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load of double systems in certain areas of grammar. The resulting compatible patterns may make use of different surface forms, inherited or borrowed, in each language.

Shared systems of discourse-marking may imply global or selective copying of discourse connectors. Matras shows that convergence at this level comprises principles for organizing speech outside the propositional domain of the utterance. The high copiability of adveratives and concessives in contact situations cannot be explained by 'grammatical gaps'.

Matras claims that the finite option has been generalized in Balkan Turkish because it allows maximum consistency in the surface representation of events. This is an advantage as regards the possibilities of applying uniform sentence planning operations. A form felt to be most compatible among a group of languages has been generalized at some stage in the convergent evolution.

In the code-copying framework, these kinds of convergence imply complex copying processes. The notion of copying also includes contact-induced simulation of language-internal change.

West Rumelian Turkish in Macedonia and adjacent areas

Victor A. Friedman

1. Introduction

Turkish is of seminal importance for the formation of the Balkan linguistic league as it exists today (or existed until recently). While the convergent phenomena in the Indo-European languages which constitute that league (Albanian, Greek, the Balkan Slavic languages, and the Balkan Romance languages) are variously attributed to contact with one another and/or with some Indo-European substratum (Daco-Thracian, Illyrian, etc.) for which we have so little data that almost no such attributions can be supported with evidence (but cf. Hamp 1982 on etymological evidence for the postponed definite article), it was the political framework of the Ottoman empire and the concomitant dominance of the Turkish language that gave the Balkan languages much of their modern lexical commonality as well as certain grammatical patterns (Gölb 1960), and the Ottoman period was crucial in shaping South-eastern Europe as a geo-cultural entity.1 Studies of the impact of Turkish on the Balkan languages are among the first associated with the field of Balkan linguistics (Miklosich 1884). However, Turkish is generally viewed as an adstratum, i.e. not a member of the Balkan linguistic league but only a contributor to it (Bernštejn 1968, Schaller 1975: 91-95). In general, these views are based on literary Turkish and do not take into account the dialects actually spoken in the Balkans. Since the seventies, studies have appeared demonstrating the 'Balkan' nature of Balkan Turkish (Jalaj-Nasteva 1972, Pokrovskaja 1974, 1979; cf. also Friedman 1982), but these studies are limited to certain specific features and/or dialects and their results do not appear to be well known to many Balkanists. Also, many descriptions of specific Balkan Turkish dialects have been done in a Turcological rather than a Balkanological context (Eriner 1970, Gülensoy 1981, Hasan 1987), with the overwhelming preponderance of material being based on dialects spoken in Bulgaria. Moreover, while works on the influence of Turkish on other languages of the Balkans are now so numerous that it would require a monograph to list all (see Friedman 1986 and Friedman 1996 on the influence of Turkish on Macedonian and on the languages of the Republic of Macedonia, with numerous references), studies of influence in the opposite direction are still relatively uncommon and deal primarily with loanwords (Tietze 1957, Jalaj-Nasteva 1957), although

1 The pre-Ottoman, i.e. medieval period was characterized by tremendous political instability, much like the post-Ottoman period. That South-eastern Europe continues to be thought of—and to some extent to be—a geo-cultural entity is arguably a legacy of Turkey in Europe.

In this paper, it is my intention to examine those Turkish dialects of the Republic of Macedonia classified as part of West Rumelian Turkish (henceforth WRT), with references to adjacent areas where appropriate (Németh 1956). Previous overviews of the WRT situation (Hazar 1978: 115-122, Tryjarski 1976, 1990) provide fairly comprehensive bibliographies (although some items such as Asim 1976, Doerfer 1959, Eren 1968, Hafiz 1976, Jašar-Nasteva 1972, Jusufi 1987, Pokrovskaja 1964, 1974, 1979, Schmaus 1968 are omitted). The surveys, however, do not go into the details of actual data. In this paper, I plan to examine those data with a view to their significance for contact phenomena and suggestions for the future. I also hope to address some sociolinguistic and historical questions that do not usually figure in such descriptions.

I shall be concentrating on the WRT dialects of the Republic of Macedonia both because of the central position of Macedonia in the Balkan Sprachbund (Gołp 1984, Hamp 1989) and because four-fifths of ex-Yugoslavia’s Turks live in Macedonia, where according to the 1994 census, conducted among 77,252 people they constituted 4% of the Republic’s counted population. 2 I will be excluding from consideration, however, the Yurük (Yörüğ, Yörüük) dialects spoken in about 65 villages in southeastern Macedonia (Štip, Radović, Kočani, Vandalovo, and Gevgelija municipalities; Nedkov 1986), for despite some contact phenomena, especially in the lexicon, these dialects are considerably closer to standard Turkish and do not differ significantly from it (Jašar-Nasteva 1986, Manević 1954). This may be due to relatively late arrival of the Yurüks, their relative isolation in mountain villages, and their practice of endogamy. Also significant, however, is the distinction Yurük make between themselves and other Turkish speakers in Macedonia, whom they call Çıtab and whose dialect they call çıtab dili. 1 Yurük tradition holds that other Turkish-speakers in Macedonia are Islamicized and subsequently Turkicized autochthonous populations (Paličuteva 1986). If this were indeed the case, then the çıtab dialects could be classified as a ‘creole’ (cf. Haugen 1971 and Muñoz 1996 on the ecology of language). This is itself a basic issue in the study of Balkan Turkish. It is well known that the Balkans have been a region of intense multilingualism for centuries, but a real question in the study of Balkan Turkish is the relationship substrate – superstrate: the lexifier is clear, but the historical relationships of the grammars (Turkish versus other) has yet to be elucidated.

This issue of multilingualism in its relation to Balkan Turkish is especially complex. During the Ottoman period, Turkish was the language of the market place and of administration as well as of villages both mixed and monoethnic. Moreover, it retained its status among urban craftsmen well into the twentieth century (Jašar-Nasteva 1992), and even today in Macedonia and Kosovo, 4 knowledge of Turkish can have a certain implication of urban sophistication regardless of the speaker’s ethnicity. In 1974 the Turkish consul in Skopje knew no Macedonian because, if he needed to communicate with people on the street, anyone over the age of fifty could speak Turkish. Among Muslims, Turkish also has a cultural prestige, but since World War Two this has yielded to numerical and cultural pressure from Albanian. At a ‘Turkish sünnet’ I attended in Ohrid in 1992, for example, the music played was exclusively Albanian. At least 200,000 Turks (and other Muslims) emigrated to Turkey after World War Two (Jašar-Nasteva 1992), 3 and additional Turkish families left the Gostivar region in 1984 out of fear that the persecution of Turks in Bulgaria would spill over into Macedonia. (In fact, at that time there were serious problems with bilingual schools for both

2 This figure probably also represents the largest concentration of WRT speakers. The following table gives absolute numbers and relative percentages by municipality for declared Turks living in Macedonia according to the 1994 census (Antonovska et al. 1994). It should be borne in mind that declared nationality does not necessarily correspond to mother tongue. This is especially true in the western Macedonian municipalities of Brod, Kievo, Debar, and Struga, where many Macedonian-speaking Muslims declare Turkish nationality. Place names are given in their Turkish form on the map but in the official Turkish language, those of political relevance (Macedonian, Albanian, Serbian) in the text. When the two names are not phonologically related, the Turkish names are given in parentheses in the text. This table gives both forms. Spellings of Turkish toponyms follow Jusufi (1987) and Birken (1992).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Absolute number</th>
<th>% of population</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3268</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Struga (Struga)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3362</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>Struga (Struga)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3821</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Struga (Struga)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3840</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Kievo (Kievo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3901</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Kievo (Kievo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4234</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>Kievo (Kievo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5625</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Debar (Debar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6965</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>Debar (Debar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12639</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Gostivar (Gostivar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13565</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>Gostivar (Gostivar)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Aksey et al. (1968:1241) glosses çıtab as kargaci ‘quarrelsome’, karij ‘vulgar’—especially in central (but also northwest) Anatolia.

4 Because both the [original] Slavic Kosovo and the Albanian [and Turkish] Kosova currently have political implications whose complexities I wish to eschew, I have chosen to use the productive English suffix when writing about this region in English.

5 See also Katera (1969) on circumstances surrounding this exodus.
spoken by non-Turks has undoubtedly influenced local Turkish. Evidence of this exists from the nineteenth century, but has yet to be studied (Hazai 1963, Pulevski 1875). Nonetheless, this paper will be limited for the most part to data from speakers who consider Turkish their first language.

2. Phonetics and phonology

Németh’s (1956) classic division of Balkan Turkish into East and West Rumelian dialects corresponds roughly to the jat-line that divides East and West Bulgarian dialects,11 thus placing all of Macedonia (except the Yuruk villages)—as well as Kosovo and Albania—in the Western area. Németh’s eight basic WRT features, as summarized by Doerfer (1959) plus two additional features subsequently suggested elsewhere (Németh 1961, Schmaus 1968, Ibrahim 1982) can be listed as follows:

1. Standard Turkish i, u, ü corresponds to i in word final position: kârt, tabâji, küp (/ü) against kâru, tabâzi, kûprü. The perfect (indefinite past) suffix -mîç is invariant (i.e. the suffix always has the shape -mîç rather than being subject to the rules of vowel harmony): almîç, olmîç, qâlmîç.
2. i > ï in nominal and closed final syllables: evîm > evamn.
3. u > o before a and o > a in many words: bûyle, ûç > boyle, aç.
4. In suffixes with low vowel harmony (e/ã), one of the two forms is generalized: yemîçlar, ahrse.
5. ã > a in about 40 words: küprü.12
6. Ottoman y is preserved consistently: aşaq.
7. Progressive in -y rather than -yv: yasqey, alyysyn. (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.)
8. The fronting of /i/ and /j/ to palatal affricates or stops as a possible ninth feature: ikiy > iki jeje (Macedonia) or içi cece (Kosovo); this was suggested in a later work by Németh (1961: 22), cf. Schmaus (1968), Ibrahim (1982).

10. Albanians and Turks; see Friedman 1993a). The numbers of those declaring Turkish as their mother tongue is always smaller than those declaring Turkish nationality. Thus, for example, of 203,938 individuals in Macedonia declaring Turkish nationality in 1953, 143,615 declared Turkish as their mother tongue. In 1981, out of 86,591 declared Turks only 69,768 declared Turkish as their first language. Nonetheless, Turkish is vital, especially in Western Macedonia, where in some regions (e.g. Zupa in the Debar commune) Macedonian-speaking Muslim parents are demanding Turkish schools for their children, because they identify Macedonian with the Macedonian Orthodox Church and Turkish with Islam (Fraenkelly 1995, see also Nova Makedonija 5. X. 95: 6; Birlik 16. II. 91: 11). Moreover, marriages in Macedonia are often contracted along religious rather than linguistic lines—and in urban areas even such ethnic criteria become irrelevant. Thus bi- and multilingual families where one of the languages is Turkish are not uncommon (Fraenkelly 1993). In this manner the Balkan Turkish linguistic contact environment continues to be replicated despite the change in the status 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. Aside from Albanians, the majority of Roms in Macedonia and Kosovia are Muslim and many speak Turkish. The Aromanian and Megleno-Romanian-speaking Muslims of Macedonia all emigrated to Turkey, but the Christian Vlachs are concentrated in areas where Turks are also numerous (in southwest and southeast Macedonia). As was indicated above, many urban Macedonians also speak Turkish.10 Balkan Turkish as

---

11. The jat-line is named for the Cyrillic letter ñ which represented what was originally a long, low, unrounded front vowel in Common Slavic (ä). In West Bulgarian (and also most of Macedonian and Eastern Serbo-Croatian), this vowel developed into /e/, whereas East Bulgarian has a variety of diachretal developments other than simply /e/, e.g. /e/, /e/, or /e/-/e/ with palatalization of the preceding consonant. (Hazai 1961) notes the coincidence.

12. This change is limited to syllable-initial position in certain lexical items (Eckmann 1960), and while the word it actually occurs in vary from one area to another, it occurs more frequently, virtually to the point of inevitability, as one moves farther west (Németh 1961, Mollova 1968, Jalal-Nastra 1970, Eckmann 1962, Kakuk 1972, Assm 1976, Hafiz 1976, Zajkovski 1968, Hazai 1960, Németh 1956: 44, Katona 1969, Németh 1952, Eren 1960), although in the southeast, as in East Rumelian Turkish and rarely in Anatolia, it is limited to initial syllables before /o/, /u/, and /y (Eckmann 1960, Hazai 1960, Macievici 1954, Cafengli 1964, Kakuk 1959, Hazai 1959, Gusev 1962).
10. The loss of /h/ — especially in initial position: hva > oca, also daha > dava, tahta > tata, sabah > saba.

Subsequent modifications of Németh’s classification were proposed by Hazai (1964), who identifies Gose Deldev (Nevrekob) as transitional between east and west,13 and Mollova (1970) traces the iso-gloss for preservation of intervocalic /'g/ (aqaq ‘tree’ versus aqaq, ak) along a line from Dolni Cîâr on the Danube to Samokov, moving thence in a south-western direction north of Blagoevgrad (Cuma-i Bâll) and south of Koçani almost to Štip, then curving south-eastward to go south of Radoviš, then running southwest again to Lake Prespa. When Hazai and Mollova were writing, however, works on other WRT dialects such as Jasar-Nasteva (1970), Katona (1969), and Kakuk (1972) were not available to be taken into account. Moreover, Jusuf (1987) makes the point that at that time, the dialects of Kosovia had been completely unstudied. Jusuf (1987: 14-16) distinguishes five Kosovian groups—Prizren-Manuš, Priština-Janjevo, Mitrovica-Vučitrn, Peć, Gjakov-Novobrod-Dobrič—however, he does not give the bases for his classification. In the meantime, virtually all of these dialects have been the subject of investigation (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, but he does not offer any concrete suggestions or solutions. Unfortunately, most of the works on the dialects of Kosovo have appeared in Turkish-language periodicals published in Kosovo and Macedonia that are printed in a small number of copies, are extremely difficult or impossible to obtain, and are not even preserved in the respective public libraries. Other studies are unpublished theses and dissertations at the University of Pristina. The periodicals Cevren (Kosovia), Setser, and Sevinç (Macedonia) contain dialect materials and descriptions, and the Skopje newspaper Birlak occasionally publishes humor columns in Skopje, Gostivar or Prizren dialect (e.g. Birlak 27. IX. 84; 22. XXVII. 85: 21. S. IV. 86: 21. 31. I. 87; 20. 27. II. 88: 20. 27. I. 90: 1: 13. 2. II. 91: 21). The collecting and publishing of these descriptions is itself a major task that needs to be accomplished.

We can note at this point also that there is virtually no data on the Turkish dialects of Albania aside from Németh (1961), Stachowski’s (1967) historical study, and the works published by Osman Myderrizi in Albania in 1950 and 1955 and cited by Németh (1961), which were unavailable to me. In addition to the towns mentioned by Németh—Tiranë, Kroja (Açkâhisar), Kocër, Elbasan, Lesh, Pogradec (Istrovâ) and Shkodër—the opening of Albania and movement of populations across the border into Macedonia in the nineties brought reports of Turkish minorities in Durrës, Saranda, and Fier as well as Elbasan, but these minorities have no official status and we know nothing of their dialects (Birlak 16: III: 91-6).14 Albania’s isolation under Enver Hoxha discouraged the academic study of its minority languages and recent years have not seen much of a change in this respect, although now in principle it should be possible to undertake a more thorough investigation of the

13 The Macedonian dialects of this region are also transitional to the eastern reflex of iž.
14 Németh (1961: 9) wrote ‘There is no Turkish population in Albania . . .’, but the reports cited in Birlak raise the possibility that this claim was the result of government policy rather than actual demographics.

remnants of Turkish in Albania. Based on the phonology of Turkisms in Albanian (cf. Botorzky 1975), however, along with the modest data available, it appears that these dialects fall within the WRT group.

Taking the foregoing as our starting point, we shall now examine specific features of WRT in the context of language contact, beginning with the phonological ones noted above. 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 /h/.

In the case of Németh’s first feature, the shift of all final high vowels to /u/ could be connected to the fact that in Macedonian /u/ does not exist and both /u/ and schwa—the closest equivalent of /u/—are excluded from nominative singular endings.15 Similarly, while Albanian does have phonemic /u/, it, too, does not natively permit /u/, /o/, or stressed schwa at the end of indefinite nouns except for a few Tosh monosyllables corresponding to Gag words in nasal vowels.16 This could perhaps have reinforced an already existing tendency of a type also attested in Northeast Anatolian (see below).

A different but related phenomenon is the conditioned neutralization of the opposition /i/ described in Németh’s second feature. Kakuk (1972), Katona (1969), and Jasar-Nasteva (1969) all 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 rounded high vowel for both back and front roots: high back unrounded, mid-unrounded, front mid-unrounded—both closed and closed-short—and high front unrounded, e.g. gelir / çärør — gelir / çarör — gelir / çärör — gelir / çarör — gelir / çarör ‘comes / calls’. None of the Balkan contact languages has a back unrounded vowel in their phonological inventories. Albanian, Vlach, and most Macedonian and South Serbian dialects all have some sort of schwa, although its realization may vary. For example, my own fieldwork indicates that in Skopje both Macedonians and Turks have a vowel that is higher and further back than schwa and approaches [i]. Stressed schwa in the southern Tosh Albanian has a low, front, and open realization approaching [i]. Azorean also has schwa but not the back high unrounded vowel of Daco-Romanian. 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 1993b). According to Katona (1969), the high back unrounded vowel is completely absent in some WRT, but Kakuk (1972) has contradictory data. In any case, like /i/, Turkish /i/ is 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).

As indicated above, the loss of /o/ and sometimes of /u/ could be connected to the fact that none of the Balkan languages possess /o/ and none of the Balkan languages except Albanian have /u/. We should note here that in the different Balkan dialects there is considerable variation regarding how these sounds are eliminated. Thus, for example, oye, oyole ‘thus’ > ü:le, üole in Skopje, oyle, yüle, in Ohrid and Resen, dört ‘four’ > derr in Prizren,

15 In Macedonian, such words are usually adapted by adding i/-ija/-ie, which makes them feminine (old a-stem declension), e.g. kujta, kapija, sabaja.
16 For example, Torsk sy ’eye’, dru ’wood’, zt ‘voice’ = Geg sy, drd, zd. 
dort in Gostivar, Ohrid, Skopje (Ago 1987, Kakuk 1972, Hazai 1960, Katona 1969, Jašar-Nasteva 1970, Jusuf 1987). Jašar-Nasteva (1969) makes precisely this point concerning the restructuring of the Gostivar Turkish vocalic system. We can also note that Ibrahimi (1982) observes that Albanians speaking Turkish have /h/ while Macedonian Muslims (sometimes called Torbeš, although some feel this term to be pejorative) have only /h/.

The loss of /h/ is shared with local Slavic and Albanian dialects, especially initially and intervocalically, e.g. WRT hoca ‘teacher’ > oca, cf. Macedonian hodi ‘goes’ > odi, Albanian huti ‘owl’ > ut; WRT daba ‘more’ > dava cf. Macedonian snuha ‘daughter-in-law’ > snuah; but unlike those languages, there are no WRT developments of /h/ into /f/ finally and before consonants, e.g. Macedonian beh ‘I was’ > bef, tafha ‘board’ > tafa, Albanian shoh ‘I see’ > shof, but WRT sabah ‘morning’ > saha, tahha > saha. However, Németh (1956: 21) points out that /h/-loss is an extremely complicated phenomenon manifested in various ways in much of the area where Turkish is spoken. Nonetheless, 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, Boretzky 1975: 153-154, 164-166, Zekerija 1971: 36, 56, Eren 1968).

The palatalization of /h/ and /g/ before front vowels, and especially the similarity of articulation in local WRT and Slavic and Albanian dialects, is a reasonable candidate for a change which may have been influenced by contact. Thus, the greatest neutralization of the opposition between palatal and velar before a front vowel occurs precisely where the same neutralization occurs in Slavic and Albanian, e.g. Kosovia and Priepi. Moreover, I have observed that 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 (k, q), palatal affricates (tq, dz, dc) or palatal stops (t’, d’) occurs only in a small part of the northeast Anatolian Turkish, is characteristic of WRT on the Balkan Peninsula (Németh 1961), and in Bajrami (1982), Jašar-Nasteva (1969), and Jusuf (1978) all identify this as particularly characteristic of WRT (cf. also Asim 1976, Kakuk 1972, Katona 1969, Zajeczkowski 1968).

Elimination of front rounded vowels, neutralization of high vowels, especially the high back rounded ones, palatalization of velars before front vowels (as well as peculiarities in vowel harmony) all occur in Northeast Anatolia (Brendenoom 1984, 1989, 1992a, 1995; Boeschoten 1991; cf. also Johnson 1979, 1992: 65, 2002a: 77-78). 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 Brendenoom has shown, these dialects themselves display contact features in which Greek may have played a conspicuous, perhaps even subtratal, 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.

Be that as it may, an unquestionable contact phenomenon in WRT is phonemic /h/ = [h], which occurs in all the relevant contact languages and dialects and is found not only in loanwords but also in productive affixes: lomah ‘cup’, isopo ‘goat’, dayeuta ‘aunt’ (≠ days ‘uncle’), okaydizita (= okayucz) ‘woman who invites one to a wedding’ (Jašar-Nasteva 1970).

Final devoicing of /g, v, z/; e.g. yus for yiz ‘one hundred’ (Jusuf 1987: 73) occurs in both Macedonian and local Albanian (not in Serbian, although there is tensing).

There is also velarization of clear /l/ after a front vowel if followed by a pause or consonant, e.g. [bǜtul] for bǜtul ‘nighingale’, which Ibrahimi (1982) associates with Macedonian Muslim Turkish, e.g. [bǜtul] as opposed to Macedonian Turkish [bǜtul], Kosovian Turkish, [bǜtul]. 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 (/l/ before front vowels, /l/ elsewhere; only rarely does /l/ 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 Kosovo, where Albanian is the dominant contact language, such is not the case.

Other phenomena reported by Jašar-Nasteva (1969) and Jusuf (1987: 67-68) as resulting from contact are loss of geminates (elll ‘fifty’ ≠ eli) and toleration of initial clusters (spanak vs. unospanak ‘spinach’).

In the realm of morphophonology, lack of vowel harmony appears to be a likely candidate for a contact-induced phenomenon, but the evidence is not entirely unambiguous. While it is certainly the case that lack of vowel harmony in the surrounding contact languages could influence the generalization of a given affix or the confusion of front/back or labial/non-labial harmony, it is also the case that some of these features could simply be archaisms preserved due to lack of contact with the innovating dialects. Again, the similarity to northeast Anatolian Turkish raises the question of parallel archaisms, parallel development, or actual connection (Johnson 1979a, 1979c, 1981, Brendenoom 1992a, Boeschoten 1991). 17

3. Morphology and syntax

With regard to inflectional morphology, there do not appear to be any noteworthy examples that do not belong to the realm of morphosyntax (see below), i.e. there are no borrowed inflectional affixes, with one possible exception: the vocative suffix -o, e.g. babo ‘O father’, abo ‘O older brother’, etc. (Bayram 1985). However, in view of the marginality and limitations of the vocative, these could be treated as individual lexical items, like Russian Bole! ‘O God!’ The -y progressive may be an archaism rather than an innovation but in any case is not a contact phenomenon, nor is it characteristic of all of WRT.17

Derivational morphology, however, is another matter and shows a number of borrowings. The most obvious borrowed suffixes are Slavic markers of feminine nouns (-ka, -tista) and diminutives (-će): namasaka ‘slut’ (< namussze), čingenka ‘Gypsy woman’ (< čingen), baldaska ‘wife’s sister’ (< baldz), dayeuta ‘aunt’ (< days ‘uncle’), okaydizita ‘woman

17 Jašar-Nasteva (1970) and Kakuk (1972) indicate that neither Gostivar nor Ohrid has the -y type of progressive, nor in -yor, although traces of -yor occur in songs in Ohrid (Kakuk 1972). Both use -y (also in Goce Delcev/Nevdok, cf. Mollica 1962). In Pirzen, however, the -y present is used (Jusuf 1987: 96).
who invites one to a wedding' (c. okuyucu), yogurcısı 'female yoghurt-seller' (c. yogurçu) (Jasari-Nasteva 1970); diminutives: keçe 'girl', parmaçe 'finger', insance 'person' (Kakuk 1972), Memete 'Mehmet' (Mollova 1968: 119), etc. Albanian does not appear to have contributed to this morphology, perhaps because such markers are more subtle (feminine markers -e, -i), phonologically alien (diminutive -th), or themselves borrowed from Slavic (diminutive -kê/kê).

The other type of derivational morphology that can be considered under contact phenomena is the high productivity of native suffixes that are themselves borrowed into the contact languages. The three most productive Turkish suffixes in the Balkans are, mutatıs mutandı, -el, -i, -ik (Fridman 1996). These same suffixes display greater productivity in WRT than in Standard Turkish, at least some of which is due to contact, e.g. aksamlik in the meaning 'evening meal' occurs as opposed to Standard Turkish aksam yemeği. However, Boeschoten (p.c.) compares some of the instances cited by Teodosijević (1985, 1987, 1988) from the Kosovian Turkish language press, e.g. memnuyetik vs. memnu- luk/memnuniyeti 'pleasure', develçi 'statesman' vs. devlet adamı, ressamclar vs. ressamlar 'artists', with the overgeneralizations found among children acquiring Turkish in Turkey, i.e. he equates these with mistakes due to imperfect mastery (cf. also Mollova 1968: 118).

Although inflectional morphology per se does not evince contact phenomena, morphosyntax, i.e. the use of inflectional forms in the sentence, does. In the nominal system, the most striking WRT features are dative/locative confusion, number agreement between demonstratives and nouns, genitive-head reversal, and confusion in the use of izafet constructions.18 The first three phenomena are unambiguously results of contact, while the peculiarities in izafet constructions are not necessarily due to language contact but nonetheless suggest structural changes or problems that could result from the isolation of the dialect and writers' imperfect mastery of Standard Turkish grammar.

In the three dominant languages of Macedonia and Kosovia—Albanian, Macedonian, and Serbian—meanings of 'motion toward' and 'location' are carried by the same prepositions (Albanian, Macedonian) or case endings (Serbian).19 Thus, for example 'He lives in Skopje' and 'He goes to Skopje' will use the same preposition: Macedonian žive/odi vo Skopje, Albanian banon/rok në Shkup. In WRT, it is usually the locative case which is generalized, as in the following examples:20


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.21 A phenomenon not noted in the dialectological literature but implicitly recognized as occurring in WRT in textbooks intended for Turkish schools in Macedonia and Kosovia is the use of the plural suffix on modifiers of plural nouns, e.g. bular çocuklar instead of bu çocuklar (Yusuf 1971: 47) 'these children', on the model of Macedonian ovie deca, Albanian këta femjë, etc., in which both the modifier and the noun carry morphological markers of plurality. The fact that Turkish children in Macedonia and Kosovia need to be told that such agreeing forms are 'wrong' is an indication that they use them.

The reversal of genitive and head in genitive constructions, e.g. familiac adamin 'the family of the man' (Katona 1969: 165), babasi Ali'in 'the father of Ali' (Ibrahim 1982) as opposed to Standard Turkish adamin familiası, Ali'nin babası, are patterned after the Indo-European contact languages, e.g. Albanian familje i njertit, babei i Aliait, Macedonian familjata na 'coovekt, takho ma na Ali.22

Teodosijević (1985, 1987, 1988) gives a number of examples of incorrect genitive constructions from the Kosovian Turkish language press. These irregularities display the following five patterns:23

[6] Q0 vs. Q3: Takdär madala verildi. vs. Takdär madalyasını... 'A merit badge was given.' (Teodosijević 1988: 106).
[9] Q0 vs. G3: Tolqq Tıyo'nun eser olan bu şeql... vs. Tiyo'nun eser... 'this beautiful... of comrade Tiyo's work.' (Teodosijević 1988: 107).

The mistakes in the usage of genitive constructions do not necessarily reflect linguistic contact, but perhaps a loss of intuition concerning correct usage, which loss itself could be due to multilingualism. The phenomenon bears further investigation.

Morphyosyntactic contact phenomena in the verb-phrase reflect tendencies to eliminate non-finite forms and move in a direction from agglutination toward analyticity—both of which tendencies are also characteristic of the Indo-European Balkan languages from which

18 Katona (1969) and Jušuf (1987: 88) also report peculiarities in subject-verb number agreement, but this is an area subject to stylistic variation in any case.
19 Some dialects of former Sotto-Croatian dative and locative cases are phonologically distinguished by tone. In the dialects of Kosovo, however, this is not generally the case.
20 Kakuk (1972) reports that less frequently a dative occurs where a locative is expected.
21 In the case of Serbo, the dative was generalized in place of the locative, but this was probably an older process. In any case, in the Serb dialects of southern Kosovo, the same situation as in Macedonian obtains.
22 It is interesting to note that Macedonian (and Bulgarian) also permit head-genitive word order, which is atypical for Slavic, e.g. na Ali adho mu is also acceptable (cf. Friedman 1986).
23 The left side gives the dative 'mistake' the right side gives the standard form. The symbol Q means 'no suffix', 3 means 'third person possessive suffix', and G means 'genitive suffix'.

the WRT constructions are evidently calqued. These tendencies are realized by substituting the optative-subjunctive or conditional for the infinitive, by substituting lexical items of 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 which is well attested in WRT in general (Mollova 1968, Jasar-Nasteva 1970, Eckmann 1962, Kakuk 1960, 1972, Németh 1965: 97,109) as well as in East Rumelian Turkish and Gagauz (Mollova 1962, Güzey 1962, Mollova & Mollova 1966, Gajdarži 1973, Pokrovskaja 1964: 210, 1979). The use of the optative-subjunctive to express indirect imperatives and clauses of goal also occurs in other Turkic languages and dialects (Kakuk 1960, Mollova & Mollova 1966), but the far greater frequency and wider range of such uses in Balkan Turkish indicate the influence of non-Turkish Balkan languages. Moreover, the optative is not the only finite form that substitutes for the infinitive in Balkans Turkish. At least in southwestern Macedonia (Kakuk 1972, Mollova 1968), the conditional can also occur in this function. In both cases, it appears that the expanded Turkish usage is calqued from subordinate clauses in Macedonian and Albanian using the particles da and të, 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:

10. Lamenta čalqalim. (Treba da rabotime Daulet të punojmë.)
   ‘We have to work.’ (Zekezëja 1976: 7).
11. Lëzm gëdëjim. (Treba da odamitë Duhet të shkoj.)
   ‘I have to go.’ (Zekezëja 1978: 38).
12. Sen lëm bëlesim. (Treba da znakaqitë Duhet ta diqsh.)
   ‘You should know.’ (Kakuk 1972: 246).
13. O këyes xam buvak agisiasja vëpyqin. (Vo tie xela treba da se napravi gojëma agisiasja Në këta fishtara duhet të bëhet agisiasjon i madh.)
   ‘In those villages some major consciousness raising needs to be done.’
   (Jasar-Nasteva 1957: 149).

Examples [14]-[17] show the optative-subjunctive and [18]-[19] the conditional after various finite verbs that would take infinitival clauses in Standard Turkish but da/të clauses in Macedonian and Albanian:

16. Ben seni iserim gëmë bët mënëcim olam. ‘Now I want you to be an astrologer.’
18. Hamama gëdë skëna. ‘She goes to the bath to wash.’ (Kakuk 1972: 246).

4. Calques

Examples [20] and [21] represent calques on Slavic. In example [20], the Turkish interrogative-possibilitive is replaced by the dialectal equivalent of Standard Turkish olur mu modelled on Slavic moze li ‘is it possible?’, while in [21], the Macedonian negative future, which is formed by a negative existential plus a da-clause (subjunctive) has been calqued by an equivalent construction in WRT:

   ‘Can we come to your place?’ (Jusuf 1977: 67).
[21] Yokar bëzëme geleseim = Bëzëme gelëmiyecësë/Nëma so nas da odi-
   ‘You won’t come [with us].’ (Zekezëja 1976: 10).

The calquing and borrowing of various conjunctions in WRT results in the reduction or elimination of participial constructions. Syntactic calquing of relativizing and coordinating conjunctions is also discussed in Matras (1996). Of particular interest is the use of ne ‘what’ as a relativizer modeled on Macedonian što as illustrated in examples [22]-[25]:

[22] Çocoklar yemislar pogaçy em oumey ng cetrum.
   ‘The children have eaten the round ouf and apple that I brought.’
[23] Cert o qitabi ng vardam sana. (Sana verdigim kitabiy getir.)
   ‘He climbed the branch that he is cutting.’
   (Kakuk 1972: 247; cf. Macedonian: Onaa granka što sece, na nego se kaçal.)
[25] O akrambës kë bëze sk sk ng gelirë
   ‘our relative that used to come to our place often’

In principle, Gëg Albanian could also serve as the model insular as the auxiliary ‘have’ is used to form the future and thus the negative future would have the same surface resemblance to the expression meaning ‘there isn’t any’ (Macedonian nema, Albanian s’a, both of which mean literally ‘it does not have’, cf. French il n’y a pas). However, the Gëg future is formed with an infinitive whereas the Macedonian is formed with a da-clause (the equivalent of a subjunctive) and thus seems to be the most likely source for the WRT calque.

Johannson (1975) has discussed the problems of syntactic classification of Turkish languages. Gavdžena (1973: 347-97) and Shelin (1986) give important insights into the history and development of subordination and its analogs in Turkish. Matras (1996) makes the point that these constructions, while inspired by the Indo-European type of subordination of the contact languages, nonetheless have a specifically Turkic character that is different from subordination per se. Nonetheless, the resemblance to Macedonian in particular is striking, and the spread of ne securely connected to contact phenomena in this region.

24. Cf. also the following examples from Vido: [i] Gëmëna verb kërperi o qutëlën e cëndë ng xe, ng xe getirë. ‘The mother-in-law gave the earrings into the hand of the woman whom the girl had brought.’ (Németh 1965: 111). [ii] Bu këzon bëhë, ng bëchëja gëmë qëd. ‘The girl’s father, who had gone on a pilgrimage.’ (Németh 1965: 111).
The use of *ne zaman* 'when?' as a calque on Macedonian *koga*, Albanian *kur* 'when' as a relativizer as well as an interrogative also serves to eliminate participial constructions (Kakuk 1972; Németh 1965: 110, Mollov & Mollova 1966).

[26] *Ne zaman gitmeksinemaya...*
   'Whenever we went to the movies...' (Zekeriyeva 1976: 10-2).

Particularly Balkan is the use of *niçin* 'why' to mean 'because' as well, this being a calque on colloquial usages of Macedonian *ziseto/zalto*, Albanian *pse*, etc., as in the following example:

[27] *Sözüm niçin paçadadan bir ay mektup yögrimis.* 'She was worried because she hadn’t had a letter from the padisah for a month.' (Kakuk 1972: 261).

In addition to calques, borrowed conjunctions such as Albanian *se* 'that, for' and Slavic *a* 'and/or but' are used as in the following examples:27

[28] *Bu ceçe celenem şe çok var iştam.*
   'I can’t come this evening because I have a lot of work.' (Yusuf 1977: 67).

[29] *Bu adamın karısı ülmüş a çocuğu ufak kaldımı.*
   'This man’s wife died, and left the little child.'

The question of whether or not the calqued constructions represent genuine hypotaxis and the discourse motivations for use of borrowed conjunctions raised by Johanson (1975) and Matras (1996) are important but beyond the scope of this survey. What is of significance to us here is the fact that these calques and borrowings 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.

5. Word order

Word order is another syntactic feature in which WRT is influenced by contact. While it is well known that colloquial Standard Turkish permits considerably more variation in word order than formal written style, what is characteristic of WRT is that word orders which would be marked in standard Turkish are unmarked, which is due to the influence of the Indo-European SVO-type 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 öğrencisi* (Zekeriyeva 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 dohar 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 nonfinal position far more than in Standard Turkish (See also Jusuf 1987: 132, Jašar-Nasteva 1970, Katona 1969, also Mollov & Mollova 1966 for East Rumelian Turkish and Doerfer 1959, Pokrovskaja 1979 for Gagauz). The following examples are typical of WRT dialectal word order under Slavic or Albanian influence.28

   'Ali’s father goes to the market every day to buy apples.' (Ibrahimí 1982: 53)

[31] *Çocuk çocu o城际inden arasa sofray.*
   'The child came that day to seek the table from us.' (Jusuf 1987: 132)

[32] *Sen de cell mişin yekanma?* ‘Are you coming to wash, too?’ (Bagaric 1978: 5)

[33] *Ben güzelden çekmeye.* ‘I told the child.’ (Zekeriyeva & Bugariç 1976: 14)

[34] *Ağan idin Orhd’de?* ‘When were you in Ohrid?’ (Zekeriyeva & Bugariç 1976: 14)


[36] *Gidey mi sinemaya?* ‘Are we going to the movies?’
   (Zekeriyeva & Bugariç 1976: 14)

[37] *Dildir o pesti. ‘He’s not stingy.* (Zekeriyeva 1976: 7)

[38] *Oynadılar çocuklar bunun için sokakta.*
   'The children played all day in the street.' (Jusuf 1987: 132)

Another example of a calqued word order is the placement of *deha* in the meaning of ‘yet another’ (Serbo-Croatian *još*, Macedonian *ulte*):

[39] *Kosova bölgesinde daha yedi kitaplık açılabacaktr.*
   'In the province of Kosovo seven more bookstores will be opened.'
   (= Jøt sedam knjižarnici/ulte sedam knjižarnici, vs. Standard Turkish yedi kitaplık daha; Teodosijević 1985).

Similar phraseological calques are the following:

[40] *kuza bir süre önce ‘a short while ago’*
   (cf. Macedonian *pred edno kratko vreme*)
   instead of *yakınlıkta* (Teodosijević 1985).

[41] *snavlja düşmek ‘to fail an exam’*
   (= Serbo-Croatian pasti na ispitu / Macedonian *paža na ispit* vs. Standard Turkish *snavda kalmak* (Teodosijević 1985).

---

27 See Matras (1996) for an interesting analysis of the choice and place of these conjunctions in the WRT system.

28 It is interesting to note that Albanian does not influence WRT even in Kosovo with respect to adjective placement. While Albanian permits the order adjective-substantive, it is highly unusual, the normal order being substantive-adjective. WRT, like Slavic, keeps the standard adjective-substantive word order.
6. Lexicon

The lexicon of WRT is heavily influenced by contact languages (cf. Jasić-Nasteva 1957, 1970) as is to be 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 & Emanov 1993). Even in Macedonia, whose language policies with regard to minorities are in general considerably better than those of its neighbors—or Turkey for that matter—interfered in print media regarding the use of Turkish (and Albanian) toponyms of places located in Macedonia, insisting, for example, on Macedonian Bitoea versus Turkish and Albanian Manastir (Friedman 1993a). For the WRT dialects of Macedonia, there are three lexical phenomena that are more specific to their environment and not common to every contact situation. Since the WRT dialects are not in direct contact with Standard Turkish, and since Turkish is a language with a significant neologizing pronominal movement, a situation sometimes arises in which WRT print media usages are 'more Catholic than the Pope', so to speak. A neologistic (Ozårke 'pure-Turkish') word may fail to gain currency in Turkey but be maintained in WRT territory, e.g. nen 'thing' vs. the Standard Turkish Araheem şey, or the use of the neologistic ulusal 'national' where Standard Turkish has the Arabism milli (Teodosijević 1987: 187). In this respect, the Kosovian Turkish media seem to be more puristic (or out of touch with Standard Turkish usage) than the Macedonian. A related phenomenon is insensitivity to nuances, e.g. the use of two different Turkish words both translatable as 'red' in the phrase al bayrak, versus kızıl bayrak both of which can mean 'red flag'. The phrase al bayrak refers to the Turkish national flag, whereas kızıl bayrak implies the banner of communism. Thus the use of al bayrak to refer to a Yugoslav soccer team whose name was based on the communist rather than the Turkish symbol is a mistake (Teodosijević 1985: 263). These are both features of print media, however. A lexical feature of colloquial WRT that is specific to its context is the re-borrowing 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 re-borrows them, as shown in the following examples:

[45] taşlıya = taş 'stone' (Bayram 1985)

7. Conclusion

We can conclude by pointing out that 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 the consonant and vowel phonemes not represented in the contact languages, e.g. /l/ and /h/, and the migration of high back unrounded /u/ to a more central or otherwise altered position. Moreover, via borrowing the introduction of a dental affricate /ts/ has also occurred. 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 /ʃ/. As a result, the phonological inventories of WRT dialects look very much like those of the Albanian and/or Slavic dialects with which they are in contact.

On the morphophonemic level, the confusion in the system of vowel harmony, while possibly in part due to archaism, undoubtedly to some extent reflects the lack of vowel harmony in the contact languages. In terms of inflection, WRT has remained fairly 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 (Johnson 1992: 231). However, this and the borrowing of the vocative affix—which can be treated in a sense as lexical or derivational—demonstrate that on the whole the WRT inflectional system is remarkably resistant.29 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 above-mentioned 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 particles. Even the inflection for interrogation and negation is sometimes replaced by lexical items based on Stavric models. In sentential word order, WRT arguably displays strong contact-induced influence. Despite the freer word order of colloquial standard Turkish itself, WRT treats as unmarked word orders that would be pragmatically marked in Standard Turkish.

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 that also exist in the centers of standardization. The preservation of neologisms not accepted into Standard Turkish and the lack of certain nuances that have developed in the standard result from the relative isolation of WRT from the Standard. The phenomenon of re-borrowing loanwords in the shape they acquired in the languages that originally borrowed them—specifically Macedonian in Macedonia and Serbo-Croatian in Kosovo—arguably reflects a change in dominance relations. Similarly, whereas Turkish was the source for all sorts of expressions in Slavic relating to

29 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.
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, which was already attested at the beginning of this century (Selićev 1931: 11-12). In many cases, either language could have been the source of a contact phenomenon, and insisting on assigning the origin to one or the other language can have ideological overtones (cf. Ibrahimi 1982). Moreover, the Yuruk tradition that the other Turkish dialects are spoken by descendants of autochthonous converts and not by descendants of Turkish immigrants to the Balkans raises the question of the extent to which WRT can be considered a 'relexified' Balkan language. From Balkanological, Turcological, general historical, sociolinguistic, and contact-theoretical perspectives, WRT displays many intriguing features that deserve further investigation. Of particular importance in this respect would be the investigation of those dialects that have not yet been studied, especially in Albania and Greece, and the publication in an accessible source of studies that are currently languishing as unpublished dissertations or articles in small periodicals.