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Language contact in spoken Ottoman: Observations on graphic syncretism in a Karamanli book (1718)

MATTHIAS KAPPLER

1. Theoretical framework

Research concerning language contacts in spoken Ottoman varieties is rare. High Ottoman, with its enormous share of Persian and ultimately Arabic lexical elements, and its partially Indo-European syntactic structure thanks to the influence of Persian, is certainly a contact language par excellence, but it does not present the appropriate sources for an analysis of colloquial speech, since it does not represent a spoken linguistic variety at all. However, spoken Ottoman has never been ousted by literary Ottoman; on the other hand, “one spoken Ottoman” does not exist, but rather a multitude of sociolects, dialects, ethnolects, and religiolects (for this term see below), featuring a situation which is much more complex than simply “diglossic” (cf. Johanson 1989).

During a project within the framework of linguistic ecology, the use of the so-called transcription texts was suggested to examine spoken urban varieties in 17th century Istanbul (Csató et al. 2016). Transcription texts are Ottoman Turkish texts in non-Arabic alphabets; the traditional use of the term was confined to texts in Latin characters, first of all from the 17th and 18th centuries, i.e. the Middle Ottoman period, but it was extended to any non-Arabic written text, such as Turkish in the Greek, Armenian, Hebrew, Syrian or Georgian alphabets (Hazai 1990). Most of these texts reflect spoken varieties of Ottoman, because the motivation of their composition was purely practical: transcription of dialogues for travelers or missionaries; grammars and dictionaries; religious material for practical use in church liturgy and at home; letters and songs etc. Moreover, some phonetic features of the language can be detected better than from the consonantal Arabic script. However, it must be said that there are also many sources in Arabic characters reflecting spoken Ottoman, even some poetical genres, excluding the largest part of the high-style Ottoman gazel and qaṣīde-poetry, but including, for instance, erotic poems in the seh-nengiz or mesnevi tradition.

Approaches, such as the aforementioned project on linguistic ecology, that aim to individuate and analyze the various codes of a multicultural environment like Istanbul, inevitably deal with language contact. Choosing the example of Turkish texts written in the Greek alphabet by and for the Turkophone Christian population both in Asia Minor and the Balkans (the so-called Karamanlidika, or Karamanli texts), I intend to combine the ecological factor with two other theoretical
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approaches. One of them is Hary & Wein’s (2013) application of Jewish-defined languages to Christian and Muslim contexts. Hary & Wein assume that Jewish varieties in different languages (such as Judeo-Arabic, Judeo-Italian, or Jewish English), named by these researchers as "religiolects", show special religion-defined features, namely, among others: (a) the use of the Hebrew alphabet, deriving from the high prestige of the language in which the holy scriptures are written; (b) many lexical copies from Hebrew; (c) sometimes the development of distinct, "unintelligible" spoken forms, as well as migrated or displaced dialectisms, and archaisms (Hary & Wein 2013, 90–93). It is true that Ottoman religiolects do not show some of the above mentioned characteristics typical of Jewish religiolects, such as the development of their own linguistic varieties, and in some cases Karamanlı texts, in contrast to most other texts in non-Arabic scripts, do not reflect spoken language at all, but simply transcribe High Ottoman written literary varieties. Nevertheless, most Karamanlı sources display many features which make these texts clearly religious-defined; first of all, the use of the alphabet and of lexical copies from the liturgical language, Greek. A further criterion for its definition as a religiolect could probably be the presence of displaced dialectisms, because of the migration of large groups of the Turkophone Christian population from Inner Anatolia and the Balkans to Istanbul during the 19th century, although it is not clear if the relevant dialectal forms have migrated only in written form or if they were also present in a kind of spoken Ottoman-Christian koine. A clear advantage of Karamanlı texts, and another common feature with Jewish religiolects, again in contrast to other transcription texts, especially in the Latin script, is that the authors of the text were almost without exception native speakers of Turkish.

The other approach that I consider to be helpful here is borrowed from religious studies, and concerns the concept of syncretism. Syncretistic structures develop because of the interaction and, eventually, the confluence of entities or systems that were originally independent from each other, creating a new system which, in its final stage, we might call symbiosis (Colpe 1997, 42–43). The Karamanlı religiolect, as I now tentatively call it here, is a clear case of syncretistic writing, with the confluence of various writing and language systems, and the subsequent symbiotic creation of a new, though very composite writing and cultural system. This system is, as a matter of course, particularly exposed to contact, since it is the result of contact. Concluding and summarizing the theoretical part of this contribution, we might say that the intent to analyze spoken Ottoman varieties within the framework of their geocultural, multilingual and multireligious environment leads to the individuation of sources which present syncretistic features, in order to permit insight into contact phenomena in relation with the surrounding codes and systems. Among texts composed in religion-defined varieties, so-called religiolects, the Karamanlı texts (except for a small number of them featuring a High Ottoman variety) seem particularly appropriate for this, because, as opposed to many transcription texts in Latin characters, the authors were native speakers of Turkish; moreover, a large portion of these texts are translations from religious works in the prestige language Greek, which makes contact analysis particularly suitable. The target language of these translations, Turkish, not being the prestige-language in question, is thus free from orthographic or stylistic constraints (again excluding texts that imitate a High Ottoman literary variety), and may serve as a valuable reflection of a spoken contact code.

2. Methodology and source of the data

2.1 Language contacts and Karamanlıdika

Research into contact-induced phenomena in transcription texts is still in its infancy; a very interesting case has been presented recently by Heidi Stein (2016), who analyzed syntactic copies in a 17th-century Italian grammar of Turkish, which are also present in Modern Turkic varieties under heavy contact influence, such as Gagauz and Cypriot Turkish. In the case of Karamanlıdika, contact-relevant research has been concentrated on comparative graphic analysis (Kappler 2003, 328–35; Irakleous 2013, 81–88); less has been done on issues concerning other linguistic levels (but cf. Arslan-Keçerioti 2009 for a syntactic analysis).1 In a very interesting recent article, Bredenemoen (2016) also argues for the use of Karamanlı texts as sources for spoken Ottoman and for the analysis of phenomena resulting from contact with Greek, providing syntactic examples as well. The opportunity offered by Karamanlıdika (and perhaps by other Ottoman religiolects) lies also in their geographical distribution: initially a phonomenon of Inner Anatolia, Karamanlı syncretistic writing spread over the West of Asia Minor to Istanbul and from there to South-Eastern Europe. The Turkophone Christian populations of the Balkans used books written in Greek characters throughout the 18th and until the late 19th century (Balta et al. 2013, 49–51); after that an intense production of books in the Cyrillic alphabet began, but probably on the model of the former Karamanlı tradition (Kappler 2011). For this reason, the analysis of language contact phenomena in Karamanlı texts concerns not only Asia Minor, but can be extended to South-Eastern Europe as well. Moreover, most of the texts in the 19th century were produced in the melting-pot Istanbul, i.e. in an environment where different codes and dialects were already converging. For the same reason, some of the aforementioned "displaced dialectisms" which can be detected in Karamanlı texts come from both areas, Anatolia and the Balkans. With the same methodological approach, we can extend our research to other graphically syncretistic varieties in South-Eastern Europe, even outside the Turkic realm, such as Bosnian, or Muslim-defined (Aljamii) Greek in Crete and Epirus.

1 On some aspects of linguistic research on Karamanlıdika see Kappler (2006; 2016).
2.2 The source: The first printed Karamanli book

I will not go so far this time, within the limited framework of the present contribution, I only want to show one text example on which we can tentatively conduct the proposed analysis, since it fulfills all the criteria I have mentioned before: religious and syncretic writing, reflection of spoken Ottoman written by a (probably) native speaker, or at least with intermediation of a native speaker, and geographical distribution from Asia Minor to South-Eastern Europe. Moreover, the text I am going to present contains both the text in the prestige- and source-language Greek, and the Turkish translation, thus facilitating the comparative analysis. I am talking about the first ever printed Karamanli book, Απάνθημα της Χριστιανικής Πίστεως / Кнзлщик Ипам. Меног (Гусар-и Иман-и Месхи), printed in 1718, probably in Istanbul (cf. Salaville & Delleggio 1958, 3-10). A second edition of the book appeared in 1741 in Amsterdam (cf. Salaville & Delleggio 1958, 11-12), exhibiting, according to Salaville & Delleggio (1958, 11), a slightly different, more progressive morpho-phonology, and a third one was printed in 1803 by the Patriarchal printing-house in the Phanar (Salaville & Delleggio 1958, 114-16). Finally, a fourth edition was produced by the famous Karamanli author, editor and translator Evangelinos Misalidis in 1883 in Istanbul, including the original prologue (Salaville & Delleggio 1974, nr. 214).

The Greek text was (re)translated or edited (Salaville & Delleggio 1958, 9) by Neophytos, Metropolitan of Nafpaktos and Arta, Exarch of Aitolia (1656-1740), as we learn from the first edition (Απάνθημα 1st ed., 1/2).2 We actually do not know if Neophytos himself was the translator or if he edited the book together with an anonymous native speaker of Turkish. The second and third editions, however, do not mention the original translator or editor, whose name is systematically removed.

In the third edition the book is presented as a work by a person with the initials “B.I.” (Απάνθημα 3rd ed., 5). Interestingly enough, the biographical context of this edition is transposed from South-Eastern Europe (Aitolia and Epirus) to Asia Minor, since “B.I.” adds a dedication to Kyrill, Exarchs of Lykaonia, and “Saint of Ikonion” (Κώνη; Απάνθημα 3rd ed., 3). The target, however, remains Anatolia: Neophytos, in the first edition, presents his book as a didactic tool not only for religious notions, but also for the Greek language, which “in Asia has been totally lost” (Απάνθημα 1st ed., VII: “καθότι την των άκρων έγχθα/καθότι γεννημένο δεν έχει τηλεαναλογία”). He continues: “That’s why the Christians living in Asia have come to such a barbarity that they have lost not only the sciences, but also their true and inherited language, and acquired instead the Turkish language, which they write and read with Greek letters”. Nevertheless, the impact of the book was not limited to Asia Minor: we know that it was used already in 1730, i.e. only twelve years after the first edition, for linguistic exercise in a Turkish grammar compiled by a Greek teacher from the Peloponnesse (Kappler 2014), practically reversing the objective of the target language to be learned: from Greek to Turkish.

2.3 Contents

The book contains the principles of Christian faith, organized in three parts: the first one (pp. 1-90), with 12 subsections concerning everything a Christian must know ‘for his salvation’, with the Greek text of unknown authorship, perhaps by Neophytos himself. The second part (pp. 91-122) consists of the 20 chapters of the Confession of Faith by the first Patriarch of Istanbul after the Ottoman conquest, Gennadios Scholarios. This text is well-known from Martin Crusius’ first publication in 1584, though this is a different version from that provided by Crusius (Salaville & Delleggio 1958, 7). The third part (pp. 123-150) contains in 15 chapters the solar and lunar cycles and the methods for calculating the Orthodox festivities.

The second edition faithfully follows the first one, but it contains a series of appendices, such as a monologue (μονόλογον), composed by Christophoros Patrikiou and Anthypatos the Mytilenian (Απάνθημα 3rd ed., 128-43), and — very important though up to now completely neglected in Turkish transcription text studies — an extensive Greek-Turkish vocabulary ("İsminin Lüğəthin şətəşı/ре́чь Унаны Легелерин теркүмсөнүгө [recte Yunani Logeterin tercümesidir]"); Απάνθημα 3rd ed., 143-77), subdivided into nouns and verbs and containing roughly 2,500 entries; moreover a bilingual conversation part on ecclesiastical themes, including two dialogues in a lively colloquial language, extremely interesting for the knowledge of both spoken Greek and Turkish at the end of the 18th century (Απάνθημα 3rd ed., 177-92). In both editions, all the text is rigorously bilingual, with interchanging pages: one page Greek, one page Turkish, except for the dialogues, which are organized in columns.

As can be easily inferred from what has been said until now, a complete comparative analysis of the Greek and Turkish texts of the whole book would be well worth the trouble. For the limited framework of the present contribution, we can only list the books, and in particular the second one, in the following columns, instead of the usual dative, but it could be a typographical mistake for "bilingualität" is particularly interesting, since A. 'ihma denotes the incorrect ("obscure") pronunciation of Arabic by foreigners (cf. Ayoub 2006, 83); the term accented, from the same root, passed into Ottoman with the meaning 'inexperienced, Persian'.

[356]
3. Analysis of contact-induced phenomena in Απάνθησις της Χριστιανικής Πλειάδας / Gültürk I Imam-i Mesih (1st ed.)

3.1 Global copies – religious terms

It can be expected from a Christian text translated from Greek that most of the religious terms may be copied from Greek. There are in fact some such instances, which fall into two categories:

(a) Terms without an available synonym, such as titles (in the Turkish texts the original Greek titles and names are shown in italics):

[3] Συντεθέν πάρα τοις πανερρήτοτοις, και λογικότατοις μηροποιούντων ναυπάκτου και Δρυτος, ἐπιρρήτου καὶ ἔδραγχος πάσης αἰτωλίας κυρίου καὶ Νεοφύτου

[b] Κύκλωσαν τις πανερρήτοτοις βεληνεκώντων ἐπιρρήτου καὶ λογικότατοις μηροποιούντων αἰτωλίας καὶ ἐδραγχοῖς. Ἐπιρρήτους κύριου καὶ Νεοφύτου τῶν τελεφ ὀλοκληρωμένων

(c) Terms formed by the very holy and learned, and honored Metropolitan of Nafplion and Arta, Exarch of all Aitolia, Κύριος Κύριος Νεοφύτος

(Απάνθησις 1st ed., 3/5)

Worth mentioning in the present example is the morphological transmission from model code to basic (target) code in terms of adaptation to the target grammar according to its syntactic constraints (αιτωλίας — αἰτωλίαιν, ἐδραγχοὶ — ἐδραγχοῖς), including the transfer from the oblique case, here genitive, to the unmarked case (nominative) (λογικότατος — λογικότατος).

In this category we also have Christian terms where a correspondence in Islam does exist, but the Islamic term is not used:

[4] Η πίστις περιέχεται εἰς τὸ πιστεύειν

[1] Μεν πιστεύει Μηρχίτουντον

(Απάνθησις 1st ed., 3/4)

Although we have morphological adaptation here as well, the locative suffix -DA is realized by the phonologically irregular form -de.6

(b) Terms with an available synonym, but where the choice of the Greek word

6 The irregular stress might indicate, at first sight, a confusion with the enclitic du, but the stress is systematically on the same syllable in all the occurrences (cf., for instance, example [1] below), and it is more probable that the translator did not want to alter the graphic shape of the
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ground of the two religions, but, first of all, because of the practical need of all Karamanli texts, which had to be easily understood by the readers/listeners. The particular case of 'God', where the Greek word is never used, is known also from other Karamanli sources – cf. the 16th century manuscript studied by Gabriel (2009, 345) – and confirms the findings in our text. In his seminal study on religious terminology in Karamanli texts, Strauss (2014) shows that the reasons for the use of Arabic terms has to be searched in the tradition of the Islamic lexicon in Ottoman Turkish itself and suggests that Karamanli authors may have been familiar with Christian Arabic texts.

3.2 Combinational copies

Beyond the borrowing of lexicon, the so-called "selective copies" (Johanson 2005, 5), especially the combinational ones at the syntactic level (Johanson 2006, 16–20), are of great interest. The Turkish text of our source presents relatively few participle and converb constructions (except másle, which is frequently used),9 most of the object and relative clauses are translated by the means of Persian conjunctions. Although this is not astonishing per se, since such constructions are very common n Ottoman texts (see below), there are some examples where the Turkish translation, compared to the Greek source text, presents peculiarities.

3.2.1 Relative clauses

The Persian ki as a conjunction to introduce a relative clause was widely used in Ottoman texts, including Karamanli books.10 Jean Deny’s (1921, 850–52) grammar dedicates a section to the ki-relative clauses, but at the end of the chapter, Deny (1921, 852) remarks that frequent use of ki in relative clauses has to be considered as a "foreign" influence: "L’usage trop fréquent des propositions subordonnées commençant par ki décele souvent la nationalité étrangère du sujet parlant."

Our text displays many relative clauses introduced by ki, such as:

[8]

έκείνος ὁπον πρώτα ἦσαν τῶν μάνων θεός
'that, who at first only was God'

ποι ἄλλα ὑπὸ δέχεται φίλος ἅλλα ἵπτι
'[he who at first only was God]

'this God, who at first only was God'

(Apánthosíma 1st ed., 78)

9 This convery, often in the forms μιθνλλι/μιθλάκα, and with different semantic contexts, seems to be one of the most frequently encountered converbs in Karamanli texts (cf. Eckmann 1958, 80–82). However, this form can be often found in "regular Ottoman texts" too (Brendensoen 2016, 30).

10 Relative clauses introduced by ki in other Karamanli texts have been noted by Arslan-Kechriotis (2009, 180).

OBSERVATIONS ON GRAPHIC SYNTAXISM IN A KARAMANLI BOOK

Quite typically, relative clauses are transformed into main clauses by resuming the heads in order to avoid clef or other untypical constructions, resulting in a repetition of the word in the Turkish translation (this can be already observed in example [5]). This proceeding is very frequent; we will provide just one example (another case can be seen in example [18c] below):

[6]

[ένα πράγμα...], τὸ ὁποῖον δὲν ἔχει ποτέ ἄρχην11
'[a thing...], which never had a beginning'

βε μοι σεγανόν ἔβεβλε διά λόγον τι
'[ve bu şeyi inveli asla yok idi]

'and this thing never had a beginning'

(Apánthosíma 1st ed., 3/4)

In quite a few instances the relative clause is omitted, being paraphrased by other constructions, e.g. the causal conjunction zira, thus resuming the head of the Greek relative clause:

[7] (talking about the two mysteries (μυστερία/εσθαν) of faith)

τὰ ὁποῖα ἔχοντο ἡμᾶς τὸς χριστιανὸν ἀπὸ ἀσφέδες ἀπόδημοι,
καὶ πνευματικοὶ 'which distinguish us, the Christians, from atheists, Jews, and some heretics'

όρα μοι καὶ τὸ κεραυνοφόρον ὕψος τῆς κρυπτολογίας μουχλητρέντεν, βασικοπλετήστεν, βασικοπλετήστεν αὐτὸν ἀγαθὸν
[ζιρα bu iki esrar biz hristianlar mülhidlerden, ve yahudilerden, ve bazı rafatardan ayrılr]

'because these two mysteries distinguish us, the Christians, from atheists, and Jews, and some heretics'

(Apánthosíma 1st ed., 3/4)

The general trend of the translator to avoid or simplify relative clauses must be certainly seen in the general perspective of the didactic function of the texts, which had to be simple and easily understood by the target readership.

3.2.2 Object clauses

The most typical construction for object clauses is not the infinite left-branching 'Turkic' one, i.e. by using a verbal noun as direct or indirect object (cf. Göksel & Kernälö 2005, 358–69), but a subordinating strategy with the Persian conjunction ki plus a right-branching clause containing a finite verb:

[8]

.getOrElse λογίαν, ὅτι δὸ δεῖ εἶναι τὰ μεγαλύτερα μυστήρια τῆς πίστεως μας

'lest a lie of falsehood should reveal one of our greatest mysteries'

[Indi bilmüş olmasa ki imanımızzan en büyük esrarı iddia]

'Thus know that two are the greatest mysteries of our faith'

(Apánthosíma 1st ed., 3/4)

The following example contains an object clause and a (right-branching) rela-
tive clause (in Greek an adversarial complement), both introduced by ki, and then another relative clause transformed into a main clause in Turkish (see example [6]). By this procedure, the translator managed to obtain exactly the same constituent order in his Turkish translation:

[5] πρέπει να ξέρετε ότι η ένωση του Θεού είναι ένα πράγμα έξω από όλα τα πράγματα του κόσμου, το σπούδαν δεν είχε ποτέ αρχήν
‘we have to know that the unity of God is one thing outside all the things of the world, which never had a beginning’
πιστεύει καθώς και άλλοι πιστεύουν πιστεύουν στη θεότητα του Θεού
[bi]lmek geryeyi ki allahun birliyi bir seylerdi ki dünüyanın bütün şeylerinden tasarrfur, ve bu şeyi un evveli asla yok idi]
‘We must know that the unity of God is one thing, which is outside all the things of the world, and this thing never had a beginning’

(Απάνθωμα 1st ed., 3/4)

An interesting case is the following example, where a verb is embedded into the finite object clause. The use of the verb (olmaye ‘< to be’) is motivated by the presence of a Greek gerund (δνενας ‘< to be’) in the source text. Note also the addition of extra lexemes (elem, derti, illet) for the meaning ‘suffering’, in order to underline the semantics of the Greek verb πάθων ‘to suffer’, but also in the stylistic tradition of the Ottoman hendadiyosin, where synonymous elements are linked by the connector ‘and’ (ve > -u/-ü):

[10] Πρέπει να ξέρετε και τούτο, ότι Ο θεός Χριστός δοθείς θεός και θεότρως, δοθείς θεότρως, δοθείς θεότρως δοθείς θεότρως
‘We also have to know this: that, the Lord Christ being God and human, his divine nature did not suffer at all, but only his human nature suffered’
Πιστεύει καθώς και άλλοι πιστεύουν πιστεύουν στη θεότητα του Θεού
[Bi]lmek geryeyi ki Hristos efendimizinin allahun ve insanln tabiati olmaye, allahun deyil, lakin yalniz insan tabiati elem, ve derti, ve illet cekti]
‘We have to know this: that, Christ our Lord being God and human, not his divine [nature], but only his human nature suffered’

(Απάνθωμα 1st ed., 7/8)

3.2.3 Comparative clauses with nice ki, with and without converses
The Greek comparative conjunction καθώς ‘as’ finds its exact correspondence in the Ottoman (< Persian) connective nice ki, following the syntactical pattern of the model code, but comprising a modality shift. The use of the conditional suffix A + gerek ‘need’ is frequent in spoken Turkish in the expression osa gerek ‘must be’, but mostly in the 3rd person and only as a probability statement (Goksel & Kerslake 2005, 299), whereas necessity semantics in other persons, and, above all, with dou-

ble personal marking, both on the verb and on gerek, seem to be less frequent. Information about this construction in Ottoman is not available (cf. example [10] bi)lmek geryeyi, with infinitive):

as we will say in the creed
‘ve]ti ki pisteriste te ve karegi
[nice ki pista]evo desak geryeyi
‘as we should say in the creed’

(Απάνθωμα 1st ed., 7/8)

Arslan-Kechriotis (2009, 183–84) detected a similar structure with nice ki... i)se in temporal clauses in another Karamanli book, though without the necessity modality, and only on one and the same verb (ī)ṣiṭ ‘to hear’. An interesting use of the conditional, though different from here, where the enclitic i)se is linked with dir and expresses a temporal verb, has also been observed in Karamanlidika by Arslan-Kechriotis (2009, 179), and by Bremendon (2016, 20–21).

The following is an example where a conditional verb contains an embedded converge clause (< in Greek a temporal clause):

[12] καθως το φύση του ήλιου ονομα ανέλεξεν είς τον διέλθην τον θεόν τον θείον τον ήλιον τον ήλιον τον ήλιον τον ήλιον ήλιον ήλιον
‘as the sunlight, when it shines on a tree, and someone wanted to cut that tree with an axe, the sunlight will not suffer, but only the tree’
βε]nti ki kawenaseuν θυγατρινη ανελεξεν εις την διελθην τον θεον τον θειον τον ήλιον τον ήλιον τον ήλιον
‘as the sunlight, when it shines on a tree, and someone cuts that tree with an axe, the sunlight will not suffer, but only the tree will’

(Απάνθωμα 1st ed., 7/8)

The step from the previous example towards a construction of the comparative clause with an adversarial clause, and not with a finite verb, as in Greek, becomes comprehensible in the following example. Furthermore, this construction contains the aforementioned converge mayale:

[13] καθως ο δινώσως έχει τρία πράγματα, ήθους νοης, λόγαν και πνεύμα, διότι δεν είναι τρίς δινήσιμοι αλλά ένας
βε]nti ki i)se is el]nti se]ni to plēv to to plēv to to plēv to to plēv
‘ve]ni ki i)se is el]nti se]ni to plēv to to plēv to to plēv to to plēv
‘as the human has three things, i.e. reason, speech, and soul, they are not three humans, but one’

(Απάνθωμα 1st ed., 5/6)
3.2.4 Plural marking after numerals

As can be seen in example [13], we come across plural marking after numerals, whereas, in Turkish, plural after quantifiers is usually not marked (Göksel & Karakule 2005, 148). The example above displays ἵς ἰσσάτερα (instead of ἵς ἰσσάρ), but also the regular ἰσσάν. In fact, the phenomenon is systematic only with the noun ἰσσάρ.

[14] [Greek text lacking]

ὃ τοῦ ἵς ἰσσάρα
[ὃ τοῦ ἰσσάρα]

'and four things'

(Aπάνθησις 1st ed., 1/2)

[15]

μὲ τὰ τέσσαρα δεικνυόντα ἐπικεφαλῆς

'with the four things to be remembered'

χαρτοφύλακκα κτητορικῶν λατρεύτων ὀλοκληρώσα

[hatabimne getürmek lazım olan ol dört akhı peşerle]

'with those four last things we have to call to mind'

(Aπάνθησις 1st ed., 3/4)

It also occurs, however, sporadically with other (inanimate) nouns:

[16]

καὶ περίχει διάδεκα μήψ

καὶ περίχει διάδεκα μήψ

[ve anun on iki kitaler vardut]

'and it contains twelve parts'

(Aπάνθησις 1st ed., 310)

Arlsan-Kechriotis (2009, 176) observes similar structures with plural-marked nouns after quantifiers in other Karamanli texts. As Breindelme (2016, 21) points out, this phenomenon is certainly to be ascribed to influence from Greek.

3.2.5 Word order

A typical phenomenon in Turkic contact languages, where the dominating code is Indo-European, is the changed word order (cf. Johanson 2006, 17). The neutral (unmarked) SOV order undergoes alteration (in principle possible in Turkish but with pragmatic markedness, e.g., focus) according to the syntax of the model code. Nevertheless, unmarked word order changes in our text are relatively rare; here is one of the examples that can be cited. Where the striking feature, apart from the word order, is also the reproduction of the Greek substantivized numeral (in Turkish, a head noun, e.g., ἵς ἰσσάτερε, 'mystery', would be regularly required, or else the adjective would occur with a possessive suffix, which is lacking here):

[364]
4. Conclusions

The phenomena found in the 1st edition of *Anavtoma* and described above occur in various contact-induced Turkic varieties of the area today, namely Gagauz, Rumelian or Balkan Turkish, Rhodian Turkish and Cypriot Turkish, as well as in the Turkish varieties spoken in Central Europe. Moreover, right-branching relative and object clauses with connectives and finite verbs are typical structures in several periods during the history of Ottoman, which itself can be considered a language under heavy contact influence. For this reason, the interpretation of these doublet contact-induced phenomena is not always unambiguous, as some of them could be interpreted as influence from Greek, others from Ottoman, i.e. ultimately from Persian, without being able to tell which is which. However, the opportunity presented by this text to compare directly the source code Greek and the target language Turkish by juxtaposition of the translated texts, does show a clear reference to the model code. Moreover, perhaps the most important conclusion, and, at the same time, prospective for the future, is the insight that these kinds of texts are highly suitable for diachronic language contact research on spoken Ottoman. For older stages of languages, here Ottoman Turkish, sources for spoken varieties are rather rare. Language systems with features that we can call, as I do, *syncretistic*, offer the opportunity to analyze language contact phenomena back in time; not all of them reflect the spoken language, but many of them do. Religiolects of the past are syncretistic linguistic systems with high information content about spoken language, and the way they are contact-induced by definition. Karamanlidika is only an example; another copious corpus could be the extensive Turkish texts in Armenian script. We can also imagine that several South-Eastern European religiolects contain equally valuable data, for example the spoken variety of Cretan Muslims, which may offer interesting insight into the contact of 18th and 19th century Cretan Greek varieties with Turkish, an aspect which, to my knowledge, has not yet been investigated. Albanian and Bosnian Aljamiado texts might also be a rewarding object of study in this field, probably providing results that exceed mere lexical copying. This existing material, therefore, being already well-known as important historical and literary sources, has to be examined in terms of deeper, not only lexical language contact.

To mention only a few, mainly recent, of the numerous studies which deal with the phenomena from a contact-induced perspective: Friedman (2006, 39–41) and Matras (2006, 53–55) on relative clauses in Macedonian Turkish varieties; Menz (2006) on word order, relative and object clauses in Gagauz; Pfaff (1991, 116) on plural marking after numerals in Turkish varieties of Germany; Rebhun (2001, 323) on continuous sentence-coordination with the connector vs as used by Turkish–German bilinguals; Kappeler (2008, 205–13) and Gulle (2011, 95–99) on object and relative clauses in Cypriot Turkish; and Kaili, Çeltek & Georgalidou (2012, 115, 117) on (though less frequently occurring) object clauses with ki in Rhodian Turkish.

Kerslake (1998, 199) speaks about a decrease of Persian syntactical influence in the Middle Ottoman period (16th to 18th c.).
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Περίληψη

Γλώσσικη επαφή στην προφορική οθωμανική: παρατηρήσεις σχετικά με τον γραφικό συγκριτισμό σε ένα καραμανλίδικο βιβλίο (1718)

Οι περισσότερες οθωμανικές πηγές σε αραβικό αλφάβητο, γραμμένες σε μια υψηλή ποικιλία, δεν μας προσφέρουν πληροφορίες για την ομιλητική γλώσσα της εποχής. Παρόλο που η οθωμανική είναι μια κατεξοχήν επαρκής γλώσσα, η δυσκολία αυτή επικεντρώνεται και στην έρευνα ψηφιακών γλωσσικών επιστημών σε επίπεδο προφορικής γλώσσας, και όχι μόνο όσον αφορά τα περισσότερα και τα αραβικά δάνεια. Εδώ και πολλά χρόνια στην τοπολογία εξετάζονται και χρησιμοποιούνται πηγές σε μη αραβικές γραφές, τα λεγόμενα κείμενα σε μεταγραφή (Transcriptionsteck), σε λατινικό, αρχαίο, ελληνικό, κυριακικό, εβραϊκό, σινικό ή άλλο αλφάβητο, που παρήχθησαν για πρακτικούς σκοπούς και αντανακλούν την προφορική γλώσσα. Ορισμένα από αυτά μπορούν να τρέφουν θρησκευτικά (religious) της οθωμανικής - επέκταση της ορολογίας των Hary & Wein (2013) - δηλαδή, αν ή δεν έχουμε γνώμη για καθολικούς πολλές χρονικές, υπό ένα διάφορα διαδικτυακά φαινόμενα και αρχαιότητα. Ένας άλλος όρος, εκτός ορισμένου συγκρητισμού, κάνει κατανόηση του συμβατικό χαρακτήρα των κείμενων μέσω της συγκεκριμένης ιδέας της γλώσσας που, υπό τις κυρίαρχες ή επίσης οι κοινωνικές, πολιτικές και θρησκευτικές συνθήκες, δυνατόν να κατανοηθεί αποκεφαλικά για μια συγκεκριμένη γλώσσα. Τέτοια κείμενα περιέχουν, έξω απομονωμένες, παραδοσιακή γλώσσα και γλώσσα αυτού του λόγου χαρακτηριστικό για την κρατική γλώσση σε παραδόσεις που δεν διαδικτυούν προφορικά κείμενα.

Τα λεγόμενα καραμανλίδικα, δηλαδή τα τουρκικά κείμενα σε ελληνική γραφή από τον 16ο έως τον 20ο αιώνα, παρέχουν περισσότερα προοπόθεσμα σημειώσεις για τις θεωρήσεις μας περί γλώσσας (κείμενα με μεταγραφή ως ψηφιακής οθωμανικής, θρησκευτικά και γραφικώς συγκριτικούς). Εξ αυτού, μιας τέτοιας προερχόμενης επέλεξε το πρώτο τυπωμένο καραμανλίδικο βιβλίο και επερχόμενες να αναλάβουμε μερικά επιστημονικά στοιχεία στην περιπτώση του λευκαλγού και της συμπαθητικής θέσης. Προκειμένου για το Απόλυμα της Χριστιανικής Πίστεως / Κουσμάν Ιανάι Μεντζεγι (Güldar-ı İman-ı Mevlih), που τεκμηριώθηκε το 1718, πιστολέουν και στην Κονσταντινούπολη, με τρεις αρχές μεταγενέστερες εκδόσεις (1743, 1803 και 1883). Ο συγγραφέας/μεταφραστής είναι ο Νέφους, "μηποίτητος Ναυ- πάκτου και Άρτη, έξαρχος πάσης Αιτωλίας" (1656-1740), και το βιβλίο περιέχει τις βασικές της Πίστεως της χριστιανικής πίστης, ένα ειρηνικό το οποίο, και και μεταγενέστερες εκδόσεις, ένα μηνυτήριο και ένα λεξιλόγιο με διάλογους πάνω σε θρησκευτικά θέματα. Το βιβλίο αποτελεί λοιπόν ένα έργο διδακτικού χαρακτήρα για τη διδασκαλία της χριστιανικής πίστης, και όπως γράφει ο πρόλογος, της ελληνικής γλώσσας στους τουρκοφώνους χριστιανούς της Μικράς Ασίας. Πώς αυτό
Τον λόγο το βιβλίο είναι διάγλωσσο, με το τουρκικό κείμενο ως μετάφραση του ελληνικού (τα δύο κείμενα εναλλάσσονται ανά σελίδα, μία σελίδα στα ελληνικά και μία στα τουρκικά με ελληνική γραφή). Εξαιτίας αυτών των χαρακτηριστικών, το βιβλίο προσφέρεται για μελέτη σε ζητήματα μετάφρασης και γλωσσικών επαφών.


Στο συντακτικό επίπεδο (combinational copies, κατά την ορολογία του Johansen) αναλόγηθησαν αναφορικές προτάσεις, π.χ. "εκείνος όπου πρώτα ήταν μόνον Θεός / ποι άλλος χι εββελε φακάτ άλλος ίτι [ba allah ki envelde fakat allah idi]", ειδικές προτάσεις, π.χ. "πρέπει να ήξερωμεν ότι η ένδοτος του Θεού είναι ένα πράγμα έξω από όλα τα πράγματα του κόσμου, το οποίον δεν είχε ποτέ άρχη / πλημέκ κερέξι κι άλλοχον προς πιστότητα τι σε στοχαστικής μεταφράσης, βε ποη σεγιον εββελε δολα γιοκ ίτι [hilemek gerezey ki allahun birlii] bir sevdâr ki dünyanyn bûtûn seylerinden taşrurad, ve bu seyûn enveli asla yek idi]", καθώς και συγκεκριμένες και επιρρηματικές προτάσεις, π.χ. "και καθώς το χώρο του θεού δεν είναι εις ένα δένδρον, και εκείνο το δένδρον που ήταν το θεού με τέκαρ; το φοί του θεού δεν ήταν πάχαι, άλλο κάτι με το δένδρον / βε ντέι κι κινουσον άγνωστη πιστό του άγαρτο δεν χαμαράκε [ve nice ki güneşin ayniliği bir aya şezerinde olmakde, ve ol aya birisi baltayle kossa, güneşin ayniliği bir ilet çekmez, lakin yalanız ayaş cezâ]", οι οποίες ακολουθούν το μοντέλο της ελληνικής σύναξης. Ενα άλλο παράδειγμα στο συντακτικό επί- πεδο είναι η – ονομασία για την τουρκική – σύνεδρον φράσεων με τον συνδέσμο και/νε. Επίσης, εντοπίστηκαν συντακτικά φαινόμενα ως προς τη σειρά των λέξεων που οφείλονται σε γλωσσική επαφή, π.χ. "διελθμόν tûrova eis to dêvâron / ke- leloðoûm àmût ikiântizî (gelemai simdi ikinciye)", καθώς και το μαρκάρισμα του πληροφορικού ύπαιθρου από άρθρικτη, το οποίο, σε τυποποιημένη τουρκική γλώσσα, εκτός από συγκεκριμένες εκφράσεις, δεν επιτρέπεται, π.χ. "και περιέχει διάδεξια / be anûn òv iki kitâleri bârtûp [ve anûn iki kitâleri vardû]".

Ολα αυτά τα φαινόμενα γλωσσικής επαφής απαντούν σε σύγχρονες τουρκικές ποικιλίες που εξακολουθούν να βρίσκονται σε επαφή με τους γλωσσικούς χώρους, όπως τα βαλκανικά τουρκικά ("roumelia"), τα γκαγκακούζικα, τα τουρκικά της Κύπρου και της Ρώσου και τα τουρκικά της Κεντρικής Ευρώπης. Στόχος μας είναι να δείξουμε ότι κείμενα όπως το Απόλυτο αποτελούν προδιάγραμμα για