΙΑΚΕΣ ΕΚΔΟΣΕΙΣ ΚΡΗΤΗΣ

ΚΟΝΔΥΛΟΦΟΡΟΣ

ΕΤΗΣΙΑ ΕΚΔΟΣΗ ΝΕΟΤΕΡΗΣ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗΣ ΦΙΛΟΛΟΓΙΑΣ

21



2023

ΜΝΗΜΗ PETER MACKRIDGE

RODERICK BEATON

DAVID HOLTON

ΧΡΗΣΤΟΣ ΚΑΡΒΟΥΝΗΣ

MATTHIAS KAPPLER

ΝΑΤΑΛΙΑ ΔΕΛΗΓΙΑΝΝΑΚΗ

ΑΛΕΞΗΣ ΠΟΛΙΤΗΣ

ΜΑΡΙΛΙΖΑ ΜΗΤΣΟΥ

ΓΕΩΡΓΙΑ ΓΚΟΤΣΗ

ΑΓΓΕΛΑ ΚΑΣΤΡΙΝΑΚΗ

ΕΛΕΝΑ ΚΟΥΤΡΙΑΝΟΥ

ΔΗΜΗΤΡΗΣ ΤΖΙΟΒΑΣ

ΣΤΕΣΗ ΑΘΗΝΗ

DAVID RICKS



ΠΑΝΕΠΙΣΤΗΜΙΑΚΕΣ ΕΚΔΟΣΕΙΣ ΚΡΗΤΗΣ

ΠΑΝΕΠΙΣΤΗΜΙΑΚΕΣ ΕΚΔΟΣΕΙΣ ΚΡΗΤΗΣ

Ίδρυμα Τεχνολογίας & Έρευνας

Ηράκλειο Κρήτης: Νικ. Πλαστήρα 100, Βασιλικά Βουτών, 700 13

Τηλ.: 2810 391097

Αθήνα: Θουκυδίδου 4, 105 56

Τηλ.: 210 3849020

info@cup.gr

www.cup.gr

ΣΥΝΤΑΚΤΙΚΗ ΕΠΙΤΡΟΠΗ

Νάσος Βαγενάς, Ναταλία Δεληγιαννάκη, Diana Haas, Χ.Α. Καραόγλου,

Renata Lavagnini, Μαριλίζα Μητσού, Αλέξης Πολίτης

ΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΕΙΑ ΣΥΝΤΑΞΗΣ

Χ.Α. Καραόγλου

τηλ.: 2310 860698, e-mail: chlkar@lit.auth.gr

ISSN 1109-4907

ΚΟΝΔΥΛΟΦΟΡΟΣ

ΕΤΗΣΙΑ ΕΚΔΟΣΗ ΝΕΟΤΕΡΗΣ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗΣ ΦΙΛΟΛΟΓΙΑΣ

ΠΕΡΙΟΔΟΣ Β΄
ΤΟΜΟΣ 21 ♦ 2023

ΜΝΗΜΗ PETER MACKRIDGE

Π Ε Ρ Ι Ε Χ Ο Μ Ε Ν Α

RODERICK BEATON, Language, identity and the “nationalisation of the past”. Peter Mackridge on the making of Modern Greece	5
DAVID HOLTON, Peter Mackridge and the origins of Standard Modern Greek	12
ΧΡΗΣΤΟΣ ΚΑΡΒΟΥΝΗΣ, Γλωσσικές κληρονομίες και γλωσσική ιδεολογία. Το αποτύπωμα του Νεοελληνικού Διαφωτισμού	27
MATTHIAS KAPPLER, Intercultural aspects of Phanariot and post-Phanariot Greek-Turkish bilingualism	74
ΝΑΤΑΛΙΑ ΔΕΛΗΠΙΑΝΝΑΚΗ, Εισ τον ωραίον Βόσπορον	93
ΑΛΕΞΗΣ ΠΟΛΙΤΗΣ, 1821. Δημοτικά τραγούδια, δημοτικά τραγουδίσματα	116
ΜΑΡΙΛΙΖΑ ΜΗΤΣΟΥ, «Από αγάπη για την Ελλάδα». Σύγχρονοι προβληματισμοί για τον φιλελληνισμό	126
ΓΕΩΡΓΙΑ ΓΚΟΤΣΗ, Βρετανικός φιλελληνισμός και μετάφραση. <i>The Songs of Greece</i> του Charles Brinsley Sheridan	144
ΑΓΓΕΛΑ ΚΑΣΤΡΙΝΑΚΗ, Το μοιρολόγι της φώκιας, ένα παραμύθι της ανυπακοής και της αμαρτίας	174

ΕΛΕΝΑ ΚΟΥΤΡΙΑΝΟΥ, Η τεχνική του κολάζ και το assemblage στην Έρημη χώρα του T. S. Eliot και στην ποίηση του Γιώργου Σεφέρη	192
ΔΗΜΗΤΡΗΣ ΤΖΙΟΒΑΣ, Ιστορία και αφηγηματικοί τρόποι. Από τη μαρτυρία στην αρχεϊακή ποιητική	214
ΣΤΕΣΗ ΑΘΗΝΗ, Καβαφικές μεταφράσεις στα γαλλικά στο αρχείο της Gisèle Prassinos	237
DAVID RICKS, Τέσσερις μεταφράσεις, μνήμη Peter Mackridge	257
Οι συνεργάτες του τόμου	263

Matthias Kappler

Intercultural aspects of Phanariot and post-Phanariot Greek-Turkish bilingualism

1. Introductory notes about Greek and Turkish in the eighteenth century

The bilingual language use of Ottoman Greeks (summarized under the denomination of the Ottoman administrative term *millet-i Rum*)¹ in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries has many aspects, such as grade and intensity of bilingualism, code-switching and code-mixing (both in Greek speaking and Turkish speaking communities and individuals), language attitudes and ideologies towards the official language (Ottoman Turkish), second language acquisition, and the sociolinguistic domains of Turkish and Greek in the daily life of both Greek Orthodox language communities.

In his numerous contributions on the language use of Ottoman Greeks in the eighteenth century, Peter Mackridge underlined the role of Turkish

I wish to thank Natalia Deliyannaki for her most valuable comments and suggestions to improve the first draft of the text. Of course, all responsibility for any errors remains with the author.

1. Of course the *millet-i Rum*, at least until the end of the nineteenth century, did not comprise only speakers of Greek, but also of Slavic languages, Romanian, Albanian and others, provided that they were of Greek Orthodox religion. In this contribution I will deal exclusively with that part of the Orthodox *millet* which spoke either Greek or Turkish, the latter known as “Karamanlides”. Cf. Richard Clogg, “The Greek Millet in the Ottoman Empire”, in *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire. The functioning of a plural society*, ed. Benjamin Braude - Bernard Lewis, vol. I, New York, Holmes & Meier, 1982, pp. 185-207; for the demography of Istanbul in the nineteenth century see Stanford J. Shaw, “The population of Istanbul in the nineteenth century”, *Istanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Tarih Dergisi*, vol. 32 (1979) 403-414; Justin McCarthy, “Greek Statistics on Ottoman Greek Population”, *International Journal of Turkish Studies*, vol. 1.2 (1980) 66-76; and Kemal H. Karpat, *Ottoman population, 1830-1900. Demographic and social characteristics*, The University of Wisconsin Press, 1985.

words in “the sparkling humour and lively colloquial language of later Phanariot literature”.² In his research, he dedicated much space to the question of language contact and bilingualism in the Phanariot period, and eventually he proposed the term “Phanariot sociolect” which he put in direct relation to “a significant degree of familiarity with Turkish”.³ In one of his last conference speeches (if not the last one) he develops this approach into an analytical discussion on what he calls “Phanariot literary koine”.⁴ Mackridge was probably the most significant scholar who provided an in-depth analysis of the Phanariot language use emphasizing the well-known gap between “high” style of enlightened authors writing in archaizing Greek in order to educate, and the “less overtly” enlightened authors using a colloquial style in contemporary Greek in order to delight their readers.⁵ A particularly colourful example is *Φιλοθέου πάρεργα*, written by Nikolaos Mavrokordatos between 1716 and 1719 in Ancient Greek, where “Mavrokordatos (or his narrator Philotheos) refuses to identify the flowers growing in Iakovos’ garden because they have names of Turkish

2. Peter Mackridge, “Enlightenment and entertainment: the intolerable lightness of Phanariot literature, 1750-1800”, *Revue des Études Sud-Est Européennes*, vol. 58.1-4 (2020) 119-138, in particular p. 124. About Turkish in Phanariot texts (not only songs), see also Johann Strauss, “The new status of Turkish in the Phanariot era. Notes on the Turkish elements in Phanariot prose and poetry writing”, in *Φαναριώτικα και αστικά στιχογραφήματα στην εποχή του νεοελληνικού Διαφωτισμού*, ed. Iliá Chatzipanagioti-Sangmeister - Chariton Karanasios - Matthias Kappler - Charalambos Chotzakoglou, Athens, Academy of Athens, 2013, pp. 263-286.

3. Peter Mackridge, “Borrowing and code switching in Phanariot Greek”, *Mediterranean Language Review*, vol. 28 (2021) 1-20, in particular p. 4. As far as I can see, however, the first time that Peter Mackridge spoke about “Phanariot sociolect” was in 2018 in a contribution about the Greek translation (presumably by Evgenios Voulgaris) of Voltaire’s *Memnon*. His definition of “Phanariot sociolect” was intrinsically linked to the use of Turkish elements: «[...] τη φαναριώτικη κοινωνιόλεκτο, με την επιδεικτική πολλές φορές χρήση τουρκικών λεκτικών και φραστικών δανείων»; Peter Mackridge, “Ο Βούλγαρης φαναριώτης στιχογράφος; Σκέψεις για τον τσελεμπή Μέμνονα”, in *Ευγένιος Βούλγαρης. Ο homo universalis του Νέου Ελληνισμού*, ed. Chariton Karanasios, Athens, 2018, pp. 253-267, in particular p. 256. Another, yet less felicitous term is “Phanariot idiom”, proposed by Savvas E. Tsilenis and Kallirroi Dafna, “Οι τουρκογενείς λέξεις στο στιχογράφημα της *Βοσπορομαχίας* και η χρήση τους σε κείμενα του 18ου αιώνα”, *Σύγχρονα θέματα*, nr. 134-135 (2016) 116-135, in particular p. 118.

4. Peter Mackridge, “Was there a Phanariot literary Koine in the eighteenth century?”, keynote at the *2ο Διεθνές Συνέδριο για την Κοινή, τις κοινές και τη διαμόρφωση της κοινής νεοελληνικής*, organized by the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 5-6 November 2021.

5. Mackridge, “Enlightenment and entertainment”, p. 124.

origin”.⁶ Mackridge made many other accurate observations about multilingualism and language contact in eighteenth-century Istanbul and in the Danubian Principalities,⁷ providing eventually his nowadays indispensable glossaries for Phanariot texts, containing, among other entries, many Turkish (and Italian) words.⁸ In doing so, he can take credit for having created awareness for the importance of Istanbul Greek in the framework of the history of Modern Greek: “Thus the Greek language of Constantinople, Bucharest and Iași, far from being of peripheral interest to the historian of the Greek language, should be central”.⁹ However he also remarks that “the extent of bilingualism among the Greek Orthodox community in Constantinople in the 18th century remains to be studied”.¹⁰

In a forthcoming contribution I have tried, thanks to the invaluable support and help by Peter Mackridge, to analyze the history of multilingualism in the cityscape of Istanbul from the eighteenth to the twenty-first centuries under the premises of linguistic ecology and translanguaging.¹¹ Following up that matter, in the first part of this contribution I will focus mainly, but not only, on the nineteenth century, as a period evolving from “Phanariot” to “post-Phanariot”, whereas I will turn back to the eighteenth century, Peter Mackridge’s main concern, at the end of the article. An important aspect in this regard is the relationship between texts written in Greek and Turkish, especially song texts, which developed from the Phanariot songs of the eighteenth-century manuscript tradition to the printed musical anthologies of the nineteenth century. Furthermore, I want to touch on the issue of teaching and learning of the other’s language. Language learning and the connected

6. *Ibidem*, p. 123.

7. Especially in: Peter Mackridge, “Some literary representations of spoken Greek before nationalism (1750-1801)”, in the *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Greek Linguistics*, ed. Th. Georgakopoulos - Th. Soula Pavlidou - M. Pechlivanos - A. Alexiadou - J. Androutsopoulos - A. Kalokairinos - St. Skopeteas - K. Stathi, Berlin, Romiosini, 2017, pp. 17-44; and, concerning Turkish: Mackridge, “Borrowing and code switching in Phanariot Greek”.

8. Peter Mackridge, *Γλωσσάρια και λεξιλογικές παρατηρήσεις σε φαναριώτικα κείμενα, 1750-1800. Συμβολή στην ελληνική λεξικογραφία*, ANEMI, <bit.ly/3NU1vOh>, last update December 2021.

9. Mackridge, “Some literary representations of spoken Greek before nationalism”, p. 26.

10. Mackridge, “Enlightenment and entertainment”, p. 119.

11. Matthias Kappler, “Language contact in a multicultural urban setting: Greek and Turkish in Istanbul through the centuries”, *2ο Διεθνές Συνέδριο για τις Γλωσσικές Επαφές στα Βαλκάνια και στη Μικρά Ασία*, organized by the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 8-10 November 2019.

language attitudes are important factors and indicators of bilingualism, and concern both speech communities, Grecophones and Turcophones. Therefore, they must be studied together: on the one hand we have a bulk of didactic material dedicated to the learning of Greek and the alphabetization of Turkish, addressed mainly to the Turcophone Christians in Anatolia but published in most of the cases in Istanbul, and, on the other hand, an intense production of language material for Grecophone learners aiming at the acquisition of Turkish.¹² Both activities certainly contributed to the bilingualism of both the Greek- and Turkish-speaking Christian Orthodox population and favoured the mutual need and practice of linguistic mediation and cooperation.

2. Greek-Turkish bilingualism in Istanbul and language learning in the nineteenth century

Skarlatos Vyzandios, the author of a famous nineteenth-century description of Istanbul (*Η Κωνσταντινούπολις ή Περιγραφή τοπογραφική, αρχαιολογική και ιστορική*, Athens 1869) writes in the third volume of his work:

[Π]άντες μὲν οἱ ὑπήκοοι ἐκ τῶν κατοίκων τῆς ΚΠ εἶνε τοῦλάχιστον δι-
γλωσσοι· διότι ἕκαστος αὐτῶν εἶνε ἠναγκασμένος ἵνα μάθη παρεκτὸς
τῆς μητρικῆς αὐτοῦ γλώσσης, καὶ τὴν Τουρκικὴν, ὡς ἄφευκτον διὰ τὰς
μετὰ τοῦ ἐπικρατοῦντος ἔθνους καθημερινὰς αὐτῶν σχέσεις.
(‘All the subjects [meaning the non-Muslims; M.K.] of the population of
Istanbul are at least bilingual, because everyone is obliged to learn Turkish
besides his mothertongue, which is unavoidable for the everyday relations
with the dominating nation’.)¹³

This seems to contradict what Alexis Alexandris states, i.e. that “Constantinopolitan Greeks – with the exception of the karamanlis – born before the 1910s did not, as a general rule, speak Turkish”.¹⁴ For an analysis of Vyzandios’ quote I refer the reader to the afore-mentioned forthcoming

12. Matthias Kappler, “Konflikt und Ideologie in den griechischen Grammatiken des Osmanischen im 19. Jahrhundert”, in *Einheit und Vielfalt in der türkischen Welt. Materialien der 5. Deutschen Turkologenkonferenz, Universität Mainz*, ed. Hendrik Boeschoten - Heidi Stein, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 2007, pp. 80-93.

13. Skarlatos Vyzandios, *Η Κωνσταντινούπολις ή Περιγραφή τοπογραφική, αρχαιολογική και ιστορική*, vol. III, Athens, 1869, p. 592.

14. Alexis Alexandris, *The Greek Minority of Istanbul and Greek-Turkish Relations, 1918-1974*, Athens, 1983, p. 192.

contribution,¹⁵ where I argue that the crucial point is not a theoretically measurable grade of bilingualism, but rather the individual bilingual mode of each speaker on a continuum, since the actual competence of Turkish depends on many factors, such as social rank, professional activity, age, or gender. In fact, Vyzandios refers mainly to those “Greeks mixed into the politics of Turkey”, as the quotation goes on (“...ἡ ἀφορμὴ τῆς ἀναμίξεως τῶν Γραικῶν εἰς τὰ πολιτικὰ τῆς Τουρκίας”),¹⁶ while a more than rudimentary knowledge of Turkish was not necessary for a Greek or Jewish inhabitant of Pera or Tatavla who was not particularly involved into Ottoman administration and thus did not have to leave the quarter he/she lived in.¹⁷ For the eighteenth century, Peter Mackridge has already pointed to the “necessity” to know Turkish on behalf of an administrative elite: “Οἱ ἴδιοι οἱ Φαναριώτες που κατείχαν τα υψηλά αξιώματα στην Οθωμανική Αυτοκρατορία ἔπρεπε να γνωρίζουν τα τουρκικά –και τη λαϊκή προφορική γλώσσα και την περίπλοκη γλώσσα της διοίκησης και της λογοτεχνίας– και οἱ αξιωματούχοι που συνεργάζονταν μαζί τους ἔπρεπε και αυτοί να μάθουν αρκετά τούρκικα”,¹⁸ and this seems to be true also for a part of the nineteenth century; however, as we will see below, things are more complex.

Alexandris takes his assertion from the fact that only in 1894/95 Turkish was introduced as a compulsory subject in the Greek schools of Istanbul.¹⁹ This may have led to a transitory situation at the turning of the centuries with a generational gap in Greek-Turkish bilingualism. An example is the novel *Loxandra* by Maria Iordanidou, written in 1963 but set in Istanbul between 1874 and 1914, in which the old Loxandra, the protagonist of the novel, does not understand Turkish, while her daughters and grand-daughters do.²⁰

However, in spite of the introduction of compulsory Turkish teaching as late as in the last years of the nineteenth century, Turkish did have a place in

15. Kappler, “Language contact in a multicultural urban setting”.

16. Vyzandios, *Η Κωνσταντινούπολις*, p. 592.

17. For this and other information on multilingual Istanbul, specifically Pera and its “spatial segregation”, see Johann Strauss, “Linguistic diversity and everyday life in the Ottoman cities of the Eastern Mediterranean and the Balkans (late 19th - early 20th century)”, *The History of the Family*, vol. 16 (2011) 126-141; in particular pp. 132 and 137.

18. Mackridge, “Ο Βούλγαρης φαναριώτης στιχουργός;”, p. 256.

19. Alexandris, *The Greek Minority of Istanbul*, p. 46; cf. also Clogg, “The Greek Millet in the Ottoman Empire”, p. 198.

20. Maria Iordanidou, *Λωξάντρα*, Athens, Hestia, 1990, p. 217. For more instances of language contact in this novel see Matthias Kappler, *Turkish Language Contacts in South-Eastern Europe*, Istanbul, The Isis Press, 2002, pp. 75, 77.

the curricula of the Greek schools in Istanbul quite earlier, also in the 1860s, when Vyzandios wrote. This is reported by Dimitrios Christidis in 1865, who speaks about five Greek schools where Turkish teaching staff was available, and in three of them Turkish was actually taught (the Great School in Phanar and two schools in Pera and Tatavla).²¹

Summing up: although individual bilinguality (as opposed to societal bilingualism, following the terminology of Hamers and Blanc)²² may have existed, a general Greek-Turkish bilingualism seems not to be the rule in nineteenth-century Istanbul.²³ This can be seen by numerous complaints of contemporary sources about lacking knowledge of Turkish in the Greek community and the attempts to overcome the deficit by a fervid production of didactic language material, such as grammars and dictionaries. Vyzandios himself laments the outpacing of the Greeks' language monopole in Ottoman administration (which they held under the Phanariots in the eighteenth century) by the Armenians due to the latter's better knowledge of Turkish,²⁴ and in the same years Christidis recommends parents to think about the future of their children and to make them learn Turkish in spite of "prejudices".²⁵ Later, in the 1880s, also I. Ordouoglous propagates the learning of Turkish.²⁶

Thus, while in the eighteenth century the knowledge of Turkish seems to be confined mostly to a political and administrative elite, which we may often, though not always, identify with the Phanariots, the nineteenth century is characterized by a campaign in favour of studying Turkish on a wider societal base. The result is that, during the second half of the nineteenth century, and specifically between 1850 and 1900, a large number of Greek-Turkish grammars (at least 13) was printed, some of them with various editions (such as the most widely used *Γραμματική της Οθωμανικής Γλώσσης* by Ioannis

21. Dimitrios Christidis, *Τα σχολεία της Κωνσταντινουπόλεως*, Constantinople, 1865, p. 40.

22. Josiane F. Hamers - Michel H. A. Blanc, *Bilinguality and Bilingualism*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1989, p. 6.

23. In an e-mail, Peter Mackridge wrote me that an informant, who grew up in Istanbul after World War II, warned him against the assumption that all Greeks of Istanbul used to be bilingual: "He told me that his father, for instance, was more or less a monolingual Greek speaker".

24. Vyzandios, *Η Κωνσταντινούπολις*, p. 593. See also Johann Strauss, "The millets and the Ottoman language: the contribution of Ottoman Greeks to Ottoman letters", *Die Welt des Islams*, vol. 35 (1995) 189-249, in particular pp. 191-208 and 211.

25. Christidis, *Τα σχολεία της Κωνσταντινουπόλεως*, p. 40.

26. Strauss, "The millets and the Ottoman language", pp. 231-232.

Chloros with four editions in 1887, 1890, 1894, and 1900).²⁷ Additionally, at least 28 language books not being proper grammars (i.e. exercise and dialogue books, chrestomathies, hornbooks) and nine bilingual dictionaries were published in the same period of time. This remarkable editorial production clearly shows the need of Turkish language acquisition on behalf of the Greek-speaking population. What is more, the prologues of the grammars give us an impressive insight into the linguistic attitudes of Ottoman Greeks towards the official Ottoman Turkish language, within the ideological framework of a diffused Ottomanism typical for the post-Phanariot society especially in the second half of the nineteenth century. These pronouncedly positive attitudes towards Ottoman Turkish (also in the sense of the language ideology of the *elsine-i selâse*, the “three languages” – Arabic, Persian and Turkish – composing the “Ottoman language”) include aesthetical, political and economical arguments which were circumstantially analyzed in previous studies.²⁸

3. Grecophones vs Turcophones

However, as has been mentioned before, the native language of the Greek Orthodox *millet* was not exclusively Greek, since there was an important Turkish-speaking part of the community who had migrated from Asia minor to the cities, especially to Istanbul, the so-called “Karamanli / Καραμανλήδες”. The relations between the Grecophone and the Turcophone communities in Istanbul were not unproblematic, since the latter were often considered as inferior in status, not pertaining to the administrative Ottoman Greek elite of the Phanariots, or their descendants, and the newly formed (non-Phanariot) urban Ottoman Greek bureaucracy, though gaining more and more importance in the intellectual life of the Ottoman capital during the nineteenth century. The literature developed by the Greek Orthodox Turcophone community is conventionally called “Karamanlidika”, according to the homonymous extensive bibliographical work compiled by Sévérien Salaville and Eugène Dalleggio from the 1950s to the 1970s and continued by Evangelia Balta

27. A fifth edition, entitled *Γραμματική της Τουρκικής Γλώσσης*, appeared in 1911. The change from “Ottoman” to “Turkish” in the title is not a coincidence, and is related to the Young Turk revolution in 1908 and the foundation of the literary group and journal *Genç Kalemler* in Thessaloniki (April 1911). See Matthias Kappler, “Maintenance and renovation in the attitudes of Ottoman Greek intellectuals towards Ottoman Turkish”, in *Language Policy and Planning in the Mediterranean World*, ed. Marilena Karyoleμου - Pavlos Pavlou, Newcastle upon Tyne, Cambridge Scholars, 2013, pp. 72-85, in particular p. 74.

28. Kappler, “Konflikt und Ideologie”; Kappler, “Maintenance and renovation”.

until today.²⁹ “Karamanlidika” is a heterogenous corpus from the linguistic, historical, genre, and functional points of view, the only unifying criterion being the fact that we are dealing with Turkish texts written in Greek alphabet. It can thus be assumed that the writing of Turkish words in Phanariot texts may be influenced by Karamanlidika models; I will come back to this issue in chapter 5 of this contribution.

The main input for the flourishing Karamanlidika literature during the eighteenth century was the urgent need of liturgical material, and, generally speaking, religious texts, in order to reach the Turcophone flock with no knowledge of Greek. Nevertheless, the primary position of Greek in the religious domain was by no means in discussion, quite the contrary: already in the eighteenth century, before nationalism, there were organized efforts by the Ecumenical Patriarchate to hellenize Turkish-speaking Orthodox Christians, for example sending young Turcophone Greeks from Kayseri to study at the Great School of the Phanar in Istanbul in order to learn Greek.³⁰ Of course, the edition of bilingual books, from the very beginning of Karamanlidika book production in the early eighteenth century, is another evidence for the promotion of Greek on behalf of the editors.

The hellenization activities were intensified with the growing nationalism: the Karamanlides were conceived by the Ecumenical Patriarchate as a “problem” already at the beginning of the nineteenth century, but it is only in the second half of the nineteenth century that the so-called “re-Hellenization” (since Karamanlides were considered Greeks who “had forgotten” their original language) took place systematically.³¹ The basic concept was that of “civilizing” the *millet*. In this effort the Greek Kingdom and its foreign policy played an important role through the establishment of schools with teachers

29. For a survey of the linguistic approach to Karamanlidika texts, see Matthias Kappler, “Karamanli”, in *Encyclopedia of Turkic Languages and Linguistics Online*, general editor Lars Johanson, Leiden, Brill. Consulted online on 9 June 2023, <dx.doi.org/10.1163/2667-3029_ETLO_SIM_032110>. First published online: 2023.

30. Richard Clogg, “A *millet* within a *millet*: the Karamanlides”, in *Ottoman Greeks in the Age of Nationalism. Politics, economy and society in the nineteenth century*, ed. Dimitri Gondicas - Charles Issawi, Princeton, 1999, pp. 115-142, in particular p. 122. [Reprinted in: Richard Clogg, *I Kath' imas Anatoli. Studies in Ottoman Greek History*, Istanbul, The Isis Press, 2004, pp. 387-410.]

31. Sia Anagnostopoulou, “Greek diplomatic authorities in Anatolia”, in *Cries and Whispers in Karamanlidika Books. Proceedings of the First International Conference on Karamanlidika Studies (Nicosia, 11th-13th September 2008)*, ed. Evangelia Balta - Matthias Kappler, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 2010, pp. 63-78, in particular pp. 64-68.

educated in Greece.³² Significant was also the contribution of the *Syllogoi*, the various Greek Ottoman societies, and the “Brotherhoods” in Anatolia, again because of their contribution to the organization of Greek-speaking school education.³³ All these attempts, and also those undertaken by the missionaries, were however crowned by a modest success, as it seems, since for communicational aims Turkish remained essential in spite of contrasting ideologies.³⁴

The sources with linguistic relevance concerning hellenization in the nineteenth century are essentially of two sorts: a) bilingual statutes of associations and brotherhoods, constituted primarily in Istanbul;³⁵ and b) didactic textbooks (grammars, phrase books etc.) used for the teaching of Greek as a second language and addressed to Turcophone Christians. A third possible source, bilingual periodicals, are rather a matter of the beginning of the twentieth century, as the most prominent example of *Αρετή*, which appears in 1912 in Istanbul, shows.³⁶

At this point I wish to present briefly one of these interesting sources. I am including this part here because Peter Mackridge was, among many other things, also involved in grammar studies, being himself a co-author of a significant grammar of Modern Greek. The book I want to describe belongs to the second category without being a grammar *sensu stricto*, but a language book that provides grammar rules together with texts and exercises. It was printed in 1885 in Istanbul, the author is Ilias Emmanouilidis. The title is:³⁷

32. Clogg, “A *millet* within a *millet*”, p. 129; Anagnostopoulou, “Greek diplomatic authorities in Anatolia”, *passim*.

33. Irini Renieri, “Xenophone Nevşehirli... Greek-souled Neapolitans’: The persistent yet hesitant dissemination of the Greek language in 1870s Nevşehir”, in *Cries and Whispers in Karamanlidika Books*, pp. 31-44.

34. Clogg, “A *millet* within a *millet*”, pp. 130-131; Renieri, “Xenophone Nevşehirli... Greek-Souled Neapolitans’”, p. 42.

35. Robert Anhegger, “Das Temaşa-i Dünya des Evangelinos Misailidis (1871/72) als Quelle zur karamanischen Sprach- und Kulturgeschichte”, in *Türkische Sprachen und Literaturen. Materialien der ersten deutschen Turkologen-Konferenz, Bamberg, 3.-6. Juli 1987*, ed. Ingeborg Baldauf-Klaus Kreiser-Semih Tezcan, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 1991, pp. 1-38, in particular p. 17; Renieri, “Xenophone Nevşehirli... Greek-Souled Neapolitans’”, p. 32.

36. See Evangelia Balta, “‘I Areti’ (La Vertu). Revue Micrasiatique illustrée, bi-mensuelle, parue en 1912”, *Journal of Turkish Studies*, vol. 20 (1996) 188-211. [Also in: *I kath’ imás Anatolí*, vol. 3 (1996) 71-115, and in E. Balta, *Problèmes et approches de l’histoire ottomane*, Istanbul, The Isis Press, 1997, pp. 201-241.]

37. Cf. for the full title: Séverien Salaville-Eugène Dalleggio, *Karamanlidika. Bibliographie analytique d’ouvrages en langue turque imprimés en caractères grecs*, vol. 3 (1866-1900), Athens, “Parnassos” Literary Society, 1974, nr. 229 (pp. 150-152). The book can be found

NEA METHODOΣ OYΣOYΛI ΔZEΔIΔ ΓIANI EΛΛHNIKA ΛIΣANHNH ΓIAZ-
MAK ANΛAMAK BE ΣOIEEMEK ITZOYN OΣOYΛ [...] HΛIAC K. EMMA-
NOYHAIΔHΣEΔEN Άλεμάν ούσουλίνδζε τεελιφ όλουνούπ [...], ΠIΠIΝΔZI
KHΣM. Άλληλοδιδακτικοοῦν σόν σηνηφῆ βέ Έλληνικοοῦν πIρIνδζI
σηνηφηνά μαχσοῦς. ΔEPI ΣAAΔET Παναγιώτης Σωτηριάδης Ματπα-
ασηνδά, 1885.

(‘New method, i.e. method to write, understand and speak the Greek language [...] composed by Ilias K. Emmanouilidis according to the German methodology [...] First part. For the last year of mutual teaching [*Allilodidaktikón*] and the first year of Greek schools [*Ellenikón*]. Istanbul, in the printing-house Panagiotis Sotiriadis, 1885’).

Interesting, for the sake of a “Karamanli” self-understanding and the language ideology of the Turcophones in the late nineteenth century, is the preface (F. 3r-4r).³⁸ After stating that any nation, and any individual, is marked by two distinctive features that differentiate them from each other, Emmanouilidis goes on saying:

Which are these two distinctive features? Religion and language. We, the Anatolian people, following the Christian Orthodox religion that has been inherited by our forefathers, if we do not master and save the Greek language given to us by our ancestors, don’t we cancel the human rules, and don’t we wound the natural laws?³⁹

On the following page, the author continues to defend a Christian, and therefore Greek identity of the Turcophone Anatolian population, vehemently rejecting the denomination of “Karamanli”:

Look: since the fact that we do not know Greek is considered like a defect and a guilt of ours, the ridiculing expression ‘Karamanli’ became like a fashion in every corner of Istanbul, and any person who does not know Greek is forced to bear that offending fashion, God forbid!! We do not ac-

in the Library of the Centre for Asia Minor Studies (Κέντρο Μικρασιατικών Σπουδών) in Athens.

38. The first five leaves of the book are unnumbered, and have been abbreviated by Salaville and Dalleggio with “F”.

39. “Νέδιο πού ιλι άλαϊμι φαρικά; μεζχέπ βέ λισάν. πIζ Άνατολή έχαλιεριοι πεδερλε-
ριμιζδέν μεβρους όλαν Χριστιάν Όρθόδοξος μεζχεπινέ ζαχιπ όλδουγουμούζ κιπι, έδζδα-
δημηζδάν πIζε τεβαρους ιτιμις όλαν Ρούμδζα λισανηνή (Έλληνική) δαχι τεμελλούκ βέ τε-
σαρούφ ιτιμέζ ισέκ, καβανίι ινσανγιεγι λάγβ, βέ σαραϊτι ταπιεγι δζερχ ιτιμις όλμάζμη
ιζ;” (F. 3r).

cept the nickname ‘Karamanli’ that was given to us unjustly... The people of Anatolia does not merit mockery...⁴⁰

Using the well-known argument of the “necessity” to learn the official language, Emmanouilidis, at the same time, mentions the “eloquence” of the state Ottoman language, following the rhetorics of his times, namely the emerging Helleno-Ottomanism, and also praising the official policy of the Ottoman state (in a period that was, under Abdülhamid II, anything but “free”!):⁴¹

Nevertheless, since we are beholden to study and learn the honorably elaborated and eloquent Turkish language as it is used by the subjects of the sublime Ottoman state we are proud of, so in this period marked by freedom we are beholden to endeavor to learn also Greek, the language of our fathers.⁴²

After this truly “post-Phanariot” preface, the book provides an extensive introduction chapter (pp. α’-ιε’) with a history of world languages and alphabets, beginning with the hieroglyphics, and including a list of “Tatar languages”, comprising also Mongol-Tungusic languages, as well as Circassian, Tajik and Tibetan.⁴³ The following 116 pages are divided into two parts: *Χαζηρολήκ* (‘preparation’, 17 pages), with word lists grouped according to semantic fields and beginning, like in the Ottoman *tuhfe*-tradition,⁴⁴ with the

40. “Πάκκηνηζκι Έλληνηκά λισανηνή πιλμεδιγιμιζ πιζέ πικρ κουσουρ βέ καπιχάτ κιπί αδδ οληνδηγηνδάν, Δέρ[-ι] Αλιγεβιν χέρ κοσσεσινδέ Καραμανλή λάφζι ιστιχζά παχσι πικρ μόδα κιπί ολδού· βέ χέρ ρούμδζα πιλμεγεν ζάτ ἴσπου χακααρατλή μόδαγι ταχαμμουλέ μεδζπούρδρι. χάσα !! Πιζέ ναχάκ γερέ άτφ οληνάν Καραμανληλάρ έλκαπήνή καπούλ ιτμέγιζ...” (F. 3r).

41. See Sia Anagnostopoulou - Matthias Kappler, “Ζήτω ζήτω ο Σουλτάνος / Bin yaşa Padişahimiz: the *Millet-i Rum* singing the praises of the Sultan in the framework of Helleno-Ottomanism”, *Archivum Ottomanicum*, vol. 23 (2005-2006, Mélanges en l’honneur de Elizabeth A. Zachariadou) 47-78.

42. “Πουνοὸν ἰλὲ περαπέρ μουφτεχίρ ὀλδουγουμοῦζ τεπαϊέτι δεβλέτι ἀλιγιέι Όσμανιενὶν ζαχίπ ὀλδουγού Τουρκι λισάνη σερεφπέζιρι πελαγετνισάνη τεαλοού ιτμεγέ μεδγιούν πουλουνδουγουμοῦζ κιπί σού ζεμάνι χουρριγέτ νισανδὲ Πεδερλεριμιζιν λισανή ὀλάν Έλληνηκά λισανηνή δαχί τεαλοῦμ βέ τεκεσσοῦπ ιτμεγέ μεδγιούνιζ” (F. 3r-3v).

43. “Καλμουκ, Μονκόλ, Καπτζάκ, Τζερκέζ, Νογιάι, Ταδζικ, Ουζπέκ, Τουρκμὲν, Τονκοῦζ, Ουῖγουρικ, Μαντσιουρικ βέ Θιβητιανικ λισανλερι. Ουῖγουρικ λισανηνδάν δαχί Τούρκ λισανή μουστάκδηρ” (‘[...] Turkish is derived from the Uyghuric language’); p. στ’, cf. also Salaville - Dalleggio, *Karamanlidika*, vol. 3, p. 151.

44. *Tuhfe* is the term for rhymed dictionaries of the Ottoman tradition, initially for Arabic and Persian, but later on also for other languages, namely from South-East Europe, thus for

religious sphere and the word “God”, and *Μέθοδος* (‘method / textbook’, 99 pages) with small texts, dialogues, word lists, grammar tables and rules, and translation exercises. This part comprises, from p. 16 onwards, scattered sections called *Γραμματική*, where more theoretical grammatical notions, such as terminology, word classes etc., are explained through a dialogue (in Turkish) between teacher and pupil, a way of teaching grammar known from both the Greco-Latin and “Oriental” (Arabo-Persian) tradition. The grammar is here subdivided into the traditional four levels, i.e. *φθογγολογία*, *τυπικόν*, *έτυμολογικόν*, and *συντακτικόν* (p. 16).

These grammatical dialogues deserve a more in-depth analysis in the framework of grammar studies, but this is not the aim of the present contribution. I would rather like to link this kind of sources to other texts that can shed light on the bilingual mode of Ottoman Greeks. Indeed, what we can see is that such books contributed to the shaping of identity, but also, unintendedly, to the development of bilingualism in a complex social setting. These seemingly contrasting efforts – on the one hand the hellenization of the Turkish-speaking population, on the other hand the propagation for the acquisition of Turkish by the Greek-speaking majority – helped to bring the two parts of the *millet*, speakers of Greek and of Turkish, linguistically together. In this framework we witness another sector of the nineteenth-century bilingual publishing industry in Istanbul: song anthologies – and thus come back to Peter Mackridge’s main concerns.

4. Multilingualism in the Phanariot manuscript tradition and the printed anthologies of the nineteenth century

The writer of Constantinopolitan descent Alexandra Papadopoulou (1867-1906) reports in one of her short stories:

Ἡ Κάκια, ὅταν μᾶς ἐπεσκέπτετο, ἐξηπλώνετο στὸ διβάνι καὶ ἐτραγουδοῦσε τούρκικα. (‘When Kakia came to see us, she lay down on the sofa and sung Turkish songs’.)⁴⁵

Greek, too; cf. Matthias Kappler, “Ottoman versified dictionaries for Balkan languages: a comparative analysis”, *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie*, vol. 37.1 (2001) 10-20.

45. Alexandra Papadopoulou, *Κόρη ευπειθής και άλλα διηγήματα*, Athens, Nefeli, 1993, p. 97.

Since Papadopoulou's stories are set in a strictly Greek-speaking surrounding, the episode is a hint on a special function of Turkish in the nineteenth-century Ottoman Greek society: music. In fact, more than twenty musical anthologies containing Greek and Turkish songs have been printed during the nineteenth century; most of them are clearly addressed to a Greek-speaking public, which can be seen by the fact that many of them contain also other texts in Greek, such as short stories, proverbs, *billets doux*, or other love-related prose and poetry texts. Moreover, besides whole texts in Greek or Turkish, the latter always written in Greek script and therefore considered as "Karamanlidika", there are also some bilingual and even trilingual specimens.⁴⁶

It can be easily imagined that the huge interest in Ottoman music with Turkish lyrics (called *güfte*), which emerges from all these sources, concerns not only the Greeks, but all the urban communities of the major Ottoman cities, especially Istanbul. While the Greek musical anthologies were the first ones to be printed (beginning with *Ευτέρπη* in 1830),⁴⁷ in the second half of the nineteenth century we find printed song books (*güfte mecmuaları*) in Armenian script (the first one appeared in 1865),⁴⁸ and in the Arabic alphabet (beginning with *Mecmu'a-i Kârâhâ ve Naqşihâ ve Şarqiyyât* by Hâşim Bey, 1852).⁴⁹

Apart from Turkish and Greek, multilingualism in musical texts concerns also other languages, first of all Romanian (cf. below footnote nr. 58), and even French. However, in this framework we must not forget the two "Islamic" languages, Arabic and Persian. Both languages occupied a very significant place in Ottoman culture, Arabic in the religious and scientific domains, and Persian in the literary field, and, together with Turkish, constituted the

46. Matthias Kappler, "L'amour voilé: poésie bilingue et plurilingue dans les anthologies grecques et bulgares des chansons ottomanes du 19^{ème} siècle", *Mediterranean Language Review*, vol. 10 (1998) 146-168.

47. See the full list in Matthias Kappler, *Türkischsprachige Liebeslyrik in Griechisch-Osmanischen Liedanthologien des 19. Jahrhunderts*, Berlin, Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 2002, pp. 744-747.

48. See Turgut Kut, "Ermeni harfleriyle Türkçe basılmış şarkı ve kanto mecmuaları", *Müteferrika*, vol. 1 (1993) 19-43.

49. Of course, as for the Greek tradition (see immediately below), also the *güfte* manuscript history in Arabic script is much older, beginning probably in the sixteenth century (Owen Wright, *Word Without Songs. A musicological study of an early Ottoman anthology and its precursors*, London, SOAS, 1992). For other manuscripts see Etem Ruhi Üngör, *Türk Musikisi Güfteler Antolojisi*, İstanbul, Eren, 1981, p. xvii; for Ottoman Turkish printed anthologies in Arabic and Latin script of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries see *ibidem*, pp. xviii-xxvii.

construct of the “three languages” (*elsine-i şelâse*) in the Ottoman language ideology, mentioned above at the end of chapter 2. Especially Persian language and culture exerted an immensely important influence upon the Ottoman musical (and poetical) tradition. In fact, we can find some specimens of Arabic and Persian texts, written in Greek letters, in the Ottoman Greek sources, both manuscript and printed. Examples for the printed sources are the Arabic songs contained in *Πανδώρα* (1846), and *Απάνθισμα ή Μεδζμουάι Μαχαμάτ* (1856).⁵⁰ Concerning the manuscript tradition, I had the opportunity to have a look at the manuscript 44 from the library of the Greek Syllogos of Constantinople (now in the library of the Türk Tarih Kurumu [Turkish History Society] in Ankara). This manuscript belonged originally to a physician from Leiden who compiled some pages about medicine and pharmacy in 1717, which is the only date provided.⁵¹ At a later stage, an extensive collection of Turkish songs written in Greek alphabet and accompanied by Byzantine musical notation was added. The largest part of this precious material has been attributed by Kyriakos Kalaitzidis to the hand of the famous composer Petros the Peloponnesian.⁵² Petros died in 1778, so the material might be approximately contemporary to BAR 927 (see below chapter 5), or even earlier. Like usually in Ottoman, Persian is transcribed in Ottoman phonology, and although many Ottoman texts contain only Persian lexical material imbedded into a Turkish syntactical matrix structure, ms. 44 of the Syllogos contains some songs that can be considered as Persian (though not evidenced as such). As an example, I transcribe below four lines of a song I had the chance to see. The whole syntax of the verses, the use of the final verb in the *miyân* (‘middle’ verse), not existent in Ottoman, and of the copula of the rhyme word (*-am*) qualify the song as undoubtedly “Persian”. The following excerpt may suffice (ms. 44 of the Syllogos/Türk Tarih Kurumu, p. 6):⁵³

50 See Kappler, *Türkischsprachige Liebeslyrik*, pp. 33, 35.

51 Paul Moraux, *Catalogue des manuscrits grecs (Fonds du Syllogos)*, Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1989, pp. 76-77.

52. Kyriakos Kalaitzidis, “Το χειρόγραφο αριθ. 44 της βιβλιοθήκης του Ελληνικού Φιλολογικού Συλλόγου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως”, in *2ο Διεθνές Μουσικολογικό και Διεπιστημονικό Συνέδριο “Από χορού και ομοθυμαδόν”*, Volos, 2017, pp. 159-179, in particular p. 160.

53. According to the original impagination in pages. The ms. has been subsequently numbered in sheets, but I could not elicit the new numbering of the sheet on the picture I saw. On the website of the Türk Tarih Kurumu (www.ttk.gov.tr/kutuphane/) the shelfmark of the manuscript is YS/0044, however there is no description, only the indication “Médecine Musicque”, following the denomination by Moraux, *Catalogue des manuscrits grecs*. A slightly

γγέχ πάχρι γγεχι χεπάπι άσκάμ
 γγέχ σισέ γγέχι σεράπι άσκάμ
 ρουσέν ναζάρι μέγερ πού πινέμ
 γγέχ ζερόε γγέχ άφιτάπι άσκάμ

geh bahr-i gehi hebab-i aşkam
geh şise geh-i şerab-i aşkam
ruşen nazar-i meyer bü-binem
*geh zerre geh afitab-i aşkam*⁵⁴

It is well-known that the printing activities in the nineteenth century origin from the manuscript tradition of the so-called “Phanariot verses” (φαναριώτικα στιχουργήματα), or “Phanariot songs”, as Peter Mackridge preferred to call them. Greek song texts destined to be sung in the “Oriental” manner, with respective instructions according to the Ottoman tradition (μακάμ – *maqâm*, ουσούλι – *usûl*) can be found already in the Phanariot *mismagies* (< Ott. *mecmu'a*) manuscripts, very much en vogue in the eighteenth century, and in printed books of that tradition, such as the *Έρωτος αποτελέσματα*.⁵⁵ The Turkish text material (as well as the music, of course, though I cannot speak of the musical aspects, since I am not a musicologist) contained in both printed and manuscript sources derives from the Ottoman-Persian poetry tradition with its related lyrical *güfte* genres (first of all *şarki* and, to a lesser extent, *gazel*), but it must be assumed that the Turkish texts written in Greek characters were mediated by the Phanariot *mismagies*. Unfortunately, the connection between the Turkish songs printed in the Greek anthologies of the nineteenth century and the Phanariot manuscripts has not

different version of the present song is reported in the *güfte* (song text) anthology by Üngör, *Türk Musikisi Güfteler Antolojisi*, p. 200.

54. This is not the place for an elaborate critical apparatus; however a very free translation could be: ‘Sometimes I am the sea and sometimes the bubbles of love, sometimes I am the bottle and sometimes the wine of love; if only I see someone with a bright glance, I am sometimes the atom and sometimes the sun of love’. I am indebted to my colleague Stefano Pellò (Venice) for helping me to understand the song.

55. From the musicological point of view see Kyriakos Kalaitzidis, *Post-Byzantine Music Manuscripts as a Source for Oriental Secular Music (15th to early 19th century)*, Würzburg, Ergon, 2012, and now Kyriakos L. Kalaitzidis, *Κοσμική μουσική στη χειρόγραφη παράδοση της φαλτικής τέχνης (15'-19' αι.)*, Athens, Institute of Byzantine Musicology, 2020. For a bibliography to the Phanariot poetry tradition see the “Βιβλιογραφία για τα φαναριώτικα στιχουργήματα”, edited by Stavroula Lofiti and Giorgos Myaris in *Φαναριώτικα και αστικά στιχουργήματα*, pp. 481-488.

yet been studied sufficiently, and only a few manuscript Turkish texts have been published so far.⁵⁶ Therefore, although the printed anthologies have undoubtedly their origin in eighteenth-century, or early nineteenth-century manuscripts, the direct models in Turkish language have not yet been identified and thus the research of the text transmission of Turkish songs in Ottoman Greek sources lags behind the respective study of songs written in Greek. The only known manuscript with a consistent part of Turkish songs connected to a printed book is a manuscript conserved in the Library of the Romanian Academy in Bucarest (BAR 370), which is a faithful copy of the first printed anthology, *Ευτέρπη* (1830).⁵⁷ The interesting part of the manuscript, which comprises 201 ff., is a section the unknown author added after the copy of *Ευτέρπη*, entitled *Μεσμοᾶ* (i.e. *μισμαγιά*, *mecmu'a*), beginning at f. 140r. An ongoing research will identify the Turkish songs in that section and their correspondence to other Phanariot and post-Phanariot manuscripts and books; in the meantime this and other issues are of the most urgent desiderata of future research, which will have to trace back the history of the printed Turkish texts and their connection with the Phanariot *mismagies*, as well as with the Ottoman manuscript *güfte* anthologies.⁵⁸ In this framework the question concerns also the mediators: which is the role of the Turcophone part of the *millet*, underestimated by the Greek-speaking elite, in this cultural transfer? The well-known Austrian Turcologist Andreas Tietze underlined the significant role of the Turkish-speaking Orthodox Christian intelligentsija in the distribution and reception of European literature in the Ottoman Muslim society;⁵⁹ could there be a similar role in the opposite direction, the mediation of Turkish literary texts in the *millet-i Rum*? And which kind of impact had the ongoing efforts of hellenization of the Karamanlides, outlined in the

56. For example the Turkish part of the ms. Genn. 725, in Ilia Chatzipanagioti-Sangmeister - Matthias Kappler, "Thoughts on the Turkish verses in Phanariot poetry collections (1750-1821)", in *Cries and Whispers in Karamanlidika Books*, pp. 219-240. The largest part of the nineteenth-century printed production in Turkish language – more precisely all the *şarki* contained in the Greek anthologies printed during that century – have been studied by Kappler, *Türkischsprachige Liebeslyrik*.

57. Constantin Litzica, *Catalogul manuscriselor grecești*, București, Carol Göbl, 1909, p. 121, ms nr. 253 (370).

58. The *μεσμοᾶ* section of BAR 370 contains also two songs in Romanian («βλάχικα», 189r-190v), which have to be studied in future. A Romanian song is also included in the printed anthology *Καλλίφωνος Σειρήν* (1859); see Kappler, *Türkischsprachige Liebeslyrik*, p. 35.

59. Andreas Tietze, "Ethnicity and change in Ottoman intellectual history", *Turcica*, vol. 21-23 (1991) 385-395.

previous chapter, in this process? Another interesting point is the interrelation between Greek and Turkish texts in the same anthologies. Many of the books, such as *Ευτέρπη*, contain songs in both languages in the same volume, while the second printed anthology, *Πανδώρα*, consists of two separate volumes, the first one (1843) with only Greek songs, and the second (1846) containing texts in Turkish. The texts apparently do not have a connection between them, and, what is more, the Greek songs, at least at a first and cursory reading, do not contain any Turkish words, very in contrast to the Phanariot songs in the eighteenth century. Is this the linguistic reflection of an ideological gap due to the political and social evolution leading eventually to 1821? To answer such questions, the research in Phanariot songs must be widened under the perspective of their evolution towards “post-Phanariot songs”.

5. Phanariot texts and Karamanlidika

The issue of “diacritics”

As a *coda* of this contribution, which seems to open more questions than to answer them, I want to turn back to the eighteenth century and touch on quite a specific aspect of the interrelation between texts in Greek and in Turkish. In fact, a couple of years ago, Peter Mackridge called my attention to a possible contact between Grecophone and Turcophone literacy in the eighteenth century, which, according to him, has been neglected in Karamanlidika studies. His point concerns the use of diacritic signs in Phanariot texts, especially in Turkish words, to denote the consonants [b] [d] [ʃ] [dʒ], which, in the Greek alphabet, cannot be rendered in one grapheme alone. The use of dotted letters was wide-spread in Ottoman Greek texts contained in many other mixed Phanariot manuscripts in the second half of the eighteenth century. The earliest Phanariot manuscript with diacritics seems to be the *μισμαγιά* 927 at the Library of the Romanian Academy (BAR 927), which was written by Petros the Peloponnesian and can be dated around 1770, and is thus the oldest surviving manuscript of Phanariot songs.⁶⁰ The document contains a bilingual (Turkish-Greek) song, where the dotted pi (π̣) occurs. As a second example may serve the Turkish song texts in the ms. 725 of the Gennadius

60. Kalaitzidis, *Κοσμική μουσική*, pp. 99-102, 394-395. The music of the bilingual song has been transcribed by Thomas Apostolopoulos and Kyriakos Kalaitzidis, *Rediscovered Musical Treasures. Exegeses of secular oriental music*, București, Editura Universității Naționale de Muzică București, 2019, p. 94.

Library, written between 1769 and 1795, and published by Chatzipanagioti-Sangmeister and Kappler.⁶¹ The grapheme in question in this case, occurring in all the Turkish songs of the manuscript, is the double-dotted sigma (ö and ç). Petros the Peloponnesian, in the above-mentioned manuscript 44 from the library of the Greek Syllogos of Constantinople (before 1778) used diacritic signs to note Turkish (Persian/Arabic) consonants that do not have a single-graphematic correspondance in the Greek alphabet, namely single dots on sigma and pi. Such examples could be continued in great quantities. Peter Mackridge, who was very interested in this question, argued that these diacritics originated from Karamanlidika. Actually, in some of his earlier contributions he even took as granted that the use of dotted and double-dotted letters such as π̇, δ̇, ö, and τ̇ζ in Phanariot texts was an adaption from a similar use in earlier eighteenth-century Karamanlidika texts.⁶²

The problem is that we cannot securely state the first occurrence of a dotted letter in a Karamanlidika text, because Karamanlidika research has been traditionally focused on the printed production, while the study of manuscripts is only in its infancy. Actually, diacritics have raised the interest of scholars dealing with Karamanlidika from the very beginning of the research in that direction, but, as has been said above, only in the domain of printed matters.⁶³ The first double-dotted sigma in a printed Karamanlidika text dates most probably from 1784 (*Πισαλέγι Σερρίφι*),⁶⁴ while the use of diacritics has been systematized only in the 30s and 40s of the nineteenth century

61. Chatzipanagioti-Sangmeister - Kappler, "Thoughts on the Turkish verses in Phanariot poetry collections", pp. 229-240.

62. Mackridge, "Some literary representations of spoken Greek before nationalism", p. 33, and Mackridge, "Borrowing and code switching in Phanariot Greek", p. 9. In both publications Mackridge mentions also a triple-dotted sigma, and makes the plausible suggestion that the three dots were borrowed from the Arabic grapheme *šim* شِم, which represents the same sound [ʃ]. I have never seen this grapheme in Karamanlidika books.

63. Sophocles A. Houdaverdoglous-Theodotos, "Η Τουρκόφωνος Ελληνική Φιλολογία, 1453-1924", *Επετηρίς Εταιρείας Βυζαντινών Σπουδών*, vol. 7 (1930) 299-307, in particular p. 304; Jean Deny, "Le géronidif en -(y)ışin d'après les écrits du moine Ioanni Hierothéos en turc des grecs-orthodoxes turcophones d'Anatolie", *Körösi Csoma-Archivum*, vol. 3 (1941) 119-128; János Eckmann, "Yunan Harfli Karamanli İmlası Hakkında", in *Türk Dili ve Tarihi Hakkında Araştırmalar I*, ed. Hasan Eren - Tibor Halasi-Kun, Ankara, 1950, pp. 27-31; Michael Miller, *The Karamanli Texts. The historical changes in their script and phonology*, unpublished PhD thesis, Indiana University, 1974.

64. Sévérien Salaville - Eugène Dalleggio. *Karamanlidika. Bibliographie analytique d'ouvrages en langue turque imprimés en caractères grecs*, vol. 1 (1584-1850), Athens, Centre for Asia Minor Studies, 1958, pp. 82-88, nr. 20.

thanks to the endeavor of the British and Foreign Bible Society through their protestant bible translations. This kind of “standardization” has been called “the Athenian system” by J. Deny and J. Eckmann, according to the main printing place of the bibles.⁶⁵ However, we don’t have evidence for this use in manuscripts, at least not before the second half of the eighteenth century.⁶⁶ At the beginning of 2022 we had long (written) conversations with Peter about this issue, who was very concerned about it during the last months of his life, but we could not get to a solution.

All the mentioned Phanariot manuscripts contain either Greek and Turkish texts, or/and bilingual songs. It thus appears natural that the writing practices of Greek and Turkish influenced each other, especially in bilingual manuscripts or texts. Yet, we do not have, at this stage of the research, evidence from earlier Karamanlidika manuscripts, so that Peter Mackridge, in early 2022, revised his assumption of a Karamanlidika origin in the use of diacritics in the Phanariot texts in occasion of a contribution for the new Brill Encyclopedia of Greek Language and Linguistics (where his article on Phanariot language will hopefully appear posthumously). At any rate, there was definitely mutual interference, though perhaps not clearly in one direction, and, as Peter wrote me in one of his last e-mails, “we have to leave open the question as to which of them may have come first”. Another open question, another desideratum for further research, and one of the many inputs and inspirational ideas Peter Mackridge gave to all of us!

65. Deny, “Le géronidif en -(y)işin”, p. 121; Eckmann, “Yunan Harfli Karamanlı İmlası Hakkında”, p. 30. See also: Matthias Kappler, “Note a proposito di ‘ortografia caramanlidica’”, in *Turcica et Islamica. Studi in memoria di Aldo Gallotta*, ed. Ugo Marazzi, Napoli, Università degli Studi di Napoli L’Orientale, 2003, pp. 309-339, in particular pp. 320-321; Stelios Irakleous, “On the development of Karamanlidika writing systems based on sources of the period 1764-1895”, *Mediterranean Language Review*, vol. 13 (2020) 57-95, in particular pp. 65, 69-71.

66. One of the few linguistically analyzed Karamanli manuscripts is a text written probably in the second half of the eighteenth century, where double-dotted characters (on σ, ζ, π, and τ) occur; see Eftychios Gavriel, *Η Τουρκική με το Ελληνικό αλφάβητο σε χειρόγραφο του 18ου αιώνα*, unpublished PhD thesis, University of Cyprus, Department of Turkish and Middle Eastern Studies, 2010, p. 184.