

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

Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics, Vol. 2, Amsterdam: Rodopi. 1982. 1-77.

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., Jašar-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, Jašar-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 Németh (1956), who, using the term *Rumelian* to the Osmanli Turkish dialects of the Balkans (as opposed to, e.g., the Tatar dialects of Dubrudja 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 (Jašar-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 Prishtina, 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, ü* -> *i* in word final position.

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

1.43. *i* -> *ı* in noninitial and closed final syllables.

1.44. *ö* -> *o*,^a *o* and *ü* -> *u*,^a *u* in many words.

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

1.46. *ö* -> *ü* in about 40 words.

1.47. Osmanli *ğ* is preserved as *g*.

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* -> *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/S.84, Vid.44, WM.111, Németh 1951/2), although in the southeast, as in ERT and rarely in Anatolia, it is limited to initial syllables before *ğ*, *v*, and *y* (Din.191,1 98; S/S.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), *süle-* (IV.56,58,59,61, 63; VIII.14), *üğre-* (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 (Yürük, Yörük) dialects of the Štip 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 *-miş* is closer to morphology than morphophonemics (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* (VIII.13), *küpri* (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.

2.11.2. *ö & ü -> o & u*. This change is most common in the northeast (Bulgarian) zone of WRT territory (Alb.16-17) and occurs only 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 *uç* in Ohrid (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.

2.11.3. *ı & 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.11 2, Ohr.235, Pri.3, Sko.20, S/S.86): *alti* (III.62), *bayagi* (III.35), *buldi* (IV.56), *büyüdi* (IV.56), *çarşi* (VIII.13), *Gideysık mi* (III.82), *havli* (IV.32), *kapi* (III.30, IV.5, VIII.13), *kapıyı* (VI.59), *kırmızı* (VIII.62), *kirmzi* (III.62),

2.11.4. *i -> ı* 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 dialects (S/S.89, but cf. Yur.339). All the examples in our corpus involve verbal suffixes attested in the APDD: *bilır* (IV.63), *celdım/geldım* (IV.56), *cittım/gittım* (IV.56), *geldık* (III.74), *gelır* (IV.63, VIII.13), *gelmişsık* (III.74), *gideceksık* (III.74), *gideysık* (III.82), *gittık* (III.10-2), *günderı* (IV.63), *gürmeymişin* (VIII.14), *sevındık* (III.74), *sülerım* (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

2.131. *i -> u or ı*. This phenomenon is limited to three lexical items, none of which are attested in the APDD: *kurşunu* (III.62), *Münur* (IV.32), *mavı* (III.62). While the change of *i* to *u* in *Münur* 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 (1.41, 2.11 3), which is one of the most common and consistent. It could well be that these forms represent hypercorrections.

2.132. *ı -> 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.11 3, Ohr.236, WM.123, Boretzky 1975:167). A number of our examples are connected with syncope and elision in the future and *y*-progressive tense forms and will be discussed in the appropriate sections below (see 2.152, 3.2, 3.4). The invariance of the perfect suffix *-miş* (1.42, 3.1) may also be connected, at least in part, with this phenomenon. Our remaining examples consist of two substantives, *biçak* (VIII.13) and *kaiş/kayış* (III.30), and two finite verb forms, *alı* (VII.5-1) and *oli* (VIII.5-5) (<- *alıy*, *olıy*, cf. Blg.20,40,71), see also 2.15242.

2.133. *ı u* and *a*. The WRT forms actually represent archaisms (*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.11 6): *Argat* (III.17), *bunar* (III.17), *furun* (IV.32), *kapu* (III.30).

2.134. *u -> o*. This change is attested elsewhere (Din.191, Gos.283, Kum.11 3, Ohr.238, S/S.89, WM.151), although not for the forms in our corpus: *dokoz* (III.62), *Yonuz* (III.23). The latter form may actually be an archaism.

2.14. Phenomena connected with StT low vowels

2.141. Dissimilation *a -> e*. Of our two examples, *pare* (III.53, VIII.13, probably due to SC influence) is attested (Gos.301 n.32, Kum.11 4, cf. also Ohr.240, WM.147) while *ema* (III.34) is not (but cf. also Caferoğlu 1964:6).

2.142. Assimilation *e -> a*. The forms in our corpus are actually either archaisms (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), *Ayşa* (III.53), *çesma* (III.35), *kafa* (III.30), *karavan* (III.35). All forms except *Ayşa* 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).

2.143. *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.11 3, S/S.89, WM.148, Yur.340). Four examples occur in our corpus: two, *cumairtesi* (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...ni* (III.34, VI.90) is clearly the result of Slv influence and is not attested in the APDD.

2.144. *e -> ı*. While this change is attested in at least one lexical item in the APDD (Kum.11 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 *b₁*, *c₁*, 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* *ch* *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), *gitma* (StT *gitmeğe* dative infinite; VIII.14-5), and *Ohri'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 *-ceğ*, which have been borrowed from Slv and are used for forming diminutives, hypocorisms, etc., are invariant, as is the high-vowel hypocoristic suffix *-uş* (see 3.8).

2.1453. The suffix of the future participial form (StT *-ecek*) 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. Aphoresis, Prothesis, Apocope, Syncope, and Elision

2.151. Aphoresis and prothesis. The absence of prothetic *i/ı* in *skara*, *skelet* (III.35), *Skender* (III.53), and *şkembe* (III.35) all reflect nonT 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 aphoresis with simplification of the initial cluster and has not 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 Elision

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. *kırımzı* in Kum.11 8). The forms *amica/amuca* (II.53) represent archaisms where the StT (*amca*) is syncopic (Flo.107).

2.1522. *Vhi*, *Vği*, *Vyi* -> *Vy*. The forms *Feymi* (III.47), *Sabayle* (III.35), *Salaydin* (III.47, IV.32), *saymi* (III.27) are all typical (Flo.107, S/S.85). Examples involving *ğ* are future tense forms: *geleceys* (III.74), *gitmeyeceys* (III.77) (see 2.111, 3.4). Those involving *y* are *y*-progressive forms: *gideym* (VII.5-4), *gideys* (III.74, IV.59, VIII.14-6), *seveym* (III.74), *süleys* (IV.59), *yapmaym* (III.77) (see 3.2).

2.1523. $V_1CV_2 \rightarrow V-2$. 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. *ađi* -> *i* (cf. 2.2111 and 2.132) *yazacim* (IV.61, VIII.14), *yazaciz* (IV.61), see 3.4.

2.15232. *eđi* -> *i* (cf. 2.2111 and 2.143) *dil* (III.7.2) (Blg.18, Din.204, KM.313, Kum.11 8, Vid.71, Yur.336), *güreciz* (IV.61, see 3.4).

2.15233. *uha* -> *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 elision 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. $VyV \rightarrow V-$

2.15241. *aya* -> *a* *proma* (VII.5-5) (Slv *promaja* 'draft'), cf. *buraa* 'hither' (Kum.11 9).

2.15242. *ıyı*, *iyi* -> *i* (cf. 2.11 3, 2.132) accusative *kapi* (VII.5-5), *y*-progressives *alim* (VIII.14), *bilim* (III.74, VIII.14), *gelim* (III.74, VIII.14), *gelis* (VIII.14), see 3.2.

2.1525. $V_1CV_2 \rightarrow V_1$

2.15251. *ađi* -> *a* lsg futures *başlayacam* (III.7-8), *celecem/gelececm* (IV.61), *diverecem* (III.74), *gidecem*, *süleyecem* (IV.61), *yapacam* (III.74), diminutive *kızcaz* (VI.60), see 2.2111, 3.4, 3.8.

2.15252. *ayı* -> *a*. It is possible that the forms *alam* (VII.5-4, StT *alayım* 'that I get') and *çalışam* (III.7-8, StT *çalışayım* 'that I work') represent this type of change. With the exception of the forms *verem* (StT *vereyim* '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 elision, e.g., *alı—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

2.21I. Preservation of *ğ* as *g*. This phenomenon is attested in most of WRT (Alb.20, Bit.559, Blg.17,23; Flo.97, Gos.286, KM.311, Kum.11 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), *bayagi* (III.35), *dag* (VII.7), *sogan* (III.46), *yag*, *yagmur* (VII.7).

2.21II. In all of WRT, however, there are certain lexical items and morphemes in which *ğ* is lost or transformed into *y* or *v*, and in the Yuruk 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), *saylıklar* (III.22), *sovan*, *sovuk*, *soyuk* (III.46), as well as the following first person future forms, *başlayacam* (III.7-8), *geleceys*, *diverecem*, *yapacam* (III.74), *gitmeyeceys* (III.77), *celecem*, *gelececem*, *gidecem*, *gürecez*, *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 *ğ*, see Alb.20, Blg.18, Din.194, Flo.93, Gos.286, KM.313, Kum.11 8, Ohr.188,24; Sko.21, Vid.405, WM.149,157; Yur.336.

2.212. 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 (*k̄*, *ḡ*), palatal affricates (*č/ć*, *dž*, *dź*) 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 APDD⁸ 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*, *çepen*, *çilim*, *çitap*, *çöfte*, *düçan*⁹, *sirçe*, *şecer* (III.35), *celdim*, *cittim* (IV.56), *cürmiş* (IV.58), *celecem* (IV.61), *celi* (VII.5-6), *celdi*, *citti* (VII.7), *cel*, *citma* (VIII.14).

2.213. 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.11 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 *albuki* (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), *ılamur* (II.56, n.b. also hypercorrect or metathesized *hılamur* 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: *Seyfula* (IV.32), *siya* (III.62), also *kaverengi* (III.62), *Abdula*, *Amet*, *Büran*, *Mamut*, *Marem*, *Tasin*, *Üseyin*, *Üsni* (VI.32), *açan* (VIII.14), *birangi* (III.10, IV.50), and perhaps *Faruş* and *Mamka* (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 nonT Balkan languages.

2.221. Voicing

2.221I. Initial. This phenomenon is characteristic of Anatolian, other Turkic languages and dialects, and certain East Rhodian and a small group of northeastern dialects of ERT (Mollova 1962a:120).

2.221II. 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.11 6, Vid.64, Mollova 1962a:120). Of these three items, *bunar* and *dembel* have been borrowed by nonT in these forms.

2.2212. Medial. *Salaydin* (III.47, IV.32, cf. Flo.106).

2.2213. Final. *I^adriz*, *Yonuz* (III.23, cf. Flo.106, Boretzky 1975:193, Caferoğlu 1959:250). Both these names are used in these forms by nonT (especially Alb) Moslems.

2.222. Devoicing

2.2221. Nonfinal (*b* -> *p*, *d* -> *t*, *z* -> *s*). All our examples involve words which were borrowed originally from nonT 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).

2.2221I *piper* (III.17, cf. Caferoğlu 1959:250)

2.22212 *kuntralar* (III.23, cf. Blg.70)

2.22213 *sincir* (III.35, Boretzky 1975:191,193)

2.22214 *skara* (III.35, direct borrowing from Slv)

2.22215 *sapun* (III.35, cf. Boretzky 1975:193)

⁸ Examples of representations used are the following:

k', *k''*, *k̄/ḡ* Ohr.242, Gos.287, Yur.335

t´/d´ Alb.21-2, Gos.287, Kum.11 2, Ohr.242

č, č'̣, ž, ž' Alb.21, Pri.7, Sko.21, WM.154

⁹ This example (*düçan*, and also the preceding *duçan*, StT *dükân* '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' -> ç*, 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.86,89,91; 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), *gitmeyeceys*, *süleys* (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.120, Ohr.243, S/S.94, cf. also Caferoğlu 1959:255). With the exception of *dükân/duçan/ düçan/dükân* (III.30,30,35, IV.32; Flo.98, Gos.289) and *teşekür* (IV.32; Gos.289, Kum.120), all the examples in our corpus occur in proper names: *Emrula* (III.47), *Salaydin*, *Seyfula* (III.47, IV.32), *Munevera* (III.53), *Abdula* (IV.32), *Marem*, *Mazes* (IV.32), also *Tefik* (<- **Teffik* <- *Tevfik*, IV.32; KM.314). The following observations can be made in the context of Balkan Turcology:
- 2.2231. Although *ll* -> *l* is attested (e.g. *ma—le* <- *mahalla* 'neighborhood' S/S.94, *akılı* <- *akıllı* 'clever' Ohr.243) the *ll* in *alla(h)* 'God', which is the second morpheme in the relevant names, does not ellide even in expressions such as *i(n) şalla(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 (*Nasrâddin*, WM.65) or Florina (*Mukaddes*, Flo.106).
- 2.2233. The form *Minävâr* 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 ellision 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, *l* -> *l̥*. In StT, clear *l* occurs automatically after and before front vowels and also occurs before *a* and *u* in certain words of foreign origin. The pronunciation of clear *l* is only indicated orthographically in this latter environment, by means of a circumflex over the vowel letter. The tendency to velarize clear *l* 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*. *tauşan* (III.30; WM.155; phonetic).
- 2.2252. *v* (-> *w*) -> Ø. *tauk* (IV.32; Gos.290, Kum.II 9, Ohr.281, S/S.94, WM.160, Yur.338; phoneetic).
- 2.2253. *v* (-> *f*?) -> *p*. *tapsızan* (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).
- 2.2255. *f* <- *b*. *fafrika* (III.53, cf. Gostivar Alb. *favrikë* [Jašar-Nasteva 1957:157]; lexical?).
- 2.2256. *hv* -> *f*. *kafa*, *kafe* (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, ef. also S/S.86, Vid.67; lexical from nonT).
- 2.2257. *vf* (-> *ff*) -> *f*. *Tefik* (IV.32; KM.314; phonetic).
- 2.226. Other conconantal phenomena
- 2.2261. *y* *ch* Ø
- 2.22611. Initially. *emiş* (III.35, cf. Din. 196).
- 2.22612. Intervocally. *kaiş* (III.30, cf. Gos.290), all the examples in 2.1524 and, perhaps, 2.15252 (loss of intervocalic *y* followed by ellision of the two vowels) are also of this type.
- 2.22613. Finally. All our examples are 3 sg *y*-progressives with a preceding *i*: *bili* (III.82, IV.59), *celi/geli* (III.82, IV.59, VII.5-6, VIII.14-5), *ali* (VII.5-1), *oli* (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, archaism).
- 2.2264. *yn* -> *ng*. *pengir* (IV.32; Gos.291, WM.158, Caferoğlu 1959:254).
- 2.2265. *ş* -> *s*. *çesma* (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: *yapmışidik* (III.74), *ağlamış*, *almış*, *büyümiş*, *cürmiş/gürmiş*, *kaçmış*, *yakmış* (IV.58), *ülmiş* (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.

3.21I. 1sg. *bilim*, *gelim* (III.74, VIII.14), *seveym* (III.74), *yapmaym* (III.77), *gideym* (VII.5-4), *alim* (VIII.14).

3.212. 2sg. *yapaysın* (III.74), *gürmeymişin* (VIII.14).

3.213. 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).

3.214. 1pl. *gideys* (III.74, IV.59, VIII.14-6), *gideysık*, *yapaysık* (III.82), *çalışız*, *süleys* (IV.59), *yapaymışsık* (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= \emptyset , 1pl=*Vs/z*)

Examples: *geleyim*, *gideyim* (KM.315-6), *bakayın*

(S/S.88), *vuriyim* (Kum.122-3)

aliy ch aliy ch alay (Blg.20,40,71), *geliy* (Vid.84-85)

veriyis ch veriyis (Din.201), *bakayıs* (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.

3.241. If $V=i/ı$, then *y* -> \emptyset , i.e. there is no *y* if the preceding vowel is *i/ı*.

3.242. 1sg=*m/n*, 1pl=*s/z ch sık*, i.e. the person marker is immediately preceded by *-y* or the preceding *i/ı* which caused *y* to drop.

3.25. The ending *-sık* 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: *bakayn* '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 *-sık/-sık*. This ending is recorded for the indefinite past, aorist and future in the APDD for WRT and other dialects (Nev.95, Lewis 1967:11 8), but none mention it as occurring in the *y*-progressive (see also Din.202, Flo.III ,11 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 *gelmişsık* (III.74, VI.43), progressive indefinite past *yapaymışsık* (VII.5-2), future *gideceksık*, *yapacaksık* (III.74), and progressive *gideysık*, *yapaysık* (III.82).

3.31. It should be noted here that our corpus does not indicate that the consonant clusters resulting from the suffixing of *-sık* are simplified. This is in marked distinction to the APDD.

3.31I. The cluster *şş* is generally simplified to *ş* (this can also occur in StT, Lewis 1967:102) or rarely to *s* (Kum.123) or *ss* (Nev.95). The combination *şş* is recorded for the 2pl indefinite past (Din.202, Kum.123).

3.312. 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/-eceğiz*. The APDD display various combinations of three basic types of developments¹⁰:

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. \check{g} V \rightarrow \emptyset -acam/-ecem, -acaz/-ecez
2. V \check{g} \rightarrow \emptyset (& $i \rightarrow i$)¹¹ -acim/-ecim, -aciz/-eciz
3. \check{g} \rightarrow g,y, \emptyset -eceyiz, etc.

The details of the various combinations which occur in the APDD need not concern us here (see Din.201, Flo.11 2, Gos.292, Kum.11 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: *başlayacam*, *diverecem*, *yapacam* (III.74), *celecem/gelececm*, *süleyecem* (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 *calışam* (III.7-8) represent the Anatolian ending *-am/-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 1967:109,11 9, where it is labeled as an Armeniansim). There is definitely a tendency to separate the auxiliary in compound tense forms in WRT (Flo.11 5, Vid.87, Yur.339). Our corpus contains one form, albeit with a perfect participle (i.e. indefinite past), viz. *yapmışidik* (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, 2.11 3). 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.

3.81. 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:

3.811. - ka. *Hüska* (III.53), *Fetka* (III.53, VI.53),
Samka (VI.53)

3.812. - ko. *Salko* (III.53), *Neçko* (VI.53)

3.813. - uş *Faruş*, *Remzuş* (VI.53)

3.814. - çe. *Nurçe* (VI.53), *kızçe*, *odaçe* (VI.60), *çoççe* 'child' (VIII.14)

3.815. - o. *Neco* (VI.53), *Nako* (III.53), *aco* (IV.32), *dedo* (III.53)

3.816. - a. *Ayşa*, *Munevera* (III.53)

3.817. -ca. *dayca* (III.53)

3.82. These forms reflect a number of different phenomena which require individual comment.

3.821. Diminutives in *-o* and *-ş* occur in StT, e.g. *Hasso* (*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 *-uša*, *-uška* (cf. Smailović 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'.

3.822. 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, Mollov and Mollova 1966:122-3, Smailović 1977:69-76).

3.823. 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').

3.824. 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.

3.91. 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).

3.911. *azlanacak* (StT *azalacak*) 'it'll decrease' from *az* 'small' (TDK I:144).

3.912. *tomurlanacak* (StT *tomurcuklanacak*) 'it'll bud' from *tomurcuk* 'bud'. The WRT form treats *-cuk* as an omissible suffix (cf. TDK III.1339).

3.913. *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:
V₁gV₂ \rightarrow V₁yV₂, then if V₂=i, \rightarrow i, then y \rightarrow \emptyset , then V₁V₂ \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 *yeşillen-* has a slang meaning 'become sexually aroused', whereas *yeşer-* does not.)

3.914. *düzlenecek* (StT *düzelecek*) 'it'll improve' see 3.92.

3.92. The form just cited above and the infinitive *düzletmek* (StT *düzeltemek*) '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 *düzle-* 'flatten', *düzlen-* 'become flat' and *düzlet-* 'cause to flatten', whereas from the latter are derived *düzle-* 'improve' and *düzelt-* '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. *sağılırtacak* (StT *sağaltacak* 'he'll cure' from *sağ* 'healthy'. Aside from the extension by *-il-* rather than *-al-* (cf. Vid.404, TDK III:11 78), we have the generalization of the causative suffix *-tr-*. In StT, polysyllabic stems in *-l* and *-r* take the causative suffix *-t-* (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.11 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 isolated 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 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* (VIII.7-1) 'when' (Flo.11 8, Gos.247, Ohr.247, WM.165; Osmanlı *kaçan/haçan*)

birhangî (VI.73) /*birangî* (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)

kınaç (III.7-4) 'pleased' (TDK II.904)

pesî (III.7-2) 'stingy' (cf. StT *pestî* 'lowness, baseness?')

ramet (II.100, IV.32) 'rain' (Kum.11 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 *mesto* '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.91) '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. Jašar-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: *çirkus* (VII.5-3) 'circus' (Slv *çirkus*); *gra* (III.35) 'beans' (Mac *graf*, SC *grah*, both have dialectal *gra*); *proma* (VII.5-5) 'draft' (slv *promaja*); *utakmiça* (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. *bı* for StT *be*) cited in 2.144 could also be included here.

4.25. The words *proba* 'test' and *pošta* '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,VI.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 "mistaken" 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. *ayvan*, *bayagi*, or reflect processes shared by WRT with nonT or adopted by it from nonT, e.g. *çilim*, *şkembe* (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 *bürek* (VII.7, VIII.13), Alb *byrek*, Slv *burek* and *çarşi* (VIII.13) Alb *çarški*, 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. Mac *dilmi* 'is't it so?' (StT *değil mi*, cf. *dil* [III.7] 'it isn't'), *biçakçija* 'knife-grinder' (StT *biçakçıl*, cf. *biçak* [VIII.13] 'knife'), Alb *gÿzlykë* 'glasses' (StT *gözlük*, cf. *güz* [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. Skaljic 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, 1981) 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), *ayvan*, *bayagi* (III.35), *biçak* (VIII.13), *bunar* (III.17), *bürek* (VII.7, VIII.13), *çarşi* (VII.17), *çemer*, *çepen*, *çesma* (SC), *çilim*, *çitap*, *çöfte* (III.35), *küfte* (VII.7, VIII.13), *da* (III.30), *dembel* (III.53), *div* (III.35), *dükân/duçan/düçan/dükan* (III.30, 30, 35; IV.32), *em* (III.30), *havli* (IV.32), *kafa/kafe* (III.30, 35), *kaiş/kayış* (III.30), *kapi* (III.30, 42; VII.5, VIII.13), *karavan* (III.35), *pare* (III.53[SC]0), *sabayle*, *sincir*, *şecer* (III.35), *turşi* (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, Mollova 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 *të*. 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/të*-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, Mollov and Mollova 1966:126-7, Gajdarži 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, Mollov 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 StT 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 StT 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. *Karışmayasın 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 çalışalım* (III.7-5) *Treba da rabotime* 'We have to work'
- 5.132. *Lâzım çalışasın* (VI.38) *Treba da rabotiš* 'You have to work'
- 5.133. *Lâzım gideyim* (VI.38) *Treba da odam* 'I have to go'
- 5.14. Negative futurity (Mac *Nema da* 'won't')
- 5.141. *Yoktur gelesin* (III.10-6) *Nema da odiš* '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) *Ima li nekoja kniga da dadeš* 'Is there a book for you to give'
- 5.152. *Yok ne darılayım* (III.10-5) *Nema što da se lutam* 'There's nothing for me to get upset about'
- 5.16. Other purposive
- 5.161. *Gideym 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 çalışsam* (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 *što* 'what, which, that, something, etc.'
- 5.211. 'something' (cf. KM.318). *Yok ne darılayım* (III.10-5) *Nema što 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 sık sık ne gelirdi* (III.10-1) *rodninata što odeše 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.
- 5.3011. After initial subject.
- 5.3012. 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
- 5.311. After initial subject.
- Direktor koyverdi oynayalım* (VII.5-2) 'The director told us to go play'
- Sen de celi misin yıkanma* (VII.5-6) 'Are you coming to wash, too?'
- Ben söyledim çoçeye* (VIII.14-4) 'I told the child'
- 5.312. After adverb or adverbial phrase.
- Sonra başlayacam çalışsam* (III.7-8) 'Then I'll begin to work'
- Ne zaman gittik sinemaya* (III.10-2) 'When(ever) we went to the movies'
- Dün utakmiçadan sonra gittim çirkusa* (VII.5-3)
'Yesterday after the game I went to the circus'
- Açan idin Ohri'de* (VIII.14-1) 'When were you in Ohrid?'
- 5.313. Absolute initial.
- 5.3131. Followed by verb phrase.
- Olur gitmeyelim okula* (III.7-6) 'We don't have to go to school'
- Lâzım çalışasın* (VI.38) 'You have to work'

Lâzım gideyim VI.38) 'I have to go'

5.3132. Followed by noun.

Yok ne darılayım (III.10-5) 'There's nothing for me to get upset about'

Olur mu Hasanlara gidelim (III.10-3) 'Can we go to Hasan's house?'

Kapa kapi (VII.5-5) 'Close the door'

Yapamışsık patırdı (VII.5-2) '[He said that] we were making noise'

Gideys mi sinemaya (VIII.14-6) 'Are we going to the movies?'

5.32. Dependent enclitic *be*.

5.321. After initial subject.

Erol'dur iyi öğrenci (III.7-3) 'Erol is a good student'

Benim senin arkadaşın (III.7-1) 'I'm your friend'

5.322. After nonfinite predicative form.

Dildir o pesi (III.7-2) 'He's not stingy'

Lâzımdır çalışalım (III.7-5) 'I have to work'

Yoktur sen bizimle gelsen (III.10-6) 'You won't come with us'

5.323. The phrase *Kaç saat?* (III.27, VI.74) 'What time is it' is normatively *Saat kaç Kaç* '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 *kaç* is not a nonfinite predicate like *var*, *yok*, *lâzım*, and *değil*.

5.4. Word order: The interrogative particle. In StT 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*, *gideysik mi*, *yapasık 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 fëmijë-këta* *fëmijë*, 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 Füsün Leventoğlu and Zülâl Balpınar for their help in this and other matters connected with this article.

ABBREVIATIONS

I. Non bibliographic

Alb - Albanian

APDD - The available published dialect descriptions. In general, this refers to analyses of the WRT dialects of Macedonia.

ERT - East Rumelian Turkish

Mac - Macedonian

pn - proper name

SC - Serbian

Slv - Slavic, i.e. Macedonian and Serbian taken together

StT - Standard Turkish

nonT - non-Turkish, i.e. Albanian and Slavic taken together unless specified as non-Balkan.

V - vowel

WRT - West Rumelian Turkish

II. Bibliographic

Alb - Németh 1961

Nev - Mollova 1962b

Bit - Eren 1968

Ohr - Kakuk 1972

Blg - Németh 1956

Pri - Asım 1976

Din	- Eckmann	1960	Pri-2	- Hafız	1976
Flo	- Mollova	1968	Rho	- Hazai	1959
Gos	- Jašar-Nasteva	1970	Sko	- Zajaczkowski	1968
Kaz	- Kakuk	1959	S/S	- Hazai	1959/60
KM	- Kakuk	1961	TDK	- Türk Dil Kurumu	1939-1947
Kum	- Eckmann	1962a	Tre	- Guzev	1962
Vid	- Németh	1956			
WM	- Katona	1969			
Yur	- Manević	1953/4			

BIBLIOGRAPHY

TEXTBOOKS

- II. Zekeriya, Necati. 1971. *Yaprak*. Skopje.
 III. Zekeriya, Necati. 1976. *Dilimizi sevelim*. Skopje.
 IV. Burgariç, Recep. 1976. *Dilimizi öğrenelim*. Skopje.
 V. Yusuf, Süreyya. 1971. *Dilimiz*. Skopje.
 VI. Zekeriya, Necati. 1978. *Dilbilgisi*. Skopje.
 VII. Bujariç, Recep. 1978. *Dilbilgisi*. Skopje.
 VIII. Zekeriya, Necati and Recep Bugariç 1976. *Dilbilgisi*. Skopje.
 High School. Yusuf, Süreyya. 1975. *Dilbilgisi*. Skopje.

OTHER WORKS

- Afendras, E.A.
 1968 *The Balkans as a Linguistic Area: A Study in Phonological convergence*. Ph.D. dissertation. John Hopkins University.
 Asım, Mücahit 1976 "Prizren civarında Mamuşa Köyünde düğün türküleria, I. *Uluslararası türk folklor kongresi bildirileri*, vol.I.1-7. Ankara.
 Bernštejn, S.B. 1968 "Les langues turkes de la Péninsule des Balkans et l'union des langues balkaniques", *Actes du Premier congrès international des études balkaniques et sud-est européennes*, vol.VI.73-79. Sofia.
 Boretzky, N. 1975, 1976 *Der türkische Einfluss auf das Albanische*. I-II. Wiesbaden.
 Caferoğlu, A. 1959 "Die anatolische und rumelische Dialekte", *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta*, I.239-260. Wiesbaden.
 Caferoğlu, A. 1964 "Anadolu ve Rumeli ağızları ünlü değişimleri", *Türk dili araştırmaları yılığı belleten*, 1-33.
 Deny, J. 1921 *Grammaire de la langue turque*. Paris.
 Doerfer, G. 1959 "Das Gagausische", *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta*, I.260-71. Wiesbaden.
 Eckmann, J. 1960 "Dinler (Makedonya) türk ağzi", *Türk dili araştırmaları yılığı belleten*, 189-204.
 Eckmann, J. 1962a "Kumanova (Makedonya) türk ağzi", *Németh armağani*, III-1 44. Ankara.
 Eckmann, J. 1962b "The Turkish Dialect of Edirne", *American Studies in Altaic Linguistics (Uralic and Altaic Series, No.13)*, 45-69. Bloomington, Ind.
 Eren, İsmail. 1968. "Manastir Türklerinin bazı Hıdrelez âdetleri", *Türk kültürü*, 6.557-559.
 Erimer, kayahan 1970 "Anadolu ve Rumeli ağızları üzerinde bir bibliografya denemesi", *Türk dili araştırmaları yılığı belleten*, 211-236.
 Gajdarži, G.A. 1973 *Gaguzskij sintaksis*. Kišinev.
 Gülensoy, T. 1981 *Anadolu ve Rumeli ağızları bibliografyası*. (Milliş folklor araştırma dairesi yayınları, No.33). Ankara.
 Guzev, V.G. 1962 "Opisanie tureckogo govora sela Krepča tyrgovištenskogo okruga v Bolgarii", *Balkansko ezikoznanie*, 5.2.57-85.
 Hafız, T. 1976 "Prizren'de türk halk türkeleri ve kaynakları", *Türk folkloru araştırmaları yılığı*, II 6-140.
 Hazai, G. 1959 "Les dialectes turcs du Rhodopes", *Acta Orientalia Hungarica*, 9.205-29.
 Hazai, G. 1959/60 "Beiträge zur Kenntnis der türkischen Mundarten Mazedoniens", *Rocznik orientalistyczny*, 23.2.83-100.
 Hazie, G. 1960a "Textes turcs du Rhodopes", *Acta Orientalia Hungarica*, 10.185-229.
 Hazai, G. 1960b "Monuments linguistiques osmanlis-turcs en caractères cyrilliques dans les recueils de Bulgarie", *Acta Orientalia Hungarica*, II. 221-33.
 Hazai, G. 1961 "Contributions à l'histoire d'une limite dialectale dans les Balkans", *Orbis*, 10.15-19.
 Hazai, G. 1964 "Mes enquêtes sur les parlers turcs des Balkans", *Communications et rapports du Premier congrès international de dialectologie générale*, vol.II.85-90. Louvain.
 Hazai, G. 1978 *Kurze Einführung in das Studium der türkischen Sprache*. Wiesbaden.
 Jašar-Nasteva, O. 1957 "Vlijanieto na makedonskiot jazik vrz albanskite i turskite govori vo Makedonija", *Makedonski jazik*, 7,2.147-64.
 Jašar-Nasteva, O. 1969 "Za neкои fonološki izmeni vo govorot na turskoto naselenie vo Gostivarsko", *Godišen zbornik na Filozofskiот fakultet na Univerzitetot vo Skopje*, 21.339-44.

- 5.61. Nonequivalent sentences and other modifications which speakers felt were not necessary.
- 5.611. *Sen karışmayasın olur mu - Karışmazsan olmaz mı* (III.7-7) 'Can't you keep from interfering?'. Both *olur mu* and *olmaz mı* are acceptable here.
- 5.612. *Sende birangi kitap var mı veresin - Sende okunacak herhangi bir kitap var mı* (III.10.4) 'Do you have a book to lend me/for me to read?'. A more exact equivalent would use *verilecek* rather than *okunacak*.
- 5.613. *Yoktur gelesin* (III.10-6) is a simple negative future 'you won't be able to go' (see 5.141) whereas the equivalent supplied in the corpus, *gelemiyecesin*, is a negative possibilitive future, i.e. it means 'you won't be able to go'. The StT negative future would be *gelmiyecesin*.
- 5.614. *Açan idin Ohri'de - Ne zaman Ohri'ye uğradın* (VIII.14-6) 'When were you in/did you visit Ohrid?'. The more exact equivalent would be *Ne zaman Ohri'deydin*.
- 5.615. *Gideys mi sinemaya - Sinemaya gidelim mi* (VIII.14-6) 'Are we going/Should we go to the movies?'. The exact StT equivalent of the WRT sentence, viz. *Sinemaya gidiyor muyuz*, would also be acceptable.
- 5.616. *Yok ne darılayım - Arada darılacak hiçbir şey yok* (III.10-5) 'There's nothing for me to get upset about'. The StT version here verges on the awkward. Unless the sentence is meant to render the meaning

- Jašar-Nasteva, O. 1970 "Turskiot govor vo gostivarskiot kraj", *Zbornik za Gostivar*, 269- 306. Gostivar.
- Jašar-Nasteva, O. 1971/2 "Bilinguität bei der türkischen Bevölkerung in der Gegend von Gostivar und dadurch bedingte phonologische Veränderungen in ihrem Dialekt", *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie*, 8.54-83.
- Jašar-Nasteva, O. 1972 "Funkcioniranjeto na turcizmi vo makedonskiot kniževen jazik", *Makedonski jazik*, 20.91-98.
- Kakuk, S. 1959 "Le dialecte turc de Kazanlyk I-II", *Acta Orientalia Hungarica*, 8.169-87, 241-311.
- Kakuk, S. 1960 "Constructions hypotactiques dans le dialecte turc de la Bulgarie occidentale", *Acta Orientalia Hungarica*, II. 249-57.
- Kakuk, S. 1961 "Die türkische Mundart von Küstendil und Michailovgrad", *Acta Linguistica Hungarica*, II. 301-85.
- Kakuk, S. 1972 "Le dialecte turc d'Ohrid en Macédoine", *Acta Orientalia Hungarica*, 26.227-282.
- Katona, L. 1969 "Le dialecte turc de la Macédoine de l'Ouest", *Türk dili araştırmaları yıllığı belleten*, 57-194.
- Kowalski, T. 1926 "Osmanische-türkische Volkslieder aus Mazedonien", *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, 33.166-231.
- Lewis, G. 1967 *Turkish Grammar*. Oxford.
- McDonald, G. et al. 1973 *Area Handbook for Yugoslavia*. Washington, D.C.
- Manević, Todor 1953/4 "Prilog proučavanju govora Juruka u Makedoniji", *Južnoslovenski filolog*, 20.333-41.
- Mollov, R. and M. Mollova 1966 "Parlers turcs des Rhodopes de l'Ouest au point de vue slavistique", *Balkansko ezikoznanie*, II, I. 121-36.
- Mollova, M. 1962a "Les *ga*-dialectes turcs dans les Balkans et leur rapport avec les autres langues turcs", *Balkansko ezikoznanie*, 4.107-30.
- Mollova, M. 1962b "Le futur dans un parler turc de Bulgarie", *Balkansko ezikoznanie*, 5.2.87-97.
- Mollova, M. 1967a "Études phonétiques sur les turcismes en bulgare", *Balkansko ezikoznanie*, 12.11 5-54.
- Mollova, M. 1967b "Les noms des jours chez les Turcs des Balkans", *Acta Orientalia Hungarica*, 20.101-9.
- Mollova, M. 1968 "Parler turc de Florina", *Balkansko ezikoznanie*, 13,1.95-127.
- Mollova, M. 1970 "Coïncidences des zones linguistiques bulgares et turques dans les Balkans", *Actes du 10^e congrès international des linguistes* (28 août - 2 septembre, 1967), 217-221. Bucharest.
- Mollova, M. 1971 "Structure lexicale de dialecte turc du Rhodope de l'Est", *Balkansko ezikoznanie*, 15,2.49-72.
- Németh, J. 1951/2 "Le passage ö > ü dans les parlers turcs de la Roumelie nord- ouest", *Rocznik orientalistyczny*, 17.11 4-21.
- Németh, J. 1956 *Zur Einteilung der türkischen Mundarten Bulgariens*. Sofia.
- Németh, J. 1961 "Traces of the Turkish Language in Albania", *Acta Orientalia Hungarica*, 13.9-29.
- Németh, J. 1965 *Die Türken von Vidin*. Budapest.
- Pokrovskaja, L.A. 1964 *Grammatika gagauzskogo jazyka*. Moscow.
- Pokrovskaja, L.A. 1979 "Nekotorye osobennosti sintaksisa gagauzskogo jazyka i balkansko-tureckix govorov", *Problemy sintaksisa jazykov balkanskogo areala*, 199-225. Leningrad.
- Schaller, H. 1975 *Die Balkansprachen*. Heidelberg.
- Schmaus, A. 1968 "Türkische k' ch g', ç ch c in den Balkansprachen", *Slavistische Studien zum VI internationalen Slavistenkongress in Prag*, 170- 82. Munich.
- Sjöberg, A. 1963 *Uzbek Structural Grammar*. (Uralic and Altaic Series, No.8). Bloomington, Ind.
- Škalijić, A. 1966 *Turcizmi u srpskohrvatskom jeziku*. Sarajevo.
- Smailović, I. 1977 *Muslimanska imena orijentalnog porijekla u Bosni i Hercegovini*. Sarajevo.
- Tietze, Andreas 1957 "Slavische Lehnwörter in der türkischen Volkssprache", *Oriens*, 10.1-47.
- Türk Dil Kurumu 1939, *Türkiyede halk ağzından söz derleme dergisi*, I, II, III. 1941, 1947 Istanbul.
- Zajączkowski, W. 1968 "Türkische Sprachproben aus Mazedonien", *Folia orientalia*, 9.19-51.

'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 sevindik* (III.10-2) 'When/Whenever 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 *sevindik* 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's gidebilirmiyiz* (III.10-3) 'Can we go to Hasan's house?'. Preferred: *Hasanlar'a gitsek olur mu*.

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

6.1I. Jašar-Nasteva's (1969, 1971/2) studies of nonT influence on the phonology of the WRT dialect of Gostivar identify the following features as relevant:

6.1II. Absence of *ö*. The loss of *ö* due to raising (*ü*) or backing (*o*) is particularly characteristic of WRT and extremely rare in Anatolia (Caferoğlu 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.III ,2.II 2), this phenomenon of elimination of *ö* is well represented in our corpus.

6.1I 2. 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).

6.1I 3. 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 modern 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).

6.1I 4. Simplification of geminate consonants. This feature is rare in Anatolia (Caferoğlu 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 *dükkân*, Alb *dyqan*, Mac *dukan*, SC *dućan* 'shop', StT *sünnnet*, Alb *synet*, Mac *sunet* 'circumcision', StT *işallah*, Mac *işala* '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).

6.1I 5. 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. *tasiyon* (IV.32) (StT *istasiyon* 'station'), *şkembe* (III.35) (StT *işkembe* 'tripe') and newer prothetic ones, e.g. *isporija* (VII.5-4) from Mac *sporia* 'roasted pumpkin seeds' (see 2.151).

6.1I 6. 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.

6.1I 7. 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. *država* 'state', *opština* 'district' (Jašar-Nasteva 1969:243).

Our only example is the word *prvi* (VIII.14-2). Other recent borrowings in our corpus are phonologically adapted, e.g. *utakmiça* (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'.

6.11 8. Phenomena connected with the affricate *ts*. Jašar-Nasteva (1969:242-243) cites the introduction of the phoneme or cluster /*ts*/ and the related phenomenon of the anticipatory softening in forms with suffixed *-itsa*, e.g. *Şabayntsa* from Şabanitsa 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: *çirkus* and *utakmiça* (VII.5-3).

6.11 9. Mollova (1970:218) cites the WRT pronunciation of StT *ı* 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 *bi, ci* "as in Serbian and Macedonian" (see 2.144).

6.111 0. The devoicing of final *z* to *s*. This occurs elsewhere in Turkish (Caferoğlu 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 2.2222).

6.1111 The phonology and morphology of Németh's first five features (1.41-1.45, 2.11 2, 2.11 3, 2.11 4, 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 dialects lacking vowel harmony (see, e.g., Sjobert 1963:3). It is entirely likely that the close contacts of WRT with nonT 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 nonT 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 nonT on WRT: Borrowings, calques, and "Turkisms".

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

6.311. 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).

6.312. Recent borrowings with phonological adaptation, e.g. *utakmiça, çirkus* (VII.5-3), *isporija* (VII.5-4) (see 4.24).

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

6.32. 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 *gibi* 'like' in place of *olarak* 'as' (VI.91) calqued, presumably, on nonT (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 nonT 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 nonT 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 nonT. 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 adamın* lit. '(his= the family of the man' for StT *adamın familiası* 'the man's family', where the former is the order, found in nonT (WM.165), we nonetheless have examples of the most important features, i.e. calquing of *da/të*-clauses 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 found 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 *yanlış* '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.)

7.11. Consonantal features. All three of these features (preservation of \check{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,VII.7; III.47; VII.7).

7.11.1. The pronunciation of \check{g} as y, v , or \emptyset 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 2.211).

7.11.2. 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).

7.11.3. 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.

7.11.4. 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:

7.1201. Lexical or unconditioned: backing of \ddot{o} and \ddot{u} to o and u ; raising of \ddot{o} to \ddot{u} .

7.1202. Environmentally conditioned: neutralization of the opposites front/back and rounded/unrounded in word final position (only i occurs) and backing of i to $ɨ$ in closed final and noninitial syllables.

7.1203. Morphophonemic (vowel harmonic): generalization of e or a in suffixes and clitics and generalization of $-mi\check{s}$ for the perfect (indefinite past).

7.121. Lexical or unconditioned. As we have noted (6.111), raising of \ddot{o} to \ddot{u} appears to be more characteristic of Macedonia and Kosovo while backing of \ddot{o}, \ddot{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 \ddot{o} is explicitly mentioned (as the pronunciation or spelling of \ddot{o} as \ddot{u}) three times (III.22,45; VII.7) and occurs in numerous examples throughout the corpus (see 2.111). The backing of \ddot{o} and \ddot{u} is illustrated by only four scattered items occurring in lists organized on lexical principles and is never explicitly mentioned (see 2.112).

7.122. 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 nonT (III.35), and in other places where there is no explicit phonological or morphological organizing principle (see 2.113, 2.114). Examples of the neutralization of high vowels word-finally to i occur throughout the corpus, but examples of the backing of i to $ɨ$ 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 change 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 $-lik$, 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.

7.123. Vowel 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 *yanlıŝ* 'wrong' forms are specifically cited. Phenomena connected with high vowel harmony, except the generalization of $-mi\check{s}$ are environmentally conditioned and were discussed in 7.122. Of the two remaining phenomena, the generalized use of $-mi\check{s}$, 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 *yanlıŝ* verb forms (III.74). The generalization of a or e in suffixes and clitics receives almost no attention, implicit or explicit. Of 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).

7.124. 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 *bıçak* (VIII.13) 'knife' (StT *bıçak*), which illustrates the fronting of *ı* to *i* 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 (*belirli*: IV.56) and indefinite/unwitnessed (*belirsiz*: IV.56, VI.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, VI.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 *-sik* as a 1pl marker in the indefinite past is alluded to in a purely morphological context (VI.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 elision 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 *kapıyı*, 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, *kapıyı* is actually phonologically motivated, *Ohri'ya* is morphophonological 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. . ., albuki, 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'*.

- 7.234. Calqued (VI.91, see 4.22): *gibi* 'like' used as 'as'.
- 7.3. Syntax. Most of the syntactic phenomena which we treated in section 5 are not explicitly isolated in our corpus. Rather, lists of sentences labeled *gelişigüzel konuşma* 'sloppy speech' are given either with *doğru* 'correct' models or with instructions to write *doğru* versions. These sentences contain various WRT phonological, 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 söyleyişe aykırıdır*" (VI.38) 'is contrary to Turkish speech'.
- 7.5. 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), *dernek* (II.142), selves. The words *kapalı* (III.7-9), *kınaç* (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 *g* to *c* for Kosovo (VII.7).
- 7.612. The use of the diminutive suffix *-çe* for Ohrid (VI.60).
- 7.613. The reflex of *ǰ* as *g* and the raising of *ö* to *ü* for Skopje (VII.7).
- 7.614. The use of the conjunction *ni . .ni . .* 'neither . . nor' for Skopje and Ohrid (VI.90).
- 7.62. As we indicated in 7.11 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 *ǰ* as *g* and the raising of *ö* to *ü* are found in Kosovo (Alb.19-20, Pri.7, Pri-2.11 8), Ohrid (Ohr.236-7,241) and throughout the WRT speech area (see 2.111 and 2.211), 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 *ɪ* 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 *mavı* and *kurşunu*, 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 Füsün Leventoğlu.

<i>WRT</i>	<i>StT</i>	<i>Gloss</i>	<i>Page</i>
II	II		
Asan	Hasan	pn	36
Fari	Fahri	pn	36
ılamur	ıhlamur	linden tree	56
ramet	yağmur	rain	100
dernek	cumartesi	Saturday	142
III	III		
Benim senin arkadaşın	Ben senin arkadaşımın	I am your freind	7-1
Dildir o pesi	O pinti değildir	He's not stingy	7-2
Erol'dur iyi öğrenci	Erol iyi öğrencidir	Erol is a good student	7-3
Kınaç olduk	Çok memnun kaldık	We were very pleased	7-4
Lâzımdır çalışalım	Çalışalım/Çalışmamız lâzım	We need to work	7-5
Olur gitmeyelim okula	Okula gitmeyebiliriz	We don't have to go to school	7-6
Sen karışmayasın olur mu?	Sen karışmazsan olmaz mu?	Can't you keep from interfering?	7-7
Sonra başlayacam çalışsam	Sonra çalışmaya başlayacağım	Then I'll begin to work	7-8
Şiiri kapalı bilim	Şiiri ezbere biliyorum	I know the poem by heart	7-9
Tegana senin aradığın	İşte senin aradığın kalem	Here's the pencil you've been looking for	7-10
Anne, o akrabamız ki bize sık sık ne gelirdi	Anne, hani bize sık sık gelen bir adrabamız vardı	Mother, there was a relative who used to come to visit us often, y'know	10-1
Ne zaman gittik sinemaya çok sevindik	Sinemaya gittiğimiz zaman çok sevindik	When we went to the movies we were very happy	10-2
Olur mu Hasanlara gidelim?	Hasan'lara gidebilir miyiz?	Can we go to Hasan's house?	10-3
Sende birangi kitap var mıveresin?	Sende okunacak herhangi bir kitap var mı?	Do you have some kind of book to lend me/for me to read?	10-4
Yok ne darılayım	Arada darılacak hiçbir şey yok	[Between us] there's nothing for me to get upset about	10-5
Yoktur sen bizimle gelesin	Sen bizimle gelemiyeceksin	You won't [be able to] come with us	10-6
argat	ırgat	day-laborer	17
bunar	pınar	well	17
pipir	biber	pepper	17
turşi	turşu	pickle	17
üğrenci	öğrenci	pupil	17
üğretmen	öğretmen	teacher	17
saylıklar	sağlıklar	good health	22
ünceleri	önceleri	at first	22
cumairtesi	cumartesi	Saturday	23
diverir	anlatır	explain, tell	23
İdriz	İdris	pn	23
kuntralar	kundurular/ayakkabılar	shoes	23
Yonuz	Yunus	pn	23
Kaç saat?	Saat kaç?	What time is it?	27
Say mi?	Sahi mi?	Really?	27

alva	helva	halva (a sweetmeat)	30
duçan	dükkân	shop	30
dükkân	dükkân	shop	30
elva	halva	halva (a sweetmeat)	30
elva	halva	halva (a sweetmeat)	30
kafa	kahve	coffee	30
kafe	kahve	coffee	30
kaiş	kayış	belt	30
kapi	kapı	door	30
kapu	kapı	door	30
kayış	kayış	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
ağladı	ağladı	and cried	
ema	ama	but	34
hay ki	olsun ki/ demek ki	it means that	34
hem da	hem de	and also	34
lakin	lâkin	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	bayağı	common	35
çemer	kemer	belt	35
çepenik	kepenik	shutter	35
çesma	çeşme	fountain, tap	35
çilim	kilim	rug	35
WRT	StT	Gloss	Page
III	III		
çitap	kitap	book	35
çöfte	köfte	meatball	35
div	dev	giant, ogre	35
düçan	dükkân	shop	35
emiş	yemiş, meyve	fruit	35
gra	fasülye [sic]	beans	35
kafe	kahve	coffee	35
karavan	kervan	caravan	35
pasul	fasülye [sic]	beans	35
pošta	posta	mail	35
proba	prova	test	35
sabayle	sabahleyin	in the morning	35
sapun	sabun	soap	35
sincir	zincir	chain	35
sirçe	sirke	vinegar	35
skara	ızgara	grill	35
skelet	iskelet	framework, scaffolding	35
şeçer	şeker	sugar	35
şkembe	işkembe	tripe	35
(üküz)	(öküz)	ox	45
(ürdek)	(ördek)	duck	45
deil	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
ıhlamur	ıhlamur	linden tree	47
İlâmi	İlhami	pn	47
neir	(nehir)	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
fafrika	fabrika	factory	53
Fetka	Fethiye	pn	53
gemik	kemik	bone	53
Hüska	Hüsamettin	pn	53
Munevera	Münevver	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
alti	altı	six	62
dokoz	dokuz	nine	62
dort	dört	four	62
kaverengi	kahverengi	brown	62
kirmzi	kırmızı	red	62
kurşunu	kurşunf	gray	62
mavı	mavî	blue	62
penbe	pembe	pink	62
sari	sarı	yellow	62
siya	s ^a iyah	black	62
turunci	turuncu	orange	62
ben gülüyoruz	(gülüyorum)	I'm laughing	71
biz okuyorum	(okuyorum)	We're reading	71
o ekmek yiyorsun	(yiyor)	He's eating bread	71
o dey	o diyor	He's saying	74
diverecem	anlatacağım	I'll tell	74
geldik	geldik	We came	74
geleceys	geleceğiz	We'll come	74
gelim	geliyorum	I'm coming	74
gelmişsik	gelmişiz	We've come	74
gideceksık	gideceğiz	We'll go	74
gideys	gidiyoruz	We're going	74
gürdük	gördük	We saw	74
seveym	seviyorum	I'm loving	74
sevındık	sevindik	We were happy	74
yapacaksık	yapacağız	We'll do	74

yapacam	yapacağım	I'll do	74
yapaysın	yapıyorsun	You're doing	74
yapmışidik	yapmıştık	We'd done	74
gitmeyeceys	gitmeyeceğiz	We won't go	77
okumay	okumuyor	He's not reading	77
yapmaym	yapmıyorum	I'm not doing	77
azlanacak	azalacak	It'll decrease	78
diverecek	anlatacak/ söyleyecek	He'll tell	78
düzlenecek	düzelecek	It'll improve	78
sağültiracak	sağaltacak	He'll cure	78
tomurlanacak	tomurcuklanacak	It'll bud	78
yeşillenecek	yeşerecek	It'll sprout	78
Bili mi	(Biliyor mu)	Does he know	82
Çalışacağız mı	(Çalışacak mıyız)	Will we work	82
Geli mi	(Geliyor mu)	Is he coming	82
Gideceğiz mi	(Gidecek miyiz)	Will we go	82
Gideysık mı	(Gidiyor muyuz)	Are we going	82
Yapaysık mı	(Yapıyor muyuz)	Are we doing	82
IV	IV		
Abdula	Abdullah	pn	32
aco	amca	paternal uncle	32
agaç	ağaç	tree	32
alma	elma	apple	32
Amet	Ahmet	pn	32
Büran	Bürhan	pn	32
dükân	dükân	shop	32
furun	fırın	oven	32
güz	göz	eye	32
havli	havlu	towel	32
kapi	kapı	door	32
düpri	köprü	bridge	32
Mamut	Mahmut	pn	32
Marem	Muharrem	pn	32
Mazes	Muazzez	pn	32
Münur	Münir	pn	32
pengir	peynir	cheese	32
ramet	yağmur	rain	32
Salaydin	Salaettin [sic]	pn	32
Seyfula	Seyfullah	pn	32
Şukri	Sükrü	pn	32
tapşan	tavşan	rabbit	32
Tasin	Tahsin	pn	32
tasiyon	istasyon	station	32
tauk	tavuk	chicken	32
Tefik	Tevfik	pn	32
teşekkür	teşekkür	thanks	32
Ümer	Ö TM mer	pn	32
Üseyin	Hüseyin	pn	32
Üsni	Hüsni	pn	32
bunlar çocuklar	bu çocuklar	these children	47
şunlar çocuklar	şu çocuklar	these children	47
onlar çocuklar	o çocuklar	those children	47
birangi	herhangi	some	50
buldi	buldu	He found	56
büyüdi	büyüdü	It grew	56
celdim	geldim	I came	56
cittim	gittim	I went	56
geldim	geldim	I came	56
gittim	gittim	I went	56
gürdüm	gördüm	I saw	56
süledim	söyledim	I said	56

ağlamış	ağlamış	He has wept	58
almış	almış	He has taken	58
büyümüş	büyümüş	It has grown	58
cürmüştür	görmüş	He has seen	58
gürmüştür	görmüş	He has seen	58
kaçmış	kaçmış	He has run	58
sülemiş	söylemiş	He has said	58
yakmış	yakmış	He has broken	58
bilir	biliyor	He knows	59
çalışmaz	çalışıyoruz	We're working	59
geli	geliyor	He's coming	59
gidecek	gidiyoruz	We're going	59
kaçıyor	kaçıyor	He's running	59
süleyiş	söylüyoruz	We're saying	59
yazıyor	yazıyor	He's writing	59
gelecek	geleceğim	I'll come	61
gelecek	geleceğim	I'll come	61
gidecek	gideceğim	I'll go	61
güreciz	göreceğiz	We'll see	61
süleyeceğim	söyleyeceğim	I'll say	61
yazacağım	yazacağım	I'll write	61
yazacağız	yazacağız	We'll write	61
bilir	bilir	He knows	63
gelir	gelir	He comes	63
gönderir	gönderir	He sends	63
görür	görür	He sees	63
söyler	söyler	He says	63
VI	VI		
lâzım gideyim	gitmeliyim	I have to go	38
lâzım çalışasın	çalışmalısın	You have to work	38
gelmişsik	gelmişiz	We've come	43
gideceys mi	(gidiyor muyuz)	Are we going	49
gideceğim mi	gidecek miyim	Will I go	49
Alko	Alâettin	pn	53
Faruş	Fahri	pn	53
Fetka	Fethiye	pn	53
Güko	Gülser	pn	53
Mamka	Muharrem	pn	53
Masko	Muazzez	pn	53
Neco	Necmiye	pn	53
Neçko	Necati	pn	53
Nurçe	Nuri	pn	53
Remzuş	Remziye	pn	53
Salko	Salâettin [sic]	pn	53
Samko	Samiye	pn	53
kapıyı	kapıyı	door (accusative)	59
Ohri'ya	Ohri'ye	Ohrid (dative)	59
kızcaz	kızcağiz	girl (diminutive)	60
kızçe	kızcağiz	girl (diminutive)	60
odaçe	odacık	room (diminutive)	60
birhangi	herhangi	some	73
kaç saat	saat kaç	What time is it?	74
saat ne kadar	saat kaç	What time is it?	74
bene	bana	me (dative)	75
sene	sana	you (dative)	75
ni sen ni ben	ne sen ne ben	neither you nor I	90
gibi	olarak	as	91
Ağabeyim	Ağabeyim	My brother	91
öğretmen gibi	öğretmen olarak	earns his living	
ekmeği kazanıyor	ekmeği kazamıyor	(lit. bread as a teacher)	
VII	VII		
Ali alma ali	(Ali elma alıyor)	Ali is buying	5-1

Direktor koyverdi oyneyalım, yapaymışık patırdı	apples (Direktor oynamamıza izin verdi/bizi oynamağa gönderdi, patırdı yapıyormuşuz)	The director told/sent us to go play, (he said) we were making noise	5-2
Dün atakmişadan sonra gittim çirkusa	(Dün yarıştan sonra sirke gittim)	Yesterday after the game I went to the circus	5-3
Gideym alam isporiya	(Kabak çekirdeği almağa gidiyorum)	I'm going to get pumpkin seeds	5-4
Kapa kapi, proma oli	(Kapıyı kapa, cereyan oluyor)	Close the door, there's a draft	5-5
Sen de celi misin yıkanma?	(Sen de yıkanmağa geliyor musun?)	Are you coming to wash too?	5-6
bürek	bürek	pasty (pie)	7
celdi	geldi	He came	7
citti	gitti	He went	7
dag	dağ	mountain	7
gürdi	gördü	He saw	7
küfte	köfte	meatball	7
küpri	köprü	bridge	7
yag	yağ	oil	7
yagmur	yağmur	rain	7
VIII	VIII		
biçak	biçak	knife	13
bürek	börek	pasty (pie)	13
çarşı	çarşı	bazaar	13
gelir	gelir	He comes	13
gürdüm	gördüm	I saw	13
kapi	kapı	door	13
kırmızı	kırmızı	red	13
küfte	köfte	meatball	13
küpek	köpek	dog	13
pare	para	money	13
sari	sarı	yellow	13
ölmüş	ölmüş	He has died	13
öyle	öyle	thus	13
alim	alıyorum	I'm taking	14
anlay mısın	anlıyor musun	Do you understand	14
WRT	StT	Gloss	Page
VIII	VIII		
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
gürmeymişin	görmüyor musun	Do you see	14
sülerim	söylüyorum	I am telling	14
yazacım	yazacağım	I'll write	14
Açan idin	Ne zaman Ohri'ye	When were you	14-1
Ohri'de?	uğradın?	in/did you visit Ohrid?	
Babam bu <i>prvi</i> bana	<i>ayın birinde</i>	My father will buy me shoes <i>on</i> <i>the first</i> [of this month]	14-2
ayakkabı alacak	<i>ikinci mevki bir</i>	Buy me a <i>second</i> <i>class ticket</i>	14-3
Bana <i>bir karta</i> <i>drugo mesto</i> al	<i>bilet</i>	I told the girl	14-4
Ben söyledim çoyçeye	Kıza ben söyledim	Are you coming	14-5
Geli misin gitma	Geliyor musun		

sinemaya?

Gideys mi
sinemaya?

Siz odmora
gitmediniz mi?

sinemaya
gidelim?
Sinemaya gidelim
mi?

ihtirahate

so we can go to
the movies?

Are we going/
Shall we go to
the movies?

Didn't you go
on vacation?

14-6

14-7

University of North Carolina