Qu'elle s'exprime par la quête utopique de l'Age d'Or originel, d'une Héliopolis imaginaire, le Paraclet des élus, ou qu'elle se manifeste par l'élision des communautés égalitaires ou anarchisantes des purs, c'est toujours en définitive l'aspiration au royaume messianique qui n'est que la transposition symbolique d'un idéal nostalgique, celui du retour à une enfance mythique de l'humanité ou à une organisation révée de la société, celle de la société non policiée qui serait dépourvue de la rigoureuse structure de classes, telle qu'elle se présentait dans la société tripartite du Moyen Age. C'est donc l'aboutissement et l'accomplissement de l'histoire qui revient à l'ère originelle, celle de l'histoire cycique qui n'est qu'un recommencement perpétuel. Situé dans l'espace géographique indéterminé d'une «terre heureuse», le royaume des Cieux corrigerait toutes les injustices et restaurerait l'égalité primitive dans une société communautaire d'amour et de liberté, sans frontières ni restrictions, sans riches et pauvres. C'est l'idéal dont le prolongement lointain, en passant par l'utopie sociale du XVIIIe-XXIe siècles, a trouvé son expression moderne dans l'eschatologie marxiste dont parlait Georges Gurvitch.

Sur le plan des antinomies fondamentales du domaine socio-culturel et existential, la spiritualité chrétienne a conçu l'idéal du corps mystique de son être historique au sein d'un paradoxe qui pourrait être formulé comme : «l'Unité dans la Liberté». Toute l'histoire du monde chrétien ne fait que mettre en évidence l'abîme qui sépare les faits de la vie de cet idéal toujours plus éloigné. Tant que persistait la faculté d'y croire, ce but pouvait cependant inspirer tout en restant bien en vue de toute action créatrice. Mais devant l'érosion de cet idéal, alors que la liberté fut sacrifiée à l'unité ou vice-versa, les hommes se réfugièrent dans le désespoir de la révolte, soit contre la vie en ce monde elle-même, soit en cherchant l'apaisement dans les chimères du retour de l'Age d'Or d'un paradis perdu sur terre.
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For more than half a millennium, Turkish was the official language in much of the Balkan peninsula. It was the language of administration and of the market place; it was spoken in villages as well as in towns; and, among populations that converted to Islam while retaining their native languages, Turkish had a sociocultural prestige added to the legal and practical importance it possessed for all of Turkey in Europe. It can even be argued that it was the Turkish conquest which created the Balkans as an entity, that it still exists as a geopolitical and sociocultural entity ever today.1 Under these circumstances, it is not surprising that the influence of Turkish on the Balkan lexicon in terms of derivational morphology, lexical items, and semantics has been significant and has lasted into the modern period. From a lexical point of view, the influence of Turkish is one of the most salient characteristics of the language of the Balkan linguistic league. In fact, Miklosich's (1884) study of the influence of Turkish on the languages of Southeastern and Eastern Europe is one of the earliest works in the field Balkan linguistics. Even those dialects of languages spoken on Balkan territory but not traditionally treated as members of the Balkan Sprachbund, e.g., Romani and Judezmo, share a significant Turkish lexical component with the Balkan languages proper (FRIEDMAN 1989a, 1989b; STANKIEWICZ 1964). The Turkish lexicon in the various Balkan languages has undergone significant vicissitudes in terms of numbers, meanings, and stylistic
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1 It is an interesting but little-known fact that while popular belief in the Balkans attributes many social ills to the Turkish occupation, popular belief in Turkey attributes these same ills to Turkey to Turkey's having spent so much time ruling the Balkans.
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of Arab and Persian words which entered via Turkish, e.g. džijer “liver”, which is ultimately from Persian. There are also ambiguous cases where it is difficult to determine whether or not such a word entered Macedonian via a Turkish intermediary, e.g. if Turkish has borrowed from Greek or Romance but the phonology of the item is such that the source of the word in other Balkan languages may be uncertain (cf. Boretzky 1975:136–169). Thus, for example, Ancient Greek mândatos “bolt” is the ultimate source of Modern Greek mándalí, Turkish mándal, Albanian mándal, mándall, FSC mândal, etc. The precise route by which this word entered the various modern Balkan languages, however, is most. As we shall see, this problem of ultimate source and route of entry also contains additional complexities for Romani. In general, however, such lexical items are popularly felt to be Turkisms or at least words associated with the Ottoman period, and this is how they function for purposes of this discussion. Turkisms in Macedonian can be divided into productive loan suffixes, calques, and loanwords. To begin with the most obvious phenomena in suffixation, there are four suffixes which were unquestionably of Turkish origin and remain productive: 1) -diža/-tiža (Tk či, etc.) used to denote types of people; 2) -lija (Tk li, etc.) used to form adjectives and descriptive nouns; 3) -lak (Tk -lak, etc.) used primarily for abstract nouns; and 4) -ana (Tk -ane) used for buildings. The functioning of these suffixes can be seen in their use in three types of words: 1) Turkish, e.g. jëvandžija “foreigner” (Tk jëbanci), kumetlija “lucky” (Tk kmetili), jëvandžija “lowness” (Tk jëvandžli); meama “tavern” (Tk meyhanë). 2) native, e.g. lovodžija “hunting”; oslija “lovely”; strovnjak “matchmaking”; ptëna “sawmill”; 3) recent loans, e.g. fudkalažija “insect soccer player”; zubotetlija “teenager” (ironic), asistentlika “assistantship” (ironic), energijski “heating plant” (colloquial but neutral). As can be seen from the glosses, the semantics of the first three suffixes has shifted downward, a phenomenon which will be discussed later (cf. Kazaz 1972). Most other Turkish suffixes, e.g. džik, -siž, etc., as in kapdžik “back-gate” (Tk kap/kažek “door/little door”), arsaz “crook”, tekšis “unceremoniously”, ñugršci “nogoodnik” (Tk ñoraz, teňekši, ñugršci), occur only with words of Turkish origin and thus should be treated as part of the lexical borrowings with which they occur rather than as borrowed suffixes (pace Markov 1977:17). The suffix -man, however, while not exactly productive (or even a suffix in Turkish, for that matter) is worthy of mention here since it functions as a suffix combining with native roots in Macedonian. Although only one of the words in -man cited by Markov (1977:17) is not a complete borrowing from Turkish, i.e. ñuman “dullard”, which is formed on the basis of (dialectal) Albanian ñt (literary but) 1. “owl”, 2. “dullard”, but which may have been borrowed as a whole from dialectal Albanian, there is another use of -man not cited by Markov, viz. with names of nationalities, e.g. grkoman “Hellenizer”, brgoroman “Bulgarianizer”, turbo-

2 For the sake of convenience I shall use the terms Macedonian and Republic of Macedonia interchangeably. Unless otherwise noted, Aegean (Greek) Macedonian, Pirin (Bulgarian) Macedonia as well as the Macedonian villages of Albania and Serbia are excluded from the terms of this discussion except insofar as they are part of the broader Balkan context.

3 The languages of the ethnic groups specifically named in the Constitution of the Republic of Macedonia are Macedonian, Albanian, Turkish, Romani, and Arumanian (Vlah). These five languages together with FSC in its Serbian variant constituted the six official languages of the 1994 extraordinary census. I am indebted to Professor Renelle Alexander for coining the term Former Serbian-Croatian. Under the current circumstances of the politically motivated purist movements that seek to divide the Southern West South Slavic (as opposed to Northern West South Slavic, i.e. Slovenian) dialects into as many languages as there are polities, e.g. Serbian Croatian Bosnian, to some extent Montenegro-Croat (cf. Nikčević 1993), and possibly even Sandžakian, Professor Alexander’s term seems most apt for capturing the interaction of underlying linguistic structure with contemporary politics. Although the 1994 census showed over 7000 (0.4%) citizens declaring Bosnian as their nationality, the issue of differentiating Bosnian and Serbian variants of FSC has yet to enter Macedonian public discourse.

4 Thus, for example, the question of whether -ana entered Macedonian via FSC or directly from Turkish is, for our purposes, irrelevant.

Similarly, the nonterminal suffix -li in verbs in -lija is limited to verbs borrowed from Turkish, for which the third singular di-past served as the base (to which the Greek aorist marker -s was added), e.g. bendija < bêgendi “like, be pleasing”.
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These works demonstrate how Turkish vocabulary has penetrated every facet of Macedonian life: urban and rural, e.g. đukan, “shop” (đukšin), sokak “street, alley” (sokak), ambarm “barn” (hambar), endek “ditch, furrow” (bendek); man-made and natural, e.g. tavam “ceiling” (tavan), șule “bottle” (șițe), zumbul “hyacinth” (zumbul), taflaiba “bedbug” (taflaibat); intimate and abstract, e.g. đizger “liver, lungs” (çiger); badžanka “brother-in-law/wife’s sister’s husband” (baca-nak), rezil “disgrace” (rezil), muhad “conversation” (muhabb). The penetration of Turkish into Macedonian reached its height during the nineteenth century. According to Koneski (1965:188–189), this was due to the immigration of Macedonians to the cities, where Turkish was the language of the market place. It was noteworthy that Turkish even penetrated the realm of Christian religious terminology, which, given the identification of Turkish with Islam, should have been the most impervious to such influence. Thus we find in nineteenth century texts kurban “sacrifice”; kurtuluš “the Savior” (Tk kurtuluš “save”); sahiba “the Lord” (Tk sahib “master”; cf. Gola 1960, Jašar-Našteva 1970, Mijović 1980, Koneski/Jašar-Našteva 1989. It was also during the nineteenth century, however, that intellectuals made the first efforts to halt the influx of Turksm by reviving and introducing Slavic words in their colloquial-based writings, i.e. in the works whose language represents the precursor of Modern Literary Macedonian. This was especially true with abstract nouns, e.g. Рečovski felt the need to gloss gordost “pride” with the Turkish fidal-bak. Even narod in the meaning of “nation” (for which the internationalism naracija can now also be used) was glossed “the Turkish millet.”

In this context we can also mention the semantic adjustment of Turkishisms. Mlo- lov (1967-116) cited in Grannes (1987:248) makes a point for Bulgarian that is also valid for Macedonian, namely that the majority of Turkishisms are borrowed without significant shift. In the cases of religious terminology just described, e.g. Kurban “sacrifice” for “Eucharist,” the adaptation is essentially a cultural one, given the role of kurban in Islam. In some cases, a secondary meaning in Turkish will become the primary meaning in the Balkans, e.g. Turkish muhab-ber “love, affection, friendship, friendly chat” is taken into Macedonian and Alban- nian as muhăber but with only the last meaning. Similarly, Turkish babi/baba “topic, subject, investigation, debate, wager” has only the last meaning in Macedonian as bas. Although in general Turkishisms are associated with stylistic lowering in the twentieth century (cf. Kazaris 1975 and see below) in at least some cases a negative expression was made somewhat less so when borrowed. Thus, for example, the exceedingly vulgar Turkish sikit, roughly “fuck off,” when borrowed into Macedonian as siker is closer to the milder (albeit still rude) “scram” and can even be used humorously in the expression sikerkafe “last cup of coffee served at the end of a visit, one for the road.”

Most of the twentieth century has seen a gradual retreat of Turkish lexical influence in two stages. Firstly, the elimination of Turkish rule in Macedonia (1912) rendered many terms obsolete due to changes in power structure. Thus, the interwar period saw the obsolescence of some Turkishisms for strictly practical reasons. Since Turkish was no longer the language of the state, many administrative terms, e.g. vilaji “province,” kaimakam “governor” etc. became obsolete. In every Macedonian speech, however, large numbers of Turkishisms were still in regular use.
In the second stage (1944–1992), the early years of the codification of Literary Macedonian, the position of Turkisms was an issue from the very beginning. There was one current of thought among some Macedonian intellectuals that maintained that Turkisms should be encouraged and preserved because they were characteristic of folk speech and also emphasized Macedonian's differentiation from the other Slavic languages. The predominant current, however, continued the nineteenth century tradition of encouraging replacements for Turkisms. Thus, for example, a year after the official recognition of Literary Macedonian, Konšek (1945) wrote an article in which, among other things, he severely criticized a Macedonian translation of Molière's “Le Tartuffe” for being full of Turkisms, writing: “Toa znaci... da so mniški... istaknjeniot poetski jazik na Moliera... do nivo na našeto balkansko, kasafsko, čaršisko mušetene.” “It means lowering the refined poetic language of Molière to the level of our Balkan small-town marketplace chit-chat.” (cf. also Ezov 1932:211, Golab 1962, Markov 1955).

The process of replacing Turkisms involved three types of words: 1) Slavic, e.g., običaj for adet “custom”; znaci for demek “it means”; ne (borrowed from Russian, v. Konšek 1965:101) for ana “but”; 2) Western, e.g., German-based pegla (from the first half of Bürgelisen) for utija “iron”; pasjava for usida “fit”; 3) so-called international (essentially, Greco-Latin) words, e.g., informacija for aber “information,” nacija for millet “nation.” In some cases, the replacement has resulted in a differentiation of written and spoken language. Thus, no educated Macedonian would use ana or demek in formal writing, but even academicians and professors use them routinely in speaking. In many cases Turkisms and Turkisms will be impossible in what they imply. Thus, for example, the Turkism kupadžija “goldsmith” indicates a dealer in traditional jewelry while the Gallicism bijuterija “jewelry” implies modern, Western-style items. In other cases, the Turkisms will remain standard for the concrete meaning while its replacement will be used for abstractions, thus, for example Turkish kavun is the standard word for ceiling, but the French plafon is used in abstract or figurative expressions such as plafon na cenite “price-ceiling,” (cf. Korunov 1981a, 1986). In some cases, the Turkism was replaced by extending the use of a Slavic word, e.g., the use of narod “people” to mean “nation” in place of Turkisk millet as well as the international nacija.

It is interesting to compare the suggestions of language codifiers during the first decade of development with the realities of usage thirty years later. For example, Markov (1955) sought to limit and reduce the spread of the suffixes -džija, -ija, and -jak by suggesting replacements, e.g., lebar “baker” for farndžija; čevlar “shoemaker” for kondadžija, etc. In an article in “Nova Makedonija” (NM) (21-X-83:3), a list of enterprises involved in the news story included the following: prodavci na zelenjak “vegetable sellers” (not zarezvatari); čevalari (not kordanadžari); česnari (not sačari); farndži (vs lebari); slatkarici i leblebishiči “sweet shops and roasted chicken shops” (not šekerdžiči i leblebisički rabulnici); i.e., in the language of the daily press, must not but all the replacements have taken hold.

In many ways, by 1990 the situation had become the reverse of what it had been a century ago or even half a century ago. Writers such as Koroški († 1820) and Pindor († 1845) had to gloss many of their Slavic words with Turkic equivalents, which were more familiar to ordinary people, but modern-day collec-
humor are seen in articles about the lighter side of rural life, especially minor
domestic squabbles, e.g. tvam miaubet “I make conversation” (literary tvam)
so nozi... ama sabajte... “what could he do... in the morning” (literary sto
moze) (NM 6-11-83:5). Sometimes an author uses Turkisms simply to convey a
sense of the old fashioned without quoting anyone, as in a local color piece about
an old man who nie pazaroj nabavego emis i zarcezit “gets fruit and vegetables
at the market” (Tkm otm. zarcezit “fruit, vegetable” versus literary ovoce, zelen-
ica) (NM 1-8-82:5).

Other times, the effect is purely pejorative, e.g. an article about the European
Economic Community Ekonomski Zden – politicko dzude (Sabota 2-6-796)
“Economic giant – political dwarf” vs. Giganzi vo zgradba (Sabota 17-7-795)
“Giants under construction” about a new hidroelektrana “hydroelectric power
plant”. (A similar contrast is provided by a cartoon of a fat old man in a blue suit
and black top hat labeled “EZ” (Evropska zasedcna “European Community”)
sitting on a ledge looking out over a distant battle and conflagration. On his back,
the word pozmatric “observer” printed in neat white letters has been crossed out
in black and below printed in a handwritten style is the word vezisja, a Turkism
with the same basic meaning, but with the connotation of “bystander, rubber
neck”. (NM 4-10-92:11) A particularly interesting phenomenon in the use
of Turkisms for ironic-pejorative purposes is their coupling with very recent loan-
words – also used ironically – as in an article headline Biznes samo za dezaradke
(NM 26-1-84:7) which could be translated roughly “Deals only for crookedness.”

One phenomenon relating to local color which has not been remarked else-
where is the use of Turkisms for regional identification. Thus, for example, jebe
“anyway, never mind” (Tkm jebe) is perceived by speakers from Bitola as being
particularly characteristic of their region. This raises the question of the distribu-
tion of particular Turkisms in Macedonian dialects, which still requires investiga-
tion.

It is also worthy of note that serious articles concerning modern Turks and
Turkey make a special effort to avoid words of Turkish origin if an alternative
exists. Thus, for example, an article on Turkish film director Yilmaz Guney (NM
7-9-82:5) did not contain a single word of Turkish origin, although the discussion
of industriousness and work habits, never afforded ample opportunities. An article on Yuruk fa-
lore (NM 29-5-81:5; the Yuraks are a Turkish ethnic group living in the Stri-
povod region) used obichaj “custom” (vs. Tkm adek) and even the uncommon za-
bratka “kercif” was then glossed with the standard word samija, which
happens to be of Turkish origin.

Although, as was mentioned above, the situation described by Kazazis (1972)
in the early seventies was still true into the late eighties, a linguistic effect of
political pluralism in the post-89 upheavals has been the rise of dialectal forms
and Turkisms in serious public discourse. Thus, for example the Turkism tajga has
become the neutral colloquial word for “group” while the term grupa (a so-called
internationalism) has taken on the negative connotations of “faction”. This, too,
could be associated with earlier debates concerning the position of Turkisms in
literary normativization.

Although, as indicated earlier, there was a school of thought that favored
the retention of Turkisms in the literary language both as a distinctive feature of Ma-
donian and as a characteristic of colloquial speech, other scholars opposed the
incorporation of most Turkisms on the grounds that their stylistic nuances were
unsuitably ironic, dialectal, or old-fashioned (e.g. Koneski 1945). The prolifera-
tion of Turkisms in the press and other media and contexts in which the norm
is expected can be seen as an attempt to “democratize” Literary Macedonian via
colloquialization. The logic of such a tendency would be that since the literary
standard of the 1944–1990 period tended to eschew Turkisms in formal contexts
while they continued to thrive in colloquial speech (cf. Koreski 1994), and since
the 1944–1990 period was characterized by a one-party system, the eschewing
of Turkisms is a characteristic of monism. Thus the opposite tendency, i.e. the use
of Turkisms in formal contexts, becomes a marker of “democracy”.

The success of the trend to avoid Turkisms has resulted in the need for folkloric
collections to contain extensive glossaries of Turkisms along with regional expres-
sions. The obsolescence of some Turkisms has progressed to the point that even
graduate students in Slavic philology do not know words like atija “clothes iron”,
which were still in common use two or three decades ago. As indicated above,
Turkisms have always been more common in informal styles than in formal speech
or writing, and the recent rise in the use of Turkisms appears to be connected
with a tendency to colloquialize the literary language in opposition to establish-
ment norms. Although ironic usage still occurs, there are many serious uses in a
broad range of contexts, albeit many of these contexts are negative, e.g. Nema veke
bezplano lekvarje: Najdragi primer e Valandovski koide momentino
dari 85 osto od osigurivace se lekwaet na vezisja. (NM 8-17-91:5) “There is
no more free health care! The most drastic example is Valandovo, where at the
moment already 85% of those insured are being treated on credit.” The use of
the Turkism vezisja instead of the Anglicism kredit is striking here, as its use is
clearly not ironic, nor is it historical, rather it is colloquial-pejorative in style but
serious in intent. However, Turkisms are also being used more in positive contexts
as well, e.g. Tatunot dogodina nema da bile badijala (NM 1-11-92:3) “Next
year’s tobacco will not be for nothing”. Another new source of Turkisms in the
news has been the increased attention focused on Islam and Islamic countries such
as Iran. Thus, for example, the word medjilt is routinely used to refer to the
Iranian parliament. This same word (medjilt) is used in English-language news ac-
counts, but in English the word must be glossed whereas in Macedonian it is a
revived Turkism.

From a sociolinguistic point of view, Turkish has become an object of affection
and nostalgia for some urban Macedonians in comparison with the perceived com-
petition from Albanian. It thus seems that a combination of pluralist linguistic
politics and tensions with Albanian have contributed to a shift in usage and atti-
due concerning Turkisms among Macedonian-speakers. To this can be added the
fact that recent events in neighboring countries have contributed to increased
closeness and cultural cooperation between Macedonia and Turkey.

6 The fact that this reasoning is essentially syllogistic does not change its ability to affect
linguistic usage.
Turning now to Albanian we find essentially the same basic situation as in Macedonian. In both Macedonian and Albanian productive derivational suffixes based on Turkish, e.g. Macedonian -dzie, -lak, Albanian -xhî-ç, -leq, are sources of variation both in older Turkisms that are replaced by formations using native material, e.g. Macedonian tòlvor lòz kundragëve or Albanian kepbaxor lòz kun-straxhë all meaning “shoemaker” (cf. English cobbler), and in their ability to produce new lexicon to compete with the old, especially at marked stylistic levels, e.g. Macedonian lòvëz “huntsman”, Albanian tshashëbëshë “gossip-monkey” and newer Macedonian majgolek “masterpiece (of poor quality)”, Albanian avo- katëlek “advocate” (regardless of the actual merits of the case), cf. also Albanian paterkaçi “party hack” (FeV 29-VII-94:11) but njerizik “humaneness” (Tribuna-Sh 20-VII-94:21). It is noteworthy that Turkish -bane is not at all productive in Albanian and -li only very weakly so, albeit there are other suffixes, e.g. -kar, that do show limited productivity (i.e. the ability to combine with non-Turkish words, albeit not indiscriminately), e.g. grabtjak “robber”, mundjak “hard worker” (see Boretzky 1975: 265–269).

There has been a significant puristic movement in Albania that has sought to eliminate as many foreign elements as possible, and Turkisms have been a particular focus of that campaign (cf. Kostallari et al. 1973). Although Albanian linguists outside of Albania have tended to endorse developments and trends in Albania since the literary unification of 1968–1972, such does not always appear to be the case. Thus, for example, Qemal Murati in one of his series of articles on calques in Albanian (FeV 13-3-90:5) recommends using the “Turkish ajsi “flatiron” (Tk. ajsi) rather than native bekr “iron” (both the metal and other meanings) on the grounds that the use of bekr to mean “flatiron” is a calque on the Romance languages. This could be seen as a tendency parallel to that which sought to endorse the use of Turkisms in the early years of the codification of literary Macedonian.

In Albanian, as in Macedonian, Turkisms are characteristic of colloquial style and are also used for pejoration, historical flavor, and local color. Thus, the Gëg dialect columns of “Flaka e vellazërimt” (FeV) abound in Turkisms that are not found in the Standard Albanian dictionaries, e.g. memnuq “pleased” (Tk. memnuq, Standard Albanian i kënuq, cf. also Boretzky 1976: 92). In the immediate pre- and post-independence period (1990–1992) the Albanian-language press in Macedonia did not seem to manifest a significant expansion of Turkisms, but the use of Gëg in serious contexts appeared to increase. Thus, for example, an article entitled Ditë e natë, pagja mesi e pritrje “Day and night, sleeplessness and waiting” (FeV 7-7-91:8), describing the anguish of parents waiting at the Macedonian Red Cross in Skopje for news of their children sent in the Yugoslav war, one of the parents was quoted in Gëg. It could be argued that this quotation was used for emotive purposes, but if so, it clearly shows that in such stressful situ-
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9 Most items in -dëli are Turkish. The chief exception appears to be words such as skrapar “person from Skrapar”.

Standard Albanian is based on the southern (Tosk) dialect region of Albania, most of the dialects of Macedonia and all those of Kosovo and Montenegro belong to the northern (Gëg) group.
the realm of oral communication. As in the other Balkan languages, Romani has borrowed not only lexical items but also productive suffixes, e.g., *ajšic/tajšic/sičic* "mill/miller" (cf. Boretsky 1992). Thus, although the actual number of Turkisms in Romani is no greater than that in any other coloquial Balkan language (cf. Friedman 1989b; cf. also Boretsky 1992), the colloquial base of Literary Romani leaves open the possibility that a greater number of Turkisms will find their way into the colloquial language currently in the process of development. Because Turkisms are extremely rare in the Romani dialects spoken outside the boundaries of the former Ottoman Empire, however, the fate of Turkisms in Literary Romani will depend in some degree on the extent to which the Romani dialects of the Balkans serve as the basis for the currently emerging Romani literary language (Friedman 1989b; cf. also Kazazis 1972:295).

A concrete example of the fact that Turkisms that have been stylistically lowered in the other Balkan languages (and even in Turkish itself) need not undergo the same transformation in Romani can be cited from the extraordinary census conducted in the Republic of Macedonia in June-July 1994. In accordance with article 35 of the census law, instructions for enumerators and census forms had to be made available in the six major languages of the Republic of Macedonia (see note 3). In the case of Romani (and Arumanian) the fact that the literary norm is still in the process of elaboration meant that the census documents themselves became part of the process of codification. Among the items to be enumerated were the number of baths and toilets in each dwelling. All those languages with established elaborated norms used euphemistic neologisms or recent borrowings as their official terminology on the census forms (P-2, VL8 and 9 in Antounovska 1994): Macedonian banja, klozet, Albanian bany, nevotore, Turkish banya, banyo ayakyaoda, Serbian kupatilo, klozet. Except for the Serbian deverbal noun meaning “bathing place” all the words for “bath” are Latinate borrowings. The Macedonian and Serbian words for “toilet” are from the British (water)closet, while the Albanian and Turkish are neologisms that can be glossed as “necessary” and “bath-footplace”, respectively. The Romani documents, however, used the Turkisms hamam and knces respectively. Hamam is the standard Turkish word for “bath” but has come to mean “Turkish bath” or “public bath”, while the knces is considered vulgar in Turkish as well as in the other Balkan languages. These terms serve as clear and concrete examples that the function of Turkisms in Romani is following its own path of development and is more resistant to stylistic lowering.

This difference of Romani from the other Balkan languages with respect to Turkisms may be reinforced by the fact that upon leaving India the Roms came into direct contact with Persian and borrowed a number of important words. Some of these Persian words, e.g. bakt “luck, happiness”, are found throughout the Romani dialects and also in Turkish, which undoubtedly reinforced their retention in the Balkan Romani dialects. Others occur in Balkan Romani and Turkish but not in all Romani dialects, e.g. *laf* (Tk lâf) "word" (English Romani *law* but elsewhere vorba, soato, dama, thavadi, etc.). Although the conscious attempt to eliminate Turkisms (or Arabo-Persianisms) in the Balkan literary languages has resulted in their stylistic lowering or marginalization (but, as noted above, this process is not necessarily irreversible), the same motivations need not apply to Literary Romani.

Moreover, Romani language planners have fewer nonlinguistic reasons for eliminating words of Turkish origin. As was mentioned, many of these words are ultimately of Persian origin. Since the Indic and Iranian languages share a common Indo-European dialectal ancestor (Indo-Iranian), such words are historically more closely related to Romani than to the other Indo-European languages of the Balkans. Moreover, some of them were borrowed directly from Persian during the early history of the Romani people. Thus, for example, while *badusz* "luckless" is a Turkism in Macedonian (< *bahtsz*), *bakt* "luck" is a Persism in Romani. In addition to this, the elimination of Turkisms from the other Balkan languages was in part motivated by political independence from the Ottoman Empire. In the case of Romani, the Turkish language does not occupy a similar political position as distinct from other non-Romani languages. This can be seen in the use of Turkisms when calquing from Slavic, e.g. *atazi* "vote" (Turkish ara*zi* "voice, shout < Persian awza "voice") is based on Slavic glas meaning both "voice" and "vote" (cf. also the example from the 1994 census documents given above). Moreover, given the line of thought that favors Romani vocabulary enrichment by borrowing from other Indic languages, the presence of a loanword in both an Indic language of India and in Romani could be construed as justification for retaining the word in Romani regardless of its ultimate origin or the fact that it entered the languages independently. Thus, for example, *Jutuv*Kepeski (1980) use the Balkan Turkism *zamani* for "epoch, time", and mark it as a Hindi word in their vocabulary despite the fact that it comes from Arabic *zamân* and probably entered Hindi via Persian.11

Arumanian and Megleno-Romanian both have significant Turkish lexical components (Atanasov 1990:249–251, 1991; Golea 1984:195–261; Caragioiu and Mironeanu 1975; Pasca 1925:106–177) cites over 1000 Turksisms in Arumanian, although Purçariu (1976:316) states that Megleno-Romanian has many Turkisms not found in Arumanian. According to Atanasov (1990:249), Turkish ranks after Macedonian and Greek as outside sources of vocabulary, and either of these may actually have served as the intermediary for the Turkisms. Basically, however, the situation is comparable with that of Romani. Like Romani, Arumanian is used in both print and mass media, but it is still primarily a language of oral communication, and as such the colloquial far outstrips the literary in usage and frequency. The elaborations of an Arumanian standard could choose to preserve Turkish words, or attempt to eliminate them as non-Romance or old-fashioned, but at present the matter is not yet settled. Just as in Romani there is an Indicizing current of thought that favors the massive introduction of vocabulary from the Indic languages of India, so in Arumanian there is a Romanizing current. In

---

11 Perhaps the most striking example of such lexical spread from Arabic is illustrated by the story of Morris Goodman, a Professor of African linguistics at Northwestern University. While attending the International Congress of Linguists in Bucharest, he attempted to buy some matches from a kiosk. He did not know Romanian, and the proprietor was unable to understand when he tried the word for "matches" in English, French, German, Dutch, and Russian. Finally, as he was leaving in frustration, he flung the Swahili word at her: "Kibiri!" The proprietor beamed understanding and exclaimed: "Ah, chibiri!"
some respects, however, the Arumanian situation parallels Macedonian as opposed to Romani (or Albanian). Just as official Bulgarian policy continues to maintain that Macedonian is a dialect of Bulgarian and to deny the legitimacy and independence of the Macedonian language, so, too, there are Romanians who will insist that Arumanian is a dialect of Romanian. The lack of territorial contiguity between the Republic of Macedonia and Romania combined with the relatively small number of Arumanians in Macedonia renders these pressures and polemics less significant, but they could help reinforce a desire to differentiate Arumanian from Romanian by retaining Turkisms rather than adopting Romanisms. For Arumanian, as for Romani, the 1994 Macedonian census forms provide a striking example of colloquial Turkisms preserved as literary forms. As mentioned above, the census documents themselves functioned as part of the codification of literary Arumanian. Like Romani, Arumanian used Turkisms for “bath” and “toilet” in census instructions and forms, viz. bañamani and hale, respectively. The latter, from Turkish hâle appears in Albanian as hale, where it is considered colloquial and would never have been used in a formal government document. Thus we see a parallel process in Romani and Arumanian in which the looseness of the emerging norm to current speech favors retention of commonly used Turkisms without stylistic lowering or marginalization.

In the process of vocabulary development, all of the nascent Balkan literary languages of the nineteenth and first three-quarters of the twentieth centuries made some overt attempts to eliminate vocabulary of Turkish origin, but in the case of Turkish itself these same words are often also considered foreign, being of Arabo-Persian origin (see Kazazis 1972:93–94). Thus in many cases the Turkisms of the Balkan languages are the Ara–Persianisms of Turkish, since it served as the intermediary via which many words of Arabic and Persian origin entered the Balkans. We thus have the interesting situation in which the same terms are considered archaic in both Turkey and the Balkan languages. For example, Turkish münnâsîî (Arabic munsâsîb), Macedonian munique, Albanian mvestës “suitable” have been replaced, by ngan, zgoden, and pershteshim, respectively. Similarly the Turkish Arabicism millet “nation, people” has been replaced by native ulas in Turkish, narod in Macedonian, and kombe in Albanian. In Turkey, too, this vocabulary can be stylistically manipulated with political implications. Thus, for example, politically right-wing publications such as the newspaper “Jercuman” favor older Arabo-Persian vocabulary while leftist publications such as the newspaper “Cumhuriyet” support Turkish neologisms (cf. Friedman 1988a, Boeschoten 1991).

It is even possible to speak of Balkan Turkisms in the Turkish dialects of Macedonia (West Rumelian). In this context, Balkan Turkism refers to the phenomenon of Turkish words borrowed by various Balkan languages and then borrowed back into Rumelian Turkish. In some cases, these represent shared dialectal processes, e.g., the loss of /i/ in amam “Turkish bath” (< hamam) but in others the form found in dialectal Turkish has been borrowed back from another contact language, as in Macedonian Turkish argat “day laborer” vs. Standard Turkish argat (< Greek argat), where the initial /a/ represents a Macedonian adaptation whose form then influences the local Turkish dialect. Macedonian Turkish educators strive to replace these local forms with the literary ones (cf. Zekrezi 1976, Friedman 1982). In some cases, a neologism introduced in Turkey will be kept in the Balkan variant of literary Turkish even after it has gone out of use in Turkey. As a result, Balkan Turkish sometimes sounds “old fashioned” not because it has retained what we can call an “old” or “Ottoman” Turkish but because it has retained an obsolete neologism. A thorough study of these phenomena has yet to be done.

A type of politically motivated differential use of “Ottoman” Turkisms similar to that seen in Turkey is also taking place in FSC. In the case of FSC, Turkisms have become symbolic in the breakdown of FSC into at least three literary languages, possibly more (see note 3). This breakdown helps reflect and reify the disintegration of former Yugoslav society. Language planners and others in the FSC-speaking territory utilize the encouragement or discouragement of FSC Turkisms as one of the means of increasing the differentiation of the codified norms or literary languages currently developing out of FSC. These attempts are directly connected with the political will to establish the separateness and identity of the nation and state via language. Croatian planners are coming or reviving neologisms or incorporating dialectalisms that on occasion, ironically, reduce the distinctiveness of Croatian by coinciding with Slovenian. Following the paradigm that identifies religion, nationality, and language (Croatian = Catholic, Serbian = Orthodox), Bosniac nationalists utilize Islam as the religion of national identity, and Bosniac language planners are attempting to reinstate as much as possible of the pre–Arabo–Persian lexicon of previous centuries, when Islam was the state religion of Turkey in Europe. Meanwhile, although Serbian continues to follow the lines of development which until recently were common to FSC, which Serbian is accused of having dominated, there is pressure to avoid lexical items that have become identified with other variants of FSC. Thus, for example, in order to say “belt”, the speaker of Serbian must choose the Slavic pojas, the speaker of Bosnian must choose the Turkism kabi, while the Croatian is told to use the neologistic oklopasti pantolodridac “circum-waist panholder". Moreover, Bosnian is attempting to lay exclusive claim to the entire Turkish vocabulary of FSC. Thus, for example, Prčić (1994) writes that the (common FSC) Turkism kosišak “neighborliness” is a true Bosnian word expressing an essential feature of Bosnian culture to which it is unique. Turkisms thereby play a uniquely differentiating role in FSC not found in any of the other languages spoken in the Republic of Macedonia. The future of Turkisms in the FSC of the Republic of Macedonia is

---

12. While this was implicit in the case of Romani, it was explicit in the case of Arumanian instructions to enumerators, which included a special last page with guide to the pronunciation of the orthography and a justification of the choice of symbols preceded by a brief statement on the significance of the census for the development of Arumanian.

13. From the nineteenth century to the end of World War One, during World War Two, and again since the outbreak of the Yugoslav War there have been linguists, politicians, and others who have openly attempted to break this paradigm via concepts such as Catholic Serb, Muslim Croat, etc. They are generally viewed merely as nationalists attempting to extend Serbian or Croatian territorial hegemony via assimilation.
difficult to predict. At least some Serbs in northern Macedonia identify with the FRY and will no doubt follow its course, but the Bosnian refugees may follow a very different course of development and shift language on the basis of religion. The topic merits careful future study.

Looking now at the commonalities and differences in the treatment of Turkisms in the languages of the Republic of Macedonia considered here, we can begin by observing that Macedonian and Albanian have had in common the attempt to restrict or marginalize Turkisms during most of the twentieth century. Many of these same words were purged from modern Turkish because they are ultimately of Aralo-Persian origin. Among the effects of this tendency — other than heightening the split between formal and informal speech — was reduction (or shift) of the commonality of lexicon that has been one of the characteristics of the Balkan linguistic league.

A recent tendency toward colloquialization in Macedonian and conservatism in Turkish (cf. Boeschenstein 1991), however, is currently altering this direction. Just as in other ways the century seems to be ending the way it began,15 so too, Turkish and Turkish are being rehabilitated to positions of influence and status in Macedonia. The situation for Albanian appears to be paralleling the Macedonian. Turning to Romani and Arumanian, we see that the very fact of non-codification has left the Turkish component in the lexicon in much the same position as that found in other Balkan languages before codification. Both Romani and Arumanian have the potential for similar puristic and neologizing tendencies, but at present they are still close enough to their colloquial bases to utilize many Turkish loans. Romani even calques from Slavic using Turkisms, while Arumanian may use Turkisms at least to some extent to resist Romanization. In FSC, Turkisms are playing a uniquely differentiating role. While Croatian follows a path of extreme purism and Serbian continues with the type of stylistic to English seen during most of the twentieth century, Bosnian has chosen to move very consciously in the opposite direction and has selected Turkisms as a banner of identification, in a manner not altogether dissimilar from that suggested by one stream of Macedonian intellectual thought right after World War Two, albeit with different ideologically underpinnings (i.e. identity with Islam added to the creation of differential solidarity).

The difference between the relationship of Turkish to the languages of Macedonina and elsewhere in the Balkans) and that of French to English or Chinese to Japanese is striking (cf. Shiptari 1990:146). Although all three languages were in positions of superiority with relation to the languages that borrowed from them, French and Chinese have served as sources of high style vocabulary, while Turkish has been consciously relegated to low style. Recent events, however, have shown that the Turkish lexicon is not merely still vigorously present, but that its position in the overall word stock of the languages of Macedonia is still flexible.

Although the pattern for most of the twentieth century has been to reduce the commonalities among the Balkan languages by various means including the elimination of restriction of Turkisms or Aralo-Persianisms, tendencies of the past few years indicate that such a trend may not be irreversible. Nonetheless, Turkisms in the languages of Macedonia (and elsewhere in the Balkans) remain firmly identified with colloquial speech. Their fate is thus directly tied to the negotiation of the position of the colloquial in standardization, although in the case of Bosnian, the type of revival under way puts Turkish in a position much more similar to that of French or Chinese noted above. We see in this the role of politics in determining linguistic status.
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After-Effects of the Proto-Bulgarian Language

HERBERT GALTON (Vienna)

It goes without saying that the "Proto-" in the above name was not used either by or for the people referred to themselves, but is only used nowadays to distinguish them from the modern Bulgarians, who in part are descended from them. The first historical reference to such a people dates back to the year 480 AD (SINOR 1990: 258); the name probably means something like "mixed", a reference to the fact that they consisted of relics of the defeated Huns, Turkish Oghur, Katurigur and other tribes, which roved between the steppes north of the Caucasus and the Balkan Peninsula; in the year 515 they are mentioned as living on the river Volga. The great majority of the scholars dealing with them assume that the Huns were a sort of Turks (AIKHEIM 1962:279), and indeed all the titles which have been handed down, usually in a somewhat hellenized form, can be interpreted on the basis of the oldest Turkish texts, in particular the inscriptions on stone found in the Orkhon valley in present-day Mongolia, dating back to the 8th century. Some of these titles are *bula*, ultimately the source of the Russian word "boyar", *boyar tarkan* and so on. The title of the Proto-Bulgarian commander of their garrison town of Belgrade (the "white", i. e. westernmost - according to the Altaic color scheme for the four points of the compass - city of the Bulgarian Empire), who hospitably received St. Method's disciples after they had been expelled from the city of Morava (= Sremska Mitrovica) after his death in 885, is given in the Greek sources the title of *Bortiakanos*, in Old Turkish *boji targin*, the first part of which means "wolf", thus in Konstantinos Porphyrogenitos (p. III). However, for fairness' sake I should mention that other scholars think the Huns constituted a separate Altaic group, somewhere between Turks and Mongols, or that at any rate we should be careful in attributing an ethnic definition to them (PRITSAK 1982: 439). I see that latterly L. DIMITROVA-TODOROVA simply classifies Hunnic toponyms in the district of Popovo, Bulgaria, as being of Turkish origin (1993:39).

It is well known that at some time in the 6th century the Proto-Bulgars split up into a northern and a southern group, the former of which ultimately settled on the Volga roughly in the area of Kazan', where they continue today as the Chuvash people, with whom we shall not be concerned here. The southern group settled at first in Daica, from where they raided Byzantine territory, and ultimately crossed en masse over the Danube into the East Roman Province of Moesia Inferior under their Khagan Asparuch (or similar) in the year 679, and remained there. It is not reported that they in any way persecuted the Slavs living there at a former Avar border, but no doubt they kept themselves at first apart, with their language and their customs. The last ruler of the Proto-Bulgarian dynasty still born a heathen was Boris, which is an Altaic name; he ruled from 852 until 889, renamed Michael (Dvornik 1970: 51), adopted Christianity and killed off fifty of his recal-