BALKANOLOGY AND TURCOLOGY: WEST RUMELIAN TURKISH IN YUGOSLAVIA AS REFLECTED IN PRESCRIPTIVE GRAMMAR
VICTOR A. FRIEDMAN


1.0 Introduction

1.1 It is still a widely held opinion that Turkish is not a member of the Balkan linguistic league but only a contributor to it (e.g., Bernštejn 1968:77-79, 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. Some more recent studies have demonstrated the "Balkan" nature of Balkan Turkish (e.g., Jasar-Nasteva 1971/2, Pokrovskaja 1979), 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 Balkan Turkish have been done in a Turcological rather than a Balkanological context, with the overwhelming preponderance of material being based on dialects spoken in Bulgaria. To this can be added the fact that 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 them all, studies of influence in the opposite direction are still quite uncommon and deal primarily with loanwords (e.g., Tietze 1957, Jasar-Nasteva 1957).

1.2 In this paper, I propose to analyze a corpus of Balkan Turkish dialect material from Yugoslavia which has heretofore gone unnoticed by linguists, viz. the examples labeled yanlış 'wrong' in the prescriptive statements of textbooks used for teaching Standard Turkish (StT) in the Turkish-language elementary schools of Macedonia and Kosovo.1 This corpus differs from that type which ordinarily serves as the basis of Balkan Turkish dialect studies in that it has been selected by educated Yugoslav Turks as being typical of their native dialects rather than comprising a series of texts recorded by linguists.2 Also, its intended audience consists of native speakers of those same dialects. As a result, this corpus serves as a source of information on popular perceptions and evaluations of dialect features, in addition to which it supplies concrete data not found in the available published dialect descriptions (APDD).3 The question of native perception of salient dialect differences as opposed to linguistic determinations of significant isoglosses has gone virtually unaddressed in Balkan linguistics in general, as have most sociolinguistic considerations other than those connected with the establishment and standardization of literary languages. The purpose of our analysis, then, will be threefold:

1.21 The placing of our corpus in the context of other Balkan Turkish dialect studies by means of linguistic analysis.

1.22. The discussion of the nature of non-Turkish (nonT), i.e. Albanian (Alb) and Slavic (Slv), viz. Macedonian (Mac) and Serbian (SC), influences reflected in our corpus.

1.23. The comparison of pedagogical considerations and the popular perceptions they reflect with dialectological analysis.

1.3 In order to accomplish our first goal, i.e. the analysis of our corpus within the context of Balkan Turkish dialectology, we shall begin with a brief survey of the general outlines of the study of Balkan Turkish as it relates to the modern dialects of Yugoslavia. Although the first dialectological observations on Balkan Turkish were published at the beginning of this century (see especially Kowalski 1926, Cf. Kakuk 1972:227-30), the first major, definitive work was that of Nemeth (1956), who, using the term Rumelian to the Osmani Turkish dialects of the Balkans (as opposed to, e.g., the Tatar dialects of Dubruda or the Gagauz dialects) established the basic division between an Eastern Rumelian and Western Rumelian group of dialects (ERT and WRT) which is still generally accepted (Jasar-Nasteva 1970:300 n.17, Kakuk 1972:232). The bundle of isoglosses, based on

---

1 The entire corpus is given in an appendix to this article. The textbooks are listed separately at the beginning of the bibliography. In order to facilitate reference and save space, references in the body of the article will consist of a Roman numeral indicating the grade in which the textbook is used and an Arabic numeral indicating the page number. Entries in the appendix are arranged by book and page number and alphabetically for each page. Entries consisting of entire sentences are arranged alphabetically according to the first word, and an Arabic numeral indicating their order is placed after the page number. Standard forms and glosses will usually not be given in the body of the text. These textbooks were those in use during the 1978-79 academic year. It should be noted that no prescriptive material occurs in the fifth grade and high school textbooks, which have been listed in the bibliography only for the sake of completeness. Our transcription follows the Turkish orthography used in our corpus. We have not attempted to differentiate between grammatical levels by graphic means, as this was not done in our source and is not necessary to our description.

2 The fact that this material is presented for the purpose of eliminating dialectal forms is relevant to our considerations only insofar as the surest guides to colloquial nonstandard usage are the "mistakes" cited by prescriptivists.

3 Since 1975, a number of articles on the Turkish dialects of Kosovo have appeared in the periodical Çevren published in Pristina, which unfortunately was not available to us. Otherwise, we have been able to consult almost all the major works on WRT (Erimer, 1970, Gülensoy 1981, Hazai 1978).
eight WRT features, very roughly follows the Bulgarian *jat* -line, thus putting all the dialects of Yugoslavia in WRT linguistic territory (see Hazai 1961, Mollova 1970).4

1.4. The eight basic WRT features can be summarized as follows (after Doerfer 1959:263; the order is that used in all the works referring to these features):

1.41. \(i, u, \ddot{u} \rightarrow i\) in word final position.

1.42. The perfect (indefinite past) suffix -*miš* is invariant (i.e. the suffix always has the shape -*miš* rather than being subject to the rules of vowel harmony).

1.43. \(i \rightarrow i\) in noninitial and closed final syllables.

1.44. \(ö \rightarrow o\) and \(ü \rightarrow u, u\) in many words.

1.45. In suffixes with low vowel harmony (e \(U\ a\)), one of the two forms is generalized.

1.46. \(ö \rightarrow ü\) in about 40 words.

1.47. European 

1.48. The progressive participle form in -*yor* is replaced by one in -*y*.

1.49. In a later work, Németh (1961:22) suggested the fronting of \(k\) and \(g\) to palatal affricates or stops as a possible ninth feature.

1.491. The loss of \(h\), especially in initial position, can be considered as a tenth feature. Although Németh (1956:21) points out that this is an extremely complicated phenomenon manifested in various ways in much of the Turkish speech area, it is nonetheless particularly characteristic of WRT, especially in Yugoslavia (cf. Boretzky 1975:153-4, 164-6).

1.5. The exact details of the distributions of these features within the WRT area are complicated and have yet to be satisfactorily established, but they are of no concern to us here, since we are treating a generalized corpus rather than the dialect of a specific place. Numerous other features in addition to these ten occur in descriptions of specific dialects and in our corpus. In the analysis which follows, we will discuss all the phonological, morphological, lexical and syntactic WRT features present in our corpus (sections 2-5) and, whenever possible, refer to the APDD which cite these items or the same features, thus placing our corpus in the context of Balkan Turcology.5 Our commentary on sociolinguistic and Balkanological (contact) phenomena will be placed at the end (section 6-7).

2.0. Phonology

2.01. Of the ten principal WRT features enumerated in 1.4., four are vocalic, three are consonantal, and two involve vowel harmony.6 Thus phonology plays the major role in the traditional classification of WRT. All of these features are represented by items occurring in our corpus. In addition to these features, there are a few other regular changes (e.g., the devoicing of \(z\) to \(s\) in word final position and the simplification of geminates) and a number of nonsystematic phonetic changes and archaisms in isolated lexical items most, but not all, of which occur in the APDD.7

2.1. Vocalic features

2.11. Németh’s four features

2.111. \(ö \rightarrow ü\). This change is limited to syllable initial position in certain lexical items (Din.190), and while the words it actually occurs in vary from one area to another, it occurs more frequently, virtually to the point of regularity, as one moves farther west ( Alb.19, Flo.96, Gos.278, Kum.11 3, Ohr.236-7, Pri.4, Pri-2 11 8, Sko.17, S/R.84, Vid.44, WM.11, Németh 1951/2), although in the southeast, as in ERT and rarely in Anatolia, it is limited to initial syllables before \(g\), \(v\), and \(y\) (Din.191 198; S/R.90, Yur.336, Caferoğlu 1964:15-16, Kaz.309.311, Rho.209, Tre.63).

2.1111. The following words occur in our corpus: Verb stems *
cür*/-gür* (III.74); IV.56.58,61,63; VII.7: VIII.13,14), *günder*- (IV.63, sülé- (IV.56.58,59,61,63; VIII.14), *eğre*- (III.17), *ül*- (VIII.13); other words bürek

---

4 The situation in ERT is now considered more complex than Németh (1956) realized (see, e.g., Hazai 1964, Mollova 1970), but this is irrelevant for WRT. The Yuruk (Yürek, Yörük) dialects of the Stip region between Kočani and Radoviš in southeastern Macedonia do form an island differing from the rest of WRT and showing both some ERT features and archaisms of their own (see Eckmann 1960, Hazai 1959/60, 1964; Manević 1953/4), but since no specifically Yuruk features are reflected in our corpus, these dialects will be treated together with the rest of WRT.

5 By Balkan Turcology we mean essentially the APDD on Macedonia, where four fifths of Yugoslavia’s Turks live (McDonald 1973:81). Although we will have occasion to refer to other WRT dialects, our main concern is with the existing analyses of dialects spoken in Yugoslav Macedonia, as our corpus is drawn almost entirely from those dialects. We shall also refer to ERT and Anatolian dialects from time to time, but it is not our intent to attempt a systematic comparison of WRT, ERT, and Anatolian, which is the task of a much larger work.

6 Invariant -*miš* is closer to morphology than morphophonemes (see 3.1, but also 2.132), while generalization of \(e\) or \(a\) in suffixes subject to low vowel harmony also affects certain enclitics (see 2.145).

7 To save space and facilitate reference, the most frequently cited dialect studies will be referred to by means of abbreviations, a list of which is given after these notes, immediately before the bibliography.
(VII.7, VIII.13), güz (IV.32), küfte (VII.7, VIII.13), küpek (VII.13), küprü (IV.32, VII.7), Ümer (IV.32), ünceleri (III.32), üyle (VIII.13). In addition to these items we can cite the pronunciations implicit in an exercise in a section on the differentiation of ö and ü (III.45) in which the student is given pictures of an ox (StT öküz), a duck (StT ördek), an iron (StT ütü), and a bunch of grapes (StT üzüm) and is instructed to write out the words paying attention to the difference between ö and ü. All of the forms in our corpus are attested in the APDD cited above.

2.11. ö & ü -> o & u. This change is most common in the northeast (Bulgarian) zone of WRT territory (Alb.16–17) and occurs sporadically in Macedonia (Bit.559, Flo.96, Gos.278–9, Ohr.237, S/S.84, WM.107, Yur.336). It only occurs in four items in our corpus: dort (III.62), duçan (III.30), Munevera (III.53), and Şukri (IV.32). It is interesting to note that in a list of "errors in numerals", 'three', which is attested as üç in Ohrud (Ohr.287) and Skopje (WM.190) but consistently occurs as üç (as in StT) in Kosovo (Alb.17) and Gostivar (Gos.279), is not included. Of the four forms in our corpus, only Munevera (III.53) does not occur in the APDD.

2.11.  1 & u & ü -> i in word final position. This change is characteristic of all of WRT except, perhaps, some of the Yuruk dialects (S/S.91, but cf. Din.199, Yur.336). Our corpus contains the following forms, all of which are attested in the APDD (Alb.14, Bit.559, Blg.12, Gos.277–8, Kum.II.2, Ohr.235, Pri.3, Sko.20, S/S.86): altı (III.62), bayagi (III.35), buldu (IV.56), búyudü (IV.56), çarşı (VIII.13), Gideysik mi (III.82), havlı (IV.32), kapi (III.30, IV.5, VIII.13), kapıyı (VI.59), kırmızı (VIII.62), kimzi (III.62), 2.11.  1 -> i in noninitial and closed final syllables. This phenomenon is especially common in suffixes subject to vowel harmony, although it does not appear to occur in some Yuruk kialects (S/S.89, but cf. Yur.339). All the examples in our corpus involve verbal suffixes attested in the APDD: bûr (IV.63), celdim/geldim (IV.56), cümüz/güzum (IV.56), geldik (III.74), gehr (IV.63, VIII.13), gelmisik (III.74), gidiceksik (III.74), gideysik (III.82), gittik (III.10–2), günderi (IV.63), gürmeymişin (VIII.14), sevindik (III.74), sülerim (VIII.14). 2.12. The remaining vocalic phenomena illustrated by our corpus are, for the most part, not systematic, although some have phonetic rather than lexical bases.

2.13. Phenomena connected with StT high vowels

2.13. i -> u or i. This phenomenon is limited to three lexical items, none of which are attested in the APDD: kursuunu (III.62), Münar (IV.32), mavi (IV.32). While the change of i to u in Münar is of a type attested elsewhere, albeit quite rarely, (WM.151, cf. also Caferoğlu 1964:12), the other two examples are particularly striking because they violate Németh's first WRT feature (I.41, 2.11.3), which is one of the most common and consistent. It could well be that these forms represent hypercorrections.

2.13. i -> i next to a palatal. This change is well attested but not entirely consistent in WRT (Alb.23:29, Flo.100.121, Gos.293, Kum.II.3, Ohr.236, WM.123, Boretzky 1975:167). A number of our examples are connected with syncope and ellision in the future and y-progressing tense forms and will be discussed in the appropriate sections below (see 2.152, 2.16.3, 2.16.4). The invariance of the perfect suffix -mış (I.42, 3.1) may also be connected, at least in part, with this phenomenon. Our remaining examples consist of two substantives, biçak (VIII.13) and kais/kayış (III.30), and two finite verb forms, alti (VII.5–1) and olti (VIII.5–5) (< alti, olti: cf. Blg.2040,71), see also 2.152.24.

2.13. i u and a. The WRT forms actually represent archaismas (u) or forms influenced by nonT (a), hence our avoidance of an arrow. Our examples all occur in the APDD (e.g., Din.192, Flo.107, WM.II.6): Argat (III.17), bunar (III.17), furan (IV.32), kapu (III.30).

2.13. u -> o. This change is attested elsewhere (Din.191, Gos.283, Kum.II.3, Ohr.238, S/S.89, WM.151), although not for the forms in our corpus: dököz (III.62), Yonuz (III.23). The latter form may actually be an archaism.

2.14. Phenomena connected with StT low vowels

2.14.1 Dissimilation a -> e. Of our two examples, pare (III.53, VIII.13, probably due to SC influence) is attested (Gos.301 n.32, Kum.II.4, cf. also Ohr.240, WM.147) while ema (III.34) is not (but cf. also Caferoğlu 1964:6).

2.14.2 Assimilation e -> a. The forms in our corpus are actually either archaismas (in which case the a is original and StT e is the innovation) or have been influenced by nonT (see 3.8, 4.2, and 4.3): alma (IV.32), alva (III.35), Ayşə (III.53), cesma (III.35), kafa (III.30), karavan (III.35). All forms except Ayşə and kafa are attested in the APDD (Din.192, Flo.96,107; Gos.282, Kum.120, S/S.85,87,94; WM.149, cf. also Boretzky 1975:182, 1976:35,77,106).

2.14.3 e -> i. The raising of e to i, especially in the vicinity of y, is widespread in Turkish (Caferoğlu 1964:10) and well attested in the APDD (Din.191, Gos.283, Kum.II.3, S/S.89, WM.148, Yur.340). Four examples occur in our corpus: two, cumaîtesi (III.23, Gos.283) and yinge (III.53, Din.191, Gos.284) involve raising, one, div (III.35, Vid.386) is an archaism reinforced by nonT, while the last, ni...ni... (III.34, VI.90) is clearly the result of Slv influence and is not attested in the APDD.

2.14.4 e -> i. While this change is attested in at least one lexical item in the APDD (Kum.II.3), its manifestation in our corpus is not found in the APDD, although it should be noted that our phenomenon is really more a case of a type of lexical influence from nonT, viz. what we have is a statement that the names
of consonant letters are to be pronounced, e.g., *be*, *ce* and not *bi*, *ci*, as is done in SC and Mac (III.41, and, we should add here, also in Alb).

2.145. Lack of low vowel harmony (generalization of *e* or *a* in suffixes with the alternation *e* vs *a*). Although this phenomenon is morphophonemic, it is actually so sporadic and inconsistent (see, e.g., Ohr.238) that its treatment with lexically limited phonetic phenomena is not inappropriate. It appears to be limited to a small number of suffixes and clitics, where generalization of a single form (as opposed to free variation) may or may not take place. Other suffixes appear to be used consistently in accordance with the rules of vowel harmony. These facts are reflected in our corpus, which devotes very little attention to this phenomenon. The inflectional and clitic forms illustrating it all involve a generalized back vowel: *ben da*, *hem da* (III.34), *citma* (StT *gitme* negative imperative; VIII.14.1), *gitem* (StT *gitmege* dative infinite; VIII.14.5), and *Onri’ya* (VI.59).

2.1451. It is interesting to note that while invariant *da* even occurs in areas which normally retain low vowel harmony consistently (WM.152, cf. also Flo.103, Gos.279, Kum.11.2, Ohr.239) and generalization of -*ma* as the negative imperative and use of dative -<y>*a* are widespread (e.g. Blg.17, 36, Gos.279, df. also Din.190), no mention has been made of this phenomenon in the infinitive (see especially Boretzky 1975:175, df. also Kum.125).

2.1452. The derivational suffixes -*ka* and -*ce*, which have been borrowed from Slv and are used for forming diminutives, hypocorisms, etc., are invariant, as is the high-vowel hypocoristic suffix -*ug* (see 3.8).

2.1453. The suffix of the future participial form (StT -*cecek*) exhibits low vowel harmony in our corpus (see 2.1523, 2.1524, 2.2111, 3.4), which appears to be consistent with the situation in most of WRT (e.g., Din.201, Flo.200, Kum.123, Vid.187, but cf. also *atacem* 'I’ll throw', *gidecam* 'I’ll go' in Ohr.239).

2.15. Apheresis, Prothesis, Apocope, Syncope, and Ellision

2.151. Apheresis and prothesis. The absence of prothetic *i* in *skara*, *skelet* (III.35), *Skender* (III.53), and *skembe* (III.35) all reflect non-T forms of these words which have come to influence the WRT forms (cf. Jašar-Nasteva 1969:243, Ohr.240). The form *tasiyon* (IV.32) displays apheresis with simplification of the initial cluster and may or may not have been noted in the APDD. On the other hand, the form *isporija* (VII.5-4; *Mac sporija* 'roasted pumpkin seeds') displays the traditional Turkish prothesis.

2.152. Syncope, Apocope, and Ellision

2.1521. The forms *kirmzi* (III.62) and *kuntralar* (III.23) involve syncope of the sort typical of rapid speech phenomena (cf. Boretzky 1975:185-6). The latter is attested in a similar form elsewhere (Gos.282, KM.380), but the former is not (cf. *kirmzi* in Kum.11.8). The forms *amica/amuca* (II.53) represent archaisms where the StT (*amica*) is syncop (Flo.107).


2.1523. *V1CV2* -> *V*—*2*. Although length is not noted in our corpus, as is also the case in StT orthography, the APDD and my own experience indicate that the vowel in question must be long. 2.15231. *agi* -> *i* (cf. 2.111 and 2.132) *yazacim* (IV.61, VIII.14), *yazaciz* (IV.61), see 3.4.

2.15232. *egi* -> *i* (cf. 2.111 and 2.143) *dil* (III.7.2) (Blg.18, Din.204, KM.313, Kum.11.8, Vid.71, Yur.336), *gureciz* (IV.61, see 3.4).

2.15233. *uga* -> *a Marem* (IV.32) and perhaps the hypocoristic *Mamka* (VI.53). We can also include here *Mazes* (IV.32) and perhaps the hypocoristic *Masko* (VI.53), although these result from ellision without the preceding loss of an intervocalic consonant. This type of change is well attested (Din.197, Flo.99, KM.312, Kum.11.8, S/S.93, Vid.73, Yur.339) although these particular forms have not been recorded.

2.1524. *VY V* -> *V*—

2.15241. *aya* -> *a proma* (VII.5-5) (Slv *promaja* 'draft'), cf. *buraa* 'hither' (Kum.11.9).

2.15242. *yi, yii* -> *i* (cf. 2.111, 2.132) accusative *kapi* (VII.5-5), *y*-progressives *alim* (VIII.14), *bilim* (III.74, VIII.14), *gelim* (III.74, VIII.14), *gelis* (III.74, VIII.14), see 3.2.

2.1525. *V1CV2* -> *V1*

2.15251. *agi* -> *a lsg futures *bašlayacam* (III.7-8), *celecegam/celecem* (IV.61), *diverecem* (III.74), *gidecem*, *suleycecm* (IV.61), *yapacam* (III.74), diminutive *kizcecm* (VI.60), see 2.2111, 3.4, 3.8.

2.15252. *ayi* -> *a*. It is possible that the forms *alam* (VII.5-4, StT *alayım* 'that I get') and *çasılışım* (III.7-8, StT *çasılışıyım* 'that I work') represent this type of change. With the exception of the forms *verem* (StT *vereyım* 'that I give') and *yavolam* ‘*<yav olayım* ‘that I report to’ from *Mac javi se appear, report, call’) (Jašar-Nasteva 1957:152-3), however, all the forms in the APDD either show a lengthened second vowel (i.e. type 2.1523) or no ellision, e.g., *ali—m* (KM.306), *alayım* (Kum.124, Vid.18). Another possible explanation of these forms is that they represent the Anatolian lsg optative-subjunctive suffix -*am/-em*, e.g. *gidem* 'that I go' (Lewis 167:133), for which see 3.5.

2.2. Consonantal features
2.21  Németh's three features

2.21.1  Preservation of ĝ as g. This phenomenon is attested in most of WRT (Alb.20, Bit.559, Blg.17,23; Flo.97, Gos.286, KM.311, Kum.II 8, Ohr.241, Pri.7, Sko.21, S/S.87-8, WM.156-8), and our corpus gives the following common examples: agaç (III.46), bayagı (III.35), dag (VII.7), sogan (III.46), yag, yagmur (VII.7).

2.21.2  In all of WRT, however, there are certain lexical items and morphemes in which ĝ is lost or transformed into y or v, and in the Yurük dialects, as in ERT, this is the normal development (Din.196, S/S.92, Yur.338). These facts are also represented by the following examples in our corpus: deil, deyil (III.46), dil (III.7-2), saylklar (III.22), sovan, sovak, soyk (III.46), as well as the following first person future forms, başlayacam (III.7-8), geleceys, divercem, yapacam (III.74), gitmyeceys (III.77), celecem, gelecm, gidecem, güreciz, süleyecem, yazaciz (IV.61), and yazacim (IV.61, VIII.14). These future examples are particularly characteristic of the WRT of Yugoslavia (vs. e.g., KM.306). For other lexical examples of unpreserved ĝ, see Alb.20, Blg.18, Din.194, Flo.93, Gos.286, KM.313, Kum.II 8, Ohr.188,24; Sko.21, Vid.405, WM.149,157; Yur.336.

2.21.2  Palatal mutation of k, g before front vowels. The automatic palatalization of velars before front vowels is characteristic of StT, but the change from palatalized velars to palato-velars (k', g') palatal affricates (c'/c, d'/d) or palatal stops (t', d') while also a feature of northeast Anatolian Turkish, is characteristic of WRT on the Balkan Peninsula (Alb.22). The wide variety of possible pronunciations reflected in the APDD cannot be easily represented in StT orthography, and so this feature occurs in our corpus simply as the replacement of the letters k, g by ç, c, which is the method used by folklorists (e.g. Pri.2) and also occurs in students' spelling errors (VII.7). Our examples are the following: duçan (III.30), çemer, çepenek, çilim, çitap, çöte, duçan9 sinç, şeçer (III.35), celdum, cittim (IV.56), çürmîş (IV.58), celecem (IV.61), celi (VII.5-6), cekli, citti (VII.7), cel, citma (VII.14).

2.21.3  Loss of h. This feature, as was indicated earlier (1.491), occurs in many Turkish dialects. It is particularly characteristic of WRT and is mentioned in all the APDD, but it never occurs with absolute consistency (e.g., Alb.22, Bit.559, Blg.21, Din.195-7, Flo.97-8, KM.312, Kum.II 8-9, Ohr.241, Pri.7, Sko.21, S/S.86-7, 92-3; Vid.62, WM.158-9, Yur.338, also Boretzky 1975:164-6, Kowalski 1926:167-8). With the exception of the words albüki (III.34), neir, tari (III.47), and most of the proper names, all 39 of the forms in our corpus occur in the APDD: Asan, Fari (II.36, III.47), 1amur (II.56, n.b. also hypercorrect or metathesized hilamur III.47), ramet (StT rahmet, II.100, IV.32), Say mi? (III.27), alva (III.30,35), elva, sabayle (III.35), all 19 words in III.47 (see appendix), of which the following also occur elsewhere in the corpus: Seyfüla (IV.32), siya (III.62), also kaverengi (III.62), Abdula, Amet, Büran, Mamut, Marem, Tasin, Üsün, Üsün (VI.32), açan (VIII.14), birangi (III.10, IV.50), and perhaps Faruş and Manka (VI.53).

2.22  Other consonantal phenomena. The remaining features, with the exception of the devoicing of final z and the simplification of geminates, are not regular phonetic processes in WRT. Some of these phenomena also occur in ERT and/or Anatolian dialects, and others are due to or reinforced by non-T Balkan languages.

2.22  Voicing

2.22.1  Initial. This phenomenon is characteristic of Anatolian, other Turkic languages and dialects, and certain East Rhodopian and a small group of northeastern dialects of ERT (Mollova 1962a:120).

2.22.1  Initial. bunar (III.17, S/S.86, Vid.64), dembel (III.53, Flo.106, Gos.289, S/S.92, Vid.64), gemik (III.53, Gos.289, KM.313, Kum.II 6, Vid.64, Mollova 1962a:120). Of these three items, bunar and dembel have been borrowed by non-T in these forms.


2.23  Devoicing

2.22.21  Nonfinal (b -> p, d -> t, z -> s ). All our examples involve words which were borrowed originally from non-T and, with the exception of kuntralar, which may involve a native dissimilative devoicing process (cf. Blg.70), all the forms cited here occur in Slv and/or Alb in these forms (see 4.2 and 4.3).

2.22.21  piper (III.17, cf. Caferoğlu 1959:250)

2.22.21  kuntralar (III.23, cf. Blg.70)

2.22.21  sincir (III.35, Boretzky 1975:191,193)

2.22.21  skara (III.35, direct borrowing from Slv)


8 Examples of representations used are the following:

- k', kş, k/ğ Ohr.242, Gos.287, Yur.335
- t'd' Alb.21-2, Gos.287, Kum.II 2, Ohr.242
- č, č'/č', č ' Alb.21, Pri.7, Sko.21, WM.154

9 This example (duçan, and also the preceding duçan, StT dükkân 'shop') actually represents a reflex of palatalized k before a back vowel, but as this represents the same basic type of palatal mutation, viz. k' -> č, we have included it here.
2.22216  pita (III.53, cf. Flo.107)

2.2222  Final z -> s. This feature is found in most of WRT with varying degrees of consistency (Alb.23, Din.194.200; Gos.288.292; KM.313, Kum.II 6.120; Ohr.243, Pri-2.121, Sko.25, S/S.86,89.9k Vid.68-9, Yur.339, but generally not in Flo.105). With the exception of Mazes (IV.32), all representations of this pronunciation in our corpus consist of the lpl suffix -(i)z in the future and y-progressive: geleceys (III.74), gideys (III.74, IV.59), gitmeyecyes, sulcays (III.77), gelis (VIII.14).

2.223  Simplification of geminates. This change is typical of WRT, although it is not completely regular (Alb.29, Flo.98.106; Gos.289, Kum.II.120, Ohr.243, S/S.94, cf. also Caferoğlu 1959:255). With the exception of dükan/dнак (III.30,30.35, IV.32; Flo.98, Gos.289) and teşkür (IV.32; Gos.289, Kum.II.120), all the examples in our corpus occur in proper names: Emrula (III.47), Salaydin, Seyfula (III.47, IV.32), Muneveru (III.53), Abdula (IV.32), Maren, Mazes (IV.32), also Tefik (< *Tefik < Tevfik, IV.32; KM.314). The following observations can be made in the context of Balkan Turcology:

2.2231  Although H -> I is attested (e.g. ma—Ie < mahalla 'neighborhood' S/S.94, akli < aq1lli 'clever' Ohr.243) the H in all(h) 'God', which is the second morpheme in the relevant names, does not elide even in expressions such as i(n) allah(h) 'God willing' (Blg.73, Gos.289, KM.312, Kum.II 9, Ohr.241, WM.159).

2.2232  The simplification of dd to d is attested in Ohrid (Nüsredin, Ohr.243) but not in nearby Resen (Nasıreddin, WM.65) or Florina (Mukaddes, Flo.106).

2.2233  The form Minävär occurs in Anatolia (Caferoğlu 1959:255), but we have münevver 'educated' in Albania (Alb.29).

2.2234  All the types of geminates in our corpus (dd, ff, kk, ll, rr, vv, zz) show elision in at least one of the APDD except zz.

2.2235  Ellision in proper names, in contradistinction to the loss of h, does not appear to occur in ERT (Kaz.266).

2.224  I -> t. In StT, clear I occurs automatically after and before front vowels and also occurs before a and u in certain words of foreign origin. The pronunciation of clear I is only indicated orthographically in this latter environment, by means of a circumflex over the vowel letter. The tendency to velarize clear I word finally and before all back vowels is well attested for WRT (Flo.97,121; Gos.287-8), but due to the fact that the indication of this sound has such a marginal place in StT orthography our examples may not be particularly significant: lakin (III.34), Salaydin (III.47).

2.225  Phenomena with v and f. These phenomena are of different types. Some represent phonetically motivated changes, while others are strictly lexical. In our corpus, however, they are each represented by a single lexical example, and so we have grouped them together here.

2.2251  v -> w. tăuşan (III.30; WM.155; phonetic).

2.2252  v (-> w) -> O. tăuk (IV.32; Gos.290, Kum.II 9, Ohr.281, S/S.94, WM.160, Yur.338; phonetic).

2.2253  v (-> f ?) -> p. tăpszan (III.30, III.53, IV.32; not in APDD, lexical?).

2.2254  f ch p. pasul (III.35, cf. Din.194, Flo.107, Kum.II 7, Vid.72; lexical from Slv).


2.2256  hv -> b. kafa, kaše (III.30,35; only ka–ve/qa–ve is attested in the APDD, but this type of change occurs in mafet- (StT mahvet- 'destroy' Din.194, cf. also S/S.86, Vid.67; lexical from nonT).

2.2257  vi (-> f?) -> f. Tefik (IV.32; KM.314; phonetic).

2.226  Other consonantal phenomena

2.2261  ych∅


2.22612  Intervocally. kaiš (III.30, cf. Gos.290), all the examples in 2.1524 and, perhaps, 2.15252 (loss of intervocalic y followed by elision of the two vowels) are also of this type.

2.22613  Finally. All our examples are sg y-progressives with a preceding i: bili (III.82, IV.59), celi/geli (III.82, IV.59, VII.7-6, VIII.14-5), ali (VII.5-1), olli (VII.5-5).

2.2262  km -> tm. petmez (III.53; Vid.399, Eckmann 1962b:50, Mollova 1967a:145). It is interesting to note that this form is typical of Bulgaria rather than Yugoslavia.

2.2263  nb ch mb. penbe (III.62; Gos.292, Flo.106, archaisms).

2.2264  yn -> ng. pengir (IV.32; Gos.291, WM.158, Caferoğlu 1959:254).

2.2265  s -> s. çeşma (III.35; SC influence).

3.0  Morphology. Excluding phenomena connected with vowel harmony which have already been treated (2.145) and morpho-syntactic phenomena, which will be treated under syntax, our corpus displays nine phenomena worthy of note; of these six involve verbal inflection, one nominal inflection, one nominal derivation, and one verbal derivation.

3.1  Invariant -miş (1.42). This feature is characteristic of all of WRT (Alb.15, Blg.13, Din.193, Flo.100, Gos.276, KM.306, Kum.II 2, Ohr.236, Sko.20, S/S.86, Vid.86) except some Yuruk dialects (S/S.91). Our corpus
contains the following examples: yapnişidak (III.74), ağlımış, almış, büyümiş, cümüş/gürümiş, kaçmış, yakmış
(IV.58), ılımiş (VIII.13).
3.20. Progressive in -y (1.48). This feature occurs in much of WRT (Alb.21, Blg.20, Din.201, KM.315-316,
Kum.122-3, Sko.21, S/S.88, WM.162) but in some Yuruk dialects and in Albania -yor is used (Alb.21, S/S.95,
Yur.339) and in Gostivar, Nevrokop (modern Goce Delčev), and Ohrid the aorist has completely replaced the
progressive (Gos.280, Nev.95, Ohr.245).
3.21. Our corpus contains examples of these forms in all persons of the singular and in the 1 pl. We will
first cite the forms and then discuss the relationship between their representation in our corpus and the
transcriptions used in the APDD.
3.21.1. lsg. bilim, gelim (III.74, VIII.14), seveym (III.74), yapmaym (III.77), gideym (VII.5-4), alim
(VIII.14).
3.21.2. 2sg. yapaysun (III.74), gürmeysın (VIII.14).
3.21.3. 3sg. dey, okumay (III.74), celi/geli (III.82, IV.59, VII.5-5, VIII.14), bili (III.82), kaçay, yazay
(IV.59), ali (VII.5-1, oli (VII.5-6), anlay (VIII.14).
3.21.4. 1pl. gideys (III.74, IV.59, VIII.14-6), gideysık, yapaysık (III.82), çağız, süleyis (IV.59),
yapaymişısık (VII.5-2), gelis (VIII.14).
3.22. Until now, we have been able to accept our corpus, within its orthographical and pedagogical
limitations (cf. 2.212) as representing both spoken and written WRT forms. We have thus not been required to
differentiate between our corpus and the narrower phonetic transcriptions of the APDD. There are a number of
1sg, 3sg, and 1pl forms of the y-progressive, however, which differ from all or most of the forms in the APDD
in such ways that we must discuss the difference between spoken and written forms. It is worth noting in
passing that while written records of WRT have been studied from an historical point of view (see, e.g., Hazai
1960b), no attention has been paid to modern day writing influenced by these dialects such as compositions
which undoubtedly served as the sources for some of the forms in our corpus.
3.23. The basic rule for the formation of the y-progressive of consonant-stem verbs in the APDD can be
formulated in the following manner: root + V + y + ending (1sg=Vm/n, 3sg= Ø, 1pl=Vs/z)
Examples: geleyim, gideyim (KM.315-6), bakayın
(S/S.88), vuryim (Kum.122-3)
   aly ch aly ch alay (Blg.20,40,71), geliy (Vid.84-85)
   veriys ch veriys (Din.201), bakayis (S/S.88), gideyis (KM.315-6)
3.24. The forms in our corpus present two significant deviations from the basic rule as it is formulated in
3.23.
3.24.1. If V=i/i, then y -> Ø, i.e. there is no y if the preceding vowel is i/i.
3.24.2. 1sg=m/n, 1pl=z/z ch sik, i.e. the person marker is immediately preceded by -y or the preceding
i/which caused y to drop.
3.25. The ending -sik will be discussed in 3.3 below and is not at issue here. What is at issue is whether
the forms in our corpus represent actual pronunciations or popular perceptions of pronunciations more accurately
represented by the transcriptions of the APDD. The former analysis is supported to some extent by the
following forms from the APDD which do not fit the rule in 3.23: bakayın 'I look' (S/S.88), gelim 'I'm
coming', seveim 'I love', seveis 'we love' (Yur.339). It could be that the transcriptions in the APDD are really
morphophonemic in these forms, whereas the forms in our corpus represent phonetic realizations. In either case,
the data from our corpus makes it clear that the precise morphology of the y-progressive is in need of further
investigation.
3.3. 1pl in -sik/-sik. This ending is recorded for the indefinite past, aorist and future in the APDD for WRT
and other dialects (Nev.95, Lewis 1967:118), but none mention it as occurring in the y-progressive (see also
Din.202, Flo.III, II 3, Gos.295, Kum.123, S/S.96, Vid.85-6, WM.133). In WRT, as elsewhere in Turkish, this
ending is an alternative in free variation with StT -iz, etc. Our corpus contains four types of examples:
indefinite past gelmişık (III.74, VI.43), progressive indefinite past yapayımişık (VII.5-2), future gideceksık,
yapacaks ik (III.74), and progressive gideysık, yapaysık (III.82).
3.3.1. It should be noted here that our corpus does not indicate that the consonant clusters resulting from the
suffixing of -sik are simplified. This is in marked distinction to the APDD.
3.3.2. The cluster ss is generally simplified to s (this can also occur in StT, Lewis 1967:102) or rarely to s
(Kum.123) or ss (Nev.95). The combination sz is recorded for the 2pl indefinite past (Din.202, Kum.123).
3.3.2.1. The cluster ks is simplified to s (Kum.123, Gos.306).
3.4. First person future suffixes. Aside from the two forms cited in 3.3, the WRT forms all reflect
developments of StT -acağız/-eçeğız. The APDD display various combinations of three basic types of
developments.10

10 We should note here that the archaic ending -n sometimes occurs in the 1sg in WRT (S/S.96, Vid.87,
Yur.339). Like the alternation of 1pl -z with its devoiced variant -s, this alternation is not germane to our
considerations here.
1. \( g \) V -> Ø -acam/-ecem, -acaz/-eciz
2. \( Vg \) -> Ø (& i -> i) -acim/-ecim, -aciz/-eciz
3. \( g \) -> g,y,Ø -eceyiz, etc.

The details of the various combinations which occur in the APDD need not concern us here (see Din.201, Flo.II 2, Gos.292, Kum.II 8,123, Nev.88, Ohr.244, S/S.96, Vid.87, WM.129, Yur.339). Our corpus contains examples of the first two types in the singular and the first and third types in the plural: bašlayacam, dvereçem, yapacam (III.74), celecem/gelecem, süleycem (IV.61), yazacim (IV.61, VIII.14), geleceys, gitmeyeceys (III.74), yazaciz, güreciz (IV.61). Our comments on the lack of a vowel between y and the person marker in section 3.2 have equal relevance here.

3.5. First singular optative-subjunctive. As was mentioned in section 2.15252, it is possible that the forms alam (VII.5-4) and caxisam (III.7-8) represent the Anatolian ending -ami-em rather than resulting from ellision. This matter requires further investigation.

3.6. Participle + auxiliary. The separation of the definite past auxiliary idi 'was' from some participles, e.g., the aorist and progressive, is considered nonstandard (Lewis 1967:109, II.9, where it is labeled as an Armeniansim). There is definitely a tendency to separate the auxiliary in compound tense forms in WRT (Flo.II 5, Vid.87, Yur.339). Our corpus contains one form, albeit with a perfect participle (i.e. indefinite past), viz. yapmścişik (III.74), which could be interpreted as illustrative of this phenomenon.

3.7. Dative. The case form Ohri ya (VI.59), like the accusative kapıyi (VI.59), has already been treated with phonological phenomena connected with vowel harmony (2.1451, II.13). The pronominal forms bene and sene (VI.75), if not resurrected on the basis of analogy, are actually archaisms (see Deny 1921:200, cf. also WM.187).

3.8. Hypocorisms, diminutives, and kinship terms.

3.8i. Our corpus devotes considerable attention to proper names, citing various hypocorisms as "incorrect" and urging students to use the full forms of proper names. Together with some kinship terms and a few diminutives, we can group the examples according to suffixes and endings:

3.8i1. - ka. Hüska (III.53), Fetka (III.53, VI.53), Samka (VI.53)
3.8i2. - ko. Salço (III.53), Neço (VI.53)
3.8i3. - uş Garuş, Remuş (VI.53)
3.8i4. - çe Nurçe (VI.53), kizçe, odaçe (VI.60), çoyçe 'child' (VIII.14)
3.8i5. - o. Neco (VI.53), Nako (III.53), aco (IV.32), dedo (III.53)
3.8i6. - a. Ayşa, Munevera (III.53)
3.8i7. - ca. Dayca (III.53)
3.8i8. These forms reflect a number of different phenomena which require individual comment.

3.8i2. Diminutives in -o and -ş occur in StT, e.g. Haso (Hasan), Aliş (Ali) (Lewis 1967:58, see also Vid.79). The use of invariant -uş however, seems to be characteristic of WRT and could be influenced by Slv -uşa, -uška (cf. Smailovic 1977:72-74). The extensive use of -o is also probably due to Slv reinforcement, and the form aco probably comes from nonT, while dedo could be treated as a borrowing from Slv or the result of Slv influence on native Turkish dede, as both mean 'grandfather'.

3.8ii. The suffixes -ka, -ko come from Slv, and the -çe, while it does occur in StT, is used with a much wider range of applications in WRT as a result of Slv influence (Gos.293-294,305 n.32, Vid.80, Mollo and Mollova 1966:122-3, Smailovic 1977:69-76).

3.8iii. The use of -a in place of -e or after a consonant in feminine proper names has not been remarked upon in the APDD but in all likelihood it is the result of nonT influence (e.g., Slv Mara, 'Mary', Alb Shpresë, definite Shpresa 'Hope').

3.8iv. The form dayca for StT dayı 'maternal uncle' may be due to analogy with amca 'paternal uncle'.

3.9. Verbal derivation. This is not so much a single phenomenon as a group of phenomena related by the fact that they are all connected in one way or another to the formation of verbs. All the forms occur together in a single section of our corpus, viz. III.78, with the exception of one, which is also cited elsewhere, probably due to its semantic frequency.

3.9i. Four forms exhibit phenomena connected with the suffix -len/-lan-, which in its origin is the reflexive-passive of the productive verb-forming suffix -le/-la. It is more common, however, in WRT than in StT (cf. Mollova 1971:68).

3.9ii. azlanacak (StT azalacak) 'it'll decrease' from az 'small' (TDK I:144).
3.9iii. toprułanacak (StT toprukluhanacak) 'it'll bud' from topruk 'bud'. The WRT form treats -cuk as an omissible suffix (cf. TDK III.1339).
3.9iv. yeşillenecek (StT yeşerecek) 'it'll sprout' from yeşil 'green'. This verb occurs in StT in the meaning 'become green, be freshened', and the form yeşer can also mean 'become green'. Hence, what we appear to

---

\(^{11}\) The order of changes can be represented in the following manner:

\[ V_1 g V_2 \rightarrow V_1 y V_2, \text{ then if } V_2 = i, i \rightarrow i, \text{ then } y \rightarrow \emptyset, \text{ then } V_1 V_2 \rightarrow V_2 \]
have here is the use of a verb which occurs in StT where StT prefers a different form. (It could also be noted that yeşiller- has a slang meaning 'become sexually aroused', whereas yeşer- does not.)

3.9.14. düzlenecek (StT düzlecek) 'it'll improve' see 3.92.

3.92. The form just cited above and the infinitive düzlemek (StT düzletemek) 'to put in order' should be treated together. In StT, düz is an adjective meaning 'smooth, flat', but there is also a verb stem düz- meaning 'arrange, mend'. From the former are derived the verb stems düz- 'flatten', düzlen- 'become flat' and düzletem- 'cause to flatten', whereas from the latter are derived düzle- 'improve' and düzletem- 'cause to improve, put in order'. In WRT, whether through metathesis or confusion of the adjectival and verbal stems or a combination of the two, we now have the forms cited here (cf. Vid.381).

3.93. sağlatacak (StT sağaltacak) 'he'll cure' from sağ 'healthy'. Aside from the extension by -il- rather than -al- (cf. Vid.404, TDK III:1178), we have the generalization of the causative suffix -tr-. In StT, polysyllabic stems in -l and -r take the causative suffix -tr- (Lewis 1967:145).

3.94. The stem diver- 'say, tell, explain' occurs in a number of places (III.23,74,78). It is derived from the verbal adverb diye/diyi- 'saying' and the verb ver- 'give' which is often used as an auxiliary in forming compound verbs. This use is especially characteristic of WRT (Flo.8-9). Cf. also the use of koyverdi 'he ordered, sent, allowed' (VII.5-2).

4.0 Lexicon. As our sections on phonology and morphology have been based on phenomena as they occur in a corpus comprising primarily isolotated lexical items, we shall now treat specifically lexical questions and deal with syntactic constructions in section 5. In this section, we shall treat three types of WRT lexical items.

4.01. Native or pre-Balkan Turkish words. These are words. These are words which are considered dialectal due to their semantics rather than due to peculiarities of phonology or morphology, although these, too, may be present.

4.02. Direct (recent) borrowings from Slv, including code-switching, calquing, and substitution of similar forms.

4.03. Turkisms, i.e. Turkish words and pre-Balkan borrowings subsequently borrowed by nonT and subsequently reinforcing the WRT forms.12

4.1 Native Turkish and pre-Balkan borrowings. açan (VII.7-1) 'when' (Flo.II.8, Gos.247, Ohr.247, WM.165; Osmanlı kaçañaça) bithangi (VI.73) /birangi (III.10, IV.50) 'some, some kind of' (KM.318, Vid.84) dernek (II.100) 'Saturday' (Flo.103, Yur.337) hay ki (III.34) 'it means that' (not in APDD) kapalı (III.7-9) 'by heart' (literally 'closed', meaning not in APDD) kinça (III.7-4) 'pleased' (TDK II.904) pesi (III.7-2) 'stingy' (cf. StT pestı 'lowness, baseness?') ramet (II.100, IV.32) 'rain' (Kum.II.9, StT rahmet ('God's mercy')) tegena (III.7-10) 'here, behold' (cf. te in this meaning Din.204, Kum.127)

4.2. Borrowings, calques, and substitutions.

4.21. If we define code-switching as involving more than one lexical item in a string, we have one clear example in our corpus: bir karta drugo mesto 'for ikinci mevki bir bilet (VIII.14-3) 'a second class ticket'. This example also contains the borrowed calque meslo 'place' on Turkish mevki, the standard Slv word being razred 'class'.

4.22. Another item in our corpus which probably represents a lexical calque is the use of qibi 'like' for olarak 'as' in Ağabeyim öğretmen gibi (vs olarak) ekmeği kazanıyor (VI.191) 'My older brother earns his living as a teacher' (with gibi 'like a teacher' in StT). Mac kako SC kao and Alb si could be used to mean both 'as' and 'like' in such a context. This phenomenon has not been commented upon in the APDD.

4.23. The use of prvi for ayın birinde 'first of the month' (VIII.14-2) represents a phonologically unassimilated borrowing, assuming that spelling represents pronunciation (for evidence that it does, cf. Jaš-ar-Nasteva 1969:243). The word odmor (VIII.14-7) 'vacation' has also been borrowed unchanged.

4.24. The following words are recent borrowings from Slv dialectal forms: çirkuș (VII.5-3) 'circuit' (Slv cirkus); gra (III.35) 'beans' (Mac graf, SC graah, both have dialectal gra); proma (VII.5-5) 'drift' (slv promaja); utakmica (VII.5-3) 'match, game' (Slv utakmica); isporija (VII.5-4) 'roasted pumpkin seeds' (Mac sporija). The use of Slv (and Alb) pronunciation of the names of consonant letters (e.g. bi for StT be) cited in 2.144 could also be included here.

4.25. The words proba 'test' and poșta 'mail' (III.35) are recent borrowings in which the Slv and StT are so similar that the Slv has influenced or substituted for the StT in WRT. Older examples of this same process are dedo (III.53) for dede 'grandfather' and ni...ni... (III.34,V1.90) for ne...ne... 'neither nor'. The form tete (III.53) is an old Slv loanword in Turkish (Tietze 1957:30-1) and also occurs in Anatolia (TDK III:1348), but is undoubtedly reinforced in WRT by Mac teta 'auntie'.

12 Archaisms, which could be treated as being of the first or third type, will not be treated here if their features are strictly phonological or morphological and have thus been discussed in one of the preceding sections.
4.26. The forms argat (III.7), pasul (III.35), piper (III.17), pita (III.53), skara (III.35), skelet (III.35) and possibly sapun (III.35) represent nonT forms of words which entered STT, Slv, and Alb independently where WRT now uses nonT rather than STT forms. These are, in essence, older examples of the phenomenon illustrated by modern pošta.

4.30. Turkisms. Our corpus (III.35) gives a list of lexical items whose "mishap" forms it attributes to the influence of "Macedonian in Macedonia and Serbian in Kosovo". (It is interesting to note that the influence of Albanian, which is surely significant in Kosovo and western Macedonia, is not mentioned.) The vast majority of these words are in fact Turkisms in the nonT languages (the remainder have been discussed in section 4.2), and their forms either reflect WRT pronunciation, e.g. avyan, bayagi, or reflect processes shared by WRT with nonT or adopted by it from nonT, e.g. cilim, şembre (cf. Schmaus 1968). What we have here, then, is the influence of the nonT pronunciation of WRT forms on speakers of WRT where the influence is more a matter of mutual reinforcement.

4.31. The list in our corpus which alludes to this phenomenon, however, does not include all of the items which illustrate it. Other obvious examples are burek (VII.7, VIII.13), Sbv burek and çarsı (VIII.13) Alb çarski, Slv çaršija. Similarly, all the proper names occur among nonT Moslems, i.e. most Albanians and Roms in Macedonia and Kosovo as well as Slv-speaking Moslems (Muslimani). In fact, the vast majority of words not cited in 4.1 or 4.2 could be included here.

4.32. Some of these "Turkisms" occur in the standard nonT dictionaries, e.g., dembel (III.53). Others occur in the standard dictionaries only in compound or complex items, e.g. Mak dilimi 'is't it so?' (STT değil mi, cf. dil [III.7] 'it isn't'), biçakçıja 'knife-grinder' (STT biçaçı, cf. biçak [VIII.13] 'knife'), Alb gjyzlykë 'glasses' (STT gözük, cf. göz [IV.32] 'eye'). Still others are limited to special dictionaries of Turkisms, e.g., sogan (III.46), or are considered dialectisms in the standard languages, the nonT standard forms being the same as the STT forms, e.g., penbe (III.62), petmez (III.53) in Slv. amam, ayat (III.47) in Alb. Uses of finite verb forms (cf. Skaljić 1966) can be considered as code-switching, as can utterances in folk tales in which some of the characters speak a little Turkish. Even further removed are words like albuki (III.34) which is used as a nonsense word in Mac children's rhymes.

4.33. As the focus of this article is on WRT, an attempt to differentiate the functions of the words in our corpus in nonT is outside our purview (see especially Jašar-Nasteva 1972 for Mac). Nonetheless, in order to give a general idea of the representation of this phenomenon in our corpus, we shall list here those WRT forms in our corpus with corresponding forms in the Fjalor i gjuhës së sotme shqipe (Tirana, 1984) and/or the Rečnik na makedonskiot jazik (Skopje, 1961-66), i.e. in the principal dictionaries of the literary languages of the majorities in Kosovo and Macedonia. Thus excluded are compounds and derived forms, dialectisms, and specialized Turkisms.

4.34. alva (III.35), amam, ava, ayat (III.47), avyan, bayagi (III.35), biçak (VIII.13), bunar (III.17), burek (VII.7, VIII.13), çarsı (VII.17), çemer, çepenk, çesma (SC), cilim, çitap, çöfte (III.35), küfte (VII.7, VIII.13), da (III.30), dembel (III.53), div (III.35), dükan dücan düçan dükan (III.30, 35, 41, 32), em (III.30), hveli (IV.32), kafa/kafe (III.30, 35), kaia/kaiş (III.10), kapi (III.30, 42), VII.5, VIII.13), karavan (III.35), pare (III.53, SC), sabayle, sinci, şecer (III.35), tursı (III.17).

5.0. Syntax. It has often been observed that the syntax of Balkan Turkish, including Gagauz, reflects a great deal of Slv influence or has been essentially Slavicized (Doerfer 1959:270, Pokrovskaja 1979, Kakuk 1960, Molova 1970:218, KM.317, Ohr.316-17, Vid.108). The role of Alb, while irrelevant for ERT and the WRT dialects of Bulgaria and thus often ignored in the APDD (except by Jašar-Nasteva), is also extremely important for Kosovo and Western Macedonia. Unlike the phonology, morphology, and lexicon of the WRT reflected in our corpus, where we have both contact phenomena and native features which are not even connected with nonT reinforcement, virtually all the WRT syntactic phenomena illustrated by our corpus involve the calquing of nonT models or, at the very least, phenomena which have unquestionably been reinforced or expanded on the basis on nonT constructions. In their broadest outlines, the syntactic features illustrated by our corpus are the following:

5.01. Use of the optative-subjunctive in place of other finite and nonfinite verbal forms as calques on Slv subordinate clauses in da and Alb ones in tê. 5.02. Noninterrogative use of interrogatives.

5.03. Placement of verb in nonfinal position.

5.04. Placement of interrogative particle (mi) after person markers in participle-based finite verb forms.

5.05. Agreement of modifiers with plural substantives.

5.06. Stylistic questions.

5.1. Optative-subjunctive as a calque on da/tê-clauses.

5.11. This phenomenon is well attested in WRT (Flo.106, Gos.297, Kum.130, Ohr.246, Vid.97,109; Kakuk 1960:253-4) as well as in ERT and Gagauz (Nev.97, Tre.79, Molov and Mollova 1966:126-7, Gajdžarić 1973:54, Pokrovskaja 1964:210, 1979:204-14). The use of the optative-subjunctive to express indirect imperatives and clauses of goal also occurs in other Turkic languages and dialects (Kakuk 1960:246, Molov and Mollova 1966:126), but the far greater frequency and wider range of such uses in Balkan Turkish indicate the influence of nonT Balkan languages. The examples in our corpus can be classified according to the corresponding ST construction or according to the nonT type of construction being calqued. Due to the fact that a given WRT form can sometimes be replaced by more than one ST construction while corresponding directly and uniquely to
a single nonT one, we have chosen the latter method. Also, since the examples in our corpus correspond most directly to Mac, that is the language we shall use as the basis of our classification. We shall give the WRT forms with references to the appendix, where the complete sentences and the StT forms can be found, and we shall also give here Mac and English translations.

5.12. Possibility (Mac može da 'be able to')
5.121. Olur gitmeyelim (III.7-5) Može da ne odime 'We don't have to go'
5.122. Olur mu gidelim (III.10-3) Može li da odime 'Can we go?'
5.123. Karışнятиась olur mu (III.7-7) Zar ne možeš da ne se mešaš 'Can't you keep from interfering'
5.13. Necessity (Mac treba da 'need to')
5.131. Lâzımdır çalıșalим (III.7-5) Treba da rabotîm 'We have to work'
5.132. Lâzım çalıșaš (VI.38) Treba da rabotîš 'You have to work'
5.133. Lâzım gideyilm (VI.38) Treba da odam 'I have to go'
5.14. Negative futurity (Mac Nema da 'won't')
5.141. Yoktur gelesin (III.38) Nema da odîş 'You won't go'
5.15. Existence for purpose (Mac ima da, nema da 'there is/isn't [something] to')
5.151. Birangi kitap var mı veresin (III.10-4) İma li nekoja kniga da dades 'Is there a book for you to give'
5.152. Yok ne darlayıšım (III.10-5) Nema şto da se lutam 'There's nothing for me to get upset about'
5.16. Other purposive
5.161. Gideyim alam (VII.5-4) Odam da zemam 'I'm going to get'
5.162. Koyverdi oynayalım (VII.5-2) Pušti da igrame 'He let/sent us to go play'
5.17. Aspectual (Begin-Continue-End)
5.171. Başlayacam çalıșam (III.7-8) Ke počnam da rabotam 'I'll begin to work'
5.2. Noninterrogative uses of interrogatives
5.21. WRT ne 'what' as a calque on Mac şto 'what, which, that, something, etc.'
5.21. 'something' (cf. KM.318). Yok ne darlayıšım (III.10-5) Nema şto da se lutam 'There's nothing for me to get upset about'
5.212. 'which, that' (cf. Ohr.247, Vid.III , Tre.79, Gajdarži 1973:19) o akrabamız ki bize sik slik ne gelirdi (III.10-1) rodninata şto odeshe često kaj nas 'the relative that used to come to our place often.'
5.22. Ne zaman 'when?' as a calque on koga 'when, whenever' (Ohr.247, Vid.II.0, Mollov and Mollova 1966:129). Ne zaman gittik sinemaya. . . (III.10-2) Koga odevme na kino 'When(ever) we went to the movies.'

5.30. Word order: main verbs. In StT, the main verb ordinarily comes at the end of the clause or sentence, although this rule is by no means adhered to rigidly, especially in emphatic and other marked contexts. Nonetheless, the verb in WRT occurs at the beginning of the sentence or in some other nonfinal position far more than in StT (Gos.297, KM.321, Vid.II 3, WM.163, also ERT: Kaz.186-7, Tre.79, Mollov and Mollova 1966:129, and Gagauz: Doerfer 159:271, Pokrovskaja 1979:215-20). The examples in our corpus can be classified according to position with respect to other units in the surface structure of the given clause in the following manner:

5.301. Full verbs and nonfinite predicates without enclitics.
5.301. After initial subject.
5.301. After adverb or adverbial phrase (no explicit subject).
5.3013. Absolute initial.
5.30131. Followed by verb phrase.
5.30132. Followed by noun.
5.302. Dependent enclitic 'be'
5.3021. After initial subject.
5.3022. After nonfinite predicative form (followed by subject or finite verb)
5.31. Full verbs and nonfinite predicative forms without enclitics
5.31. After initial subject.
5.31. After adverb or adverbial phrase.
5.31.1. Direktor koyverdi oynayalım (VII.5-2) 'The director told us to go play'
5.31.2. Sen de celi misin yıkanma (VII.5-6) 'Are you coming to wash, too?'
5.31.3. Ben söyledim göyceye (VIII.14-4) 'I told the child'
5.32. After adverb or adverbial phrase.
5.32. Ne zaman gittik sinemaya (III.10-2) 'When(ever) we went to the movies'
5.32. Düm utakımçadan sonra gittim çıręsası (VII.5-3) 'Yesterday after the game I went to the circus'
5.32. Acan idin Ohr'ıde (VIII.14-1) 'When were you in Ohrid?'
5.33. Absolute initial.
5.331. Followed by verb phrase.
5.331. Olur gitmeyelim okula (III.7-6) 'We don't have to go to school'
5.331. Lâzım çalıșaš (VIII.38) 'You have to work'
We shall cite all of the examples of these phenomena here.

The presence of an exercise requiring the correction of verb forms which do not agree with their pronominal subjects (see III.71 in the appendix) indicates that Turkish children have problems with these forms, but there is nothing about this exercise which makes it appear to be a feature characteristic of WRT. (Cf. in English children's forms of the type I goed, which do not reflect common nonstandard usage.)

I. Non bibliographic

Abbreviations

ABBR Eva ev

5.323. The phrase Kač saat? (III.27, VI.74) 'What time is it?' is normatively Saat kač, Kač 'how much' serves a predicative function in this expression, and so, in a sense, this example belongs with 5.3132. We have classed it separately because kač is not a nonfinite predicate like var, yok, lazım, and değil. The interrogative particle mi comes before the person marker in participle-based finite verb forms, e.g., geleceksin 'you'll come', gelecek misin 'will you come?'. In colloquial and dialectal Turkish, however, mi can be placed after the person marker, a fact which has not been cited in the APDD but which is amply illustrated in our corpus: Gideceğiz mi, gidey sik mi, yapası k mi (III.82), gideceğim mi,(VI.38), gideys mi (VIII.14-6).

5.5. Agreement of modifiers with plural substantives. In StT, modifiers do not agree with the substantives they modify, unlike Slv and Alb (and also English in the case of, e.g., demonstrative pronouns). Thus in StT we have bu çocuk 'this child', bu çocuklar 'these children', cf. Mac ova dete - ovie deca, Alb ky femije-kêta femije, Sc ovo dete - ova deca.

Our corpus contains evidence that there is a tendency at least among children, to calque this type of modifier agreement in WRT, viz. there is a prescription against forms of the type bunlar çocuklar (IV.47). This phenomenon has not been mentioned in the APDD. 13

5.6. Stylistic questions. There are a number of differences between the WRT sentences in our corpus and the prescriptive equivalents cited which appear to be due to the authors' stylistic preferences. As a result, some of the StT sentences are not exact equivalents of the WRT originals. Also, some of the sentences presented as StT in our corpus sounded nonstandard or awkward to native speakers from Turkey (Ankara and Eskişehir). 14

We shall cite all of the examples of these phenomena here.

13 The presence of an exercise requiring the correction of verb forms which do not agree with their pronominal subjects (see III.71 in the appendix) indicates that Turkish children have problems with these forms, but there is nothing about this exercise which makes it appear to be a feature characteristic of WRT. (Cf. in English children's forms of the type I goed, which do not reflect common nonstandard usage.)

14 I wish to thank Füsun Leventoğlu and Zülal Balpinar for their help in this and other matters connected with this article.
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'there's nothing between us two [for me] get upset about', it was felt that ortada lit. 'in the middle' would have been a better modification.

5.62. There were three sentences presented in our corpus as StT which our informants found distinctively less acceptable than the alternatives given here. (We will not cite the WRT sentences here, as they are not relevant to these considerations.)

5.621. Sinemaya gittiğimiz zaman çok sevin dik (III.10-2) 'When/Wheniver we went to the movies, we were very happy'. According to our informants, this sentence is infelicitous. Either gittiğimiz zaman should be replaced by gittiğimizde, in which case the sentence refers to a single event in the past, or sevin dik should be replaced by seviniriz, in which case the meaning is habitual with zaman taking on the meaning 'whenever', a meaning which, it should be noted, ne zaman can also have in StT (cf. 5.22). As the sentence stands in our corpus the first half is habitual while the second refers to a single past act.

5.622. Hasanlar'ı gidebilirmiyz (III.10-3) 'Can we go to Hasan's house?'. Preferred: Hasanlar'a gitsen olur mu.

5.623. Geliyor musun sinemaya gidelim (VIII.14-5) 'Are you coming so we can go to the movies?'. Preferred: Sinemaya gitmegen geliyor musun or more colloquial Var misin sinemaya gidelim.

5.7. There is one example which is difficult to interpret, and so we cite it here only tentatively. The example o akrabamız (III.10-1) in the WRT sentence is rendered as bir akrabamız in the StT equivalent. The former means 'that relative' the latter means 'a relative'. It could be that the WRT version represents the use of o 'that' (as well as bu 'this') as a calque on the nonT definite articles (Vid.92-3), but the sentence does not have a surrounding context, and so it is difficult to determine.

6.0. NonT influence on WRT

At the beginning of this article, we mentioned the relative paucity of material on nonT influence on WRT and the general lack of acquaintance of Balkanologists with even that material. In this section, we shall examine nonT influence on WRT in light of our corpus as compared with the APDD and related studies.

6.1. Phonology

6.2. Jas˘ar-Nasteva's (1969, 1971/2) studies of nonT influence on the phonology of the WRT dialect of Gostivar identify the following features as relevant:

6.21. Absence of ö. The loss of ö due to raising (ü) or backing (o) is particularly characteristic of WRT and extremely rare in Anatolia (Cafer o˘glu 1964:14). It is significant that ö is the one sound lacking in all the nonT languages with which WRT is in contact. It is also significant that the tendency to replace ö with ü increases in the western part of WRT territory, where Albanian, which has ü in its sound inventory, is widely spoken or, depending on the specific region, is the language of the majority. In the eastern part of WRT territory, on the other hand, where ü is absent from the Slv dialects of the majority as well as from the other nonT languages, the tendency in WRT is to back rather than raise, and such is the treatment of ö in the local nonT dialects.

As has been seen (2.11.2.2), this phenomenon of elimination of ö is well represented in our corpus.

6.22. Absence of h. This phenomenon is especially characteristic of Macedonian WRT (Blg.21). It is also characteristic of Mac and of the Alb and SC dialects of Macedonia and Kosovo. While loss of h may occur elsewhere in Turkish, and while its preservation may occur sporadically in the WRT of Yugoslavia, it is clear that this is basically a shared phonological phenomenon. It, too, is well attested in our corpus (2.213).

6.23. Palatal mutation of palatalized k,g. The phenomenon is somewhat controversial, as different linguists have treated it differently (e.g., Alb. vs Gos.). Németh (Alb.22) considers this to be a native WRT feature brought by the original Turkish immigrants from northeast Anatolia, where this same feature appears. Even if the tendency was present in the language of the Turkish settlers whose descendents are the modem speakers of WRT, however, there is no question that the same type of sounds were also present in the nonT languages of the area thus permitting mutual reinforcement. It is thus legitimate to include this dialectal feature among those phenomena which has at least been reinforced by contact with nonT. It is well attested in our corpus (2.212).

6.24. Simplification of geminate consonants. This feature is rare in Anatolia (Cafer o˘glu 1959:255) but is characteristic not only of WRT, but of the nonT languages with which it is in contact. The nonT languages routinely simplify Turkish geminates in borrowings, e.g. StT dükkan, Alb dyqan, Mac du˘kan, SC du˘can 'shop', StT sunet, Alb synet, Mac sunet 'circumcision', StT iskallah, Mac is˘ala 'God willing', etc. The examples of this phenomenon in our corpus are not numerous and occur mainly in proper names, but they are present (see 2.23).

6.25. Absence of prothetic vowels. The loss of prothetic high vowels in old loanwords and the failure to add them to initial consonant clusters in new loans is a sporadic phenomenon in WRT and is clearly connected with the absence of such prothesis in the nonT languages. Our corpus, however, displays both nonprothetic forms, e.g. tasiym (IV.32) (StT istasiym 'station'), şekembe (III.35) (StT is˘ekembe 'tripe') and newer prothetic ones, e.g. isporija (VII.5-4) from Mac sporia 'roasted pumpkin seeds' (see 2.151).

6.26. Velarization of clear l word finally and before all back vowels. This feature is especially characteristic of Mac. As we have already indicated (2.224) this phenomenon only has minimal possibilities for representation in StT orthography, and so examples of it in our corpus are minimal.

6.27. Changes in the distribution and frequency of consonant clusters and introduction of new sounds. These are all the result of unadapted borrowings from Slv, e.g. drˇzava 'state', opˇtina 'district' (Jas˘ar-Nasteva 1969:243).
Our only example is the word prvi (VIII.14-2). Other recent borrowings in our corpus are phonologically adapted, e.g. utakmića (VII.5-3) from Slv utakmica 'match, game' or do not display any unusual clusters or sounds, e.g. odmor (VIII.14-7) cf., e.g., StT idman 'gymnastics'.

6.II.8. Phenomena connected with the affricate ts. Jašar-Nasteva (1969:242-243) cites the introduction of the phoneme or the affricate /ts/ and the related phenomenon of the anticipatory softening in forms with suffixed -itu, e.g. Sabantusa from Sbantitsa Slv Sabanica 'Shaban's wife, Mrs. Shaban'. There are no examples of this in our corpus. Rather, we have two examples where the Slv dental affricate is rendered in the StT manner by a palatal one: čirkus and utakmića (VII.5-3).

6.II.9. Molla (1970:218) cites the WRT pronunciation of StT i in a lower, more central position, as in Slv (or, we might add, Alb). The only possible evidence for this in our corpus is the admonition to pronounce the names of consonant letters be, ce rather than be, ce "as in Serbian and Macedonian" (see 2.144).

6.III.0. The devoeing of final z to s. This occurs elsewhere in Turkish (Caferoglu 1959:251), but any possible pre-existing tendency can only have been greatly strengthened by the fact that this is a regular phonetic process in Mac and in Alb dialects. Our corpus gives a number of examples (see 2.222).

6.III.1. The phonology and morphology of Németh's first five features (1.4-I, 1.45, 2.112, 2.113, 2.114, 2.145, 3.1) all violate the rules of StT vowel harmony. It is well-known that a number of dialects of another Turkic language, Uzbek, have lost vowel harmony in connection with their close contact with Iranian, i.e. with Indo-European languages lacking vowel harmony (see, e.g., Sjöbert 1963:3). It is entirely likely that the close contacts of WRT with non-T and non-T reinforced tendencies which lead to the breakdown of vowel harmony in WRT.

6.2. Morphology. Aside from the morphophonological phenomena connected with vowel harmony just mentioned above, the only morphological influence of non-T on WRT reflected in our corpus is in the use of the derivational and hypocoristic suffixes discussed in 3.821-4, q.v.

6.3. Lexicon. We can identify three types of lexical influence of non-T on WRT: Borrowings, calques, and "Turksms".

6.3.1. Borrowings. These are of the following three types:

6.3.1. Recent borrowings without phonological adaptation, e.g. prvi (VIII.14-2), or not requiring adaptation, e.g. odmor (VIII.14-7) (see 4.21, 4.23).

6.3.1. Recent borrowings with phonological adaptation, e.g. utakmića, čirkus (VII.5-3), isporija (VII.5-4) (see 4.24).

6.3.13. Substitution of non-T forms for Turkish words with the same meaning and similar phonological shape including old and recent borrowings, e.g. piper (III.17) posta (III.35), etc. (see 4.25-6).

6.3. Calques. Our corpus displays only two examples of lexical calques: the use of Slv mesto 'place' instead of razred 'class' as a borrowed calque on StT mevki (place) (VIII.14-3, see 4.21), and the use of gribe 'like' in place of olarak 'as' (VI.91) calqued, presumably, on non-T (Mac kako, Alb si, SC kao, see 4.22).

6.33. "Turkisms". This phenomenon is implicit in the term mutual reinforcement Afendras 1968:99, viz. Turkish loanwords borrowed by non-T in their WRT forms and subjected to the phonological processes of the borrowing languages subsequently influenced WRT pronunciation. This phenomenon is explicitly referred to in our corpus (III.35) and also appears elsewhere in it (see section 4.3). Particularly worthy of note is the influence of non-T Moslem proper names on WRT forms. Onomastics has received very little attention in the APDD (a little material is to be found in, e.g., Flo. and WM, cf. Kaz.264-67 for ERT) but our corpus devotes a relatively significant amount of space to it (see 7.533-4 below).

6.4. Syntax. As we observed in section 5.0, virtually all the syntactic phenomena in our corpus reflect calques on non-T. While there are some phenomena not illustrated by examples in our corpus, e.g., the reversal of genitive-head order in definite izafet constructions as in WRT familiasi adamun lit. 'his= the family of the man' for StT adaman familiasi 'the man's family', where the former is the order, found in non-T (WM.165), we nonetheless have examples of the most important features, i.e. calquing of da/té-classes by means of the optative-subjunctive, noninterrogative uses of interrogatives, nonfinal verb position, as well as change of clitic order with the interrogative particle mi (cf. use of Slv li) and agreement of modifiers with plural substantives, which have not been observed in the APDD (see 5.1-5.5). The sentences in 5.62 which educated speakers from Turkey find awkward or unacceptable could themselves represent unintentional manifestations of WRT on the part of the authors of the textbooks.

7.0. Pedagogy, popular perception, and dialectology. It has been a basic premise of this article that the examples labeled yanlis 'wrong' in the textbooks used for teaching Turkish grammar in the Turkish language elementary schools of Yugoslavia represent WRT forms used by Turks of Macedonia and Kosovo, and this premise has been borne out by comparison with the APDD and occasional explicit statements in our corpus (III.6, 10, IV.32, VI.60, 90, VII.7, VIII.13). A unique characteristic of our corpus is that it affords us the opportunity to compare the native speaker's perceptions with those of the dialectologist. In this section, we shall discuss the manner in which the material which we have analyzed in sections 2-6 of this article is presented in the corpus itself.

7.1. Phonology. The APDD of WRT published since 1956 have taken Németh's features (see 1.4) as their starting points, and it is appropriate that we do the same in our comparison. (We shall include the two features
mentioned in section 1.49. A comparison of these features with their treatment in our corpus shows a number of significant differences.)

7.II. Consonantal features. All three of these features (preservation of ˘g as g, loss of h, palatal mutation of k,g) are treated as phonological phenomena in our corpus, i.e., there are explicit statements on how words containing these sounds should be pronounced (III.46.7; III.47.7). The pronunciation of ˘g as y, v, or Ø also occurs throughout the WRT area, and this fact is also brought out by explicit statement in our corpus (III.22.46; cf. also III.74.77; VIII.14) (see 2.2.11).

7.II.2. Loss of h is the only phonological feature illustrated, albeit not explicitly described as such, by the normative statements in the second grade textbook (II.36,56,100). It is treated more extensively at the later grade levels (see 2.213).

7.II.3. Palatal mutation of velars is explicitly mentioned only in connection with g, although numerous lexical examples also illustrate the change with k (see 2.212). The explicit treatment of the fronting of g describes it as typical of Kosovo. While such pronunciation has also been noted in Macedonia (Sko.21, WM.155), it appears that stronger fronting is more characteristic of k in Macedonia (cf. WM.155 vs 156-8, Gos.287) and Jašar-Nasteva (Gos.287) specifies greater fronting of g as typical of Kosovo. We can also note here that palatal mutation of k is only illustrated by eight substantives in two places (III.30,35) while this same phenomenon in g is limited to three verb-stems (cel- 'come', cit- 'go', and cür- 'see') but occurs in six places.

7.II.4. From this evidence we can conclude that WRT speakers are sensitive to consonantal phenomena as such as well as to regional differences (see 7.3 below).

7.12. Vocalic features. Németh’s vocalic features are more numerous and more complicated in their structure, and their varied treatments in our corpus reflect this complexity. The vocalic phenomena can be split into three groups on the basis of their inherent properties:

7.12.1. Lexical or unconditioned: backing of ˘o and ˘u to o and u; raising of ˘o to ü.

7.12.2. Environmentally conditioned: neutralization of the oppositions front/back and rounded/unrounded in word final position (only i occurs) and backing of i to i in closed final and noninitial syllables.

7.12.3. Morphophonemic (vowel harmonic): generalization of e or a in suffixes and clitics and generalization of -miš for the perfect (indefinite past).

7.12.4. Lexical or unconditioned. As we have noted (6.11), raising of ˘o to ü appears to be more characteristic of Macedonia and Kosovo while backing of ˘o, ˘u to o,u is more typical of the eastern part of WRT territory. The treatment of these phenomena in our corpus clearly reflects the predominance of the former phenomenon over the latter in the WRT dialects of Yugoslavia. The raising of ˘o is explicitly mentioned (as the rpronunciation or spelling of ˘o as ü) three times (III.22.45; VII.7) and occurs in numerous examples throughout the corpus (see 2.11 ). The backing or ˘o and ˘u is illustrated by only four scattered items occurring in lists organized on lexical principles and is never explicitly mentioned (see 2.2.1).

7.12.5. Environmentally conditioned. Both these phenomena are well attested in our corpus, but, probably due to the fact that they are environmentally conditioned, they are not explicitly treated as phonological phenomena. Rather, they occur in lists of verb forms intended to illustrate vowel harmony (VI.56,63; VI.59, VIII.13.14), a list of substantives said to be influenced by non’ (III.35), and in other places where there is no explicit phonological or morphological organizing principle (see 2.13.2, 2.14).

Examples of the neutralization of high vowels word-finally to i occur throughout the corpus, but examples of the backing of i to i in closed final and noninitial syllables are restricted to finite verb forms. This appears to be due to the fact that the former phenomenon is prominent in all types of word forms, whereas the latter is by definition restricted to polysyllabic stems and inflectional endings. This latter changes is especially prominent in nominal inflectional and derivational suffixes, e.g., the possessive suffixes of the first and second persons and also of the third when followed by a case suffix, the genitive suffix, the plural suffix, the productive derivational suffix -hk, etc. As our corpus pays remarkably little attention to nominal inflectional and derivational phenomena (see 7.22), the latter of these two types of environmentally conditioned change receives far less attention than the former.

7.12.6. Vocal harmony. The rules of vowel harmony are explicitly described from the third grade onward. For purposes of studying specifically WRT forms, however, we are concerned only with those discussions in our corpus in which yanlis ‘wrong’ forms are specifically cited. Phenomena connected with high vowel harmony, except the generalization of -miš are environmentally conditioned and were discussed in 7.122. Of the two remaining phenomena, the generalized use of -miš, is not explicitly identified as such, but a list is devoted to it in the context of teaching vowel harmony in verb forms (IV.58), and it occurs elsewhere in the context of vowel harmony (VIII.13) and yanlis verb forms (III.74). The generalization of a or e in suffixes and clitics receives almost no attention, implicit or explicit. The four examples illustrating this phenomenon in our corpus, one occurs in a lexically based list of conjunctions (clitic da III.34), one in a list devoted to vowel harmony in verbs in general (negative imperative citma VIII.14), one in a list of sentences aimed at a broad range of grammatical features (dative infinitive gitma VIII.14-5), and one in a discussion of vowel harmony in case endings (dative Ohri’ya VI.59). Thus the relative lack of consistency in this phenomenon in WRT as observed in the APDD is reflected in the general lack of attention paid to it in our corpus (see 2.145).

7.12.6. From the treatment of Németh’s vocalic phenomena in our corpus, we can reach the following conclusions:
7.1241. If the approach taken in our corpus represents popular perception, then the dialectal features affecting high vowel harmony, which are in any case more numerous, are also perceived as being more distinctive, i.e. obviously dialectal.

7.1242. It is significant that there are only two WRT forms cited in connection with vowel harmony in the nominal inflectional system (VI.59), although numerous WRT nouns violating lexical vowel harmony are cited in their nominative case forms. All other discussions of vowel harmony with WRT examples are concerned with finite verb forms. This can be taken as indicating the popular perception of nouns as absolute entities and verbs as inflected entities, but it also can be taken as indicative that high vowel phenomena are more salient in popular perception than low vowel ones, as the latter are typical of nominal inflection.

7.1243. On several occasions, the raising of ö to ü is part of the phenomenon of deviation from the STT rules of vowel harmony (IV.56, 58, 61; VIII.13). While this is not the case, e.g., the form güdüm (STT gördüm) ‘I saw’ (IV.56) does not display a violation of vowel harmony, it is a clear indication that the various vocalic phenomena are popularly perceived as being of one general type.

7.13. There is only one other phonological WRT phenomenon which occurs in the context of the explicit discussion of sounds in our corpus, viz. the form biçak (VIII.13) ‘knife’ (STT biçak), which illustrates the fronting of r to r next to a palatal, is cited in a discussion of vowel harmony. It is not, however, cited as a phenomenon per se. All the other phonological phenomena discussed in section 2 of this article are not treated systematically or explicitly.

7.14. On the basis of their treatment in our corpus, then, we can generalize that the popular perception of WRT phonological features is focused on phenomena connected with ğ, h, ö, the fronting of velars, and lack of vowel harmony in verbal inflection and the absolute forms of nouns.

7.2. Morphology.

Excluding syntactic and lexical phenomena to be discussed in 7.3 and 7.4 below, our corpus treats four parts of speech explicitly in our WRT context: verbs, nouns, conjunctions, and one postposition.

7.21. Verbs. Verbal morphology is explicitly mentioned in a number of places in our corpus (III.74, 77, 78, 82; IV.56, 57, 59, 61, 63; VI.43, 44; VIII.14), but the majority of phenomena illustrated in these sections are in fact phonological or morphophonological (see 7.1). Our corpus specifically cites the following verbal categories: present tense (şimdiki zaman: III.74, IV.59), past tense (geçmiş zaman: III.74), which is subdivided into definite/witnessed (belirtti: IV.56) and indefinite/unwitnessed (beliriz: IV.56, IV.43), future tense (gelecek zaman: III.74, IV.61), aorist tense (geniş zaman: IV.63), the negative verb (olumsuz eylem: III.77), the interrogative particle (soru eki: III.82, IV.49), the verbal noun and infinitive (eylem adı and mastar: III.78). Of all the phenomena discussed in sections 3.1-3.6 and 3.9, however, only the use of -sak as a 1p marker in the indefinite past is alluded to in a purely morphological context (IV.43, see 3.3). The present (progressive) tense in -y is a purely morphological phenomenon, but in our corpus it is treated like the future as involving "mistakes" in personal suffixes connected with ellision rather than as a tense form in competition with the progressive in -yor. (No mention is made of the substitution of one tense for another, although this is characteristic of some WRT dialects, see 3.20). The phenomena connected with verbal derivation in III.78 are treated lexically, i.e. the items cited are not related to one another on the basis of their derivational affixes and processes, they are simply given in a list in their future participial forms (with one infinitive). The remainder of the verbal categories explicitly cited as such in our corpus display WRT phonological features already discussed in 7.1 or syntactic features to be discussed in 7.3 below. The phonological (and morphophonological) features are treated as "mistakes" in vowel harmony.

7.22. Nouns.

7.221. Inflection. As we have indicated above (7.1242, also cf. 3.7), nominal inflection receives almost no attention in our corpus. Our four examples are the accusative kâpyi, dative Ohri'ya (VI.59), and the 1s, 2s dative pronouns bene, sene (VI.75). They are explicitly cited in sections concerned with vowel harmony in case endings as examples of what is done but should not be done. As we have already seen, kâpyi is actually phonologically motivated. Ohri'ya is morphophonologically and bene, sene could be treated as morphophonological or morphological.

7.222. Derivation. Of the various suffixes cited in 3.8, only the diminutive -çe is separated out and explicitly mentioned in our corpus (VI.60). The remainder occur in lexically defined lists, viz. proper names and kinship terms.

7.23. Conjunctions and postpositions. These words are generally morphologically invariant, and the features they display are phonological and lexical (native, borrowed, and calqued). Our corpus specifically cites one list of conjunctions (III.34) one member of which is cited elsewhere as a borrowed form (VI.90), and cites the usage of one postposition, which we take to be calqued, although our corpus does not specify this (VI.91). The total number of forms is eight, and we will list them here on the basis of the type of WRT features they display, although our corpus distinguishes them only as parts of speech:

7.231. Phonological (III.34, see 2.141, 2.145, 2.213, 2.224): ema, da, em...em...em...abuki, lakin 'but, and, both...and...however, but'.

7.232. Borrowed or lexically influenced (III.34, VI.90, see 4.25): ni...ni..."neither...nor...".

7.233. Native (III.34, see 4.1): hay ki 'it means that'.
three phenomena, however, are explicitly cited morphological, and lexical features as well as the syntactic phenomena we analyzed in section 5. The following three phenomena, however, are explicitly cited:

7.31. Placement of interrogative particle after person markers (III.82, VI.49; see 5.4).
7.32. Agreement of modifier with plural substantive (IV.47/ see 5.5).
7.33. Use of lâzım and optative-subjunctive in place of necessitative (VI.38; see 5.13).
7.34. As we mentioned in 5.0, virtually all the WRT syntactic phenomena displayed in our corpus result from nonT influence or reinforcement. This is not specified in the case of these three explicit references to syntactic phenomena, although it could be inferred from the statement that lâzım + optative-subjunctive in place of the necessitative "Türkçe söyleyüse aykırıdır" (VI.38) 'is contrary to Turkish speech'.
7.35. Lexicon. The treatment of lexical questions in our corpus is more varied than that used by us in section 4.
7.51. Of the native Turkish dialectisms treated by us in 4.1, only three: ramet (II.100), demek (II.142), selves. The words kapah (III.7-9), kınac (III.7-4), and tegana (III.7-10), however, are used in sentences in which they constitute the only WRT element. The conjunction hay ki is cited in a list of conjunctions displaying various types of WRT features (see 7.23 above), while açan (VIII.7-1) and pesi (III.7-2) occur in sentences which also display other WRT features.
7.52. Loanwords are explicitly cited in the list of nouns in III.35, in a note on VI.90, and in sentences in VIII.14-2,3,7. The borrowed pronunciation of letter names is also explicitly cited (III.41). The recent loanwords in the sentences in VII.5-3,4,5, however, are not identified as such. Lexical calquing (VIII.14-3, VI.91, see 4.21, 4.22) is also not explicitly identified, and no distinction is made between borrowed words and the phenomenon of mutual reinforcement from "Turkisms" described by us in 4.3 (see also 4.2).
7.53. A major difference between our treatment of the lexicon and that of our corpus is the use by the latter of a series of semantically defined lists of yanlış 'wrong' forms which display a wide variety of WRT features. These lists are the following:
7.531. Numerals (III.62); 3 items, 3 phonological features.
7.532. Colors (III.62); 8 items; 7 phonological features.
7.533. Kinship terms (III.53); 6 items, 2 phonological features, 1 morphological, 2 lexical or morphological.
7.534. Proper names (III.53, IV.32, VI.53). In addition to these explicit lists, proper names are cited in II.36, III.23, 47 for a total of 48 occurrences displaying a wide range of phonological and morphological (hypocoristic derivational) features. The great attention payed to onomastic phenomena by our corpus is particularly noteworthy. It may be associated with attempts at strengthening ethnic identification. (In this connection, note the emphasis on using full forms rather than hypocorisms [III.53; VI.53] which are, or sound as if they were, of Slv origin, although this characteristic is not explicitly mentioned.)
7.54. The treatment of lexical phenomena by our corpus indicates the following:
7.541. WRT speakers are sensitive to recent borrowings.
7.542. If a word occurs in both WRT and nonT, there is a tendency to pronounce it in the nonT rather than the StT fashion, the nonT itself frequently being WRT in origin.
7.543. Phonological phenomena are readily identified in popular perception and for pedagogical purposes with isolated lexical items or classes of lexical items.
7.544. The use of StT forms of proper names is considered very important, at least from a pedagogical or intellectual standpoint. This may be directly connected with attempts to increase ethnic awareness, but it requires further study.
7.6. Regional differences.
As we mentioned at the beginning of this article, the subdivision of WRT, aside from the identification of the Yuruk dialects, remains to be done. As we also stated, our corpus does not imply any specifically Yuruk features. On three occasions, however, it does refer to specific features, phonological, morphological, and lexical, as being typical of certain regions.
7.61. The following features are identified as being characteristic of certain regions:
7.611. The fronting of ţ to c for Kosovo (VII.7).
7.612. The use of the diminutive suffix -çe for Ohrid (VI.60).
7.613. The reflex of ţ as g and the raising of -ö to ü for Skopje (VII.7).
7.614. The use of the conjunction mi . . ni' . . 'neither'. . nor' for Skopje and Ohrid (VI.90).
7.62. As we indicated in 7.1I 3, there does appear to be evidence that there is a correlation between voice and fronting in velars, where the process occurs to a greater extent with the voiced in Kosovo and the voiceless in Macedonia.
7.63. On the other hand, the preservation of ţ as g and the raising of -ö to ü are found in Kosovo (Alb.19-20, Pri.7, Pri-2.1I 8), Ohrid (Ohr.236-7,241) and throughout the WRT speech area (see 2.III and 2.2II), and they
cannot be said to be peculiar to Skopje. It seems that we have here the assignment of particular importance to a major population center on the basis of traits which occur over a much wider area.

7.64. The use of the diminutive suffix -çe of Slv origin is recorded for Gostivar (Gos.287) and is also found elsewhere in WRT (see 3.8), while the use of ni...ni... is not mentioned in the APDD. Given the lack of additional material, we can only speculate that the use of -çe may be particularly characteristic of WRT in western Macedonia, while the mention of both Skopje and Ohrid in connection with ni...ni... may be intended simply to indicate that it is widespread.

7.65. It appears likely, we can conclude, that the pedagogical motivation for the specification of certain features as being typical of certain regions where there are large numbers of WRT speakers is to increase the students' sense of identification with the lesson.

7.7. NonT influence.

7.71. Explicit reference to nonT influence on WRT occurs in five places in our corpus (III.35.41; VI.60.90; VIII.14).

7.72. In three of these places, Mac and SC are mentioned together, in one (VI.60) Mac is mentioned alone, and the other (VIII.14) simply refers to "other languages of Yugoslavia". It is interesting to note that Alb is never mentioned, even when referring to the dialects of Kosovo (III.35), where the majority of the population is Albanian.

7.73. The five citations can be analyzed in the following list:

7.731. Mac morphological: -çe (VI.60, see 3.8).

7.732. Slv lexical: ni...ni... (VI.90, see 4.25).

7.733. nonT lexical and syntactic: see VIII.14-1 through 7 (4.2, 5.311, 5.312, 5.3132, 5.4, also 5.614, 5.615, 5.623); the lexical phenomena comprise recent unadapted loanwords and a calque while the syntactic phenomena are presented in the form of unsystematized sentences.

7.734. Slv (but actually also Alb) lexical or phonological: pronunciation of the names of consonant letters with a following i rather than StT e (III.41, see 2.14).

7.735. Slv (but actually nonT) lexical: "Turkisms" and common borrowings (III.35, see 4.2-4.3).

7.74. As can be seen, nonT influence is referred to only minimally in our corpus, and reference to specific languages is limited to Slv. Given the relative subtlety of phonological influence, it is understandable that it is reinterpreted as influence in specific lexical items. Of particular interest is the focus on nonT pronunciation of words of Turkish origin as constituting a foreign influence on WRT. The lack of differentiation between borrowing and mutual reinforcement could indicate a popular attitude that some WRT pronunciations are of nonT origin. The lack of any systematic treatment of WRT syntax, a treatment in which nonT influence would have to play a major role as it did in section 5 of this paper, contributes to the small number of references to nonT in our corpus.

8.0. Conclusions. Our analysis of the WRT material used in prescriptive statements in the textbooks used for teaching StT in Yugoslav Turkish-language elementary schools has brought out new data and raises questions for further research. Chief among the points we have tried to make are the "Balkan" nature of WRT, the difference between dialectology and popular perception, and the need to gather more data in both Balkanological and Turcological contexts.

8.1. From a Turcological point of view, there is a great need to assemble and coordinate the data which has been gathered and fill in the gaps which exist. Many of the authors cited in the bibliography to this article have unpublished materials as well as students gathering data, but until this material is generally available, we are left with a fragmented picture of WRT. Among the Turcological questions raised by our data are the following:

8.11. What is the extent and role of hypercorrection in producing forms like mavi and kıršanu, which violate the basic patterns of WRT (2.131)?

8.12. What are the relative distributions and restrictions on the 1pl markers -iz and -sik (3.25)?

8.13. What is the sound-shape vs perception of the person markers and tense marker in the y-progressive and the future (3.24, 3.4)?

8.14. What is the extent of the loss, retention, and productivity of prothesis (2.151)?

8.15. What is the level of retention of low vowel vs high vowel harmony? What, if any, are the isoglosses defining distribution of consistent and inconsistent suffixes, especially in low vowel harmony?

8.2. From a Balkanological point of view, our most important questions concern syntax and semantics. The data from our corpus show that the influence of nonT extends even further than has been described in works that deserve to be better known. Of special interest are phenomena involving modifier agreement, which has not been observed elsewhere, and verb placement and subordinate clause formation, which require further study. Lexical calques (as opposed to borrowings) have gone unnoticed, as has the phenomenon of the influence of nonT "Turkisms" on WRT (see 4.3), which also has sociolinguistic implications. Phonologically, too, however, WRT is more of a Balkan language than the StT usually referred to in Balkanology. And so, the treatment of Turkish in Balkanological studies needs to be revised and WRT investigated more thoroughly as a member and not just a contributor to the Balkan linguistic league.
APPENDIX

Forms in parenthesis were not supplied in our corpus. The sentences were checked with Füsun Leventoğlu.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WRT</th>
<th>StT</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asan</td>
<td>Hasan</td>
<td>pn</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fari</td>
<td>Fahri</td>
<td>pn</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ıhlamur</td>
<td>ıhlamur</td>
<td>linden tree</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yağmur</td>
<td>rain</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dernek</td>
<td>cumartesi</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benim senin</td>
<td>Ben senin</td>
<td>I am your freind</td>
<td>7-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arkadaşın</td>
<td>arkadaşınım</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dikdir o pesi</td>
<td>O pıntı değişdir</td>
<td>He's not stingy</td>
<td>7-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erol'dur iyi</td>
<td>Erol iyi</td>
<td>Erol is a good</td>
<td>7-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>öğrencidir</td>
<td>öğrencidir</td>
<td>student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kınacı olduk</td>
<td>Çok memnun</td>
<td>We were very</td>
<td>7-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaldık</td>
<td>pleased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lâzımdır</td>
<td>Çalışılsınız/</td>
<td>We need to work</td>
<td>7-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>çalışılınım</td>
<td>Çalışılsınamız lâzım</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>olur gitmeyelim</td>
<td>Okula</td>
<td>We don't have to</td>
<td>7-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>okula</td>
<td>gitmeyebiliriz</td>
<td>go to school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sen karısmayın</td>
<td>Sen karısmazsan</td>
<td>Can't you keep</td>
<td>7-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>olur mu?</td>
<td>olmaz mı?</td>
<td>from interfering?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonra başlayacam</td>
<td>Sonra çalışmam</td>
<td>Then I'll begin</td>
<td>7-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>çalışmam</td>
<td>to work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Şiiri kapalı</td>
<td>Şiiri ezbere</td>
<td>I know the poem</td>
<td>7-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bilim</td>
<td>biliyorum</td>
<td>by heart</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tegana senin</td>
<td>İşte senin</td>
<td>Here's the pencil</td>
<td>7-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aradroğın</td>
<td>aradroğın kalem</td>
<td>you've been looking for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne, o akrabamız</td>
<td>Anne, hani bize</td>
<td>Mother, there was</td>
<td>10-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ki bize sıık sıık</td>
<td>sıık sıık gelen bir</td>
<td>a relative who used to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ne gelirdi</td>
<td>adrabamız vardı</td>
<td>come to visit us often, y'know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne zaman gittik</td>
<td>Sinemaya</td>
<td>When we went to</td>
<td>10-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sinemaya çok</td>
<td>gittiğimiz zaman</td>
<td>the movies we</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sevindik</td>
<td>çok sevindik</td>
<td>were very happy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olur mu</td>
<td>Hasan'ılar</td>
<td>Can we go to</td>
<td>10-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hasanlarla</td>
<td>gidebilir</td>
<td>Hasan's house?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gidelim?</td>
<td>miyiz?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sende birangi</td>
<td>Sende okunacak</td>
<td>Do you have some</td>
<td>10-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kitap var</td>
<td>herhangi bir</td>
<td>kind of book to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>müberesin?</td>
<td>kitap var mı?</td>
<td>lend me/for me to read?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yok ne darlayım</td>
<td>Arada darlacak</td>
<td>[Between us]</td>
<td>10-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hicbir şey yok</td>
<td>hicbir şey yok</td>
<td>there's nothing for me to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>get upset about</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorok sen</td>
<td>Sen bizimle</td>
<td>You won't [be able to]</td>
<td>10-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bizimle gelesin</td>
<td>gelemyecekisin</td>
<td>come with us</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>argat</td>
<td>argat</td>
<td>day-laborer</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bunar</td>
<td>pnar</td>
<td>well</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>piper</td>
<td>biber</td>
<td>pepper</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tursı</td>
<td>tursı</td>
<td>pickle</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>öğrenci</td>
<td>öğrenci</td>
<td>pupil</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>öğretmen</td>
<td>öğretmen</td>
<td>teacher</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sayıklar</td>
<td>sağlıklar</td>
<td>good health</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ünceleri</td>
<td>ünceleri</td>
<td>at first</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cumartesi</td>
<td>cumartesi</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diverir</td>
<td>anlatır</td>
<td>explain, tell</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ldriz</td>
<td>İdris</td>
<td>pn</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kantarlar</td>
<td>kunduralar/</td>
<td>shoes</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ayakkabılar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yonuz</td>
<td>Yunus</td>
<td>pn</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaç saat?</td>
<td>Saat kaç?</td>
<td>What time is it?</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Say mı?</td>
<td>Sahi mı?</td>
<td>Really?</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
alva alva helva halva (a sweetmeat) 3 0
düçan dükkân shop 30
dükân dükkân shop 30
elva elva halva (a sweetmeat) 30
eль elva halva (a sweetmeat) 30
kahve kafe kahve coffee 30
kahve kafe kahve coffee 30
kaiş kayiş belt 30
kapi kapu door 30
kapu kapu door 30
kayış kayiş belt 30
tapşan tavşan rabbit 30
tauşan tavşan rabbit 30
albuki halbuki however 34
ben da geldim ben de geldim I came, too 34
em güldü em hem güldü, hem He both laughed 34
ağladi ağladi and cried 34
ema ema ama but 34
hay ki olsun ki/ demek ki it means that 34
hem da hem de and also 34
lakin lákin but 34
ni sen ni ben ne sen ne ben neither you nor I 34
alva helva halva (a sweetmeat) 35
ayvan hayvan animal 35
bayagi bayaği common 35
çemer kemer belt 35
çepenk kepenk shutter 35
çeşma çeşme fountain, tap 35
çilim kilim rug 35
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çıtap kitap book 35
çöfte köfte meatball 35
div dev giant, ogre 35
düçan dükkân shop 35
emis yemiş, meyve fruit 35
gra fasülle [sic] beans 35
kafe kahve coffee 35
karavan kervan caravan 35
pasul fasülle [sic] beans 35
posta posta mail 35
proba prova test 35
sahayle sabahleyin in the morning 35
sapun sabun soap 35
sincir zincir chain 35
sirke sirke vinegar 35
skara izgara grill 35
skelet iskelet framework, scaffolding 35
şeker şeker sugar 35
ş kembe işkembe tripe 35
(üküz) (öküz) ox 45
(ürdek) (ördek) duck 45
deił değil it is not 46
deyil değil it is not 46
sogan soğan onion 46
sovan soğan onion 46
sovuk soğuk cold 46
soyuk soğuk cold 46
amam (hamam) Turkish bath 46
Asan Hasan pn 47
ayat (hayat) life, courtyard 47
ava
hava
air 47
baar
bahar
spring 47
Bari
Bahri
pn 47
Emrula
Rmrullah
pn 47
Feymi
(Fehimî)
pn 47
hlâmur
hlâmur
linden tree 47
İlami
İlami
pn 47
neir
(nehr)
river 47
oroz
(horoz)
rooster 47
Salaydin
(Salâhettin)
pn 47
Sali
(Salih)
pn 47
Seer
(Seher)
pn 47
Seyfula
Seyfullah
pn 47
siya
(siyah)
black 47
tari
tarih
date, history 47
Üsamettin
Hüsamettin
pn 47
amica
(amca)
paternal uncle 53
amucca
(amca)
paternal uncle 53
Ayşa
Ayşe
pn 53
dayca
(dayı)
maternal uncle 53
dedo
(dede)
grandfather 53
dembel
tembel
lazy 53
fafrica
fabrika
factory 53
Fetka
Fethiye
pn 53
gemik
kemik
bone 53
Huska
Hüsamettin
pn 53
Munevera
Münever
pn 53
Nako
Nakiye
pn 53
pare
para
money 53
petmez
pekmez
jam 53
pita
pide
flat bread 53
Salko
Salâhettin
pn 53
Skender
İskender
pn 53
tapşan
tavşan
rabbit 53
tete
(teyze)
maternal aunt 53
yinge
(yenge)
brother's or uncle's wife 53
altı
altı
six 62
dokoz
dokuz
nine 62
dort
dört
four 62
kaverengi
kahverengi
brown 62
kirmzi
kırmızı
red 62
kurşunu
kurşun
gray 62
mavi
mavi
blue 62
penbe
pembe
pink 62
sari
sarı
yellow 62
siya
siyah
black 62
turunci
turuncu
orange 62
ben guluyoruz
(gülüyorum)
I'm laughing 71
biz okuyoruz
(okuyorum)
We're reading 71
o ekmek yiayorsun
(yiyör)
He's eating bread 71
o dey
o diyor
He's saying 74
diverecem
anlatacagım
I'll tell 74
geldik
geldik
We came 74
geleceys
geleçeğiz
We'll come 74
gelim
geliyorum
I'm coming 74
gelmişlik
gelmişiz
We've come 74
gideceksik
gideceğiz
We'll go 74
gideys
gidiyoruz
We're going 74
gürdük
gördük
We saw 74
seveym
seviyorum
I'm loving 74
sevindik
sevindik
We were happy 74
yapacaksik
yapacağız
We'll do 74
yapacam yapacağım I'll do 74
yapaysın yapıyorun You're doing 74
yapmışıdik yapmıştı We'd done 74
gitmeyeyeğiz We won't go 77
okumay okumuyor He's not reading 77
yapmayım yapmayorum I'm not doing 77
azalanacak azalacak It'll decrease 78
divereceğiz anlatacak/ He'll tell 78
düzenenecek düzenecek It'll improve 78
sağlatabacak sağaltacak He'll cure 78
tomurçalanacak tomurçuklanacak It'll bud 78
yesireceğiz yesirecek It'll sprout 78
Bili mi (Bilir mi) Does he know 82
Çalışacağız mı (Çalışacak mı?) Will we work 82
Geli mi (Geliyor mı?) Is he coming 82
Gideceğiz mı (Gidecek mi?) Will we go 82
Gideysız mı (Gideyorum mi?) Are we going 82
Yapayız mı (Yapıyorsunuz) Are we doing 82
IV IV
Abdula Abdullahu paternal uncle 32
aco amca tree 32
ağaçağaç tree 32
alma elma apple 32
Amet Ahmet paternal uncle 32
Büran Bürhan paternal uncle 32
dükkan dükkan shop 32
furun fırın oven 32
göz havlu towel 32
kapı kapı door 32
düprü köprü bridge 32
Mamut Mahmut paternal uncle 32
Marem Muharrem paternal uncle 32
Mazes Muazzez paternal uncle 32
Münnur Münir paternal uncle 32
pengir peynir cheese 32
ramet yağmur rain 32
Salaydin Salaettin [sic] paternal uncle 32
Seyfula Seyfullah paternal uncle 32
Şükri Sükrü rabbit 32
tapşan taşan rabbit 32
Tasin Tahsin station 32
tasiyon istasyon station 32
tauk tavuk chicken 32
Tefik Tevfik paternal uncle 32
teşekkür teşekkür thanks 32
Ümer Ömer paternal uncle 32
Üseyin Hüseyin paternal uncle 32
Üsni Hüsnü paternal uncle 32
bunlar çocuklar these children 47
şunlar çocuklar these children 47
onlar çocuklar these children 47
birangı herhangi some 50
buldu buldu He found 56
büyüdü büyüdü It grew 56
celdim geldim I came 56
cettim gittim I went 56
geldim geldim I came 56
gittim gittim I went 56
gördüm gördüm I saw 56
süledim söyledi I said 56
aglamış He has wept 58
almış He has taken 58
büyümüş It has grown 58
görümüş He has seen 58
görüms He has seen 58
kaçmış He has run 58
söylemiş He has said 58
yakmuş He has broken 58
bili He knows 59
çalışız We're working 59
geli He's coming 59
gideys We're going 59
kaçıyor He's running 59
söyleyüruz We're saying 59
yazıyor He's writing 59
çelecem I'll come 61
gelmişsin You have to work 38
gelmişiz We've come 43
gideceysin Are we going 49
gideceğim mi Will I go 49
Alko Alâettin pn 53
Faruş Fuhrî pn 53
Fetka Fethiye pn 53
Güko Gülser pn 53
Mamka Muharrem pn 53
Masko Muazzez pn 53
Neco Nécmiye pn 53
Neço Necati pn 53
Nurce Nuri pn 53
Remzu Remziye pn 53
Salko Salâettin [sic] pn 53
Samko Sâmiye pn 53
kapıyı door (accusative) 59
Ohri’ye Ohrid (dative) 59
kızca kızcağız girl (diminutive) 60
kızça kızcağız girl (diminutive) 60
oda odacık room (diminutive) 60
birhangi some 73
kaç saat What time is it? 74
saat kaç What time is it? 74
bana me (dative) 75
sana you (dative) 75
ni sen ni ben ne sen ne ben neither you nor I 90
gibi olarak as 91
Ağabeyim My brother 91
öğretmen gibi earns his living
ekmeği kazamıyor (lit. bread as a teacher)
VII
Ali alma ali (Ali elma alıyor) Ali is buying 5-1
Direktör koyverdi apples The director 5 2
oynamamıza izin verdi/bizi oynamağa gönderdi, patrıldı yapayorksuz)
patrıldı

Dün atakmiçadan Dün yarıştan Yesterday after 5 3
sonra gittim the game I went
ciikusa (Dün yarıştan the game I went
gittim)
isporiya (Kabak çekirdeği pumpkin seeds
almğa gidiyorum)
Kapa kapı, proma Close the door, 5 5
olı cereyan oluyor) there's a draft
Sen de celi misin (Sen de yıkmama) Are you coming
yıkmama?

bürek (Sen de yıkmama) Are you coming
bürek pasty (pie) 7
çarşı çarşı bazaar 13
gelir (Kabak çekirdeği pumpkin seeds
gelir He comes 13
görümdür I saw 13
kapı kapı door 13
kirmızı kirmızı red 13
küfte köfte meatball 13
küpek köpek dog 13
pare para money 13
sari sarı yellow 13
ülmüş He has died 13
öyle thus 13
alim aliyorum I'm taking 14
anlay mısın anlıyor musun Do you understand 14
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bilim biliyorum I know 14
cel gel Come! 14
citma gitme Don't go! 14
gelim gelivorum I'm coming 14
gelis gelivoruz We're coming 14
gürme misın görmyor musun Do you see 14
sülerim söyleyorum I am telling 14
yazacım yazacağım I'll write 14
Açan idin Ne zaman Ohri'ye When were you
Ohrüde? uğradın? indid you visit

Babam bu prvi ayn birinde My father will 14 2
bana buy me shoes on
ayakkabı alacak the first [of this month]
Bana bir katta ikinci mevki bir Buy me a second
drugo mesto al bilet class ticket
Ben söyledim Kızı ben I told the girl
çoyçeye söyledim
Geli mısın gitma Geliyor musun Are you coming
Gideys mi Sinemaya gidelim? Are we going to the movies?

Sinemaya mi? Shall we go to the movies?

Siz odmora ihtirahate? Didn't you go on vacation?
gimediniz mi? 14-7