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CHAPTER 1

From Orientalism to Democracy
and Back Again
Turkish in the Balkans
and in Balkan Languages

Victor A. Friedman

University of Chicago

Although the concept of substratum influence was crucial in the early conceptualization of the Balkan linguistic league, and, moreover, the current emphasis of contact linguistics as well as Trubetzkoy’s (1923) original formulation both stress grammatical convergences as the defining phenomenon of the Balkan Sprachbund, it is arguable that the shared lexical component which entered the Balkan languages via Turkish – itself the result of centuries of Turkish political and social dominance in Southeastern Europe – is the more salient unifying factor in terms of the way ordinary people think about language. This was emphasized by Kazazis (1972: 89) in his classic article on the status of Turkisms in the Balkan languages, where he observes: “Turkish linguistic elements constitute a common denominator (not the only one to be sure) for the spoken form of all the Balkan languages. Turkish further reinforced the Balkan linguistic union (Sprachbund) in certain respects such as vocabulary and ‘phraseology’ [...]”. Kazazis’ anecdotal account of the way speakers of different Balkan languages compare Turkisms such as food names (e.g. imam balyldi, Gk imám bályldi, Blg imam balyldi ‘eggplant casserole’) and obscenities (e.g. past Gk poistis, Blg pasti ‘catamite’) crystallizes the popular view of Turkish as a Balkan common denominator. At the same time, the status of Turkisms (and Turkish) has risen and fallen and risen again in response to external events. In this paper, I shall examine the symbolic deployment of Turkisms as signs in various types of linguistic ideologies, i.e. in the ideas
that people have about language and language use (cf. Silverstein 1979: 193). I shall show that Turkish continues to be a site for the exercise of lexical and symbolic power, contestation, and compromise in the Balkans even ninety years after Turkey in Europe was reduced to eastern Thrace, but that symbolism varies according to circumstances.

The penetration of Turkisms into the Balkan languages reached its zenith during the nineteenth century owing to the migration of rural populations to urban centers, where Turkish was the language of commerce and prestige (cf. Koneski 1965: 187-189). Under the Ottomans, şehiri ‘town dweller’ was a privileged tax category that required a minimum of forty years residency, and knowledge of Turkish was de facto a part of acquiring this desirable status (cf. Akan Ellis 2003: 2). Turkish was thus not only the language of the marketplace and inter-ethnic communication but also the language of urban sophistication and privilege. In Balkan Slavic, Turkish even penetrated the realm of Christian religious terminology, which, given the identification of Turkish with Islam, should have been the realm of the lexicon most impervious to such influence. Thus we find in nineteenth century Balkan Slavic texts kurban ‘Eucharist’ from Turkish kurban ‘sacrifice’, kurtulija ‘the Savior’ from Turkish kurtul- ‘save’, suhića ‘the Lord’ from Turkish susuk ‘master’ (cf. Gelb 1960, Koneski & Jasa-Nastaeva 1989). The earliest writers of Balkan Slavic often felt it necessary to use Turkish glosses for the Slavonicisms they were attempting to introduce into the emergent literary language[s]. This was especially true with abstract nouns, e.g. Joakim Krčoški felt the need to gloss gordost ‘pride’ with the Turkish foduluk, and even narod in the meaning of ‘nation’ was glossed with the Turkish millet. This reflects the position of Turkish in the vocabulary of those Balkan Slavic speakers who were in a position to acquire literacy. The prestige of Turkish in Balkan towns led to code-mixing to such an extent that Ivan Vazov described urban dialects of Bulgarian in this period as polustarka ‘half-Turkish’ (Vazov XIX: 355).

1 Here I use Balkan Slavic to refer to the nineteenth-century ancestor of both literary Bulgarian and literary Macedonian. Writers of this period generally called their language Bulgarian, but the term was not associated with the modern nation-state of today, hence my choice of a term with strictly linguistic nuances. Early writers like Joakim Krčoški (whose dialect was from the Kratovo-Kriva Palanka region of northeastern Macedonia) were attempting to promote a colloquially-based literary language in opposition to both Greek and Church Slavonic. From the point of view of language ideology and the development of modern standard languages, writers such as Krčoški have a place in the history of both modern Macedonian and modern Bulgarian, albeit of differing significance for the different modern standards.

2 References to Vazov are by volume number in the 1956-57 edition of his collected works.

3 In Cepenkov’s tales, a Macedonian-speaking Christian is a Bugarin, a Macedonian-speaking Muslim is a Pomak or a Turc, the Turkish language is called turecki, and the Macedonian language is called našinski or bugarski. I have chosen Macedonian rather than Bulgarian or Nazinski as the label for the Slavic language in question here because this first term reflects both the local provenience of the dialect and the fact that it is non-standard. Moreover, the modern language of which Cepenkov’s tales represent a dialect is Macedonian rather than Bulgarian. The problem can be compared to deciding on the temporal divide between late Gallic Latin and Old French. Cepenkov’s jokes differentiate Sop from Bugarin. The term Torbel refers to Macedonian-speaking Muslims from Mijačija, in the Debar region.
generally the Macedonian-speaking Muslims of Tikveš, a mountainous region to the northeast of the Prilep plain. Given the dominance of Turkish in the towns and the fact that Tikveš is a relatively undevolved or agricultural region, it is arguable that part of the mockery in these jokes expresses the tension between urban and rural dwellers rather than between Turks and Christians per se.

Still, while Turkish functioned as a marker of urban identity in the Empire, in rural areas it also functioned as a marker of Muslim identity among groups who adopted Islam without language shift. This is especially salient in the case of Slavic-speaking Muslims (Pomaks and Torbeš) as well as Albanian-speaking Muslims. Thus, for example, in the dialects of Slavic-speaking Muslims, as well as in standard Albanian and the dialects on which it is based, certain Turkish kinship terms replaced or were added in alongside ancient Indo-European ones, e.g., in Albanian baba ‘father’, đaje (Turkish dayv) ‘maternal uncle’, halle (Turkish hala or hale) ‘paternal aunt’, possibly also xhaqua (Turkish amfaca) ‘paternal uncle’, similarly, Bosnian baba, đaja, đajaža, hala, amida. Similarly, the Pomaks and Torbeš of Macedonia and Thrace often use Turkish numerals (cf. Vazov X: 176).

The late Ottoman period, in addition to seeing the development of nationalism and the urbanization of rural populations was also the period of “orientalism” in the West, with the Balkans constructed as a European variant on the theme of the Oriental “other” against which Western Europe could define itself (cf. Todorova 1994, Bakčić-Hayden 1995; also cf. the title of Dako 1919). During this same period, Miklošič’s (1884-90) path-breaking work laid the foundations for the study of Turkish lexical elements in the languages of Eastern and Southeastern Europe. It is ironic that the period that saw the largest influx of Turkish lexic into the Balkan languages was also the beginning of organized efforts to eliminate that vocabulary.

The rise of Balkan standard languages saw the fall of Turkisms. By recursively internalizing West European notions of the “oriental”, the Balkan elites that controlled the standardization of their respective languages banished most Turkisms to colloquial and ironic registers (although a few were thoroughly integrated, while others became archaic or dialectal). This process—explicitly labeled deorientalizacija by some Bulgarian scholars (Grannes 1996: 134)—was repeated in each standard as it achieved stability, and in some cases continued long after that period. In Bulgarian, for example, Ivan Vazov—whose status as a prominent writer gave him significant influence on the formation of the literary language (Grannes 1996: 85, which cites various Bulgarian sources)—for the most part opposed the use of Turkish vocabulary, especially in literature. However, he also opposed the radical purism that would have eliminated all traces of Turkish from Bulgarian and allowed for the retention of Turkisms that, in his words, imat pravo na graždanstvo u nas ‘have citizenship with us’ (Vazov XIX: 89). He criticized translations that made, in his opinion, excessive use of Turkisms saying that the implication that Bulgarian lacks equivalents namaga smatra obida na narodoto ni samoljubie ‘morally offends our national pride’ (Vazov XVIII: 696). Elsewhere, Vazov (XVIII: 373, 593, 696) refers to Turkisms as dumi čuđi i loši ‘nasty foreign words’, bez měda naturjani ‘unnecessarily inserted’, ulični dumi, ‘street words’. Given that Vazov was criticizing published works, it is clear that some Bulgarians either favored the use of colloquial language in writing, or, on occasion, were even unaware that a given word was of Turkish origin (Vazov XVIII: 496).

Five decades later, the same process was repeated for Macedonian, despite a current of thought among some intellectuals maintaining that Turkisms should be encouraged and preserved because they were characteristic of folk speech and also emphasized Macedonian’s differentiation from the other Slavic standard languages. Using the same tone as Vazov’s, Koneski (1945) criticized the use of Turkisms in a Macedonian translation of Molière’s Le Tartuffe in the following terms: Toa znaci [...] da go snizis [...] istančenot poezets jazik na Moliiera [...] do nivoto na našeto balkansko, kasasko, čaršiško muzabente [...] da go vulgaritira do nemajkade (“It means [...] lowering [...] the refined poetic language of Molière [...] to the level of our Balkan, small-town, marketplace chit-chat [...] vulgarizing it to the nth degree”). It is interesting to note that even at the beginning of the twentieth century, when the movement for a separate Macedonian literary language had no state support and was opposed by such state forces as did exist, there is 4

4 It may well have been true of Hellenophone Muslims such as the Vallabades of the Bistra valley in Southeastern Aegean Macedonia (de Jong 1992) as well as Aromanian and Megleno-Romanian Muslims such as the Megleno-Romanians of Nàfe in Aegean Macedonia, who were sent to Turkey in the exchange of populations of 1923 (Atanasov 1990: 6), or the Muslim Aromanians of Dolna Belica, who are now Albanianized. Necessary data are lacking, however.

5 During periods of anti-Turkish sentiment in Bulgaria, for example during the 1980s, one way of erasing (cf. Gal & Irvine 1995) the impact of Turkish was by producing dictionaries of Arabic and Persian loan-words in Bulgarian, conveniently omitting the fact that these all entered via Turkish. A similarly ideologically motivated move is to be found in works claiming that proto-Bulg (the language of the group that crossed the Danube in 681 and established a state on the territory of modern Bulgaria) was an Iranian language despite the fact that in serious scholarly circles it is well known that the language was Turks and is related to modern Chuvash.
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evidence of a policy of replacing Turkisms with Slavic formations among those who advocated standardizing Macedonian as a separate language. In this regard, Dimitrović (1966: 162) comments on the lack of Turkisms in Misirkov’s (1903) Macedonian separatist manifesto Za makedonštite raboti ‘On Macedonian matters’, observing that the book’s Macedonian is a kind of Sloveniziran zaraden jazik ‘Slavicized popular language’. Indeed, in my own count of Turkisms in that book, there are only 16 Turkish words in 142 pages, and this includes words pertaining to the Ottoman state such as sultan and sandžak ‘district’. Of these 16, only one – esap ‘account’ – occurs more than once.

Twenty years after Koneski’s criticism of Turkisms in Macedonian formal style, the campaign was still going on in Albanian, and Kranjči (1965: 150, cited in Kazazis 1972: 94) wrote that the elimination of Turkisms was “një detërë patriotike, një detërë për të gjithë” ‘a patriotic duty, a duty for everyone’. A decade later, ideologies of purity and register were still being articulated for Modern Greek as seen in Dizikirikis (1975), whose message is summarized by Kazazis (1977: 302-303):

[...] depending on their origin, loan-words differ as to the degree to which they defile a language. Thus, the Romans, the Franks (‘medieval’ West Europeans’), the Venetians, all left their linguistic (read: lexical) imprint on Greek. Those were, however, civilized nations, so that their loan-words into Greek are not much of a disgrace and do not wound the ‘linguistic dignity’ of the Greeks as Turkish loan-words do (6ff. and passim). The latter are a shameful reminder of the centuries-long abject subjugation of the Greek nation to a culturally undistinguished people, the Turks.

Similar arguments can be found for Romanian (Kazazis 1972: 92-93 and references therein, cf. also Close 1974: 119, 154, 199, 214, Žagra & Kaminska 2003).

Even Turkish itself eliminated many of these same Balkan Turkisms in the course of its twentieth-century puristic movement, since a large number of them were ultimately of Arabic or Persian origin and were therefore considered foreign to Turkish as well (see Kazazis 1972: 93-94). We thus have the interesting situation in which the same terms are considered archaic in both Turkish and in the Balkan languages. For example Turkish münasip (< Arabic munāṣib), Macedonian and Bulgarian munašip, Albanian munašip ‘suitable’ has been replaced, buy șugun, zgoden, umesnen, and përshtatshëm, respectively.

The treatment of Turkisms in the former Serbo-Croatian represents a special and interesting case. Both during the formative period of the nineteenth century and in modern times, a characteristic distinguishing Croatian from Serbian language attitudes has been that Croatian has followed the German and Hungarian model of creating neologisms whereas Serbian has been more tolerant of foreign loans already in the language and receptive to new ones. To be sure, this does not mean that there was a complete absence of purism in Serbian language planning. As Kolićević (1980: 344) notes, Vuk Karadžić intervened lexically in his first (1814) collection of folk poetry, replacing Turkisms with Slavic forms. In his second collection (1815), however, Vuk left such words alone. Jašar-Nasteva (1988) points out that although in the preface of his 1818 dictionary Vuk distinguished among Turkisms that should be replaced, Turkisms that are rare (archaic), and Turkisms that ought to be retained, his attitude towards Turkisms was generally tolerant, especially vis-à-vis competing vocabularies such as Church Slavonicisms. Hertty (1980) also documents Serbian purism – including negative attitudes towards Turkisms – during the second half of the nineteenth century. Nonetheless, as Kazazis (1972: 88) notes, on the whole Serbian has not focused on Turkisms as an object of extirpation with the same vigor as found in other languages in the Balkans. There are two explanations for this. The first is that Vuk’s explicit ideology of piše kako govoris ‘write as you speak’ favored basing the standard on colloquial speech, and throughout the ex-Ottoman Balkan Turkisms have been (and to a certain extent remain) characteristic of the vernacular. The second reason is that, in the case of Serbian, an ideology of basing the standard on the colloquial would perceive greater threats from German and Russian. German was the language of Austria, which was the conduit of modernization but also a hegemon competing with Serbia over filling the vacuum left by the retreating Turks. Russian (which includes here Church Slavonic as a major source of vocabulary in the literary language) was implicated in Slaveno-Serbian, the literary standard of Serbian elites against whom Vuk was struggling for the accep- tance of a standard based on the colloquial. Nonetheless, the Eastern Variant of post-World War II Serbo-Croatian did not appear to differ significantly from other languages to the south in the number and position of Turkisms in its vocabulary. Thus, for example, Skaljiić’s (1966) dictionary of Turkisms in Serbo-Croatian contains 6,878 headwords while Grames, Rå Hauge & Suleymanoğlu’s (2002) dictionary of Turkisms in Bulgarian contains 7,427 headwords. Works such as Jašar-Nasteva (2001) for Macedonian and Boretzky (1976) for Albanian have smaller totals of words (between 3,000 and 4,000 each), but the literary and dialectological corpora as well as secondary sources that they had to draw upon were also considerably more limited in both quantity and 6 See also Cooper 1989 on Vuk’s use of neologisms in his 1847 translation of the New Testament.
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time span. It is thus not unreasonable to hypothesize that if equivalent bodies of work were available, the totals would be fairly similar.

A manifestation of the hostility that both contributed to and is reflected by the delegation of many Turks to a lower register is the phenomenon that can be called 'say it in Turkish jokes'. The joke consists in rhetorically asking the listener how to say a given word or phrase in Turkish and then supplying a collocation of Turks which renders the concept in an approximate way that implies an imperfect grasp of a modern concept. Thus for example, radio 'radio' is güruldu kuti (Turkish gürültü kütü) literally 'noise box', liçena karta 'state-issued personal photo-identification card' is surat tapjja (Turkish surat tapu) 'face legal-document', and passport is dzen surat tapjja (Turkish cihan 'world') 'world face document'. It is worth noting that in the West Rumelian dialect of Turkish spoken in Macedonia, high vowels in final open syllables all become front and unrounded (u, ư, i, î > i). Since high vowels in general are excluded from final position in the nominative singular in Macedonian (and other Slavic languages), except in the most recent loan-words, Macedonian integrated local Turkish words ending in ü/ by adding suffixal -/j/. Thus, for example original tapu becomes dzen tapjja and is integrated Macedonian as tapjja. Of the Turkish items employed in the given examples, güruldu and kuti are thus dialectal Turks while tapjja is a Macedonian form. This phenomenon is similar to what Hill (1993, 2001) has called 'Mock Spanish' or 'Junk Spanish', i.e. a humorous use of Spanish lexical items, grammatical or derivational affixes, and collocations in English as a humorous means of signaling the subordination of Mexican-Americans. As Hill (2001: 84) observes: 'Mock Spanish, and elite racist discourse in general, seems to oscillate along the boundary between 'public' and 'private' talk, making the public reproduction of racism possible even where racist discourse is supposedly excluded from public discussion'. The genre of 'say it in Turkish' jokes also reproduces a subordinating discourse, but it is aimed at a language that was itself the subordinator less than a century ago and one that still carries prestige, especially among Muslims and the oldest generation in general. The 'say it in Turkish' jokes, however, by targeting relatively modern concepts, also seek to position Macedonian as

more modern vis-à-vis Turkish. A related phenomenon is noted by Kazazis (1975), who describes the reactions of speakers of Modern Greek to a textbook of Ancient Greek for Turkish-speakers. Because Ancient Greek vocabulary is associated with the highest register of puristic Greek (katharevousa) on the one hand, while words of Turkish origin are associated with the lowest register of demotic Greek (dimotiki) on the other, the use of Turkish glosses for Ancient Greek vocabulary—quite unmarked in the Turkish-speaking context for which the book is intended—produces an effect much like that of the 'say it in Turkish' jokes in Macedonian.

Nonetheless, in Macedonia, Turkish continued as the language of prestige among urban Muslims, as well as older urban families in general, well into the twentieth century, and to some extent continues in this role even today. In 1973, the Turkish consul in Skopje, who spoke excellent English, told me that he had no need to learn Macedonian, because if he should become lost or need help he would simply find someone over the age of fifty, and they would be sure to know Turkish. This was at a time when rural immigration to the cities was significant, but the older generation tended to remain in the villages, and thus the oldest generation in the towns still represented the urban population for whom knowledge of Turkish was a part of city life. Although Albanian supplanted Turkish among some urban Muslims in Macedonia in the last decades of the twentieth century (it had always been strong among the rural Muslim population), the prestige of Turkish has been regaining ground to some extent, and thanks to programs from Turkey available via satellite television, many urban Muslims in Macedonia can control standard Turkish in addition to the local West Rumelian dialect. It is also the case that during the Yugoslav Wars of Succession, when Macedonia was suffering under the double burden of sanctions against Serbia (its erstwhile chief trading partner) and the illegal Greek embargo, Turkey played an important role as a major trading partner, a fact of which Macedonians were cognizant and for which they were grateful. This combined with a perceived threat from Albanian contributed to a positive attitude toward Turkish among many Macedonians.

Turksmans manifested a significant expansion in the national languages of those Balkan countries that experienced the political transitions of the 1990s. Since the inception of those changes in Albania, Bulgaria, Macedonia, and Romania, Turksmans have been deployed in more formal contexts, especially the press—and in particular the tabloid press—as an index of oppositional democracy. This deployment is

---

1 It is worth noting that Macedonian liçna is derived from lice which means both 'face' and 'person', while Turkish surat has only the first of those two meanings.

2 Surat is not distinctive, since it ends in a consonant and does not involve any changes, while dzen < cihan involves a loss of intervocalic /u/ which is both Macedonian and dialectal Turkish. The fronting on /u/ to /i/ under the influence of /i/, however, looks like a Turkish dialectism rather than a Macedonian adaptation. In any case, these two words do not carry the same clear markings of provenance as those cited in the main body of the text.

3 See Akan Ellis (2003) for an excellent account of ježili and Ottoman identity in Modern Macedonia; see also Ira Lanker 1993.
associated with earlier debates on the position of Turkisms in the norm. Under the communists, Turkisms were discouraged in formal contexts and politics was characterized by a one-party system. Thus the use of Turkisms in formal contexts becomes a marker of "democracy". Krâstaeva (2000: 8-9), writing about the Bulgarian daily press – especially the yellow press – offers a different but related explanation, arguing that the use of Turkisms, especially in headlines, has the effect of rendering the news "hot", shocking, vital; in effect – newsworthy. She compares the 1990s to the 1880s and 1890s, when Bulgaria was going through the transition to autonomy and independence after the Russo-Turkish War. During this period, too, she argues, there was a rise in the frequency of Turkisms in the press. According to her argument, Turkisms have exactly the same valency today that they had a century ago – emotional-affective, familiar, intimate, colloquial – but that the use of such vocabulary in the press expresses a negative attitude to the object of the news report, the intent being to influence public opinion and manipulate facts during a period of uncertainty and crisis. Herbert's (1966: 152) observations of the prevalence of Turkish in Bulgaria can also be seen in this light. By contrast, Râ Hauge (personal communication, 10 October 2003), notes that after 1991 Russisms took the place of Turkisms as low register items, and Turkisms were concomitantly raised. These arguments are not unrelated, however, given that the rise of a yellow or tabloid press is associated with the freedom of information characteristic of a democracy and forbidden under the communists, while Russian is associated with the communist period.10

It is worth noting that language institutions which received state support under the communists and that continue to depend on government subsidies have been remarkably conservative in continuing the linguistic ideologies of the earlier period. Thus, for example, the entry for the Turkism kavarma 'a kind of meat stew' in volume VII of the most recent Academy dictionary of Bulgarian (1993) labels the word 'dialectal', although, as Grannen, Râ Hauge & Silkýmanoglu (2002: 18) point out: "the word is found on the menus of fine restaurants in the capital and all over Bulgaria".11 They treat the word as neutral, and point out that the labeling on the Academy's part is more prescriptive than descriptive.

The most salient exception to this new rise of Turkisms, however, has been on the territory of the former Serbo-Croatian (now Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian, or BCS), where Turkisms have taken on a different significance as a positive marker for Bosnian and a negative one for Croatian. Even before the Wars of Succession, however, in a manifestation of recursiveness (Gal & Irvine 1995), Turkisms were associated with Serbian in Croatian and with Macedonian in Serbian. Speakers were aware of the ironies of this semiotic process, as illustrated by a Serbian joke from former Yugoslavia in which a Serb tells a Macedonian: "Mi Makedonci uporedbljavate mnogo turcizama, a mi Srbi, joki? "You Macedonians use a lot of Turkisms, but we Serbs, yolk (a Turkish meaning 'no, not at all, no way', perceived as especially common in colloquial Serbian usage)". At the same time, this humor points to the fact that Serbs see themselves as using Turkisms. This is in contrast to Croatian, which, even during the Second Yugoslavia, produced an anti-Turkish discourse (e.g., Junke 1965), which in turn can be taken as an encoding of Turkisms as "Serbian".12

If anti-Turkish rhetoric was a manifestation of Croatian resistance to Serbian, Turkisms have become symbolic in the breakdown of BCS into at least three literary languages since 1991. This breakdown helps reflect and reify the disintegration of the former Yugoslav society. Language planners and others on BCS-speaking territory utilize the encouragement or discouragement of BCS Turkisms as one of the means of increasing the differentiation of the codified norms or literary languages currently developing out of BCS. These attempts are directly connected with the political will to establish the separateness and identity of the nation and state via language. Bosniac nationalists utilize Islam as the religion of national identity, and Bosniac language planners are attempting to restate as much as possible of the Turko-Arabo-Persian lexicon of previous centuries, when Islam was the state religion of Turkey in Europe. Meanwhile, although Serbian continues to follow the lines of development which until recently were common to BCS, which Serbian is accused of having dominated, there is pressure to avoid lexical items that have become identified with other variants of BCS. Thus, for example, in order to say 'bowl', the speaker of Serbian must choose the Slavic pojas, the speaker of Bosnian must choose the Turkish kaš, while the Croatian is told to use the neologistic okolosanina pantoladetrac

---

10 Moreover, it is worth noting that at the end of the nineteenth century, Russian political and territorial aspirations in Southeastern Europe also engendered ambivalent Bulgarian popular attitudes toward Russian, which was seen as the language of liberators who were not always reliable and who were also potential colonizers.

11 In fact, even in the Academy dictionary, the example sentence for kavarma is 'restorana poručuju tope, kavarma, i desert' (p. 20), "In the restaurant we ordered soup, kavarma, and dessert". Not only is this sentence not dialectal, but all the other nouns in it are obvious Western borrowings.

12 For a nuanced analysis of the position of Serbia vis-à-vis Turkish, see Živković (2000: 284-291).
‘circumwaistal panhandler’. Moreover, Bosnian is attempting to lay exclusive claim to the entire Turkish vocabulary of BCS. Thus, for example, Pirić (1994) writes that the (common BCS) Turkism komšiluk ‘neighborliness, neighborhood’ is a true Bosnian word expressing an essential feature of Bosnian culture to which it is unique. Turkisms thereby play a uniquely differentiating role in BCS not found in any of the other languages of the Balkans.

The 1990s have also seen a new rise in Turkisms associated with the increasing standardization of languages that until recently were absent from the realm of public discourse, namely Romani and Aromanian in Macedonia, where both languages were recognized as official in the Macedonian constitution of 1991. This rise is illustrated by 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. In the case of Romani and Aromanian, the fact that their literary norms are 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 elaborated norms used euphemistic neologisms or recent borrowings as their official terminology on the census forms (P-2, V1 questions 8 and 9): Macedonian banja, klozet, Albanian banjo, nevjetore, Turkish bano, bano-o-ayakolsa, Serbian kapatilo, klozet. Except for the Serbian deverbal noun meaning ‘bathing place’ all the words for ‘bath’ are Latinate borrowings. The Macedonian and Serbian words for ‘toilet’ are from the British [water]closet, while the Albanian and Turkish are neologisms that can be glossed as ‘necessarium’ and ‘bath-footplace’, respectively. The Romani documents, however, used the Turkisms humani and kenefti, respectively. Hamam is the standard Turkish word for ‘bath’ but has come to mean ‘Turkish bath’ or ‘public bath’, while 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. For Aromanian,

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 Aromanian. While this was implicit in the case of Romani, it was explicit in the case of Aromanian instructions to enumerators, which included a special last page with a 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 Aromanian. Like Romani, Aromanian used Turkisms for ‘bath’ and ‘toilet’ in census instructions and forms, viz. hamani and hale, respectively. The latter, from Turkish heid 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 Aromanian in which the closeness of the emerging norm to current speech favors retention of Turkisms without stylistic lowering or marginalization.

Among the Romani elites of Macedonia – as occurred in Balkan languages that underwent standardization earlier – a debate has emerged between nativizers and colloquializers who favor Indic and Turkish, respectively, as sources of vocabulary enrichment. The discourse reproduces the competing discourses in the standardization of Macedonian sixty years ago. As I have argued elsewhere (Friedman 1989), however, Romani has fewer extralinguistic reasons for eliminating words of Turkish origin. Many of these words are ultimately of Persian origin and therefore more closely related to Romani than to the other Indo-European languages of the Balkans (since Indic and Iranian share a common dialectal origin within Indo-European), and some of these words were borrowed directly from Persian during the early history of the Romani people. Moreover, the elimination of Turkisms from the other Balkan languages was in part motivated by an ideology of separation from the political and social dominance of the Ottoman past. In the case of Romani, the Turkish language does not occupy the same sociopolitical position, since Roma are marginalized regardless of who controls the state, and this in turn eliminates one of the motivations for changing the status of Turkisms. Also, Turkish is the first language of a significant number of Roma in the Balkans, and an even larger number of Roma are Muslim (in Macedonia, for example, over 90%), which,

---

13 Actually, Croatian also uses a Slavic form, renen ‘strap’ in the meaning ‘belt’. The neologism is usually cited in humorous contexts, but in fact it was proposed in all seriousness.

14 The other languages were Macedonian, Albanian, Turkish, and Serbian.

15 In the 2002 census (Form PPI-3, section 2, questions 6 and 7), the variants amami and kheneft were used for Romani. These forms reflect variants that are still in competition as the process of standardization continues. The 2002 Turkish replaced bano-o-ayakolsa with nalet, reflecting changes in Turkish linguistic practice.

16 It is worth noting that the Aromanian instructions for the 2002 census did not contain such notices but rather took for granted that users of the document would be familiar with the orthography.
given the association of Turkish with Islam in the Balkans, can also favor the retention of vocabulary of Turkish origin.\footnote{The problem of Romani identity among groups that do not speak Romani is beyond the scope of this paper. See Marunshiakova et al. (2001) for relevant discussion. It is worth noting that Roms are not the only group who speak Turkish without necessarily identifying as Turks from the documentation in Akan (2003: 1), the following quotation from Lippman (1999) is illustrative: “In Prizren most of the Albanians speak Turkish as a second, often as a first, language.” On the other hand, many Macedonian-speaking Muslims in the Župa region near Debar, insist on declaring themselves as Turks but do not know Turkish.}

It is also worth noting that while Iglia (1996: 4) writes that ‘only a couple of hundred’ Turksims survive in the dialect of the Christian Roms of Agia Varvara seventy years after the group moved from Turkey to Greece in connection with the exchange of populations following World War I, her vocabulary (pp. 277-305), which has about twice as many main entries as Messing’s (1980) glossary of the same dialect, includes many Turksims in addition to those given by him. In my comparison of the Turksims in Messing (1980) with Škaljic (1966), I found that almost a third of the entries in the former were not in the latter (Friedman 1989). This figure is also reflected in the comparison of Škaljic (1966) with Grennes, Rá Hauge & Stileymanoğlu (2002) published in the latter work (pp. 305-528). In a similar comparison of the parallel columns, the two works share only somewhere between a half and two thirds of the total number of Turkish lexical items. The remainder occur only in one dictionary or the other. Thus, while in raw numbers of head words Grennès, Rá Hauge & Stileymanoğlu (2002) surpasses Škaljic (1966) by only 549 headwords, it would appear that the number of Turkish words in Škaljic and not the number that the other dictionaries share with it in the thousands. This comparison, however, is misleading. In many instances, both languages will have the word that would constitute the main entry and differ only in which derivatives are attested. Thus, for example, both Bulgarian and BCS have abdal ‘fool’ (Turkish abdal), but only Bulgarian has the derivative abdulak ‘foolishness’ (Turkish abdallik) while, conversely, both have borrowed Turkish akraba ‘relatives’ (Bulgarian akraba, BCS akrabo), but only BCS attests akrablak (Turkish akраблак) ‘kinship’. Similarly both abdest ‘ablation’ and abdestlik ‘place of ablation’ are borrowed into both languages, but the derived noun is listed separately for each, while hos buluk ‘well have we found you’ (i.e., ‘we see you’) occurs in both languages but is listed separately because in Skaljic (1966) it occurs in the same entry after the first singular hos buļdam whereas in Grennès, Rá Hauge & Stileymanoğlu it occurs alone. To this can be added Belyavsky-Frank’s (2004: 161) observation that even these excellent dictionaries are not

exhaustive of Turksims that can occur in various corpora. The question of lexical or phrasal code-switching versus borrowing is also unaddressed and in need of greater elucidation.\footnote{See Sobolev’s (2003) examination of the distribution of Turksims in Balkan dialects.}

In addition to serving as a marker of prestige and of differentiation (both positive and negative), Turkish can function as a kind of secular mediator. In the Southwestern corner of Kosovo, just across Mount Shar from Macedonia, a region called Gora, many of the villagers in this region are inhabited by Slavic-speaking Muslims, who have a distinct Goran identity and whose dialect, Goranski or Goranche, is closer to standard Macedonian than it is to standard Serbian. Some Gorans identify with Serbia, some with Macedonia, and some with neither. Brod is a large, mixed Albanian-Goran village where there is significant tension between the two groups, especially since the 1999 war. There are two mosques in the village, one Goran closer to the center and one Albanian further up the hill. When walking in a village it is normal to say hello whenever you pass anyone on the road, and rude to pass by without speaking, especially if you are a man and the others are also men. In a village where there are ethnic tensions and where neither Goran nor Albanian men dress in a distinctively identifiable way, you are faced with a problem. You do not want to use the Albanian Medetari to a Goran or the Goranski Dobor dan to an Albanian, and as non-Muslim it is not really appropriate to use the religious salam alekum. And thus, in such a context, the neutral greeting is the Turkish Merhaba.

As the foregoing material has shown, in any discussion of convergence and divergence in the development of Balkan cultural identities, Turkish and the lexicon that entered the Balkan languages through it continue to occupy a significant place almost a century after the end of Turkish hegemony in Southeastern Europe. From functioning as a marker of both Islam and of non-sectarian urban sophistication, Turkish vocabulary was pushed to lower and archaic registers in the Balkans, and, insofar as it was of Arabo-Persian origin, even in Turkey itself. And yet today this lexicon is still deployed (or decried) in signaling political resistance, in building national identity, in recursively inscribing orientation, and as a neutral ground for negotiating social relations. Attitudes towards Turksims in the Balkans can still index conservative or radical (transitional) political stances, and the ability to speak Turkish is still an asset that draws on the cultural capital of the Ottoman past, as well as the capitalist present. At the same time, the details of the roles specific lexical items still raise questions of geolinguistic distribution that require further investigation. As we saw in the discussion of Turkish itself, much of the vocabulary that entered the Balkans via
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Turkish entered Turkish from Arabic and Persian. In this way, the Balkans are lexically linked to the broader world of Arabo-Persian influence. I shall close this article with a striking example of such linkage, as illustrated by an anecdote concerning Morris Goodman, Professor emeritus of African linguistics at Northwestern University. While attending the International Congress of Linguists in Bucharest in 1967, Professor Goodman attempted to buy some matches at 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, Russian, and Dutch. Finally, as he was leaving in frustration, he flung the Swedish word at her: “Kiberit!” The proprietor beamed understanding and exclaimed: “Ih, chibrit!”
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