

The Karamanli Text of Teodosiy of Sinai's "A book for learning of three languages" Language and Cultural Problems

HRISTO SALDŽIEV (Čirpan)

In 1945 Claude LÉVI-STRAUSS in a separate article published in a journal of linguistic studies examined the applicability of structuralism and its methodology in the field of anthropological studies. Proceeding from the concepts of the structural linguistics developed in the works of Nikolai TROUBETZKOY and Roman JAKOBSON, he outlined and delimited the main research spheres and subjects of linguistic and anthropological structuralism. Both focus on the unconscious infrastructure of the linguistic and social phenomena, on the relations between terms (phonemes and kinship denominations) and on the structure of the existing phonemic and kinship systems. Hence, the "systematic structuralism" as a whole contrasts with the "individualistic" and "atomistic" interpretation applied by the linguists and anthropologists from the older schools (LÉVI-STRAUSS 1996: 313–314). However, in the scope of anthropology Claude Lévi-Strauss distinguished two kinds of systems – the system of terminology and the system of attitudes. The first one is constituted by the kinship terms, but their functions in the system are unknown. The only obvious element is the system itself. This situation contrasts with the situation in the structural linguistics where the functions of the phonemes are obvious, but the system which they formed remains unclear. The second system stays out of the direct research interest of linguistics. By its nature the system of attitudes is psychological and social – it ensures the group cohesion and equilibrium, but its internal net and the interactions between the various attitudes are incomprehensible (LÉVI-STRAUSS 1996: 316).

Claude Lévi-Strauss' article delimited the research fields of the two branches of structuralism – linguistic and anthropological. During the next decades the number of studies in both spheres increased incessantly but their final results and conclusions were rarely compared to each other. For example, Karl KASER – one of the prominent modern researchers of the Balkans, in a recently published anthropological study on the base of the structural analysis introduced the term "Eurasia Minor" in respect to the Balkans (without Croatia and Slovenia) and Anatolia. His arguments are grounded on the finding that the "traditional kinship relations of the peoples of Eurasia Minor were very similar – in contrast to those of Western and Central Europe, on the one hand, and of the Middle East, on the other hand. Interestingly enough, the characteristics of kinship organizations – segmentation, generational distance, and birth order – as described for the Inner Asian steppe, are not limited to peoples of Turkish or Mongolian descent. We find them in most of the Balkan peoples, too" (KASER 2008: 10–11).

Actually, the problem of "the little Eurasia" was discussed in the context of the Troubetzkoy's and Jakobson's linguistic structuralism 12 years earlier by the Austrian linguist Manfred TRUMMER. He regarded South Eastern Europe as an intermediary zone between Eurasia and the Mediterranean. According to his thesis a series of

linguistic occurrences in the Balkan languages like the prevailing number of consonants, palatalization (the timbre correlation *s-s'*), reducing the role of vowels – reduction of the unstressed vowels and vowel mutation (*a/e*) as well as the traces of cases preserved in Romanian, Albanian and Greek allows South Eastern Europe to be included in a vast area whose center is Eurasia (TRUMMER 1996: 259–260). On the other hand the domination of the verb in the morphological systems connects the region with the Eastern Mediterranean and its verbal type of languages. The author considered the phonetic system as being ethnically determined and the verbal type – as a consequence of cultural intercourse and communication (TRUMMER 1996: 261).

It is remarkable that both works leaning on the methodology of structuralism, reveal different (kinship and linguistic) aspects of the connections of the Balkan and Anatolian societies with Eurasia. However, from a historical point of view these aspects, in spite of the fact that they are examined by various branches of the humanities, were not phenomena independent and isolated from each other. They must be regarded as synchronic appearances of the ethnical, social and cultural contacts between the two regions. That imposes the necessity for the “traces” of this interaction to be studied in a complex way taking into consideration all sides and manifestations of the influence exerted by the unconscious systems on the nature of the group specifics, relationships and behavior¹.

The present article deals with a document little known in the Balkan studies – “Книга за научение трѣх ѡзиковѣ, славѣно вѣлгарскѣи ѡ грѣческѣи и караманлиѣ” (A book for learning of three languages: Slavic Bulgarian, Greek and Karamanli) and more precisely with its third Karamanli part. Our aim is to investigate the Eurasian and Balkan features of the Karamanli language² and the character of religious terminology and kinship nomenclature (the system of terminology and atti-

¹ The analysis of the language and anthropological data many times leads to opposite conclusions. For instance if we accept the palatalization and existence of case system as Eurasian markers the languages of Western Slav peoples whose family, kinship and gender relations according to anthropologists are based on the German Sippe (KASER 2008: 39) or even German language itself stay much more closer to the Eurasian typology than Bulgarian. The coincidence between the Eurasian elements in the languages and the social culture on the Balkans also must not be overestimated. The Balkan languages, especially these forming the Balkan language union bear many “Mediterranean” features that categorically prevail over Eurasian. Therefore the language and social developments in the most of cases are diachronic not synchronic and parallel.

² From linguistic point of view the “Karamanli language” without any doubt belongs to Turkish and can be reckoned as one of its dialectical groups and in certain degree as a Turkish sociolect spoken by a group distinguished from the other Turks by its religious specifics. In the exposition we will use the term Karamanli first because the language used in the period XV–XX century by the Turkophone Christians (called Karamanlies) in Anatolia, Istanbul, Balkans and Crimea was known from the beginning of XIX century with this name and second because in this language a relatively rich religious and laic literature also called Karamanli was created. The term was accepted by turkologists like DMITRIEV and Evangelia BALTA who regularly used it in their works. At the same time our article is based on the evidences of the trilingual Thessalonica book and therefore the name Karamanli here has mainly textual dimensions.

tudes) from the basis of the information decoded in the text of the book. Indeed its records in a certain degree correspond to “the tyranny of the written word” – a paradigm often criticized by many linguists and anthropologists. However, the trilingual book is among the few available sources that can be used for reconstruction of the vernacular and normative culture of the Balkan Karamanli community – one of the forgotten groups of “Eurasia Minor”.

1. Karamanlies – common historical evidences

The Karamanlies are one of the several Turkish speaking Christians groups populating Anatolia and the Balkans in the time of the Oguz principalities (XIII–XV) and the Ottoman Empire (XV–XX). On the base of their group name, the Karaman principality (ancient Kapadocia and modern South-Western Turkey) is generally assumed to be their initial homeland. In the literature there are two contradictory opinions about their origin. According to the first one, which is mainly shared by Greek researchers, the Karamanlies are believed to be Greek by origin, but due to their separation from the Greek speaking population of the Anatolian coastal regions they have been linguistically absorbed by the Turkish environment. The second thesis, maintained by the Turkish historians, regards the Karamanlies as descendents of the Turkic Oguz tribes or soldiers who, as a result of conducting their military service in the Byzantine army, accepted Christianity (CLOGG 1968: 57; VRYONIS 1971: 452; TOGAN 1981: 209–210). The earliest evidences for the existence of Turkish speaking Orthodoxes in the region of Karaman date back to the 15th century. In the second half of the same century in consequence of the ultimate conquest of the Karaman principality by the Ottomans and sultan Mehmed FATİH’s deportation policy, the Karamanli community was divided into two parts: the first remained in their old settlements while the second, including mainly merchants and artisans, were settled in Istanbul. In the next centuries the Karamanlies were mentioned in the reports and letters of diplomats and travellers who visited the Ottoman capital and Anatolia, and also by some Ottoman writers. According to their data, at the beginning, the Istanbul Karamanlies inhabited a separate quarter near to Yedi Kule and were well placed to the trade in agricultural and textile products. The reports in question also shed light on the character of their family relationships and the social status of the Karamanli woman. The Karamanli community in Anatolia kept its homogeneity and big masses of Karamanlies had been inhabiting the regions of Mersin, Konya, Ermenek, Aksaray, Nigde, Ihlara, Kemerhisar, Eregli, etc. for more than five centuries, until 1922³. Most European travelers and missionaries testify that the Karamanlies did not know Greek and only their priests could read the liturgy in this language, but in the most of cases even the priests did not understand the text (CLOGG 1968: 74–76). This information is confirmed by the memoirs of the Bulgarian adventurer Svetoslav MILAROV, who in 1869 took refuge in Marash among the Karamanlies. He notices that the town was populated by Karamanli and Arabian Christians and apart from Greek Arabian was also used in the church of Marash, but the local priest could hardly read from the

³ In 1922 in accordance with the Lozano agreements the Karamanlies were forced to leave Anatolia and to immigrate into Greece.

Greek and Arabian books (Миларов 1994: 146). In 1892 a periodical of the Bulgarian Literary Society published an article dedicated to the Karamanlies. The author had spent some time among them and obviously was well acquainted with different aspects of their social life and normative culture. He regards the Karamanlies as a part of the West Anatolian Turks ethnically identical to the Middle Age Turkish Muslim population of Asia Minor and with the Gaguzes and Sorguches – Turkophone Christians from the Balkans (Черновѣждъ 1892: 436–438). ČERNOVEŽD describes the Karamanlies as a people consisting of four groups. The first covered the Orthodox Christians who were under the control of the Constantinople patriarchate, used the Greek alphabet in their written culture and learned Greek language in schools. The second group belonged to the Armenian Church, visited Armenian schools and had literature in their vernacular with Armenian letters. In spite of the influence exerted by the religious institutions on them, both groups knew neither Greek nor Armenian well and in their everyday life they spoke only Turkish. What is more, according to the information of the same author, they had no interest in learning Greek or Armenian and preferred to know the official Ottoman and Western languages (Черновѣждъ 1892: 441)⁴. The other two groups were small and had originated from the Armenian Church – they were composed of its former members having accepted Catholicism and Protestantism. Černovežd asserts that the Karamanlies did not know the linguistic and ethnical principle of self-determination and identified themselves in accordance with the confessional principle introduced by the Ottomans – “Rum millet” (Orthodox), “Ermeni millet” (the subjects of the Armenian Church), “Catholic millet” (Catholics) and “Christian millet” (Protestants). The only non religious denomination that the Karamanlies preferred to use was “Anadolu” (Anatolians) – a derivative from the geographical name Anatolia. They were named Karamanli by the other peoples – Greeks, Bulgarians and Turks (Черновѣждъ 1892: 439–440). In the 19th century the main occupation of the Karamanlies was stockbreeding and trade. During that period and as a result of certain economical factors many Karamanlies left their home places and settled in the region of Izmir and Istanbul, but their families did not follow them and remained in the Karaman region. Some of the migrants made careers as Ottoman functionaries and clerks of the Constantinople patriarchy (Черновѣждъ 1892: 452–454)⁵.

⁴ If this information was true, most likely it applied to the trade estate among the Karamanlies.

⁵ According to ČERNOVEŽD the Karamanlies working for the Ottoman government were distinguished with their loyalty: “The Karamanli Christians, irrespective of their creed, have given to the Sublime Porte a big number of deserving servants. Actually the Karamanlies have been and are the most numerous elements among the Christian subjects of the Ottoman state who have occupied and occupy at the present high positions in the administration. However because of their Turkish or Turkified names only these who are familiar with them, know that they are Christians. As Ottoman servants they are more Ottomans than the sultan himself ...”. He also gives information about the activity of some notorious and rich Karamanli families exerting a strong influence on the situation in the Constantinople patriarchy and especially underlines the role of the “household Yenidünya” and this of the rich trader Evangel MISAİLOGLU who has published a newspaper “Anatol” in Karamanli language with Greek letters (Черновѣждъ 1892: 454–455).

Starting from the 15th century a relatively rich literature was created in Karamanli language – manuscripts and printed issues. The total number of books published in Karamanli with Greek letters during the period 1711–1935 was 628 books – 340 with religious and 288 with laic content. 30 of them were issues of the printing house of the Constantinople Patriarchy and 181 of different Protestant churches (BALTA 1997–98: 137). The number of the books written with Cyrillic and Armenian letters is unknown.

2. The trilingual book – peculiarities and main problems

The “Book of learning of three languages” was published in 1841 by a Thessalonica printing house founded several years earlier by the Bulgarian monk Theodosius of Sinai (Sinaitski). The pages are divided into three columns – the first comprises the Bulgarian text, the second the Greek and the third the Karamanli. On the top of each column the name of the respective language is given⁶. The separate quires are paginated, but because in the beginning their numbering was confused, we will mark the concrete examples used in the exposition in accordance with the number of their pages and lines. All texts are written with Cyrillic script – Church Slavonic graphic. The Bulgarian and Greek texts are taken from the DANIEL’S “Αρχη του τετραγλωσσου Λεξικου” and are transliterated from the Greek alphabet to Cyrillic⁷. The Karamanli text is their translation and therefore appears to be an original contribution of the Cyrillic version. Up to this moment the text has never been a subject of separate study by the Bulgarian linguistic or historiography. It is also mentioned by some of the Russian and Bulgarian researchers of life and activity of Theodosius of Sinai – DRINOV and Daniel’s book – SELIŠČEV, POGORELOV and NIČEV. According to DRINOV the publisher of the book is Theodosius, but its compiler is unclear (ДРИНОВ 1911: 489). Pogorelov and Ničev did not pay any attention to this problem, but obviously identified the publisher with the compiler. In their works they also reprinted the first page of the trilingual book together with the Karamanli text but without any comments on it (ПОГОРЉЛОВЪ 1925: 5; НИЧЕВ 1977: 17–18). The three authors called its language “Turkish” and put the name “Karamanli” in brackets. Seliščev calls the language “Karamanli” but without additional comments (СЕЛИЩЕВ 1918: 15).

The Soviet turkologist ДМИТРИЕВ published in 1928 and 1929 a separate study in two consecutive parts concerning the phonetic material of the Karamanli text. He regarded the problem entirely in the context of the Turkish (Ottoman) phonetic system and paid little attention to the Balkanisms contained in the text. His conclusion is that the language presented in the book does not reflect completely the peculiarities of the Anatolian Karamanli but is rather a strange eclectic mix between Anatolian and Balkan Turkish vernaculars (ДМИТРИЕВ 1928: 427). He applied in the end of his study a full Arabian (Ottoman) transcription of the Cyrillic original of the text.

⁶ The term Slavic Bulgarian can be seen only in the title of the book. On the top of the columns is used the name “Bulgarian”.

⁷ “Αρχη του τετραγλωσσου Λεξικου” was compiled by Aromanian monk Daniel and printed in 1802. It contains four texts – in Greek, Albanian, Aromanian and Bulgarian. All the texts are written with Greek letters.

Many Yugoslav historians and linguists referred to the book as one of the works of the 19th century “Macedonian” literature but actually all of them repeated the propaganda theses of Haralampie POLENAKOVIĆ who in 1952 tried to present Theodosius of Sinai not as a Bulgarian but as a “Macedonian” cultural and spiritual figure. Polenaković also suggested the hypothesis according to which the translator of the Karamanli text was the printer of the book – an assertion that is more than doubtful as we will see below (Поленакović 1952: 35–39).

A careful comparison of Bulgarian and Greek parts with the Karamanli brings forward three important questions. The first one relates to the number of translators and the nature of bilingualism spread on the Balkans and Anatolia in the middle of the 19th century. Some important language differences in the Karamanli text give reason to think that the translators were at least two different people. For instance, up to the 42nd page of the book the forms of Bulgarian and Greek conjunctive (*da/va*) are expressed by the Turkish optative mood (*Istek kipi*) but after this page the optative is always replaced by the necessitative mood (*Gereklik kipi*). There are significant distinctions in the choice of some conjunctions. In the first 12 pages mainly the conjunction *EM* (*em/hem* “and”) is used as a coordinator and rarely *DA* (*da*). Subsequently *EM* (*em*) often is replaced with *VE* (*ve* “and”). In the beginning the interrogative pronoun *NE* (*ne* “what”), in two sentences (p. 5, line 6 and 12), functions as a subordinating conjunction (“because”) – an occurrence untypical of the rest part of the text. Furthermore, some lexemes appear in two phonetic variants – a fact proving that the translators were more than one and that they spoke or knew different variants of the Karamanli.

Several grammatical and lexical mistakes made by the translators shed additional light on the level of their language competence. Despite the fact that some of them are technical, there are also other mistakes that can be defined as structural. The most frequent errors are in the use of the voices. For example, the Bulgarian phrase *ѢТННСІАТОПЪ* “some are eaten” is translated into Karamanli as *ѠРАРАНДАН ѢРЛЕРЪ* “some of them eat” (p. 5, line 5) or *Ѡ ПНАНЦАТА НН ѠДВААТЪ* “and chickens make us happy” as *ПНАНЧ СЕВЕНЕРЛЕРЪ* “chickens are glade” (p. 6, lines 2, 3). In the first case the active voice is used instead of the Turkish passive and in the second instead of the causative. The reason was due most probably to the fact that the translators did not understand the meaning of the Bulgarian or Greek short reflexive and personal pronouns. On that ground we can suppose that they were bearers of asymmetric bilingualism in which mostly the parallel grammatical forms are mutually comprehensible.

In his work POGORELOV took a heed of several passages from Daniel’s Lexicon missing in the Cyrillic Bulgarian and Greek variants of the trilingual book (PROTOGEROV 1925: 6–11). The passages noticed by PROTOGEROV were also missing in the Karamanli part. The latter shows that the translators and the Bulgarian compiler used a common source where the passages in question very likely had been damaged. In the Karamanli text in the place of one of the partly lost phrases there is a new sentence added obviously by some of the translators (p. 37, lines 22–23).

Pogorelov also examined many modifications in the phonetic structure of the words that were a result of the transliteration or misunderstandings of the Greek letters. Incidentally, these modifications have led to changes in the meaning of the

respective lexemes. Sometimes they affected the Karamanli translation, sometimes not. The Bulgarian sentence from the Daniel's lexicon: Η κόχα κλάτης τραπέζατα "When you lay the table" is transliterated in Cyrillic as Η κοга κлатиш трапезата "When you shake the table" (Погорѣлов 1925: 24, lines 225–226). In the Karamanli text the parallel phrase is in accordance with the Daniel's sentence: ачан корсьнъ софрли "When you lay the table" (p. 11, lines 8–9). Another similar example is Daniel 873: Η κόχα та γω πίεσο "and when you drink it", Η κοга да доβѣш "and when you get" (p. 39, line 4), ачан ѿчнѣн "when you drink" (p. 39, line 4). However the trilingual book offers contrary examples: от прѣтата "from the beard" (Daniel 838), ѿ братата "from the brothers" (p. 37, line 16), кардашандан "from his (her)/your brothers" (p. 37, line 16). The above variants imply that the translators worked with different texts – some of them had already been transliterated into Cyrillic, the others preserved the Greek letters of Daniel's original or were in Greek⁹.

Dmitriev found the traces of initial Greek transcription in the Karamanli part: wrong substitution of *š* with *s* in many lexemes and use of *g* instead *j* in the beginning of three words (ГЮРДМЕАНСЪНЪ, ГЕНЕКЪКЪ, ГЕТНШМЕНШЕРЪ). On this ground he assumed that the Karamanli text was first written with Greek letters and subsequently, such as the Bulgarian and Greek parts, was transliterated into Cyrillic (Дмитриев 1928: 424–425).

3. Phonetic peculiarities of the Karamanli text

The problems of orthography and phonetic were examined in detail by Dmitriev. Here I will regard only these occurrences that suppose direct typological similarities between the Karamanli and the languages of the Balkan linguistic union.

3.1. Vowels

Wide spread is the appearance of *ä* (open *e*) instead *a* after *j* and the palatal *l*: ꙗꙗꙗꙗꙗꙗ (jäpamesän), ꙗꙗꙗꙗꙗꙗꙗ (jäsemaž), ꙗꙗꙗꙗꙗꙗꙗ (jäpelmiš), ꙗꙗꙗꙗꙗꙗ (jäkän), ꙗꙗꙗꙗꙗꙗꙗ (läžām), ꙗꙗꙗꙗꙗꙗꙗ (läkām) etc. The alternation *a/ä* appears in doubled forms like ꙗꙗꙗꙗꙗꙗ (älma)/ꙗꙗꙗꙗꙗꙗ (alma). According to Dmitriev the substitution of *a* with *ä* is registered after *j* and the palatal consonants in the regions of Trabzon and Konya in Anatolia and also in the Macedonian Turkish dialects, especially these spoken in Thessalonica and south from Thessalonica (Дмитриев 1928: 435–436). Actually this phenomenon can be considered as a part of the common for a big number of Romanian and Eastern Bulgarian speeches correlation 'a (ea) > e. The vowel mutation

⁹ A similar opportunity can be suggested by Daniel 330. Here, the Greek subordinating conjunction εἰδέ "if" is written wrongly in Bulgarian: аѿѿ instead аѿѿѿ. The Bulgarian compiler did not understand the real meaning of the word and replaced it with the adverb ѿѿѿѿ "well" (Погорѣловъ 1925: 8). The Karamanli translation ачан "when" by its meaning stays closer to the Greek conjunction than to the Bulgarian adverb. Unfortunately, the language data as a whole are not categorical and it is difficult to decide which language was used as a main source for the Karamanli translation. What is more, there are two other languages included in the Daniel's lexicon – Aromanian and Albanian. In fact they are not presented in the trilingual book but might have been used for the Karamanli translation.

of *a* before the palatals is qualified as “very old phenomenon in the Bulgarian language. In the speech on which was based the Cyril and Methodius’ script the mutation of *a* had already existed. It has been regular after *j* and more rare after *ǰ*, *č*, *š*” (Иванова-Мирчева/Харалампиев 1999: 71–72). In Romanian *ea* appears under stress and before hard syllables and *e* before soft or unstressed syllables (Асенова 2002: 34). Some linguists in virtue of the geographical distribution of the local names *dava/deva* are inclined to seek the roots of the alternation *e/a* in the hypothetical Daco-Moesian language – an eventual predecessor of the modern Albanian and substratum of Aromanian and Romanian (Георгиев 1958: 114–115). A similar alternation is evidenced in some Protobulgarian words recorded in the 9th century Protobulgarian and 10th century old Bulgarian epigraphic monuments: *кана/кане* (Бешевлиев 1979: 224), *ηζουρουβουλη/ητζιρωβουλε/чръгубълма* (Бешевлиев 1979: 62), *елем/леме* (Бешевлиев 1979: 207). The spread of the vocal mutation ‘*a/e*’ goes beyond the borders of the Balkans and contains large areas from North Eastern Europe – it is well known in Polish and partly in different Russian dialects. In this context the assumption that it is closely related to the Eurasian type of phonology marked by strong palatalization of the consonant systems and weakness of the vocalism seems to be reasonable (TRUMMER 1996: 259).

The reduction of the unstressed vowels is another common feature peculiar to the vocal systems of the languages members of the Balkan Linguistic Union. In fact the Balkans appears to be a periphery of a wider zone of reduction whose center is again Eastern Europe. Most probably the reduction is also due to the above mentioned Eurasian weakness of vocalism. In the frameworks of the Balkan Linguistic Union there are two areas of typological similarities in the scope of reduction. The first is Rumanian-Albanian which is characterized with historical reduction of the Latin loanwords and prototypes and with a weak degree of modern reduction: in northern and some southern Albanian dialects the unstressed *ë* (*ǣ*) disappears; in Romanian most frequent is the reduction of the unstressed *e*: *e* > *i* (Асенова 2002: 31–32). The second area embraces the eastern Bulgarian and the northern Greek dialects marked by a full reduction and disappearance of the unstressed vowels (Асенова 2002: 33). Many Turkish dialects from the eastern part of the Balkan peninsula share the same specifics in respect to reduction and can be assigned to the Bulgarian-Greek zone. In the Karamanli text of the trilingual book there are few examples of reduction. It affects predominantly the vowel *o* that in non accent position sometimes turns to *u*: *dolu* > *дѹлѹ* (*dulu*, p. 2, line 1), *odun(lara)* > *ѹдѹнлара* (*udunlara*, p. 2, line 2), *bozadzaklar* > *вѹзѹцѹкларѹ* (*buzadzaklar*, p. 3, line 19), *böcek* > **bücek* > *вѹжекѹ*, etc. (see Дмитриев 1928: 449). There are only three examples with reduction of *e*: *нкерлер*, *кннклерн*, *гнтѹрѹр*¹⁰ (Дмитриев 1928: 441). The existence of reduction of *o* in the native speech of the region of Karaman (Дмитриев 1928: 450) provides reason for its attribution more to the Turkic (Eurasian) heritage rather than to the Balkan influ-

¹⁰ In the text the appearance of *e* and *a* in unstressed syllable on the place of *i* or *ï* is a wide spread occurrence, see Дмитриев 1928: 444–447. That makes the above three examples of reduction doubtful. It is possible they to be a result of orthographic errors not of a real existing reduction of *e*. This is confirmed by the fact that in other places the word *кннклер* is written with *e*: *кѹнклерѹ* (p. 19, line 10).

ence¹¹. The other changes in the vocal system obviously relate the Karamanli text to the specifics of the Macedonian Turkish dialects according to data given by HAZAI (Хазай 1960: 506–507):

- Breach of the rules of the vocal harmony. The occurrence affects the plural, different case, tense and mood suffixes and the conjunction *da/de*: *нѡадѣзларн*, *гѡзледѣыр*, *чечекларе*, *кечеларгы*, *ѣшекларѣ*, *катерларѣ*, *ѣркеклергы*, *ѣлмасьнлѣргь*, *ѣврдерларгы*, *къштер*, *кѡланѣ*, *беслемезда*, *факѣралерѣ*, *вардер*, *корсьнѣ*, *вермезда*, *бекленесьнда*, *ѣтаньн*, *достларннда*, *теспехларѣ*, *тѣтмалѣ*, *отѣрмалѣ*, *ѣвармалѣде*, *гѡнахларемезѣ* etc.
- *й > и*: *вѣтѣнѣ*, *сѣрерлер*, *кнѣѣктер*, *кѣѣк*, *северса*, *нѣѣмден*, *вѣѣтѣѣ*, *ѣнѣѣшлерѣ*, *тѣрѣкюлерѣ*, *ѣѣюнерѣ*, *ѣѣшер*, *кнѣѣк*, *гѣѣч*, *северса*, *тѣѣѣрмелерѣ* etc.
- Preservation of the old suffix of *Görülmeven geçmiş zaman miş* (*miş*): *ѡлмьшѣ*, *ѣѣрмьшѣ*, *шашмьшнмѣ*, *кърѡлмьшѣ*, *вѣѣѣнмьшн*, *тѣѣтнмьштѣ*. In the same way is presented in the text only one phonetic form of the third person suffix of the verb “to be” *дѣр* (*dir > der*) in the present tense.
- *ѡ > о*: *сѡнлѣмншѣ*, *солѣмьшѣ*, *вѡнлѣ*, *ѣѡртѣѣ*, *ѣѡртѣѣ*, *ѡѣнрн*, *ѡѣѣклерѣргь*
- *і* instead *и* (*i*) in auslaut: *ѣѡкарѣѣ*, *ѣѣѣн*, *карн*, *ѣѣн*, *ѣлѣѣ* (*alti > *alti > alte*)
- The vowel *i* is expressed by means of three letters: *и*, *и/ѣ*, *ѣ*. The latter one was used in the Bulgarian literature from the 18th and 19th century for designation of low back vowel *ɤ* (*i*) (Венедиков 1993: 82). In the Karamanli text it is put sometimes on the place of the etymological Turkish *i* sometimes on the place of the Turkish *ı*. That implies the existing of middle vocal between *i* and *ı*. The hypothetical vocal corresponds to the replacing of *i* with *ı* in the Macedonian Turkish dialects.

3.2. Consonants

One of the paradoxes in the language of the Karamanli text is that the consonant system by contrast with the vocative shares the peculiarities of the Eastern Rumelian (Balkan) and Anatolian dialects:

- Elision of the postvocalic and intervocalic *g*: only two words preserve the old *g* – *ѣѣларлар* (p. 12, line 5) and *ѣѣѣѣ* (p. 29, line 23). The intervocalic *g* in the second

¹¹ It is interesting that reduction of *o* and *e* is registered in the early old Bulgarian monuments and the archaic Slavic toponymy on the Balkans while the first examples of reduction of *a* (*a > i*) originate from 13th century (Иванова-Мирчева/Харалампиев 1999: 77–78). Reduction of *o* and elision of *i* is registered also in the 9th century Protobulgarian inscriptions: *βοιλας*, *βοηλα/βουληας*, *βουλε* (Бешевлиев 1979: 60); *Ωμουρταγ*, *Ωμυρταγ/Ωμορταγ* (Бешевлиев 1979: 194). At the same time in many East and South Slavic, Turkic and Iranian languages the vowel *a* shifts into *o*. The labialization of *a* is a widespread phenomenon in the Balkan Turkish dialects. It appears also in the Karamanli text – *нѣѣѣѣ*, *ѡѣѣѣѣ*, *шѣѣѣѣ*. On the other hand old reduction of *a* in *ı* from the Latin prototypes is evidenced in Albanian and Romanian. On this base can be supposed that the reduction of *u* and *i* and labialization of *a* have Eurasian while the reduction of *a* of Balkan origin. However the problem needs more detail investigations.

word is also preserved in some East Rumelian Turkish dialects from the territory of Bulgaria.

- Disappearing of the initial and intervocalic velar *h*: it concerns only part of the words containing *h* (see Дмитриев 1929: 121–222)¹². This phenomenon is widely spread in many dialects of the Balkan languages including Serbian which is not a member of the Balkan Linguistic Union. In Bulgarian it is dated back to the Middle ages. Most likely the elision of *h* is rooted in the Vulgar Latinian spoken on the Balkans during the Roma rule and afterward.
- Shift *dž* > *ž*: in the text some words have doublet phonetic structures with *dž/ž* alternation: цѣвнѣсъ/жѣвнѣсъ, чѣцѣклерен/чѣжѣккъ, олоуѣжа/олоуѣца, манѣе/манжа, вѣр ларнѣт ладѣ/вѣр алла лажѣ, вѣр кнрѣс лажѣ, вѣжѣккъ, ажемаеѣсънѣ, съжѣккъ, чекажѣккъ, ѣчѣжѣк. Dmitriev notices that similar substitution of *dž* with *ž* exists in the Turkish speeches from Bosnia and consider it as typical of the Balkan Turkish dialects. He also ascribes the shift *dž* > *ž* to the Slavic influence on Turkish (Дмитриев 1929: 129). Indeed it has been constantly registered in the Turkish dialects from the Eastern Rhodope Mountains and in the language of Gagauzes.
- Shift *z* > *s* in final position: гноѣюсъ, ѡнѣдѣсъ, хорѡс, пѣрѣс, цѣвнѣсъ, кнрѣс, гннѣдѣс. The change of the final voiced consonants into unvoiced (*z* > *s*, *d* > *t*) is well presented in the speech of the Bulgarian Turks and obviously is due to the influence exerted by Bulgarian.
- Depalatalization: in all examples where *ü* shifts into *u* and *ö* into *o* the preceding palatals become hard. The same effect is observed in the roots of some other words and in auslaut: ѣлѣчъ (*il'ač* > *ilač*), гюнахлѣр (*gün'ahlar* > *günahlar*), ѣзмекар (*bizmek'ar* > *izmekar*), ѣпликъ (*iplik'* > *iplik*), ѣпекъ (*ipek'* > *ipek*), гюзелъ (*güzel'* > *güzel*). Depalatalization is registered in Eastern Balkan Turkish dialects and can be regarded as an essential moment in the process of their balkanization¹³.
- Assimilation *nl* > *nn*: ѣнарлар (*anlarlar* > *annarlar* > *anarlar*), ѡнарѣн (*onlarin* > *onnarin*). Except in the Eastern Balkans (Хазан 1964: 61) the assimilation of *l* is well known in the Anatolian speeches (Дмитриев 1929: 136–137).
- The postposition *ile* appears under the form нлен (*ilen*) – a phenomenon typical of the Turkish dialects from the territory of Bulgaria (Хазан 1964: 61).
- The Greek and Bulgarian loanwords with two or more consonants in anlaut are adopted without prothetic articles: прѣсѣлѣръ (*pirasa/pürasa-prasa*), клѣседе (*kilise – klise*).

¹² ДМИТРИЕВ asserts that “the Karamanli text does not give examples for elision of *h* in the end of word” (Дмитриев 1929: 122). That is true, but with one important exclusion: the word Allah two times is written without the final *h*: ѣлла рахмѣт ѣлѣѣ (р. 11, line 17) and ѣлла онѣдѣ (р. 47, line 10). In the second case the final *h* in the stream of speech falls among between two vowels and probably that is the reason for its disappearing.

¹³ According to the researchers of the history of Bulgarian language “the most essential further change of the Bulgarian consonant system is the salient tendency toward depalatalization. Its manifestations vary in the separate dialects but they are registered even in the earliest Bulgarian monuments (Иванова-Мирчева/Харалампиев 1999: 82).

4. Changes in the morphological system

4.1. Nouns

4.1.1. The Balkanisms in the case system:

The case system is presented with six Turkish cases – nominative, dative, accusative, locative, ablative and genitive. However, under the influence of the Balkan languages significant changes appear in their functions.

Weakening of the opposition between place (locative) and direction of action (dative). The direction is expressed by both the locative and dative cases.

Locative: чнкармышъ юкарн ёрдѣ (р. 1, lines 17–18), качарларъ андоладдѣ (р. 8, lines 9–10), чиктнм пазардѣ (р. 13, line 20), гютѣрднмъ тайфамдѣ (р. 14, lines 6–7), ѣргюн гнтсынъ канседе (р. 19, lines 20–21), нёрде дѣшёрсе (р. 27, line 12), кюктеда гнрёръ (р. 27, line 17), ѣчан ѡлюръ ѣдѣмъ лѣзъм кожсынъ хасерън ѣзеренде (р. 39, lines 12–15). The locative appears sporadically after the postposition *kadar*: кнчѣк чѣцѣклѣръ върь-ларъ гѣѡктѣ кадар (р. 12, lines 11–13). The dative case is kept mainly with the verbs *gelmek* “come”, *gitmek* “go”, *vermek* “give”, *getirmek* “bring”, *yakışmak* “suit, go well” and in most of the cases after *kadar*. The lack of differentiation between place and direction of action is one of the oldest phenomena characterizing the Balkan Language Union and appears even in some Serbian dialects from Monte Negro (Аценова 2002: 86–88). Its origin must be sought in the impact exerted by the Balkan Latin vernaculars on the historical development of the Balkan languages but its appearance in the Balkan Turkish dialects is due to their interaction with Bulgarian and Greek.

Disappearing of the third person possessive suffix (*s*)⁴ from the second noun in the genitive noun constructions sometimes accompanied by change of the places of the two noun components: зѣнгилѣрда ѣ занатлѣнъ ѣерлеръ канѣ фѣкералерннъ (р. 23, lines 1–4), капенн юкѣрдсен ѣшѣк (р. 26, lines 4–5), кѣѣпелерѣ ѣсалынъ кѣлакларданъ карнаарынъ (р. 29, lines 5–8).

The postposition *için* is used twice with the Dative case: кендеме ѣчннъ (р. 18, line 13), керимъѣ чѡѣ генчлерѣ нчнн ѡрѣр мавн чѡѡда ѣрѣръ кесъслерѣ ѣчннъ колѣграларадѣ мавндѣ генчлерѣдѣ ѣшнѣдѣ Осмонларѣ ѣчнн (р. 43, lines 21–22, р. 44, lines 1–7). In the first example the dative case copies the Bulgarian construction *за мене* (the preposition *za* + the accusative-dative pronoun *mene*). In the second the dative case is caused by the verb *yararmak* but the use of *için* is a result of Balkan language influence.

The verbal adverb (*y*)*ince*⁴ remains in nominative when used together with *kadar*: ѣтншннѣ кадар (р. 13, line 4).

The possessive constructions with the modal word *var* “to have” are in nominative: варъ чѡкъ лары “I have many bees” (р. 18, lines 4–5), вѣрдеръ ѣкнѣ каѣ “we have two vineyards” (р. 12, lines 18–19, see also the next paragraph).

Sporadic appearance of specific endings (the accusative or possessive suffixes) functioning in capacity of postpositive definite articles: кѡчлары коюнлары кѣчелары кѣзлары кѣчн чѡкъ сѣмъшыъ “(the) rams, (the) goats, (the) lambs, kid are very good” (р. 4, lines 1–6), ѣдеръмда чѡкъ вѣлъ валмѣмдѣ сатаръмдѣ ѣлннѣдѣ “I produce and sell too much honey and wax for a (the) year” (р. 18, lines 6–10), ѣтлернѣ вѣръ сѣмнѣзъ “(the) meat has fatnesses” (р. 37, lines 6–7), Домѣзларѣ вѣръ ѣѣ “(the) pigs have juice” (р. 37, lines 8–9), дамларѣ кавндеръ “(the) tendons are robust” (р. 37, lines 10–11), кнлнклернѣ колѣн кѣрѣлѣръ “(the) bones are broken easily” (р. 37, lines 12–13). This pe-

culiarity of the Karamanli text has parallels to the Turkish dialects from the territory of Bulgaria where the use of accusative (*y*)*i*' and the third person possessive (*s*)*i*' suffixes as postpositive definite article is recorded¹⁴. The postpositive definite article is among the most important typological similarities between most of the languages spoken in the vast space of the Balkans and Anatolia. Unfortunately, the specifics of its use in the Turkish dialects from the Balkans are not yet fully studied and at this stage it is difficult to establish a connection with some of the areas of spread of the postpositive definite article: Albanian/Romanian, Bulgarian and Armenian.

4.1.2. Other specifics of the case system

In many situations the accusative coincides with the dative under the impact of the transition *i* > *e* and *i* > *a*.

4.2. Some adjectives and adverbs are put after the nouns that they characterize, most likely due to Albanian or Arumanian influence: карьштерасьнь сднлен съжакъ “lets mix it with hot water” (water hot, p. 39, lines 2–3), ачанъ владноръ еръ дондкъ “when a frozen place (place frozen) be founded” (p. 41, lines 14–15), ачанъ вардер чанорларъ чокъ “when there is many mud” (mud many – p. 41, lines 18–19), гурддн бир ва фенд “I had a bad dream” (dream bad – p. 30, lines 6–7).

4.3. Pronouns

One of the most significant changes in the morphology that can be considered not only as a Balkanization but even as an Indoeuropeanization of the Karamanli, is the transformation of the interrogative pronouns *ne* “what” and *kim* “who”, *nere* “where” into relative – that, which, who, where: ѓнарн нѐ вѐръ акьмъ “these who have a mind” (p. 6, lines 11–12), емъ юктер нѐ нлен сатънъ ласьнларъ “and they have not with what to by (literal)/they have nothing to by” (p. 12, lines 8–10), кнм вѐръ евлѐтъ емъ кьзларъ “who has sons and daughters” (p. 34, lines 1–2), внѓнарда нѐ влннерлеръ вакътена “these who get married in time” (p. 34, lines 9–11), нѐ гндѐръ дерменѐ “who goes to the water-mill” (p. 35, line 22; p. 36, line 1), Карн нѐ вѐръ юзѓкъ “Woman who has a ring” (p. 36, lines 12–13), нхтеарлардан нѐ вѓк сакал вѐръ “these from the old men who has a big beard” (p. 40, lines 11–12), карьларда нѐ вѐръ вѓкъ сачъ “and women who have big hair” (p. 40, lines 18–20), сѐн нѐ нешатън вар “you who has joy (literal)/you who are happy” (p. 43, lines 8–9), нѐре гнрерлеръ “where they come in” (p. 9, line 7).

4.4. Usage of *ne* “what” and *niçin* “why” as a subordinating conjunctions for reason. The specific appearance of *ne* and *niçin* obviously follows the functions of the Greek loan word “ѓтн”/“ѓтн” in the parallel Bulgarian sentences from the text: по харно тѐ

¹⁴ In the Turkish speeches from the region of Särnena Sredna gora the accusative suffixes are used in nominative as definite article: *Arabayı geldi* “The car has come”. In the region of the Eastern Rodhopes the use of the third person possessive suffix prevails: *Arabası geldi* “The car has come”. The appearance of the accusative suffixes in capacity of postpositive definite articles can be explained with the specifics of the Turkish accusative indicating the introduction and nonintroduction of the direct object: *Arabayı gördüm* “I saw the car”/ *Bir araba gördüm* “I saw a car”.

направншъ плѣкта ѿ крава ѿ ѿ бюлница ѿти гнетъ хѣвако (Bulgarian) – дай ꙗспьнъ гениклькъ ѿнектен сѣсѣрдан нѣ влмьшъ гюзель (the Karamanli translation) “it is better you to make food from cow and buffalo because it becomes good” (p. 4, lines 15–21), ѿти донесатъ ѿ далѣко жнто пшенница ѣршъ пшенѧ (Bulgarian) – нѣ гнтерѣръ ѣзактанъ терекѣ вондѧ чавдѣръ каланѣѣкъ (the Karamanli translation) “because they bring from great distance wheat, rye, corn” (p. 5, lines 6–11), ѿти сѣ клатни (Bulgarian) – ннчьн лачтьръ (the Karamanli translation) “because they are hungry” (p. 12, line 7), ѿти сѣкаетъ рѧненіе (Bulgarian) – ннчнн ѿштереръ вешлемекъ (the Karamanli translation) “because they want to eat” (p. 12, lines 14–15), ѿти сѣ стѣдннть (Bulgarian) – ннчнн ѣтаньскн (the Karamanli translation) “because you feel ashamed” (p. 42, line 18) etc.

4.5. An essential characteristic of the Karamanli text which distinguishes its language from the modern standard Turkish is the widespread usage of the old Turkic adverb *açan* “when”. For the first time it is observed in the Mahmud KASHGARI’s dictionary (Древнотюрксий словарь 1969: 400) and up to present day it is well known in the Balkan Turkish, Gaguz and Tatar dialects¹⁵ despite its disappearance from the modern Turkish. The preservation of *açan* on the Balkans can be explained with the existing of similar parallel adverbs in the Balkan languages and the limited use of the participle constructions in the Turkish Balkan dialects. In the Karamanli text it coexists along with verbs in *Geniş* and *Gelecek zaman*: ѧчѧн ѧкаѣ акьн ꙗтанѣ “when you wash your bed” (p. 28, lines 20–21), лчѧн дѣшѣръ гюнѣшъ “when the sun goes down” (p. 23, lines 14–15).

4.6. Verbal system

Availability of the third person suffix of the verb *to be* in the present tense. The suffix appears constantly after nouns, adjectives, adverbs and pronouns. The occurrence connects the Karamanli with the Balkan languages forming an area of active use of “to be” and distinguishes it from Turkish where the suffix *dir*¹⁶ disappears¹⁶.

Replacement of the infinitive with the first and second person forms of optative and with the third person forms of imperative¹⁷: корктѣмдѧ ѧтанѧн волтанѧ “I am afraid of casting fishing rod” (p. 17, lines 1–2), шимдѣ гндѣрьскьн гнтерѣрскн саманѣтлѣкъ “now come to carry away the straw” (p. 33, lines 11–12), ѧстѣрсанъ ꙗкаскн фѣрѣнѣ “if you want kindle the bakery” (p. 27, lines 19–20), хашта аддѧн северсѧ ѧлчѣлѣскьн “if the sick man wants to take treatments” (p. 14, lines 19–21). The Turkish (Karamanli) constructions verbal tense + optative (first and second person)/imperative (third person) obviously copy the functions of the Balkan conjunctions *da*, *të*, *să*, *va* replacing the infinitive and expressing order or wish in independent sentences (Ace-

¹⁵ In the Tatar dialects from Bulgaria its phonetic form is *qaşan* (Ташева 1978: 57) and in the Turkish dialects it can be met as *baçan* or *açan*.

¹⁶ In this respect obvious parallels exist between Turkish and Russian where the verb “to be” in present tense disappears entirely.

¹⁷ In the Balkan Turkish dialects the difference between the third person forms of imperative and optative has completely disappeared and the imperative forms are used in both positions – as optative and imperative. However, in the Karamanli text the original third person forms of optative are still retained.

нова 2002: 195). The infinitive is kept mainly in constructions with the postposition *için* showing some kind of purpose and aim.

The optative and imperative also are used instead infinitive together with the modal word *lazım* “must”: *âçân walyorъ âdâlmъ leazъm koжъcъmъ xacъpъmъ 8zereндe* “when man dies he must be put on the straw-mat”¹⁸ (p. 39, lines 14–16).

The text offers two ways of formation of the future tense: the first is the well known agglutinative way with the suffixes *(y)acak/(y)ecek*. The second way can be estimated as typical Balkan – with the help of the verb *istemek* “want”. Two variants of combinations between *istemek* and the main verb are available: conjugated form of the verb *istemek* + optative/imperative form of the main verb: *шенде иштeръm сатъm ланъmъ* “now I will buy” (p. 14, lines 2–3), *ищeрmи гирeйmъ внръ канктa* “I will go on a boat” (p. 17, lines 5–6), *wzamaнда татae ол8нжа иштeръmъ ислатанъmъ пa тай ф8чнларeдe* “and then when it become sweet I will make wet ... and the butts” (p. 13, lines 7–12), *âçan канна акъ къркъ гюнъ ищeрmи âтанъmъ пeшeнкi шорaпъ внръ ф8ндa* “when it rises in bubbles forty days I will pour out the first wine in one butt” (p. 13, lines 14–17). As an exception the future tense is formed by a combination of the infinitive of the main verb and conjugated form of *istemek*: *веклeмeк иштeръ* “he will wait” (p. 13, line 3).

Specific feature of the language of the Karamanli text is the limited usage of participles and verbal adverbs. The most widespread are the participles of *miş* (мъш). There is only one example of *di*⁴ participles and not a single one of *(y)an/(y)en*¹⁹ and *tik/dik*⁴. The number of the verbal adverbs in the text is reduced to a few instances of *tikta/dikta*² and *(y)mca*⁴.

The phonetic and morphologic peculiarities of the Karamanli text²⁰ reveal a language at advanced stage of Balkanization. Predominantly, it affects the morphological and consonant system. At the same time the language of the text bears characteristics of Anatolian, East and West Balkan Turkish speeches. This is to indicate that it was based on city vernaculars uniting dialects of different groups and regions.

5. Religious terminology

The religious terms occupy a significant place in the Karamanli text and form one of the best presented lexical layers. Its specific features give us reason to regard the Karamanli as a separate Turkish sociolect. At the same time the analysis of the available religious terms can shed light on the most obscure and controversial problem in the history of the Karamanli community – its origin and initial relationships with the

¹⁸ In this sentence the verb *koymak* “put” is used in active voice instead of the passive. About the nature of this type of mistakes see part II.

¹⁹ In this sphere interesting parallels can be drawn between Bulgarian and the language of the Karamanli text. In Bulgarian the present active participles disappeared from the language in the end of the Middle ages and were subsequently restored artificially in the standard language (Мирчева, Харалампиев 1999: 157).

²⁰ The structure of the sentences in the text follows literally the structure of the Bulgarian and Greek sentences. That does not allow for any definite conclusions about the syntax of the Karamanli text to be drawn.

different religious and ethnical groups from Anatolia. In comparison with the religious and church vocabulary of the other Orthodox peoples and the abundance of terms indicating their pagan past, the Karamanli text lack any reference whatsoever to pre-existing Turkic polytheistic beliefs. In fact, the main part of the Karamanli religious lexis consisted of typical Islamic terms and notions adapted to Christianity. A considerably small number of terms related to the specific church practices and mass appears to be loanwords from Greek. The fact itself makes the Karamanli case a unique phenomenon in the Orthodox world and implies that the Christianization of the Karamanlies has been realized on Islamic base. This assumption is confirmed by the names of the days of the week which do not distinguish from the common Turkish denominations (including Sunday).

5.1. Terms with Muslim origin

Theonyms: the most frequent theonym is *Аллахъ* “Allah”²¹. It directly corresponds to the theonym *Господъ* “Lord” in the Bulgarian text and underlines the God’s exclusiveness and cosmocracy. The more common term *illâh* “god” is used only one time: *Ἄλλα ραχμέτ ελλέ βαβαλαρβηζά* “God to forgive your relatives” (p. 11, lines 16–17)²². The sentence is arbitrary translation of the Bulgarian *за тѣ ти простаѣ роднината твоѣ* and the Greek *διά τά σοῦ συγγωροῦν* (Ποροφκлов 1925: 24) – in order your relatives to give you pardon. In this case the word *illâh* obviously is inserted by the translator and probably reveals a Christian influence. However in the scope of the theonyms it remains hypothetical and uncertain²³.

Prayers: in the Karamanli text two kinds of prayers are distinguished: regular (*namaz*) and individual (*dua*). Similar delimitation is not registered in the Bulgarian and Greek parts and evidently follows not only terminologically but also typologically the Islamic model²⁴: *вò недѣліята прнаѣгатъ та се мѡдншъ* (the Bulgarian sentence) “On Sunday you must pray”, *пазрѣ гюнд лѣзъмъ намазъ гндѣснн* (the Karamanli translation) “On Sunday you must go to namaz” (p. 9, lines 19–21), *за та*

²¹ In the Greek text the respective term is not *Κύριος* but *Ὁ Θεός*.

²² In this sentence the word *ραχμέτ* (*Rahmet*) is used, which in the Islamic tradition is one of the names of God (Merciful). However, here it appears to be part of the verb *rahmet eylemek* “forgive”.

²³ Generally speaking, in the Orthodox literature and mass the word God is used more often than Lord. Both words function as synonyms at least on popular level. In this context the appearance of *illâh* instead *Allah* may be considered as a Christian feature. At the same time the two words have Islamic (Arabian) origin and it is remarkable that they are not replaced by loan words from Greek or loan translations of the Greek *Κύριος*.

²⁴ In the Islamic literature *dua* is described as an “appeal, invocation (addressed to God) either on behalf of another or for oneself or else against someone; hence prayer of invocation, calling either for blessing, or for imprecation and cursing” (The Encyclopedia of Islam, 1983 p. 617). *Namaz* or *Salat* in Arabian is a regular ritual prayer carried out in accordance with strong rules and at certain fixed time (The Encyclopaedia of Islam, 1995, p. 925–926). It is interesting that according to Koran *Namaz* is a prayer originating from the time of the first man and was an obligation also on the first Christians. Perhaps because of that reason delimitation *namaz/dua* was preserved in Karamanli.

МОЛНТЬ НА ГОСПОДЪ ЗА ВѢКОН ГРѢХОН (Bulgarian sentence), ДЪВАЕТСЬНЪ АМЛАА ГЮНАХЛАР
 НЧЪНЪ (the Karamanli translation, p. 20, lines 9–11) “to pray to God for (to forgive)
 the sins”.

The lexeme *yortu* (юртѹ)/holiday: юртѹларда нчъмиелниъ чокъ шарапъ “Let’s not
 drink much wine during the holidays” (p. 14, lines 15–17). The usage of the word
yortu is a repercussion of the Turkish-Islamic notion dividing holidays into two
 kinds: *bayram* (Muslim holiday) and *yortu* (Christian holiday).

The Muslim term *peygamber* “profit” in the text means saint: аласън валмиа
 вксьнде пергавѣрнѣне “(to) take candle and (to) light it before the saint (the icon of the
 saint)”, p. 20, lines 2–5. The use of the word *peygamber* like saint is strange in view
 of the fact that in the Turkish religious terminology there are separate words for saint
 different from *peygamber*²⁵. This indicates that at least one part of the Karamanli
 religious terms originate from an Orthodox Sunni environment in which the respect
 to the Muslim saints have not been widespread or the translators were acquainted
 with the typological differences between the Muslim and Christian saints.

The word *perhiz*: it has a Persian origin and in the text stands for fast: алацнма
 зетни танесѣ мѣрцелѣк вѣ наѣт фасѣлда салдиъ вѣлѣнѣнѣн перѣс гюнерде “I will take
 also olives, lentil, gram and beans (in order) to have a food in the days of fast” (p. 14,
 lines 9–14). In the modern Turkish *perhiz* means diet but in the Ottoman it bore a
 meaning different from the modern: “Strong abstention from things forbidden by
 religion” (ÖZÖN 1955: 689). Hence *perhiz* by its meaning nuances differed from the
 other Turkish word for fast *oruç* that can be described as contemporary abstention
 and prohibition. At the same time there are considerable differences between the
 requirements and practices of the Christian and Muslim fast. The introduction of
perhiz as well as of the above mentioned *peygamber* shows that the transformation of
 the Muslim terms into Christian in the Karamanli was not mechanical and spontane-
 ous but was rather due to conscious selection.

Sadaka “alms” (садѣка) – one of the typical Muslim social terms. Initially, in the
 early Islamic epoch it was a name of the tax *zekât* imposed on the Muslims (ALTAУ
 1983: 497). Later on the word acquired a new content “something given to the poor
 people for the sake of God” (ÖZÖN 1955: 725). With the same meaning it appears in
 the Karamanli text: садѣка верерѣсън факѣралерѣ нѣ кадѣрѣ вѣветън вардѣрѣ “(To) give
 alms to the poor as much as you can” (p. 11, lines 4–7).

Other words taken from the common Muslim terminological fund without any
 changes in their literal sense and functions are *günâh* “sin” (гюнах), *cennet* “paradise”
 (ценет), *af* “forgiveness” (афъ): афъ ѣтлѣк нчннъ гюнахларемезѣ казанамак нчннъ ценетѣ
 аминъ “Our sins to be forgiven and to gain the paradise amen” (p. 47, lines 14–18).

²⁵ According to the information of ČERNOVEŽD the Anatolian Karamanlies knew and used the
 word *aziz* “saint” (Черновѣждъ 1892: 442). In fact, in Turkish there are two words for saint
evliya and *aziz*. The first one is closely related to the Sufi brotherhoods and is widespread in
 the Turkish dialects on the Balkans.

5.2. Common Turkish-Christian terms

In Turkish, except the Muslim, there are terms for designation of some typical Christian institutions and holidays. By its origin they are Greek, Arabian and Persian loanwords. One part of them appears in the Karamanli text: *papaz* “priest” (παπάς), *kilise* “church” (κλήση)²⁶, *Paskale* “Eastern” (Πασκαλα), *keziş* “monk” (κεεъс).

5.3. Karamanli-Christian terms

All of them have Greek origin and mostly refer to the liturgical practices.

лнтѢргїа “liturgy” – a round leavened bread prepared by wheaten flour (Communion bread). One part of the bread is utilized in Eucharist, the rest is given to the worshippers: гетѢрсъндѣ папазѣ лнтѢргїа “(to) bring a liturgy (Communion bread) to the priest” (p. 20, lines 7–9). On principle the official church term is “prosfora”. The same is preferred in the Bulgarian and the Greek text. However, in the Karamanli it is substituted by its popular name (liturgy). This stylistic discrepancy can be attributed to the influence exerted by the folk Christianity on the Balkans upon the Karamanli community and its language.

ѧндѧдорѢнъ – small pieces of the Communion bread (prosfora) given to the worshippers.

ѧпсѡма – the central part of the Communion bread dedicated to Jesus Chris. It is called also Agnus Dei and it is marked by the inscription ΙΣ ΧΣ ΝΙΚΑ (Jesus Chris Victory): ѧлсѡнда ѧндѧдорѢнъ ѧпсѡмада “(to) take andidoron and ipsom” (p. 20, lines 12–14).

колѢгга “nun”: It is interesting that in Turkish there are two lexemes for Christian monk and nun taken from Arabian: *rahip/rahib* “monk” and *rahibe* “nun”. However in the Karamanli text the words for monk and nun have different origin: the first, *keziş*, is a Persian loan word while the second has a Greek origin. This paradox indicates that in the beginning the ancestors of the Karamanlies were introduced to Christianity in the regions where monkhood was not widespread phenomenon among women.

5.4. Original Karamanli terms

Two lexemes in the text can be considered as an original Karamanli “contribution” to the Orthodox social and religious terminology:

юртѣ едѣрсън – a composite verb which consisted of two components: the word *yurt*, the traditional tent of the Turkic nomads, and auxiliary *etmek*. Similar verb is unknown in Turkish language and its meaning can be reconstructed as “serve” or

²⁶ ČERNOVEŽD notices that the Karamanlies in Anatolia used the Turkish word for priest *kara-baş* (literally black head) and the word despot for bishop (Черновѣждъ 1892: 444). He also adds that “only the Karamanlies who have learned several Greek or Armenian words, sometimes use for the church terms temple, church and saint the distorted Greek words ajos and eklisa instead agios and eklisia as well as the distorted Armenian words surf and ehetsi instead surp and egehetsi. The rest say in Turkish azis (saint) and cami, cemaat ...” (mosque) (Черновѣждъ 1892: 442). The Karamanli name of Jerusalem was also typical Muslim: *Kudusisherif*.

“officiate” on the base of the data of the Bulgarian and Greek part: ἀχὰν ἰοῦτὲ ἐδερ-
сѣнѣ ѿйдерѣ пѣрѣс адерсѣнѣ вѣрѣтѣ афтѣ “when you serve (officiate) it is good to keep
fast one week” (p. 10, lines 20–23).

Осмонлар “Ottomans” – a confessional name of Muslims used by Karamanlies. It corresponds to the Bulgarian “тѣрчнтѣ” (Turks/Muslims) and the Greek “αγαρη-
νδς”: ѿшѣда Осмонларѣ ѿчѣнн “green (broadcloth) is for the Ottomans/Muslims” (p.
44, lines 7–8). This evidence is confirmed by Černovežd. According to him the Kara-
manlies called all Turks professing Islam Ottomans. They used the confessional name
Muslims as well as the more common *memleketli* or *vilayetli* “fellow-countryman”
only in respect to the Muslim population of the former *Karaman beylik*²⁷ (Черно-
вѣждѣ 1892: 439). The term Ottomans bears obvious traces of one initial clan and
political (non religious) division between the separate Oguz tribes and principalities
in Anatolia dating back to the 13th–14th century. At the same time it is a testimony
that the roots of the Karamanlies must be sought in the *Karaman beylik*. The Muslim
features of their religious terminology most likely are due to their close interaction
and contacts with the Muslim population of the Karaman principality and even to
their possible belonging to this population before their acceptance of the Orthodox
Christianity²⁸.

6. Kinship nomenclature

In comparison with the religious terms the information about the kinship nomen-
clature is more fragmentary and partial. Indeed in the trilingual book there can be
found important records concerning the family relationships on the Balkans in the
beginning of the 19th century²⁹, but because of the fact that the Karamanli text
appears to be a translation from other languages, the records in question can not be

²⁷ On the other hand the Muslims from the Karaman region called the Karamanlies Christians
or with the same common term – *memleketli* and *vilayetli*. The Christians from the other re-
gions were marked with other appellation – *reya*. It is interesting that in the speech of both
groups (Christians and Muslims from Karaman) the names *Türk* and especially *Yürük* bore
extreme pejorative and negative meaning (Черновѣждѣ 1892: 439). The latter can be inter-
preted as a repercussion of the well known from the history of the Middle Age Anatolia sharp
confrontation between the Seldzhuk state and its settled population and the Turkmen nomads
coming from Central Asia in 13th century. In this case the appearance of the Karamanlies
can be connected with the first wave of Turkic Oghuz tribes from the second half of 11th cen-
tury.

²⁸ That is confirmed by the anthroponyms given in the ČERNOVEŽD’s article. They can be
divided into three groups: people’s, Bible and Church names. The first group bears obvious
Turkish character: Arslan/Aslan, Altun, Gül, Bülbül, Horoz, Temir, Murad. The Bible names
follow the Islamic-Arabian pronunciation: Musa, Yakub, Melek, Daud, Elias, Yusuf, Zakar.
The church names are from Armenian origin: Ovanes, Istepan, Kirkor, Keork, Potos, Nikos
(Черновѣждѣ 1892: 439–440). One of the names given in the article *Allabverdi* seems to be a
loan translation from the Turkic *Tanrıverdi*. Wide spreading of Turkish people’s name among
the Christian population of Asia Minor is registered in many Ottoman documents from 16–
18th century (Венедикова 1998: 115–120).

²⁹ More precisely they refer to the Arumanians from the territory of modern southern Albania.

attributed to the Karamanlies. That imposes an analysis concentrated entirely on the character of the available kinship terminology.

6.1. Anthropological and gender terminology

ἄνθρωπος: In the text the Turkish lexeme for man (male and female) *insan* is relatively rarely used: вѣтъѣн Олѣдѣлѣтъ ἄνθρωπος “every thing that arose is for man” (p. 2, lines 20–21), чѣкѣтѣн пазарѣдѣ вѣ гнорѣдѣн чок калавалѣк ἄνθρωпадан “I went to the market and saw many people” (p. 13, lines 20–23).

ἄдѣм “man”: the word appears regularly as an equivalent of the Bulgarian човек and the Greek ἀνθρώπος: χашѣта адамѣтъ “the ill man” (p. 14, line 19), акѣлѣ ἄдѣмѣтъ “the clever man” (p. 25, line 9) etc.

ѣрѣкѣк “man”: the word is used for the delimitation of man (male) from woman (female) – a function well known from the standard Turkish.

карѣн “wife”: in the text the word appears with its more archaic meaning – as wife and woman³⁰. The lack of differentiation between the two social roles and their lexical unification in one word argues for society where matrimony had an inevitable character especially for women.

чѣѣѣк /чѣѣѣкѣк: the word preserves its main meaning “child”.

6.2. Terms for blood relationships

In the text there are two terms for relatives: the common Turkish акрабалар *akrabalar* and the specific бабалар *babalar*. The first has originated from an Arabian lexeme meaning proximity (NİŞANYAN 2007, s. *akraba*). The second is related to *baba* – father and literally means “fathers”. However the difference between both terms is not only etymological but also concerns their social functions: the status of relatives marked by means of *akrabalar* is put on the same footing with this of the neighbors while the usage of *babalar* shows a bigger degree of closeness and commitment: ачѣнѣтъ корѣсѣнѣтъ софранѣ дѣвѣѣтъ ѣдѣѣсѣнѣтъ акрабаларѣ комшелѣрѣ ἡψιλαѣсѣнѣтъ сеѣѣѣкѣкъ мѣнѣѣѣ хѣстѣлѣрѣ ἔμѣла рахѣметѣ елѣмѣ бабалѣрѣнѣѣзѣдѣ: “when you lay the table invite your relatives (*akrabalar*) and neighbors (and) send warm food to ill (and) God (will) forgive your relatives (*babalar*)” (p. 11, lines 8–17). On the base of etymology and the degrees of closeness can be supposed that the both terms marked two different groups of relatives – *babalar* referred to the patrilineal group and *akrabalar* to the rest³¹.

The word таѣѣѣѣ *taifa* is the most problematic in the kinship terminology. It has varied meanings in the official Ottoman: group, tribe, crew (ÖZON 1955: 810)³². Etymologically it comes from the Arabian *tāʿifa* – “those/these around” (NİŞANYAN 2007, s. *taife*). In the text it appears to be the Karamanli translation of the Bulgarian чѣлѣѣѣт “household”, a kinship structure spread among the big landowners or well-to-do representatives of the city environment and economy. Hence *taifa* has differed

³⁰ The word appears in the combination дѣѣѣлъ карѣлѣр (p. 40, line 4) meaning widow.

³¹ In the Bulgarian and Greek text only one word for relatives is used.

³² The word is wide spread and well known in the Balkan Turkish dialects as well as in different Bulgarian sociolects where it means a youth team, band, political clique.

from *oba* “the Turkish nomadic clan” and *hane/aile* “the Turkish nuclear family”. Most probably it has related to the rich patrilocal Karamanli trade families.

The meaning of the other available terms from the text – *евлатъ* “boy, son”³³, *къз* “girl, daughter”, *кардаш* “brother” stays close to or entirely corresponds to their meaning in the standard Turkish: *кни варъ евлатъ емъ къзларъ нншанъ етениъ вакътена* “this who has son and daughter let’s marry them in time” (p. 34, lines 1–4)³⁴.

6.3. Kinship terms by marriage

This group of terms is best presented from the kinship terminology and as whole follows without any significant changes the model of the standard Turkish. The only considerable difference appears in the pair *kaynata* “husband’s and wife’s father” – *kaynana* “husband’s mother and wife’s mother”³⁵. In the text *kaynana* is replaced with another term – *коце валнде* “grand, senior mother”. A similar term *valide-i muazzam* “grand, senior mother” has existed in the harems of the Ottoman notables. Therefore, the appearance of *коце валнде* can be regarded as a result of influence that was exerted by the Muslim polygamy on the kinship relationships of the Karamanlies. Another argument in favor of this assumption is the fact that the pair *kaynata* – *kodže valide* point out the relation established by the act of marriage between the families of the husband and wife: *каннатѣнъ коце валндеда даа чокъ североеръ гиѣвиъ ебелетанъ ѓмиа каннатѣ коце валндеда чокъ њштерлеръ къзѣ геленденъ*: “father-in-law and mother-in-law more like their son-in-law than their son but they prefer (their) daughter to (their) daughter-in-law” (p. 32, lines 3–11). In contrast to the term for mother-in-law the terms for marriage *нншанъ*, and betrothed *нншанле* (male)/*нншанлекѣзъ* (female) are taken from the popular vocabulary.

The kinship terminology enlisted in the Karamanli text of the trilingual book bears heterogeneous character. From sociolinguistic point of view it covers elements of three different layers – Turkish with pre-Islamic Turkic roots, Turkish-Islamic with popular origin and Turkish-Islamic referring to the high social strata. Two of the available terms, *babalar* and *taifa*, can be united in a separate “Karamanli” group. The mixed nature of the terms reveals a group affected by various socio-cultural influences and being in process of gradual urbanization. As a result of this process some of the Eurasian features of the kinship relations seem to be changed. For instance, the opposition *babalar/akrabalar* implies that the traditional patrilineal principle, in spite of its obvious domination, “cohabited” with other, most probably bilateral forms of kinship relations. However, the same opposition proves the avail-

³³ In Turkish and its dialects the main meaning of *evlât* is child, descendent.

³⁴ ČERNOVEŽD pays attention to the curious fact that the Anatolian Karamanlies utilized the words *aga*, *dayi*, *kodža* and *amudža* as appellatives instead the Greek *kir*, *kirios* and Armenian baron (Черновѣждъ 1892: 441). The latter can be considered as a proof that in the second half of the 19th century the opposition between the functions of the mother’s brother (*dayi*) and father’s brother (*amudža*) was already shaken.

³⁵ The terms *kaynata/kayınpeder* and *kaynana/kayınvalide* are composed from two words: *kayın* relating to the Mongolian *qadum* “relationship by marriage” (NIŞANYAN 2007, s. *kayın*) and the words *ata/peder* “father”, *ana/valide* “mother”.

ability of genealogical distance – one of the important markers of the Eurasian kinship organization (KASER 2008: 39). Therefore in comparison with the linguistic system the kinship in the conditions of the traditional society proves itself as more conservative and steady.

References

- ALTAY, Ş. (1983): *Hukuk ve Sosyal Bilimler Sözlüğü*. Ankara.
- CLOGG, R. (1968): "The Publication and Distribution of Karamanli Texts by the British and foreign Bible Society before 1850". *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, April, Vol. XIX, 1. 57–81.
- BALTA, Evangelia (1997–1998): "Periodisation et Typologie de la Production des livres Karamanlies". *Δελτίο Κέντρου Μικρασιατικών Σπουδών* 12. Athène. 129–153.
- KASER, K. (2008): *Patriarchy after Patriarchy. Gender Relations in Turkey and in the Balkans, 1500–2000*. Wien.
- LÉVI-Strauss, C. (1996): "Structural Analysis in Linguistics and in Anthropology". In: Jon McGee, Richard W. Warms (ed.): *Anthropological Theory. An Introductory History*. Mountainview (California), London, Toronto. 312–326.
- NIŞANYAN, S. (2007): *Sözlerin Soyağacı – Çağdaş Türkçenin Etimolojik Sözlüğü*. Istanbul, <www.nisanyansozluk.com>.
- ÖZÖN, M. (1955): *Osmanlıca – Türkçe Sözlük*. Istanbul.
- The Encyclopedia of Islam*. Volume II, Leiden 1983, Volume VIII, Leiden 1995.
- TOĞAN, A. (1981): *Umumî Türk Tarihi'ne Giriş*. Istanbul.
- TRUMMER, M. (1996): „Bemerkungen zur arealen Einbettung und typologischen Charakteristik der Balkansprachen“. *Балканско езиковзнание (Linguistique Balkanique)* XXXVIII, 3. 259–261.
- VRYONIS, S. (1971): *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh through the Fifteenth Century*. University of California Press.
- Асенова, П. (2002): *Балканско езиковзнание*. В. Търново.
- Бешевлиев, В. (1979): *Първобългарски надписи*. София.
- Венедиков, Г. (1993): «К истории обозначения звука (ъ) в болгарском литературном языке эпохи Возрождения». *Балканско езиковзнание (Linguistique Balkanique)* XXXVI, 1. 79–85.
- Венедикова, К. (1998): *Българите в Мала Азия*. София.
- Георгиев, В. (1958): *Въпроси на българската етимология*. София.
- Дмитриев, Н. (1928/29): «Материалы по османской диалектологии. Фонетика «Караманлицкого языка»». *Записки коллегии востоковедов*, III, 1928, 417–458, IV, 1929, 107–158.
- Древнотюркский словарь*. Ленинград 1969.
- Дринов, М. (1911): *Н колко белѣжки за триезичната солунска книга. Съчинения на М. С. Дринова, том II*, София.
- Иванова-Мирчева, Д.; Харалампиев, И. (1999): *История на българския език*. В. Търново, Варна.
- Миларов, Св. (1994): *Спомени от Цариградските тъмници*. София.
- Ничев, А. (1977): «Четириезичният речник» на Данаил. София.
- Погорѣловъ, В. (1925): «Даниловиятъ четириезичникъ». *Сборникъ на Българската академия на наукитѣ книга XVII, Клонъ историко-филологиченъ и философко-общественъ*. София. 3–48.

- Поленакoвiк, X. (1952): «Солунскиот печатар Теодосија Синиатски и неговото застапување за народниот јзика». В: Б. Конески (ed.): Од историјата на македонскиот јазик. Скопје. 35–39.
- Селищев, А. (1918): Очерки по македонској диалектологиј, т. I. Казань.
- Ташева, М. (1978): «Татарски говор села Дебово, Плевенског округа». Балканско езикознание (Linguistique Balkanique), XXI, 3. 35–66.
- Хазаи, Г. (1960): «Принос към въпроса за класификацията на балканските турски говори». В: В. Георгиев (ed.): Езикoвeдско-етнографски изследвания в памет на академик Стоян Романски. София. 505–510.
- Хазаи, Г. (1964): «О некоторых актуальных вопросах исследования балкано-турецких диалектов». Балканско езикознание (Linguistique Balkanique), IX, 1. 57–69.
- Черновѣждъ, П. (1892): «Н колко думи за караманцитѣ». Периодическо списание на Българското книжно дружество въ Сръдецъ, XXXIX. Сръдецъ. 435–456.