

How to Catalog Karamanlidika Works? Samples of Bibliographic Descriptions of Karamanlidika Works from Academic Library Online Catalogs

Karamanlıca Eserleri Nasıl Kataloglamalıyız? Çevrimiçi Kütüphane Kataloglarından Bibliyografik Kayıt Örnekleri

Selenay Aytaç

Işık University Library, Istanbul. selenay.aytac@gmail.com

Abstract: This study addresses the current problems with cataloging and classification of Karamanli (Karamanlidika) works, and seeks to provide guidance on how to improve existing bibliographic records of these unique works, which are already in many academic libraries all over the world. The Karamanli works, also known as Karamanlidika, refer to those works written in Turkish language but printed in Greek characters according to the usage of Karamanli language or Karamania in Asia Minor (Anatoli) during the Ottoman Empire. Qualitative analysis through academic library online catalogs and the OCLC's WorldCat indicates that there is no consistency among bibliographic descriptions of Karamanlidika works due to lack of standards relating to the description of these special works. In order to provide seamless access to this indigenous literature: (1) one should use new subject headings and a Library of Congress call number, (2) assign a new ISO639-2 language code for Karamanli language, and (3) digitally preserve such resources.

Keywords: Karamanlidika, special collections, cataloging special collections, Turkish Literature written with Greek script

Öz: *Bu çalışma Karamanlıca eserlerin kataloglanması ve sınıflanması sırasında karşılaşılan problemlere değinmekte ve dünyadaki birçok üniversite kütüphanesinin çevrimiçi kataloglarında mevcut Karamanlıca eserlere ait bibliyografik kayıtların iyileştirilmesi için önerilerde bulunmaktadır. Karamanlıca eserler, ya da literatürde bilindiği adıyla Karamanlidika, Osmanlı İmparatorluğu zamanında Karamanlı diliyle, çoğunlukla Türkçe fakat Yunan harfleriyle yazılmış eserleri ifade etmektedir. Metindeki örneklerden de görüleceği gibi birçok kütüphane bu eserleri kataloglarken belli bir standart olmamasından dolayı farklı ifadeler kullanmıştır.*

Bu çalışmada: (1) *Karamanlıcaya özel Kongre Kütüphanesi yeni konu başlıklarının kullanılması,* (2) *Karamanlıca için yeni ISO639-2 dil kodu oluşturulması,* ve (3) *bu eserlerin dijitalleştirilmesi önerilmektedir.*

Anahtar sözcükler: *Karamanlıca, nadir eserler, nadir eserlerin kataloglanması, Yunan harfleriyle yazılmış Türkçe literatür*

Introduction

Have you ever seen a book in your library written in Greek script but not of the Greek language? Although you are the cataloger for Greek books, you could not understand what the book title said? Finally, you obtained assistance from the Turkish language cataloger. You transcribed the text and the Turkish cataloger translated the meaning into English. However, you could find neither a subject heading from the Library of Congress nor a classification number? This article is written for you and for the sake of Karamanli works (Karamanlidika) which were lost in the library online catalogs due to lack of appropriate bibliographic descriptions.

Background

The relationship between the Greeks and the Turks extended over 700 years when the entire Balkan region was under the Ottoman Empire. The Ottoman Empire was one of the largest multi-ethnic empires lasting from the 14th century to the 20th century. It had territories from North Africa to Europe, Central Asia in the east, and the Balkans in the west. Although Ottoman Turkish was the official government language of the Ottoman Empire and the widely spoken language, there were also minority languages in use. Until the population exchange in 1922-1923 and some other population migrations, there were areas of concentrated Greek population in various parts of Anatolia such as the Aegean coast, Cappadocia, on the Trebizond region around the Black Sea, Izmir (Smyrna), and in Istanbul (Konstantinopoulis). Due to this close geographical contact, Greeks and Turks shared their

customs, traditions, culture, as well as language (Kappler, 2002).

Turkish (Fig. 1 and Fig. 1.1). This reveals another cross-cultural concern for these two languages. Despite the fact that the official government language was Ottoman Turkish written in Arabic script, the Anatolian Orthodox Christian community (also known as Turkish speaking Orthodox people) published many works in Karamanlidika, some of them published by Evangelinos Misailidis, by the Anatoli or Misailidis publishing house (Misailidis 1986, p. 134).

Karamanli works represent unique cultural and historical nuances of the period that Karamanli people existed. Unfortunately, neither Karamanli people nor the Karamanli language exist anymore. The only evidence of their past history is the works they published. The purpose of this paper is to identify problems that need solutions regarding bibliographic descriptions of the Karamanli works, which are in libraries all over the world, and to recommend some ideas about cooperation and the pooling of our intellectual resources to provide access to these indigenous works. The Karamanli works or Karamanlidika or Karamanlica works are used interchangeably in this paper to refer to the works published by the Karamanli people or Karamanlides who were the Turkish speaking Orthodoxes of Asia Minor (Clogg, 1999).



Figure 1. An example of a Karamanlidika work: *Yeni Sevdalı Şarkı* (Courtesy of Professor Evangelia Balta from her work *Karamanlidika*, 1997)

PETZEMHIM ŞARKISI
 Γκιμιλέρδε ταλήμ βάο
 Μπαχριελή γιαρήμ βάο
 όντα γιακή σφερεθ
 γέ ταίμοιζ μετασιμ βάο.
 "Ανα μπενιμ Ρεδζεμιτιμ Ριτζεμιτιμ

Figure 1.1. Macro focus on "Recebim Şarkısı"

In the introduction of his recent book Matthias Kappler pointed out that "no individual is perfectly monolingual, no society is purely monocultural, [and] no human expression of art or communication is free from external influence" (Kappler 2002, p. 1). He focused on Turkish language contacts in Southeast Europe by grounding the idea that "the contacts between languages reflect the contacts between peoples and cultures." This is especially true in the case of the Greeks and Turks. Language, one of the most important elements of any culture, is often encoded with particular nuances that enrich the understanding of the spoken word.

Works that were published in Ottoman Turkish using Greek script are called Karamanlidika or Karamanli

Literature Review

Smiraglia (2001, p. 82) stresses that "works have a significant meaning for the cultures that produce them." It is essential for librarians to preserve all those recorded memories of humanity. For this purpose, cataloging principles and rules have been developed to describe works effectively. The goal of these enormous efforts was the dissemination of knowledge without difficulty in regarding the nature of a work for the benefit of society.

The core element in this organization of knowledge efforts is a bibliographic record (Smiraglia, 2001). According to Svenonius (2000, p. 62), "A bibliographic record is a unique description of a bibliographic entity that is formatted and inscribed on a specific medium such as a book, a slide, a video recording, etc." Most of the cataloging practices employ the standard, the Anglo American Cataloging Rules (AACR), because it is one of the most sophisticated languages, which was developed to give meaning to bibliographic records (towards their bibliographic entities). Therefore, AACR used for decades in the libraries.

Bibliographic description of the works written in other languages has been debated over decades from cataloging standpoint. First of all, the AACR was basically compiled for books and mainly for the English books. However, with the increasing number of non-English works in library catalogs, some significant efforts have been made in order to provide standards to describe these works. The 61st International Federation of Library Association (IFLA) conference proceedings were dealing with multilingual and multi-script issues regarding cataloging and classification

of non-English works (Byrum & Madison, 1998). Today, AACR2 and the Library of Congress (LC) provide enormous support for cataloging non-Western languages.

Although most of the first cataloging practices seem focused on western works, Charles Ammi Cutter's 1876 Rules for a Printed Dictionary Catalogue dealt with "Oriental authors" in rule 13. Rule 52 of the 1908 Catalog Rules: Author and Title Entries mentioned that main entries should be standardized for "Turkish Writers." Cutter (1876) also provided a fuller discussion of the elements of Muslim names (Maccaferri, 1990; Blake, 2002). In the same vein, the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules were changed as a result of the International Conference on Cataloging Principles, known as "Paris Principles", held in Paris in 1961. Moreover, the Library of Congress Subject Heading (LCSH) language, an internationally accepted thesaurus was originally begun to be developed in 1898 and revised to meet this crucial need for description of works.

Furthermore, individual researchers focused on specific languages and their bibliographic description problems. Cataloging practices of Ottoman Turkish personal names were examined by Maccaferri (1990). He stated that Ottoman Turkish personal names were inadequately treated in American cataloging codes. Standardized Romanization of Ottoman names and some guiding principles were recommended in this study. Maccaferri also highlighted that library catalogs and bibliographic records facilitate studying of other peoples and cultures, but they can do so only "if they provide full access to materials in languages such as Ottoman Turkish." This is a very important point, since the Karamanli works are not treated very well in library catalogs as well. For instance, Romanization of Karamanli works is not done consistently in many cases. This is a significant problem when one seeks information regarding Karamanli works in library catalogs due to special characteristics of Karamanli language.

The Greek script is one of the most widely known scripts in the world and has a long history. For example, Greek mathematical symbols have been used for centuries by numerous societies. Although Karamanli Turkish is written with mutated form of Greek script, the ALA-LC Romanization table for Greek script (also for Coptic) is not very appropriate in terms of Romanization of these works. For example, Karamanli Turkish uses some special dots on the Greek characters often such as dotted pi and tau, as well as a iota. These special characters like dotted pi correspond to a "p" pronunciation of Arabic letter "bi" (Haralambous, 1999). Such a solution is possible since the Karamanli Turkish alphabet and its script and phonology was studied by Miller (1974) and a new transliteration schema proposed in his doctoral thesis.

Romanization of Karamanli works require special effort because of its linguistic nature of discourse. Although there are some rules to follow to Romanize the Ottoman Turkish

or Greek words according to AACR2 and LC (<http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpsd/roman.html>), no standard exists to Romanize Karamanli language. This inconsistency among different transcribing practices causes a significant information loss during the library online catalog searches.

The discourses for Ottoman Turkish, Greek, and Karamanli Turkish can be seen in Table 1. Karamanli Turkish represents unique characteristics in terms of spoken and the written discourse. Although there is no information loss in terms of meaning during this discourse, the usage of Greek script and Karamanli culture attributes precious value to the works produced in this discourse.

Table 1. Discourses of Ottoman Turkish, Greek, and Karamanli Turkish

Discourses	Spoken	Written
Ottoman Turkish	Ottoman Turkish	Arabic
Karamanli	Ottoman Turkish	Greek
Greek	Greek	Greek

Kramsch (1998, p. 61) states that, "Discourses are more than just languages, they are ways of being in the world, or forms of life that integrate words, acts, values, beliefs, attitudes, and social identities." Furthermore, it is clear that Karamanli culture is an oral culture and represents cultural nuances of its spoken community. Kramsch (1998) also underlines that orality acquires naturally and literacy is learned in schools, which clearly addresses the complexity of Karamanli language. A similar case in terms of using different languages in speaking and written discourse has been observed at Sofia. Professor Trendafil Krastanov presented another manuscript, which has the same characteristics, during the Digital Preservation of Medieval Manuscripts and Early Printed Books Summer School at the Church History Museum in Sofia, Bulgaria (Digital, 1999). The text alphabet consisted of Greek and Cyrillic alphabets with the Ottoman Turkish. This "work" spoke clear Ottoman Turkish in phonetic, but written with Cyrillic and Greek alphabet. Dissemination of this work requires the reading knowledge of Greek and Cyrillic alphabets and speaking of Ottoman Turkish.

Methodology

In this paper, a qualitative content analysis was conducted to collect data from library online catalogs. OCLC's WorldCat is the largest and most comprehensive worldwide union catalog, which embraces millions of online bibliographic records from more than 9,000 member institutions. First of all, WorldCat catalog was searched to retrieve bibliographic records of Karamanli works by using keywords "Karamanli" "Karamanli" "Karamanlidika" or "Karamanlidhika". We used two different versions of the search term: "Karamanli," and "Karamanli" because some

catalogs allow keying in six Turkish non-ASCII characters ("ç", "ğ", "ı", "ö", "ş", and "ü") and create bibliographic records with the accented versions of the same Turkish characters such as "c", "g", "i", "o", "s", and "u". This issue is still problematic for Turkish catalogers, who use international library automation systems or the OCLC cataloging module CAT ME. They not only experience difficulties when keying in the Turkish characters to the system, but also when displaying and printing bibliographic records (Çelenkoğlu, 1998; Aytaç, 2005).

OCLC's WorldCat informs the user about the home institute of a particular bibliographic record, so the names of institutions which contributed to WorldCat in terms of Karamanli bibliographic records is listed for the second search through local library online catalogs. Then to do the second follow-up in the library catalogs, individual visits to each university's library catalog was performed.

The online catalogs of the Library of Congress, Dumbarton Oaks Research Library, National Library of Turkey, Bogazici University Library (TR), Oxford University Library (UK), and Cambridge University Library were analyzed with regard to bibliographic descriptions of Karamanli works or the manifestations of Karamanli works.

Some of those aforementioned records were selected from the library catalogs in order to display the current cataloging practices of Karamanli works. As seen in Figure 2, the first record from the Library of Congress (lweb.loc.gov/z3950) is the manifestation of an original Karamanli work published in 1871-1872. This work was transliterated into Turkish and republished by a new publisher in 1986. Unfortunately, there is no specific description of the bibliographic record except the 500 notes area, nor there is a reference to the original Karamanli Turkish language.

The next MARC record was captured from the Bogazici University library online catalog (www.boun.edu.tr) (Figure 3). This is the Karamanli translation of the work written by "Gontra Buri." The MARC 008 control field states that it is written in Turkish, which makes this record lost among other Turkish works while the 650 Subject Added Entry field describes the work as Karamanli dialect and Karamanli literature.

Another record from the Bogazici University library catalog displays the difficulties of transliterating Karamanli Turkish into Turkish (Figure 4). This time the MARC 008 control field states that this work is written in Greek due to lack of appropriate language code for Karamanli language.

On the other hand, "Karamanlidika" is the most commonly used description in the literature. Because of the famous bibliographies of Salaville and Dallegio (1958; 1966; 1974), Salaville, Dallegio and Balta (1987), Balta (1987a; 1987b) and Balta and Sallaville (1997) Karamanlidika is the only evidence of this multilingual and

multicultural era and the people. Neither the Karamanli community nor the Karamanli language exists anymore.

```
LDR 01257nam 2200313 a 4500
001 2435449
005 19880609114044.9
008 871027s1986 tu ah b 000 0 tur
035 $9(DLC) 87968361
906 $a7$bcbc$scorignew$d2$encip$f19$gy-gencatlg
955 $afc21 4-27-88
955 $a bx87 to bc00 11-02-87
010 $a 87968361
040 $aDLC$cDLC$dDLC
043 $aa-tu---
050 00$aPL248.M52$bT46 1986
100 1 $aMisa`elidis, Euangelinos,$d1820-1890.
240 10$aTemaösa-i dünya ve cefakâr-u cefakeös
245 10$aSeyreyle dünyay. :$b(Temaösa-i dünya ve cefakâr-u
cefakeös) /
$cEvangelinos Misailidis ; haz.rlayanlar, Robert
Anhegger, Vedat Günyol.
260 $a[Istanbul] :$bCem Yay.nevi,$c[1986]
300 $axxxii, 840 p.:$bill., facsim. ;$c20 cm.
500 $aFiction.
500 $aRoman transcription of the orignial Turkish in
Greek script published as: Temaösa-i dünya ve cefakâr-u
cefakeös. Istanbul, 1871-872.
504 $aIncludes bibliographical references.
651 0$aTurkey$xCivilization$y19th century$xFiction.
700 1 $aAnhegger, Robert.
700 1 $aGünyol, Vedat.
740 0 $aTemaösa-i dünya ve cefakâr-u cefakeös.
991 $bc-AMED$hPL248.M52$iT46 1986$tCopy 1$mTurk$wBOOKS
```

Figure 2. A MARC record from the Library of Congress

```
LEADER 00000cam 2200000 a 4500
008 050323s1885 tu a 000 0 tur d
040 BGZ
049 BGZA
090 PL198.K37|bB87 1885
092 494.357-B85S-1885-Rare
100 1 Burinin, Gontra.
245 10 Seitanin amoudja Dzadesi, Gontra Burinin
hikiyeyesi olup, Evangelinos Misailidis Efendi
tarafından olunarak mearif hazareti dzelilesinin
1301 Dremazi-ul evvel ve 5 numeroli ruhsati ile
tappu nesr olunmiştir /|cGontra Burinin.
246 3 Şeytanın amcazadesi
260 İstanbul :|bEvangelinos Misailidis
Matpaasından,|c1885.
300 807 p. :|bill. ;|c23 cm.
650 0 Turkish language|xKaramanlı.
650 0 Karamanlı literature.
700 1 Misanaides, Evangelinos.
```

Figure 3. A MARC record from Bogazici University Library

Findings and Recommendations

Results show that published works representing of the Karamanli literature are dispersed all over the world in a variety of libraries and repositories. Unfortunately, due to the lack of subject headings and Library of Congress call numbers, retrieving Karamanli works from library catalogs is very problematic. Some of these works are in Classical Greek sections of libraries; some of them are in the Turkish literature division of repositories. There is no specific bibliographic description used for any of these Karamanli works in most of the aforementioned library catalogs, besides the "notes" area of the bibliographic records. This

is the consequence of the multilingual and multicultural nature of these Karamanli works.

Unfortunately, even the specific description of the Karamanli literature is not consistent and differs from one researcher or institution to another (Figure 5).

Some of the MARC cataloging records retrieved from the aforementioned library OPACS show that, these Karamanli works described with Turkish International Organization for Standardization (ISO) language code (tur), with Ottoman Turkish (ota), or with Greek language code (gr). According to ISO 639 (http://www.loc.gov/standards/iso639-2/englangn_ascii.html) a specific MARC record one should use the code (tur) for Turkish, and (ota) for Ottoman Turkish in order to refer to the language. However, we should acknowledge the fact that very unique characteristics of Karamanli Turkish require a new language code. In this study, a new language code, “krm” for Turkish Karamanli, is recommended for the Karamanli language. This should be added to the ISO639-2 code list.

```
LEADER 00000cam 2200000 a 4500
008 050222s1894 gr 000 0 gre d
040 BGZ
049 BGZA
090 PQ2366.M77|bT9 1894
092 843.8-M76T-1894-Rare
100 1 Montépin, Xavier de,|d1826?-1902.
245 10 Tzinkiane Kizi /|cyayet meshur fetzi ve merakli roman oloup moutevefa pederimiz
Evangelinos Misailidis tarafından tarafından
terdzeme olounmousdir
260 Dersaadet :|bAnatoli Matpaasından,|c1894.
300 1003 p. ;|c23 cm.
650 0 French fiction.
650 0 Turkish language|xKaramanli.
700 1 Misa'elid'es, Euangelinos,|d1820-1890.
```

Figure 4. A MARC record from Bogazici University Library

We need to create bibliographic descriptions of, and build catalogs that adequately represent, the works that will function as convenient guides to retrieval of cultural artifacts over the online catalogs. The following statement of Smiraglia (2001, p. 118) highlights the importance of bibliographic description of derivations which is very common in our case: “how important it is to document that two works are related and also how they are related, that nature of the relationships between works is important to readers as well.” So, the derivation of an original Karamanli work as seen Figure 2 should be treated properly in our library catalogs.

We have to appreciate the fact that we have all the rules, principles, and technology to describe world’s diverse works. Cataloging is a pretty much consistent work, which was shaped by international rules and principles. However, one of the other essential questions to be considered (when cataloging a book) is “for whom is the catalogue to be prepared?” (Bennett, 1972). For instance, there should be

some additional “notes area” for Karamanli works such as MARC 500 descriptions to help the information seeker and give the precise description to the work via bibliographic record.

Digitization of these unique Karamanli works from this multilingual era will contribute to cultural and scientific research on the World Wide Web. It will also contribute to the preservation of cultural diversity and multilingualism by fostering cross-cultural communication amongst these two countries: Turkey and Greece. Most of the Karamanli literature is dispersed all over the world and some of these works are also available from the National Library of Turkey according to the recently released CD version of “the Turkish works printed in non-roman characters” (Eski., 2001). Although 803 Karamanli records found in this CD, there is no doubt that there are thousands of Karamanli works being cataloged in many libraries all over the world.

Long term survival of these records are possible by the leadership of one academic library by establishing a web-based interface to access all the Karamanli works such as the MASTER project (<http://xml.coverpages.org/masterDRH99.html>). In such a project, all the Karamanli records will be mounted on a single networked catalog, available to everyone via Web.

To sum up, following recommendations can be made in this study in order to provide seamless access to this indigenous literature: (1) using new subject headings and a Library of Congress call number, (2) assigning a new ISO639-2 language code for Karamanli language, and (3) digital preservation of these works.

Author	Language description of the Works
Miller	Karamanli-Turkish texts
Clogg	Karamanli Books, Karamanlidika Karamanli, Turkish (Karamanlidi), or Karamanlidi Turkish
Dumbarton Oaks Res Lib, Salaville & Dallegio	Karamanlidika
Balta	Karamanlidika
Univ. of Oxford	Karamanlidika
Cambridge Univ.	Karamanlidika
Iordanoglou	Karamanlidic
Library of Congress	no specific description, only “Turkish in Greek script published”
Bogazici Univ.	Karamanli
National Lib. of Turkey	no specific description, only “Turkish in Greek script published”

Figure 5. Language description of the Karamanli works

Conclusion

Every culture is heterogeneous and is composed of a variety of subcultures. In today’s world, language and

cultural contacts are more strongly appreciated than ever before. Language evolves from its social and historical heritage; it is not just a simple vehicle for the communication of information. Librarianship is basically a science of communication and language, and, particularly, language is the first concern of librarians (Shera, 1966). Thus, this is an opportune time to disseminate the cultural information, preserved by individual libraries, to the entire world.

The Karamanli language was basically the spoken Ottoman language; works written in this language represent cultural memories of one of the minorities from the Ottoman Empire that no longer exists. Some bibliographies of these works are published by Salaville and Dalleggio (1958; 1966; 1974), Dalleggio and Balta, Balta and Salaville (1987), and Balta (1987). Today's technology allows us to reach many library catalogs online and retrieve information. Unfortunately, lack of consistency among different libraries' bibliographic descriptions for Karamanli works creates a barrier between information seekers and these unique Karamanli works which are lost in the bibliographic universe.

Karamanli bibliographic records reveal great examples of the complexities associated with bibliographic relationships in terms of manifestations or derivations of the original work in Turkish language with the mutated Greek script.

Furthermore, we believe there are many multicultural and multilingual works out there that need special attention and, presumably, that they share the same fate as the Karamanli works. At this point, it is very important that librarians should acknowledge the fact that they can save the memories of those forgotten cultures by giving them a chance to survive in our modern web-based information repositories. The vision, which will protect all those irreplaceable works from the past centuries, should be shared by all of us.

In conclusion, our paper aims to raise some awareness of these precious Karamanli collections which are currently sealed in their caves, and recommends a worldwide Karamanli literature Appreciation Week. Although these highlights do not cover all the requirements to organize recorded knowledge of Karamanli cultural heritage, the hope is that this exploratory study will start the comprehensive review of these requirements.

References

- Aytaç, S. (2005). Multilingual information retrieval on the Internet: A case study of Turkish users. *International Information & Library Review*, 37, 275-284
- Balta, E. (1987a). *Karamanlidika additions (1584-1900): bibliographie analytique*. Athens.
- Balta, E. (1987b). *Karamanlidika: XXe siècle: bibliographie analytique*. Athens.
- Balta, E., & Salaville, S. (1997). *Karamanlidika: nouvelles additions et compléments*. Athens.
- Bennett, F. (1972). *Cataloguing in practice: the organization of book acquisition in libraries*. Connecticut: Linnet Books & Clive Bingley.
- Blake, V.L.P. (2002). Forging the Anglo-American Cataloging alliance: Descriptive cataloging, 1830-1908. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 35, 3-22.
- Byrum, Jr., J.D., & Madison, O. (Eds.) (1998). *Multi-script, multilingual, multi-character issues for the online environment: proceedings of a workshop sponsored by the IFLA Section on Cataloguing, Istanbul, Turkey, August 24, 1995*. (IFLA Publications: 85) München: Saur.
- Clogg, R. (1999). A millet within a millet: the Karamanlides. D. Gondicas & C. Issawi (Eds.), In *Ottoman Greeks in the age of nationalism: politics, economy, and society in the nineteenth century* (pp. 115-142). Princeton: The Darwin Press.
- Çelenkoğlu, A. (1998). Turkish experience with multi-script, multi-character, and multilingual cataloguing issues. In J.D. Byrum, Jr. & O. Madison (Ed.), *Multi-script, multilingual, multi-character issues for the online environment: proceedings of a workshop sponsored by the IFLA section on cataloguing, Istanbul, Turkey, August 24, 1995* (pp. 14-20). München: Saur.
- Digital Preservation of Medieval Manuscripts and Early Printed Books Summer School, Sofia, July 26-August 13, 1999*. (1999). Retrieved August 22, 2007, from <http://www.math.bas.bg/~dpm/index.html>
- Eski harfli Türkçe basma eserler bibliografyası 1584-1986*. (2001). [CD-ROM]. Ankara: Nuvis.
- Haralambous, Y. (1999). From Unicode to typography, a case study: the Greek script. *Actes de International Unicode Conference XIV*, Boston, 1999, pp. B.10.1-- B.10.36 Retrieved July 15, 2007 from <http://omega.enstb.org/yannis/pdf/boston99.pdf>
- Kappler, M. (2002). *Turkish language contacts in South-Eastern Europe*. Istanbul: Isis Press.
- Kramsch, C. (2005). *Language and culture. Oxford introduction to language study*. Oxford: OUP.
- Maccafferri, J. (1990). Cataloging Ottoman Turkish personal names. *Library Resources & Technical Services*, 34, 62-78.
- Miller, M.G. (1974). *The Karamanli-Turkish texts: the historical changes in their script and phonology*. Unpublished PhD thesis. Indiana University, Indiana.
- Misailidis, E. (1986). *Seyreyle dünyayı: temaşa-i dünya ve cefakar-u cefakeş* (R. Anhegger & V. Günyol, Eds.). İstanbul: Cem.
- Salaville, S., & Dalleggio, E. (1958). *Karamanlidika: bibliographie analytique d'ouvrages en langue turque imprimés en caractères grecs. I, 1584-1850*. Athens: Center for Asia Minor Studies.
- Salaville, S., & Dalleggio, E. (1966). *Karamanlidika: bibliographie analytique d'ouvrages en langue turque imprimés en caractères grecs. II, 1851-1865*. Athens: Center for Asia Minor Studies.
- Salaville, S., & Dalleggio, E. (1974). *Karamanlidika: bibliographie analytique d'ouvrages en langue turque imprimés en caractères grecs. III, 1866-1900*. Athens: Center for Asia Minor Studies.
- Salaville, S., Dalleggio, E., & Balta, E. (1987). *Karamanlidika: bibliographie analytique d'ouvrages en langue turque imprimés en caractères grecs. 1958-1987*. Athens: Center for Asia Minor Studies.

Shera, J.H. (1966). *Documentation and the organization of knowledge*. Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books.

Smiraglia, R.P. (2001). *The nature of a work: Implications for the organization of knowledge*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.

Svenonius, E. (2000). *The intellectual foundation of information organization*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.