

# “Arabic” Turkish: The *Ak Arap*’s accent in Ritter’s *Karagöz* collection\*

Stephan Guth

## Introduction

On November 14, 2008, German TV channel SAT.1 broadcasted the second episode in the fourth series of the highly popular comedy show *Ladykracher*.<sup>1</sup> In one of the sketches of this episode, comedian and actress Anke Engelke plays a teacher giving a German lesson to a group of second-generation migrants of Turkish background (*Deutschkurs für Türken*).<sup>2</sup> The comic effect results from the fact that the pupils actually already are fluent in German, but Engelke teaches them a “typically Turkish” German that will forever brand those who use it as foreign and lower-class instead of helping them integrate into German society. The allegedly correct version “Turkifies” standard German pronunciation (*isch* [iʃ] instead of *ich* [iç] ‘I’), changes word order (*bin isch, wohn isch* [VS] instead of *ich bin, ich wohne* [SV] ‘I am’, ‘I live/dwell’), drops the typically German article, and adds elements of youth language (*aaaldr* ‘old chap’) as well as vocabulary that expresses disrespect of the country (*Schweinefresserland* ‘porkeater/devourer country’ instead of *Deutschland* ‘Germany’) and the addressee (*Du Hure* ‘you bitch’).

Would it be possible, for an imagined linguist of the year 2108, to reconstruct from this sketch the accent(s) with which native Turks used to speak German a century earlier? Of course not. Or at least not without some major reservations. We are dealing with satire here, i.e., with a construct, and what the linguist would study is not authentic material, produced by genuine speakers with a Turkish accent; rather, what we are given is nothing but some features that, in a German native’s percep-

---

\* A big thank you to Liesbeth Zack (Amsterdam) as well as the two anonymous reviewers of a preliminary version of this paper for all their precious comments and suggestions for improvement!

1 The first three installments had been shown January 2002 – December 2003. After a pause of five years the program resumed in November 2008 with its fourth season. From 2002 until 2013, the program received several prizes as ‘best comedy program’ or ‘best sketch comedy.’ <<https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ladykracher>> (as of Dec. 04, 2017).

2 Now available on YouTube under the title ‘Deutschkurs für türkische Mitbürger – Ladykracher,’ see <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mPH7ZIGZ4BE>> (last accessed Dec. 04, 2017). For a comparable sketch on Dutch TV, cf. ‘Van Kooten en de Bie – De groenteman en de Turk,’ <<https://youtu.be/bzC1dhjq0Hw>> (Thank you, Liesbeth, for supplying this parallel).

tion, (stereo-) typically constitute what an audience would recognise as “the” average Turkish accent they think they are familiar with. On the other hand, in order to be recognisable as “typically Turkish” by the audience, the parody cannot be pure fantasy either, it must be based on some real, actual features of “Turkish” German – and the closer it comes to what society at large perceives as typical, the better the parody will be. Therefore, in spite of studying a parodistic contortion of the actual linguistic situation, the early 22<sup>nd</sup> century linguist will still get *some* hints as to early 21<sup>st</sup> century realities (as [ç] > [ʃ] > *isch*, SV > VS, etc. actually *are* “mistakes” that can frequently be heard from speakers with a Turkish background).

*Mutatis mutandis*, the same holds true for the many accents of Turkish that must have been heard in late Ottoman, early Republican Istanbul. To all my knowledge, we do not possess phonographic recordings of these varieties, as for instance “Arabic” Turkish, the accent(s) I would like to focus on in this chapter. However, what we do possess are the hilarious *parodies* of such accents in a whole cyclus of *Karagöz* shadow plays, collected and meticulously transcribed in three heavy volumes by the German Orientalist Hellmut Ritter (1892–1971)<sup>3</sup> in the years following World War I. Ritter had made friends with the then Imperial shadow player, Naẓîf Bey, and followed his performances over many years, eventually covering the artist’s complete Ramadan repertoire (Glassen 1995: 124).

These shadow plays<sup>4</sup> can serve the modern linguist a function that would be similar to the role *Deutschkurs für Türken* might play for the 22<sup>nd</sup> century researcher on “Turkish” German imagined above, thanks to the important role language plays in them: aiming to mirror the “typical” neighbourhood, they use language as characteristic identity marker for all the various religious, social and ethnic groups that lived side by side in the average *mahalle*. In the plays, we meet a large number of “Dialekttypen”, as Glassen calls them – Albanians, Armenians, Jews, Kurds, Laz, black slaves, Arabs, Persians, etc. –, i.e., characters whose main features are their dialects, sociolects (women, Europeanised dandies, prostitutes), or peculiar ways of pronouncing Turkish (stammerers, drunkards, opium smokers), and this is also why the difficulties of communication among these groups feature prominently in the plays (Glassen 1995: 133–135).

Similarities between *Deutschkurs für Türken* and *Karagöz* notwithstanding, the material also differs from each other in a number of respects, most important among them the medial one. While *Deutschkurs* is a video and as such includes a sound track that preserves the performer’s actual pronunciation, the Naẓîf Bey/Ritter collection consists of written texts only. Moreover, they represent a court version of

3 On him, cf., van Ess (2014), or the concise entries in the German or English Wikipedias, <[https://de\[en\].wikipedia.org/wiki/Hellmut\\_Ritter](https://de[en].wikipedia.org/wiki/Hellmut_Ritter)>. Ritter’s collection was later also included by Cevdet Kudret in his monumental edition of *Karagöz* texts (Ankara 1968–1970).

4 Due to limitation in space and given the *linguistic* character of the present study, I will neither go into the legends about the origin of the genre nor discuss their typical setting and structure, the Sufi dimensions, performance practices or material aspects. For an overview over pertinent reference literature, cf. Glassen 1995: 122, note 1 (in general) and 2 (historical roots).

the performed pieces, which one might assume to have been “cleaned up” for use in “high society”. This, however, does not seem to be the case: a comparison with other extant material shows that the court version does not differ significantly from what used to be staged in local coffeehouses (Glassen 1995: 125). But what about the fact that we are dealing with *transcripts*, i.e., written representations of oral performances? Of course, we cannot know how exact Ritter’s transcription of what he heard actually was and whether or not, consciously or unconsciously, he made some “corrections”. However, given his expressed aim of an *authentic* rendering, especially also of the deviations from standard Ottoman, and his sensitivity to the importance of nuances within these deviations, and given also the high degree of consistency with which the linguistic peculiarities of each group are presented throughout the three volumes, it seems safe to assume a high degree of reliability in these transcripts. This impression is further corroborated by the fact, given more detailed attention below, that the features of “Arabic” Turkish found in the *Karagöz* plays do not contradict recent studies on the integration of foreign words into Arabic (as will become evident from the many cross-references to Prokosch 1983 and Hafez 1996 below). Transcription could have posed more serious problems had Ritter used the Arabic alphabet where vowel quality is expressed only deficiently. But he decided to reproduce the text in *Latin* characters, even in the first volume (1924) which was still edited and published before the “alphabet reform”. From volume two onwards, his transliteration follows modern Turkish orthography, supplemented often by an additional indication of vowel length and pharyngeal ‘[ʕ], to highlight peculiarities of *Arabic* pronunciation. This leaves us only with the problem of the (non-) representation of the “emphatic” consonants (see below).

As for the limitations of the material for a reconstruction of the actual linguistic situation a century ago, the same reservations must be made, *mutatis mutandis*, as in the case of *Deutschkurs*, discussed above. Like in *Deutschkurs*, the representatives of certain language communities in the *Karagöz* plays do not speak themselves: what is open to analysis is foreign accent *in the shadow player’s representation*, i.e., what a *Turk* considered typical of the respective communities’ way of speaking Turkish, and it is a *parody*, i.e., it exaggerates and stereotypises. However, as in the case of *Deutschkurs*, this does not necessarily mean that we have to outright reject as pure fantasy the linguistic features appearing in the material. Parody does not function without being based on what the audience can recognise from real-life experience. This is especially true for *Karagöz*, a genre of popular culture that served as an “outlet valve” for all kinds of tensions in the *mahalle* and the humorous-playful negotiation of its day-to-day affairs: the spectators could identify with the characters, would recognize themselves and their neighbours in those (stereo-) types, and everybody would laugh about each other and him/herself (Glassen 1995: 133, 136–137). The assumption that there is indeed *some* truth, however stereotypised, in the parodistic representation is confirmed, as we will see, in the case of “Arabic” Turkish, by the fact that modern findings about phonological processes accompanying acts of borrowing foreign words into Arabic are to a large extent

congruent with the results of our Karagözcü’s parodistic “analysis” of “typically Arab(ic)” Turkish.

After these preliminary remarks, let us now “listen” into some of these plays to get a feeling, however approximative, of how Istanbul may have sounded a century ago for the shadow player and his public – the late Ottoman, multi-ethnic Istanbul in which so many languages could be heard and so many people spoke with their own peculiar accents.

In the plays, two types of “Arabs” make their appearance: black slaves (called *Arap*)<sup>5</sup> and “genuine” Arabs (called *Ak Arap* ‘white Arabs’). Due to limitation in space and for methodological reasons, I will restrict myself to a closer examination of the representation of the latter’s speech only, although the shadow player (*karagözcü*) does not really seem to keep them apart and distinguish the way black and white *Arap*s speak (a fact that certainly has to be added to the above caveats.)<sup>6</sup> Since in volume one no *Ak Arap* makes his appearance my analysis will thus start with volume two.

#### Volume II (1941)

Three of the six plays contained in this volume have “Arabs” among their dramatis personae: *Yalova Sefası* (‘The Trip to Yalova’), *Çeşme ve yahut Kütahya* (‘The Well or Kütahya’), and *Kayık* (‘The Boat’). Since the *Arap* in the second is a slave of African origin, I will hop over *Çeşme* and focus on *Yalova Sefası* and *Kayık* and their ‘white’, i.e., ethnic, Arabs only.

*Yalova Sefası* has, after an opening scene, a first part in which, in addition to Hacivad and Karagöz, the two main characters of the shadow plays,<sup>7</sup> a westernized gentleman (*çelebi*)<sup>8</sup> and his naïve female friend (*zenne*) play the major roles. They prepare for a boat trip to Yalova, a popular place of excursions to the south of Istanbul on the other side of the Marmara Sea, known for its hot springs. In the second and main section, a number of *Dialekttypen* subsequently make their entry, each asking the young woman to allow him to join the group on their trip. She agrees – on the condition that the passenger finds a place for himself in a big jar in the middle

---

5 Two standard references for the history of slavery in the Ottoman Empire are Toledano (1983) and Erdem (1996). For a concise overview, cf. İnalçık (2012). In certain periods, a fifth of the overall population consisted of slaves.

6 For many of the regions which black slaves usually originated from we have to assume a non-Arabic and even non-Semitic linguistic background so that *their* Turkish with all probability sounded different from that of native Arabs.

7 Speaking Ottoman, i.e., the high variety, Hacivad represents the Ottoman elite, while Karagöz, who speaks “simple” Turkish, i.e., the low variety (often called *kaba Türkçe* ‘raw, coarse Turkish’), stands for the native population.

8 For some theories about the origin of this term, see Barthold & Spuler’s entry in *EI<sup>2</sup>* (with further references).

of the boat since there is little space elsewhere and the blind passengers should not be detected. With each new passenger squeezed into it, the jar gets extremely packed and those inside engage in fierce argument and beating – a typical carnivalesque *Karagöz* scenario. Among those on board we find also an *Ak Arap* named Hacı Kandil (i.e., ‘oil lamp’, Arabic *qindīl*).<sup>9</sup>

The song with which he enters the scene characterizes him as a mercer (trader in *bafta*<sup>10</sup> and silk). Unlike the *şarkı* sung by a black slave in volume one, which is in Turkish, Hacı Kandil’s song is in Arabic. In a footnote Ritter remarks that he tried to approximate in his transliteration the way the Turkish shadow player pronounced the lyrics.<sup>11</sup> His rendering pays attention to vowel length (*â, î, û*) as well as *qāf* [q], ‘*ayn* [ʕ] and *hamz* [ʔ], while it leaves the typical Arabic emphatics (*ḥ* [ħ], *ṣ* [s], *ḍ* [ḏ], *ṭ* [ṭ], *ẓ* [ẓ]) unmarked. I am adding, in the column to the right, a version *with* these consonants, not only to show etymologies, but also to suggest a rendering that is “more complete” and closer to modern European standard transliteration than Ritter’s, which seems to be geared to modern Turkish orthography. I have also marked in bold the corresponding characters in Ritter’s text. I am doing so because in a completely Arabic song, it is quite likely that the Arab preserved original Arabic pronunciation:

(1) (Şarkı ile Ak Arap gelir.) Şarkı *Nihavend*.

*Befta hindî, befta hindî, şâş harîr, yâ benât!*

Bafta hindî, bafta hindî, šāš ḥarîr, yâ banât!

9 For some reason, Arabs always seem to be associated with light, candles, lamps, etc. Thus, the play *Tahmis* (‘At the Coffee Roasters’, III: 439–462; see below) features a ‘white’ Arab called Hacı Fıtıl (cf. Arabic *fatīl* ‘wick’), and in two other places (II: 38, III: 458) we meet an Arab whose name is Şamandıra ‘float (for a wick)’; ‘burner (of a kerosene lamp)’ (Redhouse 1968/1992). According to (for lack of a better reference) Nişanyan (s.v., entry dated August 24, 2012), *şamandıra* goes back to Greek σημαδοῦρα *simadūra* ‘buoy, float moored in water to mark a location, warn of danger, etc.’ (< Old Greek σῆμα *sēma* ‘sign, mark’, cf. English *semantic*, etc.). However, the word also appears in Egyptian Arabic – *šamandıra* ‘buoy’ – into which it was borrowed from Turkish (so Badawi/Hinds 1986: 480). For the Turkish shadow player it appears to have sounded typically Arabic.

10 Arabic *baft* or *bafta* (< Persian *bāfti*) ‘bafetas, toile de coton blanc des Indes’ – Dozy (1881), *√bft*.

11 According to Ritter, the language here is ‘Vulgärarabisch’ (‘*āmmiyya*). However, as one of the anonymous reviewers of my contribution assures me, we should rather characterise it as ‘Middle Arabic, i.e., Standard Arabic with some colloquial elements’ (N.N., review, forwarded to me by one of the editors on March 22, 2018). A typical marker of Middle Arabic is the “wrong” use of the negation *lam* in line 4, cf. Lentin (2011) who remarks that in Middle Arabic *lam* appears ‘as stylistically marked and is often used with verbs in the perfect, or even as a nominal negation; this is a good example of a common procedure in Middle Arabic which consists in borrowing a linguistic tool from Standard Arabic and using it in a genuine manner without conforming to the syntactic constraints (and sometimes to the semantic limitations) attached to it’; for more details see Blau (2002). Dialectal elements in the otherwise “high” Arabic text are the *b*-imperfect appearing in line 3 (*b-tiḥsibū*) and the imperative *xušš* (see below).

<i>Veftehû lî, yâ sabâyâ, li’egli abât.</i>	Wa-ftahû lî, yâ şabâyâ, li-’ağlî ’abât.
<i>Küllemâ nâmet ’uyûnî b-tihsibu l-’âşiq yenâm;</i>	Kullamâ nâmat ’uyûnî b-tihsibu l-’âşiq yanâm;
<i>Vel-’âşiq muğrem, sabâyâ, lem ’ale l-’âşiq melâm.</i>	Wal-’âşiq muğram, şabâyâ, lam ’ala l-’âşiq malâm.
<i>Fatahat lî veqâlat lî: Khuş, yâ nûr ’ainî, nâm!</i>	Fatahat lî wa-qâlat lî: xuşş, yâ nûr ’aynî, nâm!
<i>Fereşet lî min qatîfa vel-mikhadda rîş na’âm;</i>	Faraşat lî min qatîfa wal-mixadda rîş na’âm;
<i>Talla’atnî qaşr ’âlî veqadatli ş-şam’dân.<sup>12</sup></i>	Ṭalla’atnî qaşr ’âlî waqadat-li ş-şam’adân.

According to Liesbeth Zack, this song is quite well-known especially in Egypt.<sup>13</sup> The dialectal imperative *khuş(ş)* ‘come in, enter!’ (line 5), too, points to an Egyptian background.<sup>14</sup> – The first “prosaic” words from the mouth of the *Ak Arap* are:

- (2) *Vay âföndüm, iki gözüm; nur-u ’aynim, khanumâföndi!* ‘Woe on me, mylady, my two eyes, my eye’s light, respected lady!’ (II: 38)

*Vay*: Although there is the Arabic interjection *wāy*, the shadow player lets the Arab pronounce it with Turkish fricative *v* instead of Arabic approximant *w*. Nazîf Bey and/or Ritter (or real Arabs?) do not seem to be consistent with regard to the preservation or non-preservation of original Arabic *w* or the change of Turkish <sup>+</sup>*v*<sup>15</sup> into *w*, cf. below samples (7) *aywa* and (10) *gahwa* for original Arabic words, (12) *werdim* (<sup>+</sup>*verdim*) and (18) *war* (<sup>+</sup>*var*) for Turkish ones, and (15) *vapur* for a Western loanword (French *vapeur*, Italian *vapore*).<sup>16</sup>

*âföndüm*: While in volume one, the shadow player has a black slave say *afendi* for <sup>+</sup>*efendi* (I: 174–175), he lets the ‘white Arab’ pronounce the word not with a darkening, but with a “vulgarisation” in the opening syllable (<sup>+</sup>*e* > *ä*), then with a contortion of <sup>+</sup>*e* to *ö* and <sup>+</sup>*i* to *ü*. As far as I can see, neither *ö* nor *ü* form part of the phonemic inventory of any variety of real Arabic; therefore, these sounds are probably meant to indicate a broader, more open pronunciation in line with the opening of <sup>+</sup>*e* to *ä*, giving the overall impression of a more “earthy”, “archaic”, perhaps even “barbaric” articulation, as opposed to the more “refined”, “cultivated” Turkish <sup>+</sup>*e* and <sup>+</sup>*i*.

12 II: 38. In Ritter’s translation (imitating rhyme and metre): ‘Baumwollstoffe, Seidentücher bring ich euch, ihr Mägdelein! / Öffnet mir die Tür, ihr Kinder, laßt mich heute Nacht herein! // Glaubt ihr, wenn die Augen schlafen, der Verliebte sank in Schlaf? / Ach, Verliebte sind von Sinnen, nie sie drum ein Tadel traf. // Und sie öffnet mir die Türe, spricht: Mein Liebling, komm herein! / Komm herein und leg dich nieder! Breite dir ein Lager fein. // Kissen von des Straußen Feder, Sammetdecken holt sie dann, / Läßt mich auf den Söller steigen, zündet mir die Kerze an’ (II: 39). The last line is said to have an obscene “secret meaning”.

13 Personal communication, January 22, 2018.

14 *b-* imperfect in *tihsibu* (line 3) could be either Egyptian or Levantine.

15 Here and in the following, I am marking with a superscript ‘plus’ (‘<sup>+</sup>’) forms as they would have been in standard Turkish/Ottoman.

16 *vapur* should probably be grouped with the Turkish words here since in (Egyptian) Arabic, where the word can be found too, it has become either *wābūr* or *bābūr*. Hafez (1996: 5, §15).

This assumption may be further corroborated by the retention of guttural ‘[ʕ] and *kh* [x] in ‘*aynim* and *khanumāfōndi*, and perhaps also by the doubling, unnecessary as it is from a semantic point of view, of (light, delicate) Turkish *iki göz-üm* (‘two eye-my’) with the almost synonymous (‘dark, earthy’) *nur-u ‘aynim*, which shows genuine *Arabic* (= more archaic, ‘raw, brute’?) vocabulary (*nūr* ‘light’, ‘*ayn* ‘eye’).<sup>17</sup> Yet, even the Arab “barbarian” seems to have at least *some* idea of Turkish grammar: in *āfōndü-m*, *göz-üm*, ‘*ayn-im* he makes correct use of the 1SG.POSS suffix.<sup>18</sup> And as all the forms of address used by him demonstrate, he also has command of a stock of words expressing refinement, though perhaps only basic and commonplace. It might be what he needs in his profession as a tissue seller.

When the *zenne* greets Hacı Kandil: *Sefa geldin!* ‘Welcome!’ he replies:

(3) *Safa bulduk, ganim!* ‘Thanks for the welcome, my dear!’ (II: 38–39)

*Safa*: While both *sefa* and *safa* are used in Ottoman Turkish, *safa* is the variant that is closer to the Arabic *ṣafā* ‘clearness, serenity, purity’; hence also: ‘happiness, felicity, gaiety, cheerfulness, etc.’ from which it is borrowed. It seems natural that a native Arab would use *safa*, probably even pronounced with initial emphatic [s].

*ganim* for <sup>+</sup>*canim*: The Arab does not pay attention to Turkish vowel harmony. Moreover, the replacement of <sup>+</sup>*c* [dʒ] with *g* [g] supports our impression that we have to imagine Hacı Kandil as a stereotypical native Egyptian (or at least somebody using Egyptian dialect, cf. Prokosch (1983: 11), Hafez (1996: 6).

When the woman asks him how he is, he answers:

(4) *Şok şukur!* ‘Thank you very much!’ (II: 38)

For the native Arab, *ç* [ʧ] in Turkish *çok* ‘much’ is a challenge: in order to make pronunciation easier he drops initial [t], turning [ʧ] into the [ʃ] he knows from his own native language; cf. Prokosch (1983: 11), Hafez (1996: 6). As for the vowels in *şukur* (for <sup>+</sup>*şükür*), these are again more “archaic” and closer to the original Arabic articulation (*şukr*) than the “refined, civilised” Turkish version; cf. (2), above.

When Karagöz addresses the merchant, the Arab asks back:

(5) *Ulaq, sen qımsin?* ‘Hey son, who are you?’ (II: 38)

*ulaq*: The form of address seems to be out of place, for two reasons: first, the Arab is probably confusing *ulak* ‘courier; messenger’<sup>19</sup> with the slang word *ulan* (= *oğlan*)

17 ‘light of the eye’ is a common metaphor for ‘one’s darling child’ (Redhouse 1992[1968]: 892), but in Ottoman Turkish the second element is usually taken from Persian: *nur-i çeşm* or *nur-i dide*. While the latter two belong to a higher register (Redhouse: “[e]a[rnd]”) and *göz* is just the normal Turkish word, ‘*ayn* must have felt to be definitively Arabic, i.e., foreign.

18 As for *-u* in *nur-u ‘aynim*, two explanations are possible: either it imitates the Persian *ezafet* (LNK) of *nur-i çeşm* or *nur-i dide* (see note 17), with <sup>+</sup>*-i* > *-u* to underline “dark, archaic” pronunciation, or it is meant to be the regular case ending *-u* (NOM.DEF) of *füşhâ* Arabic.

19 Redhouse (1992 [1968]: 1197).

‘1. Hey, fellow!, Hey, son!’ 2. ‘You rascal!’;<sup>20</sup> and second, the latter, too, would be inappropriate as polite address; as such, it is obviously meant to indicate a lack of linguistic competence that the audience would recognise as frequently found in Arab speakers they would meet in real life.

*ulaq, qim*: In the Karagözcü’s parody, the Arab uvularises velar /k/ of Turkish <sup>+</sup>*ulak* and <sup>+</sup>*kim* ‘who?’. Again, this is evidently meant to underline the “rawness”, “coarseness” or “archaism” that we have already observed above, sub samples (2) and (4), and which is stressed yet another time in the Arab’s retention of *kh* [x] in his answer to Karagöz’s question whether he does not recognise him:

(6) *Khayr, bilmadi*. ‘No, I wouldn’t know [who you are].’ (II: 38)

This sample does not only show original Arabic *khayr* for Turkish <sup>+</sup>*hayır*, but also the two characteristics of “Arabic” Turkish that we have already encountered above: the speaker has not internalised Turkish vowel harmony; and he is obviously tempted to use darker (backed) vowels (a feature frequently observed in Arabs adopting foreign words into their language, cf. Hafez 1996: 7). In addition, the form *bilmadi* (for <sup>+</sup>*bilmedim*) also lacks the suffix *-m* and thus uses 3SG instead of 1SG, as if 3SG were an uninflected form that could be used in connection with all kinds of grammatical subjects.

What follows is a typical Karagözian play on the misunderstanding of words. When Karagöz tells the Arab that he actually is his compatriot’s milk brother, Hacı Kandil remembers and says:

(7) *Aywa*. ‘Yes!’ (II: 38)

The dialectal Arabic *aywa* (*ʔaywa*) identifies the speaker again as somebody who is likely to have an Egyptian background.<sup>21</sup> Unlike in sample (2), original Arabic *w* is retained here. Although *aywa* and Turkish *evet* are phonetically close (and may even look etymologically related),<sup>22</sup> Karagöz does not understand ‘yes’ but only hears the Arab’s *aywa* as Turkish *ayva*, meaning ‘quinces’.

20 The pejorative meaning of *oğlan*, originally ‘boy’, is given in Redhouse (1992 [1968]: 1197) (s.v. *ulan*).

21 *ʔaywa* is used also in other regions, but it is not as typical of, say, Tunisian or Levantine dialects as it is of Egyptian Arabic.

22 According to Clausen’s *Etymological Dictionary of Pre-13<sup>th</sup> Century Turkish*, *evet* goes back to a form *yemet* which is “as such pec[uliar] to *Kaş[gari]* but apparently the earliest form of other (Western) words meaning ‘yes’” (1972: 935, with further references). In contrast, Egyptian Arabic *ʔaywa* ‘yes’ has often been regarded as a successor of Coptic *ha(e)io*, (*h)aiio*, etc. (for a discussion, see Corriente 2008: 67), but this etymology is also doubted by many. Some think that *ʔaywa* is short for *ʔay wallāh* ‘yes, by God’, yet others suggest a Semitic origin (cf. cognates of dialectal Arabic *ʔaywa*, *ʔəwa* in Gəʿəz Tigre Tigrīñña *ʔəwa*, Amharic *awa* ‘yes’, which seem to be based on the Semitic affirmative particle \*ʔi > Akkadian *i*, Ugaritic *i*, Arabic *ʔi* ‘yes!, certainly!’). As far as I can see, a relation between Arabic *ʔaywa* and Turkish *evet* has not been proposed so far. Could *ʔaywa* go back to *evet*?



A few more gags of this kind follow, all built on the phonological similarity of original Arabic expressions used by the merchant and their funny (mis)interpretation through the Turk Karagöz. However, although they are quite amusing I will not reproduce them here because they do not add to our knowledge of the peculiarities of stereotypical “Arabic” Turkish more than what we already know: the “un-Turkish” pronunciation could lead to misunderstandings.<sup>23</sup>

Given that we have already encountered several of the linguistic phenomena that will reappear in the following, let us bundle, from now on, some of the remaining utterances in *Yalova Sefası* in a cluster of samples, to be discussed in one:

- (8) *Sen bizim Takhtagal'a da gelirdi?* ‘Have you come from our [quarter] Tahtakale (lit. Wooden Castle)?’<sup>24</sup>
- (9) *Siz de awlād ‘Arabdan mısınız?* ‘Are you too from among the “Sons of the Arabs”?’
- (10) *Siz de gahwa benim gibi çok işer?* ‘Do also you drink as much coffee as I do?’
- (11) *Ne suylersin? Ben anlamadı.* ‘What are you saying? I haven’t understood.’

(all II: 38–39)

*Takhtagal'a, awlād ‘Arab:* For preservation of *kh* [x] and guttural ‘ [ʕ] see above, sample (2). – As with *nūr-u ‘aynım* (ibid.), the shadow player obviously could take it for granted that his audience would understand the Arabic expression *awlād ‘Arab*.

*sen... gelirdi, siz... işer, ben anlamadı:* The Arab not only often drops the correct pronominal suffixes, as in (6), but also the interrogative particle *mi* (<sup>+</sup>*geldin*, <sup>+</sup>*içer mi-siniz*, <sup>+</sup>*anlamadım*). In other cases, however, he is using them (*awlād ‘Arabdan mi-sınız, ne suylersin*) – an inconsistency on the part of Nazîf Bey, or Ritter, or meant to reflect the stereotypical foreigner’s inconsistency and, hence, lack of linguistic competence?

*Takhtagal'a, gahwa:* As we were able to assume already from several instances above, according to the Karagözcü the native Arab tends to preserve original Arabic

23 As Glassen (1995: 135) rightly remarks, although failed communication is never presented as “tragic” in these plays, Karagöz nevertheless frequently complains: ‘Isn’t there a Turkish word for this?’, ‘The Turkish between us has broken down!’, ‘One of us didn’t get it – but who?’, ‘Oh, if only I had to deal with people understanding Turkish!’ Difficulties arise mainly in two contact zones: a) between the elite and efendi group (Hacivad, Ottoman) on the one hand, and the common Turk (Karagöz, average “low” Turkish) on the other, and b) between the common Turk Karagöz and the minorities and foreigners (“Dialekttypen”). Cf. also below (*apud* note 30).

24 Ritter remarks (II: 39, fn. 2) that the interpretation, suggested via the name’s pronunciation with [x], as ‘Wooden Castle’ (as if from Persian *taxta* ‘board, plank’, which also went into Arabic), in his opinion is wrong and that it rather should be ‘Under the Castle’ (from Arabic *taht al-qal’a*). However, the etymology of the name is not as clear as Ritter assumes. In the article ‘Tahtakale’ in *İA* it says: ‘When and why the quarter’s name became Tahtakale cannot be said with certainty (*kesinlik kazanmamıştır*),’ though it seems ‘more likely’ (*akla daha yakın*) that it means ‘under the castle’. However that may be, Ritter is right in stating that the quarter is close to the Egyptian Bazar (*Mısır Çarşısı*) where there used to be, among other things, also Arab(ic) coffeehouses, see below, p. 14 with note 40. Situated in the immediate vicinity of the Eminönü piers, Tahtakale has always been, and is to this day, one of Istanbul’s busiest trading areas.

pronunciation in Turkish words of Arabic origin. This is why he pronounces [x] in *takhta-* (Arabic *taxt* ‘wood’),<sup>25</sup> [ʕ] in *-gal’a* (Arabic *qalʕa*) and [w] in *gahwa* (Arabic *qahwa*). Original Arabic /q/ however surfaces as [g] here (*gal’a*, *gahwa*), a pronunciation that would mark our speaker as stemming, with all likelihood, from the Arabian Peninsula<sup>26</sup> or Iraq and/or from a Bedouin tribe (cf. Edzard 2011); [g] for /q/ is however also attested for larger parts of Upper Egypt and the Nile Delta (cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 1985, maps 6–8), and sometimes *gahwa* would rather point to a sedentary than a Bedouin background (de Jong 2011). In contrast, in sample (5) (*Ulaq, sen qimsin*) we saw that “the” Arab also uses [q]; but there it is replacing Turkish <sup>+</sup>[k].

*şok işer* instead of <sup>+</sup>*çok içer*: shows realisation of /ʃ/ as [ʃ], as in (4) – producing a comical effect here: the Arab actually says ‘Do also you *piss* as much coffee as I do?’.

The following quote is less interesting from the linguistic perspective but from a general cultural one. It does not display many features of “Arabic” Turkish that have not been observed so far, but gives us an idea about a job that the shadow player obviously regarded as a “typically Arab” occupation. Asked by the Lady how he intends to pay her if she takes him to Yalova on the boat Hacı Kandil replies:

(12) *Qasdane qababı satar, funduq qababı satar, getirir paraları sana verdim mi.* ‘I may sell roasted chestnuts [or] sell roasted hazelnuts, [then] bring the money [and] give it to you’. (II: 40–41)

It may be worth a little study in its own right to find out whether the roasting of nuts was indeed among the professions often pursued by native Arabs at that time – in addition to the trading in tissues with which the Arab was identified in the opening song, cf. (1).

For *q* instead of Turkish <sup>+</sup>*k* (<sup>+</sup>*kestane*, <sup>+</sup>*kebab*, <sup>+</sup>*findık*), see (5). Interestingly enough, the Karagözcü seems to think (or let the Arab think) that *kebab* is a genuine Turkish word and therefore makes the Arab apply the <sup>+</sup>*k* > *q* “rule” instead of letting him follow the other “rule”, observed above in (2) and later, according to which the Arab does not change original Arabic pronunciation in Turkish words that have an Arabic etymology (which is the case with *kebab* < Arabic *kabāb*,<sup>27</sup> with initial *k*!).

*satar, getirir, verdim mi*: aorist (AOR) in the main clause to express what *may* happen *if* a condition is fulfilled is the correct tempus/aspect. Given that only the last verb in a sequence of verbs needs to have the personal marker and that the following

25 We can exclude Arabic *tahta* ‘under’ here; Ritter would have rendered it as <h>, not as <kh>.

26 Reviewer N.N. (cf. note 11, above) would also not exclude that an Arab who said *gahwa* originated ‘from Yemen, which was the place Ottomans imported their coffee from’.

27 The Arabic word itself is of genuine Semitic origin, cf., e.g., also Akkadian *kabābu* ‘to burn, scorch, char wood’, Judeo-Palestinian *kabbeb* ‘to roast’, all based on a biconsonantal root *\*kb-* ‘to turn, turn round’ (cf. Arabic *kabba* ‘to overturn, topple, turn upside down, invert’, *kab-kaba* ‘to topple, upset, etc.’, *kabā* ‘to fall forward, stumble, trip, slip’). Cohen et al. (2012 vol. 10), s.v. KB-, KBB, KBKB.

verb shows the 1SG *-im*, the forms *satar* and *getirir* are not incomplete. However, one would expect *ver-ir-im* (give-AOR-1SG) instead of *ver-di-m mi* (give-PST-1SG INT). Both the use of the past tense (PST) and of an interrogative particle (INT) are unmotivated and can probably only be explained as a mistake created by the Karagözcü with the purpose of letting the Arab finish with a wrong form to mark, again, lack of linguistic competence.

When the Arab has slipped into the big jar, a number of other *Dialekttypen* (an Albanian, an Armenian, etc.) enter the scene and, subsequently, also the jar, so that the Arab has good reason to complain and demand them let him breathe. Linguistically, the quarreling scene is of little interest for us; it does not disclose features that would be different from those that we have already observed so far.<sup>28</sup>

Like the Armenians, Albanians and other “national” characters, the Arab too marks his identity by interspersing, every now and then, original Arabic words into his speech. They seem to be so common in late Ottoman Istanbul that the Karagözcü can take for granted that his public is familiar with them. A few more examples in line with what has been observed already above, sub (2), (7), and (9):

(13) *Na’am!* ‘Yes!’ (II: 58) = Arabic *na’am*

(14) *‘Acayip!* ‘How strange!’ (II: 58) = vernacular Arabic *şağāyib* (for standard *şağāʿib*).

I am hopping over the *Çeşme* play now because it is only in *Kayık* (‘The Boat’) that we meet an *Ak Arap* again. He is introduced with exactly the same song as in *Yalova Sefası*, so that the spectator will identify him again as a silk and cotton merchant (with a – most probably – Egyptian background). From the linguistic perspective, there is not much new here either – the Karagözcü seems to be quite consistent in his representation of the peculiarities or “Arabic” Turkish. I will therefore confine myself to a comment that shows how much the *Karagöz* plays are about language.

Shortly after his entry, our *Ak Arap* asks Karagöz (whom he assumes to be one of the boatmen):

(15) *Kaba taşığım onunda sikim deriye bir vapur osurdu mu?* (II: 260).

Ritter rightly remarks that even if *taşığım onunda* is made into <sup>+</sup>*taşığım önünde*, to fulfil the requirements of vowel harmony, this question still remains out of place, made up from the beginning to let the Arab utter something obscene.<sup>29</sup> Accordingly,

28 *Arap (küçük içinde)*: *Ganim, nişun lâgirdi anlamaz siz?* [<sup>+</sup>*canım, nişin lâgirdi anlamaz siz* (*siz*), II: 48], *Ganim, öte tarafa otur, burada rahat yok!* [<sup>+</sup>*canım, öte tarafa otur*, II: 50], *Benim de, ganim, kulağım ısırıldı!* [<sup>+</sup>*benim de, canım, kulağımı ısırıldı*] ... *Nişun böyle yapar? (nişin böyle yapar*, II: 52) ‘Arab (inside the jar): “Why don’t you understand my words, dear?”’, “[Please,] my dear, sit on the other side, it’s not comfortable here”, “He has bitten also my ear, dear... Why is he doing this?”’.

29 Originally, obscenities constituted an essential aspect of Karagözian humour. Though largely reduced in the “prude” late Ottoman era, there are still remnants in the plays transmitted by Ritter (Glassen 1995: 127–28). Glassen reports that Ottoman author Namık Kemal (1840–1888) still called the shadow play a “school of licentiousness” in 1866 (Glassen 1995: 128, with refer-

Ritter refrains from translation into German and gives the meaning in Latin only: “*Ante crassos testiculos meos ad penis mei cutem navis vaporaria flatumne emisit?*” (roughly: ‘Is it possible that the steamboat broke a wind to the skin of my penis in front of my coarse testicles?’). It is only Hacıvad who tells us what the Arab actually wanted to say: *Kaba Taş önünde İskenderiyeye giden bir vapuru soruyor* ‘He is enquiring about a steamer that is leaving from Kabataş [pier] for Alexandria’. On this, Karagöz, aware of how deeply he must have misunderstood also this passenger (after similar situations have occurred with other characters), exclaims desperately: *Gelen müşterilerin hepsine bir tercüman lâzım! Hiç lâkırdıları anlaşılıyor* ‘For each of the customers who come I/we need an interpreter! What they say is not comprehensible at all’ (II: 260–261) – a pointed expression of how difficult communication in the multi-ethnic and multilingual Ottoman Empire sometimes must have been.<sup>30</sup>

### Volume III (1953)

This volume contains seven more pieces in which *Araps* play a part.<sup>31</sup> However, I will deal with them only if we encounter interesting phenomena that have not been addressed so far.

*Orman* (‘The Forest’, or ‘The Brigants’) (III: 211–236)<sup>32</sup> is about a group of brigants, among them Karagöz, who try to rob some passers-by. Before they do so they are eager to find out the person’s profession and whether he is wealthy. As in *Yalova Sefası*, the Arab is introduced here again with the *Befta hindî* song which we are already familiar with from earlier pieces. Later passages not only identify the Arab as a very rich merchant, but also as a pilgrim (cf. *ziyaret*, III: 233).

The Arab greets Karagöz and asks him for his favorite drink, coffee (*gahwa*, see (10)), taking him for a

(16) *gahveji* ‘coffeeshop owner’.

This word shows *j* [ʒ] for Turkish <sup>+</sup>*c* [dʒ] (cf. Hafez 1996: 6, §17), corresponding to the shift of unvoiced <sup>+</sup>*ç* [tʃ] to *ş* [ʃ] observed in (4). Seen in isolation, the <sup>+</sup>*c* > *j* shift would reflect a pronunciation that the Karagözcü is likely to have heard from a speaker coming from Beirut, Damascus or Tunis. Combined with the realisation of

---

ence to Menzel (1941: 49).

30 Cf. note 23 above.

31 *Orman* (‘The Forest’, or ‘The Brigants’) (III: 211–236), *Büyük Evlenme* (‘The Big Wedding’), (III: 237–264), *Karagözün Ağalığı* (‘Karagöz as Rich Gentleman’), (III: 265–296), *Kırgınlar yahut Abdal Kardeşler* (‘The Depressed/Disheartened’ or ‘The Stupid Brothers’), (III: 381–410), *Tahmis* (‘At the Coffee Roasters’), (III: 439–462), *Çivi Baskını yahut Abdal Bekçi* (‘The “Nail” Raid’, or ‘The Stupid Guardian’), (III: 511–540), and *Balıkçılar* (‘The Fishermen’), (III: 598–608).

32 All quotations from *Orman* are from (III: 233).

Arabic /q/ as [g] and the speaker's assumed Egyptianness, it may point to Upper Egypt or the Delta as the imagined Arab's region of origin.<sup>33</sup>

(17) *Siz bir gahwa bişirir?* 'Could you [please] cook a coffee [for me]?'

*Siz...* *bişirir*: Polite *siz* (2PL, not 2SG *sen*), but without interrogative particle *mi* and 2PL ending for correct inflection (<sup>+</sup>*pişirir mi-siniz*): as in (10).

*bir gahwa*: One would expect a measure word like *tane* 'piece' or *fincan* 'cup' after *bir*; its lack indicates lack of linguistic competence.

*bişirir*: Though appearing rather late in the collection, the shift from unvoiced <sup>+</sup>*p* to voiced *b* is one of the most common features of Arab(ic) accent, not only in Turkish but also in many other languages that have *p* in their phoneme inventory.<sup>34</sup>

(18) *Demak, burda şok adam var?* 'Does that mean [that] there are many people (lit. men)?'

*demak* for <sup>+</sup>*demek*: violation of vowel harmony as in (3), (6), (15) above; leaning towards "dark" pronunciation of "light" vowels, cf. (6) and later; *burda* for <sup>+</sup>*burada*: ellipsis, indicating colloquial informality; *şok* for <sup>+</sup>*çok*: see (4) or (10); *var* for <sup>+</sup>*var*: see (10).

The Arab then tells Karagöz what he and his fellow brigants hoped to hear, namely that his business is *ticaret* 'trade, commerce' (<sup>+</sup>*ticaret*, from Arabic *tiğāra*, with [g] for *fuşhà* [dʒ], as in (3)), that he has traveled a lot (*Ben şok yer dolaştı, gazdi*)<sup>35</sup> and thereby become rich:<sup>36</sup>

(19) *Şok bara gazandi.* '[Yes,] I've made/won a lot of money.'

33 While an urban Egyptian would have said *zahwagi* (with the typically urban realisation of /q/ as [ʔ] and Egyptian *-gi* for the Turkish suffix <sup>+</sup>*-ci*), Ritter's writing ⟨gahweji⟩ may perhaps also be interpreted as [gahwadʒi], with the strong palatalisation that can be found in many Bedouin dialects as well as in Middle and Upper Egypt (see Zaborski 2011, with further references).

34 Israeli Arab author Sayed Kashua (\*1975), for example, in his autobiographical novel *Aravim rōkedim* ('Dancing Arabs'), 2002, remembers the day when he, as one of only two Arab boys, was allowed to attend an Israeli elite school, was laughed at by his Israeli classmates, not only because of the way he dressed and his ignorance of table manners, but also on account of his inability to differentiate in pronunciation between Hebrew *p* and *b*. How widespread this inability is can also be seen, for example, from advices, to be found on the Internet, like S. Jenkins' "/p/ versus /b/: A Helpful Tip For Teachers Of Arab Learners," <<http://ihjournal.com/p-versus-b-a-helpful-tip-for-teachers-of-arab-learners>>, which starts with the sample phrases: 'Want some Bebsi?', 'Teacher, I don't have a bencil,' 'I was late because the bolicc stobbed me.' – For the <sup>+</sup>*p* > *b* shift accompanying borrowing into (Egyptian) Arabic, cf. Prokosch (1983: 11) and Hafez (1996: 5).

35 'I have passed by [and] visited many places', with *şok* for <sup>+</sup>*çok*, violation of vowel harmony, and the preference of quasi-analytical, non-inflected constructions instead of synthetic verb forms, as in (6), (8), (10), (11) above.

36 The same type of Arab merchant will appear again in *Çivi Baskını yahut Abdal Bekçi* ('The "Nail" Raid', or 'The Oafish Guardian'), (III: 511–540), not treated in detail below). There we learn that he has just returned from a larger trip to Aleppo, Bagdad, Basra and Damascus (III: 534).

*şok* for <sup>+</sup>*çok*, as above.

*bara*: *b* for <sup>+</sup>*p*, as in (17).

*gazandı* for <sup>+</sup>*kazandı*: violation of vowel harmony in the suffix, *g* for <sup>+</sup>*k* as in (10), and 3SG (conceived of as uninflected) instead of 1SG, as already observed above.

The brigants come and rob him as soon as he makes a move to leave:

(20) *Şimdi ben İstanbulda gidejek*. ‘I am going to Istanbul now.’

*ben... gid-ejek*: analytical construction (PERS.PRN.1SG go- FUT) instead of synthetic <sup>+</sup>*gid-eceğ-im* (go-FUT-1SG), with *j* [ʒ] (or [dʲ]?) for <sup>+</sup>*c* [dʒ], as in (16) above.

*İstanbulda*: The Arab confuses Turkish allative <sup>+</sup>*-a* with locative *-da*.

In the next piece featuring a ‘white Arab’, *Karagözün Ağalığı* (‘Karagöz as Rich Gentleman’), (III: 265–296), the character enters again with the by now familiar *Befta hindî* song (III: 293).<sup>37</sup> This time, however, he is not a rich merchant but a lame/crippled (*kötürüm*) beggar, and it is Karagöz himself who has become the rich gentleman.

In the very short scene (all following quotations are from page III: 294), we meet again many of the linguistic features that have already been discussed above. Among them, the use of original Arabic vocabulary seems to be slightly more prominent than in the other pieces looked at so far, cf. (13) and (14):

(21) *Ena miskîn* ‘Poor me!’ – *fulûs* ‘money’ (= Arabic: *ʔanā miskîn, fulûs*)

Unlike in the preceding piece, our Arab beggar’s pronunciation does not display <sup>+</sup>*p* > *b*, but <sup>+</sup>*p* > *f*:

(22) *bânâ fara wâr, fara!* (for <sup>+</sup>*bana para ver, para*) ‘Give me (some) money, money!’ – *Farşa farşa olâsin!* (for <sup>+</sup>*Parça parça olasin!*) ‘May you be [scattered into] pieces!’

Furthermore, the Karagözcü is eager to “over-Arabize” the character’s speech by letting him realise syllable-opening glottal stops [ʔ] as pharyngeal ‘*ayn* [ʕ]:

(23) *Ganim, ben sâ’il* (<sup>+</sup>*sâ’il*)! ‘Dear, I am a beggar.’<sup>38</sup> – *Bânim elim da yok, ayâgım da yok, at ‘agzımda* (<sup>+</sup>*ağzıma*)! ‘I have neither hands nor feet, (so) throw (the money) into my mouth!’ – *Bân sana şok du’a yapajak, sen ‘amin* (<sup>+</sup>*amin*) *da!* ‘I will make many prayers for you, be sure (about that)!’

37 So also later in *Çivi Baskını...* (III: 534).

38 The sound shift to [ʕ], probably heard as an indication of “Barbarian” pronunciation by an uneducated coffeehouse audience of the *Karagöz* plays, here also creates a comical distortion of meaning, which will not have passed unnoticed by spectators with a knowledge of Arabic: *sâ’il* means ‘coughing’. (Ritter collected the plays as performed by Nazîf Beğ *at court* where many *did* have a fair command of Arabic.)

## In lieu of a conclusion

Since the last two pieces in Ritter's collection that could be relevant for our investigation – *Çivi Baskını yahut Abdal Bekçi* (The “Nail” Raid, or: The Oafish Guardian, III: 511–540) and *Balıkçılar* (The Fishermen, III: 598–608 – are not giving anymore linguistically, I will use the play that precedes them and, by contrast, is rather rich in relevant phenomena, as a kind of summarising conclusion. It is probably only natural that this play, which is set in the “heart of Arabness”, so to speak – in a *Tahmis* (‘At the Coffee Roasters’), (III: 439–462) where the ingredients for the Arabs’ favorite drink are produced – features not only one, but several Arabs: Hacı Kandil, Hacı Fitol, and Hacı Şamandıra.<sup>39</sup> We learn that they often meet in the many cafés in the Tahtakale area,<sup>40</sup> among them also a place allegedly called *Avurzavur* (III: 457). Arabs also often seem to have had coffee-related jobs, e.g., as coffee grinders (*dövücü*, *ibid.*). Like in the other pieces, in *Tahmis* too the “default” Arab is from Egypt. We can guess this not only from some (though not unequivocal) features of his pronunciation, but also from the fact that someone has written to him from Alexandria.<sup>41</sup> Moreover, an interesting detail gives us some information about something like an informal Arab post office: Karagöz tells one of the Arabs that he should collect a letter (*mektup*) from a coffeeshop owner in Tahtakale (III: 459). As for the linguistic features, we can observe in this piece (unless stated otherwise, all quotations are from III: 457–458):

- “The” Arab tends to use a number of Arabic expressions without translating them, obviously because he can assume that most people understand them: *yâ weled* ‘hey, boy’, *aywa* ‘yes’, *na’am yâ sîdi!* ‘yes, sir!’, *udrub gahwa!* ‘crush/grind (the) coffee!’
- According to the Karagözcü, Arabs usually pronounce Turkish words with Arabic (or Persian) etymology with their original consonantism: *khaber* < Arabic *xabar* (Turkish would be <sup>+</sup>*haber*), *hoş* < Persian *xoš* (<sup>+</sup>*hoş*), *tahmis* < Arabic *taḥmīṣ*<sup>42</sup> (<sup>+</sup>*tahmis*).
- Egyptian accent seems to have been quite common, so we find it in several places here too: *g* [g] for <sup>+</sup>*c* [dʒ]: *ganim* (<sup>+</sup>*canim*), *agab* (<sup>+</sup>*acab*) (III: 534).
- In some instances, their stereotypical realization of pronunciation of Arabic /q/ as [g] – *gal’a* (<sup>+</sup>*qal’a*), *guruş* (<sup>+</sup>*qurūş*), *gahwa* (<sup>+</sup>*qahwa* – points (if Egyptian) to their stemming from Upper Egypt or the Nile Delta, or (if not Egyptian) to a Bedouin background, Irak, or the Arabian Peninsula, including Yemen.

---

39 See above, note 9.

40 See above, sample (8), with note 24.

41 Cf. also the mentioning of the Alexandria boat leaving from Kabataş in (15) above.

42 As in *Takhtagal’a* (see note 24, above), which may be from Arabic *taḥta* ‘under’, not from Persian/Arabic *taxta* ‘plank, wood’, the form *tahmis* for a word with original [h] shows that Arabic [h] and [x] were easily confused by native speakers of Turkish.

- This “rule” is sometimes also extended to genuine Turkish words containing initial <sup>+</sup>k. Uneducated Arabs often take this to be based on Arabic *q*, which they then pronounce according to their habit: *gaş* < \**qaş* (<sup>+</sup>*kaç*).
- Arabs’ articulation of Turkish vowels usually is darker: *safa* (<sup>+</sup>*sefa*), *guzel* (<sup>+</sup>*güzel*), *dortyuz* (<sup>+</sup>*dörtüyüz*), *duwucu* (<sup>+</sup>*dövücü*), *duwejek* (<sup>+</sup>*dövecek*), *gonderdi* (<sup>+</sup>*gönderdim*), *kapunun onunda ... soylar* (<sup>+</sup>*kapının önünde...söylar*, III: 535). In the case of /ö/ and /ü/, this feature corresponds to the lack of these phonemes in Arabic. (In contrast, /e/ is found in all dialects.)
- As a consequence, Arabic Turkish typically does not observe the rules of Turkish vowel harmony: *tanir* (<sup>+</sup>*tanır*), *guzel* (<sup>+</sup>*güzel*), *onlari* (<sup>+</sup>*onları*).
- A prominent feature of “Arabic” Turkish is the substitution of <sup>+</sup>ç [tʃ] with ş [ʃ]: *şok* (<sup>+</sup>*çok*), *Şelebi* (<sup>+</sup>*Çelebi*), *gaş* (<sup>+</sup>*kaç*), *şağrajak* (<sup>+</sup>*çağıracak*), *şalışajak* (<sup>+</sup>*çalışacak*), *şabuk* (<sup>+</sup>*çabuk*).
- The same type of “easening” takes place in the corresponding voiced consonant where *j* [ʒ] often replaces <sup>+</sup>c [dʒ]: *Hajivad* (<sup>+</sup>*Hacivad*), *werejek* (<sup>+</sup>*verecek*) and other PART.FUT forms (*gelejek*, *şalışajak*, ...). However, it cannot be excluded that Ritter’s <j> is intended as representation of a heavily palatalised [dʲ].
- Turkish <sup>+</sup>v often becomes *w* because Arabic does not have the /v/ phoneme: *werejek* (<sup>+</sup>*verecek*).
- Nor is there Arabic /p/, which is why Turkish <sup>+</sup>p usually becomes *b*: *barola* (<sup>+</sup>*parola*).<sup>43</sup>
- In the *Karagözcü*’s stereotypical representation, Arabs tend to simplify the complex “agglutinating” morphology of Turkish verb forms by substituting them with quasi-analytical ones in which Turkish 3SG forms function as (uninflected) quasi-participles: *Siz beni tanir?* (<sup>+</sup>*tanır mısınız*) ‘Do you know/recognize me?’, *gaş gurus werejek?* (<sup>+</sup>*vereceksiniz*) ‘How many piasters will you give?’, *biz Tahtagal’ada oturur* (<sup>+</sup>*otururuz* or <sup>+</sup>*oturuyoruz*) ‘We live in Tahtakale’, *ben gonderdi* (<sup>+</sup>*gönderdim*) ‘I sent’, *ben tuttu* (<sup>+</sup>*tuttum*) ‘I took’, *biz yapar* (<sup>+</sup>*yaparız*) ‘we (may/can) do’.
- An interesting special case – the only specimen of its type in Ritter’s collection – is:

(24) *Bizim burda eskiden tutar idik takhmis var.* ‘We have a coffee-roastery here that we rented (lit. took) long ago’ (III: 457).

In this sentence, a past aorist has taken the place of the “typically Turkish” factitive participle (PART.FACT) in *-dik*, so that the *Karagözcü*’s imagined Arab says:

<i>tut-ar</i>	<i>i-di-k</i> <sup>44</sup>	<i>takhmis</i>
take-AOR	AUX-PST-1PL	roastery

instead of

43 From *Çivi Baskını yahut Abdal Bekçi* (III: 535).

44 Modern Turkish would contract this to *tut-ar-dı-k* (take-AOR-COP.PST-1PL).



<sup>+</sup>*tut-tuğ-umuz*<sup>45</sup>                      *tahmis*  
 take-PART.FACT-IPL.POSS              roastery

- Last, but not least: The Karagözian stereotypical Arab is unable to produce the Turkish nasal <sup>+</sup>*ō*: *sora* (modern Turkish *sonra*, pronounced <sup>+</sup>*sōra*).

Judging from the fact that most of the phenomena that could be observed in Ritter's transcripts of late Ottoman *Karagöz* plays match Prokotsch's descriptions and Hafez's findings about the integration of foreign loanwords into Egyptian Arabic, Ritter and the Karagözcü Nazîf Beğ seem to have rendered the peculiarities of "Arabic Turkish" rather authentically, though not without some simplification and exaggeration. They seem indeed to have picked up, if in parodistic stereotypes, many characteristic features of Turkish as spoken by Arab natives in a now by-gone Istanbul.

### References

- Badawi, El-S. & Hinds, M. 1986. *A Dictionary of Egyptian Arabic: Arabic-English*. Beirut: Librairie du Liban.
- Barthold, W. & Spuler, B. Čelebî. In: *EF<sup>2</sup>* (consulted online on May 9, 2018), <[http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912\\_islam\\_SIM\\_1601](http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_SIM_1601)>
- Behnstedt, P. & Woidich, M. 1985. *Die ägyptisch-arabischen Dialekte 2: Dialektatlas von Ägypten*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Blau, J. 2002. *A handbook of early Middle Arabic*. (Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam (JSIA). Jerusalem: The Max Schloessinger Memorial Foundation.
- Clauson, Sir G. 1972. *An etymological dictionary of pre-thirteenth century Turkish*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Cohen, D. 1970, 1993–2012. *Dictionnaire des racines sémitiques ou attestées dans les langues sémitiques*. Fasc. 1 & 2. Paris & La Haye: Mouton. With Bron, F. & Lonnet, A. 1993–2012. Fasc. 3–10. Louvain & Paris: Peeters.
- Corriente, F. 2008. Coptic loanwords of Egyptian Arabic in comparison with the parallel case of Romance loanwords in Andalusí Arabic, with the true Egyptian etymon of Al-Andalus. *Collectanea Christiana Orientalia* 5, 59–123.
- de Jong, R. 2011. Gahawa-Syndrome. In: *EALL* (consulted online on Feb. 1, 2018) <[http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1570-6699\\_eall\\_EALL\\_SIM\\_vol2\\_0008](http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1570-6699_eall_EALL_SIM_vol2_0008)>.
- Dozy, R. 1881. *Supplément aux Dictionnaires Arabes*. Leiden: Brill. (Reprint Beirut: Librairie du Liban, 1991).
- EALL* = *Encyclopedia of Arabic language and linguistics*. Managing Editors Online Edition: Lutz, E. & de Jong, R. Leiden: Brill.
- EF<sup>2</sup>* = *Encyclopaedia of Islam* edited by Bearman, P. & Bianquis, Th. & Bosworth, C. E. & van Donzel, E. & Heinrichs, W.P. First published online in 2012.
- Edzard, L. 2011. Qāf. *EALL* (consulted online on Dec. 1, 2017) <[http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1570-6699\\_eall\\_EALL\\_COM\\_0277](http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1570-6699_eall_EALL_COM_0277)>.
- Erdem, Y. H. 1996. *Slavery in the Ottoman Empire and its demise 1800–1909*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

45 For readers not familiar with Turkish: In *tuttuğumuz*, the element *-tuğ-* is a variant of the PART.FACT morpheme *-dik-* which here is conditioned by preceding *-t-* (causing assimilation of morpheme-opening *d > t*) and following vowel (causing *-k-* > *-ğ-*).

- Glassen, E. 1995. Das türkische Schattentheater: Ein Spiegel der spätoosmanischen Gesellschaft. In: Bürgel, J. C. & Guth, S. (eds.) *Gesellschaftlicher Umbruch und Historie im zeitgenössischen Drama der islamischen Welt*. Stuttgart: Steiner. 121–37.
- Glassen, E. 2009. Karagöz. In: Arnold, H. L. (ed.) *Kindlers Literatur Lexikon* 3. Stuttgart & Weimar: J. B. Metzler. Quoted from *Kindlers Literatur Lexikon Online – Aktualisierungsdatenbank*, <[www.kll-online.de](http://www.kll-online.de)> (as of December 7, 2017).
- Hafez, O. 1996. Phonological and morphological integration of loanwords into Egyptian Arabic. *ÉGYPTE monde arabe* 27–28 (Les langues an Égypte), 383–410. <<http://journals.openedition.org/ema/1958>>.
- İA = Düinden bugüne İstanbul ansiklopedisi*. İstanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı. 1993–1996.
- İnalçık, H. *Ghulām*: Ottoman Empire. In: *EP*, 2: 1085–1091.
- Kudret, C. 1968–1970. *Karagöz* 1–3. Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi.
- Lentin, J. 2011. Middle Arabic. In: *EALL* (consulted online Nov. 28, 2017) <[http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1570-6699\\_eall\\_EALL\\_COM\\_vol3\\_0213](http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1570-6699_eall_EALL_COM_vol3_0213)>.
- Menzel, Th. 1941. *Meddāh, Schattentheater und orta ojunu*. Prague: Oriental Institute.
- Nişanyan, S. 2002–. *Nişanyan sözlük: Çağdaş Türkçenin etimolojisi*. <<http://www.nisanyan-sozluk.com/>>.
- Prokosch, E. 1983. *Osmanisches Wortgut im Ägyptisch-Arabischen*. Berlin: Klaus Schwarz.
- Redhouse, J. W. 1974 [1890]. *A Turkish and English lexicon = Kitab-ı masāni-yi lehce*. Constantinople: A. H. Boyajian. Reprint: Beirut: Librairie du Liban.
- Redhouse. 1992 [1968]. *Redhouse yeni Türkçe-İngilizce sözlük = New Redhouse Turkish-English dictionary*. İstanbul: Redhouse Press.
- Ritter, H. 1924–1953. *Karagös: Türkische Schattenspiele*. Herausgegeben, übersetzt und erklärt. Erste Folge [vol. I.]: *Die Blutpappel. Die falsche Braut. Die blutige Nigar*. Hannover: Orient-Buchhandlung Heinz Lafaire. Zweite Folge [vol. II.]: *Bibliotheca Islamica* 13a, İstanbul, 1941. Dritte Folge [vol. III.] mit Beiträgen von A. Tietze. Wiesbaden: Steiner.
- Toledano, E. 2014 [1983]. *The Ottoman Slave trade and its suppression 1840–1890*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Toledano, E. R. 1993. Late Ottoman concepts of slavery (1830s–1880s). *Poetics today* (Cultural Processes in Muslim and Arab Societies: Modern Period 1.) 14: 3, 477–506. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/1773282>> (accessed: 22-11-2017).
- van Ess, J. 2014. *Der Orientalist Hellmut Ritter (1892–1971)*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Zaborski, A. 2011. Jīm. In: *EALL* (consulted online on February 18, 2018) <[http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1570-6699\\_eall\\_EALL\\_SIM\\_vol2\\_0040](http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1570-6699_eall_EALL_SIM_vol2_0040)>.