Qu'elle s'exprime par la quête utopique de l'Age d'Or originel, d'une Héliopolis imaginaire, le Paraclet des élus, ou qu'elle se manifeste par l'écllosion des communautés égalitaires ou anarchisantes des pères, c'est toujours en définitive l'aspiration au royaume messianique qui n'est que la transposition symbolique d'un idéal nostalgique, celui du retour à une enfance mythique de l'humanité ou à une organisation révolue de la société, celle de la société non policée qui serait dépourvue de la rigoureuse structure de classes, telle qu'elle se présentait dans la société tripartite du Moyen Âge. C'est donc l'aboutissement et l'accomplissement de l'histoire qui revient à l'ére originelle, celle de l'histoire cyclique qui n'est qu'un recommencement perpétuel. Située dans l'espace géographique indéterminé d'une « terre heureuse », le royaume des Cieux corrigerait toutes les injustices et restaurerait l'égale primitive dans une société communautaire d'amour et de liberté, sans frontières ni restrictions, sans richesse et pauvres. C'est l'idéal dont le prolongement lointain, en passant par l'utopie sociale du XVIIIe-XIXe siècles, s'est trouvé son expression moderne dans l'eschatologie marxiste dont parle Georges Gurvitch.

Sur le plan des antagonismes fondamentaux du domaine socio-culturel et existentiel, la spiritualité chrétienne a conçu l'idéal du corps mystique de son être historique au sein d'un paradoxe qui pourrait être formulé comme: « l'Unité dans la Liberté ». Toute l'histoire du monde chrétien ne fait que mettre en évidence l'ambigu qui sépare les deux moitiés de vie qui est l'idéal toujours plus éloigné. Tant que persistait la faculté d'y croire, ce fut possible de promouvoir un idéal qui devint en restant bien en vue de toute action créatrice. Mais devant l'érosion de cet idéal, alors que la liberté fut sacrifiée à l'unité au vice-versa, les hommes se retrouvèrent dans le désespoir de la révolte, soit contre la vie en ce monde elle-même, soit en cherchant l'apaisement dans les cheminées du retour de l'Age d'Or d'un paradis perdu sur terre.
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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 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 today1. 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 Judeo-Turk, 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 significant vicissitudes in terms of numbers, meanings, and stylistic
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1 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.
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values. Not only have there been shifts in all of these areas, but in the current climate of social and political change, Turksisms 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 article, I shall examine the Turkish lexical component in the languages of the Republic of Macedonia, which is arguably located at the very heart of the complex multi-lingual contact that resulted in the Balkan linguistic league. The fate of Turksisms in the languages of Macedonia reflects the general Balkan situation but also displays unique developments that parallel the unique position of Macedonia in the Balkans. I shall concentrate on the evolution of the place and role of the Turkish lexicon in Modern Literary Macedonian followed by a comparison with Albanian, Romani, Arumanian (Vlah), Former Serbo-Croatian (FSC), and even Turkish itself. In so doing, I shall discuss how Turksisms have been manipulated to reflect and instantiate both linguistic and sociopolitical changes, especially in the course of recent developments.

Modern Literary Macedonian, which celebrated half a century of official recognition in August 1994, has been the subject of numerous specific studies dealing in whole or in part with its Turkish lexicon (e.g. Gorelov 1960; Jasjar-Nasteva 1962/63, 1963, 1966, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1974, 1978a, 1981, 1981/82, 1982, 1985, 1987, 1991; Friedman 1986, 1989a; Markov 1955, 1977, 1984; v. Schaller 1977). Turkish influence in Macedonian has also been discussed in other modern works on Turkish influence in the Balkans (e.g. Garnes 1987; Kappeler 1993; Kazazis 1972; Menkajla 1975; Schmaus 1970) as well as in other studies pertaining to Macedonian (e.g. Jasjar-Nasteva 1966, 1973b, 1974, 1978b, 1979, 1981, 1992; Koneski et al. 1981; Koneski 1965, 1983; Miovski 1982; Vidojksi 1951). For our purposes, all those words that entered Macedonian via Turkish are Turksisms. Thus, for example, although Turkish efendi "sir" (archaic) is itself from Greek αρχηγός, its presence in Macedonian is counted as a Turksism 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 the source of the word in other Balkan languages may be uncertain (cf. Boretzki 1975:136–169). Thus, for example, Ancient Greek mändallos "bolt" is the ultimate source of Modern Greek mäfti, Turkish mäft, Albanian mndal, mndall, FSC mndal, etc. The precise route by which this word entered the various modern Balkan languages, however, is most. 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 Turksisms or at least words associated with the Ottoman period, and this is how they function for purposes of this discussion.

Turksisms in Macedonian can be divided into productive loan suffixes, calques, and loanwords. To begin with the most obvious phenomena in suffixation, there are four suffixes which were unquestionably of Turkish origin and remain productive: 1) -djia/-dija (Tk dj, etc.) used to denote types of people; 2) -zja (Tk -dzi, etc.) used to form adjectives and descriptive nouns; 3) -lak (Tk -lik, etc.) used primarily for abstract nouns; and 4) -ana (Tk -hani) used for buildings.

The functioning of these suffixes can be seen in their use in three types of words: 1) Turkish, e.g. jabandija "foreigner" (Tk yapran); kusmetlija "lucky" (Tk kumeteli); javakalak "slowness" (Tk yavaklak); mehna "tavern" (Tk mihana). 2) native, e.g. dovzija "hunter"; vsija "lousy"; stusnikalak "matchmaking"; pisan "sawmill"; 3) recent loans, e.g. fikal - rept "soccer player"; pukdrtijalak "neighbor" (ironic), asistentalak "assistantship" (ironic), energalak "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 later (cf. Kazazis 1972).

Most other Turkish suffixes, e.g. -zik, -siz, etc., are in kapidžik "back gate" (Tk kapıkapıcak "door/little door"), arsaz "crook", teklišiz "unceremoniously", uguršiz "nogoodnik" (Tk koraz, telikiz, ugoraz), 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 entered 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 but) 1. "owl", 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. gekom "Hellenizer", bugroman "Bulgarianizer", srb-
These works demonstrate how Turkish vocabulary has penetrated every facet of Macedonian life: urban and rural, e.g. _dukan_ "shop" (džukan), _sokak_ "street, alley" (sokah), _ambar_ "barn" (hambar), _endek_ "ditch, furrow" (bendek); mundane and natural, e.g. _tavan_ "ceiling" (tavan), _şile_ "bottle" (šile), _zambuk_ "hyacinth" (zambuk), _şahitba_ "bedbug" (šabiti); intimate and abstract, e.g. _düzeg_ "liver, lungs" (čige), _badžanak_ "brother-in-law/wife's sister's husband" (bacanak), _rezil_ "disgrace" (rezil), _mušatel_ "conversation" (mušhubet). The degree of penetration of Turks into Macedonian reached its height during the nineteenth century. According to Koneski (1965:188–189), 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_ "sacrifice"; _kurtuluš_ "the Savior" (Tk _kurtuluš_ "save"); _sahibja_ "the Lord" (Tk _sahib_ "master"); cf. _Goli_ 1960, _Jašar-Nasteva_ 1970, _Miović_ 1980, Koneski/Jašar-Nasteva 1989. It was also during the nineteenth century, however, that intellectuals made the first efforts to halt the influx of Turks by reviving and introducing Slav 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. _knez_ felt the need to gloss _goršt_ "pride" with the Turkish _fudaluk_. Even _naf_ in the meaning of "nation" (for which the internationalism _nacija_ can now also be used) was glossed in the Turkish "mirtil." In this context we can also mention the semantic adjustment of Turks. Molova (1967:116) cited in Grannes (1987:248) makes a point for Bulgarian that is also valid for Macedonian, namely that the majority of Turks 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 _muhabel_ "love, affection, friendship, friendly chat" is taken into Macedonian and Albanian as _mušhab_ but with only the last meaning. Similarly, Turkish _habab_ "topic, subject, investigation, debate, theater" has only the last meaning in Macedonian as _bas_. Although in general Turks are associated with stylistic lowering in the twentieth century (cf. Kazazis 1975 and 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," when borrowed into Macedonian as _siktir_ is closer to the milder (albeit still rude) "scram" and can even be used humorously in the expression _siktirkapia_ "last cup of coffee served at the end of a visit, one for the road." Most of 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 Turkishisms for strictly practical reasons. Since Turkish was no longer the language of the state, many administrative terms, e.g. _tala_ "province," _kajmak_ "governor" etc. became obsolete. In everyday Macedonian speech, however, large numbers of Turks were still in regular use.
In the second stage (1944–1990), the early years of the codification of Literary Macedonian, 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 Macedonian translation of Molière's "Le Tartuffe" for being full of Turkisms, writing: "Toa znaci... da go smeti... iataniceniot poetski jazik na Moliera... do nivo na naseto balansko, kasabisko, tsarisko mukasitenje." "It means lowering the refined poetic language of Moliere to the level of our Balkan small-town marketplace shit-chat." (cf. also Ezhov 1932:211, Gost 1962, Markov 1955).

The process of replacing Turkisms involved three types of words: 1) Slavic, e.g. običaj for adet "custom"; znaci 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 Bägelsisen) for ujija "iron"; pasova for ajdisa "fit"; 3) so-called international (essentially, Greco-Latinate) words, e.g. informacija for abet "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 "Turkish kandadžija" goldsmith indicates a dealer in traditional jewelry while the Gallicism bijuterija "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 tavan is the standard word for ceiling, but the French plafon is used in abstract or figurative expressions such as plafon na cerite "ceiling," (cf. Koreski 1981:1, 1986). In some cases, the Turkism 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 nation.

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 -đišta, -lija, and -lak by suggesting replacements, e.g. lebar "baker" for jardadžija; četvar "washmaker" for kandadžija, etc. In an article in "Nova Makedonija" (NM) (21-X:83-7), a list of enterprises involved in the news story included the following: prodavač na zelenjak "vegetable sellers" (not zarezatoci); četvarari (not kandadžići); čebulšari "watchmakers" (not saštoci); jardadžići (vs lebari); skladarnici i lebolebnicini "sweet shops and roasted chestnut shops" (not šekerdžinci or lebilebnici rabotnici); i.e., in the language of the daily press, must but not all the replacements have taken hold.

In many ways, by 1990 the situation had become the reverse of what it had been a century ago or even half a century ago. Writers such as Kričkovski (1820) and Paščinovik (1845) had to gloss many of their Slavic words with Turkish equivalents, which were more familiar to ordinary people, but modern-day collec-
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"The Turkish loanwords in Macedonian by 1989 was essentially that described by Kazaris in 1972 for Balkan languages in general. Within the normative register there are those words which are both literary and colloquial standard and are not likely to be replaced, e.g. džeb "pocket," forgodan "like," various toponyms, e.g. Ciar (Tk čayjar "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 Kazaris is that of certain types of specialized terminology. Thus, for example, in the hobby of dove-raising (golubarstvo, itself a native term) Turkish terms are used for the names of different types of birds, e.g. ak kurak "white tail" karu kurak "black tail," beoz (Tk beyaz) "pure white," jija (Tk siyah) "pure black" (I am indebted to Dr. Vlado Čvetković for this information). This terminology can be treated as a technical subset of the colloquial standard.

There are the 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 -džišta, -lija and -lak which would not occur in the first and would be unlikely in the second. All these types are illustrated in various articles in NM, where Turkisms are manipulated to achieve these three effects. Thus, for example, in an editorial entitled Mal kar - goleni istori (NM 21-4:84-3) "small profit — large damages," the author, who is arguing against the legalization of raising goats in Macedonia, uses the Turkish kar for ironic pejoration and for linking the legality of goats to an oppressive past. 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 begakski prel zanimot na rasni zavojivočci "fleeing before the violence of various conquerors". Here, the choice of the Turkism zulum "violence" (versus literary nasilstvo) is a serious stylistic device evoking negative aspects of Ottoman rule in Macedonia.

Often articles using Turkisms for local color, i.e., as dialectisms, seek to conjure up images of the past, produce a humorous effect, or both. The former (local plus historical) is seen in articles such as one about the everyday life of the oldest generation in modern Macedonia Da se živeve so dikati (NM 22-11:825) "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 i dare nekakov istori... "he gave her [his wife] some sort of sign" (Tk istori versus literary znak). The old man himself is quoted using dialectal Turkisms, e.g. sekoj so svojot um i češta "each with his wits and fate (literary kasmot)". Combinations of local color and
humor are seen in articles about the lighter side of rural life, especially minor
domestic squabbles, e.g. pram mišter "I make conversation" (literary prslajm),
šo moži... ama s'zalje... "what could he do... but in the morning" (literary što
može) (NM 6-11:83:5). Sometimes an author uses Turksms simply to convey a
sense of the old-fashioned without quoting anyone, as in a local color piece about
an old man who ne pazari nadevacu emi i zarazat "gets fruit and vegetables
at the market" (Tk emi, zarazat "fruit, vegetable" versus literary ovoće, zelen-
čico) (NM 1-8:82:5).

Other times, the effect is purely pejorative, e.g. an article about the European
Economic Community Ekonomski Džin – političko džadž (Sabota 2-6:796)
"Economic giant – political dwarf" vs. Giganti vo zvgradba (Sabota 14-7:795)
"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 zakonidka "European Community")
sitting on a ledge looking out over a distant battle and conflagration. On his back,
the word pomatrat "observer" printed in neat white letters has been crossed out
in black and below printed in a handwritten style is the word vredština, a Turkism
with the same basic meaning, but with the connotation of "bystander, rubber-
neck". (NM 4-10:92:11) A particularly interesting phenomenon in the use of
Turksms for ironic-pejorative purposes is their coupling with very recent loan-
words – also used ironically – as in an article headline Biznes samo za džeparlik
(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 else-
where is the use of Turksms for regional identification. Thus, for example, nepe
"anyway, never mind" (Tk nepe) is perceived by speakers from Bitola as being
particularly characteristic of their region. This raises the question of the distribu-
tion of particular Turksms in Macedonian dialects, which still requires investiga-
tion.

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 Yılmaz Güney
(NM 7:9-82:5) did not contain a single word of Turkish origin, although the discussion
of witnesses and serious afforded ample opportunities. An article on Yuruk folk-
lore (NM 29-3:81:5; the Yuraks are a Turkish ethnic group living in the Štip-
Radošev region) used običaj "custom" (vs. Tk adê) and even the uncommon za-
bratska "kitchen", 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 Turkishisms in serious public discourse. Thus, for example, the term 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 Turksms in
literary normativization.

Although, as indicated earlier, there was a well of thought that favored the
retention of Turksms in the literary language both as a distinctive feature of Mac-
edonian and as a characteristic of colloquial speech, other scholars opposed the
incorporation of most Turksms on the grounds that their stylistic nuances were
unsuitably ironic, dialectal, or old-fashioned (e.g. Koneski 1945). The prolifera-
tion of Turksms in the press and other media and contexts in which the norm
is expected can be seen as an attempt to "democratize" Literary Macedonian via
colloquialization. The logic of such a tendency would be that since the literary
standard of the 1944–1990 period tended to eschew Turksms in formal contexts
while they continued to thrive in colloquial speech (cf. Koneski 1994), and since
the 1944–1990 period was characterized by a one-party system, the eschewing of
Turksms is a characteristic of monism. Thus the opposite tendency, i.e. the use
of Turksms in formal contexts, becomes a marker of "democracy."

The success of the trend to avoid Turksms has resulted in the need for folklore
collections to contain extensive glossaries of Turksms along with regional expres-
sions. The obstruction of some Turksms has progressed to the point that even
graduate students in Slavic philology do not know words like atija "clothes iron",
which were still in common use two or three decades ago. As indicated above,
Turksms have always been more common in informal styles than in formal speech
or writing, and the recent rise in the use of Turksms appears to be connected
with a tendency to colloquialize the literary language in opposition to establish-
ment norms. Although ironic usage still occurs, there are many serious uses in
a broader range of contexts, albeit many of these contexts are negative, e.g. Nema
veke besplana lekvarje! Njedrastčen primer e Valandovo kade momentalno
dari 85 osto od osigurite se lekvarja na vezerijaz. (NM 8:17:91:5) "There is
no more free health care! The most drastic example is Valandovo, where at the
time already 85% of those insured are being treated on credit. "The use of the
Turkism vezerija 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
serious in intent. However, Turksms are also being used more in positive contexts
as well, e.g. Tatujos dogodina nema da bide badijala (NM 1-11:92:3) "Next
year's tobacco will not be for nothing". Another new source of Turksms in the
news has been the increased attention focused on Islam and Islamic countries
such as Iran. Thus, for example, the word medli is routinely used to refer to the
Iranian parliament. This same word (medli) is used in English-language news ac-
counts, 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 com-
petition from Albanian. It thus seems that a combination of pluralist linguistic
politics and tensions with Albanian have contributed to a shift in usage and atti-
dute concerning Turksms 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.

* The fact that this reasoning is essentially syllogistic does not change its ability to affect
linguistic usage.
Turning now to Albanian we find essentially the same basic situation as in Macedonian. In both Macedonian and Albanian productive derivational suffixes based on Turkish, e.g. Macedonian -dëja, -dëk, Albanian -xhi-ca, -fell, are sources of variation both in older Turks that are replaced by formations using native material, e.g. Macedonian evërsa dëja or kondaradëja or Albanian képçar for kon- 
drekshi all meaning “shoemaker” (cf. English cobbler), and in their ability to pro-
duce new lexicon to compete with the old, especially at marked stylistic levels, e.g. Macedonian lvadhëja “hunter”, Albanian thabhetemeshki “goose-monger” and newer Macedonian majistadëk “masterpiece (of poor quality)”, Albanian avo-
kachtëk “advocacy” (regardless of the actual merits of the case), cf. also Albanian patriasqi “party hack” (FeV 29-VII-94:11) but njërzelëk “humaneness” (Tribuna-
Sh 20-VII-94:21). 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. graditqar “robber”, mundqar “hard 
worker” (see Boretzky 1975: 265–269).

There has been a significant puristic movement in Albania that has sought to 
eliminate as many foreign elements as possible, and Turksisms have been a particu-
lar focus of that campaign (cf. Kostallari et al. 1973). Although Albanian ling-
guists outside of Albania have tended to endorse developments and trends in 
Albania since the literary unification of 1968–1972, 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 (FeV 13-5-90:5) recommends using the Turkish ajkët “flat-
tron” (Tk ajkët) rather than native bëkur “iron” (both the metal and other mean-
ings) on the grounds that the use of bëkur to mean “flatiron” is a calque on the 
Romance languages. This could be seen as a tendency parallel to that which sought 
to endorse the use of Turksisms in the early years of the codification of literary 
Macedonian.

In Albanian, as in Macedonian, Turksisms are characteristic of colloquial style 
and are also used for pejoration, historical flavor, and local color. Thus, the Gëg 
dialect columns of “Flaka e vëllazëritë” (FeV) abound in Turksisms that are not 
found in the Standard Albanian dictionaries, e.g. mërrmë “pleased” (Tk mërmëm, 
Standard Albanian i kënaqurt; cf. also Boretzky 1976: 90). In the immediate pre-
and post-independence period (1990–1992) the Albanian-language press in 
Macedonia did not seem to manifest a significant expansion of Turksisms, but the 
use of Gëg in serious contexts appeared to increase. Thus, for example, an article 
titled Ditë e nate, pagumësi e prije “Day and night, sleeplessness and waiting” 
(FeV 7-7-91:8), describing the anguish of parents waiting at the Macedonian Red 
Cross in Skopje for news of their children sent to the front in the Yugoslav war, 
one of the parents was quoted in Gëg. It could be argued that this quotation was 
used for emotive purposes, but if so, it clearly shows that in such stressful situ-

7 Most items in -dëjë are Turkish. The chief exception appears to be words such as skëpa-
parr “person from Skrapar”.

8 Standard Albanian is based on the southern (Tosk) dialect region of Albania; most of 
the dialects of Macedonia and all those of Kosovo and Montenegro belong to the northern 
(Gëg) group.

9 It should be noted that the Gëg dialects of Kosovo and Macedonia belong to different 
subgroups than the northwestern type of Shkodër.

10 Kazis (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 FSC, 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 Montenegro, respectively, led to the spread of some 
Turksisms into regions that became part of subsequent Yugoslavia and Romania, e.g. 
parts of Croatia and Transylvania, where Turkish rule had been short and its influence 
minimal. A concrete example is the FSC word çështëti “grilled meat”. For colloquial 
Greek, a new source of Turksisms in the early twentieth century was the exchange of 
populations between Greece and Turkey, which began in 1923. In Romanii, 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.
the realm of oral communication. As in the other Balkan languages, Romani has borrowed not only lexical items but also productive suffixes, e.g. asjiv ‘asjivdžis “mill/miller” (cf. BORETZKY 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 BORETZKY 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 KAZAZ 1972:95).

A concrete example of the fact that Turkisms that have been stylistically lowered in the other Balkan languages (and even in Turkish itself) need not undergo the same transformation in Romani can be cited from the extraordinary census conducted in the Republic of Macedonia in June–July 1994. In accordance with article 35 of the census law, instructions for enumerators and census forms had to be made available in the six major languages of the Republic of Macedonia (see note 3). In the case of Romani (and Arumanian) the fact that the literary norm is still in the process of elaboration meant that the census documents themselves became part of the process of codification. Among the items to be enumerated were the number of baths and toilets in each dwelling. All those languages with established elaborate norms used euphemistic neologisms or recent borrowings as their official terminology on the census forms (P-2, VL8 and 9 in ANTONOVA 1994): Macedonian banja, klozet, Albanian banja, nesoqtor, Turkish banyo, banyo ayakvala, Serbian kupatilo, klozet. Except for the Serbian deverbal noun meaning “bathing place” all the words for “bath” are Latinate borrowings. The Macedonian and Albanian words for “toilet” are from the British (water)closet, while the Albanian and Turkish are neologisms that can be glossed as “necessarium” and “bath-foothole,” respectively. The Romani documents, however used the Turkisms hamami and keneft, respectively. Hamami is the standard Turkish word for “bath” but has come to mean “Turkish bath” or “public bath,” while the keneft is considered vulgar in Turkish as well as in the other Balkan languages. These terms serve as clear and concrete examples that the function of Turkisms in Romani is following its own path of development and is more resistant to stylistic lowering.

This difference of Romani from the other Balkan languages with respect to Turkisms may be reinforced by the fact that upon leaving India the Romans 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 Roman 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. laf (Tk laf) “word” (English Romani law but elsewhere vorba, voato, dama, thawali, etc.) Although the conscious attempt to eliminate Turkisms (or Arabo-Persianisms) in the Balkan literary languages has resulted in their stylistic lowering or marginalization (but, as noted above, this process is not necessarily irreversible), the same motivations need not apply to Literary Romani.

Moreover, 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 bakszis “luckless” is a Turkism in Macedonian (< bakszi), 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 awz “voice”) is based on Slavic glas meaning both “voice” and “vote” (cf. also the example from the 1994 census documents given above). 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/KEPES (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 zaman and probably entered Hindi via Persian.11

Arumanian and Megleno-Romanian both have significant Turkic lexical components (ATANASOV 1990:249–251, 1991; GOLAB 1984:195–261, CARAGU-MARGHIANU 1975). PASCU (1925:106–177) cites over 1000 Turkisms in Arumanian, although PUSCARU (1976:316) states that Megleno-Romanian has many Turkisms not found in Arumanian. 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, Arumanian is used in both print and mass media, but it is still primarily a language of oral communication, and as such the colloquial far outranks the literary in usage and frequency. The elaborators of an Arumanian standard could choose to preserve Turkish old-fashioned or eliminate them as non-typical or even as foreign, but at present the matter is not yet settled. Just as in Romani there is an Indicizing current of thought that favors the massive introduction of vocabulary from the Indic languages of India, so in Arumanian there is a Romanizing current. In

11 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: "Kiborri.” The proprietor beamed understanding and exclaimed: “Ah, chibiri!”
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In some respects, however, the Arumanian situation parallels Macedonian as opposed to Romani (or Albanian). Just as official Bulgarian policy continues to maintain that Macedonian is a dialect of Bulgarian and to deny the legitimacy and independence of the Macedonian language, so, too, there are Romanians who will insist that Arumanian is a dialect of Romanian. The lack of territorial contiguity between the Republic of Macedonia and Romania combined with the relatively small number of Arumanians in Macedonia renders these pressures and polemics less significant, but they could help reinforce a desire to differentiate Arumanian from Romanian by retaining Turkisms rather than adopting Romanianisms. For Arumanian, as for Romani, the 1994 Macedonian census forms provide a striking example of colloquial Turkisms preserved as literary forms. As mentioned above, the census documents themselves functioned as part of the codification of literary Arumanian. Like Romani, Arumanian used Turkisms for “bath” and “toilet” in census instructions and forms, viz. hamami and hala, respectively. The latter, from Turkish hala appears in Albanian as hale, where it is considered colloquial and would never be used in a formal government document. Thus we see a parallel process in Romani and Arumanian in which the closeness of the emerging norm to current speech favors retention of commonly used Turkisms without stylistic lowering or marginalization.

In the process of vocabulary building, all of the nascent Balkan literary languages of the nineteenth and first three-quarters of the twentieth centuries 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 KAZAZI 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 Balkan languages. For example, Turkish münasip (Arabic munsīṣib), Macedonian munasis, Albanian munassap “suitable” have been replaced, by wygan, zгоден, and pershëtshëm, respectively. Similarly the Turkish Arabicism millet “nation, people” has been replaced by native nacija in Turkish, narod in Macedonian, and koubë 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 “Terçiman” favor older Arabo-Persian vocabulary while left-wing publications such as the newspaper “Gumhuriyet” support Turkish neologisms (cf. FRIEDMAN 1988a, BOECHOTEN 1991).

It is even possible to speak of Balkan Turkisms in the Turkish dialects of Macedonia (West Rumelian). In this context, Balk Turkish refers to 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, 12

12 While this was implicit in the case of Romani, it was explicit in the case of Arumanian instructions to enumerators, which included a special last page with guide to the pronunciation of the orthography and a justification of the choice of symbols preceded by a brief statement on the significance of the census for the development of Arumanian.

13 From the nineteenth century to the end of World War One, during World War Two, and again since the outbreak of the Yugoslav War there have been linguists, politicians, and others who have openly attempted to break this paradigm via concepts such as Catholic Serb, Muslim Croat, etc. They are generally viewed merely as nationalists attempting to extend Serbian or Croatian territorial hegemony via assimilation.
difficult to predict. At least some Serbs in northern Macedonia identify with the FRY and will no doubt follow its course, but the Bosnian refugees may follow a very different course of development and shift language on the basis of religion. The topic merits careful future study.

Looking now at the commonalities and differences in the treatment of Turkisms in the languages of the Republic of Macedonia considered here, we can begin by observing that Macedonian and Albanian have had in common the attempt to restrict or marginalize Turkisms during most of the twentieth century. Many of these same words were 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 — was reduction (or shift)14 of the commonality of lexicon that has been one of the characteristics of the Balkan linguistic league.

A recent tendency toward colloquialization in Macedonian and conservatism in Turkey (cf. Boshchoten 1991), however, is currently altering this direction. Just as in other ways the century seems to be ending the way it began,15 so too, Turkey and Turkish are being rehabilitated to positions of influence and status in Macedonia. The situation for Albanian appears to be parallelizing the Macedonian. Turning to Romani and Aromanian, we see that the very fact of non-codification has left the Turkish component in the lexicon in much the same position as that found in other Balkan languages before codification. Both Romani and Aromanian have the potential for similar puristic and neologizing tendencies, but at present they are still close enough to their colloquial bases to utilize many Turkish loans. Romani even calques from Slavic using Turkisms, while Aromanian may use Turkisms at least to some extent to resist Romanization. In FSC, Turkisms are playing a uniquely differentiating role. While Croatian follows a path of extreme purism and Serbian continues with the type of stylistic differentiation seen during most of the twentieth century, Bosnian has chosen to move very consciously in the opposite direction and has selected Turkisms as a banner of identification, in a manner not altogether dissimilar from that suggested by one stream of Macedonian intellectual thought right after World War Two, albeit with different ideological underpinnings (i.e. identity with Islam added to the creation of differential solidarity).

The difference between the relationship of Turkish to the languages of Macedonia (and elsewhere in the Balkans) and that of English to Japanese 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 languages of Macedonia is still flexible. Although the pattern for most of the twentieth century has been to reduce the commonalities among the Balkan languages by various means including the elimination or restriction of Turkisms or Arabo-Persianisms, tendencies of the past few years indicate that such a trend may not be irreversible. Nonetheless, Turkisms in the languages of Macedonia (and elsewhere in the Balkans) remain firmly identified with colloquial speech. Their fate is thus directly tied to the negotiation of the position of the colloquial in standardization, although in the case of Bosnian, the type of revival under way puts Turkish in a position much more similar to that of French or Chinese noted above. We see this in the role of politics in determining linguistic status.
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It goes without saying that the "Proto-" in the above name was not used either by or for the people referred to themselves, but is only used nowadays to distinguish them from the modern Bulgarians, who in part are descended from them. The first historical reference to such a people dates back to the year 480 AD (Sinor 1990: 238); the name probably means something like "mixed", a reference to the fact that they consisted of relics of the defeated Huns, Turkish Ogur, Kutrigur and other tribes, which roved between the steppes north of the Caucasus and the Balkan Peninsula; in the year 515 they are mentioned as living on the river Volga. The great majority of the scholars dealing with them assume that the Huns were a sort of Turks (Altheim 1962:279), and indeed all the titles which have been handed down, usually in a somewhat hellenized form, can be interpreted on the basis of the oldest Turkish texts, in particular the inscriptions on stone found in the Orkhon valley in present-day Mongolia, dating back to the 8th century. Some of these titles are *buna*, ultimately the source of the Russian word "boyar", *boyar tarkan* and so on. The title of the Proto-Bulgarian commander of their garrison town of Belgrade (the "white", i.e. westernmost - according to the Altaic color scheme for the four points of the compass - city of the Bulgarian Empire), who hospitably received St. Method's disciples after they had been expelled from the city of Morava (= Sremska Mitrovica) after his death in 885, is given in the Greek sources the title of *Boridakanos*, in Old Turkish *börü targa*: the first part of which means "wolf", thus in Konstantinos Porphyrogenetos (p. III). However, for fairness' sake I should mention that other scholars think the Huns constituted a separate Altaic group, somewhere between Turks and Mongols, or that at any rate we should be careful in attributing an ethnic definition to them (Prtsak 1982: 439). I see that latterly L. Dimitrova-Todorova simply classifies Hunnic toponyms in the district of Popovo, Bulgaria, as being of Turkish origin (1993:39).

It is well known that at some time in the 6th century the Proto-Bulgars split up into a northern and a southern group, the former of which ultimately settled on the Volga roughly in the area of Kazan', where they continue today as the Chuvash people, with whom we shall not be concerned here. The southern group settled first in Daicia, from where they raided Byzantine territory, and ultimately crossed en masse over the Danube into the East Roman Province of Moesia inferior under their Khagan Asparuch (or similar) in the year 679, and remained there. It is not reported that they in any way persecuted the Slavs living there at a former Avar border, but no doubt they kept themselves at first apart, with their language and their customs. The last ruler of the Proto-Bulgarian dynasty still born a hesthen was Boris, which is an Altaic name; he ruled from 852 until 889, renamed Michael (Dvornik 1970: 51), adopted Christianity and killed off fifty of his recal-