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Typological and Areal Features Linking and Separating the Balkans and the Caucasus

VICTOR A. FRIEDMAN

From antiquity to modern times the Balkans and the Caucasus have been two of the oldest meeting places or outposts of what can be loosely termed 'West' and 'East': Ancient Greeks and Persians, Byzantines and Turks, Christianity and Islam (cf. Bank and Lukonin 1988, Kara 1987). Both Greek and Turkic languages have been significant presences in both regions for millennia. For at least a millennium before the Ottomans, various Turkic peoples, e.g. Huns, Avars, Khazars, Bulgars, Pechenegs, Cumans, invaded and sometimes settled these regions (cf. Fine 1983; Kosvena et al. 1960). Moreover, in the frameworks of the Byzantine and Ottoman Empires, Caucasian peoples have constituted a presence in the Balkans in such forms as colonies of Armenians and Circassians, the Georgian monastery at Bartkovo, (founded in 1083), etc. (cf. Šandze 1971). In language and culture, as in geography (Gerasimov and Gálábo 1984), the Balkans and the Caucasus constitute two distinct areas that are nonetheless also intimately linked (cf. also Bulatova 1988:25). Both regions present material and problems for the three major frameworks of linguistic comparison, namely the genetic, the areal, and the typological.

Typological and areal studies can be viewed as synchronic and diachronic sides of the same task, viz. the explanation of linguistic convergence. Typological comparisons operate on the ahistorical plane, seeking universal tendencies in language. Areal linguistics examines evidence of convergence through language contact, i.e. on the historical plane. The genetic is opposed to the areal on the historical plane in that the former studies divergence from a common source whereas the later investigates convergence into a new entity. As Hamp 1977 has pointed out, genetic studies are a prerequisite to areal investigations in order to differentiate common inheritance from convergence. Thus, for example, Georgian and Armenian have convergent three-stop systems based on separate inheritances, whereas the three-stop system of Ossetian shows the influence of structural borrowing, since it is derived from an earlier Iranian two-stop system. Similarly, the complete historical picture is essential to typological studies before such studies can separate out that which cannot be explained by any spatial (areal) or temporal (genetic) commonality and must therefore be attributed to some inherent (universal) commonality, if any.
A key issue in the study of areal linguistics is the determination of the difference between external influence on a pre-existing language-internal tendency on the one hand, and complete structural borrowing on the other. Thus, for example, it can be argued that the tendency to develop non-confirmative status from perfects in Balkan Slavic, if not part of a larger universal tendency, was at least already nascent before contact with Turkish, which contact could have encouraged the tendency without actually supplying it (cf. Friedman 1978). Similarly, in the study of calques, it is sometimes difficult to determine whether an expression is borrowed or merely coincidentally identical. Thus, for example, it seems reasonable to suppose that Macedonian has calqued from Turkish the use of the verb jade 'eat' to mean also 'undergo something unpleasant' in view of the fact that Macedonian has not only literal translation equivalents, e.g., jade dođi 'get soaked' ('eat rain', Turkish yorgun yemek) or jad gomno 'say something stupid/embarrassing' ('eat excrement', Turkish bok yemek; cf. English to put one's foot in it) but also expressions in which the object is a Turkish loanword, e.g. jad kote 'get a beating' ('eat a blow'; Turkish köpek yemek). On the other hand, the use of the name 'mother-in-law's tongue' — Macedonian avukahren jazz = Turkish kaynana dili — to denote a type of plant with long thorny leaves could just as easily be a case of parallel development based on the folklore of mothers-in-law that is shared by all the peoples of Europe and Western Asia. Given the fact that the English has the same term and is not likely to have had a Balkan source for it, the Macedonian expression cannot be identified unambiguously as a Turkish calque without some sort of documentary evidence (cf. Jakar-Nastea 1962/63, Friedman 1986).

The determination of genetic affiliation is also essential for areal linguistics in order to distinguish between inherited features and borrowed features. For the Balkans, the genetic affiliations of the relevant living languages are relatively unambiguous. Those languages that form the Sprachbund, i.e. the linguistic league produced by centuries of intense multilingual contact, viz. Albanian, Greek, Balkan Slavic (Macedonian, Bulgarian, and Torlak or South Serbian), and Balkan Romance (Romanian, Aromanian, and Megleno-Romanian), are Indo-European, as are other languages that arrived later but nonetheless participated in the pertinent processes, e.g., Romani and Judezmo. Moreover, we have significant and unambiguous attestations of considerably earlier stages (by at least a millennium) of all these languages except Albanian, albeit there are gaps in the record for some of them. Thus, for example, although we have Latin and Sanskrit as ancestors of Balkan Romance and Romani, these languages, like Albanian, do not appear as such in written records of significant length until the sixteenth century. In the case of Slavic, our earliest records are copies of documents that were not composed until after the Slavs had been settled in the Balkans for several centuries. As a result, there is sometimes a certain ambiguity regarding native tendencies in progress versus structural borrowing (cf. Van Wijk 1933, Huntley 1979). Of the languages participating in some direct way in the formation and/or functioning of the Balkan Sprachbund, only Turkish and the other Turkic languages, e.g. Gagauz and Bulgar Turkic, belong to another family, viz. Altaic. Questions of genetic linguistic of concern in the study of Paleo-Balkan languages, Thracian, Phrygian, Ancient Macedonian, etc., and in determining the source of phenomena in the modern Balkan languages, i.e. in differentiating genuine convergence from mere lack of divergence on the diachronic plane and in determining the nature of the substratum, if any — a question which must remain essentially moot in the face of the paucity of evidence concerning the pre-Greek and non-Greek ancient languages of the Balkans.

In the Caucasus, questions of genetic affiliation are at once more acute and less so. They are more pressing in that the relationship among the three indigenous families, i.e. South or Kartvelian (consisting of Georgian, Svan, Mingrelian and Laz), Northwest or Abaz-Adyghe (consisting of Abaz, Abaza, Upper/East Circassian or Kabardian, Lower/West Circassian or Adyge/Cherkess, and Ubyx), and Northeast (Nax, or North Central consisting of Chechen, Ingush and Baq or Tsivo-Tush, and Daghestanian containing about 30 languages of which Avar, Lak, Dargwa, Lezghi, and Tabassaran are literary), while widely accepted as an article of faith, may never be unambiguously established (cf. Vogt 1940; his remarks are as valid today as they were then). The fact remains that no regular sound correspondences have been established among the three groups, their morphological systems are quite divergent, and searches such as that for the remnants of noun classes in Kartvelian that reflect a relation with Daghestanian must resort to such levels of abstractness and speculation that one is left with the vague generalities that have also given us the Nostratic super-family. As a result, such similarities as do exist among these three families have been attributed to the possibility of a genetic relationship as well as to later convergence (cf. Klimov 1978, Klimov and Alekseev 1980).

These questions are less important in that the other participants in the Caucasian linguistic league, e.g. Indo-European languages such as Tat and Ossetian, which are Iranian, or Armenian, which is independent, and Turkic languages such as Azeri, Karachay, Balkar, and Kumyk, are clearly unrelated to the indigenous families and therefore are not candidates for genetic explanations, although there is the problem of poorly attested potential candidates for substrata, e.g. Urartean in the case of Armenian. Moreover, similar phenomena in these languages are subject to the possibility of typological explanation, and it is here that we come upon the greatest difficulty when studying each of the two individual linguistic areas and when attempting to relate or at least compare them. Namely, how is one to differentiate convergence that is the result of contact from convergence resulting from either universal or coincidental language-specific tendencies. Both explanations possess validity in the Balkans and the Caucasus, and a comparison of the two areas makes the need for the distinction particularly strong.

1 I am following that usage for which Ladino denotes an archaizing puristic literary form of Judezmo (cf. Bunis 1975:32).
Let us first briefly examine each area separately, pointing out some of the most common claims that are made for their each constituting a linguistic area. The Caucasus is known primarily as a classical case of phonological and to a lesser extent of morphological convergence. The most widely cited example is the rise of a three-way stop opposition in Ossetian and its preservation in East Armenian on the model of Kartvelian and reinforced by the complex systems of North Caucasian alluded to above. The presence of glottalized consonants in these systems is particularly striking, especially in view of the fact that other languages of the Caucasus, e.g. Karachay-Balkar and Tag, lack this feature, although the Lower Karu dialect of Azeri, which is spoken in Daghhestan, has the same set of consonantal oppositions as Lak, viz. glottalized and geminate-emphatic (Džidalaev 1971). In morphology, the noun in Armenian and Ossetian shows loss of gender and the preservation of case relations (in Armenian, despite the loss of final syllables) by means of the development of agglutinative suffixes. In Armenian, as in Romani, the Indo-European case relations have been preserved by means of new material. In Ossetian, the cases have even been augmented by the addition of a new local case, the superessive.

Examples of syntactic convergence in the Caucasus have either been local, e.g. the loss of ergative structure in Udi (Daghhestani) under Azeri (Turkic) influence (Gadžieva 1979:167), or have turned out to be internal developments. A case of the latter is the Armenian perfect of the type norə bereal`he has carried' where nora is the genitive of he. This has been treated as an ergative calque on Caucasian structure, especially the type illustrated by Lak zanul lavsun bur which translates the Armenian morpheme for morpheme (cf. Tumajan 1977). However, Benveniste 1952 has shown the Armenian construction to be a possessive one, i.e. the equivalent of a 'have' perfect, and thus an internal development rather than an ergative calque. The similarity with Lak is convergent and superficial. In fact, the non-Caucasian verb appears to have been remarkably resistant to Caucasian features such as poly-personal agreement as well as version/voice and status distinctions. Other coincidences of, e.g., Armenian, Ossetian and Caucasian syntax, such as the extensive use of active participial constructions, (cf. Armenian im karuca c un literally 'my building house' meaning 'the house I have built', cf. Lak tul durusa qatari also Turkish yapıştım ev),3 determiner-determined word order, postpositions, numerals + singular substantives, are shared with Turkic (cf. Vogt 1940), and one cannot help but suspect a typological explanation, given what we now know about linguistic universals (Greenberg 1966, Conrie 1981). Similarly, such phonological phenomena as the loss of length distinctions, while occurring in both the Balkans and the Caucasus, are well known in other languages of the world, and it is difficult to identify definitively an areal cause. On the other hand, one cannot help but wonder, in the light of what we know about the language contact situations involved, whether some impetus to these tendencies was not given by areal factors.

The Balkans, on the other hand, are more noted for morphosyntactic and lexico-phraseological phenomena, e.g. the analytic future in 'will', loss of infinitive, analytic comparison of adjectives, simplification of declension (especially merger of genitive and dative), object reduplication (including both substantives and pronouns), definite article (usually postposed), formation of teens by means of the expression 'on ten' (except Greek), formation of a conditional by means of a future imperfect, maintenance of an aorist/perfect distinction, etc. (cf. Asev 1989, where phonology and lexicon together take up 12% of the work, the remainder being devoted to morphosyntax). Phonological parallels such as the presence of stressed schwa (absent in Gag and West Macedonian) or the loss of tone/length distinctions (but not in Gag nor in some peripheral Tosk dialects nor in Gagauz) can be viewed as merely widespread micro-areal phenomena comparable to the loss of /h/ or the merger of /t/, /d/ and /k/, /g/ in adjacent dialects of Turkish, Albanian, Macedonian, and Serbian. However, even such classic Balkanisms as object reduplication, postposed definite articles and conditionals formed on the basis of the future anterior find historical parallels in Caucasian languages, e.g. in Georgian, that suggest the possibility of typological as opposed to areal explanations (cf. Aronson, forthcoming, but also Joseph 1983). As was just mentioned, phonological phenomena such as the loss of tone/length distinctions are also widespread in the languages of the world, including the Caucasus (Vogt 1938). While it is easy to see how situations of language contact would be conducive to prosodic changes (witness the fixed initial stress area of Czech, Slovak, Hungarian and Upper Lusitan, the fixed penultimate stress of Polish and Lower Lusitan, and the fact that Romani dialects in these regions lose their original oxytonic stress and take on fixed initial or penultimate stress, respectively), it is nonetheless difficult if not impossible to establish areal versus typological causality. Thus in examining the two individual areas we see on the one hand a tendency to stress different types of structural borrowing (perhaps due to differences in the underlying degree of genetic relatedness) and on the other questions of typological vs. areal causation.

It is at this point that I wish to examine two phenomena that link the Balkans and the Caucasus and at the same time introduce a distinction between two types of what Hamp 1979b has called convergence areas, namely I wish to differentiate between a 'contact area' and a 'diffusion area'. By 'contact area' I mean a geographical region of intense bi- or multilingual contact where convergence is achieved directly. A 'diffusion area' is made up of a series of contact areas. I would propose the distinction as a useful one in approaching types of convergence and contact phenomena. Hamp 1979b pointed out the need to formalize cluster phenomena within the Balkan Sprachbund on the one hand, and the relations of Balkan languages to other convergence areas on the other. It is the latter of these two problems that I
am examining here. Thus, I would argue that the Balkans and Caucasus are linguistic areas in the sense of contact areas but can be viewed as a linguistic area in the sense of a diffusion area.

Two phenomena shared by languages of the Balkans and the Caucasus that can be treated in the context of the concept of a diffusion area are (1) the grammatical encoding of speaker attitude (the so-called reported, witnessed, dubitative, etc. verbal forms) and (2) the lexicophrasological influence of Turkic (including Arno-Persian elements). In labelling the verbal category of speaker attitude *status* rather than as type of mood I am following Aronson's modification of Jakobson's schema which makes an essential distinction between mood as an objective, ontological qualification of reality and status as the speaker's subjective judgment on the value of that qualification (cf. Friedman 1983). While this category is found in only some of the languages of each area, those languages form an unbroken continuum from the Adriatic (Albanian) across the Balkans and along the southern shore of the Black Sea (Macedonian, Megleno-Romanian, Bulgarian, Turkish; cf. Fiedler 1989) over the Caucasus to the shores of the Caspian (Turkic, and the indigenous Kartvelian, Abaza-Adyghe, and Nax-Daghestanian).

The category of status is traditionally defined in terms of whether the event described by the speaker was reported to or witnessed by him/her, with *reported* being associated with the perfect and *witnessed* being associated with the simple preterite. However, the invariant meanings behind the uses of the category of status in these languages concern the speaker's personal willingness or lack thereof to vouch for the truth of the statement. Although the speaker's attitude is often the result of the source of the information, e.g. eye-witnessing or second-hand account, such is not invariably the case. Thus, in all those languages with marked confirmativity, the marked forms can be used to describe events of which the speaker is certain regardless of the source of information, but they cannot be felicitously subordinated to clauses that directly contradict such confirmations, e.g. Macedonian *Ne veram deta*, Bulgarian *Ne vjarmam ce*, Turkish *Inanmıyorum ki, I don't believe that...*, Georgian *Dar cmunebuli ar var rom 'I doubt that...'* Hence, I use the terms confirmative and non-confirmative to refer to the basic meanings carried by forms entering into status oppositions in the relevant languages. In looking at contextual variant meanings, however, a series of semantic isoglosses both linking and separating the chain of languages suggests important structural and geographical sub-groupings. Thus, for example, taking Georgian as representative of the South Caucasus and Lak as representative of the Northeast Caucasus (the choice of Lak being based on its relative geographic isolation from direct contact with Turkic) we find various uses of status create several types of distribution:

---

4 When such clauses are used felicitously, i.e. when they are expressing the speakers amazement but not non-confirmative (cf. English *I can't believe I ate the whole thing*), confirmatory forms can be used to emphasize the fact that the speaker does in fact believe that the event took place. Due to the syntactic structure of some Caucasian languages, e.g. Lak, subordination is expressed by participial constructions that neutralize status oppositions.

5 Albanian has a series of marked non-confirmative paradigms called habiore 'admirative', which developed from an inverted perfect (e.g., *kaja geqe 'has been the good, kaj paqar 'has had the pass*). This primary form now has a present meaning of marked non-confirmative in Standard Albanian. However, it is precisely for expressions of surprise at newly discovered pre-existing facts that Albanian permits the use of secondarily derived past admiratives, e.g. the perfect *paqar geqe, with an apparently present meaning parallel to the non-confirmative perfects in the other languages.

6 This sentence is grammatical in Lak, but not with a present meaning. The same principle is true of the asterisked sentences in the following example.
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These four points can be represented as follows:

![Diagram showing relationships between languages]

**SCHEMATIC MAP**

While the origin of status distinctions continues to be debated in terms of structural borrowing versus internal tendencies and typological universals, I would suggest nonetheless the semantic isoglosses relating to contextual variant uses of the category could well be the result of diffusion, even if the rise of the category itself is not. The Georgian data are particularly suggestive in this regard.

We note that conspicuously absent from this status-marking chain of languages are Greek, Daco-Romanian, Aromanian, Armenian, Ossetian, and Tat. We should also note, however, that the past conditional of Daco-Romanian, e.g. ar fi făcut 'he is supposed to have done/supposedly did, etc.', has admisive and dubitative functions that are carried out by status in those languages with the category. On the other hand, we find that in areas of very strong Aromanian influence, e.g. the Bitola region, the status opposition of Macedonian is weakened to the extent that the Bitola dialect is known throughout Macedonia for this. Moving further to the south and west to the Macedonian dialects spoken around Kostur (Kastoria) in Greece and Korça (Korçë) in Albania, we find that the new perfect has totally replaced the old perfect (status having been carried by the opposition of the old preterite and old perfect) and resulted in a verbal system recapitulating that of Common Slavic (in this respect) and devoid of the status distinctions which relic forms show did exist at one time. Moreover, it is precisely in the Albanian dialects of these same regions that the admivative, which is marked for non-confirmative status in most dialects, has either become a type of generalized past or has been lost. We thus have what might be termed a pocket of resistance to status distinctions in a territory which is both at the heart of the Balkan Sprachbund and on the periphery of status-using languages. I have not as yet found a similar dialectal situation in the Caucasus, e.g., in areas around Armenia or Ossetia, but this topic requires further investigation.

Turning now to the question of Turkic influence per se, we are faced with a number of potential questions. To what extent does such an adstratum penetrate the linguistic unity? What happens when political circumstances alter the sociolinguistic position of the adstratum language? What is the relation of cultural and political factors to lexico-syntactic borrowing? There is also the historical question of differentiating the layers of Turkish influence — Bulgaro-Zazax, Kipchak (Pecheneg, Kuman, Tatar, Karachay-Balkar) and Oghuz (Ottoman, Azeri) Turks have all been significant presence in both regions (cf. Menges 1958, Džidal’sev 1982) — although this is beyond the scope this work.

In both the Balkans and the Caucasus, Turkish words, phrases, and derivational morphemes have penetrated to a significant extent, and it is noteworthy that the languages on both sides of the Black Sea appear to share the same hierarchy of relative productivity of individual derivational morphemes: agentive > abstract substantival; adjectival > locational, privative, etc., i.e. -ti - li-lu, -luki-luš - dina, -stin, etc. Thus, for example, the well-known occupational morpheme which in Standard Turkish orthography is written -ci, -ci, etc., is the most productive all over the morpheme-borrowing diffusion area. Not only to we have complete loanwords, e.g., Turkish dükkan 'shopkeeper', Albanian dyqanë, Macedonian dukandija, Laku trukanči, etc. but also productive uses of the morpheme with native bases, e.g., Macedonian lovdija 'huntey (Slavic lov- hunt)', filmdijja 'film-buff; mediocre filmmaker' and Laku bakči 'leader' (Laku bak 'head'), ina cultiva? literally 'you what-šHERE', i.e. 'What is your occupation?' (cf. Turkish Necisini?). These suffixes are also productive in languages that arrived more recently in the Balkans, e.g., Judezmo maitadi 'matzoh-maker', as well as, e.g., hanukalikes 'hanukkah presents'.

One potentially significant difference between the Balkans and the Caucasus in the borrowing of Turkisms is the choice of verbal stem. In the Balkans, the stem is often the -di form of the verb, corresponding to the simple or confirmative preterite in the Indo-European Balkan languages, whereas in the Caucasus the -mit participle, which is perfect or non-confirmative, normally acts as the base, e.g. Macedonian bendis (T'urkisch beğen-di 'like, be pleased'), Albanian baterdis (T'urkisch bạt-tri 'cause to sink'), Lezghian haimitaran (T'urkisch bat-miş 'cause to sink'), Udi birmütbesin (T'urkisch bûyür-miş 'command') (cf. Job 1988, Moore 1985).

---

9 In specific cases, however, e.g., West Rumelian Turkish dialects in Macedonia, Gagauz in Bulgaria, Azeri dialects in Lezghian regions, etc., it is the Turkish language that has undergone significant influence.

10 I have only given representative allomorphs of each suffix rather than the complete range of possibilities which would have to take into account both Turkic vowel harmony and borrowing languages' adaptive strategies such as the addition of -ia in Slavic to Turkish words in -i. In Macedonian, the relative productivity of the suffixes can be gauged by frequency in the reverse dictionary (Milet 1967): -tiha = 250, -lak = 200, -tija = 200, -dina = 50, -stin = 4.

11 Interestingly, this does not appear to have been the case in Romani where the use of native derivational suffixes with these functions seems to be preferred.

12 In Balkan Slavic, the -t of the Greek sigmatic aorist is also often added. In Albanian, these Turkisms are adapted to the sigmatic paradigm, as are many borrowings from Slavic.
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colloquial while the Turks are regarded as higher style literary, e.g. podarok vs. bat'fet 'gift' in Lak. Moreover, in Dagestan we have the phenomenon of Russian Turksisms being borrowed with specialized meanings, e.g. Lak balık (directly from Turkic) means 'fish' in general whereas balık (via Russian bal'k) means 'fish dinner, prepared fish'. Compare Macedonian tava (from Turkish) 'ceiling' in the literal, physical sense vs. plafon (from French) ceiling in a metaphorical sense, e.g., a price ceiling (cf. Abdullaev 1982, Friedman 1986). Thus, in both regions we have Turkish in the role of older stratum, but for sociological and political reasons, that stratum has been lowered in the Balkans and raised in Dagestan.

Although all the languages in question have calques from Turkic, there are different boundaries for different calques. Thus, for example, the traditional beginning of fairy tales in Turkish, bir varmış bir yokmuş 'once there was, once there wasn't' is found throughout the Caucasus, e.g. Georgian iva da ara iva, Lak bivkvan bur qabtvkvan bur, and extends into the Balkans, e.g., Macedonian bilo ne bilo.13 But it is also in the Balkans that we begin to meet with the equivalent of once upon a time, e.g., Macedonian si imalo edo vreme. A typical Albanian opening exhibits the dual verbal construction but without negation: ishte se n'a ç'ishte 'there was what (to us) there was'. Related to calques are the many parallel proverbs, e.g.

Bulgarian: Vidjala žabata če kovat bivola, i tja navirala kraka.
Macedonian: Videla tebata deka bivolo go kovat i sama dignala nogaata.
Turkish: Ökste nån çarkadığını görmüş, karbağa da ayağını kaldırms.
Georgian: Badaurebisa čednën baqaqmac pexi ațvira.

"They were shoeing the ox/horse and the frog, too, lifted her leg"

In this connection, we even find the citing of whole proverbs in their Turkic form in both regions, e.g. in Bulgarian Bedava sirke baldan talti di (Ikonomov 1968:78), in Lakkia Havaja ssirka baldan širin (Abdullaev 1982:285) 'Free vinegar is sweeter than honey'. Although comparative work has been done with Balkan proverbs (Ikonomov 1968), as well as with phraseology (e.g. Papahgi 1908), it is clear that these parallels extend into the Caucasus as well. A key issue is the determination of specific isoglosses of correspondence.

The fate of Turksisms in modern Balkan and Caucasian literary languages is also instructive. In the Balkans, words of Turkish origin that have not become indispensably naturalized (e.g. ceb 'pocket' or archaic or historical (e.g. paga 'pusha', general) have been relegated to colloquial or low-style ironic (e.g. Macedonian demek vs. znati 'it means, that is to say'. seidrtija vs. svistedel 'witness'). In Dagestan, however, although some Turkish usage is characteristic of low style speech, e.g. Lak: topaŋul = Bulgarian: k'opolu [Turk köpekolu/kahpeolu 'dogmen/whoreson'], it is often the new Russianisms that are treated as

13 It is important to note that Georgian uses a marked confirmative (sorais), Albanian has an imperfect, and the other languages use an unmarked, nonconfirmative (perfect). These differences in choice of verbal paradigmatic categories reflects differences in their integration into the respective structures of the languages in question (cf. Friedman forthcoming).

14 The question of the relation of Central Asia to our proposed Balkan-Caucasian diffusion area is especially important but beyond the scope of this paper (cf. Masica 1976).