Atalialu Serapheim and the Turkophone Orthodox Christians of Anatolia: A study of eighteenth-century Turkish texts in the Greek alphabet (Karamanlidika)

Irakleous, S.

‘Ολιοὺμ γκελήρ, ὀλιοὺμ ἀλὴρ,
‘Ελὴμ γιαζὰρ, τοπρὰκ ὀλοὺρ,
Μποῦ νασιχὰτ κιταπὴ τουνιατὰ καλὴρ,
Γιαζὰν οκουγιάν, Ἂραχμὲτ ἀλὴρ.[1]
Atalialu Serapheim (APK1782:51)

Introduction

In 2008 one of the last living Turkophone Christian Orthodox Anatolians who arrived in Cyprus as refugees after the Greco-Turkish war of 1919–1922 was interviewed. When Yorgos Panayiotou set foot on the island he was nine and a half years old. His family was one of the many Turkophone Christian Orthodox who had to flee Asia Minor, ending up in a place where the majority of the population was Greek-speaking. While mentioning the difficulties of attending a Greek-speaking school, he recalled the linguistic and educational situation back in Asia Minor:

> We attended school, our school, the alphabet was Greek the pronunciation though, everything in Turkish. We only knew Turkish. Turkish. We had no knowledge of Greek language. It was prohibited to speak Greek. In the churches everything was in Turkish language written in Greek letters. The psalms again in Turkish. But even if they would have chanted in Greek, we would not understand a thing. What could we have done?[2]

He talked with enthusiasm about his homeland but when the discussion touched upon language he hummed and hesitated. The obvious guilt when he mentioned that the did not know the Greek language, and blaming the Turks for that fact, of course came from the spirit of those times and the idea of Great Greece, the one of “two continents and five seas”. This shows a change in mentality and beliefs for the aforementioned community over time. Yorgos was probably unaware of the long tradition that this Turkish language in Greek letters had, that the size of the community had aroused the interest of the Patriarchate centuries ago, the role of Cyprus in all this and the fact that he belonged to a community which distinguished

---

[1] ‘Death comes death takes (lives), my hand writes (but soon) it will become dust, (but) this advice book will remain in the world, (may) the one who writes and reads take the mercy of God.’
[2] Syndesmos Mikrasiaton Kyprou, *Ημερολόγιο,* (Λευκωσία: 2016), 198. Part of interview given to Angel Konnari and Maria Panayiotou (07.04.2008)

itself by producing its own material – what is known today as Karamanlidika. The present study deals with the first century of Karamanlidika printing and more precisely the Turkophone Christian Orthodox cleric Serapheim, one of the most important figures and a pioneer in Karamanlidika publishing. Through the study of his life and of the language used in Serapheim's books an effort will be made to trace the motives and beliefs that urged him to publish his books, his techniques and the impact his books had on the Turkophone Orthodox of Anatolia and on Karamanlidika as a phenomenon.

Karamanlidika is a conventional term attributed to Turkish texts written in the Greek alphabet,[3] a practice used for printed texts, personal correspondence and everyday items. From time to time several terms were used to describe the aforementioned practice, but none of them was eventually widely used. Some of those terms are: φώνη Τουρκική Ελληνικοίς γράμμασιν [foni Tourkiki Ellinikis grammasin] 'Turkish speech in Greek writing',[4] ρούμτζα- τουρκτζε [rumca - türkçe] 'Greek-Turkish' and ρουμί-ουλ χουρούφ τουρκί ουλ ιπαρέ [rumi ul huruf türki l ibare] 'Greek in script Turkish in language',[5] τούρκτζε [türkçe] 'Turkish', σατέ τούρκτζε [sade türkçe] 'simple Turkish', αδί τουρκί λισανή [adı türki lısani] 'common Turkish language',[6] τουρκογραικικά [tourkogrekika] 'Turkish-Greek'[7] and γραικοτουρκικά [grekotourkika] 'Greek-Turkish'.[8]

---

[3] Concerning the conventionality of the term Karamanlidika see Matthias Kappler, "Toward a Linguistic Approach to 'Karamanli' texts," in *Advances in Turkish Linguistics – Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Turkish Linguistics (11–13 August, 2004)* eds. Semiramis Yağcıoglu, Ayşen Cem Değer (İzmir: Dokuz Eylül Yayınları, 2006), 655–667. See also the definition given by Kiraz about the similar phenomenon of Garshuni: "the writing of one language (called the source language) in the script of another (called the target script) in specific sociolinguistic settings," George A. Kiraz, *Tūrrāṣ Mamllā: A Grammar of the Syriac Language, Volume 1 Orthography* (Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2012), 291.

[4] Ioannis Sakkelion, "Μεχμέτου Β' του Πορθητού Φιρμάνιον," *Πανδώρα* 16 (1866): 530.

[5] Emmanouil Tsalikoglou, "Λαογραφικά των Φλαβιανών (Ζιντζίντερε) Καισσαρείας της Καππαδοκίας," *Μικρασιατικά Χρονικά* 15 (1972): 125.

[6] János Eckmann, "Die karamanische Literatur," in *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta II*, eds. Louis Bazin et al. (Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1964), 129.

[7] Pinelopi Stathi, "Τα τουρκογραίκικα βιβλία και ο Σεραφείμ Ατταλειάτης," in *Το έντυπο ελληνικό βιβλίο 15ος-19ος αιώνας: Πρακτικά Διεθνούς Συμποσίου*, *Δελφοί, 16-20 Μαΐου 2001*, eds. Λουκία Δρούλια, Γιάννης Κόκκωνας, Τριαντάφυλλος Σκλαβενίτης, Κωνσταντίνος Στάικος (Αθήνα: Κότινος, 2004), 329.

[8] Yorgos Kechayoglou, "Η σπασμωδική συγκριτική γραμματολογία του νέου Ελληνισμού και η «γραικοτουρκική» διασκευή του Πολυπαθούς του Γρηγόριου Παλαιολόγου," *Δελτίο Κέντρου Μικρασιατικών Σπουδών* 11 (1995–1996): 126.

This practice lasted for 217 years in its printed form (1718–1935)[9] and addressed the Turkophone Orthodox Christians (or Karamanlides/Karamanli Christians as they are widely known[10]) who lived in the Ottoman Empire. Serapheim was one of the most prolific actors of the field during the second half of the eighteenth-century. The main subjects of this thesis are Serapheim and his life, and the language used in his Karamanlidika books. In addition, the thesis will include a linguistic discussion of Serapheim's books regarding phonetics, phonology, morphology and word order based on translation techniques. In conclusion, an effort will be made to interpret the cause, strategy and impact of this material from a sociolinguistic perspective.

[9] The dates mentioned here refer to the book production in Karamanlidika as it can be found in the six-volume Karamanlidika bibliography. Solid evidence on the personal use of this practice in manuscripts cannot be provided. The first three volumes of the Karamanlidika bibliography were published by Sévérien Salaville and Eugène Dalleggio, *Karamanlidika, Bibliographie Analytique d'Ouvrages en Langue Turque Imprimés en Caractères Grecs, I 1584–1850* (Athènes: Centre d'Etudes d'Asie Mineure, 1958); Sévérien Salaville and Eugène Dalleggio, *Karamanlidika, Bibliographie Analytique d'Ouvrages en Langue Turque Imprimés en Caractères Grecs, II 1851–1965,* (Athènes: Centre d'Etudes d'Asie Mineure, 1966); Sévérien Salaville and Eugène Dalleggio, *Bibliographie Analytique d'Ouvrages en Langue Turque Imprimés en Caractères Grecs, III 1866–1900* (Athènes: Centre d'Etudes d'Asie Mineure, 1974). Their work was continued by Evangelia Balta, *Karamanlidika, Additions 1584–1900, Bibliographie Analytique* (Athènes: Centre d'Etudes d'Asie Mineure, 1987a); Evangelia Balta, *Karamanlidika, XXe siècle, Bibliographie Analytique* (Athènes: Centre d'Etudes d'Asie Mineure, 1987b); Evangelia Balta, *Karamanlidika, Nouvelles Additions et Complements I* (Athènes: Centre d'Etudes d'Asie Mineure, 1997a).

[10] Although the term Karamanlides is widely used, here I will refer to them as the Turkophone Orthodox of Anatolia because, as Balta suggests, the term Karamanlides is obscure and restricting, since we can also identify the inhabitants of the all Karaman area as such. Moreover, the Turkophone Orthodox of Anatolia were spread throughout the Ottoman Empire and should be differentiated from other Turkophone non-Turkic populations, such as the Armenians and the Jews; see Evangelia Balta, "Οι πρόλογοι των Καραμανλίδικων βιβλίων πηγή για τη μελέτη της «εθνικής συνείδησης» των Τουρκόφωνων ορθόδοξων πληθυσμών της Μικράς Ασίας," *Μνήμων* 11 (1987c): 226.

0.1. Karamanlidika books

The first references to the Turkophone Orthodox of Anatolia are found in travel accounts of the sixteenth-century,[11] and missionary and consular reports in eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.[12] This orthodox population is assumed to have been located originally in the area of Karaman in central Turkey, later spreading throughout the Ottoman Empire. The majority lived in Konya, İsparta, Burdur and Antalya, while they were also found in large numbers in Istanbul, Kayseri, Nevşehir, Niğde, Adana, Kastamonu, Aydin and Sivas[13] until their violent displacement in 1923 with the exchange of populations between Greece and Turkey after the Greco-Turkish war.[14] The Turkophone Orthodox of Anatolia were sent to Greece because they were Christians, as religion rather than language

---

[11] Speros Vryonis, *The decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the process of Islamisation from the 11th through the 15th Century* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971), 399–403. A description of the travel accounts can be found also in Roderic Davison, "Nationalism as an Ottoman Problem and the Ottoman Response," in *The Dissolution of the Ottoman Empire*, eds. William W. Haddad, William Ochsenwald (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1977), 32–33; and Michael Miller, "The Karamanli Turkish Texts: the Historical Changes in their Script and Phonology" (PhD diss, University of Indiana, 1974), 1–15. The German traveller Hans Dernschwamm, during his visit in Istanbul and part of Anatolia in the years 1553–1555, describes the people who lived in the Yedikule area in Istanbul. He mentioned a Christian community, called *Karamanos*, which spoke Turkish and did not understand Greek, see Franz Babinger, *Geschichtsschreiber der Osmanen und ihre Werke* (Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1923), 52.

[12] Regarding missionary reports see Richard Clogg "The Publication and Distribution of Karamanli texts by the British and the Foreign Bible Society before 1850, I, II," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 19/I–II (1968): 57–81, 171–193. Regarding consular reports see Alkis Panayotopoulos, "The Greeks of Asia Minor 1908–1912. A Social and Political analysis," (PhD diss., Oxford University, 1984). Regarding the landscape of Greek Orthodox Communities and their demographic change in Asia Minor see Sia Anagnostopoulou, *Μικρά Ασία, 19ος αιώνας – 1919, Οι Ελληνορθόδοξες κοινότητες, Από το Μιλλέτ των Ρωμιών στο Ελληνικό Έθνος,* Αθήνα: Ελληνικά Γράμματα, 1998, 135-188. See also Gerasimos Augustinos, *The Greeks of Asia Minor: Confession, Community, and Ethnicity in the Nineteenth-century* (Kent State University Press, 1992), 11–32.

[13] See Eckmann, "Die karamanische Literatur" 819; Vryonis, *The decline of Medieval Hellenism*, 452; Richard Clogg "Anadolu Hristiyan Karindaslarimiz," in *Anatolica: studies in the Greek East in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries*, (Routledge, 1996), 69. Regarding Ottoman population during the nineteenth-century censuses and movements, see Kemal H. Karpat, "Millets and Nationality: the roots of the incongruity of Nation and State in the Post-Ottoman Era," in *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: the functioning of a plural society 1*, eds. Benjamin Braude, Bernard Lewis (London and New York: Holmes & Meier, 1982), 141–169.

[14] Concerning this exchangeable population, see Evangelia Balta, "Karamanli Press," in *İzzet Gündağ Kayaoğlu Hatıra Kitab Makaleler*, eds. Oktay Belli, Yücel Dağli, M. Sinan Genim (Istanbul: Türkiye Anıt Çevre Turizm Değerlerini Koruma Vakfı, 2006), 27–33.

decided who was to stay and who was not. Taking as the point of departure the classification of people based on their religion that existed in the Ottoman Empire (millet system), all Greek Orthodox Christians, that is those belonging to the Rum Orthodox Church of the Istanbul patriarchate, living in the Empire had to move to Greece, and the same applied to Muslims who lived in Greece. This was a part of the Lausanne treaty that led to the recognition of Turkish Republic as the successor of Ottoman Empire, and very few exceptions were made. As we tend to think that language is closely connected to ethnic origins (and it often is), from time to time the issue of the ethnic origin of the Turkophone Orthodox of Anatolia has caused disputes and still remains controversial.[15]

The total production of Karamanli books comprised 752 titles.[16] Production started in 1718[17] in Venice and continued until 1935 with the last recorded print in Cyprus.[18] Evangelia Balta divides Karamanlidika book production roughly into two periods. The first is 1751–1830 (the period from 1718–1750 is considered preliminary, with only three religious publications) with the bulk of production consisting of religious books published mainly by individuals and the Patriarchate of Istanbul. The majority of these books during this period were published in

---

[15] Analysis of the question of origin can be found in Eckmann, "Die karamanische Literatur" 819–835; Vryonis, *The decline of Medieval Hellenism*; Tsalikoglou, "Λαογραφικά των Φλαβιανών" 123–159; Anhegger, "Hurufumuz Yunanca" 157–202; Robert Anhegger, "Nachträge zu Hurufumuz Yunanca" *Anatolica* 10 (1983): 149–164; Talat Tekin, "Grekçe Alfabesiyle Türkçe" *Tarih ve Toplum* 3 (1984): 180–183; Richard Clogg, "A Millet within a Millet: The Karamanlides," in *Ottoman Greeks in the Age of Nationalism, Politics, Economy and Society in the nineteenth-century*, eds. Dimitris Gondicas, Charles Issawi, (Princeton: The Darwin Press, 1999), 115–142; Eftychios Gavriel, "Οι προλόγοι της Καραμανλίδικης και της Ελληνικής έκδοσης της περιγραφής του Κύκκου του 1782" *Επετηρίδα Κέντρου Μελετών Ιεράς Μονής Κύκκου* 5 (2001): 375–401; Balta, "Οι πρόλογοι των Καραμανλίδικων βιβλίων"; and a.o.

[16] Numbers as found in the six-volume Karamanlidika bibliography. It seems that recently new titles have been discovered – see Balta, "Cries and Whispers in Karamanlidika Books" 16.

[17] The first recorded printed document in Karamanlidika dates back in 1584, that is Martin Crusius's *Turcograecia*, printed in Basel. *Turcograecia* is usually not included in the Karamanlidika production since, it was the product of scholarly curiosity than a work designed for circulation among the Turkophone Orthodox of Anatolia. It was a translation of the confession of the Orthodox faith presented to Sultan Mehmet II in 1455 or 1456 by the new patriarch, Gennadios Scholarios. The translation was made by Ahmet, the qadi of Veroia. See Clogg "A Millet within a Millet" 123. For thorough analysis of the text see Tibor Halasi-Kun, "Gennadios' Turkish Confession of Faith," *Archivum Ottomanicum* XII (1987–1992): 5–103.

[18] Balta, *Karamanlidika, Nouvelles Additions*,148.

Venice and were translations of existing religious books in Greek. The fact that only seven secular books were published in this period is indicative of the focus on religious texts at this time.[19]

The first Karamanlidika books were published in Venice and Istanbul and to a much lesser degree in Leipzig, Amsterdam, Syra (Greece), Athens and London. The majority of these appeared in Venice (1718–1819).[20] Karamanlidika books were published by individuals, often by subscription, and during the first decades of the nineteenth-century, the Orthodox Patriarchate in Istanbul, the British Foreign Bible Society (BFBS)[21] and the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM),[22] among others, were involved.

At the beginning of the eighteenth-century, the Patriarchate believed that there was a need to educate the population. The Ecumenical Patriarchate in Istanbul was interested mainly in preserving their Orthodox faith; thus, the very first Karamanlidika publications consisted of religious books, namely selected Bible texts, catechisms, biographies of saints, liturgical texts and prayer books funded by circles within the church. The first ecclesiastical document dated around 1763 illustrates the need of the Patriarchate to communicate with the Turkophone Orthodox of Anatolia in their language since, like every Orthodox Christian of the Ottoman Empire, they belonged within its jurisdiction.[23]

Historically speaking, Karamanlidika started in the form of religious books

---

[19] Evangelia Balta, "Periodisation et Typologie de la production des livres Karamanlis," *Bulletin du Centre d'Etudes d'Asie Mineure* 12 (1997b): 138–142. Most of these secular editions were Ottoman–Greek dictionaries and vice versa, as well as translations of ancient Greek philosophers.

[20] *Ibid*, 129–153.

[21] For the rest of the text, they will be referred to as BFBS. Concerning its history, see George Browne, *The History of the British and Foreign Bible Society.* v.II (London, 1859); William Canton, *A History of the British and Foreign Bible Society.* v.II, (London, 1904).

[22] American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, For the rest of the text, this will be referred to as above. Regarding the actions of ABCFM in the Middle East see Rufus Anderson, *History of the Missions of the American Board of Commissioners of the Oriental Churches*. v.I-II. Boston, 1872. Regarding printing see F. J. Coakley, "Printing offices of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions 1817–1900: A synopsis," *Harvard Library Bulletin 9/1* (Spring 1998): 5–34, and ABCFM actions in Izmir see Pavlina Nasioutzik, *Αμερικανικά οράματα στην Σμύρνη του 19ου αιώνα* (Athens, 2002).

[23]Anastasios Iordanoglou, "Καραμανλίδικες επιγραφές της Ιεράς Μονής Ζωοδόχου πηγής Βαλουκλή Κωνσταντινοπόλεως," *Βαλκανικά Σύμμεικτα* 1 (1981): 68, see Eftychios Gavriel, "Η Τουρκική με το Ελληνικό αλφάβητο σε χειρόγραφο του 18ου αιώνα" (PhD diss., University of Cyprus, 2010b), 13.

aimed at preserving the religious identity of the Turkophone Orthodox of Anatolia (publications 1718–1830). But during the nineteenth-century a variety of books were published, such as translations of foreign literature (mostly by French novel writers like Xavier de Montépin, Eugène Sue, Charles-Paul de Kock, et al.), folk stories (like Alexander the Great, Köroğlu, Nasreddin Hoca, etc.), poetry, theatrical plays, general education, texts of general culture, history, geography, natural sciences, dictionaries, grammars and musical anthologies.[24] Books of general knowledge were also published, as well as Ottoman laws and later periodicals and newspapers (publications 1831–1835). Along with theses secular publications, religious books continued to be published and actually increased when the American and British missionaries started to publish their own religious books. The Orthodox Patriarchate was locked in a struggle with these missionaries in an effort to dissuade the conversion of the Turkophone Orthodox of Anatolia, which led to the rapid increase in publications. Apart from the publications of the Patriarchate and those produced by individual Turkophone Orthodox, the missionaries pushed publishing activity further since they used to publish their books in large numbers (from 2500 to 5000 pieces).

The majority of the early publications produced in the eighteenth-century by the Patriarchate and Turkophone Orthodox individuals were translations of religious books that were circulating mainly in Greece. The next step was the publication of secular books in Karamanlidika, such as adaptations/translations of foreign literature,[25] books written by "native" speakers, and newspapers. Secular

---

[24] Grammars and dictionaries are not to be considered Karamanlidika *in sensu stricto*, according to Balta, "Periodisation et Typologie" 132 and Matthias Kappler, "Konflikt und Ideologie in den griechischen Grammatiken des Osmanischen im 19. Jahrhundert," in *Einheit und Vielfalt in der türkischen Welt – Materialien der 5. Deutschen Turkologenkonferenz*, eds. Hendrik Boeschoten, Heidi Stein, Universität Mainz (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2007), 80-93, as well as the musical anthologies of the nineteenth-century (see Balta, "Periodisation et Typologie" 132-133 and Matthias Kappler, *Türkischsprachige Liebeslyrik in Griechisch-Osmanischen Liedanthologien des 19. Jahrhunderts [Studien zur Sprache,Geschichte und Kultur der Türkvölker, Band 3]* (Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 2002), because they have nothing to do with the Karamanlidika tradition, since they were published for Hellenophone groups and to a lesser extent for Turkophone readers, see Kappler "Toward a Linguistic Approach," 692.

[25] The method of adaptation was common in religious books as well: "those in charge for the production of Turkophone Orthodox books were working with the method of sewing together several books," Ioannis Pamboukis, *Πετεριμίζ, ολίγαι λέξεις επί της συνθέσεως των θρησκευτικών βιβλίων της Τουρκόφωνου Ελληνικής Φιλολογίας* (Athens, 1961), 20.

literature was something only the Turkophone Orthodox were engaged in, with the exception of American missionaries, who were publishing the weekly newspaper *Angeliaphoros* and its monthly children's periodical *Angeliaphoros Çocuklar için*.[26]

The second period (1831–1935) is marked by two major facts. The first is the decade of the Greek Revolution. During this decade, editions from the Patriarchate were very rare. The second is the establishment of the BFBS in Asia Minor, which published only religious books in order to proselytise. During this second period, Karamanlidika book production increased rapidly, and new titles were added both in the religious and secular genres. In general, few of the Karamanlidika books were originally written by the Turkophone Orthodox.

In this period, the publication of religious books became an even more urgent issue when missionaries, mostly British and American, began to arrive in Asia Minor at the end of eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth-century. In order to avoid conflict with the Ottoman authorities, the missionaries were aiming to convert not Muslims but the minorities of the Empire.[27] In fact, a struggle began between the Orthodox faith and Catholicism (and Protestantism to a smaller degree) for the souls of people who were considered "vulnerable" due to the use of a different language than the one the majority of their coreligionists used, like the Turkophone Orthodox of Anatolia. The publication of religious books was followed by the publication of so-called secular books and the publication of newspapers[28] from the middle of the nineteenth-century, a practice mainly

---

[26] Regarding *Angeliaphoros Çocuklar için* see Stelios Irakleous, "Sociolinguistic Aspects of *Αγγελιαφόρος Τζοτζουκλάρ Ιτζούν* 1872–1896," in *Cultural Encounters in the Turkish-speaking communities of the late Ottoman Empire*, ed. Evangelia Balta (Istanbul: Isis Press, 2014), 393–411; Stelios Irakleous "The Contents of the Periodical *Αγγελιαφόρος Τζοτζουκλάρ ιτζούν*. The First Decade (1872–1880)," in *Festschrift in honor of Ioannis P. Theocharides, Studies on the Ottoman Empire and Turkey*, v.II, eds. Evangelia Balta, Georgios Salakidis, Theoharis Stavrides (Istanbul: Isis Press, 2014) 155–198; Hayrullah Kahya, *Angeliaforos Çocukları İçün (1872) Giriş-İnceleme-Metin-Dizin,* (Istanbul: Ofis Yayınevi Istanbul), 2015.

[27] Bruce Masters, *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire, the roots of sectarianism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 145–146.

[28] Concerning Karamanlidika press, see Evangelia Balta, "Cries and Whispers in Karamanlidika Books before the doom of silence," in *Cries and Whispers in Karamanlidika Books*: *Proceedings of the First International Conference of Karamanlidika Studies. Nicosia 11-13.09.2008*, eds. Evangelia Balta, Matthias Kappler (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2010a), 11–22.

undertaken by educated Turkophone Orthodox people.

The Orthodox Patriarchate in Istanbul had already been involved in printing since 1799, as will be discussed later on. The missionary books were published in Athens, Syra and Malta from the 1830s, and after 1870, in London and Istanbul in specific printing houses owned mostly by Armenian Protestants.[29] Those books, mostly Bibles, were printed in large numbers (usually 5000 or 2500) and were distributed through ecclesiastical missionary organisations and through the activity of the missionaries in Asia Minor in general.[30]

Returning to the books originally written by the Turkophone Orthodox throughout the whole period of Karamanlidika printing, it should be kept in mind that the books were not literal translations and transcriptions. Both secular and religious books were often made by adapting elements from several books and by revising the translations, thus creating a new text. Literal translations were only made of scholarly texts.[31]

0.2. Karamanlidika and similar phenomena

The term Karamanli Christians (or Karamanlides) is generally accepted as a religious epithet to describe the Turkophone Greek Orthodox of the Ottoman Empire, and as such it is used in Western sources as early as the sixteenth-century, like the diary of Hans Dernschwamm.[32] However the term has many different meanings varying with its diverse historical and cultural context. In the nineteenth-century, the term Karamanli was used to indicate any variety of Turkish used in the

---

[29] Concerning the printing by Armenians, see Evangelia Balta, "Καραμανλίδικες και αρμενοτουρκικές εκδόσεις των «Sunday Schools Lessons»," *Τα Ιστορικά* 53 (2010b): 379–402.
[30] Evangelia Balta, "Το καραμανλίδικο έντυπο," *Τα Ιστορικά* 5/9 (1988): 216–218.
[31] Balta, "Periodisation et typologie," 142–152.
[32] Michael Knüppel, *Die Türkisch-Orthodoxe Kirche* (Göttingen: Pontus Verlag, 1996), 22. See also Eckmann, "Die karamanische Literatur" 820. The term was criticised by Robert Anhegger, "Hurufumuz Yunanca Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der karamanisch-turkischen Literatur," *Anatolica* 7 (1979–1980): 159, and Robert Anhegger, "Das Temaşa-i Dünya des Evangelinos Misailidis (1871/72) als Quelle zur karamanischen Sprach- und Kulturgeschichte," in *Türkische Sprachen und Literaturen, Materialien der ersten deutschen Turkologen-Konferenz, Baberg, 3–6 Juli 1987*, eds. Ingeborg Baldauf, Klaus Kreiser, Semih Tezcan, (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1991), 1–28. Anhegger mentions that in their texts, they had always called themselves Turkophone Orthodox of Anatolia, or Anatolian Christians.

Balkans regardless of the script, in "Christian" use though. This resulted in characterising Turkish texts written in the Cyrillic alphabet in old as well as in relatively recent scientific literature as Karamanlidika. During the political instability of the 1920s, the term was defined as "purest Turkish" on the western side of the Aegean Sea and "bastardisation of Greek" on the eastern side. To add to the confusion, the related term "Caramanian" was used in 1930s dialectology to describe a specific dialect in the region around and east of Konya.[33]

A landmark in linguistic Karamanlidika research were the studies of János Eckmann published around 1950, which are very useful for the study of dialectology.[34] Besides that, Eckmann conducted his research using various sources, published by people originating from different areas with different linguistic profiles, and generalised his results, characterising the Turkophone Orthodox as Karamanians and their language as Karamanian, thus creating the false impression that the Turkophone Orthodox people located in Istanbul, Rumeli, Inner Anatolia and other coastal areas spoke literally the same language. With the publication of the Karamanlidika bibliography and the definition given by Evangelia Balta, the term became a synonym for "Turkish text written in Greek characters".[35] Although the discussion about more suitable terminology is ongoing, Karamanlidika seems to have been established as a conventional term.[36]

The writing of one language using the script of another was (and is), in fact, a

---

[33] For the relevant discussion see Kappler "Toward a Linguistic Approach." Regarding "purest Turkish" see Knüppel, *Die Türkisch-Orthodoxe Kirche,* 16.

[34] János Eckmann, "Anadolu Karamanlı Ağızlarına Ait Araştımalar, I.Phonetica" *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil Tarih Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi* 8 (1950a):165–200; János Eckmann, "Yunan harfli Karamanlı imlası hakkında," in *Türk Dili ve Tarihi hakkında araştırmalar I,* eds. Hasan Eren, Tibor Halasi-Kun, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1950b), 27–31; János Eckmann, "Karamanlıca işin-li gerundium hakkında," *Türk Dili Belleten* 3/14–15 (1951):45–52; János Eckmann, "Karamanlıca Türkçesinde -maca ekli fiil şekli," *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı* (1953): 45–48; János Eckmann, "Einige gerundiale Konstruktionen im Karamanischen" in *Jean Deny Armağanı,* ed. János Eckmann, (Ankara, 1958), 77–83; Eckmann, "Die karamanische Literatur," 819–835.

[35] Balta, *Karamanlidika, Additions*, xvi.

[36] For a thorough analysis, summarising the discussion diachronically, containing examples from other publications ranging from 1898 until 1980, in an effort to formulate a new hypothesis for the terms employed for Karamanlidika, see Matthias Kappler, "Transcription text, regraphization, variety? Reflections on 'Karamanlidika,'" in *Spoken Ottoman in Mediator Texts*, eds. Éva Á. Csató, Astrid Menz, Fikret Turan, (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2016), 119–128.

rather widespread phenomenon. In the case of the Eastern Mediterranean it has its motivation, among other reasons, in the religious beliefs of the speakers and developed more or less in the same way (but at different times) in every case. People who spoke the same language used a different script to express it. This resulted in Turkish in Greek script (Karamanlidika), Armenian[37] and Cyrillic script.[38] Greek in Cyrillic[39], Latin (also known as Frangochiotika)[40] and Arabic script (known as Aljamiado),[41] and Arabic in Syriac script.[42]

At times when literacy was limited to a small part of the population, for the majority of people the only script they would ever encounter was the one of their faith, probably from a religious book in a language different than theirs, they could not comprehend. The accounts of European travellers from seventeenth to nineteenth-century about the Turkophone Christian Orthodox of Anatolia say that the Mass was celebrated entirely in Greek although the priest (probably the only

---

[37] Mehmet Kutalmış, "Turkish on Armenian Script," *Journal of Economic and Social sciences* 5, no.2 (2003), 47–59.

[38] György Hazai, "Kiril harfleriyle yazılan Türk metinleri," *VII Türk Dil Kurultayında okunan bilimsel bildiriler 1957*, (1960a): 83–86; György Hazai, "Monuments linguistiques osmanlis-turcs en caractères cyrilliques dans les recueils de Bulgarie," *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 11 (1960b): 221–231; Matthias Kappler, "Printed Balkan Turkish Texts in Cyrillic Alphabet in the Middle of the Nineteenth-century (1841–1875): A Typological and Graphematic Approach," in *Between Religion and Language: Turkish-Speaking Christians, Jews and Greek-Speaking Muslims and Catholics in the Ottoman Empire,* eds. Evangelia Balta, Mehmet Ölmez (Istanbul: Eren, 2011), 43–69.

[39] Maria Nystazopoulou-Pelekidou, "Ξενόγλωσσα κείμενα με ελληνική γραφή," *Ο Ερανιστής* 55 (1972): 69–111.

[40] Eugène Dalleggio, "Bibliographie Analytique d'ouvrages religieux en grec Imprimés avec des caractères latins," *Μικρασιατικά Χρονικά* 9 (1961): 385–498; Markos Foskolos, *Τα "φραγκοχιώτικα" βιβλία: Ένα κεφάλαιο από την ιστορία της καθολικής ευσέβειας στον ελληνικό χώρο* (Θεσσαλονίκη: Αποστολικό Βικαριάτο Θεσσαλονίκης, 2012).

[41] George Dedes, "Was there a Greek Aljamiado literature?" in *The balance of truth, essays in honour of Professor Geoffrey Lewis*, eds. Çiğdem Balım-Harding, Colin Imber (Istanbul: Isis Press, 2000), 83–98. Matthias Kappler, Προϋποθέσεις για μια γραφηματική προσέγγιση στα ελληνικά κείμενα γραμμένα με αραβικόν αλφάβητο," in *Ο ελληνικός κόσμος ανάμεσα στην Ανατολή και τη Δύση 1453-1981*, Vol. I, eds. A.Argyriou & K. Dimadis & A. Lazaridou, Πρακτικά Α΄ Ευρωπαϊκού Συνεδρίου Νεοελληνικών Σπουδών, Βερολίνο 2-4 Οκτ. 1988 (Αθήνα: Ελληνικά Γράμματα, 1999), 695- 709.

[42] Kiraz *Tūrrāṣ Mamllā*. Kiraz uses the term "Garshuni" to characterise this kind of phenomenon and offers a definition which could be a basis in the wider context of what we call transcription texts. He describes Garshuni as "the writing as one language (called the source language) in the script of another (called target script) in specific sociolinguistic settings: 1. when the source language is already associated with a script that is perceived to be its own. 2. There exists a readership which is either unfamiliar with the script of the source language or prefers for whatever reason to use the target script over the script of the source language," Kiraz, *Tūrrāṣ Mamllā,* 291.

literate, or semi-literate, person present) might not understand a word of it or, there was a resulting blend of the two languages like *'Patir bizim ho en tois ouranois'* [Our father in Heaven] as described by the British traveller G. T. Keppel in the earlier part of the nineteenth-century.[43] The illiterate or semi-literate Turkophone priests who read the ecclesiastical books to the public were reported to have little idea of how the Greek language sounded, but they were able to read accurately in Turkish.[44] In the case of literary Urmia Aramaic, the priests and deacon were probably able to read and understand classical Syriac as they had to recite the liturgy,[45] which would had been the case for priests in high ranks in Orthodox Christianity, but probably not for the clergy of remote areas, as will be discussed later on.

On the other hand, we also see similarities in the rhetoric used to describe people in remote areas. In the case of the Church of the East we read, 'Education, when we reached the Nestorians, was at an ebb almost as low as vital religion. None but their ecclesiastics could even read; and but very few of them could do more than chant their devotions in an unknown tongue – the Syriac, a modern dialect of which is their spoken language, while neither they nor their hearers knew anything of the meaning'.[46] It is very interesting that although this statement was primarily made in order to help the missionaries raise money for their literary and educational endeavours, the rhetoric is very similar to the one Serapheim uses in his introductions, when repeating the intellectual and religious decline of Anatolia (see 0.2.2. and 3.3.3.)

In comparison to periods before the eighteenth-century, little seems to have

---

[43] Clogg, "A millet within a millet," 121–122.
[44] Clogg, "The publication and distribution of Karamanli texts," 68. This was not surprising because the readers were not only familiar with but also a part of this tradition, as the books were written by the Turkophone Orthodox for the Turkophone Orthodox. Morpho-phonological writing is not necessary for a native speaker or someone with some knowledge of the language because they can read according to the rules of the Turkish language; see Matthias Kappler, "Note a proposito di 'ortografia caramanlidica'," in *Turcica et Islamica – Studi in memoria di Aldo Gallotta,* ed. Ugo Marazzi (Napoli: Università degli Studi di Napoli "L'Orientale," 2003), 36.
[45] Heleen Murre-van den Berg, *From a Spoken to a Written language: the introduction and development of literary Urmia Aramaic in the nineteenth-century* (Leiden: Netherlands Institute for Middle Eastern Studies, 1999), 87.
[46] Cited in Heleen Murre-van den Berg, *Scribes and Scriptures: The Church of the East in the Eastern Ottoman Provinces (1500–1850)* (Louvain: Peeters, 2015).

changed in terms of literacy; reading and writing was a privilege of the clergy. In the East Syrian tradition, during the sixteenth-century the dictum was that 'the path of reading was not for everyone'[47] while in the Christian Greek Orthodox tradition, the clerics believed that writing was a privilege only for them and some scholars. In a letter by the Patriarch around 1700, it is mentioned that 'not everything is for everyone', clarifying that writing was only for the elite.[48] In this way the lay were only listeners and that is why many books like Karamanlidika were designed primarily to be heard rather than read, including phrases like 'hear the message of the scriptures', 'when you hear' and 'hear everywhere'.[49] The element of listening was not new for Christianity, which was at its beginnings an oral culture.[50]

The only way for these people to obtain religious books they could understand, the crucial bridge between lay and clerical religious cultures,[51] was to write them, and so they did with the only script they knew. This also had religious implications; at that time, it would be a blasphemy to write the Scriptures in a script other than the one they were familiar with. In this way the aforementioned phenomenon developed. In the same way that the Christian movement was indebted to texts written in its formative years,[52] texts that defined many of its aspects, the Karamanlidika tradition and its course in time, in terms of language and practices, was indebted to the books of the early and mid-eighteenth-century, initiated and magnified by clergy and especially by Serapheim as will be discussed later on.

At the beginning of the eighteenth-century, when missionaries reached the

---

[47] Joel T. Walker, "Ascetic Literacy: Books and Readers in East Syrian Monastic Tradition," in *Commutation et Contentio: Studies in the Late Roman, Sasanian, and Early Islamic Near East, in Memory of Zeev Rubin*, eds. Henning Börm, Josef Wiesehöfer (Düsseldorf: Wellem Verlagm, 2010), 310.

[48] Filippos Iliou, "Σημειώσεις για τα «τραβήγματα» των ελληνικών βιβλίων του 16ου αιώνα," *Ελληνικά* 28 (1975a):115.

[49] See Gavriel, "Η Τουρκική με το Ελληνικό αλφάβητο," 6.

[50] Harry Y. Gamble, *A History of Early Christian texts* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1995), 28. Another clue signifying this oral tradition is the continuous script in early text destined to be read aloud. Gamble, *A History of Early Christian texts*, 203. The continuous script was used also in the early manuscript descriptions of the Kykkos Monastery tradition that the Karamanlidika publications of the eighteenth-century were based on. For the manuscripts of the book see Costas N. Constantinides, *Η διήγησις της θαυματουργής εικόνας της Θεοτόκου Ελεούσας του Κύκκου κατά τον ελληνικό κώδικα 2313 του Βατικανού* (Λευκωσία: Κέντρο Μελετών Ιεράς Μονής Κύκκου, 2002).

[51] Murre-van den Berg, *Scribes and Scriptures,* 275.

[52] Gamble, *A History of Early Christian texts*, 41.

region, many of these literary traditions had already been in existence a long time. The missionaries were clever enough not to oppose these people but rather reinforce and take advantage of their various writing traditions with the ulterior motive of converting them. In the case of Asia Minor, Turkish-speaking children from various cultures attended the missionary Sunday schools[53] with books and periodicals with identical context in the Turkish language but written in the script of their community, usually customised in order to be more understandable.[54] This type of missionary influence led many from illiteracy to literacy.[55]

For a period of time both missionary and local traditions co-existed, both falling into disuse after certain political developments and especially when the national educational systems developed.

0.2.1. Education

In order to study books and their readers it is essential to first take into consideration literary culture and literacy levels at the given time.[56] A generally accepted fact is that before the nineteenth-century not knowing how to read and write, was normal among the Christian Orthodox in the Ottoman Empire, and included both the laity and clerics.[57] Since no schools existed (except for a few in urban areas),[58] the Patriarchate, assuming that the lay needed to be educated in letters (and the ways of religion), mobilised the clerics during the nineteenth-century.[59] The level of literacy that clerics may have had was mainly gained by the

---

[53] Regarding Sunday schools see Balta, "Καραμανλίδικες και αρμενοτουρκικές εκδόσεις."
[54] Regarding the development of Karamanlidika writing systems, see Stelios Irakleous, "On the development of Karamanlidika writing systems based on sources of the period 1764–1895," *Mediterranean Language Review* 20 (2013): 57–96.
[55] Similarly, on the missionary influence see Murre-van den Berg *Scribes and Scriptures*; Murre-van den Berg, *From a Spoken to a Written language.*
[56] Gamble, *A History of Early Christian texts*, 2.
[57] Even in the nineteenth-century Anatolia was predominantly an agricultural community, see Irini Renieri, "Household Formation in nineteenth-century Central Anatolia: The Case Study of a Turkish-Speaking Orthodox Christian Community," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 34, no.3 (2002): 495–517.
[58] Alexis Alexandris, *The Greek minority of Istanbul and the Greek-Turkish relations 1918–1974* (Athens: Centre for Asia Minor Studies, 1992), 46–47. In the Patriarchate in Istanbul, a lycèe operated, but only wealthy students could attend it.
[59] Ioannes K. Chasiotis, *Μεταξύ Οθωμανικής κυριαρχίας και Ευρωπαϊκής πρόκλησης, ο ελληνικός κόσμος στα χρόνια της Τουρκοκρατίας* (Θεσσαλονίκη: University Studio Press, 2001), 86.

reading of the Scriptures and by some basic schools, which had started to operate in monasteries by the eighteenth-century.[60] Some foreign travellers mentioned that monasteries were places of education, where clerics worked all day and, during the night, read and chanted,[61] whilst others described with sarcasm the illiteracy of the Christian Orthodox in the Ottoman Empire.[62]

What foreign travellers noticed was that the Greek-speaking Christian Orthodox suffered the incorrect spellings of words (orthography) and an "absence of syntax",[63] referring to syntactic constructions that were considered by the travellers as ungrammatical. This illustrates a degree of functional literacy but perhaps inadequate training. This was not peculiar at all since, as already mentioned, few people were literate, but even if they were, they did not necessarily have knowledge of the spellings conventionally considered as correct, mainly as found in written sources. Sources mention that in Cyprus,[64] letters written by the Archbishop and the Metropolitans in the seventeenth-century illustrate a profusion of incorrect spellings and syntactic irregularities.[65] The "wrong" spellings are obvious in religious inscriptions in monasteries destined to last through time, which shows, if not illiteracy, then a lack of concern about correct spellings. Despite the aforementioned, the fact that the monks knew how to write, albeit with spelling mistakes, is evidence for the operation of schools in the monasteries.[66] Instruction in monasteries was of course obligatory for monks in order for them to be able to complete their tasks. In a book of rules found in Egypt (but with its origins and usage still in dispute), it is stated clearly that every monk shall know

---

[60] Chasiotis, *Μεταξύ Οθωμανικής κυριαρχίας και Ευρωπαϊκής πρόκλησης*, 87; Ioannes Theocharides, *Οι περιγραφές της Ιεράς Μονής Κύκκου (1751, 1782, 1817, 1819)* (Λευκωσία: Κέντρο Μελετών Ιεράς Μονής Κύκκου, 2010), 11.

[61] Theocharis Stavrides, "Η Ιερά Μονή Κύκκου και η μόρφωση του Κυπριακού κλήρου κατά την Τουρκοκρατία και Αγγλοκρατία" *Επετηρίδα Κέντρου Μελετών Ιεράς Μονής Κύκκου 5* (Λευκωσία: Κέντρο Μελετών Ιεράς Μονής Κύκκου, 2001b), 71.

[62] Iliou, "Σημειώσεις για τα «τραβήγματα»," 115; Chasiotis, *Μεταξύ Οθωμανικής κυριαρχίας και Ευρωπαϊκής πρόκλησης*, 87

[63] Iliou, "Σημειώσεις για τα «τραβήγματα»," 115. It is indicative that, by the end of the sixteenth-century, illiteracy was obvious even inside the Patriarchate in Istanbul. See Chasiotis, *Μεταξύ Οθωμανικής κυριαρχίας και Ευρωπαϊκής πρόκλησης*, 87.

[64] I believe the case of Cyprus is relevant to that of inner Anatolia since both were distant provinces of the Empire away from the urban centres.

[65] Stavrides, "Η Ιερά Μονή Κύκκου," 69–70.

[66] *Ibid*, 70.

how to read and write.[67]

Moreover, orthography was not an obligatory subject and not standardised in present-day terms, and thus not taught in any systematic way to students, even to those who could afford a private tutor. In the contracts signed by parents and tutors, one can see that the teaching of how to read was not interrelated with learning how to write or how to write correctly, and if the tutor should teach the student how to write, then a special reference was written in the contract.[68] This resulted in the preservation of the phenomenon, since it was difficult for anyone to learn correctly the complicated historical orthography of the Greek language.

Later on, when the *Lancasterian* schools were founded by the American missionaries, they were described by Greek sources of the time as schools for the masses, because their primary task was the teaching of how to read and write, along with some arithmetic.[69] But education was still not obligatory and not widespread, so – in most cases – those who had studied in these schools had achieved a primary level of literacy, which allowed them to read, attend and comprehend the Mass and to write, although perhaps with incorrect spellings.[70] In addition, the entire educational programme in these schools was occupied by elementary knowledge of ecclesiastical language and other basic elements useful to those who wanted to become members of the clergy.[71]

The *Lancasterian* schools surely contributed to the increased level of literacy, but did not contribute to introduce a standardised spelling. In the absence of capable teachers for the schools, the natural choice was the clerics, who were almost everywhere.[72] Of course, clerics were literate to a level but often did not have knowledge of orthography. Added to that was the system of these schools which had as its main characteristic the teaching of youngest pupils by the older ones. One of the main purposes of *Lancasterian* schools was the teaching of basic skills of reading and writing, and that was being done by clerics who often had

---

[67] For the discussion see Kim Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians of Letters: Literacy, Power and the Transmitters of Early Christian Literature (*New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 96.
[68] Iliou, "Σημειώσεις για τα «τραβήγματα»," 115
[69] Antonios Fatseas, *Σκέψεις επί της δημοσίας και ιδιωτικής εκπαιδεύσεως των νέων Ελλήνων, Τόμος ΙΙ* (Αθήνα: Τύποις Νικολάου Αγγελίδου, 1856), 9–10.
[70] Iliou, "Σημειώσεις για τα «τραβήγματα»," 115.
[71] Chasiotis, *Μεταξύ Οθωμανικής κυριαρχίας και Ευρωπαϊκής πρόκλησης*, 88.
[72] Fatseas, *Σκέψεις επί της δημοσίας και ιδιωτικής εκπαιδεύσεως*, 10.

limited knowledge. This knowledge was transmitted to pupils and from those to youngest ones, creating a chain where everyone's knowledge was dependent on the training their tutor had received, perpetuating a situation of people who did not have knowledge of the complicated historical writing of Greek language, which was something destined for the few.

Teachers were dividing Greek language into Hellenic and everyday speech, which was considered to be a lower form of language. What they called Hellenic was the purified version of the Greek language also known as καθαρευούσα (*katharevusa*), which was the scholarly language of the time. Students were not instructed in orthography before high school, where *katharevusa* was being taught, because orthography was considered to be a part of the *katharevusa* teaching.[73] Therefore, anyone who was not able to study in a high school or not aware of this purified version of Greek was excluded from the knowledge of standardised orthography.

0.2.2. Religion before printing

Another important aspect that needs to be addressed is the state of religion when events like the transition from manuscript to printed book, and from oral to written language, took place in Asia Minor. Illiterate societies were utterly typical for most of the world until recently, and the Ottoman Empire, Asia Minor, Syria and Palestine were no different. The distribution of knowledge on religious tradition came only through oral channels and led to inevitably patchy results.[74]

According to Serapheim the Turkophone Christian Orthodox of Anatolia suffered from intellectual decline and their religion was in decay. In his book SChr1782:14 he says that in previous years he had prepared a number of editions for the Christians who were unaware of the Greek language and the dogmas of their faith, and subsequently practised religion the way they heard and saw, or the way they believed to be correct. Of course, what comprised an intellectual decline

---

[73] Fatseas, *Σκέψεις επί της δημοσίας και ιδιωτικής εκπαιδεύσεως*, 13–14. The few students who continued their education were using Greek grammars printed in Europe during the fifteenth-century, but mainly they were reading from ancient Greek texts. See Chasiotis, *Μεταξύ Οθωμανικής κυριαρχίας και Ευρωπαϊκής πρόκλησης*, 88.
[74] James Grehan, *Twilight of the Saints, everyday religion in Ottoman Syria and Palestine* (Oxford University Press, 2014), 14.

and decay for a cleric in eighteenth-century Asia Minor is subject to interpretation and possible controversy, and something to which we will return soon. The situation described by Serapheim was not very different from the one in Syria and Palestine during the eighteenth-century, not only for Christians but Muslims as well. An interesting case is that of Rashid Rida (1865–1935) who founded a committee in order to promote education in the rural areas of the Ottoman Empire. He strived to enlighten his fellow Muslims by giving lessons from village to village, in the same manner as efforts that were underway in many towns in the same period. The reasoning behind these efforts was what Rida thought to be the decay of religion in the countryside as people were, in Rida's opinion, sinking in "superstitions" and "innovations".[75] During Sultan Abdulhamid's reign (1876–1909) state-trained missionaries were sent to "correct" the "heterodox" religion of those who were not Sunni Muslims.[76]

The countryside had, at least according to clergy or in comparison with cities, serious deficiencies in religious infrastructure regarding manpower and resources, which, in the absence of control (or guidance) from the ulema and the Christian hierarchy, led to the adaptability of believers at many levels. Both Christians and Muslims performed services in guesthouses, in the absence of a mosque or a church (which only towns could sustain); as for the villagers, the existence of an official place of worship was not their top priority. In the places that did have an official place of worship, it was often rudimentary – the builders did not know how to align the minaret towards Mecca and rural churches were decrepit. Even when a mosque was finally erected, the believers continued their previous practice of praying in convenient places rather than designated areas.[77] The erection of an official place of worship was rather an action of setting people on the right path, on behalf of the religious authorities, than something to improve people's religiosity. For Christians this started to change towards the end of the nineteenth-century, when they started to create religious infrastructure; this was mainly due to help from wealthy merchants who acquired protection and, in many cases, European

[75] Grehan, *Twilight of the Saints*, 20.
[76] *Ibid*, 28.
[77] *Ibid*, 21–26.

passports, becoming thus benefactors of their communities.[78]

Priests were educated only in the nineteenth-century and acted again as teachers but in a different way. Prior to that they were illiterate or semi-literate, passing on whatever knowledge they had and only capable of performing certain religious services like funerals and marriages, conducted in Greek or Syriac, languages they could not comprehend. There is no evidence of registers in the area for births, baptisms, weddings or deaths.[79]

The lack of control and the lives of common people being tied by oral culture led to what is defined by Grehan as "agrarian" religion, a religious mainstream that expressed itself in very similar everyday religious habits.[80] The distinction between Christian and Muslim sainthood was blurred as people were purchasing talismans from various religions. They were visiting the same shrines, on some occasions the same official houses of worship, and their distinctions were visible only in marriage and death. Marriages were taking place in a church or within the community and burials were carried out in the same place with the coreligionists.[81] The situation is vividly described by Catholic missionaries in Galilee, saying they were unable to find Christians who knew how to perform the sign of the cross. Among lay people, prayer was more of a casual rather than disciplined exercise, and even the conversion to Catholicism (when it occurred) merely eliminated a social barrier and was not an act of religious identity change.[82] Probably such was the case of the conversion of Asad Ashidyaq, a young Maronite in Beirut, who worked with American Protestants but never openly confessed a conversion although his case was conveniently exploited by the missionaries.[83] Added to that, the Turkophone Christian Orthodox living in Anatolia were in the nineteenth-century still mostly an agricultural community[84] and even when they fled Asia Minor during the 1920s as refugees, they carried with them bibles printed by Protestants in Karamanlidika, which their descendants treasure to the present day

---

[78] Grehan, *Twilight of the Saints,* 40.
[79] *Ibid*, 47,53.
[80] *Ibid*, 16.
[81] *Ibid*, 63, 181, 193.
[82] *Ibid*, 57–58.
[83] Ussama Makdisi, *Artillery of Heaven: American Missionaries and the failed conversion of the Middle East* (Cornell University Press, London 2008), 102–137.
[84] Irini Renieri, "Household Formation in nineteenth-century Central Anatolia," 495–517.

without knowing that the books belong to a different denomination.

A decisive factor in the change of the existing situation was the invention of printing press. The previously admitted and tolerated local variations started to fade away, since for the first time in Christian history it was made possible to insist upon uniformity by producing identical texts in large numbers.[85] People were no longer worshippers but were turning into believers, as the Scriptures entered their lives not through the oral channels as before, but with instruction from written texts. This "new religiosity" had as its main feature the 'overweening obsession with texts'.[86] These efforts at "correcting" religion that insisted on uniform practices are what I refer to as religious prescriptivism, namely the efforts to disseminate the "correct ways" of doing and saying things, in practices and also in language.

The liturgical book had a principle role in this procedure for a variety of reasons. At first it was scarce, meant to be heard during the Mass. It changed however into a schooling book against illiteracy (in letters and religious ways), was printed in large numbers and, memorised by people even if they could not apprehend it.[87] With its mass production and use as school handbook, it is more than possible that it affected not only religious practices in the Ottoman Empire but also language use.

0.3. Turkish language: from Anatolian Turkish to late Ottoman

The field of Turkic studies and research on the history of the Turks is a field that started and developed from the late nineteenth-century onwards. In 1889 the oldest monuments bearing written Turkic language were discovered in Orkhon (present-day Mongolia) and Yenisey (present-day Siberia). The inscriptions are written in runic script and dated around 720 AD and were deciphered by Vilhelm Thomsen in 1893; today those texts with other texts until the eleventh-century are known as Old Turkic.[88]

When the Turkic-speaking tribes left the Eurasian steppes they went west, with

---

[85] Eisenstein, *The Printing Revolution in early Modern Europe*, 155.
[86] Grehan, *Twilight of the Saints,* 196.
[87] Sklavenites, "Ανθολόγια και συνθετικές εκδόσεις λειτουργικού βιβλίων," 193.
[88] Concerning Old Turkic see Marcel Erdal, "Old Turkic," in *The Turkic Languages*, eds. Lars Johanson, Eva A. Csàto (London-New York: Routledge, 1998), 138–157.

one string taking the northern route while the second using the southern route. The Oghuz group, the one that the Turkish originated from, migrated in the south-western direction, to present-day Iran and to Anatolia, the area that constitutes most of present-day Turkey.[89] During their migration they converted to Islam around the eleventh-century and adopted the Arabic alphabet. Around two centuries after, along with the influence of Persian – the language of bureaucracy and literature, and therefore the prestigious one – several elements of the two languages found their way into Oghuz-Turkish and formed what is today widely known as Ottoman Turkish. Named after the founder of the emirate that dominated Anatolia and evolved into the Ottoman Empire, Osman, literary Ottoman Turkish can be, according to Celia Kerslake, roughly divided into three periods: Old Ottoman or Old Anatolian Turkish (thirteenth–fifteenth centuries), Middle Ottoman (sixteenth–eighteenth centuries) and New Ottoman (nineteenth century–1928).[90] However recent studies have shown that what has been called by scholars as "spoken Ottoman" present more differentiated periodisation.[91]

Transcription texts, and therefore also a great part of Karamanlidika, are sources for "spoken Ottoman",[92] where developments are different, as noted in Hazai's study on Harsany texts, which seem to prove that Middle Ottoman ends before the eighteenth-century.[93] The primary sources for this research were published throughout the second half of the eighteenth-century, so we would expect to come across a language very close to modern Turkish, since the passage from Middle to New Ottoman language development had been concluded around the eighteenth-century according to Kerslake's periodisation and around the last quarter of the seventeenth-century according to Hazai,[94] therefore Modern Standard Turkish forms (MST), will be used for comparisons, when needed.

---

[89] Peter B. Golden, "The Turkic Peoples: A Historical Sketch," in *The Turkic Languages*, eds. Lars Johanson, Eva A. Csàto (London-New York: Routledge, 1998), 16–29.
[90] See Celia Kerslake, "Ottoman Turkish" in *The Turkic Languages*, eds. Lars Johanson, Eva A. Csàto (London-New York: Routledge, 1998), 181.
[91] Eva A. Csàto, Asrtid Menz, Turan Fikret, eds. *Spoken Ottoman in Mediator Texts* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2016).
[92] Bernt Brendemoen, "Karamanlidic Literature and its value as a source for spoken Turkish in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries," *Turkic Languages,* 20, no.1 (2016): 5–25.
[93] György Hazai, *Das Osmanisch-Türkische im XVII. Jahrhundert: Untersuchungen an den Transkriptiontexten von Jakab Nagy de Harsany* (Akademiai Kiado, Budapest, 1975).
[94] See Hazai, *Transkriptiontexten von Jakab Nagy de Harsany.*

We should keep in mind though that the time of publication might not coincide with the time of writing. With the primary sources being at the threshold of Middle Ottoman to New Ottoman we would expect to come across older forms of language. A description of the morpho-phonology of Old Anatolian Turkish, the first form of Turkish in Anatolia, is important in order to understand and classify the language of the primary sources, and also its development, if any, through the years of publication.[95] Serapheim originated from Antalya and therefore we presuppose that he used a regional variety, which for sure will illustrate differences from the language of the economic and political centre of the era, Istanbul.[96]

The suffix phonology of Old Anatolian Turkish had certain characteristics that differ from the Ottoman Period per se and, of course, from MST. These characteristics can be summarised as the existence of three vowel harmonies, instead of two in late Ottoman and MST. The modern Turkish fourfold harmony or {X} (> ı, i, u, ü) of late Ottoman and Modern Standard Turkish, is the outcome of the combination of the Illabial ({I} > i/ı) and the Labial Harmony ({U} > ü/u) we come across in Old Anatolian Turkish. The Palatal Harmony, which is realised as {A} > a/e, remained unchanged. Regarding consonants, the assimilation of consonants of the suffixes was usually not yet applied in Old Anatolian Turkish. Consequently, suffixes with an initial d- (e.g. the suffixes of Locative, Dative, Ablative and others) were not assimilated in terms of +voiced or -voiced with the previous phoneme. The phonology and morphology of the primary sources will be thoroughly discussed in Chapters 2 and 3.

0.3.1. Texts in non-Arabic script and Karamanlidika

When referring to Turkish texts written in non-Arabic script (or "transcription

---

[95] Regarding the characteristics of Old Anatolian Turkish see Mecdut Mansuroğlu, "Das Alt-Osmanischen," in *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta I*, eds. Jean Deny, Kaare Grønbech, Helmuth Scheel, Zeki Velidi Togan (Wiesbaden, 1959), 161–182.

[96] For a classification of Turkish dialects see Caferoğlu, "Die Anatolischen und Rumelischen Dialekte" in *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta I*, eds. Jean Deny, Kaare Grønbech, Helmuth Scheel, Zeki Velidi Togan (Wiesbaden, 1959), 239–260. Regarding the characteristics of Anatolian dialects see Hendrik Boeschoten, "Aspects of language variation," in *Turkish linguistics today*, eds. Hendrik Boeschoten, Ludeo Verhoven (Brill, 1991), 150–193; Bernt Brendemoen, "Turkish dialects," in *The Turkic Languages*, eds. Lars Johanson, Eva A. Csàto (London-New York: Routledge, 1998), 326–241.

texts"), we are talking about very heterogeneous material containing Turkish texts written in Armenian, Georgian, Hebrew, Cyrillic, Latin, Greek and Syriac alphabets.[97] The importance of these texts cannot be emphasised enough, since they constitute valuable sources of knowledge about the linguistic history of Turkish,[98] illustrating a transitional linguistic period for Ottoman Turkish known as Middle Ottoman,[99] and about the cultural and general history of minorities in the Ottoman Empire.[100]

The earliest existing evidence of Turkic language written in Latin characters is the *Codex Cumanicus,* written in Kipchak Turkic around the early fourteenth-century.[101] It is believed that it was written during two different periods, partly in Crimea in the monastery of Saint John near Sarai and partly in a Franciscan monastery in South Russia by German Franciscan friars.[102] Although Kipchak Turkic vanished as a literary language, other variations developed written forms, such as Karaim and Armeno-Kipchak,[103] also known as Armeno-Turkish.[104] The *Codex Cumanicus* consists of 164 pages in modern pagination (instead of the old 82 r-v folios) and consists of three parts. The first part (pages 1–111, also referred to as the "Italian" part) has a secular character and probably functioned as a

---

97 György Hazai, "Die Denkmäler des osmanisch-türkeitürkischen in nicht-arabischen Schriften," in *Handbuch der türkischen Sprachwissenschaft I*, ed. György Hazai (Budapest: Wiesbaden, 1990), 63.

98 Hazai, "Die Denkmäler des osmanisch-türkeitürkischen," 67. Hazai mentions that the study of such monuments has contributed much to our knowledge concerning the phonology of Turkish. Also see Kappler "Toward a Linguistic Approach," 656.

99 Celia Kerslake, "Ottoman Turkish," 183.

100 Gavriel 2000: 202; Gavriel, "Οι προλόγοι της Καραμανλίδικης και της Ελληνικής έκδοσης," 379; Hazai, "Die Denkmäler des osmanisch-türkeitürkischen," 67.

101 Lars Johanson, "The History of Turkic," in *The Turkic Languages*, eds. Lars Johanson, Eva A. Csàto (London-New York: Routledge, 1998), 86. Kipchak Turkic and Oghuz Turkic (the family of modern Turkish) comprise the group of West Middle Turkic languages.

102 Louis Ligeti, "Prolegomena," in *Codex Cumanicus*, ed. Géza Kuun (Budapest: Budapestini Scient. Academiae Hung, 1981), 8.

103 Johanson, "The History of Turkic," 86.

104 Apparently there is confusion about these terms, since there is also what is called Armeno-Ottoman (or Turkish). The authors, though, do not distinguish between them. Concerning this issue, see Andras Rona-Tas, "Turkic writing systems," in *The Turkic Languages*, eds. Lars Johanson, Eva A. Csàto (London-New York: Routledge, 1998), 135. The Armenian script was used for ecclesiastical and secular writings by some Kipchak groups that had become Christians. After the migration of the Armenians to Asia Minor, some groups adopted the Armenian script. On Middle Kipchak, see Arpad Berta, "West Kipchak Languages," in *The Turkic Languages*, eds. Lars Johanson, Eva A. Csàto, (London-New York: Routledge, 1998), 301–317.

handbook for trade. The second part consists of eight blank pages (111–118). The third part (pages 118–164, also referred to as the "German" part) contains mostly religious texts in prose and verse, and it is likely that it was written by several different people.[105]

Concerning Ottoman Turkish, the first evidence of "texts in non-Arabic script" comes from the sixteenth-century when several Europeans showed interest in learning the language, mainly for practical reasons. Thus, the first publications consist of dictionaries and grammars of Turkish written in Latin script.[106] These publications are written in several languages, including Italian, French, English and Latin.[107] The problem of these editions is the degree to which each of the editors/writers had mastered Turkish, and the reliability of each book depends upon the skill and accuracy of these individuals.[108] The books offer valuable insights into the representation of Turkish vowels during those early times when Arabic script was not very helpful. Apart from the absence of vowels, Ottoman Turkish used a historical and, therefore, ambiguous writing system.[109] The existence of certain phonemes in Turkish that are absent from European languages made the situation complicated, since the publications represented Turkish vowels but, in the early editions, only partially,[110] with later publications being more accurate regarding vowel representation. As twentieth-century linguistic research shows, every interlocutor comprehends sounds according to the phonetic values of his or her own language,[111] and often the inability of authors to comprehend and represent the Turkish phonemes created inconsistencies.

Karamanlidika, in comparison with other Turkish "texts in non-Arabic script", like texts in Cyrillic or Armenian, use typographical accents (the acute, the grave and the circumflex), thus providing information, when they are used correctly,

---

105 Ligeti, "Prolegomena," 8–13.
106 Kerslake, "Ottoman Turkish," 183.
107 For a study concerning Greek-Ottoman grammars and dictionaries of the nineteenth-century, see Kappler, "Konflikt und Ideologie."
108 Kerslake, "Ottoman Turkish," 183.
109 Yavuz Kartallıoğlu, "The vowels of Turkish in Transcription Texts," *Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi* 17 (2005): 88–91. See also Robert Anhegger, "On transcribing Ottoman texts," *Manuscript of the Middle East* 3 (1988): 12.
110 Anhegger, "On transcribing Ottoman texts," 12.
111 Uriel Weinreich, *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems* (The Hague/Paris/New York: Mouton Publishers, 1963), 14.

about word stress, pitch or intonation.[112]

As every alphabet had its own shortcomings, also Greek script was not accurate in the representation of some phonemes, such as /ü/, /ö/ and the back /ı/, due to the absence of these vowels from the Greek phonological system and subsequently from Greek script. Efforts to solve these peculiarities were made for many years. For the first time in 1826, the BFBS, used diacritical symbols to render the sounds of Turkish[113] in an edition of the New Testament.[114] The BFBS and the ABCFM were very much in favour of employing a variety of alphabets for unwritten languages or modifying alphabets in order to create phonetic representations of languages in order make proselytism easier.[115] This was an outcome of their belief that in order to reach their main goal, they had to provide the local Christians with religious texts in their language, written in a local alphabet that enjoyed status within and outside of the literate community – and thus using that also enabled swift and broad acceptance in some communities. They therefore devoted their attention to education and printing before anything else.[116]

Finally, the Karamanlidika texts offer dialectologists unexpected insights into spoken Turkish of the Ottoman period because they are often written by native speakers, and in the case of the primary sources of this study, written by native Turkophone Orthodox people of Anatolia addressing their own.

0.4. Ottoman Empire and printing in the eighteenth-century

During the eighteenth-century, the Ottoman Empire experienced many changes at

---

[112] Eftychios Gavriel, "Transcription Problems of Karamanlidika Texts," in *Cries and Whispers in Karamanlidika Books Proceedings of the First International Conference of Karamanlidika Studies. Nicosia 11-13.09.2008*, eds. Evangelia Balta, Matthias Kappler (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2010a), 257.

[113] Eckmann "Yunan harfli Karamanlı," 29–30; Eckmann, "Die karamanische Literatur,"2; Anhegger "Hurufumuz Yunanca," 171; Clogg, "The publication and distribution of Karamanli texts," 178; Clogg, "A Millet within a Millet," 120; Kappler, "Note a proposito," 320.

[114] S.D.I,64, *Ραπί Ισά ελ μεσιχίν αχδί τζεδιδινίν γιουνανί λισανινδάν τουρκ λισανινά τερτζουμεσί* [Rabb-i İsa el Mesihin Ahd-i Cedidinin Yunan-i lisanından Türk lisanına Tercümesi].

[115] Stephen Neil, *A history of Christian Missions* (Great Britain: Penguin Books, 1964), 254; Robert Leon Cooper, *Language planning and social change* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 126. It is notable that the British missionaries edited the Gospel in 872 languages.

[116] Murre-van den Berg, *From a Spoken to a Written language,* 84–85.

all levels. The Empire saw five new sultans during the eighteenth-century alone. This was the time the Empire first opened itself to Europe and the innovations coming from there. At that time the territories of the Empire included the Balkans, present-day Turkey, the majority of the Middle East and some territories in North Africa.[117]

The first half of the eighteenth-century and more precisely the second half of the reign of Ahmed III (1703–1730) – while Ibrahim Pasha (1718–1730) was Grand Vizier – was a time of patronage of art and architecture, with great venues that included poetry events, the creation of fabulous gardens, libraries and the introduction of the first Ottoman Turkish printing house, along with conspicuous consumption of wealth. This time is widely known as 'The Tulip Era', an era which ended abruptly with the uprising of some Janissaries in 1730.[118]

The Ottoman Empire's steady decline was seen in the loss of territories and problems with tax collection, with the weakness of authority being visible even in the position of the sultan. It is indicative that after fall of Ahmed III the sultan changed four times up to 1789 when Selim III took the throne. During his reign, the long dispute with Russia about the territories of the Black Sea, lasting more than 20 years, ended with Russian victory after a five-year war (1787–1792).[119]

Cyprus, where Serapheim started his publishing activities and to which he had close bonds throughout his life, was also a province of the Ottoman Empire and was not very different in terms of administration from the rest of the Empire. The administrative status of the island changed 78 times during the course of the eighteenth-century as a result of experimentation by the authorities in order to get to grips with the numerous bureaucratic, administrative and fiscal problems present.[120] Nevertheless, the island enjoyed a high degree of administrative independence which meant that, as long as the taxes were collected and paid, the

---

[117] Erik J. Zürcher, *Σύγχρονη Ιστορία της Τουρκίας* (Αθήνα: Αλεξάνδρεια, 2004), 53.
[118] Kemal Silay, *Nedim and the Poetics of the Ottoman Court* (Bloomington: Indiana University Turkish Studies Department, 1994), 121–127.
[119] Zürcher, *Σύγχρονη Ιστορία της Τουρκίας*, 64–65.
[120] Antonis Hadjikyriacou, "Society and Economy on an Ottoman Island: Cyprus in the Eighteenth-century" (Ph.D. diss, School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, 2011), 137.

centre of imperial power did not interfere with the island's internal affairs.[121]

0.4.1. Printing presses and the printing of Greek books

As already mentioned, the first Ottoman Turkish printing house was opened in Istanbul in 1729, almost three hundred years after such developments started in Europe. The establishment was named after its founder, İbrahim Müteferrika, and remained active for sixteen years. After the death of Müteferrika in 1745 the printing house fell into disuse until it reopened in 1756. According to Yasemin Gencer, putting the Scriptures into print was unholy and therefore not permissible, and this was the main reason that the first printing house did not print any religious texts and then fell into disuse.[122] It is generally believed that printing presses were banned in the Ottoman Empire, and this is why the first printing house opened so much later than in Europe. According to the recent study by Kathryn A. Schwartz, however, the common belief that printing was banned by the sultans has no grounds, as there are no official documents to prove it. In fact, the surviving documents prove that such a restriction did not exist. Müteferrika's printing house closed because no one took over the permit and Schwartz's study attributes the established the notion of sultans banning printing to Western scholars.[123]

Concerning non-Muslims, in 1493 permission was granted to two Jewish brothers to print books in the Jewish language. Later on, Armenians and Greeks followed suit.[124] The Christian Orthodox Patriarchate had already been engaged in printing since the seventeenth-century; although the printers never used the title of 'Patriarchical printing house', mainly for political reasons. This title, however, was officially used for the first time in 1798, when the Patriarchate set up its own printing establishment in Istanbul.[125]

The absence of printing establishments was probably the factor that pushed

---

[121] Hadjikyriacou, "Cyprus in the Eighteenth-century", 134.
[122] Yasemin Gencer, "İbrahim Müteferrika and the age of Printed Manuscript," in *The Islamic Manuscript Tradition*, ed. Christiane Gruber (Indianapolis: Bloomington, 2010), 155.
[123] See Kathryn A. Schwartz, "Did Ottoman Sultans Ban Print?," *Book History* 20 (2017): 1–39.
[124] Gencer, "İbrahim Müteferrika," 155.
[125] Concerning the printing establishment of the Patriarchate, see Giorgos Mpokos, *Τα πρώτα Ελληνικά Τυπογραφεία στο χώρο της "Καθ' ημάς Ανατολής" (1627–1827)* (Αθήνα: Ελληνικό Λογοτεχνικό και Ιστορικό Αρχείο, 1997), 201–263.

people interested in printing books to Venice, a city that by the eighteenth-century had not only a long tradition in typography but also printing houses owned by Greeks, surely a decisive factor especially for religious circles.

Printing in Venice had become well established since its beginnings in the sixteenth-century. The printers were liable to strict regulations and under the supervision of the *Riformatori dello Studio di Padova*, founded in 1516 as autonomous administrative body. This body was responsible for monitoring the printers in order to maintain high standards.[126] In fact, the printers promoted their jobs by advertising those high standards, based mainly on the use of good-quality types.[127]

Greek printing in Venice during the eighteenth-century was dominated by two printing houses, those of Nikolaos Glykis, a merchant from Greece, and Antonio Bortoli, an Italian who bought a printing house also belonging to a Greek merchant. These two printing houses printed the great majority of eighteenth-century Karamanlidika books and almost all the sources used for this research.[128] Venice had the largest Greek population in the West for over 400 years, and subsequently, aided by the long tradition Venice had in printing, the first Greek printing houses were founded. The demands from the Anatolians for liturgical books was such that it constituted the mainstay of Greek printing in Venice. Add this to the fact that the Ottoman authorities neither objected to the importation of religious materials,[129] nor created obstacles to travelling in a westerly direction, and an important business advantage was created.[130]

Nikolaos Glykis wanted to expand his business, so he bought the printing house

---

[126] The Greek printers seem to have enjoyed exceptions in quality controls due to the difficulty of finding and employing correctors for Greek language. Aikaterini Koumarianou, Loukia Droulia, and Evro Layton, *Το Ελληνικό Βιβλίο 1476–1830* (Αθήνα: Εθνική Τράπεζα της Ελλάδος, 1986), 72–73. Of course, these exceptions cannot be completely disassociated from the fact that Venice was the main place for printing in Greek, a quite profitable industry.

[127] Yorgos Veloudes, *Το ελληνικό τυπογραφείο των Γλυκήδων στη Βενετία 1670–1854, συμβολή στη μελέτη του ελληνικού βιβλίου κατά την Τουρκοκρατία* (Αθήνα: Μπούρας, 1987), 43.

[128] Apart from one printed in Leipzig in 1758 for reasons I will mention below.

[129] Staikos, K.P, *Εκδοτικά Τυπογραφικά σήματα των βιβλίων του Ελληνικού κόσμου (1494–1821)* (Εκδόσεις Ατων, 2009), xix.

[130] Murre-van den Berg, *Scribes and Scriptures,* 30.

of Orsino Alibrizzi in 1670 and, along with the equipment, he inherited the copyrights for certain books.[131] His main rival was another Greek merchant, Nikolaos Saros,[132] who in 1707 sold his operation to Girolamo Bortoli, son of Antonio,[133] thus starting a story of rivalry that lasted over 80 years.

In 1712, Bortoli bought the printing house of the Italian Fransesco Juliani, aiming to become the only printer of Greek materials.[134] The copyrights of the religious titles were the main cause of the two printers' rivalry, since for a number of reasons those copyrights were somewhat of a Holy Grail. Whoever had the copyrights had also the rights of economic exploitation for a number of years, often decades, thus creating a kind of monopoly.[135] The Greek religious titles were, at that time, a sure success since Christians (mainly those under Ottoman rule) wanted to have a religious book in their possession even if they did not know how to read it.[136] The best sellers among the religious books, like the Psalterion or the various Anthologies (i.e. *Apanthismata,* which were collections of important religious texts like theology, gospel parts, prayers, hymns, commentary), had guaranteed absorption even for big print runs of 1000 or 2000 copies,[137] undeniably a huge lure for the printers in eighteenth-century Venice.[138] The Anthologies were based on the idea that their content was all a Christian needed to know,[139] and in eighteenth-century Asia Minor, when knowledge of faith was declining and education was at a low level, this was a sold-out product, even

---

131 Concerning Glykis printing house see Koumarianou, Droulia and Layton, "Το Ελληνικό βιβλίο," 135–157; and Veloudes, *Το ελληνικό τυπογραφείο των Γλυκήδων*.
132 Regarding the printing house of Nikolaos Saros, see Koumarianou, Droulia and Layton, "Το Ελληνικό βιβλίο," 157–158.
133 Regarding the printing house of Antonio broccoli, see Koumarianou, Droulia and Layton, "Το Ελληνικό βιβλίο," 158–160.
134 Veloudes, *Το ελληνικό τυπογραφείο των Γλυκήδων,* 31. See also Staikos, *Εκδοτικά Τυπογραφικά σήματα,* xvi.
135 For the issue of monopoly in Venice, see Koumarianou, Droulia and Layton, "Το Ελληνικό βιβλίο," 73–94.
136 Koumarianou, Droulia and Layton, "Το Ελληνικό βιβλίο," 76.
137 *Ibid*, 76, 92, 201, 206–207. Also, see Veloudes, *Το ελληνικό τυπογραφείο των Γλυκήδων,* 99–103.
138 Concerning the rivalry of the two printers over the copyrights, see Veloudes, *Το ελληνικό τυπογραφείο των Γλυκήδων*, 32–33.
139 Pinelopi Stathi, "Και παλι τα καραμανλίδικα ως μέσο έκφρασης των Μικρασιατών Ορθοδόξων. Δύο χειρόγραφα του 18ου αιώνα," in *Εξερευνήσεις στα χειρόγραφα της Γεννάδειου Βιβλιοθήκης,* eds. Μαρία Λ. Πολίτη, Ελένη Παππά (Princeton: New Jersey, 2011), 88.

though the reason was often simply to keep it at home like a proof of faith.

The rivalry ended in 1788, when the Bortoli printing house closed. The decline of the printing house had begun in 1774, when the grandson of Antonio Bortoli, Fransesco, died, after dominating the field for around 25 years. The Glykis printing house took over again, as it had in the first half of the century.[140]

Printing a book in Venice

The printing of a book needed, first of all, money. Finding the financial means for an edition was not an easy task if the book was not one of the bestselling religious books. If that was the case, the printers often bore the cost, an action they advertised on the front of the book as a financial sacrifice. The truth is that this was an idealisation of an action that eventually profited the financier. The second route was that funding came from another organisation like monasteries, guilds or groups of different types, and a third one was that the cost had to be covered by the writer of the book.[141] Covering the printing cost through subscriptions was a further option, an innovation of the Bortoli printing house.[142] The initiative could come from the writer himself, the printer or an organised group. Again, this was no easy task because, to cover the printing costs of a book, at least 300 subscribers were needed, as this was a time in which books were not cheap. Indicative of this situation is the fact that Glykis was asking for two-thirds of the general cost in advance before undertaking any job.[143] Nevertheless, groups like monasteries commonly used to buy a large number of copies in order to allocate them as they wished.[144]

---

[140] For a yearly list of Greek book production and printers in Venice for the years 1670–1854, see Veloudes, *Το ελληνικό τυπογραφείο των Γλυκήδων,* 133–138.
[141] *Ibid*, 104–106. It was also possible for the writer to achieve the printing of his book according to his wishes after a private deal with the printer, see Veloudes *Το ελληνικό τυπογραφείο των Γλυκήδων,* 67. See also Sklavenites, Triantafyllos E, "Ανθολόγια και συνθετικές εκδόσεις λειτουργικού βιβλίων (16ος-19ος αιώνας)," in *Το έντυπο ελληνικό βιβλίο 15ος-19ος αιώνας*, Πρακτικά Διεθνούς Συνεδρίου Δελφοί 16–20 Μαΐου 2001, eds. Λουκία Δρούλια, Γιάννης Κόκκωνας, Τριαντάφυλλος Σκλαβενίτης, Κωνσταντίνος Στάικος (Αθήνα: Κότινος, 2004), 181.
[142] Koumarianou, Droulia and Layton, "Το Ελληνικό βιβλίο," 206.
[143] Stylianos Perdikis, *Η Μονή Κύκκου, ο Αρχιμανδρίτης Κυπριανός και ο Τυπογράφος Μιχαήλ Γλυκής*, Πηγαί και Μελέται Ιεράς Μονής Κύκκου 1, (Λευκωσία, 1989), 50.
[144] For the financial support of printing in Venice, see Veloudes *Το ελληνικό τυπογραφείο των Γλυκήδων,* 106–114.

When the financial issues were settled the book would receive a permit from the *Riformatori dello Studio di Padova* and proceed to printing after one month at the latest, but this timetable was often subject to the interest of the printer, specifically if he had reasons to finish the printing earlier. If the book was a best-selling title, the printers often started to print the book before they received the permit but if the print run was not for a best-seller, the printer might start long after the one-month allowance. The printing of a book needed to take one to three months in order to be financially affordable since books that took longer than three months to print became too expensive. After printing was concluded, copies of the book had to be submitted to public libraries and the title was added to the register of the printers' guild.[145]

0.5. History of research (status quaestionis)

Taking as starting point and main subject the eighteenth-century Turkophone cleric Serapheim, the present thesis will attempt to analyse the language used in his Karamanlidika books. The method will comprise a linguistic analysis that will include phonetics, phonology, morphology, and word order based on translation techniques. A sociolinguistic perspective will be employed in order to connect Serapheim's life with linguistic findings but also in an effort to interpret the cause, strategy and impact of this material. Therefore, this research is primarily concerned with what is known as transcription texts, and more precisely Karamanlidika. Strictly speaking, Karamanlidika is a graphic phenomenon of the Ottoman language, so we are dealing with Turkish linguistics and cultural history. Yet the people who used these texts were Christian Orthodox and the sources used here are religious texts only, therefore the relation between language and religion will be examined in terms of religious texts. My intention is to address cultural issues surrounding Karamanlidika and matters of Turkish linguistics, which will be analysed further in the following chapters along with the historical background needed to explain specific findings.

0.5.1. Karamanlidika history and printing

[145] See Veloudes, *Το ελληνικό τυπογραφείο των Γλυκήδων,* 76–79.

The majority of studies that have been carried out up to today on Karamanlidika are mainly concerned with the history of the Turkophone Orthodox community and of book history. The most important work is the compilation of the Karamanlidika bibliography, the six-volume work by Salaville & Dalleggio (1958, 1966, 1974) and Evangelia Balta (1987a, 1987b, 1997a). The latter scholar has published numerous articles concerning Karamanlidika printing and history. The articles examine how the Turkophone Orthodox people of Anatolia described themselves in terms of ethnic identity in the introductions of their books (Balta 1987c), book history and press (Balta 1997b, 2005, 2009; Balta 1988, 2010b) and general articles about Karamanlidika (Balta 2000), just to mention some of the topics. Evangelia Balta has also published several books on Karamanlidika (Balta 2010a, 2011, 2013). Balta's research, which is largely based on archival sources and primary material (and Salaville & Dalleggio, concerning the Karamanlidika bibliography), is focused on the preservation of this culture and provides grounds for further research.

Another scholar engaged in the field of Karamanlidika history and printing is Richard Clogg, with studies concerning the Karamanlidika publications of the BFBS (Clogg 1968) and their Bible translations (Clogg 2011), and articles about the history of the Turkophone Orthodox of Anatolia (Clogg 1982, 1996, 1999).

In the same field but taking a more cultural perspective are the articles published by Robert Anhegger (Anhegger 1979–1980, 1983, 1988, 1991), who also transcribed a Karamanlidika book into Modern Standard Turkish (Anhegger & Günyol 1986).

The field of Karamanlidika studies in general displays a newly developed interest, with three international workshops organised the last ten years. The First International Conference on Karamanlidika, was held in Cyprus in September 2008.[146] The workshop Between Religion and Language was held in Istanbul in June 2010. There, presentations on Karamanlidika Armeno-Turkish, Hebrew-

[146] The proceedings of the conference have been published, see Evangelia Balta and Matthias Kappler, eds, *Cries and Whispers in Karamanlidika Books: Proceedings of the First International Conference of Karamanlidika Studies. Nicosia 11-13.09.2008* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2010).

Turkish and Aljiamiado texts were given,[147] and in November 2013 the Third International Workshop of Karamanlidika Studies was organised by Evangelia Balta and Mehmet Ölmez in Uçhisar Cappadocia.[148] In all three conferences the various contributions illustrated the groundwork that still needs to be done in the field but also the need for methods that will associate Karamanlidika with the various similar phenomena and that will make them accessible to a wider audience.

0.5.2. Karamanlidika linguistics

As mentioned above, most studies on Karamanlidika focus on history, and book history in particular. Linguistic studies on Karamanlidika, however, are scarce and this remains a neglected field.[149] The articles by János Eckmann published around 1950 (Eckmann 1950a, 1950b, 1951, 1953, 1958, 1964) and the comments by Mollova, criticising Eckmann's argumentation of a Karamanli language (Mollova 1979–1980), form a useful starting point for the study of the dialectology of these texts. Eckmann's work formed the basis of a 1974 PhD dissertation by Michael Miller on the writing system of Karamanlidika. As noted by Kappler, this attempt to portray the Karamanlidika varieties of Turkish as a separate language (based on Eckmann's publications) takes the issue of Karamanlidika's distinct characteristics to absurd dimensions.[150] During the second half of the twentieth-century nothing else was published on the linguistic aspects, but the opinion that Karamanlidika was a kind of "language" of its own has been maintained in non-linguistic publications (e.g. Tekin 1984: 181, Kut 1987: 342) though no else has tried to provide a basis for this classification. Robert Anhegger in 1980 led the Karamanlidika discussion back to what it should be – to a discussion about a graphical-cultural phenomenon (Anhegger 1979–1980: 167).

Further linguistic publications appeared as late as the beginning of the 21st

---

[147] The proceedings of the workshop have been published; see Evangelia Balta and Mehmet Ölmez, eds, *Between Religion and Language: Turkish-Speaking Christians, Jews and Greek-Speaking Muslims and Catholics in the Ottoman Empire* (Istanbul: Eren, 2011).
[148] The proceedings of the workshop have been published; see Evangelia Balta, ed, *Cultural Encounters in the Turkish-Speaking Communities of the Late Ottoman Empire* (Istanbul: Isis Press, 2014).
[149] Kappler "Toward a Linguistic Approach," 662.
[150] Cf. the critical remarks remarks by Kappler "Toward a Linguistic Approach," 660.

century, with studies by Kappler on the Karamanlidika musical anthologies (Kappler 2002), on "graphematics" (Kappler 2003), namely dealing solely with the alphabet (graphemes) used in Karamanlidika sources without associating further with phonetics or phonology, on the linguistic aspects of Karamanlidika (Kappler 2006), on how the terms applied to Karamanlidika were used (Kappler 2016) and by Brendemoen (2016) regarding the value of Karamanlidika as a source for spoken Turkish in eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The collective conference volume Balta & Kappler 2010, where the proceedings of the First International Conference on Karamanlidika were published, includes two articles on linguistic matters, one linguistic analysis of a Karamanlidika codex by Brendemoen (Brendemoen 2010), one on the transcription issues of Karamanlidika by Eftychios Gavriel (Gavriel 2010a). Balta and Ölmez (2011), containing the proceedings of the workshop Between Religion and Language, does not include any linguistic presentations on Karamanlidika, but Balta (2014), which published the proceedings of the Third International Workshop of Karamanlidika Studies and some additional studies, includes three of them – one by Matthias Kappler concerning the relation of a Turkish grammar book to Karamanlidika (Kappler 2014), one by the author of the present work concerning the sociolinguistic aspects of the Karamanlidika periodical *Αγγελιαφόρος Τζοτζουκλάρ ιτζούν* (Irakleous 2014), and one by Oxana Efrosinia Trandafilova-Louka (2014) about the relation of Karamanlidika and Gagauz publications from the linguistic perspective.

0.5.3. Serapheim Attaliates

The history of research regarding Serapheim includes works on his life, his publications and published primary sources. The first information about Serapheim's life was published by Danieloglou (Danieloglou 1865), which forms the first extensive biography of Serapheim. Serapheim was highly esteemed within the Turkophone Christian community, since his various editions and re-editions of books and his restless life and actions played a significant role in the development of the community. The information given in Danieloglou's work is partly reproduced by others (cf. Sathas 1868: 515–516, Dimitrakopoulos 1872: 189) but the dates mentioned are not always in accordance from one source to another, since

none of the aforementioned reference provided primary sources. After a chapter in a publication in Cyprus about Greek letters in Cyprus (Filippou 1930), the next biographical article comes as late as 1987 (Papacharalambous 1987). In this contribution we find the false claim that Serapheim was of Cypriot origin, based on his name Pissidios, arguing that it comes from a rural region in Cyprus.[151] Serapheim himself mentions in the introduction of one of his books (IPK1753:6) the fact he was born in Anatolia.[152] After 2000, we have three publications containing biographical information (see Stathi 2004, Theocharides 2010b, Kokkinoftas 2011, 131–143) with the latter being most thorough work published until today.

Serapheim's publications were also a subject of research from time to time but a full list of his publications has never been presented, since researchers chose to present only Greek publications or only Karamanlidika, while others cite only some examples. Examples in Greek and Karamanlidika can be found in Sathas 1868, Filippou 1930, Theocharides 2010b (complete for Karamanlidika), while a full list of Karamanlidika publications can be also found in Gavriel 2001, Stathi 2004. The only attempt to utilise every Serapheim publication was by Kitromilides (2002, 246–250).

In the field of published primary sources, we see Deligiannis (1927) and Theocharides (2010b) publishing the very few existing (or found) samples of Serapheim's personal correspondence. In 1996 two ecclesiastical hymns devoted to the Virgin Mary and written by Serapheim were published by Hadjisolomos. Recently a Karamanlidika document that was prepared by Serapheim and used for fundraising by the monastery of Kykkos was published by the author of the present study (Irakleous 2015).

None of the aforementioned works adds to the linguistic study of Serapheim's language or to the sociolinguistic contextualisation of his works, a task that the

---

[151] This false claim is reproduced in Solon Hadjisolomos, "Δύο άγνωστοι ύμνοι του 18ου αι. προς τιμήν της Παναγίας του Κύκκου" in *Επετηρίδα Κέντρου Μελετών Ιεράς Μονής Κύκκου* (Λευκωσία: Κέντρο Μελετών Ιεράς Μονής Κύκκου, 1996) as well.

[152] See also Eckmann "Anadolu Karamanlı Ağızlarına," 165–200, Loizos Filippou *Τα ελληνικά γράμματα εν Κύπρω κατά την περίοδο της Τουρκοκρατίας (1571–1878)* (Λευκωσία, 1930), 121–125; Gavriel, "Οι προλόγοι της Καραμανλίδικης και της Ελληνικής έκδοσης," 380.

present research will focus on.

0.6. The present study

As mentioned earlier, the present study consists of three parts, Serapheim's life and work, a linguistic analysis of his books in terms of graphematics, phonetics, phonology and analysis on morphology, vocabulary and translation techniques. In all three a sociolinguistic interpretation of the policies that governed these books will be attempted.

For the first objective, a re-evaluation of previous works regarding Serapheim and his activities will be conducted, while further research on primary sources and examination of the content of the books is expected to bring new information to light. The information about Serapheim's life and work that one can find in previous works is based mainly on secondary sources, with his books, and their introductions especially, remaining still unexploited.

For the discourse of linguistic analysis, the phonology and the morphology of Serapheim's books will be studied in order to address dialectical issues and the diachronic development of Turkish. Since Serapheim originated from the south-western provinces of Asia Minor and given the fact that the eighteenth-century Karamanlidika editions preserve aspects of oral speech (Brendemoen 2016), the language is very likely to be similar to the Anatolian dialects analysed by Korkmaz (1956, 1977) and Karahan (1996). The analysis and comparison will more precisely place Serapheim's language on the dialectal map of the region, comparing it both with MST and perhaps modern developments of Turkish.[153]

Regarding vocabulary and translations techniques, an effort will be made to describe the form and extent of Greek influence on the language based on passages that occur both in Greek and Turkish. With the main corpus consisting mostly of translations from Greek liturgical books there may thus be a more pronounced influence from Greek. It was proven before that especially in the translations of books of religious character, i.e. dogmatic or doctrinal texts, the effort made for the best possible accuracy results in cases where the outcome is a word order that

[153] Johanson, "The History of Turkic," 108.

seems "unnatural" in the target language.[154] Previous research suggested that Serapheim's writing contained both (Turkish) dialectal influence and influences from Greek.[155] Concerning vocabulary, through the utilisation of Serapheim's texts and the comparison to other works on the religious vocabulary of Karamanlidika books, such Luffin (2010) and Strauss (2014), an effort will be made to trace the intentions, techniques and traditions that provided the religious vocabulary.

The third objective, the sociolinguistic analysis, will focus on the relation between language and religion in terms of who is writing books and for whom they are destined. This analysis' main focus will be the language of the rituals described in Serapheim's books. The utilisation of the phonology and morphology will enable us to position the language of the books in the dialectal map of Turkish but also to the diachronic developments of language. Possible differentiations in the language, namely the use of archaisms or older forms words especially in the parts where rituals are described, might point to direction certain ideologies regarding language, and especially the on eased in religious environments.

In the sociolinguistic analysis we will try to explore, through re-interpreting previous findings, whether Serapheim tried to give an "aura of sacredness"[156] to his texts and employ a variety of language destined to serve for religious purposes. This will be done by investigating the history of Serapheim's role as a cleric, the translation techniques and the role of printing. Also of importance is his ideology and beliefs regarding his community, his intentions when producing and publishing these texts,[157] and the community's linguistic situation, as this information can be gleaned from the introductions (prologues) of his books. The main reasoning

---

[154] Karl H. Menges, *The Turkic Languages and Peoples. An Introduction to Turkic Studies* (Harrassowitz: Wiesbaden 1995), 182. See also Murre-van den Berg, *From a Spoken to a Written language*, on the case of Urmia Aramaic, where the translations carry elements of the target languages Classical Syriac or Hebrew and the syntax remains unchanged.

[155] Kappler, "Note a proposito."

[156] Term as described by Charles Ferguson, "Religious Factors in Language Spread," in *Language Spread, studies in Diffusion and Social change*, ed. Leon R. Cooper (Indiana: Bloominghton, 1982), 96–97.

[157] As has been pointed out before, the social and educational background of each author is of crucial importance in studying Karamanlidika; see Anhegger, "Hurunfumuz Yunanca," 189; Anhegger, "On transcribing Ottoman texts," 12-14; Kappler, "Note a proposito," 332; Gavriel, "Transcription Problems of Karamanlidika Texts," 259. The social and educational background affects many of the non-structural factors of language contact, see Weinreich, *Languages in Contact*, 5.

provided in the prologues for producing those books was the intellectual decay of Anatolian Christians, but was this really the case, or was the decay something interpreted as such by religious circles? Finally, a number of non-structural factors as described by Weinreich (1970) must be taken into consideration, but also other sociolinguistic factors like the "social values" Weinreich describes, for example. An interlocutor, in this case Serapheim, might use loanwords from Greek as means of displaying the social status of Greek over Turkish, considering Greek to be more prestigious since it is the language of Orthodox Christianity.[158] On the basis of these results, an attempt will be made to characterise Serapheim's work within the theme of language and religion.

0.6.1. Major question and hypothesis

Serapheim Attaliates' life and work are worth further study. Serapheim was an eighteenth-century bishop and monk who served in Asia Minor and Cyprus, and who was in charge as translator or editor of a very substantial part of the Karamanlidika production of religious books in the eighteenth-century. The published works so far, presented in 0.1.3., provide an overview of his life and work. However, Serapheim's writings warrant more detailed research, not only for the printing aspect but also for the linguistic characteristics of his writing. These include the dialectal features of his language and syntax structures other than standard or dialectal ones, that are probably a result of Greek influence.

The major question of this thesis, therefore, is what do Serapheim's works tell us about the form and function of Karamanlidika in the Anatolian context, about its connection to the Turkish Anatolian dialects and about the wider historical and cultural context of the Christian Turkophone Orthodox of the region? The main hypothesis is that Serapheim's works might reflect a conscious use of the everyday speech in the Anatolian Turkish dialect of the south-western region in the eighteenth-century rather than the ornate Ottoman Turkish language used by the elite. As will be discussed later on, Serapheim travelled around most of his life, so it is possible that the analysis might reveal linguistic elements from other areas as well. Furthermore, with the books being translated from Greek and being of a

[158] Weinreich, *Languages in Contact*, 59.

religious nature, they are expected to illustrate Greek elements at various levels and use techniques connected to the translation of religious material. By studying these sources, one can reconstruct, at a certain level, people's vernacular, which is always very different from written language. The use of vernacular was a way to propagate Christian morals and ideas in a period in which, according to the clergy, most of the lay people were uneducated and therefore "losing track of their faith".[159] Furthermore it is possible that the "vernacular technique" is inverted when citing prayers or the procedure of rituals, by introducing archaisms, neologisms and terms that would be difficult to use outside religious environment.

0.7. Theoretical and methodological approaches

0.7.1. Karamanlidika studies

It is important that Serapheim's literary production is studied as a whole, as a valuable contribution to the cultural history of the Turkophone Orthodox Christians of the period. Although this is primarily a piece of linguistic research, one should keep in mind that Karamanlidika is a practical means of communication and a multilateral phenomenon, so many other aspects should be taken into consideration. The people who used Karamanlidika in many respects can be seen as a "syncretic" community"[160] that wrote Turkish with the Greek alphabet. This Turkish language, in turn, displayed several varieties as well as influence from other languages.[161] In order to understand and delve fully into Karamanlidika, one

[159] Stathi, "Τα τουρκογραίκικα βιβλία," 337.
[160] Regarding Karamanlidika and syncretism see Matthias Kappler, "«Le nostre lettere sono greche, ma parliamo il turco» 'Karamanlidika' e altri casi di sincretismo grafico in ambiente ottomano," in *Contatti di lingue - Contatti di Scritture,* eds. Daniele Baglioni & Olga Tribulato, Edizioni Ca'Foscari, Venice 2015, 219-238. The term means "combining." Syncretism is used primarily in the context of religion as the attempt to put together contrary beliefs, often using practices of various schools of thought. Syncretism may involve attempts to merge several originally discrete traditions; see Charles Stewart and Rosalind Shaw, "Introduction: problematizing syncretism," in *Syncretism/Anti-Syncretism: The Politics of Religious Synthesis* eds. Charles Stewart and Rosalind Shaw (London and New York: Routledge, 1994), 1. Syncretism also poses historical questions concerning roots, cultural contacts and received influences; see Charles Stewart, "Syncretism as a dimension of nationalist discourse in modern Greece" in *Syncretism/Anti-Syncretism: The Politics of Religious Synthesis* eds. Charles Stewart and Rosalind Shaw (London and New York: Routledge, 1994), 128. Here, its use is extended to a cultural linguistic phenomenon.
[161] Kappler, "Toward a Linguistic Approach," 667.

cannot "detach the phenomenon from cultural history, since writing always implies a number of symbolic values that can be only understood in a historical context".[162]

As to the linguistic study, I take Matthias Kappler's dictum as a starting point, saying that linguistic research based on Karamanlidika texts[163] should deal with texts of one group[164] or books with common features, or with several editions of the same book,[165] because what we identify as Karamanlidika is a very heterogeneous corpus of texts. Therefore, linguistic research that does not distinguish between the different genres and sub-corpora within the larger corpus of Karamanlidika texts could lead to false and misleading conclusions.[166] Research on the full range of Karamanlidika material could be carried out only on graphematics, and one piece of research has already been carried out on a small part of it.[167]

The choice of Serapheim as the main focus restricts the main corpus to texts of one group and also makes it easier to study the educational and social background of the author. In this way, the cultural context will be in association with the linguistic research and might provide answers to questions that cannot be answered in solely with linguistic themes. Furthermore, Serapheim was responsible for the majority of Karamanlidika books published in the eighteenth-century, twelve titles out twenty in total. Almost all of this century Karamanlidika publications

---

[162] Kappler, "Transcription text, regraphization, variety?" The aforementioned applies not only to Karamanlidika but to all the phenomena that fit this category. Similar ascertainments were made for the study of the development of literary Urmia Aramaic: "The study of a literary language needs a description of the language itself, to understand the developments and variations the historical context is indispensable. The interaction between historical and linguistic developments becomes visible only in a study that takes into account both aspects." See Murre-van den Berg, *From a Spoken to a Written language,* 7–8.

[163] The need for systematic research was already expressed by Anhegger, "Hurufumuz Yunanca," 188–189.

[164] e.g, Kappler, *Türkischsprachige Liebeslyrik*, on the Karamanlidika musical anthologies of the nineteenth-century.

[165] e.g, Gavriel, "Transcription Problems of Karamanlidika Texts"; Irakleous, "On the development of Karamanlidika writing systems." Gavriel compared several editions of a religious book in order to discover an acceptable solution to the problem of the transcription of Karamanlidika. In an earlier article I studied the development of Karamanlidika writing systems through the comparison of four editions of a religious book.

[166] Kappler "Toward a Linguistic Approach," 666.

[167] Kappler, "Note a proposito," compared certain graphemes from various Karamanlidika books from different contexts and argued in favour of the graphematic influence from Greek script.

(Serapheims plus others) were of religious content (see NAC: 249-250), something that makes Serapheim a perfect case study for eighteenth-century Karamanlidika.

The aim of this research is to further explore, describe and analyse Serapheim's language through a research on dialectology, which will contribute to the historical and linguistic study of Karamanlidika in general and the eighteenth-century developments in particular. It is expected that the study of this substantial corpus of books will help understanding of the linguistic phenomena in his writings and will possibly provide information on the relation of Serapheim's writings to techniques connected with religious language. Additionally, the linguistic part will add to our knowledge of the linguistic varieties of Karamanlidika and will be another step in developing the field.

The main goal of this research is the thorough study of Serapheim's work from the linguistic and sociolinguistic aspect. Starting with introductory chapters on Karamanlidika and Serapheim, proceeding with the in-depth linguistic analysis of his writings and following this with an examination of the sociolinguistic aspects, an attempt will then be made to characterise him through his work in the conclusion.

The great complexity of Karamanlidika and the multifaceted nature of these publications is another reason this research project proposes to focus on the study of Serapheim's works alone, rather than undertake a wider comparison of texts from a variety of regions, authors and periods. While such a wider comparison is a desideratum for the future, such a comparison can only be done on the basis of a better knowledge of local and personal varieties. Moreover, the project will restrict itself to those publications by Serapheim that he supervised himself (rather than including the many republications and re-editions of later times); that is, 12 books from the period 1753–1783. The selected sources will be studied as a whole, examining graphematics, phonology, morphology and translation techniques and religious vocabulary.

0.7.2. Towards a sociolinguistic approach

Apart from the structural linguistic approach that will be used to analyse the language of the Serapheim's books, an attempt will be made to also interpret the findings from a sociolinguistic perspective. This will be done by examining the relation between religion and language, and especially the language of ritual. When dealing with eighteenth-century Karamanlidika, it is very important to take into consideration the forces that drove people to write and publish religious books – the first ever made in Karamanlidika – and also the way or ways they used language. Keeping this in mind, we could form the hypothesis that the language of the books and their use in everyday life, for religious but also for schooling purposes, might have affected people's vernacular in the long term. Elements from the language of the books, such as words from the ecclesiastical register or formulaic utterances, might have become part of everyday language. Since we are dealing with a tradition that met extinction in its printed form, it would be possible to trace such influence in personal notes, correspondence and other instances of informal writing.

In contrast to other worded forms of language use, such as poetry or ceremonial speech, there is no set of pragmatic features than can be defined as religious. The different religious practices seem to make use of the entire spectrum of linguistic possibilities according to the circumstances,[168] being closely linked to assumptions about human subjects and divine beings and their different capacities, and at the same time facing chronic dilemmas that derive, among others, from verbal practices and their concrete nature.[169] Although we cannot define a direct or simple relationship between language and religion, religious factors played a significant role in the process of diachronic language spread in many ways.[170] The absence of concrete boundaries causes language to affect and be affected by many factors, and a mutual influence between religions and language policies cannot be denied, since religious institutions do have language policies that have a wider influence on society. Religion was and still is a social force we cannot dismiss, taking into

[168] Webb Keane, "Religious Language," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 26 (1997): 49.
[169] *Ibid*, 49.
[170] Ferguson, "Religious Factors in Language Spread," 105

account that for its members in most cases, religion is the first social structure they come into contact with outside the family in terms of language use.[171] The participation in the public sphere of worship and religion, although open to everyone, with no regard to sex, age or social status, included (as we will see later on) a hierarchy of positions and strict notations that denoted social realities and stratifications.[172] In this way religions tend to form normative communities that define people in terms of practices and language. Just like social attitudes on dialects and accents where certain ideologies attribute power or prestige, in religion various configurations act as norm enforcement for religious varieties, symbolic of social identity.[173]

It is undeniable that several religions preserve an earlier version of language for public ceremonies; even when the sacred texts are available in translation (or the vernacular), an overwhelming attachment to the original is proclaimed.[174] In the case of Judaism, the decision to maintain the original Hebrew language of Jewish sacred texts led gradually to the development of a particular kind of sacred literacy.[175] A religion tied to the use of a holy book, that uses a certain form of language that might differ from the vernacular, and that is also written in the "traditional" writing system, is very likely to enforce the spread of written forms of language as well,[176] depending always on the group, author and final user.

This is quite reasonable when taking into consideration that society required its members, in the past, as much as today, to be familiar with the register associated with specialised language uses in different situations and domains. Nevertheless, as will be discussed later on, basic language proficiency has nothing to do with these specialised uses, and various opinions expressed by members of the clergy regarding intellectual decline and ignorance on language, were referring to the unfamiliarity of lay people with religious language and practices. With the

---

[171] Bernard Spolsky, "Jewish Religious Multilingualism" in *The Sociology of Language and religion: Change, Conflict and Accommodation*, ed. Tope Omoniyi (Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 14.
[172] Sklavenites, "Ανθολόγια και συνθετικές εκδόσεις λειτουργικού βιβλίων,"193.
[173] William Downes, *Language and Religion, a Journey into the Human Mind* (Cambridge, 2011), 44.
[174] Bernard Spolsky, "Religion as a site of Language Contact," *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, Language Contact and Change* 23 (2003): 82.
[175] Spolsky, "Jewish Religious Multilingualism," 25.
[176] Ferguson, "Religious Factors in Language Spread," 105.

developments during eighteenth and nineteenth centuries concerning Karamanlidika that included the transition from manuscript to printed book, the massive allocation of copies and their use for schooling, it is very possible that people's culture and language underwent a serious shift in terms of language register, since the "ecclesiastical language" was used as the model for teaching. This might have affected the vernacular in terms of slowing down processes, or by switching to older forms of words.

In order to examine this, we need first to address various factors that affected language and its use throughout time, such as the scribes and their education and practices, the transition from manuscript to printed book, translation techniques and language ideologies.

Christianity before printing

As mentioned before, Christianity was originally based on oral tradition, although there always was a rather limited written aspect.[177] The reasons for this lie firstly in the nature of books, which were handwritten, hard to find and expensive, and secondly in the inability of lay people to read. It is striking how nowadays people consider the skills of reading and writing as datum, when this was not the case 100 or 200 years before, and in many parts of the world literacy levels are still very low. In the illiterate societies under discussion here, which resemble more those societies in the first years of Christianity, rather than those of today,[178] books were written in order to be read out loud. Public reading was a common practice (e.g. the public reading of orders or other official decisions) and a proof for that is the continuous script of older books (scripto continua), which highlights the oral character of books.[179] This practice had two major outcomes important for this chapter. Firstly, the books as products had no significance for lay people, and therefore had no immediate or private use. The books were expensive, scarce and

[177] Gamble, *A History of Early Christian texts*, 28–29. See also David Crystal, *Linguistics, Language and Religion*, Burns and Oates, 1965, 134.
[178] Murre-van den Berg, *Scribes and Scriptures*, 8.
[179] Gamble, *A History of Early Christian texts,* 203–204. In the case of texts in Greek, only capital letters were used, and this remained unchanged until 400 B.C. The lower-case letters were the development from the rapid writing of capital letters, which became more cursive over time. See Bowman, *Greek Printing Types in Britain,* 11.

literacy was not widespread. Secondly, in order for the book to be read and heard, people organised weekly meetings, and this probably constituted a general practice in Christianity.[180] With the medium of communication being oral, the distribution or dissemination of religious thought (and language) was highly dependent on techniques like memorisation and public recitation, leading to their reproduction and transmission, which finally resulted in their preservation, elaboration and wider dissemination.[181]

This helps illustrate the importance of the role of scribes in this procedure, namely the people responsible, among other things, for writing or copying those Christian books. Although their role as mediators of knowledge is much neglected in research,[182] they often had immense power and linguistic influence on the texts, which again reflected their knowledge and/or opinions in writing-related issues and more importantly, language use. The scribes' influence on books survived for centuries through the procedure of copying if a book was copied without any significant changes, and then reached an even wider audience with the invention of printing, when a book was printed in hundreds or thousands of copies. Scribes were most of the time members of the clergy. Their task was of crucial importance for the procedure, even though we cannot be absolutely certain about who had the final word on what would be included or omitted from a manuscript. What do we know is that in the East Syriac tradition they did not write whatever they wished and they followed instructions, but had the freedom to add or delete parts and to adjust the manuscripts to meet certain needs.[183] Nevertheless, the scribes' knowledge and abilities were decisive factors for the final outcome.[184]

The scribes

As suggested above, the scribes played a crucial role in the transmission of knowledge and language. As we will see later, as Serapheim was a cleric at the advent of Karamanlidika printing it is more than possible that he acted as and had

---

[180] Gamble, *A History of Early Christian texts*, 205.
[181] Downes, *Language and Religion,* 114.
[182] Murre-van den Berg, *Scribes and Scriptures,* 15.
[183] *Ibid*, 144.
[184] *Ibid*, 15.

the qualities of a scribe. Therefore, and in order to enable us to reconstruct or interpret Serapheim's actions and language, we need to delve more into the backgrounds of the scribes.

The people who acted as scribes had no specific training or level of knowledge, since these could vary or change from place to place and from one monastery to another. We do know that their role was multilateral, with multiple tasks, and that their duties could not be put into categories or deciphered completely. This is made even more complex when we are faced with the diversity of procedures relating to the Church, especially at the advent of printing, but what can be said for sure is that there is no typical scribe or manuscript, and both are governed by general rules[185]. These general rules give useful indications as to how to characterise someone as a scribe.

Often their role included duties of a bureaucratic and literary character and they received a certain type of education, the kind which was restricted and only available through private channels, like monasteries, and based on Christian liturgical text.[186] The methods for this kind of education are clearly defined in a codex of the 4th century produced in Egypt with assumed Coptic connections, where the procedure followed for anyone entering the community is described:

> Whoever enters the monastery uninstructed shall be taught first what he must observe; and when so taught he has consented to it all, they shall give him twenty psalms or two of the Apostles epistles or some part of the scripture. And if he is illiterate, he shall go at the first, third and sixth hours to someone who can teach and has been appointed for him. He shall stand before him and learn very studiously with all gratitude. Then the fundamentals of a syllable, the verb, and the noun shall be written for him, and even if he does not want to, he shall be compelled to read.[187]

The practice of copying texts or dictating what should be written to the scribes and the publication of texts through their reading in public that followed, and subsequently language learning mostly through speech, created a culture

---

[185] Elisabeth L. Eisenstein, *The Printing Revolution in early Modern Europe* (Cambridge 1993), 9.
[186] Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians of Letters,* 22, 54.
[187] as cited in Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians of Letters,* 96.

somewhere in between written and oral speech that has no counterpart today.[188] Following the implementation of schooling and the use of school handbooks, the language learned by children in their family environment underwent changes as they were taught the language in the handbook, since the language of these books was most of the time different from the vernacular, as these religious book were written long before. Nowadays, many other factors have entered the equation, like the Internet or social media, but in previous centuries the exposure to a different variety of language, one other than everyday interactions, took place only in public recitations of religious material.

Leaving aside manuscript formation we need to explore the scribes' role in this social universe. Their fundamental task was of course the preservation and transmission of the holy message, thus serving as the link between church and lay people. The manuscripts constituted the tool through which the clergy acted as the mediator of divine merit and grace, preserved and transferred knowledge, and ascribed and wielded power at different levels,[189] and, as is the focus for this research, in terms of language issues. As the majority of people were not clerics, and the ability to read and write was reserved for the few, there was a natural authority deriving from it which on many occasions had undertones of supernatural power.[190]

The majority of people are and always were very opinionated regarding language use, with one of the main and never-ending debates being the so-called right and wrong use of language. A group that always carried strong opinions about language was the Church. Scribes and priests who transmitted sacred writings seem to have set aside a special language destined for use in the performance of rituals.[191] On the other hand, lay people were often denounced for attributing magic or divine properties to words, or for using other words considered taboo, especially

---

[188] Eisenstein, *The Printing Revolution in early Modern Europe*, 7.
[189] Murre-van den Berg, *Scribes and Scriptures,* 18. About the three-way relationship between society, clergy and the God see William Downes, *Language and Religion,* 97. Regarding the privilege to write see Sheldon Pollock, *The Language of the Gods in the World of Men, Sanskrit, Culture, and Power in Premodern India* (University of California Press, 2006), 4.
[190] Crystal, *Linguistics, Language and Religion,* 118.
[191] *Ibid*, 118.

when they describe the deity, illness, death and sex.[192] This can also be seen on another level where unacceptable grammar and pronunciation is attributed to the lower social groups, and the "correct" version is only used by the elite groups, thus supporting their political powers.[193] The scribes (and anyone with a similar task or ideas) who, as already mentioned, safeguarded knowledge, felt keenly the need to pick just one from an ensemble of similar words and introduce it as the correct choice, even though any of those words could meet the needs of the document. These "language guardians" do not make explicit reference to the use of a difference language system, but their choices and comments are mainly focused on certain points of usage favouring one usage or form over another.[194] When the need for a synonym arises, it seems that the scribe goes for the one least used in everyday or other styles of language – the more unfamiliar it is, the more it raises the status of the language.[195] This incidental choice of words and structures becomes finally, through persistent implementation, the rule. Books are written to be read but this confines the reason for their reading into one purpose or context as the act of reading varies accordingly.[196] Books can be read for pleasure, can complement worship, and might be used as teaching handbooks or references when searching for answers. But for religion (and not only), especially in the time of the scribes and shortly thereafter, a corpus of texts could easily become an authoritarian mechanism representing public religious thoughts at various levels, transmitting them through space and time conveyed by the appropriate vehicle. Historic and standard languages were considered to have the appropriate features for being a vehicle for the Scriptures.[197]

Impact of the transition to printed book

In the age of manuscripts, books were overly expensive and rare, as creating them was a time-consuming process and not many people produced them. These facts

---

[192] James Milroy & Lesley Milroy, *Authority in Language, Investigating languages Prescription and Standardisation,* (London: Routledge, 1991), 12.
[193] Milroy & Milroy, *Authority in Language*, 2–3.
[194] *Ibid,* 16–17.
[195] Crystal, *Linguistics, Language and Religion,* 154.
[196] Gamble, *A History of Early Christian texts,* 203.
[197] Downes, *Language and Religion,* 114.

made books beyond the reach of but also useless for ordinary people, who did not know how to read them. As a result, books could be found only in rich people's private collections and in monasteries' libraries. This changed rapidly with the invention of printing, when production increased immensely and the cost was reduced. Around 1800, the cost of a book was about the same as a day's pay for one unskilled worker and something less than that of a craftsman's salary in the Ottoman Empire;[198] this was still expensive but could by no means be compared to the price of a manuscript. In order to apprehend how the book production quantities changed and the impact of the invention of printing, Eisenstein presents the following example: by the time someone born in 1453, the year of the fall of Constantinople, had reached the age of five years old, eight million books had already been printed. In other words, in that short period, more books had been produced than the total number of books made by scribes in Europe since the creation of Constantinople in 300 AD.[199] Printing resulted in the production of hundreds and even thousands of uniform books, that in their previous manuscript form were being produced in fewer numbers and that might have had differences from one copy to another. Books were reaching more buyers, since people (mostly Christians) who lived in Ottoman Empire were buying books even if they did not know how to read, as everyone wished to have a Christian book in their possession.[200]

The aforementioned culture located in between written and oral speech had already begun to change and the influence of printing on language was substantial: according to Steinberg, printing not only preserved and codified linguistic varieties but also in many cases even created them.[201]

What we identify as Karamanlidika is a literature largely based on translation. Original works do exist and we cannot ignore the private usage of the practice in

---

198 Veloudis, *Το ελληνικό τυπογραφείο των Γλυκήδων στη Βενετία 1670–1854,* 132.
199 Eisenstein, *The Printing Revolution in early Modern Europe*, 13.
200 Koumarianou, Droulia και Layton, *Το Ελληνικό Βιβλίο 1476–1830,* 76.
201 Eisenstein, *The Printing Revolution in early Modern Europe*, 81–82. Regarding the distribution of thoughts that are publicly communicated, William Downes mentions a situation that he refers to as the media phase of dissemination, where "thoughts are publicly made manifest to wide populations over long periods of time with new potentials for reflective elaboration." See Downes, *Language and Religion,* 113. The early printed book could fit this description although Downes refers to more recent events.

correspondence, diaries, etc., but the content of the majority of books printed in Karamanlidika and especially those printed in the eighteenth-century relies on originals in other languages. Therefore, a short introduction about the translation of religious books and its techniques is required, in order to enable us to comment on the language of these editions later on.

The translation techniques

The Old Testament comprises 39 books written in Hebrew with passages in Aramaic, while the Christian Bible with the New Testament includes these parts along with 27 books written in Common Greek (Hellenistic koiné). The translation of both the Old and the New Testament began very early, with the LXX (Septuagint) of the Old Testament, used by many Christians, the Vulgate (Latin) and the Peshitta (Syriac), consisting of thousands of book or passage translations, after the finalisation of the corpus of New Testament around 337 AD.[202] The invention of printing led to its translation and publication in major European languages such as German, English, French and Spanish. Translation activities were increasing steadily and bloomed during the nineteenth-century with the missionary efforts to translate and publish the Bible in "unknown languages", while the translations in European languages continued.[203] Nevertheless, although Christianity encouraged translations from the very beginning, it exhibited strong attachments to particular sacred languages like Latin[204] and Greek, something possibly rooted in the language ideologies that will be discussed later on.

The translation techniques had been codified long before, which makes it easier for us to understand the procedures followed by the translators in older periods. Even though every translator usually has a unique style or approach, the main issues when translating a book – for example, if a translation should follow the word to word pattern, or if the structure and other elements are adequately transferred to the translation language – remain very much the same. Furthermore, there are always questions regarding to what degree the translation could or should

[202] Lynell Zogbo, "Bible, Jewish and Christian," in *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, 2nd ed, eds. Baker M, and Saldanha G, (Routledge 2009), 21.
[203] *Ibid*, 21–22.
[204] Ferguson, "Religious Factors in Language Spread," 104.

follow the original text and still be comprehensible to the readers, and whether key words, or words of great religious importance, are faithfully rendered.[205]

Two major translation techniques (as described by Zogbo, 2009) are of importance for this research – the word to word translation, and the translation whose major task is to render the meaning but no other elements of the original text. The typical example of the first technique is considered to be the English translation of 1611 AD on behalf of King James (also known as King James' version). The equivalence to the original text constituted the first priority for the translators, who tried to retain the word order and the structure of the sentences. The outcome of this kind of translation could be incomprehensible or look awkward to the reader.

The second technique aims for the "core" of text, sentences and the meanings of words, with the primary goal being to transfer the meaning to the translation language. By prioritising the meaning instead of structure and thus translating periphrastically, translators achieve more comprehensible translations. Nevertheless, the translation technique is often defined by the final recipient, which is, the in the case of liturgy, the celebrants. As we shall see, the present research suggests that translators and those who finance them may have the power and the will to use the technique they would prefer, but it should still be understandable (at least part of it) to the celebrants. A group of people in need of a translation for celebrating the Mass and fulfilling other religious tasks seeks a translation with literary qualities and a poetic nature, characteristics attributed to the King James Bible. On the other hand, as Zogbo suggests, a group of people with low levels of literacy and needing to learn the practices of their religion might seek high-level language but would first need many things explained to them in a way they understand, such as a translation in the vernacular.[206]

Elements that are ascribed "sacredness"

When referring to the relation of language and religion, one of the first elements that seems connected is the alphabet in which the holy texts are written. This is

[205] Zogbo, "Bible, Jewish and Christian," 24.
[206] *Ibid*, 25–26.

very much the same as what Ferdinand De Saussure described as the prestige of writing. We take as a starting point the statement that written language's primary purpose is to render oral language. But the oral form tends to become overshadowed by the written one, with the latter being the first's image and finally appropriating the primary role in people's minds. In this way and under certain circumstances the written form of a language can delay the changes occurring in it, while at the same time the preservation of the oral language is not endangered by the absence of a written form. Therefore, language always has an oral tradition, which in its own way is very steady, just like the written form, but the prestige of writing is what prevents us from seeing it.

The prestige of writing, according to De Saussure, is based on four main principles. First, the graphic representation of words is preserved like something tangible that is meant to last over time, thus creating to the user of a language the impression that is easier to bond with written rather than oral language. Second, visual impressions of words are more understandable and can be remembered more easily than auditory impressions. In this way, writing trumps sound. Third, literary language, with its grammars, dictionaries and other books for teaching language, increases the value of writing in people's eyes. These types of books make writing part of a defined code, which is subjected to a very strict usage, and that is orthography. Orthography and its strict rules about how to write language gives to writing its major importance and prestige in people's mind. Fourth, when there is disagreement between language and orthography, it is always difficult to find a solution. In this case, the written form always has an advantage since it is more easily recognised than the auditory one.[207]

Adding to that, according to Ferguson the distribution of the major writing systems is very much the same as the distribution of major religions. The correlation of a writing system to a religion does not derive from any inherent relationship between the religious practices and the procedures of reading and writing but is rather an outcome of the spread of major religions to illiterate communities or to (semi) literate ones, and the simultaneous introduction of a new

---

[207] Ferdinand De Saussure, *Μαθήματα Γενικής Γλωσσολογίας*, trans. F.D. Apostolopoulou (Αθήνα: Εκδόσεις Παπαζήση, 1979), 56.

writing system.[208]

Every variety of language is sufficient for fulfilling the religious tasks of a community like ceremonies, prayers, etc. Nevertheless, most believers, when in a religious environment or referring to religious matters, tend to use a specific variety of language that differs from the vernacular or the standard variety. This, when used on other occasions, might seem formal or weird and could diverge from the vernacular in many aspects but mainly in vocabulary, thus creating a different register of words, and also in syntax and morphology, conferring for the interlocutors an "aura of sacredness".[209] According to Webb Keane, it is unusual for religious language not to have some elements of formality that denote its special character, although there is no rule about what those are and where the boundaries are. Depending on its needs, religion can include components from the entire linguistic code, such as phonology, morphology, syntax prosody and lexicon, in its religious discourse.[210] The same phenomenon is defined by David Crystal as "distinctiveness", and it is described as words and structures whose use is strictly confined to religious language (and environment) or extremely rare outside of it. Such occasions are the introductions or ends of prayers, and prayers as a whole, which again contain and maintain archaisms. In this way, the liturgical language creates a unique identity, distinguishable from other varieties.[211] Furthermore, when referring to a liturgical language one can observe formal stylistic features, e.g. complex sentences, specific enunciation and conservative stylistic forms, categorising religious languages as correct or formal, and a register comprised by archaisms and formulaic utterances, elements that are most probably the result of a traditional way of phrasing certain concepts. Adding to that, one can observe the tendency (or habit) of keeping unchanged formulaic utterance in scriptural texts, commonly known prayers or traditionally quoted phrases.[212]

Returning to Ferguson, he describes the aforementioned variety as the product of a procedure comprising three stages. First, the language of the text resembles the

---

[208] Ferguson, "Religious Factors in Language Spread," 95.
[209] *Ibid*, 96–97.
[210] Keane, "Religious Language," 52.
[211] David Crystal, "Liturgical Language in Sociolinguistic perspective," in *Language and the Worship of the Church* , eds. Jasper D, and R.C.D. (Basingstoke, 1990), 122–123.
[212] Crystal, *Linguistics, Language and Religion,* 153–154.

everyday language of the community. Second, as everyday language changes, the language of the sacred text remains the same and gains a specific religious aura. Third, as the religion spreads to other territories, the language of the texts functions as a sacred language for communities linguistically unrelated to the texts. Occasionally, a translated text achieves sacred language status, creating a new sacred language and later on spreading according to the same procedure. The effect of layering several sacred languages in similar religious contexts is very common among the world's major religions, reflecting among other things the spread every religion had. One example is the case of the Vulgate (Latin) translation and preservation of Latin as a religious language and also as the language of instruction, in areas with a related variety but also in distant places. While in Italy Latin was considered archaic, in places like Germany and Hungary it was totally different from the vernacular and was used for public worship,[213] and the relationship of religious context and language has resulted from social processes, anticipations as to the genre and language ideologies.[214]

Language ideologies and the role of the vernacular

Just like in the case of erecting official places of worship in order to gather believers in one place, as mentioned in 0.2.2., prescription in language depends on a set of beliefs which require, as in other aspects of life, that things ought to be done in the "right" way. This was also described previously as "religious normativity", namely that things are not only what they are, but what they should be.[215] The requirements are usually imposed from above, in this case by the clergy as they were the only literate ones, and whatever deviates from the prescribed norm is unacceptable and immediately noticed.[216]

The methods of instruction used by the clergy had as their primary task to instil the respect for age, authority and religion and to disseminate knowledge, while

---

213 Ferguson, "Religious Factors in Language Spread," 97–98.
214 Keane, "Religious Language," 63.
215 Downes, *Language and Religion,* 15.
216 Milroy & Milroy, *Authority in Language,* 1. Concerning the formal character of religious language, is often linked to local assumptions on how language works, see Keane, "Religious Language," 55.

divine punishments were also mentioned in order to provide the proper motivation.[217] But then the issue of language would come up as most people were illiterate, and language barriers existed within the clergy as well. Within the Christian Orthodox hierarchy in Palestine, the lower levels spoke Arabic and originated from the peasantry, while the people in higher ranks spoke Greek.[218] Most probably the situation in Asia Minor, in the remote areas where Turkophone Christians lived, the situation was the same, with priests speaking Turkish while the high churchmen in urban centres also spoke Greek, both colloquial and archaic. With the vast majority of people knowing almost nothing about religious law and doctrine, things needed to be explained to them in the most accessible language – Turkish – which led finally to the literisation of Turkish, at least for the community of the Turkophone Orthodox.[219]

At least from the late seventeenth-century, a significant shift towards local vernaculars can observed. Those varieties, remaining until then in the shadow of classical and cosmopolitan languages, started to be used for literary purposes,[220] although literary translations of liturgical texts into vernacular languages from Latin or other languages began in Europe around the tenth-century AD.[221]

The use of vernaculars as media of learning and letters led also to their transformation into objects of knowledge and governmental concern, leading to the parallel learning of vernacular and sacred or classical languages.[222] The course of vernacularisation was not without any influences though, since the works were often influenced by other languages according to their genre or purpose. A significant step in the vernacularisation of Kurdish was the attempt by Ehmedê Xanî to write learned poetry in the local vernacular, which was influenced by

---

[217] Grehan, *Twilight of the Saints,* 55.
[218] *Ibid*, 52.
[219] Concerning the various developments in Karamanlidika literature from religious to secular literature and its implications see Johan Strauss, "Is Karamanli Literature Part of a "Christian-Turkish (Turco-Christian) Literature?" in *Cries and Whispers in Karamanlidika Books*: *Proceedings of the First International Conference of Karamanlidika Studies. Nicosia 11-13.09.2008*, eds. Evangelia Balta, Matthias Kappler (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2010), 153–200.
[220] Michael Leezenberg, "The Vernacular Revolution: Reclaiming early modern Grammatical traditions in the Ottoman Empire," *History of Humanities* 1, no.2 (2016): 258–259.
[221] L.G. Kelly, "Translation History," in *Concise Encyclopedia of Language and Religion*, eds. Sawyer J.F.A, Simpson J.M.Y. (Amsterdam 2001), 140.
[222] Leezenberg, "The Vernacular Revolution," 265.

Arabic probably because of the genre, but again including the language ideology shared also by Rashid Rida and Serapheim, who said that he wrote "for the sake of the illiterate masses".[223] People sharing this kind of ideology tend to believe that religion and language are always on a downhill path, and as experts it is their duty to restrain and if possible, to reverse the decline.[224] In the same way Serapheim's editions include influences from Greek mainly in writing conventions and terminology – because of their genre, with Greek being the prestigious language of Orthodox Christianity – but also because of their author's views on people's ignorance. This attitude is based on the prestige Greek acquired as one of Christianity's sacred languages, but also on the sense that some languages are better or more suitable than others.[225]

0.8. Sources

As already mentioned, the primary material for this research consists of Serapheim's Karamanlidika books.[226] The Karamanlidika editions prepared by Serapheim include numerous re-editions, so my intention is to use the first edition when possible. Following this rule, we count 12 books dating from 1753 to 1783, all of them with religious context, comprising parts from gospels, catechisms, prayers and descriptions of monasteries. In the following subsections, these works will be discussed one by one.

0.8.1. İptila kelamı cana kifaetlü (IpK1753)

A start was made in 1753 with two books. One is *Ιπτιλὰ Κελαμί Τζανὰ Κιφαετλοῦ* [İptila kelamı cana kifaetlü] 'Words of passion adequate for the soul', a translation of the Greek book *Λόγοι ψυχωφελεῖς εἰς τὸ σωτήριον πάθος* [Logoi psychofeleis eis to sotirion pathos] 'Words useful for the soul on the passion of the savior' by Athanasios Varouchas,[227] containing spiritual counsel. The book bears the icon of

[223] Leezenberg, "The Vernacular Revolution," 261–262.
[224] Milroy & Milroy, *Authority in Language,* 6.
[225] *Ibid*, 2–3.
[226] Serapheim also published several books in Greek language but those will not be the subject of the present study. All Serapheim's publications, Greek and Karamanlidika, can be seen in the Appendix.
[227] Salaville and Dalleggio, *Bibliographie I*, 14; Henceforth IpK1753.

the Virgin Mary of Kykkos (IpK1753:12) but does not have a page with the written permission for printing (*Noi Riformatori*). The introduction of the book, written in Greek and Turkish (page by page) addresses greetings to the Metropolitan of Nikomideia (Asia Minor) Gabriel and explains the reasons for writing the book. These reasons always concern the wellbeing and preservation of the religion in Anatolia. Another short introduction follows, this time only in Turkish, where Serapheim addresses the people of Anatolia, explaining why they have to get to know their religion and urges them to do so.

0.8.2. Kolay iman nasihetü (KIN1753)

The second book printed in 1753 is *Κολάι ιμάν νασιχετού* [Kolay iman nasihetü] 'Easy explanation of faith' and it is one of the rare cases we know to have been printed at the same time in Greek. The version *Διδασκαλία Πρόχειρος και Ωφέλιμος* [Didhaskalia Proheiros kai Ofelimos] 'Useful and handy teaching'.[228] The book is divided into two parts. The first includes the dialogue between teacher and apprentice where basic themes of Christian faith are being explained, while the second describes the history of Kykkos Monastery in Cyprus devoted to the Virgin Mary.[229] The description of the Monastery was originally written in Greek by Serapheim's teacher Ephraim the Athenian and afterwards translated into Turkish by Serapheim.[230] The Greek version was also printed in 1753 as a separate book.

Returning to KIN1753 and *Didhaskalia Proheiros,* the two books differ in terms of the second parts, since the Greek version of the Monastery's history was

---

[228] I am grateful to Costis Kokkinoftas who provided me with a copy of the book.

[229] Salaville and Dalleggio, *Bibliographie I*, 18-19. See also Gavriel, "Οι προλόγοι της Καραμανλίδικης και της Ελληνικής έκδοσης," 382. Henceforth KIN1753. Regarding the Karamanlidika editions of the Description of the history of Kykkos Monastery, see Gavriel, "Οι προλόγοι της Καραμανλίδικης και της Ελληνικής έκδοσης," 381–384, and for the Greek version, see Theocharides, *Οι περιγραφές της Ιεράς Μονής Κύκκου*.

[230] Ephraim the Athenian studied in Athens and in Patmos' Academy. He was invited to Cyprus and Kykkos Monastery in 1742 in order to teach at the newly founded Greek school where he taught for almost 20 years and prepared written material. During the period 1766–1770 he was Patriarch of Jerusalem. See Theocharis Stavrides, *Πατριαρχείο Ιεροσολύμων και Κύπρος, Επιστολές (1731–1884)* (Λευκωσία, Κέντρο Μελετών Ιεράς Μονής Κύκκου, 2007), 31–35. See also Chrysostomos Papadopoulos, *Η Εκκλησία της Κύπρου επί Τουρκοκρατίας (1571–1878)* (Αθήνα, Τύποις Φοίνικος, 1929). Regarding the manuscript tradition of the icon that the history of Kykkos is based on see Kostas N. Konstantinides, *Η διήγησης της θαυματουργής εικόνας της Θεοτόκου Ελεούσας του Κύκκου κατά τον κώδικα 2313 του Βατικανού* (Λευκωσία, Κέντρο Μελετών Ιεράς Μονής Κύκκου, 2002).

printed as a separate book. KIN1753 just like the previous book, does not contain the permission for printing, while the icon of Virgin Mary precedes the second part of the book (KIN1753:36). Again, a bilingual introduction in Greek and Turkish offers greetings to the Bishop of Kykkos Monastery (Cyprus) Parthenios and provides reasons for writing the book. At the end of the first part, a short colophon states that the book was printed with the help of the Orthodox Christians of Caesarea (Asia Minor) and the printer Antonio Bortoli (KIN1753:32). The second part is preceded by a short introduction about the monastery of Kykkos (KIN1753:33–34).

0.8.3. Neos Thisavros (NTh1756)

In 1756 three books were published. *Νέος Θησαυρὸς* [Neos thisavros] 'New treasure' is a translation of the Greek book with the same name by Damaskinos Studites published in 1568.[231] Like the two previous books, the book bears an icon of the Virgin Mary (NTh1756:11) but lacks a permission for printing. The absence of printing permission on this occasion is probably related to the incident of the confiscated books described later on in subchapter 1.1.1. The introduction of the book, only in Turkish, offers greetings to the Christians of Anatolia, refers to the previous books (of 1753) Serapheim prepared for the Christians of Anatolia and clarifies that he went to Venice in order to print books with the permission of Virgin Mary of Kykkos but also with the help of Avraam and Iosif, two brothers from Caesarea (also stated in the front page of the book) (NTh1756:6–7). Interesting is that Iosif's monogram appears at the end of the introduction (NTh1756:iv) but also in every image in the book. It is possible that Iosif donated money for the publication, pre-ordered copies or paid for the preparation of the images. The scarce information we have on Iosif's involvement highlights the need for more thorough research on the printing practices of Karamanlidika, which

[231] Salaville and Dalleggio, *Bibliographie I*, 31. Henceforth NTh1756. The book was supposedly printed for the first time in 1746 in Venice (NAC 1). An argument on this will follow in 0.7.13. Concerning the Greek editions of Neos thisavros in Italy and Greek editions in general see Evro, Layton, (1994) *The sixteenth-century Greek book in Italy: Printers and publishers for the Greek world* (Venice: Istituto ellenico di studi bizantini e postbizantini di Venezia, 1994), 94.

remain a still largely unexplored field. Neos thisavros is also the only book in which Serapheim gives credit for translating parts of the book to another person. In the end of the chapter about Saint John the Baptist a note clarifies that the chapter was translated by Papa Chrysafis for Caesarea (NTh1756:363).

0.8.4. Hacet name kitabı (HNK1756)

The second book from 1756, *Χατζὲτ ναμὲ κιταπὴ σουλτὰν βαλιτουλὰχ Παναγία μεβλουτουλλαχήν* [Hacet name kitabi sultan validullah Panayia mevlutullahın] 'The book of neccessity, the supplications to Queen Mother of God' includes hymns (greetings) addressed to the Virgin Mary, religious stories, prayers, psalms and parts of the book *Αμαρτωλών Σωτηρία* [Amartolon Sotiria] 'Sinnners' salvation' of 1641 by Agapios Landos.[232] The short introduction addresses the Orthodox Christians of Anatolia, explaining the contents of book and what is it about. The book contains prayers for the Virgin Mary, analyses canonical rules (e.g. which relatives can be married, by giving examples (HNK1756:177–211) and other liturgical texts. The book has a printing permission (HNK1756:8).

0.8.5. Cümle senenin kiriakilerine cevap ve nasaatlar (CSK1756)

The third book from the 1756 print run is *Τζοῦμλε σενενὴμκΚυριακηλερινὲ τζεβὰπ βὲ νασαατλάρ* [Cümle senenin kiriakilerine cevap ve nasaatlar] 'Answers and teachings for all the Sundays of the year', more commonly known as *Kyriakodromion*, containing counsel and doctrines for all the Sundays of a year. This is, once more, a translation of a book by Agapios Landos, the book named *Κυριακοδρόμιον* [Kyriakodromion].[233] In the bilingual (two-columned pages) introduction, Serapheim conveys greetings to the Ecumenical Patriarch and for the first time he undersigns as monk of the Monastery of Kykkos (CSK1756:iii–viii). A second introduction in Turkish conveys greetings to his fellow Christians once more (CSK1756:1-6) and notes again the help of the Virgin Mary. Moreover, he mentions that he translated into Turkish what Agapios translated from Greek to simple Greek (i.e. *Ellinika'dan Romca yavan diline*, CSK1756:3), an obvious

[232] Salaville and Dalleggio, *Bibliographie I*, 27. Henceforth HNK1756.
[233] *Ibid*, 22–23. Henceforth CSK1756.

reference to how people perceived the differences between the archaic language and vernacular. On the front page of the book it is mentioned for the first time that the book was printed with the financial help of Kykkos Monastery. The book bears the icon of the Virgin Mary (CSK1756:8) and the stamp of the Monastery of Kykkos (CSK1756:426). The book also contains a printing permission (CSK1756:xii).

0.8.6. Kutluşerrif (KŞ1758)

The book *Κουτλουσερρίφ* [Kutluşerrif] was published in 1758, a *proskynitarion* including description of the Holy Places, Jerusalem and Palestine. The book is a translation of the Greek book *Προσκυνητάριον* [Proskynitarion] of 1749. It is the only one of Serapheim's Karamanlidika books published in Leipzig,[234] and the only bilingual one, printed in two-columned pages, and also the only that has a front page with the majority of information written in Greek.[235] On the front page it is mentioned that Serapheim has translated into Turkish the book prepared by Sofronios, sacristan of the Holy Sepulchre. The book was funded and edited by Gedeon, a monk from Cyprus (KŞ1758:fp). The book contains two short introductions, one by Gedeon conveying greetings to the sacristan of the Holy Sepulchre (KŞ1758:3–6), and another, unsigned, addressing the general readership (KŞ1758:7-10), making it obvious that this was not an edition prepared solely for Turkophone Christians. It is also very interesting that Serapheim is mentioned as archimandrite (a superior of monks in a monastery), when just two years before he was just a monk.

0.8.7. Nakliet ve beandır azimatlu pederimis klimentos (NvB1776)

The following source *Νακλιέτ βε Πεαντηρ Αζηματλου Πετεριμης Κλημεντος* [Nakliet ve Beandır Azimatlu Pederimis Klimentos] 'Narration of [the life of] his greatness our father Klimis', published in 1776 in Venice, is the story of the martyr Klimentos, who was Metropolitan of Ankara, and Saint Agathangelos, and includes

---

[234] Why he left Venice for Leipzig is clearly described by Serapheim him self (see subchapter 1.1.1.).
[235] Salaville and Dalleggio, *Bibliographie I*, 37–38. Henceforth KŞ1758.

litany, chants and other liturgical texts.[236] The front page gives information regarding the funding of the book from Demetrios Vidales from Izmir, and the supervision and custody by Spyridon Tzigkrilara and Serapheim, who is by 1776 Metropolitan of Ankara (NvB1776:fp). The book was translated by Serapheim (NvB1776:9) who sent to someone to Venice to supervise the printing. A page of greetings addressing Serapheim written by a Cretan Monk who undersigns as M.T.Th. and mentions that while he was at the Bortoli printing house in Venice they received the book from Serapheim (NvB1776:3). Another foreword follows from Ioannes son of Iosif from Ankara (NvB1776:4–7). The printing permission for the book can be found after the introductions (NvB1776:8).

0.8.8. Psalterion of David (PsD1782)

The book *Ψαλτήριον Δαβίδ πατισσάχ βε παγαμπερίν τεσπιχατλαριλάν περαπέρ* [Psalterion David padişah ve pagamberin tesbihatlarılan beraber] 'King prophet David's psalter with praises to God' is thought to have been published for the first time in 1767.[237] This is a psalter with additional hymns, probably translated into Turkish from a Greek edition.[238] During the 1780's the Bortoli printing house lost its power and was bought by the Glykis printing house. Serapheim's books from 1782 onwards were being printed by Glykis, although some of them had still the Bortoli sign on them. This was a generally accepted practice and may even have been part of the deal. The pictures and the book in general have the sign of Glykis printing house, perhaps indicating a contribution to the funding of the book (PsD1782:xii,282). The permission of printing is included at the end of the book, something that normally appears at the beginning (PsD1782:282). This might be a sign that Glykis started printing the book before getting the permission in hand and when it was granted, he added it in the final pages.

0.8.9. Ruh afietliyi bahar-i zümbülname (RAB1782)

The second book of 1782 is *Ροὺχ ἀφιετλιγή παχάρι ζουμπιουλναμέ* [Ruh afietliyi

---

[236] Salaville and Dalleggio, *Bibliographie I*, 52. Henceforth NvB1776.
[237] I was unable to trace the first edition. The issue is thoroughly analysed in 0.7.13.
[238] Salaville and Dalleggio, *Bibliographie I*, 63. Henceforth PsD1782.

aahar-i zümbülname] 'Book of the spring of flowers and the health of the soul' containing again parts from *Neos Thisavros* by Damaskinos Studites (doctrines and prayers) and the aforementioned story of Klimis translated by Serapheim.[239] Serapheim is again mentioned as monk and former Metropolitan of Ankara (RAB1782:fp). The printing permission follows the introduction (RAB1782:viii).

0.8.10. Azim padişah monastir kykkonun (APK1782)

The third book of 1782 is *Ἀζήμ πατησσὰχ μοναστήρ,Κύκκονουν. Χεκμετλοῦ βαλιτουλλὰχ εἰκόνα τασφηροῦν, χαγιρλὴ πηνγαροῦν χεκμετναμὲ ταριχὴ πεανηντάτηρ* [Azim padişah monastir Kykkonun. hekmetlü validullah eikona tasfirun hayirli piñarun hekmetname tarihi beanındadır] 'History and description of the glorious imperial Monastery of Kykkos, of the icon of the wise Queen Mother of God and of the blessed fountain'. The icon of Monastery of Kykkos and its building), once more the story of Kykkos Monastery in Cyprus, this time as an independent book,[240] as a gift for all Christians (APK1782:fp). This is the second augmented edition of the book contained in KIN1753. The book was printed when the abbot of the Kykkos Monastery was Meletios, who conveys greetings, after Serapheim's introduction (APK1782:3–16), explaining how he became abbot after the death of Parthenios. He also describes the actions taken for rebuilding the monastery (APK1782:17–23, see also chapter 1). The permission for printing the book again follows the introductions (APK1782:24).

0.8.11. Simavı bahçe donanması (SBD1783)

In 1783 two books were published. The first one, *Σημαβὴ παχτζὲ ττονανμασσή* [Simavı bahçe donanması] 'The ornament of the heavenly gardens'[241] bears again Glykis' signs and Serapheim is described as "a monk of monks" (*rohban rakibden* SBD1783:fp [cf. rohban rahibden]). The book contains references that consist of translated parts from other religious books like Damaskinos's book (probably Serapheim means *Neos thisavros* SBD1783:1,13), *Ekloyion*

[239] Salaville and Dalleggio, *Bibliographie I,* 67–68. Henceforth RAB1782.
[240] *Ibid*, 59. Henceforth APK1782.
[241] *Ibid*, 72. Henceforth SBD1783.

(SBD1783:148,158,183,193) and *Paradeisos* (SBD1783:72,139), mainly about lives of saints and martyrs. In his introduction, Serapheim says that this book should enable the readers to act as teachers for their children (SBD1783:xiii). Towards the end of the introduction he makes a recapitulation of his work by describing what books he has published through the years (SBD1783:xi). The permission for printing can be found once more after the introduction (SBD1783:xvi).

0.8.12. Bahar-i heyat yanıa aziz mehit olan Martyrosların n aklieti (BH1783)

The second book from 1783 is *Παχαρὶ χεγιὰτ γιάνια, ἀζὶζ Σσεχὶτ ὀλάν, μάρτυροσλαριν νακλιετή* [Bahar-i heyat yanıa aziz şehit olan martyrosların naklieti] 'Spring of life, namely narrations of our holy martyrs'[242] and has a similar structure to SBD1783. Again composed of lives of saints and martyrs, it consists of parts from Damaskinos' book (BH1783:1,25,50,81,113,129,144) and *Neos Paradeisos* (BH1783:67). Unfortunately the introductory pages are missing from the copies that I was able to consult for this research as a result of bad preservation.

0.8.13. Reconsidering Neos thisavros 1746

While trying to reconstruct Serapheim Attaliates' life, existing documentation suggested that he went to Cyprus in 1751, supposedly for a pilgrimage. He then started his cooperation with Kykkos Monastery, which included the publishing of Karamanlidika books, among others. Until now, all researchers assumed that at that time Serapheim was well known, since he had already published the Karamanlidika book *Neos thisavros yeni hazine* in 1746 (NAC 1)[243] and was probably invited to Cyprus for further collaboration. The strange thing about the aforementioned book is that the only copy of this book, and the one mentioned in the bibliography, bears the icon of the Virgin Mary of Kykkos Monastery. So, how is it possible for this book to be published in 1746, with Kykkos's money, and the writer arriving in Cyprus five years after? The answer is simple. There is no such book and the first edition of *Neos thisavros* was made in 1756, five years after

[242] Salaville and Dalleggio, *Bibliographie I*, 76. Henceforth BH1783.
[243] Henceforth NTh1746.

Serapheim went to Cyprus for the first time.

The information in the Karamanlidika bibliography about NTh1746 was drawn from an article by Mario Stojanov regarding books in the National Library in Sofia.[244] After a careful study of the book one can see that the title page is missing and has a pencil note with the date 1746. From the fonts of the book it is obvious that is a book printed in the Glykis printing house and we know that until 1780 Kykkos and Serapheim worked mainly with Bortoli. Additionally, looking at the icon of the Virgin Mary, it is obvious that the book located in Sofia is probably a re-edition of 1804 or later. The icon is the one Glykis uses from 1804 onwards, when he republished the book for the third time. Adding to this, we know that Glykis wrote to Kykkos requesting a new icon for the books, since the one used during the eighteenth-century had been lost.[245] Although the icons of the various editions seem identical, the text in the icon of 1756 is abbreviated, while on the one used after 1800, it is written in full. So we are definitely dealing with books from different print runs.[246] Apart from the icon and printing fonts, we have also Serapheim's words to support that there is no 1746 book. In the recapitulation of his work in SDB1783 he writes:

> Around 1753 we printed two books named Iptila kelami (IpK1753) and Iman mesihi (KIN1753). Furthermore in 1756 again we printed Kyriakodromi kitabı (CSK 1756) and Neos thisavros yeni hazne (NTh1756) and another book named Hadjetname (HNK1756). Later on, the book about Aziz klimis bishop of Ankara (NvB1776) was printed and now we here we are again. We created the Psalterion (PsD1782), the Bahari Zumbulname (RAB1782), the Bahari heyat (BH1783) and the present book Simavi Bahche (SB1783:10–11).[247]

We can argue that Serapheim, in the last book he published, provides an overview of his life's work and says clearly that *Neos thisavros* was printed for the first time in 1756. His statement in 1783 raises questions about two more editions, the *Psalterion* of 1767 (supposedly the first edition of Psalterion, Add:1) and the *Bahar-i Zumbulname* of 1776 (supposedly the first edition of the book, Add:2).

---

[244] Mario Stojanov, "La Littérature Bulgare-Grecque-Turque «Karamanlienne»," *Études balkaniques* XV, no. 2, (1979): 76–82.
[245] Stylianos Perdikis, *Η Μονή Κύκκου,* 50.
[246] The various icons can be seen in Appendix.
[247] For the original passage see Appendix 1.1.

The information about these publications come from the volume *Additions* by Evangelia Balta. She draws the information about the *Psalterion* edition from Ioannes Pamboukis' publications and also provides the front page of the book, which, however, lacks a date of publication (see picture 4). The front page presented is again one of Glykis' editions and as already mentioned, Serapheim worked with Bortoli until around 1780. Furthermore, the insignia of Glykis is from a later decade.[248] The edition presented as one from 1767 is actually identical to the one of 1810 (SDI:44). The front page in Add:1 is from the copy found in *Demotiki Vivliothiki Neas Ionias* (Nea Ionia's Municipal Library) (see Appendix 2.5) which has the hand-written date 1767, but a closer look reveals that we are dealing with an 1810 edition. The limited space here does not allow a detailed list of all the information that proves this argument but one can observe the damaged upper part of the character <I> in "ΔΑΒΙΔ" (Appendices 2.4 and 2.5). Furthermore the strongest evidence is that Serapheim is mentioned as "Σάπηκα ΕΓΚΙΟΥΡΟΥ ΜΗΤΡΟΠΟΛΟΥΤΟΥ" [sabıka Egürü Mitropoloutu], namely former Metropolitan of Ankara, something that occurred in 1779 as we shall see later on. More or less the same applies to the edition *Bahar-i zumbulname* of 1776 (Add:2) where the information is drawn from another bibliography and we do not have the location of an actual copy. It probably does not exist, since Serapheim does not mention a re-edition of the book in 1783. It can be added that all three cases are not listed in any of Glykis' catalogues I consulted for this research.

Serapheim's statement has proved very useful in clarifying some things but it also causes some problems. It was mentioned that Serapheim published 12 titles but as anyone can easily see in the passage, only ten books are mentioned. He leaves out the narration of the Kykkos Monastery story of 1782 (APK1782) and the narration of the story of Jerusalem of 1758 (KŞ1758). Why he did that is still a matter of controversy. Perhaps we should assume that he does not mention books written by others, since his only involvement was in the translation of the book as a whole in contrast to the rest, which consist of parts or compilations brought together by Serapheim. This is the only characteristic the two books share and the rest do not.

---

[248] Staikos, *Εκδοτικά Τυπογραφικά σήματα,* 111–112.

The note finally leads us to conclude that none of Serapheim's books was published for a second time while he was alive. I will argue that it is likely that Serapheim died around 1790, and the first re-editions appeared in 1795, when the second edition of *Neos thisavros* was printed – and not the third one as it was believed until now.