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TURKISMS IN A COMPARATIVE BALKAN CONTEXT

For more than half a millennium, Turkish was the official language in much of the Balkan peninsula. It was the language of administration and of the market place; it was spoken in villages as well as in towns; and, among populations that converted to Islam while retaining their native languages, Turkish had a sociocultural prestige added to the legal and practical importance it possessed for all of Turkey in Europe. It can be even be argued that it was the Turkish conquest which created the Balkans insofar as it still exists as a geopolitical and sociocultural entity of today. Under these circumstances, it is not surprising that the influence of Turkish on the Balkan lexicon in terms of derivational morphology, lexical items, and semantics has been significant and has lasted into the modern period.

From a lexical point of view, the influence of Turkish is one of the most salient characteristics of the languages of the Balkan linguistic league. In fact, Miklosich’s (1884) study of the influence of Turkish on the languages of Southeastern and Eastern Europe is one of the earliest works in the field Balkan linguistics. Even those dialects of languages spoken on Balkan territory but not traditionally treated as members of the Balkan Sprachbund, e.g. Romani and Judezmo, share a significant Turkish lexical component with the Balkan languages proper (Friedman 1989a, 1989b; Stankiewicz 1964). The Turkish lexicon in the various Balkan languages has undergone a variety of vicissitudes in terms of numbers, meanings, and stylistic values. Not only have there been shifts in all of these areas, but in the current climate of social and political change, Turkisms are assuming new symbolic or potential roles that indicate not only their great vitality almost a century after the First and Second Balkan Wars, but also their continuing ability to assume different functions in different contexts, thereby enriching the languages into which they have been borrowed. In this paper, I shall examine the evolution of the place and role of the Turkish lexicon in Modern Literary Macedonian in the comparative Balkan context of Albanian, Romani, Arumanian, and even Turkish itself, with particular attention to recent developments and their relevance for an atlas of Balkan Turkisms.

Modern Literary Macedonian, which will celebrate half a century of official recognition in August 1994, has been the subject of

For our purposes, all those words that entered Macedonian via Turkish are Turkisms. Thus, for example, although Turkish efendi 'sir' (archaic) is itself from Greek αὑτὸς την, its presence in Macedonian is counted as a Turkism and not as a Hellenism, since Turkish was clearly the immediate source. The same can be said of Arab and Persian words which entered via Turkish, e.g. džiger 'liver', which is ultimately from Persian. There are also ambiguous cases where it is difficult to determine whether or not a word entered Macedonian via a Turkish intermediary, e.g. if Turkish has borrowed from Greek or Romance but the phonology of the item is such that source of the word in other Balkan languages may be uncertain (cf. Boretzky 1975:135-69). Thus, for example, Ancient Greek mándalos 'bolt' is the ultimate source of Modern Greek mandali, Turkish mandal Albanian mandal, mandall, Serbo-Croatian mandaš, etc. The precise route by which this word entered the various modern Balkan languages, however, is moot. As we shall see, this problem of ultimate source and route of entry also contains additional complexities for Romani. In general, however, such lexical items are popularly felt to be Turkisms or at least words associated with the Ottoman period, and this is how they function for purposes of this discussion. 4

The lexicon of Turkish in Macedonian can be divided into loan suffixes, calques, and loanwords. To begin with the most obvious phenomena in suffixation, there are four suffixes which were unquestionably borrowed from Turkish and remain productive: 1) -džija (Tk -çi, etc.) used to denote types of people, 2) -lja (Tk -li, etc.) used to form adjectives and descriptive nouns, 3) -lak (Tk -lik, etc.) used primarily for abstract nouns, and 4) -ana (Tk -hauq) used for buildings. The functioning of these suffixes can be seen in their use in three types of words: 1) Turkish, e.g. jabančija 'foreigner' (Tk yabanci), kasmetlija 'lucky' (Tk kismetli), javaslička 'slowness' (Tk yavaşlık), meana 'tavern' (Tk meyhane); 2) native, e.g. lovdžija 'hunter', vošlja 'lousy', strojniklak 'matchmaking', pilana 'sawmill'; 3) recent loans, e.g. fuabaldžija 'inept soccer player', pubertetlija 'teenager' (ironic), asistentlak 'assistantship' (ironic), energana 'heating plant' (colloquial but neutral). As can be seen from the glosses, the semantics of the first three suffixes has shifted downward, a phenomenon which will be discussed in the section on semantics (cf. Kazazis 1972).

Most other Turkish suffixes, e.g. -džik, -sič, etc., as in kapidžik 'back-gate' (Tk kapi/kapica 'door', little door'), arszax 'crook', teklifisiz 'unceremoniously' ugursuz 'nogoodnik' (Tk hirsiz, teflisiz, uğursuz), occur only with words of Turkish origin and thus should be treated as part of the lexical borrowings with which they occur rather than as borrowed suffixes (pace Markov 1977:17).

The suffix -man, however, while not exactly productive (or even a suffix in Turkish, for that matter) is worthy of mention here since it functions as a suffix combining with native roots in Macedonian. Although only one of the words in -man cited by Markov (1977:17) is not a complete borrowing from Turkish, i.e. utman 'dullard', which is formed on the basis of (dialectal) Albanian ut (literary hu) 'Lowl, 2.dullard', but which may have been borrowed as a whole from dialectal Albanian, there is another use of -man not cited by Markov, viz. with names of nationalities, e.g. grkoman 'Hellenizer', bugroman 'Bulgarianizer', srboman 'Serbianizer', probably on the model of Turkisms such as duşman 'enemy', dragoman 'interpreter'. Given that these words are ending-stressed, one might propose the Greek suffix -mán 'maniac' as in kleptomán 'kleptomaniac', megalomán 'megalomaniac' as the source, but I would argue that aside from the fact that these later words are learned whereas the former are colloquial, we have Turkisms such as Musliman 'Muslim' as well as tamán 'exactly' with final stress no doubt influenced by the long /a/ in Turkish. There is also lašoman 'liar', with native stress. If not entirely Turkish in origin, these native roots with -man must at least be influenced by Turkish.
There are other morphosyntactic processes which can be said to affect derivation, but with the exception of the use of reduplicative m- (e.g. kal-mal 'mud or whatever') they all lend themselves equally well to explanations based on parallel development, reinforcement of pre-existing tendencies, or are not so much morphological borrowings as lexical items (cf. Jašar-Nasteva 1978b:45-46; Koneski 1965:107; Markov 1977:6-7, 19; Grannes 1987; Seliszhev 1925:53-54; Friedman 1986).

The area of semantic calques -- both single words and phraseological constructions -- presents more problems for identification than do overt lexical borrowings. On the one hand, numerous partial calques, e.g. those involving Turkish or Macedonian substantives, are clear examples. For example, the use of jadē 'eat' to mean 'be subjected to' as in jadē kötek 'get a beating' (literally 'eat a blow') is obviously based on Turkish kötek yemek 'be fed', and so jadē đodë 'get soaked' ('eat rain', Tk yağmur yemek) or jadē gomno 'say something stupid/embarrassing' ('eat excrement', Tk bok yemek, cf. English to put one's foot in it) can likewise be identified as calques. There are many such cases, but on the other hand there are instances where a parallelism of idiomatic expression may be just that, i.e., a result of parallel development and not of calquing. Jašar-Nasteva (1962/63) in her excellent work on Turkish calques in Macedonian gives 350 examples, but a number of these are also identical with English usage, e.g. the use of 'fall' to mean 'come/occur' as in Bajram se paša v nedela = Bayram pazarada đüzer = 'Bayram falls on a Sunday' (p.130), svekrvin jazik = kajnana dili = 'mother-in-law's tongue (a type of plant with long spiny leaves') (p.122). Given that the English is not likely to be a Balkan calque, the Macedonian expressions cannot be definitely attributed to Turkish without some sort of documentary evidence.

The large number of Turkish lexical borrowings belong to all levels of vocabulary and almost all parts of speech, e.g. đëšeb 'n.pocket' (ceb), bendisa 'v.please' (begen)-, taze 'adj.fresh' (taze), badijala 'adv. for nothing' (badihava), ana 'conj. but' (amma), karši 'prep. opposite', (karši), ie 'pron.nothing' (hiš), sikter 'excl./interj. scram' (sikir), keški 'part. if only' (keške). The only Macedonian traditional part of speech lacking Turkske is the numeral, although there are Turkisms in numerical expressions, e.g. đerek 'quarter', and Turkish numerals in other parts of speech, e.g. bešili '5 grosch'. Numerous studies have discussed the classification and types of Turkish loanwords in Macedonian or have studied specific areas of lexical influence (e.g. general: Jašar-Nasteva 1963, 1974, 1981/82; Kazazis 1972; Kramer 1979; toponyms: Jašar-Nasteva 1978a; religion: Jašar-Nasteva 1970; color: Jašar-Nasteva 1981; law: Jašar-Nasteva 1982). These works demonstrate how Turkish vocabulary has penetrated every facet of Macedonian life: urban and rural, e.g. dušan 'shop' (duškán), sokak 'street, alley' (sokak), ambar 'barn' (hambar), endek 'ditch, furrow' (hendek); man-made and natural, e.g. tavăn 'ceiling' (tavan), şise 'bottle' (šiše), zumbul 'hyacinth' (ìumbul), taťtabita 'bedbug' (taťtabita); intimate and abstract, e.g. đile 'liver, lungs' (cišer), badžanak 'brother-in-law (wife's sister's husband)' (bacanak), rezil 'disgrace' (rezil), muhabbet 'conversation' (muhabbet).

The degree of the penetration of Turkisms into Macedonian reached its height during the nineteenth century. According to Koneski (1965:188-89), this was due to the migration of Macedonians to the cities, where Turkish was the language of the marketplace. It is noteworthy that Turkish even penetrated the realm of Christian religious terminology, which, given the identification of Turkish with Islam, should have been the most impervious to such influence. Thus we find in nineteenth century texts kurban 'Eucharist' (Tk kurban 'sacrifice'), kurtuljia 'the Savior' (Tk kurtul- 'save'), sažbiha 'the Lord' (Tk sažbih 'master', cf. Gološ 1960, Jašar-Nasteva 1970, Miovski 1980). It was also during the nineteenth century, however, that intellectuals made the first efforts to halt the influx of Turkisms by reviving and introducing Slavic words in their colloquial-based writings, i.e. in the works whose language represents the precursor of Modern Literary Macedonian. This was especially true with abstract nouns, e.g. Krovovski felt the need to gloss gordoš 'pride' with the Turkish fodulluk. Even narod in the meaning of 'nation' (for which the internationalism nacija can now also be used) was glossed with the Turkish millet.

In this context we can also mention the semantic adjustment of Turkisms. Mollova (1967:116) cited in Grannes (1987:248) makes a point for Bulgarian that is also valid for Macedonian, namely that the
The majority of Turkisms are borrowed without any significant semantic shift. In the cases of religious terminology just described, e.g. kurban ‘sacrifice’ for ‘Eucharist’, the adaptation is essentially a cultural one, given the role of kurban in Islam. In some cases, a secondary meaning in Turkish will become the primary meaning in the Balkans, e.g. Turkish muhabbet 'love, affection, friendship, friendly chat' is taken into Macedonian and Albanian as mu[h]abbet but with only the last meaning. Similarly, Turkish bahis/bahas 'topic, subject, investigation, debate, wager' has only the last meaning in Macedonian as bas. Although in general Turkisms are associated with stylistic lowering in the twentieth century (see below) in at least some cases a negative expression was made somewhat less so when borrowed. Thus, for example, the exceedingly vulgar Turkish siktir roughly 'fuck off' in Macedonian as sikter is closer to the milder (albeit still rude) 'scram' and can even be used humorously in the expression sikterkafe 'last cup of coffee served at the end of a visit, one for the road'.

The twentieth century has seen a gradual retreat of Turkish lexical influence in two stages. Firstly, the elimination of Turkish rule in Macedonia (1912) rendered many terms obsolete due to changes in power structure. Thus, the interwar period saw the obsolescence of some Turkisms for strictly practical reasons. Since Turkish was no longer the language of the state, many administrative terms, e.g. vilajet 'province' kajmakam, 'governor' etc. became obsolete. In everyday Macedonian speech, however, large numbers of Turkisms were still in regular use.

In the second stage, the codification of Literary Macedonian (from 1944), the position of Turkisms was an issue from the very beginning. There was one current of thought among some Macedonian intellectuals that maintained that Turkisms should be encouraged and preserved because they were characteristic of folk speech and also emphasized Macedonian’s differentiation from the other Slavic languages. The predominant current, however, continued the nineteenth century tradition of encouraging replacements for Turkisms. Thus, for example, a year after the official recognition of Literary Macedonian, Koneski (1945) wrote an article in which, among other things, he severely criticized a translation of Molière’s Le Tartuffe for being full of Turkisms, writing:

"Toa znači...da go snižis...istančeni ot poetski jazik na Moliera...do nivoto na našeto balkansko, kasabsko, čaršisko muhabbenje." It means lowering the refined poetic language of Molière to the level of our Balkan small-town marketplace chit-chat.' (cf. also Ezov 1952:211, Gošab 1960, Markov 1955).

The process of replacing Turkisms involved three types of words: 1) Slavic, e.g. običaj for adet ‘custom’, znači for demek ‘it means’, no (borrowed from Russian; v. Koneski 1965:101) for ama ‘but’; 2) Western, e.g. German-based pegla (from the first half of Bügelseisen) for utija ‘iron’, pasuva for udisa ‘fit’; 3) so-called international (essentially, Greco-Latinate) words, e.g. informacija for aber ‘information’, nacija for millet ‘nation’. In some cases, the replacement has resulted in a differentiation of written and spoken language. Thus, no educated Macedonian would use ama or demek in formal writing, but even academicians and professors use them routinely in speaking. In many cases Westernisms and Turkisms will be opposed in what they imply. Thus, for example, the Turkism kujundžija ‘goldsmith’ indicates a dealer in traditional jewelry while the Gallicism bijutерија ‘jewelry’ implies modern, Western-style items. In other cases, the Turkisms will remain standard for the concrete meaning while its replacement will be used for abstractions, thus, for example Turkish tavon is the standard word for ceiling, but the French plafon is used in abstract or figurative expressions such as plafon na cenu ‘price-ceiling’, (cf. Korubin 1981a, 1986). In some cases, the Turkish was replaced by extending the use of a Slavic word, e.g. the use of narod ‘people’ to mean ‘nation’ in place of Turkish millet as well as the international nacija.

It is interesting to compare the suggestions of language codifiers during the first decade of development with the realities of usage thirty years later. For example, Markov (1955) sought to limit and reduce the spread of the suffixes -đija, -lija, -lak by suggesting replacements, e.g. lebar 'baker' for furdadžija, čevlar 'shoemaker' for konduradžija, etc. In an article in Nova Makedonija (21-X-83:7), a list of enterprises involved in the news story included the following: 11 prodavači na zelenčuk 'vegetable sellers' (not zarzavatčići), 11 čevlari (not konduradžići), 11 časovničari (not saatçı) 'watchmakers', 5 furdadžić (vs lebar), 13 slatkarnici i leblebijžilnici 'sweet shops and roasted chickpea shops' (not šekerdžilnici or leblebijžki rabotilnici),
i.e., in the language of the daily press, most but not all the replacements have taken hold.

In many ways, the situation is the reverse of what it was a century ago or even half a century ago. Writers such as Krčovski (d. 1820) and Pejčinović (d. 1845) had to gloss many of their Slavic words with Turkish equivalents, which were more familiar to ordinary people, but modern-day collections of folk tales (e.g. Penušliski 1968-73, 1981) must have glossaries of Turkisms. Similarly, three and a half decades after Koneski’s criticism of Turkisms in the translation of Molière, Korubin (1981b) found it necessary to admonish translators not to become so carried away by purism that they translate Turkisms used for archaic effect in Serbo-Croatian rather than leaving them in the original, e.g. Bujrum efendi ‘At your command, sir’, with the native, but in such a context inappropriate, expression Povele gospodine.

The position of Turkish loanwords in Macedonian at the end of the nineteen eighties was essentially that described by Kazazis (1972) for Balkan languages in general. First of all, there are those words which are both literary and colloquial standard and are not about to be replaced, e.g. džeb ‘pocket’, jorgovan ‘lilac’, various toponyms, e.g. Čair (Tk čajr ‘meadow’) a district in Skopje, and many others. As a close second come the standard colloquialisms which are not used in formal writing, e.g. ama, demek, etc. Another class of standard vocabulary not mentioned by Kazazis is that of certain types of specialized terminology. Thus, for example, people engaged in the hobby of dove-raising (golubarstvo, itself a native term) use Turkish terms for the names of different types of birds, e.g. ak kuru ‘white tail’, kara kuru ‘black tail’, beaz (Tk beyaz) ‘[pure] white’, sija (Tk siyah) ‘[pure] black’ (I am indebted to Dr. Vlado Cvetkovski for this information). This terminology is closely allied to the standard colloquial level, but the fact that contextually these are technical terms with no literary equivalents sets them apart.

There are three other broad types of contexts which permit a wider range of Turkisms than those just alluded to: 1) historical/epic/archaic, 2) local color/dialectal, and 3) ironic/pejorative/low style. The first context is distinguished by a wide range of vocabulary items of all types, but many refer to specifically Turkish institutions. The second context is distinguished by a wider degree of phonological variation, especially the greater preservation of schwa. The third context also includes new formations with the suffixes -džija, -lija, and -jak which would not occur in the first and be unlikely in the second. All these types are illustrated in various articles in Nova Makedonija, where Turkisms are incorporated to achieve these effects. Thus, for example, in an editorial entitled Mali kar - golemi šteti (NM 21-4-84:3) ‘small profit -- large damages’, the author, who is arguing against the legalization of raising goats in Macedonia, uses the Turkism kar to be pejorative and simultaneously conjure up images of the past, when goats were legal. In the body of the article, the author refers to the importance of goats to the economy of people who had to hide in the hills begajki pred zulumot na razni zavojuvaci ‘fleeing before the violence of various conquerors’. Here, the use of the Turkism zulum ‘violence’ (versus literary nasilstvo) contains no irony, rather the author is seriously invoking the bad old days of the Turkish yoke without mentioning any names.

Often articles using Turkisms for local color, i.e., as dialectisms, simultaneously either seek to conjure up images of the past or produce a humorous effect. The former (local plus historical) is seen in articles such as one about old folks’ life in modern Macedonia Da se živee so dikar (NM 22-11-82:5) ‘One should live with care (i.e. carefully)’, where the author visits an old resident of Prilep and in describing the scene uses phrases such as l dade nekakov štaret... ‘he gave her [his wife] some sort of sign’ (Tk šaret versus literary znak). The old man himself is quoted using dialectal Turkisms, e.g. sekoj so svojot um i k’smet ‘each with his wits and fate (literary ksmeti)’. Combinations of local color and humor are seen in articles about the lighter side of rural life, especially minor domestic squabbles, e.g. prazm muabet ‘I make conversation’ (literary pravam), so moži...ama sabajle... ‘what could he do...but in the morning’ (literary što može) (NM 6-11-83:5). Sometimes an author uses Turkisms simply to convey a sense of the old-fashioned without quoting anyone, as in a local color piece about an old man who niz pazarot nabavuva emis i zarzavat ‘gets fruit and vegetables at the market’ (Tk emiş, zarzavat ‘fruit, vegetable’ versus literary ovoše, zelenčući) (NM 1-8-82:5).

Other times, the effect is purely pejorative, e.g. an article about
the European Economic Community *Ekonomski Džin* -- politička džudža (Sabota 2-6:79-6) 'Economic giant -- political dwarf' vs. Giganti vo izgradba (Sabota 14-7:79-5) 'Giants under construction' about a new hidroelektrana 'hydroelectric power plant'. A Similar contrast is provided by a cartoon of a fat old man in a blue suit and black top hat labeled "EZ" (Evropska zaednica 'European Community') sitting on a ledge looking out over a distant battle and conflagration. On his back, the word posmatrač 'observer' printed in neat white letters has been crossed out in black and below printed in a handwritten style is the word seidžija, a Turkism with the same basic meaning, but with the connotation of 'bystander, rubberneck'. (NM 4-10:92:11) A particularly interesting phenomenon in the use of Turkisms for ironic-pejorative purposes is their coupling with very recent loanwords -- also used ironically -- as in an article headlined Biznes samo za džeparjak (NM 26-1:84:7) which could be translated roughly 'Deals only for crookedness'.

One phenomenon relating to local color which has not been remarked elsewhere is the use of Turkisms for regional identification. Thus, for example, nejše 'anyway, never mind' (Tk neise) is perceived by speakers from Bitola as being particularly characteristic of their region. This raises the question of the distribution of particular Turkisms in Macedonian dialects, which still requires investigation.

It is also worthy of note that serious articles concerning modern Turks and Turkey make a special effort to avoid words of Turkish origin if an alternative exists. Thus, for example, an article on Turkish film director Yilmaz Güney (NM 7-9:82:5) did not contain a single word of Turkish origin, although the discussion of witnesses and prisons afforded ample opportunities. An article on Yuruk folklore (NM 29-3:81:5; the Yuruks are a Turkish ethnic group living in the Štip-Radoviš) used običaj 'custom' (vs. Tk adet) and even the uncommon zabratka 'kerchief', which was then glossed with the standard word samija, which happens to be of Turkish origin.

Although, as was mentioned above, the situation described by Kazazis (1972) in the early seventies was still true into the late eighties, a linguistic effect of political pluralism in the post-89 upheavals has been the rise of dialectal forms and Turkisms in serious public discourse. Thus, for example the Turkism tajfa has become the neutral colloquial word for 'group' while the term grupa (a so-called internationalism) has taken on the negative connotations of 'faction'. This, too, could be associated with earlier debates concerning the position of Turkisms in literary normatization. Although, as indicated earlier, there was a school of thought that favored the retention of Turkisms in the literary language both as a distinctive feature of Macedonian and as a characteristic of colloquial speech, other scholars opposed the incorporation of most Turkisms on the grounds that their stylistic nuances were unsuitably ironic, dialectal, or old-fashioned (e.g. Koneski 1945).

The success of the trend to avoid Turkisms has resulted in the need for folklore collections to contain extensive glossaries of Turkisms along with regional expressions. The obsolescence of some Turkisms has progressed to the point that even graduate students in Slavic philology do not know words like utija 'clothes iron', which were still in common use two or three decades ago. Turkisms have always been more common in informal styles as opposed to formal speech or writing, and the recent apparent rise in the use of Turkisms seems to be connected with a tendency to colloquialize the literary language in opposition to establishment norms. Although one still encounters ironic uses, there are many serious uses where in the past there would not have been. It must be admitted that many of these contexts are negative, e.g. Nema veke besplatno lekuvanje: Najdraštčen primer e Valandovo kade momentalno duri 85 odst od osigurovacite se lekuvaat na veresi. (NM 8-17:91:5) 'There is no more free health care! The most drastic example is Valandovo, where at the moment already 85% of those insured are being treated on credit.' The use of the Turkism veresiya instead of the anglicism kredit is striking here, as its use is clearly not ironic, neither is it historical, rather it is colloquial-pejorative in style but quite serious in content. But Turkisms are also being used more in positive contexts, as well, e.g. Tutunot dogodina nema da bide badjala (NM 1-11:92:3) 'Next year's tobacco will not be for nothing'. Another new source of Turkisms in the news has been the increased attention focussed on Islam and Islamic countries such as Iran. Thus, for example, the word medžlis is routinely used to refer to the Iranian parliament. This same word (mejlis) is used in English-language news accounts, but in English the word must be glossed whereas in
Macedonian it is a revived Turkism.

From a sociolinguistic point of view, Turkish has become an object of affection and nostalgia for some urban Macedonians in comparison with the perceived competition from Albanian. It thus seems that a combination of pluralist linguistic politics and tensions with Albanian have contributed to a shift in usage and attitude concerning Turkisms among Macedonian-speakers. To this can be added the fact that recent events in neighboring countries have contributed to increased closeness and cultural cooperation between Macedonia and Turkey.

Turning now to Albanian we find essentially the same situation as in Macedonian. In both Macedonian and Albanian productive derivational suffixes based on Turkish, e.g. Macedonian -džija, -jak, Albanian -xhi, -llëk, are sources of variation both in older Turkisms that are replaced by formations using native material, e.g. Macedonian čevlar for konuradžija or Albanian këpucar for kundraxhi all meaning 'shoemaker' (cf. English cobbler), and in their ability to produce new lexicon to compete with the old, especially at marked stylistic levels, e.g. Macedonian lovdžija 'hunter', Albanian thashethemexhi 'gossip-monger' and newer Macedonian majstorjak 'masterpiece' (of poor quality), Albanian avokatllëk 'advocacy' (regardless of the actual merits of the case). It is noteworthy that Turkish -hane is not at all productive in Albanian and -li only very weakly so, albeit there are other suffixes, e.g. -kër, that do show limited productivity (i.e. the ability to combine with non-Turkish words, albeit not indiscriminately), e.g. ḡabtqar 'robber' (see Boretsky 1975:265-69).

There has been a significant puristic movement in Albania that has sought to eliminate as many foreign elements as possible from Albanian, and Turkisms have been a particular focus of that campaign (cf. Kostallari et al. 1973). Although Albanian linguists outside of Albania have tended to endorse developments and trends in Albania since the literary unification of 1968-72, such does not always appear to be the case. Thus, for example, Qemal Murati in one of his series of articles on calques in Albanian (Flaka e vëllazërimit 13-5-90:5) recommends using the 'Turkish uji 'flatiron' (Turkish .utf) rather than nativehekur 'iron' (both the metal and other meanings) on the grounds that the use of hekur to mean 'flatiron' is a calque on the Romance languages.

In Albanian, as in Macedonian, Turkisms are characteristic of colloquial style and are also used for pejoration, historical flavor, and local color. Thus, the Geg dialect columns of Flaka e vëllazërimit abound in Turkisms that are not found in the Standard Albanian dictionaries, e.g. memnun 'pleased' (Turkish memnun, Standard Albanian i kënaqur cf. also Boretsky 1976:90). The Albanian-language press in Macedonia, however, does not seem to be favoring a return to Turkisms, although they are still quite common in the media when a colloquial or emotive effect is desired. Rather, there seems to be increased use of Geg in serious contexts. Thus, for example, an article in Flaka e vëllazërimit (7-7-91:8) entitled Dité e ndësh 'pajamësi e prije' 'Day and night, sleeplessness and waiting' describing the anguish of parents waiting at the Macedonian Red Cross in Skopje for news of their children sent to the front in the Serbo-Croatian war, one of the parents was quoted in Geg. It could be argued that this quotation was used for emotive purposes, but if so, it clearly shows that in such stressful situations Geg is felt to have more emotional power. One difference between the Albanian of Albania and that of Macedonia and parts of Kosovo (e.g. Prizren) is the significant presence of a Turkish-speaking population in the former and its absence from the latter (cf. Németh 1961), although the recent opening of Albania and movement of populations across the border with Macedonia has brought reports of Turkish-speaking minorities in the regions of Elbasan, Saranda, Fier, and elsewhere (Birluk 16-3-91:6).

In the case of Romani, as in other European languages, the frequency of Turkish loanwords decreases with an increase in distance from the old boundaries of the Ottoman Empire. Thus, for example, Sampson (1926) does not give a single word of Turkic origin for the dialect of Wales, nor does Bhatia (1963) in his limited vocabulary of a dialect spoken in Philadelphia. Pobozniak (1964:72-73) does mention Turkish in his description of Lovar, but only as an intermediary for Armenian and Greek. The presence of a significant lexical component of Turkish origin is a distinctive feature of the Balkan Romani dialects (i.e., those dialects spoken, for the most part, south of the Jireček line and generally characterized by an absence or low degree of Romanian influence) just as it is of the languages in
the Balkan Sprachbund.

In the southern Balkan dialects of Romani, Turkisms still comprise a significant portion of the vocabulary, since Romani has remained for a longer time strictly in the realm of oral communication. As in the other Balkan languages, Romani has borrowed not only lexical items but also productive suffixes, e.g. asjáv/asjávdzis 'mill/miller' (cf. Boretsky 1992). Thus, although the actual number of Turkisms in Romani is no greater than that in any other colloquial Balkan language (cf. Friedman 1989a, cf. also Boretsky 1992), the colloquial base of Literary Romani leaves open the possibility that a greater number of Turkisms will find their way into the codified literary language currently in the process of development. Because Turkisms are extremely rare in the Romani dialects spoken outside the boundaries of the former Ottoman Empire, however, the fate of Turkisms in Literary Romani will depend in some degree on the extent to which the Romani dialects of the Balkans serve as the basis for the currently emerging Romani literary language (Friedman 1989b; cf. also Kazaris 1972:95).

Nonetheless, Romani is in a different position from the rest of the Balkan languages in this respect. Upon leaving India the Roms came into direct contact with Persian and borrowed a number of important words. Some of these Persian words, e.g. baxt 'luck, happiness', are found throughout the Romani dialects and also in Turkish, which undoubtedly reinforced their retention in the Balkan Romani dialects. Others occur in Balkan Romani and Turkish but not in all Romani dialects, e.g. laňf (Turkish lãf) 'word' (English Romani lav but elsewhere vorba, svato, duma, thavali, etc.). Although the conscious attempt to eliminate Turkisms (or Arabo-Persianisms) in the Balkan literary languages has resulted in their stylistic lowering or marginalization (although, as noted above, this process is not necessarily irreversible), the same motivations need not apply to Literary Romani.

Romani language planners have fewer nonlinguistic reasons for eliminating words of Turkish origin. As was mentioned, many of these words are ultimately of Persian origin. Since the Indic and Iranian languages share a common Indo-European dialectal ancestor (Indo-Iranian), such words are historically more closely related to Romani than to the other Indo-European languages of the Balkans.

Moreover, some of them were borrowed directly from Persian during the early history of the Romani people. Thus, for example, while baksuz 'luckless' is a Turkism in Macedonian (< bahtisz), baxt 'luck' is a Persianism in Romani. In addition to this, the elimination of Turkisms from the other Balkan languages was in part motivated by political independence from the Ottoman Empire. In the case of Romani, the Turkish language does not occupy a similar political position as distinct from other non-Romani languages. This can be seen in the use of Turkisms when calquing from Slavic, e.g. avazi 'vote' (Turkish avaz 'voice, shout' < Persian āwāz 'voice') is based on Slavic glas meaning both 'voice' and 'vote'. Moreover, given the line of thought that favors Romani vocabulary enrichment by borrowing from other Indic languages, the presence of a loanword in both an Indic language of India and in Romani could be construed as justification for retaining the word in Romani regardless of its ultimate origin or the fact that it entered the languages independently. Thus, for example, Jusuf and Kepeski (1980:211) use the Balkan Turkism zamani for 'epoch, time', and mark it as a Hindi word in their vocabulary despite the fact that it comes from Arabic zamān and probably entered Hindi via Persian.6

Aromanian and Megino-Romanian both have significant Turkish lexical components (Atanasov 1990:249-51, 1991; Golub 1984:195-261, Caragine-Mariojeanu 1975). Pascu (1925:106-177) cites over 1,000 Turkisms in Aromanian, although Pușcariu (1976:316) states that Megino-Romanian has many Turkisms not found in Aromanian. According to Atanasov (1990:249), Turkish ranks after Macedonian and Greek as outside sources of vocabulary, and either of these may actually have served as the intermediary for the Turkish. Basically, however, the situation is comparable with that of Romani. Like Romani, Aromanian is used in both print and mass media, but it is still primarily a language or oral communication, and as such the colloquial far outranks the literary in usage and frequency. The elaborators of an Aromanian standard could choose to preserve Turkisms as distinctive or eliminate them as non-Romance or old-fashioned, but at present the matter is unsettled.

In the process of vocabulary building, all of the nascent Balkan literary languages made some overt attempts to eliminate vocabulary of Turkish origin, but in the case of Turkish itself these same words
are often also considered foreign, being of Arabo-Persian origin (see Karazis 1972:93-94). Thus in many cases the Turkisms of the
Balkan languages are the Arabo-Persianisms of Turkish, since it
served as the intermediary via which many words of Arabic and
Persian origin entered the Balkans. We thus have the interesting
situation in which the same terms are considered archaic in both
Turkey and the Balkans. For example Turkish münasip (<Arabic
munsāsib), Macedonian munsip, Albanian mynasip 'suitable' have
been replaced, buy uygun, zgoden, and përshtastëm, respectively.
Similarly the Turkish Arabism millet 'nation, people', has been
replaced by native ulus in Turkish, narod in Macedonian, and kombë
in Albanian. In Turkey, too, this vocabulary can be stylistically
manipulated with political implications. Thus, for example, politically
right-wing publications such as the newspaper Terueüm favor older
Arabo-Persian vocabulary while left-wing publications such as the
newspaper Cumhuriyet support Turkic neologisms (cf. Friedman

It is even possible to speak of 'Turkisms' in Balkan Turkish.
What this refers to is the phenomenon of Turkish words borrowed by
various Balkan languages and then borrowed back into Rumelian
Turkish. In some cases, these represent shared dialectal processes,
e.g. the loss of fi in amam 'Turkish bath' (<hamam), but in others
the form found in dialectal Turkish has been borrowed back from
another contact language, as in Macedonian Turkish argat 'day
laborer' vs. Standard Turkish argat (<Greek ἀργὰτος), where the
initial /a/ represents a Macedonian adaptation whose form then
influences the local Turkish dialect. Macedonian Turkish educators
strive to replace these local forms with the literary ones. (cf.
Zekeriya 1976, Friedman 1982).

Looking now at the commonalities and differences in the
treatment of Turkisms in the languages of the Balkans considered
here, we can begin by observing that Macedonian and Albanian
have had in common the attempt to restrict or marginalize Turkisms.
Many of these same words have been purged from modern Turkish
because they are ultimately of Arabo-Persian origin. Among the
effects of this tendency -- other than heightening the split between
formal and informal speech -- has been the reduction of the
commonality of lexicon that has been one of the characteristics of the

Balkan linguistic league.
A recent tendency toward colloquialization in Macedonia and
conservatism in Turkey (cf. Boeschoten 1991), however, may
ultimately alter this direction. Just as in so many other ways the
century seems to be ending the way it began (although to be sure
there are differences, such as the rise of Literary Romani), so too,
Turkish and Arabic are being rehabilitated to positions of influence
and status in Macedonia. The situation for Albanian is not as clear,
but a potential for the same type of development exists. Turning to
Romani, we see that the very fact of non-codification has left the
Turkish component in the lexicon in much the same position as those
of the Balkan languages before codification. Literary Romani has a
potential for similar puristic and neologizing tendencies, but for the
time being is still close enough to its colloquial base to have many
Turkish loans and is even calquing from Slavic using Turkisms. In
Aromanian, too, Turkisms remain a significant part of the vocabulary,
although how this will relate to standardization efforts remains to be
elaborated.

The difference between the relationship of Turkish to the Balkan
languages and that of French to English or Chinese to Japanese is
striking (cf. Shibatani 1990:146). Although all three languages were
in positions of superiority with relation to the languages that borrowed
from them, French and Chinese have served as sources of high style
vocabulary, while Turkish has been consciously relegated to low
style. Recent events, however, have shown that the Turkish lexicon
is not merely still vigorously present, but that its position in the overall
word stock of the Balkan languages is still flexible. Although the
pattern throughout the twentieth century has been to reduce the
commonalities among the Balkan languages, among other things by
eliminating or restricting Turkisms or Arabo-Persianisms, tendencies
of the past few years indicate that such a trend may not be
irreversible.

It has long been proposed that an atlas of Balkan Turkisms be
compiled. Such an atlas needs to be elaborated at the dialectal level,
given the variation in the use of Turkisms in individual dialects. In
addition to this, Turkisms in languages not traditionally considered in
the context of the Balkan Sprachbund, e.g. Romani and Judezmo,
should also be included. Their study -- especially in the context of a
comparative Balkan lexicon -- will add to our understanding of linguistic history and language contact. Moreover, mere observation of the presence of a Turkism is not enough (cf. Friedman 1988b on semantic versus morphological isoglosses), such an atlas must also take into consideration sociolinguistic functions and semantic levels.

NOTES
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2 It is an interesting but little-known fact that while popular belief in the Balkans attributes many social ills to the Turkish occupation, popular belief in Turkey attributes these same ills in Turkey to Turkey's having spent so much time ruling the Balkans.

3 These are the languages of the ethnic groups specifically named in the Constitution of the Republic of Macedonia.

4 Thus, for example, the question of whether -ana entered Macedonian via Serbo-Croatian or directly from Turkish is, for our purposes, irrelevant.

5 Kazazis (1972:95) points out an important exception to this principle. As a result of certain historical circumstances some Turkish lexical items actually spread after the fall of the Ottoman Empire. Three cases in point are Serbo-Croatian, Romanian, and Greek. In the case of the first two, the literary prestige of the dialects of regions that were under Ottoman rule for extended periods, Serbia and Muntenia, respectively, led to the spread of some Turkisms into regions that became parts of later Yugoslavia and Romania, e.g. parts of Croatian and Transylvania, where Turkish rule had been short and its influence minimal. A concrete example is the Serbo-Croatian word čevapića 'grilled meat'. For colloquial Greek, a new source of Turkisms in the early twentieth century was the exchange of populations between Greece and Turkey, which began in 1923. In Romani, too, it is possible that the role of the Balkan dialects in the progress of the literary language could result in the spread of some lexical items of Turkish origin.

6 Perhaps the most striking example of such lexical spread from Arabic is illustrated by the story of Morris Goodman, a Professor of African linguistics at Northwestern University. While attending the International Congress of Linguists in Bucharest, he attempted to buy some matches from a kiosk. He did not know Romanian, and the proprietor was unable to understand when he tried the word for 'matches' in English, French, German, Dutch, and Russian. Finally, as he was leaving in frustration, he flung the Swahili word at her: "Kiberiti". The proprietor beamed understanding and exclaimed: "Ah, chibriti!"
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