

Makedonia ve Civar Bölgelerde Balkan Türkçesi / Balkan Turkish in Macedonia and Adjacent Areas. *Türkler Vol. 20: Türk Toplulukları / The Turks, Vol. 6: Turkish World*, ed. by Hasan Celâl Güzel et al.. Ankara: Yeni Türkiye. 2002. 455-463 / 609-616. [published simulataneously in Turkish and English].

### Balkan Turkish in Macedonia and Adjacent Areas

Victor A. Friedman

University of Chicago

Studies of the impact of Turkish on the Balkan languages are among the first associated with the field of Balkan linguistics (Miklosich 1884), and while there are many works about the influence of Turkish on the Balkan languages (see Hazai and Kappler 1999, Jas'ar-Nasteva 2001), studies of influence in the opposite direction are less common (Tietze 1957, Jas'ar-Nasteva 1957, Kakuk 1972, Ibrahimî 1982, Jusuf 1987, Teodosijević 1985, 1987, 1988, Johanson 1992, Matras 1990, 1996), and descriptions of Balkan Turkish dialects (mostly from Bulgaria; Erimer 1970, Gülensoy 1981, Hasan 1987) have generally not examined contact phenomena as such. This article treats the Turkish dialects of the Republic of Macedonia classified as part of West Rumelian Turkish (Németh 1956; henceforth WRT) -- with references to adjacent areas where appropriate -- in the context of language contact. (For comprehensive bibliographies of WRT see Hazai 1978:115-22, Tryjarski 1976, 1990, but also Asım 1976, Doerfer 1959, Eren 1968, Gülensoy 1993, Hafız 1976, Jas'ar-Nasteva 1971/72, Jusuf 1987, Pokrovskaja 1964, 1974, 1979, Schmaus 1968).

Before the 1999 NATO bombing of Kosovo, four-fifths of ex-Yugoslavia's Turks lived in Macedonia (78,019, constituting 4% of the Republic's population according to the 1994 census). That number is now probably higher. I will exclude from consideration here the Yuruk (Yürük, Yörük) dialects spoken in about 65 villages in southeastern Macedonia (Nedkov 1986). These dialects are close to standard Turkish and do not differ significantly from it probably owing to the relatively late arrival of the Yuruks, their relative isolation in mountain villages, and their practice of endogamy (Jas'ar-Nasteva 1986, Manević 1953-54). Yuruk tradition holds that other Turkish-speakers in Macedonia are Islamicized and subsequently Turkicized autochthonous populations, which may relate to the contact features of WRT (Palikrus'eva 1986).

During the Ottoman period, Turkish was the language of the towns, especially the market place and administration as well as of some villages. Turkish retained its prestige among urban dwellers well into the twentieth century (Jas'ar-Nasteva 1992) and even today in Macedonia and Kosova (Akan 2000). Turkish remains vital, especially in Western Macedonia, and the Balkan Turkish linguistic contact environment is replicated despite the sociolinguistic shift of Turkish from dominating to dominated language.

The complex sociolinguistic situation raises the question of whose dialect of Turkish is to be taken as Balkan Turkish. Over 22,000 declared knowledge of Turkish in addition to their first language in the 1994 Macedonian census, making Turkish the most widely declared additional language after Macedonian and English. The majority of Albanians and Roms in Macedonia and Kosova are Muslim and many speak Turkish. The Aromanian and Megleno-Romanian -speaking Muslims of Macedonia almost all emigrated to Turkey, but the Christian Vlachs are concentrated in areas where Turks are also numerous (in southwest and southeast Macedonia). People from old urban families often speak Turkish regardless of religion or ethnicity. Balkan Turkish as spoken by non-Turks has undoubtedly influenced local Turkish (cf. Hazai 1963).

Németh's (1956) classic division of Balkan Turkish into East and West Rumelian dialects corresponds roughly to the line that divides East and West Bulgarian dialects (Hazai 1961). Thus all of Macedonia (except the Yuruk villages) -- as well as Kosova and Albania -- use WRT. Németh's eight basic WRT features, as summarized by Doerfer (1959), plus two additional features subsequently suggested elsewhere (Németh 1961:22, Schmaus 1968, Ibrahimî 1982) are listed below:

1. *ı, u, ü* -> *i* in word final position: *kutu, subas, ı, köprü* > *kuti, subas, i, küpri*
2. The perfect (indefinite past) suffix *-mis*, is invariant: *almis, olmis, ülmis*,
3. *i* > *ı* in noninitial and closed final syllables: *evimin* > *evımın*
4. *ö* > *o* ~ *o* and *ü* > *u* ~ *u* in many words: *böyle, üç* > *boyle, uç*
5. In suffixes with low vowel harmony (*e/a*), one of the two forms is generalized:  
*yemis, lar, alırse*
6. *ö* -> *ü* in about 40 words: *küpri*
7. Ottoman *g* is preserved consistently: *agaç*
8. Progressive in *-y* rather than *-yor*: *yapay, alaysın*. (Németh considers the *-y* progressive to be derived from that in *-yor*, but Doerfer makes the point that it could be a preservation from Old Ottoman)
9. The fronting of /k/ and /g/ to palatal affricates or stops as a possible ninth feature: *iki gece* > *ik'i g'eg'e* (Macedonia) or *içi cece* (Kosova)
10. The loss of /h/, especially in initial position: *hoca* > *oca*, also *daha* > *daa*, *tahta* > *tāta*, *sabah* > *saba*

Subsequent modifications of Németh's classification were proposed by Hazai (1964), who identifies Goce Delçev (Nevrekob) as transitional between east and west, and Mollova (1970) traces the isogloss for preservation of intervocalic /g/ (*agaç* 'tree' versus *aaç, āç*) along a line from Dolni Cibařr on the Danube to Samokov, moving thence in a southwestern direction north of Blagoevgrad (Cuma-ı Bâlâ) and south of Kocani almost to Štip then curving southeastward to go south of Radoviš then running southwest again to Lake Prespa. When Hazai and Mollova were writing, however, works on other WRT dialects such as Jasar-Nasteva (1970), Katona (1969), Kakuk (1972), and Jusuf (1987) were not available. Jusuf (1987:14-16) distinguishes five Kosovan groups -- Prizren-Mamus, Prishtina-Janjevo, Mitrovica-Vucitrn, Pec, Gnjilane-Novobrd-Dobricane (see Hafiz 1985, Hasan 1987). Tryjarski (1976, 1990) notes the need for a revised picture of Balkan Turkish dialects, and raises the additional problem that different investigations were conducted at different times. Other studies are unpublished theses and dissertations at the University of Prishtina. The periodicals *Çevren* (Kosova), *Sesler*, and *Sevinç* (Macedonia) contain dialect materials and descriptions, and the Skopje newspaper *Birlik* occasionally publishes humor columns in Skopje, Gostivar or Prizren dialect.

There are almost no data on the Turkish dialects of Albania aside from Németh (1961) and a few works cited by him. In addition to the towns mentioned by Németh -- Tiranë, Krujë (Akçahisar), Korçë, Elbasan, Lesh, Pogradec (Istarova) and Shkodër -- Turks live in Durrës, Saranda, Fier, and Elbasan (pace Németh 1961:9), but these minorities have no official status and there are no dialect studies. Based on the phonology of Turkisms in Albanian (Boretzky 1975) and the modest data available, these dialects fall within the WRT group.

There are four phonological generalizations that can be made relating to possible contact phenomena: high vowel merger, front rounded vowel loss or merger, palatalization of velars, and loss of /h/.

In the case of Németh's first feature, the shift of all final high vowels to /i/ could be connected to the fact that in Macedonian /ü/ does not exist and both /u/ and schwa -- the closest equivalent of /i/ -- are excluded from nominative singular endings. While Albanian does have phonemic /ü/, it does not natively permit /ü/, /u/, or stressed schwa at the end of indefinite nouns except for a few Tosk monosyllables corresponding to Geg words in nasal vowels. A tendency like that attested in Northeast Anatolian could thus have been reinforced (see below).

A related phenomenon is the conditioned neutralization of the opposition i/ı (Németh's second feature). Kakuk (1972), Katona (1969), and Jaṣar-Nasteva (1969) make the point that Németh's description does not correspond exactly to the situation in Western Macedonia. Kakuk (1972) describes five possible realizations of the unrounded high vowel for both back and front roots: high back unrounded, mid-unrounded, front mid unrounded -- both closed and closed-short -- and high front unrounded, e.g. *gelir/çarır* ~ *gele\_r/çare\_r* ~ *gele`r/çare`r* ~ *gelër/çarër* ~ *gelir/çarır* 'comes/calls'. None of the Balkan contact languages has a high back unrounded vowel in their phonological inventories except southern Vlah, spoken in Epirus, Thessaly, and in eastern Macedonia. Albanian, northern Vlah, and most Macedonian and South Serbian dialects all have some sort of schwa, although its realization may vary. In Skopje both Macedonians and Turks have a vowel that is higher and further back than schwa and approaches [ɨ]. Stressed schwa in Korça Tosk Albanian has a low, front, and open realization approaching [ä]. Moreover, the west-central and peripheral southwestern Macedonian dialects as well as the Macedonian of the Debar region (but not Debar itself) lack schwa altogether (Friedman 1993b). According to Katona (1969) the high back unrounded vowel is completely absent in some WRT, but Kakuk (1972) has contradictory data. In any case, like /ö/, Turkish /ı/ is in a systematically vulnerable position vis-à-vis the other languages of the Balkans with which it is in contact. This is also the case in northeast Anatolian (see below).

The loss of /ö/ and sometimes of /ü/ could be connected to the fact that none of the Balkan languages possess /ö/ (except the northern Geg dialects of Albanian) and only Albanian and a few dialects of other languages influenced by it have /ü/. In the different Balkan dialects there is considerable variation regarding how these sounds are eliminated. Thus, for example *öyle, s, öyle* 'thus' > *ü`le, s, ü`le* in Skopje, *oyle, s, ule*, in Ohrid and Resen, *dört* 'four' > *dert* in Prizren, *dort* in Gostivar, Ohrid, Skopje (Ago 1987, Kakuk 1972, Hazai 1959/60, Katona 1969, Jaṣar-Nasteva 1970, Jusuf 1987). Jaṣar-Nasteva (1969) makes precisely this point concerning the restructuring of the Gostivar Turkish vocalic system. Ibrahim (1982) observes that Albanians speaking Turkish have /ü/ while Macedonian Muslims have only /u/.

The loss of /h/ is shared with local Slavic and Albanian dialects, especially initially and intervocally, e.g. WRT *hoca* 'teacher' > *oca*, cf. Macedonian *hodi* 'goes' > *odi*, Albanian *huti* 'owl' > *uti*; WRT *daha* 'more' > *daa* cf. Macedonian *snaha* 'daughter-in-law' > *snaa*; but unlike those languages, there are no WRT developments of /h/ into /f/ finally and before consonants, e.g. Macedonia *beh* 'I was' > *bef*, *tahta* 'board' > *tafta*, Albanian *shoh* 'I see' > *shof*, but WRT *sabah* 'morning' > *saba*, *tahta* > *ta`ta*. Németh (1956:21) points out that /h/-loss is an extremely complicated phenomenon manifested in various ways in much of the Turkish speech area, but it is particularly characteristic of WRT, especially in Macedonia and Kosova, where the contact languages also eliminate /h/ from their phonological systems (cf. Kowalski 1926, Boretzky 1975:153-4, 164-6, Zekeriya 1971:36, 56, Eren 1968).

The palatalization of /k/ and /g/ before front vowels, and especially the similarity of articulation in local WRT and Slavic and Albanian dialects, is probably influenced by contact. The greatest neutralization of the opposition between palatal and velar before front vowel occurs

precisely where the same neutralization occurs in Slavic and Albanian, e.g. Kosova and Prilep. Moreover, the quality of the palatals in the WRT dialects is the same as in the non-Turkish contact languages. The automatic palatalization of velars before front vowels is characteristic of Standard Turkish, but the change from palatalized velars to palato-velars (*k'*, *g'*), palatal affricates (*c'c'*, *dz'*, *dz'*) or palatal stops (*t'*, *d'*), while also a feature of northeast Anatolian Turkish, is characteristic of WRT on the Balkan Peninsula (Németh 1961), and Hafiz (1985), Ibrahim (1982), Jas'ar-Nasteva (1969), and Jusuf (1978) all identify this as particularly characteristic of WRT (cf. also Asim 1976, Kakuk 1972, Katona 1969, Zaja, czkowski 1968).

Elimination of front rounded vowels, neutralization of high vowels (especially the high back unrounded), and palatalization of velars before front vowels (as well as peculiarities in vowel harmony) all occur in Northeast Anatolia (Brendemoen 1984, 1989, 1992, 1996; Boeschoeten 1991; cf. also Johanson 1978/79, 1992:227). This raises the question of parallel development or convergence under respective contact situations versus a common heritage of innovation due to a northeast Anatolian origin for WRT. Németh (1961) suggests the possibility of a northeast Anatolian origin for the WRT dialects, but as Brendemoen has shown, these dialects themselves display contact features in which Greek may have played an conspicuous, perhaps even substratal, role. This combined with the Yuruk tradition that the WRT dialects are spoken by Islamicized autochthonous populations suggests that parallel development may be the explanation for the similarities.

An unquestionable contact phenomenon in WRT is phonemic /c/= [ts], which occurs in all the relevant contact languages and dialects and is found not only in loanwords but also in productive affixes: *lonats* 'cup', *tsapo* 'goat', *dayitsa* 'aunt' (< *dayı* 'uncle'), *okuydz'itsa* (= *okuyucu*) 'woman who invites one to a wedding' (Jas'ar-Nasteva 1970). Final devoicing of /g, v, z/, e.g. *yus* for *yüz* 'one hundred' (Jusuf 1987:73) occurs in both Macedonian and local Albanian (not in Serbian).

Ibrahim (1982) associates the velarization of clear /l/ after a front vowel if followed by pause or consonant, e.g. [bū-bū-] for *būlbūl* 'nightingale', with Macedonian Muslim Turkish, e.g. [bu-bu-] as opposed to Macedonian Turkish [bū-būl], Kosovan Turkish, [būlbūl]. Although both Macedonian and Albanian have a phonemic contrast between clear /l/ and velar /-l/, the contrast has an extremely low functional load in Macedonian, and for the most part the two sounds are in complementary distribution (only rarely does /l/ occur before a consonant, back vowel, or word finally). In Albanian, however, the two sounds are contrasted in all environments. In WRT in Macedonia, the tendency is to treat /l/ according to Macedonian rather than Turkish distributional rules, whereas in Kosova, where Albanian is the dominant contact language, such is not the case.

Other phenomena reported by Jas'ar-Nasteva (1969) and Jusuf (1988:67-68) as resulting from contact are loss of geminates (*elli* 'fifty' > *eli*) and toleration of initial clusters (*spanak* vs *ıspanak* 'spinach').

In morphophonology, lack of vowel harmony may be a contact induced phenomenon, but the evidence is ambiguous. While lack of vowel harmony in the contact languages could influence the generalization of a given affix or the confusion of front/back or labial/non-labial harmony, some of these features could be archaisms preserved owing to lack of contact with the innovating dialects. Again, the similarity to northeast Anatolian raises the question of parallel archaism, parallel development, or actual connection (Johanson 1978/79, 1992:223, Brendemoen 1992, Boeschoeten 1991).

For inflection, the vocative suffix *-o*, e.g. *babo* 'O father', *abo* 'O older brother', etc. (Bayram 1985), could be treated as a borrowed affix, but the examples are limited to individual lexical items and can be treated as borrowed expressions. The *-y* progressive is not a contact phenomenon, nor is it characteristic of all of WRT (Jas'ar-Nasteva 1970, Kakuk 1972, Mollova 1962).

Derivational morphology shows a number of borrowings, especially Slavic markers of feminine nouns (*-ka*, *-itsa*) and diminutives (*-çe*), e.g. *baldıska* 'wife's sister' (< *baldız*), *dayitsa* 'aunt' (< *dayı* 'uncle'), (Jas'ar-Nasteva 1970), diminutive *insançe* 'person' (Kakuk 1972), *Memetçe* 'Mehmet' (Mollova 1968:119). Albanian does not appear to have contributed to this morphology, perhaps because such markers are more subtle (feminine markers *-ë*, *-e*), phonologically alien (diminutive *-th*), or themselves borrowed from Slavic (diminutive *-kë/-ka*).

The three most productive Turkish suffixes in non-Turkish Balkan languages, *mutatis mutandis*, *-ci*, *-li*, and *-lik* (Friedman 1996) are also more productive in WRT than in Standard Turkish as a result of contact, e.g. *aks*, *amlık* in the meaning 'evening meal' < Serbian *aks'amluk* vs. Standard Turkish *aks*, *am yemeg'i*, *devletçi* 'statesman' vs *devlet adamı* (cf. Teodosijevic' 1985, 1987, 1988, also Mollova 1968:118).

The most striking WRT morphosyntactic nominal features of contact origin are dative/locative confusion, number agreement between demonstratives and nouns, and genitive-head reversal.

In Macedonian, and Albanian the meaning of 'motion toward' and 'location' are carried by the same prepositions, e.g. Macedonian *z'ivee/odi vo Skopje*, Albanian *banon/shkon në Shkup* 'He lives in Skopje'/'He goes to Skopje', and in Serbian the dative and locative cases have merged. Although Kakuk 1972 reports occasional dative for locative, it is usually the locative case which is generalized in WRT, as in example (1):

(1) Üsçüp'te cidam (=Üsküb'e gidelim) (Jusuf 1987:89) 'let's go to Skopje'

In the contact languages, the original meanings of the relevant prepositions were locative, and this combined with the fact that the Turkish locative case suffix has the same phonological CV structure as the corresponding prepositions may have contributed to the choice of case for generalization.

A phenomenon implicitly recognized as occurring in WRT in textbooks intended for Turkish schools in Macedonia and Kosova is the use of the plural suffix on modifiers of plural nouns, e.g. *bunlar çocuklar* instead of *bu çocuklar* (Yusuf 1971:47) 'these children' on the model of Macedonian *ovie deca*, Albanian *këta fëmijë*, etc. in which both the modifier and the noun carry morphological markers of plurality. The fact that Turkish children in Macedonia and Kosova are told that such agreement is 'wrong' indicates that they use it.

The reversal of genitive and head in possessive *izafet* constructions, e.g., *familiasi adamën* 'the family of the man' (Katona 1969:165), *babasi Alinin* 'the father of Ali' (Ibrahimi 1982) as opposed to Standard Turkish *adamın familiası*, *Ali'nin babası*, are patterned after the Indo-European contact languages, e.g. Albanian *familje i njeriut*, *babai i Aliut*, Macedonian *familijata na c'ovekot*, *tatko mu na Ali*. (Macedonian and Bulgarian also permit head-genitive word order, which is atypical for Slavic, e.g. *na Ali tatko mu*.)

Morphosyntactic contact phenomena in the verb-phrase reflect tendencies to eliminate non-finite forms and move in a direction from agglutination toward analyticity. Both tendencies are also characteristic of the Indo-European Balkan languages from which the WRT constructions are evidently calqued. These tendencies are realized by substituting the optative-subjunctive or

conditional for the infinitive, by substituting lexical items or phrases for affixes of interrogation and negativity, and by replacing participial constructions with connectors plus finite verb forms.

Matras (1990, 1996) analyzes the origin and significance of the replacement of infinitival clauses by subjunctive ones in Macedonian WRT, a phenomenon that is well attested in WRT in general (Mollova 1968, Jas'ar-Nasteva 1970, Eckmann 1962, Kakuk 1960, 1972, Németh 1965:97,109) as well as in East Rumelian Turkish and Gagauz (Mollova 1962, Guzev 1962, Mollov and Mollova 1966, Gajdarz'i 1973, Pokrovskaja 1964:210, 1979). The use of the optative-subjunctive or 3 sg imperative to express indirect imperatives and clauses of goal also occurs in other Turkic languages and dialects (Kakuk 1960, Mollov and Mollova 1966), but the far greater frequency and wider range of such uses in Balkan Turkish indicate the influence of non-Turkish Balkan languages. The expanded Turkish usage seems calqued from subordinate clauses in Macedonian and Albanian using the particles *da* and *të*, respectively, which can function in subjunctive, optative, and conditional contexts in their respective languages (see Friedman 1985). The following examples with expressions of necessity are typical of WRT usage and are given with their Macedonian and Albanian equivalents:

- (2) Lâzım gideyim (Zekeriya 1978:38) Treba da odam/Duhet të shkoj 'I have to go'  
 (3) O köylerde lâzım büyük agitatsiya yapılsın (Jas'ar-Nasteva 1957:149) vo tie sela treba da se napravi golema agitatsija/në këta fshatra duhet të bëhet agjitacion i madh 'in those villages some major consciousness raising needs to be done'

Examples (4)-(5) show the optative-subjunctive and (6) the conditional after various finite verbs that would take infinitival clauses in Standard Turkish but *da/të* clauses in Macedonian and Albanian:

- (4) Çocuk celdi ekmek alsın (Jusuf 1987:132) 'The child came to get bread'  
 (5) Bas,layacam çalıš,am (Zekeriya 1976:7) 'I'll begin to work'  
 (6) Bas,ladi yalan söylesa (Kakuk 1972:246) 'he began to tell lies'

Examples (7) and (8) represent calques on Slavic. In example (7) the Turkish interrogative-possibilitive is replaced by the dialectal equivalent of Standard Turkish *olur mu* modeled on Slavic *moz'e li* 'is it possible?', while in (8) the Macedonian negative future, which is formed by a negative existential plus a *da*-clause (subjunctive) has been calqued by an equivalent construction in WRT:

- (7) Olor mi sizde celam (Yusuf 1977:67)=Size gelebilir miyiz/Moz'e li kaj vas da dojdeme 'Can we come to your place'  
 (8) Yoktur bizimle gelesin (Zekeriya 1976:10)=Bizimle gelmiyeceksin/Nema so nas da odis' 'You won't come [with us]

The calquing and borrowing of various conjunctions in WRT results in the reduction or elimination of participial constructions. Syntactic calquing of relativizing and coordinating conjunctions is also discussed in Matras (1996; see also Johanson 1975). Of particular interest is the use of *ne* 'what' as a relativizer modeled on Macedonian *s'to* as illustrated in examples (9)-(10):

- (9) çocuklar yemis,lar pogaçay em oumay **ne** cetırdım. (Jusuf 1987:108). 'The children have eaten the round loaf and apple that I brought.'  
 (10) Cetir o çitabi **ne** verdim sana (Sana verdig'im kitabı getir) (Yusuf 1977:65) 'Bring that book which I gave you

The use of *ne zaman* 'when?' as a calque on Macedonian *koga* Albanian *kur* 'when' as a relativizer as well as an interrogative also serves to eliminate participial constructions (Kakuk 1972, Németh 1965:110, Mollov and Mollova 1966),

- (11) **Ne zaman** gittik sinemaya. . . (Zekeriya 1976:10-2) 'When(ever) we went to the movies. . .'

Particularly Balkan is the use of *niçin* 'why' to mean 'because' as well, this being a calque on colloquial usages of Macedonian *zos ʔo/zas ʔo*, Albanian *pse*, etc. as in the following example:

- (12) Sıkılmış, **niçin** padis, adan bir ay mektup yogimıs, (Kakuk 1972:261) 'she was worried because she hadn't had a letter from the padishah for a month'

In addition to calques, borrowed conjunctions such as Albanian *se* 'that, for' and Slavic *a* 'and/but' are used as in the following examples (cf. Matras 1996):

- (13) Bu cece celemem **se** çok var ısım (Yusuf 1977:67) 'I can't come this evening because I have a lot of work'

- (14) Bu adamın karısı ülmıs, **a** çocukı ufak kalmıs, 'This man's wife died, and left the little child'

Johanson (1975) and Matras (1996) raise the question of whether or not the calqued constructions represent genuine hypotaxis and the discourse motivations for using borrowed conjunctions. These examples nonetheless represent simplifications in the WRT inflectional system which, by eliminating participial forms in favor of constructions with finite verbs bring it closer to the Balkan languages with which it is in contact.

WRT word order is also influenced by contact. While colloquial Standard Turkish permits considerably more variation in word order than formal written style, WRT has unmarked word orders that would be marked in standard Turkish, and this is under the influence of the Indo-European contact languages (which also have considerable freedom for marked word orders). Thus, for example, from the point of view of Standard Turkish there is nothing grammatically wrong with the sentence *Erol'dur iyi öğrenci* (Zekeriya 1976:7). The dialectal feature is the fact that it is the unmarked WRT equivalent of the English 'Erol is a good student' (Macedonian *Erol e dobar uc ʔenik*), whereas in standard Turkish it would have a meaning more like 'It is Erol who is the good student'. Thus, the verb in WRT occurs at the beginning of the sentence or in some other nonfinal position far more than in Standard Turkish (Jusuf 1988:132, Jas ʔar-Nasteva 1970, Katona 1969, also Mollov and Mollova 1966 for East Rumelian Turkish and Doerfer 1959, Pokrovskaja 1979 for Gagauz). The following examples are typical of WRT dialectal word order under Slavic or Albanian influence (See Teodosijevic 1985 for other examples):

- (15) Babası Alinin her gün **gider** pazara alsın alma. (Ibrahimi 1982:53) 'Ali's father goes to the market every day to buy apples'

- (16) Açan **idin** Ohri'de (Zekeriya and Bugariç 1976:14) 'When were you in Ohrid?'

- (17) **Oynadılar** çocuklar bütün cün sokakta 'The children played all day in the street' (Jusuf 1987:132)

The lexicon of WRT is heavily influenced by contact languages (Jas ʔar-Nasteva 1957, 1970), which is expected, given its current sociolinguistic situation. In Bulgaria, the government went so far as to campaign to increase the number of Bulgarian words in local Turkish dialects by publishing lists of "forbidden" Turkish words and their "correct" Bulgarian replacements (see Rudin & Eminov 1993). During the 1980's, Macedonia, whose language policies with regard to minorities are in general considerably better than those of its neighbors, interfered in print media regarding the use of Turkish (and Albanian) toponyms of places located in Macedonia, e.g. insisting on Macedonian *Bitola* versus Turkish and Albanian *Manastir* (Friedman 1993a). For the WRT dialects of Macedonia, there are lexical phenomena that are more specific to their environment and not common to every contact situation. For neologisms, WRT print media are sometimes "more Catholic than the Pope." A neologistic word may fail to gain currency in

Turkey but be maintained in WRT print media, e.g. *nen* 'thing' versus the Standard Turkish Arabism *s,ey* (Teodosijevic' 1987:187). A lexical feature of colloquial WRT that is specific to its context is the reborrowing of words that the contact languages originally borrowed and subsequently altered. Thus the "Turkisms" of Macedonian and Albanian become "contact" elements in WRT when it reborrows them, as shown in the following examples:

(18) piper = biber (Zekerija 1976:17, cf. Caferoglu 1959:250)

(19) demirliya = demirli 'iron' (Bayram 1985)

The facts of WRT raise a number of interesting questions concerning mechanisms, effects, and ideology in language contact. On the phonological level the most noteworthy phenomena are the elimination of consonant and vowel phonemes not represented in the contact languages, e.g. /ö/ and /h/, the migration of high back unrounded /i / to a more central or otherwise altered position, and the introduction of a dental affricate /c/. The palatalization of velars before front vowels and merger with palatal affricates also parallels processes in the contact dialects, as do phonotactic processes such as the elimination of geminates and the treatment of /l/. The resulting phonological inventories of WRT dialects look very much like those of the non-Turkish dialects with which they are in contact.

On the morphophonemic level, confusion in the system of vowel harmony, while possibly an archaism, also reflects the lack of vowel harmony in the contact languages, WRT inflection has remained otherwise unaffected, although the dative-locative confusion (generally in favor of the locative) is an interesting counterexample to the claim that the transparency of Turkish inflection makes it resistant to contact (cf. Johanson 1992:231). However, this and the borrowing of the vocative affix -- which can be treated as lexical or derivational -- demonstrate that on the whole the WRT inflectional system is remarkably resistant. (The replacement of nonfinite with finite clauses also affects inflection, but only insofar as there is a shift from inflection to syntax to convey some types of information.) The derivational system has been influenced precisely in those areas where the contact languages differ, e.g. the borrowing of feminine gender markers for animate beings, or where they are particularly salient, e.g. in diminutive markers. Also of significance may be the exaggerated productivity of native affixes that are borrowed and productive in the contact languages.

The realm of syntax, which is where Standard Turkish and the Balkan languages display their most salient differences, shows an especially strong tendency in WRT toward accommodation. In the noun phrase, there is the tendency to confuse dative and locative case functions, to copy patterns of modifier agreement and to use head-genitive word order. In the verb phrase, the tendency is to eliminate nonfinite forms by substituting inflected (optative/subjunctive or conditional) forms for infinitives and analytic connectives for participles. Even the inflection for interrogation and negativity is sometimes replaced by a lexical items based on Slavic models. In sentential word order WRT arguably displays strong contact induced influence.

In the lexicon, aside from calques and loanwords, some of which have affected the phonological system, there are phenomena specific to the situation of WRT as a formerly dominant language now both subordinate and beyond the borders of the centers of standardization. The phenomenon of reborrowing loanwords in the shape they acquired in the languages that originally borrowed them reflects a change in dominance relations. Similarly, whereas Turkish was the source for all sorts of expressions in Slavic relating to everything from everyday life to state administration, the opposite is now the case, with Slavic (and, where it is numerically dominant, also Albanian) serving as the source for numerous borrowings into WRT.



This brings us to the question of Slavic versus Albanian influence and the sociolinguistic position of WRT. Particularly in Western Macedonia there is a strong competition between Albanian and Macedonian, one which is already attested at the beginning of this century (Selisćev 1931:11-12). In many cases, either language could have been the source of a contact phenomenon, and insisting on assigning the origin to one or the other language can have ideological overtones (cf. Ibrahim 1982). Moreover, the fact that Turkish was often adopted by speakers of other languages raises the question of the extent to which WRT can be considered a "relexified" Balkan language.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ago, A. 1987. 1.sveće çalışmakta olan Makedonya'nın Resne bölgesinden Türk işçi ailelerinin konuşma dilindeki değişimler. *Besinci milletler arası türkoloji kongresi: Tebliğler 1. Türk dili, cilt 2*. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi. 7-15.
- Akan Ellis, B. 2000. "Shadow Genealogies: Memory and Identity among Urban Muslims in Macedonia." Ph.D. dissertation. The American University.
- Asım, M. 1976 "Prizren civarında Mamusa Köyünde dünün türkülerine, I. *Uluslararası türk folklor kongresi bildirileri*, vol.I.1-7. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi.
- Bayram, I. 1985. Sırp-Hırvat ve Arnavut dillerinin Kosova Türk Ağızlarına etkisi. (Interview with Prof. Dr. Nimetullah Hafız). *Birlik* II/5.15.
- Bernstejn, S.B. 1968 "Les langues turques de la Péninsule des Balkans et l'union des langues balkaniques", *Actes du Premier congrès international des études balkaniques et sud-est européennes*, vol.VI.73-79. Sofia: BAN.
- Birlik*. Tri-weekly Turkish-language newspaper published in Skopje. References have the following format: date.month.year:page.
- Boeschoten, H. 1991. Aspects of Language Variation. in: *Turkish Linguistics Today*, ed. by Hendrik Boeschoten and Ludo Verhoeven. Leiden: Brill. 150-76.
- Boretzky, N. 1975, 1976. *Der türkische Einfluss auf das Albanische*. I-II. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Brendemoen, B. 1984. A note on the retraction of labial front vowels in the Turkish dialect of Trabzon. *Riepmoc'ala: Essays in honor of Knut Bergsland*. Oslo: Novus Forlag. 13-24.
- . 1989. Trabzon Çepni ağızları ve Tepegöz hikâyesinin bir Çepni varyantı. *Trabzon Kültür-Sanat Yıllığı* 1988-89.13-22.
- . 1996. Phonological Aspects of Greek-Turkish Language Contact in Trabzon. Conference on Turkish in Contact, Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study (NIAS), Wassenaar, 5-6 February, 1996.
- . 1992. Some Remarks on the Vowel Harmony in a Religious dialect Text from Trabzon. In: *Altaic Religious Beliefs and Practices*, ed. by G. Bethlenfalvy. Budapest: Hungarian Academy of Sciences. 41-57.
- Burgariç, Recep. 1976. *Dilimizi öğrenelim: Sınıf IV*. Skopje: Prosvetno Delo.
- . 1978. *Dilbilgisi: Sınıf VII*. Skopje: Prosvetno Delo.
- Caferoglu, A. 1959 "Die anatolische und rumelische Dialekte", *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta*, I.239-260. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- . 1964 "Anadolu ve Rumeli ağızları ünlü değişimleri", *Türk dili araştırmaları yıllık belleten*, 1-33.

- Doerfer, G. 1959 "Das Gagusische", *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta*, I.260-71. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Eckmann, J. 1962 "Kumanova (Makedonya) türk ağzı", *Németh armagani*, 111-144. Ankara.
- Eren, ı. 1968. "Manastir Türklerinin bazı Hıdırelez âdetleri", *Türk kültürü*, 6.557-559.
- Erimer, K. 1970 "Anadolu ve Rumeli ağzları üzerinde bir bibliografya denemesi", *Türk dili aras, tırmaları yıllığı belleten*, 211-236.
- Friedman, V. A. 1982. Balkanology and Turcology: West Rumelian Turkish in Yugoslavia as Reflected in Prescriptive Grammar. *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics*, Vol. 2, Amsterdam: Rodopi. 1-77.
- . 1985. Balkan Romani Modality and Other Balkan Languages. *Folia Slavica*, 7,3.381-389.
- . 1986. Turkish Influence in Modern Macedonian: The Current Situation and Its General Background. *Festschrift für Wolfgang Gesemann, Band 3, Beiträge zur slawischen Sprachwissenschaft und Kulturgeschichte*. (Slavische Sprachen und Literaturen Band 8), ed. by Helmut Schaller. München: Hieronymus. 85-108.
- . 1993a. Language Policy and Language Behavior in Macedonia: Background and Current Events. in: *Language Contact, Language Conflict*, ed. by Eran Fraenkel and Christina Kramer. Peter Lang: New York. 73-99.
- . 1993b. Macedonian. *The Slavonic Languages*. ed. by B. Comrie and G. Corbett. London: Routledge. 249-305.
- . 1996. The Turkish Lexical Element in the Languages of the Republic of Macedonia from the Ottoman Period to Independence. *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie*. Vol. 32.
- Gadžieva, N. Z. 1973. *Osnovny puti razvitija sintaksic'eskij struktury tjurkskix jazykov*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Gajdarz'i, G.A. 1973 *Gaguzskij sintaksis*. Kıs,inaıu: S,tiint,a.
- Gülensoy, T. 1981 *Anadolu ve Rumeli ağzları bibliografyası*. (Millî folklor aras, tırma dairesi yayınları, No.33). Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı.
- . 1993. *Rumeli Ağzlarının ses bilgisi üzerine bir deneme*. Kayseri: Erciyes Üniversitesi.
- Guzev, V.G. 1962 "Opisanie tureckogo govora sela Krepc'a tyrgovis'tenskogo okruga v Bolgarii", *Balkansko ezikoznanie* 5,2.57-85.
- Hafız, N. 1985. Kosova türk ağzlarında "k > ç" ve "g > c" ünsüz deg'is,meleri. *Bes,inci milletler arası türkoloji kongresi: Teblig'ler 1. Türk dili, cilt 1. Istanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi*. 127-29.
- Hafız, T. 1976 "Prizren'de türk halk türküleri ve kaynakları", *Türk folkloru aras, tırmaları yıllığı*, 116-140.
- Hasan, H. 1987. Yugoslavya'de Türk halk edebiyatı üzerinde yapılan derleme çeviri ve aras, tırmalar üzerinde bir bibliografya. *Türk dili aras, tırmaları yıllığı Belleten*. (1984). 315-38
- Hazai, G. 1959/60 "Beiträge zur Kenntnis der türkischen Mundarten Mazedoniens", *Rocznik orientalistyczny*, 23,2.83-100.
- . 1961 "Contributions à l'histoire d'une limite dialectale dans les Balkans", *Orbis*, 10.15-19.
- . 1963. Rumeli ağzları tarihinin iki kaynağı üzerine. *Türk Dili Aras, tırmaları Yılığ'ı Belleten* (Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları 234). 117--120.
- . 1964. "Mes enquêtes sur les parlers turcs des Balkans", *Communications et rapports du Premier congrès international de dialectologie générale*, vol.II.85-90. Louvain: Centre international de Dialectologie générale de l'Université catholique de Louvain.
- . 1978 *Kurze Einführung in das Studium der türkischen Sprache*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

- Hazai, G. and M. Kappler. 1999. Der Einfluss des Türkischen in Südosteuropa., *Handbuch der Südosteuropa-Linguistik*, ed. by Uwe Hinrichs. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 649-75.
- Ibrahimi, S. 1982. Ndikimi i gjuhës shqipe në rrafshin fonologjik të turqishtes së folur në Maqedoni dhe Kosovë. *Studime fililogjike* 36(19),2.51-61.
- Jas'ar-Nasteva, O. 1957 "Vlijanieto na makedonskiot jazik vrz albanskite i turskite govori vo Makedonija", *Makedonski jazik*, 7,2.147-64.
- . 1969 "Za neкои fonolos'ki izmeni vo govorot na turskoto naselenie vo Gostivarsko", *Godis'en zbornik na Filozofskiот fakultet na Univerzitetot vo Skopje*, 21.339-44.
- . 1970 "Turskiот govor vo gostivarskiот kraj", *Zbornik za Gostivar*, 269- 306. Gostivar: Sобрание na Ops'tinata Gostivar.
- . 1971/2 "Bilinguität bei der türkischen Bevölkerung in der Gegend von Gostivar und dadurch bedingte phonologische Veränderungen in ihrem Dialekt", *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie*, 8.54-83.
- . 1986. "Prilog kon prouc'uvanjetu na Jurucite od Radovis'ko", in: *Etnogenezata na Jurucite i nivnoto naseluvanje na Balkanot*, ed. by Krum Tomovski et al. Skopje: MANU. 125-146.
- . 1992. Soziolinguistische aspekte des makedonischen und der anderen sprachen in der Republik Makedonien. *Welt der Slaven* 37 (NS 16) 1/2.188-210.
- . 2001. *Turskite leksic'ki elementi vo makedonskiот jazik*. Skopje: Institut za makedonski jazik.
- Johanson, L. 1978/79 (=1981). The indifference stage of Turkish suffix vocalism. *Türk dili aras,tprmaları yillig'i. Belleten*. 151-56. (rep. 1991. *Linguistische beiträge zur Gesamtturkologie*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. 71-76).
- . 1975. Some remarks on Turkish "hypotaxis". *Ural-Altäische Jahrbücher* 47.104-18. (rep. 1991. *Linguistische beiträge zur Gesamtturkologie*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. 210-24)
- . 1992. *Strukturelle Faktoren in türkischen Sprachkontakten*. (Sitzungsberichte der wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft an der Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main Band XXIX, Nr. 5). 163-299. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Jusuf, S. 1987. *Prizrenski turski govor*. Prishtina: Jedinstvo.
- Kakuk, S. 1960 "Constructions hypotactiques dans le dialecte turc de la Bulgarie occidentale", *Acta Orientalia Hungarica*, 11.249-57.
- . 1972 "Le dialecte turc d'Ohrid en Macédoine", *Acta Orientalia Hungarica*, 26.227-282.
- Katona, L. 1969 "Le dialecte turc de la Macédoine de l'Ouest", *Türk dili aras,tprmaları yillig'i belleten*, 57-194.
- Kowalski, T. 1926 "Osmanische-türkische Volkslieder aus Mazedonien", *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, 33.166-231.
- Manevic', T 1953/4 "Prilog prouc'avanju govora Juruka u Makedoniji", *Juz'noslovenski filolog*, 20.333-41.
- Matras, Y. 1990. On the Emergence of Finite Subordination in Balkan Turkish. Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, SOAS, 17-19 August, 1990.
- . 1996. Layers of Convergent Syntax in Macedonian Turkish. Conference on Turkish in Contact, Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study (NIAS), Wassenaar, 5-6 February, 1996.
- Miklosich, F. 1884. Die tu'rkischen Elemente in den su'dost- und osteuropa'ischen Sprachen, in: *Denkschriften der K-Ak.d.Wiss. in Wien, Phil.-Hist.Kl.* 34,35,38
- Mollov, R. and M. Mollova 1966 "Parlers turcs des Rhodopes de l'Ouest au point de vue slavistique", *Balkansko ezikoznanie*, 11,1.121-36.
- Mollova, M. 1962. "Le futur dans un parler turc de Bulgarie", *Balkansko ezikoznanie*, 5,2.87-97.
- . 1968 "Parler turc de Florina", *Balkansko ezikoznanie*, 13,1.95-127.

- . 1970 "Coïncidences des zones linguistiques bulgares et turques dans les Balkans", *Actes du 10<sup>e</sup> congrès international des linguistes* (28 août - 2 septembre, 1967), 217-221. Bucharest: Romanian Academy of Sciences.
- Nedkov, V. 1986. Juručkite naselbi i naselenie vo istocna Makedonija. in: *Etnogenezata na Jurucite i nivnoto naseluvanje na Balkanot*, ed. by Krum Tomovski et al. Skopje: MANU. 75-88.
- Németh, J. 1956 *Zur Einteilung der türkischen Mundarten Bulgariens*. Sofia: BAN.
- . 1961 "Traces of the Turkish Language in Albania", *Acta Orientalia Hungarica*, 13.9-29.
- . 1965 *Die Türken von Vidin*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Nova Makedonija*. Daily Macedonian-language newspaper published in Skopje. References have the following format: date.month.year:page.
- Palikrusheva, G. 1986. 'Etnografskite osobnosti na makedonskite Juruci. in: *Etnogenezata na Jurucite i nivnoto naseluvanje na Balkanot*, ed. by Krum Tomovski et al. Skopje: MANU. 69-74.
- Pokrovskaja, L.A. 1964 *Grammatika gagauzskogo jazyka*. Moscow: Nauka.
- . 1974. Otrazhenie foneticheskix i grammaticheskix slozhenij balkanskix jazykov v tureckix i gagauzskix dialektax. *Doklady i soobshchenija sovetskix delegatov III Mezhdunarodnyj s'ezd po izuceniju stran Jugo-Vostocnoj Evropy*. Moscow: Nauka.
- . 1979 "Nekotorye osobennosti sintaksisa gagauzskogo jazyka i balkansko-tureckix govorov", *Problemy sintaksisa jazykov balkanskogo areala*, 199-225. Leningrad: Nauka.
- Rudin, C. and A. Eminov. 1993. "Bulgarian Nationalism and Turkish Language in Bulgaria." in *Language Contact -- Language Conflict*, ed. by Eran Fraenkel and Christina Kramer. New York: Peter Lang. 43-71.
- Schaller, H. 1975 *Die Balkansprachen*. Heidelberg: Harrassowitz.
- Schmaus, A. 1968 "Türkische k' ~ g', ç ~ c in den Balkansprachen", *Slavistische Studien zum VI internationalen Slavistenkongress in Prag*, 170-82. Munich: Trofenik.
- Selishev, A. M. 1931. Slavjanskoe naselenie v Albanii. Sofia: Makedonski nauchn institut.
- Teodosijevic', M. 1985. Yugoslavya'da konusulan türkçenin sadeles, tirilmesi ve es, anlamlı kelimelerin yanlıs, kullanılması. *Bes, inci milletler arası türkoloji kongresi: Teblig'ler 1. Türk dili, cilt 1*. Istanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi. 261-65.
- . 1987. Yugoslavya Türkleri'nin basın dili üzerine lengüistik bir arastırma. *Türk dili arastırmaları yillig'i. Belleten*. (1984). 167-213.
- . 1988. Jezik shtampe turske narodnosti u Jugoslavii (List "Tan"). *Prilozi za orientalnu filologiju* 37 (1987).91-118.
- Tietze, Andreas 1957 "Slavische Lehnwörter in der türkischen Volkssprache", *Oriens* 10.1-47.
- Tryjarski, Edward. 1976. Some Problems of Research on the Rumelian dialects. *Studi preottomani e ottomani*. Naples: Instituto Universitario Orientale. 219-24.
- Tryjarski, Edward. 1990. Balkan dialects. *Handbuch der türkischen sprachwissenschaft*, ed. by Gy. Hazai. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 414-453.
- Yusuf, Süreyya. 1971. *Dilimiz: Sınıf V* Skopje: Prosvetno Delo.
- . 1977. Prizren türkçesinin tümce yapısı. *Çevren* 5,13/61-68.
- Zaja, czkowski, W. 1968 "Türkische Sprachproben aus Mazedonien", *Folia orientalia*, 9.19-51.
- Zekeriya, Necati. 1971. *Yaprak: Sınıf II* Skopje: Prosvetno Delo.
- . 1976. *Dilimizi sevelim: Sınıf III* Skopje: Prosvetno Delo.
- . 1978. *Dilbilgisi: Sınıf VI* Skopje: Prosvetno Delo.
- Zekeriya, Necati and Recep Bugariç. 1976. *Dilbilgisi: Sınıf VIII* Skopje: Prosvetno Delo.