BALKANISTICA 22

Table of Contents

Contents: ................................................................. Page

Table of Contents .......................................................... iii

From the Editor ............................................................... vii

ARTICLES

Contemporary Gothic Fiction and the European Margins
by Andrew Hammond ....................................................... 1

Indo-Hittite to (N)WIE 'bird'
Slovene vtič, Resian vtič, Revisited
by Eric P. Hamp ............................................................... 21

Western Dialect Features in the 16th-Century Damaskin
by Eric P. Hamp ............................................................... 25

How Gerund-like Are Bulgarian kato Clauses?
by John Leafgren ............................................................. 27

"His eyes were with his heart, and his heart is far away":
Nostalgic Vision in Konstantin Velichkov's Letters from Rome
by Stiliana Milkova .......................................................... 41

Exile and Ethnic Identity in Norman Manea's Work
by Mihai Mindra ............................................................. 75

The Diachrony of Bulgarian Quantification
by Olga M. Mladenova ...................................................... 89
An edited collection on the minority languages of Greece is an important publishing event, owing to the fact that, as Adamou points out in her introduction (p. 25), “working on these communities is in and of itself a political act since it implies the most elementary recognition of these populations and their language(s),” and is a form of resistance to “the very real interdiction on speaking these languages” (28). The persecution of minority languages by the Greek state is also noted elsewhere in the volume. The extent to which government forces have participated in the hastening of language death, and in some cases one could, following the rhetoric of Skutnabb-Kangas and Bucak (1994), speak of language murder — i.e., the intentional attempt to destroy a language albeit not its speakers (an example is given in an appendix) — could have received more attention in some of the individual chapters, but the authors chose to avoid such controversies (see Kontopoulou 2000 for more explicit engagement). Still, this is a relatively balanced collection.

The book contains a foreword by Lukas Tsitsipis (9-13), entitled “The Names of Languages and Their Dense Identity,” an introduction by Adamou (15-30) and six articles: “Aromanian” by Stamatis Beis (31-45), “Arvanitika” by Eleni Botsi (47-69), “Armenian” by Adamou (71-76), “Greco-Pontic” by Georges Drettas (77-88), “Romani” by Irene Sechidou (89-105) and “Slavic” by Adamou and Drettas (107-32). The volume concludes with a brief terminological lexicon (eight entries, pp. 133-34), bibliography of over 200 items (134-49), a brief biography of each author (150) and an index (151-53) of languages, countries and authors cited. The absence of Turkish and Djudzemo is explained by the authors as not intentional but due to problems related to publication schedules and deadlines. Particularly interesting would have been a discussion of the use of the term Mosoulmanika Thrakhes ‘Muslims of Thrace’ (Elliniki Dialektologia vol. 5 1996-1998) for ‘Turkish,’ an indication of how Greek minority policies are based on religion rather than language. In the case of Djudzemo (Espanolevenka ‘Judeo-Spanish’), the local self-descriptive linguistic term in Salonika before World War II was Djejko ‘Jewish,’ although Ladino and Espanol have also become known. (Among scholars, the term Ladino is restricted to the use of Djudzemo for the literal translation of the Hebrew...
Bible; see especially Harris 1994:20-29 for a detailed discussion of Djudzezmo language naming practices and Bunis 1999 for a detailed study of Salonika Djudzezmo.)

In his foreword to the collection, Tsitsipis appropriately cites Gal and Irvine's (1995) introduction of the term *erasure* to describe the semiotic process through which ideology renders complexity invisible. In the case of any standard language, erasure removes dialectal differentiation. In the case of the territory of Greece, it is the multilingualism of the territory that ideology erases. Writing of the "emancipatory moments" occasioned by language recognition, Tsitsipis states (10): "every language you speak adds to your social prosperity" we can hear stated among Arvanitika speakers, and quite likely speakers of other languages" [italics mine]. This qualification *quite likely* reveals that the writer, a native speaker of Greek, is unaware of the fact that a proverb to this effect does in fact exist in every Balkan linguistic community except Greek. Here follow some examples:

**Jazici se bogatstvo** (Macedonian)

'Languages are wealth.'

**Šljem više jezici znači, to više ljudi vredni** (Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian)

'The more languages you know, the more people you are worth.'

**So më shënuj gjuha të dhis, që më tepër vlen** (Albanian)

'The more languages you know, the more you are worth.'

**So pobuiter čitoja danjeja pobuiter vredinjeja** (Romani [Arl])

'The more languages you know, the more you are worth.'

**Bir lisan, bir inSAN, iki lisan, iki inSAN** (Turkish)

'One language, one person; two languages, two people,' i.e., a person who knows two languages is worth two people (also cited in Turkish by Djudzezmo-speakers).

**Ca fiecare alta limba treagii o nouă viaţă** (Romanian)

'With each new language you live a new life.'

A similar sentiment is even expressed in Classical Latin:

**Quintus Ennix tria corda habere sese dicebat quod loqui Greca et Osce et Latine sciret** (Gellius17.17.1)

'Q.E. used to say that he had three hearts, because he knew how to speak Greek, Oscan and Latin.'

The devaluing of foreign languages as *barbarian* (see Strabo 14.28.2 for discussion) is part of the "classic Greek ideal" alluded to by Boteri (63) in her discussion of Arvanitika, and while it is true that the Greek state's opposition to non-Hellenic languages on Greek-controlled territory has its origins in the 19th century (also made clear by Boteri, *Ibid*), the attitude has antecedents in the Byzantine period. According to Fine (1993:220), citing Molin (1963:54-69), the complete absence of Slavic-language sources prior to 1180 in the regions controlled by Byzantium can quite reasonably be attributed to a deliberate destruction of Slavic-language books and manuscripts. The evidence that it was Byzantines and not Ottomans who erased the evidence is the fact that Greek manuscripts dating back to the 9th and 10th centuries have been preserved in Ohrid, and several hundred manuscripts from the second Bulgarian Empire have been preserved in Bulgaria. If the Ottomans and not the Greeks had been responsible, then one would expect no such texts to have survived.

The collection under consideration here is thus brave, interesting and problematic. It is brave because both the official and much of the intellectual climate in Greece is hostile to acknowledging the diversity of languages still spoken natively on the territory of the Greek state despite more than a century of attempts to extirpate many of those languages (see for example Kostopoulo 2000, as well as Karakasidou 1997 and the appendix here). It is interesting because it brings to light many facts heretofore unavailable or less available to readers of English and French. Finally, it is problematic in that it claims a post-modern approach to language, but not to the state. If, as Tsitsipis writes (9), this collection is anti-essentialist in its approach to language, looking at language "as means and outcomes of communicative agency," why not also look at the state not as a given "directly mirroring human groups and their perceived naturalized features" but as the exercise of hegemonic coercive power (see Karakasidou 2002)? To some extent the authors do recognize this, but it could have been brought out more clearly.

In her list of terminological definitions in the introduction (16), Adamou defines the subjects of this volume — "languages of restricted distribution in Greece" or "languages among the least spoken in Greece" (30) — as being oral and familial as opposed to scholarly, used in parallel with one or two other languages, not official, not taught, not allowing for social mobility and not standardized. Such a definition, however, gives the impression of assuming that a language spoken in Greece cannot have any connection to a language spoken outside of Greece. It is in this context that the state appears to have been naturalized and its boundaries rendered impenetrable. Thus, for example, while Aromanian in Greece is published only in the occasional folklore collection (e.g., Padîde 1991), across the border, in the Republic of Macedonia, Aromanian is an official language, it is taught, it is a subject of academic study and it is standardized, although the process of standardization is in relatively early phases. The same is true for Romani, Armenian, as briefly described by Adamou, has not one but two standards and is even taught in
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Greece itself. Macedonian, Bulgarian and Albanian all have standards, and in the case of Macedonian and Albanian, some of the dialects spoken in northern Greece are actually very close to the dialects on which the standards are based. To some extent we seem to be faced with the claim that if a dialect is spoken in a different nation-state, then it is a different language. Precisely this process has been occurring in northern Europe, where Kven and Meänkieli (the latter meaning 'our language' in local speech), which used to be considered dialects of Finnish in Norway and Sweden, respectively, now have official status as separate languages. The Greek publication of a Macedonian textbook in 1925 and, more recently, of Pomak (Kokkas 2004) is reminiscent of this. We shall return to this issue below.

Beis's chapter on Aromanian gives a good survey but also claims that Aromanian has never been standardized, which, as I pointed out above, is not exactly true. This chapter might better be entitled "South Dalmatian Balkan Romance," since it also includes discussion of Istro-Romanian and Megleno-Romanian. It is strange, however, that Beis (33) does not cite any post-World War II work on Megleno-Romanian, e.g., Wild (1983) and especially Atanasov (1990), which give detailed information about villages and towns where Megleno-Romanian is spoken (see also Kahl 2006). According to Atanasov (1990:4), Megleno-Romanians refer to themselves as vlă (singular) and vlăd (plural) rather than vlăhi (33), although this latter might be the form on the Greek side of the border. One could also note that in former Yugoslavia vlăh was used to refer to a Daco-Romanian-speaking minority in eastern Serbia (around Negotin). Beis concludes that Aromanian denotes belonging to a linguistic and cultural community rather than a nation, which is indeed the case, but it is also worth remembering that after World War I some Aromanian intellectuals sought the creation of an Aromanian state centered on the Pindus range (see also Kahl 2002 on modern Aromanian identity).

Botu's chapter on Arvanitika also gives much useful information but contains some unfortunate errors. The northern dialect of Albanian is Gëg, not Gjëg (47 et passim), and the formulation "... Albanian does not constitute the direct descendent of an (one?) Indo-European language ..." is flat out wrong. While it is true that we are not certain which Indo-European language Albanian is directly descended from, it is as much the descendent of a single language as Greek or French. The claim that Greek and Latin are "at the origin of Albanian polygenesis" (48) is mistaken. To be sure, Albanian was heavily influenced by Latin (much less by Greek, especially in the north), but the core grammar and vocabulary represent a distinct and different branch of Indo-European. The primary shape of the root alban- in deriving the various forms of the relevant name is not clearly presented and the forms Shqiptera (Gëg Shqiptia) and Shqiptar are misspelled. The use of Arvanitika to cover all the Albanian-speakers of Greece no doubt reflects popular Greek usage, but in the
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(to use Gal) and Irvine’s term cited by TzTsipis in the foreword) efforts at creating a Macedonian standard that are documented in publications as early as Pulevski (1875:48-49, 1892) and Misirkov (1903-145). Although Drettas mentions Tsakonian in passing (86) without differentiating it from various Greek diaspora dialects, in fact Tsakonian, which is the only living descendant of Doric rather than the Attic-based Hellenistic koine, has limited recognition as a separate language in Greece.

Sechidou’s article on Roman in Greece is the most solid in the book. It contains a useful survey of the dialects and their origins. It is also distinguished by giving more actual language data than the other articles useful both for the theme of naming and for issues of Roman dialect origins and classifications. One point that comes through strikingly is the fact that as a marginalized people with no territorial pretensions, Roma have succeeded in maintaining their language in Greece better than other minority groups (except Muslim Turkish-speakers, who have had special support). Adamou and Drettas’s article on “Slavic” deals with the most fraught and painful minority language topic in Greece. For the most part, they do a good job of treating this complex and difficult subject. Missing from their account, however, is the ongoing persecution of Macedonian-speakers and the efforts in the region of Florina (Macedonian Lerin), where the local dialect is quite close to the base of the standard language, to introduce knowledge of the standard (see especially Human Rights Watch 1994 and Vinožito 2006). The authors themselves complain (109) that the region of Komotini in easternmost Greek Thrace is “practically forbidden to researchers.” But here the problem is with local rather than national authorities. At issue, ironically, is the effort of Turkish-speakers to suppress Pomak language and identity.

The discussion of the shift by Pomaks from their native language to Turkish is reminiscent of the shift from Macedonian to Turkish (or Albanian) among some Macedonian-speaking Muslims in the western part of the Republic of Macedonia. In Bulgaria, the Pomaks are Bulgarian-speaking Muslims. Speakers of the same dialects on the other side of the Rhodopes, in Greece, however, have been given pedagogical materials in Pomak dialect, which is quite distinct from standard Bulgarian. As indicated above, this is resisted by the Turkish-speaking authorities that control Muslim education in Greek Thrace.

For a better etymology of Slav (pace 112), see Golajh (1992:293). Pace note 121 (113), the Gagauz are Orthodox Christian Turkish-speakers established in the Balkans since Byzantine times (Witteke 1953). While it is true that in the late 18th century or early 19th century Tetraglosson of Danil (1802), the Slavic dialects of what is today the Republic of Macedonia were referred to in Greek as vardavida, by the early 20th century peasants in the Edessa (Macedonian Voden) region were
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Friedman: Le patrimoine plurilingue de la Grèce

Calling their language makedonski (Upward 1908:202-06). Moreover, on Greek public signs banning this language’s use in Greece after World War II, the language was called makedenhonski (see appendix). The reference to the Tetraglosson of Danil (114) demonstrates the continuity of efforts of Hellenizers to erase other languages. Here is how Danil, himself a native Aromanian-speaker, began his introduction (original and translation from Wace and Thompson 1913:6):

Ἀλβανοί, Βούλγαροι, Αλλαγίωσαν χαρής,
Κ’ ετοιμασθήσαν χλόη σου; Ρωμαίοι να γενήσης.
Βαρβαρομανίας ἀφ’ ὑμών γίνομαι, φῶν’ καὶ ἥπθη.
Ὅτι τοις Ἀθηναίοις σας να φαίνεσθε στὸν μύθον.
‘Albanians, Bulgars, Viachs and all who now do speak
An alien tongue rejoice, prepare to make you Greek,
Change your barbaric tongue, your customs rude forego,
So that as bygone myths your children may them know.’

Drettas and Adamou conclude (132):

Les parlers slaves de Grèce constituent un exemple éloquent de l’impact que la dénomination d’une langue peut avoir sur les représentations historiques des contemporains. Contrairement à l’idéologie nationaliste qui traite les noms de langues comme des objets naturels stables, il nous semble important d’aborder les dénominations des langues comme des processus et de les situer dans les contextes politico-linguistiques de chaque époque.
The Slavic dialects of Greece constitute an eloquent example of the impact that the name of a language can have on the historical representations by contemporaries. Contrary to the nationalist ideology that treats the names of languages as stable natural objects, it seems to us important to approach the naming of languages as processes and to situate them in the politico-linguistic context of each time period.

One could add that the shift from Romänisch ‘Romanic’ (or ‘Roman’) to Ellinîka ‘Hellenic’ for the Modern Greek language in the 19th century was just such a process. In the end, however, the situation for many is that described by Monova (2002:465-66) in her doctoral dissertation about the Macedonian-speaking inhabitants from Tupsîmô, on the Greek side of the Meglen, who fled the violence of the Greek Civil War and ended up in Prepel, Republic of Macedonia:
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Mais pour tous, les vraies retrouvailles se font avec la langue — celle qui fut dans leur pays d'origine la cause du rejet et des persécutions, celle qui est dans l'État macédonien le dénominateur commun avec la population locale. La langue devient ainsi un véritable lieu géographique, un territoire qui définit le Macédonien en général et dans cet ensemble ces autres Macédoniens — les Egejci.

‘But for all, real self-discovery is made by means of language — that which in their country of origin was the cause of rejection and persecution, that which in the Macedonian state was the common denominator with the local population. Language thus becomes a veritable geographic location, a territory that defines the Macedonian in general, and within this group, these other Macedonians — the Egejci.’

Despite its shortcomings, Le Patrimoine plurilingue de la Grèce represents a valuable contribution to the study of minority languages in Greece, and as such can be used profitably alongside Clogg's (2002) excellent collection on minorities in Greece, which, unfortunately, lacks a chapter on speakers of Arvanitika and Sheqip. As ongoing processes, language and identity in Greece, as elsewhere, will continue to merit further study.

Notes

1. Some chapters in the book are in French, some in English. I have given all French quotations in my own English translation.
2. We can add that the situation with Swedish and Norwegian bears some similarities to that of Macedonian and Bulgarian: two clearly distinct yet, in large part, mutually intelligible languages (cf. Haugen 1966).
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Appendix

The following sign was photographed in northern Greece some time in the 1950s. It
was authenticated by Kostas Kazazis (University of Chicago), who said that the
original colors were blue lettering on white (the Greek national colors). The
translation is based on that supplied by Brian Joseph (The Ohio State University). I
have left it as literal as possible. It is a concrete example of how language death is
sought by a state, but at the same time, it gives indirect evidence that Slavic-
speakers in Aegean Macedonia were calling their language “Macedonian” at that
time.

O ΣΚΟΠΟΣ ΑΓΙΑΖΕΙ ΤΑ ΜΕΤΑ

THE END JUSTIFIES THE MEANS

Ο ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΟΣ ΠΑΤΡΙΟΤ!

Forbid in the street, in the cafe, at your job, next to you, EVERYWHERE, that they
speak “Vlah,” “Macedonian,” etc. Tear up every relevant printed document that falls
into your perception.

USE EVERY MEANS so that the writing or unwriting instruments of foreigners who use
these “language” fabrications might understand that:
HERE IS CALLED GREECE
and that there is room only
FOR THE GREEK LANGUAGE
Break up HOWEVER YOU CAN the plans of the enemies of the People.

THE END JUSTIFIES THE MEANS
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