

## Cyrillic Literature in Turkish in the 19th century – Social and Cultural Aspects

HRISTO SALDŽIEV (Stara Zagora)

For more than a century the Balkan examples of bilingualism have been regarded in the light of unconscious language and cultural interaction. In conformity with this approach the significance of the literary monuments has been reduced to a simple chronological marker and time reference point for the changes in the vernaculars. As a result the artificial dichotomy between the popular and high culture and the ethnographic image of the Balkans imposed by 19th century researchers still continue to be main characteristics of many works on the Balkans, especially these concerning the Balkan language union<sup>1</sup>. Indeed, since the second half of the 19th century the national elite in South Eastern Europe has actively used monolingualism – often identified with “the pure people’ speeches and spirit”, as a leading principle in the national building programs but the assignment of the same principle to the representatives of the “high culture” from the earlier epochs, as we will see below, is more or less an obvious anachronism.

One of the most disputable subjects in the literature concerning the language and cultural processes in the Balkans in the period 15–20th century is the place and role of Turkish in these processes. Usually the problem is examined on two different levels. Most often the research interest is focused on the lexical “exchange” between Turkish and the Balkan languages and rarely on the morphological aspects of their interaction. Different and sometimes contradictory opinions about the social significance and role of Turkish were introduced in the literature on the basis of evidences gathered from the vernaculars and dialects spoken in the vast space of Anatolia and the Balkans. However, in respect to the high (written) culture almost all researchers share common prejudice that the influence of Turkish has not gone beyond the scope of the Muslim groups. During the last two decades that notion was shaken. Thanks to the efforts of the Greek Turkologists the existence of relatively rich Christian litera-

1 Some authors completely ignore the written sources relying entirely on the data taken from the people’s speeches. The latter becomes a reason for gross errors in facts and chronology. For example, in different works the postposition of the short dative pronouns in the Bulgarian (Macedonian) possessive constructions is regarded as a result of a direct influence exerted by the Turkish possessive endings. Actually, the similarity appears only in the cases when the nouns are used without an adjective or a numeral. The most important is the fact that the postposition of the short dative pronouns in Bulgarian is well testified in the literary monuments from the Middle Ages – long before the appearance of Turkish in the Balkans and therefore cannot be ascribed to the Turkish influence. In the same time, obvious similarities between Bulgarian and Turkish for expression of probability or simultaneousness of action have never been a subject of analysis. Probably it is due to the fact that the above mentioned constructions are rarely used in modern Bulgarian but it is not difficult to be found in the works of Bulgarian authors from the 19th and the first half of the 20th century.

ture written or printed in Turkish with Greek letters came to light. However, despite the fact that some of the most influential institutions of Eastern Christianity like the Ecumenical Patriarchy were engaged in the emergence and development of this literature known under the name “Karamanli”, it is attributed entirely to Karamanlies – a group of Turkish speaking Christians stemming from south western part of Asia Minor. As a whole, the question whether traditional Christian groups in the Balkans and Anatolia has used Turkish in their written practices and if so for what reasons remains without an answer.

The present article tries to shed a light on a completely unknown and unstudied branch of Bulgarian Cyrillic tradition from the final epoch of the Ottoman rule (19th century) – books printed by Bulgarian authors partly or entirely in Turkish language with Cyrillic letters. As a first attempt in this sphere the article has no claim to exhaust the problem and takes into consideration only three basic aspects – the number, origin and motives of authors who have written in Turkish, typology and social functions of the works in question and the peculiarities of the orthography. Chronologically, the accent is put on the 15th and the 19th century – the initial and the final stage of the active contacts of the Balkan languages, Bulgarian in particular, with Turkish on the level of “the prestige culture”. At present, the intermediate period of the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries remains a “dark age” because of the big number of “technical obstacles” which exceeds the powers of a single researcher. In spite of this sizable incompleteness the available sources allow the reasons for appearance and the main tendencies in the development of this phenomenon to be traced out.

### 1. Authors and works

The first work where a conscious use of Turkish is registered is the famous treatise of the medieval Bulgarian bookman CONSTANTINE OF KOSTENETS<sup>2</sup> *ГРЪЗАНІЕ НЪЛІАВІАІЕНО* в *ПИСМЕНЕ*<sup>3</sup> written in 1418 in the court of the Serbian despot Stefan LAZAREVIĆ. In the work Constantine considers problems referring to education, social moral in Serbia and the origin of the old Slavonic language but the main stress is put on spelling. The author sharply criticizes its contemporary state in Serbia categorically rejecting the

2 CONSTANTINE of Kostenets is one of the last representatives of the medieval Tărnovo literal school. In Serbian literature and historiography he is known under the name Constantine the Philosopher. According to his own words he has been “a stranger from Tărnovo’s lands”. The earliest evidences for him are from the very beginning of the 15th century when Constantine went to Bačkovo monastery in the northern foots of the Rhodope Mountains where the last Tărnovo patriarch EUTHYMIUS was sent into exile by sultan BAJAZID. However, when Constantine arrived, patriarch Euthymius had died and his teacher became Euthymius’ disciple ANDRONIK. Several years later, because of the civil war between Bajazid’s sons, Constantine had to leave the monastery and took refuge in the court of the Serbian despot Stefan LAZAREVIĆ where he made a career of writer and translator. Constantine is author of two original works, one compilation and one translation from Greek. Constantine also knew Turkish and participated in different diplomatic missions. Constantine is assumed to be initiator of the so called Resava spelling that in the period 15–17th centuries was a common spelling for Bulgarians and Serbians (Кѳев, Петров 1986: 11–20).

spontaneous manifestations of “phonetic” writing. Taking as a model the conservative spelling reforms of the last Tărnovo patriarch EUTHYMIUS, Constantine insists on introducing two traditional Cyrillic letters unused in Serbia. One of them is **ѣ** – the so called wide open e, a vowel with a definite importance for the historical development of Bulgarian phonology system but untypical of Serbian. Being aware of its lack in Serbian Constantine explains its sound resorting to the examples taken from the neighbor languages:

„If somebody wants to understand how a word containing **ѣ** must be pronounced, without deriding me, let him hear this letter according to the Ismailitic language and the others because I cannot explain it (the pronunciation) in another way. Because the callous evil has gone too far, now in the divine scripts no word with this letter can be found. On account of that, I have to introduce words from foreign languages and those who are learning this language have to understand how “I”, i.e. **ѣ**, is pronounced correctly in Turkish. If it is written with **ѣ** or if it is said that it is pronounced with **ѣ**, it will be not correct because it is pronounced with **ѣ**. Or how is it possible to say in Greek **ἰ** with **ѣ**? It is pronounced with **ѣ** ... Or in the Wallachian language how can we say correctly **ѣ**? Because it is also pronounced with **ѣ** not with **ѣ**” (TOTOMANOVA 1993: 33)<sup>3</sup>.

The above cited text is the first attempt a peculiarity of the Turkish vocal system to be presented in a comparative Balkan context. The text also offers interesting evidence about the language processes in the Balkans in the first decades of the XVth century. Most probably, Constantine decided to include an example from Turkish together with examples from Greek and Wallachian because Turkish in this period had already become well known and had gained currency in the eastern and central parts of the peninsula. In the information given by the author there are clear indications that even before 1418 attempts were made at recording of Turkish with Cyrillic letters<sup>4</sup>. In this respect the choice of the Turkish example – the personal pronoun *ben* (*bän*) – I, does not seem to be accidental. On the one hand, it is obvious that Constantine has sought widespread and popular monosyllabic words, but on the other *ben* by its meaning coincides with the first letter of the Cyrillic alphabet – **Ѧ** (**Ѧ**).

3 This passage is given according to the new Bulgarian translation of Constantine’s treatise made by Anna-Maria TOTOMANOVA. The treatise is preserved in two copies – long and short. The long is from the 17th century and is known as copy of Karlovtsi (Киев, Петров 1986: 32–45).

4 In his investigations on the medieval Cyrillic epigraphy the Bulgarian linguist GALABOV pays attention to an inscription dated back to the first decade of the 15th century and originating from Tărnovo – the former capital of the second Bulgarian state (1185–1393). The inscription in question is written in Bulgarian and gives information about the building of the Feruz beg’s mosque – one of the earliest in the Balkans. Here the title beg is written with wide e – **ѣ** (**ѣ**) (Гълъбов 1988: 111). In all the rest non-Tărnovo records the title is given with the “normal” **ѣ**. From a phonetic point of view the Tărnovo inscription is more correct and coincides completely with Constantine’s instructions. That makes me think that the first attempts at recording of Turkish with Cyrillic letters were made in Tărnovo in the second half of the 14th century, probably for diplomatic needs.

The appellation “Ismailitic” also raises some questions. In principle, it was widely used by the Christian authors with regard to Muslims. In the text Constantine obviously identifies Turkish with the Islamic factor. The latter indicates that Constantine, who was one of the best informed authors from this period, was not acquainted with the existence of Turkish speaking Christian groups and that their appearance on the Balkans must be sought in the decades and centuries after Constantine<sup>5</sup>.

Constantine of Kostenets in many respects appears to be a transitional type of intellectual – on the one hand he completely shared and actively supported the conservative views of his forerunners from Tǎrnovo and Mount Athos in the scope of spelling and language but on the other he was the first Sought Slavic and probably Balkan author who paid so big attention to the people’s languages – a phenomenon that would take place in the Balkan literatures centuries later<sup>6</sup>.

The work of Constantine sheds a certain light on the social dimensions of the initial contact between Turkish and the Balkan languages. Its data allow Turkish-Balkan bilingualism to be dated back to the early periods of the Ottoman conquest of the

5 Actually, the first certain evidences for existing of Turkish speaking Christian groups in the Balkans date back to the second half of the 15th century when after the conquest of Constantinople sultan MEHMED II moved part of the Karamanlies – a Turkish speaking Christian population from Anatolia – to the new Ottoman capital. The so called “Ćitaks” are the next group mentioned in the records. They were described in the 17th century by the Ottoman writer and traveler Evlija ĆELEBI. According to his information, they populated the region of Western Thrace – modern North Eastern Greece. It is interesting that at present the same designation “Ćitaks” is used by Bulgarian population as a pejorative against the Muslim Turks from the region of the Eastern Rhodopes in immediate proximity of Western Thrace. In the 19th century two other groups became known: SarguĆes and Gagauzes. The first group inhabited the region of Eastern Thrace – modern European Turkey. After the Balkan and the First World War, one part of SarguĆes settled in Bulgaria and another in Greece. Thanks to the Soviet national policy Gagauzes became the most well known group of Turkish speaking Christians. Their home places are the coastal region of Dobroudja (modern North eastern Bulgaria and South Eastern Romania) and the inner region of Provadija (North Eastern Bulgaria). In the first decades of the 19th century part of the Gagauzes together with the native Bulgarian population left the Ottoman Empire and fled to southern Russia. Later on in the 20th century the Soviet authorities on the base of 19th century Gagauz emigrants formed the “Gagauz nation” in Moldova. Separate Turkish speaking Christian settlements are registered also in Eastern and Southern Macedonia (modern Bulgaria and Greece). The fact that one part of the Armenian population in the Balkans was also Turkish speaking should be mentioned. For example, in the end of the 19th century the mother tongue of the most part of Armenian population of Varna (Bulgaria) was Turkish (Деңчев 1998: 47–50). According to the memories of Ivan ТСЕРОВ, school inspector in Varna in this time, the main task of the native Armenian schools was to restore the positions of Armenian language among the Armenian population that had completely forgotten its mother tongue (Церов 1935: 52).

6 In his work CONSTANTINE gives examples from or only mentions a big number of classical and people’s languages like Greek, Hebrew, Bulgarian, Serbian, Russian, Wallachian, Turkish, Czech, Croatian and even Bosnian. He is the first author who speaks of Serbian, Croatian and Bosnian as three separate languages all though it is not very clear on which ground (dialectical or orthographic) he distinguishes them.

peninsula and testify that the language interaction has affected the representatives of the Balkan intelligentsia. However, it is more important that in regard to Turkish the treatise suggests that the bilingualism has appeared to be result not only of spontaneous contacts but also of “conscious” efforts.

The first manifestations of this “intellectual” bilingualism can be examined also in the context of the sharp confrontation between the adherents of union with the Catholic Church and the Orthodox fraction – a conflict that shook the Constantinople patriarchy and the other Orthodox churches in the Balkans in the first half of the 15th century. Unlike the Uniates who remained constant enemies to the Ottoman expansion their Orthodox opponents consented to a political compromise with the new masters of the peninsula in the name of faith and the independence from Rome. The ultimate Ottoman victory led to the defeat of the Uniates and to the triumph of the Orthodoxies who recognized the legitimacy of sultans in return for preservation of the church rights. Shortly after the capturing of the Byzantium capital the Orthodox circles in the Constantinople patriarchy initiated the creation of the first Christian texts in Turkish – an act that put the beginning of Karamanli literacy<sup>7</sup>. The inner confrontation in the church affected also the South Slavic Orthodox authors – the anti-Catholic and pro-Turkish tendencies marked many works written in the second half of the 15th century<sup>8</sup>. The same works offer also the first examples of Turkish loan words in the South Slavic languages<sup>9</sup>. Therefore, the literature written in Turkish with Greek or Cyrillic letters was due to the simultaneous impact of two different factors – on the one hand, that were the natural process of language interaction and, on the other, the compromise between the Orthodox Church and the Ottomans.

7 The first Orthodox work written in Turkish with Arabic, Latin and Greek letters is an exposition of the Orthodox faith designated to MEHMED II and composed by the Constantinople patriarch SCHOLARIOS.

8 Typical in this respect is the example of Dimităr CANTACUZIN – the most significant South Slavic Orthodox author from the second half of the 15th century. In his biography of the Bulgarian saint IVAN of Rila he wrote a fervid panegyric dedicated to sultan MEHMED II FATIH. In the same time Dimităr Cantacuzin actively sponsored the compilation of medleys with strong anti catholic contents.

An archetype for the political behavior of the Orthodox fraction became the books of the great Hebrew prophets Isaiah and Jeremiah in which they called for submission to the Babylonians because the latter were sent by God as a punishment for the sins of the Jewish people. In the same way the Orthodox fraction created the notion of “the Turkish yoke” as a collective punishment sent by God to the Orthodox Christians because of their sins. In the 19th century the new national intelligentsia transformed the initial religious character of the notion of “the Turkish yoke” into secular one, presenting the “yoke” not as a collective punishment but as a collective (national) suffering and ordeal.

9 The most part of the loan words that can be met in the texts from 15th century are titles and personal names. In spite of this some of these loan words give important information about the processes in the Balkan Turkish vernaculars. For example, many of the personal names were recorded without *h*: **Модмеда, Ясан** (ДАНЧЕВ 1966: 61, 113). The latter shows that the typical of the Balkan Turkish dialect elision of *h* had existed long before 19th century.

The two factors continued to exert influence on the cultural processes in the Balkans up to the end of the 19th century<sup>10</sup>. In spite of the rise of the Bulgarian national movement in the epoch of the Tanzimat and the trend toward creation of a standard language, an essential part of the Bulgarian print production from this period is bi- or three-lingual and even some of the monolingual books are written in languages different from Bulgarian.

The earliest books printed in Turkish with Cyrillic letters originate from the Thessalonica print house of the Bulgarian monk THEODOSIUS of Sinai. In 1841 he published two three-lingual books – they contain parallel texts in Bulgarian, Greek and Turkish recorded with Cyrillic letters – Old Church Slavonic script. The first one is “A book for learning of three languages – Slavic Bulgarian, Greek and Karamanli”. The Bulgarian and Greek parts are taken from DANIEL’s “Αρχη του τετραγλωσσου Λεξικου” and are transliterated to Cyrillic. The Karamanli text is their translation (in some passages very arbitrary) and can be considered as an original contribution of the Cyrillic version of Daniel’s lexicon.

The second book is “An elementary education with the prayers of morn orthros: Slavic Bulgarian, Greek and Karamanli”. Actually, it appears to be a second enlarged edition of a book with a similar title published three years earlier in 1838 but comprising only the Bulgarian and Greek texts of the morn orthros. In 1841 Theodosius of Sinai included its full Karamanli translation. The book is one of the manifestations of the liberal Orthodox circles which exerted efforts to make the church practices comprehensible for the ordinary laymen. It is also an indication that in this period Turkish at least partly was used in the liturgical practices of the Orthodox Church(es).

The two books are remarkable also with the fact that they are the only ones in the whole series of works printed in Turkish with Cyrillic letters where the language is designated as “Karamanli”. Nevertheless, by its phonetic and morphological features it stays closer to the Balkan Turkish dialects than to the “classical” Karamanli Anatolian vernaculars. The other authors and publishers do not resort to this denomination. They usually use the common name “Turkish” or do not notice explicitly “the group belonging” of the language of their works.

10 In our opinion, the traces of eventual Cyrillic written practices in Turkish from previous centuries must be sought mainly in the Danube principalities Wallachia and Moldova. After the second half of the 15th century they became a center of the Cyrillic literature and education. The number of Cyrillic documents and monuments in Middle Bulgarian and Romanian created in both provinces for about three centuries exceeds several ten thousand. This literature in many aspects is a direct continuation of the Tărnovo tradition, but the most important is the fact that the Wallachian and Moldavian bookmen successfully adopted the Cyrillic script to the peculiarities of the Romanian language. Since the 16th century on in Walachia and Moldova a big number of bilingual Bulgarian-Romanian books have been written or printed (Теодосиев 2007: 37–56). Except that, both principalities were strongly affected by the political compromise between the Orthodox Church and the Ottomans. Other possible centers of Cyrillic literature in Turkish are the big Bulgarian monasteries from the inner Bulgarian lands and Mount Athos.

In 1845 another Bulgarian monk – hierodeacon Hadži JOANIKIJ<sup>11</sup> published in the print house of the Constantinople patriarchy a religious drama in metre telling the story of Abraham' sacrifice (its Old Testament version). The drama was written in Greek 250 years earlier – in the beginning of the 17th century by the Cretan poet VINCENZO KORINAROS at the time of the Venetian rule over the island. The author is the most famous representative of the Cretan Renaissance which developed under a direct Italian influence. The work obviously follows the model of the Jesuitical religious dramas. SOPHRONIOS of Sille translated it in 1836 using Greek letters (AYTAÇ 2007: 14). A short time after its publication in Turkish the book gained big popularity among the non Greek speaking Orthodox Christians in the Ottoman Empire. Nine years later the initial Turkish translation was transliterated to Cyrillic by Hadži Joanikij. Cyrillic edition is composed of two parts – the first one (92 pages) is the text of the drama itself. The second one (the last 20 pages) is in Bulgarian and represents a long list of “donors” – actually, clients who have ordered and paid the book in advance. Their number is over 400 and the number of the copies ordered by them is between 1 and 20 per person. The clients originated from villages and towns located in Central Bulgaria where there were not “original” Turkish speaking Christians. The social staff of the donors comprised many priests, monks and civil persons. In 1858 the Tărnovo priest Andrej ROBOVSKI translated this drama into Bulgarian on the base of Hadži Joanikij's edition.

In 1851 Hadži Najden JOVANOVIČ<sup>12</sup> published in the capital of the newly liberated Serbian principality – Belgrade, collection of songs whose title is “New Bulgarian Songs”. The songs are love and epic ballads but in spite of the title of the book they are written in two languages – Bulgarian and Turkish. Often both languages are used in the frameworks of one stanza. Obviously, the songs are product of the town folklore and without doubt their mixed texts reflect the language situation in the Balkan urban regions from the middle of the 19th century.

One of the most significant creators and spreaders of Cyrillic literature in Turkish is Penčo RADOV. He was born in Karlovo in Central Bulgaria and is known in the history of Bulgarian print culture as an active publisher of works with Christian content. In 1851 and 1852 again in Belgrade he published three books in Turkish with Church Slavonic letters. Among them is the first Turkish-Bulgarian dictionary and phrase-book. In the title Radov explicitly underlines the fact that the book is designed for his compatriots – i.e. Bulgarians. It is divided into six parts – an introduction, an alphabetical dictionary, a topical dictionary and a short description of the

11 By comparison with the other authors the biographic data for hierodeacon Hadži JOANIKIJ are very scarce. In the book he gives in Turkish a little information about himself. According to it he was born in Turiya – a village from the region of Kazanlăk – Central Bulgaria. In this period Turiya was known with the big number of monks originated from there and also as one of the few Bulgarian settlements in the Kazanlăk valley dominated by Turkish Muslim population.

12 Hadži Najden JOVANOVIČ is one of the eminent representatives of Bulgarian culture and education from the first half of the 19th century. His home place is a village near Pazardžik – the north western part of the Thrace plain. This region such like Kazanlăk valley was densely populated by Turks.

Turkish case and verb system, a detailed phrase-book concerning in practice all sides of everyday life, light readings and again a list of sponsors. In the introduction written in Bulgarian, Radov explains his motives to write the book. He points out two reasons – that Turkish is a beautiful language and as an official one in the Ottoman Empire should be known by its inhabitants. The whole text is dominated by strong Christian notions. The author many times calls for preservation of the Christian (Orthodox) faith and for life conformable to Christian norms. Special attention is given to the church and kinship terminology. In two separate instances Radov consciously changes the words and introduces new ones which are non-existing in Turkish lexicon. For example, instead of the Turkish *nikâh* (marriage) he uses the Greek “*stephanos*” because according to him the word *nikâh* is a Muslim term and is not suitable for Christians. Most of the clients (sponsors) of the book were Bulgarians living in Istanbul – priests, teachers, innkeepers, traders, craftsmen.

The second book published by Radov in the same year is a collection of Gospel texts in Turkish. Unfortunately, it is not preserved in Bulgarian civil libraries but judging from its title given in the national catalog of the old printed books, it can be concluded that the book was designated not for liturgical but for personal use and needs (Стоянов, Бурмов 1957: 304).

The third book includes 22 fables and is referred to as the edifying genre enjoying big popularity in the Balkan literatures from this period<sup>13</sup>. Most of the fables are usually ascribed to Aesop but there are also fables taken from the Oriental tale tradition.

Several years later in 1858 Radov published a book with love songs collected by another person – Manol LAZAROV. A big number of Turkish songs (*makam*, *hidzaz*, *huzam*) are added to the Bulgarian texts. A long poem with religious (Christian) content referring to Jerusalem and to the Holy Sepulcher is also included among the Turkish songs. The poem was written by Georgi MARKOVIČ – an eminent Bulgarian physician and civil Ottoman servant and probably was enlisted in the book on the initiative of Radov.

The most active publisher of mixed collections with Bulgarian and Turkish songs is Petko SLAVEJKOV – a key figure in the Bulgarian cultural life from the second half of the 19th century. His first “mixed” edition dates back to 1854. The next is from 1857 and contains more than 40 Turkish folk and town songs written in Church Slavonic letters. Slavejkov published new collections in 1864 and 1870. In the last work he also added a long poetical panegyric dedicated to sultan Abdul Aziz.

Slavejkov’s example was followed by other Bulgarian authors – in 1870 and 1872 two new collections of Bulgarian and Turkish songs are issued. The author of the first is unknown – his name is covered under the initials I. K. JA., the second author is Constantine TINTEROV. In his book the Turkish songs prevail over Bulgarian ones and that every part begins with a poetical dedication to sultan ABDUL AZIZ.

13 Only two years after RADOV’s edition, in 1854, the famous publisher of Karamanli literature and editor of the Karamanli journal “Anatoli” Evanglinos MISAELIDIS published in Karamanli a collection with Aesop’s fables (BALTA 1987: 46).



The popularity of this literature and especially of Turkish town folklore among the Bulgarian population is proven also by other similar editions. In 1859 an author with initials K. S. M. published in Istanbul, in the print house of the Bulgarian newspaper "Tsarigradski vestnik", a book bearing the title "Turkish songs with Bulgarian letters". Unlike all the rest collections here the accent is put entirely on the Turkish musical traditions. The texts of different kinds of melodies (gazel, nakarat, šarkā) are represented. Only one Bulgarian and one Wallachian song are included in the book.

Special attention must be paid to a book from 1866 whose author is not mentioned. Its title is "Singing rules and holy songs with their melodies". The book is in Bulgarian and Turkish but essentially differs from the traditional bilingual song collections. The first chapter regards problems relating to the music theory, in the next chapters town and religious songs and melodies (written down in notes) are presented. The texts of twenty two Christian songs in Turkish are added to the religious part of the book. Their content is completely religious and obviously follows Protestant models. Most likely the book was published by some of the Protestant missions established on the Balkans and Anatolia in the first half of the 19th century and was intended for their educational activities among the native population.

The mass character of Turkish-Bulgarian bilingualism also has exerted influence on the initial manifestations of the "westernization" of Bulgarian culture. The first attempt in this respect is made in 1858 when in Istanbul, in the print house of the famous Armenian publisher Tadej DIVITČIAN, a six-lingual dictionary and a phrasebook are printed. The edition includes the most popular words and phrases in Bulgarian, Turkish, Greek, French, English and Italian. The script of all languages is Church Slavonic and shows their exact pronunciations. The dictionary bears a typical "Levantine" character and comprises the main languages spoken in the big ports of the Balkans and Asia Minor.

In 1869 Stefan ILIEV and Dimo HRANOV published a three-lingual "French-Bulgarian-Turkish" dictionary. According to the explanation given in the introduction by the authors, the dictionary is designed for the Bulgarian schools where school aids in French were badly needed. The Turkish part is added so that Bulgarian pupils could understand French texts better because many of the Bulgarian words "are not in wide use".

Several years before, in 1861, Todor HRULEV printed the first self-teach book in Turkish. It is prepared for everyday life and comprises widely used words and phrases. The language material of the book as well as those of the "French-Bulgarian-Turkish" dictionary is entirely based on the eastern Balkan Turkish dialects.

Simultaneously in the 70s of 19th century clergy and laymen continued the tradition of printing Orthodox Christian books in Turkish with Cyrillic letters. The most interesting and original work in this sphere was issued in Istanbul, in 1870 by the print house of Bulgarian newspaper "Macedonia". The work consists of eight poems treating different religious subjects – a pilgrimage in Jerusalem, the mourning of the Virgin Mary after Jesus' cross death, the sacrifice of Abraham, the confession of and penitence for the sins, the activity and ascension of prophet Elijah, the end of the world, and the destiny of the soul after death. There is also a short poetical review of the history of humanity in accordance with the stories of the Old and New Testament. In the end some main Christian and Orthodox prayers are enlisted.

The author of the book, according to the information given by him, is a monk with the monastic name JOHAN and his home place is Indže Su – sandžak Kayseri (inner Anatolia). Therefore by origin he belonged to the Karamanli community and most likely was among these non-Bulgarian Orthodox Christians who joined or gravitated to the newly established independent Bulgarian church<sup>14</sup>. In the text of the first poem – “Visiting of Jerusalem” – passages where the author expresses his kindly feelings toward Bulgarians can be found (p. 12, verse 60). However, in the other places he speaks of “the tribe of the Orthodox Christians” (p. 20, verse 109) and even lists the “holy” languages of the Orthodoxy: Greek, Russian, Bulgarian, Turkish and Arabian. According to the author the Gospel is read in these languages in the church of the Holy Sepulture (p. 5/6, verse 25–26). The including of Turkish may reflect its real use as a liturgical language in this time or to be interpreted as a manifestation of Christian Turkish “patriotism”.

The content of the poems is strongly influenced by the prior works of the Karamanli literature. For instance, the poem dedicated to Abraham’s sacrifice is a compilation between Kornaros’ drama and original additions. The peculiarities of the orthography show connections with the initial Turkish translation made by Sophronios of Silles not with the latter Cyrillic transliteration.

14 The contemporary independent Bulgarian church was founded in 1870 with a special sultan ferman after a period of long confrontation with the Constantinople patriarchy. In Bulgarian literature the “Greek-Bulgarian church quarrel” usually is presented as a part of the struggle for national liberation. Indeed, the striving for national emancipation by means of church had leading positions in the conflict with the Constantinople patriarchy. However the social groups which took part in this conflict maintained very different viewpoints about the future of the Bulgarian church and the entire development of the Bulgarian question. On the first place the so called revolutionary wing stood outside the church movement that was led by persons loyal to the Ottoman authorities. Some of the leaders of the church struggle were authors of Cyrillic literature in Turkish like SLAVEJKOV. There were also people who insisted on a union with Rome and finally created a separate Uniat Bulgarian church, others wanted not to found a new Church but to restore the medieval Tarnovo patriarchy or the Ohrid archbishopric destroyed by the Ottomans in the 15th and 18th century. There were also Bulgarians who did not leave the Constantinople patriarchy. The Bulgarian church question found a wide response among the other Orthodox Christians. Bulgarians were supported by many Orthodox Arabs from the Jerusalem patriarchy who were not strangers to the idea for church-national differentiation. After 1870 many Wallaches and Orthodox Albanians-Gegs joined the Bulgarian church but their motives were different from those of the Arabs. The main factors here were the cultural likeness to Bulgarians and the enormous corruption imposed by the Ottomans in the Constantinople patriarchy. The “Greek-Bulgarian church quarrel” also led to the split among the Turkish speaking Christian groups in the Balkans. The inner Gagauzes and one part of Sarguĉes also joined the Bulgarian church while the so called sea Gagauzes preserved their loyalty to the Constantinople patriarchy. In the last decades of the 19th century the first group was called “Bulgarian Gagauzes” and the second “Greek Gagauzes”. In the case of JOHAN it is interesting that he published the texts of the first three poems in 1866 with Greek letters (BALTA 1987: 57) but their second edition together with the rest four poems was realized in the print house of Bulgarian newspaper “Macedonia” which was in the vanguard of the Bulgarian church struggle and whose editor was SLAVEJKOV.

Johan also creates a specific religious vocabulary that can be defined as “Orthodox” koine. It is composed from a big number of Bulgarian, Greek and Turkish religious terms. Nevertheless, unlike the other authors who introduce loan words from Bulgarian or Greek in order to replace the Turkish-Arabian lexemes considered as Moslem, Johan uses all terms as reciprocal synonyms. The Moslem influence on a subconscious level can be found in different parts of the text. The author declares that he observes “the law of Tevrat (Torah), Zebur (Psalter) and Indžil (Gospel)”. This division obviously is borrowed from the Koranic notions of the holy scripts of the Old and New Testament. A similar use of Moslem terms in the expression of Christian concepts is typical of the Karamanli texts of Theodosius of Sinai.

The most active publisher of religious Orthodox literature in Turkish from 60–70ies of the 19th century is Hadži Dimitar PANIČKOV. His first edition is “A Gospel in different languages for second Easter at noon” and according to information given in the foreword it has been ordered for the needs of the Bulgarian churches. Actually, the book is designed for liturgical use during the second Orthodox Paschal liturgy that is officiated on Sunday morning. Then one part of John’s Gospel (20: 19–25) is read in different languages. The same passage is presented in 12 languages with Church Slavonic letters. Four of them are central and west European languages, the rest are languages spoken in the Ottoman empire – Bulgarian, Turkish, Greek, Albanian, Armenian, Wallachian, Arabian and even Hebrew and Assyrian. In addition, ten pages with liturgical prayers and litanies are enlisted but all texts are only in Turkish.

In 1875 Paničkov published a paraklesis<sup>15</sup> dedicated to Virgin Mary. The text is in Turkish but the designations of the separate parts are in Church Slavonic. On the cover it is mentioned that an akathist<sup>16</sup>, a collection of church prayers and “gospel” in Turkish, have been already published but their exact content and authors (compilers/translators) are unidentified.

In the same 1875 in the printing house founded by Paničkov in Braila (Romania) two other liturgical books were issued. They bear identical titles “Prayers with church singing in Turkish” but their compilers are two different persons – Ivan HRULEV and Levter DOBRITSIJANOV. The books contain the entire text of John Chrysostom’s liturgy and also evening vesper and morning orthros. In their structure they stay close to the paraklis of Virgin Mary: the main text is in Turkish, the designations of the prayers and litanies are in Bulgarian.

The liturgical editions in Turkish give us a reason to think that it has been regularly used in the liturgical practices of some communities among the Orthodox Christians but the group and language affiliation of these Christians is uncertain.

15 During the Middle Ages paraklesis was one of the most popular and preferred genres in Orthodox literatures. In the 12th–15th many Byzantine and old Bulgarian bookmen wrote a big number of paraklesises in Greek and Bulgarian dedicated to different saints. By its structure and content paraklesis is partly a prayer, partly a panegyric and is said during the liturgy.

16 Akathist is a specific chant and takes important place in the Orthodox liturgy.

Despite the fact that works considered above are most likely only one part of the whole Cyrillic literature in Turkish<sup>17</sup>, the information that they offer makes it possible to draw some common conclusions. On the first place, the big number of books allows this literature to be defined as a cultural phenomenon and not to be simply attributed to the personal preferences of the separate authors. It is also evident that its laic branch was created by Bulgarians for the cultural and educational needs of Bulgarians. That is especially valid for the song-books that can be considered as a “product” of the mass town culture and its growing influence on the high culture on the Balkans in the 19th century. In respect to the religious editions the view that at least part of them were designed for a wider public including also “original” Turkish speaking Christians can be assumed. The connections of the religious literature with the Karamanli literature and the print activity of the Balkan Protestant missions are probably strong but the problem needs more detailed investigations.

In spite of some modern tendencies, Cyrillic literature in Turkish in many aspects bears typical traditional features. It appears to be a natural development in the processes of expanding Balkan-Turkish bilingualism both among common people and high culture. Simultaneously, this literature is a cultural expression of the political compromise between the Orthodox Church(es) and the Ottoman sultans. For example, the Christian fervency of Radov in the selection and use of the specific terms stays very close to the Constantine of Kostenets’ conceptions for the relations between language and religion or Tinterov’s and Slavejkov’s glorification of sultan Abdul Aziz, by its main suggestions, does not differ very much from these of the Dimităr Cantacuzin’s panegyric written in honor of Sultan Mehmed II four centuries earlier. The traditionalism of this literature becomes especially visible by comparison with the two new trends characterizing the development of Bulgarian culture since the 30ies of the 19th century. On the one hand, that was the appearance and consolidation of the national ideology insisting on the full political, cultural and linguistic emancipation of Bulgarians from the neighbor peoples and especially from Turks and the Ottoman Empire. Many representatives of the national movement openly propagandized the ideas of language (ethnographical) nationalism and broke their connections with the church.

At the same time, other Bulgarian intellectuals maintained views very similar to those of the new Ottomans and went far beyond the traditional loyalty to the sultans. They initiated the translation of the Ottoman legislation in Bulgarian and the creation of relatively rich Bulgarian-Ottoman literature in the scope of history, linguistics and education<sup>18</sup>. Joakim GRUEV in his “Ottoman grammar” from 1864 adduces the following motives for the learning of Turkish: “To introduce ourselves to the Muslim manners, customs and beliefs and to become well acquainted with the spirit of laws and regulations in force in the Ottoman state. Thereby we will manage better to cooperate with the Ottoman people and more successfully to bind our interests with these of the government. We will receive an opportunity to defend our rights, to

17 Periodicals, the monastery issues and the manuscript tradition that in 19th century was still actual, are not included in the present article.

18 Most of the works belonging to Bulgarian-Ottoman literature are also bilingual (in Bulgarian and Turkish) but the script used for the Turkish texts is Arabic.

go to law in courts and municipalities and probably to prepare ourselves for political career” (Гръев 1864: 1). Nestor MARKOV, another author of Bulgarian-Ottoman books and also adherent of the ideas of the new Ottomanism, shares a very similar opinion. In the first edition of his “Turkish grammar” he maintains the view that Bulgarians have to learn Turkish in order to know the laws in the empire (Марков 1871: 1).

It is obvious that the creators of Cyrillic literature in Turkish were too far from the radical demands of the national movement as well as from the ideas for political and cultural integration with the “Ottoman nation” planned by the new Ottomans. Its authors and publishers stood on the ground of Christian universalism (and more exactly on its Orthodox variant) or were bearers of the “unconscious” and ethnically mixed mass culture of the Balkan town from the 18–19th centuries. The end of this literature was predestinated by the upsurge of the national ideology. The latter completely changed the whole system of social values and loyalties and led to the gradual marginalization of Bulgarian-Turkish bilingualism. The disappearance of Cyrillic texts in Turkish from the end of the 19th century can be regarded as the first manifestation of this marginalization that reduced the cultural functions of bilingualism only to the non-prestige verbal practices.

## 2. Orthographic and language peculiarities

The orthography and language of each one of the works mentioned above, bears its own specifics and characteristics that can be a subject of separate studies. However, even at first glance it is evident that the alphabet, script and spelling norms of Cyrillic Turkish literature have followed the common trends in the development of the Bulgarian Cyrillic. As a whole, up to the 60ies of the 19th century Church Slavonic script was undoubtedly dominant. In the next two decades books printed in civil Cyrillic started to appear and in the end of the period the new script prevailed over the old. In the beginning this tendency affected the song books and subsequently was introduced in the religious works. It is remarkable that the texts of the first book written with civil script – the song book of K. S. M., are almost completely in Turkish.

The orthography of the books from the 40ies and partly from the 50ies shares some peculiarities of church Slavonic<sup>19</sup> spelling norms from the 17–18th centuries: use of the big er – ѣ only as marker for the end of words without a phonetic meaning, the letter Ѧ indicates iotation of a – ya. The back low vocal â most often is represented through ѡ and the consonant dž through the Wallahian Cyrillic letter ѱ. The combination ѱо and the letter ѱю reflect the specific Turkish vocals ö and ü as well as the iotation of o and u.

19 In Bulgarian literature the term “Church Slavonic” is used as a designation for the language and orthography of the church books printed in Russia in 17–18th centuries and became popular among the Orthodox Slavs on the Balkans in the same period. Their orthography did not include all the medieval Cyrillic letters identified as “Old Bulgarian” or “Old Church Slavonic”.

Penčo RADOV in his Bulgarian-Turkish dictionary tried to introduce some new spelling rules: The initial iotation of the vowel e is designated through the old wide e – Ё: ЁЕ, ЁА, ЁМЕК, ЁМЕК, ЁР, the words are given together with their stresses and without the final markers Ъ and Ь. However, his innovations were not accepted by the other authors.

Since the beginning of the 50ies of the 19th century the Old Bulgarian letter Ж started to appear in the Cyrillic Turkish texts even though it was absent in Church Slavonic orthography. Its place in 19th century Cyrillic was recovered by initiative of some Bulgarian bookmen who neglected Russian Church Slavonic examples and sought for restoration of the original Bulgarian Cyrillic from the Middle Ages. The letter replaced И for indication of the back narrow vocal â (РУСИНОВ 1985: 20–22). The same change occurred in Cyrillic Turkish texts almost simultaneously with that in Bulgarian and Ж completely ousted the “traditional” signs for â. At the same time, again under the impact of the processes in Bulgarian spelling norms, the use of И was restricted by the letter combination “дж”. These tendencies show the close relations existing between Bulgarian and Turkish Cyrillic. The parallel development of both was due to the fact that they were used to cater for the social and cultural needs of a multilingual population which shared identical cultural stereotypes.

One of the essential moments in the orthography is that it bears certain etymological features. The most important of them is the preservation of the postvocalic g – it appears as a constant rule in almost all works excluding the earliest Hadži THEODOSIUS' editions. Sometimes the words are given with their older forms, without vowel harmony – ИЧУН (ičun) instead ičün etc. At this stage of our investigations it is difficult to find an acceptable explanation of these peculiarities. It can be supposed that the authors of the books in question adopted some of the norms of the Ottoman or Karamanli orthography or followed the spelling of an earlier Cyrillic written tradition in Turkish.

In contrast to the etymological elements in orthography the language has obvious connections with the Balkan Turkish vernaculars. On principle, most of the authors have taken as a base the city speeches from the eastern part of the peninsula, which have been exposed to the strong influence of Bulgarian and Greek. For example, the well evidenced in many works transition of the final z into s is a typical peculiarity of the modern Bulgarian phonetic. The lack of explicitly expressed in the orthography differentiation between ü and yü/yu and ö and yo also can be due to the language interference coming from Greek or Bulgarian. The impact of the Balkan languages is especially visible in the scope of syntax that is distinguished with active usage of verbal tenses and more limited presence of participles and verbal adverbs.

Another essential difference between the language of the Cyrillic literature and the official Ottoman is the absence of Persian and Arabian grammatical constructions. They are typical of the Ottoman and many Karamanli texts but are almost unknown in the Cyrillic editions<sup>20</sup>. In regard to lexis, it is interesting that some authors consciously avoided the Arabian lexemes and used their Turkish equivalents

20 Only in some religious books can be met specific Persian and Arabian constructions like Validedullah (The mother of God) or Kitab-i Şerif (Holly Script).

even in the cases when the Arabian loan words were widely spread among the population. For instance, Radov preferred instead of the Arabian “baba” (father) the less popular Turkish “ata” and that is not an isolated occurrence. This language “purism” looks strange and surprising against the background of the tendencies in 19th century Ottoman written and print culture<sup>21</sup>. The reasons that caused it are not clear but chronologically it considerably anticipates the similar processes in the original Turkish literature.

Turkish Cyrillic literature is one of the forgotten phenomena in the cultural history of the Balkans from the Ottoman epoch. As a social fact it appears to be a result of the Bulgarian-Turkish bilingualism, the town culture from the 19th century and the political cooperation between the Orthodox churches and the Ottomans established in the 15th century. However, many aspects of its history remain unstudied. The situation in the “dark ages” (16–18th centuries), its connections with Karamanli literature and Turkish speaking Christian groups from the Balkans are the most important problems that have to be solved by the future investigations in this sphere. The separate works also deserve to be subject of detailed studies. Their content, language and orthography contain important information about the language and cultural interaction in the Balkans in the pre-national period.

### 3. Index of the books

1. Title: *Kniga za naučenie trih jazikov slavjanobolgarskij i grečeskij i karamalitskoj* (in Bulgarian) [A book for learning of three languages: Slavic Bulgarian, Greek and Karamanli]  
 Publisher: Theodosius of Sinai  
 Place of publication: Thessalonica  
 Year of publication: 1841  
 Languages: Bulgarian, Greek, Turkish (Karamanli)  
 Script: Church Slavonic  
 Annotation: Three parallel texts in Bulgarian, Greek and Turkish (Karamanli). Bulgarian and Greek texts are Cyrillic transliteration of Daniel’s “Αρχη του τετραγλωσσου Λεξικου”, the Turkish text appears to be their translation.
2. Title: *Načalnoe učenie s molitvi utrenij slavjanobolgarskij i grečeskij i karamalitskoj* (in Bulgarian) [An elementary education with the prayers of morn liturgy: Slavic Bulgarian, Greek and Karamanli]  
 Publisher: Theodosius of Sinai  
 Place of publication: Thessalonica  
 Year of publication: 1841  
 Languages: Bulgarian, Greek, Turkish (Karamanli)  
 Script: Church Slavonic

21 Perhaps the Arabian words were identified with Islam and for that reason were replaced with Turkish lexemes that were comprehended as more appropriated for the expression of Christian conceptions and notions.

- Annotation: Three parallel texts of the morn liturgy in Bulgarian, Greek and Turkish (Karamanli).
3. Title: Hazreti Avraamin ziade çok dzana menfaatli kurban hikjaesi (in Turkish) [Tale for the Abraham' sacrifice which did many people good]  
 Author: Vincenzo Kornaros  
 Publisher: Hadži yerodeacon Joanikij  
 Place of publication: Istanbul, Print house of the Constantinople patriarchy  
 Year of publication: 1845  
 Language: Turkish  
 Script: Church Slavonic  
 Annotation: Religious drama. Cyrillic transliteration of the Turkish translation from 1836.
  4. Title: Novi bălgarski pesni (in Bulgarian) [New Bulgarian Songs]  
 Publisher and collector: Hadzi Najden Yovanovič  
 Place of publication: Belgrade  
 Year of publication: 1851  
 Languages: Bulgarian, Turkish  
 Script: Church Slavonic  
 Annotation: Love songs and ballads with mixed Bulgarian-Turkish texts
  5. Title: Kratkij tursko-bolgarskij rečnik i razgovornik (in Bulgarian) [A Short Bulgarian-Turkish Dictionary and Phrase-book]  
 Author and publisher: Penčo Radov  
 Place of publication: Belgrade  
 Year of publication: 1851  
 Languages: Bulgarian, Turkish  
 Script: Church Slavonic
  6. Title: Kitabi šeriften ve çok ulyama, ve akilina kimselerin kitplarından tahsil olunma, tene ve džana menfaatli nasihitler (in Turkish) [Instructions taken from the Holly book and the books of some wise men. Advices useful for soil and body]  
 Author and publisher: Penčo Radov  
 Place of publication: Belgrade  
 Year of publication: 1851  
 Languages: Turkish  
 Script: Church Slavonic  
 Annotation: According to the information in the catalogue of the old printed books the book includes passages from the Gospels and probably from other religious books.
  7. Title: Mesrebie masallar (in Turkish) [Fables]  
 Collector and publisher: Penčo Radov  
 Place of publication: Belgrade  
 Year of publication: 1852  
 Languages: Turkish  
 Script: Church Slavonic  
 Annotation: The book contains oriental and Aesop's fables and tales



8. Title: Razna ljubovna pesnopevka (in Bulgarian) [A collection with various love songs]  
Collector: Manol Lazarev  
Publisher: Penčo Radov  
Place of publication: Belgrade  
Year of publication: 1858  
Languages: Bulgarian, Turkish  
Script: Church Slavonic  
Annotation: The book includes different types of Turkish town songs (p. 89–106)
9. Title: Veseluška za razveseljavane na mladite (in Bulgarian) [A book for cheerfulness of youth]  
Collector and publisher: Petko Slavejkov  
Place of publication: Istanbul  
Year of publication: 1854  
Languages: Bulgarian, Turkish  
Script: Church Slavonic  
Annotation: The book includes different types of Turkish town songs (p. 29–32)
10. Title: Nova pesnopoika (in Bulgarian) [A new song collection]  
Collector and publisher: Petko Slavejkov  
Place of publication: Istanbul  
Year of publication: 1857  
Languages: Bulgarian, Turkish  
Script: Church Slavonic  
Annotation: The book includes more than forty Turkish folk and town songs (p. 71–91)
11. Title: Slavejče ili sǎbiranie na različni pesni bǎlgarski i turski za raztuha na mladite (in Bulgarian) [Collection of various Bulgarian and Turkish songs for recreation of youth]  
Collector and publisher: Petko Slavejkov  
Place of publication: Istanbul  
Year of publication: 1864  
Languages: Bulgarian, Turkish  
Script: Church Slavonic  
Annotation: The book includes eleven Turkish town songs and ballades (p. 102–113)
12. Title: Pesnopoika ili sǎbiranie na razni pesni bǎlgarski i turski (in Bulgarian) [Collection of various Bulgarian and Turkish songs]  
Collector and publisher: Petko Slavejkov  
Place of publication: Istanbul  
Year of publication: 1870  
Languages: Bulgarian, Turkish  
Script: Civic Cyrillic  
Annotation: The book includes seven Turkish songs and ballades and one panegyric dedicated to sultan Abdul Aziz in metre.

13. Title: Turski pesni s bālgarski slova (in Bulgarian) [Turkish songs with Bulgarian letters]  
Collector and publisher: K. S. M.  
Place of publication: Istanbul, print house of "Tsarigradski vestnik"  
Year of publication: 1859  
Languages: Turkish, Bulgarian, Wallachian  
Script: Civic Cyrillic  
Annotation: The book includes mainly Turkish folk and town songs and one Bulgarian and Wallachian song.
14. Title: Razgovori bālgarski grečeski turski frantsuzski anglo italianski za onija koito želajat razgovor na tija jazitsi (in Bulgarian) [Speeches in Bulgarian, Greek, Turkish, French, English, Italian for people who want to speak in these languages]  
Collector: unknown  
Publisher: Tadej Divitčian  
Place of publication: Istanbul  
Year of publication: 1858  
Script: Church Slavonic
15. Title: Samoučitel za turski jazik (in Bulgarian) [Teach-yourself book in Turkish language]  
Author and publisher: Todor Hrulev  
Place of publication: Vienna  
Year of publication: 1861  
Languages: Bulgarian, Turkish  
Script: Civil Cyrillic
16. Title: Evangelie za vtoro voskresnie po pladne na različni jazitsi (in Bulgarian) [Gospel in different languages for second Easter at noon]  
Author and publisher: Hadži Dimitār Paničkov  
Place of publication: Istanbul  
Year of publication: 1862  
Languages: 12  
Script: Church Slavonic  
Annotation: Part of John's Gospel (20: 19–25) and the main Orthodox prayers and litanies are translated in Turkish.
17. Title: Pravila za penie I sveštenni pesni s napevite im (in Bulgarian) [Singing rules and holly songs with their melodies]  
Author and collector: unknown  
Publisher: Tadej Divitčian  
Year of publication: 1866  
Place of publication: Istanbul  
Languages: Bulgarian, Turkish  
Script: Civil Cyrillic  
Annotation: the book includes twenty two Turkish songs with religious (Protestant) content

18. Title: Slovar frantsusko-bălgarsko-turski za naj upotrebiteľnate dumi (in Bulgarian) [French-Bulgarian-Turkish dictionary for the words in current usage]  
 Author: Stefan Iliev, Dimo Hranov  
 Year of publication: 1869  
 Place of publication: Ruse  
 Languages: French, Bulgarian, Turkish  
 Script: Civil Cyrillic
19. Title: Bălgarska pesnopoljka s različni bălagraski i turski pesni (in Bulgarian) [Bulgarian song Collection with various Bulgarian and Turkish songs]  
 Collector and publisher: I. K. JA.  
 Year of publication: 1870  
 Languages: Bulgarian, Turkish  
 Script: Civil Cyrillic  
 Annotation: the book includes different town Turkish songs
20. Title: There is not a separate title. On the cover of the book the titles of the eight poems are presented (in Turkish)  
 Author: monk Johan from Indze Su, district Kayseri  
 Year of publication: 1870  
 Place of publication: Istanbul, print house of newspaper "Macedonia"  
 Languages: Turkish (Karamanli dialect)  
 Script: Civil Cyrillic  
 Annotation: eight religious poems in metre
21. Title: Pesnopoljče ot bălgarski i turski pesni (in Bulgarian) [Song collection with Bulgarian and Turkish songs]  
 Collector: Constantine Tinterov  
 Place of publication: Istanbul, print house of newspaper "Macedonia"  
 Year of publication: 1872  
 Languages: Bulgarian, Turkish  
 Script: Civil Cyrillic  
 Annotation: A big number of folk and town Turkish songs (p. 23–52)
22. Title: Paraklesis na presvetaja Bogoroditsa na turski jazik (in Bulgarian) [Paraklesis of Virgin Mary in Turkish language]  
 Translator and publisher: Hadzi Dimităr Paničkov  
 Place of publication: Braila (Romania)  
 Year of publication: 1875  
 Language: Turkish  
 Script: Civil Cyrillic
23. Title: Molitvi s tsărkovno penie na turskij jazik (in Bulgarian) [Prayers with church chant in Turkish language]  
 Publisher: Levter Dobritsijanov  
 Place of publication: Braila (Romania) in Hadzi Dimităr Paničkov's print house  
 Year of publication: 1875  
 Script: Civil Cyrillic  
 Annotation: John Chrysostom's mass

24. Title: Molitvi s tsarkovno penie na turskij jazik (in Bulgarian) [Prayers with church chant in Turkish language]  
 Publisher: Ivan Hrulev  
 Place of publication: Braila (Romania) in Hadzi Dimităr Paničkov's print house  
 Year of publication: 1875  
 Script: Civil Cyrillic  
 Annotation: the morn and evening liturgy

**Number of books according to the years of publication:**

1841: 2, 1845: 1, 1851: 3, 1852: 1, 1854: 1, 1857: 1, 1858: 2, 1859: 1. 1861: 1, 1862: 1, 1864: 1, 1866: 1, 1869: 1, 1870: 3, 1872: 1, 1875: 3

**Number of books according to their genre:**

Liturgical: 5

Religious non liturgical: 4 (3 Orthodox, 1 Protestant)

Dictionaries: 5

Song collections: 9

Fables and tales: 1

### Bibliography

- АУТАÇ, S. (2007): How to Catalog Karamanlidika Works? Bibliographic Description of One of the Indigenous Literatures from Academic Library Online Catalogs, <http://by2007.bilgiyonetimi.net/bildiriler/aytac-ppt.pdf>.
- BALTA, E. (1987): Karamanlidika. Additions (1584–1900). Bibliographie Analytique. Athènes.
- Груев, Ї. (1864): Османска граматика. Цариградъ (Истанбул/Istanbul).
- Гълъбов, И. (1988): Български надпис от началните години на турското владичество. В: К. Попконстантинов, П. Попова, И. Харалампиев (ed.): Палеославистика и епиграфика. В памет на професор Иван Гълъбов, В. Търново. 109–112.
- Данчев, Г. (1969): Владислав Граматик: книжовник и писател. София.
- Денчев, Б. (1998): Варна след Освобождението. Едно закъсняло възраждане на българщината. София.
- Кув, К., Петров, Г. (1986): Събрани съчинения на Константин Костенечки. Изследване и текст. София.
- Марков, Н. (1871): Граматика за турский языкъ. Русчюкъ (Русе/Ruse).
- Русинов, Р. (1985): История на българския правопис. Второ издание. София.
- Стоянов, М. (compiler), Бурмов, А. (ed.) (1957): Българска възрожденска книжнина. Аналитичен репертоар на българските възрожденски книги и периодични издания 1806–1878, София.
- Теодосиев, Н. (2007): Каталог на българските печатни книги 1508–1878. София.
- Тотоманова, А. (1993): Константин Костенечки, Съчинения: Сказание за буквите, Житие на Стефан Лазаревич. София.
- Церов, И. (1935): Спомени и бележки. Варна.