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The third chapter continues with the structural aspects of Serapheim’s text, examining morphology, lexicon and the methods of translation. While the previous chapter indicated dialectal features, this chapter indicates that Serapheim employed specific grammatical and stylistic strategies. Through the study of the diachronic morphology and morphonology of Turkish suffixes, the choice of words and the translation techniques, we will observe the effort to convey an ecclesiastical register and certain practices for the language of rituals.

3.1. Morphology

In the section on morphology, suffixes found in the sources will be presented and analysed. Based on the periodisation mentioned in 0.3., the primary sources used for this research belong chronologically to the last period of Middle Ottoman (sixteenth–eighteenth centuries). However, as the phonological analysis has already shown, the language of the texts reflect also many features of “New Ottoman”. As already mentioned, the suffix phonology of Old Anatolian Turkish (thirteenth–fifteenth centuries) had certain characteristics. Those, leaving aside other changes in suffixes, can be summarised as the existence of three vowel harmonies instead of two in late Ottoman and MST. Specifically, the illabial (\{I\} > i/i) and the labial harmony (\{U\} > ü/u) were merged into what is known as fourfold harmony or \{X\}, thus \{I\} > ı, i, u, ü, of late Ottoman and MST. The palatal harmony, realised as \{A\} > a/e; remained unchanged. Although the development of the vowel harmonies and the consonant assimilation, into modern forms, a long and complicated procedure, seems to have occurred around the eighteenth-century, certain suffixes proved to be more conservative than others, for a variety of reasons. Some of them could be diachronic, such as old forms

361 Another change was the assimilation of consonants of the suffixes which did not exist in Old Anatolian Turkish. Suffixes with an initial /d/ (e.g. the suffixes of locative, dative, ablative and others) were not assimilated in terms of +voiced, -voiced with the previous phoneme, but this cannot be analysed here because the writing system does not distinguish the two sounds. Regarding the phenomenon see Demir & Yılmaz, Türk Dili el Kitabı, 97.


surviving in dialects, or due to structural reasons, others might be more sociolinguistically motivated, like methods of translation or printing and the differentiation into spoken, written, colloquial and literary language. An effort will be made to analyse some of these in the pages and chapters to follow. Furthermore, later in the present chapter, dialectal elements, Greek stems with Turkish suffixes and Izafet constructions will be discussed. The chapter will be summarised in the Comments section.

In the absence of works on eighteenth-century Turkish language, apart from that of Gavriel (2010b), works on the seventeenth-century were consulted in order to identify the changes in suffixes. These include works on transcription texts, that give information for spoken Ottoman (i.e. Hazai (1973), Németh (1970) and Sanjian and Tietze (1981)), but also works from the Ottoman literary tradition of the seventeenth-century (i.e. Duman (1995), Develi (1995)). In order to confine the research to a smaller scale and make the comparison possible, only suffixes that differ from Modern Standard Turkish (MST) will be presented, since as mentioned earlier the development of vowel harmonies seem to have been fully developed in the eighteenth-century and thefore the language being more similar to MST. Examples marked with an asterisk illustrated single or rare appearances in the respective source.

3.1.1. Inflectional suffixes

Tense-aspect-modality markers

1. Aorist \{(A/I)r/mAZ\}

The aorist is not encountered often in Serapheim’s texts and most of the time the aorist marker corresponds to its MST form (e.g., \(\acute{a}γγιλιρ\) \(\text{aŋlr}\) (KIN1753:40), \(\text{koulanir}\) (IpK1753:vi), \(\mu\pi\acute{a}κ\acute{a}ριμ\) \(\text{bakarım}\) (KIN1753:ii), \(\kappa\nu\rho\tau\alpha\rho\acute{r}σ\nu\) \(\text{kurtarırsm}\) (KIN1753:32), \(\tau\acute{z}\acute{i}κ\acute{a}ρ\) \(\text{çikar}\) (NTh1756: 47), \(\o\lambda\omega\nu\nu\acute{r}\) \(\text{olunur}\) (KIN1753:vi), \(\kappa\iota\rho\rho\acute{o}\acute{r}ο\nu\acute{c}\) \(\acute{g}\acute{o}r\acute{r}ır\acute{s}\) \(\text{görürüs}\) (KIN1753:73)).

Older forms labial forms appear mainly in the editions of 1753 (e.g., \(\kappa\nu\rho\tau\alpha\rho\acute{r}o\nu\acute{r}\))

364 According to Johanson, “Die westoghusische Labialharmonie,” 69, labial harmony assimilation in rounded condition occurs under the influence of the preceding vowel.
2. Past {DX}

The suffix of the tense of past {DX} is described as a very conservative suffix, especially in the first and second person singular,\(^{365}\) while sixteenth-century sources illustrate favour towards unroundedness (e.g., *oldım, gördim*).\(^{366}\) In Serapheim’s texts the suffix is very much in use and illustrates many differentiations as seen below in 2.1. about personal markers. The MST form is used in the majority of editions (e.g., *βερτιλὲρ* (KIN1753:7) *εγλετίκ* (KIN1753:19) *ἐττή* (CSK1756:iv) *βερτί* (NTh1756:iv), *ίττίμ* [ittim] (IpK1753:vi) (HNK1756:122) (APK1782:4) (PsD1782:39) (SBD1783:14*), *ίττί* [itti] (CSK1756:2)).

2.1. Person markers: past {DX}

2.1.1. First and second person singular

As already mentioned, past {DX} tends to be conservative. In the editions from 1753 we encounter rounded forms of personal markers for the first and second

---

\(^{365}\) Johanson, “Die westoghusische Labialharmonie,” 89.

\(^{366}\) Sanjian and Tietze, *Eremya Chelebi Kömürjan’s “The Jewish Bride,”* 60. The authors attribute the phenomenon to diachrony or the assimilation to -ler when the plural suffix is palatalised.
person singular, preceded by unrounded forms, which points to older forms of the suffix.\textsuperscript{367} 

2SG: \textit{ίττιρτονũ} [ittirdün] (KIN1753:v), \textit{μπρακτοũν} [braktun] (IpK1753:44) 

2.1.2. Third person singular  

In the case of the marker for the third person singular we come across unrounded forms after a rounded vowel in editions dating from 1753 to 1758 and 1782, which again points to the old form.\textsuperscript{368} The phenomenon is also attested in seventeenth-century sources in Németh 1970: 81 and in nineteenth-century Karamanlidika in Kappler 2002: 172 (\textit{soldi}, \textit{oldi}). 


Beside the aforementioned data that are considered to occur regularly (based on historical information), in some of Serapheim’s texts, mainly from 1753 to 1758, we also see the rounded forms for third person singular, which have not been attested anywhere before and cannot be considered as old. 


Regarding the cases of preceding rounded vowels we cannot be sure whether the  

\textsuperscript{367} Demir & Yılmaz, Türk Dili el Kitabı, 99.  
\textsuperscript{368} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{369} In the re-published part of the book from KIN1753.  
\textsuperscript{370} In the re-published part of the book from KIN1753.
previously described phenomenon applies to the following examples or not (e.g., ἀτουλτοῦ [atuldu] (IpK1753:7), τζόκτου [çoku] (SBD1783:xi), ὀλουντοῦ [olundu] (CSK1756:fp)).

3. Past evidential {mXṣ}
The suffix of inferential (evidential) past {mXṣ} is described generally as conservative appearing thus in the old form {mIṣ}. In Sanjian and Tietze (1982) a trend towards unroundedness is described but with both forms occurring in the text. The old unrounded form is also attested in seventeenth-century transcription texts in Hazai 1973:394 and in nineteenth-century Karamanlidika in Kappler 2002:172 (görüms). In Serapheim’s works the {mIṣ}-category is used rarely in general. Unrounded, i.e. old forms do occur after rounded vowels (e.g., ὀλμῖς [olmiş] (PsD1782:6*), τογμῖς [doğmuş] (KIN1753:7)) but {mIṣ} seems to operate in the fourfold harmony as well (e.g., ἰτμῖς [itmiş] (CSK1756:2) (KIN1753:xi), γιαζῖλμῖς [yazilihanmiş] (CSK1756:iii), ὀλμῦζτουρ [olmuştur] (KIN1753:viii), γιασουζμοῦς [yapuşmuş] (IpK1753:43), ὀλουνμοῦς [olunmuş] (CSK1756:fp)).

4. Imperative
The imperative suffix of the third person singular {sXn} and plural {sXnlAr} are used rarely and most of the time in 1753 editions, and appear both in labial {sUn} and fourfold {sXn} form. The labial form of the suffix in the third person singular is also attested in nineteenth-century Karamanlidika in Kappler 2002: 172 (alsun, eylesün).


3PL: ὀλσουννὰρ [olsunnar] (KIN1753:29), γιανσουννὰρ [yansunnar]


372 Sanjian and Tietze, Eremya Chelebi Kömürjan’s “The Jewish Bride,” 60.
While the tense operates in the palatal harmony which shows less diachronic modification, many data show that the [k] of the suffix does not assimilate between vowels, both front and back. The examples are too many to be attributed to error, and in most editions the phenomenon appears more than once. The phenomenon is attested neither in Karamanlidika sources of the same and later period, nor in grammars of the time.⁷³³ A hypothesis could be that it is just a graphic phenomenon, based on the non-standard writing system used for the books, but nevertheless it needs further research in order to reach safe conclusions.

⁷³³ See Gavriel, “Η Τουρκική με το Ελληνικό αλφάβητο, 256, Demetris Alexandrides, Γραμματική Γραίκο-Τουρκική, 55.
This variation might have its roots in the development of harmonies, since it appears in older sources\(^ \text{374} \) and it is also attested in nineteenth-century Karamanlidika in Kappler 2002: 171 (*oturalum*). If we take into consideration that it is translated as ‘Let us’, a very common phrase in liturgical texts, it might have other connotations, which will be discussed in a following chapter.

\{(y)AlI\}:
\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}

\{(y)AlUm\}:
\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}

7. Necessity marker \{mAlI\}

The necessity marker is rarely used. While the last vowel of the suffix is usually

\(^{374}\) Demir & Yılmaz, *Türk Dili el Kitabı*, 101, Sanjian and Tietze, *Eremya Chelebi Kömürjan’s ‘The Jewish Bride,’* 64. See also Kappler, *Türkischsprachige Liebeslyrik*, 171, where only the labial form occurs.
illabial (e.g., \textit{(Page dimensions: 447.9x680.3 680.3} [okumaliyas]) (BH1783:9), \textit{Page dimensions: 447.9x680.3} [olmalı] (CSK1756:2), \textit{Page dimensions: 447.9x680.3} [olmalıttır] (NTh1756: 267) \textit{Page dimensions: 447.9x680.3} [gelmeli] (NvB1776:66), \textit{Page dimensions: 447.9x680.3} [görümler]t [verilmelidir] (HNK1756:4)), on certain occasions, in editions dating from 1753 to 1756, it occurs in rounded form, and is considered to be old (e.g., \textit{Page dimensions: 447.9x680.3} [eylenmelüiz] (KIN1753:10) \textit{Page dimensions: 447.9x680.3} [kavilendirmelüis] (KIN1753:63), \textit{Page dimensions: 447.9x680.3} [n Th1756: 375]), \textit{Page dimensions: 447.9x680.3} [söylemelü] (NTh1756: 47), \textit{Page dimensions: 447.9x680.3} [olmalı] (NTh1756: 57)).

Cases

1. Accusative \{(y)X\}

The accusative follows the fourfold harmony in all editions. In the edition of 1753 and rarely in NTh1756 we come across the unusual phenomenon of labialisation with rounded forms preceded by unrounded. The phenomenon is not attested in any of the other works on Anatolian dialects or Karamanlidika used for this research and cannot be justified by historical reasoning because the accusative marker contains historically only the illabial vowel.


2. Genitive \{(n)Xn\} / \{(n)Un\}

Genitive is one of those suffixes described as conservative. The old form of the suffix is \{(n)U\}, with labial vowel and the velar \(\eta\) at the end\footnote{In the re-published part of the book from KIN1753.}, in MST form is \{(n)Xn\}, with fourfold vowel harmony and the final consonant being \(\eta > n\) (see above 2.4.2.3.). In seventeenth-century texts in Develi 1995: 11 the suffix appears in the form \{(n)U\}, while in Sanjian and Tietze 1981: 60 it is generally rounded but not always. In Gavriel 2010: 235 the suffix follows the fourfold harmony but

\footnote{Johanson, “Die westughusische Labialharmonie,” 91.}
preserves the velar nasal η (i.e., {(ν)Xη}).

In Serapheim’s texts the genitive suffix appears in four different forms. It appears in the fourfold harmony (e.g., Παναγίανυ [Panayia’nın] (KIN1753:21) (IpK1753:16) (NTh1756:53)), and rarely in fourfold with the velar η (e.g., σενίγιγιλεν ([seni ile] HNK1756:21) ὤγουλουνονγ [oğulunun] (APK1782:22*)).


A form, which occurs rarely, is the unrounded form preceded by a rounded vowel (e.g., ινανιµουζην [inanımuzın] (KIN1753:7)). It is not attested in other sources and given the lack of historical reasoning and examples can be attributed to error.

Plural suffix {lAr}

In the study by Johanson (1981) regarding the plural suffix, we see that diachronically palatal harmony is rare in Ōğuz Turkish, although deviations in favour of palatal harmony do exist. The phenomenon is also attested in seventeenth-century transcription texts in Hazai 1973:386-387 (fesatlerini), in eighteenth-century Karamanlidika texts in Eckmann 1950a: 182 (ayakler, meyvaler) and in nineteenth-century Karamanlidika in Kappler 2002: 154–155.

---


175
(dağler). In Serapheim’s texts we rarely encounter the phenomenon.


Question marker {mX}

According to Johanson (1981: 12) the question marker tends to be conservative and retain the old illabial form {mI}. The illabial form is attested also in seventeenth-century transcription texts in Hazai 1973:400, in seventeenth-century Armeno-Turkish (Sanjian & Tietze 1981:68). While in eighteenth-century Karamanlidika in Gavriel (2010: 271) the suffix operates in the fourfold harmony, in Serapheim’s texts it varies between the rounded and unrounded form.

The suffix appears not to assimilate to the previous rounded vowel on most occasions (e.g., ιτζοῦν μι [için mi] (IpK1753:29) (RAB1782:153), ὀλτοῦν μι [oldun mü] (NTh1756:3) γκιορτουνόζμι [gördünüz mü] (HNK1756:69) (KŞ1758:69*), γκιορτοῦμι [gördüm mü] (CSK1756:281) (SBD1783:85), γιόκμ [yok mü] (NvB1776:53*), οὐκοῦν [uykun mü] (PsD1782:118), ὀλιού [ölüm mü] (SBD1783:19), ὀλοῦρ [olur mü] (BH1783:111*), ἀράμαγιολουμμι [arayalum mü] (NTh1756: 62), ὀλουνούς μι [olunus mü] (APK1782:8), γκιοροῦρμισινίς [görör misiniz] (RAB1782:21)).

See also (e.g., ἀγνατινής μι [anatums mü] (APK1782:5), βερίμ [verim mü] (HNK1756:12), ιτζήμ [için mü] (RAB1782:11), γκιορτουνίζμι [gördüniz mü] (CSK1756:137) μπιλέμισιν [bilme misinis] (HNK1756:26) ἔτμεετζεκμ [etmeecek mü] (PsD1782:118) παγισλαμάμγις [bayışlama müyis] (IpK1753:8), τουγιάρμισιν [duyar misimis] (KŞ1758:69), βάρμ [var mü] (NvB1776:24)).

While in many occasions assimilates to the previous rounded vowel (e.g., τουγτουνοόζμου [duğdunuz mü] (IpK1753:30), τατλούμμου [tatlum mudur] (NTh1756:66), κιορτουνούζμου [gördünüz mü] (NTh1756: 39), βουκούφμουσους [vukuf musunus] (APK1782:6), ποζουτοῦμου [bozuldu mü] (SBD1783:8), γκιοροῦρμου [görür mü] (BH1783:6), ὀλτοῦ [oldu mü] (BH1783:150), ουμουτοῦρμου [umuddur mü] (PsD1782:118) γιόκμουτου [yok mudur] (RAB1782:13)).
Converbs

1. \{DXktAn sogra\}

This suffix follows the fourfold harmony but on most occasions the second part retains the velar η (e.g., ταξιθατίκταν σογρά [tasładıktan sogra] (HNK1756:11), ἀγριλτικτάνσογρα [ayrıldıktan sogra] (NvB1776:35) σογλετικτέν σογρά [söyledıktan sogra] (CSK1756:269), τηριλτικτέν σογρά [dırıdıktan sogra] (KȘ1758:8), ἐτικτένσογρα [ettıkten sogra] (RAB1782:105), ἐντικτένσόγρα [endıkten sogra] (APK1782:23) (NvB1776:3) ὀλτουκτάνσογρα [oldıktan sogra] (CSK1756:272), ὀλτουκτένσόγρα [oldıkten sogra] (APK1782:50)).

2. \{DXkçA(s)\}

This converbal suffix appears in Serapheim’s texts in the fourfold harmony in terms of vowels, but retains almost always the final /s/ from the old form which is not standard and mainly attested in dialects, but also in old grammars such as Meninski’s. It has been studied for Karamanli sources by Eckmann (1958) and it is also attested in eighteenth-century Karamanlidika texts in Eckmann 1950a: 183 (vurudukçes) and in nineteenth-century Karamanlidika texts in Kappler 2002: 183 (başladıkças).


We cannot be sure of the existence of the rounded form, since in all examples the suffix is preceded by a rounded vowel (e.g., τουρτούκτζας [durdukças] (KIN1753:viii) (CSK1756:18) (APK1782:17), τουτουιστούκτζας [tutuştukças]

378 Kappler, Türkischsprachige Liebeslyrik, 183.
3. \{(y)XncA(s)\}

The MST form of this suffix is \{(y)XncA\}. In Serapheim’s texts, as well as the older form of the suffix, which had a final /s/, the form \{(y)IncE\} occurs. These forms are also attested in eighteenth-century Karamanlidika texts in Eckmann 1950a: 183 (akabıncas, akabinces). The form \{(y)XncA(s)\} is attested in eighteenth-century Karamanlidika in Gavriel 2010b: 269 (görünces), while in nineteenth-century Karamanlidika texts in Kappler 2002: 169,183 it occurs in both forms but with final /s/ in variation with /z/ (görüncaz, kokmainces). In the present research it occurs mostly in the form \{(y)XncAs\}.

4. \{(y)Xp\}

Regarding the converb suffix \{(y)Xp\}, in seventeenth-century Ottoman texts in Develi 1995: 117 it is attested in the old form \{(y)Ub\}, with labial harmony in vowels and a final voiced consonant. In seventeenth-century Armeno-Turkish in Sanjian & Tietze (1981) the suffix shows a bias towards the rounded form, with the suffix remaining rounded even when preceded by unrounded vowels. The authors...
attribute this either to assimilation with the final labial consonant, or preservation of the old form. In seventeenth-century transcription texts in Hazai 1973:408 in the form \{(y)Up\} and in eighteenth-century Karamanlidika texts in Gavriel 2010b: 268 the suffix is attested in the MST form \{(y)Xp\} while in nineteenth-century Karamanlidika texts in Kappler 2002: 170,190 it is attested also in the labial form \{(y)Up\}. In Serapheim’s texts the suffix occurs in the form \{(y)Xp\} in most editions. Although examples of the labial form after illabial stem, i.e. resembling the older forms do occur, mainly in editions of 1753–1756 and 1776, we cannot be sure about the voicedness of the final consonant due to the lack of distinction between /b/ and /p/ in the writing system.


Furthermore, in two editions from 1756 we see the suffix remaining unrounded when preceded by a rounded vowel – something not attested in the other works. (e.g., τοῦγιπ [duyip] (NTh1756:6), πογιου�ɨπ [böyüip] (HNK1756:25), κουρουɨπ [koroup] (CSK1756:87), ὀχοויד [ohup] (NTh1756:ix)).

---

380 Sanjian and Tietze, Eremya Chelebi Kömürjan’s “The Jewish Bride,” 60.
**PERSON MARKERS**

1. \{ fyXm \}

The first person singular follows the fourfold harmony in general but occurs in editions dating from 1753 to 1756 in labial form (e.g., ἵτερουµ [iderüm] (KIN1753:iii) (IpK1753:5) (NTh1756:21) (HNK1756:122)). Rarely, we also see illabial forms preceded by rounded vowels\(^{381}\) (e.g., κουλούγµ [kuluyım] (KIN1753:47)), which is the old form of the suffix and attested in seventeenth-century Ottoman texts in Develi 1995: 79.

2. \{ sXn \}

The copular marker of second person singular occurs in fourfold harmony apart from in the edition KIN1753, where we see some labial forms (ἵτερσουµ [idersün] (KIN1753:15)). According to Sanjian and Tietze’s findings there are no rounded forms of this suffix and unrounded forms occur after a rounded vowel.\(^{382}\) In Gavriel (2010) the suffix follows the fourfold harmony but uses the velar η,\(^{383}\) which does not occur for this suffix in Serapheim’s texts.

3. \{ DXr \}

The suffix \{ DXr \} of the third person singular is described by Johanson (1979) as conservative, especially in gospels, where we come across the labial form \{ DUr \}\(^{384}\), a form attested also in seventeenth-century transcription texts in Hazai 1973:421. In Sanjian and Tietze (1981) the condition of the suffix in this seventeenth-century Armeno-Turkish text is described as complicated, with the suffix being in general in rounded form.\(^{385}\) In Serapheim’s texts the suffix follows the fourfold harmony, but it is not the only form we come across. On many

---

\(^{381}\) See also Develi, 56. Yüzyıl Osmanlı Türkçesinde Ses Benzeşmeleri, 79.

\(^{382}\) Sanjian and Tietze, Eremya Chelebi Kömürjan’s “The Jewish Bride,” 60.

\(^{383}\) Gavriel, “Η Τουρκική με το Ελληνικό αλφάβητο, 261.


\(^{385}\) Sanjian and Tietze, Eremya Chelebi Kömürjan’s “The Jewish Bride,” 60; see also Develi, 56. Yüzyıl Osmanlı Türkçesinde Ses Benzeşmeleri, 71–72.
occasions the suffix occurs in its old labial form \{DUR\}. We also observe the opposite phenomenon with the illabial form \{DIR\} remaining unrounded, even when preceded by a rounded vowel. As noted by Johanson (1979) the conservative form is connected to gospel language, and here seems to keep appearing connected to certain stems, therefore connected possibly with a certain register that warrants a different interpretation.


4. \{(y)Xz\}

In Serapheim’s texts the suffix {\(y\)Xz} usually uses the fourfold harmony instead of the old labial form {\(y\)Uz}. Examples of the labial form \{\(y\)Uz\} come mainly from the editions from 1753. A few examples of the form \{\(y\)Iz\} following a round vowel occur in some editions. While in eighteenth-century Karamanlidika
texts in Gavriel 2010b: 261 the suffix appears in the form \{(y)Xz\}, in nineteenth-century Karamanlidika texts in Kappler 2002: 172 both the labial and illabial form are attested (sevmişiz, görmüşiz).


\{(y)Iz\}: σουτζλούγις [suçluyııς] (CSK1756:37), γιολτζούγης [yolcuyııς] (APK1782:12) ὀκουµαλίγις [okumalığiς] (BH1783:9), καβιλεντιρελούζ [kavilendirmelüıüz] (KIN1753:63) (APK1782:52*) πορτζλοὺγιζ (NTh1756:61)).

5. \{sXnXz\}
In Serapheim’s texts the suffix \{sXnXz\} follows the fourfold harmony, and rare examples of the old illabial form \{sInIz\} appear only in the editions from 1753.

\{sInIz\}: ὀβουνουρσινής [övünürsiniz] (IpK1753:16), ἰλερούσινιζ [ileruınııζ] (KIN1753:ix).

PAST COPULA \{IDI\} / \{(Y)(X)DX\}
Like the simple past suffix \{DX\}, the past copula seems to be conservative and appears in five different forms in Serapheim’s texts. Fully assimilating forms \{(y)dX\} can be seen in the majority of editions and are attested also in eighteenth-century Karamanlidika texts in Eckmann 1950a: 183 (yoğudu, az ıdılar, ölmüşüdü), Gavriel 2010b: 253 (karnıdaydı, yoğudu) and in nineteenth-century Karamanlidika texts in Kappler 2002: 172 (olmuşuðu). The form \{IdU\} with unrounded and rounded vowels in third persons, can be seen in some of Serapheim’s editions,
mainly from 1753 (this applies to APK1782, which was incorporated in KIN1753 in its first edition). The form {UdI} with rounded followed by unrounded vowels, can be seen in a limited number of Serapheim’s editions. Both forms are unusual and not attested elsewhere and might be hypercorrections. Sporadically we encounter the labial vowel first person forms, known from other “transcription texts”\(^\text{386}\) (e.g. ἀγλάριτουκ [aglariduk] (IpK1753:158), οὐλμοῦζητουμ [ümüş idüm] (KIN1753:53) γκιορούριτουμ [görüridüm] (SBD1783:26).

Rare examples of palatalised assimilation can be seen in IpK1753 and APK1782 (e.g., ἐγίγιουτου [eyiyüdü] (IpK1753:22) ἰστὲρ ουτουλὲρ [ister üdüler] (APK1782:61)), while the non-assimilating old enclitic form {IdI} occurs in many of Serapheim’s editions with the variant {yIdI}, also attested in eighteenth-century Karamanlidika texts in Eckmann 1950a: 183 (kurumuş idi) and described by Brendemoen 2016: 19 as a dialectic element (e.g., σουγιούγιτι [suyuyidi] (NTh1756: 17), ὀλάγιτι [olayidi] (HK1756:4), κιτέρσεγιτι [giderseyidi] (KIN1753:75)).

{(y)dX}: γιόκουτου [yokudu] (CSK1756:343) (PsD1782:66) (APK1782:6),


τζόγουτου [çoğudu] (KIN1753:19) (NTh1756:31) (CSK1756:13) (APK1782:18) (BH1783:28),

Παῦλοσούνουτου [Pavlos’unudu] (CSK1756:2),

ὀχούρουτουλαρ [ohur udular] (HNK1756:9), ὀλούρουτου [olurudu] (SBD1783:27),

Εὐληνοσζουτου [Ellinosz’ udu] (BH1783:3),

κιούτζουτου [güçüdü] (RAB1782:143),

τουτατζακλάριτι [tutacaklar ıdilar] (KIN1753:26),

τεκµίλιτερ [tekmil idiler] (CSK1756:v).

{(IdU}:

ὀλσάϊτου [olsaidu] (IpK1753:22),

σακίντου [sakindu] (KŞ1758:24),

ιτελλέρητουλερ [iderleridüler] (KIN1753:59),

ντεέλιτου [deelidü] (IpK1753:68),

σακλάριτου [saklar udu] (NTh1756: 33),

άτέτιτου [adetidü] (APK1782:8),

τζεκέριτου [çekeridü] (APK1782:19),

πορτζλούιτουλαρ [borçluıdular] (KŞ1758:69).

\(^{386}\) Németh, *Die Türkische Sprache in Ungarn*, 104.
CONDITIONAL COPULA {(Y)SA}

The old form of the conditional copula, which is still in use today (Göksel & Kerslake 2005: 111), is the enclitic non-harmonic form {ise}. Parallel to the old form, it could be connected and assimilated phonologically to the stem, which is the form attested in eighteenth-century Karamanlidika in Gavriel 2010b: 255–256 and in the nineteenth-century Ottoman grammar of Alexandrides (1812: 44). In nineteenth-century Karamanlidika texts in Kappler 2002: 166, 172, the suffix is attested in the assimilating form {(y)sA} but illustrates a bias towards {ysE} forms. In eighteenth-century Karamanlidika in Eckmann 1950a: 183–184 it is connected to the stem in assimilating and non-assimilating forms (varısa, yoğusa, bulunurise). In Serapheim’s texts the suffix always occurs connected to the stem. We assume this not only from the writing conventions but also from the single stress, which implies its pronunciation as one word, but not always in harmonic form.

We see the suffix being harmonic after rounded and unrounded and front and back vowels (e.g., βάρισα [varısa] (CSK1756:2), μακπούλουσα [makbulüse] (NTh1756: 92), μπουλτούμουσα [buldumusa] (IpK1753:32), ολούρουσα [olurusua] (APK1782:4), ολτούίουσα [olduğusa] (PsD1782:253), πουλτούγιουσα [bulduğusa] (APK1782:18), οκούρουσα [okurusua] (RAB1782:iv), πουλουνούρουσα [bulunurusa] (SBD1783:vi), γιογουσά [yogusa] (KIN1753:24) (CSK1756:82)).

On some occasions it appears to be non-harmonic in the form {isa} and more
rarely in the form {ise} (e.g., ἐττηλέρισα [ettilerisa] (SBD1783:vi), ὀλούρισα [olurisa] (APK1782:4), ὀγλούϊσα [olusa] (IpK1753:43), πουλουνούρισα [bulanurisa] (APK1782:6), γιόκησε [yokise] (RAB1782:2)).

Enclitics

1. {(y)lA}

The enclitic {(y)lA} is described in early nineteenth-century grammars in Alexandrides 1812: 70 as assimilating {ylA}. The suffix is attested in the old assimilating form{(y)IlAn} in eighteenth-century Karamanlidika texts in Gavriel 2010b: 236–240 and in nineteenth-century Karamanlidika texts in Kappler 2002: 164–165. In eighteenth-century Karamanlidika texts in Eckmann 1950a: 184 is attested in the form {(y)IlAn} but often non-assimilated (terahumulan, onunilan). In Serapheim’s texts the suffix is attested in the forms {(y)IlAn}, {(y)UlAn}, {(y)lAn} and {(y)lA}, with the latter being the most rarely used.


2. {(y)ken}

The suffix {(y)ken}, according to the Ottoman grammar of Alexandrides 1812: 45, operates in the enclitic form {iken} or connected to the stem and being always non-assimilating, like the MST form (Göksel & Kerslake 2005: 96). In eighteenth-century Karamanlidika in Gavriel 2010: 269–270 the suffix is attested in the non-assimilating form {iken} but also with the first vowel assimilating to the preceding one (yoğukan). In eighteenth-century Karamanlidika texts in Eckmann 1950a: 184 is attested in the enclitic form {iken}, but also connected to the stem and assimilating both vowels (kapanıkıkan, uyuruken, yogukan). In Serapheim’s texts it is attested in the same way as in Eckmann 1950a, namely connected to the stem, in assimilating form, and the opposite, but also in the form {(y)kan}, again assimilating and non-assimilating.

{iken}: ülmüş iken [IpK1753:48], oymoustsoûzikev [umutsuz iken] (APK1782:24) teçotçouyikev [çocuqiken] (NTh1756:189), tomeligikev
Possessive suffixes

1. First person singular {(X)m}

The possessive suffix of first person singular occurs rarely in Serapheim’s texts and sometimes retains the old labial harmony. The phenomenon is attested also in Kapper 2002: 173 in the old labial form but also in illabial form preceded by a labial vowel (aklum, derunim).


2. Second person singular {(X)n}
The possessive suffix of second person singular uses the fourfold harmony (deviating forms are extremely rare) and retains very often the velar ŋ, as in eighteenth-century Karamanlidika texts in Gavriel 2010: 213.


\[\text{(U)} \text{ŋ}\]: κιοπεγιουγγτέ [köpeyüde] (IpK1753:24)).

3. Third person singular \{s\}X(n)

The possessive suffix of third person singular occurs in the majority of Serapheim’s texts in the MST fourfold harmony form \{s\}X(n). In editions from the years 1753 and 1756 the labial form \{s\}U(n) and the illabial form \{s\}I(n) are attested, with the first being used more often. The illabial form \{s\}I(n) is also attested in the seventeenth-century Armeno-Turkish source by Sanjian & Tietze (1981:60), who describe the labial forms of the suffix as exceptional as regards the findings of their research. It is possible that the unusual rounded forms are the result of hypercorrection and related to the religious context.


4. First person plural {(X)mXz}

In Serapheim’s texts the suffix of the first person plural occurs in the fourfold harmony for the majority the texts.


More rarely in editions from 1753 and 1756, it appears in the labial form, mainly in words with religious connotations, (e.g., ἀλλαχουμί [Allah’umuz] (IpK1753:15)), but also with an illabial vowel in first position and labial in the second, and the opposite. While the first case {ImUz}, which also appears also in sixteenth-century Ottoman texts (Develi 1995: 109) and in seventeenth-century transcription texts in Hazai 1973:402-403, is considered to be normal, since syllables closer to the stem are assimilated earlier than more “distant” syllables and it is characterised as conservative (Johanson 1979: 69, 91–92), the case of {UmIz}
when preceded by an unrounded vowel is not. This phenomenon is also attested by Sanjian and Tietze (1981: 56-57) in seventeenth-century Armeno-Turkish texts, where it is characterised as infrequent and the change is attributed to assimilation with a preceding rounded vowel.

{ImUz}: ῶμανμουζ [imanımuz] (KIN1753:7).

{UmIz}: ἀλλαχουμις [Allah’umız] (HNK1756:261*), ὀμρουμις [ömrümiz] (CSK1756:37).

5. Second person plural {(X)nXz}
The possessive suffix of the second person plural follows the same pattern as the first person plural with an illabial vowel in first position and labial in the second (also attested in seventeenth-century transcription texts in Hazai 1973:403) and the opposite. The suffix tends to be conservative, tends to change the first vowel in favour of the preceding one, and appears in sixteenth-century texts.387 In eighteenth-century Karamanlidika texts in Gavriel (2010: 233) the suffix occurs in the fourfold harmony but retains the velar ŋ. In Serapheim’s texts the suffix occurs mainly in the fourfold harmony, retains the velar ŋ and rarely occurs in labial form, or in the forms {UnIz} and {InUz}.


{UŋIs}: ἀβουτζουνγὶς [avucuŋız] (RAB1782:11).

{UnUz}: ἀλλαχουνουζοῦ [Allah’unuzu] (IpK1753:14).

CHAPTER THREE

\{X\}_n\{Xs\}: \textit{papaγγίς} \textit{[papaŋiz]} \textit{[imdadınız]} \textit{(NTh1756:v)}, \textit{ιμματιγγίς} \textit{[immadınız]} \textit{(HNK1756:46)}, \textit{ναξαργγίζιλαν} \textit{[nazarınzilan]} \textit{(KȘ1758:4)}, \textit{όλμανγγίς} \textit{[olmanız]} \textit{(PsD1782:viii)}, \textit{χότξαρκάργγίς} \textit{[hocalarıınız]} \textit{(SBD1783:x)}, \textit{μαχαναγγίς} \textit{[mahanız]} \textit{(SBD1783:ix)}, \textit{ιμματιγγής} \textit{[immadınız]} \textit{(KȘ1758:68)}, \textit{κουλλαργγίς} \textit{[kullarıınız]} \textit{(SBD1783:31)}, \textit{τζανλαργγίς} \textit{[canlarınız]} \textit{(BH1783:8)}

\textit{έλλγγίς} \textit{[elinız]} \textit{(HNK1756:26)}, \textit{σεπεπιγγίζιλεν} \textit{[sebebiınızilen]} \textit{(CSK1756:iv)}, \textit{πεντεγγίς} \textit{[bendeüz]} \textit{(NTh1756:vii)} \textit{(KȘ1758:5)} \textit{(APK1782:4)}, \textit{μουχαπεπεγγίς} \textit{[muhabetiniz]} \textit{(PsD1782:viii)}, \textit{μπεντεγγίς} \textit{[bendeüz]} \textit{(APK1782:16)}, \textit{άλλαχλαργγίς} \textit{[Allah’larıınız]} \textit{(SBD1783:39)}, \textit{όμρουγγούς} \textit{[ömrüüz]} \textit{(RAB1782:115)}, \textit{κουλουγγουζόου} \textit{[kuluuzu]} \textit{(SBD1783:31)}, \textit{κουλουγγούς} \textit{[kuluüz]} \textit{(KȘ1758:6)} \textit{(IpK1753:viii)}, \textit{γιολουγγοούς} \textit{[yoluuz]} \textit{(KȘ1758:70)}, \textit{κουλουγγουζά} \textit{[kuluuzuza]} \textit{(IpK1753:viii)}.

\textit{κουτουζλουγουνούς} \textit{[kutuşlugunus]} \textit{(IpK1753:36)}, \textit{κουλουνούς} \textit{[kulunus]} \textit{(KȘ1758:5)} \textit{(NvB1776:3)}, \textit{όρουρζουνούς} \textit{[orurzunus]} \textit{(SBD1783:20)}, \textit{σεριφινής} \textit{[serifinis]} \textit{(KIN1753:iv)}, \textit{σιερφίνηςλεν} \textit{[şerrifinislen]} \textit{(NvB1776:3)}, \textit{τεμπιχίνις} \textit{[tembihinis]} \textit{(NvB1776:3)}.

3.1.2. Derivational suffixes

1. \{CX\}

The suffix \{CX\} is used to create nouns and adjectives from nouns and appears in Serapheim’s texts in the labial form \{CU\} and more rarely in the illabial form \{CI\}, a form attested also in Eckmann 1950a: 183 (sürücki), in seventeenth-century transcription texts in Hazai 1973:392 and seventeenth-century Ottoman texts in Develi 1995: 64.

\{CU\}: \textit{ιμματιτζοῦ} \textit{[immadıcı]} \textit{(KIN1753:24)}, \textit{ινατζοῦ} \textit{[inanı]} \textit{(IpK1753:76)}, \textit{γιαπαντζοῦ} \textit{[yabanı]} \textit{(IpK1753:16)}, \textit{μετεττζοῦ} \textit{[mededeçi]} \textit{(KIN1753:24)}, \textit{γιαρτιμτζοῦ} \textit{[yardımcı]} \textit{(KIN1753:33)} \textit{(IpK1753:x)}, \textit{γιαρτιμτζοῦ} \textit{[yardımcı]} \textit{(KIN1753:24)} \textit{(NTh1756:84)}, \textit{καπουτζοῦ} \textit{[kapuçı]} \textit{(KIN1753:40)}, \textit{γολτζοῦ} \textit{[yolcu]} \textit{(NvB1776:37)}. 
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γιαρτουµτζη [yardumcı] (NTh1756:40), γιολτζη [yolcı] (NTh1756:102).

2. {(X)ncX}

The suffix creates ordinals and appears in Serapheim’s texts in three different forms – in the MST fourfold harmony form {(X)ncX}, in the old illabial form {(I)ncI} (also attested in eighteenth-century Karamanlidika texts in Eckmann 1950a:183 (üçinci) and in seventeenth-century transcription texts in Hazai 1973:396), and {(U)ncI}. The latter illustrates a diachronic stage which probably follows the previously mentioned rule in 3.1.1.8. (4), of syllables closer to the stem assimilating earlier than the rest. The form is also attested in seventeenth-century Ottoman texts in Develi 1995: 124. The findings of labial form {(I)ncU} are very rare and can be attributed to error (e.g., γετιντζοῦ [yedincü] (KIN1753:7)).


3. {IX}

The suffix that creates adjectives from nouns is described by Johanson (1979: 93) as conservative, especially in gospel language. In Serapheim’s texts, which consist of religious content, the old labial form {lU} is very much in use, along with MST form {IX} and could be attributed to hypercorrection. In seventeenth-century transcription texts in Hazai 1973:400 the form {lU} is described as archaic (azametlü).


4. {IXK}

The suffix {IXK} creates nouns, adjectives and adverbs from nouns and occurs in
Serapheim’s texts in three different forms. Apart from the MST fourfold harmony form \{lXK\}, we also come across the labial form \{lUK\} (also attested in eighteenth-century Karamanlidika texts in Eckmann 1950a: 183 (şenlük) and in seventeenth-century transcription texts in Hazai 1973:391) and the illabial form \{lIK\}, which remains non-assimilating to the preceding rounded vowel, a form attested also in seventeenth-century Ottoman texts in Develi 1995: 123. Similarly to \{lX\} the labial form can be attributed to the nature of the religious nature of the texts and hypercorrection.


5. \{sXz\}

The suffix which creates adjectives from nouns occurs in Serapheim’s texts mainly in the fourfold harmony form \{sXz\} and rarely in the labial form \{sUz\} in editions from 1753, and in the illabial form \{sIz\} in editions from 1753 and 1756. The latter two are also attested in in seventeenth-century transcription texts in Hazai
1973:424 eighteenth-century Karamanlidika texts in Eckmann 1950a: 183 (lezetsüs, umutsıslık) and the labial form in nineteenth-century Karamanlidika texts in Kappler 2002: 174 (şüphesiz). According to Johanson (1979: 95) the suffix belongs to the group of conservative suffixes mainly used in gospel language with the illabial form {sIz} which is also attested in seventeenth-century transcription texts in Hazai 1973:424.


{sUz}: ἰμανσούς [imansusı̇s] (IpK1753:21), αμελσούς [amelsusı̇s] (KIN1753:16).

{sIz}: σουσίς [susızı̇s] (KIN1753:13), οὐμουτσισλίκ [umutsı̇sli̇k] (KIN1753:18), οὐλουμısı̇ς [ülümsısı̇s] (HNK1756:156).

6. {(y)XcX}

The suffix is used to create nouns from verbs. In Serapheim’s texts it serves for creating religious terms (see also Gavriel 2010b: 228) and occurs in the form {(y)IcU} (e.g., βεριτζοῦ [vericü] (KŞ1758:71), κουφοῦρ ἱτιτζοῦ [küfür idicü] (IpK1753:53)).
The Persian suffix {kAr} which creates nouns connected to persons or occupations appears in KIN1753 in a palatalised form (e.g., κιουναχκὲρ [günahker] (KIN1753:47), ταμαχκὲρ [tamahker] (KIN1753:64).

3.1.3. Personal pronouns

The personal pronouns that illustrate differences from MST are those of the second and third person singular. These make use of the velar η in the dative, something already discussed in 2.3.2.3. The personal pronoun of the second person singular appears in many editions with the old labial form of the genitive (σενοῦν [senün]) but most of the time we see the MST form σενίν [senin]. The personal pronoun of the third person singular appears in the archaic form an (~ο [he]) with the genitive (e.g., ἀνοῦν [anun]), a form attested also in nineteenth-century Karamanlidika texts in Kappler 2002: 174, and with the accusative (e.g., ἀνὶ [anı]). The stem also appears in the third person plural although it seems to be very rare (e.g., ἀνλὲρ [anler] (NTh1756:13)) but it is also attested in eighteenth-century Karamanlidika texts in Eckmann 1950a: 183.


3.1.4. **Turkish suffixes on Greek stems**

In Serapheim’s texts many Turkish suffixes are bound to Greek stems in order to express various meanings, mainly of religious content. This occurs by simply adding the Turkish suffix to the stem, by cutting off the ending of the Greek stem and/or adding a Turkish verb to achieve verbalisation. Further, a Greek noun is often followed by a Turkish noun with a possessive suffix which binds them together.

The ending of Greek stems denotes the gender of the words, and although there is a tendency not to cut off the endings of neutral words, it is not clear why Serapheim used this practice. Possible interpretations would be that the cut-off endings could resemble Turkish suffixes, so not cutting off would avoid confusion (there are many examples of cutting off the vowel from -si endings which is the same as the possessive suffix of the third person singular). On the other hand, the phenomenon might be connected to the fact that Turkish stems are gender free, and similar to the Greek language, which adds inflectional endings in foreign words in order to denote gender, the gender is neutralised in Turkish. Johanson (2002) notes that grammatical gender is often dispensable and therefore one of the first units to be considered as redundant and eliminated as in the case of Anatolian Greek where the grammatical gender was lost. This is an interesting case of language borrowing which warrants more research.

**Plural**

Often we come across Greek stems to which a Turkish plural (-IAr) is added (e.g., κοσμικός λαρ [kosmikos-lar] (IpK1753:30) ‘lay people’, Μάρτυρος λαρ [Martyros-lar] (NTh1756:19) ‘martyrs’, ἀκροτητικός λαρ [eretikos-lar] (HNK1756:72) (CSK1756:46) (K$1758:27) (SBD1783:48) (BH1783:51) ‘heretic/sectarian’). Cases of double plural also occur, when the Greek stem is already in the plural form and the Turkish plural is added (e.g., ισκεμνήλαρ [iskemni-ler]...
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(Κ§1758:28) ‘pew’, αἱρὲσειςλερ (NTh1756:22) (CSK1756:1) ‘sects/heresies’), a phenomenon which also occurs in Arabic borrowings in the Turkish language, where Arabic plurals are used in Turkish as singulars and get a Turkish plural suffix (e.g., Turkish: tüccar-lar < Arabic singular: tācir).

Cases

Turkish case suffixes are also added to Greek nouns: ablative (e.g., χριστοῦ γέννατεν ἐβέλ [hristoyenna’den evel] (NTh1756:168) ‘before Christmas’), dative, (e.g., ἀσκητὴς κουβούκλιονα [askitis kuvuklion’a] (BH1783:41) ‘in ascetic’s canopy’, ἐφημέριοζα [efimerioz-a] (HNK1756:19) ‘ephemeral’, ἀντίχριστοζὰ [antihristoz-a] (NTh1756:336) ‘to the antichrist’), and accusative (e.g., σήµαντρογιον βουρτουλάρ [simantro-yu vurdular] (APK1782:25) ‘they tolled the bell’).

Possessive suffixes

In the case of possessive suffixes we come across the simple addition of a possessive suffix (e.g., πατέροζου µους [pateroz-umus] (NTh1756:2) ‘our Father’) or the addition of a possessive suffix of the third person singular to the second word in order to create a compound noun: (e.g., ἀσωτος κυριακησὶ [asotos Kyriaki-si] (CSK1756:ix) ‘The Sunday of Prodigal Son’, τυρινὴ χαφτασὶ [tyrini haftasi] (KIN1753:26) ‘Cheese week / Butter week’). We also have the example of ἀνάστασι γκιοῦν [Anastasi gün] (IpK1753:197) ‘Rising of Christ’, without a reference suffix on the second component.

Verbs

The process of verbalisation follows the addition of a Turkish verb next to a Greek noun in order to denote the taken action. Usually for this action verbs like etmek and olmak and their derivations are used (e.g., διορθῶς ολουνµὰκ [diorthos olunmak] (NTh1756:fp) ‘to be corrected’, ἀφορὶς ολµὰκ [aforis olmak] (KIN1753:28) ‘to be aphorised’, συγχωρὶς ολ [syghoris olmak] (KIN1753:29) ‘to


All Greek words mentioned here ending in an <s> usually end with <si>, which denotes the female gender. The last example is the only one which contains two verbs, Greek and Turkish. The ending is probably cut off because every ending would have denoted the person performing the action (e.g., ψάλλω [psallo] ‘I chant’, ψέλλει [pselli] ‘he chants’), so by leaving aside the ending the verb is neutralised. The same occurs for the example ἄγιο πνεύματι ἁναβλύσις [ayio pnevmati anavliz] (HNK1756:101) ‘the pouring out of the Holy Spirit’, which is composed solely of Greek words, but by cutting off the ending of the verb in the last position, it gives the impression that the phrase has become lexified.

**Derivational suffixes**

The derivational suffix +lik which creates nouns, adjectives and adverbs from nouns is used often. In the stem προφήτηλικ [profiti-lik] (NvB1776:48) ‘prophecy’, the Greek male word προφήτης [profitis] ‘prophet’, loses its last letter, which denotes the gender, and the Turkish suffix is added to create the meaning of prophecy. In the case of ἐξομολογίζηλικ [eksmoloyis-lik] (CSK1756:55) ‘confession’, the Greek female noun ἐξομολόγησι [eksmoloyisi] ‘confession’, loses the last letter and the Turkish suffix is added, but the noun already has the meaning of confession. The word αἱρέσιλικ [airesi-lik] (HNK1756:20) ‘heresy’ is one of those which keeps its gender (here in the feminine) in examples which derive from the same stem – as can also be seen in the section on plurals.

Greek words are often used in sentences with a Turkish full verb at the end (e.g., ἀνάθημα όχούρ [anathima ohur] (KIN1753:27) (CSK1756:46) ‘he reads offering’), especially fully integrated loans into Turkish, such as the noun αφορισμός [aforismos] ‘aphorism’, which can be found in the dictionary. There

---

393 James Redhouse, Türkçe ve İngilizce sözlüğü, Istanbul 2000, 17.
is also a derivation of the noun by the addition of the suffixes {lA} and {mA}: ἀφοροζλαµ [aforoz-la-ma] (BH1783:24) ‘to perform aphorism, to excommunicate’). According to Weinreich (1970) a word that has been transferred from one language to another is subject to the interference of the grammatical and phonetic system, with the scale of effects ranging from complete non-adaptation to full grammatical integration, a description which our example fits perfectly.

3.1.5. Izafet constructions

Izafet constructions appear often in Serapheim’s texts but seem to be limitedly productive. Similar constructions are attested in eighteenth-century Karamanlidika in Gavriel 2010b, where we see a restricted use and only in compounds that had been already lexified, due to the restricted knowledge of this “syntactical construction” on behalf of authors who are not familiar with high-style Ottoman. Sanjian and Tietze (1981) hold a similar opinion, attributing the existence of Izafet constructions in their research on a seventeenth-century Armeno-Turkish source to fixed constructions.

The same seems to apply to this research, since the reading (or hearing public) comparable to that in Gavriel’s primary source, and also because the Izafet constructions found in the texts were probably well known. Often izafet is used to denote a title, for a person, book or institution (e.g., Βελίγι Ναζὶ [Veli-yi Nazir] ‘legate’ (KIN1753:ii), κελισάϊ σερி஫ [kelisa-i şerif] ‘holy church’ (KIN1753:ix), ἵπνη οὐλλάχ [ibn-i ül-lah] ‘son of God’ (NTh1756:146*), Παχάρι Ζουµπιουλναµ [Bahar-i Zümbülname] ‘Book of the spring of flower’ (RAB1782:iv), Παχάρι χεγιάτ [Bahar-i heyat] ‘Spring of life’ (BH1783:fp)), while the majority of usages refer to communities, probably something very widely used (e.g., Κιουµλουγέτι Ανατόλ [Küllüyet-i Anadol] ‘The community of Anatolia’ (KIN1753:ii), Κιουµλουγέτι ινσανλαρ [küllüyet-i insanlar] ‘The community of people’ (NTh1756:1), μουουµι χριστιανλαρ [müümi-i hristianlar] ‘Christian believer’ (KIN1753:vii) (IpK1753:vi)(HNK1756:139)

394 Weinreich, Languages in Contact, 44.
396 Sanjian and Tietze, Eremya Chelebi Kömürjan’s “The Jewish Bride,” 64.
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3.1.6. **Comments on morphology**

The findings of the morphology section can be divided into four categories. First, suffixes that illustrate variations of a diachronic stage of Turkish; second, suffixes that tend to be conservative and retain older forms; third, suffixes in forms that are not attested in other Turkish sources until today, and fourth, Greek words with Turkish suffixes.

Concerning the first category, suffixes like \{(X)mXz\} and \{(X)ncX\} appear in the forms \{ImUz\} and \{(U)ncI\} respectively, following the rule of syllables closer to the stem assimilating to the previous vowel, reflecting a diachronic stage of Turkish language. The second category can be divided into two sub-categories. The first includes suffixes attested in the early editions mainly from 1753 to 1756 in old forms, like \{Ur\}, \{mAlI\}, the question marker \{mI\}, the possessive suffix \{(s)X(n)\} and \{(yUz)\}, that can be attributed to previous stages of the language, as they change in books from later years. The second sub-category includes suffixes attested in older forms in the majority of editions and previously described as conservative and used in religious language. This group includes suffixes like \{(y)AlUm\}, \{DuR\} and \{Iu\} and based on the number of findings and their usage, we could argue that their old form was an effort to convey an ecclesiastical tone. This might also be the case for the third category, concerning forms that are not attested elsewhere and cannot be justified by historical reasoning, like the rounded
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form \{DU\} in the third person singular, and the rounded form for the accusative \{(y)U\}. A hypothesis could be that the author believed that rounded forms sounded more formal, thus creating forms that had not existed before. The absence of old forms of suffixes from Gavriel (2010b), a manuscript from the eighteenth-century of non-religious content, might be an indication that the older forms were no longer in use in everyday language, which makes a hypothesis of a bias towards rounded forms by Serapheim plausible.

The last category of Greek words with Turkish suffixes (as well the izafet constructions) falls into the category of religious register since the majority are found in a religious context. Many of these older forms are also attested in Kappler (2002) but are in completely different contexts, as the primary sources for that study did not consist of religious texts; as they are nineteenth-century Karamanlidika they probably imitated the historical writing of the Ottoman language and therefore used archaic forms of suffixes.

If we take a closer look at the books, we see how the various aforementioned categories are distributed. For example, many of the phenomena of the editions of 1753, which illustrate most of the older forms of suffixes, also appear in NTh1756. But this does not reflect the whole picture since the same phenomena do occur in NTh1756 but to a lesser degree, like the phenomenon of labial forms followed by illabial and the opposite, while there is extensive use of labial forms in \{y\}AIXm\} and the genitive.

In HKN1756 the older forms appear in the second part of the book, which consists mainly of liturgical texts. That might have been deliberate, or it is possible they were translated at an earlier stage. Besides these, the older forms appear to a lesser degree than in NTh1756, printed the same year.

In CSK1756 we observe the use of labial forms in \{IX\}, which, as already mentioned, tends to be conservative in the context of gospel language, while in KŞ1758, although we see extensive use of labial forms in \{DXr\} and \{IX\}, \{y\}AIU\} is very rare, no other old forms are used and \(j\) never drops in suffixes, something that is very common in the rest of the editions.

In NvB1776 the appearances of old forms are so few that they could be attributed to printing errors, while in PsD1782 we observe old forms like gendi for
kendi, but the suffixes follow in general the fourfold harmony. In RAB1782 the old forms appear in prayers and their explanations (RAB1782:33–36, 65–67) and in SBD1783 we observe reduced usage of the velar nasal ŋ in inflection but extensive use of {yAIUM}.

In general, we could sum up by saying that Serapheim’s books reflect a mixed usage of old and colloquial forms of suffixes. The differences in morphology from one book to another, or even within the same book, with some parts more closely resembling Middle Ottoman and others tending to be more similar to modern forms, and the existence of more than one factor of influence, make conclusions in terms of language change difficult to draw. Since, as mentioned before, the developments of harmonies were nearly completed by the mid-eighteenth-century it is difficult to say which of them can be attributed to a diachronic stage of language and which are closely related to the author’s beliefs about language, and the genre of the books.

3.1.7. Older language forms

While the majority of the books are written in a colloquial form of language, at the same time we observe older language forms, mainly in derivational and inflectional suffixes, like αζιμετλοῦ [azimetlü] ‘his holiness’ along with αζιμετλί [azimetli], Ὸλαχετλοῦ [illahetlü] ‘godly’ instead of Ὸλαχετλί [illahetli], or ττιγνεγελοῦµ [diŋne-yelüm] ‘let us hear’ instead of ττιγνεγελίµ [diŋne-yelim] etc. The latter example is exceptionally important since it is a form used regularly in religious texts (‘let us’). It is one of the few occasions where one can clearly see the effort to render the Greek subjunctive but also the effort to give a different tone by using an archaic form in certain contexts. While the primary sources are mostly written in a more colloquial language, we do come across various archaic forms. This is probably due to the content of the book as it is proven that certain Turkish suffixes tend to be notably conservative, especially in religious texts.\footnote{Johanson, “Die westoghusische Labialharmonie,” 63–107.} We cannot be certain about the development of the morpho-phonology at that period of time within the specific community, but the rest of the books show that even if the transformation was not complete, it had reached an advanced stage. We know,
however, that new traditions – if we try to explain the creation of Karamanlidika religious books as such – tend to use old materials, invent new languages or schemes or just extend the old vocabulary.\(^{398}\) What people express in their oral or written speech is often closely related to its textual frequency, but also to the social conditions or environment, so infrequent use does not necessarily mean that certain forms are unknown, but their use varies according to the circumstances.\(^{399}\) That is the reason why such archaic forms survived in religious contexts, even into the twentieth-century, as we will see in the last part of this chapter.

3.2. Vocabulary
Following the previous subchapters 2.2.1. and 3.1.4. where we dealt with the vocabulary of the sources in order to tackle specific phenomena (i.e. the use of Greek orthography and the use of Turkish suffixes on Greek stems respectively), this subchapter will aim to present a rough rule on the techniques for rendering religious vocabulary found in the Serapheim’s texts and its use. The religious vocabulary in Karamanlidika texts is far too complicated to be dealt with in one chapter, although an effort will be made to expand a little in the following subchapters.

Previously a number of techniques were described regarding the rendering of place or personal names and of religious terminology in Karamanlidika, such as the retention of the Greek word (with or without the addition of a Turkish suffix), the adoption of the Turkish Islamic equivalent, or the creation of a new term.\(^{400}\) To those we should add something that occurs in Serapheim’s texts – the periphrastic approach – the introduction of a term along with a short explanation introduced by the word \textit{yani} ‘namely’.

Place names can be found in both Turkish (e.g., \textit{Κυπρις} [Kibris] ‘Cyprus’ (KIN1753:33), (APK1782:8)) and Greek forms (e.g., \textit{Κουτάχεια σεχερὶ} [Kütahia şeheri] ‘the town of Kütahya’, (NTh1756:79), \textit{Σαξωνὶα βιλαετὶ} [Sakso尼亚 biłaeti].

\(^{399}\) Johanson, \textit{Structural Factors in Turkic Languages}, 5.
‘the province of Saxony’ (HNK1756:65), while personal and biblical names mostly retain their Greek form (e.g., Ἐφραὶμ [Efraim] ‘Ephraim’ (KIN1753:37), Σαμψόν [Sampson] ‘Samson’ (IpK1753:16) [Samson], Ἰουὰς [İoudas] ‘Judas’ (IpK1753:16), but also occur in Turkish (e.g., موسى [Musa] ‘Moses’, (IpK1753:30), (CSK1756:377), تابوئت [davut] ‘David’ (NTh1756:272)).

Titles connected with religious office are usually in Greek (ἐφεμερίος [efimerioz] ‘ephemeral’, (HNK1756:19), usually with Turkish suffixes when necessary (e.g., to indicate the plural number κοσμικόλαρ [kosmikos-lar] ‘lay people’, (IpK1753:30)) or with a possessive suffix (e.g., Καίσαρειας Καππαδοκίας Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος [Kaisareias Kappadokias Arhiepiskopos-u] ‘Archbishop of Caesarea Cappadocia’, (NTh1756:183)). In this category we can add the case of παπαζλάρ [papaz-lar] ‘priests’ in (IpK1753:6) (RAB1782:27), which has entered standard Ottoman in the nineteenth-century at the latest (cf. Redhouse 2000:917). More rarely we come across the Turkish and Greek equivalent as in the case of the word ‘teacher’ (e.g., χότζα [hoca] (IpK1753:31) ~ δάσκαλος [daskalos] (IpK1753:32)), the word ‘guide’ which refers to the Virgin Mary (e.g., κουλαοὺς [kulaus] (KIN1753:39) ~ ὀδηγὴτρια [odigitria] (KIN1753:43)), or ‘our father’ (e.g., πατέροζου [pateroz-umus] (NTh1756:2) ~ πετερι [pederimis] (NvB1776:fp), (KIN1753:10)).

Translations of the English ‘the Virgin Mary’ differ considerably, with Mary in various languages (e.g., μαρία [Maria] (KIN1753:77), (KŞ1758:7), (IpK1753:58), (NTh1756:247), (HNK1756:25), (RAB1782:89), μεϊρέμ [Meyrem] (KIN1753:71), (KŞ1758:54), μεργέμ [Meryem] (KIN1753:7), (IpK1753:17), (RAB1782:vi), Μαριάμ [Maryam] (BH1783:59)), with the Greek form παναγία [Panayia] (e.g., (KIN1753:74), (IpK1753:16), (NTh1756:52), (HNK1756:23), (KŞ1758:30), (CSK1756:3), (BH1783:59), or the various Islamic Turkish forms (e.g., Σουλτάν Βαχιτουλλάχ [Sultan Validullah] ‘Sultan Mother of God’ (NTh1756:52),

401 Luffin, “Religious Vocabulary in Karamanlidika Texts,” 286, questions the use of the Islamic term Kuds-i şerif for Jerusalem as something peculiar for Christians. In the sources used here the term is used extensively in KŞ1758, which is, however, a bilingual edition, so it is used side by side with the Greek equivalent. Nevertheless, I firmly believe that the use of the term Kuds-i şerif was natural for the Turkophone Orthodox of Anatolia and should not be dealt as solely Islamic in their case.
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(ΑΠΚ1782:fp), (HNK1756:10), (CSK1756:3), (RAB1782:21), (BH1783:fp), 
Βαλιτουλλὰχ Μεργὲμ [Validullah Meryem] ‘Mother of God Mary’, 
(NTh1756:156), Μεβλουτουλλὰχ Μαρία [Mevludullah Maria] ‘Mary, the one 
gave birth to God’, (HNK1756:52), (CSK1756:3), (RAB1782:89), 
(BH1783:50), Σουλτὰν Μεβλουτουλλὰχ [Sultan Mevludullah] ‘Sultan, the one 
gave birth to God’, (NvB1776:83). We also come across the word ‘virgin’ in 
Greek, Turkish or both together (e.g., Παρθένα πικίρ κίς [Parthena bikir kız] ‘Virgin, girl of virginity’ (HNK1756:118), (CSK1756:3), (APK1782:iv), πικίρ κίς [bikir kız] ‘girl of virginity’, (K$1758:7), (BH1783:50).

Jesus can be found most the times in the Greek form ‘Ιησοῦς [İsus] (IpK1753:18) ναζωραίοξλου ιησοῦς [Nazoraioz-ılu İsus] ‘Jesus of Nazareth’ (IpK1753:123), or as ‘Messiah’ (e.g., μεσία [Mesia] (IpK1753:19)), while rarely we come across the Islamic Turkish term Ὸπνη ούλλαχ [ibn-i ullah] ‘Son of God’ (NTh1756:146*). Interesting is the case of ‘Archangel Gabriel’, which occurs in various forms Greek, Turkish and in combinations of the two as well (e.g., τζεϕραήι [Çebrail] (KIN1753:76), (IpK1753:207), (RAB1782:vi), (APK1782:xx), ’Αρχάγγελος τζεϕραήι [Archangelos Cebrail] (NTh1756:iii), Γαβριήι, τζεϕραήι [Gabriel, Cebrail] (IpK1753:133), (NvB1776:151), (BH1783:58), σερασκέρ γαβριήι [Serasker Gabriel] ‘Chief Commander Gabriel’ (IpK1753:158), ἄγγελος σεραςκὶὰρ ππαςὶ τζεϕραήι [Angelos Seraskâr başı Cebrail] ‘Chief Commander of the angels Gabriel’, (HNK1756:85)).

One other case worth mentioning is the rendition of the term ‘God’, which mostly uses non-Greek words. The term used widely is Allah (e.g., άλλάχ [Allah] (IpK1753:44), (NTh1756:ii), (HNK1756:21), (K$1758:76), (NvB1776:127), (PsD1782:vi), (RAB1782:127), (APK1782:18), (BH1783:30), (SBD1783:39)), while we often come across the Turkish term Taγρι (e.g., ταγγρὶ [Taŋrı] (NTh1756:22), (CSK1756:4), (K$1758:3), or ‘Lord’ (e.g., Ράππι [Rabby] (KIN1753:92), (PsD1782:9), (PsD1782:9), (NvB1776:128), (RAB1782:38)), and very rarely the Persian equivalent Ηδα (Χουτά [huda] (KIN1753:33, IpK1753:220). The Greek word for God appears in only in passages or parts written in Greek language.

402 The word Allah seems to denote other gods as well, with the necessary clarifications (e.g, Ἀπόλλων Αλλαχλαρινὴν Πούτ [Apollon Allahlarının Put] ‘The idol of God Apollo’ (SBD1783:209)).
When coming to the various holy days, sermons, religious concepts or items, we see the combination of a Greek and Turkish word in order to render the term, and more rarely solely Greek or Turkish renditions. To start with a few examples of only Greek or only Turkish, we could mention ‘Good Friday’, where we come across the Turkish μπογιούκ τζουμαί [Böyük Cumai] (e.g., (IpK1753:13 (K$1758:23) (NvB1776:134) (RAB1782:vii) but also the Greek equivalent μεγάλη παρασκευή [Megali Paraskevi] (e.g., (NTh1756:275)). ‘Christmas’ and ‘Epiphany’ are most of the time rendered by the Greek words Χριστούγεννα [Hristoyyenna] (CSK1756:ix) and φώτα [fota] (KIN1753:25), (CSK1756:ix). The majority of the terms are coined with words from both languages bound together (e.g. άζιμ Πάσχα [azim Pasha] ‘Holy Easter’ (CSK1756:ix), άνάστασι γκιούν [Anastasi gün] ‘rising of Christ’ (IpK1753:197), τυρινή χαφτασι [tyrini haftası] ‘Cheese week/Butter week’ (KIN1753:26), Κιματλή Ψυσοι Σταυρος [Kiymatlı Ypsosi Stavros] ‘The discovery of the Holy Cross’ (CSK1756:x), or by using the periphrastic/explanatory approach (e.g., Πάσχαταν σογρὰ πεσιντζη, Γιανὲ Σαραίτις Κυριακησί [Pascha’dan soğra beşinci, yane Samareitis Kyriaki’si] ‘The fifth after Easter, namely the Sunday of the Good Samaritan’ (CSK1756:ix).


Regarding the description of ritual practices, as already discussed in 2.4.4., the verbs etmek ‘to do’ and olmak ‘to be’ are used in a process of verbalisation following a Greek noun, in order to denote the action taken. Most of these inventions consist of themes that are rarely used outside a church environment, like those previously mentioned in 3.1.4. ψάλλετ μ [psal etmek], χειροτονήσει έτμ [χειροτονήσει έτμεκ

403 Or μουκαττες Τράπεζα [mukades trapeza] ‘sacred altar’ (K$1758:30).
To those we can add terms like λειτουργία ἐτμέκ [leitourgia etmek] ‘to perform divine service/mass’ (CSK1756:53), (KŞ1758:37), Βαπτὶς ἐτμέκ [Vaptis etmek] ‘to perform a baptism’ (NTh1756:15), (HNK1756:51), (KŞ1758:7), (NvB1776:14), (RAB1782:1), (APK1782:29), (SBD1783:27), (BH1783:3), προφήτηλικ ἐτμέκ [profitilik etmek] ‘to perform prophecy’ (NvB1776:48), πανηγὺρ ἐτμέκ [paniyir etmek] ‘to perform panegyric’ (NTh1756:27), (HNK1756:31), (CSK1756:45), (SBD1783:ix), (BH1783:8).

Lastly, there are various terms that derive from the Islamic Turkish tradition like the various aforementioned names for Virgin Mary, and terms that are considered to carry Islamic connotations like: βαΐζ [vaiz] ‘service, admonition’ (IpK1753:viii), σααπ [saab] ‘companion of Prophet Mohammed’ (KIN1753:28), (IpK1753:28), (NTh1756:87) (CSK1756:iii), (KŞ1758:3), (NvB1776:13) ~ σαχὰπ [sahab] (IpK1753:171), (NTh1756:78) (NvB1776:5), (RAB1782:8), (APK1782:x), (SBD1783:vii), (BH1783:2), μαχσερ [mahşer] ‘the last judgment’, (NvB1776:94), (PsD1782:44), (CSK1756:34), (RAB1782:33), (SBD1783:x), ρούχ οὐλλὰχ [ruh ullah] ‘the Holy Spirit’ (PsD1782:v), which are used here in a Christian context. Furthermore, the majority of the chapters of the books, which are exclusively Christian in context, end with the phrase πιχὰµτ ἰλλὰχ [bihamd illah] ‘with the help of God’ (KIN1753:91), (IpK1753:124), (HNK1756:211), (CSK1756:426), (KŞ1758:84), (NvB1776:151), (PsD1782:281), (APK1782:63), (RAB1782:183), (SBD1783:224), pointing to the use of terms from the Arabic language, and therefore used in the Islamic Turkish tradition, but in a context more similar to Arabic Christianity rather than that of borrowed terms from Islamic traditions.

Johann Strauss, after working on Karamanlidika religious texts from various periods and authors, reached the conclusion that there was no standard practice and that several different methods regarding religious terminology were used over time. Nevertheless, it is evident that several authors knew Greek and Arabic versions of
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404 Regarding this particular term, which was passed on to Turkish through Greek in the form “vaftiz,” it has been mentioned before that it was never recorded in the form “vatpiz”; see Sanjian and Tietze, Ereyma Chelebi Kömürjan’s “The Jewish Bride,” 71.
the liturgical texts, and that early Karamanlidika religious texts are more similar to those of Anatolian Christians than pro-Islamic Turkish traditions, so terminology does not seem to derive from Turkish language but it is rather connected to Arabic Christianity. Concerning how this phenomenon arose, it is something that still needs to be researched, with the possibilities being: coming from above via the patriarchal institutions, or via Christian (and Muslim) exchange on the ground between the Arab provinces and Anatolia.

The techniques used in Serapheim’s texts resemble very much the findings of Luffin (2010) on *Cebel-i Sinanin Medhnamesi* (1784) and can be summarised as follows. Saints retain their Greek names but preceded by *aziz*. Mary, Jesus and David, are encountered in their Greek form and forms of other origin, mainly Arabic, the same being the case in Serapheim’s texts for these three terms. Religious and liturgical terms are to be found in Greek and the dialogues between God and Moses are in Greek followed by a translation in Turkish, introduced by the word *yani*. The concept of the prophet is usually rendered by *peygamber* but also by *προφήτης*, and religious titles are usually in Turkish. Finally, place names from Biblical tradition retain their Greek forms, and many place names are encountered in their Arabic form. All the aforementioned possibly point out, if not yet to a Karamanlidika religious tradition, at least to the communication of religious circles and the distribution of Karamanlidika printed books within them.

Moving further, when dealing with religious vocabulary in Karamanlidika, the main difficulty lies in our meagre knowledge of the semantics of many words, since dictionaries are not always helpful. An interesting case is the word γενίζερι (*yeniçeri*) ‘janissaries’, appearing on various occasions. In Serapheim’s texts, it does not have any connection with the special Ottoman army corps but carries the meaning of ‘army’ in a more general or religious sense (e.g. IpK1753:12, 15, 184, KŞ1758:17, 31), e.g.:

Γενιτζεριλέρ Χριστός ἐφέντι σταυρός ἔττικτε (IpK1753:162)


In NTh1756 we see for the first time the use of the word ἀσκερ [asker] ‘army’ (NTh1756:34) instead of γενίτζερι [yeniçeri] from the previous editions, while in CSK1756 from the same year it is used with the meaning of high-ranking officer (CSK1756:10). In one of the last books, SBD1783, we see the combination σημαβί γενιτζερὶ [simavi yeniçeri] ‘soldiers of the heavens’ (SBD1783:40) in an effort to denote angels. The case of yeniçeri illustrates the importance of research on semantics in Serapheim’s texts – it is a desideratum for the future but not the first priority for this research. Returning to the quest of an explanation regarding the terms that are also used in the Islamic Turkish tradition, we have to take a closer look at KIN1753.

3.2.1. The case of Kolay İman Nasihatü 1753

The book KIN1753 is one of the first two editions by Serapheim and it is extremely important as regards the issue of religious terminology in Karamanlidika. Being one the first books ever printed in Karamanlidika, it may provide information on how religious terms were coined, recorded or disseminated in a language that was not considered one of the traditional languages used by Christians. The structure of the book comprises two parts, with the first being a dialogue, a very popular way to introduce learning in books and something that harks back to the oral origins of the pedagogic process between the teacher and the apprentice. The second part explains through the answers the basic issues and concepts of the Christian faith, providing thus a detailed catalogue of terms in Turkish. Furthermore, KIN1753 is the only book of the kind by Serapheim (or at least the only one available) that was printed in Greek as well and it provides us with insights into how the various terms were treated in the transition from Greek to Turkish.

The two parts address through the dialogue between teachers and apprentice the
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fundamental concepts of Christianity, such as the definition of a Christian, the good works of faith, the Creed, Sunday’s prayer, the fruits of the Holy Spirit, the Ten Commandments, excusable and deadly sins, etc. Similar to this is the structure of the first book ever printed in Karamanlidika in 1718, Κιουλζάρι ιμάνι Μεσιχί [Gülzar-i iman-i mesihi] ‘Anthology of the Christian faith’, which is written in two languages, Greek and Turkish, addressing the same subjects. This suggests not only the educational character of these books, but might even point to a pre-existing tradition in oral or manuscript form in Turkish language. A rough comparison between KIN1753 and Gülzar-i iman-i mesihi illustrates not only differences in phonology but also in the vocabulary in terms of the terminology used. Specifically, in the Creed, there are small differences in the vocabulary; in the Ten Commandments, some of the Commandments are different, and the Greek parts in the latter are written in a more simple language (e.g., the word μην [min] ‘expressing negation’ is used instead of the more archaic and the one usually used in the scriptures ου [ou]). The differences in the context of the Ten Commandments could be attributed to editing errors but equally to differences in dogma.

Concerning the terminology used in KIN1753, we observe that besides very few exceptions that appear both in Greek and Turkish language and that are used strictly in a Christian context, the rest of the terms are exclusively Turkish (mostly of Arabic origin).

This is natural as the book explains or teaches fundamentals of the Christian faith to Turkish-speaking people, and anything different would not serve the book’s purpose. But can we identify these terms as Islamic? For most of them the answer is no. The majority of the words could easily be used in everyday life, and probably were. Words like γελάν [yelan] ‘lie’, ιπατέτ [ibadet] ‘wish’, ιμάν [iman] ‘faith’, ιτατσισλίκ [itaatsızlık] (disobedience), κιουνάχ [günah] ‘sin’, λουτιλίκ [lutilik] ‘incest’, μεκρεμέτ [mekremet] ‘generosity’, οβκέ [övke] ‘anger’, τεμπίχ [tembih] ‘command’, χιλέ [hille] ‘fraud’, are used in religious contexts but are also part of people’s everyday lives. On the other hand, we also come across words that could be regarded as Islamic due to the significance they carry for the Islamic religion.
Words or terms like κιουφούρ [küfür] ‘blasphemy’, ἀλλαχοῦν μερχαμετοῦ [allahun merhametü] ‘God’s mercy’, τοπέ ἱστιραφλίκ κιουναχλάρ [töbe istiraflık günahlar < tövbe istiğfar et] ‘repentance’, τοά [doa] ‘prayer’, are probably used in the Islamic religion, but like the rest they constitute part of a code used among Turkophone Christians without any Islamic connotations. A connection of these terms with Christian Arabic is more than possible, and a theory of how these influences would have run remains a desideratum for the future.

While the choice of Turkish vocabulary was the natural thing to do, the number of Greek words used is something we need to examine more thoroughly. Previously Luffin (2010) suggested a number of reasons for the retention of Greek words in Karamanlidika texts, such as the effort to avoid terms that were considered Islamic, to retain the sacredness of the term, avoid finding an equivalent in Turkish, or simply the use of vocabulary commonly used by Turkish-speaking people in their oral communication surrounding their ecclesiastical traditions. From what we see here they were not avoiding Islamic terms but embracing them, as it was more natural to them linguistically, since they were Turkish speaking. We also see that Turkish equivalents were coined through prefixes or even with the addition of Turkish suffixes.

In my opinion, the aforementioned practices were used by lay people and lower clergy, while upper clergy would avoid Islamic terms and instead introduce Greek, in order to retain the sacredness of the term and also for educating in the “correct” form of the religion. Another option was a blend of Greek-Turkish terms, which would have made them more accessible, and through dissemination these became part of common oral communication, as we shall see later on.

3.2.2. A borderline in lexis

The religious vocabulary for various reasons is particular. On the other hand, it is very similar to Karamanlidika books edited by other authors from the same period, something that points to a Turkish-speaking tradition in religious books. There are

---

408 The word carries the meaning of both blasphemy and apostasy. In KIN1753’s context it is used as blasphemy.
terms with which the author is quite flexible, using synonyms from one or both languages, while for other terms he insists on one form and sometimes creates terms by adding Turkish suffixes to Greek words, or with the use of the compound marker.

As noted in 3.2., words referring to religious offices are usually in Greek, with few exceptions; the names of saints and various religious artefacts are also in Greek, with the addition of the Turkish word азиз [aziz] ‘holy/saint’, e.g. азиз еикона [aziz eikona] ‘holy figure’. The few exceptions include terms for Archangel Gabriel and Moses. Special treatment seems to have been reserved for the Virgin Mary and Jesus (to a lesser degree), with a variety of names in Greek, Turkish and of Arabic origin, which are, however, considered normal in Turkish.

Probably the most interesting finding is the absolute absence of the Greek word for God in the Turkish text – it is used only in Greek passages. As already discussed in 3.2., God is always referred to as Allah or Rabbi or Tagiri. It seems that although the majority of terms are in Greek, probably illustrating the effort to teach people the “correct ways”, the use of the word Allah, which was possibly deep rooted and the ongoing practice, was a red line that was not to be crossed, namely should not be translated into Greek, since “knowledge is embedded in what people already know in what they trust and in what they believe in”\(^410\). This was probably the obvious, unmarked choice in sociolinguistic terms, and the use of the Greek word might seem unwelcome or strange to the Turkophone Orthodox of Anatolia.

The strategy is followed in other books and we observe that the terminology is affected by the background of the author. Serapheim, originating from Asia Minor, uses Allah, Turkish of Arabic origin and the Turkish word Tagiri, while the author of another book in Karamanlidika about Mount Sinai and member of the monastery uses, besides Allah, the Persian word Huda, which is quite common in the Middle East.\(^411\) The use of the word Allah continued until the end of Karamanlidika book

\(^410\) Murre-van den Berg, Scribes and Scriptures, 280
\(^411\) See Luffin, “Religious Vocabulary in Karamanlidika Texts, 282–288. For the use of the words Αλλάχ and Ταγγρί see also Gavriel, “Η Τουρκική με το Ελληνικό ἀλφάβητο” 345. See also Walker, “Ascetic Literacy: Books and Readers in East Syrian Monastic Tradition,” 315, who mentions that “while Syriac remained the dominant language of communication and instruction, some monasteries adopted Persian as their principle language and others in Central Asia, Sogdian and eventually Turkish.”
production in the early twentieth-century and was so deep rooted that it was inscribed in Greek script even on various ecclesiastical silverware, icons, liturgical textiles and also on gravestones.

In fact, the word *Allah* and other words in older forms mentioned in this study, like *itdim, sighoris ol*, etc. are found on nineteenth-century gravestones and in codices from the same century in the Centre for Asia Minor Studies in Athens, which point to their use explicitly for religious purposes.

Another group of words is the combination of a Greek noun (usually by removing the inflectional ending) with a Turkish verb for creating religious terminology, already mentioned in 3.1.4.. Additionally, we see the invention of terms from existing materials, terms that would be rarely used outside a church environment like *κερὲ µἐτὶτζη* [kerem edici] ‘merciful’ (APK1782:viii), *σεγτὰν ἄτεµλεριν κἀτλ. ἐτίτζησίτιρ* [şeytan ademlerin katl edicisidir] ‘Satan is the killer of men’ (BH1783:125).

All of these were possibly conventions created for the Turkophone Orthodox of Anatolia and would rarely be used outside a religious environment, but this issue warrants further research that must include some manuscript material, which for the time being is unfortunately unavailable.

---


3.3. From Greek to Turkish language

When addressing the translation of religious texts, as described in 0.7.2.4., a number of techniques can be applied, often closely connected to both the beliefs of the translator and the needs of the audience. What is important for us here is on the one hand the communication of the meaning and on the other the structural differences between the two implicated languages, which might be reflected in the translation of certain passages.

Turkish, and Turkic languages in general are often described as SOV languages, namely the subject of the sentence is found in initial position, the object in medial and the verb usually in the final position. Research has shown that case and word order systematically vary due to sentence perspective415 and our knowledge on the word order of regional Turkish varieties remains meagre, which could also point to differences from standard Turkish. The Greek language is described as an SVO language, namely the subject of the sentence is found in initial position, the verb in medial and the object in the final position.

The case of Karamanlidika religious editions complicates the situation even more. We are dealing with editions written for the most part in a variety with regional elements (as seen in 2.4.) destined for a Turkish-speaking population. This Turkish variety has a counterpart in the language of sacred books and religion, which is Greek. Previous studies proved that certain social circumstances, could lead to the adoption of typologically divergent elements that deviate from their counterparts in the recipient language. Such cases are Inner Anatolian Greek under the Turkish influence, where a Greek speaking population was almost entirely detached by Greek speaking people and surrounded, and therefore interacted, with Turkish speaking communities. Similarly are the cases of Northern Tajik and Karaim, with the latter illustrating, apart from other changes, a heavily de-Turcicised clausal structure416 due to contact situation with Indo-European languages. This is not the case with Karamanlidika but, at least in ecclesiastical contexts and especially in liturgical language, it would be interesting to see the impact of Greek language (if any), since there are certain translations that stick

---

closely to the original for the sake of accuracy. Concerning HNK1756 it was suggested previously that although elements copied from Greek are attested, its syntax constructions are genuinely Turkish. 417

Furthermore, there are other factors involved, such as when these books were translated (since as mentioned before we are dealing with translated texts and time is crucial when the language is in a transitional stage), what happened with the several reprints (did they keep the original language or did they make changes) and what the role of typesetters was, something already referred to in 2.3.3. For example, we come across an archaic word in a reprint of a book, decades after the first edition. Is it an archaic form used to serve a specific purpose, did the typesetter reproduce what he was seeing in the first edition, or is it that the language was, and still is, in a transitional stage?

With the primary sources for this research belonging to the first printed Karamanlidika books, and in the absence of studies in religious manuscripts of previous times, the role and possible influence of religious manuscripts from previous periods cannot be justified here.

In order to restrict the size of this chapter, given the large amount of Serapheim’s texts, a choice was made to use selected examples from all editions. These examples consist of passages that appear in Greek with a Turkish translation and the opposite, presented here in plain form for Greek text and bold italics for Turkish. This will enable us to trace and analyse the various translation techniques used by Serapheim, with the findings being subdivided into two categories – translations that have as a priority to pass on the meaning and do not copy the word order of the Greek passage, and translations that carry formulaic utterances. In the second part of this chapter an effort will be made to interpret the role of these translations.

3.3.1. Meaning as a priority

example 1 (IPK1753:73)
The passage forming the first example refers to ancestral sin. With both passages conveying generally the same meaning, the verb in the Turkish passage is located

in the final position and we encounter the use of a different verb – in the Greek passage the deed of sin is “diminished” while in the Turkish one it is “torn up”. Also, the second verb of the Turkish passage (to pardon) is expressed once more in the Greek version with a participle. Furthermore ἰνσὰν μιλλέτι ‘the community of people’ and ἀλλὰχ ‘God’, are absent from the Greek text, with the latter being the hidden subject of the Greek sentence.

μπιζ  ἰνσὰν μιλλέτι  ντὲρ,  σῦλοῦ  ὀλμάξαν
biz  insan milleti  der,  fillu  olmaian
WE   PEOPLE COMMUNITY.POSS3 SAY.PRE/IMPF.3SG  DEAD BE.CONV.WITH

κιουναχλαριμιζαν,  ντιριλτι  μπιζη  ἀλλὰχ,
günahlarımızdan,  dirildi  bizi  Allah,
SIN.PL.POSS.1PL.ABL  REVIVE.PASTDI.3SG  WE.ACC GOD.NOM

χριστοζοῦν  βασιτεσίλε,  βὲ  τζοῦμε  μπορτζουμουζοῦ
χριστοζ’un  vasitesile,  ve  cümle  borcumuzu
CHRIST.GEN  BY THE MEANS OF  AND  ALL  DEBT.POSS.1PL.ACC

μπαγζελαττι  μπιζη,  βὲ  σουτζλαριμζι
μπαγζελαt?i  mezi  ve  suclarımızı
PARDON.PASTDI.3SG  WE.DAT AND  MISTAKE.PL.POSS.1PL.ACC

ταχὶ,  βὲ  κιουναχλαριμζην  τεμεσιτινοῦ
taçi,  bæ  gunahlarımızın  temesitinu418
3SG.ACC

ΤΕΑΡ.PASTDI.3SG

418 cf. “temessük”
[We, the community of people, who were said to be dead with sins, were revived as God pardoned us from all of our debts and mistakes through Christ, and tore up the deed of our sin.]

κ᾽ ἡμᾶς νεκροὺς ὄντας τοῖς παραπτώμασι, AND WE.ACC DEAD.ACC BE.PART ART.M.PL.DAT MISTAKES.DAT

σηνεξωσοποίησε τῶς Χριστῶν. χαρισάμενος ἡμῖν REVIVIFY.AOR.3SG ART.M.S.DAT CHRIST.DAT ENDOW.PART WE.DAT

πάντα τὰ παραπτώματα, ἐξαλείψας EVERY ART.N.PL MISTAKES.ACC DIMINISH.PART

tὸ καθ᾽ἡμῶν χειρόγραφον ART.N.PL BY WE.GEN WRITTEN.ACC

[(God) along with Christ brought us back to life, us who were dead because of our crimes. After He spared us of all our crimes and wiped out the contract (ancestral sin).]
example 2 (NTh1756:27)
In the second example we come across the noun “Μακάριος” ‘blissful’, a very typical noun in a Christian orthodox context. The noun is rendered in Turkish by μουτλού 'happy'. The Greek participle διηγούμενος 'the one who listens', is translated into Turkish by a very "un-Turkic" cleft construction and a finite verb in optative/future.

Γιάνε νέμουτλούτουρ ὡλκίμσεκι, τιγνλεητζάλεριν
yane ne mutludur olkimseki, diyleicilerin
NAMELY HOW.HAPPY.COP3 THAT.SOMEONE.REL LISTENER.PL.GEN

κουλάκλαρινά βὰζ ἔγιλεε.
kulaklarina vaz eyilee.
EAR.PL.POSS.3.DAT PREACH DO.OPT.3SG

[Namely, how happy is the one who will preach to the ears of listeners.]

Μακάριος ὁ διηγούμενος εἰς ὠτα
BLISSFUL.NOM ART.M.SG.NOM NARRATE.PART.M.SG.NOM IN EAR.PL

ἀκουόντων.
LISTEN.PART.PL.GEN

[Blissful is he who narrates to listening ears.]

example 3 (CSK1756:16)
Once more example of similar sentence order, example three follows the pattern of similar tense/person structures while it has minor differences in words. The noun ‘Lord’ is rendered by two nouns in the Turkish passage (Rabbil efendi). Also, the structure töbeye gelinceedek ‘until repentance comes’ is to be assumed in the Greek passage, where we see only “ὡς τὸ ἐπιστρέψαι”, namely ‘until the return’ (from sin). Furthermore, the verb ömürlenmek is not attested in modern standard Turkish and might be a formation by Serapheim.
[I am alive says the Lord, thus I do not wish the death of the sinner, may he remain alive until the moment of repentance]

[The Lord says: I too live (and) I do not wish the death of the sinner, so that he may return and live.]
example 4 (CSK1756:160)

In example four we observe the first part with the verb in final position, with a postponed object in the second sentence, probably copying the Greek text.

Προωρώ θην τὸν Κύριον ἐνώπιόν μου,
SEE.PAST.IMPE.1SG ART.M.ACC LORD.ACC INFRONT CLITIC.1SG.GEN
καὶ οἱ ὀφθαλμοί μου διὰ παντὸς πρὸς
AND ART.M.PL EYES POSS.1SG FOR EVER TOWARDS
τὸν Κύριον καὶ πρὸς σὲ ἦρα
ART.M.ACC LORD.ACC AND TOWARDS YOU.ACC LIFT.AOR.1SG
τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς μου.
ART.M.PL.ACC EYES.ACC POSS.1SG

[I was seeing before me the Lord, and my eyes (turned) forever towards the Lord, and towards you I lifted my eyes.]
example 5 (K$1758:53)

In this long passage we encounter once more the similar word order and tense/person structures. The example illustrates phenomena analysed in previous chapters, like the various names that retain their Greek form in both passages; the word *kible* in the Turkish passage, a noun which often has Muslim connotations for indicating direction; and the absence of the name of the tree Elias slept under. This could be attributed to a mistake but also to the simplicity the Turkish text often has, avoiding extra or unnecessary information.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{βὲ} & \quad \text{ὀνοῦν} \quad \text{γιαματζηντὰ} \quad \text{Κανὰ} \quad \text{τῆς} \quad \text{Γαλιλαίας} \\
\text{Ve} & \quad \text{onun} \quad \text{yamacinda} \quad \text{Kana tis Galileas} \\
\text{AND} & \quad \text{HE.GEN NEXT TO THAT} \quad \text{CANAAN OF GALILEE} \\
\text{βάρτουρ,} & \quad \text{ὀντάκι} \quad \text{Χριστος} \quad \text{ταβὲτ} \quad \text{ὁλουντοῦ,} \\
\text{vardur,} & \quad \text{ondaki} \quad \text{Hristos} \quad \text{davet} \quad \text{olundu,} \\
\text{EXISTENT.COP.3SG REL} & \quad \text{CHRIST INVITE BE.PASS.PASTDI.3SG} \\
\text{βαλιτεσίγηλεν} & \quad \text{περαπὲρ} \quad \text{τουγιουνὲ,} \quad \betaὲ \quad \text{𝑖λκ} \\
\text{validesiyilen} & \quad \text{beraber} \quad \text{düyüne,} \quad \text{ve} \quad \text{ilk} \\
\text{MOTHER.POSS.3SG.WITH TOGETHER} & \quad \text{MARRIAGE.DAT AND FIRST} \\
\text{μουτζουζετὴ} & \quad \text{ὀρατα} \quad \text{γκιοστεῖ}, \quad \text{σουγιοῦ} \quad \text{σαραπᾶ} \\
\text{mucuzeti} & \quad \text{orada} \quad \text{gosterdi} \quad \text{suyu} \quad \text{şaraba} \\
\text{MIRACLE.ACC} & \quad \text{THERE SHOW.PASTDI.3SG WATER.ACC WINE.DAT} \\
\text{μουκαλίπ} & \quad \text{ἐττεϊ} \quad \betaὲ \quad \text{Κουτλουσερφιτεν κιπλὲ} \\
\text{mukalib} & \quad \text{etti;} \quad \text{ve} \quad \text{Kutluşeriften kible} \\
\text{TRANSFORM.PASTDI.3SG AND} & \quad \text{JERUSALEM.ABL SOUTH} \\
\text{ταραφινὰ} & \quad \text{kittiğite} \quad \text{iki} \quad \text{mił} \quad \text{αρασιντὰ,} \\
\text{tarafina} & \quad \text{gitikte} \quad \text{iki} \quad \text{mil arasinda,} \\
\text{SIDE.POSS.3SG.DAT} & \quad \text{GO.CONV TWO MILES BETWEEN} \\
\end{align*}
\]
[And next to that is Canaan of Galilee, to which Christ was invited with his mother to a wedding where he performed his first miracle; transforming water into wine; and went around two miles south of Jerusalem, where the monastery of prophet Elias stands, where prophet Elias fell into sleep under a tree.]
[And nearby him the Cana of Galilee is located, to which after he was invited, Christ along with his mother (went) for a marriage, (and) he performed his first miracle, namely transforming the water to wine. Leaving Jerusalem during midday, two miles away is the monastery of the Prophet Elias. In that place the Prophet fell asleep underneath a tree named juniper.]

example 6 (RAB1782:53)
The final example of this subchapter illustrates how the Turkish passages often are more detailed and descriptive than the Greek ones. In the Greek text Jesus will come and solely save the sinners, while in the Turkish one he will forgive, pardon and offer them salvation. This could be attributed also to a difference in traditions, where some concepts are to be said in certain ways, as in “heyatlı ömürlü olan” instead of the Greek “ζῶντος”.

γιανία, Ἰχάν γκετηρίριμ

γιανία, iman getiririm

NAMELY FAITH BRING.PRE/IMPF.1SG

Πάπιλ. σανά, βὲ

Rabbıl sana, ve

LORD YOU.DAT AND

Ηκράμ ἐτέριμ, μέσελα

İkram ederim mesela

HONOR DO.PRE/IMPF.1SG SUCH AS

σέναιν

sensin

YOU.COP.2SG

Ἰησοῦς Χριστός

İsus Hristos

JESUS CHRIST
Namely, I confess my faith to you Lord and honour you, that you are Jesus Christ, son of the existing God Almighty, who came to earth to give pardon and forgiveness to our sins and give salvation to every sinner with the utmost sinner to be me]
Πιστεύω κύριε, κι ὁμολογῶ. ὅτι σὺ εἶ,BELIEVE.PRE.1SG LORD.VOC AND CONFESS.PRE.1SG THATYOU BE.PRE.2SG

Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς, ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐλθὼν
JESUS CHRIST.NOM ART SON OF GOD.GEN ALIVE.PART ART.M.SG COME.PART.

εἷς τὸν Κόσμον ἁμαρτωλοὺς σῶσαι, ὃν
TO ART.M.ACC EARTH.ACC SINNER.PL.ACC SAVE.INF REL.PL.GEN.

πρῶτος, εἰμὶ ἐγὼ.
FIRST BE.PRE.1SG I.

[Oh Lord, I believe and I confess that you are Jesus Christ. the son of the living God, who came to the world to save the sinners, of whom I am the first one]

3.3.2. Teaching religion

It was previously mentioned that in texts of religious character there often is a conscious effort to maintain the word order of the original text, which might result in unintelligible translations. In Serapheim’s texts a variety of techniques are used. The main corpus is written in a colloquial language. For quotations in Greek language, with a following translation/explanation in Turkish, on many occasions the Turkish part copies the order of the sentence constituents. The syntax remains primarily Turkish, following the pattern subject-object-verb, reaffirming that the need of the intended audience for simple, comprehensive language determines the translation technique.

The aforementioned techniques are probably connected to the character of the

419 Menges, The Turkic Languages and Peoples, 182. Murre-van den Berg, From a spoken to a written language.
420 Especially for this issue in HNK1756 see Brendemoen, “Karamanlidic Literature and its value as a source for spoken Turkish in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries,” 5–25.
books, which was primarily educational. Serapheim’s books were meant to serve as handbooks for functional literacy, and like the majority of religious books of that time, they described detailed religious practices primarily for priests, and then for the rest, and thus disseminated religious terminology throughout the community.

The educational character of the books is mentioned by Serapheim in his prologue from IPK1753:5, where we read: “the teachings of faith, and the lessons deriving from it, are acquired from the knowledge and unremitting reading of religious books”. That they were intended to enhance literacy is indicated by passages such as the following, where the letters of the name Mariam (Mary) are explained one by one in terms of pronunciation and also with their position within the alphabet. The author, while explaining how Mary was given her name, takes the opportunity to explain to the reader how important this name is and also to give a short lesson on Greek letters.

… βὲ ἵσμιν Μαριὰμ τετελέρ. ζῆρα μπού ἵσιμ, μπού σοζοῦν ἵλκ χαρφί, μή. ντετικλερι, εἰγριμιτόρτ χαρφλαρίν ἀρασιντά ὅλαν, μή γιαζισι, μανέ βερμεσή μπουτοῦν μπουτουρκι, γιαληνιζ, μπού κεντισή τετεμέκτιρ. βέ μπού χαρφήν γιαματζηντά ὅλαν ἱκιντή χάρφ ἰλφα, βάρτηρ. βέ μπουουν μανεσηνήν τετεμεσή. μπού χέμεν γιαληνιζ τετεμέκτιρ. βέ οὔτζουντζού χάρφ. ρό. ἱρακάμπτηρ. βέ μπουουν μανεσή ταχι, κουρταριντζή τετεμέκτιρ. βέ τορτουντζού χάρφ ἱότα ἱ. ἱρακαμίτηρ. μανεσή μπουκι, ξεχιρτέν τετεμέκτιρ. βέ πεξιντζή χάρφ, κίνε μπιρ ἰλφα χαρφίτηρ. μανεσή μπουκι, τζέμι τζωμιλεῖ τετεμέκτιρ. βέ ἅλτιντζή χάρφ, κίνε μπιρ μή, χαρφίτηρ. βέ μπουουν ταχι μανεσή μπουτουρκι, ἐγληγι θουσουμετ ετέν τουσμάν σεγτάν τετεμέκτουρ. ἱμτί μπού ἱσσημε ἅλτι χάρφ γιαζηλήτηρ, βέ μπού ἅλτι χαρφλαρίν μανελερινή γιοκιουνου τεμαμί μπού σοζέλেτηρ.

[...ve ismine Mariam dediler. Zira bu isim, bu sözün ilk harfi, mi. dedikleri, iyirmi dört harflarin arasında olan, mi yazisi, mane vermesi bütün budurki, yalmiz, bu kendisi demektir. ve bu harfin yamacinda olan ikinci harf alfa, vardır. ve bunun

---

421 “ἡ διδασκαλία τῆς πίστεως, καὶ τὰ διδάγματα τῶν κατ’ αὐτήν ἔργων ἀποκτῶνται ἀπὸ τὴν γνώσιν καὶ συνεχείς ανάγνωσιν τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν βιβλίων.”
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manesinin demesi. bu hemen yalnızız demektir. ve üçüncü harf, ro. irakamdır, ve manesi bunun manesi dahi, kurtarıncı demektir. ve dörtlüncü harf iota ＜ι＞ irakamdır. manesi buki zehirden demektir. ve beşinci harf, gine bir alfa harfidir. manesi buki, cem-i cümlei demektir. ve altıncı harf, gine bir mi, harfidir. ve bunun dahi manesi budurki, eyliye husumet eden duşman seytan demektir. imdi bu isimde altı harf yazılıdır, ve bu altı harfların manelerini yokunu temamı bu sözlerdir.] (BH1783:59)

‘…and they give her the name Mariam. Because regarding this name its first letter is called mi, one of the 24 letters (of the Greek alphabet) that is written always in this way and it is pronounced mi. Following this is the letter alfa and it is called in this way, and pronounced alone. The third letter, ro in this figure, is pronounced as in kurtarıncı ‘saviour’. The fourth letter iota has the following figure ＜ι＞ and it is pronounced as in zehirden ‘from poison’. The fifth letter is again an alfa and it is pronounced in this way in all sentences. And the sixth letter, again a mi. In this way, the one who hates goodness is called devil. This name is written in six letters, and the meaning of these six letters is this.’

The second purpose of the books, the thorough description on how to perform religious rituals, is evident not only in the various ceremonies we come across in the books but also in the testimony of Serapheim himself. In the book KIN1753:25, he describes the fasting days throughout the year, and mentions that in 1751 in Ankara, people did not know what they should do on the day before the Epiphany. Although the introductions of his books are full of references to the “intellectual decay” of the people of the East, this is one of the rare occasions when he talked about a specific event, which helps us understand what he meant when saying that. This also supports what was mentioned in 0.7.2.1., namely that as long as the religious authorities did not have the means to promote the “correct” ways, people practised religion in their own way. Basic rituals and prayers are recurring in Serapheim’s publications, such as marriage in NvB1776:73-83 and HNK1753:177-211. In the latter not the only is the ritual described but plausible scenarios are also given as to which types of relatives can be married. Other rituals
that appear often are prayers for someone who is on his death bed (e.g., NvB1776:115-120, RAB1782:137) and the engagement ceremony (e.g., NvB1776:69-72, RAB1782:105). Prayers like Πάτερ ηµῶν [Pater imon] are also repeated (e.g., HNK1753:108, KŞ1758:71, RAB1782:65-67).

If we take a closer look to the description of these rituals, we observe that the general description of the ritual is in Turkish while the texts which the cleric has to perform remain in Greek. In short, not everything is to be translated, e.g., in the engagement ceremony:

Íµµi σόγρα, Παµάς Δισκλέλιτε όλαν Γιουζουκλερί ἀλήρ, βὲ Ἀλτούν γιουζουγιοῦ, Ἐρκέκ ὀλανήν Πασιντά Σταυρόσλαγην τοκαντηρί, ἀτέτ οὐζρέ, οὐτς κερέτ.

[İmdi soğra, Papas Diskletlite olan Yüzükleri alır, be Altun yüzüyü, Erkek olanın Başında Stavroslayın dokandırır, adet üzre, üç keret.]

‘Later on, the priest takes the rings from the tray and performs the sign of the cross three times on the man’s head with the golden ring.’

Ἀῤῥαβωνίζεται, ὁ δούλος τοῦ Θεοῦ, (Ἄβρετην ἴσµην ὄγγαρ.) Εἰς τὸ ὄνοµα τοῦ Πατρὸς, κὶ τοῦ Ὑιοῦ, κὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύµατος νῦν κὶ ἄει κὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀµήν.

[Avretin ismini ajar]

‘To be engaged, the servant of God (reads the name of partner) In the name of the Father, Son and the Holy Spirit, for now to eternity, Amen’ (NvB1776:70)

In the Christening ceremony we observe that the items used also retain their Greek names (see 3.2.) and the prayer is written in Greek language:
Παπὰς Θυμιατὸς ἀλήρ ἐληνέ, Κολιμβήθραγία γκιτέρ, βε τζέβρι ἐτραφινή θυμιατός βερίρ, βε θυμιατοσυ γκερή βερήρσιν, προσκυνής ἐτέρ, βε σόγρα ἀβὰζ ἐτέρ. Εὐλογημένη ἡ Βασιλεία τοῦ Πατρὸς, κι τοῦ Ἦιου, κι τοῦ Άγιου Πνεύματος, νυν κι άεί κι εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἄμην.

[Papas Thimiatos alır eline, Kolimvithra’ya gider, ve çevr-i etrafını thimiatos verir, ve thimiatos’u geri verirsin, proskinis eder, ve sonra avaz eder. Evloyimeni i Vasilia tou Patros, ki tou Yiou, ki tou Ayiou Pnevmatos. nin kai aei kai eis tous aionas ton aionon. Amin]

‘The priest takes the incense in his hand, goes to the font and spreads incense in the surrounding area, he gives back the incense, bows and then begins to chant, Blessed the kingdom of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, now and forever, and evermore. Amen’ (NvB1776:93)

The strategy of focusing on expanding the knowledge of religion in both languages is evident in RAB1782:64, where Serapheim gives both forms and stresses the need of having knowledge of the Seven Sacraments. On several occasions we see that in the Turkish context they were using the Greek term but in a simpler form, something we come across in Greek-speaking Christians as well. Numbers 4, 5, 6 are Turkish terms, number 1 is a Greek term that has been adapted morphologically to Turkish, and 2, 3 and 7 are unadapted Greek terms:

1. Βαπτίς  
   á. Τὸ Ἁγιον Βάπτισμα. ‘Christening’
2. Μύρον  
   β’. Τὸ Ἁγιον Μύρον. ‘Chrism’
3. Κοινωνία  
   γ'. Ἡ Θεία Λειτουργία. ‘Holy Communion’
4. Ρουχπανλίκ  
   δ’. Ἡ Ἱερωσύνη. ‘Priesthood’
5. Τογπερκιαρλίκ  
   ε’. Ἡ Μετάνοια. ‘Repentance’
6. Ἠβελενμεκλίκ  
   στ’. Ὁ Τίμιος Γάμος. ‘Marriage’
7. Εὐχέλαιον  
   ζ’. Τὸ Ἡγιον Εὐχέλαιον. ‘Unction’

422 Elsewhere it can also be found as “στέφανος ολμακ” [stefanos olmak] using the practice described in 3.2.; see NvB1776:73.
Such information can be found also in books that do not describe ceremonies, such as PsD1782:261, where we read about how and when to use the book:

Κερέκτιρκι μπιλελήμ, γιάνια μπουσεκιλ τζάηζτιρ Ψαλτήρι μπιουτοῦν σενέ όκουνσοῦν. Σεπτέμβριος άιοῦν είγρμισιντέν, χέρ γκιοῦν ουτζ (3) Κάθισμα όκούρους δρήροστα. βέ: Έσπερινοστα ταχί, πρός Κύριονλαρι όκούρους. ἁγρυπνίατα, πολυέλεοςζου ταχί τερακύ ἐτέριζ.

[Geręktrki bilelim, yania bu şekil caizdir Psaltiri bütün sene okunsun. Septemvrios ayun iyimisinden, her gün üç Kathisma okurus orthros’ta. Ve Esperinos’ta dahi, pros Kyrion’lari okurus, agryphinıda, polyleosz’u dahi teraki ederiz.]

‘We ought to know that the Psalter in this form must be read throughout the year. After the twentieth of September, every day we read the Kathisma at the Orthros. And then in the Vespers we read [the prayers which begin with] pros Kyrion (‘to the Lord’), and during the night prayers we raise the chandelier’.

The book also disseminated religious terminology and phrasing by explaining invocations in Greek and Turkish. Examples like, ἐλεήσον με ὁ Θεός. ρύχμε έγλε μπενί ‘Αλλάχ. ‘Have mercy on me God’, Κύριε εισάκουσον τῆς προσευχῆς μου, Γιάρεππι καποὺλ έγλε ιπατετιμι μπενίμι. ‘Lord accept my prayer’, are prayers (their beginning or ending), which, as mentioned before, tend to copy the existing structure in order to give an aura of “sacredness”. It should be taken into consideration though that the Turkish translation of Greek religious phrases was probably just an effort to create the knowledge required for religious participation. Another process is the gradual adoption of Turkish instead of Greek in such passages, such as the well-known trisagion (“must be said three times”) prayer, where the form of the instruction is given in Greek but then the action takes place in Turkish:
ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER AND THE LANGUAGE OF THE RITUAL


[aziz Allah, Aziz kuvet, Aziz ölümsüs, eşirge bizi.]

‘Holy God, holy (and) strong, holy immortal, have mercy on us.’

Furthermore, we come across rituals that start with Greek and continue in Turkish, giving the sense that this will be the form from now on, as in the Eucholoyion in RAB1782:77 where Serapheim gradually stops using Greek in the titles and then also in the supplications, e.g.:

Τοῦ Κυρίου Δεηθῶµεν. Ράππιε νιάς Κιλαλήµ... Ράππιε νιάς Κιλαλήµ.
[Supplicating to God]

Summarising this chapter, we see that Serapheim used various techniques of translation according to the purpose of the texts. The first technique aims for the communication of the meaning regarding religious issues outside liturgy and rituals. Here we see that the Turkish translation of the Greek passages followed its own rules and did not copy any structural elements from Greek. Regarding the language of liturgy and rituals, Serapheim tries to copy the Greek word order, namely putting the objects into a postverbal position. Educating people in Christian religion was one thing; educating them in the ways and language of the rituals was another. Therefore, as we saw in the third part of the chapter, certain themes remained untranslated while others, within the course of liturgy, were first written in Greek, then in Turkish, and gradually Turkish took over completely, maybe in an effort to formulate a version of the liturgy and rituals in Turkish.