

Hülya Çelik

Ruhr University Bochum, Germany
h.celik@rub.de

Ani Sargsyan

University of Hamburg, Germany
ani.sargsyan@uni-hamburg.de

Introducing Transcription Standards for Armeno-Turkish Literary Studies

Abstract:

Turkish literature in Armenian script comprises a large corpus of manuscripts dating from the 14th century together with printed material published between the 18th and 20th centuries. Books were printed in a wide geographical area and their contents were produced by mono- and bilingual Turkish- (and Armenian)-speaking Ottoman Armenians. Therefore, Armeno-Turkish text production represents the textual output enabled through Armenian and Turkish cross-cultural interactions, including various genres and different types of text. Although the scope of Armeno-Turkish text production is extensive, scholarly engagement with Armeno-Turkish texts at universities has only been markedly evident since the 2000s. The most significant reason for this late and limited engagement may lie in the obstacle of the hybrid nature of the script and the language, whereby Armeno-Turkish literature has a place neither in Turkish nor in Armenian literary studies. The aims of this article are therefore (1) to give a short overview of hitherto scholarly work with Armeno-Turkish text corpora and (2) to propose a standard for the transcription of Turkish texts in Armenian script. In a *longue durée* perspective, we aim to conduct inclusive literary studies and examine Armeno-Turkish literature within the greater framework of (Ottoman) Turkish literature.

Keywords: Armeno-Turkish literature, transcription, Armeno-Turkish printing, Turkish in Armenian script, inclusive literary studies

1. Introduction

As scholars of the Ottoman Turkish and Modern Turkish language, literature and culture in the 16th – 20th centuries, we began a joint study on manuscripts and printed books in Turkish written in Armenian script (Armenian Հայաստանի թրքերէն/*Hayadaş Trk'erēn*, Turkish *Ermeni Harflı Türkçe*)¹ in 2020. In the workshop “HTRising Ottoman Manuscripts”, organised by the chair of Turkish Studies at the University of Vienna on 12 March 2021, we discussed transcription standards for working with handwritten and printed material in the Turkish language and different scripts on the platform *Transkribus*.²

- 1 For the transcription of Armenian names and words we used the system of the Library of Congress. See URL: <https://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpsd/romanization/armenian.pdf> (18 August 2022).
- 2 URL: <https://readcoop.eu> (4 June 2022).

In order to be as accurate as possible when transcribing Armeno-Turkish texts with Latin letters, we investigated extant published editions (see below) and decided to propose a transcription close to the transcription system we use in our field for Turkish texts written in the Arabo-Persian alphabet, that is, the transcription table of the *İslâm Ansiklopedisi*.³ The proposed transcription system is used especially for printed books from the start of the 19th century onwards. Our intention is to provide a coherent transcription system appropriate for the demands of literary studies focused on Armeno-Turkish texts, and to invite colleagues to comment, emend and propose alternative transcriptions.⁴

Armeno-Turkish text production is not only interesting from the perspective of literary studies, but also, as already indicated by linguists of the Turkish language, ‘it tends to reflect the pronunciation [of Turkish] more adequately than texts in Ottoman script’.⁵ We also note that there is an increasing body of scholarship in the field of Armeno-Kipchak⁶ that is beyond the scope of this study.⁷

2. Armeno-Turkish Text Production as a Field of Study

Initial scholarly engagement with Armeno-Turkish literary output began in Europe in the first three decades of the 20th century, carried out by figures such as Friedrich von Kraelitz-Greifenhorst, Enno Littmann and Otto Spies.⁸ Kraelitz-Greifenhorst misinterpreted Armeno-Turkish as a dialect and (1) explained how the “Armeno-Turks” used the

3 Durmuş 2012.

4 We express our gratitude to Edith Gülçin Ambros, Janina Karolewski, Oliver Kontny, Astrid Menz, Claudia Römer, Boghos Levon Zekiyian, and the anonymous reviewers of this article for their valuable suggestions and remarks on earlier versions of this study. The authors are wholly responsible for any errors or misinterpretations.

5 Csató, Brendemoen, Johanson, Römer, Stein 2016, 19. See also Pratt 1866, 374: ‘in its [Armeno-Turkish] application to Turkish it receives some modifications which render it almost perfect as a phonetic representation of that language, and it is in this respect worthy of attention’.

6 However, for introductions to the topic and further bibliographies, see Pritsak 1959, Schütz 1961 and 1976, Dashkevich 1994, Garkavets 2017, etc.

7 Nevertheless, we underline Schütz 1961, 143: ‘The most important change that has taken place in the phonetic system of the Armenian language over part of the speech area is the “second Armenian Lautverschiebung”. This is the most essential difference between the literary language of the Armenian SSR and the literary language of the Armenians who have fled west since the 11th century. For the standard language of the medieval Cilician Little Armenia there is an unbroken line leading to the phonetic system of the modern, so-called West Armenian literary language. [...] On the other hand, viewed from the side of Turcology, the “second Lautverschiebung” (having affected the sets of explosive and affricates) as well as the phonetic system of the contemporary West Armenian literary language offer a possibility for the reconstruction of the phonetism of the Armeno-Kipchak linguistic documents.’ See also 3.1. Transcription of the current study.

8 von Kraelitz-Greifenhorst 1912, Littmann 1918 and Spies 1923/24.

Armenian alphabet to render Turkish and (2) pointed to the ‘dialectal peculiarities of Turkish speaking Armenians’.⁹ His article, which was a lecture given at the Academy of Sciences in Vienna, is not of high scholarly value and is more confusing than enlightening (see below). It is noteworthy that he used prints then available in the library of the Mekhitarist Congregation in Vienna without naming them!

Littmann and Spies, on the other hand, concentrated on folk literature. While the former analysed a shadow theatre play, the latter investigated the folk story “Esmān and Zeycān”, which – as with many other printed folk stories of the 19th century – was printed not only in Ottoman Turkish (i.e. Turkish in Arabo-Persian script), but also in Turkish using Armenian and Greek letters (Karamanli).¹⁰

In Turkey, especially in the 1980s, there was a scholarly focus on folk literature and the Turkish novel, which generated shorter articles written by Turgut Kut about Armeno-Turkish prints.¹¹ However, the most comprehensive and in-depth investigation of Armeno-Turkish texts in the context of Turkish linguistics is Armin Hetzer’s study *Daçkerēn-Texte: Eine Chrestomathie aus Armenierdrucken des 19. Jahrhunderts in türkischer Sprache* (i.e. “Daçkerēn texts: A Chrestomathy of 19th-century Armenian Prints in the Turkish Language”).¹² The somewhat confusing structure of the study does not take away from its importance for the academic engagement with Armeno-Turkish. Hetzer considers earlier studies of scholars of Turkish, such as the aforementioned Friedrich von Kraelitz-Greifenhorst and the Indo-European linguist Eugeniusz Śluskiwicz.¹³ In particular, he deals at length with Kraelitz-Greifenhorst’s misinterpretations¹⁴ of Armeno-Turkish and concludes that Armeno-Turkish is a functional style and not a dialect or sociolect.¹⁵ Nevertheless, Hetzer emphasises that Kraelitz-Greifenhorst was unable to get the results obtained by himself, as he (Kraelitz-Greifenhorst) took the Ottoman written language as his starting point.¹⁶ With a chrestomathy comprising 70 specimen texts, including well-known examples such as Vartan Paşa’s *Akabi Hikayesi*, Hetzer shows that Armeno-Turkish (as Turkish) has different registers.¹⁷ Furthermore, he demonstrates that the place of print and the intended readership of the text can reveal internal inconsistencies in terms of orthography. What Kraelitz-Greifenhorst

9 von Kraelitz-Greifenhorst 1912, 4.

10 For a detailed study of the printing of folk literature in the late Ottoman period, including prints in Armeno-Turkish and Karamanli, see Ayaydın Cebe 2009, 2013.

11 Cf. Koptaş 2002, XX–XXII.

12 Hetzer 1987.

13 von Kraelitz-Greifenhorst 1912 and Śluskiwicz 1939.

14 For a detailed review of Friedrich von Kraelitz-Greifenhorst’s article, see Acharyan 1912–3.

15 Hetzer 1987, 58–60.

16 Hetzer 1987, 11 and 65–72.

17 See also Cankara 2018, 181, who discusses Acharyan’s suggestions about the main providers and producers of Armeno-Turkish and observes at least three different registers used by Istanbulite Armenians, i.e. everyday Turkish, literary Turkish and “Turkish as it was used only when speaking in Armenian”. Compare with Acharyan 1951, 171, who actually writes about the third register as “Turkish loanwords that Armenians used when speaking Armenian”.

interpreted as ‘dialectical peculiarity’, only some decades later, after the language reform (1928–1929), ‘found its way into the rulebooks’ of standard Turkish.¹⁸

However, Armin Hetzer was not the first to make this accurate critique of Kraelitz-Greifenhorst’s biased and even false judgements. In 1913, shortly after the publication of Kraelitz-Greifenhorst’s paper, Hrach’ya Acharyan had already emphasised that, due to misreadings, Kraelitz-Greifenhorst incorrectly considered Armeno-Turkish as a separate dialect with its own grammatical and syntactical rules.¹⁹

Apart from Andreas Tietze’s edition of the first known novel in the Turkish language, *Akabi Hikayesi* (1991), and his co-authored study with Avedis K. Sanjian on Eremya Çelebi Kömürçiyân’s Armeno-Turkish poem “The Jewish Bride”, it was only after 2000 that an academic interest in Armeno-Turkish literature developed: Laurent Mignon²⁰ and Johann Strauss’s²¹ pioneering works concerned with the multi- and intercultural literary outputs of the late Ottoman Empire paved the way for a scholarly and interdisciplinary examination of Armeno-Turkish from literary and cultural historical perspectives.²² In this area the works and publications of Murat Cankara deserve special mention. Starting with his PhD “*İmparatorluk ve Roman: Ermeni Harfli Türkçe Romanları Osmanlı/Türk Edebiyatı Tarihyazımında Konumlandırılmak*”,²³ Cankara was one of the first scholars to contextualise Armeno-Turkish texts within the framework of Ottoman and Turkish literary history. After this, he focused his investigations on the ‘hybrid’ nature of Armeno-Turkish, cross-cultural encounters among the Ottoman *millet*s and the question of identity.²⁴

Although we have several bibliographies of Armeno-Turkish manuscripts and prints at our disposal, there is still a need for a comprehensive catalogue and/or bibliography to identify the location of Armeno-Turkish manuscripts, books and periodicals.²⁵ The most important bibliographies in this field were published by Hasmik Stepanyan²⁶ and

18 Hetzer 1987, 68: “Heute, da wir über einen türkischen “Duden” (Türkçe Sözlük) verfügen, erkennen wir leicht, daß manches von dem, was Kraelitz als dialektische Eigenheit der Armeno-Türken einstuft und seinerzeit von der als klassisch geltenden osmanischen Sprache abwich, den Weg in die Regelwerke gefunden hat.”

19 See Acharyan 1912–3 and Acharyan 1951, 267.

20 Mignon 2021. See especially Chapter 2, “The Roses of the Anatolian Garden”, Chapter 3, “The “Refuse and Ruins” of Literary History”, and Chapter 4 “Beyond *Atala*: Vartan Pasha, Zafer Hanım, and the Romantic Rebellion”.

21 Strauss 2010.

22 It should be noted that there is an increasing number of studies on political and cultural history investigating the Ottoman Armenians’ role in the late Ottoman Empire. See Aslanian 2014 and 2016, Der Matossian 2020, Ueno 2016, etc.

23 The English title of the PhD dissertation is: “Empire and Novel: Placing Armeno-Turkish Novels in Ottoman / Turkish Literary Historiography”. See Cankara 2011, URL: <http://www.thesis.bilkent.edu.tr/0006455.pdf> (18 August 2022).

24 Cankara 2014, 2015 and 2018. Cankara also published Vartan Paşa’s / Hovsep Vartanyan’s *Boşboğaz Bir Adem* and the memoirs of Simon Arakelyan in modern Turkish.

25 For a short overview of Armeno-Turkish, see Berberian 1964.

26 Stepanyan 2005 and 2008.

are still indispensable for research into Armeno-Turkish literature. Garo Aprahamyan wrote two short comments – the first on bibliographic catalogues comprising Armeno-Turkish literature in general and the second specifically on Stepanyan’s catalogue of Armeno-Turkish periodicals, in which he outlines the shortcomings of her bibliographies.²⁷ Further bibliographic works, none of which can be regarded as complementary to Stepanyan’s extant bibliographies, are those of Kevork Pamukciyan²⁸ and Zakarya Mildanoğlu.²⁹ While Pamukciyan’s work also comprises biographies of famous Ottoman Armenians, Mildanoğlu’s study relates to Armenian periodicals published between 1794 and 2000, but also contains a short section on Armeno-Turkish periodicals.³⁰

As a result particularly of recent library digitisation activities, we have access to a vast number of Armeno-Turkish prints comprising different genres and types of texts. The National Library of Armenia provides fully digitised prints from which it is possible to conduct further comprehensive research on a selected corpus.³¹ Viçen Tilkiyan’s Armeno-Turkish works, for example (unlike his Ottoman-Turkish works),³² were beyond the scope of Turkish literary studies because they were not accessible. Reference to these works was only possible through bibliographic data.³³

3. Proposed Transcription System

For the sake of accuracy, as well as to propose a transcription standard that facilitates the reading of Armeno-Turkish content for students and researchers, we used different material. Although there is an increasing tendency to publish literary examples in the popular rather than the academic sphere, from the body of edited Armeno-Turkish literature we used only Andreas Tietze’s edition of Vartan Paşa’s *Akabi Hikayesi*.³⁴ Further, we randomly selected from literary texts as well as functional text production but at the same time different registers such as popular folk literature, translated novels, original literature as well as one text book for primary school education. The Armeno-Turkish publications we considered for this article are as follows:

27 Aprahamyan 2011 and 2014; Aprahamyan 2011, 148–9 refers also to another bibliography of “Armenian script foreign books” by Ardashes Kardashyan.

28 Pamukciyan 2002.

29 Mildanoğlu 2014.

30 Mildanoğlu 2014, 387–96.

31 URL : <http://haygirk.nla.am/> (4 June 2022).

32 Ayaydın Cebe 2016.

33 Thanks to digitisation projects of the National Library of Armenia, Viçen Tilkiyan’s novels (*Կիլիկիայի ասիական քեֆերի կտորիւնսկէրէք հէր քէսի կտորնս պիր գոգ. Օթուզ պիր կիկիէր թազախի օրնունոշ մուգսաննէլէ*, 1868 *Gülinya yahod Kendi Görünmeyerek Her Kesi Gören Bir Kız. Otuz Bir Gıyceye Taşım Olunmuş Mukaddeme*), as well as pamphlets / satirical essays written and published in Armeno-Turkish, are at least digitally available, cf. URL: http://haygirk.nla.am/upload/1512-1940/1851-1900/kivlinea_eaxot1868.pdf. (11 June 2022).

34 Tietze 1991.

- The novel *Akabi Hikayesi*, “The Story of Akabi”, printed in 1851 in Istanbul.³⁵
- The novel *Yenoveva*, which is a translation/adaptation of Christoph von Schmid’s “Genovefa”, printed in 1868.³⁶
- The folk tale *Köroğlu/Köroğlu*, “The Blind Man’s Son”, printed in 1875 in Istanbul.³⁷
- The novel *Hekyayeyi iki kapu yoldaşları yahod hakku adaletin zabiri*, “The Story of Two Neighbours or the Appearance of Right and Justice”,³⁸ authored by Hovsep Kurban and printed in 1885 in Istanbul (3 volumes).³⁹
- The novel *Leydi İzabel*, “Lady Isabel”, printed in Istanbul in 1910.⁴⁰
- The folk tale *Aşık Kerem ile Aslı Hanım*, “Bard Kerem and Aslı”, printed in 1911 in Istanbul.⁴¹
- The novel *Aknes ve yahod ney çalan kızcığaz*, “Agnes or The Little Girl Playing the Reed Pipe”, printed in 1912 in Jerusalem.⁴²
- The textbook “The First Book of Little Children”, printed 1913 in Istanbul.⁴³

- 35 Title: *Akabi Hikayesi. Kostantaniye Mühendis Oğlu Tabhanesinde*. 1851. (= *Akabi*) (438 pages). Although the author is not recorded, it is well known that the story of Akabi was authored by Vartan Paşa aka Hovsep Vartanyan (d. 1879).
- 36 Title: *Yenoveva Yani Ahlakı Hamideyle Mevsuf Libaza Nisa Taifesine İbretnüma Olmaya Mahsus Hikayeyi Nefise İkinci Defa [Tab’ Olunmuş Dur Asitane R. H. Kürkçyan Tab’hanesinde Fincancılar Yokuşu N. 19, 1868* (= *Yenoveva*) (128 pages), English translation: “Yenoveva, this is the fine story especially applicable to women of virtue”. We know only from the introduction in the 1868 print that the first edition was in 1855: see p. 3, “Dibace”.
- 37 The full title of the Armeno-Turkish print is: *Hikayeyi Kör Oğlu Türküleri ile beraber Türki lisanından tercüme olunarak tabh ve temsil kılındı*, İstanbul, 1875 (= *Kör Oğlu*) (47 pages).
- 38 See Mignon 2021, 39, on this and other Armeno-Turkish novels.
- 39 Title: *Hekyayeyi iki kapu yoldaşları yahod hakku adaletin zabiri Eseri Hovsep H. Kurban. Cildü sani, Asitane Nşan Berberyan*, 1885 (= *İki Kapu Yoldaşları*) (254 pages). Cf. also Karakılıçık 2011 and Mignon 2021, 39.
- 40 Title: *Leydi İzabel [İst Linn], Müellifi Misis Henri Uud, Mütercimi Dokt. A. Nağkaşyan, Z. Berberyan Matbaası*, 1910 (?) (= *Leydi İzabel*) (428 pages). The year of publication is not recorded in the print, although the National Library of Armenia gives 1910 as the date: see Stepanyan 2005, 317 and URL: http://haygirk.nla.am/upload/1512-1940/1901-1940/leydiizapel_1910.pdf. (4 June 2022).
- 41 Title: *Aşık Kerem ile Aslı Hanım Hikayesi Türkileri ile. Türkçe Lisanından Terceme Olunarak Tab u Temsil Kılındı. Stambol, Matbaa Y. Holas (Bahçe kapu, Meydancık Kazasker Han Tiv 23)*, 1911 (= *Aşık Kerem*) (150 pages).
- 42 Title: *Aknes ve yahod ney çalan kızcığaz, Ermeniceden Tercime Eyledi Antebli Y. S. Kürkcianoff Üçüncü Defa Tab Olundu, Kuds şerif Ermeni Mar Yakub Manastırın Tabhanesinde*, 1912 (3rd edition) (= *Aknes*) (184 pages). Although we were not able to determine the source language of this translation we can say that the source text must be Christoph von Schmid’s “Die kleine Lautenspielerin”. The authors of the current study are preparing an edition of the Armeno-Turkish translation.
- 43 *Küçük Çocukların İlk Kitabı. Ya’ni okumak öğrenmek için eylenceli bir yol*. İstanbulda, Matba’i Hagop Madteosyan, 1913 (= *İlk Kitabı*) (74 pages).

3.1 Transcription

Before going into detail regarding existing transcription and/or transliteration tables for Armeno-Turkish texts, we should point out some peculiarities of the Armenian alphabet, especially the phenomenon of two contemporary literary Armenian standards, namely, Eastern and Western. As stated by Kevork B. Bardakjian (and many others):

There are two contemporary literary Armenian standards: Eastern (spoken in the Republic of Armenia, the former soviet dispersion, and Iran, and, in recent decades, notably in Northern America as well) and Western (spoken by the descendants of the survivors of the genocide of 1915, now dispersed throughout the world). [...] Eastern Armenian has maintained the phonetic values of Classical Armenian but uses a new spelling system. Western Armenian has maintained the traditional spelling system of Classical Armenian but not all of its phonetic values.⁴⁴

Furthermore, as Astrid Menz further explains, ‘Classical Armenian had three series of clusives and affricates, the voiced, voiceless unaspirated and voiceless aspirated.’ This phenomenon concerns the pronunciation development of the following consonants in Western Armenian: *p-uq-ih* (p / b / p^h), *η-un-θ* (t / d / t^h), *q-l-p* (k / g / k^h), *ā-ō-g* (tz / dz / ts^h), and *ǰ-ǰ-ǰ* (č / j / č^h). This means, these consonant groups have different phonetic values in Eastern and Western Armenian.⁴⁵

As the purpose of this study is to introduce a transcription standard for Turkish texts in Armenian letters written and printed especially in the 19th century and in the first two decades of the 20th century in the Ottoman realm, we decided to focus primarily on the peculiarities of the Ottoman written language of these centuries, attempting to consider the pronunciation of Western Armenian literary standards.

The best-known standard for the romanisation of Armenian letters is the so-called “Hübschmann-Meillet transliteration system”⁴⁶ introduced by Heinrich Hübschmann⁴⁷ and Antoine Meillet. It has been in use since 1913⁴⁸ and is a more appropriate fit with Eastern Armenian and Classical Armenian or Grabar / Krapar than with

44 Bardakjian 2000, 649.

45 Menz 2010, 175–6: “*Das klassische Armenische verfügte über drei Reihen von Klusilen und Affrikaten, die stimmhaften, stimmlos unaspirierten und stimmlos aspirierten. [...] Ein Merkmal, das im modernen Armenischen die Standardvarietäten Ost- und Westarmenisch voneinander unterscheidet, ist die Entwicklung eben dieser Konsonantenreihen. Während das Ostarmenische die Dreiteilung so erhalten hat, fand im Westarmenischen eine Vertauschung der Reihen der nicht-aspirierten Konsonanten statt, infolge der die ursprünglich stimmhaften Klusile und Affrikaten entstimmt wurden, die stimmlos unaspirierten dagegen stimmhaft, siehe Abeghian (1936: 15).*”

46 We emphasise that we propose a transcription system but not a transliteration system for Armeno-Turkish texts, which means our system does not allow a full reconstruction of all the Armenian letters.

47 Heinrich Hübschmann was a scholar of Iranian and Armenian studies. Cf. Rüdiger Schmitt and Erich Kettenhofen: “Hübschmann, (Johann) Heinrich”, in *Encyclopaedia Iranica Online*.

48 Meillet 1913, 8–9.

Western Armenian. This transliteration system is common, especially in linguistic literature about Classical Armenian.

The Library of Congress (LC) (see Appendix 1) introduced a slightly different transcription system.⁴⁹ As with the Hübschmann-Meillet system, its purpose is to romanise Eastern Armenian and Classical Armenian and it gives phonetic values of Western Armenian in brackets. Understandably, neither system considered Armeno-Turkish text production, as each was focused on the Armenian language. Therefore, using either of these transliteration / transcription systems to render Turkish texts written with Armenian letters will adversely affect the readability. We are aware of the fact that transliteration systems introduced especially by libraries (like that of the LC) serve to enable the recovery of the original script. While these are mostly suitable for the Armenian language (Eastern or Western), it is obvious that a transcription (but not a transliteration) system is more appropriate for the peculiarities of a Turkish text written in Armenian letters (see 3.2).

Nevertheless, until quite recently, even state libraries used one of these systems to render the Armeno-Turkish titles of works. This is still the case for many libraries in Europe, for example the Bavarian State Library. The LC transcription system is also used for Armeno-Turkish texts in a few articles written by Murat Cankara, Bedross Der Matossian and Masayuki Ueno, especially when giving bibliographic information.⁵⁰ Publications in Turkey dealing with Armeno-Turkish texts – scholarly as well as popular editions – often lack any transcription system, and mostly transfer Armeno-Turkish into modern standard Turkish.⁵¹

From the 1980s there emerged various transcription systems within the narrower field of Armeno-Turkish literary editions. In the aforementioned “The Jewish Bride”, Sanjian and Tietze already understood the difficulties of the Hübschmann-Meillet system for Armeno-Turkish and used their “own adaptation” (see Appendix 2).⁵² In his previously mentioned fundamental chrestomathy of 1987, Hetzer provides and employs another modified transcription system that is very close to our proposed table (see Appendix 3).

Later, Tietze, in his edition of Vartan Paşa’s *Akabi Hikayesi*, used quite a different system but did not offer a special transcription table.⁵³ Then, in 2002, Pamukciyan

49 LC: <https://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpsd/romanization/armenian.pdf>. (4 June 2022).

50 Cankara 2018 uses LC, but Ueno 2016 uses LC only for bibliographic information and adds: ‘[...] while in the text, I employed a slightly modified rule for the readability’ (Ueno 2016, 617).

51 For example, Ayaydın Cebe 2009 and Cankara 2015.

52 Sandjian and Tietze 1981 do not differ between \acute{p} (p) and p (ph), t (h) and t (th), k (q) and k (p). In addition, they use sh ($ç$) when we use $ş$ and jh (d) when we use j and j (h) when we use c .

53 Tietze does not distinguish between \acute{p} (p) and p (ph), t (h) and t (th) and uses capital letters for some Armenian letters that do not occur in Turkish texts, except in certain words. Examples are *pum* / *kaR*, *ηηιηιηι* / *ğurüş*, and only in terms of Armenian personal names, such as in *Համբարձում* / *HamparCum*, *Անթառնաւ* / *AntaRam*, *Բառնիկ* / *PaRnig*, *Վարդէնի* / *VarTeni* or *Սարիղու* / *MariZa*.

employed a slightly simplified transcription in *Ermeni Harfli Türkçe Metinler* (“Armeno-Turkish Texts / Turkish Texts in Armenian Letters”) (see Appendix 4).

In the following discussion we will outline the differences between the existing transcription tables and our proposed one. After showing our proposed transcription table, we will explain some peculiarities of Armeno-Turkish printed texts.

Based on the intention to render Turkish in Armenian script with Latin letters, as we maintained it within Turkish literary studies focused on Ottoman text production, we tried to emulate, as far as possible, what we considered to be the closest extant transcription standard, namely that of *İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. At the same time, we attempted to consider the peculiarities of the written Ottoman-Turkish language between 1850 and 1915, especially as that period saw a peak in Armeno-Turkish text production in the Ottoman Empire.⁵⁴ Although we attempted to provide a Latin counterpart for each Armenian letter, this was not suitable in five cases: we decided to transcribe ζ and ϱ with ζ , h and j with y , \tilde{a} and g with ts , l and ι with v , and n and o with o . Additionally, in the case of n , we decided to provide two transcription alternatives for the same letter, namely o and vo , and explain why and how we made these decisions.

We followed Hetzer especially for \dot{p} (η) and t (η), and differed in x for hu , which we transcribe with h . Although Hetzer also used the transcription sign \dot{g} for η , he did not specify this in his table. For η he additionally used the transcription sign \ddot{g} , but we used only \dot{g} for η .⁵⁵ He judged Armenian letters that only occurred in Armenian words to be unrepresentable within Turkish pronunciation. However, in common with us, he used special transcriptions within brackets as follows: for ϱ he specified “[ç]”, where we used ζ ; for n he specified “[rr]”, where we chose \dot{r} ; for g he specified “[ts]”, where we chose ts . He saw the Armenian letter ι merely as a “component of u”, whereas we decided to transcribe it as a “v” when it occurred in words of Armenian origin or Armenian names. For \tilde{a} Hetzer specified “z” in brackets, which we transcribed with ts ; for the Armenian n he used only o in brackets, which we decided to transcribe either as o (in “Ottoman” words and in the medial position in words of Armenian origin) and vo (in words of Armenian origin in the initial position).

Hetzer did not include the letters o / o and ϕ / f in his table. It was only in the explanations to the table that he transcribed them as o and f accordingly, explaining that they were “not needed in the classical language”.⁵⁶

Pamukciyan decided to differentiate between \tilde{a} (dz) and g (ts), whereas we opted to give both letters the same transcription with “ts”. Furthermore, he used the modern

54 Ottoman Turkish of that time can be described as “New Ottoman”. See Kerslake 1998, 181–2 and Woodhead 2012, 145.

55 Today’s modern Turkish \dot{g} is represented in Armeno-Turkish texts with the Armenian letters j [y], l [g] and η [\dot{g}]. For this reason we decided not to use the letter \dot{g} as a transcription letter.

56 Hetzer 1987, 417, states: “Die Buchstaben f , ϕ und o , die die klassische Sprache noch nicht benötigte, stehen außerhalb des Kanons. In Dačkere-Texten kommen sie natürlich oft vor.” He adds ‘Den ursprünglichen Buchstaben o treffen wir hingegen nur als Teil des Digramms ow an, das den Lautwert $/u/$ verkörpert.’ Cf. also Acharyan 1951, 240–1.

Turkish *ğ* for Armenian *ղ* (*y*), where we decided to use *ğ*, which would correspond mostly to the Arabic *ğayn*. In addition, he used the transcription (or pronunciation) *kh* for the Armenian letter *խ*, for which we used the transcription letter *h*. He also used *t* for the Armenian letters *դ* and *թ*, which we intended to differentiate (following Hetzer) by using *ṭ* for *դ* and *t* for *թ*. Finally, while Pamukciyan did not differentiate the Armenian letters *զ* and *ք*; in this regard, we decided to differentiate between *k* for *զ* and *k* for *ք*.

Regarding the transcription of Armenian punctuation marks as Latin ones, we chose to follow the common romanisation rules, as for example recorded in the above-mentioned LC system.⁵⁷ LC recommends transforming Armenian angle brackets («...») into curled quote marks (“...”); turning the question mark (՞) into (?); transforming the exclamation mark (՛) into (!). It also recommends not transcribing the punctuation mark (՛) at all, and to transform the Armenian mark (:) into (.). We have made two additions to what is already recorded in the LC document, namely the mark (՛) (Armenian *բութ* / *but*), which should be transcribed as a comma (,), and the mark (.) (Armenian *միջակետ* / *mijaket*) as a semicolon (;).

We note that this proposed transcription table emerged through the need to teach the platform *Transkribus* to read and automatically transcribe Armeno-Turkish texts, with the aim to make a corpus of texts available and easily readable. We are aware that this transcription table might not be as useful for linguistic purposes as it is for literary and content-based research. However, it can be extended and / or changed for further purposes.⁵⁸

Armenian Alphabet ⁵⁹	Pronunciation in (Armeno-)Turkish	Proposed Transcription
Ա ա	<i>a</i> as in ստատւմ [<i>adam</i> , “man”] ⁶⁰	<i>a</i>
Բ բ	<i>p</i> as in գաբու [<i>kapu</i> , “door”]	<i>ḡ</i>
Գ գ	<i>k</i> as in գաբու [<i>kapu</i>]	<i>ḡ</i>
Դ դ	<i>t</i> as in վարդապետ [<i>Vartabed</i> , “priest”]	<i>ṭ</i>
Ե ե	<i>y</i> as in ետևի [<i>yedi</i> , “seven”]	<i>y</i>
Զ զ	<i>z</i> as in գրչ [<i>kız</i> , “girl”]	<i>z</i>
Է է	<i>e</i> as in միլլետ [<i>millet</i> , “nation, people”]	<i>e</i>
Ը ը	<i>ı</i> as in եսպրչ [<i>yazık</i> , “a pity, a shame”]	<i>ı</i>
Թ թ	<i>t</i> as in աթ [<i>at</i> , “horse”]	<i>t</i>
Ժ ժ	<i>j</i> as in միլլետ [<i>mijde</i> , “good news”]	<i>j</i>

57 Cf. footnote 43 and see also Sakayan 2012, 36–7 and 226–67, and *İlk Kitabı*, 75.

58 Cf. the research note of Köse, Akcan, Çelik and Sargsyan, 2022 forthcoming.

59 We have decided to show both the capitals and small letters of the Armenian alphabet, as in some cases they differ very much in graphical respects.

60 For the translation of Turkish / Ottoman-Turkish words we mainly used Redhouse 2017.

Armenian Alphabet ⁵⁹	Pronunciation in (Armeno-)Turkish	Proposed Transcription
Ի ի	<i>i</i> as in զիյաւնէ [ziyade, “more, much, too much”]	i
Լ լ	<i>l</i> as in էօյլէ [öyle, “so, in that manner”]	l
Խ խ	<i>h</i> as in սախի [dahi, “also”]	h
Ծ ծ	<i>æ</i> as in ծառայ [æara, “slave”]	æ
Կ կ	<i>g</i> as in կէրի [geri, “back”]	g
Հ հ	<i>b</i> as in հէման [heman, “at once”]	h
Ձ ձ	<i>ts</i> as in ձօն [tson, “gift”]	ts
Ղ ղ	<i>ğ</i> as in սողորմ [dogru, “right”]	ğ
Ճ ճ	<i>c</i> as in ճան [can, “soul, live”]	c
Մ մ	<i>m</i> as in սամմա [amma, “but”]	m
Յ յ	<i>y</i> as in էյլէր [eyler, “he / she / it does”]	y
Ն ն	<i>n</i> as in նիշան [nişan, “sign, trace”]	n
Շ շ	<i>ş</i> as in պաշ [baş, “head”]	ş
Ո ո	<i>o</i> in the medial position as in Գրիգոր [Krikor] or <i>vo</i> in the initial position as in նրդի [vorti, “son”]	o / vo
Չ չ	<i>ç</i> as in չօկ [çok, “many, much”]	ç
Պ պ	<i>b</i> as in պիր [bir, “one”]	b
Ջ ճ	<i>ç</i> as in Վինչէնցօ [Vinçentso]	ç
Ռ ռ	<i>r</i> as in ախօն [ağor, “stable”]	ı
Ս ս	<i>s</i> as in սօնրա [sonra, “then”]	s
Վ վ	<i>v</i> as in ճիվան [civan, “young”]	v
Տ տ	<i>d</i> as in զատար [kadar, “(as) much, many as”]	d
Ր ր	<i>r</i> as in փէտէր [peder, “father”]	r
Յ յ	<i>ts</i> as in հայոց [hayots, “Armenian”]	ts
Է է	<i>v</i> as in Լուսաւորիչ [Lusavoriç, “the Illuminator”]	v
Փ փ	<i>p</i> as in փէք [pek, “much, many”]	p
Ք ք	<i>k</i> as in քօր [kör, “blind”]	k
Օ օ	<i>o</i> as in իօկ [yok, “non-existent, absent, not”]	o
Ֆ ֆ	<i>f</i> as in հաֆիֆ [hafif, “light in weight, light in degree”]	f
Digraphs		
Էօ	<i>ö</i> as in կէօկ [göz, “eye”]	ö

Armenian Alphabet ⁵⁹	Pronunciation in (Armeno-)Turkish	Proposed Transcription
իւ	<i>ü</i> as in տիւրքաւն [<i>dükyan</i> , “shop”]	ü
ու	<i>u</i> as in Պօլու [<i>Bolu</i>]	u

3.2 Explanatory Remarks Relating to Armenian Alphabetical Order and Phoneme Similarity

Consonants:

բ / ք, պ / ք and փ / ք:

For the sound “p”, we find two possible letters in Turkish texts in the Armenian alphabet: the letter *բ* / *ք* and the letter *փ* / *ք*. In printed texts, the second letter, *փ* / *ք*, is used much more frequently than *բ* / *ք*, but it is clear that the usage is interchangeable or inconsistent. For example, the word *գարն* / *քար* [“door”], *գարնուսունսուն* / *քարսուն* [“from his / her / its door”], *գարնուսունսուն* / *քարսունսուն* [“to his / her door”], (*Kör Oğlu*, p. 6, 12, 20, 25, 43) shows inconsistency, as it can also be written as *գարնուսունսուն* / *քարսունսուն*, *գարնուսունսուն* / *քարսունսուն* [“his / her / its door’s”] or *գարնուսուն* / *քարսուն* [“his / her / its door”] (*Kör Oğlu*, p. 12, 17 and 20) within the same print. Other examples are *քուտնի* / *քերի* [“his / her father”] (*Kör Oğlu*, p. 6) and *քուտնի* / *քերի* (*Kör Oğlu*, p. 21).

One example of consistent orthographical usage is the case of the verb *օք*- [“to kiss”], which is consequently given in the print of *Aşık Kerem* (1911) as *տօք*- / *օք*-. A similar case is the word *կօքրու* [“bridge”], which always occurs as *քտօքրի* / *կօքրու* in *Aşık Kerem*. While the word *քունսար* / *քունար* [“spring, fountain”] (*Kör Oğlu*, p. 5, 6, 26, 27) is written throughout with *բ* / *ք* in the *Kör Oğlu* print (1875), the same print shows inconsistencies with *տօքիւ* / *օքիւ* [“to kiss”] (*Kör Oğlu*, p. 6, 8) and *տօքիւ* / *օքիւ* [“he / she / it kissed”] (*Kör Oğlu*, p. 21).

Further common words written with a *ք* are as follows: *քարտի* / *քարտի* [“his / her / its peace, portion”] (*Aşık Kerem*, p. 68), *տարաւ* / *յարաւ* [“I shall do”] (*Aşık Kerem*, p. 69), *տարայր* / *յարայր* [“I shall do”] (*Aşık Kerem*, p. 72), *տարաւար* / *յարաւար* [“(when) you do”] (*Akabi*, p. 56), *գարն փարնար* / *քարն փարնար* [“the door being knocked”] (*Akabi*, p. 144), *քիւր* / *քիւր* [“full, filled”] (*Aşık Kerem*, p. 77), *թօք* / *թօք* [“ball, cannon”] (*Aşık Kerem*, p. 77), *քարնար* / *քարնար* [“rake, rascal”] (*Aşık Kerem*, p. 128), *գօքարնար* / *գօքարնար* [“they plucked”] (*Aşık Kerem*, p. 79) and *գօքուն* / *գօքուն* [“he / she / it shall break off”] (*Aşık Kerem*, p. 80); *քարաւարաւ* / *քարաւարաւ* [“being closed”] (*Aşık Kerem*, p. 128).

The modern standard Turkish gerund *-İp* also shows some inconsistencies, as is the case with Turkish in the Arabo-Persian script, which sometimes ends with the letter *պ* / *ք* and sometimes with the letter *փ* / *ք*. Nevertheless, there seems to be a tendency for vowel harmony, as it is in modern standard Turkish (i.e. *-ուպ* / *-ub*, *-իւպ* / *-iib*, *-իւպ* / *-ib* and *-իւպ* / *-ib*) and for *-b* instead of *-ք*, which points to an influence of the Arabo-Persian

this seems to be an exception, as in the same text (*Aşık Kerem*) there is a consistent usage of words such as *unoḡḡni / doḡru* [“right”] or *uḡuḡst / baḡçe* [“garden”].

We observed a complex and varied situation regarding the alternation from *q / k* into *η / ğ, p / k* into *l / g* or *j / y*, and *l / g* into *j / y*, which can be seen in the personal participles *-dik-* / *-dik-* / *-duk-* / *-dük-* and *-ecek-* / *-acak-*: *oḡunḡḡḡnḡ / olduḡḡn* [“(when) you are/were”] (*Aşık Kerem*, p. 18) *qoḡunḡḡḡnḡ / koyduḡḡm* [“(when) I put”] (*Aşık Kerem*, p. 21), *lḡḡḡḡḡḡḡḡ / girdiḡḡm* [“(when) I enter”] (*Aşık Kerem*, p. 21), but *unḡḡḡḡḡḡḡḡ / durduḡḡm* [“my stopping, my standing”] (*Aşık Kerem*, p. 68), *tḡḡḡḡḡḡḡḡḡ / yüzdüḡḡm* [“(when) I swim”] (*Aşık Kerem*, p. 68) and *unḡoḡḡḡḡḡḡḡ / döndüḡḡyüm* [“my return, my circling”] (*Aşık Kerem*, p. 108), *utḡḡḡḡḡḡḡḡ / sevdiḡḡm* [“my beloved”] but *lḡḡḡḡḡḡḡḡ / geldiḡḡm* [“(when) I come”] (both *Aşık Kerem*, p. 108) and *lḡḡḡḡḡḡḡḡ / geldiḡḡyim* [“(when) I come”] (*Aşık Kerem*, p. 108) and *lḡḡḡḡḡḡḡḡ / girdiḡḡyim* [“(when) I enter”] (*Aşık Kerem*, p. 111) and *unḡḡḡḡḡḡḡḡ / dediḡḡinde* [“(when) he / she / it says”] (*Aşık Kerem*, p. 116). Other examples are *lḡḡḡḡḡḡḡḡ / girdiḡḡi* [“(when) he / she / it enters”] (*Aḡnes*, p. 8), *lḡḡoḡḡḡḡḡḡḡḡ / görmediḡḡinden* [“because he / she / it did not see”] (*Aḡnes*, p. 13), but *ḡoḡḡḡḡḡḡḡḡḡḡ / tutduḡḡından* [“because he / she / it held, took”] (*Aḡnes*, p. 7) and *oḡunḡḡḡḡḡ / olduḡḡu* [“(when) he / she / it was”] (*Aḡnes*, p. 8, 11).

However, another observed inconsistency in this regard is that *-diyi* is also given as *-diḡi* or even as *-diḡi*: *ḡḡḡḡḡḡḡḡ / verdiḡḡi* [“(which) he / she / it gave”] (*Aşık Kerem*, p. 5) and *ḡḡḡḡḡḡḡḡ / verdiḡḡi* (*Aşık Kerem*, p. 69), *lḡḡoḡḡḡḡḡḡḡ / gördüḡḡyü* [“(when) he / she / it sees”] (*Kör Oḡlu*, p. 6, 28), *lḡḡoḡḡḡḡḡḡḡḡ / gördüḡḡyüm* [“(when) I see”] (*Kör Oḡlu*, p. 28), *lḡḡoḡḡḡḡḡḡḡḡ / gördüḡḡü* [“(when) he / she / it sees”] (*Kör Oḡlu*, p. 39), and *utḡḡḡḡḡḡḡḡ / sevdiḡḡyim* [“my beloved”] (*Kör Oḡlu*, p. 43) besides *utḡḡḡḡḡḡḡḡ / sevdiḡḡm* (*Kör Oḡlu*, p. 43) and even *lḡḡḡḡḡḡḡḡḡ / gidiḡḡin* [“(when) you go”] (*Kör Oḡlu*, p. 6).⁶³

η / ʈ, ʐ / t and un / d:

The Armenian letter *η / ʈ* apparently occurs more often in words of Armenian origin and interestingly, in words of Arabic origin it occurs where one would expect the Arabic letter *tā*,⁶⁴ whereas the letter *ʐ / t* is used predominantly for the phoneme “t”. We observed the letter *η / ʈ* especially in cover pages with information regarding the print (*tabʿ*) or the printing house (*tabʿhāne*). Further rare examples are as follows: *U. Հսոյորդոյթիւնս / S. Haḡoḡortutüna* [“to Holy Communion”] (*Aḡnes*, p. 33), *Վարդիկէ / Vartıge* [“to Vartıg”] (*Aşık Kerem*, p. 80).

A similarity with Ottoman Turkish is that the suffixes of the locative and ablative cases are consistently given with *-de / -da* and *-den / -dan*, and at this point there is no

63 It is questionable whether the examples *gördüḡü*, *gidiḡin* and *edecekler* could be reflexes of the indifference stage of Turkish suffix vocalism, cf. Johanson 1978–1979; 1979; 1986. We thank Claudia Römer for this reference.

64 The letter *η/t* occurs, for example, in the title page of the following Istanbul print from 1863: *Թուհիէի Վէպի Լիսանի Թխորքստէն հիւրուֆայթի էրմէնիյէէէ պի իֆրաղ ռսսւօ օրուսնուշ տիւր / Tuhfei Vehbi Lisani Türkiden bürufati Ermeniyeye bil ifrag tab' olunmuşdür*, which is the well-known Persian-Turkish dictionary of Sünbülzāde Vehbî (d. 1809), cf. Björkman and Burrill 2012.

consonant assimilation in suffixes.⁶⁵ Examples are: *խախտալիլթոտ / Խարաբիյեդե* [“in damage”] and *լիլիլիլիլիլ / girmekde* [“when he / she / it is entering”] (*Leydi İzabel*, p. 3 and 7) and *սիլիլիլիլիլ / birlikde* [“together, in company”] (*Leydi İzabel*, p. 36). The same is true for the “di-past”: *նուլիլիլիլ / uzatdı* [“he / she / it extended”] (*Leydi İzabel*, p. 8), *իլիլիլիլիլիլ / itdiyimiz* [“our pushing”] (*Akabi*, p. 17), *իլիլիլիլիլ / işitdim* [“I heard”] (*İki Kapu Yoldaşları*, p. 12).

ի / y and յ / y:

ի / y occurs mostly in Turkish words starting with y (followed by all possible vowels) in the initial position. However, there are exceptions to this rule, which, so far, we have only seen in the works *Aknes* and *İki Kapu Yoldaşları* (see below).

In non-Turkish words, *ի / y* occurs in the medial position for Arabic and Persian *ā*, *ī*, and *ū*, as in *հիլիլիլիլ / hikyaye* [“story”] or *սիլիլիլիլիլ / bazirgyan* [“merchant, greedy merchant”]. Although Tietze always renders the Ottoman-Turkish *gā* and *kā* in Persian words as *gya* and *kya* in the edition of *Akabi*,⁶⁶ our investigation shows an additional fact. The glyph combination *իւ / ya* generally (but not always) represents an *ā* in words of Arabic origin (*քիլիլիլիլ / kyamilen* [“perfectly, completely”], *էֆիլիլիլ / efkyarı* [“his / her / its thoughts, ideas”], *սիլիլիլիլ / mükyaleme* [“conversation”]) (*İki Kapu Yoldaşları*, p.15, 24 and 63) and in words of Persian origin (*իլիլիլիլ / rüzgyar* [“wind, breeze”], *սիլիլիլիլ / bazirgyan* [“merchant, greedy merchant”]) (*Kör Oğlu*, p. 7 and 29). Further examples are: *սիլիլիլիլ / meskyan* [“dwelling, house”], *քիլիլիլ / kyafir* [“unbeliever”], *քիլիլիլ / kyanına* [“to his / her / its mine, quarry”], *սիլիլիլ / nikyah* [“engagement, marriage”], *քիլիլիլ / kyabeye* [“to the Kaaba”], *սիլիլիլ / dergyabe* [“to the court”] (all examples are from *Aşık Kerem*, p. 61, 104, 132, 142, 142, 144); *թիլիլիլ / tağyir* [“changing, substitution”], *թիլիլիլ / tatyib* [“making good, pleasant”], *թիլիլիլ / tezyinat* [“adornments, ornamentations”], *թիլիլիլ / tebyid* [Ottoman *teb'îd*; “sending, to distance, banishing, banishment”], *ֆիլիլիլ / fiyuzatı* [“its prosperity” (pl.)] (all examples are from *İki Kapu Yoldaşları*, p. 15, 47, 58, 74, 183).

Exceptions to this rule(s) have been observed whereby, in some prints, there is also the tendency to show an Arabic or Persian *ā* or *ī* with the help of other letters such as *յ / y* or *է / e*. However, these rules and exceptions must be connected with factors such as printing house conventions, and the text producers’ knowledge of Arabic and Persian, as well as their local peculiarities in dialect and pronunciation. Examples are as follows: *հիլիլ / hiyle* [“trick”], *սիլիլ / alea* [“very good, excellent”], *սիլիլիլ / aleakan* [“your relationship, interest”], *սիլիլիլիլ / maneasını* [“its meaning (accusative), the meaning of”], *սիլիլիլ / halea* [“still”] (all examples are from *Aşık Kerem*, p. 6, 7, 121, 129, 144).

We recognised the above-mentioned inconsistency in the use of *ի / y* in the medial position in the following examples: *իլիլիլիլիլ / işidilyor* [“he / she / it is heard”] but *լիլիլիլիլիլ / gösderiyor* [“he / she / it shows”], *լիլիլիլիլիլ / görüyorum* [“I see”],

65 Timurtaş 1999, 51. Cf. also Lewis 1967, 12 and Göksel and Kerslake 2005, 14–17 and 44.

66 Tietze 1991, XIV: ‘*Farsça kelimelerdeki gâ ve kâ hep gya, kya olarak geçer.*’ [The *gâ* and *kâ* in Persian words always occur as *gya*, *kya*.]

սղլակերայ / aǰlayib [“to cry”], *սաղիրմսուտ / baǰırmaya* [“to shout”], *զալէլէ / kaleye* [“to the fortress”] (all examples from *Aknes*, p. 12), as well as *զալէլէ / kaleye* and *զալէլէ / kaleye* (*Aknes*, p. 13). This inconsistency can be observed throughout the whole print. Further examples are *սազլակերայ / saklayib* [“to conceal, hide”] and *կաղրմսուտ / yalymaya* [“to graze”] (*Aknes*, p. 55 and 58). The same is true for other prints, as in, for example: *կաղրմսուտ / yalya* [“to the shore”] besides *կաղրայ / yalya*, *օգուեսնկաղրմնրն / okuyanlarımız* [“of our readers”], *սորմսուտ / buraya* [“here” (dative)], *խրրբալարմսուտ / xırpalayamazdı* [“could not ill-treat, misuse”], *սնրեսուտ / acıyarak* [“being pitiful”], *կէօսթէրիտօր / gösteriyor* [“he / she / it shows”] (all examples are from *İki Kapu Yoldaşları*, p. 24, 24, 31, 45, 52, 54, and 249).

Another convention observed regarding the use of ւ/յ is that it occurs in the medial position especially in loanwords. Examples are as follows: *զօրես / kopya* [“copy”], *սանտալիէլէրիս / sandalyelerin* [“the chairs (of)/your chairs”], *սալակար / balyalar* [“bales”], *զուրմեսնսնրն / kumpanyanın* [“after company”], *ֆամիլեսնրն / familyanın* [“the family’s”],⁶⁷ *զարեօրմսուտ / karyolasında* [“in his / her / its bedstead”] (all examples are from *İki Kapu Yoldaşları*, p. 5, 5, 6, 6, 41 and 51).

ծ / dz, ձ / ts and ց / ts:

Apparently, these three Armenian letters were used in Armeno-Turkish texts only in words of Armenian origin and in words of Latin, French and Italian origin, but not in Arabic or Persian words.⁶⁸ We have decided to use the same transcription letters for ձ / ts and ց / ts.⁶⁹

լ / l / l’:

According to Tietze, there are two types of consonant *l* in Vartan Paşa’s *Akabi Hikayesi*: a “normal” *l* without any addition and another *l* with a dot on top to represent *l* with prepalatal pronunciation,⁷⁰ as in *լսքիս / lakin* [“but”], *մէնուլ / memul* [“expected”], *լսքրոր / l’akırdı* [“word, talk”].⁷¹ We have also seen an *l* with a dot on top in *Yenoveva*, as in *սիւսլ / süal* [“question”], *էնսսլ / emsal* [“similar cases”], *հայնէ / halde* [“in the condition, situation”], *զայնլ / kabul* [“acceptance”] (*Yenoveva*, p. 4–5) and *Լուհնլ զուսու / Ruhul kudas* [“Holy Spirit”] (*Yenoveva*, p. 88). However, we did not notice this

67 Of course, loanwords show a great variety when rendered in Armenian letters, presumably depending on the source language (for example in cases of translation), as one can also read *ֆամիլիսար / familiesı* (*Leydi İzabel*, p. 224).

68 Cf. footnote 47.

69 Cf. Sakayan 2012, 56: ‘g and ձ are two different graphic signs for the same sound.* They both stand for the same voiceless affricate [ts] that starts with the voiceless stop [t] and ends with the voiceless sibilant [s]. It sounds like the combination of [t+s] in the English *lots* or *cats*.’

70 Tietze 1991, XIV.

71 Tietze 1991, 14, 17 and 22–3.

in the other works studied so far. Furthermore, we observed that this differentiation only seems to be valid for words of Arabic and Persian origin.

ju / ħ and h / h:

The phoneme “h” [*h* and *ħ*] is represented with *ju* / *ħ* and with *h* / *b*. Although there is no precise orthography (as in Turkish with Arabo-Persian script), there is a tendency to use *ju* in words where one would expect a “ħ” in Ottoman Turkish. This tendency again points to the influence of Arabo-Persian orthography. Nevertheless, in a single print it is possible to see different orthographies for the same word: *juuuuġġġġġġ* / *ħaberi* [“his / her / its information; the news (accusative)”], *juuuuġġġġġġ* / *ħaber* [“news, information”] but also *huuuġġġġġġ* / *haber* (*Aknes*, p. 66, 67) and *huuuġġġġġġ* / *haber* (*Kör Ođlu*, p. 12), as well as *juuuuġġġġġġġġġġġġ* / *ħaberdar* [“possessed of information”] (*Kör Ođlu*, p. 15). We observed greater consistency in the use of *ju* / *ħ* in the following words: *uuuġġġġġġ* / *dabı* [“also”], *uuuġġġġġġ* / *dabıl* [“insight, including”], *uuuġġġġġġ* / *babş* [“giving, a forgiving, share”], *uuuġġġġġġ* / *yabşı* [“pretty, agreeable, good”], *juuuuuuuu* / *ħarab* [“ruined, in ruins”], *juuuġġġġġġ* / *ħaylı* [“many, much, very”] and *juuuġġġġġġ* / *ħaylı*.⁷²

In most of the cases where we read a *ħ* (ح) or *b* (ب) in Ottoman Turkish (especially in words of Arabic or Persian origin), we observed the use of *h* / *b*, as in *uuuġġġġġġ* / *abval* [“conditions, affairs”] (*Aşık Kerem*, p. 6), *quuġġġġġġ* / *ħabve* [“coffee”] (*Aşık Kerem*, p. 11, 37) or *uuuġġġġġġġġġġġġ* / *abbab* [“acquaintance, friend”] (*Aşık Kerem*, p. 32).

A similarity with Ottoman Turkish in this regard is the (co-)existence of *abşam* [“evening”] and *akşam*. In *Aşık Kerem*, for example, it is consistently and given passim as *uuqzuu* / *akşam*, whereas in *Akabi* it is nearly consistently and given passim as *uuġġġġġġ* / *abşam*, apart from the fact that it is used three times as *uuqzuu* / *akşam*.

đ / c, ŷ / ħ and ġ / ħ:

As is the case with Ottoman-Turkish prints, it is clear that there is not always a strict differentiation in the usage of *đ* / *c* and *ŷ* / *ħ*. In *Aknes*, for example, we read *uuuġġġġġġġġġġġġ* / *borclarımı* [“my debts (accusative)”] (instead of *borclarımı*), *uuġġġġġġġġġġġġ* / *sevincli* [“joyful”], *uuuġġġġġġġġġġġġ* / *bobca* [“bundle in a wrapper”] or *uuuġġġġġġġġġġġġ* / *āğaclarm* [“trees’ (genitive)”] (*Aknes*, p. 28, 33, 48, 166), throughout the entire print. Nevertheless, there are also inconsistencies in this, as we found *uuġġġġġġġġġġġġ* / *pençere* [“window”] (*Aknes*, p. 47), as well as *uuġġġġġġġġġġġġ* / *pencere* (*Aknes*, p. 43), and even *uuġġġġġġġġġġġġ* / *pençire* (*Aknes*, p. 11).

The letter *ġ* / *ħ*, which occurs mostly in words of Armenian or European origin, is pronounced in a very similar way to *ŷ* / *ħ*. Therefore, we decided to also transcribe *ġ* in Armeno-Turkish texts with a *ħ*.

72 In the cases of *yabşı* / *yabşı*, *abşam*, and *dabı*, the letter *ju*/*ħ* represents an allophone of *q* / *k* / *q*.

n / i:

This letter also occurs mostly in Armeno-Turkish texts within words of Armenian origin, as in the Armenian names Անթառնուս / *Antarām*, Բարնիկ / *Parnig* or Ռուբէնիկ / *Rupenig*. We observed this letter especially in the following words: լահորի / *lahori* [“lahuri, material”], ախոն / *ahor* [“stable”], (*Kör Oğlu*, p.13, 24), դուռնու / *ğuruş* [“piaster”], զոն / *zor* [“hard, difficult”] and բուն / *kar* [“snow”] (*Akabi*, p. 64, 69, 79).

վ / v and ֆ / f:

In a few cases, there is a clear inconsistency in the differentiation between վ / *v* and ֆ / *f*. There is, for example, զէֆզ / *zefk* [“sense of taste, flavour”] (p. 7) as well as զէվզ / *zevk* (p. 47) in *Kör Oğlu*. In addition, we observed the coexistence of *innuu* / *dua* [“prayer”] (*Aknes*, p. 30 and 37) and *innuṣu* / *duva* [“prayer”] within a single text (*Aknes*, p. 12 and passim), with the latter occurring much more frequently than the former. In another print, *Aşık Kerem*, for example, the same word occurs only as *innuu* / *dua* [“prayer”] (p. 6 and passim).

Vowels and Digraphs:

n / o:

This vowel is used mostly in words of Armenian origin. In combination with լ (*nl*), it represents the sound *u*.

ւ / v:

In Armeno-Turkish texts this vowel is never used alone, but only in combination with the vowel *h*, then representing *ü*. As *v* it occurs only in words of Armenian origin.

էօ / ö:

It is noteworthy that in some cases, according to modern standard Turkish, *էօ* / *ö* can be read instead of *o/o*. This is the case in the word *սոխուլթ* / *söbhet* [“conversation, chat, talk”], which is used throughout *Akabi* and *Aknes*. As there was no modern standard Turkish at this time (between 1850 and 1911), we also observed the coexistence of *böyük* [“great, large, big”] or *böyüme* [“to grow up”] besides *büyük* and *büyüme*,⁷³ although the former variant occurs much more frequently than the latter. Peculiarities in this regard (usage of *ö/ü* in first syllables) can be observed in great variety (which differ according to local and temporal prints) and must be considered from a linguistic approach, which is not within the scope of this study.

73 We note that in Anatolian Turkish dialects, the variants *böyük* and *böyüme* still exist; cf. Tietze 2016, 785.

Representation of Arabic *ʿayn*:

For the Arabic *ʿayn*, we sometimes see a sign similar to an accent; very often *ʿayn* seems to be ignored in Armeno-Turkish printing or when Turkish is transposed from the Arabic script into the Armenian alphabet. It is interesting to note that this phenomenon is also found in Ottoman-Turkish poetry and (modern) Turkish pronunciation. For example, *հուհուսս* / *cumaa* [“Friday”] (*Kör Oğlu*, p. 21) and *թասսնիսս* / *taacüb* [“being astonished”] (*İki Kapan Yoldaşları*, p. 17) are given without a sign (near to ‘) for *ʿayn*, but *Թու'սլխսնրն* / *Ta'alyanın* [“(of) God (genitive)”] (*Kör Oğlu*, p. 21) is written with a sign for *ʿayn*, *Ստպասս'սս* / *Matba'ai* [“printing press (of)”] alternating with *Ստպասսսսս* / *Matbaası* [“printing press (of)”] (generally on the title pages of Armeno-Turkish books). Kraelitz-Greifenhorst speaks of this phenomenon as ‘Schwund des Ajn’,⁷⁴ that is, elision. However, the frequent lack of a sign (letter) for *ʿayn* in Armeno-Turkish print may be due to the conventions of publishing houses, the addressed readership (resulting in high vs. vernacular language), and possibly even an imperfect knowledge of Arabic and Persian loanwords in Ottoman Turkish.

Representation of Ottoman Turkish *n̄* / *şadır nūn* / *nūn-i kefi*:

The representation of *n̄* in Armeno-Turkish shows some degree of variety: *ū/n*, *ūl/ng*, *η/ğ* and *ηū* / *gn*, due to dialectal diversity as well to the diversity of the texts themselves. In relation to this variability, we must consider different factors: in some texts we have a dialectal variety due to the knowledge of the author, who was able to insert different registers. As Tietze⁷⁵ and Hetzer observed for *Akabi*, the variant “*ağnayıslı*” [“intelligent, understanding”] is uttered by a character speaking in colloquial language. So, we cannot speak of inconsistency in these cases, but rather of the coexistence of variants (spoken and written/high language). Furthermore, we note the dominance of *ū/n*, whereas *n̄* (*nūn-i kefi*) is used in written Ottoman-Turkish texts. This may be an indication of pronunciation.⁷⁶

In *Aknes* and *Kör Oğlu*, for example, the Ottoman *añla-* is consistently written as *ağna-* (as in *սղխսշրխսնսսս* / *ağnaşilamadı* [“(it) could not be understood”] (*Aknes*, p. 10) or *սղխսշրչր* / *ağnayıslı* [“intelligent, understanding”] (*Kör Oğlu*, p. 5)), in contrast with *İlk Kitabı* (see below).

Another variant representing what, in Ottoman Turkish, is often the combination *n̄l* is the combination *ju* / *yn*, as in *սղյնլ* / *diyne* [“listen”] (*Aknes*, p. 30), *սղյնլնի* / *diynedi* [“he / she / it listened”] (*Aknes*, p. 38), *լլոյնիսնլ* / *göynüme* [“to my heart”] and *լլոյնիսնի* / *göynümü* [“my heart” (accusative)] (*Aşık Kerem*, p. 54 and 134) and *սղյնլլի* / *diyneyelim* [“let us listen”] (*Aşık Kerem*, p. 53). The combination *yn* for *n̄* can also be observed in

74 von Kraelitz-Greifenhorst 1912, 12.

75 Tietze 1991, XVI.

76 Adamović 1985, 67.

սիմիլար / *beynzer* [“similar, like, resembling”] (in *Aşık Kerem*, p. 5 and passim very consistently).

In *Kör Oğlu*, for example, the phoneme and letter \tilde{n} (*şağır nün*) is reflected by *ül / ng*, *ü / n* and *ün / ng* in the medial position: *uölünru / songra* [“then, hereafter, in the future”] (*Kör Oğlu*, p. 7 and 20), besides *uölru / sonra* (being used passim), and *Թանիրր / Tanğrı* [“God”] (*Kör Oğlu*, p. 8 and passim). In *İlk Kitabı*, we mostly read *ül / ng* as in *uölru / angladı* [“he/she/it understood”], *uölru / anglamazlar* [“they do not understand”], *uölru / songra* [“then, hereafter, in the future”] and *uölru / anglaşılmasın* [“shall not be understood”] (*İlk Kitabı*, p. 49, 53, 54 and 55).

Dialectal peculiarities may have led to the consistent use of $\eta / ğ$ in the word *uögru / soğra* [“then, hereafter, in the future”] in *Aknes* (p. 8 and passim and consistently!), and the words *էնքուտիտ / enksesine* [“to his / her / its back”] and *չենքուտ / çenyese* [“his / her / its jaw”] in *Aşık Kerem* (p. 68 and 87). Obviously, this variety in the representation of an Ottoman \tilde{n} must be studied in detail with a linguistic approach.

4. Conclusion

We are aware of the linguistic shortcomings of our proposed transcription table. However, from a philological point of view, and in order to start what one might call basic research on Armeno-Turkish text production, we see the need for a common standard in literary studies. Therefore, we have tried to provide a brief discussion on studies dealing with Armeno-Turkish texts, including previously used transliteration and transcription tables. The proposed table is already in use for the text recognition platform *Transkribus* and will be applied in future literary studies and in critical editions produced by the authors of the current article.

Appendices: Various Transcription Tables

1. Library of Congress:

Vernacular	Romanization	Vernacular	Romanization
Upper case letters		Lower case letters	
Ա	A	ա	a
Բ	B [P]	բ	b [p]
Գ	G [K]	գ	g [k]
Դ	D [T]	դ	d [t]
Ե	E	ե	e
	Y		y

Vernacular	Romanization	Vernacular	Romanization
Upper case letters		Lower case letters	
Չ	Z	զ	z
Է	Ē	ե	ē
Ը	Ĕ	ը	ĕ
Թ	T [˘]	թ	t [˘]
Ճ	Zh	ճ	zh
Ի	I	ի	i
Լ	L	լ	l
Խ	Kh	խ	kh
Ծ	Ts [Dz]	ծ	ts [dz]
Կ	K [G]	կ	k [g]
Հ	H	հ	h
Ջ	Dz [Ts]	ճ	dz [ts]
Ղ	Gh	ղ	gh
Ճ	Ch [J]	ճ	ch [j]
Մ	M	մ	m
ԅ	Y	յ	y
	Կ		ḥ
Ն	N	ն	n
Շ	Sh	շ	sh
Ո	O	ո	o
Չ	Ch [˘]	չ	ch [˘]
Պ	P [B]	պ	p [b]
Ջ	J [Ch]	ճ	j [ch]
Ռ	Ṙ	ր	ṙ
Ս	S	ս	s
Վ	V	վ	v
Տ	T [D]	տ	t [d]
Ր	R	ր	r

Vernacular	Romanization	Vernacular	Romanization
Upper case letters		Lower case letters	
Յ	Ts ^c	g	ts ^c
Բ	W	ւ	w
Ու	U	ու	u
Փ	P ^c	փ	p ^c
Զ	K ^c	ք	k ^c
Եւ	Ew	եւ	ew
Եվ	Ev	և	ev
Օ	Ö	o	ö
Ֆ	F	ֆ	f

2. Sandjian and Tietze: *Eremya Chelebi Kömürjian's Armeno-Turkish Poem "The Jewish Bride"*, 47–8:

Vowels			
u	a	ի	i
ũ	â	ն	o
է	e	օ	o
ը	ı	օ	ö
Vowel Combinations			
իւ	ya	իւ	iya
իէ	ye	իէ	iye
իը	yı	իւ	yü (in initial position)
իօ	yo	իւ	ü (in medial position)
իի	eye	ու	u
իի	eyi	նի	û
իօ	ö	օի	oye

Consonants			
բ	p	ւ	n
գ	k	չ	sh
դ	t	ջ	ch
զ	z	պ	b
թ	t	ն	r
ժ	zh	ս	s
լ	l	վ	v
խ	kh	ւն	d
կ	g	ր	r
հ	h	ւ	v
ղ	gh	փ	p
ճ	j	ք	k
մ	m	ֆ	f
յ	y		

3. Armin Hetzer: *Daçkerēn-Texte: Eine Chrestomathie aus Armenierdrucken des 19. Jahrhunderts in türkischer Sprache*, 416–7:

- 1) Großbuchstaben [Capital letters]
- 2) Kleinbuchstaben [Small letters]
- 3) modifizierte Hübschmann-Umschrift [Modified Hübschmann transcription]
- 4) westarmenische Aussprache der Buchstaben [Western Armenian pronunciation of the letters]
- 5) Lautwert in Daçkerēn-Texten nach türkischem Alphabet [Phonetic value in Daçkerēn texts according to the Turkish alphabet]

1)	2)	3)	4)	5)
Ա	u	a	a	a
Բ	p	b	p	(ḅ)
Գ	q	g	k	k, (q)
Դ	դ	d	t	(ḏ)
Ե	ti	e	e	(e), y

1)	2)	3)	4)	5)
Ƨ	q	z	z	z
Ǝ	Ǝ	ē	e	e
Ɔ	ɹ	ə	ə	ɹ
Ɔ	ɹ	tʻ	t	t
Ɔ	ɹ	ž	ž	j
Ɔ	ɹ	i	i	i
Ɔ	ɹ	l	l	l
Ɔ	ɹu	x	x (ch)	h, (x)
Ɔ	ɹ	c	dz	-
Ɔ	ɹ	k	g	g
Ɔ	h	h	h	h
Ɔ	ǎ	j	ts	-, (ž)
Ɔ	ɹ	ɫ	gh (ɣ)	ğ
Ɔ	á	č	dž (ǧ)	c
Ɔ	ú	m	m	m
Ɔ	J	y	y, h	y
Ɔ	ú	n	n	n
Ɔ	ʒ	š	š	ş
Ɔ	n	o	o	-, (o)
Ɔ	ʒ	čʻ	č	ç
Ɔ	uɹ	p	b	b
Ɔ	ʒ	j	č	-, (ç)
Ɔ	n	ř	ř	-, (rr)
Ɔ	u	s	s	s
Ɔ	ɹ	v	v	v
Ɔ	un	t	d	d
Ɔ	ɹ	r	r	r
Ɔ	g	cʻ	ts	-, (ts)

1)	2)	3)	4)	5)
Բ	Լ	Վ	Վ	- (Bestandteil von u) [Component of u]
Փ	Վի	Վ՛	Վ	Վ
Ք	Ք	Ք՛	Ք	Ք

4. Kevork Pamukciyan: *Ermeni Harfli Türkçe Metinler. Ermeni Kaynaklarından Tarihe Katkılar II*, 255:

Harf [Letter] Büyük [Capital letter] Küçük [Small letter]	Adı [Letter name]	Telaffuzu [Pronunciation]	Harf [Letter] Büyük [Capital letter] Küçük [Small letter]	Adı [Letter name]	Telaffuzu [Pronunciation]
Ա ա	Ayp	A	Շ շ	Şa	Ş
Բ բ	Pen	P	Ո ո	Vo	Vo ve [and] O
Գ գ	Kim	K	Չ շ	Ça	Ç
Դ դ	Ta	T	Պ պ	Be	B
Ե ե	Yeç	Y ve [and] E	Ջ շ	Çe	Ç
Զ շ	Za	Z	Ռ ռ	Ra	R
Է է	E	E	Ս ս	Se	S
Ը ը	It	I	Վ վ	Vev	V
Թ թ	To	T	Տ տ	Diun	D
Ժ ժ	Je	J	Ր ը	Re	R
Ի ի	İni	İ	Յ շ	Tso	Ts
Լ լ	Liun	L	Ի լ	Hıun	V
Խ խ	Khe	Kh (=ğh)	Փ Վի	Pür	P
Ծ ծ	Dza	Dz	Ք Ք	Ke	K
Կ կ	Gen	G	Օ օ	O	O
Հ հ	Ho	H	Ֆ Ֆ	Fe	F
Չ ձ	Tza	Tz			

Harf [Letter] Büyük [Capital letter] Küçük [Small letter]	Adı [Letter name]	Telaffuzu [Pronunciation]	Harf [Letter] Büyük [Capital letter] Küçük [Small letter]	Adı [Letter name]	Telaffuzu [Pronunciation]
Ղ ղ	Ğad	Ğ			
Ճ ճ	Ce	C	İki Harfle İfade Edilen Sesler [Sounds expressed with two letters]		
Մ մ	Men	M	ԷՕ էօ		Ö
ԅ յ	Hi	H ve [and] Y	ԻԻ իլ		Ü
Ն ն	Nu	N	ՈԻ ոլ		U

Bibliography

Published Primary Sources:

- Aknes ve yahod ney çalan kızcığaz, Ermeniceden Tercime Eyledi Antebli Y. S. Kürkcianoff, Üçüncü Defa Tab Olundu Kıds şerif Ermeni Mar Yakub Manastırın Tabhanesinde.* 1912 (3rd edition) (= *Aknes*). *Hıkyayei Kör Oğlu Türküleri ile beraber Türki lisanından tercüme olunarak tabh ve temsil kılındı,* İstanbul, 1875 (= *Kör Oğlu*).
- Hekyayeyi iki kapu yoldaşları yahod hakku adaletin zabiri Eseri Hovsep H. Kıurban. Cıldı sani, Asitane Nşan Berberyan,* 1885 (= *İki Kapu Yoldaşları*).
- Akabi Hıkyayesi. Kostantaniye Mübendis Oğlu Tabhanesinde.* 1851. (= *Akabi*).
- Aşık Kerem ile Aslı Hanım Hıkyayesi Türküleri ile. Türkce Lisanından Terceme Olunarak Tab u Temsil Kılındı. Stambol, Matbaa Y. Holas (Bahçe kapu, Meydancık Kızasker Han Tiv 23).* 1911 (= *Aşık Kerem*).
- Leydi İzabel [İst Linn], Müellifi Misis Henri Uud, Mütercimi Dokt. A. Nakkışyan, Z. Berberyan Matbaası.* 1910 (= *Leydi İzabel*).
- Mezarlıkdan Yuvarlanan Esgı Kıfa. Asitane. Mühendisyan Tabhanesinde Tab Olunmuş Dur.* 1870 (= *Esgı Kıfa*).
- Yenoveva Yani Ablakı Hamideyle Mevsuf Libaza Nisa Taifesine İbretnüma Olmaya Mahsus Hıkyayeyi Nefise İkinci Defa Tab' Olunmuş Dur Asitane R. H. Kürkcyan Tab'hanesinde Fincancılar Yokuşu N.* 19. 1868 (= *Yenoveva*).
- Küçük Çocukların İlk Kitabı. Ya'ni okumak öyrenmek için eyleneli bir yol. İstanbolda, Matba'ai Hagop Madteosyan.* 1913 (= *İlk Kitabı*).

Secondary Sources:

- Acharyan, Hrach'ya. 1912–13. 'Friedrich von Kraelitz-Greifenhorst. Studien zum Armenisch-Türkischen. Wien, 1912 (S. W. A. W., 168)'. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris.* 18. 60–61. ccxix–ccxxiv.

- Acharyan, Hrach'ya. 1951. *Hayots' lezvi patmut'yun*. Vol. II, Yerevan: Haypethrat. (History of the Armenian Language.)
- Adamović, Milan. 1985. *Konjugationsgeschichte der türkischen Sprache*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Aprahamyan, Garo. 2011. 'A Note on the Bibliographic Catalogues of Armeno-Turkish Literature'. In Balta, Evangelia and Ölmez, Mehmet (eds.). *Between Religion and Language: Turkish-Speaking Christians, Jews and Greek-Speaking Muslims and Catholics in the Ottoman Empire*. Istanbul: Eren Yayınları. 147–152.
- Aprahamyan, Garo. 2014. 'A Note on Sdepanyan's Bibliography of Armeno-Turkish Periodicals'. In Balta, Evangelia (ed.). *Cultural Encounters in the Turkish-Speaking Communities of the Late Ottoman Empire*. Istanbul: The ISIS Press. 303–310.
- Aslanian, Sebouh, D. 2014. 'Port Cities and Printers: Reflections on Global Armenian Print'. *Book History* 17. 51–93.
- Aslanian, Sebouh, D. 2016. 'Prepared in the Language of the Hagarites: Abbot Mkhitar's 1727 Armeno-Turkish Grammar for Vernacular Western Armenian'. *Journal for the Society of Armenian Studies* 25. 54–86.
- Ayaydın Cebe, Günil Özlem. 2009. *19. Yüzyılda Osmanlı Toplumı ve Basılı Türkçe Edebiyat: Etkileşimler, Değişimler, Çeşitlilik*. PhD Dissertation. Bilkent Üniversitesi, Ankara. <http://repository.bilkent.edu.tr/bitstream/handle/11693/15323/0006070.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y> (24 March 2022).
- Ayaydın Cebe, Günil Özlem. 2013. 'Yazmadan Basmaya, Gösterimden Romana: 19. Yüzyılda Osmanlı'da Folklor'. *Millî Folklor* 25.99. 27–40.
- Ayaydın Cebe, Günil Özlem. 2016. *Cervantes'ten Tilkıyan'a Osmanlı Edebiyatında Pastoralin Sergüzeşti*. Ankara: Grafiker Yayınları.
- Bardakjian, Kevork B.. 2000. *A Reference Guide to Modern Armenian Literature, 1500–1920: With an Introductory History*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.
- Berberian, Haig. 1964. 'La Littérature Arméno-Turque'. In Bazin, Louis et al. (eds.). *Philologicae Turcae Fundamenta*. Vol. 2. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner. 809–819.
- Björkman, Walther and Burrill, Kathleen. 2012 'Sünbül-Zâde Wehbi'. In Bearman, P.J.; Bianquis, Th.; Bosworth, C.E and van Donzel, E. (eds.). *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition*. URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_COM_1122 (6 May 2022).
- Cankara, Murat. 2011. *İmparatorluk ve Roman: Ermeni Harfli Türkçe Romanları Osmanlı / Türk Edebiyat Tarihyazımında Konumlandırmak*. PhD Dissertation. İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent Üniversitesi, Ankara. <http://www.thesis.bilkent.edu.tr/0006455.pdf> (24 March 2022).
- Cankara, Murat. 2014. 'Rethinking Ottoman Cross-Cultural Encounters: Turks and the Armenian Alphabet'. *Middle Eastern Studies* 51.1. 1–16.
- Cankara, Murat. 2015. 'Çifte Maduniyet, Çifte İşlev: Ermeni Harfli Türkçe Basında Dil ve Kimlik'. *İlef Dergisi* 2.2. 105–130.
- Cankara, Murat. 2018. 'Armeno-Turkish Writing and the Question of Hybridity'. In Babayan, Kathryn and Pifer, Michael (eds.). *An Armenian Mediterranean: Words and Worlds in Motion*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan. 173–191.
- Csató, Éva Á.; Brendemoen, Bernt; Johanson, Lars; Römer, Claudia and Stein, Heidi. 2016. 'The Linguistic Landscape of Istanbul in the Seventeenth Century. Introduction'. In Csató, Éva, Á.; Menz, Astrid and Turan, Fikret (eds.). *Spoken Ottoman in Mediator Texts*. Turcologica 106. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 1–33.
- Dashkevich, Yaroslav. 1994. 'Kto oni- "Armyano kypchaki" (Ob étnose sozdatelei armyano kypchakskikh rukopisei XVI-XVII vv.)'. *Banber Matenadarani*, 16. 58–110.

- Der Matossian, Bedros. 2020. 'The Development of Armeno-Turkish (Hayatar *Trk'erēn*) in the 19th century Ottoman Empire: Marking and Crossing Ethnoreligious Boundaries'. *Intellectual History of the Islamicate World*. 8. 67–100.
- Durmuş, İsmail. 2012. 'Transkripsiyon'. In *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. 41. 306–308.
- Garkavets, Alexander. 2017. *Kypchakskoe pis'memoe nasledie / Qypchaq written heritage*. 3 vols. Almaty: Baur.
- Göksel, Aslı; Kerslake, Celia. 2005. *Turkish: A Comprehensive Grammar*. Routledge: London and New York.
- Hetzer, Armin. 1987. *Daçkerēn-Texte: Eine Chrestomathie aus Armenierdrucken des 19. Jahrhunderts in türkischer Sprache*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Johanson, Lars. 1978–1979. 'The indifference stage of Turkish suffix vocalism'. *Türk Dili Araştırma Yıllığı – Belleten* 26–27. 151–156.
- Johanson, Lars. 1979. 'Die westoghusische Labialharmonie'. *Orientalia Suecana* 27–28. 63–107.
- Johanson, Lars. 1986. 'Zum Suffixvokalismus in zwei mittelostmanischen Transkriptionstexten.' *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 76. 163–169.
- Koptaş, Rober. 2002. 'Ermeni Harfleriyle Türkçe'. In Pamukciyan, Kevork. *Ermeni Harfli Türkçe Metinler. Ermeni Kaynaklarından Tarihe Katkılar II*. Istanbul: Aras. XI–XXIII.
- Karakılıçık, Pınar. 2011. *Hovsep H. Kurban'ın "İki Kapu Yoldaşları Yahod Hakku Adaletin Zabiri"si, 1885, İkinci Cilt, (İnceleme, Ermeni Harfli Türkçe Metin, Dizin)*. MA thesis. İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi.
- Kerslake, Celia. 1998. 'Ottoman Turkish'. In Johanson, Lars and Csató, Éva Ágnes (eds.). *The Turkic Languages*. London and New York: Routledge. 179–202.
- Köse, Y.; Akcan, A.; Çelik, H. and Sargsyan, A. (forthcoming 2022). 'Unfolding an Unacknowledged Written Cultural Heritage: The Armeno-Turkish Manuscripts, Printed Books and Newspapers from the Mekhitarist Congregation in Vienna (MEKHITAR)'. *Journal of the Ottoman and Turkish Studies Association*.
- von Kraelitz-Greifenhorst, Friedrich. 1912. *Studien zum Armenisch-Türkischen*. Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Akademie der Wissenschaften, 168, III.
- Lewis, Geoffrey L. 1967. *Turkish Grammar*. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press.
- Littmann, Enno. 1918. *Das Malerspiel. Ein Schattenspiel aus Aleppo nach einer armenisch-türkischen Handschrift*. Heidelberg. Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung.
- https://digi.hadw-bw.de/view/sbhadwphkl_1918_8/0051 (18 May 2022).
- Meillet, Antoine. 1913. *Altarmenisches Elementarbuch*. Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung.
- Menz, Astrid. 2010. 'Klusile und Affrikaten im Anlaut armenischer Globalkopien in den Dialektmaterialen von Erzurum'. In Boeschoten, Hendrik, and Rentzsch, Julian (eds.) *Turcology in Mainz*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 173–190.
- Mignon, Laurent. 2021. *Uncoupling Language and Religion. An Exploration into the Margins of Turkish Literature*. Boston: Academic Studies Press.
- Mildanoğlu, Zakarya. 2014. *Ermenice Süreli Yayınlar 1794–2000*. Istanbul: Aras.
- Pamukciyan, Kevork. 2002. *Ermeni Harfli Türkçe Metinler. Ermeni Kaynaklarından Tarihe Katkılar II*. Köker, Osman (prepared for publication). Istanbul: Aras.
- Pratt, Andrew T. 1866. 'Miscellanies. On the Armeno-Turkish Alphabet'. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 8. 374–376.
- Pritsak, Omeljan. 1959. 'Das Kiptschakische'. In Bazin, Louis et al. (eds.). *Philologicae Turcicae Fundamenta*. Vol. 1. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner. 74–87.
- Redhouse, Sir James. 2017. *Türkçe / Osmanlıca-İngilizce Redhouse Sözlüğü / Turkish / Ottoman-English Redhouse Dictionary*. Istanbul: SEV Yayıncılık Eğitim ve Ticaret A.Ş. [21st reprint of 1968]

- Sakayan, Dora. 2012. *Western Armenian. For the English-speaking World. A Contrastive Approach*. Yerevan: Yerevan State University Press. (=Sakayan)
- Sanjian, Krikor and Tietze, Andreas (eds.). 1981. *Eremya Chelebi K m rjian's Armeno-Turkish Poem "The Jewish Bride"*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Schmitt, R diger, Kettenhofen, Erich. 'H bschmann, (Johann) Heinrich'. In *Encyclopaedia Iranica Online*. URL: <https://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/hbschmann-johann-heinrich> (27 October 2022).
- Sch tz, Edmond. 1961. 'On the Transcription of Armeno-Kipchak'. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 12.1/3. 139–161.
- Sch tz, Edmond. 1976. 'Armeno-Kiptchakisch und die Krim'. *Hungaro-Turcica*. 185–205.
- Sluszkiewicz, Eugeniusz. 1939. 'Remarques sur la langue turque des Arm niens et sur les emprunts turcs de l'arm nien'. *Rocznik orientalistyczny* 14. 136–153.
- Spies, Otto. 1923/1924. 'Esman und Zeidschan. Ein t rkischer Volksroman aus Kleinasien, nach einem armenisch-t rkischen Druck'. *Anthropos* 18/19. 4/6. 804–818.
- Stepanyan, Hasmik. 2005. *Hayatař turk'eren grk'eri ev hayatař turk'eren parberakan mamuli matenagıtutyun (1727–1968)*. *Ermeni Harfli T rk e Kitaplar ve S reli Yayınlar Bibliyografyası 1727–1968*. Istanbul: Turkuaz Yayınları.
- Stepanyan, Hasmik. 2008. *Ts'uts'ak hayeren dzeragreri hayatař turk'eren nyuteri ev hayatař turk'eren dzeragreri*. Yerevan: Published by the author. ("Catalogue of Armeno-Turkish materials of Armenian manuscripts and Armeno-Turkish manuscripts").
- Strauss, Johann. 2010. 'Is Karamanli Literature Part of a "Christian-Turkish (Turco-Christian) Literature"?. In Balta, Evangelia and Kappler, Matthias (eds.). *Cries and Whispers in Karamanlidika Books. Proceedings of the First International Conference on Karamanlidika Studies (Nicosia, 11–13 September 2008)*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 155–200.
- Tietze, Andreas (ed.). 1991. *Vartan Pařa. Akabi Hikayesi. İlk T rk e Roman (1851)*. Istanbul: Eren.
- Tietze, Andreas. 2016. *Tarih  ve Etimolojik T rkiye T rk esi Lugati*. Vol I. Ankara: Ses Reklam Matbaacılık.
- Timurtař, Faruk. 1999. *Tarih  T rkiye T rk esi Arařtırmaları III. Osmanlı T rk esi Grameri Eski Yazı ve İml  - Arap a - Fars a Eski Anadolu T rk esi*. İstanbul: ALFA Basım Yayım Dağıtım.
- Ueno, Masayuki. 2016. 'One Script, Two Languages: Garabed Panosian and His Armeno-Turkish Newspapers in the Nineteenth-Century Ottoman Empire'. *Middle Eastern Studies* 52. 4. 605–622.
- Woodhead, Christine. 2012. 'Ottoman Languages'. In Woodhead, Christine (ed.). *The Ottoman World*. London: Routledge. 143–158.

Internet resources:

- <https://www.loc.gov/catdir/cps0/romanization/armenian.pdf> (4 June 2022).
- http://haygirk.nla.am/upload/1512-1940/1901-1940/leytilzapel_1910.pdf (4 June 2022).
- <https://readcoop.eu> (4 June 2022).
- <http://haygirk.nla.am/> (4 June 2022).
- http://haygirk.nla.am/upload/1512-1940/1851-1900/kiplinea_eaxot1868.pdf (11 August 2022).