Cries and Whispers in Karamanlidika Books
Proceedings of the First International Conference on Karamanlidika Studies
(Nicosia, 11th–13th September 2008)

Edited by
Evangelia Balta and Matthias Kappler

2010
Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

ISSN 0177-4743
ISBN 978-3-447-06185-8
Thoughts on the Turkish Verses in Phanariot Poetry Collections (1750–1821)

Julia Chatzipanagioti-Sangmeister & Matthias Kappler

1. The Phanariot poetry collections of the eighteenth century

In 1818, the enlightened merchant Zisis Daoutis (1772–1836) published in Vienna a small volume under the title Διάφορα ἠθικὰ καὶ ἀστεῖα στιχουργήματα (“Various Moral and Humorous Verses”). This edition – typographically far from elegant – is the first printed anthology of Modern Greek poetry. Its publication marks an important milestone in a long tradition of handwritten collections of poems, a tradition that seems to originate in the mid-eighteenth century, evolving for almost one hundred years until the first four or five decades of the nineteenth century. In his short introduction to the volume, Daoutis himself notes that these earlier handwritten collections served as a source from which he drew the verses he chose to include in his anthology:

Εἰς Ἰάσσιον καὶ Βουκουρέστιον εὑρισκόμενος πρὸ χρόνων ἡδή ἱκανῶν, ἐσύναξα ἀπὸ διάφορα καταστιχάκια (κοινὸς Μισµαγία λεγόµενα) τῶν φίλων μου διάφορα στιχουργήματα, ἀπὸ τὰ ὅποια ἀπεφάσισα [...] νὰ τυπώσω ὡσα βλέπετε εἰς τὸ παρὸν βιβλιάριον [...]. Αὐτὰ τίνων φιλογενῶν εἶναι τὰ παρόντα στιχουργήματα, ἠθελήμενος ἀναφέρει ἐνταῦθα καὶ τὰ τίµια αὐτῶν ὅνομα [...]. Ἔγὼ εἶµαι μόνον τὸ ὀργανὸ τῆς ἐκδόσεως. (Daoutis 1818: [5]–[6])

These καταστιχάκια (‘booklets’) or µισµαγία (mismagia), as the enlightened merchant terms them, could be described as a sort of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century notebook in which people wrote down mainly, yet not exclusively, various verses. Quite often, these included lyrics to songs that were popular in the urban centres of the Ottoman Empire. The verses in these handwritten collections are occasionally accompanied by indications of the Ottoman tonal system (makam), sometimes even the entire melody is transcribed in Byzantine notation. Generally, the language of the

1 Author of part 1 is Julia Chatzipanagioti-Sangmeister and of part 2, Matthias Kappler.
2 “When I found myself, already some years ago, in Iaşi and Bucharest, I collected several poems from my friends’ various booklets (generally called Mismagia), part of which I decided to print as you see in the present book […]. If I knew which patriots composed these poems, I would inevitably refer to them and to their honoured names […]. I am only the tool of publication.”
verses is Greek, though some manuscripts also contain poems in Turkish, written however in the Greek alphabet\(^3\).

Although the lack of a bibliography of the relevant handwritten collections calls for some caution in drawing conclusions, it could be argued that the practice of compiling collections of verses emerged among the higher social strata of the Greek-speaking population of the Ottoman Empire in the second half of the eighteenth century, when the members of this social group had secured the necessary economic ease that enabled them to acquire free time. It is precisely this development, in which time was freed from the commitments of day-to-day life and became invested in entertainment or educational activities, which gave rise to the creation and proliferation of the urban poems and songs under consideration, as well as the practice of compiling them into collections\(^4\).

There is no doubt that this practice was particularly popular. Libraries in Greece and Roumania preserve at least 38 codices from the second half of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century, which include *mismagia*. The earliest collection appears to be the one contained in manuscript 725 of the Gennadius Library, which was assembled from 1769 onwards. The handwritten collections of verses, as evidenced by their origin and contents, were closely related to the Phanariot environment in Constantinople and the Roumanian Principalities. This is corroborated by the biography of those rhymesters who have been identified so far, by the background of the owners and compilers of those collections which have been studied, as well as by the fact that most of the surviving manuscripts are preserved in libraries in Roumania. Recent studies focusing on the content of the verses and the ideology they promote further confirm the relation of the manuscripts to the Phanariot circles\(^5\).

In the last decade of the eighteenth century, along with the handwritten tradition of verse collection, a printed tradition began taking shape as well. The beginning was set in 1790 with Rigas Velestinlis’s work *Σχολεῖον τῶν ντελικάτων ἐραστῶν* (“The School for Delicate Lovers”), while the most prominent example is the book *Ἔρωτος Ἀποτελέσµατα* (“Results of Love”) by Ioannis Karatzas and Athanasios Psalidas, which was published in 1792. Despite their numerous similarities, the printed and handwritten traditions differ in several important respects.

First of all, in terms of genre, the printed editions do not constitute poetic collections, but contain literary narrative texts in prose which usually incorporate a large number of verses, sometimes exceeding one hundred. Moreover, the ideology reflected in these printed editions (not only in their narrative parts but increasingly in

---


the verses), no longer relates to the Phanariot circles but rather to the nascent Greek bourgeoisie which was gradually adopting the fundamental values of the Enlightenment. This is also substantiated by the fact that the printed editions were published in Vienna, which from 1780 onwards emerged as the primary place of publication of works that expressed the spirit of the burgeoning Greek bourgeoisie and the novel ideas of the Enlightenment.

Thus, the handwritten mismagia, on the one hand, and the printed editions in which verses were incorporated into a narrative context, on the other, formed from the last decade of the eighteenth century onwards two parallel axes in the Greek urban poetry tradition that were clearly different in nature. The manuscripts were created and circulated mainly in the Phanariot environment, reflecting ideologically the experiences and the worldview of those members of Greek society who, having gained a privileged access to the power structures of the State, constituted a part of the social and political status quo in the Ottoman Empire. The printed editions, conversely, relate geographically and ideologically to the emerging Greek bourgeoisie which, being excluded from political power, had already in the second half of the eighteenth century begun to show a tendency towards political emancipation and to develop a national identity.

These fundamental differences between the handwritten collections and the printed editions seem to be manifested in the language as well – more precisely, in the presence or absence of content in Turkish. While the manuscripts sometimes include verses in Turkish, the printed editions use exclusively in the Greek language with a conscious effort to avoid or eliminate any foreign elements. This tendency becomes more pronounced over time and is particularly marked in Daoutis’s 1818 edition of Λιώφορα ηθικά και αστεία στιχουργήματα.

Though fitting within the same genre category as the handwritten collections, Zisis Daoutis’s edition differs from them in the sense that it constitutes an anthology, i.e. the result of a selection from a larger corpus of texts. What is more, a considerable part of the verses which the enlightened merchant and freemason Daoutis had chosen to include clearly promote fundamental values of the Greek bourgeoisie and hence differ from the handwritten collections in an ideological sense as well. Therefore, it is hardly incidental that the poems of this particular edition are distinguished by a more “purified” language than the verses included in other printed collections. In the very introduction to his anthology, Daoutis associates the well-being of the nation, the ultimate goal of every “patriotically-minded” bourgeoisie, with the “purification” of the language. This is what he writes to his readers:

[Παρακαλῶ ὅλους τοὺς ὁμογενεῖς, ὃσοι εἶ ἀυτῶν ἔχουν στιχουργήματα, ἢ ὄλλο τι ἡθικὸν σύγγραμμα, κ’ ἔπωφελὲς διὰ τὴν ἐπίδοσιν τοῦ γένους, καὶ δέν

The arguments made so far clearly suggest that the presence of Turkish-language content in Greek collections serves as a marker of their ideology and hence justify the need for more systematic research into the role of Turkish language in Greek corpora. Remaining for a while in the period before the Greek Revolution – a period in which, as we have seen, the handwritten and printed urban poetry traditions co-existed in parallel – we shall try to examine the presence and function of the Turkish-language verses in the earliest "mismagia" discovered so far, the one contained in manuscript 725 of the Gennadius Library of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens.

Manuscript 725, a corpus of 158 folia, consists of two clearly-defined parts (Chatzipanagioti-Sangmeister 2002: 23–26). The first contains recipes for medicinal mixtures and culinary dishes, while the second includes 167 poems (Chatzipanagioti-Sangmeister 2002: 28). In terms of both form and content, the verses found in codex 725 constitute representative examples of Phanariot poetry. Their thematic range covers the typical Phanariot subject matter: love poems about unreciprocated love and refusal, the instability of fortune, the lack of true friendship, satirical poems about specific persons, verses inspired by events of importance for Constantinopolitan society, rhymes about xenitia (i.e. the hardships, isolation and estrangement of those who are forced by economic or other constraints to work and live in foreign lands). The texts included in the manuscript are for the most part in Greek, although there are some verses in Turkish, written in the Greek alphabet, which are commented upon in part II of the present paper.

2. The Turkish part of the ms. 725

2.1. The Ottoman background

Our manuscript contains twelve Turkish texts, or rather twelve texts where Turkish is used extensively, since code-switched passages consisting of one or two lexical items, as well as phonetically and grammatically integrated loanwords from Turkish to Greek, are not counted here. Apart from texts in Greek and Turkish, the manu-

---

7 'Whoever among all the fellow countrymen have poems, or any other ethical and helpful composition for the progress of the nation, and who do not want to print them for whatever reason, please send them to me [...]; I [...] shall print them immediately, so that they may not lie dead, and shall refer to their honourable names. Furthermore, I again ask them to send them to me, as far as possible, pure from foreign words.'

8 The twelve texts are included in our Appendix; the Roman numerals of the texts are used hereafter.
The Turkish texts are all written with the same hand, that of the main writer (χ') according to Chatzipanagioti-Sangmeister 2002) of the whole manuscript (see above). Another two writers have produced minor texts, but not in Turkish. Our anonymous writer elaborated the manuscript from 1769 until at least 1795. He belonged to the court of Matthaios Gkikas, living in the Roumanian Principalities and in Istanbul, and was well-educated in medicine and music.

The largest part is constituted by texts with metrical-rhythmic patterns (ten out of twelve), the most extensive texts being love songs, and specifically şarkı (II, III, IV); followed by a fragment of a gazel (VI), probably also used in music in the beste or semai part of the Ottoman concert cycle (this is evident because of the formal deficiency of the composition, typical for the musical use of this genre). The other metrical texts are two single distichs (beyt I and aphorism V), and two mani (VIII and IX), popular quatrains, one of them (IX) being a poetical dialogue, as well as another quatrain in mani-form (XII). The last metrical text, probably again a song, is a Greek-Turkish bilingual poem (X). The only two texts without a metrical pattern are a proverb (VII) and an inscription (XI); the latter we will comment on below more in detail.

The main part of the Turkish corpus consisting of musical forms (the şarkıs, the gazel and distich I), is part of the Ottoman musical and poetical tradition. The manuscript tradition of Ottoman Turkish musical texts (without notes) goes back to the seventh century (Üngör 1981: xxvii). A musical collection of this kind is called güfte mecmuası (mecmua being the etymon of the Greek Phanariot µισµαγές or µετζµουάδες, commonly used to denominate this kind of poetry and music collection). The Ottoman Turkish production of printed anthologies begins in 1852 (Üngör 1981: xviii), i.e. more than twenty years after the first Ottoman Greek printed anthologies (the first one being Εὐτέρπη, in 1830). Although none of the texts of our manuscript appears in the printed Ottoman Greek anthologies of the nineteenth century, at least one of them (II) is a well-known şarkı still present in the classical Turkish musical repertoire (Üngör 1981: 520). This could also be the case with other texts, but since the Turkish texts, except one (IV), of our manuscript lack any indication of the makam system, it is quite difficult to trace them back to the

---

9 For bibliographical hints, see Kappler 2002: 33 (Arabic in Πανδώρα), Kappler 2002: 35 (Roumanian in Καλλίφωνος Σειρήν); furthermore for Arabic in Greek letters, see Khoury 1977, for Phanariot poems containing French in Greek characters, see Kappler 1998.

10 On the printed Ottoman-Greek anthologies of the nineteenth century, see Behar 1994, Behar 2002 (from the musicological point of view), Stathi 1997 (textual observations about one specific mistmagia), Kappler 2002 (edition and linguistic analysis of all Turkish texts in Greek characters contained in the anthologies).
classical repertoire of the mecmua, always ordered by makam. Interestingly, also one Greek song (f. 73r, makam çargah) bears an Ottoman makam indication, which is very common in other contemporary manuscript and printed Ottoman Greek anthologies (such as Ερωτος Αποτελήματα) or in printed anthologies of the nineteenth century (such as Πανόραμα).

Another link to the mainstream Ottoman Turkish tradition is the mahlas (pen-name of the poet / güfteci) Tanburi in two of the şarkı (II and III), i.e. Tanburi Mustafa Çavuş (reportedly in şarkı II and supposedly in şarkı III). Tanburi Mustafa Çavuş (?–1745?) was a very productive composer and güfteci at the Sultan’s court, especially during the “Tulip Period” under Sultan Ahmed III and his brilliant Grand Vizir Damad Ibrahim Paşa. He is also the author of a mecmua (1733; see Öztuna 1990: 76–77 and 580). His works, though not this one, are frequently to be found in the printed Ottoman Greek anthologies of the nineteenth century (see Kappler 2002: 62 and 68, and respective texts).

However, not only from the point of view of musical form and authorship, but also considering the literary contents, our texts clearly belong to the Ottoman Turkish tradition. This can be seen especially in şarkı III, which is a folk song describing a male public dancer, köçek, very common in eighteenth and nineteenth century lyrics. Other evidence for this are the mystical-Islamic themes in the gazel-fragment (VI) and in şarkı IV. The texts are thus integrated into an urban and often courtly lyric tradition, sometimes even with Islamic religious undertones, and the language of the texts does not usually show up dialectal variation. The only exceptions are typically the two mani (VIII and IX), a composition stemming from the folk tradition to be found in all areas with Turkic population, and, in our case, both in South-Eastern Europe and Anatolia. It is, in fact, not a coincidence that only in these poems we encounter dialectal forms (yükmazkan; VIII.2, endim; IX.4, yidi, kize; IX.4), typical for Western and Central Anatolian, or even Black Sea, dialects. From the literary point of view the second mani (IX) is particularly interesting, since it presents the popular form of a poetical dialogue (named deyiş in Anatolia, and çatışma in Cyprus), where two persons in a question-answer mode exchange improvised verses in the strophical mani-form (Göksu 1996: xx; Gökçeoğlu 2002: 8, 66).

The only text not pertaining either to the urban Ottoman Turkish context of Istanbul, or to the Anatolian Turkish folk tradition, is obviously the bilingual song (X). Mixing up languages, first of all all Greek and Turkish, in playful songs seems to have been a very popular tradition in Ottoman Greek society; specimens of this kind can

---

11 Forms with -ikan occur in many Karamanlidika texts, and are frequent in most Turkish dialects (Balkans, Anatolia, Cyprus), see Kappler 2002: 169; en-: for the form in other Greek Ottoman anthologies and its occurrence in Central Anatolia, see Kappler 2002: 109; yidi: for the raising of /e/ in /y/-surroundings in Trabzon dialects, see Brendemoen 2002: 55–56, but also in Central Anatolian dialects (Korkmaz 1994: 34); kize: for develarization of /l/, especially in kiz, for Black Sea dialects, see Brendemoen 2002: 68.
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2.2. The relation between Turkish and Greek texts

At this point, we have to raise an important question: what is the position of the Turkish texts in the framework of the whole manuscript? Where are the Turkish texts positioned and do they have any semantic or formal relation to the main Greek corpus?

First of all it seems that the manuscript has been written chronologically and that, for this reason, there is no thematic order in the disposition of the texts. From the point of view of the contents it is evident that both the Turkish and Greek poems treat themes of a usually unrequited, unhappy and cruel love, typical for the Ottoman lyric tradition, but also for the Phanariot verses of that period.

Accordingly, it seems at first glance that generally speaking there is no direct relation between the two corpora written in the two different languages, but that the disposition of the Turkish texts in the main body is rather arbitrary. Upon closer analysis, however, we may observe that the Turkish texts are always embedded in a context loosely related to the Greek body: love songs with love songs, philosophical poems with philosophical texts etc.

Perhaps the most interesting link between the Greek and Turkish parts is the inscription (XI) which up to now we did not consider in our description because it seemingly falls out of the main lyric body of the manuscript. As we shall see, the text reveals additional information on the place of composition of the manuscript, and about the writer himself. As the Greek title (“1788 αὐγούστου ε' ὁ τίτλος ὑποῦ ἐβάλθη εἰς τὸ κοµµένο τὸ κεφάλι τοῦ µακαρίτου µισέρ δηµήτρη σκαναβῆ εἰς τὸ µπάµπι χουµαγιοῦ’) explains, the text reproduces the inscription on the execution place of the Phanariot Dimitrios Skanavis, decapitated for treason during the Turkish-Russian war (Amantos 1955–1956). Skanavis was executed at the Sublime Porte (Bab-i Hümayun) in Istanbul on August 5, 1788, the same day of the note of our writer, evidence that the manuscript was actually written in Istanbul (Chatzipanagioti-Sangmeister 2002: 27). The original official transcription was obviously in Arabic characters, and linguistic analysis of the transcription into Greek characters reveals the presence of orthographic features which could only occur if the text was transcribed from the Arabic alphabet, namely the writings idüp and gendisine (whereas the writing tertüp for tertib seems to be an over-correction). This provides
possible evidence that the main writer of the manuscript, who also produced this
text, was familiar with the Arabic alphabet, although of course we cannot exclude
that the original inscription was read to him by another person. The important link to
the main corpus of the manuscript is given by a Greek poem on the death of
Dimitrios Skanavis, following the Turkish inscription (f. 116v–117r), composed by
the writer himself (as he states in the title annotation) on August 7, 1788, i.e. two
days after Skanavis’ execution (“1788, ἀὔγουστος ζ’ ἐποιήθη αὕτη ἡ μικρά ῥηµάδα
παρ ἡµοῦ τοῖς ἀµαθοῖς”).

2.3. General conclusions and relation of the corpus to “Karamanlidika studies”
Considering this poem (as well as another one on f. 30r, reportedly of his own hand),
we can presume that our writer was a hellenophone; however the Turkish texts he
transcribes in his “diary” are nearly free of mistakes, which points to a very good
knowledge of Turkish, if not to Greek-Turkish bilinguality. If we also consider his
good Greek orthography (Chatzipanagioti-Sangmeister 2002: 27) and his knowledge
of music and medicine, and, possibly, his ability to read Ottoman Turkish texts in
the Arabic alphabet, we get the picture of a well-educated Phanariot from a high
societal layer, probably a clerk of the Ottoman administration. As far as his mother-
tongue is concerned, the manuscript seems not to contain enough information. The
framework language, and also the language in which personal annotations are made,
is Greek, as is the target language in most of the subsequently printed anthologies.
Although a few of the books printed during the nineteenth and early twentieth cen-
tury are expressly addressed to a Turkophone target readership (such as Γενί Σαρκί
and Τουρκικέ Πτυχησ [both Istanbul 1876], Ανατόλ Τουρκολεί [Istanbul 1896],
or Χανεντέ [Samsun 1914]; see Kappler 2002: 6, fn. 6), most of them are used pri-
marily by Hellenophones, although they contain Turkish texts, too. But even some
of the anthologists of the books with Greek-speaking targets, such as Ioannis Zogra-
ofos Keyvelis, are reportedly Turkophones, and we cannot exclude that many of the
anonymous scribes of the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century manuscript tradition
had, like our writer, a Turkophone Orthodox background as well. However, this
manuscript is one example within the whole, enormous tradition of these mecmuades
in general which were integrated into the everyday urban context of Istanbul, and are
an important source for the socio-cultural and anthropological research concerning
the Phanariots, and evidence for their intermediary role between the Ottoman Turk-
ish and the Ottoman Greek societies and cultures.

Another question is whether, and how, this kind of text can be considered as
“Karamanlidika” or not. What can be said for sure is that the linguistic, historical
and philological analysis of the Turkish texts contained in these anthologies shows
the close ties of the Phanariots with Ottoman Turkish cultural traditions and con-
texts; the few texts of Anatolian origin do not justify a direct link to the Turkophone
“Karamanlidika” tradition of Asia Minor, but rather point to an indirect influence
and confluence of various cultural forms of expression into the melting pot of the
Ottoman capital. But at the same time these texts, like other specimens of “Turkish
literature in Greek alphabet” (the definition of “Karamanlidika” according to Balta 1997–1998: 132–133), show that the corpus of “Karamanlidika” considerably exceeds the Anatolian sphere and the linguistic borders of the Anatolian varieties of Turkish, or, even worse, of a non-existant, imaginary “Karamanli language” (cf. Kappler 2006). Thanks to this kind of text, future research will have to reflect about the contents and definition of “Karamanlidika” from the vantage point of the multi-faceted literary and linguistic forms under which this important cultural phenomenon appears.

References
Appendix: the Turkish texts of the manuscript Gen. 725

I. Beyt

ąż νε μουσικιουλ ὄλοιρ διλέρ μουχαπτεί
ὡκαπέτ ἵπ ρεδε ὄγράρ γκερέκ

Ah ne müşkül olur dilber muhabeti
akibet bir derde oğlar gerek.

‘Ah, how hard it is to be in love with a heart-captivating beauty: as a result it must end up in grief!’

II. Şarkı

[1.] ü κις νέδιρ μπού γκιουζελिक χέπ σενζ, ἀσκίνιλαν μέστ ὅλμουσδημ γκιουλ σενζ.
σιρζα σατζλίμ, σιρζα βετζλίμ σερ ἐγλέριμ μπεγιάζ φεσλί μπαμπαγλαμίς γκιουλ πεμπέ τζαρε.
δουνά δολού γκιουζέλ ὀλζα, μπερνί ὀλζα γκενέ γκιουγνιόμ βάρσεν.

A kız nedir bu güzelik hep sende,
askınlanan mest olmuşem gül sende.
Sırma saçılm, sırma veclim seyr eylerim14
beyaz fesli baş bağlamış gül pembes camın15.
Dünya dolu güzel olsa, benim olsa gene göynüm var sende16.

‘Hey girl, what is that beauty all about you?
In the garden I must have become inebriated falling in love with you!
I look at my beloved with silver hair and silver face,
my rosy rose has blossomed with a white fez.
Even if the world was full of beauties, and all were mine, my heart would still be with you!’

12 f. 20r. The text bears the date “1774 μαΐου άν” (01.05.1774).
13 f. 73v. The first strophe of this şarkı is contained in the modern Turkish anthology Üngör (1981: 520), reporting also the musical tonality (makam) Isfahan Aksak, and the author (güfteci) of the text, Tanburî Mustafa Çavuş (?–1745?). The poet’s pseudonym (mahlas) Tanburî is contained, as usual, in the last strophe of the present şarkı. Variants in Üngör’s edition are marked as “Ü” in the following footnotes.
14 Ü: sırma saçı zerâfeti seyreyle
15 Ü: beyaz fese baş bağlyor gulpenbe
16 Ü: gene göynüm var sende
[2.] χέρ νέ γκιγισέν γιάρασίγιο μπεγενάκι,
σεβιμέζι μπογέλ μελέκ μουνάδι;
χέμ χαμήσει, χέμ τζανήσει σεμιπέ ετίν.
ό μηχανοσί γιάρ όλοτξάκ ιανάδι τζανάκι.
δουνά δολού γκιου... 

Her ne giysen yaranıyor beyendim,
sevilmez mi böyle melek menendi?
Hem hanımın, hem canımın sebep etin.
O mehbaşı yar olacak inandi canm.
Dünya ...

'Whatever you wear, it suits you, I like it;
how can one not love such an angel?
You are a lady; you are my life, and the reason of it!
That moon-face believed that it will be the beloved friend, my dear!
Even if the world…'

[3.] κιουτζουτζέκτεν μουσαδίμβαρ σεβμεγέ
μουσκιού όλούρ σόγρα γιουζού γκίορμεγέ.
γκέλσενις ἄχτι έμαν ιδελίμ.
μπέλκι μπενί μουραδίμ βαρ ὀμμεγέ τζανίμ.
δουνά δολού γκιουζ... 

Küçücekten mısadım var sevmeye,
müşkül olur sogra yüzü görmeye.
Gel seninle ahıt-i eman idelim.
Belki benim muradım var opmeye canm.
Dünya ...

'While still a child I am allowed to love you,
after it will be hard even to see your face.
Come on, let’s make a pact of peace!
Perhaps I desire to kiss you, my love!
Even if the world…'

[4.] γκερτζέκ όλδούμ σανά ἀσίκ ὀρκιμδέν [?] διαδέ,
γκιοζδέν μπράκμα μπενί, γιάκμα κίς σενάδε.
taμπουρινίν ὑρκιμά βάρ σουλτάνίς φεργιαζινέ
μπουλμπούλ μπενδέ γκιουζενδέ τζανίμ.
δουνά δολού γκιουζέ...
Gerçek oldum sana aşık ... kimden [?] dade,
gözden bırakma beni, yakma kız sen de.
Tamburi'nin efkari var sultan ile feryazine,
bülbül bende güldende canım.
Dünya ...

‘I really fell in love with you […],
don’t let me fall from your favor, don’t hurt me, girl!
Tanburî’s only thoughts are to wail because of the beloved sultana,
being like the nightingale a slave in the garden, my love!
Even if the world…’

III. Şarkı17

[1.] öyle güzel sevilmez mi
konuşmuş gül tövbümlüm serpilmüşüm
rezartanı manı olözüm
musağın türbən serpilmüşümüz
sözüm yığık chουουουου
mενενε olözüm ζουουουου
μερχαμέτ κιλ μπανά βαί.

Öyle güzel sevilmez mi,
gonce güldür sarılmaz mı?
Refiarine mail oldum,
böyle civan sarılmaz mı?
Sözüm yok hüsnüne,
bend oldum zülfüne,
merhamet kil bana vay.

‘How can one not love such a beauty?
It is a blossoming rose, how can one not embrace it?
I am inclined to his graceful walking,
how can one not embrace such a young boy?
I have no words for his beauty,
I was seized by his locks,
have mercy on me, alas!’

17 f. 74r. The last strophe of the present şarkı contains the pseudonym (mahlas) Tamburi which points to the poet Tamburi Mustafa Çavuş (?–1745?), cf. previous şarkı. It is neither listed in the modern anthologies, nor in Öztuna 1990, and thus could represent an unedited composition of the famous composer. Of course the mahlas could theoretically also refer to another “Tanburî”. The song is a köçekçe about a male dancer.
[2.] τζαλπαρεσίν ἀλίρ ἐλέ
γκιρέρ ραζά γκιουλέ γκιουλέ
γκιουζελέρδεν πέκ γκιουζέλδιρ
ὀλούρ µενζλίς πούρ βερβελέ
σοζούµ γιόκ χουσνουνέ...

Çalparesin alir ele,
girer raksı göle göle.
Güzelerden pek güzeldir,
olur menclis pür servele.
Sözüm yok...

‘He puts his castanets on his hands,
and begins to dance with laughs and cheers.
He is more beautiful than the beautifuls,
on this party full of gaiety!
I have no words…’

[3.] γκιουζέλ ογνάρ ουσούλλεν
µπιρδέν κιλάρ άνιµίλεν [?]
χέκ γκιουζέλर µπεστε ιτζούν
µπού γιαδιγιάρ σαρκί ιτζούν
σοζούµ γιόκ χουσνουνέ...

Güzel ognar usul ilen,
birden kilar anim ilen [?].
Hep güzeler beste için,
bu yadiyar şarkı için.
Sözüm yok...

‘He dances beautifully with the rhythm,
suddenly he performs with […]
All the beauties for the composition,
for this memorable song!
I have no words …’

[4.] µπάκ δού χουσνούλεν ἐδαΐ
δεγισµέ σενί δουνιαί
ταµπουρίν ναζαρετί
χενίς δουστούµ µπού σεβδαί
σοζούµ γιόκ χουσνουνέ…
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Bak bu hüsünüylen edai,
devişmem seni dünyai.
Tamburi'nin nazareti
henüz diştüm bu sevdai.
Sözüm yok …

‘Look, this manner, his beauty!
I would not exchange you for the whole world!
Tamburî overlooking says:
I just fell in love with him!
I have no words …’

IV. Şarkı

Dost istersen, Allah yeter,
ısk istersen, ibadet yeter,
mal istersen kenaat yeter,
nasihat istersen, Allah yeter.
Edep tac olmuš nur-ı hudaden,
al onu başına giy, kurtul beladen.

‘If you want a friend, God is enough,
if you want love, worshipping is enough,
if you want wealth, contentment is enough,
if you want advice, God is enough,
if you want hope, the Paradise is enough.
Modesty became the crown from the divine light,
take it, put it on your head and you will be saved from misfortune!’

V. Aphorism

18 f. 75r. The rhythm (usul) is marked as arak (ἀράκ), the makam could be sultani (?). Poem related to Islamic mystical tradition; cf. VI. gazel.
19 f. 75r
Inat cahilindir, harhar ahmeindir
sükütt akillindir, şeriat arifindir.

'Obstinity belongs to the ignorant, quarrel to the stupid, silence to the intelligent, law to the wise.'

VI. Gazel
σογιουνδούµ δερβίζ ὀλδούµ,
νεμέ γκερέκ ἀρ μπενίµ;

γόκτουρ ὅσλα χάµ ταμαχήµ,
δουνιά ἵξον κιάρ μπενίµ.

χέλε μαλή γνόγουσάδα,
καναχατίµ βάρ μπενίµ.

χαράµιν καζανιλάν
μαλέ μιννέτ ἐκλεµέµ.

Soyundum derviş oldum,
neme gerek ar benim?

Yoktur asla ham tamahim,
dınya için kar benim.

Hele malim yüşusa da,
kanaıhatim var benim.

Haram ilen kazan ilen,
male minnet eylemem.

'I put my clothes off and became a dervish, why should shame bother me?

I never have desire or avarice, nor do I seek profit for the worldly.

Even if I don’t have property, I have contentment.

20  f. 79v
With forbidden things or with gains,
I don’t go after wealth.’

**VII. Proverb**

Фелёгилен γκιουλέδεν,
χέπ ὅλτ γκαλίρ χίτς οὕστ γκελµέζ

Feleyilen güleşen,
hep alt gelir hiç üst gelmez.

‘Who fights with the destiny,
comes always down, never up [= is always defeated and never wins].’

**VIII. Mani**

Λέλιµ γιάρ μπού σεβδαί,
μπού δερδί μπού σεβδαί,
κουζόµι σενί σεβελί,
καζανόµι μπού σεβδαί.

Λέλιµ μπού σεβδά µπενί,
µπού δέρτ µπού σεβδά µπενί,
µπενί δαγλάρ γκικµάζικαν,
γικτί µπού σεβδά µπενί.

Lelim yar bu sevdai,
bu derdi bu sevdai,
kuzum seni seveli,
kazandım bu sevdai.

Lelim bu sevda beni,
bu dert bu sevda beni,

beni dağlar yaknazikan,
yikti bu sevda beni.

‘Lalala, friend, this love,
this grief, this love,

my sweetheart, since I love you
I earned this love.

---

21 f. 80r
22 f. 80v. The poem bears the Greek title “μανέδες τουρκικοί” (‘Turkish manis’).
Lalala, this love,
this grief, this love,
although the mountains did not throw me down,
this love did!’

**IX. Mani (çatışma)**

κετέν γγομλέκ ἀλιάδιρ,
γουζδέ μπεγλέρ ἀλιάδιρ,
σεβέρσεν μπίρ γκελίν σέβ,
ἀλίνµας κιζδάδιρ.

κετέν γγομλέκ ἀλλιάδιρ,
τζιφτέ μπεγλέρ ἀλιάδιρ,
σεβέρσεν μπίρ γκεσέβ,
κιζλάρ πασκά μπελάδιρ.

κετέν γγομλέκ διζδέδιρ,
τζιφτέ μπεγλέρ γουζδέδιρ,
ὄνϊκ γγελίν σεβδίµ,
ὅση γκιοννούµ κιζδάδιρ.

καγιάδαν ἐνδίµ δουζέ,
σοῦ μπαγλεδίµ νερκιζέ,
γιδιγίλ χιζµέτ ἱτίµ,
μπίρ ἐλία γκιοζλού κιζέ.

*Keten gömlek aladr,*
*yüzde beyler aladr,*
*seversen bir kız sev,*
*alınmamış kaladır.*

*Keten gömlek alladır,*
*çifte begler aladır,*
*seversen bir gelin sev,*
*kızlar başka beladır.*

*Keten gömlek dizdedir,*
*çifte begler yüzzedir,*
*on iki gelin sevdım,*
*dahi göynüm kızdadır.*

23 f. 82r. These mani are organized like a poetical dialogue (çatışma) between two persons, typical for the Anatolian tradition, but also used in cities like Istanbul (see above).
Kayadan endim düze,
su bagledim nerkize,
yidi yıl hizmet itim,
bir ela gözlü kızı.

‘The linen shirt is variegated,
the moles on the face are spotted.
If you love, so love a girl,
before they are all taken!

The linen shirt is variegated,
the double mole is spotted.
If you love, so love a bride,
girls are only a calamity!

The linen shirt is on the knees,
the double mole is on the face.
I loved twelve brides,
but my heart is still with the girl!

I went down from the rocks to the valley,
I watered the narcissus.
I served seven years
a blue-eyed girl!’

X. Bilingual song²¹
[1.] [85v] ἐφένδιµν ηνδιρ ῶντου γαζέπ;
ταξιρατίµν ηνδιρ ἀτζέπ;

γιατί νά γίνεις φῶς μου;
ἔτζ’ ἄδικα ἐχθρός μου;

Efendim nedir bu gazep?
Taksiratim nedir acep?

‘What’s this anger, efendi?
What’s my fault, I wonder?
Why, light of my eyes, will you become
my enemy without any reason?’

²¹ ff. 85v–86r. The song is dated “1780 Ἰανουαρίου ια” (11.01.1780).
'I am ever your slave,
your intolerance is a torment to me!
You learned it, you know it!
Why should you torment me?'

'How many cruelties you do!
I have no guilt, and you torture me!
Without so much reason,
I shall have so much torment!'

'Prove my sin, beloved
and don’t take my breath away unfairly!
And don’t put me to death,
don’t kill me unjustly!'

[2.] μπέν ὁτεδέν μπερί κουλούν,
µπού ὅποι ιστισκάλ µπανά ζουλούµ,
τό ἐµαθες τό ξεύρεις,
γιατί νὰ µὲ παιδεύσεις:
Ben öteden beri kulun,
bu istiskal bana zulüm.

[3.] νιτζέµπιρ µπού τζεφαλερίν,
µπίλα τζουµµούµ σκεντζελερίν.
δίχως ποσῶς αἴτια,
νάχω τόσην παιδεία
Nice bir bu cefalerin,
bila cümlems skencelerin.

[4.] σαµίτ ολσούν γιάρ γκιουναχίµ,
ἄλµα ναχάκ γερέ αχίµ.
και µή µὲ θανατόσεις,
κι’ άδικα µὲ σκοτώσεις.
Sabit olsun yar günahım,
alma nahak yere ahım.

[5.] [86r] ζήρα µπού τζάνδιρ δαγιανµάζ,
κιλ µερχαµέτ ἄσελβινάζ,
poulaki mou lupthson,
κι’ ὀλίγον εὐσπλαγχνήσου.
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Zira bu candir dayanmaz,
kil merhamet a selv-i naz.

‘Since my soul does not endure,
have pity, coquettish cypress!
My love, pity on me,
and a little mercy!’

[6.] κάλµαδι τακετίµ σαµρέ,
ἐφένδιµ γκέλ κερέµ ἐγλέ.
τρέχω στὸ ἔλεός σου,
σὰν σκλάβος ἐδικός σου.

Kalmdı taketim sabre,
efendim gel kerem eyle.

‘No strength is left to be patient,
come on and be kind to me!
I take refuge in your beneficence,
like a slave of yours!’

[7.] διλµπερλερδέ σελβιναζίµ,
καµπού ἐγλέ µπού νηγαζίµ.
καὶ δὸς παρηγορίαν,
σὲ λόγο µου καµµίαν.

Dilberlerde selv-i nazım,
kabul eyle bu niyazım.

‘Coquettish cypress of all beloveds,
accept this supplication!
And give some consolation
to what I say!’

XI. Inscription

τζενέτ µικὰν σουλτάν µουστάφα χὰν ξεµανινὸ Μουστάφα Χαν
ζεµανίνδα µοσκόβ διὰτ σεξσιβος.
χαίνι δινὶ δεβλέτ τζεζασί
tζεζασί τερτούπ
ολουµνουστουρ

25 f. 116v. See comment above.
'The decapitation of the traitor of religion and state Dimitris has been executed as punishment for having collaborated, during the reign of Sultan Mustafa, may He rest in peace, with the King [sic!] of Moscow and being rewarded with the Kingdom of Chios.'

XII. Playful song (türkü?)

Seymen başı öldü gebe,  
zarhane öldü ebe,  
emini  
küçük dahi kalırse,  
ze tandır kalır ne kebe.

'[The wife of?] the Chief Keeper of Hounds got pregnant, the mint was the midwife,  
… [Emine?]  
even if it remains small,  
no tandır is left and no kebe'.

26 f. 149v. There are some obscure points in the meaning of the text.  
27 Military rank in the Imperial Army  
28 tandır is a sort of table with a pan of coals, on which a large felt carpet (kebe) is thrown over in order to warm the feet.