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One of the most important events of the last century is the establishment, in 1917, of the communist Soviet rule, which was claimed, by its enforcers, to be tried for the first time and to be a prospective milestone with its reflections in human history, and the consequent collapse of the same after a ruling period of 74 years. As in 1918 when the non-Russian peoples in Tsarist Russia, which started to rapidly disintegrate after the declaration of independence of the Finnish people in December 1917, parted from Russia and formed their national governments, a similar process was witnessed in the dissolution of the Soviet Union. Following the famous Belovezh Agreement signed by and between Leonid Kravchuk, Boris Yeltsin, and Stanislav Shushkevich in December 1991, the liquidation of the Soviet Union started, and the said process was completed in a rapid fashion with the meeting held in Almaty near the end of the same month. As of this date, the international community automatically recognized the Union Republics, which had already resolved upon independence, as equal members.

When we take a more impartial look at the Soviet Union today, it turns out that the communist Soviet rulers were not that different from the Russian noblemen that lived in the time of the Tsar, and, on the contrary, that there are many similarities between the Tsardom and the Soviet governments. In order to understand the Soviet rule and its deeds, one should first conceive the period of Tsardom. Therefore, it is of great significance to take such a historical continuity as a reference point for foreseeing the future of the Turkish Republics that became independent in 1991. One should mention that the Soviet nationality policy which, in its very essence, is a derivation of Tsarist Russian policies, has had great impact on the evolution of the political and social systems of the newly established ex-Soviet states, the Turkish republics in particular (Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, Turkmenistan and Azerbaijan). In ex-Soviet geography the crucial factor in the transition period today is undeniably political and social stability. Besides, territorial and/or ethnic conflicts stemming from the legacy of the Soviet era pose a serious source of instability for the future.

As mentioned above, in 1991 the Union Republics within the broader Soviet administrative system automatically acquired independence and were internationally recognised. Yet, the declarations of sovereignty and the dreams of independence were not merely restricted to the union republics this right of which was already reserved by virtue of the Soviet Constitution of 1977 but also encouraged rapidly the ethnic republics and the autonomous regions within the borders of the union republics. The country that was most affected by this situation was Russia. By the end of 1991, a significant majority of the 21 ethnic republics forming the Russian Federation of today declared their independence. Most of the Turkish republics who are underlined in the classification of this volume as “Federal and Autonomous Republics” are indeed these ethnic republics within the Russian Federation. Yet, Turkish republics and peoples with such legal rights are found not only within the Russian Federation, but extend from such other former Soviet republics as Moldova and Ukraine to Eastern Turkestan within the People’s Republic of China.

The most important two states established, after the Golden Horde, in the Turkish provinces in the North are the Khanates of Kazan and the Crimea. The Kazan Tatars lived under Russian domination as of the demise of the Kazan Khanate in 1552, and were forced to accept the administrative structures which were shaped under the initiatives of Russian regimes. The union republics were reorganized in the Soviet Union period territorially as well as administratively; the communist rulers avoided granting, to Tatarstan only, the status of union republic. And, each time, the petitions which were sent, to that end, by Tatarstan to Moscow particularly in the 1960s were ignored. Yet, against all odds, Tatarstan, even today, is one of the most important members of the international society. The Kazan Tatars have always been a people which must be monitored carefully due to their political and historical mission, and due to the rich natural resources of the geography they live in, and the intellectual background they sport.
Bashkortostan is another important ethnic republic which forms the Russian Federation like Tatarstan with whom it has close ties. Today, Bashkortostan is an important republic which must be closely monitored not only because it has the position and power to influence the policy of the Russian Federation, but also because it is an actor capable of influencing the course of international events due to the rich natural resources hidden in its geography.

The third ethnic republic whose name has become more audible recently in the routines of Russian politics is that of the Saha. Being the owner of a very important position in diamond production, the Saha Republic is eager to increase the activity by actively taking part in the debates in Russia over the structure of the federation.

And the Northern republics of Altay, Tuva, and Hakas constitute the republics where the other Turkish peoples in the Russian Federation live. Yet, all these three republics, which have become rich thanks to their natural resources, have such important problems of alcoholism and an unbalanced demographic structure.

The close ties of the Crimean Tatars with Turkey, which exist even today, date back to the year of 1475. And since 1783, the regrettable destiny of the Crimean Tatars has been closely monitored by the Turkish people. The most terrible stage of this tragedy was the exile of 1943. Crimean Tatars started to return to their homeland as of 1957, the efforts they made to that end had its impact in Turkey and collective sympathy of the Turkish people and especially from many Turks of Crimean origin. The problems that the Crimean Tatars have encountered are not over. The victims of the conflict between the Russian population in the peninsula and the Ukrainian government, and thus between Ukraine and Russia are, unfortunately, the Crimean Tatars who have, today, become a mere minority in their own homeland.

Being Orthodox Turks introduced to the Turkish public by the late Hamdullah Suphi Tanrıöver, the Gagauz Turks shall constitute another topic of this volume. We tried to elaborate comprehensively the debates as to which Turkish tribe the Gagauz people belong to, and their language which is much similar to Anatolian Turkish.

Eastern Turkestan shall constitute the last topic studied in this section. We made an attempt to reflect the current status and problems, and the culture of the Turks of Eastern Turkestan whose history and historic struggle was covered in detail in the previous volumes.

The peoples dealt with under the heading “Turkish Communities” are, in a sense, the signature of the Ottoman existence in different regions. It must be remembered that the area extending from the Caucasus to Middle East and the Balkans was Ottoman land until the beginning of the last century.

Out of these said regions, the Turkish existence in the Balkan Peninsula dates back to the times before the Ottoman State, yet the most permanent settlement policy was implemented in the Ottoman period. At the outcome of the holy wars which were first initiated at the frontiers with the expedition of Aydınoğlu Umar Bey in 1332, Turkish communities -which represent an undeniable fact of their affiliated country- have emerged today in a vast geography that extends from Western Thrace to Bulgaria, Macedonia, and Kosovo.

The same situation applies to the Middle East, too. But the Turkish existence in the Middle East which constituted an important route of the paths of migration of the Turkish peoples dates back to the times before the Ottomans, and presents a great deal of diversity. For instance, in Iran where the South Azerbaijani Turks are believed to constitute a major part of the population, there is a wide range of Turkish diversity from Kashkay Turks to Sungur Turks. In addition to Syria, there is also a considerable amount of Turkish/Turkmen existence in Iraq, notwithstanding the rather insisting efforts of the public opinion today to ignore them.

Presenting a complete ethnic mosaic, the Caucasus is another region with intensive Turkish traces. The Turkish communities of today’s Caucasus are the Karachay, Balkar, Nogay, Kumuk, and Ahuşka Turks, and the Turkmen people. The Karachays and the Balkars exist in the Russian Federation as ethnic republics (Karachay-Cherkess and Kabardino-Balkar).

On the other hand, there is a considerable Turkish existence in Turkestan, and especially in Afghanistan—which is nowadays at the top of the world agenda, Siberia, and the Lower Volga region where the Åstrakhan Khanate ruled until 1556.

The Turkish settlements around the world are constituted especially by the Turks who have migrated West in the 1950s due to economic reasons. Today, a great mass of Turkish people live in Europe—mostly in Germany, and in the United States of America, Australia, and even in the Russian Federation with whom our economic and cultural ties are getting stronger each day, and these people act as a bridge in our relations with these countries.

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

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

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

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

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

1. $i, u, ü \rightarrow t$ in word final position: *kutu*, *subaşı*, *köprü* > *kutti*, *subaşı*, *kprü*

2. The perfect (indefinite past) suffix -*mis* is invariant: *almiş*, *ölmiş*, *ülmiş*

3. $i > t$ in noninitial and closed final syllables: *evimin* > *evmin*

4. $ö > o' - o$ and $ü > u' - u$ in many words: *böyle*, *uç* > *boyle*, *uç*

5. In suffixes with low vowel harmony (e/a), one of the two forms is generalized: *yemişlar*, *alirse*

6. $ö > ü$ in about 40 words: *kprü*

7. Ottoman g is preserved consistently: *agaç*

8. Progressive in -*y* rather than -*yor*: *yapay*, *alaysın*.

(Németh considers the -*y* progressive to be derived from that in -*yor*, but Doerfer makes the point that it could be a preservation from Old Ottoman)

9. The fronting of *ik* and *g* to palatal affricates or stops as a possible ninth feature: *ikl gece > ilk 'ı g'eg'e* (Macedonia) or * içi cece* (Kosovo)

10. The loss of *ų*, especially in initial position: *hoca* > *oca*, also *daş > daa*, *tahmata > ta'atha*, *sabah > saba*

Subsequent modifications of Németh’s classification were proposed by Hazai (1964), who identifies Goce Delc’ev (Nevrekob) as transitional between east and west, and Mollova (1970) traces the isogloss for preservation of intervocalic *g*/*agaç* ‘tree’ versus *aag*, *a'ç* along a line from Dolni Ciba-r on the Danube to Samokov, moving thence in a southwestern direction north of Blagoevgrad (Cuma-ı Bala) and south of Koc’ani almost to S-tip then curving southeastward to go south of Radovis’ then running southwest again to Lake Prespa. When Hazai and Mollova were writing, however, works on other WRT dialects such as Jas’ar-Nasteva (1970), Katona (1969), Kakuk (1972), and Jasuf (1987) were not available. Jasuf (1987: 14-16) distinguishes five Kosovan groups - Prizen-Mamus*, Pris’tina-Janjevo, Mitrovica-Vuc’itrn, Pec’, Gnjilane-Novobrdo-Dobric’ane (see Hafiz 1985, Hasan 1987). Tryjarski (1976, 1990) notes the need for a revised picture of Balkan Turkish dialects, and raises the additional problem that different investigations were conducted at different times. Other studies are unpublished theses and dissertations at the University of Pristitina. The periodicals *Çevren* (Kosova), *Sesler*, and *Sevinç* (Macedonia) contain dialect materials and descriptions, and the Skopje newspaper *Birlik* occasionally publishes humor columns in Skopje, Gostivar or Prizren dialect.

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

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

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

A related phenomenon is the conditioned neutralization of the opposition *i/i* (Németh’s second feature). Kakuk (1972), Katona (1969), and Jas’ar-Nasteva (1969) make the point that Németh’s description does not correspond exactly to the situation in Western Macedonia. Kakuk (1972) describes five possible realizations of the unrounded high vowel for both back and front roots: high back unrounded, mid-unrounded, mid front unrounded - both closed and closed-short - and high front unrounded, e.g. *gelir/cärër – gele/ri/cărër* – *gele/ri/çärër* – *gelir/çärër* ‘comes/calls’. None of the Balkan contact languages has a high back unrounded vowel in their phonological inventories except southern Vlah, spoken in Epirus, Thessaly, and in eastern Macedonia. Albanian, northern Vlah, and most Macedonian and South Serbian dialects all have some sort of schwa, although its realization may vary. In Skopje both Macedonians and Turks have a vowel that is higher and further back than schwa and approaches [O (i-)].

Stressed schwa in Korça Tosk Albanian has a low, front, and open realization approaching [a]. Moreover, the west-central and peripheral southwestern Macedonian dialects as well as the Macedonian of the Debar region (but not Debar itself) lack schwa altogether (Friedman 1993). According to Katona (1969) the high back unrounded vowel is completely absent in some WRT, but Kakuk (1972) has contradictory data. In any case, *ụ̊/ụ̊*, Turkish /i/ in a systematically vulnerable position vis-à-vis the other languages of the Balkans with which it
is in contact. This is also the case in northeast Anatolian (see below).

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

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

The palatalization of /k/ and /g/ before front vowels, and especially the similarity of articulation in local WRT and Slavic and Albanian dialects, is probably influenced by contact. The greatest neutralization of the opposition between palatal and velar before front vowel occurs precisely where the same neutralization occurs in Slavic and Albanian, e.g. Kosova and Prilep. Moreover, the quality of the palatals in the WRT dialects is the same as in the non-Turkish contact languages. The automatic palatalization of velars before front vowels is characteristic of Standard Turkish, but the change from palatalized velars to palato-velars (k̡, g̡), palatal affricates (p̡š, t̡ʃ, d̡ʒ, d̡ʒ) or palatal stops (IPA ŋ, ʒ), while also a feature of northeast Anatolian Turkish, is characteristic of WRT on the Balkan Peninsula (Németh 1961), and Hafiz (1985), Ibrahim (1982), Jas’ar-Nasteva (1969), and Jusuf (1978) all identify this as particularly characteristic of WRT (cf. also Asim 1976, Kakuk 1972, Katona 1969, Zaja, czkowski 1968).

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

An unquestionable contact phenomenon in WRT is phonemic /ç/ = [ts], which occurs in all the relevant contact languages and is found not only in loanwords but also in productive affixes: lonats ‘cup’, isapo ‘goat’, dayits ‘aunt’ (< days ‘uncle’), okuşud ‘itsa (sokuyugu) ‘woman who invites one to a wedding’ (Jas’ar-Nasteva 1970). Final devoicing of /g, v, z/, e.g. yus for yız ‘one hundred’ (Jusuf 1987: 73) occurs in both Macedonian and local Albanian (not in Serbian).

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

Other phenomena reported by Jas’ar-Nasteva (1969) and Jusuf (1988: 67-68) as resulting from contact are loss of geminates (elliti ‘fishy’ > eltı) and tonalization of initial clusters (spanak vs ispanak ‘spinach’).

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

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

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

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

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

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

(1) Uşçup ‘e gidam (=Üskülb ‘e gidelim) (Jusuf 1987: 89) ‘let’s go to Skopje’

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

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

The reversal of genitive and head in possessive izafet constructions, e.g., familial adamın ‘the family of the man’ (Katona 1969: 165), babasi Aitnin ‘the father of Ali’ (Ibrahimri 1982) as opposed to Standard Turkish adamin familias, Ali’nin babasi, are patterned after the Indo-European contact languages, e.g. Albanian familje i njerit, babai i Aliut, Macedonian familijata na c’evok, taito mu na Ali. (Macedonian and Bulgarian also permit head-genitive word order, which is atypical for Slavic, e.g. na Ali taito mu.)

Morphosyntactical contact phenomena in the verb phrase reflect tendencies to eliminate non-finite forms and move in a direction from agglutination toward analyticity. Both tendencies are also characteristic of the Indo-European Balkan languages from which the WRT constructions are evidently calqued. These tendencies are realized by substituting the optative-subjunctive or conditional for the infinitive, by substituting lexical items or phrases for affixes of interrogation and negativity, and by replacing participial constructions with connectors plus finite verb forms.

Matras (1990, 1996) analyzes the origin and significance of the replacement of infinitival clauses by subjunctive ones in Macedonian WRT, a phenomenon that is well attested in WRT in general (Mollova 1968, Jas’ar-Nasteva 1970, Eckmann 1962, Kakuk 1960, 1972, Németh 1965: 97,109) as well as in East Rumelian Turkish and Gagauz (Mollova 1962, Guzev 1962, Mollov and Mollova 1966, Gajdz’s 1963, Pokrovskaja 1964: 210, 1979). The use of the optative-subjunctive or 3 sg imperative to express indirect imperatives and clauses of goal also occurs in other Turkic languages and dialects (Kakuk 1960, Mollov and Mollova 1966), but the far greater frequency and wider range of such uses in Balkan Turkish indicate the influence of non-Turkish Balkan languages. The expanded Turkish usage seems calqued from subordinate clauses in Macedonian and Albanian using the particles da and ñë, respectively, which can function in subjunctive, optative, and conditional contexts in their respective languages (see Friedman 1985). The following examples with expressions of necessity are typical of WRT usage and are given with their Macedonian and Albanian equivalents:
Particularly Balkan is the use of niçin 'why' to mean 'because' as well, this being a calque on colloquial usages of Macedonian zosto/zasto, Albanian pse, etc. as in the following example:

(12) Sijklımı, niçin pađișadan bir ay mektup yegimiş, (Kakuk 1972: 261) 'she was worried because she hadn’t had a letter from the padishah for a month'

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

(13) Bu cece celimem se çok var ışım (Yusuf 1977: 67) 'I can’t come this evening because I have a lot of work'

(14) Bu adamın karisi ışıp a çocuğu ufak kalmış, 'This man’s wife died, and left the little child'

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

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

(15) Babası Alinin her gün gider pazarı alıma, (Ibrahim 1982: 53) ‘Ali’s father goes to the market every day to buy apples’

(16) Acan idin Ohrıde (Zekeriya and Bugarić 1976: 14) ‘When were you in Ohrid?’
(17) Oynadilar çocuklar bütün cün sokakta 'The children played all day in the street' (Jusuf 1987: 132)

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

For neologisms, WRT print media are sometimes “more Catholic than the Pope.” A neologistic word may fail to gain currency in Turkey but be maintained in WRT print media, e.g. nen ‘thing’ versus the Standard Turkish Arabism şey (Teodosijevic’ 1987: 187). A lexical feature of colloquial WRT that is specific to its context is the reborrowing of words that the contact languages originally borrowed and subsequently altered. Thus the “Turkisms” of Macedonian and Albanian become “contact” elements in WRT when it reborrows them, as shown in the following examples:


(19) demirliya = demirli ‘iron’ (Bayram 1985)

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

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

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

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

This brings us to the question of Slavic versus Albanian influence and the sociolinguistic position of WRT. Particularly in Western Macedonia there is a strong competition between Albanian and Macedonian, one which is already attested at the beginning of this
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