

Cries and Whispers in Karamanlidika Books

Proceedings of the First International
Conference on Karamanlidika Studies
(Nicosia, 11th–13th September 2008)

Edited by
Evangelia Balta and Matthias Kappler

2010

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

ISSN 0177-4743
ISBN 978-3-447-06185-8

Thoughts on the Turkish Verses in Phanariot Poetry Collections (1750–1821)

Julia Chatzipanagioti-Sangmeister & Matthias Kappler

1. The Phanariot poetry collections of the eighteenth century¹

In 1818, the enlightened merchant Zisis Daoutis (1772–1836) published in Vienna a small volume under the title *Διάφορα ἠθικά καὶ ἀστεῖα στιχουργήματα* (“Various Moral and Humorous Verses”). This edition – typographically far from elegant – is the first printed anthology of Modern Greek poetry. Its publication marks an important milestone in a long tradition of handwritten collections of poems, a tradition that seems to originate in the mid-eighteenth century, evolving for almost one hundred years until the first four or five decades of the nineteenth century. In his short introduction to the volume, Daoutis himself notes that these earlier handwritten collections served as a source from which he drew the verses he chose to include in his anthology:

Εἰς Ἰάσσιον [sic], καὶ Βουκουρέστιον εὕρισκόμενος πρὸ χρόνων ἤδη ικανῶν, ἐσύναξα ἀπὸ διάφορα καταστιχάκια (κοινῶς Μισμαγιά λεγόμενα) τῶν φίλων μου διάφορα στιχουργήματα, ἀπὸ τὰ ὅποια ἀπεφάσισα [...] νὰ τυπώσω ὅσα βλέπετε εἰς τὸ παρὸν βιβλίον [...]. Ἄν ἔξευρα τίνων φιλογενῶν εἶναι τὰ παρόντα στιχουργήματα, ἤθελ’ ἀφεύκτως ἀναφέρει ἐνταῦθα καὶ τὰ τίμια αὐτῶν ὀνόματα [...]. Ἐγὼ εἶμαι μόνον τὸ ὄργανον τῆς ἐκδόσεως. (Daoutis 1818: [5]–[6])².

These *καταστιχάκια* (‘booklets’) or *μισμαγιά* (*mismagia*), as the enlightened merchant terms them, could be described as a sort of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century notebook in which people wrote down mainly, yet not exclusively, various verses. Quite often, these included lyrics to songs that were popular in the urban centres of the Ottoman Empire. The verses in these handwritten collections are occasionally accompanied by indications of the Ottoman tonal system (*makam*), sometimes even the entire melody is transcribed in Byzantine notation. Generally, the language of the

1 Author of part 1 is Julia Chatzipanagioti-Sangmeister and of part 2, Matthias Kappler.

2 “When I found myself, already some years ago, in Iași and Bucharest, I collected several poems from my friends’ various booklets (generally called Mismagia), part of which I decided to print as you see in the present book [...]. If I knew which patriots composed these poems, I would inevitably refer to them and to their honoured names [...]. I am only the tool of publication.”

verses is Greek, though some manuscripts also contain poems in Turkish, written however in the Greek alphabet³.

Although the lack of a bibliography of the relevant handwritten collections calls for some caution in drawing conclusions, it could be argued that the practice of compiling collections of verses emerged among the higher social strata of the Greek-speaking population of the Ottoman Empire in the second half of the eighteenth century, when the members of this social group had secured the necessary economic ease that enabled them to acquire free time. It is precisely this development, in which time was freed from the commitments of day-to-day life and became invested in entertainment or educational activities, which gave rise to the creation and proliferation of the urban poems and songs under consideration, as well as the practice of compiling them into collections⁴.

There is no doubt that this practice was particularly popular. Libraries in Greece and Roumania preserve at least 38 codices from the second half of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century, which include *mismagia*. The earliest collection appears to be the one contained in manuscript 725 of the Gennadius Library, which was assembled from 1769 onwards. The handwritten collections of verses, as evidenced by their origin and contents, were closely related to the Phanariot environment in Constantinople and the Roumanian Principalities. This is corroborated by the biography of those rhymesters who have been identified so far, by the background of the owners and compilers of those collections which have been studied, as well as by the fact that most of the surviving manuscripts are preserved in libraries in Roumania. Recent studies focusing on the content of the verses and the ideology they promote further confirm the relation of the manuscripts to the Phanariot circles⁵.

In the last decade of the eighteenth century, along with the handwritten tradition of verse collection, a printed tradition began taking shape as well. The beginning was set in 1790 with Rigas Velestinlis's work *Σχολεῖον τῶν νελικάτων ἐραστῶν* ("The School for Delicate Lovers"), while the most prominent example is the book *Ἔρωτος Ἀποτελέσματα* ("Results of Love") by Ioannis Karatzas and Athanasios Psalidas, which was published in 1792. Despite their numerous similarities, the printed and handwritten traditions differ in several important respects.

First of all, in terms of genre, the printed editions do not constitute poetic collections, but contain literary narrative texts in prose which usually incorporate a large number of verses, sometimes exceeding one hundred. Moreover, the ideology reflected in these printed editions (not only in their narrative parts but increasingly in

3 For collections of Phanariotic poems/songs in general, see Frantzi 1999: 11–13, 17–37; Kappler 1995: 359–361.

4 Frantzi 1993: 17–18; Kappler 2002: 26–30; Chatzipanagioti-Sangmeister 2005: 256–257; Chatzipanagioti-Sangmeister 2008: 95–96.

5 Chatzipanagioti-Sangmeister 2005: 258–260, 266; Chatzipanagioti-Sangmeister 2008: 96–97, 102.

the verses), no longer relates to the Phanariot circles but rather to the nascent Greek bourgeoisie which was gradually adopting the fundamental values of the Enlightenment⁶. This is also substantiated by the fact that the printed editions were published in Vienna, which from 1780 onwards emerged as the primary place of publication of works that expressed the spirit of the burgeoning Greek bourgeoisie and the novel ideas of the Enlightenment.

Thus, the handwritten *mismagia*, on the one hand, and the printed editions in which verses were incorporated into a narrative context, on the other, formed from the last decade of the eighteenth century onwards two parallel axes in the Greek urban poetry tradition that were clearly different in nature. The manuscripts were created and circulated mainly in the Phanariot environment, reflecting ideologically the experiences and the worldview of those members of Greek society who, having gained a privileged access to the power structures of the State, constituted a part of the social and political *status quo* in the Ottoman Empire. The printed editions, conversely, relate geographically and ideologically to the emerging Greek bourgeoisie which, being excluded from political power, had already in the second half of the eighteenth century begun to show a tendency towards political emancipation and to develop a national identity.

These fundamental differences between the handwritten collections and the printed editions seem to be manifested in the language as well – more precisely, in the presence or absence of content in Turkish. While the manuscripts sometimes include verses in Turkish, the printed editions use exclusively in the Greek language with a conscious effort to avoid or eliminate any foreign elements. This tendency becomes more pronounced over time and is particularly marked in Daoutis's 1818 edition of *Διάφορα ηθικά και αστεία στιχουργήματα*.

Though fitting within the same genre category as the handwritten collections, Zisis Daoutis's edition differs from them in the sense that it constitutes an anthology, i.e. the result of a selection from a larger corpus of texts. What is more, a considerable part of the verses which the enlightened merchant and freemason Daoutis had chosen to include clearly promote fundamental values of the Greek bourgeoisie and hence differ from the handwritten collections in an ideological sense as well. Therefore, it is hardly incidental that the poems of this particular edition are distinguished by a more "purified" language than the verses included in other printed collections. In the very introduction to his anthology, Daoutis associates the well-being of the nation, the ultimate goal of every "patriotically-minded" bourgeois, with the "purification" of the language. This is what he writes to his readers:

[Π]αρακαλῶ ὅλους τοὺς ὁμογενεῖς, ὅσοι ἐξ αὐτῶν ἔχουν στιχουργήματα, ἢ ἄλλο τι ἠθικὸν σύγγραμμα, κ' ἐπωφελεῖς διὰ τὴν ἐπίδοσιν τοῦ γένους, καὶ δὲν

6 For details on the *Σχολεῖον τῶν νελικάτων ἐραστῶν*, see Pistas ²1994: λθ'–ξγ'. For *Ἐρωτος Ἀποτελέσματα*, see Ladas & Chatzidimos 1970: 132–133; Chatzipanagioti-Sangmeister 2005: 263–266.

θέλουν αὐτοὶ νὰ τὰ τυπώσουν διὰ ὁποιανδήποτε αἰτίαν, νὰ τὰ στέλλουν πρὸς ἐμὲ[...], ἐγὼ [...] θέλω τὰ τυπώνει ἀμέσως, διὰ νὰ μὴ κείτωνται νεκρὰ, ἀναφέρων τὰ τίμια ὀνόματά των. Πλὴν πάλι τοὺς παρακαλῶ νὰ μοὶ τὰ στέλλωσιν, ὅσον τὸ δυνατόν, καθαρὰ ἀπὸ ξένας λέξεις. (Daoutis 1818: [6])⁷.

The arguments made so far clearly suggest that the presence of Turkish-language content in Greek collections serves as a marker of their ideology and hence justify the need for more systematic research into the role of Turkish language in Greek corpora. Remaining for a while in the period before the Greek Revolution – a period in which, as we have seen, the handwritten and printed urban poetry traditions co-existed in parallel – we shall try to examine the presence and function of the Turkish-language verses in the earliest *mismagia* discovered so far, the one contained in manuscript 725 of the Gennadius Library of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens.

Manuscript 725, a corpus of 158 folia, consists of two clearly-defined parts (Chatzipanagioti-Sangmeister 2002: 23–26). The first contains recipes for medicinal mixtures and culinary dishes, while the second includes 167 poems (Chatzipanagioti-Sangmeister 2002: 28). In terms of both form and content, the verses found in codex 725 constitute representative examples of Phanariot poetry. Their thematic range covers the typical Phanariot subject matter: love poems about unreciprocated love and refusal, the instability of fortune, the lack of true friendship, satirical poems about specific persons, verses inspired by events of importance for Constantinopolitan society, rhymes about *xenitia* (i.e. the hardships, isolation and estrangement of those who are forced by economic or other constraints to work and live in foreign lands). The texts included in the manuscript are for the most part in Greek, although there are some verses in Turkish, written in the Greek alphabet, which are commented upon in part II of the present paper.

2. The Turkish part of the ms. 725

2.1. The Ottoman background

Our manuscript contains twelve Turkish texts, or rather twelve texts where Turkish is used extensively, since code-switched passages consisting of one or two lexical items, as well as phonetically and grammatically integrated loanwords from Turkish to Greek, are not counted here⁸. Apart from texts in Greek and Turkish, the manu-

7 ‘Whoever among all the fellow countrymen have poems, or any other ethical and helpful composition for the progress of the nation, and who do not want to print them for whatever reason, please send them to me [...]; I [...] shall print them immediately, so that they may not lie dead, and shall refer to their honourable names. Furthermore, I again ask them to send them to me, as far as possible, pure from foreign words.’

8 The twelve texts are included in our *Appendix*; the Roman numerals of the texts are used hereafter.

script also contains one bilingual poem in Greek and Persian (f. 105v). Although to our knowledge this is the only Persian example, texts in Greek script and in other languages than Greek or Turkish, namely Arabic, Roumanian and French, are well-known from other Phanariot anthologies of the nineteenth century (*Πανδώρα, Καλλίφωνος Σειρήν*)⁹.

The Turkish texts are all written with the same hand, that of the main writer (x¹ according to Chatzipanagioti-Sangmeister 2002) of the whole manuscript (see above). Another two writers have produced minor texts, but not in Turkish. Our anonymous writer elaborated the manuscript from 1769 until at least 1795. He belonged to the court of Matthaios Gkikas, living in the Roumanian Principality and in Istanbul, and was well-educated in medicine and music.

The largest part is constituted by texts with metrical-rhythmic patterns (ten out of twelve), the most extensive texts being love songs, and specifically *şarki* (II, III, IV); followed by a fragment of a *gazel* (VI), probably also used in music in the *beste* or *semai* part of the Ottoman concert cycle (this is evident because of the formal deficiency of the composition, typical for the musical use of this genre). The other metrically-organized texts are two single distichs (*beyt* I and *aphorism* V), and two *mani* (VIII and IX), popular quatrains, one of them (IX) being a poetical dialogue, as well as another quatrain in *mani*-form (XII). The last metrical text, probably again a song, is a Greek-Turkish bilingual poem (X). The only two texts without a metrical pattern are a proverb (VII) and an inscription (XI); the latter we will comment on below more in detail.

The main part of the Turkish corpus consisting of musical forms (the *şarkis*, the *gazel* and distich I), is part of the Ottoman musical and poetical tradition. The manuscript tradition of Ottoman Turkish musical texts (without notes) goes back to the seventh century (Üngör 1981: xxvii). A musical collection of this kind is called *güfte mecmuası* (*mecmuası* being the etymon of the Greek Phanariot *μισμαγές* or *μετζμουάδες*, commonly used to denominate this kind of poetry and music collection). The Ottoman Turkish production of printed anthologies begins in 1852 (Üngör 1981: xviii), i.e. more than twenty years after the first Ottoman Greek printed anthologies (the first one being *Εντέρπη*, in 1830)¹⁰. Although none of the texts of our manuscript appears in the printed Ottoman Greek anthologies of the nineteenth century, at least one of them (II) is a well-known *şarki* still present in the classical Turkish musical repertoire (Üngör 1981: 520). This could also be the case with other texts, but since the Turkish texts, except one (IV), of our manuscript lack any indication of the *makam* system, it is quite difficult to trace them back to the

9 For bibliographical hints, see Kappler 2002: 33 (Arabic in *Πανδώρα*), Kappler 2002: 35 (Roumanian in *Καλλίφωνος Σειρήν*); furthermore for Arabic in Greek letters, see Khoury 1977, for Phanariot poems containing French in Greek characters, see Kappler 1998.

10 On the printed Ottoman-Greek anthologies of the nineteenth century, see Behar 1994, Behar 2002 (from the musicological point of view), Stathi 1997 (textual observations about one specific *mismagia*), Kappler 2002 (edition and linguistic analysis of all Turkish texts in Greek characters contained in the anthologies).

classical repertoire of the *mecmua*, always ordered by *makam*. Interestingly, also one Greek song (f. 73r, *makam çargah*) bears an Ottoman *makam* indication, which is very common in other contemporary manuscript and printed Ottoman Greek anthologies (such as *Ἐρωτος Ἀποτελέσματα*) or in printed anthologies of the nineteenth century (such as *Πανδώρα*).

Another link to the mainstream Ottoman Turkish tradition is the *mahlas* (pen-name of the poet / *güfteci*) *Tanburi* in two of the *şarkı* (II and III), i.e. *Tanburî Mustafa Çavuş* (reportedly in *şarkı* II and supposedly in *şarkı* III). *Tanburî Mustafa Çavuş* (?–1745?) was a very productive composer and *güfteci* at the Sultan's court, especially during the “Tulip Period” under Sultan Ahmed III and his brilliant Grand Vizir Damad Ibrahim Paşa. He is also the author of a *mecmua* (1733; see Öztuna 1990: 76–77 and 580). His works, though not this one, are frequently to be found in the printed Ottoman Greek anthologies of the nineteenth century (see Kappler 2002: 62 and 68, and respective texts).

However, not only from the point of view of musical form and authorship, but also considering the literary contents, our texts clearly belong to the Ottoman Turkish tradition. This can be seen especially in *şarkı* III, which is a folk song describing a male public dancer, *köçek*, very common in eighteenth and nineteenth century lyrics. Other evidence for this are the mystical-Islamic themes in the *gazel*-fragment (VI) and in *şarkı* IV. The texts are thus integrated into an urban and often courtly lyric tradition, sometimes even with Islamic religious undertones, and the language of the texts does not usually show up dialectal variation. The only exceptions are typically the two *mani* (VIII and IX), a composition stemming from the folk tradition to be found in all areas with Turkic population, and, in our case, both in South-Eastern Europe and Anatolia. It is, in fact, not a coincidence that only in these poems we encounter dialectal forms (*yıkmazıkan*; VIII.2, *endim*; IX.4, *yidi*, *kize*; IX.4), typical for Western and Central Anatolian, or even Black Sea, dialects¹¹. From the literary point of view the second *mani* (IX) is particularly interesting, since it presents the popular form of a poetical dialogue (named *deyiş* in Anatolia, and *çatışma* in Cyprus), where two persons in a question-answer mode exchange improvised verses in the strophical *mani*-form (Göksu 1996: xx; Gökçeoğlu 2002: 8, 66).

The only text not pertaining either to the urban Ottoman Turkish context of Istanbul, or to the Anatolian Turkish folk tradition, is obviously the bilingual song (X). Mixing up languages, first of all Greek and Turkish, in playful songs seems to have been a very popular tradition in Ottoman Greek society; specimens of this kind can

11 Forms with *-ıkan* occur in many Karamanlidika texts, and are frequent in most Turkish dialects (Balkans, Anatolia, Cyprus), see Kappler 2002: 169; *en-*: for the form in other Greek Ottoman anthologies and its occurrence in Central Anatolia, see Kappler 2002: 109; *yidi*: for the raising of /e/ in /y/-surroundings in Trabzon dialects, see Brendemoen 2002: 55–56, but also in Central Anatolian dialects (Korkmaz 1994: 34); *kize*: for develarization of /ıl/, especially in *kız*, for Black Sea dialects, see Brendemoen 2002: 68.

be found in the contemporary Phanariot manuscript tradition as well as in the printed anthologies of the following century (Kappler 2002: 29 and Kappler 1998). As in other texts of this tradition, our bilingual song switches in parallel between two codes, language and rhyme/metre, given that two lines of each strophe rhyme accordingly to the language used, and that the metre of the Turkish lines is of eight syllables, while that of the Greek lines is of seven syllables. Counting together the metre of the two languages, the result is a “composite” *dekapendesyllavo*, the traditional 15-syllable metre of Greek folk poetry, divided according to code/language. As can be seen in the text itself, the themes are developed from one language to the other, there is an evident semantic convergence between the two segments.

2.2. The relation between Turkish and Greek texts

At this point, we have to raise an important question: what is the position of the Turkish texts in the framework of the whole manuscript? Where are the Turkish texts positioned and do they have any semantic or formal relation to the main Greek corpus?

First of all it seems that the manuscript has been written chronologically and that, for this reason, there is no thematic order in the disposition of the texts. From the point of view of the contents it is evident that both the Turkish and Greek poems treat themes of a usually unrequited, unhappy and cruel love, typical for the Ottoman lyric tradition, but also for the Phanariot verses of that period.

Accordingly, it seems at first glance that generally speaking there is no direct relation between the two corpora written in the two different languages, but that the disposition of the Turkish texts in the main body is rather arbitrary. Upon closer analysis, however, we may observe that the Turkish texts are always embedded in a context loosely related to the Greek body: love songs with love songs, philosophical poems with philosophical texts etc.

Perhaps the most interesting link between the Greek and Turkish parts is the inscription (XI) which up to now we did not consider in our description because it seemingly falls out of the main lyric body of the manuscript. As we shall see, the text reveals additional information on the place of composition of the manuscript, and about the writer himself. As the Greek title (“1788 ἀγούστου ε΄, ὁ τίτλος ὀποῦ ἐβάλθη εἰς τὸ κομμένο τὸ κεφάλι τοῦ μακαρίτου μισέρ δημήτρη σκαναβῆ εἰς τὸ μπάμπι χουμαγιοῦν”) explains, the text reproduces the inscription on the execution place of the Phanariot Dimitrios Skanavis, decapitated for treason during the Turkish-Russian war (Amantos 1955–1956). Skanavis was executed at the Sublime Porte (*Bab-i Hümayun*) in Istanbul on August 5, 1788, the same day of the note of our writer, evidence that the manuscript was actually written in Istanbul (Chatzipanagioti-Sangmeister 2002: 27). The original official transcription was obviously in Arabic characters, and linguistic analysis of the transcription into Greek characters reveals the presence of orthographic features which could only occur if the text was transcribed from the Arabic alphabet, namely the writings *idüp* and *gendüsine* (whereas the writing *tertüp* for *tertib* seems to be an over-correction). This provides

possible evidence that the main writer of the manuscript, who also produced this text, was familiar with the Arabic alphabet, although of course we cannot exclude that the original inscription was read to him by another person. The important link to the main corpus of the manuscript is given by a Greek poem on the death of Dimitrios Skanavis, following the Turkish inscription (f. 116v–117r), composed by the writer himself (as he states in the title annotation) on August 7, 1788, i.e. two days after Skanavis' execution (“1788, ἀγούστου ζ' ἐποιήθη αὕτη ἡ μικρά ῥημάδα παρ' ἐμοῦ τοῦ ἀμαθοῦς”).

2.3. General conclusions and relation of the corpus to “Karamanlidika studies”

Considering this poem (as well as another one on f. 30r, reportedly of his own hand), we can presume that our writer was a hellenophone; however the Turkish texts he transcribes in his “diary” are nearly free of mistakes, which points to a very good knowledge of Turkish, if not to Greek-Turkish bilinguality. If we also consider his good Greek orthography (Chatzipanagioti-Sangmeister 2002: 27) and his knowledge of music and medicine, and, possibly, his ability to read Ottoman Turkish texts in the Arabic alphabet, we get the picture of a well-educated Phanariot from a high societal layer, probably a clerk of the Ottoman administration. As far as his mother-tongue is concerned, the manuscript seems not to contain enough information. The framework language, and also the language in which personal annotations are made, is Greek, as is the target language in most of the subsequently printed anthologies. Although a few of the books printed during the nineteenth and early twentieth century are expressly addressed to a Turkophone target readership (such as *Γενί Σαρκί* and *Τουρκτζέ Γενί Σαρκί* [both Istanbul 1876], *Ανατόλ Τουρκιλερί* [Istanbul 1896], or *Χανενδέ* [Samsun 1914]; see Kappler 2002: 6, fn. 6), most of them are used primarily by Hellenophones, although they contain Turkish texts, too. But even some of the anthologists of the books with Greek-speaking targets, such as Ioannis Zografos Keyvelis, are reportedly Turkophones, and we cannot exclude that many of the anonymous scribes of the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century manuscript tradition had, like our writer, a Turkophone Orthodox background as well. However, this manuscript is one example within the whole, enormous tradition of these *mecmuades* in general which were integrated into the everyday urban context of Istanbul, and are an important source for the socio-cultural and anthropological research concerning the Phanariots, and evidence for their intermediary role between the Ottoman Turkish and the Ottoman Greek societies and cultures.

Another question is whether, and how, this kind of text can be considered as “Karamanlidika” or not. What can be said for sure is that the linguistic, historical and philological analysis of the Turkish texts contained in these anthologies shows the close ties of the Phanariots with Ottoman Turkish cultural traditions and contexts; the few texts of Anatolian origin do not justify a direct link to the Turkophone “Karamanlidika” tradition of Asia Minor, but rather point to an indirect influence and confluence of various cultural forms of expression into the melting pot of the Ottoman capital. But at the same time these texts, like other specimens of “Turkish

literature in Greek alphabet” (the definition of “Karamanlidika” according to Balta 1997–1998: 132–133), show that the corpus of “Karamanlidika” considerably exceeds the Anatolian sphere and the linguistic borders of the Anatolian varieties of Turkish, or, even worse, of a non-existent, imaginary “Karamanli language” (cf. Kappler 2006). Thanks to this kind of text, future research will have to reflect about the contents and definition of “Karamanlidika” from the vantage point of the multi-faceted literary and linguistic forms under which this important cultural phenomenon appears.

References

- Amantos, Konstantinos 1955–1956 (Αμάντος). “Δημήτριος Σκαναβῆς (†1788)”. *Επιστημονική Επετηρίς Φιλοσοφικής Σχολῆς Πανεπιστημίου Αθηνών* 2/6: 147–151.
- Balta, Evangelia 1997–1998. “Périodisation et typologie de la production des livres Karamanli”. *Δελτίο Κέντρου Μικρασιατικών Σπουδών* 12: 129–153.
- Behar, Cem 1994. “Türk Musikisinin Tarihinin Kaynaklarından: Karamanlıca Yayınlar”. *Müteferrika* 2: 39–54.
- Behar, Cem 2002. “Karamanli publications as Sources for the History of Turkish Music”. *Internationales Colloquium Musikarchäologie in der Ägais und Anatolien*. Berlin: Deutsches Archäologisches Institut / Verlag Marie Leidorf, 631–640.
- Brendemoen, Bernt 2002. *The Turkish Dialects of Trabzon. Their Phonology and Historical Development. Volume I: Analysis*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Chatzipanagioti-Sangmeister, Julia 2002 (Χατζηπαναγιώτη). “Στιχουργήματα και συνταγές από τον 18^ο αιώνα. Ο κώδικας 725 της Γενναδαίου Βιβλιοθήκης”. *Göttinger Beiträge zur Byzantinischen und Neugriechischen Philologie* 2: 23–37.
- Chatzipanagioti-Sangmeister, Julia 2005 (Χατζηπαναγιώτη). “Ιωάννης Καρατζάς ο Κύπριος και Αθανάσιος Ψαλίδας, ή ο έρωτας και τα αποτελέσματά του στη νεοελληνική λογοτεχνία του Διαφωτισμού”. *Επετηρίδα Κέντρου Επιστημονικών Ερευνών* 31: 249–284.
- Chatzipanagioti-Sangmeister, Julia 2008. “Έκ του οράν το εράν. Der Eros und seine Wirkungen in der phanariotischen Lyrik der Aufklärung“. Stassinopoulou, M. A. & Zelepos, I. (eds.) *Griechische Kultur in Südosteuropa in der Neuzeit*. Vienna, 91–112.
- Daoutis, Zisis 1818 (Δαούτης) (ed.). *Διάφορα ήθικά και άστεῖα στιχουργήματα*. Vienna: Johann Zweck.
- Frantzi, Anteia 1999 (Φραντζή). “Εισαγωγή”. *Μισμαγιά. Ανθολόγιο φαναριώτικης ποίησης κατά την έκδοση Ζήση Δαούτη*, 11–46. Athens: Estia.
- Gökçeoğlu, Mustafa 2002. *Manilerimiz*. Nicosia: Eğitim Vakfı Yayınları.
- Göksu, M. Hasan 1996. *Manilerimiz*. Istanbul: Say Yayınları.

- Kappler, Matthias 1995. “Über die Beziehung der griechischen Bevölkerung Konstantinopels zur osmanischen Kultur im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert”. *Θησαυρίσματα* 25: 349–361.
- Kappler, Matthias 1998. “L’amour voilé: poésie bilingue et plurilingue dans les anthologies grecques et bulgares des chansons ottomanes du 19ème siècle”. *Mediterranean Language Review* 10: 146–168.
- Kappler, Matthias 2002. *Türkischsprachige Liebeslyrik in griechisch-osmanischen Liedanthologien des 19. Jahrhunderts*. Berlin: Klaus Schwarz.
- Kappler, Matthias 2006. “Toward a linguistic approach to ‘Karamanli’ texts”. Yağcıoğlu, Semiramis & Değer, Ayşen Cem (eds.) *Advances in Turkish Linguistics – Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Turkish Linguistics (11–13 August, 2004)*. Izmir: Dokuz Eylül Yayınları, 655–667.
- Khoury, René 1977. “Appel (Adân), louanges et invocation (Duâ) musulmans en grec moderne (Dimotiki)”. *Annales Islamologiques* 13: 247–255.
- Korkmaz, Zeynep 1994. *Nevşehir ve Yöresi Ağızları*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.
- Öztuna, Yılmaz 1990. *Büyük Türk Mûsikîsi Ansiklopedisi*. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı.
- Pistas, Panagiotis ²1994 (Πίστας). “Το νεανικό έργο ενός εθνομάρτυρα. Το «Σχολείον» του Ρήγα και τα προβλήματά του”. Ρήγας. *Σχολείον των ντελικάτων εραστών*, ιδ’-ος’. Athens: Ermis.
- Stathi, Pinelopi 1997 (Στάθη). “Κωνσταντινουπολίτικα στιχουργήματα, Η ωραία Μελομένη και ο διπρόσωπος εραστής Νικολάκης”. *Ο Ερασιστής* 21: 352–365.
- Üngör, Etem Ruhi 1981. *Türk Musikisi Güfteler Antolojisi*. Istanbul: Eren.

Appendix: the Turkish texts of the manuscript Gen. 725

I. Beyt¹²

ἄχ νέ μουσκιούλ ὀλούρ διλπέρ μουχαπέτι
ἄκιπέτ πῖρ δερδέ ὀγράρ γκερέκ

*Ah ne müşkül olur dilber muhabeti
akıbet bir derde oğrar gerek.*

‘Ah, how hard it is to be in love with a heart-captivating beauty:
as a result it must end up in grief!’

II. Şarki¹³

[1.] ἄ κίζ νέδιρ μπού γκιουζελίκ χέπ σενδέ,
ἄσκίνιλαν μέστ ὀλμούσεμ γκιουλ σενδέ.
σιρμά σατζλίμ, σιρμά βετζλίμ σεῖρ ἐγλέριμ
μπεγιάζ φεσλί μπαζ μπαγλαμίζ γκιουλ πεμπέ τζανίμ.
δουνιά δολού γκιουζέλ ὀλσά, μενίμ ὀλσά γκενέ γκιουγνιούμ βάρσενδέ.

*A kız nedir bu güzellik hep sende,
aşkımlan mest olmuşem gülşende.
Sırma saçım, sırma veclim seyr eylerim*¹⁴
*beyaz fesli baş bağlamış gül pembe canım*¹⁵.
*Dünya dolu güzel olsa, benim olsa gene göynüm var sende*¹⁶.

‘Hey girl, what is that beauty all about you?
In the garden I must have become inebriated falling in love with you!
I look at my beloved with silver hair and silver face,
my rosy rose has blossomed with a white fez.
Even if the world was full of beauties, and all were mine, my heart would still be
with you!’

12 f. 20r. The text bears the date “1774 μαΐου α” (01.05.1774).

13 f. 73v. The first strophe of this *şarki* is contained in the modern Turkish anthology Üngör (1981: 520), reporting also the musical tonality (*makam*) Isfahan Aksak, and the author (*güfteci*) of the text, Tanburî Mustafa Çavuş (?–1745?). The poet’s pseudonym (*mahlas*) Tanburî is contained, as usual, in the last strophe of the present *şarki*. Variants in Üngör’s edition are marked as “Ü” in the following footnotes.

14 Ü: sırma saçlı zerâfeti seyreyle

15 Ü: beyaz fese baş bağlıyor gülpenbe

16 Ü: *gene göynüm var sende*

[2.] χέρ νέ γκιγσέν γιαρασίγιωρ μπεγενδίμ,
σεβιλμέζμι μπογλέ μελέκ μενενδί;
χέμ χανίμσιν, χέμ τζανίμσιν σεμπέπ έτιν.
ò μεχμπασί γιάρ òλατζάκ ινανδί τζανίμ.
δουνιά δολού γκιου...

*Her ne giysen yaraşıyor beyendim,
sevilmeyiz mi böyle melek menendi?
Hem hanımsın, hem canımsın sebep etin.
O mehbaşı yar olacak inandı canım.
Dünya ...*

‘Whatever you wear, it suits you, I like it;
how can one not love such an angel?
You are a lady; you are my life, and the reason of it!
That moon-face believed that it will be the beloved friend, my dear!
Even if the world...’

[3.] κιουτζουτζεκτέν μουσαδίμβαρ σεβμεγέ
μουσκιούλ òλούρ σόγρα γιουζού γκιωρμεγέ.
γκέλσενίνλε άχτι έμάν ιδελίμ.
μπέλκι μπενίμ μουραδίμ βαρ òπμεγέ τζανίμ.
δουνιά δολού γκιουζ...

*Küçükekten müsadım var sevmeye,
müskül olur sögra yüzü görmeye.
Gel seninle aht-i eman idelim.
Belki benim muradım var öpmeye canım.
Dünya ...*

‘While still a child I am allowed to love you,
after it will be hard even to see your face.
Come on, let’s make a pact of peace!
Perhaps I desire to kiss you, my love!
Even if the world...’

[4.] γκερτζέκ òλδούμ σανά άσίκ òρκιμδέν [?] δαδέ,
γκιοζδέν μπράκμα μπενί, γιάκμα κίζ σενδέ.
ταμπουρινίν έφκιαρί βάρ σουλτάνιλε φεργιαζινέ
μπουλμπούλ μπενδέ γκιουλσενδέ τζανίμ.
δουνιά δολού γκιουζέλ...

*Gerçek oldum sana aşık ...kimden [?] dade,
gözden brakma beni, yakma kız sen de.
Tanburî'nin efkari var sultan ile feryazine,
bülbül bende gülşende canım.
Dünya ...*

'I really fell in love with you [...],
don't let me fall from your favor, don't hurt me, girl!
Tanburî's only thoughts are to wail because of the beloved sultana,
being like the nightingale a slave in the garden, my love!
Even if the world...'

III. Şarkı¹⁷

[1.] όγλέ γκιουζέλ σεβιλμέζμι
κοντζέ γκιούλδουρ σαριλμάζμι
ρευταρινέ μαίλ όλδούμ
μπογλέ τζιβάν σαριλμάζμι
σόζουμ γιόκ χουσονουέ
μπένδ όλδούμ ζουλφουνέ
μερχαμέτ κίλ μπανά βάι.

*Öyle güzel sevilmez mi,
gonce güldür sarılmaz mı?
Reftarine mail oldum,
böyle civan sarılmaz mı?
Sözüm yok hüsnüine,
bend oldum zülfüne,
merhamet kıl bana vay.*

'How can one not love such a beauty?
It is a blossoming rose, how can one not embrace it?
I am inclined to his graceful walking,
how can one not embrace such a young boy?
I have no words for his beauty,
I was seized by his locks,
have mercy on me, alas!'

17 f. 74r. The last strophe of the present *şarkı* contains the pseudonym (*mahlas*) Tanburî which points to the poet Tanburî Mustafa Çavuş (?–1745?), cf. previous *şarkı*. It is neither listed in the modern anthologies, nor in Öztuna 1990, and thus could represent an unedited composition of the famous composer. Of course the *mahlas* could theoretically also refer to another "Tanburî". The song is a *köçekçe* about a male dancer.

[2.] τζαλπαρεσίν άλίρ έλέ
 γκιρέρ ράζά γκιουλέ γκιουλέ
 γκιουζελερδέν πέκ γκιουζέλδιρ
 όλούρ μεντζλίζ πούρ βερβελέ
 σοζούμ γιόκ χουσνονέ...

*Çalparesin alır ele,
 girer raksa güle güle.
 Güzelerden pek güzeldir,
 olur menclis pür vervele.
 Sözüm yok ...*

‘He puts his castanets on his hands,
 and begins to dance with laughs and cheers.
 He is more beautiful than the beautifuls,
 on this party full of gaiety!
 I have no words...’

[3.] γκιουζέλ ογνάρ ουσουύλιλεν
 μπιρδέν κιλάρ άνίμιλεν [?]
 χέπ γκουζελέρ μπεστέ ιτζούν
 μπού γιαδιγιάρ σαρκί ιτζούν
 σοζούμ γιόκ χουσνονέ...

*Güzel oğnar usul ilen,
 birden kılar anim ilen [?].
 Her güzeler beste için,
 bu yadigar şarkı için.
 Sözüm yok ...*

‘He dances beautifully with the rhythm,
 suddenly he performs with [...]
 All the beauties for the composition,
 for this memorable song!
 I have no words ...’

[4.] μπάκ σού χουσνούίλεν έδαί
 δεγισμέμ σενί δουνιαί
 ταμπουρινίν ναζαρετί
 χενίζ δουστούμ μπού σεβδαί
 σοζούμ γιόκ χουσνονέ...

*Bak bu hüsnüyle edai,
değişmem seni dünyai.
Tamburi'nin nazareti
heniz düştüm bu sevdai.
Sözüm yok ...*

'Look, this manner, his beauty!
I would not exchange you for the whole world!
Tamburî overlooking says:
I just fell in love with him!
I have no words ...'

IV. Şarki¹⁸

δόστ ιστέρσεν ἀλλάχ γετέρ.
ĩşk ιστέρσεν ιπαδέτ γετέρ.
μάλ ιστέρσεν κενάτ γετέρ.
νασιχάτ ιστέρσεν ἀλλάχ γετέρ.
οὐμίδ ιστέρσεν ἀχρέτ γετέρ.
ἐδέπ τάτζ ὀλμούζ νούρι χουδαδέν.
ἄλ ὀνού πασινά γκίγ κουρτούλ πελαδέν.

*Dost istersen, Allah yeter,
iřk istersen, ibadet yeter,
mal istersen kemaat yeter,
nasihat istersen, Allah yeter.
Edep tac olmuş nur-ı hudaden,
al onu başına giy, kurtul beladen.*

'If you want a friend, God is enough,
if you want love, worshipping is enough,
if you want wealth, contentment is enough,
if you want advice, God is enough,
if you want hope, the Paradise is enough.
Modesty became the crown from the divine light,
take it, put it on your head and you will be saved from misfortune!'

V. Aphorism¹⁹

ινάτ τζαχλίνδρι, χιρχίρ αχμείνδρι,
σουκιοút ἀκλίνδρι, σερίατ ἀριφίνδρι

18 f. 75r. The rhythm (*usul*) is marked as arak (ἀράκ), the *makam* could be sultani (?). Poem related to Islamic mystical tradition; cf. VI. gazel.

19 f. 75r

*Inat cahilindir, hırhur ahmeindir
suküt akıldır, şeriat arifindir.*

‘Obstinacy belongs to the ignorant, quarrel to the stupid,
silence to the intelligent, law to the wise.’

VI. Gazel²⁰

σογιουνδούμ δερβιζ όλδούμ,
νεμέ γκερέκ άρ μπενίμ;

γióκτουρ άσλα χάμ ταμαχίμ,
δουνιά ίτζούν κιάρ μπενίμ.

χέλε μαλίμ γιόγουσάδα,
καναχατίμ βάρ μπενίμ.

χαράμιλεν καζανιλάν
μαλέ μιννέτ έίλεμέμ.

*Soyundum derviş oldum,
neme gerek ar benim?*

*Yoktur asla ham tamahım,
dünya için kar benim.*

*Hele malim yogusa da,
kanahatim var benim.*

*Haram ilen kazan ilen,
male minnet eylemem.*

‘I put my clothes off and became a dervish,
why should shame bother me?’

I never have desire or avarice,
nor do I seek profit for the worldly.

Even if I don’t have property,
I have contentment.

20 f. 79v

With forbidden things or with gains,
I don't go after wealth.'

VII. Proverb²¹

Φελέγλεν γκιουλεσέν,
χέπ ἄλτ γκελίρ χίτζ οὔστ γκελμέζ

*Feleyilen güleşen,
hep alt gelir hiç üst gelmez.*

'Who fights with the destiny,
comes always down, never up [= is always defeated and never wins].'

VIII. Mani²²

λέλιμ γιάρ μπού σεβδαί,
μπού δερδί μπού σεβδαί,
κουζούμ σενί σεβελί,
καζανδίμ μπού σεβδαί.

λέλιμ μπού σεβδά μπενί,
μπού δέρτ μπού σεβδά μπενί,
μπενί δαγλάρ γικμάζικαν,
γικτί μπού σεβδά μπενί.

*Lelim yar bu sevdai,
bu derdi bu sevdai,
kuzum seni seveli,
kazandım bu sevdai.*

*Lelim bu sevda beni,
bu dert bu sevda beni,*

*beni dağlar yıkamazıkan,
yıktı bu sevda beni.*

'Lalala, friend, this love,
this grief, this love,

my sweetheart, since I love you
I earned this love.

21 f. 80r

22 f. 80v. The poem bears the Greek title "μανέδες τουρκικοί" ('Turkish *manis*').

Lalala, this love,
 this grief, this love,
 although the mountains did not throw me down,
 this love did!

IX. Mani (çatışma)²³

κετέν γγομλέκ αλιάδιρ,
 γιουζδέ μπεγλέρ αλιάδιρ,
 σεβέρσεν μπίρ κίζ σέβ,
 αλίναμιζ καλάδιρ.

κετέν γγομλέκ αλλιάδιρ,
 τζιφτέ μπεγκλέρ αλιάδιρ,
 σεβέρσεν μπίρ γκελίν σέβ,
 κιζλάρ πασκά μπελάδιρ.

κετέν γγομλέκ διζδέδιρ,
 τζιφτέ μπεγλέρ γιουζδέδιρ,
 ὄνικί γγελίν σεβδίμ,
 δαχί γκιογνούμ κιζδάδιρ.

καγιαδάν ενδίμ δουζέ,
 σου μπαγλεδίμ νερκιζέ,
 γιδιγίλ χιζμέτ ίτίμ,
 μπίρ έλιά γκιοζλού κιζέ.

*Keten gömlek aladır,
 yüzde beyler aladır,
 seversen bir kız sev,
 alınmamış kaladır.*

*Keten gömlek alladır,
 çifte begler aladır,
 seversen bir gelin sev,
 kızlar başka beladır.*

*Keten gömlek dizdedir,
 çifte begler yüzdeder,
 on iki gelin sevdim,
 dahi göynüm kızdadır.*

²³ f. 82r. These *mani* are organized like a poetical dialogue (*çatışma*) between two persons, typical for the Anatolian tradition, but also used in cities like Istanbul (see above).

*Kayadan endim düze,
su bagledim nerkize,
yidi yıl hizmet itim,
bir ela gözlü kize.*

‘The linen shirt is variegated,
the moles on the face are spotted.
If you love, so love a girl,
before they are all taken!

The linen shirt is variegated,
the double mole is spotted.
If you love, so love a bride,
girls are only a calamity!

The linen shirt is on the knees,
the double mole is on the face.
I loved twelve brides,
but my heart is still with the girl!

I went down from the rocks to the valley,
I watered the narcissus.
I served seven years
a blue-eyed girl!’

X. Bilingual song²⁴

[1.] [85v] ἐφένδιμ νέδιρ μπου γαζέπ;
ταξιρατίμ νέδιρ άτζέπ;

γιατί νά γίνεις φῶς μου;
εἶτζ’ ἄδικα ἐχθρός μου;

*Efendim nedir bu gazep?
Taksiratim nedir acep?*

‘What’s this anger, efendi?
What’s my fault, I wonder?
Why, light of my eyes, will you become
my enemy without any reason?’

24 ff. 85v–86r. The song is dated “1780 Ἰανουάριος ια” (11.01.1780).

[2.] μπέν ότεδέν μπερί κουλόν,
 μπού ίστισκάλ μπανά ζουλούμ.
 τό έμαθες τό ξεύρεις,
 γιατί νά μέ παιδεύεις;

*Ben öteden beri kulun,
 bu istiskal bana zulum.*

‘I am ever your slave,
 your intolerance is a torment to me!
 You learned it, you know it!
 Why should you torment me?’

[3.] ντζέμπιρ μπού τζεφαλερίν,
 μπίλα τζουρμούμ σκεντζελερίν.
 δίχως ποσώς αίτία,
 νάχω τόσην παιδεία

*Nice bir bu cefalerin,
 bila cürmüm skencelerin.*

‘How many cruelties you do!
 I have no guilt, and you torture me!
 Without so much reason,
 I shall have so much torment!’

[4.] σαμπίτ όλσούν γιάρ γκιουναχίμ,
 άλλμα ναχάκ γερέ άχίμ.
 και μή μέ θανατώσεις,
 κι’ άδικα μέ σκοτώσεις.

*Sabit olsun yar günahım,
 alma nahak yere ahım.*

‘Prove my sin, beloved
 and don’t take my breath away unfairly!
 And don’t put me to death,
 don’t kill me unjustly!’

[5.] [86r] ζήρα μπού τζάνδιρ δαγιανμάζ,
 κίλ μερχαμέτ ά σελβινάζ.
 πουλάκι μου λυπήσου,
 κι’ όλίγον εϋσπλαγχήσου.

*Zira bu candır dayanmaz,
kıl merhamet a selv-i naz.*

‘Since my soul does not endure,
have pity, coquettish cypress!
My love, pity on me,
and a little mercy!’

[6.] κάλμαδι τακετίμ σαμπρέ,
έφένδιμ γκέλ κερέμ έγλέ.
τρέχω στό έλεός σου,
σάν σκλάβος έδικός σου.

*Kalmadı taketim sabre,
efendim gel kerem eyle.*

‘No strength is left to be patient,
come on and be kind to me!
I take refuge in your beneficence,
like a slave of yours!’

[7.] διλμπερλερδέ σελβιναζίμ,
καμπούλ έγλέ μπού νγιαζίμ.
και δός παρηγορίαν,
σέ λόγο μου καμμίαν.

*Dilberlerde selv-i nazım,
kabil eyle bu niyazım.*

‘Coquettish cypress of all beloveds,
accept this supplication!
And give some consolation
to what I say!’

XI. Inscription²⁵

τζενέτ μεκιάν σουλτάν μουσταφά χάν ζεμανινδά μοσκόβ κραλίγλε ιττιχάτ ιδούπ
γκενδουσινέ σακίζ κραλιγί παγεσί βερδιρέν. χαίνι δίνι δεβλέτ δημήτρηϊ σέρι
μακτουΐδιν τζεζασί τερτούπ όλουνμούστουρ

25 f. 116v. See comment above.

Cenet-mekan Sultan Mustafa Han zamanında Moskov Kralıyle ittihat idüp gendüsine Sakız Kral[ı]ığı payesi verdiren hain-i din-i devlet Dimitrii ser-i maktuudır cezası tertüp olunmuştur

‘The decapitation of the traitor of religion and state Dimitris has been executed as punishment for having collaborated, during the reign of Sultan Mustafa, may He rest in peace, with the King [sic!] of Moscow and being rewarded with the Kingdom of Chios.’

XII. Playful song (türkü?)²⁶

σειμέν πασί ὀλδοῦ γκεπέ
ζαρχανέ ὀλδοῦ ἐπέ
ἐμινί
κιουτζούκ δαχί καλίρσε, νέ τανδίρ καλίρ νέ κεπέ.

*Seymen başı oldu gebe,
zarbhane oldu ebe,
emini
küçük dahi kalırse,
ne tandır kalır ne kebe.*

‘[The wife of ?] the Chief Keeper of Hounds²⁷ got pregnant,
the mint was the midwife,
... [Emine?]
even if it remains small,
no *tandır* is left and no *kebe*²⁸.’

²⁶ f. 149v. There are some obscure points in the meaning of the text.

²⁷ Military rank in the Imperial Army

²⁸ *tandır* is a sort of table with a pan of coals, on which a large felt carpet (*kebe*) is thrown over in order to warm the feet.