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TURKISH INFLUENCE IN MODERN MACEDONIAN: THE CURRENT SITUATION AND ITS GENERAL BACKGROUND

1. Introduction

Studies of Turkish influence in Balkan languages date from the earliest days of Balkan linguistics (e.g., Miklosich 1884, Seleščev 1925, Skok 1935). Even so young a language as Literary Macedonian, which celebrated its fourth decade in August 1984, has been the subject of numerous specific studies (e.g., Golab 1960; Jašar-Nasteva 1962/63, 1963, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973a, 1978, 1981/82, 1982; Markov 1955, 1977; v. also Schaller 1977). Turkish influence in Macedonian has also been discussed in other modern works on Turkish influence in the Balkans (e.g., Grannes 1980; Kazazis 1972; Menskaja 1975; Schmaus 1970) as well as in other studies pertaining to Macedonian (e.g., Jašar-Nasteva 1966, 1973b, 1974, 1978b, 1979, 1981; Koseski et al. 1981; Koneski 1965, 1983; Miovska 1980; Videski 1974). I hope to contribute here to this much studied subject in two ways. Firstly, I shall give a general survey of Turkish influence on Macedonian on all linguistic levels: phonological, morphological (both inflectional and derivational), syntactic, and semantic. Such an overview has not been done before; all of the works dealing in whole or in part with Turkish influence in Macedonian have focused on specific areas. Secondly, I shall assess the current status of the results of Turkish influence by drawing upon data from the daily press and my own field experience which have not heretofore been utilized.

2. Phonology

Turkish phonological influence on Macedonian can be classified into four types: 1) extremely isolated (h, ū), 2) marginal/lexical (schwa), 3) contributing factor (ř, ř, ę) and 4) major (dž, ḫ). Turkish /ū/ is generally borrowed by Macedonian as /ū/ or /u/, e.g., kumur (Turk. kümir) 'charcoal', bilbilj (Turk. bulbul) 'nightingale'. In a few peripheral dialects, however, Turkish /ū/ is preserved in loanwords, e.g., Kumur in dialects from the Korča (Korçë) region (Mazin 1936: 17-18, Jašar-Nasteva 1971:261). The preservation of /ū/ here, however, is also due to Albanian
influence, as many of the Turkish words in these dialects entered via Albanian (Jašar-Nasteva 1971:318). Turkish /h/ underwent the same fate as inherited /x/, i.e., in most of western Macedonia it was lost, e.g., aber (Turk.haber) 'news', asma (Turk.sama) 'neighborhood', or changed to a labio-dental fricative, e.g., befe (Turk.befes) 'garden'. In the town dialect of Ohrid, however, /h/ is preserved, at least in some words, due to the prestige of Turkish (and also Greek) (Koneski 1965:78, 1983:85). In both these instances, the sounds involved, viz./u/ or /h/, are marginal to the individual dialect systems in which they occur. Their position is comparable to that of, e.g., (x), (i), or (n) in the speech of Americans who pronounce Bach (bak) or genre (zeRa) (vs the more common (bak) and (zam)) due to the prestige of pronouncing German or French "correctly", i.e., imitatively. It should also be noted that Turkish is not the sole source for either /u/ or /h/, where they do occur. In Literary Macedonian, /u/ is totally absent and /h/ has been reintroduced from various non-Turkish sources, e.g., Church Slavonic (duh 'spirit'), other dialects (hreba 'food' vs. rana 'wound'), in recent loanwords (hotel 'hotel'), neologisms (dohod 'income'), and Toponyms (Ohrid).

At the time of the Ottoman conquest (fifteenth century), schwa occurred in all Macedonian dialects, albeit from different sources in different dialects (generally the sources were *ə in the West, *i in the East and *i, *u in the North). Turkish high back unrounded i (i) was usually borrowed as schwa and then underwent the same fate as native schwa, i.e., it was preserved in the North and East and usually became /a/ in the West. Like /ü/ and /h/, schwa occurs in isolated lexical items in the Western dialects. Unlike the first two, however, schwa is widespread in both rural and urban Western dialects and occurs in native as well as Turkish words, e.g., in Dihovo kisem 'fate' (Turk.kisem) but also gaska 'goose', kane 'bite' (both with schwa from original ə) and maeka 'mile' (from original ə), but normally, e.g., pet 'road' (original ə), enof 'moss' (original ə), sakalida 'upset, excite' (Turk.sakill-) (Green 1977:10). The treatment of schwa, both native and of Turkish origin, was a question addressed by the codifiers of literary Macedonian in the first Pravopis (1945:6) and in both of its subsequent editions (1950:5; 1970:3, 99, 147).

1945 Pravopis specifies the orthographic use of the apostrophe for schwa in dialectisms, e.g., p'no 'full' (lit. polno) and Turks, e.g., k'zmet, when used for local color. The 1950 Pravopis specifies the use of a for schwa in the suffix -lik (sic), e.g., javaplik 'slowness', and prefers -- but does not require -- the use of a in other Turks, e.g., saklet 'langour' but also s'klet, k'zmet. The 1970 Pravopis specifies the use of a in Macedonian words of Turkish origin, e.g., kisemt, saklet, javaplik (p.3), but allows either a or the apostrophe in the transcription of a in Turkish words (p.99). Both of the later works also permit schwa (orthographic apostrophe) in native words when consciously used as dialectals. It is interesting to note that the enormous influx of English loanwords has not brought about a new rise in the frequency of schwa. English schwa is borrowed as a, e.g., samit 'summit' (Nova Makedonija /N.M./-V-79-7), or on the basis of spelling, e.g., budet 'budget' (Sabota '14-XI-81:2); there is some variation in the treatment of unstressed schwa, e.g., delis 'delicious/a type of apple' (Cvetkovski 1966:149). While it is true that these words are, for the most part, entering via mass media and not as a result of mass bilingualism, the reitive marginality of schwa undoubtedly contributes to the fact that no attempt is made to imitate English pronunciation more exactly. Thus, while the influx of large numbers of Turkish loanwords with /h/ may have strengthened the position of schwa in the Eastern Macedonian dialects, (where schwa from a back nasal had already become /a/ but schwa from vocalic ə did not) (Koneski 1983:39, 66-673), its position in the West remains marginal, albeit far more widespread than /u/.

Both /f/ and the palatals /k, ɟ/ are of native origin, but the influx of large numbers of Turkish (and Greek, etc.) loanwords greatly increased their frequency, freedom of positional occurrence, and range of distribution. Native Macedonian /f/ occurs initially only as the reflex earlier of xy- (e.g., fati 'grab, get') and elsewhere only as a result of the devoicing of v (e.g., sfat/'in law', /jubof/'love'), or later from i in these same environments (e.g., bef, befe/'be' 1 sg, 2 pl aor, and by analogy also in the 1 pl aor and impf., e.g., /pravifme, pravfme/). Tur-
kish (and Greek) loanwords increased the occurrence of ʃ and introduced it into environments where it had been rare (e.g., _fil'can_ 'demi-tasse cup' (Turk. _filcan_) or nonexistent (e.g., meri-fet 'trick, scheme' (Turk. _meri-fet_)). Native Macedonian ʃ, ʤ as the reflexes of *š, *ķ, *dj did not originally extend as far south as they do now (the earlier reflexes having been ʃt, ʃd) as evidenced by toponyms, e.g., Krivogashtani (from *Krivogashtani) and other words, e.g., gažnik 'trouser-strap' (from _gatnik_), cf. gaki 'britches' (from _gatli_). Although the initial impulse for the spread of ʃ, ʤ came from Serbian before the Ottoman conquest (Koneski 1983:54), Turkish added many new occurrences after Serbian influence had waned, e.g., _ker_ 'profit'; _kef_ 'pleasure', _kor_ 'blind', _kunk_ 'water/drainage pipe', etc. According to Koneski (1983:53) the palatalization of ʃ in the toponymic suffix -ʃi, e.g., Carevik, which does not come from original *-ti, is due at least in part to the fact that Turkish automatically palatalizes velars after (as well as before) front vowels. At the present time, ʃ/ is as solidly established as ever, but the phonemes /k, ʃ/ are tending to merge with /x, ʃ/ in urban dialects, e.g., Skopje, Prilep, Struga (Koneski 1983:94). Thus, for example, I have seen signs such as ГАЈХАТЈА (Prilep), _ЦУБЕ_ (Skopje) (for literary _gajhatija_ 'bagpipe-master', _gubre_ 'trash') as well as the proper name Надживка (N.M. 8-X-72: for _napčija_), and _dževre_ 'Turkish coffee pot' even has the literary variant _gazve_ (Turk. _gazdevi, gubre, Naciće, coze_).

In the case of the sounds /ʒ/ are /l/ (the latter being a clear ʃ as opposed to /ʃ/, the dark ʃ; hereafter we will use the standard Macedonian Latinizations ʒ and ʃ for /ʒ/ and /ʃ/ when these sounds are transliterated), Turkish was instrumental in the spread of the former and in preventing the loss of the latter. Before the fifteenth century, /ʃ/ occurred only before voiced consonants as an allophone of /ʃ/, e.g., _lišba_ /liʃba/ 'beauty', and as a variant of /ʃ/ in initial consonant clusters and, in some dialects, next to any sonorant or another /ʃ/, e.g., _džrka_ 'squetch', dial. _poldžav_ 'snail', _vežža_ 'eyebrow' (literary _poldžav_, _vežža_; the analysis of the reflex of *dj as phonemic /ʒ/ realized as phonetic /ʒ/ is only one possibility, but regardless of the analysis, /ʃ/ cannot be regarded as phonemic in this environment prior to the fifteenth century). According to Koneski (1983:79-80), it was only after the massive influx of Turkish words with /ʃ/ in any position where a voiced consonant was permissible that this sound became phonemic. The position of ʤ in the modern Macedonian system continues to be supported by the influx of new foreign words, especially from English, e.g., _budžet_ 'badge, button', _tinežđor_ 'teenager', etc. (v. Cvetkovski 1966:57). The opposition ʃ/1/ (older [ʃ]/1/), modern [ʃ]/1/ (11) was already disappearing in the thirteenth century, as evidenced by confusions of, e.g., _soyu_ /1/ in documents from that period, and it was completely lost in the Prilep-Vales region by the time of the Ottoman conquest (Koneski 1965:56-57). The influx of Turkish loanwords with clear /l/ (automatically before and after front vowels, distinctively elsewhere) prevented the spread of the change and reintroduced clear /l/ as a phoneme in Prilep-Vales, e.g., _bela_ 'white' vs _bežja_ 'trouble', _bilbili_ 'nightingale' vs _unilba_ 'effort', _bil_ 'was'. This did not, however, reverse the effect of hardening of soft /l/ where it had already occurred, e.g., _luše_ 'people', _nedela_ 'sunday, week' (Koneski 1965:56). In recent years, the tendency to eliminate clear /l/ has reasserted itself among the youngest generation of urban speakers, especially in Prilep: orthographic ʃ is pronounced [ʃ] in all positions and orthographic ʃ is pronounced [ʃ] due to Serbo-Croatian influence (cf. Körubin 1976:107-12, 1980:157-66).

To summarize the influence of Turkish on the Macedonian phonological system, it can be said that the phonemization of ʤ has been entirely stable major effect in which Turkish influence was the single most important factor. The reestablishment of the opposition ʃ vs ʃ is proving unstable, as is the opposition ʃ, ʧ vs ʃ, ʃ, ʤ - - which latter was only partially influenced by Turkish in many cases. The phoneme ʃ is stable but has additional sources. Schwa has remained marginal while the rise of a new h took place subsequent to Turkish influence, and ʃ is confined to a tiny number of dialects spoken outside the Socialist Republic of Macedonia. The one other possible effect of Turkish influence which has been hinted at elsewhere (e.g. Koneski 1983:2) is the
increase in the relative frequency of certain phonemes which were well established in any case. Thus, for example, the relative frequency of /a/ may have been increased by the large number of Turkish words in which [a:] was borrowed as [a]. This interesting statistical question has yet to be investigated, but a prerequisite is the publication of a comprehensive dictionary of Turkisms in Macedonian such as Jašar-Nasteva's doctoral dissertation (v.Jašar-Nasteva 1963, Schmaus 1970).

3. Morphology. A. Inflectional:
The influence of Turkish on Macedonian inflectional morphology has been minimal and is essentially limited to a small class of lexical items of Turkish origin, viz., adjectives that inflect only for number or not at all, e.g. kabaštije/kabaštijl 'guilty' (Turk. kabahatlı), tase 'fresh', bajat 'stale', etc. Many adjectives of Turkish origin, however, do inflect, e.g., kor, -a, -2, -i 'blind' (Turk. kőr), or are suffixed and made to conform to Macedonian inflectional patterns, e.g. bakaus 'luckless' (indecl.) but bakasen -zna, -2, -i 'ibid.' (Turk. bahtıslı) (cf. Markov 1977:9, Konški 1955:121). Modern Macedonian continues to borrow some adjectives as indeclinable, e.g. fer 'fair' (as in fer iyera 'a fair game'), super 'wonderful', but normalen, -ina, -2, -i 'normal' (cf. Cvstovski 1966:154). As Grannes (1984:25) has pointed out, this is not so much a matter of influence as of borrowing lexical items without adaptation.

Certain other features of Macedonian inflection (or rather the lack thereof) have also been attributed on occasion to Turkish influence, but these other instances are far from certain and raise the basic question of when a given feature can actually be traced to Turkish influence. Thus, for example, Markov (1977:7-8) claims that the borrowing of Turkish nouns (all of which denote animate beings) ending in a consonant (e.g. abdal, akmak 'fool') or -a (e.g. buda 'fool') as epicene, i.e., as capable of functioning as grammatically masculine, feminine, or neuter depending on the grammatical gender of the referent; is part of the influence of Turkish on the grammatical structure of Macedonian. While it is true that Turkish lacks grammatical gender, it is also true that native Slavic nouns in a consonant or -a can be epicene, e.g. svedok 'witness', audija 'judge', as can recent loanwords, e.g. star 'star', akademik 'academician', etc. This pattern also occurs in North Slavic languages, e.g. Russian vrač 'physician', doktor 'doctor', sirota 'orphan'. Thus, the Turkish nouns fit a native pattern, and their treatment as epicene, while unusual, is not foreign to Slavic. This phenomenon, therefore, is one of Macedonian fitting Turkish loanwords into an uncommon but already existent pattern.

Goļeb (1960:43) suggests that the loss of gender distinction in the 3 sg dative enclitic pronoun (masc.-neutr. mu for fem. as well), which occurs in the dialects of Upper Fojn (Gostivar), part of neighboring Fojn, and south of a line running from Struga to Gusmendi (Goumenissa) may be due to Turkish influence. Konški et al. (1966:521), however, point out that both Albanian and Aromanian have exactly the same type of single-gender dative enclitic. Since the dialects of these regions are in close contact with one or both of these other languages, the role of Turkish is moot at best.

Another inflection-loss phenomenon attributed to Turkish by Markov (1977:10-11 after Konški 1967:240) is the loss of vocative inflection. While it is true that Turkish does not have a vocative ending and that Turkish loanwords can be used in Macedonian without the vocative ending, the fact is that native Slavic, Turkish and recent foreign words all occur in Macedonian both with and without the vocative ending, e.g. đovek/doveku '0 person!', beg/begu '0 beg!', idiot/idiotet '0 idiot!'! The loss of the vocative is also well-known in many North Slavic languages, e.g., Russian. The degree to which Turkish actually influenced Macedonian in this phenomenon is extremely difficult to determine, especially in view of the tendency of Balkan Slavic to lose nominal inflections in favor of analytical constructions.

One other inflectional phenomenon, or rather the lack of it, which has sometimes been included in discussions of Turkish influence is the analytic formation of comparative and superlative adjectives, e.g., poubav 'more beautiful' (Turk. daha güzel, en güzel) (cf. Grannes 1984:25, also Sandfeld 1970:101, but Markov 1954:163). The process in question was already under way before the Ot-
toman invasion (Koneski 1965:120), and it has occurred elsewhere both in and beyond the Balkans, so that the most that can be said is that the two languages share parallel development with the possibility that Turkish reinforced the already developing native pattern.

In matters pertaining to Macedonian inflectional morphology, then, Turkish influence has been invoked as a causative or contributing factor in the loss of gender distinctions and vocative endings and the development of the analytic comparative. While it is true that Old Church Slavonic tended to make all borrowed words conform to some inflectional pattern (v.Diels 1963:180), it is also true that nonassimilation of foreign borrowings, e.g., in-declinal foreign nouns, is characteristic of a wide range of languages including New Testament Greek and Russian. It is true that loss of nominal inflection was a general characteristic of Macedonian (and the rest of Balkan Slavic). Thus, none of the phenomena ascribed to Turkish influence are without plausible native models and sources except, perhaps, the uninflected adjectives, which in any case are better seen as unassimilated loanwords.

Morphology. B. Derivational:

The entry of Turkish on Macedonian derivational morphology is much clearer. To begin with the most obvious phenomena in suffixation, there are four suffixes which were unquestionably borrowed from Turkish and remain productive: 1) -díja (Turk. -ği, etc.) used to denote types of people, 2) -ija (Turk. -i, etc.) used to form adjectives, 3) -lak (Turk. -lik, etc.) used primarily for abstract nouns, and 4) -ana (Turk. -hane) used for buildings. The functioning of these suffixes can be seen in their use in three types of words: 1) Turkish, e.g., jabandžija 'foreigner' (Turk. yabancı), meraččija 'fond, pleasure-loving' (Turk. meraklı), javančlak 'slowness' (Turk. yavaşlık), meansa 'tavern' (Turk. meyhané); 2) native, e.g., lovdžija 'hunter', voščija 'lousy', stromniklak 'matchmaking', pílana 'chicken coop', 3) recent loans, e.g., fudbalsčija 'impt soccer player', pubertetlja 'teenage' (ironic), asistentlak 'assistentship' (ironic), hidroelektrana 'hydroelectric power station'. As can be seen from the glosses, the semantics of the first three suffixes has shifted downward, a phenomenon which will be discussed in the section on semantics (cf. Kazazis 1972).

One other suffix which can be mentioned at this point is -ša. This suffix occurs natively in both Turkish and Macedonian, and its use in Macedonian cannot for the most part be attributed to Turkish influence. The one exception to this is the use of -še in toponyms, where the original suffix was -ica, e.g., Vranče from original Vranica, where Macedonian has borrowed the Turkish form of the toponym (Koneski 1983:53). This is essentially a lexical phenomenon, however, and cannot really be construed as an influence on productive derivational morphology.

Similar examples of nonproductive borrowings are cited by Markov (1977:17), viz. -man, and -džik. In the case of -man, only one of the words cited by Markov is not a complete borrowing from Turkish, viz. utman 'dullard', which is formed on the basis of ut 'owl, 2. dollard', which in its turn is borrowed from Albanian but (dialectal ut), which also has three meanings. Although I have not found utman attested in Albanian reference works, it is nevertheless possible that this word was borrowed as a whole from dialectal Albanian. In the case of -džik, which is a diminutive marker in Turkish, there are only three words in literary Macedonian with this suffix, Markov cites only two of them, and they are all borrowed directly from Turkish, viz. kapidžik 'back-gate' (Turk. ka-pi/kapıcık 'door/little door'), arpadžik 'onion bulb' (Turk. apar/arpacık 'barley/sty /in the eyelid/ but arpacık soğana 'a type of onion'), and -- not cited by Markov -- jandžik 'flank-bag' (Turk. yan/yançık 'side/flank-bag'). These are strictly lexical borrowings in Macedonian, and one is no more justified in citing -džik (or -man) as a borrowed suffix than one would be in citing -siz, etc., 'without' just because there are six Turkish words with this suffix in Macedonian, viz. bakusz 'luckless', Edinburgh 'ashameless', spansz 'unexpectedly', arenaz 'crook', teklifsziz 'unceremoniously, freely', ugurusz 'nogoodnik' (Turk. bahtsız, edepsiz, spansz, hir-siz, teklifsziz, ügurusz).

Markov's (1977:16-17) claim that the expanded use of the Slavic suffixes -io and -ina, e.g., mešlo 'pot-bellied'(from mev 'belly')
ed are native to Slavic, albeit relatively rare (cf. Russian žarpitca 'firebird', v.Granne 1984:20-21). The use of a given form as more than one part of speech is known in Old Church Slavonic, e.g., adjectives functioning as nouns or adverbs, and even without this fact, Markov's examples all involve Turkish words which have multiple functions in Turkish, i.e., this is really just a type of lexical borrowing since the phenomenon did not spread to native words or newer loanwords.

In concluding the section on morphology, we can say that the only unambiguous result of Turkish influence has been the rise of the productive derivational suffixes -dija, -lija, -lak, and -ana and the use of reduplicative -a. All of the other phenomena cited as evidence of Turkish influence lend themselves equally well to explanations based on parallel development, reinforcement of pre-existing tendencies, or are not so much morphological borrowings as lexical. We shall return to these questions at the end of this paper.

4. Syntax and Semantics:

The influence of Turkish on Macedonian syntax and semantics presents both the clearest and the most dubious cases. On the clearest side are the large number of lexical borrowings belonging to all levels of vocabulary and almost all parts of speech, e.g., dišeb 'n.pocket' (cub), bendise 'v.please' (bećen-), tase 'adj. fresh' (tare), badnjala 'adv for nothing' (badnjava), am 'conj. but' (amma), karši 'prep.opposite' (карпс), ić 'pron.nothing' (хиц), sikter 'excl./interj. scam' (сикти), keški 'part if only' (кешко)

A number of studies have discussed the classification and types of Turkish loanwords in Macedonian or have studied specific areas of lexical influence (e.g., general: Jašar-Nasteva 1963, 1974, 1981/82; Kazazis 1972; Kraser 1979; toponyms: Jašar-Nasteva 1978; religion: Jašar-Nasteva 1970; color: Jašar-Nasteva 1981; law: Jašar-Nasteva 1982). These works demonstrate how Turkish vocabulary has penetrated every facet of Macedonian life: urban and rural, e.g., dušen, 'shop' (dükkan), sokak 'street, alley' (sokak), ambar 'barn' (hambar), endek 'ditch, furrow' (hendek); man-made and natural, e.g., tavan 'ceiling' (tavan), šiša 'bottle' (siza), zumbul 'hyacinth' (zümbull), taftabita 'bedbug' (taftabiti), intimate
and abstract, e.g., điger 'liver, lungs' (ciger), badhanak 'brother-in-law (wife's sister's husband)' (hacanak), rezil 'disgrace' (rezil), suhabet 'conversation' (suhabet). In the nineteenth century when the borrowing of Turkish vocabulary reached its height, even religious terminology contained many Turkisms, e.g., kurban 'sacrifice', kurbuluša 'Saviour' (kurbuluš 'escape, be saved'), sahibia 'The Lord' (sahib 'master'), etc. (Gojčić 1960: 32; Jašar-Nasteva 1970). Given the general identification of Turkish with Islam and Macedonian with Christianity, this can be seen as the most extreme manifestation of Turkish lexical influence.

The twentieth century has seen a gradual retreat of this lexical influence. According to Koneski (1965: 187-188), the great rise in Turkisms in the nineteenth century was due to the migration of Macedonians into the cities, where Turkish was the language of the market place, while the decline in the twentieth century took place in two stages: (1) the elimination of Turkish rule in Macedonia (1912) rendered many terms obsolete due to changes in the power structure, then (2) the codification of Literary Macedonian (from 1944) included conscious efforts to eliminate Turkisms (cf. Ežov 1952: 211; Gojčić 1960; Koneski 1949; Korubin 1981; Markov 1955). Thus the current situation is the reverse of what it was a century and more ago. Writers such as Kačovski (d. 1820) and Pejčinović (d. 1845) had to gloss many of their Slavic words with Turkish equivalents, which were more familiar to ordinary people, but modern-day collections of folktales (e.g. Penušilski 1968-73, 1981) must have glossaries of Turkisms. We shall discuss the current status of Turkisms at the end of this section.

The area of semantic calques, both single words and phraseological constructions, presents more problems for identification than do overt lexical borrowings. On the one hand, numerous partial calques, e.g., those involving Macedonian verbs and either Turkish or Macedonian substantives, are clear examples. Thus, e.g., the use of jada 'eat' to mean 'be subjected to' as in jada kotek 'get a beating' (literally 'eat a blow') is obviously based on Turkish köteş veme 'ibid.', and so jada doš 'get soaked' ('eat rain', Turk. vadam veme) or jada gornova 'say something stupid/embarrassing' ('eat excrement', Turk. bok veme), cf. English to put one's foot on it) can likewise be identified as calques. There are many to such cases, but, on the other hand, there are cases where a parallelism of idiomatic expression may be just that, i.e., a result of parallel development and not of calquing. Jašar-Nasteva (1962: 63) in her excellent work on Turkish calques in Macedonian gives 350 examples, but a number of these are also identical with English usage, e.g., the use of 'fall' to mean 'come/occur' as in Bajram se pada v nedelja = Bajram pada vesera džeg = 'Bajram falls on a Sunday' (p. 130), raka karti = el iskambil = 'a hand of cards' (p. 126), etc. Given the fact that the English is not likely to have had a Balkan source, the Macedonian expressions cannot be definitely attributed to Turkish without some sort of documentary evidence.

This same question of influence vs autochthony is pertinent for almost any matter relating to syntax. Thus, for example, it has been suggested that the Macedonian use of postposed dative enclitic pronouns to indicate possession, e.g., majka mi 'his mother' has been influenced by the Turkish use of possessive suffixes, e.g., annesi 'ibid.' Given the fact that this type of phenomenon is known from Old Church Slavonic and other Slavic languages, this hypothesis is no more demonstrable than a suggestion that the spread of the athematic 1 sg pres marker -g from five verbs in Old Church Slavonic to all verbs in Macedonian is due to the influence of the Turkish first person marker -(V)ım or that the rise of final devoicing in Macedonian was influenced by the existence of this same phenomenon in Turkish. I have never seen either of these two latter suggestions in print, and given similar developments in North Slavic, and in the case of final devoicing elsewhere in Europe, I do not consider them particularly plausible. And yet one could always invoke the argument that Turkish reinforced the Macedonian tendency, i.e., given any similarity between Macedonian and Turkish, it can always be claimed that bilingualism participated to a greater or lesser extent in the similarity. This argument applies to virtually every other syntactic or morpho-syntactic similarity between Macedonian and Turkish.

One of the most popular subjects for demonstrating Turkish in
fluence on Macedonian (and Bulgarian) grammatical structure is the development of the so-called witnessed/reported (or definite/indefinite) opposition in Macedonian out of the older opposition aorist, imperfect/perfect on the basis of the Turkish opposition di-past/miş-past. I have argued elsewhere (Friedman 1977) that the real meaning of this opposition in Macedonian is confirmative/nonconfirmative, and I have also argued (Friedman 1978) on the bases of the actual historical developments and modern structures of Turkish and Macedonian that the similarities in their respective oppositions are the result of convergence or at most reinforcement rather than influence. Since I cannot repeat all of the evidence here due to limitations of space, I must refer the reader to the aforementioned works.

Another syntactic phenomenon said to have been calqued from Turkish is the possessive isafet construction with the order genitive-head, e.g., na carot majka mu = sultanın annesi ‘the king’s mother’ (literally ‘of-the-king his mother’) (Goğab 1960:41). The other order, i.e., majka mu na carot also occurs in Macedonian, and Goğab includes this as part of the same phenomenon. Katona (1969:165), however, points out that this latter order, which in Turkish would be annesi sultanın and is impossible in the literary language, occurs in Western Macedonia due to Slavic influence, so the direction of borrowing is somewhat mottled. It is, perhaps, worthy of note that this essentially dialectal construction is especially common in proverbs which are in all likelihood calqued on Turkish, as these are the only contexts in which verb-final constructions—typical of Turkish but otherwise extremely rare in Macedonian—normally occur in Macedonian, e.g., na komšijata kokoštaka po dve jajca mu nositi (Pemišlijski 1969:93) ‘The neighbor’s chicken lays his two eggs at a time’ (literally ‘Of-the-neighbor the-chicken apiece two eggs to-him lays’, i.e., the grass always looks greener on the other side of the fence); cf. Turkish Komşunun tavunu komşuya kaz görünür (Tülbentç 1977:376) ‘The neighbor’s chicken appears to be a goose’ (literally ‘Of-th-neighbor his-chicken to-the-/-other/-neighbor /as a/ goose appears’).

Other syntactic phenomena which have been attributed to Turkish influence include the following: 1) The use of verbal nouns instead of finite forms, e.g., ne treba odjene ‘going is not necessary’ (Koneski 1965:158); 2) the use of imperfective presents in negative sentences with a future meaning, e.g., ne tei dava’i ‘I won’t give you’ (vs. perfective future in affirmative sentences, e.g., tei dadam ‘I will give you’) (Koneski 1965:147); 3) imperative plus deconstruction for emphasis, e.g., begoj da begane ‘let’s get the heck out of here’ (literally ‘run that we run’ or ‘run let’s run’). All of these constructions, however, could be due to inherited patterns or the influence of other Balkan languages, and so the nature of Turkish influence here is moot.

Given the modestness of Turkish influence on Macedonian syntax (outside of proverbs and fixed expressions), I will discuss here only the current state of Turkish influence on the Macedonian lexicon. As was mentioned earlier, conscious efforts have been made to replace Turkishisms in Literary Macedonian. These replacements have been of three types: 1) native or other Slavic words, e.g., običaj ‘custom’ for adet, znači ‘it means, i.e.’ for demek, no ‘but’ for ama (this last was borrowed from Russian /Koneski 1965:107/); 2) West European words, e.g., German-based pagla ‘iron’ and pasuva ‘fit’ for Turkish-based utiğ and uđiğ; 3) so-called international (essentially, Greco-Latinate) words, e.g., pecijë for miljet, informacijë for aber. Many of these replacements have been successful, and some have affected the colloquial standard. In other cases, however, there has been some sort of differentiation. Thus, for example, no educated Macedonian would use ama or demek in writing or formal speech, but even university professors use them in ordinary conversation. Likewise, words like tavan (from Turkish) and plafon (from French) ‘ceiling’ coexist, but only the latter would be used in figurative expressions, e.g., plafon na cenite ‘price-ceiling’ (Korubin 1961b).

It is interesting to compare the suggestions of language codifiers during the first decade of development with the realities of usage thirty years later. For example, Markov (1955) sought to limit and reduce the spread of the suffixes -đija, -lija, and -lak by suggesting replacements, e.g., lebar ‘baker’ for fumadija, čevlar ‘shoemaker’ for konduradija, etc. In a relatively recent article in Nova Makedonija (21-X-83:7), a list of enterprises in-
volved in the news story included the following: 77 prođavači na
zelećuk 'vegetable sellers' (not začevatcić;), 77 čevlari (not konudežii), 77 časovnici (not saatli); 'watchmakers', 5 jur-
nadžii (vs jebari), 77 šlatarnici i lebeldižilici 'sweetshops
and rasted chickpea shops' (not šekerdižilici or lebeldižski ra-
botilnici), i.e., in the language of the daily press, most but not all
the replacements have taken hold. In many ways, the situation
is the reversal of what it was forty years ago. Thus, for example,
a year after the official recognition of Literary Macedonian, Ko-
neski (1945) wrote an article in which, among other things, he se-
verely criticized a translation of Molière's Le Tartuffe for being
full of Turkisms, writing: "Toa znači...da go snišiš...istančeniot
poetski jazik na Moliere...do nivo na našeto balkansko, kasab-
sko, čaršisko mubatenej." 'It means lowering the refined poetic
language of Molière to the level of our Balkan, butcher's, market-
place chit-chat'. Three and a half decades later, Korubin (1981a)
found it necessary to admonish translators not to become so car-
rried away by purism that they translate Serbo-Croatian Turkisms
such as Buqum efendi 'At your command, sir' with the native but
here inappropriate Povele smestnoin.

The position of Turkish loanwords in Macedonian today is essen-
tially that described by Kazazis (1972) for Balkan languages in
general. First of all, there are those words which are both litera-
ry and colloquial standard and are not about to be replaced, e.g.,
dfeb 'pocket', joxvovan 'illic', various toponyms, e.g., Čair
(Turk.çayır 'meadow') a district in Skopje, Aliań (Turk.alian
'gold'), Merkez (Turk.merkez 'center') names of coffee-houses in
Skopje, and many others. As a close second come the standard col-
loquialisms which are not used in formal writing, e.g., ama, de-
nek, etc. Another class of standard vocabulary not mentioned by
Kazazis is that of certain types of specialized terminology. Thus,
for example, people engaged in the hobby of dove-raising (golubarst-
vo, itself a native term) use Turkish terms for the names of dif-
ferent types of birds, e.g., ak kuruk 'white tail', kara kuruk
'black tail', beaz (Turk.veyaz) 'pure white', siya (Turk.siyah)
'pure black'. This terminology is closely allied to the standard
colloquial level, but the fact that contextually these are technical
terms with no literary equivalents sets them apart.

There are three other broad types of contexts which permit a
wider range of Turkisms than those just alluded to: 1) historical/
epic/archaic, 2) local color/dialectal, and 3) ironic/pejorative/
low style. The first context is distinguished by a wide range of
vocabulary items of all types but many referring to specifically
Turkish institutions. The second context is distinguished by a
wider degree of phonological variation, especially the greater
preservation of schwa. The third context also includes new for-
mations with the suffixes -đija, -lija, and -jak which would not
occur in the first and be unlikely in the second. All these ty-
pes are illustrated in various articles in Nova Makedonija, where
Turkisms are manipulated to achieve these three effects. Thus,
for example, in an article entitled Mali kar — glede števi (N.
M.27-IV-84:3) 'small profit — large damages', the author, who is
arguing against the legalization of raising goats in Macedonia,12
uses the Turkish kar to be pejorative and simultaneously conjure
up images of the past, when goats were illegal. In the body of the
article, the author refers to the importance of goats to the econ-
omy of people who had to hide in the hills "besjark pred zulmut
na razni zavojuvali" 'fleeing before the violence of various con-
quorers'. Here, the use of the Turkish zulum 'violence' contains
no irony, rather the author is seriously invoking the bad old days
of the Turkish yoke without mentioning them by name. A particular-
ly interesting phenomenon in the use of Turkisms for ironic-pejo-
rative purposes is their coupling with very recent loanwords —
also used ironically — as in an article headlined Biznes samo za
dgornjak (N.M.26-I-84:7) which could be translated roughly 'Trade
only for crookedness'. The article used phrases such as the fol-
lowing: seto toa se prodava reči 'bad jale, se pravi nekaj; biz-
ness'...all this is sold virtually' 'for nothing', some kind of
"deal" is made...", nekolku šifte pantaloni 'a few pairs (Turk.
gifte 'pair') of pants', počna enormno da se zplemeva 'it began
to increase enormously', etc. Often articles using Turkisms for
local color, i.e., as dialectisms, simultaneously either seek to
conjure up images of the past or produce a humorous effect.
The former (local plus historical) is seen in articles in the series
Specimen od minatoto 'Memoires of the past', e.g., one entitled

for example, an article on Turkish film director Yılmaz Güney (N.M.7-IX-82:5) did not contain a single word of Turkish origin, although the discussion of witnesses and prisons afforded ample opportunities. An article on Yörük folkore (N.M. 29-III-81:5) the Yörüks live in the Stip-Radović region and are a distinct group from the rest of the Turks of Macedonia) used običaj 'custom' (vs. Turk. adet) and even the uncommon zabratka 'kercchief', which was then glossed with the standard word šamija, which happens to be of Turkish origin.

5. Conclusion:
In examining the current results of Macedonia's five centuries of intimate contact with Turkish, it can be seen that the effects have been extensive, but not as much as some scholars suggest, and there are many areas which may remain forever moot. On the level of phonology, the only long-lasting effect which Turkish does not share with Greek is the phonemicization of dž. It is particularly interesting to note that some processes which Turkish halted, i.e. the hardening of soft ň, or which Turkish encouraged, i.e., the spread of kš, now appear to be reasserting themselves by disappearing. The only significant Turkish influences which can be correctly and unquestionably assigned to the level of morphology are the productive derivational suffixes -džija, -lija, -lak, -ana and the use of reduplicative -e. All other phenomena which have been cited -- lack of inflection or gender distinction, analytic comparatives, nominal compounding, reduplication, multiple word classes, other suffixes -- are either not demonstrably the results of Turkish influence (i.e., they could have resulted from parallel development, the continuation of pre-existing tendencies, or contact with other languages [Greek, Albanian, Aromanian]) or they belong properly to the category of lexical borrowings. Turkish influence on the Macedonian lexicon is the most obvious, stable, and widespread of the contact phenomena, and while many terms have become obsolete or stylistically demoted due to the fall of the Ottoman empire and the subsequent loss of power and prestige undergone by Turkish, as well as due to conscious puristic efforts by codifiers since 1944, Turkish elements remain vital and stable. In the case of syntax, including morphosyntactic catego-
ries and semantico-syntactic constructions, the situation is much like that in morphology. Obvious calques, proverbs, etc. constitute the only areas of indisputable Turkish influence. All other phenomena could have resulted from native developments, and at least some of them probably did. The question one is left with is given any particular parallel between Macedonian and Turkish which is not undeniably of Turkish origin, how can one prove autochthony vs influence? While some of these questions may never be fully answered, there is still a great deal of work that can be done both statistically and in terms of specialized terminologies and local and regional usage and attitudes.

Notes:

1) Throughout this paper I will be considering only Ottoman Turkish, not pre-Ottoman Turkish influence. All non-Turkish elements entering Macedonian via Turkish, e.g., Arabic and Persian, will be considered as part of Turkish. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Committee for Information of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, the Institute for the Macedonian Language, and the Macedonian Academy of Arts and Sciences for supplying me with publications which were essential to this work.

2) Final ü gives i in the Turkish dialects of Macedonia (West Rumelian Turkish, hereafter WRT), e.g., Macedonian kapıja 'bridge' comes from WRT kırpı; the literary Turkish form is köprü (v. Friedman 1982:6; Jašar-Nasteva 1971:322).

3) The sound h is also lost in WRT.

4) Schwa from original back nasal had already become a by the fifteenth century in the East (Koneski 1983:65-66). Some Eastern dialects also have schwa as the result of vowel reduction, viz. from unstressed a.

5) In WRT, ò becomes i in final position, e.g., older Ottoman kapu 'door' gave modern kapı, which gave WRT kapı, whence Macedonian kapja. Also, i is borrowed as ò when it occurs next to a palatal, e.g., alli-variş 'business' (literally 'taking-giving') from alli-variş, but this may also be due to a sound change in WRT (Jašar-Nasteva 1971:519; Friedman 1982:7-8). Other results of i also occur on occasion, e.g., Mac.kurumz 'red' from Türk kirmizi (v.Koneski 1983:66; Jašar-Nasteva 1971:320). In Upper Polog and the towns of Debar and Ohrid, schwa is uniformly preserved; in Bobošica (Korča region) it only occurs in Turkish loanwords; in the countryside of the greater Debar region, schwa gives o or open o (Koneski 1983:39,66-66).

6) In some dialects, e.g., the villages around Prilep, ò never occurs and it is instead absent. e.g.,vati 'grab' (literary fati), marivet 'trick, scheme' (literary marifet), vudbal 'soccer' (literary fudbal) (Koneski 1983:79).


(Commission for language and orthography)


Sabota: Saturday supplement appearing in: Nova Makedonija.


